

FEEDBACK REPORT

Regulations concerning Interactive Gaming Regulation amendments proposed January 29, 2026

DATE RECEIVED	FEEDBACK	RESPONSE & DATE OF RESPONSE
2/11/2026	Feedback was received from an existing licence holder. They asked to clarify Section 270—specifically to explain when the Commission would, at its sole discretion, accept a complaint without requiring completion of the Authorized Client Provider’s dispute-resolution process. They indicated that the proposed wording creates uncertainty given the otherwise structured process, request examples or criteria for such exceptions should be added (i.e., the types of scenarios that would justify bypassing the licence holder’s process), and encourage the Commission to add more detailed guidance.	The Commission has added additional language to Section 270 to outline examples of specific situations where a dispute would bypass the licence holder’s dispute resolution process and be handled by the Commission’s Approved Agent directly. Informed of update on 2/27/2026.
2/11/2026	Further feedback was received from the same operator. The operator raised two concerns about per-complaint charges: first, that vexatious complaints should be exempt from fees as it is unfair to charge operators for meritless claims; and second, that flat fees create a risk of abuse, where knowledgeable complainants may use the cost of proceedings as leverage to force settlements, regardless of merit – undermining the integrity of the process.	We considered feedback and will not be proposing additional amendments at this time. Vexatious complaints are screened out before processing and do not attract a fee. Players are also required to exhaust direct resolution with operator before escalation. The \$300 fee only applies to complaints that have cleared that threshold meaning the fee is intended to reflect a genuine unresolved dispute.

March 25, 2026

Submitted by Damian Whyte, Office/Compliance Manager, Kahnawà:ke Gaming Commission