Submitted via Qualtrics

(Anonymous)

Company/Organisation view

Law Firm

Question 1

Do you agree that the WVR Financial Eligibility Test thresholds should be lowered?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

We agree with the proposal as it better aligns the financial eligibility requirements with our peer exchanges. We do not think the lowering of the thresholds will result in a proliferation of WVR structures in Hong Kong. It is welcomed from a competitiveness perspective.

Question 2

Do you agree with the proposed WVR Financial Eligibility Test thresholds (as set out in paragraph 91 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

We agree with the proposal as it better aligns the financial eligibility requirements with our peer exchanges.

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposal to accept a 20:1 WVR Ratio Cap if an applicant has a market capitalisation of at least HK$40 billion at the time of listing (see paragraph 103 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

We agree with the proposal in particular the availability of the 20:1 ratio to larger cap issuers. The market has progressed since WVR was first introduced and the types of issuers that we see in the market – e.g. AI, robotics etc. – now typically have a much larger pool of pre-IPO investors resulting in WVR beneficiaries holding a much smaller stake. Many issuers also have significant financing needs post-IPO resulting in further dilution. A larger voting ratio will give the WVR beneficiaries better control for the benefit of the company and its shareholders.

Question 4

Do you agree with the proposal to clarify that the Exchange may be prepared to accept the listing of an applicant whose WVR beneficiaries collectively hold a lower minimum economic interest at listing only if such lower underlying economic interest, at the time of the applicant's initial listing: (a) represents at least 5% of the applicant's total issued share capital; and (b) has an amount of at least HK$4 billion (see paragraph 105 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes, we agree. More clarity is welcomed. The market has found it hard to utilize the note to the rule as it was effectively on an exceptional basis. The market will welcome clarity and certainty.

Question 5

Do you agree with the proposal to provide a choice of Route A and Route B that applicants can use to meet the Innovative Company Requirements (as set out in paragraph 126 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes. We agree with better clarity for business model-based innovative companies. However, our observation remains that the Innovative Company requirement remains burdensome and inefficient. Typically, lawyers write lengthy submissions explaining "innovation" which is often difficult to describe in plain language. This results in rounds and rounds of comments and responses. The HKEx already deems Chapter 18A and Chapter 18C companies to be innovative for the purposes of Chapter 8A, and there should be a more efficient way of demonstrating suitability for Chapter 8A for companies that are in many respects similar to Chapters 18A and 18C companies (or even within the list of industries for Chapter 18C). This is an important competitive issue to consider.

Question 6(a)

In respect of Route A, do you agree with the proposed retention of the current Specialist Company Presumptions (as set out in paragraph 127(a) of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 6(b)

In respect of Route A, do you agree with the proposed "innovative" presumption for Qualified Biotech Applicants and Qualified Specialist Technology Applicants (as set out in paragraphs 127(b), 132 and 133 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 6(c)

In respect of Route A, do you agree with the proposed refinements to the Innovative Characteristics that are applicable to Route A (as set out in paragraphs 127(c), 129 and 130 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 7(a)

Do you agree with the proposed refinements to the Innovative Characteristics that are applicable to Route B (as set out in paragraphs 129 and 131 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 7(b)</u>

Do you agree with the proposed guidance on the meaning of a “sophisticated investor” for the purpose of the “external validation” requirement (as set out in paragraph 134 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 7(c)</u>

Do you agree with the proposed guidance on what constitutes “meaningful third-party investment” for Route B applicants for the purpose of the “external validation” requirement (as set out in paragraph 135 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 8</u>

Do you agree with the proposal to lower the financial eligibility thresholds for a secondary listing of an overseas issuer with a WVR structure to align them with those proposed for WVR issuers with a primary listing (see paragraph 173 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 9

Do you agree with the proposal to lower the market capitalisation threshold under Criteria B from HK$10 billion to HK$6 billion (see paragraph 177 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 10

Do you agree with the proposal to retain the market capitalisation threshold under Criteria A (see paragraph 178 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 11

What measures (if any) do you think the Exchange should implement to further facilitate the listings, in Hong Kong, of issuers listed overseas (see paragraphs 198 and 199 of the Consultation Paper)?

We believe that the HKEx should explore ways of facilitating secondary listings. For example, there should be a leveling of the playing field between Greater China Issuers and Non-Greater China Issuers. In addition, for competitive reasons, the HKEx should explore streamlining the application process for secondary listings – whether a sponsor is required (c.f. LSE requirements) and whether there can be passporting of prospectuses or incorporation by reference (see SGX/NASDAQ proposals). From a competitiveness standpoint, the HKEx should make secondary listings a welcoming and attractive means of accessing the pool of capital of the HKEx, but the rules and procedures are currently cumbersome and in many ways prohibitive to issuers. The regulatory philosophy of secondary listings is that we defer primary regulation to the acceptable home market and the current regime overlays too many processes and requirements to secondary listings.

Please give reasons and specify any accompanying conditions for your suggested measures.

<u>Question 12</u>

Do you agree with the proposal to codify the existing guidance into a Rule to state that an applicant will be considered to have satisfied the Ownership Continuity Requirement if it can demonstrate, to the Exchange's satisfaction, that there was no material change in influence on management during the Relevant Period despite the change in controlling shareholder over that period to address any packaging concerns (see paragraphs 205 and 206 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 13</u>

Do you agree with the proposed consequential updates to our guidance (as set out in paragraph 207 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 14</u>

Do you agree with the proposal to expand the permitted use of US GAAP (as set out in paragraph 213 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 15

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement that a US-listed issuer using US GAAP must revert to preparing financial statements using HKFRS or IFRS if it subsequently delists from the US (see paragraph 214 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 16

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for a Reconciliation Statement produced for the purpose of unaudited financial results to be reviewed by auditors (see paragraph 215 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 17

Do you agree with the proposal to allow Eligible Specialist Companies to seek a listing under the applicable Specialist Chapters (see paragraph 232 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree. The current regime is somewhat unfair to issuers who are within the Spec Tech list of industries but have achieved success such that they are forced to list under Chapter 8 but without the Chapter 18C facilitative provisions (such as deemed to be Innovative for Chapter 8A purposes).

Question 18

Do you agree with the proposed modifications to the additional requirements under the Specialist Chapters to be imposed on Eligible Specialist Companies (as set out in paragraph 233 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 19

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the Publication Requirements for all listing applicants, such that a listing applicant (including a listing applicant associated with an Issuer-related Listing Application) may choose not to publish its AP at the time it submits its listing application, in which case it would only be required to publish an OC Announcement on the same date as it publishes its PHIP (as set out in paragraph 260 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 20(a)

Do you agree with the proposal that, in addition to the existing Return Application Details, the identities of other professional parties responsible for the Application Materials also be displayed on the designated webpage of the Exchange (as set out in paragraphs 264 to 265 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Question 20(b)

Do you agree with the list of professional parties proposed to be considered as responsible for the Application Materials for the above purpose (as set out in Box 1 under paragraph 265 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 21</u>

Do you agree with the proposal to amend the starting point of the 8-week moratorium to either: (a) the date on which all applicable review procedures in respect of the Listing Division's decision to return the listing application have been completed; or (b) the date on which the time period for invoking any such review procedures has lapsed (as set out in paragraph 266 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

<u>Question 22</u>

Do you agree with the consequential changes to issuers' disclosure obligations in relation to Issuer-related Listing Applications (as set out in paragraph 268 of the Consultation Paper)?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views and any alternative suggestions.

Yes we agree.

Please provide your overall comments (if any) regarding the Consultation Paper which have not been covered in the questions above.