

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2) 2457/01-02
(These minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Ref : CB2/HS/1/00

**Subcommittee to follow up the outstanding capital works projects
of the former municipal councils**

Minutes of Meeting
held on Thursday, 10 January 2002 at 8:30 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members Present : Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP (Chairman)
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

Members Absent : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon WONG Sing-chi

Public Officers Attending : Agenda items II(a) & (b)

Mrs Stella HUNG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A)

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 2

Mrs Marion LAI
Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
(Administration and Development)

Mr HUNG Chi-pai

Assistant Director (Operations) 1
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mrs Angel CHOI
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr WONG Shiu-kwan
Project Director 3
Architectural Services Department

Mr LING Kar-kan
District Planning Officer/Hong Kong
Planning Department

Agenda item II(c)

Ms Eva TO
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Recreation and Sport)

Mr Michael LEUNG
Acting Chief Executive Officer (Sport Policy Review)
Home Affairs Bureau

Ms Pamela CHAN
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Daniel MAK
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr WONG Shiu-kwan
Project Director 3
Architectural Services Department

Clerk in Attendance : Mrs Constance LI
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)5

Staff in Attendance : Miss Betty MA
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)1

Action

I Confirmation of minutes of meeting

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 810/01-02]

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2001 were confirmed.

II Administration's response to concerns raised by members at the meeting on 15 November 2001

(a) Retro-fitting of air-conditioning to 19 existing markets and/or cooked food centres

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 798/01-02(01)]

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 55/01-02(01) & CB(2) 353/01-02(01)]

2. Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (DS(EF)) said that the Administration had further reviewed the implementation timetable for the 19 retro-fitting of air-conditioning projects, and the revised timetable was provided at the Annex to the Administration's paper. She stressed that the revised timetable was drawn up in consultation with the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and the relevant consultants, and there was not much room for further compressing the implementation timetable. DS(EF) further said that the consultants had just provided the schematic design of the projects for approval by ArchSD. She said that the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had already started consulting the relevant District Councils (DCs) on the proposed projects and would brief the Market Management Consultative Committee (MMCC) as soon as possible.

3. Members noted that the implementation date of the 19 projects was advanced for about two to three months, as compared to the previous plan submitted to the Administration.

4. Mr Fred LI expressed concern that as consultants had been appointed for carrying out the retro-fitting works, consultancy fees might be wasted if FEHD could not obtain support from 85% of the stall lessees concerned for the projects.

5. Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Administration and Development) (DD(A&D)) responded that FEHD had discussed with the Finance Bureau the scenario described by Mr Fred LI. The consultants were required at the initial stage to prepare the schematic design only, to facilitate consultation with the DCs and MMCC. The consultants would proceed with the detailed design only after the necessary consent had been obtained from the stall lessees concerned.

6. Mr Albert CHAN said that most stall lessees would not be prepared to bear the additional recurrent costs for air-conditioning. He suggested that the Administration might first consult the stall lessees on the general arrangements before incurring any expenses for engaging consultants to prepare the schematic design.

Action

7. DS(EF) said that apart from retro-fitting of air-conditioning to the markets, general improvement works would also be carried out in these markets. As the conditions in individual markets varied, there was practical need to engage consultants to study the feasibility of these improvement proposals. DD(A&D) added that based on past experience, the lessees concerned were very concerned about the impact of the construction works on their stalls. It was only fair that when the Administration consulted them on the projects, details of the project, including how their stalls would be affected by the works, the possible levels of recurrent costs that needed to be borne by them and the operational arrangements during and after the improvement works should be provided to them.

8. In response to Mr Albert CHAN, Project Director 3/ArchSD (ArchSD) said that the consultancy fee for the pre-construction work of each project was in the region of \$3 million to \$4 million, and the schematic design only represented a small part of the contract.

9. Mr Albert CHAN remained concerned that the preparatory work of the consultant would be wasted if there was no majority consent from the stall lessees concerned. He said that according to a survey conducted by him, about 70% of the respondents objected to the projects if they were required to bear the recurrent costs of air-conditioning. Mr CHAN reiterated that the Administration should consult the stall lessees whether they agreed in principle to the proposed projects in the first instance before engaging consultants for the projects. He said that only those projects with majority support should proceed. Mr CHAN also requested the Administration to provide a breakdown of consultancy fees for these projects.

Admin

10. DD(A&D) explained that it was necessary to have clear information such as the recurrent costs to be borne by each stall, and the number of stalls which would be affected by the proposed works, for consultation with the stall lessees. She said that the Administration would be responsible for the project costs. She assured members that the Administration would exercise care and prudence in spending public money in proceeding with these projects.

11. Mr Albert CHAN said that he was not convinced of the Administration's approach in taking forward the projects and in consulting the stall lessees. He further said that if it was eventually proved that public money was wasted in the engagement of consultants for these projects, the Director of Audit should be invited to look into the matter. Mr IP Kwok-him also expressed similar concerns. He pointed out that the stall lessees were more concerned about the recurrent cost implications of air-conditioning than the short-term impact of the construction works on their stalls. He considered that the Administration should provide a reference figure to the lessees based on the recurrent costs of the existing air-conditioned public markets.

12. Mr IP Kwok-him said that while he agreed that a project should not be taken forward if stall lessees affected did not support the proposed retro-fitting works, the need for retro-fitting of air-conditioning varied substantially among individual

Action

markets. To his knowledge, there was a pressing need for the project in the Central and Western district. To avoid wasting public money and holding up the projects which were ready to proceed, Mr IP agreed with Mr Albert CHAN that it would be useful to conduct a preliminary consultation with the affected stall lessees on their willingness to bear the recurrent costs for air-conditioning, before the consultants actually started work. Mr IP considered that details of the projects could be provided to the stall lessees at a later stage if they indicated agreement in principle to the proposals.

13. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that there had been protracted discussion on the implementation timetable of the 19 projects because of the bureaucratic approach of the Administration in taking forward these projects. Miss CHAN queried whether the lead time for preparation of detailed design, working drawings and tender documents, etc. could be further shortened by means such as engaging more consultants to work concurrently. She said that she could not understand why these projects, which were relatively not complicated, should take such a long time to materialise.

14. PD3/ArchSD responded that all the 19 projects would be contracted out and eight packages of consultants (comprising architects, electrical and mechanical engineers, structural engineers and quantity surveyors) would be engaged to expedite the work. He pointed out that the preparation of detailed design, working drawings and tender documents were carried out by different streams of professionals, and the timetable was drawn up after detailed discussion with the consultants concerned. As the total project costs of the 19 projects amounted to some \$2 billion, the tender documents involved were complex. PD3/ArchSD said that refurbishment of existing facilities were often no easier than constructing new facilities because of the physical constraints of the markets. Moreover, the project scope and detailed design might have to be revised after consulting the stall lessees concerned. The consultants were therefore working under a very tight schedule in respect of the 19 projects, and there would not be much room for further compressing the implementation timetable.

15. Mr Fred LI suggested that improvements to the signage and lighting of the markets should be included in the projects, in order to improve the business environment of public markets. PD3/ArchSD responded that improvements to the signage and lighting inside the markets were already included in the project scope, but those on the periphery of markets would need discussion with the Highways Department.

Admin

Action

16. Mr WONG Yung-kan expressed concern that the markets would still face keen competition from the superstores in the vicinity, even the improvement works and retro-fitting of air-conditioning were carried out for the markets. He asked whether the Administration would take into account the long-term viability of these public markets when deciding whether to proceed with the improvement projects. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked whether the Administration would make reference to the design of superstores when carrying out improvement works to public markets, in order to enhance their competitiveness.

17. DD(A&D) responded that the Administration hoped to enhance the business environment of the 19 markets/cooked food centres concerned through implementation of the proposed retro-fitting of air-conditioning and upgrading works. PD3/ArchSD added that the design for improvement works in the 19 markets/cooked food centres was based on present-day standards.

18. Mr Albert CHAN said that he had stated his position in paragraph 11 above. If the Administration decided to take these projects forward in the manner proposed, it should bear the responsibility for wasting public money for the engagement of consultants, should the stall lessees concerned eventually decide not to support the projects.

(b) Progress of Stanley Complex

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 798/01-02(02)]

19. DD(A&D) said that in response to concerns raised by members, the Administration had provided the background for revising the project scope of the Stanley Complex project and the views of the Southern DC on the revised project scope.

20. Regarding the demand for market facilities in Stanley, DD(A&D) said that there was a temporary market which was opened in January 2000, providing 24 market stalls including meat, fish, vegetable, grocery and poultry stalls of up-to-date standards and design. It was conveniently located and was accessible from the Stanley Main Street and Ma Hang Estate. The temporary market was about three minutes' walking distance from the proposed site of the Stanley Complex.

21. DD(A&D) added that Stanley would continue to be developed as a resort outlet and a low-density residential area, and the population intake had stabilized. The existing market facilities there should be adequate to meet demands in the area.

22. Mr IP Kwok-him referred to a previous letter from Dr YEUNG Sum requesting inclusion of market facilities in the Stanley Complex and said that the question was whether market facilities should be provided in the proposed Stanley Complex. He said that he also received similar requests from residents in the Stanley area. He pointed out that despite the availability of a superstore in the district, the Chinese residents still preferred to buy fish, fresh meat, poultry and vegetables from markets.

Action

As the site presently occupied by the Stanley temporary market was not earmarked for other uses in the next few years, Mr IP asked whether the Administration would consider converting the temporary market to a permanent market on the present site.

23. DD(A&D) responded that the Stanley Temporary Market would continue to exist for some time. She said that the Administration would pursue the proposal for a permanent public market in Stanley only if there was evidence for such a need. She added that in planning a public market, the overriding consideration would be its viability, according to the Director of Audit's recommendation made in his Report "Value for Money Audit Report on Urban Council Public Market" published in 1997.

24. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that although the patronage level of the Stanley Temporary Market was not very high, she believed that the viability of the temporary market could be enhanced if the Administration took a proactive approach to improve the business environment of the market. Mr Albert CHAN expressed similar views. Miss CHAN Yuen-han also suggested that as the Stanley Temporary Market was occupying a scenic site, a Seattle-style seafront market could be built on the site to attract tourists.

25. DD(A&D) said that the Administration had a similar thinking as that of Miss CHAN. She pointed out that to enhance the viability of the temporary market, the Administration was actively exploring ways to improve the conditions of the market and to enrich the scope of commodities and services provided thereat. DS(EF) said that her bureau and FEHD had held preliminary discussion with the Tourism Commission and Planning Department on how to better use the area in line with the development of Stanley.

26. Miss CHAN Yuen-han commented that the Administration should make full use of the location and panoramic view of the Stanley Temporary Market in further developing the district into a tourist area.

27. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that to design a market for the purpose of attracting tourists was different from that for meeting the local demand for market facilities. He said that the previous Stanley Market which had been demolished was more accessible as it was situated in the Main Street and had parking facilities. However, the temporary market was less accessible and this had adversely affected its business. Mr CHAN further said that the viability of public markets depended largely on Government policy, such as whether the market was located at densely populated area and was easily accessible. Mr CHAN added that the patronage level and business turnover of the Yeung Uk Road Market were very high, despite the fact that there were several superstores nearby. It was because the market was conveniently located and it offered a great variety of goods at competitive prices.

28. The Chairman noted from the record of the Southern DC meeting on 28 June 2001 that beautification works would be carried out in respect of the rooftop of the

Action

Stanley Complex, but it would not be open to the public. The Chairman sought clarification on the target users for the rooftop.

29. Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1/Leisure and Cultural Services Department (CEO(P)1/LCSD) clarified that the Administration was exploring ways to further develop Stanley as a tourist attraction. The construction of a rooftop garden at the Stanley Complex was one of the feasible options under consideration.

(c) Accelerated Programme for capital works projects involving leisure and cultural services facilities

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 798/01-02(03) & CB(2) 353/01-02(02)]

30. Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport) (PAS(HA)) said that as requested by members, the Administration had further reviewed the Accelerated Programme for Capital Works Projects involving Leisure and Cultural Facilities. After careful review, the Administration considered it feasible to further advance the implementation dates for four projects, the details of which were provided in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2) 798/01-02(03)]. She further said that the Administration would monitor closely the progress of projects within the Accelerated Programme to see if there was any scope to further advance the programme as a result of new development or change in circumstances.

Implementation timetable

31. The Chairman asked whether the implementation timetable of projects included in the Accelerated Programme had actually been "advanced", when compared with that approved by the two former Provisional Municipal Councils (PMCs).

32. Mr Albert CHAN said that it was misleading for the Administration to state that the implementation of some ex-PMC projects had been advanced. He further said that the Administration had still not provided a comparison on the project commencement and completion dates as approved by the former PMCs and the revised dates proposed by the Administration, despite his repeated requests. He further said that as far as he was aware, most of the projects included in the Accelerated Programme were in fact much delayed when compared to the original implementation timetable of the two ex-PMCs. To facilitate members to review the implementation progress of the ex-PMC projects, Mr CHAN strongly requested the Administration to provide members with details of all outstanding projects in tabular form, showing the project nature, the project costs, the original estimated project commencement and completion dates as approved by the former PMCs, the revised commencement and completion dates proposed by the Administration, and the reasons for not being able to adhere to the PMC timetable. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed support for the request.

33. PAS(HA) said that only tentative dates had been proposed by the PMCs for many of these outstanding ex-PMC projects, as they were still at a relatively early

Action

stage of development. She also said that the procedures for taking forward these projects by the Administration were different from that of the PMCs.

34. Mr Albert CHAN disagreed with PAS(HA)'s response. He said that the estimated commencement and completion dates of individual projects, as well as details on the proposed facilities and project costs were included in the five-year plans of the respective PMCs. Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr WONG Yung-kan agreed with Mr Albert CHAN that the information requested should be provided by the Administration. At the request of the Chairman, PAS(HA) agreed to provide the information as far as practicable.

Admin

35. Mr IP Kwok-him asked the Administration to explain the meaning of "original works start dates". CEO(P)1/LCSD clarified that these referred to the original start dates proposed by the Administration prior to the proposal of advancing these projects.

36. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that while she appreciated the efforts made by the Administration in further advancing the implementation of some projects, she hoped that the pre-construction preparatory work of individual projects beyond 2003, and not only those for 2002, could also be advanced.

37. PD3/ArchSD said that his department had already started the preparatory work for these projects as far as practicable. For example, discussion was held with Government Property Agency (GPA) in respect of the plot ratio for building projects and identification of joint users as early as possible, to facilitate planning of the facilities to be included in such projects. PD3/ArchSD further said that sometimes the sites for individual projects could not be released earlier as they were temporarily used for other purposes, e.g. as construction site offices.

38. CEO(P)1/LCSD added that the reasons for not being able to take forward specific projects were listed in the Annexures to the Administration's paper for the Subcommittee's last meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)353/01-02(02)]. She said that LCSD would make efforts to take forward the projects in the Accelerated Programme as early as possible. For instance, to facilitate the construction of a Complex, LCSD would assist the joint users in securing funding for their respective project cost. Moreover, the more straightforward open space projects were already included in the early part of the Accelerated Programme.

39. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that he was still not happy with the progress made by the Administration. Referring to the Administration's proposals, Mr WONG raised the following queries -

- (a) whether the Territory Development Department (TDD) could surrender the site for District Open Area 40A in Tseung Kwan O earlier so that the project could be advanced;

Action

- (b) why the golf course in Shuen Wan Landfill in Tai Po could not start earlier given that the site was already available;
- (c) why two years would be required for conducting an environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the improvement works to the Jockey Club Wong Shek Water Sports Centre; and
- (d) why the territory-wide renovation for libraries could not be advanced.

40. Chief Executive Officer (Planning)2/LCSD (CEO(P)2/LCSD) provided the following response -

- (a) The site for the District Open Space Area 40A in Tseung Kwan O was currently used by the Mass Transit Railway Corporation (MTRC). TDD had originally intended to use the site as its temporary works area after it was handed back by MTRC, but TDD had now decided to surrender the site. The project could therefore be advanced to start in 2004 instead of 2006.
- (b) Regarding the improvement to the Jockey Club Wong Shek Water Sports Centre, an EIA was required because part of the seawall within the centre had collapsed and needed to be re-instated. The project would be taken forward after the EIA issue was resolved. To expedite the project implementation, the project would be entrusted to an expert department, i.e. Civil Engineering Services Department.
- (c) LCSD had appointed the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to act as the works agent for golf course in Shuen Wan Landfill in Tai Po because of its experience in preventing and abating environmental problems in landfills. EPD did not recommend further advancement of the project.
- (d) As the renovation programme for libraries involved more than ten libraries, separate assessments had to be carried out for individual libraries. To expedite renovation and avoid a large number of libraries being closed at the same time, the project would be implemented by phases.

41. Mr LAU Ping-cheung said that he was disappointed with the progress of the ex-PMC projects, as only four projects would be advanced for implementation, and two of these projects were only minor works projects. He considered that the few projects could not help create many jobs and this was not in line with what the Chief Executive had pledged in his Policy Address 2002. As regards the two projects which had been advanced for implementation, Mr LAU asked whether funds had already been secured.

42. PD3/ArchSD replied that the pre-construction work of the two projects were carried out in-house by ArchSD, and the schematic design had been completed. His department was now preparing the detailed design. He informed members that funds had been reserved for these two projects which were now in Category B. The

Action

Administration planned to submit the project to Public Works Subcommittee for endorsement and the Finance Committee (FC) for funding approval shortly.

43. Mr LAU Ping-cheung expressed doubts that the Administration could adhere to the implementation timetable since funding approval had yet to be obtained. Referring to the Sports Ground, Town Park and Indoor Recreation Centre in Area 45 in Tseung Kwan O, Mr LAU asked about the reasons for not being able to take the project forward at an earlier date, since Government projects were exempt from approval for working drawings.

44. PD3/ArchSD said that as the project was a joint-user Complex, problems such as plot ratio and identification of joint-users would need to be resolved. CEO(P)2/LCSD added that LCSD was actively discussing with other departments in identifying joint-users for the building. He said that if it was unable to find other joint-users after a period of time, LCSD would apply to Finance Bureau (FB) for exemption from achieving the optimal plot ratio.

45. In response to the Chairman, PAS(HA) said that plot ratio was the greatest problem in proceeding with joint-user buildings, because many departments did not consider that leisure and cultural service facilities were compatible to government offices and the location of such buildings might not be suitable. Moreover, the potential joint-users might not be able to secure funding at the same pace as the LCSD facilities. The problem had been reflected to GPA. The current position was that subject to the approval of GPA and FB, LCSD could put up a case for proceeding with a particular building project even if the maximum plot ratio could not be reached.

46. Mr LAU Ping-cheung commented that in order not to delay the implementation of joint-user buildings, a deadline should be set for the process of identifying joint users. The Administration noted the comments.

Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park

47. Mr IP Kwok-him noted that the proposed Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park in the Central and Western District was scheduled for commencement in March 2007 and LCSD had not recommended advancement of the project because the site boundary had been revised for better accessibility and part of the site would not be available until 2007. Mr IP said that he was not convinced of these reasons, as the site had been left idle for many years. He pointed out that the Central and Western DC had made strong request for expedition of the project.

48. CEO(P)1/LCSD explained that although the site was available, the Administration was considering developing facilities to link up the site with the nearby buildings. As the plan was not yet finalised, the Administration did not propose to advance the project for the time being. She said that temporary facilities would also be developed in addition to the indoor recreation centre and temporary open space

Action

provided near the site. The Administration would keep the project under review, and would advance the programme if possible.

Tin Shui Wai District Library

49. Mr Albert CHAN noted that the annual rental cost for the temporary Tin Shui Wai Library (including management and air-conditioning charges) amounted to \$7.2 million. He pointed out that the former Provisional Regional Council had approved the provision of a permanent library in Tin Shui Wai which was scheduled at that time to commence in 1995. Because of the delay in taking forward the project, additional rental cost had to be incurred for the provision of a temporary library. Mr CHAN considered the proposed implementation timetable for the Tin Shui Wai District Library unacceptable and he strongly requested for an explanation for the delay. He held the view that the matter would warrant examination by the Director of Audit if the responsible department(s) could not provide a satisfactory explanation.

50. CEO(P)2/LCSD said that LCSD recognised the strong demand for library services in Tin Shui Wai, and therefore a temporary library had been provided on leased premises since October 2001, with the support of Yuen Long DC. He further said that Yuen Long DC had also agreed that after the provision of a temporary library in Tin Shui Wai, priority should be given to the construction of a district library in Yuen Long. Moreover, there were problems in identifying joint users and attaining the optimal plot ratio in the proposed Tin Shui Wai District library. Further advancement of the project was therefore not recommended at the moment.

51. Mr Albert CHAN was not satisfied with the Administration's explanation. He commented that Yuen Long DC supported the provision of a temporary library only as an interim measure to meet the strong demand for library services pending the construction of a permanent library. Mr CHAN urged the Administration to seriously re-consider advancing the implementation timetable for the Tin Shui Wai District Library. He suggested that the Chairman should write to the Chief Secretary for Administration (CS) relaying members' concern about the delay in implementing the project, if the Administration could not provide a satisfactory explanation on the matter.

52. The Chairman said that he was Chairman of Yuen Long DC. He advised that Yuen Long DC members were in support of both library projects in Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai. The temporary library for Tin Shui Wai was supported because the permanent library could not commence on schedule due to the economic downturn at the time.

Action

53. Mr WONG Yung-kan concurred with Mr Albert CHAN and the Chairman. Mr WONG further said that the Administration should also provide a long-term plan for the Tai Po Temporary Market which had remained "temporary" for many years.

Way forward

54. Miss CHAN Yuen-han agreed with Mr Albert CHAN that the Chairman of the Subcommittee should write to CS to relay members' dissatisfaction about the slow progress made in respect of the ex-PMC projects due to red tapes of the Administration. Miss CHAN urged the Administration to ensure timely commencement of the projects as proposed in the revised Accelerated Programme, since some of these projects were advanced only after painful efforts of the Subcommittee. She said that any further delay in implementing the projects was totally unacceptable.

Clerk

55. Mr LAU Ping-cheung said that as the plot ratio was a primary consideration for not taking forward a number of building projects, the representatives of GPA should be invited to attend the next Subcommittee's meeting. Members agreed.

Admin

56. Regarding Mr Albert CHAN's proposal that the Chairman should write to CS, the Chairman suggested that the Administration should first provide members with information on the status of 149 ex-PMC projects involving leisure and cultural facilities, including the estimated project commencement and completion dates as approved by the former PMCs, the revised project commencement and completion dates proposed by the Administration, the reasons for not being able to adhere to the PMC timetable, and reasons for not according priority to those projects which were not included in the Accelerated Programme. The Chairman said that members would take a decision on Mr Albert CHAN's proposal after considering the supplementary information to be provided by the Administration. Members agreed.

Clerk

57. Miss CHAN Yuen-han also requested the Clerk to provide a chart showing the position of those projects which had not been recommended for further advancement.

58. Responding to Mr WONG Yung-kan, PAS(HA) said that the Administration expected that the "Consultancy Study for the Provision of Regional/District Cultural and Performance Facilities in Hong Kong" would be completed in mid-2002.

59. Members agreed to hold the next meeting in early March 2002.

(Post-meeting note : The next meeting would be held on 7 March 2002 at 8:30 am.)

60. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:33 am.