

# Meeting of the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board: 1 December 2015

**Venue:** London Mathematical Society, Hardy Room, De Morgan House, 57-59 Russell Square, London, Greater London, WC1B 4HS

**Time:** 10.15 – 14.00

**Attendees:** Henrietta Bowden-Jones (HBJ), David Forrest (DF), Ian Gilmore (IG), Russell Hoyle (RH), Chris Kelly ((CK) (Chair)), Rachel Lampard (RL), Richard Ives (RI), David Miers (DM), Simon Tanner (ST), Heather Wardle (HW)

**In attendance:** Amanda Allen (AA) (minutes), Ruth Callaghan (RC), Marc Etches (ME), Sarah Harrison (SH), Joanne Higgs (JH), Paul Hope (PH), Jonathan Watkin (JW)

**Apologies:** Katherine Jackson (KJ), Kate Anthony (KA)

Ref	Action:	Status	Minute number / Page
106	Board members to encourage responses to the consultation from as many stakeholders as possible.	Done	3.3/ p2
107	Secretariat to draft a statement on conflicts of interest in conjunction with the Chair and for review and approval by the Board.	In progress	3.3/ p2
108	Secretariat to highlight suggested redactions in future minutes for CK consideration.	Done	4.6/ p3
109	Secretariat to action the changes to the RGSB website.	In progress	4.6/ p3
110	Secretariat to undertake further work on a stakeholder engagement plan in line with Board feedback.	To be done	4.6/ p3
111	All to provide any further drafting comments to RC on the Evaluation Protocol.	Done	5.1/ p3
112	JW to amend paragraph 21 of the Evaluation Protocol to clarify that it is a living document and comments can be built in from others.	Done	5.1/ p3
113	RGT/RGSB to convene a workshop early in the New Year to consider what further investigation is needed.	In progress	7.1/ p4

## **1: Apologies and declarations of interest**

1.1. There were no declarations of interest.

- 1.2. Apologies were received from Katherine Jackson and Kate Anthony. CK advised the Board that KA was unwell and had passed his regards to her on behalf of the Board.

## **2: Minutes and matters arising from meeting on 14 October 2015: RGSB 15 07 (01)**

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were approved. There were no matters arising.

## **3: Feedback on Strategy Consultation: RGSB 15 07 (02)**

- 3.1 JH provided an update on the strategy consultation. Two responses have been received so far and it is hoped that more will follow over the next week or so. CK is encouraging as many stakeholders as possible to respond when he is meeting them. The consultation will also be promoted at the RGT Annual Conference on 9 December.
- 3.2 SH felt that the two things that were most compelling within the draft strategy was the vision and that expectation that different parts of the industry are to take responsibility in different areas. DM thought the final document should include an Executive Summary and include an overall theme. RH said that Industry are indicating that it is a 'sensible document'. ST wondered if it could be possible to arrange a 'one voice for industry' response.
- 3.3 Feedback from RT Trustees on the draft strategy raised a question around whether or not the document adequately deals with perceived conflicts of interest of RGSB Board members who may also be active in the research field. There was some discussion regarding how we deal with conflicts of interest and an agreement that RGSB should document its position on this and publish a statement on the website for transparency.

**Action:** Board members to encourage responses to the consultation from as many stakeholders as possible.

**Action:** Secretariat to draft a statement on conflicts of interest in conjunction with the Chair and for review and approval by the Board.

## **4: Stakeholder Engagement Strategy: RGSB 15 07 (03)**

- 4.1 JH introduced the paper which contained proposals for 1) how RGSB might develop a stakeholder engagement plan to support the implementation of the new strategy, 2) how RGSB could improve its web presence and governance arrangements, and 3) how RGSB could address the commitment in the draft strategy to be more transparent and open about the way it works. Board were asked to provide a steer on the recommendations.
- 4.2 In terms of RGSB transparency, Board members felt that RGSB minutes and papers were redacted too heavily and more so than the Gambling Commission. It was agreed that the secretariat should reduce the level of redaction and to highlight in draft minutes the proposed sections for redaction.
- 4.3 Board approved the proposed changes to the RGSB website to improve its usability and visibility. This will include creating a new governance area (which would contain the statement on managing conflicts of interest), a new area for the strategy and one for advice notes, position papers and information papers.

4.4 Board spent a considerable amount of time discussing the draft stakeholder mapping table and the draft stakeholder engagement matrix and the following observations were noted:

- RGSB should give greater prominence to engagement with local authorities
- RGSB should do more to engage directly with gamblers
- Engagement with Public Health England and the NHS was missing
- RGSB should differentiate who it needs to engage with in Scotland and Wales
- RGSB should do more to engage with minority ethnic groups
- RGSB should consider its position and voice with regards to media engagement
- RGSB should consider hosting a symposium style meeting once or twice a year which all of these stakeholders could be invited to
- The two tables were not felt to be a helpful way to move our thinking on stakeholder engagement forward.

4.5 It was suggested that RGSB might want to engage with professional communications organisations to help it develop a stakeholder engagement strategy and communications plan although CK felt this was not necessary at the present time.

4.6 CK asked the secretariat to create a new table by organisation setting out why we would want to engage them, how to do this most effectively and the frequency.

**Action:** Secretariat to highlight suggested redactions in future minutes for CK consideration.

**Action:** Secretariat to action the changes to the RGSB website.

**Action:** Secretariat to undertake further work on a stakeholder engagement plan in line with Board feedback.

#### **5: Evaluation Protocol and Research Governance: RGSB 15 07 (04)**

5.1 RC gave an update on the progress of the Research governance and strategic priorities protocol and JW updated the Board on the Evaluation Protocol, both of which the Board had received previously. JW informed the Board that after consultation with Professor David Parsons the planned launch of the protocol at the RGT Harm Minimisation conference on 9 December would not happen until we could be clearer on the supporting package of training that would follow. However Board noted that it was important that this was not delayed for too long as key point is to engage with industry and build evidence. The research governance protocol was due to be considered at the RGT research committee meeting later on that day.

**Action:** All to provide any further drafting comments to RC on the Evaluation Protocol.

**Action:** JW to amend paragraph 21 of the Evaluation Protocol to clarify that it is a living document and comments can be built in from others.

#### **6: Delivering the Strategy: RGSB 15 07 (05)**

6.1 This paper provided an update on RGSB's progress against the work priorities in the current strategy. The paper was primarily for information and update and no comments were received from the Board.

## **7: £100 Stakes: RGSB 15 07 (06)**

7.1 The Board was invited to discuss the issues set out in the paper and to comment on whether the proposed principles to underpin future advice are the right ones. The Board discussed what would be required to get us in position to provide advice on the £100 staking issue as part of the forthcoming Triennial Review in 2016. It was agreed that RGT/RGSB would hold a workshop in early 2016 to try and get answers to from the newer set of machines data. This would allow RGSB to deliver a proposed set of analysis that could be worked on in the early part of 2016.

**Action:** RGT/RGSB to convene a workshop early in the New Year to consider what further investigation is needed.

## **8: Presentation on Vulnerability Research**

8.1 HW presented the findings from phase one of a research project that was being undertaken by Geofutures with Westminster and Manchester City Council. The purpose of the research was to explore who may be vulnerable to gambling-related harm, assess the strength of the evidence base supporting this and map the results visually, so that areas of potential risk are highlighted. The intention is that the map would become a tool for both Local/Licensing Authorities (LA) and industry to help them make decisions about the location of gambling venues and the specific needs of local communities to enable them to work together to develop plans to protect vulnerable people.

## **9: GRaHM Pilots: RGSB 15 07 (07)**

9.1 The Responsible Gambling Trust provided an evaluation paper on their Gambling Risk and Harm Minimisation (GRaHM) pilots as requested by Board at the previous meeting. This paper was for information only and there was no discussion.

## **10: Update from the Responsible Gambling Trust: RGSB 15 07 (08)**

10.1 The Responsible Gambling Trust provided a briefing note for the Board updating them on their current activities. There was no time for discussion on this item.

## **11: Any other business**

11.1 There were no additional items for discussion.

**Next meeting: Tuesday 26 January 2016, Thistle Euston Hotel, Exeter Meeting Room, 43 Cardington Street, Euston, London, NW1 2LP**