



廉政公署

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

廉政專員

Commissioner, ICAC

Our Ref : CPD/ASM/TOC/2010/036

Your Ref : CB(4)/PAC/R62

20 May 2014

Miss Mary So  
 Clerk  
 Public Accounts Committee  
 Legislative Council  
 Legislative Council Complex  
 1 Legislative Council Road, Central  
 Hong Kong

Dear Miss So,

**Public Accounts Committee**  
**Consideration of Chapter 3 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 62**  
**Mega Events Fund**

I refer to your letter of 19 May 2014.

Our suggested changes to paragraph 1.11 of the draft Chapter 3 of the captioned report are as follows :

"After presenting the assignment report to its Corruption Prevention Advisory Committee, the ICAC further recommended that the TC should issue more stringent guidelines for its staff in evaluating events that involved substantial grants and carried a commercial name. Furthermore, the ICAC also raised the concern with the need for continuing the MEF which .... "

----- The draft version of the Audit Report is attached for your easy reference.

The reason for our suggestions is that it is not the ICAC usual practice to quote whether and which individual recommendations of our assignment reports are made by CPAC members when making the issue known publicly. As the advice from CPAC on the draft report is an integral process of completing and endorsing our assignment studies, it is unnecessary to differentiate recommendations made by CPAC members from other recommendations in the report.

Yours sincerely,

( Simon YL Peh )

Commissioner

Independent Commission Against Corruption

香港北角渣華道303號

303 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong

電話 Tel: (852) 2826 3111

圖文傳真 Fax: (852) 2810 8956

網址 Website: www.icac.org.hk

**40<sup>th</sup>** Anniversary  
 四十周年

為下一代 共建廉潔將來

A clean future for our next generation

1.1 1 After conducting the 2010 review, the ICAC also drew the TC's attention to the comments made by members of its Corruption Prevention Advisory Committee. Members of the ICAC Advisory Committee recommended that the TC should issue more stringent guidelines for its staff in evaluating events that involved substantial grants and carried a commercial name. Furthermore, the members were concerned with the need for continuing the MEF which was set up at a time of financial difficulties and, in view of the changed economic situation, suggested that the TC should consider returning the unused funds (i.e. the balance of the time-limited MEF of \$100 million — see para. 1.2) to the Government. As it transpired, the MEF had continued to operate and in April 2012, the TC/CEDB introduced a modified two-tier MEF which comprised a new category called Tier 1 with Tier 2 which is essentially a revised version of the original scheme operated by the MEF (see paras. 1.3 and 2.4).