



Department for
Digital, Culture,
Media & Sport

Lord Ashton of Hyde
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State
4th Floor
100 Parliament Street
London SW1A 2BQ

www.gov.uk/dcms
enquiries@culture.gov.uk

Lord Clement-Jones
House of Lords
London
SW1A 0PW

TO2018/02167/DC
6 February 2018

Dear Tim

Thank you for your contribution to the debate on our update to Schedule 6 of the Gambling Act 2005, which took place on 1 February.

I promised to write on the question of why United Kingdom Anti-Doping (UKAD) was included in Part 3 of Schedule 6 rather than Part 2.

Section 30(2) of the 2005 Act provides bodies which are listed in Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 6 with express power to provide relevant information to the Gambling Commission. In contrast, the purpose of listing persons or bodies in Part 3 of Schedule 6 is to provide the Gambling Commission with express power to disclose information to those persons or bodies.

While I agree that there are good reasons for regarding UKAD as an “enforcement and regulatory body” (within the meaning of the title to Part 2 of Schedule 6), there is no need to include it in that Schedule, as UKAD is registered as a private company, it already has the legal power to disclose information to the Commission. It was therefore most appropriate to include it in Part 3, to provide the Gambling Commission with an express power to disclose information to it, and to regard it for these purposes as a “sport governing body” (within the meaning of the title to Part 3 of Schedule 6).

A copy of this letter has been placed with the House Library, and copied to Baroness Finlay of Llandaff and Lord Griffiths of Burry Port.

Lord Ashton of Hyde
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

