

RFP: Scratch Ticket Testing - dated 12/16/25 Responses to Questions Received

1. Will the awarded company's participation preclude it from bidding on and performing other testing, consulting or security services in the future?

No.

2. Section 1, Step 3 states "Price proposals must be separately sealed and signed." Where would Minnesota State Lottery prefer the pricing form entitled "Attachment C: Cost Detail" to be signed as there is no signature line provided on the form? Would a signature line added to the bottom of the form be acceptable or would Minnesota State Lottery rather have a vendor include an acknowledgement of pricing on a signed transmittal letter?

Either way is acceptable; however, the price must be signed.

3. Can the Minnesota State Lottery provide clarification and further description and/or alternative names for the following tests listed in Section 4 of this RFP:

- #3 Impression
 - **This is an antiquated method and is no longer an industry standard, please see the First Amended RFP which has stricken this requirement.**
- #9 Varnish/graphic ink adhesion
 - **This is a durability test that measures whether the play symbols and/or varnish will remain intact after application of a weight under a stylus. References ASTM D2197-16 (2022). Testing is not done on the graphic section of the tickets.**
- #11 Kamar lifting test
 - **Kamar is one of the spray coating products that is used in lift testing. Please see the First Amended RFP which has stricken the word "Kamar" but note that lift testing is still required.**
- #25 Linear taber abrader
 - **This is a test using latex scrape adhesion to determine the amount of weight and the number of replicates required to remove the latex. References ASTM D2197-16 (2022).**

4. Does the Lottery plan on having all 44 games of \$2 and above tested each year?

We plan to test all tickets each year, including \$1 and above. This is our current practice, and we plan to continue this for the foreseeable future. However, please note that the contract does not guarantee any number of tests and is priced on a per test basis.

5. Section 4, Item 4.1 indicates that we should “Provide one (1) report you have provided to a United States lottery in the past year. This report may be redacted to remove confidential lottery data, but must be an actual report provided to a United States lottery.” How may we make the required redactions to the report?

Please use a secure redaction method.

6. Do you required that we physically mark out any confidential lottery data on a copy of the report, or may we reprint the report after deleting the confidential information using a word processing program?

Either method is acceptable, the Minnesota Lottery does not want to obtain confidential information through this process.

7. What do you consider “confidential lottery data”? Do you require the State Lottery name not be redacted?

Please consult with your client to determine what can be shared.

8. We are currently seeking permission from the state lottery for which we currently conduct testing to utilize one of their reports for this purpose. However, we take the confidentiality of our testing very seriously and would never share any such data with anyone other than the client lottery without direct permission from the client. If we do not receive the permission from our client lottery to use one of their redacted reports as our “Work Sample”, can the “sample” report we commonly include in other RFP’s be submitted as our “Work Sample”. The “sample” report that we commonly provide is representative of actual tested tickets, but does not reflect the results of any one specific ticket.

Our preference is a redacted report; however, a work sample as described above is acceptable.

6. Section 4 Required scratch ticket tests included in the per ticket price, #3 Impression, #17 microscope readout and #18 IR video readout. Please describe, if possible what you are looking for on these points.

Please see above, removing #3. “Microscope readout” is a quality assurance test using a microscope to confirm continuity of colors, contrast, etc. “IR video readout” is a security test to candle the ticket and confirm play symbols, validation numbers, etc. cannot be exploited using infrared light.

7. Page 3. DO NOT INCLUDE Non-Public/Trade Secret data (as defined in this link to Minn. Stat. § 13.37). Should information of this nature be included as an Appendix or can they be marked as confidential within the body of the response? Similarly, in Section 6 on page 9 it states to clearly

mark trade secret materials in its response at the time the response is submitted. How should this information be presented?

Please mark trade secret materials.