

## 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:

<http://www.hkex.com.hk/-/media/HKEX-Market/News/Market-Consultations/2016-Present/May-2019-Review-of-ESG-Guide/Consultation-Paper/cp201905.pdf>.

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

### Timeframe for Publication of ESG Reports

1. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Main Board Listing Rule 13.91 and GEM Listing Rule 17.103 to shorten the time required to publish an environmental, social and governance (“**ESG**”) report from three months after the publication of the annual report to within four months for Main Board issuers or three months for GEM issuers from the financial year-end date?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

### Printed Form of ESG Reports

2. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Listing Rules and the Guide to clarify that issuers are not required to provide printed form of the ESG report to shareholders unless responding to specific requests, but are required to notify shareholders that the ESG report has been published on the Exchange’s and the issuer’s websites?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.



## Introducing Mandatory Disclosure Requirements

### General

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Guide to introduce Mandatory Disclosure Requirements (“MDR”)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

This should promote higher consistency and standards in disclosure among companies.

### Governance Structure

4. If your response to Question 3 is positive, do you agree with our proposal to introduce an MDR requiring a statement from the board containing the following elements:

(a) a disclosure of the board’s oversight of ESG issues?

(b) the process used to identify, evaluate and manage material ESG-related issues (including risks to the issuer’s businesses); and

(c) how the board reviews progress made against ESG-related goals and targets?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

It is a given that all matters of importance to the business and strategic in nature are the responsibilities of the Board of Directors. It goes without saying and it is common sense. We do not consider a mandatory disclosure of this statement will motivate companies to improve on ESG matters. However if this is unavoidable due to international trend, then the Exchange must ensure it provides useful and practical guidance to the issuers.

5. Do you agree with our proposal to set out in a note that the board statement should include information on the issuer's current ESG management approach, strategy, priorities and goals/targets and an explanation of how they relate to the issuer's businesses?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

See item 4

### Reporting Principles

6. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Guide to introduce an MDR requiring disclosure of an explanation on how the issuer has applied the Reporting Principles in the preparation of the ESG report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

This is probably one of more difficult disclosure areas for a lot of companies. Exchange should give better guidance.

7. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Reporting Principle on "materiality" to make it clear that materiality of ESG issues is to be determined by the board and that the issuer must disclose a description of significant stakeholders identified, the process and results of the issuer's stakeholder engagement (if any), and the criteria for the selection of material ESG factors?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

While we agree with setting materiality, stating again it is the board who sets the materiality level is not necessary and duplicates with item 4. It is crucial to avoid any kind of duplication and to make the report as easy to read as possible.

8. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Reporting Principle on “quantitative” to:

(a) require disclosure of information on the standards, methodologies, assumptions and/or calculation tools used, and source of the conversion factors used for the reporting of emissions/energy consumption (where applicable); and

(b) clarify that while key performance indicators (“KPIs”) for historical data must be measurable, targets may be expressed by way of directional statements or quantitative descriptions?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

### Reporting Boundary

9. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Guide to include an MDR requiring an explanation of the ESG report’s reporting boundary, disclosing the process used to identify the specific entities or operations that are included in the ESG report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

## Introducing Aspect on Climate Change and Revising the Environmental KPIs

### Climate Change

10. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Aspect A4 requiring:

(a) disclosure of policies on measures to identify and mitigate the significant climate-related issues which have impacted, and those which may impact the issuer; and

(b) a KPI requiring a description of the significant climate-related issues which have impacted, and those which may impact the issuer, and the actions taken to manage them?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

### Targets

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the Environmental KPIs to require disclosure of a description of targets set regarding emissions, energy use and water efficiency, waste reduction, etc. and steps taken to achieve them?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

GHG Emissions

12. Do you agree with our proposal to revise an Environmental KPI to require disclosure of Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (“**GHG**”) emissions?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

**Upgrading the Disclosure Obligation of the Social KPIs**

13. Do you agree with our proposal to upgrade the disclosure obligation of all Social KPIs to “comply or explain”?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

## Revising the Social KPIs

### Employment Types

14. Do you agree with our proposal to revise a KPI to clarify “employment types” should include “full- and part-time” staff?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

### Rate of Fatalities

15. Do you agree with our proposal to amend the KPI on fatalities to require disclosure of the number and rate of work-related fatalities occurred in each of the past three years including the reporting year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Supply Chain Management

16. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce the following new KPIs in respect of supply chain management?

(a) Description of practices used to identify environmental and social risks along the supply chain, and how they are implemented and monitored.

(b) Description of practices used to promote environmentally preferable products and services when selecting suppliers, and how they are implemented and monitored.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Anti-corruption

17. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new KPI requiring disclosure of anti-corruption training provided to directors and staff?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

## Encouraging Independent Assurance

18. Do you agree with the proposal to revise the Guide's wording on independence assurance to state that the issuer may seek independent assurance to strengthen the credibility of ESG information disclosed; and where independent assurance is obtained, the issuer should describe the level, scope and processes adopted for assurance clearly in the ESG report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We are strong opposer of independent assurance as (i) these organisations often do things by the book; (ii) will never really understand the company, its operations and risks by merely spending a few hours or perhaps days with management and hence it will never have the ability to form a useful judgement; (iii) it adds very heavy financial burden (as well as burden on management time) to companies especially when the companies are often required to "educate" these advisers. Unlike say "financial accounting standards" which is one single set of rules for all HK companies, the ESG related rules and regulations are "numerous" and "vary" across different industries. Also many assuring organisations could be standalone independent companies not formally goverened by international standards both on technical and ethical. Most of the time these reports state the obvious. There is almost no way one can make any useful comparison among companies' assurance reports and therefore not a mean to strengthen the credibility of ESG information disclosed. It will also be misleading to consider Company A is better than Company B because A has an independent assurance report whereas B has not comissioned one. We strongly disagree with the proposal and urge the Exchange not to adopt the proposal.

- End -