

Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of  
the Finance, Administration and Publicity Committee (2016-2017) of  
the Tuen Mun District Council

---

Date : 22 April 2016 (Friday)

Time : 9:34 a.m.

Venue : Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) Conference Room

<u>Present</u>		<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Departure</u>
Mr AU Chi-yuen (Chairman)	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr HO Kwan-yiu (Vice-chairman)	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LEUNG Kin-man, BBS, MH, JP	TMDC Chairman	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LEE Hung-sham, Lothar, MH	TMDC Vice-chairman	9:35 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr SO Shiu-shing	TMDC Member	9:34 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TO Sheck-yuen, MH	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms KONG Fung-yi	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Yau-hoi, MH, JP	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms WONG Lai-sheung, Catherine	TMDC Member	9:40 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms HO Hang-mui	TMDC Member	9:45 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LAM Chung-hoi	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms CHING Chi-hung	TMDC Member	9:38 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Man-wah, MH	TMDC Member	9:38 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms CHU Shun-nga, Beatrice	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSANG Hin-hong	TMDC Member	10:00 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms SO Ka-man	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr KAM Man-fung	TMDC Member	9:38 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr MO Shing-fung	TMDC Member	9:38 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YIP Man-pan	TMDC Member	9:42 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YEUNG Chi-hang	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YAN Siu-nam	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TAM Chun-yin	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms LEE Wen Choi, Winnie (Secretary)	Executive Officer I (District Council) 2, Tuen Mun District Office, Home Affairs Department		

Absent with Apologies

Ms LUNG Shui-hing	TMDC Member
Mr CHAN Manwell, Leo	TMDC Member
Mr CHEUNG Hang-fai	TMDC Member

By Invitation

Ms WONG Kwai Kiu, Connie

Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Tuen Mun)

Mr WONG Tak Choy, David

Housing Manager/Tuen Mun 3, Housing Department

In Attendance

Ms FUNG Ngar-wai, Aubrey

District Officer (Tuen Mun), Home Affairs Department

Mr LAU Chun-fai, Lawrence

Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Tuen Mun District Office, Home Affairs Department

## **I. Opening Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed all to the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Finance, Administration and Publicity Committee (“FAPC”).

2. The Chairman asked Members to note that any Member who was aware of a personal interest in a discussion item should declare the interest before the discussion. The Chairman would, in accordance with Order 39(12) of the Tuen Mun District Council Standing Orders, decide whether the Member who had declared an interest might speak or vote on the matter, might remain in the meeting as an observer, or should withdraw from the meeting. All cases of declaration of interests would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

3. In respect of the arrangements on the agenda items, the Chairman said that as the 2015-16 financial year (“FY”) had just drawn to a close and to help Members understand the draft budget to be discussed, Members were invited to note the Position of TMDC Funds up to 31 March 2016 under the Reporting Items of the agenda before moving on to the Discussion Items.

4. The Chairman continued that in respect of Cases on Cancellation of Reimbursement of DC Funds under the Reporting Items, as the organiser of one of the activities had lodged an appeal after the sending out of the agenda, the FAPC would go through the report while discussing the appeal case. Members agreed to the above two arrangements.

## **II. Absence from Meetings**

5. The Secretary said that no application for leave of absence had been received from Members.

## **III. Confirmation of Minutes of the Last Meeting**

6. As no amendment was proposed by Members, the Chairman announced that the minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the FAPC (2016-17) were confirmed.

## **IV. Matters Arising**

### **(A) Improve the Arrangements for Hanging of Banners by District Councillors (Paragraphs 15-18 of Minutes of the Last Meeting) (Paper No. 1 on Table)**

7. The Chairman welcomed Ms Connie WONG, Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Tuen Mun) (“DLO/TM”) and Mr David WONG, Housing Manager/Tuen Mun 3, Housing Department (“HD”) to the meeting. He also said that though the Transport Department had not sent any representative to this meeting, it had explained the matters concerned at the last meeting and had submitted a written reply before this meeting. He continued that the FAPC had, at the last meeting, resolved that the departments concerned should visit the constituencies jointly with TMDC Members for the selection of appropriate display spots.

8. Ms Connie WONG of the DLO/TM said that though the consultancy company had tried to contact all TMDC Members, some of them still could not be reached. Among those who had been successfully contacted, 13 had conducted site visits. The DLO/TM was examining the report submitted by the consultancy company and would brief the FAPC on the progress after consulting the views of departments concerned.

9. Mr David WONG of the HD remarked that the HD had designated banner display spots in housing estates under its management and so far, no enquiry on this aspect had been received from TMDC Members.

10. Members put forward their views and enquiries which were summarised as follows:

- (i) It was pointed out that the consultancy company engaged to deal with the banner issue had been slow in its progress of contacting TMDC Members. Another Member said that TMDC Members had to remove their banners during the election period of this year's Legislative Council ("LegCo") election, which meant that by the time the election was over, they would lose ten months of time for displaying banners. The DLO/TM and the consultancy company should therefore speed up the process. In addition, a Member opined that the procedures should be streamlined and the DLO/TM should take the place of the consultancy company to coordinate the work directly. A deadline for processing should also be set;
- (ii) It was pointed out that as the DLO/TM had indicated at the last meeting that it would contact every TMDC Member, it should take the initiative to do so, otherwise it should notify TMDC Members of the relevant arrangements, for example, asking them to contact the DLO/TM before the deadline or fill in a form regarding the requested display spots, with the view to processing their applications in a fair and speedy manner;
- (iii) A Member who had conducted site visits pointed out that it had been quite a long time since the visit, however, the DLO/TM and the consultancy company had not responded on the follow-ups. The Member suggested that the DLO/TM should process cases where site visits had already been conducted first or handle the cases by batches. A Member who had not been arranged to conduct site visits suggested that the processing of cases where TMDC Members had failed to respond repeatedly should be suspended and the processing of cases where TMDC Members had actively put forward their views should be speeded up;
- (iv) It was pointed out that the performance of the consultancy company was unsatisfactory and queried that the consultancy company had shifted the responsibility of turning down the requests for displaying banners at certain locations to the DLO/TM or the TD. Another Member said that during the visit, the consultancy company had neither adopted a satisfactory approach nor taken an active role to follow up the issue;

- (v) A Member enquired whether the DLO/TM's criteria on displaying banners were on a par with those of the HD. The Member also enquired on the number of banners allowed to be displayed at the locations managed by the HD and the relevant restrictions. Another Member opined that the TD had adopted double standards in handling the display of banners and wanted to know more about its criteria;
- (vi) It was noted that banners of some TMDC Members displayed at previous display spots had been removed. It was enquired that whether TMDC Members were allowed to display banners at the original display spots before the DLO/TM completed the site visits and the follow-up actions;
- (vii) It was pointed out that as District Council ("DC") members had to handle district affairs, the DLO/TM used to allow DC members to enjoy higher priority than LegCo members over the selection of display spots. It was enquired that whether the criteria had been changed;
- (viii) It was opined that some of the display spots in rural areas were unsatisfactory (e.g. locations which could be obscured easily). The DLO/TM was asked to conduct site visits for enhancement.

11. The Chairman remarked that a Member had relayed to him that his banners had been removed because the display period had not been marked. He opined that it was obvious that the display period was the four-year term of office of DC members, so there was no need to mark it on the banners.

12. In response to Members' enquiries and views, Ms Connie WONG of the DLO/TM said that the consultancy company had tried to contact all TMDC Members but some of them could not be reached. She then briefed Members on the list of TMDC Members who had been arranged to conduct site visits and indicated that the consultancy company would continue to contact other TMDC Members. She also said that the permitted display spots had been set out in the approval letters issued by the DLO/TM in late 2015, and that while the DLO/TM and the consultancy company were following up the issue, TMDC Members could continue to use the permitted display spots. The DLO/TM could follow up the cases by batches and in a speedy manner as suggested by Members.

13. Regarding the incident that the consultancy company had contacted the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") for removal of banners of a TMDC Member, Ms Connie WONG said that Members could refer to the guidelines issued by the Lands Department which had set out in details the requirements on displaying banners by DC members, for example, basic information like the size of banners. The guidelines also prescribed that information contained on the banners must not involve fee paying services, the name of the individual or organisation must be shown, and the approval number as well as the approval date must be shown at the top right-hand corner in characters of suitable size. She continued that the display period of the permitted banner should be the date prescribed in the approval letter, and that wordings like the "whole term of the office of DC Members" should be clearly shown and arranged in a neat and tidy manner. She also said that the guidelines, which could be

downloaded from the Internet, would be distributed to TMDC Members again. She further pointed out that the same requirements had also been contained in the notification on displaying banners previously issued to TMDC Members. However, TMDC Members might be unaware of the requirements because they were accustomed to them.

(Post-meeting note: DLO/TM submitted supplementary information after the meeting specifying that the above-mentioned “characters of suitable size” meant “characters not smaller than 2.5cm x 2.5cm”.)

14. Ms Connie WONG of the DLO/TM continued that a number of display spots in Tuen Mun District had been confirmed. The DLO/TM would examine the display spots proposed by TMDC Members and study the feasibility of streamlining the procedures. It would also consult relevant departments on the proposed display spots in a speedy manner so as to brief Members on the progress at the next meeting.

15. In response to Members’ enquiries, Mr David WONG of the HD said that there were three types of public housing flats in Tuen Mun, namely, general public rental housing (“PRH”) flats, Tenant Purchase Scheme (“TPS”) flats and Home Ownership Scheme (“HOS”) flats. He continued that regarding TPS and HOS estates, locations for displaying banners would be decided by the respective owners’ corporations. For PRH estates, display spots, which are usually railings on the ground level of the public housing blocks or those near the concourses, would be designated according to guidelines of the HD. The locations of display spots would be arranged in a concentrated manner to facilitate public’s access to information. He further said that LegCo members, DC members, government departments, non-governmental organisations, mutual aid committees and approved charitable institutions could all apply for display of banners. Any person who intended to display banners should submit the application form 4 to 20 working days before the start date of the display period. While the display spots were allocated on a first-come-first-served basis in general, priority was given to people serving the district which included LegCo members as well as DC members, and allocation would be made by drawing lots when necessary. He added that the display period would last for a month, and for the sake of fairness, a new application had to be submitted after the expiry of the display period.

16. The Chairman concluded that the criteria of the HD were clearer and a number of Members raised doubts about the DLO/TM’s criteria on approving applications for displaying banners, the performance of the contractor as well as the follow-up timetable. He asked the DLO/TM to complete the site visits within one month after the meeting and consult relevant departments within another month with a view to completing the necessary follow-ups before the next meeting. He also asked the DLO/TM to discuss the matter directly with TMDC Members and provide its contact information.

## **V. Reporting Items**

### **(A) Position of TMDC Funds up to 31 March 2016** **(FAPC Paper No. 9/2016)**

17. The Chairman said that as at the end of the FY 2015-16, the TMDC had

allocated a total funding of \$28,091,832 for organising 1 138 community involvement (“CI”) projects. In view of the actual use of funding, the amount of funding had been revised to \$24,067,000 by the end of the FY. As at 31 March 2016, the actual expenditure of the TMDC for the FY 2015-16 had amounted to \$24,066,920, representing 100% of the allocated funding. Outstanding payments of \$2,621,770.01 of the FY 2015-16 would be carried forward to the FY 2016-17 for settlement

## **VI. Discussion Items**

### **(A) Outstanding Payments for Projects Approved in 2015-2016** **(FAPC Paper No. 6/2016)**

18. The Chairman remarked that the FAPC would adopt the previous practice to carry forward the outstanding payments of the approved projects set out in the paper to the new FY (i.e. FY 2016-17) for settlement. As Members raised no objection to the paper, the Chairman announced that the FAPC endorsed the allocation of funding for the projects set out in the paper. Projects involving funding of \$100,000 or more would be, in accordance with the general procedures, submitted to the TMDC for endorsement at its meeting to be held on 3 May this year.

### **(B) Draft Budget of TMDC Funds (2016-2017)** **(FAPC Paper No. 7/2016)**

19. The Chairman remarked that the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) had announced that the approved funding for the TMDC for the FY 2016-17 was \$24,400,000, and that the Secretariat had preliminarily consulted the views of the chairmen and the vice-chairmen of the TMDC and the respective committees on the draft budget, which had already been incorporated in the draft budget.

20. The Secretary briefed Members on the highlights of the draft budget as follows:

- (i) The amount of approved funding for the TMDC for the FY 2016-17 was \$24,400,000, which was the same as that for the last FY. Of which, \$21,600,000 would be allocated to organise general CI projects, \$1,400,000 would be allocated as a dedicated funding to promote local arts and cultural activities, and the remaining \$1,400,000 was a time-limited funding which would be dedicated to promote local arts and cultural activities for a period of five years starting from the last FY, with this year being the second year of the five-year period;
- (ii) Over the past few years, the level of over-commitment of TMDC Funds had been so high that each FY, the amount of outstanding payments which had to be carried forward to the new FY for settlement was very considerable. The outstanding payments carried forward from the FY 2015-16 to the new FY had amounted to more than \$2.6 million, though slightly less than that carried forward from the FY 2014-15 to FY 2015-16. To avoid a further increase in outstanding payments at the end of this FY, which would seriously affect the use of funding of the subsequent FY, this year’s budget had to be prudent;

- (iii) The amount of funding for most of the committees/working groups under the TMDC, committees under Tuen Mun District Office (“TMDO”) and district organisations was the same as that of the previous year, except for the following:
- (a) **Hiring Dedicated Staff to Assist the TMDC in the Discharge of Duties:**  
In view of inflation and funding earmarked for subsequent pay rise, it was unavoidable to slightly increase the amount of funding for this item. The funding application concerned had been approved by the TMDC earlier;
  - (b) **Working Groups under the Commerce, Industry and Housing Committee:**  
When discussing the draft budget, the convenors and vice-convenors of the working groups under the TMDC and its committees had suggested that the Working Group on Economic Development in Tuen Mun should transfer a funding of \$50,000 each to the Working Group on Occupational Safety and Health as well as the Working Group on Building Management;
  - (c) **Publicity Activities (Production of Red Packet Envelopes and Calendars):**  
In FY 2015-16, the number of calendars produced had been reduced due to the suspension of the operation of the TMDC, resulting in a decrease in the amount of funding when compared with that of the previous years. The estimated funding for this year had been increased to the level similar to that of the previous years;
  - (d) **Tuen Mun District Council Work Report (“the Report”) and Tuen Mun Residents Handbook (“the Handbook”):**  
The Report was produced once every two years, and there would be no need to produce the Report in 2016-17. Regarding the Handbook, since it had been updated in 2013 and there were sufficient copies for distribution, it was suggested that there was no need to earmark any funding for this purpose;
  - (e) **Activities of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (“ICAC”):**  
The ICAC had indicated that this year, there was no need to use DC funds to implement its programmes;
  - (f) **Working Groups under the Traffic and Transport Committee (“TTC”):**  
In view of the TTC’s work programmes to be implemented this year, the chairmen and vice-chairmen had, during the discussion of the draft budget, suggested increasing the funding for the working groups to \$100,000. The proposed increase would be transferred from Tuen Mun District Road Safety Campaign Organising Committee;
  - (g) **Steering Group on District Arts and Steering Group on Leisure and Sports Development under the District Facilities Management Committee (“DFMC”):**  
When discussing the draft budget, the chairmen and vice-chairmen had suggested transferring a funding of \$100,000 from the Steering Group on



District Arts to the Steering Group on Leisure and Sports Development;  
and

- (h) Tuen Mun District Organising Committee for Hong Kong Games:  
Since the Hong Kong Games was held once every two years, there had been no need to earmark funding for this purpose in the previous FY. The amount of funding for this year's Hong Kong Games was the same as that for the previous one.
- (iv) The funding of \$2,800,000 for the promotion of local arts and cultural activities had been allocated to various working groups and organisations engaged in the promotion of local arts. The arrangements on allocation were the same as those of the previous year;
- (v) When discussing the draft budget earlier on, the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the TMDC and the committees had pointed out that the amount of approved funding in the last round of application in each FY was too small for organisations to organise activities. They had suggested capping the total funding for the first two rounds of application at \$3 million and reserving \$1 million for the last round; and
- (vi) To sum up, the estimated over-commitment for this year was about 16.21%. According to the requirements of the HAD, the amount of over-commitment should not exceed 25% of the total funding. If the amount of over-commitment reached the limit of 25% during the preparation of the budget, it would be impossible to settle such amount at the end of the FY. Since the over-commitment was expected to reach 16.21%, representing about \$4 million of the total funding, it was undesirable to increase the funding unless there were special needs.

21. The Chairman pointed out that over-committing was not a sound financial management practice and the amount over-committed had to be settled eventually. He asked Members to note that at the meeting of the Working Group on Development and Planning of Tuen Mun District held on 14 April this year, the matter concerning an allocation of \$500,000 for a study on the development of the old area of Tuen Mun had not yet been decided and had to be deferred to the next meeting for follow-ups. Therefore, at this moment, no funding had been earmarked for the study concerned in the budget. However, even if the working group later resolved to earmark funding for the study, which would cause a rise in the estimated allocation, the amount of over-commitment would not exceed the cap set by the HAD. Therefore, by then the TMDC could still consider allocating funding to the working group to carry out the study.

22. Members' views on the draft budget were summarised as follows:

- (i) It was opined that a minimum of \$150,000 should be reserved for the TTC as it was an important committee;

- (ii) It was pointed out that the Working Group on Community Crisis Management had, at its meeting, decided to amend its terms of reference to include the publicity work on prevention of major incidents (e.g. publicity on the prevention of the outbreak of Zika virus infection). Therefore, it was hoped that funding could be earmarked for the related work. A Member opined that the publicity work on disease prevention could be taken up by the Working Group on Medical and Rehabilitation Services under the Social Services Committee, and that the HAD would provide additional funding in case of crisis. A Member enquired whether the funding could be increased in case of major incidents, given that at present, the budget had not reached the cap of the over-commitment;
- (iii) It was pointed out that in general, the amount of funding for working groups would not be less than that of the previous FY, and an enquiry was made on the reasons for reducing the funding for the Steering Group on District Arts;
- (iv) It was opined that the provision from the HAD was insufficient, and that the funding available for other items had been reduced due to the increase in the funding for some established items (e.g. recruitment of staff), resulting in the need to arrange funding transfer among working groups. It was suggested that a letter should be written to the HAD, requesting the department to provide additional resources which were in line with the inflation rate; and
- (v) It was opined that if Tuen Mun District could not spend as much as possible under the limit of over-commitment, the funding would be allocated to other districts.

23. The Chairman said that for better planning, each committee should thoroughly discuss its activity programmes and submit the respective draft budget to the FAPC before the start of the FY.

24. In response to the enquiry on whether the funding could be increased in future, the Secretary said that since the level of over-commitment had not exceeded the cap (i.e. 25% of the total funding) set by the HAD, there would be room for upward adjustment in case of major incidents. However, she continued that the level of over-commitment should not be too high. Otherwise, even if the HAD provided additional funding, it might not be sufficient to settle the payments concerned, which would affect the financial position in the next FY. She added that in case of major incidents, Members could consider other options, such as distribution of leaflets produced by other departments like the Department of Health.

25. District Officer (Tuen Mun) added that the purpose of the HAD to cap the level of over-commitment at 25% of the total funding was to strike a balance between items of the overspending and those of the underspending so as to fully utilise the funding. It was believed that in case of outbreak of community crisis, additional provision might be granted since there was room for upward adjustment of TMDC funds, and the HAD would by then discuss the matter.

26. The Chairman remarked that at present, the estimated over-commitment was

about 16% of the total funding and there was room for upward adjustment. He therefore suggested that views of Members expressed at the meeting should be put on record and discussion on allocation of additional funding should be held after the committees drew up their programmes. A Member, however, opined that a decision should be made on the draft budget under this agenda item, and that if the amount of additional funding proposed by Members was not substantial, it should be granted accordingly. Another Member opined that no funding should be reserved for working groups which had not yet drawn up any activity programmes. The Chairman then directed that Members should discuss the controversial items one by one.

27. Regarding the suggestion to provide an additional funding of \$50,000 to the TTC, the Chairman of the TTC opined that the TTC needed more funding because its work was very important. A Member hoped that the funding concerned could help improve the current traffic condition of Tuen Mun District. The Chairman sought Members' views on whether they supported the provision of an additional funding of \$50,000 to the TTC. Members raised no objection. A Member, however, said that if the funding for the TTC would be increased, then, on parity grounds, funding should also be reserved for the Working Group on Community Crisis Management.

28. In this regard, the Chairman suggested making a tentative allocation of \$50,000 to the Working Group on Community Crisis Management. Members raised no objection.

29. Regarding the suggestion to increase the amount of funding for the Steering Group on District Arts to that of the previous year, its Convenor opined that the funding could help enhance the artistic and cultural qualities of Tuen Mun District. The Chairman pointed out that the amount of funding for the DFMC had been substantial, and the transfer of funding from the Steering Group on District Arts to another working group which was also under the DFMC would not practically affect the overall funding for the DFMC. The Chairman of the DFMC added that the estimated funding for the Steering Group on District Arts was higher than its actual expenditure calculated at the end of the previous FY, and the overall allocation for the DFMC had not been reduced. He also said that adjustment could be made if the funding for the Steering Group could not meet the needs in future. In this regard, the Convenor of the Steering Group pointed out that the use of funding of the previous year, which was an election year, might be different, and it was not fair to reduce the funding for the Steering Group. The Chairman continued that the amount of funding for various working groups/steering groups under the DFMC was higher than their actual expenditure calculated at the end of the previous FY. He opined that resources should be optimally used and believed that an appropriate distribution of funding would be made by the Chairman of the DFMC.

30. As Members had no other views, the Chairman announced that the above revised draft budget (Annex 1) was endorsed and the budget concerned would be submitted to the TMDC for endorsement. The Chairman reiterated that over-committing was not a sound financial management practice and asked the TMDO to relay the suggestion to increase the funding in accordance with the inflation rate to the HAD for its consideration.

**(C) DC Funds Applications (Projects to be Held or Commenced between July 2016 and March 2017)**  
**(FAPC Paper No. 8/2016)**

31. The Chairman remarked that the Secretariat had recommended an allocation of \$402,040 to a total of three funding applications. Since Members had no other views, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the paper. Applications involved funding of \$100,000 or more would be submitted to the TMDC for endorsement.

**VII. Reporting Items (Continued)**

**(B) Cases on Cancellation of Reimbursement of DC Funds**  
**(FAPC Paper No. 10/2016)**  
**(Paper No. 2 on Table)**

32. The Chairman said that there were three cases of cancellation of funding of activity. Funding for the first two activities had been cancelled because the organisers had, without any reasonable excuse, failed to complete the reimbursement procedures within the two month time upon the completion of the activities. In this regard, the Secretariat had repeatedly reminded the organisers to submit vouchers but the organisers had not taken any follow-up actions accordingly.

33. The Chairman continued that the organiser of the third activity had changed the date of activity from 20 December 2015 to 28 February 2016 without applying for approval before the commencement of the activity, which had violated the requirements of the Tuen Mun District Council Funding Guidelines (“Funding Guidelines”). Moreover, according to the Manual of the Use of District Council Funds issued by the HAD, a DC could only commit items of expenditure within its existing term. As the activity had been postponed to the new DC term, even if the organiser had applied for change of date of activity before the commencement of the activity, approval would not be granted. Due to the above reasons, the funding for the activity had been cancelled.

34. The Chairman added that the organiser had lodged an appeal afterwards, saying that it had not submitted the application on time because of negligence, and that as a non-profit making organisation, it did not have any source of funding, and therefore hoped that the expenses could be reimbursed. In this regard, the Chairman said that since the activity had violated two requirements in respect of DC funds, the organiser should be held responsible for its mistake. As the activity had been endorsed by the last-term TMDC, it could not be allowed to be postponed to the current term. He also indicated that other organisers had also enquired on the postponement of activity to the new DC term, and they had been informed that such arrangement would not be accepted. Therefore, on parity grounds, all organisers should be treated equally.

35. The Chairman asked the Members assisting the organiser in lodging the appeal whether they had anything to add. One of them said that he had rendered support to the organiser in lodging the appeal because he had thought at first that there was nothing wrong to change the date of activity.

36. The Chairman remarked that since the organiser had violated the requirements in respect of DC Funds and to avoid setting a precedent, the funding for the activity

had to be cancelled. As other Members did not have any views, the Chairman announced that the original arrangement, i.e. cancelling the funding for the activity should be maintained.

**VIII. Any Other Business and Date of Meeting**

37. There being no other business, the Chairman announced the close of meeting at 11:14 a.m. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 17 June 2016 (Friday).

Tuen Mun District Council Secretariat

Date: 18 May 2016

Ref: HAD TM DC/13/25/FAPC/16