

**CENTRAL MONITOR AND CONTROL SYSTEM FOR A VIDEO LOTTERY
TERMINAL PROGRAM
(#2009-11)**

**RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS
September 10, 2009**

This list of questions and responses #4 (Q&A#4) is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named Request for Proposals (RFP). The statements and interpretations of Contract requirements, which are stated in the following questions are not binding on the State, unless the State expressly amends the RFP. Nothing in the State's responses to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the entity asking the question as to what the Contract does or does not require. Some questions have been edited for brevity and clarity, and duplicate questions may have been combined or eliminated.

The following are questions submitted pursuant to the RFP and the Lottery Commission's responses to those questions:

85. QUESTION: Section 5.11.1 – Initial Acceptance of Central System, Page 111; Section 5.12.1 – Implementation Plan, Page 113; and Section 5.15 – Deliverables. Pages 120- 123: RFP Section 5.15 states that an asterisk in the deliverables table “denotes the dates ... required by RFP Section 5.11.1.” We believe this is a typo and that the requirement should instead reference RFP Section 5.12.1. Please confirm.

ANSWER: Yes. In Section 5.15, the reference to Section 5.11.1 will be corrected to be 5.12.1. (See Amendment #1)

86. QUESTION: Section 5.15 – Deliverables, Pages 120-123; Section 5.12.1 – Implementation Plan (pages 108-110); and RFP Appendix F – Financial Proposal Sheet (pages 182-186)

1. Will the Commission allow an Offeror to assume an arbitrary date (e.g., Facility go live) as the NTP for the next scheduled Facility and the tasks that require an NTP + under Section 5.15 that are identified by an asterisk? (There is really no way to assign the NTP + days to some of the items because they are part of the detailed schedule that would be submitted upon contract award in accordance with Section 5.12.1.)
2. Will the Commission agree that the NTP + may increase if the NTP is moved up from the arbitrary date as the implementation schedule will be based on the Facility rollout schedule, which, in turn, is based on the requirement in Appendix F?

ANSWER: There is no need to assume any arbitrary dates. Offerors need only to indicate how many days after receipt of a NTP from the Commission they

will need to accomplish the specified work (i.e., NTP + X days).

87. QUESTION: Section 7.3.11 – Required Submissions, Page 139: This Section requires the electronic submission of all Application forms on a CD. It is the intent of our company to submit the personal history disclosure form (VLT Form – 1004) in a sealed, confidential envelope in order to protect the confidentiality of employees and key personnel. This form requests highly sensitive information. With a sealed, confidential submission, we assume a tight control over the information will be provided. We will not place an electronic copy of this form on the CD as this creates a copy version of the form that can be easily replicated and distributed. Please confirm that the intended process outlined here is acceptable?

ANSWER: Section 7.3.11 requires Applicants to submit one (1) paper original and one (1) electronic copy on CD in PDF format of the Application forms listed in items #9 through 15, to include all exhibits and appendices to the Applications. The Commission is well aware of the sensitive nature of information included in all Application forms, both in paper and electronic format.

88. QUESTION: Section 7.3.11 – Required Submissions, Page 139; and Section 9.1 – Manufacturer’s License Applications and Disclosure Forms, Pages 144-145: The Multi-Jurisdictional Personal History Disclosure Form and the Maryland Supplemental Form were issued by the Commission on August 27, 2009.

a) These are lengthy forms that require a significant amount of personal and confidential information be collected and documented about the offeror’s executives and its board members. We request that additional time be allowed to collect the necessary information required to complete these forms and that the Commission allow submission of these forms within a reasonable time after the proposal submission date (e.g., ten additional business days or submission by September 30, 2009)?

b) Some of these forms (e.g., VLT form #1002) require numerous exhibits (e.g., SEC Filings) that are quite voluminous and it is difficult to comply with the requirement in Section 7.3.11 that we submit “one (1) electronic copy on CD in PDF format....” There are simply too many to scan into a single file. Is it acceptable for exhibits that are required as part of forms be provided as PDF files on separate CD(s)?

ANSWER: a) The Due Date for Receipt of Proposals is being extended until September 30, 2009. (See Amendment #1)

b) There is no limitation on the number of CDs submitted. Offerors may submit as many CDs as necessary to accommodate the required data.

89. QUESTION: a) Should the Central System contractor require the services of an independent testing laboratory during contract implementation/execution, may it

retain such services following consultation with and approval from the Commission?

b) If yes, would the utilization of an independent testing laboratory cause that lab to be precluded from any follow-on testing procurements, or procurements containing testing, that may be issued by the Lottery or Commission?

ANSWER: a) The Commission does not anticipate that the Central System Contractor will require the services of an independent testing laboratory, but any such subcontract arrangement would require prior approval by the Commission.

b) The RFP states that the Contractor for the Central System shall be prohibited from being awarded a subsequent contract by the Commission for the provision of VLTs or VLT Testing, however, the restriction on providing VLTs is being deleted. (See Amendment #1) In regard to a prohibition on subcontractors, the Commission would have to make a determination on a case by case basis dependant upon what role the subcontractor was fulfilling, or proposed to fulfill, on both contracts.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK