

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/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2017111.pdf>.

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

PART I: INDEPENDENT NON-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Overboarding and INED's time commitment

1. Do you agree with our proposed amendment to Code Provision (“**CP**”) A.5.5 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that in addition to the CP’s current requirements, the board should also explain, if the proposed independent non-executive director (“**INED**”) will be holding his seventh (or more) listed company directorship, why he would still be able to devote sufficient time to the board?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Board diversity

2. Do you agree with our proposals to upgrade CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their corporate governance reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.5.5 that it requires (on a “comply or explain” basis) the board to state in the circular to shareholders accompanying the resolution to elect the director:
- (i) the process used for identifying the nominee;
 - (ii) the perspectives, skills and experience that the person is expected to bring to the board; and
 - (iii) how the nominee would contribute to the diversity of the board.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We do not agree with (iii) as currently worded. The implicit suggestion of (iii) is that a director cannot be appointed if he or she does not make the board more diverse. It should be sufficient that the appointment is consistent with the board's diversity policy. We consider that (iii) should be reworded as follows. "how the appointment of the nominee is consistent with the diversity policy of the board."

4. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) to reflect the upgrade of CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their Corporate Governance Reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Factors affecting INED's independence

A. Cooling off periods for former professional advisers

5. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13 (3) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for professional advisers before they can be considered independent, instead of the current one year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The consultation paper provides no evidence that an extended cooling off period will enhance independence. Of the other jurisdictions referred to, only the US will have a mandatory three year cooling off period. The other jurisdictions with three year cooling off periods permit shorter periods with explanation. We note the statement in the consultation paper that there are mixed views as to whether there is a shortage of potential INEDs. Our experience (as a listed company which believes in the benefits which suitably qualified INEDs bring to corporate governance) is that there is a shortage of suitably qualified INEDs. In this connection, we believe that more weight should be given to the views of those with experience of appointing INEDs to the boards of significant listed companies than to the views of those without such experience. The proposal will exacerbate the shortage of suitably qualified INEDs without it being demonstrated that independence will be enhanced. If the cooling off period is to be extended, we see no reason why it should not be on a comply or explain basis. To take an example, a partner of a law firm or management consultancy may give a one off (but significant) piece of advice to a listed company. The listed company is impressed by that advice, not least because of its objectivity and independence. A year later there is a vacancy for a INED. The partner is available. Why should she not be appointed with an explanation as to why her having provided services on a one off basis is not expected to compromise her independence?

6. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP C.3.2 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for a former partner of the issuer's existing audit firm before he can be a member of the issuer's audit committee?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

See our answer to question 5.

B. Cooling off period in respect of material interests in business activities

7. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13(4) to introduce a one-year cooling off period for a proposed INED who has had material interests in the issuer's principal business activities in the past year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper. In addition, we consider that, if the proposal is taken forward, it adds weight to the argument against extending the cooling off period for professional advisers. There is no reason of principle why professional advisers should be treated differently from those with material interests in an issuer's business activities.

C. Cross-directorships or Significant Links with other Directors

8. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Recommended Best Practice A.3.3 (i.e. voluntary) to recommend disclosure of INEDs' cross-directorships in the Corporate Governance Report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

D. Family ties

9. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Note under Rule 3.13 to encourage inclusion of an INED's immediate family members in the assessment of the director's independence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

10. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt the same definition for "immediate family member" as Rule 14A.12(1)(a) which defines an "immediate family member" as "his spouse, his (or his spouse's) child or step-child, natural or adopted, under the age of 18 years"?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART II: NOMINATION POLICY

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) of Appendix 14 to require an issuer to disclose its nomination policy adopted during the year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART III: DIRECTORS' ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Directors' attendance at general meetings

12. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.6.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) by removing the last sentence of the current wording (i.e. they should also attend general meetings and develop a balanced understanding of the views of shareholders.)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Chairman's annual meetings with INEDs

13. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP A.2.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to state that INEDs should meet at least annually with the chairman?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART IV: DIVIDEND POLICY

14. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce CP E.1.5 requiring (on a “comply or explain” basis) the issuer to disclose its dividend policy in the annual report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART V: ELECTRONIC DISSEMINATION OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS – IMPLIED CONSENT

15. Do you think that the Rules should be amended to allow shareholders’ consent to be implied for electronic dissemination of corporate communications by issuers?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The current regime is extremely burdensome. If anything, it creates more paper (and certainly creates more work) than a regime which does not permit electronic dissemination of corporate communications at all. We appreciate that the Hong Kong Companies Ordinance needs to be amended in order for listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong to take advantage of this proposal. But we see no reason why listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong should be prevented by the Listing Rules from permitting shareholders consent to be implied for electronic distribution of corporate communications if that is permitted by the relevant legislation in their jurisdictions of incorporation. In fact, we recommend that Listing Rule 2.07A(2A) should be repealed. This would achieve the objective of permitting implied consent for listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong, subject to their own legislative requirements. Repeal would of course not significantly affect listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong. They would continue to be bound by the relevant provisions of the Companies Ordinance (which the Listing Rule largely reflects). However, the repeal would still benefit companies incorporated in Hong Kong, on the footing that it should encourage the Hong Kong government to amend the Companies Ordinance so as to permit implied consent. The repeal would benefit everybody, on the footing that reduced paper usage would benefit the environment.

- End -

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/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2017111.pdf>.

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

PART I: INDEPENDENT NON-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Overboarding and INED's time commitment

1. Do you agree with our proposed amendment to Code Provision (“**CP**”) A.5.5 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that in addition to the CP’s current requirements, the board should also explain, if the proposed independent non-executive director (“**INED**”) will be holding his seventh (or more) listed company directorship, why he would still be able to devote sufficient time to the board?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Board diversity

2. Do you agree with our proposals to upgrade CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their corporate governance reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.5.5 that it requires (on a “comply or explain” basis) the board to state in the circular to shareholders accompanying the resolution to elect the director:
- (i) the process used for identifying the nominee;
 - (ii) the perspectives, skills and experience that the person is expected to bring to the board; and
 - (iii) how the nominee would contribute to the diversity of the board.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We do not agree with (iii) as currently worded. The implicit suggestion of (iii) is that a director cannot be appointed if he or she does not make the board more diverse. It should be sufficient that the appointment is consistent with the board's diversity policy. We consider that (iii) should be reworded as follows. "how the appointment of the nominee is consistent with the diversity policy of the board."

4. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) to reflect the upgrade of CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their Corporate Governance Reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Factors affecting INED's independence

A. Cooling off periods for former professional advisers

5. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13 (3) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for professional advisers before they can be considered independent, instead of the current one year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The consultation paper provides no evidence that an extended cooling off period will enhance independence. Of the other jurisdictions referred to, only the US will have a mandatory three year cooling off period. The other jurisdictions with three year cooling off periods permit shorter periods with explanation. We note the statement in the consultation paper that there are mixed views as to whether there is a shortage of potential INEDs. Our experience (as a listed company which believes in the benefits which suitably qualified INEDs bring to corporate governance) is that there is a shortage of suitably qualified INEDs. In this connection, we believe that more weight should be given to the views of those with experience of appointing INEDs to the boards of significant listed companies than to the views of those without such experience. The proposal will exacerbate the shortage of suitably qualified INEDs without it being demonstrated that independence will be enhanced. If the cooling off period is to be extended, we see no reason why it should not be on a comply or explain basis. To take an example, a partner of a law firm or management consultancy may give a one off (but significant) piece of advice to a listed company. The listed company is impressed by that advice, not least because of its objectivity and independence. A year later there is a vacancy for a INED. The partner is available. Why should she not be appointed with an explanation as to why her having provided services on a one off basis is not expected to compromise her independence?

6. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP C.3.2 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for a former partner of the issuer's existing audit firm before he can be a member of the issuer's audit committee?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

See our answer to question 5.

B. Cooling off period in respect of material interests in business activities

7. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13(4) to introduce a one-year cooling off period for a proposed INED who has had material interests in the issuer's principal business activities in the past year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper. In addition, we consider that, if the proposal is taken forward, it adds weight to the argument against extending the cooling off period for professional advisers. There is no reason of principle why professional advisers should be treated differently from those with material interests in an issuer's business activities.

C. Cross-directorships or Significant Links with other Directors

8. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Recommended Best Practice A.3.3 (i.e. voluntary) to recommend disclosure of INEDs' cross-directorships in the Corporate Governance Report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

D. Family ties

9. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Note under Rule 3.13 to encourage inclusion of an INED's immediate family members in the assessment of the director's independence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

10. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt the same definition for "immediate family member" as Rule 14A.12(1)(a) which defines an "immediate family member" as "his spouse, his (or his spouse's) child or step-child, natural or adopted, under the age of 18 years"?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART II: NOMINATION POLICY

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) of Appendix 14 to require an issuer to disclose its nomination policy adopted during the year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART III: DIRECTORS' ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Directors' attendance at general meetings

12. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.6.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) by removing the last sentence of the current wording (i.e. they should also attend general meetings and develop a balanced understanding of the views of shareholders.)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Chairman's annual meetings with INEDs

13. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP A.2.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to state that INEDs should meet at least annually with the chairman?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART IV: DIVIDEND POLICY

14. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce CP E.1.5 requiring (on a “comply or explain” basis) the issuer to disclose its dividend policy in the annual report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART V: ELECTRONIC DISSEMINATION OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS – IMPLIED CONSENT

15. Do you think that the Rules should be amended to allow shareholders’ consent to be implied for electronic dissemination of corporate communications by issuers?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The current regime is extremely burdensome. If anything, it creates more paper (and certainly creates more work) than a regime which does not permit electronic dissemination of corporate communications at all. We appreciate that the Hong Kong Companies Ordinance needs to be amended in order for listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong to take advantage of this proposal. But we see no reason why listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong should be prevented by the Listing Rules from permitting shareholders consent to be implied for electronic distribution of corporate communications if that is permitted by the relevant legislation in their jurisdictions of incorporation. In fact, we recommend that Listing Rule 2.07A(2A) should be repealed. This would achieve the objective of permitting implied consent for listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong, subject to their own legislative requirements. Repeal would of course not significantly affect listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong. They would continue to be bound by the relevant provisions of the Companies Ordinance (which the Listing Rule largely reflects). However, the repeal would still benefit companies incorporated in Hong Kong, on the footing that it should encourage the Hong Kong government to amend the Companies Ordinance so as to permit implied consent. The repeal would benefit everybody, on the footing that reduced paper usage would benefit the environment.

- End -

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/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2017111.pdf>.

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

PART I: INDEPENDENT NON-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Overboarding and INED's time commitment

1. Do you agree with our proposed amendment to Code Provision (“**CP**”) A.5.5 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that in addition to the CP’s current requirements, the board should also explain, if the proposed independent non-executive director (“**INED**”) will be holding his seventh (or more) listed company directorship, why he would still be able to devote sufficient time to the board?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Board diversity

2. Do you agree with our proposals to upgrade CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their corporate governance reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.5.5 that it requires (on a “comply or explain” basis) the board to state in the circular to shareholders accompanying the resolution to elect the director:
- (i) the process used for identifying the nominee;
 - (ii) the perspectives, skills and experience that the person is expected to bring to the board; and
 - (iii) how the nominee would contribute to the diversity of the board.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We do not agree with (iii) as currently worded. The implicit suggestion of (iii) is that a director cannot be appointed if he or she does not make the board more diverse. It should be sufficient that the appointment is consistent with the board's diversity policy. We consider that (iii) should be reworded as follows. "how the appointment of the nominee is consistent with the diversity policy of the board."

4. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) to reflect the upgrade of CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their Corporate Governance Reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Factors affecting INED's independence

A. Cooling off periods for former professional advisers

5. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13 (3) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for professional advisers before they can be considered independent, instead of the current one year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The consultation paper provides no evidence that an extended cooling off period will enhance independence. Of the other jurisdictions referred to, only the US will have a mandatory three year cooling off period. The other jurisdictions with three year cooling off periods permit shorter periods with explanation. We note the statement in the consultation paper that there are mixed views as to whether there is a shortage of potential INEDs. Our experience (as a listed company which believes in the benefits which suitably qualified INEDs bring to corporate governance) is that there is a shortage of suitably qualified INEDs. In this connection, we believe that more weight should be given to the views of those with experience of appointing INEDs to the boards of significant listed companies than to the views of those without such experience. The proposal will exacerbate the shortage of suitably qualified INEDs without it being demonstrated that independence will be enhanced. If the cooling off period is to be extended, we see no reason why it should not be on a comply or explain basis. To take an example, a partner of a law firm or management consultancy may give a one off (but significant) piece of advice to a listed company. The listed company is impressed by that advice, not least because of its objectivity and independence. A year later there is a vacancy for a INED. The partner is available. Why should she not be appointed with an explanation as to why her having provided services on a one off basis is not expected to compromise her independence?

6. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP C.3.2 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for a former partner of the issuer's existing audit firm before he can be a member of the issuer's audit committee?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

See our answer to question 5.

B. Cooling off period in respect of material interests in business activities

7. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13(4) to introduce a one-year cooling off period for a proposed INED who has had material interests in the issuer's principal business activities in the past year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper. In addition, we consider that, if the proposal is taken forward, it adds weight to the argument against extending the cooling off period for professional advisers. There is no reason of principle why professional advisers should be treated differently from those with material interests in an issuer's business activities.

C. Cross-directorships or Significant Links with other Directors

8. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Recommended Best Practice A.3.3 (i.e. voluntary) to recommend disclosure of INEDs' cross-directorships in the Corporate Governance Report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

D. Family ties

9. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Note under Rule 3.13 to encourage inclusion of an INED's immediate family members in the assessment of the director's independence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

10. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt the same definition for "immediate family member" as Rule 14A.12(1)(a) which defines an "immediate family member" as "his spouse, his (or his spouse's) child or step-child, natural or adopted, under the age of 18 years"?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART II: NOMINATION POLICY

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) of Appendix 14 to require an issuer to disclose its nomination policy adopted during the year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART III: DIRECTORS' ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Directors' attendance at general meetings

12. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.6.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) by removing the last sentence of the current wording (i.e. they should also attend general meetings and develop a balanced understanding of the views of shareholders.)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Chairman's annual meetings with INEDs

13. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP A.2.7 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to state that INEDs should meet at least annually with the chairman?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART IV: DIVIDEND POLICY

14. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce CP E.1.5 requiring (on a “comply or explain” basis) the issuer to disclose its dividend policy in the annual report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART V: ELECTRONIC DISSEMINATION OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS – IMPLIED CONSENT

15. Do you think that the Rules should be amended to allow shareholders’ consent to be implied for electronic dissemination of corporate communications by issuers?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The current regime is extremely burdensome. If anything, it creates more paper (and certainly creates more work) than a regime which does not permit electronic dissemination of corporate communications at all. We appreciate that the Hong Kong Companies Ordinance needs to be amended in order for listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong to take advantage of this proposal. But we see no reason why listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong should be prevented by the Listing Rules from permitting shareholders consent to be implied for electronic distribution of corporate communications if that is permitted by the relevant legislation in their jurisdictions of incorporation. In fact, we recommend that Listing Rule 2.07A(2A) should be repealed. This would achieve the objective of permitting implied consent for listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong, subject to their own legislative requirements. Repeal would of course not significantly affect listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong. They would continue to be bound by the relevant provisions of the Companies Ordinance (which the Listing Rule largely reflects). However, the repeal would still benefit companies incorporated in Hong Kong, on the footing that it should encourage the Hong Kong government to amend the Companies Ordinance so as to permit implied consent. The repeal would benefit everybody, on the footing that reduced paper usage would benefit the environment.

- End -

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/eng/newsconsul/mktconsul/Documents/cp2017111.pdf>.

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

PART I: INDEPENDENT NON-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Overboarding and INED's time commitment

1. Do you agree with our proposed amendment to Code Provision ("CP") A.5.5 (on a "comply or explain" basis) so that in addition to the CP's current requirements, the board should also explain, if the proposed independent non-executive director ("INED") will be holding his seventh (or more) listed company directorship, why he would still be able to devote sufficient time to the board?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Board diversity

2. Do you agree with our proposals to upgrade CP A.5.6 (on a "comply or explain" basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their corporate governance reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

3. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.5.5 that it requires (on a “comply or explain” basis) the board to state in the circular to shareholders accompanying the resolution to elect the director:
- (i) the process used for identifying the nominee;
 - (ii) the perspectives, skills and experience that the person is expected to bring to the board; and
 - (iii) how the nominee would contribute to the diversity of the board.

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We do not agree with (iii) as currently worded. The implicit suggestion of (iii) is that a director cannot be appointed if he or she does not make the board more diverse. It should be sufficient that the appointment is consistent with the board's diversity policy. We consider that (iii) should be reworded as follows. "how the appointment of the nominee is consistent with the diversity policy of the board."

4. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) to reflect the upgrade of CP A.5.6 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to a Rule (Rule 13.92) requiring issuers to have a diversity policy and to disclose the policy or a summary of it in their Corporate Governance Reports?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Factors affecting INED's independence

A. Cooling off periods for former professional advisers

5. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13 (3) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for professional advisers before they can be considered independent, instead of the current one year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The consultation paper provides no evidence that an extended cooling off period will enhance independence. Of the other jurisdictions referred to, only the US will have a mandatory three year cooling off period. The other jurisdictions with three year cooling off periods permit shorter periods with explanation. We note the statement in the consultation paper that there are mixed views as to whether there is a shortage of potential INEDs. Our experience (as a listed company which believes in the benefits which suitably qualified INEDs bring to corporate governance) is that there is a shortage of suitably qualified INEDs. In this connection, we believe that more weight should be given to the views of those with experience of appointing INEDs to the boards of significant listed companies than to the views of those without such experience. The proposal will exacerbate the shortage of suitably qualified INEDs without it being demonstrated that independence will be enhanced. If the cooling off period is to be extended, we see no reason why it should not be on a comply or explain basis. To take an example, a partner of a law firm or management consultancy may give a one off (but significant) piece of advice to a listed company. The listed company is impressed by that advice, not least because of its objectivity and independence. A year later there is a vacancy for a INED. The partner is available. Why should she not be appointed with an explanation as to why her having provided services on a one off basis is not expected to compromise her independence?

6. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP C.3.2 (on a “comply or explain” basis) so that there is a three-year cooling off period for a former partner of the issuer's existing audit firm before he can be a member of the issuer's audit committee?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

See our answer to question 5.

B. Cooling off period in respect of material interests in business activities

7. Do you agree with our proposal to revise Rule 3.13(4) to introduce a one-year cooling off period for a proposed INED who has had material interests in the issuer's principal business activities in the past year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper. In addition, we consider that, if the proposal is taken forward, it adds weight to the argument against extending the cooling off period for professional advisers. There is no reason of principle why professional advisers should be treated differently from those with material interests in an issuer's business activities.

C. Cross-directorships or Significant Links with other Directors

8. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Recommended Best Practice A.3.3 (i.e. voluntary) to recommend disclosure of INEDs' cross-directorships in the Corporate Governance Report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

D. Family ties

9. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a Note under Rule 3.13 to encourage inclusion of an INED's immediate family members in the assessment of the director's independence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

10. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt the same definition for "immediate family member" as Rule 14A.12(1)(a) which defines an "immediate family member" as "his spouse, his (or his spouse's) child or step-child, natural or adopted, under the age of 18 years"?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART II: NOMINATION POLICY

11. Do you agree with our proposal to amend Mandatory Disclosure Requirement L.(d)(ii) of Appendix 14 to require an issuer to disclose its nomination policy adopted during the year?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART III: DIRECTORS' ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

Directors' attendance at general meetings

12. Do you agree with our proposal to amend CP A.6.7 (on a “comply or explain” basis) by removing the last sentence of the current wording (i.e. they should also attend general meetings and develop a balanced understanding of the views of shareholders.)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

Chairman's annual meetings with INEDs

13. Do you agree with our proposal to revise CP A.2.7 (on a “comply or explain” basis) to state that INEDs should meet at least annually with the chairman?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART IV: DIVIDEND POLICY

14. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce CP E.1.5 requiring (on a “comply or explain” basis) the issuer to disclose its dividend policy in the annual report?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

We agree with the reasons in the consultation paper.

PART V: ELECTRONIC DISSEMINATION OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS – IMPLIED CONSENT

15. Do you think that the Rules should be amended to allow shareholders’ consent to be implied for electronic dissemination of corporate communications by issuers?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your views.

The current regime is extremely burdensome. If anything, it creates more paper (and certainly creates more work) than a regime which does not permit electronic dissemination of corporate communications at all. We appreciate that the Hong Kong Companies Ordinance needs to be amended in order for listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong to take advantage of this proposal. But we see no reason why listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong should be prevented by the Listing Rules from permitting shareholders consent to be implied for electronic distribution of corporate communications if that is permitted by the relevant legislation in their jurisdictions of incorporation. In fact, we recommend that Listing Rule 2.07A(2A) should be repealed. This would achieve the objective of permitting implied consent for listed companies incorporated outside Hong Kong, subject to their own legislative requirements. Repeal would of course not significantly affect listed companies incorporated in Hong Kong. They would continue to be bound by the relevant provisions of the Companies Ordinance (which the Listing Rule largely reflects). However, the repeal would still benefit companies incorporated in Hong Kong, on the footing that it should encourage the Hong Kong government to amend the Companies Ordinance so as to permit implied consent. The repeal would benefit everybody, on the footing that reduced paper usage would benefit the environment.

- End -