WRITTEN SUBMISSION TO PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND INDUSTRY ON GAMBLING REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

“REVIEW OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN GAMBLING LEGISLATION AND ITS REGULATION”

Prepared for
Ms. J. Fubbs
Chairperson

Organisation
Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry
## APPROVAL RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 September 2011</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Pramodh Munbodh</td>
<td>Regulatory Compliance Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REVISION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05 September 2011</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Pramodh Munbodh</td>
<td>Creation. This version REPLACES Version 1.0 which was e-mailed to <a href="mailto:ahermans@parliament.gov.za">ahermans@parliament.gov.za</a> and faxed to 021 021 403 3776 on Monday, 05 September 2011.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 2011</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Pramodh Munbodh</td>
<td>Creation. This version REPLACES Version 1.0 which was e-mailed to <a href="mailto:ahermans@parliament.gov.za">ahermans@parliament.gov.za</a> and faxed to 021 021 403 3776 on Monday, 05 September 2011.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DISTRIBUTION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled Copy</th>
<th>Distributed to</th>
<th>Copy Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WRITTEN SUBMISSION ................................................................. 5
2. REFERENCE ................................................................................................................................... 5
3. COMPANY PROFILE ...................................................................................................................... 6
4. ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN GAMBLING REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT ........ 9
   4.1 APPROVAL OF GAMBLING DEVICES AND EQUIPMENT .......................................................... 9
   4.2 APPLICATION TO THE FIC ACT .......................................................................................... 13
   4.3 NATIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SUITABILITY ........................................................................... 14
   4.4 IMPROVING UNIFORMITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY AMONGST NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL GAMBLING REGULATORS ..................................................................................... 15
   4.5 B-BBEE IN THE GAMBLING INDUSTRY ................................................................................ 17

APPENDIX 1: COPY OF NOTICE PUBLISHED IN 28 AUGUST 2011 EDITION OF SUNDAY TIMES .............................................................................................................................................................. 20

APPENDIX 2: COPY OF NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS LICENSE ............................................................................................................. 21
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY NOTICE

This document, all related documents, and methodologies embodied in this document and related documents ("The Documents") are the intellectual property of Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd. Unauthorised copying and distribution of The Documents, by any means, on any media is STRICKLY PROHIBITED.

Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd, national and provincial gambling boards and the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry are the only authorised and eligible recipient of The Documents. Any person found with a copy of The Documents or employing the methods and applications identified in The Documents, who does not have the express permission of Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd. to do so, may be subject to legal proceedings.

This page must be reproduced with all copies of this Document. It MUST NOT be removed from this document under any circumstances.

The Documents are copyright. Other than, for purposes of and subject to, the conditions prescribed under the Copyright Act, no part of it, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, micro-copying, photocopying, recording or otherwise) may be reproduced, transmitted without prior written permission of Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd.
1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WRITTEN SUBMISSION

1.1 The purpose of this written submission is to present a gambling equipment manufacturer’s perspective on some of the recommendations published in the Gambling Review Commission report “Review of the South African Gambling Legislation and Its Regulation”.

1.2 It is envisaged that some of the comments and recommendations put forward by this written submission will enable progressive changes to be made to national gambling legislation.

2. REFERENCE

This written submission is submitted in response to the notice of public hearings published in the 28 August 2011 edition of the Sunday Times (see Appendix 1).
3. COMPANY PROFILE

3.1 Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd is licensed, in terms of Chapter 3 – Part B – Section 37 of the National Gambling Act (2004), by the Gauteng Gambling Board as a manufacturer, supplier or maintenance provider. A copy of the company’s manufacturer’s license is attached under Appendix 2.

3.2 Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd. is engaged in the distribution and maintenance of electronic gaming machines and online casino monitoring systems to licensed casinos and limited payout machine gambling operations in the sub-Saharan and other regions of the African continent.
3.3 The products are distributed via a variety of transportation modes such as air, road and land. The mode of transport is often dictated by transportation costs, the customer’s delivery deadline and the timeous receipt of the relevant gambling board transport approvals, both South African and international.

3.4 The components in the electronic gaming machines consist of, amongst others, hoppers, bill validators, monitors, coin comparitors, sophisticated circuitry and EPROMs. These components are manufactured outside of South Africa and assembled by Aristocrat Technologies Australia (Pty) Ltd. for distribution all over the world.

Figure 3: Example of Game Software Media

3.5 The online casino and monitoring systems are driven purely by software which is developed by Aristocrat Technologies Australia (Pty) Ltd. and some of its subcontractors.

3.6 In terms of the viability of the business Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd. is engaged in several long term agreements with key customers of the gambling industry.

3.7 Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd is a subsidiary of Aristocrat International, an Australian slot machine and casino monitoring systems developer to regulated gaming jurisdictions around the world.

3.8 For the purposes of the report, Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd will be referred to as Aristocrat.
3.9 Aristocrat is but one of many gambling equipment manufacturers that sell products and services to licensed casinos and limited payout machine route operators in Southern Africa.

3.10 A detailed picture of where Aristocrat, as a manufacturer, is located in the design of the industry is depicted below.

![CURRENT REGULATORY STRUCTURE Diagram]
4. ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN GAMBLING REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

4.1 Approval of Gambling Devices and Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>4.4.3.4.2 Approval of gambling devices and equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASA raised the concerns regarding the delays in obtaining approval by the PGRA’s for the testing, approval and certification of gambling equipment and devices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Gambling Act sets out what the standard is for compliance in respect of gambling equipment and devices. The process thus requires that such equipment should be tested by licensed testing agents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the equipment is compliant the testing agent refers the matter to the National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications who issues a Letter of Certification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should be sufficient to ensure compliance with the National Legislation. Despite this certain provinces require further approval processes to be complied with, which CASA submit is a duplication of cost and effort and causes delays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>4.4.3.4.5 Application of the FIC Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manufacturer further highlighted that there are considerable delays in obtaining the approval of gambling equipment and proposed that provision be made in the national legislation for national gambling equipment approval to avoid the delays of lodging applications for approval with nine (9) provinces. The following additional problems when dealing with the provincial gambling regulators were raised:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of resources to review the application;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of technical competence to understand technical information and test result conclusions published in the test reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Different interpretations of the same technical requirements that may exist;

4. Non-approval of a product by one board regardless of the fact that the other eight might have approved; and

5. Some boards take months and even years to review an application.

Furthermore, the suggestion of national gambling equipment approval should be explored further. The role of the SABS in such a process could be considered, as should the inclusion of a national gambling equipment approval certificate, which can be used in any province.

1. Aristocrat supports the recommendation from the Gambling Review Commission that the issuing of a Letter of Certification from the National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications is all that is needed to demonstrate compliance to national legislation for gambling equipment.

2. As pointed out by the Commission, despite the issuing of a Letter of Certification, certain provinces require further approval processes to be complied with. The effect of these processes is felt in the description of the problems encountered with these provinces and described in extract 4.4.3.4.5 above.

3. Aristocrat is the manufacturer referred to in 4.4.3.4.5, wherein it highlighted the current problems of applying to nine provincial gambling boards for approval of gambling devices that have already been certified by the National Regulator for Compulsory Certifications.

4. It put forward a recommendation, accepted by the Commission, for the introduction of a National Gambling Equipment approval that would serve as a single gambling board approval for a gambling device and for use in all nine provinces of South Africa.

More details on the engineering design of these proposals are available in the following reports, available on request from Aristocrat:

1. Comments on National Gambling Legislation to Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry, P.Munbodh, 28 October
### Recommendations for Change in Gambling Legislation

The current 3 step process (see figure 1) to get gambling equipment approved for use in all nine provinces is onerous. This process needs to be reduced to a 2 step process, in line with international best practice. The possible models that can be employed are as follows:

1. **Model # 1 (Figure 2)**
   1.1 The test laboratory tests the gambling equipment.
   1.2 The test report is sent to a designated provincial gambling board for a National Gambling Equipment approval. The National Gambling Equipment Approval will exist in parallel to each province's provincial gambling equipment approval and will apply to only those gambling equipment that is allowed by all the provincial gambling boards.

   OR

2. **Model # 2 (Figure 3)**
   2.1 The test laboratory tests the gambling equipment.
   2.2 The test report is submitted to the NRCS for a Letter of Certification. Once the Letter of Certification is issued, that is it – no further approvals required for the gambling equipment.

   OR

3. **Model # 3 (Figure 4)**
   3.1 Section 25 of the National Gambling Act to be amended to allow for multiple certification agencies, and not just one, as is
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>currently the case with the NRCS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 The test laboratory tests the gambling equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 The test report is submitted to the NRCS or any other certification agency accredited to perform certification of gambling equipment. Once the Letter of Certification is issued, that is it – no further approvals required for the gambling equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1

Product tested by testing agent.

Product certified by NRCS

Manufacturer prepares 9 applications to 9 provincial gambling boards for approval
Manufacturer submits test report from test lab to any of the 9 provincial gambling boards for a national gambling equipment approval.

One approval letter!!!!!
Appendix 3

Product tested by testing agent.

Product certified by NRCS

bmmcompliance

NRCS national regulator for compulsory specifications
Product tested by testing agent.

Product certified by NRCS, GLI, SIQ or any other certification body accredited to ISO/IEC 17020 to certify gambling equipment and which is independent of the test lab that did the testing.
### 4.2 Application to the FIC Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>4.4.3.4.5 Application of the FIC Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td>A submission from a gambling machine manufacturer raised a concern that section 37(2)(b) of the National Gambling Act requires as a condition of the holder of a national licence that there must be compliance with the applicable provisions of the Financial Intelligence Centre Act (“FICA”). However, FICA does not apply to manufacturing businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary by Aristocrat on these extracts from the Gambling Review Commission Report</td>
<td>The request for a review of the requirement for FICA compliance with respect to manufacturers appears is reasonable. Consideration should be given to amending the National Gambling Act to allow for an exemption to FICA compliance by holders of a manufacturer, supplier or maintenance provider licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Change in Gambling Legislation</td>
<td>Section 37(2) (b) of the National Gambling Act to be amended to exempt manufacturers from the licensing requirements to comply with the FIC Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A detailed explanation for this recommendation is available in the following reports, available on request from Aristocrat:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3 National Certificate of Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>4.4.3.5 Enhancing the Regulatory Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td>Some fairly detailed regulatory changes were proposed by the provinces, which should be reviewed by the DTI. These include suggestions that a national certificate of suitability should be introduced…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary by Aristocrat on these extracts from the Gambling Review Commission Report</td>
<td>1. Aristocrat supports this observation made by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A certificate of suitability is issued to a supplier of goods or services, lender or lessor to a licensee or any borrower or lessee of a licensee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Currently, this certificate is issued by each individual provincial gambling board. There are some manufacturers that supply just peripheral equipment and services and, thus, require just a certificate of suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. However, the cost and administration for a certificate of suitability from each province is very cost prohibitive to these manufacturers. The effect of this is that these manufacturers cannot distribute their products directly to licensed operators except through national manufacturer licensed manufacturers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Change in Gambling Legislation</td>
<td>The National Gambling Act and its Regulations to include a provision for National Certificates of Suitability. The actual requirements, procedures and forms to be used for a National Certificate of Suitability can be derived from that used for National Licenses (reference: National Gambling Act 2004, Part B, National Licences; National Gambling Regulations – sections 20 – 22).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 Improving Uniformity and Accountability Amongst National and Provincial Gambling Regulators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>5.5 Improving Uniformity and Accountability in the Regulatory Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td>Although South Africa is a well-regulated jurisdiction overall, there appears to be overlap and a degree of inefficiency in the regulatory framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The biggest source of conflict appears to be the respective roles of national and provincial government. The Commission is of the view that a clearer delineation of the roles of national and provincial government needs to occur. Furthermore, there are currently inconsistencies between provincial gambling regulatory authorities in the implementation and interpretation of laws, as well as in the enforcement of illegal activities. Current mechanisms aimed at ensuring uniformity need are not effective and need to be reconsidered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary by Aristocrat on these extracts from the Gambling Review Commission Report</td>
<td>The Commission offers the following recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The DTI, together with the South African Bureau of Standards, should be responsible for developing national norms and standards. These norms and standards should be comprehensively tested and there should be adequate consultation with all gambling regulators about these norms and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Aristocrat supports this recommendation by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Though some provincial gambling boards have the exact same requirements written in their provincial gambling rules and regulations, the interpretation and applications of these requirements often differ between provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Aristocrat, as a gambling equipment manufacturer, often encounters difficulties in operating its business because of these discrepancies between provinces’ interpretation and application of requirements, even though they might have the same requirements written in their rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Areas of impact on the manufacturing business by the differing provincial gambling legislation requirements are:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Application for approval to transport gambling machines and devices;

b) Application for approval for gambling equipment;

5. Different gambling boards have different requirements and different turnaround times when it comes to the above. Turnaround times can vary from 1 working day to 2 months for some approvals, impacting on Aristocrat’s and other manufacturers’ ability to deliver product to the marketplace.

**Recommendations for Change in Gambling Legislation**

It is recommended that, where there are similar or same requirements between the different provinces in their provincial gambling legislation, those requirements be lifted out of their legislation and placed in a national gambling legislation or norms and standards document.

In the case of applications for gambling equipment approval and transportation approval, a single norm and standard for these elements, combined with having to lodge an application with just one gambling regulator as opposed to multiple ones, will definitely be a quantum leap forward in the standard of business regulation.
## 4.5 B-BBEE in the Gambling Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>Page 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for a clear and consistent policy on B-BBEE in the gambling industry as a whole to be developed, with particular emphasis on casinos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently, there is an overarching target of level two compliance by 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that a consistent approach should be proposed by the DTI for discussion with and adoption by provinces once agreement has been achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>Page 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Codes of Good Practice allow corporate entities to choose how to structure their B-BBEE commitments, and do not anticipate that the regulator will seek to influence decisions at this level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the Commission is appreciative of the fact that provinces wish to ensure that CSI spend is allocated to the areas of greatest social need, it is dangerous when regulators become involved in directing the spend and opens up the potential for political interference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better approach would be to have an overarching policy and to require operators to align with the provincial policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report</th>
<th>Page 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bookmaking industry is extremely concerned about attempts by provincial regulators to require bookmakers to reach certain B-BBEE levels (as defined by the Codes of Good Practice) within a prescribed time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As such, although they would appear to be small businesses, they are classified as Qualifying Small Enterprises, and are subject to the relevant B-BBEE requirements outlined for this category of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The concern is well placed. A one-person business cannot be expected to transform its ownership, management, employment equity, preferential procurement policies, skills development policies, enterprise development policies, and socio-economic development policies (the seven pillars of B-BBEE) in the same way that larger corporate structures can. Indeed, the Codes make this provision in recognition of this limitation.

Reference in Gambling Review Commission Report

Page 135

Extract

There is a need for a clear and consistent policy on B-BBEE in the gambling industry as a whole to be developed, with particular emphasis on casinos.

Currently, there is an overarching target of level 2 compliance by 2015. Each province determines that pace and extent to which this objective is achieved and there appear to be different approaches between provinces. Although it appears that the discussions around BBBEE have been protracted and that it has been difficult to reach agreement, it is recommended that a consistent approach should be proposed by the DTI for discussion with provinces and adoption once agreement has been achieved.

Commentary by Aristocrat on these extracts from the Gambling Review Commission Report

1. Aristocrat agrees with the comments made by the Gambling review Commission in the above extracts.

2. Though the comments quoted above were relevant to the operators functioning in the gambling industry, manufacturers like Aristocrat received a letter from its licensing authority, the Gauteng Gambling Board, in March 2010 requiring a B-BBEE level of 2 by 2015.

3. Letters were sent to the Gauteng Gambling Board explaining that for an enterprise like Aristocrat, and based on its B-BBEE programme, level 2 was not going to be possible by 2015 or any other year.

4. At the 6th Biennial Gambling Conference, Aristocrat was on the panel for the topic **Level 2 BBBEE Status by 2015 – can it be achieved?** and it stated, with scientific evidence, that an enterprise’s best ever B-BBEE level would be dependent on the size and nature of the organisation (see Appendix 5).
5. Aristocrat also asserts, as depicted in Appendix 5, that instead of requiring a specific BEE level as proof of compliance, the enterprise should be left to grow their programmes to the best of their ability. An “apply or explain” approach is appropriate as opposed to a “comply or explain” approach which will result in mindless compliance and possible fronting for enterprises to elevate their BEE scorecards.

| Recommendations for Change in Gambling Legislation | <not applicable> |
LEVEL 2 BBBEE STATUS BY 2015 – CAN IT BE ACHIEVED?

Presented by: Pramodh Munbodh
Designation: Regulatory Compliance Director
Company: Aristocrat Technologies Africa (Pty) Ltd
Date: 20 April 2011
Time: 08h35
PURPOSE OF PRESENTATION

• To share information from 5 years of implementation of a B-BBEE programme;

• To make an affirmative statement, based on experience and knowledge of B-BBEE, regarding the attainment of B-BBEE Level 2

• To outline recommendations regarding what should be done by 2015 or other target date regarding B-BBEE requirements from gambling regulators.
B-BBEE PROFILE

- Multinational company
- >R35 million Total Revenue per annum
- Rated according to Generic scorecard (all 7 B-BBEE elements)
- Black owned (28% shareholding).
- Staff number: 44
- Highest configuration B-BBEE profile for a gaming equipment manufacturer
STATEMENTS

1. B-BBEE Level 2 (85 points) will not be possible nor realistic for many private companies.

2. Best-ever B-BBEE compliance level for an organisation is a function of:
   
a) **Size** of the organisation;

   b) **Nature** of the organisation;
Prior to 2004, Aristocrat Africa was 100% owned by Aristocrat International, an Australian company.


2006 onwards – Black chairman of board of directors.
HISTORY

- February 2007 – Publication of B-BBEE Codes of Good Practice.

**CONSTRAINTS**

**Management Control**

- Structure of Boards for private companies - Companies Act (2008) and King 3 Code of Corporate Governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation / Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Companies Act (2008) – 66(2)(a)</strong></td>
<td>minimum :1 director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King 3 - 2.18</strong></td>
<td>Majority – non-executive directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 2 executive directors – one must be CEO/MD and the other must be the director responsible for finance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSTRAINTS

Management Control

• Board makeup governed by Shareholder’s agreement – 5 directors. 2 non-executive directors from Yabohle, 1 non-executive director from Aristocrat Australia, MD and FD from Aristocrat Africa.

• No points in Codes for black non-executive directors.

• Companies Act, King 3 Codes, Shareholders Agreement supersede BEE Codes in terms of composition of Boards.

• Small private companies – limited i.t.o. numbers for executive directors.
Management Control

- As executive directors also fall under Senior Top Management, same constraints.

- Small, private companies - just one level of Other Top Management - limited number of managers already present. Replacement of managers – resignation and recruitment policies – dependent on right calibre of candidates.

- Adjusted Recognition for Gender – 50% of target – black females. Affects numbers for Executive Directors, Senior Top Management and Other Top Management.
CONTRAINTS

Black Disabled Employees

• 2 points in Employment Equity and 3 in Skills Development. – adjusted for gender.

• EE Act (1998, as amended) - *people who have a long-term or recurring physical or mental impairment which substantially limits their prospects of entry into, or advancement in, employment.*

• Inherent safety risks in some positions already exclude physical or mentally disabled people. E.g. Production Technician, Storeman, Service Technician.

• Positions with little or no safety risks – Receptionist, Data Controller. Already filled with able bodied candidates – no applications received from disabled people.
CONSTRAINTS

Employment Equity

• Staff numbers are always changing – new appointments and resignations.

• Aggressive competition for highly qualified black software programmers and engineers. Average duration of employment per black software programmer: 2 years.

• Economic recession forces some vacancies to be frozen – not immediately filled after resignation of personnel.

• Labour market forces affect total staff numbers and numbers of black employees – impossible to control to ensure and maintain numbers required for Level 2.
Skills Development

- Skills development aligned with IDP and KPO processes.

- Budgetary restrictions – money spent on skills development of black people but not the vast amounts required by the codes to get the full 3 points required.

- Sustainability of spend on an annual basis to maintain points for Level 2 – very difficult.

- Restrictions by SETAs on type and structure of learnerships – onerous for a small private company.
CONSTRAINTS

Preferential Procurement

• Black owned (more than 50% black owned) suppliers are very few. Aristocrat has just 19 out of its 142 B-BBEE verified suppliers meet this criterion (13%).

• Black female owned (more than 30% shareholding) suppliers are very few. Aristocrat has just 11 out of its 142 B-BBEE verified suppliers meet this criterion (8%).

• 4.00 points
FUTURE CHALLENGES

• What to do about job positions currently filled? Would need to retrench / fire a certain number of employees to be replaced by a certain number black candidates to make up the numbers for MC, EE and SD.

• Proposed changes to ED and SED calculation methods will affect the future points earned for these categories – could be lowered. Extra budgetary pressure to increase spending in one financial year, as opposed over a long term.

• Higher targets for Employment Equity element from February 2012 will make an already difficult task impossible.
FUTURE CHALLENGES

• DTI Medium Term Strategic Plan 2011 – 2014 (12 April 2011) – Changes planned to B-BBEE Act and Codes (Legislative work handed to B-BBEE Advisory Council for review).

• Introduction of Broad-based Black Economic Empowerment Amendment Bill – September 2011. Revised Codes thereafter. Changes will affect current verified companies. Key focus: entrepreneurship and enterprise development.
RECOMMENDATIONS

• B-BBEE compliance is a function of the size and nature of the organisation.

• Do not dictate a specific B-BBEE Level to all organisations. Defeats the spirit of the Codes, which encourages voluntary compliance via the procurement value chain. “One size does not fit all”

• Instead of asking Level 2 from all organisations, allow the organisations to take ownership of their B-BBEE plans and let them implement and grow their programmes to the best of their ability.
RECOMMENDATIONS

• “Apply or explain” approach should be followed rather than “comply or explain”.

  former - shows an appreciation for the fact that it is often not a case of whether to comply or not, but rather to consider how the principles of the Codes can be applied.

  latter - could denote a mindless response to Codes.

• Any level from 8 upwards is B-BBEE compliance. The best level attainable will be based on the size and nature of the organisation.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


CONTACT DETAILS

• e-mail: pramodh.munbodh@aristocrat.co.za

• Fax: 086 565 0360

• Fax: 011 608 0030

• Tel: 011 997 4200
APPENDIX 1: COPY OF NOTICE PUBLISHED IN 28 AUGUST 2011 EDITION OF SUNDAY TIMES

HAVE YOUR SAY
PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE REPORT BY THE GAMBLING REVIEW COMMISSION
“REVIEW OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN GAMBLING LEGISLATION AND ITS REGULATION”
CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

(Final report submitted to the Minister of Trade and Industry – September 2010)

The Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry will hold public hearings on the Report by the Gambling Review Commission “REVIEW OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN GAMBLING LEGISLATION AND ITS REGULATION”.

Interested individuals and organisations are invited to submit written comments on the Recommendations of the Report by the Gambling Review Commission.

Interested individuals and groups wishing to comment are kindly requested to forward written submissions to the Committee by no later than Friday, 9 September 2011.

Public hearings have been scheduled for Friday, 16 September 2011 and Wednesday, 21 September 2011.

Members of the public and stakeholders, who wish to obtain copies of the legislation, may contact the nearest Government Printers, or access the Department of Trade and Industry website or contact the Committee Secretary on the contact numbers indicated below.

All correspondence should be addressed to Ms J. Fubbs, Chairperson: PC on Trade and Industry and marked for the attention of Mr A. Hermans, PO Box 15, Parliament, Cape Town 8000. Enquiries may be directed to Mr A. Hermans on tel: 021 403 3776, fax: 086 652 7753 or via e-mail: ahermans@parliament.gov.za

Issued by: Ms J. Fubbs, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee of Trade and Industry (National Assembly).

APPENDIX 2: COPY OF NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS LICENSE

GAUTENG GAMBLING BOARD

NATIONAL MANUFACTURER, MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLIERS LICENCE

A licence is hereby granted in terms of section 37 of the National Gambling Act, 2004 (“Act 7 of 2004”)

To

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES AFRICA (PTY) LTD

To carry on the business of manufacturing, distribution, repairing and maintenance of gambling devices subject to the attached conditions.

Acting Chief Executive Officer

Date issued: 31 March 2012

Date of expiry

Licence number: NAM-006
THE END