

# International Comparative Legal Guides



## Fintech 2021

A practical cross-border insight into fintech law

### Fifth Edition

#### Featuring contributions from:

A&L Goodbody

Advokatfirmaet BAHR AS

Afridi & Angell

Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune

Appleby

Astana International Financial Centre (AIFC)

AZB & Partners

Bär & Karrer

BBA//Fjeldco

Bird & Bird LLP

Bredin Prat

Carey Olsen Jersey LLP

Chandler MHM Limited

Christiana Aristidou LLC

DDPV Studio Legale

De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek

DivinaLaw

DQ Advocates Limited

Ellex

FINREG PARTNERS

Furtună și Asociații

Gilbert + Tobin

Gorrißen Federspiel

Hammad & Al-Mehdar

Janson Baugniet

Jonathan Cardenas, Chair, Financial Services  
Technology Joint Subcommittee

KPMG Law Firm

Lazcano Sámano, S.C.

Lee & Ko

Lloreda Camacho & Co.

LPS L@W

Mannheimer Swartling

Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr e Quiroga  
Advogados

McMillan LLP

PFR Attorneys at Law

QUORUS GmbH

RHTLaw Asia LLP

RIAA Barker Gillette

Shearman & Sterling LLP

Shearn Delamore & Co.

Slaughter and May

Triay Lawyers

Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie

Uría Menéndez

Uría Menéndez – Proença de Carvalho

VD Law Group

Walalangi & Partners (in association with  
Nishimura & Asahi)

ICLG.com

## Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** **The Collapse of Cryptography? Considering the Quantum Threat to Blockchain**  
Ben Kingsley & Emily Bradley, Slaughter and May
- 4** **AIFC's Initiatives for Emerging Venture Capital in Central Asia**  
Kairat Kaliyev, Arslan Kudiyar, Nazgul Baitemirova & Aigerim Omarbekova, Astana International Financial Centre (AIFC)
- 8** **Fintech SPAC Transactions in Europe and the United States**  
Jonathan Cardenas, Chair, Financial Services Technology Joint Subcommittee

## Q&A Chapters

- 14** **Australia**  
Gilbert + Tobin: Peter Reeves, Richard Francis & Emily Shen
- 22** **Austria**  
PFR Attorneys at Law: Bernd Fletzberger
- 29** **Belgium**  
Janson Baugniet: Muriel Baudoncq
- 34** **Brazil**  
Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr e Quiroga Advogados: Pedro Eroles & Marina Procknor
- 41** **British Virgin Islands**  
Appleby: Rebecca Jack
- 47** **Canada**  
McMillan LLP: Pat Forgione & Anthony Pallotta
- 55** **Colombia**  
Lloreda Camacho & Co.: Santiago Gutiérrez & Adriana Galeano
- 61** **Cyprus**  
Christiana Aristidou LLC: Christiana Aristidou & Evdokia Marcou
- 69** **Czech Republic**  
FINREG PARTNERS: Ondřej Mikula & Jan Šovar
- 74** **Denmark**  
Gorrissen Federspiel: Tue Goldschmieding & Morten Nybom Bethe
- 80** **France**  
Bredin Prat: Bena Mara & Ariel Axler
- 88** **Germany**  
Bird & Bird LLP: Dr. Michael Jünemann, Jörg-Alexander Paul & Dr. Barbara Geck
- 94** **Gibraltar**  
Triay Lawyers: Javi Triay & Jay Gomez
- 101** **Hong Kong**  
Slaughter and May: Peter Lake & Mike Ringer
- 112** **Iceland**  
BBA/Fjeldco: Stefán Reykjalin
- 119** **India**  
AZB & Partners: Srinath Dasari, Vipul Jain & Rachana Rautray
- 125** **Indonesia**  
Walalangi & Partners (in association with Nishimura & Asahi): Sinta Dwi Cestakarani, Andhika Indrapraja & Indira Setyowati
- 131** **Ireland**  
A&L Goodbody: Kevin Allen, Peter Walker & Chris Martin
- 143** **Isle of Man**  
DQ Advocates Limited: Adam Killip & Andrew Harding
- 148** **Italy**  
DDPV Studio Legale: Luciano Vasques & Chiara Sciarra
- 156** **Japan**  
Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki & Takeshi Nagase
- 163** **Jersey**  
Carey Olsen Jersey LLP: Peter German, Chris Griffin & Huw Thomas
- 172** **Korea**  
Lee & Ko: Jongsoo Yoon & Hyun Koo Kang
- 178** **Lithuania**  
Ellex: Ieva Dosinaitė & Julija Šlekonytė
- 184** **Malaysia**  
Shearn Delamore & Co.: Christina Kow & Timothy Siaw
- 192** **Mexico**  
Lazcano Sámano, S.C.: Alfredo Lazcano & Andrea Avedillo
- 197** **Netherlands**  
De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek: Willem Röell & Christian Godlieb
- 205** **Nigeria**  
Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie: Yinka Edu, Joseph Eimunjeze & Pamela Onah
- 213** **Norway**  
Advokatfirmaet BAHR AS: Markus Nilssen & Eirik Basmo Ellingsen

- 221** **Philippines**  
DivinaLaw: Danny E. Bunyi, Jay-R C. Ipac,  
Emma Ruby J. Aguilar & Shiela Camile S. Esquivel
- 227** **Portugal**  
Uría Menéndez – Proença de Carvalho:  
Pedro Ferreira Malaquias & Hélder Frias
- 236** **Romania**  
Furtună și Asociații / VD Law Group: Mihai Furtună &  
Sergiu-Traian Vasilescu
- 242** **Russia**  
QUORUS GmbH: Maxim Mezentsev & Nikita Iovenko
- 250** **Saudi Arabia**  
Hammad & Al-Mehdar: Suhaib Adli Hammad
- 257** **Senegal**  
LPS L@W: Léon Patrice Sarr
- 263** **Singapore**  
RHTLaw Asia LLP: Ch'ng Li-Ling & Aaron Lee
- 269** **Spain**  
Uría Menéndez: Leticia López-Lapuente,  
Isabel Aguilar Alonso & Carolina Albuérne González

- 278** **Sweden**  
Mannheimer Swartling: Anders Bergsten &  
Carl Johan Zimdahl
- 285** **Switzerland**  
Bär & Karrer: Dr. Daniel Flühmann & Dr. Peter Ch. Hsu
- 295** **Taiwan**  
KPMG Law Firm: Kelvin Chung & Lawrence Ong
- 301** **Thailand**  
Chandler MHM Limited: Wongsakrit Khajangson &  
Nuanporn Wechsuanarux
- 307** **United Arab Emirates**  
Afridi & Angell: James Bowden, Zaid Mahomed &  
Alex Vromans
- 314** **United Kingdom**  
Slaughter and May: Rob Sumroy, Ben Kingsley,  
Natalie Donovan & Selmin Hakki
- 323** **USA**  
Shearman & Sterling LLP: Reena Agrawal Sahni

## Digital Edition Chapter

- 331** **Pakistan**  
RIAA Barker Gillette: Mustafa Munir Ahmed &  
Saira Khalid Khan

# Hong Kong

Slaughter and May



Peter Lake



Mike Ringer

## 1 The Fintech Landscape

1.1 Please describe the types of fintech businesses that are active in your jurisdiction and the state of the development of the market, including in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Are there any notable fintech innovation trends of the past year within particular sub-sectors (e.g. payments, asset management, peer-to-peer lending or investment, insurance and blockchain applications)?

As an international financial centre and a gateway to Mainland China, Hong Kong has been continuing to establish itself as a launch pad for fintechs looking for opportunities in Asia and Mainland Chinese fintechs looking to expand internationally. Fintech businesses cover a range of sub-sectors and it is common to see collaborations between established financial institutions and fintech start-ups in this space.

Hong Kong was one of the early adopters of device-based “stored value facilities” (prepaid instruments with monetary value) and has granted 15 stored value facility (“SVF”) licences to non-bank payment service providers to date.

More recently, the government has focused on moving Hong Kong to a new era of “smart banking” with numerous initiatives. In September 2018, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority (“HKMA”) launched the Faster Payment System – a round-the-clock real-time payment platform, allowing banks and SVF providers to offer their customers almost instant HK\$ and RMB payment and fund transfer services supported by the use of mobile phone numbers, QR codes or email addresses.

December 2018 saw the grant of Hong Kong’s first virtual life insurer licence, under the new “fast track” for applications for authorisations of new insurers owning and operating solely digital distribution channels, with the first virtual general insurer licence subsequently granted in October 2019.

The first batch of virtual banking licences was granted in March 2019 to three virtual banks, with another five licences having been granted since then as at the time of writing. These virtual banking licensees include – whether on their own or in conjunction with joint venture partners from other sectors – traditional global banks, insurers, telecommunication operators and “pure” fintech companies.

The HKMA also published in July 2018 an Open Application Programming Interface (“API”) Framework for the banking sector, which adopts a four-phase approach to implement various Open API functions. Phases I (*Product information*) and II (*Customer acquisition*) were launched in January and October 2019 respectively, with the timetable for the launch of Phases III (*Account information*) and IV (*Transaction*) to be set following publication of technical standards in 2020.

In relation to distributed ledger technology (“DLT”), in keeping with Hong Kong’s role as a global trading hub, various major banks have worked with the HKMA to launch (in October 2018) a blockchain-based trade finance platform called eTradeConnect, and is exploring opportunities to connect it with trade platforms in other regions. For example, on 3 November 2020, eTradeConnect completed the first phase of integration and commenced trial operation of a cooperative initiative with the People’s Bank of China’s Trade Finance Blockchain Platform.

On 12 November 2019, the HKMA issued the inaugural edition of its “Regtech Watch” publication, the purpose of which is to promote the adoption of regulatory technology (“regtech”) by the banking industry. The series provides information on actual or potential regtech use cases rolled out or being explored in Hong Kong or elsewhere. The objective is to assist banks and other authorized institutions (“AIs”) regulated by the HKMA in adopting innovative technology to enhance their risk management and regulatory compliance. Five editions have been published to date.

On 29 September 2020, the HKMA informed AIs of the implementation of the “AML/CFT Surveillance Capability Enhancement Project” (“**AMLS Project**”), through which the HKMA is strengthening the use of data and supervisory technology (suptech) in its risk-based AML/CFT supervision. This responds to the international trend of leveraging technology and data to identify and assess money laundering and terrorist financing risks to the stability and integrity of the financial system. AIs are asked to assess the implications of the AMLS Project with respect to the adoption of regtech solutions in their AML/CFT programmes.

On 29 December 2020, the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer (“**OGCIO**”) launched the initiative of iAM Smart. In a circular of the same date, the HKMA encouraged AIs and SVF licensees to actively consider the adoption of iAM Smart. iAM Smart provides all Hong Kong residents with a single digital identity and authentication to conduct government and commercial transactions online. Users can make use of the biometrics in their personal mobile devices to authenticate their identities, which will have been verified against their Hong Kong ID cards during the iAM Smart registration process. This means that users can enjoy convenient access to various online services without the need to manage different groups of usernames and passwords or carry multiple security tokens. It is also possible (by attending in person for registration) for iAM Smart to support digital signing with legal backing under the Electronic Transactions Ordinance (legal backing means that it can be used to sign statutory forms and contracts with the government). iAM Smart may be used to store personal data. This avoids users filling in the same data when making different online applications. Users may also consent to their

personal data being provided to other entities for different online services. iAM Smart is expected to facilitate remote on-boarding of customers. The HKMA regards the introduction of iAM Smart as a key milestone in the development of Hong Kong's fintech ecosystem.

On 15 December 2020, OSL Digital Securities Limited became the first Securities and Futures Commission (“SFC”)-licensed virtual asset trading platform operator, under the SFC's new licensing regime for virtual assets. See question 3.2 for further detail.

The HKMA, the Insurance Authority (“IA”) and the SFC each operates a regulatory sandbox. As at the end of January 2021, the HKMA's sandbox had tested 199 new technology products – eight in biometric authentication, six in DLT, 14 in API, 100 in regtech, five in soft token, three in chatbot, 14 in mobile app enhancements and 49 in miscellaneous technologies. Separately, banks had collaborated with tech firms in 151 trial cases.

Finally, it is notable that Hong Kong is one of the key cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macau “Greater Bay Area” roadmap announced by the Chinese government in February 2019 to develop and integrate an area in southern Mainland China, Hong Kong and Macau into an innovation and technology hub.

### 1.2 Are there any types of fintech business that are at present prohibited or restricted in your jurisdiction (for example cryptocurrency-based businesses)?

No particular fintech businesses are prohibited or restricted (except that fintech businesses in the gambling sector are effectively prohibited under Hong Kong's gambling legislation).

Cryptocurrencies as such are not prohibited, but the offer of cryptocurrencies to investors in Hong Kong (typically as part of an Initial Coin Offering (“ICO”)) may, depending on the features of the offering, be subject to Hong Kong's existing securities law regime. Intermediaries providing services to Hong Kong investors in relation to investments in cryptocurrency-related investment products (such as Bitcoin futures) or funds may also be regulated by the existing regulatory regime.

In addition, on 3 November 2020, the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau of the Hong Kong government (“FSTB”) published a consultation paper on legislative proposals to introduce a new licensing regime for virtual asset services providers, which will apply to virtual asset (including cryptocurrency) exchanges. See section 3 below for further detail.

## 2 Funding For Fintech

### 2.1 Broadly, what types of funding are available for new and growing businesses in your jurisdiction (covering both equity and debt)?

Generally speaking, equity funding by a small number of investors for a private company in Hong Kong is relatively simple and straightforward. However, existing regulatory restrictions in Hong Kong will need to be considered in the context of crowd-funding in Hong Kong (including restrictions regarding the public offer of shares and the issue of advertisements/invitations to the public to acquire securities). See section 3 for further detail.

Most new and growing businesses can obtain debt financing from banks and money lenders operating in Hong Kong. Peer-to-peer lending in Hong Kong may be subject to certain restrictions under the current regulatory regime – for example, under the Money Lenders Ordinance (“MLO”) and the “regulated activities” regime under Hong Kong's securities legislation (see section 3 below).

### 2.2 Are there any special incentive schemes for investment in tech/fintech businesses, or in small/medium-sized businesses more generally, in your jurisdiction, e.g. tax incentive schemes for enterprise investment or venture capital investment?

The SME Funding Scheme provides financial assistance to SMEs looking to expand their markets outside of Hong Kong and The Innovation and Technology Fund provides financial support for businesses that contribute to innovation and technology in Hong Kong.

Other facilitation measures include the incubation programmes at Cyberport and the Hong Kong Science & Technology Parks (“HKSTP”), both of which provide funding and other support for technology start-ups.

A two-tier profits tax regime applies (profits tax rate for the first HK\$2 million of profits is lowered to 8.25%, with the standard tax rate of 16.5% for profits exceeding that amount) and enhanced tax deductions are available for eligible R&D expenditure. These measures were initially introduced with effect from the 2018/2019 tax year and continue to apply.

### 2.3 In brief, what conditions need to be satisfied for a business to IPO in your jurisdiction?

The listing criteria depends on whether a business intends to list on the Main Board or the GEM Board (designed for growth companies) of The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited (“SEHK”), and whether the company intends to list with weighted voting rights (“WVR”).

#### Main Board

For a listing on the Main Board, an applicant without WVR must meet the following key requirements (amongst others):

#### Financial Requirements

The applicant should generally have a trading record of at least three financial years and fulfil one of the following three criteria:

1. Profit Test:
  - a. profits attributable to shareholders of at least HK\$50 million in the last three financial years (with profits of at least HK\$20 million recorded in the most recent year and aggregate profits of at least HK\$30 million recorded in the two years before that); and
  - b. market capitalisation of at least HK\$500 million at the time of listing.
2. Market Capitalisation/Revenue/Cashflow Test:
  - a. market capitalisation of at least HK\$2 billion at the time of listing;
  - b. revenue of at least HK\$500 million for the most recent audited financial year; and
  - c. positive cashflow from operating activities of at least HK\$100 million in aggregate for the three preceding financial years.
3. Market Capitalisation/Revenue Test:
  - a. market capitalisation of at least HK\$4 billion at the time of listing; and
  - b. revenue of at least HK\$500 million for the most recent audited financial year.

On 27 November 2020, the SEHK issued a consultation paper on the proposed changes to the Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited (“Listing Rules”) to increase the profit test for listing on the Main Board. The consultation paper provides for two options:

- (i) profits attributable to shareholders of at least HK\$125 million in the last three financial years (with profits of at

least HK\$50 million recorded in the most recent year and aggregate profits of at least HK\$75 million recorded in the two years before that); or

- (ii) profits attributable to shareholders of at least HK\$150 million in the last three financial years (with profits of at least HK\$60 million recorded in the most recent year and aggregate profits of at least HK\$90 million recorded in the two years before that).

Considering potential listing applicants' financial performances may have been adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and the uncertainties arising from the economic and political frictions between the United States and China, if increased profit requirements are adopted, the consultation paper further proposes to give certain temporary reliefs from the new requirements if an applicant is able to meet specified conditions. The consultation paper also proposes certain transitional arrangements for the new requirements, such that the effective date would be no earlier than 1 July 2021 and Main Board listing applications will be assessed under the existing profit requirements if they are submitted before the proposed effective date and remain active as at that date. Such applications would be allowed to be renewed once after the proposed effective date for the new requirements for continued assessment under the existing requirements.

The consultation period ended on 1 February 2021.

#### Accounting Standards

Accounts must be prepared according to HKFRS, IFRS or (in the case of applicants from the Mainland of the People's Republic of China ("PRC")) China Accounting Standards for Business Enterprises.

#### Suitability for Listing

The business must be considered suitable for listing by the SEHK.

#### Public Float

Normally, at least 25% of the company's total number of issued shares must be in public hands, with market capitalisation of at least HK\$125 million in public hands.

#### GEM Board

The same requirements on accounting standards and suitability for listing apply to the GEM Board, but there are less onerous financial requirements compared with the Main Board (given GEM is designed for growth companies), with the key differences being:

#### Financial Requirements

The applicant must have a trading record of at least two financial years comprising:

1. positive cashflow generated from the ordinary course of business of at least HK\$30 million in aggregate in the last two financial years; and
2. market capitalisation of at least HK\$150 million at the time of listing.

#### Public Float

The same 25% public holding applies, but with market capitalisation of at least HK\$45 million in public hands.

#### WVR

Subject to adopting certain investor protection safeguards, a company is permitted to list with WVR on the Main Board if (amongst other things) it is considered "innovative" by the SEHK, has a minimum expected market capitalisation of HK\$10 billion

and at least HK\$1 billion of revenue for the most recent audited financial year. If its revenue is below this, then it must have a minimum expected market capitalisation of HK\$40 billion.

The new regime currently limits beneficiaries of WVR to "founder-type" individuals who are materially responsible for the growth of the issuer's business. WVR beneficiaries are not permitted to transfer their WVR interests and must remain directors of the issuer (failing which their WVR interests will convert into ordinary shares). In January 2020, the SEHK published a consultation paper to seek views on whether WVR should be extended to corporates, subject to further safeguards. However, in its consultation conclusions published on 30 October 2020 the SEHK confirmed that it would not be implementing the proposals in the consultation paper at this stage in order to give the market more time to understand the regulatory regime applicable to WVR and for the regulators to monitor how the current regime is operating. The SEHK did confirm, however, that it would extend the existing grandfathering arrangements for Greater China issuers (namely those with a centre of gravity in Greater China) seeking a secondary listing in Hong Kong, where such issuers are (a) controlled by corporate WVR beneficiaries as at the date of the consultation conclusions, and (b) primary listed on a qualifying exchange (comprising of the New York Stock Exchange, NASDAQ or the Main Market of the London Stock Exchange) on or before the date of the consultation conclusions.

Companies with primary WVR listings are now also eligible for Stock Connect (a collaboration between the Hong Kong, Shanghai and Shenzhen Stock Exchanges, allowing international and Mainland Chinese investors to trade securities in each other's markets through the trading and clearing facilities of their home exchange) and it is hoped that this will be extended to companies with secondary WVR listings.

Xiaomi and Meituan Dianping became the first companies to list under the new WVR regime, raising HK\$58.8 billion and HK\$42.6 billion, respectively. Alibaba recently became the third – and the first secondary listing – and was followed by the secondary listings of JD.Com, ZTO Express, GDS Holdings Limited and Baozun Inc. It is hoped that more high-profile new economy companies will follow suit, particularly given the extension of the existing grandfathering arrangements for Greater China issuers controlled by corporate WVR beneficiaries seeking a secondary listing in Hong Kong.

#### **2.4 Have there been any notable exits (sale of business or IPO) by the founders of fintech businesses in your jurisdiction?**

The SEHK ranked first globally for total funds IPO funds raised in 2019, with 183 completed during the year, raising total funds of HK\$314 billion. In addition, the Main Board achieved a historical high of 168 new listings during 2019 (including 20 transferred from the GEM Board). In 2020, 154 new listings were completed, raising total funds of HK\$398 billion, an increase of over 26% on the HK\$314 billion raised in 2019. More than 60% of the HK\$398 billion raised in 2020 was raised by "new economy" companies, with new economy listings accounting for 29% of total market capitalisation in Hong Kong as of 31 December 2020.

Technology, media and telecoms (TMT) was the leading sector in terms of funds raised in 2019, bolstered by the secondary listing of Alibaba, which raised a total of HK\$101.2 billion, representing 33% of the total funds raised in the Hong Kong IPO market. In 2020, the SEHK welcomed the secondary listings of NetEase at HK\$24.3 billion and JD.com at HK\$34.6 billion. On 3 November 2020, Ant Group's record-setting dual listing in Shanghai and Hong Kong, which would have raised some HK\$28.7 trillion, was suspended pending regulatory review.

The healthcare and life sciences sector also performed strongly in 2019, raising HK\$38.5 billion, buoyed by the continued development of Hong Kong's biotech ecosystem. This included the listing of nine pre-revenue biotech companies under the new listing regime, raising a total of HK\$15.4 billion. The upward trend continued in 2020 with 23 new listings raising a total of HK\$105 billion. This included the listing of 14 pre-revenue biotech companies, raising a total of HK\$40 billion.

### 3 Fintech Regulation

#### 3.1 Please briefly describe the regulatory framework(s) for fintech businesses operating in your jurisdiction, and the type of fintech activities that are regulated.

There is no specific regulatory framework for fintech businesses operating in Hong Kong. Such businesses are subject to the existing body of Hong Kong financial laws and regulations.

Fintech firms which carry out "regulated activities" in Hong Kong must be licensed by the SFC unless they fall within an exemption. Types of regulated activities under the Securities and Futures Ordinance ("SFO") which are more relevant to fintech businesses include: dealing in securities or futures contracts; advising on securities, futures contracts or corporate finance; leveraged foreign exchange trading (which broadly covers forwards); providing automated trading services; securities margin financing; and asset management. In addition, the new regulated activities relating to OTC derivatives (dealing in or advising on OTC derivative products and providing client clearing services for OTC derivative transactions), which are not yet in force, may be relevant to fintech businesses operating in Hong Kong once brought into effect (the timing for this remains unclear).

The SFO regime applies to all types of entities carrying out a regulated activity, whether they provide traditional financial services or activities more typically associated with fintech start-ups, such as crowdfunding, peer-to-peer lending and automated trading platforms. For the regulation of virtual assets, see question 3.2 below.

In addition to the SFO regulated activities regime, other potentially relevant regulatory regimes are summarised below:

- **Banking Ordinance ("BO")**  
The BO provides:
  - (i) no person shall act as a "money broker" unless approved by the HKMA – broadly this covers entities that negotiate, arrange or facilitate the entry by clients into arrangements with banks (or the entry by banks into arrangements with third parties);
  - (ii) no "banking business" shall be carried on in Hong Kong except by a licensed bank – this covers: (a) receiving from the general public money on current, deposit, savings or other similar account repayable on demand or within less than a specified period; and (b) paying or collecting cheques drawn by or paid in by customers; and
  - (iii) no business of taking deposits can be carried on in Hong Kong except by an AI.
- **MLO**  
A person carrying on business as a "money lender" in Hong Kong requires a money lender's licence under the MLO. Broadly, a "money lender" is a person whose business is that of making loans or who holds himself out in any way as carrying on that business. Certain types of loans are exempted, including loans made by a company, or an individual whose ordinary business does not primarily involve money lending in the ordinary course of that business.

- **Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing Ordinance ("AMLO")**

Under the AMLO, the Hong Kong Customs and Excise Department requires any person who wishes to operate a "money service" in Hong Kong to apply for a Money Service Operator licence.

"Money service" covers: (i) a money changing service (a service for exchanging currencies that is operated in Hong Kong as a business); and (ii) a remittance service (a service operated in Hong Kong as a business for: sending money (or arranging for such) to a place outside Hong Kong, receiving money (or arranging for such) from outside Hong Kong, or arranging for the receipt of money outside Hong Kong).

- **Payment Systems and Stored Value Facilities Ordinance ("PSSVFO")**

The PSSVFO provides a licensing regime for the issue of "stored value facilities". Broadly, these are facilities that can be used to store the value of an amount of money that is paid into the facility from time to time as a means of making payments for goods or services. The regime covers both device-based and network-based facilities.

The PSSVFO also regulates retail payment systems, but only where the failure of a particular system may result in systemic issues for the Hong Kong financial system. It is therefore not relevant to the majority of retail payment systems.

- **Insurance Ordinance ("IO")**

The IO provides no person shall carry on any class of insurance business in or from Hong Kong unless authorised to do so. The IO was also amended with effect from 23 September 2019 to cover the regulation of insurance intermediaries – i.e. agents and brokers – which were previously regulated by three self-regulatory organisations (SROs).

#### 3.2 Is there any regulation in your jurisdiction specifically directed at cryptocurrencies or cryptoassets?

There are currently no laws in Hong Kong that specifically regulate virtual assets. However, as described in question 1.3 above, on 3 November 2020 the FSTB published a consultation paper on legislative proposals to introduce a new licensing regime for virtual asset services providers, which will apply to virtual asset (including cryptocurrency) exchanges. This is described in further detail below.

In addition, the SFC has issued a number of circulars and statements clarifying its regulatory stance in relation to virtual assets.

The first such circular was a statement published in September 2017 in relation to ICOs, in which the SFC warned that:

- where the digital tokens involved in an ICO fall within the definition of "securities" in the SFO, dealing in or advising on the digital tokens, or managing or marketing a fund investing in such digital tokens, may constitute a "regulated activity";
- where an ICO involves an offer to the Hong Kong public to acquire "securities" or participate in a collective investment scheme, registration or authorisation requirements may be triggered unless an exemption applies;
- parties engaging in the secondary trading of such tokens (e.g. on cryptocurrency exchanges) may also be subject to the SFC's licensing and conduct requirements; and
- certain requirements relating to automated trading services and recognised exchange companies may be applicable to the business activities of cryptocurrency exchanges.

This was followed by a circular published in December 2017 in relation to Bitcoin futures contracts and other cryptocurrency-related investment products, in which the SFC warned that:

- Bitcoin futures contracts traded on and subject to the rules of a futures exchange are regarded as “futures contracts” for the purposes of the SFO, even though the underlying assets of such contracts may not be regulated under the SFO;
- other cryptocurrency-related investment products may, depending on their terms and features, be regarded as “securities” as defined under the SFO; and
- parties dealing in, advising on, or managing or marketing a fund investing in such contracts or products may therefore be subject to the SFC’s licensing, conduct and authorisation requirements under the SFO.

On 28 March 2019, the SFC published a statement on Securities Token Offerings (“STOs”). The circular explains that STOs typically refer to specific offerings which are structured to have features of traditional securities offerings and involve security tokens which are digital representations of ownership of assets (e.g. gold or real estate) or economic rights (e.g. a share of profits or revenue) utilising blockchain technology. It goes on to explain that security tokens are normally offered to professional investors only and that in Hong Kong, they are likely to be “securities” as defined under the SFO and therefore subject to the securities laws of Hong Kong. In particular, under the SFC’s Guidelines on Online Distribution and Advisory Platforms and paragraph 5.5 of the SFC’s Code of Conduct for Persons Licensed by or Registered with the Securities and Futures Commission (“**SFC Code of Conduct**”), security tokens would be regarded as “complex products” and therefore additional investor protection measures apply. In addition, intermediaries are expected to observe requirements which are similar to those set out in the SFC’s circular on the distribution of virtual asset funds published on 1 November 2018 (discussed below), namely enhanced selling restrictions, due diligence and information to be provided to clients.

In November 2018, the SFC published a statement and a circular containing measures which aim to regulate the management and distribution of virtual asset funds so that investors’ interests are protected at the fund management or distribution level (or both). The measures do not amend the law or the definitions of “securities” or “futures contracts” – they are intended to clarify the existing law whilst imposing new requirements on virtual asset fund managers in the form of licensing conditions and new requirements on virtual asset fund distributors as provided for under the circular. The SFC published proforma terms and conditions for this purpose on 4 October 2019, which will be imposed as licensing conditions on licensed corporations that manage a fund (or portion of a fund) that invests in virtual assets and which meet the *de minimis* threshold. Contravention of a licensing condition is likely to be considered as misconduct under the SFO which will reflect adversely on the fitness and properness of a virtual asset fund manager to remain licensed and may result in disciplinary action by the SFC.

The November 2018 statement clarified that managing funds solely investing in, or operating platforms which only provide trading services for, virtual assets that are not “securities” or “futures contracts” are outside the scope of SFC regulation. However, the statement provides that the following types of virtual asset portfolio managers and fund distributors will be subject to SFC supervision:

- Firms managing funds which solely invest in virtual assets that do not constitute “securities” or “futures contracts” and which distribute the same in Hong Kong. These firms will typically require a licence for Type 1 regulated activity (dealing in securities) because they distribute these funds

in Hong Kong. The management of these funds will also be subject to SFC oversight through the imposition of licensing conditions.

- Firms which are licensed or are to be licensed for Type 9 regulated activity (asset management) for managing portfolios in “securities”, “futures contracts” or both and which manage portfolios which invest solely or partially (subject to a *de minimis* requirement) in virtual assets that do not constitute “securities” or “futures contracts”. Such management will also be subject to SFC oversight through the imposition of licensing conditions.
- Firms which distribute funds that invest (solely or partially) in virtual assets in Hong Kong, irrespective of whether such funds are authorised by the SFC. These firms will require a licence for Type 1 regulated activity (dealing in securities) and are therefore subject to existing requirements, including suitability obligations, when distributing these funds.

The November 2018 statement also set out details of a conceptual framework to explore the regulation of virtual asset trading platforms. This was followed on 6 November 2019 by the publication by the SFC of a position paper (the “**Position Paper**”) setting out a new regulatory framework for virtual asset trading platforms (the “**opt-in regime**”). Like the original conceptual framework, the opt-in regime effectively applies on a voluntary basis; although the Position Paper emphasises that the SFC will only grant licences to platform operators which are capable of meeting robust regulatory standards, being standards comparable to those which apply to licensed securities brokers and automated trading venues but which also incorporate additional requirements to address specific risks associated with virtual assets. For example, the SFC will impose licensing conditions requiring that platform operators offer their services exclusively to professional investors, only service clients who have sufficient knowledge of virtual assets and maintain stringent criteria for the inclusion of virtual assets on their platforms. These terms and conditions (the “**VA Platform Operator Ts&Cs**”) are set out Appendix 1 of the Position Paper. The VA Platform Operator Ts&Cs include the requirement for platform operators to perform all reasonable due diligence on all virtual assets before including them on its platform for trading and to ensure that they continue to satisfy all application criteria. In relation to virtual assets which fall under the definition of “securities” under the SFO, a platform operator should only include those which: (i) are asset-backed; (ii) are approved or qualified by, or registered with, regulators in comparable jurisdictions (as agreed by the SFC from time to time); and (iii) have a post-issuance track record of 12 months. We expect the 12-month post-issuance track record to present particular challenges for prospective licensees. In addition, licensed platforms will be placed in the SFC’s regulatory sandbox for a period of close and intensive supervision.

On 15 December 2020, OSL Digital Securities Limited became the first SFC-licensed virtual asset trading platform operator under the new licensing framework set out in the Position Paper. OSL’s SFC licences granted for this purpose – for Type 1 (dealing in securities) and Type 7 (providing automated trading services) regulated activities – are subject to the VA Platform Operator Ts&Cs.

As described above, on 3 November 2020, the FSTB published a consultation paper on legislative proposals to introduce a new licensing regime for virtual asset services providers (“**VASPs**”). This ties in with the Financial Action Task Force (“**FATF**”)’s revision of its Standards in February 2019, under Recommendation 15, to require jurisdictions to regulate (or prohibit) VASPs for AML/CTF purposes in the same way as financial institutions. For now, the VASP licensing regime will only apply to “VA exchanges” (as defined below), and not to other VASP activities



(such as virtual asset payment systems or custodian services), as those are not prevalent in Hong Kong. Future consideration will be given to extending the VASP licensing regime if there is a need to do so – and flexibility will be built into the licensing regime from the outset to provide for such expansion.

A “virtual asset”, or “VA”, is defined in the consultation paper to mean: a digital representation of value that is expressed as a unit of account or a store of economic value; functions (or is intended to function) as a medium of exchange accepted by the public as payment for goods or services or for the discharge of a debt, or for investment purposes; and can be transferred, stored or traded electronically. The definition does not cover: digital representations of fiat currencies (including digital currencies issued by central banks); financial assets (e.g. securities and authorised structured products) already regulated under the SFO; or closed-loop, limited purpose items that are non-transferable, non-exchangeable and non-fungible (e.g. air miles, credit card rewards, gift cards, customer loyalty programmes, gaming coins, etc.). Virtual assets purportedly backed by some form of assets for the purpose of stabilising their value (commonly known as “stablecoins”) would however be caught.

A “VA exchange” is defined to mean any trading platform which is operated for the purpose of allowing an offer or invitation to be made to buy or sell any VA in exchange for any money or any VA (whether of the same or different type), and which comes into custody, control, power or possession of, or over, any money or any VA at any point in time during its course of business. Peer-to-peer trading platforms (i.e. platforms that only provide a forum where buyers and sellers of VAs can post their bids and offers, with or without automatic matching mechanisms, for the parties themselves to trade at an outside venue), to the extent that the actual transaction is conducted outside the platform and the platform is not involved in the underlying transaction by coming into possession of any money or any VA at any point in time, are not covered under the definition of “VA exchange”.

Under the consultation paper, any person seeking to operate a VA exchange must apply for a licence from the SFC under AMLO. Only locally incorporated companies with a permanent place of business in Hong Kong will be permitted to apply for a licence. Applicants, their responsible officers and ultimate owners must satisfy a “fit and proper” test (including experience and relevant qualification requirements). A licensed VA exchange will also be required to observe the AML/CTF requirements under Schedule 2 to the AMLO that apply to financial institutions.

With reference to the current opt-in regime (to ensure a level playing field), the FSTB also proposes to empower the SFC to impose licensing conditions on licensed VA exchanges and to implement regulatory requirements (including codes and guidelines) covering, amongst other things: (a) offering services to professional investors only (for the initial stage of the regime at least – the SFC will continue to monitor the market and reconsider its position as the market becomes more mature in future); (b) financial resources; (c) knowledge and experience; (d) soundness of business; (e) risk management; (f) segregation and management of client assets; (g) VA listing and trading policies; (h) financial reporting and disclosure; (i) prevention of market manipulative and abusive activities; and (j) prevention of conflicts of interest.

A VA exchange that is already regulated as a licensed corporation under the opt-in regime will be exempt from the VASP licensing regime. After a short period, currently anticipated to be 180 days after commencement of operation of the VASP licensing regime, all operators carrying on VA exchange business must possess a valid licence issued by the SFC. The regime will also prohibit a person, whether in Hong Kong or elsewhere, from actively marketing to the Hong Kong public a regulated VA activity or associated services, unless that person is properly licensed and regulated by the SFC to carry out the regulated VA activity.

### 3.3 Are financial regulators and policy-makers in your jurisdiction receptive to fintech innovation and technology-driven new entrants to regulated financial services markets, and if so how is this manifested? Are there any regulatory ‘sandbox’ options for fintechs in your jurisdiction?

Financial regulators and policy-makers in Hong Kong are receptive to fintech. Banking, securities and insurance regulators have each set up dedicated fintech offices and sandboxes to deal with regulatory enquiries and handle pilot trials respectively. The sandboxes of the three regulators are linked up so that there is a single point of entry for pilot trials of cross-sector fintech products.

The HKMA’s supervisory approach to fintech is risk-based and technology-neutral. It has established a Fintech Facilitation Office to act as an interface between market participants and the HKMA. The HKMA’s sandbox allows banks (together with their partnering technology firms) to conduct pilot trials of their fintech initiatives involving a limited number of participating customers without the need to achieve full compliance with the HKMA’s supervisory requirements. See question 1.1 above for a summary of the pilot trials so far.

The SFC’s approach to fintech is also technology-neutral. It has established a Fintech Contact Point and a regulatory sandbox. The SFC’s sandbox is open to SFC-licensed corporations and start-ups that intend to carry on an SFO-regulated activity to test the activities in a confined regulatory environment before the fintech is used on a fuller scale.

The IA has also established a sandbox for authorized insurers, as well as an Insurtech Facilitation Team to enhance communication with businesses involved in the development and application of fintech, and a fast track for applications for authorisation of new insurers owning and operating solely digital distribution channels.

The HKMA, the SFC and the IA are members of the Global Financial Innovation Network, to which firms can apply to conduct cross-border tests of innovative financial products or services.

### 3.4 What, if any, regulatory hurdles must fintech businesses (or financial services businesses offering fintech products and services) which are established outside your jurisdiction overcome in order to access new customers in your jurisdiction?

The SFO licensing regime applies to all businesses carrying out regulated activities in Hong Kong, whether they are established in Hong Kong or not. A fintech business based overseas which actively markets, to the Hong Kong public, services which constitute a regulated activity will *prima facie* be regarded as carrying on business in a regulated activity, for which a licence is required. An overseas-based fintech firm would be caught whether it is marketing by itself or through another entity, and whether in Hong Kong or otherwise.

There are various exemptions from the licensing regime, including (for certain regulated activities) dealing only with professional investors, or targeting/carrying on business with a small number of investors in Hong Kong (not constituting the “public”). An overseas fintech firm may also be able to “deal in securities” through another entity licensed to deal in securities or which is a Hong Kong-licensed bank. There are specific requirements in order to fall within the exemptions and specific legal advice in the context of the particular facts should be sought.

The SFO also prohibits overseas firms issuing to the Hong Kong public any advertisement or invitation to acquire securities and other specified products unless prior SFC authorisation

is obtained. The definition of “advertisement” is very broad and includes every form of advertising, whether made orally, electronically or by any other means. There are a number of exemptions, including one relating to professional investors. Again, specific legal advice in the context of the particular facts should be sought.

In addition to the SFO regime, fintech businesses intending to operate in Hong Kong, whether or not they are established here, should comply with (or fall within an exemption to) the regulatory regimes under the BO (which includes restrictions on deposit advertisements), MLO, AMLO, PSSVFO and the IO referred to in question 3.1. The extent to which these regimes apply to a fintech firm will depend on the specific nature of the firm’s operations.

## 4 Other Regulatory Regimes / Non-Financial Regulation

### 4.1 Does your jurisdiction regulate the collection/use/ transmission of personal data, and if yes, what is the legal basis for such regulation and how does this apply to fintech businesses operating in your jurisdiction?

The Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (“**PDPO**”) establishes a principles-based regime which regulates the collection, holding, processing and use of personal data in Hong Kong.

Fintech businesses in Hong Kong which are “data users” (defined as persons who control the collection, holding, processing or use of personal data) are regulated by the PDPO. The principles which data users must observe mainly relate to notification requirements at the time of collection of personal data, accuracy and duration of retention of personal data and security and access to personal data. There are also particular restrictions regarding the use of client lists to market products.

In addition to the PDPO, the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (“**Commissioner**”) has published industry guidance on the proper handling of customers’ personal data, including for those in the banking industry. The Commissioner has issued guidance in relation to the collection and use of personal data through the internet, use of portable storage devices, online behavioural tracking and “cloud computing”, and has issued an information leaflet on physical tracking and monitoring through electronic devices.

Unsolicited direct marketing by electronic means is also covered by the Unsolicited Electronic Messages Ordinance, which applies to electronic commercial messages with a “Hong Kong link” including those to which the PDPO does not apply. This would cover messages sent by fintech entities to promote their services or investment opportunities over a public telecommunications service to electronic addresses.

### 4.2 Do your data privacy laws apply to organisations established outside of your jurisdiction? Do your data privacy laws restrict international transfers of data?

Although the PDPO does not have extraterritorial application, it applies to foreign organisations to the extent they have offices or an operation in (including agents located in) Hong Kong. The PDPO applies to data users that are able to control the collection, holding, processing or use of personal data in or from Hong Kong.

The PDPO contains a restriction on the transfer of personal data outside Hong Kong and transfers between two other jurisdictions where the transfer is controlled by a Hong Kong data user, although this restriction has not yet been brought into force. The restriction, once in force, will prohibit the transfer of personal data from Hong Kong to a place outside Hong Kong

unless one of a number of conditions is met, including: the data user taking all reasonable precautions and due diligence to ensure the data will not be dealt with in a manner that would contravene the PDPO; transferring to a place which has data protection laws similar to the PDPO; or where the data subject has consented in writing to the transfer.

### 4.3 Please briefly describe the sanctions that apply for failing to comply with your data privacy laws.

Failure to comply with the PDPO could potentially result in the following sanctions:

- Regulatory action: the Commissioner may investigate complaints of breaches of the PDPO, initiate investigations and issue enforcement notices. A data user who contravenes an enforcement notice is liable to a fine and imprisonment.
- Criminal liability: the PDPO contains a number of criminal offences; for example, failure to comply with requirements of the Commissioner, disclosing personal data without consent for gain or causing loss, and in relation to direct marketing. Maximum penalties for breaches under the PDPO are fines of up to HK\$1 million and five years’ imprisonment.
- Civil claims: individuals who suffer loss as a result of their personal data being used in contravention of the PDPO are entitled to compensation by the data user. The Commissioner may also institute civil proceedings against any data user that fails to comply with an enforcement notice.
- Reputational risk: the results of any investigation, the name of the organisation involved and details of the breaches may be published by the Commissioner.

Liabilities incurred under the PDPO are likely to be direct marketing breaches. This is because breach of the other provisions of the PDPO tends first to lead to the Commissioner issuing an enforcement notice – and the recipient of the enforcement notice will only be subject to liabilities upon non-compliance with the enforcement notice.

### 4.4 Does your jurisdiction have cyber security laws or regulations that may apply to fintech businesses operating in your jurisdiction?

In Hong Kong, cybersecurity is dealt with through a range of laws and regulations, including the PDPO and criminal law. There are various criminal offences relating to cybersecurity, such as: damaging or misusing property (computer program or data); making false entries in banks’ books of accounts by electronic means; unauthorised access to a computer with intent to commit an offence or with dishonest intent; and unlawfully altering, adding or erasing the function or records of a computer. Although there is currently no mandatory data breach notification requirement in Hong Kong applicable to data users generally, the Commissioner has provided data users with guidance on practical steps in handling data breaches and mitigating the loss and damage caused to the individuals involved. Data users may also be required to notify data breaches under applicable regulatory regimes and their associated codes/guidelines (e.g. the SFC Code of Conduct).

The Cyber Security and Technology Crime Bureau of the Hong Kong Police Force is the department responsible for handling cybersecurity issues and carrying out technology crime investigations and prevention. It has established close links with local and overseas law enforcement agencies to combat cross-border technology crime.

Cybersecurity remains a key priority for the regulators. The HKMA has launched several significant measures to strengthen cyber resilience in the banking sector, including an enhanced competency framework on cybersecurity. Entities that are regulated as licensed corporations by the SFC are equally expected to take appropriate measures to critically review and assess the effectiveness of their cybersecurity controls. The SFC has issued a circular setting out certain key areas that licensed corporations should pay close attention to when reviewing and controlling their cybersecurity risks, as well as certain controls that such corporations should consider implementing where applicable, and has also issued guidelines to mitigate hacking risks associated with internet trading. In October 2019, the SFC issued a circular to licensed corporations on the use of external electronic data storage, which is now supported by a set of frequently asked questions (FAQs) issued by the SFC in December 2020.

#### 4.5 Please describe any AML and other financial crime requirements that may apply to fintech businesses in your jurisdiction.

International standards of anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing are set by the FATF. As a member of the FATF, Hong Kong implements recommendations promulgated by this inter-government body to combat money laundering and terrorist financing.

Local legislation dealing with money laundering and terrorist financing includes: AMLO; Drug Trafficking (Recovery of Proceeds) Ordinance (“DTROP”); Organized and Serious Crimes Ordinance (“OSCO”); and United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance (“UNATMO”).

In addition to the requirements discussed under question 3.1 above, the AMLO imposes customer due diligence and record-keeping requirements on financial institutions (including licensed corporations, banks and other AIs, and insurance companies, agents and brokers) and certain professions, while DTROP, OSCO and UNATMO require the reporting of suspicious transactions regarding money laundering or terrorist financing and prohibit related dealing activities.

The SFC, HKMA and the IA have each issued guidance to financial institutions on designing and implementing anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing policies and controls to meet AMLO and other relevant requirements.

The Prevention of Bribery Ordinance is the primary anti-corruption legislation in Hong Kong. It is directed at the corruption of public officers (public sector offences) and corrupt transactions with agents which includes employees of private companies (private sector offences).

#### 4.6 Are there any other regulatory regimes that may apply to fintech businesses operating in your jurisdiction?

In addition to the legal and regulatory regimes described above, fintech businesses will, depending on the nature and structure of their operations, also be subject to other laws, including: business registration (if carrying on business in Hong Kong); Hong Kong Companies Registry registration (if having a place of business in Hong Kong); and Hong Kong tax laws (noting that corporate income tax applies only to locally sourced profits – not worldwide profits).

## 5 Accessing Talent

### 5.1 In broad terms, what is the legal framework around the hiring and dismissal of staff in your jurisdiction? Are there any particularly onerous requirements or restrictions that are frequently encountered by businesses?

The requirements for the hiring or dismissal of employees in Hong Kong are not particularly onerous. In relation to hiring employees, a written employment contract is advisable but not strictly required in most cases (although a written notice of certain key terms may be required upon request by an employee). Notification to the Inland Revenue Department is required within three months of commencement of employment. Collective agreements and trade union arrangements are not compulsory and are relatively uncommon in Hong Kong.

Unless there are grounds for summary dismissal (such as habitual neglect of duties), a statutory minimum notice period (or payment *in lieu*) will apply to a notice of termination of an employment contract, and statutory severance or long service payment (but not both) may be payable up to a statutory maximum amount of HK\$390,000. Statutory severance is payable to an employee (with minimum two years’ continuous service) who is made redundant. Long service payment is payable to an employee (with minimum five years’ continuous service) who is dismissed for any reason other than summary dismissal unless he is already entitled to severance payment.

The employer must notify the Inland Revenue Department (and the Immigration Department if the employee’s working visa is sponsored by the employer) of the dismissal. There are no other particular dismissal procedures which must be observed under Hong Kong legislation, but employers must follow any internal company procedures that may form part of the employment terms.

Employers must not dismiss certain protected categories of employees (such as pregnant employees or employees on statutory sick leave) or in contravention of anti-discrimination laws (e.g. on gender, race and disability). Otherwise, provided the employer has either served the requisite notice of termination or made payment *in lieu* of notice, the contract is terminated lawfully, regardless of the reason for dismissal. That being said, an employee with a minimum of two years’ continuous service has a right to make a claim in the Labour Tribunal for dismissal, where the employee is dismissed because the employer intends to distinguish or reduce any statutory right or benefit of the employee, unless the dismissal is for a “valid reason”, being: the conduct of the employee; his or her capability or qualifications to perform the role; redundancy or other genuine operational requirements; continued employment would be unlawful; or any other reason of substance in the opinion of the Tribunal. In practice, unless the dismissal is of a protected category of employee, the remedy which a tribunal may award is usually limited to any unpaid termination entitlements the employee should have received.

### 5.2 What, if any, mandatory employment benefits must be provided to staff?

The statutory minimum hourly wage (currently HK\$37.50) applies to most workers in Hong Kong.

Key mandatory employment benefits include:

- enrolment in a mandatory provident fund, with a monthly contribution from each of the employer and employee of 5% of the employee’s income. The mandatory element of the monthly contribution by each of the employer and employee is currently capped at HK\$1,500. The requirement does

not apply to foreign nationals with an employment visa who are either working in Hong Kong for 13 months or less, or belong to an overseas retirement scheme;

- maternity leave (14 weeks – increased from 10 weeks as from 11 December 2020) and paternity leave (five days). Employees with more than 40 weeks' continuous service are entitled to 80% pay during such leave, subject to a cap of HK\$80,000 per employee in respect of maternity leave pay for the additional four weeks of maternity leave, effective from 11 December 2020;
- paid annual leave and sickness allowance for qualifying employees; and
- employers must take out insurance in relation to employees' work-related injuries, but there are no compulsory medical benefits.

Certain statutory rights are applicable only to “continuous” employees (those who have worked for 18 or more hours per week for at least four consecutive weeks).

### 5.3 What, if any, hurdles must businesses overcome to bring employees from outside your jurisdiction into your jurisdiction? Is there a special route for obtaining permission for individuals who wish to work for fintech businesses?

Individuals who are not Hong Kong permanent residents would generally require an employment visa to enter Hong Kong for employment purposes under the General Employment Policy (“GEP”) (or the Admission Scheme for Mainland Talents and Professionals for nationals of the PRC). The GEP is quota-free and non-sector-specific. The visa must be sponsored by the employer in Hong Kong, who must demonstrate the application fulfils certain criteria, including that the applicant is employed in a job relevant to his academic qualifications or work experience that cannot be readily taken up by the local work force.

More sector-specific is the Technology Talent Admission Scheme, which the government announced in May 2018 to meet demand for talent in the innovation and technology sector. The scheme provides a fast-track arrangement for eligible companies to admit overseas and Mainland talent to undertake R&D work for them and will run on a pilot basis for three years. Eligible companies are tenants and incubatees of the HKSTP or Cyberport that are engaged in fintech, biotechnology, AI, cybersecurity, robotics, data analytics or material science.

Individuals who wish to establish or join fintech businesses or start-ups in Hong Kong may also consider an “investment as entrepreneur” visa. Such applications may be favourably considered if the applicant can demonstrate they: (i) are in a position to make a substantial contribution to the Hong Kong economy (by reference to, for example, their business plan, financial resources, investment sum and introduction of new technology or skills); or (ii) wish to start or join a start-up that is supported by a Hong Kong government-backed programme and the applicant is the proprietor or partner of the start-up or a key researcher.

Finally, there is also a quota-based Quality Migrant Admission Scheme which seeks to attract highly skilled or talented persons to settle in Hong Kong in order to enhance Hong Kong's economic competitiveness. Applicants are not required to have secured an offer of local employment but are required to fulfil a set of prerequisites under a point-based test.

## 6 Technology

### 6.1 Please briefly describe how innovations and inventions are protected in your jurisdiction.

Fintech products based on computer programs are protected

by copyright in Hong Kong. The Copyright Ordinance recognises computer programs, and preparatory design materials for computer programs, as types of literary works which can be protected by copyright. Copyright in the source code arises automatically, and registration is not needed or possible.

A database will be protected as a literary work if it falls under the general copyright law in Hong Kong. There are no separate database protection rights in Hong Kong.

In terms of patents, computer programs and business methods “as such” cannot be patented. However, patent protection may be available for software-related inventions that produce a further technical effect. Given the potential difficulties, the common law of confidence may be useful in preventing the disclosure of technical information which are trade secrets.

It is possible to register a trade mark in Hong Kong, which will protect the branding applied to a fintech product.

### 6.2 Please briefly describe how ownership of IP operates in your jurisdiction.

No registration of copyright is required or possible in Hong Kong. The general rule is the author is the first owner of copyright. In the case of a computer-generated work, the author will be the person who undertakes the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work.

However, first copyright to works: (i) made by an employee in the course of his employment will belong to the employer (unless a contrary agreement has been made); and (ii) which have been commissioned will belong to the commissioner provided there is an express agreement with the contractor to this effect. The legislation provides: (i) in the case of work produced in the course of employment, further reward for an employee if the use of the work is beyond the parties' reasonable contemplation at the time it was created (the parties can contract out of this); and (ii) in the case of commissioned work, that even where the contractor is the party entitled to the copyright under the agreement, the commissioner will still have an exclusive licence to exploit the work for purposes reasonably contemplated at the time of commissioning it, as well as the power to stop it from being used for purposes against which the commissioner could reasonably object.

The general rule is that the right to a patent belongs to the inventor. The exception is where the inventor is an employee – in which case, ownership will belong to the employer if certain conditions are met. However, compensation may be awarded to the employee where the invention is of outstanding benefit to the employer (parties cannot contract out of this).

### 6.3 In order to protect or enforce IP rights in your jurisdiction, do you need to own local/national rights or are you able to enforce other rights (for example, do any treaties or multi-jurisdictional rights apply)?

For copyright, Hong Kong has an “open qualification” system whereby works can qualify for protection irrespective of the nationality or residence of the author and where the work was first published. This extends the reciprocal protection under various international copyright conventions applicable to Hong Kong (which include the Berne Convention and WIPO (Copyright) Treaty).

A new original grant patent (“OGP”) system came into effect on 19 December 2019, which creates a direct route for seeking standard patent protection in Hong Kong with a maximum term of 20 years, as an alternative to the existing “re-registration” route. OGP applications are subject to substantive examination by the Patents Registry of the Intellectual Property Department

for determining the patentability of the underlying inventions. Under the existing “re-registration” route, a UK, EU (designating UK) or PRC patent forms the basis of a standard patent application in Hong Kong. There is no substantive examination by the Patents Registry of such “re-registration” applications. Patent protection for Hong Kong via the international patent system under the Patent Cooperation Treaty can be obtained on the basis of an international application designating the PRC, followed by a further application in Hong Kong after the international application has entered its national phase in the PRC. It is also possible to apply for a short-term patent in Hong Kong with a maximum term of eight years. Although there is also no substantive examination of short-term patent applications, another feature of the new patent system is enabling any short-term patent owner or third party having a legitimate interest in the validity of a short-term patent to request the Patents Registry to carry out a post-grant substantive examination of the underlying invention. The use of certain misleading or confusing titles/descriptions relating to the qualification of patent practitioners is also prohibited in Hong Kong under the new patent system. In tandem with the launch of the new patent system, a new electronic processing system started operation on 19 December 2019 to underpin electronic patent searches and filings.

Trade mark protection will require national registration as the international registration of trade marks under the Madrid Protocol does not currently apply to Hong Kong. On 19 June 2020, the new Trade Marks (Amendment) Ordinance 2020 came into effect, which empowers the Registrar of Trade Marks to make rules for implementing the Madrid Protocol in Hong Kong. However, actual implementation is not expected until 2022–2023 at the earliest.

#### 6.4 How do you exploit/monetise IP in your jurisdiction and are there any particular rules or restrictions regarding such exploitation/monetisation?

IP is usually exploited by means of assignment, licensing or the granting of security interests.

Depending on the type of IP right, the formalities for assignments and licences are different. Generally, an assignment must be in writing and signed by the assignor. An exclusive copyright licence should be in writing and signed by or on behalf of

the copyright owner. There is no formal written requirement for non-exclusive copyright licences. Patent licences do not need to be in writing but it is encouraged for registration (see below). Trade mark licences must be in writing and signed.

It is important to register transactions (assignments, licences and security interests) concerning registered rights (such as patents and trade marks) on the relevant IP register in order to maintain priority as against third-party interests registered in the interim. Failure to register a patent assignment or exclusive licence, or trade mark assignment or licence, within six months, will result in the assignee/licensee being unable to claim damages for any infringement relating to the period before their registration.

In addition to any registration at the relevant IP registry, certain security interests over unregistered or registered rights (copyrights, patents or trade marks) granted by Hong Kong companies should be registered at the Companies Registry within a month in order to protect against creditors.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank their colleague Benita Yu for her contribution to this chapter. Benita is a Partner at Slaughter and May. Benita has substantial experience in securities transactions, including cross-border listings and PRC state-owned enterprises and mergers and acquisitions. She also advises on international financing transactions.

Benita is a member of the Takeovers and Mergers Panel and the Takeovers Appeal Committee and was a member of the SFC (HKEC Listing) Committee of the SFC in Hong Kong. She is also a member of the Technical Panel and chairs the Company Law Interest Group of the Institute of Chartered Secretaries. She was a member of the Standing Committee on Company Law Reform of the HKSAR Government.

Benita is listed as a leading lawyer in the *IFLR1000 Asia-Pacific 2021* for Capital Markets: Debt, Capital Markets: Equity, and M&A in Hong Kong and in *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific 2021* for capital markets (Equity) in Hong Kong. She is also listed as a leading lawyer for Capital Markets: Equity (International Firms), China and Corporate/M&A: Hong Kong-based (International Firms), China in *Chambers Asia-Pacific 2021*.

The authors would also like to acknowledge their colleagues Jason Webber, Ruby Chik and Ada Zhang for their contribution to this chapter.



**Peter Lake** is a partner in the firm's Hong Kong office and is involved in a range of regulatory and corporate work, advising companies, financial institutions and fund management groups. He read law at Cambridge University and is qualified to practise Hong Kong and English law. Peter is a member of the APLMA Hong Kong Documentation Committee and The Law Society of Hong Kong's Investment Products and Financial Services Committee.

Peter is listed as a Global Leader in the 2021 edition of *Who's Who Legal Banking: Finance* and *Who's Who Legal Banking: Regulatory*, and as a leading lawyer in the *IFLR1000 Asia-Pacific 2021* for Banking in Hong Kong. He is recommended in *Chambers Asia-Pacific 2021* for Banking & Finance: Hong Kong-based (International Firms), China, and Financial Services: Non-contentious Regulatory (International Firms), China. Peter co-authored the Hong Kong chapters of *The Asset Management Review 2020* edition, *The Banking Regulation Review 2020* edition and *The Lending and Secured Finance Review 2020* edition.

**Slaughter and May**  
47/F Jardine House  
One Connaught Place, Central  
Hong Kong

Tel: +852 2521 0551  
Email: [peter.lake@slaughterandmay.com](mailto:peter.lake@slaughterandmay.com)  
URL: [www.slaughterandmay.com](http://www.slaughterandmay.com)



**Mike Ringer** is a counsel in the firm's Hong Kong office. He has a wide-ranging practice covering the full spectrum of corporate, regulatory and financing work, with a particular focus on complex regulatory issues and fintech. His clients include regulators, market infrastructure operators, commercial and investment banks, insurers, brokers, asset managers and corporates, as well as international fintech businesses and other emerging tech businesses at various stages of development.

Mike co-authored the Hong Kong chapters of *The Global Guide to Blockchain 2020* edition and *The Asset Management Review 2020* edition. Prior to joining Slaughter and May's Hong Kong office, Mike was based in the firm's London office. He is admitted as a solicitor in England and Wales and in Hong Kong.

**Slaughter and May**  
47/F Jardine House  
One Connaught Place, Central  
Hong Kong

Tel: +852 2521 0551  
Email: [mike.ringer@slaughterandmay.com](mailto:mike.ringer@slaughterandmay.com)  
URL: [www.slaughterandmay.com](http://www.slaughterandmay.com)

Slaughter and May has a long-standing presence in Asia. Our office in Hong Kong was opened in 1974 and we have extensive experience of a wide range of work throughout Asia.

In particular, we are familiar with the challenges facing clients in the fintech sector, having been involved in numerous transactions for financial institutions, global technology companies, trading platforms, investors and start-ups. Our experience includes advising: Purity Investment Limited, acting as the offeror, in relation to the proposed delisting of Huifu Payment Limited from the SEHK; Standard Chartered on its strategic investment in Linklogis, China's leading supply chain financing platform; joint sponsors and underwriters on the Hong Kong IPO of Yidu Tech Inc.; Alibaba Health Information Technology on its HK\$10 billion primary placing; Standard Chartered on its strategic joint venture to build a new standalone digital retail bank in Hong Kong; ARM on the acquisition of its share capital by SoftBank Group; SoftBank Vision Fund's investment in Ping An Healthcare and Technology and Ping An Medical and Healthcare; Zhong An Online

P&C Insurance (China's first internet insurance company) in its first round of fundraising – one of the biggest fundraisings by a Chinese fintech company in 2015; Alibaba Group on (amongst others) its cornerstone investment in Fosun Tourism Group, privatisation of Intime Retail and acquisition of SCMP Group Limited; and a number of leading international fintech businesses such as Stripe, Ingenico, Flywire, PayActiv and LiquidX.

[www.slaughterandmay.com](http://www.slaughterandmay.com)

SLAUGHTER AND MAY

# ICLG.com

## Other titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds  
Anti-Money Laundering  
Aviation Finance & Leasing  
Aviation Law  
Business Crime  
Cartels & Leniency  
Class & Group Actions  
Competition Litigation  
Construction & Engineering Law  
Consumer Protection  
Copyright  
Corporate Governance  
Corporate Immigration  
Corporate Investigations  
Corporate Tax  
Cybersecurity  
Data Protection  
Derivatives  
Designs

Digital Business  
Digital Health  
Drug & Medical Device Litigation  
Employment & Labour Law  
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments  
Environment & Climate Change Law  
Environmental, Social & Governance Law  
Family Law  
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes  
Franchise  
Gambling  
Insurance & Reinsurance  
International Arbitration  
Investor-State Arbitration  
Lending & Secured Finance  
Litigation & Dispute Resolution  
Merger Control  
Mergers & Acquisitions  
Mining Law

Oil & Gas Regulation  
Patents  
Pharmaceutical Advertising  
Private Client  
Private Equity  
Product Liability  
Project Finance  
Public Investment Funds  
Public Procurement  
Real Estate  
Renewable Energy  
Restructuring & Insolvency  
Sanctions  
Securitisation  
Shipping Law  
Technology Sourcing  
Telecoms, Media & Internet  
Trade Marks  
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms