



# **A study of the costs to government of Gambling-Related Harm in Great Britain**

---

## **Invitation To Tender**

**Author: Iain Corby**

**April 2016**

**Version 1.0**

## 1. Purpose and Scope of this Document

- 1.1. This document is an invitation to tender for conducting a study into the costs to the public purse caused by gambling-related harm in Great Britain. The project is targeted at demonstrating a business case for action on gambling-related harm to Government. In simple terms, this project is aiming to do this by showing the Government what gambling-related harm costs it. It is likely to focus largely on impacts that are measurable in money terms – although there may be other non-monetary costs to Government that also need to be described for completeness.
- 1.2. The purpose and scope of this document is to:
  - 1.2.1. Provide researchers with sufficient information to enable them to consider the appropriateness of this invitation and to respond
  - 1.2.2. Outline the information required in the responses
  - 1.2.3. Outline the tendering process and timetable
  - 1.2.4. Set out the administrative arrangements for the receipt of proposals.

## 2. Background

### About RGT

- 2.1. RGT is the leading charity in the UK committed to minimising gambling-related harm. As an independent charity funded by donations from the gambling industry, RGT funds education, prevention and treatment services and commissions research to broaden public understanding of gambling-related harm. RGT's aim is to stop people getting into problems with their gambling, and ensure that those that do develop problems receive fast and effective treatment and support.
- 2.2. RGT develops its commissioning plans in collaboration with the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board and the Gambling Commission. These arrangements are underpinned by an 'assurance and governance framework'<sup>1</sup> agreed between the three parties and rely on openness, transparency and partnership to deliver results.
- 2.3. RGT provides treatment for problem gambling ranging from online advice ([www.gambleaware.co.uk](http://www.gambleaware.co.uk)) to a helpline, face-to-face counselling and clinical therapy and residential rehabilitation.

### About the study

- 2.4. As a recognised addiction, gambling can for some be a very complex mental health issue. Individuals with gambling problems at all levels of severity often present with co-morbidities, with some very complex cases. RGT trustees accept that it may not always be possible or in the best interests of the clients, for them to be treated by services which specialise in gambling or addiction alone.
- 2.5. Despite this need, there is no universal provision of treatment for problem gambling within the NHS. RGT funds the National Problem Gambling Clinic which was originally a pilot scheme created with the ambition that it would be replicated across the NHS. This has not happened.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/user\\_uploads/pdfs/statementofintent.pdf](http://www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/user_uploads/pdfs/statementofintent.pdf)

- 2.6. RGT also recognises that prevention is better than a cure, and believes that including gambling within public health campaigns, and in the information and advice disseminated through the public health system would help reduce gambling-related harm.
- 2.7. RGT is also engaging with Government to highlight gambling-related harm across a wider range of services including health, housing, welfare and criminal justice
- 2.8. RGT has therefore determined to pursue a Public Health Initiative. This began with a seminar in September 2015 attended by a wide range of stakeholders. RGT issued a position paper after the event which is available on its website<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.9. RGT has three goals within its Public Health Initiative:
  - 2.9.1. Education: As prevention is better than cure, RGT wishes to raise the issue of problem gambling up the agenda of the public health community, in particular within local government, and to work to inform and educate the public about problem gambling.
  - 2.9.2. Treatment: The gambling industry is unique in funding treatment for those who suffer from gambling related harm, and is committed to doing so in future. However, RGT recognises many of those clients it helps have other or more complex needs that a charity is not best placed to treat alone. So at some point, clients need to re-integrate with NHS provision and RGT wishes to improve that process.
  - 2.9.3. Signposting: RGT also wants to encourage frontline public health staff, from GPs to housing officers, to recognise gambling problems and signpost people towards appropriate treatment, which RGT will frequently provide.
- 2.10. In parallel, Tracey Crouch MP, the Minister with responsibility for gambling, has been talking to Alastair Burt MP and Jane Ellison MP, ministers in the Department of Health, about raising the profile and availability of treatment for problem gambling.
- 2.11. RGT recently met with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Department of Health officials and agreed to facilitate two things to help them progress this agenda with ministers; first, a study of treatment by The Royal College of Psychiatrists to demonstrate the effectiveness of treatments and second, a study of the cost to government of gambling-related harm, to build the business case for action within government.
- 2.12. RGT is issuing this invitation to tender to generate a rigorous, independent, credible report assessing the cost to government of gambling-related harm.
- 2.13. By “government” RGT means:
  - 2.13.1. HM Government
  - 2.13.2. Devolved administrations in Scotland and Wales (Not Northern Ireland)
  - 2.13.3. Local government across Great Britain (so also excluding Northern Ireland)
  - 2.13.4. Affected Non-departmental public bodies and other organisations which are funded or sponsored by the above (for example, The Probation Service, Public Health England, Public Health Wales, NHS England).
- 2.14. By “problem gambling”, RGT means gambling undertaken by individuals who are screened as problem gamblers at the time they undertake the gambling or within the previous six months.
  - 2.14.1. problem gambling is not a binary experience but exists on a spectrum of behaviour and severity. It is highly likely that some people are officially screened as 'problem

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/media/1076/position-paper-public-health-for-website.pdf>

gamblers' but cause very little cost to the public purse but that those at the most severe end of the spectrum experience excessive difficulties and are more likely to cost government.

2.15. It is important to note that there is a second, much wider concept of Gambling-Related Harm which looks more generally at harm caused by gambling. This is not restricted to the harm attributed to problem gamblers or those around them whom they affect, but also harm arising from gambling in general. This concept has not been well defined to date, and RGT is funding a separate, longer-term study which seeks to do so. For the purposes of the study which is the subject of this invitation to tender, RGT is confining the scope to the costs arising from problem gamblers and those around them whom they affect. These costs are certainly a component of the wider harms caused by gambling, but are only a subset of what is undoubtedly a much bigger but ill-defined concept.

2.15.1. RGT would expect the results of the study described in this document to be an important input into the other project defining gambling-related harm more generally.

2.16. RGT has already identified some examples of areas where it believes significant costs are incurred as a result of problem gambling:

- Criminal justice (police, courts, prisons, probation)
- Health (e.g. providing treatment for other problems, where gambling is the underlying cause)
- Benefits, including the costs of relationship breakdown
- Housing e.g. rent arrears, eviction, homelessness
- Unpaid taxes, and reduced taxes as a costs to businesses rise

2.17. A distinction should be made between costs which impact government and costs which impact individuals receiving funding from government. For example, if someone is claiming jobseekers allowance because they lost their last job because of a gambling issue, then this would be a relevant cost. However, this would need to be treated differently to someone spending their jobseekers allowance on gambling. This does not directly increase costs to the exchequer. Similar logic should be applied across this project.

2.18. Further care is required when considering comorbidities. Many of those experiencing gambling related harm also suffer from other difficulties such as depression or stress. The study will need a clear methodological approach to apportioning such costs.

2.19. A recently published paper "Understanding gambling related harm: A proposed definition, conceptual framework, and taxonomy of harms" is available on RGT's Infohub<sup>3</sup>. This paper is an important element of the existing literature on this subject, albeit wider in scope than this project.

2.20. Of course, government policy balances such costs against the tax receipts from gambling, the employment the industry creates and, in the widest utilitarian view, the enjoyment it provides as a form of entertainment. The study should include for reference this side of the balance sheet, but is not itself intended to be a cost-benefit study of legal gambling so an equivalent level of analysis of benefits to that required for costs is beyond scope.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://rgtinfohub.org.uk/document/understanding-gambling-related-harm-a-proposed-definition-conceptual-framework-and-taxonomy-of-harms/?ref=ds>

### **3. Work Requirements**

- 3.1. This study should:
  - 3.1.1. Identify all significant costs caused or increased by problem gambling to the state at each level of government
  - 3.1.2. Through a combination of well-founded estimates, available data and if required, newly developed secondary data from existing sources, estimate the overall annual cost
  - 3.1.3. Consider trends in these costs and make reasonable projections of future costs
  - 3.1.4. Reference the benefits of gambling to the Exchequer and the economy as a whole for context
- 3.2. The expected output would include
  - 3.2.1. The model that is developed for the study – and the data sets that it makes use of
  - 3.2.2. A technical report on the methodology and rationale – e.g. how data has been treated, assumptions, etc.
  - 3.2.3. An exec summary designed to articulate the headline findings to a Government audience.
- 3.3. RGT expects the process of research will include interviews and workshops with stakeholders across government which will in itself raise the profile of the issue.

### **4. Governance**

- 4.1. The RGT Research Committee will commission the study. This is a committee of independent trustees, excluding all trustees with a declared interest in the gambling industry.
  - 4.1.1. DCMS, the Gambling Commission and RGSB attend the Research Committee as observers.
- 4.2. The Research Committee is advised by an International Research Oversight Panel (IROP) both at the commissioning stage and at the conclusion of the project as part of RGT's academic quality assurance process.
  - 4.2.1. The draft report will be subject to peer review by IROP
- 4.3. The Research Committee is available to provide advice to appointed researchers on request.

### **5. Programme Schedule**

- 5.1. RGT expects the study to take 3 – 6 months
  - Tender Process – April/May 2016
  - Study commences – June 2016
  - Final Report – by November 2016
- 5.2. Regular monthly written progress reports will be expected.

## 6. Tendering Process and Timetable

- 6.1. The proposal should outline the researcher's previous experience in this area (or related areas), and provide a candid assessment of the potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed approach. It should explain the specific benefits of using this approach over others.
- 6.2. The proposal should detail what inputs the project will require to perform effectively particularly in respect of new data, and how this will be collected.

### Evaluation Process and Timeline

- 6.3. The Evaluation Panel will be made up of the RGT's Research Committee and other experts or advisers it wishes to appoint.
- 6.4. Tenders will be submitted by 5pm on the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2016.
- 6.5. Applicants may be required to attend a meeting to discuss any aspect of proposals.

### Questions

- 6.6. You may submit, by no later than 17.00hrs GMT on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2016 any queries that you have relating to this ITT. Please submit such queries by email to [ian@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk](mailto:ian@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk).
- 6.7. If you intend to submit a proposal, you may notify the RGT at this email address by 28<sup>th</sup> April 2016, and all those who have notified us will be provided with an anonymised summary of our answers to questions raised by other tenderers soon after the deadline in paragraph 6.6.
- 6.8. Any queries should clearly reference any appropriate paragraph in the documentation. As far as is reasonably possible, RGT will respond to all reasonable requests for clarification of any aspect of this ITT and supporting documents, if made before the above deadline.
- 6.9. Proposals must be submitted by 17.00hrs GMT on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2016 to the following e-mail address [ian@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk](mailto:ian@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk). RGT reserves the right to extend any deadline. Any extension granted will apply to all applicants.
- 6.10. RGT reserves the right to reject any proposals:
  - 6.10.1. received after the deadline; and/or
  - 6.10.2. which do not comply with the conditions and requirements set out in this ITT.
- 6.11. All documents and all correspondence relating to the tender must be written in English. You should consider only the information contained within this ITT and supporting documents, or otherwise formally communicated to you in writing when making your offer.
- 6.12. The submission of tender documentation should include:
  - An understanding of the research objectives and work requirements
  - An outline of and justification for proposed research methods
  - A summary of key activities to support specified outputs
  - A timetable linked to key activities (e.g., GANTT chart)
  - A summary of any proprietary intellectual property which will be used to carry out the research
  - Full disclosure of costs, including number of days required for each task, day rates for different members of the research team, VAT (as relevant) and anticipated expenses

- A CV or brief biography for each member of the team
- Contact details for two referees.

## 7. Intellectual Property

- 7.1. RGT is committed to delivering an independently commissioned research programme that focuses on gambling behaviour and the effectiveness of various treatment, prevention and education strategies in minimising gambling-related harm. This is intended to improve knowledge amongst all those involved in this issue, so RGT will wish to publish the results of the research it funds. Our requirements below in respect of intellectual property and confidentiality are intended to promote good project management, quality assurance and research integrity, and are not included in order to influence the independent conclusions of this research or its presentation.
- 7.2. The successful researcher(s) will be required to assign to RGT all rights in and to any intellectual property created or arising from the work carried out by the researcher(s) (or by the researcher's employees or agents).
- 7.3. RGT acknowledges that the researcher(s) may own proprietary software, analytic tools and techniques which may not be assigned to RGT. Where such software, tools or techniques exist and will be used by the researcher(s) in the proposed research, the researcher(s) should provide details in its tender of the methodology, to be used in the proposed research highlighting clearly where such software, tools or techniques will not be assigned to RGT and/or may not be shared with the public.
- 7.4. On completion of the initiatives, RGT plans on publishing a research paper which may include details of the methodology, techniques and tools used by the researcher(s) in carrying out the initiatives.

## 8. Confidentiality and publicity

- 8.1. The successful researcher will be required to enter into a legally binding agreement with RGT which will contain, inter alia, confidentiality provisions pursuant to which the researcher will be required to:
  - 8.1.1. keep confidential all intellectual property and know-how, including confidential commercial and financial information, disclosed to the researcher by RGT or any third party introduced by RGT during the course of the initiative;
  - 8.1.2. not disclose to third parties without the express prior written consent of RGT any information arising from the work performed as part of the initiative; and
  - 8.1.3. ensure that all proposed publications are submitted to RGT for approval prior to publication with the expectation that approval will be given unless there are reasonable grounds not to do so.
- 8.2. RGT may from time to time require that the successful researcher's employees and/or other person working on the initiative enter into a confidentiality agreement with RGT.

## 9. Budget

- 9.1. The maximum budget allocated by RGT for this study is £40,000.

## 10. Eligibility

10.1. Applications will be accepted from all locations. Those teams located outside Great Britain must ensure they specify, in their proposal, how they will facilitate meetings with RGT, industry collaborators and other stakeholders and manage communication during the project. Cost proposals must be inclusive of travel expenses.

## 11. Conditions of Tender

- 11.1. RGT reserves the right to issue the response to any clarification request made by you to all applicants unless you expressly require it to be kept confidential at the time the request is made.
- 11.2. The information contained in this ITT and the supporting documents and in any related written or oral communication is believed to be correct at the time of issue but RGT does not accept any liability for its accuracy, adequacy or completeness and no warranty is given as such. This exclusion does not extend to any fraudulent misrepresentation made by or on behalf of RGT or to any other liability which cannot be excluded at law.
- 11.3. By issuing this ITT, RGT is not bound in any way to enter into any contractual or other arrangement with you or any other party.
- 11.4. It is intended that the remainder of this procurement will take place in accordance with the provisions of this ITT but RGT reserves the right to terminate, amend or vary the tendering process by notice to all tendering organisations in writing. RGT does not accept any liability for any losses caused to you as a result of such termination, amendment or variation.
- 11.5. You will not be entitled to claim from RGT any cost or expenses that you may incur in preparing your proposal irrespective of whether or not your tender is successful.
- 11.6. All information supplied to you by RGT, either in writing or orally, must be treated in confidence and not disclosed to any third party (save to your professional advisers) unless the information is already in the public domain.
- 11.7. There must be no publicity by you regarding the project or the future award of any contract unless RGT has given express written consent to the relevant communication.
- 11.8. You must declare any conflicts of interest within your proposal and state how these would be managed. RGT reserves the right to refuse any application based on such conflicts.

## 12. Evaluation Criteria

12.1. The principal purpose of this evaluation is to determine the tender(s) which best meet the requirements of the RGT and deliver best value for money. The evaluation should be a rigorous examination and comparison of all submissions received on an equal and consistent basis without bias.

12.2. Tenders will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that:

- Tenders have been submitted on time, completed correctly and meet the requirements of the invitation to tender.

- Tenders are sufficiently complete to enable them to be evaluated in accordance with these criteria.
- The Researcher has not contravened any of the terms and conditions of the tender process.

12.3. Tenders that do not meet these requirements may be rejected at this stage. Tenders that pass the initial screening assessment check will be distributed to Evaluation Panel members who are expected to subject them to a detailed evaluation in accordance with the criteria as set out in this document.

12.4. All tenders will be scored in accordance with the marking system set out below:

Score Key Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Excellent	5	Excellent standard with no reservations about acceptability.
Good	4	Good standard with no reservations about acceptability.
Acceptable +	3	Acceptable standard with minor reservations about acceptability.
Acceptable -	2	Acceptable standard with reservations that require review.
Serious Reservations	1	Meets minimum requirements - but serious reservations.
Unacceptable	0	Fails to meet the minimum requirements.

The following table will be used to guide the evaluation.

Theme	Criteria	Score (0-5)	Comments
The researcher	The researcher demonstrates sufficient depth and breadth of relevant experience		
	The researcher has a relevant network to support their work		
	The researcher will command credibility within government and with other key stakeholders		
The project	The approach outlined in the tender will achieve the research goal		
	The tender outlines sufficient internal research governance		
	The researcher adopts effective quality assurance procedures		
	The timescale is within that outlined in the ITT		
The cost	There are sufficient resources of suitable quality allocated to deliver the research		
	The proposal includes all necessary costs		
	The costing fair and reasonable/justified?		
	The overall research cost represents value for money		