

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)2176/04-05(05)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

Panel on Home Affairs

**Background brief prepared by Legislative Council Secretariat
for the meeting on 8 July 2005**

Review of advisory and statutory bodies

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the current review of advisory and statutory bodies (ASBs) in the public sector undertaken by the Administration and summarises relevant discussions at meetings of the Panel on Home Affairs.

Background

2. At present, there are about 500 public sector ASBs, with over 5 600 individual members. ASBs can be classified into statutory and non-statutory bodies. Statutory bodies are those set up by enabling legislation and they can either be advisory or executive. Non-statutory bodies are those set up administratively and are mainly advisory in nature. ASBs may also be classified by functions as follows:

- (a) advisory committees;
- (b) non-departmental public bodies;
- (c) regulatory boards and bodies;
- (d) appeal boards;
- (e) trusts;
- (f) public corporations; and
- (g) other boards and committees, such as university councils.

3. Advisory committees are set up to provide ongoing information or professional expertise in particular areas or subjects, and/or to advise on the development of policies or the delivery of services, e.g. the Commission on Youth and the Culture and Heritage Commission.

4. Non-departmental public bodies are non-commercial organisations set up to deliver services to the public. They enjoy a high degree of autonomy in their day-to-day operations, e.g. the Hospital Authority and the Hong Kong Trade Development Council.

5. Regulatory boards and bodies can be divided into four types –

(a) registration board : it regulates a profession or trade by way of registering entrants to the profession or trade, e.g. the Land Surveyors Registration Committee;

(b) licensing board : it regulates the licensing of premises or equipment for a specific purpose or function, e.g. the Liquor Licensing Board;

(c) supervisory board : it supervises a specific activity or range of activities, e.g. the Electoral Affairs Commission; and

(d) regulatory body: it is responsible for regulating an industry or a sector of the economy in Hong Kong, e.g. the Securities and Futures Commission.

6. Appeal boards usually perform a semi-judicial function by adjudicating on appeals, e.g. the Hong Kong War Memorial Pensions Appeal Board and the Licensing Appeals Board.

7. Trusts are bodies set up to hold and control property for the benefit of named beneficiaries or for stated purposes, e.g. the Board of Trustees of the Sir Edward Youde Memorial Fund.

8. Public corporations are commercial entities set up by law to provide goods or services. They are usually created by transferring the assets of a Government department into a corporate structure, e.g. the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation.

Need for a review of advisory and statutory bodies

9. The House Committee set up the Subcommittee on Payment of Honoraria to Government Boards and Committees (the Subcommittee) in

February 2000 to study the arrangements for remunerating non-official members serving on Government boards and committees. The Subcommittee recommended, among other things, that a general review of the operation of Government boards and committees, including those financially autonomous bodies established by statute, should be undertaken. The review should cover the functions of each board/committee, the criteria for the appointments of non-official members, and the remuneration policy for non-official members.

10. The recommendations of the Subcommittee were endorsed by the House Committee on 23 June 2000. In response, the Administration agreed to conduct a general review on the operation of the system of Government boards and committees, and the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) was tasked to conduct the review.

11. The Panel on Home Affairs was briefed on 12 March 2002 on the outcome of the general review, which included the findings of a survey conducted among all bureaux and departments about the operation of ASBs, and the measures recommended to enhance the operation of the ASB system. Members considered the review too general. They pointed out that there was a need to rationalise the ASB system and its policy of remuneration, and to increase the transparency of the operation of ASBs. The Panel was of the view that the Administration should undertake a comprehensive review of the ASB system, including the role and functions of ASBs, criteria of appointment, involvement of non-official members, and the rationale for its policy of remuneration.

12. When the framework of the accountability system for Principal Officials was presented to the Legislative Council (LegCo) on 17 April 2002, Members were informed that the Administration would review the role and functions of ASBs after implementation of the accountability system. According to the Administration, the aim of the review was to ensure the effectiveness of these bodies, so that they would be able to tap the best talents and advice from a wide spectrum of the community and maintain a free flow of opinions and innovative ideas.

Current review of advisory and statutory bodies

13. HAB is tasked to conduct an overall review of ASBs. The Administration explained to the Panel on Home Affairs at its meeting on 14 March 2003 that a two-stage approach would be adopted for the review. During the first stage, issues and problems of the existing system of ASBs would be identified. After considering these issues and problems, a set of guiding principles for conducting a further review would be recommended. During the second stage, individual bureaux would conduct an in-depth review of ASBs within their purview on the basis of the recommended guiding

principles.

14. Members made a number of suggestions to improve the system of ASBs at the meeting. Members in general were of the view that the Administration should establish a clear set of guidelines for making appointments to ASBs to ensure broad representation and that the selection of members was based on merit. Members noted with concern that many non-official members of ASBs were serving on more than six boards/committees and they urged the Administration to ensure strict compliance with the six-board rule in making appointments to ASBs.

15. To enhance the accountability of ASBs, some members suggested that that ASBs should be required to report their work to LegCo on an annual basis, and that a certain proportion of the members of an ASB should be appointed through nomination by the relevant community groups or professional bodies.

16. Members also suggested that the Government should review the existing policy on remuneration of non-official members of ASBs with a view to devising guidelines for setting rates of remuneration for them.

17. In April 2003, HAB issued the “Consultation Paper on Review of the Role and Functions of Public Sector Advisory and Statutory Bodies” to invite views from ASBs and the public on issues and problems in respect of the system of ASBs.

Progress of the current review of advisory and statutory bodies

Objectives spelt out by the Chief Executive

18. The Administration originally planned to complete the first-stage review by June/July 2003 and submit an initial report in early 2004. In February 2004, the Administration provided a progress report to the Panel on Home Affairs advising that as the Chief Executive had spelt out a number of objectives regarding the overall policy for ASBs in his Policy Address in 2004, it would be necessary to conduct further study to incorporate these objectives into the policy for ASBs. The objectives spelt out by the Chief Executive were as follows –

- (a) streamlining structure to avoid excessive duplication in organisation and membership;
- (b) bringing in more talents from different backgrounds to enhance representativeness;

- (c) reinforcing the role of ASBs as important partners of the administration and strengthening their participation in the decision-making process;
- (d) increasing the role of ASBs in reconciling different interests in the community;
- (e) further using ASBs as important channels for public participation in public affairs;
- (f) enhancing the role of ASBs in grooming leaders;
- (g) reinforcing the function of ASBs in connecting the Government and the community;
- (h) explaining public policies and encouraging public discussions; and
- (i) improving the performance evaluation of ASBs and elevating their status as public policy think tanks.

Further review of ASB's governance and check-and-balance mechanism

19. The Administration also informed the Panel that events relating to the appointment and termination of the appointment of Mr Patrick YU as Director (Operations) by the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) had revealed that the governance of ASBs should be further looked at, including whether there was a need to provide a check-and-balance mechanism in these bodies. Questions such as whether there should be an executive Chairperson of EOC, and whether the role of EOC Chairperson should be separated from that of Chief Executive Officer had been raised. As the Administration would need some time to complete the review, findings and conclusions in respect of the review would be reported to the Panel in a series of interim reports.

13 interim reports and a progress report on the current review

20. During the 2003-04 and the current sessions (as at end of June 2005), the Administration submitted to the Panel 13 interim reports on the following topics –

- (a) policy responsibility for ASBs under the accountability system (interim report no. 1);
- (b) classification of ASBs (interim report no. 2);

- (c) policy responsibility of HAB in respect of ASBs (interim report no. 3);
- (d) gender balance in ASBs (interim report no. 4);
- (e) remuneration of non-official members of ASBs (interim report no. 5);
- (f) the six-year rule (interim report no. 6);
- (g) the six-board rule (interim report no. 7);
- (h) handling conflicts of interest (interim report no. 8);
- (i) diversity in appointments to ASBs (interim report no. 9);
- (j) review of the Central Personality Index System (interim report no. 10);
- (k) review of non-departmental public bodies (interim report no. 11);
- (l) proposal for the establishment of a consultative forum (interim report no. 12); and
- (m) report on the establishment of the Public Affairs Forum (interim report no. 13);

as well as a report on the progresses made in the current review of ASBs.

Discussion of the Panel on Home Affairs on the interim/progress reports

21. The Panel on Home Affairs discussed the 13 interim reports at its meetings on 13 February, 16 April, 14 July and 10 December 2004, and the progress report on the review on 13 May 2005. The concerns raised by members are summarised in paragraphs 22 to 48 below.

Gender balance in ASBs

22. The Administration had set an initial working target of at least 25% for each gender in the appointment of members to ASBs. As at 31 March 2005, 1 888 (24.3%) of the 7 761 appointed non-official post holders were women, compared with a women participation rate of 22.6% (1 764 female post holders) in March 2004. Some members, however, considered that the 25% gender benchmark was low as compared with international norms. A member suggested that the Administration should make reference to the gender

benchmark adopted in Norway, which was at least 40% for each gender. The Administration responded that it planned to raise the gender benchmark in the longer term in line with international norms, i.e. between 30% and 35%.

23. Some members commented that there was little participation of women from the grassroots and queried whether the Government had kept appointing the same group of women to ASBs. They urged the Administration to appoint more women from the grassroots to ASBs, especially those with important functions, such as EOC, the Urban Renewal Authority and the Women Commission.

24. The Administration explained that while gender balance was one of the principles in making appointments, it should not take precedence over the principle of merit. The Administration also explained that it was anxious to see greater participation of women from the grassroots, but it was not easy to identify suitable candidates for appointment. The Administration agreed to provide the Panel with aggregate statistics on the number of ASBs served by non-official female members, their occupation/profession, and the number of women serving on ASBs which had executive powers.

Remuneration of non-official members of ASBs

25. Members noted that there was a set of guidelines i.e. Financial Circular No. 7/2000 on the payment of an annual fee/attendance allowance to part-time chairmen/members of ASBs. The basic principle was that the service of part-time non-official members was voluntary and, as a general rule, unpaid (the voluntary service principle). No person, however, should suffer a pecuniary embarrassment through voluntary public service. Furthermore, the Government should not be obtaining the services of highly-qualified professional persons “on the cheap”.

26. The Administration proposed that the long-established voluntary service principle should be maintained. Remuneration of non-official members of ASBs should be justified on a case-by-case basis. The Administration also proposed that as part of the second-stage review, bureaux should examine -

- (a) whether there were justifications for paying an honorarium/attendance allowance to non-official members of ASBs within their purview in accordance with the voluntary service principle and the guidelines set out in Financial Circular No. 7/2000; and
- (b) whether the current rates of annual fee/attendance allowance payable to non-official members of the bodies within their purview were justifiable and appropriate.

27. Members expressed dissatisfaction that the remuneration of non-official members of ASBs lacked consistency. They queried why –

- (a) the remuneration rate for non-official members of ASBs ranged from a few hundred thousand dollars to only fifty dollars; and
- (b) members of some appeal boards were remunerated while members of other appeal boards were not.

28. The Administration explained that remuneration was always justified on the grounds that the business of certain boards or committees was very time-consuming, and that professional experience and expertise were required and ought to be appropriately recognised. The Administration further explained that the cases which had aroused concern were probably those relating to financially autonomous public corporations, e.g. the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation and the Airport Authority. The work handled by the boards of these corporations was similar to that handled by the boards of large business corporations. The Administration was therefore of the view that appropriate directors' honorarium should be provided to the non-official members concerned in recognition of the amount of time they spent on such voluntary public service.

Six-year rule and six-board rule

29. As a general rule, a non-official member of an ASB should not serve for more than six years in any one capacity (the six-year rule), or as a member on more than six boards/committees (the six-board rule). Members, however, noted at the Panel meeting on 16 April 2004 that as at 31 March 2004, 1 695 non-official members of ASBs (21.7%) out of a total of 7 811 posts, were serving in the same post for over six years, and 45 persons were serving on more than six boards/committees. Members urged the Administration to make improvement and avoid giving the impression that only persons who supported the Government were appointed. The Administration informed the Panel that HAB would issue a circular memorandum to all bureaux and departments to remind them of the need to comply with the six-year and the six-board rules in the appointment of non-official members to ASBs.

30. The Panel discussed the progress of the review at its meeting on 13 May 2005. Members noted that as at 31 March 2005, 1 408 (18.1%) out of the 7 761 non-official posts of ASBs were still taken up by appointed members who had served in the same post for over six years, and 21 out of the 5 112 non-official members appointed to ASBs were serving on more than six boards/committees.

31. Members expressed dissatisfaction with the slow progress made by the Administration in improving non-compliance with the six-year and six-board

rules. A member considered it unacceptable that 461 out of the 1 408 non-official posts of ASBs were taken up by appointed members who had served in the same post for over 10 years. The Administration explained that some serving non-official members had particular skills or experience essential to the effective and efficient functioning of the ASBs concerned, and certain office holders were traditionally appointed to a particular committee (e.g. District Council members were usually appointed to the Area Committees of their constituency).

32. The Administration also pointed out that given the diverse nature and functions of ASBs, bureaux in the past had been allowed discretion to adopt measures (including not to strictly comply with the six-year and the six-board rules) which they considered to be necessary and appropriate for the boards and committees under their purview. However, any exception to the rules was required to be reasonable and proportionate to the special circumstances of the case.

33. A member suggested that a central vetting mechanism should be put in place to monitor whether any appointments to be made by a bureau/department would be in breach of the six-year and the six-board rules so that the bureau/department concerned would be advised to appoint another person. The Administration responded that a coordinating mechanism similar to the one proposed was already in place to ensure new appointments made to ASBs would not breach the rules. The Administration agreed to provide the Panel with a breakdown, by boards/committees, of the 461 non-official posts taken up by appointed members who had served in the same post for over 10 years. In addition, HAB would consider issuing another circular memorandum to remind all bureaux and departments of the need to comply with the rules.

Handling conflicts of interest

34. Members noted that there was a set of guidelines for declaration of interests by non-official members of ASBs and for handling conflict of interest and potential conflict of interest situations. The guidelines had been promulgated to all bureaux and departments by way of a circular memorandum issued in September 1994. The guidelines had set out two different systems for declaring interests: a one-tier reporting system where relevant interests were declared at the meeting during which a matter was discussed and determined; and a two-tier system where, in addition to the declaration of relevant interests at a meeting, members' interests were disclosed upon appointment and recorded by way of a register.

35. The Administration considered that compliance with the guidelines for the declaration of interests on the whole had been satisfactory. HAB would update and issue the relevant circular memorandum to all bureaux and departments to remind them that a declaration of interest system should be

introduced when a new board or committee was formed, and the system for declaration of interests for an existing board or committee within their purview should be reviewed from time to time.

36. Some members considered that the Administration should also put in place a mechanism to prevent any possible “transfer of interests” between the Government and individual members of ASBs. They pointed out that although members of some ASBs did not receive any remuneration for their work, some of them might be given other benefits, such as being awarded Government contracts. These members suggested that each ASB should publish in its annual report whether any of its members had been awarded any Government contracts and, if so, the value of the contracts.

37. The Administration pointed out that guidelines for declaration of interests and for handling conflicts of interest or possible conflicts of interest were already in place and it would be for the relevant boards/committees and their chairmen to strictly enforce the guidelines. The Administration would also consider drawing up a set of fundamental principles, based on similar guidelines published in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, for reference of ASB members. The Administration agreed to consider whether ASBs which had only put in place a one-tier reporting system should have a mechanism to facilitate public inspection of any Government contracts awarded to their members.

Review of the Central Personality Index System

38. Members noted that HAB maintained a Central Personality Index database which contained the personal data of political personalities, community leaders, persons who were prepared to serve on public sector ASBs and persons who had been given an award under the honours system in Hong Kong.

39. At the Panel meeting on 14 July 2004, the Administration informed members that there was no requirement for a person to be appointed to an ASB to disclose his/her affiliations to political parties or political groups. The Administration proposed that to enhance the openness and transparency of the work of ASBs, this item of information should be included in the curriculum vitae (CV) form to be filled in by any person for inclusion of his name and personal particulars in the database. The provision of this information, however, would be on a voluntary basis.

40. When the Administration reported on the progress made in revising the CV form at the Panel meeting on 13 May 2005, a member expressed dissatisfaction with the policy that persons serving on public sector ASBs were allowed not to disclose their affiliations to political parties or political groups. He pointed out that without such information, the public would not be able to

monitor whether the Government was fair and impartial in making appointments to ASBs. In response, the Administration agreed to explain at a future Panel meeting the factors that the Administration had taken into consideration in not requiring an appointee to disclose, on a compulsory basis, sensitive personal data relating to his/her affiliations to political parties or political groups.

Review of non-departmental public bodies

41. Non-departmental public bodies are governed by their management boards. Of all the non-departmental public bodies, only EOC has an executive Chairman. The other public bodies have a part-time Chairman and a full-time Chief Executive Officer. The Administration informed the Panel that it would study whether the corporate governance of EOC could be enhanced if the policy-making function was exercised by a management board consisting of a non-executive Chairman and part-time members, and the executive function was exercised by a full-time Chief Executive Officer who was the administrative head of EOC. The Administration would also review other types of boards and committees along similar direction.

42. A member queried whether the Administration was planning to centralise power by transferring power from non-departmental public bodies such as the Hospital Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Authority to Principal Officials. The Administration explained that the Administration did not have such a plan. Principal Officials, however, had the responsibility to regularly review boards and committees under their purview to study whether these bodies should be maintained, restructured, merged or abolished.

43. Another member commented that under the accountability system, the number of non-departmental public bodies should be reduced to avoid possible conflict of roles between these bodies and the Principal Officials concerned.

Establishment of the Public Affairs Forum

44. The Administration had consulted the Panel on its proposal to set up a Public Affairs Forum (the Forum) to canvass the views of business, professional and middle class people and people from academia who could not afford the time to sit on boards and committees but would like to contribute to the discussion of public issues. According to the proposal, the Forum would consist of 600 members from the business, professional and academic fields. 120 (20%) out of the 600 places would be designated for candidates nominated by political parties and groups with political affiliations currently represented in LegCo. The Forum would conduct discussions by way of the Internet so as to allow forum members maximum flexibility in participating in the forum discussions. The Administration proposed that access to the discussion room was restricted to members of the Forum and bureaux and departments, in order

to ensure that discussions were conducted in an orderly and appropriate manner.

45. Some members considered that the Forum fell far short of expectations on how the Government would, as undertaken in the 2004 Policy Address, involve more middle class people in political affairs and the policymaking process. A member criticised the Administration for creating a new kind of elitism under the current proposal. He considered that the problem with the proposal was that only a small group of people who were selected by the Government would be consulted on important issues, and the representativeness of this small group of people was doubtful. Another member, however, considered that the Administration could give the Forum a try, given the low costs involved.

46. Some members had proposed opening up access to the discussion room of the Forum to the public. The Administration explained that in that case, there might be too many participants and some might not observe the rules of participation.

47. At the Panel meeting on 13 May 2005, the Panel received a progress report on the setting up of the Forum. Noting that there had been only some 400 messages posted on the dedicated website of the Forum since its launch on 10 March 2005, a member expressed doubts about the effectiveness of the Forum in gauging views. He asked how the Administration would ensure grassroots participation in the discussion of the issues over which Forum members had been consulted, as these issues might also impact on people at grassroots level.

48. The Administration responded that as the Forum had been launched only for a short period of time, it would operate more smoothly later. The Administration pointed out that it had all along made available various channels for gauging grassroots people's views and comments on public issues.

Questions and motions on issues relating to advisory and statutory bodies

49. Questions/motions on issues relating to ASBs raised/moved by Member at Council meetings since the first term of LegCo are in **Appendix I**. The Official Records of Proceedings of relevant Council meetings are available on the LegCo website at <http://www.legco.gov.hk>.

Relevant papers

50. A list of relevant papers, minutes of meetings and research report on the review of ASBs is in **Appendix II**. Soft copies of these documents are also available on the LegCo website.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
7 July 2005

**Council questions and motions on
issues relating to advisory and statutory bodies**

Since the first term of the Legislative Council, a number of questions/motions have been raised/moved by Members in Council on issues relating to advisory and statutory bodies.

Meeting Date	Question/Motion
23.9.98	Hon Christine LOH raised a written question on measures to enhance the transparency of the operation of advisory and statutory bodies.
10.2.99	Hon Eric LI raised a written question on the appointment of Provisional District Board members to advisory committees.
24.3.99	Hon Emily LAU raised a written question on the appointment of women to advisory and statutory bodies.
20.10.99	Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung raised an oral question on enhancing the transparency of the operation of advisory and statutory bodies.
8.11.00	Hon NG Leung-sing raised an oral question on the appointment of members of the public to advisory and statutory bodies.
4.7.01	Hon Eric LI raised a written question on the appointment of young people to advisory boards and committees.
12.12.01	Hon Albert HO moved a motion urging the Government to review the pay adjustment mechanisms of statutory bodies and the Hong Kong Monetary Authority.
3.7.02	Hon IP Kwok-him raised a written question on the appointment of District Council members to advisory and statutory bodies.
10.7.02	Hon Emily LAU raised a written question on the reappointment of a member of the Culture and Heritage Commission with low meeting attendance rate.
16.10.02	Hon Emily LAU raised a written question on the low meeting attendance rates of some members of advisory and statutory bodies and the number of members of the

	Election Committee appointed as members of advisory and statutory bodies.
21.5.03	Hon Cyd HO moved a motion urging the Government to take measures to ensure the independence of four statutory bodies, namely, the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, the Office of The Ombudsman and the Equal Opportunities Commission.
3.12.03	Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong raised an oral question on the appointment of chairpersons and members of statutory and advisory bodies.
4.2.04	Hon Emily LAU raised a written question on the 102 persons appointed as members of the second term District Councils in December 2003.
2.6.04	Hon Albert HO raised an oral question on the justifications for the Government's deviation from the six-year rule and the six-board rule in the appointment of some members of the Equal Opportunities Commission.
5.1.05	Hon Albert HO raised a written question on gender benchmark for the appointment of members to statutory and consultation bodies.
26.1.05	Hon Alan LEONG raised a written question on information about each statutory body.
18.5.05	Dr Fernando CHEUNG raised a written question on setting up of internet websites by advisory and statutory bodies.
22.6.05	Hon Alan LEONG raised a written question on statistics on directorate staff of certain statutory bodies.

Panel on Home Affairs

Relevant documents on review of advisory and statutory bodies

Date of meeting	Meeting	Minutes/Paper	LC Paper No.
23.6.00	House Committee	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)2459/99-00 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/hc/minutes/hc230600.pdf
		Report of the Subcommittee on payment of honoraria to Government boards and committees	CB(1)1903/99-00 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/hc/papers/cb1-1903.pdf
20.10.00	House Committee	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)98/00-01 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/hc/minutes/hc201000.pdf
		Paper entitled "Payment of honoraria to non-official members of Government boards and committees"	CB(1)5/00-01 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/hc/papers/cb1-5.pdf
12.3.02	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)1535/01-02 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha020312.pdf
		Discussion paper entitled "Review of the Operation of Government Advisory and Statutory Bodies"	CB(2)1276/01-02(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0312cb2-1276-1e.pdf
-	Subcommittee to Study the Proposed Accountability System for Principal Officials and Related Issues	"Legislative Council Paper : Accountability System For Principal Officials" issued by the Constitutional Affairs Bureau	http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/ca/papers/ca0418cb2-paper-e.pdf

Date of meeting	Meeting	Minutes/Paper	LC Paper No.
14.3.03	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)1676/02-03 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha030314.pdf
		Discussion paper entitled "Review of the Role and Functions of Government Advisory and Statutory Bodies"	CB(2)1419/02-03(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0314cb2-1419-1e.pdf
		Research report on "System of advisory committees in some overseas places" prepared by the Research and Library Services Division of the Legislative Council Secretariat	RP03/02-03 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/sec/library/0203rp03e.pdf
		Consultation paper entitled "Review of the Role and Functions of Public Sector Advisory and Statutory Bodies"	CB(2)1713/02-03(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0411cb2-1713e-1e.pdf
13.2.04	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)1746/03-04 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha040213.pdf
		Interim Report Nos. 1 - 4	CB(2)1263/03-04(03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0213cb2-1263-03e.pdf
16.4.04	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)2323/03-04 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha040416.pdf
		Interim Report Nos. 5 - 8	CB(2)1991/03-04(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0416cb2-1991-1e.pdf

Date of meeting	Meeting	Minutes/Paper	LC Paper No.
14.7.04	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)3312/03-04 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha040714.pdf
		Interim Report Nos. 9 - 12	CB(2)3059/03-04(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0704cb2-3059-1e.pdf
10.12.04	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)597/04-05 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha041210.pdf
		Interim Report No. 13	CB(2)342/04-05(03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ha/papers/ha1210cb2-342-3e.pdf
13.5.05	Panel on Home Affairs	Minutes of meeting	CB(2)1917/04-05 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha050513.pdf
		Progress report on the review of advisory and statutory bodies	CB(2)1488/04-05(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0513cb2-1488-1e.pdf