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1 Introduction

1.1 The aim of the Betting Integrity Workstream is to identify and reduce the risks to betting and sport in the UK being corrupted. This includes; players betting on their own sports, event manipulation for betting purposes (cheating), corrupt approaches, misuse of inside information and much more.

1.2 This document is aimed at those bodies the Commission might work with in respect of betting integrity. It sets out the Commission’s processes and decision making framework in the context of betting integrity, from when it first receives a piece of information through to when a case is closed. This framework has been refined following the development of the Sport Betting Intelligence Unit (SBIU).

1.3 The SBIU are at the hub of what has become known as the national platform. This refers to the Commission, law enforcement agencies (LEAs), operators and sport collaborating and cooperating to address match fixing and betting integrity in the UK.

1.4 This document may be revised from time to time to reflect any developments in the Commission’s approach.

2 Background

2.1 The overall aim of the Commission, and its partners, is to reduce the likelihood of corruption and where it is discovered to cause it to end. This is best achieved by working together on a combination of prevention, disruption, deterrence and sanction opportunities. It should be noted that betting in the UK is not restricted to sport; bets can be placed on a number of different markets such as political markets, TV talent competitions, winners or nominees of awards or novelty bets such as the colour of the Queen's hat at a royal event. The decision making framework applies equally to each of these markets i.e. it is not restricted to sports betting.

2.2 There are various other publications that help set out and supports the Commission’s decision making processes, most notably the Licensing, Compliance and Enforcement policy statement, the Licensing Conditions Code of Practice (LCCP), the Sports Betting Intelligence Unit Terms of Reference, the Betting Integrity Policy Position Paper, Misuse of Inside Information Paper and In Play Betting Paper.

2.3 A key component of the Commission’s work on betting integrity is LCCP licence condition (15.1) which requires betting operators to share information on suspicious transactions with the Commission and sports governing bodies (SGBs).

2.4 Under the Gambling Act 2005 (the Act) the Gambling Commission has powers to prosecute offences of cheating and to void bets. Our powers to prosecute cheating offences apply where a person cheats at gambling or where they do anything for the purposes of enabling or assisting another (person) to cheat at gambling.

2.5 If the SBIU receives information that indicates potential criminality, the Betting Integrity Triage Process can be invoked.

2.6 In such cases relevant stakeholders will meet to discuss the available intelligence. This allows each party to understand the potential issues and agree what action should be taken by whom in relation to actions that could be undertaken in relation to both criminal and sports investigations. Appendix 1 shows an overview of the process.
2.7 We also have powers to make an order voiding an individual bet accepted by, or through, the holder of a betting specific licence.

2.8 Pursuing a criminal sanction will not always be possible, and often will not be the most effective or efficient approach to take. It is difficult to prove that the result of an event has been manipulated simply by watching it; instead, a criminal case will very often rely on establishing relationships between those involved and following flows of money.

2.9 In some cases, a SGB sanction may be more appropriate and can act as a timely deterrent. In short this is because the standards of proof required for a civil sanction are less than those required for a criminal sanction and an SGB’s rules, when effectively applied, can be an effective control to achieve our joint aims. Our decision making framework reflects this aim and these issues. However, each case will be considered on its merits and appropriate action taken dependent on the circumstances. Furthermore, SGB action doesn’t rule out the possibility of a criminal charge brought in an appropriate case.

2.10 Once a piece of information is received there are broadly four key partners who can be involved in a case – the Commission, SGBs, betting operators and the police (and/or other law enforcement agencies).

2.11 The flow chart on the next page, in general terms, sets out how a case progresses and the decision making processes. However, it should be noted that this model does not purport to capture all circumstances and the approach may vary according to the occasion. The flow chart will be useful to understand the structure, and different sections, of this document.
3 Approach and decision making framework

Sources of information

3.1 The Commission receives information from a variety of sources, including but not limited to:
- Betting operators
- Bet monitoring companies
- Sports governing bodies (SBGs)
- Law enforcement
- Commission’s confidential hotline
- Media

SBIU development and assessment

3.2 Having received the information, the SBIU will look to establish whether there is any potential criminal activity.

3.3 The SBIU will also consider whether the activity falls within its terms of reference, in particular whether the activity:
- Relates to a sporting event that occurred in Great Britain, and/or
- Involves parties based within Great Britain, and/or
- Occurred with a Gambling Commission licensed operator.

3.4 The quality and detail of information provided may vary substantially. Whilst the SBIU will assess all information provided it must prioritise its use of resources. Accordingly, it may be that not enough information is provided to warrant further work on an issue at that stage. However, all information is logged and if further relevant intelligence came to light the issue could be looked at again.

Decisions on how to progress the intelligence gathered

3.5 SBIU will assess the intelligence gathered to decide on the most appropriate course of action. At this point the following potential next steps are available for consideration:
- No further action – for example, this could be due to a legitimate explanation being identified that accounts for suspicious betting activity or insufficient information is available to proceed with a regulatory or criminal investigation. However, all information received will be logged for intelligence purposes in line with Data Protection principles and the Commission’s own Retention Policy.
- Refer to SGB – this could be where there is potentially a breach of a sport’s rule. The SGB would be best placed to identify and pursue any breaches of rules, regulations or codes of conduct
- Refer to betting operator/employer – this could be where there is potentially a breach of a betting operator’s terms and conditions or contracts of employment. The betting operator would then decide how to proceed with it.

3.6 In addition, some cases may progress to a case assessment – this is where there is sufficient intelligence and evidence to consider progressing the matter. The outcome of this could be:
- Further SBIU development – to secure additional intelligence and evidence. (Information on the case will be disseminated to the Commission’s Issues Management Group (IMG) where relevant and/or appropriate)
• Progress to the IMG. There may be times where the significance of an issue might mean it is escalated to the IMG before all of the elements have been identified.

3.7 If it is established that a referral is not suitable for investigation focused upon a criminal prosecution – for example a breach of sports rules - the SBIU would be unlikely to look into this further. Our investigatory powers, such as those under Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA), can only be utilised when investigating (which covers intelligence work as well as enforcement work) a potential crime. As such we could not use our powers once we consider an issue unsuitable for investigation.

3.8 If the SBIU are satisfied that there is potential criminal activity the issue will be referred to IMG for a decision on to how to progress the issue. Broadly speaking this establishes whether the Commission could progress a case, whereas the case conference stage establishes whether it should.

Issues Management Group

3.9 Cases are progressed to IMG via an Incident Referral Form (IRF). Included within an IRF is a synopsis of is the key issues, including any risks or breaches of licencing objectives/ or Social Responsibility Code and a reference to any alleged offences under the Gambling Act 2005 (or other legislation).

3.10 The purpose of the IMG is to ensure that emerging issues or trends are escalated appropriately within the Commission.

3.11 The potential outcomes from IMG are:
• Further intelligence gathering required to establish circumstances
• Referred to SGBs or betting operators for disruptive (including disciplinary) action
• Escalate to the Case Management Group (CMG).

Case Management Group

3.12 The purpose of the CMG is to ensure that the Commission responds appropriately to key issues or cases, which due to their scale, complexity or novelty are of strategic significance to the Commission. The CMGs role is to identify and manage emergent risks and provide clarity, support and direction to those undertaking casework from case commencement till closure.

3.13 Escalated IRFs will be discussed at the fortnightly CMG. An allocated Case Manager will be in attendance for direction regarding their allocated IRF. CMG direction will ensure that the Case Manager has steer on:
• Focus of investigation: Scope, scale and emphasis / identification of any urgent actions / identity of any criminal offences (GA2005 Section 42 Cheat) / bet voiding options (GA2005 Section 336) or regulatory issues.
• Risk priorities: What elements or actions are urgent / what is the likely consumer impact / what other internal related activity is ongoing within the Commission or with external stakeholders / identifying any reputational risks.
• Identification of resource requirements: Identification of legal lead / general resource planning / identification of external stakeholders / identification of whether contribution by a Director is required / identification of whether Executive Group flagging is required / identification of requirement for further SBIU support.
• Communications requirements.
Effective use of resources

3.14 An underlying aim of this approach is to ensure that criminal activity ceases. This means that the partners involved should use their resources in the most effective and efficient way possible to achieve an effective combination of prevention, deterrence, disruption and sanction.

Investigation (Commission or police)

3.15 The Commission’s broad policy framework in relation to the investigation and prosecution of offences under the Act, including the Commission’s powers is set out in the Commission’s document Licensing, compliance and enforcement policy statement (June 2017). Investigations in respect of betting integrity can be taken individually by the police or Commission or the lead can be taken by one and supported by the other as outlined in the Triage Process (Appendix 1). This arrangement can change during the course of a case depending on developments.

Investigation - Sports Governing Body

3.16 Where or when appropriate, some cases may be referred to a SGB to consider potential breaches of sports rules. The Commission will support SGBs to help ensure that disruptive actions are effective.

Information to SGBs and Operators during investigations

3.17 The Commission may, where appropriate, share information with SGBs and betting operators during investigations. It may be feasible for a SGB to prepare or progress disciplinary cases under sports rules at the same time as a criminal one and it may be appropriate for betting operators to take appropriate action in their own right. These should be the subject of joint discussions to ensure neither the criminal nor the disciplinary action could negatively impact on the other.

Voiding

3.18 The Commission has powers to void individual bets either as a disruptive end in itself or as a stage on the way to a prosecution. More detail about this power is set out in section 5.49 of Licensing, compliance and enforcement policy statement (June 2017).

3.19 Where the Commission exercises this power, any contract or other arrangement relating to the bet will be void, and any money paid in relation to the bet must be returned to the person who paid it. The power to void a bet only applies to the parties to a specific bet; it does not apply to all bets placed on an event.

3.20 In some circumstances the Commission would provide information to operators to support any action they may take relating to suspension or non payment of bets that are deemed to be unfair.

Enforcement

3.21 Following an investigation the Commission may proceed to prosecution, issue a caution or decide to take no further action. Information concerning the framework for deciding how to proceed following an investigation is set out in section 6.8 to 6.111 of Licensing, Compliance and Enforcement policy statement (March 2015).
3.22 The Commission may take action if a licensee is found to be involved and would deal with such cases under our regulatory powers.

3.23 Whilst the Commission can take prosecutions itself, often such court cases will be led by the relevant prosecuting authority, particularly where a police force has been involved, so whether or not to prosecute will often be a decision for them in the first instance. If the Crown Prosecution Service does not think it appropriate to prosecute, the Commission is unlikely to proceed independently with a criminal investigation unless there are exceptional circumstances (for example, the need to set a legal precedent).

SBIU dissemination

3.24 Following the outcome of a case, including where there is no further action, the SBIU may disseminate information to other parties. The information that can be shared will be dependent on the case and any legal restrictions which may apply. The SBIU would also welcome any relevant information from partners on the completion of any action taken by them regarding lessons learnt or emerging themes, to feed back into the wider strategic intelligence picture.

Sharing information with partners

3.25 The Commission will generally look to share information with partners where it is considered appropriate to do so and having made the decision will do so as soon as possible. Generally, and particularly for non-law enforcement partners, this will be in a summarised format. The Commission is usually more able to share data with law enforcement agencies for the purpose of criminal investigations. However, there are constraints as to the circumstances in which the Commission can share data.

3.26 Section 301 and schedule 6 (which names a number of SGBs and competition organisers) of the Act provide a limited list of third parties with whom the Commission may provide information received by it in the course of its duties. However the Commission may choose to provide information to parties not listed where this is considered appropriate in furtherance of the licensing objectives and is not prohibited by any statutory provision or legal principle. Where necessary information provided by the Commission to third parties may be subject to conditions, including the requirement to apply good information handling procedures. The Commission would not be able to pass data to those that do not have appropriate information handling procedures.

3.27 All disclosures of personal data made by the Commission will be subject to the requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

3.28 From May 2018, the Commission will also manage all data in line with the soon to be implemented, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
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Appendix 1 - Triage Process

- SBIU Dissemination
  - Prosecution, Caution or NFA
    - Void?
  - Information Exchange where appropriate

- Referred to Sport/Betting Operators/Others for action
  - Potentially Criminal/Suitable for criminal prosecution?
    - Case Conference
      - SBIU arrange Case Conference
        - Conference outcome: Criminal Investigation appropriate?
          - Information Exchange where appropriate

- Decisions documented & confirmed in writing by SBIU within 3 days of CC

To take place ASAP (in most cases within one week) of criminal activity being identified by SBIU