

## 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/consul/paper/cp200910ct\\_e.pdf](http://www.hkex.com.hk/consul/paper/cp200910ct_e.pdf).

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

### A. Transactions with persons connected with an issuer only by virtue of their relationship with the issuer's subsidiaries

1. Do you think that the definition of connected person should exclude persons connected by virtue of their relationship with an issuer's subsidiaries?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the view as outlined in paragraph 18 of the consultative document.

2. If your answer to question 1 is "Yes", do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is "No", please provide reasons and alternative views.

N/A

3. On the basis that the definition of connected person will continue to include person connected at the subsidiary level, do you agree with the proposal to introduce an “insignificant subsidiary exemption” for connected transactions?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We support the proposal that persons connected at subsidiary level be excluded from the definition of connected person but on the basis that it will continue to be included, we agree that insignificant subsidiary be exempted by virtue of the “insignificant” connection in order to relieve undue burden and save compliance costs.

4. Based on your experience, do you think that the “insignificant subsidiary exemption” would be used by you (or for market practitioners, your clients)?

Yes

No

Please describe the circumstances and refer to Option 1 or 2.

5. If your answer to question 3 is “Yes”, do you agree with

- (a) the proposed materiality threshold under (i) Option 1 or (ii) Option 2?

Yes (*please choose one of the following options*)

Option 1

Option 2

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We opt for option 1 as the 5% definition is familiar to the market.

(b) the proposed bases for assessing the significance of a subsidiary, i.e. the asset ratio, revenue ratio and the profits ratio?

Yes

No. The significance of a subsidiary should be determined by (*please specify*): \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide reasons for your views.

These significance tests are familiar to the market.

(c) the proposed additional safeguard to require the consideration ratio be less than 10% if an “insignificant” subsidiary concerned is itself a party to the transaction or its securities/assets are the subject of the transaction?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

It is not necessary to introduce new restrictions as the existing rules and regulations have already had that covered under Chapters 14 and 14A where applicable.

(d) the proposed mechanism for applying the exemption to continuing connected transactions described in paragraph 27 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree to the proposed measures as outlined in paragraph 27 except imposing the 3-year limit requirement as in Rule 14A.35 as that rule applies to non-exempt continuing connected transactions whereas we are dealing with exempted continuing connected transactions.

6. If your answers to question 5 are “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

7. If you agree with Option 2, do you think that the definition of “major subsidiary” under Rule 13.25 should be amended to align with that in the “insignificant subsidiary exemption” if adopted?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

N/A

**B. De minimis thresholds that trigger disclosure or shareholders’ approval requirement for connected transactions**

8. (a) For the exemption from independent shareholders' approval requirement, do you support the proposal to revise the percentage threshold to 5%? If your answer is "No", please specify the percentage threshold that you consider appropriate.

Yes

No. The percentage threshold should be (*please specify*): \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree this should be in line with international standards.

- (b) For the exemption from all reporting, announcement and independent shareholders' requirements, do you support the proposal to revise the percentage threshold to 1%? If your answer is "No", please specify the percentage threshold that you consider appropriate.

Yes

No. The percentage threshold should be (*please specify*): \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree to these proposals as they reduce the compliance burden where transactions of immateriality are concerned.

9. If your answer to question 8 is "Yes", do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is "No", please provide reasons and alternative views.

10. Do you agree that a percentage threshold is sufficient to assess whether a connected transaction is eligible for the de minimis exemptions?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We believe the percentage threshold is sufficient as it reflects the degree of materiality of the transaction to the company based on the relative size of the transaction to the size of the company. This is a fair and objective way of determining the materiality. For this reason, it is not necessary to impose a monetary cap for it would arbitrarily impose restriction on a company's ability to conduct transactions that it would be able to carry out based on the materiality considerations. This would defeat the objective of taking a percentage approach.

11. Do you believe that an absolute monetary cap should also be imposed, irrespective of the percentage threshold test for de minimis exemptions? If your answer is yes, please specify the monetary cap that you consider appropriate for fully exempt connected transactions (the monetary cap for connected transactions exempt from independent shareholders' approval would be adjusted proportionately).

Yes. The monetary cap for fully exempt connected transactions should be:

- HK\$100 million
- HK\$200 million
- HK\$500 million
- HK\$1,000 million
- Other monetary cap (*please specify*): HK\$\_\_\_\_\_

No

**C. Transactions that are revenue in nature and in the ordinary and usual course of business**

12. Do you agree that the connected transaction Rules should govern revenue transactions with connected persons?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

Hong Kong should follow the international example of excluding revenue transactions from the connected transaction rules, especially when the Consultation Paper has pointed out over half of the revenue transactions with connected persons announced in 2008 had a value of 2% or less, and 67% had a value of below 5%.

Proposed exemption for revenue transactions with associates of a passive investor

13. Do you agree with the proposed exemption for revenue transactions with associates of a substantial shareholder who is a passive investor in the issuer group?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree to the views outlined in the Consultation Paper. The possibility of abuse in this case is small.

14. Do you think that the proposed exemption should also require the substantial shareholder be a passive investor in the relevant associate, for example, it is not involved in the management of the relevant associate?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper. This should provide additional safeguard.

15. If your answer to question 13 is “Yes”,
- (a) do you agree that the passive investor must be a sovereign fund or an authorised unit trust or mutual fund?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

Please see also our views and comments on question 15(b).



(b) do you think that the exemption should be made available to other passive investors? If so, which?

Yes. The exemption should be made available to *(please specify)*:

[REDACTED]

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We believe all associates of any substantial shareholder of an issuer should be exempted if such substantial shareholder is a passive investor of the issuer and that they fulfil the criteria as set out in paragraph 59 of the Consultation Paper. This should not be limited to a sovereign fund, unit trust or mutual fund. The exemption should also be extended to private equity funds that fulfil the criteria.

(c) do you agree that the passive investor must not have representative on the board of directors of the issuer and its subsidiaries?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

To be considered a passive investor, one must not have a representative on the board of directors of the issuer and its subsidiaries. A board representation gives an investor ways to participate in decision making and is not passive anymore.

(d) do you agree with other proposed conditions set out in paragraph 59 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree except that the passive investor need not only be limited to a sovereign fund, unit trust or mutual fund but should include other entities as long as they fulfil the conditions set out in paragraph 59.

16. If your answer to question 13 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

Proposed modification of the exemption for provision of consumer goods or consumer services

17. Do you agree with the proposed changes to expand the exemption for acquisition of consumer goods or services described in paragraph 66 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views as contained in the Consultation Paper.

18. If your answer to question 17 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

19. Can you think of any other suggestions to improve the regulation of revenue transactions with connected persons?

Yes

No

If your answer is “Yes”, please elaborate your views.

#### **D. Definition of associate**

##### **(1) Definition of associate in Rule 1.01 (for non-PRC issuer) and Rule 19A.04 (for PRC issuer)**

20. Do you support the proposal to carve out from the definition of associate the following entities?

(i) The holding company of the investee company or a fellow subsidiary of this holding company described in paragraph 68(e) of the Consultation Paper.

Yes

No

(ii) A company controlled by the investee company (not being a subsidiary of the investee company) described in paragraph 68(f) of the Consultation Paper and this company's subsidiary, holding company and fellow subsidiary.

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

21. If your answer to question 20 is "Yes", do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is "No", please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(2) Extended definition of associate in Rule 14A.11(4)**

22. Do you agree with the proposed extension of the definition of associate to a company in which a connected person's relative has a majority control as described in paragraph 74 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We believe the current definition of associates is wide enough to include persons or entities who may only be remotely related to the connected persons.

23. If your answer to question 22 is "Yes", do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is "No", please provide reasons and alternative views.

**E. Definition of connected person**

**(1) Non wholly-owned subsidiary**

24. Do you agree with the proposed exemption for (i) transactions between a connected subsidiary and any of its own subsidiaries; and (ii) transactions between any subsidiaries of the connected subsidiary?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

25. If your answer to question 24 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

26. Do you agree that a non wholly-owned subsidiary should not be regarded as a connected person in the circumstances described in paragraphs 81(a) and (b) of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

27. If your answer to question 26 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(2) Promoter of a PRC issuer**

28. Do you support the proposal to delete “promoter” of a PRC issuer from the definition of connected person?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

29. If your answer to question 28 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(3) PRC Governmental Body**

30. Do you support the proposal to apply those provisions for PRC Governmental Body in Chapter 19A to connected persons of non-PRC issuers?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

31. If your answer to question 30 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

#### **(4) Management shareholder of a GEM issuer**

32. Do you support the proposal to delete “management shareholder” from the definition of connected person in the GEM Rules?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

33. If your answer to question 32 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.



**F. Other changes to the connected transaction Rules**

**(1) Exemption for small transaction involving issue of new securities by subsidiary**

34. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the restriction on applying the de minimis exemptions to an issue of securities by the issuer's subsidiary?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

35. If your answer to question 34 is "Yes", do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is "No", please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(2) Exemption for financial assistance provided on a pro-rata basis**

36. Do you agree with the proposal to clarify that the exemption under Rule 14A.65(3)(b)(i) will apply where the commonly held entity is also a connected person?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper.

37. If your answer to question 36 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(3) Transactions with third parties involving joint investments with connected persons**

38. Do you agree with the proposal to extend the exemption under Note 3 to Rule 14A.13(1)(b)(i) to disposal transactions mentioned in paragraph 108 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the views and analysis of the Stock Exchange as contained in the Consultation Paper. Some of our members expressed in actual applications, when a transaction will be exempted under Note 3 to Rule 14A.12(1)(b)(i) is unclear and it is hoped that more guidance will be provided to help listed issuers better determine when a transaction will be exempted and when it will not.

39. If your answer to question 38 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

**(4) Annual review of continuing connected transactions**

40. Do you agree with the proposed Rule amendments to clarify that the annual review requirements apply to continuing connected transactions that are subject to reporting and disclosure requirements in Chapter 14A?

Yes

No

Please provide reasons for your views.

41. If your answer to question 40 is “Yes”, do you agree that the proposed draft Rule amendments in Appendix I to the Consultation Paper will implement our proposal?

Yes

No

If your answer is “No”, please provide reasons and alternative views.

42. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Yes

No

If your answer is “Yes”, please elaborate your views.

- End -