As a courtesy and convenience, the following document is the Report and Recommendation of the Evaluation Committee created to review responses to the Commission's Request for Applications for Mobile Sports Wagering Platform Providers. Commission staff has applied redactions permissible pursuant to the N.Y.S Public Officers Law Article 6.

New York State Gaming Commission Recommendation of License Award

FOR

Mobile Sports Wagering Platform Providers

November 1, 2021

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Recommended Award	5
Summary of Initial Ranking Scoring	6
Pricing Factor Scoring	9
Total Score	9
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	11
SUMMARIES OF EACH APPLICANT	16
Hillside (New York) LLC dba bet365	17
Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi (Application #1)	26
Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook	39
TSG Interactive US Services Limited dba FOX Bet	62
Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi (Application #2)	69
Score Digital Sports Venture Inc. dba theScore Bet	95
APPLICANT INITIAL RANKING SCORE	103
Hillside (New York) LLC dba bet365	104
Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi Application #1	108
Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook	112
TSG Interactive US Services Limited dba FOX Bet	117
Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi Application #2	121
Score Digital Sports Venture Inc. dba theScore Bet	127
CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL LICENSE AWARD	131
Consideration of Betfair's Application for Additional Licensure	136
Consideration of bet365's Application for Additional Licensure	141

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter 59 of the Laws of 2021 amended PML Section 1367 and added a new PML Section 1367-a to authorize mobile sports wagering when the sports wager is made through virtual or electronic means from a location within New York and is transmitted to and accepted by electronic equipment located at a Licensed Gaming Facility. The statute directs the Commission to conduct a competitive bidding process to award licenses to Mobile Sports Wagering Platform Providers based on the ability of the Platform Provider to maximize sustainable, long-term revenue for the State.

Pursuant to that authority, on July 9, 2021 the Commission issued a RFA to award a license to at least two Mobile Sports Wagering Platform Providers such that the result will be the hosting of four Mobile Sports Wagering Operators. On August 9, 2021, the Commission received six Applications in response to the RFA. The Applications, along with all associated Platform Providers and hosted Operators are provided in the table below:

	Primary Applicant	Platform	Operators
1	Hillside (New York) LLC dba bet365	Hillside (New York) LLC dba bet365	Hillside (New York) LLC dba bet365
2	Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi	Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi	FBG Enterprises, LLC dba Fanatics Sportsbook Penn Sports Interactive, LLC
	Detfeiolote as ether UCLLC	Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook	Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook
3	Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook	Bally's Interactive, LLC dba Bally Bet BetMGM, LLC	Bally's Interactive, LLC dba Bally Bet BetMGM, LLC
		DraftKings	DraftKings
4	TSG Interactive US Services Limited dba FOX Bet	TSG Interactive US Services Limited dba FOX Bet	TSG Interactive US Services Limited dba FOX Bet
		Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi	Rush Street Interactive NY, LLC dba Rush Street Interactive
5	Sports Information Services	American Wagering, Inc. dba Caesars Sportsbook	American Wagering, Inc. dba Caesars Sportsbook
	Limited dba Kambi	Wynn Interactive	Wynn Interactive
		PointsBet New York LLC dba PointsBet	Empire Resorts, Inc. dba Resorts World PointsBet New York LLC dba
6	Score Digital Sports Venture Inc. dba theScore Bet	Score Digital Sports Venture Inc. dba theScore Bet	PointsBet Score Digital Sports Venture Inc. dba theScore Bet

Recommended Award

Upon a comprehensive, fair and impartial evaluation of all Applications timely received, the Evaluation Committee recommends an initial award of Mobile Sports Wagering Licenses to Platform Providers and Operators contained within Sports Information Services Limited dba Kambi's Application #2 (Kambi #2). Such Application received the highest Total Score, meets the requirements for licensure, and reaches the minimum requirement of two Platform Providers and four Operators without inclusion of other Applications.



Upon a comprehensive review of all market study material and information provided by the Applicants, the Evaluation Committee determined that it is in the best interest of the State to award additional licenses. Therefore, the Evaluation recommends the award of additional licenses to Betfair Interactive US LLC dba FanDuel Sportsbook (Betfair) and the Platform Providers and Operators contained within such Application.

The Evaluation Committee did not determine that it is in the best interest of the State to award additional licenses beyond the Betfair Application.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Commission constituted an evaluation Committee comprised of staff of the Commission and the Division of the Budget to conduct a comprehensive, fair, and impartial evaluation of all Applications timely received. The Committee reviewed and evaluated the proposals submitted in response to the RFA issued on July 9, 2021.

In evaluating the Applications, the Committee followed the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 7.2 of the RFA as amended by the Commission Response to Second Questions issued on August 2, 2021.

Technical Factor	Value Up To
Expertise in the market of the Applicant and the Applicant's Proposed	
Operators	25 points
Integrity, sustainability and safety of the Mobile Sports Wagering	
Platform	20 points
Past relevant experience of the Applicant and the Applicant's	
proposed Operators	15 points
Advertising and promotional plans	7.5 points
Capacity to rapidly and efficiently bring Authorized Sports Bettors into	
the Applicant's Platform	2.5 points
Applicant's efforts to foster racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in	
Applicant's workforce and the each of the Applicant's proposed	
Operators' workforce	2.5 points
Other factors impacting revenue to the State	2.5 points
Maximum cumulative score to be awarded for Technical Factors	75 points

Bonus	
Applicant with an agreement(s) that provides for revenue-sharing	
related to mobile sports wagering with a Native American tribes or	
nations that is party to a compact with the State.	5 points

Only those with a Technical Factor Score at or exceeding 60 points out of 75 points will be considered a Qualified Applicant.

Responses to RFA section 6.8, Pricing Matrix and Accompanying Analysis were sealed and all associated documents were withheld from the Committee until finalization of the Initial Ranking Score Upon completion of the Initial Ranking Score, Pricing Matrixes were unsealed, and Pricing Factor scoring was applied to determine Total Score.

Pricing Factor	Value	
Proposed taxation rate on Mobile Sports Wagering Gross Gaming Revenue		
12.5 percent up to 30 Percent	Up to 3 points	
30 percent up to 40 Percent	5 points	
40 percent up to 50 Percent	10 points	
50 percent	20 points	

An Applicant will be awarded an additional point for each full percentage point over 50 percent

In its deliberations, the Committee further refined the allocation of points within each section by distinguishing the weight of categories within each section. A summary of the Committee's methodology follows below:

Expertise (25 points)

The Committee broke this section out by Platform Provider expertise and Operator expertise for each Application with the majority of the scoring weight being given to the Operator's expertise as the Platform Provider's expertise is also evaluated and awarded up to 20 points in the subsequent "integrity, sustainability and safety of the Mobile Sports Wagering Platform" section. Additionally, the Committee placed greater significance on the expertise of the Operator since it is more directly attributable to the ability of the Applicant to maximize sustainable, long-term revenue for the State as compared to the expertise of the Platform Provider.

Platform Provider Expertise:

The Committee reviewed five separate categories on the Application relative to Platform Provider expertise: 1) the technical features and operation of the Mobile Sports Wagering Platform; 2) the continual support and maintenance of the Mobile Sports Wagering Platform; 3) the Mobile Sports Wagering Platform designed to support the Operators; 4) the technology to be used or features offered that the Applicant believes sets the Applicant apart from other potential Applicants; and 5) additional information the Applicant believes relevant to demonstrate the Applicant's expertise. The Committee weighted the technical features and the continual support and maintenance of the Platform responses most heavily, with the remaining categories weighted significantly less. The Committee deemed the first two categories to contain the most relevant information for demonstrating expertise in the market.

Operator Expertise:

The Committee reviewed five separate categories on the Application relative to Operator expertise: 1) the integration between the Applicant's Platform and the Operator's wagering system; 2) the features offered or used by the Operator that the Applicant believes sets it apart from other potential Applicants; 3) the sample wagering menu the

Operator intends to offer if such wagers are approved by the Commission; 4) the proposed Operator's ability to rapidly effectuate the commencement of mobile sports wagering on the Applicant's Platform; and 5) additional information the Applicant believes relevant to demonstrate the Operator's expertise, including, without limitation, experience in the field of mobile sports wagering. The Committee weighted the outline of features offered or used by the Operator that the Applicant believes sets it apart most heavily, followed by a sample wagering menu the Operator intends to offer if such wagers are approved by the Commission.

Integrity, Sustainability and Safety Platform (20 points)

The Committee reviewed eight separate categories on the Application relative to the integrity, sustainability and safety of the Platform: 1) the wager acceptance; 2) the verification of information provided by Bettors opening a new account (KYC); 3) the systems used for monitoring structured wagers and unusual/suspicious wagering; 4) the systems used to ensure that Bettors are physically located within New York; 5) the technology to ensure that any wager is accepted through equipment physically located at a licensed gaming facility in the State; 6) the security of servers, applications, and communication networks; and patron personal and wagering information; 7) the integrity monitoring/reporting, including any current affiliations related to integrity monitoring; and 8) responsible gaming.

The Committee weighted understanding the process of accepting a wager, systems that monitor structured and suspicious wagers, their technology to ensure a safe flow of information and responsible gaming plans as the most crucial aspects due to compliance with the Constitution and security of the public trust. The redundant server(s) category was not scored as it was informational so that the Commission has a better idea of size and space requirements.

Past Relevant Experience (15 points)

The Committee evaluated information provided by the Applicants in two separate segments, past relevant experience of the Applicant as a Platform Provider and as an Operator. Additionally, the Committee placed greater significance on the experience of the Operator as it believes it to be more directly attributable to the ability of the Applicant to maximize sustainable, long-term revenue for the State as compared to the experience of the Platform Provider.

Platform Provider Experience:

The Committee reviewed six categories on the Application relative to Platform Provider experience. 1) an overview of wagering activity conducted on the Platform; 2) jurisdictions

where the Applicant operates the Platform; 3) integrations of the Platform with other wagering Operators; 4) number of accounts maintained through the Platform, 5) wagering volume processed annually through the Platform; and 6) additional information the Applicant believed to be relevant to demonstrate their experience as a Platform Provider. The Committee weighted jurisdictions where the Applicant operates their Platform, number of accounts maintained on their Platform and wagering volume processed annually through their Platform more heavily. The Committee felt that these categories illustrated if a Platform Provider could handle the expected high volume and accounts in New York.

Operator Experience:

The Committee reviewed five categories on the Application relative to Operator experience: 1) jurisdictions where the Operator is licensed and operating; 2) wagering volume; 3) estimated market share within each jurisdiction; 4) Platforms currently used to accept wagers; and 5) any additional information the Applicant felt would demonstrate the Operator's experience in mobile sports wagering. The Committee weighted jurisdictions where the Operator is licensed and operating, and estimated market share within those jurisdictions more heavily. The Committee felt that these categories illustrated if an Operator was more likely to provide sustainable, long-term revenue for the State.

Advertising and Promotional Plans (7.5 points)

The Committee examined two categories for this section: 1) the estimated marketing budget; and 2) the overall marketing plan which includes promotion and player loyalty programs, advertising plans, player acquisition models, efforts to be undertaken to convert customers from wagering through unlicensed channels to wagering legally in the State and examples of promotional activities. The Committee used a projected average marketing spend per Operator approach in order to judge all six Applicants equally.

Capacity to Rapidly and Efficiently Bring Authorized Sports Bettors into the Applicant's Platform (2.5 points)

The Committee examined three categories for this category: 1) the ability to effectuate rapidly the commencement of mobile sports wagering onto the Platform; 2) the ability to bring bettors effectively on the Platform; and 3) the time from award of license to the date in which wagers will occur. For this section, the Committee did not consider the number of bettors that an Applicant may bring to its Platform, but rather if this process can be done in a quick, efficient, and safe manner.

Efforts to Foster Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity (2.5 points)

The Committee examined if an Applicant and each of its Operators provided information demonstrating how they foster racial, ethnic and gender diversity within the organization's workforce. Such demonstration shall include: 1) the organization's policy on workforce diversity; 2) workforce demographics demonstrating the organization's current workforce diversity; and 3) efforts the Applicant and Operators will undertake to foster workforce diversity.

For scoring purposes, the Committee weighted efforts to foster workplace diversity more heavily since it shows whether an Applicant has a commitment and a plan of action to foster a diverse workforce.

Other Factors Impacting Revenue to the State (2.5 points)

The Committee examined if an Applicant provided any other factors that could impact revenue paid to the State from mobile sports wagering. To be considered in this section, a factor could not be already considered in another aspect of the Application (e.g., advertising, launch, workforce diversity, expertise, technology or experience). For this reason, the Committee only awarded points when factors unrelated to other sections were demonstrated.

CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL LICENSE AWARD

N.Y. Racing, Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law ("Racing Law") Section 1367-a(4)(d) provides that the Commission may award additional licenses if it determines that such additional awards are in the best interests of the State. Section 7.5 of the RFA states that if the Committee determines that such aggregate revenue is higher than the aggregate revenue without the additional Platform Provider(s) and Operator(s) associated with such next-highest-scoring remaining Qualified Applicant, then the Committee shall recommend such Qualified Applicant as an additional Applicant for licensure. In accordance with these provisions, the Committee undertook an evaluation to consider the award of additional licenses.

Pursuant to Section 7.4 of the RFA, the Committee established the Final Tax Rate Matrix utilizing the highest tax rate for each scenario from the Selected Applicant(s). On October 18th, 2021, the Committee sent all Qualified Applicants the Final Tax Rate Matrix. Each Applicant was provided five business days to amend its Appendix B: Pricing Matrix to conform with the Final Tax Rate Matrix. All Qualified Applicants amended their Appendix B: Pricing Matrix to conform with the Final Tax Rate Matrix.

Evaluation Methodology

Section 7.5 of the RFA requires the Committee to consider the highest scoring Qualified Applicant based on each Applicant's Technical Score. Only upon a determination that the licensing of that Applicant is in the best interest in the State can the Committee move to consider the next highest scoring Applicant.

In conducting the evaluation, the Committee considered the following factors; 1) the likelihood that the Selected Applicant would be able to achieve full market potential without additional licensees; 2) the likelihood that adding the next highest scoring Applicant would result in a larger aggregate market; and 3) the impact on long-term revenue to the State by adding the next highest scoring Applicant.

The Committee reviewed the market analysis materials submitted by the Applicants, in addition to its own supplemental analysis, to determine whether the aggregate revenue to the State is higher than the aggregate revenue without the additional Platform Provider(s) and Operator(s) associated with the next-highest-scoring remaining Qualified Applicant. While the Committee utilized the market analysis materials submitted by the Applicants, such materials were viewed in the light that such materials were likely prepared in a manner to advance the Applicant's position rather than provide independent analysis.