Panel on Security

List of follow-up actions (position as at 3 June 2004)

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required | Administration's response |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Admission Scheme for Mainland Talents and Professionals | 4 April 2003 (Joint meeting with the Panel on Manpower) | The Administration agreed to provide members with progress reports on the Scheme on a regular basis. | Progress report on the Scheme for the period from 1 November 2003 to 31 March 2004 was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2124/03-04 on 22 April 2004. |
| 2. | Issues relating to right of abode | 16 March 2004 | The Administration was requested to provide - (a) all information relevant to the Administration's estimates in 1999 of the number of Mainland persons with ROA in Hong Kong under BL24(2)(3), including why the Randomised Response Technique was used in the survey instead of the Direct Questioning Method, the interim estimates, the final estimates and the revised estimates after the interpretation of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPCSC) on 26 June 1999; | Response awaited. |

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | | Follow-up action required | Administration's response |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | (b) | information on how the estimates in 1999 were arrived at, how the estimates had changed after NPCSC's interpretation, the latest situation and an assessment of the future situation regarding such Mainland persons; and | Response awaited. |
| | | | (c) | a paper on the information required for assessing the accuracy of the estimates in 1999 of Mainland persons with ROA in Hong Kong, and to set out the arguments, if it was not possible to assess the accuracy of its estimates. | - Ditto - |
| 3. | Implementation of Phase III of the Updated Information Systems Strategy for the Immigration Department (ImmD) | 16 March 2004 | (a) | The Administration was requested to advise on the circumstances under which an incoming electronic mail would be permanently stored in the new system of ImmD, its legal status under local legislation, and whether it fell within the meaning of a record of ImmD in claims for right of abode; and | Response circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2334/03-04 on 12 May 2004. |

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required Administration's response |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | (b) The Administration was requested to provide information on the criteria for classifying an electronic mail as an enquiry or an application and how applications not submitted with the use of suitable forms would be dealt with. Response circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2334/03-04 on 12 May 2004. |
| 4. | Mechanism for review of the List of Recordable Offences | 2 April 2004 | The Administration was requested to - (a) provide the list of some 167 offences which might be recordable by the Police; Response awaited. |
| | | | (b) explain the criteria for recording an offence, including conviction during the serving of a suspended sentence and offences where a heavier sentence would be imposed on reconviction; |
| | | | (c) explain the circumstances under which the court would order that a particular conviction be recorded, the legal basis of such an order and whether such an order was still given by the court; and |

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required Administration's response |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | (d) provide information on the circumstances under which a Certificate of No Criminal Conviction would be issued. |
| 5. | Progress of review of the Interception of Communications Ordinance (IOCO) | 2 April 2004 | The Administration was requested to - (a) provide members with a list of problems associated with IOCO, advise members of the latest development of its work in addressing the problems, inform members of the options being considered and the Administration's inclination on the way forward regarding interception of communications; and |
| | | | (b) provide a paper on - (i) the scope of the Chief Executive's discretion under Article 64 of the Basic Law and section 1(2) of IOCO in deciding whether and when IOCO should come into operation; and |

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required | Administration's response |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | (ii) the criteria for determining whether and when IOCO should come into operation. | |
| 6. | Issues relating to the incident on 2 April 2004 where protestors were removed from the area outside the Central Government Offices | 8 April 2004 | The Administration was requested to - (a) provide the Police's guidelines on Resistance Control Tactics; (b) provide information about the relative timing of the injury of a Police officer and the removal of | Response awaited. - Ditto - |
| | | | reporters by Police officers; (c) confirm whether a government official had contacted a newspaper company at 4:30 am on 2 April 2004 stating that removal action would be taken and requesting it to withdraw its reporters from the spot; | - Ditto - |
| | | | (d) provide information on the sequence of events relating to the requests of protestors and the respective responses of the Administration Wing on 1 and 2 April 2004; and | - Ditto - |

| | Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required Administration's response |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | (e) provide a response on the suggestion that the Police should include in their internal guidelines certain actions and postures, such as "throat-locking" when dragging a person, which should be avoided when carrying out removal actions. |
| 7. | Policy on integrity checking for disciplined forces | 13 May 2004 | The Administration was requested to - (a) advise whether integrity checking on disciplined forces between 2001 and 2003 had resulted in disciplinary actions such as interdiction from duty or |
| | | | termination of employment; - Ditto - (b) provide a comparison between the integrity checking on civil servants and background checks on persons to be appointed to advisory committees and persons to be appointed Justices of the Peace; |

| Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required Administration's response |
|---------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | (c) advise on the government department, besides the Fire Services Department and the Hong Kong Police Force, where the promotion of an officer was denied as a result of information revealed from integrity checking in the past three years; |
| | | (d) provide a paper explaining Ditto - (i) the types of integrity checks applicable to civil servants and other public officers, such as principal officials and the chairmen and members of advisory bodies; |
| | | (ii) the types of integrity checks conducted at different stages, such as those conducted on appointment or promotion; (iii) the persons responsible for |
| | | conducting integrity checks and how integrity checks were conducted; |

| Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required | Administration's response |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | (iv) measures to ensure that integrity checks were conducted independently; (e) provide the Police's new internal guideline on the declaration by a Police officer on his spouse's or dependent's interest in the entertainment business; and (f) advise whether disciplined forces other than the Police had laid down reporting requirements on the interest of an officer's spouse or dependent in the entertainment business. | Response awaited. - Ditto - |
| 8. Police's handling of cases of intimidation or violence against public figures which may be relating to their public comments | 25 May 2004 | The Administration was requested to provide, in relation to the 48 criminal cases against public figures between 1 January 2003 and 20 May 2004 - (a) more information about the cases, including the number of cases not reported by the victims and information about the victims and detection of the eight detected cases; and | Response awaited. |

| Subject | Date of Meeting | Follow-up action required | Administration's response |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | (b) information about criminal cases against Legislative Council Members. | Response awaited. |

Council Business Division 2
<u>Legislative Council Secretariat</u>
3 June 2004