

NSW Gaming Machine Prohibited Features Register revision F

28 November 2011

	Issue	Action	Decision	Reason
1	Non-linear payable game	A non-linear payable issue was identified with the 'Wild Pedro' winning combinations in a game being submitted for approval.	It was determined that non-linear payable games were not appropriate for use in NSW.	The payable for the game listed the top prize as being different depending on the amount bet (i.e.) bet 1cr 5 X WP's = \$100, bet 2cr 5 X WP's = \$300, and bet 3cr 5 X WP's = \$500. This was considered to be a harm minimisation issue since it encourages players to increase their bet amounts.
2	Free game limit	A trend in game design was identified where the number of free games being offered was increasing significantly.	A limit was put in place of 40 free games on gaming machines.	The typical number of free games being offered by machines was rapidly increasing (some offered 100 free games and the probability of winning the 100 free games was remote). This was considered both a harm minimisation and player fairness issue.
3	Display of legal tender	It was recommended that the initial submission of a game not be approved because real money was displayed on the game's artwork.	There was concern about the display of money on the gaming machine, and the artwork was re-worked to stylise the monetary notes (and coins) and the game was subsequently approved.	The display of legal monetary notes (and coins) in a game's artwork, and as part of the game's theme, is considered a player inducement issue.
4	Game name	Advice was sought regarding the name of the game: <i>The Big Money</i> .	The game was authorised to be approved, but a caution was issued.	The name <i>The Big Money</i> is 'border-line' when considering it from a responsible gambling point of view.

5	Player inducement messages	It was recommended that the initial submission of a game not be approved because of verbal player inducements.	The manufacturer was advised of harm minimisation concerns where the machine verbally prompted players.	The game contained messages in the feature such as 'try again' and 'have another go' in the event a player didn't win the feature game.
6	Inappropriately advertising the top prize	It was recommended that the initial submission of a game not be approved because the game's top prize was being used as an advertising inducement to play the game.	The manufacturer was required to modify the artwork so that the top prize was not the main theme of the rules.	Rather than listing the top prize as a part of the game rules, the game advertised the top prizes on the artwork in the following manner: Win Up To: \$3,000, \$5,000, or \$10,000 . However the player had to bet the maximum bet to win the advertised \$10,000 prize.
7	Mixing high & low denominations on gaming machines	A concern was raised that multi-denomination GMs shouldn't be allowed to mix 1 cent and \$1 games on the same machine. However a trial was conducted that demonstrated players do not significantly migrate from playing 1 cent games to \$1 games when both denominations are on the same machine.	The Authority has determined that it is acceptable to offer low denominations of 1 & 2 cents and high denominations (50 cents & \$1) for operation together on the same gaming machine. However the high denomination games must offer the player a high return to play. Mid-range denominations should offer players a reasonable rate of return.	It would be unacceptable if multi-denomination machines were to offer players a similar RTP for both 1 cent and \$1 games. And hence the minimum RTP for high denomination games on these types of gaming machines will be at least (or is as close as practical to) 92%.

8	Qualifying bet requirement to win a top prize or a jackpot prize.	On the initial submission of the game, there was concern that the player needed to make a minimum qualifying bet in order to win the top prize. The manufacturer was asked to address the issue.	The game was reworked so that the top prize could be won at a minimum bet (as well as a maximum bet) and it was subsequently approved.	It was considered that by requiring players to bet a minimum of 4 lines (as opposed to the minimum bet option of 1 line) in order to win the top prize, that this was inappropriately encouraging players to raise their bets.
9	Inappropriate button panel layout	A responsible gambling issue was identified on a proposed button panel layout which prompted players to increase their bet to play all lines.	It was considered that the layout of this particular button panel was designed with the intent to get players to play all lines rather than 1 line. The manufacturer removed the bash button and the game was approved.	The game's proposed button panel was structured such that a very large 'bash' button prompted players to play all lines.

10	Qualifying bets on feature games	Concern was expressed when ante bets (to play feature type games) had increased from 25 credits to 35 credits, and the corresponding RTP increase hadn't kept up.	It is expected that when players are required to spend more money to play a feature game, they should get a reasonable additional rate of return for their extra bet. It is expected that manufacturers will heed the following bet limits on feature type games: There is to be a maximum 30 credit ante bet limit on feature type games. For a 25-30 credit qualifying bet, the feature RTP must be at least 5%. For games with a ≤ 25 credit qualifying bet, the feature RTP must be at least 4%. Feature games with an ante bet will only be allowed on games up to 10 cents.	The rate of increase of feature game qualifying bets (ante bets) is seen as a responsible gambling issue because players will often 'do anything' to win the feature games; and they should get a reasonable rate of return for their additional bet. Note that exceptions to the rule will be considered; however the exceptions must offer players a reasonable increased rate of return for any functionality that is not in accordance with the limits. Each exception will be examined by the Authority on a case by case basis.
11	Cashback terminals	An outcome of the TITO harm minimisation trial was that cashback terminals equipped with display screens should use the on-screen display to periodically display the Problem Gambling Notice information.	It is expected that all cashback terminals (equipped with display screens) submitted for approval should use the screen for the purposes of periodically displaying the Problem Gambling Notice information.	The more accessible Problem Gambling Notice information is to players, the more likely problem gamblers are expected to seek help. It is desirable that if the screen is large enough, the G-Line information will be displayed generally at all times. Otherwise it can be displayed periodically.

12	Minimum bet configurations	Concern was expressed regarding a \$1 denomination Blackjack game where it was possible for venues to configure the machine such that players are required to bet a minimum of \$10 per hand.	The manufacturer was required to remove the configuration that enabled the machine to offer a minimum bet above the base denomination.	It is a harm minimisation concern when a game requires a player to bet a minimum number of credits - with the intent to not provide any additional features or functionality for the player.
13	Gaming machine headphone operation	A number of jurisdictions expressed objection to the proposed operation of gaming machines where players could use headphones.	The Authority took the view that any gaming machine in NSW that has the capability to operate with headphones - this facility must be disabled.	The Authority considers players to be at risk when they immerse themselves in gaming with the use of headphones.
14	Simultaneous multi-game onscreen games	A number of games have been proposed that play multiple on-screen games at once, such as 4-in-1 games or 2-in-1 games.	The Authority determined they will not consider the approval of 2-in-1 and 4-in-1 games; free game features are exempt.	It is considered multi-screen simultaneous game play encourages players to play more than one gaming machine at a time. In addition, venues have a strict allotment of the number of machines they are allowed to operate, and the multi-screen game concept is seen to be a method to circumnavigate this gaming machine limit.