

**Submitted via Qualtrics**

**Ka Shi LAU**

**Personal view**

**Others (please specify)**

**Question 1**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Code Provision (CP) under the Corporate Governance Code (CG Code) requiring issuers without an independent board chair to designate one independent non-executive director (INED) as a Lead INED to enhance engagement with investors and shareholders?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

The role of INED is very important to ensuring that all shareholder interests (minority shareholders in particular) are being taken care of.

Investors would not only want to meet with the executive team, but also the independent directors. Engagement could be enhanced with meeting with at least one INED - having a lead INED will serve this purpose.

**Question 2(a)**

**Regarding continuous professional development for directors, do you agree with our proposal to make continuous professional development mandatory for all existing directors, without specifying a minimum number of training hours?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Global economies, investment environment and Market trend/development are evolving and ever changing. Directors must be kept up-to-date with such development and be given information and insights in the discharge of their fiduciary duty as directors.

Having a minimum number of training hours is recommended - say 8-10 hours.

**Question 2(b)**

**Regarding continuous professional development for directors, do you agree with our proposal to require First-time Directors to complete a minimum of 24 hours of training within 18 months following their appointment?**

No

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

While a minimum of hours should be set, but i would think 12 - 15 hours might be more amenable.

**Question 2(c)**

**Regarding continuous professional development for directors, do you agree with our proposal to define “First-time Directors” to mean directors who (i) are appointed as a director of an issuer listed on the Exchange for the first time; or (ii) have not served as a director of an issuer listed on the Exchange for a period of three years or more prior to their appointment?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Seems reasonable to get a new director to have a better grasp of the company and the latest requirement for a listed company.

**Question 2(d)**

**Regarding continuous professional development for directors, do you agree with our proposal to specify the specific topics that must be covered under the continuous professional development requirement?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Some topics are basic and fundamental, and should therefore be specified.

**Question 3**

**Do you agree with the proposed consequential changes to Principle C.1 and CP C.1.1 of the CG Code?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

No strong view

**Question 4**

**Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade the current Recommended Best Practice (RBP) in the CG Code to a CP requiring issuers to conduct regular board performance reviews at least every two years and make disclosure as set out in CP B.1.4?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Would suggest a formal review every three years. 2 years might be a bit too frequent with special changes not expected within such a short time span. It would take time for new proposed changes to take effect (from recommendation to planning, implementing to seeing the results).

**Question 5**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new CP requiring issuers to maintain a board skills matrix and make disclosure set out in CP B.1.5?**

Yes

**Please give reasons for your views.**

A board skills matrix is very basic and fundamental for board composition and succession planning.

**Question 6(a)**

**In relation to our proposal to introduce a “hard cap” of six listed issuer directorships that INEDs may hold, do you agree with the hard cap to ensure that INEDs are able to devote sufficient time to carry out the work of the listed issuers?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Directors must devote sufficient to review papers, for board meetings, board committee meetings, visits to the company, engagement with management, and other stakeholders. Having 6 boards is more than enough.

**Question 6(b)**

**In relation to our proposal to introduce a “hard cap” of six listed issuer directorships that INEDs may hold, do you agree with the proposed three-year transition period to implement the hard cap?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Any changes take time in order to achieve the desired results.

**Question 7**

**Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a new Mandatory Disclosure Requirement (MDR) in the CG Code to require the nomination committee to annually assess and disclose its assessment of each director's time commitment and contribution to the board?**

No

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Not annually - too frequent for a formal assessment. Such disclosure does entail time to plan, prepare, and implement.....

**Question 8(a)**

**In relation to our proposal to introduce a "hard cap" of nine years on the tenure of INEDs, beyond which an INED will no longer be considered to be independent, do you agree with the proposed hard cap to strengthen board independence?**

No

**Please give reasons for your views.**

If hard cap, I would go for 12 years; maybe 9 years is okay but there should be a process where an assessment is made by the company for allowing an INED to go beyond 9 years.

**Question 8(b)**

**In relation to our proposal to introduce a "hard cap" of nine years on the tenure of INEDs, beyond which an INED will no longer be considered to be independent, do you agree that a person can be re-considered as an INED of the same issuer after a two-year cooling-off period?**

No

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

If the question is on the independence of a director, having the person to return after a 2-year cooling-off period is not that sensible. If someone is considered not "independent" enough after 9 years, having a short cooling-off period would not make him/her any more independent!

**Question 8(c)**

**In relation to our proposal to introduce a “hard cap” of nine years on the tenure of INEDs, beyond which an INED will no longer be considered to be independent, do you agree with the proposed three-year transition period in respect of the implementation of the hard cap?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Changes like this would take time to achieve the desire outcome.

**Question 9**

**Do you agree with the proposal to require all issuers to disclose the length of tenure of each director in the CG Report?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

transparency

**Question 10**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a CP requiring issuers to have at least one director of a different gender on the nomination committee?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Helps to ensure gender diversity.

**Question 11**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Listing Rule to require issuers to have and disclose a diversity policy for their workforce (including senior management)?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Transparency

**Question 12**

**Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade from a CP to a MDR the requirement on the annual review of the implementation of an issuer’s board diversity policy?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Helps to push board diversity to a desired state.

**Question 13**

**Do you agree with our proposal to require as a revised MDR separate disclosure of the gender ratio of: (i) senior management; and (ii) the workforce (excluding senior management) in the CG Report?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Transparency and helps to separate the disclosure of the two groups of employees.

**Question 14**

**Do you agree with our proposal to codify the arrangements during temporary deviations from the requirement for issuers to have directors of different genders on the board as set out in draft Main Board Listing Rule 13.92(2) in Appendix I?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Codification pushes for faster result.

**Question 15(a)**

**Do you agree with our proposal to emphasise in Principle D.2 the board's responsibility for the issuer's risk management and internal controls and for the (at least) annual reviews of the effectiveness of the risk management and internal control systems?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Robust risk management and effective internal control systems are fundamental to the long-term sustainability of a company.

**Question 15(b)**

**Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade the requirement to conduct (at least) annual reviews of the effectiveness of the issuer's risk management and internal control systems to mandatory and require the disclosures set out in MDR paragraph H?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Same as question 15(a)

**Question 16**

**Do you agree with our proposal to refine the existing CPs in section D.2 of the CG Code setting out the scope of the (at least) annual reviews of the risk management and internal control systems?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Same as question 15.

**Question 17**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new MDR requiring specific disclosure of the issuer's policy on payment of dividends and the board's dividend decisions during the reporting period?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Transparency. Impact shareholders interest

**Question 18**

**Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Listing Rule requirement for issuers to set a record date to determine the identity of security holders eligible to attend and vote at a general meeting or to receive entitlements?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Clarity

**Question 19**

**Do you agree with our proposal to codify our recommended disclosures in respect of issuers' modified auditors' opinions into the Listing Rules?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Such opinions are important important to investors/shareholders and other stakeholders.

**Question 20**

**Do you agree with our proposal to clarify our expectation of the provision of monthly updates in CP D.1.2 and the note thereto?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Provide clarity and guidance.

**Question 21**

**Do you agree with our proposal to align requirements for the nomination committee, the audit committee and the remuneration committee on establishing written terms of reference for the committee and the arrangements during temporary deviations from requirements as set out in draft Main Board Listing Rules 3.23, 3.27, 3.27B, 3.27C and 8A.28A in Appendix I?**

Yes

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Terms of reference is important to the R&R of board committees.

**Question 22**

**Do you agree with the proposed implementation date of financial years commencing on or after 1 January 2025, with transitional arrangements as set out in paragraphs 182 to 183 of the Consultation Paper?**

No

**Please provide reasons for your views.**

Could you give more time for such implementation to the companies?