

Part B Consultation Questions

Please reply to the questions below that are raised in the Concept Paper downloadable from the HKEX website at:

<http://www.hkex.com.hk/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2017061.pdf>

Please indicate your preference by checking the appropriate boxes.

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

1. What are your views on the need for Hong Kong to seek to attract a more diverse range of companies and, in particular, those from New Economy industries to list here? Do you agree that the New Board would have a positive impact on Hong Kong's ability to attract additional New Economy issuers to our market?

Please give reasons for your views.

Yes, a board to attract new economy companies to list in Hong Kong would have a positive impact on the market generally.

2. What are your views on whether the targeted companies should be segregated onto a New Board, rather than being included on the Main Board or GEM?

Please give reasons for your views.

This depends on the structure of the New Board and whether the Main Board or GEM are able to accommodate targeted companies instead.

3. If a New Board is adopted, what are your views on segmenting the New Board into different segments according to the characteristics described in this paper (e.g. restriction to certain types of investor, financial eligibility etc.)? Should the New Board be specifically restricted to particular industries?

Please give reasons for your views.

The New Board should be restricted to particular types of industries, but participation should be as wide as possible even if limited to targeted investors, to ensure adequate market interest and liquidity.

4. What are your views on the proposed roles of GEM and the Main Board in the context of the proposed overall listing framework?

Please give reasons for your views.

n.a.

5. What are your views on the proposed criteria for moving from New Board PRO to the other boards? Should a public offer requirement be imposed for companies moving from New Board PRO to one of the other boards?

Please give reasons for your views.

Moving securities should meet the requirements of the hosting board

6. What are your views on the proposed financial and track record requirements that would apply to issuers on New Board PRO and New Board PREMIUM? Do you agree that the proposed admission criteria are appropriate in light of the targeted investors for each segment?

Please give reasons for your views.

Yes we agree

7. What are your views on whether the Exchange should reserve the right to refuse an application for listing on New Board PRO if it believes the applicant could meet the eligibility requirements of New Board PREMIUM, GEM or the Main Board?

Please give reasons for your views.

Yes

8. What are your views on the proposed requirements for minimum public float and minimum number of investors at listing? Should additional measures be introduced to ensure sufficient liquidity in the trading of shares listed on New Board PRO? If so, what measures would you suggest?

Please give reasons for your views.

The proposed requirements seem reasonable

9. What are your views on whether companies listed on a Recognised US Exchange that apply to list on the New Board should be exempted from the requirement to demonstrate that they are subject to shareholder protection standards equivalent to those of Hong Kong? Should companies listed elsewhere be similarly exempted?

Please give reasons for your views.

In principle yes, as long as appropriate jurisdictions are chosen - EU, Australia, Singapore, Japan, Taiwan, Switzerland and others with robust investor protection.

10. What are your views on whether we should apply a “lighter touch” suitability assessment to new applicants to New Board PRO? If you are supportive of a “lighter touch” approach, what relaxations versus the Main Board’s current suitability criteria would you recommend?

Please give reasons for your views.

n.a.

11. What are your views on whether the New Board PRO should be restricted to professional investors only? What criteria should we use to define a professional investor for this purpose?

Please give reasons for your views.

In principle yes, as long as Individual professional investors are permitted to participate.

12. Should special measures be imposed on Exchange Participants to ensure that investors in New Board PRO-listed securities meet the eligibility criteria for both the initial placing and secondary trading?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Any restrictions on investors should apply equally in initial placing and secondary trading.

13. What are your views on the proposal for a Financial Adviser to be appointed by an applicant to list on New Board PRO, rather than applying the existing sponsor regime? If you would advocate more prescriptive due diligence requirements, what specific requirements would you recommend be imposed?

Please give reasons for your views.

It should be possible for any SFC registered firm with an appropriate license to act as Financial Adviser without the application of the sponsor regime.

14. What are your views on the proposed role of the Listing Committee in respect of each segment of the New Board?

Please give reasons for your views.

n.a.

15. Do you agree that applicants to listing on New Board PRO should only have to produce a Listing Document that provided accurate information sufficient to enable professional investors to make an informed investment decision, rather than a Prospectus? If you would advocate a more prescriptive approach to disclosure, what specific disclosures would you recommend be required?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

16. What are your views on the proposed continuous listing obligations for the New Board? Do you believe that different standards should apply to the different segments?

Please give reasons for your views.

Yes, different standards should apply to the different segments

17. For companies that list on the New Board with a WVR structure, should the Exchange take a disclosure-based approach as described in paragraph 153 of this Concept Paper? Should this approach apply to both segments of the New Board?

Please give reasons for your views.

Yes

18. If, in addition, you believe that the Exchange should impose mandatory safeguards for companies that list on the New Board with a WVR structure, what safeguards should we apply? Should the same safeguards apply to both segments of the New Board?

Please give reasons for your views.

n.a.

19. Do you agree that the SEHK should allow companies with unconventional governance features (including those with a WVR structure) to list on PREMIUM or PRO under the “disclosure only” regime described in paragraph 153 of the Concept Paper, if they have a good compliance record as listed companies on NYSE and NASDAQ? Should companies listed elsewhere be similarly exempted?

Please give reasons for your views.

We suggest SEHK make a fundamental decision ot allow companies with unconventional governance features and objective criteria for listing such companies and then allow them to list irrespective of whether or where they may be listed.

20. What are your views on the suspension and delisting proposals put forward for the New Board?

Please give reasons for your views.

n.a.

21. Should New Board-listed companies have to meet quantitative performance criteria to maintain a listing? If so, what criteria should we apply? Do you agree that companies that fail to meet these criteria should be placed on a “watchlist” and delisted if they fail to meet the criteria within a set period of time?

Please give reasons for your views.

The only criteria that apply and which trigger a delisting should be the level of or lack of trading in the shares (apart from enforcement or fraud issues to do with the company or its officers).

22. Do you consider that an even “lighter touch” enforcement regime should apply to the New Board (e.g. an exchange-regulated platform)?

- Yes
 No

Please give reasons for your views.

Enforcement regimes should be the same, irrespective of Board.

- End -