

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of
the Education and Welfare Committee in 2017

Date : 28 February 2017 (Tuesday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr MAK Yun-pui (Vice-Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, BBS, MH	DC Chairman	2:43 pm	4:30 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:30 pm	4:23 pm
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	”	2:30 pm	4:24 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	”	2:30 pm	3:42 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	”	2:30 pm	3:30 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	”	2:30 pm	3:41 pm
Mr CHIU Man-leong	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	”	2:42 pm	4:30 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	”	2:30 pm	4:28 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	”	2:30 pm	4:13 pm
Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan, BBS, JP	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	”	2:45 pm	4:14 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	”	2:39 pm	3:00 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”	2:40 pm	4:30 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	”	2:39 pm	4:30 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	”	2:40 pm	4:13 pm
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris	”	2:39 pm	4:30 pm
Mr WONG Yue-hon	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	”	2:30 pm	3:41 pm
Mr YIP Wing	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr YIU Ka-chun	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Ms YUE Shin-man	”	2:30 pm	4:11 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	”	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr MOK Man-lok, Mannix (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council)1 / Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Mr CHAN Ping-ching, Roy

Mrs YU CHOW Kai-ching, Alice

Ms LAU Yuk-yee, Lydia

Ms CHENG Ka-po, Theresa

Ms LO Wai-man

Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

TitleAssistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sha Tin) 1 /
Social Welfare DepartmentSenior School Development Officer (Sha Tin) 4 /
Education Bureau

Housing Manager (Sha Tin 1) / Housing Department

Chief Liaison Officer / Sha Tin District Office

Acting Senior Liaison Officer (East) / Sha Tin District Office

Senior Executive Officer (District Council) /
Sha Tin District Office**In Attendance by Invitation**

Mr CHAN On-ting

Ms NGAI Hoi-fong

TitleSenior Manager (External Affairs) of Mandatory Provident
Fund Schemes AuthorityManager (External Affairs) of Mandatory Provident Fund
Schemes Authority**Absent**

Ms LAM Chung-yan (Chairman)

Mr LEE Chi-wing, Alvin

Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor

Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS

Ms TSANG So-lai

Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick

Mr SIU Hin-hong

Title

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)

" (")

" (")

" (")

" (")

" (No application for leave of absence received)

" (")

Action

The Vice-Chairman welcomed all members and representatives of government departments to the 2nd meeting of the Education and Welfare Committee (EWC) this year.

Application for Leave of Absence

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

Ms LAM Chung-yan	Sickness
Mr Alvin LEE	Official commitment
Mr Victor LEUNG	"
Mr MOK Kam-kwai	"
Ms TSANG So-lai	"

3. Members unanimously endorsed the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above. Since Ms LAM Chung-yan, Chairman of EWC, failed to attend this meeting, the Vice-Chairman would preside over the meeting on her behalf.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 January 2017

(EWC Minutes 1/2017)

4. Mr Michael YUNG asked why there was a column of "under" printed after the time of leaving the meeting of members in the minutes.

5. Mr Mannix MOK, Executive Officer (District Council)1 of Sha Tin District Office replied that it was a misprint and the Secretariat would pay attention to this in the future.

6. Members endorsed the meeting minutes.

Matters Arising

Response of the Relevant Government Department to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting

(Paper No. EW 6/2017)

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

- (a) Social Welfare Department (SWD) replied that Refine Home was required to move out; he asked SWD about the latest follow-up progress of this issue;
- (b) given that Refine Home was required to move out on 31 March and the elderly needed to move out around mid-March; he wondered whether SWD could provide the number of the elderly having been assisted, being assisted and to be provided with follow up actions. He asked, for allowing flexibility, whether a grace period would be granted if the elderly could not find a suitable nursing home in such a short period;
- (c) since at present SWD still had not yet got in touch with a dozen of the elderly, he hoped SWD could provide information about relevant follow-up at the next meeting; and
- (d) he asked the Secretariat about the latest news about the letter sent by EWC earlier on to Office of the Chief Executive of HKSAR (Office of the Chief Executive) regarding the issue related to English Schools Foundation.

8. The Acting Chairman asked SWD about the number of the elderly who had not found a settlement home yet. As SWD said the Integrated Family Services Centre was following up with relevant issue, he would like to know what follow-up action did the Integrated Family Services Centre take, how many cases were involved and whether the elderly accepted SWD's arrangements.

9. Regarding the letter sent earlier on in the name of EWC to the Office of the Chief Executive to condemn the Education Bureau, Mr Mannix MOK replied that the Secretariat sent the letter on 10 January 2017; the Office of the Chief Executive replied on 23 January that they had received the letter and had referred it to the Education Bureau for follow-up.

10. The responses of Mr Roy CHAN, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sha Tin) 1 of SWD were summarised below:

- (a) SWD had kept close contact with various departments, the operator and the family members of affected residents. Government Property Agency sent another letter on 5 February this year requesting the operator to move out before 31 March so as

to make room for the expansion project of Prince of Wales Hospital;

- (b) SWD reminded the operator of Refine Home that it must follow the requirements of relevant code and properly arrange accommodation for the elderly residents. Since the operator was also running other nursing homes outside the district, they would arrange accommodation based on the preferences of the residents;
- (c) on 14 February, SWD sent another social work team to Refine Home to talk to each elderly resident and informed them by letter that Refine Home was required to move out before 31 March; they also took this chance to get in touch with those elderly residents who had not yet contacted SWD and their family members, and referred their cases to SWD's Integrated Family Services Centre for follow-up;
- (d) the social workers had contacted with family members of the elderly so as to provide necessary assistance, such as providing them with information about other nursing homes. If necessary, the social workers would accompany relevant family members to other nursing homes for a visit; and
- (e) as at mid-February, there were 85 elderly people living in Refine Home. SWD had come into contact with 73 of them and their family members; among them, family members of a dozen of the elderly said they had found suitable nursing homes and would move out in or before mid-March; about a half of the rest were looking for suitable nursing homes while others were taking a wait-and-see attitude, expecting delayed moving or resettlement at Refine Home. For the over a dozen elderly residents whom SWD failed to have contact with, the social workers would try to get in touch with them and their family members so as to follow up with their cases appropriately. At present, there were a total of over two hundred vacant beds in other private nursing homes in Sha Tin District and over three hundred vacant beds in the private nursing homes in Tai Po and North District. In addressing the relocation of Refine Home, SWD would put the well-being of the elderly residents at the top of the priorities and make sure they were well accommodated.

11. Members noted the above paper.

Discussion Items

MPF Default Investment Strategy
(Paper No. EW 7/2017)

12. Mr CHAN On-ting, Senior Manager (External Affairs) of Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority (MPFA) gave an introduction of the contents of the paper.

13. The views of Ms Scarlett PONG were summarised below:

- (a) she held that MPFA issued relevant briefing leaflets too late; she hoped in the future relevant data could be provided as early as possible to the members for reference;

- (b) she held the rates of Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) Schemes could definitely be lower, for such investment did not require much efforts from fund managers, especially for bond investment;
- (c) MPF Default Investment Strategy (Default Investment) was a “package for the lazybones” designed for those who know little about investment or do not have time for investment management; luckily, there were charge limits and retirement schemes for the retired to choose from; and
- (d) she held MPFA should step up publicity and education to encourage the public to manage their own investments before retirement. For example, Hong Kong Investment Funds Association would provide information about MPF performance to acquaint the public with past performances of MPF. She held that MPFA should improve the website design so that the public could find information about assessment of MPF performances more easily.

14. The views of Mr PUN Kwok-shan were summarised below:

- (a) Default Investment could be a solution to some problems but there were different problems with the fees charged by funds. He asked whether MPFA could require the fund manager to manage investments more actively. Dispersed accounts were not a good thing for employees and might even trigger unfairness; he hoped MPFA could come up with improvement measures;
- (b) it is right to include those who had not chosen specific funds into the scope of Default Investment, but MPFA should figure out whether they failed to make a choice because of a lack of understanding of the funds or because the fund managers did not remind them to do so; in this connection, MPFA could request the fund managers to provide services in a more active manner; and
- (c) it is not bad for the fund managers to invest in global bonds, but he hoped MPFA could provide more information about fund returns and performances.

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

- (a) he opined that MPFA distributed the leaflets too late. He had received relevant letters from MPF trustees around the lunar new year, and the contents of which were complicated and hard to understand. He doubted if the public had the patience to read these documents before deciding what to do with their MPF arrangements;
- (b) the concept of Default Investment featured a gradual reduction of investment risks from the age of 50 to 65. Though there were upper limits for charges, the public must pay service charges however the MPF service provider performed, nibbling the investment returns of their MPF in disguised form and even bringing negative investment returns. Now that the risks would be reduced under Default Investment, the public would get lower investment returns accordingly or could only break even; in the end, the public would have to rely on the government’s welfare protection scheme after retirement. Since the strategy would help solve

the retirement protection problem, he wondered whether MPFA would make further improvement in this regard;

- (c) how MPFA would help those people without an MPF account, such as housewives or self-employed persons, who had no retirement protection; and
- (d) as the headquarters of MPFA was located in a grade A office building, he asked whether MPFA would consider moving to another place to cut down administrative expenses. Since MPFA could not make ends meet itself, he doubted if they could well manage the public's retirement protection schemes. Though MPFA said relevant expenditures had nothing to do with the public's contributions to MPF, all the funds allocated by the government to MPFA came from the public.

16. The views of Mr James CHAN were summarised below:

- (a) the Default Investment package was based on the assumption that members of the public were not willing to take care of retirement life themselves. He remembered that some foreign-funded companies also had provident fund schemes in the past, which were better than the MPF system in terms of scope of protection. After implementation of the MPF system, these companies cancelled the original schemes, leaving employees' retirement life being less protected;
- (b) he held that the public did not want a fund service provider with a service charge rate of higher than 2% in general, but they did not know the exact amount of service charge when they were choosing service providers. At present the rate of service charge was about 2% in the market while the charge rate limit of relevant scheme was 0.95%; he did not see much difference;
- (c) as Default Investment featured a gradual adjustment of investment risks from high risk to low risk, he held that investment itself was risky, with no difference between high risk or low risk. All the companies that were closed down in the financial tsunami in 2008 were those once rated as low risk companies;
- (d) for those who had not given any investment instructions, their MPF would automatically fall into the scope of Default Investment; he held that most people would be arranged to choose this Default Investment strategy. He held the purpose of this strategy was to set the public free from seeking more retirement protection arrangements; and due to inadequate publicity, he believed many members did not know this strategy would be launched until now;
- (e) regarding MPFA's saying that overall fund performance of MPF scheme outperformed inflation in the past 16 years since its implementation, he held that other investment plans in the market might bring higher returns. Though the performance of MPF was barely satisfactory and the members present needed not make contribution to MPF, he would, as required by MPFA, step up advertising the deficiency of the system to the public; and

- (f) the MPF strategy was introduced because the market could not meet the public's needs for retirement security; now MPFA said it did not want to overcontrol trustee companies or intervene in market operation, which was self-contradictory. In his view, the retirement life of the public could only be secured if the employer, employee and even the government made contributions to each MPF account. He hoped the MPFA representatives could bring the government's attention to this.

17. The views of Mr Billy CHAN were summarised below:

- (a) regarding MPFA's saying that \$600 billion was invested in the past 16 years with a return of over \$100 billion, he asked about the percentage of administrative fees paid to fund managers; he also asked whether MPFA had thought about the reason why 70% of people prefer other investment plans to MPF;
- (b) given that MPFA aimed at gradually adjusting the risks of investment from high risk to low risk with the increase of age of account holders, he asked how to define high risk and low risk and what risk levels Lehman bonds were of in the past. He asked what MPFA would do if something was wrong with investment products of relatively low risk such as bonds;
- (c) he asked whether the upper limit of management charge of 0.95% applied only to all service providers under Default Investment; and
- (d) in his view, the public were not interested in managing their MPFs account because of their low or even negative returns; he asked whether MPFA would impose punishments on those underperformed funds. He also asked whether the government would make contributions to MPF together with employers and employees.

18. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) given that the upper limit of administrative charge was 0.95% and investments would gradually transfer to bonds and other low-risk products with the increase of age of account holders, he asked whether the return of low-risk investments would catch up with inflation or would be enough to cover administrative charges, and whether the charges could be lower; and
- (b) he asked how to define high risk and low risk investments and whether the administrative charges could be linked up with investment performances. MPF was supposed to provide retirement protection. Nevertheless, as the amounts of MPF benefits returned to many retirees were even less than the principal amounts invested in MPF, he doubted if MPF could really play its role of provision of retirement security.

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

- (a) at present over 600 000 account holders did not manage their MPF accounts, which was a relatively high figure. Some were too busy to take care of them and some simply did not know how to manage the accounts. He held that MPFA

should step up publicity and education to teach the public how to manage their accounts;

- (b) he asked whether the rate of administrative charges was 0.95% for both “Core Accumulation Fund (CAF)” and “Age 65 Plus Fund (A65F)” after choosing Default Investment;
- (c) he asked whether MPF members who had received the “Notice of Reinvestment under Default Investment Scheme” could choose cash besides conservative funds by giving specific investment instructions within the 42-day response period; and
- (d) the fees charged by MPF trustee companies were not in proportion to their performances; he asked whether MPFA could increase the transparency of trustee companies’ performances and enhance supervision so that the public could tell reliable companies from unreliable ones.

20. The views of Mr WONG Ka-wing were summarised below:

- (a) he had grave doubts about Default Investment. In his view, genuine fund investment should be a portfolio of investment tools of different risk levels with a stable return rates of 3%-5%. Nobody would care about administrative charges if the return rate was high. He asked whether MPFA had evaluated the performances of MPF trustee companies; he held that MPFA could make public a list of underperformed companies so that they could be eliminated by the market;
- (b) the rate of yearly return of MPF was only about 3.3%, which was insufficient to secure the public’s retirement life in two or three decades’ time. In his view, if a public member had contributed \$1 million to MPF from the beginning of his/her career to retirement and got a return of \$100,000 on retirement, the amount of return was too low; any other investment instruments might bring the same return. Besides absence of investment knowledge, another reason why the public did not want to manage their MPF accounts was that they were unwilling to spend time on managing such a low-return investment tool; and
- (c) though the MPF scheme had been in place for some time, he believed that Hong Kong citizens preferred retirement security provided by the government.

21. The views of the Acting Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that in the market, there were many insurance agents teaching the public how to choose MPF schemes and persuading them to combine multiple MPF accounts; then these agents changed the responsible persons of concerned schemes to themselves to gain a profit. He asked MPFA about the specific publicity and education plans. In addition, he held that the publicity work should be not only with wide coverage but also effective. If the public still could not understand the contents of the scheme after publicity, such publicity work could hardly be counted as a successful one;

- (b) as the maximum rate of administrative charges was 0.95% for the funds under Default Investment, which was below the market average, few fund managers were willing to manage MPF; he asked whether MPFA would conduct a review on determination of the administrative charges; and
- (c) MPFA had rationalised risks by differentiating high risk from low risk under the Default Investment. He held that MPFA should do a better job in management of MPF.

22. The responses of Mr CHAN On-ting were summarised below:

- (a) after the passage of relevant laws last year, MPFA had publicised the scheme by stages and through different means; since some of the promotional materials must be published together with the notice sent to scheme participants by the industry, the leaflets were not distributed until recently;
- (b) setting charge ceilings for Default Investment was only a starting point; MPFA hoped that setting charge ceilings for Default Investment could provide an index for other funds in the market. MPFA hoped that charges of Default Investment fund could be further reduced in the long run. MPFA would review the scheme within three years after enactment of the laws;
- (c) Default Investment Fund was an extra choice for those who did not have knowledge or interest in managing MPF accounts. MPFA had a series of comprehensive publicity and education plans for not only DC members but also various stakeholders including trade unions and business associations; the public would be taught knowledge about MPF and encouraged to manage their own accounts timely;
- (d) MPFA would also improve website design and add different information so that the public could have easier access to the information they wanted. Now the website listed out information about charges of different trustee companies and performances of various MPF funds. After implementation of the Default Investment Strategy, MPFA would upload the charges and performances of the funds to the website so that the public could have more reference materials before they made appropriate investment decisions;
- (e) MPFA agreed that trustee companies should try their best to help customers manage their accounts;
- (f) MPFA would urge service providers to provide information to customers and send a “Notice before Implementation of Default Investment Strategy” to scheme participants to inform them of upcoming implementation of legislations related to Default Investment and relevant arrangements. MPFA understood that since relevant documents involved technical contents, they were difficult to understand. Therefore, MPFA had attached simple leaflets to the documents for easy understanding by the public;

- (g) regarding the queries raised by the members on whether bonds were of high or low risk, he replied that though bonds were generally defined as a low-risk investment tool, the past few months saw fluctuation in bond prices. However, as a long-term investment tool, “Default Investment” could still balance risk levels in the long run;
- (h) MPFA agreed that there was still room for improvement in the MPF system, especially for the concern that the scheme participants might have to manage multiple accounts. The Chief Executive said in his recently published *Policy Address* that it was MPFA’s goal to establish an “eMPF” online platform to align all administrative arrangements of MPF, paving the way for “one person, one account” in the long run;
- (i) MPFA knew that its operating funds came from the public funds; being aware of the public’s inner voices, MPFA had been prudent in financial management and had its headquarters moved from the superstructure of Kowloon Station to Kwai Hing. He added that now MPFA did not charge administrative fees from funds, and the operation of MPFA had nothing to do with the public’s contributions to MPF;
- (j) MPFA had not compiled relevant statistics on the amount of expenses earned by trustee companies. Besides, MPFA had studied the charges of MPF and found that a large proportion of management fees charged by trustee companies were their administrative costs. Therefore, MPFA hoped to simplify relevant procedure and reduce the administrative workload of trustee companies;
- (k) some members had pointed out that the percentage of voluntary contributions and special voluntary contributions in total MPF contributions was only 24%, which was not a very high percentage. However, MPFA noticed that the percentage of voluntary contributions did increase steadily in recent years;
- (l) the charge ceiling of 0.95% only applied to funds under Default Investment and was not applicable to other funds. If the members who had received the “Notice of Reinvestment under Default Investment Strategy” decide not to choose Default Investment within the 42-day response period, they needed to make a reply to the trustees. Moreover, though investments in the MPF scheme did not have the option of “cash deposit” currently, those with conservative investment inclinations could choose conservative funds, and the risks of which were as low as bank deposits. Besides, there were restrictions on charges of conservative funds; if the return rate of such fund was lower than the prescribed savings rate (i.e. about 0.007%), no fees shall be charged by the fund;
- (m) some members had said that some funds could guarantee an annual return of 5%; they knew that if these returns were calculated at compound interest rates, the returns were considerable. However, there were few investment products in the market that could guarantee a stable return rate of 5%;
- (n) regarding the return rates of funds under Default Investment, two reference indexes were set for comparing the performances of funds in the industry, which

were agreed upon by MPFA. If the Default Investment performance of individual trustee company was well below the reference index, the trustee must give an explanation in the fund fact sheet. In addition, though the investment managers were not under the direct management of MPFA, MPFA would require relevant trustee company to take follow up actions if some investment managers underperformed for a prolonged period. He added that since investment managers were licensees of SFC themselves, it was hard to ask them to leave the market if they did not violate the rules; and

- (o) DC Members and the public might have different opinions about MPF, and MPFA hoped and was more than willing to answer the questions of the public. They would also inform relevant policy bureau of the opinions collected from DCs, such as some members had mentioned that they hoped the government to make contributions to MPF and listen to the opinions about retirement security.

Proposed Estimates under Expenditure Head 5 of 2017/2018

(Paper No. EW 8/2017)

- 23. Members endorsed the above paper unanimously.

Updated Member Lists of Working Groups under the Committee

(Paper No. EW 9/2017)

- 24. Members endorsed the above paper unanimously.

Information Items

Reports of Working Groups

(Paper No. EW 10/2017)

- 25. Ms Scarlett PONG reported that after the meeting of EWC held on 1 November 2016 the Working Group on Age-friendly Community had submitted relevant paper of “Age-friendly Community” Accreditation Scheme to World Health Organization (WHO) on 9 November 2016 and was informed by WHO on 3 February 2017 that Sha Tin District was identified as a world age-friendly community. She appreciated the support from the members and said that the group would continue to promote age friendliness in Sha Tin.

- 26. Members noted the above paper.

Information Papers

Number of Newly Arrived Mainland Children Admitted to Public Sector Primary and Secondary Schools in Sha Tin District Provided by the Education Bureau

(Paper No. EW 11/2017)

- 27. Mr Michael YUNG said as residents, some being new migrants, moved into new estates in the district, he wondered whether the Education Bureau had estimated the P1 places needed by each estate in Sha Tin, such as Shui Chuen O Estate, in the future. He asked whether it was necessary to borrow places from other school nets apart from continuing to

borrow places from the school nets in Tai Wai and Ma On Shan. He hoped that the Education Bureau could provide the number of school places increased and tell whether it is necessary to borrow places at the next meeting.

28. Mr CHIU Man-leong asked about the admission quota of each class in the popular schools in School Net 91 and the upper limit permitted by the Bureau; he also asked whether some “door knocking places” would be reserved and how many such places were left.

29. The responses of Mrs Alice YU CHOW, Senior School Development Officer (Sha Tin) 4 of Education Bureau were summarised below:

- (a) according to the current mechanism, children applying for P1 places could be allocated places in listed schools covered by school nets they belonged to. The Bureau learnt that there would be new residents moving into Shui Chuen O Estate and the places in School Net 91 (Sha Tin Town Centre) were in short supply. As usual, the Bureau would continue to make flexible arrangements such as borrowing places from neighbouring school nets, using vacant classrooms, or changing other rooms of schools into extra classrooms; if necessary, the Bureau would temporarily increase the allocation places of each P1 class, in order to increase the P1 places of individual school nets in a flexible manner;
- (b) as the P1 places in School Net 91 in 2017 were in short supply, the Bureau had reached a consensus with the principals of schools in the net to temporarily increase the allocation places of each class of all schools in School Net 91 to 33. Some schools in School Net 91 were further discussing about using other rooms as extra classrooms. By using vacant classrooms (including temporary classrooms applied for), School Net 88 (Tai Wai) and School Net 89 (Ma On Shan) could meet their own needs and lend some places to School Net 91 according to established arrangements. Besides, schools in School Net 88 and School Net 89 would consider increasing the number of classrooms to offer sufficient places for applying children in Sha Tin District; and
- (c) the maximum admission quota of each P1 class in public primary schools was 10% above standard quota, namely, the maximum admission quota of each P1 class in schools with the standard class size of 25 was 27 and that of schools with the standard class size of 30 was 33. “Door knocking places” referred to those places beyond the standard quota of each P1 class. When it is necessary to temporarily “increase allocation places” under the Primary One Admission System, the number of “door knocking places” would not be affected.

30. Members noted the above paper.

Date of Next Meeting

31. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 2 May 2017 (Tuesday).

32. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/35

April 2017