

Responsible Gaming Certification & Recertification - Insights from the WLA Independent Assessment Panel

Anne Pattberg, Chair 20.11.26

A Framework Designed for Ongoing Progress

- Built as a maturity model rather than a "pass/fail" system
- Encourages steady refinement of player protection practices
- Helps lotteries improve governance, accountability, and transparency
- Promotes global consistency in responsible gaming standards



What Continuous Improvement Really Means

- Not about major changes every cycle
- Emphasis on meaningful, purposeful evolution
- Even Level 3–4 lotteries must continue deepening practices
- Progress may be incremental but must be visible and intentional



Should You Move Up a Level?

- No obligation to advance every three years
- Level increases should reflect operational readiness, not pressure
- Consider governance maturity, system stability, and organizational capacity
- Maturity evolves differently based on jurisdiction, size, and resources



Why Maintaining a Level Can Be the Right Choice

- Allows time to embed and reinforce RG measures
- Supports long-term integration across departments
- Prevents rushing into higher-level expectations prematurely
- Panel values thoroughness over speed



Maintaining a Level Still Requires Movement

- Must show progress since the last certification
 - E.g. updates to policies, programs, training, or data use
 - E.g. strengthened monitoring, evaluation, or reporting processes
- Submission must reflect evolution—not copied content



How to Show Meaningful Advancement

Examples:

- Enhancements to player protection initiatives
- Expansion of staff or retailer training
- Improved communication strategies and outreach
- Stronger internal controls or risk detection tools
- Evidence of deeper cross-departmental collaboration



Clarity and Evidence Are Essential

- Provide examples showing before vs. after improvement
- Explain the driver behind each change
- Use data, KPIs, or evaluation results where available
- Highlight lessons learned and how they shaped decisions



Being Honest About Challenges Builds Credibility

- The IAP does **not** expect perfection
- Identify obstacles and capacity limitations
- Outline how issues are being addressed
- Transparent action plans show maturity, not weakness



Deciding Whether to Stay or Move Up

- Review the previous IAP assessment thoroughly
- Identify gaps, risks, and areas of strong progress
- Consider strategic priorities, resources, and timing
- Both maintaining and advancing levels can be appropriate



Lessons from Other Lotteries

- Same-level recertifiers succeed through strong documentation
- Advancing lotteries show deeper integration & measurable impact
- Clarity and evidence matter more than level achieved
- Peer examples illustrate different pathways toward maturity



Lessons from Other Lotteries

- Opportunity to refresh priorities across the organization
- Reassess emerging risks (digital, AI, online play, youth exposure)
- Strengthen governance structures and internal accountability
- Renew staff engagement and cross-functional collaboration



Key Criteria the Panel Uses to Assess Recertification

- Evidence of continuous improvement
- No repetition of previous submissions
- Organization-wide RG embedding and leadership support
- Monitoring, evaluation, and learning processes
- Clear links between policies, practices, and outcomes



What Differentiates Strong Submissions from Weak Ones

- Updated standards and player-protection measures
- Protection of vulnerable groups and risk-mitigation tools
- Stakeholder engagement (regulators, NGOs, researchers, retailers)
- Data-driven decision-making and research-based improvements
- Clean, structured, and concise documentation



Final Takeaways for WLA members

- Progress, learning, and transparency matter more than perfection
- Staying at your current level is valid
- Movement (even subtle) is essential
- The goal is to strengthen responsible gaming sustainably, cycle after cycle



Thank you!

