Part B Consultation Questions

Please indicate your preference by checking the appropriate boxes. Please make your comments by replying to questions below against proposed changes discussed in the Consultation Paper at the hyperlink:

http://www.hkex.com.hk/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2010122.pdf

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

| Α. | Presen | tation |
|----|--------|--------|
|----|--------|--------|

| 1: | Do yo | ou prefer the style in Appendix I or in Appendix II? | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Appendix I | |
| | Ø | Appendix II | |
| | Please | explain your reasons. | |
| | good of the "E reader advise | roposed drafting in Appendix II has already adopted plainer language and is enough for readers to understand the contents. I prefer using the pronouns exchange" and the "Applicant" to using "we" and "you". It is because the is may not necessarily be the applicant. Readers may well be professional ers (eg lawyers and professional accountants) and may even be the isional investors themselves. I consider that the style in Appendix II should opted. | |
| 2: | should | ou agree that the expression "debt issues to professional investors only" I replace "selectively marketed securities" to more clearly indicate the ed scope of the Rules? | |
| | V | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | Please | Please explain your reasons. | |
| | The pr | oposed expression is clearer. | |
| | | | |

B. **Eligibility Requirements**

3:

| 3: | - | Do you agree that professional investors should be defined by reference to the SFO as proposed? | |
|----|-------------------|--|--|
| | ☑ | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | Please | explain your answer. | |
| | clear. prescri | agree with the proposal. However, the proposed definition is not very Since the definition of "professional investor" also include the persons as ibed in section 3 of the Securities and Futures (Professional Investor) Rules, 71D, I think the proposed definition should be expanded to make it clearer. | |
| ; | ı | see my mark up on the definition of "professional investor" in the ament for your consideration. | |
| 1: | Do you | u agree with the eligibility standards in proposed Rules 37.03 to 37.25? | |
| | Ø | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | If not, | please explain how you would change them | |
| | N/A | | |
| 5: | system | d applicants be required to deposit their issues into overseas settlement as to further ensure that they will not be acquired by retail investors in the dary market? | |
| | | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | Please | explain your answer. | |
| | As I ar | m not quite sure with the answer, I have no comment for this question. | |

| 6: | Should there be a minimum board lot size for products? | |
|----|--|--|
| | | Yes. The minimum board lot size should be ☐ HK\$1,000,000 ☐ HK\$500,000 ☐ Other amount (please specify): HK\$ |
| | | No |
| C. | Listi | ng Approval |
| 7: | Do you agree with the proposed listing approval authority discussed in parag 31 of the Consultation Paper? | |
| | I | Yes |
| | | No |
| | If not please explain how you would revise the approval authority. | |
| | N/A | |
| D. | Listi | ng Documents |
| 8: | Do yo | ou agree with the proposed content requirements in proposed Rules 37.26 to |
| | \square | Yes |
| | | No |
| | Please | explain your answer. |
| | I gene | rally agree with the proposal as set out in paragraphs D37 to D40. |

| 9: Should we retain any of | | d we retain any of the current disclosure requirements we propose to delete? | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | \square | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | If you | answered no please provide details. | |
| | | | |
| F. | Appl | lication Vetting | |
| 10: Do you agree with our proposal to continue vetting applications for with listing eligibility standards? | | ou agree with our proposal to continue vetting applications for compliance isting eligibility standards? | |
| | | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | Please explain your answer. | | |
| : | I gene | rally agree with the proposal set out in paragraphs E41 to E43. | |
| 11: | respor | ou agree with our proposal to vet listing documents to ensure they include asibility and disclaimer statements in prescribed forms, statements limiting oution to professional investors and any other information required by the inge? | |
| | Ø | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | Please | explain your answer. | |
| | I gene | rally agree with the proposal set out in paragraph E44. | |

| 12: | Do you agree with our proposal not to vet the other detailed contents of listing documents? | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | □ Yes | | |
| | □ No | | |
| | Please explain your answer. | | |
| | As I am not quite sure with this answer, I have no comment on this question. | | |
| F. | Application Procedures | | |
| 13: | Do you agree with the proposals in respect of application procedures? | | |
| | ☑ Yes | | |
| | □ No | | |
| | If you do not agree please indicate how you would change them. | | |
| | N/A | | |
| G. | Continuing Obligations | | |
| 14: | Do you agree with the proposed continuing obligations set out in proposed Rules 37.44 to 37.57? | | |
| | ☑ Yes | | |
| | п No | | |
| | Please explain your answer. | | |
| | I generally agree with the proposal. | | |
| | <u> </u> | | |

| 15: | Should delete | d we retain any of the current continuing obligations that we propose to? |
|-----|----------------|---|
| | | Yes. Please provide details of the requirements |
| | Ø | No |
| Н. | Othe | r Issues |
| 16: | Should GEM? | d eligibility under the GEM Rules be limited to companies already listed on |
| | 図 | Yes |
| | | No |
| | Please | explain your answer. |
| | | |
| 17: | Should | d any other provisions in the Listing Rules be included in Chapter 37? |
| | 0 | Yes. Please provide details of the requirements |
| | Ø | No |
| 18: | Should | d any other consequential changes be made to the Rules? |
| | | Yes. Please provide details of the requirements |
| | Ø | No |

| 19: | Are there are any other comments you would like to make? | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | $\overline{\square}$ | Yes | |
| | | No | |
| | If your answer is "Yes" please elaborate your views. | | |
| | Pleas | se see my comments on the Attachment. | |