

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1151/14-15

Ref: CB4/PL/PS

Report of the Panel on Public Service for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

This report gives an account of the work of the Panel on Public Service ("the Panel") during the 2014-2015 legislative session. It will be tabled at the Council meeting on 24 June 2015 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure.

The Panel

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining government policies and issues of public concern relating to civil service and government-funded public bodies, and other public service matters. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 15 members, with Hon POON Siu-ping and Hon KWOK Wai-keung elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Panel respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major Work

Appointment and employment

Extension of the service of civil servants

4. Issues related to the manpower situation of the civil service and retirement age of civil servants have received ongoing attention by the Panel. Following the announcement made by the Chief Executive ("CE")

in his 2015 Policy Address that the Government had decided to extend the service of civil servants, the Panel received a briefing from the Administration on 19 January 2015 on the following initiatives to extend the service of civil servants:

- (a) raising the retirement age of new recruits joining the civil service from around mid-2015 to (i) 65 in respect of the civilian grades; and (ii) 60 in respect of the disciplined services grades, regardless of their ranks;
- (b) in connection with the implementation of the new retirement age in (a) above, revising the scale of the Government's contributions to the Civil Service Provident Fund ("CSPF") Scheme for new recruits joining the civil service to keep the Government's overall financial commitment within 18% of the salary cost;
- (c) adjusting the present mechanism for further employment of civil servants beyond retirement age by (i) institutionalizing the selection process by reference to the modus operandi for promotion and recruitment; (ii) allowing a longer period of further employment up to a maximum of five years beyond the normal/prescribed retirement age; (iii) relaxing the approval criteria for further employment, such as allowing the transfer of expertise or experience to younger officers as an additional acceptable justification for all further employment cases; and (iv) extending the coverage of further employment to officers appointed on the New Permanent Terms ("NPT") in the form of extension of CSPF service;
- (d) introducing a new Post-retirement Service Contract Scheme for engaging retired civil servants on contract terms to fill non-directorate positions to perform time-limited/seasonal tasks which required specific civil service expertise or experience; and
- (e) extending the blanket permission for taking up post-service outside work after retirement to cover some 150 junior ranks of non-directorate civil servants whose maximum pay points did not exceed Master Pay Scale ("MPS") Point 20 or equivalent.

5. Whilst members supported higher retirement age for civil service new recruits, some of them were of the view that the Administration should

give all serving civil servants the option to extend their service beyond their current retirement age up to the retirement age to be set for new recruits without going through any selection by the management. These members pointed out that to do so should not adversely impact on the promotion prospects of younger serving officers, as younger serving officers also had the same option to extend their service and they could have the chance to fill vacancies at the promotion ranks upon the retirement of the post-holders.

6. The Administration advised that it had carefully considered the feedback received through the consultation on extension of the service of civil servants, including the views that all serving civil servants should be given the option to extend their service beyond their current retirement age up to the retirement age to be set for new recruits without going through any selection by the management. As there would be no anticipated significant succession or recruitment problems across-the-board over the coming decade or so, the Administration was mindful of the management problems which might come with automatic extension of the service of serving civil servants, including manpower mismatch and adverse impacts on the employment prospects of younger generations and promotion prospects of serving civil servants.

7. A member asked whether consideration could be given to providing all serving civil servants, who had been appointed on or after 1 June 2000 and on the NPT of appointment (i.e. those on the CSPF Scheme), the option to extend their service beyond their current retirement age up to 65 in respect of civilian grades or 60 in respect of disciplined services grades without going through any selection by the management, if these civil servants agreed to be on the adjusted CSPF contribution scales for new recruits.

8. The Administration considered the suggestion not feasible, as delineating which categories of serving civil servants should be subject to a higher retirement age would be impractical and divisive. As the challenges brought about by an ageing population to bureaux/departments ("B/Ds") would be a dynamic process, the Administration considered it more appropriate to devise a mechanism through which management could flexibly retain staff beyond retirement age in the light of operational needs, succession planning and recruitment situation, which varied from grade to grade and from time to time.

9. Noting that the Administration would adjust the present mechanism for further employment of civil servants beyond retirement age, question was raised as to the adjustments that would be made to avoid the

creation of a culture of cronyism or flattery in the civil service on the one hand and not adversely impacting on the promotion prospects of serving civil servants on the other.

10. The Administration advised that the selection process would be institutionalized by making reference to the modus operandi for promotion and recruitment under which selection boards would be convened to consider applications for further employment. Head of Grade/Head of Department would be required to submit selection board reports to the Civil Service Bureau ("CSB") and/or the Public Service Commission as appropriate for scrutiny to ensure that the selection process was fair and objective. Furthermore, detailed guidelines setting out the criteria and procedures for considering applications for further employment would be drawn up by CSB. CSB would consult the grade/departmental management and the staff sides before finalizing the guidelines for implementation. The Administration's target was to hammer out the implementation details in around mid-2015 after consultation with the management and staff sides.

11. Some members were unconvinced about the effectiveness of the measures to ensure that the selection process under the adjusted further employment mechanism would be conducted in a fair and objective manner. They considered that so long as the applications for further employment were considered and vetted by the bureau/departmental management, the development of a culture of cronyism or flattery could not be avoided.

12. On 23 March 2015, the Government announced that it would adopt a higher retirement age for new recruits with effect from 1 June 2015. The Panel held a public hearing on 18 May 2015 to listen to the views of civil service unions/associations and other relevant concerned parties on the way forward on extension of service of civil service. At the meeting, a majority of the deputations called upon the Government to give serving civil servants, particularly those at the junior ranks, the option to work beyond their retirement age. However, representatives from the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union ("HKPTU") and the Hong Kong Fire Services Department Ambulancemen's Union ("HKFSDAU") held different views. HKPTU considered that the retirement age of teachers at the government schools should maintain status quo, i.e. 60 years old, as extending teachers' retirement age to 65 years old would discourage young people to become teachers. HKFSDAU was of the view that new ambulancemen recruits should be given the flexibility to opt for early retirement at the age of 55 because their jobs were physically demanding. In closing, members urged the Administration to maintain a close dialogue with the staff sides to ensure the smooth implementation of the various

initiatives relating to the extension of service of civil servants.

Employment of non-civil service contract staff by the Government

13. The Panel continued to follow up closely the policy on employment of Non-Civil Service Contract ("NCSC") staff at the meeting on 15 December 2014. Some members expressed grave concern that although the total number of NCSC had reduced from 16 488 as at 31 March 2006 to 12 147 as at 30 June 2014, the number of NCSC staff who had worked for five or more years still stood high at around 4 533. They urged the Administration to speed up the pace of replacing NCSC positions by civil service posts, and critically review the manpower situations of those B/Ds which had a relatively high ratio of NCSC staff.

14. The Administration pointed out that given the unique operational needs of some B/Ds, the employment of NCSC staff was necessary to provide B/Ds with the flexibility in manpower deployment to cope with service needs which might be seasonal, time-limited, or subject to market fluctuations etc. The Administration further pointed out that although some 37% of the 12 147 NCSC staff as at 30 June 2014 were employed for five years or more, this did not mean that all of them served in the same NCSC positions for five years or more as some of them also served in different NCSC positions in the same B/Ds without a break in service.

15. Whilst recognizing the needs of B/Ds to employ NCSC staff, members hoped that the unfair situation of B/Ds engaging NCSC staff to perform the same type of work carried out by civil servants could be avoided as far as possible so as not to undermine the morale of those NCSC staff, such as seasonal lifeguards, who were receiving different pay from their civil servant counterparts for doing the same type of work.

16. The Administration advised that B/Ds were required to ensure the competitiveness and attractiveness of the terms and conditions of employment of the NCSC positions, so as to recruit adequate persons of suitable calibre from the labour market and retain the NCSC staff. B/Ds would also conduct periodic reviews on the pay of their NCSC staff to ensure that it remained competitive with the prevailing pay levels in the market, and enabled them to recruit and retain NCSC staff. Where justified, pay revisions were implemented on a prospective date after the conclusion of pay reviews and/or upon contract renewal of serving NCSC staff. In fact, the vast majority of NCSC staff had a pay rise over the past years, and the rates of such increase were broadly comparable to the rates of pay increase for civil servants in comparable civil service ranks or with comparable levels of responsibilities. In some cases, the pay increase of

certain NCSC staff might be even higher than that of the civil servants if the expertise of the NCSC staff in a particular area was not available in the civil service.

17. The Administration further pointed out that for those NCSC staff who wished to become civil servants, those NCSC staff with suitable working experience in the Government in general had an edge over other applicants in applying for the civil service posts. The success rate of NCSC staff in applying for civil service posts was around 16%, whereas the success rate of other applicants was only about 2%.

18. Noting that CSB, in conjunction with B/Ds, conducted a special review on the employment situation of NCSC staff in 2006, the Administration was asked whether it would conduct another special review on the employment situation of NCSC staff within the current term of the Government to identify more NCSC positions for replacement by civil service posts. The Administration did not see the need to do so for the following reasons. First, under the established policy, NCSC positions with long term services needs should be replaced by civil service posts in the long run. Second, CSB had been reviewing with B/Ds from time to time to identify NCSC positions for replacement by civil service posts.

Use of agency workers

19. Agency workers are labour force supplied by employment agencies under service contracts and work under direct supervision of the procuring B/Ds. The Panel received an update from the Administration on the use of agency workers by B/Ds at its meeting held on 20 April 2015. As at 30 September 2014, there were 965 agency workers working in B/Ds. This represented a reduction of 1% compared with the position in September 2013.

20. Although the number of agency workers working in B/Ds had been on the decline in recent years, the need for agency workers to fill short-term manpower gap and/or unforeseen short-term service needs of B/Ds would always exist. To prevent incidents similar to the recent case of outsourced public libraries workers being owed wages from their employer from happening again, a member asked whether the Administration would consider setting up a department supplying civil service staff to replace the use of agency workers.

21. The Administration considered that it would not be a prudent use of resources nor practical to set up a department supplying civil service staff to fill short-term manpower gap and/or meet unforeseen short-term

service needs of B/Ds, as such staff would not have enough work to do at times or they would be unable to meet all work requests from B/Ds which came at the same time. The existing arrangement of allowing B/Ds to use agency workers already provided B/Ds with the necessary flexibility in meeting their short-time operational needs under different circumstances. There was no cause for concern about employment agencies exploiting their workers assigned to work in the procuring B/Ds, as agency workers were accorded protection and benefits under the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57).

22. In order to uphold the principle of "same pay for the same job" advocated by the Government, some members were of the view that the Administration should employ adequate number of civil servants to cope with sudden upsurge of work and fill short-term manpower gap in B/Ds, instead of allowing B/Ds to procure employment agencies to supply workers to meet the same ends. They pointed out that the prevailing Statutory Minimum Wage merely provided a wage floor to protect employees against excessively low wages, not to mention that the existing labour law failed to provide adequate protection for employees against being exploited by their employers.

Pay and conditions of service

2013 Pay Level Survey

23. On 17 November 2014, the Panel received a briefing from the Administration on the findings and recommendations of the Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service ("the Standing Commission")'s Report on the Civil Service Pay Level Survey 2013 ("the Report"). The Standing Commission recommended no change to the salary of officers of Job Level ("JL") 1 to JL 4 (i.e. Model Scale 1 Pay Scale and MPS Point 0 to 44) and an upward adjustment of 3% to the salary of officers of JL 5 (i.e. MPS Point 45 to 49) with effect from 1 October 2014 (i.e. the beginning of the month in which the Standing Commission submitted the Report to CE).

24. Some members questioned the need of conducting a six-yearly Pay Level Survey ("PLS") which required much time and resources to complete, as the annual Pay Trend Survey ("PTS") could also achieve the purpose of ascertaining whether civil service pay remained broadly comparable with private sector pay.

25. The Administration pointed out that the PTS and the PLS were two different types of surveys in that the PTS aimed to ascertain the year-on-year pay adjustments in the private sector whereas the PLS aimed to ascertain whether the level of civil service pay remained broadly comparable with that of the private sector pay. As the PLS was more complex and had a wider scope and impact on the civil service, it would be a much more complicated exercise requiring much longer time to complete as compared to the PTS.

26. Whilst some members considered that the PLS should continue to be conducted in future, unless a better alternative could be identified to ascertain whether civil service pay was broadly comparable with private sector pay, some other members were of the view that a review of the PLS should be carried out to examine whether the PLS should continue to be conducted, as the PLS would widen pay disparity between senior and junior civil servants, which in turn would create conflicts amongst civil servants. Taking the 2013 PLS as an example, with reference to a plus/minus 5% range, the salary of officers of JL 5 was recommended for an upward adjustment of 3%. Despite the fact that the salary of officers of JLS 3 and 4 lagged behind that of the comparable jobs in the private sector by 4% and 2% respectively, no change was recommended to the salary of officers of JLS 3 and 4. These members further pointed out that as private sector organizations tended to remunerate their senior staff more generously than their junior staff, particularly so for those organizations belonging to the financing, insurance and real estate sector, junior civil servants would more likely have their salaries adjusted downward if their salaries were found to be higher than the comparable jobs in the private sector by more than 5% in the next PLS exercise.

27. The Administration responded that the Government's civil service pay policy was to offer sufficient remuneration to attract, retain and motivate staff of suitable calibre to provide the public with an effective and efficient service; and to ensure that civil service remuneration was regarded as fair by both civil servants and the public they serve through maintaining broad comparability between civil service and private sector pay. To achieve such broad comparability, under the Improved Civil Service Pay Adjustment Mechanism implemented in 2007, civil service pay was compared with private sector on a regular basis through three separate surveys, i.e. the annual PTS, the three-yearly Starting Salaries Survey and the six-yearly PLS. A holistic view would be adopted in determining how to take forward the recommendations made in the Report. In doing so, the Administration would take into account the views of the staff bodies. The Administration also advised that it would conduct a review of the PLS, after completion of its work on taking forward the recommendations of the

Standing Commission. The review would take place before the next PLS exercise.

28. The Panel received a briefing from the Administration on the application of the 2013 PLS on 16 February 2015. Some members considered that only raising the salaries of civilian civil servants in JL 5, civil servants in the disciplined services and Independent Commission Against Corruption ("ICAC") staff remunerated on the equivalent range of pay points as JL 5 as well as civilian directorate civil servants and heads of disciplined services and ICAC by 3% with effect from 1 October 2014 was tantamount to "fattening the top and thinning the bottom".

29. The Administration disagreed it had been "fattening the top and thinning the bottom" in adjusting civil service pay. For examples, although the pay for senior civil servants was adjusted downward some 10 years ago, the pay for civil servants in the middle and lower salary bands was only frozen. In the 2014 PTS, although the net pay trend indicator ("PTI") for civil servants in the lower salary band was 3.80%, the Government decided to bring up the pay adjustment for civil servants in the lower salary band to align to the net PTI for the middle salary band at 4.71%. The Administration pointed out that since the adoption of the Improved Civil Service Pay Adjustment Mechanism in 2007, the cumulative pay increase for civil servants in the upper salary band was 31.6% whereas that for civil servants in the middle and lower salary bands was 35.4%.

Conditioned hours of work for Model Scale 1 Grades

30. According to the Administration, there are two different systems of conditioned hours of work: gross and net. The gross conditioned hours system incorporates the time for meal breaks in the stipulated conditioned hours of work; the net system excluded the time for meal breaks in the stipulated conditioned hours of work. In response to the call of Model Scale 1 ("MOD 1") grade staff for the adoption of 44 or 45 gross conditioned hours of work per week, the Administration had embarked on a review in June 2013 to assess whether it would be feasible to reduce the conditioned hours of work of the MOD 1 grades to 45 hours gross per week. The review had covered 11 MOD 1 grades involving around 7 450 MOD 1 staff spreading over 63 B/Ds as at 30 June 2013.

31. The Panel continued to follow up with the Administration on the progress of the review on conditioned hours of work for the MOD 1 grades at the meeting on 15 December 2014. Members noted that although the Administration considered after the first stage of the review that the

conditioned hours of work of around 1 500 of the some 7 450 MOD 1 staff could be reduced from 45 hours net per week to 45 hours gross per week (i.e. inclusive of meal breaks) without compromising the three prerequisites of cost-neutrality, no additional manpower, and maintaining the same level of service to the public, only a total of 40 staff (or 0.5% of the some 7 450 MOD 1 staff) involving four of the 11 MOD 1 grades, namely Barber, Explosives Depot Attendant, Gardener and Supplies Attendant, were considered feasible to reduce their conditioned hours of work to 45 hours gross per week.

32. Whilst agreeing that there should be criteria for reducing the conditioned hours of work of civil servants, members considered that full compliance with the three prerequisites of cost-neutrality, no additional manpower, and maintaining the same level of service to the public rendered it very difficult, if not impossible, to reduce the conditioned hours of work of MOD 1 staff. Members asked whether consideration could be given to exploring the feasibility of relaxing the compliance with one or more of the three prerequisites, such as the no additional manpower prerequisite, in reducing the conditioned hours of work of MOD 1 staff.

33. The Administration explained that as the stipulated conditioned hours of work had been taken into account in determining the overall remuneration package offered to different civil service grades, a reduction in the conditioned hours of work of a particular grade without any corresponding change to its pay was an improvement to the pay and conditions of service of that grade. To ensure prudent use of public funds and the upkeep of the level of service to the public, it was an established policy that the Administration would only consider a proposal to reduce the conditioned hours of work of a particular civil service grade if the proposal complied with the three prerequisites of cost-neutrality, no additional manpower, and maintaining the same level of service to the public. For parity consideration and proper management of the civil service, the conditioned hours of work for all members of the same grade/rank should be the same.

34. The Administration also pointed out that it had critically reviewed the feasibility of reducing the conditioned hours of work of MOD 1 staff during the second stage of the review. Although there was no change to the result after the second stage of the review, it had provided a platform for staff to be involved in the process and understand why it was not feasible to reduce the conditioned hours of work of certain grades under the established prerequisites and principle. Whilst the Administration had no plan to conduct a similar review of a similar scale in the near future, the Administration was open-minded in maintaining dialogue with the Staff

Side through the MOD 1 Council on the issue. Separately, the Administration would encourage the departmental management to continue monitoring the work patterns of MOD 1 staff having regard to the changing operational circumstances, and exploring to improve their work arrangements wherever feasible.

Medical and dental benefits for civil service eligible persons

35. The provision of medical and dental benefits for civil service eligible persons ("CSEPs"), i.e. serving and retired civil servants and their eligible dependants, was a major concern of the Panel. At the meeting on 16 March 2015, the Panel was briefed by the Administration on the subject. The subject was also raised at the meeting of the Panel on 19 January 2015 when discussing the policy initiatives of the CSB featured in the 2015 Policy Address.

36. Members were of the view that the Government, as an employer, had a contractual obligation to provide the best available medical services for CSEPs. The Administration was urged to review the provision of Chinese medicine services to CSEPs, as Chinese medicine had gained wide recognition in the community in treating various diseases and that medical certificates issued by registered Chinese medicine practitioners were recognized for the grant of sick leave.

37. The Administration advised that medical services for CSEPs were provided through the Department of Health ("DH") and the Hospital Authority ("HA"). Presently, DH did not operate any Chinese medicine clinics ("CMCs") and its role was more of a regulatory body over the Chinese medicine industry. HA also did not directly operate any CMCs on its own. Each of the public CMCs was operated on a tripartite collaboration model involving HA, a non-governmental organization and a local university to promote the development of "evidence-based" Chinese medicine. Although the Administration had no plan to expand the scope of civil service medical benefits to include CMCs at this stage, it would keep in view any significant changes to the nature and mode of service delivery of public Chinese medicine services in future that would merit a review of their implications on civil service medical benefits.

38. On the suggestion that the Government should cease the operation of families clinics and take out group health insurance for CSEPs to use private healthcare services, the Administration advised that this might not be better than the existing arrangements of DH or HA providing medical services to CSEPs free of charge. In addition to the families clinics which were dedicated for use by CSEPs, certain medical services provided by HA

were also reserved or dedicated for use by CSEPs. CSEPs might also apply to DH for reimbursement of medical expenses if the attending HA/DH doctors certified that the drugs, equipment and services concerned were prescribed in accordance with medical necessity and were chargeable by HA or not available in HA/DH. As regards dental benefits, DH operated more than 30 dental clinics for use by CSEPs only. In 2014, additional general dental surgeries had been provided in some of these DH's dental clinics. As changing the mode of providing medical and dental benefits for CSEPs was a major change, detailed examination would be required. The Administration would keep in view of the outcome of the public consultation on the Voluntary Health Insurance Scheme to see how the Scheme, if it were to be implemented, would impact on the existing provision.

Management and training

Training and development for civil servants

39. At the meeting on 16 February 2015, the Panel received a briefing by the Administration on the provision of training and development for civil servants.

40. There was concern that civil servants were being brainwashed into a "One country, One system" mindset through attending national studies and Basic Law training organized by the Civil Service Training and Development Institute ("CSTDI"). The confrontational approach adopted by the Police in the handling of the "Occupy Central" movement was a testament that civil servants were no longer politically neutral in discharging their duties.

41. The Administration stressed that political neutrality was one of the core values of the civil service. All civil servants were well aware of their responsibility, as set out in the Civil Service Code, to implement the policies and decisions of the Government of the day in a professional and impartial manner. The objective of national studies training was to enhance civil servants' understanding of and exposure to the systems and developments in the Mainland. These efforts took the form of training courses and theme-based visits to the Mainland, local seminars, civil service exchange programme and a dedicated website on Mainland-related information and developments. In respect of the Basic Law training, its objective was to enhance civil servants' understanding of the Basic Law.

42. On the suggestion that CSTDI should provide training to senior civil servants to enhance their skills in communicating with LegCo Members, the Administration advised that one of the major functions of the CSTDI was to provide training to enhance the skills of civil servants in communicating with different stakeholders such as LegCo Members, District Council members, public and media. In this regard, for instance, CSTDI had invited Hon Jasper TSANG, President of LegCo, to share his valuable insights and experience on the subject at a leadership programme for senior civil servants held last year.

Grade structure review of civil service lifeguards

43. At the Panel meeting on 20 April 2015, the Administration briefed members on the Government's views on the request for a grade structure review ("GSR") of civil service lifeguards. Some members were dissatisfied about the Government's refusal to introduce a separate grade for civil service lifeguards in recognition of the professional nature of their work, as repeatedly requested by civil service lifeguards and the union representatives over the past 10 years, so as to better attract qualified candidates to become and remain as lifeguards to address the lifeguard shortage at swimming pools and beaches managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"). They pointed out that placing civil service lifeguards and senior civil service lifeguards under the Artisan grade and Senior Artisan grade respectively was outdated and inappropriate, as lifeguards were professionals akin to firemen and ambulancemen.

44. The Administration explained that GSRs would only be considered for individual non-directorate civilian grades if (a) the concerned grades had proven and persistent recruitment and retention difficulties which could not be resolved through the regular pay surveys under the Improved Civil Service Pay Adjustment Mechanism which had been put in place in 2007 or (b) there were fundamental changes to the job nature, job complexity and level of responsibilities of the grades. As neither of the aforesaid circumstances had occurred in civil service lifeguards, there was no ground for the Government to conduct a GSR of civil service lifeguards. The Administration pointed out that introducing a new grade for certain non-directorate civilian grade was not the only means to help the civil servants concerned cope with the increased workload. Individual B/Ds could adopt various measures such as strengthening their manpower and providing more training to enhance the skills of their staff. To help civil service lifeguards cope with the increased workload, LCSD had put in place appropriate measures, such as raising the monthly salary of beach seasonal lifeguards by \$700 to \$14,815 for the 2015 swimming season,

increasing the number of civil service lifeguards by another 21 lifeguards in 2015-2016 and employing an additional 20-odd NCSC seasonal lifeguards for the peak and non-peak seasons in 2015-2016.

45. With Hong Kong in a state of full or close to full employment, it had become increasingly difficult for LCSD to employ sufficient number of seasonal lifeguards during the peak and non-peak seasons. To prevent temporary closure of public swimming pools and suspension of lifesaving service at beaches due to insufficient lifeguards on duty, LCSD was urged to create more civil service lifeguard posts to obviate the need of employing seasonal lifeguards.

Other issues

46. During the current legislative session, the Panel also received briefings from the Administration on the policy initiatives of CSB featured in the 2015 Policy Address, civil service-related issues featured in the 2015-2016 Budget, Commendation Schemes for civil servants as well as civil service establishment, strength, retirement and age profile.

Panel meetings held

47. From October 2014 to June 2015, the Panel held a total of nine meetings. The Panel has scheduled another meeting on 20 July 2015.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 June 2015

Legislative Council

Panel on Public Service

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to the civil service and Government-funded public bodies, and other public service organizations.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

**Legislative Council
Panel on Public Service**

Membership list for 2014 – 2015 session

Chairman Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH

Deputy Chairman Hon KWOK Wai-keung

Members
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Claudia MO
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

(Total : 15 members)

Clerk Mary SO

Legal Adviser Mimi CHANG