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The year ended 31 March 2015 was another year of significant progress for RGT.\(^1\)

RGT is an independent charity responsible for fundraising and commissioning activity to deliver the strategy that the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB) advises the Gambling Commission should be followed, subject both to evidence evaluated by RGT and to the availability of funds.

An agreed ‘assurance and governance framework’ enables the Gambling Commission to assure itself, and therefore Government, that the combined work of the RGSB and RGT and thus the voluntary system as a whole is working successfully, both to contribute to minimising the level of gambling-related harm in Britain and to ensure that effective treatment is available to those who require it. This is achieved by the RGSB setting substantive priorities for funding and RGT generating funds and commissioning work to give effect to RGSB’s priorities – including in the generation of evidence that will better inform decisions about the regulatory framework.

These arrangements are predicated on all parties working together openly and in active partnership with an overriding commitment to transparency and engagement with all stakeholders – and it is this transparency and engagement that will underpin trust and credibility in the current arrangements.

We continue to have a very constructive relationship with our key stakeholders, the RGSB; the Gambling Commission and the Government (DCMS). I am grateful to my fellow chairs, Philip Graf and Sir Christopher Kelly, for their continued support and wise counsel.

The primary objective of RGT remains to minimise the level of gambling-related harm in Britain by promoting the ethos that those who do decide to gamble should do so responsively and ensuring that those who do develop problems get the support and help that they need quickly and effectively. Our work continues to be evidence based, both from the point of view of what causes harm and also what harm prevention and treatment measures are most effective.

As an independent charity, it is vitally important that we maintain the confidence of all stakeholders in the work that we undertake, and in particular the research that we commission. Our Board consists of five “independent” trustees and five trustees who represent a cross section of our industry donor base. As Chairman, I do not hold a vote so there are ten voting trustees. We have also established a Research Sub-Committee, consisting (only) of our five independent trustees, which oversees our research programme and ensures rigorous

---

\(^1\)Please note that the statutory and financial information contained in this report is from the financial year 2014/15 but we seek to make the commentary as up to date as possible.
independence in both the results and their eventual publication.

RGT has also invited RGSB, the Gambling Commission and DCMS to send observers to both RGT Board meetings and Research Committee meetings. We are delighted that all three key stakeholders have taken up this offer. These arrangements help us to reassure both these stakeholders and society at large that RGT is commissioning services objectively and independent of those (the industry) that contribute to our funding.

In the twelve months to 31 March 2015, our fundraising (donor) income rose by 4% from £6.3m to £6.5m and in the current year we are on target to deliver further growth. This is well above the £5.0m per annum minimum we committed (to the Government in 2009) to raise and is well on the way to our target of raising over £7.0m per annum from our industry donor base.

The increased income has created financial stability for RGT with carried forward funds of £4.3m, including reserves of £500,000 held in a separate deposit account and has, in turn, allowed us to take a far more strategic, long term, approach to our commissioning activities and, in particular, to enter into new funding agreements with treatment providers, to explore the effectiveness of new and innovative harm-prevention services and to commission research into a number of key areas where significant knowledge gaps exist.

I would like to thank all those who have continued their generous support of RGT in the past and current year. I believe that RGT is continuing to make significant progress and is leading the drive to prevent and reduce gambling-related harm in Britain. We can only continue, and increase, this good work with the on-going support of our donors and we are extremely grateful for their continued support. Last year, I expressed my concern that a number of gambling operators licensed in Britain do not currently contribute to RGT. I am pleased to say that this situation is improving and, with the assistance of the Gambling Commission, this year we received donations from 63% of all licensed business entities.

I am particularly grateful to our top 15 donors who together contributed £4.7million (70%) of the £6.5million donated in 2014/15. Collectively they increased their contributions by 3% in a period of continued restrained economic growth.

2014/15 was the third fundraising year under arrangements that came into effect from 1 April 2012 when RIGT re-launched itself as the Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT). The Gambling Commission reported total gross gambling profits (GGP) in Britain for the year ending September 2014 excluding the National Lottery as £7.1billion. A further £689million was retained collectively by the operator of the National Lottery and its network of retailers. On this basis, RGT’s recommended minimum donation of 0.1% of GGP ought to have raised £7.8million. Among current donors, a dozen or so large and mid-sized companies contribute at a level below RGT’s recommended minimum of 0.1% of GGP and this ‘shortfall’ represents about £1m.

We will continue to work with all licensed businesses and with the various Trade Associations to demonstrate the good work being carried out by RGT and that our donors’ money is spent wisely and delivers exceptional value for money. Britain has an enviable reputation for socially responsible gambling backed by a voluntary system of donations that contribute to the minimisation of gambling-related harm. The voluntary system also allows RGT to engage the industry in harm prevention measures and in our research programme. This can only continue with the continued support of a growing donor base. The unwelcome alternative is a statutory levy and the disengagement of the industry.

Looking ahead, RGT is commissioning further research to build on the world-class research into gaming machines and machine players, with a focus on B2 gaming machines published in December 2014. This research was the first
of its kind, with unsurpassed access to industry data for the independent research team and provided significant insights into machine-related harm and credible harm prevention measures, which have relevance to everyone, domestically and internationally, who is working to minimise gambling-related harm. Specifically, RGT has now commissioned independent research into customer behaviour when gambling online, in land-based bingo operations and in casinos as well as further surveying the largest cohort of ‘problem gamblers’ ever identified as a follow-up to the gaming machines research.

Also, we will be commissioning research to help us to define better and measure gambling-related harm, investing in various harm-prevention services focused on young people and other potentially vulnerable groups, as well as offering practical support to various industry initiatives around messaging, self-exclusion and staff training. Evaluating the effectiveness of RGT-funded treatment services is a key objective behind the implementation of a national data reporting framework. To succeed with the delivery of this expanding range of activities we have increased the number of permanent staff from five to seven.

Finally, after five years as chair of RGT, I feel the time is right to stand down. I am proud that RGT has grown into a financially and operationally stable charity that does exceptional work in minimising gambling-related harm. The new chair will inherit a strong financial position, an ambitious five year plan and an exceptional executive team, led by Marc Etches. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Marc and his team, my fellow trustees, and our provider partners, most notably GamCare, Gordon Moody and the National Problem Gambling Clinic, for their sterling work in support of our fundraising and commissioning activities, and to congratulate them on a successful 2014/15.

Neil Goulden, Chairman
Since its launch in April 2012, the Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT) has established itself as a respected and independent charity working in partnership with the British-based gambling industry, the Gambling Commission and the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB), as well as the Government via the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and an array of treatment providers. In July 2014, an additional protocol to further improve partnership working between RGT, the RGSB and the Gambling Commission was appended to the original ‘statement of intent’ and is available via the RGT website.

As an independent national charity, RGT is registered with and regulated by the Charity Commission for England and Wales and has adopted its ‘Hallmarks of an Effective Charity’ to ensure best practice.

RGT continues to ensure that its board of trustees properly balances the need to retain the confidence of a diverse industry, vital in the context of a voluntary (donation-based) system, with the need for robust governance arrangements when commissioning independent research, for example. The inclusion of five trustees who work in the British gambling industry – specifically covering adult gaming centres, betting, bingo, casinos, pubs and remote gambling – helps to facilitate confidence in and support for RGT across the industry. In turn, this promotes better understanding of and willing engagement in harm prevention measures, which is exemplified by the independent research into industry data, venues, gaming machines and customers brokered by RGT in relation to licensed betting offices (2013/14), bingo (2015/16) and remote gambling (2015/16).

RGT has an eminent group of non-industry trustees, who oversee the charity’s research activities via a Research Committee, and a Treatment Panel of experienced experts who advise trustees in relation to treatment and harm-minimisation. A register of interests of all trustees is published on the RGT website. RGT understands the need to be financially sound and prudent, as well as transparent and accountable, so as to generate widespread trust and credibility in its independence and integrity. A Remuneration Committee made up of three of RGT’s trustees operates to review and to make recommendations regarding the recruitment, salaries and benefits of all management and staff members.

In 2014/15, RGT fundraised £6.5million from both the British land-based gambling industry and global online organisations that provide services to the British market gambling industry. The success of the current voluntary (donation-based) arrangements rests in the confidence that the money raised is spent wisely and is successful in achieving desired outcomes in relation to research, treatment and harm prevention.

RGT trustees are in the process of agreeing a new rolling strategy in response to the publication of the Responsible Gambling Strategy, 2016-19. In parallel, a new research strategy and communications strategy are being developed.
Treatment and harm prevention

The current organisational strength and financial stability of RGT has provided trustees with the confidence to be ambitious in how the charity develops as a grant-making and fund-distributing body during the next five years as it continues to strive to be a respected and independent voice and catalyst for minimising gambling-related harm and promoting responsible gambling behaviour.

RGT is committed to continuing to build on the excellent and trusted partnerships that currently exist but will be careful to offer funding that is affordable and, in the long term, sustainable. Trustees plan to continue distributing funds in the period to 31 March 2021 broadly as follows: 85 per cent for treatment and harm prevention, including education, and 15 per cent for research into gambling-related harm.

Trustees intend to support and work with a wide range of services that is likely to include general public awareness-raising, education and early prevention work, particularly among young people, self-help and mutual aid initiatives together with a variety of treatment providers, different modes of treatments and ‘treatment care pathways’ that extend into local NHS foundation trusts as and when required on the basis of the local knowledge and professional relationships of the counselling services that RGT funds in the future.

RGT’s position is that it is right that the gambling industry stands first in line to contribute to research, treatment and harm prevention services. However, national and local government authorities and agencies ought to recognise there is a wider responsibility to promote healthy lifestyles and to provide harm prevention and treatment services for those that need help. Addiction is an issue that can impact on health and well-being, social care and the criminal justice system, and solutions require multi-disciplinary responses from a range of agencies involved in education, public health, primary care, social care and welfare, mental health and criminal justice.

Trustees have agreed that RGT should actively work to raise the profile of problem gambling amongst national and local government authorities and agencies and to encourage the use of public funding to provide a broader and a more joined-up response to minimising gambling-related harm.

RGT does not regard itself as a ‘commissioner’ in the sense of the term understood within a statutory agency context such as the NHS. Rather, RGT is a ‘grant-making body’ with the objective of using best-practice aspects of commissioning such as needs assessment, service planning and outcomes reporting to support its role as a grant-funder of effective, evidence-informed, high-quality gambling-related harm support services. This role is underpinned by a commitment to monitoring and evaluating services to ensure on-going and continuous quality improvement of the grant-funding process.

Identifying how value for money in relation to the funding of treatment services can be improved depends in part on the production of comparable outcome data from across the range of providers using a common Data Reporting Framework (DRF), which was implemented by RGT treatment providers in April 2015.

This will help to create an evidence-base upon which to evaluate and make assessments about what treatment works best for different presentations of problem gambling and
Liz Karter, therapist specialising in gambling addiction in women who has contributed to the design of the new innovative pilot residential treatment program for women which RGT funded.
therefore guide how best to direct future funding. RGT is actively encouraging other non-RGT funded problem gambling treatment services to use the DRF to help build what is anticipated to be a world-leading dataset, and to inform the development of best practice and outstanding care in Great Britain. We anticipate that the evidence generated from the DRF will allow us to develop a clear view of treatment efficacy in Great Britain in the coming years, and to commission services which account for this. This initiative requires a move away from simply understanding how many clients attend treatment sessions towards an assessment of how many successful outcomes are achieved and sustained, and at what cost. RGT is not decreasing the commitment to spend on treatment services, but is committed to making what is spent go further. We want to see a greater proportion of our funds being spent on prevention and education. It will also be important to consider comorbidity and the importance of integrating treatment for problem gambling alongside other presenting problems, acknowledging that those in need of both help and support often have complex and changing needs. We are keen to work with both the DCMS and Department of Health, and other relevant public bodies, to develop the evidence base and appropriate care pathways for all those in need of interventions to reduce gambling-related harm.

RGT has established the National Clinicians’ Network Forum with the specific object to share learning across a range of relevant issues between clinicians working with problem gamblers, including clinical governance, occupational standards and service-user engagement. This shared learning will be extended to policy makers, funders and gambling operators through the development of a programme of seminars and conferences.

In 2014/15, RGT spent almost £5 million on treatment services, including the National Gambling Helpline, which is available via telephone and online; counselling services which are available via GamCare’s network of partner agencies across Great Britain; an NHS service for those with more complex social or psychiatric presentations; and residential care through two treatment facilities in the South East and West Midlands.

It is estimated that there may be as many as 590,000 problem gamblers in Great Britain, and RGT funded services are treating around 1% of these. Although counselling is available locally via the GamCare network to 95% of the population, provision of NHS services is limited by geography with the sole NHS clinic being located in London. While counselling is also available online to anyone with access to the internet, the scale of unmet demand is not yet known.

We know that many problem gamblers won’t seek treatment and that many recover without treatment. We are keen to assist the journey to natural recovery for those who don’t wish to engage in formal treatment. This may include working to develop access to existing self-help groups and developing the provision of mutual aid services.

**Evidence-based treatment pathways**

RGT has recently commissioned work to scope the development of evidence-based treatment pathways for problem gamblers. This will require common screening and assessment tools to identify different levels of severity and complexity of presentation, both within RGT-
funded treatment services and those services funded by other bodies. The work will seek to understand how this relates to our current articulation of tiered care, service user choice, and the appetite to develop common screening and assessment tools. We will work with current service providers to scope a process of co-production of pathways and screening tools and encourage provider ‘buy-in’ to enable the likelihood of future implementation.

**Harm Minimisation**

£1,000,000 has been set aside for 2 years harm-minimisation funding with the overall aim of developing evidenced approaches to reduce the impact of gambling-related harm, particularly on vulnerable populations. An invitation to tender was issued in July 2015, and the RGT Treatment Panel has overseen the evaluation of the proposals submitted. RGT trustees approved five proposals focussing on homeless gamblers, educational resources for young people in England, Scotland and Wales, debt advice training/screening/outreach and education for sports men/women. An invitation to tender has been issued to evaluate these projects, and RGT will issue further invitations to tender to address gambling-related harm within the military and criminal justice system.

**GamCare**

In July 2015, RGT and GamCare signed a new two-year funding agreement to secure the provision of treatment services for gamblers and others adversely affected by gambling, including the National Gambling Helpline and the partner network of organisations around the country.

The National Gambling Helpline received over 40,000 calls via its telephone and Netline services in 2014/15, which equates to around 100 calls a day, though not all relate to problem gambling. The GamCare counselling network received 5,500 clients and delivered nearly 45,000 counselling sessions in 2014/15.

Outcome measures used by GamCare were CORE-10, a score of psychological distress, and the DSM IV, a problem gambling specific diagnostic criteria. 83% of clients showed improvement on both CORE-10 and DSM IV at discharge from GamCare’s services.

**Figure 1 – average CORE-10 scores**

Figure 1 shows that individuals scored on average 17 on the CORE-10 upon entering the programme, and 6 on completion of the treatment. A maximum CORE-10 score of 40 shows severe distress.

**Figure 2 – average DSM IV scores**

Figure 2 shows that clients scored an average of 7 on the DSM IV when they entered treatment and an average score of 2 when they had completed the treatment programme. A maximum DSM IV score of 10 shows increased problem gambling severity.
GamCare partner network

RGT also funds GamCare to provide face-to-face counselling in many locations around Britain, through a network of 15 partner agencies which are trained and funded to deliver the service. This network means that counselling is available locally via the GamCare network to 95% of the population.
**Jason’s Story**

Jason came to GamCare for counselling at the request of his wife who felt their marriage was in jeopardy. A particularly unmotivated client, during his first session Jason described the frenzied nature of his gambling. At the age of seven Jason parents went through a nasty divorce and soon after his mother married a violent, domineering man. Jason received regular beatings and was routinely punished. His only respite was occasional visits to his paternal grandmother where they all enjoyed watching horseracing. One Saturday Jason’s grandfather put a bet on the Grand National for him; the horse won and the memory of winning was one of the fondest of his childhood.

Jason spent years of his childhood with his violent, jealous stepfather and became increasingly anxious for his mother’s attention. It was his gambling that activated a response from her. Jason visited the betting shop several times a day in moments snatched from work. He would back a horse, turn to the FOBT and ‘before he knew it’ would have ‘fed’ £250 into it. Chasing his losses, Jason would dash to the cashpoint for more funds, resulting in further financial loss.

Determined to change, after several counselling sessions Jason decided to try not to gamble. At the end of therapy Jason had learned to control his gambling. Most importantly, he described an increasing ability to manage difficult feelings and to tolerate and reflect upon challenging situations without recourse to gambling as a means of avoiding them.

**Martha’s Story**

Martha had for many years worked in the gambling industry and enjoyed placing the occasional bet. She liked to go to bingo on Sundays. Her life took a dramatic downturn with the death of her baby. Martha could not cope with the trauma the loss of her baby had wrought and the massive hole she felt was left in her life. The deep despair she felt turned her occasional bet into a gambling problem as a way to escape her sorrow. For that short period of time while she was gambling, she could zone out and be released from the pain she felt inside. She found it impossible to walk past a betting shop without venturing inside. At her lowest point, she was so out of control that she felt life was not worth living. It was then that Martha went to Gamblers Anonymous and there heard about GamCare. Through her involvement in Gamblers Anonymous and her GamCare counselling sessions she was finally able to face her grief and come to terms with her sadness. Martha’s treatment is now complete and she has managed to stop gambling. Moreover, she has learned how to enjoy life again and is able to cope with life’s stresses and strains.
Gordon Moody Association
In November 2014, RGT announced a new two and half year funding agreement with the Gordon Moody Association (GMA) for residential treatment services. GMA delivered residential treatment for 72 clients in 2014/15 and a new women’s service is currently being piloted.

Outcome measures used by GMA were the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI), the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) used to identify depression, and the Generalised Anxiety Disorder assessment (GAD-7).

Key activities for GMA include:
Residential treatment programme of 12 weeks duration (preceded by 2 week residential assessment) providing 18 bed spaces in West Midlands and South London.
Half-way house accommodation and relapse prevention support for up to 14 ex-residents for up to 3 months following treatment.
Outreach support for ex-residents provided face to face and online.
Online support for friends and families of residents.

Figure 3 – average PGSI scores
Figure 3 shows that average PGSI scores for individuals at the start of the programme were 22 and 4 on discharge. A maximum score of 27 indicates increased problem gambling severity.

Figure 4 – average PHQ-9
Figure 4 shows that clients scored an average of 17 on the PHQ-9 scores at assessment and 5 when they had completed the treatment programme. A maximum score of 27 indicates more severe depression.
Figure 5 shows that average GAD-7 scores for individuals at assessment were 13 and 4 on completion of the treatment programme. A maximum score of 21 indicates severe anxiety.

Some of the residents have spoken about their time at GMA:

"I came to Gordon Moody Association after leading a hectic lifestyle of which I felt I had no control over. I'm leaving a changed man, I can budget my own money without the urge to gamble. To sum it up for me, I'm gambling free, content and happy this is all thanks to the staff and support I’ve had from other residents. I’ve come a long way.”

"I wanted to die, I saw no other way out, I’m so glad that my sister found out about Gordon Moody.”

"What a difference…I came into Gordon Moody a broken man; I left with my head held high.”

"I was a dirty lying cheat before I came here, a real nasty piece of work. But now I feel like a different bloke again.”
The National Problem Gambling Clinic

In June 2015, RGT and the Central and North West London (CNWL) NHS Trust signed a new two-year funding arrangement for the delivery of treatment services at the Tier 3 level at the National Problem Gambling Clinic (NPGC).

The NPGC received 853 clients in 2014/15 and outcome measures used were the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI), ‘average days gambling in last 30 days’; and ‘average amount spent’.

Figure 6 – average PGSI scores

Figure 6 shows that clients had an average PGSI score of 21 upon entering the programme and 5 on completion of the treatment programme. The average score at the 3 month follow up was 2 and at the six month follow up it was 3. A maximum PGSI score of 27 indicates increased problem gambling severity.

Figure 7 – average gambling days

Figure 7 shows that the average number of days that a client gambled reduced from 12 at assessment to 5 at the end of the treatment programme. The average score at the 3 month follow up was 1 and at the six month follow up it was 2.

Figure 8 – average amount spent

Figure 8 shows that the average amount spent by individuals reduced from £1,781 at assessment to £136 at discharge. This amount then increased to £1,180 at 3 month follow up and reduced again to £294 at 6 month follow up.
**GambleAware**

GambleAware is now well-established as the most well recognised specialist website for those seeking information about responsible gambling or help with problem gambling. During 2015, there were 2.2 million hits on the GambleAware website, 1.8 million of which were unique users. Visits to the site have increased to over 6,000 per day. The website provides information to help people make informed decisions about their gambling and what responsible gambling means. It is also intended to help people understand and recognise problem gambling and show where to go for further information, help and support, should it be needed. An advisory panel of experts has been appointed and regularly reviews and evaluates the website’s performance. Work is underway to promote the site more actively online through search engine optimisation and pay-per-click advertising.

RGT has sought to understand better the current strength of public awareness of GambleAware in light of the current discussions around responsible gambling messaging, advertising, and ‘signposting’ to self-exclusion schemes. A recently commissioned YouGov poll showed an encouraging level of awareness of the brand, with 30% of people stating, when prompted, that they had heard of GambleAware. Awareness was highest amongst younger males (36% of males aged 25-44), and was also high amongst the unemployed (45%), both of which are key target groups.

**Research**

The RGT’s broad research remit is to explore the nature of gambling and gambling-related harm, with the aim of preventing people from experiencing such harm and helping those who do experience difficulties to effectively address them. The RGT Research Committee will agree a research strategy in 2016 - taking account of both the Responsible Gambling Strategy 2016-19 and a commitment to spend 10-15% of funds distributed - that delivers a balanced research programme that shifts the focus beyond the individual to include the gambling environment and products in line with a public health approach.

The evaluation of bids in response to invitations to tender for research will be performed by RGT’s Independent Research Oversight Panel (IROP). This Panel advises the Research Committee, which then takes the final decision. In the case of treatment and harm prevention-related invitations to tender, it is the RGT Treatment Panel that reviews submissions and advises RGT’s full board of trustees.

RGT has commissioned and published a number of high quality evidence reviews focused on ‘harm minimisation’ in the last two years, and published a significant body of independent research into B2 gaming machines in December 2014.

RGT has embarked upon a new program of research into remote gambling behaviour to understand and assess what types of data online gambling industry operators hold and retain on their customers and how these data might be used for harm minimisation proposes. This research will build on the work undertaken with regard to Category B gaming machines.

**PhD funding**

RGT plans to fund two new PhD students with effect from autumn 2016. Projects will be related to our aims, objectives and programme themes and successful applicants will be funded for a three-year PhD programme.

**Gambling-related harm**

RGT issued an open invitation to tender in October 2015 for a new programme of research into ‘Gambling-related harm: what does this term involve and how best to measure and account
for it in Great Britain?'. The aim of the research is to examine what is meant by gambling-related harm, what kinds of harms people experience and who experiences them, and to understand how these harms can be measured and monitored in Great Britain in order that attempts to minimise gambling-related harm might be more accurately evaluated.

**Gambling and social media**

RGT has commissioned think-tank Demos to conduct a study of the link between online communities and gambling. The study will look at the scale and nature of conversations on social media regarding gambling and assess whether it is possible to identify the prevalence of conversations which reflect problematic gambling behaviour. RGT invited proposals in March 2015 from organisations with relevant expertise and experience to participate in a programme of research into remote gambling behaviour. Demos submitted a proposal for research into gambling and social media as part of that open tender. A final report is expected to be published in February 2016.

**Follow up to NatCen loyalty card customer survey**

RGT has commissioned NatCen Social Research to conduct a follow up to a survey of bookmaker loyalty cardholders first published in 2014. Researchers will measure problem gambling rates and study reasons for behaviour change since the original survey. The people being surveyed include the largest number of problem gamblers outside of treatment settings identified with a research study internationally.

NatCen are inviting other researchers to submit new questions to the latest survey. This will allow members of the wider policy and research community to participate in an authoritative and high quality survey without carrying the full burden of the cost of the research. Proposals for new questions will be reviewed and assessed by an expert panel to ensure they are methodologically robust and will yield insights which address evidence gaps and data required for policy needs. The selection process will be independently conducted by NatCen.

**Bingo**

RGT has launched a programme of research into the nature and extent of problem gambling behaviour in licensed bingo retail operations in Great Britain. Researchers were invited to tender for funding in June 2015 to complete a review of existing evidence, develop a method of identifying any problem gambling behaviour in licensed bingo premises and to collect data on problem behaviour. Researchers will be expected to report key findings, including commercial implications of improved player protection regulatory implications, and make recommendations for future research. RGT and The Bingo Association will facilitate participation of licensed bingo retail operators to provide data and practical support to the research programme.

**Remote Gambling**

Online gambling operators collect more data on their customers than any other gambling operators. As well as a full ‘know your customer’ check, customers deposit and withdrawals, bets made, type of device used, bonuses spent and time spent on the website are collected along with other data sets. Some of the data collected may give indications that the customer feels that they wish to limit their gambling spend, e.g. changing spend or time limits, viewing information on the help pages on a regular basis, undertaking partial exclusion from products. Regulators are asking all operators whether they are using analytics as a way to predict who is likely to be a ‘problem gambler’ and enable operators and customers to take harm minimisation measures.

RGT issued an invitation to tender in March 2015 for a programme of research into remote gambling behaviour in collaboration with the gambling industry. The overall aim of the research programme is to inform practical applications of harm minimisation for remote gambling operators serving British customers. This research will build on the work undertaken with regard to Category B gaming machines.

In September 2015, RGT commissioned PwC to conduct a two-phase programme of research to explore the potential of behavioural analytics and industry-held data to indicate and mitigate the potential for gambling-related harm. During the first phase PwC will work with Canada’s Responsible Gambling Council to engage with
remote operators participating in the research programme to understand their existing processes and controls to minimise harm. Phase two of the research programme will analyse industry data and control systems to recommend practical applications of harm minimisation for remote gambling operators serving British consumers. The research programme is expected to take eighteen months to complete.

RGT has also commissioned Sophro Ltd to complete a study of online gambling behaviour which will investigate the causes of harm in online gambling. This project will look at a smaller number of participants in greater depth. Researchers expect to be able to identify behavioural processes relevant to understanding problem gambling behaviour and recommend appropriate responsible gambling interactions to promote improved commercial, regulatory or clinical responses to problem gambling.

Category B Gaming Machines
RGT commissioned a two-stage independent research programme into Category B gaming machines. The first stage sought to understand data the industry currently holds on such machines and was completed in December 2013. Following input by the Government, the Gambling Commission, and the RGSB the second stage of research was expanded in recognition of growing concern about gaming machines in LBOs and RGT was asked to deliver a programme of research directed at the following questions posed by RGSB: Can we distinguish between harmful and non-harmful gaming machine play in LBOs? If we can, what measures might limit harmful play without impacting on those who do not exhibit harmful behaviours? RGT published the seven reports in 2014, which were presented by the independent research team at RGT’s annual ‘harm minimisation in gambling’ conference in December 2014.

Other Research Priorities
Other research priorities for RGT include:
- Investigating the role of social media in relation to gambling
- Investigating the international evidence for the effectiveness of treatment of ‘problem gambling’
- Assessing motivation and need satisfaction in relation to gambling.

While RGT will continue to identify and commission research projects on a selective case-by case basis, it also intends to create a mechanism to receive speculative applications that seek to meet the research objectives of its research strategy.

InfoHub
In September 2015 RGT relaunched the Responsible Gambling InfoHub, an independent and free online library of gambling research and details of relevant conferences and events. The InfoHub provides a fully searchable database of more than 2,000 pieces of research and contains all of the independent research commissioned by RGT. The website will provide eLearning on topics relevant to professionals working in the gambling field and allied professions, and InfoHub users can also sign up to receive regular emails containing the latest research.

Harm Minimisation Conferences
In December 2014, RGT held its second annual harm minimisation conference. While the overall theme of the conference remained ‘harm minimisation in gambling’, the programme focused on the independent research into gaming machines located in licensed betting offices that the RGT commissioned with a consortium of researchers. Hosted by Liz Barclay, broadcaster and former trustee of RGT, the conference was intended to be helpful in informing the direction of future research and policy development as well as industry practice in relation to promoting player protection and responsible gambling behaviour.

The third harm minimisation conference was held in December 2015, attended by over 200 stakeholders and again hosted by Liz Barclay. The aim of the conference was to review and discuss recent advances made in Great Britain in the understanding of harm minimisation.
and gambling. The keynote address was made by Tracey Crouch MP, the Minister for Sport, Tourism & Heritage and speakers included Sarah Harrison, Chief Executive of the Gambling Commission; Dr Jon Kelly, Chief Executive of Canada’s Responsible Gambling Council and Sir Chris Kelly, Chair of the RGSB. RGT’s conferences form part of an on-going process of sharing and discussing current knowledge and practice in relation to harm minimisation in gambling in Great Britain.

**Fundraising**

The Responsible Gambling Trust receives no public funding. The range of research, treatment and harm prevention activities are funded by donations from the gambling industry. RGT’s objective is to fundraise annually 0.1% of gross gambling profit (GGP) from all organisations that derive an income from commercial gambling in Great Britain within a voluntary (donation-based) system to fund effective research, harm prevention and treatment services.

On the basis of the industry statistics reported by the Gambling Commission for the 12 months to 31 March 2015, an industry-wide contribution of 0.1% of gross gambling profit would amount to circa £10 million. In addition to what might be thought of as the primary source of funding - that is licensed gambling operators - there are other business sectors that derive an income from commercial gambling including professional sports and media. RGT will be working hard to encourage these sectors to get more involved in the future.

Fundraising for the twelve months to 31 March 2015 reached £6,543,925 and donations were received from around 63% of licensed gambling operators. The intention over the next five years is to build towards a sustainable financial model in which income and expenditure are equally balanced at a level of £10 million per annum.

Trustees are keen to focus a particular effort in communicating more effectively with the industry whose donations it requires to fund RGT’s activities. To this end, RGT will establish new ways in which it can share transparently how it is spending the monies raised and what is being achieved, as well as helping the industry to better know and understand what makes a difference in terms of minimising gambling-related harm.

In February 2016, supporters of RGT will summit Africa’s highest mountain, Mount Kilimanjaro to raise additional funds for RGT. This will be the fourth international fundraising trek. Having trekked up Mount Kilimanjaro in 2013, the Sahara Desert in 2014 and the Great Wall of China in 2015, a total of £175,000 has been raised. In October 2016, RGT volunteers will join a fundraising trek to Machu Picchu in Peru. Beyond the fundraising, the other significant success arising from these trekking events is the opportunity to raise the profile of and support for RGT among a diverse group of people working in a range of disciplines within the British gambling industry.

Careful management over the last two years means the charity now holds £500,000 in operational reserves and has a strong, well-managed cash-flow that is being used to build a newfound measure of confidence and stability for those organisations that RGT funds.

On behalf of the management team, I should like to thank all those businesses and individuals that have donated or otherwise helped to support RGT in the last 12 months. Also, a personal thank you to my management team and to each of the RGT trustees, and especially Neil Goulden, who so generously give up their time, energy and wise counsel with no material reward other than my sincere thanks.

Marc Etches, Chief Executive.
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Report of the Trustees

The Trustees present their report and the audited financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2015.

Reference and administrative information set out on the previous page forms part of this report. The financial statements comply with current statutory requirements, the memorandum and articles of association and the Statement of Recommended Practice – Accounting and Reporting by Charities (SORP 2005).

Structure, governance and management
The organisation is a charitable company limited by guarantee, incorporated on 28 February 2002 and registered as a charity on 24 September 2002.

The company was established under a memorandum of association which established the objects and powers of the charitable company and is governed under its articles of association.

All Trustees give their time voluntarily and receive no benefits from the charity. Any expenses reclaimed from the charity are set out in note 5 to the accounts.

About Responsible Gambling Trust
Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT) is the leading charity in the UK committed to minimising gambling-related harm. As an independent national charity, RGT raises a minimum of £5 million each year from the gambling industry operating in Britain within a voluntary (donation-based) system and funds harm prevention and treatment services, and commissions independent research to broaden public understanding of gambling-related harm.

The aim of the charity 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.

During the year, RGT raised £6,466,227 in donations; received £17,672 donations in kind (in the form of meeting room hire, exhibition space and computers); raised £46,804 from sponsorship of an expedition to the Great Wall of China; and, received £13,222 in interest – giving a total of £6,543,925.

A total of £6,097,954 was spent on treatment and harm prevention, and research.

Objects of the charity
A. The relief of those who are vulnerable or otherwise in need as a result of gambling in particular but not exclusively, by provision of counselling and advice; and
B. The advancement of education for the benefit of the public by research into responsible gambling, the nature and causes of gambling-related harm and the effectiveness of treatments, and the publication of the results of such research.

The Trustees have referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission’s general guidance on public benefit when reviewing the charity’s aims and objectives and in planning its future activities. In particular, the Trustees consider how planned activities will contribute to the aims and objectives that have been set. Our strategic aim and objectives are as follows:

Strategic aim
• Minimise gambling-related harm by funding effective harm prevention strategies and ensuring that those individuals who do develop problems receive fast and effective treatment and support

Strategic objectives
• Fundraise annually from all organisations that derive an income from commercial gambling in Great Britain within a voluntary (donation-based) system to fund effective research, harm prevention and treatment services. Our current guideline is that organisations that receive commercial benefit from gambling activities in Britain should donate a minimum of 0.1% of gross gambling profit to RGT to support our charitable objectives
• Commission effective and value-for-money services from treatment and harm prevention providers through a commissioning approach focusing on partnership working and appropriate evaluation, which is proportional to the relevant grant
• Deliver an independently commissioned research programme that focuses on gambling behaviour and the effectiveness of various treatment and harm prevention strategies in minimising gambling-related harm
Organisational structure and future plans
RGT develops its commissioning plans in collaboration with the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB) and the Gambling Commission. The RGSB is the Gambling Commission’s independent adviser and is responsible for generating an independent, unbiased, evidence-based national responsible gambling strategy.

It is this national strategy advised by RGSB and endorsed by the Gambling Commission that guides RGT funding priorities. The latest RGSB Strategy was published in December 2012 and is currently being updated.

These arrangements are underpinned by an ‘assurance and governance framework’ agreed between the three parties and published in August 2012. The success of these arrangements relies on openness, transparency and partnership between the three parties.

Throughout the twelve months to 31 March 2015, RGT had five full-time members of staff. These were the Chief Executive, Director of Fundraising, Administrator and Assistant to the Director of Fundraising, Director of Commissioning, and Assistant Director of Commissioning. Accountancy services were provided by a freelance contractor on a part-time basis.

Governance
As an independent national charity, RGT is registered with and regulated by the Charity Commission for England and Wales and has adopted its ‘Hallmarks of an Effective Charity’ to ensure best practice.

RGT understands the need to generate widespread trust and credibility in its independence and integrity, particularly in view of the investment of both fundraising and commissioning functions in a single, industry-funded body. RGT has put in place robust governance arrangements including:

• Appointing five wholly independent Trustees
• Inviting the Government (Department of Culture, Media and Sport), the Gambling Commission and the RGSB to observe RGT Board and Committee meetings
• Publishing details of how funds will be distributed each year guided by the RGSB’s rolling three-year strategy as endorsed by the Gambling Commission
• Ensuring research is commissioned via an independent Research Committee in consultation with the RGSB
• Seeking advice from external experts in collaboration with the RGSB

Reserves policy
RGT’s need for reserves has been reviewed in line with guidance issued by the Charity Commission. The majority of RGT’s funds are used to fund its charitable objectives and operating costs, and it was decided that a reserve sum of £500,000 be set aside as of 31 March 2013. This is equivalent to 12 months of the Charity’s operating costs. The level of reserves ensures that RGT could continue during a period of unforeseen difficulty and takes into account the impact of RGT reducing or winding up its operation.

Funds held at 31 March 2015 were £4,294,511, which will enable RGT to invest in further research, harm prevention and treatment services.

Investment policy
The Board of Trustees has agreed that cash reserves should be held in a readily realisable form in low risk bank accounts.

Grant-making policy
RGT’s grant-making policy is for management to identify possible grant recipients which are then considered by the Trustees acting as a body. Currently RGT does not seek applications for grants and generally will not make grants in response to unsolicited applications received.

Funding policy
Funds raised by RGT are distributed in accordance with the strategic direction provided by the RGSB. During the year, a total of £6,097,954 was spent on treatment and harm prevention, and research.

Risk review
Risk review is an integral part of the planning, budget, forecasting and management cycle of RGT and takes into account factors such as income streams varying from forecast; the on-going effectiveness of our funded projects;
staff welfare; and reputation management.
Management periodically report a risk analysis
to the Board of Trustees. The Trustees are of
the view that an appropriate control framework
is in place to manage the risks identified,
whilst recognising that no system of internal
control can provide absolute assurance or the
elimination of risk.

Statement of responsibilities of the Trustees
The Trustees (who are also directors of RGT for
the purposes of company law) are responsible
for preparing the report of the Trustees and
the financial statements in accordance with
applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting
Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted
Accounting Practice).

Company law requires the Trustees to prepare
financial statements for each financial year
which give a true and fair view of the state
of affairs of the charitable company and
of the incoming resources and application
of resources, including the income and
expenditure, of the charitable company for that
period. In preparing these financial statements,
the Trustees are required to:

• Select suitable accounting policies and then
  apply them consistently;
• Observe the methods and principles in the
  Charities SORP;
• Make judgements and estimates that are
  reasonable and prudent;
• State whether applicable UK Accounting
  Standards have been followed, subject
to any material departures disclosed and
  explained in the financial statements; and
• Prepare the financial statements on the
  going concern basis unless it is inappropriate
to presume that the charitable company will
  continue in operation.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping
proper accounting records that disclose with
reasonable accuracy at any time the financial
position of the charitable company and enable
them to ensure that the financial statements
comply with the Companies Act 2006. They
are also responsible for safeguarding the
assets of the charitable company and hence for
taking reasonable steps for the prevention and
detection of fraud and other irregularities.

In so far as the Trustees are aware:

• There is no relevant audit information of
  which the charitable company’s auditors are
  unaware; and
• The Trustees have taken all steps that they
  ought to have taken to make themselves
  aware of any relevant audit information and
to establish that the auditors are aware of
  that information.

The Trustees are responsible for the
maintenance and integrity of the corporate and
financial information included on the charitable
company’s website. Legislation in the United
Kingdom governing the preparation and
dissemination of financial statements may differ
from legislation in other jurisdictions.

Board of Trustees and governance
During the year in question, RGT was governed
by a Board of Trustees; under the leadership
of the Chairman (non-voting), the Board
monitored and reviewed RGT’s strategy, policy
and budgets to enable the charity to achieve its
objectives.

In appointing the Board members, the selection
process took into account the balance of
skills and experience required and the need
to include members with expertise in issues
such as problem gambling research and
corporate social responsibility. RGT is managed
by the Trustees with decisions taken at the
regular Trustee meetings. Where necessary,
Trustees are given training and advice on their
responsibilities when they take on the position.

The Trustees in 2014/15 included a number
who held senior positions at companies or
organisations within the industry that make
donations to RGT:

• Peter Brooks, President and Chief Operating
  Officer, Genting UK
• Richard Glynn, Chief Executive Officer,
  Ladbrokes plc
• Nick Harding, Chief Executive Officer,
  Praesepe plc
• Clive Hawkswood, Chief Executive Officer,
  Remote Gambling Association
• Jonathan Paveley, Chairman, The Hook
  Norton Brewery Co Ltd
Trustees understand the need to generate widespread trust and credibility in RGT’s independence and integrity, particularly in view of the investment of both fundraising and commissioning functions in a single, industry-funded body. This is especially so in relation to the commissioning of research.

All research activity is wholly the responsibility of its Research Committee, currently chaired by Professor Jonathan Wolff who is also the RGT’s senior independent Trustee. This arrangement ensures that those Trustees who may have a direct interest in any research outcomes are entirely excluded from directing or otherwise influencing any research activity that RGT undertakes to commission. The terms of reference for the Research Committee are published via its website www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk.

The Research Committee at the date of this report consists of:

- Jonathan Wolff (Chair) – Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Professor of Philosophy, University College London
- Alan Jamieson – Former Deputy CEO of the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, and former Director of the National AIDS Helpline
- Patrick Sturgis - Professor of Research Methodology, University of Southampton and Director of the ESRC National Centre for Research Methods
- Chris Brady - Professor of Management Studies and Co-Director of the Centre for Sports Business at the University of Salford
- Annette Dale-Perera (appointed 1 July 2015) – Home Office advisor on the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) and former Strategic Director of Addictions and Offender Care for Central North West London NHS Foundation Trust

RGSB, the Gambling Commission and DCMS are invited to observe all full Board and Research Committee meetings. Also, for each substantial research project commissioned, RGT will establish a panel of independent experts to provide further academic oversight. These arrangements are expected to ensure all aspects of any research programme are transparent to the Gambling Commission and therefore to the Government. Furthermore, RGT is committed to publishing all research outputs following a rigorous and entirely independent peer-review process.

Trustees understand the need to be financially sound and prudent, as well as transparent and accountable, so as to generate widespread trust and credibility in RGT’s independence and integrity.

A Remuneration Committee operates to review and to make recommendations regarding the salaries and benefits of all management and staff members. The terms of reference for the Remuneration Committee are published via its website www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk.

The Remuneration Committee at the date of this report consists of:

- Clive Hawkswood (Chair)
- Neil Goulden
- Alan Jamieson

The Trustees are members of the charitable company and guarantee to contribute an amount not exceeding £1 to the assets of the charitable company in the event of winding up. The total number of such guarantees at 31 March 2015 was 13 (2014: 11).

All Trustees give their time voluntarily and receive no benefits from the charity in their capacity as Trustees. One Trustee receives payment for professional advice. Details of this and any expenses reclaimed by the Trustees from the charity are set out in note 5 to the accounts.

Auditors

Sayer Vincent LLP were re-appointed as auditors during the year and has expressed its willingness to continue in that capacity.

The report of the Trustees has been prepared in accordance with the special provisions applicable to companies subject to the small companies’ regime.

Approved by the Trustees on 11 November 2015 and signed on their behalf by

Neil Goulden - Chairman
Independent auditors’ report

We have audited the financial statements of Responsible Gambling Trust for the year ended 31 March 2015 which comprise primary financial statements and the related notes. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

This report is made solely to the charitable company’s members, as a body, in accordance with Chapter 3 of Part 16 of the Companies Act 2006. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the charitable company’s members those matters we are required to state to them in an auditors’ report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the charitable company and the charitable company’s members, as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of Trustees and auditors

As explained more fully in the statement of responsibilities of the Trustees set out in the report of the Trustees, the Trustees (who are also the directors of the charitable company for the purposes of company law) are responsible for the preparation of the financial statements and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view.

Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board’s Ethical Standards for Auditors.

Scope of the audit of the financial statements

An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes an assessment of: whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the charitable company’s circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed; the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the Trustees; and the overall presentation of the financial statements. In addition, we read all the financial and non-financial information in the report of the Trustees to identify material inconsistencies with the audited financial statements and to identify any information that is apparently materially incorrect based on, or materially inconsistent with, the knowledge acquired by us in the course of performing the audit. If we become aware of any apparent material misstatements or inconsistencies we consider the implications for our report.

Opinion on financial statements

In our opinion the financial statements:

• Give a true and fair view of the state of the charitable company’s affairs as at 31 March 2015 and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, for the year then ended;

• Have been properly prepared in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice; and

• Have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006.

Opinion on other matter prescribed by the Companies Act 2006

In our opinion the information given in the report of the Trustees, for the financial year for which the financial statements are prepared is consistent with the financial statements.
Matters on which we are required to report by exception

We have nothing to report in respect of the following matters where the Companies Act 2006 requires us to report to you if, in our opinion:

- Adequate accounting records have not been kept; or
- The financial statements are not in agreement with the accounting records and returns; or
- Certain disclosures of Trustees’ remuneration specified by law are not made; or
- We have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit; or
- The Trustees were not entitled to prepare the financial statements in accordance with the small companies’ regime and take advantage of the small companies’ exemption in preparing the report of the Trustees and take advantage of the small companies’ exemption from the requirement to prepare a strategic report.

Helen Elliott (Senior statutory auditor)
11 November 2015

for and on behalf of
Sayer Vincent LLP,
Statutory Auditors Invicta House,
108-114 Golden Lane,
LONDON
EC1Y 0TL
## Statement of financial activities

(incorporating an income and expenditure account)

For the year ended 31 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>2015 £</th>
<th>2014 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming resources from generated funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,443,899</td>
<td><strong>6,483,899</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for generating funds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,804</td>
<td><strong>46,804</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td><strong>13,222</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,503,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,543,925</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs of generating funds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of generating income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>273,757</td>
<td><strong>273,757</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,264,814</td>
<td><strong>1,264,814</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment &amp; Harm Prevention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,833,140</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,833,140</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance costs</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,218</td>
<td><strong>27,218</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,398,929</td>
<td><strong>6,398,929</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net incoming resources for the year</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>104,996</td>
<td><strong>144,996</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds at 1 April 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,149,515</td>
<td><strong>4,149,515</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds at 31 March 2015</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>4,254,511</td>
<td><strong>4,294,511</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,149,515</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the above results are derived from continuing activities. There were no other recognised gains or losses other than those stated above. Movements in funds are disclosed in Note 13 to the financial statements.
Balance sheet
As at 31 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>£ 2015</th>
<th>£ 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible fixed assets</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,228,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>502,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,091,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,823,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors: amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>534,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,288,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets less current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,294,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors: amount due after more than one year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,294,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The funds of the charity</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,254,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,294,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by the trustees on 11 November 2015 and signed on their behalf by
Neil Goulden
Chairman
1. Accounting policies

a) The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention and in accordance with applicable accounting standards. They follow the recommendations in the Statement of Recommended Practice, Accounting and Reporting by Charities (issued in March 2005) and the Companies Act 2006.

b) Voluntary income is received by way of donations and is included in full in the statement of financial activities when receivable. Donations received before the year end which are clearly specified for a future accounting period are shown as deferred.

c) Donated services and facilities (gifts in kind) are included under Incoming Resources (with an equivalent amount in Resources Expended) where the benefit to the Trust is quantifiable and material. The value placed on these resources is the estimated value to the Trust of the service or facility received.

d) The full costs of the majority of grants payable by the Trust are included in the statement of financial activities in the year in which they are approved and notified to the grantee, even if they are for projects which cross more than one financial year, or for multi-year programmes of work. If such grants that are approved during the year are payable by instalments or have not been paid, in part or in full, by the end of the year, any unpaid amounts are included as creditors in the balance sheet if the conditions attached to the grant are accepted by the beneficiary before the accounts are signed.

If a multi-year award is subject to the recipient submitting a satisfactory progress report and the renegotiation of targets and conditions between the recipient and the group, only the current year’s grant will be included in the statement of financial activities.

e) Governance costs comprise the costs of complying with statutory requirements, including the annual audit.

f) Tangible fixed assets costing more than £50 are capitalised and included at cost including any incidental expenses of acquisition.

Depreciation is provided on all tangible assets at rates calculated to write each asset down to its estimated residual value evenly over its expected useful life, as follows:

- Computer equipment: 33.33% reducing balance
- Fixtures, fittings and equipment: 20% reducing balance

g) Unrestricted funds are donations and other income received or generated for the Trust’s purposes.

h) Resources expended are recognised in the period in which they are incurred. Resources expended include attributable VAT which cannot be recovered.

i) Resources expended are allocated to the particular activity where the cost relates directly to that activity. However, the cost of overall direction and administration of each activity, comprising the salary and overhead costs of the central function, is apportioned on a total expenditure basis which is an estimate of the support attributable to each activity:

- Costs of generating funds: 35%
- Research: 24%
- Treatment & Harm: 38%
- Governance: 3%

j) Rentals payable under operating leases, where substantially all the risks and rewards of ownership remain with the lessor, are charged to the statement of financial activities in the year in which they fall due. There was one operating lease commitment during 2014/15.

No assets are held under hire purchase agreements or finance leases.

k) The Trust agrees to contribute to a group pension scheme. The pension cost charge represents contributions payable by the Trust to the employees’ schemes within the group plan. The Trust has no liability under the schemes other than for the payment of those contributions.
2. Voluntary income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>2015 Total</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry donations</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,412,987</td>
<td>6,452,987</td>
<td>6,116,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry sponsorship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of conference and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,672</td>
<td>17,672</td>
<td>10,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,443,899</td>
<td>6,483,899</td>
<td>6,137,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Donated services**

During 2014/15, the Trust was provided with services and assets free-of-charge, which amounted to an estimated value £17,672. These were: boardroom hire £9,000; exhibition space £5,000; and IT equipment £3,672. The estimated value of these gifts in kind has been presented in the accounts, thus giving a fair representation of the costs of the Trust during the year.

3. Activities for generating funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Total</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising from Great Wall of</td>
<td>46,804</td>
<td>123,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China expedition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,804</td>
<td>123,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RGT organised a fundraising expedition to the Great Wall of China in April 2015, and all fundraising has been accrued in 2014/15. The prior year figure represents fundraising for two separate expeditions which took place during the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable (note 6)</td>
<td>54,376</td>
<td>4,623,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of accrued grant commitments from prior years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with institutions and individuals</td>
<td>1,030,246</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Treatment and Harm Prevention project costs</td>
<td>30,642</td>
<td>7,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.gambleaware.co.uk">www.gambleaware.co.uk</a></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>25,427</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs (note 7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>377,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations and branding</td>
<td>62,996</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition and event costs</td>
<td>25,962</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website costs</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy and audit fee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and payroll fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, postage and office supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software and IT costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, entertainment and meeting costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Expenses not included in direct project costs (note 5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff welfare</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions and memberships</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Rate Variance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,398,929</td>
<td>4,619,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs reallocated</td>
<td>6,398,929</td>
<td>4,619,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resources expended</td>
<td>6,398,929</td>
<td>4,619,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Net incoming resources for the year

This is stated after charging / crediting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; loss on disposal of fixed assets</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating lease costs - property</td>
<td>39,840</td>
<td>39,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors’ remuneration</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees’ remuneration</td>
<td>14,750</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees’ expenses</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>5,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payments to trustees**

During the year a payment of £1,477 (2014: £968) was made to the Chairman of RGT for meetings and travel expenses and £4,214 was paid during the year to three of the Trustees of RGT (2014: £4,752), to reimburse the cost of travel, accommodation and subsistence relating to charitable expenditure activities and Trustee meetings. Additionally, £14,750 (2014: £8,000) was paid to one Trustee, Alan Jamieson, in respect of attendance at meetings, and professional expertise and advice. Payments are made under a formal contract for services that limits the number of days he can be paid for, as provided for in the governing document. These reimbursed expenses and remuneration are included in expenditure for 2014/15. There were expenses of £2,178, and fees of £1,950 outstanding at the year end.

6. Grants payable

Grants awarded to institutions during the year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gamcare</td>
<td>3,678,207</td>
<td>2,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Treatment Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Gordon Moody Association</td>
<td>591,190</td>
<td>498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central &amp; North West London NHS - Problem Gambling</td>
<td>339,016</td>
<td>339,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Health Action Support Team (PHAST)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm Prevention</td>
<td>15,160</td>
<td>24,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>54,376</td>
<td>50,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of accrued grant commitments from prior years</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>(245,326)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the research grant disclosed in this note, RGT spent £1,030,246 directly on research in 2014/15, by entering into contracts with institutions, and funding work by individuals. Expenditure included contracts valued at £653,200 with NatCen and £211,200 with FeatureSpace (research projects and data study reports). Work undertaken by individuals covered contextual papers and academic reports; peer review of these papers; and Machines Research Oversight Panel participation.
7. Staff costs and numbers

Staff costs were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff salaries</td>
<td>£327,620</td>
<td>£296,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security costs</td>
<td>£40,004</td>
<td>£34,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension contributions</td>
<td>£9,516</td>
<td>£14,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff costs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>£1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total salary costs</td>
<td>£377,140</td>
<td>£347,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary staff costs</td>
<td>£560</td>
<td>£1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff costs</td>
<td>£377,700</td>
<td>£348,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One employee earned between £100,001 and £110,000 during the year (2014 – one), and this employee received pension benefit of £5,997 (2014 – £5,850). One employee earned between £60,001 and £70,000 (2014 – one). No pension benefit was received for this employee (2014 – £3,645).

Staff bonuses for 2014/15 have been accrued in these accounts, and were paid in April 2015. However it should be noted that staff salaries also includes the prior year’s bonuses, as they were not communicated to staff during 2013/14, and thus could not be accrued in the 2013/14 accounts.

The average weekly number of employees (full-time equivalent) during the year was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Taxation

The charitable company is exempt from corporation tax as all its income is charitable and is applied for charitable purposes.
9. Tangible fixed assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£ Computer Equipment</th>
<th>£ Fixtures, Fittings &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>£ Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the start of the year</td>
<td>12,576</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>14,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions in year</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the year</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>19,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the start of the year</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>10,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge for the year</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the year</td>
<td>11,119</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>13,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net book value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the year</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the start of the year</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Debtors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding donations</td>
<td>967,383</td>
<td>516,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income: donations pledged and/or received after year-end</td>
<td>244,921</td>
<td>242,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayments</td>
<td>15,437</td>
<td>12,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other debtors</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,228,741</td>
<td>771,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outstanding donations and accrued income were received by November 2015.
11. Creditors: amounts falling due within one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade creditors</td>
<td>61,702</td>
<td>187,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation and social security</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>7,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other creditors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations received in advance</td>
<td>50,723</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accruals</td>
<td>38,130</td>
<td>21,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Grants payable</td>
<td>378,444</td>
<td>274,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>534,907</td>
<td>494,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Creditors: amounts due after more than one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Movements in funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At the start of the year</th>
<th>Incoming resources</th>
<th>Outgoing resources</th>
<th>At the end of the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total restricted funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General funds</td>
<td>4,149,515</td>
<td>6,503,925</td>
<td>(6,398,929)</td>
<td>4,254,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unrestricted funds</td>
<td>4,149,515</td>
<td>6,503,925</td>
<td>(6,398,929)</td>
<td>4,254,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds</td>
<td>4,149,515</td>
<td>6,543,925</td>
<td>(6,398,929)</td>
<td>4,254,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purposes of restricted funds
Research – Relates to funding received from Camelot during 14/15 to be used specifically on research.
14. Grant Commitments

Future commitments in respect of grants agreed in principle but for which payment is subject to future delivery and performance review are not included as creditors as no commitment exists at the year-end. In addition to the grant creditors recognised in the accounts there was £1,262,265 of potential future grant commitments where agreements are in place but the recipients have not yet fulfilled the necessary criteria to be eligible to receive payment.

15. Operating lease commitments

The charity had annual commitments at the year end under operating leases expiring as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>39,840</td>
<td>39,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 39,840 | 39,840 |