

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. FC215/18-19

(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(8)

**Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Friday, 7 December 2018, at 3:20 pm**

**Members present:**

Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Members absent:**

Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding

**Public officers attending:**

Ms Alice LAU Yim, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Carol YUEN, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1
Mr Mike CHENG Wai-man	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Ms Amy WONG Pui-man	Deputy Secretary for the Civil Service 2
Dr Constance CHAN Hon-ye, JP	Director of Health
Dr Raymond SO Wai-man, BBS, JP	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Ms Linda SO Wai-sze	Deputy Director-General of Civil Aviation (2)
Mr Raymond LI Kwok-chu	Assistant Director-General of Civil Aviation (Air Traffic Management)
Ms Mona CHEUNG Lai-kuen	Chief (Technical and Development), Civil Aviation Department
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Francis CHAU Siu-hei, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)3
Mr Alfred SIT Wing-hang, JP	Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services
Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi, JP	Under Secretary for Home Affairs
Ms Sandy CHEUNG Pui-shan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Culture)2
Mr CHAN Shing-wai	Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Heritage and Museums)

**Other person attending:**

Mr Daniel HO Chi-wai	Director, Building Rehabilitation, Urban Renewal Authority
----------------------	---

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
--------------	-------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Angel SHEK	Chief Council Secretary(1)1
Ms Ada LAU	Senior Council Secretary (1)7
Miss Judy YEE	Council Secretary (1)1
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Miss Mandy POON	Legislative Assistant (1)1

---

Action

The Chairman reminded members of the requirements under Rules 83A and 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

**Item 1 — FCR(2018-19)61**

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT  
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 31 OCTOBER 2018**

**EC(2018-19)13**

**HEAD 37 — DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH**

**Subhead 000 — Operational expenses**

2. The Chairman advised that the item sought the approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") of the recommendation made by the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") at its meeting held on 31 October 2018, i.e. the recommendation set out in EC(2018-19)13 to create one permanent post of Consultant (D4/D3/D2) as Consultant (Family Medicine) 2 under the Department of Health ("DH") to enhance the overall clinical supervision, planning, development and operation of Families Clinics. ESC had spent about 1 hour and 36 minutes on the scrutiny of the aforesaid proposal. The Administration had also submitted an information paper.

3. Dr Pierre CHAN expressed support for the staffing proposal and called on members to give their support. He said that the proposal to create the proposed post to enhance the overall clinical supervision, planning, development and operation of Families Clinics could not only enhance the quality of healthcare services provided for civil servants and eligible persons ("CSEPs"), but also reduce their demand for public healthcare services. Deputy Secretary for the Civil Service 2 ("DS(CS)2") thanked Dr CHAN for his support.

4. Regarding the recruitment exercises conducted by DH from 2015 to 2017 to fill vacancies of doctors in Families Clinics, Mr Martin LIAO asked about the following:

- (a) the result of each recruitment exercise;
- (b) whether the Administration had conducted reviews after each recruitment exercise to identify the reasons for not being able to recruit enough doctors to fill the vacancies and come up with improvement measures;
- (c) whether DH had, so far, yet to recruit enough doctors; and
- (d) the result of the recruitment exercise conducted in October 2018.

5. Director of Health advised that:

- (a) 67 doctors were employed to work under DH from 2015 to 2017, and 9 of them had joined the Families Clinics to provide services;
- (b) some doctors who had rejected the employment offers relayed to DH that they chose to stay in their original positions or had other career development plans;
- (c) at present, DH had yet to fill all vacancies of doctors in the Families Clinics; and
- (d) a new round of recruitment exercise for doctors, which was originally scheduled to be conducted in October 2018, had been postponed to November 2018, and the relevant sections under DH were still handling follow-up work relating to the recruitment exercise.

6. Mr HO Kai-ming expressed support for the staffing proposal. Mr HO noted that there was a dedicated multi-disciplinary team under the Hospital Authority ("HA") providing HA employees injured at work with the necessary medical services, in order to expedite the recovery of the relevant employees and help them resume duty. Mr HO asked if similar service teams were provided under the Families Clinics of DH to help civil servants injured at work; if not, whether arrangements could be made with DH to provide the same service for civil servants.

7. Director of Health advised that as no similar medical teams were provided under the establishment of Families Clinics, Families Clinics must refer civil servants in need of the aforesaid treatment to the relevant specialty departments of HA for follow-up.

8. DS(CS)2 replied that:

- (a) Occupational Health Centres were set up in Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital respectively to provide civil servants injured at work with necessary physiotherapy or occupational therapy treatment during office hours; and
- (b) some civil servants who were injured at work outside office hours would be given priority treatment at designated general out-patient clinics of HA.

Voting on FCR(2018-19)61

9. At 3:28 pm, the Chairman put item FCR(2018-19)61 to vote. The Chairman was of the view that the majority of the members present and voting were in favour of the item, and he declared that the item was approved.

**Item 2 — FCR(2018-19)62**

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT  
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 31 OCTOBER 2018**

**EC(2018-19)15**

**HEAD 28 — CIVIL AVIATION DEPARTMENT**

**Subhead 000 — Operational expenses**

10. The Chairman advised that the item sought FC's approval of the recommendation made by ESC at its meeting held on 31 October 2018, i.e. the recommendation set out in EC(2018-19)15 to create one permanent Chief Air Traffic Control Officer ("CATCO") post (D1) and one supernumerary CATCO post (D1) to strengthen managerial oversight of daily air traffic control ("ATC") operations to ensure the provision of safe, reliable and efficient ATC services. ESC had spent about 34 minutes on the scrutiny of the aforesaid proposal. The Administration had also submitted a number of information papers.

Voting on FCR(2018-19)62

11. At 3:29 pm, the Chairman put item FCR(2018-19)62 to vote. The Chairman was of the view that the majority of the members present and voting were in favour of the item, and he declared that the item was approved.

**Item 3 — FCR(2018-19)63**

**HEAD 42 — ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT**

**Subhead 700 — General non-recurrent**

**New Item — "Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme"**

12. The Chairman advised that the item invited FC to approve a new non-recurrent commitment of \$2.5 billion for implementing the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme ("LIMSS"). The Development Bureau ("DEVB") consulted the Panel on Development on the proposal on 23 October 2018. The Panel had spent about 1 hour and 11 minutes on the discussion of the proposal.

Scope of works and services to be covered by the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme

13. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired about the consideration to be given by the Administration in prioritizing the handling of applications of eligible buildings when implementing LIMSS.

14. Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services ("DEMS") advised that the Administration intended to adopt a risk-based strategy in handling applications under the proposed scheme, i.e. priority would be accorded to applications of buildings with lifts which had not been installed with all the essential safety devices listed in paragraph 8(a)(i) of the discussion paper.

15. While expressing support for LIMSS, Dr Priscilla LEUNG considered that the proposed scheme might serve to treat the symptoms but not the root cause of the ageing problem of lifts in Hong Kong. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Helena WONG and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung also expressed the same concern.

16. DEMS explained that under LIMSS, consultants engaged by the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") would conduct lift assessment for eligible buildings, and if complete replacement of lifts would be more cost effective than retrofitting the essential safety devices listed in paragraph 8(a)(i) of the discussion paper, owners of the eligible buildings could choose at their discretion whether or not to use the subsidy under the proposed scheme (subject to a cap of \$500,000 per lift) for complete replacement of the lifts.

17. In the light of the Administration's response, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting considered that the Administration should step up its publicity and education work, so that the owners concerned could make a wise decision after they had fully grasped the respective pros and cons as well as the costs of the two options to either retrofit the safety devices or completely replace the lifts. Expressing agreement with Mr LAM's suggestion, the Chairman called on the authorities to consider requesting contractors tendering for the lift works to provide separate quotations for replacement of safety devices and complete replacement of lifts for owners' easy reference.

18. DEMS supplemented that under LIMSS, the subsidy would cover complete replacement of lifts which had not been equipped with all essential safety devices. As such, it was envisaged that contractors of lift works under LIMSS were required to provide quotations respectively for the retrofitting of safety devices and complete replacement of lifts during the tendering process, to facilitate the applicants concerned to make a wise decision after having all relevant price information.

19. Dr Fernando CHEUNG was concerned about the inconvenience that might be caused to the elderly and disabled persons living in the buildings concerned when works under LIMSS were being carried out. He suggested allocating part of the resources under LIMSS to provide assistance to those people, such as following the example of the Hong Kong Council of Social Service to provide staircase climbing service for persons with mobility difficulties.

20. Noting Dr CHEUNG's view, Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PSD/W") advised that the Administration would follow up the



suggestion with the relevant organizations. DEMS said that the authorities would consider how to assist the elderly and persons with mobility difficulties to go up and down the buildings during the works period, and he undertook that the authorities would strive to minimize the inconvenience caused by the works under LIMSS to the residents.

#### Eligible buildings and target beneficiaries

21. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Dr Helena WONG said that while there were a total of 13 000 lifts in eligible buildings, subsidy for modernization works was only intended to be provided to about 5 000 lifts with higher priority under LIMSS, and they enquired about the reasons for that. Dr KWOK was concerned that owners of eligible buildings without owners' corporations might have no way to tell whether lifts in their buildings were equipped with the essential safety devices, and whether the Administration would assist those owners in conducting inspections of the buildings.

22. In response, DEMS advised that having regard to the fact that not every eligible building would participate in LIMSS, the Administration had only sought FC's funding approval to carry out modernization works of 5 000 lifts at this juncture. The Administration would keep monitoring the feedbacks and results of LIMSS as well as the capacity of the industry before reviewing whether LIMSS would be expanded in due course. When necessary, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") would provide information to building owners about the essential safety devices not yet equipped in the lifts. Upon commencement of LIMSS, URA's social service teams would also assist building owners in applying for the subsidy.

23. Mr Christopher CHEUNG expressed support for the funding proposal, particularly because the subsidy under LIMSS could cover all/part of the costs for complete replacement of lifts. Noting that about 8 000 eligible lifts could not benefit from LIMSS, Mr CHEUNG was concerned whether the said lifts were safe for use in the next few years and whether the Administration would increase the frequency of repair and maintenance for those lifts.

24. Ms CHAN Hoi-yan expressed support for the funding proposal. She said that of the lifts in eligible buildings, more than half had not been installed with double brake systems, while nearly 80% had not been installed with unintended car movement protection devices. Thus, she considered that the number of lifts to be benefitted under LIMSS was on the low side and was worried about potential safety risks that might be created to the public by the remaining lifts.

25. DEMS explained that:

- (a) periodic maintenance for lifts operating in Hong Kong should be carried out by registered lift workers in accordance with the law;
- (b) with technological advancement, most of the lifts available in the market at a later stage were equipped with the aforesaid essential safety devices. Lifts installed in earlier times, however, were safe for use so long as they were under proper examination, repair and maintenance periodically, even if they were not equipped with the essential safety devices. Building owners could decide whether to retrofit the aforesaid devices at their own cost to enhance the safety standard of those lifts; and
- (c) the authorities noted that in lift incidents causing injuries and deaths in recent years, proper operation of the lift brake system was crucial to ensuring the safe operation of lifts. EMSD had updated the Code of Practice for Lift Works and Escalator Works in 2018, including the requirement that from 1 February 2019, lift contractors and responsible persons should carry out semiannual special maintenance works for brake systems of aged lifts which had yet to be modernized.

26. Mr Vincent CHENG enquired whether measures had been put in place to assist owners of eligible three-nil buildings (i.e. buildings with no owners' corporation or owners' committee formed nor property management company employed) to participate in LIMSS; and of the three-nil buildings with lifts installed, what the proportion of such lifts was to the 5 000 lifts to be benefitted from LIMSS.

27. PSD/W and DEMS advised that at present, there were about several tens of three-nil buildings with lifts installed in Hong Kong, and URA's district partners would take the initiative to contact owners of those buildings and assist them to apply for LIMSS when necessary.

28. Mr Martin LIAO enquired how the Administration would step up publicity on LIMSS and the policy of providing additional subsidy to elderly owner-occupiers living in eligible buildings, while assisting them in making applications. Mr LIAO suggested that the Administration could enlist the help of non-governmental organizations in this regard. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the amount and disbursement

method of the additional subsidy for elderly owner-occupiers under LIMSS.

29. Director, Building Rehabilitation, URA ("D(BR)/URA") replied that URA would assign a case officer for each successful participating building under LIMSS, and the case officer would be responsible for explaining the details about the arrangements, requirements and subsidies of LIMSS to building owners, as well as handling administrative work relating to the processing of applications for subsidies, etc.

30. Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)<sup>3</sup> advised that elderly eligible owner-occupiers aged 60 or above would be subsidized with the full cost that they needed to contribute towards the lift modernization works, subject to a cap of \$50,000 per domestic unit. Depending on the payment arrangements made between the owners' corporations and elderly owner-occupiers for the cost of works, the additional subsidy would be disbursed to the owners' corporations or elderly owners direct (subject to the production of proof of payment by the owners) by URA. The additional subsidy payable to eligible elderly owner-occupiers would not count towards the amount of subsidy per lift (subject to a cap of \$500,000).

31. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting enquired whether housing estates under the Tenants Purchase Scheme were eligible to take part in LIMSS. PSD/W replied in the affirmative.

32. Referring to the lift accident that happened at Sheungshui Town Centre, Mrs Regina IP and Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether the lift involved in the accident ("the Incident Lift") was one of the 5 000 lifts eligible for subsidies for conducting modernization works. DEMS advised that as the Incident Lift had not been equipped with all the essential safety devices, and the rateable value ("RV") of the building concerned was below the ceiling, the building met the conditions for participating in LIMSS. That said, the granting of subsidies for conducting modernization works would depend on the relative priorities of other eligible buildings.

33. Mr Gary FAN enquired about the reasons for the Administration using the average RV of housing units as one of the criteria in determining the eligibility of buildings, how such a criterion would be applied in the case of large housing estates, and how the authorities would handle the matter if building owners disagreed with the Administration's view on whether the building concerned was eligible for LIMSS.

34. PSD/W explained that the Administration had made reference to the practice of the ongoing Operation Building Bright 2.0 Scheme and Fire

Safety Improvement Works Subsidy Scheme when adopting the average RV as one of the criteria in determining the eligibility of buildings under LIMSS.

35. D(BR)/URA supplemented that the Administration had identified the buildings eligible for participating in LIMSS on the basis of data of the Rating Valuation Department for 2017-2018. The identified buildings would not be deleted from the list even if there were property price fluctuations after 2017-2018. Separately, in the case of large housing estates, the average RV would be worked out according to the number of domestic units in buildings covered by the Deed of Mutual Covenant by taking the average RV of the units concerned.

36. Mr Jeremy TAM queried the Administration's adoption of two different average RVs for buildings in urban areas and the New Territories, rather than using a unified RV as the application threshold for LIMSS. Mr AU Nok-hin considered that apart from the age of buildings, it would be more reasonable to assess the risk of lifts on account of their age and operating conditions or status. Mr TAM requested the Administration to list out respectively the average ages of private and composite buildings in Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories with aged lifts installed; and make use of the data to explain how the Administration used two different average RVs as the application threshold for the scheme.

37. DEMS replied that one of the elements under LIMSS was "care-based". By using average RV as the screening criterion for participating buildings, the Administration could allocate resources to help those building owners in need of assistance, while avoiding the need to conduct other asset or income means tests. In addition, the authorities would also adopt a risk-based approach to prioritize the provision of subsidies. For example, priority would be accorded to lifts which had not been equipped with a greater number of safety protection devices. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Mr TAM after the meeting.

*[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC86/18-19(01) on 7 January 2019.]*

#### Manpower resources required for implementing the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme

38. Expressing concern over the manpower shortage of registered lift workers, Mr KWONG Chun-yu was worried about the impact of

manpower shortage on the quality of lift repair and maintenance works. He enquired how the Administration would work together with the industry in coordinating manpower demand and supply when implementing the proposed scheme; and what measures the Administration would put in place to raise the standard of the industry and monitor the quality of works, given the occurrence of a number of fatal lift accidents in recent years.

39. Dr Priscilla LEUNG was concerned whether there was a sufficient supply of technicians engaging in lift repair and maintenance or replacement works, and asked whether the Administration would consider importing foreign labour to assist in the implementation of LIMSS.

40. DEMS advised that:

- (a) since the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618) came into effect in 2012, the number of registered lift workers had, as at 2017, increased by 15% from about 4 960 to about 5 700, while around 1 800 general technicians were now waiting for completion of registration;
- (b) registered lift workers were capable to conduct lift repair and maintenance and/or replacement works;
- (c) compared with 2017, the number of lifts throughout the territory had increased by about 10%;
- (d) given the current manpower shortage, the authorities intended to modernize about 5 000 aged lifts through LIMSS over six years, with 600 lifts to be modernized in the first year upon the implementation of the proposed scheme; 800 lifts to be modernized in the second year; and 900 lifts per year in the following four years. If LIMSS was not implemented by phases, it was anticipated that the manpower shortage situation would be aggravated, pushing the cost of works upward while affecting the quality of works;
- (e) since the authorities promulgated the non-mandatory Guidelines for Modernising Existing Lifts in 2011 for voluntary participation by owners, the industry had once completed modernization works of about 2 000 lifts in a single year. Hence, the authorities were quite confident that the target of completing the modernization of 5 000 lifts could be achieved as per the schedule set out in item (d) above; and

- (f) the Code of Practice for Lift Works and Escalator Works was updated in 2018 to raise the industry's standard of works.

41. Mr HO Kai-ming suggested that to enhance the efficiency of LIMSS, each registered lift worker could lead a certain number of unregistered general technical workers to carry out the relevant lift modernization works, thereby increasing short-term manpower supply. Mr HO also suggested that in the long run, the authorities should promote the establishment of a lift industry council by the industry for the sake of nurturing talents. Considering from the perspective of safeguarding public safety, he did not support the suggestion of importing foreign labour to help implement the proposed scheme.

42. DEMS advised that according to the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance, registered lift workers and unregistered general workers under their direct supervision could carry out lift works, which was in line with the suggestion made by Mr HO Kai-ming. The Administration had set up the Lift and Escalator Safety Advisory Committee in 2013 to advise on matters relating to the administration and enforcement for lift and escalator safety in Hong Kong.

43. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong supported the funding proposal. He was concerned whether the proposed scheme would further aggravate the manpower shortage of the industry. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired about the supply of technicians for lift and escalator works in the next five years.

44. DEMS advised that in recent years, the Administration had put in place a series of measures as follows:

- (a) since the Vocational Training Council ("VTC") introduced the Earn & Learn Scheme in conjunction with the Construction Industry Council ("CIC") in 2014, the number of new apprentices enrolled each year had increased remarkably, from about 70 in the past to more than 200 in 2015, and more than 250 annually from 2016 to 2018;
- (b) in 2016, VTC and the School of Professional and Continuing Education of the University of Hong Kong launched two different continuing education programmes related to lift and escalator for the practicing workers to acquire the required qualifications to meet the registration requirements of registered workers;

- (c) CIC implemented the Contractor Cooperative Training Scheme for the Electrical and Mechanical ("E&M") trades (including lift and escalator mechanics) to provide financial support to those people who wished to join the lift and escalator industry; and
- (d) since 2016, EMSD had started to invest more than \$600 million in the hope of recruiting more than 1 000 technician trainees in five years to provide new blood for the entire E&M industry (including the lift and escalator engineering trade) to cope with future challenges.

45. Mr Tony TSE expressed concern over manpower training of the lift and escalator industry. He enquired about the following:

- (a) wastage rate of the Earn & Learn Scheme; and
- (b) difference between the qualifications of EMSD's technician trainees and participants of the Earn & Learn Scheme.

46. DEMS advised that:

- (a) no statistics relating to the wastage rate of the Earn & Learn Scheme had been kept by the authorities, but the number of registered lift workers had increased from about 4 960 in 2012 to about 5 700 in 2017, representing a net increase of around 15%;
- (b) the Earn & Learn Scheme was a programme launched by the Administration to provide financial support for secondary graduates. Under the Scheme, the Government would grant an allowance to the participants from their enrolment to completion of the programme and until a certain period of time after joining the industry, so as to encourage them to enroll in relevant E&M programmes and retain talents of the industry. In the past few years, the annual rates of salary increase of the practitioners ranged from 6% to 9%; and
- (c) the post of technician trainees recruited by EMSD was of an apprenticeship nature.

Arrangements prior to invitation of applications

47. Expressing support for the funding proposal, Mr Wilson OR called on the Administration to streamline the application procedures as far as possible to expedite the implementation and completion of LIMSS. Mr OR considered that the proposed scheme which could only benefit 5 000 lifts was a drop in a bucket. Mr OR enquired about the following:

- (a) to prevent deferral of the necessary lift modernization works by owners of eligible buildings, whether any arrangements had been made under LIMSS to cover building owners with lift modernization works now in progress;
- (b) whether the Administration would appoint professionals and public opinion representatives (such as Members of the Legislative Council ("LegCo")) to join the committee comprising representatives from DEVB, URA and EMSD to be set up to vet applications received for LIMSS ("the vetting committee"), so as to assist in monitoring the implementation of LIMSS and tender advice; and
- (c) nature of cases that required special consideration by the vetting committee.

48. Mr CHAN Han-pan suggested that non-official members be included in the vetting committee.

49. PSD/W noted the views expressed by Mr Wilson OR on streamlining the application procedures. He explained that the major duties of the vetting committee were to vet the applications received and prioritize subsidies for eligible buildings under LIMSS, while cases requiring special consideration would include those of three-nil buildings. DEMS advised that to prevent deferral of lift modernization works by owners of eligible buildings in order to obtain the subsidy under LIMSS, ongoing modernization works of such buildings would still be eligible for making applications under LIMSS provided that ("transitional arrangements"):

- (a) the Resumption Permit (i.e. Form LE8) allowing resumption of the use and operation of the lift undergoing the modernization works had not been issued by EMSD as at 10 October 2018 when LIMSS was announced by the Chief Executive in her 2018 Policy Address. Lift modernization



works would be regarded as ongoing if tender invitation had already been made or the works had already commenced as at the date when first-round applications under LIMSS were invited;

- (b) the lift modernization works concerned must cover at least one of the essential safety devices as set out in paragraph 8(a) of the discussion paper; and
- (c) the tendering process for procuring the lift modernization works concerned must comply with the requirements of the Building Management Ordinance (Cap. 344). In this connection, the applicants should submit relevant documentary proof for vetting by URA.

50. Mr CHAN Han-pan enquired about at what stage and how the Administration would announce the list of buildings which were installed with the 5 000 lifts with higher priority under LIMSS. Mr CHAN said that some building owners might defer the necessary modernization works if they were uncertain about whether lifts in their buildings were on the list or among the first 600 lifts to be handled in the first year upon implementation of the scheme.

51. PSD/W advised that the authorities intended to invite first-round applications by the end of the first quarter of 2019, with a view to announcing the priority (based on the result of risk assessment) of those first-round eligible applicants by around the fourth quarter of the same year. According to the plan, second-round applications would be invited in the second half of 2019. The number and priority of eligible buildings for each round could only be determined after invitation of the relevant round of applications had been closed. DEMS advised that the authorities would announce the list of eligible buildings for each round of applications as soon as possible, so that both successful and unsuccessful applicants could plan and arrange their lift modernization works accordingly. He advised that before the invitation of first-round applications, building owners with lift modernization works that had already commenced and complied with the aforesaid transitional arrangements could also apply for subsidy under LIMSS. However, as those applications would be assessed together with other applications, applications under the transitional arrangements might not obtain the subsidy if there were other lifts with higher priority in that particular round of applications.

52. Mr Martin LIAO enquired whether lift modernization works eligible for handling under the transitional arrangements would be given

priority in receiving the subsidy before the authorities invited the first-round applications under LIMSS without having to go through vetting and approval. If that was not the case, Mr LIAO was worried that owners of those buildings would halt or defer ongoing modernization works pending the announcement of application results, which would run contrary to the policy objective of LIMSS. DEMS advised that applications under the transitional arrangements would be assessed based on the same set of criteria applicable to other applications received.

### Management of the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme

53. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung expressed support for the funding proposal. Mr LEUNG said that as LIMSS would be implemented by phases in six years, he was concerned that the cost of works might increase over that period, such that the amount of subsidy would be inadequate to complete modernization works of about 5 000 lifts with higher priority. Mr Vincent CHENG enquired about the Administration's timetable for reviewing LIMSS in the future, so as to consider how to assist buildings eligible for making applications but had failed to benefit from the proposed scheme in carrying out lift modernization works. Dr Helena WONG asked whether the authorities would request additional funding to expand the scope or target beneficiaries of LIMSS when reporting the review outcome to LegCo.

54. PSD/W replied that:

- (a) the authorities would report the progress of LIMSS to the Panel on Development after the scheme had been implemented for two years. The authorities would also examine from time to time whether there was room for expanding the scheme; and
- (b) the cost of works was related to the capacity of the market. As the industry had stepped up the training of talents in recent years, thereby helping to increase manpower of the industry, the implementation of LIMSS by phases should not create any pressure in terms of rising costs.

55. Mr HO Kai-ming said that given the limited number of lift and escalator spare parts suppliers in Hong Kong, the prices of relevant products might easily stand at a high level due to a lack of competition. He was concerned whether the arrangement where building owners participating in LIMSS must use URA's Smart Tender could effectively prevent or reduce bid-rigging. Mrs Regina IP raised concern about the

processing time required for conducting tendering exercises under Smart Tender. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting was concerned about the possibility of bid-rigging under the proposed scheme. He enquired whether all registered lift and escalator contractors in Hong Kong were registered contractors under Smart Tender, and whether a list of approved consultants for lift works had been maintained and made public by the Administration. Mr Wilson OR enquired how the Administration could ensure the provision of suitable consultancy services to building owners subsidized under LIMSS.

56. PSD/W, DEMS and D(BR)/URA advised that:

- (a) at present, there were 41 registered lift contractors in Hong Kong. The lift market was an open market with more than 10 lift brands available for consideration by owners. However, spare parts of some older lifts might be in short supply given the decreasing number of lifts of the corresponding models. Thus, the Administration hoped that with LIMSS, the modernization of aged lifts could be expedited;
- (b) URA was now preparing to add an e-tendering platform for lift contractors under Smart Tender and would invite the aforesaid 41 registered lift contractors to register on the e-tendering platform in due course;
- (c) the Administration maintained lists of registered contractors and consultants under different categories of building services works and E&M works, and members of the public could access those lists online; and
- (d) to prevent bid-rigging, participating buildings of LIMSS must use the e-tendering platform under URA's Smart Tender to conduct the tendering exercise; in addition, URA's consultants would provide free consultancy services to these buildings. The consultancy services included scope assessment and cost estimation, tender document preparation, tendering through URA's e-tendering platform, tender evaluation, works supervision and contract management associated with the lift modernization works. Participating buildings of LIMSS could also engage their own consultants. The related cost of engaging consultants would be covered in the scope of subsidy under LIMSS, subject to a cap of \$20,000 per lift.

57. Expressing worry about malpractices of some lift contractors, Mr AU Nok-hin enquired how the authorities would monitor the quality of their works. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noted that URA's consultants or consultants engaged by the applicants would be responsible for monitoring the progress and quality of the lift modernization works. EMSD would conduct sample inspections following receipt of an application from the applicant for resumption of the use and operation of the lift in question. Dr CHENG enquired about the following:

- (a) how EMSD would conduct sample inspections on the completed lift modernization works;
- (b) given that modernization works of 5 000 lifts would be completed in the next six years, whether the associated sample inspections would create pressure on the manpower of EMSD; and
- (c) in respect of cases with substandard quality of works, what actions would be taken by the authorities, including whether the subsidy would be cancelled.

58. DEMS advised that if any irregularities were found which resulted in contravention of the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance on the part of the registered lift contractor or the registered lift engineer, EMSD would instigate appropriate regulatory actions, e.g. prosecution and/or disciplinary actions, against the person(s) concerned. To ensure proper use of public funds, URA's consultants would conduct site visits to ensure that the claimed lift modernization works had taken place. Moreover, in deciding the amount of subsidy to be disbursed, URA would make reference to the progress and quality report of the works provided by its consultants, while EMSD would also conduct inspection of the relevant lift at that time. Given that LIMSS would be implemented by phases, the authorities believed that the existing manpower could cope with the increased workload.

59. Mrs Regina IP said that the New People's Party supported the funding proposal. She was concerned whether the implementation progress of LIMSS would be affected by the manpower situation of URA.

60. DEMS advised that the consultants engaged by URA would directly follow up the progress and quality of lift modernization works to be subsidized under LIMSS. Hence, the progress of LIMSS would not be affected by the manpower resources of URA.

61. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned about possible business dealings between the consultants engaged by URA and a great number of lift contractors, thus giving rise to conflict of interests. Mr CHAN enquired how URA would identify consultants in this area and formulate relevant terms and conditions to avoid conflict of interests. Mr CHAN also asked that in case the participating buildings of LIMSS engaged their own consultants, what criteria were adopted by the authorities to set the cap on subsidy at \$20,000 per lift.

62. D(BR)/URA replied that URA would engage its consultants by tendering, and the consultants were required to declare any business relationship or interest (if any) they might have with registered contractors in the industry when submitting the tender. He envisaged that a sufficient number of consultants who met the requirements of URA could take part in the tendering exercise.

63. DEMS advised that in general, when implementing construction projects in Hong Kong, an E&M consultant was required to monitor the quality and progress of E&M fitting out works thereunder. Under LIMSS, the Administration envisaged that owners of the participating buildings would use free services provided by the consultants engaged by URA. However, the Administration also allowed owners of those buildings to choose their own consultants. Taking into account the cap on subsidy at \$500,000 per lift, it was appropriate to set the proportion of consultants' fee at \$20,000 or below. If building owners chose to use URA's consultants, no sum would be deducted from the capped amount of subsidy per lift.

64. At 5:58 pm, Mr Jeremy TAM was then the last member on the wait-to-speak list. The Chairman advised that as members had already spent more than two hours on the discussion of the funding proposal, he considered that the item had been thoroughly discussed. He would put the item to vote after Mr TAM had spoken.

#### Voting on FCR(2018-19)63

65. At 6:02 pm, the Chairman put item FCR(2018-19)63 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division, and the division bell was rung for five minutes. The Chairman declared that 36 members voted in favour of and no member voted against the item. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung	Prof Joseph LEE Kok-long
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee	Ms Claudia MO
Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun	Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr CHAN Han-pan	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr KWOK Wai-keung	Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	Mr IP Kin-yuen
Dr Elizabeth QUAT	Mr POON Siu-ping
Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan	Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin	Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr HO Kai-ming	Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr SHIU Ka-chun	Mr Wilson OR Chong-shing
Dr Pierre CHAN	Mr LUK Chung-hung
Dr CHENG Chung-tai	Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho	Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Mr AU Nok-hin	Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun
Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen	Ms CHAN Hoi-yan
(36 members)	

66. The Chairman declared that the item was approved.

**Item 4 — FCR(2018-19)64**

**HEAD 95 — LEISURE AND CULTURAL SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT**

**Subhead 677 — Acquiring and commissioning artworks by local  
artists**

**Item 827 — Acquiring and commissioning artworks by local  
artists**

**Subhead 700 — General non-recurrent**

**New Item — "Intangible cultural heritage initiatives"**

67. The Chairman advised that the item sought FC's approval to increase the approved commitment under Subhead 677 "Acquiring and commissioning artworks by local artists" Item 827 "Acquiring and commissioning artworks by local artists" of Head 95—Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") from \$50 million to \$550 million and rename both the subhead and item as "Acquiring museum collections and commissioning art and cultural projects", as well as to create a new commitment of \$300 million under Subhead 700 "General non-recurrent"

of Head 95—LCSD for the safeguarding, promotion and transmission of intangible cultural heritage in respect of the New Item "Intangible cultural heritage initiatives". The Home Affairs Bureau consulted the Panel on Home Affairs on the proposal on 28 May 2018. The Panel had spent about 51 minutes on the deliberation of the proposal.

68. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, the Chairman of the Panel on Home Affairs, briefed members on the salient points of the Panel's discussion on the proposal. Mr KWOK said that Panel members were mainly concerned with the procedures and assessment criteria devised by LCSD for museums to acquire collections and artefacts and expressed views on the content of some permanent exhibitions. Members were also concerned with the Administration's selection procedures and criteria for including items in the "Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Hong Kong" and suggested that the Administration should legislate for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage ("ICH").

#### Acquiring museum collections and commissioning art and cultural projects

##### *Existing policies of local museums on acquisition of collections and commissioning*

69. Mr AU Nok-hin sought information about Hong Kong's museum policy, including the setting of a museum's theme, the criteria and procedures for acquiring collections, the policy on displaying museum collections and the means to enhance the characteristics and attractiveness of local museums.

70. Under Secretary for Home Affairs ("USHA") advised that each of LCSD's museums had its unique identity, and collections would be acquired to match the same. In the past few years, the overall attendance of museums had been quite satisfactory. Regarding the policy on acquiring museum collections, LCSD, having regard to the advice given by the Independent Commission Against Corruption ("ICAC"), had devised a set of procedures and assessment criteria for the acquisition of artefacts and organizing public programmes for museums, and the same had been publicized on the websites of museums. LCSD would also invite Museum Expert Advisers ("Advisers") who were appointed according to their areas of expertise to give independent advice on proposed acquisitions.

71. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that in 2013, FC had approved a funding of \$50 million for LCSD to acquire and commission artworks by

local artists. As at the end of 2017-2018, the remaining balance was \$14.9 million. Mr CHAN enquired about the following:

- (a) whether the remaining balance would still be used to acquire and commission artworks by local artists; and whether the existing policy on acquiring artworks by local artists would be abolished after the sum had been used up; and
- (b) the criteria for acquiring and commissioning artworks in the past; and whether a ceiling had been set for the yearly disposable amount.

72. USHA advised that after obtaining funding approval of \$50 million from FC in 2013, the Administration had spent sums in the range of some \$3 million to some \$8 million each year to acquire and commission artworks by local artists. So far, about \$35 million had been used, of which about \$32 million and about \$2.8 million was used respectively for the acquisition and commissioning of artworks by local artists. He said that the remaining balance of about \$15 million would still be used for the aforesaid purpose.

73. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan asked about the number of artworks acquired by the Administration with the approved funding in 2013; the highest and lowest prices of those artworks; and the number of those artworks which had already appreciated in value.

74. USHA advised that the Administration had acquired a total of about 1 760 artworks in the past five years, with an average price of \$20,000. Taking 2017-18 as an example, the artworks acquired included photographs, ceramics, prints and seal engravings.

75. Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Heritage and Museums) ("AD(H&M)/LCSD") advised that the Administration had acquired a wide variety of artworks. As certain kinds of artworks (such as photographs) were purchased in bulk, the unit price would be lower than that of artworks acquired individually. He said that the Administration had once acquired a single piece of artwork at a cost of more than \$1 million, and the artistic merit, rarity, education value and market price of artworks had also been set out in respective museum websites.



*Use of funding and procurement mechanism*

76. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the Administration's projection on the number of years over which the additional provision of \$500 million could be spent.

77. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed support for the two funding proposals under the item. Mr YIU asked about the following:

- (a) whether the Administration had set any targets for the annual expenditure on acquiring museum collections and commissioning art and cultural projects by artists, including the upper and lower limits on total annual expenditure and the ceiling on a single procurement item;
- (b) the details of the vetting and approval mechanism for acquiring museum collections and commissioning art and cultural projects by artists; and
- (c) the procedures adopted by the Administration for appointing officers to be responsible for the vetting and approval of procurement proposals.

78. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan enquired about the considerations for acquiring museum collections and commissioning art and cultural projects. Ms Claudia MO and Mr LUK Chung-hung expressed concern about how the Administration could prevent the abusive use of funds.

79. USHA advised that when vetting and approving the acquisition of museum collections and commissioning of art and cultural projects, the Administration would adhere to the prevailing mechanism, namely, following the procedures devised after having regard to the advice of ICAC and conducting procurements upon review by the relevant Advisers, whereby each procurement proposal would be assessed by three Advisers under a scoring system. The Administration expected that the annual expenditure would be about \$40 million, but no upper and lower financial limits were intended to be set for a single procurement item.

80. AD(H&M)/LCSD supplemented that all acquisition proposals must match the identity of the museums concerned; or else, they would not be further considered by the relevant Advisers. For example, the collection policy of the Hong Kong Museum of Art ("HKMA") was to preserve and collect artworks that could reflect art development of Hong Kong, while

that of the Hong Kong Heritage Museum was to preserve and interpret the cultural heritage, artefacts and works of arts of Hong Kong.

81. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan enquired whether, given the substantial increase in funding, the Administration would consider acquiring artworks that were more valuable and costlier for their higher appreciation value and greater value preservation ability.

82. USHA said that in the course of deciding on the acquisition of artworks, the Administration and the relevant Advisers must take into account factors such as whether the proposed procurement would match the identity of the museums concerned, as well as the public's preference in art appreciation. As such, the benefits of acquisition decisions could hardly be weighed solely from the perspective of investment return.

83. Mrs Regina IP suggested that the Administration should consider collecting or acquiring antique elephant ivory with artistic merit, as well as ivory sculptures or craft products prior to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora for museum collection or display, in order to preserve such disappearing forms of art.

84. USHA said that the Administration would consider the aforesaid suggestion made by Mrs Regina IP. USHA and AD(H&M)/LCSD added that:

- (a) a batch of antique ivory sculptures dated back to the 18th to 19th century and owned by the Administration had been put on exhibition earlier. Those items were now being restored, and they would be put on exhibition in due course after restoration; and
- (b) the Administration was committed to preserving ivory artefacts with historical value, with such items being part of HKMA's collections on export artefacts and artworks. An exhibition of export artefacts would be reinstated with ivory artworks put on display again when HKMA reopened in November 2019.

85. Mr LUK Chung-hung asked which party would set the theme for commissioned artworks. He was concerned with price fluctuation of museum collections and asked whether the Administration could cooperate with overseas museums through the exchange/lease of exhibits or resale of exhibits that had appreciated in value.

86. USHA and AD(H&M)/LCSD advised that:

- (a) in the Administration's view, it provided good value for money to acquire artefacts with artistic merit as museum collections and make them available for the free enjoyment of the public/visitors, as such a move could enhance the artistic quality of the public, as well as Hong Kong's image in the eyes of overseas tourists;
- (b) in line with the practice of international museums, the Hong Kong Government would not resell artefacts and museum collections. Such a practice was also intended to encourage collectors to donate their valuable collections to the Government for sharing with members of the public. Separately, temporary loan of exhibits from other museums was allowed; and
- (c) regarding the commissioning of artworks, the Administration would set the theme for creation by the artists concerned. As resources were required for the artists to get hold of the materials for their creation, the Administration would not withhold payment of the commissioning fee until the works were completed.

87. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked about the following:

- (a) whether there was a significant change in the procurement policy of museums as such a substantial funding increase for the acquisition of collections and commissioning of projects could hardly be justified even with the impending completion of museum renovation or expansion projects; and
- (b) given the Administration's intention not to set any financial ceiling for a single procurement item and its statement that the proposed funding would not be spent in one go, the Administration should not seek approval from FC for a one-off allocation of \$500 million, as such a move would make it more difficult for FC to monitor the use of funds.

88. AD(H&M)/LCSD advised that funding allocations in the past could only be used to acquire and commission artworks by local artists. With the expansion of a number of local museums, the Administration considered it necessary to enrich the collections of museums. Thus, the Administration had sought additional funding to acquire collections from

different parts of the world, and the proposed provision would be spent over 10 to 15 years. In addition, to encourage the collaboration between local and overseas artists, the Administration considered it necessary to allocate additional resources to facilitate creative activities in this regard.

*Impact on local artists*

89. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned whether local museums would reduce their acquisition and commissioning of artworks by local artists. Ms Claudia MO and Mr CHAN enquired whether funding would be set aside from the additional provision of \$500 million to acquire and commission artworks by local artists. Dr Helena WONG asked if the Administration had stipulated any target ratios for acquiring artworks from Hong Kong and regions outside Hong Kong and commissioning projects.

90. USHA replied that the Administration anticipated that the expenditure would be around \$40 million per year. The Administration did not intend to stipulate fixed target ratios for the funding spent on local artists or their artworks and that spent on non-local artists or their artworks. However, as resources would be substantially increased, local artists would definitely be benefitted. He emphasized that it was envisaged that resources used in acquiring artworks and commissioning art and cultural projects by local artists would not be less than those currently devoted.

91. USHA added that artworks were acquired and projects were commissioned to showcase the arts, history and characteristics of Hong Kong. They must also meet the themes of the relevant museums. In terms of the types of collections, the Administration anticipated that the majority of them would be artworks, with the rest being relics and items related to humanities and natural sciences.

Safeguarding, promotion and transmission of intangible cultural heritage

92. Regarding the proposed creation of a new commitment of \$300 million to launch a funding scheme to engage the community to participate in the safeguarding, research, education, promotion and transmission of ICH, Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the vetting and approval criteria under the funding scheme, including:

- (a) whether support would be provided to activities relating to the safeguarding, research, education, promotion and transmission of ICH and serving the purpose of promoting tourism;

- (b) if the organizations hosting the above activities were of a commercial nature, whether they could be benefitted from the funding scheme; and
- (c) how the Government would match the funds with the organizations hosting the above activities.

93. USHA advised that under the present proposed funding scheme, the Administration intended to provide support only to the identified projects and activities organized by or in partnership with community organizations and ICH bearers. AD(H&M)/LCSD said that the Administration would provide full support to those projects and activities which obtained approval from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee ("ICHAC").

94. Dr Helena WONG noted that applicants might apply time and again to the proposed funding scheme for support in respect of community-driven projects, and there would be no cap for the fundings approved. Dr WONG opined that under such arrangements, public funds might be abused to hold community activities just for eating, drinking and having fun. She also enquired about the number of items currently on the ICH inventory of Hong Kong.

95. USHA advised that, at present, the ICH inventory of Hong Kong contained 480 items in total; among which, 10 were national ICH. AD(H&M)/LCSD said that taking "Poon Choi" ("盆菜"), or "big bowl feast", as an example, the Administration planned to promote the custom of "Eating the Poon" ("食盆"), which included the process of making Poon Choi, the symbolic meaning of each step, etc. As for the promotion of Cantonese opera, the Administration attached importance to the conservation, research, promotion, transmission and education of the stage culture, props, etc. of Cantonese opera. He explained that every project applying for support would be assessed with objective standards by an assessment panel set up under ICHAC.

96. The meeting was suspended at 5:16 pm and resumed at 5:30 pm.

97. The meeting ended at 7:01 pm.