

Response One

Please find attached the number of new self-exclusions and breaches by operator as you requested.

I should explain that there are limitations as to what can be established from these figures and some contextual points that I need to highlight.

A relatively high number of new self-exclusions could for example be a positive thing as result of a well promoted and easy to access self-exclusion scheme or a negative thing in that more customers are keen to self-exclude from that operator because of problems they have experienced, or online because it is an easy way to close your account and remove yourself from receiving marketing material.

A relatively low number of self-exclusion could for example be because the operator has an effective customer interaction policy and less customers reach the point where they feel they need to self-exclude or could be because the self-exclusion scheme is not very well promoted or easy to access.

The new self-exclusion figures are the new self-exclusions during that 12 month period. Operators will be administering a larger number of self-exclusions as some customers will self-exclude for a longer period than a year.

A breach refers to an individual breaching their self-exclusion agreement, not a breach of regulations by the operator.

The number of breaches refers to the number of incidents where an operator has identified a self-excluded customer whether before or after gambling. It does not refer to the number of individuals, so one person breaching ten times adds 10 to the total.

A relatively high number of breaches may indicate good procedures to identify self-excluded customers attempting to gamble. The actual level of breaches will always be an unknown from these figures as operators will be unaware of the number of customers that have breached who they didn't identify.

A number of gambling companies may also appear several times on the list, where they have different legal entities within a group who each hold their own operating licences. Some of these operators may report all self-exclusions for a group through a single entity due to the way in which they capture information corporately.

With remote operators, we only started regulating the majority of the market in November 2014 following a change in legislation which is why there is an increase in figures from that period onwards.

The Multi-operator self-exclusion scheme (MOSES) was launched in the non-remote sector last year. Some of the 2016 data is post implementation of the MOSES – so operators may be picking up people who were originally self-excluded by other operators and consequently there isn't a direct comparison with earlier years. Also the MOSES should remove many of the duplications so there's a discontinuity in the time series from that in the number of self-exclusions. Details of the scheme are below.

<http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/for-gambling-businesses/Compliance/General-compliance/Social-responsibility/Self-exclusion/Non-remote-self-exclusion.aspx>

Response Two

The following table shows the number of incidents requiring Police assistance broken down by gambling sector and year end date. Please be aware that the data for 2016 may not be complete as the fourth quarter (October-December) has yet to be submitted by all operators.

Sector	End Date						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Adult Gaming Centre	481	358	236	264	301	419	346
Betting	11,506	9,368	8,387	7,443	11,235	8,830	6,845
Bingo	224	256	78	33	79	169	103
Casino	640	707	333	100	72	65	36
Family Entertainment Centre	65	48	37	36	26	21	20

With regards to part B of your request; the data that is provided by the operators via the regulatory returns does not state whether the police were unable to attend, therefore we are unable to provide these figures.

Response Three

The Commission does not log SARs with the NCA, although we do share information with them for operational purposes. Please note however that information relating to National Security agencies is exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

Response Four

The Commission publishes this information as a matter of course:

<http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/Regulatory-action/Regulatory-action.aspx>

<http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/news-action-and-statistics/Regulatory-action/National-Lottery-regulatory-action.aspx>

For ease of reference, the following table shows all financial sanctions which have been imposed following regulatory action under the Gambling Act 2005 for the date range you have requested.

Licence Holder	Fine Imposed	Date Imposed
David Neville Porter	£10,000	23 February 2016
Diamond Gaming Group Limited	£5,000	8 September 2015
Gary Wiltshire	£2,500	13 May 2014
Celtic Racing CB Limited	£8,000	21 March 2013
Gamestec Leisure Ltd	£6,508	19 January 2012
Mazooma International Games Ltd	£13,494	19 January 2012
Nicolwain Ltd	£3,500	16 December 2010

The following table shows all licences which have been revoked due to regulatory action:

Operating Licences = 12

Licence Holder	Licence Held
Jamie Knott t/a Bet James Bet Butler Limited	General Betting Standard – Non-remote & Ancillary Remote Remote General Betting Standard – Real Event, Casino and Betting Intermediary
Betting Consultancy Limited	Non-Remote and Remote Betting Intermediary
*Globet International Sports Betting Ltd	Remote General Betting Standard – Real Event
*Joyce Bezel t/a J.b. Racing	General Betting Standard – Remote Platform; General Betting Limited – Non-Remote
Bodugi Limited	Remote General Betting Standard – Real event; Remote Pool betting
Venue Gaming Ltd t/a Magic	Gaming Machine General (AGC)
*Cricket Bet Limited	Remote General Betting Standard – Real Event
*ibetX Limited t/a Bettor.com	Remote Betting Intermediary; Non-Remote General Betting Standard
Bet n Lay	Non-Remote General Betting Limited; Ancillary Remote General Betting Limited
ATL Amusements/ATL Hire	Gaming Machine General (AGC); Gaming Machine Technical (Supplier)
KK Racing	Non-Remote General Betting Standard

Personal Licences = 107

Licence Holder	Licence	Date Revoked
Mohamed Mahmoud Yehia Ahmed El Sayed	Personal Functional Licence (PFL)	8 November 2016
Fergus Carmichael	PFL	9 August 2016
Sianne Wardle	PFL	29 July 2016
David Kay	Personal Management Licence (PML)	18 July 2016
Robiul Alom Matin	PFL	14 July 2016
Waseem Pervez	PFL	6 July 2016
Richard Andrew O'Neill	PFL	5 July 2016
Andrew Scott Wilson	PFL	15 June 2016
Sergej Kiricenko	PML	18 May 2016
Gintaras Svilpa	PML	18 May 2016
Konstantin Beniusis	PML	18 May 2016
Stuart Paul Brown	PFL	19 April 2016
Eduard Haralambie Kepert	PFL	3 March 2016
Ella Mudd	PFL	2 February 2016
Melvin Ronald Rowland	PFL	4 January 2016
Anthony Donald Dobbs	PFL	21 December 2015
Ricardo Martin Roma Calero	PFL	28 October 2015
Daniel Johnson	PFL	22 July 2015
Craig Walker	PFL	22 July 2015
Stephen Grace	PFL	18 June 2015
Fama Massimiliano	PFL	4 June 2015

Marcin Grobelny	PFL	1 June 2015
Shaun Pace	PFL	13 May 2015
*Filippe Scalora	PML	1 May 2015
Simon Crudgington	PFL	18 February 2015
Andrew Hosie	PML	23 January 2015
Barry Witherspoon	PFL	19 January 2015
Hayley Walker	PFL	2 December 2014
Keith Fagan	PFL	2 December 2014
Melizza De Guzman	PFL	9 October 2014
Simon McKenry	PFL	6 August 2014
Nathan Kenworthy	PFL	17 June 2014
Marco Bove	PFL	16 April 2014
Philip Barratt	PFL	24 March 2014
Nathan Glenn Droniuk	PFL	18 March 2014
Giovanni Maria Milazzo	PFL	11 March 2014
Marco Giammona	PFL	10 March 2014
Israel John Charles Rowe	PFL	7 March 2014
Arben Sina	PFL	3 March 2014
	PFL	4 February 2014
	PFL	20 January 2014
	PML	23 December 2013
	PFL	23 December 2013
	PFL	5 December 2013
	PFL	24 October 2013
	PFL	23 October 2013
	PFL	4 October 2013
	PML	19 September 2013
	PML	27 August 2013
	PFL	19 August 2013
	Combined PML and PFL	19 August 2013
	PFL	19 August 2013
	PML	1 August 2013
	PFL	29 July 2013
	PFL	17 June 2013
	PML	6 June 2013
	PFL	20 February 2013
	PML	24 October 2012
	PFL	18 September 2012
	PFL	20 August 2012
	PML	11 July 2012
	PFL	11 June 2012
	PFL	6 March 2012
	PFL	16 February 2012
	PFL	4 January 2012
	PFL	25 November 2011
	PFL	25 November 2011
	PML	22 November 2011
	PML	22 November 2011
	PFL	9 November 2011
	PFL	9 November 2011
	PFL	19 July 2011

	PFL	11 July 2011
	PFL	11 July 2011
	PFL	11 July 2011
	PFL	7 June 2011
	PFL	7 June 2011
	PML	26 May 2011
	PFL	6 April 2011
	PFL	6 April 2011
	PML	22 March 2011
	PFL	27 January 2011
	PFL	27 January 2011
	PFL	27 January 2011
	PFL	25 January 2011
	PFL	25 January 2011
	PML	8 November 2010
	PFL	28 October 2010
	PFL	28 October 2010
	PFL	19 October 2010
	PFL	19 October 2010
	PFL	24 August 2010
	PML	28 July 2010
	PML	28 July 2010
	PFL	2 July 2010
	PFL	1 July 2010
	PFL	28 June 2010
	PFL	21 June 2010
	PFL	3 June 2010
	PML	3 June 2010
	PFL	25 May 2010
	PML	25 March 2010
	PML	25 March 2010
	PML	25 March 2010
	PFL	23 March 2010
	PML	28 January 2010
	PFL	5 January 2010

Please note that some personal data has been removed from this list. Whilst we recognise that there is a legitimate public interest in promoting the accountability and transparency of public authorities and also that there is an interest in highlighting instances of non-compliance within the industry in order to promote compliance from other operators; over three years has passed since the revocation of these individuals licences.

The Commission publishes information on regulatory sanctions that it imposes, having carefully considered the level of detail which would be proportionate to release to increase public understanding and encourage compliance from other operators.

The Commission's policy on publishing sanctions currently provides that the sanctions stay as a matter of public record for three years, releasing the identity of these individuals once this period has expired would be contrary to this principle.

The names of individuals who have had their licence revoked would constitute personal data which is exempt from disclosure. The Data Protection Act 1998 requires the processing of

personal data to be fair and lawful. It would be disproportionate for us to publically disclose these details unless there is a strong public interest in doing so. These individuals have a legitimate expectation that their personal details will not be disclosed in the context in which they were held. Where action is taken against individuals who hold personal licences, this information is published on the Commission's website for a period of three years. On balance, there is no legitimate public interest in disclosing this information and it would not be fair to do so. This information is therefore exempt under section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

With regards to your request relating to the number of complaints received by the Gambling Commission, the following table shows a breakdown of complaints received by our contact centre during 2016.

Area	Total
About another regulator	183
Advertising & Marketing	481
Binary options	269
Complaints & Disputes	38
Gambling management tools	37
General	14
Illegal Activity	311
Other	1394
Protection of Children	24
Protection of Vulnerable	69
Provision of Credit	2
Self-exclusion	643
Social gaming	67
Terms and Conditions	1879
Unfair RNG	288
Withdrawal of money	2073
Grand Total	7772

Previous to this complaints were not categorised in this way. The details of a complaint received would have been contained within the 'free text' area of our recording system. The only way to identify which category a complaint relates to would require manually checking the comments entered against the records, or emails attached to the records.

Section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) makes provision for public authorities to refuse requests for information where the cost of dealing with them would exceed the appropriate limit, which for public authorities, such as the Commission, is set at £450. This represents the estimated cost of one person spending 2.5 working days in determining whether the department holds the information, locating, retrieving and extracting the information. We estimate that it would take in excess of 2.5 working days to determine appropriate material and locate, retrieve and extract any relevant information in reference to your request as there are over 3000 records which may contain relevant information and would need to be checked. If you are able to narrow your request, in terms of the timescale or type of complaint we should be able to provide some data by working up to the time limit.

Response Five

Individuals and operators licensed by the Gambling Commission are required to report 'Key Events' to us. A key event is an incident that could have a significant impact on the nature or structure of the business. The incidents which you have detailed in your request to us do not fall under the category of events which are required to be reported to us by licensees. A detailed list of what they are required to report can be found under [licence condition 15.2](#) of the Licence conditions and codes of practice.

The Gambling Commission does receive reports of incidents involving children or vulnerable persons from various different sources through our contact centre or confidential reporting line and also other law enforcement agencies. This information will be passed on the most appropriate department and dealt with accordingly.

Unfortunately this is not something that is stored centrally and we do not categorise this information in such a way that we can easily extract the data which you are looking for. Therefore it would require a manual search of records (including enquiries received, policy areas, casework and so forth).

Section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) makes provision for public authorities to refuse requests for information where the cost of dealing with them would exceed the appropriate limit, which for public authorities, such as the Commission, is set at £450. This represents the estimated cost of one person spending 2.5 working days in determining whether the department holds the information, locating, retrieving and extracting the information. We estimate that it would take in excess of 2.5 working days to determine appropriate material and locate, retrieve and extract any relevant information in reference to your request. Therefore, this part of your request will not be processed further. Due to the scope of this part of the request, it would be unrealistic to give an estimate of the cost that such a search would be likely to generate.

Public authorities are under a duty to advise and assist requestors with their requests, including instances where a request cannot be dealt with within the time limits provided by the FOIA. You may wish to narrow the scope of your request to bring it within the time limit. If there is a particular aspect that you are interested in, please advise of this and we will continue to process this part of the request.

[Young People and Gambling 2016](#)

Response Six

The following table shows a breakdown of key events submitted to the Gambling Commission Since 2010.

Category	Year								Grand Total
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Administration					6	25	12		43
ADR entity					3	117	28	1	149
Audit concerns						3	1		4
Banking arrangements					4	40	16	7	67
Bankruptcy/Sequestration/IVA	5	1	29	16	16	5	10	1	83
Breach of a covenant			1		4				5
Changes to key positions		1				1	168	96	266
Complaints and disputes					7	71	104	4	186

Compliance assessments						14	17	7	38
Composition of affairs			1		2	1			4
Court judgment	2	1	5	3					11
Criminal investigations							1	11	12
Criminal offence	5	4	48	13	5	5	2		82
Customer funds account deficit						4	4		8
Customer funds change						9	21	2	32
Customer proceedings						1	3	1	5
Default on a loan						2	1		3
Departure qualifying position	6	10	62	72	124	159	122		555
Disciplinary sanction	34	121	194	173	172	162	117	27	1000
Gross misconduct	2	2	18	22	30	10	4	3	91
Investigation			1	4	16	13	18	3	55
Licence applications					3	56	55	5	119
Loans and investment					2	10	34	1	47
Loans and investment non FCA					1	18	33	2	54
Material litigation	3	4	1	4	9	23	23	2	69
Name/address change	205	202	1605	1889	1634	1497	1262	228	8523
Organisational changes		2		3	71	253	274	57	660
Other	1	2	7	23	58	63	44	9	207
Payment processors					7	38	64	7	116
Qualified audit report					2	20	8		30
Regulatory investigations							1	6	7
Sanction or penalty	2	5	3	10	6	14	8		48
Suspicious activity report SAR					693	1979	2374	274	5320
Third party services					9	49	71	11	140
Trading website/domain changes	1	2	12	33	66	247	413	49	823
Unpaid court judgments		1	1	1		2	4	1	10
Unplanned change of auditor		1							1
Winding-up of companies	1		3	10	4	10	11	3	42
Grand Total	267	359	1991	2276	2954	4921	5328	818	18915

Response Seven

With regards to SARs, we are notified by operators of the number of SARs they have submitted to the NCA over the course of a year. We do not receive details of the reasons, just the number that have been submitted.

The NCA publish details of the SARs they receive in annual reports:

<http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/publications/677-sars-annual-report-2015/file>

Review of the decision

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your Freedom of Information request and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, you should write to FOI Team, Gambling Commission, 4th floor, Victoria Square House, Victoria Square, Birmingham, B2 4BP.

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner (ICO) for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Gambling Commission. The ICO can be contacted at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.

Request One

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I seek the following information:

1. For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar year and operator:
 - a. The number new self-exclusions
 - b. The number of self-exclusion breaches

Request Two

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I seek the following information:

1. For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar year, sector involved (e.g. betting, bingo, casino) and type of incident (if held):
 - a. The number times police assistance was required to deal with an incident directly related to the gambling activity
 - b. Of that figure, how many times police were unable to attend

Request Three

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I seek the following information:

1. For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar year, glossary code and reason for suspicion:
 - a. The number of Suspicious Activity Reports logged by the Gambling Commission

Request Four

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I seek the following information:

1. For the period 2010 to 2016 please provide:
 - a. Every fine levied by the Gambling Commission, including the sum and date of the fine
 - b. Every license revoked, including the date and whose license was revoked
2. For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar year and type of complaint:
 - a. The number of complaints recorded by the Gambling Commission

Request Five

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I seek the following information:

1. For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar and type of incident:
 - a. The number of incidents in which children were harmed or exploited by gambling
 - b. The number of incidents in which other vulnerable persons were harmed or exploited by gambling

Request Six

For the period 2010 to 2016 please break down by calendar year and type of incident, all "Key Events"

Request Seven

What information is held by the Gambling Commission in relation to SARs?

I would prefer to receive the above requested information electronically, preferably as a data set, eg. as a .CSV or .XLS file, NOT as a PDF.

If the decision is made to withhold some of this data using exemptions in the Data Protection Act 1998, please inform me of that fact and cite the exemptions used.

If some parts of this request are easier to answer than others, I would ask that you release the available data as soon as possible.

If you need any clarification then please do not hesitate to contact me. I'd like to remind you that Under Section 16 it is your duty to provide advice and assistance and so I would expect you to contact me if you find this request unmanageable in any way.

I would be grateful if you could confirm in writing that you have received this request, and I look forward to hearing from you within the 20-working day statutory time period.