

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(2)424/17-18(04)

Ref : CB2/PL/SE

**Panel on Security**

**Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat  
for the meeting on 5 December 2017**

**Results of Study of Matters Raised in the Annual Report  
to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner  
on Interception of Communications and Surveillance**

**Purpose**

This paper summarizes past discussions by the Panel on Security ("the Panel") on the results of study of matters raised in the annual reports to the Chief Executive ("CE") by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance ("the Commissioner").

**Background**

2. The Interception of Communications and Surveillance Ordinance (Cap. 589) ("ICSO"), which came into force on 9 August 2006, provides a statutory regime to regulate the conduct of interception of communications and covert surveillance by designated law enforcement agencies ("LEAs"). Under section 49 of ICSO, the Commissioner shall, for each report period, submit a report to CE. The report is to be submitted within six months after the expiry of the report period. CE shall cause a copy of the report to be laid on the table of the Legislative Council ("LegCo").

3. In the course of examination of the Interception of Communications and Surveillance Bill in 2006, the Administration undertook, inter alia, to report to the Panel the results of the Administration's study of matters raised in the Commissioner's annual report to CE.

## **Deliberations of the Panel**

4. Since the commencement of ICSO on 9 August 2006, annual reports had been submitted by the Commissioner to CE. The results of the Administration's study of matters raised in the annual reports have been discussed at a number of Panel meetings and the deliberations are summarized below.

### Compliance with the statutory requirements among officers of the law enforcement agencies

5. Some members were concerned that law enforcement officers were unfamiliar with the rules and procedures of the ICSO regime. Some members were of the view that sufficient training on the requirements in ICSO should be provided to newly appointed as well as existing staff, including those at the supervisory level.

6. According to the Administration, in response to the recommendations in the reports of the Commissioner, numerous revisions had been made to the Code of Practice ("CoP"). The Administration was aware of the importance of getting existing and newly appointed ISCO-related law enforcement officers familiar with requirements under ICSO and CoP, including any new requirements. In this connection, the LEAs concerned had been directed to provide appropriate induction training and refresher training for relevant officers.

7. Members were advised that frontline and supervisory level law enforcement officers newly appointed to perform listening duties were provided with induction training, which covered the operation of the listening system, practical listening techniques, the conditions imposed by panel judges on prescribed authorizations and legal professional privilege ("LPP"). Training packages had been developed to enhance the knowledge of law enforcement officers in the requirements in ICSO and facilitate the adoption of a proper and prudent attitude towards ICSO-related matters.

### Prevention of abuse of power by law enforcement officers

8. While noting that interception of communications and covert surveillance was critical to the combating of serious crime, some members expressed concern about the possibility of abuse of power by LEAs.

9. Members were advised that under ICSO, all interception required the prescribed authorization of a panel judge. When making an application for a

prescribed authorization, an LEA applicant had to submit with his application an affidavit or written statement on his assessment of the likelihood of involvement of LPP to a panel judge for issue of a prescribed authorization. Whenever there were any subsequent changes which might affect the assessment, the LEA concerned had to notify the panel judge, who would determine whether the prescribed authorization should continue and if so, whether any additional conditions needed to be imposed. LEAs were required to submit reports within specified time limits to the Commissioner, who monitored the compliance of LEAs with ICSO. Where there were cases of non-compliance or irregularity, follow-up actions were taken by LEAs in accordance with the established mechanisms of the LEAs concerned having regard to the Commissioner's advice and recommendations. Where disciplinary actions were to be taken against the officers concerned, the LEAs concerned would take into account the views of the Commissioner, if any, before actions were taken against the officers concerned.

10. Some members were of the view that more information on cases of non-compliance and irregularities should be disclosed in the Commissioner's annual reports. Members were advised that the Commissioner had highlighted in his annual reports his continued practice of providing the utmost transparency of his work, while taking care not to divulge any information the disclosure of which might prejudice the prevention or detection of crime or the protection of public security.

#### Protection of information subject to legal professional privilege and privacy of members of the public

11. Some members raised concern over the increasing number of requests for interception of communication by LEAs where information obtained was or likely to be subject to LPP while the Commissioner could not verify the cases.

12. According to the Administration, LEAs were required to notify the Commissioner of operations that were likely to involve LPP information or where LPP information had been obtained inadvertently. An LEA applicant was required to state his assessment of LPP likelihood in his affidavit or statement in support of his application. Whenever there were any subsequent changes which might affect the assessment, such as heightened LPP likelihood or obtaining LPP information, the LEA applicant had to notify the panel judge as soon as practicable. The panel judge might impose additional conditions if the prescribed authorization was allowed to continue. In addition, at the request of the Commissioner, all intercept products and related records had been preserved to enable him and his designated staff to check cases of special interest or chosen at random and there was an audit trail record for all access to

the intercept products. To avoid being criticized for operating above the law, the Commissioner had chosen not to listen to the intercept products until relevant amendments to ICSO had been enacted in June 2016.

13. Some members expressed the view that law enforcement officers should under no circumstances be allowed to listen to any communication between a client and a law firm. Law enforcement officers who listened to such communication should be prosecuted under ICSO.

14. According to the Administration, LPP was protected by the common law and Article 35 of the Basic Law, which guaranteed that "Hong Kong residents shall have the right to confidential legal advice". ICSO did not preclude LEAs from intercepting the communications of a lawyer provided that the interception was carried out pursuant to a prescribed authorization in accordance with the requirements in ICSO. In relation to the protection of LPP in ICSO, section 3 of ICSO required the consideration of all relevant circumstances and the balancing of competing interests, including the protection of privacy and LPP, in the issue, renewal or continuance of a prescribed authorization. Schedule 3 to ICSO also required LEAs to assess the likelihood of obtaining LPP information when making an application for interception. Under ICSO, no prescribed authorization might contain terms that authorize the interception of communications by reference to any telecommunications service used at an office or other relevant premises, or a residence, of a lawyer unless exceptional circumstances existed. Section 62 of ICSO further guaranteed that "Any information that is subject to legal professional privilege is to remain privileged notwithstanding that it has been obtained pursuant to a prescribed authorization". Administrative measures were in place supplementing the statutory safeguards.

#### Cases involving journalistic material

15. Some members were concerned whether a prescribed authorization would be granted, if an LEA applicant indicated at the time of application that journalistic material ("JM") would be obtained. Concern was also raised about the possibility of cases where an application for a prescribed authorization was submitted without informing the panel judge that JM would likely be obtained.

16. According to the Administration, there was no question of an LEA submitting an application for a prescribed authorization without informing the panel judge if JM would likely be obtained. ICSO required an applicant to set out, at the time of applying for a prescribed authorization, the likelihood that any information which might be the contents of any JM would be obtained by carrying out the interception or covert surveillance sought to be authorized.

LEAs were required to notify the panel judges of cases where information which might be the contents of any JM had been obtained.

#### Commissioner's power and authority to listen to interception product

17. The Panel noted the recommendation of the first Commissioner for empowering him and staff designated by him to examine intercept and covert surveillance products. The Commissioner considered that the provision of such power for himself and his designated staff to listen to and inspect intercept and surveillance products would serve as a strong deterrent against malpractice or concealment.

18. Members noted that the Interception of Communications and Surveillance (Amendment) Bill 2015, which proposed, among other things, empowering the Commissioner to require LEAs to provide protected products for his checking, was passed at the Council meeting of 16 June 2016. Some members expressed concern about how such examination would be conducted, whether there were measures to prevent the leakage of information in the process and whether relevant training were provided to the Commissioner's staff designated for carrying out examination of protected products.

19. Members noted that the examination of protected products was carried out at the premises of LEAs. The Commissioner had drawn up confidentiality requirements, internal guidelines and procedures as well as provided training to relevant staff on the examination of protected products.

#### Documentation requirement on cases of non-compliance

20. Noting from a non-compliance case in which three officers involved did not remember the exact date of discovering the mistake, some members raised queries over the absence of any written records of the internal communications among different ranks regarding the case. Information was sought on whether there was any requirement within LEAs on the keeping of records in government departments to facilitate internal monitoring and checking by the Commissioner.

21. According to the Administration, the Government Records Service had formulated records management procedures and guidelines to ensure proper management of government records. Policy bureaux and government departments, including LEAs, should create and capture adequate but not excessive records to meet operational, policy, legal and financial purposes. While CoP provided a general overview on record management, under the ICSO regime, LEAs were further required to follow the Commissioner's more

stringent requirements in reporting on cases of irregularity or non-compliance. All written documents and file records of such cases would need to be preserved for inspection by the Commissioner, in addition to a full investigation report on each of such incidents.

### Statistics relating to ICSO

22. Some members were concerned about a lack of breakdown in the statistics provided in the annual reports between cases involving serious crime and those involving public security. Given the lack of such a breakdown in the annual reports and the absence of a definition of "public security" in ICSO, these members expressed concern about the possibility of interception for political monitoring.

23. According to the Administration, there was no question of interception for political monitoring. Under ICSO, a prescribed authorization had to be granted by a panel judge in fulfilment of the objectives of the operation as prescribed under section 3 of ICSO.

### **Relevant papers**

24. A list of relevant papers on the LegCo website is in the **Appendix**.

## Appendix

### Relevant papers on Results of Study of Matters Raised in the Annual Report to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
Panel on Security	6.11.2007 (Item V)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	6.12.2007 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	16.2.2009 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	3.3.2009 (Item IV)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	7.12.2009 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	6.7.2010 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	29.11.2010 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	5.12.2011 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	3.1.2012 (Item VI)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Legislative Council	18.1.2012	<a href="#">Motion on "Annual Report 2010 to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance"</a>

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
Panel on Security	4.12.2012 (Item IV)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	2.7.2013 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	3.12.2013 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	2.12.2014 (Item IV)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	1.12.2015 (Item IV)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Panel on Security	6.12.2016 (Item IV)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2017