



Final Report:

Stakeholder Views of EVAT

Office of Liquor Gaming & Racing

4 June 2014

Project Reference Number: 4807

Taverner Contact: Dr Don Porritt
(Senior Research Director)

CONFIDENTIAL/DISCLAIMER NOTICE

The information contained herein is confidential and has been supplied under a confidentiality agreement. If you are not authorised to view or be in possession of this document you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this document is expressly prohibited. If you receive this document in error, please notify Taverner Research immediately on +61 2 9212 2900.

Contents

1.	Executive Summary	4
1.1.	Contribution to ILGA decision making	4
1.2.	ILGA Satisfaction with EVAT	5
1.3.	The Contribution to OLGR Processes	5
1.4.	EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee Member Views	6
1.5.	Technical Issues Identified: Coverage	6
1.6.	Other Issues Raised	7
1.7.	Overall Conclusions	7
2.	The Development of EVAT	9
2.1.	The EVAT Trial	9
2.2.	How EVAT Works	9
3.	The Stakeholder Qualitative Research	12
3.1.	Project Objectives	12
3.2.	Project Methodology	12
3.3.	Areas Covered in the Discussions	13
4.	Findings	14
4.1.	Contribution to ILGA Decision Making	14
4.2.	ILGA Satisfaction with EVAT	15
4.3.	The Contribution to OLGR Processes	17
4.4.	EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee Member Views	18
4.5.	Technical Issues Identified: Coverage	18
4.6.	Other Issues Raised	19
4.7.	Overall Conclusions	20

1. Executive Summary

The Environment and Venue Assessment Tool (EVAT) was developed to indicate the risk of adverse social outcomes, and especially of increased violence, that might follow from granting of a new liquor licence. It was based on a thorough review of relevant literature and analysis of possible predictors of reported violent offences across NSW LGAs.

Qualitative research was conducted involving a discussion with the Board of the Independent Liquor and Gaming Authority (ILGA) and staff of ILGA, of the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing (OLGR), and other stakeholders in the use of the EVAT. One group discussion and 11 interviews were carried out.

Key conclusions that emerged from the research are summarised for each project objective.

1.1. Contribution to ILGA decision making

The current version of EVAT is useful but limited, and could benefit from further development.

- ✧ EVAT and the summary scores seem designed for a go/no go decision
- ✧ ILGA is making “Yes, but ... decisions” – more about licence conditions and part of a process of negotiations to reduce any stakeholder disquiet
- ✧ So far full EVAT reports have only been considered by the ILGA Board for a small number of applications, so it is too early for the Board to fully assess the impact and alignment with other information considered by the ILGA Board
- ✧ The EVAT reports give a useful overview of some key issues that ILGA needs to consider
- ✧ The contribution to decision making is (as expected) limited and likely to remain limited
- ✧ Limitations include the scores often being not geographically “fine” enough
- ✧ There are also significant gaps, especially lack of health data (e.g. ambulance emergency call outs) and limitations on the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research offence data included
- ✧ Summary scores are given little attention; the individual “risk factor” information is of more value
- ✧ Applicants have some difficulty dealing constructively with the EVAT information

1.2. ILGA Satisfaction with EVAT

The development of EVAT had initiated a process of dialogue between stakeholders that has been valuable, and continued dialogue and clarification is expected to add further value.

- ✧ The Board and senior staff have found the development of EVAT a very worthwhile process
 - Development of EVAT facilitated dialogue with OLGR and other stakeholders, and was associated with a marked improvement in the structure, completeness and clarity of narrative reports
 - EVAT reports provide very useful concise summaries of some key decision inputs
- ✧ There was some uncertainty about the appropriateness of the component score ranges (Mitigating, Low Risk, Moderate Risk, High Risk, Extreme Risk)
- ✧ Some items are reported as dichotomies (especially mitigating actions) that would be more useful if reported in finer categories
- ✧ The summary scores for Location and Venue Risk are given little attention as the basis of the scores is not clear to ILGA Board members and staff
- ✧ The weighting of the components is questionable, especially as the appropriate measures and critical adverse outcomes vary with the type of licence sought
- ✧ ILGA stakeholders appreciated the clear focus on risk associated with EVAT
- ✧ Some doubts were expressed about value and relevance of Council and Police reports

1.3. The Contribution to OLGR Processes

The development of EVAT had initiated a process of dialogue between stakeholders that has been valuable, and continued dialogue and clarification is expected to be valuable.

- ✧ The development of EVAT initiated constructive dialogue with other stakeholders
- ✧ The dialogue has proven to be very valuable, improving relationships and the quality of prose reports produced for ILGA
 - Many reporting processes have been improved
 - EVAT provides a disciplined structure around which more detailed reports can be organised

- ✧ Some gaps in the available data that need to be filled have been identified
- ✧ Interviews with OLGR revealed less focus than those with ILGA on licencing as a process of negotiating conditions and seeking to reconcile stakeholders to a licence decision, as might be expected given the different responsibilities of the two organisations

1.4. EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee Member Views

The committee's contribution was felt to have been limited. Although most members had found it useful, they would like to see it more involved in the development and use of EVAT and in the licensing decision process.

- ✧ The limited number of meetings and lack of information about actual EVAT reports have limited value of participation for many members
- ✧ For some members the Committee has provided a useful venue for:
 - Exchange of views
 - Having some input into how decisions are made
 - Learning about the overall decision making process
- ✧ Some members do not see themselves or the organisations they represent as having a real role in such a committee or as contributing to the EVAT development or evaluation process
- ✧ Perspectives varied with the roles taken by Committee members in their main positions
- ✧ As contributors to EVAT reports, Police and Council representatives had some quite specific suggestions but felt their access to the total decision making process was too limited and the overall process too opaque
- ✧ Applicant confidentiality issues were recognised, but felt to be limiting the access to information that would allow worthwhile contributions to be made to a better risk-oriented licensing system

1.5. Technical Issues Identified: Coverage

EVAT has aroused a hunger for even more, neatly summarised, finer-grained data reported in a simple, summary format.

Specific potential improvements to the range and detail of data summarised in the EVAT that were identified by stakeholders included:

- ✧ Alcohol-related ambulance emergency call outs, aggregated preferably at locality level and at least at suburb level
- ✧ Alcohol-related road injury crashes, perhaps at LGA level
- ✧ Reported alcohol related and other domestic assaults at LGA level
- ✧ Malicious damage to property at locality or suburb level
- ✧ Offensive behaviour at locality or suburb level
- ✧ Breakdowns of offences into day and time bands that correspond to licence operating hours and closing times
- ✧ Indicators of "business model risk" that are discussed in the narrative reports on applications, but not summarised in EVAT
- ✧ SEIFA rankings for suburbs or localities
- ✧ Indicators (not just in dichotomies) of transport availability or ease of access both for travel to and travel away from venues, broken down by time of day and whether weekday or weekend
- ✧ Density data broken down by type of venue, especially packaged liquor, hotel, club, on premises without a Primary Service Authorisation (PSA) and on premises with a PSA
- ✧ Applicant history (but the value and validity of such data were thought by some to probably be limited)

1.6. Other Issues Raised

- ✧ There was widespread interest in extending EVAT reports to:
 - Additional locations beyond the Sydney and Newcastle CBDs
 - Other types of licence application, including applications for increased capacity and for PSA
- ✧ Some concern was expressed about the opacity of the current licence approval process to those who are not directly part of making licencing decisions
- ✧ Some expressed a desire for greater integration of currently separate processes, such as liquor licence approval and Council DA approval
- ✧ Despite some small issues, the report layout and labelling of score range was generally considered appropriate, although the basis for selection of the score ranges was questioned

1.7. Overall Conclusions

- ✧ The development of EVAT has been a worthwhile process that triggered many improvements in communication and

processes associated with liquor licence approvals and a sharper focus on the risk of adverse outcomes of a decision and on risk mitigation

- ✧ Data currently included in EVAT reports is very useful, but could be improved by:
 - More “granularity”
 - Adding additional data items
- ✧ Given the nature of the licence approval process, decision makers (and applicants) find the individual data inputs are of more value to them than summary scores, however valid those scores might be; perhaps the original “vision” for EVAT needs to be re-considered
- ✧ There appears to be scope to extend the range of decisions where EVAT is used to cover:
 - Additional LGAs
 - Additional licencing decisions
- ✧ Extension to additional LGAs would also increase the currently limited range of scores on location risk, which would result in the EVAT data being more discriminating and informative
- ✧ There might be scope for increased data sharing and integration between Council approval processes and liquor licence assessment processes, depending on relevant legislation

2. The Development of EVAT

The Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing engaged the Allen Consulting Group to undertake research into the cumulative impact of licensed premises in NSW. The research comprised two phases. Phase 1 investigated the factors that contribute to the cumulative impact of licensed premises and provided the evidentiary base for Phase 2 of the research: the development of a tool to guide liquor licensing decisions.

In Phase 1, the ACIL Allen Consulting Group undertook a comprehensive review of the national and international literature, extensive statistical analysis, and a broad ranging consultation process. This consultation process involved NSW Police, local councils, other government agencies, industry groups, liquor accords, business organisations and community groups. The Phase 1 report identifies the economic and social impacts of licence density and outlines the contributing external and market risk and mitigation factors.

The Environment and Venue Assessment Tool (EVAT) is based on the large body of evidence collected under Phase 1. It recognises the broad range of net impacts of liquor licence density, accounts for a wide range of risk factors, and supports risk mitigation.

The EVAT provides two overall risk assessments:

- ✧ location risk (which includes both external and market factors)
- ✧ venue risk

The tool is intended to provide a consistent and transparent basis on which to make licensing decisions.

2.1. The EVAT Trial

The EVAT has been trialled for new liquor licence applications in the City of Sydney and the City of Newcastle local government areas from early 2013.

A further decision regarding the EVAT's use will be made following an evaluation of the twelve month trial and release of the research findings.

This report forms part of that evaluation.

Another report prepared by Nexus Consulting reviews the research basis and technical construction of the EVAT.

2.2. How EVAT Works

The EVAT is designed to give weighted risk assessments for individual liquor licence applications based on several risk factors identified by the Phase 1 research.

The EVAT includes two weighted risk assessments – one for location risk, and one for venue risk. Location risk assessments are classified as low, moderate, high or extreme and venue risk assessment are classified as low, moderate or high.

Raw data scores on each risk factor are classified as mitigating, low, moderate, or high based on the distribution of scores across NSW Local Government Areas.

All individual risk factors in the EVAT are weighted as high or low, based on the strength of evidence identified by the Phase 1 research. Those factors weighted as 'High' have three times the contribution to the final weighted risk assessments as those factors weighted as 'Low'.

Two overall risk scores are calculated – location risk and venue risk.

Location risk incorporates external risk factors, which are seen as beyond the control of venue operators or the market, and market risk factors which are related to the liquor supply sector but not necessarily the consequence of the activity of an individual operator.

External risk factors included in EVAT are:

- ✧ The rate of alcohol-related assaults reported to and recorded by police for the LGA
- ✧ The rate of offensive behaviour offences recorded by police in the LGA
- ✧ The presence or absence of late night transport
- ✧ The assessment by police of the risk posed by granting the licence
- ✧ The assessment by the local council of the risk posed by granting the licence

Market risk factors included are:

- ✧ The density of liquor licences within a specified distance from the proposed venue
- ✧ The proportion of those licences that are hotel licences (which are regarded as high risk venues)
- ✧ The proportion of venues regarded as diversifying (licences without a primary service authorisation)
- ✧ Proportion of venues with late night trading approval

The venue risk assessment score includes:

- ✧ The licence type
- ✧ Patron capacity
- ✧ Whether extended trading hours are sought

- ✧ Membership of the liquor accord
- ✧ Commitment to adoption of other risk mitigation strategies

These risk assessments are only intended to form part of the decision making process for liquor licence applications.

The risk assessments are only relevant to liquor licence density (i.e. the clustering of licensed premises within a geographic area) and do not provide a definitive response to an application.

Community Impact Statements and submissions are still a critical part of the decision-making process.

3. The Stakeholder Qualitative Research

3.1. Project Objectives

As part of the overall evaluation of the EVAT Trial, Taverner Research was commissioned to provide an independent qualitative assessment of:

- ✧ The extent to which EVAT has contributed to the Independent Liquor and Gaming Authority's (ILGA) decision making
- ✧ Whether or not ILGA is satisfied with the EVAT assessment reports produced by OLGR
- ✧ The extent to which EVAT has contributed to OLGR's internal assessment processes for liquor licence applications
- ✧ The extent to which the EVAT trial evaluation steering committee is satisfied with both EVAT and the conduct of the EVAT trial evaluation
- ✧ Stakeholder views on technical or process improvements that may enhance the ability of EVAT to assist the decision making process for liquor licence applications

3.2. Project Methodology

In consultation with OLGR staff, the following stakeholder groups were identified:

- ✧ The ILGA Board (the primary decision making body)
- ✧ Key ILGA staff, who funnel data to the Board, and make some decisions under delegation
- ✧ OLGR staff who prepare input for and finalise submissions to ILGA about an application, including preparation of EVAT reports
- ✧ Officers of organisations that have or could have input to EVAT assessments
- ✧ Member of the EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee

The last two categories overlap as almost all those who have input into EVAT reports are members of the EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee.

Experienced qualitative researchers from Taverner Research met with the ILGA Board for a half hour discussion of EVAT at the Board's regular meeting in April 2014. The discussion followed up on a set of discussion points submitted to the Board with its agenda papers for the meeting.

Additional interviews were conducted face to face or by telephone with 11 other available stakeholders, including the CEO and staff of ILGA, key staff of OLGR with involvement in preparing EVAT and other

reports about licence applications that then go to ILGA, and members of the Evaluation Trial Steering Committee, including all those who provide input into EVAT.

3.3. Areas Covered in the Discussions

The areas covered varied with the role of the stakeholder, but could include:

- ✧ The stakeholder's role in the assessment process
- ✧ If providing data, the source of the data and any concerns about the quality of the data
- ✧ If involved in reporting on or assessing applications
 - What is taken into account
 - Assessment of the application process
 - Overall impression of EVAT and reasons for the assessment
 - Likes and dislikes about EVAT
 - Usefulness of EVAT reports when making licensing decisions
 - Usefulness of any other tools (e.g., IAB reports)
- ✧ (STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS)
The role and contribution of the Steering Committee
- ✧ What issues have been referred to the Committee
- ✧ EVAT reports actually seen
- ✧ Other uses (if any) for EVAT reports
- ✧ (IF PROVIDING EVAT DATA) Data provided for EVAT reports
- ✧ Impact of the data provided
- ✧ (ALL) Other data that would add value to the EVAT reports
- ✧ (ALL) How else could EVAT reports be used
- ✧ (ALL) Any changes that could improve EVAT reports
- ✧ (STAKEHOLDERS FAMILIAR WITH INDIVIDUAL EVAT REPORTS) How well the reports aligned with their own assessment of the risk posed by an application

4. Findings

The findings are reported for each of the project objectives in turn, followed by a summary of other issues that emerged.

4.1. Contribution to ILGA Decision Making

The current version of EVAT is seen as useful but limited and could benefit from further development.

The Decision Making Context

- ✧ EVAT and the summary scores in particular seem designed for a go/no go decision
- ✧ Very few licence applications are actually refused by ILGA
- ✧ ILGA is making “Yes, but ... decisions” – more about licence conditions and part of a process of negotiations to reduce any stakeholder disquiet

Alignment between EVAT and Other Risk Assessments

- ✧ The initial EVAT reports only provided the summary scores which ILGA did not find informative or useful
- ✧ Following a substantial amount of work by OLGR and ILGA staff, the current summary format was developed
- ✧ From the process much more structured, consistent and informative narrative reporting formats were developed that are now being used by OLGR for consideration by ILGA for all applications
- ✧ So far full EVAT reports have only been considered by the ILGA Board for a small number of applications, so it is too early for the Board to fully assess the impact and alignment with other information considered by the ILGA Board
- ✧ However, so far no one felt that any of the reports clashed with their own assessments

Value and Limitations of EVAT

- ✧ The EVAT reports give a useful overview of some key issues that ILGA needs to consider
- ✧ The contribution to decision making is (as expected) limited and likely to remain limited
- ✧ Limitations include the scores often being not geographically “fine” enough
- ✧ There are also significant gaps, especially lack of health data (e.g. ambulance emergency call outs) and limitations on the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSR) offence data included in EVAT reports

- ✧ Summary scores are given little attention; the individual “risk factor” information is of more value and the EVAT reports summarise the data in a convenient accessible format

Impact of EVAT for Applicants

- ✧ ILGA has to provide all its input documentation to applicants who are asked to respond to the material
- ✧ The intention is both to establish if the submissions (including the EVAT report) have missed anything, and to encourage applicants to modify their application to reduce risks that might be posed by granting their licence
- ✧ Applicants have some difficulty dealing constructively with the EVAT information as it is really designed for people who are familiar with and understand the data
- ✧ Thus the EVAT reports at present do not stimulate constructive and detailed responses from applicants unless they are represented by lawyers with a good background in the area

4.2. ILGA Satisfaction with EVAT

The development of EVAT initiated a process of dialogue between stakeholders that has been valuable, and continued dialogue and clarification is expected to add further value.

Overall Value of Developing EVAT

- ✧ The Board and senior staff have found the development of EVAT a very worthwhile process
 - Development of EVAT facilitated dialogue with OLGR and other stakeholders, and was associated with a marked improvement in the structure, completeness and clarity of narrative reports
 - EVAT reports provide very useful concise summaries of some key decision inputs
- ✧ ILGA stakeholders appreciated the clear focus on risk associated with EVAT

How EVAT might be improved

- ✧ There was some uncertainty about the appropriateness of the component score ranges (Mitigating, Low Risk, Moderate Risk, High Risk, Extreme Risk) and the basis for the definition of these ranges was not well understood
- ✧ Some items are reported as dichotomies (especially mitigating actions) that would be more useful if reported in finer categories; for example:
 - While committing to having security or RSA marshals at least once a week might be an indicator of some commitment to reducing violence for high alcohol

- consumption on the premises, knowing how many days a week, which days and which times such staff were employed would be much more informative for decision makers
- Similarly, committing to not supply drinks in glass from midnight or earlier on at least two days per week might indicate some willingness to try to limit the means of causing injury, but knowing on how many days and on which days this was to be done would be much more useful to decision makers
- ✧ The summary scores for Location and Venue Risk are given little attention as the basis of the scores is still not clear to ILGA Board members and staff
 - ✧ The weighting of the risk factors in calculating the summary scores was questioned
 - ✧ The measures that are seen as most relevant and the critical adverse outcomes vary with the type of licence sought – for example:
 - There is evidence that a high density of packaged liquor outlets increase the rates of domestic violence (alcohol related and other) recorded by the police from the LGA where the outlets are located, and there is some evidence that rates of offensive behaviour offences are also affected
 - Rates of alcohol-related assaults, damage to property and offensive behaviour recorded by police in areas close to venues are affected by the density of “high risk” premises (hotels and clubs)
The appropriate geographic reporting units for the impacts of the different types of licence are not the same
 - EVAT currently covers only some of the offence types using ratios of offence numbers to population at the suburb level
 - For some offence types not currently included (such as alcohol related and other domestic violence offences or alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes) assessment at the LGA level might be more appropriate
 - BOCSR “hot spot” maps of offence counts within smaller localities around the proposed venue address are seen by some stakeholders within ILGA (and OLGR) as more useful for detecting the potential impact of adding a hotel licence than EVAT reports which use ratios of offence numbers to population for a whole suburb

- ✧ One member suggested that there could be value in seeing what the summary Venue Risk score would be if the mitigation actions are implemented, and if they are not; however, until there is evidence about how much difference such strategies make to levels of violence and public nuisance, such indications of risk score sensitivity would be of limited value
- ✧ The impact on adverse outcomes of giving a Primary Service authorisation was also raised, as the Board members suspect that some operators set up an outlet that provides food, obtain a liquor licence, then seek a Primary Authorisation to allow them to serve alcohol without serving food and once approval is obtained reduce the attractiveness and variety of food offered, so that what was authorised as a restaurant with a liquor licence effectively becomes a late night bar with a much greater risk of increasing alcohol-related violence
- ✧ Some doubts were expressed about value and relevance of Council and Police reports.
 - In particular some commented that police often have very relevant and detailed knowledge of the impact on violence of particular premises but this is often not reflected in the formal police reports submitted as inputs to EVAT
 - Another participant commented that some ratings from police indicate extreme risk, but the police do not offer any objection to granting of that licence, do not give any explanation of why the risk was rated as extreme or why no objection is being made
 - In other reports from police, all of a standard list of recommended licence conditions might be recommended, including some that are not relevant for the type of licence sought

4.3. The Contribution to OLGR Processes

Interviews with staff of OLGR confirmed the view expressed by ILGA Board members and staff that the development of EVAT had initiated a process of dialogue between stakeholders that has been valuable, and continued dialogue and clarification is expected to be valuable.

- ✧ The development of EVAT initiated constructive dialogue with other stakeholders that has proven to be very valuable
 - Relationships have improved
 - EVAT provides a disciplined structure around which more detailed reports can be organised
 - Consequently, the quality of prose reports produced for ILGA have improved

- Reporting processes as well as report structures have been improved
- ✧ Some gaps in the available data that need to be filled have been identified – these are discussed later (see Section 4.5)
- ✧ Interviews with OLGR revealed less focus than those with ILGA on licencing as a process of negotiating conditions and seeking to reconcile stakeholders to a licence decision, which is understandable given the different roles of the two organisations

4.4. EVAT Trial Evaluation Steering Committee Member Views

The committee's contribution was felt by most members to have been limited. Although most members had found the Committee useful, they would like to see it more involved in the development and use of EVAT and in the licensing decision process.

- ✧ The Committee has given some members a useful venue for:
 - Exchange of views
 - Having some input into how decisions are made
 - Learning about the overall decision making process
- ✧ The limited number of meetings and lack of information about actual EVAT reports have limited value of participation for many members
- ✧ Some members do not see themselves or the organisations they represent as having a real role in such a committee or as able to contribute to the EVAT development or evaluation process
- ✧ Perspectives varied with the roles taken by Committee members in their main positions
- ✧ As contributors to EVAT reports, Police and Council representatives had some quite specific suggestions but felt their access to the total decision making process was too limited and the overall process too opaque (see Section 0)
- ✧ Applicant confidentiality issues were recognised, but felt to be limiting the access to information that would allow worthwhile contributions to be made to a better risk-oriented licensing system

4.5. Technical Issues Identified: Coverage

EVAT has aroused a hunger for even more, neatly summarised, finer-grained data reported in a simple, summary, format.

Specific potential improvements to the range and detail of data summarised in the EVAT that were identified by stakeholders included:

- ✧ Alcohol-related ambulance emergency call outs, aggregated preferably at locality level and at least at suburb level
- ✧ Alcohol-related road injury crashes, perhaps at LGA level
- ✧ Reported alcohol related and other domestic assaults at LGA level
- ✧ Malicious damage to property at locality or suburb level
- ✧ Offensive behaviour at locality or suburb level
- ✧ Breakdowns of offences into day and time bands that correspond to licence operating hours and closing times
- ✧ Indicators of “business model risk” that are discussed in the narrative reports on applications, but not summarised in EVAT
- ✧ SEIFA rankings for suburbs or localities
- ✧ Indicators (not just in dichotomies) of transport availability or ease of access both for travel to and travel away from venues, broken down by time of day and whether weekday or weekend
- ✧ Density data broken down by type of venue (especially packaged liquor, hotel, club, on premises without PSA and on premises with PSA)
- ✧ Applicant history (but the value and validity of such data were thought by some to probably be limited)

The appropriateness of applicant history data was questioned by some stakeholders, in part because legislation requires consideration of licence risk but not of compliance risk.

4.6. Other Issues Raised

- ✧ There was widespread interest in extending EVAT reporting to:
 - Additional locations beyond the Sydney and Newcastle CBDs
 - Other types of licence application, including applications for increased capacity and for PSA
- ✧ Some concern was expressed about what some stakeholders see as the opacity of the current licence approval process to those who are not directly part of making licencing decisions
- ✧ Some expressed a desire for greater integration of currently separate processes, such as liquor licence approval and Council DA approval or decision by police about “declared premises”

- ✧ Despite some small issues, the report layout and labelling of score ranges was generally considered appropriate, although the basis for selection of the score ranges was questioned
- ✧ One perceived limitation flows from the restriction of the EVAT trial to the Sydney and Newcastle CBDs; as this ensures that location risk is always high or extreme, the value of location risk scores is limited

Difficulties in providing some of the additional data were recognised – for example that while the information needed to summarise ambulance call outs is currently recorded, this is in narrative text reports and there is currently no system for coding and summarising the information as a basis for small area statistics.

The appropriate geographic scope of data on offence rate or alcohol related road crashes requires careful thought and might require additional empirical investigation. Impacts on some measures might be seen in nearby streets or the suburb where a venue is located, while impacts for other measures might be more evident at the LGA level. ILGA Board members and ILGA and OLGR staff currently use BOCSR “hot spot” maps to assist them in identifying the “spread” of possible effects, as these allow effects at across geographic areas of different size to be visualised.

The possibility that beneficial owners, who would have effective control of how venues operate, might not be identified in applications was mentioned. This would limit the value of applicant history data.

4.7. Overall Conclusions

- ✧ The development of EVAT has been a worthwhile process that triggered many improvements in communication and processes associated with liquor licence approvals and a sharper focus on the risk of adverse outcomes of a decision and on risk mitigation
- ✧ Data currently included in EVAT reports is very useful, but could be improved by:
 - More “granularity”
 - Adding additional data items
- ✧ Given the nature of the licence approval process, decision makers (and applicants) find the individual data inputs are of more value than summary scores, however valid those scores might be; perhaps the original “vision” for EVAT needs to be re-considered
- ✧ There appears to be scope to extend the range of decisions where EVAT is used to cover:
 - Additional LGAs

- Additional licencing decisions
 - ✧ Extension to additional LGAs would also increase the currently limited range of scores on location risk, which would result in the EVAT data being more discriminating and informative
 - ✧ There might be scope for increased data sharing and integration between Council approval processes, police “declared premises” decisions and liquor licence assessment processes, depending on relevant legislation

