

(Confirmed minutes)

(Draft Translation)

**Sai Kung District Council**  
**Minutes of the Fifth Meeting in 2020**

---

Date: 1 September 2020 (Tuesday) and 3 September 2020 (Thursday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room of the Sai Kung District Council

1 September 2020 (Tuesday)

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>From</u></b>	<b><u>To</u></b>
Mr CHUNG Kam-lun (Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH (Vice-Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Ms CHAN Ka-lam, Debby	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHAN Wai-lit	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-chor, Andrew	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHENG Chung-man	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung, Chris	9:35 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu	9:33 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHOI Ming-hei	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr CHUN Hoi-shing	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr FAN Kwok-wai, Gary	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Ms FONG Kwok-shan, Christine	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr FUNG Kwan-on	10:00 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr HO Wai-hong, Stanley	9:45 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LAI Ming-chak	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LAI Wai-tong	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LAM Siu-chung, Frankie	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LAU Kai-hong	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LEE Ka-yui	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LEE Yin-ho, Ryan	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Ms LEUNG Hin-yan	9:35 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LEUNG Li	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr LUI Man-kwong	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr OR Yiu-lam, Ricky	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr TSE Ching-fung	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.

Ms WONG Cheuk-nga, Valerie	9:30 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr WONG Shui-sang	9:30 a.m.	11:35 a.m.
Mr YIP Brandon Kenneth	9:40 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Mr YU Tsun-ning	9:37 a.m.	11:42 a.m.
Ms TSOI Leung-leung, Teresa (Secretary)	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sai Kung District Office	

**Absent**

Mr LUK Ping-choi

**In Attendance**

Mr CHIU Yin-wa, David, JP	District Officer (Sai Kung), Sai Kung District Office
Mr CHOW Tat-wing, Cyrus	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)1, Sai Kung District Office
Mr NG Wai-chung, Justin	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)2, Sai Kung District Office
Mr CHENG Chi-wing, Ken	Senior Liaison Officer (1), Sai Kung District Office
Mr LIU Chung-him, Michael	Executive Officer I (District Council), Sai Kung District Office
Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department
Ms LUI Siu-ying, Micy	District Social Welfare Officer (Wong Tai Sin/Sai Kung), Social Welfare Department
Mr Mark Ronald ANSTISS	District Commander (Tseung Kwan O), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LEE Chin-wang, Chris	Police Community Relations Officer (Tseung Kwan O) (Acting), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr TAM Lok-wang	Miscellaneous Enquiries Sub-unit Commander (Tseung Kwan O District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHOI Tung-tsoi	District Commander (Wong Tai Sin), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms SHUM Pok-yu	Divisional Commander (Sai Kung), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHENG Chun-tung, Seann	Police Community Relations Officer (Wong Tai Sin), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LO Sai-pak, Sunny	Chief Engineer/E1, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms LING Kuk-yi	Chief Manager/Management (Kowloon West and Sai Kung), Housing Department
Mr WONG Chak-kwan, Byon	Chief Transport Officer/Goods Vehicle, Transport Department
Ms KONG Po-yee, Alice	District Leisure Manager (Sai Kung), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms OR Siu-shan	Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Ms LAM Wai-ki	Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr MA Hon-yim, Francis	District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, District Lands Office, Sai Kung
Mr TSANG Ka-lok, Raymond	Administrative Assistant/Lands, District Lands Office, Sai Kung

The Chairman said a quorum was present and the meeting commenced officially. The Chairman was informed of the passing of Mr WAN Hon-cheung, William, Chairman of

the first term of Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) the day before due to illness. Mr WAN was highly attentive to the affairs in Sai Kung district during his lifetime. The Chairman extended his condolences to Mr WAN's family.

2. The Chairman welcomed all Members and attendees to the meeting, in particular –

- Mr Chris LEE, Police Community Relations Officer (Tseung Kwan O) (Acting), Hong Kong Police Force;
- Mr TAM Lok-wang, Miscellaneous Enquiries Sub-unit Commander (Tseung Kwan O District), Hong Kong Police Force;
- Ms OR Siu-shan, Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), and Ms LAM Wai-ki, Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)2, FEHD, who attended the meeting on behalf of Mr NG Kwok-lun, Wilson, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sai Kung).

3. The Chairman said Mr LUK Ping-choi was unable to attend the meeting due to other work commitments. He had submitted the Notification of Absence from Meeting before the meeting as required. There being no objection, the Chairman declared that the application for absence from meeting was approved in accordance with Order 51(1) of SKDC Standing Orders (Standing Orders).

4. The Chairman said the arrangements for the meeting would be subject to restrictions amid the COVID-19 epidemic. The duration of the meeting would be limited to about two hours; and the meeting would be continued at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday if the meeting time today was insufficient. As the whole meeting would only last for about four hours, the Chairman asked Members to deliver their speech as concisely as possible.

#### **I. Confirmation of Minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Sai Kung District Council held on 7 July 2020**

5. The Chairman noted that the Secretariat had not received any proposed amendment to the above minutes before the meeting.

6. Mr CHAN Wai-lit hoped that the Secretariat would correct the typo of his (Chinese) name in paragraph 49 of the minutes of the last meeting.

7. The Chairman agreed that “陳煒烈”, as mentioned in the paragraph concerned, should be amended to “陳緯烈”. There being no other proposed amendment from Members, the Chairman declared that the above minutes were confirmed.

## **II. Matters Arising**

### **(A) Follow-up on motions of the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SKDC held on 7 July 2020**

8. The Chairman said 13 motions and four extempore motions had been endorsed at the fourth meeting in 2020. SKDC had expressed its requests and views regarding the endorsed motions to relevant organisations and government departments in writing. The Secretariat had forwarded the replies to Members by email and uploaded the content onto the SKDC website. SKDC would continue to observe the development of the matters and the corresponding agenda items would be deleted at the next meeting.

9. The Chairman continued that with regard to the issue on Tai Sheung Tok Transfer Station, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had provided a written reply after the meeting stating that the project was currently still at a stage where the consultancy study was under preparation, and that as no further information could be reported, EPD would not attend the meeting for the time being. In addition, regarding the issue on “Request Sai Kung District Council to explore and complete the proposal on the amendments to the Standing Orders or draft administrative guidelines within four months to stipulate a deadline for public officers to submit supplementary documents or written replies within one month after the meeting” raised at the third meeting, the Secretariat had expressly required the departments to submit the necessary replies within one month after the meeting as requested by Members since May. The Secretariat had also compiled statistics on the time taken by the departments to submit a reply. As at 10 August, 109 replies could be submitted within one month, while 23 replies could not, i.e. over 80% of the replies could be submitted within one month. The reasons for the departments’ being unable to submit a reply within one month included: the involvement of more than one department in the issue, the need for additional time to give a reply, the need for time to collect the required information, the need for follow-up work after the meeting before preparing a reply, etc. Chairmen of the respective Committees had been notified of the situation and reasons timely. The Secretariat would continue to remind departments to submit replies as early as possible.

## **III. Report Items**

### **(A) Financial Position of the District Council Funds as at 15 August 2020**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 222/20)

10. Members noted the above paper.

### **(B) Progress Report of the District Council Committees**

- (1) Education, Health and Social Welfare Committee
  - (2) District Facilities Management Committee
  - (3) Traffic and Transport Committee
  - (4) Housing, Planning and Development Committee
  - (5) Environmental Hygiene, Climate Change, Agriculture and Fisheries Committee
  - (6) Community Building and Social Innovation Committee
  - (7) Finance and Administration Committee
- (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 223/20 to 229/20)

11. Members endorsed the above reports.

#### **IV. Motions Raised by Members**

12. As the meeting would be held on two separate days, some Members hoped to accord priority to issues related to epidemic prevention to enable departments to respond as early as possible. The Chairman suggested handling the relevant issues first, which included agenda items IV(A)(10), IV(A)(13), IV(A)(15), IV(A)(16), IV(B)(1), IV(B)(2) and IV(B)(4). Besides, the Chairman said as Mr CHAN Wai-lit had notified him before the meeting that he would like to make a verbal statement related to epidemic prevention measures at the meeting, he also suggested according priority to the verbal statement. Members agreed to the above arrangements.

##### **(A) Motions Raised by Members:**

##### **(10) Request the Department of Health to improve the notification mechanism** (SKDC(M) Paper No. 239/20)

13. The Chairman said the motion was moved by Ms Valerie WONG and seconded by Messrs LEE Ka-yui, Ryan LEE, CHOI Ming-hei, LUI Man-kwong, Ms Debby CHAN, Messrs Frankie LAM, Andrew CHAN, LAI Ming-chak, TSE Ching-fung, the Vice-Chairman, Messrs CHEUNG Wai-chiu, CHUN Hoi-shing, Gary FAN and Stanley HO.

14. Members noted the written reply from the Department of Health (DH) (SKDC(M) Paper No. 272/20).

15. Ms Valerie WONG said during the period when the epidemic was serious, DH did not take the initiative to notify the respective management offices of the buildings where there were confirmed cases; management companies and even Members could only learn about the confirmed cases through the Centre for Health Protection (CHP) website. If the management companies could be informed of the situation as early as possible, they could

carry out disinfection and cleaning work at the buildings earlier, which she believed would be conducive to epidemic prevention to a certain extent. Besides, as DH would not notify the management offices in advance that ambulancemen would go to the buildings to convey confirmed patients to hospital, this would cause unnecessary anxiety and confusion among residents. She hoped that DH could improve the arrangements for the notification mechanism.

16. Mr LUI Man-kwong considered that CHP should notify property management companies of the information on confirmed cases in the housing estates concerned as early as possible so as to facilitate the respective management offices to learn of the situation and make corresponding arrangements as soon as possible.

17. Mr Ricky OR declared that he was engaged in property management field. He supported the captioned motion in principle. However, he also understood that DH might encounter difficulties in its operation in practice. To his understanding, government departments did not seem to have a database which consolidated the contact information of management companies or management offices of different housing estates and buildings; and such information was also difficult to be searched and found online. Therefore, he took the view that government departments should consider whether it was necessary to build a complete database to improve the notification mechanism in the long term; while at the same time, consideration should also be given to privacy protection issues such as whether the data could be shared among departments, whether the transfer of data to other departments for use would be acceptable to the public, etc.

18. Mr LAI Wai-tong considered the existing notification mechanism very chaotic. Taking his constituency as an example, he said a management company was notified by CHP of a confirmed case in the housing estate under its management and the corresponding case number. However, the management company found out subsequently that there should be two confirmed cases in the housing estate. He made further enquiries with DH in this regard, the staff replied him that the household cleaning record of FEHD indicated that patients of the two confirmed cases lived in different units; but DH sent him a letter later stating that the two patients were living in the same unit. He considered such confusion in dissemination of information would hinder residents from understanding the latest epidemic situation in their housing estate and also delay the management companies from carrying out disinfection or other work related to the epidemic. He hoped that DH would improve the existing notification mechanism, which included notifying the Member of the respective constituency and the property management company concerned as soon as possible.

19. Mr CHAN Wai-lit asked DH about the procedure adopted in informing the Housing Department (HD) of the confirmed cases involving units in public housing estates. He

considered that HD, as one of the government departments, should obtain relevant information timely to facilitate early follow-up work.

20. Mr LAI Ming-chak said the practice of CHP in refusing to disclose whether different confirmed patients of the same building lived in the same unit would cause unnecessary doubt or panic among residents. He hoped that the departments concerned could improve such an arrangement.

21. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said although the public could browse the CHP website on their own to access relevant information on confirmed cases, there was often a time lag in the release of information on the website, in particular the Local Situation Dashboard, which took one day or even one week to display the updated information occasionally. As a result, the public would, after failing to get the information, seek assistance from Members, who also did not have first-hand information. Therefore, he considered that the Government needed to improve the notification mechanism. In addition, he suggested DH to increase the manpower of civilian staff to handle liaison work at the district level and respond to the enquiries from Members on behalf of doctors. Besides, the Secretariat of SKDC only forwarded the information issued by DH to Members in accordance with the existing mechanism, however, given that the information had long been released or disseminated to the public, it was not useful in answering public enquiries.

22. Mr LEUNG Li considered that there had been a significant delay in the mechanism through which DH notified Members. Residents always made enquiries with Members on whether there was any confirmed case in the housing estates and the buildings where the patients of confirmed cases lived but Members could only obtain relevant information from the website of the Government. In addition, if DH had notified HD of the confirmed cases in public housing estates, HD should also immediately inform Members of the relevant information. Besides, DH first informed him of a confirmed case at Ming Yat House of Kin Ming Estate with the case number 2029. He found on the Internet subsequently that the case concerned had been updated as a confirmed case in another district. However, DH did not inform Members and residents of this. He asked DH to make improvements in this aspect as well.

23. Mr CHENG Chung-man said the information of some confirmed cases would only be displayed on the Local Situation Dashboard on the CHP website after the patients were discharged from hospital, which made it difficult for residents to make early preparations. Besides, some staff of DH were also unable to fully grasp relevant information. Therefore, he asked DH to improve the arrangements of the notification mechanism.

24. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said if Members could receive DH's early notification of the

information on confirmed cases, they could assist DH in verifying whether the information on the confirmed cases concerned was correct as early as possible. Taking her constituency as an example, she said DH had announced inaccurately the residential addresses of patients of confirmed cases several times. For example, DH had written “Tui Min Hoi Tsuen” as “Tui Min Hoi Chuen”, which resulted in the immediate cleaning and disinfection work carried out at Tui Min Hoi Chuen. Besides, although DH said it would maintain communication with District Offices in different districts, District Offices were also only able to obtain information on the epidemic through the hotline for district liaison, and doctors operating the hotline were also unable to provide relevant information within a few days. She considered that DH needed to maintain good communication with Members and District Offices instead of only asking Members to call the hotline for enquiries.

25. Ms Debby CHAN said, as many villages in rural areas were not managed by management company, DH initially stated that it would inform the respective village representatives of the confirmed cases concerned. However, she frequently found that the village representatives concerned were not being informed, and she needed to notify Sai Kung District Office (SKDO) to inform the village representatives on her behalf. She found it difficult to understand how the existing notification mechanism actually operated. Besides, given that DH had been making mistakes still in the residential address of patients of confirmed cases since the beginning of this year, she hoped that DH would provide accurate information and improve the notification mechanism to reduce unnecessary panic among residents. In addition, she had repeatedly made enquiries with DH or the departments concerned on the time when staff would be deployed to carry out cleaning and disinfection work at the premises of patients of confirmed cases. However, she found inconsistency in the handling of each case and varied replies by DH staff operating the hotline. Some replies were even given to Members only after the cleaning work was completed. As a result, Members were unable to obtain centralised and reliable information as early as possible. Therefore, she considered it necessary for government departments to formulate a clear workflow.

26. The Chairman said he agreed with Mr Edwin CHEUNG. Doctors or nurses operating the hotline could only provide information set out in the press release and Members were also not making enquiries about the clinical diagnostic information of the patients of confirmed cases. He considered it unnecessary for DH to deploy doctors or nurses to operate the hotline and that civilian staff were already capable of assisting in the liaison work. He also suggested DH to authorise more staff to coordinate the overall follow-up work on confirmed cases.

27. Ms LING Kuk-yi, Chief Manager/Management (Kowloon West and Sai Kung), HD, responded that after staff of the estate offices were notified by DH of the name of building

where a patient of confirmed case lived, HD would commence the cleaning work at public places in the building concerned. After DH had notified the staff concerned of the unit where the patient of confirmed case lived, HD would then commence the inspection work on drainage pipes in the unit.

28. Mr CHAN Wai-lit hoped that HD would clearly specify whether HD staff would ultimately know the exact units of public housing estates in which all patients of confirmed cases were living.

29. Ms LING Kuk-yi of HD responded that HD would be informed of the relevant information in the end as HD staff needed to inspect the drainage pipes in the units with confirmed cases.

30. Ms Valerie WONG said DH would only inform HD of the buildings where the patients of confirmed cases lived at first and would inform HD of the exact address of those patients after two to three days. She asked HD to confirm whether what she had just said was correct.

31. The Vice-Chairman said, to his previous understanding, if the patient of a confirmed case did not permit DH to disclose the residential address to other departments, departments would not be informed of the relevant information. However, HD stated earlier that DH would inform it of the units with confirmed cases in the housing estates under its management to allow it to carry out inspection work on drainage pipes in the unit. Therefore, based on the consideration of epidemic prevention work, he considered that DH should also disclose the unit where the patient of confirmed case lived to the management company of private housing estates to facilitate the arrangement of epidemic prevention work.

32. Mr LUI Man-kwong said, to his understanding, DH would only inform individual departments of the units with confirmed cases if the property management company of private housing estates needed to inspect the drainage pipes in the units concerned. He asked DH whether the exact address of patients of confirmed cases would be kept from the management company of private housing estates.

33. Ms LING Kuk-yi of HD said DH would notify HD of the exact residential unit of the patients of confirmed cases to let HD staff carry out inspection work on the pipes. The practice of DH was to announce the information on the confirmed cases to the public and then notify HD of the unit of public housing estates involved in the confirmed cases. However, HD had not compiled statistics on the exact time of receipt of notification from DH. HD would stay in contact with DH and commence follow-up work as soon as it had received notification from DH.

34. The Chairman asked whether DH would inform HD of the units with confirmed cases in Tenant Purchase Scheme (TPS) estates.

35. Ms LING Kuk-yi of HD said as HD needed to determine relevant follow-up work based on whether the flat concerned was a rental flat or private flat, DH would also inform HD of the units with confirmed cases in TPS estates.

36. Ms OR Siu-shan, Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)1, FEHD, said FEHD was mainly responsible for carrying out cleaning and disinfection work of the streets near the buildings where the patients of confirmed cases lived and performing disinfection work at the units with confirmed cases. As it was not necessary to know the address of units with confirmed cases for carrying out cleaning of streets, FEHD staff would normally check the CHP website and, upon finding information on new confirmed cases, arrange for cleaning and disinfection of streets on the same day or the following day as far as possible. As for the disinfection work at the units with confirmed cases, FEHD would wait for the notification from CHP. However, CHP might not be able to inform FEHD for following up at once because CHP staff had to first successfully contact the tenant of the unit concerned or the relatives and friends of the tenant to ensure that the unit would be open to access before liaising with FEHD for following up and arranging for household cleaning and disinfection work. As such, she understood that DH might need to inform FEHD at a later time.

37. The Chairman suggested DH to increase the manpower of non-professionals in the healthcare system to coordinate the follow-up work on the epidemic and liaison work at the community level.

38. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was endorsed. SKDC would convey the request to DH in writing.

**(13) Request for enhancing border control measures to stop the spreading of COVID-19 in Hong Kong**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 242/20)

39. The Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr CHUN Hoi-shing and seconded by Messrs LUI Man-kwong, Gary FAN, LEUNG Li, LAI Ming-chak, LAI Wai-tong, CHAN Wai-lit, Frankie LAM, FUNG Kwan-on, he himself, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, Mr Stanley HO, Ms Debby CHAN, Messrs CHEUNG Wai-chiu, YU Tsun-ning, CHOI Ming-hei, LEE Ka-yui, Ms Valerie WONG, the Vice-Chairman, Messrs Ryan LEE and Brandon YIP.

40. Members noted the joint written reply from the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and

DH (Paper on table (1)).

41. Ms Christine FONG said she supported the motion. She noticed that although many inbound travellers had undergone virus testing and obtained a negative test result before coming to Hong Kong, they were tested positive after taking another virus test upon arrival in Hong Kong. She considered that the Government had to step up virus testing at the border and conduct regular virus testing for inbound travellers who stayed in Hong Kong on a long-term basis for work.

42. Mr LAI Ming-chak said many experts considered that the third wave of the local epidemic was relevant to inbound travellers exempted from quarantine earlier. Although the daily number of confirmed cases had gradually dropped to double digits at present, the Government still needed to learn a lesson and should not relax the quarantine measures at border control points easily. Given ten categories of persons were exempted from the compulsory quarantine arrangement, he considered that risk still existed and hoped that the Government would review afresh and compress the list of various categories of persons exempted from compulsory quarantine. He also considered that universal testing was not very useful and meaningful as members of the public who tested negative at that time might still be infected in the future by the virus carried by persons exempted from quarantine. He asked the Government not to relax the quarantine measures at border control points easily to facilitate effective control of the epidemic.

43. Mr CHOI Ming-hei agreed that the Government should enhance border quarantine and control measures and reduce the number of categories of persons exempted from quarantine. However, he did not agree to universal testing which had high cost and low effectiveness.

44. Mr Edwin CHEUNG considered that huge loopholes existed in the quarantine exemption arrangements for certain categories of inbound travellers. He suggested the Government to deploy additional healthcare personnel at the border as far as practicable to provide inbound travellers with rapid tests and not to allow them to enter Hong Kong before the test result was available. As the testing time of rapid tests only took half an hour to an hour, it could achieve the effect of gate-keeping yet brought about only a slight increase in the transportation time of goods.

45. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was endorsed. SKDC would convey the request to FHB in writing.

**(15) Request “Tell me@1823” to continue receiving cases during the epidemic**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 244/20)

46. The Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr LAI Wai-tong and seconded by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

47. Members noted the written reply from the Efficiency Office (EffO) (SKDC(M) Paper No. 274/20).

48. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said EffO pointed out in the reply that: “As the working environment of 1823 is relatively dense, our operation may need to be suspended once any of the employees is infected”. She considered that the situation was true for all government departments and she found it difficult to understand why other departments could operate normally during the epidemic while EffO had to suspend the operation of the mobile application “Tell me@1823”. Besides, although EffO pointed out that the telephone service of hotline 1823 was operating normally, the fact that EffO staff could not answer calls from the public within a reasonable time had made it impossible for the public to convey their views to government departments during the epidemic, which she considered unsatisfactory. She emphasised that she was not asking EffO to handle cases from the public immediately; instead, she requested the continuous provision of effective channels by EffO for the public to put forward their views or lodge complaints. Even though EffO could not handle the cases at once, the accumulated cases could be handled when the manpower returned to normal, which would be more desirable than the current situation where the public had no way to express their views to government departments.

49. Mr LUI Man-kwong quoted an example during the passage of typhoons in the city where it was difficult for members of the public to successfully call the 1823 hotline and seek assistance from government departments on matters that needed to be handled urgently. He considered that EffO needed to maintain the operation of the mobile application to facilitate effective receipt of public views. If the government departments concerned could not arrange staff to handle some non-urgent matters for the time being, they could inform members of the public that the cases were still being processed.

50. Mr LAI Wai-tong was dissatisfied with the reply from EffO. He pointed out that, when expressing views, members of the public would also provide multimedia information such as images, photos, videos, etc., which could not be submitted through voice calls. He considered that while EffO could handle cases according to their priorities, it should not completely stop receiving written submissions from the public. Unless the public could call 999 on non-urgent matters, EffO had no justification for suspending the operational arrangements.

51. Mr CHUN Hoi-shing said, apart from affecting the public, EffO’s cessation of receiving cases submitted in the form of text messages also greatly affected the work of

Members, who often used the application concerned to report local situations, damaged facilities, etc., to government departments during non-office hours. Although the cases might not be handled timely, EffO should not completely stop receiving cases. He suggested EffO to accord priority to matters related to public health. In addition, compared with answering phone calls, the use of mobile application was more effective in receiving cases and handling more cases. As such, he found it difficult to understand why EffO decided to suspend the receipt of text messages but not phone calls.

52. The Chairman also did not understand why EffO decided to suspend the use of the application because using application was more effective and faster than answering phone calls by real persons. At the same time, as members of the public could also provide information such as photos, locations, etc., in the application, he hoped that EffO could re-arrange the priorities of its services based on the needs of the public in the future.

53. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was endorsed. SKDC would convey the request to EffO in writing.

**(16) Opposition to the Government's introduction of "Hong Kong Health Code" to control and monitor the society in the name of epidemic**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 245/20)

54. The Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr Gary FAN and seconded by Messrs LUI Man-kwong, Frankie LAM, LEUNG Li, CHUN Hoi-shing, LAI Wai-tong, LAI Ming-chak, CHOI Ming-hei, Brandon YIP, CHAN Wai-lit, CHEUNG Wai-chiu, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, the Vice-Chairman, Ms Valerie WONG and Mr Ryan LEE.

55. Members noted the joint written reply from FHB and DH (Paper on table (1)).

56. Mr Gary FAN emphasised that the anti-epidemic work of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government did not accord any priority to the safety of Hong Kong residents. The acts of not closing all border control points, not tightening the exemption of 33 categories of inbound travellers from compulsory quarantine and introducing universal testing, which had low effectiveness and high cost, were completely useless in solving the problem. He considered that the views of the professional medical and healthcare sectors were very important and the World Health Organisation (WHO) had also pointed out that population-wide or large-scale testing could not address the epidemic effectively. He continued that precious and scarce medical resources should be targeted at high-risk groups, and that the effect of epidemic prevention and control could only be achieved by conducting virus testing for the groups concerned. Besides, the Government had violated procedural justice by commissioning a company from the Mainland to conduct testing work for universal

testing without inviting tenders, which caused the public to worry that their genetic data would be used for social surveillance in the future. In summary, he considered that the Government should not introduce “Hong Kong Health Code” and universal testing. Besides, he pointed out that, as Ms Christine FONG had publicly encouraged the public to participate in universal testing on her website, he invited her to clearly state whether she supported universal testing.

57. Mr LAI Wai-tong asked FHB about the measures to be taken by the Hong Kong Government to follow up on the health conditions of inbound travellers after they entered Hong Kong by converting their “Yue Kang Code” or “Macao Health Code” into “Hong Kong Health Code”. He considered that no testing method would be completely accurate and there might be false negative or false positive testing results. Therefore, inbound travellers holding the “Health Code” might still be at risk of carrying the virus. He considered it important to follow up on the health conditions of those inbound travellers and asked the Government to clearly explain how to trace them. Besides, he hoped that the Secretariat would assist in making enquiries with FHB in writing on the ways for FHB to safeguard public health.

58. Mr CHENG Chung-man considered that the Government used the “Hong Kong Health Code” as the Hong Kong version of the social credit system to monitor and restrain Hong Kongers totally, thereby restricting their freedom of speech. He also considered that the system was completely useless in epidemic control and was not in line with the societal culture in Hong Kong. Therefore, he asked the Government not to adopt it.

59. Mr LAU Kai-hong did not agree with the captioned motion.

60. Mr WONG Shui-sang personally considered that the “Hong Kong Health Code” was useful and asked the Chairman to note that not all Members agreed to endorse the motion.

61. As two Members had reservations about the captioned motion, the Chairman invited Members to vote on whether or not to endorse the motion.

62. Mr LEE Ka-yui agreed with the justifications for opposing the “Health Code” as set out in the motion paper and the views raised by Members of the pro-democracy camp earlier. He queried that the Government used the “Health Code” to monitor the public in the name of epidemic control and to make preparations for the implementation of the social credit system. He was also worried that the introduction of the “Health Code” would cause unnecessary suspicion among residents and damage mutual trust. He supplemented that the “Health Code” was implemented in the Mainland earlier but its implementation was chaotic and the system showed occasional errors in locations – some members of the public were categorised

as red, i.e. the most dangerous category, without reasons after going out for shopping, which made the accuracy of the “Health Code” system questionable.

63. Mr David CHIU, District Officer (Sai Kung) (DO(SK)), SKDO, said, according to the reply submitted by FHB, the Government had put in abeyance the implementation of the “Pilot Scheme on Mutual Exemption from Compulsory Quarantine in Hong Kong, Guangdong and Macao to be Implemented under Cap. 599C” and the “Health Code” would only be used for health declaration on arrival. The Government had no plan to let members of the public use the “Health Code” as a means to seek exemption from certain social distancing requirements, or be allowed free access to certain venues at a certain time. Besides, as for the views of Members on the implementation details of the “Health Code”, the Secretariat could convey those views to the relevant authority in writing after the meeting.

64. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan disagreed with DO(SK). She said many companies made it compulsory for their staff to participate in the Universal Community Testing Programme (UCTP) and required them not to go to work before obtaining a negative test result. She criticised the Government for failing to consider the possible problems arising from UCTP thoroughly.

65. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu considered that the Government did not take the meal-taking situation of outdoor workers into consideration when introducing the round-the-clock ban on providing dine-in services earlier. He criticised the Government for failing to consider various factors thoroughly when tightening epidemic prevention measures. Besides, although the Government had no plan to exempt certain social distancing requirements by using the “Health Code” at the current stage, members of the public were still worried about whether the Government would extend the usage of the “Health Code”.

66. Mr Chris CHEUNG considered it inappropriate to discuss unverified statements. However, he considered that health conditions of the public would change with time, establishing the system of the “Health Code” was therefore not cost-effective compared to Macao’s measures to require inbound and outbound travellers to present a valid health proof issued within seven days. Therefore, although he did not completely agree with the wording of this motion, he would support this motion as he had reservations about the Government’s implementation of the “Health Code”.

67. Ms Christine FONG said DO(SK) had stated that the Government had put in abeyance the implementation of the Pilot Scheme and Mr Chris CHEUNG had also expressed his views. She supported the first half of the motion, i.e. ‘Opposition to the Government’s introduction of “Hong Kong Health Code”’ and considered that the Government should not hastily introduce the “Health Code” without consultation, which would give rise to

apprehension in society. Therefore, she would support this motion.

68. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the motion.

69. The Chairman concluded that the voting result was as follows: 25 votes for the motion and 2 votes against it. The Chairman declared that the motion was endorsed and the requests of SKDC would be conveyed to FHB in writing.

(B) Questions raised by Members:

**(1) Enquiry about Department of Health's mechanism on assisting patients waiting for admission to hospitals**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 250/20)

70. The Chairman said the question was raised by Ms Valerie WONG.

71. Members noted the joint written reply from FHB and DH (Paper on table (1)).

72. Ms Valerie WONG was dissatisfied that the written reply from FHB was submitted to Members late and did not respond to her question directly. She mentioned that, in view of the tight supply of negative pressure beds in public hospitals, some patients of confirmed cases, including the patient of confirmed case living in Hau Tak Estate in Tseung Kwan O (case number: 2065), needed to stay at home and wait for admission to hospital. Regarding the case mentioned above, she had repeatedly called DH to enquire whether the patient had been admitted to hospital and DH subsequently responded that the patient had been admitted to hospital. However, as the departments concerned had delayed the updating of the list "Latest situation of cases of COVID-19" for a prolonged period of time, some media misreported the above case as the case with the longest waiting time for admission to hospital, which made residents misunderstood the situation. While she understood that the negative pressure beds in public hospitals needed to be allocated by the Hospital Authority through centralised handling and it took time to make relevant arrangements, she considered that DH could cooperate with relevant departments. For example, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) could provide appropriate support to patients of confirmed cases and their carers when they were waiting for admission to hospital.

73. The Chairman said he learnt from media reports that community isolation facilities were now open and the situation of delayed hospitalisation had also been improved accordingly. He went on to enquire how DH handled the confirmed cases waiting for admission to hospitals. He also enquired whether SWD would provide assistance to patients of confirmed cases with special needs and their carers as just mentioned by Ms Valerie WONG.

74. Ms Micy LUI of SWD responded that the overall anti-epidemic work of the Government was led by FHB and DH, and risk assessment was made for individual cases; SWD provided support in accordance with the cross-departmental collaboration mechanism formulated by FHB and the departments concerned. As patients of confirmed cases were highly infectious and the transfer of information on the cases involved personal privacy considerations, DH would be responsible for triaging patients of confirmed cases and making arrangements for them to receive treatment in public hospitals or community isolation facilities. According to the cross-departmental collaboration mechanism, SWD was mainly responsible for providing support to persons subject to compulsory quarantine for 14 days under Cap. 599C and 599E. She thanked Ms Valerie WONG for notifying SWD earlier that the patient of confirmed case and persons living with the patient had special needs and hoped that SWD would provide assistance. SWD was willing to provide practicable assistance to patients of confirmed cases with special needs and their carers depending on the circumstances. However, as the residential address of the patient concerned was not known at that time, SWD could not provide immediate assistance. SWD subsequently learnt from DH that the patient and persons living with the patient had been admitted to hospitals for treatment. She continued that the departments concerned had provided additional facilities and introduced various measures to increase capacities for patient at present. She believed that such arrangements could alleviate the situation of tight supply of negative pressure beds and shorten the waiting time for patients to be admitted to hospitals.

75. The Chairman made a further enquiry on whether SWD had established an emergency response mechanism to provide assistance to patients of confirmed cases with special needs and their carers.

76. Ms Micy LUI of SWD responded that DH would triage patients to give them treatment in public hospitals or community isolation facilities and send their close contacts to quarantine centres for isolation and quarantine. SWD was currently responsible for the operation of several quarantine centres with special care services for residents from residential care homes for the elderly and residential care homes for persons with disabilities in need of quarantine.

77. Mr Ricky OR said he learnt from newspapers and the social platforms of individual well-known persons that some patients of confirmed cases needed to stay at home and wait for up to several days for admission to hospital. He considered that CHP of DH should notify the respective property management offices so that they could deploy resources flexibly to strengthen the cleaning and disinfection work in public places near the residential premises of patients of confirmed cases and remind frontline practitioners and residents to be vigilant. Otherwise, once any of the frontline practitioners was infected, the departments

concerned would need to make arrangements for patients to receive treatment in hospitals and their close contacts to be isolated, which would inevitably cause panic among practitioners and residents.

78. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to convey the views of Members on the existing notification and coordination mechanism to DH in writing.

**(2) Enquiry about the existing quarantine inspection of imported goods; request the Government to step up inspection of imported goods at the airport, sea boundary and land boundary control points and to conduct environmental virus testing for the mode of transport for goods delivery**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 251/20)

79. The Chairman said the question was raised by Ms Christine FONG, Messrs Chris CHEUNG and Edwin CHEUNG.

80. Members noted the joint written reply from FHB and DH (Paper on table (1)).

81. Ms Christine FONG said as her family members, the family member of the Vice-Chairman and individual Member at the meeting were nurses, she understood the importance of conducting rapid tests for inbound travellers and hoped that the relevant authority could further expedite the testing time. She mentioned that the infected persons of the third wave of local epidemic involved persons exempted from quarantine such as cross-boundary goods vehicle drivers, imported cases from the Philippines, the cluster of infected cases involving Kerry Logistics, etc., and she emphasised the importance of cleaning and disinfecting imported containers and goods. She raised this question in the hope of making an enquiry about the existing quarantine inspection of imported goods. However, as DH did not deploy staff to attend this meeting, she expressed disappointment in this regard.

82. Mr Gary FAN considered that Members should not disclose the personal information of family members of Members or mention any information irrelevant to the discussion item during the meeting. He also mentioned that Ms Christine FONG was dissatisfied with the decision by the Chairman of SKDC and had verbally attacked him after the last meeting of the Housing, Planning and Development Committee. He considered that such behaviour was undesirable. He hoped that the Chairman would remind Members to be mindful of their words and deeds as well as avoid disclosing the personal information of Members and their family members.

83. The Chairman asked Members to note the views of Mr Gary FAN. He said SKDC would write to FHB in the hope that it would provide further response to the question.

**(4) Enquiry about the role of District Officer in anti-epidemic work at district level**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 253/20)

84. The Chairman said the question was raised by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

85. Members noted the written reply from SKDO (SKDC(M) Paper No. 277/20).

86. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said the written reply mentioned that SKDO had been maintaining close collaboration with relevant government departments and had timely disseminated information on epidemic prevention to different stakeholders through the local network. Except for the use of SKDC fund to purchase anti-epidemic masks, SKDO mainly communicated with the Chairman of SKDC but not with other Members. She welcomed other Members present at the meeting to provide supplementary information and correct her mistakes, if any. The written reply also mentioned that CHP of DH had produced various types of health education materials, including leaflets, brochures, etc., for distribution in the community. However, apart from the banners displayed on Ying Yip Road by the departments concerned, she queried whether the Government had given any education on epidemic prevention in the district. At the same time, she considered that SKDO, supposedly a bridge of communication, did not have a role in anti-epidemic work at district level. Members who hoped to enquire about the information on confirmed cases in the district could only call the CHP hotline on their own. Regarding the earlier confusion over the addresses of Tui Min Hoi Tsuen and Tui Min Hoi Chuen, SKDO did not contact the Hong Kong Housing Society and the village representatives of Tui Min Hoi Tsuen to help clarify and verify the residential addresses of the patients of confirmed cases. She queried how SKDO maintained liaison with stakeholders in the district.

87. Mr Frankie LAM said the Government commenced universal testing today. As most of the testing centres in the district were close to residential areas, for example, Tsui Lam Sports Centre was close to a green minibus stand, he asked whether the Government would arrange thorough cleaning of the testing centres and nearby streets if positive cases were found at the testing centres. At the same time, as he considered that members of the public who received a negative result might still be infected in the future, he queried the effectiveness of universal testing and therefore objected to its implementation by the Government.

88. The Chairman considered that the passivity of government departments in anti-epidemic work was not satisfactory. In fact, Members needed to wait for the dissemination of details on confirmed cases in the district from CHP of DH every day. However, Members hoped that the Liaison Section of SKDO could play a greater role in the delivery of messages. He continued to quote the words of the former Chief Executive, hoping that the District Officer, as the “Chief Executive of the district concerned”, would take

up a leading role in anti-epidemic work at district level and convey the views of Members to senior government officials.

89. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said FHB and DH were responsible for coordinating and supervising epidemic response work; SKDO maintained close liaison and collaboration with other bureaux and departments to carry out prevention and control measures together and to complement government policies proactively. As he heard that some Members had misunderstood or even queried the work of SKDO, he hoped to further explain the role of SKDO in anti-epidemic work at district level. In addition to the work mentioned in the written reply, SKDO also had the following roles:

#### Coordination work

- SKDC approved funding in late January to subsidise organisations in the district to purchase epidemic prevention supplies and distribute them to residents in the district and approved funding in mid-August again to purchase masks for residents in the district. The Secretariat was responsible for the relevant procurement work and the Liaison Section of SKDO was responsible for the relevant liaison work.
- SKDO had always been in contact with different stakeholders in the district and had distributed epidemic prevention supplies to specific groups of residents in the district through rural committees, local residents' organisations, non-governmental organisations, etc. SKDO also assisted in arranging the distribution of masks, provided by the Government for all Hong Kong residents, to the small number of remote rural households not covered by postal services.

#### Dissemination of information

- Since the beginning of the epidemic, the Secretariat had been relaying the information on confirmed cases issued by CHP to Members every day.
- SKDO had displayed banners and posters at many places in the district to disseminate information on epidemic prevention to residents to enhance their awareness of epidemic prevention.
- SKDO had kept sending publicity information on epidemic prevention to owners' corporations (OCs), owners' committees, property management companies, etc. in the district.

#### Cleaning and disinfection work

- In general, the departments concerned were responsible for carrying out cleaning and disinfection work at the premises and facilities under their management, for example, FEHD, HD and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).
- SKDO would coordinate with the departments concerned and responsible units to strengthen cleaning and disinfection or carry out deep cleaning in locations such

as rural common places or places involving private land.

90. Ms Debby CHAN said Members raised this question as they were not familiar with the anti-epidemic work of SKDO. She mentioned that rural households had received masks distributed by SKDO earlier but not information related to the epidemic. She believed this could be attributed to the fact that some residents had no access to the Internet and some non-Chinese speakers did not receive the information in English. In view of this situation, she suggested the departments concerned to produce bilingual publicity publications in Chinese and English. She also pointed out that she had asked the Liaison Officer responsible for Sai Kung Islands earlier about the details of confirmed cases in her constituency and the timetable for the cleaning of streets in rural areas but the Liaison Officer replied that no relevant information was available. She went on to enquire whether SKDO had established a notification mechanism for confirmed cases in the district and issued clear guidelines to the Liaison Section.

91. Mr CHENG Chung-man said he was not criticising SKDO but agreed that SKDO could enhance its information dissemination mechanism. He suggested SKDO to make reference to its mechanism for coping with typhoons by: setting up an emergency coordination centre for COVID-19 to cooperate closely with other departments and district organisations to provide residents with support services; creating a webpage similar to a disaster prevention network on epidemic prevention and control to give residents health information; and launching a mobile application to give residents the latest information on the epidemic. He believed that this series of measures could facilitate the effective release of information to residents and build their confidence in SKDO.

92. Mr LEE Ka-yui mentioned that some testing centres were close to residential areas and Sheung Tak Community Hall in his constituency was even located within the housing estate. As he was worried that the gathering of crowds would increase the risk of infection, he asked what consideration was given to the site selection of testing centres. Besides, he also mentioned that he had conducted a site inspection at Sheung Tak Community Hall in the morning and noticed that there were only a few members of professional healthcare staff in the community hall but staff of SKDO were abundant. He enquired why SKDO had mobilised a large number of staff to assist in the operation of the testing centre.

93. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan asked whether SKDO had informed Members of the hotline set up for persons under compulsory home quarantine. She also asked about the time for SKDO to display the banners printed with information on epidemic prevention and the number and locations of such banners. Besides, she had asked the Liaison Officer responsible for Sai Kung Central about the site selection of testing centres. However, the Liaison Officer replied that no relevant information was available. She considered that, as the department

responsible for the management of community halls, SKDO ought to know that the community halls would be acquired for use as testing centres; however, as SKDO did not inform Members of this in advance, she expressed dissatisfaction in this regard. Besides, she considered that in case FHB and DH were unable to deploy staff to rural areas to educate residents on epidemic prevention, SKDO should assist in such work and provide rural residents with corresponding support.

94. Ms Valerie WONG mentioned that the Government had acquired many government primary schools, community halls, etc. for use as testing centres in all 18 districts; some of the testing centres were located within housing estates, such as Tseung Kwan O Government Primary School in Hau Tak Estate and Chung Ming Court. Apart from not conducting a consultation on the location of testing centres, the departments concerned also did not notify the property management offices concerned in advance to step up the cleaning and disinfection work nearby, relying solely on OCs to make arrangements on their own. She criticised the Government for failing to truly achieve the objective of “Together, We Fight the Virus”.

95. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), SKDO, gave a consolidated reply as follows:

#### The work of SKDO

- The hotline of SKDO (Tel: 3740 5360) was set up for persons subject to compulsory home quarantine under Cap. 599. SKDO would answer simple enquiries from callers and provide them with appropriate support. If callers were genuinely unable to make arrangements for their daily necessities, SKDO would verify the identity of the persons under quarantine and refer such cases to SWD for following up.
- The Liaison Section of SKDO had kept releasing information on epidemic prevention to residents through stakeholders in the district, including rural committees, local residents’ organisations, property management companies, OCs, etc. However, as CHP was responsible for releasing the details of confirmed cases and their close contacts, SKDO did not have relevant information and therefore could not notify Members.

#### UCTP

- Through UCTP, the Government aimed to gauge the infection situation of COVID-19 in the community, find asymptomatic patients in the community as early as possible and cut the virus transmission chain in the community.
- The Civil Service Bureau took the lead in the implementation of UCTP and relevant departments including the Home Affairs Department had also participated in the discussion on the site selection of testing centres. As the Government hoped that the public would support UCTP proactively, the testing

centres needed to have a certain degree of accessibility. Given that the preparation for the whole testing programme was under a tight schedule, the Government finalised the locations of testing centres only a few days before the commencement of the programme. Therefore, Members could not be timely informed of the site selection of testing centres in advance.

- Before confirming the locations of testing centres, both DH and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) would conduct site inspections and assessments at various places to inspect the locations of the venues, the locations of entrances and exits, ventilation systems, etc., to ensure that the venues met the strict requirements of DH and were suitable for use as testing centres.
- It was understood that appointments for Sheung Tak Community Hall and Hang Hau Sports Centre in the following seven days were all fully booked. SKDO had also received feedback from some members of the public who hoped that the Government would provide additional testing centres in places such as Tseung Kwan O South, LOHAS Park, etc. However, not many venues were suitable for use as testing centres.
- Various infection control measures would be implemented at the testing centres in accordance with the guidelines promulgated by DH: members of the public could make online appointments; staff on duty must put on protective gear; and members of the public must wear masks and undergo body temperature checks before entering the venues.
- Trained healthcare or nursing staff on duty would collect specimen from members of the public while other staff were responsible for the management and operation of the venues. SKDO had also deployed staff to take part.

96. The Chairman said all motions and questions related to the epidemic were handled.

#### **Any Other Business raised by Members**

97. Mr Frankie LAM hoped to move an extempore motion, the wording of which was: “Request the government departments concerned to strictly implement the daily cleaning of the Community Testing Centres of the Universal Community Testing Programme to eliminate cross infection”.

98. The extempore motion was seconded by Messrs CHENG Chung-man, Ryan LEE, Ms Valerie WONG, Messrs LEE Ka-yui, TSE Ching-fung, CHEUNG Wai-chiu, YU Tsun-ning, Ricky OR, CHOI Ming-hei, Gary FAN, LUI Man-kwong and FUNG Kwan-on.

99. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the motion would be included in the agenda for discussion.

100. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion was endorsed and asked the Secretariat to follow up.

### **Verbal Statement made by Members**

101. The Chairman said Mr CHAN Wai-lit had notified the Secretariat before the meeting that he would make a verbal statement at the meeting. The Chairman asked Mr CHAN Wai-lit to make the verbal statement.

102. Mr CHAN Wai-lit said, on behalf of all SKDC Members of the pro-democracy camp, he opposed the Hong Kong communist regime's introduction of universal testing and introduction of "Health Code" in the name of the epidemic. As a registered nurse, he hoped to tell the public that UCTP had no scientific and medical basis. Universal testing aimed to identify invisible transmission chains in the community. However, the Government was simply unable to conduct testing for millions of people in Hong Kong within a short period of time. The Government's requirement of members of the public to go out and get tested in crowded areas would just increase the risk of contracting the virus. Overseas research studies pointed out that if members of the public were tested on the same day after exposure to the virus, the chance of a "false negative" result would reach 100%; if they were tested during the incubation period, there was also a high chance of a "false negative" result. Members of the public who obtained a "false negative" result would mistakenly believe that they were healthy and would continue to engage in social activities without worries, which would lead to another wave of outbreak of infection in the community. He considered that the correct approach was to call on persons with corresponding symptoms to seek medical advice as soon as possible and receive virus tests continuously to improve the accuracy of the tests. From the epidemiological perspective, the lower the prevalence of the target group, i.e. the more the number of healthy persons, the higher the chance of false positive results. The Government was currently using the test reagent of BGI while Sweden had found as many as 3 700 "false positive" results in the positive cases tested with this reagent. In fact, experts from WHO also pointed out that medical resources should be used properly and emphasised that large-scale testing was a waste of resources and impractical. Therefore, he considered that the Government should concentrate resources to handle cases of possible infected persons and their close contacts, which included conducting virus tests on them. If the Government hoped to identify asymptomatic patients through universal testing, it should implement measures to completely close all border control points at the same time to eliminate the source of virus. The venues for universal testing were open from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. with only a one-hour break in between for cleaning and disinfection. In addition, to his understanding, personnel taking specimens were healthcare students, ambulancemen, allied health students, etc. without any clinical experience, instead of healthcare personnel with professional qualifications. The Government also did not provide training on infection

control and adequate protective equipment to personnel taking specimens. More than a thousand persons would access testing venues each day and members of the public were required to take off their masks there. They might cough during the collection of specimen and droplets might contaminate areas within several metres and the virus might survive for several days. Overall speaking, he considered that large crowds would gather at testing venues, which increased the risk of infection among the public and ran counter to the social distancing measures. Besides, the regime repeatedly emphasised during the epidemic that the “Health Code” would be introduced in the future. He considered that such act was restricting the freedom of the public on the pretext of conducting testing. Although holders of the “Health Code” were not confirmed cases at the time of testing, it did not mean that they would not be infected subsequently. If the “Health Code” was hoped to be effective, every member of the public needed to get tested every week in order to ensure a negative result for the virus on an on-going basis. However, the existing healthcare system in Hong Kong was simply unable to afford such an arrangement. The Government’s using of the “Health Code” to force members of the public to receive unnecessary testing and disclose their own health conditions was a complete disregard of personal privacy and a violation of medical ethics. The “Health Code” developed out of the epidemic was the regime’s measure to cooperate with the Communist Party of China to strengthen the monitoring of the public and was designed to suppress the freedom of Hong Kongers more rigorously and comprehensively. The Government must take full responsibility for the unfortunate passing away of 80-odd elderly persons, disregarding the livelihood of the grassroots and causing the third wave of the epidemic due to failure of completely closing all border control points. On behalf of all SKDC Members of the pro-democracy camp, he condemned the Hong Kong communist regime for introducing universal testing without a scientific basis and introducing the “Health Code” arbitrarily.

#### **IV. Motions Raised by Members**

**(1) Request the Government to give an account of the works progress of converting Ex-Sai Kung Central Primary School into a residential care home cum day care centre for the elderly, day activity centre and hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons; and to consider optimising the land resources of the site before commencement of the conversion works**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 230/20)

103. The Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr Stanley HO and seconded by he himself, the Vice-Chairman, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan and Ms Debby CHAN.

104. Members noted the written responses from the Lands Department (LandsD), SWD and the Planning Department (PlanD) (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 255/20 to 257/20).

105. Mr Stanley HO learnt that SWD resumed the land of Sai Kung Central Primary School

on 31 August, and the land would be converted into a residential care home cum day care centre for the elderly, day activity centre and hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons. He pointed out that the mangrove in front of the school was ecologically important and asked SWD to remind the contractor to be mindful of the drainage design in the premises to avoid affecting the ecology. Besides, he mentioned that residents in Sai Kung Town Centre and rural areas had a strong demand for elderly and rehabilitation services. Therefore, he hoped that SWD could monitor the progress of the conversion works and maintain communication with village representatives and other local stakeholders so that the social welfare facilities concerned could commence service in 2022 as scheduled.

106. Ms Micy LUI of SWD responded that SWD would ask the Haven of Hope Christian Service to convey to its appointed engineering consultant the concerns of Members about the impact of the works on the surrounding environment. Besides, she supplemented that the service places of the day care centre for the elderly were used by residents in the district. In terms of residential care services, elderly residents had to pass the standardised assessment of the application for long-term care services and be allocated according to their location preference and the order on the waiting list. Past experience reflected that family members of the elderly usually applied for residential care homes for the elderly (RCHEs) near their residential premises so it was anticipated that the RCHE concerned mainly provided services for residents in the district.

107. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan considered that the elderly in other districts would also apply for RCHEs in Sai Kung district. Therefore, she hoped that SWD would accord priority to the elderly in the district for use of residential care services.

108. The Chairman asked SWD to note the views of Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

109. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was endorsed. SKDC would convey the request to SWD, LandsD and PlanD in writing.

## **V. Any Other Business**

### **(A) Updated Membership List of the Committees/Working Groups under SKDC (SKDC(M) Paper No. 254/20)**

110. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above updated membership list was endorsed.

## **VI. Date of Extended Meeting**

111. The extended meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 3 September 2020 at 9:30 a.m. The Chairman declared the adjournment of the present meeting at 11:42 a.m.

**(Extended)**

3 September 2020 (Thursday)

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>From</u></b>	<b><u>To</u></b>
Mr CHUNG Kam-lun (Chairman)	9:31 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH (Vice-Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	12:24 p.m.
Ms CHAN Ka-lam, Debby	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHAN Wai-lit	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-chor, Andrew	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHENG Chung-man	9:38 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin	9:30 a.m.	12:30 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung, Chris	9:40 a.m.	12:30 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu	10:10 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHOI Ming-hei	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr CHUN Hoi-shing	9:36 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr FAN Kwok-wai, Gary	9:45 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Ms FONG Kwok-shan, Christine	9:55 a.m.	11:40 a.m.
Mr FUNG Kwan-on	9:45 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr HO Stanley Wai-hong	9:50 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LAI Ming-chak	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LAI Wai-tong	9:38 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LAM Siu-chung, Frankie	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LAU Kai-hong	9:30 a.m.	12:00 noon
Mr LEE Ka-yui	10:15 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LEE Yin-ho, Ryan	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Ms LEUNG Hin-yau	9:38 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LEUNG Li	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LUI Man-kwong	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr LUK Ping-choi	9:30 a.m.	11:44 a.m.
Mr OR Yiu-lam, Ricky	9:30 a.m.	12:28 p.m.
Mr TSE Ching-fung	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Ms WONG Cheuk-nga, Valerie	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr WONG Shui-sang	9:30 a.m.	11:43 a.m.
Mr YIP Brandon Kenneth	9:30 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Mr YU Tsun-ning	9:39 a.m.	12:31 p.m.
Ms TSOI Leung-leung, Teresa (Secretary)	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sai Kung District Office	

### In Attendance

Mr CHIU Yin-wa, David, JP	District Officer (Sai Kung), Sai Kung District Office
Mr CHOW Tat-wing, Cyrus	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)1, Sai Kung District Office
Mr LIU Chung-him, Michael	Executive Officer I (District Council), Sai Kung District Office
Ms LAM Shu-tsook, Kitty	Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O, Planning Department
Ms LUI Siu-ying, Micy	District Social Welfare Officer (Wong Tai Sin/Sai Kung), Social Welfare Department
Mr Mark Ronald ANSTISS	District Commander (Tseung Kwan O), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LEE Chin-wang, Chris	Police Community Relations Officer (Tseung Kwan O) (Acting), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHOI Tung-tsoi	District Commander (Wong Tai Sin), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms SHUM Pok-yu	Divisional Commander (Sai Kung), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHENG Chun-tung, Seann	Police Community Relations Officer (Wong Tai Sin), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr WONG Chung-pong, Gavin	Senior Engineer/22(E), East Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms LING Kuk-yi	Chief Manager/Management (Kowloon West and Sai Kung), Housing Department
Mr WONG Chak-kwan, Byon	Chief Transport Officer/Goods Vehicle, Transport Department
Ms KONG Po-yee, Alice	District Leisure Manager (Sai Kung), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms OR Siu-shan	Chief Health Inspector (Sai Kung)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr CHOY Tak-shing, Dixon	Senior Estate Surveyor/Tseung Kwan O, District Lands Office, Sai K
Mr TSANG Ka-lok, Raymond	Administrative Assistant/Lands, District Lands Office, Sai Kung

112. The Chairman said that a quorum was present and the meeting commenced officially.

113. The Chairman welcomed all Members and attendees to the extended meeting, in particular:

- Ms Kitty LAM, Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O, PlanD, who attended the meeting on behalf of Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands;
- Mr Dixon CHOY, Senior Estate Surveyor/Tseung Kwan O, District Lands Office, Sai Kung (DLO/SK), who attended the meeting on behalf of Mr MA Hon-yim, Francis, District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, DLO/SK;
- Mr Gavin WONG, Senior Engineer/22(E), East Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), who attended the meeting on behalf of Mr LO Sai-pak, Sunny, Chief Engineer/E1.

114. The Chairman remarked that a violent incident had recently occurred in Tseung Kwan O, resulting in the death of a cash escort guard. SKDC was shocked and saddened, and

Members would like to offer their deepest condolences to his family.

**IV. Motions Raised by Members:**

**(A) The 20 motions raised by Members:**

- (1) Request the Government to give an account of the works progress of converting Ex-Sai Kung Central Primary School into a residential care home cum day care centre for the elderly, day activity centre and hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons; and to consider optimising the land resources of the site before commencement of the conversion works**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 230/20)

(Note: Motion (1) had been discussed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 103 to 109 of the meeting minutes.)

- (2) Request the Highways Department and Electrical and Mechanical Services Department to thoroughly repair and improve the water dripping problem in lifts at footbridges in Tseung Kwan O and Hang Hau to ensure safety and provide convenience to residents**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 231/20)

115. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Messrs TSE Ching-fung and Andrew CHAN and seconded by Mr Ryan LEE, the Vice-Chairman, Messrs LUK Ping-choi, CHOI Ming-hei, Ms Valerie WONG, Messrs Ricky OR, LEE Ka-yui and CHENG Chung-man.

116. Members noted the written replies from the Highways Department (HyD), EMSD and Link Asset Management Limited (the Link) (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 258/20 and 259/20).

117. Mr TSE Ching-fung pointed out that water dripping occurred in the lift at the footbridge connecting Bauhinia Garden and The Grandiose. Despite having been put into service for only four years, the lift had already undergone repair works for a few times, each of which lasted for one to two months. Such a situation had caused inconvenience to residents, the elderly and persons with disabilities. After liaising with HyD and EMSD on the matter, he had been informed that water dripping occurred on rainy days causing damage to lift parts. Yet, it took time to order the parts for repair. Given that the repair works failed to resolve the problem of water dripping in the lift, he enquired how the relevant departments would deal with the matter. He opined that although the above footbridge had been open for use for four years only, frequent water dripping in the lift was found, while other outdoor lifts in the district did not have similar problems. Hence, he expressed

discontent on behalf of the residents of Bauhinia Garden and Yee Ming Estate, hoping that HyD and EMSD would address the water dripping problem.

118. Mr Ricky OR opined that if defective lift design was the main cause of the problem, theoretically speaking, water seepage would occur frequently in other lifts of the same type in Hong Kong. He was worried that water dripping was attributable to problems in workmanship and acceptance inspections. Furthermore, as high voltage electricity was involved in lift operation, he expressed concern about water seepage affecting the safety of passengers. He therefore hoped that HyD and EMSD would carefully examine outdoor lifts with water dripping problems, thereby ensuring that the safety factors and risk were maintained at a satisfactory level.

119. Mr LEUNG Li said that despite the few repair works carried out for the lift at the footbridge connecting Hong Kong Velodrome Park and the car park at Sheung Tak Shopping Centre, its internal facilities, such as buttons and glass wall, were already damaged. Since EMSD had once arranged repair of the air-conditioning system of the lift, he suggested that EMSD should also repair other equipment inside the lift. In addition, footbridges were often provided for connecting shopping malls managed by the Link with MTR stations and private shopping malls. In view that the conditions of environmental hygiene and equipment in lifts at those footbridges were unacceptable, he hoped that the Council would reflect the situation to the Link.

120. Mr LUI Man-kwong mentioned that hygiene problems were also found in the lifts at both ends of the footbridge linking Tong Ming Car Park and Sheung Tak, and suggested that SKDC reflect the matter to the Link. He also opined that HyD and EMSD should give a more detailed explanation and identify the causes of frequent lift failures.

121. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the concerns of SKDC, including those over lift maintenance, water dripping and hygiene problems as raised by Members, would be expressed to HyD, EMSD and the Link in writing. The Chairman also suggested that EMSD conduct a comprehensive review on the conditions of outdoor lifts in the district, including the lift at Tseung Kwan O Sports Ground.

**(3) Request the Government to use the new recessed LED traffic system in Hang Hau on a trial basis to facilitate pedestrians to cross the roads safely**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 232/20)

122. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr CHENG Chung-man and seconded by Mr Andrew CHAN.

123. Members noted the written reply from the Transport Department (TD) (SKDC(M) Paper No. 278/20).

124. Mr CHENG Chung-man said that in view of the considerable number of “phubbers” in the society, he proposed that signal lights be installed on the ground surface of pedestrian crossings or at other locations which could easily be spotted by “phubbers”, thus facilitating road users to observe the road conditions. He pointed out that the practice had been adopted in many places in the world and hoped that the Government would use Hang Hau as a trial spot to examine the effectiveness of the proposal. He also invited TD to conduct feasibility studies, provide a timetable of the proposal and consider carrying out site inspection with SKDC Members for identifying appropriate locations as trial spots. If the proposal was found to be infeasible upon completion of study, he hoped that TD would still report the findings of the study to SKDC.

125. Mr LAI Ming-chak asked TD to examine the feasibility of the proposal. He noticed that in some overseas places, the colour of the stripes marking the crossings would be changed, which, in his opinion, would cause confusion to drivers. Therefore, he suggested that recessed LED traffic lights be installed at locations visible only to pedestrians, with a view to reducing the occurrence of traffic accidents.

126. Mr Andrew CHAN remarked that the above proposal aimed to assist pedestrians in crossing the road safely. He had once reflected his views on the matter to HyD, but was informed that the proposal was within TD’s scope of work; besides, it involved changes to all crossings in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, he still hoped that the Government would study the proposal in an open and flexible manner, examining whether there was room for improvement in the system that had been in use for years. He pointed out that the extremely poor lighting at the pedestrian crossing at the junction of Po Ning Road and Ying Yip Road seriously affected the safety of road users, and therefore suggested that the Government, having regard to overseas experience, improve the pedestrian crossing facilities, such as installing sensor-activated traffic lights at appropriate locations to enhance traffic safety.

127. Mr LAI Wai-tong asked TD to review the signal timings of traffic lights at the pedestrian crossings. At present, some traffic lights required pedestrians to press the button for changing to green signal. Yet, the relevant instructions were often posted on the traffic light post, and some residents might not be aware of the need to press the button for crossing the road. He urged TD to show instructions on the ground surface of the crossings so that the public could notice the relevant arrangements.

128. The Chairman said that the issue of “phubbers” crossing the road was noteworthy, but

installation of recessed LED traffic lights did not obviate the need for “phubbers” to beware of vehicles on the road. He therefore suggested that TD show instructions on the ground surface of the crossings to remind pedestrians to pay attention to the road conditions and avoid using mobile phones while waiting to cross the road.

129. Mr WONG Chak-kwan, Byon, Chief Transport Officer/Goods Vehicle, TD, stated that TD was aware of the in-ground LED traffic signal system adopted in overseas cities, and would review its effectiveness so as to consider introduction of the system in Hong Kong at an appropriate juncture. There was no specific timetable or trial spot at the present stage. He noted Members’ views on improving the pedestrian crossing arrangements and would reflect the views to Task Force/Walkability and other relevant divisions under TD. He also took the opportunity to appeal to the public to pay close attention to the road and traffic conditions when crossing the road.

130. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the concerns of SKDC would be expressed to TD in writing. The Chairman invited the TD representative to reflect the views of Members to the relevant divisions, with a view to transforming Hong Kong into a walkable community.

**(4) Request for leasing Area 72 in the form of short term tenancy to revitalise the site (SKDC(M) Paper No. 233/20)**

131. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr Brandon YIP and seconded by Mr YU Tsun-ning.

132. Members noted the written replies from LandsD and LCSD (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 260/20 and 279/20).

133. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said that according to the reply from LandsD, LCSD had not submitted a land lease application for the proposed long-term development plan of Area 72, but he had often received enquiries about the development progress of the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O”. He pointed out that the above site had been rezoned as an Open Space back in 2001, but regrettably, it was not included in the Five-Year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities (the Five-Year Plan) in the 2017 Policy Address. Despite so, it did not imply that LCSD was not required to commence relevant work. Citing the example of the works proposal “Construction of sitting-out facilities at Tiu Keng Leng Park in Area 72 of Tseung Kwan O” that had been endorsed by SKDC in the past term, he highlighted that the site area of the minor works project was only 400 square metres, but it had taken two years to carry out the technical study, and the tendering exercise had yet to commence. Hence, he believed that longer time was needed to complete the preliminary work given that the area of

the open space in Area 72 was 100 times larger than that of minor works project. After consolidating the above opinion, he suggested that LCSD submit a land lease application to LandsD at the soonest possible time so as to carry out preliminary work including feasibility studies and district consultation.

134. Mr LAI Wai-tong asked LCSD to provide more information on the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O”. According to the written reply to the same subject submitted by the department for the last full council meeting, the department would plan the use of the remaining open spaces after completing the work for “Construction of sitting-out facilities at Tiu Keng Leng Park in Area 72 of Tseung Kwan O”. Owing to the lack of sitting-out facilities in Tseung Kwan O South, he asked LCSD to consider commencing preliminary work for the open space in Area 72 as early as possible, including consulting new residents, so as to review the proposed facilities and the way forward for the open space development.

135. Ms Alice KONG, District Leisure Manager (Sai Kung), LCSD, responded that LCSD had been endeavouring to implement the three major works projects in the Five-Year Plan while carrying out initial planning for the works project of the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O”. Regarding the suggestion of submitting an application to LandsD as early as possible for initial planning, LCSD would normally submit a land lease application to LandsD only after the works project had been kick-started, but the department understood the concern of Members and would take forward the works project of “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O” in a timely manner subject to the implementation progress of the Five-Year Plan.

136. Mr LEUNG Li said that SKDC had been striving for expeditious development of the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O”, therefore, he made an enquiry to LCSD about the details of the project, such as its progress and design. Moreover, he asked about the works progress and the commissioning of the facilities in the minor works project “Construction of sitting-out facilities at Tiu Keng Leng Park in Area 72 of Tseung Kwan O”.

137. Mr LUI Man-kwong believed that Members would agree that the planning and implementation of the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O” should commence as soon as possible. Since LCSD could only submit the land lease application to LandsD after commencing the works project, he suggested that LandsD carry out site formation first to shorten the time required for the works.

138. The Chairman said that although the “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O” was not included in the Five-Year Plan, LCSD had started communicating with various parties about the project over the past period of time, including seeking views from SKDC on conceptual issues. He asked LCSD and DLO/SK if there was any work that could

commence at the present stage.

139. Ms Alice KONG of LCSD responded that since the Planning Section of LCSD was responsible for the two projects “Open space in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O” and “Construction of sitting-out facilities at Tiu Keng Leng Park in Area 72 of Tseung Kwan O”, LCSD would provide further information at the next meeting of the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC).

140. Mr Dixon CHOY, Senior Estate Surveyor/Tseung Kwan O, DLO/SK, mentioned that LandsD was not a works department and therefore not under the purview and not having the resources to implement the works project. If the relevant government department submitted a land allocation application, DLO/SK would follow up.

141. Messrs CHEUNG Mei-hung and Edwin CHEUNG abstained from voting on the motion.

142. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the concerns of SKDC would be expressed to LCSD and LandsD in writing. The matter was referred to DFMC for follow-up work.

**(5) Opposition to the “Clearwater Bay STEAM and Innovation School”  
Development Project**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 234/20)

143. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr YU Tsun-ning and seconded by Mr Brandon YIP.

144. Members noted the written replies from PlanD, Policy Innovation and Co-ordination Office (PICO) and Education Bureau (EDB) (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 261/20 and 262/20).

145. The Chairman stated that the development plan had been discussed at the meeting of the Social Services & Healthy and Safe City Committee (SSHSCC) in July 2019. At that time, SSHSCC had indicated support to the plan. If the current-term SKDC came up with new viewpoints after consulting residents, they could be raised at the present stage.

146. Mr YU Tsun-ning said that even though SKDC had indicated support to the plan in the previous term, he found that many residents were not aware of the implementation of the project by the Government when he conducted consultation in the district again; even for those who knew about the project, they hoped that he would be present at the meeting to express opposition. He pointed out that there were many vacant or abandoned school

premises in Hong Kong. Rather than wasting public money to build new school premises, it would be better to make use of vacant or abandoned school premises to take forward the project in order to enhance cost efficiency. On the other hand, there was a lack of community facilities in rural areas. If the Government mobilised resources to provide additional social welfare facilities, it was believed that resistance could be reduced and the expectations of residents could be better addressed.

147. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan mentioned that serious traffic congestion occurred at the entrance/exit of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology before and after school hours. During the suspension of classes, the number of private cars dropping off and picking up students had greatly reduced and the traffic congestion on Hiram's Highway had been alleviated, which proved that construction of the proposed international school would definitely affect the traffic in the district. It also reflected that it was unreasonable for PlanD to consider that the new school premises would not affect the traffic.

148. The Chairman indicated that SKDC had reflected the traffic impact of the new school premises to the Government in the last term. As some residents near the site considered that they had not been consulted and had reservations about the plan, he urged relevant government departments, organisations and the Shaw Foundation to carry out consultation in the district.

149. The Vice-Chairman said that since the current location was a Green Belt site, a rezoning application had to be submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) in the future. He asked PlanD whether public consultation would be conducted at the rezoning stage.

150. Ms Kitty LAM, Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O, PlanD, said that the Shaw Foundation had submitted a rezoning application, and PlanD was collecting the views of relevant departments on the application, but the application had yet to be submitted to TPB for consideration.

151. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said that the project background was captured in the written reply from PICO and the project had been discussed at the meeting of SSHSCC in July 2019. At that time, SSHSCC agreed with the direction of the project and requested the Shaw Foundation to listen to the views from the local community and to maintain communication with stakeholders. Regardless of the fact that SKDC might conduct a new round of discussion on the previous matters in the new term, the motion moved by Members was about opposition to the project; if the motion was carried, the stance of SKDC on the same matter would be inconsistent. Whilst it was arguably permissible to do so, he suggested that SKDC liaise with the Shaw Foundation and EDB on an appropriate platform to obtain more information before further discussion and decision on the subject matter.

152. Mr LAI Ming-chak said that even if SKDC held different views in the current and past terms, PlanD only needed to present the different views of SKDC in the two terms for the information of TPB and the public when submitting the proposal to TPB for consideration in the future. He also welcomed relevant departments or the school institution to consult the current-term SKDC.

153. The Vice-Chairman said that he had supported the project in the past term, in fact, many opinions about the project impact on the traffic and school net in the district had been voiced in the past term. Given that the Shaw Foundation was the land owner of the project site and the project did not involve public money, and additionally, this kind of school development project was favourable to development of Hong Kong, he inclined to support the project and objected to the motion.

154. Mr Edwin CHEUNG asked the proposer whether he would still object to the project if government departments or the relevant body could reach consensus with local stakeholders on traffic and other ancillary measures.

155. Mr YU Tsun-ning opined that it was difficult for the school organisation and residents to reach consensus on the traffic problem and believed that the project would bring disastrous impact on the traffic nearby. Hence, he moved the motion and resolutely objected to the project.

156. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the motion.

157. The Chairman concluded that the voting result was as follows: 10 votes for the motion, 3 votes against it and 9 abstentions. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed and the concerns of Members would be expressed to PlanD, PICO and EDB in writing. If PlanD, PICO, EDB and the Shaw Foundation considered that the plan was still worthy of support from residents, he hoped that they would proactively contact and appeal to relevant stakeholders including SKDC Members and residents, and would report the consultation findings to SKDC Members at the site rezoning stage.

**(6) Request the tenants of the respective shopping centres under the Link to step up management of escalator maintenance in TKO Gateway to reduce the number of escalator related accidents**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 235/20)

158. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Ms Valerie WONG and seconded by Messrs Ryan LEE, Andrew CHAN, LEE Ka-yui and the Vice-Chairman.

159. Members noted the written reply from the Link (SKDC(M) Paper No. 263/20).

160. Ms Valerie WONG mentioned that in June this year, the escalator connecting the first floor and the supermarket on the second floor in TKO Gateway had suddenly ceased operation, causing injuries to members of the public, who subsequently needed to receive treatment in hospital. Yet, the Link shirked its responsibility and claimed that the escalator was managed by the tenant. As the accident occurred in the mall, she considered that the Link should shoulder the responsibility to a certain extent. Besides, the escalator in TKO Gateway connecting the first floor and the market on the ground floor often experienced different kinds of service disruptions. Although the Link indicated that regular inspections, repair and maintenance work were conducted for escalators, accidents still occurred frequently, which reflected the loopholes in the policy on escalator inspection. Therefore, she hoped that relevant government departments would review whether the prevailing policy was still effective.

161. Mr CHENG Chung-man expressed that the above incident had aroused residents' concern about the safety problem and inspection arrangements for escalators. The maintenance arrangements for escalators and lifts in the district fell short of public expectations, but whenever SKDC reflected the views to EMSD or other relevant departments, as likely as not, the justifications of various departments were that private companies were responsible for the repair and maintenance of escalators and lifts, no problem was found after inspection or advice was given to the responsible party. He opined that the practice of EMSD could not improve the situation and no plan was formulated. He suggested that inspections be arranged by the Government to review the maintenance of escalators and the progress of follow-up work after the incident. Moreover, the responsible party should be advised based on the review findings to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

162. The Vice-Chairman said that if the motion was carried, he suggested writing to EMSD to urge the department to investigate into the escalator incident in TKO Gateway because the escalator had experienced the problem of inconsistent speed of the step chain and handrail chain. Although the Link expressed that it was not involved in the above incident, the escalator concerned was in fact located in the shopping mall under the management of the Link. Hence, the Link should bear the same responsibility as that of the tenant.

163. The Chairman agreed that the Link had to be responsible for all escalators in properties under its management. In fact, many lifts and escalators were still frequently out of order even after inspection by specialists. He suggested that an independent third party be engaged by the Link to review the maintenance of lifts and escalators and to monitor the work of contractors.

164. Mr Ricky OR expressed his reservations about the proposal put forward by the Chairman. In accordance with the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618), the maintenance agent had to assume full responsibility for maintenance of lifts and escalators; without the consent from the maintenance agent, other companies could not participate in inspection and maintenance work. Hence, he considered that a request could be made to EMSD for providing feasible solutions and clarifying whether the suggestion made by the Chairman contravened the ordinance.

165. Mr CHOI Ming-hei opined that the work of EMSD in monitoring the maintenance of escalators in private properties was inadequate. Taking Tsui Lam Square as an example, the problem of aged escalators in the shopping mall was serious as malfunctions occurred every week. He hoped that EMSD would monitor the maintenance of escalators in private properties more proactively.

166. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the concerns of SKDC would be expressed to EMSD and the Link in writing. An enquiry would also be made to EMSD as to whether there were measures for property owners and management agents of lifts or escalators to monitor the performance of contractors.

167. Ms Christine FONG agreed with the content of the motion. As the lift at the footbridge across Shek Kok Road and Wan Po Road had water dripping problem, she suggested including the incident in the motion and requested EMSD to proactively participate in the repair and maintenance of the lift. Meanwhile, she suggested reducing the cost of lift installation through reviewing the prefabricated parts of a lift. She also opined that the design of the lift was closely linked with repair and maintenance in the future.

168. The Chairman said that the views raised by Ms Christine FONG were related to motion (2), he therefore suggested reflecting the views in the letter to EMSD.

169. The Chairman said that the content of motions (7) and (8) were similar and asked Members whether they agreed to discuss the motions together.

170. Mr FUNG Kwan-on said that as the content of the two motions were not entirely the same, he suggested discussing them separately.

**(7) Request the departments concerned to review the measures on maintaining the health of trees, enhancing the accuracy of regular tree health inspections and the efficiency of replanting in Sai Kung community; and to disclose the relevant**

**information as open data for public inspection**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 236/20)

171. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr Andrew CHAN and seconded by Messrs CHENG Chung-man and Ryan LEE.

172. Members noted the written replies from the Development Bureau (DEVB) (Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section), SKDO, LCSD and HyD (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 264/20 to 267/20).

173. Mr FUNG Kwan-on made an enquiry to LCSD about the strength and establishment of arborists, trees inspectors and engineers responsible for tree management in Sai Kung district as well as whether the strength had been increased when compared to that in the past year. An enquiry about tree planting by the Government was made to PlanD to see whether soil properties of private land or government land would be studied for assessing the tree species that were suitable for planting. Even though it was stated in the *Guidelines for Tree Risk Assessment and Management Arrangement* that trees in public places were managed by LCSD, he hoped to understand if PlanD, Hong Kong Police Force, developers of private land or horticultural companies followed the guidelines; if not, whether DEVB or relevant departments would set out some regulations.

174. Mr Andrew CHAN raised the following views:

- He questioned the effectiveness of the scheme on regular monitoring of tree health. Even though government departments conducted tree inspections every six months, he discovered that notices were attached to some trees right away, stating that the tree had to be removed due to serious infection, while other trees were removed without any notice. He had attempted to look for reasons from the relevant department, officers concerned claimed that the trees had been seriously infected, but one would query why the department had not discovered the problem during the inspection six months ago, nor had it implemented any remedial measures. Worse still, he had found a removal notice attached to a tree with green sprouts a few years ago. After reflecting the situation to the department, the tree had not been removed and was still growing healthily. The incident showed that the tree inspection work carried out by government departments was very sloppy and the practice was inconsistent among different departments.
- Replanting of trees was very inefficient. Government departments claimed that locations would be expeditiously identified for replanting of trees, but clearance of fallen trees consequent of typhoon Mangkhut on a slope near Fu Ning Garden

and replanting of trees had yet to be made. He hoped that government departments would handle the work properly.

- He had made an enquiry to HyD about the details of the programme on vegetated slopes, but no information was provided. According to DEVB, seven trees in Sai Kung district were worth noting, which were listed in the Register of Old and Valuable Trees, but he considered that care and attention should also be given to younger trees familiar to the public.
- He had volunteered to be a Green Ambassador of LCSD on 28 January 2020, but he had not received any confirmation letter or notification of activities to date.

175. Mr CHENG Chung-man pointed out that while Hong Kong had been battered by typhoon Mangkhut, an old tree in Ming Tak Estate had toppled and was not cleared yet. The Mutual Aid Committee and management office of Ming Tak Estate made strenuous effort in tree inspection. If trees were found to be infected by bacteria or other special situations arose, enquiries were made to government departments, which usually expressed that the trees were fine. However, government departments would remove infected trees without prior notification. He considered the practice very absurd and would only undermine public confidence in tree management work implemented by the Government. On the contrary, if the Government could disclose more information beforehand, it was believed that public doubt could be dispelled.

176. Ms Debby CHAN said that trees on different road sections were managed by different government departments. Although DEVB suggested an “integrated approach”, various departments had different guidelines and practices with a lack of coordination. Therefore, she suggested that DEVB and various departments devise standardised guidelines for District Council (DC) Members’ reference. Moreover, trees on private land in rural areas had many problems. Residents worried about the risk of trees collapse in adverse weather, but when they made enquiries to government departments as to which department was responsible for the management of the tree concerned, it was eventually found that they were the responsible party in a helpless situation. Since the management approaches to landscaped plantation and wild trees varied, she suggested that the Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section of DEVB refer to the practice for urban residential estates and provide rural residents with professional knowledge or reference information applicable to trees in rural areas.

177. Ms Kitty LAM of PlanD responded that the department offered professional advice mainly on the landscape design. If PlanD received a planning application, the department would give advice on the species and number of plants proposed by the applicant. Besides, tree risk assessment and management was outside the purview of PlanD.

178. Ms Alice KONG of LCSD responded that the scope of tree management undertaken by LCSD was as follows:

#### Leisure venues managed by LCSD

- Site staff were responsible for tree care at leisure venues and closely monitored the growth of trees within the precincts of venues. LCSD offices in various districts had to inspect all the trees on their premises every year and had to prepare assessment reports on the tree conditions. If the conditions of some trees were found unsatisfactory during the assessment period, LCSD staff would follow up the cases; and if tree growth was still found unsatisfactory, LCSD would remove the trees according to the established procedures.

#### Trees in roadside flowerbeds, tree pits and within ten metres of roads except expressways managed by HyD

- LCSD had two tree teams responsible for managing trees in flowerbeds and tree pits in Sai Kung district, which were formed by a total of 16 members.
- In view of the public concern over tree care, LCSD had employed contract tree team members and had purchased required equipment.
- LCSD earmarked resources every year for managing trees on government land within ten metres of roads except expressways on a contract basis.
- In summary, the manpower of LCSD was sufficient to cope with the current situation.

179. Ms Christine FONG said that SKDC was very concerned about trees in the district. In the last term, SKDC had participated in the related work of the Greening Master Plan, which facilitated planting of many trees at LCSD venues with teams for following up the tree conditions. She pointed out that the public did not understand the management responsibilities of different departments for trees in different locations, for instance, HyD planted trees on slopes and LandsD was responsible for managing trees on vacant government land; hence, it might require DO(SK) to coordinate the work of various government departments. Furthermore, many members of the public were worried that infected trees would pose danger to pedestrians, but it was difficult to ascertain the health conditions of trees judging from their appearance, it would then require the advice from professionals. She agreed that the Government should enhance the transparency of tree management, such as stating the conditions of trees under observation or treatment. She also opined that trees should be named to realise the concept of “People, Trees and Harmony”, so that people would understand the hard work behind tree planting.

180. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the concerns of SKDC would be expressed to DEVB (Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section), SKDO, LCSD and HyD in writing.

#### **(8) Request for formulating legislation on trees and increasing the manpower and resources of the tree teams of Sai Kung**

181. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr FUNG Kwan-on and seconded by the Vice-Chairman and Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu.

182. Members noted the written replies from DEVB (Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section), SKDO, LCSD and HyD (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 264/20 to 267/20).

183. Mr FUNG Kwan-on raised the following views:

- In the absence of legislation on trees, the Government could only handle cases of tree collapse on private premises in accordance with seven to eight ordinances. Since the relevant ordinances and requirements were not in fact legally binding, responsible persons of private premises seldom consulted tree experts and would only handle the matters by felling the trees. In light of the above, tree experts had suggested that the Government consider adopting a practice similar to that of window inspection for conducting tree inspection.
- A practicable mechanism for tree management staff was not established in Hong Kong. He considered that a holistic mechanism was needed in Hong Kong for professionals to carry out tree management work, for example, trees at cultural and leisure venues should not be solely managed by site staff.
- Based on the figures in the previous year, there were 2 300 arborists in Hong Kong. The papers of the Legislative Council (LegCo) and DEVB indicated that the Government needed to manage trees amounting to a total of 1.7 million in 2019-20. Since the Government only had about 500 professionals working in nine different departments, it implied that each of them needed to manage an average of some 3 000 trees, reflecting serious manpower shortage, not to mention the lack of coordination among various departments.
- Currently the nine ordinances related to trees were mainly applicable to different departments, rural areas and remote places as well as situations including illegal felling and theft of trees. As the ordinances were seldom related to tree management and DEVB could only unilaterally issue orders to various departments responsible for tree management and could not regulate departments' compliance with those orders, there was a genuine need to enact legislation on trees to provide objective criteria for different departments, such as specifications on the height and species of trees and regulations on felling, transplanting, pruning, etc.
- No department could make a response concerning the *Guidelines for Tree Risk Assessment and Management Arrangement*, which showed that private residential estates were not required to fulfil the requirements therein and contractors were

not subject to legal consequences for non-compliance with the guidelines.

- Back in 1975, the Parks and Trees Act had been passed in Singapore; and in 2006, the “Green Tokyo Plan” had been formulated by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, which laid down the requirement of proper management of trees on private and government land and determined the scope of responsibilities of private residential estates; whereas in the United States and the United Kingdom, all states and governments of different levels had brought into effect legal regulations on tree felling, for example, permission had to be obtained before tree felling, etc.
- Hong Kong government should enact legislation on tree management for setting standards for acts such as planting, pruning and removal of trees. If trees of suitable species were planted in the right places, it would definitely bring benefits to human and trees alike.

184. Ms Debby CHAN recognised the need for setting standards of tree management. A friend of hers who was an arborist pursued studies in the discipline in Taiwan for the reasons that the Hong Kong Government did not formulate relevant standards of tree management, local courses were based on those offered in Taiwan and courses on management of native species or transformation of Hong Kong landscape design, etc., were not available. She pondered how to examine the tree conditions in Sai Kung district but discovered that no government departments or experienced local individuals could be assigned to carry out relevant work. To begin at the district level, SKDC should make known the significance of conjuring up a vision of tree management or laying down the respective criteria. She continued that government departments planted trees from the perspective of landscape design, rather than giving consideration to the health of trees; whereas SKDC cared about the well-being of the public and safety of residents and considered that tree management was not merely about appearance but about how to handle and assess tree risks. Assessment reports compiled by government departments after tree inspection were very unprofessional. She hoped that SKDC would identify the right person to carry out a study and provide some preliminary guidelines for different government departments.

185. Mr Andrew CHAN agreed with the enactment of legislation on trees and opined that reference could be made to the experience in Taiwan. Even though the extreme weather in Taiwan was serious, damaged trees pending to be cleared were not found in the city. He opined that the situation in Hong Kong was consequent of resource allocation problems; therefore, he suggested that the Government dedicate resources to tree management work. Moreover, he pointed out that the Government did not respond to the matter of “open data” in the motion and considered that “open data” could facilitate the society to assist the Government in managing and monitoring the health of trees, thereby achieving mutual

communication.

186. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the aspirations of SKDC would be conveyed to DEVB (Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section) in writing. He also suggested that the Secretariat assist in inviting representatives of DEVB to attend the meetings of the Environmental Hygiene, Climate Change, Agriculture and Fisheries Committee (EHCCAFC), to introduce the tree management strategies adopted by the Government and to exchange views on the proposal to formulate clear, uniform standards for managing trees in public places and private areas. The motion was referred to EHCCAFC for follow-up work.

187. Mr LAU Kai-hong supported an increase in manpower for tree management and supplemented that the location mentioned in SKDC(M) Paper No. 237/20 was New Clear Water Bay Road instead of New Clear Water Bay.

**(9) Request the Home Affairs Department to allocate funding to housing estates affected by wild pigeon problem to purchase contraceptive feed for pigeon; request the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and Housing Department to join hands in combating illegal feeding of pigeons**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 238/20)

188. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr FUNG Kwan-on and seconded by Ms Valerie WONG and Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu.

189. Members noted the written replies from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), FEHD, HD and SKDO (SKDC(M) Paper Nos. 268/20 to 271/20).

190. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the aspirations of SKDC would be conveyed to AFCD, FEHD, HD and SKDO in writing. The motion was referred to EHCCAFC for follow-up work and for examining the possibility of carrying out similar work with the use of funding from SKDC.

**(10) Request the Department of Health to improve the notification mechanism**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 239/20)

[Note: Motion (10) had been discussed and passed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 13 to 38 of the meeting minutes.]

**(11) Request the Government to launch a new round of anti-epidemic subsidies, including but not limited to distributing consumption vouchers of at least \$10,000 to residents of Sai Kung district**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 240/20)

**(12) Request for launching the third round of Anti-epidemic Fund and disbursing a contingency of \$30,000 to all Hong Kong residents**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 241/20)

191. As the content of motions (11) and (12) were related and there being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the motions would be discussed together.

192. The Chairman said that motion (11) was moved by Mr LEE Ka-yui and seconded by Messrs CHOI Ming-hei, TSE Ching-fung, LAI Ming-chak, Ryan LEE, Ms Valerie WONG and Mr CHAN Wai-lit. Motion (12) was moved by Mr CHOI Ming-hei and seconded by Messrs Frankie LAM, CHENG Chung-man, CHAN Wai-lit, Ms Valerie WONG, Messrs TSE Ching-fung, Stanley HO, CHUN Hoi-shing, FUNG Kwan-on, Ms Debby CHAN, Messrs Gary FAN, LEE Ka-yui, LEUNG Li, LAI Ming-chak, LUI Man-kwong, Ryan LEE, Ricky OR, LUK Ping-choi, LAI Wai-tong, CHEUNG Wai-chiu, Brandon YIP, YU Tsun-ning and the Vice-Chairman.

193. Members noted the written reply from the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office (SKDC(M) Paper No. 280/20).

194. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above two motions were passed and the aspirations of SKDC would be conveyed to the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office in writing.

**(13) Request for enhancing border control measures to stop the spreading of COVID-19 in Hong Kong**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 242/20)

[Note: Motion (13) had been discussed and passed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 39 to 45 of the meeting minutes.]

**(14) Request the Government to extend the coverage of Public Transport Fare Concession Scheme for the Elderly and Eligible Persons with Disabilities to those who have reached the age of 60**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 243/20)

195. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr Frankie LAM and seconded by he himself, Messrs Gary FAN, LEUNG Li, LUI Man-kwong, LAI Ming-chak, FUNG Kwan-on, CHUN Hoi-shing, LAI Wai-tong, LUK Ping-choi, Ricky OR, TSE Ching-fung, Ryan LEE, Andrew CHAN, Ms Valerie Wong, Mr LEE Ka-yui, the Vice-Chairman, Messrs

CHAN Wai-lit, Brandon Kenneth YIP, Ms Debby CHAN, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, Messrs Stanley HO, YU Tsun-ning, CHEUNG Wai-chiu, CHOI Ming-hei and CHENG Chung-man.

196. Members noted the written response from the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB) (SKDC(M) Paper No. 273/20).

197. Mr Frankie LAM said that the request for extending the coverage of the scheme had been suggested by SKDC in the previous term, and the Chief Executive (CE) had announced the decision to lower the eligible age. There were rumours about implementation of the scheme in October and political parties expressed that it would be implemented in April 2021; hence, he hoped that LWB would understand the actual progress of the scheme.

198. Ms Christine FONG said that SKDC had supported and proposed the scheme in the last term and LegCo would discuss the matter soon. She hoped that the scheme would be rolled out expeditiously and suggested that the Chairman reflect the views of SKDC to CE.

199. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed. An enquiry about the timetable for introducing the scheme and the request for early implementation would be made to the Chief Executive's Office in writing.

**(15) Request "Tell me@1823" to continue receiving cases during the epidemic**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 244/20)

[Note: Motion (15) had been discussed and passed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 46 to 53 of the meeting minutes.]

**(16) Opposition to the Government's introduction of "Hong Kong Health Code" to control and monitor the society in the name of epidemic**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 245/20)

[Note: Motion (16) had been discussed and passed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 54 to 69 of the meeting minutes.]

**(17) Request the Audit Commission to conduct value for money audits of government departments' replies to papers of the current term Sai Kung District Council with a view to enhancing performance and work efficiency**

**(18) Opposition to the Government's formulation of guidelines on the walkout of public officers who attend District Council meetings**

200. The Chairman said that a letter from SKDO had been received before the meeting,

which pointed out that the above agenda items were incompatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance (DCO) and were not suitable for discussion at DC meetings. Besides, the Secretariat would not provide any secretariat services. He had re-examined the content of the agenda and had preliminarily sought legal advice before reaching the following decision: regarding motion (17), the content and background mentioned were related to the views on the anti-epidemic measures in Sai Kung district, which involved the provision and use of public facilities and services in Sai Kung district, he therefore considered that the motion was not incompatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO; regarding motion (18), Members and the public had expectations for the operation of SKDC and hoped that officials would attend SKDC meetings to facilitate SKDC Members in fully reflecting public opinions to the Government. Smooth conduct of meetings was highly conducive to district administration; in addition, Members and the public knew about the “guidelines” from media reports and were uncertain whether the “guidelines” would inhibit the operation of SKDC or would affect the matters that required the attention of the Member who chaired or convened the meeting, he was therefore of the view that the motion was related to operational matters of SKDC. Taking the above reasons into consideration and with reference to the past experience of SKDC in handling similar matters, he opined that the above two motions were compatible with the DC functions specified in section 61 of DCO, and it was appropriate to include the motions in the agenda. He asked DO(SK) whether he had any supplementary response.

201. Mr David Chiu, DO(SK), expressed that a letter had been addressed to the Chairman before the meeting, stating that the above two motions were incompatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO and it was not appropriate to discuss the issues at the meeting of SKDC; subsequently, the Chairman gave a reply indicating that he did not agree with the conclusion drawn by the Government. He reiterated that the Government maintained a consistent stance. Motion (17) was originated from the allegation by some Members that certain government departments had failed to respond to Members’ satisfaction regarding their enquiries made to the Government during the epidemic, but the purpose of the motion was to request the Audit Commission (Aud C) to carry out a value for money audit on individual or a number of government departments. The views of Members on how to effectively enhance communication with government departments could be regarded as largely compatible with section 61 of DCO, which provided that one of the functions of DCs was “to advise the Government on the provision and use of public facilities and services within the District”. Seemingly, reflecting opinions to the Government could facilitate communication between departments and could be deemed as related to the operation of SKDC, but according to the legal advice obtained by the Government, SKDC could not infer from those justifications that all discussion or actions were possible as the matters for discussion or follow-up work had to be compatible with the functions of DCs specified in DCO. The motion on requesting Aud C to conduct a value for money audit for individual or

a number of government departments was considered incompatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO because Aud C conducted audit work on the policy bureaux/ government departments, agencies, other public bodies, public offices or audited organisations under the authority conferred by the Audit Ordinance (Cap. 122). Aud C had been selecting auditees according to the established mechanism including making reference to public opinion. In other words, members of the public including DC Members were not prohibited by law from making suggestions for conducting value for money audit on particular organisations, and whether the suggestions would be adopted was a decision of Aud C. However, if the request for Aud C to conduct a value for money audit was put up for discussion, voting or subsequent follow-up in a DC meeting, whether the subject matter was compatible with the functions of DCs would need to be taken into consideration.. SKDO had consulted relevant bureaux and departments and had sought legal advice according to the existing mechanism. The Government considered motion (17) incompatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO.

202. Mr David Chiu, DO(SK) went on presenting the stance of the Government on motion (18). He believed that the guidelines mentioned in motion (18) referred to the internal circular recently issued by the Government, which provided government departments with internal guidelines on the administrative arrangements for sending representatives to attend DC meetings or handling matters related to DCs. Since the circular only provided a set of internal guidelines, it was neither within the purview of the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO, nor did it affect the normal operation of DCs. Hence, the Government considered motion (18) inappropriate for discussion at the meeting of SKDC. If the Chairman eventually decided to discuss the above motion, government representatives including staff of the Secretariat would walk out on the meeting and would not participate in the discussion of the paper.

(The Chairman decided to continue the discussion of motions (17) and (18) and SKDO staff and representatives of government departments left the Conference Room.)

[Note: As motions (17) and (18) were not compatible with the functions of DCs specified in section 61 of DCO (Cap. 547), the Secretariat would not provide any support services.]

**(19) Request for clarifying the purview and functions of District Officer at Sai Kung District Council**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 248/20)

203. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Ms Debby CHAN and seconded by Mr Frankie LAM, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, Messrs Brandon YIP, CHUN Hoi-shing, Gary FAN, LUI Man-kwong, CHEUNG Wai-chiu, the Vice-Chairman and Mr CHAN Wai-lit.

204. Members noted the written reply from SKDO (SKDC(M) Paper No. 275/20).

(SKDO staff and representatives of government departments returned to the Conference Room.)

205. Ms Debby CHAN said that the background of the motion was about DO(SK) and representatives of departments having walked out on the previous meeting of SKDC. She had asked DO(SK) about his role in SKDC, but there had been no satisfactory response. She needed to know about the role of District Officer in order to understand why DO(SK) had led representatives of departments to walk out of the meeting. Walkout was a matter involving officials' compliance with code of conduct, she therefore considered that the situation revealed dereliction of duty of many department representatives if without proper explanation. DO(SK) often indicated at the meeting that opinions from government departments and legal advice had been sought, she enquired which department or individual was responsible for giving legal advice and expressed that there had been no written reply or concrete statement addressing her enquiry. At the fourth meeting of SKDC, EDB had responded to a motion/question, but the motion/question was eventually screened out. DO(SK) had pointed out that the advice from relevant government departments had been sought, she queried if there were any inconsistencies between the advice from EDB and that from its legal consultant. SKDC Members needed to know the detailed information; otherwise, incidents of attendees walking out on the meeting would recur. In the response, it was only stated that the District Officer was the person-in-charge responsible for the role of communication, coordination, etc., but it did not mention that the District Officer could lead representatives of departments to walk out on the meeting. She was sceptical whether there was dereliction of duty of all representatives of departments. Regarding the extempore motion "Request for disapproving the District Officer and government officials for walking out on the meeting held on 7 July 2020 which has affected the operation of Sai Kung District Council" passed at the fourth meeting of SKDC, she had requested officials to provide the reasons for having walked out on the meeting on that day, but the matter was not followed up.

206. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested that the Chairman ask representatives of departments who had just left the meeting for their reasons for walking out on the meeting and she also questioned the role of District Officer as a bridge of communication between DC and departments. Earlier, she had moved a motion on the exhaust of sewers in the vicinity of Sai Kung old town, government departments had provided 11 replies up to the moment, but there was still no solution. She pointed out that DO(SK) had not assisted her in communicating with government departments, including DH, and had not received any meaningful response. Regarding the paper tabled at this meeting that was incompatible with the functions of DCs, DO(SK) had not directly discussed with her who was the proposer of the motion, she queried

how the District Officer could serve as a bridge of communication. Lastly, she opined that the Secretary had to be seated on the Chairman podium in order to provide assistance to the Chairman during the meeting, but she did not understand why DO(SK), as a department representative, was also seated on the Chairman podium. She hoped that DO(SK) would respond to the matter.

207. Mr LAI Ming-chak said that many questions would not arise if DO(SK) had endeavoured to handle them, for example, the matter about the exhaust of sewers in the vicinity of Sai Kung old town had been discussed at the meeting for many times. If DO(SK) had made more arduous effort in handling the matter, motion (17) would not have been moved. The replies from government departments on the matter about the exhaust were irrelevant, for instance, a photo of the exhaust was included in the motion paper, but one of the replies provided information about U-traps. As a bridge of communication, District Officer should intervene in this situation. Even if the problem still could not be solved, one could explain to Members how he/she had attempted to follow up the matter so as to avoid conflicts like the one that had just arisen. As for the motion mentioned by Ms Debby CHAN, Members considered that it was fine for EDB to comment on the motion. He doubted that SKDO might have determined the motion being incompatible with DCO after having consulted other departments. From his viewpoint, even if the stances of the Government and SKDC were inconsistent, SKDC should be informed of the departments that SKDO had consulted and be furnished with justifications provided by the departments to facilitate Members' understanding of the views of different departments.

208. The Chairman opined that DO(SK), as a facilitator, should help out in the situation of government departments not following up the matter proactively because motion (17) was moved due to the unsatisfactory responses from government departments. Instead of formulating "guidelines" on walking out on the meeting, it would be better for the Government to set out guidelines to urge District Officers to handle controversial issues or long-standing problems that could not be resolved by any department. The matter related to the exhaust suggested by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan was not groundless, but departments had been claiming that it was not within their purview; hence, the District Officer had the responsibility to handle similar controversial issues.

209. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), clarified that the prevailing internal guidelines of the Government were applicable to all public officers in the Government; hence, it was not appropriate for public officers to participate in the discussion on matters considered incompatible with the functions of DCs, and walkouts were not led by the District Officer but the decision of various departments involved in compliance with the guidelines. The legal advice obtained by government departments was from the Department of Justice (DoJ) and SKDO consulted relevant subject bureaux and departments according to the nature of the

motions/questions. To address Ms LEUNG Hin-yan's concern and the issue about the role of District Officer as a coordinator, he responded that various departments might have examined the matter about the exhaust from different perspectives, SKDO had been communicating with relevant departments and clarifying the problem. With the knowledge that Members considered the responses from departments irrelevant to the subject matter, SKDO continued to perform the coordinating role. At present, the matter was referred to the Sai Kung District Management Committee (SKDMC) for follow-up work, salient points of Members' concerns were concluded after some rounds of discussion, and follow-up work would continue after receiving replies from departments. He reiterated that SKDO had all along endeavoured to coordinate the replies from various departments.

210. Ms Debby CHAN said that the statement about the District Officer leading other department representatives to walk out on the meeting was based on the announcement made by the District Officer about the Government's decision before leaving the meeting. Besides, government representatives who did not need to respond to the motion had also walked out on the meeting, and Members needed to wait for department representatives to return to the Conference Room before discussing the next motion, she opined that the practice had lowered the efficiency. She made a suggestion to the Chairman about writing to DoJ, mentioning about the past motions that were incompatible with DCO and walkout incidents of government officers as well as elaborating the enquiries about the acts of government officers, legal basis provided by relevant bureaux for supporting the decision of the District Officer and reasons for walkouts of department representatives. She supplemented that the extempore motion moved by her had been carried at the previous meeting, which requested departments to provide explanations for walkouts of their representatives on that day, and she hoped that follow-up work would continue; otherwise, Members would be perplexed and it was difficult to explain to residents why matters of their concern were interpreted by some unknown authorities.

211. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan hoped that DO(SK) would further elaborate by specifying the department of which its guidelines considered the motions excluded from the agenda just now and in the past incompatible, so that SKDC Members and the Government could work together with mutual respect. Furthermore, she hoped that DO(SK) would further respond why he, as a bridge of communication, could not provide a written reply. Regarding the establishment of a quarantine centre in Sai Kung, he had not liaised with her, but she was not sure if the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman had communicated with him on her behalf. She supplemented that the item on the exhaust of sewers in the vicinity of Sai Kung old town had been deleted at the meeting of EHCCAF and the issue could not be discussed within six months; hence, it could not be examined whether the exhaust of sewers posed the risk of spreading diseases to people. Given that the District Officer did not lead other department representatives to walk out on the meeting, it implied that other department representatives

were not subject to the directives of the District Officer. She therefore considered that it was not necessary for the District Officer to be seated on the Chairman podium.

212. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the aspirations of SKDC would be conveyed to the Home Affairs Department and the Secretary for Justice's Office.

**(20) Request MTR to set up entry/exit gates at Exit B and other suitable locations of LOHAS Park Station to provide convenience to residents**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 249/20)

213. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr Chris CHEUNG and seconded by Ms Christine FONG and Mr Edwin CHEUNG.

214. Members noted the written reply from the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (SKDC(M) Paper No. 276/20).

215. Mr Chris CHEUNG hoped that TD would assist in following up the motion and pointed out that the written reply from MTRCL did not provide an actual reply. Since the opening of the shopping mall, Exit B of LOHAS Park Station became crucial. He enquired when Exit B would be opened and when additional entry/exit gates would be provided. He suggested that the Chairman refer the motion to the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) for follow-up work.

216. Mr Byon WONG of TD said that he had referred Members' proposal for additional entry/exit gates to MTRCL for consideration.

217. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above motion was passed and the aspirations of SKDC would be conveyed to MTRCL in writing. The motion was referred to TTC for follow-up work.

(B) 4 questions raised by Members:

**(1) Enquiry about Department of Health's mechanism on assisting patients waiting for admission to hospitals**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 250/20)

[Note: Question (1) had been discussed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 70 to 78 of the meeting minutes.]

- (2) Enquiry about the existing quarantine inspection of imported goods; request the Government to step up inspection of imported goods at the airport, sea boundary and land boundary control points and to conduct environmental virus testing for the mode of transport for goods delivery**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 251/20)

[Note: Question (2) had been discussed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 79 to 83 of the meeting minutes.]

- (3) Enquiry about how Sai Kung District Council can assist departments to respond to the concerns and views of local community more efficiently**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 252/20)

218. The Chairman said that the question was raised by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

219. Members noted the consolidated written reply from SKDO and relevant departments (SKDC(M) Paper No. 281/20)

220. According to Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, the response gave readers an impression that as long as Members discussed matters related to livelihood in the district, departments could respond to them, but in fact it was not true. Taking the enquiry about the information of the quarantine centre as an example, she pointed out that departments could not provide the details of the internal arrangements for the quarantine centre and had responded to her request for detailed information about the traffic arrangements and the quarantine centre by stating that “arrangements will be made as appropriate” and “an account of the details will be given in due course”. She considered such responses unreasonable. Departments could not specify areas in which SKDC could further assist them, which represented that the assistance currently provided by SKDC or its mode of collaboration were sufficient and could fulfil their requirements; therefore, departments should not make any excuses for refusing to cooperate with SKDC in the future. She continued that the Government did not provide SKDC with any means to assist departments, nor did it allow Aud C to review the efficiency of departments. Besides, departments often failed to address the questions and skirted the livelihood issues, which left SKDC Members at a loss to know how they could facilitate collaboration with departments. Members moved motions and raised questions for better utilisation of government resources to serve the public, it was hoped that government departments would follow up matters raised by Members seriously. She also asked DLO/SK and PlanD if they had any views on the matters she had expressed and asked the Secretariat to recall if any proposers had been contacted to clarify the content of motions during preparation of responses.

221. The Chairman said that DLO/SK and PlanD did not have any supplementary responses. Regarding the question directed to the Secretariat, he asked Ms LEUNG Hin-yan whether the Secretariat should seek her views on the response to question (3).

222. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan indicated that it was mentioned in the reply that the Secretariat would clarify any unclear wording in the papers on motions or questions with the respective Members when preparing the response, but she opined that the Secretariat did not put it into practice.

223. The Secretary expressed that in relation to the motions or questions tabled by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan at the meeting, the Secretariat had contacted her to clarify some motions or questions particularly those presented at the meetings of Education, Health and Social Welfare Committee (EHSWC). As for the enquiries made to departments by the Chairperson of EHCCAF, the Secretariat had also sought clarifications from her and had passed the enquiries to respective departments for preparation of response and supplementary information. The Secretariat would continue communicating with Members with regard to unclear wording of motions or questions in the future.

224. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan expressed that regarding the motions or questions tabled at the meetings of EHSWC, the Secretariat had only sought clarifications from her owing to several unsatisfactory replies from departments after the meeting. For motions and questions presented at the meetings of the full council of SKDC, including question (3) under discussion, the Secretariat had only liaised with the Chairman to discuss which department the matters should be referred to and had not contacted her, i.e. the Member who had presented the motions or questions.

225. Mr CHAN Wai-lit hoped that SKDO would make known the departments included in relevant departments as mentioned in SKDC(M) Paper No. 281/20 and would give an account of the content of the responses from various departments.

226. The Secretary expressed that the views of departments, which often attended SKDC meetings or responded to motions or questions, on the captioned question had been sought. Members would be provided with the list of departments after the meeting and the views of departments were already reflected in the reply.

227. Mr CHAN Wai-lit opined that it was not necessary for SKDO to consolidate the responses. It was hoped that the Secretariat would clearly indicate the wordings in the responses from various departments and would send them to Members by email for information.

228. The Chairman said that if Members would like to know the responses from specific departments, they might request the departments to submit responses.

229. Mr CHAN Wai-lit expressed that he would like to know the views and details collected from departments before the Secretariat prepared the consolidated reply.

230. The Chairman indicated that the Secretariat would provide supplementary information after the meeting. He was of the view that SKDC should solicit views from different departments in the light that various departments were involved in different arenas at the district level, for instance, the Police might consider community policing very important and they might have their own views on the areas for collaboration with SKDC and facilitation of understanding for effective handling of district matters.

**(4) Enquiry about the role of District Officer in anti-epidemic work at district level**  
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 253/20)

[Note: Question (4) had been discussed at the meeting on 1 September. For details, please refer to paragraphs 84 to 96 of the meeting minutes.]

**V. Any Other Business**

231. The Chairman had received an email before the meeting expressing concern about the distribution of anti-epidemic supplies, which were procured by SKDC earlier this year, in areas outside Sai Kung district. The complainant considered the practice inappropriate. He continued that a similar incident had occurred during the distribution of SKDC calendars in the past. He asked Members and the Secretariat to voice their opinions on how to handle the incident.

232. The Chairman supplemented that the anti-epidemic supplies were hand sanitisers with SKDC logo printed on them. The email contained a complaint about why supplies with SKDC logo were distributed in a housing estate in Island East. Since the hand sanitisers were mostly distributed by Members, he suggested that the Secretariat ask Members if they had passed the anti-epidemic supplies to individuals in other districts for distribution. Besides, an individual was accused in the complaint. In the capacity of the Chairman, he would write to the individual and request him to explain how he had obtained the supplies for distribution purposes. The Chairman asked if Members would like to make any supplementary reply.

233. Mr Brandon YIP remarked that the anti-epidemic supplies were procured with the use of SKDC resources and could only be distributed in Sai Kung district as specified in the

guidelines. He enquired whether the matter should be reported to the Police if the individual had his ulterior motive of achieving personal objectives or fulfilling personal commitments in other districts with the use of SKDC resources, or used other means to obtain SKDC resources because it was highly likely that the act might constitute theft.

234. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu expressed that community efforts and mutual assistance among kaifongs emerged during the anti-epidemic period. Perhaps some residents in Sai Kung district realised that they did not need the anti-epidemic supplies after receiving them, and it could not be ruled out that they might have gathered the supplies and transported them to another district. Hence, he agreed with the approach suggested by the Chairman, that the Chairman should contact the individual concerned to understand the incident before deciding the next step.

235. Mr LAI Wai-tong said that some residents were aware of some photos posted by an SKDC Member on his Facebook page, showing distribution of hand sanitisers at the intersection in Sheung Tak. It was seen in the photos that the SKDC Member had distributed hand sanitisers together with the male individual involved in the above incident. He hoped that the SKDC Member, i.e. Mr Ricky OR, could explain if he was related to the complaint.

236. Mr Ricky OR expressed that the hand sanitisers distributed at the intersection and on the footbridge in Sheung Tak were sponsored by a manufacturer and they were not the hand sanitisers procured with the use of funding from SKDC. Before distribution, he had written to the Secretariat to enquire if any declaration was needed. As reported by his staff member, the Secretariat indicated that there was no specific requirement of the need for declaration. A Member had mentioned about an individual distributing hand sanitisers procured with the use of SKDC funding in another district, that individual might be his staff member, but he stated he neither knew nor had participated in this personal matter.

237. The Chairman suggested that the Secretariat should send an email to all Members and ask about the distribution of anti-epidemic supplies allocated to them.

238. Mr CHAN Wai-lit said that since the Chairman would write to the individual concerned, he asked how the Chairman was able to confirm the identity of the individual. As Mr Ricky OR had mentioned about the identity of the individual, he enquired whether Mr Ricky OR admitted that the individual in the photo was his staff member.

239. Mr Ricky OR said that a friend had sent photos related to the complaint to him and he identified that the individual concerned was his staff member. Moreover, a Member had also mentioned that the staff member had accompanied him to distribute hand sanitisers at the intersection in Sheung Tak as shown in the photos. In response to the complaint, he

reiterated that he had no prior knowledge of the incident and had not participated in this personal matter.

240. Mr Brandon YIP said that as clearly expressed by Mr Ricky OR, the individual concerned had taken away the resources of SKDC without approval from him, and Mr OR had no prior knowledge of the incident; therefore, he suggested that the matter be reported to the Police.

241. Mr CHENG Chung-man was baffled by the assertion of the individual concerned having stolen or snatched the supplies from the Member or having obtained the supplies in other circumstances without notifying the Member. He opined that the individual concerned might have obtained the supplies due to mutual assistance among kaifongs as suggested by Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu. The individual concerned was a renowned figure and it was believed that all people in the Conference Room should know him. It was possible that the individual concerned might have set up a supplies collection point on the street or might have done something similar. The most objective approach was to ask the Chairman to write to the individual concerned in order to understand the incident and give him an opportunity to explain.

242. Mr Ricky OR did not comprehend why someone asserted that he had provided the supplies to the individual concerned. He supplemented that shortly after some confirmed cases had appeared in Kwong Ming Court, staff of his office had already distributed all the hand sanitisers with SKDC logo while handing out masks. There was no stock of those hand sanitisers in his office and he was currently distributing hand sanitisers of other brands which were not procured with the use of funding from SKDC. He reiterated that he did not play a part in and had no prior knowledge of the incident, neither did he give the supplies to the individual concerned for carrying out his personal commitment.

243. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested that the supplies allocated by SKDC to Members for distribution be printed with Members' names in the future to avoid supplies from falling into the hands of others.

244. The Chairman expressed that similar incidents had occurred in the past, which had been discussed at a meeting of the Finance & Administration Committee (FAC) in 2019. At that time, the handling of souvenirs for Chinese New Year had been discussed, and he considered that the handling method was applicable to other supplies of SKDC. The then Chairman of FAC had concluded that Members should not indicate their information or that of others on SKDC souvenirs for Chinese New Year by using stickers or other means and should not distribute them in bulk in areas outside Sai Kung district. He considered that the matter should be handled according to his suggestion first, which was to ask the Secretariat to

write to all Members for understanding the distribution of anti-epidemic supplies and to take the opportunity to remind all Members of the regulation and consensus reached by FAC in 2019. He would also write to the individual concerned to request explanation of the incident.

245. The Chairman enquired if Members would like to raise other matters.

246. Mr FUNG Kwan-on had received some views reflected by local people, who suspected that the river in Shap Sze Heung was enclosed due to the road widening works on Sai Sha Road nearby. Cattle could find nowhere to drink water and could only survive by drinking the accumulated water on grass slopes after rain. Local people could not get in touch with the responsible person of the works project. He hoped that the Secretariat would liaise with relevant government departments to consider setting aside some space for cattle to drink water.

247. The Chairman indicated that the location was in Tai Po district.

248. Mr Stanley HO pointed out that the above-mentioned location was in Sai Kung North and was part of Tai Po district. He suggested contacting the DC Member of the respective constituency after the meeting to carry out follow-up work.

249. The Chairman supplemented that liaison with the Chairman of the respective DC might be initiated.

250. Mr LAI Ming-chak said that SKDC might make enquiries to departments via the Secretariat. As cattle might tread across the two districts, departments could provide an answer to Mr FUNG Kwan-on's question if they were willing to follow up the matter.

251. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to liaise with relevant government departments for them to know about the matter and to ask them to contact Mr FUNG Kwan-on directly.

252. The Chairman asked Ms LEUNG Hin-yan if she would like to raise other matters.

253. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired the meeting date of SKDMC. She would like to lodge a complaint and ask SKDO to follow up the matter.

254. The Chairman said that the meeting date of SKDMC was yet to be confirmed.

255. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan would like to lodge a complaint about misconduct by SKDO staff at the Sai Kung Jockey Club Town Hall (the Town Hall) and ask SKDO to follow up and

give an account of the incident. On 1 September, she put up a banner on the metal gate of the Town Hall, but in less than 20 seconds after hanging the banner, two men and one woman whose identities were unknown came out from the Town Hall and told her in an agitated tone of voice that banners should not be hung there. Although the three people did not identify themselves or produce any proof of identity, nor did they attempt to explain why banners could not be hung, she still instructed her assistants to remove the banner in order to ease the tension at the scene. While her assistants were removing the banner, the three people came up and claimed to offer assistance. She recounted that the three people folded the banner from the bottom to the top and stood there, inhibiting her assistants from taking back the straps and removing the banner. The contradictory move of the staff members was rather confusing. At that time, she tried hard to explain that those were eco-friendly straps, but someone had taken a pair of scissors from the Town Hall claiming to assist in removing the straps even though one did not need scissors to remove them. She opined that the acts of the three people did not facilitate but rather repeatedly hindered the removal of banner. Furthermore, the woman shoved one of her assistants who were removing the banner at the stairway and came in contact with the assistant's breast, causing the assistant to feel anxious and frightened. After searching the records, she had identified that the woman was Miss YIP Wing-sze, Felicia, Senior Executive Officer (District Management), SKDO. At the time of the above incident, some other banners were put up outside the Town Hall and there were no signs on the metal gate prohibiting display of banners. Even though she had put up a banner at an inappropriate location, public officers should notify her according to the established procedures and give her sufficient time to remove the banner. If public officers had to remove the banner forcefully, they should take photos before removal for record purposes so as to protect the interests of both parties. In view of the above incident, she commented that the three public officers had entirely tarnished the professional image of civil servants and had failed to deal with the matter in a composed manner according to the established procedures, their performance of duties was disappointing. The three public officers had not identified themselves throughout the incident and their acts were inconsistent with the purpose claimed. Neither had they properly communicated with her during the process. It was therefore worrying whether they could continue to serve in their positions, particularly when the work of SKDO often involved daily matters of the public. Hence, she decided to make a complaint about SKDO staff members' misconduct at the meeting and requested SKDO to follow up and give an account of the incident. In the meantime, she would like to ask Miss Felicia YIP, who had shoved her assistant on that day, to attend the meeting and give an explanation.

256. Mr David Chiu, DO(SK), expressed that he was aware of the incident and had gathered some information on the internet. On that day, a Member had been livestreaming on Facebook at the Town Hall, the video showed some people filming and commenting on the situation in the periphery of the community testing centre. Another live video showed some

people arguing with residents and the voice-over described that some people and SKDO staff had been jostling against each other. Nevertheless, the above account of the incident was merely portrayed by the Member. If the Member would like to lodge a complaint against public officers, the Government had an established mechanism for handling complaints. Before clarification of the facts, discussing the matter at the meeting was unfair to the SKDO staff as we had only heard the complainant's representation but not the explanation given by the staff member concerned. In addition, the Government indeed had a mechanism for handling complaints. He therefore made clear to the Chairman that he opposed discussion of the matter at the meeting.

257. The Chairman suggested that SKDO obtain a full picture of the incident.

258. Mr David Chiu, DO(SK), expressed that in case any member of the public, including Members, would like to lodge a complaint against a public officer, departments would carry out investigation and make a response in accordance with the established mechanism.

259. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said that DO(SK) had misunderstanding of the incident as she had not entered the Town Hall on that day.

260. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), responded that he had not mentioned about Ms LEUNG Hin-yan having entered the Town Hall. He had only mentioned that some people had been filming in the periphery of the Town Hall.

261. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan expressed that the Facebook live webcast viewed by DO(SK) was not related to the incident. She had a one-minute footage showing the incident, if needed, the footage could be played or the link to the footage could be provided.

262. Mr Chris CHEUNG suggested following up the above incident after the meeting.

263. The Chairman agreed that the above incident could be followed up after the meeting. He asked SKDO to contact Ms LEUNG Hin-yan to understand the full details of the incident and review if any improvement was needed.

264. Mr CHAN Wai-lit expressed that discussion on other matters was being conducted and Ms LEUNG Hin-yan had requested to discuss the matter at the meeting. If the Chairman considered it inappropriate to do so, he should ask Members to decide whether to include the matter in the agenda by voting.

265. The Chairman opined that time should be allowed for SKDO to obtain clear understanding of the incident first.

266. Mr CHAN Wai-lit pointed out that the decision was in the hands of the Chairman instead of DO(SK). He queried if the Chairman did not wish to handle the incident and considered that the fair practice was to let Members determine whether the matter should be included in the agenda.

267. Mr LAI Ming-chak pointed out that the discussion suggested by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan was not an extempore motion and hence voting was not needed.

268. The Chairman decided that the incident would not be discussed at the meeting. He once again requested SKDO to gather the full details of the incident from Ms LEUNG Hin-yan and review if any improvement was needed.

269. Mr LAI Ming-chak remarked that Ms LEUNG Hin-yan had already given a personal account of the incident and DO(SK) had responded to the matter, therefore, discussion had already been conducted. If DO(SK) would like to watch the footage mentioned by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan just now, he might watch it after the meeting. The Member had not moved a motion and the incident had been handled as appropriate. If subsequently the incident was still unresolved, then it had to be discussed at the meeting inevitably. The situation was similar to the issue about the exhaust of sewers in the vicinity of Sai Kung old town. As such, he hoped that DO(SK) would demonstrate commitment to the handling of Ms LEUNG Hin-yan's complaint.

## **VI. Date of Next Meeting**

270. The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, 3 November 2020 at 9:30 a.m. The present meeting ended at 12:31 p.m.

Sai Kung District Council Secretariat  
October 2020