

# WINNEBAGO TRIBE OF NEBRASKA

P.O. Box 687 • Winnebago, Nebraska 68071 • PH: 402-878-2272 • Fax: 402-878-2963

Visit us at: [www.winnebago-tribe.com](http://www.winnebago-tribe.com)

April 24, 2012

Via Electronic Mail: [reg.review@nigc.gov](mailto:reg.review@nigc.gov)

Ms. Tracie L. Stevens, Chairwoman  
National Indian Gaming Commission  
1441 L St. NW, Suite 9100  
Washington, DC 20005

RECEIVED  
NATIONAL INDIAN  
GAMING COMMISSION  
2012 JUN 27 PM 4: 01

Re: Preliminary Discussion Draft of 25 C.F.R. Part 543: Class II MICS

Dear Chairwoman Stevens:

On Behalf of the Winnebago Tribe, we offer the following comments on the National Indian Gaming Commission's (NIGC) discussion draft of 25 C.F.R. Part 543, which set forth the Minimum Internal Control Standards (MICS) for Class II gaming.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

### 1. Revising the Discussion Draft's Prescriptive Approach to Regulations

Historically, one of the overriding Tribal concerns with the MICS has been their prescriptive And procedural approach dictating the specific manner in which a regulatory objective is to be achieved. Such an approach is ill-suited to the Tribal gaming industry in which technologies and industry practices are constantly changing and evolving. Among other problems, the specific requirements of prescriptive regulations may become difficult to justify over time as certain requirements become technologically obsolete. The enforcement of outdated regulations that are no longer compatible with industry practices can drive up compliance costs and ultimately hurt the tribe's bottom line by diverting tribal resources and time away from investments and innovation.

Despite repeated tribal government requests to scale back the prescriptive requirements in the Class II MICS, the proposed changes in the discussion draft fail to adequately resolve these fundamental problems. Much like the Class III MICS and the Nevada Gaming Commission regulations on which it is based, the discussion draft consists largely of rigid and highly detailed procedural requirements. By locking in certain specifics such as the department, position title, and game play components, the discussion draft prevents tribes from considering more cost-effective and efficient procedures – even if such alternative procedures will ultimately result in the same desired outcome.

The discussion draft thus leaves little to no room for tribes to exercise flexibility in carrying out their regulatory responsibilities. The proper and most effective procedure for achieving compliance with Class II MICS can vary across gaming operations depending on the operations

#### TRIBAL COUNCIL

CHAIRMAN- JOHN BLACKHAWK

VICE-CHAIRMAN- DARWIN SNYDER

SECRETARY- LOUIS C. HOUGHTON, JR.

TREASURER- TRAVIS MALLORY

MEMBERS: CHARLES W. ALDRICH, MORGAN F. EARTH, LAWRENCE PAYER, THOMAS E. SNOWBALL, SR., RAMONA C. WOLFE

structure, size, scope, and gaming floor layout. In addition, the technology-specific regulatory requirements in the discussion draft risk becoming quickly dated as new technologies and innovations become available. Because tribal gaming operations are diverse and complex and differ in terms of available resources, it is critical that tribes have the flexibility to develop and fine-tune their internal controls and processes based on their available resources and any changes in circumstances or technology.

In our view, a more balanced and flexible approach to the Class II MICS would be one that focuses on broader regulatory standards and objectives and describes the ends, as opposed to the means, of achieving compliance. Under such an approach, compliance would be measured by the extent to which the tribe has successfully achieved the stated regulatory standard objective, not the extent to which the tribe has followed the step-by-step procedures in the MICS. So long as the tribe's own procedures achieve a level of security and integrity sufficient to meet the stated regulatory standard in the MICS, the tribe should have the discretion to tailor their procedures based on the specifics of their particular gaming operation without falling out of compliance with the Class II MICS.

The content of the Class II MICS should thus be focused on providing adequate standards and objectives that tribes must meet in order to achieve MICS compliance. To that end, the detailed, procedural steps in the regulation should be removed and placed in guidance documents for use by tribes in developing their own controls and procedures. This way, the Class II MICS can focus on "what" needs to be achieved so that tribes can rely on their own internal controls and processes in determining "how" such compliance will be achieved.

We note that there are several benefits to using guidance documents rather than the regulation to describe specific procedures that tribes should follow to achieve compliance. First, the issuance detailed procedural requirements through guidance documents instead of the regulation gives the NIGC the flexibility to revise its procedures without having to undergo the full rulemaking process, which can become particularly useful in the tribal gaming context where technology and industry practices are constantly changing. Second, the use of guidance documents would be useful for those smaller tribes with fewer resources that may need more guidance in improving their own regulatory systems. And finally, a less prescriptive and more outcomes-based approach to the Class II MICS would bring the regulation closer to the purposes and goals of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), which vests tribes with primary regulatory authority over their gaming activities and the NIGC with important oversight responsibilities.

## 2. Recognizing the Role of Tribal Governments as Primary Regulators

Section 543.3(a) of the discussion draft provides that tribal gaming regulatory agencies (TGRAs) may establish and implement additional controls since "TGRAs *also* regulate Class II gaming" (emphasis added). However, later in that same section, in § 543.3(h)(2), the discussion draft "recognize[es] that tribes are the primary regulator of their gaming operation(s)." In addition to being inconsistent, the first statement of the TGRA's regulatory authority runs contrary to the plain language in IGRA, which vests Indian tribes with "the exclusive right to regulate gaming activity on Indian lands." Moreover, § 2706(a)(2) of IGRA states that Class II gaming activities



consolidated into one section that contains the cage controls for all games instead of being scattered throughout the regulation based on the game being regulated. Consolidating all related information into fewer sections will make it easier for tribes and gaming operations to reference and implement the regulatory standards set forth in the Class II MICS.

## TECHNICAL COMMENTS

### 1. 25 C.F.R. § 543.2: Definitions

The discussion draft's definition of an "agent" is problematic because it does not support the use of a computer application in performing the functions of an agent. As defined, only individuals can qualify as an agent. Such a narrow definition of an agent can be impracticable under certain circumstances where more than one agent is required to be present. Furthermore, by narrowly defining agent to include only persons, the discussion draft prevents tribes from taking advantage of technological advances that may perform the functions of an agent in a more cost-effective and efficient manner.

### 2. 25 C.F.R. § 543.5: Use of an Alternate Control Standard

We are concerned by the lack of any guidance as to what constitutes an "alternate standard." Without a definition or explanation clarifying the elements of an alternate standard, any slight wording differences or minor procedural changes that do not alter the intent of the standard or the overall objective of the standard could be subject to the requirements in this section. We ask for clarity in either the form of a definition or in the preamble of the proposed rule to ensure that only those significant changes in intent and coverage will be considered an alternate control standard for purposes of this section.

### 3. 25 C.F.R. § 543.7 & § 543.8: Bingo Games

The discussion draft's distinction between "gaming system" bingo and "manual" bingo is an unprecedented and unnecessary departure from the well-accepted view and general consensus that "bingo is bingo." It is unclear why bingo is now being classified according to the technology being used when bingo has historically been treated as one type of gaming activity by both the NIGC and tribal governments. We are unaware of any events or incidents that may have prompted this new classification scheme or of any regulatory benefits of drawing such a distinction.

Among other problems, this unnecessary distinction between manual and gaming system bingo causes confusion and increases the risk of error and duplication. For instance, in § 543.8(e)(5)(ii), the regulation provides that "controls must include the number of agents required for authorization or signature for each predetermined level of payout," despite the fact that an earlier provision in the same section requires at least two agents to perform the validation and verification of a payout. Also, as drafted, the discussion draft contains several misplaced provisions that do not accurately reflect the type of bingo being conducted. For instance, § 543.8(e)(3)(iv)(B) requires payout records to include a description of the event, including any

*player interface malfunction*, despite the fact that the requirements set forth in § 543.8 apply only to *manual bingo*, which does not involve any player interfaces.

Furthermore, some of the requirements for bingo games in both sections are impracticable or unnecessarily burdensome. For instance, § 543.7(d)(3)-(4) require that two agents be present to verify every bingo pattern before a payout in *gaming system bingo*. Since the discussion draft prohibits computer systems from serving as the agent for purposes of this regulation, this means that two employees must be present to validate and verify every win on a gaming system. While we can certainly understand the need to validate and verify hand-pays in manual bingo, such a requirement seems unnecessarily burdensome in the gaming system context.

We urge the NIGC to abandon this new regulatory approach to bingo in light of the foregoing concerns and to streamline the MICS requirements for bingo games by merging the two sections together.

#### 4. 25 C.F.R. § 543.12: Gaming Promotions

To the extent that promotions are non-gaming activities, we believe that TGRAs should be responsible for establishing and enforcing proper standards to govern promotional activities. We therefore ask the NIGC to rely on guidance documents instead of the regulations in providing regulatory requirements for gaming promotion, which we believe gives due deference to TGRAs in regulating the conduct of gaming promotions.

#### 5. 25 C.F.R. § 543.17: Drop and Count

To eliminate confusion and ensure adequate coverage for all drop and count controls, we recommend streamlining the drop and count standards into one section instead of separating them by department or game type. By separating out the requirements for card games from player interface and financial instruments in the discussion draft, certain provisions have become misplaced so that the functions required no longer correspond with what is being controlled. For instance, § 543.17(f)(8) prohibits posting rejected currency to a nonexistent interface, despite the fact that § 543.17 governs card games where interfaces are not used.

#### 6. 25 C.F.R. § 543.18: Cage, Vault, Kiosk, Cash and Cash Equivalents

This section contains provisions for patron deposited funds and promotional payouts, drawings, and giveaway programs. To minimize confusion, these provisions should be covered in their respective sections instead of scattered throughout the regulation.

#### 7. 25 C.F.R. § 543.23: Audit and Accounting

This section confuses the functions of independent accountants by requiring controls to ensure that each gaming operation “records journal entries prepared by the gaming operation and by its independent accountants.” Journal entries, however, are not generally recorded by independent

accountants. We ask that the "and" in this provision be replaced with an "or" to better reflect industry practices.

Also, § 543.23(c)(8) refers to "instances of non-compliance cited by internal audit, the independent accountant, and/or the *Commission*" (emphasis added). The term "Commission" should be replaced with "TGRA."

In closing, we thank you for the opportunity to share our views and concerns with the discussion draft of the Class II MICS and ask that you give favorable consideration to the issues and recommendations we have identified above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John Blain".

Tribal Official