

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BRIEF

DISTRICT COUNCIL REVIEW – IMPLEMENTATION IN LIGHT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

INTRODUCTION

At the meeting of the Executive Council on 26 September 2006, the Council ADVISED and the Chief Executive ORDERED that, subject to necessary approval by the Legislative Council (LegCo) and passage of the necessary amendment legislation relating to financial assistance to District Council (DC) election candidates, the Administration should implement –

- (a) all the recommendations contained in the DC Review consultation document (except the proposal to postpone the DC polling day from late November to early December) with several minor revisions relating to the setting up of a District Facilities Management Committee under each DC and the remuneration package of DC Members, according to the details and timing as set out at **Annex A**; and
- (b) a pilot to involve DCs in the management of district facilities in four selected districts, namely Wan Chai, Wong Tai Sin, Sai Kung and Tuen Mun from 1 January 2007 with the necessary support measures as set out at **Annex B**.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATIONS

Public Consultations

2. In his 2005-06 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced that DCs would be allowed to assume responsibility for the management of some district facilities, such as libraries, community halls, leisure grounds, sports venues and swimming pools, within the limits of the existing statutory powers and resources of the executive departments. The implementation plan for this proposal would be worked out in the context of an ongoing review on the functions and composition of DCs. A public consultation on the review would be carried out.

3. On 27 April 2006, the Home Affairs Bureau and the Constitutional Affairs Bureau jointly released a consultation document for a three-month consultation. The document contains not only proposals to implement the initiative to involve DCs in the management of some district facilities but also relevant proposals to strengthen the role of District Officers (DOs) in co-ordinating the work of government in districts, to enhance communication between DCs and the Administration, to improve the remuneration package of DC Members and to address a couple of election-related matters. The document also invites views on the future composition of DCs.

4. During the consultation period, a delegation of senior officials led by the Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) attended meetings of the 18 DCs. We also organised three public forums, created a dedicated website and attended meetings of the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs (CA Panel) and various consultation sessions organised by different organisations to listen to public views. The public consultation period ended on 31 July 2006. A total of 162 written submissions were received.

Views Received

5. All the 18 DCs have passed positive motions in support of the broad directions of the recommendations in the DC Review. There was also general support in the community for the thrust of the proposals; no

major controversy was recorded. While there were also views on constitutional issues such as the future composition of DCs (in particular in relation to the future of appointed and ex-officio membership) and long-term arrangements regarding the size of the DC constituencies, attention was generally focused on the more pragmatic concerns and issues relating to the role of DCs in district affairs, the adequacy of resources for DCs to perform their functions and the co-ordination of government departments in district work.

6. The proposal to involve DCs in the management of certain district facilities (totalling more than 1,700 comprising community halls and all district-based libraries, leisure and sports facilities) received almost unanimous support. DC Members, academics and commentators generally welcomed this as a positive move to better meet district needs and to give DC Members greater responsibility beyond their advisory role. Although many considered that the scope of the proposed district facilities was limited, for example, no environmental hygiene facilities are included, there was sufficient support for a prudent and gradual approach to provide a balance in views. This was reinforced by some reservations expressed by members of the public over the readiness and ability of DC Members to manage district facilities. Thus, by and large, the proposals were regarded as a timely, first step in the right direction.

7. We believe that to a large extent, the warm reception given to the proposals was due to the Government commitment to devote more resources to DC work, for example, the proposed dedicated capital works block vote to enable DCs to undertake priority projects of up to \$15 million each in their districts was particularly well received. Amongst DC Members, the proposed improvements to their remuneration, in particular the creation of a new non-accountable allowance of \$4,000 per month to meet their miscellaneous outlays, were appreciated. However, views expressed by the general public were not entirely supportive of a proposed increase in DC Members' remuneration.

8. The consultation document contained several specific proposals to strengthen the co-ordinating role of DOs and enhance communication between the DCs and the Administration. Feedback from DC Members was particularly positive towards the proposal that Heads of Departments with a direct public interface would be required to attend DC meetings regularly in future.

9. A full summary of the views received during the public consultation period is set out in the report at **Annex C**. The report will be available for distribution at the 18 District Offices on 28 September 2006 and it will also be uploaded to the DC Review website on the same day.

The Administration's Response and Implementation of Recommendations

Management of district facilities

10. We proposed in the consultation document that DCs should set up a new District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) to initiate, consider and endorse proposals regarding the management of district facilities. During the public consultation period, some DC Members considered that there might not be a need to set up a new DFMC as some of the proposed DFMC functions would duplicate with the work of existing committees under DCs.

11. We see merit in giving individual DCs the flexibility to arrange their committee structure to discharge the functions of managing district facilities. Subsuming the functions in the existing committees would also help contain the workload of the DC Secretariats. In any case, under section 71 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547), DCs are empowered to appoint committees to carry out their functions. We therefore **propose** that instead of mandating DCs to set up a new DFMC, individual DCs should be given the flexibility to set up a new DFMC or to restructure existing committees to cover the functions of DFMC when the proposal is implemented in all 18 districts. However, for the pilot scheme, because of the need to focus discussion and facilitate evaluation within a short timeframe (the pilot will last for only slightly more than 10 months before the current DCs are suspended for the election towards end 2007), we would urge the pilot DCs to set up a dedicated DFMC to guide its work.

12. It should be noted that while there was general support for the proposal to involve DCs in the management of certain district facilities, some DC Members and academics urged the Government to commit to

further devolution of responsibilities to DCs, such as giving DCs executive powers in managing district affairs, financial autonomy and powers to hire and fire staff. There is also a considerable body of opinion that DCs should be allowed to take up a more direct role in street management work including hawker control, unauthorized building works, obstructions causing public nuisance, etc. Such proposals are not in line with our suggestion of adopting a prudent and gradual approach in enhancing the role of DCs.

13. In discussing the possibility of further devolution of responsibilities to DCs, a sizeable number of DC Members advocated an independent DC secretariat and some influence of DC Members over the appraisal of DOs. We consider both to be inappropriate at this stage as the guiding principle of the current Review is that the proposals should not involve any legislative amendments (except those relating to election matters) or alter the existing staffing arrangements in the civil service. Specifically, the idea of an independent DC secretariat (that is, the secretariat to be staffed by officers directly employed by DCs) is not possible at present because individual DCs are not separate legal entities under the law, which means they cannot hire staff or sign contracts.

Enhancing work in districts

14. While some respondents advocated additional powers for DOs to enable them to direct or override other departments in district affairs and others expressed worries over a centralisation of powers in the proposed setting up of a Steering Committee on District Administration (SCDA), there was general appreciation of the acknowledgement by the Administration that district co-ordination work has much to be improved. Coincidentally, the inter-departmental efforts to tackle on-street used clothes collection cages¹ made during the public consultation period has helped instil some confidence in the effectiveness of the proposed

¹ Under the steer of the Home Affairs Bureau, with participation of relevant departments at the senior level, a new strategy to tackle the problem of obstruction by on-street collection cages for used clothes was launched in July 2006. The scheme has since eradicated nearly all collection cages from the streets of Hong Kong. Given the high level support and steer, DOs have carried out operations in their respective districts involving the DCs. This exercise has demonstrated to the DCs and the general public how high-level intervention may help expedite the effective resolution of district problems.

high-level steer to the work of District Management Committees and in assisting DOs to resolve district problems.

15. We consider that a right balance needs to be struck between high-level intervention and district-level co-ordination. The proposed SCDA is a mechanism to empower DOs to escalate problems that cannot be resolved at the district level and to provide more systematic support to DOs in discharging their role as overall co-ordinator and the leading representative of Government at the district level.

16. The proposal for Heads of Departments to attend DC meetings was well received at the DC meetings. We have lined up 22 Heads of Departments that have more direct interface with the public to take turns in attending DC meetings starting from January 2007. We envisage that each Head of Department will have to attend about four or five DC meetings in a year and will complete his or her tour round 18 DCs in three to four years. We will also be reviewing the representation of regular attendees of the relevant Government departments at meetings of DCs or committees to enhance communication. For example, in addition to his own attendance as one of those Heads of Departments mentioned above and District Commanders as regular attendees, the Commissioner of Police has volunteered to ask his Regional Commanders to attend District Fight Crime Committees once a year to explain the work of the Police in the coming year. Upon full implementation of the recommendations and provision of additional resources, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services will upgrade Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)'s representation at DC meetings to regional Chief Leisure Services Managers.

17. To take forward the proposal of an annual Chief Executive's District Administration Summit, we intend to hold the first one in early 2008 upon the full implementation of the DC Review proposals in all 18 districts. This would allow time for the pilot districts to gather enough experience for sharing at the Summit and for other recommendations to be tested before the Summit is held. As 2008 will be the first year of the new DC term from 2008 to 2011, hosting the Summit early in the year will serve to demonstrate Chief Executive's recognition and support for DCs.

New remuneration package for DC Members

18. While nearly all DC Members were supportive of the proposed new remuneration package, the public expressed mixed views. Some DC Members took the view that since the current remuneration was far from adequate, the improved package should be implemented without delay, instead of waiting until the next term from January 2008.

19. We consider it more prudent to adhere to the well rehearsed principle, in the case of LegCo, that any substantial changes to the remuneration of LegCo Members, particularly those relating to LegCo Members' own benefits, proposed in one LegCo term will only be implemented in the following term to preserve the credibility of the remuneration regime and avoid the undesirable perception that Members are sanctioning pay rises for themselves.

20. Taking account of the views expressed by DC Members and the public, we **propose** to raise DC Members' Operating Expenses Allowance (OEA) (which is a fully accountable allowance) by 10% as soon as possible, say from 1 January 2007, subject to approval from LegCo Finance Committee. This would address concerns from DC Members that the existing level of OEA is inadequate for them to cover the expenses they need to incur in order to discharge their duties effectively. There is also a precedent in the 2001 DC Review². Separately, in view that DC Members unanimously supported the early introduction of the newly created Winding-up Allowance, a fully accountable allowance which is payable only when DC Members step down from office and have to disband their staff and/or close their ward offices, we **propose** to also advance the implementation of this component to the current term. Both allowances are payable on a reimbursement basis.

21. Apart from the timing of implementing the proposals, we **propose** to make two minor revisions to the proposed package, taking account of comments from DC Members. The first revision is to expand

² In the 2001 DC review conducted following the dissolution of the Municipal Councils, proposals to increase DC Members' Operating Expenses Allowance were implemented within the same term, benefiting the then existing DC Members.

the ambit of the fully accountable OEA to restore some expenditure items currently reimbursable, namely expenses on printing, publicity and communication to facilitate DC Members' liaison with their constituents. Secondly, noting that the Setting-up Allowance is a newly available allowance, we consider it justifiable to modify the original proposal to give re-elected or re-appointed Members who have used OEA for running a ward office only 50% of the Allowance. We now recommend that all DC Members using the Setting-up Allowance for the first time should be eligible for the full rate.

22. We have submitted the proposed package with the above revisions as well as public views collated to the Independent Commission on Remuneration for Members of the District Councils for consideration at its meeting on 17 August 2006. The Commission has endorsed the new remuneration package in full and supported the early introduction of the Winding-up Allowance and the 10% increase to the OEA.

23. In view of concerns expressed by some members of the public over the mis-use of funds by some DC Members and the need to guard against abuse, we are compiling a comprehensive manual in consultation with the ICAC for reference by DC Members and the DC Secretariats.

Composition of DCs

24. In considering whether appointed seats and ex-officio seats should be retained in the next term DCs commencing in 2008, we need to consider carefully the role currently played, and the contribution made, by appointed members and ex-officio members. Over the years, the appointment system has provided an additional channel for individuals who wish to serve the community to do so. Ex-officio members, being Chairmen of Rural Committees with strong ties with the rural community, have also provided a very effective channel of communication between the DC and the rural community. Through their expertise, networks and knowledge, appointed members and ex-officio members complement elected members and have made constructive and important contribution to the work of DCs, especially in ensuring the efficient delivery of services at the district level.

25. The future of appointed and ex-officio membership should also be considered in the context of the various important and fundamental changes which will be made to the role and functions of DCs. We need to ensure that while these new measures are implemented, the smooth delivery of district services will not be affected. Therefore, it is prudent not to introduce changes to the overall composition of the DCs for the coming term. Accordingly, we consider that appointed seats and ex-officio seats should be retained for the next term DCs in 2008.

26. As regards the number of elected DC seats, the Government has decided to increase the number from 400 to 405 to take into account the increase in population in the Sai Kung and the Islands Districts, notably in Tseung Kwan O and Tung Chung. The increase in the number of elected seats has the support of LegCo, and the relevant legislation was passed in June 2006. The total number of DCs and elected seats for the respective districts is set out in statute. Practical arrangements for the 2007 DC election are already in full progress. Prospective candidates for the election and political groups and parties are mapping out their campaigning strategies on the basis of the legislative framework.

27. Given the considerations set out in paragraph 26 above, it will not be appropriate to make any further changes to the number of DCs, the number of elected seats and the population quota for the 2007 DC election. These issues may be further considered in the longer term having regard to the role and functions of the DCs, and in the light of the actual operational experience of the next term DCs, in particular vis-à-vis their enhanced role and functions in the management of district facilities.

DC Election-related Matters

28. The original proposal to postpone the polling day from late November to early December is aimed at minimizing disruption to the normal operation of DCs, and hence DCs' service to the public. There are views welcoming the general principle to minimize disruption and hence the proposal to postpone the polling day. However, there are also some views expressing reservations on the proposal on the ground that the resultant period between the polling day and the commencement of the new DC term would be too short for outgoing DC Members to make

the necessary arrangement to terminate the employment of their staff and the tenancy agreements of their ward offices.

29. In the light of comments received during the consultation, we **propose** maintaining the status quo, i.e. to continue holding the poll in November, and to retain the existing legislative provision regarding the suspension of DC operation during the DC ordinary election until the commencement of a new DC term. The impact of the “suspension of operation” on the work of the DCs could be reduced by better planning. In case of urgent and unforeseen matters which require the attention of the DC or its committees, the Director of Home Affairs may exercise her existing power under section 28(4) of the District Councils Ordinance to permit or request the DC or committee to hold one or more meetings during the period of suspension.

30. On financial assistance to DC election candidates, based on the election expenses declared by candidates, the election expenses per vote in the 2003 DC election was around \$20. This is broadly the same as that in the 2004 LegCo election as declared by candidates. In accordance with the established principle (adopted for the financial assistance scheme for LegCo election candidates) that candidates and the Government should both shoulder part of the election expenses, we consider that the level of financial assistance for DC election candidates should be the same as that for LegCo election candidates, i.e. \$10 per vote, capped at 50% of a candidate’s actual election expenses. This proposal has been discussed at, and supported by, the CA Panel. Details of the formula for calculating the amount payable to candidates will be set out in amendment legislation which will be submitted separately to LegCo for approval.

The Pilot Scheme

31. In the course of consultations, we have made it clear that the purpose of the pilot scheme was not to decide whether we should or should not involve DCs in the management of district facilities. The pilot was needed to test out protocols and working relationship amongst the various stakeholders in order to pave the way for a smooth and effective roll-out to all the 18 districts from the next term DCs. Despite some suggestions that the pilot scheme should be implemented in all 18

districts for fairness, we remain of the view that a pilot approach is necessary. This has taken account of the consideration that the involvement of DCs in the management of district facilities would necessitate changes to internal operations, particularly of LCSD, and would require considerable mindset change among departmental staff. Since the pilot will last for less than one year and all the 18 DCs will implement the proposals from 1 January 2008, we do not envisage any serious objection to a pilot in selected districts.

32. The 18 DCs comprise four on Hong Kong Island, five in Kowloon, five in New Territories West and four in New Territories East. Conventional wisdom suggests that it would be appropriate to select one DC per region to pilot the scheme reflecting the urban and rural characteristics. A further practical consideration for a regional approach is to tie in with the regional-based structure of LCSD's Chief Leisure Services Managers to ensure that a critical mass of experience among the departmental staff could be built up in preparation for the full roll-out. We **propose** that the pilot scheme should be implemented in Wan Chai, Wong Tai Sin, Sai Kung and Tuen Mun districts taking into account the following factors –

- (a) the DC should have a balanced representation of different political groupings to work out a model that would succeed even in DCs with diverging interests;
- (b) the DC should have a good mix of district facilities; and
- (c) the DC should have indicated its readiness and willingness to join the pilot or at least, is supportive of the pilot approach and is not against the idea of joining the pilot.

Among the 18 DCs, seven (Wan Chai, Sham Shui Po, Sai Kung, Tuen Mun, North, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing) have volunteered to join the pilot scheme. Instead of including all seven DCs into the pilot scheme, we favour a regional approach. Based on the above factors, we propose implementing the pilot in Wan Chai, Wong Tai Sin, Sai Kung and Tuen Mun.

TIMETABLE

33. We will proceed according to the following timetable –

Announcement of implementation plan (including selection of pilot districts)	28 September 2006
Briefing for the relevant LegCo Panels	November 2006
LegCo Finance Committee's approval of the new remuneration package for DC Members	November/December 2006
Implementation of pilot scheme in selected districts on involving DCs in management of district facilities as well as other proposals to enhance government work in districts. Implementation of the Winding-up Allowance and the proposed 10% increase of OEA to Members' remuneration package	January 2007
Implementation of DC election-related matters	2007
Full implementation of DC involvement in management of district facilities in all 18 districts and new remuneration package for DC Members	January 2008

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSALS

34. The additional expenditure incurred by the DC Review would be phased in over the next two years as the pilot scheme is rolled out to 18 districts and the new remuneration package fully put in place from January 2008. For 2006-07, we will absorb the required additional expenditure in current Estimates. For 2007-08, despite the suggestion of a dedicated \$300 million block vote for minor district works to replace other existing mechanisms and an increase in DC funds also to \$300 million, to keep things simple for administration, we will only make

additional provision for the four pilot districts while keeping existing mechanisms intact. This will take the form of a new block vote under the Capital Works Reserve Fund, which is subject to LegCo's approval, with an initial provision of \$20 million and an additional provision under the General Revenue Account of \$3 million for each pilot district for additional community involvement and district programmes. An extra \$26 million recurrent expenditure will be required from 2007-08 for LCSD and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) to assume the management and maintenance responsibilities for some 170 district works items hitherto developed by DCs/DOs which are not being properly managed. These facilities, likewise, will come under the purview of the proposed DFMC. In addition, 31 additional staff at a cost of about \$9 million will be required to support the pilots and implement other recommendations before the full implementation scheduled for January 2008. The Setting-up and Winding-up Allowances are estimated to cost about \$67 million for the first four-year DC term, i.e. 2008-2011, and \$48 million for every four-year term thereafter.

35. From 2008-09 onwards and on a full year basis, implementation of all the recommendations under the DC Review in the 18 districts will incur additional recurrent cost of around \$190 million. The dedicated capital works block vote will require a provision of \$300 million per year of which about \$200 million are ongoing expenditure from existing sources for district works.

36. The resource requirements mentioned above have been secured through the established resource allocation process while those for implementing the proposed financial assistance scheme for DC election candidates will be absorbed by the existing provision for DC elections.

37. The revised recommendations at **Annex A** and **Annex B** are in conformity with the Basic Law, including the provisions concerning human rights. The proposals have no significant environmental or productivity implications. As more resources will be provided to DCs to implement more works projects and programmes in the 18 districts, there will be a positive impact on the local economy of the 18 districts.

38. In line with the sustainability principle of enhancing the vibrancy of Hong Kong's recreational opportunities, leisure activities and

cultural diversity, giving DCs a greater say in the management of district facilities will better meet the specific district needs. Residents' sense of belonging and involvement in the community should thereby be enhanced. More collaboration between DCs and other sectors should also foster harmony in the community in the long run.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

39. During the public consultation period, we have attended meetings of the 18 DCs, organised three public forums, created a dedicated website and attended various consultation sessions organised by different organisations. We have also briefed the CA Panel twice and attended a special CA Panel meeting to receive views from a large number of deputations.

40. Staff of the executive departments (HAD and LCSD), especially the staff unions of LCSD, have expressed concerns on the involvement of DCs in the management of district facilities and the possible impact on their professionalism. We met with staff associations of HAD and LCSD to address their concerns. We will continue to engage the staff to solicit their support for the implementation plan and their understanding that DCs' involvement would also help them to better serve the local community.

PUBLICITY

41. A press briefing for the media will be held on 28 September 2006 to announce the implementation plan, including the selection of pilot districts. A report summarising the views received during the public consultation period will be published at the same time. A letter will also be issued to all LegCo and DC Members on 28 September 2006 providing details of the implementation plan. A special briefing will be arranged for the 18 DC Chairmen and Vice-chairmen as soon as

practicable, to be followed by special meetings with the four DCs selected to join the pilot scheme to brief them on the implementation plan and to actively engage them in the preparation for the pilot scheme. A spokesman will be made available to answer press enquires.

ENQUIRY

42. Enquiries in relation to this Brief should be directed to Miss Victoria Tang, Assistant Director of Home Affairs (3), on 2835 1483.

Home Affairs Bureau

28 September 2006

**Recommendations to be implemented arising from
the District Council Review**

[revisions to the original proposals in the consultation document are underlined]

Management of district facilities

- (a) To enable DCs to play an active role in the management of some district facilities, individual DCs will be given the flexibility to consider if a District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) should be set up to steer and oversee the work involved or whether such functions should be discharged by existing committees under the DCs. For the pilot scheme, the pilot DCs are encouraged to set up a dedicated DFMC to focus discussion and facilitate evaluation;
- (b) Upon full implementation, we will involve DCs in the management of over 1,700 district facilities, including district libraries, community halls, leisure grounds, sports venues and swimming pools (including beaches). We will transfer the management and maintenance responsibilities for some 150 district works projects previously developed by DCs to LCSD and ArchSD. These facilities, likewise, will come under the purview of the DFMC;
- (c) DFMCs or existing committees under the DCs, as the case may be, will be invited to provide input, consider and endorse proposals from HAD and LCSD regarding the management of the identified district facilities. Without prejudice to the statutory powers and obligations of the concerned departments and subject to the financial authority of these departments, relevant international professional or safety standards, prevailing government policies on staff and resources management (including government fees and charges), they will follow the decisions of the DCs as far as possible;
- (d) DC Funds will in future be expanded to cover leisure, sports

and cultural programmes and community involvement and partnership projects. Taking account of the provision for programme expenses to be transferred to DC Funds from LCSD's approved budget (which accounts for about \$68 million in the 2005-06 financial year), we propose to increase the DC Funds to an annual provision of \$300 million upon full implementation in all 18 districts in the 2008-09 financial year. For the pilot scheme, we propose to provide an extra sum of \$3 million to each of the pilot districts in the 2007-08 financial year;

- (e) We propose introducing a pilot scheme and implementing the proposals in four districts with a view to paving the way for full implementation in all 18 districts in the next DC term commencing 1 January 2008. Subject to the necessary approval, we propose that the pilot scheme be implemented from 1 January 2007;

Capital works improvement to district facilities and district minor works

- (f) Subject to LegCo approval, we will create a dedicated capital works block vote under the Capital Works Reserve Fund for DCs to initiate and implement minor works in the districts particularly those district facilities placed under their management. The block vote will have an annual provision of \$300 million upon full implementation in the 18 districts, replacing three existing sources for district minor works. We will also make provision for the maintenance of the minor capital works facilities initiated by DCs. For the pilot scheme, we propose a provision of \$20 million for the pilot districts;

Strengthening the role of District Officers and enhancing communication with DCs

- (g) We will set up a Steering Committee on District Administration from January 2007, to be chaired by the Secretary for Home Affairs or Permanent Secretary for Home Affairs and attended by the Heads of Departments, to provide a forum for top management in various departments to exchange views on issues of mutual concern and resolve

inter-departmental district management issues, as well as to formulate strategies on enhancing district work;

- (h) We will arrange for Heads of Departments that have direct interface with the public to attend four to five DC meetings every year commencing January 2007;
- (i) The Chief Executive will host an annual District Administration Summit to provide enhanced dialogue between DCs and senior Government officials and to discuss strategic issues relating to the District Administration Scheme. The first Summit will be held in early 2008;

Enhancing District Partnership

- (j) With the proposed increase in DC Funds for community involvement projects and more active involvement of DCs in the management of some district facilities, we will encourage DCs to draw up plans for collaboration with other sectors and initiate proposals with district characteristics aiming to achieve a wide spectrum of social objectives;

Support for DC Members and DC election-related matters

- (k) Subject to LegCo's approval of funding, we will raise the level of Members' honourarium (non-accountable) and Operating Expenses Allowance (OEA) (accountable) by 10% and introduce a new non-accountable Miscellaneous Expenses Allowance and two new accountable allowances on the setting-up and winding-up of ward offices. Taking into account the views expressed by DC Members during the public consultation period, we propose to expand the ambit of the OEA to cover expenses relating to communication between DC Members and their constituents and the local community. We also propose to seek LegCo Finance Committee's approval to increase Members' OEA by 10% as soon as possible, say from 1 January 2007;
- (l) We propose to allow all first-time users of the Setting-up

Allowance to reimburse up to the full rate of the Allowance and only up to 50%, in subsequent terms, for those Members who have already used the Allowance in the previous term. Having regard to the views from DC Members and the fact that the Winding-up Allowance will only be used every four years, we propose to advance the implementation of the Winding-up Allowance to the current DC term to allow incumbent DC Members to benefit from this proposal if they retire from the DCs in 2007;

- (m) Having regard to the views received during public consultation that the proposal to postpone the DC election from late November to early December would make the resultant period between the polling day and the commencement of the new DC term too short for outgoing DC Members to make the necessary arrangement to terminate the employment of their staff and the tenancy agreements of their ward offices, we propose that the existing practice to hold the election in November should remain unchanged;
- (n) Subject to the necessary amendment legislation, we will introduce a financial assistance scheme for DC election candidates. Under the proposed scheme, candidates who get elected, or those who received 5% of valid votes or more, will be eligible for financial assistance. We will set the subsidy rate at \$10 per vote, capped at 50% of the actual election expenses of the candidates; and
- (o) The next DC term will have 534 seats, comprising 405 elected seats (including the five additional elected seats for Sai Kung DC and Islands DC which have been approved by LegCo in June 2006), 102 appointed seats and 27 ex-officio seats. The population quota will remain unchanged.

**A Pilot Scheme to involve District Councils in the Management of
District Facilities to be implemented in
Wan Chai, Wong Tai Sin, Tuen Mun and Sai Kung**

The pilot scheme will be implemented from 1 January 2007 and last till the suspension of DCs for the next round of DC election towards the end of 2007. The purpose of the pilots is to try out the various guidelines to facilitate DCs' involvement in the management of district facilities relating to capital works and programmes. Additional staffing and financial resources will be provided to pilot districts. The ultimate objective is to pave the way for a smooth roll-out to all the 18 Districts from the next term DCs commencing 1 January 2008.

Financial Support to Pilot DCs

- (a) To support the pilot DCs in the management of district facilities, an additional \$3 million will be added to the DC Funds provision for each of the pilot DCs for the organisation of community involvement programmes;
- (b) To enable pilot DCs to initiate and implement district minor works projects, a dedicated capital works block vote will be created under the Capital Works Reserve Fund in the 2007-08 financial year with an initial provision of \$20 million for that financial year for deployment by the pilot DCs. Given the lead time for project planning, it is envisaged that the provision with an over-commitment facility would provide sufficient room for the pilot districts to plan additional works;

Manpower Support to Pilot DCs

- (c) To support the pilot DCs in discharging their enhanced role in the management of district facilities, service the District Facilities Management Committee and handle the increased

provision of DC Funds, an additional Executive Officer II and Assistant Clerical Officer will be provided to each DC Secretariat of the pilot districts;

- (d) To support the pilot DCs in deploying the DC Funds in organising community involvement programmes, an additional Liaison Officer will be provided to each District Office of the pilot districts;
- (e) To support the pilot DCs in participating in the management of district facilities, an additional Senior Librarian and Leisure Services Manager will be provided to each of the pilot districts. These district-based librarians and leisure services managers will attend District Facilities Management Committee and/or other relevant DC meetings and work closely with the pilot DCs on proposals initiated and/or endorsed by them; and

Evaluation

- (f) A tertiary institution will be engaged as consultant to conduct an evaluation study on the implementation of the pilot scheme. The consultant will work closely with the pilot DCs to track the progress of the pilot scheme, evaluate the effectiveness of the new mechanisms and identify room for improvement.

**Review on the Role, Functions and
Composition of District Councils**

Report on Public Consultation

September 2006

CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Public Views on the Overall Direction of District Council Review	4
Chapter Three: Public Views on Specific Topics of District Council Review	7
- Management of District Facilities	7
- Capital Works Improvement to District Facilities and District Minor Works	9
- Strengthening the Role of District Officers and Enhancing Communication with District Councils	11
- Enhancing District Partnership	13
- Support for District Council Members	13
- Composition of District Councils	14
- District Council Election-Related Matters	16
- Financial and Staffing Implications	16
Appendix A: List of Written Submissions Received During the Public Consultation Period	
Appendix B: Motions passed by the 18 District Councils in respect of the District Council Review Consultation Document	

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 In his 2005-06 Policy Address, the Chief Executive (CE) announced that we would allow District Councils (DCs) to assume responsibility for the management of some district facilities and an implementation plan will be worked out in the context of a review of the functions and composition of DCs.

1.2 The consultation document “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” (DC Review) was released on 27 April 2006 for a three-month public consultation. The public consultation period ended on 31 July 2006. The following recommendations were put forward in the consultation document:

- (a) To involve DCs in the management of some district facilities on a pilot basis;
- (b) To create a dedicated capital works fund with an annual provision of \$300 million for DCs to carry out minor works projects and to increase DC Funds to \$300 million per annum for organising district sports, recreational and cultural activities and community involvement programmes;
- (c) To set up a Steering Committee on District Administration to expedite resolution of district management issues requiring inter-departmental collaboration and to devise the strategy and measures for furthering district administration;
- (d) To enhance communication between DCs and the Administration, Heads of Departments with public interface will take turns to attend DC meetings more regularly in the future and an annual CE’s Summit on District Administration will be organised;
- (e) To raise DC Members’ honorarium and Operating Expenses Allowance (OEA) by 10%, modify the OEA ambit to cover only office rental and employment of assistants and related expenses, and introduce a

non-accountable Miscellaneous Expenses Allowance and accountable Setting-up and Winding-up Allowances;

- (f) To introduce a financial assistance scheme for candidates standing for DC elections to encourage participation in public elections; and
- (g) To conduct the poll in early December to minimise the impact of the suspension of the operation of DCs in election years.

1.3 Around 42,000 copies of the consultation document and 250,000 copies of leaflets on the DC Review were distributed to members of the public through District Offices, venues of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in 18 districts and through other channels. Information on the DC Review is also available at a dedicated website set up for the review (www.dc-review.gov.hk).

1.4 We used a variety of open channels to collect views from different sectors of the community. We appealed to organisations and individuals to forward their views on the proposals set out in the consultation document by post, facsimile or email. 162 written submissions were received during the consultation period.

1.5 To facilitate different sectors of the community to discuss further the proposals set out in the consultation document, the Home Affairs Department (HAD) organised three regional forums on Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories on 23 May 2006, 16 June 2006 and 11 July 2006 respectively. Over 700 individuals participated in these forums, including members of Area Committees, representatives of owners' corporations, mutual aid committees and district organisations, school principals and members of the general public.

1.6 During the public consultation period, the Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) and representatives from Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and Constitutional Affairs Bureau (CAB) attended the meetings of all the 18 DCs to listen to the views of DC Members direct. All DCs passed motions to support the direction of the DC Review and the proposals in the consultation document.

1.7 SHA, Secretary for Constitutional Affairs and representatives from HAB and CAB attended two meetings of the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Constitutional Affairs (CA Panel) to brief LegCo Members and listen to their views. Representatives from HAB and CAB also attended a special meeting of CA Panel to receive views from deputations of various sectors, including DC Members, political parties, staff unions of LCSD, local organisations, professional organisations and think-tanks.

1.8 To receive directly the views of different sectors of the community, representatives of HAB also attended various consultation sessions organised by different organisations to listen to public views.

1.9 The list of the 162 written submissions received from the public on the DC Review during the consultation period is at Appendix A, while the full text of these written submissions³, as well as the discussion summaries of the regional forums and the extract of notes of meetings with DCs can be viewed at the District Offices and at the dedicated website on DC Review.

³ Among the 162 written submissions, eight required confidentiality and have been dealt with separately.

CHAPTER TWO: PUBLIC VIEWS ON THE OVERALL DIRECTION OF DISTRICT COUNCIL REVIEW

2.1 This Chapter gives an account of the general views received regarding the overall direction of the DC Review. Views on the specific proposals put forward in the DC Review consultation document are summarised in Chapter Three.

2.2 General Direction of District Council Review

2.2.1 A majority of views express support for the general direction of the DC Review as a positive move to enhance the role of DCs. All the 18 DCs have passed motions in support of the direction and recommendations of the DC Review and their individual motions are set out at [Appendix B](#).

2.2.2 There are a number of views that welcome the recommendations of the DC Review as a timely or a somewhat belated move of the Government to respond to the aspirations of DCs and to enhance work in districts.

2.2.3 There are a number of views that the DC Review should have set out a road map for the future development of DCs, including the future composition of DCs. A few views suggest that a comprehensive review should be undertaken to examine the District Administration Scheme and the relationship between District Offices, DCs and different district organisations, instead of only reviewing the role, functions and composition of DCs.

2.2.4 There are also a number of views that consider the scope of the DC Review to be too narrow as it has not explored the devolution of powers once belonged to the ex-Municipal Councils to DCs nor the gradual reduction of appointed seats in DCs.

2.2.5 A few views consider that the DC review should explore how DCs can be put as the centre of the whole District Administration Scheme as DCs represent the voice of the local community.

2.3 Broad Parameters on the Role of District Councils

2.3.1 There are a number of views that the role of DCs should gradually evolve from purely advisory to a more involved role in district management. They welcome the Government's initiative to involve DCs in management of district facilities and to provide DCs with more resources to meet district needs.

2.3.2 There are a few views that the DC Review should not be bound by the existing legal provisions but should explore how the role of DCs could be expanded beyond the advisory nature currently stipulated in the law. There are also a few views suggesting that the Government should make necessary legislative amendments to give legal status to individual DCs so as to give DCs and DC Members more protection under the law.

2.3.3 There are a few views expressing concern on the lack of delineation of responsibilities between DCs and Government departments concerned under the proposals. They are concerned that DCs could be held accountable on the provision of district services without the powers to initiate and implement change.

2.3.4 There are a few views that it is inappropriate to delegate executive powers to DCs as they are statutory advisory bodies. There are also a few views that DC Members are already heavily laden and could hardly take on extra functions.

2.3.5 There are views that expanding the role of DCs would not be in line with the Basic Law.

2.4 Pace of Development

2.4.1 There are some views that a prudent and gradual approach should be adopted in reviewing the role of DCs to maintain service continuity and social harmony at the district level. There are a few views that the recommendations of the DC Review would serve to raise the quality of district services and help ensure that provision of district services and facilities would meet district needs.

2.4.2 There are a number of views that the current recommendations of the DC Review are only a small step forward. More should be done to enhance the role of DCs.

2.4.3 There are a number of views that the current pace of development is appropriate and that there should be further reviews on DCs after implementation of the current recommendations.

2.4.4 There are views that the DC Review has failed to make any real progress or development in expanding the role and functions of DCs and instead has only made minor adjustments to the existing system such as providing extra funds for DCs and revising the remuneration package.

2.4.5 There are a number of views that a slower pace should be adopted as the current recommendations could risk hampering governance at the district level and disrupting district services.

CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC VIEWS ON SPECIFIC TOPICS OF DISTRICT COUNCIL REVIEW

3.1 This Chapter provides a summary of the public views on specific proposals put forward in the DC Review consultation document according to its chapters.

3.2 Management of District Facilities

(i) Views on DCs' Involvement in Management of District Facilities

3.2.1 Many views, especially those from DC Members, support the proposal to enhance the role of DCs in the management of district facilities since DCs have an intimate knowledge of district needs.

3.2.2 There are some views that the parameters that DCs' proposals and decisions regarding the management of district facilities should not affect the statutory powers and obligations of the departments concerned and should observe the departments' financial authority are limiting the ability of DCs in managing district facilities. They view these parameters as "restrictions" that would make it impossible for DCs to manage district facilities effectively. They also consider that if DCs could not make decisions on operational issues concerning the district facilities, e.g. opening hours, fees and charges, etc., there would be little that DCs could do to improve the management of district facilities.

3.2.3 There are a number of views that an effective monitoring mechanism should be set up to guard against conflict of interests that may arise from the involvement of DCs in the management of district facilities.

3.2.4 There are views that the involvement of DCs in the management of district facilities could affect district service continuity as DCs change term every four years.

3.2.5 There are some concerns on whether DC Members have professional knowledge and adequate experience to manage district facilities, in particular, libraries.

3.2.6 There are a number of views from DC Members that the Government should provide training for DC Members to help them prepared for their new functions.

3.2.7 There are a number of views that the involvement of DCs in the management of LCSD facilities could lead to favouritism towards the district organisations, thus reducing the opportunities for professional sports organisations to use LCSD facilities for training and for promotion of elite sports.

3.2.8 There are many views suggesting that apart from the management of the five types of district facilities stated in the 2005-06 Policy Address and the consultation document, namely community halls, libraries, leisure grounds, sports venues and swimming pools (including beaches), DCs should also be involved in the management of other district facilities, such as wet markets, which used to be managed by the ex-Municipal Councils.

3.2.9 There are some views that the setting up of the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) may lead to duplication of work as certain existing committees under DCs already share similar terms of reference such as monitoring of district facilities and implementation of district minor works. They consider that DCs should be given the flexibility to decide, based on their own circumstances, whether to set up a DFMC or subsume the proposed functions of the DFMC into existing committees.

(ii) Implementation – Pilot Approach

3.2.10 Seven DCs that passed motions in support of the DC Review have indicated their interest to join the pilot scheme. There are some views that support a pilot implementation approach to reduce disruption to departmental operations.

3.2.11 There are views that the criteria for the selection of pilot districts should be made known to the DCs.

3.2.12 However, there are some views that the proposals should be implemented in all 18 districts in one go as the situations at different districts vary and the results and experience of the pilot districts may not be applicable to other districts.

(iii) To Increase DC Funds to \$300 Million Per Year for Organising District Sports and Recreational Activities and Community Involvement Programmes

3.2.13 While there is general support for the increase of DC Funds to meet district needs, a few views express concern over the mechanism to allocate funds and that the actual funds allocated to individual districts would be limited.

3.3 Capital Works Improvement to District Facilities and District Minor Works

(i) Overall Views on the Creation of a Dedicated Capital Works Block Vote

3.3.1 Some views welcome the creation of a dedicated capital works block vote and consider that this initiative would enable DCs to implement district works and improvement projects more effectively to suit public needs.

3.3.2 There are also a number of views that the proposed annual provision of \$300 million for the dedicated capital works block vote is inadequate, especially as many district works projects have been delayed after the dissolution of the ex-Municipal Councils. Hence the funding provision should be increased.

3.3.3 There are a few views that express concern that the work projects may not be prioritized according to the actual needs of the whole district owing to political considerations of DC Members, thus the block vote would not be put to the most effective use.

3.3.4 There are a number of views that a monitoring mechanism should be set up for the implementation of district works projects.

3.3.5 There are views that the proposed creation of the dedicated capital works block vote would not help improve the local environment if recurrent resources were not provided to DCs or the departments concerned to manage and maintain the works completed.

3.3.6 There are views that question whether the funds could be carried forward to the next financial year if DCs could not spend the allocated amount within one financial year.

(ii) Allocation of Funds to 18 Districts

3.3.7 There are some views that clear criteria should be drawn up for the allocation of DC Funds to the 18 districts. They consider that there should be a fair and transparent mechanism to ensure that resources would be put to good use and conflicts among DCs and political parties would be avoided. Criteria for allocation of funds should include the resident and mobile population and the actual development needs of the districts.

3.3.8 There are views that a central body should be assigned to allocate funds from the block vote to the 18 districts. There are a number of views that the actual funds to be allocated to individual districts from the \$300 million block vote would be limited.

(iii) Other Views on District Works Projects

3.3.9 There are questions on whether cross-district works projects would be allowed under the proposed block vote if DCs want to join hands in implementing works projects that cut across more than one district, and in such cases, whether the cost ceiling of each project would still remain at \$15 million.

3.4 Strengthening the Role of District Officers and Enhancing Communication with District Councils

(i) Strengthening the Role of District Officers

3.4.1 Some views support strengthening the role and authority of District Officers (DOs) in order to further enhance their co-ordination role in districts.

3.4.2 There are views suggesting that certain district staff of other Government departments should be put under the DOs so as to enhance DOs' ability in co-ordinating district services.

3.4.3 There are a few views that the rank of DOs should be raised such that they could command the needed respect and authority to co-ordinate the district staff of other Government departments to resolve inter-departmental issues.

3.4.4 There are also a number of views that the DOs should be elected through universal suffrage and should be accountable to the DCs.

(ii) Steering Committee on District Administration

3.4.5 There are a number of views supporting setting up the Steering Committee District Administration (SCDA) to help resolve long-standing district problems that involve cross-departmental policies, and to tackle the territory-wide problems that require legislative or policy change.

3.4.6 A few views express high expectations of the ability of SCDA that would be chaired by SHA or Permanent Secretary for Home Affairs and attended by Heads of Departments (HoDs) to help resolve district problems.

3.4.7 There are views that the SCDA adopts a top-down approach in resolving district problems, thus run against the principle of "local resolution of local problems". They consider that inter-departmental coordination should be undertaken by the DOs at district level.

3.4.8 There are views that the SCDA should focus on higher level policy matters than petty district issues.

3.4.9 There are also a few views that DC Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen should be invited to join the SCDA to enhance local participation and the SCDA's representativeness.

(iii) HoDs that Have Direct Interface With the Public to Attend DC Meetings

3.4.10 A number of views express support to the proposal that HoDs should take turns to attend DC meetings. They also suggest that guidelines on HoD's attendance at DC meetings should be drawn up.

3.4.11 There are views that directorate grade officers in Government departments should also be requested to attend DC meetings regularly, say every three months in order to have a better understanding of district opinions. This would address DC Members' complaint that the officials attending DC meetings are not senior enough and are unable to make substantive response to DCs.

(iv) Annual Summit on District Administration

3.4.12 There are a few views that the proposed annual CE's Summit on District Administration should enhance the dialogue between senior Government officials (Principal Officials, Permanent Secretaries, HoDs) and DCs, and through the Summit, the senior officials could have a better understanding of district issues.

3.4.13 There are a few views that the Summit should be held more frequently so that senior Government officials could have more opportunities to listen to district views direct.

3.4.14 There are also views that the Summit would be a mere show and would not help deliver concrete achievements to enhance work in districts.

3.5 Enhancing District Partnership

3.5.1 There are a number of views that support the direction of promoting DCs' partnership with other sectors to further social objectives and meet district needs, in particular, to encourage the setting up of social enterprises and creation of jobs. A few also consider that DCs should partner with other sectors to do more on local tourism, environmental protection, education and volunteerism.

3.5.2 There are views that more should be done to encourage cross-district partnership between neighbouring DCs on matters that are of mutual concern, e.g. cross-district developments.

3.5.3 There are a few views that a mechanism should be devised to facilitate partnership between DCs and LegCo and to provide added channels for LegCo to exchange views with DCs on district matters and territory-wide matters that are of particular concern to certain DCs.

3.6 Support for District Council Members

(i) To Increase the Level of Honorarium to \$18,700 Per Month and Increase the Level of OEA to \$18,000 Per Month

3.6.1 Diverse views were received in the consultation period towards this proposal.

3.6.2 Many views support the proposed increase of honorarium and OEA to attract more people to participate in district work and hope that the proposal could be implemented as soon as possible. Some of them consider the proposed increase inadequate and urge the Government to consider increasing the honourium and OEA further.

3.6.3 Many views do not support the proposal, in particular, some of them consider the performance of some DC Members as unsatisfactory and so an improved remuneration package is not justified. They suggest setting up a mechanism to monitor the performance of DC Members.

3.6.4 Some views consider that the Government should provide DC Members with medical benefits, accident insurance, provident fund and other retirement benefits.

(ii) To Introduce Non-accountable Miscellaneous Expenses Allowance, Accountable Setting-up Allowance and Accountable Winding-up Allowance

3.6.5 A number of views support the introduction of new allowances, but a few have expressed reservations.

3.6.6 Some views consider the proposed restriction on the ambit of OEA inappropriate as some DC Members who have no ward offices may want to use the OEA to cover other expenses to facilitate communication with their constituents and the local residents. They propose to relax the ambit of OEA to allow flexibility and enable DC Members to use it to cover expenses on printing, publicity and communications.

3.6.7 There are views suggesting that DC Members should engage professional auditors to audit their expenses. However, there are also other views that the auditing expenses would pose a heavy burden on the DC Members and would only reflect the Government's lack of trust on DC Members' integrity.

3.7 Composition of District Councils

(i) Retention of Appointed Seats in 2008

3.7.1 There are both views supporting and opposing the retention of appointed seats in DCs in the next term commencing in 2008.

3.7.2 Those supporting retention consider that appointed seats could facilitate individuals of different background, including for example professionals and businessmen, to participate in and contribute to the management of district affairs. Their expertise and experience could complement those of the elected members.

3.7.3 Among those who support the retention of appointed seats in the 2008 DCs, there are suggestions that the appointment process could be made more transparent. Some also suggest that appointed seats could be reduced in number or abolished in the longer term.

3.7.4 On the other hand, those who are against the retention of appointed seats consider that appointed membership is not in line with the principle of democracy. Nevertheless, many of them acknowledge the quality of appointed members and their contribution to the work of DCs over the years.

(ii) Retention of Ex-officio Seats

3.7.5 There are views which support as well as views which oppose their retention.

3.7.6 Those in support consider that since the ex-officio members are elected Chairmen of Rural Committees (who are in turn mainly made up of elected village representatives), they are also returned through a democratic electoral process. It has also been pointed out that they have served as an important bridge between DCs and village residents.

3.7.7 On the other hand, those who are against the retention of ex-officio membership consider that the existing arrangement is unfair to urban residents as it effectively allows village residents to have two representatives on DCs.

(iii) Population Quota

3.7.8 Some views consider the current population quota of around 17,000 to be too low and suggest that the population quota be increased to enhance the representativeness of elected members.

3.7.9 Some also suggest that increasing the size of the constituencies will facilitate the grooming of political talents with a broader outlook. Some of them suggest maintaining the existing number of elected seats but having the members returned through multiple-seat constituencies. There are also views which consider that the number of elected seats could be reduced.

3.7.10 A few submissions suggest reducing the number of DCs from 18 to, say, five to seven.

3.8 District Council Election-Related Matters

3.8.1 There are views in support of the proposal, put forth in the consultation document, to put back the polling day of future DC elections to early December to minimize the impact of the suspension of DCs' operation.

3.8.2 On the other hand, others express reservations because they consider the resultant period between the polling day and the commencement of the new DC term to be too short for outgoing DC Members to make the necessary arrangement to terminate the employment of their staff and the tenancy agreements of their ward offices.

3.8.3 The proposal to provide financial assistance for candidates of DC elections is generally welcomed. There are views that, in calculating the amount of financial assistance, the amount of donations received by candidates should not be deducted from the election expenses.

3.8.4 There are also a few views that the proposed maximum level of assistance (i.e. 50% of the actual election expenses of the candidates) should be raised.

3.8.5 On the other hand, there are views suggesting that the amount of assistance should be reduced to, say, \$5 to \$8 per vote received.

3.9 Financial and Staffing Implications

(i) Staffing Resources for Supporting DCs

3.9.1 There are some views that the Government should provide more staffing resources to District Offices and DC Secretariats to handle the additional work to be created by the DC Review, such as the management of district facilities and increase of DC Funds.

(ii) DC Secretariats

3.9.2 There are a number of views urging the Government to set up independent DC secretariats which would be directly responsible to DCs to allow DCs more flexibility and independence in deploying resources to support its work.

(iii) *Impact on Staff of Government Department*

3.9.3 There are a few views (especially staff of departments concerned e.g. LCSD) that express concern over the delineation of responsibility between DCs and Government departments. They consider that lack of clear delineation would create difficulties for departmental staff in executing their duties.

Home Affairs Bureau

September 2006

List of Written Submissions Received During the Public Consultation Period

Serial No.	Name
001	Dr Wong Yee-him, John, Kowloon City District Councillor
002	黎先生
003	賽孔明
004	黃大仙區議員 (李思泌, 李明佩聯署)
005	Ting Ping
006	民建聯黃大仙支部 (簡志豪, 何賢輝, 陳曼琪, 鄭德健, 林文輝, 黎榮浩聯署)
007	大埔區議員 (鄭家富, 李志成, 黃俊煒, 關永業, 區鎮樺, 黃天龍, 任啓邦, 易健卿聯署)
008	民主黨新界西支部 (何俊仁, 陳樹英, 蔣月蘭, 黃麗嫦, 何杏梅, 林頌鎧, 方麗雯, 盧民漢, 黃偉賢, 張賢登, 鄭俊宇, 鄭智揚, 洪秀明, 馬玉妹聯署)
009	屯門區議員 (李瑩, 英汝興, 劉業強, 劉智鵬, 蕭楚基, 龐創聯署)
010	傅夏茂
011	黃國新
012	Joseph Salaroli, Eastern District Councillor
013	(Name not provided)
014	葵青區議員李志強
015	屯門區議員蕭楚基
016	Jennifer Lo
017	嚴祖龍
018	John Cable
019	(Name not provided)
020	L1
021	香港民主民生協進會
022	九龍城區議員 (馮競文, 陳家偉, 劉定邦, 文德全, 陳麗君聯署)
023	九龍城區議員 (林健文, 蔡麗玲, 區嘉誠聯署)
024	九龍城區議員伍精民
025	黃鍵鴻
026	陳健雄
027	(The sender requested anonymity)
028	九龍社團聯會
029	工聯會地區服務處
030	觀塘區議員高寶齡
031	Tam Wai-chu, Maria
032	公民力量
033	沙田民主派議員
034	楊其超
035	(Confidentiality required)

Serial No.	Name
036	Amy Kok
037	香港游泳協會 (with the results of 306 questionnaire returns)
038	藍田社區事務促進會
039	新力量網絡 (SynergyNet)
040	葵青區議員黃光武
041	Louisa Ng
042	盧黃鳳萍
043	盧黃鳳萍
044	李大壯
045	石禮謙
046	西貢區議員邱全
047	不留名委員
048	Ricky
049	盧黃鳳萍
050	馬長奎
051	盧黃鳳萍
052	盧黃鳳萍
053	盧黃鳳萍
054	周健平
055	盧黃鳳萍
056	甘先生
057	葉偉文
058	吳麗容
059	邱經偉
060	陳冬玲
061	朱馥均
062	李珏楠
063	文承祖
064	何富明
065	何良
066	(Confidentiality required)
067	盧黃鳳萍
068	Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China
069	東區區議員王金殿
070	kanmang tong
071	(The sender requested anonymity)
072	呂偉廉
073	胡伯林
074	Ir Dr Dennis HF Mui
075	盧黃鳳萍
076	沙田專上學生同盟
077	Business and Professionals Federation of Hong Kong
078	東區區議員林翠蓮
079	一南區市民
080	離島區議會副主席周轉香
081	郭偉強
082	香港工會聯合會社會事務委員會

Serial No.	Name
083	Calvin Cheung
084	香港一群忠心的市民
085	Hong Kong Schools Sports Federation
086	離島區議員容詠嫦
087	鄭承峰
088	(Confidentiality required)
089	一群基層員工及市民
090	(The sender requested anonymity)
091	Tam Man-ip
092	Playright Children's Play Association
093	康樂事務主任協會，康樂事務經理協會及政府康樂體育事務職員會聯署
094	東區區議員曾健成
095	(The sender requested anonymity)
096	Lau Siu-fai
097	香港職工會聯盟社會事務委員會
098	Mary Mulvihill
099	東九龍居民委員會
100	極大部份選民的心聲
101	王佐基
102	西貢區議員何民傑
103	HongKong Civic Association
104	Hong Kong Rugby Football Union
105	公民黨
106	QQ_Boston
107	觀塘區議會主席陳振彬
108	(Confidentiality required)
109	毛小姐
110	耆康會荃葵青長者綜合服務長者地區委員會
111	選舉工程司
112	梁廣華
113	Duncan Ho
114	(The sender requested anonymity)
115	李治南
116	Dr Wong Yee-him, John, Kowloon City District Councillor
117	Alice Lau
118	(Confidentiality required)
119	(Confidentiality required)
120	(Confidentiality required)
121	香港基督教協進會社會公義與民生關注委員會
122	Ip Lau Suk-ye, Regina
123	葉慶龍
124	C.C. Lee
125	油尖旺區議員陳健成
126	香港中華基督教青年會荃灣會所「你想社區」公民教育計劃小組成員
127	(Confidentiality required)
128	Sarah Ng
129	離島區議員梁兆棠
130	香港長者協會

Serial No.	Name
131	區政論壇
132	香港環境保護協會
133	民主黨
134	曾慶光
135	華富及薄扶林分區委員會
136	香港公共圖書館館長張燕清
137	深水埗區議員 (陳東，曾淵滄，郭振華，李漢雄，陳鏡秋聯署)
138	South Lantau Liaison Committee
139	香港專上學生聯會
140	黃大仙中分區委員會及黃大仙南分區委員會
141	(The sender requested anonymity)
142	Civic Exchange
143	中華基督教會深愛堂社關團契
144	公民力量
145	香港中央青年議會副主席呂永基
146	民主動力
147	Cherish
148	葵青區議會主席周奕希
149	陳偉雄
150	自由黨
151	星斗市民
152	香港一市民
153	Kam Leung
154	香港研究協會
155	香港婦女中心協會
156	東區區議員曹漢光
157	二級助理康樂事務經理協會
158	政府圖書館館長協會
159	傅滿芳
160	深水埗區議會
161	政府文化事務職系大聯盟
162	政府圖書館館長協會主席謝蘊璿

**Motions passed by the 18 District Councils
in respect of the District Council Review Consultation Document**

District Council (DC)	Meeting Date	Motion¹
Tuen Mun	2 May 2006	Tuen Mun DC supports the direction of the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and requests for the inclusion of Tuen Mun into the first batch of pilot districts to “manage district facilities”.
Tai Po	2 May 2006	Tai Po DC welcomes the recent consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” issued by the Government. We support the proposals set out therein and consider the Review to be in the right direction to enhance the role and functions of DCs in a prudent and gradual manner.
Wong Tai Sin	2 May 2006	Wong Tai Sin DC agrees with the direction of the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and in principle supports the proposals therein. The Wong Tai Sin DC hopes that the Government would listen to public views in order to fine-tune the proposals and details contained in the consultation document.
Eastern	9 May 2006	Eastern DC supports the proposals set out in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and considers the Review to be in the right direction to enhance the role and functions of DCs in a prudent and gradual manner.
Kwai Tsing	11 May 2006	Kwai Tsing DC supports the proposals set out in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and agrees that the role and functions of DCs should be enhanced in a prudent and gradual manner. It strongly requests Kwai Tsing to be included into the first batch of pilot districts to manage district facilities.

District Council (DC)	Meeting Date	Motion¹
Wan Chai	16 May 2006	The Council supports the direction of the Review and requests Wan Chai to be a pilot district.
Kowloon City	18 May 2006	This Council supports the implementation of the proposals set out in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils”.
Kwun Tong	18 May 2006	Kwun Tong DC supports the Government to conduct a review on enhancing the role and functions of DCs. We consider the proposals in the Review to be in the right direction and should be implemented as soon as possible to enhance the role and functions of DCs in a prudent and gradual manner.
Sham Shui Po	23 May 2006	<p>Sham Shui Po DC supports the direction of the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils”. However, because the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” consultation document does not fully devolve the powers of the dissolved Municipal Councils to DCs, nor does it make a clear pledge to scrap the appointed seats in the DCs, the Sham Shui Po DC strongly requests the SAR Government to set out a timetable for devolving powers to DCs to implement and enhance the principle of “district matters handled at the district level” and to facilitate effective governance. At the same time, there should be universal suffrage of DCs as soon as possible to address the public aspirations for democratic constitutional reform.</p> <p>Nevertheless, Sham Shui Po DC understands that “changes take time and it all starts with the first step”. It welcomes the Government to consider Sham Shui Po as a pilot district for participating in the management of certain district facilities. If so, the Government should provide adequate support to cater for the enhanced role and functions of DCs.</p>

District Council (DC)	Meeting Date	Motion ¹
Central and Western	25 May 2006	This Council agrees with the direction as set out in the consultation document on “Enhancing work in districts, strengthening District Councils” and requests for the early implementation of the proposals and the further expansion of the management role of DCs.
Sha Tin	25 May 2006	As the Review on the Role, Functions and Compositions of DCs recently put forward by the Government can strengthen DCs’ role in district management, Sha Tin DC supports the Review. As the same time, Sha Tin DC urges the Government to listen to the views of DCs and the public during the consultation period and implement the proposals as soon as possible to ensure that this district administration reform will indeed meet the public interest.
Tsuen Wan	30 May 2006	Tsuen Wan DC supports the proposals set out in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and considers the Review to be in the right direction to enhance the role and functions of DCs in a prudent and gradual manner. It requests Tsuen Wan to be included into the first batch of pilot districts to manage district facilities.
Sai Kung	6 June 2006	This Council supports the proposals in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and request to set up the District Facilities Management Committee under this Council to steer and monitor the management of district facilities starting from January 2007.
North	8 June 2006	North DC supports the proposals in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and considers that a prudent and gradual approach should be adopted to enhance the role and functions of DCs for effective improvement in community services and grooming political talents. This Council is willing to participate in district management work and hopes that the Northern district can be included as one of the pilot districts.

District Council (DC)	Meeting Date	Motion¹
Islands	19 June 2006	Islands DC supports the direction and proposals of the Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils recently put forward by the Government and agrees that a prudent and gradual approach should be adopted to enhance the role and functions of DCs.
Yuen Long	22 June 2006	This Council supports the content of the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” issued by the Government as it can enhance the role of DCs in district administration and ensure timely response to district needs.
Southern	29 June 2006	Southern DC supports the proposals in the consultation document on the “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils” and requests to review the pilot scheme one year after its implementation in order to gradually enhance the role of DCs and expand their functions. In the long run, the Government should examine the composition and election of DCs.
Yau Tsim Mong	29 June 2006	Yau Tsim Mong DC supports the overall direction of the consultation document on “Review on the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils”. This Council also agrees to enhance the role and functions of DCs through a prudent and gradual approach and to enhance the communication and cooperation between DCs and various Government bureaux and departments.

Note 1: The motions contained in this table are the translated version of the original Chinese version passed by the DCs.