



## Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety

### **Inquiry into Cashless Gaming in the ACT** **ANSWER TO QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

Asked by Mr Andrew Braddock on 27 March 2024: Aino Suomi from the ANU Centre of Gambling Research took on notice the following question:

Reference: Hansard [uncorrected] proof transcript 27 March 2024, page 40:

In relation to:

**A/Prof Suomi:** ... So we looked at some data here in the ACT and in Tasmania and looked—done some modelling around low-risk gambling guidelines, so what expenditure or proportion of your income is likely to start experiencing harms. And they are a lot lower than the Tasmanian limits. So I would recommend evidence-based recommendation would be lower than that.

I understand that it is difficult to have a one-size fits all if you are going a lot lower than 5,000 a year, 500 or 100 on weekly basis. And then that needs to be a practical consideration. Also there is other measures like a proportion of your income, which is obviously more difficult to implement because, you know, it is—you know, you cannot spend more than this and you need to have other more sophisticated systems in the pre-commitment systems.

You can also pre-commit time or breaks. So there is all sorts of things. I think the expenditure, or loss limits, it is an easy one. So it is easy to understand. It is easy to market, and it is easy to implement in terms of—I think we need more recent data. So we have looked at the data that is now five years old. We know that gambling participation, expenditure, has changed in the last five years. So we also need some more recent data from the ACT to really understand what the—but I think the Tasmanian model is a nice happy medium with the current knowledge.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Sorry, I just got confused by your answer. You were indicating earlier in your answer that it should be lower than the Tasmanian model? Which was going to be my next question, as to what do you recommend would be the limits?

**A/Prof Suomi:** I do not have any exact figures what it would be. But our evidence is about—we said for EGM gambling, in our lower risk gambling guidelines, it would be about 400 a month, if I remember correctly. I might get back to you on that. But it is a lot—

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you. If you could please take that on notice I would appreciate that.

ANU Centre for Gambling Research: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:–

I have attached the peer reviewed article (Dowling et al., 2022) to my submission and outlined the relevant findings below:

Using general population data from ACT and Tasmania, low-risk gambling limits were identified for all gambling activities. For EGMs they are as follows: 10 times per year, AUD\$300/year, 0.63–1.04% of personal income, AUD\$35 per session, 40 min/session. **Exceeding these** limits was a significant strong predictor of gambling harm. The annual expenditure limit of \$300 is much lower than the Tasmanian limit (\$5,000) and likely not feasible to implement for a universal pre-commitment scheme, but will provide guidance in striking the right balance for the loss limits. In addition, more recent data from ACT is needed to understand what the low-risk limits should look like.

Dowling, N. A., Youssef, G. J., Greenwood, C., Merkouris, S. S., Suomi, A., & Room, R. (2022). The identification of low-risk gambling limits for specific gambling activities. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 38(2), 559-590.

Approved for circulation to the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety



Signature:

Date:10/4/2024

By ANU Centre for Gambling Research, Associate Professor, Aino Suomi