



**Multi-State Lottery Association
Request for Proposals for National For Life Game Research**

Issued January 24, 2025

Questions Due February 5, 2025

Responses Issued February 10, 2025

Proposals to the RFP are due February 17, 2025, via email to Procurement@MUSL.com, subject line “For Life Research”

Question 1: On page 11 of the RFP, there are 11 states or territories that are listed in gray. Are we excluding the areas in gray from the sample?

Response 1: No, we are not excluding areas in gray from the sample. For clarity, here is an updated table:

Blue	Cash 4 Life - 10 Lotteries
Green	Lucky 4 Life - 23 Lotteries
Yellow	9, 14 Lotteries not in either game

State	Number of Completes	State	Number of Completes	State	Number of Completes
Arizona		Kentucky		North Dakota	
Arkansas		Louisiana		Ohio	
California		Maine		Oklahoma	
Colorado		Maryland		Oregon	
Connecticut		Massachusetts		Pennsylvania	
Delaware		Michigan		Puerto Rico	
District of Columbia		Minnesota		Rhode Island	
Florida		Mississippi		South Carolina	
Georgia		Missouri		South Dakota	
Idaho		Montana		Tennessee	
Illinois		Nebraska		Texas	
Indiana		New Hampshire		Vermont	
Iowa		New Jersey		Virgin Islands	
Kansas		New Mexico		Virginia	
		New York		West Virginia	
		North Carolina		Wisconsin	
				Wyoming	

Question 2: On page 11 of the RFP, there is a footnote in read that reads “Option: provide supplemental sample with individual state database of players.” Can you elaborate on what this means?

Response 2: Given the condensed timeline for this project and the time it would take to coordinate with many different lotteries, we have decided to not allow or utilize individual state’s player databases to supplement the sample.

Question 3: On page 11 of the RFP, you suggest that one option is to align sample distribution to current “4Life” sales by state. Are you going to provide a percentage of sales by state for estimation purposes, or should we assume that this issue could potentially be addressed via weighting, if this is indeed how you want it handled?

Response 3: MUSL will provide the selected firm with sales distributions for the current Cash 4 Life and Lucky for Life game. Bidders should propose their recommended approach based on the goals and sample framework provided.

Question 4: To clarify, do you want to show all concepts in all states, or do you want exposures parsed only to the games currently available in each state?

Response 4: We would like the “4 Life” concepts tested in each state.

Question 5: Do you want to place a quota limit on the number of Powerball or Mega Millions players overall or by state?

Response 5: In states that offer a “For Life” game the primary goal is to establish minimum quotas of “For Life” players (see chart on page 10). After that the rest of the sample can be filled with Powerball and Mega Millions players. For states that don’t offer a “For Life” game the sample will be made up completely of Mega Millions and Powerball players.

Question 6: There appear to be two (2) options for each of the “4 life” products and two (2) options for each of Powerball and Mega Millions (<\$400M prize and \$400M+ prize). Just to confirm, there are a total of eight (8) relatively fixed options and the features on each concept wouldn’t change. It’s a matter of choosing which option for each “4 life” product delivers highest volume in the Mega Millions and Powerball context?

Response 6: Mega Millions and Powerball are not part of the concept evaluation. Sample selection is based on the participation in any of the multi-state games including Mega Millions, Powerball or “For Life”. We would also like to understand how the proposed concepts compare to the other multi-state games. Jackpot levels are used to determine whether a player is labeled a “jackpot chaser” as well as the spend simulation exercise to determine high jackpots impact on “For Life” game spend.

Question 7: We assume that a simulation would be built on a total sample basis. Do you also need simulations for any of subgroups? If so, which subgroup simulations are needed? For example, current “4 Life” players vs non players, Powerball players vs. non-players, males vs. females, younger vs. older players, frequent vs. infrequent players, etc.

Response 7: Yes, we would like to be able to look at simulations for the subgroups referenced.

Question 8: For comparison, do you need a simulation that shows how the current game offerings perform in the Mega Millions or Powerball context?

Response 8: Spend simulations should reflect the incremental impact of the new concept on “For Life” as well as multi-state spend.

Question 9: Could the game concepts be simplified to key points to enable more efficient player estimations?

Response 9: Yes, the working group is working on stimuli that will include a Marketing/positioning piece in addition to a more detailed concept overview.

Question 10: Do you want the survey in English only? Do you think the study should offer Spanish language as an option for either:

- a. The questionnaire
- b. The 4 concepts

Response 10a: Yes, please offer a Spanish version.

Response 10b: Yes, please offer Spanish versions.

Question 11: On page 5 of the RFP, the third objective is to *Understand any meaningful differences by player type – existing For Life frequent, occasional, infrequent players, jackpot chasers and core multi-state jackpot players*. Can you please define “core multi-state jackpot players”?

Response 11: Core multi-state game players would be considered as the ‘Frequent’ group identified in the sample frame on page 10 of the RFP.

Question 12: On page 6 of the RFP, based on the recent survey data, *10% of players play For Life games daily and 46% play For Life games at least monthly*

- a. Were these percentages generated among “general population consumers”, “any Lottery game players” or just among “every players of For Life games”, “past year players of For Life games”, “past 6-month players of For Life games”, etc.?
- b. If NOT among the general population consumers, what is the incidence of qualification for this larger sample frame that these percentages were generated among?

Response 12a: Percentages were based on player panel respondents across 9 participating jurisdictions, not gen pop studies.

Response 12b: We can't provide an accurate read on incidence based on the varying criteria of the states that ran the surveys independently among their player panels.

Question 13: On page 10 of the RFP, the requested sample frame indicates that *All respondents must have played a multi-state game in the past 12 months and be able to identify by: Cash4Life or Lucky for Life players / Powerball and/or Mega Millions players:*

- a. Would respondents need to play both a For Life game AND Powerball and/or Mega Millions in the past 12 months?

Response 13a: Respondents should have played at least one (1) multi-state game in the past 12 months – which could be any of the four games identified.

- i. *Just a For Life game in the past 12 months?*

Response 13a.i: As noted above, respondents should have played at least one (1) multi-state game in the past 12 months – which could be any of the four games identified.

- b. *If this is allowable, those who have played in the past 12 months but not the past 6 months would not fit into one of the player types on the page 10 chart.*
- i. *Would they just be classified into another “Lapsed Player” segment*

Response 13b.i: They would be considered as “Occasional” or “Jackpot Chaser” depending on the level of jackpot in which they participated.

- c. *Would respondents need to play either a For Life game OR Powerball and/or Mega Millions in the past 12 months?*

Response 13c: Yes.

- i. *Similarly, how would we classify Powerball/Mega Millions players who have played within the past year but more than 3 months ago and don't only play when the jackpot is over \$400MM? Would they just be classified into a separate classification, such as “Infrequent” or “Lapsed Player” segment*

Response 13c.i: They would be considered “Occasional”

Question 14: There are four sample games in the RFP. How close are those games to the finished prototypes that need testing?

Response 14: The four sample games are the models that should be used for testing. Stimuli for each concept is currently being developed that will consist of game Marketing piece in addition to a more detailed description of the game.

Question 15: The RFP asks for ‘representative’ samples. However, we are not surveying the entire populations of states, just past year players of Powerball, Mega Millions, Lotto and ‘For Life’ games.

- a. We would recommend utilizing the demographics from the Powerball brand study (by states) for Past Year PB/Mega/For Life players to set quotas for gender, age and ethnicity, instead of ‘proportions of the U.S. adult population’. This would be significantly more accurate and also more cost efficient. Does the MUSL team agree?

Response 15a: Not all interested firms have access to the Powerball brand study that was recently completed. For purposes of this RFP, research firms should provide proposals based on surveying the proportions of the US adult population.

- b. With 4 concepts, and testing the four concepts monadically, we would recommend a minimum of n=50 per cell (so n=200 total), at the state level, for the smallest states. This may rise to n=500 (n=125 per cell) for larger states, and potentially n=1,000 for CA, TX and similar sized states. Does that sound appropriate?

Response 15b: We look to the respondents to provide the recommended statistically significant sample size per state.

- c. With an estimated incidence of 50% of the U.S. population (which may vary from state to state), is the MUSL team comfortable with a sample size of approximately n=20,000 players based in the United States.

Response 15c: See response to 15b above.

Question 16: Do you have names and/or messages to test for the four different concepts?

Response 16: Yes, stimuli for each of the concepts is currently being developed. Potential game names will need to be tested independent of the concepts, not necessarily as part of each concept.

Question 17: Based on an award date of Feb 21st, by what date does MUSL expect results and a presentation?

Response 17: March 31st for presentation to working group.

Question 18: What is the incidence rate of the sample – what percentage of the legal age population would you think will qualify for the survey? Will it be okay to consider 60% as a NET Incidence across the states?

Response 18: Page 10 sample frame

Question 19: As per our understanding of the brief, the states in 'grey' color are not participating in this research and only the 33 states in 'green' and 4 states in 'yellow' constituting a total of 37 states is where the research will need to be conducted.

Response 19: Please see Response 1 for clarifying table of lotteries, research should be conducted in all jurisdictions.

Question 20: In smaller states such as Wyoming, North Dakota, Vermont, Washington DC, Delaware, etc. will it be possible to have access to a players club list? If so, will the list be handled by our team, or will the state lottery teams do the reach out?

Response 20: MUSL does not believe that access to a player's club information will be provided. Not all lotteries have such groups, and the information contained in the lists is considered personally identifiable information in most, if not all instances.

Question 21: For states such as Washington DC, will it be okay to consider sample from border towns of other states such as Maryland if the player is purchasing games in DC despite living in Maryland?

Response 21: No, a player must be a resident of the district being sampled

Question 22: Is there a budget target that is desirable for this project?

Response 22: MUSL does not provide the budget for the project. Interested firms should provide the best solution for the project requirements and provide a cost proposal for the level of services offered.

Question 23: How does MUSL define "brand loyalty" in this context? Are there specific benchmarks or KPIs or precursors to loyalty that MUSL uses?

Response 23: Brand loyalty would be considered as motivating regular, reoccurring purchases of the game.

Question 24: Should the research assess different marketing messages alongside the game concepts?

Response 24: Research should assess the concepts based on the provided stimuli. Marketing messages will not be assessed as part of this project.

Question 25: Pages 5 and 17 outline that forecasted spend/ increased revenue are goals for MUSL. Slide 18 suggests it is the 3rd level of importance. With that, how important is understanding revenue estimates/forecasted spend?

Response 25: Understanding revenue estimates is the primary goal of the research. This will be a game change for most states so understanding how the new concept will create incremental growth for the game and the category is very important.

Question 26: If a state opts for a supplemental sample through their database, will MUSL provide direct access to the respective player database, or must the vendor source players independently?

Response 26: See response 2 above.

Question 27: Given the tight timelines, how quickly will MUSL provide approvals on research instruments (e.g., questionnaire, sampling plan)?

Response 27: MUSL anticipates that the project team will meet with the successful firm virtually (via Teams) to review and provide real-time feedback on research instrument drafts provided by the firm.

Question 28: The RFP states a project meeting is required the week of February 27. Is this a single meeting, or should vendors plan for multiple touchpoints?

Response 28: The contracted vendor should expect to meet with the working group soon after award for a project kickoff. The subsequent agreed upon project plan will dictate future meetings, which we anticipate will be weekly for certain phases of the project given the tight timeline.

Question 29: Is the target completion date of March 31st the date for survey fielding to be completed, or is that the date MUSL expects final results in the form of a report and/or presentation?

Response 29: This is the date that MUSL expects final results to be presented.

Question 30: With Mega Millions going from \$2 to a \$5 price point in April, is MUSL concerned about testing these concept changes/enhancements under the current paradigm where Mega Millions is \$2 might affect the ability to project results to a product and market landscape where a key flagship product like Mega Millions' price point will more than double?

Response 30: We understand that the current dynamic with the upcoming Mega Millions price point change will have an impact on the overall multi-state landscape and think that it is important for the research to reflect Mega Millions as a \$5 game when running the simulations and determining how differentiated the multi-state games are from each other.

Question 31: For availability for project meeting or meetings during the week of February 27th, we assume these would be remote meetings conducted over Teams or Zoom? Please confirm.

Response 31: Remote meetings via Teams, coordinated by MUSL.

Question 32: On slide 17, it states that "Concepts should be compared against current games, not each other". Is that against current games such as Powerball and Mega Millions, plus any type of current "For Life Games" within each state that has a "For Life" type of game? Or is that against all current games in each state's lottery portfolio?

Response 32: Current games of Powerball, Mega Millions, and For Life if applicable to that lottery. Not any other individual lottery game. We are not testing the 4 “For Life” concepts against each other, but where applicable against the current For Life game in the state.

Question 33: Will MUSL be able to provide a list of each currently offered lottery game for each state lottery?

Response 33: The table provided shows the lotteries that participate in either/or Cash for Life and Lucky for Life. All US lotteries participate in Powerball, and all US lotteries except Puerto Rico participate in Mega Millions.

Question 34: Is MUSL looking to compare these tested games against each game offered by each lottery, or against generic descriptions of games (except for Powerball and Mega Millions); for example “In-state pick 5 or pick 6 lotto game, in-state 3 or 4 digit draw game”, etc.?

Response 34: We would only like the concepts to be compared against multi-jurisdictional games, and not individual state lotto or pick games. The primary interest is comparing the relative value of the concepts against the current For Life game in the state. For states that don’t currently offer a For Life game, the concepts should be compared against a generic For Life game based on the current Cash 4 Life game.

Question 35: On slide 18, MUSL indicates its desire to “determine spend based on when jackpots are over \$400 million for Powerball and for Mega Millions”. Is that the only threshold point to be tested? Or is MUSL also interested in testing at lower or base levels?

Response 35: MUSL is interested in both scenarios.