

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?

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?

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?

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?

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.

We disagree on (i) but agree on (ii).

We are of the view that all shareholders shall be entitled to the rights to vote on the appointment and re-election of director(s) (including Long Serving INEDs), so long as each and every shareholder has been given the necessary information through proper disclosure by the issuer. In our view, proper disclosure could mean additional disclosures with respect to the re-appointments of Long Serving INEDs and may include reasons to justify why the issuer is of the view that independence of the Long Serving INEDs has not been compromised despite his/her long tenure, why the issuer thinks the Long Serving INEDs are still "fit and proper" to assume the role, and why the issuer thinks it is in the interests of all shareholders as a whole to retain the Long Serving INEDs. Subjecting the re-election of Long Serving INEDs to independent shareholders' approval is essentially a deprivation of certain shareholders' right to vote. It could be interpreted by other shareholders as an act of disenfranchisement, and could also be seen as an act to undermine the integrity of those experienced INEDs. Also it is unfair to have a preconception that the non-independent shareholder(s) has/have bias on re-appointment of Long Serving INED(s).

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?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We disagree on the proposal to introduce a CP requiring an issuer to appoint a new INED at the forthcoming AGM where all the INEDs on the board are Long Serving INEDs. So long as the issuer can justify why the independence of the Long Serving INEDs has not been compromised despite his/her long

tenure, why the issuer thinks the Long Serving INEDs are still “fit and proper” to assume the role, and why the issuer thinks it is in the interests of all shareholders as a whole to retain the Long Serving INEDs, we do not think there is such a need to strictly require the issuer to appoint a new INED. Also, if any shareholder(s) consider(s) it is necessary to appoint a new INED, they can make such proposal to the Company or propose an agenda to that effect through the existing mechanism. It is not necessary to make such appointment mandatory.

We agree on disclosing the length of tenure of the Long Serving INEDs on the board on a named basis in the shareholders’ circular as this will enhance transparency of information for shareholders.

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?

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?

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)?

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?

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6d

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

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

Please give reasons for your views.

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?

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?

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?

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?

Please give reasons for your views.