

UKGC vs AGCO:

The UK and Ontario
gambling licences
compared, side by side



UNITED KINGDOM
GAMBLING COMMISSION

VS



ONTARIO
ALCOHOL AND GAMING
COMMISSION OF ONTARIO



REGULATORY
FRAMEWORK



LICENSING
MODEL



COMPLIANCE
STANDARDS



ENFORCEMENT
APPROACH



MARKET
ACCESS

GAMINGCOMPLIANCE

COMPLIANT MARKETS. SUSTAINABLE GROWTH.

UKGC vs AGCO at a glance

The UK Gambling Commission runs the most demanding compliance regime in the licensed gambling sector, with point-of-consumption authority over any operator that touches British consumers. The Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario, working alongside iGaming Ontario under section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code, runs the largest regulated internet gaming market in North America under a conduct-and-manage architecture that has no exact parallel anywhere else. They are the two licences English-speaking operators most often hold in parallel. The decision frame changes sharply on **1 April 2026**, when UK Remote Gaming Duty rises from 21% to 40% on remote-gaming profits.

UKGC · UNITED KINGDOM

Direct point-of-consumption licensing; 40% RGD from 1 Apr 2026 + 1.1% statutory levy

Gambling Act 2005 + Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014. Three licence categories: Operating + PML + PFL. LCCP + RTS rulebooks span thousands of binding conditions. GGY-banded annual fee from £4.2k to £793k+. UKGC is itself the AML supervisor under MLR 2017; NCA receives SARs. Target time to grant: ~16 weeks.

AGCO + IGO · ONTARIO

Conduct-and-manage architecture; flat CAD \$100k + ~20% NGR share (contractual, not tax)

Gaming Control Act 1992 + Criminal Code s. 207(1)(a). Single Internet Gaming Registration + iGO Operator Agreement for B2C. Registrar's Standards: ~200 standards across 6 risk themes. Flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year. FINTRAC supervises AML; AGCO operates overlay through RSIG. Target time to grant: ~6 to 9 months for B2C.

Eight discriminating dimensions

Dimension	UKGC · United Kingdom	AGCO + iGO · Ontario
Regulator	UK Gambling Commission · est. Gambling Act 2005; remote regime operational 2007	AGCO · est. 23 Feb 1998; iGaming Ontario incorporated Jul 2021; market live 4 Apr 2022
Framework statute	Gambling Act 2005 + Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014	Gaming Control Act 1992 + Criminal Code of Canada s. 207(1)(a) (federal)
Licence shape	Operating licence + Personal Management Licence + Personal Functional Licence	Internet Gaming Registration (operator / supplier / trade person) + iGO Operator Agreement for B2C
Jurisdictional reach	Point of consumption — any operator transacting with British consumers	Ontario residents — players physically located in Ontario at time of bet
Headline duty / revenue charge	40% Remote Gaming Duty on remote-gaming profits with UK persons from 1 Apr 2026 (was 21%) + 1.1% statutory levy on online GGY	~20% NGR revenue share to iGO under operating agreement (contractual, not a tax)
Base annual licence fee	GGY-banded £4.2k → £793k+; > £1bn GGY adds £125k per £500m	Flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year
AML supervisor	UKGC itself under MLR 2017; HMRC for duty lines; NCA receives SARs	FINTRAC (federal) under PCMLTFA; AGCO operates overlay through Registrar's Standards
Standards shape	LCCP + RTS — thousands of binding conditions across general, SR, technical, AML, advertising and funds protection	~200 Registrar's Standards across 6 risk themes (RG, integrity, AML, infosec, advertising, operational)

VERDICT · WHICH LICENCE TO PICK IF...

Rarely winner-take-all — the largest English-speaking operators hold both

Pick UKGC if British consumers are the priority: a UKGC operating licence is the only route under the 2014 point-of-consumption test, the brand sits inside the world's most demanding licensed gambling regime, and the 40% RGD economics from 1 Apr 2026 plus the 1.1% statutory levy are absorbed in exchange for access to a deep, mature market. **Pick AGCO if** Ontario consumers are the priority: the flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year stack plus the ~20% NGR revenue share (with no separate provincial gaming tax) is preferable to the UK's GGY-banded fee plus 40% RGD plus 1.1% levy at scale, and the Registrar's Standards model gives more operational design latitude than the LCCP-plus-RTS perimeter. **Hold both** if the operator is a brand-name English-speaking group: the two licences address different markets that cannot be served from the other authorisation; heavier compliance machinery, wider market-access surface.

Table of contents

01	Two operating theories	Direct point-of-consumption licensing against the conduct-and-manage model
<hr/>		
02	Statutory foundations	Constitutional and statutory architecture on each side
<hr/>		
03	Licence architecture	Three UK licence categories against one Ontario registration + iGO agreement
<hr/>		
04	Fees and cost stack	GGY-banded UK fee + 40% RGD against flat CAD \$100k + ~20% revenue share
<hr/>		
05	Tax architecture	Direct excise model against the no-gaming-tax revenue-share model
<hr/>		
06	Standards depth and shape	LCCP + RTS depth against the focused Registrar's Standards
<hr/>		
07	AML supervision	UKGC as the sector supervisor against FINTRAC + AGCO as overlay
<hr/>		
08	Player protection	GAMSTOP + LCCP against BetGuard + RG Check
<hr/>		
09	Enforcement	Published per-case ledger against quieter consistent supervision
<hr/>		
10	Migration playbook	Moving in either direction: what the operation actually involves
<hr/>		
11	The verdict	Which licence for which operator
<hr/>		
12	Frequently asked questions	Twelve Q&A pairs on the operator decision frame
<hr/>		
13	Resources & primary sources	16 cited references · continue reading

40% vs **~20%**

HEADLINE CHARGE ON REVENUE

UK RGD (statutory) from 1 Apr 2026 vs Ontario iGO revenue share (contractual)

GGY band vs **\$100k**

ANNUAL LICENCE FEE

UKGC £4.2k → £793k+ by GGY band vs flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year at AGCO

2007 vs **4 Apr 2022**

MARKET LIVE

UKGC remote regime operational from 2007; Ontario regulated market opened 4 Apr 2022

LCCP+RTS vs **~200**

STANDARDS SHAPE

UK two-rulebook depth vs ~200 Registrar's Standards across 6 risk themes

Direct point-of-consumption licensing against the conduct-and-manage model

The UK Gambling Commission and the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario are the two regulators English-speaking operators most often hold in parallel. They reach the same destination — demanding, standards-based supervision of a mature regulated market — from opposite starting points. The UKGC licenses operators directly under the Gambling Act 2005 and the Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014; any operator that transacts with a British consumer must hold a Commission operating licence regardless of where the business sits. The AGCO regulates operators under the Gaming Control Act 1992 and the Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming, but the legal authority that lets a private operator participate at all comes from [iGaming Ontario](#), a subsidiary corporation of the AGCO that signs an operating agreement with each registered operator under section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

The choice for an operator is direct-licensing-with-tax-burden against commercial-counterparty-with-revenue-share. A UKGC operator holds a single operating licence that authorises specified gambling activities, pays a GGY-banded annual fee plus the 1.1 percent statutory levy plus Remote Gaming Duty on casino profits, and is supervised directly by the Commission across the full LCCP and RTS rulebook. An Ontario operator holds an AGCO registration that confirms fit-and-proper status plus an iGaming Ontario operating agreement that places it inside the conduct-and-manage framework; it pays a flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year to the AGCO and remits approximately 20 percent of Net Gaming Revenue to iGO under the operating agreement, with no separate provincial gaming tax layered on top.

The two regulators are not in competition for the same operators. A UKGC licence is the only route to British consumers under the 2014 point-of-consumption test; an AGCO registration plus iGO operating agreement is the only route to Ontario consumers under the conduct-and-manage architecture. Many of the largest operators carry both because they want both. For the regulator profiles in full, see the [UKGC cornerstone](#) and the [AGCO + iGO cornerstone](#).

The Ontario solution is constitutional, not commercial. Section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code permits a province to conduct and manage lottery schemes; iGaming Ontario is the conducting entity through commercial agreements with private operators. The model was tested in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in 2024 and survived.

Editorial · drawn from the Criminal Code of Canada s. 207(1)(a) and the 2024 Ontario Superior Court of Justice ruling

Source. [Gambling Act 2005](#); Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014; [Gaming Control Act, 1992 \(Ontario\)](#); Criminal Code of Canada s. 207(1)(a); [UK Gambling Commission](#); [AGCO history](#).

The constitutional and statutory architecture on each side

Both regimes rest on a layered legal architecture: a primary statute, a secondary rulebook, a supervisory authority and a fiscal instrument. The UK regime is direct and unitary; the Ontario regime is split between the regulator (AGCO), the conducting entity (iGO) and the federal criminal-law authority that makes the whole structure possible.

Milestone	Date	Effect
Ontario · Criminal Code s. 207(1)(a)	1985 (consolidated)	Federal Criminal Code provision permitting a province to conduct and manage lottery schemes — the constitutional basis for every provincial iGaming framework
Ontario · Gaming Control Act	1992	Provincial statute that became the legislative foundation for Ontario gaming registration and, eventually, the Registrar's Standards model
Ontario · AGCO established	23 Feb 1998	Crown regulatory agency created by merging the Liquor Licence Board, the Racing Commission and the Gaming Control Commission
UK · Gambling Act 2005	7 Apr 2005	Primary statute consolidating gambling law for Great Britain; established the Gambling Commission and the three licensing objectives
UK · remote regime operational	2007	UKGC assumes full regulatory function; remote operating licences begin issuing
UK · Licensing and Advertising Act	2014	Establishes point-of-consumption authority: any operator transacting with British consumers needs a UKGC licence regardless of where it is based
Ontario · Bill C-218 (single-event sports)	Aug 2021	Federal Criminal Code amendment permitting single-event sports betting; foundational for modern provincial iGaming frameworks
Ontario · iGaming Ontario incorporated	Jul 2021	AGCO incorporates iGO as the conducting entity under section 207(1)(a); board appointed by AGCO
Ontario · regulated market opens	4 Apr 2022	First regulated private-operator iGaming market in North America goes live; operators migrate from offshore grey market and the OLG monopoly
UK · statutory levy in force	6 Apr 2025	1.1 percent of online GGY mandatory levy commences under the Gambling Levy Regulations 2025 , replacing voluntary contributions
UK · LCCP current edition	6 Apr 2026	Current LCCP edition takes effect; references updated to the Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act 2024
UK · Remote Gaming Duty hike	1 Apr 2026	RGD rises from 21 percent to 40 percent on a gaming provider's profits from remote gaming with UK persons (Excise Notice 455a); Bingo Duty abolished

The UK architecture is unitary: Parliament passes the Gambling Act 2005, the Commission issues licences and the LCCP, HMRC administers RGD and the statutory levy, the National Crime Agency receives the criminal-law

output. One regulator runs the supervisory line, one statute anchors the authority, one revenue body collects the duty. The Ontario architecture is layered: federal criminal law (section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code) creates the constitutional space; provincial statute (the Gaming Control Act 1992) gives AGCO its regulatory authority; AGCO incorporates iGaming Ontario as the conducting entity; iGO signs the operating agreement with each operator. The Ontario Superior Court of Justice tested and upheld the architecture in 2024, giving the model constitutional cover for further build-out and providing the template that [Alberta is now using for its 13 July 2026 launch](#).

Three UK licence categories against one Ontario registration plus an iGO agreement

The UKGC issues three categories of licence covering operating businesses, individual management roles and individual operational functions, with remote operators applying for the activities they intend to offer. Ontario uses a single Internet Gaming Registration instrument from the AGCO, paired with the iGaming Ontario Operator Agreement that places the operator inside the conduct-and-manage framework. The structural difference is that an Ontario operator needs both authorisations — the registration and the agreement — before accepting a single Ontario wager.

UK · OP	Operating licence. Authorises the business to provide gambling. Remote operators apply for the activities they intend to offer (remote casino, remote betting, remote bingo). Software suppliers and white label providers hold their own operating licences. The activity scope defines exactly what the business may do; operating outside that scope is itself a breach.
UK · PML	Personal Management Licence. Required for individuals in specified management positions: overall management, financial affairs, regulatory compliance, marketing, gambling and IT functions. PML holders carry personal accountability and are assessed by the Commission for competence and integrity. GBP 1,234 per person per role.
UK · PFL	Personal Functional Licence. Required for individuals performing operational functions in land-based premises. Remote-only operators generally do not need PFLs.
ON · AGCO	Internet Gaming Registration. Single instrument covering an operator (or supplier, or trade person). Confirms fit-and-proper status, binds the entity to the Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming, runs against officers, directors and significant owners. The three categories are operator (B2C), supplier (B2B) and trade person (individual).
ON · iGO	iGaming Ontario Operator Agreement. Commercial contract between iGO and the registered B2C operator setting out the ~20 percent NGR revenue share, integration requirements, BetGuard integration scope, and the conduct-and-manage framework under Criminal Code s. 207(1)(a). Required for B2C only; suppliers do not contract with iGO directly.

Architecture line	UKGC · United Kingdom	AGCO · Ontario (+ iGO)
Licence categories	Three: Operating licence + Personal Management Licence + Personal Functional Licence	Three AGCO registration categories: operator (B2C) + supplier (B2B) + trade person; plus the iGO operating agreement for B2C only
Activity-type subdivision	Remote casino, remote betting, remote bingo — one operating licence can cover multiple activities	Single Internet Gaming Registration covers all verticals; the iGO agreement and technical certification set the product scope
Personal licensing	PMLs required for accountable individuals; personal accountability and personal enforcement risk	No separate personal licence; officers, directors and significant owners assessed as part of the operator fit-and-proper review
Target time to grant	Approximately 16 weeks for a clean operating licence application	Approximately 6 to 9 months for a clean B2C operator application across AGCO + iGO tracks
Process structure	Single five-stage assessment: scope, policies, funding, PMLs, go-live	Parallel five-stage assessment: scope, AGCO registration, iGO agreement, technical audit, go-live
Commercial counterparty	None — the Commission is the regulator only; no commercial relationship	iGaming Ontario is the operator's commercial counterparty under the operating agreement

The structural point for the operator is that the UKGC matrix asks the licensee to declare its activity perimeter (remote casino, remote betting, remote bingo) on a single operating licence and then maintain personal licences for the accountable individuals; the AGCO matrix asks the licensee to obtain a single registration covering all verticals and then sign a commercial agreement with iGO that defines the conduct-and-manage relationship and the ~20 percent NGR share. The UK regime concentrates personal accountability through PMLs in a way Ontario's officer-and-director assessment does not equally emphasise — consequential when enforcement starts asking who knew what when. The Ontario regime introduces a commercial counterparty (iGO) the UK regime does not have, which makes the operator's legal posture in Ontario partly contractual rather than purely regulatory.

The cost line: GGY-banded UK fee + 40% RGD against flat CAD \$100k + ~20% revenue share

The UKGC stack pairs a GGY-banded annual licence fee with a 1.1 percent statutory levy on online GGY and the 40 percent Remote Gaming Duty on casino profits from 1 April 2026. The AGCO stack pairs a flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year regulatory fee with the ~20 percent NGR revenue share to iGaming Ontario under the operating agreement. For a meaningful UK casino book the UK stack is materially heavier per pound of revenue, especially from 1 April 2026; for a meaningful Ontario book the cost line is flat at the regulatory level and proportional at the revenue line, with no separate provincial gaming tax layered on top.

Cost line	UKGC · United Kingdom	AGCO + iGO · Ontario
Application fee	Set by fee category — £4.2k → £91.7k by projected GGY band	CAD \$100,000 at application (per the AGCO Internet Gaming Fees schedule)
Annual licence / registration fee	£4.2k → £793k+ by GGY band (remote casino); operators > £1bn GGY pay £125k per added £500m	CAD \$100,000 per site per year flat — the entire AGCO recurring charge
PML / key-person charges	£1,234 per PML per person per role; recurring across senior management	No separate per-person fee; fit-and-proper covered inside the operator registration
Statutory levy / sector charge	1.1% of online GGY statutory levy under the Gambling Levy Regulations 2025, in force from 6 Apr 2025; uncapped	No separate statutory levy at the provincial level
Headline duty / revenue charge	40% Remote Gaming Duty on profits from remote gaming with UK persons from 1 Apr 2026 (was 21%); 15% General Betting Duty on remote sports, rising to 25% from 1 Apr 2027 (UK horseracing stays at 15%); Bingo Duty abolished 1 Apr 2026	~20% of NGR revenue share to iGaming Ontario under the operating agreement (commercial, not a tax); calculated on GGR less player winnings less promotional credits; remitted monthly
Separate provincial / national gaming tax	None additional — RGD and General Betting Duty are the gaming taxes	None separate — the ~20% iGO share is the province's economic mechanism
Investigation cost recovery	No explicit cost-recovery line	Registrar may recover reasonable costs of any investigation; variable line
Effective cap on revenue charges	None — RGD, levy and General Betting Duty all scale with revenue	None at the contractual line — ~20% NGR scales with performance; AGCO registration line is flat
Practical implication at scale	Materially heavier per pound of casino GGY from 1 Apr 2026	Materially lighter on the regulatory and per-revenue lines

EFFECTIVE-BURDEN MODELLING FOR A HYPOTHETICAL MID-SIZE OPERATOR

- 1. UK · £10M GGY remote casino operator.** UKGC annual fee in the mid-six-figure band (driven by GGY); 1.1 percent statutory levy on £10M = £110,000; 40 percent RGD on the casino-profits base from 1 Apr 2026 (the dominant cost line). Headline regulatory and excise stack: **roughly 41–44 percent of profits** once RGD and the levy are accounted for, before corporation tax. Pre 1 Apr 2026 the same operator was paying RGD at 21 percent — the duty doubling is the single largest unit-economics shift of the decade for UK casino operators.
- 2. Ontario · CAD \$25M NGR operator (single site).** AGCO registration CAD \$100,000 flat; ~20 percent NGR revenue share to iGO = approximately CAD \$5,000,000 remitted monthly. Total regulatory and contractual stack: **approximately 20.4 percent of NGR**, with no provincial gaming tax bolted on. Multi-site operators pay multiples of the CAD \$100,000 fee; single-brand operators have a flat regulatory line and a proportional iGO line.
- 3. Normalised to USD for headline comparison.** A UK £10M GGY casino operator at current FX hits an effective regulatory-and-duty burden on USD-equivalent revenue that exceeds the Ontario CAD \$25M NGR operator's equivalent by a meaningful margin, even before PML budgets and the additional General Betting Duty exposure for any sports activity. The Ontario regime is the lower-cost regime per dollar of revenue, before counting the brand-and-market-access trade-offs covered in section 11.
- 4. Caveats.** The UK RGD base is profits from remote gaming with UK persons (bonuses and freeplays not deductible; [Excise Notice 455a](#) treats a used freeplay as a notional gaming payment). The Ontario iGO base is NGR (GGR less player winnings less promotional credits). The two bases are calculated differently; modelling should never compare a single percentage on different bases without normalising for promotional deductibility.

Two caveats on the modelling. First, UKGC annual fees are set by GGY band and rise into six figures for the largest remote operators; operators above £1 billion GGY pay an extra £125,000 per added £500 million of GGY above the threshold. There is no single "UK annual fee" figure that maps onto Ontario's flat CAD \$100,000; the cost stack of a comparable UK operator is the sum of the GGY-banded fee plus the levy plus RGD. Second, the Ontario ~20 percent revenue share is a contractual commercial arrangement with iGaming Ontario, not a statutory tax; it is structured as the province's economic mechanism under the conduct-and-manage architecture and there is no additional provincial GGR tax layered on top.

Source. [UKGC Fees we charge](#); [Gambling Duty Changes \(HM Treasury / HMRC\)](#); HMRC Excise Notice 455a; [Gambling Levy Regulations 2025](#); [AGCO Internet Gaming Fees](#); [iGaming Ontario Market Performance Report](#).

Direct excise model against the no-gaming-tax revenue-share model

The two regimes diverge sharply on tax design. The UK runs a direct excise architecture: HMRC administers Remote Gaming Duty on a gaming provider’s profits from remote gaming with UK persons, with the 1.1 percent statutory levy on online GGY layered on top. Ontario runs a no-gaming-tax architecture: the province takes its share through the iGaming Ontario revenue-share contract under the conduct-and-manage framework, not through a statutory tax. The two models share a feature — both impose a meaningful charge on operator revenue — but they reach that point through different legal instruments with different consequences.

Tax line	UKGC · United Kingdom	AGCO + iGO · Ontario
Gaming tax on operator revenue	40% Remote Gaming Duty on profits from remote gaming with UK persons from 1 Apr 2026 (was 21%); place-of-consumption regime regardless of operator location	None separate — the ~20% NGR share to iGO is a contractual commercial arrangement, not a tax
Sports betting	15% General Betting Duty until 31 Mar 2027; 25% remote betting rate from 1 Apr 2027 (UK horseracing stays at 15%)	No separate sports betting tax; the same ~20% NGR share applies across all verticals under the iGO agreement
Statutory funding charge	1.1% statutory levy on online GGY (Gambling Levy Regulations 2025) since 6 Apr 2025; remitted to research, prevention and treatment bodies	No separate statutory funding charge
Bingo duty	Abolished 1 Apr 2026	No separate bingo duty — revenue share applies
Corporate income tax	UK CT applies on operator profits; OECD Pillar Two top-up for in-scope multinational groups from 31 Dec 2023	Federal + Ontario combined CT applies on operator profits; OECD Pillar Two top-up for in-scope multinational groups from 31 Dec 2023
OECD Pillar Two	Applies to in-scope multinational groups (consolidated revenue ≥ EUR 750m) on GloBE basis	Applies to in-scope multinational groups (consolidated revenue ≥ EUR 750m) on GloBE basis
Revenue collection authority	HMRC for RGD and General Betting Duty; UKGC collects the statutory levy	iGaming Ontario collects the revenue share under the operating agreement; AGCO collects the registration fee

The economics are straightforward in concept and different in mechanism. A UK-licensed online casino operator pays RGD to HMRC at 40 percent of profits from remote gaming with UK persons, the 1.1 percent levy on online GGY to the UKGC, and corporation tax on the residual profit. An Ontario-registered operator pays the AGCO registration fee, remits the ~20 percent NGR revenue share to iGaming Ontario under the operating agreement, and pays federal-plus-Ontario corporation tax on the residual profit. The UK base is “profits from remote gaming” with bonuses and freeplays not deductible (HMRC Excise Notice 455a explicitly states that a used

freeplay is treated as a notional gaming payment); the Ontario base is “Net Gaming Revenue” with player winnings and promotional credits deducted. Comparing the two as bare percentages without normalising for the deductibility difference is the most common modelling error operators make when scoping market entry.

Pillar Two consequences on both sides. For in-scope multinational groups (consolidated revenue at or above EUR 750 million) the OECD Pillar Two 15 percent global minimum tax applies through Income Inclusion Rule and Under-Taxed Payments Rule mechanics. UK and Canadian operating subsidiaries of in-scope groups are exposed to top-up tax to the extent the local jurisdictional effective tax rate falls below 15 percent. The Ontario subsidiary’s effective rate is shaped by the deductibility (for corporation tax purposes) of the iGO revenue share; the UK subsidiary’s effective rate is shaped by the deductibility (for corporation tax purposes) of RGD and the statutory levy. Pillar Two modelling is unavoidable for the largest groups under either regime.

LCCP plus RTS depth against the focused Registrar's Standards

Both regulators publish standards-based rulebooks that operators self-attest to at registration and maintain compliance evidence against on an ongoing basis. The rulebooks differ in drafting style, in what they cover, and most importantly in depth. The UKGC writes specific product limits into the rule; the AGCO writes outcome-based standards across six risk themes and leaves operational design to the operator.

UKGC · LCCP + RTS

Two consolidated rulebooks, very deep

The [Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice](#) combines binding licence conditions, mandatory Social Responsibility Code provisions, and ordinary code provisions that carry evidential weight in any review (current edition: 6 Apr 2026). The [Remote Technical Standards](#) govern game integrity, RNG, customer interaction and player-protection technical controls. Together they run to thousands of individual binding requirements covering general conditions, social responsibility, technical standards, customer interaction, advertising, AML and customer funds protection.

Open: gamingcompliance.io/ukgc/licence-conditions-and-codes-of-practice/

AGCO · REGISTRAR'S STANDARDS FOR INTERNET GAMING

~200 standards across six risk themes

The [Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming](#) organise close to 200 individual standards into six risk themes: responsible gambling, game integrity, anti money laundering, information security, advertising and marketing, and operational integrity. The drafting style is outcome-based: the standard sets the required outcome and the operator demonstrates the control. RG Check accreditation operates as a separate operational gate alongside the standards themselves.

Open: gamingcompliance.io/jurisdictions/agco/

The drafting style matters in practice. The UKGC writes specific product limits directly into the rule: a slot must have a minimum spin speed; autoplay is prohibited; reverse withdrawal is not permitted; online slots are capped at £5 per spin for adults aged 25 and over and £2 per spin for 18 to 24 year olds. The AGCO writes the outcome (player protection, game integrity, responsible gambling) and tests operator design against it through the Registrar's Standards plus RG Check accreditation plus pre-launch technical certification by an AGCO-approved testing laboratory. The trade-off is depth against focus: a UKGC-licensed operator knows exactly which features are banned and operates inside the perimeter; an AGCO-registered operator has more product latitude and more responsibility to evidence the controls. The 91.1 percent channelisation rate in the April 2025 Ipsos study, up from roughly 30 percent pre-launch, suggests the Ontario approach has reached enforcement maturity faster than the lighter-touch supervision-of-design model would predict on first principles.

UKGC as the sector supervisor against FINTRAC plus AGCO as overlay

The single biggest AML architectural difference between the two regimes is who actually supervises the operator. In the UK the gambling regulator is itself the AML supervisor; in Canada the federal financial intelligence unit (FINTRAC) is the AML supervisor under PCMLTFA and the AGCO operates an overlay supervisory programme through the Registrar’s Standards. Both regimes require an MLRO designation; the reporting line and the sanctioning authority differ materially.

UKGC · TRIPARTITE UK MODEL

UKGC is the gambling-sector AML supervisor

Remote casino operators are relevant persons under the Money Laundering Regulations 2017 and are bound by the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. The UKGC is the **AML supervisor for the British gambling sector** under MLR 2017; HMRC administers the gaming tax and excise lines; the National Crime Agency receives the criminal-law output (Suspicious Activity Reports through the SAR regime). Licence condition 12.1.1 requires a money laundering and terrorist financing risk assessment with proportionate controls. AML financial penalties are issued by the Commission itself, often combined with social-responsibility findings.

Recent enforcement theme: source-of-funds scrutiny on high-spending players; the AML thread runs through every major UKGC settlement

AGCO · FINTRAC OVERLAY MODEL

FINTRAC supervises; AGCO operates overlay

Ontario operators are reporting entities under the federal [Proceeds of Crime \(Money Laundering\) and Terrorist Financing Act](#) and report directly to FINTRAC. The AGCO is the **gambling-sector AML overlay supervisor** through the Registrar’s Standards but does not itself impose AML financial penalties; the federal-AML penalty authority sits with FINTRAC. iGO is the operator’s commercial counterparty under the operating agreement and receives transaction data through the integration but does not exercise AML sanctioning authority. The seven required FINTRAC compliance-programme components apply in full.

Recent enforcement theme: AGCO escalation around AML programme readiness during fit-and-proper review and ongoing supervision

Why the split matters for an operator. A UKGC licensee that fails its AML programme faces a single combined enforcement action from the Commission across SR and AML lines. An Ontario operator that fails its AML programme can face an AGCO action on the gaming-conduct standards and a separate FINTRAC action on the federal AML programme, with two penalty notices to manage and two supervisors to brief. The MLRO function is required on both sides, but a group operating in both jurisdictions runs two parallel MLRO programmes and two parallel reporting lines (NCA in the UK, FINTRAC in Canada); the AML programme cannot be unified across regimes because the statutory reporting standards differ.

GAMSTOP and LCCP against BetGuard and RG Check

Both regulators require operators to verify identity and age, to offer responsible-gambling tools and to handle self-exclusion. The UK uses a national mandatory self-exclusion register (GAMSTOP) and writes specific product limits into the LCCP and the RTS. Ontario uses a centralised provincial self-exclusion register (BetGuard, launched 14 May 2026), the RG Check accreditation requirement as an operational gate, and the player-protection block within the Registrar's Standards.

UKGC · GAMSTOP + LCCP SR

National scheme, regulator-set thresholds

Mandatory participation in **GAMSTOP**, the national online self-exclusion scheme. From 30 Aug 2024, light-touch financial vulnerability checks trigger at a net loss of **£500 in any 30 day period**; the threshold dropped to **£150** on 28 Feb 2025. SR Code 3.4.1 on customer interaction requires licensees to monitor for indicators of harm and to act on them, not merely to record them. Recording risk indicators without acting is itself a failure.

Slot caps: £5 / spin age 25+, £2 / spin age 18–24 (since Apr/May 2025)

AGCO · BETGUARD + RG CHECK + RSIG

Centralised SE register + accreditation gate

BetGuard, the iGaming Ontario centralised self-exclusion programme, launched 14 May 2026. A player completes the BetGuard process once and is excluded from all 82 registered Ontario sites in real time through API integrations; terms run from six months to five years, extendable but not cancellable. [RG Check](#) accreditation operates as a separate operational gate alongside the Registrar's Standards 2.x player-protection block.





Slot caps: none imposed at the regulator level; RGS-driven operator design within the Standards

Structural difference: the UKGC writes the specific player-protection limits into the rule, with hard product caps (slot stakes, autoplay prohibition, minimum spin speed, win-presentation features) and frictionless vulnerability checks at low net-loss thresholds. The AGCO relies on operator design within the Registrar's Standards plus the BetGuard centralised SE register plus RG Check accreditation as a separate operational requirement. Both regimes treat the existence of an RG policy as insufficient by itself: the UKGC enforces against outcomes (documented procedure that is not applied in practice attracts the same penalty as no procedure at all); the AGCO enforces against the Registrar's Standards-set outcomes and uses the public Notice of Proposed Order mechanism to surface non-compliance.






Published per-case ledger against quieter consistent supervision

The UKGC publishes the most detailed enforcement record in the licensed gambling sector and concentrates fewer but very large penalties. The AGCO publishes Notices of Proposed Order and Orders of Monetary Penalty with comparable per-case detail but at lower quantum reflecting the younger market and the conduct-and-manage architecture. Both treat AML failure and customer-interaction failure as the heaviest enforcement themes; the AGCO additionally treats sport integrity reporting failure as the highest-risk supervisory theme of the live market era.

UKGC SELECTED LANDMARK PENALTIES

William Hill group WHG, Mr Green & WH Org · 2023 · SR + AML		£19.2 m
Entain (LC International) Ladbrokes & Coral · 2022 · SR + AML		£17.0 m
888 VIP and AML control failures · 2022		£9.4 m
Paddy Power Betfair Customer interaction · Dec 2025		£2.0 m

AGCO SELECTED ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

PointsBet Canada 5-day registration suspension · Feb 2026 · Jontay Porter NBA bets, failure to report		Suspension
FanDuel Canada Jan 2025 · Czech table tennis sport-integrity reporting failure		CAD \$350 k
BetMGM Canada Mar 2025 · Cash inducements at trade show and via affiliate		CAD \$110 k
Relax Gaming & Arrise Solutions May 2026 · Registered B2B suppliers whose games appeared on unregulated sites		CAD \$40 k x 2
NorthStar Gaming Oct 2024 · Site accessible outside Ontario (geo-fencing failure)		CAD \$30 k

The UKGC ledger is the most detailed in the sector: full regulatory action notices, settlement amounts, named operators, conduct findings, and the underlying SR or AML failure trace. The William Hill case in 2023 (a customer was able to open an account and spend tens of thousands within minutes without checks, alongside AML gaps that let large deposits pass without source-of-funds scrutiny) remains the per-case record. Almost every major UKGC penalty cites both SR and AML failures combined; the Commission has signalled willingness to consider licence suspension but has typically settled with financial penalties instead.

The AGCO ledger is quieter but consistently enforced. The February 2026 PointsBet five-day registration suspension was the first iGaming registration suspension in the regulated market era and signalled that AGCO

will treat a failure to report on the operator side as more serious than the underlying betting activity itself. The FanDuel CAD 350,000 penalty in January 2025 established the financial reference point for sport-integrity reporting failure; the BetMGM CAD 110,000 in March 2025 set the reference for advertising-rule breaches; the May 2026 action against Relax Gaming and Arrise Solutions opened a third theme of supplier-side enforcement when registered B2B suppliers' games appeared on unregulated sites accessible to Ontario players. The pattern: smaller per-case quantum than the UKGC, comparable detail in publication, and the supervisory toolkit extends to registration suspension as well as monetary penalty.

Source. UKGC regulatory action notices: William Hill (2023), Entain (2022), 888 (2022), Paddy Power Betfair (Dec 2025); [AGCO Public Interest Decisions](#) including [PointsBet](#) (Feb 2026), [FanDuel](#) (Jan 2025), [BetMGM](#) (Mar 2025), [Relax Gaming & Arrise Solutions](#) (May 2026) and NorthStar (Oct 2024).

Moving in either direction: what the operation actually involves

The two migration paths are asymmetric. A UKGC-licensed operator entering Ontario has to build a provincial corporate presence, navigate the conduct-and-manage architecture, secure RG Check accreditation and register with FINTRAC under federal law. An Ontario-registered operator entering the UK has to undertake a fresh UKGC operating-licence application (16 weeks target), put personal management licences on accountable individuals, build LCCP compliance from the ground up, register with HMRC for RGD and integrate with GAMSTOP and the statutory levy.

UK → ONTARIO MIGRATION

1. **Corporate restructure.** Establish (or use) an Ontario corporation as the AGCO-registered entity and as the iGO operating-agreement counterparty. Map the beneficial-ownership chain to AGCO fit-and-proper expectations; officers, directors and significant owners are assessed against integrity, financial and competence criteria. A UKGC PML does not automatically translate; Ontario assesses the people through the operator registration, not through a separate personal licence.
2. **AGCO Internet Gaming Registration.** CAD \$100,000 application fee, Registrar's Standards Gap Analysis prepared against the ~200 standards, fit-and-proper review of officers, directors and significant owners, financial verification. Plan 6 to 9 months for a clean application.
3. **iGaming Ontario operating agreement.** Commercial counterparty negotiation: ~20 percent NGR revenue share, integration plan, BetGuard centralised self-exclusion integration scope, sport-integrity reporting cadence. The iGO agreement runs in parallel with the AGCO registration track.
4. **Technical certification.** Pre-launch assessment by an AGCO-approved testing laboratory against the Registrar's Standards. The technical platform must be certified before the iGO agreement activates and the CAD \$100,000 per site per year annual fee triggers.
5. **RG Check accreditation.** Operational gate separate from the Registrar's Standards; accreditation by the Responsible Gambling Council against the RG Check standards is expected of Ontario-facing operators.
6. **FINTRAC enrolment.** Register as a reporting entity under the federal PCMLTFA; build a federal AML programme around the seven required FINTRAC compliance-programme components. The UK MLR 2017 programme is a starting point but the reporting line, the suspicious-transaction standard and the supervisor change completely.
7. **Advertising recalibration.** Ontario advertising rules tightened materially on 28 Feb 2024: no active or retired athletes in iGaming advertising (except for RG advocacy), no celebrities with minor appeal, no public advertising of inducements or bonuses outside direct marketing to existing players. UK marketing playbooks must be reviewed line by line against the AGCO standards.

1. **UKGC operating licence application.** Fresh application through the iAGCO-equivalent UKGC online licensing portal; target 16 weeks for a clean file; complex ownership, weak documentation or outstanding PML checks extend the timeline. The application fee is set by fee category from £4,200 to £91,700 by projected GGY.
2. **Personal Management Licences for key individuals.** Each accountable individual occupying a specified management position (overall management, financial affairs, regulatory compliance, marketing, gambling and IT functions) must apply for and hold a PML. GBP 1,234 per person per role, approximately 8 weeks processing. PMLs introduce personal accountability that the Ontario fit-and-proper review does not equally emphasise.
3. **LCCP compliance build-out.** The LCCP plus RTS are materially deeper than the Registrar's Standards; operators migrating into the UK must build out policies and operational procedures against the full rulebook. Particular attention to SR Code 3.4.1 on customer interaction, LC 12.1.1 on AML risk assessment, LC 17 on identity and age verification, LC 4 on customer funds protection.
4. **HMRC Remote Gaming Duty registration.** Register with HMRC for RGD; build the duty-calculation engine against the "profits from remote gaming with UK persons" base, with bonuses and freeplays treated as notional gaming payments per Excise Notice 455a. Plan 40 percent of casino profits as the headline duty line from 1 Apr 2026.
5. **GAMSTOP integration.** Mandatory participation in the national online self-exclusion scheme; build the API integration before launch. The Ontario BetGuard integration is the closest analogue but the standards differ and the registers are separate.
6. **Statutory levy enrolment.** Register for the 1.1 percent statutory levy on online GGY under the Gambling Levy Regulations 2025; the UKGC collects on behalf of government and remits to research, prevention and treatment bodies.
7. **Product reconfiguration.** UK-specific product limits (slot stake caps at £5 / £2, autoplay prohibition, minimum spin speed, no reverse withdrawal, no win-presentation features) require a UK build of the platform that may differ from the Ontario configuration. Multi-jurisdictional operators typically run a UK build and a non-UK build with different feature sets.

Which licence for which operator

The UKGC vs AGCO decision is rarely a winner-take-all. It is a market-and-cost-stack decision driven by which players the operator intends to serve, how much regulatory depth the brand wants to operate inside, and how the post 1 April 2026 UK economics compare against the Ontario revenue-share model. The dual-licence pattern is common among the largest English-speaking groups precisely because the two licences address different markets that cannot be served from the other authorisation.

PICK UKGC IF...

British consumers are the priority

The book is British-facing and a UKGC operating licence is the only route under the 2014 point-of-consumption test. The brand sits inside the most demanding licensed gambling regime in the world, with the published enforcement ledger that comes with it. The 40 percent RGD economics from 1 Apr 2026 plus the 1.1 percent statutory levy are absorbed in exchange for access to a deep, mature market with sophisticated payment, advertising and partnership infrastructure that demands UKGC authorisation as a prerequisite.

Typical fit: British-facing online casino, sportsbook, bingo or lottery operator; brand-name groups with material UK exposure regardless of cost stack

PICK AGCO IF...

Ontario consumers are the priority

The book is Ontario-facing and an AGCO registration plus iGO operating agreement is the only route under the conduct-and-manage architecture. The flat CAD \$100,000 per site per year cost stack and the ~20 percent NGR revenue share (no separate provincial gaming tax) are preferable to the UK's GGY-banded fee plus 40 percent RGD plus 1.1 percent levy at scale. The Registrar's Standards model gives more operational design latitude than the LCCP plus RTS perimeter; the published 91.1 percent channelisation rate means the market is real and the brand inside the regulated channel is meaningful.

Typical fit: Ontario-facing online casino or sportsbook; North-American-focused groups; operators whose product mix benefits from the RGS-driven framework rather than the UKGC's hard product caps

The third pattern is dual-licensing, and it is the dominant pattern among the largest English-speaking groups. A UKGC operating licence as the British-market authorisation and an AGCO registration plus iGO operating agreement as the Ontario-market authorisation, run in parallel. The compliance machinery is heavier (two regulators, two AML programmes reporting to two different financial intelligence bodies, two product configurations, two annual cost stacks, two enforcement-risk profiles) but the market-access surface is the two most demanding English-language regulated markets in the world. For operators planning the sequence: the UK regime takes 16 weeks to a clean grant; the Ontario regime takes 6 to 9 months; the UK regime requires PMLs that the Ontario regime does not; the Ontario regime requires a commercial counterparty (iGO) that the UK regime does not. Entering the UK first builds the personal-accountability discipline that the AGCO fit-and-proper review then absorbs; entering Ontario first builds the technical-certification discipline that the UKGC RTS sign-off then expects. For peer reading see the [UKGC vs MGA EU-EU peer comparison](#) and the [AGCO vs AGLC Canada-Canada peer comparison](#).

Frequently asked questions

Q. Why might an operator hold both UKGC and AGCO licences?

A. Because the two licences address completely different markets that cannot be served from the other authorisation. A UKGC operating licence is the only route to British consumers under the Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014; an AGCO registration plus an iGaming Ontario operating agreement is the only route to Ontario consumers under section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code and the Ontario conduct-and-manage architecture. Many of the largest North-American and European groups hold both because they want both. The compliance machinery is heavier (two regulators, two AML lines, two product configurations) but the market access is wider and the brand benefits from sitting inside the two most demanding English-language regulated markets in the world.

Q. Is Ontario's ~20 percent revenue share really lower than UK's 40 percent RGD?

A. At the headline rate, yes, but the comparison is not apples to apples. Ontario's ~20 percent is a commercial revenue share paid to iGaming Ontario on Net Gaming Revenue (GGR less player winnings less promotional credits) under an operating agreement, not a statutory gaming tax. The UK's 40 percent Remote Gaming Duty from 1 April 2026 is a statutory excise charged by HMRC on the gaming provider's profits from remote gaming with UK persons, with bonuses and freeplays not deductible (Excise Notice 455a treats a used freeplay as a notional gaming payment). UK operators also pay the 1.1 percent statutory levy on online gross gambling yield on top of RGD, which Ontario operators do not face. After the full stack of charges is modelled, the Ontario regime sits materially below the UK regime on a per-pound basis, particularly from 1 April 2026.

Q. What's the LCCP+RTS pages count compared to Registrar's Standards?

A. Different drafting traditions. The UKGC Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice plus the Remote Technical Standards together run to thousands of pages and many thousands of individual binding licence conditions, mandatory Social Responsibility Code provisions, ordinary code provisions and technical control statements. The AGCO Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming run to roughly 200 individual standards across six risk themes (responsible gambling, game integrity, anti money laundering, information security, advertising and marketing, operational integrity). The trade-off is depth against focus: the UKGC writes specific product limits into the rule (slot stake caps, autoplay prohibition, minimum spin speed), the AGCO writes outcome-based standards and leaves operational design to the operator.

Q. Does the UK 1.1 percent statutory levy apply to Ontario operations?

A. No. The statutory levy under the Gambling Levy Regulations 2025 applies only to operators holding a Gambling Commission operating licence and is charged on the licensee's online gross gambling yield generated under that British licence. An Ontario-registered operator pays the AGCO registration fee and remits the ~20 percent revenue share to iGaming Ontario on Ontario-resident NGR. The two regimes do not overlap: a group that holds both licences runs the levy on its UK book and the revenue share on its Ontario book, with no double charge.

Q. Can a UKGC-licensed operator just bolt on Ontario, or do they need a fresh entity?

A. Ontario typically requires a corporate presence in the province. Operators establish (or use) an Ontario corporation as the AGCO-registered entity and as the counterparty to the iGaming Ontario operating agreement. The fit-and-proper review runs against the Ontario entity, its officers, directors and significant owners; a UKGC personal management licence does not automatically translate. The AGCO registration is a fresh application, not a bolt-on, and the technical platform must pass certification by an AGCO-approved testing laboratory against the Registrar's Standards before the iGO agreement activates.

Q. What does "conduct and manage" mean in practice?

A. Section 207(1)(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada permits a province to conduct and manage lottery schemes. Ontario's solution is iGaming Ontario, a subsidiary corporation of the AGCO, which signs an operating agreement with each registered private operator. The legal position is that iGO is the entity that conducts and manages the gaming activity and that the private operator assists iGO in delivering the scheme under the agreement. In commercial reality the operator runs the brand, the platform, the customer accounts and the player relationship; the conduct-and-manage architecture is the constitutional scaffolding that lets a private operator participate without falling foul of Canadian criminal law. The Ontario Superior Court of Justice upheld the structure in 2024.

Q. Does FINTRAC supervise UK operators too?

A. No. FINTRAC is Canada's federal financial intelligence unit and supervises Ontario-registered operators as reporting entities under the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act. UK operators are supervised for anti money laundering by the UKGC itself under the Money Laundering Regulations 2017 and are bound by the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. The two AML supervisory architectures are completely separate: a UK operator files with the National Crime Agency in the UK; an Ontario operator files with FINTRAC in Canada. A group operating in both markets runs two parallel MLRO functions and two distinct AML programmes.

Q. How long does each licence take to get?

A. The UKGC targets approximately 16 weeks for a complete operating licence application, with personal management licences for accountable individuals running in parallel; complex ownership, weak documentation or outstanding PML checks push the timeline materially. The AGCO and iGaming Ontario process for a clean B2C operator application typically runs 6 to 9 months across the parallel AGCO registration track (fit-and-proper, financial verification, technical certification) and the iGO operating agreement negotiation. Both regimes treat 16 weeks and 6 to 9 months respectively as targets for well prepared applicants rather than guarantees.

Q. Which regulator publishes more enforcement detail?

A. The UKGC publishes the most detailed enforcement record in the licensed gambling sector: full regulatory action notices, settlement amounts, named operators and the conduct findings behind each decision. The record fine remains the William Hill group package at GBP 19.2 million in 2023, with Entain (GBP 17.0 million) and 888 (GBP 9.4 million) the next largest. The AGCO publishes Notices of Proposed Order and Orders of Monetary Penalty through its Public Interest Decisions page with the underlying conduct and the standards breached identified; recent landmark actions include the PointsBet five-day registration suspension in February 2026 (the first iGaming registration suspension), the FanDuel CAD 350,000 sport-integrity penalty in January 2025 and the BetMGM CAD 110,000 advertising penalty in March 2025. The UKGC publishes more frequently and at larger amounts; the AGCO publishes with comparable detail but at a lower volume and smaller per-case quantum reflecting the younger market.

Q. What are the PML requirements on the UK side?

A. A Personal Management Licence (PML) is required by individuals occupying specified management positions at a UKGC-licensed business, including responsibility for overall management, financial affairs, regulatory compliance, marketing, gambling and information technology functions. Each PML holder is assessed by the Commission for competence and integrity and carries personal accountability for the conduct of the licensed business. A PML costs GBP 1,234 per person per role with approximately 8 weeks processing. The Commission can act against PML holders directly, so a named MLRO or senior compliance officer can face their own enforcement consequences alongside the corporate licensee. Ontario has no exact equivalent: the AGCO assesses officers, directors and significant owners as part of the operator fit-and-proper review but does not issue a separate personal licence to each.

Q. Are crypto deposits allowed under either regime?

A. Neither regulator prohibits crypto deposits outright, but both treat crypto exposure as an elevated AML risk requiring enhanced controls. UKGC LC 12.1.1 requires a money laundering and terrorist financing risk assessment that covers payment-channel risk; crypto on-ramps must be documented within the licensee's AML risk assessment and the source-of-funds controls. The AGCO position under the Registrar's Standards is similar: crypto deposits are not banned but the operator must demonstrate KYC, source-of-funds verification and FINTRAC reporting integrity equivalent to fiat channels. In practice mainstream UK and Ontario operators do not offer direct crypto deposit; the regulatory friction outweighs the commercial benefit at brand-name scale.

Q. What changes 1 April 2026 in the UK and how does that compare to Ontario's stable revenue-share model?

A. On 1 April 2026 Remote Gaming Duty rises from 21 percent to 40 percent on a gaming provider's profits from remote gaming with UK persons, under the changes announced in the November 2025 Autumn Budget. Bingo Duty is abolished on the same date. From 1 April 2027 a new remote betting rate at 25 percent within General Betting Duty takes effect, with UK horseracing remote bets staying at 15 percent. For UK-licensed online casino operators the 1 April 2026 change is the single largest unit-economics shift of the decade. Ontario's ~20 percent NGR revenue share to iGaming Ontario has been stable since the market opened on 4 April 2022 and shows no indication of change. The contrast is intentional: UK operators must re-baseline cost stack and pricing from April 2026; Ontario operators continue under a predictable contractual share.

Primary sources & continue reading

The UKGC vs AGCO licence decision is a moving target through 2026. Track the 1 April 2026 Remote Gaming Duty hike, the LCCP amendments, AGCO Public Interest Decisions and iGaming Ontario market reports. The references below are the primary sources behind every figure in this report.

WEB UKGC Licence Conditions & Codes of Practice (LCCP)	WEB UKGC Remote Gambling and Software Technical Standards (RTS)
WEB UKGC Fees we charge & calculator	WEB UKGC Statutory gambling levy guidance
WEB HM Treasury · Gambling Duty Changes (Autumn Budget 2025)	WEB HMRC Excise Notice 455a: Remote Gaming Duty
WEB Gambling Act 2005 — legislation.gov.uk	WEB AGCO Registrar's Standards for Internet Gaming
WEB AGCO Internet Gaming Fees	WEB AGCO · Roles of the AGCO and iGaming Ontario
WEB iGaming Ontario Market Performance Report	WEB AGCO Public Interest Decisions (enforcement register)
WEB Gaming Control Act, 1992 (Ontario) — ontario.ca	REF gamingcompliance.io/ukgc-licence-requirements/
REF gamingcompliance.io/agco-registration-requirements/	REF gamingcompliance.io/ukgc/licence-conditions-and-codes-of-practice/
REF gamingcompliance.io/jurisdictions/agco/	REF gamingcompliance.io/ukgc-vs-mga-licence-comparison/
REF gamingcompliance.io/agco-vs-aglc-standards-comparison/	REF gamingcompliance.io/mga-vs-curacao-licence-comparison/
REF gamingcompliance.io/france-vs-spain-affiliate-rules/	REF gamingcompliance.io/tools/tax-calculator/
REF gamingcompliance.io/jurisdictions/	

Continue reading at gamingcompliance.io/ukgc-vs-agco-licence-comparison/

Build the dual-market compliance plan from the source. Explore both rulebooks side by side, model the cost stack with the Tax Calculator, and track every amendment from the 1 April 2026 Remote Gaming Duty hike to the next AGCO Public Interest Decision. The online cornerstone is updated as primary sources move; this PDF is the 2026 Edition snapshot.

Open: gamingcompliance.io/ukgc-vs-agco-licence-comparison/ · [tools/tax-calculator/](https://gamingcompliance.io/tools/tax-calculator/) · [compare/](https://gamingcompliance.io/compare/)

About this report. The UKGC vs AGCO licence comparison is a cornerstone cross-jurisdiction analysis published by GamingCompliance.io. It synthesises the primary statutory framework on both sides (Gambling Act 2005 + Gambling (Licensing and Advertising) Act 2014 on the UK side; Gaming Control Act 1992 + Criminal Code of Canada s. 207(1)(a) on the Ontario side), the published fee policies of both regulators, the UKGC and FINTRAC AML supervisory architecture, the UKGC Regulatory Action register and the AGCO Public Interest Decisions ledger. The 2026 Edition incorporates the 1 April 2026 Remote Gaming Duty hike (21% to 40%), the 6 April 2026 LCCP edition, the 14 May 2026 BetGuard launch and the February 2026 PointsBet registration suspension. Figures cited are as published by the regulators; analysis and interpretation are editorial. Not legal or tax advice.