Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation

Submission requirements
Version 1.6

Contents

1   Introduction

Policy

The Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (OLGR) administers the following Acts and Regulations:

- *Casino Control Act 1982 and associated Agreement Acts*
- *Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999*
- *Gaming Machine Act 1991*
- *Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998*
- *Keno Act 1996*
- *Lotteries Act 1997*
- *Wagering Act 1998*
- *Liquor Act 1992*
- *Wine Industry Act 1994*

Where the legislation provides for regulated gaming equipment, this equipment must be evaluated and approved prior to use in a Queensland Casino or other licensed premises in accordance with gaming Rules, technical requirements and other guidelines.

In accordance with the *Liquor Act 1992*, OLGR evaluates networked ID scanner systems and equipment. Refer 'ID Scanning System Minimum Technical Requirements'.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to:

- provide the industry with details of what OLGR requires in order to conduct an evaluation of regulated equipment in the most efficient and effective manner;
- ensure requirements are consistently applied;
- advise industry of OLGR's evaluation process, including the use of approved evaluators
- advise industry of billing requirements; and
- achieve a high standard of fairness and integrity for gaming systems and equipment.

Scope

This document is applicable to all gaming providers in Queensland. However, it does not apply to submission requirements for electronic gaming machines (otherwise known as slots, pokies, or poker machines). Submission requirements for electronic gaming machines are contained within the latest version of the 'Australian/New Zealand Gaming Machine National Standard' available from OLGR website under 'Publications/Technical Information'.

The OLGR receives a variety of products for submission. In this regard, it is not possible to define comprehensive submission requirements for each individual product or item. Accordingly, these submission requirements may not be exhaustive for a particular product or item. In some cases, OLGR may require additional material or information.

Before making a submission, you are encouraged to contact OLGR well in advance to discuss your product or concept, to ascertain any additional submission requirements (see Section 15). This will avoid delays in the evaluation.

2   Definitions

This section lists the terms and abbreviations used within this document.

Term or Abbreviation	Description
Approved evaluator (/AE)	An entity declared by the Governor–in-Council as an approved entity for evaluating regulated wagering, lotteries, keno, ID scanners, and casino equipment under the applicable legislation.
Artwork	Is any form of display (static or animated) which is used to convey information to the users or players of a product, that includes game rules, prizes, betting options, information related to wins, information related to game outcomes or other important game related information. Displays which contain only the game name are not considered to be Artwork for the purposes of this document.
Element	An element is an entity that is contained within a system or sub-system that is distinct and exists independently (although it may not be able to usefully function without its related components). For example, consider an EGM monitoring system that contains a voucher printer used by a player loyalty system to print out promotions when certain events occur. In this example, the voucher printer is an element of the player loyalty system, and the player loyalty system, is a sub-system of the EGM monitoring system.
OEM	Original equipment manufacturer
OLGR Website	http://www.business.qld.gov.au/liquor-gaming
Product	In this document, a 'Product' refers to any item that is submitted to OLGR for evaluation.
SHA-256	A reference to a SHA-2 Secure Hash Algorithm (SHA). The SHA-256 algorithm produces a 256-bit hash value.
Sub-system	A sub-system is any identifiable component of a larger system that, itself, is made up of interrelated elements.
Submission	A submission is material that is lodged with OLGR for evaluation and/or approval as required by legislation
System	A system is made of at least two elements or sub-systems that are physically or logically interrelated to each other. A system is composed of interrelated parts but can be perceived as a whole.
Update	'Update' refers to a submission of a new version of a product that has been previously approved. This is usually because the product required bug fixes, enhancements or other changes.

3   Evaluation fees

If an evaluation of regulated equipment is carried out then a fee prescribed under a regulation is payable by the licensee/operator.

The current evaluation fees are prescribed in the following regulations:

- Schedule 4 of the [Casino Control Regulation 1999](#)
- Schedule 2 of the [Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Regulation 1999](#)
- Schedule 5 of the [Gaming Machine Regulation 2002](#)
- Schedule 3 of the [Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Regulation 1998](#)
- Schedule 3 of the [Keno Regulation 2007](#)
- Schedule 1 of the [Liquor Regulation 2002](#)
- Schedule 3 of the [Lotteries Regulation 2007](#)
- Schedule 3 of the [Wagering Regulation 1999](#)

4   Evaluation times

The following information can be used as a guide to estimate the time for a product to be evaluated by OLGR. These times are for an 'ideal product' evaluated under 'ideal conditions'.

An 'ideal product' is a product that is submitted with all necessary submission material, contains no deficiencies/bugs/defects and meets all regulatory and technical requirements. 'Ideal Conditions' are conditions where all necessary resources and personnel can be assigned to perform the evaluation.

It is strongly recommended that the following minimum evaluation times be factored into the design/product plan of a new product or product update.

Minimum evaluation times

Evaluation type*	Minimum time (weeks)	
	New	**Update**
Large system (e.g. EGM monitoring system)†	> 24	16
Med system (e.g. Internet based wagering system)†	16	12
Small system (e.g. Wide area linked jackpot system)†	8	5
Hardware (e.g. A gaming terminal)	4	2
Software	Contact OLGR	4#
Software bug fix or minor change	N/A	2
Mathematics (New Game)	12	N/A
Mathematics (Change to an Existing Game)	N/A	2
Mathematics RNG	4	4
Artwork	2	2

N/A – Not applicable.
* Times are added if a submission contains more than one evaluation type.

 # This figure may increase depending on the number of changes made to the software.

† Please be aware of the definition of a 'System', 'Sub-system' and 'Element' in Section 2 above. Licensees should be aware that an 'upgrade to a system' may actually be an 'upgrade to a Sub-system or Element'. Depending on the upgrade, evaluation times for sub-system or element upgrades would normally be significantly less than the minimum evaluation times for Systems. For example, an entire system may be comprised of a host system, terminals, internet betting system, telephone betting system, etc. In this example, the host system would be considered a 'sub-system' of the entire system.

Please note that the above evaluation times will be subject to variation from time to time, at OLGR's discretion.

5 Using approved evaluators for non-EGM/system products

This section outlines the general process for the use of approved evaluators (AEs) for non-EGM/system products.

The Chief Executive, Commissioner or their delegate will determine whether OLGR carries out the evaluation, or the product is to be evaluated by an approved evaluator. The guiding principle is that OLGR will evaluate higher risk or more complex systems and equipment.

5.1 Established framework for utilising an approved evaluator

In some instances, a licensee may have a framework established and approved which identifies which products can be evaluated by an AE, which products require OLGR assessment prior to be submitted to an AE and which products OLGR must evaluate.

5.2 Determining if an approved evaluator can be utilised

If a licensee wishes to make an application to OLGR for approval of a product based entirely on an AE recommendation and report then they must consult with OLGR first.

Following the initial consultation with the licensee, OLGR will require a concept submission, which typically will include a high level overview document or presentation about the proposed product. Additional information such as software, hardware, artwork, maths, tools, specification and/or documentation could also be requested in order to properly assess whether the product can be evaluated entirely by an AE.

A determination will then be made by OLGR as to whether all, part or none of the product can be evaluated by an AE.

5.3 If OLGR needs to conduct further evaluation on a product after it has been evaluated by an AE then OLGR will notify the licensee prior to performing any additional evaluation.

5.4 The decision to approve regulated equipment rests with the chief executive or Commissioner, regardless of whether or not an approved evaluator is utilised, for the conduct of an evaluation.

6 Submissions—General

This section is applicable to all products that are required to be submitted to OLGR.

6.1 For new systems or major updates to systems including the introduction of new concepts/schemes, OLGR expects that:

6.1.1 The new system or major update be presented to OLGR at the earliest opportunity. This will allow for consultation to occur and for OLGR to provide feedback on what considerations will be required in order to achieve approval.

6.1.2 A concept submission is made identifying considerations and/or potential impacts on both technical and legislative requirements.

6.1.3 If OLGR has agreed that the new system or major update can be evaluated by an approved evaluator or Licensed Testing Facility Operator (LTFO), the presentation

and/or concept submission should be made to OLGR prior to having the AE/LTFO test the system.

6.1.4 The submitter provides access to the new system or major update as early as possible, by providing the test system to OLGR or on site.

6.1.5 The submitter conducts its own due diligence of the product to ensure it meets OLGR's regulatory requirements prior to lodging a submission.

6.2 All submissions to OLGR must contain a letter requesting OLGR perform an evaluation of the product being submitted. This letter must contain at least:

6.2.1 The date of the submission.

6.2.2 Addressed to the Executive Director, OLGR and marked ATTN: Technical Unit.

6.2.3 A description of the product/s being submitted and the intent of the submission. This may be in tabular form if there is more than one item being submitted.

6.2.4 The market(s) which the product will be used in e.g. casinos, clubs and hotels.

6.2.5 The name and signature of the person/s responsible for the submission and contact details of where technical enquires regarding the submission may be directed.

6.2.6 If the submission is not from a licensee or submitted under the *Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999*, then the name of the licensee who is sponsoring (i.e. submitting on behalf of a non-licensee) the submission must be included.

6.3 All submissions to OLGR must contain a 'Certification and Indemnity Form' which is signed by a person of an acceptable level to OLGR Executive Director. For example, the CEO or compliance manager of the company would be acceptable or an officer who can be held accountable for the submission (if it is unclear whether or not the person is of an acceptable level, OLGR should be contacted). A copy of this form may be found in Appendix A. This form must reference the version of the system/software/hardware that is being submitted.

6.4 Except where a document requires a signature (such as the formal submission letter or indemnity form), all submission documents, artwork and software must be submitted in an IBM PC compatible electronic format. Note that if proprietary software is required in order to open, view or otherwise interpret information, this software may need to be supplied by the submitter.

6.5 All submissions including comments in source code must be in English.

6.6 Where appropriate, submissions must contain a point by point response to any applicable minimum requirements document(s).

6.7 To assist in the evaluation of a submission, a report of any testing conducted on the product (prior to the submission) should be submitted. This report must contain the testing bodies name, the name of the individual who conducted the testing, a description of what was tested, how it was tested (photos may be required), and the test results.

6.8 If the submission is an update submission, then the submission must include a complete list and description of all the changes.

6.9 All submission documentation and electronic media must be labelled with the company name, the product name, the product version and the submission date. Resubmissions must also include the resubmission number, e.g. version 2. Note: version numbers are to be unique and any change to an already approved submission should require this unique version number to change.

6.10 All submissions must include a list of all known unresolved issues, bugs and incidents. This list must be comprehensive and include any issues identified with previous versions which have not been resolved with the current version, even if these issues have been previously notified to OLGR. Note: submissions are 'evaluation type' specific (as detailed in Section 4), so if the submission is relating to a particular product or system component then it is expected that the list of all known unresolved issues, bugs and incidents is related to that particular product or system component (rather than the entire system overall).

6.11 In the event that all or part of a submission comes from an AE/LTFO, or the equipment comes directly from an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), the submission must contain a 'Third Party Correspondence Form' from the licensee sponsoring the product. The purpose of this form is to set out communication protocols between OLGR technical officers, the licensed operator, and AE/LTFOs/OEMs. This form is to be signed by a person of an acceptable level to the Executive Director, OLGR. If it is unclear whether or not the person is of an acceptable level, OLGR should be contacted. A copy of this form can be found at Appendix B. This form must reference the version of the equipment that is being submitted.

6.12 Possession and return of source code

6.12.1 Approved source code is retained during the period of the product's operation in Queensland, and for a further seven years duration subsequent to the product ceasing to operate in Queensland.

6.12.2 After this seven year period has elapsed and subject to the absence of any ongoing OLGR investigations or legal proceedings that would require access to the code, OLGR will return the source code to the OEM, or destroy it in a manner acceptable to the OEM.

6.12.3 Source code relating to products that are not approved in Queensland will be returned to the OEM, or destroyed in a manner acceptable to the OEM.

6.13 Possession and return of products

6.13.1 Where possible, products will be retained during the period of the product's operation in Queensland, and for a further seven years duration subsequent to the product ceasing to operate in Queensland.

6.13.2 After this seven year period has elapsed and subject to the absence of any ongoing OLGR investigations or legal proceedings that would require access to the product during this period, OLGR will return the product to the OEM.

6.13.3 Products that are not approved in Queensland will be returned to the OEM.

6.14 Confidentiality of submissions

Under the respective legislation, all OLGR officers are bound by product and source code confidentiality requirements.

6.15 Natural Justice on submissions

If it is likely that the decision maker may not approve a product or concept OLGR will advise the licensee and provide an opportunity for the licensee to provide further information to address the issue or concerns identified. If no further information is received, a decision on the submission will be made based on the information currently held.

6.16 Extent of evaluation

OLGR reserves the right to conduct further evaluation for the chief executive to be satisfied that the system will allow the operator to meet their legislative requirements including, but not limited to, taxation.

6.17 Data collection and distribution functionalities

Any patron data collection/distribution functionalities (e.g. real time data aimed at enhancing customer experience) must be separated from regulated products approved in accordance with the applicable legislation administered by OLGR.

6.18 Data Privacy

Data management and protection is governed by the applicable Commonwealth Privacy legislation and other relevant State legislations. It is advisable that all parties continue to be mindful of these privacy and data protection obligations.

7 Hardware submissions

7.1 Depending on the applicable legislation or requirements, a hardware sample of the product may be required in order to complete an evaluation of a product. If it is unclear whether or not a hardware sample is required for a submission, OLGR should be contacted (see Section 15).

Note that this does not initially have to be a final production version (the version that will be actually used), but a final production version will be required at some stage in order to complete the evaluation.

7.2 Hardware submissions must contain a Part/Model Name, Part/Model Number and the date of manufacture of the item itself.

7.3 Hardware submissions must contain any equipment that may be required in order to perform an evaluation. For example, specialised software, custom tools, keys, test harnesses, etc.

7.4 Hardware submissions must contain all standard maintenance tools sold with the equipment.

7.5 Hardware submissions must contain applicable user/operational manuals, service manuals and installation manuals.

7.6 Hardware submissions must contain a statement signed by a person of an acceptable level to OLGR Executive Director, which states that all hardware submitted has been previously

tested as being electrically safe, and meets all other statutory obligations with regard to electrical and other safety.

7.7 Hardware submissions must contain all notes and warnings with regard to the safe use of the product. For example, cautions and warnings with respect to potential electrical shock hazards must be included in the submission.

7.8 Hardware submissions must contain a detailed list of the functions of all control elements (such as switches, dials, dip switches, jumpers, etc.).

7.9 Technical documents (such as technical drawings, circuit diagrams, PCB layouts, schematics, data sheets, etc.) may be required for certain types of hardware submissions.

7.10 The results of electromagnetic, electrostatic and radio frequency interference testing may be required for certain types of hardware submissions.

8   Software submissions

8.1 Depending on the applicable legislation or requirements, software may be required in order to complete an evaluation of a product. If it is unclear whether or not software is required for a submission, OLGR should be contacted (see Section 15). This section is applicable to all software submissions.

8.2 When required to submit software for approval, the following applies:

8.2.1 If the software is open source (i.e. it is 'off the shelf'), supply the software name and version number. Depending on the type of submission, a copy of the software may be required.

8.2.2 If the software is proprietary and developed by the submitter, or 'sub-contractor' acting on behalf of the submitter, then the source code is required (refer Section 9).

8.2.3 All executables submitted must have their individual filename, file size and SHA-256 hash result stated on the signed submission letter. If there are many executables then a manifest document containing this data for all the executables may be stated on the signed submission letter instead. The file manifest document corresponding to the manifest filename, file size and hash result appearing on the signed submission letter must be supplied electronically with the submission.

8.2.4 All software submitted must have the facility to perform SHA-256 over all executable production files intended for the production system.

8.3 Depending on the type of the software being submitted, and on the number of changes from previously approved software, program block diagrams, flow charts and other information that describes the software algorithm may be required. Note that this information will always be required for submissions of new software.

8.4 If the software being supplied has been previously evaluated (i.e. the submission is an update to a previously approved version), supply a complete and comprehensive change/revision history. This should include as a minimum, a list of the individual module/file names with corresponding changes and this also must include the reason for the change.

8.5 Submissions of software updates must include the entire software, and not just the modules that have been modified.

9   Source code submissions

9.1   As per 8.2.2 above, source code is required to be submitted. Source code submissions will require the source code, a compiler, assembler, linker and any other tools that are required to compile the final executable files (or binaries if applicable). The OLGR should be contacted to determine exactly what is required to be submitted (see Section 15). This section is applicable to all source code submissions. Submitters of regulated equipment (e.g. regulated gaming software) need to be mindful of the requirement to provide OLGR with the source code and associated tools. This requirement should be considered when entering into contractual arrangements with parties who may be unfamiliar with this requirement.

9.2   Any source code submitted must be complete and able to be compiled. Compiled binary/executable files must also be supplied.

9.3   All compiled binary/executable files required to operate/run the equipment must be supplied.

9.4   OLGR must be able to compile the submitted source code. This is to ensure that the output of the compilation of submitted source code is identical to submitted precompiled code in order to allow verification of source code with object code. This may require supplying OLGR with a licensed copy of the compiler, linker, assembler, etc., and in some circumstances, a PC to perform the compilation (e.g. a LINUX PC may be needed to compile the source code).

9.4.1   Where compilation of source code is not deterministic (i.e. repeating the compilation of the same source code results in different object code), a witness build must be conducted by OLGR or an AE/LTFO. See OLGR's 'Witness Build Guidelines' for more information.

9.5   Source code submissions must contain detailed, step by step instructions on how to setup, configure and use the compilation program(s) to create the binary/executable files.

9.6   All source code is to be properly commented and contain a change/revision history. If applicable, module descriptions or similar should also be supplied.

10   Mathematics submissions

10.1   In order to ensure the integrity and fairness of a product, it may be necessary to conduct an analysis of the mathematics underlying a submission. The following circumstances are examples of when a mathematics submission would be required:

10.1.1   The product submitted relies on a 'Random Number Generator' (RNG) to produce a random result.

10.1.2   The product is an implementation of a 'new' gambling game. Note, for the purposes of this section, if the rules or parameters of an existing game are changed in any way, the resulting game is considered to be a new game.

10.1.3   The product is a jackpot system.

10.1.4   The product has some other form of mathematics component.

OLGR should be contacted to determine exactly what will be needed to be submitted (see Section 15).

10.2 The following information is required for any product that includes a software based RNG:

10.2.1 The algorithm and flow chart of the RNG implementation. In order to reduce evaluation time and costs, applicable text and journal references should also be supplied where possible.

10.2.2 The complete source code of the RNG process and the mapping process if applicable.

10.2.3 Details of all parameters that are being used by the RNG.

10.2.4 Details of the method of seeding the RNG. This must include how the RNG is initially seeded, and a list of all other times the RNG is re-seeded.

10.2.5 Details of where, when and how often the product calls on the RNG. If the RNG is cycled (i.e. called repeatedly) in a background task, provide details of how often this occurs.

10.2.6 Details of the RNG 'Cycle'.

10.2.7 A data sample of 500,000 outcomes (before any mapping algorithm is applied). This must be provided in an ASCII text file format, or in Microsoft Excel file format.

10.2.8 A point by point response to all applicable requirements outlined in the latest version of the RNG Minimum Technical Requirements document available from OLGR website under 'Publications/Technical Information'.

10.3 New and updated gambling game submissions

The following information is required for a new or updated gambling game:

10.3.1 An algorithm and flow chart of the game.

10.3.2 Details of all of the games rules, including a list of prizes.

10.3.3 If possible, details (including calculations) of the theoretical 'Return to Player' of the game.

10.3.4 Details of any configurable parameters that are in the game, and the circumstances under which each of the parameters will be used.

10.3.5 Any associated artwork. Refer to Section 11.

10.3.6 Details of all the different betting options available for the game.

10.4 The requirements of jackpot submissions (including the mathematics component) are in the latest version of OLGR 'Jackpot System Minimum Technical Requirements / (Casinos)' document available from OLGR website under 'Publications/Technical Information'.

11 Artwork submissions

This section is applicable to any submission of artwork. Artwork is defined in Section 2.

11.1 Where possible, artwork must be submitted in an electronic form on CD or DVD, in an industry standard format. If in a non-industry standard format, provide appropriate tools to view and print the artwork. If it is not possible to submit electronic artwork, then a physical sample of the artwork must be submitted.

11.2 All submitted artwork must be of a resolution that is sufficient to easily read all text and other information.

11.3 A unique part number must be marked on every static artwork item.

12 System submissions

This section is applicable to an 'entire' system submission that has never been evaluated by OLGR. It is also applicable to system update submissions, where a change has occurred in a system that gives the system (as a whole) different or changed functionality.

For example:
- A new sub-system added to a system that provides extra functionality to the system as a whole, would constitute a system update;

- A change to a sub-system module that fixes a bug does not constitute a system update;

- A change to a sub-system that adds functionality to that sub-system only, and does not change the way the system behaves as a whole, does not constitute a system update.

A new system evaluation is the most complex evaluation that OLGR performs, and it is strongly advised that OLGR be contacted as early as possible in the development of the system (see Section 15).

12.1 A full system submission must contain the following:

12.1.1 A block diagram of the entire system.

12.1.2 A submission of each sub-system, as described in Section 13.

Note: OLGR may require additional information in order to complete an evaluation of a new system. It is recommended that submitters contact OLGR to arrange a meeting and where applicable a presentation.

12.2 System update submissions must include a revised block diagram of the entire system, which indicates/highlights any elements that have changed.

12.3 System update submissions must include a software submission for all new or revised sub-systems or elements. Refer Section 0 for details.

12.4 System update submissions must contain a hardware submission for all new or revised hardware.

13 Sub-system submissions

This section is applicable to new sub-system submissions and to sub-system update submissions. A sub-system update occurs when any element within a sub-system is modified, added or deleted without changing the functionality of the system as a whole (in which case it becomes a system submission – see Section 12).

13.1 All new sub-system submissions must contain:

13.1.1 A block diagram of the sub-system.

13.1.2 A submission of each sub-system element, as described below in Section 14.

13.2 Sub-system update submissions must include a block diagram of the sub-system that indicate which elements of the sub-system have been changed.

13.3 Sub-system update submissions must include a software submission for all elements that have changed. Refer Section 0 for details.

14 Element submissions

This section is applicable to any system element or sub-system element that is required to be submitted to OLGR for evaluation.

14.1 All new element submissions must contain a functional description of the element, and its relationship(s) with the system or sub-system that encapsulates it.

14.2 New element submissions, and element update submissions may need to include a hardware submission (refer Section 7) and a software submission (refer Section 0).

15 Approved evaluator submissions

This section is applicable to any submissions made by a licensee for products evaluated by an AE. The information detailed in this section should be provided in a summary page or similar at the start of a report. Note that completion of the below is not to the exclusion of other relevant sections of this document.

15.1. All submissions are to detail the following:

15.1.1. The manufacturer of the product

15.1.2. Licensee,

15.1.3. The Act under which the submission is made,

15.1.4. The relevant regulation, standards, Minimum Technical Requirements, etc. if applicable,

15.1.5. Product name,

15.1.6. Product version,

15.1.7. A description of the product and the reason for the submission,

15.1.8. A reference to where in the report hardware/software/equipment required for operation is listed,

15.1.9. A reference to where in the report any items of concern that OLGR may need to be made aware of,

15.1.10.   A reference to where in the report any special conditions and/or dispensations are detailed, and

15.1.11.   A list of all materials supplied as part of the submission (e.g. artwork, source code, executables, hardware, etc.)

15.2. For submissions that include a hardware component, the following must be included:

15.2.1. An overall hardware unique identifier,

15.2.2. Part/model names for each hardware item making up the component,

15.2.3. Version/revision numbers for each hardware item making up the component,

15.3. For submissions that include a software component, the following must be included:

15.3.1. The name and version number of any software being submitted,

15.4. In the event any bugs or issues are present in or directly related to the submission, the following must be provided:

15.4.1. A description of the bug or issue,

15.4.2. How the bug or issue has been resolved, if applicable,

15.4.3. The manufacturer of the product that includes the bug/issue,

15.4.4. The market(s) affected by this bug,

15.4.5. The equipment affected by this bug/issue.

16   Contacting OLGR

You are strongly encouraged to contact OLGR well in advance of lodging a submission, so that the product can be discussed, submission requirements ascertained, and evaluation resources planned.

In this regard, the OLGR Technical Unit Manager should be contacted on telephone (07) 3738 8535.

Certification and indemnity form

I _____ (full name)

being _____ (position held)

for and on behalf of _____

_____ (supplier)

1. warrant that the Supplier has obtained (or will obtain prior to implementation) and will maintain all licences, approvals, consents, permissions and assignments necessary to perform the actions or carry out the activities in respect of which this application or its subsequent approval relates without infringing the intellectual property rights of any third parties;

2. indemnify the State of Queensland, the Chief Executive Officer, Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and their officers, employees and agents ('those indemnified') from and against any actions, proceedings, claims, demands, costs (including all reasonable legal costs and all reasonable costs associated with defending those indemnified), losses, damages and expenses, including those arising out of the terms of any settlement, which:

   a. may be brought against or made upon those indemnified; or

   b. those indemnified may occur or sustain,

   arising out of or as a consequence of any official act undertaken by those indemnified when acting within the scope of their duties and responsibilities, regarding this application or any subsequent approval, whether in relation to the alleged infringement of the intellectual property rights of any third parties or otherwise;

3. certify that the statements contained in the attached documents are to the best of my knowledge and belief true and correct in every detail and are a complete disclosure of the information requested; and

4. certify that the items submitted are complete and operational.

Name/description of equipment _____

signed at _____

This _____ day of _____ 20 _____

_____
(signature of Deponent)

in the presence of _____
(signature of Witness)

Name and address of Witness _____

_____

_____

Third party correspondence form

I _____ (full name)

being _____ (position held)

for and on behalf of _____

_____ (supplier)

grant permission to the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and their officers, employees and agents to contact any approved evaluators, LTFOs, and/or the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM where applicable) that had involvement with creation or testing of the submitted equipment.

Approved evaluators, LTFOs, and/or the OEM (where applicable) may be contacted via the following methods (select all that apply):

    a. It is acceptable to contact the approved evaluator and/or LTFO directly .... ☐

    b. It is acceptable to communicate with the OEM (where applicable) directly............................. ☐

    c. No communication may occur directly. Any communication intended for a third party must be sent to the licensee who will then make it available to the approved evaluator/LTFO/OEM .... ☐

I grant this permission with the understanding that the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation and their officers, employees and agents will provide a copy of any communication between themselves and the approved evaluator/LTFO//OEM where possible.

Name/description of equipment _____

signed at _____

This _____ day of _____ 20 _____

_____
(signature of Deponent)

in the presence of _____
(signature of Witness)

Name and address of Witness _____

_____

_____

17 Revision history

Version	Changes	Who	Date
1.0	Initial release	MB	17/03/2005
1.1	Detailed 7 Acts to clarify purpose of document and explained the minimum evaluation times guide. Added requirement on SHA facility and details required in submission documentation.	LC	09/09/2009
1.2	Updated to new DEEDI report document template	RLL	20/08/2010
1.3	Update with new C & I form and DJAG format	YS	07/01/2013
1.3.1	Update with new DJAG template	JG	19/07/2016
1.4	Update to reflect need to consult with OLGR as early as possible with respect to any new system or large update to a system, and natural justice processes surrounding submissions. Include reference to source code provision and witness build guidelines where builds are not deterministic. Added Third Party Correspondence Form. Inserted reference to Evaluation Fees. The utilisation of Approved Evaluators (AEs).	LC TS	15/11/2017
1.5 #1732973	Updated to inform licensees that OLGR reserves the right to conduct evaluations for the chief executive to be satisfied that the system/equipment will allow the operator to meet their legislative requirements including, but not limited to, taxation.	AL/MM	26/02/18
1.6 #1780552	Updated re the use of SHA-256 Added section 15 Approved Evaluator Submissions Updated Definitions table Updated 6.12 and 6.13 Updated 8.2.1 to open source Updated 16 Added 6.17 and 6.18 relating to data collection and distribution functionalities	RL/TS	18/02/2020