

To: Secretariat, Committee on Review of Post service Outside Work for Directorate  
Civil Servants

[comment@dcspostservice-review.org.hk](mailto:comment@dcspostservice-review.org.hk)

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity of seeing the review and proposals. It is appreciated that the Committee has to deal with the issues of having to protect the public interest versus the protection of the individual's right to continue to work; as well as having to make gainful use of limited human resources in the community while avoiding any possible suspicion of "deferred reward". These are certainly no easy tasks. Whilst the principles may be correct, the application and outcome would require more sensitive balancing vis-à-vis the professional officers' genuine desire to serve the community and the net impact on community as a whole. While our individual officers may submit their respective comments as they wish, I have discussed with some colleagues and have put together a few salient points for your consideration as follows.

- (a) As a general comment, the ban on retired officers to work should not be so restrictive as to include D1 and D2 officers since the more politically sensitive matters are mostly related to officers at much higher ranks. It would be a waste of professional resources in the community to forbid the experienced officers to continue to make useful contributions.
- (b) Decisions, especially in the current planning process, are made collectively by committees and there is no direct relationship showing that an individual officer's decision making would surely lead to a favourable outcome to a stakeholder in the private sector, especially after the officer has left his post. Take for example, the Town Planning Board's meetings are quite open these days since the last review of the Town Planning Ordinance in 2004. Notices of the meetings and the gists of the applications are given well ahead before the meetings, the public can also watch the meetings and the minutes are accessible by the public in both English and Chinese languages. Aggrieved parties would also have statutory channels of seeking Review and Appeal.
- (c) Banning of the teaching in universities is considered too restrictive. The teaching of such professional theories and techniques in universities is an essential way to train up the successors to be. The wealth of the working experience of the retired

officers is invaluable. Even when some officers are still in service, they could seek permission for teaching part-time where necessary. There is thus more reason that after retirement, there should not be any such ban.

- (d) We would like to see in place more clear guidelines and mechanism of appeal, with independent expert panels including experts in the relevant professional field.

Yours sincerely,

---

(P.Y. TAM)

AD/Technical Services,  
for Director of Planning  
20 April 2009