

## Tasmanian Hospitality Association (THA) submission

### 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**
2. If you answered "NO" for question 1, what categories would you suggest and why?
3. Do you think that one or more of the categories should receive a greater proportion of funding over any of the others? **No - We believe flexibility within the fund is paramount to allow ability to fund good initiatives or issues as they arise.**
4. If you answered "YES" for question 3, please provide details of your recommended weightings for each category and why.
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? **As per answer to Qu 3**
6. Are there any other comments you wish to provide regarding the proposed categories for the distribution of CSL funds? **'Flexibility' within the fund is the key**

### 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**
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?
3. Are there any other comments you wish to provide regarding the proposed considerations for informing the distribution of CSL funds?
  - We need to look at a new self-exclusion system based on other models around the country. The industry needs to be involved to have the best system given they are responsible in identifying and administering the process and system.
  - We need to look at Gaming Care Officers who work with venues to focus on harm minimisation. They could work on issues such as RCG training for staff. Refresher training, guidance and advice on the mandatory code with venues and staff, provide links between venues and individuals on the self-exclusion list as an example. It would be a great way to improve and continually work on harm minimisation issues and strategies working closely with venues and staff given they are the front-line.
  - Gaming Care Officers could be a link with organisations like Anglicare and Hobart City Mission and be a connection back to venues and staff.
  - Neighbourhood Houses that are currently funded out of CSL should be taken out and funded from the correct budget allocation, not the CSL. This money could be more appropriately used in future.

- Given staff and venues are taking more responsibility under the new 'owner/operator/ model, consideration needs to be given to funding initiatives and ideas that allow venues and staff to have the support they need (as per above).
- As the industry body representing venues, the THA would welcome the opportunity to further discuss the above initiatives and other ideas that help in the prevention of problem gambling such as future technology changes and other initiatives as they arise.