

Name of respondent / 回應者名稱: -

Q1: Yes / 支持

Q1 Comment / 意見: To answer your question 1, please remember that it's a "Mandatory" fund which means people do not have choice in the first to decide whether they would like to participate in the scheme. The government who introduced this mandatory scheme in 2000 which affect the majority of the working class in Hong Kong, I am shocked about the expense ratio could be at such a high level and government did not step in to regulate. Having said that, any enhancements would reduce the expense ratio would be welcomed.

Q2: No / 不同意

Q2 Comment / 意見: This question is only valid when when the "employee choice arrangement" are fully implemented in all stages with any restriction. I don't see how "substantially the same in all MPF schemes" would help lower the fee by introducing competition to the service providers. This should be right way to use "本末倒置" rather than how "基金公會行政總裁黃王慈明" describe the CF to the media.

Q3: No / 否

Q3 Comment / 意見: Please refer to my answer for question 2.

Q4: Yes / 同意

Q4 Comment / 意見: No comment.

Q5 Comment / 意見: No comment.

Q6: Yes / 同意

Q6 Comment / 意見: I don't see the reason why the MPF providers could charge anything more than the expense ratio of "Tracker Fund of Hong Kong - 2800 HK" (it was 0.15% last year) if they offer a similar product.

You could argue that they have higher administration cost. The problem is the "clients" (MPF contributors) do have option to invest in a more competitive product which it's available in the market because of the design of the MPF scheme.

If it's a free market, MPF providers charge higher than the market price would be gradually eliminated. The inefficient MPF providers should suffer the penalty rather than the MPF contributors (pay higher fee). Or to choose between competing fund managers based on performance.

Being the regulator of the MPF scheme, the introduction of the FULLY "employee choice arrangement" would provide huge benefit to the working class. That would increase the incentive for employee to manage their own account based on their own investment decision and also introduce a true competition to the MPF providers.

The MPFA should request MPF providers to provide the complete historic performance (daily closing unit price) of every fund in the MPF schemes in a easy to use format. Please keep in mind that not all MPF contributors has a high level of computer skills. Such basic MPF data should be mandatory provided to the public by all MPF provided. The data is not something like Monte Carlo option model nor multiple regression model, it is just a simple price time-series, it doesn't require a lot of resources from the MPF providers and in fact, they should already have the data handy. MPF scheme has been in place for 14 years and how could that be not regulated?!?

Q7: No / 不同意

Q7 Comment / 意見: Please refer to my answer to question 6.

Q8: -

Q8 Comment / 意見: No comment.

Q9 Comment / 意見: No comment.

Q10: No / 不同意

Q10 Comment / 意見: No comments.

Q10 Preference / 較可取的名稱: -

Q11: -

Q11 Comment / 意見: No comments.

Q12: -

Q12 Comment / 意見: No comment.