

# Survey Questions - allocation of Community Support Levy Funding under the Future Gaming Market - July 2021

## INTRODUCTION

The Government announced, in the release of its future gaming market policy, that there would be a significant increase in Community Support Levy (CSL) funding available for distribution from 1 July 2023. The CSL, applied to the gross profit of Electronic Gaming Machines (EGMs), is currently set at four per cent for hotels and clubs. Government will effectively double the CSL fund to improve harm minimisation by increasing the hotel rate and extending the CSL to EGMs in casinos.

Under the policy, hotels will pay a CSL of five per cent, clubs four per cent, and casinos will pay three per cent. To the extent that these levies are not sufficient to double the funding pool from current levels, Government has committed to providing a direct contribution.

With a new gaming market structure and an increased pool of CSL funds, a revised CSL distribution model is being considered.

While the objective of the CSL itself will not change, the objective of any changes to the CSL distribution model will be to improve the effectiveness of the CSL through allocation of the increased funds.

## PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to seek your input into how the increased CSL funds ought to be distributed, with the aim of improving the effectiveness of the CSL.

## CURRENT CSL MODEL

The *Gaming Control Act 1993* currently specifies that the CSL is distributed as follows:

- 25 per cent for sport and recreation clubs;
- 25 per cent for charitable organisations; and
- 50 per cent for problem gambling, for:
  - research into gambling;
  - services for the prevention of compulsive gambling;
  - treatment or rehabilitation of compulsive gamblers;
  - community education concerning gambling; and
  - other health services.

# Survey questions - Community Support Levy funding under the Future Gaming Market - July 2021

## PROPOSED CSL MODEL

The proposed legislative amendments require that the Minister must distribute the total CSL in the manner prescribed by the regulations. This replaces the current requirement in the Act that the Minister must distribute the CSL to specified categories in accordance with specified weightings.

This will provide greater flexibility and responsiveness to any emerging issues and changes in priorities within the gambling environment, with Parliamentary oversight through the making of regulations.

## SURVEY QUESTIONS

### Categories for distribution of the CSL

It is proposed that the following new, and more broadly worded, categories for distribution of the CSL replace the current categories and set weightings contained in the Act.

**Subject to this consultation, these categories will be included in the regulations:**

- **community capacity building projects or initiatives;**
- **preventative programs or initiatives;**
- **direct support programs or initiatives; and**
- **research activities.**

In relation to the above categories for the distribution of CSL funds, we would appreciate your feedback to the following questions:

1. Do you support the proposed categories? **YES** / NO

Yes, depending on clarifications. Evidence of demonstrated effective practice for the first three categories must direct selection and funding. "Community capacity building" must be defined and the essential features of effective approaches must be included in selection and evaluation. In rural and regional Tasmania in particular, local organisations may need funding to develop effective capacity. Community organisations are not necessarily skilled in building capacity.

All of these categories can be informed by evidence based practice. Preventative programs can include local sports, social, arts clubs when the links between effective prevention and the proposed program are made. Interested organisations with limited experience and knowledge will need support to focus their interest directly on preventative action. A mentor system would help local groups grow skills and build sustainable support for their communities.

All research should lead to findings of use to communities and preference given to methodologies based on community engagement and development of local skills and knowledge. Citizen science approach to collecting and acting on local subjective wellbeing data is an example.

2. If you answered "NO" for question 1, what categories would you suggest and why?

# Survey questions - Community Support Levy funding under the Future Gaming Market - July 2021

3. Do you think that one or more of the categories should receive a greater proportion of funding over any of the others? **YES** / NO

4. If you answered "YES" for question 3, please provide details of your recommended weightings for each category and why.

*This will provide greater flexibility and responsiveness to any emerging issues and changes in priorities within the gambling environment, - this is a great opportunity to vary weighting and funding depending on local/ regional/ statewide need.*

The weighting should be based on the unique opportunities the fund offers. Two questions address this. Which of these has access to other sources of funding? Which of these has undeveloped potential to decrease the negative effects on the community of gambling? The latter question could be focussed on local communities most affected. A local government view may prefer emphasis on the first two and any weighting should still require building local skills and directly available local resources and support.

5. Do you believe that the percentages should be more flexible at the margins, eg "not more than x per cent" or "no less than x per cent", rather than a set percentage? **YES** / NO

6. Are there any other comments you wish to provide regarding the proposed categories for the distribution of CSL funds?

# Survey questions - Community Support Levy funding under the Future Gaming Market - July 2021

## Considerations for the distribution of the CSL

It is proposed that the following considerations inform the distribution of CSL funding within the categories under the new model. For funding to be approved, a project, program or grant would need to be consistent with at least one of these considerations.

**Subject to this consultation, these considerations for the approval of funding from the CSL within each category will be included in the regulations:**

- **creating a link between the location of gambling losses and CSL spending;**
- **collaboration and partnering with other organisations to maximise reach and delivery of programs/initiatives to support prevention and treatment of problem gambling;**
- **supporting long term programs aimed at reducing problem gambling behaviour;**
- **supporting one-off grants for major initiatives aimed at reducing problem gambling;**
- **provisioning of ongoing counselling for problem gamblers;**
- **investment in programs, infrastructure and activities that enable greater community engagement and healthy lifestyle opportunities (as a diversion from gambling);**
- **supporting funding for research and evaluation of problem gamblers; and**
- **ensuring the distribution of the CSL is subject to regular review (eg to be reviewed every five years following the Social and Economic Impact Studies).**

In relation to the above considerations for determining the distribution of CSL funds, we would appreciate your feedback to the following questions:

1. Do you support the above considerations? YES / NO / **NOT ALL**
2. If you answered “NO” or “NOT ALL” for question 1, please provide details of the considerations you would suggest for determining the allocation of CSL funds and why?

This requires a ‘depends’ answer! The list of considerations for distribution are a combined set of necessary characteristics for sustained improvement. At minimum, no one characteristic should enable funding. Links are required between locally owned action, ongoing skill/ knowledge development for organisations, research data and findings relevant and accessible for informing community actions. 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 are readily aligned and most are elements of effective change. Project design could include a mixture of them. One off research should be driven by research questions relevant to some of them and, at minimum, make findings that inform practical community action.

Provision of counselling is important if there are no other adequate resources.

## Survey questions - Community Support Levy funding under the Future Gaming Market - July 2021

3. Are there any other comments you wish to provide regarding the proposed considerations for informing the distribution of CSL funds?

Thank you for your input.