Criteria and framework for approved evaluators

Version 1.0.1

Queensland Government

For further information, please contact the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation on 13 QGOV (13 74 68) or visit www.business.qld.gov.au/industry/liquor-gaming

Contents

1 Introduction

This document describes the criteria for determining the suitability of entities for being listed as Approved Evaluators of gaming equipment in Regulation. It also outlines the framework for the submission process and ongoing performance monitoring of such entities.

Purpose:

The purpose of this document is to:

- Clarify the criteria used to determine suitability of Approved Evaluators
- Outline the submission framework for Approved Evaluators
- Outline the monitoring framework for Approved Evaluators

Scope:

This document is only applicable to the following Regulations:

- Casino Control Regulation 1999
- Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Regulation 1999
- Keno Regulation 2007
- Lotteries Regulation 2007
- Wagering Regulation 1999
- Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) 1998

Note: Gaming Machines are excluded from the Approved Evaluators framework as they are captured by the Licensed Testing Facility Operator (LTFO) framework under the *Gaming Macine Act 1991*.

2 Definitions / Abbreviations

GIC

Governor-in-Council

LTFO

Licensed Testing Facility Operator

NATA

National Association of Testing Authorities

3 Criteria for Approved Evaluators

The following criteria are assigned a weighting when used to determine if an entity is suitable to become an approved evaluator. The total score obtained from the criteria should be *at least* 25 out of the possible 40 for an entity to be considered suitable to become an Approved Evaluator under each of the five Regulations listed above. It should be noted that the enclosed criteria are in addition to any probity assessment deemed necessary, which may include criminal history, business and financial assessment.

3.1 NATA Accreditation

NATA Accreditation for compliance with the ISO/IEC 17025 standards is MANDATORY.

The scope of the entity's accreditation which includes *22.02 Gaming systems tests* or equivalent – is worth 7 points.

3.1.1 Casino products

The scope of accreditation for an Approved Evaluator under the Casino Control Regulation should include *.01 Interactive gaming systems*, *.02 Terrestrial gaming equipment* and *.03 Wide area gambling equipment* or equivalent. This will contribute 3 points towards the suitability rating for becoming an Approved Evaluator under this Regulation only.

3.1.2 Charitable and Non-Profit gaming systems

The scope of accreditation for an Approved Evaluator under the Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Regulation should include *.01 Interactive gaming systems* or equivalent. This will contribute 3 points towards the suitability rating for becoming an Approved Evaluator under this Regulation only.

3.1.3 Keno systems

The scope of accreditation for an Approved Evaluator under the Keno Regulation should include *.01 Interactive gaming systems* and *.03 Wide area gambling equipment* or equivalent. This will contribute 3 points towards the suitability rating for becoming an Approved Evaluator under this Regulation only.

3.1.4 Lottery systems

The scope of accreditation for an Approved Evaluator under the Lotteries Regulation should include *.03 Wide area gambling equipment* or equivalent. This will contribute 3 points towards the suitability rating for becoming an Approved Evaluator under this Regulation only.

3.1.5 Wagering systems

The scope of accreditation for an Approved Evaluator under the Wagering Regulation should include *.03 Wide area gambling equipment* or equivalent. This will contribute 3 points towards the suitability rating for becoming an Approved Evaluator under this Regulation only.

3.2 Demonstrated experience of performing evaluations for similar products in other Australian jurisdictions. Note that experience gained in international jurisdictions may also be considered, but might not be as highly regarded as experience in Australian jurisdictions.

No experience in products covered by the Regulation in question: 0 points
Limited experience in products covered by the Regulation in question: up to 4 points
Significant experience in products covered by the Regulation in question: up to 8 points

3.3 Demonstrated experience of performing evaluations for products covered by other gaming-related Regulations in other Australian jurisdictions. Note that experience gained in international jurisdictions may also be considered at this stage, but will not be as highly regarded as experience in Australian jurisdictions.

No experience in products covered by other Regulations: 0 points
Limited experience in products covered by other Regulations: up to 2 points
Significant experience in products covered by other Regulations: up to 3 points

3.4 Demonstrated field performance of evaluated products in other Australian jurisdictions. A rating between 0 and 6 will be assigned for this criterion, which may be based on a number of factors, including (but not limited to) testimonials from other jurisdictions, the number and significance of field issues that are identified in products evaluated by the entity, and documented quality management response to identified flaws in evaluation procedures.

3.5 LTFO under the *Gaming Machine Act 1991*.

If an entity is an LTFO under the *Gaming Machine Act 1991*, this is worth 3 points.

3.6 Other capability-related assessment by OLGR's Technical Unit. A rating between 0 and 10 may be assigned by OLGR's Technical Unit, based on observed and documented capability, including evidence of a mix of expertise, staff qualifications, prior staff experience, and the quality of prior submissions.

4 Submission Framework for Approved Evaluators

OLGR is determining the parameters and processes for Approved Evaluator submissions, and will discuss these with licensees. Approved Evaluator submissions should comply with OLGR's *Submission Requirements* document.

The required submission materials include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A submission letter (please refer to section 4.1 of *Submission Requirements v1.3*).
- A Certification and Indemnity (C&I) form (please refer to section 4.2 of *Submission Requirements v1.3*).
- Other submission materials as detailed in *Submission Requirements*, such as proprietary source code for software submissions and part/model names, part/model numbers and date of manufacture for hardware submissions.

5 Monitoring Framework for Approved Evaluators

Approved Evaluators will have their performance monitored in much the same way as LTFOs are monitored for EGM product evaluations, the primary difference being a state-based performance monitoring as opposed to national monitoring for EGMs.

5.1 A non-conformance, when identified, will be assigned a severity level (KPI) as per the document *PEP02 Fault Resolution and Retrofit Control* and as paraphrased here:

- KPI 0 – Pre-approval. Administrative recommendation issue.
- KPI 1 – Bug for which the affected item is allowed to continue operating in the field. Generally this must be fixed / resolved in future submissions of updated products.
- KPI 2 – Bug that requires that the affected item undergo a staged retrofit.
- KPI 3 – Bug that warrants the item being disabled immediately from use until such time as a fix / resolution is made available.
- KPI 4 – Pre-approval. The Approved Evaluator recommended a product that indicated a deficiency in the testing process. These bugs may have resulted in a KPI 1, 2 or 3 if the item had been approved.

5.2 These non-conformances will be monitored and analysed by OLGR. Ongoing serious non-conformances may necessitate the Approved Evaluator to submit a quality improvement plan to OLGR, and may also result in temporary administrative adjustment of scope to lower-risk products or other restrictions.

5.3 In severe cases, a recommendation can be made to the GIC to remove an Approved Evaluator from one or more Regulations.

6 Revision History

Version	Changes	Who	Release Date	Incept Date
1.0	Initial Release	MM	14/2/2014	14/2/2014
1.0.1	Updated to new JAG report document template	JG	12/4/2016	12/4/2016