

For information

PFC Staff Side GSR Paper 2 / PPS

Grade Structure Review – Police

Background

The Police Force Council Staff Side, represents the majority of the serving 27,000 men and women of the Hong Kong Police from Constable to Chief Superintendent ranks. We have carefully reviewed the Reports on the Grade Structure Review (GSR), dated 27th November 2008, and actively consulted with our members. The Administration (SCS) has indicated that she maintains an 'open mind' on any of the Recommendations and she has now taken the GSR process forward with a three-month consultation period until the end of February 2008.

2. The PFC SS wrote to both SCS and LegCo Panel of Public Service on 12th December outlining our overall disappointment and dissatisfaction with the GSR Report. We are concerned about SCS comments on deferment and then the conversion and implementation arrangements for this GSR. On 12th January 2008 the Staff Side met with the Secretary of the Civil Service and outlined to her in more detail the views and sentiment of serving Police officers.

3. We are now seeking action by SCS for clarification and changes to SCDS recommendations in the GSR report.

Sentiment of Police Officers

4. The Hong Kong Police needs to be supported by a workable and sustainable package from the Grade Structure-Police that can be a strategy for the next six years, until the next review in 2013. It must resolve the current low morale and resolve the dispute we continue to have with the Administration on the deficiencies in incremental structure of the Police ranks. It is vital that Honourable Members appreciate that this is not a “pay rise” It is supposed to be a structural review of the Police Pay Scale, the first such review in 20 years.

5. We find the GSR Report on the Police in its present form to be unacceptable. The Report publication only serves to exacerbate the depth of

negative feeling within our ranks at this time. We have been waiting for a proper review for over twenty years. We have been patient in anticipation of the support of an effective grade structure to provide recognition, career progression and sufficient value for the job we do. We have risen to numerous operational challenges and excelled to met efficiency targets and savings these past years.

6. Our Staff Side position is that there is no simple answer for acceptance or rejection of the GSR report recommendations. The GSR report is not an effective package, being too superficial and lacking of clarity as to what Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service SCDS was thinking and how the GSR can implement a proper incremental career structure for the HKP in the coming years.

7. The Report does not live up to its claims to be pragmatic, providing best judgment for having considered all relevant factors. The Report does not provide sufficient relief to the current deficiencies in the incremental structure of the Police compared to our complex role and responsibilities, both job factors and our special job factors. It fails to provide sufficient logic and rationale for the adjustments or the SCDS findings on the Police Grade Structure. It fails to appreciate the requirement for best calibre of staff within our organisation as is already required by Force management and the high demands being placed on staff and distinguish the Police within the civil service. It prefers to recommend pursuit of a damaging course towards mediocrity recommending a Police service staffed by **only suitable calibre staff on sufficient remuneration**. The Report if acted upon in its present form would be a retrograde step for professionalism in the Hong Kong Police.

8. Police Officers are sorely disappointed and understandably very angry about the gap between the SCDS recommendations and the advice and comments made by both Force Management and Staff Side submissions to the SCDS on a proper career structure in the Hong Kong Police. The staff side submissions in the GSR process, since November 2007, are summarised in **Annex 'A'**. We have provided this bundle of documents to the SCS for her careful review of the issues. We also understand that the Commissioner of Police will provide to SCS the force management submission to SCDS, including a summary letter of the issues raised in a letter from the Commissioner of Police to SCDS Chairman on 13th October 2008.

9. The Report recommendations have raised serious concerns with us about the context of the deliberations by the members of the Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS). It appears the SCDS has taken the macro environment of current financial upheavals, as they see it, to limit their thinking and approach in this GSR. The GSR Report quality has been adversely impacted and as it stands the Report can offer not more than a one-year approach. The SCDS is fully aware that staff have now waited for 20 years for this GSR and the long gap has heightened expectations on the GSR. SCDS has failed to meet satisfactorily meet those expectations to provide a way forward for the six year gap they recommend before carrying out the next review (**Recommendation 3.15**). The Report will, if pursued without necessary clarifications and adjustment, result in inequities and cause all the issues and deficiencies to require being revisited once again in less than 12 months time. It will also be divisive and cause ill feeling between certain ranks.

10. The recommendations have failed to outline a package of measures that can support the effectiveness of the Police in the coming years, say 3 to 6 years. We are still seeking a fair and reasonable outcome.

GSR Report – Way Forward for the Career Structure

11. There are things in the report that are in the right direction, things that do not go far enough if the recommendations are really going to operate for the next 6 years and then there are things that are simply not properly addressed. Overall the GSR report falls short of what is needed in a number of areas and this now needs a concerted effort by SCS, Force Management and Staff Side to get things right. We seek clarifications and improvements to career structure and the recommendations by SCDS in a number of areas:

Regular Grade Structure Reviews

12. SCDS has recommended a regular Grade Structure Review in future. (**Recommendation 3.15**). As the CE in Council has endorsed an improved civil service pay adjustment mechanism including the conduct of annual pay trend surveys (PTS) and a Pay level Survey (PLS) every six years for the civilian grades, it is appropriate to adjust this mechanism to formalise arrangement for a GSR for the Police in place of the PLS. It is therefore agreed by staff that it is reasonable to conduct a GSR as a regular review of career structure every six years, next in 2013 and adjust Police Pay in line

with market indicators and the economy with reference to appropriate PTI in the Annual Pay trend Survey Report. The recommendations for Police in this GSR therefore need to stand the test of being able to support an effective career structure for the next six years.

Motivational Increments - PC/SPC

13. The SCDS have agreed with both Management and Staff Side that there is a need for improvements to career motivation to underpin the experience and morale of mid-career rank and file frontline Police Officers (**Recommendation 8.3**). The mid-career runs from the 12th to 25th year of service. The introduction of both an early advancement to SPC and service increments (LSI) are supported. For constable the 30th year increment recommended by SCDS does not provide any real benefit to career structure and the staff side recommends SCDS recommendation need to be adjusted as follows;

- ◆ LSIs be granted at four yearly intervals from the completion of 12th year of service. (i.e. 12th, 16th, 20th and 24th)
- ◆ LSIs be granted based on service criteria, subject to existing performance and conduct criteria.
- ◆ Passing of SGT Promotion Examination with credit/great credit could be used for early advancement to SPC on same increment as the 12th year LSI. Normal advancement to SPC remains after 18th year of service.

Increments and broad comparability

14. SCDS (**Recommendation 8.4**) has failed to meet expectations in properly defining the basis for the police incremental scale. Frontline police officers need to understand the basis and value of their incremental scale and reference themselves with broad comparability to the civil service general grade with consideration for the special factors in policing, working shifts, hardships and longer working hours. (48-hour working week compared to 44 hours in the civilian grades). The civil service general grades incremental scales were effectively examined in the PLS in 2006 against the Hong Kong market and confirmed by CE in Council. This GSR disappoints as it fails to properly address the comparability and special factors for police officers. The Staff Side considers SCDS recommendations in this GSR need to be clarified with;

- ◆ PC having broad comparability to ACO: \$24,729 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance after adjustment. Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with PC maximum increment be raised by one further increment.
- ◆ Sgt having broad comparability to CO: \$32,447 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance). Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with Sgt maximum increment be raised by two further increments.
- ◆ SSGT having broad comparability to SCO \$42,080 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance. Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with SSGT maximum increment be raised by one further increment point.

Provide sufficient recognition for experience at SGT rank

15. The SGT rank is integral to the supervision and mentorship to assure the quality of policing in the frontline. The career (LOS and Age profile) of SGT means that some 70% will not progress further to SSGT rank in their police careers. The GSR report falls short when it comes to looking at the SGT incremental scale. There is a need to maintain sufficient differential between maximum increment of PC, SSGT and SSGT. Put simply it seems that SCDS has not provided sufficient examination of the increment range for career SGT, possibly as they may have misunderstood that SGT rank is a throughscale rank between PC and SSGT, which it is not. The organisational factors of career progression means a police officers career is limited by retirement aged 55 and limited vacancies at SSGT. It is necessary to recognize and motivate the Sgt rank and the maximum increment should be extended by two increments to around \$32,000 (i.e. midpoint between the maximum increment of SSGT (PPS 31: \$40,900) and PC (PPS 15: \$23,805), to be set at PPS 26 (\$32,255).

- ◆ If SSGT's increment can be enhanced to PPS 32 as proposed in para 14, SGT's increment should be enhanced to PPS 27 (\$33,720) with SSGT minimum increment be increased to PPS 25 (\$31,285)]

Incremental Scale – address disadvantages and redundant PPS

16. SCDS has simply not addressed the inequities and poor management of the career structure by allowing the uneven increment scale at various ranks to persist. The increment steps are less than those existing in the Master pay scales MPS where increments of 4% and 5% are provided. This situation of uneven increments is divisive between ranks in the police force. The Staff Side recognizes that annual pay adjustments over twenty years have led to distortions and a lack of rationale on the incremental steps in the PPS. It is timely with each GSR (every six years) to rationalize police increments at a standardized % as follows:

- ◆ Increment size should be standardised to 4% PC to SSP

17. The SCDS recommendations (**Recommendation 8.1 and 8.2**) do recognize there are redundant increments and a need to set the minimum entry requirement for PC to five passes in HKCEE. Staff Side considers the current PPS can be simply rectified by renumbering;

- ◆ PPS 1, 1a and PPS 2 be removed.
- ◆ PPS 3 – 54a as recommended by SCDS be re-numbered as PPS 1 - 53

Officer Cadre (IP to SSP)

18. SCDS (**Recommendation 8.6**) has taken an over simplistic approach to the roles and responsibilities to ranks in the various disciplined services. The ‘averaging approach’, which is acceptable for the various posts and responsibilities within a rank of a single department is not a valid approach for SCDS to take for jobs in the various disciplined services or to increments in the MPS. The officer cadre of the Police Force should not be directly comparable to these ranks and we strongly oppose the limited thinking of the view expressed by the SCDS (**Paragraph 1.18 (b)**). The command role and special factors of policing need to be given due recognition as was outlined in police staff side submission to SCDS. The Special factors in policing involve:

- Position and role of HKP in Hong Kong (agency of first and last resort)
- Professional knowledge for policing and law enforcement
- Risk and hardships faced

- Discipline and accountability
- Restrictions on personal life and disruption by irregular work schedules and call out
- Organisational factors (secondary duties, incident command, readiness and contingency planning)

19. In providing a way forward for this GSR (over the next 6 years) to recognize the uniquely applicable factors from command responsibility in the Police Force it would be acceptable to set the maximum increment in each rank IP to SSP so that

- ◆ Police ranks have at least one additional increment over the equivalent named rank in the general disciplined services.

Inspector – IP and SIP

20. SCDS has sought to arbitrarily raise a proposal in this GSR to change the existing arrangement for a through-scale for increments at IP-SIP rank (**Recommendation 8.5**). The proposal although intended only to apply to new recruits would require an IP to qualify by professional examination rather than by service and experience to attain the top incremental points with pay equivalent to SIP. This proposal would cut the four incremental points from the IP scale for those unable to attain professional qualification for advancement to SIP. For a very long time IP and SIP have been considered one combined establishment where both IP and SIP do interchangeable posts and the same work, duties and responsibility. This proposal by SCDS, understood to provide greater professionalism and motivation for IP to SIP needs to be better understood to assure effective incremental systems both at IP and SIP. The proposal needs further refinement to and could be pursued on the basis of:

- IP and SIP remains a combined establishment
- Implementation of requirement for examination to progress to SIP is applied to new recruits through a grandfathering principle
- SIP scale is improved to provide sufficient increments to fit the service profiles, experience of staff in that level extending the incremental scale by two points.

Directorate – Increments

21. Policing is a career where the Directorate police officers are career professionals who reach these ranks at the later part of their career. The ability to earn increments is limited by retirement from service at age 55 or 57 (SACP and above). Directorate officer increments, with a scale of increments at 0,2,4,6 years, means many Directorate (Police) will not attain the increments in their rank before retirement. The suggestion by SCDS for the introduction of the maximum increment at 6 years is a disadvantage over the current maximum increment, which is achieved in year 5. By contrast the career structure is a better fit for the Directorate (Administrative Grade) who as early career personnel can progress through DI to D3 with increments over 5 or 6 years in each rank. There is not a one fits all solution. Incremental steps should be adjusted to remove inequities and recognize the different career structures as follows:

- ◆ Maintain the status quo for maximum increment at year 5 for all grades with increments be granted every two years ie 0,1,3,5 and
- ◆ Increments be granted on annual basis for police officers CSP – SACP

Directorate Increment and comparability to civilian grades

22. SCDS views for the Directorate ranks (Chapter 11.6) simply do not work to fit the existing career progression and fail to recognize the changes and increase in special factors in policing. The Directorate ranks in the police senior command may have broadly comparable policy and management responsibilities either equivalent to or more complex than their civilian and disciplined service colleagues in other departments and bureau. These responsibilities are then augmented by special factors applying to Police officers and their role as commanders, which must be met by an incremental scale where there is clearly defined increment lead or advantage. What is unique to Police commanders is their additional major incident and operational command responsibilities. To maintain the efficiency of the police command ranks it is necessary to assure some increment advantage over other Directorate posts in the civil service as follows:

- ◆ Consideration given to special factors in policing and command as well as management function similar to other grades / ranks in the Civil Service – providing increment advantage.

- ◆ SACP and ACP need to lead others by 3% of increment.
- ◆ The increment lead for CSP needs to be increased from 3% to 5%

Morale

23. SCDS has failed to put sufficient emphasis and explore in sufficient depth the poor state of morale in the police force towards the administration as an employer, whilst force members patiently and conscientiously continue to function with pride and a good sense of duty and care towards the community. The Staff Side continues to act in good faith in anticipation of a fair and reasonable outcome, however staff are feeling their efforts are being simply being taken for granted.

24. On December 6th the 2008 Fight Crime Conference sought to make Hong Kong a safe and harmonious home with a focus on law and issues including youth crime and youth drug abuse, domestic violence, quick cash crime, fraud, burglary, home security and commercial crime. Hong Kong needs a disciplined and well motivated, professional Police Service where staff are not continually worrying about their remuneration and incremental scale in their career.

25. Submissions have been made on the poor state of morale by Staff Side (**Police Staff Side Paper 4 on 2008-03-03 and supplementary letter dated 2008-08-26**) and are supported by the Staff Opinion Surveys in 2004 and 2007 where low morale was indicated by overall low rates of satisfaction by less than 40% of the Police Force. This needs careful consideration. SCS needs to consider the immediate need for a positive impact to raise the morale of Police Force and provide an effective career structure for the Police Force that can last until 2013. The completion of the GSR in 2008/9 needs to address openly and take action on the reservations highlighted in this paper by the Staff Side. The downgrading the Force with the 'suitable calibre with sufficient remuneration' and a one solution fits all approach in this GSR by SCDS risks a further deterioration in morale and consequently the effectiveness of the Hong Kong Police.

Hours of work

26. SCDS has not properly addressed the issues relating to hours of work and should not arbitrarily impose a set of conditions on the Police for any future consideration of a reduction of working hours. Police work is recognized as being stressful and the Commissioner of Police needs to balance operational effectiveness, work-life balance in police careers. As deployments, tactics and police operations change there may be a case to allow a reduction in working hours without a reduction in service. Between 1998 and 2001, the Police trialed a reduction in working hours from 51 to 48 hours. This GSR and SCDS should not impose any restriction on the Commissioner of Police from considering and embarking on any trial that can reduce working hours below 48 hours. Police work is most stressful and physically demanding. Conditioned hours should be further reduced to 44 hours per week (CSD: 49, C&E: 51, FSD: 54, IMM: 44).

Medical Services – supporting the frontline

27. SCDS did make a good observation on the lack of proper medical support, particularly to our officers who are injured on duty as an issue that needs the immediate action of SCS. The issue is how to provide effective and better treatment and support to our colleagues. (Some 1200 are injured on duty each year of which 700 are injured in arrest or similar action.) This issue has been dragging on far too long and needs SCS's action to resolve as a matter of priority.

Conversion and Implementation

28. Clarifications are needed on conversion and implementation dates. This is a matter of concern to all staff and particularly staff on maximum increment for some years and those retirees in 2008/9. The GSR report has been completed on 27th November 2008 and following clarifications and revisions should be implemented in financial year 2008/9. Should there be any deferral to some future date when there is a 'steady state' in the local economy it would be fair and reasonable to implement retrospectively to the Report issue date.

29. The conversion arrangements for a revised police incremental structure (PPS) must recognize the SCDS objective of their recommendations impacting on the careers of over 80% of staff on the

implementation date. Staff would move to the new PPS on the implementation date and then progress to further increments on their next or future increment dates.

Financial Implications

30. We believe the Administration has the fundamental fiscal stability to implement the GSR for the Police and make a proper investment in PEOPLE as well as infrastructure and other programmes. Government resources and spending continues on new infrastructure, buildings, new directorate civilian posts. The infrastructure of police careers is equally important to the security and stability of Hong Kong. There has been a long delay since the last review (Rennie Review in 1988) and the cycle of review and implementation of more appropriate career structures should be allowed to progress. The Administration (SCS) can work closely with the Commissioner of Police to determine the extent and source of funding required in this GSR in the current climate.

31. On 27th November 2008 SCS indicated that she would propose to initially defer implementation of recommendations with financial implications until the local economy achieves a 'steady state'. This is regrettable as SCS made this unilateral decision before the GSR report was published and before genuine consultation with Staff. We fully understand the concerns in the local economy and can appreciate background for caution. We seek the implementation of the GSR as soon as is practicable.

Police Force Council Staff Side
January 2008

PFC Staff Side – Summary
(GSR – Police from Nov 2007 – Jan 2009)

Date of submission	From	To	Details
2007 Nov			<ul style="list-style-type: none">● LegCo Panel on Public Service – Grade Structure Reviews LC Paper No. CB(1)206/07-08(03)
2007-11-19	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to SS, invite SSs to attend kick-start briefing on 2007-11-23
2007-12-05	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman, welcoming the kicking off of GSR
2007-12-14	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to SS, giving membership of SCDS 2008
2007-12-21	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reply letter and invite SS's views on GSR
2008-02-01	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to SS, stating that the SCDS would consider proposals relating to entry qualifications
2008-03-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman SCDS with summary on PFC SS recommendations (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 1 (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 2 (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 3 (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 4 (Chi & Eng)
2008-03-18	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to the Chairman SCDS, stating the SS's expectations on the GSR
2008-06-30	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 1 (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-09	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter giving deadline for submission set as 2008-07-18
2008-07-11	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Invite PFC SS to attend informal meeting on 2008-08-26
2008-07-17	PFC SS PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman SCDS on submission of Paper 5 (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 5 (Chi & Eng)● Letter to Chairman SCDS on submission of Paper 6 (Chi & Eng)● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 6 (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman SCDS, asking for more consultation sessions (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-29	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reply letter decline further meeting before 2008-08-26 (Chi & Eng)
2008-08-14	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Letter to Chairman SCDS, reiterate the need for more consultation sessions (Eng)
2008-08-21	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reply letter decline further consultation meeting (Eng)

2008-08-25	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to CP, giving views from PFC SS giving SS's disappointment on SCDS (Eng)
2008-08-26	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 2 & 3 (Eng) ● Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 4 (Morale) (Eng)
2008-08-27	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, propose details of further consultation sessions
2008-09-02	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply letter, giving details of further consultation sessions
2008-09-03	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CP's reply letter, giving support to PFC SS on GSR issues
2008-09-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving disappointment from the SS on insufficient consultation hours
2008-09-08	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to CP giving SS's views on GSR consultation
2008-09-08	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS on consultation matters
2008-09-09	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving summary of meeting held on 2008-09-06 am
2008-09-10	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply on PFC SS's letter on 2008-09-08
2008-09-12	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman, supplementary to Paper 2 & 3, plus Pay Claim up to SSP
2008-09-16	PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman on Directorate Pay Claim
2008-09-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving clarifications on the Pay Chart (proposed)
2008-09-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman, giving supplementary information on Pay Claim
2008-09-24	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to CP on GSR issues
2008-10-03	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply to SS, support on SS's Pay Claim
2008-10-06	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply on letters dated 2008-09-24, invite SS to attend another meeting on 2008-10-15
2008-10-09	PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving supplementary information & further clarification on proposed Pay claim for Senior Police officers and Directorate
	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, agree to meet on 2008-10-15 and giving summaries of meetings held on 2008-09-09 & 2008-09-18
2008-10-09	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Asking CP about his stand on Police SS's Pay Claim
2008-10-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving disappointment on the consultation process of GSR
2008-10-24	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Ms Denise YUE, giving SS's disappointment on Henry FAN's performance in the GSR
2008-10-24	PFC SS	Henry FAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Henry FAN, giving disappointment from the SS on his performance and asked him to step aside

2008-10-24	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Thanks CP for his support, asked for a copy of his letter to SCDS issued on 2008-10-13
2008-10-29	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to the Acting Chairman SCDS, asked him to review the whole process due to the failure in consultations.
2008-10-31	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply & gives copy of his letter to SCDS on 2008-10-13 <p>(PFC SS has approached CP on 8th January 2009 to release copy of letter to SCS)</p>
2008-11-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Atg Chairman SCDS, asking him to receive the letters collected from police officers on their comment on GSR on 2008-11-06
2008-11-06	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Atg Chairman SCDS, handing over of 19,220 letters collected in the letter campaign of the Force
	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letters (collected in the letter campaign) to SCDS Chairman, giving stands of police officers on GSR
2008-11-06	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply to SS's letters (2008-10-24,29 & 2008-11-03) decline to re-visit SS's points of concern in GSR, but could arrange courtesy visit to Atg Chairman
2008-11-07	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SCS claimed that SS's concern is noted
2008-11-13	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Atg Chairman, agree to attend courtesy visit
2008-11-25	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to invite SS to a reception on 2008-11-27 pm
2008-11-27			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Denise YUE, SCS met SSs of DSCC & PFC (am session), telling the SSs that SCDS would submit the GSR reports to the Mgt and she decided to announce deferment in implementation of recommendations which required additional financial input. ● Barry CHEUNG, Atg Chairman SCDS, met SSs of DSCC, ICAC & PFC (pm session) briefed and distributed the GSR reports
2008-12-12	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to SCS, giving SS's disappointment on the GSR Report and ask for meeting with SCS on GSR concerns
2008-12-12	PFC SS	LegCo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PFC SS submitted paper to the LegCo Panel on Public Service for their information in the meeting scheduled on 2008-12-15
2008-12-15			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LegCo Panel on Public Service meeting discussed the Reports on GSR
2008-12-15	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Informed PFC SS on the new membership of SCDS
2008-12-18	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interim reply from SCS in response to PFC SS's letter of 2008-12-12
2009-01-12			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SCS met PFC SS in response to PFC SS's letter of 2008-12-12