

## LCQ15: Protecting jurors from clandestine video-recording and photo-taking

Following is a question by the Hon Paul Tse and a written reply by the Secretary for Justice, Ms Teresa Cheng, SC, in the Legislative Council today (June 6):

Question:

It has been reported that four alleged incidents of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking in courtrooms occurred in the past three months. Three of such incidents occurred during the trial of cases of the offences of riot, etc. committed in Mong Kok, and the latest one occurred during the trial of contempt of court case relating to the Occupy Mong Kok movement in 2014. On February 23, a man pointed his mobile phone to the direction of the jury and took photos and videos, and disseminated the photos and video clips through an instant messaging software. However, the judge who tried the case decided not to pursue the matter after the man deleted the photos and video clips. On May 18, when the jurors of that case retired for deliberation, the Judiciary received an email with words which read "there are a lot more" and with a photo with features of the jurors. Some members of the legal profession have considered that the person who sent the email attempted to challenge the court's impartiality in the trial of the case. On the other hand, it has been reported that in an article entitled "Smart tips to observe trials in High Court" posted on a Mainland website with a number of photos featuring local courts, the author said that, "fortunately, the clandestine photo-taking was not discovered by the judge". Also, an article entitled "What kind of experience is it to observe trials in Hong Kong's High Court", along with photos of local courts, can be found through a Mainland Internet search engine. Those articles show that the courts in Hong Kong seem to have become a tourist attraction for Mainland tourists. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has assessed if the aforesaid acts of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking, as pointed out by the media, relate to politically sensitive cases, and whether such incidents (i) involved the intention of some people to influence the trials by sending out threatening messages, (ii) will cause members of the public who serve as jurors to worry about their identities being exposed and their personal safety, and (iii) has an impact on the confidence of members of the public on the court's impartiality in trying cases;

(2) whether it will seriously pursue the criminal liability of the aforesaid persons involved in the clandestine video-recording and photo-taking;

(3) whether it knows if the Judiciary has stepped up measures to prevent the recurrence of incidents of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking of

the jury in court to ensure that they discharge their duties impartially without worries and free from threats; and

(4) whether it will request the relevant Mainland authorities to (i) address squarely the aforesaid issues and (ii) step up education of Mainland residents of their obligation to abide by the laws of Hong Kong, including the requirement that no video-recording and photo-taking is allowed when observing trials in court, when they are in Hong Kong?

Reply:

President,

Trial by jury for criminal cases at the Court of First Instance (CFI) is an indispensable component of the criminal justice system and a deep-rooted aspect of the common law tradition of Hong Kong. Article 86 of the Basic Law provides that "the principle of trial by jury previously practised in Hong Kong shall be maintained."

In *HKSAR v Lee Ming-tee and another* (2001) 4 HKCFAR 133 (FACC No. 8 of 2000), the Court of Final Appeal pointed out in its judgment that "reliance on the integrity of the jury and its ability to try the case fairly on the evidence, to put aside extraneous prejudice and to follow the directions of the judge is fundamental to the jury system itself."

Any intended or actual threat that constitutes undue pressure on jurors and judicial officers resulting in biased acts on their parts is completely unacceptable. Such acts may not only bring about injustice to the defendants in certain cases, but also weaken public confidence in the jury system and the criminal justice system.

In a recent case of criminal contempt of court handled by the CFI of the High Court involving photo-taking in court, the defendant was convicted by the Court for criminal contempt of court. In the reasons for verdict and sentence, the Court clearly pointed out that photo-taking in court would very likely prejudice or interfere with the due administration of justice. This is because photo-taking in the courtroom would possibly disrupt or interrupt court proceedings. Moreover, photo-taking may cause concern or unease among jurors and witnesses (including victims in sexual assault cases), in particular when their identities are disclosed, thereby leading to issues of their safety. If the photographs are misused, it will deal an even more serious blow to the due administration of justice. Therefore, photo-taking in court would very likely constitute the offence of criminal contempt of court.

Under existing laws, there are generally two ways to deal with the acts of taking photographs in court:

(i) Under section 7 of the Summary Offences Ordinance (Cap. 228), certain acts of taking photographs in court are prohibited. Offenders are liable to a fine of \$2,000 upon conviction.

(ii) Suspected offenders may also be prosecuted for criminal contempt of court, and could be sentenced to a fine and imprisonment upon conviction.

In a most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI referred above, the trial judge has taken forward proceedings for contempt of court according to summary procedures in respect of the act of clandestine photo-taking by the offender. The offender was ultimately convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for seven days. As regards another incident involving clandestine photo-taking of jurors during a trial at the CFI, the Police have launched investigation into the case. The Department of Justice (DoJ) will take a serious approach in following up on the case, and on receipt of the Police's investigation report and evidence gathered, it will consider, in accordance with the Prosecution Code and the applicable law, whether to initiate prosecution or proceedings for committal for contempt of court.

In respect of the question raised by the Hon Paul Tse, the DoJ has consulted the Judiciary Administration, whose response to part (3) of the question is as follows:

"The Judiciary takes the view that due administration of justice is of paramount importance for all court proceedings. In particular, trial by jury is an important part of the administration of justice under the common law, which is constitutionally protected under Article 86 of the Basic Law. Serving jurors must be free from all actual or perceived interference or pressure. An important safeguard is the prohibition of photography and audio or video recording inside courtrooms.

According to the Judiciary, the Judiciary has all along been taking measures to remind court users that photo-taking is not allowed in courtrooms. For example, clear signage is posted inside courtrooms and at court lobbies. The Judiciary staff has been reminding court users of such restriction as necessary. The Judiciary has also been referring cases involving photo-taking at court buildings to the DoJ and/or Police for follow-up actions as appropriate.

The Judiciary is very concerned with the recent incidents of photo-taking in courtrooms when proceedings were held and takes the matter seriously. Besides taking the necessary follow-up actions, the Judiciary has recently put in place the following enhancement measures:

(i) making public announcements in courtrooms before commencement of court proceedings to remind court users of the photo-taking prohibition. The announcements are made in Cantonese, English and Putonghua;

(ii) putting up more notices and signage on the prohibition of photo-taking in more prominent areas in courtrooms and at court lobbies;

(iii) reminding court users of the prohibition of photo-taking more extensively by Judiciary staff verbally or through written notices as appropriate; and

(iv) strengthening security personnel manpower during court proceedings for monitoring the situation as necessary.

In addition, the Judiciary is actively considering the issuance of a Practice Direction to regulate the use of mobile phones and other devices with photo-taking or audio/video recording capability for jury proceedings."

As regards parts (1), (2) and (4) of the Hon Paul Tse's question, the DoJ's response is as follows:

(1) and (2) We do not provide specific comments on individual cases. In respect of the incident of clandestine photo-taking of jurors referred above, it is already under police investigation. The DoJ attaches great importance to the incident. But to avoid affecting the related follow-up actions, it is inappropriate for us to comment any further or disclose any specific details at this stage. On receipt of the Police's investigation report and evidence gathered, the DoJ will make an independent professional consideration as to whether to initiate prosecution or proceedings for committal for contempt of court in accordance with the Prosecution Code and the applicable law, and the offender may also be subject to arrest or punishment. In the most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI referred above, the trial judge emphasised in his judgment that the court must protect the privacy and safety of jurors and witnesses, so that they would not be subject to unnecessary interference. And because photographs taken inside the court may also be disseminated quickly and fall into the hands of the bad elements, thereby seriously disrupting the court's judicial proceedings, it is necessary to impose penalties with deterrent effect on offenders for illegal photo-taking in court.

(4) Taking into account the various measures set out in the Judiciary's response to part (3) of the question set out above, it is considered that there are sufficient measures to ensure that people observing trials in court are aware of the requirement that photo-taking is not allowed in court. The sentence imposed in the most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI has also sent a clear and deterring signal to the public, the court definitely would not tolerate acts of illegal photo-taking in court.

---

## [LCQ15: Protecting jurors from clandestine video-recording and photo-taking](#)

Following is a question by the Hon Paul Tse and a written reply by the Secretary for Justice, Ms Teresa Cheng, SC, in the Legislative Council today (June 6):

Question:

It has been reported that four alleged incidents of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking in courtrooms occurred in the past three months. Three of such incidents occurred during the trial of cases of the offences of riot, etc. committed in Mong Kok, and the latest one occurred during the trial of contempt of court case relating to the Occupy Mong Kok movement in 2014. On February 23, a man pointed his mobile phone to the direction of the jury and took photos and videos, and disseminated the photos and video clips through an instant messaging software. However, the judge who tried the case decided not to pursue the matter after the man deleted the photos and video clips. On May 18, when the jurors of that case retired for deliberation, the Judiciary received an email with words which read "there are a lot more" and with a photo with features of the jurors. Some members of the legal profession have considered that the person who sent the email attempted to challenge the court's impartiality in the trial of the case. On the other hand, it has been reported that in an article entitled "Smart tips to observe trials in High Court" posted on a Mainland website with a number of photos featuring local courts, the author said that, "fortunately, the clandestine photo-taking was not discovered by the judge". Also, an article entitled "What kind of experience is it to observe trials in Hong Kong's High Court", along with photos of local courts, can be found through a Mainland Internet search engine. Those articles show that the courts in Hong Kong seem to have become a tourist attraction for Mainland tourists. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has assessed if the aforesaid acts of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking, as pointed out by the media, relate to politically sensitive cases, and whether such incidents (i) involved the intention of some people to influence the trials by sending out threatening messages, (ii) will cause members of the public who serve as jurors to worry about their identities being exposed and their personal safety, and (iii) has an impact on the confidence of members of the public on the court's impartiality in trying cases;

(2) whether it will seriously pursue the criminal liability of the aforesaid persons involved in the clandestine video-recording and photo-taking;

(3) whether it knows if the Judiciary has stepped up measures to prevent the recurrence of incidents of clandestine video-recording and photo-taking of the jury in court to ensure that they discharge their duties impartially without worries and free from threats; and

(4) whether it will request the relevant Mainland authorities to (i) address squarely the aforesaid issues and (ii) step up education of Mainland residents of their obligation to abide by the laws of Hong Kong, including the requirement that no video-recording and photo-taking is allowed when observing trials in court, when they are in Hong Kong?

Reply:

President,

Trial by jury for criminal cases at the Court of First Instance (CFI) is

an indispensable component of the criminal justice system and a deep-rooted aspect of the common law tradition of Hong Kong. Article 86 of the Basic Law provides that "the principle of trial by jury previously practised in Hong Kong shall be maintained."

In *HKSAR v Lee Ming-tee and another* (2001) 4 HKCFAR 133 (FACC No. 8 of 2000), the Court of Final Appeal pointed out in its judgment that "reliance on the integrity of the jury and its ability to try the case fairly on the evidence, to put aside extraneous prejudice and to follow the directions of the judge is fundamental to the jury system itself."

Any intended or actual threat that constitutes undue pressure on jurors and judicial officers resulting in biased acts on their parts is completely unacceptable. Such acts may not only bring about injustice to the defendants in certain cases, but also weaken public confidence in the jury system and the criminal justice system.

In a recent case of criminal contempt of court handled by the CFI of the High Court involving photo-taking in court, the defendant was convicted by the Court for criminal contempt of court. In the reasons for verdict and sentence, the Court clearly pointed out that photo-taking in court would very likely prejudice or interfere with the due administration of justice. This is because photo-taking in the courtroom would possibly disrupt or interrupt court proceedings. Moreover, photo-taking may cause concern or unease among jurors and witnesses (including victims in sexual assault cases), in particular when their identities are disclosed, thereby leading to issues of their safety. If the photographs are misused, it will deal an even more serious blow to the due administration of justice. Therefore, photo-taking in court would very likely constitute the offence of criminal contempt of court.

Under existing laws, there are generally two ways to deal with the acts of taking photographs in court:

(i) Under section 7 of the Summary Offences Ordinance (Cap. 228), certain acts of taking photographs in court are prohibited. Offenders are liable to a fine of \$2,000 upon conviction.

(ii) Suspected offenders may also be prosecuted for criminal contempt of court, and could be sentenced to a fine and imprisonment upon conviction.

In a most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI referred above, the trial judge has taken forward proceedings for contempt of court according to summary procedures in respect of the act of clandestine photo-taking by the offender. The offender was ultimately convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for seven days. As regards another incident involving clandestine photo-taking of jurors during a trial at the CFI, the Police have launched investigation into the case. The Department of Justice (DoJ) will take a serious approach in following up on the case, and on receipt of the Police's investigation report and evidence gathered, it will consider, in accordance with the Prosecution Code and the applicable law, whether to initiate prosecution or proceedings for committal for contempt of court.

In respect of the question raised by the Hon Paul Tse, the DoJ has consulted the Judiciary Administration, whose response to part (3) of the question is as follows:

"The Judiciary takes the view that due administration of justice is of paramount importance for all court proceedings. In particular, trial by jury is an important part of the administration of justice under the common law, which is constitutionally protected under Article 86 of the Basic Law. Serving jurors must be free from all actual or perceived interference or pressure. An important safeguard is the prohibition of photography and audio or video recording inside courtrooms.

According to the Judiciary, the Judiciary has all along been taking measures to remind court users that photo-taking is not allowed in courtrooms. For example, clear signage is posted inside courtrooms and at court lobbies. The Judiciary staff has been reminding court users of such restriction as necessary. The Judiciary has also been referring cases involving photo-taking at court buildings to the DoJ and/or Police for follow-up actions as appropriate.

The Judiciary is very concerned with the recent incidents of photo-taking in courtrooms when proceedings were held and takes the matter seriously. Besides taking the necessary follow-up actions, the Judiciary has recently put in place the following enhancement measures:

- (i) making public announcements in courtrooms before commencement of court proceedings to remind court users of the photo-taking prohibition. The announcements are made in Cantonese, English and Putonghua;
- (ii) putting up more notices and signage on the prohibition of photo-taking in more prominent areas in courtrooms and at court lobbies;
- (iii) reminding court users of the prohibition of photo-taking more extensively by Judiciary staff verbally or through written notices as appropriate; and
- (iv) strengthening security personnel manpower during court proceedings for monitoring the situation as necessary.

In addition, the Judiciary is actively considering the issuance of a Practice Direction to regulate the use of mobile phones and other devices with photo-taking or audio/video recording capability for jury proceedings."

As regards parts (1), (2) and (4) of the Hon Paul Tse's question, the DoJ's response is as follows:

(1) and (2) We do not provide specific comments on individual cases. In respect of the incident of clandestine photo-taking of jurors referred above, it is already under police investigation. The DoJ attaches great importance to the incident. But to avoid affecting the related follow-up actions, it is inappropriate for us to comment any further or disclose any specific details at this stage. On receipt of the Police's investigation report and evidence gathered, the DoJ will make an independent professional consideration as to

whether to initiate prosecution or proceedings for committal for contempt of court in accordance with the Prosecution Code and the applicable law, and the offender may also be subject to arrest or punishment. In the most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI referred above, the trial judge emphasised in his judgment that the court must protect the privacy and safety of jurors and witnesses, so that they would not be subject to unnecessary interference. And because photographs taken inside the court may also be disseminated quickly and fall into the hands of the bad elements, thereby seriously disrupting the court's judicial proceedings, it is necessary to impose penalties with deterrent effect on offenders for illegal photo-taking in court.

(4) Taking into account the various measures set out in the Judiciary's response to part (3) of the question set out above, it is considered that there are sufficient measures to ensure that people observing trials in court are aware of the requirement that photo-taking is not allowed in court. The sentence imposed in the most recent case involving clandestine photo-taking during court proceedings in the CFI has also sent a clear and deterring signal to the public, the court definitely would not tolerate acts of illegal photo-taking in court.

---

## [LCQ11: Supply of sites for private housing](#)

Following is a question by the Hon Jimmy Ng and a written reply by the Secretary for Development, Mr Michael Wong, in the Legislative Council today (June 6):

Question:

According to the information from a think tank, it is projected that 24 280 residential units can be built on the private housing sites launched in the first three quarters of the past financial year. As many as 64 per cent of such units will be provided by privately-led development projects, which is 49 percentage points higher than the average percentage (around 15 per cent) for the past five financial years. The think tank has also pointed out that the current problem of acute housing shortage in Hong Kong can be attributed to a certain extent to the lack of reserves for "spade-ready" sites (i.e. the sites concerned have been properly zoned, and do not require resumption, clearance or reprovisioning of existing facilities, site formation, or provision of additional infrastructure) by both the Government and private developers. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has explored why as many as 64 per cent of the aforesaid 24



280 residential units will be provided by privately-led development projects; if so, of the details; as the Secretary for Development remarked in December last year that there was no guarantee that the momentum for private development projects would be maintained in the coming years, of the authorities' ways to increase Government-led land supply so as to achieve the annual supply target for private residential units;

(2) given that a number of the sites included in the Land Sale Programme for the 2017-2018 financial year (e.g. the sites located in Pak Shek Kok of Tai Po and Castle Peak Road-Area 48 of Tuen Mun, as well as the eight sites located in Kai Tak) are not spade-ready sites, whether the authorities have drawn up a timetable for converting such sites into spade-ready sites; if not, of the reasons for that; if so, the details and the estimated total number of residential units to be built on such sites;

(3) whether it will set up a reserve for spade-ready sites and improve the existing land premium mechanism in order to increase land supply; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether it will resume major reclamation projects for setting up a land reserve; if so, of the timetable; if not, the reasons for that?

Reply:

President,

My reply to various parts of the question is as follows:

(1) Private housing land supply sources include government land sale, railway property development projects, projects of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and private development/redevelopment projects. The aggregate private housing land supply in 2017-18 (i.e. from April 2017 to March 2018) can provide a total of about 25 500 housing units. Details are set out below:

Source of land supply	Estimated flat number
Government land sale	5 840
Railway property development projects	2 600
Projects of the URA	280
Private development/redevelopment projects	16 780
Total	25 500

While there was a significant boom in private developments and redevelopments in 2017-18, with an estimated flat yield significantly higher

than the 10-year average (i.e. 2007 to 2016) of 4 200 flats, the Government is unable to accurately forecast whether this situation will continue as private developments or redevelopments are initiated by the private land owners taking into account different considerations, including the owner's assessment on the market outlook, development initiative and financial consideration, etc. Hence, the Government does not and should not rely on a single source of land supply. We will continue to maintain a sustained and stable private housing land supply to meet the needs for private housing land in the community.

(2) The 2018-19 Land Sale Programme comprises a total of 27 potential residential sites capable of providing about 15 250 private housing units. As at May 2018, out of the 27 sites, amendments to the outline zoning plan (OZP) are not required or have been completed for 20 sites (including nine sites in Kai Tak), capable of providing about 11 760 units. The other seven sites require amendments to the OZPs for rezoning or increasing the development density; these sites are capable of providing about 3 490 units. We will complete the statutory processes in a timely manner having regard to the land sale programme.

Following established practice, government sites expected to be put up for sale will be decided and announced on an annual basis, shortly before the start of the financial year concerned, taking into account prevailing circumstances such as the readiness of individual sites, the supply situation from other private housing land supply sources, the housing supply target set under the Long Term Housing Strategy and market conditions.

(3) and (4) Land development takes time and we need sustained efforts for the planning and development of land resources. Under a multi-pronged approach, the Government endeavours to identify and provide land to meet the emerged, foreseeable and unforeseeable needs for housing, economic and social developments. Over the past few years, the Government has identified, through land use reviews, over 210 sites with housing development potential in the short to medium term, involving a total of over 310 000 housing units (with over 70 per cent being public housing). These sites, together with the initiative to suitably increase development intensity as well as the implementation of the Kai Tak Development, Anderson Road Quarry Site, railway property developments and urban renewal projects, could provide over 380 000 units in the short-to-medium term. As for the medium-to-long term, the Government is pressing ahead various New Development Areas and railway property developments (including Siu Ho Wan Depot) projects to provide over 220 000 residential flats.

In the medium-to-long term, reclamation as a means of land formation is indeed capable of providing more sizeable new land to accommodate different uses. Among other efforts, reclamation works for the Tung Chung New Town Extension has commenced in end-2017. We will seek funding from the Legislative Council in due course to commence the detailed studies for other reclamation projects.

Besides, the Task Force on Land Supply (Task Force) launched a five-month public engagement exercise on April 26, 2018 to lead a discussion in

the community on the pros and cons and relative priority of 18 land supply options (including near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour) and relevant issues (such as building a land reserve), with a view to making a compromise on the land supply options and strategy while achieving the broadest consensus in the community. Based on the public views collected, the Task Force will submit a report to the Government tentatively by end-2018.

Regarding streamlining and expediting the premium assessment process, the Government has implemented various measures in recent years. For example, premium assessments are centralised at Lands Department (LandsD) Headquarters in respect of lease modification/land exchange cases involving a premium of over \$100 million or a gross floor area permissible exceeding 10 000 square metres after the lease modification/land exchange. LandsD has also adopted a new set of updated construction costs data as a common reference by the Government and market practitioners to facilitate agreement in premium negotiations. The Government introduced the Pilot Scheme for Arbitration on Land Premium (Pilot Scheme) in October 2014 to facilitate early agreement on land premium payable for lease modification/land exchange applications, with the objective of expediting land supply for housing and other uses. Given the limited number of completed arbitration cases, the Government after consideration has extended the Pilot Scheme for two years until October 2018 to accumulate more experience and will conduct a review towards the end of the trial period.

---

## **Government increases shareholding in Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited to 6 per cent**

The following is issued on behalf of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority:

The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government notified Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited (HKEx) on June 4 that it has increased its shareholding in HKEx, for the account of the Exchange Fund, to 6.00 per cent.

This is a modest and limited increase in shareholding as a result of scrip dividend election under the scrip dividend scheme in relation to the final dividend for the year ended December 31, 2017.

The shareholding in HKEx is a strategic use of the Exchange Fund by the Government to enable the Government to contribute, over the longer term, to HKEx's development, particularly in strategic partnerships and linkages with other institutions in the region.

The Government became a minority controller of HKEx by increasing its shareholding to 5.88 per cent of HKEx's issued share capital in September 2007.

---

## **LCQ4: Immunisation for children**

Following is a question by the Hon Holden Chow and a reply by the Secretary for Food and Health, Professor Sophia Chan, in the Legislative Council today (June 6):

Question:

At present, the Department of Health (DH) provides vaccines and boosters for children from birth to Primary Six under the Hong Kong Childhood Immunisation Programme (the Immunisation Programme) in order to protect them from 11 infectious diseases, such as measles, poliomyelitis and chickenpox. Parents may bring their children from birth to five years of age to the various Maternal and Child Health Centre for immunisation. Inoculators of DH will visit primary schools to provide immunisation service to primary students. Moreover, children aged six months to under 12 years are eligible for free and subsidised seasonal influenza vaccination (SIV) via the Government Vaccination Programme (GVP) and Vaccination Subsidy Scheme (VSS) respectively. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the number and percentage of children in the relevant age groups receiving the various types of vaccines and boosters under the Immunisation Programme, as well as the number of inoculators visiting schools to provide immunisation service, in each of the past three years;

(2) of the number of primary schools participating in the outreach SIV activities at schools organised under VSS in each of the past two years, and the number of primary school students thereby receiving vaccination; the total number of children receiving free SIV via GVP in each of the past three years; and

(3) whether it will consider including SIV in the Immunisation Programme in the near future, and deploying inoculators to schools to provide SIV for primary students; if so, of the details, including the additional number of inoculators needed to be recruited; if not, the reasons for that?

Reply:

President,

Vaccination is an effective means to protect oneself against infectious diseases. The Government is currently conducting several free vaccination

programmes or subsidy schemes (note 1) to provide free or subsidised vaccination services for children of different target groups.

Having consulted the Department of Health (DH), I now give a reply to the three parts of the question by the Hon Holden Chow as follows:

(1) Eligible children will receive different types of free vaccines and boosters under the Hong Kong Childhood Immunisation Programme (HKCIP) for the prevention of 11 types of infectious diseases. Vaccines are first given to newborn babies in hospitals. During their pre-school period, children will receive different types of vaccines and boosters at recommended ages of vaccination at the DH's Maternal and Child Health Centres (MCHCs). As for primary school children, vaccination is provided at schools by the DH's outreaching School Immunisation Team (SIT) (details at Annex 1). Apart from the free vaccination provided by the DH, parents may arrange their children to receive vaccination in private healthcare facilities or clinics at their own expense.

In each of the past three years, about 112 000 to 120 000 doses of vaccine were given to newborn babies by public and private hospitals; about 600 000 doses to children by the DH's MCHCs; and about 160 000 doses to all Primary One and Six school children by the SIT under the HKCIP (details at Annexes 2, 3 and 4 respectively). The number of staff of the SIT was 58 in the financial years from 2015/16 to 2017/18 (details at Annex 5).

Since 2001, the DH has conducted territory-wide immunisation coverage surveys regularly to monitor the vaccination coverage of pre-school children (note 2). The most recent survey conducted in 2015 (note 3) indicated that the overall coverage of various vaccines under the HKCIP had reached as high as above 95% (details at Annex 6). In addition, the SIT examines the immunisation records of primary students when vaccination is provided at schools annually. Statistics show that the vaccination coverage of Primary One and Six students has been consistently maintained above 97% (details at Annex 7).

(2) Regarding seasonal influenza vaccination, children aged 6 months to less than 12 years can receive subsidised vaccination at the clinics of private doctors enrolled in the Vaccination Subsidy Scheme (VSS) (note 4). These private doctors can also organise outreach vaccination activities in primary schools. In the seasons of 2016/17 and 2017/18 (note 5), about 17 000 students in 54 primary schools and 24 000 students in 65 primary schools received influenza vaccination respectively under the VSS. While these school outreach vaccination services were provided by private doctors enrolled in the VSS, the logistics and inspection of services were carried out by the Centre for Health Protection (CHP) of the DH.

In addition, children from families receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance or those holding valid Certificate for Waiver of Medical Charges may receive free influenza vaccination under the Government Vaccination Programme (GVP) at the DH's MCHCs (for children aged 6 months to under 6 years) or the Student Health Service Centres (for children aged 6

years to under 12 years) (note 6). In the seasons of 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 (note 7), some 2 400, 1 600 and 1 900 eligible children received influenza vaccination respectively under the GVP.

(3) The CHP has kept abreast of the latest position of the World Health Organization on immunisation and vaccination, the scientific development and application of new vaccines as well as their cost-effectiveness, the latest global and local epidemiology of vaccine preventable diseases, and the experience of other health authorities. The Scientific Committee on Vaccine Preventable Diseases under the CHP holds regular meetings and makes recommendations to the CHP regarding the types of vaccines to be incorporated into the HKCIP from the public health perspective. Generally speaking, the incorporation of a new vaccine to the HKCIP will be based on scientific evidence, taking into account a number of public health considerations including the overall disease burden on society, the efficacy and safety of the vaccine, the availability of other effective preventive measures, cost-effectiveness and public acceptance of the vaccine.

The CHP is actively preparing for the launch of the School Outreach Vaccination Pilot Programme (Pilot Programme) in the 2018/19 school year. Under the Pilot Programme, the Government will provide free outreach influenza vaccination services for participating primary schools by either the Government Outreach Team or the Public-Private-Partnership Outreach Team. Meanwhile, the CHP is working to enhance the school outreach vaccination services (note 8) under the existing VSS (enhanced outreach VSS) by such ways as increasing the amount of subsidy and strengthening the support for participating private doctors. A list of doctors participating in the enhanced outreach VSS will be uploaded to the CHP's website in due course. No extra fees will be charged by these participating private doctors for the service.

Primary schools which will not participate in the Pilot Programme may take the initiative to invite private doctors on the list to provide free outreach vaccination services at their schools. The CHP will review various modes of influenza vaccination, including services provided by the Government Outreach Team, the Public-Private-Partnership Outreach Team and the enhanced outreach VSS, with a view to working out a mode of vaccination for the future, including whether the Pilot Programme will be regularised and the manpower required.

Note 1: They include the Hong Kong Childhood Immunisation Programme, the Government Vaccination Programme and the Vaccination Subsidy Scheme.

Note 2: It refers to the percentage of children having received vaccination at recommended ages under the HKCIP.

Note 3: Immunisation records (or vaccination cards) of children born between 2009 and 2012 were randomly examined.

Note 4: In the seasons of 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 (as at May 20, 2018), some 45 200, 110 600 and 150 000 eligible children received influenza vaccination respectively under the VSS.

Note 5: As at May 20, 2018.

Note 6: In 2016/17, the Government extended the scope of the eligible target

groups of the GVP and the VSS to cover eligible children aged 6 years to under 12 years. These enhancement measures have been regularised from the season of 2017/18 onwards.

Note 7: As at May 20, 2018.

Note 8: Primary schools, kindergartens and child care centres will be covered.