

APPENDIX A
General

Schedule 1
Specific Questions FOR COMMENT Relating to the Proposed Amendments
and Proposed Changes

General

1. Are there any areas that would benefit from a reduction of undue regulatory burden or streamlining of requirements, while preserving investor protection and market efficiency, which we should consider as part of Phase 2, Stage 2 (and onwards)? Please prioritize any suggestions you may have.
2. With the exception of Workstreams 1, 2 and 3, the Proposed Amendments and Proposed Changes do not introduce any new requirements for investment funds. Instead, we are either removing requirements or introducing exemptions that are permissive in nature. As a result, we do not contemplate any prolonged transition period following the in-force date of the proposals. Are there any specific elements of the Proposed Amendments and Proposed Changes which investment funds and their managers would require additional time to comply with? If so, please explain why and provide suggestions for an appropriate transition period.

Workstream One: Consolidate the Simplified Prospectus and the Annual Information Form

Consolidation of Form 81-101F2 into Form 81-101F1

3. As described in footnotes 3 to 5 of the Notice, certain specific requirements from the existing Form 81-101F1 and Form 81-101F2 were not carried over into the proposed Form 81-101F1. Do you support or disagree with these changes? If so, please explain.
4. Are there any disclosure requirements from the proposed Form 81-101F1 that are redundant or unnecessary and that can be removed or modified without impacting investor protection or market efficiency? If so, what are the reasons why the disclosure requirements should be removed or modified and how will investor protection and market efficiency be maintained? Are there any significant cost implications associated with sourcing the required disclosure? If so, please explain. Please comment in particular on the proposed Item 4.14 (Ownership of Securities of the Mutual Fund and the Manager) of Part A and whether it should be narrowed in scope or removed entirely.
5. As an alternative to complete removal, are there any disclosure requirements from the proposed Form 81-101F1 that could be relocated to another required disclosure document or to the proposed “designated website” for investment funds, while still maintaining investor protection and market efficiency? If so, why should these disclosure requirements be relocated and where should they be relocated to? Please comment in particular on any of the following proposed Items:

- a. Part A, Item 4 (Responsibility for Mutual Fund Operations);
 - b. Part A, Item 7 (Purchases, Switches and Redemptions);
 - c. Part A, Item 8 (Optional Services Provided by the Mutual Fund Organization);
 - d. Part B, Item 8 (Name, Formation and History of the Mutual Fund).
6. The proposed Item 7(2) of Part A of Form 81-101F1 requires a description of the circumstances when the suspension of redemption rights could occur. We are considering, however, whether to require specific disclosure in the prospectus regarding any liquidity risk management policies that have been put in place for the investment fund. This would include a list of any liquidity risk management tools that have been adopted as permitted by securities regulations, along with a brief description of how and when they will be employed and the effect of their use on redemption rights. Would the prospectus be the most appropriate place for this type of disclosure, or are there other alternatives that we should consider?
 7. The current prospectus disclosure rules were drafted at a time when inventories of physically printed prospectuses were required to satisfy prospectus delivery requirements. In recognition of this, flexibility exists in terms of how to deal with amendments to avoid significant costs that might be associated with having to reprint large quantities of commercially prepared copies of the prospectus. With the transition to delivery of the Fund Facts and the ETF Facts documents in place of the prospectus, along with the advent of print-on-demand technology and electronic delivery, is it still necessary to maintain this flexibility? Would it be less burdensome for investment funds and investment fund managers to follow the approach taken with the Fund Facts document and ETF Facts document by requiring that all amendments be in the form of an amended and restated prospectus, prepared in accordance with the proposed Form 81-101F1? Why or why not?
 8. Item 11.2 (Publication of Material Change) of NI 81-106 sets out requirements that an investment fund must satisfy where a material change occurs in its affairs. Can these requirements be streamlined or modified in any way while maintaining investor protection and market efficiency?
 9. Will any exemptive relief decisions be rendered ineffective as a result of the repeal of Form 81-101F2? If so, are there any transitional issues that need to be considered? Please explain.
 10. Are there any disclosure requirements in the proposed Form 81-101F1 that require additional guidance or clarity?
 11. Currently a final prospectus must be filed within 90 days of receiving a receipt for a preliminary prospectus. We are of the view that this requirement is more relevant to non-investment fund issuers and is not necessarily applicable to investment funds, particularly to investment funds in continuous distribution. As a result, we are currently considering

whether to either extend the final filing deadline or remove this requirement entirely. Do you have any views on the applicability of this provision to investment fund issuers? If you agree that the provision is not required, please explain whether it would be preferable to extend or eliminate the filing deadline, including the reason for your preference. If an extension is preferred, would 180 days be sufficient?

Investment Funds Not in Continuous Distribution

12. Should investment funds not in continuous distribution that have already prepared and filed an AIF using Form 81-101F2 be permitted to continue using that Form? If so, why?
13. Should investment funds not in continuous distribution be relieved entirely of the requirement to file an AIF? If so, what impact would this have on an investor's ability to access an up-to-date consolidated disclosure record for an investment fund not in continuous distribution? Alternatively, please comment on whether elements from the current Form 81-101F2 should be incorporated into any of the following:
 - a. Form 81-106F1 *Contents of Annual and Interim Management Report of Fund Performance*;
 - b. a designated website;
 - c. other forms of disclosure (please specify).

Workstream Two: Investment Fund Designated Website

14. The proposed Part 16.1 of NI 81-106 requires reporting investment funds to designate a qualifying website on which the investment fund must post regulatory disclosure documents. This proposal represents the first stage of a broader initiative to both improve the accessibility of disclosure to investors and enhance the efficiency with which investment funds can meet their disclosure obligations. The CSA, however, recognize that electronic methods of providing access to information and documents besides websites may be used to provide information regarding investment funds. As a result, we ask for specific feedback on the following questions related to the issue of making the proposed Part 16.1 more technologically neutral:
 - a. Should the proposed Part 16.1 be revised to provide investment funds with the option to designate other technological means of providing public access to regulatory disclosure besides websites? In your response, please comment on the following issues: any potential investor protection concerns, consistency with securities instruments outside of the investment fund regime, and the benefits of making such a change.
 - b. What other technological means of providing public access to regulatory disclosure should be captured by the proposed amendments? Please be specific. Of these means, please identify which are currently in use and which are expected to be used in the future.

- c. Should any parameters (e.g. free to access, accessible to the public) be applied to limit which technological means of providing public access to regulatory disclosure besides websites should be included in the proposed Part 16.1? If so, please state which parameters should apply and why.
 - d. If you agree that technological means of providing public access to regulatory disclosure besides websites should be included in the proposed Part 16.1, what terms could be used to refer to these means? What are the benefits and drawbacks of each possible option? Some examples include “digital platform”, “electronic platform”, and “online platform”.
 - e. Are there any elements of the current proposed amendments and proposed changes under Workstream Two that would not work if an investment fund could designate other technological means of providing public access to regulatory disclosure besides websites?
15. Are there unintended consequences arising from the proposed section 16.1.2 of NI 81-106 that we should consider? For example, under the proposed section, an investment fund may designate a website that is maintained by a Related Person. We are of the view that this would avoid circumstances where an investment fund would have to create an entirely new and separate website, where to do so would not be desirable. Are there any practical issues associated with this that we should consider?
16. Are there any aspects of the proposed guidance provided in 81-106CP that are impractical or misaligned with current market practices?
17. Some investment funds may maintain a website that is accessible only by securityholders with an access code and a password (i.e. a private website). Would an investment fund currently maintaining a private website accessible only to its securityholders encounter any issues with the proposed requirement to post regulatory disclosure required by securities legislation on a designated website that is publicly accessible?

Workstream Three: Codify Exemptive Relief Granted in Respect of Notice-and-Access Applications

18. Will participation rates for investment fund securityholder meetings change under the notice-and-access system? In particular, is it anticipated that participation rates would change? Please provide an explanation for your answer.

Workstream Four: Minimize Filings of Personal Information Forms

No questions.

Workstream Five: Codify Exemptive Relief Granted in Respect of Conflicts Applications

19. The Proposed Amendments include new exemptions in sections 6.3 and 6.5 of NI 81-107 to permit secondary market trades in debt securities of related issuers and secondary market trades in debt securities with a related dealer, respectively. The exemptions are based on

discretionary relief granted to date that includes pricing conditions. The pricing conditions are not the same under each exemption and also differ from what is currently codified under section 6.1 of NI 81-107.

- In accordance with subsection 6.1(2) of NI 81-107, for inter-fund trades of portfolio securities between related reporting investment funds, non-reporting investment funds and managed accounts, the portfolio manager may purchase or sell a debt security if, among other conditions, all of the following apply:
 - the bid and ask price of the security is readily available as provided under paragraph 6.1(2)(c);
 - the transaction is executed at a price, which is the average of the highest current bid and lowest current ask determined on the basis of reasonable inquiry as provided under paragraph 6.1(2)(e) and subparagraph 6.1(1)(a)(ii).
- In accordance with the proposed paragraph 6.3(1)(d) of NI 81-107, reporting and non-reporting investment funds would be able to invest in non-exchange traded debt securities of a related issuer in the secondary market if, among other conditions, all of the following apply:
 - where the purchase occurs on a marketplace, the price is determined in accordance with the requirements of that marketplace as provided under the proposed subparagraph 6.3(1)(d)(i) of NI 81-107;
 - where the purchase does not occur on a marketplace, as provided under the proposed subparagraph 6.3(1)(d)(ii), the price is either of the following:
 - the price at which an arm's length seller is willing to sell the security;
 - not more than the price quoted publicly by an independent marketplace or the price quoted, immediately before the purchase, by an arm's length purchaser or seller.
- In accordance with the proposed subsection 6.5(1), reporting investment funds, non-reporting investment funds and managed accounts, may trade debt securities with a related dealer if, at the time of the transaction, among other conditions, all of the following apply:
 - the bid and ask price of the security transacted is readily available as provided under the proposed paragraph 6.5(1)(d);
 - the purchase is not executed at a price which is higher than the available ask price and the sale is not executed at a price which is lower than the available bid price, as provided in the proposed paragraph 6.5(1)(e).

Should these pricing conditions be revised? Should they be more harmonized? Are there any self-regulatory organization rules or guidance for pricing methods that we should consider in such cases?

Workstream Six: Broaden Pre-Approval Criteria for Investment Fund Mergers

20. We propose to mandate new disclosure requirements in the Information Circular in subparagraph 5.6(1)(a)(ii) and paragraph 5.6(1)(b) of NI 81-102 as pre-approval criteria for investment fund mergers. Are there any additional disclosure elements that we should require beyond what has been proposed? If so, please provide details.

Workstream Seven: Repeal Regulatory Approval Requirements for Change of Manager, Change of Control of a Manager, and Change of Custodian that Occurs in Connection with a Change of Manager

21. Given the oversight regime in place for investment fund managers, we are proposing to repeal the requirement for regulatory approval of a change of manager or a change of control of a manager under Part 5 (Fundamental Changes) of NI 81-102. Does this proposal raise any investor protection issues? If so, explain what measures, if any, securities regulators should consider in order to mitigate such issues. Alternatively, should we maintain the requirements for regulatory approval of these matters and seek to streamline the approval process by eliminating certain requirements in subsection 5.7(1) of NI 81-102? If so, please comment on whether such an approach would be preferable to the existing proposal, which has been put forward with consideration given to the presence of the investment fund manager registration regime.
22. When there is a change of manager or a change of control of a manager, should securityholders have the right to redeem their securities without paying any redemption fees before the change? If so, what should be the period after the announcement of the change during which securityholders should be allowed to redeem their securities without having to pay any redemption fees?
23. We propose to add to subsection 5.4(2) of NI 81-102 certain disclosure requirements in the Information Circular regarding a change of manager. Is there any other disclosure in the Information Circular that we should mandate, beyond what has been proposed? If so, please provide details.
24. When a change of manager is planned, we are considering requiring that the related draft Information Circular be sent to securities regulators for approval before it is sent to securityholders in accordance with subsection 5.4(1) of NI 81-102. What concerns, if any, would arise from introducing this requirement? We expect that securities regulators would establish a process to review the Information Circular. If securities regulators took 10 business days to approve the Information Circular as part of the review process, would that create any issues with respect to the organization of the securityholder meeting?

25. Investment funds currently rely on the form of Information Circular provided for in Form 51-102F5 *Information Circular* of NI 51-102, which was developed primarily for non-investment fund issuers.
- a. Should Form 51-102F5 of NI 51-102 be replaced with an Information Circular form that is tailored to investment funds?
 - b. If investment funds had their own form of Information Circular, would this reduce costs or make it easier to comply with requirements to produce an Information Circular?
 - c. If investment funds had their own form of Information Circular, are there certain form requirements that should be added which would provide investors with useful disclosure that is not currently required by Form 51-102F5? Alternatively, are there disclosure requirements that could be removed? Please provide details.
 - d. Should investors receive additional tailored disclosure adapted to their needs? Would investors benefit from receiving a summary of key information from the Information Circular in a simple and comparable format, in addition to the Information Circular itself or as a distinctive part of the Information Circular (e.g. as a summary appearing at the front of the document)?

Workstream Eight: Codify Exemptive Relief Granted in Respect of Fund Facts Delivery Applications

26. Currently, a separate Fund Facts or ETF Facts must be filed for each class or series of a mutual fund or ETF that is subject to NI 81-101, or NI 41-101 respectively. The Proposed Amendments contemplate allowing a mutual fund to prepare a single consolidated Fund Facts that includes all the classes or series covered by certain automatic switch programs on the basis that the only distinction between the classes or series relates to fees.
- a. Should the CSA consider allowing the preparation and filing of consolidated Fund Facts and ETF Facts where there are no distinguishing features between classes or series other than fees, even in circumstances where there is no automatic switch program? Alternatively, should the CSA consider mandating consolidation in such circumstances? In either case, we anticipate revising the form requirements of Form 81-101F3 to be consistent with paragraph 3.2.05(e) of NI 81-101 as set out in Appendix B, Schedule 8 of this publication.
 - b. Are there other circumstances where consolidation should be allowed or mandated? If so, what parameters should be placed on such consolidation? Additionally, what disclosure changes would need to be made to Form 81-101F3 to accommodate the consolidation?