

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC172/19-20
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(10)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 9th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 15 January 2020, at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)

Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP

Hon Claudia MO

Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP

Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Hon Alvin YEUNG

Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

Hon HO Kai-ming

Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

Member attending:

Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin

Members absent:

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Howard LEE Man-sing	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) ²
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹
Ms Maisie CHENG Mei-sze, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment

Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Miss Cheryl CHOW Ho-kiu	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)2
Ms Alice PANG, JP	Project Manager (South) South Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Raymond LEE Wai-man	Chief Engineer (South)1 South Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr David LAM Chi-man	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)5
Mr Frankie FUNG Yiu-man	Chief Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)1
Mr Albert CHEUNG Ka-lok	Assistant Director of Lands (Specialist)3
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr LEUNG Kam-pui	Assistant Director of Architectural Services (Property Services)
Mr MAK Ka-wai, JP	Deputy Director of Drainage Services
Mr Ricky LAU Chun-kit, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr CHENG Tak-kuen	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Infrastructure Planning)
Mr Tony CHEUNG Wai-hung	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Management Policy) Environmental Protection Department
Mr NG Wai-keung	Deputy Director of Highways

Mr Tony CHEUNG Ka-leung	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works)1 Highways Department
Ms Eugenia CHUNG Nga-chi, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2)
Mr Paul AU Ying-kit	Chief Engineer (Works) (Acting) Home Affairs Department
Mr Louis LEUNG Sze-ho	Deputy Secretary-General (1) University Grants Committee Secretariat
Mr Samuel FAN Kim-fung	Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance) Education Bureau
Ms CHAN Lai-hung	Senior Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance) Education Bureau
Mr Alex WONG Kwok-chun	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions)
Mr Andy LIU Hon-wah	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1 Social Welfare Department
Mr WONG Chung-leung, JP	Director of Water Supplies
Mr Boer CHAN Hon-kwong	Assistant Government Chief Information Officer (Governance and Resources) Office of the Government Chief Information Officer
Mr Gavin WAH Kwok-kee	Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources) Office of the Government Chief Information Officer
Mr Michael HONG Wing-kit	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Doris LO

Chief Council Secretary (1)2

Staff in attendance:

Mr Keith WONG

Council Secretary (1)2

Ms Christina SHIU

Legislative Assistant (1)2

Ms Christy YAU

Legislative Assistant (1)8

Ms Clara LO

Legislative Assistant (1)9

Action

Application for late membership

The Chairman advised that the meeting would first deal with the application for late membership from Mr Andrew WAN (Mr WAN's application letter was issued to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC64/19-20 on 7 January 2020). The Chairman drew members' attention to paragraph 4B of the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") Procedure on applications for late membership, and sought members' views on Mr WAN's application.

2. Mr Holden CHOW and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said that they had no objection to Mr Andrew WAN's application. However, they considered that Mr WAN should attend the meeting to explain to other members his reason for applying for late membership. Mr LUK Chung-hung opined that Mr Andrew WAN should show his respect to the Subcommittee by attending the meeting. They opined that the application of Mr WAN should be dealt with only when he attended a meeting.

3. Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed support for Mr Andrew WAN's application for membership. Ms CHAN opined that the Subcommittee should proceed forthwith to deal with Mr WAN's application. Mr CHAN opined that Mr Andrew WAN's not attending the meeting was not necessarily a sign of disrespect to the Subcommittee, as some committees had previously dealt with applications for late membership from Members without necessarily requesting their attendance at the meeting and some Members had attended the meeting of committees only after their applications for late membership were accepted.

4. The Chairman advised that Members applying for late membership of the Subcommittee were not necessarily required to attend the meeting

relevant to their applications. As far as the application of Mr Andrew WAN was concerned, as some members had requested that his reason for not signifying membership before the deadline be heard first, the Chairman considered that the agenda item should be deferred until Mr Andrew WAN attended a meeting and responded to questions from other members, so that the Subcommittee could make thorough consideration.

5. The Chairman directed that the Subcommittee should first deal with other items on the agenda for the meeting. He advised that there were two papers for discussion on the agenda for the meeting, both of which were funding proposals carried over from the previous meeting. The two funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$22,847.4 million. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 707 — New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2019-20)16 332CL West Kowloon Reclamation — main works (remainder)

6. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)16](#)) sought to upgrade part of 332CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$331.9 million in money-of-the-day prices for the construction of a footbridge system at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Hing Wah Street West in Sham Shui Po ("the proposed footbridge system"). The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the funding submission at the meeting on 11 December. The deliberation would continue at today's meeting.

Number of lifts at the proposed footbridge system

7. Noting that the Administration had elaborated on the justifications for its plan of lift installation at the proposed footbridge system in its supplementary information paper (i.e. [LC Paper No. PWSC68/19-20\(01\)](#)), Ms Tanya CHAN requested the Administration to further explain the reasons for providing two lifts at each of the three crossheads of the proposed footbridge.

8. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1 ("DS(PL)1/DEVB") and Project Manager (South), South Development Office,

Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(S)/CEDD") said that the Government had planned to remove the at-grade pedestrian crossings at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Hing Wah Street West after the completion and commissioning of the proposed footbridge system, by which time all pedestrians would have to use the proposed footbridge system to cross the roads. If each crosshead of the proposed footbridge was equipped with only one single lift, those in need would have to make a detour ranging from about 100 to a few hundred metres to access other barrier-free crossing facilities when the lift was under routine maintenance or out of service for other reasons. Apart from the inconvenience caused, there were also concerns that some members of the public might commit jaywalking and put themselves in danger. Also, having considered the large number of community facilities and schools in the vicinity along Sham Mong Road that were either completed or to be constructed and the availability of sufficient space for construction near the landing points of the footbridge, the Government had therefore proposed that except for the connection point to a private residential development named Aqua Marine, two lifts would be provided at each of the three remaining crossheads to meet the needs of residents in the vicinity.

9. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to explain the criteria currently adopted in determining the number of lifts to be provided at newly-built footbridges.

10. DS(PL)1/DEVB said that the Government did not specifically set out hard and fast rules as to how many lifts should be provided at newly-built footbridges, so that the number of lifts to be provided could be determined flexibly in the light of the actual conditions and the need of individual footbridge projects. The Transport and Housing Bureau/Transport Department would review the guidelines for lift provision at footbridges with the relevant bureaux and departments and consider the need to lay down requirements in more specific terms.

11. The Chairman and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the completion time of the review of the guidelines for lift provision at footbridges and report the review findings to the relevant Panel(s) of LegCo.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC173/19-20\(01\)](#) on 16 June 2020.)

12. Ms Claudia MO suggested that each crosshead of the proposed footbridge should be provided with only one lift and the space so released

should be used for provision of escalators, so as to reduce the waiting time for using the lift.

13. PM(S)/CEDD said that providing two lifts at each of the three crossheads of the proposed footbridge system would meet the needs of users who required barrier-free facilities (including wheelchair-users and those with trolleys), and in terms of functions, such needs could not be met by escalators instead. She added that two crossheads of the proposed footbridge system would be provided with escalators, which were believed to be sufficient to cope with the pedestrian flow.

Removal of at-grade pedestrian crossings

14. Referring to the report of the pedestrian and traffic study provided by the Administration, Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the junction of Sham Mong Road and Hing Wah Street West would have a reserve capacity of 9% in 2031 even if the proposed footbridge system was not built and the existing pedestrian crossings were retained. He questioned whether the Administration's removal of the at-grade pedestrian crossings was justified. Mr CHU, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr Vincent CHENG and Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to provide supplementary information to illustrate how the traffic flow of the junction of Sham Mong Road and Hing Wah Street West would be improved after the removal of the at-grade crossings, including the comparative data on the vehicular flow concerned, the travel time for vehicles to pass through the junction and the effective green time of traffic lights for vehicles.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members via [LC Paper No. PWSC173/19-20\(01\)](#) on 16 June 2020.)

15. DS(PL)1/DEVB and PM(S)/CEDD said that it could be seen from the photographs at Annex 3 to the supplementary information paper (i.e. [LC Paper No. PWSC68/19-20\(01\)](#)) that the vehicular traffic of Sham Mong Road and Hing Wah Street West was very busy, and the roads were relatively wide to walk across. The existing at-grade pedestrian crossings adopted a staggered crossing arrangement as refuge islands were provided for the public to make a stopover. However, the existing situation of pedestrians and vehicles competing for the use of road space was less than desirable. Moreover, according to the Traffic Impact Assessment conducted, if the at-grade pedestrian crossings at the junction were retained and a straight crossing arrangement was adopted for better walkability, the reserve capacity of the junction would be reduced to a negative value in 2031 after the completion of the housing developments and community facilities in the

vicinity. This implied that by that time, the junction would not be able to cope with the additional traffic flow generated by the adjacent housing developments, resulting in occasional traffic congestion thereat. Therefore, it was proposed that the footbridge be built and the at-grade crossings be removed in order to shorten the waiting time of vehicles for traffic signals and facilitate the flow of vehicular traffic at the junction.

16. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that as Hing Wah Street West and Sham Mong Road were not trunk roads, the proposed removal of the at-grade pedestrian crossings at the junction of the two roads after completion of the proposed footbridge system could not be justified on the grounds of improving the vehicular flow. Dr CHEUNG, Ms Tanya CHAN and Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to explain whether relevant guidelines or planning criteria were in place for determining the locations at which footbridges should be built to replace the at-grade pedestrian crossings.

17. In response, DS(PL)1/DEVB and PM(S)/CEDD said that there were no such guidelines under the current planning criteria. The need of improvement works (such as construction of footbridges to replace the at-grade pedestrian crossings) was determined generally based on the actual traffic conditions of each and every road junction, including the current volume of traffic and pedestrian flow and the estimate for future growth, as well as the actual available space for construction.

18. Mr WU Chi-wai pointed out that pedestrian crossing facilities adopting the staggered crossing arrangement with the provision of refuge islands could be found over the territory. He requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on its concrete plans to improve the safety of such crossings.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC173/19-20\(01\)](#) on 16 June 2020.)

19. The Chairman pointed out that the safety of pedestrian crossings in various districts over the territory was a transport policy issue of a wider scope. He suggested that members should follow up on that at a relevant Panel.

Connectivity of the proposed footbridge system to facilities in the district

20. Mr Vincent CHENG and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan pointed out that after the completion and commissioning of the proposed footbridge system, residents of Hoi Lai Estate could use it and other connecting footbridges to access

MTR Nam Cheong Station. They requested the Administration to build a covered access connecting the proposed footbridge system to Hoi Lai Estate.

21. DS(PL)1/DEVB and PM(S)/CEDD said that the Government's preliminary assessment found the proposed construction of a cover at the walkway between the proposed footbridge system and Hoi Lai Estate technically feasible. As the connection point concerned was near a substation, the Administration would work out with the power company a suitable proposal for constructing the cover at the walkway. In addition, pedestrians accessing Hoi Lai Estate from the proposed footbridge system must cross Hoi Lai Street, which was now used as a major access by buses heading to Hoi Lai Estate Bus Terminus. As sufficient headroom must be provided for double-deckers to drive through, it might not be possible to construct a cover on that road section. At the request of members, the Administration would further explore how the cover of the walkway could be extended to the farthest extent.

22. Dr Helena WONG and Dr Junius HO said that they wished for the expeditious completion of the proposed footbridge system in order to meet the demand of local residents, including the additional demand generated after the completion and population intake of the housing development at North West Kowloon Reclamation Area Site 6 ("Site 6"), and achieve effective connection with other pedestrian facilities and footbridge systems in the district. They enquired when the Administration would submit the funding proposal to LegCo for implementing another footbridge project in the district, i.e. the footbridge system at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Yen Chow Street West. Dr HO also enquired about the cost estimate of the footbridge system at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Yen Chow Street West.

23. PM(S)/CEDD said that the gazetting procedure for the footbridge system at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Yen Chow Street West was underway. Upon completion of the procedure concerned, the Administration would consult the Panel on Development on the project and seek funding approval from the Finance Committee ("FC"). She added that the cost estimate of the project was similar to that of the proposed footbridge system under discussion.

24. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired why escalators were not provided at the connection points of the proposed footbridge system to the housing development at Site 6 and to Aqua Marine. Dr CHENG also enquired about the opening arrangement of the connection point to the housing development at Site 6 at night.

25. PM(S)/CEDD said that the housing development at Site 6 and Aqua Marine, both connected to the proposed footbridge system, had their own escalators. It was therefore not necessary to provide escalators at the two connection points of the proposed footbridge system. Moreover, there was a barrier-free public walkway, which was open for public use around the clock and provided access to the ground level, in the housing development at Site 6.

Facilities of the proposed footbridge system

26. Mr HUI Chi-fung pointed out that recently, the Administration had adopted an enclosed design by fitting wire meshes on both sides of many footbridges across the territory. He was concerned about the fire risk that might arise. He enquired whether the proposed footbridge system would be fitted with wire meshes in future and whether its current design was up to fire safety standards.

27. PM(S)/CEDD said that the design of the proposed footbridge system was undertaken by a consultant engaged by the Government. The current design did not include fitting wire meshes on both sides of the footbridge. The current design also met the fire safety standards.

28. Dr Junius HO suggested that solar power generators be provided on top of the cover of the proposed footbridge system and greening facilities be included on the footbridge.

29. PM(S)/CEDD said that there would be greening facilities on the footbridge under the proposed footbridge system project. The Administration was installing photovoltaic panels on a trial basis on top of the cover of the footbridge system, which was already open for public use, at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West. It would also consider installing such facilities on top of the cover of the proposed footbridge system.

30. Mr Alvin YEUNG suggested that some of the facilities of the proposed footbridge system be shut off in late-night hours in order to save energy.

31. PM(S)/CEDD said that equipped with sensing elements, the escalators would automatically slow down when there were no passengers or go idle in late-night hours. The exhaust system of the lifts would shut off automatically to save energy when there were no passengers for prolonged periods of time.

32. Dr Helena WONG pointed out that the glass cover design currently adopted in most of the newly-built public footbridges was ineffective in blocking out sunlight, resulting in poor heat insulation. She enquired whether the proposed footbridge system would adopt the glass cover design. Moreover, she suggested that dog excreta collection bins be provided on the proposed footbridge for the convenience of users with dogs.

33. PM(S)/CEDD said that the middle strip portion of the cover of the proposed footbridge system that took up one-third of the cover area would be fitted with opaque suspended ceiling and flanked on both sides by glass cover made of sparsely-striped glass panes. With such design, the deck of the footbridge would not be exposed to excessive sunlight. She added that she would relay the suggestion of providing dog excreta collection bins to the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department for consideration.

Voting on PWSC(2019-20)16

34. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2019-20\)16](#) to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Twenty-six members voted for, one member voted against the proposal and no member abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Ms Claudia MO
Mr Frankie YICK	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG	Dr Helena WONG
Mr Alvin YEUNG	Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Junius HO	Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Holden CHOW	Mr Wilson OR
Ms Tanya CHAN	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr HUI Chi-fung	Mr LUK Chung-hung
Mr LAU Kwok-fan	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr KWONG Chun-yu	Mr Vincent CHENG
Mr Tony TSE	Ms CHAN Hoi-yan
(26 members)	

Against:

Dr Fernando CHEUNG
(1 member)

Abstained:
(0 member)

35. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. Ms Tanya CHAN requested separate voting on the item, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)16](#), at the relevant FC meeting.

[*Post-meeting note:* Members were informed vide LC Paper No. PWSC171/19-20 issued on 16 June 2020 that Ms Tanya CHAN had informed the Secretariat on 15 June 2020 of her decision to withdraw the request that the above item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.]

Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations
PWSC(2019-20)23 — Provision for Capital Works Reserve
Fund block allocations in 2020-21

36. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)23](#)) involved a total allocation of \$22,515.5 million for the block allocation subheads under the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF") for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. A full list of items proposed to be funded by CWRF block allocations for 2020-2021 (i.e. [PWSC41/19-20\(01\)](#)) had been provided by the Administration to the Subcommittee on 4 December 2019. The Government had consulted the Panel on Development on the funding proposals set out in the funding submission on 26 November 2019. The Office of the Government Chief Information Officer had consulted the Panel on Information Technology and Broadcasting on the proposed block allocation for Subhead A007GX — New administrative computer systems under Head 710 — Computerisation on 11 November 2019. The Transport and Housing Bureau had consulted the Panel on Transport on the implementation of Subhead 6101TX — Universal Accessibility Programme under Head 706 — Highways on 15 November 2019. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panels was tabled at the meeting.

37. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he and nine other members had submitted a joint letter to the Chairman (i.e. [LC Paper No. PWSC67/19-20\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version only), in which they requested that the Secretary for Security ("S for S") or the Commissioner of Police ("C of P") should attend the meeting of the Subcommittee to respond to members' questions on CWRF items related to the Hong Kong Police Force ("HKPF"). However, the Administration had only replied via its letter (i.e. [LC Paper No.](#)

[PWSC74/19-20\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version only) that only the controlling officers for the relevant subheads would attend the meeting of the Subcommittee as they were the officers who managed the use of the allocations and implemented the project items. He questioned that the argument put forward by the Administration in its letter of reply could not be substantiated, as other officials who were not the controlling officers of project items had previously been arranged to attend the meeting.

38. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen pointed out that in accordance with paragraph 16 of the PWSC Procedure, the Chairman or PWSC might invite any public officer to give information which PWSC might require in the performance of its duties. Ms Claudia MO opined that the Chairman should exercise his power to summon S for S and C of P to attend the meeting of the Subcommittee.

39. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)³ said that items under various CWRP subheads totalled over 10 000 and were all managed by the controlling officers for the subheads concerned. These officers or their representatives would therefore attend the meeting of the Subcommittee to receive members' questions. Such a practice was also in line with the meeting arrangement that had been adopted for years. He added that if members wished to obtain further information about individual items, the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau or other representatives of the Government who attended the meeting would relay members' questions to the relevant departments for follow-up.

40. The Chairman pointed out that in accordance with RoP, the Subcommittee did not have the power to summon the persons concerned to attend its meeting, unless so authorized by LegCo. Regarding the request from individual members for inviting specific officials to attend the meeting of the Subcommittee, the Chairman said that he had directed the Clerk to the Subcommittee to refer the request to the Administration for consideration, to which the Administration had also provided a written reply. As the Chairman, he must see to it that the Subcommittee moved on to the substantial discussion of the funding proposals as soon as possible rather than spending too much time on discussing procedural matters. If the officials attending the meeting were unable to respond to members' questions, the Subcommittee could always resort to the suitable avenues, including requesting the Administration to provide supplementary information for the Subcommittee after the meeting. That said, in view of the fact that the PWSC Procedure did not provide for the procedure for dealing with individual members' request for inviting the attendance of officials in the name of the Subcommittee, the Chairman said that he would let the Subcommittee decide after brief discussion whether such an invitation should

be made if some members insisted that specific officials be invited to attend the meeting for the agenda item.

41. Mr HUI Chi-fung said that he and six other members belonging to the Democratic Party had submitted a joint letter to the Chairman (i.e. [LC Paper No. PWSC71/19-20\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version only), in which they requested that the CWRP items involving HKPF be taken out from the paper. He requested the Chairman to respond as to how their request would be dealt with.

42. The Chairman responded that pursuant to the established practice of PWSC and the decisions he had previously made about such requests, he considered it unsuitable to take out individual items under the CWRP block allocations for separate deliberation and voting.

43. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 10:32 am.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
19 June 2020