

Hong Kong (Special Administrative Region)

Hin Han Shum, Squire Patton Boggs, Hong Kong

1. What is the understanding or definition of AI in your jurisdiction?

The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is a part of the People's Republic of China and enjoys a special one-country, two-systems arrangement with the People's Republic of China. Hong Kong is a common law jurisdiction, where the law is formed not only by statute but also case law. The rule of law serves as a keystone to this legal system. There is a robust and independent judiciary, and cases from other common law jurisdictions are considered persuasive, though not binding. Former foreign judges of the judiciary in common law jurisdictions outside Hong Kong are also invited to sit at the Court of Final Appeal.

There is no statutory definition of artificial intelligence (AI) under Hong Kong laws. Despite not having an official statutory definition or specific legislation in relation to AI, there is a generally accepted understanding that AI means emerging technological programs/robots that use, inter alia, algorithms, big data learning and machine learning to perform tasks traditionally performed by humans. Types of AI tools include natural language processing; programmed data collection and data analytics; chatbots; and automated processing.

2. In your jurisdiction, besides legal tech tools (ie, law firm or claim management, data platforms, etc), are there already actual AI tools or use cases in practice for legal services?

It is common to engage external service providers that deploy natural language processing and machine learning programs to conduct translation work, electronic discovery and due diligence services.

Many law firms also have contract template generating programs and document management systems that allow for the categorisation of documents. These assist with data segregation requirements under certain regulations. Some law firms use chatbots to facilitate initial instruction taking and provide preliminary information for reference. The Law Society of Hong Kong has also recognised the potential of AI in the legal profession, especially in conducting legal research and processing complex analysis.³⁸⁹

389 'Onboarding AI in Legal Industry' (*Hong Kong Lawyer*, February 2024) www.hk-lawyer.org/content/onboarding-ai-legal-industry accessed 25 July 2024.

In January 2024, the Law Society of Hong Kong published a position paper³⁹⁰ stating its opinion on the scope of use of AI in the legal profession. It acknowledged the many advantages of adopting AI in legal work, highlighting the benefits of machine learning algorithms and AI research tools. However, it emphasised that the legal profession is defined by the core values of independence, confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest. The profession is bound by the Hong Kong Solicitors' Guide to Professional Conduct: regardless of the tools available to a lawyer, the lawyer has a duty to responsibly use the tools, in compliance with the laws and regulations and codes, to serve the public ethically, diligently and competently. When choosing to deploy AI tools, it is of utmost importance for a lawyer to understand the advantages and shortcomings of AI tools.

The courts are also enhancing their technological capabilities and have endorsed alternative ways, other than physical court appearance, to continue court proceedings.

The judiciary published the *Guidance Note for Remote Hearings for Civil Business in the High Court* in 2020 to facilitate court proceedings during the Covid-19 pandemic.³⁹¹ The guidelines apply on a 'technology neutral basis' to the possible use of electronic means and paves the way for further enhanced technological tools, such as AI, to be used in the future.

On 1 October 2021, the Court Proceedings (Electronic Technology) Ordinance (Cap 638) came into force. It provides a legislative framework to enable court-related documents to be processed in electronic form. The judiciary has been developing an integrated court case management system across all levels of court in phases for handling various court processes, such as the filing and service of documents, and payments through electronic means.

The judiciary published the *Draft Courts (Remote Hearing) Bill, Practice Directions and Operational Guidelines* in June 2022,³⁹² aimed at providing a general framework to enable the use of remote hearings for all types of court proceedings. The draft bill

390 *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Legal Profession* (Law Society of Hong Kong, January 2024) www.hklawsoc.org.hk/-/media/HKLS/Home/News/LSHK-Position-Paper_AI_EN.pdf?rev=994b381c215e4ec78dee22a784f89798 accessed 25 July 2024.

391 *Guidance Note for Remote Hearings for Civil Business in the High Court* (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, 2020) www.judiciary.hk/doc/en/court_services_facilities/guidance_note_for_remote_hearings_phase1_20200402.pdf accessed 3 July 2024; *Guidance Note for Remote Hearings for Civil Business in the High Court Phase 2* (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, 2020) www.judiciary.hk/doc/en/court_services_facilities/guidance_note_for_remote_hearings_phase2_20200608.pdf, accessed 3 July 2024.

392 *Draft Courts (Remote Hearing) Bill, Practice Directions and Operational Guidelines* (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, June 2022) www.judiciary.hk/remote_hearing_bill/consultation_doc/eng.pdf accessed 25 July 2024.

has already undergone public consultation,³⁹³ and was discussed in the Legislative Council Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services in May 2023.³⁹⁴

The electronic Business Related Arbitration and Mediation system (eBRAM) is an international online dispute resolution platform operated by a company limited by guarantee established in 2018, with the support of the Asian Academy of International Law, the Hong Kong Bar Association and the Law Society of Hong Kong. It utilises AI tools³⁹⁵ and allows lawyers or parties acting in person to use the platform for mediation, arbitration or deal-making negotiations.

The Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC), a leading dispute resolution organisation situated in Hong Kong, enables arbitration, mediation, adjudication and domain name dispute resolution, in addition to offering users integrated virtual hearing services.³⁹⁶ Furthermore, the HKIAC has partnered with Jus Mundi, an AI-powered search engine for international law and arbitration, since April 2022³⁹⁷ to enable access to summaries of anonymised procedural decisions taken by HKIAC.

3. If yes, are these AI tools different regarding: independent law firms; international law firms; and in-house counsel; and what are these differences?

Some law firms have partnered with IT companies to deploy their own in-house legal AI chatbot or other AI-powered software programs to streamline work. This reflects the trend of law firms investing more on developing and integrating AI into their practice.

Typically, international firms are the sector developing or deploying in-house AI tools as it usually is quite costly, although independent firms (ie, local firms) are also considering deploying options.

In-house counsel may have even fewer resources than law firms to invest in legal technology. However, they have the option of engaging external counsel to assist with their work, and thereby can benefit from the AI tools that those firms use.

393 'Public consultation on draft Courts (Remote Hearing) Bill launched' (Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 16 June 2022) www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202206/16/P2022061600210.htm#:~:text=A%20spokesman%20for%20the%20Judiciary,remote%20hearing%20shall%20be%20handled accessed 25 July 2024.

394 *Courts (Remote Hearing) Bill* (Legislative Council on Administration of Justice and Legal Services, 3 May 2023) www.legco.gov.hk/yr2023/english/panels/ajls/papers/ajls20230503cb4-344-3-e.pdf accessed 25 July 2024.

395 See <https://ebram.org> accessed 3 July 2024.

396 'Virtual Hearings' (HKIAC) www.hkiac.org/content/virtual-hearings accessed 3 July 2024.

397 'HKIAC partners with Jus Mundi (HKIAC, 28 April 2022) www.hkiac.org/news/hkiac-partners-jus-mundi accessed 25 July 2024.

4. What is the current or planned regulatory approach on AI in general?

There is currently no Hong Kong legislation that specifically regulates AI. Many of the existing ordinances are technology neutral (eg, the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap 486) or the PDPO).

However, regulators have issued AI specific guidelines. For example, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority,³⁹⁸ the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) and the Privacy Commissioner of the Personal Data (PCPD) have all issued guidelines that relate to AI or the internet of things.

The SFC has also commented on its philosophy to promote the responsible deployment of technology, provided it enhances market efficacy and transparency, cost savings and investor experience. The SFC warned that firms must stay alert to AI-related risks and ensure clients are treated fairly, and expressed its expectation to licensed corporations to thoroughly test AI to address any potential issues before deployment, and closely monitor the quality of data used by the AI:

‘Firms should also have qualified staff managing their AI tools, as well as proper senior management oversight and a robust governance framework for AI applications. For any conduct breaches, the SFC would look to hold the licensed firm responsible – not the AI.’³⁹⁹

This appears to be a consistent treatment of AI-related negligence claims and non-compliance. Despite there being no legislation governing this area in Hong Kong, there is a growing trend for regulators to expect firms/parties to be held to the same high standards when it comes to the use of AI.

The PCPD has been advocating the adoption of data ethics. The 2018 *Ethical Accountability Framework for Hong Kong, China* (‘Ethical Accountability Framework’) report, prepared for the Office of the PCPD, mentioned that the regulatory regime may not adequately address data protection risks arising from advanced data processing activities and advocated data ethics as the way forward.

In August 2021, the PCPD published its *Guidance on the Ethical Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence* report, which further expands on some of the concepts discussed in the Ethical Accountability Framework report.⁴⁰⁰

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) has extraterritorial jurisdiction and is applicable for Hong Kong businesses under certain circumstances. Where

398 ‘Regulatory approaches to Authorized Institutions’ interface with Virtual Assets and Virtual Asset Service Providers’ (HKMA, 28 January 2022) www.hkma.gov.hk/media/eng/doc/key-information/guidelines-and-circular/2022/20220128e3.pdf accessed 25 July 2024.

399 ‘Reflect, Reset and Refocus: Game Plan for Hong Kong as an Asset Management Hub’ (SFC, 5 June 2023) HKIFA-Keynote---Eng_20230605.pdf (sfc.hk) accessed 25 July 2024.

400 *Guidance on the Ethical Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence* (PCPD, August 2021) www.pcpd.org.hk/english/resources_centre/publications/files/guidance_ethical_e.pdf accessed 25 July 2024.

it applies, the provisions relating to, inter alia, 'automated processing' and so on apply in Hong Kong and should be complied with if Hong Kong companies or firms utilise such technologies and/or AI tools.

The Personal Information Protection Law (PIPL) was enacted by the People's Republic of China on 1 November 2021 and has extraterritorial effect. Hong Kong entities that handle the personal information of natural persons within mainland China may be bound by the PIPL. The PIPL has provisions on automated decision-making. It requires transparency, fairness and no unreasonable price discrimination against individuals when data processes use automated decision-making processes.

5. What are the current or planned regulations on the general use of AI or machine learning systems?

There is no specific law on the general use of AI or machine learning systems. However, there is guidance on the development and use of AI issued by regulators.

For example, the PCPD co-sponsored the Declaration on Ethics and Data Protection, which was passed in October 2018 at the 40th International Conference on Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners held in Brussels. The declaration provides six guiding principles to preserve human rights in the development of AI. The principles are as follows:

1. fairness;
2. continued attention and vigilance;
3. transparency and intelligibility;
4. ethics by design;
5. empowerment of every individual; and
6. reducing and mitigating biases or discrimination.⁴⁰¹

In October 2020, the newly named Global Privacy Assembly adopted the Resolution on Accountability in the Development and Use of AI. It recommends the adoption of 12 accountability measures for organisations that develop and use AI, to facilitate trust building with stakeholders.⁴⁰²

The PCPD was also involved in preparing the *Data Stewardship Accountability, Data Impact Assessments and Oversight Models – Detailed Support for an Ethical*

401 'Declaration on Ethics and Data Protection' (Global Privacy Assembly, 23 October 2018) http://globalprivacyassembly.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20180922_ICDPPC-40th_AI-Declaration_ADOPTED.pdf accessed 25 July 2024.

402 'Resolution on Accountability in the Development and Use of AI' (Global Privacy Assembly, October 2020) <https://globalprivacyassembly.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/FINAL-GPA-Resolution-on-Accountability-in-the-Development-and-Use-of-AI-EN-1.pdf> accessed 25 July 2024.

Accountability Framework guidance. Organisations can consider the guidance on how to act ethically and apply equitable principles, ‘particularly in advanced data processing activities, such as AI and machine learning, and the application of knowledge to enable data-driver innovation to reach its full potential’.⁴⁰³

Organisations are to understand and evaluate how their activities affect the parties positively or negatively; act as data stewards rather than data custodians; and consider whether the outcomes of their AI and machine learning processing activities are legal, fair and just.

Although this document is a guidance note and does not require mandatory compliance, the document serves as a framework for law firms and other businesses to consider how data is collected and handled by the technology they deploy. The approach taken by the PCPD is to promote awareness of the concept of data stewardship and accountability where AI and machine learning is used, and to promote organisational policies and change of culture and conduct to achieve this. In the 2021 Guidance on the Ethical Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence, the PCPD also provided a self-assessment checklist to help organisations assess the adoption of guidance recommendations relating to their development and use of AI.

6. Is free data access an issue in relation to AI?

For AI tools to run smoothly, it is important to have a large and/or accurate set of data input to facilitate proper machine learning. Data bias or inaccurate data will greatly affect the function of the AI tools.

There is a large amount of data that relates to personal information. In order to protect data subjects under the PDPO, data is to be collected (to the extent necessary and not excessively) and used only for the purposes for which it is collected (pursuant to the consent provided). If the purpose for using the personal data in a data analytics or machine learning scenario was not communicated to the data subject (ie, the person who the personal information pertains to), such use of that personal information may amount to a breach of the law.

Therefore, a balance must be struck between the use and development of AI tools using these types of data, and the protection of personal data and privacy. Please see also the data stewardship and data ethics principles that were discussed in the responses to Questions 4 and 5 of this report.

Furthermore, Hong Kong law firms and companies need to comply with the GDPR and PIPL where they, inter alia, collect, hold or process personal data of residents in those jurisdictions. Provisions relating to the personal information being collected (using various methods, including AI tools such as automated decision-making)

⁴⁰³ *Data Stewardship Accountability, Data Impact Assessments and Oversight Models – Detailed Support for an Ethical Accountability Framework* (PCPD/Information Accountability Foundation) www.pcpd.org.hk/misc/files/Ethical_Accountability_Framework_Detailed_Support.pdf accessed 3 July 2024.

and its use will also be subject to similar considerations outlined above in relation to the PDPO.

7. Are there already actual court decisions on the provision of legal services using AI or decisions concerning other sectors that might be applicable to the use of AI in the provision of legal services?

To the author's best knowledge, there are no published court cases deciding on issues materially relating to the provision of legal services using AI. However, Hong Kong also looks to other common law cases as reference: this serves as persuasive, but not binding, authority.

In the Court of First Instance defamation case *Dr Yeung Sau Shing Albert v Google Inc (No 2)* (2014) HKEC 1782, a question arose as to whether Google had in fact published the alleged defamatory content or if it was a passive facilitator of information by way of its AI-based auto-complete and search engine systems. The court considered it arguable that through the automated algorithmic processes (which collect and collate information from search requests and web content to present them to users as auto-complete and predictive keyword searches), Google would not be a mere passive facilitator and may be considered a publisher. However, the court left the discussion open for the Court of Appeal on that point due to the differing foreign case law, and the significance and inter-lay of this technology and defamation law.

There have been cases where the courts have sanctioned the use of alternative technological means to further court cases.

Cyberworks Audio Video Technology Ltd (In Compulsory Liquidation) v Mei Ah (HK) Co Ltd [2020] HKCFI 347, *Cyberworks Audio Video Technology Ltd (In Compulsory Liquidation) v Silver Kent Technology Ltd* [2020] HKCFI 347 and *Cyberworks Audio Video Technology Ltd (In Compulsory Liquidation) v Silver Kent Technology Ltd* [2020] HKCFI 347 (the 'Cyberworks case') explored the use of technology to conduct court hearings. Traditionally, attendance at Hong Kong courts required the physical attendance of the parties and/or their lawyers. With the general court closure (except those of an urgent and essential nature, and certain criminal matters) commencing 29 January 2020 and continuing at the time of the hearing of that case caused by Covid-19 (the 'General Adjournment Period' or GAP), many proceedings had to be adjourned. The *Cyberworks* case, which was decided on 21 February 2020, resulted in an unprecedented confirmation of the legality of telephone hearings relating to High Court proceedings under the Hong Kong legal framework. This ruling was the first of many changes demonstrating the court's intention to consider the enhanced use of technology tools to enable better access to justice.

Subsequent to the *Cyberworks* case, on 2 April 2020, the judiciary also published a Guidance Note for Remote Hearings for Civil Business in the High Court to provide an alternative way to continue court proceedings rather than physically appearing in court. The guidelines apply on a ‘technology neutral basis’ to the possible use of various types of electronic means in phases.

The first phase of remote hearings by videoconferencing facilities (VCF) in civil cases in the Court of Appeal and the Court of First Instance of the High Court commenced during the GAP. On 8 June 2020, the judiciary published a Guidance Note for remote hearings for civil business in the Civil Courts. This note is to be read in conjunction with the Guidance Notice issued on 2 April 2020, and sets out the second-phase developments for alternative modes of court hearing disposal. It provides for expanded videoconferencing facilities and telephone remote hearing practice to be applicable to the Court of Appeal of the High Court, the Court of First Instance of the High Court, the Competition Tribunal, the District Court and the Family Court.

In the second phase, which started on 15 June 2020, remote hearings conducted by VCF and telephone in civil cases were extended to the following civil courts:

1. the Court of Appeal of the High Court;
2. the Court of First Instance of the High Court (Judges and Masters);
3. the Competition Tribunal;
4. the District Court (Judges and Masters); and
5. the Family Court.

The third phase was implemented on 2 January 2021, under which remote hearings by the use of VCF and telephone in civil cases were extended to the Labour Tribunal and Small Claims Tribunal.⁴⁰⁴

In February 2022, the judiciary also issued a note on the use of VCF for remote hearings for civil business.⁴⁰⁵

More VCF hearings are expected in the near future. Other hearings will be dealt with by paper disposal where suitable.⁴⁰⁶

404 *Guidance Note for Remote Hearings for Civil Business in the High Court Phase 3* (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China, 2020) www.judiciary.hk/doc/en/court_services_facilities/guidance_note_for_remote_hearings_phase2_20200608.pdf accessed 3 July 2024.

405 ‘The judiciary’s video conferencing facilities for remote hearings for civil business’ (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China) www.judiciary.hk/doc/en/court_services_facilities/technical_specifications_of_vcf_of_the_judiciary_20220302.pdf accessed 3 July 2024.

406 ‘Notice for Stakeholders about General Adjournment of Proceedings (“GAP”) Between 7 March 2022 and 11 April 2022’ (Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China) www.judiciary.hk/doc/en/court_services_facilities/press_release_20220304_annex.pdf accessed 3 July 2024.

In January 2022, the judiciary additionally introduced an e-Appointment service, which allows unrepresented litigants or applicants to make online appointments through new dedicated web links for specified services of the registries and office. This e-Appointment service is applicable to various services in the Probate Registry; the Family Court Registry and the Lands Tribunal Registry; the Appeals Registry at the Clerk of Court's Office of the High Court; the High Court Registry; and the Integrated Mediation Office.⁴⁰⁷

In January 2024, the Court of Final Appeal livestreamed one of its appeal proceedings.

In the case of the Hong Kong Court of First Instance of *Hwang Joon Sang And Future Cell Plus Co, Ltd v Golden Electronics Inc, Worldbest Global Supplier Inc, Harmony Electronics Inc, Quantum Electronics Inc, Jin Miao International Limited, Vivien Chung Ying-Yin, Magic Electronics Inc, BC Century Technology Limited, Chen Nien Fang, Chen Yi Kuei, China Dynamic Limited, Chiu Wei Fen, Chou Lin Chiao, Glory Dynamic Limited, Hsu Wei Lun, Hu Hong Bin, Imperial Dragon Limited, Lin Chih Cheng, Liu Mei Ting, Magic Crystal Limited, Niu Hsiu Chen, Su Chao Ming, Su Kuang Hong, Su Pei I, Tsai Pao Tsai, Wang Chao Cheng, Wang Hui Min, and Chou Pei Fen* (2020) HKCFI 1084, the Hong Kong courts allowed for a novel mode of ordinary service of court documents. In that case, the court held that any document, not being an originating process or one requiring personal service, may be served by providing access to an online data room with authorisation by the court. This decision can be made by courts pursuant to Order 65(1)(d) of the Rules of the High Court, where the court can, on a case-by-case basis, consider alternative methods of service in various situations.

In *Zhuhai Gotech Intelligent Technology Co Ltd v Persons Unknown* (HCZZ 10/2020), the Court of First Instance allowed a plaintiff to serve proceedings and related documents (including an interlocutory injunction order), out of jurisdiction by way of substituted service, via Facebook messaging.

8. What is the current status – planned, discussed or implemented – of sectorial legislation in your jurisdiction on the use of AI in the legal profession or services that are traditionally provided by lawyers?

Hong Kong lawyers are to abide by the *Hong Kong Solicitors' Guide to Professional Conduct*. Although solicitors may use information communication technology available at the time of the use, chapter 1.07 of the *Hong Kong Solicitors' Guide* sets out that, even with such use, solicitors are still responsible and bound by the duties relating to professional conduct.⁴⁰⁸ In other words, lawyers can use AI tools

⁴⁰⁷ 'e-Appointment service extended to Appeals Registry, High Court Registry and Integrated Mediation Office' (Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 4 January 2022) www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202201/04/P2022010400178.htm accessed 3 July 2024.

⁴⁰⁸ *The Hong Kong Solicitors' Guide to Professional Conduct* (The Law Society of Hong Kong, 2020) (vol 1).

where they see fit (eg, document management tools, electronic discovery and template generating tools), but they must ensure that they comply with the Hong Kong Solicitors' Guide to Professional Conduct, practice directions and applicable laws governing their legal practice.

9. What is the role of national bar organisations or other official professional institutions?

The Law Society regulates the solicitor, whereas the Bar Association regulates barristers. The Law Society and the Bar Association have the power to sanction or discipline their members if they fail to comply with the relevant codes, rules and guidelines.

The Law Society of Hong Kong arranges and hosts many conferences open to both local and international participants. For the past several years, such conferences have contained at least one session on AI and legal practice. One of the more prominent conferences was the ABC to Building a Smart Belt and Road: Law and Artificial Intelligence, Blockchain and Cloud, which took place on 28 September 2018, with sessions focusing on AI tools. Such conferences explore the various opportunities, risks and liabilities that are involved in AI and legal practice.

Risk management courses relating to, inter alia, cybersecurity, data privacy and the cloud are also provided by the Hong Kong Academy of Law, which is a subsidiary entity under the Law Society of Hong Kong. These courses aim to educate practitioners as to the risks and ways to manage those risks where technologies are used in firms, and attendees are awarded continual professional education points. To renew a solicitors' practising certificate in Hong Kong, generally, 15 points is required on an annual basis.

Hackathons have also been organised by the Law Society of Hong King on using AI to solve problems and providing better access to justice. The themes for the hackathons conducted so far have been to encourage cross-disciplinary innovation and collaboration in relation to various legal issues that people may encounter on a day-to-day basis.⁴⁰⁹

The Hong Kong Government has been promoting 'LawTech', which is the concept of law and technology. Its aim is to make use of technology in providing legal services to the public.

On 8 April 2020, as part of the measures to ease the economic and commercial challenges posed by Covid-19, the Hong Kong Government announced the establishment of the LawTech Fund and the Covid-19 Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) Scheme:

409 'Belt & Road Justice Challenge: Cultivating Innovation with Hackathon' (*Hong Kong Lawyer*, November 2018) www.hk-lawyer.org/content/belt-road-justice-challenge-cultivating-innovation-hackathon accessed 3 July 2024.

1. The LawTech Fund was set up to assist small and medium-sized law firms (where there are five or fewer solicitors) and some small barristers' chambers in procuring and upgrading information technology systems (eg, hardware, servers, computer equipment, software, databases, networks, cloud-based services and other information technological tools), and funding their staff for LawTech training courses.⁴¹⁰
2. The ODR Scheme was established in anticipation of the disputes arising from or relating to Covid-19,⁴¹¹ and enables parties to use the AI-supported eBRAM platform for various dispute resolution services.

The Hong Kong Legal Cloud service was launched on 1 March 2022. It serves to provide a secure and affordable data storage service for local legal and dispute resolution professionals; harness modern technology; and enhance the service capability of the legal profession. The Department of Justice also set up the Hong Kong Legal Cloud Fund, administered by the Asian Academy of International Law on a pro bono basis, to offer eligible local legal and dispute resolution professionals free subscription to the Hong Kong Legal Cloud service for up to three years.

410 'LawTech Fund to open for applications on April 28' (Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 27 April 2020) www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202004/27/P2020042700514.htm accessed 25 July 2024.

411 'Online dispute resolution effective' (*news.gov.hk*, 13 April 2020) www.news.gov.hk/eng/2020/04/20200413/20200413_110404_476.html accessed 25 July 2024.