

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 1st Meeting of
the Health and Environment Committee in 2021

Date : 4 February 2021 (Thursday)
Time : 2:38 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Office Conference Room 441
 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 TING Tsz-yuen (Chairman)	DC Member	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming (Vice-Chairman)	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	DC Vice-Chairman	2:44 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:40 pm	3:48 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	"	3:09 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	"	2:38 pm	3:36 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	3:01 pm	5:06 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	"	3:00 pm	4:05 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	"	2:38 pm	4:46 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	"	4:25 pm	4:38 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	"	4:35 pm	5:06 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	"	2:54 pm	5:06 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	"	3:21 pm	5:06 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	"	2:38 pm	3:45 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	"	3:21 pm	5:06 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr SHEK William	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr TSANG Kit	"	2:38 pm	3:37 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	2:57 pm	4:30 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	3:11 pm	5:06 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:38 pm	3:36 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	2:38 pm	5:06 pm
Ms LEE Yin-ching, Karen (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 3/ Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Ms WONG Yuen-shan, Candice
Mr YAN Ka-kit, Ric

Ms MOK Siu-fan

Ms WONG Pui-wan, Cecilia

Mr LI Ho-yin

Mr HO Kin-nam, David

Title

Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) (2)
Chief Health Inspector (Sha Tin)3/
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Assistant Housing Manager/SC 3/
Housing Department
Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional N)4/
Environmental Protection Department
Deputy Leisure Manager 2 (Sha Tin)/
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg)/
Sha Tin District Office

Absent

Mr CHAN Nok-hang

Mr YIP Wing

Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS

Mr YEUNG Sze-kin

Mr WONG Ho-fung

Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond

Title

DC Member	(Application for leave of absence received)
”	(”)
”	(”)
”	(”)
”	(”)
”	(No application for leave of absence received)

Action**Welcome Speech**

The Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the first meeting of the Health and Environment Committee (HEC) of this year.

Application for Leave of Absence

2. The Chairman said that the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) Secretariat received the applications for leave of absence in writing from the following members:

Mr CHAN Nok-hang	Sickness
Mr YIP Wing	”
Mr MOK Kam-kwai	Official commitment
Mr YEUNG Sze-kin	”
Mr WONG Ho-fung	”

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

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 November 2020
(HEC Minutes 9/2020)

4. Mr Michael YUNG wished to know whether the Annex regarding the setting up of a Community Testing Centre in Lek Yuen Estate would be uploaded to the STDC website along with the minutes upon endorsement.

5. Ms Karen LEE, Executive Officer (District Council) 3 of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) said that the whole set of minutes would be uploaded to STDC website upon endorsement.

6. Mr Michael YUNG proposed the following amendment:

“37(a)He thanked the Chairman for accepting members’ opinion and inviting the Drainage Services Department to report to the HEC on the works progress;”

7. Members unanimously endorsed the amended minutes.

Matters Arising

Responses of the Relevant Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting
(Paper No. HE 1/2021)

8. Mr SIN Cheuk-nam said, according to the Annex, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had inspected most of the private markets in the district, except for Yiu On Market. He asked whether the FEHD would make arrangements for inspecting Yiu On Market.

9. Mr Ric YAN, Chief Health Inspector (Sha Tin)3 of the FEHD responded that the FEHD inspected Yiu On Market previously. That was why the relevant information was not included in the Annex.

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

- (a) he wished to know the situation and the frequency of inspecting the deodourisation system by the department; and
- (b) he hoped the department, when expanding the facility, would add a pressure pipe as ancillary equipment for future inspection of and repairs to pressure sewers.

11. Mr Ricardo LIAO wished to know if the FEHD would boost temporary manpower responsible for hawker control during the Lunar New Year.

12. Mr Ric YAN said apart from the existing 8 units, the headquarters would send officers to different districts in the New Territories for inspection during the Lunar New Year to assist in handling hawker issues.

13. Members noted the above paper.

Discussion Item

The EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme
(Paper No. HE 2/2021)

14. Ms Cecilia WONG, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional N)4 of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) briefly introduced the paper.

15. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

- (a) he said applicants were required to be an Owners' Corporation (OC), a Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC) manager or all owners. He asked if the department had counted the number of car parks managed by those eligible applicants. He pointed out that there were a number of car parks managed by the Link or other companies, but the EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme (the Scheme) did not cover those car parks and hence failed to incentivise car owners to switch to electric vehicles (EV). He asked whether the department would consider extending the Scheme to include properties sold by the Housing Department (HD); and
- (b) to his knowledge, there were different kinds of charging systems at present. He asked whether the Scheme set out certain requirements for the system specifications.

16. The views of Mr Felix CHOW were summarised below:

- (a) he said a number of home owners were considering getting EVs, but charging facilities were lacking in residential estates and self-installing the systems would entail taking estate management into consideration. He opined that OCs taking the lead in the works would facilitate home owners' installation of charging systems in their parking spaces;
- (b) he asked why the scope of the subsidy scheme did not include particular chargers;
- (c) he said some residential units were houses where owners could connect the power from there to the charging facilities. He asked whether such a scenario would comply with the definition of a car park under the Scheme; and
- (d) he wished to know whether the department would deploy manpower to arrange briefing sessions to inform owners' representatives of the Scheme details.

17. Ms WONG Man-huen asked whether an application made by a DMC manager would be required to be endorsed in an owners' meeting. She said it was not easy for large-scale residential estates to convene an owners' meeting, and thus asked whether the department would consider streamlining the application procedure.

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

- (a) he said a number of parking spaces at private residential estates had been sold and communal parking spaces were scarce. He wished to know whether the Scheme would cover sold parking spaces;
- (b) he asked whether a residential estate without an OC or a DMC manager yet would be eligible for application;

- (c) residential estates might not be able to convene an owners' meeting due to the pandemic. He asked when the application would be due, and whether it would be possible for an applicant to indicate to the department its interest in applying before providing necessary information later on; and
- (d) he wished to know whether the department would work with the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to review the tenders concerning the works project to prevent bid rigging.

19. The views of Mr SIN Cheuk-nam were summarised below:

- (a) he wished to know the number of residential estates in the Sha Tin District eligible for applying; and
- (b) he said private companies had bought car parks of the Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) estates, and asked whether the department would provide subsidies for those car parks, particularly those managed by the Link. If no, he asked whether the department would provide technical support for installing charging facilities.

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

- (a) he suggested that the EPD actively consider carrying out a plan to install EV charging facilities in car parks managed by the HD and the Link. As EVs were getting popular, the demand for charging facilities in commercial or hourly parking spaces would also grow;
- (b) he said some residents were worried that the power supply facilities would affect communal areas, so they were conservative about installing charging facilities. He opined that residents would veto the installation, if it was to be decided by an owners' meeting, out of concern about the impact of the power supply facilities on the residential estates. He hoped the department would learn more about the difficulties residential estates were facing. If a certain proportion of EV users requested for installing charging facilities, it would be mandatory for the OC to make an application; and
- (c) he suggested that the department explain more often to OCs and owners the zero impact of the power facilities on communal areas so as to allay owners' doubts.

21. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) according to the data of the Census and Statistics Department, the number of EVs grew 1.7% in 2020. He considered the application requirements for the Scheme rather harsh, and questioned whether the department intended to incentivise members of the public to use EVs; and
- (b) he said some residential estates decided the locations of parking spaces by drawing lots every year. He asked if installing charging facilities would turn parking spaces of EV users into fixed ones.

22. Mr HUI Lap-san pointed out that the Scheme failed to cover car parks managed under single ownership, and asked what plans the department had in mind to help them. EV brand BYD Co. Ltd. withdrew from the Hong Kong market in July 2019. He asked if the department would consider modifying the company's charging stations for the use by EVs of other brands.

23. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) to his knowledge, the department intended to introduce the Scheme to residential estates through workshops. He wished to know the effectiveness of the workshops and the number of participating residential estates under the pandemic;
- (b) he said different brands of EVs had different charging facilities, and asked whether the department would consider standardising the voltages and plugs of charging facilities by legislation;
- (c) he said there were a relatively large number of old residential estates in Sha Tin which might have to undergo repairs, inspections and changes of power control cabinets for installing charging facilities. He asked whether the Scheme would cover such works projects. He said that works contracts might include different works items, and he asked whether the department would subsidise the contract items eligible for the subsidy. Besides, assessing the contracts might involve a plethora of technical issues. He asked if the URA could be invited to help vet the tenders to ensure they were eligible; and
- (d) he wished to know if the STDO and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department would provide support for the Scheme, e.g. assisting in holding owners' meetings and providing guidelines on power safety.

24. The views of Mr LUI Kai-wing were summarised below:

- (a) he asked if unauthorised installation of charging facilities by owners in their own parking spaces prior to the OC's consent would take a toll on the OC's application for the subsidy; and
- (b) he wished to know how to handle bid rigging.

25. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he pinpointed that the guidelines available online were in English with quite a lot of technical terms. OCs found the Scheme details rather hard to understand. He asked the department to provide explicit guidelines and elaboration, so that OCs and owners would clearly understand the specific scope of subsidy; and
- (b) he said there were hourly parking spaces owned by consortiums and parking spaces purchased by owners. He wished to know how to calculate the ownership ratio concerning the eligibility.

26. The views of Mr George WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he said the car parks of the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) estates in his constituency were owned by the Link, and some of the parking spaces had been sold to other owners. They were not managed by OCs and Owners' Committees. He pointed out that the Scheme failed to cover that kind of car parks, and asked if the department would expand the Scheme to include them; and
- (b) he asked how to calculate the ownership if parking spaces of car parks were sold individually.

27. The views of Mr LAI Tsz-yan were summarised below:

- (a) he asked if the department would engage in mediation to deal with disputes if there was disagreement between the OC and EV owners about the installation of charging facilities; and
- (b) he asked how to handle bid rigging.

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

- (a) he said the Scheme without including car parks of industrial and commercial buildings would make it hard to encourage car owners to switch to EVs;
- (b) there was a residential estate with 2 car parks – 1 under single ownership and 1 under multiple ownership. He asked whether it was eligible for application;
- (c) he opined that the Government should take the lead to encourage members of the public to switch to EVs. He asked how many government vehicles were EVs at present. The Government had set up a Steering Committee on the Promotion of EVs, and he asked how many members were using EVs; and
- (d) since only a small number of EV users would benefit from the Scheme, intensified conflicts among owners might result and subsidy applications be hindered. He opined that the Government should offer a greater incentive to encourage members of the public to use EVs.

29. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that installation of charging facilities in some parking spaces might not be possible due to limited space, and unfairness might result;
- (b) he opined that the causal link between the number of charging facilities and the popularity of EVs was mutual. The Government should encourage installation of charging facilities in car parks to increase the incentive to use EVs; and
- (c) he suggested that the Hong Kong Housing Society increase EV parking spaces in the car parks under its purview.

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

- (a) he supported encouraging members of the public to use EVs as they were the trend. He hoped the scope of the subsidy would be expanded and the application procedure streamlined so as to prompt members of the public to take part;
- (b) he suggested using “Smart Tender” to give more choices to OCs and members of the public;
- (c) he wished to know the number of EVs used by the Government; and
- (d) though EVs could effectively improve roadside air quality, EV battery manufacturers still posed serious pollution problems. He hoped the department would review the use of renewable energy when promoting EVs so as to improve the environment of Hong Kong.

31. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong were summarised below:

- (a) he wished to know if there were similar schemes to include car parks of public housing estates so that more ancillary facilities could be provided to drum up public interest in using EVs; and
- (b) he asked how many car parks of private residential estates, private shopping malls and public housing estates were equipped with EV charging facilities.

32. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

- (a) he said the Scheme did not cover car parks already sold to consortiums, and asked how EV owners renting that kind of parking spaces could be helped. He opined that the consortiums’ monopoly on the car parks rendered them reluctant to install charging facilities, and hence they failed to make things convenient for EV users supporting environmental protection; and
- (b) he opined the number of parking spaces in residential estate car parks eligible for application was smaller than that of car parks in public housing estates and HOS estates. The proportion of the number of people benefiting from the Scheme was insignificant. He opined that carrying out the Scheme in Government-sold car parks could benefit more people, and the Government should make the Scheme work for residents of public housing estates as well.

33. The views of Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa were summarised below:

- (a) he said most of the parking spaces in car parks had been sold and there was no room available for installing charging facilities. He asked how to deal with such a situation;
- (b) he asked what would be done if the parking spaces of EV users were not fit for installing charging facilities but those of general vehicle owners were;

- (c) he said 40% or more of the parking spaces of City One Shatin might be under single ownership, which meant they could barely meet the eligibility criteria. He found the application requirements rather harsh; and
- (d) he deemed it difficult to convene owners' meetings to discuss whether they would apply for the subsidy and how to deal with technical issues regarding the installation.

34. The views of the Chariman were summarised below:

- (a) he said the numbers of eligible residential estates and members of the public who could afford EVs in the Sha Tin District were inconsiderable; and
- (b) he said the parking spaces of public housing estates were allotted by drawing lots. The Scheme, if covering those estates as well, might favour EV users and lead to unfairness.

35. Ms Cecilia WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the department hoped to promote the use of EVs by helping owners of parking spaces under relatively multiple ownership solve technical problems and install charging facilities. It would review the effectiveness after the completion of the Scheme;
- (b) since every residential estate faced different financial and technical difficulties, the department had set up a hotline and outreach teams responsible for handling enquiries from different residential estates. Those interested to apply could contact the outreach teams via the hotline, and the owners' concerns would be addressed based on their practical situation;
- (c) the department's consultation team would estimate the costs of installing the EV charging-enabling infrastructure (EVCEI) based on the market price and use the reference to calculate the subsidy amounts to prevent bid rigging and unreasonable pricing;
- (d) the department hoped to effectively utilise resources to help owners of parking spaces under multiple ownership, and hence the Scheme would not cover daily, monthly and loading parking spaces. Also, car parks participating in the Scheme would be required to comply with specific requirements to ensure proper use of public money;
- (e) the department would offer different schemes to accommodate the needs of different targets such as public housing estates and communal facilities. "The EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme" targeted parking spaces of private residential estates under multiple ownership. There were 189 charging facilities in total in Sha Tin, including standard, medium and quick charging speeds. Some public housing estate car parks were also equipped with chargers. Members of the public could search their locations online;

- (f) the Scheme would handle applications on a first-come-first-served basis. Those interested to apply could familiarise themselves with the application procedure online or via the enquiry hotline;
- (g) the Scheme provided a one-off subsidy for car parks to install charging facilities, but it did not include particular EV chargers. Since different kinds of EVs required different chargers, it would be more appropriate for EV owners to install their own. Car parks installed with charging facilities would encourage EV owners to install chargers;
- (h) the Scheme included hiring works consultants and contractors to provide professional opinions to help individual residential estates solve technical issues and to install EVCEI;
- (i) generally speaking, residential estates could submit applications for individual car parks managed by them based on practical situations. As for details concerning differentiation of individual car parks, applicants could call the hotline for enquiry;
- (j) residential estates wanting to know more details of the Scheme, the eligibility of their car parks and the application procedure could call the hotline for enquiry. The outreach teams would organise workshops for residential estates and explain the Scheme details if necessary;
- (k) the department hoped the Scheme would make it convenient for EV owners to charge their vehicles at their residential estates. The Government would also provide charging stations in car parks of public housing estates and government facilities for EV owners to temporarily charge their vehicles;
- (l) the Government had extended the first registration tax concession arrangement for EVs to March 2024 as an incentive for vehicle owners to switch to EVs; and
- (m) members of public had been responding positively to “the EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme”. Over 100 applications had been received so far which amounted to over 10 000 parking spaces. The department would arrange special teams to follow up on each application.

36. Ms MOK Siu-fan, Assistant Housing Manager/SC 3 of the HD said that she would convey the members’ request for adding EV charging facilities in public housing estates to the relevant section of the HD.

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

- (a) he said that the existing power supply facilities in housing estates could not meet the Government’s minimum requirement for power supply. If an extra cable was to be added, it would be quite costly. The number of benefited parking spaces and the locations of installations also had to be taken into account. He asked whether the addition of a cable was eligible for subsidies under the Scheme. Moreover, some OCs considered the Scheme not beneficial to their parking spaces for tenancy and neglected the interests of EV owners. He opined that the

department should have further communication with the OCs; and

- (b) he added that charging locations in public housing estate car parks were scarce and useless, with 11 in Mei Tin Estate, 6 in Shek Mun Estate, and 15 in Shui Chuen O Estate. Owners who wished to use those spaces had to ask the attendants to unlock them, and bring their own chargers. Besides, the charging speed was slow. He was of the view that those locations could not encourage EV owners to use them and asked the HD whether there was any room for improvement.

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

- (a) he said that the meeting time was limited and should focus on discussing the next agenda item; and
- (b) he added that the power supply facilities of some housing estates were already overloaded. An extra cable would lead to the addition of a transformer room, a meter and a pre-meter switch. However, there was no room for those installations in the housing estates. He considered the department's plan unrealistic.

39. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped that the department would respond to questions regarding switch rooms; and
- (b) he said that applicants of the Scheme were required to be either an OC or a DMC manager. He asked whether the OC and the DMC manager were required to provide documents to indicate the share of subsidies and expenditure incurred.

40. Ms Cecilia WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the Scheme covered the costs of installing EVCEI in car parks. Members could provide case details for the department's follow-up actions to help housing estates review whether the installations were eligible for subsidies; and
- (b) the Scheme operated on the basis of car parks as a unit. The application and calculation of subsidy amount of each car park would be handled individually.

41. Ms MOK Siu-fan said that the charging situations of Mei Tin Estate, Shui Chuen O Estate and Shek Mun Estate raised by members would be conveyed to the relevant staff of the HD for information and follow-up actions.

42. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the department had already dealt with many cases and should be able to respond to members' enquiries; and
- (b) he suggested that the EPD send an engineer to answer members' questions at the meeting.

43. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr Ricardo LIAO.

44. Members agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr Ricardo LIAO.

45. Mr Ricardo LIAO proposed the provisional motion as follows:

“Currently, the ‘EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme’ does not include those car parks which were originally the properties of the Housing Department, and have been divested by the Department. However, at present, there are a large number of car parks in the Sha Tin District which are owned by various companies, including the Link REIT, and have not yet been installed with charging facilities for electric vehicles. As a result, the residents of the concerned public housing estates/residential estates will not consider replacing their cars with electric vehicles.

Motion

The Health and Environment Committee of the Sha Tin District Council strongly requests the Department to study the extension of the ‘EV-charging at Home Subsidy Scheme’ to those car parks which were originally the properties of the Housing Department, and have been divested by the Department, so as to serve as an inducement to attract the car park owners to install charging facilities for electric vehicles, and thus benefitting the residents of the concerned public housing estates/residential estates.”

Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Mr LI Sai-hung and Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa seconded the motion.

46. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 45.

47. The Chairman announced the end of the agenda item.

2020-2021 Funding Matters of Working Group under the Committee

48. The Chairman said that Mr CHAN Pui-ming, the convenor of the Working Group on Healthy City and International Day of Disabled Persons, had prepared a paper for members’ reference, and asked him to briefly introduce the paper.

49. Mr David HO, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg) of the STDO said that the 2-hour meeting time was running out and asked members to seize the time. He added that in accordance with Sha Tin District Council Funding Application Procedures and Guidelines (the Guidelines), if non-government organisations or working groups under the STDC would like to apply for STDC funding to organise activities, they were required to set out specific arrangements for the activity such as the executing organisation, co-organiser / collaborating organisation, a specific work plan, timetable and estimates of revenue and expenditure. The duly completed application form with authorisation from the organisation could then be submitted to the Secretariat. The Secretariat would review the proposal to ascertain whether the activity fell into STDC funding and the expenditure complied with the Guidelines. If necessary, the Secretariat would first consult with government departments which might be involved in the proposed activity, and pass the information to the working group responsible for approving the activity for consideration. Based on past arrangements, in approving activities, the working group might invite activity proponents and non-government organisations to the

meeting to explain details of the activity. The persons concerned would also declare their interests in the working group meeting. It was learned that the working group had discussed the framework of the activity plan in a previous meeting, but the procedure for submitting the funding application to the committee for approval had not yet been completed. The Secretariat opined that no sufficient information was available for the committee's consideration and approval of the funding application at the current meeting, but the committee could comment on the activity plan.

50. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) the working group could not call a meeting at the end of last year due to the pandemic, and the meeting could only be convened on 28 January this year; and
- (b) the working group's activity plan used the activity organised by the STDO and the Area Committees as a reference, which only covered the housing estates with an OC or Owners' Committee in the district. As the three-nil buildings and villages in the district did not have any management company, it was difficult for them to arrange cleaning services from cleaning companies. Therefore, the working group would like to organise a similar activity to disseminate information about health and hygiene to the residents, and engage professionals to clean the buildings or villages. He asked members for their views, which would then be followed up by the working group.

51. Ms Candice WONG, Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) (2) said that as per the Secretariat's reminders prior to and during the meeting, the meeting time was limited to 2 hours. Therefore, the representatives of government departments would withdraw from the meeting first.

52. The Chairman said that the meeting would continue. He asked whether the working group would breach the Guidelines if it organised the activity and proceeded with the procurement direct.

53. Mr David HO responded that according to the Guidelines, the activity plan was required to be approved by the working group. The Secretariat would also gather information before the working group's approval of the funding application for the working group's full consideration. At present, the working group's application skipped the relevant procedures, which might be unfair to other working groups and non-government organisations.

54. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he found it a shame that the representatives of government departments withdrew from the meeting. He worried that if the agenda of future meetings took more time, the representatives of government departments would not be able to respond to enquiries comprehensively; and
- (b) he said that the paper he had prepared was not uploaded to the STDC website as an annex to the agenda item, and he hoped that the Chairman would address it.

55. Mr David HO responded that the paper provided by the convenor of the working group had not been submitted at the previous working group meeting for discussion, and the Secretariat did not receive details of the activity until the morning of the current meeting. Therefore, the working group had not completed the procedure for submitting the funding application to the committee for approval.

56. The Chairman opined that the paper could still be provided at the meeting for members' reference.

57. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said the paper was a draft of the activity funding proposal. He asked the secretary of the working group to prepare the paper as soon as possible after the working group meeting on 28 January this year. He also hoped that the committee would consider the proposal preliminarily, which would then be followed up by the working group. However, the paper could not be provided prior to the meeting. After he found out that the matter had been included in the agenda, he immediately prepared the paper himself for members' reference. He added that the paper was not an official paper for approval.

58. Mr LAI Tsz-yan asked whether the Secretariat had assisted in gathering information. He considered that the working group could go ahead with the activity on its own and the details of the activity were similar to the funding applications approved by the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee (CSCDC).

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

- (a) he clarified that the EPD representative wanted to respond to members' enquiries as much as possible, instead of prolonging the meeting on purpose. He expressed regret that the Assistant District Officer walked out of the meeting and therefore could not address questions and enquiries regarding the information papers. He would propose a provisional motion later;
- (b) he expected that even if the committee endorsed the funding application of the activity, the funding would not be granted. He suggested proposing a provisional motion to record the committee's support for the activity and include the paper as an annex to the motion to safeguard the right of public access to information;
- (c) he had no grounds to oppose the funding application. It was learned that the convenor had followed up with the Secretariat after the working group meeting on whether the funding application paper had been prepared, and the Secretariat had not pointed out prior to the meeting any technical issues with the paper written by the convenor. He said that the Secretariat had not replied to his email by the specified time, and the Assistant District Officer could not be reached; and
- (d) he asked whether the Assistant District Officer's instructions to the Secretariat counted as maladministration; if yes, he opined that the Chairman of the committee should follow up seriously.

60. Mr NG Kam-hung pointed out that the STDO was the collaborating organisation in Paper No. CSCD 4/2021 of the CSCDC. He wanted to know whether the committee could be the collaborating organisation of the activity.

61. The Chairman said that including the agenda item and providing the paper for members' reference at the meeting were in compliance with the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders. He added that it was not against the laws for the working group under the committee to conduct activities; it was merely different from the usual practice. Therefore, he opined that the paper could be put to the vote by members. He proposed endorsing the paper on a show of intent, and asked the working group to find a collaborating organisation to conduct the activity as soon as possible.

62. Mr David HO responded that as the STDC funding involved public money, the Secretariat would follow the Guidelines strictly when handling funding. In addition, he expressed to the Chairman and members that the meeting had lasted for over 2 hours, and asked members to seize the time and finish the meeting as soon as possible.

63. The Chairman announced that the meeting would be adjourned for 10 minutes.

(After adjournment)

64. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr CHAN Pui-ming.

65. Members agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr CHAN Pui-ming.

66. Mr CHAN Pui-ming proposed the provisional motion as follows:

“The Health and Environment Committee of the Sha Tin District Council agrees that its Working Group on Healthy City and International Day of Disabled Persons (Working Group) may submit a funding application (for details, please refer to the annex), but requests the Secretariat to assist the Working Group in rationalising the arrangements upon funding approval as soon as possible. Meanwhile, the Committee condemns Ms WONG Yuen-shan, Candice, Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)² for walking out of the meeting with the representatives of the departments as the meeting was prolonged. Such an act has obviously violated the public expectations for civil servants.”

(See Annex: https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/st/doc/2020_2023/tc/committee_meetings_doc/HEC/19587/Supp_Info.pdf)

Mr Michael YUNG seconded the motion.

67. The Chairman added that the paper would be included in the agenda item for record.

68. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 66.

69. The Chairman announced the end of the agenda item and that the remainder would be addressed in the resumption meeting.

Date of Next Meeting

70. The date of next meeting was to be confirmed.

71. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/40

April 2021