

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)1691/20-21  
(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, 31 May 2021, at 4:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan, JP

**Member absent** : Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

**Public Officers attending** : **Agenda item III**

Department of Justice

Dr James DING  
Commissioner  
Inclusive Dispute Avoidance and  
Resolution Office

Ms Helen KUNG  
Deputy Principal Government Counsel  
(Acting)  
Civil Division

Miss Jacqueline CHEUNG  
Government Counsel  
Civil Division

Miss Helen TANG  
Government Counsel  
Civil Division

**Agenda item IV**

Department of Justice

Ms Jenny FUNG Mei-fung  
Deputy Solicitor General (Policy Affairs) (Acting)

Ms Peggy AU YEUNG  
Senior Assistant Solicitor General (Policy Affairs)1

**Attendance by  
invitation**

: **Agenda item III**

Hong Kong Bar Association

Mr Jeremy J BARTLETT, SC

Mr Jonathan WONG

The Law Society of Hong Kong

Mr Eric WOO Hing-yip  
Member of Arbitration Committee

Ms Heidi CHUI Hoi-yee  
Member of Arbitration Committee

Mr Barbarossa WAN Hoi-tick  
Dispute Resolution Co-ordinator

**Agenda item IV**

Hong Kong Bar Association

Mr Jeremy J BARTLETT, SC

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

**Staff in attendance** : Ms Clara TAM  
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2

Miss Janice HO  
Council Secretary (4)6

Ms Emily LIU  
Legislative Assistant (4)6

---

Action

**I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting**

There was no information paper issued since the last meeting.

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

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(01) - List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(02) - List of follow-up actions)

2. Ms Elizabeth QUAT referred to the agenda item "Enhancements to the mechanism for handling complaints against judicial conduct" discussed at the last meeting of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services ("the Panel"). She requested that, as certain issues relating to that item had yet to be settled satisfactorily, they should be further discussed at a future meeting. The Chairman said that he would invite the Judiciary Administration to take note of Ms Elizabeth QUAT's views.

*(Post-meeting note: The written reply of Judiciary Administrator was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1128/20-21 on 17 June 2021.)*

3. Members noted that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting of AJLS Panel to be held on 28 June 2021 –

- (a) Implementation of the recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong; and

(b) Professional development for legal profession.

*(Post-meeting note: Members were informed vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1068/20-21 on 3 June 2021 that the meeting was rescheduled to 21 June 2021. Subsequently, members were informed vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1135/20-21 on 18 June 2021 that the item "Proposed upgrading of one permanent directorate post of Principal Government Counsel to Law Officer in the Law Reform Commission Secretariat of the Department of Justice" was added as an agenda item of the meeting.)*

### **III. Latest developments in international arbitration for Hong Kong**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(03) - Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(04) - Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

#### Briefing by the Administration

4. Commissioner, Inclusive Dispute Avoidance and Resolution Office ("C/IDAR") of the Department of Justice ("DoJ") briefed members on the progress of the Administration's initiatives on developing Hong Kong as a leading international arbitration centre in the Asia-Pacific region and promoting Hong Kong as a preferred seat of arbitration for both local and overseas parties.

#### Views of the Hong Kong Bar Association

5. Mr Jeremy J BARTLETT, SC of the Hong Kong Bar Association ("the Bar Association") expressed support for the various measures in the Administration's paper. In particular, Mr BARTLETT, SC commended the 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 ("Interim Measures Arrangement") and the Supplemental Arrangement Concerning Mutual Enforcement of Arbitral Awards between the Mainland and HKSAR as valuable for developing Hong Kong as a leading international arbitration centre in the Asia-Pacific region.

#### Views of The Hong Kong Law Society

6. Mr Eric WOO of The Law Society of Hong Kong ("the Law Society") supported the measures for developing Hong Kong into an international

arbitration centre and, in particular, welcomed the inclusion of Hong Kong as one of the four places of arbitration by the Baltic and International Maritime Council ("BIMCO"). In view of this development, Mr WOO suggested that the Administration liaised with BIMCO as well as other standard-setting bodies on international trades, such as the Grain and Feed Trade Association and the Federation of Oils, Seeds and Fats Association striving for including Hong Kong as one of the venues for arbitration in their standard forms (e.g. BIMCO's Time Charter (NYPE 2015) form), which would enhance Hong Kong's status as an international arbitration centre.

7. Mr Eric WOO also pointed out that comparing with the Interim Measures Arrangement, it seemed more difficult to obtain the interim measures such as property preservation from Hong Kong courts than Mainland courts as the threshold in the former case was quite high. He suggested simplifying the relevant procedures to facilitate the seeking of interim measures in Hong Kong so as to entice more cross-boundary and international arbitration and dispute resolutions to be seated in Hong Kong.

8. Ms Heidi CHUI of the Law Society said that while Hong Kong should celebrate for being ranked third among the most popular locations for arbitration and dispute resolution globally according to the latest International Arbitration Survey conducted by the Queen Mary University of London, there was much to be learned from the top-ranked Singapore, in particular the support provided by its government to the arbitration industry. Ms CHUI said that Hong Kong should harness its unique advantage of being a common law jurisdiction within the People's Republic of China and connections to the Greater Bay Area ("GBA") in order to gain a competitive edge and, to this end, the Administration should promote cooperation between the arbitral institutions in Hong Kong and the Mainland.

#### Declaration of interest

9. Dr Priscilla LEUNG declared that she was a teaching faculty at the School of Law of the City University of Hong Kong.

#### Discussion

10. Mr Holden CHOW, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and the Chairman expressed support for the Administration's initiatives to promote international arbitration in Hong Kong, which had taken strides in recent years. Ms YUNG urged the Administration to provide more training opportunities for barristers and solicitors to become qualified arbitrators and more practising opportunities for the qualified arbitrators which suited their different levels of expertise.

### *Maritime arbitration*

11. Mr Holden CHOW said that with the development of maritime industry, many related trades would flourish such as ship finance and shipping insurance, and maritime arbitration would be one of them. In particular, reference could be made to London which had the most thriving maritime industry in the world.

12. In view of some notable developments in maritime industry in Hong Kong including the establishment of offices of renowned international organizations such as the International Chamber of Shipping, Mr Holden CHOW said that the Administration should step up its efforts in developing and industrializing maritime arbitration. To this end, the Administration should focus its efforts on providing training on maritime law for local legal professionals to meet the rising demand for relevant legal services.

13. While expressing appreciation of the Administration's resolve to develop maritime arbitration in Hong Kong, Dr Priscilla LEUNG was concerned about its prospect in view of the shortage of talents in the field of maritime law, in particular the shortage of teaching staff for relevant courses in the universities. She also pointed out that with the rapid development in maritime industry in the Mainland, it should have more experience in handling maritime arbitration cases than Hong Kong which Hong Kong could learn from.

14. In response to members' views, C/IDAR advised that DoJ had been working with the Transport and Housing Bureau ("THB"), which was responsible for coordinating the policies on developing the maritime industry, to promote maritime arbitration. In 2014, the Administration had established the Maritime and Aviation Training Fund ("MAT Fund") under which funding for training relating to the maritime industry might be applied for. Although no application for MAT Fund had been received on training programmes relating to maritime arbitration, C/IDAR said that DoJ would work with THB to identify suitable training programmes for grooming the right talents for maritime arbitration.

### *Online dispute resolution platform*

15. Dr Priscilla LEUNG noted that the Administration had provided a total of \$150 million to support the eBRAM International Online Dispute Resolution Centre Ltd. ("eBRAM Centre"). She said that the Administration should ensure that the public money would be spent accountably and achieve value-for-money. In response, C/IDAR clarified that the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council had approved in January 2021 a sum of \$100 million which was for eBRAM Centre's development of an online dispute resolution ("ODR") and deal making platform. Prior to that, following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic

and in anticipation of an upsurge of disputes arising due to the pandemic, funding of \$50 million had been provided to eBRAM Centre for the COVID-19 ODR Scheme.

16. C/IDAR further said that, to ensure that the financial provision for eBRAM Centre would be properly used and appropriately scrutinized, the Administration would provide the approved sum to eBRAM Centre by phases. A memorandum of understanding had also been signed between the Administration and eBRAM Centre mandating its regular reporting of expenditure.

*Utilization of the online dispute resolution platform*

17. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan considered that the COVID-19 pandemic had given rise to more opportunities for the handling of disputes through ODR services. She enquired whether the Administration had collected and analysed the relevant statistics on the use of ODR as well as face-to-face dispute resolution services during the last year, so as to provide a realistic appraisal of the dispute resolution business situation in Hong Kong and to foster its further development.

18. In reply, C/IDAR said that according to the report of the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre ("HKIAC"), there was an increasing trend in the use of arbitration services. On the other hand, as ODR was still at its early stage of development, it was too preliminary to collect useful data for analysis. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan requested that the Administration should not just rely on the statistics from, such as HKIAC, and be more proactive in conducting its own survey among the practitioners to form an objective assessment of the business situation regarding the provision of dispute resolution services in Hong Kong. The Chairman requested C/IDAR to take note of Ms YUNG's view.

19. The Chairman and Ms Elizabeth QUAT noted that one of the actions taken by the Law Society in its intervention into the practice of Messrs Wong, Fung & Co. ("the Firm") was to coordinate a list of mediators who could provide mediation services to clients of the Firm, and the Law Society had talked to an ODR service platform with a view to facilitating a speedy resolution for disputes. They enquired whether eBRAM Centre's ODR service had been effectively utilized as a means of dispute resolution for the Firm's affected clients. In reply, C/IDAR said that the Administration was given to understand that eBRAM Centre's ODR services had not yet been used in resolving the intervention case. In response to Ms QUAT's enquiry on why this was the case, C/IDAR explained that the actual utilization of ODR would depend on whether parties to a dispute had given consent to using the services.

*Pilot Scheme on Immigration Facilitation for Persons Participating in Arbitral Proceedings in Hong Kong*

20. The Chairman and Dr Priscilla LEUNG enquired about why the Pilot Scheme on Immigration Facilitation for Persons Participating in Arbitral Proceedings in Hong Kong ("the Pilot Scheme"), as set out in the Administration's paper, would exclude residents of the Mainland, Macao and Taiwan. The Chairman said that such an exclusion, which would create much inconvenience to Mainland clients, was contradictory to the Administration's policy of enticing Mainland clients to choose Hong Kong as the seat of arbitration.

21. C/IDAR stressed that it was not the Administration's intention to exclude the residents of the Mainland, Macao and Taiwan. He noted that the implementation of the Pilot Scheme would involve coordination with the Security Bureau and the Immigration Department ("ImmD"), as well as the Mainland authorities if the Mainland residents were involved. He explained that after consulting ImmD, it was noted that more time was required to resolve technical issues involved in allowing nationals from countries which required visa for entry into Hong Kong or two-way permit holders to enjoy immigration facilitation to participate in arbitral proceedings in Hong Kong under the Pilot Scheme. In this connection, the Administration considered it preferable to start with the Pilot Scheme under which nationals of countries who might visit Hong Kong visa-free (visa-free nationals) and were in possession of the "Letter of proof" were allowed to participate in arbitral proceedings in Hong Kong as visitors, which could be implemented without much difficulty.

22. C/IDAR clarified that at present, residents of the Mainland and Macao were able to participate in arbitral proceedings in Hong Kong as long as the requisite visa had been obtained. He also stressed that the Administration would review the Pilot Scheme in two years' time and members' concerns would certainly be taken into account.

*New opportunities for promoting the dispute resolution services in Hong Kong*

23. Dr Priscilla LEUNG urged the Administration to step up promoting Hong Kong's international arbitration services to the Belt and Road countries, in particular the Russian Federation, Romania and Croatia which represented those countries with different jurisdictions offering new opportunities for Hong Kong. She considered that by doing so, Hong Kong's competitive edge as an international arbitration centre would be strengthened.

24. While supportive of Dr Priscilla LEUNG's suggestion, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan expressed concerns about the potential difficulties faced by practising mediators and arbitrators in expanding their services to jurisdictions with a



different language and/or legal system (such as Macao). He sought the views from the Bar Association and the Law Society as to whether there was a need for the Administration to provide assistance by way of legislation.

25. As invited by the Chairman, Mr Jonathan WONG of the Bar Association said that, as parties to arbitration could choose the law applicable to the arbitral proceedings, he did not foresee any insurmountable obstacles arising from differences in the legal systems of jurisdictions which would invalidate the proceedings. Furthermore, as an international arbitration centre, Hong Kong was well-equipped to handle arbitral processes using different languages and foreign laws. For arbitral proceedings involving foreign law, for example, the usual practice was to engage an expert on the foreign law concerned for giving expert evidence in the arbitral proceeding concerned.

26. Mr Eric WOO concurred with Mr Jonathan WONG's views and supplemented that, other than engaging a foreign lawyer to give expert evidence, there was also an option for a Hong Kong law firm to collaborate with a law firm in other jurisdictions to handle foreign laws in arbitral proceedings. To preserve flexibility in the choice of law for the parties involved, both Mr WOO and Mr Jonathan WONG expressed reservations about mandating the use of Hong Kong law in arbitrations seated in Hong Kong by way of legislation.

27. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman requested the Administration to take note of the various views and concerns expressed by members and the two legal professional bodies at the meeting.

#### **IV. Latest development on the framework for cooperation with the Mainland on corporate insolvency matters**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(05) - Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)1014/20-21(06) - Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

#### **Briefing by the Administration**

28. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Solicitor General (Policy Affairs) (Acting) ("DSG(P)(Ag)") of DoJ briefed members on the latest development on the framework for cooperation with the Mainland on corporate insolvency matters ("the framework"), including the "Record of Meeting of the Supreme People's Court and the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region on Mutual Recognition of and Assistance to Bankruptcy (Insolvency)

Proceedings between the Courts of the Mainland and of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("Record of Meeting") signed by DoJ and the Supreme People's Court ("SPC") on 14 May 2021, the "Opinion on Taking Forward a Pilot Measure in relation to the Recognition of and Assistance to Insolvency Proceedings in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region" promulgated by SPC ("the Opinion") to implement the Record of Meeting, and the practical guide issued by DoJ ("Practical Guide") with the key features of the existing procedures for an application to the Hong Kong court for recognition of and assistance to Mainland insolvency proceedings.

### Views of the Hong Kong Bar Association

29. Mr BARTLETT, SC expressed support on the part of the Bar Association for the framework. Mr BARTLETT, SC said that the Bar Association looked forward to seeing cooperative equality of treatment being put into practice under the framework and given to liquidators and provisional liquidators in Hong Kong insolvency proceedings ("Hong Kong Administrators") seeking recognition or assistance from the Mainland courts in the pilot areas as were currently given to Mainland Administrators by the Hong Kong Court. He wished to highlight one issue in that it was his understanding that under Hong Kong law, companies incorporated offshore including many Hong Kong listed companies, of which many were operating in Hong Kong, could still be treated under insolvency law as having Hong Kong as its centre of main interests if its actual operation, businesses and employees, etc. are in Hong Kong. This Hong Kong position could be read as broader in scope than the concept of "centre of main interests" referred to in paragraph 4 of the Opinion. It was important that the same flexibility (whereby it was not an absolute pre-requisite that Hong Kong be the place of incorporation) be applied under the framework for mutual recognition on an application made in the Mainland. He enquired whether the people's courts would share the same understanding as under Hong Kong law when handling applications for recognition of Hong Kong insolvency proceedings.

30. DSG(P)(Ag) replied that according to paragraph 4 of the Opinion, while "centre of main interests" would generally mean the place of incorporation of the debtor, the people's courts shall take into account other factors including the place of principal office, the principal place of business, the place of principal assets of the debtor. DSG(P)(Ag) added that in practice, Hong Kong Administrators could submit relevant materials to the relevant people's courts to prove that Hong Kong was the centre of main interests of the debtor even though the debtor was not incorporated in Hong Kong.

## Discussion

31. Mr Holden CHOW indicated support for the framework. Noting that the Hong Kong Administrators would be allowed to perform a number of duties in the Mainland as set out in paragraph 14 of the Opinion, and the people's courts might also designate a Mainland Administrator according to paragraph 15 of the Opinion, Mr CHOW asked whether it would be for the people's courts to decide which set of laws to follow if conflicts arose between the Hong Kong and Mainland Administrators.

32. DSG(P)(Ag) explained that under the framework, the procedures for and manner in which applications for recognition and assistance were to be made would be in accordance with the provisions of the requested place. In addition, issues arising from Hong Kong insolvency proceedings concerning the debtor's assets in the Mainland, such as priorities for repayment of creditors from those assets and cooperation between Hong Kong and Mainland Administrators would be subject to the relevant rules and regulations under Mainland law (e.g. the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China).

33. Dr Junius HO enquired whether and, if yes, where in the Opinion had reflected that the framework would provide for a mutual arrangement so that Mainland Administrators could also apply to Hong Kong courts for recognition of and assistance to Mainland insolvency proceedings. In response, Senior Assistant Solicitor General (Policy Affairs)1 ("SASG(P)1") explained that the Opinion promulgated by SPC set out detailed provisions for implementing the framework in the Mainland whereby it was a breakthrough that Hong Kong insolvency proceedings could now be recognized and assisted by Mainland courts and such was not possible before. SASG(P)1 added that on the basis of the existing common law regime in Hong Kong, Hong Kong courts had been recognizing and assisting insolvency proceedings commenced in places outside Hong Kong, including Mainland insolvency proceedings.

34. Dr Priscilla LEUNG expressed support for the framework and considered that it could mitigate the difficulties faced by creditors in cross-border insolvency cases in the execution of liquidation orders made in one jurisdiction in another jurisdiction and would therefore facilitate the protection of their interests. Noting that paragraph 18 of the Opinion had listed out the scenarios under which a people's court shall refuse to recognize or assist Hong Kong insolvency proceedings, Dr LEUNG asked whether Hong Kong courts would have the same power of refusing to recognize or assist Mainland insolvency proceedings.

35. In response, DSG(P)(Ag) said that according to the existing common law principles, Hong Kong courts already had the power to examine the propriety of an application for recognition of and assistance to insolvency proceedings outside

Hong Kong and whether it had fulfilled the requisite requirements. For example, Hong Kong courts might consider whether a court order was obtained by fraud or whether there were any irregularities in the submission of documents. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that the Administration should not assume that Mainland lawyers would, in making applications for recognition of Mainland insolvency proceedings, have knowledge about the practices and procedures of Hong Kong courts.

36. DSG(P)(Ag) advised that the Practical Guide issued by DoJ on 14 May 2021 included the relevant sample documents and would provide a useful reference for Mainland Administrators. There were also two cases decided in 2020 in which the High Court of Hong Kong had recognized Mainland insolvency proceedings and granted assistance to the relevant Mainland Administrators.

37. Dr Priscilla LEUNG pointed out that the Practical Guide only provided technical details instead of a clear guidance on the aforesaid issues, and the Administration should summarize the relevant legal principles or, at least, clearly spell out that the existing common law regime would be adopted in Hong Kong. Dr Junius HO shared a similar concern and pointed out that parties not familiar with insolvency matters might misunderstand that the Record of Meeting had already provided for a full a set of rules for mutual recognition and assistance.

38. Dr Junius HO further pointed out that in Hong Kong, "bankruptcy (破產)" and "insolvency (清盤)" were two different legal terms, with the former applicable to unincorporated bodies and the latter limited companies. He noted that, however, when referring to insolvency proceedings in Hong Kong, such as the expression "Hong Kong Insolvency Proceedings", the Opinion had invariably used the term "破產" in Chinese. Dr HO asked the Administration to clarify whether the use of different terminologies in Hong Kong and the Mainland would have any implications. In reply, DSG(P)(Ag) said that the Opinion was promulgated by SPC and it followed that the relevant legal terms used therein would reflect the usual usage of legal terminologies in the Mainland. She added that the framework was applicable only to corporate insolvency matters (referred to as "enterprise bankruptcy" in the Mainland) but not personal bankruptcy.

39. Noting that under paragraph 22 of the Opinion, a party applying for recognition of and assistance to Hong Kong insolvency proceedings shall pay the fees in accordance with the laws and regulations in the Mainland, Dr Junius HO enquired about the exact amount of the relevant fees, or which parts of Mainland law should be referred to in this regard. In response, DSG(P)(Ag) explained that those fees would be decided in accordance with Mainland law and details of which were not available for the time being.

40. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan indicated that the framework would have extensive impact on the business sector having operations or businesses in the Mainland. In response to Mr CHUNG's question, DSG(P)(Ag) clarified that the establishment of the framework would be useful for liquidators of both sides to locate and take into control the relevant documents and records of the debtor and also the assets of the debtor in the requested place and it would be a matter for the liquidators to consider if, for example, the debtor's assets in Hong Kong would be required to be secured and realized for the purpose of the relevant insolvency proceedings in the Mainland. If there existed such a need, the framework would now provide a tool to address the same.

41. The Chairman sought confirmation of his understanding that, in case a Hong Kong Administrator was seeking the Mainland court's assistance to locate and take into control the assets that a debtor in a Hong Kong insolvency proceedings had in the Mainland, only the debtor's assets but not the personal assets of individual investors would be pursued. DSG(P)(Ag) confirmed the Chairman's understanding to be generally correct.

42. DSG(P)(Ag) further explained that debt restructuring in Hong Kong would generally be pursued through provisional liquidation wherein a provisional liquidator would be appointed by the court. If the debtor had assets in the Mainland, the provisional liquidator may seek assistance from the Mainland court under the framework so that the provisional liquidator would perform his duties in the Mainland, such as taking control the debtor's property in the Mainland or investigating into the debtor's financial position. DSG(P)(Ag) also confirmed Mr CHUNG's understanding that under the framework, a Mainland Administrator may seek similar assistance from the Hong Kong court in relation to Mainland debt restructuring proceedings.

43. Dr Priscilla LEUNG questioned why Beijing was not included as one of the pilot areas given that it had been having close tie with Hong Kong. In reply, DSG(P)(Ag) said that Shanghai, Xiamen and Shenzhen (i.e. the three pilot areas designated by SPC) were the top three Mainland cities wherein Hong Kong companies have their principal assets, or established places of business or representative offices. These three pilot areas were also having strong ties with Hong Kong in terms of investment and trade. DSG(P)(Ag) added that the Administration would continue to discuss with SPC with a view to expanding the scope of pilot areas in due course.

44. The Chairman welcomed the signing of the Record of Meeting, by which Hong Kong had become the only jurisdiction to have established a cooperation mechanism with the Mainland for mutual recognition of and assistance to insolvency proceedings. He considered that it had fully reflected the unique competitiveness of Hong Kong under the principle of "One Country, Two

Systems". While noting the Administration's explanation of the rationale for picking the three pilot areas, the Chairman remarked that it would be important to also consider the possibility of expanding the framework to cover the Greater Bay Area ("GBA") in the near future as such would facilitate Hong Kong's integration and cooperation with GBA.

**V. Any other business**

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:23 pm.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
26 October 2021