

Submitted via Qualtrics

**Taste Gourmet Group Limited
Company/Organisation view
GEM Listed Company**

Question 1

Do you agree that an alternative eligibility test should be introduced to enable the listing of high growth enterprises substantively engaged in R&D activities on GEM?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 2

Do you have any comments on the proposed thresholds for the alternative eligibility test as set out in paragraphs 63 to 75 of the Consultation Paper?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the post-IPO 24 month lock-up period imposed on controlling shareholders of GEM issuers to 12 months as set out in paragraph 76 of the Consultation Paper?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

As "Shell" Companies are a concern of the Exchange, the 24 months post-ipo lock-up period should deter companies from these kind of arrangements. I also believe that the decline in these activities was mainly the result of the removal of the simple transfer process, as such with the reinstatement of the simple transfer process to the main board, these activities will resume.

Question 4

Should any other existing eligibility requirement for a listing on GEM be amended?

No

If so, please state the requirement(s) that should be amended and give reasons for your views.

Question 5

Do you agree with the proposed consequential and housekeeping amendments to the reverse takeover and extreme transaction Rules as set out in paragraphs 81 and 82 of the Consultation Paper?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

In order to control the "Shell" companies activities, these rule should remain.

Question 6

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to remove GEM's compliance officer requirement as set out in paragraph 85(a) of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

I see no difference on listing on GEM and the Main Board on compliance issues.

Question 7

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to shorten the period of engagement of GEM issuers' compliance advisers and to remove the additional obligations currently imposed on a GEM issuer's compliance adviser as set out in paragraphs 85(b) and 86 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

On full financial year should be sufficient.

Question 8

Should any other continuing obligation currently applicable to a GEM listed issuer also be removed?

No

If so, please state the requirement(s) and give reasons for your views.

Question 9

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to remove quarterly financial reporting as a mandatory requirement for GEM issuers and instead introduce it as a recommended best practice in GEM's Corporate Governance Code?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Reduce the cost of compliance.

Question 10

Do you agree with the Exchange’s proposal to align the timeframes for GEM issuers to publish their annual reports, interim reports and preliminary announcements of results for the first half of each financial year with those for the Main Board, as set out in paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

GEM and Main Board should be aligned.

Question 11

Do you agree that a streamlined mechanism should be introduced to enable qualified GEM issuers to transfer their listing to the Main Board?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Without the transfer mechanism, SMEs will not have a platform to grow as they will choose to wait till they are eligible to list on the Main Board or choose to list on other platforms such as NASDAQ. I also believe that there should be a mechanism for any Main Board companies that no longer meet the Main Board listing requirements to be demoted to GEM.

Question 12

Do you agree with the removal of the requirement for the appointment of a sponsor for the purpose of a streamlined transfer as set out in paragraph 108 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

GEM companies are already listed, the appointment of a sponsor will not add any value to the transfer, just costs.

Question 13

Do you agree with, for the purpose of a streamlined transfer, the removal of the requirement for a “prospectus-standard” listing document and other requirements as set out in paragraphs 111 to 114 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

GEM companies publishes annual reports, the public already has sufficient information on the companies. A listing document just adds costs and burden on the already public

001

companies.

Question 14

Do you agree with the track record requirements for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraphs 117 to 118 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Agree with the Exchange's view.

Question 15

Do you agree with the daily turnover and volume weighted average market capitalisation requirements for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraphs 120 to 133 of the Consultation Paper?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

This is a chicken and egg issue. The lower turnover rate for GEM companies is an inherent problem of being on GEM. The purchase of GEM companies' share are prohibited by the major funds and are also prohibited to be promoted by most stock commentators. I believe the daily turnover rate of most GEM companies will increase once transferred to the Main Board.

Question 16

Should the Minimum Daily Turnover Threshold for the Daily Turnover Test be set at: - Selected Choice

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 17

Do you agree with the proposed compliance record requirement for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraph 134 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

No comments.

Question 18

Do you agree with the proposed modification to the existing compliance record requirement for a transfer from GEM to the Main Board as set out in paragraph 136 of the Consultation Paper?

001

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

No comments.

Question 19

Do you agree that the Exchange should exempt GEM transferees to the Main Board from the Main Board initial listing fee?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

GEM companies are already paying listing fees, should just make up the differences if fees are higher on the Main Board.