

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)883/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/CI/1

Panel on Commerce and Industry

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 17 December 2013, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Members attending : Hon Claudia MO

Public officers attending : Agenda item IV
Mr Andrew H Y WONG, JP
Permanent Secretary for Commerce and Economic
Development (Commerce, Industry and Tourism)

Mr David F L WONG, JP
Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic
Development (Commerce and Industry) 2

Miss Patricia SO
Principal Assistant Secretary for Commerce and
Economic Development (Commerce and Industry)3

Ms Ada LEUNG
Deputy Director of Intellectual Property

Ms Michelle CHONG
Assistant Director of Intellectual Property
(Copyright)

Agenda item V

Mr Peter K F CHEUNG, JP
Director of Intellectual Property

Mr Thomas C S TSANG
Assistant Director of Intellectual Property (Patents)

Mr David F L WONG, JP
Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic
Development (Commerce and Industry) 2

Miss Patricia SO
Principal Assistant Secretary for Commerce and
Economic Development (Commerce and Industry)3

Clerk in attendance : Ms Annette LAM
Chief Council Secretary (1)3

Staff in attendance : Ms Connie HO
Senior Council Secretary (1)3

Ms Katrina Wu
Research Officer 4

Miss Rita YUNG
Council Secretary (1)3

Ms May LEUNG
Legislative Assistant (1)3

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)514/13-14 -- Minutes of meeting held on 22 October 2013)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2013 were confirmed.

II. Information papers issued since last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)394/13-14(01) -- Administration's paper on proposed adjustment to fees and charges under the purview of the Trade and Industry Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)530/13-14(01) -- Information on the Hong Kong/Shenzhen Co-operation Meeting held on 25 November 2013)

2. Members noted that the above papers had been issued since the last meeting.

III. Date of next meeting and items for discussion

(LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Members noted that the next regular Panel meeting would be held on 21 January 2014 at 2:30 pm to discuss the relevant policy initiatives featuring in the Chief Executive's 2014 Policy Address.

IV. Public consultation on treatment of parody under the copyright regime

(LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(03) -- Administration's paper on public consultation on treatment of parody under the copyright regime

LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(04) -- Paper on treatment of parody under the copyright regime prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief)

Presentation by the Administration

4. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Permanent Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development (Commerce, Industry and Tourism) (PSCIT) briefed members on the outcome of the 4-month public consultation ("the consultation exercise") carried out from 11 July to 15 November 2013 on treatment of parody under the copyright regime and the way forward.

5. PSCIT briefed members that the consultation exercise aimed to explore how Hong Kong's copyright regime should give due regard to present day circumstances and take care of parody as appropriate, so as to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of copyright owners and users and the general public, and to serve the best interest of Hong Kong. During the consultation, the Administration received a total of 2 455 written submissions from different stakeholders including users and netizen groups (2 387 submissions); copyright owners' organizations and companies (43 submissions); online service providers (OSPs) (7 submissions); and other organizations including professional bodies, academics, political parties and non-government organizations (18 submissions).

6. PSCIT said that views collected were diverse and on some issues divided. The Administration would continue to engage stakeholders to exchange thoughts on how best to consolidate and reconcile ideas before drafting legislative proposals that would address all the pertinent issues the consultation had brought up. Subject to progress of such work, the Administration planned to take a view on the way forward and prepare the necessary amendments in earnest. The Administration aimed to conclude the efforts started since 2006 to update Hong Kong's copyright regime in the digital environment, taking into account the latest views of stakeholders collected in this consultation exercise.

Discussion

The User-generated Content Option

7. Ms Claudia MO was pleased to note some copyright owners' views that the changes to the copyright legislation they had been pushing for were aimed at curbing online copyright piracy rather than targeting the normal

daily non-commercial activities of individual users. She said that while some copyright owners were now more agreeable to making changes to the current copyright regime, such as considering a criminal exemption for non-commercial parodies, to accommodate genuine parody, netizens were generally concerned that copyright owners could still pursue civil claims against parodists for copyright infringement, thereby restricting freedom of expression on the internet platform. Internet users therefore had put forward the 4th Option, proposing a copyright exception for User-generated Content (UGC) that was for non-profit purpose or UGC produced not in the course of business. This option was principally based on section 29.21 of the Canadian Copyright Act. Ms MO asked how the Administration would strike a proper balance between the conflicting interests of copyright owners and users.

8. PSCIT responded that Canada was the only country which had enacted the UGC exception in its copyright law, and the exception had been in place for just about one year. In the absence of similar international precedents, the Canadian UGC exception had attracted considerable discussions and comments on its compatibility with international copyright treaties, in particular, whether it complied with the three-step test under the Berne Convention ("Berne") and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights ("TRIPS"). The Administration had provided in Appendix III of the paper a preliminary assessment on compliance of the Canadian UGC exception and the 4th Option proposed by Internet users with the three-step test under Berne and TRIPS. The Administration would discuss the proposed 4th Option further with copyright owners, Internet users and academics.

9. Noting that the 4th Option proposed by Internet users did not seem to be fully compatible with the three-step test under Berne and TRIPS, Mr MA Fung-kwok asked how the Administration would explain to users concerned that the proposed option was not acceptable. Mr WONG Ting-kwong, too cast doubt on whether the proposed 4th Option, which was largely based on the Canadian model, was in compliance with the three-step test. He was concerned about the impact on Hong Kong in the event that the proposed 4th Option was adopted but found to be incompatible with the international obligations of Hong Kong.

10. In response, PSCIT advised that whether the Canadian UGC exception was in compliance with the three-step test might in future be subject to the assessment of the Dispute Settlement Body under the World Trade Organization (WTO) on a relevant dispute case filed by its members in connection with the exception. Deputy Director of Intellectual Property (DDIP) added that some scholars and authorities specialized in information technology and intellectual property (IP) law had expressed reservations

about the Canadian UGC exception's compatibility with the three-step test under Berne and TRIPS. She said that to comply with the three-step test, any copyright exception must be (a) confined to "certain special cases" (the first step), (b) did not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work (the second step), and (c) did not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the copyright owner/author (the third step). According to the WTO Panel Report (WT/DS160/R), "special" meant that an exception or limitation must be clearly defined and should be narrow in scope and had an exceptional or distinctive objective. There were concerns that the Canadian UGC exception might not pass the first step of the three-step test as the use of an existing work in the creation of a new work in which copyright subsisted solely for non-commercial purposes as provided under the Canadian UGC exception might not be regarded as "clearly defined". Also, given the large number of potential users, the scope might not be considered as "narrow". Neither did the "non-commercial purposes" requirement suggest "an exceptional or distinctive objective". Considering that the three-step test was applied having regard to a modified work's overall effects on the actual or potential markets for the underlying work, it was arguable as to whether the Canadian UGC exception met the 2nd step of the three-step test, as the Canadian UGC exception did not consider the overall actual or potential impacts of a modified work on the market for the underlying work when the acts were multiplied, or when taken into account the effect on the actual or potential market for derivative works of the existing work. In respect of the 3rd step of the three-step test under Berne, there were views that the Canadian UGC exception seemed to have removed the safeguard guaranteed for the respect of the author's moral right of integrity and did not protect the author's legitimate interests in controlling the adaptations and future uses of his or her work, which in turn might have a bearing on the overall assessment of whether the legitimate interests of the author were unreasonably prejudiced. In the light of the above, whether the Canadian model was in compliance with the three-step test under Berne and TRIPS was still subject to further study and discussion.

11. DDIP drew members' attention that there were doubts as to whether the proposed 4th Option would satisfy the three-step test. While the proposed 4th Option appeared to be based on the Canadian UGC exception, it covered an even wider scope as it did not only cover a new work where copyright subsisted, but also extended to a work of joint authorship and a work with transformative purposes. Further, as opposed to the Canadian UGC provision, the proposed 4th Option limited substantial adverse economic effect to "market or exploitation" of copyright works as one of the qualifying conditions, which did not appear to be in line with the three-step test in relation to the "normal exploitation of a work" as decided by the WTO Panel Report (WT/DS160/R) because the Report did not exclude "potential market" from the ambit of "normal exploitation" of copyright works. Considering

that the proposed 4th Option might conflict with a normal exploitation of the underlying work, it might cause unreasonable prejudice to the legitimate interest of the author or copyright owner, rendering it non-compliant with the 3rd step under TRIPS.

12. DDIP said that given that the Canadian UGC exception, which already had more stringent qualifying conditions than the proposed 4th Option, had raised controversies as commented by renowned IP scholars, it was questionable whether the proposed 4th Option was in conformity with international standards given its much wider scope and its potential application to the broadest possible category of adaptations and derivative works.

Updating of Hong Kong's copyright regime

13. Mr Charles MOK said that the atmosphere of this consultation exercise was much better than that of the previous rounds of consultation. He commended the Administration's efforts in maintaining close communication with major stakeholders i.e. the copyright owners and users, to narrow their differences. Mr MOK opined that the consultation exercise had achieved the purpose of identifying some common ground to take forward the matter as more copyright owners had indicated their acceptance of options 2 and 3 while users had become more receptive to certain exceptions for the treatment of parody. Pointing out that Hong Kong's copyright regime had lagged behind technological development and would face continuous international pressure on this front until its copyright regime was brought up to international standard, Mr MOK urged the Government to take forward the relevant legislative process to update Hong Kong's copyright regime without further delay.

14. Mr Martin LIAO shared Mr Charles MOK's view, adding that the copyright law of Hong Kong had lagged behind global practices as the review of the Ordinance had been dragged on for years. He opined that discussion on the subject should be on a reasonable and rational basis. Populism should be avoided when consulting the public's views so that a fair balance could be struck between the freedom of expression and the protection of the right to property. While expressing his support for the Administration's efforts in conducting further consultation with copyright owners and users to narrow their differences, Mr LIAO said that it would not be possible to secure a common consensus among all stakeholders with different interests given the existence of some extreme views. Cautioning that an outdated copyright law would undermine the Administration's efforts in developing Hong Kong into an IP trading hub in the region, Mr LIAO urged the Administration to put forward the relevant legislative proposals to the LegCo as soon as practicable so as to bring the copyright regime of Hong

Kong in line with international standards. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan expressed a similar view.

15. Pointing out that amendments to the Ordinance were all about balancing the interests between copyright owners and users, Mr SIN Chung-kai opined that it would not be possible for the Administration to secure a 100% agreement between conflicting views. He advised the Administration to put forward the legislative proposals to the LegCo expeditiously upon completing what needed to be done in accordance with the normal procedure. Ms Claudia MO, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles MOK and Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan enquired about the Administration's legislative timetable in this regard.

16. PSCIT agreed with members' views that the copyright law of Hong Kong should be updated as it was lagging behind other countries and jurisdictions in the region. He said that the Working Group on IP Trading had already formulated an overall strategic framework and identified four strategic areas, one of which was enhancing the IP protection regime for promoting Hong Kong as a premier IP trading hub in the region. The Administration would continue to discuss with relevant stakeholders regarding their concerns about specific acts on the internet platform that might constitute copyright infringements, and clarify whether these acts were permissible under the existing legal framework or how they would be accommodated in future amendments to the Ordinance. The Administration aimed to conclude the painstaking efforts started since 2006 to update Hong Kong's copyright regime in the digital environment, taking into account latest views of stakeholders collected during the consultation exercise. PSCIT said that the Administration was determined to narrow the differences between the copyright owners and users. No specific legislative timetable had been set for the time being. PSCIT added that updating the copyright law in the light of prevailing circumstances to meet the changing needs of society required on-going effort and it might not be appropriate nor pragmatic for the Administration to seek to resolve all the outstanding issues in one sweeping exercise. The Administration would report to the Panel again in a few months' time the progress of discussion as well as the way forward.

17. Ms Emily LAU supported the Administration to further engage the relevant stakeholders and listen to their views to strive for the greatest consensus when taking forward the relevant legislative proposals to align Hong Kong's copyright regime with international developments. She said that other Government bureaux and departments should also make every effort in consensus building when handling controversial issues to minimize hiccups during the legislative process. Noting that diverse views from stakeholders were received during the consultation exercise, Ms Emily LAU suggested that the Administration should make reference to international

practices in the treatment of parody on how to strike a right balance between the interests of copyright owners and users.

18. PSCIT responded that among other common law jurisdictions, Australia and Canada had provided a copyright exception for parody and satire, which was crafted within the ambit of "fair dealing" with no statutory definition of those terms. The United Kingdom was following a similar approach in taking forward a fair dealing exception for parody, caricature and pastiche. Canada was the only country among major common law jurisdictions that had provided copyright exception for UGC. PSCIT hoped that the scope of special treatment could be drawn up by clarifying with users how specific acts on the internet platform could be catered for under the existing and the proposed legal framework to allay their concerns.

Development trend of copyright law

19. In response to Mr SIN Chung-kai's question about new developments in the European Union (EU) in respect of the copyright exemption for UGC, PSCIT advised that the EU had launched a public consultation as part of its on-going efforts to review and modernize its copyright rules with UGC as one of the many subjects under review. Canada was so far the only country that had incorporated the UGC exemption in its copyright law.

20. DDIP added that the Administration had been monitoring closely the development of copyright law in various overseas jurisdictions. She briefed members that in October 2013, a Copyright Review Committee in Ireland submitted a report entitled "Modernising Copyright" to the Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation recommending the introduction of a new copyright exception for non-commercial UGC along similar lines of the Canadian model. In June 2013, the Australian Law Reform Commission ("the Commission") issued a discussion paper entitled "Copyright and the Digital Economy" which rejected a standalone transformative use exception, after studying the Canadian UGC model and identifying many problems associated with it. The Commission had submitted its final report to the Attorney General, the public release of which was pending. In the public consultation being conducted in the EU, questions were raised with regard to fundamental rights such as the freedom of expression and the right to property. It was noted that during previous rounds of discussions, no consensus was reached among stakeholders on either the problems to address or the definition of UGC.

21. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok opined that the treatment of "secondary creations" or "parody" under the copyright regime was not an issue unique to Hong Kong. Given the rapid development in the Internet world and being a small city with a population of about just 7 million, Ir Dr LO considered it more

appropriate for Hong Kong to be on a par with international standards by following the practices of major overseas countries rather than being a pioneer in this respect. He enquired about Hong Kong's participation in international IP platforms that provided opportunities for obtaining and exchanging information on the latest developments of copyright law in the global context.

22. PSCIT said that the treatment of parody under the copyright law of various overseas jurisdictions was evolving and some related issues were subject to further discussion at the international level. The Administration would address the relevant issues arising from the consultation exercise based on precedent cases and currently available information. He informed members that Hong Kong, as part of the delegation of the People's Republic of China, had participated in the World Intellectual Property Organization, the global forum for IP services, policy, information and cooperation. Hong Kong, China, was also a member of WTO and its IP protection system met the standards set out in TRIPS. Mr Charles MOK suggested that the Administration should consider participating in the Internet Governance Forum hosted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization where IP was one of the subjects that would be discussed on this platform.

Fair dealing exception

23. While requesting the Administration to actively consider the proposed 4th Option, Mr Dennis Kwok expressed his reservation over Hong Kong Bar Association's ("HKBA") preference of introducing a fair dealing exception for "commenting on current events" instead of "parody". He considered that such a suggestion would in effect narrow the scope of protection provided under option 3 of the Administration's consultation paper. Mr KWOK added that he did not subscribe to HKBA's view that the provision of an exception for parody and/or satire would give rise to difficulties of definition and understanding, and that there was no sufficient public interest justification to create an exception specifically for parody and/or satire (irrespective of purpose). Mr KWOK said that according to the case law of Australia since 2006, whether the work in question was a parody or not was not difficult to judge. Thus, the use of "parody" as the subject of the exemption would not pose any difficulty in terms of definition.

24. PSCIT responded that the rationale behind HKBA's view was that the provision of an exception to acts of copyright infringement under the Ordinance should be based on a balancing of the rights and interests of copyright owners and the public interest, and the public interest in issue was the freedom of expression of the public. HKBA considered that the proposed fair dealing exception could strike the proper balance between

protecting the public's freedom of expression regarding commentary on current events on one hand and the legitimate rights and interests of copyright owners on the other. PSCIT pointed out that the core issue to be addressed in the consultation exercise was essentially the scope of exemption, which would vary according to the different options proposed by the Administration and the stakeholders, as well as the terms to be used in the exemption. The Administration had received wide-ranging views with regard to whether satire, caricature and pastiche in addition to parody should also be provided with special treatment. For instance, the Law Society of Hong Kong had indicated its support for a fair dealing exception for parody, which should include satire, caricature and pastiche without any further statutory definitions.

Summing up

25. The Chairman hoped that the Administration could narrow the differences between major stakeholders in the discussion to be held in the next couple of months despite the divergent views received in the consultation exercise. He also hoped that the Administration could present the legislative timetable in connection with the updating of Hong Kong's copyright regime during its next report to the Panel on the subject matter.

V. Proposed creation of one supernumerary post of Assistant Director of Intellectual Property in the Intellectual Property Department

(LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(05) -- Administration's paper on proposed creation of one supernumerary post of Assistant Director of Intellectual Property in the Intellectual Property Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(06) -- Paper on review of the patent system and development of intellectual property trading in Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief))

Presentation by the Administration

26. At the invitation of the Chairman, Director of Intellectual Property (DIP) briefed members on the proposed creation of a supernumerary post of Assistant Director of Intellectual Property (ADIP) (DL2) in the Intellectual Property Department (IPD) for a period of three years with effect from 1 April 2014 to carry out the work relating to the implementation of the "original grant" patent (OGP) system and strengthening the promotion of Hong Kong as an intellectual property (IP) trading hub. Details of the proposal were set out in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)516/13-14(05)).

Discussion

Proposed creation of a supernumerary ADIP post

27. The Deputy Chairman and Mr WONG Ting-kwong opined that the introduction of the OGP system and development of IP trading in Hong Kong required long-term and continuous efforts. They enquired about the reasons for creating a supernumerary ADIP post for a limited three-year term instead of a permanent post.

28. DIP replied that in anticipation of the substantial increase in workload in the coming years for implementing the OGP system and promoting Hong Kong as an IP trading hub, there was indeed a genuine operational need for IPD to create an additional ADIP (DL2) post heading a dedicated team to take forward these new initiatives. He further explained that having regard to the timelines of the various tasks involved, as an interim measure, IPD had temporarily deployed its existing manpower and resources, and created a supernumerary ADIP post with effect from October 2013 for six months under the delegated authority to carry out the relevant work. Adopting a prudent approach, the Administration considered it imminent and expedient to propose the creation of a supernumerary ADIP post for a period of three years upon the lapse of the six-month supernumerary ADIP post on 31 March 2014 to continue providing strategic steer and directorate leadership to a new dedicated team to be created to pursue the package of new initiatives. The Administration would review the long-term directorate leadership requirement of the department taking into account developments on all fronts in due course.

Implementation of the OGP system and development of IP trading in Hong Kong

29. Mr WONG Ting-kwong said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the proposed creation of a

supernumerary ADIP post to take forward the new initiatives relating to the introduction of the OGP system and the promotion of Hong Kong as a premier IP trading hub in the region. He enquired whether the Administration would explore the possibilities of mutual recognition of patents between Hong Kong and other jurisdictions, in particular, the Mainland. Noting that Macau had already implemented an OGP system, the Deputy Chairman called on the Administration to pursue the introduction of the OGP system as soon as practicable.

30. In response, DIP advised that having regard to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Review of Patent System in Hong Kong, the Administration had announced the way forward for the development of the patent system in Hong Kong, including, inter alia, introducing an OGP system with substantive examination conducted by other patent office(s) while retaining the current re-registration system, and retaining the short-term patent system with suitable refinements. It was the target of IPD to explore the development of capability in conducting substantive examination in certain areas where Hong Kong should have the expertise to do so. The Administration had reached a co-operation arrangement with the State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) to secure its support in providing technical assistance and support in substantive examination for Hong Kong's OGP system and refined short-term patent system, and to assist Hong Kong in manpower training and development to build up its capability for conducting substantive examination. IPD would continue to enhance the OGP system to ensure that it was on par with international standards, and to explore co-operation with other patent authorities such as mutual facilitation of application procedures. While acknowledging the stakeholders' call for mutual facilitation between Hong Kong and the Mainland, DIP advised that the Administration's priority was to set up the OGP system first and that it would then explore with SIPO the possibilities of mutual facilitation of patent applications between the two places when appropriate.

31. Mr Charles MOK supported the creation of the supernumerary ADIP post, highlighting that the development of a sound IP protection regime and promotion of IP trading would complement the development of innovation and technology in Hong Kong, in particular the realization and commercialization of research and development results. Mr MOK called on the IPD to enhance the communication with the innovation and technology sector, as well as the Innovation and Technology Commission which was responsible for promoting innovation and technology in matters relating to the implementation of the OGP system and promotion of IP trading in Hong Kong. DIP took note of the views expressed by Mr Charles MOK.

32. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about the job duties of the proposed supernumerary ADIP post in relation to IP trading, DIP advised

that the Working Group on IP Trading set up in March 2013 had identified four strategic areas under which to group the focus strategies to promote IP trading in Hong Kong. These included enhancing the IP protection regime; supporting IP creation and exploitation; fostering IP intermediary services and manpower capacity; and pursuing promotion, education and external collaboration. The Working Group on IP Trading would continue deliberations and recommend support measures under each specific focus strategy to form a coherent action plan. IPD was heavily involved in conducting relevant researches and studies to support the formulation of the action plan, and would play a central role in its implementation. The proposed ADIP would assist in driving the new policy initiative of IP trading with the support of the existing Marketing Division.

33. The Deputy Chairman suggested that further exchanges with IPD, apart from discussion at Panel meetings, be arranged to enable members to better understand IPD's work in promoting IP trading in Hong Kong and in general. DIP welcomed the suggestion, and advised that briefing sessions had been held for relevant stakeholders, including IP owners/creators, intermediaries and users, relevant professional bodies, trade and industrial organizations, and local and overseas chambers of commerce, to discuss and exchange views on promoting the development of Hong Kong as an IP trading hub. The Chairman instructed the Secretariat to liaise with the Administration for appropriate arrangement.

Secretariat

Summing up

34. The Chairman concluded that the Panel supported in principle the proposed creation of a supernumerary post of ADIP in the IPD for a period of three years with effect from 1 April 2014.

VI. Any other business

Consideration of an overseas duty visit

(LC Paper No. IN04/13-14

-- Paper on innovation and technology industry in South Korea, Israel and Belgium prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (information note))

35. Members noted that following the preliminary discussion of an overseas duty visit to study the innovation and technology development of

certain overseas jurisdictions proposed by some members at the last Panel meeting, the Research Office of the Secretariat had prepared an information note on the development of innovation and technology in South Korea, Israel and Belgium. As those members who had made the proposal were not present at this juncture, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the Panel would consider the proposal at the next regular Panel meeting.

36. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:03 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
12 February 2014