

**IN THE MATTER** of the Gambling Act 2003

**AND** the amendment by the Gambling Commission of the Responsible Gambling Programme for the Auckland casino

**BEFORE THE GAMBLING COMMISSION**

Members: G L Reeves (Chief Gambling Commissioner)  
P J Stanley  
L M Hansen  
R D Bell  
A K Foote

Date of Decision: 12 April 2013, 12 July 2013

Date of Notification  
of Decision: August 2013

**DECISION ON THE AMENDMENT BY THE GAMBLING COMMISSION OF THE RESPONSIBLE GAMBLING PROGRAMME FOR THE AUCKLAND CASINO**

**Introduction**

1. By this decision, the Gambling Commission ("**Commission**") amends the Responsible Gambling Programme ("**RGP**") for the Auckland casino approved by the Commission on 3 December 2007, and approves in its place the amended RGP **attached** to this decision. The attached document bears the title "Host Responsibility Programme" ("**HRP**"), but constitutes the RGP referred to in licence conditions attached to the operator's licence held by SKYCITY Casino Management Limited ("**SCML**") for the Auckland casino.

**Process**

2. Condition 23 of SCML's operator's licence provides that the Licence Holder shall operate in compliance with the RGP approved by the Casino Control Authority on 1 December 2003, as amended in accordance with licence conditions. Condition 24 specifies the matters which must be included in the RGP. Condition 27 allows the Commission to review the RGP stating that, in doing so, the Commission will consult with interested parties, as appropriate, and amend the RGP as it determines, after giving SCML the opportunity to comment.
3. The Commission wrote to SCML on 6 July 2012, inviting it to submit for review a draft RGP/HRP. In doing so, the Commission's expectation was that it would receive SCML's proposed HRP and consult with interested parties in the usual manner. However on 17 July 2012, the Commission received correspondence from the Problem Gambling

Foundation (“**PGF**”) which stated that SCML’s then current HRP had some shortcomings, with PGF suggesting a number of variations. The Commission determined that PGF’s letter should be forwarded to SCML for it to consider while it drafted its proposed HRP.

4. The Commission next decided that it would be useful for SCML, while it drafted its documents, to be aware of suggestions that other parties may have for the HRP. Therefore on 31 July 2012, the Commission wrote to the Salvation Army (“**SA**”), Ministry of Health (“**MoH**”), the Secretary for Internal Affairs (the “**Secretary**”) and Lifeline Aotearoa (“**Lifeline**”) and invited them to provide suggestions on matters for possible inclusion in the HRP.
5. The Commission informed parties that the invitation to submit suggestions to SCML did not replace the submission process on the proposed HRP, but rather supplemented it. In introducing this step, the Commission’s intention was that the submission process would be more targeted and efficient.
6. The Commission received a number of suggestions for the HRP, all of which were forwarded to SCML.
7. The Commission received SCML’s draft HRP and supporting documentation in October 2012. The Commission consulted with the Secretary, SA, PGF, Lifeline, MoH, Christchurch Casinos Limited, Dunedin Casinos Management Limited, Otago Casinos Limited; and Deborah Edwards and Shannon Hanrahan (“**H&E**”). These parties were invited to make submissions on SCML’s proposed HRP. Submissions were received from the Secretary, MoH, PGF, SA, Lifeline, and H&E.
8. In addition, the Commission retained Dr Paul Delfabbro, Associate Professor at the School of Psychology, University of Adelaide, to provide the Commission with expert advice on the HRP. Dr Delfabbro undertook for the Commission a review of the draft HRP and produced a report dated January 2013.
9. On 24 January 2013, the Commission circulated a copy of the submissions received, and Dr Delfabbro’s report, to all submitters and invited them to file submissions in reply. Submissions in reply were received from the Secretary, PGF, SA and H&E in February and March 2013.
10. SCML was provided with a copy of the submissions received, and it provided comments in reply.
11. Dr Delfabbro was also provided with a copy of the submissions received, and he produced a second report for the Commission.

12. The Commission considered SCML's proposed HRP on the papers at its April 2013 meeting. On 14 May 2013 the Commission met with SCML to communicate its initial views to SCML and to invite comment.
13. On 29 May 2013, SCML advised the Commission orally that it accepted the Commission's views, with only two exceptions (which are addressed later in this decision).
14. SCML wrote to the Commission on 4 June 2013 with its written response on the Commission's initial views, and invited the Commission to reconsider the two matters with which it disagreed.
15. The Commission considered SCML's comments at its July 2013 meeting, before finalising its decision.

### **Background**

16. Licence condition 27 provides that the Commission will review SCML's RGP every two years. The Commission last reviewed SCML's RGP in 2007. The Commission has, in previous decisions, set out the reasons for its departure from the anticipated two year review cycle. Following its approval of the Auckland Programme in December 2007, the Commission began reviewing the HRPs for each of the remaining casinos. The review process was quite advanced, with the Commission receiving drafts (which were based on the Auckland Programme) and submissions on those drafts from interested parties.
17. During this time, the Commission received regular updates on the effectiveness of the Auckland Programme in the form of written and oral six-monthly reports from SCML. As the Commission considered these reports, it became apparent that the Auckland Programme was offering valuable on-the-ground experience and lessons that should be applied to the other five casinos. As a result, work on the other Programmes was paused so that the Auckland data and feedback could be taken into consideration. This decision was made with the knowledge that each casino had an existing Programme which imposed binding obligations on the operator, sufficient to hold them to account if required.
18. By 2011, the Commission felt that the Auckland experience was well understood and recommenced its reconsideration of the non-Auckland HRPs.
19. The Commission approved new HRPs for the Hamilton, Queenstown, Wharf, Dunedin and Christchurch casinos in 2012. Those HRPs incorporated the abovementioned lessons from the Auckland Programme. Following this, the Commission returned immediately to the planned cycle of HRP reviews, commencing with the revision of the HRP for the Auckland casino.

## Jurisdiction

20. Condition 24 of the licence conditions attached to SCML's operator's licence for the Auckland casino specifies the matters which must be included in the HRP. Condition 24 provides:

24. The Programme shall be consistent with and impose no lesser requirement than specified in the Act or Regulations. The Programme shall address and not be limited to:
- (a) the provision of information for customers relating to game rules, permissible bets and payment of winning bets pursuant to section 175 of the Act;
  - (b) the provision of signage, brochures and publications, and the effective display and distribution of the same, to inform gamblers of the odds of winning, how to gamble safely, the characteristics of problem gambling and the availability of counselling and other support services;
  - (c) a policy for identifying problem gamblers. This policy shall include, as a minimum, the following:
    - (i) an acceptable definition of problem gambling;
    - (ii) indicators of problem gambling in the gambling venue;
    - (iii) the steps to be taken by the Licence Holder in identifying actual or potential problem gamblers;
  - (d) the provision of staff training;
  - (e) the provision of exclusion, self-exclusion and limitation programmes;
  - (f) assistance to casino employees with managing the potential for personal problem gambling;
  - (g) recognition of cultural differences amongst gamblers using the Casino, and the need to tailor delivery of host responsibility obligations to maximise effectiveness for customers;
  - (h) guidelines for responsible marketing and advertising of the Casino, including exterior signage, and restriction on jackpot advertising and branding pursuant to Regulations 9 and 10 of the Gambling (Harm Prevention and Minimisation) Regulations 2004;
  - (i) responsible practices in the conduct of promotions and inducements to gamble at the Casino;
  - (j) design of the Gambling Area to minimise problem gambling behaviour and to maximise the likelihood that episodes of problem gambling will be noticed and addressed by staff;
  - (k) promotion of the responsible consumption of alcohol, including provision of staff training in responsible service of alcohol;
  - (l) standards of dress and behaviour at the casino;
  - (m) liaison with community service organisations, patrons with gambling problems, and family members of patrons with gambling problems; and

(n) such other matters as the Commission may require.

21. The attached HRP addresses the matters specified in condition 24, many of which, in turn, specify how SCML will implement obligations imposed by the Gambling Act 2003 (“Act”) and Regulations.
22. In relation to conditions 24(c) and (e), sections 308-311 of the Act set out particular obligations relating to the identification of problem gamblers and exclusion procedures:
- (a) Section 308(1) requires the holder of a casino operator’s licence to develop a programme or policy for identifying problem gamblers. A notice advising customers of the existence of this policy must be displayed and a copy of the policy made available on request.
  - (b) Section 308(4) provides that:

The persons required by subsection (1) to develop a policy for identifying problem gamblers must take all reasonable steps to use that policy to identify actual or potential problem gamblers.
  - (c) Sections 309(1) and (2) of the Act require the holder of a casino operator’s licence to approach and provide information to every person identified under section 308(4) as a person whom the Licence Holder has reasonable grounds to believe is a problem gambler. The information must include a description of the self-exclusion procedure which must be made available under section 310
  - (d) Section 309(3) provides that an exclusion order may be issued to a problem gambler identified under section 308.
  - (e) Section 310 specifies when an exclusion order must be issued; namely, when requested by a person who has identified himself or herself as a problem gambler.
23. The HRP details how SCML will undertake both compulsory and discretionary activities aimed at harm minimisation, including how SCML will exercise the discretion (provided by section 309(3)) to exclude a problem gambler who has not requested exclusion, and how it will implement the self-exclusion procedure required by section 310.
24. Section 4 of the Act defines “problem gambler” as:

A person whose gambling causes harm or may cause harm.

25. "Harm" is defined in the Act as:

- (a) means harm or distress of any kind arising from, or caused or exacerbated by, a person's gambling; and
- (b) includes personal, social, or economic harm suffered –
  - (i) by the person; or
  - (ii) the person's spouse, civil union partner, de facto partner, family, whanau, or wider community; or
  - (iii) in the workplace; or
  - (iv) by society at large.

26. A careful examination of these provisions and definitions reveals that, for understandable reasons, the Act's obligations are not confined to a single category of persons who have been formally diagnosed as problem gamblers. Even the definition of "problem gambler" includes an element of potentiality and the Act's various provisions cover a range which extends from potential problem gamblers (a person who is potentially someone whose gambling may cause harm) to self-identified problem gamblers.

27. In summary:

- (a) A problem gambler is someone whose gambling conduct has characteristics which "may cause harm". There is a sense in which any undertaking of a particular activity carries with it the potential for that activity to cause harm (in the sense that the possibility of harm being cause by an activity can only be completely excluded if the activity itself does not take place) but it is clear that the definition is not to be interpreted in that very broad way. Such an approach would eliminate any of the distinctions which the language of the Act clearly recognises (as set out below). A problem gambler, as defined, is not limited to someone whose gambling has actually caused harm but includes someone who gambles in a manner which may cause harm.
- (b) The Problem Gambler Identification Programme ("**PGIP**") required by section 308(1) must be used to identify actual or potential problem gamblers (section 308(4)); that is, those who may be gambling in a manner which may cause harm.
- (c) Of those identified as actual or potential problem gamblers, only those whom the casino operator has reasonable cause to believe to be a problem gambler (as defined) must be approached and given information.
- (d) Any of those approached may be excluded by the casino operator for a period of up to 2 years.
- (e) Only those who identify themselves as a problem gambler and who request exclusion must be excluded by the casino operator for a period of up to 2 years.

28. The foregoing are the minimum steps that are required to be taken under the Act. The HRP must contain the detailed steps which will ensure that those minimum requirements are met but it is also intended to be a working operational document which records what the casino operator will in fact do, including in respect of discretionary matters. For that reason, the HRP contains steps which are additional to the statutory minimum and may even contain matters which are not, strictly speaking, concerned with problem gambling but which are conveniently located with harm minimisation activities.

### **Submissions to the Commission**

29. Submissions to the Commission and Dr Delfabbro's reports identified the following major issues for discussion:
- (a) The HRP should be independently examined to test whether:
    - (i) SCML is implementing the HRP appropriately; and
    - (ii) the HRP is effective (PGF, SA, H&E, the Secretary).
  - (b) The HRP should include a section on identifying and managing continuous play (the Secretary, SA).
  - (c) The current limitation options should be retained for VIP patrons and extended to general patrons (the Secretary, Lifeline).
  - (d) The thresholds of expenditure (in the General Indicators section of the PGIP) are set too high (MoH, SA, Delfabbro). Further, SCML should examine loyalty data at different thresholds of loss and frequency for different customer types (the Secretary).
  - (e) There should be greater clarity surrounding the opening of Gambler of Interest ("GoI") files, and the recording and use of relevant host responsibility information (the Secretary, H&E, Delfabbro, SA).
  - (f) SCML should utilise technology to prevent excluded patrons from entering the casino (SA).
  - (g) Performance targets could be set to assess the effectiveness of the HRP (H&E).
  - (h) Data relating to Focal Research's "predictive model" should be publicly available (PGF, H&E).
  - (i) SCML should annually measure and monitor problem gambling amongst casino staff (H&E).

## **Analysis of Major Issues**

### *Independent examination of the HRP*

30. PGF submitted that, although the Commission reviews the HRP's design and its results, there is no independent examination of how well the HRP is being implemented.
31. PGF submitted that commercial imperatives run counter to the requirements of the HRP, a factor which means that the HRP may not be well adhered to or given management priority at the expense of maximising profit. For this reason, PGF submitted "that it is critical to have an independent audit of host responsibility conducted by a reputable organisation funded independently of the casino. Ideally this would be a service provider. This would also enable independent verification and analysis of data."
32. Similarly, H&E submitted that the current review of the HRP should be deferred until there is an independent evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of the HRP. The results of this independent evaluation could then inform the review.
33. The Secretary submitted that, if the Commission were inclined to require an independent evaluation, the current review should not be held up pending the outcome of that task. He submitted that there are important improvements that can be made to the HRP immediately and that any independent evaluation could inform a future review.
34. In response, SCML submitted that an independent evaluation is unnecessary. It stated that its harm minimisation and host responsibility obligations, together with its reporting and monitoring requirements, are significant and are unmatched by any other casino licensee, or the Class 4 sector. This is coupled with a very high level of regulatory oversight of the Auckland casino in what is acknowledged as one of the most rigorous legislative and regulatory environments to promote responsible gambling in the world.
35. Additionally, SCML noted that a process exists for the regular review of its HRP involving consultation with external stakeholders, and in between these reviews, SCML is required to report to the Commission on a range of matters relating to the Programme's implementation.
36. SCML also noted that the Secretary is able to review, audit and investigate any issue he deems worthy.
37. The Commission first considered whether there is a need for additional independent assessment of SCML's implementation of its HRP. The Commission was of the view that there is no need because there is already sufficient independent oversight of SCML's implementation of its HRP by the Secretary and his Department, the Department of

Internal Affairs (“**DIA**”). The DIA is responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance by casino operators with a range of matters including the Gambling Act, Regulations, licence conditions, Minimum Operating Standards and game rules. As part of this process, the DIA is able to inspect, monitor and audit any matter relating to casino gambling, including SCML’s implementation of its HRP. The DIA undertakes a number of audits in this area including:

- an audit of the HRP;
- an audit of SCML’s procedures for identifying problem gamblers;
- an audit of SCML’s procedures for interacting with problem gamblers;
- an audit of SCML’s Standard Operating Procedures;
- an audit of SCML’s GOI files.

38. The Commission has been advised that the DIA audits all of these matters on a monthly, quarterly and six-monthly basis with no issues of substance having ever been brought to the Commission’s attention in relation to SCML’s implementation of the HRP. The Commission sees no proper basis for suggestions either that the Secretary and DIA are not independent or that problem gambling providers should be regarded as independent (as their business is providing services to assessed problem gamblers, giving them an interest in the assessment of problem gambling). In the Commission’s view, implementation is already independently assessed and monitored.

39. The Commission next considered whether there is a need for an additional independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the HRP. Again, the Commission saw no such need. The Commission itself undertakes such an evaluation in the course of its periodic reviews of casino HRPs. It does so by consulting with a range of knowledgeable parties and by seeking independent expert assistance. The results can be seen in the present state of affairs. Dr Delfabbro reported to the Commission that New Zealand’s regulatory environment is rigorous in the extent to which it emphasises responsible gambling principles, and that SCML’s current HRP is of a high standard internationally. At pages 2 and 3 of his first report for the Commission, Dr Delfabbro noted as follows:

To a large extent, the quality and rigour of a HRP is influenced by the nature of the legislative/regulatory requirements prevailing in a particular jurisdiction. From an international perspective, current New Zealand legislation would be considered quite rigorous in the extent to which it emphasises responsible gambling principles. In particular, the requirement for providers of gambling services to have policies which mitigate “potential harm” as opposed to just actual harm is not a feature that is observed in many jurisdictions. In Australia, for example, policies requiring venues to develop policies to assist in the identification of problem gamblers are legislatively required only in two jurisdictions (the Australian Capital Territory and South Australia). In other States and Territories, staff receive training in how to assist problem gamblers if they show obvious signs of distress or request assistance, but there is less emphasis on proactive strategies whereby attempts are made to assist patrons perceived to be at risk. For these reasons, SKYCITY’s Programme ... would be

considered of a higher standard than what is offered in other casinos within Australia. Collectively, the responsible gambling measures provided in both Australia and New Zealand are more rigorous than anything offered in the United States, United Kingdom, and Asia. The only locations where responsible gambling provisions have progressed to similar levels is in some parts of Europe, most notably in Holland and Switzerland.

40. The Commission receives regular information from SCML through the reporting measures set out in section 3.0 of the HRP, measures described by Dr Delfabbro as being “quite extensive”.
41. In this context, the Commission does not consider imposing additional obligations for an “independent evaluation” of SCML’s HRP to be warranted. Dr Delfabbro’s report makes clear that New Zealand is leading the world in this area and both the current HRP and the revised HRP approved in this decision are the products of an evaluation process which is thorough and independent.

*Identifying and managing continuous play*

42. The Secretary submitted that the HRP should contain a section for identifying and managing continuous play. The Secretary has made this submission previously and, in decision GC27/12, the Commission recognised his concerns, while noting the difficulty of identifying suitable parameters for what might be considered to be “continuous play”.
43. In his submission, the Secretary did not propose parameters for continuous play, but submitted that the HRP should oblige SCML to have a policy for the active management of extended sessions. This policy should:

... address monitoring, reporting and recording of staff decisions, and patron behaviour/responses, timeframes, mandatory stand-downs, where staff responsibilities lie, and the escalation of decision-making obligations. It should also include considerations of the bounds in which discretion is to be exercised including having an awareness of the customer with respect to the circumstances of the visit to the casino including the frequency of visitation by the patron and the intensity of play in a particular session.

44. The Secretary noted that SCML currently has a process for recognising and reporting on extended continuous play for carded players (that is, customers who have been issued with and use loyalty cards which track their gambling activity); the system runs over a rolling 24 hour window with the first warning activated at the 12 hour mark, and warnings sent to staff every two hours thereafter. SA submitted that this initiative should be extended to all casino patrons.
45. PGF and SA supported the Secretary’s submission with SA submitting that a 12 hour timeframe before a warning is given exceeds what could be considered a healthy length of play. SA submitted that casino staff should be notified when a patron has been playing a table game for six hours or a gaming machine for four hours. PGF submitted that any

more than six hours of continuous play carries a high risk of being driven by problem gambling behaviour.

46. Dr Delfabbro concurred with the Secretary's submission, stating that any period of continuous play longer than five hours would be a matter for considerable concern. This is because, if a person were to gamble for this long without a proper break, it would likely extend their gambling through regular meal and/or sleep times and raise questions about whether the person is using restrooms with appropriate regularity.
47. In response, SCML stated that the issue of continuous play is very complex, and that the provisions in its PGIP provide the best tools for staff to make assessments and act on issues as they arise. SCML noted that a "one size fits all" provision may not work and being too prescriptive about timeframes could have unintended consequences, akin to a "six o'clock swill" mentality.
48. The Commission considered the issue of continuous play in decision GC27/12, when it approved an HRP for the Wharf casino. At paragraphs 34-37 of that decision, the Commission stated as follows:
  34. The Secretary sought clarification of the term "continuous play" with a suggestion that a timeframe be attached, presumably on the basis that a patron who gambles for longer than that period is deemed to be playing continuously. The Commission understands the reason for the Secretary's suggestion as it would provide clarity, but it doubts that the question "for how long should gambling take place before it is regarded as continuous for the purposes of the HRP?" has a sufficiently obvious and self-evident answer to justify its inclusion in this HRP.
  35. It is not a question that the Commission presently considers that it is in a good position to answer. The Secretary did not suggest an appropriate timeframe in his submissions and even if he had done so, the Commission would have wanted to consult and receive advice and information before concluding whether the Secretary's view was correct.
  36. The Commission intends to consider this matter in more detail when it reviews the new Auckland HRP. This will allow the Commission to be assisted by a range of views and advice, including from Associate-Professor Paul Delfabbro from the University of Adelaide, whom the Commission will likely engage to assist with this review.
  37. The Commission expects that the Secretary, and other interested parties, will consider this matter further and make submissions on it, including whether there should be a definitional timeframe for continuous play and, if so, what it should be, in the context of the Auckland review.
49. The Commission now has the benefit of additional information from submitters and from the Commission's expert.
50. At present, SCML's approach to continuous play is addressed in the PGIP; it is listed as a "General Indicator" in section 2, while narrative is provided under the "behavioural observations" heading of section 3, as follows:

... Some patrons may gamble very frequently, spend very large amounts of money, but not produce any obvious emotional responses or other indicators to draw attention to themselves. For this reason, staff should remain vigilant to the presence of people who spend many hours in a casino, and who visit very frequently. In such cases, staff should be vigilant for additional indicators of harm. As noted below, frequency of gambling and level of expenditure are indicators in their own right, and also ways of identifying people who require additional observation.

Staff who observe the indicators specified in section 2 must report the observation to the appropriate supervisor/manager. All observations of indicators reported to them by staff in and any follow up responses taken by staff and/or supervisors/managers must be logged by the supervisor/manager and sent through to Host Responsibility. The recorded observations form part of the volume of information upon which assessments of problem gambling are to be made.

51. It appears that SCML already monitors carded players with its system providing a first warning at the 12 hour mark. It is surprising that SCML has not included its existing monitoring activity within its proposed HRP; the HRP is supposed to reflect SCML's actual operational policies and procedures for the monitoring of problem gambling activity and this was an obvious matter for inclusion. The HRP should reflect, at a minimum, the monitoring activity which SCML already undertakes.
52. The Commission was of the view that, because of the complexity and variability of conduct which comprises problem gambling, one cannot apply rigid rules, the breach of which would produce a reliable conclusion that a patron requires assessment, monitoring or intervention. As a result, the HRP generally does not reflect a "one size fits all" approach but instead requires a process of observation, reporting, monitoring, assessment and re-assessment of individuals and their apparent circumstances. However, the Commission was troubled by the extent of the discrepancy between the time periods suggested by PGF, SA and Dr Delfabbro, and the period at which SCML appears to have concern in relation to continuous gambling by its carded players. On the face of it, the discrepancy is too large and the Commission considers that SCML should be taking steps well before a patron has been gambling continuously for 12 hours.
53. However, information in the Secretary's submissions indicates that SCML's electronic monitoring does not actually record continuous play of the type described by Dr Delfabbro in paragraph 46 above. The monitoring of carded play is not minute-by-minute but only restarts after a 4 hour break in play. As a result, breaks in play of up to 4 hours are effectively ignored by the carded play period monitoring and the system output does not necessarily reflect truly continuous or uninterrupted play.
54. The foregoing factors have led the Commission to the conclusion that it should not amend the PGIP to specify a precise period as defining, or even illustrating, continuous play. On the information before the Commission, as any such period would need to be of actual continuous play, the electronic carded play monitoring would not be definitive. In addition, the Commission is reluctant to fix a defined period as one possible result of doing so

would be to reduce the degree of responsibility which the HRP generally requires of SCML. Defining a specific period tends to have the effect of creating an impression of “safe harbour”, with lesser periods being ignored, in the way that it is suggested that other illustrations have had that unintended effect (see below).

55. However, the Commission considers that the carded pay monitoring system should be improved to produce more useful data. Ideally the 4 hour reset period should be substantially reduced and the warning triggered much earlier than after 12 hours of continuous play. It should ideally be extended to other than loyalty card holders as well. However, these are matters of future development which the Commission expects to see addressed in the next HRP review. In the meantime, SCML will be necessarily dependent on staff observations of continuous play (both for all non-carded play and to establish whether carded play is truly continuous). The General Indicator will remain in the HRP as it presently is, without being defined to a specific period. However, there is considerable concurrence in the views before the Commission that a period of 5 hours or more should generally be regarded as a matter for attention and consideration. A casino operator can expect to come under some pressure to explain why such periods of uninterrupted play were regarded as unexceptional and not worthy of recording.
56. The Commission’s decision not to define continuous play should not be taken as implied acceptance that periods of continuous gambling of up to 12 hours are of no concern as the contrary is the case. Notwithstanding that, it considers that the lack of prescription in the current General Indicator is, in the present circumstances, appropriate. It intends to keep the issue under consideration in subsequent reviews.

#### *Limitation options*

57. SCML’s HRP currently offers two limitation options for VIP players; Time Out and Limited Play. The Time Out option allows a VIP patron to take a break from all gambling for a period of time (such as three months), while the Limited Play option allows a VIP patron to continue gambling but places restrictions on the time that the patron can play for (for example for six hours per day, or two days per week).
58. The Secretary observed that SCML had deleted the Limited Play option from the proposed Auckland HRP, as it did for the Hamilton and Queenstown HRPs. The Secretary did not support the removal of this option, noting that, although it may not have received much uptake, its availability nonetheless provided VIP patrons with another option to manage their gambling.
59. The Secretary also noted that it should now be possible for gambling limitation to be available for all cardholders, following SCML’s introduction of a voluntary pre-commitment

scheme in December 2012. This scheme allows players to set limits on how much they spend and how long they play for on gaming machines.

60. PGF contended that a voluntary pre-commitment system is not a significant host responsibility initiative, submitting that only a mandatory system would be so regarded, a submission echoed by H&E in their submissions in reply.
61. SCML responded that it reviewed its limitation programme in 2008, after consulting with Gambling Helpline. (Gambling Helpline is now operated by Lifeline, which was consulted as part of this review.) SCML specifically examined the potential to extend the limitation programme from VIP patrons to general customers, but concluded that it should not be extended for a range of policy and practical reasons.
62. In relation to retaining the Limited Play option for VIP gamblers, SCML submitted that it has been neither effective nor popular, with only three VIP customers having taken the option since it was first introduced. All three customers breached their agreements and were subsequently excluded, a result which SCML considers shows that the options were ineffective for those customers. By contrast, over 70 customers utilised the Time Out option with “beneficial” results
63. Further, SCML submitted the enforcement and monitoring of even a handful of VIP Limited Play agreements is very challenging as staff are obliged to check that customers are playing for no more than their allotted hours per session, and on no more than their allotted days per week.
64. Finally, SCML revealed that it has since rolled out a voluntary pre-commitment system which allows customers voluntarily to set limits on how much they spend and for how long they play on gaming machines. SCML is apparently the first operator in New Zealand, in either the Class 4 or casino sectors, to introduce pre-commitment technology on gaming machines.
65. The Commission considered whether the Limited Play option should be retained for VIP patrons, and whether this and the Time Out option should be made available to non-VIP patrons. The Commission last considered this when it reviewed the HRPs for the Hamilton and Queenstown casinos in decision GC14/12. At paragraphs 56-60 of that decision, the Commission stated as follows:
  56. The Commission’s expectation when it completed its review of the programme for the Auckland casino was that both limitation options would be available at all casinos – initially for VIPs, but subsequently to all gaming patrons. When it first considered this issue for Hamilton and Queenstown, it saw no reason to deviate from this approach. However, upon reflection and with the benefit of additional submissions and data from SKYCITY, the Commission was persuaded that, for now, the Hamilton and Queenstown

casinos need not offer the limited play option to VIPs, nor any form of Agreed Limitation to general (non-VIP) customers. The Commission reached this decision for two principal reasons. First, as the number of patrons at the Auckland casino who activated the limited play option over a two year period was very low, the Commission considered that there was little point in requiring SCML to deploy it at the Hamilton and Queenstown casinos simply to make their obligations uniform with Auckland's. The Commission wants the HRPs to be of value and to assist patrons. If the limited play option is not doing that at this stage, there is no point including it.

57. The Commission also noted that the Auckland casino is many times larger than the Hamilton and Queenstown casinos combined, so if the demand at Auckland is very low, there is likely to be virtually no demand at the Hamilton and Queenstown casinos.
  58. Secondly, the Commission accepted SCML's submission regarding the workability of the limited play option. The Auckland casino has separate VIP areas where the majority of its VIP patrons play. They are generally known by SCML's VIP staff and can be monitored accordingly. VIP patrons at the Hamilton and Queenstown casinos would be largely indistinguishable from regular patrons so overseeing them would have significant challenges, despite the smaller sizes of those casinos.
  59. As such the Commission was satisfied that, for now, the limitation programmes at Hamilton and Queenstown can be restricted to a time out option for VIP customers only. However, the Commission wants to make it plain to SCML, and other casino operators, that, in time, it expects each casino to expand its limitation programmes beyond the time out option for VIPs. The Commission expects that, in time, an expanded limitation programme will be quite feasible – particularly with improvements in systems and as staff and patrons become more familiar with such programmes.
  60. The Commission also noted that condition 27 of SCML's operator's licence provides that SCML may voluntarily improve its HRPs. If SCML sees value in including a limited play option before these programmes are next reviewed, it can do so.
66. The Commission's approach has been that ideally each casino should offer the same range of limitation options but that those options should be periodically assessed for effectiveness and changed to reflect what worked best in practice, without too much concern about uniformity for its own sake. The Commission wants the most effective limitation options to be made available to casino patrons and less effective options should be removed and replaced with something better.
  67. The records support SCML's submission that VIP Limited Play has not been popular, with only a small number of VIP patrons utilising the option. Further, the Commission accepts that the option is difficult to give effect to, even when limited to VIP customers, and those difficulties make its extension to other customers impractical. The claimed lack of benefit however is more contentious – it seems to have been effective in eventually producing the exclusion, as problem gamblers, of all 3 VIP customers who utilised it, preventing them from continuing to suffer harm.
  68. The Commission considered that there would be much more value in adopting in its place the new limitation option which SCML now offers to all patrons. It has introduced a voluntary pre-commitment scheme whereby patrons can voluntarily set limits on how

much they spend and for how long they play. This scheme is not restricted to VIP patrons, but is available for all patrons for use on gaming machines.

69. Although SCML submitted that its new pre-commitment option was superior to the Limited Play option, which it proposed to delete, it did not include the pre-commitment option in its place in Section 2.1.6 of the HRP. It should have done so and the section has now been amended to include the new option.
70. Although PGF expressed reservations about the voluntary nature of this scheme (preferring something mandatory), that criticism overlooks the purpose of gambling limitation options; namely the provision of a tool to assist patrons to manage their gambling activity within the limits that they consider to be safe. It is not primarily intended for problem gamblers but for prudent gamblers who wish to set limits for themselves in advance.
71. In addition, the new pre-commitment option is not limited to VIP patrons; it is available to all casino patrons. Its adoption in the place of the VIP Limitation therefore extends significantly the accessibility of an important form of limitation to casino patrons.
72. Finally, the pre-commitment option is available for use by patrons on the form of gambling that is generally recognised as causing the most harm; electronic gaming machines. It is also the form of gambling which has the lowest level of interaction with casino staff.
73. While the pre-commitment scheme is not foolproof (patrons could set very high financial or temporal limits, gamble without using a card or choose not to use the scheme at all), that does not diminish its value. The VIP Limitation option is similarly voluntary with the limits set by the patrons concerned. The new system is more widely available and has the advantage of electronic (rather than relying on human) monitoring to improve its accuracy and effectiveness.
74. Finally, the Commission considered whether to retain the Time Out option for VIP patrons and/or to introduce it for general patrons. It appeared to the Commission that the Time Out option was simply self-exclusion under another name in that it allows patrons to choose to remove themselves from the casino for a defined period of time. The Commission doubted the need for such duplication and the resulting overlap created by separate Time Out and self-exclusion options. It considered that the same outcome could be achieved more simply by amending the self-exclusion section of the HRP to include additional periods of self-exclusion for 3, 6 and 9 months. The Commission therefore proposed removing the Time Out option from section 2.1.6 and amending section 2.1.1 to provide for periods of self-exclusion of 3, 6, 9, 12 and 24 months.

75. In response to the Commission's proposal, SCML submitted that the VIP Time Out option should be retained in section 2.1.6, and not incorporated into the exclusion section at 2.1.1. SCML submitted that the VIP Time Out option had value in its own right, and was concerned that a very short period of self-exclusion, such as three months, would be too enticing for some patrons, and would provide insufficient time for them to disassociate themselves from their problem gambling. SCML submitted that Time Out for three months is workable for VIP patrons who are assessed as being capable of continuing to gamble without experiencing harm, but this is not the case for excluded patrons. SCML therefore submitted that the minimum period of exclusion should be six months. SCML also submitted that the additional exclusion time provided greater opportunity for customers to undergo counselling. The Commission has several difficulties with these submissions:

- (a) Both Time Out and self-exclusion are the same thing – a patron voluntarily asks the casino for assistance in staying away for a particular period.
- (b) If a 3 month period is too enticing, by artificially dividing the available periods into two groups and separately naming them, it is simply enticing (VIP) patrons to select the form of self-exclusion called "Time Out" rather than the form of self-exclusion called "self-exclusion".
- (c) If a break of 3 months is insufficient when it is called self-exclusion, then the same criticism must apply to a Time Out option of 3 months.
- (d) SCML's submissions are consistent with a desire to retain a softer option for VIPs only, which may be contrasted with the harder option of self-exclusion. A minimum period of 6 months creates a serious disincentive to choose self-exclusion. No other explanation for a separately named option, exclusive to VIPs, suggests itself, as operational variations could be incorporated into self-exclusion to recognise different circumstances.
- (e) If self-exclusion were limited to patrons who had identified themselves as problem gamblers, there might be some justification for imposing a higher minimum period but self-exclusion is not so limited and is available both to self-identified problem gamblers (as required by section 310) and to patrons who simply choose to prevent or limit opportunities for harm (as is the case for Time Out). It is questionable whether the aim of allowing customers to take steps to manage their risk of harm is enhanced by creating such a distinction anyway, as it is another reason why customers are less likely to choose self-exclusion.

(f) The functional distinction between Time Out and self-exclusion, as explained by SCML, appears to rest on an unrealistic set of assumptions; namely that certain customers can gamble safely, if they voluntarily choose to be excluded from casino gambling for a period of 3, 6 or 9 months, but other customers cannot gamble safely when they choose to be excluded for periods of 6, 12 or 24 months AND that it is possible for SCML to identify reliably which group each customer belongs at the time of request (ie at the start of the period).

76. The Commission accepts that distinctions may be appropriate between patrons who self-identify as problem gamblers or who are so assessed by SCML, and those who seek to limit risk of harm by voluntarily seeking a period of exclusion, but that distinction does not account for the different options, only VIP status does. The split of the self-exclusion options into Time Out and self-exclusion creates a softer form of self-exclusion for VIP customers. In addition, the blurring of boundaries creates potential enforcement difficulties with the prohibition on offering lesser forms of limitation than self-exclusion to those to whom self-exclusion must be offered under section 309. The Commission therefore did not accept SCML's additional submissions, and maintained its original decision to incorporate the Time Out periods into section 2.1.1 of the HRP.

*The thresholds of expenditure*

77. The Secretary, MoH and SA all made submissions in relation to the thresholds of expenditure cited among the General Indicators in the PGIP.

78. MoH submitted that the descriptions of loss may set at too high a threshold with regard to the casino's lower income-earning customers and, alternatively, may capture many high rollers by default. SA submitted that, if a customer is visiting the casino up to five times per week with an expenditure of \$300+ each session, then an intervention should be considered at an earlier stage than after one month of this occurring.

79. The Secretary stated that he understands that SCML conducts regular monthly reporting using only the examples noted in the PGIP, rather than using the intensity and frequency of play examples as being indicative only. As such, he is of the view that a requirement for operators to examine loyalty data at different thresholds of loss and frequency of play for different customer types should be made explicit.

80. Dr Delfabbro stated that he supports the general assumptions underlying SCML's approach to the frequency and expenditure indicators, but suggested that a lower threshold for expenditure could be set. He noted studies from Tasmania and Queensland which showed that the mean loss per session for problem gamblers was \$196 and \$283 respectively for each jurisdiction.

81. In its reply, PGF agreed that the expenditure figures were too high and suggested that they be lowered to \$150 and \$200 per session.
82. In response, SCML stated that the effect of lowering the threshold would be to capture a very large group of patrons with no other traits to indicate a problem. It argued that the most effective approach would be to continue to use the current thresholds and to examine proactively an individual's data when other General Indicators present themselves during a risk and harm assessment.
83. In its consideration of this matter, it appeared to the Commission that the submissions made by MoH, SA, PGF and the Secretary, although well intended, were misguided. This is understandable because at first glance, the expenditure figures do appear to be high, especially in light of Dr Delfabbro's observations about the mean levels of problem gambler losses in two Australian jurisdictions. It was therefore natural for submitters to suggest significant reductions in the expenditure figures. However the purpose of the parameters is not to keep problem gambling losses below a particular mean but to provide some General Indicators of potential use in bringing patrons to the attention of the casino for consideration, possibly leading to an assessment, in circumstances where there may be no other problem gambling indicators observed. These indicators need to recognise the fact that gambling harm can occur for individuals at a range of different losses and that not all problem gamblers exhibit other signs or indicators.
84. The Commission is of the view that these indicative time and loss indicators must strike a balance which best assists in the identification of problem gamblers. If the example time and expenditure figures are set too low, too many patrons will be captured by the parameters, undermining the usefulness of the examples as indicators. The parameters need to be set by reference to what patrons overall do, to distinguish from other patrons, rather than to what problem gamblers do in common with other gamblers.
85. The Commission sought additional guidance from Dr Delfabbro on this issue. Dr Delfabbro confirmed his earlier reports, advising that the example expenditure figures are too high and recommended that they be reduced in each case to \$250 and \$400 respectively. The Commission concurred with his assessment that a reduction of that amount would better balance the competing consideration and amended the first and second indicators under the "Intensity and frequency of play" subheading as follows:
- Very high visitation frequency (for example, five times per week up to daily), combined with high levels of expenditure on gaming machines (for example, \$250+ lost per session) over a period of time (for example, one month).
  - High visitation frequency (for example, two times per week or more), combined with very high levels of expenditure on gaming machines (for

example, \$400+ lost per session) over a period of time (for example, one month).

86. In the Commission's view, these figures strike the appropriate balance to allow SCML to assist with the identification of potential problem gamblers without devaluing the indicator by excessive capture.
87. However the Commission wants to clarify an important aspect of these indicators and in doing so repeats comments that it made in decision GC27/12; namely that the intensity and frequency of play indicators are merely examples, not safe harbour thresholds, regardless of the level they are set at. At paragraph 32, the Commission stated as follows:

In relation to the general indicators, the Commission again wants to make it clear that the "Intensity and Frequency of Play" examples are just that – examples. They are to assist operators in the areas of frequency and expenditure, but are not to be applied strictly or literally. That is, a loyalty member may not necessarily be a problem gambler simply because s/he loses \$300 per session on gaming machines having visited the casino five times per week, over a one month period. However, if that member was sustaining this level of loss on gaming machines, having attended the casino almost daily, over the period of one month, the Commission would expect the operator to know about it and to have investigated and actively considered whether he or she should be treated as a problem gambler – "a person whose gambling causes harm or may cause harm".

88. In relation to the Secretary's submission that operators should examine loyalty data at different thresholds of loss and frequency of play for different customer types, the Commission again refers to comments it made in decision GC27/12. At paragraph 33 of that decision the Commission stated as follows:

As the intensity and frequency of play examples are indicative only, the Commission saw no need to stipulate that operators must examine loyalty data at different thresholds for different customer types and to fix what they should be. The obligation is to use the data proactively to screen for persons who should be monitored. Depending on what is known about individual customers, operators are expected to adopt appropriate thresholds on a common sense basis.

89. The operator is required to use data proactively to screen for patrons who should be monitored. The Commission amended the PGIP to make this clear. If an operator is not doing so, or is running reports using only the examples noted in its PGIP, it risks falling short of its obligations, and the possibility of action being taken against it which could lead to licence suspension or cancellation.

*GOI Files/Recording of relevant information*

90. Dr Delfabbro and H&E both stated that it is unclear when SCML will open a GOI file.
91. Dr Delfabbro was generally supportive of SCML's overall approach and noted that SCML appears to log information in a similar manner to the Swiss system, but considered it less

clear when a GOI file will be opened by SCML than it is under the Swiss system. Under the Swiss system, a file is opened whenever indicators are observed.

92. Further, Dr Delfabbro noted that SCML's staff are trained to look for indicators, with these indicators being reported to Host Responsibility, which then records them. However unlike the Swiss system, Dr Delfabbro noted that the person who makes the observation might not be the person who logs it. He considered that this procedure creates a potential gap in that in order for an observation to be logged, a frontline worker must speak to a manager who must both remember to log it and decide it is worth logging. However, Dr Delfabbro noted that this situation may be hard to avoid given the obvious logistical challenges a busy casino faces, including the problem of trying to log too much information.
93. Dr Delfabbro also noted that, once information has got to Host Responsibility, the latter is expected to undertake a risk and harm assessment based on the information collated. If a person has been identified as a problem gambler, then SCML opens a GOI file and this provides the basis for monitoring. However, he stated that, if the purpose of the file is to identify actual or potential problem gamblers, then it is contradictory to open a file only after Host Responsibility has identified the person as a problem gambler.
94. He observed that the Swiss system appears to allow greater flexibility in allowing staff to accumulate and log information, whether or not they believe that the patron is a problem gambler. Dr Delfabbro recommended a number of changes for SCML, as follows:
- frontline staff be given more ability to log information concerning patrons;
  - that the roles and responsibilities of staff be clearly articulated in the PGIP. It should be clearer when managers are mentioned as opposed to the generic term "Host Responsibility";
  - Indicators should be logged in GOI files for people considered to be at risk rather than just for confirmed problem gamblers.
95. H&E raised a similar issue with regard to "transition points"; that is, they submitted that it should be clear at what point a person moves from the incident spreadsheet to a GOI file, and an explanation of the point at which a casino-initiated exclusion applies.
96. The Secretary took a different view, noting that, while having specific clarity around this point is "an alluring prospect from an audit standpoint" (as it places measurable obligations around the HRP) there is a danger that such an approach would derogate from the discretion which SCML is expected to exercise.

97. The Secretary considered, however, that there should be greater clarity surrounding the documentation of certain key decisions (for example whether or not to open a GOI file, whether to exclude a patron, etc) as this also creates an appropriate audit trail and demonstrates transparency of decision-making. He observed that each time an indicator is reported to Host Responsibility, there needs to be an assessment. He understands that such an assessment does take place, but for clarity, section 5 of the PGIP should be amended to include “Host Responsibility staff also record the risk and harm assessment referenced in “Section 4 – Identification”.”
98. In response to Dr Delfabbro’s observations about when a GOI file is opened, the Secretary opined that he does not think that SCML’s wording is necessarily contrary to the intent of the HRP, PGIP or the Act. This is because an assessment which leads the Host Responsibility team to consider that harm is occurring would lead to an obligation to approach the customer in terms of section 309, but would not necessarily lead to an exclusion. A GOI file being opened in circumstances where a customer is not excluded would be appropriate.
99. In reply, SCML stated that it recognised that the recording of observations and interactions is a key part of proactive harm minimisation. Consequently, it is constantly encouraging and training its staff to report observations, and for Host Responsibility to analyse these observations to help assess customers for risk of harm.
100. SCML observed that it is important to remember that an increase in reported observations is an indication that the system of proactive observation and recording is working well, not necessarily that gambling harm is increasing. It works hard to ensure that the observation numbers are as high as possible as it means that staff are actively participating and implementing host responsibility.
101. SCML accepted that it is important that staff note observations so that, if further indicators were observed over time, staff would be better placed to make appropriate judgments about what action to take. However, as Dr Delfabbro acknowledges, there are logistical challenges in frontline staff recording their observations directly. These challenges are compounded when the range of indicators frontline staff have to contend with is so extensive, as is the case with SCML’s Indicator list. SCML’s indicator list is much more extensive than that used by the Swiss.
102. SCML contended that, although its system of reporting observations has more steps than the Swiss system, it is no less effective or efficient. SCML’s process allows frontline staff to concentrate on simply watching for and noting observations while performing their core duties. Its system passes the observations through the management chain, ensuring

there is a broad understanding of what is occurring on the casino floor and, importantly for SCML, allowing frontline staff to feel as if they are not compromising their relationships with patrons.

103. Further, SCML stated that Dr Delfabbro appeared not to be aware that any observation and information in general about patrons (whether they are GOIs or not) is recorded against their profile in iTrak, SCML's incident tracking system. Whenever an observation is made about a patron and entered into iTrak, Host Responsibility evaluates the entry against the existing profile. Thus, SCML submitted, the iTrak profile is almost an unofficial GOI file used by Host Responsibility to assess for potential problem gambling issues on each occasion information is entered. This may trigger the opening of a GOI file for monitoring, perhaps leading to an intervention by Host Responsibility.
104. SCML claimed that its existing process allows for the most efficient and effective reporting of observations to the Host Responsibility team without being operationally disruptive.
105. SCML also explained that it does not wait to open a GOI file until a patron is identified as a problem gambler; such a person is approached and offered exclusion, or is excluded, as required by the Act. It argued that Dr Delfabbro's recommendations are the result of him being unaware of all of the steps which SCML in fact takes to make and record observations for potential harm assessment.
106. It may be true that SCML's recording of indicators is as good as the Swiss system in that any and all relevant observations are in fact recorded by SCML; either on a patron's GOI file, or on iTrak. The problem is that the proposed HRP does not record most of the details of the recording system in operation. They were not apparent to Dr Delfabbro because the description in the HRP of the system for recording and assessing observations is incomplete, with no mention of the use of iTrak. The Commission found this puzzling as the recording of information in iTrak is integral to SCML's host responsibility practices and should have been shown clearly in the HRP. The consequence is that the proposed HRP indicated that SCML's practices are worse than they are in fact.
107. The Commission sought Dr Delfabbro's revised views on the HRP and PGIP in light of SCML's submissions in reply on iTrak. Dr Delfabbro expressed the view that the use of iTrak directly addressed one of the areas of concern and that, if the HRP were amended to set out the system fully and accurately, it would address his earlier concern.
108. The Commission amended the HRP to include SCML's use of iTrak and to clarify the opening of GOI files.

109. In relation to the other matters identified for change by Dr Delfabbro, the Commission was of the view that further amendment was not required. The roles and responsibilities of staff are already set out clearly in section 2.9 of the HRP. Similarly, the term “host responsibility” is defined at section 2.0, and SCML has clarified that it does not wait until a patron is confirmed as a problem gambler before opening a GOI file.
110. In response to the H&E submission on transition points, the Commission’s view was that the HRP should not be too prescriptive in relation to exactly when a patron transitions from one point to another. The nature of the assessments do not lend themselves to prescription of points. Each patron must be assessed individually and SCML’s assessment of each patron should not be constrained by a formulaic approach. SCML is expected to exercise proper judgement on each patron, with the underlying knowledge that it has clear host responsibility obligations which it must adhere to.
111. The Commission concurred however with the Secretary’s submission regarding the documentation of key decisions. Each time an indicator is reported to Host Responsibility, an assessment must take place and a decision needs to be made on what steps, if any, SCML will then take. In its submissions, SCML confirmed that it is undertaking such assessments whenever indicators are reported and that, if “an incident or a cluster of indicators means a customer is assessed by Host Responsibility there is, by virtue of that assessment, a documented record of this interaction regardless of whether a GOI is opened or not.” On that basis, it did not see the need to record its assessment decisions formally.
112. It appeared to the Commission that if SKYCITY is undertaking all of the actions required of it by the HRP and the PGIP, there will be little difficulty in recording that an assessment has taken place, and the outcome of that assessment. Section 4 of the PGIP clearly states that:
- Whenever a disclosure or observation is reported to Host Responsibility, Host Responsibility collates and reviews all information available to it in relation to the relevant customer ...
- Host Responsibility undertakes a risk and harm assessment based upon the information collated. ...
113. The Commission accordingly amended section 5 of the PGIP to require a record of assessment decisions.
114. In response to the Commission’s amendment, SCML submitted that the amendment should be reversed. It argued that its current processes achieve the same outcome and, if it is mandated to record why it does not take action on the recording of every indicator, this effectively means that all observations are treated as equally severe, regardless of

how isolated or harmless they may be. This in turn will have an effect on its ability to prioritise effectively more urgent cases from lesser ones.

115. SCML also submitted that the proposed amendment would fundamentally contradict the existing guidelines in the PGIP (which state that SKYCITY provides graduated responses, depending on the perceived severity and urgency of a situation) and that its obligations to record and analyse information under the PGIP are already comprehensive.
116. The Commission was not persuaded by SKYCITY's submissions. As noted in its initial findings, it appeared to the Commission that SCML is undertaking the necessary assessments, so there should therefore be no difficulty for Host Responsibility to record the fact of those assessments and their outcomes.
117. The Commission did not consider there to be any force in the submission that the subsequent recording of assessments would in any way result in all observations being treated equally, or less urgent cases being prioritised above more urgent cases. Prioritisation of assessments and actions are not affected by the requirement to record assessments when made. Neither does the requirement change the basis for making assessments. The outcome of an assessment is not affected by its subsequent recording.

*Utilising technology to control casino entry*

118. SA submitted SCML could utilise new technology to help monitor exclusion orders and to prevent the breaching of them by patrons. It stated that there is presently technology that allows for patron IDs to be scanned, which would immediately notify casino staff if the ID belongs to an individual who is not meant to be at the casino.
119. SA's submission also had relevance to an observation made by Dr Delfabbro, namely that some overseas jurisdictions require the production of ID before patrons can enter into casinos.
120. H&E recognised the operational difficulty with instituting mandatory identity checks in relation to the Main Gaming Floor, but submitted that photographic ID should be required before patrons enter the VIP rooms.
121. In his submissions in reply, the Secretary noted that the ability of banned patrons to re-enter the casino is a weak point in SCML's processes, if not the HRP itself. He observed there are a large number of exclusions that security staff are obliged to monitor and, in the absence of loyalty cards or some other form of technology, excluded gamblers are identified only when recognised by SCML staff. He thought that the potential for an

excluded customer to continue to gamble in breach of an order is significant and not an uncommon experience.

122. The Secretary also noted that the production of ID by patrons at overseas casinos is not uncommon, while the introduction of some form of technology and associated processes would be a significant tool in ensuring that excluded gamblers remain outside of the casino environment. However, he also noted that the use of such technology or the compulsory production of ID raises a number of considerations not just for the casino, but also for the public at large, his Department and the Commission. The Secretary submitted that this matter should be explored further, including consideration of whether alternative technologies may help SCML achieve the same end without the intrusive step of requiring ID. He suggested that the Commission should require SCML to explore this matter further.
123. In its consideration of this matter, the Commission was attracted to the idea of patrons producing identification before entering the casino's Gambling Areas; the appeal being that the compulsory production of photographic ID is a simple requirement which would go a long way to preventing underage and excluded patrons from entering the casino. The Commission also considered that the requirement for photographic ID might act as a significant disincentive for other unwanted activities which have the potential to take place at casinos, such as loan sharking, money laundering or drug dealing.
124. However, the Commission decided, on balance, that it would not require SCML to obtain photographic identification from every patron who wishes to enter the casino's Gambling Areas. The Commission reached this decision for a number of reasons. First, requiring each patron to produce photographic ID is not an obligation that should be imposed lightly. New Zealand is a society which enjoys considerable freedoms and requiring the public to produce identification to enter the Gambling Areas of a casino to undertake legal activities would be considered by many to be an erosion of some of those freedoms. The Commission was of the view that the compulsory production of ID would sit more comfortably within the traditions of some overseas jurisdictions than it would in New Zealand.
125. Secondly, the vast majority of people who enter the casino are neither problem nor excluded gamblers, and the Commission was wary about imposing an obligation on this majority in order to address issues with the minority.
126. For these reasons, if the compulsory production of photographic ID is to be introduced, it is a matter that is better introduced by Government through changes to the Act, or by harm minimisation regulations made under it, than by the Gambling Commission in the

course of approving individual HRPs. The Commission is of the view that the DIA should consider this issue and reach an informed view on whether it should be adopted and applied countrywide.

*Performance targets*

127. H&E submitted that the HRP should be amended to describe outcomes over a short, medium and long-term period. They stated that establishing a clear outcome measure that articulates the change expected while the HRP is in operation is integral to ensuring that SCML can demonstrate that it prevents and minimises gambling-related harm and is therefore held accountable.
128. In reply, the Secretary stated that, while he was not averse to this suggestion, he was cautious that any such outcomes should not be expressed as targets.
129. Similarly, Dr Delfabbro stated that he understands the logic of H&Es' submission, but was also highly cautious about provisions of this nature. He stated that performance targets can often lead to distortions in practice and can also be meaningless unless they are well-defined. For example, he stated that it would be very misleading if a "reduction in problem gambling or detection" was set as the performance target because it would be difficult to know why this was occurring. In effect, this might act as a disincentive to apply the HRP in a systematic and effective manner because SCML would have an incentive to minimise its detection rate so as to give the impression that fewer problem gamblers were visiting or present in the casino.
130. In reply, SCML stated that it is already subject to a very high level of regulatory oversight and that performance targets are unnecessary.
131. The Commission was of the view that performance targets are inherently problematic for the type of monitoring and intervention model which the HRP adopts to address a problem which not easily or accurately detected. Targets can lead to unintended adverse consequences, as the Secretary and Dr Delfabbro suggested. The Commission considers that the better course is for SCML to undertake its host responsibility practices without the distraction of targets which have the potential to undermine the integrity of those practices.

*Focal Research's predictive model*

132. H&E and PGF suggested that the Commission should require SCML to make publicly available all data relating to the development, ongoing maintenance and calibration of the loyalty data algorithm that Focal Research is developing for implementation at the Auckland casino, so that that data may be independently analysed.

133. PGF submitted that this data should be shared with the provider sector in an anonymous form so that they can undertake an independent analysis of the data. H&E said that the Focal Research data can provide insight into a number of useful areas.
134. Dr Delfabbro supported the submissions made by PGF and H&E, advising that it would be appropriate for the outcomes of the testing to be made available for external scrutiny.
135. In reply, SCML submitted that the loyalty database contains individual and commercial information which SCML should not be required to release. It said that the predictive model relies on patrons' use of loyalty systems. Any disincentive for patrons in using their cards, such as the potential dissemination of their information, may compromise the breadth of the model's reach.
136. When the Commission approved SCML's current HRP, it noted that SCML had commissioned a Canadian company, Focal Research, to develop an algorithm which might assist SCML with the identification of problem gamblers using loyalty data. The Commission has been told by SCML that, since that time, SCML has been working with Focal Research on the "predictive model" of problem gambler identification, with a view to using the output in the place of the General Indicator examples discussed above. It says that the testing of the Focal model is currently underway and will not conclude until later in 2013.
137. At this stage, it is unclear to the Commission exactly when the predictive model will be deployed at the Auckland casino, what data will be generated and how it is proposed to use it. The Commission was of the view that it would be premature, in the circumstances, to impose requirements on SCML in relation to Focal Research's model, or the data that it generates until the predictive model has been tested and is ready for deployment.
138. The Commission had expected SCML to have made greater progress with testing and deployment of the predictive model, because SCML raised the prospect in 2007. The Commission has since learned that deployment of the Focal Research predictive model is a term of the agreement between SKYCITY and the New Zealand Government for the construction and operation of the New Zealand International Convention Centre. The Commission will likely examine the deployment of the predictive model during the next HRP review.

*Monitoring of problem gambling amongst casino staff*

139. H&E submitted that there should be a requirement annually to measure and monitor problem gambling and risk prevalence amongst staff. They say that international research suggests that exposure to gambling by employees in the workplace can lead to

increased participation in gambling and rates of problem gambling and, as such, staff should be measured and monitored to assess their levels of problem gambling.

140. In reply, SCML stated that the HRP already has provisions relating to employee gambling-related harm, but nonetheless believes that there is further opportunity to ensure that its staff are provided with information about personal problem gambling, particularly at times when staff may seek assistance for other reasons. As such, it has amended section 2.3 of the HRP to include the following (under the “Information resources” heading):

- Promote information about personal problem gambling support services when staff approach the SKYCITY Connect Centre to participate in the Employee Assistance Programme, Employee Financial Assistance, and/or where appropriate where a staff member may be seeking financial assistance.

141. The Commission was of the view that the purpose of an HRP is to provide a safer environment for casino patrons, rather than for casino staff. Casino staff are, in fact, prohibited from gambling in any premises operated by SCML, a step which should guarantee that they do not suffer harm from gambling at the casino. Although providing a safe environment for staff is important for every employer, including SCML, that is a matter better addressed elsewhere than in an HRP. The Commission was therefore of the view that the HRP is already sufficiently comprehensive in relation to casino employees and did not approve the suggested addition.

### **Analysis of specific amendments proposed**

142. In addition to the abovementioned major issues, submitters also identified a number of specific areas for consideration, which are set out below. This decision does not address every single submission made by parties, as not all submissions were relevant to the HRP. Each relevant submission is set out below, followed by SCML’s response and the Commission’s determination.

143. *Section 2.1.1 – Exclusion – Introduction* – This section suggests that self-exclusion is only available for periods of either six months or one year. Section 310 of the Act states that self-exclusion is for any period up to two years and gamblers should be able to nominate exclusion for any period up to this timeframe (PGF). SA submitted that patrons should be able to self-exclude for periods of six, 12 and 24 months. In response, SCML stated that it amended this section of the HRP to make clear that self-exclusion is offered for periods of six, 12 or 24 months but allowing patrons to specify any period at all (for example seven months) creates unnecessary administrative issues.

144. PGF correctly submitted that the Act provides for self-exclusion of any “period of up to 2 years”. However the Commission accepted that exclusion periods should be defined for

administrative reasons. SCML amended the HRP to include a 2 year self-exclusion, while the Commission amended it to include 3 and 9 month options, following its decision to incorporate section 2.1.6 into section 2.1.1. The Commission was satisfied that these amendments provide patrons with an appropriate range of self-exclusion periods, within the 2 year maximum (namely for 3, 6, 9, 12 and 24 months).

145. *Section 2.1.1 – Exclusion* – SCML should report on the different periods that patrons decide to self-exclude for (the Secretary). SCML made no submissions in response. The Commission was of the view that SCML should report on the different periods as suggested, and amended the reporting measures accordingly. The Commission concurred with the Secretary’s submission that this measure might identify a trend or trends with periods of exclusion that could be helpful for future reviews.
146. *Section 2.1.1 – Exclusion* – Clients have expressed concern about SCML contacting them near the end of their exclusion period. No contact should be made by SCML to excluded persons, even after the expiry of their exclusion (PGF). In response, SCML stated that it does not deliberately contact customers who are excluded, but accepted that there have been isolated incidents where patrons have been contacted inadvertently. The Commission was of the view that SCML should not contact patrons near the end of their exclusion periods, but accepted SCML’s submission that these incidents were inadvertent rather than standard practice. The Commission therefore saw no need to amend the HRP expressly to prohibit such contact in this circumstance. However, the Commission will revisit this matter when it next reviews this HRP. If the contact continues, the Commission will consider amending the HRP to prevent this expressly.
147. *Section 2.1.1 – Exclusion – Re-entry* – The requirements for patrons to re-enter the casino should be amended. SKYCITY previously had a re-entry standard operating procedure, and it is not clear whether this is still in operation (PGF, H&E). In response, SCML stated that provisions relating to patron re-entry are now contained in its “exclusion” SOP, and amended section 2.1.1 of its HRP to make this clear. SCML then set out to the Commission the details of its re-entry requirements. The Commission was satisfied with SCML’s approach to this issue, noting that the re-entry requirements appeared thorough. As such, the Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.
148. *Section 2.1.1 – Exclusion – Loyalty card holders* – This section notes that excluded customers who use a loyalty card see an error message asking them to “present his/her card to a SKYCITY staff member”. It is unlikely that an excluded patron attempting to gamble contrary to an exclusion would approach casino staff. It should be possible for the monitoring system to alert casino staff when a deactivated card is used. Host

Responsibility staff can then take appropriate action (the Secretary). In response, SCML stated that it considers complete deactivation to be the most fail-safe option in ceasing links to gambling following exclusion. In order for a card to alert casino staff, it would need to remain active in the system. Retaining cards in a “live” state increases the risk of accidental communication with excluded customers, or an expectation that a customer would return following exclusion. The Commission concurs with SCML’s submission and, on balance, considers that the best practice is deactivation. The Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

149. *2.1.1 – Exclusion – Loyalty card holders* – It is unclear if loyalty cardholders from the other SKYCITY casinos have their cards deactivated as a result of an Auckland deactivation (MoH). In response, SCML stated that cards deactivated at the Auckland casino cannot be used at any other SKYCITY site. The Commission noted that the HRP makes it clear that cardholders’ accounts are deactivated whenever that cardholder is excluded, trespassed or formally requested to leave the premises.
150. *2.1.1 – Exclusion – Loyalty card holders* – Patrons who have been excluded should not receive any advertising information from the casino, during their exclusion period. Excluded patrons have reported that they have received marketing paraphernalia after the commencement of their exclusion periods (PGF, Lifeline). In response, SCML stated that it does not deliberately contact patrons who are excluded. There have been isolated incidents where excluded patrons have been inadvertently contacted through its marketing system. It has apologised on each occasion. As with paragraph 146 above, the Commission saw no need to amend this section of the HRP expressly to prohibit such contact (as the contact was inadvertent). The Commission will revisit this matter during the next review and if the contact continues, will consider amending the HRP to prevent this expressly.
151. *2.1.1 – Exclusion – Third Parties and Service Providers* – It would be beneficial for customers to be aware of the expectations of counselling and what customers will gain from it (Lifeline). In response, SCML stated that it provides this information to patrons in a document entitled “Explanation of Exclusion Order”. The Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.
152. *2.1.1 – Exclusion – Other measures* – The HRP states that SCML promotes an ongoing dialogue with counselling services to improve the exclusion process. However, providers state that sometimes it is not clear if the person contacting them is the actual excluded customer. It has been submitted that it is important that SCML initiates a system that clearly identifies those people excluded and notes that the customer has signed informed consent for information sharing between SCML and the nominated provider (Lifeline). In

response, SCML stated its exclusion forms clearly state the identity of the patron being excluded. The onus is on the provider to establish and verify the identity of the patron. The Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

153. *2.1.1 – Exclusion* – Customers often request six counselling sessions as part of the exclusion process. It is submitted that the exclusion process should also include counselling sessions close to when the patron is able to re-enter the casino. This would allow the service provider to establish the patron’s progress and consider whether s/he is ready to safely re-enter (Lifeline). In response, SCML stated that it has no involvement in a patron’s counselling or re-entry until the customer applies to re-enter, at which point its Host Responsibility team assesses whether the patron meets the re-entry criteria. The Commission agreed that the counselling provided should be a matter for the patron and the provider without involvement of SCML and accordingly saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.
154. *Section 2.1.3 – Approach* – The following should be added with regard to security officers patrolling the carpark to detect unattended children:

... or elsewhere, with all areas checked at intervals of no less than 30 minutes.  
(PGF)

PGF suggested that a further point should be added, as follows:

A Security Officer must report the incident to the host responsibility team who must then follow up potential problem gambling issues.

In response, SCML stated that it already has a number of measures in place in relation to this area. Section 2.1.3 already provides that “In all instances of unattended children, the Host Responsibility team must be notified to follow up potential problem gambling issues.” The Commission considered that the HRP was sufficiently comprehensive in relation to patrolling and saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

155. *Section 2.1.6 - Gambling Limitation* – The term “VIP customer” is not defined. SCML interprets VIP customer to be those patrons in the top two tiers of the loyalty programme (VIP Black and Platinum). If the Gambling Limitation programme is not to be rolled out to all carded players, a definition would provide clarity (the Secretary).

In response, SCML stated that it is reluctant to prescribe this level of definition because the loyalty programme tier names or the programme itself may change, as it has done since the last review (from “Action” to “Premier”). This would render the provision redundant. SCML stated that the catch-all phrase “VIP customer” is the most appropriate description.

The Commission concurred with the Secretary's submission, but the need for a definition was obviated following the Commission's amendment to section 2.1.6 of the HRP as the term does not appear elsewhere in the HRP or PGIP.

156. *Section 2.3 – Employee gambling-related harm – Information resources* – Should begin with:

Utilise resources from problem gambling service providers and develop supporting resources for employees that will be made available when required. They will include:

- Information on how to access problem gambling services (PGF).

In response, SCML stated that this section of the HRP is already sufficiently comprehensive. The Commission agreed and saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

157. *Section 2.3 – Employee gambling-related harm – Information resources* – The second bullet point should be expanded to include “debt” along with “depression and alcoholism” as underlying risk factors (PGF). In response, SCML stated that this section of the HRP is already comprehensive. The Commission concurred and repeats its comments made in paragraph 141 above. It saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

158. *Section 2.3 – Policies and Procedures* – The prohibition on gambling by staff should extend from the SKYCITY casinos to all New Zealand casinos (PGF). In response, SCML stated that its employees are prohibited from gambling at any SCML site, with this prohibition being recorded in the HRP, and that it is not reasonable for it to prohibit its staff from gambling at venues not under its control. The Commission agreed. It did not see how SCML could be expected to monitor and enforce such a prohibition or that it would be reasonable to impose it on staff. It declined to amend further this aspect of the HRP.

159. *2.6.1 – Safe gambling environment – third party loans for financial gain* – As loan sharking is prohibited by the Act, the manner in which SCML proposes to respond is inadequate. For example, how long would a Trespass Notice be issued for (MoH)? In response, SCML submitted that this section of the HRP is already comprehensive and, in addition to the HRP, it has a specific Standard Operating Procedure which relates to loan-sharking. The Commission was of the view that this section of the HRP clearly and adequately sets out how SCML will address the issue of third party loans for financial gain, or “loan-sharking”. This includes the steps that SCML will take to identify people who offer or receive such loans, and the consequences that will follow. The Commission was also of the view that the HRP should not be prescriptive in terms of the length of any

trespass notice as that could be expected to depend upon the circumstances of each case. The Commission therefore saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

160. *2.6.2 – Safe Gambling Environment – Cheque retention policy* – Is a GOI file created when SCML holds an unbanked cheque for a patron (SA)? The Commission addresses this matter later in this decision.
161. *Section 2.7 – Responsible marketing – Requirements* – The following should be added so that SCML does not either:

Specifically target local residents, Maori, Pacific Island, East Asian or other ethnic groups when advertising or in marketing gambling opportunities or gambling products. (PGF)

or

... target older adults by providing free transport or free or subsidised meals or drinks specifically provided for older adult customers. (PGF)

In response, SCML stated that the HRP presently provides that SCML will not “target groups at increased risk of experiencing gambling harm”. SCML submitted that this is sufficient for groups or demographics considered a particular risk, and who should not be targeted with promotional activity. The Commission concurred with SCML and saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

162. *Section 2.8 – Display of signage and provisions of gaming information to customers* – SCML has proposed removing signage stating that “staff cannot accept tips” (PGF, the Secretary). In response, SCML stated that it considers this requirement superfluous as staff are aware that they are strictly prohibited from accepting tips.

The Commission was of the view that, consistent with the HRPs for the other casinos, SCML should display signage stating that staff cannot accept tips. The Commission did not consider the requirement to be superfluous, because although staff are aware that they cannot accept tips, not all customers may be. The Commission therefore amended this section of the HRP to re-include the requirement.

163. *Section 2.9 – Learning & Development* – SCML has minimal external involvement and no external validation of its training programmes (PGF). SA, on the other hand, noted that its team has been invited to participate in staff training.

In response, SCML stated that it has consistently ensured that external providers participate in training, particularly level 3 training where it has used PGF, SA and GH. The Commission was of the view that, absent a credible suggestion that SCML’s training programme is deficient in some material way, it is content for SCML to determine the

detail of its staff training programme. On the information before it, the Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

164. *Section 2.9 – Learning and Development – Introduction Training (Level 1)* – The Secretary queried whether the final paragraph of “Induction training (Level 1)” should have a higher standard. Currently it states that SKYCITY employees are encouraged to complete a four hour classroom training session which refreshes the e-learning, but as the e-learning modules are essentially self-directed, the classroom refresher training should be mandatory. SA concurred with the Secretary, but noted that the one month timeframe could be extended to two months to allow this.

In response, SCML stated that training for all staff is already very comprehensive, and it set out exactly how its staff are trained.

As with the above point, the Commission was of the view that, unless it appears that there are problems caused by inadequate training, it is prepared to allow SCML to determine how it trains its staff. The Commission notes that SCML has clear host responsibility obligations which it must adhere to. If SCML trains its staff poorly, it could fall short of these obligations, risking the possibility of suspension or cancellation of licence. In this context, SCML is adequately incentivised to train its staff well. The Commission therefore saw no need to amend further this aspect of the HRP in the absence of any evidence that the current training is inadequate.

165. *3.0 – Monitoring and Reporting* – The six-monthly reporting requirements should be retained, as it provides an opportunity to view trends and patterns that may need to be addressed (SA). SCML did not respond to this submission. When the Commission approved SCML’s RGP in 2007, it required SCML to report to it every six months. The purpose of this was to allow time for the HRP to become embedded and for the Commission to gain an understanding of how the HRP was tracking. The Commission now has a good understanding of the HRP, which is well embedded. The Commission is therefore content to receive annual reports covering both six month periods in the year. This is consistent with the reporting requirements in the HRPs for the other casinos.
166. *Appendix A* – One of the Host Responsibility Resources noted in the Hamilton HRP is a brochure titled “Children at SKYCITY” which outlines New Zealand law and SKYCITY policy with respect to unattended children. This resource should also be listed in the Auckland HRP (the Secretary). In response, SCML stated that it has updated its resources to include this brochure and amended its HRP accordingly.
167. *General* – The addition of a minimum timing requirement for the provision of indicator information to the Host Responsibility team would be desirable. This matter was raised

after it was discovered that the indicator “not having sufficient money to exit car park” was provided to Host Responsibility in the form of a monthly report. While SCML has changed its practice in this regard, a timing requirement would provide clarity for staff and enhance an operational document. An appropriate requirement could be: “As soon as practicable; and no later than 24 hours” (the Secretary).

In response, SCML stated that the current provision around processing of Indicator information is dealt with as soon as possible. There is an inherent understanding in the business that processing this information is a high priority, which is reinforced by training at all levels. Some reports citing General Indicators are generated as monthly reports and are cross-referenced with other General Indicators for analysis and action. However it is not practical to provide a specific timeframe.

The Commission found the Secretary’s submission to be persuasive, and considered that the monthly reporting of indicators to Host Responsibility was insufficient. However, the Commission also accepted SCML’s submission that it would be impractical to impose a fixed timeframe on the reporting of some indicators through to Host Responsibility. On balance, the Commission therefore decided to amend the PGIP to include a variation of the Secretary’s submission; namely that SCML should provide information to Host Responsibility “as soon as practicable”. The HRP and PGIP have been amended to reflect this. If there is still concern at the next review, the Commission will look at adding maximum periods.

168. *PGIP – Section Two – General Indicators* – “Breaching Pre-commitment limits” and “Multiple increases or disabling of pre-commitment limits” should be included as General Indicators. In response, SCML stated that it will include “breaching pre-commitment levels” as a General Indicator, but it did not consider it appropriate that “multiple increases or disabling of pre-commitment limits” are necessarily indicative of problem gambling.

The Commission was of the view that both of these should be included as General Indicators. The presence of these indicators in patrons does not automatically result in those patrons being confirmed as problem gamblers, but they are indicators of behaviour that could be present in a patron who is a potential problem gambler. They are indicators that Host Responsibility should be aware of as part of a larger matrix of information in relation to a patron. Accordingly, the Commission amended this section of the PGIP to include both of these matters as “General Indicators”.

### Consideration of issues raised in Gambling Commission decisions

169. In a number of decisions since it last reviewed SCML's HRP, the Commission has made mention of issues that should be considered as part of this review. These decisions, and the issues raised, are as follows:

- (a) GC24/07 – Gambling information to non-loyalty club customers;
- (b) GC31/08 – Fun Play tables;
- (c) GC04/10 – Credit policy/cheque retention;
- (d) GC25/10 – Redevelopment of levels 5 and 6 of the Auckland casino;
- (e) GC15/11 – Approval of smoking balcony with gaming machines;
- (f) GC14/12 – Gambling limitation;
- (g) GC27/12 – Continuous play;
- (h) GC28/12 – Use of loyalty cards by excluded gamblers;
- (i) GC28/12 – Third party loans for financial gain.

170. Issues (f)-(i) have already been addressed in this decision. Issues (a)-(e) are considered below.

#### *Gambling information to non-loyalty customers*

171. At paragraphs 36 and 37 of its decision approving the current HRP, the Commission stated as follows:

The Commission considers the ability of members of the public to access information about their personal gambling activity to be an important aspect of harm minimisation. This section has been amended to require SKYCITY to provide loyalty club players, on request, information on their gambling activity, including the number and length of their gambling sessions and their gambling expenditure.

SKYCITY is also required to develop the ability in the future to provide the same information to customers who are not loyalty club players on request. This will be something which the Commission expects to see at the next review.

172. SCML stated that it introduced a voluntary player information card in 2008 which allows non-loyalty customers to obtain information on their gambling activity. However, to date, no player information cards have been issued.

173. The Commission was satisfied that SKYCITY had met its obligation, but amended the HRP to make it plain that both loyalty and non-loyalty patrons can be provided with information on their gambling activity.

#### *Fun Play tables*

174. When it approved the deployment of Fun Play tables in the Auckland casino, the Commission commented as follows:

- 26. As the point of permitting the additional gaming tables is largely educational, the Commission expects SCML to provide information, not only on how to play the games, but also on the odds and risks of gambling in these forms. Rather than specifying this requirement as a separate licence condition, however, the Commission considered that it was more appropriately done

through SCML's responsible gambling programme. SCML is expected to propose amendments to the Programme to utilise the new tables for responsible gambling education.

27. For that purpose, the Commission will require SCML, pursuant to condition 39, to submit to it details relating to the odds of the games played, the house advantage on bets permitted in each authorised game, and the risks of gambling in those forms and to submit for approval gaming guides suitable for distribution to patrons in connection with Fun Play. The future requirements for education and distribution of such information will be dealt with by amendment of the Responsible Gambling Programme in due course.

175. SCML noted that it currently has no Fun Play tables in operation but, because they are provided for in its licence conditions, it has amended section 2.8 of the HRP in accordance with the Commission's decision, as follows:

**Display of game rules, odds of winning and information on problem gambling for Fun Play Tables**

Information is made available to customers that pertain to game rules, odds of winning and information on problem gambling.

Whenever a Fun Play Table is open, information is displayed which advises customers that the game rules for the game are available upon request, and odds of winning and information on problem gambling.

176. The Secretary supported the amendment. The Commission was also satisfied with SCML's amendment.

*Credit policy/cheque retention*

177. In approving a cheque retention policy following an application by Dunedin casino, the Commission commented as follows:

50. In addition, the Commission agrees with the Secretary's submission that the casino should be required to adopt harm minimisation procedures in a context of accepting cheques which it will hold unbanked by arrangement with a customer. The appropriate place for such procedures is the casino's harm minimisation policy, usually called the Host Responsibility Programme. The Commission therefore expects that all casinos which have cheque retention facilities to propose suitable provisions in the next revision of their Programmes.

51. In the interim, and to ensure that casinos are required now to monitor the activities of customers using such facilities, it will be a condition of the approval that casinos monitor participating customers for potential harm effects. No customer to whom facilities are provided should be regarded as someone whose activities do not warrant attention. The expectation is that there will be a host responsibility file for each such customer.

178. SCML submitted that in keeping with the Commission's decision, it amended section 2.6 of the HRP, as follows:

**2.6.2 Safe gambling environment – cheque retention policy**

SKY CITY will when accepting cheques which it will hold unbanked by arrangement with the customer report this to staff.

Host Responsibility staff will record the activities of any customer whose cheque it is holding unbanked by arrangement for indicators of potential gambling harm.

179. The Secretary supported the amendment. The Commission considered SCML's amendment to be appropriate, but made some minor amendments to better reflect decision GC04/10, as follows:

SKYCITY will when accepting cheques which it will hold unbanked by arrangement with a customer report this to Host Responsibility staff.

Host Responsibility ~~staff~~ will monitor and record the activities of any customer whose cheque it is holding unbanked by arrangement for indicators of potential gambling harm.

*Redevelopment of levels 5 and 6*

180. In granting a number of approvals in relation to the Auckland casino, including the redevelopment of levels 5 and 6 into VIP areas, the Commission commented as follows:

20. ...

- (e) VIP gambling is likely to trigger many indicators of harm, including continuous play and amount of loss, but, for the reason just given, it is important to bear in mind that these indicators are just that – indicators set by reference to conduct of normal patrons – rather than harm itself. The casino has responsibilities under its Host Responsibility Programme to monitor closely the gambling activities of those who trigger harm indicators (and who take action when the potential for harm is seen); it is not required to ensure that the indicators are never triggered.
- (f) There was validity however in the Secretary's concern about possible reluctance of casino staff to intervene appropriately with VIP clientele, notwithstanding SCAL's submission that the staff who work with VIP clientele have extra harm minimisation training and a higher ratio of staff to clientele and the greater number of interactions through both table games (as opposed to gaming machines) and other services (such as food and beverage requests), would allow staff to more easily monitor play and intervene where necessary. The Commission records its expectation that SCAL will ensure that its staff undertakes all appropriate interventions in accordance with the requirements of the approved Host Responsibility Programme, notwithstanding any commercial pressure arising from the nature of VIP gambling. SCAL can expect serious consequences to follow if it is found in the future to have elevated its commercial interests over those responsibilities.
- (g) Whether the current Host Responsibility Programme is adequate, having regard to such things as continuous play, will be addressed when the Programme is reviewed periodically.

181. SCML submitted that the redevelopment of levels 5 and 6 of the Auckland casino has not exacerbated or increased actual or potential harm to customers, and as such, no amendments to the HRP are required. It stated that the provisions in its existing documents are comprehensive in relation to the identification and prevention of gambling-related harm and minimising gambling-related harm for customers, and VIPs in particular. These include:

- A high staff/clientele ratio, as such, more is known about a customer and there is a high level of interaction with customers. Changes in behaviour and circumstances are more likely to be apparent to staff.
- Activity in VIP areas is more visible to staff and regulators.
- Staff working with VIP customers receive a high level of host responsibility training.
- The availability of the VIP agreed limitation programme. This is available on request to all VIP customers, and SCML can offer it to VIP customers who are identified as being at risk from harm.
- Specific indicators around “Intensity and Frequency of Play” are comprehensive.
- It has included a new indicator of harm – extreme changes in patterns of play.

SCML submitted that continuous play is a complicated area, with no two customers’ circumstances being the same. The PGIP identifies the issues and directs staff on how to respond.

182. The Commission was of the view that, in the light of the changes already addressed above, nothing additional was required from SCML in relation to the VIP areas on levels 5 and 6. SCML’s PGIP allows staff to identify potential problem gamblers in these areas, particularly in the context of much smaller gambling areas and higher staff to player ratios. The issue of continuous gambling has been addressed already in this decision.

*Smoking balcony with gaming machines*

183. In approving the construction of an area where casino patrons can both smoke and gamble, the Commission commented as follows:
- 28.(a) The Commission considers that the research does not establish a clear benefit for the minimisation of problem gambling harm from banning smoking while gambling. Although there is evidence of a correlation between smoking and problem gambling, the evidence does not establish that smoking bans would reduce incidences of problem gambling (as opposed to gambling *per se*).
  - (b) The level of host responsibility at the Auckland casino is of a sufficiently high standard that if a patron exhibited signs of problem gambling while smoking and playing gaming machines, the Commission would expect that person to be identified and the appropriate intervention to occur.
  - (c) The Commission can exercise considerable controls over the casino. This means that the Commission can, for example, grant an approval but impose additional host responsibility obligations, or additional licence condition requirements. The correlation means that SCAL should consider its harm minimisation obligations carefully and address the issue in the next revision of its Host Responsibility Programme but does not lead the Commission to forbid gambling in an open area.

184. SCML did address this issue as part of this review, submitting that the area has not led to an increased level of observed indicators of customers experiencing gambling harm. Notwithstanding this, SCML has amended section 2.8, as follows:

**Display of host responsibility information in open areas where there are gaming machines**

Information on problem gambling and responsible gambling are displayed and made available to customers in open areas (e.g. decks) where gaming machines are present.

185. The Secretary supported the amendment. The Commission saw no need to amend further this section of the HRP.

**Conclusion**

186. The Commission specifies the RGP attached to this decision, including the PGIP annexed to and forming part of the RGP. This document bears the title Host Responsibility Programme as originally submitted but constitutes the RGP under licence conditions. These documents shall take effect from **2 September 2013**, replacing SCML's RGP dated 3 December 2007. SCML is required to report next to the Commission in accordance with condition 27 and section 3 of the RGP soon after 2 September 2014.



Graeme Reeves  
Chief Gambling Commissioner

for and on behalf of the  
Gambling Commission

7 August 2013





**SKYCITY Auckland**

**Host Responsibility  
Programme**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|              |   |           |
|--------------|---|-----------|
| <b>1.0</b>   | <b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....  | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>1.1</b>   | <b><i>Statement of position</i></b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1.2</b>   | <b><i>Programme objectives</i></b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2.0</b>   | <b><i>Harm minimisation and prevention components</i></b> .....                         | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2.1</b>   | <b><i>Policies and procedures</i></b> .....   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>2.1.1</b> | <b><i>Exclusion</i></b> .....   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>2.1.2</b> | <b><i>Responsible service of alcohol</i></b> .....                                      | <b>10</b> |
| <b>2.1.3</b> | <b><i>Unattended children</i></b> .....   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>2.1.4</b> | <b><i>Underage persons</i></b> .....  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>2.1.5</b> | <b><i>Standards of dress and behaviour</i></b> .....                                    | <b>14</b> |
| <b>2.1.6</b> | <b><i>Gambling limitation</i></b> .....   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>2.2</b>   | <b><i>Host responsibility information for customers</i></b> .....                       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>2.3</b>   | <b><i>Employee gambling-related harm</i></b> .....                                      | <b>17</b> |
| <b>2.4</b>   | <b><i>Stakeholder engagement</i></b> .....  | <b>19</b> |
| <b>2.5</b>   | <b><i>Environmental design</i></b> .....  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>2.6</b>   | <b><i>Safe gambling environment – gaming machine play</i></b> .....                     | <b>21</b> |
| <b>2.6.1</b> | <b><i>Safe gambling environment – third party loans for financial gain</i></b> .....    | <b>21</b> |
| <b>2.6.2</b> | <b><i>Safe gambling environment – cheque retention</i></b> .....                        | <b>22</b> |
| <b>2.7</b>   | <b><i>Responsible marketing</i></b> .....   | <b>23</b> |
| <b>2.8</b>   | <b><i>Display of signage and provision of gaming information to customers</i></b> ..... | <b>24</b> |
| <b>2.9</b>   | <b><i>Learning and development</i></b> .....  | <b>26</b> |
| <b>2.10</b>  | <b><i>Identification of problem gamblers</i></b> .....                                  | <b>29</b> |
| <b>3.0</b>   | <b><i>Monitoring and reporting</i></b> .....  | <b>30</b> |

***Appendix A – Current Host Responsibility Resources for Customers***

***Appendix B - Identification Policy***

---

## 1.0 Introduction

### Approval

Effective date: 2 September 2013

Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

General Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_

General Manager SKYCITY Auckland

## **1.1 Statement of position**

### **Statement of position**

SKYCITY is committed to providing a fun and safe environment for all customers and staff.

SKYCITY recognises that alcohol and gambling can be associated with harm for some of its customers. SKYCITY takes its role as a responsible host seriously and recognises that it has an important role to play in preventing and minimising alcohol and gambling-related harm for its customers and staff.

SKYCITY Auckland intends this Programme to be a usable document for all staff which clearly sets out its obligations with respect to harm minimisation and prevention.

### **Compliance with legal obligations**

The Programme has been developed by SKYCITY Auckland and addresses the host responsibility conditions in the Casino Operator's Licence held by SKYCITY Casino Management Limited that relate to the Auckland property.

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) developed by SKYCITY shall be consistent with and impose no lesser obligations than provided in the Gambling Act 2003 (Act), regulations, licence conditions or this Programme.

### **SKYCITY Code of Business Practice**

The Programme contributes to SKYCITY Auckland's compliance with the SKYCITY Code of Business Practice.

## 1.2 Programme objectives

### Objectives

The principal objectives of the SKYCITY Auckland Host Responsibility Programme include:

- Preventing the onset of gambling and/or alcohol related harm and minimising gambling related harm for customers and other persons potentially affected by their gambling behaviour; and
- Facilitating responsible gambling.

SKYCITY Auckland aims to fulfil these objectives by:

- Providing effective staff training;
- Providing a safe gambling environment;
- Providing responsible marketing and promotional initiatives;
- Promoting the responsible consumption of alcohol; and
- Engaging effectively with stakeholders.

### Outcomes

SKYCITY intends that implementation of the Programme will assist customers who may be experiencing harm as well as assist in preventing the onset of gambling and/or alcohol related harm to those customers who may be at risk. Reporting requirements relating to achievement of Programme objectives are set out in section 3.

## 2.0 Harm minimisation and prevention components

### Introduction

SKYCITY will focus on addressing underlying causes of gambling and alcohol-related harm as well as taking steps to minimise harm. Harm prevention and minimisation initiatives will be undertaken in the following areas:

- Policies and procedures;
- Host responsibility information for customers;
- Employee gambling-related harm;
- Stakeholder engagement;
- Environmental design;
- Provision of safe gambling environments;
- Marketing practices;
- Display of signage and provision of gaming information to customers;
- Learning and development;
- Identification of problem gamblers; and
- Gambling limitation.

The Programme's requirements for each area are outlined below.

### Roles and responsibilities

The Host Responsibility function at SKYCITY Auckland is managed by the Security, Surveillance & Host Responsibility Manager. Reporting to this role are the Host Responsibility Executives. Both roles are responsible for the ongoing monitoring and management of GOI (Gambler of Interest) files, feedback and review of new information for GOI files and the provision of host responsibility advice and support to staff. Recording, collating and analysing all information relating to indicators of problem gambling noted by frontline staff, supervisors and managers are typically managed by the Host Responsibility Executives.

References in SKYCITY Auckland's Host Responsibility Programme and Problem Gambler Identification Policy to "Host Responsibility", "Host Responsibility staff" and "the Host Responsibility team" denote the function managed by the Security, Surveillance & Host Responsibility Manager.

## 2.1 Policies and procedures

### **Policies and procedures**

The following policies and procedures have been developed to provide operational guidelines on the implementation of aspects of the SKYCITY Auckland's Host Responsibility Programme. The policies and procedures are consistent with the Act, regulations, licence conditions and this Programme, and will be updated to reflect changes.

### **Policies:**

- Problem Gambler Identification Policy

### **Standard operating procedures:**

The following SOPs relate to harm prevention and minimisation activities. An overview of how these procedures are put into practice is shown below.

- Exclusion;
- Unattended Children;
- Underage Persons;
- Responsible Service of Alcohol;
- Undesirable Behaviour; and
- Agreed Limitation.

The following SOPs relate to the Problem Gambler Identification Policy:

- Information Collection and Collation; and
- Analysis and Intervention.

## 2.1.1 Exclusion

### Introduction

SKYCITY offers two types of exclusions:

- Self Exclusion; and
- SKYCITY Exclusion.

SKYCITY Auckland provides the facility for Self Exclusion of customers from the gaming areas of all SKYCITY sites for periods of three months, six months, nine months, one year, or two years and until they meet re-entry conditions. A customer may request and undertake Self Exclusion for a range of reasons, for example, where the customer has self-identified as a problem gambler or where the customer chooses to prevent or limit opportunities for harm to occur. The Self Exclusion process may also be initiated by problem gambling treatment providers or other venues where there are multi-venue exclusion arrangements in place.

SKYCITY Exclusion is for a period of two years and the customer must also meet re-entry conditions.

SKYCITY Exclusion is undertaken where a problem gambler does not take up Self Exclusion, and SKYCITY determines that the customer or his or her family or wider community is or may be experiencing harm as a consequence of that person's gambling behaviour. SKYCITY imposes exclusion when it has been determined that the customer is a problem gambler (in line with the definitions in the Act) and unable to continue gambling without further harm. This determination is generally made on the basis of assessment(s), provision of information, advice and assistance, monitoring of a GOI file, and refusal of a Self Exclusion offer or other host responsibility efforts to assist the customer to gamble without harm. SKYCITY may also impose exclusion after a serious one-off incident where an offer of Self Exclusion has been refused.

Conditions for re-entry are contained in the Exclusion SOP.

### Approaches to customers

Only Level 3 trained staff may undertake exclusions with customers, which are generally Host Responsibility, Security or Gaming Shift Managers.

### **Features of the exclusion process**

To ensure the effectiveness of the exclusion process, the following are features of the process:

#### **Communication**

- Provides a translation service where necessary;
- Provides support to excluded customers through provision of materials from problem gambling counselling service providers and contact details; and
- For Self Exclusion, provides Questions and Answers in appropriate languages.

#### **Third parties and service providers**

- Emphasises culturally appropriate processes and, wherever possible and appropriate, encourages families and/or friends to accompany the customer;
- Encourages third party involvement i.e. that a mentor is nominated who can be contacted on the progress of the excluded customer and during any discussion relating to re-exclusion or re-entry;
- Encourages the excluded customer to nominate a counselling service; and
- Arranges for the counselling service to call the excluded customer, if the excluded customer agrees.

#### **Other measures**

- Provides an updated database that is accessible to Security and Gaming staff to ensure detection of customers breaching an exclusion order;
- Promotes ongoing dialogue with counselling service providers to continually improve the exclusion process;
- Provides the customer with an opportunity to immediately redeem all redeemable loyalty points for rewards and suspends sending all loyalty information to the customers;
- Requires timely action from staff if a customer approaches requesting Self Exclusion, with every endeavour made to ensure that approaches are responded to while the customer is on the premises or phone; and
- Provides opportunities for off-site Self Exclusion procedures e.g. Self Exclusion forms are held by problem gambling service providers and can be completed at home.

#### **Breaches**

SKYCITY staff are required to be vigilant for any excluded customer who attempts to re-enter gaming areas. SKYCITY Auckland Security and Gaming staff enforce the exclusion process and take action against those detected committing a breach of the exclusion process. Customers discovered attempting to do so may face a fine and/or prosecution. The Department of Internal Affairs is notified of all breaches by excluded customers.

The SKYCITY Auckland Host Responsibility team regularly reviews the exclusion process and when necessary, makes improvements, in alignment with Group policy. The reviews may involve seeking customer and staff feedback through informal research processes.

#### **Loyalty card holders**

SKYCITY Auckland must remove from its loyalty programme all excluded and trespassed customers and customers formally requested to leave the premises.

The SKYCITY Auckland Security staff member responsible for the administration of the exclusion and trespass records must:

- Advise Host Responsibility within 24 hours of a loyalty programme cardholder being excluded, trespassed or formally requested to leave the premises, to ensure their account is deactivated; and

- Forward any surrendered loyalty card(s) to the loyalty station.

Host Responsibility must:

- Deactivate Excluded cardholders' accounts
- Deactivate the accounts of cardholders who have been excluded, trespassed or formally requested to leave the premises; and
- Deactivate from mailing lists, cardholders who are excluded, trespassed, or formally requested to leave the premises.

Loyalty cards which are deactivated are not required to be returned by the customer to SKYCITY. Should a customer attempt to use his/her deactivated card, an error message will appear, asking the customer to present his/her card to a SKYCITY staff member. Having confirmed that the customer has been excluded, trespassed or formally requested to leave, the SKYCITY staff member will contact Security and appropriate action will be taken in relation to that customer.

## 2.1.2 Responsible service of alcohol

### Background

The SKYCITY Auckland Responsible Service of Alcohol Programme is designed to ensure customers enjoy an environment that is safe and enjoyable. A key component is the SKYCITY Auckland Responsible Service of Alcohol training programme, which is designed for all staff who work in areas where alcohol is served, to promote effective team work to ensure customers' safety and enjoyment.

SKYCITY's Responsible Service of Alcohol Programme is guided by the six key principles of Host Responsibility (Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, 2005) in licensed premises. A responsible host:

- Prevents intoxication;
- Does not serve alcohol to minors;
- Provides and actively promotes non-alcoholic alternatives;
- Provides and actively promotes substantial food;
- Serves alcohol responsibly or not at all; and
- Promotes safe transport options.

### Approach

The following is the SKYCITY Auckland programme regarding the responsible service of alcohol:

- SKYCITY Auckland provides the sale of alcoholic beverages in a responsible manner, including monitoring and limiting the supply of alcohol to customers.
- SKYCITY Auckland maintains an effective Responsible Service of Alcohol training programme to train and inform relevant employees on the responsible sale and supply of alcohol.
- All SKYCITY Auckland employees, temporary and contract staff complete the Responsible Service of Alcohol training programme during induction as part of the Host Responsibility Level 1 training programme, including recognition of excessive alcohol consumption traits<sup>1</sup>.
- SKYCITY Auckland takes all reasonable steps to ensure intoxicated persons are prevented from entering the premises.
- SKYCITY Auckland takes all reasonable steps to ensure that customers are not served to the point of intoxication. Any customer displaying signs of intoxication will be removed from the premises.
- Any customer who appears under the age of 25 is asked for verification of identity and proof of age, before being served or sold alcoholic beverages. If such identification cannot be produced, the customer is not served or supplied with any alcohol.
- Staff tactfully intervene to prevent possible problems arising from excessive alcohol consumption, including enlisting the services of staff of similar social/ethnic background to the customers to assist in explaining the programme to customers when required.
- No person who appears intoxicated is served or sold alcohol, allowed to gamble or allowed to remain on the premises. The decision by any employee to withhold service cannot be revoked or overruled by another, without referral to a more senior employee.
- At all times, when liquor is sold or supplied to members of the public, there is a manager or managers on duty who hold current General Manager's Certificates under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989.

---

<sup>1</sup> This provision includes those staff employed on a casual basis.

- When appropriate, SKYCITY Auckland controls the hours of service and locations from which beverages are served.
- No complimentary alcoholic drinks will be supplied to customers participating in gaming except at the discretion of a Gaming Supervisor or Host<sup>2</sup>. This is not intended to prohibit normal complimentary food and beverage service for customers, and does not require a customer to participate in gaming activity as a condition of service.
- Customers contracting to use any meeting room, banquet or out-catering facilities must agree to abide by the SKYCITY Auckland Responsible Service of Alcohol Programme and procedures regarding responsible service of alcohol.

---

<sup>2</sup> The discretion to serve drinks will only be exercised where the Gaming Supervisor or Host is satisfied that the customer is not intoxicated.

## 2.1.3 Unattended children

### **Background**

SKYCITY management does not allow children to be left unattended on any part of its premises.

### **Approach**

SKYCITY Auckland takes active steps to prevent children being without adult supervision.

Employees must report to Security any incident where it is apparent that a child has been left unattended.

Security Officers must intervene and take all practicable steps to locate an adult responsible for an unattended child.

Security must contact the Police and trespass the customer in every case where there is an absence of a reasonable explanation for the child being left unattended.

In all instances of unattended children, the Host Responsibility team must be notified as soon as practicable to follow up potential problem gambling issues.

Security Officers must patrol the SKYCITY Auckland car parks and environs to detect any unattended children in vehicles.

## 2.1.4 Underage persons

### **Background**

SKYCITY is committed to keeping minors out of the gambling area. SKYCITY will rigorously enforce the prevention of underage gambling in its casinos.

### **Approach**

SKYCITY Auckland must take all reasonable steps to restrict gambling activities only to those persons legally permitted by age to enter the gambling facilities (currently 20 and over).

Any customer who appears under the age of 25 is asked for verification of identity and proof of age before being permitted to enter the gambling area.

SKYCITY Auckland must take all reasonable steps to restrict access to 'supervised areas' only to those persons legally permitted by age to enter the area (currently 18 and over), unless accompanied by a parent or guardian.

Training for SKYCITY Auckland Security and Gaming staff must include the need to be particularly vigilant for the presence of underage persons.

Any SKYCITY Auckland staff member has the authority to approach suspected underage persons and seek identification for proof of age.

## 2.1.5 Standards of dress and behaviour

### **Background**

SKYCITY Auckland must provide a comfortable environment where customers are able to enjoy their surroundings without disruption from others who are inappropriately dressed or behave in an unacceptable manner.

### **Dress code**

SKYCITY Auckland requires a neat and tidy standard of dress. While it is difficult to be prescriptive about dress suitability, in normal circumstances the following are not permitted at SKYCITY Auckland's casino:

- torn clothes;
- gang patches or other insignias;
- track pants;
- dirty clothes or footwear; or
- hats or caps (unless for religious or medical reasons or for Texas Hold'em Poker).

### **Behavioural standards**

If a customer is detected:

- under the influence of alcohol;
- abusing or threatening staff or other customers;
- causing conflict with other customers or staff, or
- otherwise being unpleasant.

then SKYCITY Auckland staff must:

- take appropriate steps to stop the behaviour, or
- in appropriate circumstances, have the customer escorted from the premises.

Customers exhibiting undesirable behaviour may be trespassed or excluded.

## **2.1.6 Gambling limitation**

SKYCITY offers customers a voluntary Pre-Commitment system.

This system is available to all casino patrons and allows customers to voluntarily set limits on how much they spend and how long they play for on gaming machines.

Breaches of pre-commitment limits and multiple increases or disabling of pre-commitment limits are new general indicators.

Host responsibility staff will proactively encourage the use of this system, where appropriate, during interactions with patrons.

## **2.2 Host responsibility information for customers**

### **Customer information resources**

SKYCITY produces a range of host responsibility information resources for customers. Copies of all SKYCITY brochures and other host responsibility information resources are available and displayed where appropriate in SKYCITY Auckland's gambling areas.

This information is also supplemented and supported by the SKYCITY Auckland website ([www.skycityauckland.co.nz](http://www.skycityauckland.co.nz)) where electronic copies of the resources are made available. A copy of this Host Responsibility Programme is displayed on the SKYCITY Auckland website.

There is an ongoing process of review and development of resources for customers.

Information resources are translated into a variety of languages consistent with the cultural make-up of SKYCITY Auckland's customer base.

A summary of SKYCITY Auckland's host responsibility resources for customers is shown in Appendix A.

## 2.3 Employee gambling-related harm

### Introduction

SKYCITY is committed to developing an internal culture that proactively supports and promotes Host Responsibility.

### Background

SKYCITY undertakes a range of measures concerning the potential for employee gambling related harm that aim to:

- Prevent and minimise gambling-related harm amongst SKYCITY employees as a result of their own, or someone else's, gambling;
- Enhance the ability of SKYCITY staff to undertake effective Host Responsibility; and
- Contribute to the prevention and minimisation of gambling-related harm in the community.

These measures are intended to address the operator licence condition:

'24(f) assistance to casino employees with managing the potential for personal problem gambling.'

### Requirements

SKYCITY Auckland recognises that employee gambling-related harm is a sensitive issue. Accordingly, measures to promote awareness and encourage and support help-seeking will be discreet and interventions with SKYCITY staff kept confidential.

SKYCITY Auckland will undertake the following to provide assistance to casino employees with managing the potential for personal problem gambling:

### Information resources

- Develop supporting resources for staff that will be made available when required using appropriate channels, including:
  - a standardised gambling screen; and
  - self-help resources to assist with early self-identification and intervention;
- Include information about personal problem gambling and underlying risk factors (such as depression and alcoholism) in Host Responsibility training programmes and in the Workplace Support (employee assistance) programme; and
- Promote awareness about self-assessment and self-help resources, and encourage staff to use these resources themselves to assist with early identification and intervention.
- Promote information about personal problem gambling support services when staff approach the SKYCITY Connect Centre to participate in the Employee Assistance Programme, Employee Financial Assistance, and/or where appropriate where a staff member may be seeking assistance.

### Policies and procedures

- Prohibit staff from gambling at any SKYCITY owned or operated casino;
- Prohibit access to online gambling sites by staff while on SKYCITY premises, unless such access is required for genuine business reasons; and
- Identify high risk areas for staff and target with increased levels of information.

### Recruitment

- Assess all job applicants for evidence of problem gambling (via questions in job application forms);

- Decline applications from those who are identified as problem gamblers either through their screening results, or disclosure of relevant indicators (as set out in the SKYCITY Identification Policy) during the recruitment process and provide appropriate information, advice and assistance; and
- Respond to applicants identified as problem gamblers who are also customers in accordance with the Auckland Host Responsibility Programme.

#### **Support for staff**

- Provide assistance to staff who are experiencing gambling-related harm, including:
  - Identification;
  - Intervention;
  - Referral to confidential support through the Workplace Support Programme and/or a problem gambling treatment provider;
  - Confidentiality; and
  - Wherever possible, SKYCITY Auckland will involve problem gambling counsellors in staff induction training about the signs of problem gambling among staff and customers.

#### **Engagement**

- Work with class 4 organisations to maximise the effectiveness of their host responsibility programmes.

## 2.4 Stakeholder engagement

### Background

SKYCITY Auckland aims to maintain constructive relationships with members of the local community.

### Approach

SKYCITY Auckland will continue to facilitate opportunities for regular engagement to ensure local stakeholders:

- Understand and are aware of SKYCITY Auckland's Host Responsibility Programme;
- Are able to continue to raise and discuss operational issues in relation to Host Responsibility;
- Continue to have opportunities to provide input into SKYCITY Auckland's Host Responsibility Programme and harm prevention and minimisation initiatives; and
- Have opportunities to participate in partnership projects on key initiatives where appropriate.

SKYCITY convenes a bi-monthly Auckland Host Responsibility Community Liaison Group to discuss Host Responsibility issues. These issues primarily relate to operational processes e.g. referrals, exclusions etc. There are also opportunities to discuss strategic or broader sector issues.

Membership includes representatives from:

- Treatment service providers including problem gambling and alcohol and other drugs;
- Public health providers;
- Government agencies including the Police, Department of Internal Affairs and Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand (ALAC);
- Overseas student liaison groups;
- Budgeting services;
- Ethnic/migrant services; and
- Researchers.

In developing and implementing its Programme, and harm prevention and minimisation initiatives, SKYCITY will consider the views expressed by members of the Liaison Group.

SKYCITY will make available to the Liaison Group a copy of the report provided to the Commission under section 3 of this Programme.

SKYCITY also arranges site visits, including presentations, for representatives to become familiar with the SKYCITY Auckland Host Responsibility Programme. SKYCITY also undertakes off-site visits to stakeholder organisations.

SKYCITY develops Terms of Reference for Liaison Group meetings.

## 2.5 Environmental design

### Approach

SKYCITY's general approach towards environmental design is to ensure the provision of safe environments that are conducive to responsible gambling and consumption of alcohol.

### Considerations

In considering the impact of any proposed changes, the key objectives are to ensure that environmental features:

- Contribute to harm prevention or have a neutral impact on harm;
- Encourage responsible gambling and alcohol consumption choices;
- Do not contribute to the onset of harm or exacerbate risk; and
- Facilitate effective host responsibility, particularly early identification and intervention.

This approach applies to the following SKYCITY areas:

- Floor lay-out, furnishing and design;
- Casino electronic gaming machine and table game location;
- Access to cash;
- Game and equipment features;
- Environments adjacent to the gaming floor, including access to other entertainment options;
- Physical location and presence of Security and Host Responsibility;
- Location of information resources; and
- Access criteria, including dress codes and age restrictions.

### Requirements

SKYCITY shall in its environmental design seek to ensure:

- Problem/responsible gambling signage and exit points clearly are visible;
- Patrons are visible to venue staff on the gaming floor;
- Machine alleys with no exit point and in dimly lit corners are avoided;
- Gambling areas are well lit, utilising natural light where appropriate;
- Clocks are visible in the gambling areas; and
- Other non-gambling entertainment options are available.

### Other regulatory processes

All applications for construction or design changes to gambling areas must be approved by the Gambling Commission. As part of any such application, SKYCITY assesses any impacts the alterations may have on harm prevention and harm minimisation. The impact of any proposed design change on gambling harm is assessed in determining the suitability of any such proposal prior to making applications to the Commission.

## **2.6 Safe gambling environment – gaming machine play**

### **Requirements**

SKYCITY will take all reasonable and practicable steps to ensure a customer plays no more than one gaming machine at a time.

### **2.6.1 Safe gambling environment – third party loans for financial gain**

#### **Legislation**

Under section 15(1) of the Act, SKYCITY is prohibited from offering or providing credit intended for use in gambling, except in circumstances approved by the former Casino Control Authority (CCA) or the Gambling Commission. The Gambling Commission regulates and approves, as necessary, all cash access arrangements provided by SKYCITY at the Auckland casino.

#### **Policy**

SKYCITY does not permit loan transactions by third parties for financial gain at the casino venue, except as approved by the CCA or the Gambling Commission. It is particularly concerned to protect customers from illegal or oppressive loan activity, or “loan sharking” as it is known.

#### **Requirements**

- SKYCITY will ensure that signage is displayed in appropriate areas publicising that loan sharks will be excluded.
- SKYCITY will take all reasonable steps to identify and exclude persons at the casino offering loans for financial gain. To assist this process SKYCITY will maintain an Undesirable Behaviour Standard Operating Procedure which shall explain how SKYCITY will identify, investigate and respond to persons at the casino suspected of offering loans for financial gain.
- Where casino staff observe suspicious behaviour or information is presented from external parties regarding loan activity, SKYCITY will investigate and act in a timely manner. This process is outlined in the SKYCITY Auckland Undesirable Behaviour Standard Operating Procedure.
- If it is obvious that a person is engaged in offering or providing loans for financial gain, SKYCITY will issue that person with a trespass notice. If there is reasonable cause to believe that a person is engaged in offering or providing loans for financial gain, SKYCITY may issue that customer with a requirement to leave the premises, pending further investigation. At the completion of its investigation, and where a person is found to be offering loans for financial gain, SKYCITY will issue that person with a trespass notice.
- SKYCITY will notify Department of Internal Affairs Gambling Inspectors of suspected loan sharking activity in accordance with Minimum Operating Standards (MOS) for Records and Notification. Where appropriate, SKYCITY will also notify relevant agencies.
- Where a customer is established as receiving a loan for financial gain from a third party (ie, not the casino), SKYCITY will open a GOI file to investigate further. A customer borrowing money in these circumstances is considered a potential problem gambler and will be provided with appropriate information, advice and assistance including information on exclusion.

- Depending on the outcome of the GOI investigation, the customer may be issued with a SKYCITY Exclusion depending on whether the customer is identified as a problem gambler and unable to continue gambling without experiencing further harm.
- SKYCITY will provide appropriate staff training to assist in preventing and minimising harm associated with loan sharking.

## **2.6.2 Safe gambling environment – cheque retention**

### **Policy**

SKYCITY will when accepting cheques which it will hold unbanked by arrangement with a customer report this to Host Responsibility.

### **Requirements**

Host Responsibility staff will monitor and record the activities of any customer whose cheque it is holding unbanked by arrangement for indicators of potential gambling harm.

## 2.7 Responsible marketing

### Legislation and industry codes

SKYCITY's marketing activities comply with applicable laws, Regulations 9 and 10 of the Gambling (Harm Prevention and Minimisation) Regulations 2004, relevant industry codes (including the New Zealand Advertising Standards Authority "Code for Advertising Gaming and Gambling") and licence conditions.

### Requirements

SKYCITY Auckland will not pursue marketing initiatives which have any of the characteristics set out below. Where concerns are raised by third parties, SKYCITY will investigate and, where appropriate, take immediate action to withdraw or amend the marketing initiative.

SKYCITY Auckland will ensure an internal process is followed to ensure harm minimisation issues are considered and addressed in the development of marketing initiatives, including those directed to members of SKYCITY's loyalty programme.

This process includes consultation with Host Responsibility as well as the Regulatory team, with final sign-off by Legal (both of which are based at SKYCITY Auckland).

Consultation includes consideration of the following principles.

Does the marketing initiative:

- Target groups at increased risk of experiencing gambling harm?
- Target minors, portray minors participating in gambling activities, or advertise gambling on radio/television at times when minors are more likely to be exposed?
- Encourage or reinforce gambling behaviour(s) that may be associated with harm, including:
  - encourage customers to participate beyond their limits of time or money?
  - discourage customers from taking breaks?
  - promote gambling as a means of relieving financial or personal difficulties?
  - state or imply that gambling is a means of winning or paying for household staples, education or housing commitments?
  - promote excessive alcohol consumption or associate gambling with excessive alcohol consumption?
- Present gambling in an unrealistic, misleading, or deceptive way, including:
  - exaggerating the chances of winning or the size of the prize, including a promise of winning?
  - stating or implying that a player's skill can influence the outcome of a game unless the skill can affect the outcome of the game?
  - exploiting superstitions or concepts of luck?

## **2.8 Display of signage and provision of gaming information to customers**

### **Background**

A key component of the Programme is the provision of information for customers. Provision of information is intended to assist customers to make informed decisions about their gambling and alcohol consumption while at SKYCITY.

A description of how SKYCITY will discharge its obligations to offer information and advice to persons identified as problem gamblers is addressed in the Problem Gambler Identification Policy and the SOPs.

### **Approach**

SKYCITY has a range of information resources that are provided to customers, summarised in Appendix A.

### **Display of signs, brochures, clocks and website**

SKYCITY ensures that:

- Host Responsibility material is displayed prominently and translated into key languages, besides English, to reflect the ethnicity of SKYCITY Auckland visitors;
- Brochures are maintained in sufficient quantities so as to be generally available at all times, at all locations;
- All gaming machines and gaming tables at SKYCITY display problem gambling helpline telephone numbers, with information in a range of languages. The information is also displayed on or near all ATMs and public phones;
- Clocks are on display in all SKYCITY gambling areas; and
- Call Centre facilities include a direct line to the Gambling Helpline.

SKYCITY Auckland will make available a 'responsible gaming' brochure, intended to assist in reducing the tendency of patrons to be subject to erroneous beliefs, e.g. that the odds of winning are better than they are, that skill can influence outcomes (where it cannot), or player tendencies to engage in various superstitious practices.

SKYCITY actively promotes the Gambling Helpline and other free problem gambling counselling service contact details through its Host Responsibility resources. Customers demonstrating potentially harmful behaviour are encouraged to contact these services. All excluded customers, and third parties who contact SKYCITY about another's gambling problems, are actively encouraged to contact the appropriate services for help and support.

SKYCITY Entertainment Group has a Host Responsibility section on its website.

### **Display of game rules, permissible bets and payment of winning bets for table games**

Information is made available to customers that pertain to game rules, permissible bets and payment of winning bets as required by section 175 of the Act.

Whenever a table is open, information is displayed which advises customers that the game rules for the game are available upon request, and specifies minimum and maximum bets, and payments of winning bets. Signage is also displayed stating that staff cannot accept tips.

**Display of game rules, permissible bets and payment of winning bets for electronic gaming machines**

All gaming machines display information regarding the denomination of the game. Game rules are provided on the machine and/or electronically via the screen. Gaming machine odds are explained in the "Responsible Gaming" brochure, which is available on the gaming floor.

Customers may request a copy of game rules at any time. If the request is for general information or an overview of a game, the Area Manager will explain this and can provide a "How to Play" brochure.

**Display of game rules, odds of winning and information on problem gambling for Fun Play Tables**

Information is made available to customers that pertain to game rules, odds of winning and information on problem gambling.

Whenever a Fun Play table is open, information is displayed which advises customers that the game rules for the game are available upon request, and odds of winning and information on problem gambling.

**Display of host responsibility information in open areas where there are gaming machines**

Information on problem gambling and responsible gambling are displayed and made available to customers in open areas (e.g. decks) where gaming machines are present.

**Information requests by customers**

Customers wishing to seek further clarification of game rules will be given access to the relevant approved rules.

**Information on gambling activity**

Patrons (both loyalty and non-loyalty) can be provided, on request, with information on their gambling activity, including the number and length of their gambling sessions and their gambling expenditure.

## 2.9 Learning and development

### Introduction

SKYCITY Auckland is committed to developing staff awareness, understanding and commitment to Host Responsibility especially with respect to gambling and alcohol-related harm. SKYCITY Auckland shall comply with its statutory obligations relating to problem gambling awareness training, including as set out in Regulation 12 of the Gambling (Harm Prevention and Minimisation) Regulations 2004.

SKYCITY Auckland will aim to ensure its learning and development initiatives are appropriate to the needs of its customers and staff.

SKYCITY's learning and development resources approach employs established models of best-practice and include a training mix of classroom based, multi-media and on-the-job coaching. Learning and development resources are tailored depending on the roles and responsibilities of staff, and their required host responsibility customer interactions.

### Overview of staff roles

**Staff:** All staff, regardless of position, are trained to identify indicators of harm. Staff are expected to refer the observation of indicators to a supervisor/manager.

**Frontline staff:** All staff who have contact with gambling customers in the casino are required to be trained in problem gambling awareness and how to approach customers to offer information and assistance about problem gambling. Frontline staff have a primary role in being alert to and identifying indicators of harm, and will report observations of concern to a supervisor/manager. While it is not their primary role, frontline staff are trained and will approach customers themselves in circumstances, for example, where a matter is urgent or a manager/supervisor is not available.

**Supervisor or manager:** The supervisor/manager is the first point of contact for escalation for indicators of harm. Depending on the circumstances, the supervisor/manager delivers interventions by providing information, advice and assistance to customers and taking other appropriate action(s) to minimise harm.

Supervisors and managers are also responsible for ensuring that all observations of indicators reported to them by staff, and follow up responses taken by staff and/or supervisors and managers, are logged and sent to Host Responsibility. Supervisors and managers are also responsible for providing additional information to Host Responsibility to assist with the ongoing monitoring of, and interaction with, the customer.

**Host Responsibility:** Host Responsibility record, collate and analyse all information relating to indicators of problem gambling noted by frontline staff, supervisors and managers. They also record interactions and interventions they undertake themselves. The information is used to undertake a section 309 assessment. As a result of the assessment, a GOI file may be opened, and/or appropriate follow up interactions or interventions undertaken by frontline staff, managers or supervisors or by Host Responsibility staff. This may include meeting with customers. Host Responsibility staff are responsible for the ongoing monitoring and management of GOI files, feedback and review of new information on GOI files and the provision of host responsibility advice and support to staff.

### Learning and development requirements

### **Induction training (Level 1)**

All permanent staff, whether or not in direct contact with customers, will complete the three compliance e-learning modules within one month of commencement of employment. Access to the modules is available to new employees before they start work as soon as they are assigned an employee number.

The three compliance modules are:

- Play Safe – Health and Safety;
- Responsible Service of Alcohol; and
- Responsible Gaming, which includes:
  - Responsible service of gambling and alcohol;
  - Identification of problem gamblers;
  - Reporting and recording procedures for observations;
  - Approaching and providing information about problem gambling to players; and
  - Awareness of employee gambling-related harm.

For all staff in direct contact with customers, SKYCITY will work to supplement this e-learning based training by ensuring that these staff also complete a self-guided workbook with a practical component to be completed within two months of initial classroom based training. Follow up recall testing will be undertaken within 6-8 weeks of completing the workbook. There will also be refresher training as noted below.

Training for staff in direct contact with customers will be further supplemented by on-the-job coaching and support.

Further Responsible Service of Alcohol training (2 hours) is provided to staff employed in positions associated with the following departments:

- Gaming;
- Food & Beverage; and
- Security & Surveillance.

Within the first month of working at SKYCITY, employees are encouraged to complete a four hour classroom session which refreshes the compliance information from the e-learning modules and also covers general policies and procedures, and an orientation to SKYCITY.

### **Training for supervisors (Level 2)**

Supervisors from Gaming, Food & Beverage, and Security & Surveillance must participate in supplementary Level 2 training (four hours). This training is classroom based and is run bi-monthly or as necessary. The training includes information on:

- Identification of problem gamblers;
- Overview of the legal framework and Host Responsibility Programme;
- Initial action with respect to customers requesting problem gambling assistance;
- Identification and intervention with respect to excessive alcohol consumption;
- Support of staff who have intervened and debrief; and
- Importance of reporting.

### **Advanced training (Level 3)**

Advanced training (eight hours), supplementary to induction training, is provided for selected senior employees who may be expected to deliver interventions to customers. For frontline staff, this includes some supervisors and all managers. It also involves other

senior employees throughout the Auckland business who might be expected to deliver interventions to customers.

This training includes both theoretical and practical components. The training includes:

- SKYCITY's legal and regulatory requirements;
- Identification of problem gamblers;
- Intervention including brief interventions, de-escalation and motivational interviewing;
- Debriefing and staff support;
- Problem gambling treatment processes;
- Cultural awareness;
- Advanced Responsible Service of Alcohol – intervention and slowing service; and
- Awareness of employee gambling-related harm.

### **Refresher training**

SKYCITY Auckland provides department-based/site-wide refresher training on an ongoing basis. Refresher training is available to all staff at SKYCITY. Refresher training is provided when a learning and development need is identified or requested, and for those who fail knowledge recall tests.

### **General Manager training – Sale of Liquor Act**

The Licence Controller Qualification, as required by the Sale of Liquor Act, is facilitated through an external provider.

### **External operators training**

SKYCITY Auckland will offer external operators (e.g. TAB, BNZ) providing customer services at SKYCITY Auckland, the opportunity to participate in training, where appropriate.

### **Suicide-awareness Training**

Host Responsibility staff and senior Security Managers are trained to respond to customers who are at risk of suicide. This training is facilitated through an external provider.

### **Informal learning and development**

As learning and development is an ongoing process, SKYCITY provides a range of other opportunities for host responsibility learning to occur. There is an emphasis on sharing information and experiences across SKYCITY's portfolio to build host responsibility knowledge. These internal opportunities include:

- Internal communications e.g. staff newsletters;
- Inclusion in business or management processes e.g. staff meetings and key performance indicators;
- Discussion forums led by Harm Minimisation and Host Responsibility staff; and
- Participation by staff in Harm Minimisation and Host Responsibility policy development processes.

### **Evaluation**

SKYCITY undertakes a range of evaluation measures as part of its commitment to learning and development quality improvement. These measures include:

- Staff training feedback and evaluation forms;
- Staff knowledge recall and application of knowledge;
- Staff focus groups; and
- Analysis of training needs.

## 2.10 Identification of problem gamblers

A copy of SKYCITY's Problem Gambler Identification Policy is attached as Appendix B and forms part of this Programme. The policy fulfils SKYCITY's obligations under the following sections of the Act:

Section 308 requires that the holder of a casino operator's licence, or person acting on behalf of that person, must have a policy for identifying problem gamblers, which includes:

- an acceptable definition of problem gambling;
- indicators of problem gambling in the casino; and
- the steps to be taken in identifying actual or potential problem gamblers.

This policy must be made available upon request. SKYCITY must take all reasonable steps to use the policy to identify actual or potential problem gamblers.

Section 309 requires that the holder of a casino operator's licence, or person acting on behalf of that person, must, after identifying a person who he or she has reasonable grounds to believe is a problem gambler, approach the person and offer information or advice to the person about problem gambling.

The information or advice offered must include a description of:

- (a) The self-exclusion procedure available; and
- (b) Any procedures described by Regulations made under the Act.

## 3.0 Monitoring and reporting

### Introduction

SKYCITY will evaluate its performance against the objectives of the Programme.

The Auckland Host Responsibility Programme is measured and monitored using a range of indicators that are set out below. These indicators reflect the level of activity under the Programme, compliance with legal obligations, and progress against all the Programme objectives as set out in section 1.

As the Programme is implemented and embedded into the business, and any initiatives are developed, SKYCITY Auckland may seek to amend this section of the Programme, prior to the Commission's next two-yearly review.

### Reports to the Gambling Commission

SKYCITY will report annually to the Commission on the implementation of the Programme.

Reports will include the following information:

- A description of the resources put into the core elements of the Programme;
- A description of activities undertaken by SKYCITY under the Programme;
- Reporting against the measures specified below, including a comparison to previous data where applicable;
- SKYCITY discussion on the effectiveness of the Programme and the extent to which Programme objectives in section 1 are being achieved. This will include reference to feedback from internal and external stakeholders received through a range of forums such as regular meetings with the Department of Internal Affairs and other meetings held as required; and
- Proposed improvements to the Programme.

| <b>Gambling Related Measures</b>  | <b>Source of data</b> | <b>Frequency</b> |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customers about whom there have been observations.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of observed indicators reported to Host Responsibility.</li> </ul>  |                       |                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of approaches to SKYCITY by third parties.</li> </ul>   | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of problem gamblers identified (in the first instance) by requests for exclusion or forthright disclosure, compared to number of problem gamblers identified by the casino.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of Gambler of Interest (GOI) files by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethnicity</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Age</li> <li>Preferred mode of gambling.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of approaches to customers to offer information about self-exclusion.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of exclusions (both casino and self-exclusions) by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethnicity</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Age</li> <li>Preferred mode of gambling (tables/EGMs)</li> <li>Prompted by third party disclosures</li> <li>Exclusion type (self/SKYCITY)</li> <li>Following re-entry.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customers participating in Limitation programme.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY               | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of excluded customers (both casino and self-exclusions) agreeing to be contacted by help services on exclusion form.</li> </ul>   | SKYCITY               | Annual           |

|  |                                    |                  |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of breaches of exclusion (both casino and self-exclusions) by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethnicity</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Age</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of exclusions by length: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 months</li> <li>6 months</li> <li>9 months</li> <li>12 months</li> <li>24 months</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of successful and unsuccessful applications to re-enter following exclusion.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which customers have been assisted (drawing, inter alia, on feedback from customers and staff).</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of persons trespassed or required to leave for making loans for financial gain.</li> </ul>   | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <b>Measures relating to Responsible Consumption of Alcohol</b>   |                                    |                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of "Under the Influence" (UTI) incidents (internal report).</li> </ul>   | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of Police contacts citing SKYCITY as venue where their last drink was served.</li> </ul>   | Police Alcolink database           | Annual           |
| <b>Measures relating to Staff Training</b>   |                                    |                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HR1 courses</li> <li>HR2 courses</li> <li>HR3 courses</li> <li>Refresher training</li> <li>Number of staff who need to be trained in each category, and proportion of those staff who have completed the appropriate level training.</li> </ul> | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff recall of knowledge and behaviours related to Host Responsibility and associated policies and procedures.</li> </ul>  | L&D Evaluations<br>Mystery Shopper | Annual<br>Annual |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff perceptions of the effectiveness of training.</li> </ul>  | L&D Evaluations                    | Annual           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff perceptions on the effectiveness of the Employee Gambling Harm Programme, reporting to the Commission to include percentage response rate of staff to the SKYCITY survey.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY commissioned survey        | Annual           |
| <b>Other Programme activity and compliance-related measures</b>  |                                    |                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of internal and external underage incidents.</li> </ul>  | SKYCITY                            | Annual           |

|   |         |        |
|---|---------|--------|
| • Number of unattended children.                    | SKYCITY | Annual |
| • Number of Requests to Leave the Premises (RTLPs). | SKYCITY | Annual |

## **Appendix A – Current Host Responsibility Resources for Customers (as at August 2013)**

---

**“Being A Responsible Host: Our Commitment To Our Customers”** – poster  
SKYCITY developed and displays the A3 “Being a Responsible Host” poster in key gaming areas. The customer-focused poster is designed to provide an overview of SKYCITY’s Host Responsibility Policy and the key initiatives undertaken.

**“Would you like a Helping Hand?”** – brochure  
SKYCITY provides “Would you like a Helping Hand” - brochures in 12 different languages: Chinese, English, Korean, Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Thai, Hindi, Arabic, Farsi, Japanese and Khmer. The brochure provides the gambling helpline information and signs and symptoms of problem gambling. It also outlines other free problem gambling counselling services.

**“Would you like a Helping Hand?”** - poster  
In supplementing the “Would you like a Helping Hand” – brochure, SKYCITY also produces an A1 poster version. The poster provides the gambling helpline number and is displayed in various places across gambling areas including some customer restrooms.

**“Would you like a Helping Hand?”** - wallet card  
This pocket size card also supplements the brochure and presents the gambling helpline number and other free problem gambling counselling service contact numbers. Available in Chinese, English, Tongan and Samoan.

**“Responsible gaming?”** – brochure  
This brochure provides responsible gambling tips and an overview of the odds of winning and player returns and highlights that casino games are based on chance and randomness. It also provides Gambling Helpline and SKYCITY Host Responsibility contact details. Available in Chinese and English.

**“Self-Exclusion at SKYCITY”** – brochure  
The brochure outlines the self-identified exclusion process. It provides simple information on frequently asked questions and shows Gambling Helpline and SKYCITY Host Responsibility contact details. The “Self-Exclusion at SKYCITY” brochure is available in 12 different languages: Chinese, English, Korean, Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Thai, Hindi, Arabic, Farsi, Japanese and Khmer.

**“Concerned About Someone’s Gambling? SKYCITY Can Help”** – brochure  
The brochure outlines the SKYCITY (third party) exclusion process. It provides simple information on frequently asked questions and shows Gambling Helpline and SKYCITY Host Responsibility contact details. The “Concerned About Someone’s Gambling? SKYCITY Can Help” brochure is available in 12 different languages: Chinese, English, Korean, Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Thai, Hindi, Arabic, Farsi, Japanese and Khmer.

**“Why We Can’t Serve You”** – tent card  
This card provides a summary of the SKYCITY Responsible Service of Alcohol Policy. The tent card is provided to all staff to show to customers when explaining decisions regarding service of alcohol, including the slowing or stopping of service.

**“SKYCITY Auckland Dress Code”** – brochure  
This brochure explains the casino’s policy regarding acceptable standards of dress.

**“Children at SKYCITY” - brochure**

The brochure explains New Zealand law and SKYCITY's policy with respect to unattended children. It is available in Chinese, English and Hindi.

## Appendix B



# Host Responsibility

# PROBLEM GAMBLER IDENTIFICATION POLICY

(Gambling Act 2003, sections 308-311)

## **Problem Gambler Identification Policy**

References: Gambling Act 2003 ("Act"), sections 308, 309, 310 & 311

### **Objective**

The Problem Gambler Identification Policy ("Policy") has been developed pursuant to the Act to enable SKYCITY to take all reasonable steps to identify actual or potential problem gamblers and to act on that information.

### **Statutory Requirements**

Section 308 of the Act requires the holder of a casino operator's licence who is conducting casino gambling to develop a policy for identifying problem gamblers. This Problem Gambler Identification Policy ("Policy") has been developed by SKYCITY pursuant to section 308(1). Using this Policy, all reasonable steps must be taken to identify actual or potential problem gamblers.

Section 309 of the Act requires that the holder of a casino operator's licence, or person acting on behalf of the licence holder, must, after identifying a person who he or she has reasonable grounds to believe is a problem gambler, approach the person and offer information or advice to the person about problem gambling.

The information or advice offered must include a description of:

- (a) the self-exclusion procedure available; and
- (b) any procedures prescribed by Regulations made under the Act.

After offering information or advice, the holder of a casino operator's licence may issue an exclusion order to the person that prohibits the person from entering the gambling area of the casino venue for a period of up to two years.

Section 310 of the Act requires that the holder of a casino operator's licence, or person acting on their behalf, must promptly, after being requested, issue an exclusion order to a person that prohibits the person from entering the gambling area of the casino venue for a period of up to two years if the person:

- (a) has identified himself or herself as a problem gambler; and
- (b) has made a request to prohibit themselves from entering the venue concerned.

Section 311 of the Act requires that the holder of a casino operator's licence, or person acting on behalf of, must remove any person who enters the gambling area of a casino venue in breach of an exclusion order.

### **Scope of SKYCITY Problem Gambler Identification Policy**

This Policy describes:

- The legal definition of a problem gambler;
- Indicators of problem gambling;
- A description of sources of indicator data to be used by SKYCITY;
- A description of how indicator data is to be used by SKYCITY to identify problem gamblers; and

- An outline of record keeping requirements and review of the Policy.

The Policy applies to SKYCITY Auckland only.

### **Supporting Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)**

The following SOPs provide operational guidelines relevant to the Policy:

- Information Collection and Collation;
- Analysis and Intervention; and
- Exclusion.

## Section One – Definition of a problem gambler

Under the Act, a problem gambler is “a person whose gambling causes harm or may cause harm”.

“Harm” is defined as:

- “(a) harm or distress of any kind arising from, or caused or exacerbated by, a person’s gambling; and
- (b) includes personal, social or economic harm suffered:
  - (i) by the person; or
  - (ii) the person’s spouse, partner, family, whanau, or wider community; or
  - (iii) in the workplace; or
  - (iv) by society at large.”

## Section Two - Indicators of problem gambling

### Introduction

SKYCITY uses a number of indicators to assess whether a customer is likely to be a problem gambler. Although these indicators provide an appropriate basis for making determinations as to whether someone is a problem gambler, the nature and range of indicators may vary from one customer to the next. Wherever possible, indicator information should be interpreted in the context of other relevant information to develop an overall assessment of the customer's position.

Based on research and evidence, SKYCITY has developed a list of visible signs and behaviours that may be indicators of gambling-related harm. Some of these can be considered "high confidence" or "strong indicators".

"*Strong indicators*" are those where the presentation of even one or two indicators is usually sufficient to identify the person as a problem gambler.

Other indicators referred to as "*general indicators*" are behaviours which may be observed in a range of gamblers, but occur more frequently amongst problem gamblers. They are warning signs that may, or may not, indicate a problem if only one or two factors are observed in isolation, but which become indicative when a greater number of signs are observed together or across time.

Problem gamblers can be identified by inferring that harm is present or may occur using the indicators set out below. They can also be identified on the basis of information from customers or persons affected by a customer's gambling behaviour. Customers (and affected persons) may directly disclose that the customer is experiencing problems with gambling or requires assistance (eg, they want to self-exclude), or do so indirectly.

### INDICATORS

#### ***Strong Indicators***

- Requests to self-exclude;
- Self-identified problem gambler;
- Self-disclosures that may or may not make reference to the person's gambling;
- Third-party disclosures that may or may not make reference to the person's gambling; or
- Severe emotional distress due to gambling, including expression of suicidal thoughts.

#### ***General indicators***

##### *Intensity and Frequency of Play*

- Very high visitation frequency (for example, 5 times per week up to daily) combined with high levels of expenditure on gaming machines (for example, \$250+ lost per session) over a period of time (for example, 1 month);
- High visitation frequency (for example 2 times per week or more), combined with very high levels of expenditure on gaming machines (for example, \$400+ lost per session) over a period of time (for example, 1 month);
- High visitation frequency combined with very high levels of expenditure on all forms of gambling, including table games, over a period of time;
- Very few breaks from gambling – almost continuous play;

- Increasing periods of play, and betting more each time, noted over a period of time (noting that gambling expenditure may reduce as the customer's financial resources are exhausted);
- Disconnect with time spent playing, including missing key times (eg, meals), rushing when leaving machine or staying after friends/family leave;
- Extreme changes in patterns of play; or
- Breaching pre-commitment limits and/or multiple increases or disabling of pre-commitment limits.

#### *Visible Emotional Disturbance*

- Emotional distress including agitation, mood swings, crying, holding head in hands, or out-of-character behaviour;
- Personalising machines, including abuse of machines;
- Irritated by interruptions to gambling;
- Rudeness and complaints to staff about gambling outcomes; or
- Possessiveness of particular machines or spots at tables (eg, standing over other patrons, hovering, aggression).

#### *Dysfunction in Social Behaviour*

- Attempts to conceal gambling activities, including making phone calls giving excuses for lateness;
- Steps apparently taken to avoid monitoring of gambling activity, such as ceasing to use a loyalty card;
- Not celebrating wins;
- Disintegration of physical appearance (eg, clothing or personal hygiene) over time;
- Family/friends seeking out or enquiring about a customer;
- Falling asleep at a machine or table;
- Claims of malfunction of gaming machines or gaming errors;
- High consumption of alcohol while gambling (eg, demanding drinks);
- Interaction with a known or suspected loan shark;
- Unattended children;
- Breach of an Agreed Limitation agreement; or
- Previous breach-history of barrings or exclusion orders.

#### *Excessive Access to Money*

- Leaving the casino to get additional money and coming back after having appeared to have run out of money;
- Repeated ATM visits and/or multiple declined transactions;
- Borrowing money, including begging;
- Not having sufficient money to exit car park;
- Constant demand for compliments; or
- Tray-surfing.

### **Expenditure and Frequency of Play**

Both expenditure and frequency of play, especially on gaming machines, are currently included as general indicators, rather than as strong indicators, because it is recognised that not all customers who exhibit high expenditure levels and frequent visitation are necessarily problem gamblers. However, such indicators are much more likely to be observed amongst problem gamblers than others and therefore may indicate a greater risk of gambling related harm. It is established from international research that problem gamblers are more likely than other players to lose control of their expenditure, to chase their losses, and to have very strong urges to gamble. Most studies of problem gambling have found that problem

gamblers spend significantly more, and gamble significantly more frequently than other players.

Frequency and expenditure data are especially important as indicators in the case of users of gaming machines for several reasons:

- It is easier for people to gamble without being noticed because gaming machine gambling involves very little interaction with casino staff, compared to table games, making it less likely that their behaviour and emotional reactions will be observed;
- There is a stronger relationship between problem gambling and play on gaming machines than with other forms of casino gambling;
- Electronic data gathering from gaming machines is more accurate than from table games.

#### **Other Observations**

The indicators listed above are not exclusive – staff are encouraged to report observations of customers based on other factors which raise concerns.

## Section Three – Sources of Indicator Data

The indicators described in Section 2 may emerge from the five principal sources of information SKYCITY collects, collates and analyses. Information sources include:

- customer disclosures;
- behavioural observations;
- customer data including loyalty;
- third-party disclosures; and
- interviews with customers or staff.

All information on customers collated from the sources described below is recorded as soon as practicable into iTrak, SKYCITY's incident reporting and retrieval database.

iTrak centralises information from multiple business sources (Security, Surveillance, Host Responsibility and Gaming) which can be shared, when appropriate, across the SKYCITY Group.

Host Responsibility use iTrak to record, manage, review and assess all information about all customers on the database, including gamblers of interest and excluded or banned customers.

### **CUSTOMER DISCLOSURES**

Customer disclosures may or may not make reference to the person's gambling (ie, they may be direct or indirect).

#### **Direct disclosures**

Direct disclosures make reference to a customer's gambling and examples may include any of the following:

- I think I have a gambling problem;
- I want to be excluded/barred; or
- I don't want to come here anymore.

#### **Indirect disclosures**

Indirect disclosures do not make reference to a customer's gambling and examples may include any of the following:

- Comments regarding impact on personal life;
- Voicing repeated attempts to stop or control gambling;
- Comments regarding psychological distress; or
- Comments regarding financial distress.

The significance of indirect disclosures should be determined by the nature of the disclosure. Indirect disclosures referring to harm, financial difficulties or loss of control would lead to a high suspicion that the person was experiencing, or at risk of experiencing, harm associated with their gambling.

Direct and indirect disclosures from customers must be recorded and sent to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable to be used in making problem gambling assessments.

## **BEHAVIOURAL OBSERVATIONS**

Although staff cannot be expected to watch all customers on all occasions, the process of observation and identification is enhanced by the fact that one may observe a clustering of indicators. Those customers who present with strong indicators, or who produce several common indicators, may produce many more. In effect, problem gamblers may draw attention to themselves through observable behaviour. Staff should use this information to focus their observations to particular customers.

At the same time, there will be customers where the problematic behaviour may be 'silent' or hidden. Some patrons may gamble very frequently, spend very large amounts of money, but not produce any obvious emotional responses or other indicators to draw attention to themselves. For this reason, staff should remain vigilant to the presence of people who spend many hours in the casino, and who visit very frequently. In such cases, staff should be vigilant for additional indicators of harm. As noted below, frequency of gambling and level of expenditure are indicators in their own right, and also ways of identifying people who require additional observation.

Staff who observe the indicators specified in Section 2 must report the observation to the appropriate supervisor/manager. All observations of indicators reported to them by staff and any follow up responses taken by staff and/or supervisors/managers must be logged into iTrak by the supervisor/manager so as to make the record of the disclosure or observation available to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable. The reported disclosures and observations form part of the body of information upon which assessments of problem gambling are to be made.

## **CUSTOMER DATA INCLUDING LOYALTY**

High levels of frequency and expenditure are indicators (see Section 2). SKYCITY will monitor the amount of money and time spent over time proactively using the loyalty programme. Although high levels of expenditure and visitation are listed as general indicators, it is important that SKYCITY take steps (where it has concerns about a player's expenditure or visitation frequency) to obtain additional information that places this behaviour into context. For example, through discussions with the customer or other parties, there may be direct or indirect disclosures concerning the lack of affordability of the gambling. Alternatively, staff might find that some players who spend very large amounts appear to be chasing their losses, or are making very frequent use of ATMs, or are leaving the casino and then returning with additional money. SKYCITY may also make enquiries about the affordability of losses.

In addition, where a customer is brought to the attention of Host Responsibility by disclosure or observation, SKYCITY must ascertain whether the customer is a loyalty member. Where the customer is a member of the loyalty programme, SKYCITY will examine their data to determine:

- Their time of play;
- Duration of play;
- Turnover;
- Win/Loss;
- Patterns of expenditure (for example, increase over time);
- Games played;
- Tier upgrades;
- Non-gaming use of card (eg, car park use); and

- Visitation frequency.

### **THIRD PARTY DISCLOSURES**

Information concerning gambling-related harm may also be obtained via third-parties. This might include:

- an enquiry from a concerned family/whanau member; or
- a formal enquiry about the potential problem gambler from the wider community, (eg, probation officer, general practitioner or employer).

A third party may only seek general information about a customer, and will not always voluntarily identify gambling as the cause of their concerns about a customer (eg, who may be a friend or relative of the inquirer). Where a third party appears to express general concern about a customer, staff must ask if there are concerns that the customer's gambling may be causing problems. Where there is a positive response to this question, this must be recorded in iTrak and made available to Host Responsibility. Details must be taken, including contact details and a brief summary of concerns. An attempt to identify the customer within the venue (eg, via Loyalty card use, if available or feasible) should be undertaken. If found, further enquiry must be undertaken and the customer may be requested to leave the premises for a period of time. If requested to leave, SKYCITY must also provide to the customer problem gambler information, including exclusion options. The action must be logged in iTrak and made available to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable.

A third party request that the customer at the casino be removed immediately because of concerns about the customer's gambling is a strong indicator of harm, and should be treated on an urgent basis. The third party must be referred immediately to Host Responsibility or Security. Details must be taken, including contact details and a brief summary of concerns. An attempt to identify the customer within the venue (eg, via loyalty card use, if available or feasible) should be undertaken. If found, further enquiry must be undertaken and the customer may be requested to leave the premises for a period of time. If requested to leave, SKYCITY must also provide to the customer problem gambler information, including exclusion options. The action must be logged in iTrak and made available to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable.

All third party information should be corroborated as part of an internal investigation. The Exclusion Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) outlines the specific steps taken by SKYCITY Auckland in corroborating information.

### **INTERVIEWS WITH CUSTOMERS OR STAFF**

From time-to-time, Host Responsibility or other appropriate staff may interview either customers or staff as part of an investigation.

**Customer interviews:** During the course of an interview, information may be disclosed by a customer that suggests that he/she may be experiencing harm or gambling in a way that may cause harm. All such information must be recorded into iTrak and made available to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable.

**Staff interviews:** During the course of an interview, information may be disclosed by staff that suggests a customer may be experiencing harm or gambling in a way that may cause harm. This information must be recorded in iTrak and made available to Host Responsibility as soon as practicable.

## **Section Four - Identification**

Section 2 highlights the indicators that are taken into account in identifying whether a customer may be an actual or potential problem gambler.

Section 3 identifies the primary sources of information available to identify problem gamblers. It also describes the ways in which this information might be utilised and consolidated so as to assist in the identification process.

SKYCITY must use data from the sources identified in Section 3 to identify customers who are actual or potential problem gamblers, ie where their gambling is causing harm, or may cause harm, to the customer or others. Once identified, SKYCITY will determine, based on direct information or inference (using indicators) whether it has reasonable cause to believe that the customer is or has been gambling in a manner that has caused harm or may cause harm.

Depending on the assessment, including the perceived severity and urgency of a situation, SKYCITY provides graduated responses ranging from immediate intervention, advice and discussion to ongoing monitoring. If there is reasonable cause to believe that a customer is a problem gambler, SKYCITY's legal obligations under sections 309-311 of the Act are engaged immediately.

### **Obligation to Identify**

The assessment by SKYCITY, whether there is reasonable cause to believe that a customer is a problem gambler, must be made in good faith, in accordance with the statutory test and within a reasonable timeframe.

### **Analysis of Information**

As outlined in Section 5, all disclosures or observations related to indicators of harm noted by staff are reported to, and recorded by, the supervisor or manager and made available to Host Responsibility.

When a disclosure or observation report is made available to Host Responsibility, Host Responsibility must collate and review all information available to it in relation to the relevant customer. This includes a review of incident reporting and loyalty databases and other relevant internal information sources. Host Responsibility may also make further enquiries of relevant staff in relation to that customer.

Host Responsibility undertakes a section 309 assessment based on the information collated.

A variety of different types of information is used when undertaking a section 309 assessment, taking into account:

- Severity of presenting indicators;
- Anti-social behaviour including uncharacteristic or unusual behaviour;
- Uncharacteristic changes in appearance;
- Changes in patterns of play; and
- Number of indicators and repetition over time.

## **Identification**

### *Strong indicators*

Direct disclosures by customers are expected to result in an immediate assessment that a customer is a problem gambler, with SKYCITY taking the required steps in response promptly.

The presence of any strong indicator should be sufficient to indicate that the customer is very likely to be a problem gambler unless another more likely explanation is established.

For instance, although emotional distress may be a reliable and valid indicator of gambling-related harm, not all people who appear distressed will necessarily feel this way because of gambling. Therefore, if this strong indicator is evident, it would be appropriate to interpret the person's behaviour in the context of other indicators. For example, is the person gambling large amounts of money for long periods and displaying other signs of gambling-related harm? If a person only appears distressed, such people should be approached initially on the assumption that they require general assistance, but not necessarily because their gambling is a problem.

### *General indicators*

The observation of small clusters of general indicators should be sufficient to trigger further monitoring but, depending on the circumstances, may not necessarily lead to an immediate assessment that the customer is a problem gambler. As part of a graduated response, it is expected that such people should be subject to further monitoring to determine whether any further general indicators emerge, including the repetition of the same indicators. If there is an accumulation of general indicators over a period of time (eg, several general indicators recur during a one month period) SKYCITY would have reasonable grounds to consider such people to be problem gamblers.

## **Consequences of Identification**

Once identified as a problem gambler, SKYCITY must as required in section 309 of the Act, offer assistance and information to the customer about problem gambling within a reasonable time of identification, taking into account the urgency of the situation and the risk of harm. As set out in section 309 of the Act, the information or advice provided must include a description of self exclusion procedures.

## Section Five – Record keeping

### Recording, collation and analysis of information

Host Responsibility is responsible for the collation, analysis and electronic records of all information relating to indicators of harm. Host Responsibility also keep records of observations noted by frontline staff, supervisors and managers and of all direct and third party disclosures, interactions and interventions undertaken in relation to a customer by frontline staff, supervisors and managers.

Host Responsibility also record the problem gambler assessment referred to in Section 4 above, and the outcome of that assessment.

As outlined in Section 3, all information collated by SKYCITY in relation to a customer is recorded as soon as practicable into iTrak.

Host Responsibility uses iTrak to manage, monitor, review and assess information about all customers on the iTrak database, including gamblers of interest and excluded or banned customers.

### GOI files

A key purpose of a GOI file is to institute a formal monitoring process in relation to a customer. A GOI file is opened by Host Responsibility:

- in circumstances where a customer has come to the attention of Host Responsibility for monitoring;
- a third party disclosure is made in relation to a customer's gambling; or
- a customer returns from exclusion having fulfilled the re-entry criteria.

SKYCITY may also open a GOI file in other circumstances, as may be appropriate, including where:

- Information is requested or presented from government agencies; or
- Suspected or actual undesirable activity is present, including unattended children, unaccompanied minors, breaches of trespass orders.

Once opened, all available customer data to assist the assessment of whether a customer is a problem gambler must be obtained and placed on the file. In the case of customers who come to attention as a result of expenditure and visitation frequency, a GOI file must be open so that further information and observations can be recorded for assessment.

SKYCITY will regularly review GOI files at a minimum, at the following intervals and more often as required:

- Monthly review for the duration of the investigation; and
- Formal 12 week review.

Whenever new information becomes available or is obtained, a problem gambling re-assessment must be undertaken. If an assessment is made that the customer is not a problem gambler after the 12 week review period, the GOI file is deactivated. If concerns remain, the file will be left open and reviewed on a regular basis.

All deactivated GOI files will be retained by SKYCITY. A GOI file may be reactivated at any stage subsequent to the 12 week review period if further information or indicators in relation to a customer emerge. In this case, a problem gambling reassessment will be undertaken, and monitoring may continue.

## **Section Six – Review**

The Problem Gambler Identification Policy will be measured and monitored as part of the Auckland Host Responsibility Programme.

Where new evidence emerges in relation to indicators of harm and identification of problem gamblers, SKYCITY will review its Problem Gambler Identification Policy accordingly.