

Submitted via Qualtrics

(Anonymous)

Personal view

Corporate Finance / Bank Staff

Question 1

Do you agree that an alternative eligibility test should be introduced to enable the listing of high growth enterprises substantively engaged in R&D activities on GEM?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 2

Do you have any comments on the proposed thresholds for the alternative eligibility test as set out in paragraphs 63 to 75 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

GEM listed companies and applicants might not participate in industry that required high investment of R&D. R&D investment does not guarantee growth.

Companies in traditional industry, such as manufacturing/ F&B, may achieve growth through effective marketing or expand its facility line. The introduction of R&D cost as part of the eligibility test only favors industries that required substantive R&D cost in early stage (eg tech), and neglect traditional industries, which really is the backbone of our economy.

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the post-IPO 24 month lock-up period imposed on controlling shareholders of GEM issuers to 12 months as set out in paragraph 76 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

improves liquidity

Question 4

Should any other existing eligibility requirement for a listing on GEM be amended?

Yes

If so, please state the requirement(s) that should be amended and give reasons for your views.

The growth potential of listing applicant should be assessed by the market based on a basket of factors rather than rigid quantitative test. For example the listing requirement of NASDAQ Capital market is extremely low as compared to GEM. The market will make its decision about the applicants potential. The new R&D test may not be a very effective measure of the applicant growth potential.

Question 5

Do you agree with the proposed consequential and housekeeping amendments to the reverse takeover and extreme transaction Rules as set out in paragraphs 81 and 82 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 6

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to remove GEM's compliance officer requirement as set out in paragraph 85(a) of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 7

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to shorten the period of engagement of GEM issuers' compliance advisers and to remove the additional obligations currently imposed on a GEM issuer's compliance adviser as set out in paragraphs 85(b) and 86 of the Consultation Paper?

No

Please give reasons for your views.

Such compliance cost is insignificant, and the amendment might not have material impact.

Question 8

Should any other continuing obligation currently applicable to a GEM listed issuer also be removed?

No

If so, please state the requirement(s) and give reasons for your views.

Question 9

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to remove quarterly financial reporting as

a mandatory requirement for GEM issuers and instead introduce it as a recommended best practice in GEM's Corporate Governance Code?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

a huge plus

Question 10

Do you agree with the Exchange's proposal to align the timeframes for GEM issuers to publish their annual reports, interim reports and preliminary announcements of results for the first half of each financial year with those for the Main Board, as set out in paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 11

Do you agree that a streamlined mechanism should be introduced to enable qualified GEM issuers to transfer their listing to the Main Board?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

The cost of the existing one too high

Question 12

Do you agree with the removal of the requirement for the appointment of a sponsor for the purpose of a streamlined transfer as set out in paragraph 108 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 13

Do you agree with, for the purpose of a streamlined transfer, the removal of the requirement for a "prospectus-standard" listing document and other requirements as set out in paragraphs 111 to 114 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 14

Do you agree with the track record requirements for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraphs 117 to 118 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 15

Do you agree with the daily turnover and volume weighted average market capitalisation requirements for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraphs 120 to 133 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 16

**Should the Minimum Daily Turnover Threshold for the Daily Turnover Test be set at: -
Selected Choice**

(b) HK\$50,000

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 17

Do you agree with the proposed compliance record requirement for a streamlined transfer applicant as set out in paragraph 134 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 18

Do you agree with the proposed modification to the existing compliance record requirement for a transfer from GEM to the Main Board as set out in paragraph 136 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.

Question 19

Do you agree that the Exchange should exempt GEM transferees to the Main Board from the Main Board initial listing fee?

Yes

Please give reasons for your views.