

SCS visits Marine Department (with photos)

The Secretary for the Civil Service, Mr Joshua Law, visited the Marine Department today (May 9) and met with its management and frontline staff to learn more about the department's work and challenges.

Accompanied by the Permanent Secretary for the Civil Service, Mr Thomas Chow, Mr Law first met with the Director of Marine, Ms Maisie Cheng, and the directorate staff to get an update on the department's work concerning maritime and navigational safety.

He then toured the Vessel Traffic Centre (VTC) located at the Hong Kong-Macau Ferry Terminal to find out how the VTC, with the help of the newly upgraded third generation Vessel Traffic Services system, monitors vessels' movements in Hong Kong waters round the clock and facilitates the safe arrival and departure of the vessels.

He also boarded a department patrol launch at Central Government Pier to learn more about how frontline officers support the VTC in co-ordinating actions to facilitate safe navigation and patrolling duties in places such as anchorages, fairways and cargo working areas.

In addition, Mr Law visited the Maritime Rescue Co-ordination Centre (MRCC) to learn more about its operation. The MRCC, equipped with advanced Global Maritime Distress and Safety Systems, co-ordinates search and rescue operations during maritime distress situations in Hong Kong waters and within the Hong Kong Search and Rescue Region in the South China Sea.

At a tea gathering with staff representatives of various grades, Mr Law exchanged views on matters of concern. He also encouraged them to continue to provide quality and professional marine services to the public.





Application of Financial Technology in Personal Lending Business

The following is issued on behalf of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority:

The Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA) issued today (May 9) guidelines to banks on Credit Risk Management for Personal Lending Business. The guidelines allow banks to adopt innovative technology to manage credit risks related to personal lending business, in a bid to improve customer experience in the digital environment.

Under the new guidelines, banks may carve out a portion of their personal lending portfolio as "New Personal-Lending Portfolio" (NPP), in respect of which adherence to conventional lending practices will not be required. Instead of collecting borrowers' income proof to assess their repayment ability, banks may adopt new credit risk management techniques and practices enabled by innovative technology, such as big data and consumer behavioural analytics, to approve and manage the related credit risks.

To ensure proper management of the associated risks, banks should set a limit for the NPP, which should not exceed 10 per cent of their capital base. At the initial stage, the amount of credit extended to individual borrowers

should generally be smaller than that of conventional credit products. In applying new credit risk management techniques and practices, banks should conduct the lending business in a responsible manner and provide customers with adequate information, including key product features and their repayment obligations under the loan product, to enable them to make informed borrowing decisions and avoid over-indebtedness. The HKMA will review the effectiveness of the new risk management practices at a suitable juncture, and consider the future scope of application of the new arrangements.

The Deputy Chief Executive of the HKMA, Mr Arthur Yuen, said, "The new guidelines will enable banks to be more innovative and adopt more financial technology in personal lending business in order to improve digital customer experience. This is also a major development in banking supervision."

As part of the HKMA's seven initiatives to promote Smart Banking in Hong Kong in September, 2017, the Banking Made Easy initiative aims to streamline banking supervisory practices, thereby facilitating the application of financial technology, in a bid to improve digital customer experience. The new guidelines are developed after consultation with banks and tech firms undertaken by the HKMA's Banking Made Easy taskforce.

[Tender of 2-Year Exchange Fund Notes to be held on May 18](#)

The following is issued on behalf of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority:

The Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA) announces that a tender of 2-year Exchange Fund Notes will be held on May 18, 2018 (Friday) for settlement on May 21, 2018 (Monday), as set out in the tentative issuance schedule announced on February 15, 2018. This is to roll over an issue of 2-year Exchange Fund Notes maturing on the same day.

A total of HK\$1,200 million 2-year Notes will be on offer, of which HK\$5 million will be made available for offer to members of the public who wish to submit non-competitive tender bids through Hong Kong Securities Clearing Company Limited (HKSCC). If the Notes reserved for non-competitive tender are under-subscribed, the non-subscribed amount will be added to the portion of notes for competitive tender (initially set at HK\$1,195 million). The Notes will mature on May 21, 2020 and will carry interest at the rate of 1.79% per annum payable semi-annually in arrears.

Members of the public who wish to submit non-competitive tender applications for Notes that are open to HKSCC may do so through Stock Exchange Participants/Brokers, or for those who hold Investor Accounts of the Central Clearing and Settlement System (CCASS) at the HKSCC, directly through

HKSCC, for submission to the HKMA for processing. Competitive tender applications for the Notes must be submitted through any of the Eligible Market Makers on the current published list, which can be obtained from the HKMA at 55/F, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street, Central, Hong Kong (telephone 2878 1465), or from the HKMA's website at www.hkma.gov.hk; Each tender must be for an amount of HK\$50,000 or integral multiples thereof for both competitive and non-competitive tender.

The tender results will be published on the HKMA's website, the Reuters screen (HKMA00E), and Bloomberg. Applicants who submitted non-competitive tender bids through HKSCC may also obtain the tender results from Stock Exchange Participants/Brokers, or for applicants who hold Investor Accounts at HKSCC's CCASS from the CCASS terminal for CCASS Broker/Custodian/Participants and CCASS Phone System.

Hong Kong Monetary Authority Exchange Fund Note Programme Tender Information

Tender information of 2-Year Exchange Fund Notes:

Issue Number	:	02Y2005
Stock code	:	4072 (EFN 1.79 2005)
Tender date and time	:	May 18, 2018 (Friday) 9.30am to 10.30am
Issue and Settlement Date	:	May 21, 2018 (Monday)
Amount on offer	:	HK\$1,200 million (up to HK\$5 million for non-competitive tender)
Commencement of/ Deadline for submission of non- competitive tender bids by retail investors through HKSCC	:	Please refer to requirements as set down by HKSCC
Maturity	:	Two years
Maturity Date	:	May 21, 2020
Interest Rate	:	1.79% p.a.
Interest Payment Dates	:	November 21, 2018 May 21, 2019 November 21, 2019 May 21, 2020

Each tender must be for an amount of HK\$50,000 or integral multiples thereof for both competitive and non-competitive tender. Members of the public who wish to apply for the Notes through non-competitive tenders that are open to HKSCC may do so through Stock Exchange Participants/ Brokers, or for those who hold Investors Accounts at HKSCC's CCASS, directly through HKSCC. Members of the public who wish to apply for the Notes through competitive tender may only do so through any of the Eligible Market Makers on the current published list.

Tender amount

: Participants/ Brokers, or for those who hold Investors Accounts at HKSCC's CCASS, directly through HKSCC. Members of the public who wish to apply for the Notes through competitive tender may only do so through any of the Eligible Market Makers on the current published list.

Please see Information Memorandum published or approach Eligible

Other details

: Market Makers, HKSCC, or brokers who are Exchange Participants of the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong.

Expected commencement date of dealing on the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong

: May 23, 2018

Price/Yield Table of the new EFN at tender for reference* only:

Yield-to-Maturity	Price	Yield-to-Maturity	Price
0.79	101.98	1.79	100.02
0.84	101.88	1.84	99.92
0.89	101.78	1.89	99.82
0.94	101.68	1.94	99.73
0.99	101.59	1.99	99.63
1.04	101.49	2.04	99.53
1.09	101.39	2.09	99.44
1.14	101.29	2.14	99.34
1.19	101.19	2.19	99.24
1.24	101.09	2.24	99.15
1.29	100.99	2.29	99.05
1.34	100.89	2.34	98.96
1.39	100.80	2.39	98.86
1.44	100.70	2.44	98.77
1.49	100.60	2.49	98.67
1.54	100.50	2.54	98.58
1.59	100.40	2.59	98.48
1.64	100.31	2.64	98.39
1.69	100.21	2.69	98.29

1.74	100.11	2.74	98.20
1.79	100.02	2.79	98.10

* Disclaimer

The information provided here is for reference only. Although extreme care has been taken to ensure that the information provided is accurate and up-to-date, the HKMA does not warrant that all, or any part of, the information provided is accurate in all respects. You are encouraged to conduct your own enquiries to verify any particular piece of information provided on it. The HKMA shall not be liable for any loss or damage suffered as a result of any use or reliance on any of the information provided here.

LCQ11: Introduction of mandatory cooling-off period to protect consumers

Following is a question by the Hon Shiu Ka-fai and a written reply by the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development, Mr Edward Yau, in the Legislative Council today (May 9):

Question:

Earlier on, the Government allocated funds to commission the Consumer Council to conduct a study on the introduction of a statutory cooling-off period. In this connection, the Consumer Council submitted to the Government last month A Report to Advocate Mandatory Cooling-Off Period in Hong Kong (the Report), recommending the introduction of a mandatory cooling-off period targeting certain industries (including the beauty industry) and specific transaction modes. The Government has indicated that it plans to submit the relevant proposed legislative framework to this Council within this year. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether the Government and the Consumer Council have assessed the impacts of the introduction of a mandatory cooling-off regime on the business environment; if so, of the outcome; if not, why the Consumer Council has made the relevant recommendation on enacting legislation;

(2) as the Consumer Council has indicated that it has examined the legislation on mandatory cooling-off periods in various jurisdictions, if the Government knows whether there are jurisdictions which have introduced a mandatory cooling-off regime for the beauty industry; if there are, of such jurisdictions and the relevant details; if there are not, whether the Consumer Council has enquired with various jurisdictions and studied carefully the reasons for various jurisdictions not having put in place the

relevant regime;

(3) whether it knows if the Consumer Council has studied which jurisdictions in which a voluntary cooling-off regime for certain industries have now been put in place; if the Consumer Council has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) as the Report has pointed out that sales practices which seriously damage the rights and interests of consumers have emerged from time to time in individual industries, whether it knows if the Consumer Council can provide details and objective evidence to support such a remark; if no such details and objective evidence are available, why the Consumer Council has made such a remark in the Report;

(5) whether the Government and the Consumer Council have assessed the prevalence of using distance contracts as a transaction mode in economic activities and the impacts of introducing a mandatory cooling-off regime on such activities, e.g. a distributor not being able to return the products returned by consumers to the general agent and hence suffering a loss; if they have not assessed, why the Consumer Council has made the relevant regulatory proposal;

(6) as the Report has pointed out that various types of unfair trade practices have emerged in the beauty industry in recent years, whether it knows if the Consumer Council can provide objective evidence to support such a remark; how the data on the adoption of unfair trade practices by operators in the beauty industry compare with the relevant data in other industries;

(7) among the complaints in relation to the beauty industry received by the Consumer Council from 2013 to 2017 as set out in the Report, of the number of those which have been found substantiated;

(8) whether it has assessed if the complaint figure, based on which the Consumer Council made the remark that operators in the beauty industry had adopted various types of unfair trade practices, covers complaints which have not yet been substantiated; if the figure does, whether the Government has assessed if such an approach is prudent, objective and fair;

(9) among the various types of complaints received by the Consumer Council in each of the past three years, of the number of those which have been found substantiated and the amounts of money involved (set out the breakdown by type in a table);

(10) whether it knows the justifications for the Consumer Council coming to the view that the duration of the cooling-off period should not be less than seven days;

(11) whether it knows the justifications for the Consumer Council recommending that the time limit for traders to make a refund should not be more than 14 days;

(12) as the Consumer Council has recommended that if the consumer has requested for using the services concerned during the cooling-off period, the

trader can deduct from the refund the value of the service used and the amount shall be calculated pro rata to the total consideration stipulated in the contract, whether the Government knows the Consumer Council's justifications for recommending that the mandatory cooling-off regime be applicable to cases in which the consumer has started using the service concerned; whether, before making this recommendation, the Consumer Council has considered (i) the fact that the trader's cost of providing a single unit of goods or service to the customer is usually higher than that of providing a batch of such goods or service, making it very likely for the trader to eventually bear the relevant differences in the cost, and (ii) if this recommendation will induce many people to exploit the loophole to enjoy part of the services at a lower average price through the purchase of packages;

(13) whether it knows if the Consumer Council has considered whether the mandatory cooling-off regime should apply to cases involving existing customers; if the Consumer Council has and the outcome is in the affirmative, of the justifications; if the consideration outcome is in the negative, why the Consumer Council has not recommended in the Report the granting of exemptions to such cases;

(14) as the Consumer Council has recommended that if the consumer has paid by credit card, the trader is to be allowed to deduct, when making a refund, an administrative fee of not more than three per cent of the credit card transaction value, whether the Government knows if the proposed administrative fee level is sufficient to offset the related expenses that the trader has incurred (e.g. the costs arising from advance payment for the refund and waiting for refund by the card-issuing bank) and the various handling fees and transaction fees that the bank charges the trader for the refund; if it may not be sufficient to offset such expenses, why the Consumer Council has made this recommendation;

(15) whether it knows if the Consumer Council has discussed its recommendations with the banking industry to understand the corresponding business strategies which card-issuing banks will adopt; if the Consumer Council has discussed, of the response of card-issuing banks; if not, how the Consumer Council ascertains the feasibility of its recommendations;

(16) whether it knows if the Consumer Council has considered the following scenarios: card-issuing banks may increase the refund handling fees or other transaction fees for customers' purchase-by-installment transactions, impose an additional requirement for using cash or assets as collateral for security, or even delay paying traders the relevant monies for as long as half a year because they have to set aside funds for making refunds, and such practices will increase the operating costs of traders or even render it impossible for them to operate, resulting in closure of their businesses;

(17) whether it knows the justifications for the Consumer Council to recommend that the consumer may request a refund without giving any reasons, and whether it has considered if this recommendation may lead to abuses or even be exploited as a strategy to undermine competitors in the business arena, which may eventually throw the market into chaos; and

(18) as the Consumer Council has recommended that a mandatory cooling-off period be imposed on contracts for beauty services with a duration of not less than six months, whether the Government knows the justifications for the Consumer Council setting six months as the minimum duration of such contracts; whether it will consider bringing this minimum duration on par with the recommended minimum duration for timeshare contracts, i.e. imposing a cooling-off period only on contracts for beauty services with a duration of more than one year?

Reply:

President,

Having consulted the Consumer Council (the Council), a consolidated reply to the 18 parts of the question is provided below:

According to the Council, the Report to Advocate Mandatory Cooling-Off Period in Hong Kong (the Report) aims to recommend to the Government the imposition of a mandatory cooling-off period, and suggests principles for a legislative proposal. Over the years, the Council has been encouraging traders to provide cooling-off period on a voluntary basis, and has worked with and encouraged different industries (including the beauty and fitness industries) to put in place voluntary cooling-off arrangements for consumer protection. The Council's study does not cover cooling-off arrangements offered on a voluntary basis by traders in other jurisdictions. Insofar as the local market is concerned, according to the Council's understanding, some traders of the timeshare, beauty and fitness industries provide a cooling-off period to consumers. However, as traders are scattered and their scales of operation vary, ensuring that all traders in the industries provide voluntary cooling-off period would be difficult and challenging. The Council also notes that the cooling-off periods offered by individual traders are subject to different terms, which cause disputes from time to time, for example the cooling-off period only lasts for 24 hours, contracts cannot be cancelled once the supply of service has begun or free gifts has been received, and a high cancellation fee is charged. Given the various limitations imposed by these terms, voluntary cooling-off arrangement cannot effectively protect consumers. Therefore, the Council considers it necessary to impose a mandatory cooling-off period, with operational arrangements regulated by statutory provisions.

The Report shows that the arrangements on cooling-off period imposed in the jurisdictions studied vary depending on the consumer culture, development of specific industries, and the nature of unfair trade practices encountered by the local consumers. Nevertheless, the commonality shared by the arrangements is that they require the provision of mandatory cooling-off periods that target consumer contracts in specific sectors or specific transactions. The focus of the Council's study is to recommend a solution to improve the situation of unfair trade practices deployed by traders in Hong Kong. According to the complaints statistics of the Council, the numbers of complaints about sales practices of the beauty industry were 225 in 2013, 407 in 2014, 515 in 2015, 444 in 2016, and 373 in 2017 respectively, representing

more than 30 per cent of all complaints against the industry on average. The total amounts involved ranged from over \$4 million to over \$17 million, with the average being \$33,000 per case. As for complaints against the fitness industry, the numbers of complaints about sales practice were 268 in 2013, 342 in 2014, 431 in 2015, 328 in 2016, and 221 in 2017 respectively, representing more than 40 per cent of all complaints against the industry on average. The total amounts involved ranged from \$6.8 million to over \$14 million, with the average being \$36,000 per case. The Council is not a law enforcement agency and does not have the power to conduct investigations. When a consumer complaint is received, the Council will help the consumer and trader resolve their dispute through conciliation. The Council points out in the Report that common malpractices deployed by salespersons in the beauty and fitness industries include prolonged sales pitches by a number of staff for a long period of time; using different excuses to take away the identity cards or credit cards of the consumers; and using the credit cards of consumers to purchase service without the consumers' consent etc. Considering that the numbers of complaints against beauty and fitness industries are relatively higher, involve larger amounts, and often relate to high pressure sales, the Council therefore recommends imposing a mandatory cooling-off period on these industries.

In addition to examining the legislation on mandatory cooling-off period in a number of jurisdictions, the Council has also taken into account the views and concerns of different industries regarding mandatory cooling-off period. In formulating its recommendations, the Council has considered the trades' ability to bear, and recommended various measures to lower the compliance cost of relevant traders and guard against consumer abuse of the arrangement, such as consumers would need to pay for the services consumed during the cooling-off period, and traders could charge an administrative fee of not more than three per cent of the credit card transaction value. The Council considers that the imposition of a mandatory cooling-off period would not result in a large number of consumers cancelling their contracts with legitimate traders, therefore the impact should be limited. In addition, as some jurisdictions outside Hong Kong have already imposed mandatory cooling-off period in consumer contracts in different sectors (e.g. fitness services) or specific types of transactions (e.g. unsolicited contracts and distance contracts) for many years, and the Council's recommendations have made reference to the experience of those jurisdictions, the Council believes that a balance has been struck between protecting consumers' legitimate rights and maintaining a business-friendly environment.

In considering the duration of the cooling-off period, the Council made reference to factors including (1) cooling-off periods in other jurisdictions last for three to 14 days (including 14 days in the United Kingdom, three working days in the United States, and seven days in the Mainland). Since Hong Kong has no existing legislation on mandatory cooling-off period, the Council is mindful of the effect of cooling-off period on traders and consumers, and recommends that the cooling-off period should not be too long or too short to facilitate adjustment and learning from implementation experience; (2) a cooling-off period that is too long may generate other problems, such as a protracted cooling-off period may more easily lead to

wear and tear of goods, cause disputes between the parties on compensation, affect the business operation and cash flow of traders, or lead to abuse more easily; (3) if the cooling-off period is too short, consumers may not have enough time to consider their decision and submit their cancellation notice. Therefore, having considered all factors, the Council is of the view that a cooling-off period of not less than seven days is reasonable. Similarly, for the time limit for refund, the Council has made reference to the practices in other jurisdictions (including 14 days in the United Kingdom, 10 working days in the United States, and 15 days in the Mainland) and considers that making a refund within 14 days is a reasonable timeframe.

On whether to allow the deduction of administrative fee, the Council's study shows that the mainstream practice of other jurisdictions is to prohibit traders from deducting any administrative fee from the refund. However, the Council notes that credit card is the major payment tool used in Hong Kong, and that while the service charge for use of credit cards is specified in the commercial agreement between the acquiring banks/companies and traders, credit card transactions normally involve a certain amount of service charge. On the premise that the exercise of the cooling-off right is not hindered, the Council considers that traders should be allowed to deduct a small amount of administrative fee when consumers use credit card to settle payment. This can relieve the compliance costs of traders and minimise consumer abuse. The Council, having considered the general level of relevant charge, recommends that an administrative fee of not more than three per cent of the credit card transaction value may be deducted by traders from the refund when consumers pay by credit card. In the course of its study, the Council did not come across views expressed in other jurisdictions concerning acquiring banks/companies increasing their administrative fees for refund or delaying payment to traders because of the imposition of cooling-off period. The Council is of the view such matters are commercial arrangements between the acquiring banks/companies and traders, and not directly related to the imposition of cooling-off period.

Regarding the scope of application of the mandatory cooling-off period, the Council recommends that all contracts specified should be regulated except for those that are exempted. The Council also recommends that, if consumers request for service to be provided during the cooling-off period, traders should be allowed to deduct the value of the services consumed, and such value should be calculated on a pro-rata basis based on the total price set out in the contract. If an existing consumer renews or signs a new contract, and that contract falls under the scope of the mandatory cooling-off regime, the Council recommends that the consumer should also be protected by the mandatory cooling-off regime. Overall speaking, for legitimate traders in general, the Council considers that the imposition of a mandatory cooling-off period will not lead to a large number of consumers cancelling their contracts, therefore the impact should be limited. To the contrary, the Council believes that mandatory cooling-off period could enhance consumer confidence and may benefit the business of relevant industries.

The Council considers that contracts involving long duration or prepayment warrant special attention from consumers, as the Council's

statistics show that quite a number of complaints relating to unfair trade practices are related to contracts with long duration or involving prepayment, for instance, as salespersons may easily be enticed by the large transaction amount to deploy unfair trade practices in order to increase their sales or commission income. The Council states that, if mandatory cooling-off period is imposed on services contracts with a shorter duration, protection for consumers may be enhanced but traders' operation will be affected more; if mandatory cooling-off period is imposed on services contracts with a longer duration, protection for consumers will be diminished. On balance, the Council considers that imposing cooling-off period on beauty and fitness services contracts with a contract duration of over six months or involving prepayment is a reasonable arrangement. The Council points out that timeshare contracts are different from general consumer contracts, as the terms of the former are relatively more complicated, often involving overseas properties, large amounts of prepayment or long payment periods, therefore they are not comparable to beauty and fitness service contracts.

The Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (CEDB) is working with relevant Government departments to study various issues relating to legislating on cooling-off period arrangement, including the scope of application; definitions of sectors; implementation details; redress mechanism; and exemptions, etc.; and consider the appropriate implementation arrangements. The recommendations in the paragraphs above are the Council's recommendations made after its study. CEDB will consider the Council's recommendations in detail and make specific policy decisions. We will also listen to views of various sectors regarding legislating on cooling-off period arrangement. For the next steps, our goal is to submit the Government's proposed framework to the Legislative Council within this year, and consult the public thereafter.

LCQ8: Industrial accidents of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Main Bridge

Following is a question by the Hon Chu Hoi-dick and a written reply by the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Mr Frank Chan Fan, in the Legislative Council today (May 9):

Question:

The Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Authority (the HZMB Authority), jointly established by the governments of Hong Kong, the Guangdong Province and Macao, is responsible for the construction and operation of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB). In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that the information provided by the HZMB Authority, as quoted by the Transport and Housing Bureau, indicates that since the commencement of the part in Mainland waters of the construction works of the HZMB Main Bridge project, a total of nine fatal industrial accidents resulting in nine deaths in total have happened so far, whether the Government knows the following details of each of such accidents (set out in a table):

- (i) the date and time of the accident,
- (ii) the location of the accident,
- (iii) the name and post title of the deceased,
- (iv) the gender and age of the deceased,
- (v) the sequence of events leading to the accident,
- (vi) the progress and outcome of the investigation into the cause of the accident, and
- (vii) the amount of the employee's compensation and the disbursement progress;

(2) whether it knows the number of serious work injury accidents since the commencement of the part in Mainland waters of the construction works of the HZMB Main Bridge project, and the resultant number of injuries, as well as the details of each of such accidents; and

(3) given that the Zhuhai Housing, Urban-Rural Planning and Development Bureau indicated in a gazette issued in October 2016 that an accident of collapse of structure and drowning of workers had happened in the HZMB Zhuhai boundary crossing facilities (BCF) project in August of the same year causing one death, whether the Government knows (i) if this deceased person was not counted towards the nine deaths mentioned in (1), and (ii) the respective numbers of industrial accidents as well as the resultant deaths and serious work injuries since the commencement of the construction works of the HZMB Zhuhai BCF and Macao BCF projects, and the details of each of such accidents?

Reply:

President,

My reply to the various parts of the Hon Chu Hoi-dick's question is as follows:

The entire Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) project consists of two parts: (i) the HZMB Main Bridge (i.e. a 22.9 km-long bridge and a 6.7 km-long subsea tunnel) situated in Mainland waters which is being taken forward by the HZMB Authority; and (ii) the link roads and boundary crossing facilities under the respective responsibility of the governments of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao.

The HZMB Authority is directly responsible for the construction and management of the HZMB Main Bridge. In the event of industrial accidents or cases of work injuries, the contractors concerned are required to report to the HZMB Authority and the relevant local government department(s) in a timely manner. According to the information provided by the HZMB Authority,

since the commencement of construction of the HZMB Main Bridge, there were nine fatal accidents relating to the Main Bridge causing the death of nine workers. The details of the cases are at Annex. Apart from the nine fatal cases mentioned above, the HZMB Authority indicated that they had not received reports of other work injuries.

As regards the accident at the HZMB Zhuhai boundary crossing facilities project in August 2016 referred to in the question, the HZMB Authority indicated that the accident did not occur within the area of the HZMB Main Bridge project and therefore it was not included in the above nine accidents.

Based on the territoriality principle, the governments of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao should be responsible for the link roads and boundary crossing facilities within their own boundaries; we do not have the information on industrial accidents that occurred in the sites of either the Zhuhai or Macao boundary crossing facilities project.