THE CODE COMPLIANCE PANEL OF PHONEPAYPLUS TRIBUNAL DECISION

Thursday 4 AUGUST 2011 TRIBUNAL SITTING No. 82/ CASE 2 CASE REFERENCE: 857142/DL

Service provider: Nova Telecom Limited, London

Information provider: Rentabiliweb Europe Sarl, Lyon, France

Type of service: Gambling and competition service

Service title: 'Primescratchcards.com'; 'Primegrattage.com' O9090241602 plus mobile network shortcode

Cost: £1.53 per minute

Network operator: Atlas Interactive Group Limited, All Mobile

Network Operators

Number of complainants: 2

THIS CASE WAS BROUGHT AGAINST THE SERVICE PROVIDER UNDER PARAGRAPH 8.5 OF THE CODE

BACKGROUND

PhonepayPlus was notified of an online gambling service operating in the UK, and in other parts of Europe, using a fixed-line number and mobile network shortcode for UK premium rate service payments. The fixed-line premium rate number (09090241602) was supplied by Nova Telecom Limited, which was the Service Provider, and the number was operated by Rentabiliweb Europe Sarl, which was the Information Provider.

The Executive was concerned that the Service Provider did not appear to have the requisite prior permission certificate for gambling services. There was also evidence of individual users being charged more than £30 in a single 24-hour period using the premium rate number.

The Service

The service was accessed online via a number of website addresses, including 'primescratchcards.com' and 'primegrattage.com', which were operated by one of the Information Provider's clients. The service provided a number of online games for consumers to play. Consumers could sign up to the service for free, but were required to purchase virtual currency in order to play games in which they could win prizes, including cash prizes.

The service provided a number of means by which consumers could purchase the virtual currency, including the use of a premium rate number (09090241602). If the consumer called the premium rate number, they were provided with a code. If a consumer then entered this code on the service websites, they would be credited with virtual currency which they could use to play games in which prizes could be won.

The Investigation

The Executive conducted this matter as a Standard Procedure investigation in accordance with paragraph 8.5 of the Code. The Executive issued a breach letter to the Service Provider dated 19 July 2011. The Service Provider responded to the breach letter in a letter dated 26 July 2011.

The Tribunal made a decision on the breach raised by the Executive on 4 August 2011. The Service Provider did not make any informal representations to the Tribunal.

SUBMISSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

ALLEGED BREACH ONE PRIOR PERMISSION (Paragraph 5.1.1)

'PhonepayPlus may require that particular categories of service must not be provided without its prior written permission for any service within that category. PhonepayPlus will give reasonable notice of such a requirement and the category of service to which it applies, and will publish a full list of such service categories from time to time. Prior permission may be granted subject to the imposition of additional conditions. Such permission may be withdrawn or varied upon reasonable grounds and with notice in writing.'

- 1. The Executive submitted that certain categories of premium rate service require prior permission from PhonepayPlus before the service can start operating, and that a list of such services was, and is, available on the PhonepayPlus website. The Executive said that the requirement for prior permission was brought to the attention of the industry in:
- March 2008, via a published "Help Note for service providers requiring prior permission";
- August 2010, via the monthly PhonepayPlus 'NewsPlus' newsletter; and
- September 2010, via a news item on the PhonepayPlus 'NewsPlus' newsletter providing compliance information on remote gambling services.

All three publications had stated that remote gambling services (i.e. services which enable gaming or betting to take place at a distance electronically or via voice telephony) require prior permission from PhonepayPlus before a service can start operating. The news item of September 2010 had informed the industry that:

"It is important to note that consumers are not permitted to bet more than £30 using premium rate payment in any 24-hour period, as this is a condition imposed on all certificates for remote gambling services."

The Executive submitted that the service under investigation fell within the definition of 'remote gambling service' under the Gambling Act 2005 (the 'Act'). Section 3 of the Act defines gambling as gaming, betting or participating in a lottery. The Executive submitted that the games available on the service websites, which required virtual currency to play and in which prizes could be won by consumers, either fell within the definition of 'gaming' (under section 6 of the Act) or 'participating in a lottery' (under section 14 of the Act).

The Executive noted that the 'Primescratchcards.com' website (Appendix A) included a 'responsible gaming' webpage, which offered advice to users regarding gambling and made protection mechanisms available to users.

The Executive submitted that the Service Provider was therefore responsible for the provision of a remote gambling service, which required prior permission from PhonepayPlus before operating, and that the Service Provider had failed to obtain such prior permission before operation of the service had begun. The Executive submitted that, as such, the Service Provider was in breach of paragraph 5.1.1 of the Code.

The Executive noted that there was evidence that there was no £30 daily cap in place and that at least one complainant had incurred more than £30 for premium rate payments in a single 24-hour period.

- 2. The Service Provider submitted that, when it first started working with Rentabiliweb Europe Sarl, it had not been aware that the service would be used for remote gambling purposes. The Service Provider also explained that, despite the PhonepayPlus publications referred to by the Executive, it had not been aware of the requirement to obtain prior permission for the service, and that its breach of the Code was due to ignorance and was not deliberate. The Service Provider asked the Tribunal to take into account the fact that it had co-operated quickly with PhonepayPlus when it was first contacted, and that it had cancelled the service and had engaged in dialogue. Furthermore, the Service Provider pointed out that it had provided refunds to complainants.
- 3. The Tribunal considered the evidence, including the Service Provider's acceptance of the breach. The Tribunal accepted the Executive's submission that the service constituted a remote gambling service within the meaning of the Gambling Act 2005 and thereby required a gambling licence, and that, as such, the Service Provider required prior permission from PhonepayPlus to operate the service. The Tribunal found that the Service Provider had failed to obtain the necessary prior permission before commencing the service, and the Tribunal accordingly upheld a breach of paragraph 5.1.1 of the Code.

Decision: UPHELD

SANCTIONS

The Tribunal's initial assessment was that, overall, the breaches taken together were significant.

In determining the sanctions appropriate for the case, the Tribunal took into account the following aggravating factors:

- The behaviour of the Service Provider was reckless, either in relation to its
 obligations under the Code to obtain prior permission before operation of the
 service, or in relation to being aware of the intended or actual use of the premium
 rate number by the Information Provider.
- The cost of the service to individual consumers was high. The absence of a £30 spend limit in any 24-hour period, which would have been a condition of prior permission had it been granted, meant that at least two consumers had incurred charges above the spend limit.

The Tribunal took into account the following mitigating factors:

- The Service Provider co-operated with PhonepayPlus and switched off the service immediately when contacted by PhonepayPlus.
- The Service Provider said it had made refunds to complainants.

The revenue in relation to this service was in the range of Band 6 (£1-£5,000).

Having taken into account the aggravating and mitigating factors, the Tribunal concluded that the seriousness of the case should be regarded overall as **significant**.

Having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the revenue of the service, the Tribunal decided to impose the following sanctions:

- A Formal Reprimand;
- A fine of £2,500.

The Tribunal commented that it expected claims for refunds to continue to be paid by the Service Provider for the full amount spent by complainants, except where there is good cause to believe that such claims are not valid.

The Tribunal strongly recommended that the Service Provider reviews its compliance procedures to ensure it meets all of its obligations under the Code.

Appendix A – screenshots of 'Primescratchcards.com' website







