

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
2 JULY 2015
N HALL
10:00 LOCAL TIME
INTERNET OPENNESS AND TRANSPARENCY REPORTING
CRITICAL INTERNET RESOURCES
SESSION 23

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning
are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility
and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

Live captioning at APrIGF Macao 2015 is brought to you by
Internet Society

>> JENNIFER ZHANG: Good morning, everyone.

So thank you for coming to our session called Internet
transparency and the Internet openness in Hong Kong.

It is a pleasure for me to have two panelists with me. One
is Glacier Kwong from Keyboard Frontline and the other Clement
Chen from the University of Hong Kong. First we'll talk about
the transparency reporting situation in Hong Kong, and then
we'll introduce the project of Glacier Kwong in Keyboard
Frontline and then Clement will talk about Freedom of
Information and the information law in Hong Kong.

First of all, I would like to give you a brief introduction
of the Hong Kong transparency reports.

I would like to introduce our project. We're under the
media study center, HKU and the project started in 2013. We
mostly research the Hong Kong government's surveillance and we
do advocacy for transparency reporting and the government
accountability

A brief background for our project: As you all know, there is the Edward Snowden revolution in the U.S. which has leaked dramatic -- a bunch of the government's access of the users metadata, so based on this. So based on this revolution we think that the Hong Kong government, we need to hold the Hong Kong government accountable as well to research on how many surveillance activities and data requests are being done by the Hong Kong governments. Why do we need the transparency reporting? First we know that the law enforcements, it is their duty to come back and to detect prevent crimes by conducting surveillance activities which poses privacy risks for the Internet users.

Then the Internet users, themselves, they have the right to know whether the government's access to their data is related, necessary and proportionate.

Obviously, it is good for the government and companies to have accountability by voluntarily releasing their user data and content removal requests. As we all know -- -- sunlight, they're the best for that.

We're all familiar with the article 17 of the international covenant on the civil and political rights and the citizens privacy, it is also protected and that's in Hong Kong's basic law, and when the law enforcement in Hong Kong, they try -- they want to conduct surveillance activities, their activities are regulated under the interception of communications and surveillance ordinance and the personal data privacy ordinance.

So for our Hong Kong transparency report we -- we have two major parts. The first part is the government's surveillance and interception report, which is released annually by our surveillance and interception commissioner.

The second report, it is a new report, the government hasn't released this report yet. We need to gather the data ourselves, which is the government's request for subscribers and don't removal from the Internet service providers and the online service providers.

The last is the surveillance reports, under the interception of communications and surveillance ordinance of Hong Kong, the interception commissioner is required to release the annual report on the Hong Kong law enforcement's surveillance activities. Here is our incumbent interception Commissioner who used to be a judge before his current position. Here is the interception Commissioner's annual report. We review the reports in the last three years.

As you see, the -- the authorization of the interception, the number for these organizations, it has grown, it has almost shown a growing trend. This report is part of a comprehensive -- it is showing the authorizations, the

rejections and also the person, the people arrested and -- under the authorizations for interception and for surveillance.

If we -- if we look at a report on the civil subscribers, that request, we want to know how many requests the government sent to the ISPs, OSPs each year and how many requests they had and how many accounts were affected are basic elements and the reasons for such requests.

So this part, for the second reports the government -- so for this part, the second reports the government has not voluntarily released information yet. We work to have our Hong Kong legislature to request the government to release that data, Charles Mok. In February, 2013, Charles Mok asked the gov to release the number of the user of the Hong Kong removable requests and the government produced this data. The original file format is in a PDF file. As you may say, so it has several categories such as the government department, which government departments and subscribers that requested and the general reasons for making such requests, the details of the requests, of the required requested items, whether the requests were acceded to and the reason given by the ISP for rejecting the request. Then based on that preliminary report, we have analyzed that and seeking missing data, mostly by using the code on access to information in Hong Kong, and then we also utilize the data requests each year and also the Hong Kong government's content removable requests. As you see, we also categorized the request by the different departments.

For this, it is covering 2014 from January to October. As you see, the Hong Kong police force is the biggest requester for the user data. We also categorized the reasons for the users subscribers that have requested in 2014. As you see, the majority, 98% of the requests were related to crime prevention and detection. Also for the removable requests, the biggest request comes from the Department of Health and drug office. The reason for the removable requests is mostly the registered medicines or drugs, so we just had an overview of the numbers, but we need to ask what these numbers did not tell us. First is -- there were actually no laws or regulations governing the law enforcement agency's access to the subscribers metadata and there was no regulatory or legal framework for the content removable request. There is no independent oversight over the law enforcements requesting or continuing the removable processes and there is no way to justify the government's request and what's more, there was no standard documenting or reporting mechanism.

I just want to give you a brief overview of the two reports we analyzed, and then as you may have noticed, lastly, it is the occupy movement, it has also triggered the public's speculation

over the law enforcements controversial use of authority on the cyberspace. Firstly there were across the life cycle visits fearing that the law enforcement is conducting unauthorized surveillance -- there were activists fearing -- and then they were fearing the government is using the cybercrime law to crackdown on pro-democracy organizers and we set up a database to record such an online speech of related arrests. So far we have recorded none and most of them are arrested based on access to computer with criminal or dishonesty.

If we look at content removal, we see an increase of the content removable requests from the police during the period of early August of 2014.

There were media reports on the Hong Kong -- during the occupy period, there was a lot of reporters and demonstrations that were organized on social media such as Facebook and the golden forum, the Hong Kong local forum, it is popular in Hong Kong, and the police, they have -- the police, the workforce in this January, and they have been arresting the social media activists who posted radical comments online which is, again, public speculation over whether the police is using its power to achieve a political purpose and a crackdown on the freedom of speech. So all this, the public wants to know whether the government is monitoring activists, whether the government's evidence can be justified and if there is a privacy protection online. We can look at the transparency reporting and then the law enforcement, in the name of preventing, the detecting of crimes, the users have requested the removable requests to ISPs and they have a choice to either comply with this request or reject such requests. We have civil societies who actively advocate for user's privacy rights.

A last look at the companies in the transparency reporting context: In 2014 the United Nations of the High Commissioner Of Human Rights issued a report on right to privacy in the digital age, the Internet companies are expected to communicate trans apparently with users about risks and compliance with government demands as a way to honor Human Rights principles. The Hong Kong transparency report, we found that at least six multinational companies have released their transparency reports revealing the requests they received from the Hong Kong governments.

As you see, Google received the biggest amount of requests, followed by Microsoft and Yahoo.

At our local level, the Hong Kong Internet service providers association, they have also started drafting a code of practice for release of information. Basically when they request law enforcement mostly the police force and the customers, they fill in a form and it explains the reasons for

requesting user's data. And this is to formalize this process.

Still, in Hong Kong, most of Hong Kong local Internet companies, they still have not set up a clear guidelines to respond to a government request for subscribers meta data, such as their IP address, Internet transactions, they have not set up a transparency reporting mechanism and so we cannot help but asking how can users trust these companies in handling their data?

A last look at the Civil Society perspective: Internationally we know that the electronic foundation has issued a who has your back study each year to evaluate the big Internet companies respect for users' privacy rights and then we have the new ranking digital rights project to rank the codes with respect to user privacy and the Human Rights. We have the University of Toronto who has released another survey evaluating their local Canadian telcos and of course we have the Civil Society access that's launched its own transparency reporting index.

This is the who has your back, this year, there was -- there was a considerable amount of reports on this as you see. It only landed one star, and it doesn't -- it has not yet released their own best practices on whether the request to tell the users about the governments, that have requested or the user has set up a user notification system. These companies, the media, they have been -- these big companies are in compliance with the transparency reporting standard and it has attracted media attention in terms of cybersecurity and privacy consents.

When we come to the end of my presentation, a question that's got our attention is that the law enforcement's duty to protect users, to protect public security should not be at the expense of the user privacy. Now in Hong Kong the situation is there was a question of privacy and how do we achieve the balance of law enforcement and user privacy and again the United Nations report, the privacy rights in the digital age proposed the three notions, one is legality and then necessity, the law enforcements requesting to be necessary and proportional.

It is high time for the government to release their transparency reports, and to foster the user trust and accountability.

Thank you.

I just mentioned the Civil Rights perspectives, so Glacier Kwong from Keyboard Frontline will introduce her project from Hong Kong.

>> GLACIER KWONG: Good morning, everyone.

Today I would like to talk about Hong Kong's local forum, are they gathering too much information of users.

For decades the Internet has become an inevitable part of

our lives. We cannot live with it. Every morning we scroll our screens to know what's happening in the other end of the world. We rely so much on the Internet to store, communicate, to search and most of the online platforms we have here requires registration. What kind of information do you give out? What do you opt to give out? Your name, gender, your date of birth, your nationality, your phone number, et cetera. Is that too much for an online forum, online platform to collect?

Some say it is necessary as they want to have users have having too many numerous numbers of accounts, others say it is excessive collection of personal data because no one really knows what happens to them after you give them out.

What really happens to your online data? Are they given away? Are they given to banks that bombard you with calls to try to get to you borrow money from them, to banks saying you need a new credit card. Are they selling your information? Are they giving it to the police for investigation? Given to whom? The police, any other third party? This is what really happens to our online data.

From October the 1st, 2014 to 29th, January, 2015 police handled 2,431 technology crime cases, and made 1,156 user information requests towards Internet service providers and online platforms.

However, neither the government or service providers have properly addressed the mounting public concern over whether governments has requested a legitimate and whether the service providers respond to the government requests in a responsible manner. In light of this, it is necessary for us to look into how ISPs and OSPs determine whether or not our information should be given away. Do they require a court order to do so? Do they just give it away? Do they tell you that the information is given away? Do they issue a transparency report to inform the users of what happened to their data?

The point I was trying to make here is that who's on your side on the Internet. Keyboard frontline, the University of Hong Kong, the IT legislature, Charles Mok conducted the first who's on your side survey. Hong Kong is a frontier of Internet transparency. The government's controversial use of computer crimes to arrest online forum users during the occupy movement makes us we think Internet governments, user privacy and free speech. The lack of transparency in the request making process casts shadow on both government and corporate accountability. The possible suggestion of government surveillance and information misuse could have a chilling effect on citizens and intellectual curiosity and free speech which is what we want to see in Hong Kong. This survey aims to help obtain a general picture of how online data is being collected and handled by

local forums. To raise awareness and promote good practice in local Internet community, while attempting to establish a transparency reporting standard that can ultimately lead to the company accountability and better protection of user privacy.

Here are some of our key findings.

Key findings include five out of nine forums surveyed requires court orders for government's data request. Most of the forums surveyed have not published transparency reports to inform users of how many government requests they received. With respect to compliance rates and a number of users affected. Media HK is the only website that's published some sort of transparency report, but it is not bilingual and it is a statement, not a full report. A third of the forum mandates use registration by either mobile phone number or ISP e-mail, the practice which is likely to facilitate self-censorship and surveillance.

Two-thirds of on line forums posted privacy policy statements on their websites. They do not have clear league guidelines for responding to government requests.

Who is really on your side? However this is not president final version of our report, amendments will still be made. The Checkmarks cannot tell the whole story. How do users protect themselves? Users who choose and urge ISPs and OSPs to issue transparency reports to tell users what happens to their online data. Users should urge OSPs and ISPs to issue clear privacy policy, and they should only use the service of OSPs that issued clear privacy guidelines to protect themselves from their information being leaked.

Anonymous on the Internet, pay attention to what information is being given out. Actually some said that right to be forgotten is the solution to this, but this is definitely not true. We cast serious doubt on that. The right to be forgotten is only deleting the search results from online search engines and it may lead to abuse and the most importantly, why a commercial enterprise makes the decision on what we can search. Right to be forgotten in a way is a right to force people to forget. In this city, there may be some part of the history which is too painful to remember, but a Hong Konger should never forget.

This is the end of our presentation on who's on your side project. Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> CLEMENT CHEN: Good morning. It is a pleasure to be here and to share with you some of the findings on the access to information in Hong Kong.

Just now two speakers shared with us their grave concerns about a sort of lack of transparency in the law enforcement in

Hong Kong regarding critical aspect of Internet regulation which is the collection and use of personal data from social networking sites. I think that the unsatisfactory situation of transparency in Hong Kong can be partly attributed to the lack of legislation on Freedom of Information on a general level and the lack of effective enforcements mechanism in Hong Kong.

That's my -- the theme of my presentation. It is basically -- okay. I'll use mouse.

In my presentation, I may discuss the regime on access to information in Hong Kong which can be a general regime which is prescribed by a non-statutory code on access to information and other special statutory regimes.

We'll also introduce the situation across the main river in China. Okay.

In general, unlike most of the -- like most developed economies in the world, Hong Kong and Singapore, they're the only two regions which does not have any legislation on Freedom of Information. There is, however, a code on access to information which was introduced in 1995, by the British governor as to appease the demands among the public for Freedom of Information legislation. This code is non-statutory code of practice. It is not legally binding. It is not creating any statutory rights. It is just voluntary and discretionary disclosure on the part of the government. This violation will not be subjected to judicial review.

In parallel, there are several special legal regimes concerning access to government information. One of which was already mentioned by our first speaker, it is the ordinance on interception of communications and surveillance which will be used to disclose on a discretionary basis the data concerning how the government and law enforcement agencies collect and use the personal data which is stored in ISPs and OSPs. In addition, there are also information access regimes concerning the town planning and the budget of the government.

Under the personal data privacy ordinance you can also request access to your personal data which is stored by the government agencies, however this ordinance has a special clause which precludes any information on data concerning interception and covert surveillance which should be governed by the ordinance that I just mentioned, it is the ordinance on interception of communications and surveillance.

Overall, a sense that the current -- no matter general regime or special regime, the thrust or the emphasis was on information relating to commerce and finance rather than relating to people's livelihood and especially on the information which could facilitate public participation in policy-makings.

As regard a code to access to information, its scope is relatively restricted compared to other FOI legislations in other areas. It only covers government department bus in Hong Kong there is a great variety of -- strictly-speaking, non-government branches, but which are exercised, a certain exercise of public administration or are responsible for the delivery of public services. There is a total of more than 500 such bodies which is called in Hong Kong an advisory and statutory bodies. This code does not apply to the legislature and judiciary as well. In relation to the approaches of the disclosure, there are two main approaches and the one that is closely related to the general public is the disclosure upon request. Any citizen can apply information relating to the policies, services, decisions and other matters falling within its area of responsibility of the agencies with the government. The government should replay normally within 10 days, however there are certain circumstances that rely period can be extended to a total of around one month.

The greatest effect of this code comes from extremely broad exceptions. There is a total of 16 categories of exemptions under which information requests could be denied. Some of the categories, such as the security and defense and personal privacy and commercial secrets, they're often seen in other FOI regimes and the purpose is regarded as legitimate. Under this code there are also other ambiguous and problematic categories of exemptions. For example, there is one exemption which is frequently used by the government to deny FOI requests, it is the so-called incomplete research or statistics, where disclosure could be misleading, however it is widely considered as a kind of abuse of exemption because if academic freedom is to be served in a free, open society, it should be left to researchers and other citizens to decide whether the statistics or other materials they got from the government is incomplete or misleading or not. It should not be left to the government to decide in place of the citizen.

On the other side, there are some bonus regarding this code, this code allows for -- allows discretionary disclosure which means that even the information request is covered by one of the 16 categories of exemption, the agency could choose to disclose those information anyway if they consider the public interest in disclosing that information, otherwise the interest protected by those exemptions.

As I said before, the remedy concerning this access to information, it is rather big in Hong Kong. You have no right to broad -- the denial of access to information before the code because you enjoy no statutory right. The only way that you can resort to independent and external remedy is to complain to the

Ombudsman. They can review the merits of the complaints and make recommendations if the complaint is substantiated, however the recommendations have no legal effect and there is a variety of instances where the government has refused to agree with the recommendation made by the Ombudsman.

How about the real situation regarding the FOI in Hong Kong, in this chart we can see the situation on the demand side. Since that, overall duo manned by Civil Society or from a general public of information, it is on the rise, especially recent years, we can see a sharp increase of FOI demands since the year 2012. However, the intensity of FOI requests in Hong Kong is actually rather low. What do I mean by intensity? It means that among around 100,000 population, how many FOI requests have been made? As we can see in this table, in other traditional jurisdictions such as Canada and Australia, in early years the intensity of the requests was not very high, but in those countries who have introduced FOE law in recent years, the intensity of FOI requests, it is rather high. For example, in the United Kingdom which introduced a code of practice on access to information in 1996 substituted this outdated code in the year 2000 by introducing a law on Freedom of Information, their general public seems to be rather active in filing FOE requests, there is a total of 183 requests per 100,000 population. Even in China, which introduced FOI-like regulation back in 2008 several provinces -- I count 10 provinces here because the data in China is rather incomplete -- in relation to the 10 provinces which mostly is eastern -- in the eastern region, the intensity of FOI requests is much greater than that in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong we may expect in a society as free and open as Hong Kong, there should be more -- in Hong Kong we may expect -- in a society as free and open we would think there would be more FOI requests than in this table. I think this could be because of the statistic criteria of the government, the government only -- only counts those -- only counts those requests which debunk the code on access to information. Many of the public does not even know the existence of this code. They only just go to the government and ask for information without invoking that code. Those kinds of requests, they were not counted in the government data.

What about supply side? According to the data released by the government it seems that the disclosure rate is rather high. It can amount to as high as almost 90% of the requests. However, there are severe and critical defects in this data because there are no specific and concrete data concerning the nature of the requests. There are no grounds for no data concerning the grounds for rejection and no data on what departments are handling the requests. Basically the government

only display a lump sum of the data without any specific breakdowns which cause a great difficulty for researchers to evaluate the FOI requests. We may have to refer to the FOI requests made by the Civil Society to assess the adequacies of the government's handling of requests. According to FOI audit -- audit, it means just filing the same requests with different agencies across the whole region so as to discover the results and differences among different agencies. According to an FOI audit conducted by the Hong Kong association of journalists back in 1999 they made around 300 much FOI requests and a third of defensive only a third were satisfied by the government which could be a hint to how the government handles the FOI requests which have public interest implications. There are also a series of incidents in which when the people seek access to information concerning public interest was not satisfied by the government.

Overall, the current situation is that although with a great degree of press freedom and legislature which can exercise certain amount of power to monitor and check the government, Hong Kong is up until now still a free and open society. However, the flow of information in Hong Kong is largely not -- largely speaking cannot be attributed to the regime of access to information. The access to information -- the access of information, per se, is on the economic dimension rather than the dimension of accountability and civil engagement. I think the Hong Kong society nowadays is in great need of a legislation of Freedom of Information which ultimately will also contribute to the transparency regarding both Internet governance and other areas of regulation of the whole society.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> Now I would like to invite our panelist back on the stage again and open the floor to the audience. If you have any questions regarding transparency reporting, who has your back or the Freedom of Information regime in Hong Kong, please feel free to ask our panelists.

>> AUDIENCE: In your presentation you're talking about the right to be forgotten. I'm thinking about that issue, but if we apply the right to be forgotten in general, is it really good to make the information really transparent? For example, maybe this is not a very good example -- but for example, like, maybe of course we know that a family says I want to Google out any information on Hitler, do you agree with that? Is there a right to be forgotten? The right to be forgotten, I think we have to be thinking a bit more on what kind of information we want to be forgotten is not all. You know. Some information on the Internet is related to the history. I know -- I'm -- I mean

I'm not against that idea. I think when we talk about the issue right to be forgotten, we should think about it in many different angles or many different issues, not just some tech, whatever, some people say oh, this is a hot issue, then we go for it. You know, in some sense I support the idea, but I just say we have to be careful in case to case to discuss what kind of information, you know, what kind of data should be forgotten.

>> GLACIER KWONG: In our situation we're opposed to the right to be forgotten in Hong Kong for several reasons. The first, in Hong Kong we have no archive law or any regulations of law -- it is about Freedom of Information, therefore we're totally against those issues if no law is established in Hong Kong to ensure free flow of information because as what you just said, it is -- the information on the Internet, most is related to history. It is really dangerous if we removed these informations without archive law or any other laws protecting them. For another reason is that the threshold of celebrity, it is really vague and not clear. What if a high ranked official is retired, is he any longer a celebrity? What if some high-ranked officials that are involved in corruption that after he retired, can we delete all of those searches on the Internet about him involving in those corruptions? This is a matter of public interest so we think if we cannot ensure that the data can eventually be found by the public through other means instead of search engines, then we should not implement it in any place.

>> AUDIENCE: I just try to add a bit.

Actually, this is also discussed in Taiwan. I think the most important thing in Taiwan is somehow -- we as society we like to think about these issues and open up and trans apparently discuss on these issues, but we didn't yet because it is not a simple concept. We have to carefully see what can be forgotten, what should not. Just as you say, this is also part of the -- in the future, it may be part of the history you just cannot delete it. I agree about that. I just say -- it is good time to raise the topic to be discussed in society.

Thank you.

>> JENNIFER ZHANG: Okay.

Do you want to ask a question?

>> AUDIENCE: I wanted to ask, pose this question to Clement, but either of the other panelists, I would be happy to hear your views.

You showed two slides, one slide rather on comparison on the number of requests, Clement, between different countries. Do you have -- have you done research or survey on the different countries in Asia-Pacific region, what are there -- what's the current status on their FOI laws? How does Hong Kong compare

and contrast with other countries in Asia for the laws and also for the right to forget? Have you done any sort of comparison?

Thank you.

>> CLEMENT CHEN: Thank you for the question. Yeah.

Actually I have been trying hard to search for comparative data. So far I have only found one scholar who was doing this research until the year 2011. Basically he compiled a big list concerning the volume of requests, the nature of the region and the sort of other properties concerning other FOI law in each country, and the total list of amount, I think it amounted to 80 countries which certainly include countries in South Asia and Eastern Asia. However, I'm not too sure about the accuracy of data presented in his table. The name of the scholar, I can share with you afterwards.

I think one of the very important things that researchers now need to explore is to come up with common standard which can be applied to different regions, different jurisdictions so that the statistics compiled according to those standards could be comparable among the regions. If you ask me about the data in South Asia or in -- according to my impression, the intensity of FOI requests, it is rather low with one exception, India. India is doing pretty well in both in terms of the volume of requests and rate of disclosure by the government. Those may need to be verified as well.

Thank you.

>> GLACIER KWONG: Regarding the right to be forgotten question, so far the European Union is the only state that has implemented right to be forgotten in their regime. It is a very hot topic for the world, not only in the Pacific region is talking about it but actually the whole world. It is really arguing, debating about this topic.

We have spoke to search engines and different parties from the E.U. and we found that the problem that they're facing is mostly -- that don't -- they don't have clear guidelines. When they're going through those requests there are too many requests, they're actually -- there is nearly a million requests that they have received. They have to spend very short time on each request so they cannot really look at what's happening there. They can only have a glimpse and then they have to decide whether or not they should remove it from the Internet. Remove it from the search results actually. For Hong Kong, we're not yet having any legislation or any other formal procedure of implementing the right to be forgotten in Hong Kong. Our privacy Commissioner has been very eager on promoting this idea in Hong Kong. He's written articles and blogs about it. We think it is time for Hong Kongers to be more careful and become more aroused about this issue. It really

affects their right to know in Hong Kong.

>> JENNIFER ZHANG: Just a quick comment.

I think we're also waiting for case law in Hong Kong. We now have a case pending, it is a billionaire that asked Google to remove links because of alleged defamation and we have to wait for that. In Japan, similarly, the court has already favored the right to be forgotten. There is a case that the court supports the removable of links from the search engine.

>> AUDIENCE: Jennifer, I wanted to ask you about -- you talked about the EFF report, the who has your back report. The table you showed of the different Internet companies and what sort of protections they have in place was very revealing. What has been the feedback to that report that you have observed in Hong Kong? Do you remember the one where you had -- the one that was on the right-hand side. How have young people in Hong Kong reacted to that?

>> JENNIFER ZHANG: I think since -- okay. I think since our local media also covered that, because this is a very popular mobile app among young people so we noticed that a lot of young people have transferred to using -- it is like an automatic related deletion of the conversation, and since the occupy movement, there was a lot of cases where the police asked the protesters to unlock their phone to read the what's up messages, people feel that this, this automatic deletion of the messages, it is providing more protection.

The general comment is sense the occupy movement, Hong Kong people, they're more aware of their digital privacy rights and I think Glacier has something to add as well.

>> GLACIER KWONG: We're actually a user group. So far as we're concerned, after the occupy movement people are more and more aware of their mobile encryption. They start using end-to-end encryption apps because that's more safe, no matter what, the police cannot read the message if they have deleted it and they cannot request service providers to give out the records of the communications. Before the occupy movement Hong Kongers are actually not really aware of the problem of encryption. They would send quite important messages through what's up and other unencrypted communication apps which is quite worrying. After that, we have done -- we have -- we have printed some handbooks for them to tell them actually you should use some encrypted apps for communication that would be safer. I think the situation began to improve. Recently there is an issue in our parliament establishing that things have leaked, more and more legislators and Hong Kongers, they're very aware of their mobile privacy. It is a great improvement and a good start too.

>> AUDIENCE: I would like to raise another topic that

you're talking about, the open governance, and actually many topics that you have talked about is actually in Taiwan, we have also a lot of room to talk about these issues. I don't know how -- did you ever have dialogue or communication? I know several of my friends have traveled to Hong Kong to participate in your discussions. Many from Taiwan want to participate in that. Do you have some kind of mechanism to work together between Taiwan and Hong Kong, or just a case by case?

>> JENNIFER ZHANG: As far as I'm aware of, for the transparency reporting team, we have our counterpart in Taiwan as well, which is affiliated with the Taiwan Human Rights association. Also we have the South Korean transparency report which is under the University of South Korea or -- University of Korea. Yeah. We follow quite a similar -- we have formed similar issues among our own respective governments and actually last week we just had a global panel on transparency in Canada where we communicated with the Canadian and the U.K. transparency reporting team.

I think the Hong Kong is as Clement and Glacier has mentioned, the freedom of law of information, it has an economic damage rather than an accountability and civil engagement element which we hope will with the efforts of academic and civil society we'll gradually improve on.

Thank you.

I think we're running out of time.

Thank you for your participation of our panel.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
