

Panel on Financial Affairs

List of follow-up actions arising from discussions in previous sessions and the current session
(Position as at 2 April 2008)

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
1. Proposal of re-structuring the filing fees for non-Hong Kong companies	3 January 2005	The Administration was requested to report to the Panel in due course on the situation about non-Hong Kong companies' compliance with the new requirement for them to file a full annual return. The report should include, inter alia, the statistics on compliance, non-compliance and late returns, enforcement actions taken/to be taken (if any), and measures proposed by the Administration to improve the situation.	Information awaited.
2. Progress report on proposed measures to address risks arising from securities margin financing	6 February 2006	Members noted that the proposal of imposing a 180% re-pledging limit on securities margin financing (SMF) providers and the long-term measure of complete segregation of collateral of borrowing and non-borrowing margin clients would have cost implications on SMF providers and their clients. In this connection, members requested the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) to provide the following information: (a) The number of SMF providers that were likely to be affected by the 180% re-pledging limit;	The required information for item (a) and the interim reply for item (b) provided by SFC was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1023/05-06(01) on 3 March 2006. SFC's further response on item (b) awaited.

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>(b) The impact of the long-term measure of complete segregation of collateral of borrowing and non-borrowing margin clients:</p> <p>(i) on the operating cost of SMF providers, including the respective impact on small, medium and large-sized SMF providers; and</p> <p>(ii) on borrowing and non-borrowing margin clients, including the likely increase in service fees paid by them.</p>	
<p>3. Policies on remuneration for and post-termination employment of senior executives of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority and Securities and Futures Commission</p>	<p>4 May 2006</p>	<p>Regarding the reviews being conducted on the policies on post-termination employment of senior executives of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA) and SFC, members suggested that reference be made to the improved arrangements introduced for directorate civil servants on 1 January 2006. In this connection, the Governance Subcommittee (GSC) of the Exchange Fund Advisory Committee and the SFC were invited to inform the Panel of the outcome of their reviews in writing in due course.</p>	<p>The written response from the GSC Chairman was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)182/06-07(01) on 27 October 2006.</p> <p>Response from SFC awaited.</p>
<p>4. Review of the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Compensation Fund</p>	<p>3 July 2006</p>	<p>In response to members' concern about the review of collection of levy and reserve level of the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Compensation Fund (Compensation Fund), the Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) Schemes Authority undertook to:</p>	<p>The progress report on the review of the Compensation Fund was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)497/07-08 on 24 December 2007. MPFA will</p>

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>(a) explore feasible measures to improve provision of services to members of MPF Schemes; and</p> <p>(b) work out a model/mechanism for determining the optimum level of the Compensation Fund and provide a progress report to the Panel in 18 months' time. The progress report would also cover information on the assessment of the risks arising from claims, if any, to the Compensation Fund.</p>	<p>complete the review and provide a report for consideration in 18 months' time.</p>
<p>5. Review of the Personalized Vehicle Registration Marks Scheme</p>	<p>28 February 2008</p>	<p>(a) Of the some 700 traffic offence cases involving vehicles bearing Private Vehicle Registration Marks (PVRMs) between September 2006 and September 2007, the Administration was requested to provide information/statistics on the number of prosecutions, convictions, acquittals, and cases which had been dismissed on the grounds of enforcement difficulty caused by PVRMs.</p> <p>(b) The Administration was requested to provide a report to the Panel reviewing the implementation, operation and auction proceeds of the PVRM Scheme in one year's time.</p>	<p>Response to item (a) was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1150/07-08 on 28 March 2008.</p> <p>Response to item (b) awaited.</p>
<p>6. Budget of the Securities and Futures Commission for the financial year of 2008-2009</p>	<p>28 February 2008</p>	<p>To address members' concerns, SFC undertook to:</p> <p>(a) provide statistics on the number of enforcement</p>	<p>Response from SFC issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1148/07-08 on 28 March</p>

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>cases investigated and completed by the SFC as well as relevant information on performance indicators/pledges regarding its enforcement capabilities; and</p> <p>(b) provide statistics/ breakdown on the number of complaints received and investigated by SFC which involved the provision of inaccurate or misleading information by financial advisors and intermediaries to their clients with regard to various derivatives and financial products.</p>	2008.