

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1177/18-19
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/AJLS

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 29 April 2019, at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

- Members present** : Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
- Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon HUI Chi-fung

**Public officers
attending**

: Agenda item III

Department of Justice

Dr James DING
Principal Government Counsel/Secretary for Justice's
Office

Mr LEE T Y
Senior Assistant Solicitor General (Arbitration)

Mr Bernard YUE
Senior Government Counsel

Agenda item IV

Judiciary Administration

Mrs Erika HUI
Deputy Judiciary Administrator (Operations)

Ms Wendy CHEUNG
Assistant Judiciary Administrator (Development)1

Mr Harry TSANG
Assistant Judiciary Administrator
(Quality and Information Technology)

**Attendance by
invitation**

: Agenda item III

Hong Kong Bar Association

Mr William WONG M F, SC

Agenda item IV

Hong Kong Bar Association

Mr Robin Gregory D'SOUZA

Mr Jeremy CHAN S K

Clerk in attendance : Mr Lemuel WOO
Chief Council Secretary (4)6

Staff in attendance : Mr YICK Wing-kin
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2

Ms Macy NG
Senior Council Secretary (4)6

Ms Emily LIU
Legislative Assistant (4)6

Action

I. Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(4)768/18-19(01) - Letter from Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT on request for arranging a joint special meeting to discuss combating clandestine photo-taking

LC Paper No. CB(4)790/18-19(01) - Joint letter from Hon Charles MOK, Hon Alvin YEUNG and Hon Dennis KWOK requesting to discuss prosecutions instituted under "access to computer with criminal or dishonest intent" and enactment of legislation against the offence of voyeurism

LC Paper No. CB(4)797/18-19(01) - Information paper on annual review of financial eligibility limits of legal aid applicants provided by the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office and the Legal Aid Department)

Members noted the above papers issued since the last meeting. Members also noted that the information paper on annual review of financial eligibility limits of legal aid applicants (LC Paper No. CB(4)797/18-19(01)) was related to a legislative proposal.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(01) - List of outstanding items for discussion)

Regular meeting in May 2019

2. The Chairman informed members that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting to be held on 27 May 2019:

- (a) The United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods and its application to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR"); and
- (b) The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong – Consultation Paper on Causing or Allowing the Death or Serious Harm of a Child or Vulnerable Adult.

3. Members raised no other views and agreed to invite members of the Panel on Commerce and Industry to join the discussion on (a) above as suggested by the Department of Justice ("DoJ").

Regular meeting in June 2019

4. The Chairman referred to the letter from Dr Elizabeth QUAT (LC Paper No. CB(4)768/18-19(01)) and the joint letter from Hon Charles MOK, Hon Alvin YEUNG and Hon Dennis KWOK (LC Paper No. CB(4)790/18-19(01)) requesting the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services ("AJLS Panel") to hold a joint meeting with the Panel on Security to discuss combating clandestine photo-taking and prosecutions instituted under "access to computer with criminal or dishonest intent" and enactment of legislation against the offence of voyeurism respectively. She advised that DoJ had been requested to provide a written response to the matters.

(Post-meeting note: DoJ's written response was issued to members on 7 May 2019 via LC Paper No. LC Paper No. CB(4)848/18-19(01).)

5. The Chairman said that while she would explore with the Chairman of the Panel on Security on holding the joint meeting, members might also raise their concerns in this regard at the AJLS Panel meeting to be held on 24 June 2019 under the item on "Implementation of the recommendations made by The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong". Members agreed.

Visit to the Judiciary

6. The Chairman reminded members that AJLS Panel would visit the Judiciary on 21 May 2019 and the visit programme was issued to members on 16 April 2019. The deadline for enrollment was 7 May 2019. The Chairman hoped that members would actively participate in the visit and directed the Clerk to issue a circular reminding members of the visit.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued a reminder to Members on 30 April 2019 via LC Paper No. CB(4)827/18-19 regarding the visit.)

III. Cooperation between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Mainland on arbitration-related matters

(LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(02) - Administration's paper on cooperation between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Mainland on arbitration-related matters

LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(03) - Paper on cooperation between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Mainland on arbitration-related matters prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief)

LC Paper No. CB(4)725/18-19(01) - Information paper on arrangement concerning mutual assistance in court-ordered interim measures in aid of arbitral proceedings by the courts of the Mainland and of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region)

Briefing by the Administration

7. Principal Government Counsel/Secretary for Justice's Office ("PGC/SJO") briefed members on the latest development of cooperation between HKSAR and the Mainland on arbitration-related matters as detailed in

the Administration's paper, in particular the *Arrangement Concerning Mutual Assistance in Court-ordered Interim Measures in Aid of Arbitral Proceedings by the Courts of the Mainland and of the HKSAR* ("Arrangement") which was signed between DoJ and the Supreme People's Court on 2 April 2019. PGC/SJO stressed that under the Arrangement, HKSAR was the first jurisdiction outside the Mainland where parties to arbitral proceedings seated in Hong Kong might apply to the Mainland courts for interim measures.

8. PGC/SJO also briefed members about DoJ's plans to explore the possibility of introducing an initiative to enable two Mainland parties in the Greater Bay Area to freely choose Hong Kong as the seat of arbitration and the law of Hong Kong as the governing law of a contract, and to promote Hong Kong as a regional capacity building centre for international law and dispute resolution including the development of Hong Kong's capacity building in the specialized area of sports arbitration.

Views of the Hong Kong Bar Association

9. Mr William WONG, SC, of the Hong Kong Bar Association ("the Bar Association") said that the Arbitration Committee of the Bar Association as well as the legal sector in general warmly welcomed the Arrangement as it would enhance Hong Kong's competitiveness in providing international arbitration services. However, he was concerned whether the interim measures could be granted after an arbitral award had been made but was not yet enforced.

10. Mr William WONG, SC, also expressed support for DoJ's initiative in exploring, together with the Higher People's Court of Guangdong Province and the Guangdong Justice Department, the setting up of a platform for training of judges and lawyers and conducting a comparative study of legal concepts in the Greater Bay Area. He said that the Bar Association hoped that it could participate in this initiative as the Hong Kong barristers should be in a right position to contribute their knowledge and experience to promote Hong Kong law in the course of providing training.

Discussion

Interim measures from Mainland Courts available to parties to institutional arbitrations seated in Hong Kong

11. The Chairman said that she was pleased to note the progress made by DoJ in developing the cooperation between HKSAR and the Mainland on arbitration-related matters. Pursuant to the Arrangement, parties to arbitral proceedings seated in Hong Kong and administered by eligible arbitral institutions which had been designated would be able to apply to the relevant

Mainland court for interim measures including property preservation and conduct preservation in aid of such arbitral proceedings. She considered that it would greatly enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong arbitrators against their Mainland counterparts.

Opportunities and challenges for Hong Kong arbitrators

12. The Deputy Chairman relayed the concern of the legal and arbitration services sector regarding Article 11.2 of the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre ("HKIAC") Administered Arbitration Rules ("HKIAC Rules") which stated that "... as a general rule, where the parties to an arbitration under [the HKIAC Rules] are of different nationalities, a sole or presiding arbitrator shall not have the same nationality as any party unless specifically agreed otherwise by all parties". With the above restriction, as an arbitrator holding an HKSAR Passport was having Chinese nationality, he/she could not handle an arbitration case if at least one party to it was from the Mainland.

13. In response, Senior Assistant Solicitor General (Arbitration) of DoJ ("SASG(A)) said that DoJ had liaised with HKIAC on the above concern. According to HKIAC, a Practice Note on Appointment of Arbitrators ("Practice Note") came into force at the same time the latest version of the HKIAC Rules came into effect in 2018. Among other things, the Practice Note stated that, considering HKSAR's status with a legal system separate from that of Mainland China under the "one country, two systems", in cases in which at least one party was from Mainland China, the holder of a HKSAR passport might be appointed as sole or presiding arbitrator, provided that none of the parties object within a time limit set by HKIAC.

14. The Deputy Chairman said that notwithstanding the Practice Note, Article 11.2 remained part of the HKIAC Rules. He commented that, since an arbitrator holding HKSAR Passport was still having the same nationality to one of the parties who was from the Mainland, he/she could not be appointed as a sole or presiding arbitrator unless specifically agreed by all parties to the arbitration, and it was difficult to obtain such mutual agreement in practice as the parties would have little incentive in engaging Hong Kong's arbitrators.

15. In response, SASG(A) said that there were incentives for engaging Hong Kong's arbitrators holding HKSAR Passport such as their Chinese-English biliteracy. He further said that DoJ would, with the cooperation of the legal sector, continue to promote Hong Kong's legal system under the "one country, two systems" principle and Hong Kong's arbitration services to the Mainland and other countries.

16. The Deputy Chairman said that while he was not against the principle underpinning Article 11.2 of HKIAC Rules, the Administration should consider whether the relevant restriction should be removed or an alternative solution should be made to address the problem facing arbitrators holding HKSAR Passports. PGC/SJO undertook that DoJ would discuss with HKIAC on whether the Practice Note was effective to address the concern.

17. Mr William WONG, SC, said that under the Nationality Law of the People's Republic of China, arbitrators holding HKSAR Passport were having Chinese nationality and hence subject to the restriction of Article 11.2 of HKIAC Rules if at least one of the parties to the arbitration was from the Mainland. He pointed out that the restriction was in conflict to the notion being promoted to overseas countries that, under the "one country, two systems" principle, Hong Kong had a separate legal system from the Mainland China. The Deputy Chairman pointed out that as a result of the restriction, any effort to promote Hong Kong's arbitration services on the Mainland would only benefit those Hong Kong's arbitrators with overseas passports.

18. The Chairman urged that the Administration should take heed of the strong views expressed by the legal and arbitration services sector regarding Article 11.2 of HKIAC Rules. She pointed out that when HKIAC developed its Rules upon establishment, it could not have envisaged the latest developments and opportunities offered by the Greater Bay Area or the Belt and Road Initiative to the Hong Kong's arbitrators. Therefore, HKIAC should vigilantly review its Rules to see whether they were suitable for the present circumstances. The Chairman considered that nationality was not the main issue and HKIAC and the Administration should emphasize HKSAR's status with a legal system separate from that of Mainland China under the "one country, two systems", and promote the many advantages of Hong Kong's common law system to the provision of arbitration services.

19. The Chairman also said that the Administration and the arbitration services sector should remove any obstacle which might hinder the development of Hong Kong as a leading centre for international arbitration services or deprive Hong Kong's arbitrators of the opportunities to arbitrate in cases in which at least one party was from the Mainland. Towards that end, the Chairman considered that DoJ should play an important role in liaising with the arbitral institutions in Hong Kong, including HKIAC. AJLS Panel might also consider the subject in more details at a future meeting.

Capacity building

20. In relation to DoJ's initiative in exploring the setting up of a platform for training of judges and lawyers as mentioned in paragraph 20 of the

Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(02)), the Chairman pointed out that the three law schools in Hong Kong had been offering programmes on arbitration for years. However, she expressed concern that many people who had obtained the qualification of an arbitrator were not practising as arbitrators, and urged the Administration to provide more opportunities for these arbitrators to handle arbitration work and involve them in the development of Hong Kong's arbitration services.

21. Mr William WONG, SC, shared a similar concern of the Chairman that, having completed their arbitration courses, the qualified arbitrators had difficulties in finding arbitration work. In this regard, he urged the arbitration services sector to provide more opportunities for newcomer to enter the sector, such as working as tribunal secretaries or pupils of arbitrators to gain hands-on experience. Mr WONG, SC, also said that if the restriction imposed by Article 11.2 of HKIAC Rules could be lifted, there would be a soaring opportunity for Hong Kong arbitrators as they could take up dispute resolution cases in the Greater Bay Area if Hong Kong was chosen as the seat of arbitration.

22. PGC/SJO took note of the above views. He also advised that DoJ was in the process of exploring the setting up of the platform and would take into account the views of the Bar Association and AJLS Panel members on how exchanges between Hong Kong and the Mainland could be further strengthened, and it would reflect the relevant views to the Mainland authorities.

Submitting a dispute involving parties in the Mainland to an arbitral institution outside the Mainland

23. The Chairman noted from paragraph 10 of the Administration's paper that wholly owned Hong Kong enterprises ("WOKE") and joint ventures set up by Hong Kong investors in the Mainland were treated as Mainland legal persons under Mainland laws and, in the absence of any foreign-related elements, Mainland parties were not allowed to submit a dispute to an arbitral institution outside the Mainland for arbitration. She said that, to her understanding, WOKE were all along regarded as wholly foreign owned enterprises having foreign-related elements under the civil law of the Mainland, and the parties to a contract involving WOKE had a right to submit a dispute to an arbitral institution outside the Mainland.

24. PGC/SJO explained by referring to Article 1 of *Interpretations of the Supreme People's Court on Certain Issues Concerning the Application of the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Application of Laws to Foreign-Related Civil Relations* (Fashi [2012] No. 24) (最高人民法院關於《中華人民共和國涉外民事關係法律適用法》若干問題的解釋(法釋[2012]24號)), which provided:

"Where a civil relationship falls under any of the following circumstances, the people's court may determine it as foreign-related civil relationship:

- (1) where either party or both parties are foreign citizens, foreign legal persons or other organizations or stateless persons;
- (2) where the habitual residence of either party or both parties is located outside the territory of the People's Republic of China;
- (3) where the subject matter is outside the territory of the People's Republic of China;
- (4) where the legal fact that leads to establishment, change or termination of the civil relationship happens outside the territory of the People's Republic of China; or
- (5) other circumstances under which the civil relationship may be determined as foreign-related civil relationship."

25. PGC/SJO then pointed out that wholly foreign-owned enterprises, Sino-foreign equity joint ventures and Sino-foreign cooperative joint ventures set up by Hong Kong investors in the Mainland were treated as Mainland legal persons without any foreign-related elements. While the Chairman agreed that such entity would be considered a Mainland legal person, she asked whether there would still be any foreign-related elements, e.g., when that entity was a party to a contract which involved capital flow from outside the Mainland.

Admin

26. PGC/SJO replied that the position was not clear. Hence DoJ would like to put beyond doubts that disputes arising from such circumstances could be resolved by arbitration seated in Hong Kong, and to explore the possibility of introducing an initiative to enable two Mainland parties in the Greater Bay Area to choose Hong Kong as the seat of arbitration. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide more details on its explanation after the meeting since it was different from her understanding.

IV. Proposed legislative amendments for the implementation of the Information Technology Strategy Plan of the Judiciary

(LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(04) - Judiciary Administration's paper on legislative proposals for the implementation of the Information Technology Strategy Plan of the Judiciary

LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(05) - Paper on the Information Technology Strategy Plan of the Judiciary prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief))

Briefing by the Judiciary Administration

27. Assistant Judiciary Administrator (Development)1 ("AJA(D)1") briefed members on the Judiciary's legislative proposals for the implementation of its Information Technology Strategy Plan ("ITSP") ("the Proposals"), as set out in the Judiciary Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(4)782/18-19(04)). Among other things, she pointed out that an integrated court case management system ("iCMS") would be implemented under ITSP to streamline and standardize the electronic court processes across different levels of courts as appropriate. However, while the Electronic Transactions Ordinance (Cap. 553) was generally applicable in Hong Kong, court proceedings were excluded from the operation of its material provisions (section 13 of Cap. 553). On the other hand, the legislation relating to court procedures, dispersed over a number of Ordinances/rules, did not fully envisage the possibility of electronic mode of handling. Therefore, the Proposals were needed to implement ITSP.

28. AJA(D)1 advised members that a new Bill ("e-Bill") would be introduced to provide for an overall legislative framework for the electronic mode of handling court-related documents eventually covering all levels of court. Under the framework, the Chief Justice might designate the use of iCMS in certain courts and tribunals ("e-Courts") and detailed court procedures for the electronic mode in these e-Courts were proposed to be set out in court procedural rules ("e-Rules") in the form of subsidiary legislation.

(Post-meeting note: An information paper on "Legislative proposals for the implementation of the Information Technology Strategy Plan of the Judiciary" further provided by the Judiciary Administration was issued to members on 9 August 2019 via LC Paper No. CB(4)1167/18-19(01) for reference.)

Views of the Hong Kong Bar Association

29. Mr Jeremy CHAN of the Bar Association said that the Bar Association was supportive of the Proposals as it had been working closely with the Judiciary over the years to contribute its views on ITSP, many of which had been taken on board by the Judiciary Administration. In particular, the Bar Association noted that the Judiciary had taken its view into account that, as

court users in future might choose to use manual or electronic mode in handling transactions with the court and other parties, it was important to maintain parity between these two types of users as far as possible.

30. Mr Jeremy CHAN also said that the Bar Association was concerned about the operation and user-friendliness of the various systems under ITSP, e.g. iCMS, after they were formally launched. In this regard, the Bar Association would maintain close communication with the Judiciary to monitor their implementation.

Discussion

Progress of implementation of the Information Technology Strategy Plan

31. The Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan indicated support for the Proposals but considered that Hong Kong had far lagged behind other jurisdictions, such as Singapore, in enabling the perusal of documents by electronic means in court proceedings. The Deputy Chairman enquired about the current progress and timetable for the implementation of ITSP.

32. In reply, Deputy Judiciary Administrator (Operations) ("DJA(O)") explained that ITSP would be implemented in two phases and the first phase of implementation ("Phase I") was further broken down into two stages for better management. In Phase I Stage 1, iCMS would be implemented in the District Court and the Summons Courts of the Magistrates' Courts ("Summons Courts"). She informed members that the development of iCMS in these courts had been at an advanced stage with all activities relating to the building and set-up of the Information Technology infrastructure foundation completed as at March 2019. Various components under Phase I Stage 1 were being progressively rolled out to the District Court and the Summons Courts. Other components were scheduled to be rolled out by phases in 2019 and after.

33. On the other hand, DJA(O) advised that e-Bill and e-Rules required to provide the proper legal status for the use of an electronic mode for court documents were under preparation in parallel, and the Judiciary had been consulting the legal professional bodies and relevant stakeholders on the draft e-Bill and e-Rules and would take their views into account as appropriate before taking forward the legislative process.

34. The Chairman and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan opined that Hong Kong had to catch up expeditiously in respect of transacting court businesses by electronic means. However, they also acknowledged that individual counsels and solicitors might find it difficult to adapt to the electronic mode in handling

transactions with the court and other parties, and asked how the Judiciary would address this problem.

35. In response, DJA(O) advised that having listened to the views of the legal professional bodies and other stakeholders, the Judiciary fully appreciated that court users might have different needs and preferences in relation to the use of electronic mode of handling court business. In this connection, electronic services and facilities of various types would be introduced as appropriate as an additional option to the existing channels, to be used on a voluntary basis. Nevertheless, the Judiciary would encourage counsels, solicitors and other court users to transact court businesses by electronic means.

36. DJA(O) also advised members that the Judiciary considered it prudent to build in the legislative flexibility in the Proposals to allow for possible actual implementation of iCMS in a more gradual manner, say from the easier applications to the more complicated ones, as switching to an electronic mode meant substantive operational changes on all fronts and could affect all stakeholders concerned.

37. The Chairman stressed that the Judiciary should strike an appropriate balance among the needs and concerns of various court users and review the implementation of ITSP from time to time.

Legislative proposals for the implementation of the Information Technology Strategy Plan

38. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan noted from the Judiciary Administration's paper (paragraph 34) that, for District Court civil cases, the Judiciary intended to largely follow the arrangements for the manual mode of handling at present in respect of the effective date of service, i.e. if electronic service was used for originating documents, the document was, unless the contrary was shown, taken to have been served on the seventh day following the day on which the document was served. He suggested that the time required for handling these cases could be shortened if there was prior consent between the parties concerned to use electronic service and the relevant electronic contacts.

39. Quoting the above arrangements as example, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan pointed out that upon the full implementation of ITSP, the time needed for litigation would not be saved in the electronic environment. In reply, AJA(D)1 said that the Judiciary needed to consider, inter alia, how best to facilitate the use of electronic means without compromising the need to safeguard the interests or rights of the parties concerned, and while ensuring fairness of the judicial process and integrity of the documents and processes. In deciding whether to provide for an electronic option for certain court procedures and

documents, therefore, the principles and spirit of the administration of justice as set out in the existing legislation should be carefully balanced against the convenience made possible with the introduction of ITSP.

40. Mr Jeremy CHAN said that the Bar Association also considered it necessary to ensure that a party be informed of any important steps or developments in the court process so that their right would not be prejudiced, such as owing to not having access to the electronic system, not being familiar with the electronic process or the use of a computer, or failure of the electronic system.

41. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan said that, while he could understand the reasons behind maintaining the manual mode of handling documents to be transacted, the Judiciary should make good use of ITSP in the long run. He stressed that the benefits of ITSP and iCMS were not limited to saving papers or for faster transaction of documents, but the advantages they could bring to help streamline the court proceedings, shorten the waiting times for court hearings and hence enhance the access to justice.

42. In response to Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan's concerns, AJA(D)1 said that it would be more appropriate to maintain parity between electronic and manual users at this stage. In future, when more court users got familiar with the electronic mode in handling transactions with the court and other parties as well as in the light of the actual experience gained, the Judiciary might consider reviewing whether there would be room to refine the arrangements. The Judiciary would also continue to listen to the views of different stakeholders, including members, on the Proposals, as well as keep monitoring and reviewing the implementation of ITSP.

43. The Chairman noted from the Judiciary Administration's paper (paragraph 26) that, for documents to be adduced as evidence, unless otherwise specifically provided for in the ITSP-related legislation, they should continue to be presented/submitted to the court in hard copy. She enquired if there was any exception to this rule.

44. AJA(D)1 replied that having examined similar court-related legislation of some overseas jurisdictions, the Judiciary found that most generally followed the requirement of the manual mode for the rules of evidence except those who had changed the laws through law reforms. Therefore, the Judiciary considered that documents to be adduced as evidence should continue to be presented/submitted to the court in hard copy. Notwithstanding this, the Judiciary found that exceptions might be possible for a limited number of documents, such as certain documents relating to Summons Courts, which might be submitted through electronic means. However, AJA(D)1 stressed

that only very few exceptions would be allowed at this stage and such exception(s), if any, would be clearly specified in the ITSP-related legislation.

Security concerns

45. In view of some recent incidents of the leakage of massive personal data by government departments and private companies, the Chairman enquired about the measures adopted by the Judiciary for enhancing information and cyber security upon the implementation of ITSP.

46. In reply, AJA(D)1 said that with a view to safeguarding information and cyber security, the Judiciary Administration had been relying on colleagues of the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer in the course of implementing ITSP. The Judiciary would also strictly follow the relevant legislation, government policies and guidelines in relation to cyber security and the protection of personal data privacy, and closely monitor their developments to ensure compliance with the latest standards in respective areas.

V. Any other business

47. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:05 pm.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 August 2019