

Name of respondent / 回應者名稱: -

Q1: Yes / 支持

Q1 Comment / 意見: -

Q2: Yes / 同意

Q2 Comment / 意見: -

Q3: Yes / 是

Q3 Comment / 意見: There should be just one default fund in the market and carried by all MPF schemes.

Q4: Yes / 同意

Q4 Comment / 意見: To allow me to have easy understanding, there should be one fund and the derisking should be done for all members within the same fund.

Q5 Comment / 意見: At times, it may create a number of target date funds. How could MPFA ensure the cost of setting up new funds and performance are up to standard. Therefore, I prefer one fund run by the same investment manager for all MPF schemes as stated above.

Q6: No / 不同意

Q6 Comment / 意見: I believe in value for money. In my previous investment experience, how could you ensure that such a low fee could motivate an investment manager to generate more return for us?

Do you think of how to monitor the performance? If there is a default fund, MPFA has the responsibility to ensure member are enjoying a reasonable performance and let us know what would happen if the fund does not perform well.

I noted that there are retail funds which only charge performance fee. This would be a good method in ensuring fund manager to achieve better performance.

I am fine to have a fee as high as 2% if a fund could have an annualized return of 6%p.a. to 10% p.a.

Q7: No / 不同意

Q7 Comment / 意見: My comment is same as question 6.

Q8: No / 不同意

Q8 Comment / 意見: I do not see how this could generate good returns for us. Could you tell us for current MPF funds using this strategies, what are the return and how MPFA see this as a good investment approach when compare with other MPF funds which are not using this approach?

Q9 Comment / 意見: I don't know. Maybe property.

Q10: Yes / 同意

Q10 Comment / 意見: Core fund means we should all invest in it unless we think otherwise. This does not consistent with your consultation paper. I don't see why you keep saying core fund. So misleading.

Q10 Preference / 較可取的名稱: MPF Default Investment Fund (reinforcing that its primary design is built around the default investment strategy for those who do not, or do not want to make an investment choice in saving for retirement)

Q11: No / 不同意

Q11 Comment / 意見: This may create a lot of papers such as receiving notices from trustees which I hate. I think be there as it may and only apply to future investment.

Q12: No / 不同意

Q12 Comment / 意見: paper and paper. very bad. it may even confuse me.