Gaming Machine Harm Minimisation Measures Consultation Paper
Response Form

Interested persons and organisations can make a submission on the issues raised in the Gaming Machine Harm Minimisation Measures Consultation Paper by completing this submission form.

This response form includes the questions from the Gaming Machine Harm Minimisation Measures Consultation Paper.

If you have any queries about this process please email the following address with the subject heading – Harm Minimisation Consultation Paper.

Email: liquorgamingandracingenquiries@justice.vic.gov.au

Submissions must be received by 5pm, Monday 16 January 2017.

Your details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lisa Stafford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (If applicable)</td>
<td>City of Stonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lstaffor@stonnington.vic.gov.au">lstaffor@stonnington.vic.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>311 Glenferrie Road, Malvern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 21, Prahran 3181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>8290 1333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note:

All submissions will be published on the Department of Justice and Regulation’s website.

Please ensure that your submission does not include confidential, commercial-in-confidence or personal information.

The department reserves the right to not publish information that could be seen to be defamatory, discriminatory or unrelated to the review.
### Questions: Gaming Machine Harm Minimisation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.1. Is the current $200 per EFTPOS transaction limit appropriate? If not, what other regulatory measures would support the objectives of the Act?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current $200 per EFTPOS transaction limit should be replaced with a personal daily limit of $200 in a gaming venue. This would help protect problem gamblers but affect very few casual gamblers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q.2. Is the current $1,000 threshold for the payment of winnings by cheque appropriate? If not, what should be the limit and why? |
| Q.3. Should payment by EFT be permitted in addition to, or as a replacement for, payment by cheque? |
| The current $1000 threshold for the payment of winnings by cheque should be replaced with the option for electronic transfer, to be processed the following day. This would ensure that the winnings are not immediately available for further gambling. |

| Q.4. Are there other payment methods that should be considered for the payment of credits / winnings? |

| Q.5. Should venue operators be able to exchange personal cheques for cash? |
| Venues should not be able to exchange personal cheques for cash. This practice allows cheques issued as winnings in one venue to be exchanged at another. Other businesses such as loan providers, pawn shops and banks, should also be prohibited from cashing these cheques on the same day as issued. |

| Q.6. If cashless gaming and or TITO is introduced, how should they be regulated so that they are consistent with other measures that limit access to cash? What harm minimisation measures should apply? |
| Cashless gambling and Ticket-in-Ticket-out (TITO) should not be legalised in the absence of mandatory pre-commitment. |
| Research suggests that those who experience problem gambling lose track of the monetary component of their gambling while using machines. Further removal of tangible monetary indicators is likely to intensify the problem. |
### Q.7. What opportunities are there to improve the way codes operate in Victoria?

- Are there other models that would be more effective? If so, what are they?
- Would a more prescriptive approach for all venue operators be better? Could the operation of codes be simplified?
- Are there other matters that should be provided for in the Ministerial Direction for codes?
- What requirements for loyalty schemes should be included in a code to promote responsible gambling?
- Does the annual review process contribute to fostering responsible gambling? If not, why not? Are there other options to ensure that the codes meet this aim?

The current codes are a weak form of self-regulation.

The Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation should be asked to write a code of conduct building on the indicators and actions identified in their Venue Best Practice Guide (June 2016).

### Q.8. Should the requirement to interact with customers who are showing signs of distress from gambling be part of codes, or should a separate offence be created for venue operators who fail to respond to suspected problem gambling?

There should be a separate offence for venue operators that fail to respond to problem gambling. As operators of a high-risk and potentially harmful product, gambling venue operators have a duty of care to ensure their customers are not harmed by their product, as far as practical.

### Q.9. Are self-exclusion programs best administered by the industry or by another body?

### Q.10. Should there be one self-exclusion program in Victoria?

### Q.11. How could self-exclusion programs be improved?

Self-exclusion programs should be simple and easy to use, and allow a person to restrict themselves from multiple venues. This system should have a single point of entry and be administered by Gambler’s Help.

### Q.12. Is the annual review useful or are there other ways to report on program trends and compliance?
Q.13. Should there be a separate offence for venue operators who knowingly allow self-excluded persons to enter or remain in the venue?

There should be a separate offence for venue operators who knowingly allow self-excluded persons to enter or remain in a venue.

The penalty should be similar to that for serving alcohol to intoxicated or underage people.

Q.14. Should a new requirement to undertake advanced responsible service of gaming training be introduced?

Q.15. If so, who should be required to complete the advanced training and what content should the training include?

Advanced training should be compulsory for all staff who work in the gaming room. The training should include identifying problem gambling and how to intervene to reduce risks of harm.

Q.16. Who should be responsible for the development and provision of the advanced training?

The Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation should be responsible for the development and provision of advanced training.

Q.17. Do you think regional caps and municipal limits should be maintained? Why?

Q.18. Should regional caps be extended beyond the existing capped areas and if so, why?

Q.19. Are the current regional cap and municipal limit levels appropriate?

Regional and municipal caps do not protect vulnerability or recognise areas (suburbs/precincts) of disadvantage.

In addition, there is potential for EGM numbers to be within the municipal cap but exceed the ratio (10 EGMs per 1,000 adults) at a sub-municipal (suburb or precinct) level.

Research conducted for the development of the City of Stonnington’s Responsible Gambling Policy (2016) found a wide variation in the distribution of EGMs and the number of EGMs as a proportion of the allowable number across Stonnington and neighbouring municipalities (Yarra, Boroondara, Monash, Glen Eira and Port Phillip). The densities reflecting a higher concentration in areas experiencing social and economic disadvantage.

Whilst Stonnington has a relatively low number of gaming machines (303) compared to the allowable limit (825) as determined by the Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation (13 September 2012) the cap exceeds community expectations.

The results of the Stonnington Survey Group Gambling Survey (2014) suggest low levels of
community support for further increases in EGM numbers. The survey, conducted to inform the review of the Responsible Gambling Policy, was completed by 150 respondents and found:

- Three quarters of respondents (75.2%) 'object / have a concern about poker machines'. Respondents aged between 45 and 74 had the strongest objection to poker machines (67.1%)
- The majority of respondents (80.7%) either opposed or fully opposed the increase in poker machines. A very small amount of respondents (3.3%) supported the increase.
- Eight out of ten of respondents believe Council should be involved in limiting the expansion of electronic gambling machines.

The findings suggest that the municipal EGM cap should be reduced to better align with community expectations.

Council’s Responsible Gambling Policy strongly discourages any additional gaming venues or additional gaming machines in the municipality in order to prevent an increase in the negative impacts of gambling on the community.

Council’s approach to responsible gambling is to minimise harm; limit expansion of EGMs; provide leadership; consult and engage with the community; advocate on behalf of the community; and undertake appropriate research to inform decision making.

Council’s Policy identifies five distinct geographically based precincts each with a policy statement outlining how Council will respond to requests to increase EGM numbers. Strongest action will be taken in precincts experiencing socio-economic disadvantage and high EGM expenditure.

Please note, the Gaming Machine Harm Minimisation Review timelines have prevented Council from undertaking further consultation with our community. Stonnington’s Engagement Policy does not support undertaking engagement activities over holiday periods.