

**Minutes of the 52nd Meeting of
RTHK Board of Advisors (Part 2)
held at 9:15 am, 13 March 2020
at Conference Room, G/F, Broadcasting House
30 Broadcast Drive, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon**

Present

Dr Eugene CHAN Kin-keung, BBS, JP (Chairman)

Mr Walter CHAN Kar-lok, SBS, JP

Ms Dilys CHAU Suet-fung

Ms Linda CHOY Siu-min

Mr Mohan DATWANI

Ms Helen KWAN Po-jen

Ms Shirley LOO Marie Therese, BBS, MH, JP

Dr TIK Chi-yuen, SBS, JP

Ms Eva WONG Ching-hung

Ms Elaine WU Siu-ling

Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, Director of Broadcasting

In Attendance from RTHK

Mr Eugene FUNG, Deputy Director of Broadcasting (Review)

Ms CHAN Man-kuen, Deputy Director of Broadcasting (Programmes)

Mr Albert CHEUNG, Assistant Director (Radio & Corporate Programming)

Ms Jace AU, Assistant Director (TV & Corporate Businesses)

Mr Brian CHOW, Controller (Radio)

Ms Natalie CHAN, Controller (TV)

Ms Amen NG, Head/Corporate Communications & Standards

Ms Mayella CHEUNG (Board Secretariat)

Ms Sara FONG (Board Secretariat)

Absent with Apologies

Professor Anthony FUNG Ying-him

Mr Augustine WONG Ho-ming, JP

Professor WONG Kam-fai, MH

Secretary

Ms Yvonne WU (Board Secretariat)

1. Professor Anthony FUNG Ying-him, Mr Augustine WONG Ho-ming and Professor WONG Kam-fai sent their apologies for not being able to join this meeting.

Agenda Item 1: Updates on the Role of RTHK Regarding Recent Hong Kong Public Events

2. The Chairman enquired about paragraph 6 of the Minutes of the 52nd Meeting (Part 1) regarding the progress of the follow-up concerning the opinion of the former Board Chairman, Mr Lester G. HUANG. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that the management had reviewed the content related to the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (“PolyU”) incident of the programme “Hong Kong Today” broadcast on three consecutive days, and what Mr HUANG listened to should be part of the content. Mr Albert CHEUNG added that RTHK’s news reports had comprehensively covered the whole story of the PolyU incident. He quoted statistics in **Appendix 1** and explained that the content mentioned by Mr HUANG should be part of a featured interview of the programme “Hong Kong Today” only. He remarked that as RTHK kept updating the news content based on the latest development of the incident, the content quoted by Mr HUANG could not reflect the full picture of RTHK’s report on the incident. Mr LEUNG said that from time to time, external parties would give advice to RTHK about the content of individual programme in the form of excerpts. He suggested that the complainant could go over the entire news feature again for a detailed understanding of RTHK’s overall report of the incident. Ms Amen NG reiterated that when handling the news feature concerned, RTHK had gathered reports of many days from different perspectives for an integrated report of the incident, which complied with the stance and editorial principles that RTHK should have as a public service broadcaster.
3. The Chairman concluded that he understood that the public usually only commented on certain parts of the programme content, but he still hoped that RTHK could learn from this experience and avoid similar incidents from happening again.
4. Regarding paragraph 7 of the Minutes of the 52nd Meeting (Part 1), the Chairman asked RTHK to provide more information related to the complaint letter sent by the Police Public Relations Branch (“PPRB”) of the Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”). Ms Amen NG responded that the said complaint was related to a news report about the rally at Edinburgh Place in Central. RTHK had replied to PPRB regarding the sequence of events concerned and the use of the term “hit back” in the report. She had passed the relevant news content and RTHK’s reply letter to the Secretariat. *[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat forwarded the relevant documents for Members’ reference on 14 March 2020.]*

Agenda Item 2: Advice on Report Received from RTHK Regarding the Complaint Letter from the Commissioner of Police

5. The Chairman said that the Board had received the letters dated 15 February and 3 March 2020 from the Commissioner of Police to Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, the Director of Broadcasting (“DB”) by copy, and had sent letters to Mr LEUNG on 18 February and 9 March 2020 regarding the letters from the Commissioner of Police to express its concern on the matter. Meanwhile, the Board had also received the replies dated 25 February and 12 March 2020 from Ms Jace AU as delegated by Mr LEUNG. Nonetheless, the Chairman hoped that Mr LEUNG could respond to the two letters from HKPF mentioned above in person, especially the parts related to the Charter of RTHK (“the Charter”), such that the Board could have a thorough understanding of the whole matter and provide advice accordingly.
6. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that RTHK had immediately handled and replied to the two letters mentioned above in accordance with the established procedures, and had reminded colleagues to accept criticism and continue to reflect. He said that RTHK was handling the matters stated in the letters internally, which included verifying if the programme content complied with the requirements stated in the Charter, and explaining to the complainants. He reiterated that “Headliner” was not a news report programme, and RTHK would consider the criticism and suggestions raised by the public. He also hoped that the Board could provide advice.
7. In addition, Mr LEUNG Ka-wing said that he did not understand why the Chairman stated in his letter that the complaint from the Commissioner of Police had become a “prima facie” case. According to his understanding, a prima facie case was usually determined by judges or prosecutors. He hoped that the Board would not become a judge or supporter of the complainant, therefore he would like the Chairman to explain what it meant, such that RTHK could provide a response in more detail. As for why he delegated Ms Jace AU to reply on his behalf, it was because the matters mentioned in the Chairman’s letters were concerning day-to-day operation. Ms AU added that as the Chairman’s letter involved legal terms, she could only prudently provide a brief reply before figuring out the nature of the letter. She remarked that when drafting the reply, she had made reference to the decisions made by the Communications Authority (“CA”) in the past when dealing with the complaints against the fairness of “Headliner”. Over the years, the public had perceived “Headliner” as a light-hearted programme which did not belong to the news report programme category, and as it presented the public and current affairs in a satirical way, it should not be considered as serious news report.

8. A Member considered that the incident was gone beyond the area of day-to-day operation. He asked whether Mr LEUNG Ka-wing had replied to all the questions in the Chairman's letter, and invited Mr LEUNG to respond in person.
9. A Member responded to Mr LEUNG Ka-wing's enquiry on the term "prima facie" used in the Board's letter. The Member indicated that even though the term seemed to be a legal term, it was being widely used in the commercial context. The term used in the letter was not a legal allegation, but its meaning was to "see on the face of it". He pointed out that since the content of the episode of "Headliner" mentioned by the Commissioner of Police was questionable whether it complied with the requirements stated in paragraph 4 of the Charter, the Board had to provide advice to DB in accordance with paragraph 13 of the Charter. The Board only enquired about whether the programme complied with the requirements in paragraph 4 of the Charter and discussed about matters like whether the programme adhered to the principle "be accurate and authoritative in the information that it disseminates" as stated in paragraph 7 of the Charter. At first, he expected that RTHK would reply to the enquiry from the Board concerning whether the programme complied with the Charter. Yet, RTHK only replied that "Headliner" was a satirical programme and it was not possible for RTHK to have a programme satisfying all requirements mentioned in the Charter. He stated that there was no doubt that the Board understood and would not require RTHK to have a programme satisfying all public purposes mentioned in the Charter all in one go. However, the Member questioned if only certain programmes could not comply with the Charter's requirements while the others could, would that mean those programmes could be exempted and did not have to comply with the Charter's requirements. He considered the Charter as the primary overall requirements imposed on RTHK as a public service broadcaster, and the Board carried out its duties under this primary principle. The Chairman added that the Board was not a judge, but it was discharging its functions under the Charter to provide advice to DB conscientiously. He also clarified that the Board was not the supporter of any complainant.
10. A Member proposed three concerns on the complaints against "Headliner" from the Commissioner of Police. Firstly, he agreed with the opinion that the Board should not intervene in the independence of "all aspects" of RTHK, which was pointed out by the RTHK Programme Staff Union. However, as a Board Member, it was his duties stipulated in the Charter to provide criticism, compliment or advice to RTHK programmes, and therefore should not be taken as intervention. Secondly, he stressed that most RTHK programmes were brilliant and he hoped that RTHK would continue to produce quality programmes, while the Board's concentrated

discussion on the programme in accordance with the Charter was factual and reasonable. The RTHK management should tackle problems wisely, and it was a social consensus for discussions to be based on the Charter. Thirdly, he reminded the RTHK management to reflect on what made good management. Meanwhile, he opined that when RTHK needed clarification with the content of the letter from the Chairman, the management should take the initiative to call the Chairman and communicate frankly. Regarding the handling of the “Headliner” issue, he did not agree with the management’s explanation that “the programme was satirical”. Even so, the level was far too low. The explanation would result in a negative impression of the public towards RTHK. As a public organisation, RTHK should manage such kind of impression.

11. A Member opined that even though the Board faced a difficult situation, it would still perform its role and discharge its responsibilities in complete accordance with the Charter. The Member also raised three concerns on “Headliner”. Firstly, even though “Headliner” received a lot of compliments, it also received a lot of criticism, so the management should take it seriously. Secondly, although “Headliner” was widely known as a non-news programme and might be regarded as an entertainment programme, the programme title was “Headliner”, and thus the contradictory logic behind the idea that the programme title was “Headliner” but the programme was not regarded as a news programme could not be neglected. Thirdly, the Member opined that attention should be drawn to whether the programme content was factual. It was because he considered that some of the satirical content of the programme was apparently not based on facts. As a result, even though the programme was satirical, it had still breached the requirements stipulated in the Charter and the requirements imposed on RTHK as a public service broadcaster. He would like RTHK to follow up on some of the content of “Headliner” which seemed not to be based on facts after the meeting. Another Member also agreed that it was hard to take ““Headliner” was not news” as an explanation. He opined that the high rating of “Headliner” reflected its great influence on the public’s perception. He expected that the programme staff could balance complimentary and critical opinions when producing “Headliner”.
12. A Member stated that he understood that RTHK was not a commercial radio station, so the Charter had never imposed any requirements in respect of ratings on RTHK. However, it was of utmost importance that the content of the programmes produced by RTHK must comply with its mission as a public service broadcaster. He suggested that RTHK should analyse the more than 30 000 compliments recently received for “Headliner”, with a view to gaining a deeper understanding of the content and reasons that the public admired, and treat

the compliments and complaints as an urge for improvement. He also quoted paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Charter and pointed out that RTHK should provide accurate and impartial information, and not just limited to news information. “Headliner” could not be clearly separated from news as it focused on the hottest news every time, and the accuracy of its content should be ensured. He also noticed that there were inaccuracies in the content of the programme. He then quoted paragraph 7(a) of the Charter to remind RTHK that it should adhere to the editorial principles and be accurate and authoritative in the information that it disseminated. As a mass media, RTHK had a great impact on public education since the education sector would use segments from various RTHK programmes for educational purposes from time to time. Therefore, RTHK must ensure the accuracy of all information. Another Member stated that the Board and RTHK were “in the same boat” and hoped to strengthen mutual communication, so as to discuss how RTHK could continue to perform well in the future.

13. A Member opined that “Headliner” was a very controversial programme, and to a certain extent, it also reflected the different views in the Hong Kong society. He thought that it would not make much sense for RTHK to handle controversies only through the number of compliments or criticisms. RTHK should concentrate on the quality and accuracy of its programmes; and as the management, it should perform its gate-keeping role well, in order to ensure that the programme content fully comply with the requirements of the Charter. What mentioned above was critical. As for the controversies that happened after the programme was broadcast, sometimes they reflected the different views of the society on the issue. To ensure that RTHK programmes met the requirements of the Charter, the RTHK management was duty-bound. If the programme was criticised after it was broadcast, the matter would of course be handled according to the mechanism, but the management's early gate-keeping was even more important. He believed that the Board would not and should not replace RTHK's role in handling complaints. However, after receiving RTHK's report, the Board would perform its duties and review it. Nevertheless, he personally would emphasise more on the management in terms of quality control and accuracy of the programmes, as well as the role and performance on gate-keeping in accordance with the Charter.
14. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing said that his duty in the Board was to listen to advice. To a journalist, the term “prima facie” mentioned in the letter from the Chairman was a matter that required prudent handling by the media. As for the complaints against “Headliner”, he stressed that RTHK accepted criticism. He stated that he had finished reading thousands of complaint letters in person in the past two weeks,

carefully discussed and reviewed the complaint content with relevant colleagues, tackled the issues point by point, and had internal review.

15. A Member responded that the Board only wrote to ask RTHK questions related to a complaint lodged by the Commissioner of Police, which was based on the Charter. He reiterated that the term “prima facie” mentioned in the letter was not accusing RTHK that it had breached the Charter, but the incident was worthy of the Board’s discussion and advice to DB, which was also based on the responsibilities assigned to the Board stipulated in paragraph 13 of the Charter. As such, the so-called “the Board actively looked for different incidents and asked RTHK to respond” did not exist.
16. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing thanked the Member for clarifying the meaning of that term.
17. Some Members pointed out that part of the content of “Headliner” was seemingly not based on facts. Ms CHAN Man-kuen asked them to provide the relevant information, so as to facilitate the follow-up by RTHK. Meanwhile, Ms CHAN Man-kuen stated that paragraph 4 of the Charter listed five public purposes of RTHK as the public service broadcaster. She hoped that Members would understand that RTHK could not satisfy all the requirements with the same programme. Different types of programmes of RTHK had their different functions and value. They were in various art forms or of creativity and diversity to complement one another, so as to make RTHK cover all those public purposes and mission listed in paragraph 4 of the Charter as a whole.
18. Ms Amen NG added that she understood that the Charter entrusted the Board with the function of receiving reports on complaints against editorial principles, programming standards and quality of RTHK programming. She stated that RTHK received many complaints every day, and there was a prevailing mechanism for RTHK to handle all complaints. RTHK was currently following up the complaint by HKPF to CA regarding “Headliner” and would report to the Board after the handling procedures were completed.
19. The Chairman pointed out that the Charter stipulated the tripartite relationship among RTHK, the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau and the Board, which was like a “family”. He had all along sincerely hoped that RTHK would become the most credible medium in China, and the idea had never changed. He concluded that through RTHK’s reply letter, DB’s open letter to his colleagues and RTHK management’s response at the meeting, the Board had a clear picture of Mr LEUNG Ka-wing’s views on the issue.

20. The Chairman declared that the meeting be adjourned for 40 minutes to let the Board have a closed-door discussion, and then provide its concrete advice to RTHK with regard to the issue.
21. After the meeting was resumed, the Chairman said that the Board received the complaint letter from the Commissioner of Police to DB concerning “Headliner” on 15 February 2020. After thorough discussion, the Board was deeply concerned with the complaint. Therefore, it wrote to DB in accordance with the Charter in the hope that he would follow up and give an account of the issue. Meanwhile, with regard to the factual description involved in the complaint and the reply from Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, the Board provided the following three pieces of advice to him, in order to fulfil the responsibilities of the Board as stated in paragraph 13 of the Charter:
- (i) The Charter covered all programmes of RTHK, and there should not be and were no exceptions and exemptions. All programmes should promote understanding of our community, our nation and the world through accurate and impartial news, information, perspectives and analyses in accordance with the public purposes and mission listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Charter. RTHK should also adhere to paragraphs 7(a) and (b) of the Charter and be accurate and authoritative in the information that it disseminates, as well as be impartial in the views it reflects;
 - (ii) The Board hoped that DB and the RTHK management would handle all complaints strictly, and have an overall consideration based on different parties’ advice and should not be hasty; and
 - (iii) The Board also hoped that Mr LEUNG could follow paragraph 16 of the Charter and seek advice of the Board on matters pertaining to editorial principles, programming standards and quality of RTHK programming, so as to ensure that its programmes in the future would comply with the requirements of the Charter.
22. The Chairman said that the Board noted that HKPF had lodged a complaint to CA regarding the content of “Headliner”, and would wait for CA to handle the complaint. The Board’s duty was to provide advice to DB, and hoped that DB would act in accordance with paragraph 16 of the Charter, and value and consider the advice provided by the Board. He should report and explain to the Board the reasons for not following the advice of the Board.

Agenda Item 3: RTHK Board of Advisors Working Groups

23. The Chairman stated that the Board had had a basic discussion on the forming of the working groups at the meeting held on 17 January 2020. As there were time constraints in the regular Board meetings, and it would not be practical to increase the number of Board meetings, he believed that calling a working group meeting when necessary would be more effective to fulfil the responsibilities stipulated in paragraph 13 of the Charter. The Chairman stated that the nature of the working groups was exactly the same as that of the Board, but there would be more flexibility in arranging meetings. After the working groups had completed the discussions on different topics, it would report timely at the Board meetings. In response to the concerns about the working groups, the Chairman responded that the Board had always been working in cooperation, and Members also had consensus on how to carry out the duties. Therefore, the above concerns were not necessary. The Chairman added that the Board would only activate the individual working groups when necessary to enhance the communication between the Board and RTHK. He said that there was no need to activate the working groups for the time being, and he would notify the Secretariat and DB when necessary and ask RTHK to provide support to the working groups.

24. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing said that he had no objection to the forming of the working groups, but he had reservations and questions about the operational details of the working groups. As such, he wanted to first know the arrangement on the appointment of the working group members, the office terms of the members, the discussion topics and the handling of records, and whether the advice of the working groups on the complaint reports represented the advice of the Board, as he needed to explain to his colleagues and the public the issues related to the establishment of the working groups. He stressed that whether the advice was from individual or several members after discussions, he would treat them as the Board's advice and would definitely listen.

25. A Member said that he hoped that the working groups would facilitate the communication between the Board and RTHK, and enhance the work efficiency of the Board. He understood that the working groups would be authorised by the Board to deal with specific matters and therefore had to report to the Board and follow up. As for the operational details set out by Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, Members would discuss them in depth. Therefore, he suggested that the forming of the working groups should be approved in principle first, and then the working groups and Mr LEUNG should discuss the specific operational details before passing it to the Board meeting for approval. Another Member responded that the working

groups would be accountable to the Board and that the Board would make the final decision on whether to accept the working groups' advice before giving them to DB.

26. The Chairman concluded that the Board needed to be accountable to the public. He pledged that the work of the Board was based on the responsibilities entrusted by the Charter. In response to Mr LEUNG Ka-wing's query, the Chairman explained that the members of the working groups were Members of the Board; as long as Board Members had time, they would attend the working group meetings. The Board hoped that it would be able to provide more timely advice to DB through the working groups. A Member suggested that the Board could first invite the RTHK management to discuss the operational details of the working groups. The Chairman and Members agreed.

Agenda Item 4: RTHK Annual Plan for 2020-21

27. Ms CHAN Man-kuen, Mr Albert CHEUNG and Ms Jace AU briefed Members on the updates on the RTHK Annual Plan for 2020-21. Members had no comment on the document.

Agenda Item 5: Programmes on Culture and Heritage

28. The briefings had been issued to Members for reference. In view of the time constraint, this item could not be discussed at this meeting.

Agenda Item 6: Updates on RTHK's Response to Audit Commission's Report

29. Ms CHAN Man-kuen informed Members of RTHK's progress on the implementation of the recommendations in the Report of the Audit Commission. Details were set out at **Appendix 2**. Members had no comment on the progress report.

Agenda Item 7(a): Updates on Programmes (BOA Paper 1/2020)

30. The paper had been issued to Members for reference. Members had no comment on the paper.

Agenda Item 7(b): Updates on Complaints (BOA Paper 2/2020)

31. The paper had been issued to Members for reference. Members had no comment on the paper.

Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business

32. A Member stated that the name of the RTHK Programme Advisory Panel (“the Panel”) was similar to that of the RTHK Board of Advisors, which could confuse the public. The Chairman suggested that RTHK could consider whether there was a need to change the name of the Panel. Ms Amen NG explained that the Panel and the Board each had their own clear functions and they were not the same. Ms CHAN Man-kuen added that the Panel had been established for many years, and meetings were held only once per year.

33. The Chairman remarked that letters from the public and external organisations had been received, and the details were set out at **Appendix 3**.

34. The Chairman said that he and Board Member Ms Linda CHOY Siu-min had attended the “College Christmas Concert – Messiah Encore” on 24 December 2019. He was glad that RTHK had held a successful concert in such difficult circumstances.

35. The Chairman informed the Board that he had a meeting with Mr LEUNG Ka-wing on 10 January 2020 regarding the Board’s issues.

Agenda Item 9: Date of Next Meeting

36. The next meeting was scheduled for 27 March 2020.

37. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Secretariat

RTHK Board of Advisors

Statistics on the Coverage of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University Incident by Radio Television Hong Kong

Regarding the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (“PolyU”) incident, Radio Television Hong Kong (RTHK) did not one-sidedly cover the rescue operation by school principals, but reported factually the related news incidents in different lengths, including the radical actions of protestors, injuries caused on the people concerned, damages to the university campus, impacts on the university, dangerous items being left behind in the campus and the Police’s responses. RTHK had fully and comprehensively reported the information mentioned above on both the day when the protest broke out at PolyU (17 November 2019) and the day when the Police went into the PolyU campus to search for dangerous items (29 November 2019). And on 30 November 2019, since the PolyU incident had been resolved, the aforesaid information was not mentioned in “Hong Kong Today”. The relevant news reports on the Internet are as follows:

Date: 17 November 2019

1. The clash between a group of black-clad people and the Police continued at night. A footbridge connecting PolyU and Hung Hom train station was set on fire multiple times and explosions were heard.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492816-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17
2. The footbridge above the toll booths at the Cross-Harbour Tunnel Kowloon entrance caught fire and multiple explosions were heard. An armoured vehicle of the Police was even hit by petrol bombs and set on fire. Police described that the violent acts around PolyU had reached the level of riots.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492814-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17
3. The Police said that the footbridge connecting PolyU and Hung Hom train station was set on fire. Flaming fragments even dropped to the road under the footbridge, seriously threatening the safety of people at the scene.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492803-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17
4. Some black-clad people threw petrol bombs towards the Police cordons on Cheong Wan Road above the toll booths at the Cross-Harbour Tunnel Kowloon entrance. The fire was fierce and the flame once reached around two meters in height.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492773-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17

5. Rioters continued to confront Police officers near PolyU. Apart from the scene at Chatham Road South, some rioters built barricades on the footbridge at Cheong Wan Road to obstruct Police action.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492781-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17
6. A police officer of the Media Liaison Team was shot in the calf with an arrow. Meanwhile, a riot police officer was hit on the face mask near his nose bridge by a ball bearing at the intersection of Chatham Road South and Austin Road.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492755-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17
7. A police officer of the Media Liaison Team was shot in the calf with an arrow and was taken to the hospital for treatment.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1492739-20191117.htm?archive_date=2019-11-17

Date: 29 November 2019

1. Around 3 800 petrol bombs, more than 900 cassette gas canisters and over 500 bottles of chemicals were found in the PolyU campus.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495069-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29
2. The Police seized a further 280 petrol bombs, 318 cassette gas canisters, 28 barrels of chemicals and various kinds of weapons at PolyU in the morning. Firefighters found a few more dangerous goods and immediately passed them to the Police to handle.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495092-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29
3. The Police concluded that in the recent ongoing search operation, 3 989 petrol bombs, 1 339 explosive items, 601 bottles of corrosive liquid and 573 pieces of weapons were seized in the PolyU campus.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495128-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29
4. After the handover of the campus back to PolyU, the management of the university revealed that the campus was damaged. Facilities of the buildings and the library were seriously damaged, and great efforts had to be made to repair them. It also said that due to the incident, 27 000 students had to suspend their studies, which affected teaching activities and scientific research.
https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495154-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29

5. The Police concluded that they seized 3 989 petrol bombs, 1 339 compressed gas cylinders, 601 bottles of chemicals and 573 dangerous items, including hammers, air pistols, 12 catapults, and around 28 bows and 200 arrows. Different corners and each floor of every building in the campus suffered from a different extent of damage, and lots of dangerous goods were seized. Multiple gas canisters were placed at the open area of the podium, which posed a risk of explosion.

https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495165-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29

6. The report mentioned that the protestors needed to bear the cost of being arrested because of the incident. The Police arrested 1 377 people in the PolyU incident, among which 810 people were arrested when they left the PolyU campus. Other 567 people were arrested at the periphery or vicinity of PolyU. And among those who left PolyU and let the Police record their details, 318 people were under the age of 18.

https://news.rthk.hk/rthk/ch/component/k2/1495170-20191129.htm?archive_date=2019-11-29

Radio Television Hong Kong: Provision of Programmes
Progress in Implementing the Audit's and Public Accounts Committee's Recommendations
(as at 17.1.2020)

Para. No.	Audit's Recommendations	Progress
Part 2: Production of Programmes		
2.10	<p><u>Planning and Budgetary Control</u></p> <p>Audit has recommended that the Director of Broadcasting (DB) should –</p>	
	<p>take into account information for performance evaluation of individual radio and TV programmes, in order to facilitate the making of more meaningful planning decision for the programmes.</p>	<p>The new Annual Plan cycle will be executed in April 2020. The annual planning exercises will take into account information for performance evaluation of individual radio and TV programmes.</p>
2.54	<p><u>Community Involvement Broadcasting Service (CIBS)</u></p> <p>Audit has recommended that the DB should –</p>	
(c)	<p>regularly conduct focus group studies to assess the cost-effectiveness of the projects funded by the Community Involvement Broadcasting Fund.</p>	<p>The focus group study (with a total of six focus group sessions involving 50 people from successful applicants, unsuccessful applicants, and audiences regardless of whether they had listened to CIBS programmes before) was successfully conducted from October to November 2019. The full report will be ready in early 2020.</p>

Part 3: Broadcasting of Programmes and New Media Services		
3.6	<u>Management of TV Broadcasting Hours</u> Audit has recommended that the DB should endeavour to enrich the TV programmes, including –	
	explore ways to enrich the miscellaneous contents of TV 31 and TV 32 with a view to enhancing the channels’ attractiveness.	For TV 31, programmes were scheduled round-the-clock (i.e. 24-hour a day) according to programming strategy from 1 April 2019. Miscellaneous content was no longer broadcast on TV 31.
		For TV 32, there would be more programme varieties, such as live coverages of local sports events, live relays of important Mainland and overseas events and short interview videos on various topics.
Part 4: Evaluation of Programmes and Other Administrative Issues		
4.33	<u>Evaluation of TV Programmes</u> Audit has recommended that the DB should –	
	(d) ascertain the reasons for low ratings of RTHK’s programmes and take measures to enhance the popularity of its TV programmes, especially for those which are intended to be popular programmes; and	A working group has been set up to take forward the “Digital Terrestrial Television (DTT) Penetration Survey”, which commenced in January 2020, to collect information and data on the penetration / take-up pattern of the DTT channels, viewing habits and preferences of the audience.
	(e) take measures to address the issue of lower TV ratings of RTHK TV programmes broadcast on RTHK channels than the ratings of the same programmes broadcast on a commercial channel.	

4.44	<u><i>Evaluation of Radio Programmes</i></u> Audit has recommended that the DB should –		
	(a)	keep in view the number of listeners for each of the seven radio channels and take appropriate action to boost the number of listeners for radio channels with decreasing number of listeners; and	The Radio Audience Survey will be conducted annually. Information on the appreciation index of selected radio programmes by sampling will also be collected, so as to monitor the quality of radio programmes.
	(b)	take measures to improve the appreciation index and awareness level of RTHK's radio channels.	

Appendix 3

List of Letters Received by the Board of Advisors (From 10 January 2020 to 13 March 2020)

No.	Date	Sender	Subject	Note
1.	13/3	RTHK Programme Staff Union	Regarding the details of the Working Groups of the Board of Advisors	–
2.	13/3	Public (At least 2 000 000 +1 Hongkongers)	Regarding the independence of production of the RTHK programmes	–
3.	12/3	Assistant Director (TV & Corporate Businesses)	Reply to the Board of Advisors' enquiry on the content of "Headliner"	–
4.	12/3	Head/Corporate Communications & Standards	Reply to the Commissioner of Police's complaint about the content of "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors
5.	12/3	Head/Corporate Communications & Standards	Reply on Public Broadcaster Concern Group's invitation to meet with the Director of Broadcasting	For the Board of Advisors' reference
6.	12/3	Director of Broadcasting	Letter to Colleagues	For the Board of Advisors' reference
7.	10/3	Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, Convenor, Public Broadcaster Concern Group	Invitation to meet with the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development	C.c. the Board of Advisors
8.	5/3	Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, Convenor, Public Broadcaster Concern Group	Regarding the reform of RTHK	–
9.	5/3	Public (Helen CHAN)	Regarding "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors
10.	3/3	Commissioner of Police	Complaint about the contents of "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors

No.	Date	Sender	Subject	Note
11.	2/3	Public (A group of family women)	Regarding the Director of Broadcasting's governance	–
12.	1/3	Public (Mr LAI)	Regarding the map of China on the RTHK website	C.c. the Board of Advisors
13.	27/2	Head/Corporate Communications & Standards	Reply to the Commissioner of Police's complaint about the content of "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors
14.	25/2	Assistant Director (TV & Corporate Businesses)	Reply to the Board of Advisors' enquiry on the content of "Headliner"	–
15.	25/2	Corporate Communications & Standards Unit	Reply regarding "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors
16.	19/2	Public (Miss HO)	Regarding "Headliner"	–
17.	19/2	Public (Anonymous)	Regarding "Headliner"	–
18.	19/2, and 16/2	Public (CHUNG Yuen-ye, LAM Fung (林峰), LAM Yin-ming (林彥明))	Regarding "Headliner"	–
19.	18/2	Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, Convenor, Public Broadcaster Concern Group	Invitation to meet with the Chairman of the Board of Advisors	–
20.	18/2	Public (LAI Yung-sang) (賴容生)	Regarding "Headliner"	–
21.	17/2	Public (Mr YIP, Mr LAM and LAM Mei-yung (林美蓉))	Regarding "Headliner"	–
22.	15/2	Commissioner of Police	Complaint about the content of "Headliner"	C.c. the Board of Advisors
23.	24/1	Public (50 People)	Regarding "Legco Review"	–
24.	16/1	RTHK Programme Staff Union	Regarding the issues of the Board of Advisors and the details of the Working Groups	–
25.	10/1	Confidential	Advice for a Member of the Board of Advisors	–