



**Q&A RESPONSES**  
**RFP-LC000062 – ENTERPRISE REGULATORY SYSTEM**  
**Published: August 25, 2023**

- 1. Page 2 of the RFP indicates the Commission prefers the Regulatory System to be implemented by June 14, 2024 for supporting sports betting, yet page 10 indicates a delivery date no later than 7 weeks than seven (7) weeks from contract execution. Please confirm when the Commission desires the system to go live.**

The RFP document states, “The Commission prefers a configurable, modular Regulatory System that can be implemented rapidly so that the Commission can launch sports betting in North Carolina before its June 14, 2024, statutory deadline.” Please see Section 7 of North Carolina Session Law 2023-42 for additional information regarding the Commission’s statutory deadline.

See the RFP at Section 5.2, Written Response to Scope of Services (“Include a ‘no later than’ go live date in the project timeline. Please note that the Commission prefers a delivery date no later than within seven weeks of contract execution.”) and 6.1, Summary of Key Dates (“Immediately following contract execution: Implementation project begins; System go-live date: TBD).

- 2. Is the Commission open to a phased implementation approach to go-live with sports betting by June of 2024 and other programs / functions to be stood up after that date? If a phased implementation approach is acceptable, what is the desired order for which the Commission programs / areas are to be implemented?**

Please see the RFP at Section 5.2. Bidders are to provide the Commission with a project timeline, initial schedule, a work break down schedule, and descriptions of “significant phases, activities, tasks, milestones, deliverables and resource requirements necessary for Commission staff to evaluate the implementation plan.” Further, Section 3.4, Design, Test, and Implement states that the “Vendor shall provide on-demand resources to assist [the] Commission with new or complex work flow or data flow configurations or designs during the first 12 months of the engagement.”

Depending on the solution proposed, the Commission is amenable to considering a phased implementation that fully addresses the Commission’s critical and immediate operational and business needs. In particular, at the outset the Commission will be keenly focused on deploying the solution to facilitate receipt and review of license application materials, which will require, for example (among other things), a secure, structured, public-facing application submission portal

and a suite of tools for Commission staff to receive, track, and evaluate application submissions. The solution's ability to address other necessary tasks during the life-cycle of a license (e.g., annual compliance submissions, renewal, surrender/termination, compliance check, etc.) remain important; however, in the discretion of the Commission, these components and other less-critical features could be developed and deployed later in the implementation.

If a bidder proposes a phased project timeline, the implementation and/or satisfaction of the Security and Integrity requirements outlined in 3.3 at any point in time *other than* the vendor's first implementation phase (or after the first seven weeks following execution) will be highly disfavored. Any proposed phased implementation shall still be fully completed within 15 weeks of contract execution.

**3. Please elaborate upon any timing considerations for when specific programs / areas / functions will need to be fully transitioned to the new solution.**

This is a net new system; no existing system or data needs to be transitioned to the new solution.

**4. What costs has the Commission incurred for the initial set up, ongoing maintenance, hosting, software licensing, support, and enhancements (i.e., "change orders") over the lifetime of the current system(s) to be replaced by the new solution?**

There is no "current system" to be replaced by the new solution, which will be a net new system; accordingly, the Commission has not incurred costs described in this inquiry relative to a "current system."

**5. What presentations, software demonstrations and/or estimates / quotes has the Commission received related to this project and from whom?**

For purposes of this inquiry the "project" is the Commission's formal Request for Proposal: Enterprise Regulatory System. Please review Sections 5.3 ("Costs") and 6.0 ("RFP Process and Other Important Information") of the procurement document.

Written proposals, including a specific cost proposal, are due from bidders on or before September 6, 2023. Between September 11-15, 2023, the Commission may schedule virtual product demonstrations with responsive contractors, based upon the strength and responsiveness of written proposals.

To protect the integrity of this procurement, bids submitted to the Commission will remain sealed until the procurement process is complete.

- 6. For data conversion requirements, please inventory all data sources, file formats, and size of the current data sets to be converted and migrated into the new system.**

Please see response to inquiry No.3

- 7. What is the Commission’s budget for the initial system implementation?**

The Commission’s budget for “initial system implementation” and this procurement is not yet determined. As outlined in the Section 1.0 of the RFP (“Intent of the Request for Proposal”), “The Commission desires to obtain what it believes to be the best flexible solution within the required specifications with optimal price-value and responsiveness to the Commission’s needs.”

- 8. What, if any, amount of the budget is subject to expire by a certain timeframe and when? Please elaborate.**

The Commission’s budget for this procurement is not yet determined.

- 9. What amount is being budgeted for ongoing support, software licensing, hosting, and support of the new system.**

The Commission’s budget for “ongoing support, software licensing, hosting, and support of the new system” and this procurement is not yet determined. As outlined in the Section 1.0 of the RFP (“Intent of the Request for Proposal”), “The Commission desires to obtain what it believes to be the best flexible solution within the required specifications with optimal price-value and responsiveness to the Commission’s needs.”

- 10. Is the Commission desiring to have the option for staff to be trained on application administration to make changes, updates, and add new capabilities to the system after go-live? Or is the Commission anticipating the vendor to perform future updates and changes (such as addition of new license types, form configuration, business rule changes, etc.) to the system?**

The RFP addresses training requirements and updates. By way of example, please see:

- Section 3.0, Scope of Services
- Section 3.1.6, General Requirements
- Section 3.1.7, General Requirements
- Section 3.2, Training
- Section 3.4, Design, Test, and Implement

**11. Please provide an approximate number of standard email/letter templates that will be used by the Commission that are to be integrated and automated by the system.**

The number of “standard email/letter templates” is an unknown number at this time. The Commission requires a flexible, scalable solution that can support the creation of multiple template communications that can issue from the system.

**12. How many different or distinct application types will be supported in this solution? Please provide a comprehensive list.**

Presently, the Commission will issue four different types of licenses. See North Carolina Session Law 2023-42. It is in the process of designing no fewer than four distinct license applications, each of which will have multiple components. Because future legislative initiatives may expand or change the duties and powers of the Commission, the system’s flexibility and scalability to support other or additional distinct applications or registration forms is an important consideration.

**13. Please identify ALL other systems that the new solution will need to integrate with (i.e. payment processor, other systems such as financial, etc.) along with an inventory of which interfaces will need to be whether a one-way (import or export) or two-way data exchange?**

The Commission prefers a configurable, modular Regulatory System that can (i) be implemented rapidly; (ii) scale to accommodate similar Commission uses cases; and (iii) be deployed to address expanded or changed Commission duties and powers. Accordingly, the solution’s capabilities to integrate with third party providers to automate such functions as payment processing, finger prints, universal exclusion, case management, etc. are of interest to the Commission. Bidders are invited to identify and describe in their bids their solution’s integration capabilities in their bids with Enterprise applications and/or solutions (e.g., IDP, 2fa, Email, Secure File Transfer). On initial deployment, however, the solution’s capability to integrate with other interfaces is preferred but not required.

**14. Please provide the annual number of applications / renewals processed by the Commission.**

This procurement is for a net new system to implement newly authorized gaming initiatives in the State. See RFP at Section 1.0, Intent of the Request for Proposal. Bidders may choose to research application and licensing processes in other domestic jurisdictions that have recently authorized sports betting. The number of applications/renewals expected is undetermined at this time.

**15. Is the Commission expecting the vendor to incorporate a payment processor within the proposal, or provide recommendations?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**16. Please provide a breakdown of the number of the Commission employees that will be using the new solution by the Commission Program and role.**

The Commission has not yet fully identified the employees or the number of employees that will be using the new solution at the time of implementation. Initial informal estimates suggest the solution will need to accommodate a minimum of 5-10 users within weeks of contract execution; Commission users will include technical / security administrators, analysts, investigators, clerks, and others. We expect the number of users to grow as the operations mature.

**17. Given the complexity of the RFP, extensive requirements, etc. can the proposal due date be at least 2-4 weeks?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 1.

**18. Will the selected vendor have the opportunity to provide exceptions and/or alternative contract language during contract negotiations, or will vendors need to provide those within their respective proposals?**

Please see Section 6.8 (“Negotiation and Execution of Contract”), which states, in pertinent part:

A Successful Potential Contractor under this RFP shall negotiate and execute a contract containing such terms and conditions as shall be satisfactory to the Commission. **Attachment G is a draft of the contract, which contains the terms and conditions required by the Commission.** At the sole discretion of the Commission, certain provisions may be negotiated and modified subsequent to Contract award. Please be aware that, as an agency of the State of North Carolina, the Commission is limited in its ability to accept certain provisions that are commonly found in commercial non-governmental contracts. (emphasis added).

The Commission includes the Sample Contract: Enterprise Regulatory System to help potential bidders determine whether they can meet the Commission’s needs. Vendors are not prohibited from including in their bid proposals “exceptions and/or alternative contract language” to what appears in the Attachment G; however, if such proposed contract language conflicts with State requirements or the Commission cannot accept the proposed terms, then the proposed language may disqualify the bidder, impact the responsiveness of the bid, or negatively impacts its evaluation. Given the urgent timeline to complete this project and implement the solution, the Commission will proceed through contract negotiations in an expedited manner. Software as service terms and “standard” terms that bidders propose will be evaluated and may be negotiated in the Commission’s sole discretion.

**19. Can the Commission provide an inventory of all the reports that need to be replicated within the new system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 3.

**20. It is unclear how proposals will be evaluated, both generally and in regard to technical responses versus pricing. Can the Commission provide any clarification or information regarding the specific scoring of proposals as described in section 6.5, such as number of points per category, percentage, weighting of items, etc.? In addition, what weight is being placed on vendors' pricing responses?**

As outlined in the Section 1.0 of the RFP ("Intent of the Request for Proposal"), "The Commission desires to obtain what it believes to be the best flexible solution within the required specifications with optimal price-value and responsiveness to the Commission's needs."

The text of Section 6.5 ("Proposal Evaluation") speaks for itself. The Evaluation Committee, once formed, will conduct a fair, comprehensive, and impartial evaluation of each responsive proposal based upon factors identified in the RFP; it will utilize an evaluation rubric, which will be finalized and weighted based upon quickly-evolving business needs. See also Attachment E ("Equal Business Opportunity Forms").

**21. Enterprise Regulatory System RFP Page/Section - Pg. 10, 5.3 Costs**

**RFP Requirement: Submit a detailed itemized proposed overall cost to complete the entire scope of work**

**For the purposes of calculating the entire cost for all licensing subscription fees, maintenance, and training how many licensed users are anticipated? Of this total, how many Users will be assigned to compliance and inspection activities that will require input from a smart phone or tablet in the field?**

With respect to licensed users, please see the response to inquiry No. 16. The number of licensed users with compliance and inspection responsibilities, including those that will utilize mobile devices in the field to accomplish their work, is not known at this time. The Commission expects this its gaming compliance and inspection workforce to grow in coming years; however, forecasting specific hiring and technology needs at this time is challenging.

**22. Section: General**

**Item Number: Extension**

**While we understand the importance and urgency of this project, we kindly request an additional two-week extension to provide a more thorough response. In summary, will the Commission allow for submissions no later than September 20, 2023?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 1.

**23. Section: 3.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 1**

**Could you define “voluminous sensitive data files”? Estimated number of records? Average document file size? This is for us to determine if the native document management is sufficient or if we will need to implement a Document Management System with additional storage.**

The Commission anticipates that the system will function as the “source of truth” for materials that applicants and licensees submit to the State for regulatory purposes. Further, it will be the repository for all manner of sensitive documents (e.g., PII, proprietary data, trade secrets, criminal background checks, sensitive investigation documents) over the full life-cycle of a license. Sensitive documents will include materials submitted by applicants and licensees, as well as sensitive records created by Commission staff.

At this time, the Commission cannot estimate the number of records it expects to store or the average document size. It expects, however, to receive, maintain, and utilize a significant volume of sensitive data using the solution and further expects that many files will be relatively larger in size.

**24. Section: 3.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 1**

**Ballpark quantity of “thousands of applicants”?**

Section 3.1.1, General Requirements states: “Mandatory: Capable of facilitating license application submissions for thousands of applicants and securely receiving, organizing, and maintaining (i) voluminous sensitive data files submitted by applicants and (ii) information in hundreds of required data fields supplied by applicants.”

Initial implementation of Session Law 2023-42 may result in hundreds or even thousands of entities and individuals submitting materials to the Commission through the solution. Over the course of the agreement “thousands of applicants” may utilize the solution; accordingly, the successful bidder’s solution will have the mandatory capabilities described in the RFP.

**25. Section: 3.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 3**

**Approximate number of distinct application types in initial release?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 12.

**26. Section: 3.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 5**

**Could you more clearly define your approximation of “exponential growth”?**

Future legislative initiatives may expand or change the duties and powers of the Commission; thus, the solution’s flexibility and scalability are important considerations. The Commission seeks a scalable solution that can be utilized to address licensing and compliance matters in the event the Commission is tasked with expanded regulatory responsibilities. If the tool is successfully deployed, in the future the Commission may consider deploying it to address use cases arising from its traditional lottery operations. Bidders are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the North Carolina market and gaming-related proposals and initiatives that lawmakers are evaluating.

**27. Section: 3.2**

**Item Number: Mandatory 1**

**Please outline the roles and associated skills and skill-levels of the Commission personnel who will independently configure the platform and tools, etc.**

Section 3.2.1 in the RFP states: “Contractor shall have a comprehensive training program. Contractor will conduct train-the-trainer, administrator, and report building training to provide a key group of individuals all knowledge necessary to efficiently and fully utilize the solution. At minimum, training should enable and empower Commission personnel to independently configure the platform and its tools, create work flows and dataflows, utilize dashboard features, configure data pushes, automate data flows of sensitive information, write and deploy business rules and data logic, leverage reporting tools for custom and routine reports, and train others to use all facets and features of the solution. Any training provided virtually will need to be recorded.” (emphasis added).

During initial implementation and beyond, new and existing Commission staff of various skill levels will utilize the system.

**28. Section: 3.2**

**Item Number: Mandatory 2**

**Please more clearly define “Optional”**

Section 3.2 (“Training”) is comprised of mandatory items, including a requirement that the winning contractor provide end-user training. Bidders have the option to propose in-person training, virtual training, or a combination of in-person and virtual training.



**29. Section: 3.2**

**Item Number: Mandatory 5**

**Please more clearly approximate “annual training time”**

As the system matures and tasks change for its users, additional training will be required for the different functions and tools. The capabilities and complexity of the solution offered, as well as the frequency of updates, are likely to influence the amount of “annual training time” needed to make users proficient. See, e.g., RFP Sections 3.2.6 and 3.2.7.

**30. Section: 3.3**

**Item Number: Mandatory 5**

**Will you not accept a solution delivered via a highly secure but multi-tenant architecture?**

The Commission’s current preference is for a single-tenant solution. Bidders that propose solutions which utilize multi-tenant architecture should describe their capabilities and security in detail. If a bidder has the capabilities to provide either a single-tenant or multi-tenant solution, then it may provide separate bids for each.

**31. Section 3.4**

**Item Number: General**

**What are the responsibilities of the Commission employee assigned to work with the contractor? What are this employee’s skills and skill-levels?**

With respect to 3.4 Design, Test, and Implement, the Commission anticipates assigning a project manager and a technical engineer to work closely with the winning contract. For additional information, see response to inquiry No. 16.

**32. Section: 3.4**

**Item Number: Mandatory 1**

**What purpose does SFTP serve in your expected solution?**

SFTP will provide the capability of securely transferring data in and out of the solution.

**33. Section: 4.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 9**

**Could you define “voluminous (i) applicant and licensee records and (ii) Commission staff records and entries”? Is this the same data as in 3.1 Mandatory 1? If in addition, estimated number of records? Average document file size? This is for us to determine if the native document management is sufficient or if we will need to implement a Document Management System with additional storage.**

See responses to inquiry numbers #23 and 24.

**34. Section: 4.1**

**Item Number: Mandatory 11**

**What is the Lottery Commission’s data archival policy our solution must support?**

The Commission is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Act and the Functional Schedule for North Carolina State Agencies set forth by the State Archives within the NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

As a practical matter, the tool should support the Commission’s ability to see the contents or status of an applicant’s or licensee’s file at an earlier point in time – either through archival capacity, versioning, and/or audit trail reporting. See Section 3.1.9, General Requirements (Mandatory: “Ability to record and audit transactions (e.g., uploads, data entry, changes, downloads, task completions) within the System, for both Commission staff and licensees/applicants. Ability to produce a report/document showing the contents of an application as it existed at various points in time.”). See also Section 4.5, Security Resilience, and Recovery regarding back-up capabilities.

**35. Section: 4.7**

**Item Number: General**

**Does the Lottery Commission already have any of the following? Or will our proposal need to include the procurement/use of such tooling?**

- **Project management (e.g. JIRA)**
  - **Test management (e.g. Provar Manager)**
  - **Test automation (e.g. Provar)**
- DevOps software (e.g. Copado)**

The Commission has Jira for bug tracking as well other applications utilized for testing and Project Management. Presently the Commission does not expect to do any development on or against the solution offered; consequently, the Commission is relying on vendor to independently address test management, test automation, DevOps.

**36. Section: General**

**Item Number: Integrations**

**Will the Enterprise Regulatory System need to be integrated with any external systems? If so, what are the external systems? Will data need to be transferred to and from these systems?**

**Are the systems API-enabled?**

**What is the nature of the data in these systems? Are there any real-time or near-real-time integration requirements?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**37. Section: General**

**Item Number: User count**

**What are the counts for the following user types:**

- **Internal named users (not concurrent users)**
  - **External applicants (rough estimate of monthly logins to applicant site)**
- Other external users, if any**

With respect to internal users at the Commission, please see response to inquiry No. 16. The Commission expects the number of external applicants, including individuals and entities that will utilize the solution's public-facing submission portal, to increase over time, which will increase the number of monthly logins to the site. Additionally, future legislative initiatives may expand or change the duties and powers of the Commission; thus, the solution's scalability and capability to support an expanded number of external applicants and an increased number of logins is an important consideration. Please describe the solution's capabilities.

**38. Section: Attachment G**

**Item Number: Right to Audit**

**Our solution involves a multi-tenant cloud service provider that typically does not typically offer a Right to Audit clause as part of the base service offering. As a multi-tenant service, compartmentalization is virtual, not physical. Per our cloud service provider, annual site visits can be arranged at the Commission's expense, but in consideration of their other customers, random access cannot be permitted. They have third party auditors that inspect and review their security. They undergo annual audits for compliance with additional frameworks such as SSAE 16 SOC 1, SOC 2, SOC 3, ISO 27001, and PCI-DSS Level 1. The results of these audits can be provided to the Commission as desired under NDA. Is this acceptable to meet the Commission's requirements?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 30.

**39. RFP Section: 3.1**

**What device types must be supported for the mobile device access requirement?**

Section 3.1.8, General Requirements, states the following requirement for the solution: "Functional and secure remote access via authorized mobile devices or tablets." Presently, authorized mobile devices include iOS devices such as the iPhone and iPad.

**40. RFP Section: 3.3**

**Are there any specific requirements or limitations on the vendor used as the cloud service provider used to host the application?**

Please see “mandatory” elements in RFP Section 3.3, Security and Integration Requirements.

**41. RFP Section: 4.0**

**Will a phased approach be considered where deliverables are broken into phases to achieve the delivery of the full scope?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 2.

**42. Can the Commission provide the number of named agency users that will require access to the future state system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 16.

**43. Can the Commission confirm the number of transaction types (i.e. license types) that will be configured in the future system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 12.

**44. Can the Commission please provide a list of required integrations for the future system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**45. Can the Commission please provide details relating to data conversion (if required), such as 1) what type of data will be converted 2) will the Commission convert data for completed transactions or in-flight as well and 3) what is the source system(s) for this data?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 3.

**46. Can the Commission indicate if they have a payment processor for online payments? If so, who is the payment processor vendor?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**47. Can the Commission please elaborate on the following statement from the RFP:**

*Include a “no later than” go live date in the project timeline. Please note that the Commission prefers a delivery date no later than within seven weeks of contract execution.*

**Does this imply the Commission is expecting the future system to go-live with all required functionality no later than seven weeks after the start of the implementation project?**

Please see responses to inquiry No. 1 and 2.

**48. Has the Commission participated in any meetings or demos with prospective vendors for a future system in the past 12 months? If so, with which vendors?**

Commission staff have engaged in efforts to identify business needs and potential technology solutions available in the marketplace, within the agency, from the State of North Carolina, and from other states that could be used to help implement recently enacted changes to the North Carolina State Lottery Act. The Commission may require multiple “future systems” to support such implementation efforts, including systems, services, and solutions that go beyond the scope of this procurement.

At this time and as part of this formal procurement process, it would be inappropriate for the Commission to identify the third-parties and state actors with whom it has informally discussed its possible technology needs.

**49. Does the Commission have a budget range in mind for the implementation of the future system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 5.

**50. Reference: Extension**

**While we understand the importance and urgency of this project, we kindly request an additional two-week extension to provide a more thorough response. In summary, will the Commission allow for submissions no later than September 20, 2023?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 1.

**51. How many internal users will be accessing this system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 16.

**52. Is there any historical data loading required for this new system?  
If so, in what systems does this data currently reside?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 3.

**53. Are the mobile requirements for connected devices?**

The inquiry concerning “mobile requirements for connected devices” is vague. Bidder should describe its capabilities in response to the RFP Section 4.1.16 and see the response to inquiry No. 39.

**54. Are there any requirements for disconnected mobile devices?**

The inquiry concerning “requirements for disconnected mobile devices” is vague. Bidder should describe its capabilities in response to the RFP Section 4.1.16 and see the response to inquiry No. 39.

**In accordance with Section 3.1(7) of the RFP the North Carolina State Lottery Commission has mandated that the system must have a:**

**“High level of flexibility and configurability for interfaces and functions, including customizable intake forms, data fields, work flows, system notifications, retention and purging rules, user and case access, and ability to sort and prioritize files without contractor support.”**

**In relation to this requirement we have the following clarifying questions:**

**55. Will this requirement include providing an API gateway using common best practices for HTTPS communications?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13. At the present time, the Commission does not require bidder to provide an API gateway; however, the Commission may want the solution to have this capability in the future and have it provided in a manner consistent with best practices for HTTPS communications. Please describe the solution’s capabilities.

**56. What API standards will the NC State Lottery Commission use/mandate?**

Please see responses to inquiry Nos. 13 and 55.

**57. Will the NC State Lottery Commission require cross domain graphql?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13. At the present time, the Commission does not require bidder to provide capabilities to support cross-domain query needs; however, the Commission may want the solution to have this capability in the future. Please describe the solution's capabilities.

**58. Will the data structure of the system be required to be in JSON format or be capable of accepting JSON formatted data?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13. At the present time, the Commission does not require bidder's solution to be in JSON format or be capable of accepting JSON formatted data; however, the Commission may want the solution to have this capability and feature in the future. Please describe the solution's capabilities.

**59. What authentication methods will the portal need to accept? API Keys? Oath tokens? Other security mechanisms?**

Requirements relevant to this inquiry can be found in the RFP. For example, please see Section 3.3, Security and Integrity Requirements. Please describe the solution's capabilities.

**60. Will the NC State Lottery Commission require the portal supplier to provide endpoint URLs for different API operations?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13. At the present time, the Commission does not require endpoint URLs for different API operations; however, the Commission may want the solution to have this capability in the future. Please describe the solution's capabilities. Note: if such feature is available, the Commission prefers that (i) the portal utilize a different URL than any potential API endpoint URL(s) offered by the vendor and (ii) the Commission controls access to API.

**61. Please specify the rate limiting and throttling mechanisms the NC State Lottery Commission will require to prevent abuse and ensure fair usage of the API from the portal's perspective.**

**This can include**

- Defined limits on the number of requests
- Defined limits from a specific domain
- Threat scoring by times rate limiting was forced to be applied
- Set limits on the complexity and depth of queries to prevent overly complex queries

**(assuming graphql is an option)**

Please see responses to inquiry Nos. 13, 55, 56 and 60. Please describe the solutions capabilities.

**62. What are the requirements for comprehensive API documentation?**

Please see response to inquiry Nos. 13, 55, 56, 60, and 61.

**63. What will the status codes and those documented values be from those endpoints?**

In this inquiry concerning “status codes” and “documented values” are vague. With respect to endpoint URLs and API operations, generally, please see response to inquiry No. 60.

**64. What will be the required availability of testing and staging environments?**

The Commission expects that the solutions testing and staging environments will be made available on an agreed-upon schedule during test cycles.

**65. Could we please have an extension until September 27<sup>th</sup> (3 weeks extension)?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 1.

**66. I cannot find the information for the pre-proposal conference and we want to make sure we have the points awarded in that category for attendance. Have you scheduled it?**

No “pre-proposal conference” occurred in connection with this procurement. No bidder will have “points awarded” for any actions outside of this formal procurement. The RFP document—including its sections concerning evaluation, scheduling, and potential demonstrations – speaks for itself.

**67. How many internal users will be using the new Enterprise regulatory system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 16.

**68. How many external users are expected to use the public facing portal to apply, view and upload application documents?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 37.



**69. Please share some insight on who are users/applicants who will be using the front end portal?**

Users of the front-end, public facing portal will be entities and individuals who apply for licenses from the Commission. Those who receive licenses will continue to use the front-end portal while they hold licenses. For additional information, review the RFP at Section 1.0, Intent of the Request for Proposal and Session Law 2023-42.

**70. Please confirm the total number of applications that needs to be configured for applicants?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 14.

**71. Please share the total number of Licenses types that needs to be built?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 14.

**72. Please share the total number of forms that needs to be built?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 12.

**73. Please share the total number of email templates, letters and other notifications templates that needs to be built?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 11.

**74. Please confirm if all the communication with the applicant/submitters would be through email or any other system like SMS is required?**

It is anticipated that communications with applications and submitters will occur through multiple channels. However, as outlined in the RFP, the solution should support the Commission's ability to communicate with applicants and licensees through dashboards, template messages, and email. Please describe the solution's capabilities to facilitate communication. With respect to SMS, this capability is not required generally; however, it may be needed to support two-factor authentication. See Section 3.3.10 of the RFP.

**75. Does Commission want to enable Payment gateway integration through the public facing portal or will it be handled in different system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**76. Any payment refund process to be enabled for Commission's internal users?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 75.

**77. Please share the list of boundary systems that the new Enterprise Regulatory system will need to integrate with?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 13.

**78. Does Commission require any chat functionality to be enabled to collaborate with the external applicants/submitters?**

No; chat functionality is not a technical requirement at this time. If a bidder offers chat functionality as part of its technical proposal, it should describe its capabilities, including the archival and retrieval capacity for chat logs.

**79. What are the different types of reports that commission currently uses?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 3.

**80. Please share the volume of data/entities that needs to be migrated to the new system?**

Please see response to inquiry No. 3.

**81. Please share insight about the complete end to end process of Commission's licensing system. How the entire Commission operates. This is to understand the process and share a compelling solution.**

The North Carolina State Lottery Commission is a state agency. Information about the Commission is available on its website ([www.nclottery.com](http://www.nclottery.com)) and throughout the public domain. See Section 1.0 ("Intent of the Request for Proposal") of the procurement document for general information about the Commission. At the time of this posting, the Commission's licensing system(s) are being developed.

**82. Can you please consider giving 1-2 week extension in submission deadline for this RFP? This extension will allow us sufficient time to accommodate answers to above questions into our proposal.**

Please see response to inquiry No. 1.