

## LCQ3: Explanatory work by HKSAR Government in US

Following is a question by the Hon Chung Kwok-pan (Hon Shiu Ka-fai to ask on his behalf) and a reply by the Acting Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development, Dr Bernard Chan, in the Legislative Council today (January 8):

Question:

According to the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act (the Act) enacted earlier by the authorities of the United States (US), the US Secretary of State shall submit annually to the Congress a certification in conjunction with the report required under the US-Hong Kong Policy Act, enunciating whether Hong Kong continues to warrant existing treatment under US laws, including being treated as a separate customs territory. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the details of the lobbying, conducted by the Government's Economic and Trade Offices (ETOs) in three US cities, against the enactment of the Act, including the ways in which and the number of occasions on which such lobbying was conducted, the politicians met, as well as the relevant reasons and data presented to them (set out by date in a table);

(2) as the Government has reproached a few Hong Kong people for visiting the US in September last year to urge the Congress to pass the Act and making at a hearing misrepresentations of the violent demonstrations in Hong Kong, whether, in view of such a situation, the ETO in Washington DC stepped up efforts at that time to lobby US politicians and explained to them the real situation of Hong Kong; if so, of the details, and whether it has studied the reasons why the Act was still enacted eventually by the US authorities; if it did not step up lobbying efforts, the reasons for that; and

(3) of the Government's specific plans in place to lobby US politicians this year, so as to avoid the US authorities ceasing to treat Hong Kong as a separate customs territory?

Reply:

President,

Under "one country, two systems", the Basic Law confers on Hong Kong a unique status. Article 116 of the Basic Law stipulates that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) is a separate customs territory and Article 151 provides that Hong Kong may, using the name "Hong Kong, China", participate in such international organisations as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation as a separate member.

Therefore, Hong Kong's unique status is not granted unilaterally by any other country, but is conferred by the Basic Law. Hong Kong's unique status is well recognised and respected by the international community. Our economic and trade status is on par with other WTO members, and we are making use of this capacity in the international economic and trade arena and we establish mutually beneficial relations with our trading partners around the world.

The United States (US) enacted in 1992 the US-Hong Kong Policy Act (the Policy Act) which sets out its policy and principled positions towards Hong Kong. The act is a policy legislation of the US itself but not an international or bilateral agreement. Over the years, the US has been conducting economic and trade exchanges with Hong Kong in accordance with the Policy Act, has been respecting Hong Kong as a separate customs territory, and has on this basis established mutually beneficial bilateral economic and trade relations with Hong Kong. The US is Hong Kong's second largest merchandise trading partner in the world, while Hong Kong is the US' tenth largest export market. According to the US' statistics, the US has been enjoying the largest trade surplus with Hong Kong among its global trading partners for many years, valued at US\$33.8 billion in 2018 alone. In 2018, the US was the seventh major source of inward direct investment into Hong Kong and the ninth major destination of outward direct investment from Hong Kong. Moreover, there are 1 344 US companies in Hong Kong, of which 278 are regional headquarters. Around 85 000 US citizens also live in Hong Kong. The close and reciprocal bilateral relation between the two places is obvious.

Therefore, the enactment of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act (the Hong Kong Act) by the US is unnecessary and unwarranted. The uncertainty caused by the Hong Kong Act will inevitably affect the confidence of international investors and companies in Hong Kong and will certainly damage the mutually beneficial relationship, including the US' interests.

My consolidated reply to the three parts of the question is as follows:

As for explanatory work, the HKSAR Government has been explaining to countries around the world the successful implementation of "one country, two systems" since our return to the Motherland, and promoting Hong Kong's unique status under the Basic Law and "one country, two systems" as well as our own various advantages. Such work is done through exchanges of information, reciprocal official visits, participation in international conferences, and the regular liaison of the overseas Economic and Trade Offices (ETOs). The Financial Secretary visited the US in October 2019, while the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development visited the US three times in September 2018, June and September 2019 respectively, during which they met with US government officials, Congressmen, think tanks as well as the business community there, updated them on the unique status of Hong Kong under the Basic Law, the intrinsic strengths of Hong Kong as well as Hong Kong's latest situation and measures taken to address current challenges, with a view to illustrating that despite the difficulties faced by Hong Kong, the city remains a highly efficient and safe city, welcoming people from around the US to visit and do business. In respect of the Hong Kong Act, we have been

explaining the situation in Hong Kong to relevant persons and organisations, actively clarifying misunderstandings, stressing that Hong Kong and the US are partners which bring mutual benefits to each other, and that the changing of US' policies towards Hong Kong is unwarranted and will bring negative impact on the exchanges of people and businesses between the two places. Moreover, the Chief Executive, the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development and officers of the ETOs in the US have written many times to various interlocutors in the US to explain clearly and in detail the situation in Hong Kong and the HKSAR Government's position.

The ETOs in Washington DC, New York and San Francisco have all along maintained regular contact with various sectors in the US, including federal government officials responsible for Hong Kong affairs in the White House, Department of State, Department of Commerce and US Trade Representative, congressional members and their staffers (in particular members and staffers of the Senate and House committees for foreign affairs and the Congressional-Executive Commission on China), think-tanks, media, academia, business communities and other opinion leaders. Through meetings and other arrangements, the ETOs work in earnest to facilitate the understanding of more people on the latest and actual situation in Hong Kong. Among these, in the case of the ETO in Washington DC, the ETO met around 240 US government officials and congressional members/staffers last year, with around 100 being government officials and around 140 being congressional members and their staffers. The ETO reiterated to them that HKSAR Government had spared no effort in implementing "one country, two systems", following free trade and economic policy, and safeguarding the core values of Hong Kong. The ETO explained the latest and actual situation in Hong Kong in order to clarify the misunderstandings that some of them had and maintain Hong Kong's international image and US-Hong Kong bilateral relations. The ETO also highlighted that Hong Kong and the US, being important partners in trade and such other areas as export control, anti-money laundering and counter terrorism, had mutually beneficial bilateral relations, providing significant benefits to the US economy and homeland security, and that any change to current US policy towards Hong Kong could have adverse impact on the people and business-trade interests of both places.

During the past year, the ETOs in the US facilitated visits to Hong Kong by committees relating to US-China relations as well as congressional members and staffers. These included a delegation of the Congressional US-China Working Group, a delegation of the US-China Economic and Security Review Commission and a congressional delegation organised by the US-Asia Institute in March, May and August 2019 respectively. The Government also invited two delegations of US congressional staffers to visit Hong Kong in March and October 2019 respectively under the Sponsored Visitors Programme. They met with senior HKSAR Government officials, and were given a wide range of briefings by government bureaux/departments and relevant organisations on the latest development in Hong Kong. Such visits were useful for the visitors to have a better understanding of the situation in Hong Kong such as the economy, opportunities and challenges.

In addition, the Government has been regularly meeting with Consulates-

General and foreign chambers of commerce in Hong Kong and updated them on the latest situation of Hong Kong. The International Business Committee chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration, with members comprising representatives of foreign chambers of commerce in Hong Kong and the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, meets regularly and discusses matters relating to the business environment and perceptions of Hong Kong. In the past six months, the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development also updated the Consuls General in Hong Kong and leaders of foreign chambers of commerce on the latest situation of Hong Kong and the Government's responding measures through meetings and letters, etc.

The Government and overseas ETOs have been paying close attention to local media reports of other countries on different aspects of Hong Kong affairs. The overseas ETOs would take the initiative to request the media to rectify false reports or false information of media reports. The Government would also proactively make such clarifications and upload the statements on HKSAR Government's relevant webpages and ETOs' social media platforms.

The Government and ETOs in the US will continue to maintain close working relationship with high-level US government officials responsible for Hong Kong affairs, congressional members and their staffers, think-tanks, media, academia and business communities, continue to closely monitor the US Government's policy direction as well as the US political and economic landscape, in particular developments relating to the US Administration's implementation of the Hong Kong Act, and continue to explain the latest situation in Hong Kong to interlocutors in the US so that the reports required under the Hong Kong Act could reflect the actual situation in Hong Kong. The Government will also rebuild the confidence of various US sectors in Hong Kong's future through promotion and other activities.

---

## [Operator and managers of unlicensed guesthouses convicted](#)

Two women and a man were charged with contravening the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance at the Kowloon City Magistrates' Courts today (January 8). A woman was fined \$8,000, and the other woman and the man were sentenced to two months' imprisonment, suspended for one year.

The courts heard that in June and July last year, officers of the Office of the Licensing Authority (OLA), the Home Affairs Department, inspected three suspected unlicensed guesthouses on Nathan Road, Portland Street and Nelson Street in Mong Kok. During the inspections, the OLA officers posed as lodgers and successfully rented rooms in these guesthouses on a daily basis.

According to the OLA's records, these guesthouses did not possess

licences under the Ordinance on the days of inspection. The women and the man responsible for operating and managing the premises were charged with contravening section 5(1) of the Ordinance.

A department spokesman stressed that operating or managing an unlicensed guesthouse is a criminal offence and can lead to a criminal record. Upon conviction, the offender is liable to a maximum fine of \$200,000 and two years' imprisonment.

The spokesman appealed to anyone with information about suspected unlicensed guesthouses to report it to the OLA through the hotline (Tel: 2881 7498), by email ([hadlaenq@had.gov.hk](mailto:hadlaenq@had.gov.hk)), by fax (2504 5805) using the report form downloaded from the OLA website ([www.hadla.gov.hk](http://www.hadla.gov.hk)), or through the mobile application "Hong Kong Licensed Hotels and Guesthouses".

---

## [Public hospital daily update on Wuhan-related cases](#)

The following is issued on behalf of the Hospital Authority:

As at noon today (January 8), in the past 24 hours public hospitals had admitted eight patients who have been to Wuhan in the past 14 days and presented with fever, respiratory infection or pneumonia symptoms.

	Hospital	Age	Gender	Condition
1.	Caritas Medical Centre	10	Female	Stable
2.	Princess Margaret Hospital	6	Female	Stable
3.	Prince of Wales Hospital	10	Female	Stable
4.	Prince of Wales Hospital	61	Male	Stable
5.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	28	Female	Stable
6.	Ruttonjee Hospital	27	Female	Stable
7.	Tin Shui Wai Hospital*	3	Female	Stable
8.	Tin Shui Wai Hospital*	15	Female	Stable

\*Cases have been transferred to Tuen Mun Hospital

The Hospital Authority (HA) has reported the cases and sent the specimens to the Department of Health (DH) for testing. The patients concerned are in stable condition and being treated under isolation. "The patients concerned had not visited wet markets in Wuhan before the onset of symptoms. The HA will keep monitoring the patients' conditions and provide appropriate treatment," the HA Chief Infection Control Officer, Dr Raymond

Lai, said.

Including the above-mentioned cases, public hospitals have reported 38 patient cases to the DH since December 31, 2019. Twenty-one of the patients have been discharged.

---

## LCQ9: Recovery and recycling of waste glass

Following is a question by the Hon Chan Hak-kan and a written reply by the Secretary for the Environment, Mr Wong Kam-sing, in the Legislative Council today (January 8):

Question:

Regarding the recovery and recycling of waste glass, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that in response to some demonstrators recently making incendiary bombs by using waste glass bottles, the Government requested the glass management contractors (GMCs) to temporarily suspend the waste glass container collection services starting from November 16 last year, of the quantity of waste glass disposed of at landfills from that day onward to December 31 last year, and how such quantity compares with that for the same period of the preceding year; whether it will improve the design of the recycling bins to prevent the waste glass bottles inside such bins from being stolen; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) whether it knows the respective monthly quantities of waste glass containers collected by GMCs in the catchment regions of (i) Hong Kong Island (including Islands District), (ii) New Territories and (iii) Kowloon, since the commencement of their respective contracts in November 2017 and May 2018 (set out in a table), as well as the relevant public expenditure;

(3) of the recovery rate of waste glass containers, and the respective percentages of waste glass containers turned into the following recycled uses, in each of the past three years: (i) eco-pavers, (ii) eco-cement, (iii) fill materials and (iv) making of new glass products after export; whether the Government will explore new uses of waste glass so as to increase the outlets for waste glass containers; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) given that in response to some demonstrators' digging up bricks from pavements in recent months for blocking roads and hurling at police officers, the Highways Department will switch to using concrete as the paving material

for some pavements, whether it has assessed how this move will affect the utilisation rate of eco-pavers;

(5) as the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) is undertaking preparatory work for the implementation of the Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage containers, of the latest implementation timetable for the Scheme, and whether the relevant preparatory work has been hindered due to the recent social disturbances;

(6) of the number of organisations/companies, since the EPD launched the Glass Container Recycling Charter (Charter) in January last year to invite the various sectors in the community to join hands in promoting glass container recovery, that have signed the Charter, as well as the effectiveness of the Charter; and

(7) of the number of organisations currently subsidised by the Environment and Conservation Fund to undertake recycling of waste glass containers; the total amount of the relevant subsidies and the total quantity of waste glass recovered by them in each of the past three years; the quantity recovered since June last year, and whether it has been affected by the recent social disturbances; whether the Government has plans to continue subsidising such organisations to undertake waste glass recovery work in the coming three years; if so, whether it will make adjustments to the subsidy arrangements?

Reply:

President,

The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) has appointed Glass Management Contractors (GMCs) to undertake the collection and treatment services for waste glass containers progressively across the territory since 2018. The GMCs provide recycling bins and associated collection services to parties or organisations that are interested in participating in waste glass container recycling, including residential estates, catering outlets, shopping malls, hotels, industrial and commercial premises, and government facilities.

My reply to the question raised by the Hon Chan Hak-kan is as follows:

(1) The total quantity of waste glass containers disposed of at landfills in 2018 was 77 400 tonnes. Relevant statistics for 2019 are still under compilation.

Glass containers are fragile and may cause danger to the public if they are not handled properly. For the sake of safety, most glass container recycling bins are equipped with a lock to prevent users or others from directly contacting or tampering with the waste glass containers inside.

However, in view of continued escalation of violent and illegal attacks in the society earlier, the Government temporarily suspended waste glass container collection service to better safeguard public safety. We would make

suitable arrangements for waste glass container collection service at different locations subject to the social situation.

(2) The glass management contracts for Hong Kong Island (including Islands District) and the New Territories came into effect in November 2017, and the contractor has been providing waste glass container collection service since January 2018. The contract for Kowloon came into effect in May 2018, and the contractor has been providing collection service since July 2018. As at October 2019, the quantities of waste glass containers collected under the three glass management contracts are as follows:

Glass management contract	Total quantity of waste glass containers collected in 2018 (tonnes)	Quantity of waste glass containers collected in 2019 (as at October 2019) (tonnes)
Hong Kong Island (including Islands District)	4 063	7 174
New Territories	3 600	6 214
Kowloon	1 913 (From July onwards)	5 736

Under the contracts, the service fees payable to the GMCs by the Government are primarily calculated based on the tonnage of collected waste glass containers that are treated. As at October 2019, the service fees calculated based on the quantities treated under the three glass management contracts are as follows:

Glass management contract	Total service fee calculated based on the quantity treated (HK\$ million)
Hong Kong Island (including Islands District)	22.85
New Territories	17.9
Kowloon	7.32

(3) The recovery rates of waste glass containers in the past three years are as follows:

Year	Recovery rate of waste glass containers
2017	12.1%
2018	16.3%
2019	Under compilation

From the commencement of respective glass management contracts up to October 2019, the major recycling outlets for the waste glass containers collected and treated by the GMCs are as follows:

Outlets for recycling	Quantity (tonnes)	Percentage
Production of cement	6 264	27 per cent
Production of eco-pavers	3 612	16 per cent
Exported abroad	2 832	12 per cent
Used as fill materials in local works projects	10 427	45 per cent
Total	23 135	100 per cent

Under the glass management contracts, the two GMCs are required to properly treat the waste glass containers and then arrange for their reuse and recycling. Currently, glass containers recovered and treated locally may be used for producing cement and eco-pavers, while some are exported for recycling. The recycled glass materials are also used as fill materials in public works projects. These outlets can absorb the glass materials recovered locally in full. Meanwhile, we have also encouraged the GMCs to continue exploring other outlets for recycled glass materials, such as the production of decorative tiles or other building materials.

(4) In pursuing green procurement in the Government, the EPD has been encouraging bureaux/departments to incorporate green specifications/features

during procurement, including the use of recycled and other green materials in public works projects. When reinstating pavements where paving blocks were removed by protestors, the Highways Department will, taking into account the practical circumstances, consider adopting suitable paving materials, and will also consider using green materials where practicable. Even if there is reduced use of eco-pavers, the GMCs' established recycling outlets can sufficiently absorb the recycled glass materials generated in Hong Kong.

(5) We are preparing the subsidiary legislation concerned to provide for the operational details for the implementation of the scheme. We plan to submit the subsidiary legislation for the Legislative Council (LegCo)'s scrutiny in 2020, and the actual implementation time would depend on the progress of relevant work of the LegCo.

(6) The EPD launched the Glass Container Recycling Charter (Charter) in January 2019. As at December 2019, about 980 participants have signed the Charter, including housing estates, shopping malls, hotels, restaurants and bars, commercial and industrial buildings, and about 30 per cent of them were new participants in waste glass container recycling. The awareness of the participants in waste glass container recycling has enhanced.

(7) To avoid overlapping of services with the glass management contracts awarded by the EPD, the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) has stopped approving new projects on waste glass container recovery since the second half of 2016. Projects approved by the ECF previously had been gradually taken over by the respective GMCs, which would continue to provide free collection and treatment services for waste glass containers in the districts concerned. The GMC of Hong Kong Island and the New Territories have taken over all relevant ECF projects since May 2018, and that of Kowloon in July 2018. Currently, the ECF does not provide direct subsidy to projects on waste glass container recovery.

---

## **LCQ2: Measures against doxxing**

Following is a question by the Hon Alice Mak and a reply by the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs, Mr Patrick Nip, in the Legislative Council today (January 8):

Question:

Since the occurrence of the disturbances arising from the proposed legislative amendments, quite a number of persons have engaged in doxxing police officers and persons holding different views (i.e. searching for and disclosing their personal information and that of their family members on the Internet), and the doxxed information has subsequently been used by others for harassing and threatening the victims and their family members. Some

persons holding different views have silenced themselves to avoid being doxxed. Moreover, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (PCPD) has indicated that in view of the multiple difficulties encountered in investigating and following up doxxing acts, it is actively studying the introduction of amendments to the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the number of complaints, received by PCPD since the occurrence of the disturbances arising from the proposed legislative amendments, about personal data being disclosed on the Internet without the consent of the data subjects, and how many persons' personal data were involved in the complaints; among such complaints, the number of those involving doxxing acts; the details of the follow-up actions taken by PCPD;

(2) as some social platforms have repeatedly refused to provide to PCPD the registration information or Internet protocol addresses of persons who uploaded the doxxing postings, whether the existing legislation has empowered PCPD to prosecute those social platforms; if so, of the number of prosecutions instituted by PCPD since the occurrence of the disturbances arising from the proposed legislative amendments; if not, the measures PCPD has in place to deal with this situation before the relevant legislation is amended; and

(3) whether it knows the latest progress of PCPD's study on the introduction of amendments to the aforesaid Ordinance; whether the Government will accept the proposed legislative amendments of empowering PCPD to search for and seize evidence, and to conduct prosecution, etc., and whether it has drawn up a timetable for introducing such legislative amendments; if so, of the details; if not, whether it will draw up such a timetable; of the measures the authorities will take before the completion of the legislative amendment process, in order to protect the privacy of persons who have been doxxed during the disturbances arising from the proposed legislative amendments?

Reply:

President,

After consulting the Security Bureau and the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (PCPD), my consolidated reply to the question raised by Hon Alice Mak is as follows:

(1) and (2) The Government is deeply concerned about the incidents of doxxing that took place over a recent period of time in the society. The PCPD received the first doxxing case related to the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance on June 14, 2019. As at December 31, 2019, the PCPD has received and proactively uncovered over 4 300 doxxing-related cases, the latest number of cases is 4 700. The victims of doxxing are from all sorts of backgrounds and all walks of life with various views, among which police officers and their family members are the single largest sector of people falling victim to doxxing. Among these cases, over 1 500 cases (representing around 36 per cent of total cases) involved police officers and their family

members. One hundred and eighty cases were related to doxxing on government officials and public servants (representing around 4 per cent of total cases). In addition to public servants, there are also members of the public (representing around 30 per cent of total cases) who were doxxed for stating their support for the government or the Police. On the other hand, some members of the public were doxxed after making online comments against the government or the Police (accounting for about 10 per cent of total cases). Some others were dissatisfied with the behaviour of protestors and disclosed their personal data online (accounting for about 20 per cent of total cases).

Under the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (PDPO), the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (the Commissioner) is empowered to conduct investigations and inspections, and is vested with the authority to discharge investigative functions, including entering into premises, summoning witnesses and requiring the persons concerned to furnish information to the Commissioner. However, the Commissioner has no authority to carry out criminal investigation or initiate prosecution on his own. At present, criminal investigations are conducted by the Police, and prosecutions, if so required, are initiated by the Department of Justice. As at December 31, 2019, the PCPD has referred more than 1 400 doxxing cases to the Police in accordance with the law for further criminal investigation. It is currently stipulated under section 64(2) of the PDPO that any person who discloses any personal data of a data subject which was obtained from a data user without the data user's consent, and such disclosure causes psychological harm to the data subject, that person has committed an offence and is liable on conviction to a maximum penalty of a fine of HK\$1,000,000 and to imprisonment for up to five years. As at December 31, 2019, a total of eight persons were arrested by the Police for alleged violation of such provision. On September 25, 2019, a man was charged with an offence relating to "conspiracy to disclosing personal data obtained without data users' consent" under section 64 of the PDPO for alleged improper disclosure of the personal data of other individuals on the Internet. The case will be heard again by the court on January 15, 2020.

Apart from referring the cases to the Police for follow-up, the PCPD has also reminded operators of relevant websites, online social media platforms or discussion forums that they should prevent their platforms from being abused as a tool for infringing personal data privacy. It has also requested the operators concerned to issue on their platforms warnings to netizens that doxxing behaviour may violate the PDPO. With regard to the doxxing cases, the PCPD has actively approached and written for over 140 times to operators of websites, online social media platforms and discussion forums involving doxxing postings, urging them to remove over 2 500 relevant web links, of which close to 70 per cent has been removed. The PCPD will continue to review relevant platforms and pursue follow-up and will spare no efforts in keeping doxxing in check.

Furthermore, on October 25, 2019, the court granted an injunction order restraining any person from using, publishing, communicating or disclosing personal data of any police officer(s) or their family members intended or likely to intimidate, molest, harass, threaten or pester any police

officer(s) or their family members without consent of the persons concerned; from intimidating, molesting, harassing, threatening or pestering any police officer(s) or their family members; or from assisting, inciting, abetting or authorising others to commit any of these acts. As at December 31, 2019, the PCPD has referred 40 cases it had received and found to have allegedly violated the injunction order of the court to the Department of Justice for follow-up.

(3) In response to the spate of major data breach incidents last year, we are now working with the PCPD to review and consider the amendments to the PDPO, with a view to better safeguarding personal data privacy. Drawing on the experience in handling the doxxing cases concerned over the past months, the PCPD reflected to us that there is room to enhance the PDPO for tackling the problem of doxxing, including to consider introducing legislative amendments to more specifically address doxxing, conferring on the Commissioner statutory powers to request the removal of doxxing contents from social media platforms and websites, as well as the powers to carry out criminal investigation and prosecution, etc. We are seriously examining how the PDPO should be amended with the PCPD. Relevant considerations include a number of legal issues related to the regulation of doxxing-related behaviour, such as how the offence should be defined and the need to strike a balance among the protection of personal data privacy, freedom of expression and free flow of information. We note that some other jurisdictions have started to take actions to regulate doxxing recently. For example, Singapore passed the Protection from Harassment (Amendment) Act 2019 last year. We will consider the actual circumstances of Hong Kong in the light of the relevant legislation of other jurisdictions on the regulation of doxxing, and consult relevant stakeholders in examining the direction and details of introducing legislative amendments.

Prior to the completion of legislative amendments, the Police will continue to tackle doxxing in accordance with section 64 of the PDPO. The PCPD will actively pursue relevant work on safeguarding personal data privacy, including the referral of relevant cases to the Police for follow-up, proactive liaising and writing to operators of doxxing-related platforms to request the removal of relevant web links and issuance of warnings on the platforms to netizens that doxxing may violate the PDPO.

Thank you, President.