



GBG Machines Group Meeting Notes

Held on Wednesday 29th November 2023 via Teams at 11.00 am.

In attendance:

Nigel Davis (Merkur) – Chair
 Peter Hannibal (GBG)
 Steve Sharp (GBG)
 Charlotte Meller (GBG)
 Rob Wheeler (GBG)
 Amanda Fry (GBG)
 Steve Brownlow (Bpops)
 Heidi Hards (Buzz Bingo)
 Sam Moore (Buzz Bingo)

Andrea Rushworth (Crown Leisure)
 Dean Harding (Crown Leisure)
 Stuart Green (Game Nation)
 Graham Glanfield (Game Nation)
 Andy Bullock (Innovative Technology)
 Ian Fuller (Playsafe)
 Brian Jamson (Roadchef)
 Caroline Bates (Roadchef)

Item		Action
1	<p>Welcome and Introductions.</p> <p>ND welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted. There were no declarations of interests.</p>	
2	<p>Notes from Meeting held on 6th Sept 2023 – Any outstanding matters</p> <p>There are no outstanding matters from the last meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Review of Gaming Machine Technical Standards</p> <p>PH reported that Nigel Owen has been re-appointed by the GC on a consultancy basis and has already consolidated the 12 documents. PH went through the questions</p> <p><i>Do you agree that the current 12 x GMTS should be consolidated into a single document?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle makes sense to have all the information in one document with inclusions and exclusions clearly defined, streamlining any duplication across the current 12 documents <p><i>Do you agree that the style of land-based GMTSs should be more aligned to the RTS, using Aim, Requirement and Implementation Guidance format?</i></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manufacturers need to take the lead with evidence on responding to this one, as they will be more familiar with the RTS than operators. <p><i>The GC are asking us if there are any current standards that need amending? Please advise.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question depends on the outcome of the proposal to phase out legacy machines. What is in the current standards that mean that legacy machines cannot compete, or is it customer demographic issue? <p><i>We should also think about any new standards that we want to introduce through the GC?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot look to standards for local area progressives on Cat C machines as this must be done through primary legislation Discussed thoughts on defining playing sessions and limit setting. Rob Wheeler advised that the facility for sessions and player sessions is already available to anyone using the MDC standard and that the facility for general limit setting could be easily added (the structure is there, the data fields just need to be added)– which an operator could enable when they wanted to. The GBG data capture protocol would be used to define limits (and where sessions are currently defined) It was agreed that it would be sensible to future proof the MDC - RW to progress this work via the GBG Technical Standards Group. <p><i>Do you agree with the proposal to ‘phase out legacy machines over time’?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall view is “no”. The fundamental point here is why phase them out – it cannot be a stakes and prizes issue given its 25p stake and £25 prize. There are customers that want to play with coins and reels. What would the recompense package be for operators if they have to remove these from FECs? (eg a tax break on new purchases – akin to tax breaks for cars when diesel was stopped?) Legacy machines will be naturally phased out over time as they are unlikely to be repaired and it has become harder to buy reels etc since Covid. If the GC intention is to remove legacy machines because they can’t support sessional play and limit setting then what about some B3s which are not legacy machines but which equally don’t support limit setting. Need to be careful not to set a precedent which would see these machines ruled out. Need to see GC evidence for wanting to remove these machines <p><i>Do you agree with the proposal for a Security Audit for non-remote gaming machine manufacturers – as per the Remote sector?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One for the Manufacturers to comment on but concern expressed that if align too closely with remote that could open the land based sector up to 	
--	---	--

	<p>changes that land based premises couldn't comply with (eg remove autoplay) or certainly couldn't do so quickly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns also expressed this could lead to player tracking. <p><i>Do you agree with the proposal to implement a non-remote games register – akin to the online portal used for remote games testing?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One for the Manufacturers to comment on <p><i>Do you agree with the proposal to implement a non-remote annual games testing audit as per Remote operators that develop RNG driven software?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One for the Manufacturers to comment on but what does 'audit' entail - is it the software? Doesn't the Commission already look at this when they undertake their compliance checks on manufacturers? <p><i>Do you agree with the proposal the coverage of gaming machine categories that require external testing?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One for the Manufacturers specifically to comment on However concern expressed that there are already queues at testing houses with manufacturers releasing @1 B3 game/month, Cat C manufacturers could be releasing @10 games/month so including Cat C machines would add to the test house delays and also have to be factored into the lead in time for pre testing time for machines Cat Cs are currently signed off internally by PMLs who are licensed by the Commission – why are the Commission now saying this is insufficient. What problem is GC trying to fix with this proposal (where is the evidence)? <p>No comments made in relation to frequency of reviews going forward.</p>	
4.	<p>DCMS Data Request Update All data went into the DCMS two weeks ago, which they are currently processing.</p>	
5.	<p>Machine Security Issues ND reported that he has not had been made aware of any new issues. No issues raised by the meeting.</p>	
6.	<p>Standards & Protocols RB advised the Tech Forum have a meeting next week and their last meeting was in September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no further action on the progressives No outstanding requirements from the Machines Group Minor technical change to the GBG TiTo which allows system host to specify what value of the ticket can be transferred back to the bank account (see next agenda point below) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RW asked if GBG want the Technical Forum to review the MDC protocol and include limit settings within the power of registration so it gives the capacity for the system to manage the limit settings across all machines that support the MDC? It is for the operators. The GBG Machines Group supports this development as a good and positive step forward for responsible gambling. 	
7.	<p>Discussion about AML Compliance and Credit Card Usage</p> <p>PH reported that this agenda item arose via a particular product 'Link for Pay'. There is a concern that this product allows debit card transactions but does not differentiate between cash and digital cash when returning money to the bank account and there might be a tweak we need to make to our technical standards to make sure that is still compliant.</p> <p>This was discussed in quite some detail in the meeting and whilst it is not for the GBG to police/regulate Operators compliance with AML regulations, we will always look at ways of improving our standards. RW will discuss options at the meeting next week.</p>	Action RW
8.	<p>Any other business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BACTA have sent a letter to the Minister requesting a review of stakes and prizes (Triennial Review) and the meeting agreed that we should be supporting the principle, especially in light of the (unhelpful) Autumn Statement. PH will draft a letter to the Minister supporting a Triennial Review. <p>Date of next Meeting: <u>Wed 14th Feb 2024</u></p> <p><u>Remainder of dates for 2024</u> Wed 8th May Wed 4th Sept Wed 27th Nov</p>	Action PH

Meeting finished at 11.50