

Submitted by Kyle Kozuska, Paradigm Portfolio Management Company – February 28, 2012

Review of Minimum Amount and Accredited Investor Exemptions – Public Consultation

1. Primarily Educational background and investment experience should provide basis, as it is the individuals responsibility to determine their desire or ability to take on risk.
2. Registrant obligations address some concerns, although the registrants ability to know and communicate all suitable investments is suspect.
3. Primarily an arbitrary number of any amount is a poor gauge of suitability. It should be the individuals responsibility and choice to investment the appropriate amount for them based on their financial situation.
4. The minimum amount exemption would be better set by the issuer, whilst the ability of the investor to invest should be based on education and experience.
5. No, I do not agree with the maintaining the minimum amount exemption in its current form.
6. My answer would not change in light of the listed factors.
7. If there remains a limit, it should be indexed to real terms.
8. Any flexibility provided to the static threshold would increase the ability to raise capital.
9. No, my answer would not change given any of the factors as listed.
10. No, if an individual is able to acquire securities, there should not be any limitations.
11. The impact would be minimal.
12. Alternative qualification criteria would most likely remain the individuals ability to determine the risks involved in the asset.
13. Other limitations might include issuer asset class criterion.
14. Yes, the minimum amount exemption should be repealed, and my answer wouldn't likely change based on the listed factors.
15. If the minimum amount exemption was repealed the AI is an adequate alternative.
16. I am not aware of other options to modify the minimum amount exemption.
17. The issues as described are primarily a question as to what are the best factors are to determine access to the exempt market. Whatever qualifications afford an individual the best understanding of the risks in the investment would make the best guidelines for access to the exempt market.
18. Other issues might include less reliance on static or indexed numbers and more on the individuals ability to make an informed decision.
19. I do not agree to retaining the AI exemption in its current form. Alternative qualifications should be considered.
20. The income and asset thresholds might change if the securities were recommended by a registrant.
21. No. Indexing is irrelevant.
22. A change to the income/asset thresholds could be massive in impact on raising capital.
23. The best qualification used in the AI exemption is some combination of work experience and education. None of the factors listed would change my answer to any significant degree.

24. A change to the qualification criteria would have a marked impact on capital raising.
25. Yes, individuals should be able to acquire securities under the AI exemption. My answer would not change based on the listed changes.
26. An investment limit should not be imposed as this is a personal decision based on a myriad of factors. My answer might vary if a registrant was involved.
27. Investment limitations for individuals would greatly impact capital raising, depending on the magnitude of the change.
28. Further costs such as review by a professional such as an accountant or lawyer are not constructive, and should not be considered in a review.
29. I do not agree with imposed such a requirement.
30. Perhaps random audits of individuals would maintain order and integrity in the utilization of the exemptions.
31. I am not currently aware of any other options for revising the AI exemption.