PREDICTION MARKET CONSUMER PROTECTION STANDARDS

Classification Standard

The test that determines which products the PMCPS family applies to.

DESIGNATION	PREPARED BY	PUBLISHED BY	LOCATION
PMCPS-C	Tony Morelli, PhD	Institute for Emerging Gaming Markets	Charleston, SC

VERSION	SUPERSEDES	STATUS
1.3	v1.2	WORKING DRAFT

PREFATORY NOTE

This is the classification standard in the PMCPS family. It determines which products are subject to the family, and nothing else. Apart from the classification records, filings and reclassification duties in § 105 and § 106, it imposes no operating requirement on anyone.

The family follows the three-layer structure used in Indian gaming regulation, where classification, internal controls, and technical standards are published separately and do different work:

LAYER	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL ANALOGUE	QUESTION ANSWERED
Classification	**PMCPS-C**	25 C.F.R. pt. 502	Is the product in scope?
Minimum internal controls	PMCPS-M	25 C.F.R. pt. 543	What must the operator do?
Technical standards	PMCPS-T (reserved)	25 C.F.R. pt. 547	What must the system do, and how is it tested?

Classification is published first and separately because it is the layer on which the current dispute turns. The Commission's proposed rule of June 9, 2026 offers a classification test for gaming. Forty-four state attorneys general dispute the Commission's authority to apply it. A federal court has held that a tribe is likely to succeed in showing that the same products are class III gaming. Each of those is a classification question, and each asks which regulator may act.

This standard asks a different question, and asks it on purpose. It does not ask whether a product is gaming, a bet or wager, an event contract, or class III gaming. It asks whether a retail participant is exposed to the harms the PMCPS family addresses. A test built on consumer exposure survives the jurisdictional dispute regardless of outcome, and can be applied today by an operator, an assessor, or a regulator who has not waited for the dispute to resolve.

Section 107 and Appendix B set this test against the four classification tests in force or proposed under applicable law. The divergences are deliberate and are identified.

PART 100

CLASSIFICATION STANDARD

§ 101 Purpose

This standard states the test by which a person determines whether a product is a covered contract, and therefore whether the PMCPS family applies to it.

§ 102 Scope and relationship to the other Standards

(a) This standard determines scope. Except for the procedural recordkeeping, filing, and classification-documentation obligations set out in § 105 and the reclassification obligations in § 106, it imposes no operational design, system, or trading conduct requirement on a covered operator. The obligations in § 105 and § 106 are classification and records obligations and are enforceable as stated. Operational, system and conduct requirements are stated in PMCPS-M and, when issued, PMCPS-T.

(b) A reference in PMCPS-M or PMCPS-T to a covered contract or a covered operator is a reference to those terms as determined under this standard.

(c) This standard does not determine whether a product is lawful, whether it constitutes gaming, a bet or wager, an event contract, or class III gaming under any applicable law, or which authority regulates it. A determination under this standard is not evidence on any of those questions.

(d) A determination that a product is not a covered contract is not a determination that the product is unregulated, safe, or exempt from any obligation imposed by applicable law.

§ 103 Definitions

As used in the PMCPS family:

Affiliate means a person that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with a covered operator.

Covered contract means a product that satisfies the test in § 104.

Covered operator means a person that offers, lists, executes, clears, or settles a covered contract for a participant, or that solicits or accepts a participant's order for a covered contract. The term includes an intermediary that provides participant-facing access to a covered contract offered by another person.

Fixed-odds wager means a product under which the amount payable to the participant is determined at the time the participant commits value, by reference to odds or a price set by the operator, and does not vary thereafter with the views of other participants.

Hedging nexus means the relationship described in § 104(f) between a participant's holding of an underlying exposure and a product that offsets it.

Market-determined value means a value established by trading between participants. A price quoted by an operator on its own account, or set by an operator by reference to its own risk position, is not a market-determined value.

Participant means an individual who holds or applies for an account with a covered operator. The term does not include an entity trading through a registered intermediary for commercial risk management purposes.

Position means a participant's open interest in a covered contract, whether long or short, that has not settled or been closed.

Product means an agreement, contract, transaction, swap, wager, or other arrangement offered to a participant, however denominated by the person offering it.

Resolution source means the data source, publication, official determination, or other authority by reference to which a product settles.

Settlement means the final determination of a product's outcome and the corresponding crediting or debiting of participant accounts.

§ 104 Applicability test

(a) **Purpose.** This section states the test by which a person determines whether a product is a covered contract. The test is functional. It does not depend on how the operator characterizes the product, on the operator's regulatory status, or on whether the product constitutes gaming, a bet or wager, or an event contract under any applicable law.

(b) **Sequence.** A product is a covered contract only if Gates 1 through 4 are each satisfied and no exclusion in Gate 5 applies. The gates are applied in order. A product that fails a gate is not a covered contract, and the remaining gates need not be applied.

(c) **Gate 1: stake and contingent return.** At the point of entry the participant irreversibly commits money or another thing of value, and the amount the participant receives depends on an outcome not determined at that time.

(d) **Gate 2: discrete outcome, resolved exogenously.** The amount payable is determined by whether a specified event occurs, or by the extent of a specified occurrence, resolved against criteria fixed in advance by reference to a source outside the operator's platform.

(1) A product whose payout is the continuous, point-in-time price, rate, level, or index value of a commodity, security, or index, meaning the contract settles at the underlying level rather than by reference to a discrete threshold or occurrence, does not satisfy this Gate. A binary, threshold, or otherwise discretized contract that pays on whether an underlying price, rate, or index crosses a stated threshold remains subject to the test in § 104. This exclusion applies only where the contract's settlement mechanism and economic characteristics make it substantially equivalent to a regulated financial instrument whose primary regulatory framework governs continuous-price settlement.

(2) A product whose outcome is generated by the operator, including by a random number generator or by the operator's own game, does not satisfy this Gate.

(e) **Gate 3: transferable position at a market-determined value.** Before the outcome is determined, the participant's position has a value established by trading between participants, and the participant may close, reduce, or transfer the position at that value.

(1) A price quoted unilaterally by the operator for repurchase of a fixed-odds wager, including an offer commonly described as a cash-out, is not a value established by trading between participants.

(2) Odds or payouts that vary before the outcome is determined but that afford the participant no means of exit, as in a pari-mutuel pool, do not satisfy this Gate.

(f) **Gate 4: absence of a hedging nexus.** The participant does not hold an underlying exposure that the product offsets.

(1) This Gate is applied to each participant separately. A product may be a covered contract as to one participant and not as to another.

(2) A participant is presumed not to hold an underlying exposure. An operator may treat a participant as holding one only where the participant has identified the exposure and the operator has documented it. The operator shall retain that documentation under PMCPS-M § 601.

(g) **Gate 5: exclusions.** A product that satisfies Gates 1 through 4 is nonetheless not a covered contract where it is:

(1) offered under a licence issued by a gaming regulatory authority that imposes requirements at least equivalent to Parts 300 through 500 of these Standards and supervises compliance with them, provided that (i) the covered operator documents the basis for claiming equivalence, (ii) the adopting regulatory authority has made a written determination that the licensing regime meets the equivalence standard, and (iii) that determination is filed with the covered operator's assessor before the product is first offered;

(2) a contract of insurance or indemnity;

(3) a security regulated as such; or

(4) a deposit or other transaction with an insured depository institution.

(h) **Boundary cases.** Appendix C applies this test to specified products.

DRAFTING NOTE

Gates 3 and 5 are what keep a traditional regulated sports wager outside these Standards, and they do so independently. A fixed-odds wager with a licensed sportsbook fails Gate 3 because the bettor's payout is fixed at placement and the position cannot be sold to another participant; a cash-out offer is a price the house sets, not a price the market makes. It fails Gate 5 separately because a licensed sportsbook already operates under a gaming framework that imposes exclusion, limits, and problem gambling requirements. Applying these Standards to it would duplicate supervision that already exists and would weaken the case for applying them where no supervision exists at all. That is the point of the test: it identifies products carrying gambling-like consumer exposure that no gaming regulator is currently supervising, without asserting that those products are or are not gambling. Gate 3 is also the reason PMCPS-M § 301(d) is drafted as it is, since a position that can be closed is a position an excluded participant must be able to close.

§ 105 Classification determination, filing, and record

(a) A covered operator shall make a written classification determination under § 104 for each product before it is offered to a participant.

(b) The determination shall record:

(1) the product and its settlement terms;

(2) the conclusion reached at each gate, with the reasoning;

(3) the resolution source relied on for the purposes of Gate 2, identified in the form required by PMCPS-M § 501(a)(7), so that the classification record and the disclosure made to the participant use identical identifiers;

(4) where the product is found not to be a covered contract, the gate that was not satisfied or the exclusion relied on; and

(5) where an exclusion under § 104(g)(1) is relied on, the licence relied on, the adopting authority's written equivalence determination, and the date of that determination.

(b-1) **Evidence package.** The written determination shall be accompanied by, and the covered operator shall retain and produce on request, an evidence package sufficient for an assessor or any applicable regulatory authority to verify the classification. The evidence package shall include:

(1) an evidence map that links each discrete conclusion reached under Gates 1 through 4 to one or more contemporaneous source records or, where contemporaneous raw source records

cannot be produced, to contemporaneous metadata, an attestation, or validated system audit log excerpts. Each link shall identify the class of source evidence, a unique identifier for the record or extract relied on, and a timestamp for when the source evidence was created or captured;

(2) a copy of the product specification and the full settlement terms relied on for the determination, or, where a substantially equivalent document exists within the operator's routine system of record, such as a trade capture record, a rulebook entry, or an operational configuration file, a reference to that record together with its location and identifier in the evidence map;

(3) where the covered operator relies on a deliverable required by PMCPS-M, such as the machine-readable resolution specification under PMCPS-M § 501(a)(7) or proof of signatory designation under PMCPS-M § 204(a), either (A) that deliverable and any cryptographic hash the operator maintains for it, or (B) an explanation in the evidence map of why the referenced provision of PMCPS-M does not apply to the product, together with the equivalent system record or attestation relied on in its place;

(4) examples of the participant-facing disclosures or descriptions used at or about order entry, identified in the evidence map by version identifier and timestamp. Where the operator cannot produce the original participant display artefacts for reasons of confidentiality or system architecture, it may provide a contemporaneous version identifier, a sanitized or redacted rendering, or a signed attestation describing the disclosure as presented and the method by which it was displayed, together with the location and identifier used in the evidence map;

(5) where the classification relies on participant position, hedging, or account relationship information, identification in the evidence map of the category of account or ledger evidence relied on, and, as appropriate, sanitized extracts, system identifiers, transaction identifiers, or attestations sufficient to permit verification without disclosing unnecessary confidential counterparty data; and

(6) documentary evidence of the identity and authority of the individual whose signature is required by paragraph (c), and evidence of that individual's designation in the operator's internal designation records, which may be the record required by PMCPS-M § 204(a).

(b-2) For the purposes of paragraph (b-1), **contemporaneous** means created at, or within a reasonable period of, the event on which the gate analysis relies. Documentation created at product launch is contemporaneous for Gate 1; execution records are contemporaneous for a

conclusion under Gate 3; system configuration records are contemporaneous for the period of tradability evaluated. The evidence map shall state the basis for any date range relied on and identify the applicable retention period for each class of evidence. Every item in the evidence package shall be retained for the period stated in paragraph (f).

(b-3) **Federal recordkeeping alternative.** Where the covered operator is a designated contract market, a clearing organization, or otherwise subject to federal recordkeeping obligations, it may satisfy paragraph (b-1) by producing the records it is required to retain under applicable federal law, including as applicable 17 C.F.R. Parts 1, 38 and 40, together with an evidence map that links those records to the conclusions reached at each gate.

(b-4) **Redaction and protected records.** Where a raw source record cannot be made available to an assessor because it contains confidential participant data or is otherwise protected, the covered operator may supply redacted extracts, metadata, validated audit log excerpts, or attestations sufficient to permit verification. The operator shall document in the evidence map the legal or operational basis for each redaction or limitation, and shall state a reasonable method by which an applicable regulatory authority may obtain the full records under that authority's legal powers.

(c) A determination shall be signed by the individual designated under PMCPS-M § 204(a).

(d) **Filing before first offer.** Where a covered operator intends to offer a product to participants located in a jurisdiction that has adopted these Standards, or to participants resident in a jurisdiction in respect of which the operator relies on a gaming licence equivalence under § 104(g)(1), the covered operator shall file the written classification determination with the applicable regulatory authority and with its assessor not less than fourteen calendar days before the product is first offered in that jurisdiction. The filing shall include every item listed in paragraph (b) together with any material supporting documentation.

(e) A covered operator shall update a filing made under paragraph (d) within seven calendar days of any reclassification event under § 106.

(f) A covered operator shall retain each determination, and each superseded determination, for not less than five years after the product is last offered. A copy of each filing made under paragraph (d) shall be retained, and made available to any adopting regulatory authority, for not less than five years after the product is last offered.

(g) A covered operator shall produce a determination on request to an assessor or to any applicable regulatory authority. Records retained under PMCPS-M § 601 in respect of a covered

contract are subject to the retention and production obligations stated in that section, and nothing in this section reduces them.

> **DRAFTING NOTE**
>
> Paragraph (a) is what converts this standard from an analytical exercise into an operating requirement. A classification test that produces no record cannot be assessed, and an operator that has never written down why a product falls outside these Standards has not made a determination, it has made an assumption.

§ 106 Reclassification

(a) A covered operator shall repeat the determination under § 105 where:

(1) the settlement terms of the product change;

(2) the resolution source changes or ceases to be available;

(3) the means by which a participant may close, reduce, or transfer a position change; or

(4) a licence relied on under § 104(g)(1) is varied, suspended, or withdrawn; or

(5) an equivalence determination made under § 104(g)(1) is withdrawn or materially modified.

(b) A covered operator shall review each determination not less than annually.

(b-1) A covered operator shall re-apply the § 104 determination, and an assessor shall re-examine any reliance on § 104(d)(1), whenever a materially relevant change in federal or other applicable law, or in market practice affecting continuous-price financial instruments, occurs. The covered operator shall document the analysis by which it determined equivalence or non-equivalence.

(c) Where a product that was not a covered contract becomes one, the covered operator shall bring the product into compliance with PMCPS-M before continuing to offer it, or shall cease offering it.

(d) Where a product ceases to be a covered contract, the covered operator shall continue to apply PMCPS-M to positions opened while the product was a covered contract until those positions settle or are closed.

§ 107 Relationship to classification tests under applicable law

(a) The test in § 104 is independent of the tests described in this section. A product may be a covered contract while falling outside each of them, and may fall within one or more of them without being a covered contract.

(b) **Gaming under the Commission's proposed rule.** Proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(b)(1) would define gaming as an activity that participants typically engage in for recreation or to entertain others, that is governed by rules, and that includes measurable occurrences or outcomes depending on the participants' luck, skill, or athletic ability. Proposed § 40.11(a)(3) would treat a contract as involving an activity where its settlement is determined by an occurrence or contingency in that activity. That test governs whether the Commission may find a contract contrary to the public interest. It does not address participant protection, and its first element turns on why the underlying activity is conducted, which is immaterial to a participant's exposure.

(c) **Bet or wager under UIGEA.** 31 U.S.C. § 5362(1)(A) defines a bet or wager as the staking or risking of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game subject to chance, upon an agreement that the person will receive something of value in the event of a certain outcome. Section 5362(1)(E)(ii) excludes any transaction conducted on or subject to the rules of a registered entity under the Commodity Exchange Act. That exclusion determines the reach of a payment-processing statute. It creates no substantive permission, and does not alter any tribal-state compact or the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

(d) **Excluded commodity under the Commodity Exchange Act.** Section 1a(19)(iv) reaches an occurrence, extent of an occurrence, or contingency that is beyond the control of the parties and is associated with a financial, commercial, or economic consequence. Both elements are required. That test determines whether the Commission has subject matter reach, not whether a participant is protected.

(e) **Class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.** 25 C.F.R. § 502.4 defines class III gaming residually as all forms of gaming that are not class I or class II, expressly including any sports betting and pari-mutuel wagering. That test determines whether conduct on Indian lands requires a compact.

(f) **State definitions.** A state definition may reach a product by structure rather than by form. Ohio Rev. Code § 3775.01(O)(2) includes exchange wagering within sports gaming. An operator shall not treat the order-book structure of a product as determinative of its classification under state law.

(g) Appendix B compares these tests.

Basis: Proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(a)(3), (b)(1), 91 Fed. Reg. (June 9, 2026); 31 U.S.C. § 5362(1); 7 U.S.C. § 1a(19)(iv); 25 C.F.R. §§ 502.3, 502.4; Ohio Rev. Code § 3775.01(O); Ho-Chunk Nation v. Kalshi Inc., No. 25-cv-698-wmc (W.D. Wis. May 11, 2026); 25 C.F.R. pt. 543; Ohio Admin. Code 3772-12-01.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION OF THE § 104 TEST

This Appendix applies the test in § 104 to specified products. It is illustrative. Where an example conflicts with § 104, § 104 governs.

Y indicates the gate is satisfied. N indicates it is not. A dash indicates the gate was not reached because an earlier gate failed. Under Gate 5, "excl" indicates that an exclusion applies.

#	PRODUCT	G1 STAKE	G2 DISCRETE	G3 TRADEABLE	G4 NO HEDGE	G5	RESULT
1	Binary contract, "Will [team] win [title]?", retail participant on a derivatives exchange	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**
2	Binary contract, "Will [player] score the first touchdown?"	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**
3	Binary contract on the winner of a political election	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**
4	Binary contract on whether a named individual will attend a scheduled public event	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**
5	Binary contract, "Will CPI exceed 3 percent?", retail participant with no exposure	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**

#	PRODUCT	G1 STAKE	G2 DISCRETE	G3 TRADEABLE	G4 NO HEDGE	G5	RESULT
6	The same contract as example 5, bought by a firm documenting an input-cost exposure	Y	Y	Y	N	not reached	Not covered as to that participant
7	**Fixed-odds wager at a state-licensed sportsbook**	Y	Y	**N**	not reached	**excl**	**Not covered**
8	The same wager as example 7, where the sportsbook offers a cash-out	Y	Y	**N**	not reached	**excl**	**Not covered**
9	Pari-mutuel wager into a horse racing pool	Y	Y	**N**	not reached	excl	Not covered
10	Slot machine or other casino game	Y	**N**	not reached	not reached	excl	Not covered
11	Licensed betting exchange, participant-to-participant, under a state gaming licence	Y	Y	Y	Y	**excl**	Not covered
12	Crude oil futures contract settling at the price of the commodity, retail participant	Y	**N**	not reached	not reached	none	Not covered
13	Parametric weather insurance policy	Y	Y	N	not reached	excl	Not covered
14	Contract on the aggregate rate of a specified crime in a geographic area over a year	Y	Y	Y	Y	none	**Covered**

Notes on selected examples

Examples 1 and 2. The contract forms are those recorded by the court in *Ho-Chunk Nation v. Kalshi Inc.*, No. 25-cv-698-wmc (W.D. Wis. May 11, 2026), at 6. Example 2 would additionally be a negative factor under proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(a)(6)(iii)(B)(4) as a contract settling solely by reference to a discrete action in a game.

Example 3. Under the Commission's proposed rule an election contract is not gaming, and so falls outside the Special Rule entirely. It is a covered contract under these Standards nonetheless. The participant's exposure is identical in kind to example 1, and the justification for exclusion, limits,

and disclosure does not depend on whether the underlying activity is played for recreation. This divergence is deliberate and is the clearest illustration of why § 104 is drafted independently of the gaming question.

Example 4. These are the facts of *In re Santos*, CFTC Docket No. 26-05 (July 31, 2026). Under these Standards the contract is covered, and PMCPS-M § 402 would have required the operator to identify the respondent as an influencing person and restrict him before he traded, rather than leaving the matter to enforcement five months after settlement.

Example 5. The hardest case at v1.1, and now settled by the operative text. The contract satisfies Gate 2 because it settles on whether a threshold is crossed, which is a discrete occurrence, and § 104(d)(1) as amended at v1.2 says so expressly. The futures contract in example 12 settles at the continuous level itself and is excluded. What remains open is not where the line sits but whether the substantial-equivalence qualifier in § 104(d)(1) can be applied consistently; see Appendix C item 1.

Examples 7 and 8 are the control cases. A traditional regulated sports wager is outside these Standards for two independent reasons. It fails Gate 3, because the payout is fixed when the bet is placed and the bettor cannot sell the position to another participant. A cash-out offer does not change that result: the price is set unilaterally by the house under § 104(e)(1), not established by trading. It is separately excluded under Gate 5, because a licensed sportsbook already operates under a gaming framework imposing exclusion, limits, and problem gambling requirements. Either ground alone is sufficient.

Example 11. A participant-to-participant betting exchange satisfies Gate 3, which is why Gate 5 is necessary. Where the exchange holds a gaming licence carrying equivalent requirements, these Standards do not apply. Where it does not, they do.

Example 14. Included because the Commission has proposed that contracts on aggregate crime rates over extended periods weigh against a public interest finding under proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(a)(6)(i)(C). A contract may be permissible to list and still expose a retail participant to the harms these Standards address. Permission to list and adequacy of consumer protection are separate questions.

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON WITH CLASSIFICATION TESTS UNDER APPLICABLE LAW

TEST	SOURCE	ELEMENTS	DETERMINES	RELATIONSHIP TO § 104
PMCPS-C § 104	This standard	Stake; discrete exogenous outcome; transferable position at a market-determined value; no hedging nexus; no exclusion	Whether the PMCPS family applies	Reference test
Gaming	Proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(b)(1)	Typically engaged in for recreation or to entertain others; governed by rules; measurable outcomes depending on luck, skill, or athletic ability	Whether the Commission may find a contract contrary to the public interest	Narrower. Excludes elections and economic indicators, which § 104 covers
Involvement	Proposed 17 C.F.R. § 40.11(a)(3)	Settlement determined by an occurrence or contingency in the activity	Whether a contract involves an enumerated activity	Similar in mechanism to Gate 2, applied to a different question
Bet or wager	31 U.S.C. § 5362(1)(A), (E)(ii)	Staking value on the outcome of a contest, sporting event, or game of chance, with a contingent return; excludes transactions on a registered entity	Reach of a payment-processing statute	Broader in form, narrower in effect. The registered-entity exclusion removes the products § 104 is most concerned with
Excluded commodity	7 U.S.C. § 1a(19)(iv)	Beyond the control of the parties; **and** associated with a financial, commercial, or economic consequence	Commission subject matter reach	Both elements required. § 104 does not require an economic consequence
Class III gaming	25 C.F.R. § 502.4	Residual: all gaming that is not class I or class II, expressly including any sports betting	Whether a compact is required for conduct on Indian lands	Turns on the character of the activity, not the participant's exposure
Sports gaming	Ohio Rev. Code § 3775.01(O)	Accepting wagers on sporting events, expressly including exchange wagering	State licensing	Reaches exchange structure, as Gate 3 does, but only for sporting events

Where the tests diverge, and why

Elections. A contract on the winner of a political election falls outside the proposed gaming definition, because an election is not conducted for recreation. It is a covered contract under § 104.

The participant's exposure is the same as on a sports contract, and the case for exclusion, limits, and disclosure does not depend on why the underlying activity is held.

Licensed sports betting. A fixed-odds wager at a licensed sportsbook is class III gaming, is a bet or wager, and is sports gaming under Ohio law. It is **not** a covered contract under § 104, because it fails Gate 3 and is separately excluded under Gate 5. The protections already apply to it under a gaming licence.

Commodity futures. A futures contract settling at the price of a commodity is within the Commission's reach and is not gaming. It is not a covered contract, because it fails Gate 2 under § 104(d)(1).

The pattern. The tests under applicable law sort products by the character of the underlying activity and by which sovereign may act. Section 104 sorts them by whether a retail participant bears an unhedged, transferable, event-contingent exposure that no gaming regulator is currently supervising. Those are different sorting criteria, and they should not be expected to agree.

APPENDIX C

MATTERS ON WHICH COMMENT IS INVITED

1. **Section 104(d)(1), the commodity carve-out. Addressed at v1.2.** The line is now drawn in the operative text: the exclusion reaches only a contract settling at the continuous, point-in-time level of a commodity, security, or index, and only where its settlement mechanism and economic characteristics make it substantially equivalent to a regulated financial instrument whose primary framework governs continuous-price settlement. A binary or threshold contract remains subject to § 104. Comment is now invited on whether the substantial-equivalence qualifier is administrable, rather than on where the line sits. Section 106(b-1) requires the determination to be re-applied when the law or market practice around continuous-price instruments moves.
2. **Section 104(f), the hedging nexus.** Whether a per-participant test is administrable, and whether the presumption in § 104(f)(2) is set correctly.
3. **Section 104(g)(1), the equivalence exclusion.** Whether an operator should be permitted to determine equivalence itself, subject to documentation and assessment, or whether equivalence should require a determination by the certifying body.

4. **Section 104(e), market-determined value.** Whether the distinction between a market-determined value and an operator-quoted price holds against product designs that blend the two, including operator-supplied liquidity and automated market makers.
5. **Scope of covered operator.** Whether an intermediary providing participant-facing access to another person's contracts should be subject to the full PMCPS family or a subset.
6. **Section 105.** Whether the classification record should be published, filed with a regulatory authority, or retained and produced on request as drafted.

End of PMCPS-C Version 1.3 Working Draft.

REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	CLASS	SUMMARY	EXTENT
1.3	2026-11-01	**Substantive**	Committee amendments of 2026-10-02. Two adopted suggestions applied. Section 102(a) narrowed so that the recordkeeping, filing and reclassification duties in sections 105 and 106 are stated as enforceable rather than disclaimed, resolving a contradiction present since v1.0. An evidence package added to section 105. The gaming licence equivalence exclusion in section 104(g)(1) now requires a written determination by the adopting authority, filed before first offer, with withdrawal or material modification added as a reclassification trigger.	32 rendered lines, 15 to 17 pages
1.2	2026-09-11	**Substantive**	Committee amendments of 2026-09-09. Four adopted suggestions applied. One section replaced, four edited. Commodity carve-out narrowed in the classification gate, reclassification trigger added, pre-listing filing of classification determinations required.	38 rendered lines, 15 to 15 pages
1.1	2026-08-11	**Editorial**	License and imprint blocks added. No normative text changed.	not published
1.0	2026-08-10	**Editorial**	First publication.	not published

Rendered both versions to plain text, normalised whitespace, diffed, counted changed lines, excluding the version string, the Supersedes value and the closing line. Produced by framework/tools/revdiff.py. Version 1.2 is the first build rendered with a correct print stylesheet. Earlier PDFs were produced at a width that clipped roughly a third of each page, so a page held materially less readable text than a page of this version does.

Page counts recorded for versions before 1.2 are therefore not comparable like for like with those from 1.2 onward, and the before figure in the Extent column of the 1.2 row should be read with that in mind.

LICENSE AND NAMING

(c) 2026 Aevora Solutions LLC. Published by the Institute for Emerging Gaming Markets.

This document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You may copy, redistribute, adapt and build upon this material for any purpose, including commercially, provided you give appropriate credit to the Institute for Emerging Gaming Markets, provide a link to the license, and indicate whether changes were made. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

PMCPS and Institute for Emerging Gaming Markets identify the source of this document. A modified version may not be described as PMCPS-C, or as an Institute standard. Conformance with this standard may be claimed only in respect of the document as published, without modification.

Institute for Emerging Gaming Markets
A standards body under Aevora Solutions LLC
Charleston, South Carolina
iegm.org

PMCPS-C Version 1.3, Working Draft. This document has not been adopted by any regulatory authority.