

**PATTERNS OF PLAY  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
28 August 2018**

**Applicants for Patterns of Play phase 1 were given an opportunity to ask questions until Friday 23 August.**

**Please find below a summary of questions (in black) and answers provided (in red)**

Q: In relation to 'Phase 1: Exploring online patterns of play' in '(B) Summary of programme of work' section, it is mentioned that "Exploring online patterns of play Phase 1 will focus exclusively on online gambling. This is an area where we believe data should be most readily available." Can you share what kind of data this would likely include? Would it include data on harm?

A: We don't know yet exactly what data will be included but once the bids have come in, we will have a better idea. Although not impossible, it is very unlikely that there will be existing data on harm.

Q: How will the evaluation criteria be weighted?

A: We will not be weighting the evaluation criteria as such for the assessment of bids- and consider each item listed to be equally important. The scoring between 1 (Not at all) and 5 (completely) for each item will be indicative only, for us to see where strengths and weaknesses lie and won't be the only basis on which bids will be assessed. The initial assessment will be followed by an interview process.

Q: We have a clarification request in relation to the ITT for the Patterns of Play research project. We would like to clarify a couple of the items in the response requirements listed at section 10:

b) A clear description of your proposed intervention

d) A clear description of how you have taken into account the views of people with lived experience of gambling-related harm in the design of your intervention

Please could you clarify what is meant by 'intervention' in the context of this research project?

A: Intervention means what you are intending to do

Q: What is meant by "people types" used in the ITT

A: People types can mean groups of people from different social economic backgrounds; age; etc

Q: Can we assume that the successful bidder - via GambleAware - will have access to the data repositories relatively soon?

A: At this stage, it is hard to predict how quickly we will get data but with some operators already quite engaged, we hope it is not too drawn out. Furthermore, we are doing a lot of ground work right now in preparation.

Q: Will this data allow anonymised access to customers in a way that would enable us to send out surveys (via phone or internet) to collect additional data (e.g. questionnaires), which could be linked backed to their patterns of play?

A: This is the intention- we still need to work out the mechanics to ensure that all data complies with data protection laws etc.

Q: How many industry players do you envisage being included in this phase of the analysis?

A: We had around a dozen online brands included in the preliminary analysis conducted by David Forrest and Ian McHale (referenced in Annex A of the brief), so we would envisage that we would get at least that many for this main stage. There will be additional operators that we will want to

include this time around, given the fact that this phase includes additional online products whilst the Forrest/McHale piece was focussed on online casino games.

Q: As a result do you have an idea of how many online products are within this scope for this work?

A: As per the brief, there are 6 as follows:

- Online betting – where we currently have very little descriptive data for this very large product group. This includes sports and non-sports betting, betting exchanges and pool betting.
- Slots / casino games – where currently have an aggregate understanding (see Forrest and McHale, 2018) which should act as the foundation for further data collection and analysis
- National Lottery instant wins, and other high frequency online lottery products
- Online bingo
- Online poker
- National Lottery draw based games – where tickets are bought online

Q: Paragraph B3: What is the current definition of at-risk behaviour / harmful play?

A: We continue to measure problem gambling using either the DSM-IV or the PGSI scales. The PGSI's scoring system also provides thresholds for moderate-risk and low-risk gamblers, which is what we are referring to when we say 'at-risk behaviour'. Our recently published framework for measuring gambling-related harms defines harms as "*the adverse impacts from gambling on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families, communities and society*".

At the moment we don't have a full understanding of what harmful play looks like, which is why we have included the objective to find out 'What types of behaviours are associated with problem or at-risk gambling'. There has been some work already published which has made great progress in starting to explore this, so we'd advise looking at the recent work conducted by pwc on markers of harm, and by Jonathan Parke exploring problematic play online (both are referenced in Annex A of the brief). The latter identified features such as:

- Speed of play
- Use of cash-out
- Long sessions
- High bet frequency
- Gambling at unsociable hours
- Monetary and time losses

Q: Data collection: you mention you don't have access to the datasets required for analysis. Do you have an indication of what data sources will be made available (e.g. CRM data, online behaviour per customer account, billing systems)? Does this vary significantly between industry members?

A: We will not know this for certain until we start to engage with operators, however the spreadsheet provided with the briefing materials gives a good estimate of what kind of data is available for what product. The Forrest and McHale piece also recommends further data points that should be included in the next stage of the work. We are intending that the data received goes beyond just play data so that we can link play to other aspects of customer behaviour, as well as demographic / socio-economic characteristics. For the latter, we anticipate that there will be a need for primary data collection with customers.

It is likely that data is going to be stored and structured in different ways across different operators. The Commission will endeavour to ensure as much consistency as possible across the data requests, but we still envisage that the first part of this phase is going to involve extensive data management and restructuring to allow comparable analysis to take place across products.

Q: Data collection: Is there a predefined process of how the Service Provider will be dealing with industry members i.e. would you expect them to communicate directly with the operators or would all communication go through the Commission or/and GambleWare?

A: We would prefer communications with operators to go through the Commission or at a minimum coordinated with them

Q: Does the Commission or/and GambleWare collect and store any particular data themselves, which is relevant to the project and will that information be available to the potential Service provider? If so what could we expect to receive?

A: We have a very minimal amount of data but all data we have and will acquire will be available to all

Q: Budget: Would the amount mentioned be granted to one service provider, or is this possibly a budget for several providers?

A: The full budget may be given to one provider or to several. We will be clearer on that when bids come in

Q: Do you have any specific requirements for project deliverables: written reports, PPT decks, online dashboards or any software solution etc., or it is strictly Service provider discretion?

A: This will be finalised in due course but we will require written reports

Q: Involvement of machine operators:

A: We are not comfortable with the suggestion of industry operators taking on a direct role within research teams. This is because of the sizable challenges this is likely to create in terms of raising questions:

- regarding our governance structures, which are there to limit undue industry influence on research; and
- potential conflicts of interest, including with operators who are being asked to contribute data.

We'd need to be persuaded that the approach offered significant benefits to the work and see a clear plan for how conflicts of interest would be managed. In reality it would take very strong arguments to shift us away from the rule of thumb that industry should be engaged with the research, but not involved in its delivery (unless it's to supply data).

Q: Leveraging industry relationships

A: Whilst we appreciate there is value in teams having relationships and expertise with industry, we do not want the project to be constrained to those relationships and therefore we are working on an approach where the Commission co-ordinates access for all data, not just those with which research relationships are good. This also ensures that those without these pre-existing relationships are not discriminated against and we invite the widest possible pool of researchers to present their ideas. Of course, we value experience but pre-existing access to certain datasets will not get any sort of preferential treatment in the review process.

If a successful bid can utilise existing relationships to access data from certain sectors then it will be vital that the Commission is still involved in the request to ensure that datasets received across the whole project complement one another and provide similar variables and structures. We envisage that the Commission should have a co-ordinating role, even if access to the data is sped up via certain teams' direct engagement with certain operators. Any data agreements would also need to

include ensuring wider access to the data so that all parties of the consortium, and indeed other researchers, can make use of the data.