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P R O C E E D I N G S:

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to order the 190th public meeting of the Mass. Gaming Commission today at our offices on 101 Federal Street at 1:00. Today is May 10, 2016. As the agenda makes clear, we are here to talk today about social gaming. This is a commissioner education session as well as a public education session.

We, as you know, have talked about all different aspects of online gaming. And Rick said in our DFS white paper that it didn't make sense to focus on any one of them because there is an incredible proliferation of online games that are going to be hitting regulators and legislators alike, policymakers alike all of the time.

And we recommended that organizations such as ours and perhaps our Legislature as well look at these holistically. But in the meantime, we want to try to keep ourselves abreast of everything that's going on, particularly aspects of online gaming which
have a direct or potentially direct relationship to the casino industry over which we have a regulatory role.

With that I'll introduce our executive director who will give a little more thorough introduction of what we're going to do here today.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I just want to refresh your memory about the subject matter today, social gaming and how we got here.

In March of this year, there was a meeting at Mass. Gaming Commission with representatives of Penn Gaming, the parent company of Plainridge Park Casino. In that meeting, Penn representatives discussed how Penn was going to use social gaming in their business plan.

Following that meeting at the Commission's March 29th meeting, it was decided the Commission, Mr. Chairman as you said, should educate itself on social gaming which a very broad term, and specifically casino social
gaming as a prelude to hearing from our licensees about how they either intend to use or are using social gaming and whether the Commission has a regulatory role.

As you also pointed out, the
Commission has played a role in such subjects like daily fantasy sports. Because of the success of daily fantasy sports educational forum, I volunteered Mr. Stempeck from our legal department to help me in this regard, organize the experts who are here today. I want to thank him for that work.

In terms of process, members of the Commission, I have a recommendation. Once you hear from our presenters today and ask questions, in the next day or so Mr. Stempeck and I will determine the next steps in scheduling the next presentation with either some more industry experts and/or our licensees. We hope and anticipate that at least one of those follow-up meetings would happen rather shortly.

With that Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask Mr. Stempeck to do a quick introduction of
our speakers.
MR. STEMPECK: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. This afternoon we have four speakers for you. The first two are from MassDiGI which is the Massachusetts Digital Games Institute. Just by way of background, and I'm sure the speakers will get into it in more detail, that is an organization that's a statewide center designated by the Commonwealth to combine academic cooperation, entrepreneurship and the economic development of the video game ecosystem.

From MassDiGI, we have Tim Loew who is their executive director as well as Monty Sharma, their managing director. They will be speaking to you first.

After the presentation by the gentleman from MassDiGI, we have Luc Delany. He's the CEO of the International Social Gaming Association. He's also the founder and CEO of Delany and Company, a public policy and communications agency. Mr. Delany is a former policy executive of both Facebook and Google and has a broad-based knowledge in the social
gaming and social casino industry.
And finally, to wrap up today's presentations, we have Keith Whyte, who you are all familiar with. He's the executive director of the National Council on Problem Gaming. So, without further ado, I'll turn it over to the gentlemen from MassDiGI.

MR. LOEW: Thank you very much. I should be familiar with these things. It's very reminiscent of my time on the Worcester Zoning Board of appeals, quite different setting but similar technology.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Our condolences.
MR. LOEW: Mr. Chairman, thank you, members of the Commission. We appreciate the opportunity speak here. Staff terrific, thank you for including us in this day.

So, MassDiGI is the statewide center for entrepreneurship, academic cooperation and economic development across the games ecosystem here. So, we're based at Becker College in Worcester. We started just a little over five years ago, actually, April 26, 2011. We came about as a result of sort of this
collaboration, conversation --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, never mind. I just got it, thanks.

MR. LOEW: -- in private/public sector and the higher education sector here in the state.

Games have been part of the Massachusetts sort of technology entertainment infrastructure, since the 60s. In fact, probably we're the birthplace of the modern video game here, across the river at MIT. First game was called Space War. That was reminiscent. So, we have a pedigree here like many things gives us a sort of an opportunity to talk about it in a way most other states can't.

So, our goal ultimately is to get more games made here in the state. By our games, we're not talking the same as most of the games that you are used to. Our games are mostly the ones that you might play on a console or a PC or on your mobile device these days.

We have some support from the US

Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration. We're a university center. We receive additional federal funding to build out what we call our new venture center, which will open next year.

And that targets supporting what I call sort of novice entrepreneurs, sort of student entrepreneurs from gateway cities in this state, to build the game sector leveraging the relationships we have in those communities, so whether it's Springfield, Lowell and Worcester and those sorts of things. So, we're excited about that.

We get up every day and we can be anywhere between Amherst and Boston talking with developers, with students and on occasion to groups like yours about issues that connect with the public sector. And those are the main areas in which we have conversations.

We can go to the next slide. And we'll just talk quickly about our major activities fall into these four categories. Here is business and workforce development. We run a big pitch contest each year in Cambridge
over at Microsoft. We've got several hundred developers coming in students, professionals pitching new game ideas. They win prizes. It's great time. You guys are welcome to come. It'll be probably next March. We'll let you know.

We have a summer innovation program. It's the largest game development internship program of its kind in the country. Hundreds of students from around the world apply each year; we accept 24 of them. They come work in our studio in Worcester. Becker College gives us a dorm. So, they live there for free. It's a great opportunity for them. And it's a great opportunity for us to work with talented students from around the world.

Then we have a regular sort of series of mentoring programs, and something we call live studio, which is a multiinstitutional course that students at a number of different colleges and universities take. It's sort of a course, but it's really an internship. So, they are working on live product that's in the market, making changes
and learning how to understand what the game industry is about.

Then we focus on education and research. We do some surveys. We should have one coming out actually in the next month that we are working on with UMass Boston, which is the latest sense of the state of the game industry here in the Commonwealth, how many employees etc., etc. So, I guess that'll be in the next 60 days.

We do a lot of outreach in industry marketing. Just a couple of weeks ago PAX East was here. PAX is the largest single event that comes to New England each year. Certainly, the largest event at the Boston Convention Expo Center. They don't quite ever divulge exactly, but I'd say this year was approaching 100,000 people attended. It's by far the single piece of business MCCA does.

And then we work on various things around advocacy and policy with our industry partners.

So, I'll back up a little bit, Monty is there something you want to take from here?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Mr. Loew, can I ask you a question? Are you a state agency here or state funded?

MR. LOEW: No. We actually have a very little bit of state money, but no, we're not part of state government. We are a private entity that is actually functionally an autonomous department within Becker College.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: The funding flow comes primarily through Becker?

MR. LOEW: Yes, they are our
conduit. We are sort of the same thing. Our mission is little bit different. It's one of these interesting things and it's something that I would hope other colleges and universities around the states would look to do, which is sort of turn their abilities and the strengths but they have on campus and utilize them to help build regional and local economies.

So, it's something that Becker has done. It's really terrific. President Robert Johnson has been probably the single biggest reason why we exist. His willingness to extend
some of the college's resources in support of growing the sector in the state has been really unbelievable.

Of course, there is some selfinterest there. Becker has one of the top game development academic programs in the country, number five as ranked by the Princeton Review this year. They have nearly 500 students studying game development. I'll touch on this a little bit later.

In Massachusetts, we're doing a
census later in the summer. We probably are approaching 2500 students studying game development in some shape or form. And that's a relatively significant jump from a handful of years ago, let alone a decade ago.

Nationally, I think there are now over 400 colleges and universities with programs in game development. So, it's big. One of the reasons why it's big -- I'll sort of give you the funnel picture here. -- the overall digital economy is enormous right now. The World Economic Forum last year estimates it will be hundred trillion dollars by 2025. I
don't even know how many zeroes that is, but it's enormous.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A hundred
trillion?
MR. LOEW: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's the
overall digital economy.
MR. LOEW: Yes, global digital economy. Globally, games are expected next year or the year after to be about $\$ 100$ billion as a global industry. You'll see various numbers depending on what source you go to but that's about where we are today.

In North America, primarily
obviously, it's a US market. We are about \$25 billion. And these are games that you might see advertised on TV whether they're mobile games or big console games whether it's Call of Duty or things like that that you see advertised during football games.

And down to the smaller games that you might play on your phone, although these days I'm not sure you could say that they are smaller. Candy Crush is a big game. I'm sure
there are probably people here who play it. We won't ask you to raise your hand but those games make hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, what did Activision buy? King. So, King was a publicly traded company. Last year they were acquired for several billion dollars.

It's a very active marketplace.
Significantly larger than the music industry and domestic box office. Some people will argue that videogames, our kind of games are the largest form of entertainment on the planet today.

In this state, we have on our last survey about 4000 direct and indirect employees in the sector. Probably close to that right now. We've had a little turbulence the last few years as we shifted into more of the mobile marketplace. That mirrors what's gone on in other regions and other parts of the world.

The largest sectors are in
California, Washington state and Texas and a few other places. New York generally is a corporate headquarters not so much development.

And then I think I might have in here somewhere about the number of states, but there are thirty-six or so states. The majority of states that have heavy presence are the beneficiaries of significant tax incentive programs that go to game companies as are many countries.

Canada, for example, has been very aggressive in the marketplace. Montréal has 10,000 jobs just in the city of Montréal, approximately in the game development sector. That's where the 37.5 percent incentive on payroll. So, the marketplace is --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Tax credit of 37.5 percent?

MR. LOEW: Yes, for every dollar of payroll you have, you get 37.5 cents back from the province, let alone the federal incentives as well. That's Canada. That's one marketplace.

So, it's a very competitive world. Games are hard to make. What you build today always has to be better than what you built yesterday. So, it's a very fast-moving
marketplace. Consumers are fickle. Platforms are changing. Technology's improving. So, there's lots of churn. But it's an enormous market.

MR. SHARMA: One of the elements -When we talk about employees, what are we really talking about? There's programmers but there's artists, there's writers, there's musicians. It's a wide range of skills that go into the game sector.

And it's essentially adjacent to
educational software, social gaming simulations, a wide range of other sectors that are very strong in Massachusetts. This is a place where skilled people can move back and forth interchangeably as the economy moves.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How do you distinguish between what you're describing, I guess you refer to as gaming and social gaming? You just set that out as --

MR. LOEW: Social gaming, we'll get into that a little bit more. But social gaming is a subset. So, there are various genres of games. There are role-playing games. There
are sort of action games. There are sports games. There are all these different genres of games just like you might watch on TV. There's those puzzle games. There are word games. Social games are themselves a category. But from our perspective almost all games are social, right, with the exception of solitaire.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there some kind of functional distinction?

MR. LOEW: These days, it's really hard to say, because there is multiplayer and those functional components of any game are --

MR. SHARMA: Making games social is critical to game success. So, developers are --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: By social, you
mean multiple players?
MR. SHARMA: Right. Bringing in
your friends, playing against other people, whether you know them or not. All of those elements are key.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, if you talked about the videogame industry as the social gaming industry, would anybody say no, no
you're mixing apples and oranges?
MR. LOEW: Yes. I think they might parse that a little bit to say social games do have some features that not all game share, but all games also have certain social elements.

So, let's say you're playing a game.
You're online with your console and you're talking to other people on your headset. Well, that's social. Or you're playing a game and you're chatting with people in a sidebar while you're playing the game. That's social. You're playing a game, a word game like Scrabble and you're going back and forth with other people. That's social.

So, there's a social element to almost every game that exists. Some are built more around that as a core piece of their monetization model. So, that's probably where we draw the line. By mining your social graph, they are trying to leverage your relationships for their benefit.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is it fair to say that the social subset has had an increase in recent years because of networking and

Facebook and that's how young people are socializing?

MR. SHARMA: Yes. It drives the interaction. So, it's very hard to write an artificial intelligence for a game and how do you make it scale well and provide challenges to a wide range of people.

If you can get people to play other people, people to play their friends, you have a much larger set of comparators to work with. And that's created an entirely new sector of we call eSports where it gets that intense that people will just watch other people playing.

This is something that the last
championship for League of Legends was 30 million viewers. They fill stadiums to watch these things. So, it's all part of that activity.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Mr. Loew, what was that phrase that you used, monocrization?

MR. LOEW: Monetization.
COMMISSOINER MACDONALD: Oh,
monetization.

MR. SHARMA: Although I like monocrization.

MR. LOEW: But monetization is a term that --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I know what that is.

MR. LOEW: -- is turning players into money.

MR. SHARMA: In general, the games that we talk about are not involved in any sort of gambling or making money other than through the game itself, although there are things that are starting to open up in that space.

MR. LOEW: For example, World of Warcraft or League of Legends, you've might have heard of these. League of legends has tens of millions of players globally. It's by far the largest sort of social experiment maybe on the planet. It's amazing. And if you ever have a chance to watch some of these eSports things live, it's an experience. It's on ESPN now so I'm sure you'll have an opportunity. So, World of Warcraft has about 5 million active players and they pay a
subscription at this point. So, there are different business models behind a lot of these things. League of Legends is a free to play model. So, there are different ways that companies have targeted their audience.

But the sort of market breaks down like this. I don't know if everybody can sort of see this but just to give you a sense. These are from a company called NewZoo, which does some of the market analysis. Just to give you a sense of the trend lines over some recent years and where it's going and the different platforms.

It's a global marketplace. US is certainly a large market, but Asia is right on its heel. In fact, in mobile China surpasses the US. As I said, it's a large sector. It's something that in the last few years given the proliferation of mobile technology means more people are playing more games on more devices in more places than ever before.

So, from a cultural standpoint more people are making more games and involved in the culture around game making. And PAX is a
good example of that. It's also a sight to see.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mr. Loew, what is $C-A-G-R$ in your sheet here?

MR. LOEW: It's compound annual growth rate.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.
MR. LOEW: Then this is the US game market last year. So, it gives you a sense, also from NewZoo. So, there are number of providers out there. I chose NewZoo today, but they are all in the same ballpark.

It's a pretty vibrant marketplace growing consistently. I don't even think in there is virtual reality. I know Monty will have different opinion on the prospects of VR. But VR gaming is on the horizon.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is VR?
MR. LOEW: Virtual reality, so you know those headsets that people wear like oculars and things like that. So, that's a major component. Facebook bought oculars for a couple of billion. These are major investments that big tech companies are making. A lot of
people thought games might be the first place where they get some traction in the market.

MR. SHARMA: We'll see. I'm betting they will.

MR. LOEW: So, these are just to give you some sense of also what people do on these mobile devices. This is from a company called Flury. These are about accurate. So, I think this may be from last year. But about 85 percent of the revenue made in the Google Play Store or the App Store are on games.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 80 percent of
the revenue you said?
MR. LOEW: Yes. So, let's say for example the App Store makes \$1 billion, \$850 million of that is in games.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just one dollar at a time, if you will.

MR. LOEW: Actually, they're free to play for the most part. So, you're buying inapp purchases, so on and so forth. In fact, sometimes there's other models.

MR. SHARMA: I spent $\$ 50$ this week on one game alone.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You did?
MR. SHARMA: I did.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What game is
that?
MR. SHARMA: Star Trek Timelines made by a local developer Disrupter Beam, wonderful game.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You bought extra time?

MR. SHARMA: No. What I wanted to do was get Spock with a beard from the alternate universe. And it's a chance. You buy these packs of cards, can you get him, can you not get him. I didn't get him.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Things you never thought you'd hear at a Gaming Commission meeting.

MR. LOEW: Videogames are great. They cover everything. So, you see a lot of big IP here. There are games in this state. For example, we talked a little bit before about the different skills that go into making games.

There's a company in Needham that
makes a game called Lord of the Rings online. They title right. They have a consultant and at times they've had employees who speak Elvish, Tolkien's version of Elvish because that is critical to the community that plays that game. So, the authenticity of the experience has to match their expectations or surpass it or they will leave the game. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is probably may be getting ahead but is this a digital version of something else we humans have been doing for a long time? Or is this a whole new human experience?

MR. SHARMA: There are some elements that are analogous. So, in some cases especially in the early days it's a board game that's converted over. Or it's a motion game where you're Space Invaders. Something is moving and I'm shooting at it.

But as time has gone on, game developers are really going through interactions. How do we experience things? What makes us feel good? That's fundamentally what it comes down to. And is there a sense of
achievement and progress in what we're doing. That happens all sorts of ways.

There's a class of games called idle games where essentially you tap, not a lot of strategy involved. You just tap. And then if you tap enough, it'll start going on its own and you can come back later and tap some more.

MR. LOEW: That's it literally.
MR. SHARMA: That is the gameplay. This sounds insane. In fact, I said it was insane when $I$ first started playing it. And hours later I still thought it was insane and my finger hurt.

These sorts of things that you see a lot of people doing second screens. They're watching TV and they're playing games. And they're games that don't take a lot of cognitive overhead, spend time doing that.

Virtual reality is an element to bring that wider sense where the world gets closed off around you. And it's fairly significant. I don't doubt the eventuality of the technology. I just think it's more years off than others do.

MR. LOEW: But games have been part of the human experience for thousands of years. So, whether it's --

MR. SHARMA: All mammals play games.
MR. LOEW: -- dice, chess, the litany of games that we've made to entertain ourselves or to train ourselves for some purpose has a history as long as our species for all intents and purposes. So, this is an extension of that long line of interests.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: With technology being a massive force.

MR. LOEW: Yes. As I said, it's allowed tens of millions of people to be playing the same game at the same time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Why the heavier weight on people playing games off their tablets as opposed to their phones?

MR. LOEW: Because they're not making calls. They're texting for the most part.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Anything to do with the size of the screen?

MR. SHARMA: You can do different things with a larger screen. So, you can get more complex games. When I was younger, I used to play X based board games. And those translated to the tablet and work very well. So, you can spend a lot of time currently a Civil War game. Historically accurate, very interesting but it takes hours to play a session.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How do you guys see the difference between social gaming and skill-based gaming? Do they overlap in too many places?

MR. SHARMA: We define social gaming as games that have a social element to them. To be clear, every game other than the tapping game essentially requires some form of skill. What you do with that skill $I$ guess is really the question.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's a different kind of a cut. They're not vertical categories. They're horizontal categories.

MR. LOEW: And what your motivation to play that game is different. Skill-based
game that might have some kind of reward at the end of it, may attract a different kind of player than a social game where you're just sort of playing words with friends or something like that. There's so many different kinds. There's as many kinds of player profiles almost as there are players.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: These pie charts here, the category of utilities is that texting and emailing?

MR. LOEW: I think that's what they mean by that. To tell you the truth, I'm not sure.

MR. SHARMA: Utilities, I have something that tells me forecast my bandwidth usage. There's things like that just little tools, calculators, currency exchangers.

MR. LOEW: Just to give you a sense. And that number shifts around a little bit as the platforms come online, new technology gets deployed, bandwidth expands, LTE expands globally. Particularly in emerging-markets where they don't have to build out for a physical infrastructure. Put up some towers
and you're in.
Just to give you a sense this is from the Entertainment Software Association. They do a biannual look at this. So, a lot of people think the average videogame player might be a teenager, not true. These days in fact, not only is that not true but $I$ think that gender numbers are beginning to change people's understanding of games as well.

So, it's the sort of industry where you wait five minutes and something different has happened. Certainly, in the last few years the game industry has been able to attract more and more women to play games.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Same games or different games?

MR. LOEW: I think they're playing different. So, I don't think women are playing Call of Duty or Madden at the same rate that they might be playing Candy Crush or some of the others. That was always a challenge I think in the industry. And they've sort of solved that and been able to attract more and more players.

MR. SHARMA: A lot of it is location-based. Apparently, women do much more in society than the men do. They are busier. So, they tend to play mobile games while they're waiting in line and doing something with the other hand. So, there's a different category.

MR. LOEW: So, here's where we get a little into sort of what we define and sort of think of as social gaming. So, you're playing games that allow or require you to interact with other players whether it's you're on a quest and you need somebody else's help to solve a particular problem.

That sort of social interaction or it's Words with Friends where you're handing off it's your turn now that sort of interaction. It's a significant chunk of the -- particularly mobile game. Once again this is from the Entertainment Software Association. Forty-six percent play social games. Where casual comes in there because they're not what we call sort of core gamer which are people who might spend -- It's their
entertainment. They spend hours if not hundreds of hours a year or month playing games as part of who they are. That's how they define themselves.

I'm a gamer. I do this; I play
that. It's what they might do instead of going to movies and things like that. So, it's where they choose to spend their entertainment time and dollars.

MR. SHARMA: So, some of the things that we see in again, what we consider social gaming. We focus a lot on the decay curve of players.

So, you're getting players in these games that are free to play. So, everybody can come in the door. My sort of marketing effort to get you to spend five dollars is way down. But then I need to keep them. So, in a very good game seven days into it you've lost 70 percent of your players.

So, there is a high degree of churn. The game has to grab you very quickly or you'll walk away because there's many other free games.

Game companies are always working through this thing of viral growth, what we call the $K$ factor. And that is can I get my friends to play because I like this game. And if $I$ can do that then the game company is getting players for free. If they can't then it's a cost per install basis. Right now in the US, a mobile game costs you somewhere between two and four dollars to get a player to start playing a free game. So, that's your advertising costs and things like that. So, you've got to find a way to retain and manage across all these areas.

Essentially, they've come to find that the longer you can hold the player the more money you make. It seems relatively obvious. And there's emerging models of revenues. So, there is absolutely in-app purchases where people will spend money to do things faster.

There is advertising which is growing quite heavily. In fact, the strongest one of digital advertising on mobile is in games something called rewarded video. Watch
this video and I'll give you something in the game. Between advertising and in-app purchases, this is a growing market size.

Developers are really looking at how do I keep somebody playing longer. That is the element on the social side is if you're playing with your friends, so, Words with Friends, it's a little hard to drop off if your grandmother is sending you back to the board. So, you're going to keep playing because you went in to answer her, you'll send something to somebody else. And that keeps that network engaged for a larger period of time.

In the more complex games, it's finding a competitor that's evenly matched with you. So that you're playing a game and so the matching algorithms that some of these large game use is a very sophisticated to quickly figure out who you should playing against to make sure you're not always losing, you're not always winning. You're walking away with a feeling of satisfaction of competition.

And then the ultimate thing in
gaming is it comes down to analytics and AV
testing in ways that we don't see in most other industries. We can see everything the player does. How long they've looked at something, what they clicked. What they didn't click, combinations of things.

With all of those things, game companies are issuing update after update to try and increase that retention level. So, heavy analysis is all part of what happens in the game sector.

MR. LOEW: In fact, that might be one of the hardest to fill jobs for most local game companies is your data analyst or your data scientists. These are in some cases the largest like League of Legends when you have the amount of data and you're trying to balance a community that large representing that many cultures is an incredible task.

It's one that $I$ think presents a lot of opportunity. Actually, we talk to a lot of students about that in the context of game industry careers.

MR. SHARMA: So, one of the elements is brand matters. Angry Birds is a movie, is a
theme park, is a Cartoon Network in Finland. It's building out based on the brand. So, a lot of these brand values like the Star Trek brand I spoke of or Game of Thrones, brands are beginning to get involved in gaming in a much more significant way. And it moves a lot.

Advertising in terms of public television advertising was something that was a big question until the last year. The Game of War came out. They started with Kate Upton, Mariah Carey. They did a $\$ 20$ million advertising campaign. It was a significant television campaign. And it paid off.

So, the users they got and the money they spent exceeded what it cost to do the advertising. It was a very good deal, which then leads to stronger growth in that space. You have to make a bigger game to justify a $\$ 20$ million ad spend which means you've got to get users, you've got to work them through.

In these free to play games, most of the money comes from what are called whales coming from the casino model, and what we categorize as the top five percent of spenders.

Tend to be male, two-thirds of them are male. They're about 30 years old. So, it's not kids pounding away at it. It's people who are a little older.

And they are playing 26 hours a week. That is somewhat deceptive for these things because they're not sitting focused 26 hours a week. I have my breakfast and I play little bit. I'm watching TV and I play some more. I put it down when $I$ talk to my family. Otherwise, it's just something that they do and they do it over an overextended period of time.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How does that translate -- Of what you define as the whales, what percentage of the overall industry revenue are they?

MR. SHARMA: In terms of free to play, they're a substantial part of the revenue. They're a very small part of the player base. One of the things though that's different from a casino is I can't take out a loan to play a video game. I've usually prepaid or it's going onto my credit card. That's all $I$ can do. And it's limited; it's
driven.
You are spending money for the satisfaction you get. So, you don't have to. There's another game that I've played for three years, and I haven't given them money in two and a half years.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a disconnect when you say free to play and then you talk about the highest revenues.

MR. SHARMA: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Would you explain the monetization models? It sounds like free to play ought to be free but apparently it's not. What are the monetization models here?

MR. LOEW: If you downloaded an app lately on your phone, for example, you'll see it says get now. It used to say free. They changed that to get. It means you can get the game for free and you can play in many cases almost the entire game.

But if you want to accelerate your progress, if you want to say your character you what him to have more interesting hat --

MR. SHARMA: -- or Spock with a
beard.
MR. LOEW: -- or Spock with a beard, you have opportunities to then buy those sorts of things or unlock other things in the game.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, that's
referred to as free to play?
MR. LOEW: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But the
monetization strategy is it basically enhancements?

MR. LOEW: Yes.
MR. SHARMA: Enhancements or
advertising are the two main things.
MR. LOEW: Virtual goods.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll give you an example. I have never hit a golf ball over 200 yards in my life. I play a golf game. They offered me for $\$ 1.25$ I can routinely hit 300 yards. In my world it was worth $\$ 1.25$ well spent.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a sucker born every minute.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Better than a golf lesson.

MR. SHARMA: One of the things we should note on free to play games is for I'm going to so many of them but $I$ believe it's most if not all, they tend to have an energy mechanic which limits how much you can play in a day.

So, you could spend a little money to play more in a day but it limits that. And part of that is the belief in terms of the game developer that if $I$ let you play $a$ lot in $a$ short period of time, you're going to burn out on this game. People burn out on games.

And if you burn out on the game, I don't have that extended relationship with you. That's not good. So, I want to keep you playing for a little bit. I want you to check back three times in the day, but $I$ don't want you to play 20 hours straight.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But if you pay money, you can do that.

MR. SHARMA: So, in one of the games I'm currently playing, $I$ can only do it so many times a day. Then $I$ am still limited to that. So, there is that element.

MR. LOEW: And there are other models too. So, there is still the model that you can go to the mall and you can go to GameStop and you pay 60 bucks for the latest release and take it home and install it into your console. That model still exists.

There's all these business models. Some work better on certain platforms than other. Free play has certainly done really well on mobile platform. But there are subscription models that still work. There are sort of the box game model that still exists.

MR. SHARMA: It's substantial.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In order of magnitude is free to play sort of where it's at and the other stuff is marginal?

MR. SHARMA: No. On the mobile side, free to play is, I'm going to say, a very large part of the margin. When you get to things like console game, so PlayStation, Xbox, there's very few free to play games there. And they're nowhere near that size of the market.

On the PC, they're mainly straight up paid games but there's growth from free to
play. Free to play really is this element where it's become cheaper and easier to build a game.

A kid in high school, actually we saw one this year, can put together a perfectly decent game. But how do you get somebody to play it. If I'm going to ask you $\$ 10$ to play my game, I've got to do a lot of convincing to get there. So, play it for free. If you like it then watch a video so I get a few cents.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When $I$ was in the sales business, we used to call them puppy dog close. Take it home, see if you like it. If you don't, you can bring it back.

Is there a gambling dimension to all of these? You could bet I'll do better than you do.

MR. SHARMA: In terms of formally, there's I'll say two categories emerging. For the most part, no. eSports is coming out. And these are major competitions with lots of people watching. Gambling is nowhere near close to the Kentucky Derby. There is no formal line of players in the industry that it
needs regulation. It needs other things before that emerges. Right now, they're just trying to build big competitions. But you can see it go down the sports betting path.

MR. LOEW: It's coming. I do think that some of the daily fantasy sites were poking around at that because they see it as an emerging opportunity. I do think there are probably some parts of the world where there is active gambling culture around eSports just like there is horse racing or football or whatever. We just don't see that here.

MR. SHARMA: Most of the skillsbased stuff where you sort of trying to beat somebody at something, you don't get money back. Game companies have worked very hard to make it difficult for you to extract money from the game. And they'll use analogues and things like that just don't make it worthwhile.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there any indication that informally, ad hoc people are gambling on it?

MR. SHARMA: Not the people I know, which is not great data set, but it's nothing
that comes up in conferences. It's nothing that we're deeply concerned about.

MR. LOEW: I don't see it as much as -- It's not necessarily part of this culture. It's not like I'll bet I can do better than you at Madden. It's more like let's play against each other in Madden. And that's where it ends.

If there probably were a space where there's be some that's sport side, FIFA is probably most popular of those big games, the soccer game.

We just don't see it that much. But there are and I think you'll hear a little more about the social casino component of that broader social gaming sector and where those lines might be there. We do have a couple of companies in this state that operate in that space or produce games that are sold into that space, but it's not the majority of what goes on here.

Most of it is for the entertainment market and then simulation market, education market, healthcare company. This is
interested. They just raised $\$ 30$ million to take their game through the FDA approval process so that their game can be prescribed by doctors.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: You said FDA?

MR. LOEW: FDA approval so they can obviously get reimbursement.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What is that game?

MR. LOEW: I think it's an ADHD game. The company is called Achilles Labs. So, we haven't seen it yet but it's in testing at the moment through that whatever trial process that you go through.

So, games are across the sector and it's fairly amazing what game players can do. There's another game that's relatively famous called Foldit. It's made by University of Washington. And it's a protein folding game. They were able to -- The human mind is superior to a computer in many, many ways. And spatial recognition is one way that it's far superior. They are able to fold proteins and give these
researchers a significant sort of piece -solve a piece of the puzzle --

MR. SHARMA: It would have taken 20 years for the computer to figure out how these proteins fit together.

MR. LOEW: They had tens of thousands of players working on the problem. So, sort of citizens science, crowd source information like that. There's another one working on a -- These things happen with regularity. So, the games do that massive social network not only for fun but they solve real problems as well.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So, Mr. Chairman, I would just suggest to keep this on time, Mr. Loew and Mr. Sharma are going to stay that we move up Mr. Delany and Mr. Whyte. Then you can ask them questions as they go. And then at the end if we have sort of panel questions for everyone, they'll still be here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Just a point of
reference, a special thanks to Mr. Delany who traveled here from London to be with us.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
MR. DELANY: Mr. Chairman and
Commissioners, thank you very much for having me. It's a privilege to be here addressing you today. It's great to see a whole Commission taking such an interest in this vibrant, exciting new space of social games.

You just obviously heard from our colleagues before just how important sector this is for the states, the US as a leading country in the space.

I myself have actually worked for some of this country's biggest tech giants in Facebook and Google. I obviously work with the social games industry now and also have worked with other giants of technology from this country like Uber and Airbnb and others.

My background has always been in online media looking at policy and regulation. I signed the European Safer Social Networking Principles with European Commissioner Vivian Reding some years ago. And I've continued to try and take the knowledge that I've taken from learning about social media onto social games.

We have a slightly different
definition of social games than our colleagues earlier. But $I$ intend to drill down really into social casino as a subgenre and address the question of play for fun, which I know has been of particular interest to this Commission.

To try not to repeat what the colleagues of MassDiGI has already said, social games are a rapidly growing form of entertainment, consumption tied to Internet and mobile growth. As you know in fact all forms of media and entertainment have moved online and are now growing with Internet penetration, the use of smartphones, etc.

We have an estimated over 750 million players of social games worldwide. And social games, as we've already seen are consistently the most popular form of app in the Apple and Google stores.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Excuse me, you said that you have a slightly different definition of social games. What is your working definition so that we can follow the meaning of these bullet points?

MR. DELANY: We consider social
games to be the casual, quick to learn, easy to play bite-sized games that people play on their smartphones, on their tablets, on social networks. The kind of the social name of the category of game has really come because they started on some of the social platforms like Facebook.

We don't consider -- Within our membership we don't have for example the World of Warcraft games which have a highly social element. They are built on social but they are not the kind of game that you play on your phone when you're waiting for a bus, for example.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Say again, what is the distinction?

MR. DELANY: We talk about games that are played on mobile, on tablets, quick, easy to learn games, sometimes called casual games as well. And they started originally really on the social networks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And they started on social networks that's the key. Because the
other games can be casual, quick to learn and can be played on tablets.

MR. DELANY: The primary route to these games are through the app stores. And those apps stores are found on mobile and tablet computers.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there some reason why you describe it that way? Why would it not include -- Why would you industry not include the war games for example?

MR. DELANY: The origins of the games have come from different routes really. Those big platform games have come from computers, from consoles and they've added social elements as the games have developed and become networked. Whereas these games have started as typically a small game that have grown through the prevalence of social media.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But don't they get pretty much to the same place? Is there some rational business reason or functional or psychological reason?

MR. DELANY: The way the game is played is different. It's normally a short
timeframe, play for a few minutes here, play for a few minutes there. The other larger games are typically got bought differently, got paid for differently. You need equipment use them like a console or a computer traditionally. So, it's really the smaller bite-sized kind of game that we talk about. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The delivery. MR. DELANY: Delivery and the access and the approach that people have to when they go to play them. As we've seen before, the US is at the forefront of developing social games. And it's estimated that 155 million Americans play video game, many of which play social games as a subcategory.

About the International Social Games Association. We founded the association just over three years ago. It is a global nonprofit trade association established to provide a unified voice for the social games industry on social, commercial, legal and regulatory issues.

I am based in the UK in London as you heard before. But we represent a global
membership and I have (INAUDIBLE). We represent a cross-section of social games from boutique startups like Abzorba and Plumbee, although Plumbee has actually just been bought by one of your local games companies here, to some of the larger and more establish players such as Playtika and Zynga.

The association is committed to researching and understanding social gameplay; working with policymakers such as yourselves for a balanced and proportionate rules base; upholding industry best practice. In fact, setting best practices one of the first things we did as an association.

And we continue to evolve those on the basis of new evidence or new understanding of the industry. And we promote safe and responsible gameplay through our portal smartsocialgamers.org. I launched that myself in Washington, DC last November at the Family Online Safety Institute's annual meeting.

There we provide players with
information from some of the more straightforward things such as where do I
download games from safely. What is an in-app purchase? How do I pay things? But we also try and tackle some of the harder questions that people may have around if they consider themselves to be playing for too long or they have unwanted contact from strangers, those kind of issues.

We commissioned work from clinical psychologists to write that piece so that we have real expert's advice for players.

Actually, one of the experts as we heard earlier, social games can be used to help people who have for example social anxiety, ADHD and others. So, there are real benefits to games as well as pure entertainment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there also the same propensity for addictive behavior? Is it another area that is prone to addictive behavior?

MR. DELANY: We in our second research project looked at the prevalence of gameplay. And you heard a little bit about whales earlier. The consumption bell curve was exactly in line with other forms of
entertainment consumption.
So, there certainly are people who play perhaps a disproportionate amount or we might consider to be disproportionate or may spend a disproportionate amount but it's in line with people spending money on too much golf or too many subscriptions to Netflix, Amazon and Google Play which are all the things we have in our house.

So, yes, there are some people who have issues with overspend and overplay, however that is the same in every single entertainment center.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Don't be defensive about it, $I ' m$ just trying to get information.

MR. DELANY: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to be.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Has there been any study on comorbidities? Is there any -- Do people who tend to play too much, also tend to smoke too much, drink too much have other problems? Has there been any research on that?

MR. DELANY: I don't have that
research. So, about social games, about how we
define them. So, obviously all games are social they always have been. Games innovation has always followed technology innovation.

Our first research project looked at the evolution, use and impact of social games. One of the things that I found most interesting within that was how the developments of the steam engine and trains drove people to miniaturization of games. And cribbage became very popular because it was a way you could take your little set with you in your pocket. And actually portable games, thanks to the steam engine, became more popular than some of the less portable ones.

Social games are really just the next innovation. It's simply just going with you in your pocket as it may have been a deck of cards before. Of course, the scale is different and the usage is different.

The first point of interactive games where people were playing with balls and things were they pinball machines of the '30s based on Bagatelle. More advanced versions of these games were developed with bumpers, flippers and
the two-play games within pinball. And the first digital screens and counting were actually introduced in the mid-60s.

70 s and 80 s we get onto arcades, PacMan, Space Invaders. We're actually paying $\$ .20$ or five cents even to get three lives to play for as long as you can was the norm. Not too dissimilar to some of the free to play freemium model that $I$ will look into later.

Personal computers, game consoles developed with the 90 s and the early 2000 's. Now with the miniaturization of devices, mobile Internet, smartphones, etc. has led to this more mobile portable consumption of social games.

So, how do we define social games and who plays them? As I said, we consider them to be social, casual games that are quick to play and learn. They are part of a changing consumer preference towards bite-sized entertainment videogame experience. Perhaps when they're out and about, there's an appetizing break to ties to the television or they're waiting for a friend at the bus stop.

We heard the free to play phrase used earlier. We tend to use the word freemium because I think it's actually perhaps clearer for the consumer to understand that there is an element that is free and premium. So, it's a corruption of the two words freemium.

So, access is free. You can get the games in the app stores for no cost. However, the additional features, additional time, a bigger sword, a better hat, a beard for Spock could all be purchased through in-app purchases.

The vast majority of players do not spend any money whatsoever. It's up to 10 percent of players in general ever spend money within a game.

The average player in the US spends $\$ 7.20$ per month.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the average player that spends?

MR. DELANY: That pays.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That pays.
MR. DELANY: Yes. So, of the five to 10 percent they will spend on average about
$\$ 7.20$ per month. This is less than the average American spends on reading materials, less than the average American will spend on -- those who spend money on console games as well. Wellknown examples include Farmville, Candy Crush and Angry Birds.

People of all ages and genders play. Obviously, there is a variation across genders. I have a graph to show some of that split in demographic and game style.

Social casino games are a subgenre of social games. They are frequently using in the same game mechanics. They fit with the same genre. You find them in app stores as well. They take inspiration from the most well-known real money casino games such slots or roulette. But they are delivered in an innovative, mobile way. And we think people enjoy them because they actually are familiar with the games, but they don't have any risk because they're not gambling.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What's the age of the population you find playing social casino games?

MR. DELANY: The average age is around 40 years old and skewed toward women.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Playing social casino games?

MR. DELANY: Playing social casino, yes. Mirrorball slots and Slotomania are a couple of good examples of social casino. These games do not involve gambling. They are not gambling. And I'll explain a little bit more about that in a moment.

Gambling of course I don't need to tell you guys involves consideration, chance and price. Social games have no requirement to pay to play. There is no consideration. The vast majority of people don't spend any money.

I use the word spend very deliberately. When people go to a casino, they think -- you may say that they spend money as well but they are betting. They are placing a stake. And that requires an expectation that there may be a financial return.

Within all social games, there is no expectation of a financial return. So, even if you are spending money, the player always knows
that they're never going to see that money again. They're never going to get it back. They are putting money in for the purpose of entertainment only.

The average monthly spend again is \$7.20. There is no tangible reward from gameplay. The games are based on the virtual credits typically. So, there may be what we might refer to as Monopoly money. There is no opportunity to exchange these credits for any money. And as you referred to earlier, there are no secondary markets where you can trade these either.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is there a community though of people who are playing these games competitively and staking on the outcome?

MR. DELANY: I've never heard of it or seen it.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I almost can't imagine it.

MR. DELANY: Typically, the average player is picking it up because they are at the bus stop and they've got five minutes to kill
or they're waiting for a meeting to start. They are not playing for intense period of times to level up and build things.

There are games where people do that. That tends to be the more traditional console, PC type of game. It's just not the consumption model here.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: To use your phrase, it's quite descriptive, bite-sized. So, if it's a bite-sized game, you almost don't have enough time to set up a competition.

MR. DELANY: People could but also you are playing often against hundreds of millions of people potentially within your network. I think trying to game the network to try and establish to make sure you're just playing within a particular pool may technology be quite difficult as well. So, social casino games --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think you skipped your last bullet point.

MR. DELANY: I'm sorry, yes. So, social casino games are found in the app stores, on the digital platforms, on Facebook
just as the rest of the social games are. They are not connected to real money gaming. There are however, some uses of social casino games in the use of marketing. I think this is where the phrase play for fun has been used. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, what are those?

MR. DELANY: I'm going to explain that in one moment.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I back up a little bit of the prior slide? So, they are not gambling because they've removed one of the three elements, right, price?

MR. DELANY: There's no consideration either. You don't have to spend any money at all.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You could if you were in the freemium model, correct?

MR. DELANY: Correct.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I know that's a subset. But there's value in some of the attainment in some of these games; isn't there? This may not be the case for social casino games, but there are other games that
were being described before. Isn't social status potentially valuable to some people?

MR. DELANY: Certainly. You have bragging rights for people who want to talk about how well they're doing and compare themselves to others. That's part of the social element, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How often do you think somebody is playing -- We hear a lot about I don't want to go sit at a blackjack table because I don't want to biff it for the guy sitting next to me because I take an extra card.

Do you get a sense of how often people are playing a social casino game to learn the rules of the game, get comfortable with the game before they actually step into a live bricks-and-mortar facility?

MR. DELANY: We've been looking at the market. And we've seen no evidence of people converting from social to real money.

There are certainly people who are gamblers will also be interested in social casino because it's something that they enjoy.

Equally, they'll be watching ESPN to watch gambling coverage on there. Equally, they'll be on YouTube looking at tactics and things as well.

So, yes, there is going to be an overlap between some social casino players and real money gamblers. However, there is no causal link and there are many other forms of entertainment that are associated with gambling that they will also be consuming.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
MR. DELANY: So, this grid here looks at age and gender percentage of the various different games. You can see things like strategy games, shooter games, racing car games skew to a younger male audience. Games like slots you can see here, actually this grid suggests around the age of 45 and 70 percent female.

We actually have a wealth of data on who plays social casino games. They simply don't have a young demographic, which obviously youth play is something that's been raised as a potential concern, but the data doesn't bear
it out.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are there fewer younger people playing social casino games than other social games?

MR. DELANY: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really?
MR. DELANY: There are almost --
Well, I'll go through a little bit of the data now. Actually, social casino games are renowned amongst developers as being an older demographic, which actually makes it more appealing because older people tend to have some money that they can spend within a game. So, it's a stable player base who are able to pay.

The UK Gambling Commission have done work looking at social casino specifically. I'll go into this particular investigation by the UK Gambling Commission later on in my slide when I look at some of the other regulatory concerns that have been raised. And they found that having looked at real data from gaming companies who provided the data directly to them, the number of under $18 s$ on an average day
was comfortably in single figures.
In fact, they could find three people under the age of 18 just playing social casino in that data set. So, we're talking a very few number of people at all. And that's real numbers three not a percentage.

Harvest Research is actually an Australian --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's out of hundreds of thousands of players they found three?

MR. DELANY: Yes. Harvest Research is an Australian-based research firm that we commissioned to look into real player data as well. They had access to 12 million data sets with players across Europe, US and Australia. That was real data coming from real social game companies, only social casino game companies. They found only . 74 percent players were under the age of 18. And of those only half a percent were paying. So, that comes out to something like 0.00 --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: How would you know? Until you buy something, you wouldn't
know the age of the individual, correct?
MR. DELANY: Typically, these people have plugged in through a social network or they've downloaded the app through an app store. So, the game providers do get data from the app stores where they provide the games through or the social media that they have connected through to the game in order to connect with their friends.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: All of those games analyzing those two data pieces are not illegal for an 18-year-old to play or younger, right?

MR. DELANY: Absolutely not. So, these games are accessible on the app stores. The app stores set the age rating. Typically, a minimum age is set for 13 for social games. That actually is a historical thing to do with COPPA regulation here and nothing to do with -CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To do with what? MR. DELANY: The Child Online Privacy Protection Act. Within in the US, you're not allowed to collect data from a minor without parental consent. And trying to get
parental consent is difficult. So, it's about historic data protection regulation rather than anything else.

These games are accessible through the app stores to anyone. That's simply not interesting for young people who would rather be on an adventure in a more immersive environment than spinning a wheel or playing cards.

Play for fun, which I think is really where your interest was initially sparked. Social games can be used as a marketing tool. We see cross promotions across games and brands all the time. And social games, as you have seen, have hundreds of millions of players worldwide. Anyone doing some marketing wants to have access to an audience. Social games is another channel for them.

They are frequently white labeled, cross branded for marketing purposes. Angry Birds, for example, have done work with Star Wars, McDonalds. I think they actually had a reward scheme with McDonalds. And you'll see
it across clothes stores as well as with casino companies.

Some casino companies do use social
games as a tool to engage their clients when they're outside their venues. This is sometimes referred to as play for fun. And they're casino styled games. And they're all located on the bricks-and-mortar casino website. So, the access point is from the gambling location through their website. So, it's being targeted at gamblers.

The games look very, very similar or have exactly the same game mechanics as the rest of the games industry including social casino. However, the casinos will often want to put some of their own branding in, share the titles, icons, etc. so that people are familiar when they go back to the bricks-and-mortar casino. But this is specific to this application and use.

You also have the freemium model where people can buy credits as with the rest of the industry. Loyalty programs may be in place. They're also in place in other parts of
the game sector as well. However, the terms of service clearly state that the practice for success does not imply future success in real money gambling.

We've done analysis of the sites that you have been referring to earlier. And those terms of service are there and they're clear on those websites.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One of the things that has come up is the concern that the algorithms are different that the likelihood of winning is different. That if you play the free games, you get a sense that winning is relatively easy. And then you go to the machine and it's different.

Are there statistics or models or evidence one way or the other on that?

MR. DELANY: We have obviously
spoken to the companies that do provide those games. And in fact, I believe they've publicly stated how their math models are identical to the games that they provide in the casino.

People go to casinos because the games work and they enjoy them. And there is
obviously a balance between the model that casino has found that continues to engage people and they come back to play and the amount of money that they spend. That actually maps to social in general as well.

To give people inflated payout rates or percentage would make the game less interesting. The balance in payout rates to spins needs to be the right compelling number. And there is no evidence to suggest that these games are trying to manipulate people in some way.

People would simply switch off. If I just won every time, where's the challenge? If I lost every time, where's the challenge? There is the sweet spot. And it seems to be analogous with real money and in social.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do you know if that's an area in the UK or in Europe where that's regulated by some of the bodies like us?

MR. DELANY: Yes. It should be mentioned that social casino games in general don't have an equivalent in the real world. Social casino games in general are within their
own universe using their own content.
Where there are real money
equivalents of the game and they are specifically used for marketing, there are two markets that spring to mind, New Jersey and the UK where the online game may have -- it is specifically used to allow people to gamble online as well.

So, you have a one for one game which is play this game, try before you buy and then come directly to our online casino. That doesn't exist in this state and most of the states because there isn't a one for one transfer. So, you can't say I played this and therefore I have that expectation.

So, the law in the UK essentially says if you have a like for like game for your online game and you are using it to entice people to go to the next one then your math has to be the same.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That came about because there's online gambling that's both legal in New Jersey and the UK.

MR. DELANY: Correct. As I hope I'm
making clear, the use of these games for marketing purposes is differentiated from the rest of the social game space. The access is different. It's through a bricks-and-mortar casino website and is used for engaging gamblers. It is not the same as people going to be entertained through an Apple App Store. Social games in general are governed by an extensive consumer protection framework. In the US, social games like any form of consumer activity including video gaming, eCommerce are subject to a wealth of federal and state consumer law.

For example section 5 the Federal
Trade Commission Act and state-by-state little FTC Acts cover a full gambit of consumer protection from false advertising, unfair and deceptive trade practices, fraud, data protection and so on. There's also wide range of federal regulations covering the social media platforms in app stores that people typically access these games through and spend money through.

The social games that means there is
a particular framework around transparency, accountability, consent in relation to monetization and in-game purchases. And I'll give a couple of examples later on how that law has actually been used to good effect.

Similarly, in the EU, the use of any online service is regulated by the eCommerce directive as well as consumer rights directive, distant selling and others. So, there is a full set of consumer protection regulations for consumers. They're used to it. The same set that covers their use of Amazon will cover their use of Apple.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Has this space been controversial to any significant extent in the EU or the UK?

MR. DELANY: The UK has done an investigation into social casino in particular. And I'm about to present their findings.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: What about just in general? That last slide had to do with the EU.

> MR. DELANY: Yes. So, in-app
purchases have been a concern.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What purchases?
MR. DELANY: In-app purchases, so that is where you pay some money within the app.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh, within the app. I thought you were saying inept.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Inept I thought you said.

MR. DELANY: In-app, we are separated by a common language here. So, within an application is when you do spend that money. There have been concerns in the US and in Europe about people perhaps being misled when they are making these purchases or that young people or children who have been given devices overspend.

Again, that happens in other forms of online media as well. I just read an article about a child who bought a car on eBay. So, there's some shared responsibility there. Yes, there's been some work on in-app purchases.

Essentially, the laws that we have in place for consumer protection work. They
have had to be reinterpreted for the new use of the way people are buying and spending money. But I'll give a couple of examples now where they've been applied well.

First of all, the conclusion of the UK Gambling Commission's scoping review. So, in January of last year, the UK Gambling Commission completed a two-year scoping review of the social game sector. And they said that there is no compelling reason to impose gambling regulation on social games.

As I referred to earlier, they had a large-scale data set from social games companies. They have supplementary data about the applications, how they were used, who was using them. This is the largest scale investigational study by a regulative authority anywhere in the world so far.

They cited the extensive framework of existing consumer protection regulation which already governs that sector. And other factors that they highlighted include the moderate amount of time and money that most people spend within the games. There's no
increase in portion of young people participating in social gaming or real money gambling despite revenue growth by sectors. The absence of evidence that social games are a cause of real money gambling participation in young people or otherwise.

And I believe this presentation will be available later where that link will work. But that takes you through to the UK Gambling Commission's full review.

As I said, to quote from the report, "We are clear that there is no compelling reason at the moment to impose additional gambling regulation on the social gaming sector given that it is subject to an extensive set of consumer protection regulation."

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In this study
-- And I look forward to the link, thank you. -- were they studying social casino games or all social games?

MR. DELANY: Social casino specifically.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, this is social casino?

MR. DELANY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, we're clear there is no compelling reason at the moment to impose additional gambling regulation on the social casino gaming sector is what this meant to say. What the study was about --

MR. DELANY: It was studying social casino.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That is their mandate, I guess.

> MR. DELANY: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That is their mandate, they're the gambling commission.

MR. DELANY: Exactly. So, specifically to Commissioner Macdonald's question before about European interest in some of these areas, particularly with the in-app purchases when you're spending money within the games, we have worked with European Commission to look at the application of existing consumer protection regulation within the space of social games in particular. And we've been praised by the European Commission for doing

SO.
In the US, there's been a positive reaction by the industry to well-publicized FTC enforcement actions against Amazon, Facebook and Google. This is where those companies have essentially refunded money to players on a large scale because of deemed infractions of consumer protection. So, the law has worked here in the US.

And the majority of platforms now offer easy to use mechanisms for restricting or preventing unwanted spending both on Apple devices and Google devices, which has the largest market share of the phones.

We at the ISGA updated our best practice principles to incorporate European guidance. And we were praised by the European Commission to do so. This for example is addressing purchases should be fair, transparent, people understand what they are doing.

An industry has an equivalent within the US with the FTC guidelines. This started actually with the Office of Fair Trading in the

United Kingdom setting out the principles for app-based games. Again, this is intended to protect consumers from unwanted purchases or being led into misleading versions of the game. This is perhaps coming back to the question of is free a misleading term when it's freemium. You have to pay to play. Well, you don't have to pay to play but there is the option.

The Consumer Protection Cooperation
Network of European Consumer Enforcement Authorities have also launched a review of some of these concerns and launched a common position paper. So, this is the national consumer protection ombudsman or regulator, if you like, across every single European member state.

So, some of the misconceptions that we are faced with about social casino perhaps in particular or social games in general. Social casino mechanics, again, Mr. Chairman you asked me about earlier. Social games do not offer higher percentage payouts to give inflated expectations or encourage real money
gambling participation.
As we've heard before, this is a multi-billion-dollar industry. If people were trying to get people to leave their games, they'd be cannibalizing themselves. It simply does not make logical sense to move people from a highly profitable growing game sector to try and do something else.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, your conviction is that when a casino company is in a social casino game, it's in it for the revenue stream in the freemium model not in it for purposes of switching people to traditional games.

MR. DELANY: Absolutely. There are perhaps two use cases here that we shouldn't confuse. One is where social games companies may have casino companies who are their parent. They may also have television companies, film companies who are also their parents.

As I've said, many people in the entertainment industry in general are trying to learn about this industry and get in on it. The social games, social casino games that may
have a gambling parent are typically run as standalone businesses. And to link them to real money gambling would in fact be in breach of their gambling licenses in the vast majority of markets, which would be antithetical to them. It would make no sense.

So, if you have a social casino
company with a gambling parent, there is likely to be absolutely no link in the games whatsoever or to drive people to real money gambling.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other than brand cross promotion.

MR. DELANY: You don't see brand cross promotion either.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really?
MR. DELANY: Playtika for example is an entirely standalone business in the social casino space. It's very, very popular. It's in the top five, I believe. And it happens to be owned by Caesars. But it is not driving people to any Caesars' property online or off. It's an entirely standalone business.

And we addressed again earlier the
concerns about where it's used as a marketing tool, where games are used on the bricks-andmortar website to engage with gamblers. Those companies have explained, I believe that they are offering equivalent payout rates. And we've seen no evidence of games offering inflated rates at all.

Also, as mentioned before, the vast majority of social casino games actually don't have a real world equivalent. So, if I did have a Luc's Lucky Slots that was offering a payout rate that would be considered to be high, there isn't Luc's Lucky Slots in a real casino anywhere. So, there couldn't be that misleading connection.

Higher percentage rates are antithetical to the freemium business model. And actually, within our best practice principles we make it clear that games must state that social casino games does not equate to real world success. So, that's part of our best practice principles.

It reminds me somewhat of the idea that violent videogames will lead to violent
actions. Or that driving fast cars in a video game will convert people to be driving poorly in the real world. But both cases have been proven that to be untrue. Of course, we should investigate and see but there's no evidence at all that this kind of conversion or that people are so stupid that they may confuse the two.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Where is
that information or where is that message shared with the player, at what point or stage in the game?

MR. DELANY: It's within the terms of service of the game. Actually, I can show you here. There's a screenshot. This is in the app store. This is before someone has downloaded it. They can look at the details of the game. They can understand it.

Just as a note, within the social casino genre, the ISGA represents approximately 82 percent of the genre. So, we have a very, very broad coverage of the social casino genre.

A look at youth gambling and problem gambling. One of the concerns about social casino has been this question about
convergence of people by playing social casino converting or going to real money gambling. There is no evidence that social casino games are a cause of gambling in young people.

Rates of prevalence of gambling and gambling addiction are both in young and old have changed very little over time, over recent time. And we have figures that actually in the UK that rate has been slowly declining.

We're talking about during a time of massive growth of social casino over a number years. And we are sometimes challenged as an industry to prove that social games are not doing something, but to prove a negative is of course impossible.

But the data just simply -- You
would expect logically if social casino did have such a negative impact that the numbers of prevalence or problem gaming would be spiked in some way or at least a bump, an uptick, something. And there simply hasn't been that. There is just no evidence of this conversion or this impact of social casino.

And the most recent national
replication survey in the US shows that problem gambling rates have also continued to remain stable. So, that for this market, rates have remained stable despite half of the adult population playing social games, many of which who will be playing social casino.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In that second bullet point, those percentages are as the entire population not the adult population?

MR. DELANY: I would like to verify that before I answer that. I'll have to get back to you on that. I believe it's for the whole population, but $I$ don't want to give you the wrong information.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If it's adult
population -- It'd be interesting to know what that is.

MR. DELANY: Yes, absolutely. So in summary, social games are a very popular form of entertainment. They are enjoyed by hundreds of millions of people worldwide.

Social casino is a popular genre of social games, has an older demographic. Social games can be used for marketing. Social
casinos used for marketing bricks-and-mortar casinos tend to be referred to as play for fun. Whether any oversight of play for fun is necessary or not is evaluated on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis. Obviously, this is what you are interested in looking at at the moment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, I probably missed something. Rationalize the statement that casino companies like Playtika don't cross market to Caesars and this statement that social games are used to market bricks-and-mortar casino games.

MR. DELANY: I'm sorry. There are some social games companies like Playtika that do social casino games. They have a parent company that happens to be casino company. They're not driving people to their properties at all.

The example that has come about in Massachusetts has been a website belonging to a gambling company has put a social game on it in order to engage gamblers when they are outside of the casino. That's a separation. That's
the difference. That social games is being used to specifically to engage gamblers when they are outside of that property.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does Playtika, for example, do that as well?

MR. DELANY: No.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, Penn National, the company that we have has also a freestanding division, I believe, that is their social gaming that includes social casino games. They do have play for fun games?

MR. DELANY: Correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Playtika does not.
MR. DELANY: Yes.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, Penn actually has two different versions. One of which they own might be proprietary which may fall into the Playtika category. And one in which they like many other companies have put their own marketing skin on, for lack of better term, which is the one that they are interested in marketing.

I think what we are hearing is, and correct me if I'm wrong, is there are casino
companies that own --
MR. DELANY: -- social games -MR. BEDROSIAN: -- maybe as a profit center not as a marketing tool. Then they can contract usually with other entities for the marketing purposes; is that correct?

MR. DELANY: Indeed. It is about the intent of the game and how it is marketed and how it is accessed. When you're on a casino website you are clearly engaging gamblers. And the play for fun category therefore is a use of social games or social casino to engage with gamblers.

Playtika, and others, Plumbee for example, has been bought by GSN but it's also been heavily invested by Endemol who is a television production company. They are standalone. They are not used for marketing. They are not used to draw in people to a bricks-and-mortar. They are an entirely separate space.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But your data and opinion and apparently data suggests that the play for fun games don't have the effect of
acting as a gateway, as an acquisition.
MR. DELANY: No. I don't consider any of the social games that are accessible through the app stores as play for fun. Play for fun is a specific marketing tool accessed through a gambling website.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's the difference between the games, a play for fun game? Is that because it replicates all the casino games?

MR. DELANY: It may replicate the casino game. It may be casino branded. And the purpose is to engage gamblers. So, it's been targeted to the existing audience of the casino. You're accessing it through a casino website.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But if the game can be essentially the same game as in the app store, why would it not have the same function in the app store?

MR. DELANY: Why would Playtika drive people to spend money elsewhere when they are profitable standalone businesses? It's one of the few growth centers for many of these
companies in fact who may have dwindling casino revenues. Social games is a vibrant, profitable, exciting business center for them. And driving people elsewhere would be bad business.

They spend a lot of money on these companies when they bought them. They are not trying to drive people away.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You may not be talking about the same game; is that a fair statement? When you talk about play for fun games that replicate the casino games to engage gamblers, etc. that's similar to say slots, one of the slots in the casinos may not be the same game as what you referred to as what we saw when you talk about Playtika or could they?

MR. DELANY: The games may look very similar, but it's about who is the audience. What is the intent? What are they trying to do with it? So, you might have an Angry Birds game that is purely just a straightforward game but they may cross brand it with Star Wars because they're trying to sell Star Wars merchandise.

So, that's the intended difference. It's a marketing tool and how people are driven somewhere else is the purpose of the game.

Here the social casino sector is a standalone profitable industry. They have no desire to drive people away from their Playtika for example.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That may be true for standalone companies that aren't owned by casino companies, but --

MR. DELANY: I'm sorry, but it's also true for companies that are owned by casino companies.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That's what I'm getting at. You're saying that's the case.

MR. DELANY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I take your word for it that Playtika for example does not cross promote, but I gather the Penn National Company does, online gaming company, social gaming company does.

MR. DELANY: They'll have two separate arms. They have a profitable social games business. There are also gambling
companies who wish to white label their services for specific purpose of engaging a specific audience. That is this play for fun category.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What would you attribute that to that the audiences are just simply different?

MR. DELANY: The purpose is to engage gamblers with their brand when they're outside the bricks-and-mortar casino. The purpose of a standalone social game is for people to stay and be entertained and play.

It's like using my AMEX card is actually a Virgin Atlantic one because they want me to continue to fly with them. But I also have a Visa card that is not co-branded. It's simply for spending. And I choose where to spend my time depending on my motivation.

So, if my motivation is I'm a gambler. And I want to engage with my brand and potentially play and be rewarded with a voucher for a burger at the end of the month, then me as a gambler then that's my motivation.

The social games regardless of who
their parent company is are growing profitable businesses. When you are looking at the distinction, I think you have to look at what is the motivation of the game. Is there cross branding? Are they driving people to casino properties? What is the commercial intent of the provision of this game? And how is it accessed? If it's on a bricks-and-mortar casino website, it's very likely that the purpose of that is to continue to engage people with that casino brand.

The games within the app stores simply don't have that cross branding. They're not driving people. They're not trying to get people. It's a separate use. It's a separate standalone business.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Who are your members of the organization? What kind of companies or groups comprise it?

MR. DELANY: We have 12 members. They are some of the world's biggest social game. Zynga you may have heard of who own some of the biggest titles in social game, all of the way down to some smaller developers based
in the US, UK, Europe, Australia as well. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Did you say just 12 members?

MR. DELANY: Just 12, but of the estimated 750 million players, we probably have about 40 percent coverage of the player base. And within this specific genre of social casino that goes up to about 84 percent. The vast majority of questions about the social game space come down to casino questions.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And no currently active casinos are members?

MR. DELANY: We wouldn't have them. We don't represent casinos. We don't represent real money gambling. It's not our industry.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, the games can be used to market bricks-and-mortar casino games if you choose to use them that way?

MR. DELANY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But they
oftentimes are not and sometimes are. Your industry does not obviously because you don't want to drive people out of your industry and into somebody else's bricks-and-mortar. But
your evidence is that even though they could be used to market (A) they're not and (B) there is no evidence in any appreciable way that suggests that they are having that effect.

So, you're not studying people who are playing social casino games that are owned by casino companies because they're not in your -- were they in --

MR. DELANY: We have members who are owned by casino companies.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, you do. Okay.
MR. DELANY: Playtika is an example of a member company who is owned by casino company, by Caesars. They have nothing to do with the casino business. They're not cross branding. They're not promoting. They're not driving people away.

And the vast majority of these games of all social casino don't have a real world equivalent. You couldn't pop to an arcade or a casino bricks-and-mortar or elsewhere online and find an equivalent.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They don't have Jeopardy on the social casino floor, probably
not you're saying.
MR. DELANY: I've not seen it. I've seen Jeopardy in a real money casino but it's also on television. It's on YouTube. It's entertaining.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Your conclusion is that regulators don't need to worry about social casino games as a gambling regulatory model unless they're being used for gambling essentially.

MR. DELANY: Yes. That's a fair
summary. So, social games, social casino games, they're covered by consumer protection regulation. That regulation has been demonstrated to work in this country and elsewhere in the world. Consumers are used to that consumer protection regulation.

And the impact of the social games industry is akin to the rest of the entertainment industry in terms of consumption, of behavior models. How a casino chooses to market itself I think is somewhere that a gambling commission has an interest to assess how they are marketing themselves.

They also use more traditional media forms and mail shots and email. And we've seen some today in fact. And how they behave in their marketing communications, I understand absolutely is an area for a gambling commission to understand how they work. But we urge caution and the risk of unintended consequence of throwing in the lot of the rest of the social games or even the rest of social casino.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else questions before we move on? Thank you. This is really, really interesting. You finished?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yes.
MR. DELANY: No, I think we covered everything. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. That was very helpful. Let's take a real quick break. And we'll come back for our next speaker.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are reconvening at five minutes before three public meeting 190. And Justin, is somebody going to introduce our next guest or do I do that?

MR. BEDROSIAN: I'd just say I don't think he needs an introduction. He's been here before.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I should welcome back Keith Whyte. Thank you for all your time you've put in with our organization. We appreciate it.

MR. WHYTE: The pleasure is ours, an active engaged regulator, and a progressive regulator is the best friend for advocates. So, again we commend you for your approach on a wide range responsible gaming issues and responsible play issues. And again, I'm happy to be here on social casino gaming.

I do have to say that the white paper approach that Chairman Crosby mentioned before, looking at various forms of online gambling type games, we absolutely agree with and endorse that approach. Because I think with daily fantasy sports, with social casino,
with other types of activities that may be coming down the line, there is a need to get beyond traditional definitions of gambling and gaming.

We think there are some consumer protection concerns at the intersection of gaming and gambling. But there's also other solutions. That's what I'm happy to talk about today.

Because of course as we've heard from the previous speakers, I think we looked at the social gaming industry broadly defined. Luc talked a lot about social casino which is obviously a subset. Then we're going to talk about a further subset which are mainly those people who monetize at social casino and/or who may have problems.

So just to be clear, the National
Council of course is neutral on legalized gambling. We are of course neutral on social casino gaming, gambling whatever you want to call it. We are not calling for regulation. We believe as Luc said, I think the UK Gambling Commission got it quite well.

Frankly, there may be concerns and we will certainly demonstrate a few of those but there's also solutions. And at this moment, if we continue to be able to engage with the operators and vendors in the social casino space, $I$ do think we can come up with a set of voluntary, commonsense practical guidelines that build on what ISGA has already developed.

And I think we can achieve a pretty good homeostasis, a pretty good balance of consumer protection while protecting that very small percentage of people who may have a problem while allowing this industry to grow and flourish.

You asked about ISG membership. I would just note that many of their members are also or several of their members are members of the National Council. So, there is certainly an overlap in this space.

So, for those of you who don't know, and again it is a pleasure to be up and down on this shuttle quite frequently to work with you all. The National Council, we are the national
advocates for programs and services to assist problem gamblers and their families. Again, as stated, we are neutral on legalized gambling. Again, a lot of our work here with you with the Commission, who is also a member of the National Council, and thank you for that, a lot of our work with you and our various members and various stakeholders in the legislative, regulatory, operator, vendor, health and advocacy communities is just to do this, bring together folks around common concerns and then provide commonsense solutions.

Definitions are interesting. One of the things that we would say, we would try and help provide some clarity and kind of sharpen the edge, if you will on this discussion. When we talk about social casino, it's gambling games that include at least one but not all three elements of the traditional definition of gambling.

So at least temporarily prize, chance and/or consideration have been removed from the game. Again, as you know certainly
with the freemium model, which we agree is a much better term than FTP, with the freemium model you may remove that temporarily. Theoretically you could even remove it for just one spin of a slot and then require play. Again, we'll get into some --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Or you can remove it forever.

MR. WHYTE: You can remove it forever, sure. And you can remove various things at various times. Again, technology allows us really unlimited opportunity to alter these games as developers see fit.

So, there are three basic models.
This is not a perfect nomenclature because again there's a lot of innovation in this. But generally on the free to play or freemium model, you've removed obviously consideration.

Sweepstakes models are also like this. So, many of these games that we have seen are based on a not very opaque -- not very transparent but sweepstake model where since there is the possibility for free entry you can even reward prizes because it's like the
sweepstakes on the back of a cereal box, or a McDonalds game which is not required purchase. Sweepstakes have always been traditionally held to you're allowed to participate for free.

So, there is a real interesting set of social gaming mechanics all around sweepstakes play. And I'll get into this. There are some big gaming companies that are using versions of this to be able to reward valuable prizes.

And then obviously, you can remove chance. So, there is a fair amount of literature in the gambling space about adaptive or reflexive models that the game essentially plays you. The algorithm adapts to your play. It's very hard to tell who's using these and who isn't, because again, a lot of the terms and conditions are not very transparent.

I will say this model does not seem to be as popular as the freemium model or the sweepstakes model, but it may exist out there. It's just very hard to find because one of our big concerns, one of our big solutions is of course a little bit better transparency in how
the results are calculated.
Being able to allow consumers and advocates and regulators frankly a little bit more clarity into what exactly the model is the game -- is underneath the game. It's general equivalent of having a par sheet. If you wanted to, you could go on the floor right now and find a par sheet for the machine there. And that would tell you the odds and the math and how that outcome is generally determined.

Now no one can actually read those. Again, theoretically you could. Again, that's one of the things we'll talk about in a little bit. And then there's obviously play for fun. You can remove the prize.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This conversation goes quickly into angels dancing on the head of a pin. But $I$ would've said that the three elements are not consideration, chance and prize. It's consideration, unknown outcome and prize.

There is a lot of debate about chance versus -- skill versus chance but that's only one dimension. There's plenty of gambling
which is not merely a matter of chance. It's unknown outcome but skill might affect the income.

MR. WHYTE: Sure. And we'll cop to that. There is certainly skill involved in almost all this stuff just as long as there's chance involved.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm not saying what should be gambling. As a practical matter, if you want to gamble on throwing darts, nobody would say that's about skill versus chance.

MR. WHYTE: Oh, yeah, they would.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, whatever. But we don't have to get into the debate about whether there's skill versus chance to talk about whether you've got gambling or not.

MR. WHYTE: We absolutely agree. That really drives us down a road that we have no interest in going down. We're not going to debate the percentage of chance versus skill, absolutely not.

We'll be down and many of us will be down in Washington tomorrow on the daily
fantasy hearing where much will be made about skill versus chance.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But this slide suggests that chance is one of the three elements of gambling.

MR. WHYTE: Yes. And I think you can also remove it from some of these games, if you'd like, because you can determine it based on almost any metric.

So, you may think you're playing a slot machine, but really you're playing a predetermined outcome. It can determine the outcome in any way you'd like. It just appears the wheels appear to spin and the outcome, it may appear to be random to you but to the mechanic of the game, it's absolutely either predetermined or it's based on how frequently you've played, your reward status.

There's almost infinite possibilities you could use to determine the outcome of the game that have nothing to do with a random number generator mechanic.

There is as Luc said very well, there is some research here. There's more
every day. We welcome that. We really commend ISGA for their approach to make some of this available. There's also some academic studies, mainly coming out of Australia.

As mentioned before the UK Gambling Commission really performed a valuable service and really dug into this. And we'll certainly reference some of their findings again further.

There is, $I$ think, a rich source of information that I'll share with you a little bit. It's industry and analyst information. Many of these companies are publicly held. They do report their performance to Wall Street analysts. That information is available if you know where to look. It helps us get a better sense of the size and scope of the social casino industry.

The National Council has another source of information which are people that are starting to come up, very, very few in number. Maybe I can count on one hand the number people over the past several years that have reached out to us directly for help.

There's lots of reasons why people
who get in trouble with this might not reach out directly to us for help. Clearly, the fact that they may not see it as gambling. But we have had, and I've personally talked to people who have reported they have been negatively affected by excessive play on social casino.

Again, I don't want to over exaggerate this at all. We think is a very small issue. We don't have a good number. I don't know anybody that does have a good number of the percentage of social casino players who may or may not have a gambling problem. As we'll argue there are both concerns and solutions. There's some things that may argue it's a little bit higher risk. There's some things that argue it's lesser risk. Certainly, monetization and the fact that the vast majority of people never monetize is one of the most significant.

So, I want to be very clear that we're not saying that this is an epidemic. We wouldn't expect to see huge rates of increases in gambling problems. But it does not mean that there aren't concerns. And it does mean
we need to take a little bit more active -- I think the UK Gaming Commission is perhaps a little too passive on this.

We would favor an approach that has a little bit more engagement from the major stakeholders to make sure that we're doing everything we can to minimize harm. Because frankly the structures in the United Kingdom and European Union are a little bit different.

I would argue that United States customers have far less consumer protections than are in European Union. So, perhaps we need to do a little bit better. And we could do a little bit better on some voluntary responsible play features. And we'll talk about that.

So, I think Luc is right. We're probably going to split hairs a little bit. They would say players can't lose money in these games. And I think technically yes, you're not losing money in the game itself. Of course, when you're spending a lot of money and then you lose those credits you have then credits that is credits you paid for that you
have then lost. And you may need to buy more credits again.

So, it's perhaps a distinction without a difference but we would certainly agree that they are games that are generally free to play. But we would also stipulate and as we'll show later that there are people that are paying an awful lot of money to play these games.

Of course, that does not in and of itself mean it's gambling or mean that it's problematic, but it does mean that there is the potential to spend a considerable amount of money in this space to play these games. And therefore, there could be the potential for harm.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me though, that's true of shopping at Saks Fifth Avenue, right?

MR. WHYTE: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, it doesn't have much to do with a gambling commission that problem.

MR. WHYTE: That may or may not be
true. These are gambling type games. We're not arguing again that you necessarily should regulate this. We're not necessarily saying that this is your -- but we are saying as I'll go further, there is some linkages here. That's again what we're saying.

There's areas of concern that may rise to the level of concern or that may fall within your purview.

The UK Commission broke it down I think it's very illustrative, three types of risk. Problem gambling type risks, people are spending too much not just money -- and time. And that's something we're going to talk a little bit about. Traditional type risks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Keith, I'm sorry, there's a really important distinction here. You're saying problem gambling type risks is people spending too much time and money.

Yes, you can call that a problem gambling type of risk, but it's any other kind of spending. It's an addictive personality risk. It's an addictive behavior risk.

Incidentally, it has some of the
same features as gambling problems. But to suggest that the two have something to do with one another, there is no more to do with a gambling type problem than it is to be a retail shopping type problem or an eating type problem.

MR. WHYTE: Respectfully, yes. We would say that if you have a gambling addiction and you're spending excessive amounts of time and money on a social casino product that is a problem. And the people that are seeking help are experiencing gambling addictions.

So, while they may also have other problematic behavior in other areas of their life that's not what we're concerned about. And frankly as a commission, I'm sure you're not either.

Our concern is of course people with gambling addiction who are playing these games and who may or may not also develop problems on these games and who may or may not have connections to the regulated casino space.

Again, I would absolutely agree with you that the cause-and-effect is interesting.

These may be people that have other comorbid issues. And we've long known in the gambling industry that causation is separate.

That if someone has a problem on the floor of your casino or in a social casino owned or operated or sponsored by a licensed regulated operator that is a problem for us as advocates and for you as a commission and for them as a society.

So, yes, I want to be clear. We're not assigning causation. A lot of this is associational. We're not calling on regulation. We're not saying that because, but we are saying that something -- Again, this is an informational hearing. This is something to really think about.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I understand that but I think it's a little bit -- concerned categories could say addictive behavior type risks as opposed to problem gambling type risks. The language you're using is suggesting a relationship. I don't think that's the kind of risk this is. This is an addictive behavior type risk.

MR. WHYTE: We'll see. Because when you simulate gambling and when people are participating in gambling activities, whether or not it's for real currency and money I think you can absolutely develop a gambling problem or exacerbate a gambling problem.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On that note I was going to ask is it possible to decouple? You mentioned there's concerns on gambling type risks of spending too much time and money. If you are spending too much time but not too much money or not money at all, could that by itself begin to signal an element of risk of problem gambling?

MR. WHYTE: It could, but it's very, very low risk and again the harm there. I think too, when we look at risk-based regulation or risk-based responsible play concerns, our concerns are primarily focused on people that are spending money at all and then spending too much money. So, again this is a subset of a subset of a subset.

Concerns about people spending too much time, it's relevant to us. But there's
much less harm there. Preoccupation is certainly one feature of gambling addiction and it's not something to be overlooked, but it's not again our primary concern, our concern at all within this population. It's a very, very, very small concern, I think.

We're much more focused on the harm
caused through excessive spend rather than excess of time. Again, the UK Commission noted that it is possible and it's something we've seen as well.

There have been instances in the infancy of the social casino industry where companies reported to us that they dealt with customers who they felt, their own customer service people felt were excessive by giving them just lifetime free coins.

These are people who were bugging them so much to buy more coins or act in ways even their customer service people felt were excessive, they said fine. Just go away. We're just going to give you unlimited coins for life.

Whether or not that causes harm to
that individual just allowing them to play obsessively over and over and over again maybe, maybe not. It's not my concern. That's not what I'm here today to really talk about. But it does happen.

And as Chairman Crosby said, there's excessive play in lots of things. Again, we don't want to over exaggerate the risks. We do want to say that these are some of the categories that we're thinking about that we're pursuing. We're talking with our industry partners about. We're talking with other advocates, healthcare professionals.

This does get into things like excessive videogame play, which is very hard to wrap your hands around. The levels of time and energy that people spend on this to me seems a lot but to this next generation that may be normative.

I appreciate your point, because we want to be very careful when talk about these types of risks. We're just saying this is what could be a risk. Or that these are risks that have been identified or these are risks that
we're talking about.
This is not necessarily here's the case why $X$ should happen based on excessive play.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm getting
a bit confused or I'm experiencing mixed signals from you. On the one hand you appear to be saying that you agree or least not take issue with Mr. Delany's report to us and evaluation of whether there are sources of concern in this area.

But on the other hand, you've got a slide up there that identifies three concerns of problem gambling type risks, transitional risks and consumer protection risks. Why do you --

MR. WHYTE: I think they're risks. They're mitigatable. So, I agree mostly with Luc and ISGA. We certainly have some differences in degree as we'll talk about but $I$ think the important point for us is if there is indeed some risk, either theoretical or real, how do we address it. And let's move forward.

We are arguing about definition
still. I think it's pretty clear there are some risks. So, I'd rather focus our discussion on the solutions. Let's try and figure out how that we can minimize whatever there is. Do more research certainly.

But we are stuck in this
definitional thing which I understand, but we very much want to move to the pragmatic part and let's talk about solutions. So, again, while these risks are there, some are greater than others. Some are more theoretical, some are more apparent. I think the only response can be some better voluntary responsible play measures.

So, I can go through this real quick. Again, these are risks that are nonzero. There's certainly aggressive monetization which we'll talk about. There are some people that the curve -- If most people do not monetize, and even those who monetize only do very little then that means that there is certainly a very sharp small tail.

And that in and of itself is
probably normative spend on a wide range of
consumer behavior. It's not in and of itself problematic. But it indicates to us at least some of those people who may be spending lots of money may be doing so because they have something that is or looks like a gambling addiction.

We know the high frequency and speed of play are correlated. When talked about the energy mechanic, I'll show you some examples of that. In some ways, the energy mechanic, encouraging people to come back every day or every hour, for the vast majority of customers may be a fine way to prevent them from burning out. But for a very small percentage of people who are prone to addictive behavior might be quite dangerous.

I've talked a little about
transparency. We'll focus on that. Autoplay has been regulated out of many slot machines. It is a feature found in some casino -- in some of the social casino space. Loss disguised as win. I'll show you. Again, that's permissible in most slots. I think a loss disguised as a win represents itself in social casino with
massively inflated both bets and win sizes can be a little bit interesting.

And there's not a lot of responsible play features. That's again where we want to encourage people to go. If there is potential harm, let's try and get on top of this now. Let's try and use of these social mechanics frankly to do it perhaps even better than we can do.

Frequency, on the screen you'll see play every day to increase your bonus. While this is a legitimate energy mechanic, it's also if you have someone who is potentially a problem gambler or addictive gambler or compulsive gambler that exhortation to play every day or every hour could be difficult, especially if they're monetizing.

You would not see this for various reasons I think in the regulated space. Rarely would you see $I$ think a casino ad saying come back and play every day. But it is possible in this space. It's frequent. It's not an inappropriate mechanic. It's just we have to look at that one percent not the 99 percent.

This may be an appropriate mechanic regardless, but I think for people who are atrisk, and that again is our concern the one percent, for people who are at risk this could be problematic.

What do we do about is another question. And again, we would argue not that this should be illegal or band or prohibited, but perhaps there's a little bit more disclosure and transparency.

So, loss disguised as wins, this is as you can see a bet of 3000 credits. And a few machines, maybe penny machines can get up to 3000 credits but most traditional slot machines are going to be far less, 3000 coins.

I've spun and won 1500. Although of
course on a 3000 credit bet, I actually lost 1500. I'll demonstrate a little bit on a game. I've got a quick video of a typical social casino game, which we'll play right now.

The very first spin, I hit max bet. Just so you know, this is of course play for fun casino. In Luc's nomenclature, this is kind of a marketing thing. The very first spin
as you'll see, I go to Jungles Wild. The very first spin, $I$ hit max bet. So, it's 6000. And I've won 1000.

This will be over in just a second, but I wanted to give you sort of a sense. And now that I'm out credits, of course, I need to monetize. And the video ends here.

So, packed in that 30 -second presentation are many of the monetization mechanics that we've been talking about. And I wanted to demonstrate those to you a little bit.

Again, this is all well and good, but you saw the levels. Leveling up is a big mechanic. What you can't see on there is some leader boards and other things. This is what the monetization screen would look like. You can see here you're buying credits and there's bonuses. And there are quite a lot of different monetization things packed in here.

There's some real interesting lens into consumer behavior. Again, we would not suggest that these are at all unethical or illegal or need to be regulated but you can see
it's pretty aggressive monetization. For a game that is free to play or even a freemium model, $\$ 249$ for those credits that's a significant amount of money.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are there similar such purchase prices for other social games?

MR. WHYTE: For social casino games, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, other social games.

MR. WHYTE: I don't know. So, I don't play Candy Crush a whole lot, but I would suspect it is very similar to the rest of the social gaming as broadly defined.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Luc is nodding yes.

MR. WHYTE: If Luc says yes, it is.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, this kind of a purchase chart, credit purchase chart could represent social games across the board.

MR. WHYTE: I would assume so, yes. Again, we're focused on social casino. Another one that's a little bit of a different, and this includes some other neat mechanics that
are fun. As you can see here, it's denominated in trillions. So, the least you can buy is a trillion credits.

I would note that the game is denominated in billions. So, you can't bet less than a billion, obviously. So, a trillion credits goes actually relatively quickly.

Then again some more mechanics, which are just of interest to you maybe. Bonus for inviting friends. The socialization, wanting to have friends to play. Giving you money to invite your friends or giving you virtual currency to invite friends to play is a popular mechanic, makes a lot of sense.

The bonus again for regular visits. And whether this is burnout prevention or whether it's encouragement or enticement to play frequently is an open question. It's probably both. These bonuses can scale up. So, the more you play by day, by hour, the more bonuses you get. Again, there's no surprise that people spend a lot of time on device on some of these games.

And then bonus for successful games.

The more you win, the bigger bonus you get. Again, this is probably not a game that is based on random number generator model. It's hard to tell. But if you are really able to increase your winnings like that perhaps there's some other mechanics at play in there.

Again, it just goes back to our fundamental concern about lack of transparency and call to provide greater transparency on how some of these games are performed just to allow the consumers a little bit more information.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm
continuing to get this mixed signal from you. And it just occurred to me that I am wondering if what we have here is the equivalent of Marc Antony's speech on the death of Caesar on which he is saying but Brutus is an honorable man.

You're saying that Mr. Delany and his organization are honorable men and honorable institutions and yet you're going through a succession of illustrations here that to use your word raise concerns. At the end of it all --

MR. WHYTE: That's up to you. We've
certainly called and we've worked in some sense with ISGA and their members. This is for your information. You decide where you're going to go on this.

We're not making a recommendation that you aggressively regulate this, but again that's your choice. We're not suggesting anything.

I would suggest that there is a reason that they should be working with us. These are the same types of conversations that we've had with the regulated gambling industry for the last 40 years. As advocates for solutions this is the space we operate in.

We do point out sometimes inconvenient truths. We do try and find -bring everybody to the table for solutions. But the solution is not to say -- we're not anti-gambling. Fundamentally, we recognize the vast maturity people probably are able to engage in any of these mechanics without harm or without significant harm, and without harm that concerns us from the National Council on Gambling's perspective.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think there clearly are risks in social gaming or social casino gaming. The three that apparently that UK or somebody defined those three risks. They're there. And it's perfectly appropriate to pay attention to those risks and not inconsistent with supporting the industry.

The issue that I have is that you are the National Council on Problem Gambling not the national council on addictive behavior. Whether this is a gambling problem or not is a legitimate issue.

Kids that are too much on videogames is a legitimate issue for concern. We all have experiences with people who have real serious problems with an over ill. But whether it's a gambling issue is another question for me. But go ahead.

MR. WHYTE: Absolutely. We agree. So, when we look at monetization again, much has been made of this and I think it's absolutely appropriate to note, the vast majority of social casino players do not monetize and are therefore almost beyond our
purview. If you don't monetize, I think your risk of having problems that we're concerned about. You eventually come to seek help from us is almost basically zero.

So, again, we're carving out that whole crowd. But of the crowd that do, it's important to note again -- And as we see in the legalized regulated industry, large spend is not indicative of a problem gambling problem. Problem gamblers will spend large amounts of money, but not everybody who spends large amounts of money is a problem gambler, of course.

So, the curve when we look at only a small percent monetize and of that there is again a very, very tall but very narrow tail. Just to put this in perspective. So, based on these numbers, if the average social casino game had 10,000 players, between 15 to 75 would account for roughly half of the game's revenue. Just to be clear, I'm not saying that that 15 to 75 people all have or any of them have gambling problems, but it's possible. It's certainly possible that some of that might.

That's one reason that you might monetize so excessively on a game that you don't have to pay to play.

Just to give you a little sense of the scale, and this is from analyst data provided by one of the largest gaming companies who is in the social casino space. I'll explain the acronyms. We're from DC. We love them. DAU is daily average users. So, when you're looking at six and a half million people, it's a significant number.

So, the daily average revenue per user is of course in cents. It's $\$ .35$ roughly for this particular company's product. Again, very little evidence of concern.

But averages are misleading because of cost of 95 percent of people don't monetize that means when you're doing daily average revenue per user, you're really masking a lot of this. So, when you look at monthly unique payers, so these are users who've paid in a given month, now you've cut it down. Still it's almost a million. So, it's one-sixth, maybe one-seventh of players monetize in a
given month, which is actually one of the best performing social casino games out there. That's really heroic. Most people in the social game industry, not casino but social game industry would love to get a percentage of MUPs.

And then average monthly revenue per paying user, which I think is a much more relevant metric is roughly $\$ 78$ per paying user. So, that's where again you start to see this very, very sharp but narrow tail problem exists. So, averages when you've got millions and millions of players, just a straight average is not really all that descriptive when you are concerned like we are about people that are monetizing.

So, when you really start to bear down on the monetization part, you're looking at $\$ 78$ per person. And this company is on pace to make about $\$ 1$ billion per year in revenue. That's not net. There's certainly costs there. But just to give you a sense of the scale, it's roughly we believe it's roughly about $\$ 2$ billion in revenue last year from the social
casino games segment in the United States. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think you just answered the question $I$ was going to ask. Where are these figures from, United States only social casino games?

MR. WHYTE: Yes. So, there's a broader market I think clearly we're the leader. Luc would know better than I, I believe this represents the US figures.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And there are multiple companies, some of them not necessarily bricks-and mortar casinos.

MR. WHYTE: Correct. It's a fascinating space. Just little bit more to it narrow down again and to note that of course as National Council, we are concerned about the intersection of social casino or social gaming rather and problem gambling.

There is some research. It's small. It's early stages. I think there's probably -I think it's easy to say and I think it's true to say there always could be and should be more. But when we start to look at some of the studies, they are indicative.

This is one study in 2014 that showed that social gaming involvement was not associated with problem gambling in these 10 individuals. However, some of those individuals who played social casino games reported that when they played they felt like they or they felt an urge to gamble in the real-life space. And that's not surprising. Not controversial at all. It makes a lot of sense.

A little bit larger study looked at problematic social gaming use among problem gamblers and found that social gaming play in general, some of it was associated with the desire to escape. That is a known criteria for gambling addiction, playing to escape.

Of course, we all do this, but problem gamblers tend to do it more. They tend to use or they can use games, gambling games as a means of escaping problems in life. So, there is an association there. We are far away from causation and correlation, but there's an association. Which again for us means that this is an area to look at a little bit
further.
Problem gamblers, people with gambling problems tended to use social casino games much more frequently than gamblers who did not have problems.

And then when you look at again another study for social casino gamblers, rRoughly half of them were classified at not problem gamblers at all. Of those people who gambled, a quarter were low-risk gamblers, 14 moderate and 4.7 were considered to be problem gamblers.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is this in your definition of gamblers meaning that in their play in the freemium model social casino games?

MR. WHYTE: No. These are people who are gambling real money.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is just a correlation between real problem gamblers and people who play social casinos.

MR. WHYTE: It's between gamblers in the general population who also play. Some of those gamblers had gaming problems. Obviously, most of them didn't.

But when you look at people who gamble and you look at their social casino play, you start to see. And again, not unexpected, if you've got a gambling problem in the real money space, you might well use and abuse social casino as well. I think that's fairly clear here.

They've almost certainly started gambling for real money first. They may have come across a social casino site. Again, we want to be very careful about correlation and causation.

So, it has been argued not here but in other venues that people can't become addicted to social casino games because there is no monetary reward. That a virtual currency or virtual credits somehow that the action of gambling if there's not prize, chance or consideration, you can't meet the definition of gambling addiction.

I would just call your attention to the fact that the criteria does not require you to have to win money. It's losing money. It's the action of gambling. And we've long known
this of course. Most people with gambling problems report they gamble for the action. They gamble to escape. They gamble for lots of reasons. They do not gamble only to win money. So, it's a little bit of a straw man, but $I$ think it's just important to note that a definition of gambling addiction does not depend or is not based on or rely upon whether or not the activity is legally considered under a narrow definition of gambling or not.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can we go back to that last slide and your second bullet point here just so that I can be comfortable that I understand what the point is.

For nonsocial casino gamers, the percentages were 84.4(SIC) percent. And presumably that means 84.4(SIC) percent who were non-problem gamblers, 12.8 percent 5.8 and 1.0 percent. What is the universe of that second bullet point, just people on the street?

MR. WHYTE: Gamblers.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: People who are gamblers.

MR. WHYTE: Yes. So, this was a study in Australia of people who gambled and then they asked them about their social casino play.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So, of the universe of people who would be categorized as gamblers, we're now looking at a subset of that which are gamblers but who don't participate in social casino games, right?

MR. WHYTE: Correct, those who do and those who don't.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I see.
MR. WHYTE: Transitional type risks, we've talked about this. I think it's absolutely correct that when you look at the marketing and when you look at the free to play model again this would be an example of what $I$ assume we're talking about would be a more white label type marketing site. Again, play for fun network is sort of part of the description.

You can see here, I've blown it up a little bit, play these games online for free. Then pay us a visit to play them on the casino
floor. So, it's clearly a marketing, as Luc described very well. There's a flavor of social casino gambling. Very clearly involved in marketing.

I guess our only note here is that it's hard for the consumers to tell. It may be easy for those of us in the industry, this is a white label site and this is not. I think that again with a little bit more it might help everyone to have a little bit more clarity for the user so you know maybe which site is which.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Keith what do you mean by white label casino?

MR. WHYTE: Luc talked a bit about the free to play model game, sort of a white label product that a regulated gambling company would put on its site in order to help market its gambling in general to users when they are outside the casino. This is an example of these types of games.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But Keith, isn't it so that to get to that you have to go on the casino gaming -- you have get there through their site? In other words, the only
ones that would be going there are those that are already affiliated with that casino?

MR. WHYTE: Perhaps. That's not a requirement certainly. You could hang a link up anywhere.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's not the case with the Penn National model. They have a separate independent company with separate games. Then integrated into their games are references to their hard casinos.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think separately. I think that was the point that was made. They have two different business. One that does not market to the casino and one that does. So, they're targeting their gamblers, right?

So, in order to get to this site, you'd have to go through but you're saying that's not necessarily the case.

MR. WHYTE: That's the practice now. But there's no requirement that that happen. You could have these games available lots of places. And I think Luc was talking about regulated casino companies. You can also have
as we've seen an unregulated online gambline company that could have a social site. And they would then have -- Luc's argument was that the regulated company would have no reason to change the payout percentages because you want to bring the people to your casino. And you want to have the even math.

And in some cases like New Jersey and the UK it's required to have the same or similar math. But if your underlying casino is not regulated then that requirement goes away. Dr. Jeff Juravinski has done some studies. And he's looked at some sites that again operate in the unregulated space both online casino and social casino that have had inflated payout percentages.

So, we are both correct. If you have a regulated company, you would I think be treading on very thin ice to offer a -knowingly offer a social casino product that had different math, especially if was purportedly the same game.

We've never seen any instance of that in the regulated space. For a regulated
casino company, we've never seen any instance where they have offered a product, a facsimile product online on a social casino site that has different math. But there are examples of that in unregulated online gambling and unregulated social casinos.

But again you really depending on the operators and you're depending on -- And I think that's where we call for a little more transparency and a little bit more working together on this.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But if they're running an unregulated casino, I don't know that they're worried or they're going to be worried about your concerns, right?

MR. WHYTE: I think there is always going to be a black market. We've seen this with the online poker space. We've seen this with frankly numbers in the lottery space. We can only work with those who are going to work with us. We've not omniscient regulators. The Internet and long before the Internet there's always been a parallel market. You don't want to pay taxes or you don't -- that's just the
world we've lived with.
I do think that companies, especially companies with regulatory concerns, public companies are going to want to come together and work with us. We've seen a lot of examples of that. We've had some very good partnerships to date. We'd like that to go further. But yes, if you're a private company operating out of Costa Rica, there is very little we can do to bring you to the table. And frankly, there's very little you can do to bring them to the table. That's the space that we've been in for a long time, unfortunately.

Again, from a consumer protection standpoint, the more that we can all work together to help consumers differentiate between the white-hat operators that are trying to do the right thing whether they're being regulated or whether they're doing it voluntarily and other operators that are in this space or could be in this space that don't have the same sorts of protections, I think it behooves all of us to encourage consumers to make informed choices about where they play.

Where they gamble, where they play whether it's social, whether it's online regulated, and I think we have some tools do that. And it would probably behoove the industry to do that as well because they are being competed -- some of the competitors are frankly not holding themselves or being held to the same rules they have.

Again, it's a pretty aspirational approach, but we're an advocacy based nonprofit. We don't really have much of a choice. That is our motto, to try and bring everyone together. And there's actors that are going to stay outside that space.

Promotion to play, I sign up for a lot of these apps and I get this. On the right it's national stress awareness day. Are you aware that playing slots online is a fantastic way to relax. That's an interesting exhortation, again, one that you might not find in the regulated space.

$$
\text { Margaritaville spin } 2000 \text { times now }
$$ through Tuesday to get a million credits. There's a fine line in that energy mechanic.

It's a great lesson that $I$ learned from our MassDiGI folks, the energy mechanic. I didn't know what we called it before.

But I think there's a fine line between encouraging frequent play and encouraging excessive play. And I don't know where that line is but $I$ know when $I$ see it. I'm not sure if it's Margaritaville or not, but you can imagine there's been some pretty aggressive ones that we've seen.

We talked a little bit about convergence. And I do think it is true that there is very little not nothing but there's very little evidence to show that you're moving people from social casino gaming to online gambling, real money gambling in a regulated space. That convergence isn't really there.

However, what the industry will tell
you and maybe some of this is drive by the vendors who are selling these social casino products is there is convergence on the floor, which makes sense. Because certainly for that marketing model that play for fun model, you wouldn't be doing it if it wasn't effective.

This is just some quotes from an article that just came out last month. These are social casino vendors who are talking about in the tribal space that we reported 28 percent uplift in land-based revenues from those casino patrons who went home and started playing online.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just to make sure I understand. This would be the model that Luc and you have described where the casino company is promoting an online tool whether it's free or not.

MR. WHYTE: Correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That is what the suggestion from Luc was that this is really more of a retention tool or an engagement tool rather than a customer acquisition tool. And that there is evidence as a retention and engagement tool that it works.

MR. WHYTE: I believe so. An I'm not sure that there's that much distinction between some of these products. I think people would happy if they worked both ways. I think for the consumer, there's no real distinction
between these games that they're playing and whether or not they're being monetized or hoping to be retained or both. But that's fair enough, it just might help them articulate better to make some choices.

They again said the average daily social player will engage in the casino brand four times a day for a total of between 80 and 100 minutes which is interesting for us. I think that it shows that there's probably some convergence and that probably makes sense. You wouldn't do this otherwise.

One of the things that is interesting to us is that we've really been talking mostly about freemium-based model, where again an essential feature of this is that you do not receive monetary rewards. A lot is made in the definitional space about you can't receive value.

As Enrique said, I think virtual credits are valuable for people, I think leader boards. I think there's a lot of these rewards that are of value. Whether or not they're of tangible exchangeable value is an argument and
more of a legal argument than we're going to go into here, I believe.

But you can also operate the social casino games in a manner, and mostly the underlying mechanic seems to be a sweepstakes model where you can provide prizes.

So, here are two examples on the screen of MGM and Foxwoods who allow you to play for free a social casino game. And then based on the winnings you've had in the game, provide you with actual valuable, tangible rewards. Generally, not cash prizes but things like hotel rooms, rewards points that you can then redeem at the casino.

So, here you can see remember every time you spin myVEGAS reels you attain valuable rewards including complimentary hotel rooms, show tickets, delicious meals and more.

Again, this challenges some of the definitional discussions that we've heard before that you can't win anything. You can't win money, perhaps but there is certainly items of value that you can win in some of the social casino models that we see today.

Last but not least when we talk about transitional type risks, one of our concerns, and again, I'll talk about this a little bit more is that most of these apps are rated $T$ for teen.

I think to be fair, I've heard from our colleagues in the social casino industry that they have talked with Google and Apple and they've encourage them to change this rating. Apparently, and I don't have any clarity on this point at all, apparently the rating systems are set or determined by Apple and Google themselves, not by the developers on the companies.

So, you submit your app and based on the characteristics Apple and Google say this is appropriate for teens. However that happens the space we're in right now today as of May 2016, the vast majority of social casino apps while intended by the developers for 21 plus are rated $T$ for teen.

And I would suggest that's an area that needs to be corrected. Simply if they're intended for adults, let's figure out how we
can -- I don't know whose responsibility it is, but let's figure how we can make the rating system and the app store harmonize with the intent. And I'll just leave it there.

Because when you get down to it, the terms of service in most of these apps, you will find that if you are under the age of 18 , you represent that you are either an emancipated minor or you've obtained the legal consent of a guardian.

Really, as Luc said, a lot of the early age verification of this was based on the social platform. And Facebook's platform was essentially to ensure 13 plus in order to comply with COPPA, the Child Online Privacy Protection Act.
So, really, with one-click
verification, you're not going much past that. I think that is a vulnerability especially when you're monetizing.

Again, $I$ can say for the vast majority people who don't monetize, if you're 17, you lied about your age or you violated the terms of service that's a problem but that's a
relatively minor problem. We're not happy about it but we can live with that.

But I do think when you start to monetize, and I suspect those who take credit cards and process payments want to do a little bit more verification. I know that it's expensive, but $I$ think that's an area where there needs to be some continued work done.

True free to play, even if it's a casino style game, I think the risks for youth are relatively minor. And as Luc said, the number of kids that are playing that they know of is extremely low. And that would make sense.

However, as you'll see when we talk a little bit more about social gaming and kids, I think it's very important to perhaps clarify that previous discussion. The number of kids who pay to play is almost zero. The number of kids who are playing is actually, I would say, fairly high. Fifteen percent in the UK reported they played a social casino game within the last month. But they're not paying. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They're also not
gambling.
MR. WHYTE: They're engaging in gambling activity. They're just not able to win.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, okay. But this is the same point you talked about before. But I don't think it's trivial though, Keith.

This is a gaming commission. There
is I grant a fine line between addictive behavior and gambling addiction. But I think you say kids gamble on the Internet at high rates, well they're not gambling. They might be playing a gambling like game, but as you yourself it doesn't have the elements of gambling. So, the language matters in this case. I don't think it's a trivial definitional debate.

MR. WHYTE: To be clear, we believe there are rates of kids gambling in the real money space online. So, just to be clear on this bullet, kids gamble on the Internet at high rates. They are playing to pay in the real money space.

Then when you look and you see in
the second bullet when you look at social gaming and youth, it's no surprise that there are an active number of youth who are participating in social casino. It's just the point is -- I think 15 percent is a pretty high level of participation. It's just they're not monetizing. So, participation, yes. In the social casino space, monetization is very, very low among youth. And again, there's very, very, very few.

This is the transitional type risks. So, we are concerned that those youth who are playing social casino games may be more likely to have problems down the road because they are engaging in gambling, they're just not winning the money. And they're not paying to play. But they're playing roulette. They're playing slots. They're playing poker.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But what little evidence there is out there with the possible exception of your one study that had an N of 10, there is no evidence out there that kids playing social games or social casino games or even other people playing social games or
social casino games, unless they are designed and marketed by companies that are trying to drive them that it has the impact of moving them towards a gambling problem.

There's some reason to think it might my lead them toward some kind of an addiction problem, but there's no relationship between the utilization of these sites that we know of yet and gambling real gambling, real money gambling or a gambling problem.

MR. WHYTE: Yes. I think that's -quibble a little bit, but generally you're right, yes. And again, we're not trying to be alarmists to all.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I understand. I'm with you on that. But this is also an industry that gets brushed quickly with broad brushes. We need to very, very careful that we use our language right and carefully.

And that we as we are analyzing these things that we are understanding both the nuances of the problems that you, thank God for you fight the good fight to deal with, but on the other hand the nuances that are unfairly
categorizing an industry in a way that is not legit.

MR. WHYTE: Absolutely. It includes
some of our members.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think you're
committed to that too.
MR. WHYTE: Another study, and again, Luc talked about this but we think it's very relevant research. I think it's absolutely helpful to have these statistics. Again, it just shows that players under 18 is a pretty low percentage. It differs significantly from the UK Gambling Commission study.

And that payers among underage players is very, very low. Again, that's not surprising at all. A lot of kids don't have access to this kind of money. There's other things they want to do with their money etc., etc., etc.

I do think again, given our sort of one-click age verification concerns, they might be missing some kids that have simply said they are of age. I don't know how they would spot
that. But $I$ still think it's a very, very small issue.

So, just to summarize some of these transitional risk factors, it seems very clear to us and I think this is absolutely to your point, Chairman that many social casino game players while they do gamble and some are likely to have gambling problems, it's most likely not really related to their social casino play.

And this is the same thing we found with Internet of course as well. So, it's no surprise at all. If you've been following the Internet debate, we believe most people who when you screen them online, if they're an online gambler, they report yes, I have a gambling problem, but then you really ask them, where is it developed. Where are you really spending your problem, it's off-line.

And we think the same thing is probably true for social casino. Given the scale of social casino, even if it's a tiny percentage of their players who do have a problem that they developed off-line, they are
still on your site. They are still people with gambling problems. And there's an opportunity there, if not a responsibility but we would argue both, to help them make an informed choice and get the help they need.

So, again, we're not talking causation and correlation even, we're talking opportunity and we're talking kind of responsibility in a general way. And so minimization of harm is what we want to talk to.

To your discussion earlier about whether or not MGC has jurisdiction over this, that's not our purview at all. That's yours. We note that in your Responsible Gaming Framework there's a couple of points that may or may not extend to social casino or various types of social casino. And you want to promote best and promising responsible gaming practices in all aspects of licensee activities.

You want to utilize principles of responsible gaming in introducing new and emerging technologies. And finally of course,
you want to provide accurate and balanced information to enable informed choices. I leave that for your consideration. That's again not our concern, it is yours.

When you look at the market I think one of the other issues is while Luc does speak for the vast majority of industry, this is an incredibly evolving space. And there are at last count according to Tribal Government Gaming over 1000 apps currently available for download on Facebook.

So, there's companies that are working progressively $I$ think on things, but there's a lot of other people out there as well. And $I$ think it's always important not to assume that just because ISGA members do it or because people are doing it now does not necessarily mean that others are or that the majority of people will in the future. So, it's a point to keep in mind.

We want to focus on solutions. We've been active on the online side for a long time. We believe in general technology offers as many opportunities as it does risk. So, while I
wanted to take a little bit more time than $I$ wanted to really look at the risks, I prefer to spend most of our time on the solutions.

I think we do have to make the case that there are risks, because I think it's been minimized at times. Again, we congratulate ISGA and their member companies for stepping up to the plate in some ways. We think there's more to do. And I'll talk about the more.

We launched in 2012 the GRADE social casino consumer protection standards. Again, the language choice was very deliberate. We did not call it responsible gaming although we certainly see it as responsible gaming. But because there is such definitional issues, okay, we'll call it consumer protection, no problem.

We want to be very clear that our concern is only gambling type games and only gambling type monetized games. We don't care about your Candy Crush. You may have problems with it. You may have problems with consumer spend in other areas of your life, but we believe that gambling addiction can and should
is our concerns are focused around gambling type games, and again the monetized part.

So, we called for some responsible gaming consumer protection. We did call and we will continue to discuss age controls. We encourage the industry and they did step up and fund some research. We think obviously we'd love to understand more, and I think everyone else would as well. And then we looked for some player education.

Version four is under development. This is very much a work in progress. I'm pleased to say we're working with a couple of the companies that are represented here today. And we hope to have -- It may look like -- I'll get to version four in a second.

I think this supplements ISGA's existing code. We think their code could go a little bit further. And again in these specific areas are where we have identified an opportunity to go a little bit further in the US space for several reasons. But I think it really builds on and is consistent with some of the work they've done.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Keith, just
for a second go back to the previous slide. So, gambling-like monetize games and you mentioned Candy Crush. You can play Candy Crush, but you can also go into a casino and see a Candy Crush slot machine. You have no worries about any connection between them?

MR. WHYTE: Not significant worries, no, especially not on the casino side -- not on the social casino side -- I mean not on the social games side, sorry.

So, if it's not a gambling game in the social casino space, our concerns are narrowly focused there. Even though there is certainly overlap and again there's some broader public health concerns, if you will, but it's not our concerns specifically. But it is a good point, this is all kind of a spectrum. And it's very hard to draw that bright line for all of us.

So, I think what the next version of GRADE will look like will be a little bit more focused on responsible play features. Again, I think most of these problems can be solved with
a little bit better disclosure transparency, a little bit more information to the player, whether it's in the terms and conditions or making that available $I$ think makes a lot of sense.

I'll talk about promoted responsible play versions in a second. I think there still are age considerations. I think probably some of those are more platform related. So, that's beyond the purview of the social casino industry.

We want to try and narrow down as
much as we can and really look at maybe how advertising is targeting and try and make sure that's being targeted to a reasonable extent to consumers who are 18 plus. So, I think again there's ways we can really come a lot further and make some progress in this.

We still do think research is important, third-party research is crucial. And then probably what you'll see is I think a move towards some sort of life form of exclusion. We've seen a lot of work in the daily fantasy space, which has a little bit --
some of the same KYC account registration issues, what's very light registration.

But even within that while it may not be a perfect solution, even being able to exclude people by their username and/or their name that they register would be a big step forward. Is it a perfect solution, of course not. If someone really wanted to get around it, would it be hard, not at all. But the further steps we can take to develop some sort of common exclusion options $I$ think are going to help those -- it's likely to help those who need help the most.

We're again working together with folks. We welcome your comments and feedback as well to try and find some next step that's doable.

I do think one of the things I'm excited about in this space is the chance to -let's monetize responsible gaming, if you will. So, if it is a free coin mechanic, we can and should -- and again there's a lot of models out there that people are given coins for doing all sorts of behaviors. Why not for doing some
responsible gaming things as well.
So, if you're already paying people -- common monetization mechanic is to pay people to watch a 30 -second ad. Why not also pay them to watch a 30 -second PSA? Especially here in Massachusetts you have an opportunity. If Penn is going to integrate their reward system with their social casino platform, as I understand they are, then you can offer them 10,000 free coins to join My Play through their rewards program.

Again, I think our imagination should not be limited by what's here today. Right now most responsible play features in the space are very static. It's a link to our website or another website. That's fine. That's good.

But we believe that if you can make this fun, innovative and exciting, we can really minimize some of these potential or actual risks in a way that is going to be fun and transparent and light. And it's going to fit within that social casino model.

> We're also very big on making sure
that people are able to access health the same platform they're using to gamble. For example, we have text enabled and chat enabled our helpline. So, if you know your players are on mobile, just giving them a link to a website or a link to something in FAQs, you can go to step beyond that say here it's mobile to mobile. If you want to chat for help, click here and then hand them off to us and we'll take care of that.

So, you should be able to seek help the same way that you're using to play. And I think that's again pretty low hanging fruit that's pretty basic.

So, just to wrap up, social casino gaming, there's challenges and opportunities. And it's how we choose to go about it. We think the relative risk and looking at a riskbased approach means that it's very minimal risk but not zero risk.

I think there have been some efforts to try to minimize harm. I think they could be strengthened. We are opened and welcoming to strengthening them. And that this does give us
an opportunity if the vast majority of people are playing or even paying to have fun in the social casino setting, maybe we can use some of those same tools to provide some innovative responsible play features. And again, the more we can minimize harm, the more everyone benefits. Again, thank you for the opportunity. I'm sorry to go so late on a long day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Not at all. It was great. Thank you. More questions for Mr. Whyte? Thank you very much. We appreciate all your time. We're done, I think, right? MR. BEDROSIAN: We are. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think among other things, I at least have figured that I would like to learn more about what Penn is doing and probably our other licensees as well now that we have a little bit better understanding about what some of the issues are. So, hopefully they'll all be interested. MR. BEDROSIAN: I know they will at some point. Just give Mr. Stempeck and I a short amount of time. We'll figure out what
the next steps are.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Before we adjourn, I'd be curious if those participants, Mr. Delany and the others from MassDiGI, do you have any comments in the light of what Mr. Whyte has presented?

MR. BEDROSIAN: You can come up, just make sure the green light is on.

MR. DELANY: Yes. Thank you for your presentation. Only to say that it's always been the intent of the International Social Games Association to have our best practice principles as a living document. And we do plan to continue to evolve those on the basis of evidence and need.

So, we do not see the social game space at all the same as gambling. However, an industry that has a long history of dealing with people at risk could certainly be of help to us in working out the risks within the social game space. We look forward to working with Keith who is obviously a national if not global expert on those issues to inform how we work on our sector and (INAUDIBLE).

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As you heard, with that one amendment calling it addictive type problem rather than problem gambling type problems, everybody agrees that there are those risks inherent in social gaming. It's got nothing to do with us particularly but we all know people who have problems with various kinds of social videogame stuff.

So, anything that you guys can do to think creatively and to be proactive in that is number one, is a good preemptive strategy, but number two, is the right thing to do.

Anything else? All right. Thanks all very much. Motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's unanimous.
(Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.)
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