

clean and efficient civil service, is there a need to modernise it so that the revised system can be more in line with good practices elsewhere, making it simpler and easier to administer, and that it can better meet the changing expectations of all concerned under the current socio-economic circumstances of Hong Kong?

III. Major Questions To Be Addressed

The Task Force wishes to maintain an open mind at this stage and to seek public views on the following questions² before it formulates its recommendation to the Administration:

1. Should there be a major overhaul of the civil service pay policy and system, putting more emphasis on performance-pay, clean wage policy (i.e. paying "all cash" wages in lieu of allowances, housing and medical benefits, etc.), etc., and building in more flexibility for adjustment? *Should* [3.23 (a) & 3.36(c)]
2. Should senior civil servants be subject to a pay policy which is different from that of the middle-ranking and junior ranks, placing more risk/ award factors on the former? *Should* [3.23(b)]
3. Should the disciplined services' pay be treated differently from the rest of the civil service? *Should* [3.23(c)]
4. Should we adhere to the principle of broad comparability with the private sector and continue to conduct regular pay level, pay structure and pay trend surveys to ensure that civil service pay remains competitive? *Should* [3.23(d) & 3.36(a)]

² For easy reference, the numbering within the brackets refer to the corresponding paragraphs in the Task Force's Interim Report.

5. Or should Government's affordability to pay be an over-riding consideration in pay adjustments? *Should* [3.23(e)]
6. Should flexible pay ranges be introduced into the Hong Kong civil service to replace fixed pay scales? If so, should they apply only to senior civil servants or the entire service, including both the civilian grades and the disciplined services? *No* [3.30(c)&(d)]
7. Is the existing pay adjustment system still regarded as fair by both civil servants and the public which they serve? Would another mechanism serve this purpose just as well, or better? *No* [3.36(b)]
8. Is there merit for elements of performance pay to be incorporated into civil service salaries? *Yes* [3.44(a)]
9. Should team-based performance rewards be used and, if so, to which group (senior, middle, lower or all levels) should they apply and on what basis? *No* [3.44(c)]
10. Should individual performance rewards be introduced and, if so, to which group (senior, middle, lower or all levels) should they apply and on what basis? *No* [3.44(d)]
11. Should consideration be given to introducing decentralisation of civil service pay administration for a city like Hong Kong? *No* [3.51(a)]
12. Should some or all of the current general/common grades staff be departmentalised to facilitate department-based management? *Should* [3.51(c)]

13. If civil service pay administration is to be decentralized, there may be a rather long transition period. How can the standard of service and staff morale be maintained during that period? *N/A* [3.51(d)]
14. In terms of simplification, is there scope to amalgamate existing grades within broader occupational categories? Is there scope for having flatter organizations with wider span of management control and fewer rank layers? *Yes* [3.51(e)]
15. Should a formal job evaluation system be introduced and, if so, should this be operated centrally or at department level? *Should, centrally* [3.51(f)]

IV. Public Consultation

 22 MAY 2002

Views are welcome from all quarters of the community on the interim report and the questions raised in Section III above.

Please forward your views and comments to the Joint Secretariat for the Advisory Bodies on Civil Service and Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service on or before 25 May 2002 at –

Address: Room 701, 7th Floor
Tower Two, Lippo Centre
89 Queensway
Hong Kong
Fax: 2877 0750
E-mail: jsscs@jsscs.gov.hk

Task Force on the Review of Civil Service Pay Policy and System
April 2002