

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)414/11-12
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

Panel on Home Affairs

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Friday, 18 February 2011, at 10:45 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon Tanya CHAN
- Members attending** : Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH
- Members absent** : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun

Public Officers : Home Affairs Department
attending

Mrs Pamela TAN, JP
Director of Home Affairs

Ms Sharon HO
Assistant Director of Home Affairs (4)

Attendance by : The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
invitation

Mr Gary YEUNG
Chairman of Property and Facility
Management Division

The Federation of Hong Kong Property
Management Industry Limited

Mr Albert LAM Kwok-fai
President

The Hong Kong Association of Property
Management Companies

Mr Sanford POON
Vice President

Hong Kong Owners Club Limited

Mr SHEA Hing-wan
Chairman

The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management

Mr Nelson HO Siu-leung
Immediate Past President

Student Association of Supply Chain
Management, Hang Seng Management College

Mr Simon CHAN Chun-sing
Chairman

Consumer Council

Ms Connie LAU
Chief Executive

Housing Managers Registration Board

Mr Mingo KWAN
Chairman

The Hong Kong Institute of Housing

Mr SHARE Tai-ki
President

Civic Party

Mr LEUNG Siu-sun
Member

Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators

Mr KWONG Ching-wai
President

Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch

Mr Cliff WONG
Chairman

Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Mr David TSE
RICS International Governing Councillor

Clerk in attendance : Mr Thomas WONG
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Alice LEUNG
Senior Council Secretary (2)2

Yvonne OA-YANG
Council Secretary (2)2

Miss Meghan MOK
Legislative Assistant (2)2

Miss Monique TSEUNG
Clerical Assistant (2)2

Action

I. Regulation of the property management industry
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1015/10-11(01) and (02)]

At the Chairman's invitation, Director of Home Affairs ("DHA") briefed members on the latest progress on the Administration's public consultation exercise on the regulation of the property management industry [LC Paper No. CB(2)1015/10-11(01)]. The public consultation exercise commenced on 3 December 2010 and would end on 15 March 2011.

Views of deputations

2. Members received an oral presentation of views from the following 13 deputations on the Administration's consultation paper on the regulation of the property management industry -

- (a) The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1015/10-11(03)];
- (b) The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited ("FHKPMI")
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1015/10-11(04)];
- (c) The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies ("HKAPMC")
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(01)];
- (d) Hong Kong Owners Club Limited
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/10-11(01)];

Action

- (e) The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1069/10-11(01)];
- (f) Student Association of Supply Chain Management, Hang Seng Management College
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1168/10-11(01)];
- (g) Consumer Council
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(02)];
- (h) Housing Managers Registration Board
[LC Paper No. CB(2) 1140/10-11(02)];
- (i) The Hong Kong Institute of Housing ("HKIH")
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1168/10-11(02)];
- (j) Civic Party
[LC Paper No. CB(2) 1140/10-11(04)];
- (k) Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators ("HKIREA")
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1140/10-11(01)];
- (l) Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch
[LC Paper No. CB(2) 1140/10-11(03)]; and
- (m) Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors ("RICS")
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(03)].

A summary of views of the above deputations is in the **Appendix**.

3. Members noted the written submissions from Dr YANG Mo, Southern District Councilor, and a member of the public [LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1059/10-11(04) and CB(2)1069/10-11(02) respectively].

Discussion

Regulation of the property management industry

4. Mr LEE Wing-tat remarked that given the inadequacy of the existing self-regulation of the property management industry, there was a need for mandatory regulation of the industry. Referring to his letter dated 16 February 2011 to the Chairman tabled at the meeting concerning his complaint about a property management company ("PMC") which

Action

was the property manager of a housing estate in Tsuen Wan District, he raised grave concern about the occurrence of incidents in which certain property managers had imposed measures to prohibit communications among owners on matters relating to the incorporation of Owners Corporations ("OCs").

(Post-meeting note: Mr LEE Wing-tat's letter dated 16 February 2011 was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/10-11(04)] on 21 February 2011.)

5. Mr Sanford POON of HKAPMC said that he did not have information about the case cited by Mr LEE Wing-tat. However, HKAPMC had set up a Disciplinary Committee responsible for, among others, investigating complaints and allegations about member companies for breaching HKAPMC's Codes of Conduct. Based on the facts and information provided by a complainant, the Disciplinary Committee would consider whether to convene a meeting to consider a complaint case. As the existing legislation might not be able to deal with the problems associated with PMCs effectively, HKAPMC shared the view that it was time to consider introducing a mandatory licensing regime for PMCs.

6. Referring to the case cited by Mr LEE Wing-tat, the Chairman reminded members that only policy issues relating to the regulation of PMCs should be discussed by the Panel and it was inappropriate for the Panel to handle cases concerning individual PMCs.

7. The Deputy Chairman expressed surprise that the Consumer Council only received 54 complaints about property management services in 2010. Chief Executive of the Consumer Council explained that the Council staff would help resolve complaints with pursuable grounds through mediation. If mediation failed, consumers would lodge their complaints with the Council. She advised that the number of complaints about property management services increased from 45 in 2009 to 54 in 2010.

8. Ms Miriam LAU said that she had been the Chairman of the Security and Guarding Services Industry Authority ("SGSIA") established under the Security and Guarding Services Ordinance (Cap. 460) ("SGSO") for about 10 years. She expressed concern about whether the future statutory licensing regime for PMCs and property management practitioners would overlap with the existing SGSO regulatory regime under which security companies and security personnel had to apply for a license and a permit respectively.

Action

9. Prof Patrick LAU advised that he was the current member of SGSIA. He shared the views of some deputations that PMCs should not be classified into different tiers. It was of paramount importance to enhance the quality of service of PMCs and practitioners, as the property management industry was a service industry.

10. Mr WONG Sing-chi suggested that the future statutory licensing regime for PMCs should include a demerit points system under which the licence of a PMC would be suspended or revoked if it had accumulated a certain number of demerit points within a specified period. He also suggested that should the Administration decide to introduce a multi-tier licensing regime for PMCs, PMCs should be categorized in terms of performance and standard of professionalism rather than capital and scale.

11. Mr Albert LAM of FHKPMI did not consider it necessary to categorize PMCs into different classes. A multi-tier licensing regime would create a negative labelling effect on small and medium sized PMCs with a lower-tier licence, as property owners might tend to perceive PMCs with an upper-tier licence, which were usually big PMCs, as more capable of providing better services. He opined that under a single universal licensing regime, OCs should still be able to choose suitable PMCs to serve their needs. At present, property owners could set their requirements in tender documents.

12. DHA advised that the Administration was aware of the diverse views on whether to introduce a statutory multi-tier licensing regime for PMCs, as it might lead to monopoly of big PMCs and undermine the survival of small and medium sized PMCs. The Administration was open to both single universal and multi-tier licensing regime options, and would analyze the views collected and formulate a regulatory framework in consultation with the relevant stakeholders before introducing the legislative proposal into the Legislative Council.

Review of the Building Management Ordinance

13. Mr Ronny TONG considered that the problems associated with PMCs could not simply be addressed by the introduction of a statutory licensing regime. He criticized the Home Affairs Department ("HAD") for failing to enforce the Building Management Ordinance (Cap. 344) ("BMO") effectively, as it had not instituted any prosecution against PMCs over the past years. He also opined that the provisions of BMO relating to PMCs were not sufficiently clear, resulting in the lack of transparency in the operation of PMCs which made it difficult for

Action

property owners to monitor their services. The Administration should review BMO to facilitate effective implementation of the future regulatory framework for PMCs.

14. Echoing Mr Ronny TONG's view, Mr WONG Sing-chi opined that many disputes between PMCs and OCs had arisen from the provisions relating to the appointment, powers and duties of property management agents in Deeds of Mutual Covenant. These provisions had made it difficult for OCs to terminate property managers appointed by developers, despite their unsatisfactory performance. In many cases, property managers were subsidiaries of developers. He called on the Administration to review BMO with a view to enhancing the operation of OCs and protecting the interests of individual owners and in particular allowing OCs to change their property managers after a specified period (say, three to five years).

15. DHA responded that the Administration would not take a lax attitude towards the malpractice of PMCs which was detrimental to the interests of property owners. HAD would consult the Department of Justice as and when necessary before deciding whether relevant legal action should be taken. In the meantime, the Administration had established the Review Committee on the BMO which would study problems commonly found in building management.

Admin

16. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to provide the following information over the past 10 years -

- (a) the number of complaints received by HAD concerning property management companies; and
- (b) of these cases, the number of cases referred to DHA for consideration; the number of cases referred by HAD to DoJ for advice; and the number of prosecutions instituted.

DHA undertook to provide the requested information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide Appendix II to LC Paper No. CB(2)1420/10-11 on 7 April 2011.)

Action

Regulatory body

17. The Deputy Chairman, Ms Miriam LAU and Ms Cyd HO asked deputations whether the property management industry should be self-regulated or regulated by a statutory body, and should a statutory body be set up to regulate the industry, its nature, functions and powers.

18. Mr Albert LAM of FHKPMI was of the view that instead of forming a regulatory body, it would be more appropriate and effective to form a joint licence issuing authority comprising representatives of relevant government departments (e.g. HAD, the Hong Kong Police Force and the Buildings Department). FHKPMI considered that a regulatory body could not substitute the work of relevant government departments, and might duplicate work and increase the compliance costs and management fees.

19. Mr SHARE Tai-ki of HKIH considered that the regulatory body, if any, should be independent of the Government and include representatives from relevant stakeholders in the property management industry. Mr KWONG Ching-wai of HKIREA and Mr David TSE of RICS shared a similar view. Mr KWONG Ching-wai of HKIREA and Mr Sanford POON of HKAPMC opined that the regulatory body should perform the dual roles of monitoring and promoting the property management industry.

Legislative timetable

20. The Deputy Chairman sought information on the timetable for introducing a bill into LegCo on the regulation of the property management industry.

21. DHA advised that the Administration would decide on the key parameters for the regulatory framework and consult the Panel within the first half of 2011. The whole legislative process for the enactment of any major bill would normally take about two to three years.

22. The Chairman urged the Administration to expedite the legislative timetable and submit the bill to the Panel for consideration as early as possible.

Action

V. Any other business

23. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:40 pm.
Council Business Division 2

Legislative Council Secretariat
25 November 2011

Panel on Home Affairs

Summary of views expressed by deputations/individuals on the regulation of the property management industry at the special meeting on Friday, 18 February 2011

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Mandatory licensing at both company and individual levels	
Consumer Council Housing Managers Registration Board Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies Student Association of Supply Chain Management, Hang Seng Management College	Both property management companies ("PMCs") and practitioners should be subject to mandatory licensing, as the operational experience and financial situation of PMCs and the professional knowledge, experience and conduct of practitioners were important to the quality of property management services.
The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies	PMCs or individuals performing a managerial role in the overall quality assurance of property management services should be subject to mandatory licensing.
The Hong Kong Institute of Housing Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch	The property management industry should be licensed at both company and individual levels. However, PMCs providing stand-alone services only, and individuals providing a single item of services (e.g. security and engineering work) who had been subject to other regulatory regimes, should be excluded from the licensing regime for the property management industry.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Mandatory licensing at the company level	
<p>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</p> <p>The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited</p> <p>Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch</p> <p>The Hong Kong Institute of Housing</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A mandatory licensing regime for the property management industry at the company level was preferable because it would enhance the professionalism of PMCs and their service quality, although it would increase practitioners' liability. 2. Some deputations are of the view that the mandatory licensing regime, if any, should not set the thresholds too high and too many, so that small and medium sized PMCs would still have room for survival. As licensing at the individual level would have direct impact on the overheads of PMCs, it should only be considered in future.
<p>The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to PMCs, security companies providing property management services should be subject to the mandatory licensing regime; otherwise, they might be driven out from the market after PMCs were statutorily licensed. 2. Owners Corporations ("OCs") managing their own properties without engaging PMCs should be exempted from the licensing regime so as to avoid imposing unnecessary pressure and difficulties on them.
<p>The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies</p>	<p>OCs and Resident Committees ("RCs") which manage their own buildings should be subject to a certain degree of regulation. At least one member of an OC or RC should be required to have a license for property management.</p>

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Mandatory licensing at the individual level	
Civic Party Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies	The property management industry should be regulated at the individual level.
The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	A two-tier licensing system for property management industry practitioners should be adopted.
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	Property management practitioners should be regulated, but they were not clearly defined in the Administration's consultation document, as it appeared that everyone who would directly or indirectly affect the quality of property management services provided to private owners and tenants would be covered.
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	Professional property managers had already been regulated by the rules of conduct of their own professional institutes. Owing to a wide variety of specialists involved in property management, it would be difficult to establish a single and effective licensing system. Registered surveyors, registered housing managers and members of some other professional institutions should be exempted from the licensing regime, if any, for the property management industry.
Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch	Security personnel and engineering professionals/personnel who are subject to other regulatory regimes should not be included in the licensing regime for the property management industry.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Single universal regime for PMCs	
<p>The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited</p> <p>Student Association of Supply Chain Management, Hang Seng Management College</p> <p>Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors</p>	<p>A single universal regime should help establish a uniform set of standards for the property management industry and avoid creating any negative labeling effect on small and medium sized PMCs. A multi-tier regime might drive out small and medium sized PMCs and lead to monopoly of big PMCs.</p>
Multi-tier licensing regime for PMCs	
<p>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</p>	<p>A two-tier licensing regime was preferable, as it was unfair to request small PMCs to pay the same level of license fee as big PMCs.</p>
<p>Civic Party</p> <p>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators</p> <p>Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch</p> <p>Housing Mangers Registration Board</p> <p>The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies</p> <p>Consumer Council</p>	<p>A multi-tier regime should enable PMCs and practitioners with different qualifications and experience to continue to provide services for different types of properties.</p>

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management	A three-tier regulatory framework should be established based on the complexity of the property ownership (i.e. Category 1 - single-block residential building (least requirement); Category 2 - multi-block residential buildings (medium requirement), and Category 3 - complex properties with non-residential elements (highest requirement)).
Multi-tier licensing regime for practitioners	
Housing Managers Registration Board The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	Two different classes of licences (i.e. Registered Professional Housing Manager and Registered Housing Practitioners) should be issued to property management practitioners. OCs or RCs might be categorized under the group of Registered Housing Practitioners.
The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management	The licensing regime for property management practitioners might be formulated with reference to the system of Technical Competent Persons ("TCP") adopted by the Buildings Department. Under TCP, T1 to T5 were used to classify the individuals in construction works. This system would be good for individuals who were not members of recognized professional bodies. Those qualified members of professional bodies, such as the Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management, Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and Hong Kong Institute of Housing, should be allowed to practice in their relevant fields without being required to obtain an extra license for property management.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	Members of professional bodies which had been able to demonstrate effective self-regulation of their members should be recognized under the regulatory regime for property management.
Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch Student Association of Supply Chain Management, Heng Sang Management College	A multi-tier licensing regime for property management practitioners was preferable because the setting up of different standards for different tiers of practitioners would enhance the professionalism of the industry.
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	As property management services involved different areas of professional knowledge, property management practitioners had been requested to lead or co-ordinate a team of multi-disciplinary professionals. If the practitioners were classified into different tiers, there might have a negative impact on their work.
Consumer Council	The Administration should study whether a multi-tier licensing regime would have a labelling effect reducing the income level of practitioners and the job market for practitioners in the lower tier(s). If a licensing regime was introduced at the company level, the licensing conditions for practitioners at the managerial level in PMCs might affect the relevant employment market and level of remuneration of such practitioners. It was therefore difficult to assess the impact on the employment market for lower-tier practitioners before the detailed licensing conditions for PMCs had been worked out.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Licensing criteria	
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	The licensing regime for the property management industry should follow the registration of general building contractors/minor works contractors currently adopted by the Buildings Department where a certain number of Registered Professionals were appointed as senior members and members of the company concerned as one of the licensing criteria.
Regulatory body	
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	The regulatory body should act as a regulator, supervisor as well as disciplinary body. It should set up an enforcement section to ensure that licensees would provide property management services in accordance with a code of conduct. An independent appeal mechanism for licensees should also be put in place.
Civic Party	The regulatory body should be responsible for issuing licenses, monitoring the conduct of the property management industry and handling complaints, with major representation from the public.
The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies	A statutory regulatory body should be set up to administer the regulatory framework for the property management industry. It should be mainly responsible for issuing licenses and monitoring the conduct of the industry. It might also promote the development of the industry in partnership with the stakeholders.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited	Setting up a regulatory body for PMCs was not preferable as it would increase the operational cost of PMCs. It should be more appropriate and effective to set up a licensing authority comprising representatives from different government departments (e.g. the Hong Kong Police Force, Home Affairs Department, Housing Department, Labour Department and Audit Commission), as matters relating to PMCs were usually complicated and not restricted to PMCs themselves.
The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	An independent non-government regulatory board or authority with representatives from all stakeholders in the field, such as Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management, Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and Hong Kong Institute of Housing, should be set up, and details of the regulatory body should be further consulted.
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators Housing Managers Registration Board Chartered Institute of Housing Asia Pacific Branch	The regulatory body should perform the dual roles of monitoring and promoting the property management industry.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Transitional period	
Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch The Hong Kong Association of Property Companies The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As it would take about three years to enact new legislation on the regulation of the property management industry, PMCs and practitioners should have sufficient time to prepare for the implementation of mandatory licensing. As such, a transitional period might not be necessary. 2. The Hong Kong Association of Property Companies suggested that a transitional period, if the Administration considered it necessary having regards to public opinions, should not exceed one year.
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	It was necessary to provide a transitional period during which the Administration should educate the public to understand the importance of establishing a regulatory framework for PMCs.
Civic Party The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A transitional period of at least three years should be provided and it should not overlap with the legislative process relating to the regulation of the property management industry. 2. The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Limited suggested that in setting the length of a transitional period for the implementation of a regulatory framework for the property management industry, the Administration should take into account the impacts of regulation on the operation of the industry and the availability of professional training programmes for practitioners to meet regulatory requirements. 3. The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management opined that adequate training courses should be arranged to upgrade non-professional practitioners and better equip small PMCs to meet the regulatory requirements.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	A transitional period of five years is required to allow sufficient time for PMCs make the necessary preparation for compliance with the new regulatory requirements and the practitioners to acquire the necessary qualifications for registration.
Compliance costs	
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	The Administration should take into account the affordability of small PMCs and the practitioners in setting the compliance costs.
Mandatory requirement for employing PMCs	
Civic Party	A mandatory requirement for all buildings to employ PMCs was not preferable, as it would increase the financial burden on owners of single tenement buildings.
Other issues	
Civic Party Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	The Administration should conduct a review on the Building Management Ordinance (Cap. 344) if a regulatory framework for PMCs was to be implemented.
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	The Administration's public consultation document did not address the issue of third party service providers and the potential impact of a licensing regime on them. At present, there were licensing/registration schemes for lift, security, plumbing, electrical and other service providers. Under a new licensing regime for the property management industry, property managers would be required to conduct due diligence and opt for licensed third party providers. The Administration should ensure that the third party provider and not the property manager would be liable for losses relating to property management.

Deputations/individuals	Summary of views
Hong Kong Owners Club Limited	Directors of PMCs should abide by a professional code of ethics, and property managers should be more professional and put under regulation.

<u>Name of deputations/individuals</u>	<u>Submissions [LC Paper No.]</u>
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	LC Paper No. CB(2)1015/10-11(03)
The Federation of Hong Kong Property Management Industry Ltd	LC Paper No. CB(2)1015/10-11(04)
The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies	LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(01)
Hong Kong Owners Club Limited	LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/10-11(01)
The Hong Kong Institute of Facility Management	LC Paper No. CB(2)1069/10-11(01)
Student Association of Supply Chain Management, Hang Seng Management College	LC Paper No. CB(2)1168/10-11(01)
Consumer Council	LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(02)
Housing Managers Registration Board	LC Paper No. CB(2)1140/10-11(02)
The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	LC Paper No. CB(2)1168/10-11(02)
Civic Party	LC Paper No. CB(2)1140/10-11(04)
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	LC Paper No. CB(2)1140/10-11(01)
Chartered Institute of Housing Asian Pacific Branch	LC Paper No. CB(2)1140/10-11(03)
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/10-11(03)