

FINAL REPORT

July 2005

Prepared for:

The Ministry of Health

By:



Auckland UniServices Limited

Host Responsibility for Gambling Venues in New Zealand

The Guidelines Report: **Developing Best Practice Guidelines for Host Responsibility in Gambling Venues in New Zealand**

With

The Companion Report: **Gambling Harms and their relationship to concepts of Best Practice in Host Responsibility in Gambling Venues in New Zealand**

Summary and Recommendations

Presented by Ms Billie Harbidge
Auckland UniServices Ltd
Private bag 92109
Auckland
Phone +64 09 373 7522 ext 86985
Email: b.harbidge@auckland.ac.nz

Principal Investigator Dr Samson Tse
Centre for Gambling Studies
School of Population Health
University of Auckland
Phone: +64 9 3737599 ext 86097
Email: s.tse@auckland.ac.nz

This report is prepared by staff members from the Centre for Gambling Studies, School of Population Health, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, University of Auckland:

Dr Samson Tse,	Senior Lecturer
Ms Rachel E. Stevenson,	Project Manager
Dr Robin-Marie Shepherd,	Researcher
Dr Peter Adams,	Director
Dr Robert Brown	Research Associate
Miss Melissa-Jade McArthur,	Researcher
Ms Fiona Rossen,	Researcher
Ms Sonia Townsend,	Researcher

This report should be referenced as follows:

Tse, S., Stevenson, R. E., Shepherd, R-M, Adams, P., Brown, R., McArthur, M-J, Rossen, F., & Townsend, S. (2005). *Host Responsibility for Gambling Venues in New Zealand: Guidelines Report*. Auckland UniServices Limited, University of Auckland.

For a copy of the full report please contact Lisa Campbell, Research and Administration Coordinator, Centre for Gambling Studies on Ph: 09 3737599 xtn 89206 or by email at l.campbell@auckland.ac.nz.

Host Responsibility for Gambling Venues in New Zealand:

THE GUIDELINES REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This Guidelines Report is one of two related reports produced from this project, undertaken to develop a framework for best practice host responsibility in gambling venues in New Zealand, which proceeded in two phases. The Guidelines Report was produced after completion of consultation undertaken in phase two of the project, while the Companion Report is a revised version of the phase one report.

The Companion Report provides an analysis of harms caused by gambling (including problem gambling and broader harms), describes and reviews current gambling practice in New Zealand and considers key concepts underpinning development of host responsibility best practice processes and systems. Two main theoretical models for harm prevention seem to be emerging, each which has different implications for the development of an evidential base for best practice. Of the two models considered in the Companion report (the Reno and Halifax models), the Halifax model appears most suited to use in the context of New Zealand's public health orientated gambling legislation, given the precautionary approach to gambling mandated therein.

Methods

The research on which the Guidelines and Companion Reports are based has included:

- Review of the research literature in three main areas: harms from gambling, best practice, and commentary or research related to specific interventions into gambling practice; and
- Compilation and analysis of local and relevant international Codes of Practice in the range of gambling venues represented in New Zealand, as these represent a substantial portion of existing 'best practice' in host responsibility for those venues, and
- Consultation with key organisations within the gambling industry and the problem gambling intervention service sectors, representatives of vulnerable ethnic communities, and with key officials in the Ministry of Health and the Department of Internal Affairs.

Key findings

Rather than viewing best practice guidelines as a *subset* of legal compliance, the Project Team adopts a community development approach, encouraging all stakeholders with a connection to gambling practices in venues (including the providers of gambling at the venues) to work together to frame, try out, test, assess, and otherwise explore initiatives which have the potential to prevent or reduce harms from gambling - with the practices mandated by explicit legislative provisions providing a *base-line* for developing best practice.

This project has focused on producing conceptual guidelines for developing best practice in gambling venues in New Zealand with aims for: 1) Developing shared understandings of the elements of best practice in host responsibility for gambling, and 2) assessing whether harms from gambling are prevented and/or minimised by particular systems, structures or behaviours in use at, or related to gambling venues in New Zealand. The conceptual analysis has resulted in development of a guidelines framework that is a necessary precursor to (and provides a robust basis for) deriving and evaluating future best practice host responsibility interventions for New Zealand gambling venues.

Host Responsibility for Gambling Venues in New Zealand:

THE GUIDELINES REPORT

The framework or conceptual guidelines recommended for the ongoing development of best practice in this context has three dimensions:

- **Content:** what subject matter and measures are included in host responsibility?
- **Process:** how can we know what we should be considering in relation to best practice in any given topic area and any specific practice?
- **Relationship:** what is the underlying rationale for, and who is seen as the arbiter of, 'best practice' in this country?

Sections 1 to 3 of the report outline the project background, the conceptual basis for developing a three dimensional framework to best practice and the methodology employed by the project team in deriving and testing the framework guidelines. Section 4 refers the reader to Appendix 1, where key terms are discussed. Section 5 discusses the Content dimension of the framework developed in this project, which contains eight key areas of 'host responsibility' in which exemplars of best practice need to be developed and agreed. These areas are: safe product, responsible marketing, safe access, informed patrons, responsible venue design, responsible delivery, contribution to responsible community problem-solving and contribution to responsible community planning. Section 6 discusses the Process dimension of the framework developed in this project, explaining and illustrating each element of the Process dimension through an example of an intervention. Three key elements are: Categories of harm from gambling, a typology of medium of intervention (technological, human and environmental) and the range of evidential sources to use to assess the link between the intervention and the harm it purports to address, and for determining the interventions currently indicated as best practice. Section 7 presents seven critical interventions, in terms of the Process dimension and summarises findings from our consultation on those interventions with key industry groups, problem gambling intervention services and population groups. Section 8 discusses the Relationship dimension of the framework developed in this project. This section examines the mechanisms by which individuals and organisations within the five relevant sectors could work cooperatively in advancing best practice in host responsibility in an ongoing way. It also explores how these developments could be facilitated by setting up structures that manage the processes of best practice development, research and evaluation, and dissemination.

Recommendations

The Project Team made the following key recommendations:

- That (in accordance with the public health goals endorsed by the Ministry of Health) a broad-based, inclusive (Halifax) model of **evidential sources** be adopted for developing best practice interventions in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand
- That the three dimensional framework developed in this project be used for the ongoing development of best practice in host responsibility in New Zealand. The three key elements cover content, process and relationship dimensions.
- That the typology of technology-based, human and environmental interventions be adopted as describing the medium of intervention for developing best practice interventions in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand.

- That the ongoing development of best practice in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand focus on “stay and play” venues, and **on the provision of EGM gambling** as the particular form of continuous gambling provided at those venues likely to generate the highest risk of harm from problem gambling, as well as broader harms from gambling.
- That those responsible for ongoing development of host responsibility best practice in venue-based gambling pay attention to comments about each of the detailed intervention (see Section 7) which have arisen during the consultation phase of this research.
- That an independent best practice development group (IBPDG) is formed as a coordinating centre point of the relationship framework for advancing host responsibility. This group would require a governance board comprised of members representing each of the key relevant sectors. It would also require a small administrative group to coordinate projects and to manage the intervention database.

9. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Summary

Section 1

In this overview we consider the public health and legislative background to our host responsibility project:

The MOH six-year strategic plan, *Preventing and Minimising Gambling Harm*, provides a broad framework for addressing problem gambling across the continuum of harm.

An underlying premise of New Zealand gambling legislation is *that gambling causes harm* (including harm from problem gambling) (*Gambling Act 2003, s3*). The legislation provides that:

- it is the *responsibility of gambling hosts* (both operators and venues) to conduct gambling in ways which fulfill the *purposes* of the *Gambling Act 2003*, and meet minimum standards expressed within the Act or under associated regulations, and that
- *ongoing and effective host responsibility practices* are an essential ingredient in ensuring that gambling activity is not “prohibited and illegal” – as it otherwise would be under New Zealand law.

The primary objective of this Project is “*to minimise the harms related to gambling*” through the “*development of host responsibility best practice guidelines*” for the New Zealand gambling industry.

In the project we develop *conceptual and strategic guidelines* in the form of a *three dimensional* best practice development *framework*. The underpinning *assumptions* of this framework (as conceptual and strategic guidelines) are:

- That *it is the responsibility of gambling hosts* (both operators and venues) *to conduct gambling in ways which meet the purposes of the Gambling Act 2003*, as well as meeting minimum standards expressed within the Act or under associated regulations; and
- Acceptance that an *open and willing dialogue* (including a cooperative “show and tell” process of making exemplars public) between all the parties involved in, and affected by, harms from gambling *is a best practice model for evolving standards for host responsibility*; and
- Acceptance that, in the face of rapidly changing gambling technologies and a plethora of gambling research performed in a variety of cultural and legal gambling environments, *a database needs to be maintained within New Zealand to support such open and willing dialogue and provide it with an appropriate and relevant evidential base*. Such a database is required to create and maintain current and local knowledge of the actual or suspected connection between particular provider gambling practices (referred to herein as interventions) and harms from gambling, and the current forms of evidence which support a link between these.

➤ Section 2

The Report from the Host Responsibility Best Guidelines Project is in two volumes:

- The Guidelines Report, which presents a three dimensional framework for the on-going development of best practice in host responsibility for gambling venues in New Zealand, with particular reference to the precautionary aspect of our legislative environment, and

- The Companion Report, which provides an information base related to harms from gambling, and current gambling practice in New Zealand (including Codes of Practice for key gambling providers current as at May 2005), together with consideration of key concepts underpinning development of host responsibility best practice processes and systems.

Two theoretical models for harm prevention are emerging, and each of these has different implications for the development of an evidential base for best practice:

- The Reno model; and
- The Halifax model

In the view of the project team (and the Department of Internal Affairs), the Halifax model is the most useful approach for developing best practice in New Zealand and aligns best with our precautionary legislative framework and public health perspective on gambling harm.

The research on which the Guidelines and Companion Reports are based has included:

- Review of the research literature in three main areas: harms from gambling, best practice, and commentary or research related to specific interventions into gambling practice; and
- Compilation and analysis of local and relevant international Codes of Practice in the range of gambling venues represented in New Zealand, as these represent a substantial portion of existing 'best practice' in host responsibility for those venues, and
- Consultation with key organisations within the gambling industry and the problem gambling intervention service sectors, representatives of vulnerable ethnic communities, and with key officials in the Ministry of Health and the Department of Internal Affairs.

Section 3

This section summarises the key aspects of the three dimensional framework recommended for developing best practice in host responsibility for venue-based gambling in New Zealand, noting that guidelines for best practice exist at two levels:

- Conceptual (or strategic) guidelines – ie guides to the on-going best practice *process*, and
- Operational guidelines – ie heuristics or “checklists” for quick action in the moment.

This project has focused on producing *conceptual* guidelines for developing best practice in gambling venues in New Zealand; ie guidelines for:

- *Developing shared understandings* of the elements of best practice in host responsibility for gambling, and for

- **Assessing** whether harms from gambling are prevented and/or minimised by particular systems, structures or behaviours in use at, or related to gambling venues in New Zealand.

The conceptual guidelines framework recommended for the ongoing development of best practice in this context has three dimensions:

- **CONTENT** ie - A guide to the subject matter included in the host responsibility domain
- **PROCESS** ie - A guide to the matters that need to be considered in order to determine best practice in any given content area and in relation to any specific practice
- **RELATIONSHIP** ie - A guide to the key relationships in, and the appropriate arbiter of, 'best practice' in this country.

Each of the dimensions is discussed in detail in sections 5 – 8 of this report.

Section 4

Refers the reader to Appendix 1, where the following key terms are discussed:

- 1 What is *host responsibility*
- 2 What is a gambling *venue*
- 3 Who is a *host*?
- 4 What is *best practice*?
- 5 What is a best practice '*intervention*'?
- 6 What is *harm from gambling*?
- 7 What is meant by *harm prevention* and/or *harm minimisation*?
- 9 What is *responsible gambling*?

Section 5

This section discusses the **CONTENT DIMENSION** of the framework developed in this project.

This dimension contains **eight key 'content' areas of 'host responsibility'**. These content areas are a synthesis of key concerns within the literature on gambling harms, and the stated purposes of New Zealand's legislative framework for addressing harms from gambling (ie s3 of the *Gambling Act 2003*).

The eight **key 'content' areas of 'host responsibility'** contained in this dimension are described in this report as:

- A **Safe PRODUCT**: Venues ensure that the design of *gambling product(s)* made available by the venue is as 'safe' (from problem gambling implications) as possible.

- B **Responsible MARKETING:** Venues market their gambling product(s) and their venue in ways that *promote responsible gambling* and *minimise impact* on vulnerable groups.
- C **Safe ACCESS:** Venues *limit access* to gambling (in the venue) for particular vulnerable groups.
- D **INFORMED patrons:** Venues *provide information* to all patrons about their own gambling that is useful for informed decision making, and promotes responsible gambling.
- E **Responsible VENUE DESIGN:** Venues are designed to *minimise triggers* for 'problem gambling', and *maximise* likely *intervention* points when 'problem gambling' behaviours are occurring on site.
- F **Responsible DELIVERY:** Venue *technological systems* and/or *staff intervene* when evidence exists that 'problem gambling' behaviours are occurring on site.
- G **Assists responsible COMMUNITY PROBLEM-SOLVING:** Venues *provide relevant information* (via appropriate communication channels) to communities, including problem gambling help providers, to assist them to *monitor* problem gambling behaviours in the aggregate, and to promote responsible gambling in their own ways.
- H **Assists responsible COMMUNITY PLANNING:** Venues *provide relevant information* (via appropriate communication channels) to communities about community benefits from gambling at the venue (eg employment statistics, transfer of funds to community groups, etc) to assist them engage in responsible *community planning* in relation to gambling.

These content areas form part of a *framework for considering* specific best practice interventions into gambling practice. They reflect outcomes that must be achieved in order to achieve the wider aim of harm prevention and minimisation. They are not, of themselves, best practice interventions, nor do they make presumptions about what interventions would best achieve each stated outcome.

These key content areas fall within *four* main phases of the *venue-relationship with patrons*: ie inviting patrons to the venue; including and excluding patrons; taking care of patrons on-site; and, ongoing care of patrons in the broader context.

Providing a safe product is noted as an *over-arching concern* in that any particular gambling product needs to be considered in relation to each of the other areas of host responsibility.

Of particular note is that “stay and play” gambling products (referred to in the research literature as ‘continuous gambling’) require greater consideration in relation to host responsibility than “buy and go” products (eg Lotto). EGMs, the most prevalent form of “stay and play” products, are considered as *the most at-risk product* for problem gambling behaviours.

Section 6

This section discusses the PROCESS DIMENSION of the framework developed in this project.

This section explains the key elements of the process dimension, illustrating the range and operation of each element within the Intervention Table approach by reference to one example of the interventions (from the examples discussed in section 7).

Three key “Process” elements are described:

- A typology of *harm from gambling* matched to a corresponding typology of harm prevention or minimisation measures (see below).
- A typology of *medium of intervention* (technological, human and environmental)

- A range of *evidential sources* to be used to assess the likelihood of a link between the intervention and the harm it purports to address, and for determining the form(s) of intervention currently indicated as best practice by those sources.

Harms from gambling (including problem gambling):

The typology of harms from gambling used in the process dimension of the framework produced by this project is matched to a set of harm prevention or minimisation measures as follows:

TYOLOGY OF HARMS	HARM LIMITATION MEASURE
Harms related to Problem Gambling	
Triggering problem gambling behaviours in an individual	→ Limits or removes triggers for problem gambling behaviour
Permitting problem gambling episodes to occur at the venue (leading to downstream harms)	→ Prevents/minimises problem gambling behaviour in any given gambling session
Broader Harms from Gambling	
Harms flowing from <i>compromised consumer protection in relation to gambling</i>	→ Strengthens consumer sovereignty
Harms flowing from <i>normalising gambling as an acceptable leisure activity</i>	→ Reduces normalisation of gambling activity
Harms flowing from <i>marketing which understates the 'dangerous consumption' aspect of gambling</i>	→ Creates increased individual and community awareness of 'dangerous consumption' and potential for PG behaviours
Harms flowing from <i>public dependence on gambling funds (taxation & grants)</i>	→ Decreases community dependence on funds from gambling

Note: The Companion Report contains an in-depth discussion of harms from gambling, including harms related to problem gambling, and broader harms from gambling.

Section 6 (continued)

The process dimension of the framework allows development of an open-ended range of interventions aimed at preventing or minimizing harms from gambling, with *each intervention belonging to a 'family' of interventions aimed at the same high level purpose* – the key areas of the process framework.

Over the duration of the project a wide range of intervention tables have been considered for development from information available in the literature indicating interventions which are believed to 'make a difference'. A list of interventions on which at least some research exists is

Host Responsibility for Gambling Venues in New Zealand:

THE GUIDELINES REPORT

contained at Appendix 3. It is noted that *an evolutionary approach* to compiling best practice evidence and exemplars can accommodate what could become a very lengthy list of individual interventions.

During this project, we only developed seven of those considered into fuller intervention tables for the purposes of consultation and inclusion in this report.

These seven interventions chosen for further consultation were selected on the basis that they are required by current legislation (and therefore of immediate concern to those consulted) and there is increasing evidence to support their effectiveness. In particular the project focused on interventions into gambling using Electronic Gambling Machines (EGMs), as this form of continuous gambling is the most harmful form currently available in New Zealand gambling venues.

The production of a more extensive list of interventions on which research data currently exists (see Appendix 3) as a guide to the way the process dimension of the framework interacts with the content dimension is seen as an important further outcome of this project.

Typology of medium of intervention

The three types of medium in use (ie technological, human, or environmental processes) are reflected in the Intervention Tables by noting the medium of intervention in the title of the intervention, and are contained in its description.

Evidential basis for best practice (based on Halifax approach):

The Intervention Tables provide for a range of evidence sources to be recorded. The full list of evidential categories provided in the basic table is:

- NZ Legislation
- Controlled / behavioural studies (eg laboratory based / replicable)
- Naturalistic studies (eg based on observation in gambling situations, case studies, first person accounts)
- Population studies (demographic, socio-cultural, economic or other studies)
- International currency (eg government inquiries, comparisons of practice)
- Gambling industry practice (ie supported by providers of gambling experiences – as evidenced by Code of Practice, website or documented observation)
- Other stakeholder inputs (eg community group leaders, Problem Gambling assistance provider groups)
- Substantial face value

Section 6 (continued)

- Substantial success in other areas (eg HR for alcohol, response to substance abuse, other consumer sovereignty issues)
- Simple to benchmark / monitor (ie able to be monitored across venues &/or patron populations for compliance and effect)
- Low cost / easy implementation (ie worth trying anyway)
- Other things worth noting

Space is provided for **exemplars** (ie examples of this intervention in practice currently deemed to embody 'best practice' in this regard) to be acknowledged. (See section 8).

Constant updating is required

Research and other data (eg commentary on mandatory legal requirements) relevant to each Intervention Table can change by the day. The consultation process related to these tables has itself provided further data about current New Zealand "gambling industry practice", and further "other stakeholder inputs".

Between the time of consultation and the final writing of this report, for example, several key decisions were reported from New Zealand (eg the decision of the Regulations Review Select Committee re Regulation 8, and that of the Gambling Commission re positioning of ATMs) and from international sources (eg the report of South Australian Independent Gaming Authority re Smartcards) that necessitated updating of information contained in tables.

This highlights the **need for an ongoing, constantly updated database relevant to the best practice concerns of the New Zealand gambling environment.** (See section 8.)

Section 7

Section 7 discusses the PROCESS DIMENSION of the framework **in practice**

This section examines seven host responsibility interventions developed *as examples of the way the PROCESS dimension of the framework operates* to bring together relevant data about an intervention, its key elements, a description of the way(s) in which it purportedly works to prevent and reduce harm, a range of factors which suggest (or refute) its status as an effective intervention (ie its capacity to prevent or reduce harm) and point to the form(s) of the intervention currently indicated as best practice.

As well as comprehensively illustrating the process (and complexity) of drawing a range of relevant information about any given intervention into one accessible summary, the specific intervention tables discussed have been used as a focus for consultation with key stakeholders, and site visits by the research team. This has resulted in new information about these interventions as currently implemented in gambling venues in New Zealand.

Discussion is related to information derived from the detailed intervention tables used for consultation during the project, together with analysis of feedback from the consultation process, highlighting areas of consensus, controversy, lack of clarity, and other matters warranting comment by the project team.

Section 7 (continued)

In relation to each intervention discussed, and where appropriate, recommendations have been made about starting points for developing best practice, current practices which could be developed into exemplars, and areas in which local research would be helpful to the establishment of best practice.

Each of the seven examples of host responsibility interventions is presented in the following format:

Description of Intervention

Legal baseline (ie minimum) for this Intervention in New Zealand

Feedback from consultation:

Does intervention prevent/reduce harm?

Challenges and difficulties in implementing the Intervention

Other relevant comments

Summary Points

Consensus

Controversy

Lack of Clarity

Comment by project team

Concrete examples of current action that could be developed into best practice *exemplars*

Recommendations

Section 8

Section 8 discusses the RELATIONSHIP DIMENSION of the framework developed in this project.

This section examines the mechanisms by which individuals and organizations within the five relevant sectors could work cooperatively in advancing best practice in host responsibility.

It outlines how intervention types in relationship with exemplars and venues could provide the reference points for development.

It explores how these developments could be facilitated by setting up structures that manage the processes of best practice development, research and evaluation, and dissemination.

9.2 Recommendations

Section 1

- 1 That the conceptual guidelines described in this report, in the form of a three dimensional framework, **be adopted as a strategic platform** for the ongoing development of best practice in host responsibility in New Zealand.

Section 2

- 2.1 That the Guidelines Report and Companion Report **be adopted as the rationale** for developing best practice in host responsibility for venue-based gambling in New Zealand.
- 2.2 That the **Halifax model** for harm prevention and minimisation (in accord with the New Zealand public health perspective and gambling legislation) **be acknowledged as the basis for developing best practice** in host responsibility for venue-based gambling in New Zealand, including the inclusive approach of that model to developing an evidential basis for accepted best practice.

Section 3

- 3.1 That the **elements of Content, Process and Relationship**, as outlined in the three dimensional framework recommended in this report, **be adopted as guidelines** for the ongoing development of best practice in host responsibility in New Zealand.
 - i) **Content** – ie Guide to particular subject matter of host responsibility
 - ii) **Process** – ie Guide to the matters that need to be considered in order to determine best practice in any given content area and in relation to any specific practice, particularly the harm –intervention link, and nature of the evidential base
 - iii) **Relationship** – ie A multi-sector group as arbiter of ‘best practice’ in this country

Section 5

- 5.1 That the following **eight key content areas of the framework** (and the explanations of those areas provided by this project) **be adopted** for use in the ongoing development of host responsibility best practice in venue-based gambling in New Zealand:
 - A **Safe PRODUCT**
 - B **Responsible MARKETING**
 - C **Safe ACCESS**
 - D **Informing PATRONS responsibly**
 - E **Responsible VENUE DESIGN**
 - F **Responsible DELIVERY**
 - G **Assisting with Responsible COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING**
 - H **Assisting with Responsible COMMUNITY PLANNING**

Section 5 (continued)

- 5.2 That the ongoing development of best practice in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand **focus – as a priority** – on best practice interventions in “stay and play” venues, and **on the provision of EGM gambling** as the particular form of continuous gambling provided at those venues likely to generate the highest risk of harm from problem gambling, as well as broader harms from gambling.

Section 6

- 6.1 That the following typology **be adopted** as describing **key categories of harm** to be considered for developing best practice in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand:

A Harms related to problem gambling

Triggering problem gambling behaviours in an individual

Permitting problem gambling episodes to occur at the venue:

B Broader harms from gambling

Harms flowing from compromised consumer protection in relation to gambling

Harms flowing from normalising gambling as an acceptable leisure activity

Harms flowing from marketing which understates the ‘dangerous consumption’ aspect of gambling

Harms flowing from public dependence on gambling funds (taxation & grants)

- 6.2 That the following typology **be adopted** as **key categories of harm prevention or minimisation** to be considered in developing best practice in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand:

A Harms related to problem gambling

Limits triggers for PG Behaviour

Addresses/minimises PG behaviour in a session:

B Broader harms from gambling

Strengthens consumer sovereignty

Reduces normalisation of gambling activity

Creates increased awareness in community of PG behaviours

Increases community control of gambling availability

Decreases community dependence on funds from gambling

- 6.3 That the following typology **be adopted** as describing the **medium of intervention** for developing best practice interventions in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand:

i Technology-based interventions

ii Human interventions

iii Environmental interventions

Section 6 (continued)

- 6.4 That a broad-based, inclusive (Halifax) model of **evidential sources be adopted** for developing best practice interventions in host responsibility in venue-based gambling in New Zealand; that model to at least initially include:
- i NZ Legislative and regulatory requirements
 - ii Local and international research from a range of methodological bases, such as:
 - Controlled / behavioural studies (eg laboratory based / replicable)
 - Naturalistic studies (eg based on observation in gambling situations, case studies, first person accounts)
 - Population studies (demographic, socio-cultural, economic or other studies)
 - iii International currency (eg government inquiries, comparisons of practice)
 - iv Gambling industry practice which exceeds statutory minimums (ie supported by providers of gambling experiences – as evidenced by Code of Practice, Website or documented observation.)
 - v Other stakeholder inputs (eg community group leaders, problem gambling service provider groups)
 - vi Substantial face value
 - vii Substantial success in other areas (eg HR for alcohol, response to substance abuse, other consumer sovereignty issues)
 - viii Simple to benchmark / monitor (ie able to be monitored across venues &/or patron populations for compliance and effect)
 - ix Low cost / easy implementation (ie worth trying anyway)

Section 7: Recommendations re detailed interventions

7.1 re EGMs display of 'popup' game information

- 7.1.1 That the provision of *game specific information* to patrons be progressed through action research in accord with the precautionary approach to preventing gambling harms embodied in the New Zealand public health perspective and gambling legislation.
- 7.1.2 The nature and presentation of *game specific information* requires further study and it is critical to have input from gambling industry, population groups and problem gambling intervention services in order to determine a preliminary *best practice format* in which this information should be supplied. Because the provision of certain *game specific information* to patrons is mandated to be implemented by October 2005 (on all new

EGMs), development of a *best practice format* for this information should be fast-tracked through multi-sector cooperative pilot studies.

7.1.3 That research be undertaken to determine whether *consistency in the format* of *game specific information* across venues and games contributes to best practice.

7.1.4 That the implementation time scale of the regulated form of the intervention (ie Regulation 7) warrants immediate commencement of systematic impact studies.

7.2 re EGMs display of ‘popup’ session information

7.2.1 That the provision of *session specific information* to patrons be progressed through action research in accord with the precautionary approach to preventing gambling harms embodied in the New Zealand public health perspective and gambling legislation.

7.2.2 The nature and presentation of *session specific information* requires further study and it is critical to have input from gambling industry, population groups and problem gambling intervention services in order to determine a preliminary *best practice format* in which this information should be supplied. Because the provision of certain *session specific information* to patrons is mandated to be implemented by October 2005 (on all new EGMs), development of a *best practice format* for this information should be fast tracked through multi-sector cooperative pilot studies.

7.2.3 That research be undertaken to determine whether *consistency in the format* of *session specific information* across venues and games contributes to best practice

7.2.4 That the implementation time scale of the regulated form of the intervention (ie Regulation 8) warrants immediate commencement of systematic impact studies.

7.3 re Limiting ATM Proximity to gambling area

7.3.1 That a minimum physical distance is set, as a matter of best practice, between the site of gambling (eg EGM) and ATM facilities.

7.3.2 Other forms of access to funds for gambling be included in further investigation in order to maximise the effect of this intervention.

7.3.3 The impact of this harm-minimisation intervention on patrons who gamble, patrons with gambling problems and patrons of other activities within the same facility be included in further investigation.

7.4 re Venue management responsibility to design, monitor and enforce clear directions (‘policy’) re actions to be taken when ‘problem gambling’ behaviours are occurring on site

7.4.1 That venue-based management policies for dealing with individuals with problem gambling behaviours should be carefully formulated, explicit, communicated to all staff, and clearly displayed in public areas.

7.4.2 All venue staff should receive appropriate training in identifying problem gambling behaviours, and in venue policy for dealing with problem gambling behaviours.

7.4.3 Relevant venue staff should be adequately trained and supported to carry out interventions in accord with management policies.

7.5 re Venue staff responsibility to actively monitor gambling areas for signs of ‘problem gambling’ behaviours

7.5.1 Staff training on detecting problem gambling behaviours needs to address both the identification of target behaviours and how and when to intervene.

7.5.2 The success of this monitoring, detection and intervention relies heavily on training and ongoing support from management.

7.5.3 It is important to have appropriate cultural input to training staff in detecting and dealing with problem gambling behaviours.

7.5.4 The success of monitoring, detection and intervention in various sized gambling venue requires careful consideration and application by management.

7.6 re Venue staff responsibility to intervene appropriately when evidence exists that ‘problem gambling’ behaviours are occurring on site

7.6.1 That venue staff undergo comprehensive training in how to identify and approach appropriately patrons showing signs of problem gambling behaviours.

7.6.2 The training curriculum (programme and content) should be developed by professionals, published and monitored closely.

7.6.3 Reputable trainers with appropriate qualifications, skills, attitudes, cultural awareness and life experiences should be used.

7.6.4 Independent auditing of the training and assessment of graduates should be undertaken by an external independent party.

7.7 re Venue authorised and trained staff to explain exclusion options to patrons showing signs of ‘problem gambling’ behaviours

7.7.1 To implement the self-exclusion procedure as an effective harm-minimisation intervention, relevant personnel at gambling venues should receive adequate training and ongoing support from management and senior personnel.

7.8 re Overview of detailed interventions

7.8.1 That those responsible for ongoing development of host responsibility best practice in venue-based gambling in New Zealand take particular note of the information in the “points to note” provided about each of the detailed interventions which have arisen during the consultation phase of this research.

- 7.8.2 That those responsible for ongoing development of host responsibility best practice in venue-based gambling in New Zealand take particular note of the “summary of observations re training of venue staff” reported from this research.
- 7.8.1 That those responsible for ongoing development of host responsibility best practice in venue-based gambling in New Zealand take particular note of the range of possible interventions which this project has identified as having at least *some* research evidence and/or commentary recorded (this range being summarised in Appendix 3).

Section 8

- 8.1: That **an independent best practice development group (IBPDG) is formed** as a coordinating centre point of the relationship framework for advancing host responsibility. This group would require a governance board comprised of members representing each of the five relevant sectors. It would also require a small administrative group to coordinate projects and to manage the intervention database. Maori form a critical part of the relationships framework and it is considered essential that Maori perspectives on Host Responsibility are adequately represented within the IBPDG.
- 8.2 That **an initial working group undertakes** the necessary tasks and processes involved in forming the IBPDG. The formation of the IBPDG will require involvement of all five relevant sectors both in engaging key people and organizations and in determining the necessary structures and processes. This will take time and consequently will require an interim working group comprised of key members of government and leading proponents of host responsibility.
- 8.3 That **the IBPDG develop and maintain a database** for both intervention types and exemplars and actively promotes access to the host responsibility intervention database within the five relevant sectors. The current project has begun the process of constructing an intervention database by collecting details on a limited range of intervention types and exemplars. Considerably more work is required to construct a comprehensive database that ideally should be made available in easily comprehended form on the Internet.
- 8.4 That **the IBPDG devise a research and evaluation strategy** for host responsibility that provides ongoing direction for improving the knowledge base on both intervention types and exemplars. Research and evaluation is the fuel that will drive the substance and quality of future attempts at host responsibility. Organized expenditure into research and evaluation projects will be a necessary part of future development. At this stage, an initial research and development strategy could be devised that scopes current understandings, identifies directions for the future and formulate key priorities for research expenditure.