

**Bills Committee on
Property Management Services Bill**

**List of follow-up actions arising from the discussion
at the meeting on 4 November 2014**

1. Members noted the profile of buildings which were currently managed by owners' corporations ("OCs") or other forms of owners' organizations without engaging property management companies ("PMCs") or property management practitioners ("PMPs"), as provided in paragraph 2 of LC Paper No. CB(2)191/14-15(02). The Administration was requested to provide, in the table below, a further breakdown of those figures -

<u>No. of units</u>	<u>No. of single tenement buildings</u>		<u>OCs or owners' organizations managing more than one block of building</u>	
	(%)	No. of buildings	Proportion of OCs/owners' organizations managing property units in the range defined (%)	No. of buildings/block of building managed by the OCs/owners organizations concerned
Less than 50 units	82%		57%	
Less than 100 units	94%		72%	
101 - 200 units				
201 - 300 units				
301 - 400 units				
401 - 500 units				
501 - 600 units				
601 - 700 units				
701 - 800 units				
801 - 900 units				
901- 1 000 units				
More than 1 000 units				

2. The Administration was also requested to provide more detailed information on the existing nine single tenement buildings/estates which comprised more than 500 units and were managed by OCs or owners' organizations without engaging PMCs or PMPs, including names of these buildings, their location and age, number of storeys/blocks involved, the exact number of flats/property units in the buildings, the dates when the respective

buildings started to be managed by OCs or other forms of owners' organizations without engaging PMCs or PMPs and the forms of management adopted etc.

3. Regarding Clause 7 of the Property Management Services Bill ("the Bill") about exceptions to Clause 6 which sought to prohibit unlicensed activities, members remained concerned that it might create loopholes for owners, OCs or other forms of owners' organizations to circumvent the legislation. In some members' view, in order to plug the loopholes, the Administration should require that OCs' decision to opt for "self-management" without engaging any PMCs or PMPs must be made by passing a resolution at an owners' meeting. It was suggested that amendments be made either to the Building Management Ordinance (Cap. 344) or the Bill to provide for such a requirement. The Administration was requested to respond to the above suggestion.

4. Concern was raised that there was no elaboration on what constituted "self-management of property" by an OC, an owners' organization or individual owners as contemplated by Clause 7(3) or (4) of the Bill. For example, it was not clearly specified as to whether "self-management" could involve tenants and/or agents managing the property on behalf of the owners. The Administration was requested to consider the need to clearly define the relevant circumstances of the exceptions in the Bill.

5. Enquiry was raised about the course content and detailed arrangement (e.g. evening or weekend classes) of continuing professional development ("CPD") courses designed for in-service PMPs to meet the future licensing requirements as well as the fees to be charged on those CPD courses. There was a suggestion that existing PMPs should be provided with paid training leave or training subsidy to attend the CPD courses. The Administration was requested to consider and provide a written response to this suggestion.