

**Bills Committee on Communications Authority Bill**

**List of follow-up actions arising from the discussion  
at the meeting on 4 November 2010**

1. The Administration was requested to provide:
  - (a) information in table form on the composition, membership (including whether the members were full-time or part-time; and the level of fees and salaries for these members), functions and missions of unified regulators for telecommunications and broadcasting sectors in overseas jurisdictions (such as the United States (the US), Canada, the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia) and the proposed Communications Authority (CA);
  - (b) a summary table of the provisions of the relevant legislation regulating conflict of interests and governing the disclosure of interests for members of unified regulators in overseas jurisdictions (such as the US, Canada, the UK and Australia);
  - (c) information on the workload (such as the number of open/closed meetings, the duration of each meeting, the number of issues handled) of the Telecommunications Authority and the Broadcasting Authority (BA), and how the proposed membership of the CA could perform the complex and heavy duties efficiently and effectively after the merger; and
  - (d) a list of agenda items (indicating whether the items were confidential or open) for meetings of the BA in the past four years, and the relevant press releases announcing BA's deliberations after the meetings.
  
2. The Administration was also requested to:
  - (a) confirm whether the appointment of members to the future CA would be in compliance with the six-year and six-board Rules and the principle of gender mainstreaming;
  - (b) consider if amendments to the Bill should be made to include the public mission of the CA;

- (c) consider amending Clause 3 of the Bill to spell out clearly that the CA was an independent statutory body other than the provisions stipulated in Clause 3(3);
- (d) consider members' request to propose amendments to the Bill requiring the chairperson-designate of the CA to go through a non-binding pre-appointment hearing at the Legislative Council, similar to the relevant practice of the UK;
- (e) consider amending Clause 8(1)(c) of the Bill to spell out clearly that the Director-General of Communications was a public officer;
- (f) consider whether nomination from the trade and different sectors of the community should be accepted so as to enhance the transparency of the appointment mechanism of the CA; and
- (g) re-consider the suggestion of establishing a non-civil service organization as the executive arm of the CA in future, by making reference to the relevant practices in overseas jurisdictions (such as the US, Canada, the UK and Australia).