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The French gambling policy model

- Prevent problem gambling and protect minors
- Ensure the integrity, reliability of games
- Prevent criminal activities and money laundering
- Protect balanced economic sectors
An emerging concept in the early 2000s … debatable … and discussed
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Logic modeling methods in evaluation
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Logic model of a gambling policy based on the regulation of a legal supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Long-term effects</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of gambling supply</td>
<td>Actions against criminal uses (money laundering)</td>
<td>Reduce the criminal use</td>
<td>Protect public safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions against fraud on games</td>
<td>Protect the integrity of sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions against illegal supply</td>
<td>Protect player safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management of a regulated supply</td>
<td>Protect the gambling economic sectors</td>
<td>Protect the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>setting taxes</td>
<td>Protect state revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible component</td>
<td>Setting up prevention</td>
<td>Reduce problem gambling</td>
<td>Protect public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting up treatment</td>
<td>Treat pathological gamblers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating component</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Logic model of a public policy on gambling based on the regulation of a legal supply (Protect public health part)

- Set taxes
- Issue approvals/licenses
- Control and regulate operators’ “responsible gambling” programs
- Implement prevention actions
- Control compliance with regulations on gambling ads
- Implement gambling treatment services

Actions

Results

- Decreasing payback ratio
- Legal supply safer used by gamblers
- Devices preventing the participation of minors effectively
- Play moderators effectively
- Checking non-participation of banned gamblers applied
- Effective and adapted prevention actions
- Problem gamblers detection and orientation effectively
- Advertising complying with regulations
- Effective and adapted treatment services

Short term effects

- Less practices on unregulated gambling supply
- Decreasing participation of minors
- Increasing use of play moderators
- Decreasing participation of banned gamblers
- Reduce at risk gambling practices
- Treat pathological gamblers

Long term effects

- Protect state revenues
- Reduce problem gambling
- Reduce gambling related risks and harms
- Protect public health
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Logic model of a public policy on gambling based on the regulation of a legal supply (Protect public health part)

Actions
- Set taxes
- Issue approvals/licenses
- Control and regulate operators’ “responsible gambling” programs
- Implement prevention actions
- Control compliance with regulations on gambling ads
- Implement problem gambling treatment services
- Decreasing payback ratio
- Legal supply safer used by gamblers
- Devices preventing the participation of minors effectively
- Play moderators effectively
- Checking non-participation of banned gamblers applied
- Effective and adapted prevention actions
- Problem gamblers detection and orientation effectively
- Advertising complying with regulations
- Effective and adapted treatment services

Results
- Decreasing participation of minors
- Decreasing participation of banned gamblers
- Increasing use of play moderators
- ?

Short term effects
- Protect state revenues
- % gamblers using unregulated gambling supply
- Last year (last month) gambling prevalence among minors
- % at risk practices
- Reduce at risk gambling practices

Long term effects
- % problem gamblers within general population
- Reduce problem gambling
- Protect public health
- % problem gamblers treated
- Reduce gambling related risks and harms
- Gambling social cost
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Toward efficacy assessment of a responsible gambling policy

Quantitative approach
Logic model of a public policy on gambling based on the regulation of a legal supply (Protect public health part)

**Actions**

- Set taxes
- Issue approvals / licenses
- Control and regulate operators’ “responsible gambling” programs
- Implement prevention actions
- Control and regulate operators’ “responsible gambling” programs
- Implement problem gambling treatment services

**Results**

- Decreasing payback ratio
- Legal supply safer used by gamblers
- Devices preventing the participation of minors effective
- Play moderators effective
- Checking non-participation of banned gamblers applied
- Effective and adapted prevention actions
- Problem gamblers detecting and orientation effective
- Advertising complying with regulations
- Effective and adapted treatment services

**Short term effects**

- Less practices on unregulated gambling supply
- Decreasing participation of minors
- Increasing use of play moderators
- Decreasing participation of banned gamblers

**Long term effects**

- Protect state revenues
- Reduce % problem gamblers within general population
- Reduce problem gambling
- Reduce gambling related risks and harms
- Protect public health
- Treat pathological gamblers

---
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## Evaluation of “responsible” gambling policies
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### Overall PG prevalence

#### Problem gambling prevalence in France in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGSI</th>
<th>Overall 15-75 years population</th>
<th>Gamblers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gamblers</td>
<td>6851</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problem gamblers</td>
<td>7481</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-risk gamblers</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-risk gamble</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem gamblers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Enquête nationale sur les jeux d’argent et de hasard ODJ/INPES 2014*
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PG prevalence by games

Source: Enquête nationale sur les jeux d’argent et de hasard ODI/INPES 2014, calcul ODJ
Gambling revenue share derived from PG
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Source: Enquête nationale sur les jeux d'argent et de hasard ODI/INPES 2014, calcul ODI
Spending concentration as proxy
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\[ r = 0.72 ; \text{p-value} = 0.03 \]

\[ r = 0.73 ; \text{p-value} = 0.02 \]
Toward efficacy assessment of a responsible gambling policy

Qualitative approach
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Logic model of a public policy on gambling based on the regulation of a legal supply (Protect public health part)

Actions

Set taxes

Control and regulate operators “responsible gambling” programs

Issue approvals / licenses

Implement prevention actions

Control compliance with regulations on gambling ads

Implement problem gambling treatment services

Results

Decreasing payback ratio

Legal supply safer used by gamblers

Devices preventing the participation of minors effectively

Play moderators effectively

Checking non participation of banned gamblers applied

Effective and adopted prevention actions

Problem gamblers detection and orientation effectively

advertising complying with regulations

Effective and adapted treatment services

Short term effects

Less practices on unregulated gambling supply

Decreasing participation of minors

Increasing use of play moderators

Decreasing participation of banned gamblers

Reduce at risk gambling practices

Long term effects

Reduce problem gambling

Protect public health

Reduce gambling-related risks and harms

Protect state revenues

Treat pathological gamblers
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Cross assessment: efficacy * effectiveness

Efficacy: Validated knowledge in the overall field of addiction prevention, and more specifically, the prevention of problem gambling


Effectiveness: my own value judgement
Cross assessment: efficacy * effectiveness
Case studies (3)

Toward assessment of the 2010 French gambling law

Gambling legal framework in France before 2010

- Casinos (Tables games, Slot machines, Poker)
- Lotteries
- Sports betting
- Horse racing

Off line:
- Authorization/Concession
  - FDJ (Française des jeux)
  - FDJ (Française des jeux)
  - PMU (Pari mutuel urbain)

On line:
- Prohibited (except for some FDJ and PMU games)
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Toward assessment of the 2010 French gambling law

Gambling legal framework in France after 2010

- **Casinos**: (Tables games, Slot machines)
  - **Off line**
    - Authorization/Concession
    - FDJ (Française des jeux)
    - PMU (Pari mutuel urbain)
  - **On line**: Licensed operators
- **Lotteries**: FDJ (Française des jeux)
- **Sports betting**: FDJ (Française des jeux)
- **Horse racing**: Licensed operators

= State monopolies
= Private operators
= Prohibited
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Logic model of a public policy on gambling based on the regulation of a legal supply (Protect public health part)

- Actions
  - Set taxes
  - Control and regulate operators' "responsible gambling" programs
  - Implement prevention actions
  - Control compliance with regulations on gambling ads
  - Implement problem gambling treatment services

- Results
  - Decreasing payback ratio
  - Legal supply safer used by gamblers
  - Devices preventing the participation of minors effective
  - Play moderators effective
  - Checking non participation of banned gamblers applied
  - Effective and adapted prevention actions
  - Problem gamblers detection and orientation effective
  - Advertising complying with regulations
  - Effective and adapted treatment services

- Short term effects
  - Less practices on unregulated gambling supply
  - Decreasing participation of minors
  - Increasing use of play moderators
  - Decreasing participation of banned gamblers
  - Reduce at risk gambling practices

- Long term effects
  - Protect state revenues

1 - Do people gamble on regulated websites?
2 - Practices on the regulated supply are they safer?
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### 1 - Do people gamble on regulated supply?

**Nature of the online gambling practices in France in 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lottery</th>
<th>Poker</th>
<th>Sports betting</th>
<th>Horse racing</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulated practice *</td>
<td>90,2</td>
<td>84,2</td>
<td>90,4</td>
<td>98,5</td>
<td>81,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unregulated practice *</td>
<td>13,0</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>31,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated and unregulated practice</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>12,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of the practice unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lottery</th>
<th>Poker</th>
<th>Sports betting</th>
<th>Horse racing</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33,1</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>21,1</td>
<td>19,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % calculated on individuals for whom the nature of the practice is determined

**Regulated practice**: playing lottery games, poker, sports betting or horse racing on at least one approved website.

**Unregulated practice**: practice games for which there is no regulated offer or practice a regulated activity on at least one illicit website.

Source: ODJ, eGames 2017
2 - Practices on the regulated supply are they safer?

Gambling patterns of individuals who participated to a regulated online gambling activity* according to the regulatory status of gambling sites (N=3,230).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Consequences</th>
<th>Overall (N=3,230)</th>
<th>Regulated sites only</th>
<th>Unregulated sites</th>
<th>OR¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady involvement in gambling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent gambling (≥ 52 times in the past 12 months)</td>
<td>41,4</td>
<td>47,6</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important spending (pent ≥ 500 € in the past 12months)</td>
<td>25,2</td>
<td>26,8</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic gambling (score of 3+ on the PGSI)</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>0.67***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep disturbance</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>20,1</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhealthy eating</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal problems (arguments. conflicts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased concern about alcohol consumption</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased concern about tobacco use</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased concern about cannabis use</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased concern about use of illicit drugs (excluding cannabis)</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Significant odds ratio (OR) adjusted for age and sex: *p<=.05, ** p<=.01, ***p<=.001

*regulated activities: lotteries, poker, horse racing and sports betting
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Conclusions

✓ Methodological issue

✓ Political issue

Towards a responsible gambling policy ...

... to open the debate
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