

To: patricklau@gmail.com, nwkam@dphk.org, nwkam@dphk.org, rctho@capitalchina.com, jkstolegco@gmail.com, arazack@netvigator.com, ahtat@dphk.org, hokming\_cheung@yahoo.com.hk, info@starrylee.com, priscilla@lmf.hk, ipkh@dab.org.hk, paultse@paultse.org, contact@alanleong.net, info@tanyachan.hk, sc\_dev\_bs@legco.gov.hk  
From: rctpun@bd.gov.hk  
Date: 02/14/2012 11:37AM  
cc: tlho@bd.gov.hk, lsangtam@bd.gov.hk, ahlip@bd.gov.hk, fhliu@bd.gov.hk, kinwaichan@bd.gov.hk, pid@legco.gov.hk  
Subject: Fw: Staff consultation on proposed creation of a CPO post in the new Village House Section LC paper No. CB(1)524/11-12(01) & (2)

Dear Hon Members of Legislative Council,

I refer to the attached LegCo Paper :CB(1)836/11-12(01) and wish to advise that serious mistakes have been found in the Paper. As frontline staff associations of the Buildings Department, we have to express our regret to the input of Development Bureau and Buildings Department that have provided such unreliable information to Legislative Council for discussion.

Parts of the arguments are in chronological order for your reference please:-

1. **Para 5**

**BDNCSCA had replied BD Mgt that they had strong objection to the creation of a CPO post**, copy of the reply is attached for your reference . It is totally different from that was said in the Paper.

2. **Para 8**

It is fact that certain permanent technical staff posts was increased to deal with huge increase of workloads and upgraded enforcement work, eg Sub-divided Flats, Mandatory Building Condition Scheme and many large scale operations. **But BD Mgt fails to advise Panel Members that hundreds of contract posts (mostly technical posts but a large volume of work left unfinished) had been deleted meantime and the large number of professional posts be created at the same time for comparison.** The intention for giving partial information to Panel Members is doubtful. It is also unfair situation for the existing technical support in BD to meet the extant and new challenges. Bureau and BD Mgt should give full pictures to the Panel for careful consideration.

3. **Para 9**

BD Mgt have had no positive measures to resolve poor work arising from outsourced consultancies. No effective management system has been set up to alleviate the workload pressure of technical staff in checking/monitoring the work of these consultants and then to quickly respond to meet public expectation. From time to time, technical staff

have been asked to arrange payroll to the outsourced consultants before close of every financial year even though most of the work assigned to the consultants have been found ineffective and outstanding.

**The majority of BD staff had strong objection to the creation of this CPO as 3 out of 5 staff associations had confirmed in writing to object the proposal.** In addition to our email of 15.12.2011 to you, it is worthwhile to elaborate more about the organization of task sections in BD. Before 2008, a CPO has to lead about 90 staff, comprising 5 SPO, 10 PO and 4 PSO/PTO and 60 technical staff to task for UBW/building condition. In the proposed Village House Section of 40 BD staff, of about 3 SPO, 17 PO, 18 technical staff, such a very unsatisfactory balance of workforce, does it warrant for creation of a CPO post??

Lastly, what BD needs to deal with the threat arising from and enforcement against UBW of NT village houses, is the increase of frontline technical staff. Mere creation of CPO, many supervising professional officers has no benefits as for the best utilization of resources. **We appeal to the Panel Members to reject the proposal and then to request Bureau to review for more technical staff to overcome this hot issue.**

If you require any information, please contact us. All BD technical staff would like to meet you to voice out our grievances.

Many thanks and best regards,  
Rodney Pun, Chairman of BDSOWG  
HO Tak-lung, Chairman of BDTOWG