
**QUESTIONNAIRE ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO FILING
AND CHECKLIST REQUIREMENTS FOR LISTING OF
EQUITY SECURITIES**

Part B Consultation Questions

1. Yes
 No
2. Yes
 No

(a) As to 9.11(1), it is good to reduce the numbers of copies of draft prospectus. But I would suggest all documents shall be submitted via e-submission instead of CD-ROMs as it is not environmental friendly.

(b) As to 9.11(2), if the purpose for the Exchange to remove the requirement of submitting copies of audited accounts is to release its administrative burden as well as wastage of papers, I would strongly suggest not to remove the requirement but to change the means of submission to e-submission. While it is environmental friendly, the Exchange can closely monitor the quality of the IPO progress. Subsequent amendments to the audited accounts for whatever reasons will not be possible without informing the Exchange.

(c) As to 9.11(3), since the definition of connected party is very broad, their acts are in practice not within the control of the applicant or the substantial shareholders of the applicants. In some occasions, additional waivers after the first draft will be required. It is practically necessary for the Exchange to allow submission of additional waiver thereafter.

3. Yes
 No

(a) As to 9.11(6), I would suggest all documents shall be submitted via e-submission for reason discussed in 2(b) above.

(b) It is proposed that the wordings of the confirmation from the company's Hong Kong legal advisors regarding the articles of association shall be change from "contain provisions complying with the Listing Rules" to "the articles of association are not inconsistent with the Listing Rules". I am not sure what is the different between the two. If they do, the Exchange must explain the same to us. We have to decide the right thing to proceed. Mirroring the change in 13.51(1) is not a sufficient explanation. The Exchange have to tell what are the differences, if any.

4. Yes
 No

5. Yes
 No

As to 9.11(11), if the applicant is an overseas issuer, I wonder if it is required to observe the requirements of the Companies Ordinance. In any event, I would suggest all documents shall be submitted via e-submission for reasons discussed in 2(b) above. This applies to 9.11(11), 9.11(15) and 9.11(16).

6. Yes
 No

As to 9.12(7) and 9.12(8), while it is the responsibility of the relevant company and its advisers to ensure good title documents, there is no harm for the Exchange keeping specimen of title documents via e-submission. The purpose of which is to ensure all documents are in good order. For some important issues, the Exchange shall exercise its monitoring role.

7. Yes
 No

8. Yes
 No

9. Yes
 No

10. Yes
 No

Please refer to comments above.

11. Yes
 No

Please refer to comments above.

12. Yes
 No

13. Yes
 No

14. Yes
 No

15. Yes (except for the comments above)
 No

16. Yes
 No

17. Yes
 No