

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)1259/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen by  
the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/EDEV

**Panel on Economic Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 24 June 2019, at 10:45 am**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present :** Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan (Chairman)  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Member attending :** Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Members absent** : Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda item III  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Dr Raymond SO, BBS, JP  
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing  
Mr Wallace LAU, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 4  
Airport Authority Hong Kong  
Mr Steven YIU  
Deputy Director, Service Delivery  
Mr Chris AU YOUNG  
General Manager, Smart Airport  
Agenda item IV  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Mr Wallace LAU, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 4  
Ms Joyce CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing  
(Transport) 9  
Civil Aviation Department  
Miss Linda SO  
Deputy Director-General of Civil Aviation (2)

Mr Alan SHUM  
Assistant Director-General of Civil Aviation (Air Services  
and Safety Management)

Mr Michael YUEN  
Acting Chief Operations Officer (Technical  
Administration)

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Shirley CHAN  
Chief Council Secretary (4)5

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Bonny LOO  
Assistant Legal Adviser 4 (Agenda item IV only)

Ms Shirley TAM  
Senior Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Lauren LI  
Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Zoe TONG  
Legislative Assistant (4)5

Miss Mandy LUI  
Clerical Assistant (4)5

---

Action

**I. Information papers issued since the last meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)953/18-19(01) — Administration's paper on tables and graphs showing the import and retail prices of major oil products from May 2017 to April 2019

LC Paper No. CB(4)1036/18-19(01) — Administration's paper on basic tariff adjustment of the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited)

Members noted the above papers issued since the last regular meeting.

## **II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1020/18-19(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(4)1020/18-19(02) — List of follow-up actions)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 17 July 2019 at 10:45 am –

- (a) Sustainable development of Hong Kong's port and development of high value-added maritime services; and
- (b) Proposal to turn a supernumerary post of Administrative Officer Staff Grade C in the Transport and Housing Bureau into a permanent post.

*(Post-meeting note: Members were informed on 5 July 2019 vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1096/18-19 that the Chairman had decided to cancel the above meeting due to safety reasons in the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Complex.)*

## **III. Smart Airport Development at Hong Kong International Airport**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1020/18-19(03) — Airport Authority Hong Kong's paper on smart airport development at Hong Kong International Airport)

### Presentation by the Administration and Airport Authority Hong Kong

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing gave an introductory remark on the initiatives of "smart airport development" at the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA"). With the aid of the powerpoint presentation material, Mr Steven YIU, Deputy Director, Service Delivery of the Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AAHK"), briefed the Panel further on the details of the initiatives. Details of the briefings were set out in the paper provided by AAHK (LC Paper No. CB(4)1020/18-19(03)).

*(Post-meeting note: The powerpoint presentation materials provided by AAHK was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1037/18-19(01) on 24 June 2019.)*

Discussion

*Smart airport development*

4. Mr SHIU Ka-fai welcomed the initiatives of AAHK to apply smart technologies and facilities at HKIA, which he considered to be the direction of development for airports worldwide. He noted AAHK's initiatives in enhancing efficiency with robotics and automation, and sought information on the details of the application of driverless electric tractors at HKIA. He also enquired about the benefits the application of automation would bring, in particular in monetary terms as well as the anticipated decrease in the demand for manpower at HKIA.

5. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that robotics technology was being used for some cleaning work and ambience monitoring in the terminals, and that currently 10 such robots were in use. However, AAHK had not come to any conclusion on the decrease in manpower demand, while the quality of the monitoring work in the terminals had been enhanced after the application of robotics technology.

6. Mr CHAN Chun-ying supported the initiatives of "smart airport development" at HKIA as such developments would provide greater convenience for passengers. He enquired about the time passengers could save after all the automated and self-service facilities, including the smart mobile check-in kiosks and self-bag drop facilities, had been launched, compared with the conventional ways of going through processes such as check-in, bag drop and security checks at manual counters. He was also concerned about the timeline for the launch of all the automated and self-service facilities at HKIA.

7. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that under normal circumstances, 40 minutes would be adequate for a passenger to go through all the necessary processes for departure at HKIA. The installation of the self-service facilities at the airport would not only reduce the time passengers spent on the various processes, but would more importantly enhance HKIA's efficiency and capacity to handle more passengers before the commissioning of the three-runway system ("3RS"). AAHK would review the operation of the self-bag drop facilities when passengers got more familiarized with the use of them.

8. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that a new generation of smart mobile check-in kiosk had been launched, and a total of 120 kiosks were in service at various locations at HKIA as well as at off-airport locations such as the High

Speed Rail West Kowloon Station and the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB"). Mr CHAN asked if such kiosks would be deployed at other boundary control points. He also sought information on the factors to be considered when deciding whether or not such kiosks would be deployed at certain boundary control points.

9. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that factors including the distribution of such kiosks, passenger flow at different boundary control points, as well as issues relating to maintenance of the kiosks had to be considered in deploying the kiosks in various boundary control points.

10. Mr YIU Si-wing was of the view that more smart mobile check-in kiosks should be deployed at boundary control points where passenger flow was heavy. He also considered that the new boundary control point at Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai, which was equipped with the most up-to-date facilities, could better accommodate the smart mobile check-in kiosks. He suggested that such kiosks could also be deployed at certain Mainland piers in order to enhance the service network of HKIA.

11. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that some smart mobile check-in kiosks had been deployed on the Zhuhai side of HZMB. AAHK would closely monitor the service demand and would try to increase the service coverage of such kiosks.

12. Mr YIU Si-wing pointed out that HKIA had been awarded the World's Best Airport at Skytrax's World Airport Awards for eight years before 2011. However, HKIA's global ranking as shown in the Award had dropped from the fourth in 2018 to the fifth in 2019. Mr YIU enquired about the difference between HKIA and the four top-ranking airports, in particular Singapore Changi Airport which ranked first in 2019, in terms of smart airport development, and whether smart airport development at HKIA was comparable with that of the other top-ranking airports.

13. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that a number of factors would affect the global ranking of HKIA, and that one of such factors was fast and reliable internet connectivity at airports. He pointed out that after a major upgrade to HKIA's free Wi-Fi service, HKIA had been at the leading position in the provision of Wi-Fi service and in terms of download speed when compared with other international airports. AAHK had been making the best endeavours to enhance passenger experience by providing personalized services at HKIA, which was a very busy airport handling about 75 million passenger flow every year, before significant enhancements could be made possible after the commissioning of the whole 3RS in 2024.

14. Mr Andrew WAN noted HKIA's global ranking had dropped in 2019. He said that some of the airports that topped the list might be inferior to HKIA in terms of hardware development and space, but they still ranked higher than HKIA as they provided better services to passengers. In this regard, he considered that smart airport development at HKIA should be handled in a personalized manner to facilitate different users, including the elderly group, with various service needs. Emphasizing the importance of developing human capital, he also stressed that the various initiatives under the smart airport development should not be used as an excuse for future layoffs or reduction in jobs.

15. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that AAHK would strive to cater for the different needs of users of HKIA in developing technological applications for HKIA. The use of robotics would not only enhance efficiency but also improve occupational health of employees at HKIA. The increasing automation and use of robotics did not aim to replace certain kinds of job, but would reduce the reliance on manpower resources and expand the recruitment base of some job types.

16. Mr Andrew WAN noted that the development of internet-of-things network and big data analysis would enable predictive decisions and timely enhancements in queue management and deployment of manpower or other resources for serving flights and passengers. In this regard, he asked if AAHK would consider cooperating with nearby airports in regards of airspace management and passenger transfer arrangements riding on the advantages brought about by internet-of-things network and big data analysis, with a view to strengthening Hong Kong's position as a regional and global aviation hub. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that as such cooperation would involve confidentiality and privacy issues, further discussion with the airports concerned would be required.

17. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed concern about the long baggage waiting time at HKIA, and enquired if the collection of the relevant big data and the use of smart facilities at HKIA would improve the situation.

18. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that in 2016-2017, there were times when baggage delivery performance could not meet the targets. At HKIA, the target for delivery of the first bag to baggage reclaim was 20 minutes, and that the target for delivery of the last bag to baggage reclaim was 40 minutes throughout the airport. AAHK found that most cases of baggage delivery delay were attributable to the baggage delivery service providers' lack of the relevant equipment. In this connection, AAHK purchased such equipment from 2018 onwards for renting to the service providers concerned with a view

to enhancing the efficiency of baggage delivery service. Mr YIU of AAHK remarked that there had been an overhaul to the baggage handling system in the past few years. For example, there was better resources sharing within the apron area. Subsequently, the situation of long baggage waiting time had been significantly improved. Currently, more than 95% of the baggage delivered could meet the baggage delivery targets mentioned above.

19. Ms Claudia MO opined that smart airport development had been seen in many airports overseas. In this regard, she asked what made the developments at HKIA unique from the other airports. Ms MO also enquired how AAHK would strike a balance between the adoption of various automated processes at HKIA and protection of users' privacy associated with the application of such processes.

20. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that in order to cater for the needs of different passengers, both automated facilities and person-to-person services were available at HKIA. Furthermore, matters concerning users' privacy and internet security had been taken into consideration at the design stage of the automated systems. All such systems complied with the relevant legal requirements. AAHK also had an established mechanism regarding the storage and retrieval of relevant data, and such data would be deleted after a designated period of time.

21. In response to Ms Claudia MO's further enquiry, Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that AAHK had established procedures in handling requests for passenger information made by different authorities. He added that as the Immigration Department ("ImmiD") had got hold of all passenger information, relevant authorities might more possibly turn to ImmiD for requesting passenger information instead of turning to AAHK. Mr Chris AU YOUNG, General Manager, Smart Airport of AAHK added that, in the event that relevant requests were received, AAHK would first seek legal advice as to whether the information requested should be disclosed, and how much of such information should be disclosed.

22. Mr WONG Ting-kwong supported AAHK's smart airport development which would enhance services provided to passengers. He said that due to the construction works for the expansion of HKIA, roads on the airport island had always been changed and/or diverted, which caused much confusion and inconvenience to drivers. In this connection, he urged AAHK to improve the situation. Mr WONG also suggested that clearer road signs should be erected where appropriate to inform drivers of the changes/diversions. In response, Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that AAHK, which was responsible for managing matters relating to road diversion associated with airport expansion works, would continue to pay efforts in minimizing the impact of road works on drivers.



*Smart infrastructure, HKIA's mobile app and smart baggage tag*

23. Noting that Wi-Fi speed in terminals had been further upgraded, Mr SHIU Ka-fai expressed concern about issues relating to privacy and cyber security when passengers used Wi-Fi at HKIA. Mr Chris AU YOUNG of AAHK replied that Wi-Fi at HKIA was a free Wi-Fi system and would not request any personal information for accessing the system. AAHK would continue to follow this principle in the provision of Wi-Fi services for users of HKIA.

24. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that AAHK was preparing for the application of 5G technologies in airport operations. He sought information on the relevant preparatory work and the implementation timeline. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK advised that the relevant work was at the preliminary stage, and that the related detailed design and tendering work had not yet commenced. Careful consideration would be required as the application of 5G technologies at HKIA would affect all infrastructure at HKIA. AAHK would proactively follow up on such matters.

25. Mr Jeremy TAM supported AAHK's initiatives of "smart airport development" at HKIA. To enhance efficiency and passenger experience, he urged AAHK to deploy smart mobile check-in kiosks at different boundary control points and improve the user-friendliness and contents of HKIA's mobile app "HKG My Flight". He was of the view that there was room for improvement of the app, in particular in respect of providing passengers with information on in-town transportation, and suggested that more detailed information on hotel shuttle bus services and franchised bus routes should be provided to passengers through the app. To promote the app to passengers, AAHK should consider publicising the app through the video played to passengers on board of an aircraft by airlines before landing.

26. Mr SHIU Ka-fai expressed concern about promotion of HKIA's mobile app "HKG My Flight" to tourists. He urged AAHK to consider integrating apps of relevant government departments and public bodies in Hong Kong under HKIA's app so that users could access a range of useful information by installing only one app.

27. Mr Chris AU YOUNG of AAHK replied that AAHK had been expeditiously promoting the "HKG My Flight" app to passengers since the app's launch in 2013. He advised that promotion of the app was currently not included in the video mentioned by Mr Jeremy TAM, and that AAHK would consider the suggestions made by members. Mr Steven YIU of AAHK added that AAHK would continue to explore different ways to perfect the existing app.

28. Mr Jeremy TAM noted that HKIA's smart baggage tag, MyTAG, would allow arrival passengers to receive notifications on their mobile phones when their bags were ready for pick-up from the carousels if the tag was paired with the "HKG My Flight" app. He enquired if similar technology was applied in any other airports, and urged AAHK to consider cooperating with other airports and/or manufacturers of luggage to extend the scope and coverage of the application of MyTAG.

29. Mr Chris AU YOUNG of AAHK advised that HKIA was the only airport in the world which provided the smart baggage tag service to passengers. He added that only airports equipped with Radio Frequency Identification ("RFID") technology in their baggage handling systems could use the smart baggage tag. The International Air Transport Association had started to promote application of RFID technology at airports, with a view to promoting it to be a new international service standard at airports. AAHK would consider Mr Jeremy TAM's suggestion and proactively liaise with airports at popular destinations of Hong Kong people for extending the service. Furthermore, AAHK had liaised with certain manufacturers of luggage to explore the feasibility of integrating the MyTAG function into the luggage they produced. Although no cooperation had been confirmed at the moment due to some unresolved technical problems, both the manufacturers concerned and AAHK were paying efforts to make such cooperation possible.

#### **IV. Legislative proposal for regulating the operations of small unmanned aircraft in Hong Kong**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)999/18-19(01) — Administration's paper on legislative proposal for regulating the operations of small unmanned aircraft in Hong Kong

LC Paper No. CB(4)1020/18-19(04) — Paper on regulation of unmanned aircraft systems prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief)

Declaration of interest

30. Mr Jeremy TAM declared that the company he worked for might engage in business related to the operations of small unmanned aircraft ("SUA") in Hong Kong in future.

Presentation by the Administration

31. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 4 briefed members on the legislative proposal for regulating the operations of SUA in Hong Kong. SUA, generally weighing 25 kilograms or less, was a subset of unmanned aircraft systems ("UAS") and was commonly referred to as "drone". Under the new regulatory regime, the SUA operations would be classified into Category A and Category B while Category A comprised sub-categories A1 and A2 according to the weight of SUA and the operational risk level. With the aid of power-point presentation material, Acting Chief Operations Officer (Technical Administration) of the Civil Aviation Department ("CAD") elaborated on the proposal further. Details were set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)999/18-19(01).

*(Post-meeting note: The powerpoint presentation material provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1037/18-19(02) on 24 June 2019.)*

Discussion

*New regulatory regime*

32. Supporting the new regulatory regime for SUA operations, Mr Tony TSE sought further information about the minimum age of persons allowed to fly SUA under both Categories A and B operations. Noting that persons involved in Category B operations would be required to undertake advanced training and assessment for flying SUA from a training organization approved by CAD at their own cost, he considered that more organizations should be allowed to provide SUA training courses to provide more choices to interested parties and facilitate the development of SUA in Hong Kong.

33. Deputy Director-General of Civil Aviation (2) ("DDGCA(2)") replied that whilst there was no minimum age requirement for Category A1 operations, the minimum age for persons flying SUA would be set at 14 years for Categories A2 and B operations to facilitate the use of SUA by young people. The minimum age requirement of SUA operations was among one of the lowest in major jurisdictions, and would facilitate the use of SUA as far as

practicable. To ensure competency, persons flying SUA under Category B operations should attain specified training and assessment requirements. The Administration would give due regard to a number of factors when considering whether a training organization was suitable for providing relevant courses.

34. Mr Jeremy TAM considered that from the technical point of view, it was essential to require persons flying SUA to go through specified training and assessments so as to ensure competency and improve safety awareness. However, requiring persons intending to fly SUA under Category B operations to seek prior permission from CAD might cause unnecessary burden on SUA users. He asked about the justification for imposing this requirement.

35. The Deputy Chairman raised concern about the mechanism and criteria adopted by CAD in processing such SUA applications for Category B operations. To facilitate the development and diversified uses of SUA, he suggested that a blanket approval should be given by CAD if the applicant had already attained specified level of competency.

36. DDGCA(2) explained that while no prior permission from CAD would be required for all Category A operations which were subject to the standard operating conditions specified by CAD, any SUA operations exceeding the standard operating conditions would be regarded as Category B operations and prior permission from CAD would be required. In processing the applications for Category B operations, CAD would give due consideration to various factors, for example, whether the applicant had undertaken appropriate training and would implement sufficient safety measures to mitigate the risk. Subject to the applicant's compliance with certain conditions, CAD might grant permission for the applicant to conduct certain operations for a specified period. The detailed requirements of each category of SUA operations would be set out in the safety guidelines.

37. Mr Jeremy TAM noted that to facilitate persons who had already gone through the required training and assessment in other jurisdictions in operating SUA in Hong Kong, CAD might issue the Certificate of Competency to these persons subject to the provision of proof of competency. Sharing his experience of taking relevant overseas assessments, he considered that the assessment criteria varied significantly across different jurisdictions. He urged the Administration to review thoroughly the relevant qualifications awarded by other civil aviation authorities based on the local situation. He also requested the Administration to provide details of recognized qualifications awarded by other civil aviation authorities when the related legislative proposal was submitted to LegCo for negative vetting.

38. DDGCA(2) advised that CAD would consider in detail the assessment criteria of major civil aviation authorities before granting any recognition. She said that as SUA was an innovative and new development having tremendous potentials in both applications and technological advancement which would benefit the community at large and in turn Hong Kong, it was of utmost importance that any legislation should not be unduly rigid and restrictive as to hinder SUA development or flourishing of innovative ideas.

*Insurance*

39. Whilst supporting the need for imposing insurance requirements, Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the reasons for requiring that the policy of third-party insurance for Category A2 and/or B operations should be issued by an insurer authorized under the Insurance Ordinance (Cap. 41). Pointing out that certain overseas parties might have already obtained an annual insurance plan with global coverage, he considered it unnecessary to require these parties to take out another insurance policy from a local insurer authorized under Cap. 41 for conducting SUA operations in Hong Kong.

40. DDGCA(2) explained that such a requirement could avoid the SUA owners/operators from taking out fake insurance policies on internet and ensure the presence of a valid third-party insurance policy for the SUA concerned. In fact, a number of insurers authorized under Cap. 41 were international corporations. Acknowledging the views of Mr Jeremy TAM, the Administration would discuss further with the Insurance Authority and the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers on this matter.

41. The Deputy Chairman suggested that the Administration could consider imposing the insurance requirements on SUA products at the wholesale level so that all such products would already have a valid insurance coverage for third-party liability at the retail level. This bulk purchase arrangement of insurance policy could also reduce the overall insurance cost.

42. DDGCA(2) agreed to explore the feasibility of the suggestion with relevant manufacturers. However, irrespective of such, the first and foremost issue was the availability of insurance products for SUA operations in Hong Kong as for instance privately-built SUA also needed insurance. On this, the Administration had been working together with the Insurance Authority and the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers to encourage insurers to provide relevant insurance products with flexible choices of coverage and duration at an affordable price.

*Enforcement*

43. Mr Tony TSE was concerned about the enforcement actions under the new regulatory regime as well as the delineation of legal responsibilities between SUA owners and persons flying SUA in case of non-compliance. He also asked about the method of measuring the maximum flying altitude under the proposed standard operating conditions for Category A operations, and suggested that details of those conditions should be set out clearly to facilitate SUA users.

44. DDGCA(2) advised that in determining the responsible parties of an incident, the authority would look into the facts of the case, such as whether the person flying SUA had duly followed the operation procedures and whether the SUA had been registered. The requirement for SUA for Category A2 and/or B operations to be equipped with flight log would enable the recording of basic flight parameters such as altitude and speed of the SUA which would provide more information when incidents occurred. DDGCA(2) also advised that the flying altitude of SUA would be measured and expressed in terms of height above ground level (AGL) which was commonly adopted in the aviation sector. CAD would provide more details of the standard operating conditions when introducing the subsidiary legislation.

*Restricted Flying Zones*

45. Mr James TO raised concern about the excessive power of police officers in preventing an SUA from flying or causing an SUA to land. He asked about the basis of consideration for the Police to exercise such power and requested the Administration to set out those considerations in detail to ensure proper compliance.

46. Noting that CAD had consulted other Government bureaux/departments in identifying Restricted Flying Zones ("RFZs"), the Deputy Chairman enquired about the details of the proposed RFZs and the criteria and mechanism for designating future RFZs. To facilitate public compliance, he considered that RFZs should be clearly delineated in the drone map published by CAD. The Administration should also make available the updated drone map for public inspection as early as possible.

47. DDGCA(2) said that under the new SUA legislation, the Director-General of Civil Aviation ("DGCA") should be empowered to designate RFZs to restrict the flying of SUA by reasons of aviation safety, emergency/security and/or the intended gathering or movement of a large number of persons. For instance, flying of SUA should not be allowed for airspace within or adjacent to aerodromes and heliports and associated flight

paths so as to avoid affecting aircraft operations therefrom. In addition, restriction on flying SUA might be required for some public events like Formula E races which involved a large gathering of spectators. Such proposal was in line with international practice at which civil aviation authorities had the powers to restrict the flying of SUA to govern airspace usage.

*Venue*

48. In response to the Deputy Chairman's concern on venues for SUA activities, DDGCA(2) advised that with the enactment of the new SUA legislation encompassing the registration and labeling requirements, it would help enhance traceability of the SUA owners and persons flying SUA and in turn assist other Government bureaux/departments or regulatory authorities to enforce requirements under their respective purview. Therefore many Government bureaux/departments were generally positive towards appropriate use of SUA in their venues. While CAD targeted to publish a map via the electronic portal to indicate the latest RFZs for reference by persons flying SUA, it would continue to discuss with Government bureaux/departments on the use of SUA in their venues. The Administration would provide more information in this regard when the related legislative proposal was submitted to LegCo.

49. In response to Mr Jeremy TAM's enquiry about the progress of identifying more venues for flying SUA, DDGCA(2) advised that CAD was still liaising with related Government departments such as the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, and the Water Supplies Department. CAD aimed to identify suitable places which had relatively low patronage and with sufficient railings, such as the recreational space on the rooftops of service reservoirs.

50. Ms Claudia MO said that the media sector frequently used SUA fitted with cameras to take aerial photographs during large-scale public events. She enquired about the type of SUA commonly used by the media sector and the Administration's measures to facilitate the use of SUA by the media sector to report major events. She considered that discretion should be granted to allow the SUA of the media sector to enter certain RFZs to facilitate news coverage of large-scale public events. Mr James TO also took the view that it was important to allow the use of SUA by the media sector to cover large-scale public events, such as demonstrations and assemblies etc., at the scene.

51. DDGCA(2) said that it was not the Administration's intention to restrict the use of SUA at all public gatherings involving a large number of persons.

To address the need of the media sector in using SUA which normally fell under Category B operations and to ensure public safety, CAD would consider granting a longer-term permission to relevant media organizations subject to their compliance with specified conditions. Certain RFZs might be opened to the media for news coverage, but some like those which might affect aircraft operations might not. CAD would discuss with the media sector further in due course.

*Specific SUA operations and privacy-related matters*

52. Mr Jeremy TAM was of the view that drone racing was a kind of low-risk activity operated in designated areas, and hence the regulatory requirements under the new SUA legislation targeting this activity should be less stringent.

53. DDGCA(2) advised that the Administration was positive to facilitate drone racing in Hong Kong and would consider giving a special permission for relevant applications which would be classified as Category B operations. Exemptions from certain requirements might be granted to this activity if DGCA thought fit, provided that such exemptions were in line with the overarching policy objective to safeguard public safety.

54. In response to Mr Holden CHOW's enquiry about indoor operations of SUA, DDGCA(2) advised that indoor operations of SUA in non-domestic premises such as shopping malls should be subject to various statutory requirements, including the registration and labelling requirements, as well as the insurance requirements. Considering that SUA operating indoors would not affect aviation safety and that each indoor venue had its own specific environment, the Administration considered it more practical to issue general safety guidelines on indoor SUA operations for reference by property owners/managers and allow them to impose additional requirements for their own venues.

55. Mr Holden CHOW raised concern about the privacy-related matters arising from the use of SUA fitted with cameras. Given that such matters were under the purview of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data ("PCPD"), he enquired about the enforcement actions for protecting the personal data privacy rights of an individual on the use of SUA and whether PCPD would have enough manpower resources to handle relevant complaints.

56. DDGCA(2) said that according to PCPD, the established complaint handling procedure would be adopted to handle cases in relation to SUA



operations. With the introduction of the new SUA legislation, the traceability of SUA owners and persons flying SUA would be enhanced which would contribute to enforcement of the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486). CAD would include the privacy awareness information that the person flying SUA had to go through during the registration process. It was believed that PCPD would make suitable arrangements on its manpower resources to cover the work arising from SUA operations.

Conclusion

57. The Chairman concluded that the Panel was generally supportive of the legislative proposal put forward by the Administration.

**V. Any other business**

58. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:43 pm.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
15 October 2019