

June 3, 2013

To: British Columbia Securities Commission

Alberta Securities Commission

Saskatchewan Financial Services Commission

Manitoba Securities Commission

Ontario Securities Commission

Autorité des marchés financiers

New Brunswick Securities Commission

Superintendent of Securities, Prince Edward Island

Nova Scotia Securities Commission

Securities Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador

Superintendent of Securities, Yukon Territory

Superintendent of Securities, Northwest Territories

Superintendent of Securities, Nunavut

C/o: The Secretary

Ontario Securities Commission

20 Queen Street West

Suite 1900, Box 55

Toronto, ON M5H 3S8

Fax: (416) 593-8145

Email: comments@osc.gov.on.ca

Anne-Marie Beaudoin, Secrétaire

Autorité des marchés financiers

Tour de la Bourse

800, square Victoria

C.P. 246, 22^e étage

Montréal, QC H4Z 1G3

Fax: (514) 864-6381

Email: consultation-en-cours@lautorite.qc.ca

Re: Multilateral Instrument 62-104 and 62-103 Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids

Dear Sirs,

Further to your March 13, 2013 request for comments on MI 62-104 Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids and NI 62-103 Early Warning System and Related Take-Over and Shareholder Reporting, enclosed are my comments

I strongly disagree with the reduction of the early warning report requirement from 10% to 5%, especially as it relates to TSXV/CNSX listed issuers. In small cap issuers this threshold is extremely low and a small \$500,000 investment could trigger reporting requirements. The insider reporting change to include warrants in the 10% insider reporting calculation has already reduced the number of institutions that are willing to invest due to increased administrative burden. This proposed change would again reduce the amount of funding available to junior issuers as the institutions don't want the hassle of continuous disclosure both up and down by 2% as their holdings fluctuate or the issuer's capitalization changes. The requirement to disclose when it reduces also requires them to monitor holdings which may change without them being involved in the change, such as a subsequent financing, exercising of options etc., which could trigger a reporting requirement. I disagree with the request to report a reduction of 2% in any circumstances and to report when holdings decrease below 5%.

Question 1.

The proposal to maintain the requirement for further reporting at 2% is the correct decision. Anything less is not material and becomes too onerous for reporting purposes.

Question 2.

In several instances the institutions will complete a private placement and buy shares in the open market and the timing of the closing of the placement is not always within their knowledge. I feel the moratorium is not necessary for TSXV issuers as the market cap is small and the information is not material. I don't think the moratorium is effective at any level.

Question 3.

I agree with not requiring to further accelerate early warning reporting during a take-over bid.

Question 4.

As stated earlier, the 5% threshold will reduce the available capital for junior issuers.

Question 5.

No benefits to require Mutual Funds to report.

Question 6, 7.

I agree with the approach to capture equity derivative positions in Early Warning reporting.

Question 8, 9, 10, 11.

I agree with these proposals.

Question 12, 14, 15.

No opinion.

Question 13.

I strongly disagree with applying this proposal to Venture issuers. None of the new proposals except the equity derivative position should apply to Venture issuers.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Gordon Keep

CEO

Fiore Management & Advisory Corp.