



An MSCI Brand

2013 Hong Kong Proxy Voting Guidelines

December 19, 2012

Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.

Copyright © 2012 by ISS

www.issgovernance.com

ISS' 2013 Hong Kong Proxy Voting Guidelines
 Effective for Meetings on or after Feb. 1, 2013
 Published Dec. 19, 2012

Table of Contents

Board of Directors	3
Election of Directors	3
Remuneration	4
Director Fees.....	4
Compensation Plans	4
Audit	4
Share Issuance Requests	5
General Issuance Mandate	5
Share Repurchase Plans (Repurchase Mandate)	5
Reissuance of Shares Repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate).....	6
Related-Party Transactions	6
Mergers & Acquisitions	6
Structure of analysis	7
ISS Analytical Focus.....	8
Asset Divestments/Purchases	8
Divestments	8
Asset Purchases	8
Capital	9
Corporate Governance Issue:	9
Voting on Debt Issuance Requests	9
Voting on Loan Guarantee Requests	10
Social/Environmental Issues	11
Disclosure/Disclaimer	12

Board of Directors

The SEHK listing rules now require that at least three independent directors be appointed to boards of listed companies. Companies are likewise required to form audit committees composed of three nonexecutive directors, a majority of whom must be independent. The committee must have as a member an independent director with appropriate professional qualifications or accounting or related financial management expertise. The establishment of a remuneration committee is not required in Hong Kong, but the new listing rules state that, if such a committee exists, a majority of the committee's members must be independent.

In cases when companies bundle the election of directors in one voting item and do not disclose the names of nominees, ISS opposes the election, as such practice restricts shareholders' ability to block the election of individuals unfit to hold office.

Election of Directors

Generally vote FOR director nominees to the board. Vote AGAINST any nominee who:

- Is classified by the company as independent, but fails to meet the ISS criteria for independence - (additional rule: classify a director as non-independent director where the directors has served on the board for more than nine years (three terms), and where the board either fails to provide any reason for considering the director to still be independent, or where the stated reasons raise concerns among investors as to the director's true level of independence);
- Has been a partner of the company's auditor within the last three years, and serves on the audit committee;
- Had attended less than 75 percent of board meetings in the most recent fiscal year, without a satisfactory explanation;
- Is an executive director serving on the remuneration committee or nomination committee, and the committee is not majority independent;
- Is an executive director serving on the audit committee; or
- Sits on a total of more than six public company boards (ISS will accept a commitment by an overboarded director to step down from one or more boards at the next annual meeting of the company or companies in question, if that will bring the total number of boards to no more than six).

If the board is composed of less than one-third independent directors, a vote AGAINST all non-independent directors is warranted.

Vote FOR the election of a CEO/managing director, executive chairman or company founder who is deemed integral to the company.

ISS will recommend voting against shareholder-nominated candidates who lack board endorsement, unless they demonstrate a clear ability to contribute positively to board deliberations.

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from individual directors, members of a committee, or the entire board, due to:

- Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- Egregious actions related to a director's service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

Generally vote AGAINST all members of the audit committee up for reelection if:

- The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive; or
- The company did not disclose the audit fees and/or non-audit fees in the latest fiscal year.

Remuneration

Director Fees

ISS generally supports resolutions regarding directors' fees unless they are excessive relative to fees paid by other companies of similar size.

Compensation Plans

ISS will recommend voting against an option scheme if:

- The maximum dilution level for the scheme exceeds ISS guidelines of 5 percent of issued capital for a mature company and 10 percent for a growth company. However, ISS will support plans at mature companies with dilution levels up to 10 percent if the plan includes other positive features such as challenging performance criteria and meaningful vesting periods as these features partially offset dilution concerns by reducing the likelihood that options will become exercisable unless there is a clear improvement in shareholder value; *and/or*
- Directors eligible to receive options under the scheme are involved in the administration of the scheme.

Audit

An auditor who has been removed from office has the right to attend the AGM and to make statements to members at the AGM immediately following removal. Auditors can require subsidiaries of holding companies to provide detailed information regarding their operations – an important point in Hong Kong, because holding companies are becoming the favored corporate structure for Hong Kong conglomerates.

The right of auditors to attend AGMs following removal from office is an important safeguard for shareholders because it forces the company to justify its actions. Therefore, companies usually provide reasons for changes of auditors, and opposing the reappointment of auditors would only take place in extreme circumstances.

The practice of auditors providing non-audit services to companies is problematic. While large auditors may have effective internal barriers to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest, an auditor's ability to remain objective becomes questionable when fees paid to the auditor for non-audit services such as management consulting, general bookkeeping, and special situation audits exceed the standard annual audit fees. While some compensation for non-audit services is customary, the importance of maintaining the independence of the auditor is paramount. If fees from non-audit services become significant without any clear safeguards against conflicts of interest, ISS recommends opposing the auditor's reappointment.

With regard to the proposals to (re)appoint auditors, ISS will recommend supporting the appointment of auditors and authorizing the board to fix their remuneration, unless:

- There are serious concerns about the accounts presented or the audit procedures used;
- The auditor is being changed without explanation; *or*
- The non-audit fees exceed the total fees paid to the external auditor in the latest fiscal year without satisfactory explanation.

Whilst ISS will consider the nature and scope of non-audit fees when assessing their magnitude, where non-audit fees have constituted more than 50 percent of total auditor compensation during the most recent fiscal year, ISS will ordinarily not

recommend support for the reappointment of the audit firm. ISS will make exception to this policy if excessive non-audit fees are in relation to special projects or due to unusual circumstance, and are not recurring in nature and are unlikely to create conflicts of interest. An example of acceptable "non-audit" fees would be fees for a special audit in connection with an IPO.

Share Issuance Requests

General Issuance Mandate

Hong Kong companies routinely seek shareholder approval to authorize their boards to:

- Issue shares up to 20 percent of existing capital without preemptive rights (General Issuance Mandate);
- Repurchase shares of up to 10 percent of issued capital (Repurchase Mandate); *and*
- Reissue repurchased shares by extending the General Issuance Mandate to include the number of shares repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate).

This section deals with the General Issuance Mandate, while the other two mandates are discussed below. The interrelationship between the three items is, however, extremely important because the Share Reissuance Mandate extends the board's authority to issue shares without preemptive rights from 20 percent to 30 percent, assuming a 20 percent request has been made under the General Issuance Mandate.

Hong Kong companies routinely ask shareholders to grant the board of directors a "general mandate to issue shares" without preemptive rights, at least once every year. This mandate, pursuant to the Listing Rules, allows companies to issue shares of up to 20 percent of issued capital without preemptive rights at a discount to market prices of up to 20 percent (or more under special circumstances). This is a routine item on AGM agendas, but companies can also seek to renew (or 'refresh') the share issuance amount at an EGM later in the year. The authority is limited to one year or the next general meeting, as revoked or renewed by shareholders.

In recent years, many institutional investors have voted against all requests to issue shares without preemptive rights in Hong Kong as this mandate is subject to abuse by companies that could issue shares at steep discounts, potentially to related parties, and renew the share issuance amount several times within a period of one year. A small number of Hong Kong companies have, recently, made mandate requests smaller than the 20 percent maximum that the Listing Rules allow.

Taking account of the views of a wide range of institutional investors with investments in Hong Kong companies, ISS will now recommend a vote supporting the General Issuance Mandate for companies that:

- Limit the aggregate issuance request – that is, for the General Issuance Mandate and the Share Reissuance Mandate combined – to 10 percent or less of the existing issued share capital (rather than the maximum 20 percent + 10 percent that the Listing Rules permit companies to request);
- Limit the discount to 10 percent of the market price of shares (rather than the maximum 20 percent permitted by the Listing Rules); *and*
- Have no history of renewing the General Issuance Mandate several times within a period of one year.

Share Repurchase Plans (Repurchase Mandate)

The Hong Kong Code on Share Repurchases, enacted in 1991, made stock repurchases legal under specific guidelines. Companies usually request the authority under the title "General Mandate to Repurchase Shares," and the authority lasts for one year or until the next shareholder meeting. Repurchase programs are limited to 10 percent of the company's outstanding capital on the date the authority is granted. In addition, the funds to make the repurchases should be obtained from reserves established or authorized for this purpose. Companies are allowed to purchase ordinary shares or warrants on the open market through brokers, but purchases cannot knowingly be made from specific individuals or shareholders. Repurchased shares must be destroyed and removed from the company's issued capital. In some cases, however, the

company seeks separate authority to reissue the shares repurchased over and above the General Issuance Mandate (see "Share Reissuance Mandate," below).

There are several other aspects of the authority designed to protect shareholders' interests. As with the General Issuance Mandate, most companies use the exact wording from the official text of an amendment when making requests for such authorizations or when amending their articles to allow use of the authority and establishing reserves for that purpose.

Reissuance of Shares Repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate)

Companies may request board authorization to reissue any shares repurchased during the year under the Repurchase Mandate without limiting the General Issuance Mandate. This is known as the Share Reissuance Mandate. This authority is limited to shares repurchased in a given year and is thus limited to the maximum 10 percent allowed under the Repurchase Mandate. It is valid for one year. The Share Reissuance Mandate extends the board's authority to issue shares without preemptive rights from 20 percent to 30 percent, assuming a 20 percent request has been made under the General Issuance Mandate.

The Share Reissuance Mandate gives the board power to issue shares on the same terms and conditions (for example, in relation to discount to market price) as exist under the General Issuance Mandate.

ISS will recommend a vote supporting the Share Reissuance Mandate only if:

- The aggregate issuance request – that is, for the General Issuance Mandate and the Share Reissuance Mandate combined – is limited to 10 percent or less of the existing issued share capital (rather than the maximum 20 percent + 10 percent that the Listing Rules permit companies to request);
- The General Issuance Mandate request limits the discount to 10 percent of the market price of shares (rather than the maximum 20 percent permitted by the Listing Rules); *and*
- The company has no history of renewing the General Issuance Mandate several times within a period of one year if it has recommended For the General Issuance Mandate.

Related-Party Transactions

ISS assesses related-party transactions on a case-by-case basis, using the methodology described under Mergers and Acquisitions in this document.

Mergers & Acquisitions

Merger and acquisition activity is regulated by the Hong Kong Code on Mergers and Takeovers, which does not have the force of law but does have the support of the SFC and the SEHK. Any person acquiring shares worth 30 percent of a company's voting rights must make a general cash offer to other shareholders. The offer should be at a price no less than the highest price paid by the person or group during the preceding six months. Any person holding between 30 percent and 50 percent of the voting rights who acquires an additional 2 percent of the voting rights during any 12-month period must also make a general offer for the rest of the company.

Some M&A transactions require shareholder approval in Hong Kong. For example, privatization proposals, where a major shareholder wishes to buy out the minority shareholders in a listed company; very substantial acquisitions of assets; and very substantial disposals of assets.

ISS evaluates merger and restructuring transactions on a case-by-case basis, giving consideration to economic, operational, and governance factors. Our analyses are based on the following principles:

- *Current shareholders' viewpoint:* All analyses are conducted from the point of view of enhancing long-term shareholder returns for the company's existing shareholders. Since transactions will often involve more than one

corporation, this may lead to contradictory recommendations. It is important for investors to evaluate our recommendations in light of their relative investment holdings. If an investor holds many shares of company A, for whom a transaction is deemed to be favorable, and relatively few shares of company B, for whom a transaction is held to be unfavorable, it may be in the best interests of the investor to vote for the transaction for both companies rather than follow ISS's recommendations.

- *Enhancing shareholder value:* The fundamental objective of these analyses is to determine whether a transaction will enhance shareholder value. While the post-transaction governance structure is an important factor in the decision, the paramount concern is whether the transaction makes economic sense and is expected to produce superior shareholder returns. If poor governance is being introduced as a result of the transaction, the company must demonstrate that the economic benefits clearly outweigh any reduction in shareholder rights.
- *Independent evaluation:* ISS prefers to see a fairness opinion prepared by a recognized investment banking firm. In transactions where inside directors or management have a conflict of interest, we prefer the assurance that the transaction was reviewed by the independent directors.

Structure of analysis

For every M&A analysis, ISS reviews publicly available information and evaluates the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

- Valuation

Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? If a fairness opinion has been prepared, it provides an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, but ISS also places emphasis on the offer premium, market reaction, and strategic rationale.

- Market reaction

How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction will cause ISS to scrutinize a deal more closely.

- Strategic rationale

Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.

- Negotiations and process

Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arms-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders.

- Conflicts of interest

Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. ISS will consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger.

- Governance

Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the respective current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.

ISS Analytical Focus

The case-by-case basis is the appropriate and correct approach to analyzing M&A, but the emphasis of any ISS analysis will be first and foremost on shareholder value. ISS recognizes the importance of other factors, including corporate governance, to our clients, yet cases where corporate governance dominate an M&A vote decision will be rare.

Moreover, ISS cannot hold itself out as an industry expert. Any ISS analysis of strategic rationale will be limited to general comments on the typical strategic rationales themselves (e.g., economies of scale, aggressive/conservative synergy assumptions, horizontal vs. vertical vs. conglomerate mergers, etc.).

In short, our vote recommendation will be based on an analysis of shareholder value, which itself can be affected by ancillary factors such as the negotiation process. However, our research product can be distinguished from traditional brokers' analysis by the inclusion of intelligent discussions, where appropriate, of such ancillary factors.

If the shareholder value is indeed fair, then all the other considerations listed above (e.g., conflicts, process, etc.) become secondary. However, negative factors may indicate that the valuation of a proposed transaction is not in fact "fair." For example, a poor process can lead to a less than ideal valuation, or excessive change-in-control payments may transfer some of the rightful value due shareholders to conflicted insiders. In these cases, ISS will scrutinize a deal's valuation more closely to determine whether it is fair to shareholders despite the applicable negative ancillary factors. A transaction can be fair from a valuation standpoint despite being "unfair" in other aspects. In such cases, shareholder value is the trump card.

Asset Divestments/Purchases

Divestments

Vote recommendations on asset sales will be determined on a case-by-case basis after considering:

- Impact on the balance sheet/working capital;
- Potential elimination of diseconomies
- Anticipated financial and operating benefits;
- Anticipated use of funds;
- Value received for the asset; accountants' report; fairness opinion (if any);
- How the deal was negotiated;
- Conflicts of interest.

Asset Purchases

As with disposals, vote recommendations on asset sales will be determined on a case-by-case basis taking into account:

- Purchase price, including earnout and contingent payments;
- independent accountants' report;
- Fairness opinion (if any);
- Financial and strategic benefits;
- How the deal was negotiated;
- Conflicts of interest;
- Other alternatives for the business;
- Noncompletion risk (company's going concern prospects, possible bankruptcy).

Capital

Corporate Governance Issue:

Voting on Debt Issuance Requests

Debt Issuance Requests

- Vote non-convertible debt issuance requests on a CASE-BY-CASE basis, with or without preemptive rights.
- Vote FOR the creation/issuance of convertible debt instruments as long as the maximum number of common shares that could be issued upon conversion meets ISS' guidelines on equity-issuance requests.
- Vote FOR proposals to restructure existing debt arrangements unless the terms of the restructuring would adversely affect the rights of shareholders.

In evaluating debt-related proposals, the following factors will be considered:

- Rationale/use of proceeds: Why does the company need additional capital? How will that capital be used?
- Terms of the debts: Are the debt instruments convertible into equity? What are the interest rate and maturity dates? Any call or put options? Often these terms will not be determined until the time of issuance of debt instruments (or when the actual loan agreement is signed). The terms of the debts would generally be determined by the market conditions, and lack of disclosure concerning these terms should not be a cause for significant concern so long as the debt is not convertible into equity.
- Size: At a minimum, the size of the debt issuance/potential borrowing should be disclosed.
- The company's financial position: What is the company's current leverage and how does that compare to its peers?
- The risk of non-approval: What might happen if the proposal is not approved? Are there any alternative sources of funding? Could the company continue to fund its operations? Would it hinder the company's ability to realize opportunities?

A distinction should be made between a specific debt issuance or pledging of assets, and authority to issue or increase debt; as in the case of specific equity issuances and requests for authority to issue equity. For specific debt issuances or pledging of assets, while the above factors will be examined, in general a vote FOR these proposals will be warranted if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- Details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed (for specific asset pledge proposals); AND
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

So long as the proposal meets the above conditions, a vote FOR will be warranted even if the company has a high level of debt or the proposed issuance could result in a large increase in debt. A vote AGAINST will be warranted only in extremely egregious cases or where the company fails to provide sufficient information to enable a meaningful shareholder review.

Where a general authority to issue debt or pledge assets is requested, in addition to the above criteria, we will oppose such proposal if it could result in a potentially excessive increase in debt. A potential increase in debt may be considered excessive when:

- The proposed maximum amount is more than twice the company's total debt;
- It could result in the company's debt-to-equity ratio exceeding 300 percent (for non-financial companies); AND
- The maximum hypothetical debt-to-equity ratio is more than three times the industry and/or market norm.

When the above conditions are met, the proposed increase in debt may be considered excessive and thus the proposal may warrant an against vote. If we do not have data regarding the normal level of debt in that particular industry or market, only the company-specific information will be considered.

Pledging of Assets for Debt

Vote FOR proposals to approve the specific pledging of assets for debt if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- Details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed; AND
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

For proposals seeking a general authority to pledge assets for debt, the specific assets to be pledged need not be disclosed. However, in such cases, the authority should be limited such that it would not result in an excessive increase in debt. If the proposal grants excessive authority to the board or management, a vote AGAINST will be recommended.

In certain countries, shareholder approval is required when a company needs to secure a debt issuance with its assets. In many cases, this is a routine request and is a formality under the relevant law. When reviewing such proposals, ISS takes into account the terms of the proposed debt issuance, the company's overall debt level, and the company's justification for the pledging of assets.

ISS will issue vote recommendations against specific requests to pledge an asset in cases where no information regarding the size of the debt to be raised is disclosed, no credible explanation for the need of funding is provided, no details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed, or in extreme cases where shareholders' rights and economic interests could be negatively affected. When the board is requesting a general authority to pledge assets, the details regarding the assets to be pledged need not be disclosed; however, ISS will oppose such a proposal if it would grant the board excessive authority.

Increase in Borrowing Powers

Vote FOR proposals to approve increases in a company's borrowing powers if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- The potential increase in debt is not excessive; AND
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

In some countries, companies are required to seek shareholder approval for increases in their aggregate borrowing power authorities. The aggregate limit on the board's ability to borrow money is often fixed in a company's articles, and shareholder approval to change this limit is therefore legally required. ISS' analysis of borrowing power increase requests takes into account management's stated need for the increase, the size of the increase, and the company's current gearing level. Large increases in borrowing powers can sometimes result in dangerously high debt-to-equity ratios that could harm shareholder value. If no information regarding the limit on the borrowing power is disclosed, no credible explanation for the need of funding is provided, or an increase is excessive considering the company's debt level as well as normal levels of debt in its industry or market, ISS recommends opposing the request.

Voting on Loan Guarantee Requests

Chinese companies listed in Hong Kong often provide loan guarantees for subsidiaries, affiliates, and related parties.

Such requests will be evaluated on a CASE-BY-CASE basis. Generally vote AGAINST the provision of a guarantee where:

- The identity of the entity receiving the guarantee is not disclosed;

- The guarantee is being provided to a director, executive, parent company, or affiliated entities where the company has no direct or indirect equity ownership; or
- The guarantee is provided to an entity in which the company's ownership stake is less than 75 percent; and such guarantee is not proportionate to the company's equity stake or other parties have not provided a counter guarantee.

When the proposed guarantee does not fall into the above criteria, vote FOR such request provided that there are no significant concerns regarding the entity receiving the guarantee, the relationship between the listed company and the entity receiving the guarantee, the purpose of the guarantee, or the terms of the guarantee agreement. Examples of such concerns include a previous default by the entity receiving the guarantee or a sub-investment grade credit rating.

Social/Environmental Issues

Global Approach

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor covered standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short term or long term.

Generally vote CASE-BY-CASE, taking into consideration whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value, and in addition the following will be considered:

- If the issues presented in the proposal are more appropriately or effectively dealt with through legislation or government regulation;
- If the company has already responded in an appropriate and sufficient manner to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope, timeframe, or cost) or overly prescriptive;
- The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not reasonable and sufficient information is currently available to shareholders from the company or from other publicly available sources; and
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Disclosure/Disclaimer

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the “Information”) is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits) or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.