
From: PokerXanadu [xanadu@pokerxanadu.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2013 11:13 AM
To: Elloyan, Sally
Subject: re: NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR COMMENTS, Notice # 2013-20

Dear Ms. Elloyan,

I am writing in the interests of poker players in regards to interstate agreements for interactive gaming, per your Request for Comments, Notice # 2013-20. Poker player concerns for the regulation of interactive gaming include these main points of interest:

1. Protection of player account funds.
2. Protection from cheating and fraud by sites or their employees.
3. Protection from cheating and fraud by other players.
4. Protection of player privacy and account information.
5. An accessible process for dispute resolutions between players and sites.

While intrastate regulations can directly address each of these concerns, the multi-jurisdictional agreements for interstate gaming need to also address these issues to ensure that players are protected across the jurisdictions.

1. Protection of player account funds.

Interstate agreements should require sites outside of Nevada to separate and protect player account funds to the same standard as required in the regulations for sites licensed in Nevada. There must also be a method for Nevada regulators to examine account records and enforce compliance with these standards.

2. Protection from cheating and fraud by sites or their employees.

There should be a method for players to report to Nevada regulators suspected cheating or fraud by any site included in interstate agreements, and a mechanism for Nevada regulators to investigate and resolve such reports, including reimbursement of any funds found to be missing, stolen or wrongfully taken from players by the site operator which registers a player's account. In other words, the site operator should be responsible to reimburse their own registered players regardless of which site on their network effected the cheating or fraud, and such reimbursement to players should not be contingent upon recovery of the funds by their site operator from the offending site.

3. Protection from cheating and fraud by other players.

There should be a method for players to report to Nevada regulators suspected cheating or fraud by other players included in interstate agreements, and a mechanism for Nevada regulators to investigate and resolve such reports. Interstate agreements should address several issues which require special treatment for multi-jurisdictional agreements:

Multi-accounting: Players should be prevented from playing from multiple accounts on the same network at the same tables or tournament at the same time. Players should be allowed to register on the different skins of the same network, in multiple jurisdictions, in order to avail themselves of the varying promotional incentives, but there must be mechanisms in place to prevent the same player from playing on the same table or tournament under two or more different registered accounts.

Prosecution of criminal acts: In order to deter cheating and fraud, interstate agreements should require that players who commit cheating or fraud in other jurisdictions should face either prosecution in Nevada or criminal

penalties in their own jurisdiction which are at least as severe as those in Nevada. There should be a mechanism for cross-jurisdictional cooperation in investigations and prosecution.

Reimbursement of players: Similar to instances of site cheating or fraud, site operators should be required to reimburse their own registered players who lose funds to cheating or fraud by other players, regardless of which site registered the player who committed the criminal act. Of course, there should also be a commensurate method for the site operator to recover the funds from the other site, but reimbursement of the affected players should not be contingent on such recovery.

4. Protection of player privacy and account information.

The private and account information of players should not be shared between sites without the permission of the players. Similarly, permission of the player should be required for sharing their private or account information with any regulatory body outside of Nevada.

5. An accessible process for dispute resolutions between players and sites.

Players should have a mechanism for filing and resolving a dispute against a site with the regulatory body which grants the site license, regardless of the cross-jurisdictional nature of such a dispute. There should also be a mechanism available for appeal by the player to the regulatory body of their own jurisdiction should they fail to gain satisfaction from the regulatory body of another jurisdiction.

I hope the Nevada Gaming Commission will address these issues in development of their regulations for interstate agreements.

Sincerely Yours,