

Question 1

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a code provision ("CP") requiring an issuer's board to set culture in alignment with issuer's purpose, value and strategy?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 2a

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a CP requiring establishment of an anti-corruption policy?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 2b

Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade a Recommended Best Practice ("RBP") to CP requiring establishment of a whistleblowing policy?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 3

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a CP requiring disclosure of a policy to ensure independent views and input are available to the board, and an annual review of the implementation and effectiveness of such policy?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 4a

Do you agree with our proposal regarding re-election of an independent non-executive director serving more than nine years ("Long Serving INEDs") to revise an existing CP to require (i) independent shareholders' approval; and (ii) additional disclosure on the factors considered, the process and the board or nomination committee's discussion in arriving at the determination in the explanation on why such Long Serving INED is still independent and should be re-elected?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

As compared with director tenure, it is more important that the Directors are of upright character, bring diverse viewpoints, exhibit a variety of skills, knowledge, professional experience and background, highly engaged and represent the long-term interests of shareholders.

If indeed this CP will be revised as per the above proposal, I would strongly recommend to amend the following Listing Rule (Rule 3.13(7)):

"(7) is, or has at any time during the two years immediately prior to the date of his proposed appointment been, an executive or director (other than an independent non-executive director) of the listed issuer, of its holding company or of any of their respective subsidiaries or of any core connected persons of the listed issuer;"

The situation in Hong Kong is that many of the INEDs are Long-Serving INEDs. As there is a possibility that those INEDs who are subject to retirement by rotation may be outvoted by the independent shareholders, he/she would rather resign and not offer himself/herself for re-election.

Quite a number of listed issuers will then need to search for new INED(s) at around the same time. Given the difficulty in looking for new INED(s), there is a possibility for listed issuers to appoint those long-serving executives or directors (whether EDs or NEDs) who have resigned or retired more than two years ago as INEDs, as they are more likely to be perceived as "loyal". It then turns out that the number of "truly" independent directors will be even less than that as at present.

I would therefore suggest to amend Rule 3.13(7) so that those executives or directors (other than INEDs) who have served the listed issuer for more than nine years should NOT be allowed to act as INEDs and that this amendment should be implemented in tandem with other proposed changes, i.e. financial year

commencing on or after 1 January 2022 so as to avoid listed issuers taking advantage of the existing Rule 3.13(7).

Question 4b

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a CP requiring an issuer to appoint a new independent non-executive director ("INED") at the forthcoming annual general meeting where all the INEDs on the board are Long Serving INEDs, and disclosing the length of tenure of the Long Serving INEDs on the board on a named basis in the shareholders' circular?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 5

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new RBP that an issuer generally should not grant equity-based remuneration (e.g. share options or grants) with performance-related elements to INEDs as this may lead to bias in their decision-making and compromise their objectivity and independence?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6a

Do you agree with our proposal to highlight that diversity is not considered to be achieved by a single gender board in the note of the Rule?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6b

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Mandatory Disclosure Requirement ("MDR") requiring all listed issuers to set and disclose numerical targets and timelines for achieving gender diversity at

both: (a) board level; and (b) across the workforce (including senior management)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6c

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a CP requiring the board to review the implementation and effectiveness of its board diversity policy annually?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6d

Do you agree with our proposal to amend the relevant forms to include directors' gender information?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 7

Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade a CP to Rule requiring issuers to establish a nomination committee chaired by an INED and comprising a majority of INEDs?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 8

Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade a CP to a MDR to require disclosure of the issuer's

shareholders communication policy (which includes channels for shareholders to communicate their views on various matters affecting issuers, as well as steps taken to solicit and understand the views of shareholders and stakeholders) and annual review of such policy to ensure its effectiveness?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 9

Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Rule requiring disclosure of directors' attendance in the poll results announcements?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 10

Do you agree with our proposal to delete the CP that requires issuers to appoint non-executive directors for a specific term?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 11

Do you agree with our proposal to elaborate the linkage in the Code by (a) setting out the relationship between corporate governance and environmental, social and governance ("ESG") in the introductory section; and (b) including ESG risks in the context of risk management under the Code?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 12

Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Rules and the ESG Guide to require publication of ESG reports at the same time as publication of annual reports?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Unlike the annual report in which a large proportion of the information are the same as the previous year, the information about ESG performance as described in the ESG report are different year from year.

As the translation work is usually outsourced to printers who at the same time are working on the annual report, it is highly likely that the printers are unable to handle the translation work for the ESG report. I have actually talked to the sales personnel of a printing company and that is her feedback.

I would therefore recommend to retain the five-month deadline.

Question 13

Do you have any comments on how the re-arranged Code is drafted in the form set out in Appendices III and IV to the Consultation Paper and whether it will give rise to any ambiguities or unintended consequences?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 14

In addition to the topics mentioned in the Consultation Paper, do you have any comments regarding what to be included in the new guidance letter on corporate governance (i.e. CG GL) which may be helpful to issuers for achieving the Principles set out in the Code?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 15a

Do you agree with our proposed implementation dates for all proposals (except the proposals on Long Serving INED): the financial year commencing on or after 1 January 2022?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 15b

Do you agree with our proposed implementation dates for proposals on Long Serving INED: the financial year commencing on or after 1 January 2023?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

I would suggest that the implementation date be deferred to the financial year commencing on or after 1 January 2024 so that listed issuer can have more time to plan for director succession.