立法會
Legislative Council

Ref. : CB1/PL/ITB

Panel on Information Technology and Broadcasting

Meeting on 8 April 2002

Information note on
Members' concerns about tenancy matters at the Cyberport

Purpose

      This note recaps major views and concerns expressed by Members on tenancy matters of the Cyberport.

Background

2.   The Panel has been receiving periodic progress reports on the Cyberport project from the Administration. On tenancy matters, members have noted that a Committee on Admission of Cyberport Office Tenants (CACOT) was set up in March 2001 to advise on matters relating to the selection and admission of office tenants. On 20 April 2001, the Administration announced its invitation to IT companies to apply for tenancy for all the phases of the Cyberport.

3.   At the Panel meeting on 8 February 2002, members were informed that a total of 79 tenancy applications had been received and their required accommodation accounted for 94% of the total lettable floor area (of 87 500m^2) in different phases of the Cyberport. The expected fitting out date for tenants of the first phase (CI) of the Cyberport would be 2 April 2002.

Discussion at Legislative Council meeting

4.   Arising from an oral question by Mr Abraham SHEK at the meeting of the Council on 19 December 2001, Members raised supplementary questions and expressed concern about the tenancy take-up rate of the Cyberport in the wake of the September 11 incident, the supply and demand for office space, the effectiveness or otherwise of the Pacific Century Group (PCG) in marketing the Cyberport, the profiles of prospective Cyberport tenants and the rental level.

5.   The Administration assured members that it would closely monitor the tenancy situation of the Cyberport in the light of changing economic conditions and confirmed that PCG had the role of a marketing agent and had in fact brought in a number of interested companies through its marketing activities. The rental at Cyberport had been set on the advice of a consultant having regard to market levels.   The Administration also agreed to release more details on individual tenants after they had moved into the Cyberport.

6.   The official record of proceedings detailing the questions and answers is at **Appendix I**.

Discussion at Panel

7.   During the last and current sessions, the Panel has been briefed on the Cyberport project on 11 December 2000, 9 July 2001 and 8 February 2002.

8.   The Panel was keen to ensure that the project would serve its intended objective of creating a strategic cluster of IT/IS companies instead of competing with other developers in offering quality office premises.   They were therefore concerned about whether the prospective Cyberport tenants were setting up their new offices in the Cyberport, or merely relocating their existing offices from elsewhere in Hong Kong. Some members also questioned whether there was an element of government subsidy in the rental of the Cyberport offices.   In response, the Administration said that there was no question of government subsidy as the announced monthly rental of HK$11 to HK$13 per ft^2 lettable as recommended by an independent consultant was comparable to similar facilities in other countries.

9.   On whether priority would be given to overseas IT companies which established their offices in Hong Kong for the first time by becoming a Cyberport tenant, the Administration advised that pursuant to the objective of the Cyberport, IT companies which planned to establish their regional headquarters in the Cyberport would probably be given priority.   Regarding members' request for more information about the applicant companies, the Administration considered it more appropriate to release the details at a later stage when the companies had moved into the Cyberport.

10.   At the Panel meeting on 8 February 2002, members were informed that on the advice of CACOT, the University of Hong Kong had been selected to operate the Cyberport Institute in the Cyberport. A member raised concern as to whether the Cyberport Institute was compatible with the original objective of the Cyberport.   The Administration responded in the affirmative and made reference to the Report of the Taskforce on IT Manpower published in July 2001 which supported the implementation of an academic plan in the Cyberport.   It undertook to provide further information on the Cyberport Institute such as its funding arrangements as soon as available.

Latest position

11.   As at 3 April 2002, three companies have confirmed their tenancy in CI of the Cyberport Portion.   They are PCCW Services Ltd., GEIS International Inc. and Sonera SmartTrust Ltd..

Legislative Council Secretariat
6 April 2002

甄選數碼港租戶
Selection of Tenants of Cyberport

1.   **MR ABRAHAM SHEK**: *Madam President, when the Cyberport project was announced in early 1999, the Administration claimed that the project aimed "to create a cluster of leading information technology (IT) and services companies and a critical mass of professional talents in Hong Kong in the shortest possible time". Also, it was reported in November 2001 that the Government now aims to fill the Cyberport with a balanced mix of large and medium-sized, local and international IT firms. In this connection, will the Administration inform this Council of:*

> *(a)   the measures in place to ensure that the tenant selection process is open and transparent;*

> *(b)   the measures to ensure that the selected tenants are indeed leading companies committed to developing new and leading-edge applications of IT; and*

> *(c)   the respective up-to-date numbers of tenancy applications made by large, medium-sized, local and international companies?*

SECRETARY FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND BROADCASTING: Madam President,

> (a)   Companies interested in becoming Cyberport office tenants are required to submit formal applications on the basis of a standard application form. This application form and its accompanying guide to applicants, which were promulgated in April this year, have been widely distributed to local and overseas IT companies. An electronic version is also readily available at our websites.

> Each of the applications is put to the Committee on Admission of Cyberport Office Tenants (CACOT) for consideration. This Committee comprises seven core members, including a local member who is Professor Charles KAO; three international

members who are Dr Jeremy FAIRBROTHER from Cambridge University, Professor John O'CALLAGHAN from Australian National University and Professor Victor ZUE from Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and three technical members who are the Director-General of Telecommunications, Director of Information Technology Services and Director of Lands.

We have promised the applicants that the information provided in connection with their applications will be treated in the strictest confidence by us and used only for the processing of the applications. We will, therefore, not discuss individual applications publicly. However, the mechanism for selecting the Cyberport office tenants has been widely publicized, both locally and overseas. We have presented the mechanism to the Information Infrastructure Advisory Committee which comprises members from the academia, IT industry and other business sectors. We have also made various presentations to the IT companies and IT associations. The mechanism is generally accepted to be open and transparent.

(b)   A company applying for office space at the Cyberport needs to provide sufficient information to satisfy the CACOT that its Cyberport operation will fit in with the Cyberport which, as stated in the guide to applicants, is a technology-themed project with its focus on IT, information services, multimedia content creation and related sectors. With this in mind, our seven core CACOT members consider each of the applications on its own merits.

(c)   The Cyberport will open in phases between early-2002 and end-2003 to provide altogether about 110 000 sq m of office space to accommodate over 100 companies. We have so far received 72 applications from companies interested to move into the various phases of the Cyberport development.

We have made it clear in our guide to applicants that companies of varying sizes and at different stages of development are welcome, subject to their Cyberport operations fitting in with the profile of the Cyberport project as I have just referred to in part (b) of my reply.

It would not be particularly meaningful to classify the 72 applicant companies into large or medium-sized companies. Even if we were to make such an attempt, the results could well be misleading, bearing in mind that the size of an applicant company itself could well be different from the scale of its Cyberport operation. For example, a large company which applies for a modest office space at the Cyberport could be wrongly classified as a small-sized company if we were to take into account only the scale of its Cyberport operation.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK: *Madam President, I would like to ask the Secretary how many of these 72 applicant companies are existing Hong Kong companies and how many are new companies attracted from overseas?*

SECRETARY FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND BROADCASTING: Madam President, we do not have a breakdown in respect of where these companies come from or whether they are already operating in Hong Kong. The important point is that we want to attract companies of different sizes and at different stages of development to operate in the Cyberport, as long as they fit in with the theme of our Cyberport project.

吳亮星議員：*主席，九一一事件引起全球各類經濟相對的變化，在數碼港計劃方面，有否因為九一一事件而在出租條件方面作出相應調整，或其出租率有否受到影響呢？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，我們是密切注視九一一事件對我們的影響，可幸到目前為止，在出租第一期數碼港寫字樓時，仍出現求過於供的情況，所以我們的態度是審慎樂觀的。

陳智思議員：*主席，局長在主體答覆提到 72 份申請，請問申請租用第一期寫字樓的公司中，主要是經營甚麼行業、打算在香港投資多少資金，以及可製造多少就業機會呢？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，在第一期寫字樓方面，我們吸引了不同種類和活動的公司，業務包括資訊科技、多媒體創作及資訊服務等，它們大致都符合我們的要求。至於公司的投資額，這不是我們的申請條件之一；我們只要求有關公司提供某些資料，以確保它們有一定的營運資金，以及所從事的行業符合數碼港的主題。因此，我們沒有這麼全面的資料。

余若薇議員：*主席，政府說希望吸引一些一流的資訊科技服務公司，又說希望吸引不同類別的大、中、小型公司。不過，我們從主體答覆的第(三)部分看到，政府本來預期有 100 間公司，但截至目前只收到 72 份租用申請；如果政府希望能有所選擇，則申請者須多於可出租的單位，但現在似乎是申請者少於可出租的單位。請問政府現時採取甚麼措施來吸引更多租用申請，令政府有所選擇，以達到擁有大、中、小型公司及一流資訊科技的目的？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，正如我在主體答覆所說，由於數碼港是分階段完成的，所以即使我們現在只接到 72 份申請，但如果我們能配合宣傳，以及在吸引力方面做得更好，我相信是會繼續接到新的申請的。我想澄清，有關申請是沒有截止日期的。再者，可能某些公司會在數碼港落成前半年才提出申請，我不排除一些公司會有這樣的想法。

　　至於余議員提及我們採用甚麼方法吸引更多人租用數碼港寫字樓的問題，我們會繼續進行海外宣傳活動，而在軟件配套設施方面，我們現有一些多媒體的試驗室和公用設施，以吸引小規模公司在這裏運作。此外，在培訓方面，我們除了利用數碼港從事資訊科技活動外，亦會令它成為人才匯聚的中心，就這方面，我們將會推出新的計劃。

劉炳章議員：*主席，請問政府，數碼港與科技園之間有否出現重疊的問題，尤其在客戶及租金釐定方面有否重疊？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，我聽不清楚劉議員的補充質詢，劉議員是否問此計劃如何與科技園重疊呢？

劉炳章議員：*主席，我想請問政府，數碼港在客戶及租金釐定方面，會否出現與科技園重疊的情況？若有，政府如何協調？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，是不會出現重疊的情況，因為兩者對客戶具有不同的吸引力。科技園的層面較為廣闊，可吸引一些資訊科技以外的高科技公司；而數碼港的重心則在於資訊科技、資訊服務、多媒體創作和有關的界別等方面。

單仲偕議員：*主席，當年宣傳數碼港時，當時的財政司司長，即今天的政務司司長曾強調為何會把這項目交給電訊盈科發展，理由是電訊盈科的國際網絡能夠引入一些國際機構來港發展。請問政府，今天如何評估電訊盈科能否履行當時向政府作出的承諾，即引入一些國際機構來港發展呢？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，答案是正面的，因為有很多客戶是透過電訊盈科的推廣活動而來港發展的。電訊盈科有確定的責任推廣數碼港，以及帶回一些新的申請者。

單仲偕議員：*請問能否履行當年的承諾？政府有否評估有關情況？*

主席：局長，你是否有所補充？

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，我沒有甚麼補充了。我們主要曾評估電訊盈科有否盡力推行推廣活動和帶來新的客戶，而答案是電訊盈科能夠履行這項承諾。

馬逢國議員：*主席，我想請問政府有否評估該 72 間公司可招聘的職員數額是多少呢？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，這不是我們其中一項對申請者的規定，或申請者須履行的一項服務承諾，所以我們並沒有有關數據。如果是一些初次來港的全新公司，則這些公司的新聘人員數額當然是很容易估計的；但實際上，一些資訊科技公司已在香港運作，有些只是把業務擴充，所以在估計新聘職員方面會有困難。不過，其實作出這樣的評估並不可以達到任何特別的目的，因此我們主要是把精力花在吸引租戶到數碼港，從事數碼港的主題活動方面。

李家祥議員：*主席，政府在主體答覆第(一)部分的末段，強調有關申請機制
是公開和具透明度，這點我並不質疑；但質詢的原意是希望政府在作出有關
決定時，以及最後的決定和結果都必須公開和具透明度，但我卻覺得這方面
是完全不公開的。舉例來說，一些商業大廈的最後租約是會經過登記的程
序，讓人知道那些公司或集團的背景、一般業務，甚至租用的條件等。既然
數碼港是動用公帑來興建，我想理解在有關寫字樓租出後，政府會於何時或
會否公開租戶的有關條件，讓公眾知道政府的最後決定能符合其目標？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，待所有的租約都簽署妥當，數碼港的租戶均
遷入數碼港後，我們會將有關的資料公開；只是在現階段，我們必須尊重我
們和申請者的協議，所以有關資料是不可以公開的，但政府會定期在資訊科
技及廣播事務委員會內向議員提供所需的資料。

李家祥議員：*主席，我想問的是，甚麼資料可以公開呢？*

主席：局長，你是否有所補充？

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，有關資料是公司名稱、所從事的活動等。

何鍾泰議員：*主席，局長剛才在回應劉炳章議員時說，科技園的範圍比較廣
闊，所以有關客戶通常不會只屬於資訊科技方面的，這是否表示，如有屬資
訊科技範疇的申請人想加入科技園，當局便會把他轉介到數碼港？*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，這是很難一概而論的。原則上，我們設有協
調機制，本局和科技園會不時舉行協調會議，以處理個別的個案。舉例來說，
一間屬於資訊科技範疇的電訊公司若想申請租用一些地方以生產晶片，則設
於數碼港還是科技園會較好呢？我們的答案可能是科技園；不過，我們亦須
尊重客戶本身的要求。無論如何，我們是有協調機制，以處理個別個案的。

主席：本會就這項質詢已用了超過16分鐘。現在是最後一項補充質詢。

田北俊議員：*主席，當局在擬定數碼港發展計劃時，談到資訊科技，我們很關注有真正的科技和人才的轉移；其中一項我們關注的問題，是希望那些公司不要把數碼港當作貨倉，只放置硬件作買賣便算。政府在主體答覆的第(三)部分提及有 72 位申請者，如果我們要求取得每間公司的資料，政府當然是不應該回答的；但如果是有關寫字樓的平均租金，則是一項合理的問題，因為若呎價只是數元一呎或 10 元一呎，有關公司便一定把寫字樓當作貨倉，但若要二十多元一呎，便可能真的會有科技轉移的情況了。*

資訊科技及廣播局局長：主席，我們的租金現時是訂在每呎 11 至 13 元，這是透過資深的地產顧問，根據市場的基準而定出的。

主席：第二項質詢。

食環署對零售活雞攤檔的政策
FEHD's Policy on Live Chicken Retail Stalls

2.   **張宇人議員**：*主席，據悉，食物環境衞生署（"食環署"）在終止轄下零售活雞攤檔的租約後，不會把該檔位重新出租作同一用途。就此，政府可否告知本會：*

(一)   食環署何時開始實施這政策，至今涉及多少個檔位，以及這政策是否旨在根除售賣活雞的攤檔；

(二)   香港房屋委員會（"房委會"）及香港房屋協會（"房協"）對轄下售賣活雞攤檔有否實施同一政策；若然，至今涉及多少個檔位；及

(三)   房委會、房協及食環署有否對轄下售賣其他類別的新鮮肉類、海鮮及蔬菜攤檔實施同一政策？

環境食物局局長：主席，

(一)   自食環署成立以來，一直致力改善街市管理，提升街市清潔衞生及改良通風系統。食環署處理空置檔位（包括活禽檔位）時，一般會按個別街市的情況，考慮以下的因素，然後才決定是否把檔位再推出作公開競投：