



## AWARD RECOMMENDATION

---

### RFP No. MSL 23-001 Internet Sales Platform & Related Services

The Michigan Bureau of State Lottery (Michigan Lottery) has completed the evaluation of bidder proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. MSL 23-001, Internet Sales Platform and Related Services. The Michigan Lottery recommends an award to NeoGames US LLP in the amount of \$250,000,000, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: <https://www.michigan.gov/dtmb/policies/state-ad-board>.

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the Michigan Lottery's rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Dana Worrall, Solicitation Manager  
MSL-RFP@Michigan.gov

#### **Purpose:**

RFP No. MSL 23-001 was issued to procure a contract to provide an internet sales platform and related services to the Michigan Lottery. The term of the contract is six years, with up to six one-year renewal options.

#### **Background Information:**

In 2014, Michigan Lottery launched one of the first online lottery sales programs in the U.S. (iLottery). When the RFP was issued for these services in January 2013, iLottery was a new idea. There were no established U.S. iLottery programs and there were no established iLottery platform contractors operating in the U.S. And as a result, no U.S. residents held accounts that allowed them to purchase lottery tickets online. In the North American lottery market in 2013, iLottery was a start-up business concept. That is why the 2013 RFP for iLottery services had fewer restrictions for bidders and simpler technical requirements compared to this RFP.

Michigan Lottery was one of the first states to sell electronic versions of both draw and instant games online, but the products entered the market incrementally. In August 2014, the Michigan Lottery was the first in the U.S. to sell electronic scratch-off tickets (electronic instant games) The platform and business processes developed over the next 17 months and draw games sales went live online in January 2016.



Over the years, other states have launched iLottery programs using Michigan as a model and Michigan has continued to evolve. In the 10 years since the program launched, Michigan's iLottery has contributed more than \$1 billion dollars to Michigan's School Aid Fund, with more than half coming in the last three fiscal years. To accomplish these contributions, numerous and extensive integrations and improvements to systems and processes have taken place.

The Michigan iLottery is a mature program that moved out of the start-up phase long ago and is currently focused on refining established protocols and maximizing the accessible market. The iLottery achieved the highest annual online revenue in fiscal year 2023 (measured as draw sales plus electronic instant games net gaming), with the second highest in fiscal year 2021. These accomplishments happened despite more entertainment competition and economic challenges than ever before.

Michigan's state population is about 10 million and almost 7.9 million are over the age of 18. Michigan's iLottery has more than 2.2 million registered account holders and more than 1.1 million players that have purchased Michigan Lottery products online. Framed differently, twenty-eight percent of Michigan adults are registered iLottery users. Every month, there are around 168 million purchases and wins processed, more than 1.2 million deposits and withdrawals handled, and nearly 8.3 million logins from approximately 500,000 unique users. To put that all into perspective, more than 1 out of every 4 adults in Michigan is registered, more than 1 out of every 8 has purchased lottery online, and around 1 out of 16 are regularly logging in every month. In sum, Michigan Lottery requires a best-in-class iLottery platform to maintain the high expectations and performance of this program.

### **Request for Proposal, Contract Formation, and Conversion Timelines**

The current iLottery system contract ends July 17, 2026, with no further optional extension years. To allow for a complete examination of the available platforms and a successful launch of what could be a new iLottery platform, Michigan Lottery issued an RFP approximately three years before the current contract expiration. This provided about twelve months for proposal review and vendor selection, six months for contract formation, and eighteen months for system conversion.

Twelve months is a minimal timeline for proposal review considering the complexity of modern iLottery platforms and services. Each bidder proposal is 600 curated pages. All bids go through a scrutinous review performed by an Evaluation Committee made up of Michigan Lottery employees. The Evaluation Committee assessed the totality of all bids to determine which are eligible and which provides the best value for the Michigan Lottery and the State of Michigan.



Six months is an ambitious timeline for contract formation, negotiation, adequate review, and required State approvals. Contract formation includes, but is not limited to, service level agreements, third party agreements, liquidated damages, and other negotiable items.

A minimum of 18 months is necessary for conversion to a new platform. This time period was anticipated in 2013 when the RFP included an 18-month conversion period. 18 months is also the conversion timeframe identified in the current contract. 18 months is a challengingly short timeline given the sophistication of the current system and player market, and the extensive testing that must be conducted. The Michigan Lottery must ensure adequate timelines for the conversion so there is no negative impact to state funding that would come from disruption to the system.

Conversion to an iLottery system other than the current system would require a migration of all existing system data, including, but not limited to: all system integrations, all game studio integrations, all game records, all player data for more than 2.2 million registered players, all records of approximately 2 billion sales and wins per year, and all financial transactional data from the more than 1.1 million depositors (which already includes approximately 253 million deposits and withdrawals). And by the time conversion occurs, there would be an additional two years of data. Migration must occur in a safe and secure way prior to testing. Migration must occur while the new system runs in parallel with the existing system, necessitating an initial migration and several delta migrations built in over a series of months. After migration, every aspect of the system, including every game and every report must be fully tested end-to-end by multiple units within the Michigan Lottery. Any bugs would need to be corrected and the affected systems would need to be retested. Estimating an 18-month conversion is reasonable.

In addition to the technical aspects of conversion, it is critical that all Michigan Lottery and vendor staff be educated on any systems changes so that all integrations, all payment systems, all games, and all account functions perform flawlessly with no downtime. Downtime of even 24 hours could result in more than \$1 million dollars of lost revenue. A seamless conversion is important for players as even a 5% reduction of sales resulting from errors or unhappy players would be more than \$16 million less in contributions to schools.

In sum, beginning the process of forming a new iLottery contract three years before the current contract expires is eminently reasonable and necessary.



**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted at <https://www.michigan.gov/msl/2023001> on June 16, 2023. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of November 29, 2023.

<b>Bidder</b>	<b>Address, City, State, Zip Code</b>	<b>SDVOB*</b>	<b>GDBE**</b>
<b>Allwyn North America Inc. (Allwyn)</b>	200 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 425, Chicago, IL 60606	No	No
<b>IGT Global Solutions Corporation (IGT)</b>	10 Memorial Blvd., Providence, RI 02903	No	No
<b>NeoGames US LLP (NeoGames)</b>	20 Cabot Blvd., Suite 300, Mansfield, MA 02048	No	No
<b>Pollard Banknote Limited (Pollard)</b>	140 Otter Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 0M8	No	No
<b>Scientific Games, LLC (Scientific Games)</b>	1500 Bluegrass Lakes Parkway, Alpharetta, Georgia 30004	No	No

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

\*\*GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise



## EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

---

### I. Evaluation Process

A bidder must demonstrate that it can successfully perform the duties identified in the RFP. A proposal had to be submitted in accordance with the RFP instructions and meet all mandatory minimum requirements identified in the RFP.

#### **Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements**

1. Own or have unlimited license to the code that forms the core functionality of the iLottery system being proposed by bidder, and
2. Have provided services of similar size and scope as those outlined in this RFP using the same iLottery system proposed by bidder in at least one government-operated lottery in North America for at least 6 months.

#### **Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process**

The Evaluation Committee reviewed all submitted proposals to determine if any proposals failed to meet the mandatory minimum requirements identified in the RFP. Any proposal that failed to meet the mandatory minimum requirements was removed from further consideration and was not scored.

The Evaluation Committee scored all properly submitted proposals that conformed to the minimum requirements. A total of 530 points were available as follows:

- a. System Overview – 180 Points
- b. Player Accounts – 74 Points
- c. Games Support – 54 Points
- d. Payments – 82 Points
- e. Communications and Promotions – 72 Points
- f. Staffing and Support – 68 Points

To be eligible for further consideration, a proposal must have reached a score of 477 points (the Eligible Score), which is 90% of all points available. Scoring stopped when a proposal reached the Eligible Score, and no additional points were awarded. The Evaluation Committee continued reviewing a proposal after reaching the Eligible Score, for the purpose of noting any deficiencies and evaluating the best value. A scoring summary is attached at the end of this award recommendation.

Best value does not simply mean lowest price. Best value is a combination of factors including but not limited to price of goods and services offered, total cost of operation, breadth and flexibility of the proposal, local economic benefits, ease of administration, bidder experience and expertise, risks of disruption or delay, and any other factors the Evaluation Committee determines relevant to identifying what it believes to be the best overall proposal for Michigan Lottery and the State of Michigan at the time.

***The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.***



## II. Evaluation Committee

Properly submitted proposals were reviewed by the Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Scott Hall, Director of IT Security Michigan Bureau of State Lottery	Dana Worrall, Contract Specialist Michigan Bureau of State Lottery
Abby Harvey, Digital Gaming Specialist Michigan Bureau of State Lottery	Julie Proux, Department Services Manager Michigan Bureau of State Lottery
Sandeep Jain, Director of Technology and Platforms Michigan Bureau of State Lottery	Jake Harris, Player Relations Manager Michigan Bureau of State Lottery
Zac Strickler, Director of Digital Gaming Operations Michigan Bureau of State Lottery	Joe Froehlich, Chief Operating Officer Michigan Bureau of State Lottery
Shontae Tolliver, UX/Usability Analyst Michigan Bureau of State Lottery	

## III. Evaluation Summary

### A. Bidder # 1: Allwyn North America Inc.

The Evaluation Committee determined that Allwyn North America Inc. met the Eligible Score by evaluating Allwyn’s responses to Section 7 of the RFP, the Technical Requirements.

#### 1. A. System Overview

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section A.9.b, Data Breach Alerting – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

#### 2. B. Player Accounts

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section B.1.e, Player Authentication – Did not describe how they will comply with restricted login.

#### 3. C. Games Support

The Evaluation Committee determined that Bidder met all requirements of this section.



#### **4. D. Payments**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Bidder met all requirements of this section.

#### **5. E. Customer Engagement**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section E.4.b, Managing Loyalty Points – Did not match with calendar month example.

#### **6. F. Staffing and Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Bidder met all requirements of this section.

### **B. Bidder # 2: IGT Global Solutions Corporation**

The Evaluation Committee determined that IGT Global Solutions Corporation met the Eligible Score by evaluating IGT's responses to Section 7 of the RFP, the Technical Requirements.

#### **1. A. System Overview**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section A.1.c, Third-Party Integration – Did not describe promotions or marketing integration capabilities.

Section A.1.d, Equipment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.1.e, Diagrams – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.2.f, System Availability and Monitoring – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.2.h, Hosting Environment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.3.e, Protection against Unauthorized Access or Service Disruption – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.a, Stand Alone or Multi-Tenant Environment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.h, Software Development Resources – Did not describe how estimations are done and did not provide a detailed plan.

Section A.4.i, Multi-Tenant – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.



Section A.5.a, Quality Assurance Environment – Did not meet the requirement for MSL use of QA.

Section A.5.c, Production Testing – Did not meet the requirement.

Section A.7.b, Coupon system – Did not meet the requirement and relies on the retail central gaming system for coupon creation.

Section A.9.a, Payment alerts – Did not address payment issues outside of fraud.

Section A.9.b, Data Breach Alerting – Did not provide sufficient alerting to meet the requirement.

Section A.9.c, Production Software and Hardware Alerts – Did not provide sufficient software change alerting.

Section A.9.f, File Failure Alerts – Did not address requirement.

## **2. B. Player Accounts**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section B.2.b, Spending Limits – Did not address cool-off for raising limits.

Section B.3.d, Shopping Cart Functionality – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section B.3.h, UI and Content Testing – Bidder relies on separate party or optional service to meet this requirement.

## **3. C. Games Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section C.1.a, Game Integration Documentation and Developer Kit – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section C.2.a, Game Compliance – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section C.3.b, Scope of Transactions – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section C.3.c, Third-Party Integration – Daily file does not provide sufficient ICS alignment.

## **4. D. Payments**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:



Section D.1.a, Vendor Banking Services – Did not propose methods to ensure funds more than \$250,000 remain secure against risks.

Section D.1.g, Failover Protection – Did not include failover protection in the bid.

Section D.2.d, ACH Funding Verification – Did not address pre-note for new funding sources.

Section D.2.f, Single Debit Funding and Purchase – Did not describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section D.3.d, Additional Payment Projects – Did not agree to the three per year requirements.

## **5. E. Customer Engagement**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section E.4.a, Earning Loyalty Points – Insufficient flexibility for point assignment.

Section E.4.b, Managing Loyalty Points – Did not match with calendar month example.

Section E.4.d, Ticket Entry Capabilities – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

## **6. F. Staffing and Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section F.1.c, Support Availability – Bidder recommends part-time coverage.

Section F.1.l, Automated Prompt System – Automated prompt system only includes chatbot.

Section F.1.n, Chat and Chatbot – Did not describe escalation to live agent.

Section F.1.q, Player Account Access – Did not describe MSL access.

Section F.1.r, CSC Service Levels – Did not agree to required service levels.

Section F.2.a, Staff Working Hours – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section F.2.c, Staffing Practices – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section F.2.g, Strategic Planning Services – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.



### **C. Bidder # 3: NeoGames US LLP**

The Evaluation Committee determined that NeoGames met the Eligible Score by evaluating NeoGames' responses to Section 7 of the RFP, the Technical Requirements.

#### **1. A. System Overview**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section A.2.f, System Availability and Monitoring – Did not agree to 100% uptime.

Section A.4.i, Multi-Tenant – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.8.h, Expired Prizes Reporting – Bidder wrote that the export file would contain two prizes.

#### **2. B. Player Accounts**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section B.1.k, Player Data and History – Did not provide the full list.

Section B.1.l, Data Ownership – Did not comply with this requirement.

Section B.3.f, Messaging Center – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

#### **3. C. Games Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Bidder met all requirements of this section.

#### **4. D. Payments**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section D.3.e, Check Writing – Did not describe how they will comply with the maintenance requirement.

Section D.4.c, Annuities – Did not comply with this requirement.

#### **5. E. Customer Engagement**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section E.2.a, Promotion Codes – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.



Section E.2.b, Free Games – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

## **6. F. Staffing and Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Bidder met all requirements of this section.

### **D. Bidder # 4: Scientific Games, LLC**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Scientific Games, LLC met the Eligible Score by evaluating Scientific Games' responses to Section 7 of the RFP, the Technical Requirements.

#### **1. A. System Overview**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section A.1.b, System Flexibility – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.1.c, Third-Party Integration – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.1.d, Equipment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.1.e, Diagrams – Architecture and network diagrams were not provided.

Section A.2.e, System Performance and Scalability – Did not provide adequate metrics and speed.

Section A.2.f, System Availability and Monitoring– Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.2.h, Hosting Environment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.3.a, System Access Approval – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.3.b, Authentication, Authorization and Access Controls – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.3.d, Compliance with Security Requirements – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.a, Stand Alone or Multi-Tenant Environment – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.



Section A.4.d, Release Cycles – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.e, Documentation Process – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.f, Software and Hardware Documentation – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.4.g, Testing Plans – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement and example documents are not readable.

Section A.4.h, Software Development Resources – Did not describe estimation and the software release plan is not fully built out.

Section A.4.i, Multi-Tenant – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.5.a, Quality Assurance Environment – Did not meet the requirement for MSL use of QA.

Section A.5.c, Production Testing – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.8.b, Reconciliation Reporting – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.8.c, Balancing Reports – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section A.8.l, Geolocation Reporting – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

## **2. B. Player Accounts**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section B.1.h, Player Wallets – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section B.1.i, Player Account Security – Architecture and network diagrams were not provided.

Section B.1.j, Fraud Accounts – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

## **3. C. Games Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:



Section C.1.a, Game Integration Documentation and Developer Kit – Referenced 7.C.1.d, which did not describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section C.2.b, Draw Game Requirements – Did not describe daily maintenance.

Section C.3.b, Scope of Transactions – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section C.3.c, Third-Party Integration – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

#### **4. D. Payments**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section D.1.a, Vendor Banking Services – Did not propose methods to ensure funds more than \$250,000 remain secure against risks.

Section D.1.g, Failover Protection – Did not include failover protection in the bid.

Section D.2.c, Player Wallet Funding Methods – Did not meet the requirement for Discover or American Express.

Section D.4.d, Claim Center Back Office – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

#### **5. E. Customer Engagement**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section E.2.a, Promotion Codes – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section E.3.b, Raffle System – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section E.4.e, Loyalty Tiers – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

Section E.4.i, Future Development – Did not fully describe how they will comply with this requirement.

#### **6. F. Staffing and Support**

The Evaluation Committee determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

Section F.1.i, Automated Prompt System – Automated prompt system only includes chatbot.



Section F.2.b, Staffing Levels – Did not indicate commitment to hire in Michigan.

#### **E. Bidder # 5: Pollard Banknote Limited**

The Evaluation Committee determined that Pollard Banknote Limited did not meet the mandatory minimum requirements of the RFP. As required by paragraph 47 of the RFP instructions, Pollard’s proposal was removed from further consideration and the Evaluation Committee did not evaluate Pollard’s responses to Section 7 of the RFP, the Technical Requirements.

Paragraphs 45 through 47 of the RFP state:

45. To meet the minimum requirements of this RFP, bidder must:

- a. own or have unlimited license to the code that forms the core functionality of the iLottery system being proposed by bidder, and
- b. have provided services of similar size and scope as those outlined in this RFP using the same iLottery system proposed by bidder in at least one government-operated lottery in North America for at least 6 months.

46. The Evaluation Committee will begin its review of properly submitted proposals to determine if any proposals fail to confirm these minimum requirements.

47. Any proposal that fails to meet the minimum requirements will be removed from further consideration and will not be scored.

Question 9 of Section 4 of the RFP states:

Describe any relevant experiences from the last five years supporting your ability to successfully manage a contract awarded under this RFP.

In response to Question 9, Pollard discusses the iLottery system provided by NeoPollard Interactive (NPi) in Michigan and various other U.S. states. NPi is Pollard’s 50%-owned joint venture with NeoGames. But the iLottery system proposed by Pollard in this RFP is not the same iLottery system provided by NPi, and Pollard does not own or have unlimited license to the code that forms the core functionality of the iLottery system being provided by NPi.

Pollard’s response to Question 9 of Section 4 of the RFP also indicates that the iLottery system proposed by Pollard in this RFP has been implemented in whole or in part to provide iLottery services in the following jurisdictions: Danske Spil (Denmark), British Columbia Lottery Corporation (BCLC), OPAP (Greece), Loto Catalunya (LCAT) (Spain), Norsk Tipping (Norway), Euloto (Lithuania) and Promosport (Tunisia). But the services



identified in Question 9 do not meet the mandatory minimum requirements of this RFP because the lotteries identified are not in North America, or the services are not provided using the same iLottery system that forms the basis of the core functionality of the Pollard's iLottery system.

Question 15 in Section 4 of the RFP states:

For at least six months, have you provided services of similar size and scope as those described in this RFP to at least one government-operated lottery in North America using the same iLottery system described in your answer to [Question 14]? If so, provide the name, contact person, contact information, and contract number for each lottery. If not, your proposal may be disqualified.

Pollard's response to Question 15 does not indicate that Pollard has provided services of similar size and scope as those described in the RFP to at least one government-operated lottery in North America using the same iLottery system that forms the basis of the core functionality of the Pollard's proposed iLottery system. Instead, Pollard's response to Question 15 indicates that Pollard has provided services to two government-operated lotteries in Europe. These services do not meet the mandatory minimum requirements because the lotteries identified are not located in North America. Pollard's response to Question 15 also indicates that Pollard Banknote Limited has provided services to one government-operated lottery located in North America, but those services were not provided using the same iLottery system that forms the basis of the core functionality of the Pollard's iLottery system described in their response to the RFP.

The services identified by Pollard do not meet the mandatory minimum requirements because the services are not of similar size and scope as those described in the RFP. In addition, these services do not meet the mandatory minimum requirements because the services are not provided using the same iLottery system that forms the basis of the core functionality of the Pollard's iLottery system described in the RFP.



#### IV. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for all bids that met the Eligible Score as follows:

Model 1	Flat percent of gross sales through the shopping cart and deposits into the player account.			
	Allwyn	IGT	NeoGames	Scientific Games
<b>First Round Pricing</b>	5.5%	1.95%	7.3%	1.56%
<b>Best and Final Offer (BAFO)</b>	5.4%	No BAFO submitted	7.1%	1.33%

NOTE: As explained in the later section discussing price, the Michigan Lottery believes that IGT and Scientific Games interpreted model 1 to mean total gross sales from all games, which is different than what is written in the RFP. Michigan Lottery sought clarification in the Best and Final Offer request sent to both bidders. IGT did not submit a Best and Final Offer. Scientific Games stated in their Best and Final Offer that “the rates include an assumption of 0 (zero) for deposits.” Deposits are not zero in a system that runs in a manner described in the RFP. Contracts using the model 1 pricing IGT and Scientific Games submitted would likely not be feasible or sustainable.

Model 2	Allwyn	IGT	NeoGames	Scientific Games
<b>First Round Pricing:</b> Percent of gross sales through the shopping cart.	5.5%	6%	2.5%	5%
<b>First Round Pricing:</b> Percent of net gaming revenue (sales less prizes and promotions)	6.7%	12%	12.5%	12.89%
<b>BAFO:</b> Percent of gross sales through the shopping cart.	5.45%	No BAFO submitted	2.5%	4.25%
<b>BAFO:</b> Percent of net gaming revenue (sales less prizes and promotions)	6.65%	No BAFO submitted	12%	10.91%



## **V. Best Value Evaluation and Award Recommendation**

All proposals that reached the Eligible Score were reviewed for best value to Michigan Lottery and the State of Michigan. Best value does not simply mean lowest price. Best value is a combination of factors including, but not limited to, price of goods and services offered, total cost of operation, breadth and flexibility of the proposal, local economic benefits, ease of administration, bidder experience and expertise, risks of disruption or delay, and any other factors the Evaluation Committee determined relevant to identifying what it believes to be the best overall proposal for the Michigan Lottery and the State of Michigan at the time.

Award recommendation is made to the bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan.

### **Overview**

All bids that met the minimum requirements and reached the Eligible Score on the technical requirements were of excellent quality and were fully reviewed by the Evaluation Committee for this RFP. NeoGames provides the best value to the Michigan Lottery and State of Michigan.

The Evaluation Committee's consideration of the following summarize how it was determined that NeoGames provides the best value: technical evaluation, agreement to contract terms, North American market experience, games support, existing platform functionality and integrations, experience with payments, system reliability, sales volumes handled, established processes, training considerations, player support needs, migration and conversion requirements, price, provided contract funds, development hours, and other values.

#### **1. Technical score**

All bids met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation and all bidders provided lengthy documentation to address the technical requirements.

#### **2. Contract Terms Agreement**

The Michigan Lottery values adherence to the Contract Terms. NeoGames and Scientific Games agreed with all standard contract terms. IGT and Allwyn made numerous changes to various sections of the standard contract terms. By agreeing to the standard contract terms, there is less potential for extended contract disputes when forming the contract. This increases the likelihood of meeting the six-month timeline for contract formation.

#### **3. North American Market Experience**

North American market experience is important because North American lotteries must adhere to individual state or provincial regulations as well as federal laws.



North America has heightened payment regulations and anti-money laundering laws. Lotteries must meet stringent physical security, data security, and brand guidelines to sell multi-state games like Mega-Millions and Powerball. North American markets are competitive with expansive entertainment options, including internet gaming and internet sports betting. Players in North America expect a wide variety of play styles, price points, prize types, graphics, themes, and play length. Players also have high expectations for customer service and overall user experience.

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation offer an iLottery system that is currently running in at least one North American jurisdiction.

- The iLottery system offered in the IGT proposal began running in Georgia in 2013 and is running in three states.
- The iLottery system offered in the NeoGames proposal began running in Michigan in 2014 and is running in five states and one Canadian lottery.
- The iLottery system offered in the Scientific Games proposal began running in Pennsylvania in 2018.
- The iLottery system offered in the Allwyn proposal began running in Illinois in 2019.

While they all have experience, NeoGames leads for this consideration.

#### **4. Games**

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation committed to integrating required third party game providers. However, NeoGames is already integrated with third party game providers and will support every current game in the Michigan iLottery portfolio at the time of conversion.

A game studio integration can be lengthy for any iLottery platform. Thorough testing is needed from lottery staff for all game functionality (UI, backend, account functions, canceled sales, etc.) and reporting. Many players have games that are their favorites and are often older games. Not having those games available would cause a disruption and a shift for players. With the Michigan Lottery competing with internet gaming and internet sports betting, not providing players with their favorite games could mean permanently losing them.

NeoGames leads for this consideration.

#### **5. Platform Functionality and Integrations**

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation promised most of the required functionality. Allwyn and NeoGames currently meet nearly all



required functionalities. NeoGames will be providing nearly identical functionality with required third party integrations, which will lead to fewer disruptions for Michigan Lottery and players. NeoGames leads for this consideration.

## **6. Payment Options Experience**

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation have experience accepting online payments and offered most of the required payment processing functionality. Allwyn and NeoGames indicated the ability to currently provide all required functionality. At present, Allwyn's platform in North America only accepts deposits into player accounts through credit or debit and only issues withdrawals through ACH or paper check. IGT was unclear about the pre-note requirement on ACH payments. Scientific Games did not meet the requirement of accepting Discover and American Express for direct payments. Given NeoGames' ability to provide desired functionality combined with its experience offering a variety of deposit and withdrawal methods, NeoGames leads for this consideration.

## **7. System Reliability**

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation committed to systems with sufficient uptime. However, system uptime is not a statistic that is publicly reported by the bidders. Considering the Michigan Lottery's experience with the NeoGames platform uptime and its reliability, NeoGames leads in this consideration.

## **8. Processes and Training**

There is significant best value in retaining processes and practices developed and refined over the last 10 years. If Michigan Lottery were to convert to a different code, both the Michigan Lottery and the public would have to learn a new system and with over 2.2 million registered accounts and more than 1.1 million depositors, a change carries an inherent risk of player confusion, sales disruptions, and loss of players. Staff from many different work units would need extensive re-training on the use of the system, integrations, terminology, communication practices, and staff contacts. This would be done while the teams are performing their normal duties and potentially result in risks to all Michigan Lottery programs.

The platform currently running in Michigan uses the NeoGames code. With NeoGames as the chosen bidder, the technological systems and processes already in place would be mostly unchanged. The player facing elements would stay consistent. The backend systems used by the various teams would contain the same controls. Functionality and reporting refinements would stay in place.



The protocols in place for currently active business processes would continue to function.

NeoGames leads for this consideration because it significantly reduces risks related to processes and training.

## **9. Player Support Needs**

All bidders who met the Eligible Score on the technical evaluation offered customer support center functionality. Allwyn and NeoGames meet all functionality requirements. Otherwise, there is little difference between bidders in this category because any selected bidder will need to set up a new customer support team, train the team on Michigan Lottery protocols, and align communications with Michigan Lottery Player Relations.

## **10. Migration and Conversion**

Every attempt must be made to ensure the migration and conversion is seamless. A migration of an iLottery platform of this size and scope is monumental and has not been attempted in North America.

Maintaining success without disruption is critical as players have many options for wagering in this State.

When it comes to iLottery platforms, back-end systems and controls rely on intellectual property, customized software, and vendor-specific equipment. The Michigan Lottery and the vendor must collaboratively establish a full conversion plan with affected units within Lottery. The vendor must develop any required functionality that was not already in the vendor's system, including securing other contracts and integrations, and testing the new functionality. Converting to a new iLottery platform means testing all back-end functionality, every game, every report, all software bundles, and software update processes to ensure proper functionality, compatibility with other systems, security, and integrity. All bugs must be tracked, fixed, and retested. Servers and other equipment must be set up and checked to confirm they meet requirements. And all of this must be completed while simultaneously running and updating the current iLottery platform. Testing requirements and migration needs are high for any of the selected bidders, but much higher when converting to an entirely new iLottery platform.

With NeoGames as the chosen bidder using the same code, the test cases and testing experience stay the same. The current third-party integrations will be familiar and the already possessed documentation will be unchanged. The bug submission processes will remain intact and the established processes around



software updates will remain consistent. For that reason, NeoGames leads for this consideration.

## 11. Price

**System Price:** To explore pricing options and invite creativity, this RFP asked bidders to respond with two required price models and offered the option to propose alternative price models. Best and Final Offers were requested from all bidders that met the minimum requirements and the Eligible Score. Bidders were also able to offer pricing for providing remote gaming services for electronic instant games and draw games.

**Model 1:** This model is based on a flat commission percentage applied to gross sales through the shopping cart and to deposits. Allwyn and NeoGames responded with 5.4% and 7.1%, respectively. Those rates would result in similar revenue to the companies as the other pricing models. IGT and Scientific Games responded with 1.95% and 1.33% respectively. IGT's rate would result in revenue of about 25% of their Model 2 pricing. Scientific Games's rate would result in about 20% of the revenue compared to their Model 2 pricing. These prices are so low that they would not be sustainable and likely result in contract disputes. We believe that IGT and Scientific Games misunderstood Model 1 to mean a flat percentage applied to gross sales for all games. Scientific Games stated in their Best and Final Offer that "the rates include an assumption of 0 (zero) for deposits." However, deposits will not be zero. Applying the Model 1 rates IGT and Scientific Games submitted to gross sales for all games, the estimated commissions project out similarly to the projected costs of their Model 2 pricing. Michigan Lottery is therefore not considering the Model 1 pricing from IGT or Scientific Games.

**Model 2:** This model asked for a commission rate for gross sales through the shopping cart and a separate rate for instant net gaming (sales less prizes and promotions) sold through the system. This model is like the current contract.

**Draw:** For the draw game rate, IGT offered 6%, Allwyn offered 5.45%, Scientific Games offered 4.25%, and NeoGames offered the best rate of 2.5%.

**Electronic instant games:** For the electronic instant game net gaming rate, IGT and NeoGames offered 12%, Scientific Games offered 10.91%, and Allwyn offered the best rate of 6.65%.

**Option Pricing:** In the RFP, option pricing included alternative system pricing models and pricing for remote gaming services for draw and instant games.



- **System Pricing:** Three vendors offered optional pricing. All options involved tiered rates that changed based on the dollar amount of sales through the system. Allwyn offered draw rates that move from 5.5% to 3.9% as sales go up and electronic instant game rates that move from 6.9% to 5% as sales go up. Scientific Games offered a flat draw rate of 5% and electronic instant game rates that move from 12.84% to 13.8% as sales go up. NeoGames offered draw rates that move from 2.6% to 2% as sales go up and electronic instant game rates that move from 9.95% to 10.95% as sales go up.
- **Remote Gaming Services Pricing:**
  - **Draw:** NeoGames offered 1% to provide draw games. IGT and Scientific Games indicated that draw games were included with the system price. Allwyn was not clear about whether draw games were included or not. For purposes of evaluation, the Evaluation Committee assumed that Allwyn intended to include draw games.
  - **Electronic instant games:** Allwyn and IGT offered electronic instant games at 4.5% of net gaming revenue. NeoGames offered electronic instant games at 3.9% of net gaming revenue. Scientific Games offered “off the shelf” titles as included with the system price and did not indicate charges for other games. Last year, games from the NeoGames studio accounted for nine out of the top ten selling games and 66% of online instant games sales through the Michigan iLottery platform, which means the lowered commission rate may apply to a relatively larger amount of total online instant games net gaming.
- **Price Summary:** When evaluating system pricing models as a whole, Allwyn comes out as least expensive. IGT is the more expensive option. NeoGames and Scientific Games are nearly identical to each other and are in the middle. Using average sales from the last two fiscal years, pricing models showed that the cost difference between the lowest priced and highest priced platforms would likely equal less than 3.5% of the iLottery program revenue. In other words, a change of around 3.5% of revenue could equal the savings between the lowest and highest priced systems. The difference between the two best prices was closer to 1.9% of program revenue. The optional system pricing models did not substantially change the comparisons. The remote gaming services pricing moves Scientific Games between Allwyn and NeoGames, but again that is assuming that there is no additional commission charged for Scientific Games electronic instant games and no additional commission charged for Allwyn providing draw games.



## **12. Provided Contract Funds**

Allwyn offered an annual fund of \$100,000 (\$600,000 contract value) to be used for responsible gaming. IGT offered an annual fund of \$1.5 million dollars (\$9 million contract value), but IGT needs to approve the use of funds. IGT also offered a \$750,000 one-time IGT-connected play credit, an annual IGT game development fund of \$375,000 (\$2.25 million contract value), and a \$200,000 annual (\$1.2 million contract value) content integration credit. While these credits and funds add more than \$2 million annually, all of the funds and credits must be spent with IGT. NeoGames offered an annual \$500,000 unrestricted discretionary fund (\$3 million contract value). Scientific games offered no annual or one-time funds. IGT leads for total funds offered, but funds are restricted to be paid to IGT or for IGT approved items. NeoGames is second for total funds but leads in flexibility of use.

## **13. Development hours**

Allwyn offered 8,000 development hours, a 167% increase over the 3,000 hours in the current contract. If the hours are exceeded, Allwyn will charge \$150-\$173 per hour. IGT offered 1,000 development hours, a 66.7% reduction from the current contract. IGT did not address the price for development hours past the provided hours, which could mean unexpected charges or restrictive development. NeoGames offered 7,000 development hours, an increase of 133% over the current contract. If the hours are exceeded, NeoGames will charge \$175 per hour. Scientific Games offered 3,500 development hours, an increase of 16% from the current contract. Scientific Games did not address the price for development hours past the provided hours, which could mean unexpected charges or restrictive development. Allwyn leads in this category with NeoGames as a close second.

## **14. Other Value**

Allwyn offered to employ ninety individuals in a Lansing-based office. Thirty of those employees are employees for the subcontracted customer service center. Allwyn committed to a \$500,000 one-time donation to the Lansing Arts Center. IGT agreed to employ the required sixty positions to be placed in the existing in-state IGT facility. NeoGames offered to employ sixty-one individuals out of a Lansing-based office. NeoGames committed to an annual \$100,000 for scholarships for college intern programs. NeoGames also offered to include customer service support for all Lottery operations and to provide a full central data warehouse at no additional cost. Allwyn and NeoGames are leaders in this consideration.



### **15. Overall Economic Impact**

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

### **VI. Conclusion**

Award Recommendation is made to NeoGames US LLP in the amount of \$250,000,000.



## Scoring - Request for Proposals RFP No: MSL 2023-001

Section	Number	Letter	Description	Points Possible	Allwyn Score	IGT Score	NeoGames Score	Sci. Games Score
<b>A. System Overview – 180 Points</b>								
<b>General Requirements</b>								
A	1	a	Business Capabilities	3	3	3	3	3
A	1	b	System Flexibility	3	3	3	3	2
A	1	c	3rd Party Integration	3	3	2	3	2
A	1	d	Equipment	3	3	2	3	1
A	1	e	Diagrams	3	3	2	3	1
A	1	f	Industry Standards	2	2	2	2	2
A	1	g	System Hardware/Software Upgrades	3	3	3	3	3
A	1	h	Time Zones	2	2	2	2	2
A	1	i	Time Alignment	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Infrastructure</b>								
A	2	a, b, & c	Data Centers	6	6	6	6	6
A	2	d	Failover/Disaster Recovery	3	3	3	3	3
A	2	e	System Performance and Scalability	3	3	3	3	1
A	2	f	System Availability and Monitoring	3	3	2	2	2
A	2	g	Communications Networks	3	3	3	3	3
A	2	h	Hosting Environments	3	3	2	3	1
<b>System Security</b>								
A	3	a	System Access Approval	2	2	2	2	1
A	3	b	Authentication, Authorization, and Access Controls	2	2	2	2	1
A	3	c	Principle of Least Privilege	2	2	2	2	2
A	3	d	Compliance with Security Requirements	2	2	2	2	1
A	3	e	Protection Against Unauthorized Access	3	3	2	3	3
A	3	f	Other System Controls	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Software Development</b>								
A	4	a	Stand Alone or Multi-Tenant Environment	3	3	2	3	1
A	4	b	Software Development Methodology	3	3	3	3	3
A	4	c	Software Planning	3	3	3	3	3
A	4	d	Release Cycles	3	3	3	3	1
A	4	e	Documentation Process	2	2	2	2	1
A	4	f	Software and Hardware Documentation	2	2	2	2	1
A	4	g	Testing Plans	4	4	4	4	1
A	4	h	Software Development Resources (i-iii)	5	5	3	5	3
A	4	i	Multi-Tenant	2	2	1	1	0
A	4	j	Current technology	2	2	2	2	2
A	4	k	Unused Hours	2	2	2	2	2
A	4	l	Development Tracking	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Testing and Quality Assurance</b>								
A	5	a	Quality Assurance Environment	3	3	2	3	2
A	5	b	Lottery Testing Environment	3	3	3	3	3
A	5	c	Production Testing	3	3	1	3	2
A	5	d	Test Accounts	2	2	2	2	2
A	5	e	Lottery Testing Devices	2	2	2	2	2
A	5	f	Regulatory Compliance Testing	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Data Integration</b>								
A	6	a	Player Database Integration	3	3	3	3	3
A	6	b	Communications Systems Integration	3	3	3	3	3
A	6	c	Analytic Systems Integration	2	2	2	2	2
A	6	d	Other Systems Integration	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Retail Sales Support</b>								
A	7	a	Retail Integrations	3	3	3	3	3
A	7	b	Coupon System	3	3	1	3	3
A	7	c	Affiliate Program	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Reporting Services</b>								
A	8	a	General Services	3	3	3	3	3
A	8	b	Reconciliation Reporting	2	2	2	2	1
A	8	c	Balancing Reports	2	2	2	2	1
A	8	d	Daily Online Play Reporting	2	2	2	2	2
A	8	e	iLottery Game Reporting	2	2	2	2	2
A	8	f	Loyalty Reporting	2	2	2	2	2
A	8	g	Tax Reporting	2	2	2	2	2
A	8	h	Expired Prizes Reporting	2	2	2	1	2



A	8	i	Expired Player Wallet Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	j	Redemption Code and Promotions Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	k	Payments Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	l	Geolocation Reporting	2	2	2	2	1	
A	8	m	Identity Verification Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	n	Virtual Claims Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	o	Back Office User Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	p	Business Intelligence Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	q	Responsible Gaming Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	r	Other Reporting	2	2	2	2	2	
A	8	s	Customization	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Alerting</b>									
A	9	a	Payment Alerts	2	2	1	2	1	
A	9	b	Data Breach Alerting	2	1	0	2	1	
A	9	c	Production Software and Hardware Alerts	2	2	1	2	2	
A	9	d	Account Alerts	2	2	2	2	2	
A	9	e	Anti-Money Laundering Alerts	2	2	2	2	2	
A	9	f	File Failure Alerts	2	2	0	2	2	
A	9	g	Report Alerts	1	1	1	1	1	
A	9	h	Other Alerts	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Audit Requirements</b>									
A	10	a	Financial Audit	1	1	1	1	1	
A	10	b	Operations Audit	1	1	1	1	1	
A	10	c	System Changes Audit	1	1	1	1	1	
				Total points for section ----->	180	179	159	177	146
				Total points for all sections above ----->	180	179	159	177	146

## B. Player Accounts – 74 Points

<b>Player Account Management</b>									
B	1	a	Age and Identity Verification	3	3	3	3	3	
B	1	b	Player Registration	3	3	3	3	3	
B	1	c	Secure Upload Center	2	2	2	2	2	
B	1	d	Player Geolocation	2	2	2	2	2	
B	1	e	Player Authentication	2	1	2	2	2	
B	1	f	Password Reset	2	2	2	2	2	
B	1	g	Player Information	2	2	2	2	2	
B	1	h	Player Wallets	3	3	3	3	2	
B	1	i	Player Account Security	3	3	3	3	1	
B	1	j	Fraud Accounts	3	3	3	3	1	
B	1	k	Player Data and History	3	3	3	2	3	
B	1	l	Data Ownership	1	1	1	0	1	
B	1	m	Limited Access Accounts	2	2	2	2	2	
<b>Responsible Gaming</b>									
B	2	a	Responsible Gaming Standards	3	3	3	3	3	
B	2	b	Spending Limits	3	3	2	3	3	
B	2	c	Time Limits	2	2	2	2	2	
B	2	d	Self-Exclusion	2	2	2	2	2	
B	2	e	Reinstatement After Exclusion	2	2	2	2	2	
B	2	f	Responsible Gaming Integration	2	2	2	2	2	
<b>User Interface Components and Integration</b>									
B	3	a	Central and Persistent Authentication	2	2	2	2	2	
B	3	b	UI Components	3	3	3	3	3	
B	3	c	Mobile-first Design	2	2	2	2	2	
B	3	d	Shopping Cart Functionality (i-iv)	5	5	3	5	5	
B	3	e	API Services	3	3	3	3	3	
B	3	f	Messaging Center	2	2	2	1	2	
B	3	g	Personalization	3	3	3	3	3	
B	3	h	UI and Content Testing	2	2	0	2	2	
<b>Accessibility</b>									
B	4	a	Screen Reader and Accessibility	2	2	2	2	2	
B	4	b	Standards Requirements	2	2	2	2	2	
B	4	c	ADA Compliance	1	1	1	1	1	
B	4	d	Ada Coordinator	1	1	1	1	1	
B	4	e	Other Guidelines	1	1	1	1	1	
				74 Total points for section ----->	74	73	69	71	69
				Total points for all sections above ----->	254	252	228	248	215



## C. Games Support – 54 Points

General Games Services								
C	1	a	Game Integration Documentation and Dev. Kit	4	4	2	4	3
C	1	b	Remote Game Server Integration	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	c	Third Party Game Contracts	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	d	Restrictions	2	2	2	2	2
C	1	e	Minimum Integrations	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	f	Existing Integrations and Roadmaps	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	g	Third Party Game Requirements	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	h	Game Launch Controls	3	3	3	3	3
C	1	i	Third-Party Reporting	3	3	3	3	3
Game Sales								
C	2	a	Game Compliance	3	3	2	3	3
C	2	b	Draw Game Requirements	6	6	6	6	5
C	2	c	Subscription Support	4	4	4	4	4
Internal Control System								
C	3	a	Near Real Time Processing	3	3	3	3	3
C	3	b	Scope of Transactions	3	3	2	3	2
C	3	c	Third-Party Integration	3	3	2	3	2
C	3	d	Environments	2	2	2	2	2
C	3	e	Balancing	3	3	3	3	3
54	Total points for section ----->			54	54	49	54	50
Total points for all sections above ----->				308	306	277	302	265

## D. Payments – 82 Points

General Requirements								
D	1	a	Vendor Banking Services	3	3	2	3	2
D	1	b	Compliance and Risk Requirements	2	2	2	2	2
D	1	c	Merchant of Record	2	2	2	2	2
D	1	d	PCI Certification	2	2	2	2	2
D	1	e	Responsibility of Payment Fees	2	2	2	2	2
D	1	f	Lottery Approval	2	2	2	2	2
D	1	g	Failover Protection	2	2	1	2	1
Payment Acceptance								
D	2	a	Payment Processing Services	3	3	3	3	3
D	2	b	Backup and Failover Capabilities	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	c	Player Wallet Funding Methods	4	4	4	4	3
D	2	d	ACH Funding Verification	3	3	2	3	3
D	2	e	Player Facing Fees	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	f	Single Debit Funding and Purchase	2	2	1	2	2
D	2	g	Minimum Purchases and Deposits	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	h	Player Refunds	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	i	Saved Payment Types	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	j	Payment Enablement and Disablement	2	2	2	2	2
D	2	k	Prepaid Acceptance	2	2	2	2	2
Payment Issuance								
D	3	a	Withdrawal Methods	4	4	4	4	4
D	3	b	Withdrawal Methods (Amounts)	2	2	2	2	2
D	3	c	Payment Holds	2	2	2	2	2
D	3	d	Additional Payment Projects	2	2	1	2	2
D	3	e	Check Writing	2	2	2	1	2
Online Claim Center								
D	4	a	Immediate Prize Payments	3	3	3	3	3
D	4	b	Large Prize Claim Thresholds	3	3	3	3	3
D	4	c	Annuities	3	3	3	0	3
D	4	d	Claim Center Back Office	2	2	2	2	1
D	4	e	Message Exchanges	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	f	Offset Management	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	g	Tax Withholdings (-ii)	3	3	3	3	3
D	4	h	Prize Claim Hold	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	i	Documentation Storage	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	j	Completion of Prize Claim	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	k	Exceptions and Overrides	2	2	2	2	2
D	4	l	Remote Ticket Cashing	3	3	3	3	3



82	Total points for section ----->	82	82	77	78	78
	Total points for all sections above ----->	390	388	354	380	343

## E. Customer Engagement – 72 Points

Player Communication								
E	1	a	Contact Methods	3	3	3	3	3
E	1	b	Player Communication Preferences	3	3	3	3	3
E	1	c	Player Notifications	3	3	3	3	3
Promotions Capabilities								
E	2	a	Promotion Codes	3	3	3	1	2
E	2	b	Free Games	3	3	3	2	3
E	2	c	Deposit Offers	3	3	3	3	3
E	2	d	Promotion Triggers and Conditions	3	3	3	3	3
E	2	e	Shopping Cart Discounts	3	3	3	3	3
E	2	f	General Capabilities	3	3	3	3	3
E	2	g	Other Offers	3	3	3	3	3
Promotional Drawings								
E	3	a	Promotional Drawings Overview	3	3	3	3	3
E	3	b	Raffle System	3	3	3	3	2
E	3	c	Raffle drawings	3	3	3	3	3
E	3	d	Communication of Entries	3	3	3	3	3
E	3	e	Additional Promotional Games	3	3	3	3	3
Loyalty Program								
E	4	a	Earning Loyalty Points	3	3	2	3	3
E	4	b	Managing Loyalty Points	3	2	2	3	3
E	4	c	Point Spending and Rewards	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	d	Ticket Entry Capabilities	3	3	2	3	3
E	4	e	Loyalty Tiers	3	3	3	3	2
E	4	f	Drawing Tools	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	g	Prize Fulfillment	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	h	Additional Opportunities	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	i	Future Development	3	3	3	3	2
72	Total points for section ----->	72	71	69	69	68		
	Total points for all sections above ----->	462	459	423	449	411		

## F. Staffing and Support – 68 Points

Customer Service Center								
F	1	a	Support Channels	2	2	2	2	2
F	1	b	Accommodations	2	2	2	2	2
F	1	c	Support Availability	2	2	1	2	2
F	1	d	Oversight Capabilities	2	2	2	2	2
F	1	e	Data Retention	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	f	Satisfaction Measurement	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	g	Staffing Levels	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	h	Staff Information and Contacts	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	i	Failover and Disaster Recovery	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	j	Player Hotline	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	k	Call Back System	1	1	1	1	1
F	1	l	Automated Prompt System	1	1	0	1	0
F	1	m	Email	2	2	2	2	2
F	1	n	Chat and Chatbot	2	No deficiency	1	2	2
F	1	o	System Access and Case Transfers	2	No deficiency	2	2	2
F	1	p	Subject Matters Supported	2	No deficiency	2	2	2
F	1	q	Player Account Access	2	No deficiency	1	2	2
F	1	r	CSC Service Levels (i-xiii)	2	No deficiency	1	2	2
Staffing								
F	2	a	Staff Working hours	1	No deficiency	0	No deficiency	1
F	2	b	Staffing Levels	2	No deficiency	2	No deficiency	1
F	2	c	Staffing Practices	2	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	2
F	2	d	Project Manager	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1
F	2	e	Solutions Architect	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1
F	2	f	Data Analyst	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1
F	2	g	Strategic Planning Services	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1
F	2	h	Responsible Gaming manager	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1
F	2	i	Other Staff Support	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1



# MICHIGAN LOTTERY™

F	2	j	Additional Services	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
<b>Implementation Plan</b>										
F	3	a (i-iii)	Migration Strategy and Services	4	No deficiency	4	No deficiency	4		
F	3	b	Startup Schedule	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	3	c	Startup Resourcing	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
<b>Security</b>										
F	4	a	Methods and Procedures	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	b	Inspections	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	c	Unauthorized Access	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	d	Unauthorized Use	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	e	Data Integrity	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	f	Contingency Planning	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	g	Personnel Security (i-ix)	4	No deficiency	3	No deficiency	4		
F	4	h	Security Violation Reporting	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	i	Security Information (Disclosure) Updates	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	j	Disclosure	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	k	Assurances (i-ii)	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	l	Notifications (i-iii)	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
F	4	m	Eligibility of Vendor Employees	1	No deficiency	1	No deficiency	1		
<b>Additional Services</b>										
F	5	a	Legal Services	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
F	5	b	Financial and Administrative Services	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
F	5	c	Information Technology	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
F	5	d	Communications	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
F	5	e	Security	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
F	5	f	Local-economic Benefits	1	No deficiency	No deficiency	No deficiency	1		
				68	Total points for section ----->	68	18	54	28	66

Total score for all sections	Points Possible	Allwyn Score	IGT Score	NeoGames Score	Sci. Games Score
Must reach 477 points or 90% of the total 530 possible from all sections A - F ----->	530	477	477	477	477