

GAMBLING COMMISSION

National Casino Forum Independent Panel for Casino and Bingo Arbitration (IPCA)

Report for period 1 October 2015 – 30 September 2016

The following table sets out the numbers of disputes and complaints which consumers referred to IPCA in the year to 30 September 2016 and how they were dealt with by IPCA.

Information to be provided as required by the relevant regulations	IPCA response
a) the number of domestic disputes and cross-border disputes the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) entity received;	The IPCA received 32 enquiries relating to potential domestic disputes. (None were cross-border disputes). Of these 4 proceeded to a full ADR investigation: these are described in b) below. The remainder were dealt with as in e) below.
b) the types of complaints to which the disputes related;	<p>4 cases were subjected to a full ADR investigation: all were casino cases. Of these:</p> <p>1 related to withholding monies from a player who had placed late bets.</p> <p>1 related to disputed outcome of a poker game.</p> <p>1 related to withholding winnings from a player who used unfair gaming practices.</p> <p>1 related to withholding winnings from a barred player.</p> <p>Of the 4, 1 was found in favour of the player concerned and 3 in favour of the casino.</p>

c) a description of any systematic or significant problems that occurred frequently and led to disputes between consumers and traders of which the ADR entity has become aware due to its operations as an ADR entity;	There were no common or systematic issues.
d) any recommendations the ADR entity has as to how the problems referred to in paragraph c) could be avoided or resolved in future, in order to raise traders' standards and to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices;	Not applicable.
e) the number of disputes which the ADR entity refused to deal with, and percentage share of the grounds set out in paragraph 13 of Schedule 3 of the regulations on which the ADR entity declined to consider such disputes;	<p>3 enquires were not for ADR (eg complaint matter for Gambling Commission).</p> <p>17 enquiries had not exhausted internal company procedures.</p> <p>3 enquiries were a matter for another ADR entity.</p> <p>5 enquiries had insufficient information to categorise or progress.</p> <p>This means that more than 87% of enquiries received by IPCA were not ADRs that required investigation.</p>
f) the percentage of alternative dispute resolution procedures which were discontinued for operational reasons and, if known, the reasons for the discontinuation;	None
g) the average time taken to resolve disputes;	On average the ADR process took 30 days to complete.
h) the rate of compliance, if known, with the outcomes of the alternative dispute resolution procedures;	1 out of 1 (100%)
i) the co-operation, if any, of the ADR entity within any network of ADR entities which facilitates the resolution of cross-border disputes.	Not applicable.