## ANNEX H

## SPECIFIC CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

In addition to your comments on all aspects of the Proposed Amendments and the Proposed Changes, we are seeking specific feedback on the following questions:

1. The Proposed Amendments clarify that a principal distributor cannot have multiple principal distributor relationships except where it acts as principal distributor for mutual funds in the same mutual fund family. Are there any circumstances under which a dealer should be permitted to act as a principal distributor for more than one mutual fund family? In responding, please explain the advantages and disadvantages of such a model as compared to a participating dealer model for both investors and market participants. In particular, please outline the specific benefits for investors as they pertain to competition, cost and investor choice. Please provide quantitative data, where relevant, to support your answer.

2. If your answer to question #1 was yes, please also comment on the following:
   (i) What are the specific circumstances under which a principal distributor should be allowed to act for more than one mutual fund family?

   (ii) If a principal distributor could act for more than one mutual fund family, should the compensation arrangements between the principal distributor be required to be the same or substantially similar in respect of each mutual fund family? If not, how could we ensure that any compensation arrangement differences would not influence a principal distributor to favour the mutual fund family with the most favourable compensation structure?

   (iii) What factors and considerations would be relevant to determining the appropriate number of mutual fund families for which a dealer should act as principal distributor? Explain how the distinction between principal distributors and participating dealers does not become blurred as the number of mutual fund families distributed by the same principal distributor increase.

   (iv) Should there be minimum duties and obligations owed by the principal distributor in respect of each principal distributor relationship? Should those obligations be the same across all mutual fund families for which the dealer acts as principal distributor?

(v) Should mutual funds that have a principal distributor be exclusively distributed by the principal distributor and not be distributed by other principal distributors or participating dealers?

3. Do the Proposed Amendments fully address potential investor protection concerns for existing principal distributor business models and any foreseeable new mutual fund distribution business models? Are there any other considerations, limits or factors about a principal distributor arrangement that we should consider?

4. The Proposed Amendments to NI 81-105 will come into force 18 months after the final publication date. Does this provide sufficient time for dealers that act as a principal distributor for more than one unaffiliated manager to transition their practice, operational model and compensation arrangements? Does this provide sufficient time for impacted investment fund managers to make alternate distribution arrangements for their mutual fund securities prior to the effective date? If not, please explain.

5. Some principal distributors may currently use chargebacks. Chargebacks involve a compensation practice where a representative is paid upfront commissions and/or fees from the dealer when their client purchases securities. Chargebacks occur when investors redeem their securities before a fixed schedule as determined by the dealer, and the dealing representative is required to pay back all or part of the upfront commission/fees to the dealer. In June 2023, the CSA announced that it would be reviewing the use of chargebacks in the mutual fund industry due to concerns about potential conflicts of interest associated with this practice. The CSA is of the view that the use of chargebacks raises a significant conflict of interest for principal distributors in the distribution of mutual fund securities and we are considering the appropriate regulatory steps. We are requesting additional feedback on this practice.