

Name	Rule	Rule Reference	Comment on Rule	Proposed Changes
Michael Norton	Sports betting	R19-4-101	Scumbags profiting from individuals with addiction, and low-intellect. You should all be ashamed, but you're probably getting kickbacks. Keep selling your citizens out for a buck.	Arizona Department of Gaming Director Tedd Vogt goes down in the history book as a scumbag, the end.
Gary	Licensees	Sports Book	After some of the toughest years we have seen why not allow some of the SMALL business to have an opportunity to take advantage of this situation?	Quit focusing on the big corporations that already have more money than any other business in town and allow small business that is represented by
Rob Dalager for the Arizona Cardinals	Definitions and general	R19-4-101	<p>The regulations in general are unclear as to which party is responsible for the various obligations set forth in the regulations. In particular, the regulations refer to (i) "Event Wagering Operator"; (ii) "Designee"; and (iii) "Responsible Party." The term "Event Wagering Operator" is defined in the Act and means, in part, the sports team or their designee. The term "Designee" is defined in the regulations as a "person authorized to act on behalf of an event wagering operator..." and the term "Responsible Party" is defined in the regulations as the event wagering operator and designee.</p> <p>As the designee is the "Event Wagering Operator" under the Act, we believe the intention is that the designee is responsible for the various licensing and operational obligations set forth in the regulations. However, the added definitions of Designee and Responsible Party cause some confusion.</p>	Specify that if a Designee is authorized to act on behalf of an Event Wagering Operator, the Designee is the Responsible Party.
Rob Dalager for the Arizona Cardinals	Systems and Platforms	R19-4-121	R19-4-121 addresses systems and platforms and states that "each event wagering operator may only have one event wagering system, whether its own or as provided by a management services provider." Is the intent to disallow a Designee from contracting with more one Tribe or sports team?	Clarify to all a Designee to contract with more than one Event Wagering Operator.
Dan McCoy	Integrity Monitoring	R19-4-118 (A/B)	<p>Need clarification on the following:</p> <p>A.All integrity monitoring providers shall share information and shall disseminate all reports of unusual and/or suspicious wagering activity to all responsible parties. All responsible parties shall review such reports and notify the integrity monitoring providers whether they have experienced similar activity.</p> <p>B.The integrity monitoring providers shall notify the Department and the appropriate sport's governing body of any suspicious wagering activity as soon as practically possible.</p>	Are you saying we review the reports the integrity monitoring providers send us, then we in turn send back to the integrity monitoring provider to advise the regulator?
Kristopher Morrow	Event Wagering	R19-4-101	DraftKings should be live before September 9th.	Make DraftKings live before September 9th.
Tom Auther	license Categories	R19-4-104D	HB 2772 Section 5-1307 says an event wagering operator MAY partner with a Racetrack that holds a Limited event Wagering permit. Does this mean that we, as a racetrack, are required to have an event wagering operator as our partner? This is extremely onerous as there is really not a large amount of money in this for us and having to negotiate with a professional team and further water down our income seems unfair. I realize that I am partially addressing the Bill not the rules but R19-4-104 D when combined with the word "may" in the Bill seems to leave the possibility that we do not need to work with a pro team open..	Eliminate the requirement that a racetrack needs to partner with an Event Wagering Operator. We already are the only non-tribal entity that handles bets, we have the equipment, we have the personnel and we have a permit already...why do we need to partner with somebody else.
Laura MCALLISTER COX	Wager Rules (Mobile)	R19-4-135	We are seeking clarification that section I voids do not require the section H approval.	Amend Section I to state: "The responsible party may cancel an accepted wager for obvious error without prior written approval of the Department."

Tom Auther	license Categories	R19-4-104D	When combined with HB 2772 Section 1307 The question arises can an OTB, which needs to be affiliated with a track in order to have an OTB permit, pursue a limited event wagering permit independent of the track or does the track receive the permit(s) and determine what OTBs it wants to use for limited event wagering? If the OTB can do it on its own this presents some problems in as much as the track can typically terminate its agreement with the OTB operator on short notice thus making this limited event wagering operator very temporary.	The limited event wagering permit for OTBs must be attached to the track and the track can then select the appropriate OTB. Without this we will have a constant turnover of these limited wagering permits.
Laura MCALLISTER COX	League Data	R19-4-119	We would like to confirm that if an unofficial data source satisfies R19-4-119.A. 1-2 and is appropriately licensed, we would be able to use them if so desired whether an official league data source is available or not.	Add the following sentence to Section D: "An approved non-official league data provider which satisfies R19-4-119.A. 1-2, may be used whether or not an official league data source is available."
Laura MCALLISTER COX	Definitions	R19-4-101.B.26h	We seek clarification on what is meant by "marketing services".	Clarify what is meant by "marketing services".
Laura MCALLISTER COX	Technical Standards	R19-4-115	Remove outdated GLI-27 as there are relevant ISMS standards referenced within GLI-33.	Remove outdated GLI-27 as there are relevant ISMS standards referenced within GLI-33.
Laura MCALLISTER COX	Annual Testing	R19-4-123	Geofencing field tests are conducted as part of initial certification for go-live authorization. It is not included in periodic integrity and security assessments.	We suggest removing Section A3 of R19-4-123.
Laura MCALLISTER COX	Event Wagering System Recertification	R19-4-130.B	Recommend removing the second sentence in section B. This is already covered by the Department's ability to test/inspect at any time independent of the annual recertification (R19-4-103 (C)(1))	Recommend removing the second sentence in R19-4-130.B.
Bas Aja	Event Wagering	R19-4-104 D.	This section references "additional wagering facility" which in reality is an "off track betting" (OTB) site for simulcast wagering on racing. The statutory framework for these simulcast locations requires various agreements with other parties such as Arizona Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association (AHBPA) for without such - these locations are unable to take wagers. These agreements require the racing track to share a portion of the betting proceeds with the horse racing purse account in order to receive the signal If such agreements are not finalized these locations are no longer valid to receive betting on races and therefore would no longer qualify as "additional wagering facilities." This needs to be clarified in these rules.	Define "Additional Wagering Facility" for race tracks are the locations where the the racetrack has an agreement with the AHBPA to receive the horse racing signal for simulcast wagering.
David Miller - Assistant General Counsel, PGA TOUR and TPC Scottsdale	"Designee" Definition and Licensing Requirement	R19-4-101(6) and R19-4-104(C) and (I)	The draft regulations provide that a "designee" is appointed by an "event wagering operator" and would receive a separate "designee" license. However, the statute -- specifically A.R.S. 5-1301(7) -- provides that the designee is actually the "event wagering operator" and is appointed by a qualifying sports organization or tribe, which is not the event wagering operator. The PGA TOUR / TPC Scottsdale requests that this be addressed in the revised regulations.	<p>In R19-4-101(6), replace "authorized to act on behalf of an event wagering operator" with "designated by a qualifying owner, operator, promoter or tribe set forth in A.R.S. 5-1301(7)."</p> <p>In R19-4-104(C), first sentence, replace "appointed by an event wagering operator" with "designated by a qualifying owner, operator, promoter or tribe set forth in A.R.S. 5-1301(7)" and insert "event wagering operator" before "license."</p> <p>In R19-4-104(I), delete the separate Designee license, as a Designee obtains an Event Wagering Operator license, as set forth in A.R.S. 5-1301(7).</p>

<p>David Miller - Assistant General Counsel, PGA TOUR and TPC Scottsdale</p>	<p>League Data</p>	<p>R19-4-119</p>	<p>R19-4-119 is not compatible with the statutory requirement (in A.R.S. 5-1314 (F)) that league data be used for live betting unless it is not offered on "commercially reasonable terms." The PGA TOUR / TPC Scottsdale -- together with the NBA, NFL, MLB, DraftKings, FanDuel and BetMGM -- respectfully request the Department of Gaming adopt provisions establishing a more comprehensive process and a list of factors for determining whether league data is offered on commercially reasonable terms. These provisions have been used (in a substantially similar form) in several states, including Michigan and Virginia, and would establish more guidance and certainty regarding the use of league data to the benefit of all constituents in the Arizona sports wagering system.</p>	<p>Replace the current R-19-4-119 with the following:</p> <p>(1) A sports governing body may notify the Department that it desires event wagering operators to use official league data to settle tier two sports wagers on sports events of such sports governing body. Such notification shall be made in the form and manner as the Department may require. The Department shall notify each event wagering operator of a sports governing body's notification within 5 days of the Department's receipt of such notification. If a sports governing body does not so notify the Department, an event wagering operator is not required to use official league data for determining the results of tier two sports wagers on sports events of such sports governing body.</p> <p>(2) Within 60 days of the Department notifying each event wagering operator of such a sports governing body notification to the Department (or such longer period as may be agreed between the sports governing body and the applicable event wagering operator), event wagering operators shall use only official league data to determine the results of tier two sports wagers on sporting events of that sports governing body, unless:</p> <p>(a) the sports governing body or its designee(s) cannot provide a feed of official league data to determine the results of a particular type of tier two sports wager, in which case event wagering operators are not required to use official league data for determining the results of the applicable tier two sports wager until such time as such a data feed becomes available from the sports governing body on commercially reasonable terms and conditions; or</p> <p>(b) an event wagering operator can demonstrate to the Department that the sports governing body or its designee(s) will not provide a feed of official league data to the event wagering operator on commercially reasonable terms and conditions.</p> <p>The following is a non-exclusive list of factors the Department may consider in evaluating whether official league data is being offered on commercially reasonable terms and conditions for purposes of subsections (a) and (b) above:</p> <p>(i) The extent to which sports wagering operators have purchased the same or similar official league data on the same or similar terms, particularly in jurisdictions where such purchase was not required by law (or was required by law, but only if offered on commercially reasonable terms);</p> <p>(ii) The nature and quantity of the official league data (including, without limitation, its speed, accuracy, reliability, and overall quality) as compared to comparable non-official data;</p> <p>(iii) The quality and complexity of the process used to collect and distribute the official league data as compared to comparable non-official data;</p> <p>(iv) The availability of a sports governing body's tier two official league data to an event wagering operator from more than one authorized source;</p> <p>(v) Market information (including without limitation price and other terms and conditions) regarding the purchase by event wagering operators of comparable data for the purpose of settling sports wagers in this state and other jurisdictions; and</p>
--	--------------------	------------------	--	---

David Miller - Assistant General Counsel, PGA TOUR and TPC Scottsdale	Systems and Platforms	R19-4-121(B)	The PGA TOUR / TPC Scottsdale believes the legislative intent was for a single skin licensing model, i.e., for up to 20 mobile wagering platforms in the State of Arizona. Interpreting the statute to allow for multiple skins would mean there could theoretically be unlimited mobile wagering platforms in the State, which was never intended.	In R19-4-121(B), insert: "Each event wagering operator may contract with only one (1) management services provider for the provision of an event wagering platform. If an event wagering operator operates its own event wagering platform, it may not contract with a management services provider for the provision of a separate event wagering platform." OR "Each event wagering operator may only have one (1) event wagering platform, whether its own or as provided by a management services provider."
Jordan Rose	License Categories	R19-4-104(B)	We represent Phoenix Rising Football Club and this comment relates to the interpretation of "professional sports" teams defined in A.R.S. Section 5-1301 (14), its use in the definition of "event wagering operator" defined in A.R.S. Section 5-1301(7), and the use of "event wagering operator" in A.R.S. Section 5-1304, describing the applicants to whom the Department may issue an event wagering operator license. 14. "PROFESSIONAL SPORT" MEANS A SPORT CONDUCTED AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL LEAGUE OR ORGANIZATIONAL PLAY FOR ITS RESPECTIVE SPORT AND INCLUDES BASEBALL, BASKETBALL, FOOTBALL, GOLF, HOCKEY, SOCCER AND MOTORSPORTS. Phoenix Rising is Arizona's highest level professional soccer team playing in the United Soccer League (USL). It's consistently one of the best teams in the USL and has either been in 1st or 2nd place in the league since 2019. It's playing at Wild Horse Pass Stadium, which currently has a capacity of 10,000 with room to grow, while consistently hosting one of the highest attended home games in USL. By comparison, the NHL's Coyotes have averaged 13,000 fans over the past 5 seasons (before Covid). It is possible to interpret the definition of "professional sport" to exclude soccer teams within the USL (in light of Major League Soccer). The USL is the highest level professional soccer possible in Arizona as MLS has not granted a franchise to Arizona. Because Phoenix Rising is the highest level professional soccer team in the State and no other professional sport deliberately listed in the law has a professional team playing a listed sport that won't be awarded an event wagering operator license, we are submitting this comment to clarify and have any necessary further discussion in advance of Phoenix Rising's future application. We believe this clarity is consistent with the overall intent of the legislation and will not further expand the State's obligation to license other sports organizations as "soccer" is the only listed sport that has this specific situation.	See above.
Richard Verri, attorney for Quechan Tribe and Tonto Apache Tribe	License Categories	R19-4-104 (A)(B)	Tribes may wish to apply for an Event Wagering Operator License either directly in the name of the tribe or in an entity wholly owned by the tribe. In that regard, we do not believe that the ADG should conduct background investigation or suitability determinations on elected tribal leadership.	In the event an entity fully owned by an Arizona Indian tribe is an applicant to obtain an Event Wagering Operator License, only the entity fully owned by an Arizona Indian tribe shall be required to submit an Application. For purposes of clarity, no officer, director, employee, or member of an Arizona Indian tribe that owns the entity be subject to background investigation, review, or suitability determination by the Department if that individual is not also an officer or director of the tribal entity.

Laura McAllister Cox	Internal Control System	R19-4-113.F	We recommend that public companies be permitted to submit consolidated audited financial statements.	Amend the proposed language of R19-4-113.F to add: For responsible parties that are publicly traded companies, consolidated audited financials will be accepted to satisfy this requirement.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Responsible Advertising	R19-4-111(C)	Although rules and standards for sports wagering marketing are necessary and similar standards have been implemented through compliance with requirements of other U.S. jurisdictions, adoption of the American Gaming Association Responsible Marketing Code (AGA RMC) may not be the most appropriate method for ensuring responsible advertising. Adoption and incorporation of the AGA RMC by reference could present unintended legal and enforcement issues and remove influence and authority from the Department.	Revise to include responsible advertising rules and standards directly in the Rules. This can be accomplished using other jurisdictions' marketing regulations and the AGA RMC as guidelines.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	License Categories / Procedures for Licensing	R19-4-104(F)(2) / R19-4-105(C)	Requirement to submit supplier and employee lists on a monthly basis will be overburdensome.	Revise Rules to require submission of lists on an annual basis and/or submission of updates within 30 days of any changes.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Internal Control System	R19-4-113(E)	Player transactions will still be processed in a separate and distinct bank account, but the separate and distinct bank account will also process similar transactions for players in other states where the activity is legal and licensed.	Revise Rule to permit use of a single, segregated account for player deposits, receipts and disbursements for legal and licensed online sports wagering and other real money wagering operations in other US states: The responsible party shall maintain bank account(s) that are separate and distinct from all other corporate accounts other than account(s) that are used solely for player deposits, receipts and disbursements in connection with online sports wagering or other forms of real money wagering in other U.S. states where the responsible party is licensed and legally conducting such operations, unless otherwise agreed to by the Department. The account(s) shall be used for all player deposits, receipts, and disbursements relating to its operation of event wagering under the Act. The responsible party shall utilize a software accounting system that separates and distinguishes all receipts and disbursements regarding or in any way relating to event wagering activity under the Act, the operation, and the construction or operation of event wagering facilities.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Internal Control System	R19-4-113(F)	Clarify that audited, financial statements will be required only with respect to Arizona Event Wagering operations. This should provide the necessary financial information to the Department and avoid extensive costs for an audit that covers operations in other states that are not within the Department's jurisdiction. Audited financial statements should also be treated as confidential and proprietary business information that is exempt from public disclosure.	Financial statements of the responsible party's event wagering operations in the State shall be audited, not less than annually at its fiscal year end, by an independent certified public accountant at the expense of the responsible party. The audit shall also include or be supplemented with an attestation by the auditor that adjusted gross event wagering receipts are accurately reported. If the responsible party changes its fiscal year end, it may elect either to prepare financial statements for a short fiscal year or for an extended fiscal year, but in no event shall an extended fiscal year extend more than fifteen (15) months. Financial statements provided under this rule shall be treated confidentially and exempt from public disclosure.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Servers and Cloud Storage	R19-4-117(A)	Clarify that, in accordance with and subject to applicable federal law, the requirement for locating servers in the State of Arizona is limited to services used for accepting event wagers.	Revise "conduct event wagering" to read "accept event wagers".
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Servers and Cloud Storage	R19-4-117(A)	Clarify that, in accordance with and subject to applicable federal law, the requirement for locating servers in the State of Arizona is limited to services used for accepting event wagers.	Revise "conduct event wagering" to read "accept event wagers".
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Self-Monitoring of Critical Components	R19-4-122	Implement authentication as part of the change management process instead of continuous requirement.	Event wagering systems shall perform a self-authentication process on all critical components contained on an event wagering system upon initial installation of the software, each time the software is loaded for use, and upon new releases pursuant to the change management process.

Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Forms of Payment for Event Wagers	R19-4-131	Credit cards are a commonly used deposit method for online players. Deposit limits and other responsible gambling features available on the Event Wagering Platform provide player-protection tools that are not available in the retail operation.	All payment for event wagers made for event wagering activity under the Act shall be made by cash, cash equivalent, electronic funds transfer, debit card, personal check, winnings, or promotional or bonus credit. Credit cards may be utilized for mobile event wagering deposits only. Other forms of payment may be utilized upon written approval of the Department.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Events and Wagers	R19-4-133(E)	Clarify that additional approvals are not required once an event or wager is approved.	The Department shall publish a list of authorized events and wager types on its website. Events and wagers previously approved by the Department and included on such list shall not need approval under Sections A, B or C above.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Accounting / Revenue Audit	R19-4-143	Revise rule to clarify which requirements apply to retail and which requirements apply to mobile. In general, the requirements in Section 143 are extensive and should be revised to lessen the burden on operators.	No specific changes proposed. See comment.
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Promotions and Bonuses	R19-4-148(B)	Compliance with rules for promotions and bonuses should be sufficient. Advance notice prior to implementation is cumbersome and should not be necessary.	Delete subsection (B).
Chad Riney, Senior Counsel, Churchill Downs Incorporated	Allocation For Applicants	R19-4-106	If licenses must be allocated among applicants, objective criteria should be established for the Department to following in determining which applicants (and their partners and providers) are most qualified to receive a license and capable of establishing a successful event wagering operation.	No specific change proposed.
Terry Rambler, Chairman	Platforms	R19-4-121(B). Systems and Platforms	Rule still to be determined. The San Carlos Apache Tribe believes it is critical for the Department, as soon as possible, to determine the specific number of skins available per license.	Each event wagering operator or tribal licensee shall provide a minimum of one individually branded online event wagering platform and, in its discretion, may provide additional event wagering platforms.