

Panel on Public Service

List of follow-up actions

(Position as at 11 October 2010)

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
1. <u>Briefing by the Secretary for the Civil Service on the policy initiatives of the Civil Service Bureau featuring in the Chief Executive's 2008-2009 Policy Address</u>	20.10.2008	The Administration was requested to look into and provide information on the phenomenon quoted by a member where, as a result of the implementation of the revised starting salaries of the teaching grades in 2007, certificated masters/mistresses (CMs) converted to graduate masters/mistresses after the new starting salaries took effect in August 2007 received salaries allegedly higher than those received by CMs similarly converted before August 2007.	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2899/09-10 on 24 September 2010.
2. <u>Government outsourcing</u>	29.5.2009	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p> <p>(a) The number of workers employed under the some 4 000 contracts for the delivery of public services awarded to the private sector over the past eleven years, and information on the wages of workers concerned;</p> <p>(b) A paper to set out the difficulties encountered by government departments as revealed in past outsourcing surveys;</p> <p>(c) Outcome of the Administration's consideration of the Chairman's suggestion that the Efficiency Unit should provide channels for gauging civil servants' views in the course of conducting the biennial outsourcing.</p>	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2598/09-10 on 21 July 2010.

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>reviews, such as by consulting civil service staff unions/associations and Departmental Consultative Committees, so as to ensure that civil servants' views on outsourcing could be properly heeded. A sample of the questionnaire used for conducting the surveys should also be provided; and</p> <p>(d) Written responses to the following cases:</p> <p>(1) The case highlighted in the submission from the Land Inspectors Union tabled at the meeting;</p> <p>(2) The case regarding use of security guards employed by contractors to perform the duties of court ushers as highlighted in the submission from the Hong Kong Federation of Civil Service Unions. In particular, the response should explain how concerns about court security so arising would be addressed; and</p> <p>(3) The two cases regarding the Lands Department and the Marine Department respectively as elaborated in the submission from the Public Services Committee of the Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions.</p>	
3. <u>Use of agency workers</u>	18.1.2010	The Administration was requested to provide to the Panel a paper on the circumstances under which non-civil service contract staff might be employed and those under which agency workers might be used.	The Administration's response is awaited.

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
4. <u>Civil service entry system</u>	19.4.2010	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) To report in May 2010 on the progress of consultation on the proposed revision to the entry system for recruitment to the basic ranks in the civil service, and again in mid-June 2010 on when the proposed revision could be implemented and, if the actual date of implementation was still not available by then, to explain the difficulties involved; and (b) To provide a snapshot (as at the above implementation date) of the total number of civil servants appointed on three-year probation and three-year agreement terms before they were considered for appointment on permanent terms, together with a breakdown of these civil servants by bureaux/departments and by the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Those who were still serving the three-year probation period; (2) Those who were in their fourth year of service; (3) Those who were in their fifth year of service; and (4) Those who were in their sixth year of service. 	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2304/09-10 on 18 June 2010.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>5. <u>Medical and dental benefits for civil service eligible persons</u></p>	<p>19.4.2010</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A progress report on and the timetable for the implementation of the “Electronic Patient Record Sharing Pilot Project”, in particular between the Department of Health and the Hospital Authority (HA); (b) A written reply on the relationship between HA and the Government, in particular the reasons and justifications for the Government to shift to HA its responsibility, as the employer, to provide medical benefits to its employees, the civil servants; and (c) Further information on whether and how the provision of civil service medical benefits could be separated from the public healthcare system when any progress was made. 	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 2902/09-10 on 24 September 2010.</p>
<p>6. <u>Language proficiency requirements for civil service appointments</u></p>	<p>24.5.2010</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Relay to the Commissioner of Police members' request for explanation of the criteria adopted by the Hong Kong Police Force for evaluation of its tentative plans to establish a team of community liaison assistants who needed to be proficient in the language(s) of the ethnic minorities; and 	<p>The Administration's response is awaited.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		(b) Provide information on whether in general ethnic minority candidates applying for posts in the Hong Kong Police Force had to sit for additional written Chinese tests and if so, the details.	
7. <u>Requests for the conduct of grade structure reviews (GSR) for specific non-directorate civilian grades: assessment criteria</u>	21.6.2010	The Administration was requested to provide to the Panel a paper to explain how the criterion of whether there were fundamental changes in the job nature, level of responsibilities and job complexity of a grade had been applied in assessing requests for the conduct of GSRs in the past ten years.	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 2900/09-10 on 24 September 2010.
8. <u>2010-2011 Civil Service Pay Adjustment</u>	21.6.2010	<p>The Administration was requested to provide to the Panel a table showing the occasions over the past 18 years on which the Executive Council decided on civil service pay adjustment rates which were –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Above the net Pay Trend Indicator (PTI) worked out under the pay trend survey mechanism; (b) Below the net PTI worked out under the pay trend survey mechanism; (c) Not in keeping with the inflationary environment at the time in question; and (d) Not in keeping with the deflationary environment at the time in question. 	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 2901/09-10 on 24 September 2010.

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
9. <u>Disciplinary mechanism and progress on various disciplinary matters</u>	21.6.2010	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) A breakdown of the reasons for rejecting the 52 applications for legal or other forms of representation at disciplinary hearings conducted under the respective Disciplined Services Legislation; and(b) A written explanation of the reasons for the delay in re-processing the disciplinary cases concerning the appellants in the following two successful cases of appeal to the Court of Final Appeal, which had been highlighted by Mr LIU Kit-ming, representative of the Police Force Council Staff Side, at the meeting:<ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) <i>Lam Siu Po v. Commissioner of Police</i> (FACV No. 9 of 2008); and(2) <i>Chiu Hoi Po v. Commissioner of Police</i> (FACV No. 9 of 2009).	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 2757/09-10 on 19 August 2010.</p>