

# GAMBLING COMMISSION

## **Integrity in Sports Betting: Responses**

October 2007

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Issues and responses to the paper</b>	<b>3</b>
	Integrity in sports betting	3
	Sports betting audit and risk-assessment	8
	Education on sports betting integrity	11
	Code of practice: 10- point plan	12
	Single source of data for determining the official result	14
	Other jurisdictions	15
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Annex A List of respondents</b>	<b>16</b>

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1 In May 2007, the Gambling Commission (the Commission) published an issues paper on Integrity in Sports Betting.
- 1.2 This followed a period of consultation relating to information sharing between the relevant sport governing bodies and the betting sector, which formed part of the Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice (LCCP) consultation.
- 1.3 The issues paper was released as an opinion gathering exercise designed to provide the Commission with information on whether the interrelationship between sport and gambling might impact upon the licensing objectives, which are:
  - preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder, or being used to support crime;
  - ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
  - protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.
- 1.4 There were 12 responses to the issues paper. A list of the respondents is at Annex A. We are grateful for all of the responses received. This document aims to reflect the views offered, but it does not purport to describe all of the responses in detail.
- 1.5 The Commission has given careful consideration to the consultation responses before finalising its policy position.
- 1.6 This document reflects the Commission's latest thinking on the issues surrounding integrity in sports betting.

## 2 Issues and responses to the paper

### Integrity in sports betting

#### Consultation question

- Q 1. What evidence is there of the incidents giving rise to concern about the integrity of sports betting in Great Britain?

#### Consultation proposals

- 2.1 The issues paper made clear that the interest of the Commission in integrity in sports betting occurred because of the potential impact on the licensing objectives. Evidence of incidents giving rise to concern could potentially demonstrate a need for the Commission to act if the licensing objectives were being undermined.

#### Respondents' views

- 2.2 All respondents suggested that although there was some evidence of incidents taking place which gave rise to concern about the integrity of sports betting, the number of incidents over the last few years was very small.
- 2.3 An industry body mentioned eight instances in the last five years where sports bodies had made contact with them to request specific betting information. In the same period, the industry body made eight contacts with sports bodies to highlight unusual betting patterns. Two sports bodies raised specific instances of incidents concerning integrity of sports betting; again the number of incidents was low.

- 2.4** Several respondents highlighted the fact that incidents giving rise to concern can be damaging to a sport, by damaging its reputation which could have a knock-on impact on revenues and participation in the sport.
- 2.5** The sports bodies raised the issue, both in their responses and at the workshop, that they are reliant on the betting industry for the information to assess whether an incident giving rise to concern over integrity had actually taken place. The sports bodies stated that their concern is that the betting industry has sole access to the information and it is the judgement of the betting operators as to whether an incident giving rise to concern over integrity has taken place. They would like enhanced access to the betting information, subject to the requirements of the Data Protection Act.
- 2.6** In response to the concerns of sports bodies, the Association of British Bookmakers (ABB) has offered to hold a seminar for sports bodies to explain how the betting operators work and to help sports bodies understand how operators deal with issues surrounding suspicious betting patterns and the use of information.

## **The Commission's position**

- 2.7** We are aware that the number of reported incidents giving rise to concern about the integrity of sports betting is relatively low in Great Britain. We are also aware that any incident that takes place can be damaging to the reputation of a sport and to the betting market on it. The information received indicates that such incidents are very infrequent. The Commission has the power to void bets and to prosecute anyone involved in cheating in betting. We will receive, and encourage, information either from sports bodies or from the betting industry involving allegations of cheating or of suspicious betting patterns.
- 2.8** The Commission encourages the ABB and the sports bodies to take part in the proposed seminar and welcomes this progressive development in the relationship between the sports bodies and the betting industry. We encourage both sides to improve their understanding of how each other's industry operates and to share information – the Commission is happy to facilitate meetings between both sides to achieve this.
- 2.9** We will also continue to develop our intelligence sources to keep abreast of any emerging integrity issues. The Commission will be able to monitor the frequency of incidents giving rise to concerns about the integrity of sports betting and will keep this under review to assess what action, if any, needs to be taken to uphold integrity in sports betting. In addition to this we will publish a regular monitoring report detailing sports betting activity, in order to ensure we are aware of the sports betting market and any emerging integrity issues.

## **Consultation question**

- Q 2.** Do you consider sports betting integrity in Great Britain to be affected by sports betting integrity incidents overseas?

## **Consultation proposals**

- 2.10** The Commission has used the issues paper to open up the discussion on sports betting integrity. We are interested in any evidence that could demonstrate that gambling in Great Britain is causing the licensing objectives to be undermined in any way. In this case, we are interested in the effect of overseas sports betting integrity on Great Britain and sports betting integrity here.

## Respondents' views

- 2.11** Respondents highlighted the fact that there are increasing markets being offered by the British betting industry on sporting events taking place overseas. The integrity of these events is therefore important to sports betting integrity in Great Britain.
- 2.12** A number of respondents highlighted specific incidents that have taken place overseas which have tainted the integrity of sports betting in British markets. These incidents demonstrate the prevailing view that sports betting integrity in Great Britain is affected by integrity incidents overseas.
- 2.13** Several respondents also pointed out that British sporting events often have big betting markets overseas and it is possible that this volume of overseas betting could potentially influence an integrity incident in a sporting event in Great Britain.

## The Commission's position

- 2.14** We note the views expressed that sports betting integrity in Great Britain is affected by incidents overseas. Stakeholders will be aware that the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Great Britain only.
- 2.15** The betting industry now offers markets on many overseas sporting events and it is up to them to satisfy themselves that any risk involved to sports betting integrity is minimised.

## Consultation questions

- Q 3. Are additional measures necessary and appropriate to uphold integrity in sports betting and if yes, what are they?
- Q 4. What is the detailed breakdown of their cost?
- Q 5. How do you suggest that these costs should be met?

## Consultation proposals

- 2.16** The Commission noted the arguments already put forward by both the sports bodies and the betting industry in the issues paper. Sports bodies have argued that additional measures are necessary due to the rise of gambling on sporting events which has heightened the potential risk of integrity problems. The betting industry has argued that there is no need for further measures as there is no evidence of a substantive problem.
- 2.17** If there is evidence of sports betting integrity endangering the licensing objectives, then the Commission wanted to hear the arguments for and against taking additional measures. We were also interested to hear what these measures should be, how much they would cost, and who should pay for these measures.

## Respondents' views

- 2.18** Responses to the question of additional measures varied with several respondents suggesting either none or very few additional measures were necessary, while a small number of respondents suggested several additional measures.

**2.19** The most frequently mentioned measure was enhanced information sharing between sports bodies and bookmakers and a closer relationship between the two groups. One respondent suggested setting out a statutory relationship between sports bodies and betting operators.

**2.20** Other measures suggested were:

- the ability of sports authorities to prohibit certain bets on their sports;
- an education campaign to make all players aware of sports integrity issues;
- effective information sharing between sports and bookmakers;
- a fair and effective system of investigating and trying suspected breaches of integrity;
- compile a black list of known fraudsters involved in sports betting and share it amongst operators;
- financial contributions from the betting sector towards the cost of policing integrity in sport;
- betting licence conditions should enshrine support for the rules of sports bodies;
- betting operators should not allow sporting participants to make bets that are against the rules of the sport body;
- betting information should be made freely available to sports bodies and to the Commission;
- bets should be settled on the official result as defined by the sports bodies and this should be consistent across all betting organisations;
- sports bodies should be able to interact with the Commission over the voiding of bets;
- sports bodies should be provided with betting information relating to the size and volumes of their sports betting market to enable them to make balanced judgements alongside betting organisations;
- sports bodies should have access to a formal risk analysis of which bets are more likely to cause potential problems to their sports integrity;
- there should be a centralised “Early Warning” database of betting information that provides aggregated figures for betting on sports betting markets. This should be a live system that informs the sports when there are unusual movements in the market against “averages” for each market; and
- sports bodies should be able to have a meaningful discussion with betting organisations under the umbrella of the Gambling Commission about whether certain high risk bet types should be offered in the marketplace.

**2.21** Responses to the question of breakdown of cost varied and most did not include a detailed breakdown of actual costs. This was due to a lack of information of what work would be required and how much it would actually cost to police integrity in sports betting.

**2.22** One company spends £250,000 a year on its integrity department. One sports body spends \$1 million dollars a year on policing its sport. Another respondent suggested that a sporting body spends a baseline £2 million a year on policing integrity in its sport.

**2.23** However, there were a variety of accompanying views on this subject. One industry trade association believed that costs would not have to be high to police integrity, while another industry body found it hard to evaluate a cost because operators already have security and integrity functions within their businesses. Sports bodies on the whole felt that more information was required from betting operators in order to appreciate the scale of work required and then cost it.

**2.24** Responses to who should meet these costs all fell into one of two categories, either the betting industry should pay contributions or sports bodies should fund their own arrangements.

- 2.25** The betting industry considers that the sports bodies should meet the costs of policing integrity in their own sports, while betting operators should look after integrity within their operations. One industry body observed that bookmakers have to pay for integrity in their operation on account of potentially corrupt practices by sports players who are licensed by sports bodies and breaching the rules of that sports body.
- 2.26** The sports bodies believe that the betting industry should contribute funding to sports bodies to police integrity in sports betting. On the basis that income is generated by betting using sports as the basis of these markets, sports bodies argue that some of that income should be returned to the sports. They also argue that resources are being diverted to integrity issues that could be spent on encouraging participation in sports.
- 2.27** One organisation produced a list of options for potential sources of funding:
- direct Government grants (similar to those to police anti-doping measures);
  - a statutory levy on all betting operating licence holders;
  - a statutory sports betting relationship, setting up a mechanism between sports bodies and operators;
  - licensing fees – apportioning a part of the fees to pay for policing integrity;
  - voluntary arrangements between the betting industry and sports bodies; and
  - sports themselves funding integrity costs.

## **The Commission's position**

- 2.28** The Commission is keen to ensure that any additional measures that might be necessary to uphold integrity in sports betting are risk-based and proportionate. We are of the view that a statutory relationship between the betting industry and sports bodies is not necessary. However we do encourage the development of a good working relationship between both sides, the Commission will work with both sports bodies and the betting industry to develop channels of communication and understanding between them.
- 2.29** We consider that encouraging stronger working relations, understanding and information sharing between the sports bodies and the betting industry are important steps going forwards. The Commission will facilitate meetings between the sports bodies and the betting industry and we encourage both sides to meet and discuss how they operate in order to develop an improved understanding of each others' work. The Commission will monitor the operation of licence condition 15 on information sharing to see how this affects sporting integrity issues and will continually monitor any intelligence and information received to assess the issue of integrity in sports betting.
- 2.30** The Commission will also meet with sports bodies to ensure that their rules on sports betting are fit for purpose. We also encourage the sports bodies to share best practice on integrity in sports betting and to understand the provisions of the Gambling Act 2005. We note that the Professional Players Federation have recently issued a Code on Sport Betting, this is useful and has informed our views.
- 2.31** The existing costs involved in maintaining integrity in sports betting should continue to be met by the organisation responsible, in other words the betting industry should continue its work to uphold integrity where it has influence and the sports bodies should continue to police their sports in a satisfactory manner, with both sides meeting their own costs.

## Sports betting audit and risk-assessment

### Consultation question

Q 6. Should each type of bet in each sport be risk-assessed? If so, by whom?

### Consultation proposals

**2.32** The issues paper set out the sports bodies' position that a risk-assessment of all bets should be undertaken to generate a regulatory, educational and compliance-based response. The Commission was also clear that this move was opposed by the betting industry. We wanted to hear the arguments from both sides about the necessity, or not, for such a project.

### Respondents' views

**2.33** The responses were divided into two categories. Responses from the betting industry stated that bookmakers already risk-assess all bets offered and scrutinise all bets that pose any form of risk. On the other hand, the sports bodies consider that each type of sports bet should be risk-assessed in order that sports can fully understand the risk that bets pose to their respective sports. They have proposed that they undertake such a risk-assessment of bets offered on sports and have sought the assistance of the industry for this project.

**2.34** The betting industry is concerned that such a risk-assessment by the sports bodies might be used to ban particular markets from being offered by bookmakers at the behest of the sports bodies. Bookmakers feel that it is the business of the Commission to regulate their operations and not the sports bodies, who are not regulated by the Commission. They also feel that any further risk-assessment of sports bets merely duplicates the work that they do normally before they offer these bets on a market.

### The Commission's position

**2.35** We acknowledge the position of the betting industry that a risk-assessment already takes place on all types of bet offered; therefore any further assessment would be duplicating work that has already taken place.

**2.36** At the same time we recognise the concerns of the sports bodies that they do not understand the risks involved in betting on their sports. There has been a suggestion by the sports bodies to undertake a risk-assessment exercise of all types of sports bets, especially if this assists them in understanding how the betting industry operates as well as the scale of betting on their respective sports.

**2.37** It is not for the Commission to insist on a risk-assessment taking place and we do not intend to do so.

### Consultation questions

Q 7. Do you consider some types of betting to present a greater risk to the integrity of sport than others?

Q 8. If you consider some types of bets to be riskier than others, should further measures be taken to regulate them?

## Consultation proposals

**2.38** The Commission was interested in hearing the views of sports bodies and the betting industry on the level of risk surrounding betting and whether any measures were necessary in order to prevent the bets with a higher level of risk from corrupting a sport. The issues paper set out the view that a risk-assessment was considered necessary by some in order to understand the level of risk and how best to respond to it.

## Respondents' views

**2.39** The majority of respondents believed that some types of bet present a greater risk to sporting integrity than others. The bets most commonly named were those where an individual had the opportunity to manipulate the sporting event in such a way as to make the outcome happen. For example, one sports body argued that in football the bets that presented most risk were those that were placed on the time of the first card or first throw-in. Certain bets in cricket matches were also highlighted which were placed on the outcome of an individual ball being bowled.

**2.40** One industry trade body believed that the risk was created by the decision of a player to cheat and it is this, not the bet, that is the problem. One betting operator argued that the bets which pose the greatest risk are in spread betting, which is not regulated by the Commission. Representatives from the betting industry argued that all bets are risk-assessed before they are offered.

**2.41** The sports bodies believe that some types of bets pose a greater risk and there should be a risk-assessment of bets followed by a decision not to allow such bets that pose a risk to the integrity of sport.

**2.42** The sports bodies called for the power to prevent certain riskier bets from being offered on their sports. One organisation argued that this could come after a regulatory monitoring process and using voluntary arrangements rather than needing compulsion. Several sports organisations felt that they should be consulted by betting operators on the bets offered on their sports.

**2.43** Betting operators and trade bodies believe that further measures do not need to be taken. If someone has decided to cheat, then they will still find a market to cheat on and by preventing British operators from offering certain bets, the business will transfer to offshore operators. Operators already assess the risk of bets and are cautious about what they offer due to the risk of loss of revenue and reputation.

## The Commission's position

**2.44** The betting industry reiterated the point that it already risk-assesses all bets before they are offered. We understand the point made that it is the cheating that produces the risk and not the type of bet on the market. The Commission also understands the view that some types of bet may have more potential to be exploited by cheats than other bets.

**2.45** The Commission considers that further measures should not be taken at the present time. The role of the Commission is to ensure that all betting is fair and open, it is not our role to scrutinise all bets and restrict certain markets unless there is an obvious need to do so to uphold the three licensing objectives.

**2.46** In the light of this, we do not feel it necessary to take further measures on bets that do not necessarily pose a risk to integrity and which have not been convincingly demonstrated to us that they are of a high enough risk to warrant further measures.

## Consultation question

Q 9. Should the Commission require the gambling industry to offer only certain categories of betting opportunity?

## Consultation proposals

**2.47** The issues paper made it clear that the Commission would only act in a risk-based and proportionate manner. The Commission stated in the issues paper that we do not want to restrict licensees to offering only certain types of bet as we do not think that this intrusive action would be proportionate. We were interested in hearing views on this matter.

## Respondents' views

**2.48** The responses from the gambling industry all argued that the Commission should not require them to offer only certain categories of bets. It was argued that this would be over-regulation, disproportionate and unwarranted interference in the businesses of operators. It was also argued that this would push business away from British operators (who are regulated by the Commission) to less scrupulous offshore operators (who are not regulated by the Commission). It was also pointed out that operators from outside Great Britain (all EEA states as well as white-listed countries) could advertise markets in Great Britain that they offer, that British operators could not offer, therefore defeating the object of the exercise as the markets would still exist.

**2.49** The sports bodies all stated that high risk bets should not be offered by the gambling industry. They all wanted the power to restrict bets on their sport that posed a risk to the integrity of that sport. One sports body observed that the difficulty with restricting bets offered by British bookmakers was the fact it would simply shift the problem to bookmakers outside of Great Britain and bring a loss of transparency.

## The Commission's position

**2.50** The Commission considers that it would not be appropriate to restrict the categories of betting opportunity offered by British betting operators to the British betting market. As mentioned above, by restricting those operators who are based in Great Britain and regulated by the Commission we may simply shift the business across to operators based abroad who are not regulated by the Commission. We want to be able to regulate the British betting market in order to uphold the licensing objectives; therefore, we are not inclined to put in place restrictions on betting opportunities unless it is absolutely necessary to do so.

## Education on sports betting integrity

### Consultation questions

- Q 10. Do you think that higher standards of integrity could be achieved by:
- (a) more education and information for sports players and officials;
  - (b) more education and information for people working in the betting industry;
  - (c) more education of those placing bets?
- Q 11. Should the betting industry and the sport governing bodies undertake an education programme on sport betting integrity within their industry and sector and how should it be conducted?

### Consultation proposals

**2.51** Education is seen as an important part of achieving sports betting integrity. The sports bodies fully support the education of consumers and participants, while the betting industry trains its staff in order to be able to manage the betting process satisfactorily. The Commission was keen to hear in further detail the views on the potential value and importance of educating all those involved in sports betting.

### Respondents' views

**2.52** All respondents agreed that more education and information for players and officials could help to achieve higher standards of integrity. Several sports bodies have already started the process of educating players on the rules and regulations of their sport and what the risks are to integrity in their sport. One body felt that a high profile education campaign on the impact of the new Gambling Act would be good to raise awareness of this issue among players and officials. Sports bodies are working together to share best practice in this area, including holding a seminar in July 2007 to discuss integrity issues and gambling. Sports bodies are also reviewing their rules and regulations to ensure they are up-to-date and reflect current issues and concerns surrounding betting.

**2.53** The betting industry stated that a lot of work is already done to prevent cheats and frauds profiting from sports betting. The industry already provides high standards of training to people working in the industry to prevent cheats. The betting industry felt it would be helpful to have copies of the rulebooks from the sports bodies, as this may assist in training employees. The sports bodies felt that more education for people working in the betting industry would be beneficial.

**2.54** There were few responses to whether those placing bets needed more education. One industry body pointed out that staff will assist a customer if they ask for help, but were not convinced that education of those betting would not impact on the cheats. One sports body felt that more education and awareness for everyone involved, including those betting, would help to achieve higher standards of integrity. Another respondent observed that if all bets were in a risk index this might be useful to educate the person placing the bet.

**2.55** Most respondents felt that an education programme on sports betting integrity would be beneficial to achieving higher standards of integrity in sports betting. Ensuring awareness of the rules and regulations of sports was important for those participating in the sports. Several respondents showed a willingness to work across both the gambling industry and the sports bodies to assist in the education of those participating in the sport and those working in the industry. One respondent felt it was important that both the betting industry and the sports bodies worked together to deliver a programme for sports players that could be run through players' associations.

## The Commission's position

- 2.56** We welcome the views of the respondents that more education and information for sports players and officials would be beneficial to upholding integrity. We therefore encourage sports bodies to take steps to provide this information and education and support any partnership working with other relevant organisations that will assist this. As mentioned earlier, we encourage sports bodies to share best practice on integrity in sport issues and note the Code on Sport Betting issued by the Professional Players Federation.
- 2.57** The Commission considers that high standards of training and education are required within the betting industry to ensure integrity is maintained in sports. We encourage the betting industry to continue to work hard to provide the highest standards of education and information possible to those who work in the betting industry in order to uphold integrity.
- 2.58** We do not feel that it is necessary to specify any additional measures to educate customers at the present time.
- 2.59** We are encouraged by the responses to the idea of an education programme produced by both the sports bodies and the betting industry. The Commission does not feel that it is necessary to compel such a programme upon the organisations but would recommend that it is considered and that the two sides make contact to consider such an idea in further detail. We believe that closer working between the betting industry and sports bodies would be beneficial to upholding integrity in sports betting. We hope that the seminar offered by the ABB to educate sports bodies will help to foster cooperation and information sharing between the two sides. The Commission will also assist by facilitating meetings between the sports bodies and the betting industry to help achieve this cooperation and sharing of information.

## Code of practice: 10-point plan

### Consultation questions

Q 12. How effective do you consider the 10-point plan?

Q13. How might the Commission beneficially get more involved, if at all, in each of the ten items in the 10-point plan?

### Consultation proposals

- 2.60** The issues paper discussed the 10-point plan and the focus on sports betting integrity. The 10-point plan is for sports bodies to use through setting out minimum standards in order to protect the integrity of their sport. The issues paper states that sports bodies can use the 10-point plan as a starting point to develop more detailed rules and policies of their own. Betting trade associations have agreed to the information sharing principles contained in the 10-point plan. The issues paper noted the concern of sports bodies that the 10-point plan only addresses what sports bodies can do.

## Respondents' views

**2.61** Respondents all offered their support to the 10-point plan and welcomed its introduction. A number of the sports bodies that responded are signatories to the 10-point plan. One respondent observed that there is no monitoring of the effectiveness of the plan. Another respondent asked about how the costs of implementing the plan should be met. Several respondents pointed out that the plan is for sports bodies, who are the signatories to the plan, and does not apply to the betting industry. Two respondents called for an equivalent plan for the betting industry that could cover:

- self-regulation, particularly for high-risk bets;
- meeting the costs of sports integrity issues; and
- providing education on sports betting integrity.

One industry trade body pointed out that there had not been a significant increase in concerns raised after the introduction of the plan.

**2.62** One respondent stated that if a role had been envisaged for the Commission regarding the 10-point plan, then it would have been written into the plan when it was produced. The role of the Commission is to act on allegations of cheating and it will receive information from sports bodies and the betting industry when concerns relating to sports betting integrity are raised. The plan was designed to foster cooperation between the betting industry and sports bodies.

**2.63** Several respondents suggested some ways in which the Commission could get involved with the items in the 10-point plan. The Commission:

- could act as a central repository for current rules and regulations of each sport;
- could maintain a list of the persons within each sport who had responsibility for betting issues;
- could identify and promulgate good practices and facilitate regular cross sport/industry seminars;
- should consider entering into memorandum of understanding with sporting bodies to facilitate the sharing of information;
- could collate information and maintain a database of account holders that have aroused bookmakers' suspicions and whose details have been passed to the relevant sports body; and
- could be involved in establishing how the costs of meeting the plan could be met.

## The Commission's position

**2.64** The Commission is encouraged by the support given to the 10-point plan. We do not consider that it is necessary for us to become more involved in the operation of the 10-point plan. The plan was written for and applies to sports bodies, who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Commission. The plan encourages cooperation between sports bodies and betting operators and the Commission believes that this has started and we encourage further cooperation going forwards.

**2.65** We have already developed licence condition 15 which requires the sharing of information in cases where a betting operator suspects an offence under the Gambling Act, or where the Commission may consider voiding a bet and also to pass on information to the relevant sports body in certain circumstances. We will monitor the operation of licence condition 15 and will also develop our intelligence sources in order to be aware of any emerging integrity issues.

**2.66** The betting industry is already regulated by the Commission and we will monitor the effectiveness of regulation going forwards to ensure that it is working to uphold the licensing objectives.

## Single source of data for determining the official result

### Consultation question

Q 14. Would integrity in sports betting be improved if there was a single source of results for each UK sport and if so, how do you suggest this might operate?

### Consultation proposals

**2.67** The issues paper mentioned the debate between the sports bodies and the betting industry over whether the sports bodies should be the only authorised body to determine results in their sport. This function already exists in horseracing. The Commission put forward this question as one issue where views were welcomed as an idea that could assist sports betting integrity.

### Respondents' views

**2.68** Responses were split evenly between two views. The betting industry firmly stated that integrity would not in any way be improved by having a single source of results for each UK sport. The industry further argued:

- if a single source was compromised then this would actually have the opposite effect and be a threat to integrity;
- current data providers are satisfactory in terms of accuracy and speed, there is no need to change the current situation;
- the issue over integrity is about the influencing of results, not the reporting of results; and,
- a single source of results will slow down the bet settlement process.

**2.69** The sports bodies all argued that integrity would be improved by a single source of results as it would:

- help the perception of integrity in the sports;
- assist with the flow of information around each sport and to the betting markets;
- produce better accuracy and consistency in results across the betting industry; and,
- allow the sports bodies to control the information and influence a decision to void a bet or market where there was suspected corruption or cheating.

### The Commission's position

**2.70** The Commission does not propose the imposition of a requirement of a single source of results for each UK sport. We do not consider that this will assist in upholding integrity in sports betting. We also consider that this would not assist us in our work to uphold the three licensing objectives, as operating licence conditions already require betting operators to trade according to rules that are fair and open.

## Other jurisdictions

### Consultation question

Q 15. We are aware of developments relating to integrity in sports betting issues in other jurisdictions. What comments do you have on these measures and how they might apply to Great Britain?

### Consultation proposals

**2.71** The issues paper raised the development in the state of Victoria, Australia, of a sports betting bill. The Commission was interested to hear whether it would be beneficial if a similar development happened in Great Britain. However we did note that there are differences in the legal framework and the betting market and the aim was to introduce a wider range of thinking with this question.

### Respondents' views

**2.72** We received a variety of responses and comments to this question. Several respondents observed that overseas developments were of questionable relevance to Great Britain. The British betting market is very different to that of many other countries and best practice from other countries may not be relevant or helpful.

**2.73** Several respondents discussed the situation in Australia that was mentioned in the consultation paper and believed that this could be a useful and constructive template for a similar approach in Great Britain. A number of the sports bodies highlighted the need for a structured relationship between sports bodies and the betting industry, possibly on a statutory footing.

**2.74** Another respondent listed developments in several other countries – USA, Mauritius, France, Germany and Israel – and discussed the common themes in these countries:

- sports create and control official data which is used in betting;
- sports bodies and the fans who bet on their events need to be protected by some legislative mechanism from being subjected to the whims of a betting industry;
- increasing control of unlicensed betting either onshore or offshore; and
- increasing accountability for betting organisations.

We also received the observation that the huge increase in the British betting market means that the time has come for a modern legislative arrangement to reflect this modern commercial activity.

### The Commission's position

**2.75** The Commission considers that it is appropriate to monitor developments in other jurisdictions to seek out possible best practice in order to be an effective regulator. However, at present we do not feel the need to follow the example of any overseas jurisdiction.

### 3 Conclusion

3.1 The Commission is grateful for the responses received to this consultation and the information that has been provided. In response, we have decided that the following steps are necessary to uphold integrity in sports betting. The Commission will:

- call on the sports bodies and betting operators (both traditional and betting exchanges) to improve their understanding of how each others' industry operates and to share information relevant to integrity in sports betting;
- continue to develop our intelligence sources to keep abreast of any emerging integrity in sports betting issues;
- encourage the ABB offer to hold a seminar for sports bodies to give them the knowledge they need to understand the betting industry;
- encourage the sports bodies to share best practice on integrity in sports betting and to understand the Gambling Act;
- encourage the betting industry and sports bodies to meet so that the sports bodies can get a better understanding of how betting works and how it relates to their sports;
- offer to facilitate meetings as appropriate between the sports bodies and the betting industry;
- meet with the relevant sports bodies to assist them to ensure their rules on sports betting are fit for purpose;
- monitor how the licence condition on information sharing operates and its effect on integrity in sports betting;
- encourage the sports bodies and the betting industry to continue to provide evidence of incidents that may impact on integrity in sports betting; and
- publish a regular monitoring report, detailing sports betting activity.

### Annex A List of respondents

List of Respondents	Category
1. Association of British Bookmakers	Trade Association
2. Betfair	Betting operator
3. Remote Gambling Association	Trade Association
4. International Cricket Council	Sports body
5. PA Sport	Company
6. Professional Players Federation	Sports body
7. The Football Association	Sports body
8. AS Biss	Company
9. Party Gaming	Betting operator
10. Lawn Tennis Association	Sports body
11. Football DataCo	Company
12. Central Council of Physical Recreation	Sports body

### Gambling Commission October 2007

The Gambling Commission regulates gambling in the public interest. It does so by keeping crime out of gambling, by ensuring that gambling is conducted fairly and openly, and by protecting children and vulnerable people from being harmed or exploited by gambling. The Commission also provides independent advice to government on gambling in Britain.

For further information or to register your interest in the Commission please visit our website at: [www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk)

Gambling Commission  
Victoria Square House  
Victoria Square  
Birmingham B2 4BP

T 0121 230 6500

F 0121 230 6720

E [info@gamblingcommission.gov.uk](mailto:info@gamblingcommission.gov.uk)