

**Sha Tin District Council**  
**Minutes of the 6th Meeting of**  
**the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee in 2017**

**Date** : 14 December 2017(Thursday)  
**Time** : 2:30 pm  
**Venue** : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room  
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Time of joining the meeting</u></b>	<b><u>Time of leaving the meeting</u></b>
Mr CHIU Man-leong (Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen (Vice-chairman)		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-chairman	2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:30 pm	3:31 pm
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James		2:35 pm	2:44 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man		2:36 pm	3:48 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny		2:30 pm	3:36 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick		2:36 pm	3:29 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan		2:41 pm	3:44 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan		3:18 pm	3:48 pm
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor		2:30 pm	3:01 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung		2:36 pm	3:48 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui		2:30 pm	3:15 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan, BBS, JP		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH		2:30 pm	3:44 pm
Mr SIU Hin-hong		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai		2:44 pm	3:48 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai		2:30 pm	3:29 pm
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH		2:30 pm	2:40 pm
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun		2:36 pm	3:44 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael		2:30 pm	3:48 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-sum, Ada (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 2 / Sha Tin District Office		

**In Attendance**

Ms LO Ho-yee

Ms LI Wing-sze, Grace

Miss LEE Mei-yee

Miss CHAN Siu-kin, Ester

Ms TSANG Mei-ying, May

Ms NG Sheung-han, Alice

Ms TSANG Suet-man

Ms CHENG Ka-po, Theresa

Ms NING Fung-jin, Jeanny

Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

Ms LO Lai-fong, Jackie

**Title**

Senior Community Relations Officer /

Independent Commission Against Corruption

Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin) 2 /

Social Welfare Department

Senior Librarian (Sha Tin) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sha

Tin / Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and District

Activities / Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Senior School Development Officer (Sha Tin) 1 /

Education Bureau

Chief Liaison Officer /

Sha Tin District Office

Acting Senior Liaison Officer (West) /

Sha Tin District Office

Senior Executive Officer (District Council) /

Sha Tin District Office

District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**Absent**

Mr LEE Chi-wing, Alvin

Mr WONG Yue-hon

Mr YIP Wing

Mr YIU Ka-chun

Ms YUE Shin-man

**Title**

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)

" ( " )

" ( " )

" ( " )

" ( " )

**Action**

The Chairman welcomed all members, representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting.

**Application for Leave of Absence**

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received the applications for leave of absence in writing from the following members:

Mr Alvin LEE

Official commitment

Mr YIU Ka-chun

"

Mr WONG Yue-hon

Sickness

Mr YIP Wing

"

Ms YUE Shin-man

"

3. Members unanimously endorsed the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above.

**Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 26 October 2017**

(CSCDC Minutes 5/2017)

4. Members unanimously confirmed the above minutes.
5. Mr Michael YUNG said that he had no comments on the minutes. He wanted to follow up on whether the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had noted his views. He pointed out that his request was actually attaching the minutes of the related briefing session to his question as an annex. He was unsure about the follow-up actions by Ms Theresa CHENG, Chief Liaison Officer of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO).
6. Ms Theresa CHENG responded that the relevant views had been reflected to the HAB, which however had no further response yet.
7. Ms Ada LUK, Executive Officer (District Council) 2 of the STDO, responded that meeting papers of the committee were issued before the meeting and generally speaking, no extra papers would be inserted to the issued papers after meeting.
8. Mr Michael YUNG asked on behalf of which department the relevant response was given. He demanded a follow-up action after the meeting.
9. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would work with Mr Michael YUNG after the meeting to follow up on the practice of attaching papers as annexes.

**Matters Arising**

**Responses of Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting**

(Paper No. CSCD 79/2017)

10. Mr TING Tsz-yuen said that the residents wanted the sports centre in Area 103 to be completed as soon as possible. However, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) pointed out that the Government kept an open mind towards the construction of a new public market in Ma On Shan. This seemed to contradict the earlier response of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) that the FEHD had no plan to build the relevant market there. He urged the LCSD to discuss with the FEHD again and asked whether the FEHD could send representatives to attend the next meeting to give a response as to what it meant by an “open mind”.
11. The views of Mr MAK Yun-pui were summarised below:
  - (a) He opined that the relevant response was not specific and could be called ambiguous. He opined that the Government should state clearly whether its feasibility and should provide a timetable if a study was necessary. He hoped that the departments would clearly convey their stances to members if the FEHD found it feasible and the LCSD did not see any big problems; and
  - (b) He hoped that the relevant departments could give a clear account of, among other things, how the library’s new book processing centre (new book centre)

would be dealt with, how the facility would be rehoused and whether the area it occupied would expand or shrink. He said that he not only hoped that the relevant parties would provide a definite and clear statement, but more importantly, a timetable, since the relevant facility had been long awaited by the residents. He hoped that the relevant departments could deal with the issue as soon as possible.

12. Mr Michael YUNG opined that the Architectural Services Department or the LCSD could provide information on the usable floor area of the entire Area 103, while the STDO or the HAB could provide information on the area, floor area and occupied floors of the community hall concerned. In addition, he asked how many facilities, including the swimming pool and the sports centre, were planned to be built within the sports centre and the new book centre, as well as the floor area and the number of floors each facility would occupy. The Food and Health Bureau could also provide information on the area occupied by standard FEHD markets or cooked food centres. Relevant departments should inform members of the floor area required to build all the proposed facilities and whether they could be accommodated by the existing construction site. If feasible, they should start contemplating; if not, members should be allowed to choose which facilities to remove. He asked the relevant departments to list the above data at the next meeting.

13. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) He said that much time of the previous meeting was spent on discussing Area 103. Given the scarcity of land and the controversies sparked by the new book centre in the previous meeting, he hoped that the department would reconsider the issue and give a response concerning the arrangement of the new book centre.
- (b) He said that parking spaces in Ma On Shan were insufficient. He had personally visited Area 103 and upon a visual inspection, there were about 200 parking spaces. He hoped that the departments would build a car park with more than 200, preferably with 300 to 500 parking spaces, in basement and on ground floor. But he understood that there were restrictions on the floor area; and
- (c) Given the restriction of plot ratio, he asked whether the departments would consider downward development as it would not be calculated in the plot ratio. Despite the rise in costs, he hoped that this could increase the floor area, considering the scarcity of land and the advantageous location of Area 103. He understood that we could not have our cake and eat it but he hoped that a balance could be struck so that the sports centre project in Area 103 would be implemented as soon as possible. At the same time, he wondered whether the relevant departments could consider digging deeper into the ground to add two floors, so as to include such facilities as a car park, a market and a cooked food centre mentioned by members.

14. The Chairman said that the FEHD responded that it would keep an open mind and listen to the views of stakeholders. He opined that the FEHD should give an account of the progress as soon as possible because the department was collecting opinions and had listened to the members' views. He asked whether the design was underway, what facilities would be

included and what restrictions there were, such as floor space, the feasibility of including a cooked food centre and the number of parking spaces. He hoped that the LCSD and the FEHD could give an account to the Council of the progress, the feasibility and the reasons.

15. Mr LI Sai-wing said that he was supplementing instead of expressing his views, since he had expressed many views on Area 103 at the last meeting. He hoped that the relevant departments would not bypass the Sha Tin District Council (STDC). He also hoped that the departments would discuss with members the progress at the next meeting, so as to implement a proposal which followed public opinion closely as soon as possible.

16. Ms Jackie LO, District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) of the LCSD, responded that as far as she understood, the Planning Section was collating information on members' views after the previous meeting and would later resubmit it to the DC to brief members.

17. The Chairman said that he would continue to follow up on the issue. He hoped that the LCSD and the FEHD would submit the views collected and the findings of the basic research to the DC as soon as possible for further discussion, so as to come up with a proposal that best met the residents' actual needs. He also hoped that the planning of Area 103 could be perfect.

### **Discussion Items**

#### **Formation of Working Group on Screening of Funding Applications (Ad Hoc) under the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee** (Paper No. CSCD 80/2017)

18. The Chairman asked members to endorse Paper No. CSCD 80/2017, including the proposals that:

- (a) The establishment of a Working Group on Screening of Funding Applications (Ad Hoc) (Working Group) and its terms of reference be endorsed;
- (b) The term of office of the Working Group expire on 13 August 2018;
- (c) Members of the Working Group must be DC members; and
- (d) Two DC members (who were concurrently members of the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee) be elected as conveners of the Working Group, responsible for processing funding applications of Cultural, Recreation and Sports Group and Community Development and Community Organisations Group respectively.

19. Members unanimously endorsed the above arrangements.

20. The Chairman briefed members on the procedure for electing conveners of the Working Group. The candidates, nominators and seconders were as follows:

Cultural, Recreation and Sports Group (Expenditure Head 1 and Expenditure Head 6):

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Nominator</u>	<u>Seconder</u>
Mr YIU Ka-chun	Ms Iris WONG	Mr Thomas PANG Mr CHING Cheung-ying Mr PUN Kwok-shan Ms TUNG Kin-lei

21. The Chairman said that he received a written notice from Mr YIU Ka-chun before the meeting, indicating that he would accept the relevant nomination if he was nominated as a convener.

**Community Development and Community Organisations Group (Expenditure Head 10 and Expenditure Head 11):**

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Nominator</u>	<u>Seconders</u>
Mr CHING Cheung-ying	Mr Michael YUNG	Mr HO Hau-cheung Mr Billy CHAN Mr CHAN Nok-hang Mr LAI Tsz-yan Mr PUN Kwok-shan

22. The Chairman announced that as there was only one candidate in each of these two categories, the two candidates were elected ipso facto. He hoped that members would actively join the Working Group.

Nomination of Members to be Sports Ambassadors  
(Paper No. CSCD 81/2017)

23. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received two nominations by the deadline of nomination:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Nominator</u>	<u>Seconder</u>
Ms Iris WONG Mr SIU Hin-hong	Mr PUN Kwok-shan Mr YIU Ka-chun	Mr CHIU Man-leong Ms TUNG Kin-lei

24. Mr SIU Hin-hong asked why two sports ambassadors were needed. He suggested the two sports ambassadors be responsible for different categories, such as the youth category and the adult category; otherwise one ambassador would be sufficient.

25. The Chairman said that the LCSD had written to DC Chairmen to invite nominations for sports ambassadors. The letter stated the significance of sports ambassadors. Their duties included assisting with the promotion of sports in the district and promoting the importance and benefits of regular participation in sports and other physical activities to the public. The

Chairman suggested that the two sports ambassadors divide the work between them after they were elected.

26. Mr CHAN Nok-hang pointed out that there should be no less than two sports ambassadors as stated in the letter. He enquired about the maximum number allowed. He asked whether other members could nominate on the spot if Mr SIU Hin-hong was not elected as a sports ambassador.

27. Ms Iris WONG said that over the past year, the sports ambassadors had promoted different types of sports activities in Sha Tin District. There were no age categories for those activities and all Sha Tin residents were welcome. The two sports ambassadors divided their work based on the workload of the events. For example, it would be more ideal for the two sports ambassadors to share the workload when attending an event ceremony.

28. Mr Ho Hau-cheung said that the STDC responded to the invitation by the LCSD. Although the division of labour was not introduced in the past or mentioned in the invitation letter, Mr SIU Hin-hong's suggestion was worth considering by the LCSD. If the LCSD considered it responsive to actual needs, it might specify the requirement in the invitation letter so that the STDC could make a proper response. While the nomination process for the sports ambassadors had been completed this time, the LCSD could refer to the proposed manner of nomination in the next nomination period.

29. Mr Michael YUNG said that the sports ambassador could divide their work on their own. He also pointed out that there were four blanks in the nomination paper. Although the nomination period in the invitation letter had expired, some members present expressed their interest. He wondered whether two more persons could be nominated on the spot so that a consolidated reply could be sent to the LCSD.

30. Ms CHAN Man-kuen said that the document clearly stated the deadline for nomination. If members were interested in becoming sports ambassadors, they should have submitted their applications before the deadline instead of discussing the possibility of increasing the quota at the meeting.

31. Mr WAI Hing-cheung asked whether the LCSD welcomed more interested members to become sports ambassadors and why there were four blanks when there should be not less than two nominations. He asked whether applications could be handled on the spot if no members had applied by the deadline and there were members present who expressed interest in participating. If not, he wondered whether there would be no sports ambassadors representing the STDC; and if so, he wondered why applications of the two remaining blanks could not be handled during the meeting.

32. Mr Tiger WONG said that the manner of nomination had been proved effective and that members should submit their applications within the nomination period stated in the document.

33. The Chairman said that the invitation letter stated that not less than two members shall take up the posts of sports ambassadors, , which meant that more than two members could take up the posts. However, according to the invitation letter issued by the Secretariat on 16 November 2017, "the nomination period shall begin today and run until 5:30 pm on 29 November 2017 (Wednesday). No nominations will be accepted after the nomination period

or during the meeting.” According to the said document, no nominations should therefore be accepted during the meeting. He hoped that interested members would submit their applications as early as possible next time.

34. Ms Jackie LO responded that the sports ambassadors were tasked with helping encourage local residents to participate in sports activities. Dividing the work into two groups was not a big problem since activities organised by the LCSD were intended for people of different ages. Besides, inviting two or more nominations was intended to provide flexibility to DCs. She hoped that more members could serve as sports ambassadors next time so that sports activities in the community could be further promoted.

35. The Chairman announced that as there were only two candidates, members unanimously endorsed the election of Mr SIU Hin-hong and Ms Iris WONG as sports ambassadors of Sha Tin District to assist the LCSD in promoting sports activities in the community.

### **Information Items**

#### **Reports of Working Groups**

(Paper No. CSCD 82/2017)

36. Members noted the minutes submitted by the Working Group on Festive Celebrations and the Working Group on Recreation and Sports Development.

### **Information Papers**

#### **Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Cultural Activities and Utilisation of Facilities in Sha Tin District (4th Quarter of 2017 and 1st Quarter of 2018)**

(Paper No. CSCD 83/2017)

37. Members noted the above information paper.

#### **Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Recreation and Sports Activities and Management of Facilities in Sha Tin District (4th Quarter of 2017 and 1st Quarter of 2018)**

(Paper No. CSCD 84/2017)

38. Ms Jackie LO gave a brief introduction.

39. The views of Mr SIU Hin-hong were summarised below:

- (a) He said that the LCSD had organised many diversified activities with limited resources. He asked whether the LCSD needed more resources to organise activities for persons with autism or disabilities. He also asked whether the department had made arrangements in line with the Social Welfare Department's requirements regarding persons with needs for special care, such as the ratio between carers and participants, when organising the activities concerned. In addition, he pointed out that the growth rate of participation in



the relevant activities was high and asked whether corresponding facilities were installed to prevent danger;

- (b) He said that the labelling effect should be avoided. For example, it was expected that many people would participate in hiking but might refrain from joining because the activity was named “Hiking Fun for Low-income Persons”. Alternatively, youths might not participate in activities intended for youths at risk. Therefore, he hoped that the LCSD would pay attention to the names of activities they organised; and
- (c) He knew that some government departments adopted a two-envelope tendering system, which included the price aspect as well as the technical aspect and other factors. He asked whether the LCSD adopted such an approach.

40. Mr WONG Hok-lai said that the service performance of the LCSD’s horticultural contractor was unacceptable. The contractor often left branches and leaves on the street or in shrubs after trimming, and it would take several months to weed. He pointed out that it was necessary to review the performance of the relevant contractor.

41. Mr LAI Tsz-yan said that the horticultural contractor often put the weeds aside for a whole week after mowing without clearing them. Besides, he did not understand why the weeds could grow as tall as about one metre in spring and summer. He asked when the contractor could be replaced.

42. Mr Rick HUI thanked the new cleaning workers responsible for clearing garbage in 444. flower beds under bridges, where waste problem had improved significantly. However, although winter was approaching, mosquito problems were still rampant there. He hoped that the department could step up mosquito control.

45. The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:

447.

- (a) He asked how the department monitored the performance of contractors. He had raised concerns about flowers and plants on Mei Tin Road, but would not receive a reply until a month later. He asked whether it was because of inadequate manpower and supervision of the department, or also due to the manpower shortage of the contractor; and
- (b) He said that the tender price might not necessarily reflect the performance of a contractor. Apart from issuing advisory letters and warning letters as well as imposing fines, he asked whether there were alternative solutions to improve the contractor’s performance such as the termination of contract, and what the department would do after the termination. The matter affected not only the image of the LCSD, but also the daily living environment of residents in the community and even the work of local DC members. For example, the contractor might take a month or two to clear some weeds upon DC members’ referral of complaints.

48. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) He said that he often patrolled in Ma On Shan with LCSD staff. He thanked Ms

Jackie LO and her team for dealing with problems efficiently. However, he was dissatisfied with the contractor's failure to cooperate. He pointed out that while greening works beautified the environment, fallen leaves should be cleared on a regular basis as well. Weeding in the vicinity of Lok Wo Sha Lane was done poorly and there were mosquito problems off Double Cove. He urged the relevant parties to step up supervision. If the performance of the contractor remained unsatisfactory, the authority should take some deterrent measures, in addition to condemnation by the STDC. If the contractor ignored the warning letter from the department, its contract should not be renewed and the department should engage another contractor which was sincere in serving the public; and

- (b) He opined that it was necessary to adjust the weighting currently set at 70% on the price aspect and 30% on the technical aspect. Awarding the contract to the lowest bid might not necessarily be the best approach. Members of the public would understand that better services were not necessarily provided at the lowest price.

49. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) He said that Sha Tin was a large district with a wide scope of services and target groups. Some residents reflected that services of the horticultural contractor hired by the LCSD were poor and the LCSD had made a lot of efforts to supervise its work. He hereby thanked Ms Jackie LO and her team for their efforts in planting, greening and organising activities.
- (b) From his previous communication with Ms Jackie LO, he had noted that about half of the score in the contractor vetting system was attributed to the price of the service. Therefore, problems were likely to arise from the practice of "the lowest bid wins". He hoped that Ms LO could reflect to the department whether there was a need to adjust the marking scheme for evaluating contractors. Otherwise, the same contractor might win the contract again because "the lowest bid wins" and continue to provide unsatisfactory services, making it difficult to improve the planting or maintenance of flower beds in Sha Tin District.
- (c) He asked whether issuing advisory letters and warning letters to a contractor would affect its next bid and whether a contractor would not be considered if it had received a certain number of warning letters.

50. Ms Jackie LO gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She thanked the Chairman and members for their encouragement to the LCSD.
- (b) She said that although the relevant activities organised by the LCSD targeted people with autism or disabilities or youths at risk, labelling was avoided. Those activities were generally organised jointly with voluntary agencies or welfare organisations. They referred the list of service recipients to the LCSD for organising recreational activities. Therefore those activities were not open

for application and would not cause labelling effect.

- (c) She said that the LCSD attached great importance to safety in activities. When organising activities or training sessions for persons with special needs, the LCSD would follow the requirements of relevant associations to comply with the ratio of minders to persons with disabilities;
- (d) She said that the LCSD would pay attention to arrangements of facilities. For example, in a swimming class for persons with disabilities, there would be pool lifts to facilitate their access to swimming pools. They would arrange facilities depending on the activities and the needs of persons with disabilities.
- (e) She thanked members for their concern about the performance of the horticultural contractor. It was an important issue and a major challenge for her. The contract with the current contractor would expire on 30 November 2018. The marking scheme of evaluating tenders was based on the principle of “the lowest bid wins”, with 70% weighting given to the price aspect and 30% to the technical aspect. Therefore the weighting on price was higher. She could reflect the committee’s view which was to slightly lower the weighting on price and take into account other aspects such as performance, for the sake of selecting a contractor providing better services.
- (f) Regarding the supervision of contractors, a team of LCSD staff was responsible for daily work such as conducting site inspections. They also reviewed the performance of contractors and Reports of Inspection and Action (RIA) were issued to contractors when necessary to urge them to give responses and make improvements within seven days. It often took a longer time for underperforming contractors to give a response. In that case, the department would issue an advisory letter which was of a higher level. If ignored, a default notice would be issued and payment to the contractor would be deducted.. In October this year, the department issued 16 advisory letters and 7 RIAs to contractors. The LCSD had all along closely monitored the work of the contractors. However, they often made various excuses and unsatisfactory responses. Even so, the team from the department would still closely monitor the work of contractors and request them to make improvements;
- (g) For the tendering procedures, the LCSD adopted a two-envelope tendering system which included the price aspect and the technical aspect. If a tenderer had performed unsatisfactorily in previous contract periods (e.g. it had received many advisory letters and warning letters), its score in the technical aspect would reflect the relevant situation. In compliance with the spirit of contract, the department would follow contractual terms and the existing mechanism and urge contractors to perform their contractual duties;
- (h) The contractor was able to handle a weeding request within three days or even on the same day if the location was clear and easily accessible. However, it responded relatively slowly to mowing requests. In some cases, the contractor started working only after the issuance of two RIAs and one advisory letter. The relevant procedure took 21 days and therefore the public got the impression of a delay. In view of this, the department would now issue an

advisory letter promptly after an RIA, and then would issue a default notice if no improvements were made within seven days; and

- (i) She said that a letter would be sent to the contractor based on the minutes of this meeting to reflect members' views on its performance. She thanked members for promptly notifying the LCSD of unsatisfactory planting, so that the department could commence work as soon as possible.

Report and Plan on Public Libraries Promotion Activities Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District (4th Quarter of 2017 and 1st Quarter of 2018)

(Paper No. CSCD 85/2017)

51. Members noted the above information paper.

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Arts Association

(Paper No. CSCD 86/2017)

52. The views of Mr Tiger WONG were summarised below:

- (a) He thanked directors of the Sha Tin Arts Association (STAA) for leading the STAA for over 30 years and pulling through difficult times. He had been a director of the STAA on behalf of the STDC for more than a year. He learnt that the STAA organised many arts classes and community performances in the district, and assisted the STDC in holding various large-scale events. It was greatly popular with residents of Sha Tin District. He opined that the STAA was already on the track but there was still room for improvement. In the board meeting in October, he garnered the support of Mr SUNG, the Chairman of the STAA, and other directors, including member representatives present at the meeting, for setting up a working group on procurement procedure, . The said working group was intended to help the STAA develop a set of procurement guidelines based on that of the ICAC, so as to institutionalise the procurement work of the STAA.
- (b) For over 30 years, the STAA had adhered to the procurement and claiming procedures of the STDC. But it had not developed its own procurement procedures. Given that the STAA applied for STDC funds of more than one million dollars, he opined that it was necessary to improve its procurement procedures. After certain years, when all the current directors retired, and the STAA was still running, it would be necessary to institutionalise the procurement procedures and the operation, so as to facilitate the then incumbent directors to oversee the overall operation and the STDC to supervise the STAA. He opined that it was a very important matter. Improvements were still necessary even if there were no problems at present; and
- (c) He disagreed that there was currently a set of internal procurement guidelines in the STAA because the guidelines provided at the meeting were STDC's. He had reviewed several procurement items and did not think that the relevant quotations had been reported to the STDC.

53. The views of Mr CHING Cheung-ying were summarised below:

- (a) He would like to make a simple statement here as the Vice Chairman of the STAA. Most of the STAA funding came from the STDC. The STAA must strictly follow STDC's requirements. Any procurement must be conducted in adherence to the STDC's declaration system, with the documents monitored and vetted by the STDC. Such a practice had always been effective. The STAA's own expenditures had been subject to a vetting system. For example, a procurement exceeding \$5,000 must be approved by the board of directors. The STAA was also willing to listen to Mr Tiger WONG's views at any time to learn about any room or need for improvement;
- (b) He said that the STAA definitely had a procurement system. Firstly, it should follow the STDC's requirements. If there were inadequacies within the system, the STDC would not approve its funding application. There was no room for improvement on the related system. The Secretariat could only be asked to make amendments if necessary. Secondly, the STAA had a clear set of internal guidelines on goods and service procurement. The STAA was willing to listen to Mr Tiger WONG's substantive or specific views, instead of mere indications of the need to review, at a group meeting or a board meeting, ; and
- (c) The STAA would make declarations upon STDC's request; otherwise it would not get any write-back of provision from the STDC. The STAA often clearly responded to questions raised by the Secretariat. He stressed that its funding arrangements would otherwise not be approved by the STDC.

54. The Chairman said that the STAA had been established in Sha Tin District for a long time and had rendered significant contributions to the district. The District Officer (Sha Tin) and DC members were also invited to serve as directors. Even he himself was an honorary vice-president. He said that nowadays many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) established procurement procedures to protect their directors and facilitate their daily operations. He pointed out that the STAA was not a subsidiary of the STDC. The STAA could have more internal discussions on this matter and study whether there were measures to optimise its operation.

55. Members noted the above information paper.

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Sports Association  
(Paper No. CSCD 87/2017)

56. Mr Ho Hau-cheung said that he and Mr CHING Cheung-ying had previously attended an executive committee meeting of the Sha Tin Sports Association (STSA). They were entrusted with enquiring about the reasons for the long time required to apply for write-back of provision from the STDC, since it caused difficulties to the STSA's financial status and cash flows.

57. Mr CHING Cheung-ying said that the said situation started from the dragon boat race last year. Despite the back-and-forth of documents, the STSA was willing to follow the STDC's declaration system at the Secretariat's request. However, the funding process was too long and the relevant situation should be reviewed.

58. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) He said that the Chief Liaison Officer should reflect to the District Officer (Sha Tin) and the Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) on the severe manpower shortage of the Secretariat. He pointed out that the problem was that it took time for staff to handle members' claims for allowances or funding declarations under various expenditure heads. Besides, with the Legislative Council (LegCo) by-election this year, the Secretariat also needed to handle the relevant election advertisements. Therefore, he did not expect to see a rapid progress. The process of handling applications of operating expenses reimbursement had become slower since he first served as a DC member a decade ago. He believed the situation for other expenditure heads to apply for write-back of provision was similar due to the relevant manpower shortage; and
- (b) If manpower shortage was identified as the key of the problem and if relevant procedures were necessary, the workload would not be reduced after the optimisation of the procedures. The LegCo by-election added workload to the Secretariat on top of its daily work. He pointed out that the Secretariat could concentrate on electoral affairs due to the suspension of DCs during a DC election. By contrast, DCs operated as usual during the LegCo by-election, which, however, should be the responsibility of the Registration and Electoral Office. Therefore related manpower should be increased instead of relying solely on the STDO.

59. Ms Theresa CHENG responded that the District Officer (Sha Tin) had noted members' views on the manpower issue of the Secretariat, and had discussed with the Senior Executive Officer (District Council) on how to optimise the procedures and accelerate the process. The Legislative Council New Territories East By-election required not only the assistance of the Secretariat staff, but also the participation of all STDO staff to different extents.

60. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) Some non-profit-making organisations reflected to him that the progress of applications for write-back of provision from the STDC was unsatisfactory. He said that not every NGO was financially capable and that cash flows were very important for industrial and commercial enterprises or non-profit-making organisations. He hoped that the STDO and the STDC could accelerate the handling of members' applications for operating expenses reimbursements or applications for write-back of provision from STDC-funded organisations; and
- (b) As far as he understood, the relevant work still required two to three staff. That might be one of the causes of the problem. He said that the STDO and the Secretariat were fully aware of members' concerns about the shortage of manpower to handle applications for write-back of provision. Therefore, he urged the STDO to hire sufficient staff to cope with the workload.

61. Members noted the above information paper.

**Date of Next Meeting**

62. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 1 March 2018 (Thursday).
63. The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat  
STDC 13/15/50

March 2018