

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 1st Special Meeting of
the Health and Environment Committee in 2020

Date : 3 March 2020 (Tuesday)
Time : 4:03 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 TING Tsz-yuen (Chairman)	DC Member	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming (Vice-Chairman)	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	DC Vice-Chairman	4:09 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	”	4:06 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	”	4:03 pm	5:18 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	”	4:03 pm	6:22 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	”	4:09 pm	7:33 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	”	4:03 pm	6:38 pm
Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	”	4:09 pm	7:19 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	”	4:03 pm	4:37 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	”	4:03 pm	7:10 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	”	4:07 pm	6:15 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	”	4:03 pm	6:13 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	”	4:06 pm	7:33 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	”	4:03 pm	5:33 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	”	4:03 pm	6:22 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Mr SHEK William	”	4:09 pm	7:33 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	”	4:03 pm	5:18 pm
Mr TSANG Kit	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	”	4:03 pm	5:41 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”	4:03 pm	5:45 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	”	4:03 pm	7:33 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	”	4:03 pm	7:08 pm

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr YAU Man-chun	DC Member	4:03 pm	7:32 pm
Mr YIP Wing	”	4:06 pm	7:32 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	”	4:03 pm	7:19 pm
Ms LEE Yin-ching, Karen (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 3/ Sha Tin District Office		

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Title</u>
Mr WONG Shek-hay, Sebastian	Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) (2)
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek	Senior Executive Officer (District Council)/ Sha Tin District Office
Mr CHOY Cho-hei, Saki	Executive Assistant (District Council) 5/ Sha Tin District Office

<u>In Attendance by Invitation</u>	<u>Title</u>
Mr YIP Kin-chung	Assistant Supervisor / Hong Kong Evangelical Church School Services Team
Ms LAM Lai-yee	Registered Nurse / Hong Lok Health Care Company Limited
Ms LAM Man-wa	Director / Yee Health Company Limited
Ms LEE Ka-man	Secretary / Care Association Limited
Ms LEUNG Chui-ting	Volunteer / Care Association Limited

<u>Absent</u>	<u>Title</u>
Mr HUI Yui-yu	DC Member (No application for leave of absence received)
Mr LO Yuet-chau	”
Mr YEUNG Sze-kin	”

Action

Welcome Speech

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

Discussion Items

2020 Work Plan of Working Group under the Committee (Paper No. HE 5/2020)

2. The Chairman explained that the special meeting was convened because many members had doubts about the funding content and criteria of the work plan of the “Working Group on Enhancing the Public Health in Sha Tin District (Ad Hoc)” (Working Group) that was originally passed by means of circulation. He hoped that through this meeting, the Committee members could understand the work plan and endorse the papers at the HEC meeting on 10 March 2020.

3. Mr MOK Kam-kwai believed that the fourth item in the remarks, “Epidemic prevention and cleaning supplies should be distributed by elected members of Sha Tin District” in the work plan should be eliminated.

4. Mr Chris MAK, the convenor of the Working Group explained the progress of the Working Group as follows:

- (a) due to time constraints and the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) Secretariat being unable to provide venues, the first meeting of the Working Group was held at an elderly centre in Ma On Shan, which affected the funding process;
- (b) the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) stated that it had started purchasing alcohol hand sanitiser for distribution to District Council Members. However, the notice was yet to be received, so the STDC hoped to approve funding as soon as possible to cooperate with non-governmental organisations to purchase epidemic prevention supplies. He condemned the District Officer/Shan Tin for delaying progress;
- (c) at the first meeting, the Working Group decided to refer to the practice of the Tsuen Wan District Council and cooperate with non-governmental organisations or charitable organisations with no political party background. The organisation was required to have at least 5 service units. Large-scale charitable organisations were monitored by the Social Welfare Department to ensure proper use of public funds;
- (d) at the second meeting, the Working Group approved "Procurement and Distribution of Anti-epidemic Cleaning Supplies" and "Personal and Environmental Hygiene Publicity" jointly organised with the "Hong Kong Evangelical Church School Services Team (HKECSST)";
- (e) he declared interest, stating that he had served in the HKECSST and left his post in October last year;
- (f) at the first meeting, the Working Group discussed that the masks purchased would have to be confirmed by experts to meet international certification. However, the Government Logistics Department (GLD) document attached to the letter of intent to invite co-organisation had strict requirements for the procurement of masks, so the group could not fully meet the procurement requirements. At the second meeting, the Working Group agreed to consider 4 applicants, and those organisations had already submitted the required information documents before the deadline;
- (g) the Working Group had requested a meeting on 24 February, but the Secretariat stated that the work schedule was unable to provide sufficient manpower due to the epidemic. He expressed strong dissatisfaction with this, thinking that the STDO and the Secretariat did not cooperate with the Working Group;
- (h) it was difficult for the co-organiser to complete all administrative procedures on or before 15 March this year, and he believed that the STDO should handle applications flexibly;
- (i) he asked why the STDC did not adopt the practice of arranging the procurement of anti-epidemic supplies by the STDO;

- (j) the HKECSST was a charitable organisation and the information and documents submitted for the first time were relatively complete. The members of the Working Group voted to approve the HKECSST as the joint organisation for Activity 1 and Activity 2; and
- (k) the proposal in Note 4 of the work plan was based on the principle of fair allocation of resources to avoid wasting public funds due to overlapping areas.

5. The Chairman stated that he would deal with the criteria for distribution first, and then arrange for the four organisations to explain their services.

6. Mr CHING Cheung-ying expressed his advocacy for the fairness of the system. Based on the principle of equality, he believed that all Members had the role and responsibility of distributing epidemic prevention supplies.

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

- (a) he thanked the Chairman for requesting the Secretariat to integrate the quotation documents of the activities, which would be easier for Members to evaluate the quotations of the four applicants;
- (b) he suggested that the Chairman should ask the applicants basic questions first, and members should raise follow-up questions afterwards;
- (c) since the activity was funded by public funds, he understood that the procurement was required to be based on the document of the GLD as an objective indicator. He asked what to do if the purchased goods did not meet the indicators. He believed that inspecting samples of anti-epidemic supplies could ensure quality better than filling in technical indicators; and
- (d) he asked the Chairman or the Secretariat to clarify the purpose of the meeting. He asked if members had other opinions, whether it should be remitted to the Working Group for processing or the HEC would make the final decision.

8. The Chairman drew up a template for the enquiry to the organisations, including when the order would be shipped, the logistics speed and how they would cooperate with other co-organisers.

9. Mr MOK Kam-kwai said that the quantity of anti-epidemic supplies might not be able to meet the needs of the entire Sha Tin District and worried that the villages would not be allocated with the supplies. He, in the capacity of a district councillor, believed that villagers should also be allocated with supplies, and the criteria for distribution should be determined based on this principle, and the issue of overlapping constituencies should not be considered.

10. The views of Mr Jimmy SHAM were summarised below:

- (a) if the village was located in the constituency of the elected member, Mr MOK Kam-kwai or the rural representative would be invited to distribute supplies. Based on the principle of fairness, he asked Mr MOK Kam-kwai how to avoid repeated

collection; and

- (b) the standards of the GLD were harsh, such as restricting the color of masks. Light-colored masks could easily show the dirt on the masks, such as blood splashes. He believed that ordinary people did not need such masks. Therefore, it was suggested in the Working Group meeting that the standards of the GLD was for reference only, and organisations should try their best to meet, rather than rigidly following, the standards.

11. The views of Mr Raymond LI were summarised below:

- (a) he thought that it should be stated in the remarks in the information document that the standards of the GLD were for reference only. He believed that the supplies with international certification or medical care approval already reached the epidemic prevention effect. He condemned the STDO for ignoring the request of the Working Group; and
- (b) in order to avoid duplication of resources, the Working Group made the proposal of note 4 in the document, and therefore he hoped to keep the note.

12. Mr TSANG Kit said that he would invite Mr MOK Kam-kwai to Tin Sum Tsuen to distribute epidemic prevention supplies.

13. Mr MOK Kam-kwai believed that this was a STDC activity and all Members should participate.

14. Mr WONG Ho-fung said that when he had distributed epidemic prevention supplies in the district earlier, the villagers had also been distributed and believed that the Working Group's recommendations were appropriate.

15. Mr Chris MAK was worried about unfair distribution, so the Working Group had this suggestion. As Mr MOK Kam-kwai expressed dissatisfaction, he recommended that all Members be responsible for the distribution.

16. Mr LAI Tsz-yan did not object to all Members being responsible for distributing epidemic prevention supplies. He asked Mr MOK Kam-kwai how to solve the problem of repeated collection by citizens.

17. Mr CHENG Chung-hang believed that the most important thing was to solve the problem of repeated collection. He asked whether Mr MOK Kam-kwai had any way to avoid it. If the villagers directly ask for supplies from Mr MOK Kam-kwai, it might cause inconvenience to Mr MOK or residents. He believed that the current method was more convenient for the public.

18. Mr MOK Kam-kwai stated that based on experience, the distribution of supplies did not require resident registration. He believed that all Members had the right to distribute anti-epidemic supplies.

19. The Chairman added that in the past, all Members were responsible for distributing District Council souvenirs. Members should also consider that villages were allocated with fewer

anti-epidemic prevention supplies on average.

20. In response to Mr MOK Kam-kwai's proposal to amend the distribution of anti-epidemic supplies by all Members, the Chairman asked whether members had any objections or abstentions. Members unanimously approved the above amendment.

21. The Chairman met with the organisation in the order in which the letter of intent was submitted, and reminded members to declare their interests before speaking.

22. Mr CHAN Pui-ming stated that he would not vote on the choice of co-organisers. He suggested asking the organisation when the stock would be available; if Activity 1 and Activity 2 were jointly organised by two organisations, how the two parties would cooperate; whether there were samples of masks, alcohol hand sanitisers and publicity materials for reference; whether the organisation needed advance payment and the related administrative procedures etc.

23. The Chairman welcomed Mr YIP Kin-chung, Assistant Supervisor of HKECSST. The representative of the organisation would first give a 5-minute introduction, and then let the committee members enquire.

24. Mr YIP Kin-chung gave a brief introduction as follows:

- (a) the organisation provided different services, such as services for the elderly. After receiving the co-organisation invitation, he started to contact the mask supplier and was confident that he could obtain the anti-epidemic supplies. However, if the approval of the funding was delayed, it would be difficult to complete the activity and submit the receipts on or before 10 March; and
- (b) the organisation had been distributing masks in the district and hoped to purchase masks and distribute them to the public as soon as possible. The organisation would not make profit from it, but only hoped to implement relevant activities as soon as possible and distribute epidemic prevention supplies to the elderly in the district who lacked masks.

25. The Chairman asked, assuming that the organisation became the co-organiser of the event, when the shipment would be delivered.

26. Mr YIP Kin-chung responded that if the event was confirmed two weeks ago, supplies would be available on 15 March. If the DC still could not confirm by mail within 2 to 3 days from today, the activity could not be completed before the deadline, and the supplies would be available around the end of March to mid-April, but it could not be confirmed yet.

27. The Chairman asked if an organisation was only invited to be a co-organiser of one of the events, how to cooperate with another co-organiser.

28. The response of Mr YIP Kin-chung were summarised as follows:

- (a) if it became a co-organiser of Activity 1, it would be responsible for the procurement of anti-epidemic supplies. He hoped that it, as a non-governmental organisation, would provide citizens with the cheapest anti-epidemic supplies as

soon as possible, and could cooperate with the co-organiser of Activity 2; and

- (b) for publicity projects, mask sets would be produced with masks and alcohol hand sanitiser, and the entire set would be distributed to the public. If the epidemic continued to worsen, it was estimated that the elderly would be short of masks by the end of March, so mask covers could store masks for reuse. The mask covers would also be printed with the method of wearing masks and pictures promoting epidemic prevention.

29. The Chairman asked whether the organisation applied for 10% of the funding, and the two activities applied for a total of \$200,000 for administrative expenses.

30. Mr YIP Kin-chung responded that administrative expenses ultimately provided services to the Government.

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

- (a) the HKECSST stated in the document that it was unable to provide the contents of Information 1, but would ensure that the purchased supplies would be inspected by professionals (registered nurses) before being distributed. He asked how to check the supplies;
- (b) he asked the Secretariat how long it would take for the advance payment to be issued, and how long it would take for the HKECSST to order supplies after receiving the payment;
- (c) he asked whether the organisation would request a test report from the supplier; and
- (d) whether the organisation was involved in legal proceedings. Due to the advance payment involved, it was necessary to prevent the District Council from incurring losses.

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

- (a) the organisation stated that it was unable to provide individual documents to the Secretariat and it was difficult to trace the source of the supplies. He asked how to confirm the organisation's procurement of supplies from reliable suppliers;
- (b) he asked how to recover the losses if the material supplier absconded or failed to deliver the goods as scheduled; and
- (c) in the quotation, the organisation stated that it would purchase 27 000 batches of masks, each batch with a quantity of 3-10 masks. He asked the organisation how to determine the quantity of each batch.

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

- (a) the organisation failed to provide the exact number and unit price of each material,

and it was difficult to estimate the quantity of each batch;

- (b) the organisation stated that it would only provide one receipt issued by the organisation, which was difficult to ensure the source and quality of the supplies, and the manufacturer should be able to provide the receipt. Hopefully the difficulties of the organisation could be understood;
- (c) he thought that the 10% administrative fee charged by the organisation was quite high, and this administrative fee should be better used for procurement; and
- (d) he asked the Secretariat about the arrangements and actual procedures for advance payments.

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

- (a) he asked the organisation to provide the number of masks, the allocation of expenditures of masks and hand sanitisers, so that members could compare them;
- (b) he asked the Secretariat and the STDO if the masks did not fully meet the standards of the GLD, whether the organisation would not be subsidised; and
- (c) he asked how the advance payment should be handled.

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

- (a) he mentioned that he hoped that there would be more physical promotional supplies for Activity 2 in the Working Group meeting. He asked whether the organisation had any other actual anti-epidemic promotional supplies besides a single poster; and
- (b) the organisation provided more comprehensive information documents when quoting, so it was listed as the first choice. He said that due to the pressing situation, he hoped to implement the activities as soon as possible.

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

- (a) he asked the agency to explain how administrative expenses were incurred;
- (b) he asked how the leaflet posters and promotional videos of Activity 2 would be released and whether the lead time would affect the preparation of epidemic prevention supplies; and
- (c) he asked about the procurement channels of supplies, and who should be responsible if there was a problem with the supplies. He believed that the organisation needed to bear risks because the sources of supplies were unknown.

37. The responses of Mr YIP Kin-chung were summarised as follows:

- (a) in response to questions about the quality of masks, the organisation had included

the requirements of the GLD's annex in the supplementary documents;

- (b) it was a usual practice to charge 10% as an administrative fee in social services;
- (c) the organisation was not involved in legal proceedings;
- (d) he stated that the quantity and unit price of anti-epidemic supplies were currently not available, and the organisation was now requesting a quotation of 10 masks per batch from the supplier. If the appropriation time continued to be postponed, the price of masks would rise and the available quantity would decrease. Therefore, the final quantity had not been confirmed yet;
- (e) he asked when the Secretariat would approve the advance payment. If the supplier failed to supply after the advance funding, the organisation would bear the responsibility, so the administrative fee was also a risk-bearing fee. The anti-epidemic supplies had certification information and the source could be traced. He said that if the delay continued, he would not be able to complete the project before the deadline;
- (f) in addition to the poster, mask covers would be produced and epidemic prevention information would be printed thereon. He stated that he would try his best to diversify the publicity, but time was limited; and
- (g) the Secretariat replied earlier that individual documents would have to be submitted, except for administrative fees.

38. Mr Derek YUEN, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the STDO responded that the advance payment would be issued in the form of a cheque, which would usually take one week. The processing time was not within the control of the Secretariat, but it would assist in processing the application as soon as possible.

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

- (a) he declared his interest, saying that he had been employed by the HKECSST and left his job in November last year. He did not have any interest and had declared it in the Working Group;
- (b) he asked the organisation whether it would consider purchasing more masks or allocate funds for alcohol hand sanitisers to purchase more masks if there was a surplus after purchasing a specified number of masks; and
- (c) he asked whether the administrative expenses included the salaries of the employees of the organisation.

40. Mr YIP Kin-chung responded that after deducting 10% of the appropriation as administrative expenses, all appropriations would be used to purchase epidemic prevention supplies. Administrative expenses include employee salaries.

41. The Chairman announced the end of the session of the HKECSST. He invited the next

agency representative, Ms LAM Lai-yee, a registered nurse of Connaught Medical Co., Ltd. He asked members to note that the company's offer for Activity 1 did not provide masks, while the offer for Activity 2 was \$240,000.

42. The profile of Ms LAM Lai-yee was summarised as follows:
- (a) the organisation had a mobile publicity vehicle that had assisted the Sham Shui Po District Council in organising activities. There were 3 parts of the promotion: (1) Distribute anti-epidemic gifts. The budget for each person in Sha Tin District was \$25. (2) Get flu vaccine on the car. Experts said that flu vaccination would help prevent pneumonia. (3) Hand-washing demonstration. Mobile cars were equipped with ultraviolet lights to check the degree of hand hygiene; and
 - (b) Activity 1 failed to provide masks. The alcohol hand sanitisers were 30 ml each, met American standards, were made in China, and were \$12 each.
43. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:
- (a) he asked about the logistics speed of the organisation and when it could complete the activities;
 - (b) if the organisation was only invited to co-organise one activity, how they would cooperate with other organisations;
 - (c) what the anti-epidemic products mentioned in Activity 2 were; and
 - (d) whether the organisation could provide masks and how long it would take to purchase them.
44. The responses of Ms LAM Lai-yee were summarised as follows:
- (a) the organisation already had mobile publicity vehicles. The promotion period would be from 7 to 10 March this year, 4 days in total;
 - (b) due to the relatively demanding requirements for joint procurement of masks and the high cost, the procurement of masks was abandoned. If other organisations could provide masks and supplies, they could be distributed on mobile publicity vehicles;
 - (c) the anti-epidemic products distributed in Sha Tin District were 30 ml of alcohol hand sanitisers and wet tissues with an alcohol concentration of 75%. We were now contacting other companies to provide sponsorship. It was estimated that about 6 000 sets would be distributed; and
 - (d) the financial budget included the costs of renting mobile publicity vehicles and hiring nurses and social workers on site; the budget for anti-epidemic gifts was about \$150,000, and the organisation charged an administration fee of less than 10%.

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

- (a) he was put off by Ms LAM Lai-yee's private contact to enquire about the funding situation. He hoped that the process of inviting co-organisers was fair and could not accept calls from organisations to enquire about the results;
- (b) the contents of the promotional activities, such as promotional materials, short videos, distribution of supplies, etc., should be listed in the invitation document of the joint intention. Publicity activities were required to provide physical publicity materials printed with epidemic prevention information. Online publicity such as short videos was also required;
- (c) he believed that the organisation's mobile publicity vehicles could only reach 3 locations in Sha Tin District, and the distribution of supplies lacked masks and the quantity was insufficient. He hoped that each district councilor would have a corresponding amount of supplies to be distributed to the public; and
- (d) he said that he could not accept using public money to help organisations promote influenza vaccination.

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

- (a) he made a declaration of interest by stating that this year's influenza vaccination activity at Chevalier Garden was organised by Connaught Medical Co., Ltd.;
- (b) he asked whether alcohol hand sanitisers could be provided from 7 to 10 March this year, how the quality would be ensured, and whether a test report could be provided; and
- (c) whether the institution was involved in legal proceedings.

47. Mr Johnny CHUNG asked which 3 locations in Sha Tin District the organisation initially planned to hold promotional activities at.

48. The responses of Ms LAM Lai-yee were summarised as follows:

- (a) she apologised to Mr Chris MAK. She was not familiar with the procedure, so she called to enquire about the situation;
- (b) the organisation was not involved in legal proceedings;
- (c) she said that there was no test report for the alcohol hand sanitisers for the time being, and it could be obtained from the manufacturer if necessary. There were 10 000 alcohol hand sanitisers in the warehouse; and
- (d) due to the rush of time, the promotion period lasted for 4 days. You could go to 3 locations every day for a total of 12 promotion locations. The promotion locations would be prioritised according to the population density.

49. The Chairman asked whether promotion in places with concentrated crowds would cause crowds to gather and whether it would violate the current health and epidemic prevention guidelines.

50. The responses of Ms LAM Lai-yee were summarised as follows:

- (a) she stated that members of the public would disinfect their hands and shoe soles before boarding the mobile publicity vehicle. If they chose not to board the publicity van, they would leave after picking up the supplies; and
- (b) she added the expert opinion that since the symptoms of influenza and pneumonia were similar, influenza vaccination could help divert patients. Thus, the publicity activities included on-site influenza vaccination for members of the public.

51. Mr Chris MAK emphasised two principles: (1) All District Councillors needed to have supplies to be distributed to the public. (2) He could not accept using public funds to promote influenza vaccination.

52. The views of Mr Raymond LI were summarised below:

- (a) the purpose of this event was to promote epidemic prevention and distribute epidemic prevention supplies to residents in the area. Although influenza vaccination was one of the preventive measures, this event did not include the promotion of influenza vaccination; and
- (b) the number of places visited by the mobile vehicles and the amount of supplies distributed were relatively few, failing to meet the needs of the population in Sha Tin District. He asked how to arrange for the locations of the publicity vehicle and arrange for members of the public in remote areas to obtain supplies and services.

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

- (a) he asked whether materials would be allocated to district councillors to distribute in the district; and
- (b) he would like to know when the Department of Health's Vaccination Subsidy Scheme for influenza vaccination would end this year, and if the elderly received a subsidy for influenza vaccination, how the organisation would handle the relevant accounts.

54. Mr Michael YUNG asked the Secretariat whether the "Procedures and Rules of Application for Sha Tin District Council Funds" allowed the funds for this event to be used to promote influenza vaccination projects.

55. Mr Derek YUEN responded that the district council funding criteria did not allow the funds of one activity to be used on another activity.

56. The Chairman reminded members that the quotation for Activity 1 of Hong Lok Health Care (HLHC) only provided alcohol hand sanitisers at the unit price of \$12. Members needed to

consider whether to choose this organisation as a co-organiser of Activity 1, and to only procure hand sanitisers.

57. The Chairman concluded the discussion on HLHC. He invited the next organisation representative, Ms LAM Man-wa, Director of Yee Health Company Limited (YHCL). He asked members to note that YHCL only applied to be the co-organiser of Activity 1. The quotation price for 30 masks was \$34 and the price for 30 ml of alcohol hand sanitiser was \$16.

58. The brief introduction by Ms LAM Man-wa was summarised as follows:

- (a) the organisation had been established for 10 years and was responsible for community medical work including vaccination, outpatient services and community health care for the elderly. The organisation had a professional medical team and worked in the community for a long time; and
- (b) the quotation for Activity 1 was 30 masks for \$34 and a bottle of alcohol hand sanitiser for \$16. The total price quoted was \$1.38 million.

59. Mr CHAN Pui-ming declared interests that the organisation he worked for in the past had cooperated with the company in holding influenza vaccination activities.

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

- (a) he declared interests that his office had cooperated with the company in holding influenza vaccination activities; and
- (b) he asked the organisation 6 questions: (1) When the masks would arrive; (2) How to cooperate with the co-organiser of Activity 2; (3) How to ensure the quality of masks and alcohol hand sanitisers; (4) Whether advance payment was not required by the organisation; (5) Whether there were test reports for the masks and alcohol hand sanitisers; (6) Whether the organisation was involved in legal proceedings.

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

- (a) there were usually 50 masks in a box, and the organisation provided 30 masks in each pack. He asked the organisation if the masks had to be repackaged and suggested reducing the number of masks to 10 per pack to benefit more members of the public;
- (b) he asked when the organisation could provide supplies; and
- (c) whether the masks could meet the technical indicators of the GLD and whether relevant data had been provided for the reference of the STDC.

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

- (a) he asked members to note that the organisation submitted the application after the deadline for application;

- (b) he asked whether the organisation could guarantee the provision of protective equipment according to the quotation and before 10 March;
- (c) he asked members to note that the current prices of alcohol hand sanitisers had dropped and the unit price provided by the organisation was higher. He asked whether the organisation would consider allocating funds to procure masks; and
- (d) whether the promotional materials would involve the promotion of the organisation.

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

- (a) he declared interests that his office had cooperated with YHCL in holding influenza vaccination activities;
- (b) he asked whether the organisation could provide masks that met requirements with the quoted price and provide mask samples to ensure quality;
- (c) he opined that the quoted price of 30ml of alcohol hand sanitiser was more expensive than the market price, and asked whether the organisation would consider using all the funds to procure masks; and
- (d) the organisation did not apply for Activity 2. He asked whether the STDC logo would be printed on the materials to show that they were sponsored by the STDC.

64. Mr Raymond LI asked whether the organisation would consider lowering the unit price of alcohol hand sanitiser, allocate funds to purchase masks, and increase the quantity of materials. He suggested that the number of masks per set as well as the ratio of masks and alcohol hand sanitiser be adjusted flexibly.

65. Mr WONG Ho-fung believed that the organisation's mask price was cheaper than the market price. He asked whether the quality and supply of goods could be ensured.

66. Mr LAI Tsz-yan asked the organisation about the source from which the anti-epidemic materials were purchased, whether the funds could be adjusted to purchase more masks, whether the anti-epidemic materials listed in the quotation could be guaranteed, and how long the delivery period would take.

67. Mr HUI Lap-san said that the quotation had listed 50 masks for \$50, and he asked whether the quotation included packaging costs. He asked, according to the quotation, if the organisation could guarantee when the goods would be available.

68. Mr YIP Wing said that the organisation's offer was very attractive. He asked if the number of masks per set could be divided and asked about the source of the masks.

69. Mr Chris MAK asked members to note that the co-organiser approved by the Working Group at the first meeting of the event was required to be a charity exempt from tax under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance.

70. The responses of Ms LAM Man-wa were summarised as follows:

- (a) according to the requirements stated in the invitation letter for the event, the goods would have to arrive on or before 10 March. The organisation could not ensure that the goods arrive on or before the specified date and could only try to make it as soon as possible. Local mask manufacturers might not be able to provide the specified number of masks in time;
- (b) she stated that since she did not apply for Activity 2, the organisation would cooperate with the co-organiser of Activity 2;
- (c) the organisation intended to purchase masks from local manufacturers that had been tested, and she said she could provide test reports;
- (d) she stated that the organisation was not involved in legal proceedings;
- (e) regarding the enquiry about reducing the number of masks, she said that she could discuss it with the manufacturer, and she was currently ordering 30 masks per set, but she did not favour repacking them by the organisation;
- (f) the quotation was calculated based on a total of \$50 per set of masks and alcohol hand sanitisers. She said that she could not provide a separate quotation for the time being;
- (g) responding to enquiries about whether the masks met the specifications, she said that she believed that local manufacturers produced masks in accordance with the technical specifications funded by the Hong Kong Trade Development Council , but failed to provide mask samples. In addition, the alcohol hand sanitisers were manufactured in accordance with the guidelines of the World Health Organisation;
- (h) she admitted that the organisation submitted the application more than 10 hours later than the deadline;
- (i) she stated that she understood that district council resources could not be used to promote the organisation, so she promised not to promote its vaccination services;
- (j) the quotation mentioned by Mr HUI Lap-san was an incorrect version and the organisation had corrected it; and
- (k) the organisation tried to procure masks in the Mainland, but was unsuccessful, so it was now purchasing from local manufacturers.

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

- (a) he said that before each Working Group meeting, he checked the prices with local mask manufacturers, so he knew that no manufacturer could provide masks according to the organisation's quotation. He asked whether the source of the organisation's masks was the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (FTU). It was reported that the FTU masks had its name printed on them. According to the

terms and conditions, the anti-epidemic materials were not allow to contain promotional elements; and

- (b) he asked whether the organisation had spot goods. He believed that no local manufacturer could provide masks at the organisation's quotation price.

72. Ms LAM Man-wa responded to Mr Chris MAK's enquiry. She stated that the quotation was based on 30 masks and 1 alcohol hand sanitiser per set, and the price was \$50. She promised not to print the names of other organisations on the masks, nor to use them for publicity. In addition, the epidemic prevention materials were not in stock. She added that the organisation did not require advance payments.

73. The Chairman concluded the discussion on YHCL.

74. The Chairman asked members to note that according to the information provided by YHCL, the organisation did not comply with Article 4.4.1(a) of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council", i.e. "a statutory organisation or an organisation registered under the laws of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (e.g. the Companies Ordinance (Cap.622), the Societies Ordinance (Cap.151), and the Inland Revenue Ordinance (Cap.112)) and established wholly or mainly for the benefit of the district in which it is set up." This organisation was only a company under the Business Registration Ordinance, so there was no need to consider this organisation.

75. The Chairman announced inviting the next representatives of the organisation, Ms LEE Ka-man, Secretary of Care Association Limited (CAL), and Ms LEUNG Chui-ting, a volunteer. He asked members to note that the quotation for Activity 2 was \$620,000.

76. Ms LEUNG Chui-ting introduced the background of the establishment of the organisation and the services provided for the elderly.

77. The Chairman asked whether the organisation would be responsible for the packaging of anti-epidemic supplies, what the logistics speed would be, when to ship and how to cooperate with other bid-winning organisations.

78. Ms LEE Ka-man stated that the organisation would be responsible for packaging the anti-epidemic materials, discussing with suppliers as soon as possible to ship them before 10 March, and providing documents. Regarding the procurement of anti-epidemic materials, she said that alcohol hand sanitisers were in stock, and she would have to liaise with suppliers regarding masks.

79. Mr Chris MAK asked if the organisation could provide 27 600 epidemic prevention kits.

80. Mr Michael YUNG asked the organisation 7 questions: (1) When the goods would be available after the confirmation was issued; (2) how to cooperated with other co-organisers; (3) how to ensure the quality of masks and alcohol hand sanitisers; (4) whether the organisation needed advance payment; (5) whether test reports on masks and alcohol hand sanitisers could be provided; (6) whether the institution was involved in legal proceedings; (7) what the background of the establishment of the charitable trust was.

81. Mr CHENG Chung-hang was worried about the price fluctuation of masks and asked whether the organisation could ensure the procurement of relevant anti-epidemic materials at the quoted price.

82. Mr CHIU Chu-pong asked whether the organisation could provide 27 600 sets of anti-epidemic materials and promotional packs for both Activities 1 and 2.

83. The responses of Ms LEE Ka-man were summarised as follows:

- (a) she stated that the organisation promised to provide the quantity of anti-epidemic materials listed in the quotation;
- (b) she stated that the organisation was not involved in legal proceedings; and
- (c) the organisation could provide quality reports for masks and alcohol hand sanitisers to verify the quality.

84. The Chairman asked who the organisation served.

85. Ms LEE Ka-man said that the organisation would go to the elderly center to promote health information to the elderly and provide simple physical examination services.

86. The Chairman announced the end of the session of CAL.

87. Mr Michael YUNG wanted to know why YHCL was not eligible for the event. Although the Chairman has stated that the organisation only had a business registration certificate, as far as he knew, in addition to applying for business registration, a limited company also needed to apply for a company registration certificate. Therefore, the organisation might simply have omitted to submit the company registration certificate. He asked if the Secretariat had reminded the organisation to submit relevant documents.

88. The Chairman stated that YHCL had only submitted a business registration certificate for the time being. According to the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council", the organisation was not eligible for application. If there was an omission of documents, the organisation could be required to make up later. But this meeting needed to decide on the joint organisation as soon as possible, which was difficult to ratify.

89. According to information on the Internet, Mr Michael YUNG confirmed that YHCL had a company registration number. He believed that if the Secretariat provided wrong information to the committee members, and the committee consequently rejected the organisation that was originally qualified for the application, the HEC might be liable.

90. The Chairman asked the secretary of the Working Group to first explain the organisation's submission of documents. If the members thought it was necessary, they could adjourn the meeting for 10 minutes and let the Secretariat contact the person in charge of YHCL to provide additional information.

91. Mr Saki CHOY, the secretary of the Working Group (Ad hoc), explained the status of documents submitted by relevant organisations. He emphasised that both YHCL and CAL

submitted applications after the deadline and only submitted the reply slip and Annex 1. At the second meeting of the Working Group, after discussion, the members of the Working Group agreed to invite relevant organisations to submit additional information documents. As a result, YHCL submitted the business registration certificate of the organisation. The Secretariat was responsible for forwarding relevant documents to the committee members for consideration.

92. The Chairman said that if the organisation failed to provide sufficient information, it would be difficult for members to consider their application.

93. Mr WONG Ho-fung asked whether the Secretariat had informed the relevant organisations of the left out documents, whether the organisations still had omissions after submitting the missing information, and whether there was a misunderstanding during communication. He suggested asking the organisation if it could provide the required supporting documents.

94. Mr Michael YUNG believed that it was necessary to confirm whether the organisation complied with Article 4. 4. 1(a) of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council" before deciding whether YHCL was eligible for application, so as to avoid the organisation from appealing in the future. He believed that the Secretariat was responsible for distinguishing relevant supporting documents for members.

95. Mr Raymond LI believed that it was up to the HEC to decide not to co-organise activities with the relevant organisations if they were late or failed to submit information. He suggested that the HEC confirm the organisation's qualifications through other channels before considering its application, but it should be noted that the organisation did not provide sufficient information and documents.

96. Mr NG Kam-hung believed that the Secretariat had no responsibility to remind organisations of the missing documents, and that they should be treated equally to show fairness.

97. The Chairman adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes. If the organisation could provide relevant documents, it would be considered together.

98. According to the documents provided by YHCL at the beginning of the meeting, the Chairman showed that the relevant organisation did not meet the application qualifications stipulated in the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council". When the meeting was adjourned, the Secretariat tried to contact the relevant organisation, but it was still unable to provide relevant supporting documents. Therefore, the Chairman decided to review the other three organisations.

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

- (a) he believed that the Chairman did not need to bear related risks. He pointed out that the Secretariat had not responded to whether it had reviewed all the documents submitted by the organisation, and believed that the Secretariat had not cooperated with the work of the HEC;
- (b) he believed that when discussing matters, it was necessary to establish criteria. If price and quantity were considered criteria, YHCL was more appropriate. He

suggested that the organisation be considered once it was confirmed to have complied with Article 4. 4. 1(a) of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council";

- (c) as the Working Group accepted late applications for consideration and invited relevant organisations to submit additional information. He asked the Secretariat about the entire procedure for inviting co-organisers and releasing documents to confirm whether the process violated guidelines or constituted bid rigging; and
- (d) he suggested selecting co-organisers in order of priority, so as not to cancel qualified applicants.

100. The Chairman stated that this special meeting was held in order to let the committee members understand the application and the content of the quotation. According to the decision of the Working Group, the joint organisation was required to be a charity exempt from tax under Article 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance. However, members said that the charity's procurement ability might not be as strong as that of the medical organisation. The Chairman also reminded members that Activity 1 and Activity 2 did not need to be bundled.

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

- (a) he emphasised that the Working Group recommended that the joint organisation should be a charity that was exempt from tax under Article 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance. According to this criterion, only the HKECSST and CAL were eligible. The Working Group had also set priorities for co-organisers;
- (b) he believed that due to the Secretariat's mistakes, the relevant organisations should not be disqualified from applying in accordance with Article 4.4.1(a) of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council"; and
- (c) he had learned from the secretary of the Working Group that there were only two applications on the day of the deadline. The Secretariat responded to a total of four applications the next day. The Working Group agreed to accept and consider the two late applications, and listed the co-organisers in order of priority. He hoped that the Secretariat clarified the current situation and how to deal with the recommendations of the Working Group.

102. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had contacted YHCL, and the relevant organisation would provide a company registration certificate under the Companies Ordinance (Chapter 622) within 15 minutes. He reiterated that it was the responsibility of the organisation to provide sufficient supporting documents, but in order to avoid possible disputes, he asked the relevant organisations to submit additional supporting documents.

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

- (a) he declared interests by stating that Mr YIP Kin-chung was his intern tutor for the Master of Social Work Programme at the Chinese University of Hong Kong; and
- (b) he stated that at the first meeting of the Working Group, he suggested that the co-

organiser be a charity exempted from tax under Section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance. He alleged that it was not documented. He asked why there was such an omission.

104. Mr CHAN Pui-ming believed that the dispute lay in whether YHCL had a company registration certificate. He asked the Secretariat to explain clearly the liaison situation; and he would like to know whether the Secretariat had informed the applicants of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council", provided a reasonable time for the organisation to respond, and provided a checklist for the organisation to submit relevant documents.

105. Mr Raymond LI believed that whether the company actually met the application qualifications should be considered; and late submission or omission of documents was the reference factor for members who should refrain from determining the organisation's application qualifications.

106. Mr George WONG asked the Secretariat to explain why it told the Chairman that YHCL did not provide the required supporting documents after the discussion.

107. Mr Saki CHOY said that after the first meeting of the Working Group, the first draft of the meeting minutes had been drafted and approved by the Working Group. The documents for inviting co-organisers had been uploaded to the District Council website with the approval of the convenor. After the deadline for the application for the event, YHCL and CAL submitted the application. At that moment, they were already informed that the application period had expired. Then their applications were forwarded to the Working Group for consideration. At the second meeting, members of the Working Group learned that the relevant organisations submitted late applications and agreed to take them into consideration. They also discussed and ranked them at the meeting. The first choice was the HKECSST, because the organisation submitted the application before the deadline and could provide most of the required information. Since YHCL and CAL only provided reply slips and quotation forms with incorrect information, members of the Working Group were unable to judge whether the organisation's application qualifications and quotations met the requirements of the event. Since none of the 4 organisations submitted all the required information, members of the Working Group agreed to invite the organisations to submit additional documents. After their supplementary information had been received, it was forwarded to the Working Group members for reference. After that, the Working Group approved the HKECSST to become the co-organiser of the event, and it was considered by the HEC.

108. The Chairman said that it was necessary to decide at today's meeting whether to pass the Working Group's recommendation by giving priority to charities exempted from tax under Article 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance, or to choose co-organisers from the four organisations.

109. Mr YAU Man-chun said that the Working Group had submitted its recommendations to the HEC. He asked whether it was possible to directly choose from the four organisations regardless of the Working Group's recommendations, and whether the funding would have to be approved by the Finance and General Affairs Committee(FGAC) and the District Council.

110. Mr Derek YUEN responded that the relevant funding was approved at the District Council meeting earlier. The purpose of this meeting was to select the co-organisers for the event. He

asked members to note that the district council meeting did not approve the project expenditures related to administrative fees and salaries. This was a major change. If the HKECSST was decided by the HEC to be a joint organisation, the relevant expenditure would have to be approved by the DC meeting.

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

- (a) he asked the Secretariat to confirm whether YHCL was eligible for application;
- (b) he asked whether the advance payment to the HKECSST would not be allowed before the appropriation amendment was passed at the District Council meeting; and
- (c) after applicants had been confirmed to have complied with Article 4.4.1 of the "Procedures and Rules for Fund Application for Sha Tin District Council", whether the recommendations of the Working Group or the lower bid should be used as the criterion for the decision.

112. Mr Jimmy SHAM said that the second meeting of the Working Group was based on the information and documents provided by the organisation, and the information was not complete at that time. The meeting arranged for representatives of relevant organisations to give briefings and the information was more complete. He suggested that the order of priority decided by the Working Group be used as a reference.

113. Mr Wilson LI believed that the organisations failed to submit sufficient information at the last Working Group meeting, and agreed that the decision of the Working Group could be referred to and the assessment should be based on more comprehensive information at the meeting.

114. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had just received the company registration certificate provided by YHCL, and the organisation was qualified to apply.

115. Mr WONG Ho-fung believed that the quality and quantity of masks provided by the organisations should be considered. He suggested that members vote based on their understanding of the organisations during the meeting.

116. Mr Chris MAK said that, as the convenor of the Working Group, he did not mind the committee overturning the Working Group's recommendations.

117. Mr CHAN Pui-ming proposed voting on three issues: (1) whether the HEC agreed to the Working Group's recommendations; (2) selecting a joint organisation for Activity 1 after considering the Working Group's recommendations, if the recommendations were not approved; (3) selecting a joint organisation for Activity 2 after considering the Working Group's recommendations, if the recommendations were not approved.

118. The Chairman asked whether the committee members objected to the proposal made by Mr CHAN Pui-ming to resolve items (2) and (3). The committee members did not object, and unanimously passed the procedures for deliberating over items (2) and (3).

Action

119. The Chairman stated that due to the significant funding involved, members were invited to make declarations of interests, and members still had the right to vote.

120. Mr Chris MAK, Mr Raymond LI, Mr Johnny CHUNG and Mr Jimmy SHAM made declarations of interests by stating that they knew the HKECSST.

121. Mr George WONG, Mr WONG Ho-fung, Mr SHEK William, Mr YIP Wing, Mr CHENG Chung-hang and Mr Chris MAK made declarations of interests by stating that they knew HLHC.

122. Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr YAU Man-chun, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Mr TSANG Kit, Mr SHEK William, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr LO Tak-ming, Mr Raymond LI, Mr Chris MAK, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Mr YIP Wing and Mr HUI Lap-san made declarations of interests by stating that they knew YHCL.

123. The Chairman invited members to vote on the co-organiser of Activity 1.

124. The HKECSST received 0 vote, HLHC received 0 vote, YHCL received 15 votes, and CAL received 3 votes. The HEC endorsed the YHCL to become the co-organiser of Activity 1.

125. The Chairman invited members to vote on the co-organiser of Activity 2.

126. The HKECSST received 4 votes, HLHC received 0 vote, and CAL received 16 votes. The HEC endorsed the CAL to become the co-organiser of Activity 2.

127. The Chairman said that he would pass the implementation details to the Working Group for its follow-ups.

128. Mr Chris MAK suggested that the Secretariat establish a Working Group for all members to participate and invite all members to attend the meeting.

129. The Chairman declared the end of the agenda item.

Date of Next Meeting

130. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 10 March 2020 (Tuesday).

131. The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/40

April 2020