



**GBG Zoom Meeting held on  
Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021 at 11.00 pm**

In attendance

- |                               |                               |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Peter Hannibal (GBG)          | Graham Roberts (Inseinc)      |
| Steve Sharp (GBG)             | Nigel Kelly (Novomatic)       |
| Tracy Baitup (Roadchef)       | Elizabeth Speed (Novomatic)   |
| Amanda Fry (GBG)              | Nigel Davies (Praesepe)       |
| Alan Humble (CPI)             | Rob Wheeler (Rimini)          |
| Stuart Green (Game Nation)    | Tracy Baitup (Roadchef)       |
| Sasha Blodau (Gauselmann)     | Lee Morton (Scientific Games) |
| Tony Boulton (Gauselmann)     | Ewen Macgregor (TLT)          |
| Mark Edmundson (GeWeTe)       | Dave Newman (Welcome Break)   |
| Howard Gant (IHL)             | Tez Field (William Hill)      |
| Lee Jefferson (Inseinc)       | Graham Glanfield              |
| Paul Monkman (Luxury Leisure) | David Lucas                   |
| Wayne Forster (Moto)          | Byron Evans                   |

		<b>ACTIONS</b>
1	<p><b><u>Introduction and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>PH welcomed everyone to the update meeting. Apologies were noted.</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>Matters brought forward from the last meeting – 6 Nov 2020</u></b></p> <p>There were no matters from the last meeting</p> <p>PH advised that he has had an invitation to attend a round table meeting with John Whittingdale on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> March at 10.00 am. If anyone has any questions they would like tabled please let PH have them by <b><u>Friday 12<sup>th</sup> March 2021</u></b></p>	
3.	<p><b><u>Gambling Act Review GBG Submission</u></b></p> <p>PH advised that there was a meeting earlier this week which was very productive and PH will send the next version out next week. PH reminded everyone to complete the industry survey and please ask your peers and colleagues to do the same. AF will send out a reminder after this meeting with the link.</p>	Action PH/AF
4.	<p><b><u>Gambling Commission Fees Review</u></b></p> <p>PH advised that at a meeting a couple of weeks ago we agreed to put together a discussion document which was sent round this morning.</p>	

	<p>The Gambling Commission’s document is very well put together and in terms of a response PH needs to get input from members on what they want to say. PH then shared the document on the screen and the highlighted sections are what we need to focus on. Although the document has been published by the DCMS it is based on recommendations from the Gambling Commission.</p> <p>The Commission say they are experiencing new challenges and they include payment innovation as a reason for increasing their workforce. Increasing risks associated with unlicensed operators and the need to protect consumers and the industry from “black market” encroachment which is complete contradiction to what they have been saying regarding affordability checks.</p> <p>PH went through the key elements of the three challenges and pulled out a few points that are relevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GC has been using up its reserves in the last couple of years so the fees income has not been covering their overheads.</li> <li>• The largest increases in annual fees is therefore proposed for remote and gambling software operators.</li> <li>• Each fee band for remote operating licences and for gambling software licences will therefore see an annual fee increase of 55%.</li> <li>• Each fee band for non-remote licences, other than gambling software will see an increase of 15%.</li> <li>• Licence application fees are going to go up by 60%.</li> <li>• Without increase in fees the GC will see a decline in income.</li> </ul> <p>PH advised that they are looking for another £7m of licence fees from licencees.</p> <p>There are also elements of the regulatory challenges which are being partly driven by the non-remote sector, for example product and payment innovation. Other elements, such as the need for the Commission to be resourced to respond to the industry’s increased willingness to challenge its decisions, should be borne in part by the non-remote sector from which such challenges also emanate.</p> <p>PH asked members if we are objecting to their proposals, agreeing with them or challenging them.</p> <p>TB – from a land-based perspective we should be pushing back. The headline is 15%, but there is a further 5% in real terms because they are going to remove the discount available to land-based. They have completely removed the machines specialist department and we understand that the number of physical visits to venues is decreasing. Some of the costs associated with the land-based side are difficult for them to support in terms of evidence because everything over the last 2/3 years has been moving away from regulating land based and putting the fees up by 20% is not acceptable. They need to see where their increase in costs are associated and make sure their approach is balanced.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>SS advised that from a GBG view we need a consolidated view to go back to them.</p> <p>ES advised that they have taken the conscious decision to reduce their land-based specialist skills and offices and from a land-based view we will end up paying more and getting less. TB will email their draft response to PH</p> <p>SB – if they come up with a financial gap we should show them our financial gap for last year and this year.</p> <p>DL – they want to increase the fees for applications but the applications are prolonged by the fact you are dealing with officers who do not seem to read the applications. They then send out reams of questions which take up time. If they read and understood the application the whole process would be more efficient and less demanding on their resources.</p>	Action TB
5.	<p><b><u>GBG Strategy Discussion</u></b></p> <p>For those who have not met him before, PH introduced Steve Sharp. PH then shared the draft document on the screen</p> <p>SS advised the call that he and Peter have been reviewing how GBG is working and how to position GBG to work to its best for the future needs and want to involve the members in this process. The strategy section in the document is what is being suggested, but we need members to give us their opinions on whether it is what they want.</p> <p>PH asked members for their input either on this call or are happy to talk offline as well. PH talked the call through the document. Below are the Specific Strategic Aims from the final section.</p> <p><b>Specific Strategic Aims.</b></p> <p><b>Differentiate from other trade associations by developing appropriate and creative technology environments.</b> Target specific industry partners to cooperate and develop solutions with, for collective industry benefit. Suggested initiatives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Influence and enable members/wider industry to implement safer gambling methods.</li> <li>○ Create and Innovate new technology and industry standards as required.</li> <li>○ Continue to maintain existing Protocols.</li> <li>○ Deliver the cross-industry cashless (debit card etc) environment.</li> <li>○ Create environment for sharing machine security information safely and within GDPR regulations.</li> <li>○ Develop a set of Protocols for the deployment of facial recognition and age estimation technologies.</li> <li>○ Develop protocol for linking jackpots across technologies.</li> <li>○ Develop protocol for using game data for improving intelligence.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop processes for understanding customer visit patterns &amp; duration.</li> <li>○ Be the central hub for (anonymous) consolidated statistical data.</li> <li>● <b>Continue and strengthen GBG political lobbying using hard data/facts gained from GBG and wider industry sources.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Engage with data analyst and market research information/intelligence both external and from our members.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Create a long-term plan to extend GBG operations – making GBG financially sustainable</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Look to acquire/secure member resources to help deliver industry projects - request our members be more proactively involved.</li> <li>○ Identify and attract suitable new members. Include potential suppliers that have an interest in new workstreams.</li> <li>○ Be more open and transparent, to make sure the work that GBG delivers is appreciated.</li> <li>○ Monetise GBG IP use by non-members – GBG is not a charity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>SB advised that they appreciate the targets and will come back via email.</p>	ALL
6.	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>SS suggested we send out a note with cut off dates for information. PH will discuss with AF and send out a note.</p> <p>TB asked PH to ask DCMS to make sure each of the Trade Associations has enough time to speak as the GBG did last time. PH explained that there may in fact be two meetings this time as there were two different diary times in circulation. PH to clarify.</p>	Action PH/AF  PH
7.	<p><b><u>Date of next meeting</u></b></p> <p>The date of the next meeting is <b><u>Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021 at 11.00 am.</u></b> AF will send out a calendar invite.</p> <p>PH suggested we have a 45 minute call on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> March as an update from the Round Table meeting with the Minister. AF will send out a calendar invite</p>	AF  AF