

AGCO vs AGLC

Ontario and Alberta's iGaming frameworks, side by side

Both provinces use the same legal blueprint:
a Crown regulatory agency that writes the standards,
plus a Crown corporation that signs the operator agreement
under section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code.



AGCO

ALCOHOL AND
GAMING COMMISSION
OF ONTARIO

REGULATORY AGENCY



iGaming
ONTARIO

CROWN OPERATOR

VS



AGLC

ALBERTA GAMING,
LIQUOR & CANNABIS
COMMISSION

REGULATORY AGENCY



Play
ALBERTA

CROWN OPERATOR

GAMINGCOMPLIANCE

COMPLIANT MARKETS. SUSTAINABLE GROWTH.

AGCO vs AGLC at a glance

Two Canadian provincial frameworks built on the same constitutional foundation — section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code — reach the same regulator-plus-Crown-corporation architecture by very different operational routes. Ontario went live in April 2022 and tested the model in court in 2024. Alberta enacted the iGaming Alberta Act in March 2025 and launches the regulated private market on **13 July 2026**.

ONTARIO · AGCO + IGO

Live since April 2022; outcome-based RGS; ~20% NGR to province via iGO

AGCO writes the Registrar's Standards (~196 standards, 6 themes) and runs registrations. iGaming Ontario, an AGCO subsidiary, signs the operator agreement and runs BetGuard (centralised self-exclusion, launched 14 May 2026). CAD 100,000 per site per year. RG Check not mandated; political-event wagering permitted.

ALBERTA · AGLC + AIGC

Launches 13 July 2026; prescriptive SRIG; ~22.4% effective GGR

AGLC publishes the SRIG (~335 standards, 4 chapters) and the binding Security Assurance Standards. Alberta iGaming Corporation, established under Bill 48, signs the operator agreement. CAD 50,000 one-time application + CAD 150,000 per site per year. Mandatory RG Check accreditation; day-one centralised self-exclusion integration; political-event wagering banned.

Eight discriminating dimensions

Dimension	AGCO · Ontario	AGLC · Alberta
Regulator	Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario	Alberta Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis (est. 1996)
Conducting Crown corp.	iGaming Ontario (iGO) · AGCO subsidiary, July 2021	Alberta iGaming Corporation (AiGC) · under Service Alberta minister
Framework statute	Criminal Code s. 207(1)(a) · AGCO regulations	iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48, March 2025) · GLCA as amended by Bill 16
Market launch	4 April 2022 (court-tested 2024)	13 July 2026 (confirmed by Service Alberta & AGLC)
Standards count	~196 standards across 6 themes (RGS)	~335 standards across 4 chapters (SRIG); SOC 2 hard-coded
Per-site annual fee	CAD 100,000 per site / year	CAD 50,000 one-time + CAD 150,000 per site / year
Effective provincial take	~20% of NGR (contractual via iGO Operating Agreement)	~22.4% of GGR (2% First Nations + 1% RG off-the-top, then 20% of net)
Distinctive obligations	BetGuard since May 2026 (online only); RG Check optional	Mandatory RG Check; day-one centralised SE; political-event wagering banned; SAS binding

VERDICT · WHAT CHANGES FOR AN ONTARIO OPERATOR GOING TO ALBERTA?

Same blueprint, new project — budget for five Alberta-specific work items

The constitutional architecture is identical, and most of the Ontario policy work (AML programme, key persons, technical architecture, RG framework) is reusable. But the second registration is not a copy-paste. Plan for: **mandatory RG Check accreditation** (weeks, not days); **day-one centralised self-exclusion integration** as a hard launch gate (extending to land-based exclusion data, not just online); **political-event wagering removed** from the Alberta product; **AGLC Security Assurance Standards** as a binding floor with SOC 2 Type 1 at go-live and SOC 2 Type 2 or ISO 27001 within two years; and **AML reporting to AiGC in addition to FINTRAC**. Alberta is 50 percent more expensive per site, the effective provincial take is roughly 2.4 percentage points higher, and the integration gate moves the timeline by months, not weeks.

Table of contents

01	Shared blueprint	The same federal foundation, two local interpretations
02	Architecture	Regulator + conducting corporation, on each side
03	Registration	Two-track approvals on both sides
04	Fees and revenue share	Two cost stacks, two different shapes
05	Standards architecture	RGS and SRIG: similar tradition, different shape
06	Player protection	Two centralised self-exclusion systems
07	Advertising	Both strict, with one product-level divergence
08	AML supervision	FINTRAC on both sides, two reporting-line shapes
09	Where Alberta goes stricter	The Alberta-specific obligations Ontario operators must add
10	Operator entry playbook	From Ontario-registered to Alberta launch-ready
11	Frequently asked questions	Five Q&A pairs on the most-asked compliance questions
12	Resources & primary sources	10 cited references · continue reading

Apr 22

ONTARIO LIVE

Market opened 4 April 2022 with iGaming Ontario as the conducting entity

13 Jul 26

ALBERTA LAUNCH

Confirmed by Service Alberta & Red Tape Reduction Minister and AGLC

196 vs 335

INDEXED STANDARDS

RGS (6 themes) vs SRIG (4 chapters)

20% vs 22.4%

EFFECTIVE REV SHARE

ON: ~20% NGR to iGO.
AB: 3% off-the-top from GGR + 20% of net = ~22.4%

The same legal foundation, two local interpretations

Ontario and Alberta are building iGaming markets on the same federal foundation. Both rest on section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada, which permits a province to conduct and manage a lottery scheme. Both use the same architectural twist that Ontario pioneered in 2022: the provincial regulator writes the standards and runs registrations, while a Crown corporation, owned by the regulator or by the province, signs the actual operating contract with each private operator and conducts and manages the iGaming activity on behalf of the province.

The reason for the architecture is constitutional, not commercial. Under section 207, a province cannot delegate the conduct-and-manage role wholesale to a private operator. The Crown corporation is the legal proxy that allows private operators to participate while keeping the conducting and managing function with the province. The model has been tested in court: in 2024 the Ontario Superior Court of Justice upheld the iGaming Ontario arrangement, giving the framework constitutional cover and effectively endorsing the same blueprint for any province that chose to adopt it. Alberta passed the iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48) in March 2025 to do exactly that.

The blueprint is identical. The fees, the standards count, the self-exclusion architecture, the advertising perimeter and the launch maturity are not. Ontario-licensed operators planning Alberta should treat the second registration as a new project, not a copy-paste.

Editorial · drawn from Bill 48 (iGaming Alberta Act) and the AGLC Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming

This comparison sets out the architecture on both sides, the cost stack, the standards mapping, the player-protection regimes, the AML supervisory split, and the changes an Ontario-licensed operator should plan for. For the underlying regulator profiles, see the dedicated [AGCO + iGaming Ontario cornerstone](#) and the [AGLC Standards Explorer](#).

Source. Criminal Code of Canada s. 207(1)(a); iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48, March 2025); Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Act amended by Bill 16 (May 2024); Ontario Superior Court of Justice ruling (2024) upholding the iGaming Ontario conduct-and-manage model.

Regulator + conducting corporation, on each side

Both provinces split the regulatory function from the commercial conduct-and-manage function. The split is structural, not nominal: each side has a different name and a different scope.

ONTARIO

AGCO + iGaming Ontario

AGCO is the Crown regulator: writes the Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming, runs the registration process, conducts technical audits, and pursues enforcement. **iGaming Ontario** is a subsidiary corporation of AGCO, incorporated in July 2021, with its board appointed by AGCO. It executes the operating agreement with each B2C operator, collects the contractual ~20 percent net-gaming-revenue (NGR) share, and runs the centralised BetGuard self-exclusion programme.

Market open: 4 April 2022 · **Court tested:** Ontario Superior Court 2024

ALBERTA

AGLC + Alberta iGaming Corporation

AGLC is the established provincial Crown regulator (1996), already supervising the land-based casino, lottery, liquor and cannabis sectors. **AiGC** is the new Crown corporation established by the iGaming Alberta Act, governed by a board of up to seven directors appointed by the Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction. AiGC signs the operator agreement, collects the 20 percent provincial share, and handles AML reporting and public complaints.

Launch: 13 July 2026 · **Enacted:** iGaming Alberta Act, March 2025

Two non-obvious differences are worth flagging. First, AGLC continues to operate the AGLC-run online gambling channel (PlayAlberta) alongside the new private market, making AGLC simultaneously regulator and competitor. AGCO does not run an operator. Second, AiGC reports up to a different ministry than AGLC, which creates a cleaner ministerial separation between regulator and conducting entity than Ontario has, where iGaming Ontario sits directly under AGCO.

Two-track registration on both sides

Both jurisdictions require the operator to clear two parallel approvals before going live: regulatory registration with the AGCO or AGLC, and a commercial operating agreement with the conducting Crown corporation. Holding only one of the two does not authorise operation.

OPERATOR	Ontario: AGCO Operator Registration + iGO Operating Agreement. Alberta: AGLC iGaming Operator Registration + AiGC Operating Agreement. Both required for B2C operation.
SUPPLIER	Ontario: AGCO Gaming-Related Supplier Registration. Alberta: AGLC Supplier Registration, split into two annual-fee subcategories. Suppliers in neither jurisdiction need a conducting-corporation agreement directly.
PERSONNEL	Ontario: Trade Person Registration where the role affects gaming integrity. Alberta: Equivalent individual-level checks within the operator and supplier categories; AGLC has historically required fit-and-proper assessment of named personnel under its land-based regime.

Alberta runs a three-step registration process: due diligence, compliance, and self-exclusion integration. The third step is the operational difference from Ontario: in Alberta, no operator goes live without first being integrated with the centralised self-exclusion programme, and AGLC is treating that step as a hard launch gate. In Ontario, the equivalent integration is with BetGuard, which only became mandatory in May 2026 when BetGuard launched, four years after the Ontario market opened.

Two cost stacks, two different shapes

Ontario charges a flat per-site annual fee plus a clean 20 percent revenue share. Alberta charges a much larger annual fee, a one-time application fee on top, and an effectively higher provincial take once the First Nations and social-responsibility allocations are counted.

Line	AGCO · Ontario	AGLC · Alberta
Application fee	Variable; recovery of investigation costs	CAD 50,000 one-time
Annual registration	CAD 100,000 per site per year	CAD 150,000 per site per year
Multi-brand operators	Each registered site pays the annual fee	Each distinct iGaming site requires a separate application and a separate annual registration
Supplier annual fee	Variable by category	CAD 15,000 or CAD 3,000 by subcategory
Revenue share (provincial)	~20% of net gaming revenue (NGR) to province via iGO (contractual, not a statutory tax)	20% of net iGaming revenue to province via AiGC (after the 3% off-the-top deductions)
First Nations allocation	None separate	2% of GGR allocated to First Nations communities
Social responsibility	None separate	1% of GGR allocated to social responsibility initiatives
Investigation cost recovery	Yes, at Registrar's discretion	Yes, at Registrar's discretion
Effective provincial take	~20% of NGR (contractual via iGO Operating Agreement)	~ 22.4% of GGR (3% off-the-top from GGR + 20% of net)

THE COST STACK AT A GLANCE

1. **Both jurisdictions charge per site.** The annual fee is multiplied by the number of distinct iGaming brands the operator runs in each province, not by the corporate entity behind them.
2. **Alberta is 50 percent more expensive per site, plus the application fee.** CAD 150,000 per site per year versus Ontario's CAD 100,000, with an additional CAD 50,000 one-time application fee in year one.
3. **Alberta's effective tax is higher.** A 3 percent deduction from GGR comes off the top (2 percent First Nations + 1 percent social responsibility), then 20 percent of the remaining net is the provincial share, bringing the effective all-in take to about 22.4 percent of GGR. Ontario's effective take is ~20 percent of NGR via the iGO Operating Agreement.
4. **Suppliers pay more, more cleanly, in Alberta.** AGLC's fixed annual supplier-fee tiers (CAD 15k for platform / critical gaming systems providers; CAD 3k for e-wallet, oddsmaker, independent integrity monitor and accredited testing facility categories) are clearer than Ontario's variable supplier-category fees, which tends to favour smaller and mid-market platform providers.

RGS and SRIG: similar tradition, different shape

The two rulebooks share the same standards-based regulatory tradition: a single document of numbered, themed standards that operators must self-attest to at registration and maintain compliance evidence against on an ongoing basis. The organisation, granularity and emphasis differ.

AGCO REGISTRAR'S STANDARDS (RGS)

~196 standards · 6 themes

Themes: **Entity Level, Responsible Gambling, Player Account Management, Game Integrity and Player Awareness, Information Security and Protection of Assets, Minimizing Unlawful Activity.** Outcome-based throughout, with a focus on what the operator must demonstrate rather than how to implement.

AGLC STANDARDS (SRIG)

~335 standards · 4 chapters

Chapters: **Regulatory Oversight, Social Responsibility, General Standards for iGaming Suppliers, Information Technology and Security.** Broader granularity and a tighter focus on the IT-security chapter, which incorporates AGLC's Security Assurance Standards by reference and is more prescriptive on operator and supplier controls.

Despite the headline difference in standards count, the regulatory tradition is shared: both rulebooks operate by self-attestation at registration through a Gap Analysis, with ongoing evidence maintenance and audit. The drafting style differs. AGCO leans toward outcome-based language; AGLC, building on its long-running land-based supervision experience, is more prescriptive in places, especially around information technology and security where the SRIG references AGLC's separate Security Assurance Standards as the binding floor.

The Gap Analysis itself is the most important shared document. In both jurisdictions, the operator declares against every standard whether it is in compliance today, will be in compliance by a stated date, or considers the standard inapplicable to its operation, and provides the documentary basis for each claim. The Gap Analysis becomes the operator's working file for the registration and the reference document for every subsequent audit. Operators that already maintain a clean AGCO Gap Analysis have a substantial head start on Alberta, because most of the source policy work (AML programme, RG framework, technical architecture, key persons) is reusable.

Security certifications. The SRIG hard-codes a concrete IT-security certification timeline that the AGCO RGS does not. Alberta operators must hold a SOC 2 Type 1 attestation at go-live for every named iGaming site, and within two years of going live must hold either a SOC 2 Type 2 attestation or ISO 27001 certification, or an equivalent approved by AGLC. AGCO's Registrar's Standards include robust information-security controls but do not hard-code a specific certification stepping-stone, which leaves Ontario implementation more flexible at the cost of less predictability when an audit arrives. SRIG was published on 13 January 2026, simultaneously with the opening of AGLC registration.

For multi-jurisdictional operators the practical implication is documentation reuse: most of the policy work and most of the system controls satisfy both regimes. The differences cluster around specific operator-side requirements that Alberta has added on top, which the next sections set out.

Two centralised self-exclusion systems, one is older

Both jurisdictions operate centralised, national-for-the-province self-exclusion programmes that operators must integrate with as a condition of registration. Alberta’s programme is older and broader; Ontario’s is newer and online-only.

ONTARIO · BETGUARD

Launched 14 May 2026

iGaming Ontario’s centralised self-exclusion programme. Five-minute setup, real-time API enforcement across all 82 registered Ontario sites, terms from six months to five years, extendable but not cancellable. Online-only at launch. Modelled on Australia’s BetStop.

Mandatory operator integration as of **14 May 2026**

ALBERTA · AGLC SE PROGRAMME

Live for retail; extended to iGaming day one

AGLC’s long-running centralised self-exclusion programme covers casinos and racing entertainment centres and is extended to the iGaming market from day one of the regulated launch. Patrons can elect to exclude from iGaming only, land-based only, or both.

Mandatory operator integration is a launch gate.

Mandatory integration **before** launch on 13 July 2026

RG Check accreditation. AGLC and AiGC have made Responsible Gambling Council accreditation a registration requirement. From February 2026, every Alberta iGaming registrant must complete the RGC’s RG Check assessment. Ontario does not impose RG Check as a mandatory accreditation, though many AGCO-registered operators hold it voluntarily. For operators entering Alberta from Ontario, RG Check is a new programme to plan into the timeline; the assessment takes weeks, not days.

The GameSense connection. AGLC participates in the GameSense responsible-gambling programme that originated with the British Columbia Lottery Corporation in 2009 and is now used by several Canadian provinces. AGCO does not. The practical effect for operators is that Alberta’s player-facing RG resources will carry the GameSense brand and toolset.

Both jurisdictions strict, with a key product divergence

Ontario tightened its iGaming advertising regime on 28 February 2024 to ban active and retired athletes (except for responsible-gambling advocacy) and to restrict celebrities likely to appeal to minors. Alberta is launching with an equivalent restriction in the SRIG and adds a product-level ban that Ontario has not made.

KEY ADVERTISING RULES IN COMMON

1. **Athlete ban.** Both jurisdictions prohibit the use of athletes, active or retired, in iGaming marketing, except where the appearance is exclusively for the purpose of advocating responsible gambling.
2. **Minor-appealing celebrities restricted.** Cartoon figures, social-media influencers and symbols that appeal to minors are restricted in both.
3. **Inducements perimeter.** Bonuses, sign-up offers and credits may not be advertised publicly. Direct marketing to existing players is permitted on both sides, as is on-platform disclosure.
4. **Affiliate responsibility.** The registered operator is accountable for the advertising conduct of its affiliates in both jurisdictions, mirroring the UK and Maltese approach.

Where the two diverge: political event wagering. AGCO permits novelty wagering on political events under its Internet Gaming Standards. AGLC announced in March 2026 that political-event wagering is banned in the Alberta regulated market, a product-level divergence that operators planning to offer Ontario-style novelty markets must address before launch.

FINTRAC on both sides, two reporting-line architectures

AML supervision in both provinces is layered. Both AGCO and AGLC supervise the gaming-specific controls. Neither imposes AML financial penalties directly. The actual AML supervisor for both is FINTRAC, the federal Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada. The reporting line differs in one important way.

Ontario-registered operators are reporting entities under the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act and report directly to [FINTRAC under the seven required compliance-programme components](#). iGaming Ontario does not sit between the operator and FINTRAC.

Alberta's framework includes AiGC in the AML reporting line. AiGC has been positioned as the entity that handles AML reporting on behalf of the operators in the framework, in addition to FINTRAC. The practical effect for operators is an additional reporting cadence to plan for in Alberta and an additional supervisor with visibility of the operator's AML controls, on top of the same federal regime that applies in Ontario.

The substantive AML expectations on the operator side are essentially the same in both jurisdictions because they flow from the federal PCMLTFA, not the provincial framework. Casino operators are reporting entities, must maintain a written compliance programme, appoint a chief AML compliance officer, conduct a documented risk assessment, train staff at scheduled intervals, file large cash transaction reports, file electronic funds transfer reports, file suspicious transaction reports without delay, and undergo an independent effectiveness review every two years. The bar that AGCO and AGLC apply through their respective gaming standards layers on top of that floor, with both regulators paying particular attention to source-of-funds scrutiny on high-spending players and to controls around cash and cash-equivalent payment methods, including cryptocurrency.

Source. Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act; FINTRAC casino guidance; iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48) AiGC mandate; AGLC Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming, Chapter 1 Regulatory Oversight.

The Alberta-specific obligations Ontario operators must add

Most of the operator playbook from Ontario carries over to Alberta. The exceptions are concentrated in five areas where AGLC has chosen to go beyond AGCO. For an operator already running an Ontario book, these are the work items.

FIVE ALBERTA-SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS

1. **Mandatory RG Check accreditation.** Every Alberta registrant must complete the Responsible Gambling Council's RG Check assessment. Plan for the assessment in the registration timeline; this is not a paper formality.
2. **Day-one centralised self-exclusion integration.** No Alberta operator goes live without the AGLC self-exclusion integration in production. The integration must extend to land-based exclusion data, not just online.
3. **Political-event wagering ban.** Novelty markets on political events that are permitted in Ontario must be removed before going live in Alberta.
4. **Security Assurance Standards as a binding floor.** AGLC's separate Security Assurance Standards document is incorporated into the SRIG by reference, raising the IT-security bar above AGCO's outcome-based RGS treatment.
5. **AML reporting to AiGC in addition to FINTRAC.** Build the additional reporting cadence into the AML programme; do not assume Ontario's FINTRAC-only model carries over.

From Ontario-registered to Alberta launch-ready

For an operator already AGCO-registered and live in Ontario, the Alberta entry is not a copy of the original Canadian launch. It is a parallel project with its own timeline, its own counterparty, and its own gating items. The shape that has emerged from pre-launch counsel work is the following.

<p>1</p> <p>Pre-app</p> <p>AGLC iGaming portal account, Alberta entity structure confirmed, RGS-to-SRIG mapping started.</p> <p>MO 0</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AGLC reg</p> <p>Operator application, three-step process: due diligence, compliance, self-exclusion integration.</p> <p>MO 1 - 4</p>	<p>3</p> <p>RG Check</p> <p>RGC RG Check accreditation assessment scheduled and completed; remediations closed.</p> <p>MO 2 - 5</p>	<p>4</p> <p>AiGC deal</p> <p>Operating agreement negotiated, 20% of net revenue plus the 3% off-the-top deductions confirmed, integration plan signed off.</p> <p>MO 3 - 6</p>	<p>5</p> <p>Go live</p> <p>SE integration cut over to production, political-event markets pulled, AML/AiGC reporting line live.</p> <p>MO 6 - 8</p>
--	--	---	--	---

For a deeper look at the day-1 changes an Ontario operator should make, see our companion article [AGLC vs AGCO: what Ontario-licensed operators must change when entering Alberta](#), which covers the integration, marketing and product-side deltas in operational detail.

Looking ahead. Three trajectories will define the next eighteen months for operators working across both jurisdictions. First, the Alberta launch itself: AGLC reported strong interest from over 55 operator sites as of late April 2026, with around nine having paid the full registration fees; the field will narrow as the 13 July gating date approaches and integration cut-overs are stress-tested. Second, the Ontario enforcement curve: the PointsBet Notice of Suspension in February 2026 and the May 2026 actions against Relax Gaming and Arrise Solutions signal that AGCO is now policing both operator conduct and supplier distribution discipline at the same intensity. Third, the precedent effect: every other Canadian province considering a private-operator iGaming market is studying the Ontario and Alberta architectures as templates. The dual-entity blueprint that began in Ontario in 2022 and is taking root in Alberta in 2026 is now the working model for Canadian iGaming federation.

Frequently asked questions

Q. Are AGCO and AGLC the same kind of regulator?

A. Functionally yes. Both are provincial Crown agencies that licence and supervise iGaming alongside other regulated sectors. Both delegate the actual conduct-and-manage role to a subsidiary Crown corporation: iGaming Ontario (iGO) on the Ontario side and the Alberta iGaming Corporation (AiGC) on the Alberta side. The two-track architecture is essentially identical because both regimes rest on the same federal foundation: section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada, which permits a province to conduct and manage a lottery scheme.

Q. Will an AGCO registration carry weight in Alberta?

A. Not automatically. AGLC has signalled that it will give weight to existing Canadian provincial registrations during fit and proper assessment, particularly for operators that have demonstrated good standing in Ontario. But Alberta still requires its own AGLC registration and its own AiGC operating agreement, and operators must complete a Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming Gap Analysis specific to Alberta. Plan for a full Alberta application even when entering from Ontario.

Q. What does it actually cost to enter Alberta versus Ontario?

A. Ontario: CAD 100,000 per site per year to AGCO plus a contractual ~20 percent of net gaming revenue (NGR) to the province via iGO under the Operating Agreement (NGR = GGR minus player winnings and promotional credits). Alberta: CAD 50,000 one-time AGLC application fee plus CAD 150,000 annual registration fee per distinct iGaming site, plus a 3 percent off-the-top deduction from GGR (2 percent First Nations + 1 percent social responsibility) and then 20 percent of net iGaming revenue to the province, for an effective all-in provincial take of roughly 22.4 percent of GGR. Both jurisdictions charge per site, both add the Registrar's recoverable investigation costs. Alberta's per-site annual line is 50 percent higher than Ontario's, and the effective tax on revenue is also higher once the 2 percent and 1 percent allocations are counted.

Q. Is the Alberta SRIG just a renamed copy of the Ontario RGS?

A. No. Both are standards-based rulebooks built on the same regulatory tradition, but they organise differently and Alberta is more granular in places. AGCO's Registrar's Standards run to about 196 standards across six themes. AGLC's Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming run to about 335 standards across four chapters (regulatory oversight, social responsibility, supplier standards, information technology and security). Alberta also imposes operator-side requirements that Ontario does not, including mandatory Responsible Gambling Council (RG Check) accreditation, day-one integration with the centralised AGLC self-exclusion programme, and a ban on political event wagering.

Q. When does Alberta's market actually go live?

A. Monday, 13 July 2026, confirmed by Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Minister Dale Nally and AGLC in early 2026. Operators in the registration pipeline may advertise and sign up prospective customers during the pre-launch window but cannot accept funds or wagers until the launch date and until they are fully integrated with the centralised self-exclusion programme.

Resources & continue reading

WEB AGCO Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming · agco.ca	WEB AGLC Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming (SRIG) · aglc.ca
PDF AGLC Security Assurance Standards · aglc.ca	WEB iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48, March 2025) · open.alberta.ca
WEB AGLC iGaming Application Guide · aglc.ca/igaming	WEB AGCO iGaming Operator Application · agco.ca
WEB Alberta's iGaming Strategy · alberta.ca	REF AGCO + iGaming Ontario cornerstone · agco-registration-requirements/
REF AGCO Standards Explorer (196 standards) · agco/	REF AGLC Standards Explorer (335 standards) · aglc/
REF UKGC vs MGA comparison · ukgc-vs-mga-licence-comparison/	REF Brazil vs Colombia vs Peru comparison · brazil-vs-colombia-vs-peru-gambling-regulation/
REF Jurisdictions atlas · jurisdictions/	TOOL iGaming Tax Calculator · tools/tax-calculator/

Two markets, one compliance backbone

Build the dual-market compliance plan from the source. Explore both rulebooks, compare requirements across regulators, and track every amendment.

Continue reading at gamingcompliance.io/agco-vs-aglc-standards-comparison. For the underlying regulator profiles see agco-registration-requirements/, agco/ and aglc/. For cross-jurisdiction comparisons see [UKGC vs MGA](https://ukgc-vs-mga-licence-comparison/) and [Brazil vs Colombia vs Peru](https://brazil-vs-colombia-vs-peru-gambling-regulation/). To model the dual-market tax position see [/tools/tax-calculator/](https://tools/tax-calculator/). Full atlas at [/jurisdictions/](https://jurisdictions/).

About this report. This comparison was authored by the GamingCompliance.io editorial team from primary sources: section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada, the iGaming Alberta Act (Bill 48, March 2025), the Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Act as amended by Bill 16 (May 2024), the AGCO Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming, the AGLC Standards and Requirements for Internet Gaming (SRIG, published 13 January 2026), the AGLC Security Assurance Standards, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, FINTRAC casino guidance, and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice 2024 ruling upholding the iGaming Ontario conduct-

and-manage model. Current to 28 May 2026. Published 30 May 2026. The PDF mirrors the on-page comparison at gamingcompliance.io/agco-vs-aglc-standards-comparison/ and is free to share with attribution.