

## Part B Consultation Questions

Please indicate your preference by checking the appropriate boxes. Please reply to the questions below on the proposed change discussed in the Consultation Paper downloadable from the HKEX website at:

<https://www.hkex.com.hk/-/media/HKEX-Market/News/Market-Consultations/2016-Present/December-2019-Chapter-37-Debt-Issues/Consultation-Paper/cp201912.pdf>

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

**Capitalised terms have the same meaning as defined in the Consultation Paper unless otherwise stated.**

1. Do you agree with the proposed increase of the NAV Requirement from HK\$100 million to HK\$1 billion?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

2. (a) Do you agree that the Exchange should maintain the current Eligibility Exemption available for State corporations?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We have no view on this question.

- (b) If not, which type of State corporations should comply with Issuer Eligibility Requirements? Please give reasons for your views.

not applicable

3. (a) Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a minimum issuance size of HK\$100 million (or equivalent in other currencies) for Chapter 37 Debts?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We consider that a minimum issue size was correctly removed following the 2010 consultation on the basis that it was a requirement to protect retail investors and not applicable to a regime for professional investors. If a minimum issue size is restored, unlisted securities which are issued by way of private placement under listed medium term note programmes should be expressly exempted provided that the programme size itself is more than HK\$100 million.

- (b) Do you agree that such minimum issuance size shall not apply to tap issuances?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

4. Do you agree with the proposal to require issuers to state explicitly on the front cover of the listing document the intended investor market in Hong Kong (i.e. professional investors only) for its Chapter 37 Debts, in addition to the existing legend required under Rule 37.31?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

5. Do you agree with the proposal to require publication of listing documents for Chapter 37 Debts on the Exchange's website on the listing date?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We would not object to this requirement if the pricing supplements for unlisted securities issued by way of private placement under medium term note programmes were expressly exempted. The terms of such issues should properly remain confidential to the parties. This could be achieved by inserting "of listed debt securities" after "each issue" in the proposed new rule 30.32A.

6. (a) Do you agree that the Exchange's current disclosure and vetting approach in relation to listing documents for Chapter 37 should remain unchanged, notwithstanding that the intended investors would include HNW Investors?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

- (b) For the purpose of Rule 37.29, should there be a different standard with specific disclosure requirements in respect of Chapter 37 Debts that are offered to HNW Investors, compared to those that are offered to Institutional Investors, for example, the manner of presenting information such as the terms and conditions and financial information of issuer and any credit support provider (even though the current Hong Kong legal framework does not differentiate disclosure standards between Institutional Investors and HNW Investors)? If so, what should those specific disclosure requirements be?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

7. (a) Do you agree that the Exchange should publish disclosure guidance to the market on specified Special Features found in certain Chapter 37 Debts and other disclosure-related matters?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We think that this is something best left to market participants. High level guidance will not be particularly helpful. Specific guidance is likely to be outdated by market developments.

- (b) Do you have other suggestions on any additional or alternative proposals that the Exchange may implement to promote disclosure quality and consistency for Chapter 37 Debts?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

8. Do you agree with the proposal to codify the PI Waiver by revising the definition of “professional investors” under Chapter 37 to include HNW Investors?

Yes

No

You may provide reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

9. (a) Do you agree with the proposal to allow eligibility of a REIT Issuer (or a REIT Guarantor) to be assessed by reference to the REIT Assets and REIT Financials respectively, provided that it has recourse to the REIT Assets to satisfy the obligations under the relevant Chapter 37 Debts?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The proposal treats REITS and their guarantors in a manner which is in substance equivalent to ordinary issuers and their guarantors.

- (b) Do you agree that if the relevant REIT is listed on the Exchange, a REIT Issuer (or a REIT Guarantor) should be qualified as a HK Listco and therefore, be exempted from the Issuer Eligibility Requirements?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The proposal treats REITS and their guarantors in a manner which is in substance equivalent to ordinary issuers and their guarantors.

10. Do you have any comments on the proposed enhancements relating to the continuing obligations of the issuer and guarantor under Chapter 37?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

11. Do you agree with the proposal to replace the existing requirements to submit copies of constitutional documents and resolutions as part of the listing application documents with a requirement to provide written confirmation by the issuer (or guarantor, as the case may be) in relation to its due incorporation, capacity and authorisation?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

12. (a) Do you agree with the proposal to replace the existing requirement to submit last published financial statements with a new requirement for an issuer (or the guarantor that an issuer relies in fulfilling the Issuer Eligibility Requirements) to submit its audited financial statements to evidence its fulfilment of the Issuer Eligibility Requirements?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

- (b) Where the issuer (or the guarantor) is exempted from the Issuer Eligibility Requirements or where the required audited financial statements are disclosed in the listing document, do you agree that such issuer (or guarantor) should not be required to separately submit financial statements to the Exchange?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

13. Do you agree with the proposal to amend Rule 37.26 to clarify that supplementary listing document includes a pricing supplement?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We would not object to this proposal if it is made clear that the responsibility statement required to be included in pricing supplements issued under medium term note programmes can state that the pricing supplement together with the offering circular for the programme contains the information about the issuer [and the guarantor] as required by the listing rules. Otherwise pricing supplements will have to repeat offering circulars, which defeats the purpose of having the latter.

14. The Exchange invites your comments regarding whether the drafting of the proposed housekeeping Rule amendments will give rise to any ambiguities or unintended consequences.

Please see the response to question 13.

15. Do you have any other comments in respect of the matters discussed in the Consultation Paper? If so, please set out your additional comments.

No.

- End -