

# **A Summary of Gambling Consultation Responses and CAP and BCAP's Consultation Evaluation**

## **Introduction**

CAP and BCAP's public consultation on The Regulation of Non-Broadcast and Broadcast Advertising of Gambling ended on 15 September. CAP and BCAP received around 80 responses.

The new rules for gambling advertisements include changes to the rules that were proposed in CAP and BCAP's consultation document. Those changes result, in the main, from CAP and BCAP's evaluation of consultation responses. Significant responses, which include points raised by numerous respondents and noteworthy individual comments, plus CAP and BCAP's evaluation of those, are summarised in Annex A.

## **Evaluation: general observations**

The consultation responses were generally supportive of CAP and BCAP's policy position and draft rules. Respondents from all sectors and standpoints were in favour of many, if not all, of CAP and BCAP's proposals.

## **Evaluation: consultation questions**

**Q.1 Do you agree that the UK National Lottery should be regulated under the proposed non-broadcast and broadcast gambling advertising rules, subject to the exceptions made in the proposed rules and the possible exceptions raised in Questions 5 and 7? Or should the UK National Lottery be regulated under a separate set of rules, which would be subject to public consultation?**

The vast majority of respondents to this question considered the National Lottery (NL) should be regulated under the CAP and BCAP general rules and the proposed gambling rules, as proposed by CAP and BCAP in the consultation document. Those responses came from a broad range of stakeholders: media owners and related bodies and marketers (the "advertising industry"), gambling advertisers (the "gambling industry") and faith entities.

Significant points raised in favour of the proposal to include the NL in the proposed gambling rules were: there was a proposal to move regulation of the NL from the National Lottery Commission (NLC) to the Gambling Commission (GC), which government rejected because of the NL's special

role. There is no reason why that reasoning should extend to advertising regulation; consumers are best served by one set of rules and one regulator to which to complain; the good causes that benefit from NL sales do not negate any risks the NL may carry for children, young persons and vulnerable adults; those risks are greater for scratch cards, which provide instant gratification; the objectives in the proposed CAP and BCAP rules are just as pertinent to the NL as to other operators.

Significant points in opposition to the proposal to include the NL in the proposed gambling rules were: there is regulatory demarcation between the NL and other gambling operators in the form of the NLC and the GC; the NL was intended by Parliament to have a special national status and major fundraising role; the NL operator is also regulated by the NLC under the NL Code of Practice and could be subject to double regulation if two detailed sets of sector-specific rules were applied by two different bodies; the rationale for the proposed gambling rules reflects the licensing objectives of the Gambling Act, which do not apply to the NL.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** CAP and BCAP acknowledge the backing for the proposal to include the NL within the CAP and BCAP gambling rules. But CAP and BCAP are mindful of the unique status of the NL, which continues to be subject to specific regulation administered by the NLC, as highlighted in the NLC's consultation response. CAP and BCAP accept that implementation of the Gambling Act provides no explicit public policy mandate to include the NL in the proposed gambling rules. On balance, CAP and BCAP have decided to exclude the NL from the new CAP and BCAP gambling rules.

The BCAP TV and Radio Codes, however, presently include specific rules that cover the advertising of the NL and all other lotteries. Those rules are less numerous and, on certain points, less restrictive than the new BCAP gambling rules, which will apply to all other lotteries from September. BCAP is mindful of that fact and the requirements of the Communications Act, which establishes the principle that under 18s should be protected and, like the Better Regulation principles, that regulation should be consistent. BCAP has determined, therefore, to maintain dialogue with the NLC about how the NL is regulated under the BCAP Codes, mindful of the special status of the NL.

The CAP rules do not presently include specific rules for the NL. Because it aims to comply with the Better Regulation principles, under which regulation should be consistent, CAP has decided to enter into exploratory discussions with the NLC about how the NL is regulated under the CAP Code, mindful of the special status of the NL. But the CAP and BCAP Codes do not have to be the same. CAP is not affected by the Communications Act.

Discussions between the CAP Executive and the NLC will be held within a reasonable timeframe but they are not subject to the same deadlines as the new gambling rules.

**Q.2. Do you agree that the proposed CAP and BCAP gambling rules will secure the objectives set out in the Gambling Act 2005?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that the rules would secure the licensing objectives of the Gambling Act. Both the group that agreed and the group that disagreed were made up of a wide range of stakeholders, with advertising and gambling industry and faith entities represented on both sides.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** CAP and BCAP consider the overwhelming weight of responses supports the view that the new rules will secure the licensing objectives of the Gambling Act; no amendments are necessary.

**Q.3. Do you agree that the proposed BCAP rules have regard to the principles and standards objectives set out in s.3 and s.319(2) of the Communications Act 2003?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that the proposed BCAP rules have regard to the principles and standards objectives set out in s.3 and s.319(2) of the Communications Act. Only one significant point was made in disagreement, that the broadcast scheduling rules should apply an 18 age limit to all gambling products (the British Casino Association).

**BCAP's evaluation:** Because BCAP's proposal on broadcast scheduling mirrors the existing BCAP rules, which have not attracted meaningful or significant criticism, and because BCAP's policy position on the age 18 limit for the particular appeal of content and the age 25 restriction on playing a significant role in a gambling ad mean that all children and young people will be protected, BCAP considers the points raised in response to question 3 do not warrant any amendments to the rules.

**Q.4 Do you consider that the general principles set out in the proposed gambling rules are suitable?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that the general principles were suitable. That group was made up of a wide range of stakeholders, with advertising and gambling industry and faith entities represented. The group that disagreed comprised 2 gambling trade associations, 1 faith group and an individual.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** The points raised in response to question 4 do not warrant any amendments to the rules.

**Q.5 Do you consider that the proposed rules on the appeal of the content of gambling advertisements are suitable? Because their purpose is to raise funds for good causes, should the minimum age of appeal for lotteries be 16?**

A significant majority agreed with CAP and BCAP's proposal that the minimum age of particular appeal should be set at 18 for all gambling products. That group was made up of a wide range of stakeholders, with advertising and gambling industry (betting and casinos) and faith entities represented. Significant arguments given in support included: an 18 age limit demonstrates a socially responsible approach by CAP and BCAP.

The group that disagreed with the 18 age limit was made up of entities from broadcast advertising (RACC, Satellite and Cable Broadcasters Group, Chrysalis) and gambling industries (Lotteries Council, BACTA). The following arguments were made in favour of lowering the age of particular appeal to 16 for all gambling products (not only lotteries) that may be legally used at that age: the rule should reflect the legal age of participation; unsuitable content will be caught by other content rules; present BCAP policy, which prevents advertisers from appealing particularly to an audience below the legal age of participation, has not been shown to be detrimental and broadcast and non-broadcast rules should be harmonised only when necessary.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** The CAP Code presently restricts the appeal of the content of gambling ads to 18s and over. CAP and BCAP agree that it is right to prevent gambling products from appealing particularly to under 18s, even when the legal age of participation is lower than age 18. The points raised in response to this question do not warrant any amendments to the proposed rule.

**Q.6 Do you agree that the minimum age limit for people featured incidentally in gambling advertisements (as opposed to those featured gambling or playing a significant role in the advertisement) should be set at 18 years? Do you agree that it is proportionate to make exceptions for (a) family entertainment centres and travelling fairs and (b) lottery products? Should other exceptions be made?**

A significant majority of respondents considered the minimum age limit for people featured incidentally in gambling advertisements (as opposed to those featured gambling or playing a significant role in the advertisement) should be set at 18 years. Both the group that agreed and the group that disagreed with this proposal were made up of a wide range of stakeholders,

with advertising and gambling industry and faith entities represented on both sides.

Around the same number of respondents favoured or opposed making exceptions for FECs and travelling fairs (with Category D gaming machines). Again, both the group that agreed and the group that disagreed with the consultation proposal comprised a wide range of stakeholders, with advertising and gambling industry and faith entities represented on both sides. Arguments made in support were: the exception is proportionate to the risk posed to young people by Category D gaming machines, as reflected in the legal age of play under the Gambling Act, and therefore it meets the draft rules' objective of protecting children and young persons; the exception is proportionate because families are expected to participate at such venues. Arguments against making an exception for FECs and travelling fairs were: all gambling products should be treated in the same way; an exception could fall foul of the objective of protecting under 18s; no children or families should ever be shown gambling; the appearance of a younger person could appeal to a younger audience.

More respondents opposed making this exception for lottery products than supported it, but CAP and BCAP consider the difference is not significant either in terms of numbers or noteworthy comments. The group that opposed the exception comprised a wide range of stakeholders (although all gambling industry respondents were from the casino, bingo and betting sectors and therefore subject to an 18 age limit). Comments were: exceptions should not be made for any gambling products, regardless of any money raised for good causes, because that could expose under 18s to risk, fall foul of the Gambling Act's objectives for society lotteries, and fail to provide a level playing field across the gambling industry.

The group that considered it proportionate to make an exception for lottery products came from the advertising industry (IPA, ISBA, BACC, AA, Sky, At the Races) and the gambling industry (Lotteries Council). Significant comments were: nonetheless, under 18s should not be shown playing or winning a lottery; the exception should be limited to those over 16; the exception should be limited to lotteries that benefit children and young people.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** i) the minimum age limit for people featured incidentally (as opposed to those featured gambling or playing a significant role) in gambling ads should continue to be set at 18; ii) FECs, travelling fairs and lottery products should be exempted from that rule.

Regarding whether any other exceptions should be made, Racing UK Ltd pointed out that the racing industry likes to encourage families to attend race

courses. DCMS confirmed that under 18s are allowed to enter horse race courses and greyhound race tracks, but not to place bets.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** CAP and BCAP acknowledge that, unlike the other exceptions, racecourses provide, in the main, 18-restricted gambling products and services. But they consider it is proportionate to the risk posed to children and young people and in line with the overarching objectives to extend the exemption to those venues. CAP and BCAP consider the same exemption should apply to ads for non-gambling leisure facilities that incidentally refer to separate gambling facilities, e.g. as part of a list of facilities on a cruise ship. In providing such exceptions, CAP and BCAP are mindful of a response to question 8, which calls for the rules to take into account that licensed FECs may have areas for (Category C) machines restricted to 18s and over. CAP and BCAP appreciate that that principle applies to some other venues. To that end, they have included the phrase "in areas that the Gambling Act 2005 does not restrict by age". Those amendments affect CAP Code rule 57.4(o), BCAP Radio Code 21.1(c) and BCAP TV Code 11.10.2(d):

Marketing communications/ Advertisements for family entertainment centres, and travelling fairs, **horse racecourses and dog race tracks, and for non-gambling leisure facilities that incidentally refer to separate gambling facilities, for example as part of a list of facilities on a cruise ship,** ~~in which families are~~ may include children or young persons provided they are accompanied by an adult **and are socialising responsibly in areas that the Gambling Act 2005 does not restrict by age.** Advertisements for a lottery product may include children or young persons. No-one who is, or seems to be, under 25 years old may be featured gambling or playing a significant role.

**Q.7 Do you agree that the minimum age limit for people featured gambling or playing a significant role in a gambling advertisement should be 25 years for all types of gambling? ...**

A significant majority agreed with the consultation proposal that the minimum age limit for people featured gambling or playing a significant role in a gambling advertisement should be 25 years for all types of gambling. Those stakeholders came from the advertising and gambling industries and faith groups. Reasons given in support were: that places clear water between adults and adolescents and will give certainty to advertisers, viewers/listeners and the ASA Council and give effect to the objective of protecting all children and young people; there is an argument that the age limit should mirror the legal age of play but gambling is a special category activity because evidence indicates that it causes significant harm to a minority and people aged 16-24 are up to three times more likely to be problem gamblers than those aged 25 and over [Gambling Prevalence

Study 1999]; the operators of “soft” gambling like football pools, lotteries and bingo may argue that they should be an exception but those who gamble to excess usually participate in a range of activities.

The group that disagreed comprised advertising (PPA, Chrysalis) and gambling industry bodies. Significant concerns were: the age limit for bingo/casino/betting should be the same as the minimum age of participation (18) or a compromise of 21; it is more subjective to decide if someone looks over 25 than if they look over 18 or over 21 – age verification should be requested on premises if someone looks under 21; if advertising adheres to the rest of the rules the 25 age limit should not be necessary; there should be flexibility for operators to show a range of ages enjoying their facilities.

**CAP and BCAP’s evaluation:** The points raised in response to question 7 do not warrant an amendment to the 25 age limit for betting and gaming ads.

**... Because their purpose is to raise funds for good causes, should the minimum age of people playing a significant role or featured playing be lower for advertisements for lottery products?**

A significant majority of respondents considered that the minimum age of those playing a significant role or featured gambling should not be lower for lottery advertisements. Respondents came from the advertising (Sky, Racing UK, RACC) and gambling industries (casinos) and faith groups. Significant arguments given were: it is irrelevant whether the purpose of a lottery is to raise funds for good causes – the question is the level of harm posed to children and young people; all forms of gambling are potentially harmful to children and young persons; an exception could be against the objectives of the rules; it seems arbitrary to make an exception for lotteries.

Only 1 respondent explicitly supported the proposition that the minimum age of those playing a significant role or featured gambling should be lower for lotteries; they considered that limit should be set at age 18.

**CAP and BCAP’s evaluation:** The 25 age limit for those playing a significant role or featured gambling limit should apply to lotteries also.

**Q.8 Do you agree that the proposed rules on the scheduling of broadcast advertisements and the placement of non-broadcast advertisements are proportionate by giving reasonable flexibility to media owners and working with the general principles and content rules to protect all under 18s?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that the proposed scheduling or placement rules are proportionate. That group comprised advertising and gambling industry entities and a faith group (Church of England). Points

raised in support include: media owners are professional and constrained as regards preventing irresponsible advertising and should be afforded some flexibility in working with the general principles to protect under 18s; we do not consider that this relaxation is likely to cause additional harm (Church of England).

A group of respondents, principally faith entities, disagreed with the proposed scheduling or placement rules. That group also comprised advertising (Racing UK Ltd) and gambling (ABB, Kerzner) industry entities (associated with 18 age limit products) and corporate responsibility groups. Significant points in opposition to the proposal included: the caveat that the ad itself should be responsible and not “likely to be of particular appeal to children or young people” seems inconsistent with the idea of scheduling or placing ads in young people’s media; many problem gamblers begin gambling as children or young people and the latter must be protected under the objectives.

**CAP and BCAP’s evaluation:** The points raised in response to question 8 do not warrant any amendments to the principle behind the scheduling or placement rules. CAP and BCAP consider that, because of the nature of FECs, lotteries, football pools and fairs, the 18 age limit on the particular appeal of content, and the 25 age limit on playing a significant role, children and young people will be protected in line with the Gambling Act and the Communications Act. Better regulation principles and the Communications Act also provide that regulation must be proportionate and necessary.

But BCAP has brought the wording of the TV scheduling rules into line with the Radio scheduling rules so that they target more precisely the gambling products under the Gambling Act 2005:

**BCAP Rules on the Scheduling of TV Advertisements, Section 4, Rule 4.2.1:** (a) The following may not be advertised in or adjacent to children’s programmes or programmes commissioned for, principally directed at or likely to appeal particularly to audiences below the age of 18:

...

(ii) gambling except lotteries, football pools, ~~family entertainment centres and traveling fairs~~ **equal chance gaming (under a prize gaming permit or at a licensed family entertainment centre), prize gaming (at a non-licensed family entertainment centre or at a travelling fair) or Category D gaming machines** (see 4.2.1(b) below);

...

(b) The following may not be advertised in or adjacent to children’s programmes or programmes commissioned for, principally directed at or likely to appeal particularly



to audiences below the age of 16:

- (i) lotteries;
- (ii) football pools;
- ~~(iii) family entertainment centres~~
- ~~(iv) travelling fairs~~
- (iii) equal chance gaming (under a prize gaming permit or at a licensed family entertainment centre);**
- (iv) prize gaming (at a non-licensed family entertainment centre or at a travelling fair);**
- (v) Category D gaming machines.**

**Q.9 Do you consider that the proposed content rules meet the objective of ensuring that vulnerable persons are not harmed or exploited by gambling advertisements?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that the proposed content rules meet the objective of ensuring that vulnerable persons are not harmed or exploited by gambling advertisements. That group was made up of advertising and gambling industry entities and faith groups (Evangelical Alliance, Quaker Action on Alcohol and Drugs, Church of England, Methodist Church). Significant comments include: vulnerable people cannot be protected totally but the rules set out a checklist that can be expected to limit the potential for harm and it is not easy to see what more could be done within this framework (Church of England).

The group that considered the proposed content rules would not meet the objective of ensuring that vulnerable persons are not harmed or exploited was made up of gambling industry entities (ABB, PartyGaming, Racing UK Ltd), 1 corporate responsibility company and Lord Lipsey. Their comments are summarised in the table in Annex A.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** The points raised in response to question 9 do not warrant any amendments to the content rules on protecting the vulnerable. But CAP and BCAP have made a rule amendment to reflect the fact that there are facilities like restaurants or bars, and not only entertainment, that can be accessed only by going into gambling areas. Ads should make that clear to consumers:

**CAP Code 54.4(r), BCAP Radio Code 21.2(m) and BCAP TV Code 11.6.2:** Marketing communications/Advertisements for ~~entertainment events or facilities~~ that can be accessed only by entering gambling premises should make that condition clear

**Q.10 Do you agree that the proposed rules address concerns about the effect of gambling advertisements on problem gambling without the need for compulsory educational messages or warnings and that those**

**should not be required in the absence of evidence on the impact of gambling advertising on problem gambling and the effectiveness of compulsory messages or warnings in gambling advertising?**

A significant majority of respondents agreed that compulsory educational messages or warnings should not be required at this stage. That group comprised advertising and gambling industry entities. Significant arguments were: at present there is no clear evidence that messages or warnings are effective; it is more important at this stage to have carefully controlled ad content; most people who smoke are addicted but most of those who gamble are not, meaning that a more subtle approach is necessary; the compulsory inclusion of messages satisfies a regulator's need to be seen to take a tough line rather than offering real protection to consumers; gambling products will be regulated by the Gambling Commission and warnings and sources of help will be available at gambling venues/sites so that advertising can be permitted without warnings, subject to review in the future; such messages disproportionately impact on radio as a linear medium; messages are likely to be impractical on ads received on a mobile device.

The group that considered messages or warnings should be compulsory comprised faith groups, West Midlands Department of Health, 1 corporate responsibility company, 1 spread betting advertiser (a sector required to carry FSA warnings) and 2 individuals. Significant arguments made were: warnings create an environment of informed consent about the potential effects of consumer choices; the gambling industry has much larger budgets than statutory or voluntary bodies; warnings and information on sources of problem gambling help counterbalance the inducement to gamble, which ads constitute; consumers are not used to seeing gambling ads and therefore should not ignore messages or warnings for the time being; if messages only reach those that enter gambling venues/sites, they will have missed the wider community who will be deprived of the chance to give fuller consideration to whether to make that visit; it is difficult to prove a negative effect in terms of preventing or inhibiting behaviour.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** Respondents did not challenge CAP and BCAP's consideration of the research discussed in the consultation paper and did not provide robust evidence to demonstrate that compulsory educational messages or warnings would be an effective measure as regards problem gambling. CAP and BCAP appreciate that cost is an important consideration for statutory and voluntary agencies. But CAP and BCAP consider the balance of robust evidence fails to show that compulsory messages or warnings are an effective public policy measure. Consumers are used to seeing warnings on ads for a variety of products other than gambling and there is no robust evidence that they are effective in those cases. CAP and BCAP consider research that sought to prove a positive effect of messages/warnings, i.e. a positive decision by heavy or addicted

consumers of a certain product to reduce or give up consumption, and that failed show that compulsory warnings or messages are effective.

CAP and BCAP are also mindful of the Better Regulation Commission's October report "Risk, Responsibility, Regulation: Whose Risk Is It Anyway?", which considered:

"The provision of information in a market can be a good alternative to more intrusive regulation provided that the information can be understood by consumers **and real protection is delivered** at a justifiable cost. It is also essential that information is targeted at and tailored for those whom the regulation is trying to protect"<sup>1</sup>.

CAP and BCAP consider the points raised in response to question 10 do not warrant any change to their policy on compulsory messages or warnings in gambling ads and that position is proportionate, targeted and in line with evidence-based regulation.

**Q.11 Do you agree that to require gambling advertisements to carry a statement of the operator's licensor or place of licensing would be disproportionate?**

A significant majority agreed that it would be disproportionate to require gambling advertisements to carry a statement of the operator's licensor or place of licensing. That group of respondents comprised advertising and gambling entities and faith groups. Significant responses were: such messages would increase consumer confusion because operators may advertise in the UK and be licensed in any of around 30 states (UK, the rest of the EEA and "White List" countries); consumers would not be in a position to discriminate between local jurisdictional or licensing variations; licensing information is likely to be provided *de facto* for Gambling Commission licensees in the event that the GC becomes a trusted brand, which is likely to be the reason remote operators choose to be established in the UK; such messages disproportionately impact on radio as a linear medium; if operators comply with advertising standards and relevant laws the place of licensing is irrelevant.

The minority that disagreed comprised faith groups, a licensing authority (Alderney), 2 gambling industry entities (Kerzner, Casino Operators' Association), 2 consultancies, 1 individual and faith groups. The significant comments are summarised in Annex A.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://www.brc.gov.uk/publications/risk\\_report.asp](http://www.brc.gov.uk/publications/risk_report.asp)

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** The points raised in the consultation do not warrant any change to CAP and BCAP's policy position.

**Q.12 Can you identify any problems in relation to gambling advertisements that are not addressed either by the specific gambling advertising rules proposed here or by other CAP or BCAP Code rules?**

Two significant responses were received on this question. Firstly, the Racecourse Association said that race courses often host social events at times when no racing or gambling is taking place.

**CAP and BCAP's evaluation:** CAP and BCAP consider that in those circumstances the ad would fall under draft CAP rule 57.3(c) and the introductory paragraph to the BCAP Radio and TV Rules: "Unless they portray or refer to gambling, these Rules do not apply to marketing communications/ advertisements for non-gambling leisure facilities, for example hotels, cinemas, bowling alleys or ice rinks, that are in the same complex as but separate from gambling facilities". But, to make that clear, CAP and BCAP have agreed to add "event" to "facilities":

These clauses do not apply to marketing communications/ advertisements for non-gambling leisure **events or** facilities, for example hotels, cinemas, bowling alleys or ice-rinks, that are in the same complex as, but separate from, gambling **events or** facilities.

**Q.13 Do you agree that spread betting should be allowed to be advertised as a specialist financial investment on specialist financial TV channels and radio stations and within specialist financial programming on TV and radio?**

A significant majority agreed that spread betting should be allowed to be advertised as a specialist financial investment on specialist financial TV channels and radio stations and within specialist financial programming on TV and radio. Respondents came from the advertising and gambling industries.

But 2 respondents, At the Races (broadcaster) and the Spread Betting Association, questioned the proposal to limit spread betting ads to financial stations/channels or programmes and argued that spread betting ads should be allowed on sports stations/channels. Comments in support of that view included: there are spread betting products where bets are placed on the outcome of future sporting events rather than on future financial events; although customers can lose more than their initial stake, the risks involved in spread betting are no larger than those involved in betting because losses from betting are not proportionate to someone's income, for example; the FSA Conduct Of Business (COB) rules regulate the promotion of spread

betting operations and will ensure that any risks beyond those posed by betting are described thoroughly e.g. ads must include a fair and accurate description of the nature of the investment or service, the commitment required and the risks involved and must avoid accentuating the benefits of an investment without also giving a fair indication of the risks.

**BCAP's evaluation:** Because spread betting is a higher risk product where losses can exceed the initial stake and to an extent unknown when the bet is placed, BCAP consider spread betting advertisements should be limited to specialist financial channels/stations or programmes. A further consideration is that the power and impact of broadcast media and the technical constraints on the amount of detail that can be properly communicated and understood warrant greater restrictions on where and when spread betting ads can appear than under the non-broadcast CAP Code. Neither the weight of responses nor the points raised in support of removing the scheduling restrictions merit a change from BCAP's consultation proposal.

### **The Advertising Advisory Committee**

The AAC, a consumer expert body set up to advise BCAP, has been involved in the drafting of the BCAP gambling and spread betting rules from an early stage and considers BCAP has conducted the consultation evaluation in a fair manner.

### **Conclusion**

CAP and BCAP consider their evaluation of consultation responses properly took into account the views of the public, the AAC, the gambling and advertising industries, faith entities and corporate responsibility bodies. CAP and BCAP's evaluation of significant comments (Annex A) illustrates that the rules they have introduced are robust and in accordance with the objectives for the advertising of gambling under the Gambling Act 2005 and, for broadcast, with the Communications Act 2003.