

To: Chairman and Members of the Home Affairs Panel, Legislative Council

**Response from SDB Elite Coaches on the HAB's Paper, entitled
"A New Administrative Structure for Sports Development"**

Since the Home Affairs Bureau's publication of the Sport Policy Review consultation paper last year and the recent recommendation paper, entitled "A New Sport Administrative Structure for Sports Development," the SDB Elite Coaches have made submissions to the Legislative Council and met with HAB officials to provide their professional views on the impact of the new structure on elite training in Hong Kong. We hope that our communication with Home Affairs Panel members will help LegCo members to better understand the local sports structure and elite training. We further hope that, when making critical decision at such a critical moment, LegCo members and the government consider the recommendations of the elite coaches on the new structure and policies.

In its recommendation paper, the government insists on the dissolution of the Sports Development Board (SDB). It also effectively downgrades its commitment to elite training by changing the status of the Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI) from a statutory body to an incorporated body. It proposes to dissect the only elite training base in Hong Kong – the HKSI -- and give it to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to turn the Institute into a public recreational facility. This change is indeed a major drawback for sports development in Hong Kong. It inevitably will decrease the resources for elite sport development and create conflicts that will hamper the long-term development of the HKSI as an elite training center for Hong Kong athletes. It will further lead to a **"One Institute, Two systems"** management style. In our view, the recommendation paper contains many contradictions, and there are few rational grounds for the basis of its recommendations. The following highlights a number of examples:

1. The dissolution of SDB will simplify the sports structure.

From Appendixes C and D of the paper on the structure diagram, we perceive a more complicated structure replacing the existing one. Particularly in terms of elite sports, the procedures for policy making and funding application have become more complicated and inflexible.

2. The new Sports Commission can take a more comprehensive approach in promoting sports and can strengthen unity in the sports community.

The current SDB and LCSD are under the direct auspices and control of the HAB. The government directly appoints members to the SDB. The current sports resource allocation and the management represent the government's direct involvement in sports. Our concern is that in the future when there are three different new committees with representatives from different sports and community sectors, this will cause more confusion and competition for resources. This will cause even more unnecessary contradictions and conflicts than is the case in the current situation in which the government provides direct funding to its direct subordinates. Being the Chairman of the Sports Commission, the Secretary of Home Affairs may face a more difficult position in the future. We also worry that the competition for resources may affect elite training in the future.

3. The new structure provides a better environment and a more focused approach for elite athletes.

In our view, should the HKSI be made open for public use or managed by LCSD staff who have no experience in elite facilities management, coaches and athletes in the HKSI will lose the flexibility necessary for elite training and will have no scope for long-term planning and development for elite sports. The training environment and conditions will be adversely affected, thus affecting the chances of better performance in international competitions.

4. An incorporated HKSI will have greater opportunities in seeking sponsorship and greater flexibility in using such income.

Currently, SDB has complete flexibility in seeking commercial sponsorship. Through its commercial operations approach, SDB is also able to generate additional income. Such income supplements the government's subvention shortfall to elite training, and there is currently a high degree of flexibility in the use of such money. On the other hand, once the HKSI turns into an incorporated body, from the point of view of commercial partners, it will potentially lose the trust it has gained from being part of a statutory body.

We also have the following views on the proposed new sports structure.

1. Elite Training must continue to be managed by a statutory body.

Changing the management of elite training from a statutory body to an incorporated body will create difficulties establishing and retaining the commitment and confidence of elite athletes, coaches, and other involved persons. This will also affect the international image of HKSI as the elite training base of Hong Kong.

The government can consider repealing the existing Ordinance of the SDB to make it a statutory body exclusively for elite training, athlete support, coach education, elite sports research, etc. Any other business and projects not related to elite training can be handed over to the LCSD. (There are precedent-setting cases involving SDB handing over its own distinct projects on school sports and community sports to the LCSD). An alternative would be to reinstate the HKSI Ordinance, so that it can continue its operation as a statutory organization.

Under the new structure, the government can use its administrative and funding control over the SDB to correct what it considers to be inappropriate practices of the past. This will help the government better monitor the progress and achievements of elite training and demonstrate its commitments to elite sports development in Hong Kong. At the same time, HKSI may continue to seek sponsorship with its unique nature and status, thus improving the support for elite training.

Another benefit of this alternative approach is that the SDB can continue to top up the funding for elite training with the SDB Trust Fund and HKSI Trust Fund, in case there is a shortfall of government funding. This means that elite sports need not worry about not being able to find sponsorship in case of an economic downturn. Athletes will thus not be affected.

2. The administration, management, and facilities usage at HKSI should be considered an integral part of an elite training base for comprehensive and long-term development and should not be dissected.

At their meeting with HAB officials on 15 July, elite coaches protested strongly against the recommendation giving the HKSI outdoors facilities to the LCSD for public recreational use. As professionals in the field, we pointed out once again that this is a total misunderstanding of elite training needs. This reflects once again the danger of having non-professionals monitoring professionals. The response from elite coaches and the discussion record is in Attachment I for members' information.

3. The government must review the current \$2.5 billion funding to sports.

Over \$2.3 billion out of the \$2.5 billion of government funding is allocated to the LCSD for sports for recreation purposes. Compared with other countries, this direct investment in sports can be regarded as big. The SDB only receives \$180 million from the government to cover the following areas for competitive sports development:

- Funding to national sports associations for administration, personnel and programme expenses (about \$80 million each year)
- Elite training at HKSI and Athletes Support
- Talent identification and potential athletes development
- Coach education
- Management and maintenance of HKSI
- Funding allocation and sports development programmes
- Administration expenses of SDB and HKSI

Based on the aforesaid allocation of resources, there were much fewer resources allocated to elite training. There is a need to rationalize the allocation of resources for sports.

Once the government dissolves the SDB and withdraws the \$80 million funding that is currently allocated to NSAs, the actual remaining funding will be nominal and not sufficient to support the current needs of elite training.

Moreover, the extra income generated from the outdoor facilities will be taken by the LCSD, and the HKSI will have to pay an extra fee for booking our own outdoor facilities at the HKSI. After the dissolution of SDB, HKSI will have to find extra money to employ marketing staff to solicit sponsorship as required by the government. At the same time, the Trust Fund from SDB will no longer be available. Putting all these together, elite training at HKSI will face a very difficult situation. The original tight budget will be further reduced if the government "maintains the same level of support to elite sports."

Therefore, the government must seriously consider the actual needs of elite sports development in the future, and undertake its responsibilities and commitments to elite training and athletes. Other than the routine training programmes, there are a number of areas that have been under-developed over the years due to the lack of funding. This means that Hong Kong continues to fall further behind its counterparts in the international arena. These under-developed areas are:

- Maintenance and re-construction of HKSI
- Coaching and technical support for elite training (sports science, sports medicine and on-field support)
- Accommodation and study environment of elite athletes (need expansion of athletes hostels and study facilities)

- Talent identification and development of junior potential athletes
- Coach education

Concerns and voices from elite athletes

HAB officials also met the representatives of elite athletes on 15 July 2003. Athletes expressed their concerns and submitted a document to the HAB (Attachment II). The government reiterated its concern and respect for elite athletes, and once again committed itself to increasing resources to support athletes. We hope that such commitments are not mere lip service.

However, the incorporation of HKSI and the opening of HKSI facilities to the public could hardly fail to get the attention of the athletes. They expressed the opinion that the situation will affect their concentration and focus on training and preparation for competitions.

Moreover, support to athletes represents far more than funding needs. It is more important for the government to take a leading role in helping athletes to resolve their study and career problems. This will require the government to pursue a coordinated approach in seeking support from different departments and educational institutions to provide flexible education modules, flexible admission criteria and procedures, vocational training, career opportunities, and a retirement benefits scheme. This type of support goes far beyond basic funding requirements and is reflective of the practical needs of athletes. In addition, this practical support will demonstrate to athletes, parents, and the community at large that the government is truly committed to elite training.

Future sports policy and implementation

To ensure that sports policy is professional enough and funding allocations meet the needs of elite training, we request the inclusion of elite coaches and athletes in the Provisional Organizing Committee of the new structure, as well as in the Committees and the Sports Commission. The involvement of coaches and athletes will help the Committees and the Commission to have a better understanding of the actual needs of the core users, and to have professional input into decision making.

Value of sport and elitism

The honour of Hong Kong athletes in international competitions in the past decade is also the honour of elite training in Hong Kong. The social effects and community impact generated from the \$100 m+ investment in competitive sport is a return that is not comparable to any other investment. While the government and the community become more and more concerned about the future of Hong Kong, elite sport development becomes a unique channel of charisma to build up community confidence, solve youth-related problems, foster youth education and health development, and nurture a more responsible and committed new generation. Competitive sport has its charisma and attraction to young people. That is the reason many governments use it as a powerful tool to develop the spiritual strength of their young people. Therefore, we consider the investment in elite training in Hong Kong in the past years worth every dollar spent. If we want to climb another mountain in developing Hong Kong elites, a good sports structure, adequate resources, and commitment from government and the community are most important.

Conclusion

All SDB elite coaches and elite athletes have great concerns and anxiety about the uncertainty facing HKSI in the proposed new structure. We wish to express our discomfort at the unfairness of SDB staff losing their jobs because the government has decided to place the burden of a deficit budget and enhanced performance indicators of LCSD onto SDB staff. We sincerely hope that the government will listen with an open mind to the voice of the people (Was there any recommendation during the consultation period that HKSI should be incorporated or that the facilities should be dissected?). We believe the government should not pre-empt the discussion and directions of the Preparatory Committee or Elite Committee before it is in place. We also urge the government not to consider elite training as a commercial activity, because investing in elite sports is for the honour and long-term well being of Hong Kong. Meanwhile, during the change of structure, consideration should also be given to those dedicated and committed staff who have contributed to the success of elite sports over the years. It is important that such expertise and professionals be retained to serve sports in the new structure.

From SDB Head Coaches and all elite coaches of Elite Training Departments

Yu Lik	Atg Head Athletics Coach	Chan Chi Choi	Head Badminton Coach
Shen Jin Kang	Head Cycling Coach	Wang Ruiji	Head Fencing Coach
Chris Perry	Head Rowing Coach	Tony Choi	Head Squash Coach
Chan Yiu Hoi	Head Swimming Coach	Hui Jun	Head Table Tennis coach
Stan Tamura	Head Tennis Coach	Jim Porter	Atg Head Tenpin Bowling Coach
Ruth Hunt	Head Triathlon Coach	Rene Appel	Head Windsurfing Coach
Yu Li Guang	Head Wushu Coach		

23 July 2003

c.c. Dr. Patrick Ho, Mr. Leo Kwan – HAB
Mr. Victor Hui, Mr. Herman Hu, Prof. Chan Kai-ming, Prof. Frank Fu – SDB
Mrs. Maureen Chan, Dr. Chung Pak-kwong – SDB Management

HAB Meeting with SDB Elite Coaches

Date: 15 July 2003 (Tuesday)

Time: 6:30pm

Place: HKSI Conference Room

Present: Mr Eddie Poon , Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport), HAB
Mr Cheung Koon Lam, Senior Leisure Manager (Sports Policy Review), HAB
Mr Charles Chu, Chief Leisure Manager (Sports Policy Review). HAB
Dr Chung Pak Kwong, Director of Elite Training and Sports Development, SDB
Ms Margaret Siu, Head, Sports Development, SDB
Dr Trisha Leahy, Head, Technical Services, SDB
Mr Yu Lik, Acting Head Athletics Coach, SDB
Mr Chan Chi Choi, Head Badminton Coach, SDB
Mr Shen Jin Kang, Head Cycling Coach, SDB
Mr Wang Rui Ji, Head Fencing Coach, SDB
Mr Tony Choi, Head Squash Coach, SDB
Mr Stan Tamura, Head Tennis Coach, SDB
Mr Hui Jun, Head Table Tennis Coach, SDB
Mr Wan Shu Wah, Assistant Triathlon Coach, SDB
Mr Yu Li Gang, Head Wushu Coach, SDB
Ms Cindy Leung, Sports Development Manager, SDB (Secretary)

Background

1. In view of the great concerns from elite coaches on the recent HAB document of “A New Administrative Structure for Sports Development” on the usage and management of S.I. facilities, HAB representative met elite coaches again. Purpose of the meeting was to understand to actual needs of Elite Sports for S.I. outdoor facilities, the usage mode, number of athletes etc., in order to gather some facts and figures for submission to the Provisional Elite Sport Committee for discussion and consideration. Should figures reflects a high usage rate of certain outdoor facilities by elite sports (say over 80%) the Government may re-consider to leave such facilities to the future S.I. Management.

Summary of opinion from SDB Elite Coaches:

1. HKSI is the one and only elite training base in Hong Kong, has a high recognition and reputation locally and internationally. Its facilities, administration and management is a complete package, and should not be separated due to non-elite training related purposes.

2. Elite training requires high flexibility. All sports need to use different facilities for sport-specific or cross-training. Therefore the management concept should be elite training oriented, which allows coaches to adjust training plans, according to athletes' status and actual needs.
3. The Government should have a macro vision on the long-term elite training development planning needs of S.I. facilities, allow flexibility and space of future development of elite and potential sports.
4. Elite training requires excellent environment, atmosphere and high quality facilities, as well as coordinated management. Training of elite athletes should not be disturbed, and close-door training is sometimes necessary so that competition tactics and athletes conditions are not accessible for competition opponents. Opening up of S.I. facilities to general public would intensify the wear and tear of facilities and destroy the elite training atmosphere and conditions. No elite training center of any sports advanced countries opens its elite training facilities to the public.
5. Number of elite training athletes must be kept very small. To compare the "usage rate" of elite training facilities to other recreational public facilities is highly un-professional and not understanding the nature of elite training.
6. Currently there are many other similar public sports facilities, specially in the Shatin district. Taking back part of the S.I. facilities would have very little effect/impact on the overall sports facilities usage, but only hamper the quality of elite training in Hong Kong.
7. If resources allow, S.I. facilities could be further opened up for junior athlete development and talent identification purposes. Non-elite sports, such as soccer and golf, can also use the available facilities for squad training and junior development programmes in order to enhance their international competitiveness.
8. Maintaining the distinctive features and qualities of HKSI as an elite training center helps to attract more young people to competitive sport and elite training, and attracts community and commercial sponsorships.
9. Any change on sport policy and structure should aim for the better. Current recommendations contain too much uncertainty, which reflects the position of elite training within the Government. Short-term contracts and lip-services promises cause anxiety from athletes, parents and coaches, who can hardly focus and concentrate on the

training. There are incidents of losing some of the elite athletes and coaches due to the above reasons, thus affecting the preparation of Olympic Games in 2004.

10. The Government must re-allocate the 2.3 billion funding to sport, out of which only 180 million is allocated to SDB for Elite Training and other Sports Development functions. There is a huge shortfall in the overall funding to elite training. This reflects the Government's position of elite training, and mis-allocation of resources. The Sports Policy Review is an opportune time to re-shuffle Government resources to increase support to elite sports so that elite training facilities could be upkept according to international standard, and improve support and training resources for elite athletes.
11. Elite training is a national/government behaviour, and should be fully responsible by the Government. Elite training in Hong Kong should continue to be managed by a statutory body instead of downgraded it to a incorporated body and operate in a business manner. This will adversely affects the international status of Hong Kong, as well as the confidence from local, commercial and international partners and counter-parts.
12. The Government should not pre-empt the directions and decision of the Provisional Elite Sport Committee before the Committee is in place.
13. Professional coaches, elite athletes and responsible professionals should be involved in the future sports policy and resources allocation decisions.

民政事務局與康體發展局精英教練會晤討論內容

日期：2003年7月15日

時間：6:30pm – 8:30pm

地點：體院會議室

出席：民政事務局 - 潘太平先生，首席助理秘書長〔康樂及體育〕
張觀霖先生，高級康樂事務經理〔體育政策檢討〕
朱福榮先生，總康樂體育主任〔體育政策檢討〕

康體發展局 - 鍾伯光博士，精英培訓及康體發展總監
蕭宛華女士，康體發展主管
李翠莎博士，技術發展主管
余力先生，署理田徑總教練
陳智才先生，羽毛球總教練
沈金康先生，單車總教練
王銳基先生，劍擊總教練
蔡玉坤先生，壁球總教練
田村赤榮先生，網球總教練
惠鈞先生，乒乓球總教練
溫樹華先生，三項鐵人助理教練
于立光先生，武術總教練
梁韻妍女士，康體發展經理〔秘書〕

討論內容

政：民政事務局

教：體院教練及代表

政：就民政事務局發表“有關體育發展的新行政架構”建議書後個多星期以來政府得悉教練就體院場地設施使用和管理方面有強烈的迴響。今天會晤目的在跟進了解各精英項目使用體院室外設施的實際需要，使用的模式和次數，就此收集一些數據，提供即將成立的體院籌委會以作考慮。

建議中體院日後室外設施由康文署負責管理維修，體院精英項目以優先租用方式使用有關設施，室內設施由未來體院自行管理維修。

教：體院設施是一個整體，是精英培訓基地，各項目都同意訓練需要共用所有室內室外設施，作日常及交替訓練(cross training)。精英培訓需極大彈

性，各方面即時配合。若一個中心的設施歸不同部門管理，實難以作全面統籌，亦會引致混亂。最大考慮不是甚麼設施應歸何人管理，而是先要宏觀地考慮香港到底需要的是怎樣的一個精英培訓設施。

以單車場為例，雖陳舊一點，經維修後仍可繼續使用。若失去此場地，最近亦要到深圳龍崗，單程也要兩三小時，並要付運單車器材，舟車勞頓，費時失事。加上香港與中國乃競爭對手，國內場地在大賽前都會封閉，雙方也不願意洩露最後階段的訓練戰術及車手的狀態，因此只有體院場地可供使用。精英訓練須因應運動員狀態，天氣及其他條件隨時改動訓練模式，亦會用到其他設施，不能只局限在單車場。

政府亦應宏觀地考慮長遠有潛質可發展的項目，並預留場地作整體發展及調配之用，而不是抹殺其他項目發展的可能。

政： 同意要認真思考未來體院發展規劃，會成立籌委會由康體局主席許晉奎作主席，及現時體院管理委員會的一些委員出任。建議書內的提案並非一意孤行，只屬建議，可因應實情再調節有關建議，希望教練在這段思考過程多提意見。

教： 須考慮體院及精英培訓發展的穩定性，建議書提案缺乏穩定性，一個家由三個家長管治，其複雜性可料，所以不應分割處理。

政： 明白到所有項目都有需要使用其他設施，希望將這些使用量的資料轉化成數據。若數據能反映某些室外設施精英使用率極高(達80%)，可考慮撥歸體院管理。

教： 政府不應用康樂管理模式管理精英培訓設施，亦不能以使用率及人數計算使用量和衡量其價值，此乃以蘋果和橙作比較，非專業所為。

政： 政府不會以人數多少和用量來判斷場地是否浪費，切合考慮實際需要，但總要有數據作參考。

教： 從群眾體育概念考慮競技體育需要會有偏差，政府先要弄清楚群眾體育與競技體育的分別。縱觀國內外所有精英培訓中心都是一個整體，將之混淆斬件會弄至“五不像”。精英培訓設施須保持一定質素條件，太多人使用精英設施會加速損耗，破壞條件，不利精英培訓。

政： 政府有需要視乎實際需要作安排，若設施資源充足，則丟空亦問題不大。但若整體設施不足，公眾人士有需要而又有若干丟空，政府則有責任將場地資源作合理分配與公眾使用，今次會晤目的在找出實際室外場地需要，好代爭取。

教： 從未見過任何體育先進國家會將精英培訓基地開放公眾使用，外國中心

不單封閉，更有加設電網防止外人進入。體院作為精英培訓中心，應有其專用性，並應可因應需要隨時改變設施用途，以配合其他項目所需，以爭取更多不同項目在國際上獲取獎牌機會。一旦由另一機構分割某部份管理，則體院長遠不能作宏觀調控。

既然政府在新架構中建議有“精英委員會”為精英培訓長遠政策作規劃，何以不等待籌委會成立後再考慮未來體院方向及運作模式，而要在籌委會成立之前就推出如此短視方案，同時亦規限了由專家組成的籌委會的討論範圍，這是基於什麼理由？

政府現時提出由康文署接管體院室外設施對整體體育發展，特別是精英發展有何好處？是否因為公眾設施不足而必須取回體院部份設施？目前單就沙田區同類型設施已有不少，多了體院少量設施對公眾需求又能解決多少問題？何以目前有如此迫切性去作短視又不專業的決定？

政：籌委會一兩個星期內會成立，並開會研究場地使用問題。籌委會乃未來體院前身，籌備工作包括成立公司架構、訂立營運策略 (Business Plan)、精英培訓路向，為成立體院鋪路。會有很多議程討論及決定，亦有迫切性討論場地使用整體問題。根據內部研究顯示，目前好些體院精英項目並不在體院訓練，而部份設施使用率亦不高，希望將管理者和使用者分開，使體院可專注精英培訓而不另花資源和精力去管理維修場地設施。

教：如果政府認為體院不應花資源和精力去做設施管理維修，何以又建議體院須自行管理維修室內設施，這豈非自相矛盾？惟有室內 / 室外設施由同一機構管理方才符合上述邏輯和說法。

政：如認為有需要，亦可提出室內室外設施都不由體院管理，以便心無旁騖集中精神做精英培訓及教練培訓工作。

教：似乎政府跟教練對精英培訓設施有截然不同的理念及看法：教練認為體院乃精英培訓基地，其整體環境，配套設施及管理都必須以精英培訓為中心，以康樂管理的方式難以達到精英培訓基地管理的要求。現在教練一致意見不同意對外開放，因目前體院設施雖有限度對外開放，須仍保持精英培訓為本的方式運作，但亦關注到此等安排使場地損耗大，過去幾年間中亦有內部協調問題，但無奈政府撥款不足，康體局迫於要有限度開放體院設施給外界使用，但難免一定程度上亦因財政收入而破壞精英培訓需要的氣氛和環境，若一旦門戶大開，日後更難走回頭路。

日後若將場地交由另一個以康體概念為本的機構管理體院設施，恐怕會失去彈性使用場地。精英培訓要能保證訓練質量，要能跨越界限，部份設施維持空置有利精英培訓有彈性空間，而不是必須將之出租予公眾人士。政府當然有權決定由誰人來管理設施，但目前康文署在沙田區並不缺乏場地，是否應考慮體院作為香港唯一精英培訓基地的需要。建議的

改變看不出好處何在，卻只反映出政府對精英培訓支持的倒退，亦不了解精英培訓的特質。

政：今次會晤目的乃多了解精英培訓運作的需要，然後向公眾、立法會、未來的體委交代，需要有理據及數據爭取或改變當初決定。政府背後的動機並不因為要增加 70 萬收入而收回場地，錢不是考慮要素，反而因收回場地政府要花更多資源去管理維修。現理解到外國經驗有為精英培訓需要而封閉場地自用的做法。

教：精英培訓不一定要完全封閉式訓練，著眼點更在乎管理權問題。目前康文署自己本身在場地使用上，就本身不同部門，體育總會及地區使用亦有很多矛盾及令人垢病的地方。精英培訓很難確定兩星期前不改變訓練的方式，更遑論一年半載前預訂場地。目前康體局因以精英培訓為本，很能配合。總教練在設施使用有主導權及能互相遷就配合，亦沒有時間和用量限制，精英培訓要講求彈性應變及效率，往往需要臨時改動訓練計劃，如室內管理權可以由體院負責，何以室外設施又不可以？

相信政府過往很多官員都有探訪過外國很多精英培訓設施，一個精英培訓中心予人不同的感覺，令人嚮往。增加使用率亦可朝青少年及精英選才有關的活動作考慮，維持高質量的模式，並達到一定的教育和感染的作用。

體院其他設施目前只規限精英項目可免費使用，若資源許可或有需要的話，亦可開放與有關體育總會作代表隊及青少年使用。若政府銳意發展足球，亦可為足球提供資源，使用體院設施作高水平訓練之用。體院應繼續朝精英發展，若背道而馳，將得不償失。

政：今次來取數據不是要證明低使用率以便將場地交予康文署，數據只是用來提供籌委會作參考之用，高爾夫球練習場有需要亦可改變其用途。

教：康體局曾就體院場地設施修建做過全面檢討研究報告，目前高爾夫球練習場所在處本建議作未來多項體育設施大樓之用。但當時因為康體局需要尋求收入以維持體育開支，同時建高爾夫球練習場的決定政府亦有參與，縱使是一個錯誤的決定，亦不能短期內彌補，亦不足以構成全面取回所有室外設施的理由。現在應要前瞻，全面考慮精英培訓的需要。

對體院設施的未來方向和管理方式應由籌委會決定，現在不必如此早下定論。進行體育政策檢討是政府表示肯承擔及為長遠體育發展定方向。

政：民政事務局有責任將數據提交籌委會，讓他們考慮什麼設施在未來有改變或重建可能，如目前草場使用者是誰？使用率如何等？可分開公眾及精英培訓使用數字，如某些設施精英培訓使用高達 80% 者；便有足夠理據將之撥歸精英培訓專用。

教：一般使用數據可向營運部索取，但須知此等數目只是日常一般訂場數字，但很多時總教練亦因應當時需要，視乎有什麼可用的空置場地而決定訓練內容，而不須經過訂場手續亦可使用體院任何設施。精英培訓實有需要如此彈性。從事精英培訓的專業人士很少，若籌委會只是一般“體育界”人士或官員，他們不一定真正了解精英培訓所需，建議籌委會應包括運動員代表（現役或退役），教練代表，精英培訓總監及其他和精英培訓有關的專業人士，使他們參與提意見，而這些人不是大局已定才從報章收音機才知道政策及理念。

教：體育政策及架構的改變應朝改善方向走。目前的建議有太多不明朗，政府對精英政策搖擺不定，運動員有表示憂慮，覺得連唯一精英培訓基地也保不住，覺得精英培訓沒有前途而考慮放棄，或不敢全心投入，有所保留。

關心資源重組問題，大家理解到在目前財赤狀況，要政府增加資源作體育發展並不可能。但目前存在嚴重的資源錯配及不合理分配，十多年來康體局經營下精英培訓有良好發展及表現。在去年諮詢文件中亦強調精英培訓發展，讀完只覺充滿希望，如春天將至，但如今建議文件推出，令人心頭冷了一截，只覺如處嚴冬，完全看不見政府有提到會增加精英培訓資源，本來以為會有更多資源做更多訓練及比賽，可以有更好的機會爭取更多獎牌機會。觀乎中國，韓國及亞洲各國都爭相投放資源發展競技體育，備戰 2008 奧運。過去，香港以如此少資源取得這般成就，值得自豪。以目前如此少資源，對香港整個財赤不起負面作用，反之為社會帶來榮譽，為年青人帶來希望及價值，為社會帶來凝聚力，解決很多社會問題，大多是年青人問題，體育無價乃在於此。

政府每年二十三億體育撥款，只有一億多元放到競技體育，便能達到以上目的及為政府建立正面形象信息，而這一億多元並不構成政府財赤減少了，亦不能為政府解決任何問題。凡事不能只用金錢或以商業經營角度來衡量，精英體育是政府投資極少而回報最高的一個項目，相信市民亦會同意資源用得其所，並樂意見到政府增加精英培訓資源。

政：多謝對諮詢文件的意見，目前階段建議只包括架構重組方面，政府並非不處理其他意見和事項，只是留代將來的新架構下各委員考慮。教練的意見對未來整體發展有很大幫助。政府亦無意低貶精英培訓，而新建議內亦提出三大方向，三範籌互相關連影響，精英是其中主導方向之一。討論較集中設施只是希望體院在資源管理上更集中做好精英培訓工作。政府與教練就精英培訓概念共同多於差異，場地使用只是架構轉變下一個建議，不能因有此建議而反映政府不承擔精英培訓，或視為黑箱作業。籌委會亦可以邀請鍾博士及教練加入。

教：道理似乎好顯淺，但若制定未來政策及架構時多考慮用家心態，便不致造成如此大反應。如今政府撥款不能符合精英培訓所需，康體局除營運

體院及尋求贊助外，仍須從其基金中抽七千多萬來補貼撥款不足，政府只是表示架構重整所慳取資源會放回未來“體育發展”，而未有提及在精英培訓如何增加資源。須知體院設施已十分殘舊，康體局亦因沒有足夠的資源而只能有限度維持可用性，即使做了顧問報告有重建 / 維修方案亦因得不到政府 / 馬會撥款而擱置，假若建議「拆局」事成，更沒有機構承擔額外必須的維修及建設費用，希望政府在重組架構同時亦考慮確保精英設施能維持國際精英競技水平。

此外，由於撥款不足，精英訓練、比賽和教練人手安排資源短缺，逐漸被其他競爭對手拋離。政府應趁體育政策檢討及架構重整而重新檢討投放在康文署的二十三億體育資源，按精英培訓實際需要和市民的期望作合理調配。

政： 將來在體育委員會會有更高層次的討論及決定，政府亦得知各位有關設施使用的回應，待取得有關數據後再詳細討論，建議文件若是未能令各位明白政府的善意和立場，反而導致迷惘、憂慮和信心問題，文件是失敗的，政府歡迎隨時再見面加強與各位溝通，以便解釋文件背後理念，釋去各位心中的疑慮，政府絕不想見人心浮動。

教： 引致人心惶惶者莫如將體院公司化的建議。原先康體局將教練合約縮為三個月、六個月、一年不等的短期合約，已令人心不安，如今政府更有將體院公司化的建議。至今已有些高水平的教練因前途不明朗而拒絕接受新合約及相繼離開，就單車已失去了兩名合作多時，關心運動員的國際級教練。雖然我們願意相信政府的口頭承諾，但在建議文件中不但看不出政策上配合，反而只覺嚴冬降臨。須知精英發展非十年八載以上不能培養出如李麗珊、黃金寶等水平的優秀運動員，缺乏長遠發展的承諾和承擔不能使教練、家長和運動員安心全情投入精英培訓。

政： 民政事務局已與運動員見面，而他們提出的訴求已是我們在未來方向的重點，希望他們能體會政府的誠意。將來會有專責委員會，亦由最高決策官員做主席，足見政府承擔的決心，從文件中可能較難體會。

將來體院日常事務由其董事局負責管理，而精英委員會負責制定精英方向和政策，如精英項目數目準則和甄選。三個事務委員會就其範疇向體育委員會提交方案及撥款要求，體委會在最高層負責協調及決定。當事務委員會與體委議決政策及資源分配後會交體院董事局制訂營運策略，提交實施方案。精英委員會及體院董事局會有共通成員，體院以公司形式運作，財務全面由政府承擔。

教： 精英培訓只有由法定機構管理才能使人有信心，否則難免使人覺得一旦政府不注資而有風險，特別是在建立國際地位及吸引商業贊助方面，很難建立信心及地位，況且精英培訓是國家 / 特區政府的責任，理應由政府全面承擔。

政： 以後精英培訓仍會由政府承擔，只是以公司營運方式來管理，今次會晤有助溝通，教練的意見及訴求亦清晰表達，日後繼續在其他議題上繼續會晤，直接溝通。

教： 多謝政府尊重精英教練意見，希望下情上達，大家樂意繼續為精英培訓及香港體育整體發展共同努力。

運動員的疑慮 12.7.2003

1. 場地管理方面

如果開放更多專業訓練場地予公眾人士，會導致：

- a. 運動的技術及戰術不夠保密；
- b. 加快場地的損耗；
- c. 精英訓練場地管理不夠專業

影響：

- 精英運動員訓練的時節及訓練的彈性，訓練的質素大受影響；
- 增加精英運動員受傷的機會

2. 現役或退役精英運動員加入委員會

要求加入現役及退役運動員於體委會、精英體育事務委員會、社區體育事務委員會及大型體育活動事務委員會，以瞭解運動員切身的情況，和加強運動員與體育委員會高層溝通。

3. 成為法人團體後之改變

將現時的香港體院轉為法人團體後，運動員的角色定位如何？運動員是否成為公司的僱員？對運動員有何幫助？

建議

- 1. 提高全職訓練運動員的經濟資助；
- 2. 加強運動員的生活保障；
- 3. 增加及保障運動員的未來出路；
- 4. 保障運動員就業及升學的機會。

運動員的心聲

精英運動員在體壇有一個帶領的作用，對香港普及運動，甚致香港體壇在國際的認受性，有很大影響。香港運動員獲得國際賽事的殊榮，對整個社會都有鼓舞作用。若因精英運動員未能得到足夠的資助及支持，而新政策更把香港唯一綜合運動的專業訓練場地商業化，難免會在場地影響到精英運動員的練習，這樣又如何能夠使我們安心訓練從而為體壇達到佳績呢？

我們希望政府可以投入更多的資源，以發展本地精英運動，例如，加強教練培訓工作、提高運動員在社會的地位，保障運動員的福利，場地管理專業化，增加專業訓練的場地及配套設施等等，令運動員能夠全心全意地投入訓練，提升實力，為香港體壇再創奇績。

我們謹以至誠，希望在香港特區政府及全港市民的支持下，香港的體育運動能邁向世界，再創高峰！