

# LOCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REVIEW - NSW

---

EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES, PREVENTING AND MINIMISING GAMBLING HARM

## PRINCIPLES

The Alliance is a collaboration of organisations with a shared concern about the harmful impacts of gambling in Australia. The Alliance formed in 2014 and currently has over 60 member organisations and 14,000 supporters.

Our purpose and objectives are to:

- Represent the needs of the community to both prevent and minimise the harm from poker machine gambling; and
- Empower communities to have a greater say about poker machines in their local area.

The Alliance adopts evidence and independent research based positions on policy. We welcome the opportunity to respond to this review to give a greater voice to those impacted by gambling harm and those wishing to prevent harm in their local community.

Our board is comprised of people with a lived experience of gambling harm, community sector organisations and people with detailed knowledge of gambling legislation and harm in Australia.

## OVERVIEW

This submission responds to the Local Impact Assessment Review Discussion Paper. Specifically:

1. The Terms of Reference scope, objectives, conflicts of interest and disclosure requirements;
2. Key facts and figures (and the impacts of gambling);
3. Key questions for consideration and comment (response to the questions in the Discussion Paper); and
4. Next steps in a genuine consultation process for amendment of the LIA process.

## SUMMARY OF THE SUBMISSION

The Alliance believes that:

- The Terms of Reference are insufficient for the review;
- The Discussion Paper fails to highlight key facts, figures and impacts relevant for discussion and decision making;
- The objective of the LIA process should be to prevent and minimise harm, not develop the gambling industry or create dependency on gambling venues for community services;
- Any review of the Act or the LIA process needs to be conducted independently, free of conflicting priorities arising from agreements between the NSW government or political parties and the gambling industry;
- The requirements in NSW are generally much weaker than other jurisdictions – NSW should adopt successful measures from other jurisdictions;
- Political donations (either financial or in kind) should be prohibited from any entity associated with the manufacture or operation of gaming machines;

- Clubs should be required to commit to specific community contributions, be held accountable for those commitments and provide an annual statement on Community Benefits (as is required in Victoria);
- Communities need to be more proactively consulted and provided with transparent data on gambling in their local area and any political gifts or donations by associated entities disclosed;
- The Authority needs to take a more comprehensive role in the application process and managing consultation;
- The LIA process needs to address both the number and type of machines (eg. Maximum bets, expected revenue, machine intensity, design features and emerging technologies that may cause further harm);
- The LIA process should be updated to include all measures of harm and detriment to communities;
- The LIA process needs to seriously address reduction in the number of machines in NSW, and address high concentration of machines in particular LGAs and venues (through regional caps and reduction strategies);
- There should be no exceptions to the LIA process;
- The ‘responsible gambling’ approach as a harm minimisation measure needs to be reviewed; and
- Further discussion and consultation is required for the review and amendment of the LIA process, involving all stakeholders.

The Alliance also seeks clarification on stakeholders to be consulted in the development of the revised LIA process as a result of this submission process.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Objectives

The stated objectives of the review include *‘the balanced development – in the public interest – of the gaming industry’* and the document requests consideration as to *‘whether the tests for approving an expansion in the availability of gaming in a venue strike an appropriate balance between permitting industry development and minimising community harm’*.

The Alliance does not believe that further growth and development should be a stated objective, given that:

1. There has been long term and consistent growth of gaming machine revenue in NSW<sup>1</sup>;
2. The number of gaming machines in NSW is almost half of the national total and as a result, constitutes the state with the greatest harm;
3. Gaming machine data is not freely and transparently available to the public to assess and respond to requests for further development; and
4. A review of the NSW Gaming Machines Act in 2007 recommended reducing the overall number of poker machines across the state – which reflects a reduction strategy rather than development strategy.

The stated objectives of the review also do not give sufficient weight to adequate community consultation and a meaningful, evidence-based impact assessment process to both prevent and minimise harm. Efficiency is a stated aim, whereas there is a clear requirement for the Authority to strengthen its capacity to adequately assess local impacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sean Nicholls, *Pokie gambling in NSW surges to \$73b despite fewer machines* (November 21, 2015) <http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/pokie-gambling-in-nsw-surges-to-73b-despite-fewer-machines-20151119-gl2q1b.html>

The Alliance also believes that a stated aim should be to reduce the dependence on gambling venues for community services, rather than increasing it.

In relation to economic benefits and job creation, there is no evidence to suggest that gambling venues enhance economic growth or are beneficial overall to communities. Gambling venues do not create new jobs and simply divert employment from other sectors that are more labour intensive<sup>2</sup>. Further, the bottom line on the benefits of gambling (Productivity Commission Report, 2010) found that:

*“the real size of genuine community benefits are a fraction of those recorded — most particularly for clubs. This mainly reflects the fact that ordinary business expenses are sometimes deemed to be community benefits and that the alternative social uses of the large implicit tax subsidies to clubs are disregarded in the analysis”.*<sup>3</sup>

## **Conflicts of Interest and Disclosure**

### Conflicts and Independence

We also note the reference to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Liberal/National Parties and Clubs NSW within the Discussion Paper. This highlights a critical conflict of interest in the review. All reviews and assessments of the effectiveness of the Local Impact Assessment and the Act itself need to be performed by an independent body, free of influence or pressure from political agreements and donations.

We request that the MOU be withdrawn, no political promises are made, and decisions are based on:

- Public interest;
- Evidence and research based policy (independent of industry funding); and
- Successful policies in place in other jurisdictions, and internationally.

### Disclosure and Transparency

The Alliance requests that the following information be made publicly available and accessible:

- All correspondence in relation to the LIA process from all stakeholders;
- Details on lobbying, discussions and meetings that have taken place (access provided to various stakeholders by politicians and government departments);
- Political donations and benefits derived from the gaming machine industry (operators, manufacturers, owners or representative bodies), including:
  - Financial donations to political parties, individual politicians and representatives
  - Donations in kind (such as use of club facilities or other benefits) to political parties, individual politicians, representatives or departments;
- All gaming machine data (numbers and financial information), by venue, on a six monthly basis (as is provided by other jurisdictions, such as Victoria); and
- The Gambling Harm Report, submitted to the NSW government in December 2015, which has not been released to the public.

---

<sup>2</sup> Chapter 6.8 Vol 1 "Gambling" Productivity Commission 2010

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 6.9 Vol 1 "Gambling" Productivity Commission 2010

## Scope

The review will not consider planning laws or the NSW merger process. The Alliance believes these aspects must be included in the scope of the review for the following reasons:

1. Currently, local councils in NSW are not permitted to consider social impacts of gambling in a Development Application (DA) for a new venue with gaming machines, as the basis for rejecting or approving a DA, as they are for alcohol and other social considerations. It is an exception that removes local decision making power. Any level of government, particularly those closest to the people impacted, should have the right to consider impacts on their community of gaming machines.
2. The merger process will result in larger LGAs that will conceal issues and disadvantage in pockets of LGAs and potentially allow movement of EGMs into areas without adequate assessment and community consultation. Further, we believe the merger process gives greater cause for assessing impacts at a local venue level, rather than LGA level.

## KEY FACTS AND FIGURES

### Problem Gambling and the Scale of Harm

The discussion paper notes that the government recognises the contribution that hotels and clubs make to the NSW economy, but does not sufficiently recognise the harm and negative impacts.

The paper also highlights the 0.8 per cent of adults who are classified as ‘problem gamblers’ and emphasises the need to not impact recreational gamblers. These statistics and the accompanying commentary fails to recognise the leading cause, scale and impact of harm from gaming machines. Specifically:

- Accessibility (availability of machines);
- Statistics on harm (gamblers and impacted others); and
- Impacts (financial and social).

### Accessibility

The availability of gambling products in the community, often termed accessibility, has frequently been linked to problem gambling (Vasiliadis et al 2013)<sup>4</sup>.

The accessibility of gambling has most often been studied with reference to gaming machine venues. For example, Young, Markham and Doran (2012)<sup>5</sup> found venues in an accessible location, such as near a supermarket, and those with higher numbers of gaming machines, were associated with higher levels of gambling related harm.

The review does not adequately take into account accessibility as a key risk factor.

---

<sup>4</sup> Vasiliadis, SD, Jackson, AC, Christensen, D & Francis, K 2013, ‘Physical accessibility of gaming opportunity and its relationship to gaming involvement and problem gambling: a systematic review’, *Journal of Gambling Issues*, vol. 28, pp. 1–46.

<sup>5</sup> Markham, F, Young, M & Doran, B 2014, ‘Gambling expenditure predicts harm: evidence from a venue-level study’, *Addiction*, vol. 109, pp. 1509–16.

## Statistics on harm

The statistics quoted and commentary in the Discussion Paper understate the impact of gambling harm, evidenced by research. Specifically:

- Impacted others;
- The harm created from moderate and low risk gambling; and
- The level of harm among regular users of gaming machines, as distinct from the total population.

### Impacted Others

For every person experiencing gambling problems, 5-10 others are impacted<sup>6</sup>, including children. This means that 199,200 – 398,400 people experience in harm from 'problem' gambling at any point in time in NSW<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, while these rates are for current problematic gambling, they do not consider the full lifetime of impacts resulting from gambling harm, or the harm that is created from less severe problem gambling (see the following section).

### Moderate and Low-Risk Gambling Harm

Recent research in Victoria used a standard public health methodology endorsed by the World Health Organisation to measure the impact of gambling on quality of life<sup>8</sup>. The aim of the research was to systematically investigate gambling-related harm in Victoria and assess the aggregate 'burden of harm' with reference to different levels of problem gambling, and other comparable conditions.

The study found that low and moderate-risk gamblers account for a majority of the aggregate years of health life lost in Victoria. In total:

- 50.24 per cent of years lost to disability were from low-risk gamblers
- 34.52 per cent of years lost to disability were from moderate-risk gamblers
- 15.24 per cent of years lost to disability were from problem gamblers

When all risk categories are combined, gambling accounts for years lost to disability that equates to about two-thirds of the years lost to disability for alcohol use and dependence and major depression, and much more than many other conditions such as diabetes. Therefore, the harm caused by varying levels of problematic gambling is high when aggregated and must be considered in impact assessments and prevalence rates.

These figures do not include the harm to impacted others (estimated at 5-10 others). When we consider the potential scale of harm in NSW to both gamblers and impacted others, using the NSW prevalence rates, this finding translates to:

---

<sup>6</sup> 'The facts about gambling' Department of Social Services, accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017 <https://www.dss.gov.au/communities-and-vulnerable-people/programs-services/gambling/the-facts-about-gambling>

<sup>7</sup> Sproston, K., Hing, N., & Palankay, C. (2012). [Prevalence of Gambling and Problem Gambling in New South Wales](#), NSW Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing.

<sup>8</sup> Browne, M, Langham, E, Rawat, V, Greer, N, Li, E, Rose, J, Rockloff, M, Donaldson, P, Thorne, H, Goodwin, B, Bryden, G & Best, T (2016) *Assessing gambling-related harm in Victoria: a public health perspective*, Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, Melbourne.

Table 1 – Gambling Prevalence and Impacted Others

	<b>Gambling Prevalence</b>	<b>No. of people</b>	<b>5 Others</b>	<b>10 Others</b>
Problem Gambling (15.24% of years lost)	0.8%	39,840	199,200	398,400
Moderate Risk (34.52% of years lost)	2.9%	144,420	722,100	1,444,200
Low Risk (50.24% of years lost)	8.4%	418,320	2,091,600	4,183,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>602,580</b>	<b>3,012,900</b>	<b>6,025,800</b>

### Regular use of EGMs

The Productivity Commission Report (2010) highlighted the link between regular EGM usage and high problem gambling prevalence rates. Of people who regularly used EGMs, 30% of users developed a moderate to significant gambling problem<sup>9</sup>. This, rather than total population, is a more relevant statistic in terms of the likelihood of harm from EGM usage.

Other research has highlighted that as many as two-thirds of those with severe gambling-related problems have been overlooked in sample surveys of the general population.<sup>10</sup>

### **Impacts**

The Alliance requests that consideration be given to the significant impacts resulting from problematic gambling and EGM usage, as impacts were not mentioned in the Discussion Paper. Given it is in relation to a Local Impact Assessment process, impacts must be discussed.

In the research referenced above *Assessing gambling-related harm in Victoria: a public health perspective*, the following impacts were highlighted:

- financial harm
- relationship disruption, conflict or breakdown
- emotional or psychological distress
- decrements to health
- cultural harm
- reduced performance at work or study
- criminal activity.

### Financial Harm

The financial losses from gaming machine gambling in NSW is significant and is not mentioned in the Discussion Paper. Gaming machine losses nationally in 2014-15 were \$11.6 billion, excluding all casinos. Of this, \$5.7 billion was lost in NSW alone.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> p5.25 Vol 1 "Gambling" Productivity Commission 2010

<sup>10</sup> Brown, Hayden: City of Greater Dandenong, *A Review of Gambling Related Issues*, May 2017

<sup>11</sup> Queensland Treasury, *Australian Gambling Statistics, 32<sup>nd</sup> edition summary tables, Table D* (released August 2016)

While the Discussion Paper acknowledges the contribution that clubs make to communities, this contribution is a small fraction of the amount lost to gaming machines. Livingstone, Francis and Wynen (2015) found that contributions in NSW amounted to just 1.7% of machine revenue.<sup>12</sup>

Further, the current taxation arrangements need to be taken into account. Clubs, generally incorporated as “not for profit” organisations, do not pay corporate tax and usually benefit from reduced gambling tax rates compared to corporate gambling operators, including reduced GST arrangements. The Productivity Commission (2010) noted the impacts of tax concessions for Club venues, drawing particular attention to NSW:

*The large tax concessions on gaming revenue enjoyed by clubs in some jurisdictions (notably New South Wales) cannot be justified on the basis of realised community benefits. There are strong grounds for these concessions to be significantly reduced, though this would require phased implementation to facilitate adjustment by clubs.*<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, all impact assessments need to take into account the financial losses, tax concessions and direct community contributions, and transparently reported.

### Crime

A study into gambling related crime was released by Warfield and Associates in August 2016.<sup>14</sup> The study identified 265 criminal convictions involving 267 offenders from 2011 to July 2016.

The amount stolen totalled \$104,143,790, averaging almost \$400,000 per offender, who ranged in age from 18 to 78. The study found that poker machines were by far the most regular mode of gambling by the offenders. Of the 75 cases where the mode of gambling could be identified for females, poker machines were the preferred mode in 62 cases.

Only 19% of the offenders had a prior criminal history.

Associate Professor Nicki Dowling also commented on the research as follows in an article appearing in the SMH:

*Associate Professor of Psychology at Deakin University, Nicki Dowling, says internationally, about one-quarter to one-third of people seeking help for gambling problems have embezzled or stolen from the workplace.*

*A gambling researcher for 17 years and a problem gambling counsellor for 12 years, Dr Dowling said an analysis of more than 4000 records of clients attending Gambler's Help services in Victoria revealed 21 per cent had committed illegal acts such as forgery, fraud, theft or embezzlement to finance gambling.*

*"Severe gambling problems typically lead to a constant need for money, whereby people often 'juggle' money, either to gamble or pay their most urgent bills," Dowling said. "While there are some individuals with a criminal lifestyle who steal money for gambling at the workplace, it is my experience that many people with gambling problems who engage in theft would never have been exposed to the criminal justice system were it not for their gambling behaviour."*<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Livingstone, C. Francis, L. Wynen, T (2015) How real are claims of community benefits. The Conversation <https://theconversation.com/how-real-are-claims-of-poker-machine-community-benefits-49136>

<sup>13</sup> Finding 6.2, Page 6.32, Vol 1 "Gambling" Productivity Commission 2010

<sup>14</sup> Warfield, Brett: Warfield and Associates, Gambling Motivated Fraud in Australia: 2011-2016 (August 2016)

<sup>15</sup> Belinda Williams, *Australians Pay High Price for Country's Gambling Addiction*, Sydney Morning Herald (June 2016) <http://www.smh.com.au/small-business/finance/australian-businesses-pay-high-price-for-countrys-gambling-addiction-20160721-gqaeky.html>

## Family Violence

There is an established link between harm from gambling and family violence. Recent Australian research indicates that people who have significant problems with their gambling are more likely than people without gambling problems to be victims and perpetrators of family violence and over half of people with gambling problems report perpetrating physical violence against their children.<sup>16</sup> Research indicates that family violence is three times more likely to occur in families in which there is significant harm from gambling than in families in which there is no gambling-related harm.<sup>17</sup>

The research above linking family violence and gambling is consistent with recent public health research that shows that ‘gambling as a behaviour, can be seen to have an impact on a number of other determinants... that increase the risk of, or contribute to, negative health outcomes’.<sup>18</sup> Family violence is one such determinant that has significant health impacts on women. In 2004 it was reported that violence between intimate partners, ‘is responsible for more ill-health and premature death in Victorian women under the age of 45 than any other of the well-known risk factors, including high blood pressure, obesity and smoking’.<sup>19</sup>

A recent Victorian study describes the association between police-recorded family violence and EGM accessibility at the postcode level. Postcodes with no electronic gaming machines were associated with 20% fewer family violence incidents per 10,000 and 30% fewer family-violence assaults per 10,000, when compared with postcodes with 75 electronic gaming machine per 10,000.<sup>20</sup>

Recent New Zealand research also shows that family violence and abuse is common in people seeking help for their own or for someone else’s gambling.<sup>21</sup> The 454 participants in the study, which took place from June 2013 to March 2015, were clients of problem gambling treatment services (370 gamblers and 84 affected others; for example, partners, other family members and friends). The study found that half (50%) of the participants were victims of abuse.

---

<sup>16</sup> Dowling, N. (2014). *The impact of gambling problems on families*. AGRC Discussion Paper No. 1 – November 2014, retrieved from <https://www3.aifs.gov.au/agrc/publications/impact-gambling-problems-families/what-are-impacts-gambling-problems-families>

<sup>17</sup> Dowling, N. A., Ewin, C., Youssef, G. J., Thomas, S. A., & Jackson, A. C. Problem gambling and family violence: Findings from a population representative community study. Manuscript in preparation.

<sup>18</sup> Langham, E., Thorne, H., Browne, M., Donaldson, P., Rose, J., & Rockloff, M. (2016). Understanding gambling related harm: a proposed definition, conceptual framework, and taxonomy of harms. *BMC Public Health*, 16(80), 23. doi:DOI 10.1186/s12889-016-2747-0

<sup>19</sup> Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth) (2004) *The health costs of violence Measuring the burden of disease caused by intimate partner violence: A summary of findings*, VicHealth, Melbourne, retrieved from <https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/media-and-resources/publications/the-health-costs-of-violence>

<sup>20</sup> Markham, F., Doran, B., Young, M., The relationship between electronic gaming machine accessibility and police-recorded domestic violence: A spatio-temporal analysis of 654 postcodes in Victoria, Australia, 2005–2014, *Social Science & Medicine* (2016), doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.06.008.

<sup>21</sup> Bellringer, M., Palmer du Preez, K., Pearson, J., Garrett, N., Koziol-McLain, J., Wilson, D., & Abbott, M. (2016). *Problem gambling and family violence in help-seeking populations: Co-occurrence, impact and coping*. Auckland University of Technology, Gambling and Addictions Research Centre and Centre for Interdisciplinary Trauma Research



## Premier Priorities

Four of the 12 priorities of the Premier of NSW<sup>22</sup>, are:

- Improving education results;
- Creating jobs;
- Protecting our kids; and
- Reducing domestic violence.

These priorities are incompatible with further development of the gambling industry and should be given due consideration against independently researched adverse impacts on these priorities.

## Prevalence and Impact

The 2010 Productivity Commission report also highlighted that small population prevalence rates, do not mean small problems for society:

*"Currently adult prevalence rates are 0.7 percent and 1.7 percent of the adult population for problem and moderate risk gambling respectively. That looks small — and indeed some segments of the industry have suggested that consequently the social policy significance of such problems is also small. However, to put these figures in context, only around 0.15 per cent of the population are admitted to hospital each year for traffic accidents and around 0.2 per cent of the population are estimated to have used heroin in the preceding year. Small population prevalence rates do not mean small problems for society."*<sup>23</sup>

## KEY QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AND COMMENT

### **Does measuring the risk of harm at the LGA level remain appropriate?**

The Alliance believes that the current LGA level assessment is inadequate for addressing harm, for the following reasons:

- Councils are not adequately engaged in or required to comment on harm within their LGA;
- The LGA level does not address pockets of disadvantage within an LGA. For example, low income households and areas of public housing;
- It does not address customer catchment areas that may be outside of the LGA of the applying venue; and
- Insufficient information is considered when assessing risk and harm.

Therefore, we believe the measure of risk and harm should be addressed through:

- Councils being required to report on and determine specific impacts within their LGA and submit their findings to the Authority for assessment as part of the overall impact assessment process;
- Every venue based application should be subject to a development application process, allowing for the comment and submission of any resident, business or community body concerned with the likelihood of harm (see consultation);

---

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.nsw.gov.au/improving-nsw/premiers-priorities/>

<sup>23</sup> Productivity Commission (2010) No 50 Gambling V1 P11

- The applicant should be required to submit customer catchment information as part of their application, so that impacts for those customer catchments can be assessed and residents consulted;
- Transparency of data on the current number of machines and turnover in the affected areas; and
- Ensuring all appropriate measures to assess risks and harm are considered (see criteria).

### Should the LIA scheme continue to classify areas into Bands 1, 2 or 3?

The Alliance believes that every application should be subject to a process of assessing risks and potential harm and community consultation, regardless of classification. The process needs to allow the right of members of the community and community services organisations to address concerns about prevention of harm as well as reducing and minimising harm.

We note that the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Impact of Gambling recommended that this review identify mechanisms to stop the concentration of poker machines in neighbourhoods and registered clubs where they cause greater harm and to examine the number of entitlements in all local government areas with above average frequencies of problem gambling.

The following analysis is based on NSW data purchased by an Alliance supporter or otherwise made public through the purchase of data – as data is not freely available to the public in NSW (as it is in Victoria).

The band system has not prevented:

- High concentration of EGMs in particular areas, in relation to the adult population;
- The creation of large gambling venues, with more than 200 machines; and
- Higher than average spend on machines (greater harm).

#### Concentration of Machines per Capita

The following table demonstrates the saturation of gaming machines, where the number of machines per capita is greater than the NSW average of 1 machine to 81 people. This indicates the need for regional caps (as is established in Victoria) and setting targets to reduce the number of machines in areas of high concentration of machines.

*Table 2 – EGMs per LGA with adult population*

LGA	EGMs	2016 adult population (20+)	EGMs per 1000 people	People per EGM	Difference to state average (81)
Murray River Council	1016	9650	105.28	9.50	71.50
Federation Council	832	10550	78.86	12.68	68.32
Berrigan Shire Council	385	7000	55.00	18.18	62.82
Wentworth Shire Council	236	5650	41.77	23.94	57.06
Walgett Shire Council	186	5400	34.44	29.03	51.97
Albury City Council	1286	42350	30.37	32.93	48.07
Tweed Shire Council	2060	78200	26.34	37.96	43.04
Bega Valley Shire Council	712	28250	25.20	39.68	41.32
Coonamble Shire Council	79	3150	25.08	39.87	41.13
Eurobodalla Shire Council	823	32850	25.05	39.91	41.09
Cobar Shire Council	95	3900	24.36	41.05	39.95

<b>LGA</b>	<b>EGMs</b>	<b>2016 adult population (20+)</b>	<b>EGMs per 1000 people</b>	<b>People per EGM</b>	<b>Difference to state average (81)</b>
Lachlan Shire Council	122	5200	23.46	42.62	38.38
Fairfield City Council	3841	164300	23.38	42.78	38.22
Griffith City Council	468	20450	22.89	43.70	37.30
Bland Shire Council	109	4800	22.71	44.04	36.96
Newcastle City Council	3071	137250	22.38	44.69	36.31
Narrandera Shire Council	107	4800	22.29	44.86	36.14
Broken Hill City Council	333	15450	21.55	46.40	34.60
Moree Plains Shire Council	230	10850	21.20	47.17	33.83
Edward River Council	152	7250	20.97	47.70	33.30
Narrabri Shire Council	221	10850	20.37	49.10	31.90
Nambucca Shire Council	337	16550	20.36	49.11	31.89
Council of the City of Sydney	3944	194650	20.26	49.35	31.65
Parkes Shire Council	244	12050	20.25	49.39	31.61
Murrumbidgee Council	59	2950	20.00	50.00	31.00
Muswellbrook Shire Council	270	13550	19.93	50.19	30.81
Shoalhaven City Council	1628	83000	19.61	50.98	30.02
Forbes Shire Council	146	7450	19.60	51.03	29.97
Mid-Western Regional Council	380	19600	19.39	51.58	29.42
Kempsey Shire Council	466	24250	19.22	52.04	28.96
Burwood Council	628	32950	19.06	52.47	28.53
Richmond Valley Council	360	19050	18.90	52.92	28.08
Narromine Shire Council	100	5300	18.87	53.00	28.00
Clarence Valley Council	813	43350	18.75	53.32	27.68
Snowy Valleys Council	225	12000	18.75	53.33	27.67
Cessnock City Council	836	44700	18.70	53.47	27.53
Goulburn Mulwaree Council	449	24350	18.44	54.23	26.77
Western Plains Regional Council	736	40450	18.20	54.96	26.04
Wollongong City Council	3151	173600	18.15	55.09	25.91
Mid-Coast Council	1383	76300	18.13	55.17	25.83
Port Macquarie-Hastings Council	1196	66100	18.09	55.27	25.73
City of Lithgow Council	308	17450	17.65	56.66	24.34
Upper Hunter Shire Council	210	11950	17.57	56.90	24.10
Cowra Shire Council	177	10100	17.52	57.06	23.94
Coolamon Shire Council	60	3450	17.39	57.50	23.50
Gunnedah Shire Council	179	10400	17.21	58.10	22.90
Central Coast Council	4704	275750	17.06	58.62	22.38
Ballina Shire Council	592	34750	17.04	58.70	22.30
Gilgandra Shire Council	63	3700	17.03	58.73	22.27
Gundagai Council	154	9100	16.92	59.09	21.91
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	4855	287550	16.88	59.23	21.77
Temora Shire Council	80	4750	16.84	59.38	21.63

LGA	EGMs	2016 adult population (20+)	EGMs per 1000 people	People per EGM	Difference to state average (81)
Bellingen Shire Council	176	10650	16.53	60.51	20.49
Byron Shire Council	429	26700	16.07	62.24	18.76
Snowy Monaro Regional Council	272	17000	16.00	62.50	18.50
Singleton Council	311	19500	15.95	62.70	18.30
Shellharbour City Council	897	56800	15.79	63.32	17.68
Port Stephens Council	955	60550	15.77	63.40	17.60
Penrith City Council	2561	162550	15.76	63.47	17.53
Liverpool Plains Shire Council	100	6400	15.63	64.00	17.00
Cumberland Council	2693	173400	15.53	64.39	16.61
Hawkesbury City Council	832	53650	15.51	64.48	16.52
Tenterfield Shire Council	93	6000	15.50	64.52	16.48
Gwydir Shire Council	65	4200	15.48	64.62	16.38
Tamworth Regional Council	761	49300	15.44	64.78	16.22
Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council	751	49500	15.17	65.91	15.09
Oberon Council	65	4300	15.12	66.15	14.85
The Council of the Municipality of Kiama	272	18150	14.99	66.73	14.27
Campbelltown City Council	1912	128800	14.84	67.36	13.64
Lake Macquarie City Council	2450	165150	14.83	67.41	13.59
Leeton Shire Council	134	9200	14.57	68.66	12.34
Orange City Council	479	33050	14.49	69.00	12.00
Wagga Wagga City Council	756	52300	14.46	69.18	11.82
Glen Innes Severn Council	105	7350	14.29	70.00	11.00
Rockdale City Council	1321	95250	13.87	72.10	8.90
Junee Shire Council	69	5100	13.53	73.91	7.09
Hilltops Council	209	15500	13.48	74.16	6.84
Coffs Harbour City Council	828	61750	13.41	74.58	6.42
Dungog Shire Council	96	7200	13.33	75.00	6.00
Georges River Council	1657	124650	13.29	75.23	5.77
Armidale Regional Council	322	24800	12.98	77.02	3.98
Greater Hume Shire Council	106	8200	12.93	77.36	3.64
Weddin Shire Council	38	3000	12.67	78.95	2.05
Inverell Shire Council	176	13900	12.66	78.98	2.02
Bathurst Regional Council	434	34350	12.63	79.15	1.85
Inner West Council	2026	163000	12.43	80.45	0.55
Maitland City Council	768	62000	12.39	80.73	0.27

Source:

- Data purchased by an Alliance supporter on machine entitlements (May 2017)
- NSW Population projection data, Department of Planning and Environment (2016 population data)

### Venues with a large number of machines

Further evidence that the LIA process is failing to curb the concentration of gaming machines is the large number of machines in specific venues – in both city and rural areas. The number of machines that are concentrated in single venues clearly demonstrates a significant problem with the approval process and the stated goal of reduction of machine numbers and reducing concentration of machines in particular areas.

*Table 3 – Venues with 200 or more EGMs*

<b>LGA</b>	<b>Licensee Name</b>	<b>EGMs</b>
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	BANKSTOWN DISTRICT SPORTS CLUB LTD	745
Blacktown City Council	ROOTY HILL R S L CLUB LTD	726
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	CANTERBURY LEAGUE CLUB LIMITED	695
Albury City Council	COMMERCIAL CLUB (ALBURY) LTD	623
Penrith City Council	PENRITH RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	610
Fairfield City Council	MOUNT PRITCHARD & DISTRICT COMMUNITY CLUB LTD	603
Tweed Shire Council	TWIN TOWNS SERVICES CLUB LTD	596
Newcastle City Council	WESTERN SUBURBS (N'CLE) LEAGUES CLUB LTD	556
Cumberland Council	WENTWORTHVILLE LEAGUES CLUB LTD	541
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	REVESBY WORKERS CLUB LTD	525
City of Parramatta Council	PARRAMATTA LEAGUES CLUB LTD	520
Campbelltown City Council	WESTERN SUBURBS LEAGUE CLUB (CAMPBELLTOWN) LTD	510
Northern Beaches Council	DEE WHY R S L CLUB LTD	494
Campbelltown City Council	CAMPBELLTOWN CATHOLIC CLUB LTD	490
Central Coast Council	MINGARA RECREATION CLUB LTD	481
Randwick City Council	SOUTH SYDNEY JUNIOR RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	474
Inner West Council	WESTERN SUBURBS LEAGUES CLUB LTD	463
Fairfield City Council	CABRA-VALE EX-ACTIVE SERVICEMEN'S CLUB LTD	450
Cumberland Council	DOOLEYS LIDCOMBE CATHOLIC CLUB LTD	450
Penrith City Council	ST MARYS RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	437
Liverpool City Council	LIVERPOOL CATHOLIC CLUB LTD	435
Blacktown City Council	BLACKTOWN WORKERS CLUB LTD	430
Georges River Council	ST. GEORGE LEAGUES CLUB LTD	418
Fairfield City Council	ST JOHNS PARK BOWLING CLUB LTD	398
Sutherland Shire Council	SUTHERLAND DISTRICT TRADE UNION CLUB LTD	391
The Council of the Shire of Hornsby	HORNSBY R S L CLUB LTD	385
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	CANTERBURY-HURLSTONE PARK R S L CLUB LTD	374
Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council	QUEANBEYAN LEAGUES CLUB LTD	373
Fairfield City Council	CLUB MARCONI OF BOSSLEY PARK SOCIAL RECREATION & SPORTING CENTRE LIMITED	355
The Hills Shire Council	CASTLE HILL R S L CLUB LTD	350

<b>LGA</b>	<b>Licensee Name</b>	<b>EGMs</b>
Central Coast Council	CENTRAL COAST LEAGUE'S CLUB LTD	343
Fairfield City Council	CITY OF FAIRFIELD RSL MEMORIAL CLUB LTD	332
Waverley Council	EASTERN SUBURBS LEAGUES CLUB LTD	328
Fairfield City Council	THE LEO-MCCARTHY MEMORIAL SMITHFIELD R.S.L. SUB-BRANCH CLUB LIMITED	325
Albury City Council	THE ALBURY SAILORS SOLDIERS & AIRMEN'S CLUB LTD	318
Ryde City Council	NORTH RYDE R S L COMMUNITY CLUB LTD	310
Blacktown City Council	SEVEN HILLS - TOONGABBIE R S L CLUB LTD	300
Burwood Council	BURWOOD R S L CLUB LTD	294
Hurstville City Council	ILLAWARRA CATHOLIC CLUB LTD	291
Willoughby City Council	CHATSWOOD R S L CLUB LTD	280
Council of the City of Sydney	CITY TATTERSALLS CLUB	280
Wollongong City Council	WESTERN SUBURBS LEAGUES CLUB ILLAWARRA LTD	279
Ryde City Council	RYDE-EASTWOOD LEAGUES CLUB LTD	270
Newcastle City Council	WALLSEND RSL & COMMUNITY CLUB LIMITED	265
Shellharbour City Council	SHELLHARBOUR WORKERS CLUB LTD	261
Cumberland Council	MERRYLANDS R S L CLUB LTD	260
Western Plains Regional Council	DUBBO R S L MEMORIAL CLUB LTD	260
Lake Macquarie City Council	BELMONT 16FT SAILING CLUB LTD	260
Wollongong City Council	COLLEGIANS RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL CLUB LTD	260
North Sydney Council	NORTH SYDNEY LEAGUES CLUB LTD	253
Central Coast Council	WYONG RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	251
Murray River Council	MOAMA BOWLING CLUB LTD	250
Tweed Shire Council	TWEED HEADS BOWLS CLUB LTD	250
Coffs Harbour City Council	COFFS EX-SERVICES MEMORIAL AND SPORTING CLUB LTD	247
Campbelltown City Council	INGLEBURN RSL SUB-BRANCH CLUB LIMITED	245
Newcastle City Council	WESTERN SUBURBS (N'CLE) LEAGUES CLUB LTD	244
City of Canada Bay Council	WESTERN SUBURBS SOCCER; SPORTS & COMMUNITY CLUB LIMITED	243
Cumberland Council	GUILDFORD RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL & RECREATION CLUB LTD	242
Penrith City Council	PENRITH R S L CLUB LTD	242
City of Parramatta Council	EPPING R S L (SUB-BRANCH) & COMMUNITY CLUB LTD	240
Liverpool City Council	JOHN EDMONDSON VC MEMORIAL CLUB LIMITED	236
Port Macquarie-Hastings Council	MINGARA RECREATION CLUB LTD	232
Ballina Shire Council	BALLINA R S L CLUB LTD	231
Port Macquarie-Hastings Council	PENRITH RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	228
Central Coast Council	Doyalson-Wyee RSL Club Limited	220
Tweed Shire Council	NORTH SYDNEY LEAGUES CLUB LTD	220
Shellharbour City Council	WARILLA BOWLS & RECREATION CLUB LTD	218

LGA	Licensee Name	EGMs
Sutherland Shire Council	ILLAWARRA CATHOLIC CLUB LTD	217
Orange City Council	ORANGE EX-SERVICES CLUB LTD	216
Lake Macquarie City Council	WESTERN SUBURBS (N'CLE) LEAGUES CLUB LTD	215
Cumberland Council	MERRYLANDS BOWLING SPORTING & RECREATION CLUB LIMITED	210
Central Coast Council	ETTALONG BEACH WAR MEMORIAL CLUB LTD	210
Blacktown City Council	CITY OF BLACKTOWN R S L CLUB LTD	208
Georges River Council	RIVERWOOD LEGION AND COMMUNITY CLUB LIMITED	208
Wollongong City Council	THE ILLAWARRA MASTER BUILDERS CLUB LTD	208
Wollongong City Council	DAPTO LEAGUES CLUB LTD	206
Rockdale City Council	EARLWOOD-BARDWELL PARK R S L CLUB LTD	204
Federation Council	COROWA R S L CLUB LTD	203
Camden Council	WESTERN SUBURBS LEAGUE CLUB (CAMPBELLTOWN) LTD	202
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	CAMPSIE R S L SUB-BRANCH CLUB LTD	200
Northern Beaches Council	MANLY-WARRINGAH RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB LTD	200

Source: data purchased by an Alliance supporter on machine entitlements (May 2017)

### Financial Impacts of Machines

While the number of machine entitlements is cause for concern, the machine intensity, features and losses per machine should also be scrutinised and taken into account with every application. Club machines with the lowest losses per machine take ten times less than machines with the highest losses per machine. The following demonstrates the disproportionate financial impact of machines in some areas:

*Table 4 – Turnover per EGM*

Top ten LGA by losses / EGM		Bottom ten LGA by losses / EGM	
Local Government Area (LGA)	Losses / EGM	Local Government Area (LGA)	Losses / EGM
Auburn	146,434	Ku-ring-gai	12,924
Fairfield	131,658	Hunters Hill	13,114
Burwood	125,077	Bland	14,800
Canterbury	118,924	Oberon	14,974
Holroyd	114,119	Greater Hume	15,029
Bankstown	98,598	Snowy River	15,373
Hurstville	96,945	Kyogle	15,844
Willoughby	91,889	Cabonne	16,786
Blacktown	87,983	Dungog	17,313
Liverpool	87,305	Woollahra	17,795

Source: data purchased by an Alliance supporter on machine entitlements (May 2017)

## Do the criteria used to determine levels of risk remain valid?

While more could be done to give due attention to SEIFA scores, this measure alone is insufficient to measure harm and needs to be supplemented with:

- Financial impacts;
- Prevalence of violence;
- Crime;
- Gambling harm at all levels (using internationally recognised public health measures);
- Existing level of problem gambling and potential increase;
- Gambling sensitive sites;
- Existing level of accessibility to EGMs;
- Synergy with neighbouring businesses, residences and community facilities;
- Availability of alternate recreation in the local area with similar opening hours to make sure the community has alternate choices;
- Impact on local businesses;
- Level of expected revenue per machine, based on historic trends, proposed machine design and features; and
- Previous efforts to prevent and reduce problem gambling.

Further, these measures need to be regularly reported on, post approval of an increase in gaming machine numbers in an area so that the impacts are proactively monitored.

The report submitted to the NSW Government in December 2015 on Gambling Harm in NSW, and the types of gambling creating the most harm, needs to also be publicly released to better inform this process.

To adequately address gambling harm from gaming machines, the Alliance believes that regular, published research on harm from gaming machines needs to be commissioned by the NSW government. The government needs to ensure that all research is independent of industry involvement and funding to promote, rather than undermine, public health.<sup>24</sup>

### Harm minimisation and 'responsible gambling'

The Alliance also notes that the process requires an applicant to demonstrate 'harm minimisation' measures (rather than harm prevention or reduction) and focuses on 'responsible gambling' measures. Greater emphasis needs to be given to harm prevention, such as a requirement for intervention with signs of problematic gambling in early stages. The requirements for early intervention in NSW are particularly weak compared with some other jurisdictions and requires review.

The 'responsible gambling' messages and approach need to be reviewed for their effectiveness. Recent research (Miller, Thomas 2017)<sup>25</sup> noted that participants perceived that "*responsible gambling discourses had limited*

---

<sup>24</sup> S. Cowlshaw (2017): Legitimate concerns about industry involvement in gambling research: response to Delfabbro and King (2017), *International Gambling Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/14459795.2017.1321682

<sup>25</sup> Helen E. Miller & Samantha L. Thomas (2017): The problem with 'responsible gambling': impact of government and industry discourses on feelings of felt and enacted stigma in people who experience problems with gambling, *Addiction Research & Theory*, DOI: 10.1080/16066359.2017.1332182



*impact on either their own gambling behaviour or help seeking” and concluded that “discourses which focus on responsible gambling may have a negative and potentially stigmatising impact for people experiencing gambling problems”.*

As noted earlier, the level of risk needs to focus on all levels of gambling harm, not just ‘problem gambling’ or severe levels of gambling harm, on communities.

### **Should the existing community consultation process be amended?**

The Alliance believes that the consultation process needs significant review, including information provided as part of that process. The process should be managed independently by the Authority and include:

1. Information provided by the applicant;
2. Information provided by the Authority;
3. Proactive consultation with the community;
4. Impact Assessment – including personal impact statements of harm and submissions from independent experts;
5. Public disclosure of findings and decision making and reporting measures.

#### Information provided by the applicant

Every application needs to include (in addition to current information):

- Customer catchment areas and target market (areas and zones impacted by the application);
- Current venue data – number of machines, revenue / losses for the community (including type of machines, average turnover per hour, maximum available bets);
- Expected increase in gaming machine revenue / losses for the community (including type of machines, average turnover per hour, maximum available bets);
- Harm prevention measures (ie. Measures they will undertake to prevent problematic gambling, including intervention with early signs of problematic gambling);
- Harm reduction measures to reduce the impact of problematic gambling for existing levels of harm;
- How the applicant will report on and measure the effectiveness of harm reduction and prevention;
- Specific commitments to financial community contributions (excluding general business expenses); and
- Disclosure of political gifts or donations by the applicant or their representative bodies.

Note: disclosure of political gifts or donations is standard practice for any development application to Council.

#### Information provided by the Authority

The Authority and State Government needs to make publicly available on a regular basis:

- The number of machines in each venue;
- The gaming machine turnover, revenue and profit of every venue;
- A historical view of the above over a three year period;
- SEIFA scores for the customer catchment area and LGA;
- Current density of machines in the customer catchment area and LGA, compared with other areas (the number of machines per member of the adult population);
- Current crime rates in the customer catchment area and LGA; and
- Current family violence rates in the customer catchment area and LGA.

Note: this information for the relevant venue application needs to be provided for consultation with the community.

### Proactive consultation with the community

The community consultation process should be managed by the Authority (not the applicant) and needs to proactively identify appropriate residents, businesses and community groups to be consulted.

Similar to a development application (DA) process, the Authority should initially write to the following groups with the information provided by the applicant and prescribed above, compiled by the Authority:

- a prescribed list of community groups (eg. Public Health Associations, Social Services Groups, Community groups concerned with responsible development);
- Local Councils – requesting a submission on the impacts within their LGA and in customer catchment areas;
- residents in the LGA and customer catchment areas; and
- local businesses in the LGA and customer catchment areas.

A plebiscite should be held for all applications to increase the number of machines in any local community. Should 50% (or more) of residents object, the application should be denied.

### Impact Assessment

All impacts (both financial and social, as outlined in the Impacts section of this paper, above) should be assessed.

The impact assessment process should include the ability for individuals impacted by gambling harm (directly or indirectly) to make a personal impact statement to decision makers at the Authority. Again, this process should be managed by the Authority and not require involvement of the applicant or their representatives.

The Authority should proactively seek statements from independent experts and researchers (not funded by the industry) in the areas of gambling, family violence and crime to understand the likely impacts.

### Public Disclosure of the Decision

The Authority needs to make public:

- The findings and decisions of the Authority in relation to the development application and the basis for the decision;
- The agreed reporting measures to assess impacts, harm prevention measures and agreed community contributions; and
- The processes available for appeal of the decision.

### **Should what constitutes a ‘positive contribution’ be more clearly defined?**

When considering ‘positive contribution’, the following factors need to be taken into account:

- Services that might otherwise be provided by government, other not for profit organisations, for profit organisations or volunteers;
- Tax concessions provided to Clubs as not-for-profit organisations (foregone tax for money that would have gone to taxable activities);
- Impact on local businesses;

- Impacts on residents in the LGA and customer catchment areas (rates of gambling harm – ie. All levels as described earlier in this submission);
- Rates of family violence and crime;
- SEIFA scores;
- The average turnover and profit for machines in the area compared with the rest of the state/other LGA jurisdictions and customer catchment areas; and
- Long term contributions by the venue (ie. Over ten years), ensuring that contributions are clearly identified as being made directly to the community, and not general business expenses.

Further, every Club venue should be required to submit an annual Community Benefits Statement, with a detailed breakdown of contributions, in the same manner as is required in Victoria. Penalties need to be imposed on clubs that fail to make contributions according to their agreed commitments.

The Alliance also notes that the 2010 Productivity Commission report found that rates of sporting participation and volunteering in Western Australia (where gaming machines are not permitted in pubs and clubs) were greater than in States and Territories where gaming machines are permitted in pubs and clubs. And that clubs with the least dependence on gaming machine revenue were more focused on sport.<sup>26</sup>

### **Should the exemptions from the LIA process remain?**

The Alliance believes that all communities deserve the opportunity to respond and object to gaming machine applications that will affect their local area, without exception, for the reasons outlined throughout this paper.

## **FURTHER QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AND COMMENT**

### **Does the current LIA scheme achieve the objectives of the Act? If not, how could it?**

Given that NSW has the highest number of machines in Australia, and on a per capita basis well exceeds other State jurisdictions, more can be done to reduce the number of machines. Since the introduction of the LIA process, only 5,213 machine licenses have been forfeited over seven years.

The discussion paper states: *"Under section 37A of the Act, clubs being established in new development areas within a Band 1 LGA which are not seeking to apply for more than 150 entitlements are only required to complete a Class 1 LIA and are subject to reduced forfeiture requirements when the first 50 entitlements are transferred to the new club."* This exception makes it extremely difficult to reduce the number of gaming machines, which is a stated objective of the Act.

Communities should also be better protected with the existing provisions of the Act. For example, a community in Casula (in the Liverpool Local Government Area) had significant difficulty opposing a new venue to be located near a school, despite the Gaming Machines Act explicitly stating that no new venue should be located near a school. The matter was required to be resolved at the Land and Environment Court to finally be rejected. If the Act was being followed, this should have been a straight forward case for the application to be denied. This is a strong example of the Act not being adequately or fairly applied or meeting the objectives and intent of the Act.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Chapter 6.6 Vol 1 "Gambling" Productivity Commission 2010

<sup>27</sup> Kirsty Needham, Sydney Morning Herald (December 2016) Pub Baron Peter De Angelis Loses Bid to Open Pokie Palace Near Casula School <http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/pub-baron-peter-de-angelis-loses-bid-to-open-pokie-palace-near-casula-school-20161214-gtbfq5.html>

These development application restrictions should extend to child care centres and other essential services being housed within or near a gambling venue.

The objectives of the Act also need to be reviewed. As noted earlier in this paper under the objectives of the review, the Alliance does not believe that further growth and development should be a stated objective.

While the Discussion Paper highlights the obvious issue of poker machine density in NSW (that NSW overall has one gaming machine per 81 people compared with one gaming machine per 221 people in Victoria) it does not address high density areas within NSW, intensity and turnover of machines with increased financial harm, or a plan to address this (refer to tables 2, 3 and 4 above).

This review should consider the density of gaming machines in every LGA (based on number of machines compared with the population of each LGA), within single venues, the average machine turnover in those venues, proactively consult the community, and set a target to reduce gaming machine numbers in areas of high machine density for the population. The review should also consider machine design and emerging technologies with a view to preventing an increase in harm from new features.

With only 8 of the 156 applications between 2009 and 2016 being refused, this indicates that there is little problem for the industry to gain approvals, but a greater problem for communities to have a say in the process and that applications could be more rigorously assessed for negative impacts. This approval figure would also not include those currently granted exemptions from the LIA process and so understates the high level of approvals.

### **Should the requirement that a Class 2 LIA must demonstrate an overall positive impact on the local community be maintained? If not, how should it be modified?**

All applications should demonstrate overall positive impact on the local community and include assessment of negative impacts highlighted earlier in this submission under the heading *“Should what constitutes a ‘positive contribution’ be more clearly defined?”*

### **Are there any other relevant matters that should be considered as part of this review?**

The Authority needs to consider comparisons with other state jurisdictions. Given that NSW has the highest number of machines and carries the highest level of harm, this justifies using successful measures being applied in other jurisdictions.

The Authority should exercise caution when considering ‘under developed areas’ (as defined in the Act) to be areas that would benefit from facilities provided by gambling venues. There should be consideration given to support for developing alternate sources of infrastructure and community services so as to not create dependency on gambling venues for local residents. The Alliance does not believe residents should be required to attend a gambling venue as their only option for essential and recreational services, including emergency evacuation.

Political gifts and donations should be prohibited by any associated entity connected with the venue, including representative bodies, owners, manufacturers or operators of gaming machines.

An essential part of this review needs to address the provision of data on NSW gaming machines, community contributions and transparent reporting of not-for-profit clubs to the public. Residents, independent researchers and concerned community groups should have access to this information and be empowered with knowledge that affects their community. Further, all not-for-profit organisations should be subject to the same level of scrutiny and transparency.

## PROCESS AND NEXT STEPS – FURTHER CONSULTATION

Given the short timeframe permitted for responding to the LIA Discussion Paper, and the inherent conflicts of interest, the Alliance believes further work should be done to proactively and genuinely consult with all stakeholders, prior to any final recommendations or implementation of a revised LIA process. Stakeholders should include those who have made submissions, any other interested community or service groups, independent researchers and people with a lived experience of harm.