

Part B Consultation Questions

Please reply to the questions below that are raised in the Consultation Paper downloadable from the HKEX website at: <https://www.hkex.com.hk/-/media/HKEX-Market/News/Market-Consultations/2016-Present/January-2020-Corporate-WVR/Consultation-Paper/cp202001.pdf>. Please indicate your preference by ticking the appropriate boxes.

Where there is insufficient space provided for your comments, please attach additional pages.

We encourage you to read all of the following questions before responding.

1. Do you agree, in principle, that the Exchange should expand the existing WVR regime to enable corporate entities to benefit from WVR provided that they meet appropriate conditions and safeguards?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. If your agreement is conditional upon particular aspect(s) of the proposed regime being implemented, please state what those aspect(s) are.

We are strongly in favour of the one share one vote principle, and are against any deviation from this principle. We hold that WVR are incompatible with the principle of equal treatment of all shareholders. The proposed safeguards may help to mitigate, but do not remove risks WVR can pose to minority shareholders.

2. Do you agree that a corporate WVR beneficiary must be either the Eligible Entity or a wholly owned subsidiary of the Eligible Entity?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

A wholly-owned subsidiary of an Eligible Entity may not be subject to the same regulatory scrutiny, corporate governance requirements, listing rules and transparency requirements as the Eligible Entity itself.

3. Recognising that, with at least a 30% economic interest, the corporate WVR beneficiary would be regarded as having “de facto control” of the relevant listing applicant even without WVR and would be considered a Controlling Shareholder under both the Listing Rules and the Takeovers Code, the Exchange has proposed a minimum shareholding requirement for a corporate WVR beneficiary to own at least 30% of the economic interest in the listing applicant.

(a) Do you agree with the proposed requirement for a corporate WVR beneficiary to own at least 30% of the economic interest in the listing applicant and be the single largest shareholder at listing?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the principle that there should be a minimum level of economic interest required to be maintained, however it is difficult to determine the appropriate level - in particular given the complexity of how individual and corporate WVR regimes will interact and impact each other.

(b) Do you agree that a corporate WVR beneficiary's shares should lapse if it fails to maintain at least a 30% economic interest on an ongoing basis?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

In principle we agree that WVR should lapse if the minimum economic interest is not maintained. However we note that individual WVR do not have a requirement to maintain the 10% minimum economic interest on an ongoing basis and the rules do not state that failure to maintain this interest will result in the lapse of the individual WVR.

4. (a) If your answer to Question 3(a) is “no”, do you propose a different economic interest in order for the applicant to benefit from WVR and, if so, what this should be?

Yes

No

If so, please state these conditions/requirements.

See response to question 3(a).

(b) Do you believe that any other conditions and requirements should be imposed if a lower economic interest threshold is allowed?

Yes

No

If so, please state these conditions/requirements. Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

We do not have any specific additional comments to add to this question.

5. Do you agree with the proposed exception from the Rules to permit an issuance of shares on a non-pre-emptive basis to a corporate WVR beneficiary without shareholders' approval if the below conditions are satisfied?

(a) The subscription is solely for the purpose and to the extent necessary to allow the corporate WVR beneficiary to comply with the 30% economic interest requirement;

(b) such shares do not carry WVR;

(c) the subscription will be on the same terms or better (from the perspective of the listed issuer) as the original issuance that triggered the need for the corporate WVR beneficiary to subscribe for additional shares in order to comply with the 30% economic interest requirement; and

(d) the subscription price paid by the corporate WVR beneficiary for the anti-dilution shares is fair and reasonable (having regard, among other things, to the average trading price of the listed issuer's stock over the preceding three months).

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. If your answer to Question 5 is "no", and you agree with the requirement for the corporate WVR beneficiary to hold at least 30% of economic interest in the issuer on an ongoing basis, what alternative measures would you propose to enable such minimum economic interest to be maintained on an ongoing basis? In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

Such issuance should be only made with shareholder approval, and under a one-share one-vote basis. It is important that shareholder approval is sought and received.

6. Do you agree with the proposed requirement that a corporate WVR beneficiary must have held an economic interest of at least 10% in, and have been materially involved in the management or the business of, the listing applicant for a period of at least two financial years prior the date of its application for listing?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. If your answer to 6 is “no”, do you agree that a historical holding requirement should be imposed? If so what alternative threshold or holding period would you propose?

In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

We question if 2 years is sufficient to meet the requirements of the listing applicant to 'grow and evolve' with the 'ecosystem' - a longer time frame (potentially 5 years) may be more appropriate and could include provisions for if the listing applicant is a new business that has not been operating for 5 years.

7. (a) Do you agree that the maximum ratio of weighted votes permitted for shares of a corporate WVR beneficiary should be lower than the maximum ratio permitted for individual WVR beneficiaries?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We do not have a comment on this question.

- (b) Do you agree that this ratio should be set at no more than five times the voting power of ordinary shares?

Yes

No

If not, what is the maximum ratio that you would propose? Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

We have an inprinciple objection to WVR.

8. In summary, the Exchange recognises that the synergistic benefits of the ecosystem and the strategy and vision of the leader in developing the ecosystem may be difficult for a listing applicant to replicate on its own or with other business partners; and that this provides a basis for the listing applicant to determine that it is in its interest to issue WVR shares to the lead company within the ecosystem in order to reinforce its own role within the ecosystem. Accordingly, the Exchange has proposed that a corporate WVR beneficiary should be required to demonstrate its contribution through the inclusion of the listing applicant in its ecosystem in order to benefit from WVR. Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal in relation to the ecosystem requirement?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We question if WVR are required for a company to continue to benefit from the 'ecosystem' of companies of which it may be part and disagree that synergistic benefits from being part of an 'ecosystem' are a basis for WVR to be issued. If the benefits are clear, the relationship with ecosystem companies and strategic advantages should receive support of all shareholders. Furthermore, the presence of WVR could result in initiatives or strategies that benefit the ecosystem at the expense of ordinary non-WVR shareholders

9. Do you agree with the required characteristics of an ecosystem as set out below:
- (a) a community of companies (which includes the listing applicant) and other components (which may be non-legal entities such as business units of the corporate shareholder, user or customer bases, applications, programs or other technological applications) that has grown and co-evolved around a technology or know-how platform or a set of core products or services, owned or operated by the prospective corporate WVR beneficiary (for the avoidance of doubt, such platform or products or services does not need to represent the main business of the prospective corporate WVR beneficiary);
 - (b) the components within the ecosystem (including the listing applicant) both benefit from, and contribute to, the ecosystem by sharing certain data, users and/or technology (for example, software, applications, proprietary know-how or patents);
 - (c) the ecosystem must have attained meaningful scale, which will normally be measured by reference to indicators such as the number and technological sophistication of the components connected to the ecosystem, the size of its (combined) user base, or the frequency and extent of cross-interaction between the users or customers of different components;
 - (d) the core components within the ecosystem, and the listing applicant, are in substance controlled by the corporate WVR beneficiary; and

- (e) the growth and success of the listing applicant was materially attributable to its participation in and co-evolvement with the ecosystem; and the applicant is expected to continue to benefit materially from being part of that ecosystem.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. Please elaborate if you wish to propose an alternative or additional criteria.

We do not believe that involvement in an 'ecosystem' is a basis for the issue of WVR. This includes an in principle objection to the view that voting power could be determined by the perceived value contributed by a group of shareholders (i.e. we support the one share one vote principle).

10. Are there other circumstances relevant to innovative companies that, in your view, could either (a) justify granting WVR to a corporate WVR beneficiary; or (b) be required as a pre-requisite to being granted WVR?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

11. Do you agree that the corporate WVR beneficiary can be a traditional economy company provided that it develops a similar ecosystem which can satisfy the eligibility criteria?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

This question raises the issue of the clarity of the definition of ecosystem and extent to which benefits can be attributed as described. In our view, if the 'ecosystem' concept is adopted in the Listing Rules it will be important to have a clear and precise definition with a narrow scope of application.

12. If your answer to 8 is “yes”, do you agree that the corporate WVR beneficiary should be required to provide a contribution to the WVR issuer (e.g. by facilitating the applicant’s participation in the ecosystem and including the applicant in its vision and planning for the ecosystem) on an ongoing basis and that its WVR should lapse if the corporate’s contribution to the WVR issuer is substantially terminated or materially disrupted or suspended for a period exceeding 12 months?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

While we answered 'no' to question 8, if the listing applicant is no longer a beneficiary of the ecosystem the WVR should lapse immediately upon confirmation by the issuer's corporate governance committee.

13. Are there alternative or additional conditions or requirements that you would propose for the corporate WVR beneficiary or the WVR issuer on an ongoing basis?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We are concerned that there could be multiple recipients of WVR, that could be related parties - if WVR were to be extended, we would support a cap on the total voting power of all WVR holders, potentially at a level where non-WVR shareholders could block a special resolution.

WVR enhance the need for robustly independent INEDs - we therefore would support that the appointment or removal of independent directors be on a one-share one-vote basis.

14. (a) If your answer to 0 is “yes”, do you agree that a WVR issuer’s corporate governance committee should (after making due enquiries) confirm, on a six month and annual basis, that there has been no termination or material disruption, etc., to the corporate WVR beneficiary’s contribution to the listing applicant and that this requirement be set out in the committee’s terms of reference?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

In our view it will also be important for shareholders to be able to assess the basis upon which the assessment and judgement have been made.

- (b) Alternatively, would you prefer there to be a different mechanism to check that this requirement is being met?

Yes

No

If so, please state what this should be. Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

15. Balancing the need to ring-fence corporate WVR beneficiary on a fair, rational and justifiable basis to avoid a proliferation of WVR structures, and the risk that a high market capitalisation requirement may be seen as creating an uneven playing field, the Exchange has proposed that a prospective corporate WVR beneficiary must have an expected market capitalisation of at least HK\$200 billion at the time of the WVR issuer's listing. Do you agree with the proposed minimum market capitalisation requirement of HK\$200 billion for a prospective corporate WVR beneficiary?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We believe it is important to have a high threshold to constrain the number of WVR issuers. The limit appears to only be at time of listing, an ongoing requirement could potentially be considered.

16. Do you consider that any exceptions to the market capitalisation requirement should be provided?

Yes

No

If your answer to this question is "yes", please explain the reason(s) for your view and state under what circumstances, and the factors that you consider to be relevant. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.



17. Do you agree with the proposed requirement that to be suitable to benefit from WVR, a corporate WVR beneficiary must be either: (a) an Innovative Company or (b) have business experience in one or more emerging and innovative sectors as well as a track record of investments in, and contributions to, innovative companies?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

18. Do you agree with the proposed requirement that to benefit from WVR, a corporate beneficiary must have and maintain a primary listing on the Exchange or a Qualifying Exchange?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

We would also support the inclusion of a requirement to meet the minimum standards of companies listed on the Exchange - not all issuers listed on Qualifying Exchanges are subject to the same standards which can vary due to country of incorporation.

19. Do you agree with the requirement that a listing applicant must not represent more than 30% of the corporate WVR beneficiary in terms of market capitalisation at the time of its listing?

Yes

No

If not, do you prefer an alternative threshold? Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

20. (a) Do you agree with the proposed requirement that at least one director of the listing applicant must be a Corporate Representative?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

(b) Are there any alternative or additional measures that you would propose to increase a corporate WVR beneficiary's responsibility and accountability for how it exercises its control?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

A strong focus on robust and genuinely independent INEDs.

21. Do you agree that the WVR attached to a corporate WVR beneficiary's shares must lapse permanently if:

(a) the beneficiary no longer has a Corporate Representative on the listed issuer's board of directors for a continuous period of 30 days;

(b) the Corporate Representative is disqualified as a director or found unsuitable by the Exchange as a result of an action or decision taken in his or her capacity as director of the listed issuer save where the corporate WVR beneficiary is able to demonstrate to the Exchange's satisfaction that the action or decision was taken outside of the authority granted by the corporate WVR beneficiary to the Corporate Representative; or

(c) the corporate WVR beneficiary has been convicted of an offence involving a finding that the beneficiary acted fraudulently or dishonestly?

Yes

No

If not do you suggest any alternative criteria? Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measures to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

22. Do you agree that the Exchange should impose a time-defined sunset on the WVR of a corporate WVR beneficiary?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

In our view this is an important protection mechanism for minority shareholders.

23. If your answer to 0 is “yes”, do you agree with the proposed maximum 10 year length of the initial “sunset period”?

Yes

No

If not, what length of period would you prefer? Please give reasons for your views.

10 years is quite significant, 5 years appears more appropriate - in particular given the requirement that the WVR beneficiary only needs to be materially involved in the business of the listing applicant for 2 years.

24. (a) Do you agree that the WVR of a corporate WVR beneficiary could be renewed at the end of the sunset period with the approval of independent shareholders?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We hold that WVR should lapse at the end of the initial (5 year) period. If renewal was possible, it should be voted on a one-share one-vote basis by independent shareholders.

(b) If so, do you agree with the maximum five year length of the renewal period or would you prefer an alternative renewal period length?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

25. Do you agree that there should be no limit on the number of times that the WVR of a corporate WVR beneficiary could be renewed?

Yes

No

If not, what is the limit that you would propose? Please give reasons for your views.

We do not support the option for renewal.

26. Should the Exchange impose any other requirements on a corporate WVR beneficiary as of a condition of renewing its WVR?

Yes

No

If so, please provide details of the suggested requirement. Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measure to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

27. Do you agree that the Exchange should not restrict an issuer from granting WVR to both corporate and individual beneficiaries provided that each meets the requisite suitability requirement?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The introduction of mixed WVR regimes for individuals and corporates could introduce confusion, especially given the different conditions each is subject to.

28. Are there any additional measures that you would propose for the WVR beneficiaries or the WVR issuer to safeguard the interests of the WVR issuer (e.g. prevent a deadlock) if there were both corporate and individual beneficiaries?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

29. Do you agree that where an issuer has both a corporate WVR beneficiary and individual WVR beneficiaries, the time-defined sunset should only apply to the corporate WVR beneficiary?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Both should be subject to the same time-defined sunset.

30. Do you agree that, in the event that the WVR of the corporate WVR beneficiary falls away as a result of its time-defined sunset, the individual beneficiary should be required to convert part of his or her WVR shares into ordinary shares such that the individual beneficiary will control the same proportion of voting power in the issuer both before and after the corporate WVR beneficiary's WVR fall away?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measure to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

The lapse of WVR shares for a corporate beneficiary should not be a catalyst for increased effective voting power from an individual beneficiary.

31. Do you agree that the Listing Rules need not mandate that, if an individual beneficiary's WVR falls away before a corporate WVR beneficiary's WVR, the corporate WVR beneficiary should convert part of its WVR shares into ordinary shares such that the corporate WVR beneficiary will control the same proportion of voting power in the issuer both before and after the individual beneficiary's WVR fall away?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views. In your response, you may propose additional or alternative measure to the ones discussed in the Consultation Paper.

The lapse of WVR share for a individual beneficiary should not be a catalyst for an increase in effective voting power from a corproate beneficiary.

- End -