

RFP-LC000067 – LICENSING AND REGULATORY PLATFORM

Q&A RESPONSE

February 16, 2026

1. Offshore Personnel Usage. Can you clarify whether the restriction on offshore personnel applies exclusively to environments where Commission data is processed or stored? Specifically, is the use of offshore developers allowed for portions of the project that do not involve handling or accessing production data (e.g., custom development in isolated environments)?

Answer:

Please see the RFP at Section 3.4.10 Security and Integrity Requirements:

Data shall only be localized within the United States of America. [Note: For clarity, note that this requirement applies to the Successful Contractor and to any subcontractors engaged to provide Services under this Agreement or with access to Commission data. The Successful Contractor must ensure that its subcontractor agreements address this requirement, and the Successful Contractor will be responsible for monitoring and enforcing subcontractor compliance at all times.] (underline added).

Please see the RFP at Section 4.1.2 Qualification and Capacity:

The project team(s) and human resources that responding company would use to staff this project, including identification of key personnel, their credentials, relevant experience, and general roles and responsibilities for the project. The NCSLC operates in the Eastern time zone; identify resources not based in Eastern or Central time zones.

It may be permissible for the Successful Contractor to utilize offshore personnel to fulfill certain requirements set forth in the RFP provided that all data in all environments is localized within the United States of America.

2. Volume and Scope of Existing Licensing Data. Can you provide estimates or details on the number of licensees, application types, and historical records that will need to be migrated from legacy systems?

Answer:

Current information about North Carolina State Lottery Commission gaming licensees can be found online at NCgaming.gov. Presently, the Commission has three types of sports wagering licensees; a unique application for each license type, as well as a form to capture information about certain “key persons” are available for review online. The Commission may authorize additional license types in the future.

While the Commission maintains certain structured data in platforms like Smartsheets and OnBase, it also manages electronic files (pdfs, .xls, .docx, etc.) in case files in a secure system of folders. Staff decline to provide precise estimates about the volume of Commission's present and historical records; however, there are tens of thousands of individual files and more than 100 GB of data.

The Commission will consult with the Successful Contractor about an appropriate, cost-effective approach to migrating some or all existing data from legacy systems to the new Licensing and Regulatory Platform. The Commission may elect to migrate certain unstructured data to the new platform in an "archived" status or it may preserve existing legacy systems for archive-only purposes and choose not to migrate existing data. That decision may hinge, in part, on the Successful Contractor's capabilities. See RFP at Section 4.7 (Data Migration).

3. Legacy System Information. Can you identify or describe the current systems/platforms in use for licensing, case management, or compliance workflows? Are data dictionaries or APIs available for these systems?

Answer:

The Commission has built in-house solutions to support licensing and case management. These include licensee and public-facing portals that utilize OnBase, Smartsheets, and DocuSign. Staff anticipate sunseting these solutions after implementation of the new Licensing and Regulatory Platform.

The Commission will provide data dictionaries and other information about current IT infrastructure to the Successful Contractor.

4. Integration Details. What specific internal systems are expected to be integrated with the new platform? Can you share the nature of these systems (e.g., ERP, identity management, document management)?

Answer:

The solution must be able to integrate with an IdP (Identity Provider) to support SSO and 2FA functionality, Microsoft Suite, DocuSign, and SmartSheet.

It is anticipated that most Commission data that presently exists on internal platforms that be treated as "legacy data" if migrated to the new platform. Staff expect that any legacy data transferred to the new platform will not require significant integration following a migration to archive the data within the new platform.

5. Regarding integration with SAS Viya for data reporting: is there a preferred method of integration (e.g., API, scheduled export), and will documentation be provided?

Answer:

To the extent the solution integrates with SAS Viya, our initial assessment is that data files from the system (e.g., a CSV file) sent to an SFTP for collection and subsequent integration represents the preferred approach for current business needs at this time. Staff will work with the Successful Contractor to examine integration possibilities between the solution and SAS Viya.

6. **Complaint Portal Workflow.** For the public-facing complaint intake portal, what is the expected internal workflow once a complaint is submitted? Are there standard response timelines or categorization requirements?

Answer:

Materials submitted through a public-facing portal will progress through workflows in the Regulated Gaming Division. An intake specialist's review of the submission initiates the appropriate workflow and response timelines based on the content of the submission. For purposes of on-going improvement, Staff will look to optimize and automate complaint workflows in connection with system implementation.

7. **External Training Requirements.** Is there a requirement to host public-facing user training content (videos, guides) on NCSLC infrastructure, or may vendors host and maintain this content in the cloud?

Answer:

The Commission is open to proposals where the Successful Contractor hosts and maintains content in the cloud. The RFP does not set forth a requirement that public-facing user content be hosted on NCSLC infrastructure.

With respect to questions about external training requirements, generally, please review the RFP at Section 3.3 Training, User Experience, and Accessibility. In particular, please review the following sections:

- **3.3.2: The Responding Contractor will provide administrator user manuals and other training resources, with updates and revisions made as needed throughout the term of the contract.**
- **3.3.5. Training must be available to external users (applicants, licensees) on how to use the platform and submit documentation. This can be in the preferred form of the Responding Contractor but shall include a user guide. Training shall include a guide or other information for public-facing training (i.e. those that do not need to be registered but submit complaints via the portal).**

- **3.3.6. Mobile-responsive design compatible with modern browsers and common mobile devices.**
- **3.3.8. Any Web/internet presence will comply with the Commission’s and federal laws and standards including but not limited to those required accessibility Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 AA- for users with disabilities, and any current release of web content accessibility guidelines published by the Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).**

8. Document Retention and Destruction Policies. Are there specific North Carolina records retention schedules or regulatory mandates that the solution must enforce? If so, will those schedules be provided?

Answer:

The North Carolina State Lottery Commission adheres to the State’s Functional Schedule with respect to retaining documents and electronically stored information. General information about state policy is available online with the State Archives of North Carolina, which operates in the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources. The Commission will work with the Successful Vendor to institute appropriate, compliant retention policies in the procured Licensing and Regulatory Platform.

For informational purposes, State Archives record management functional schedules can be found at: <https://archives.ncdcr.gov/functional-schedule>.

9. AI Functionality. The RFP references potential AI usage. Are there specific restrictions on the use of AI/ML features (e.g., for risk flagging, autofill, or case recommendations)?

Answer:

With respect to potential functionality for machine learning and/or artificial intelligence, Commission staff require the ability to elect whether or not these features are in use. In other words, the platform must support Commission’s ability to turn such features off and on.

The solution must be fully operable and satisfy all requirements of this RFP even without machine learning and/or artificial intelligence functionality enabled.

Because of the dynamic nature of artificial intelligence / machine learning, including nascent government regulation, evolving standards of care, emerging best practices, novel use cases, and rapid technological advances, the Commission also expects the following:

- **Full Disclosure.** Respondents and the Successful Contractor shall identify both in their responses and in any subsequent work product arising from this RFP any and all uses of AI or machine learning connected with their offering. By way of illustration and without limitation, such disclosures shall include all open- or closed loop AI training; any “open

loop” configuration; any time data within the system would be used for system training purposes or otherwise disclosed to third parties (including subcontractors).

- **Guidance / Approval.** The Commission and its staff ultimately determine what artificial intelligence and/or machine learning features, if any, may be deployed with the solution. The Successful Contractor will affirmatively and voluntarily provide comprehensive and relevant information to the Commission regarding AI and machine learning functionality and timely supply the Commission staff with any supplemental materials it requests.
- **Comply with Commission Direction.** The Successful Contractor will comply with directions from Commission staff concerning AI and machine learning.

10. Environments and Staging. How many environments are expected (e.g., development, UAT, training, production)? Should each environment be fully isolated with its own user management and audit trail?

Answer:

The Commission is open to Responding Contractors’ respective proposals. However, to support the robust solution sought in this procurement, staff anticipate that fully isolated environments for development, UAT, training, and production will likely be needed; each environment included in the solution is likely to require unique user management and audit trail capabilities.

11. Cost Evaluation Clarification. How will optional features and modules (e.g., integrated payments, license printing, AI tools) be evaluated if proposed in the cost matrix? Should they be included in the base bid or clearly marked as optional?

Answer:

With respect to pricing optional features, please review the following sections of the RFP: 5.3 Costs; Attachment A; 6.0 RFP Process and Other Important Information (Proposal Evaluation).

For the sake of clarity and importance, it should be advised that any optional features proposed should not be included in the base bid; these should be marked as optional with separate pricing structures for these additional proposed add-ons.

12. Does the NCEL plan to host a pre-bid conference call as part of the procurement process as well?

Answer:

No. The Commission does not plan to host a pre-bid conference call as part of the procurement process.

13. RFP Page/Section (p. 2), 1.0 Intent of the Request for Proposal Background. Has the Commission refined its goals or implementation priorities since the release of RFP LC000062 (Enterprise Regulatory System, 2023), which may have influenced the scope and structure of RFP LC000067 (Licensing and Regulatory Platform, 2025)? If so, can you highlight key changes in strategic direction, functional scope, or implementation approach that offer additional context for vendors responding to the current RFP?

Answer:

The documents supporting RFP LC000062 and RFP LC000067 speak for themselves.

13. RFP Page/Section (p. 2), 1.0 Intent of the Request for Proposal Background. Are there specific lessons learned from the 2023 procurement process that informed how this RFP was structured?

Answer:

The documents supporting RFP LC000062 and RFP LC000067 speak for themselves.

14. RFP Page/Section (p. 2), 1.0 Intent of the Request for Proposal Background, 1st bullet under “key materials” RFP Requirement. End-to-end system that can support the entire life cycle of a license and the corresponding case management concerning a licensee. This will include an initial application review, denial/approval of licenses, application amendments, case assignment and management, audits and investigations, legal review, compliance reviews, regulatory submissions, case closures, etc. What is the anticipated staff user count for the platform overall?

Answer:

At this time, anticipated staff user count for the platform upon implementation is likely to be between 25-35 users. The number of staff that will access and use the platform may grow over time. Responding contractors shall describe their solution’s ability to scale and accommodate additional staff users. See, e.g., RFP at Section 4.4.1.

15. RFP Page/Section (p. 3)

1.0 Intent of the Request for Proposal About the Agency Paragraph 2

How many active licenses/permits does the NC State Lottery Commission (regulated gaming) currently have?

Answer:

Current information about North Carolina State Lottery Commission gaming licensees can be found online at NCgaming.gov. Presently, the Commission has three types of sports wagering

licensees; a unique application for each license type, as well as a form to capture information about certain “key persons” are available for review online. The Commission may authorize additional license types in the future. Presently, approximately 40 entities hold a Commission-issued gaming license.

16. RFP Page/Section (p. 3) Intent of the Request for Proposal, RFP Requirement.

(Please note that the solution the Commission seeks with this procurement will support the agency’s regulatory function. Any additional functionality a bidder proposes which supports the Commission’s NCEL lottery operations is “optional,” and to the extent that any such additional functionality is being proposed, it must also be reflected in the cost proposal).

Please elaborate on the Commission’s intent to leverage the selection of a licensing and regulatory technology solution that will serve both the North Carolina Education Lottery’s (NCEL) regulatory/licensing functions in addition to the North Carolina State Lottery Commission (NCSLC) regulated gaming programs.

Answer:

As noted in the RFP, “this procurement will support the agency’s regulatory function.” That is the primary focus of this RFP.

By including the excerpted language above in the procurement document, NCSLC staff conveyed to potential Responding Contractors that the agency was not foreclosing the possibility of leveraging the new platform for non-regulatory use cases – especially, those applications that that may provide additional value to the State.

Nevertheless, be advised that the overriding focus of this RFP is supporting the agency’s regulatory work (i.e., non-lottery operations). Responding Contractors are encouraged to maintain focus on the central needs and requirements outlined in the RFP.

17. RFP Page/Selection p. 16, 5.2 Costs. Does the Commission have a defined budget (or budget range) for the Licensing and Regulatory Platform procurement (software + services + implementation)?

Answer:

No, the Commission does not have a defined budget or budget range but instead asks for a comprehensive cost proposal submitted with the proposals, as outlined in Section 5.3 Costs.

Additionally, please review “Proposal Evaluation” in Section 6.0 (RFP Process and Other Important Information”) on p. 18 of the RFP:

A variety of factors (including, but not limited to, experience, integrity, proposed solution, satisfying specified requirements, implementation process and time, data security, cost/price and value to the NCSLC, background, financial viability, minority business participation, and

ability to perform the Contract) shall be considered in determining the Successful Contractor that provides the best overall solution at a fair and reasonable price and consistent with the goals and objectives of this procurement. The illustrative factors here are not necessarily listed in the order of importance or weight. Thus, while Responding Contractors are strongly encouraged to offer the lowest price and total cost and highest value possible, the responsive offer with the lowest price and lowest total cost may not be selected as the Successful Contractor.

18. RFP Page/Selection p.19, 6.3 Proposal Validity; Incurred Expenses. Please clarify the rationale for including both a retainage fee and a bond (or letter of credit) for this procurement, given that these mechanisms can serve similar purposes (financial assurance).

Answer:

The NCSLC's requirements speak for themselves and reflect a need for financial assurance from the Successful Contractor, generally.

[Note: The RFP section cited by the submitter of this question concerns "Proposal Validity; Incurred Expenses." Other portions of the RFP – e.g., 4.2.4 Project Plan and Timeline; 6.6 Background Investigation; Bond / Letter of Credit; Attachment G, Sample Contract at ¶¶ 5.E, 16.E; 16.I, 16.G – are more appropriate for the written inquiry.]

19. RFP Page/Selection p. 10, 3.4 Security and Integrity Requirements, number 15 RFP Requirement.

15. Functional and secure remote access for staff via authorized mobile devices or tablets

Does the Commission anticipate the need for a remote mobile app for field inspection/investigation staff to use? If so, what is the anticipated staff user count?

Answer:

No, the Commission does not anticipate that its staff will need a dedicated remote mobile app for field inspection/investigation. That said, as set forth in RFP Requirement 3.4, number 15, the Commission does require the solution to have capabilities to support "[f]unctional and secure remote access for staff via authorized mobile devices or tablets."

20. RFP Page/Selection p.10, 3.5 System Integration and APIs, number 3, RFP Requirement

3. Integration with third-party and external systems, such as:

How many third-party integrations does the Commission expect the platform to support (e.g., background check services, payment gateways, identity verification, compliance data sources, NCEL)?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 4. The flexible solution the NCSLC seeks must be able to accommodate additional third-party integrations in the future in order to meet business needs.

21. RFP Page/Selection p. 10, 3.5 System Integration and APIs, RFP Requirement. 3. Integration with third-party and external systems, such as: What systems outside the core platform does the Commission need to interface with to complete regulatory workflows?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 4.

22. RFP Page/Selection p. 11, Second 3.8 Preferred Additions Item 4, RFP Requirement.

Integration with secure online payment gateways to process application fees, renewal fees, civil penalties, or other payments.

What payment processor(s) does the Commission currently use for license/permit fee collections?

Answer:

The Commission's Regulated Gaming Division does not presently utilize a payment processor to facilitate transactions with its license applicants and licensees.

23. RFP Page/Selection P 11, Section 3.8 Additional Requirements and 3.8 Preferred Additions

Should Preferred Additions be identified as 3.9? Will the Commission be issuing an addendum reflecting different numbering?

Answer:

The Commission does not intend to issue an addendum to the RFP. Please utilize the numbering reflected in the live RFP. For purposes of clarity in proposals, a Responding Contractor may include footnotes, utilize a notation such as "[sic]," or take other reasonable steps to mitigate potential confusion that may arise from an inadvertently repeated number.

24. RFP Page/Selection p. 12, 3.8 Preferred Additions, RFP Requirement.

The Commission also has several areas for optional improvements, some of which may be needed for future scalability.

What type and volume of license/permit growth does the Commission anticipate over the next two years?

Answer:

The Commission cannot anticipate how the regulatory and marketplace landscapes will change in the next two years. Additional entities are expected to apply for licenses before existing licensees begin the licensure renewal process in or around late 2028.

25. RFP Page/Selection P 15, Section 4.6, RFP Requirement. There are 2 questions numbered “7” and 2 questions numbered “11”. Please confirm there are 13 questions that can be numbered in order. Will the Commission be issuing an addendum reflecting different numbering?

Answer:

The Commission does not intend to issue an addendum to the RFP. Please utilize the numbering reflected in the live RFP. For purposes of clarity in proposals, a Responding Contractor may include footnotes, utilize a notation such as “[sic],” or take other reasonable steps to mitigate potential confusion that may arise from an inadvertently repeated number.

26. RFP Reference

3.0 Scope of Services Requirements

Specific RFP Language: 1. Create public-facing license applications designed to collect information and materials Commission requirements for each gaming license type the Commission offers.

Which specific programs are in scope for this implementation? How many and which specific license types will the new system support? Can you please provide the program names and quantities? How many applications are anticipated annually? Are there any anticipated new program areas coming?

Answer:

Responding Contractors are encouraged to review information about the NCSLC’s regulatory functions at NCgaming.gov and in the North Carolina State Lottery Act.

To date, the NCSLC supports three distinct license types of licenses, each concerning sports wagering; approximately 40 entities hold a sports wagering license. A scalable solution is sought to address any additional license types that may arise.

27. RFP Reference

3.0 Scope of Services Requirements

Specific RFP Language

2. Design, test, and implementation will include the design and structure of customizable Commission reports and dashboard configurations.

What reports are required? How many reports are required to be configured? Can you provide samples?

Answer:

The Commission requires the solution to be customizable and flexible; it must have robust capabilities for creating ad hoc reports and regular reports using data sets held within or connected to the solution. Reports and dashboard configurations will concern a variety of matters. The Commission does not have sample reports or a finite count of reports it will create in the future.

28. RFP Reference

Page 5: Section 3.1.1 Gaming License Application Management and Page 6: 3.1.3 Flexible and Dynamic Workflows

Specific RFP Language

Requirement in Section 3.1.1 indicates "8. Design and implement batch printing functionality so Commission staff can mass print applications and associated case file materials, renewed or newly issued licenses. "

And Requirement in 3.1.3 Flexible and Dynamic Workflows says "10. All case communication will be done directly through the portal and allow staff to reply through the system."

Is there a legislative requirement or business need requiring batch printing? Please explain. Requirement in Section 3.1.1 indicates "8. Design and implement batch printing functionality so Commission staff can mass print applications and associated case file materials, renewed or newly issued licenses. " However, the Requirement in 3.1.3 Flexible and Dynamic Workflows says "10. All case communication will be done directly through the portal and allow staff to reply through the system." Can you please confirm all communications will be done electronically?

Answer:

While Regulated Gaming Division staff will endeavor to communicate about all case matters directly through the system, circumstances may not always allow for this occur. Batch printing is required to address other internal use cases that may arise (e.g., litigation, document review, public records request, audit, etc.).

29. RFP Reference

Page 13 & 14

Specific RFP Language

"The Commission seeks to understand Responding Contractor's ability and approach to migrating data from the proposed solution to a different system."

How many legacy systems does NCSLC currently have that you plan to consolidate into a single new solution? What specific expectations does NCSLC have from the vendor to perform data migration into the new solution? What systems does NCSLC want the new system to migrate data to?

Answer:

While the Commission maintains certain structured data in platforms like Smartsheets and OnBase, it also manages electronic files (pdfs, .xls, Word, etc.) in case files in a secure system of folders.

Staff decline to provide precise estimates about the volume of Commission’s present and historical records; however, there are tens of thousands of individual files and more than 200 GB of data.

The Commission will consult with the Successful Contractor about an appropriate, cost-effective approach to migrating some or all existing data from legacy systems to the new Licensing and Regulatory Platform. The Commission may elect to migrate certain unstructured data to the new platform in an “archived” status or it may preserve existing legacy systems for archive-only purposes and choose not to migrate existing data. That decision may hinge, in part, on the Successful Contractor’s capabilities. See RFP at Section 4.7 (Data Migration).

30. RFP Reference (N/A), Specific RFP Language (N/A). How many users (internal and external) will be using the new system?

Answer:

Please see answers to Question #14. There are ~35 expected internal staff members using the new system.

The number of external users will vary but these individuals will not need full account access.

31.

RFP Reference

Training Audience and Scope (51-52): 3.3.1–3.3.5 (training for all user types); role/permission models in 3.1.5.

Specific RFP Language

“Training must be all-inclusive to cover all user types and roles. These user roles must also have customizable permissions.” (3.3.4) “The training must cover the complete system and be detailed enough for Commission staff to independently configure the platform, create workflows...train others...” (3.3.1.a)

Role permissions reinforced in 3.1.5: “Ability and functionality to support multiple kinds of user roles across the platform.”

How many internal staff require training, by role?

Answer:

All internal staff (~35) will require training. Smaller subsets of staff will require specialized training based on their responsibilities and the platform’s capabilities. The Commission will work with the Successful Contractor to shape various user roles for internal staff.

32.

RFP Reference

3.2.1 External User Portal; 3.2.2 Complaint Intake Portal; 3.3.5 (external user training).

Specific RFP Language

External user portal includes: “applicants, licensees, and related individuals” (3.2.1)

Complaint portal includes: “Complainant shall not be required to register or login...” (3.2.2)

“Training must be available to external users on how to use the platform...” (3.3.5)

Which external user groups require training or guided support?

Answer:

Applicants, licensees, and related individuals identified in Section 3.2.1 will require training or guided support.

The Commission’s complainant portal for members of the public will not require formal training or support; however, it should be intuitive for users and be accompanied by a “help” section for questions on submission.

33.

RFP Reference

3.2.1–§3.2.2 (public-facing users); 3.3.7–3.3.9 (language/readability expectations).

Specific RFP Language

External portals serve public users (3.2.1–§3.2.2).

Plain-language and accessibility requirements indicate need for audience-appropriate materials (3.3.7–§3.3.9).

Do you anticipate the need for multilingual materials for applicants, licensees, or complainants? If so, which languages should we plan for?

Answer:

These sections of the RFP speak for themselves. The solution should be accessible in a way that meets any applicable state or federal regulations, which may include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and its implementing regulations as well as the current WCAG. As the Commission creates multilingual materials for public-facing users in the future, the solution must be able to support these.

34. Section # | RFP General Scoping Question | Page # Which license types are in scope for this engagement, and approximately how many external portal users (licensees) and internal Commission staff users are expected to use the system? What's the average number applications received and processed per month?

Answer:

Please see the responses to Question #26 and Question #30.

The average number of applications received and processed per month will vary.

35. Section # 3.1.1 Gaming License Application Management

(15) Timeline view of all interactions (e.g., submissions, communications, inspections, payments, deadlines, status changes, and enforcement actions).

Page #5

What types of inspections are in scope, and approximately how many inspectors (Commission staff and/or third-party) will use the system?

Answer:

Please see the responses to Question #14 and Question #30.

The “timeline view or all interactions” should be configurable by staff to capture a variety of regulatory events identified by staff. “Inspections” could include staff members’ examinations of in-person wagering facilities.

36. Section # 3.1.4 Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

Page #7

Does NCSLC have any existing tool such as enterprise integration hub, BI tools, training tools etc., that need to/can be used for this project?

Answer:

The Commission presently utilizes SAS Viya for certain “rollup” reporting needs. See answer to Question # 5.

37. Section # 3.3 Training, User Experience, and Accessibility

Page #9

Will the vendor deliver training for Commission staff and/or external users? If yes, what training tools or systems does the NCSLC use today for training registration and content delivery (including any Learning Management System (LMS))?”

Answer:

The Successful Contractor is expected to deliver training for Commission staff and external users. The Commission currently uses an internal LMS program that is only available to staff.

Please review specific training requirements in the RFP document, including those identified at sections 3.3.1 – 3.3.5.

38. Section # 3.3 Training, User Experience, and Accessibility

Page #9

Training scope - Is vendor required only to provide train-the-trainer? Can the agency provide the count of users who need to be trained by their role?

Answer:

Please review all of Section 3.3 for descriptions of training requirements. See the response to Question #37. Among other training responsibilities, the Successful Contractor is required to provide both train-the-trainer and other resources/guides for users, based on roles.

Presently, the Commission staff of ~35 internal users requiring user training, with others needing training resources to be available. The number of staff that will access and use the platform may grow over time.

39. Section # 3.5 System Integration and APIs

Page #10

How many total systems must the new Licensing Solution should integrate with, and can you provide the list of those systems, indicate whether each integration is bi-directional or one-way, and confirm whether there is an existing payment gateway we should integrate with (if so, which one)?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 4.

40. Section # 3.6 Change Management

Page #11

Is the vendor responsible for the execution of the Change Management Plan?

Answer:

As stated in Section 3.6.1 of the RFP (“Change Management”), the vendor will be responsible for providing a “documented change management plan including stakeholder engagement, communication strategy, resistance management, and readiness assessment.”

See also Section 4.1.7 of the RFP (“Provide your proposed Service Level Agreement(s) for all aspects of the solution and related deliverables, as outlined in this procurement. By way of example (and not limitation) SLAs may address system availability and uptime; system performance; support and help desk; incident management; data integrity and processing; security; *change management and release*; integrations and APIs; reporting and analytics; accessibility compliance; and data migration.” (emphasis added).

41. Section # 3.8 Preferred Additions: (3) Develop a system for use that will manage the data used by the Commission for future transportation of retail sportsbook materials.

Page #11

What types of data does NCSLC need to manage for the future transportation of retail sportsbook materials, and what should the system do with that data (e.g., capture, update, approve, track, report, audit)?

Answer:

In the event a licensed operator opens a retail sportsbook in North Carolina, the Commission will require the means to collect data from those locations and ensure it is updated, approved, tracked, reportable, and auditable, in the solution.

42. Section # 4.7 Data Migration

Page #15

Please confirm the data migration scope: which data must be migrated, the estimated data volumes and total file sizes, and how many (and which) legacy source systems the data will come from. What data management system is currently in use?

Answer:

Please see response to #29.

43. RFP Section 6.5 & Att. E

Regarding the 50-point requirement for minority business participation in Affidavit B: Is this threshold strictly a pass/fail responsiveness gate as per G.S.143-128.2, or does the evaluation rubric allocate specific weighted points to minority participation within the competitive technical score?

Answer:

Affidavit B is not “pass/fail.” It is a points-driven scoring mechanism that will be factored into the overall scoring of each Responding Contractor’s technical proposal.

44. RFP Section 6.5

To assist vendors in prioritizing their responses, can the Commission provide the specific weighting for the evaluation criteria (e.g., Technical vs. Cost vs. Experience)? Is the total score based on a 100-point or 1,000-point scale?

Answer:

Weighted evaluation criteria are not available. Please see Section 6.5 Proposal Evaluation for further information.

See also "Proposal Evaluation" in Section 6.1. ("A variety of factors (including, but not limited to, experience, integrity, proposed solution, satisfying specified requirements, implementation process and time, data security, cost/price and value to the NCSLC, background, financial viability, minority business participation, and ability to perform the Contract) shall be considered in determining the Successful Contractor that provides the best overall solution at a fair and reasonable price and consistent with the goals and objectives of this procurement. The illustrative factors here are not necessarily listed in the order of importance or weight. Thus, while Responding Contractors are strongly encouraged to offer the lowest price and total cost and highest value possible, the responsive offer with the lowest price and lowest total cost may not be selected as the Successful Contractor.").

45. RFP Section 5.3

Will the Commission provide a standardized Cost Workbook or Pricing Matrix to ensure all vendors utilize consistent assumptions for licensing and implementation costs?

Answer:

Please see response to Question #45. See also the following sections of the RFP: 5.3 Costs.

Further, the RFP documents directly address this question. See Attachment A: Cost Submission. That document states that, " The Vendor must list, itemize, and describe any applicable offer costs. A cost proposal matrix that itemizes components and identifies one-time and recurring costs is favored. Responding Contractors are encouraged to customize a matrix like the illustration below. . . ." (emphasis in original).

The Commission allows flexibility in the cost proposal matrix because it cannot anticipate the various components Responding Contractors may include in their bids. Thus, while the Commission desires to make "apples to apples" cost comparison(s) across responsive bids, the expected variety among those bids, their various components, and unique associated cost structures can make such comparisons impossible. The Commission reminds Responding Contractors that it is looking for the best combination of the factors listed in RFP Section 6.5, not necessarily the lowest priced bidder.

46. RFP Section 1.0 & 3.1.5

Please provide the estimated number of internal users within the Regulated Gaming Division and other support units (Legal, MIS) who will require full system access. Does the Commission envision this user base expanding to the wider NCEL staff?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #14.

As noted in the RFP, the Commission is interested in the solution being scalable to change and grow as the agency's regulatory duties change. *See, e.g.,* RFP Section 3.1.10 ("10. Ability for a scalable solution that can allow new license types to be created as needs grow."); Section 4.2.2 ("Include content on release strategies for functionality, roadmap for technical architecture, how scalability of solution is planned."); Section 4.4.1 (seeking information about the proposed solution's "scalability.").

47. RFP Section 3.2.1 What is the anticipated volume of external portal users (Operators, Service Providers, Suppliers, and Key Persons) in Year 1? Can the Commission provide a current count of active licensees across all categories?

Answer:

We cannot provide an exact number of external portal users. There are currently 38 active licensees in the state of North Carolina (7 operators, 4 service providers, and 27 suppliers), which can be found at ncgaming.gov. These license holders are corporate entities with varying numbers of employees who are likely to engage with the Commission via the solution's external portal.

48. RFP Section 3.8

Does the Commission anticipate activating the pari-mutuel wagering module within the initial contract term, and if so, what are the projected licensee volumes for that vertical?

Answer:

As noted in the RFP, the Commission is interested in the solution being scalable to change and grow as the agency's regulatory duties change. *See, e.g.,* RFP Section 3.1.10 ("10. Ability for a scalable solution that can allow new license types to be created as needs grow."); Section 4.2.2 ("Include content on release strategies for functionality, roadmap for technical architecture, how scalability of solution is planned."); Section 4.4.1 (seeking information about the proposed solution's "scalability.").

Pursuant to the powers granted to it in Article 10 of the State Lottery Act, the Commission has not yet authorized pari-mutuel wagering in North Carolina. The number of licensees and license applicants for ADW licensing is unknown at this time.

49. RFP Section 3.8.7 Regarding the preferred SAS Viya integration: Is the Commission seeking a bidirectional integration where SAS analytics can automatically trigger case workflows in the Regulatory Platform, or is the scope limited to uni-directional data exports?

Answer:

See response to Question # 5.

50. RFP Section 3.5 Can the Commission list the specific "current NCEL systems" (e.g., IGT, Scientific Games) requiring integration and their available interface specifications (REST, SOAP, SFTP)?

Answer:

The premise of this question is false. There are currently no plans to connect the NCEL's traditional lottery operation systems (including those supported by vendors like Brightstar, Scientific Games, and Aristocrat) to the licensing and regulatory platform solution.

See also Section 1.0, p.3 ("Please note that the solution the Commission seeks with this procurement will support the agency's regulatory function. Any additional functionality a bidder proposes which supports the Commission's NCEL lottery operations is 'optional,' and to the extent that any such additional functionality is being proposed, it must also be reflected in the cost proposal.").

51. RFP Section 3.1.1 Does the Commission require integration with the existing FirstPoint background check contract via API, and will documentation be provided?

Answer:

The particular use case described in this question does not appear in Section 3.1.1. The RFP document does not specifically require the solution to integrate with the system(s) or platform(s) utilized by the their-party entity that conducts background check reviews for regulatory purposes.

However, as outlined in Section 3.5 (System Integration and APIs) and referenced in other portions of the RFP, the Commission requires the solution to have various capabilities to support system integrations and secure data exchange.

52. RFP Section 3.8

Does the Commission mandate the use of the statewide PayIt digital payment platform, or should vendors propose an independent payment gateway?

Answer:

Section 3.8 (Preferred Additions) indicates that certain capabilities to enable payment processing "would be beneficial for organizational use, but not necessarily required at this time." See, e.g., 3.8.2, 3.8.4 -.6.

The RFP does not require integrated payment processing. Nor does it mandate a particular platform for this “preferred addition.” That said, any payment gateway or integrated payment process, if selected by the NCSLC, will need to satisfy any applicable state or federal requirements.

53. RFP Section 3.4. Is StateRAMP Authorization required for the hosting environment, or will FedRAMP Authorization (Moderate/High) be accepted via reciprocity?

Answer:

See Section 3.4 (Security and Integrity Requirements), generally.

54. RFP Section 3.6 & 4.7. Can the Commission clarify the volume and format of the "limited" legacy data to be migrated? Does this data reside in structured databases (SQL) or unstructured formats (Excel/ShareBase), and what is the approximate record count?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

55. RFP Section 3.1.3. Will the business process maps and data dictionaries developed by the Commission’s consultants (e.g., GLI) be made available to the Successful Contractor to accelerate the configuration phase?

Answer:

Commission staff will collaborate with the Successful Contractor on all aspects of the project, including identification and use of the Commission’s existing regulatory resources that may be leveraged to accelerate the configuration phase.

56. RFP Section 3. We have identified integrations for a payment gateway, email, identity access management for internal and for external users, and background checks. Can you provide a list of any other specific systems for integration?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 4.

57. RFP Section General. Where are the NCLSC legacy documents stored? Do these legacy documents need to be migrated along with the associated legacy records?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

58. Does NCLSC have a preferred document management system?

Answer:

Presently, the NCSLC's document management platform is OnBase.; The Commission seeks viable solutions that meet the document management requirements laid out in the RFP.

59. What is the expected daily volume of external user sessions (for authenticated external users)?

Answer:

At this time, staff cannot forecast the daily expected volume of external use sessions. Usage will vary by licensee and be based upon deadlines for various regulatory submissions. Daily volume will likely be higher at the time of license renewal in or around late 2028.

60. What is the expected annual volume of licensing applications?

Answer:

The Commission cannot forecast an expected volume of licensing annual applications. There are currently 38 active licensees in the state of North Carolina (7 operators, 4 service providers, and 27 suppliers), which can be found at ncgaming.gov. Volume will likely be higher during the licensure renewal process in or around late 2028.

61. What is the expected volume of background checks per month?

Answer:

The Commission cannot forecast an expected volume of background checks per month.

62. 3.1.1 Gaming License Application Management

(9):Include background check integration capabilities (e.g., capacity for API integration, SFTP with human intervention, etc.) to include financial checking, fingerprinting, criminal history, and the like. *Is there a preferred vendor for any of the checks contemplated in section 3.1.1 (9)?*

Answer:

Note that this provision concerns "background check integration capabilities." There is no requirement that the Responding Contractor propose a background check vendor, and the RFP does not identify a preferred background check vendor.

If Responding Contractor proposes a background check vendor in its proposal, mark this itemized offering and related pricing as "optional."

63. Should the cost of running the contemplated checks in 3.1.1 (9) be included in our pricing proposal?

Answer:

See response to Question # 62.

64. 3.1.2 System and Document Management

(12) Retention, archiving, and disposition rules aligned with state directives and legally mandated retention schedules as provided by the NCSLC.

Question: Can you provide the NCSLC legal requirements referenced in this requirement.

Answer:

See response to Question # 8.

65. 3.1.4 Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

(5) The Successful Contractor must provide on-demand resources to assist the Commission with new or complex workflow or dataflow configurations during the first 12 months of the system going live.

Question: Is the expectation for these on-demand services to be provided in person or virtually?

Answer:

These on-demand services may be provided virtually.

66. 3.1.5 Internal Configuration

(16) Ability to produce redacted fields such as SSNs, bank account numbers, DOB, or contact details.

(17) Rules-based access for fields and files labeled sensitive, protected, or confidential under statute.

Question:

Is the goal of these requests to prevent some users from seeing all applicant information, while giving full access to others?

Answer:

The solution requires the ability for certain fields to be redacted, as well as ability to mark fields as sensitive, protected, or confidential for privacy of PII information. Certain kinds of sensitive data may be subject to user-based restrictions.

67. 6.6 BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION; BOND / LETTER OF CREDIT

Other Questions: *If the applicant and/or the applicant's parent company is a current gaming licensee (supplier) in North Carolina, would they still be required to provide all requested information as requested in sections 6.6 and 6.16?*

Answer:

To be considered for an award, a Responding Contractor must provide all required information as laid out in the RFP. See also Section 6.5 (Proposal Evaluation) ("the Commission reserves the right to determine if a particular deficiency or inadequacy is significant enough to disqualify the Proposal and Contractor").

68. Are you able to provide a range or estimate in the amount of current users using the current system at the North Carolina Lottery? (Section 3.0)

Answer:

See Question #14 for estimated number of internal users.

69. Is it possible for the lottery commission to provide the number of anticipated applications per month? (Section 3.2.1)

Answer:

The average number of applications received and processed per month will vary.

70. Is it possible for the lottery commission to provide the average amount of applications over the last two years? (Section 3.2.1)

Answer:

We cannot provide an exact number of license applications submitted over the last two years. However, it exceeds the current 38 active licensees in the state of North Carolina.

71. Is it possible for the lottery commission to provide the average amount of complaints over the last two years? (Section 3.2.2)

Answer:

The number and volume of complaints from the public submitted to the Commission regarding regulated matters and wagering fluctuates throughout the year.

72. Is it possible for the lottery commission to list all of the possible integrations or additional applications that the solution will connect with? (Section 3.1.1)

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 20.

73. RFP Section(s) (ref) Section 6.6; Attachments B, C, and D

Given the breadth of background disclosures required for corporate officers, general partners and equity holders, including criminal, civil, and financial history, can the Commission clarify whether it is open to a role-based approach to these disclosures, limiting checks to individuals with direct involvement in the proposed solution?

Answer:

The background disclosure requirements speak for themselves and are required pursuant to N.C.G.S. §18C-152(b).

74. Does Statute 18C-152, Investigation of lottery potential contractors, apply to this contract as the awardee is providing licensing not direct lottery gaming operations or goods?

Answer:

Yes. N.C.G.S. §18C-152 applies to this contract.

75. Administrative / General Section 6.1 – Summary of Key Dates

Given that there are approximately two weeks between the release of responses to vendor questions and the proposal submission deadline, would the Commission consider extending the proposal due date to allow vendors three weeks from the release of responses to incorporate clarifications and prepare a complete and responsive proposal?

Answer:

At this time, the Commission does not intend to alter deadlines previously outlined.

76. Section 5.2 – Proposal Format and Content

Does the Commission permit proposers to use a vendor-defined proposal structure and section numbering, provided all requirements in Sections 3 and 4 are clearly addressed in order and are easy to locate?

Answer:

Please review Section 5.2 Proposal Format and Content, which states: “written responses are required for Sections 3 and 4 of this RFP. Please provide answers to each question in order in your bid submission to the NCSLC.”

77. Section 3.0 – Scope of Services (Response Instructions)

Does the Commission prefer the mandatory Section 3 requirements to be presented in a standalone compliance matrix/table, or embedded within narrative sections, as long as each requirement is individually addressed using the required response scale?

Answer:

The Responding Contractor(s) may submit the proposal in any format, as long as all requirements are addressed and narrative responses are thorough and complete.

78. Section 5.2 – Proposal Format and Content. Are there any page limits, font size, margin, or formatting standards the Commission expects proposers to follow beyond the instruction that responses should be concise and limited to the information requested?

Answer:

No, there are no additional specific formatting standards the Commission expects beyond the instructions laid out in the RFP. See additional information to Question #79.

79. Section 6.4 – Submission of Proposals. For electronic submission, does the Commission prefer a single consolidated PDF for the technical proposal (excluding the separate cost proposal), or multiple clearly labeled PDF files?

Answer:

The Commission requests cost and technical Proposals be submitted in a PDF format. If necessary, Proposals may utilize multiple volumes provided in clearly labeled and separated files with a maximum size of 190 MB each. There should be a separate PDF file included in the submission which contains a table of contents for the entire Proposal, noting the contents of each individual volume comprising the submission. Each volume of the submission should also have its own table of contents.

All electronic cost and technical Proposals should be submitted to Anthony Downey via LiquidFiles using the following link:

<https://pdcliquid.lotterync.net/filedrop/Anthony.Downey@lotterync.net>.

Please note that the above requirements also apply to electronic files submitted to the Commission on flash drives.

80. Section 6.4 – Submission of Proposals. Are there any maximum file size limits for emailed electronic submissions, and if so, is file compression or splitting into multiple emails acceptable?

Answer:

Please see the answer to Question #79.

81. Section 6.4 – Submission of Proposals / Section 5.2 – Confidential or Trade Secret Information

If a redacted proposal is submitted, should it mirror the full proposal structure exactly with redactions applied, or may sensitive sections be omitted entirely?

Answer:

A redacted proposal should exactly mirror the unredacted proposal exactly but with redactions applied. Sensitive sections should not be omitted.

82. Section 4.0 – Written Response Requirements. May supporting exhibits (e.g., architecture diagrams, security exhibits, sample reports) be included as appendices, provided they are clearly referenced in the applicable narrative sections?

Answer:

Yes, supporting exhibits may be included as appendices as long as they are clearly referenced and labeled, and the information is complete for all narrative sections.

83. General Scope and Governance Section 1.0 – Intent of the RFP

The RFP references compliance with the North Carolina State Lottery Act and Commission regulations, policies, and procedures. Can the Commission confirm whether there are any additional internal guidelines or operating procedures, beyond those publicly available, that will materially impact system configuration or workflows?

Answer:

Commission staff will work with Successful Contractor to implement system configurations and workflows that will build upon internal guidelines and operating procedures, which will be made available as planning and implementation begin.

84. Section 1.0 – Scope of Solution. The RFP notes that functionality supporting traditional NC Education Lottery operations is optional. Can the Commission confirm whether such functionality should be excluded from the base solution unless explicitly proposed as an option?

Answer:

See responses to Questions # 16 and 50.

85. Section 1.0 / 3.6 – Governance

Will the Commission designate a **single business owner** for licensing and regulatory workflows, or should vendors assume decision-making authority is distributed across divisions (Regulated Gaming, MIS, Legal)?

Answer:

To be determined. The Commission will work with the Successful Contractor to structure efficient project management and clear decision-making processes.

86. Section 1.0 / 3.6 – Governance. What is the expected **decision turnaround time** from the Commission for workflow, data model, and configuration approvals during implementation?

Answer:

Because “decision turnaround time” will be fact-specific and project-specific, the Commission cannot answer this question.

87. Users, Roles, and Volumes. Section 3.1 / Section 3.2 – Users and Roles. Can the Commission provide an estimated number of internal users, broken out by role where possible (e.g., licensing staff, investigators, auditors, legal, supervisors, executives)?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #30 on number of internal users.

Staff will work with the Successful Contractor to identify potential user roles for the system. Presently, licensing staff, investigators, attorneys, regulatory leadership, and others in supporting roles across the agency support its regulatory functions.

88. Section 3.2.1 – External User Portal. Can the Commission provide estimates for the number of active licensees, applicants, and other authorized external users expected to access the portal?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #26.

89. Section 3.2.2 – Consumer Complaint Intake Portal. Are there historical or estimated annual volumes for consumer complaints or wager disputes that vendors should plan for in system sizing?

Answer:

The Commission cannot estimate volumes for complaints or disputes as these vary based on external users. See also the response to Question # 71.

90. Section 3.7 – User Acceptance Testing (UAT). Approximately how many concurrent internal users should vendors plan to support during the UAT period?

Answer:

The Commission will work with the Successful Contractor to determine the appropriate number of internal users to be supported during the UAT period.

91. Section 1.0 – Scalability. Does the Commission anticipate growth in license types, wagering categories, or regulated entities over the next three to five years that vendors should consider for scalability planning?

Answer:

As outlined in the RFP, including at Sections 1.0 and 4.4, the scalability of the solution is an important consideration for the Commission. The solution should have the ability to adapt and

support regulatory changes brought about by legislation, industry developments, market forces, consumer behavior, and the like.

92. Section 1.0 – Scalability. Does the Commission anticipate regulating additional gaming categories (e.g., new wagering models, suppliers, affiliates) during the initial contract term?

Answer:

See response to Question # 91.

93. Section 1.0 – Scalability. Should vendors design workflows assuming multi-agency data sharing in the future?

Answer:

Commission staff will work with the Successful Contractor to design workflows. The Commission shares certain regulatory data securely with other government agencies for approved use cases.

94. Section 3.1 / 3.2 / 4.4. Are there seasonal or event-driven spikes (e.g., license renewals, major sporting events, regulatory changes) that significantly increase portal usage?

Answer:

In the brief period since launching sports wagering in North Carolina, staff have anecdotally observed seasonal and event-driven spikes in activity from the public and from licensees.

95. Section 3.1 / 3.2 / 4.4. Does the Commission have performance SLAs in mind for: Portal response times, document upload/download, and/or Report generation for large datasets?

Answer:

The solution must be highly reliable, user-friendly, and performance driven with low latency. The RFP requests that Responding Contractors provide proposed SLAs (see, e.g., RFP at Section 4.1.7).

96. Section 3.1 / 3.2 / 4.4. Approximately how many documents and how much volume of data is expected to be stored in the system in Year 1?

Answer:

The Commission cannot precisely address this general question.

97. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. What is the current system's database that legacy commission data will be migrated from?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

98. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. What is the volume of data to be migrated from the legacy system?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

99. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. What is the current document management system in use that documents must be migrated from?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

100. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. How many documents (and total size) need to be migrated from the legacy system to the new solution?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

101. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. What is the expected maximum document file size?

Answer:

Please see response to Question # 80.

102. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. What is the number of legacy systems currently used for licensing, investigations, and document storage?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

103. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. Whether those systems are commercial products, custom-built, or file-based?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

104. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. Approximately how many years of historical data are expected to be migrated versus archived?

Answer:

Please see response to # 29.

Additionally, Commission staff will work with the Successful Contractor to determine what historical data should be migrated to the new platform. It may choose to migrate data from the time enabling legislation became law in June 2023, the time license applications opened in fall/winter 2023, or the launch of sports wagering in March of 2024.

105. Section 4.7 – Data Migration. Are there known data quality issues (duplicate entities, incomplete records, inconsistent identifiers) vendors should plan to remediate?

Answer:

Commission staff will work with the Successful Contractor to determine what historical data should be migrated to the new platform. It may choose to migrate data from the time enabling legislation became law in June 2023, the time license applications opened in fall/winter 2023,

or the launch of sports wagering in March of 2024. These discussions will address data quality considerations; at this time, however, vendor remediation of existing data quality issues, if any, is not a requirement in the RFP response.

106. Licensing and Regulatory Workflows, Section 3.1.1 – Gaming License Application Management. Does the Commission currently maintain standardized application forms and data requirements for each license type, or should vendors assume these will be finalized during implementation?

Answer:

The Commission’s standardized application forms and data requirements for each license type are publicly available on NCgaming.gov.

107. Section 3.1.1 – Background Checks. Can the Commission clarify whether specific background check vendors are currently in use, or whether the Successful Contractor should plan to integrate with multiple providers?

Answer:

At this time the Commission works with its vendor FirstPoint for regulatory background checks. In the future it may continue to work with FirstPoint and/or other background check vendors.

See also response to question # 62.

108. Section 3.1.1 – License Renewals. Are license renewal cycles and fee structures standardized across license types, or do they vary by license category?

Answer:

Information about licensing and license renewals is available in the State Lottery Act and on NCgaming.gov. In short, each of the three gaming licenses available from the Commission lasts for five years; separate costs are associated with each license type.

109. Section 3.1.1 – Gaming License Application Management. Requirement states *“8. Design and implement batch printing functionality so Commission staff can mass print applications and associated case file materials, renewed or newly issued licenses.”*

Does the State currently have a State print services group the vendor will leverage for printing? Is the State looking for the vendor to provide print services, or just functionality in the solution to batch print jobs to be sent to the State’s printing service?

Answer:

The Commission has print services available; the solution sought in this RFP required batch print functionality.

110. Section 3.1.3 – Administrative Hearings. Are hearings handled internally or by an external adjudicative body?

Answer:

Please review the North Carolina State Lottery Act, Commission policies, RFP Section 6.7, and the Commission’s Rules Manual for Sports Wagering and Pari-Mutuel Wagering for information that may be responsive to this general question.

111. Section 3.1.3 – Administrative Hearings. Will external judges, hearing officers, or counsel require temporary system access?

Answer:

The Commission looks forward to working with the Successful Contractor to define role-based access to the solution. At this time it has not yet been determined the extent to which actors such as external judges, hearing officers, and outside counsel may benefit from temporary system access / user role.

112. Section 3.1.3 – Administrative Hearings. Are there statutory timelines for hearings and appeals that must be system-enforced?

Answer:

The Commission looks forward to working with the Successful Contractor to examine how the solution can facilitate administrative hearings and how to leverage the required capabilities outlined in Section 3.1.3 of the RFP. Due-date tracking (whether rooted in statute, Commission rule, or otherwise) and related required functionality are outlined in the RFP documents.

113. Document Management and Public Records, Section 3.1.2 – Records Retention. Are there existing state or Lottery-specific records retention schedules that vendors should design against, or will these be provided post-award?

Answer:

Please see response to Question #7.

114. Section 3.1.2 – Public Records Requests. Does the Commission maintain formal guidance defining which licensing, investigative, or enforcement records are considered public versus confidential?

Answer:

From time to time the Commission provides licensees and applicants informal guidance regarding appropriate treatment of various regulatory submissions and Commission records. Formal guidance is not available at this time.

115. Section 3.1.2 – Public Records Requests. Do users primarily expect to locate documents via folder-based navigation?

Answer:

Section 3.1.2 outlines various requirements concerning System and Document Management. As suggested by those requirements, the solution shall enable credentialed users to organize, access, and use files and related data in a variety of ways. With respect to the solution's capabilities to support responses to public records requests, please review Section 3.1.2 generally and 3.1.2.15, specifically.

116. Section 3.1.2 – Public Records Requests. Is the Document Management System expected to be native to the platform or integrated with an external enterprise content management system?

Answer:

Responding Contractors may propose document management system solutions that meet the requirements outlined in the RFP. Presently, the solution does not need to integrate with a pre-existing enterprise content management system.

117. Section 3.1.2 – Redaction Workflows. Should vendors assume that automated redaction rules will be provided by the Commission, or should the Successful Contractor propose an initial redaction framework for Commission review?

Answer:

The Commission will collaborate with the Successful Contractor about business rules / configurations to enable automated redactions in appropriate circumstances. In addition to describing their solution's capabilities, Responding Contractors may choose to forecast or propose an initial redaction framework in their response.

118. Section 3.1.2 – Public Records. Should vendors assume a default-open or default-restricted model for records, with exceptions applied by role and record type?

Answer:

The RFP does not specify a default-open or default-restricted model for records. Staff will work with the Successful Contractor to determine the appropriate approach(es) for regulatory records, many contain protected commercial information; PII; non-public information; investigatory materials; and other sensitive content.

119. Section 3.1.2 – Public Records. Is there interest in publishing near real-time public dashboards (e.g., license status, enforcement summaries), or only static disclosures?

Answer:

Responding Contractors whose solution supports capabilities to publish “near real-time public dashboards” should describe those capabilities. Please review RFP Section 3.1.4 (Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting).

120. Investigations, Audits, Complaints, and Enforcement, Section 3.1.3 – Case Management. Can the Commission provide additional context on the expected volume and complexity of investigations, audits, and enforcement actions handled annually?

Answer:

The solution sought with this RFP will provide the Commission with the ability to use data to provide more reliable estimates concerning the volume and complexity of investigations, audits, and enforcement actions. As a general matter, staff anticipate that the volume and complexity of agency regulatory actions is likely to increase.

121. Section 3.1.3 – Enforcement Actions. Does the Commission have standardized enforcement artifacts (e.g., notices of violation, consent orders, settlement agreements) that should be reflected in system templates?

Answer:

The Commission will share standard or template materials with the Successful Contractor.

122. Section 3.1.3 – Confidentiality Controls. Are there predefined rules governing which investigative or enforcement records must be sealed or restricted, or will those rules be defined during implementation?

Answer:

The Commission will provide these rules during implementation.

123. Analytics, Reporting, and SAS Viya, Section 3.1.4 – Reporting and Dashboards. Does the Commission have predefined KPIs or regulatory performance metrics currently used for internal reporting that should be reflected in initial dashboards?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #27.

124. Section 3.8 – Preferred Additions / SAS Viya. The RFP references a preference for integration with SAS Viya. Can the Commission clarify whether SAS Viya is currently in production use and the expected direction of data flow between systems?

Answer:

See response to Question # 5.

125. Section 3.8 – Preferred Additions / SAS Viya. If payment processing is proposed: Will the Commission act as merchant of record, or should vendors assume that role? Are there statutory constraints on refund handling, chargebacks, or partial payments? Are payment workflows expected to integrate with state finance or accounting systems?

Answer:

If payment processing is proposed for regulatory purposes, then the Commission will act as merchant of record. Payment workflows would be expected to integrate with the Commission's

finance and accounting system. If the Commission pursues payment processing functionality with the Successful Contractor, then legal or regulatory constraints will be identified and addressed during implementation.

126. Section 3.1.4 – Ad Hoc Reporting. Will Commission staff require the ability to create and modify ad hoc reports and dashboards without vendor assistance following go-live?

Answer:

Yes.

127. Section 3.1.4 – Ad Hoc Reporting. Is near real-time data replication or synchronization required for downstream analytics platforms?

Answer:

Yes, the Commission is looking for a solution where staff is able to pull near real-time data for reporting and analytics purposes.

128. Integrations and Technical Environment, Section 3.5 – System Integrations. Does the Commission maintain an inventory of current internal and external systems (e.g., background check vendors, payment processors, identity systems) that the Successful Contractor will be expected to integrate with?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 4.

129. Section 3.5 – Authentication and MFA. Can the Commission confirm the identity provider(s) currently in use for MFA and SSO, and whether these are expected to remain unchanged?

Answer:

See RFP Section 3.4.9 (“Microsoft Azure or DUO compatible multi-factor authentication is required for all cloud-based solutions. Provide a detailed explanation of your company’s ability to provide MFA. 2FA for both system users and as a front-end access for licensees and applicants.”).

130. Security, Compliance, and Data Governance, Section 3.4 – Security Frameworks. The RFP references multiple security standards (e.g., NIST, ISO, PCI). Is the Commission expecting formal certification against any specific framework, or is demonstrated alignment sufficient?

Answer:

Please review Section 3.4 in detail. Requirements outlined speak for themselves.

131. Section 3.4 – Data Localization. Does the U.S.-only data localization requirement apply to all environments, including backups, disaster recovery, logging, and monitoring services?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 1.

132. Implementation, Training, and Change Management, Section 3.6 – Change Management. Does the Commission anticipate a phased rollout by license type or regulatory function, or a single enterprise-wide go-live?

Answer:

Please review the RFP at Sections 3.6 (Change Management) and 4.2 (Project Plan and Timeline). The Commission looks forward to reviewing project plans and timelines proposed by Responding Contractors. Staff are open to utilizing either a phased rollout or a single enterprise-wide go-live; however, an enterprise go-live is favored.

133. Section 3.3 – Training. Approximately how many internal users and external users should vendors plan for when designing training programs and support materials?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #7 and #14.

134. Section 3.3 / 4.1. After go-live, what level of **self-sufficiency** does the Commission expect (examples: full internal configuration or limited admin changes only)?

Answer:

The Commission will review each of the responsive Proposals and examine the level of self-sufficiency they enable the Commission's staff to exercise. Ultimately, the Proposal offering the best overall solution at a fair and reasonable price will be selected.

135. Section 3.3 / 4.1. Will the Commission require **named support resources** (dedicated team) versus pooled vendor support?

Answer:

Please see Section 3.8.1 (Additional Requirements): "The Successful Contractor shall designate a Project Manager who will provide a single point of contact for management and coordination of the project work. All work performed pursuant to the Agreement shall be coordinated between the NCSLC and the Project Manager."

Please see Section 4.1.1-2 (Qualifications and Capacity):

"With respect to Responding Contractor's qualifications and workforce capacity, describe the following:

"1. The size of the responding company; its staff resources; the credentials and experiences of its key principals.

"2. The project team(s) and human resources that responding company would use to staff this project, including identification of key personnel, their credentials, relevant experience, and general roles and responsibilities for the project. The NCSLC operates in the Eastern time zone; identify resources not based in Eastern or Central time zones. Additionally, identify the full-time project manager(s) who would be assigned to this project."

136. User Acceptance and Acceptance Criteria, Section 3.7 – Acceptance Criteria. Will the Commission provide formal acceptance criteria and test scripts, or should the Successful Contractor propose these for Commission approval?

Answer:

The Commission expects a collaborative approach to developing User Acceptance Testing (UAT) acceptance criteria and test scripts with the Successful Contractor. These will be negotiated in light of Section 6A of the Sample Contract (Attachment G to the RFP).

A Responding Contractor may choose to include with its bid submission proposed “formal acceptance criteria and test scripts” for the Evaluation Committee’s review, but the RFP’s bid requirements speak for themselves. For example, Section 3.7, User Acceptance Testing (UAT) Environment outlines mandatory requirements for the Successful Contractor. With respect to each of the numbered requirements, the Responding Contractor must directly address its ability to meet each requirement and, as needed or desired, provide explanatory or informational text. See “Mandatory Requirements” on p.4 of the RFP. See also Section 4.3.12 (“Technical Approach and Requirements”), which seeks additional narrative information about the Responding contractor and its proposed UAT environment.

137. Section 3.7 / Contract / SLA. Beyond UAT completion, will acceptance be tied to Regulatory compliance benchmarks and/or user adoption metrics?

Answer:

It may, as the Commission reserves the right to negotiate any and all Acceptance terms and conditions with the Potentially Successful Bidder. See also response to Question 136.

138. Section 3.7 / Contract / SLA. Are there specific failure scenarios the Commission considers material (e.g., missed enforcement deadlines, delayed renewals)?

Answer:

Any number of fact-specific “failure scenarios” could be “material.” The question is not specific enough to provide further information at this time.

139. Commercial and Contractual Clarifications, Section 5.3 – Cost Proposal. Does the Commission expect pricing assumptions for renewal option years to remain consistent with the base term, or to be renegotiated at renewal?

Answer:

The Commission expects pricing / rates for renewal terms to remain consistent with the base term in order to evaluate whether to exercise renewal options.

140. Section 4.2 – Retainage. Can the Commission clarify whether the 10% retainage applies only to implementation milestones or also to ongoing operational services?

Answer:

The retainage applies to implementation milestones only. See Exhibit G at Paragraph 16.I (“The Commission shall hold a retainage of 10% of the contract value, and shall withhold the final payment contingent on final acceptance (following adequate User Acceptance Testing (“UAT”)) by the Commission, unless waived or otherwise agreed, in writing. The Services herein will be provided consistent with and under these Services performance review and accountability guarantees.”).

141. Section 6.8 – Negotiation and Execution of Contract. RFP Section 6.8 references limitations on accepting certain provisions commonly found in commercial non-governmental contracts. Can the Commission please clarify which specific provisions or restrictions it is referring to?

Answer:

Attachment G is the Commission’s draft contract for this procurement. The Commission will only consider minor proposed edits to the sample contract. However, Potentially Successful Bidders should be prepared to discuss and negotiate certain terms and conditions with the Commission, such as acceptance criteria, schedules of SLAs and liquidated damages, and other terms which are fact-specific as to a given Proposal.

142. AI / Advanced Analytics Governance, Section 4.3 – AI Usage. If AI is used for analytics, triage, or pattern detection, are there policy restrictions on automated decision support versus human-only decisions and will the Commission require model transparency or explainability?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #9.

143. Section 4.3 – AI Usage. Are there concerns about AI being classified as a “regulatory decision-maker” under NC law?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 9.

144. In reference to the Background Section of the solicitation: Can the NC State Lottery Commission provide a range or estimate in the number of users using the current system at the North Carolina State Lottery Commission?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #14.

145. In reference to Section 3.0 and 3.1.1: Is it possible for the NC State Lottery Commission provide the number of anticipated applications for licenses that occur per month currently?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 69.

146. In reference to Section 3.0 and 3.1.1: Is it possible for the NC State Lottery Commission to provide the average number of applications for licenses over the past two years?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 70.

147. In reference to Section 3.1.2 and 3.1.3: Is it possible for the NC State Lottery Commission to list all of the possible integrations or additional applications that the proposed solution will be required to connect with?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question # 4.

148. RFP Section 3.5 System Integration and APIs. #3 Integration with third-party and external systems, such as:

- Background check vendors;
- Tax, revenue, and identity verification systems;
- Financial institutions and payment processors; and
- Law enforcement or sister regulatory bodies

Exactly how many integrations are in scope? Are there any that are homegrown systems?

Answer:

Please see the response to Question # 4. The flexible solution the NCSLC seeks must be able to accommodate additional third-party integrations in the future in order to meet business needs.

149. RFP Section 3.6 Change Management #3. 3. Migration of limited Commission legacy data with accuracy verification, reconciliation reporting, and user acceptance sign-off. How much legacy data do you expect? Is it from a single source or multiple? Are any of the sources homegrown systems?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #29.

150. 3.1 System Configuration and Case Management , 3.1.1 Gaming License Application Management 3.1.1.8. *Design and implement batch printing functionality so Commission staff can mass print applications and associated case file materials, renewed or newly issued licenses.*

What is the resulting printed material used for? Does it require physical printing or is a secure electronic packet acceptable?

Answer:

Please see answer to Questions # 28 and 109.

151. 3.1.1.14. *Relationship mapping to link individuals, entities, suppliers, locations, and other regulated parties, including contractual relationships, ownership hierarchies, and percentage-ownership structures.* Can we please get an example of an ownership hierarchy and how the individuals/entities relate to each other?

Answer:

The Commission does not have a sample to make available with this RFP.

152. 3.1.1.16. *Search and filtering tools for names, entities, license numbers, submission status, compliance history, and risk indicators.* Can you please provide some examples of risk indicators and how they apply to records in the system?

Answer:

The Commission may seek to create “risk indicators” utilizing other data points housed within the solution. These may include indicators based on information about previous enforcement actions, staff caution letters, licensee self-disclosures, or the like. The Commission does not presently have the capabilities to create risk indicators like these in an efficient manner.

153. 3.1.2 System and Document Management, 3.1.2.15 b. Automated redaction workflow that allows staff to apply redactions at scale, annotate reasons, and track exemptions. Can we get an example of annotation reasons and exemptions?

Answer:

The Commission does not presently have this tool or functionality; consequently, it cannot provide an example.

154. 3.2 Portal Specifications , 3.2.1 External User Portal Specifications, 3.2.1.6. Self-service dashboard for each licensee / applicant showing required filings, open actions, historical submissions, license standing, contact information, authorized users, and other configurable information.

Please provide an example of other configurable information that will display on the portal.

Answer:

At this time, staff do not have a public example of an existing dashboard to share in connection with this RFP.

155. 3.8 Preferred Additions: 3.8.2. Integrated payment processing with solution for credit card and e-check payments. Fees charged by Commission rules with automated fee calculations. Do you have a preferred/selected payment provider already?

Answer:

See Response to Questions # 20, 22, 52, 125.

156. The RFP references a requirement for a 5% performance bond or letter of credit. Performance bonds and letters of credit are more commonly associated with construction or goods-based contracts and are less typical for IT and software development engagements. Could the State please confirm whether this requirement is mandatory for this procurement? If so, would the State consider alternative forms of financial assurance more customary for software and professional services contracts?

Answer:

Please see answer to Question #18

157. Page 12, Section 4.1 (Qualifications & Capacity) references gaming-specific experience.

Could the State clarify whether this experience is a mandatory requirement or one of several factors considered in evaluating a respondent's qualifications? Additionally, would the State consider comparable experience delivering complex, highly regulated transactional systems outside of the gaming domain as meeting the intent of this requirement?

Answer:

Gaming-specific experience is not mandatory but rather one of several factors considered in evaluating qualifications. All Responding Contractors should articulate their track record of other similar, successful projects.

158. Related to Section 4.1. May a teaming partner proposed by the prime contractor contribute relevant past performance references and experience toward satisfying qualification requirements? If so, are there any limitations on how such experience should be presented or weighted?

Answer:

A "teaming partner's" experience may be utilized towards satisfying qualification requirements. The prime contractor must clearly identify the name of the teaming partner whose experience is being used and point out that the experience is that of the teaming partner and not the prime contractor. See RFP Section 4.1(3).

159. Has the State previously conducted market research, an RFI, or similar outreach related to this procurement? If so, can the State share whether existing platforms, technologies, or vendors are currently in use or under consideration as part of this effort?

Answer:

The documents constituting RFP LC000067 speak for themselves.

160. The solicitation notes that travel costs should be embedded within pricing. Could the State clarify its expectations regarding remote versus onsite work, particularly for key personnel, outside of essential milestones such as project kickoffs, quarterly business reviews, or major delivery events?

Answer:

See the RFP at Section 4.1.2 (Qualifications and Capacity).

The Commission looks forward to reviewing the Responding Contractors' respective Project Plans and Timelines (see RFP at Section 4.2), which may impact the agency's expectations of when the vendor conducts remote work or onsite work "outside of essential milestones."

161. Is it acceptable for the proposed technology provider to be included as part of the implementation team without a formal subcontractor or joint venture relationship, or does the State require an official subcontracting or JV arrangement between the prime and technology provider? If so, would their experience be considered under sections 5.1 Qualifications?

Answer:

Any entity that provides products or services contemplated by this RFP must be either a joint venturer or a subcontractor and must be clearly disclosed to the Commission at the time the proposal is submitted. The qualifications of the Responding Contractor should be provided under RFP Section 4.1 and 5.1 and the experience of proposed subcontractors should be disclosed under Section 5.1(3).

162. Are respondents expected to hold existing contracts, licenses, or authorizations with the State or other jurisdictions related to the provision of gaming goods or services? If so, please clarify which requirements apply to technology and implementation vendors versus operational gaming service providers.

Answer:

The RFP does not require the Successful Contractor to hold a gaming license issued by the Commission.

Please review Paragraph 16 A of the Sample Contract (“Upon execution VENDOR shall provide the Commission current Certificate of Authority from the North Carolina Secretary of State showing that it and each Subcontractor are qualified to transact business in the State of North Carolina. Vendor shall ensure that the Certificate of Authority remains current at all times during the term of this Agreement.”). Responding Contractors are encouraged to seek independent counsel, as needed, to assess their ability to conduct business in the state.