

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LOTTERY COMMISSION**

**RFP LOT 2020-02 Addendum
e-Instant Lottery Games
NHLC Responses to Proposer Inquiries**

September 26, 2019

| Section of RFP | Question | NHLC's Answer |
|---|--|---|
| Section 1 – Executive Summary, page 1 | The RFP indicates a minimum of at least one qualified vendor. Is there a maximum number of contractors/e-Instant content providers that New Hampshire can select under this RFP? | There is no maximum. |
| Section 1 – Executive Summary, page 1 | Please confirm that the NHLC will award a contract first and then the contract will be negotiated and then executed. | The NHLC will make a selection and then enter into negotiations with the selected vendors before executing a contract. |
| Section 1 – Executive Summary, page 1 | Please clarify what is meant by “Each resultant contract will not obligate NHLC to make a purchase...” | The NHLC will likely choose games offered by each provider, but the NHLC is not obligated to do so if the games do not align with the NHLC’s game schedule, promotions, and the like. The NHLC may request games from different game providers, but it is not obligated to. |
| Section 1 – Schedule, page 2 | Would the Lottery please extend the date to ask questions by one (1) week to allow vendors more time to gather questions to the detailed requirements? | No. |
| Section 1 – Schedule, page 2 | Would the Lottery please extend the due date by three (3) weeks to allow vendors more time to gather answers to the detailed requirements? | No. |
| Section 2 – Agency Background and iLottery Portal, page 3 | NHLC states “As of June 30, 2019, the net gaming revenue was \$6.4 million for ten months since launch, with the goal in FY20 to reach almost \$10 million.” Does this factor into securing an additional premium content provider, which would aim to boost NGR? | No. |
| Section 2 – Agency Background and iLottery Portal, page 3 | RFP requirement: “It is NHLC’s intent to continuously expand the game library available to players and to introduce new e-Instants on a pre-determined schedule, currently set to one per month.” Question: Is NPi planning to expand the cadence of releases beyond one per month? How many third party (non-NPi) games are expected to be released per month and over the course of the year? | The NHLC has no current plans of launching more than one e-Instant per month at this time, but may do so in the future. It is undetermined at this time how many non-NPi games will be released per year. This largely depends on the mix of games, the quality and the cost of games, and subsequently, the performance of the games and ease of working relationship. |
| Section 2 – Agency Background and iLottery Portal, page 3 | Regarding: “The transactional and e-Instant/game information is transmitted through secure APIs (application programming interfaces) from the Vendor’s RGS (remote gaming system) to the NPi system. A copy of that data is also stored on the Vendor’s RGS.” Can you confirm that the platform provider will | It is the NHLC’s understanding that the platform provider will provide their API for 3 rd party game integration. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | provide their API for 3 rd party game integration? | |
| Section 2 – Agency Background and iLottery Portal, page 3 | Regarding: “The current agreement to utilize the NPi platform runs through June 30, 2025. Since the launch, NHLC has been implementing e-Instants developed and supplied by NPi. It is NHLC’s intent to continuously expand the game library available to players and to introduce new e-Instants on a pre-determined schedule, currently set to one per month. Accordingly, NHLC is seeking proposals from multiple game providers to supply NHLC e-Instants that can be integrated with the existing NPi platform. NHLC expects integration costs will be borne by the successful proposers and will not be paid directly by NHLC or NPi.” With added game suppliers as result of this RFP, is NHLC open to launching more than one game per month? | Potentially, if there is a need to do so based on game and sales performance as well as other factors. |
| Section 3 – Process for Submitting a Proposal, page 4 | Can NHLC confirm if Proposers need to officially register with the state to submit a response to this RFP? If so, can NHLC please provide instructions how to properly register? | Proposers do not need to register with the State to submit a proposal, however, any company selected for award would need to register as a State vendor and register to do business through the Secretary of State’s office. Information on State vendor registration is available here: https://das.nh.gov/purchasing/vendorresources.aspx Information on registration to conduct business in the State is here: http://sos.nh.gov/Corp_Div.aspx |
| Section 3 – Process for Submitting a Proposal, page 4 | At the conclusion of the Inquiry Period, can NHLC provide a fully amended RFP as a Word document? | The NHLC will provide the Response to Proposer’s Inquiry, which is an addendum to the RFP. The contract will be amended before execution but the RFP will not be at this time. |
| Section 3 – Process for Submitting a Proposal, page 4 | How will NHLC provide responses to the questions received during the Inquiry Period? | NHLC will email all parties who initially expressed interest in the RFP as well as any organization that submitted questions. This addendum will also be posted https://das.nh.gov/purchasing/specRFP.asp?rfplD=13197 . |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | Regarding: Ability to offer games for free and integrate into the existing customer relationship management tools currently in place. Can you confirm that the platform provider will be responsible to provide an API that supports free game deployment? | It is the NHLC’s understanding that the platform provider will provide an API for this. |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | Will the Lottery please confirm that Vendors are required to provide all 25 minimum, off-the-shelf game options on day one of integration with NPi? In addition, we understand the NHLC limits | The NHLC expects that vendors submitting proposals have a library of at least 25 games to qualify as an e-Instant provider. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | the release of new e-Instant games to one per month. Could this number increase (i.e., unlimited number) over the course of the contract? | At this time there are no plans to increase the number of launches per month, but that is a possibility in the future if sales and customer experience warrant it. |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | Regarding the requirement of remote gaming server (RGS) of both primary and secondary servers located within the State of New Hampshire. Since the RGS are not mission critical to the operation of iLottery program, will the Lottery consider amending this requirement to allow the vendor to house both the primary and secondary servers in one data center? | The NHLC is open to considering a solution of two gaming servers being co-located in one facility. |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | The RFP states a minimum of 25 off the shelf games be provided. Later in this section it also states the vendor must provide remote gaming servers (RGS), primary and secondary servers within the state of New Hampshire as well as Quality Assurance (QA) and User Acceptance Testing (UAT) servers. This is a significant investment for many vendors, and potentially cost-prohibitive for smaller game providers without any guarantee in the number of games the NHLC will select from each vendor. While we understand the legal necessity, the NHLC may be limiting who will bid without any commitment in the number of games to each provider since they will not be able to cover their investment costs. Will the Lottery consider allowing each vendor to propose a minimum number of games, which the Lottery will accept? | <p>The NHLC acknowledges there is significant investment needed to support this endeavor.</p> <p>Vendors can certainly propose a minimum number of games that must launch in order to support the 3rd party program but are not required to. However, the NHLC may choose not to accept a minimum number of games per vendor if it is not in the NHLC’s best interest.</p> <p>The NHLC prefers that vendors submit the minimum number of games as a note, and if they pass the evaluation, the NHLC and vendor can enter into talks to determine if the 3rd party integration is in each party’s best financial interest.</p> |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | The RFP states the vendor provide “working papers to comply with the Lottery’s standard.” Will the Lottery provide a sample of these working papers currently used for e-Instant games? Will the Lottery also consider reviewing the current working papers from each provider given current and industry standards and best practices? | NHLC will not share current working papers, but upon contract execution will review the working paper requirements. The requirements are standard items found in working papers for scratch games, such as prize structure, covered art, uncovered, cost(s), default price, and the like. |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | The requirement states “Utilizing the payout designated by the NHLC.” What is the desired payout range (RTP) for NHLC iLottery games? | 85% |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | The requirement states “The Lottery requests that games are similar in functionality and user experience as existing games to maintain consistency for players.” Will the NHLC provide a | The majority of these features are outlined in the RFP. Beyond that the NHLC recommends vendors visit the NHLC’s website and current iLottery e-Instants games and play them in demo mode (via desktop and mobile) to understand the nuances of game play and how the game |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>guideline for consistent features, layouts and verbiage? Does off-the-shelf price expectations include all the changes that would follow such a guideline?</p> | <p>pages are structured with information, help, sound, ticket cost and more. Once the contract is signed and work begins, the NHLC will share a guideline for consistent features, layouts and verbiage.</p> <p>Off the shelf price expectations lays out the most common items. The RFP states that beyond the items listed other basic localization and modifications could also fall into off the shelf.</p> |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work page 6 | <p>Regarding: Back office to configure free games and bonuses and to connect to the NPi free games API. As is standard in the US iLottery industry, will the Lottery be open to a solution that only requires one back office to administer free games?</p> | <p>Yes; but this needs to be discussed with NPi before it can be agreed upon.</p> |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | <p>Regarding: Integration with marketing agency of record to support game launches on a schedule determined by the Lottery. Can you confirm that “integration” refers to a technical solution to pass data? Or is the term referring to a working relationship with the marketing agency?</p> <p>If a tech solution, is there an existing API? If so, can you please share this API?</p> | <p>Both: the launches follow a communication and launch plan so a working relationship with the marketing agency of record is essential.</p> <p>The game vendor will be responsible for providing game data via API. The marketing agency will integrate with game vendor to get game data either through the API or manually for game launches.</p> |
| Section 4 – Scope of Work, page 6 | <p>Integration/sharing of raw game data into the Lottery’s business intelligence (BI) tool, currently housed with the Lottery’s advertising agency of record. Is there an existing API for the BI tool integration? If so, can you please share this API?</p> | <p>The game data is shared via SFTP. The marketing agency will provide access to the game vendor for data import via SFTP, which the BI tool will consume daily.</p> |
| Section 5, I. The Technical Proposal Contents, B. Financial Capabilities, page 8 | <p>This requirement states that “audited financial statements may be submitted in PDF format and can be provided on a CD or flash drive.” Can un-audited financial statements also be provided in PDF format on a CD or flash drive?</p> | <p>Yes; however, audited financial statements must also be submitted.</p> |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirements for a Proposal .I.D. | <p>While e-instant games are a newly emerging category within U.S. lotteries, WLA vendors have been creating digital games for the global lottery market for over a decade. Further, at this point in time, only two U.S. lotteries regularly work with third-party game providers, and therefore, the number of opportunities to provide games to U.S. lotteries has been limited. So, as to not disqualify world leading game content vendors with 10+ years of e-instant lottery game experience who meet the requirement of having games live in at least three WLA member jurisdictions,</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | would the New Hampshire Lottery Commission please amend this requirement to award points in the "Past and Current Projects With E-Instant Games" category to vendors who can demonstrate successful e-instant win game content in WLA member jurisdictions, without the requirement that at least one be inside the United States? | |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirements for a Proposal I.E.d. page 9 | Document a basic timeline from inception to launch for each category of game. This must include number of days, weeks, and months; and key tasks and deliverables along the timeline. This includes, but is not limited to, prize structure creation, game testing in UAT, feedback and necessary changes, working paper development and sign off, game help paper development and sign off, and the launch process. Can NHLC please confirm current testing timeline? When do games need to deliver into QA and when do games need to deliver to UAT? | Ideally games should deliver to QA 3-6 months before launch, after the prize structure is approved. Delivery to UAT occurs 1-3 months before launch. Testing occurs along the way in both environments. At least one month before launch, the working paper should be signed off. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirements for a Proposal I.E.i, page 10 | Regarding: Provide unlimited series of tickets for e-Instants; i.e., when tickets are purchased, they are replaced with the same prize. Provide three examples where Proposer has delivered unlimited or limited series ticket functionality to the US, Canadian Provinces, and other foreign jurisdictions; and for each example, note which type of ticket series was utilized. If you have only provided limited series, please detail your ability to provide unlimited series.” Can the Lottery please clarify the ticket structure it wishes to offer? We understand that NHLC offers depleting pool ticket functionality, so, when a ticket is purchased, it is removed from that series of tickets. Then, when all tickets in a series are purchased, a new set of tickets will automatically start, seamless to the player. Is this the ticket structure NHLC wants to offer? | The NHLC is moving to unlimited series and will only launch unlimited series moving forward. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirements for a Proposal I.E.i, page 10 | The RFP states “Provide unlimited series of tickets for e-Instants.” Is this a legal requirement or will the Lottery consider RNG based games. In some cases, RNG games make for a better user experience for the player. RNG games can be defined as randomly choosing the outcome from | The NHLC is open to discussing this option. |

| | <p>an unlimited game file, with predetermined outcomes. This means that all prizes are always present, however, when they occur is randomly determined from a predetermined file. Would this be an acceptable approach for the NHLC?</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------|-----------------|------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|------|--------|-------|---------|--------|-------|------------------|--------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <p>Section 5 – Content and Requirements for a Proposal I.E.n, page 10</p> | <p>Subsection n requires a proposed roadmap, meanwhile on page 13, there is a description of the category of games proposers should provide. Does the NHLC have any preference for the mix of categories and the number of games per month in the proposed roadmap?</p> | <p>The mix of games should provide variety for the player to include single ticket, multi-ticket and multi-ticket bonus round games with various themes and seasonality. The NHLC is also open to extended play type games and games not currently offered, but provide entertainment value for the players. The number of games launched per month is currently one. At this time the NHLC has no plans to change that, but may do so in the future.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal I.E.q, page 11</p> | <p>Regarding: “All e-Instants provided must be supported on mobile and desktop platforms, and multiple browsers offering the same play experience. Browsers include but are not limited to Internet Explorer, Edge, Chrome, Safari, and Firefox.” Can you please provide statistics on percent of play by browser type?</p> | <p>From 9/4/2018 to 9/17/2019, below is the data for people coming to the iLottery games page:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="849 743 1482 1293"> <thead> <tr> <th>Browser</th> <th>Number of Users</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chrome</td> <td>273,751</td> <td>50.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Safari</td> <td>190,329</td> <td>34.96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edge</td> <td>27,507</td> <td>5.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Firefox</td> <td>15,423</td> <td>2.83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Samsung Internet</td> <td>11,727</td> <td>2.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Internet Explorer</td> <td>11,090</td> <td>2.04%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Android Webview</td> <td>7,284</td> <td>1.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Safari (in-app)</td> <td>2,858</td> <td>0.53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amazon Silk</td> <td>2,718</td> <td>0.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opera</td> <td>1,569</td> <td>0.29%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Browser | Number of Users | Percentage | Chrome | 273,751 | 50.29% | Safari | 190,329 | 34.96% | Edge | 27,507 | 5.05% | Firefox | 15,423 | 2.83% | Samsung Internet | 11,727 | 2.15% | Internet Explorer | 11,090 | 2.04% | Android Webview | 7,284 | 1.34% | Safari (in-app) | 2,858 | 0.53% | Amazon Silk | 2,718 | 0.50% | Opera | 1,569 | 0.29% |
| Browser | Number of Users | Percentage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chrome | 273,751 | 50.29% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Safari | 190,329 | 34.96% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Edge | 27,507 | 5.05% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Firefox | 15,423 | 2.83% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samsung Internet | 11,727 | 2.15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Internet Explorer | 11,090 | 2.04% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Android Webview | 7,284 | 1.34% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Safari (in-app) | 2,858 | 0.53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Amazon Silk | 2,718 | 0.50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opera | 1,569 | 0.29% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Section 5.F.c, page 11</p> | <p>Regarding: “Provide marketing materials suited for promotional banners featured on the Lottery’s website or within email communication to players. Provide three (3) marketing pieces delivered to lottery partners for customer relationship marketing (CRM) and three (3) marketing pieces delivered for acquisition. Materials must be accompanied with a brief description of the promotional piece. Provide results from each piece including registrations, deposits, conversion rates, sales, and bets. This work will be evaluated based on creative design, call to action, and results.” Game providers do not have access to registrations, deposits, conversion rates, sales and bets related to marketing materials.</p> | <p>The NHLC will amend this section to only evaluate marketing materials provided. However, if vendors are able to secure the results of promotions using the marketing materials and can provide them to the NHLC, it would be appreciated.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Is NHLC open to amending this section of the RFP and focus its evaluation on the marketing materials provided rather than the results? | |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal I.F., page 11 | This section of the RFP requires proposers to provide marketing services that support the iLottery program. Could the NHLC please provide a percentage of handle/hold or other defined metric the NHLC will dedicate to marketing services that support the growth of the iLottery program including, player acquisition, retention, and other activities? | The NHLC dedicates approximately 30% of its overall marketing budget to the iLottery acquisition program. The retention budget is between 3-7% of NGR. The NHLC is starting cross-over promotions in retail, will launch additional DBG games, and will continue to tag traditional lottery marketing assets with iLottery. The NHLC will continue to evolve the program as the landscape changes and new opportunities arise. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal I.G.f, page 12 | Regarding: “Provide details on the back office system the Lottery will access to view wagers and other game-specific details not disseminated fully through the NPi system.” Can the Lottery please confirm the use case they envision using this back-office system for? | If there is data beyond what is provided via NPi’s system, the NHLC would like to access it so it can better understand the game play and can continue to enhance its offerings and better understand player habits. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal II. The Price Proposal Contents, page 13 | The RFP states that net gaming revenue (NGR) is defined as tickets sold less prizes and bonuses paid. Could the NHLC further define NGR by letting proposers know what the aggregate payout is? Further, what are the percentages of bonusing outside the payout? | The payout for e-Instants is 85%. The budget for CRM bonuses is between 3-7% of NGR. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal II. The Price Proposal Contents, page 13 | Would the NHLC be willing to pay the Vendor a minimum guarantee per month (in addition to the NGR% for content), which would enable the Vendor to cover significant hosting and capital expenditure costs? | No, NHLC will not consider this pricing structure. |
| Section 5 – Content and Requirement for a Proposal II. The Price Proposal Contents, page 13 | The RFP illustrates a pricing matrix for content (as % of NGR); does the NHLC also intend to pay the Vendor for the design, implementation and adaptation of bespoke, customized and makeover content? | The cost of design, implementation, adaptation and the like for customized, makeover or bespoke games should be reflected in the price percentage proposed. |
| Section 6 – Evaluation of Proposals, J., page 17 | Regarding: “Proposers who have been identified as qualifying for selection will be advised of their pending selection and given a set period of time to meet with NPi and the advertising agency of record to develop an integration plan for review and acceptance by NHLC. The final approved integration plan will become a component of any future contract between NHLC and the Proposer. The integration plan must include, at a minimum, a work plan and schedule which will allow for launch of | A myriad of items will determine integration including each vendor’s timeline and ability to integrate (if vendor A indicates it will take 6 months we will not prioritize them or hold back vendor B who may be able to integrate in 2 months), game offerings, and pricing. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Proposer’s games on the iLottery platform within twelve (12) months of the date of contract. Note, though integration onto the platform is required within twelve (12) months of the date of contract, the Lottery is not required to launch any particular vendor’s games in twelve (12) months. The schedule of game launch is determined by the Lottery. All integration plans must include...” Understood that the game launch is determined by the Lottery, but can NHLC confirm how they will select the order of supplier integrations?</p> | |
| <p>Section 7 – Terms and Conditions Related to the RFP Process, C., page 18</p> | <p>The RFP states that, “Upon contract award, the State reserves the right to use any information presented in any Proposal.” Please confirm the information submitted shall never be shared with other government divisions, and will be kept confidential from the public unless legally required to be distributed (in which case redacted documents will be distributed).</p> | <p>Confirmed.</p> |
| <p>Appendix A: Standard Terms and Conditions, 4., page 2 of 4</p> | <p>Please confirm that the payments owed for e-Instant services shall be made regularly, and not subject to “the availability and continued appropriation of funds, and in no event shall the State be liable for any payment hereunder in excess of such available appropriated funds.”</p> | <p>Given the nature of the contract (payment as a percentage of product sold), the payments are not subject to appropriation of funds.</p> |
| <p>Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 2., page 26</p> | <p>Please confirm the extension in case of emergency (Section 2) does not apply to this agreement.</p> | <p>Extension in case of emergency applies to this contract.</p> |
| <p>Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 8., page 27</p> | <p>Termination for convenience is not practical under this circumstance, as the Contractor will incur integration costs and travel expenses which will be significant. Please confirm that if terminated for convenience, NHLC would cover all costs incurred until that point, including integration costs.</p> | <p>NHLC is willing to negotiate compromise language relating to the termination for convenience.</p> |
| <p>Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 10., page 29</p> | <p>Will there be any appeal or arbitration process for damages, remedies and rulings that the proposer might find unreasonable?</p> | <p>There is no arbitration process; however vendors may utilize the dispute resolution process provided in the agreement.</p> |
| <p>Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 16., page 30</p> | <p>Please provide an example of a Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan that would be acceptable under Section 16.</p> | <p>The NHLC cannot provide an example of a plan. This is up to the vendor and based on best business practices for continuity of operations and disaster recovery.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 28.A.I., page 34 | Timely and Accurate Report and Files - \$1,000 per file loss per day is significant. Please reduce to \$1,000 per day maximum. | The NHLC will amend as suggested. |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 28.A.III., page 34 | The penalty for a delayed launch is open-ended and does not account for situations that may be beyond the contractor’s control. For example, a licensor may hold up a game for a few days or indefinitely or UAT may hold up a game for a visual bug found very late in integration testing. Would it be acceptable that in the final contract the verbiage be amended to include “until a mutually agreed upon replacement is found” and “unless there are extenuating circumstances beyond contractor’s direct control.” | Yes, the NHLC will agree to this and will amend the contract to reflect this change. |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 28.A.III., page 34 | Warranty on e-Instant Launch - \$10,000 seems excessive for the damage incurred. Please reduce to \$1,000 per day. | The NHLC will reduce to “up to \$5,000 per day.” |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 28.A.IV, page 34 | Warranty on e-Instant Functionality - \$1,000 per hour seems excessive. Please reduce to \$1,000 per day. | The NHLC will reduce to “up to \$5,000 per day.” |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, general question. | Please reconsider all liquidated damages to a more reasonable \$1,000/day for all occurrences. | NHLC is willing to consider amendments to the liquidated damages provisions during negotiations. |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, general question. | All the penalties appear to be flat amounts regardless of the financial impact of the failure and the number of games deployed or amount of revenue our games make. Would the Lottery consider a prorated penalty system based on game’s GGR, or at least a commitment to a minimum number of games deployed to avoid potential penalties far exceeding the proposer’s potential revenue? | NHLC is willing to consider amendments to the liquidated damages provisions during negotiations, including changing the format of damages to a percentage as opposed to flat fee. |
| Section 2 – General Terms and Conditions, 28.A.XII, page 34 | In regards to the penalties for failing to pass UAT on time, would it be reasonable for the contractor to expect some clarity and rules up front on what is considered a non-passable issue (like a crash or broken functionality) versus a minor visual bug that may be deemed acceptable and unworthy of holding up a game launch? Might the contractor also expect a mutually agreed upon cut-off date for polish requests and fixes for any minor presentation or art issues, i.e. an Art Freeze date? | Note that the vendor may be charged. It does not state it will be charged. The NHLC is looking to partner with various vendors to bring the best possible games to the players. There may be minor glitches in games in UAT that can easily be addressed and updated without penalty and without delay of launch. Delay of launch is the larger concern, which may then incur penalty. The NHLC is open to mutually agreed-upon cut-off dates for polish requests and fixes. |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| General Question | For connectivity planning and scoping, can the Lottery please provide physical locations for Primary and Secondary servers for production, UAT and QA for the NeoPollard iLottery platform and servers that will require RGS integration? | The NHLC cannot provide exact locations until contracting is underway, and only upon written consent of NPi. However, both sites are within an hour of the NHLC headquarters in Concord, NH. |
|------------------|---|--|