

Part B Consultation Questions

Please indicate your preference by checking the appropriate boxes. Please reply to the questions below on the proposed change discussed in the Consultation Paper downloadable from the HKEX website at:

<https://www.hkex.com.hk/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp20171111.pdf>.

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

PART I: INDEPENDENT NON-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Overboarding and INED's time commitment

1. Do you agree with our proposed amendment to Code Provision ("CP") A.5.5 (on a "comply or explain" basis) so that in addition to the CP's current requirements, the board should also explain, if the proposed independent non-executive director ("INED") will be holding his seventh (or more) listed company directorship, why he would still be able to devote sufficient time to the board?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Sufficient or insufficient time does not depend on the exact time that INED spending on the listed issuer but should depend on the quality how INED spending time on the listed issuer. Generally speaking, INED, who hold seventh or more directorship, is the legal or accounting expert (i.e. solicitor, CPA) with various experience. They can provide contributable advices to the board by one sentence that hit the matter rather than some INED keep talking so much during the meeting but not contributable to the board.

In case the above requirement being a code provision, what extent does HKEx expect the listed issuer to disclose? If every listed issuer says INED has provided sufficient time to their company although he/she hold seventh or more directorship, would HKEx accept it?

Board diversity

2. Do you agree with our proposals to upgrade CP A.5.6 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their corporate governance reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

I agree with it because my company has already done so.

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.5.5 that it requires (on a “comply or explain” basis) the board to state in the circular to shareholders accompanying the resolution to elect the director:

- (i) the process used for identifying the nominee;
- (ii) the perspectives, skills and experience that the person is expected to bring to the board; and
- (iii) how the nominee would contribute to the diversity of the board.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Generally speaking, although lots of listed issuers have nomination committee ("NC") to recommend the board the right candidate. However, in reality, the chairman of the board (normally one of the substantial shareholders) chooses the candidate, and then introduce to NC, NC just follow the agreed procedures to conduct the due diligence checking and then recommend to the board.

4. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) to reflect the upgrade of CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their Corporate Governance Reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

I agree with it because my company has already done so.

Factors affecting INED's independence

A. Cooling off periods for former professional advisers

5. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13 (3) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for professional advisers before they can be considered independent, instead of the current one year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

6. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP C.3.2 (on a "comply or explain" basis) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for a former partner of the issuer's existing audit firm before he can be a member of the issuer's audit committee?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

B. Cooling off period in respect of material interests in business activities

7. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13(4) to introduce a one-year cooling off period for a proposed INED who has had material interests in the issuer’s principal business activities in the past year?

- Yes
- No

Please give reasons for your views.

C. Cross-directorships or Significant Links with other Directors

8. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Recommended Best Practice A.3.3 (i.e. voluntary) to recommend disclosure of INEDs’ cross-directorships in the Corporate Governance Report?

- Yes
- No

Please give reasons for your views.

I think we have already disclosed all directorship of each director and the relationship between the director and substantial shareholder/ controlling shareholder, if any, in each of their biographical details in the annual report. Will there be in duplicated if also disclosure in CG Report?

D. Family ties

9. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Note under Rule 3.13 to encourage inclusion of an INED's immediate family members in the assessment of the director's independence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

It will be more clear and helpful to consider a person whether independent or not.

10. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt the same definition for "immediate family member" as Rule 14A.12(1)(a) which defines an "immediate family member" as "his spouse, his (or his spouse's) child or step-child, natural or adopted, under the age of 18 years"?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

PART II: NOMINATION POLICY

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) of Appendix 14 to require an issuer to disclose its nomination policy adopted during the year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

PART III: DIRECTORS' ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Directors' attendance at general meetings

12. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.6.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) by removing the last sentence of the current wording (i.e. they should also attend general meetings and develop a balanced understanding of the views of shareholders.)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Better to keep the current wording. If they do not attend the general meetings, how the listed issuer confirm that they have provided the sufficient time to the listed issuer?

Chairman's annual meetings with INEDs

13. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP A.2.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to state that INEDs should meet at least annually with the chairman?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

PART IV: DIVIDEND POLICY

14. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce CP E.1.5 requiring (on a “comply or explain” basis) the issuer to disclose its dividend policy in the annual report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

In case a listed issuer does not declare dividend for long times. Even if it has disclosed the dividend policy, seems not useful for the investors. I suggest that it can be introduced to the RBP rather than CP.

PART V: ELECTRONIC DISSEMINATION OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS – IMPLIED CONSENT

15. Do you think that the Rules should be amended to allow shareholders' consent to be implied for electronic dissemination of corporate communications by issuers?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

For the concern stated in item 120 of the Consultation Paper, can the Rules include the exception or exemption for the companies incorporated in Hong Kong so that HKEx does not need to wait for the change of the Hong Kong's Company Law.
--

- End -