



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMICS, INDUSTRY
AND RECREATION**

(Reference: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2024-25](#))

Members:

MR T WERNER-GIBBINGS (Chair)
MS F CARRICK (Deputy Chair)
MR T EMERSON
MS E LEE
MR S RATTENBURY

PROOF TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

THURSDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2025

This is a **PROOF TRANSCRIPT** that is subject to suggested corrections by members and witnesses. The **FINAL TRANSCRIPT** will replace this transcript within 20 working days from the hearing date, subject to the receipt of corrections from members and witnesses.

Acting Secretary to the committee:
Mr A Walker (Ph: 620 74843)

By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

Submissions, answers to questions on notice and other documents, including requests for clarification of the transcript of evidence, relevant to this inquiry that have been authorised for publication by the committee may be obtained from the Legislative Assembly website.

APPEARANCES

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Access Canberra..... | 128 |
| Gambling and Racing Commission | 128 |

Privilege statement

The Assembly has authorised the recording, broadcasting and re-broadcasting of these proceedings.

All witnesses making submissions or giving evidence to committees of the Legislative Assembly for the ACT are protected by parliamentary privilege.

“Parliamentary privilege” means the special rights and immunities which belong to the Assembly, its committees and its members. These rights and immunities enable committees to operate effectively, and enable those involved in committee processes to do so without obstruction, or fear of prosecution.

Witnesses must tell the truth: giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter, and may be considered a contempt of the Assembly.

While the committee prefers to hear all evidence in public, it may take evidence in-camera if requested. Confidential evidence will be recorded and kept securely. It is within the power of the committee at a later date to publish or present all or part of that evidence to the Assembly; but any decision to publish or present in-camera evidence will not be taken without consulting with the person who gave the evidence.

Amended 20 May 2013

The committee met at 10.45 am

Appearances:

Access Canberra

Rynehart, Mr Josh, Head of Access Canberra, City and Environment Directorate;
Acting Commissioner for Fair Trading

Gambling and Racing Commission

Beacroft, Ms Laura, Chairperson
Cubin, Ms Derise, interim Chief Executive Officer

THE CHAIR: Good morning and welcome to the public hearings on the Standing Committee on Economics, Industry and Recreation for its Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2024-25. The committee will today hear from the Gambling and Racing Commission.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land we are meeting on, the Ngunnawal people. We wish to acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of the city and this region. We would also like to acknowledge and welcome other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending today's event.

This hearing is a legal proceeding of the Assembly and has the same standing as proceedings of the Assembly itself. Therefore, today's evidence attracts parliamentary privilege. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as contempt of the Assembly.

The hearing is being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published. The proceedings are also being broadcast and web-streamed live. When taking a question, it would be useful if witnesses use these words: "I will take that question on notice". This will help the committee and witnesses to confirm questions taken on notice from the transcript.

We welcome witnesses from the Gambling and Racing Commission. For the Hansard record, when you first speak, please state your name and the capacity in which you appear.

As we are not inviting opening statements, we will now proceed to questions.

Colleagues Mr Rattenbury and Ms Lee owe apologies for today.

MS CARRICK: I would like to start with the number of harm incidents. There is a table in there, Table 6, that talks about self-exclusions and gambling harm. Gambling harm incidents seem to be increasing quite a lot year on year: 29,500 in 2022-23; 32,000 in 2023-24; and a big jump up to 47,000 in 2024-25. Can you explain why those incidents of harm are increasing?

Ms Cubin: Derise Cubin, interim CEO of the Gambling and Racing Commission. With regards to the harm incidents, you are correct; they are increasing. I think there have

been elements where some of the commission's regulatory activities have acted as a deterrent effect; the expectation that venues would continue to submit harm incidents so we can track those. I think the other aspect is that we had some engagement last year with venues to remind them about the need to continue to submit incidents about harm.

One of the other elements that we are doing this year is taking a closer look at the types of incidents that are being recorded. I think that is a key factor around the scale of the type of incidents that are being identified, because that will allow us to hone into where the real incidents of harm might be happening.

Ms Beacroft: I am just confirming what my colleague said. My name is Laura Beacroft. I am chair of the commission. We do not have a comprehensive answer for you but it is a massive increase, clearly. We have a program which is happening this year, which is going to, if you like, interrogate more what is happening with the incidents that have been reported. But one thing we do know from analysis is that the large increase in incidents being reported is not uniform across all licensees; it is only some licensees. I have got those figures if you like. As an example, the Hellenic Club reported 3,200 more incidents than in 2023-24. The Vikings Group—

MR EMERSON: 3,200?

Ms Beacroft: 3,200 more.

MS CARRICK: Yes, but the incidents are 47,000.

Ms Beacroft: Yes. Well, Raiders Group reported 8,367 more incidents than 2023-24. Vikings Group reported 1,219 more incidents than in 2023-24. So, it is not a uniform pattern across all clubs. But we have got this program that is happening this year to look more closely at the incidents being reported; why some clubs are reporting more than others, and what, in fact, should be the best practice. It is obviously a program that involves a lot of cooperative work with clubs and the casino, and also looking at what they do about the incidents—because that is another issue, what the follow-up is. If they are reporting an incident, what then happens with that customer?

MS CARRICK: Is there not a process already in place for that follow-up?

Ms Beacroft: By us or the club?

MS CARRICK: By the club. Some guidance to what the club should be doing?

Ms Beacroft: There is guidance, but—

MS CARRICK: Yes, but to know whether they are actually doing it or not?

Ms Beacroft: So one of the things that a club will report when it reports an incident is whether they took action to offer support or refer individuals experiencing gambling harm—such as providing information on the help service or offering information on self-exclusion. And we know from analysing last year's data that less than 1.5 per cent of those incident reports said that had happened.

One view is that best practice is that in many incidents, maybe not all, one would think the helpline and self-exclusion might be something that would be suggested or talked about. So, clubs have guidance but—I guess like a lot of things—it is how it gets put into practice, understanding there is a lot of movement among staff.

MS CARRICK: There are some exclusions that are not really moving in the same proportion. They go from 226 in 2022-23 to 295 in 2024-25. It is not on that same trajectory. So why is it that the self-exclusions are not increasing in some sort of proportion to the incidents being reported?

Ms Beacroft: I do not know if you have actually gone onto our website and looked at what the process is, but it is a paper-based process, largely, because in the ACT someone who wants to self-exclude completes a trust deed and that has to be in writing. So it is at one extreme compared to, say, BetStop—which you might be familiar with, which is the commonwealth government’s self-exclusion—where you go online and it is a one-stop shop, and you can do it all online.

The commission is aware that there are hurdles, if you like. That the consumer who already is bravely thinking, “Okay, maybe I need to do something here,” and has bravely gone to our website, then has these hurdles around paper copies and, you know, it is quite a process. Now, of course our staff make it as easy as they can, but ideally we would have a process which is web-based.

MS CARRICK: So, when are you going to have a web-based process?

Ms Beacroft: We are working with government to work through that now. One of the first things is to look at whether that trust deed has to stay. If we could get rid of the trust deed—but that is a legal question—then we could move to something that is more web-based, in time.

MS CARRICK: That table does not have licensee exclusions. Do you have the numbers for licensee exclusions?

Ms Beacroft: We will take that on notice.

MS CARRICK: Also, can you provide those numbers of the licensee exclusions, the self-exclusions—well, maybe that does not fit into this category—but the gambling harm incidents by club group?

Ms Beacroft: Sorry, can I clarify the question? The incidents by the entity, or club group?

MS CARRICK: Club group, yes, or the entity. If you want to break it down further—like the Southern Cross Club has got three or four clubs.

Mr Rynehart: Josh Rynehart, Head of Access Canberra. Yes, we will take it on notice. We will come back with whatever we can. I am just conscious that if there are very low numbers, we may need to look at it.

MS CARRICK: You can do it at the club level, but if it is very low numbers then the

group level.

Mr Rynehart: We will take it to a level that we can report.

MS CARRICK: Thank you.

MR EMERSON: So, the self-exclusion system is paper based. Is it easier to withdraw extra cash than to self-exclude?

Ms Beacroft: Well, there are ATMs in the club. There are restrictions on where they are and how much you can withdraw but, yes, it would be.

MR EMERSON: And I was curious about the findings around ensuring the actual rules being followed. So, nearly a quarter of poker machines inspected were found to be in breach of gaming laws, half of all venues inspected were also noncompliant.

Ms Beacroft: This is the actual machines?

MR EMERSON: Yes. Maybe I will go to the first part; the inspection of the machines. Let me get the exact figure. Yes, nearly a quarter of poker machines inspected in the financial year were not compliant. What does that noncompliance look like, exactly?

Ms Beacroft: So that is the noncompliance of the actual machines?

MR EMERSON: Of the machines, yes.

Ms Beacroft: Just one moment. I have got it here. If you like, I can give you an indication. There were multiple instances of noncompliance. Nineteen of the 37 inspected venues—that is 23 per cent of those inspected—had signage, return to player per cent, or note higher denomination acceptance issues, just to go into that in a bit more detail. So, signage is very important, and there was a percentage that did not have signage that was correct or present at all. Some gaming machines did not display what is called a linked jackpot sign. Some were operating at the incorrect return-to-player per cent. One venue was not compliant in that the gaming machine accepted a \$50 note.

Mr Rynehart: Just to clarify so that is 23 per cent is of venues, not of machines.

Ms Beacroft: That is of venues, yes.

MR EMERSON: Although you said 19 out of 37, right? Which is 51 per cent. Or was it 19 were not compliant. There were 56 venues.

Ms Cubin: Nineteen of the 37 inspected venues.

MR EMERSON: Okay. So that is more than half.

Ms Beacroft: Which translates to a certain percentage of machines. Sorry, I think the figure I gave you was about machines. I apologise. Let us talk venues; 19 out of 37.

THE CHAIR: That makes sense. So, in those 19 venues there are 23 per cent of the

total machines.

Ms Beacroft: 143 of the machines inspected, which is 23 per cent of those inspected, had issues—within those 19 venues.

THE CHAIR: Okay, so it is all the same dataset.

Ms Beacroft: It is, I suppose whether you are counting machines or venues.

THE CHAIR: Have you published those venues anywhere?

Ms Beacroft: No. So, this is a proactive regulatory program that we are doing. We have not published the names of those venues.

MR EMERSON: And what are the consequences? Are those venues fined?

Ms Beacroft: Depends on the nature of the noncompliance.

MR EMERSON: Sorry to interrupt, but I am really curious about this. The jackpot not returning what you are supposed to be returning, that is probably as bad as you can get when it comes to noncompliance. What is the consequence of doing that?

Ms Beacroft: There were no disciplinary notices issued as a result of that program. What happened was they have been all brought into compliance.

MR EMERSON: Okay, so you say, “Fix this up. We will come back in a week.” Something like that?

Ms Beacroft: Well, there is a follow-up program in this financial year. What would normally happen is if there is a follow-up program, the sanctions—well, if you like, the response, becomes more significant. But this was the first time in recent years that had occurred, so it was a problem-solving solution, if you like, taking into account the nature of what was discovered.

MR EMERSON: So, when you say that they have been brought into compliance but perhaps you will audit again this financial year. Whether that has happened, you have received an assurance from the club that they have fixed those issues?

Ms Cubin: Yes, we have. So, as Ms Beacroft said, there is a follow-up, operational program, but regarding the incidents of noncompliance that were identified through the previous program, we would, within a week or so, seek that they had remedied those through either evidence provided to us by email, or a revisit.

THE CHAIR: What kind of extra information can you provide? Mr Werner-Gibbings has asked if that information is published—

THE CHAIR: Or even to the committee on notice, about the venues where they had machines that were not compliant. Are you able to share that with us?

Mr Rynehart: We will have a look and see what we can come back with, about that.

THE CHAIR: It could also be shared in confidence, by the way.

MR EMERSON: Yes, if there is a public interest issue.

Ms Beacroft: We will do our very best. As you know, we have got a matrix of secrecy provisions. That is why we cannot say precisely, right at this moment, what we can share with you. We will look at it and give you whatever we can.

MR EMERSON: Thank you. I think if we are able to get something about the venues and the nature of noncompliance in each venue—so they are not all just being summarised or tarred with the same brush, but what exactly happened here and there.

Ms Beacroft: And we can give you the status of compliance in relation to that. My colleagues have indicated they have all been brought into compliance, but we can just clarify that.

MR EMERSON: Clarify when as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: On the compliance, is it that we find a machine and there is something wrong with the programming; or we flip a switch; or there is a switch that should have been flipped that was not, on purpose or by accident? How do you bring a machine back into compliance? How does it fall out of compliance? How does it stop giving the right amount of money?

Ms Beacroft: You are talking about the return to player?

THE CHAIR: As an example. Could some of these issues, or all of these issues of noncompliance be programming bugs or on purpose?

Ms Beacroft: I think we would have to take that on notice because there were specific instances of return-to-player per cents. I appreciate it is a serious matter, but it is better if we put it in a table, if you do not mind, and we indicate what exactly the nature of that was. If that is all right?

THE CHAIR: That is fine. Because a return-to-player fault might still be a bug in the machine. There might not be a special switch that you can flick, saying, “We are not going to give them the right amount of money”—or some sort of programming. Compliance can be on purpose or not; and remedying it can be quick or not.

Mr Rynehart: I think speaking more generally is probably a little better. Yes, there are a range of things that may lead to a machine having an error in it. There are a range of reasons that can lead to having incorrect signage and other things, as well. Part of our compliance program is to look at where the rates are at. Then we start to look at the potential causes and the drive behind those.

There are lots of reasons that things can happen, absolutely. I think we are probably just better to speak more generally about what might happen rather than specifics—particularly in a case that we either have not completed or we are still running a program, that sort of stuff, just rather than looking at the specifics of what caused a

particular issue.

THE CHAIR: I am interested in a general sense.

MR EMERSON: Is the requirement for a minimum return to the player? And that would be the breach?

Ms Cubin: Yes.

MR EMERSON: I am thinking about the chair's question. Would you have any evidence if a machine was accidentally returning way more than is normal? Obviously, you might give that club a pat on the back! But I am just wondering if that would help us understand is it an error in the machine, a technical bug, in which case sometimes it will be more, sometimes it will be less. If it is always less, then it is a little bit more suspicious, right?

Ms Beacroft: Yes. It is fairly technical. Perhaps we could take that on notice and provide background about what exactly the return to player is, what the requirements are, and how that can be checked. If that would be all right, to provide more context?

THE CHAIR: You do not have to focus on the return to player; all forms of noncompliance. There is a whole range. That would be useful for us, because we are all likely to be on this committee for the next three years.

Ms Beacroft: A random machine?

THE CHAIR: Yes. So, the work you are doing and how you do it. That would be helpful.

Ms Beacroft: We have a rolling cycle, checking a certain percentage of machines every year.

MR EMERSON: Perhaps also on that—I do not think you would log it, but maybe you would—checking if you have encountered any incidences of a far higher return to player.

Mr Rynehart: We will take it on notice. With regard to how these things come to attention: it can be an inspection program; it can be reporting; it can be information that comes to us in various ways. And there are ways that we then consider that information that form programs and other activities.

MR EMERSON: I understand. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I understand, but I have one question. It is related to the regulatory activities per page 12 in financial year 24-25: the commission undertook a series of targeted regulatory activities focused on areas identified as having elevated risk and potential for harm. What were, in that financial year, the identified elevated risk areas? What sort of harm is there potential for?

Ms Cubin: With regards to that, highlighting below: they do targeted inspection

activities. We say they are “in the field” or operation activities. So, when there is, for example, the Melbourne Cup or Black Opal races, the team will go on site to those particular venues or where that might be happening. There is sports bookmaking, and we also look at other activities. I guess it is focusing on those activities where people might be potentially gambling more on that particular day. So that is the targeted aspect. We do have, as Ms Beacroft identified, rolling compliance programs, as well, throughout the year, with a key focus.

THE CHAIR: Once again, the areas that are identified: is it more just on an event basis? It is not geographical locations?

Ms Cubin: It is event-based.

Ms Beacroft: But also, we do a risk analysis. The commission does a fairly comprehensive risk analysis which is integrated with all the branches. That concludes in time for our planning for the forthcoming year. And the risks that, if you like, underpin the programs we conducted in the last financial year, translated into the following proactive programs. Is that the sort of thing that you wanted to know?

We have a rolling program of monitoring compliance by the casino, but the scope varies from year to year. The sorts of things we looked at last year were about financial integrity, because of some of the issues that have flowed through from interstate. Also, a risk that we are looking at in general—not just to do with the casino—is how they were managing and what sort of procedures they had in place, what approaches they had for minimising harm, and identifying self-excluded persons entering.

That also flowed through to the gambling harm minimisation program for clubs, where we looked at what approaches they had for minimising harm, what sort of procedures they had. I mean, there are some subjective elements in some of this. It is not all about requirements, because everything is not laid down in black and white. But, as I said, the commission had already realised that it was a tiny per cent of incidents that said people were being referred to the helpline and for self-exclusion. So, that indicated that program was necessary to see what was happening.

Another one is the community contributions program, which is also being conducted now, as we speak, because there had been various issues raised with the commission—not in the form of a formal complaint as such, but there was interest in making sure that area of our legislation was being administered properly. We did the first phase of that program last financial year and it will conclude before Christmas.

Also, we did the rolling program of gaming machine checks, where, again, the scope varies a little bit with the gaming machines from year to year.

So those were the four that we did last year, which came out of this sort of integrated risk planning and listening to issues that are raised.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. This is a different issue. It is a bit more philosophical. What is the commission’s position—or potential levers, if any—on mitigating the steepening usage and resulting harm of mobile phone based sports gambling? Is that out of your purview? Because it is a thing, from my understanding.

Ms Cubin: It is a thing. I guess it comes back to the online gambling, which is out of our scope—apart from obviously promoting like the harm minimisation strategies and the gambling harm support services that we have.

Ms Beacroft: Our prevention services, and we have got a lot—they are all set out in the annual report, and we are constantly expanding them and the research we do—do not just look at what we have got jurisdiction for. It is about trying to work out how we can contribute as a whole, whether it is online gambling, mobile-based, children, young people, adults. But in terms of our jurisdiction to regulate, we do not have tentacles into the online gambling.

THE CHAIR: That was my expectation. Just checking.

MS CARRICK: I was looking in the legislation. Does it have a definition of a casino? Do you know what the definition is, in your world?

Ms Beacroft: I would have to look at it. I would be guided by the legislation. If there is no definition, I would have to take that on notice.

MS CARRICK: Could you take that on notice? I am curious to know what the difference is between the casino and the clubs?

Ms Beacroft: We will take that on notice.

MS CARRICK: Thank you. Do you check that the annual reports are all published by the clubs?

Ms Cubin: I am happy to start. Yes we do. Although, with the annual reports from clubs there is not a reporting period that lines up. So, they do not have to do financial year. They do not have to do calendar year. They can do whatever works best for the club, because some of them do it from their incorporation or another aspect.

I think, from the data that we have, there are approximately seven potential different reporting periods across different clubs. Within that, they have up to six months to provide their report to the commission, for us to then publish. So, there is inconsistency with regards to the reporting requirements on the commission to upload their reports. Also, there is not one specific timeframe in which they need to provide their annual reports. But they do need to provide them. It makes it tricky.

MS CARRICK: Are you required to publish them? And are the clubs required to publish them on their websites as well?

Ms Cubin: Yes.

MS CARRICK: So, if I went to a club website, I should be able to find their annual report? Do you check that they actually do that?

Ms Beacroft: It might be good if we took this on notice, to give you the exact sections, but I will just try to summarise. It is unfortunately complicated. Section 158 of the

Gaming Machine Act requires licensees to have their financial statements audited, and then part of that section requires them to provide a copy to the GRC. So, most clubs, in giving us their financial statements, give us their annual report. But it is not necessarily the same. Licensees, which are a bit smaller, only need to have statements certified, not audited. They might not have an annual report. But yes, they also have to provide us with that documentation.

And then section 54(2) of the Gaming Machine Act requires club licensees to provide an electronic copy of the annual report to us, and also make it public on the website that can be accessed free of charge. Generally, the clubs do publish that on their website. As my colleague was explaining, because they have six months to give us whatever they are going to provide us, if they publish on their website it is usually much quicker. They might provide it to us in the fifth month, and also there are all these seven timeframes, so it does not all happen by Christmas for the entire sector.

MS CARRICK: That is okay, as long as they consistently put it on there. It is just that I have tried finding some and I cannot find them. That is why I raised it and I am wondering if you check that they actually do it.

Ms Beacroft: Well, there is a level of noncompliance. We know that because when we have been doing the community contributions program, which is partially reported on for last year's annual report, we found a level of noncompliance with what I have just spoken of, which we are fixing. But, of course, that is for previous annual reports. So what we also need to do as we go forward with that program is make sure that all the clubs understand what they have to do—and also the specifics of what has to be in it, around community contributions. So that is also something we have to do going forward. You will not see that until they publish their next annual report.

MS CARRICK: That is okay, as long as it is consistently published.

Ms Beacroft: Okay, yes. Did you want us to take on notice the requirements for publishing? Did you want us to do that?

MS CARRICK: No, I have got it in the Act. I know it is all there. I just cannot find some of them, that is all.

MR EMERSON: I understand there is a loophole where people who have voluntarily self-excluded through the national self-exclusion register, that they are able to still withdraw large sums of cash and place bets with major bookmakers in town, without any verification against BetStop. Are you also aware of that?

Ms Beacroft: I am aware of that case. I think that there is litigation about that. That is to do with BetStop.

MR EMERSON: Is that something that, at the ACT level, we are working on or focusing on?

Ms Beacroft: Like I said before, we do not have jurisdiction with that. I think that person went on to do online betting; it was not related to entering the club.

I guess there are lessons for any self-exclusion scheme. How do we make it as good as we can for the consumer? We know from evidence—even our own surveys—that someone who does self-exclude will try, often, to gamble again. So, we have to be aware of that and try to shore up our own self-exclusion scheme so it gives the consumer as good an assurance as we can give them—even if they then, a couple of weeks later, try to gamble.

We do have breaches, and disciplinary action is taken because sometimes people do manage to gamble again and even, in some cases, receive winnings. So it is not a perfect system in the ACT. It is partly because it is paper based. It makes it more complicated.

MR EMERSON: Are you able to provide on notice of any instances of how many times that is happened in the last financial year? Obviously, it will not be relevant to my question about BetStop but—

Ms Beacroft: I think I do have that.

THE CHAIR: In the meanwhile, Mr Rynehart?

Mr Rynehart: So designation of a casino. Section 62(1) of the Casino Control Act indicates a regulation may define a designated casino. Section 6 of the Casino Control Regulation indicates that schedule 1, 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 designate a casino, which has a series of pictures of floor plans related to the casino. So that is how we would define a casino relating to our regulations. It is defined by the floor plan of the casino, under the regulation.

MS CARRICK: So what is the difference between the floor plan at the casino and the floor plan in a pokie area?

Mr Rynehart: I suppose for the purposes of this legislation, that is how the casino is defined. That is probably the best way I can answer that question. So, the Casino Control Act defines the casino by the floor plan of the casino.

MR EMERSON: You mean by the floor plan of Canberra Casino; the casino that we have?

Mr Rynehart: Yes, within the regulation there is actually a floor plan in there. So that is what defines the casino for the purposes of the Casino Control Act. Clubs are licensed through the Gaming Machine Act and other pieces of legislation. That is the difference.

MS CARRICK: So it is the floor plan as opposed to the function of what they actually do.

Mr Rynehart: Yes. By definition, it defines that floor plan is that function.

MS CARRICK: Yes, right. That is a bit odd.

Ms Beacroft: I do have that data, if you would like it. We have been interrogating what is called the exclusion database more because, coming back to the question you asked before of how we assess risk, obviously that is a wonderful database for us.

To be specific around your question: if we analyse the exclusion breaches—that is where an entity has said that a self-excluded person got into the club—the good news is that 59 per cent of those people were picked up at reception. That is good news. But two per cent were picked up when claiming winnings. And there were 21 individuals—that is 16 per cent of the self-exclusion breachers—where they had entered a club on more than one occasion.

So that is 21 people who are getting in despite their own self-exclusion, more than once. That is obviously an area where the commission is concerned. The program we have got this year is trying to work out—obviously we respect the individual—if the clubs, with the help of the commission, can do a bit more to try to stop that.

MR EMERSON: Can I just clarify one fact really quickly? I know we are out of time, but it is 59 per cent picked up at reception, two per cent picked up when claiming winnings?

Ms Beacroft: For 2024-25, correct. Fifty-nine per cent were picked up at reception, by the club; and 2 per cent on winnings.

MR EMERSON: And so does that mean 39 per cent were not picked up?

Ms Beacroft: The rest were picked up. These are of people who have entered. The others were picked up in the gaming areas; 27 per cent. They had not actually got winnings, but they were in the gaming area. That is a concern.

MR EMERSON: Thank you.

Ms Cubin: And Ms Carrick, you asked a question before about licensee exclusions. In 2023-24 there were 14. So far in 2024-25, eight in that total number.

MS CARRICK: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: All right. There were a few questions taken on notice. Please provide your answers to the committee secretary within five business days of receiving the uncorrected proof Hansard.

On behalf of the committee, I thank you for your attendance today. We also thank broadcasting and Hansard for their support. I am sorry, we did it to you again: kept you late. If a member wishes to ask questions on notice upload them to the parliamentary portal as soon as possible, no later than five business days from today. This meeting is now adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 11.20 am