

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
1	1.1.A	Section 1.1.A requires 3+ years of experience operating a regulated lottery/gaming central system with "terminals similar to those that are the subject of this solicitation."	Can the Agency clarify what specific characteristics of an ITLM (e.g., ticket validation method, central system architecture, prize determination method) it will use to assess whether an offeror's existing terminal deployments qualify as "similar"? Specifically, would electronic pull-tab systems used in regulated charitable gaming in other states be considered responsive to this qualification?	Yes, the RFP states, "terminals similar to those that are the subject of this solicitation." An instant ticket lottery machine ("ITLM"), which means a machine or other device provided to a retailer through the Agency's contractor as required under <u>State Government Article § 9-112, Annotated Code of Maryland</u> .
2	1.1	Attachment L	Will the Agency accept references (Attachment L) from charitable/nonprofit gaming operations regulated at the state level, even if those programs are not administered by a state lottery agency specifically?	No
3	2.1 / 2.3.1.1	Section 2.1 states the State will not procure products "still under development" or "announced but not yet engineered." Section 2.3.1.1. states "The Contractor may not provide a proposal containing items that are at the specifications and concepts stage only, early development, or that are products announced, but not yet engineered and ready for manufacture and delivery."	Please provide more clarification what is required to meet these standards in the RFP. For example, does the Agency consider a currently-deployed or previously-deployed system or systems that require(s) updates, modifications, and/or configuration/certification changes to meet Maryland-specific requirements to be "under development" for purposes of this restriction, or is that treated as standard implementation work?	The Offeror's proposal must include a demonstrable "turn-key", ready to use, complete system. At the time of submission of the offeror's proposal, the system proposed may not be "in development".
4	2.2.2.4	Section 2.2.4.3(B) says at least two new themes go to the Maryland market each year, about six months apart, and that MLGCA approves all themes.	It appears under MLGCA's responsibilities, so first: can you confirm it is the contractor who introduces them? Second, what counts as a "new theme" - is new artwork on an already-approved prize structure enough, or does it need a different prize structure? Third, does each theme	The contractor introduces theme options to the MLGCA. A new theme could be new artwork on an already-approved prize structure or a new prize

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			need its own independent lab certification and MLGCA sign-off before going live, and if so, how much approval lead time should we plan for?	structure. The contractor should introduce both throughout the course of the contract. Yes, each theme must be certified through an approved Independent Test Lab (ITL) and approved by the MLGCA before launch.
5	2.3.1.11	"Minimize Risk and Disruption. To ensure a seamless experience for players and ITLM Facilities, the Contractor is required to mitigate risks associated with conversion, specifically addressing potential data loss and system downtime. "	Is this specifically referring to the transfer of the system to a new contractor?	Yes
6	2.3.2 / 2.3.4.1 / Appendix 3	Appendix 3 identifies three separate financial file outputs: the Facility Sweep Summary/Bank Tape Report (B.11), the NACHA Appendix 3 Report/File (B.12), and the Positive Pay Report (B.8), the last of which is used to create a positive pay file uploaded to MLGCA's bank. Section 2.3.2 also references creating the sweep "after MLGCA adjustments," and Appendix 3 B.15 requires a weekly Facility Adjustment Report covering adjustments made by	Can the Agency provide: (1) the current file specifications and designated bank information for all three outputs; (2) clarification of the adjustment workflow, specifically whether MLGCA enters adjustments through an interface the Contractor must provide or communicates them for the Contractor to apply; and (3) a sample of the current weekly facility invoice?	(1) NACHA FILE: https://developer.sec.wellsfargo.com/documentation/api-references/ach-payments/v2/ach-payments-api-ref-v2 See Wells Fargo Positive Pay Format document The Facility Sweep Summary/Bank Tape Report should include the reporting period, transaction type, bank account type, bank routing number, bank account number, retailer number, retailer name and amount. Our current bank is Wells Fargo, but the vendor must be able to transition to another bank if requested by MLGCA

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		both MLGCA and the vendor.		(2) Adjustments: see 2.3.4.1 General Requirements H. The expectation is that MLGCA will use an interface to create individual retailer adjustments. However, the vendor must have the ability to adjust multiple retailers if the need should arise. (3) See attached. (NACHA FILE)
7	2.3.3.7	Section 2.3.3.7(B) requires us to follow the State of Maryland Information Technology Cybersecurity & Privacy Policy Suite.	Which version applies as of contract execution, and are there web-application-specific controls in it that apply to the reporting interfaces we provide?	https://doit.maryland.gov/policies/ci/Pages/IT-Security-Policy.aspx
8	2.3.3.7, 2.3.12.2	Section 2.3.3.7(B) requires logging every successful and failed sign-on and log-off to the Central System.	Does that include users of our web-based reporting, asset tracking, and problem management applications, including your own staff building and scheduling reports under Section 2.3.12.2(D)?	Yes. As noted in Section 2.3.3.7(B) “every” successful and failed sign-on and log-off must be logged.
9	2.3.3.9, 3.4.2.4	Section 2.3.3.9(A) states that, following Agency acceptance, software or database changes may not be implemented without prior written approval. Section 3.4.2.4 establishes liquidated damages for late or unauthorized software changes.	Please clarify the Agency's change approval process for system modifications, upgrades, and maintenance activities. Specifically: Which system components are subject to Agency review and approval requirements ? What is the expected approval workflow and timeline for routine updates, including security patches, operating system updates, bug fixes, third-party dependency updates, and other maintenance releases? Which changes, if any, require formal certification, testing, or Agency approval prior to deployment, and which may be implemented through standard operational change management procedures? Would the addition of new reports, modifications to existing reports, or other Agency-requested reporting enhancements be	All hardware and software changes must be approved by the Agency. Refer to the RFP for details. Amendments to reporting will be addressed on an as needed basis. Agency requested changes will outline reporting requirements and include the expected timeline for deployment.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			considered changes requiring prior written approval?	
10	2.3.3.11 / Appendix 3	Section 2.3.3.11(B) says the system has to email MLGCA automatically, with no human involved, about report generation and certain file access events. Appendix 3 A.10 also requires a Security Update Report covering all additions, deletions and revisions to the security schema and Central System configuration.	Which events do you want covered by the automatic notifications - every scheduled report run, every ad hoc report, every data export, every time a record is viewed? Who should receive them, and how often?	Daily / Weekly REPORTS and NOTIFICATIONS that are automated and are detailed in Appendix 3. There may be additional reporting requirements post award. These will be addressed on an ad hoc schedule.
11	Section 2.3.4.1.C-D	The RFP references a \$600 Reportable Prize threshold and \$5,000 withholding threshold	Please confirm that the Central System must maintain these as configurable parameters (not hard-coded) so future statutory or IRS changes can be applied without a code release.	Yes, must be configurable.
12	2.3.4.1.E	Section 2.3.4.1(F)(7) outlines creation of weekly bank sweep files with the Sweep amount defined as Net Proceeds (sales less prizes paid) less deductions as specified by law.	Please specify what these "deductions" would include.	Deductions could be made to an invoice. An example is a fee added to the invoice for a nonpayment fee.
13	2.3.4.1.F.7	Section 2.3.4.1(f) identifies ticket validation equipment that includes a barcode scanner and a letter-size document printer.	Please clarify the intended use of the letter-size document printer within the ticket validation process. Additionally, is the barcode scanner required for ticket validation, or may validation be performed through another method that satisfies the Agency's operational and security requirements? If the scanner is required, please describe its	The letter-size document printer is for check printing at Lottery and Gaming Headquarters. A scanner is required at all locations, including Lottery and Gaming Headquarters, for scanning TITO tickets.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			expected role in the validation workflow.	
14	2.3.4.2	Section 2.3.4.2 requires the Primary Site to be within 10 miles of MLGCA Headquarters in Baltimore.	Will the Agency consider a Primary Site that is newly established for this Contract (rather than an existing Contractor facility), provided it meets all other Section 2.3.4 requirements and is operational by the required NTP milestone?	RFP Amended. The Agency desires that the contractor operate in a location that complies with network latency limits, real-time synchronous replication constraints for data recovery. The location should be a location that ensures high-performance connectivity and rapid physical access during emergencies.
15	2.3.4.3	Back-up Site Location. The Back-Up Site may be located outside Maryland.	Please confirm: a. Whether the Back-Up Site must be located within the continental United States. b. Whether any specific jurisdictions are prohibited for regulatory/data-residency reasons, and c. Whether a shared cloud region (e.g. AWS/Azure availability zone) is acceptable	a. Yes, the Back-Up Site must be located within the continental United States. b. At this time, based on Maryland's Department of Information Technology's Policies, there are no jurisdictions within the continental United States that are prohibited. c. A cloud platform, such as AWS / Azure would be acceptable as long as the availability zone meets the geolocation requirements in the RFP (i.e. > 50 miles, within the continental U.S.).
16	2.3.5.2.A		What form must the protocol documentation take for MLGCA's security evaluation, and are proprietary encrypted TCP protocols acceptable if documented?	Communications protocols must be fully explained and documented. Proprietary encrypted TCP protocols are acceptable, but must be documented and approved by the MLGCA.
17	Section 2.3.5.2.C.2	Local server continuity. The RFP allows ITLMs to remain operational for up to 24 hours after loss of communication to the ITLM Central System, provided they remain	Please clarify: a. Whether the 24-hour clock resets upon restoration of central connectivity, and b. Whether ITLMs must automatically disable if the local Facility server fails, or if a shorter/different threshold applies. 2.3.4.9 / 2.3.12.2 25, 53 Section 2.3.4.9(B) requires all meter-reading data to reach the ITLM Central	a. Yes. b. The machines must be connected to a local server. The deals live on the local server. The ITLM must communicate transactions in real time. The purpose of the ITLM Central System polling hourly is to ensure communication is still active and functioning. Offerors are encouraged

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		connected to the local Facility server.	System in real time through an automated online process, and requires the central system to poll every machine at least once an hour. Section 2.3.4.9(C) requires the central system to acquire, read and report the full set of actual ITLM meters, and states that ITLMs may not use a meter incrementation process. In a print-on-the-fly design, plays are issued and their outcomes determined centrally, so the central system already holds the authoritative record of every transaction and the machine's meters reflect that record rather than originate it. Can the Agency clarify what the hourly poll is intended to produce in that model? Specifically: will the Agency accept the central transaction record as the system of record, with device meters polled for reconciliation and exception detection? Or does the Agency require the device-resident meters to be the authoritative source for financial and performance reporting? Relatedly, what does the Agency intend by "actual ITLM meters" and by the prohibition on a meter incrementation process where outcomes are determined centrally?	to describe in detail their solution regarding communications between the ITML Central System, ITLMs, and ITLM Facility Servers. The Agency will evaluate an offeror's proposal for its meter reading system. The meter reading system must meet the reporting requirements in the RFP.
18	2.3.7.1(U)(3)	Section 2.3.7.1(U)(3) says each machine has two separate printing mechanisms: one that prints the TITO voucher, and, for print-on-the-fly machines, a second one that prints a ticket at the end of every game	Does this mean two physically separate printers in each machine, or would a single printer that can produce both the voucher and the game ticket be acceptable?	Separate printers are preferred that pull from different paper stock because TITO tickets have specific MLGCA language on the back. This language/size/scale would not be the same as the individual game play ticket. MLGCA will consider a proposal with a single printer provided the proposal can accommodate the RFP requirements i.e. multiple ticket stock.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
19	2.3.7.1, 2.3.7.2	Machines are allowed to offer free bonus plays that do not require another wager (Section 2.3.7.2(D)). Section 2.3.7.1(U)(3)(b) says a ticket prints at the end of every game.	Does each free bonus play get its own printed ticket, or can a single ticket cover the base play plus all of its bonus rounds?	A single ticket may cover the base play plus all of its bonus rounds.
20	2.3.7.1, 2.3.11.1	Section 2.3.7.1(Y) is headed "Instant Ticket Reader and Dispenser" and requires a mechanism for reading and dispensing Instant Tickets that confirms the order and result of every play via the ITLM Facility server or the ITLM Central System.	On a print-on-the-fly machine there is no pre-printed ticket to read, so we would like to understand how the confirmation obligation applies Does every play have to be confirmed against the facility server or the central system before the result is shown to the player and the ticket prints, or may confirmation be recorded after the play completes? And what does "order" mean here - strict sequence within a pool, or simply that each play is recorded in sequence?	Yes, a ticket on a print on the fly configuration would have to be confirmed in the system in real-time. Order means "sequence within a pool".
21	2.3.7.3.C, E.3-4		(a) Please confirm whether the progressive amount must also be displayed on an ITLM's game-selection (lobby) screen before a player has selected a game or denomination. (b) If so, for a multi-game, multi-denomination ITLM participating in more than one progressive link, please specify what must be displayed at the game-selection level	a. Yes, if offered, the progressive amount must also be displayed on the ITLM game-selection screen. b. Offerors are encouraged to propose how they would display their progressive display for MLGCA to evaluate.
22	2.3.7.10 (B)	"Before shipping any ITLMs into, out of, or within the State, a Contractor is required to submit a written notification to the MLGCA ("Shipping Notice").	How much time ahead? Is there a specific template?	MLGCA has required a 10-day shipping notification for the ITLM program. Upon award, a template will be provided to the Contractor.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
23	2.3.5.2 (D)	2.3.5.2 (D) 26 Section 2.3.5.2 D states "Any remote access, control, or dialing into an ITLM or server from an external device is prohibited unless the MLGCA provides prior written authorization".	Would we be able to get a blanket statement that covers support teams logging in remotely via logme in to provide troubleshooting? We can clarify that the log in sessions are recorded and track who was in the server and when (a) must all 14 meter categories also persist in terminal-local battery-backed/NVRAM storage for 10 days, or does server-side persistence satisfy the requirement?	No, a blanket approval is not acceptable. Any and all remote access must be requested and approved by the MLGCA, as stated in the RFP.
24	2.3.7.1.M, 2.3.8.3		Does the no-automatic-clearing rule prohibit operator-initiated *period* meter resets when lifetime meters are immutable?	Any meter resets require MLGCA approval.
25	2.3.7.2A	Section 2.3.7.2(A) states that maximum bet for any single play event shall be set by the MLGCA	Can you provide guidance on MLGCA's current position on bet levels?	MLGCA does not have particular restrictions. Offeror may include in its proposal any bet levels it wishes to propose.
26	2.3.7 (R)	"Tampering Alarm. The ITLM cabinet shall have a sensor with an alarm to detect tampering. At the time the alarm is tripped the ITLM shall also send a transaction to the ITLM Central System. "	Will the alarm need to create an event that is logged in the system?	Yes.
27	2.3.7.1 , 2.3.9.4	Section 2.3.9.4 says every Instant Ticket needs a barcode, and it is very specific: interleaved 2-of-5 symbology, 21 digits, and a 95% first-pass read rate.	If barcode requirement does apply to print-on-the-fly tickets, would a (a) printing a unique instant ticket ID or (b) printing the encoded 21 digits mentioned in section 2.3.9.4 B(2) on the ticket suffice in place of the barcode?	The game play ticket that is "printed on the fly" should include both a barcode and the unique code or something comparable. The RFP will be amended to reflect the flexibility in the two types of codes required.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		But Section 2.3.7.1(U)(3)(b), which lists what has to appear on a print-on-the-fly ticket, does not mention a barcode at all.		
28	2.3.7.3.C, F, E.4		(a) Please confirm that per-ITLM on-screen progressive meters, continuously displaying the current jackpot amount on every linked ITLM, satisfy the display requirements of Sections 2.3.7.3.C and E.4. (b) When a progressive jackpot is recorded, please confirm whether displaying the winning amount on the triggering ITLM's own display alone satisfies Section 2.3.7.3.F, or whether the winning amount and the identification of the triggering ITLM must also be presented on the remaining linked ITLMs' displays	The MLGCA does not currently offer progressives. The progressive option and how it would be managed would have to be MLGCA approved if proposed.
29	2.3.7.6	Section 2.3.7.6 requires Contractor to provide Validation Terminal at each ITLM facility.	Is there are preference or requirement that these be fully automated kiosks or is a traditional point of sale capable of reading a TITO ticket acceptable?	A traditional POS is acceptable.
30	2.3.7.14 (E-1)	"Response Requirements. The Contractor is responsible for monitoring the operational status of all ITLMs. In the event of a malfunction, the Contractor must restore the affected ITLM to service within three (3) hours. This three-hour response window excludes any time the ITLM Facility is closed	1. What is considered a malfunction? 2. Does the 3-hour response window apply from the time of ITLM malfunction, or from the time MLGCA or the facility notifies the Contractor of the malfunction? 3. Does this requirement apply to situations that cannot be resolved by remote support and require on-site intervention. 4. What documentation or evidence does MLGCA require from the Contractor to support a restoration-time claim?	1. A malfunction in a gaming machine refers to any technical fault, software bug, or hardware failure that causes the machine to operate outside of its approved regulatory parameters or be non-operational. 2. When host facility notifies the Contractors, the 3-hour window applies. 3. Yes. 4. A log is required per the SLA.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		for business. The MLGCA retains the ultimate authority to determine whether an ITLM has been restored to service and whether it occurred within the mandated timeframe. "		
31	2.3.7.14 (E-7)	Requires a physical maintenance log in each ITLM's cabinet, retained 3 years.	Is a digital log acceptable in place of or alongside the required written log, provided it captures the same fields (date, time, entrant, areas inspected/repaired)?	A digital log alongside a written log is acceptable, but a written log inside the machine must exist.
32	2.3.7.14 (E-7)	Requires "at least one" on-site ITLM Technician for "at least one (1) day" after a new facility opens	Does the Tech have to be physically on site for all day 1 operation, regardless of size of the location or ITLM count?	Yes.
33	2.3.8.4	Section 2.3.8.4 requires ITLMs to support capability to "key" or transfer lock up amounts directly to credit meter.	Can you please elaborate on what is intended here?	A jackpot prize of \$600 (configurable – not hard coded into the system) or more is won, the ITLM must lock-up. An authorized individual must be able to "key" the machine out of lock-up. Sending the win to the credit meter and allowing player/winner details to be gathered and processed through the central system for processing.
34	2.3.8.2 / 2.3.8.3	Section 2.3.8.2 covers restoring credits after a malfunction, and Section 2.3.8.3(A) covers keeping accounting data for 10 days after a power interruption. Neither one covers what happens when a play finishes but the ticket	When the machine comes back up, should it reprint the ticket, void and reissue the play, or something else? Is a specific audit record or notification required when this happens?	Offerors are encouraged to detail their suggested path for post error / malfunction recovery record-keeping.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		does not print, whether from power loss, running out of paper, or a jam.		
35	2.3.8.5 (E) Appendix 3	Appendix 3 A.2 requires a daily Software Utility Check Report showing validation status during startup, normal operation, and shutdown of each ITLM. Section 2.3.8.5(E) further states that the ITLM Central System will perform real-time software version checks and implement a mechanism such as electronic signatures or similar verification methods to prevent unauthorized modification.	Please clarify the scope and intent of these software verification requirements. Specifically: What software and system components are subject to validation (e.g., ITLM software only, or also the Central System and related infrastructure)? Does the required validation consist solely of software version verification against approved builds, or are additional integrity checks (e.g., electronic signatures, checksums, hashes, or similar mechanisms) expected? What information should be included in the Software Utility Check Report during "normal operation" as distinguished from startup and shutdown events?	The scope is detailed in the RFP reference. The intent is to have a record of validation or verification of all applicable software and hardware functionality.
36	2.3.9.5	2.3.9.5(C) says every play symbol has to be paired with a caption spelling it out in smaller text.	Does that apply to the ticket a print-on-the-fly machine prints, to what is displayed on screen, or to both?	2.3.9.5(C) is only applicable if an Offeror utilizes play symbols. If Alphanumeric characters are used, no caption is necessary.
37	2.3.9.8	2.3.9.8 States "Each Deal must have the same quantity of instant tickets. Deal sizes may be approved by MLGCA by the theme and prize point".	Clarity on if all prize points across themes have to have the same deal size (\$5 tickets on all games have the same deal size) OR if all prizes within a theme have to be the same deal size (All tickets \$1,\$2 etc in Game A have the same deal size)	For clarification – "All deal sizes should be the same, no matter the prize point."

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

QUESTION	RFP SECTION	RFP CONTEXT	OFFEROR QUESTION	MLGCA RESPONSE
38	2.3.9.4, 2.3.11	asks us to say whether we use Deals at all.	If we run print-on-the-fly from a pool that is not split into Deals, what should go in the Deal code portion of the barcode? Would a different pool identifier be acceptable there instead?	A deal is required. Offerors who have alternative proposals are encouraged to propose how their solution would satisfy the requirement.
39	2.3.9.10	Section 2.3.9.10(F) says MLGCA can require all identification letters and numbers on tickets to be both OCR-A readable and barcoded.	Do you intend to require that for print-on-the-fly tickets under this contract?	The identification letters and numbers will need to be on tickets with OCR-A readable with a barcode or a comparable alternative.
40	2.3.9.12	Section 2.3.9.12 requires that any Instant Ticket be reconstructed upon demand, with a monthly reconstruction report and records kept for at least three years.	For a print-on-the-fly play, what does reconstruction include - the transaction and result data for the play (ticket number, pool, wager, outcome, prize, date/time, machine), or also a reproduction of what was displayed to the player on screen?	Reconstruction in a print on the fly configuration would include a physical ticket and a report of the ticket.
41	2.3.11	2.3.11 covers Print-on-the -Fly Instant Ticket requirements	Is there any requirement that the tickets be perforated or dispensed individually versus being dispensed as a continuous roll?	Yes. An individual game ticket must be dispensed after each play. They must be dispensed individually and cannot be grouped and then dispensed at cash out.
42	2.3.12 / Appendix 3	Appendix 3 lists roughly forty named reports across four categories: operational for MLGCA, financial for MLGCA, financial for ITLM Facilities, and tax reporting. Section 2.3.12 also makes the Contractor responsible for building new ad hoc and scheduled reports as MLGCA requires	Is Appendix 3 the complete initial report set to be delivered at go-live? Beyond that set, roughly how many new or modified report requests per year should offerors plan for, and what turnaround does MLGCA expect? Can MLGCA also provide samples of the reports currently produced under the existing ITLM contract?	Appendix 3 states the required reports due and when they are due. New reports will be on an ad hoc schedule or as needed. Reporting will be available in Excel format at the go-live date. MLGCA doesn't expect many new reports to be requested. Offerors are encouraged to detail how they would create their system-specific reports.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
43	2.3.12.2 / Appendix 3	2.3.12.2(D) says MLGCA staff will develop, modify, save, and schedule their own reports against the reporting database	Would a commercially available reporting or business intelligence tool licensed for MLGCA users satisfy this requirement, or must the self-service capability be custom-built as part of the Central System? If a commercial tool is acceptable, is it considered a "component of the ITLM Central System" subject to the ISO/IEC 15408 requirement in Section 2.3.3.7(D)?	Origination of the tool itself is vendor defined in each proposal. Section 2.3.3.7(D) requires that all components of the central system be subject to ISO/IEC 15408 complaint. If it is a proprietary tool, it would be subject to this standard.
44	2.3.12.2 / Appendix 3	Section 2.3.12.1 requires data export in Excel, Access or text, and reports printable to PDF and exportable to CSV. Appendix 3 says financial reports "should include PDF and Excel" and does not mention Access	For the Access requirement, is a CSV or Excel export that MLGCA staff can import into Access sufficient, or does MLGCA require native Access database file (.accdb/.mdb) output?	MLGCA currently requires data export in Excel, and reports printable to PDF and exportable to CSV. (.accdb/.mdb) output is not currently required.
45	2.3.12.5	Section 2.3.12.5 says MLGCA gets read-only access to all reports plus the asset tracking, inventory management, and problem management systems.	How do you want that delivered - a login to our web application, a read-only copy of the database, an API, or is the method our choice subject to your approval?	Offerors should detail their method of delivery in their proposals.
46	2.3.12.4 / Appendix 3	There are now three different retention horizons in the documents: Section 2.3.12.4(B) requires at least 12 months of trouble tracking history available in real time; Appendix 3 C.7 requires the Machine Revenue Report to be available on request for	For each of these, does MLGCA require the data to remain live and queryable for the full period, or is migration to archival storage acceptable with a defined retrieval time? Is there a single overall retention schedule that governs all ITLM Program data?	All data must be queryable. Migration to archival storage is acceptable with a proposed retrieval time. Refer to each referenced RFP section for specific retention schedules.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		the prior 36 months; and Appendix 3 B.10 requires Weekly Program Summary data and retailer invoices, including terminated retailers, to be retained for at least seven years after the invoice date.		
47	2.3.15.9	"Key Roles. The MLGCA prefers the minimum Contractor staffing levels outlined below for specific key roles, which are required to be full-time positions unless noted otherwise. All personnel assigned to this Contract are subject to approval by the MLGCA. The Contractor is required to provide the following two categories of staff"	Can we recommend a different staffing model? Can the same team work both the Implementation and On-going Staff? Does MLGCA require the Installation Specialist and Field Technician to be distinct individuals for every install, or may one qualified individual perform both roles at a given facility?	Offerors can recommend alternative staffing models, but shall adhere to the required positions described in Section 2.3.15.9
48	2.4		Please provide more detail on how a Contractor that has not yet hired for the positions identified for Implementation and Ongoing Support can meet the RFP response requirement? The RFP references "representative sample resumes" but it is unclear what exactly is intended.	If an offeror does not have these positions in house, the Proposal should include resumes from the subcontractors with their skills and certifications offerors may require.
49	3.3.2.3	"Deficient ITLM Field Service. If the MLGCA determines that performance standards are not being met by the Contractor's field	What is considered Standards not being met?	The "performance standards" not being met refers to Service Level Agreements and response times identified in the RFP.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		service staff, the Contractor will have 30 days to deploy additional resources. If resources are not deployed: \$500 per day until additional resources are deployed. "		
50	3.4.2.4	Central System Downtime LDs. Liquidated damages of \$1,000/hour apply to Central System Downtime "in excess of 5 minutes per day."	Please clarify whether the 5-minute daily allowance is cumulative across brief interruptions or a single continuous outage threshold.	The 5-minute daily allowance is cumulative per day upon which then LDs may be assessed.
51	3.14.3	Non-renewal, Cancellation, or Expiration. All insurance policies shall be endorsed to include a clause requiring the insurance carrier to provide the Procurement Officer, by certified mail, not less than 30 days' advance notice of any non-renewal, cancellation, or expiration. The Contractor shall notify the Procurement Officer in writing, if policies are canceled or not renewed within five (5) days of learning of such cancellation or nonrenewal. The Contractor shall provide evidence of replacement insurance	While our insurers can provide notice of non-renewal or cancellation, they are challenged to provide notice of expiration because this is already a fixed and knowable date. Is there some flexibility with this requirement?	The Contractor shall provide notice that there will be replacement coverage if their existing coverage is expiring. The MLGCA does not require notice directly from the insurer.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		coverage to the Procurement Officer at least 15 days prior to the expiration of the insurance policy then in effect.		
52	3.14.3	Non-renewal, Cancellation, or Expiration. All insurance policies shall be endorsed to include a clause requiring the insurance carrier to provide the Procurement Officer, by certified mail, not less than 30 days' advance notice of any non-renewal, cancellation, or expiration. The Contractor shall notify the Procurement Officer in writing, if policies are canceled or not renewed within five (5) days of learning of such cancellation or nonrenewal. The Contractor shall provide evidence of replacement insurance coverage to the Procurement Officer at least 15 days prior to the expiration of the insurance policy then in effect.	While our insurers can provide notice of non-renewal or cancellation, they are challenged to provide notice of expiration because this is already a fixed and knowable date. Is there flexibility with the evidence of replacement insurance coverage requirement? While we are able to provide proof of replacement insurance prior to the expiration of the existing insurance, our insurance partners have challenges meeting the "15 days prior" requirement.	The Contractor shall provide proof of insurance showing that there will be replacement coverage if the existing coverage is expiring. The MLGCA does not require notice directly from the insurer.
53	4.15 & 6.6	While section 4.15 states the performance bond may be annually renewable, the bond form as referenced in	Is the State of Maryland open to amendment of the bond form language or the use of the issuing surety's bond form?	An alternative bond form may be used, but it must be approved by the State prior to use. At a minimum in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations 21.06.07.09D(2),

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		6.6 Table B does Attachment W) not contain such reference		“a bid bond on a form other than the preferred form under §D(1) of this regulation may be accepted if the form provides that the principal and the surety shall be liable under the bond in an amount at least equal to the difference between the amount of the principal's bid and such other amount or amounts for which the obligee may contract with another party to perform as required by the solicitation for which the principal's bid was submitted.”
54	5.3.2	In Table A-Attachments and Documents Required with the Proposal, the instructions for Tab A and Tab B both seem to include the table of contents. There is nothing on the “pricing form” to show how MLGCA will determine ‘lowest price’.	Which tab needs to include the table of contents? Will MLGCA average the various percentages? Will they be weighted?	Tab A requires a Table of Contents. The lowest price is determined by comparing the offerors’ financial proposals. A lower fixed percentage offered by an offeror would result in a lower price to the State and will be ranked higher than a higher percentage. Attachment #2 will be amended.
55	Attachment B	Pricing schedule requests a fee against Net Proceeds.	Please confirm definition of Net Proceeds to be sales less prizes paid. Please confirm that Net Proceeds times the fee percentage will be the revenue to Contractor and that there are no deductions before calculating the Contractor fee. If there are any deductions, please clarify types and amounts. Also, please clarify if the MBE and VSBE requirements are off of the gross or net amount. please clarify how to read the fee table. If a Contractor prices 0 to 100 ITLM locations at X% and 101 to 125 ITLM locations at Y%, how would the fee on 110 ITLM locations be calculated? Would the	Attachment #2 will be amended.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			first 100 be at X% and the next 10 be at Y% or are all 110 locations at Y%? Please explain this credit "Credit: per person, per site visit, for unused press checks/security visits." Can the MLGCA provide the specific data fields or a sample report format expected for this submission, so Offerors can confirm their logging and auditing infrastructure meets the required level of detail.	
6	Appendix 3	Requires annual failover testing with results reported to the MLGCA within five (5) business days	Can the MLGCA clarify the A.7 expected scope of this testing (e.g., full system failover vs component-level failover) and whether there is a defined format or template for the results report?	MLGCA requires a full failover. There is no industry standard for the report format, but it must capture all of the details of the event.
57	Appendix 3	The Appendix 3 header reads "Veterans' Organizations Instant Ticket Lottery Machines and Central System, Solicitation #: 2025-03," while this procurement is Solicitation 2026-02 for Veterans' and Fraternal Organizations. The body of Appendix 3 does refer to both program types.	Can the Agency confirm that the Appendix 3 provided is the current version applicable to Solicitation 2026-02, and that no reports have been added or changed for the fraternal organization expansion?	Appendix 3 provided is the current version applicable to Solicitation 2026-02. The use of 2025-03 was incorrect.
58	Appendix 3	Appendix 3 states in several places that "required data fields will be provided on request" - specifically for the Facility Sweep Summary/Bank Tape Report (B.11), the	Can the Agency provide these data field specifications and the bank file layouts now, so that offerors can size the reporting and financial file work accurately?	See the answer to question 6.

ITLM RFP 2026-02 Questions and Answers 09/02/2026 (Final)

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Facility 1099 Year-End Earnings Report (D.1), and the W2G Year-End Reportable Prize Report (D.2). The Positive Pay Report (B.8) and NACHA Report/File (B.12) are described only as "specific to bank requirements."		
59	Appendix 3	Appendix 3 B.13 requires an Expired Prize Report "due within 182 days of the date that voucher was produced," listing all vouchers that have not been paid	Can the Agency confirm that 182 days is the voucher expiration period, that the clock runs from voucher production rather than from validation or the end of the gaming week, and what the system must do with the value of an expired voucher in the weekly sweep calculation?	The 182 days until expiration begins when a voucher is produced. An uncashed prize voucher is not included in the Net Proceeds calculation and is collected and held by MLGCA until the voucher is cashed or 182 days has elapsed. After 182 days the voucher must expire.
60	Appendix 3	Appendix 3 C.10 requires a daily Progressive ITLMs Report providing a breakdown of local ITLM progressive meters and jackpots, including reinvestment (escrow) and payment values.	If an offeror proposes progressive ITLMs, can the Agency clarify what is meant by reinvestment or escrow values, whether progressive contributions must be held in a separately accounted balance, and how progressive liability is expected to be reflected in the weekly sweep and net proceeds calculation?	The ITLM Program does not currently offer any Progressive play. If an Offeror who proposes a Progressive ITLM is selected, the MLGCA will clarify reporting requirements upon award.
61	Appendix 9		Is the 1% Maryland Department of General Services processing fee calculated off of Contractor revenue before or after meeting the MBE and VSBE requirement?	The Department of General Services processing fee is calculated off of Contractor revenue before meeting the MBE and VSBE requirement.
62	Attachment Y	Attachment Y, the Data Use Agreement, requires notification to the State and to mdsoc@maryland.gov within 24 hours of	Can the Agency confirm that Attachment Y applies to the Contractor's reporting and claims systems, provide the applicable retention and disposition schedule, and clarify whether the 24	Yes, the data use agreement is applicable to the reporting and claims systems, and all other systems within the proposed solution.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		discovering or reasonably suspecting a breach, obliges the Contractor to follow a State-provided data retention and disposition schedule, and requires certified destruction or return of all personal information at termination, including personal information held by sub-processors.		The retention period is covered in Section 3.2.7 of the RFP. The 24-hour period and the 12-hour period are concurrent.
63	2.2.4.1.B; 2.2.4.2.B	§2.2.4.1.B (Veterans'): "These percentages must be easily modified should statutory changes be enacted. Any adjustments will be made at no cost to the Agency." §2.2.4.2.B (Fraternal): "Any adjustments will be made at no cost to the Agency."	Section 2.2.4.1.B states that percentages applicable to Veterans' Organizations must be easily modified should statutory changes be enacted, at no cost to the Agency. Section 2.2.4.2.B (Fraternal Organizations) carries only the "no cost" sentence and omits the "easily modified" language. Will the Lottery please confirm whether the same modification requirement applies to Fraternal Organization percentage splits?	As outlined in the RFP, any modification requirements for both Veterans' and Fraternal participants will be specific to each designation if enacted. The selected Offeror must comply with all enacted laws.
64	2.2.4.1.B; 2.2.4.2.B	§2.2.4.1.B: "State law permits the Veteran's Organization, after deducting any validated prize payout, to retain 50% of the net proceeds. The MLGCA distributes the remaining funds as follows: 5% to the Maryland Veterans' Trust Fund, to the	To what decimal precision must net revenue percentage splits be configurable for Veterans' and Fraternal Organizations? Attachment B suggests three decimal places (XX.XXX%). Please confirm the same precision applies here.	The RFP is correct for both, three decimal places (XX.XXX%) is required.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Agency an amount necessary to pay for the purchase or lease of the instant ticket lottery machines and Agency administration fees for the program, and any remaining amount to the Education Trust Fund.” §2.2.4.2.B: “State law permits the Fraternal Organization, deducting any validated prize payout, to retain 25% of the net proceeds for undergraduate, graduate, or trade school scholarships or capital improvements, capital outlays, acquisitions, or existing community outreach programs and resources. The MLGCA will distribute the remaining funds as follows: 20% to the Homelessness Solutions Program in the Department of Housing and Community Development, to be used, in consultation with the Department of Veterans and Military Families, to assist veterans and families of veterans, 5% to the		

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Maryland Veteran's Trust Fund, to the Agency an amount necessary to pay for the purchase or lease of the instant ticket lottery machines and Agency administration fees for the program, and any remaining amount to the Education Trust Fund."		
65	2.3.1.5	"Testing. The ITLM Central System, and the ITLM devices are subject to testing, at the Contractor's expense, by an MLGCA approved Independent Certified Testing Laboratory that has tested systems for the MLGCA within the past five years."	Will the Lottery please provide the list of Independent Certified Testing Laboratories that have tested systems for the MLGCA within the past five years and are therefore approved under this section?	Known Labs consist of Gaming Laboratories International (GLI), BMM Test Labs, and Eclipse Test Labs.
66	2.3.3.7.D	"All components of the ITLM Central System shall meet or exceed the standards contained in ISO/IEC 15408-1:2022-ISO/IEC 15408-5:2022 Information security, cybersecurity and privacy protection — Evaluation criteria for IT security (Parts 1 through 5) (https://www.iso.org/ Key Search Term 15408) and any subsequent updated versions. The	A search of iso.org for "15408-1:2022" returns no results; a search for "15408-1" returns a 2026 edition of the standard. We were also unable to find a list on the Maryland Lottery's website. Will the Lottery confirm that the 2026 edition of ISO/IEC 15408 is the appropriate standard to apply for this procurement, and clarify whether certification to this standard is required as part of the proposal or is instead a deliverable of the successful Offeror post-award?	Yes.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Contractor shall work with the Agency to update the testing requirements on an annual basis."		
67	2.3.1.7; 2.2.4.3.B	§2.3.1.7: "Upgrades and Updates. All upgrades and regulatory updates shall be provided at no additional cost." §2.2.4.3.B: "MLGCA must approve all themes placed into service in the State. Not less than two new themes are to be introduced to the Maryland market each calendar year, approximately six months apart."	In order to clarify the scope of "all upgrades and regulatory updates... at no additional cost", will the Lottery please answer the following questions? (a) how many games are available in the market today? (b) What is the minimum number of games that must be available, per device, at launch (by January 1, 2028)?; (c) if the Contractor offers more than the required two games per year, are additional releases, beyond the number proposed also to be provided at no additional cost?; (d) Will the Lottery please provide additional details of the existing deal structures (working papers) including deal ticket counts and payout percentages available in the market today?; and (e) Is the current payout percentage required by law? If no, will the Lottery consider alternative payout percentages (other than 90.5%)?	(a)Currently, approximately 20 game themes/ variations exist today. (b)Vendor proposed / defined as approved by MLGCA (c)Yes. (d)The MLGCA is unable to provide existing deal (game) structures because MLGCA is unable to disclose proprietary confidential financial information or trade secrets. The MLGCA does not own the currently available deals. (e)The current payout percentage is 90.5%
68	2.3.1.17; 2.3.4.1.E	§2.3.1.17: "Exclusion of Individuals. The Contractor must have a process to ensure that prizes are not paid to winners on the Voluntary Exclusion List or those with specific debts and liabilities the Lottery is required to collect from prizes that are reportable for income tax purposes." §2.3.4.1.E: "Before a prize is paid, the Contractor must	Is the comparison of claimants' Social Security numbers against Maryland Central Collection Unit debts and the Voluntary Exclusion List expected to be an automated function integrated into the ITLM Central System, or a documented manual process performed prior to payment? If yes, will the Lottery please also confirm the defined source/format of the Voluntary Exclusion List and whether the Lottery provides that list to the Contractor or a designated verification vendor?	The comparison of claimants' Social Security numbers against Maryland Central Collection Unit debts and the Voluntary Exclusion List and other payer obligations lists are expected to be an automated function. MLGCA will provide access to the identified lists and other statutory lists to the selected Contract Awardee.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		compare all claimants' social security numbers to: 1. Specific unpaid State debts to include child support and other debts collected by Maryland's Central Collection Unit ("CCU"); and 2. the Voluntary Exclusion List."		
69	2.3.1.17; 2.3.4.1.E	§2.3.1.17: "Exclusion of Individuals. The Contractor must have a process to ensure that prizes are not paid to winners on the Voluntary Exclusion List or those with specific debts and liabilities the Lottery is required to collect from prizes that are reportable for income tax purposes." §2.3.4.1.E: "Before a prize is paid, the Contractor must compare all claimants' social security numbers to: 1. Specific unpaid State debts to include child support and other debts collected by Maryland's Central Collection Unit ("CCU"); and 2. the Voluntary Exclusion List."	The Lottery's Expanded Cashing Authority Program (XCAP) already validates larger winning tickets through authorized retailers, with claim tiers up to \$5,000 at XCAP retailers, up to \$25,000 at casino cashier windows, and above that at the Lottery's Customer Resource Center. With access to the ITLM validation file, XCAP retailers should be able to redeem winning ITLM tickets under this same structure. How is the Lottery handling these queries today? Will the Lottery accept a solution that leverages the existing XCAP infrastructure for prize validation and required debt/exclusion-list screening, rather than requiring the Contractor to build a new, separate verification system?	The ITLM Contract is not subject to XCAP program.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
70	2.3.4.1.A; 2.3.4.1.F.6	§2.3.4.1.A: "The Contractor must provide an ITLM Central System and related services with comprehensive functionality which shall include, but not be limited to: ITLM devices; a means of determining the outcome for each ticket sold; validations; inventory management; marketing support; tax reporting for winners and ITLM retailers; check printing at MLGCA Headquarters; and information management reporting." §2.3.4.1.F.6: "Ticket validation equipment for MLGCA Headquarters that includes, at minimum: a fully equipped personal computer (CPU, keyboard, mouse, and monitor), a bar code scanner, a letter-size document printer, a secure check printer, a receipt printer, and all required consumable supplies for such equipment restocked by the Contractor, as needed. Contractor	Section 2.3.4.1 refers to check printing at MLGCA Headquarters. Will the Lottery please clarify what checks (prize levels) are contemplated to be paid by check at MLGCA Headquarters, which party issues them, whether prizes at or above the lock-up threshold are paid directly by the Agency, and whether the Central System is expected to generate the checks?	Any and all prize amounts or issued vouchers should be able to be paid at MLGCA Headquarters. The ITLM Central System must provide the printing functionality.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		must maintain the ticket validation equipment."		
71	2.3.2.1; 2.3.2.2; 2.3.4.1.H	§2.3.2.1: "The Contractor must prepare on a weekly basis for each ITLM facility an invoice indicating the calculations that are to be provided in the bank sweep and distribute the invoice to the MLGCA." §2.3.2.2: "After preparing an invoice, the Contractor must create the bank sweep incorporating any adjustments provided by the MLGCA." §2.3.4.1.H: "The ITLM Central System must generate the required reports and files necessary for the MLGCA to perform an electronic funds transfer with ITLM Facilities weekly and on demand. The ITLM Central System must allow for invoice adjustments, as needed or directed by the MLGCA. The ITLM Central System shall support 'Sweep on Demand' of individual ITLM Facility accounts."	Section 2.3.4.1.H states that the Central System must generate the reports and files necessary for the Agency to perform weekly and on-demand electronic funds transfers, and must allow for invoice adjustments. Please confirm whether these functions must be performed within the Central System itself, or whether they may be performed by an external process that consumes data and reports the Central System produces.	The Central System is required to perform these functions.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		The ITLM Central System must generate the MLGCA approved National Automated Clearing House Association (NACHA) file and transfer that file to the MLGCA designated financial institution."		
72	2.3.3.6.A; 2.3.4.2. A	§2.3.4.2. A: "The Contractor must provide and operate a primary data center site (the 'Primary Site'), that must include but not be limited to, facilities, equipment, and on-site staff." §2.3.3.6. A: "The purpose of the physical security component of the Security Plan is to reduce the risk of data compromise due to physical break-ins or unauthorized access to equipment and data. The Contractor must ensure that adequate protective measures are implemented for all computing resources."	A modern approach uses a commercial colocation data center rather than a Contractor-built and staffed facility. The RFP's physical-security and staffing language appears to assume a dedicated, Contractor-operated site. Please confirm whether a commercial colocation data center facility is acceptable for the primary site, the back-up site, or both.	With Agency review and approval of a specific site, a commercial colocation data center facility may be acceptable.
73	2.3.3.6.C (items 7, 18)	"Surveillance systems shall monitor all vulnerable and sensitive areas. The Contractor shall provide video monitoring systems for the computer rooms at	Please confirm whether the physical security obligations in Section 2.3.3.6 may be satisfied through the facility operator's controls and contractual commitments — evidenced by the operator's audit reports and certifications — rather than requiring duplicate Contractor-operated controls in a colocation environment.	All of the physical security controls must be in place. If these are achievable through an agreement with the facility operator, then that is acceptable.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		the Primary Site and Back-up Site. Activities must be able to be monitored remotely from the MLGCA Headquarters and recorded for security purposes. Security recordings shall be kept for a minimum of one (1) month;" (§2.3.3.6.C, item 7) "The Contractor shall control the computer room access of maintenance and other personnel;" (§2.3.3.6.C, item 18)		
74	2.3.3.6.C (item 7)	"Surveillance systems shall monitor all vulnerable and sensitive areas. The Contractor shall provide video monitoring systems for the computer rooms at the Primary Site and Back-up Site. Activities must be able to be monitored remotely from the MLGCA Headquarters and recorded for security purposes. Security recordings shall be kept for a minimum of one (1) month;" (§2.3.3.6.C, item 7)	In a colocation environment, camera systems and access records are maintained by the facility operator rather than the Contractor. Will the Lottery please clarify what form of access to that recorded material would satisfy this requirement?	The equipment must be able to be monitored and we must be able to have access with live monitoring. If this is achievable through an agreement with the facility operator, then that is acceptable.

QUESTION	RFP SECTION	RFP CONTEXT	OFFEROR QUESTION	MLGCA RESPONSE
75	2.3.3.6.C (items 11, 13)	"The Contractor shall keep a current listing or memorandum authorizing access to MLGCA staff and their access levels to the secure areas. Sensitive areas shall include, at a minimum, host systems and the communications equipment and workstations used to access host systems;" (item 11) "The MLGCA shall approve any individuals permitted to access the data centers or the equipment installed at ITLM Facilities;" (item 13)	We would not want facility-level access changes — e.g., a new bartender who needs to load printer paper — to require MLGCA pre-approval each time. Will the Lottery clarify which party is responsible for maintaining the listing of individuals authorized to access equipment installed at ITLM Facilities — the facility manager or the Contractor — and whether Agency approval is required for facility employees whose access is limited to routine tasks such as replenishing printer paper?	The Offeror would maintain a listing of authorized individuals approved by the MLGCA. Sensitive areas at an ITLM facility would include the site server and portions of the ITLM. Routine tasks such as emptying the cash box, replenishing paper supply, etc would not require sensitive keys or MLGCA approval.
76	2.3.4.2.C	"The Primary Site must be located within ten (10) miles from the MLGCA Headquarters. MLGCA Headquarters is currently located at Montgomery Park Business Center, 1800 Washington Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21230."	If colocation is acceptable, a strict 10-mile radius may unnecessarily narrow the field of qualifying facilities, including facilities operated by certified minority business enterprises. Will the Lottery please clarify the basis for the ten-mile radius requirement and whether the Agency would consider broadening it to any location within the State of Maryland?	The RFP will be revised to allow greater flexibility in the location of the primary data site.
77	2.3.4.2.H; 2.4.4.2.A	§2.3.4.2.H: "Contractor's on-site staff must be available to MLGCA 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every day of the year." §2.4.4.2.A: "Generally. For security purposes,	ITLM Facilities themselves are not open 24/7/365, and this staffing level appears drawn from higher-volume, higher-density lottery/VLT programs rather than a program of this scale. Given the limited operating hours of veteran and fraternal clubs and number of actual locations licensed to offer ITLMs, will the Lottery	Requirement removed from RFP. RFP Amended.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		there shall never be fewer than two (2) Computer Operators on-site in the computer room at any time."	please clarify the need for Contractor on-site staff and the two required Computer Operators must perform at the data center around the clock, and whether remote monitoring paired with a defined on-site response time would satisfy this requirement?	
78	2.3.4.2.C	"The Primary Site must be located within ten (10) miles from the MLGCA Headquarters. MLGCA Headquarters is currently located at Montgomery Park Business Center, 1800 Washington Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21230."	The prior RFP for this program required the successful contractor to provide a primary site at Lottery Headquarters. If a different vendor is selected under this RFP, will the space currently occupied by the incumbent contractor be available to the new contractor? If so, is that space already compliant with this RFP's data center requirements, or would improvements be needed?	See Question #14
79	2.3.4.1.G; 2.3.15.7	§2.3.4.1G: "The ITLM Central System must meet all performance requirements specified in this RFP, including being operational each and every day (seven days per week, three hundred sixty-five/six (365/366) days per year), during times established by the MLGCA." §2.3.15.7: "Hours of ITLM Operation. The Contractor must connect ITLMs to the ITLM Central System and allow them to operate during the hours specified by the MLGCA."	Charitable facilities have hours when they are closed, during which maintenance and updates could be performed with minimal disruption. Will the lottery provide the expected operating hours for ITLM Facilities and confirm whether any facilities are open 24 hours a day, so that maintenance windows can be scheduled around actual operating hours rather than a blanket 365/366-day standard?	The MLGCA is unable to provide expected operating hours. No one facility currently has 24-hr a day operating hour; the current 89 facilities have a wide-range of operating hours. With the expansion to Fraternal Organizations MLGCA anticipates that range will increase. MLGCA does not provide guidance or restrictions on when facilities can operate. ITLM Machines must be available during the business' hours of operation. This is why the MLGCA has a the 24/7/365 requirement.
80	2.3.3.11.B, C	§2.3.3.11.B: "The ITLM Central System,	Will the Lottery please specify the events for which unattended email notification is required,	See Question #10

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		without human involvement, must automatically send email notifications to the MLGCA regarding report generation and specific file access events, as specified by the MLGCA." §2.3.3.11.C: "Before the system goes live, the Contractor is required to have an MLGCA-approved procedure for reporting and notifying the MLGCA of key alerts. Notifications and reporting for these key alerts include: changes to object code, key files, system values or options, security reports, or network parameters will be prioritized and delivered via email based on an MLGCA-approved severity and alert escalation process."	the recipients, and the required delivery timing for each? Will the Lottery also please provide the Agency's severity and alert escalation definitions referenced in Section 2.3.3.11.C, or confirm they will be established jointly after award?	
81	2.3.3.13. B	"This initial notification must be delivered either in-person or by telephone to the MLGCA within one (1) hour of the Contractor's discovery of the incident."	A one-hour reporting window is a significant operational commitment across a distributed, ~100-site program; we understand this is typical in broader lottery contexts but ask the Agency to consider the scale here. Will the Lottery please confirm the start point for the one-hour security violation reporting window	No

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			— detection, confirmation, or classification — and the acceptable reporting channels. Would the Agency consider a longer initial window given the scale and geographic distribution of ITLM Facilities?	
82	2.3.4.9.B; 2.3.12.2.B; 2.3.8.5.E	§2.3.4.9.B: “All meter-reading data must be received by the ITLM Central System in real time via an automated, on-line process. The ITLM Central System is required to poll every ITLM at least once per hour, and manual meter readings cannot be used to substitute these automated requirements.” §2.3.12.2.B: “All data items must be updated in real time, or as close to it as possible.” §2.3.8.5.E: “Software Version Validation. The ITLM Central System will perform real-time software version checks to ensure that only approved and intended versions are in use. To prevent unauthorized modifications, a mechanism such as Electronic Signatures or a similar verification method shall be implemented.”	Section 2.3.4.9.B defines 'real time' concretely for meter-reading data, requiring polling at least once per hour. Sections 2.3.12.2.B and 2.3.8.5.E impose the same undefined 'real time' (or 'as close to it as possible') standard for other functions. Real-time reporting requirements of this kind are common in traditional, high-volume retail lottery systems, where large terminal counts and rapid ticket sales create operational needs (such as fraud detection, liability management, or inventory replenishment) that depend on immediate visibility into activity across the network. Will the Lottery describe the specific operational use case(s) that require 'real time' (or 'as close to real time as possible') data under Sections 2.3.12.2.B and 2.3.8.5.E? For example, what decision or action depends on receiving that data within a real-time window rather than through periodic reporting? To the extent those use cases were developed for a higher-volume, traditional retail lottery environment, please confirm whether they also apply to the more limited veteran and fraternal ITLM program, currently offered at fewer than 90 locations statewide?	No, the Lottery will not define specific “Use cases”. Real-time refers to systems or processes that respond, process, or transmit data instantly as events occur .

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
83	2.3.4.9.A	"Data for Reports. The ITLM Central System shall monitor the operation of each ITLM and create reports using, at minimum, the following information for each ITLM, each ITLM Facility, and total for the ITLM Program: 1. Amount wagered; 2. Amount won; 3. Amount identified on a printed ITLM ticket; 4. Amount paid out on a printed and validated ITLM ticket; 5. Number of printed and validated ITLM tickets paid; 6. Unpaid amount on ITLM tickets not validated; 7. Number of ITLM tickets not validated; 8. Unpaid amount on expired ITLM tickets; 9. Number of expired ITLM tickets 10. Amount accepted by an ITLM via bill, ticket, or other instrument of value; 11. Amount transferred to or from the ITLM electronically, if applicable; 12. Amount on the credit meter; 13. Number of ITLM tickets played; 14. Number of ITLM tickets won; 15.	Section 2.3.4.9.A appears to use "ticket" for both cash vouchers and instant tickets purchased or played. Will the Lottery please confirm which is intended in each report requirement, or provide the Agency's definitions for each term? For example, "ticket" as used in 2.3.4.9.A. item 10 seems to refer to a cash voucher.	For each play, the ITLM shall produce a ticket with the appropriate information. The term 'ticket' in RFP section 2.3.4.9.A refers to this ticket, for ITLM Central System reporting.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Number of times the logic area was accessed; and 16. Number of times the cash door was accessed.”		
84	2.3.12.2. D	“Utilizing the relational database architecture, MLGCA staff shall have the capability to develop, modify, save, and schedule individual reports.”	Our understanding is that report authoring is commonly delivered through parameterized, schedulable templates rather than direct end-user query construction against the schema. Will the Lottery please clarify the expected scope of MLGCA staff report authoring — specifically, whether staff are to construct queries directly against the relational schema, or to modify and schedule reports from a Contractor-provided library of parameterized templates?	MLGCA staff should have the ability to do both. To include run and modify existing/scheduled reports; but also, the ability, within reason, to construct a report utilizing the data, if a template report does not exist. Or, if the vendor prefers, they can provide on-demand reports at the MLGCA's request for no additional cost within an agreed upon turn-around period (48 hours, i.e.)
85	2.3.7.1. J	“Unique Internal Number. The Contractor is responsible for assigning a unique internal identification number for each ITLM within the ITLM Central System. This identifier must be securely stored in non-volatile memory on the main logic board or an alternatively Agency-approved location.”	This provision appears to assume a thick-client architecture with on-board NVRAM storage. A more-modern architecture maintains this data securely in the site-level server database (e.g., thin-client architecture). Will the Lottery please confirm that a securely maintained record within the site-level system database is an acceptable “alternatively Agency-approved location” under this provision?	The RFP requires that the unique identifier be stored on the ITLM itself.
86	2.3.7.1.M	“Protection of Meter Data During Power Fluctuation & Outages. To ensure the accuracy of all ITLM status reports and accounting records, electronic	This provision appears to assume a thick-client architecture. A more-modern architecture maintains this data securely in the site-level server database (e.g., thin-client architecture).	An Offeror can propose their solution. The ITLM program requires specific protections during power outages. This is defined in the referenced RFP section.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		meters must be equipped with a battery backup or an equivalent power source. This backup system must remain functional for at least ten (10) days following a power disconnection from the ITLM. Additionally, the backup device is required to be stored inside the ITLM's locked logic board compartment (i.e. Security Lock)."	Will the Lottery please confirm whether this architecture satisfies the intent of this provision, and what evidence of ten-day retention the Agency would require?	
87	2.3.7.1.P.4.c	"It must be uniquely linked to the specific IT LM it was pulled from;"	Will the Lottery please clarify the nature of the required unique link between a cash container and the specific machine it was removed from — whether an electronic association is required, or whether physical identification such as an affixed machine-number label is sufficient?	Devices (i.e. cash container and ITLM machine) should be physically labeled and electronically associated.
88	2.3.7.1.Q.1-2	"1. The internal space of an ITLM shall not be readily accessible when the ITLM's front door is closed. 2. All components shall be accessible via the front door."	This requirement is not consistent with modern ITLM solutions. Will the Lottery please confirm whether a cabinet with more than one door on the front elevation satisfies this requirement, so cabinet construction is not unnecessarily constrained to a single-door design?	Offerors are encouraged to propose their product and its features as they understand the ITLM Program requirements.
89	2.3.7.1.Q.3	"Access to the interior of the ITLM shall be controlled through a series of two or more locks"	Common industry practice is a single lock securing the main interior, with additional independent locks on high-security assemblies such as the logic compartment and cash drop. Will the Lottery please confirm whether that arrangement satisfies this requirement?	Yes. This satisfies the requirement.
90	2.3.7.1.U; 2.3.7.1.U.3 ;	§2.2.1.3: "This amendment also expanded the manner in which ITLM terminals operate by	Section 2.3.7.1.U states predetermined results may be "stored electronically," but Section 2.3.7.1.U.3 separately requires each ITLM to contain two physical printing mechanisms. There would be	No. A game play ticket must be printed (either pre-printed or print-on-the-fly) after EACH game play.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
	2.3.4.1.B; 2.2.1.3	eliminating the requirement for pre-printed instant lottery tickets and instead only requiring that the element of chance is contained wholly within the predetermined ITLM ticket. This means that print-on-the-fly ITLMs are now permissible." §2.3.7.1.U: "Instant Tickets. The ITLMs must allow for the element of chance in the conduct of gaming through the ITLMs is contained wholly within the predetermined instant lottery ticket. This may include a 'Print on the Fly' ITLM ticket system, or another system that allows for predetermined results that are stored electronically. Player enhancements in an ITLM may not affect the element of chance." Printing Mechanism. Each ITLM shall contain two separate standard printing mechanisms." (§2.3.7.1.U.3)	meaningful cost savings — capital cost, consumables, maintenance, and e-waste, consistent with Section 3.13's environmental preference policy — in eliminating ticket printing entirely where the predetermined outcome is otherwise fully auditable. Does the RFP and applicable Maryland law permit a fully electronic ITLM solution that does not print a physical ticket at any point in the transaction — for example, an electronic pull-tab-style system where the play result is generated, displayed, and recorded electronically and no ticket is ever printed? If yes, will the Lottery also confirm that the secondary print mechanism requirement in Section 2.3.7.1.U.3.b does not apply to such a solution, and identify any other ticket-specific requirements in the RFP (such as those governing barcodes, captions, or validation numbers) that would likewise not apply where no physical ticket exists?	

QUESTION	RFP SECTION	RFP CONTEXT	OFFEROR QUESTION	MLGCA RESPONSE
91	2.3.7.1.W	"Cashless Feature. ITLMs must support TITO vouchers and have the ability to function without currency. Debit or credit cards may not be accepted by ITLMs."	Please clarify the intended scope of the "function without currency" requirement. Does the Agency contemplate (a) voucher-in/voucher-out only, (b) vouchers purchased at a point of sale or kiosk and inserted at the machine, or (c) a funded electronic account accessed at the machine by credential entry?	Currently a TITO can be taken from machine to machine within a specific Post. This functionality must exist. Other options are not being contemplated at this time.
92	2.3.5.2.G; 2.3.7.3; 2.3.7.3.A	G. Progressive Jackpots. Should progressive jackpots be utilized, ITLMs must provide an additional port or connection capability to a progressive controller, or a similar management device." / "2.3.7.3 Progressive ITLMs. If Provided by the Contractor:" / "A. Approval of Progressive ITLMs. The MLGCA must approve the placement of the Progressive ITLMs before it is deployed at an ITLM Facility."	Sections 2.3.5.2.G and 2.3.7.3 confirm that progressive jackpots are offered at the Contractor's option, subject to MLGCA's approval of placement. Before proposing a solution, we would like to understand the current player experience in the Veterans ITLM program. Are progressive jackpots currently offered on any ITLMs in the Veterans' or Fraternal Organizations program today, and if so: (a) at how many facilities and on how many machines; (b) whether they are single-ITLM, multigame, facility-wide, or statewide progressives; and (c) a general description of their current features and functionality (e.g., jackpot structure, seed amount, contribution rate)?	The current Contractor does not offer progressive jackpots.
93	2.3.7.4.C	"Authorized personnel must be present for any repairs to or replacements of the circuitry or logic board within the ITLM's logic area. Access to the logic area is strictly limited, and it may only be unlocked by authorized individuals."	Will the Lottery please define "authorized personnel" for purposes of conversions, upgrades, and expansions — whether Contractor employees, Agency employees, or both?	Authorized persons would include but not be limited to vendor, vendor's contractor/sub-contractor, MLGCA staff.

QUESTION	RFP SECTION	RFP CONTEXT	OFFEROR QUESTION	MLGCA RESPONSE
94	2.3.7.6	“Validation Terminal. The Contractor must provide a Validation Terminal at each ITLM Facility. The Validation Terminal must be connected to the ITLM Central System to allow for the validation and redemption of vouchers.”	This provision could be read to imply a centralized voucher database supporting cross-facility redemption, rather than facility-level storage. Will the Lottery please confirm whether a voucher issued at one ITLM Facility is intended to be redeemable at a different Facility, or whether redemption is limited to the issuing Facility? How long is a voucher valid for redemption?	Vouchers are only redeemable at the facility in which they were issued or MLGCA HQ. A voucher is valid for 182 days from issuance.
95	2.3.4.1.F.5 -6; 2.3.15.6.A	§2.3.4.1.F.5: “Ticket validation equipment for ITLM Facilities that includes, at minimum: a fully equipped personal computer (CPU, keyboard, mouse, and monitor), bar code scanner, letter size document printer, receipt printer and all required consumable supplies for such equipment restocked by the Contractor, as needed. Contractor must maintain the ticket validation equipment.” §2.3.4.1.F.6: “Ticket validation equipment for MLGCA Headquarters that includes, at minimum: a fully equipped personal computer (CPU, keyboard,	A touchscreen point-of-sale terminal can provide the same validation and redemption functions without a separate keyboard and mouse, using on-screen input. This equipment list appears to reflect a specific existing implementation and, as written, would require components that increase system cost without a clear operational need. Will the Lottery please confirm whether a touchscreen point-of-sale terminal providing equivalent validation and redemption functions is acceptable in place of the listed keyboard/mouse/monitor configuration? If no, will the Lottery please identify the specific use cases requiring a letter-size document printer at ITLM locations?	A touch screen design could be an acceptable alternative that can be proposed as a solution. A printer is needed.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		mouse, and monitor), a bar code scanner, a letter-size document printer, a secure check printer, a receipt printer, and all required consumable supplies for such equipment restocked by the Contractor, as needed.” §2.3.15.6.A: “Ticket Validation Equipment. The Contractor must provide ticket validation equipment for each ITLM Facility and MLGCA Headquarters.”		
96	2.3.9.4	“A unique identifying bar code must be included on each Instant Ticket. The bar code must: 1. Utilize interleaved two (2) of five (5) or another Bar Code symbology approved by the MLGCA. 2. Encode a total of twenty-one (21) digits, which refer to the Deal code, ticket sequence, the initial six (6) digits of the Instant Ticket verification number, and a two (2) digit check. C. All variances shall be in accordance with the American National	This barcode requirement appears written for pre-printed tickets specifically. Print-on-the-fly tickets currently in use in Maryland do not carry this barcode, and the printed ticket already contains the information necessary to identify the ticket and prizes payable. Please also confirm whether the Lottery’s existing infrastructure includes barcode scanners for POF-format tickets today, and what function they serve. This requirement seems to refer to standard paper instant tickets. Will the Lottery please confirm whether an alternative to the 21-digit interleaved two-of-five barcode requirement is acceptable in a pre-printed ITLM ticket and in the event an Offeror proposes a print on the fly solution, it applies at all?	See Question #36

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Standard Institute (ANSI). A first pass read rate of ninety-five percent (95%) or more is required.”		
97	2.3.9.5.C	“Each play symbol must be paired with a caption that spells it out in a smaller font size. This serves as a redundant security measure and helps mitigate potential consumer disputes.”	Will the Lottery please confirm whether this requirement applies to all ticket presentations, and whether an alternative dispute-mitigation measure providing equivalent redundancy would be acceptable?	AI See Question #36
98	2.3.9.6	“Instant Tickets must be secure and traceable through use of a validation number. Each Instant Ticket must feature a Validation Number that is unique.”	Will the Lottery please confirm whether a combination of form code, deal number, and ticket number satisfies the “validation number” requirement, or otherwise specify the additional elements required?	Yes, this satisfies the “validation number” requirement.
99	2.3.9.10	“Within every Deal (if applicable), each Instant Ticket must feature a unique, consecutive number beginning with ‘-001’. A check digit must be included within the Instant Ticket number. Each Instant Ticket number must include its Deal number, if applicable.”	Will the Lottery please confirm whether the specified Instant Ticket Number structure is mandatory in form, or whether an alternative structure containing the same required data elements is acceptable?	This is a mandatory form.
100	2.3.8.3.B.4 ; 2.3.11.1	§2.3.8.3.B.4: “Number of credits wagered in the entire Pool;”	Please confirm the Agency’s own definition of “Pool” as distinct from “Deal” for consistency across Sections 2.3.8.3, 2.3.9, and 2.3.11.	This distinction is correct. Deal – A pre-determined quantity of pre-printed Instant Tickets, among which are a

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		§2.3.11.1: "Issuing Plays and Pool Design. The Contractor must explain how it will distribute the pool of a game amongst ITLM Facilities. The Contractor must explain whether Deals are utilized." Subsection C: "Describe how the plays are distributed, such as: 1. Issued to individual ITLMs when needed for play; 2. Issued to the ITLM Facility servers that will then distribute plays on demand to an individual ITLM; 3. Issued to an ITLM from a central server each time a play occurs; or 4. Some other process."		predetermined and fixed quantity of winning chances, each of which rewards of a predetermined prize value and may include a set or series of pre-printed Instant Tickets. Pool - A pre-determined and fixed quantity of winning and losing chances for the print on the fly ticket option, each of which rewards a predetermined prize value.
101	2.3.8.3. B.5	"The 'win meter,' which displays the history of the four most recent complete and valid plays;"	Will the Lottery please confirm whether this is a player-facing display, or a record available to an attendant through an administrative interface for dispute resolution?	This information will be only available to the Contractor and is selected approved subcontractors. Post / players will not have visibility of this information.
102	2.3.9.11	"Delivery Services to ITLM Facilities. ITLM Facilities are located throughout the State." Subsection C: "Delivery. Instant Ticket orders must be delivered to ITLM Facilities within 24 hours of being picked up from the	This section appears geared toward pre-printed ticket delivery specifically. Print-on-the-fly delivery (blank ticket stock) should be less restrictive, and costs would be reduced further for machines that do not print at all. Will the Lottery please confirm whether these delivery service requirements apply differently to pre-printed ticket stock versus blank stock used by machines that print on demand (a POF solution),	All ITLM machines must print a game play ticket after each play. MLGCA will review proposed delivery procedures for print-on-the-fly blank paper, but it must be approved by MLGCA prior to use. The RFP will be amended. All ITLM machines must print a game play ticket after each play. MLGCA will review proposed delivery procedures for print-on-the-fly blank paper, but it

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Contractor's warehouse. When scheduling shipments, the Contractor must take into account that certain ITLM Facilities operate with limited hours. A signature must be obtained from an ITLM Facility employee before dropping off the Instant Ticket order."	and whether they apply at all to machines that do not print a physical ticket?	must be approved by MLGCA prior to use. The RFP will be amended.
103	2.3.7.14.E. 7	"Maintenance Log. Each ITLM must contain a written maintenance log within its main cabinet access area. All individuals entering an ITLM's internal space, including staff from the MLGCA, are required to sign this log, noting the date and time of entry as well as the specific areas inspected or repaired. These log forms must be kept by the Contractor for three (3) years after the final entry and remains accessible for MLGCA inspection upon request."	Will the Lottery please confirm whether an electronic maintenance log capturing the same entries — identity, date and time of entry, and areas inspected or repaired — with tamper-evident records available to the Agency on demand, satisfies this requirement?	See Question #31.
104	2.3.4.1.C	§2.3.4.1.C: "Currently, all prizes of \$600 or more are defined as reportable for tax purposes (each, a 'Reportable Prize'). Should the MLGCA	W-2G reporting is typically associated with casino-scale payouts. Given that ITLM stakes are lower, we understand this threshold may be triggered infrequently in practice, and historical data would help quantify that.	According to "Instructions for Forms W-2G and 5754 (Rev. January 2026)," Form W-2G is to be file for each person to whom you pay gambling winnings including for lottery winnings.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		increase the dollar amount that defines a Reportable Prize, the Contractor must adjust withholdings accordingly. ” §2.3.4.1 .D: “For prizes \$5,000 and above, the Contractor must withhold Federal and State taxes.”	Historically, what percentage of prizes paid in the Veterans ITLM program annually are \$600 or more?	
105	2.3.4.1. D	§2.3.4.1.C: “Currently, all prizes of \$600 or more are defined as reportable for tax purposes (each, a ‘Reportable Prize’). Should the MLGCA increase the dollar amount that defines a Reportable Prize, the Contractor must adjust withholdings accordingly. ” §2.3.4.1 .D: “For prizes \$5,000 and above, the Contractor must withhold Federal and State taxes.”	Historically, what number or percentage of prizes paid in the Veterans ITLM program are \$5,000 or more?	None

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
106	2.3.4.1.C-E	§2.3.4.1.C: "Currently, all prizes of \$600 or more are defined as reportable for tax purposes (each, a 'Reportable Prize'). Should the MLGCA increase the dollar amount that defines a Reportable Prize, the Contractor must adjust withholdings accordingly." §2.3.4.1.D: "For prizes \$5,000 and above, the Contractor must withhold Federal and State taxes." §2.3.4.1.E: "Before a prize is paid, the Contractor must compare all claimants' social security numbers to: 1. Specific unpaid State debts to include child support and other debts collected by Maryland's Central Collection Unit ("CCU"); and 2. the Voluntary Exclusion List."	Tax withholding by the Contractor was not a requirement of the prior RFP that led to the current solution. How does the Lottery or the current contractor process tax withholding today, given that it was not a deliverable under the prior contract? How many withholding events occur in this program per year?	ILTM Central System must be able to process the calculations for Federal and State taxes for all prizes subject to the claim process. 2.3.4.1.D "For prizes \$5,000 and above, the Contractor must withhold Federal and State taxes"
107	General / Key Information Summary Sheet	The RFP does not state minimum/maximum ticket prices, the maximum prize per ticket, or the number of games available per terminal anywhere in the	The RFP does not state the minimum or maximum ticket price, the maximum prize per ticket, or the number of games available per terminal anywhere in the document body. The Key Information Summary Sheet (pp. 2–4) covers the Solicitation Number, Contract Type, and Contract Duration, but not these figures.	The Lottery will not provide that information to the public.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		document body. The Key Information Summary Sheet (pp. 2–4) covers Solicitation Number, Contract Type (“Firm Fixed Percentage — a fixed percentage of Net Proceeds”), and Contract Duration (“Five (5) year base period with one (1), three (3) year option period”), but not these figures.	Will the Lottery provide a detailed description of the ITLM program, including: the minimum and maximum prices of tickets made available for sale; the maximum prize allowed on an individual ticket/wager; and, by law, how many games are available for sale per terminal?	
108	2.2.4.2.A; 2.2.1.6	§2.2.4.2.A: “MLGCA will license Fraternal Organizations as lottery retailers under the ITLM Program.” §2.2.1.6: “The amended law allows the issuance of up to five (5) ITLMs each to MLGCA licensed Veterans’ Organization and amended the law to allow licensed Fraternal Organizations to operate up to three (3) ITLMs.”	We understand fraternal organizations are now authorized under the 2025 legislative expansion, but sizing and cost planning depend on the anticipated scale. Will the Lottery license additional veteran or fraternal locations under the current program, and if so, will the Lottery update the expected number of ITLMs to be in production on day one, and the number of fraternal organizations currently eligible to participate?	Applicants are required to meet specific criteria to be eligible to be licensed. The Agency does not have information about additional veteran’s organizations applying. We anticipate up to 70 fraternal/sororal organizations to apply for licensing.
109	2.2.1.5	“As of April 2025, there were 90 Veterans’ Organization ITLM retailers in Maryland operating 401 ITLMs. The currently approved ITLM retailer locations are listed on the Agency’s website.”	In order to propose a solution appropriately sized, scoped, and staffed to support the program, we request a full picture of current participants. Will the Lottery provide a list of all veteran organizations currently participating in the program, including name/Post #, address, phone number, email address, operating hours, primary	As stated in the question, the veteran organizations are posted on the website and the name, post, and addresses are listed. www.mdgaming.com/ancillary-responsibilities/ITLM-program/

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			point of contact, number of machines at the location, and annual sales per ITLM?	
110	6.2; 6.5.3	§6.2: "6.2.1 Offeror's Technical Response to Requirements and Work Plan." / "6.2.2 Experience and Qualifications of Proposed Staff." / "6.2.3 Offeror Qualifications and Capabilities, including proposed subcontractors." / "6.2.4 Economic Benefit to State of Maryland (See Appendix 8. Economic Benefit Factors)." / "6.2.5 Offeror's Technical Response to an expansion of the ITLM Program." §6.5.3: "Upon completion of the Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal evaluations and rankings, each Offeror will receive an overall ranking. The Procurement Officer will recommend award of the Contract to the responsible Offeror that submitted the Proposal determined to be the most advantageous to the State. In making this most advantageous	The MLGCA's own materials note that the ITLM Program has contributed over \$64 million in profits to participating Veterans' Posts since 2014. How will the benefit of a proposal to Veteran and Fraternal Organizations be considered in the "most advantageous to the State" determination? If an Offeror's solution demonstrates significant experience and evidence of benefiting veteran, fraternal, and sororal organizations, will the Lottery treat that as advantageous to the State in evaluating proposals?	The MLGCA will comply with COMAR 21.05.03.03(F) and will recommend award to the responsible offeror whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the State, considering the price and the evaluation factors set forth in the request for proposals.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		Proposal determination, technical factors will receive greater weight than financial factors."		
111	2.2.3.2.C; 3.2.6.2.K	§2.2.3.2.C: "Preservation of Existing System Information. The MLGCA will oversee the ongoing use of the legacy system and the preservation of validation hardware for TITO ticket processing, should a different Contractor be selected through this RFP." §3.2.6.2.K: "Final validations of winning plays must continue for at least 30 days after conversion at each ITLM Facility. Agency staff must be able to redeem vouchers for 182 days after the last Facility is converted."	Outside of an end-of-contract transition (where Section 3.2.6.2.K already specifies a 182-day voucher redemption window), how long are winning ITLM tickets and TITO vouchers valid for redemption during normal, ongoing operations?	182 days.
112	2.2.3.2.C	§2.2.3.2.C: "Preservation of Existing System Information. The MLGCA will oversee the ongoing use of the legacy system and the preservation of validation hardware for TITO ticket processing, should a different Contractor be selected through this RFP."	Section 2.2.3.2.C states that the MLGCA will oversee the ongoing use of the legacy system and preserve validation hardware for TITO ticket processing if a different Contractor is selected. This is the RFP's only reference to this retained infrastructure, and no other section specifies its scope or how a newly selected Contractor would access or utilize it. Will the Lottery please describe the specific legacy system components and TITO validation hardware	MLGCA would keep a legacy terminal with existing architecture for a minimum of 182 days. The MLGCA would retain ownership of this information. A selected Offeror would be required to install and maintain a proprietary 'turn-key' complete system, independent of legacy equipment.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			referenced in Section 2.2.3.2.C that would be preserved and made available to a newly selected Contractor, including: (a) what hardware and functionality this encompasses; (b) who owns and maintains it; (c) how it would interface with the new Contractor's ITLM Central System; and (d) whether a new Contractor may rely on this retained infrastructure to reduce its own transition costs, or whether it is intended solely to support redemption of vouchers issued under the prior contract?	
113	2.3.7.14. E	Maintenance Response Requirements (p. 38) states, "the contractor must restore the affected ITLM to service within three (3) hours." While a contractor may make all reasonable efforts to restore affected ITLMs as promptly as possible, circumstances such as site geographic location, retailer personnel availability, and the complexity of a given issue may make this timeframe difficult to achieve in certain instances. Based on experience, approximately 65% of field issues can be resolved through	Would the MLGCA consider revising this maintenance response requirement to require the contractor to contact the retailer and make reasonable efforts to restore service within three (3) hours but that the contractor must restore the affected ITLM to service within twenty-four (24) hours?	No.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		phone support. Most issues requiring a site visit can be addressed within the three-hour / timeframe, however, staffing to ensure a 3-hour restoration window for all sites, under all circumstances, could materially increase bidder costs and may affect pricing proposals, while providing limited incremental improvement to operational uptime.		
114	2.4.3	Key Personnel (p.64) states that certain Key Personnel require the “Microsoft Certified System Engineer (MCSE)” certification. Microsoft retired the MCSE certification in 2021, and it is no longer available.	Could the MLGCA confirm whether relevant experience may be substituted for this certification requirement, or identify an alternate certification that would be acceptable in place of the MCSE for purposes of fulfilling this requirement?	CCNP in any of the current Cisco concentrations will suffice, or the offeror can propose a replacement.
115	3.14.5	Current Certificates to be Provided (p. 83): This section requires the Contractor to furnish current certificates of insurance within five (5) business days of	We respectfully request that this timeframe be extended to ten (10) business days. This would provide sufficient time to request, generate, and verify the required certificates.	This is a State of Maryland Procurement requirement, not defined by the MLGCA. This cannot be extended.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		the notice of recommended award		
116	Professional Services Supp.	This section states that "This solicitation does not require a Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure."	This appears to conflict with Tab Q of Table A, which includes the Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure among the documents required with the proposal. Could the MLGCA please clarify whether this document is required as part of our submission?	This solicitation does not require a Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure.
117	2.3.4.2 / 2.3.4.6	Both sites, the primary, which must be within 10 miles of the Lottery, and the backup must be up, operational and fully staffed 24X7X365.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.4.2 (other than subsection C, addressed separately in Question 63 below), 2.3.4.3, and 2.3.4.6? 51(b). Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.4.2 (other than subsection C, addressed separately in Question 63 below), 2.3.4.3, and 2.3.4.6 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	No.
118	2.4.4. 2.4.4.1 2.4.4.2 2.4.4.3	2.4.4. Key Personnel: Ongoing Support Staff 2.4.4.1 Project Manager 2.4.4.2 Computer Operators 2.4.4.3 Network Integration Specialist Must be located at the Contractor's Primary Site. This requires the person to be within 10 miles of the Lottery rather than focusing on overall availability. At least two operators must be on site, within	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.4.4.1, 2.4.4.2, and 2.4.4.3? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.4.4.1., 2.4.4.2, and 2.4.4.3 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	See Question #77

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		10 miles of the Lottery, 24X7X365. Must be available 'at all times'		
119	2.3.4.1.G/ 2.3.15.7 (Hours of Operation)	The Central System must run every day of the year, regardless of whether any ITLM Facility is actually open.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.4.1G and 2.3.15.7? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.4.1.G and 2.3.15.7 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	No.
120	2.3.7.3	It is unclear whether an offeror will be penalized for not offering progressives.	Please clarify whether RFP Section 2.3.7.3 requires an Offeror to offer progressives. If the answer is Yes, will the Lottery amend the RFP to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.7.3 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations	Progressives are not currently offered. Progressives are not required, but may be proposed by an Offeror.
121	2.3.7.14.E.7	Each ITLM must contain a handwritten paper log inside its cabinet, signed in person by every visitor, for three years.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.7.14.E.7? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.7.14.E.7 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	See Question 31

QUESTION	RFP SECTION	RFP CONTEXT	OFFEROR QUESTION	MLGCA RESPONSE
122	2.3.10.1	This requirement appears to be a legacy requirement for a traditional lottery scratch ticket, not a pre-printed ITLM ticket nor a POF solution. Additionally, more modern methods are available to securely transmit necessary deal and validation data.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.10.1.F? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.10.1.F to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	The RFP will not be amended. The current RFP allows an offeror to propose a print-on-the-fly solution that complies with the stated requirements.
123	2.3.10.10	This requirement — that perforations between pre-printed Instant Tickets allow for easy separation without accidental detachment — is written for physical ticket stock and has no application to a print-on-the-fly (which is cut when dispensed by the device) or a fully electronic solution where no physical paper ticket is printed.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.10.10? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.10.10 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	Proposed Language – The MLGCA will not amend / change the RFP for this provision. A recent law change allows both pre-printed and print-on-the-fly Instant Ticket Lottery Machines (ITLM) options. Removing either option would hurt market competition and limit the agency's choices. Vendors are encouraged to submit bids using their most established, fully developed systems for evaluation. Alternative proposals will not be accepted.
124	2.3.7.1	This requirement is contradictory as many of the requirements are not consistent with current ITLM hardware solutions, detailed in later questions, but are nonetheless “required”.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to clarify that Offerors may propose state-of-the-art ITLMs that meet the Lottery's reasonable needs, even if the hardware of such state-of-the-art ITLMs would render irrelevant or otherwise supersede certain of the RFP's current minimum ITLM specifications? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.7.1 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and	The MLGCA will not amend / change the RFP. A recent law change allows both pre-printed and print-on-the-fly Instant Ticket Lottery Machines (ITLM) options. Removing either option would hurt market competition and limit the agency's choices. Vendors are encouraged to submit bids using their most established, fully developed systems for evaluation. Alternatives to this requirement will not be accepted for evaluation.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
			fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	
125	2.3.4.1.F.5-6; 2.3.15.6	The RFP mandates a specific keyboard, mouse, and monitor configuration for every Validation Terminal, rather than the touchscreen terminals now standard across the industry.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.4.1.F.5-6 and 2.3.15.6? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.4.1.F.5-6 and 2.3.15.6 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	A touchscreen solution could be acceptable. Vendors are encouraged to submit bids using their most established, fully developed systems for evaluation.
126	2.3.7.1.J; 2.3.7.1.M	Both provisions assume the ITLM itself stores its ID and meter data on board, in its own battery-backed compartment. A thin-client architecture keeps that data secure at the site server instead, which is a design the RFP doesn't contemplate but doesn't need to exclude.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.7.1.J and 2.3.7.1.M? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.7.1.J and 2.3.7.1.M to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	No. The RFP will not be amended.
127	2.3.10.3	This requirement appears to be a legacy requirement for a traditional instant scratch ticket, sold at retailers across Maryland. This is not a requirement traditionally found in pre-print ITLM solutions.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.10.3? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.10.3 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	The RFP will not be amended. If using pre-printed this requirement stands. If using print-on-the-fly, then no rub-off material coating would apply

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
128	2.3.9.4 /2.3.9.5.C; 2.3.9.6; 2.3.9.10	These provisions — a specific 21-digit interleaved two-of-five bar code, redundant caption text beside every play symbol, and a prescribed ticket-numbering format — are written for pre-printed instant tickets and mirror requirements found in traditional scratch-ticket RFPs. A print-on-the-fly or fully electronic ticket does not carry a bar code in this sense, and the underlying information these provisions are meant to capture is already recorded electronically.	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.9.4, 2.3.9.5.C, 2.3.9.6, and 2.3.9.10? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.9.4, 2.3.9.5.C, 2.3.9.6, and 2.3.9.10 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	The RFP will not be amended for this. Both a pre-printed and a print-on-the-fly game ticket should present with a barcode and a 21-digit code or a vendor specific proposal to incorporate this information.
129	2.3.4.2	The prior RFP for this program required the successful contractor to provide a primary site at Lottery Headquarters, and the current incumbent has occupied that space accordingly. A ten-mile radius requirement is not merely burdensome in the abstract; it also happens to already be satisfied by the incumbent's existing facility, while any new entrant would need to acquire, build out, and staff a qualifying site within that radius before	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.4.2.C? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.4.2.C to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	See Question #14

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		it could even compete for the award.		
130	2.3.10.11	Shrinkwrap is required but is unnecessary for blank paper used in a print-on-the-fly solution	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.10.11? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.10.11 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	The RFP will not be amended. The blank paper will need to be secure and tamper proof. Vendors are encouraged to submit bids using their most established, fully developed methods.
131	2.3.7.1.U	Section 2.3.7.1.U permits predetermined results to be "stored electronically," consistent with the RFP's own recognition that print-on-the-fly and fully electronic solutions are appropriate, industry-standard devices. Section 2.3.7.1.U.3 nonetheless requires every ITLM to contain two separate physical printing mechanisms regardless of whether a ticket is printed at all. Eliminating an unnecessary printing mechanism would meaningfully reduce capital cost, consumables, maintenance, and e-waste (consistent with the RFP's own environmental	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Sections 2.3.7.1.U and 2.3.7.1.U.3? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Sections 2.3.7.1.U and 2.3.7.1.U.3 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	A game play ticket MUST be printed after each and every game play. Either pre-printed or print-on-the-fly. There is no plan to eliminate the printing of a game play ticket in the current ITLM program.

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RFP SECTION</u>	<u>RFP CONTEXT</u>	<u>OFFEROR QUESTION</u>	<u>MLGCA RESPONSE</u>
		preference policy) without any corresponding benefit to the Lottery or the program.		
132	2.3.9.11	Twenty-four-hour warehouse-to-facility delivery with a signed receipt makes sense for pallets of pre-printed ticket stock. It unnecessarily adds cost and logistics overhead where tickets are generated on the fly or not printed at all	Will the Lottery amend the RFP to eliminate or modify the requirements in RFP Section 2.3.9.11? Will the Lottery amend the RFP to allow Offerors to propose multiple or alternative solutions to the requirements of RFP Section 2.3.9.11 to achieve the utility and cost saving opportunities of current industry standard solution sets available today and to avoid impeding revenues for the Veterans and fraternal organizations this program is designed to benefit?	The RFP will not be amended. Vendors are encouraged to submit bids using their most established, fully developed methods.
133	General		Will the Lottery issue a formal amendment to the RFP that eliminates ticket-manufacturing and delivery requirements that serve no purpose where no physical ticket is produced, so that the program is not overburdened with unnecessary costs and does not favor the current vendor	No. See Question #131