

Debrief – Meeting with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], BHA

Meeting Details

With	Marcus Boyle [REDACTED]
Date	21 June 2022
Time	16.00
Background to meeting	This was planned to be an introductory meeting

Overview

As part of welcome and brief introductions, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] had met former GC CEO and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] noted some of that funding goes to maintaining the integrity of GB racing a shared interest with GC. In their gambling review submissions, they have suggested the GC should have greater powers to prosecute conspiracy offences to improve safeguards against those figures behind betting corruption cases not necessarily licensed participants.

Whilst the meeting was intended to be a general introduction, it focused almost entirely on affordability and the impact of GC activity on betting revenues and in turn racing's finances.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] wanted to understand whether the action of licensees is due to new requirements from the GC or in anticipation of the white paper.

[REDACTED] explained some of the impact is likely linked to GC enforcement action and additional controls being implemented by licensees. [REDACTED] referenced some operators are applying £500 stop limits (£100 for u25s).

[REDACTED] explained the process the GC had undertaken on the customer interaction consultation and affordability call for evidence. Some of the details had been misinterpreted. Explained why action is necessary given recurring failings uncovered under outcomes-based approach.

[REDACTED] explained the difference between the GC powers to set requirements and DCMS's. [REDACTED] asked if the GC required DCMS approval to impose conditions such as loss limits [REDACTED] explained the GC is an independent statutory regulator with powers to impose conditions. GC does not legally require DCMS sign off for new requirements. [REDACTED] reiterated that any proposals to use the GC powers in this area would be subject to an open consultation which racing stakeholders could contribute to.

[REDACTED] explained they had shared a lot of analysis on the impact on racing and met with DCMS officials during the government's call for evidence. [REDACTED] asked if that has been made available to GC [REDACTED] explained we had worked closely with DCMS but if they are concerned, they could share the analysis with us directly. In the event of a GC consultation [REDACTED] offered to

meet with GC to explain some of the modelling that had been done. [REDACTED] agreed that we would want to ensure we understood all aspects.

[REDACTED] reemphasised that the GC need to explore further requirements due to the failings on the part of licensees and the impact on consumers and confidence in regulation that was having. [REDACTED] said racing does not want to benefit from customers experiencing harm, but they are concerned that any new measures are proportionate and do not impact on people gambling within their means. [REDACTED] shared the three areas of risk the GC is focusing on (Vulnerability, Binge and heavy losses over time) but agreed our aim is to find proportionate solutions.

MB referenced that the Minister appeared to be alive to potential impact on racing. [REDACTED] agreed but noted it would nonetheless be difficult to get the balance right in spite of the Minister's assurances. [REDACTED] noted BHA will continue to lobby for other measures such as further levy form in the event racing's finances are impacted.

[REDACTED] accepted that some of the coverage of racing and racing views is sensationalist. In part driven by the need to feed a daily industry newspaper. BHA try to avoid lobbying through the media but would welcome an open line of communication with the GC.

Actions

- BHA to share their affordability impact analysis
- [REDACTED] to flag to [REDACTED] offer of a meeting once the consultation is launched