

警察評議會職方協會

香港軍器廠街一號警察總部

警政大樓三十九樓

電話 Telephone: 2860 2645

傳真 Fax: 2200 4355



POLICE FORCE COUNCIL

STAFF ASSOCIATIONS

39/F, ARSENAL HOUSE

POLICE HEADQUARTERS

1 ARSENAL STREET

HONG KONG

協會檔號 OUR REF: (29) IN SF (10) IN SS/C 1/12 PT.5

來件編號 YOUR REF:

25th February 2009

Miss C. Y. Yue, Denise, GBS, JP
Secretary for the Civil Service,
10/F, West Wing, Central Government Offices,
11 Ice House Street, Central
Hong Kong.

Dear Miss Yue,

Grade Structure Review
Concerns of the PFC SS

Further to our letter dated 23rd January 2009 and our comment in PFC Staff Side GSR Paper 1 and 2/PPS. We have further consulted with our members and now submit PFC Staff Side GSR Paper 2 (Revised 25th February 2009) to include the latest staff concerns and sentiment. This will also be forwarded to update the Commissioner of Police, Secretary for Security and LegCo Panel on Public Service, Chairman of SCDS on our position.

The current GSR package does not provide what is needed. We would ask for a concerted effort with all parties to amend the GSR report to get things right and do this in an expeditious manner. We are committed to genuine consultation to resolve this matter in a fair and reasonable way. The Police Force Council Staff Side awaits an opportunity for a proper dialogue with you on the issues in the GSR report and we look forward to your early arrangement.

HONG KONG


SUPERINTENDENTS'
ASSOCIATION
警司協會

POLICE INSPECTORS'
ASSOCIATION
香港警務督察協會

OVERSEAS INSPECTORS'
ASSOCIATION
海外督察協會

JUNIOR POLICE OFFICERS'
ASSOCIATION
警察員佐級協會

Yours faithfully,



Wong Chi-hung
Chairman
SPA

Liu Kit-ming
Chairman
HKPIA

David Williams
Chairman
OIA

Chung Kam-wa
Chairman
JPOA

Police Force Council
Staff Side

. Encl.

c.c. w/e

Chairman, LegCo Panel on Public Service
Secretary for Security
Chairman, SCDS
Commissioner of Police

Grade Structure Review – Police

Background

The Police Force Council Staff Side represents the majority of the serving 27,000 men and women of the Hong Kong Police from Constable to Chief Superintendent ranks. We have carefully reviewed the Reports on the Grade Structure Review (GSR), dated 27th November 2008, and actively consulted with our members. The Administration (SCS) has indicated that she maintains an 'open mind' on any of the Recommendations and she has now taken the GSR process forward with a three-month consultation period until the end of February 2009.

2. The PFC SS wrote to both SCS and LegCo Panel of Public Service on 12th December outlining our overall disappointment and dissatisfaction with the GSR Report. We are concerned about SCS comments on deferment and then the conversion and implementation arrangements for this GSR. On 12th January 2009 the Staff Side met with the Secretary for the Civil Service (SCS) and outlined to her in more detail the views and sentiment of serving Police officers.

3. We are now seeking action by SCS for improvements to SCDS recommendations in the GSR report.

Sentiment of Police Officers

4. The Hong Kong Police needs to be supported by a workable and sustainable package from the Grade Structure-Police that can be a strategy for the next six years, until the next review in 2013. It must resolve the current low morale and resolve the dispute we continue to have with the Administration on the deficiencies in incremental structure of the Police ranks. It is vital that Honourable Members appreciate that this is not a “pay rise”. It is supposed to be a structural review of the Police Pay Scale, the first such review in 20 years.

5. We find the GSR Report on the Police in its present form to be unacceptable. The Report publication only serves to exacerbate the depth of negative feeling within our ranks at this time. We have been waiting for a proper review for over twenty years. We have been patient in anticipation of the support of an effective grade structure to provide recognition, career progression and sufficient value for the job we do. We have risen to numerous operational challenges and excelled to meet efficiency targets and savings these past years.

6. Our Staff Side position is that there is no simple answer for acceptance or rejection of the GSR report recommendations. The GSR report is not an effective package, being too superficial and lacking of clarity as to what Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service, SCDS, was thinking and how the GSR can implement a proper incremental career structure for the HKP in the coming years.

7. The Report does not live up to its claims to be pragmatic, providing best judgment for having considered all relevant factors. The Report does not provide sufficient relief to the current deficiencies in the incremental structure of the Police compared to our complex role and responsibilities, both job factors and our special job factors. It fails to provide sufficient logic and rationale for the adjustments or the SCDS findings on the Police Grade Structure. It fails to appreciate the requirement for best calibre of staff within our organisation as is already required by Force management and the high demands being placed on staff and distinguish the Police within the civil service. It prefers to recommend pursuit of a damaging course towards mediocrity recommending a Police service staffed by **only suitable calibre staff on sufficient remuneration**. The Report if acted upon in its present form would be a retrograde step for professionalism in the Hong Kong Police.

8. Police Officers are sorely disappointed and understandably very angry about the gap between the SCDS recommendations and the advice and comments made by both Force Management and Staff Side submissions to the SCDS on a proper career structure in the Hong Kong Police. The staff side submissions in the GSR process, since November 2007, are summarised in **Annex 'A'**. We have provided this bundle of documents to the SCS for her careful review of the issues. We also understand that the Commissioner of Police will provide to SCS the force management submission to SCDS,

including a summary letter of the issues raised in a letter from the Commissioner of Police to SCDS Chairman on 13th October 2008.

9. The Report recommendations have raised serious concerns with us about the context of the deliberations by the members of the Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS). It appears the SCDS has taken the macro environment of current financial upheavals, as they see it, to limit their thinking and approach in this GSR. The GSR Report quality has been adversely impacted and as it stands the Report can offer not more than a one-year approach. The SCDS is fully aware that staff have now waited for 20 years for this GSR and the long gap has heightened expectations on the GSR. SCDS has failed to meet satisfactorily those expectations to provide a way forward for the six year gap they recommend before carrying out the next review (**Recommendation 3.15**). The Report will, if pursued without necessary clarifications and adjustment, result in inequities and cause all the issues and deficiencies to require being revisited once again in less than 12 months time. It will also be divisive and cause ill feeling between certain ranks.

10. The recommendations have failed to outline a package of measures that can support the effectiveness of the Police in the coming years, say 3 to 6 years. We are still seeking a fair and reasonable outcome.

GSR Report – Way Forward for the Career Structure

11. There are things in the report that are in the right direction, things that do not go far enough if the recommendations are really going to operate for the next 6 years and then there are things that are simply not properly addressed. Overall the GSR report falls short of what is needed in a number of areas and this now needs a concerted effort by SCS, Force Management and Staff Side to get things right. We seek clarifications and improvements to career structure and the recommendations by SCDS in a number of areas:

Regular Grade Structure Reviews

12. SCDS has recommended a regular Grade Structure Review in future. (**Recommendation 3.15**). As the CE-in-Council has endorsed an improved civil service pay adjustment mechanism including the conduct of annual pay trend surveys (PTS) and a Pay level Survey (PLS) every six years for the civilian grades, it is appropriate to adjust this mechanism to formalise

arrangement for a GSR for the Police in place of the PLS. It is therefore agreed by staff that it is reasonable to conduct a GSR as a regular review of career structure every six years, next in 2013 and adjust Police Pay in line with market indicators and the economy with reference to appropriate PTI in the Annual Pay trend Survey Report. The recommendations for Police in this GSR therefore need to stand the test of being able to support an effective career structure for the next six years.

Motivational Increments - PC/SPC

13. The SCDS have agreed with both Management and Staff Side that there is a need for improvements to career motivation to underpin the experience and morale of mid-career rank and file frontline Police Officers (**Recommendation 8.3**). The mid-career runs from the 12th to 25th year of service. The introductions of both an early advancement to SPC and service increments (LSI) are supported. For constable the 30th year increment recommended by SCDS does not provide any real benefit to career structure and the staff side recommends SCDS recommendation need to be adjusted as follows;

- ◆ LSIs are granted at four yearly intervals from the completion of 12th year of service. (i.e. 12th, 16th, 20th and 24th)
- ◆ LSIs are granted based on service criteria, subject to existing performance and conduct criteria.
- ◆ Passing of SGT Promotion Examination with credit/great credit could be used for early advancement to SPC on same increment as the 12th year LSI. This can provide motivation for officers with less than 12 years of service but with professional examination credit or higher to gain an increment equivalent to the 12th year LSI and SPC status.
- ◆ Normal advancement to SPC is currently at 18 years of service and this can be adjusted, as necessary to fit with the new LSIs, say at the 16th year.
- ◆ Long service medals are unaffected by these arrangements and operate by separate mechanisms as awards at 18, 25, 30 and 33 years rather than part of career progression that is met by LSIs.

Increments and broad comparability

14. SCDS (**Recommendation 8.4**) has failed to meet expectations in properly defining the basis for the police incremental scale. Frontline police

officers need to understand the basis and value of their incremental scale and reference themselves with broad comparability to the civil service general grade with consideration for the special factors in policing, working shifts, hardships and longer working hours. (48-hour working week compared to 44 hours in the civilian grades). The civil service general grades incremental scales were effectively examined in the PLS in 2006 against the Hong Kong market and confirmed by CE in Council. This GSR disappoints as it fails to properly address the comparability and special factors for police officers. The Staff Side considers SCDS recommendations in this GSR *first* need to be clarified with broad comparability;

- ◆ PC having broad comparability to ACO: \$24,729 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance after adjustment. Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with PC maximum increment be raised by one further increment.
- ◆ SGT having broad comparability to CO: \$32,447 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance). Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with Sgt maximum increment be raised from PPS 23 as recommended by SCDS to PPS 26 by a further three increments.
- ◆ SSGT having broad comparability to SCO \$42,080 – this includes adjustment taking account of 44 hour week needs to be adjusted to a comparable 48 hours with hardship allowance and shift allowance. Increment disadvantage in relation to civilian grades be rectified with SSgt maximum increment be raised by one further increment point.

Secondly the enormous weight of special factors, which has not been adequately addressed in the above comparison, needs to be given sufficient examination and be taken into consideration.

Provide sufficient recognition for experience at SGT rank

15. The SGT rank is integral to the supervision and mentorship to assure the quality of policing in the frontline. The career (LOS and Age profile) of SGT means that some 70% will not progress further to SSGT rank in their

police careers. The GSR report falls short when it comes to looking at the SGT incremental scale. There is a need to maintain sufficient differential between maximum increment of PC, SGT and SSGT. Put simply it seems that SCDS has not provided sufficient examination of the increment range for career SGT, possibly as they may have misunderstood that SGT rank is a through scale rank between PC and SSGT, which is not the case. On the other hand SCDS may have simply focused on giving one point to SGT rank in other disciplined services and they treated the Police SGT rank in the same way without noticing the disadvantageous position that has then resulted. SCDS needs to approach the task examining the position of each disciplined service according to its own merit. The organisational factors of career progression means a police officers career is limited by retirement aged 55 and limited vacancies at SSGT. It is necessary to recognize and motivate the Sgt rank and the maximum increment should be extended by three increments to around \$32,000 (i.e. midpoint between the maximum increment of SSGT (PPS 31: \$40,900) and PC (PPS 15: \$23,805), to be set at PPS 26 (\$32,255).

- ◆ If SSGT's increment can be enhanced to PPS 32 as proposed in para 14, SGT's increment should be enhanced to PPS 27 (\$33,720) with SSGT minimum increment be increased to PPS 25 (\$31,285)]

Incremental Scale – address disadvantages and redundant PPS

16. SCDS has simply not addressed the inequities and poor management of the career structure by allowing the uneven increment scale at various ranks to persist. The increment size for JPO's, except for a few increments overlapped SSGT and IP, ranges 2.34-3.47%. The increment steps are less than those existing in the Master pay scales MPS in JPO pay ranges where the increments are double at 4.57-6.24%. The Officer cadre increment range is uneven at 3.1-5.26%, with most below 4%. In the MPS the range is mostly above 4% at 3.58-4.73%. This situation of lower increments for the PPS is unreasonable and within the PPS it is divisive between ranks in the police force to have an uneven pattern. The Staff Side recognizes that annual pay adjustments, rounding calculation mechanisms over twenty years have led to distortions and a lack of rationale on the incremental steps in the PPS. It is timely with each GSR (every six years) to rationalize police increments at a standardized % as follows:

- ◆ Increment size should be standardised to 4% PC to SSP

17. The SCDS recommendations (**Recommendation 8.1 and 8.2**) do recognize there are redundant increments and a need to set the minimum entry requirement for PC to five passes in HKCEE. Staff Side considers the current PPS can be simply rectified by renumbering;

- ◆ PPS 1, 1a and PPS 2 are removed.
- ◆ PPS 3 – 54a as recommended by SCDS be re-numbered as PPS 1 - 53

Officer Cadre (IP to SSP)

18. SCDS (**Recommendation 8.6**) has taken an over simplistic approach to the roles and responsibilities to ranks in the various disciplined services. The ‘averaging approach’, which is acceptable for the various posts and responsibilities within a rank of a single department, is not a valid approach for SCDS to take for jobs in the various disciplined services or to increments in the MPS. The officer cadre of the Police Force should not be directly comparable to these ranks and we strongly oppose the limited thinking of the view expressed by the SCDS (**Paragraph 1.18 (b)**). The command role and special factors of policing need to be given due recognition as was outlined in police staff side submission to SCDS. The Staff Side considers this needs to be recognized by a number of additional increments, say 3 or more. The Special factors in policing involve:

- Position and role of HKP in Hong Kong (agency of first and last resort)
- Professional knowledge for policing and law enforcement
- Risk and hardships faced
- Discipline and accountability
- Restrictions on personal life and disruption by irregular work schedules and call out
- Organisational factors (secondary duties, incident command, readiness and contingency planning)

19. In providing a way forward for this GSR (over the next 6 years) to recognize the uniquely applicable factors for command responsibility in the Police Force it would be acceptable as an interim arrangement to set the maximum increment in each rank IP to SSP so that

- ◆ Police ranks have **at least** one additional increment over the equivalent

named rank in the general disciplined services.

Inspector – IP and SIP

20. SCDS has sought to arbitrarily raise a proposal in this GSR to change the existing arrangement for a through-scale for increments at IP-SIP rank (**Recommendation 8.5**). The proposal although intended only to apply to new recruits would require an IP to qualify by professional examination rather than by service and experience to attain the top incremental points with pay equivalent to SIP. This proposal would cut the four incremental points from the IP scale for those unable to attain professional qualification for advancement to SIP. For a very long time IP and SIP have been considered one combined establishment where both IP and SIP do interchangeable posts and the same work, duties and responsibility. This proposal by SCDS, understood to provide greater professionalism and motivation for IP to SIP needs to be better understood to assure effective incremental systems both at IP and SIP. The proposal needs further refinement to and could be pursued on the basis of:

- IP and SIP remains a combined establishment
- Implementation of requirement for examination to progress to SIP is applied to new recruits through a grandfathering principle
- SIP scale is improved to provide sufficient increments to fit the service profiles, experience of staff in that level extending the incremental scale by two points.

Directorate – Increments

21. Policing is a career where the Directorate police officers are career professionals who reach these ranks at the later part of their career. The ability to earn increments is limited by retirement from service at age 55 or 57 (SACP and above), as opposed to Directorate General grade whose retirement age is 60. Directorate officer increments, with a scale of increments at 0,2,4,6 years, means many Directorate (Police) will not attain the increments in their rank before retirement. The suggestion by SCDS for the introduction of the maximum increment at 6 years is a disadvantage over the current maximum increment, which is achieved in year 5. By contrast the career structure is a better fit for the Directorate (Administrative Grade) who as early career personnel can progress through D1 to D3 with increments over 5 or 6 years in each rank. There is not a one fits all solution.

Incremental steps should be adjusted to remove inequities and recognize the different career structures with three options as follows:

- ◆ Maintain the status quo for maximum increment at year 5 for all grades with increments be granted every two years i.e. 0,1,3,5, or
- ◆ Increments be granted on the basis of 0,2,3 and 4 years, or
- ◆ Increments be granted on annual basis for police ranks CSP – SACP

Directorate Increment and comparability to civilian grades

22. SCDS views for the Directorate ranks (Chapter 11.6) simply do not work to fit the existing career progression and fail to recognize the changes and increase in special factors in policing. The Directorate ranks in the police senior command may have broadly comparable policy and management responsibilities either equivalent to or more complex than their civilian and disciplined service colleagues in other departments and bureaux. These responsibilities are then augmented by special factors applying to Police officers and their role as commanders, which must be met by an incremental scale where there is clearly defined increment lead or advantage. What is unique to Police commanders is their additional major incident and operational command responsibilities. To maintain the efficiency of the police command ranks, it is necessary to assure some increment advantage over other Directorate posts in the civil service as follows:

- ◆ Consideration given to special factors in policing and command as well as management function similar to other grades / ranks in the Civil Service – providing increment advantage.
- ◆ SACP and ACP need to lead others by 3% of increment.
- ◆ The increment lead for CSP needs to be increased from 3% to 5%.

Morale

23. SCDS has failed to put sufficient emphasis and explore in sufficient depth the poor state of morale in the police force towards the administration as an employer, whilst force members patiently and conscientiously continue to function with pride and a good sense of duty and care towards the community. The Staff Side continues to act in good faith in anticipation of a fair and reasonable outcome, however staff are feeling their efforts are being simply being taken for granted.

24. On December 6th the 2008 Fight Crime Conference sought to make Hong Kong a safe and harmonious home with a focus on law and issues including youth crime and youth drug abuse, domestic violence, quick cash crime, fraud, burglary, home security and commercial crime. Hong Kong needs a disciplined and well motivated, professional Police Service where staff are not continually worrying about their remuneration and incremental scale in their career.

25. Submissions have been made on the poor state of morale by Staff Side **(Police Staff Side Paper 4 on 2008-03-03 and supplementary letter dated 2008-08-26)** and are supported by the Staff Opinion Surveys in 2004 and 2007 where low morale was indicated by overall low rates of satisfaction by less than 40% of the Police Force. (The two study methodologies in 2004 and 2007 were slightly different but they were consistent in showing exceptionally low morale. There were only 28.8% of respondents in 2004 and 37.1% in 2007 satisfied with staff morale.) This points to the need for very careful consideration of the morale of our Police service. SCS needs to consider the immediate need for a positive impact to raise the morale of Police Force and provide an effective career structure for the Police Force that can last until 2013. The completion of the GSR in 2008/9 needs to address openly and take action on the reservations highlighted in this paper by the Staff Side. The downgrading the Force with the ‘suitable calibre with sufficient remuneration’ and a one solution fits all approach in this GSR by SCDS risks a further deterioration in morale and consequently the effectiveness of the Hong Kong Police. Force Management has provided two information papers on the Staff Opinion Survey 2004 and 2007. The staff morale issue was highlighted as ‘staff remuneration’ in 2004 and ‘salary’ in 2007 as the major contributory factors for low morale. The sentiment of Staff has been subject to a force-wide consultation and is the hot topic of discussion with the Staff Side Regional representatives and in all staff relation’s contacts and reports. A Summary of staff sentiment comments on the GSR is at Annex ‘B’.

Hours of work

26. SCDS has not properly addressed the issues relating to hours of work and should not arbitrarily impose a set of conditions on the Police for any future consideration of a reduction of working hours. Police work is

recognized as being stressful and the Commissioner of Police needs to balance operational effectiveness, work-life balance in police careers. As deployments, tactics and police operations change, there may be a case to allow a reduction in working hours without a reduction in service. Between 1998 and 2001, the Police trialled a reduction in working hours from 51 to 48 hours. This GSR and SCDS should not impose any restriction on the Commissioner of Police from considering and embarking on any trial that can reduce working hours below 48 hours. Police work is most stressful and physically demanding. Conditioned hours should be further reduced to 44 hours per week (CSD: 49, C&E: 51, FSD: 54, IMM: 44). The staff side considers that immediately following this GSR there should be a detailed study on the way forward to enable a reduction in working hours to 44 hours per week. When recommendations are available the matter should again be brought before the SCDS for the earliest possible implementation and this matter should not need to wait until the next GSR in 2012.

Medical Services – supporting the frontline

27. SCDS did make a good observation on the lack of proper medical support, particularly to our officers who are injured on duty as an issue that needs the immediate action of SCS. The issue is how to provide effective and better treatment and support to our colleagues. (Some 1200 are injured on duty each year of which 700 are injured in arrest or similar action.) This issue has been dragging on far too long and needs SCS's action to resolve as a matter of priority. SCDS interim measures for priority in public hospitals and clinics or arranging tailor-made group medical insurance coverage to underwrite medical treatment for police officers are pragmatic solutions. The Staff Side looks forward to specific solutions and the earliest improvement in this area for the Police. We will need SCDS's review of the progress in the next 12 months.

Conversion and Implementation

28. Clarifications are needed on conversion and implementation dates. This is a matter of concern to all staff and particularly staff on maximum increment for some years and those retirees in 2008/9. The GSR report has been completed on 27th November 2008 and following clarifications and revisions should be implemented in financial year 2008/9. Should there be any deferral to some future date when there is a 'steady state' in the local economy it would be fair and reasonable to implement retrospectively to the

Report issue date.

29. The conversion arrangements for a revised police incremental structure (PPS) must recognize the SCDS objective of their recommendations impacting on the careers of over 80% of staff on the implementation date. Staff would move to the new PPS on the implementation date and then progress to further increments on their next or future increment dates.

Financial Implications

30. We believe the Administration has the fundamental fiscal stability to implement the GSR for the Police and make a proper investment in PEOPLE as well as infrastructure and other programmes. Government resources and spending continues on new infrastructure, buildings, and new directorate civilian posts. The infrastructure of police careers is equally important to the security and stability of Hong Kong. There has been a long delay since the last review (Rennie Review in 1988) and the cycle of review and implementation of more appropriate career structures should be allowed to progress. The Administration (SCS) can work closely with the Commissioner of Police to determine the extent and source of funding required in this GSR in the current climate.

31. On 27th November 2008, SCS indicated that she would propose to initially defer implementation of recommendations with financial implications until the local economy achieves a 'steady state'. This is regrettable as SCS made this unilateral decision before the GSR report was published and before genuine consultation with Staff. We fully understand the concerns in the local economy and can appreciate background for caution. We seek the implementation of the GSR as soon as is practicable.

Police Force Council Staff Side
February 2009 (Revised)

PFC Staff Side – Summary
(GSR – Police from Nov 2007 – Feb 2009)

Date of submission	From	To	Details
2007 Nov			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LegCo Panel on Public Service – Grade Structure Reviews LC Paper No. CB(1)206/07-08(03)
2007-11-19	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to SS, invite SSs to attend kick-start briefing on 2007-11-23
2007-12-05	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman, welcoming the kicking off of GSR
2007-12-14	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to SS, giving membership of SCDS 2008
2007-12-21	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply letter and invite SS's views on GSR
2008-02-01	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to SS, stating that the SCDS would consider proposals relating to entry qualifications
2008-03-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS with summary on PFC SS recommendations (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 1 (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 2 (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 3 (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 4 (Chi & Eng)
2008-03-18	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to the Chairman SCDS, stating the SS's expectations on the GSR
2008-06-30	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 1 (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-09	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter giving deadline for submission set as 2008-07-18
2008-07-11	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Invite PFC SS to attend informal meeting on 2008-08-26
2008-07-17	PFC SS PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS on submission of Paper 5 (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 5 (Chi & Eng) ● Letter to Chairman SCDS on submission of Paper 6 (Chi & Eng) ● PFC SS Submission for GSR Paper 6 (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, asking for more consultation sessions (Chi & Eng)
2008-07-29	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply letter decline further meeting before 2008-08-26 (Chi & Eng)
2008-08-14	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to Chairman SCDS, reiterate the need for more consultation sessions (Eng)
2008-08-21	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reply letter decline further consultation meeting (Eng)

2008-08-25	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to CP, giving views from PFC SS giving SS's disappointment on SCDS (Eng)
2008-08-26	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 2 & 3 (Eng) Letter to Chairman SCDS with supplementary on Paper 4 (Morale) (Eng)
2008-08-27	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, propose details of further consultation sessions
2008-09-02	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply letter, giving details of further consultation sessions
2008-09-03	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP's reply letter, giving support to PFC SS on GSR issues
2008-09-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving disappointment from the SS on insufficient consultation hours
2008-09-08	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to CP giving SS's views on GSR consultation
2008-09-08	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS on consultation matters
2008-09-09	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving summary of meeting held on 2008-09-06 am
2008-09-10	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply on PFC SS's letter on 2008-09-08
2008-09-12	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman, supplementary to Paper 2 & 3, plus Pay Claim up to SSP
2008-09-16	PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman on Directorate Pay Claim
2008-09-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving clarifications on the Pay Chart (proposed)
2008-09-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman, giving supplementary information on Pay Claim
2008-09-24	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to CP on GSR issues
2008-10-03	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply to SS, support on SS's Pay Claim
2008-10-06	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply on letters dated 2008-09-24, invite SS to attend another meeting on 2008-10-15
2008-10-09	PFC SS (SPA)	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving supplementary information & further clarification on proposed Pay claim for Senior Police officers and Directorate
	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, agree to meet on 2008-10-15 and giving summaries of meetings held on 2008-09-09 & 2008-09-18
2008-10-09	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asking CP about his stand on Police SS's Pay Claim
2008-10-24	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Chairman SCDS, giving disappointment on the consultation process of GSR
2008-10-24	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Ms Denise YUE, giving SS's disappointment on Henry FAN's performance in the GSR
2008-10-24	PFC SS	Henry FAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Henry FAN, giving disappointment from the SS on his performance and asked him to step aside

2008-10-24	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks CP for his support, asked for a copy of his letter to SCDS issued on 2008-10-13
2008-10-29	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to the Acting Chairman SCDS, asked him to review the whole process due to the failure in consultations.
2008-10-31	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply & gives copy of his letter (letter to SCDS dated 2008-10-13) to PFC SS. <p>(PFC SS has approached CP on 8th January 2009 to release copy of letter to SCS)</p>
2008-11-03	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Atg Chairman SCDS, asking him to receive the letters collected from police officers on their comment on GSR on 2008-11-06
2008-11-06	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Atg Chairman SCDS, handing over of 19,220 letters collected in the letter campaign of the Force
	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters (collected in the letter campaign) to SCDS Chairman, giving stands of police officers on GSR
2008-11-06	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply to SS's letters (2008-10-24,29 & 2008-11-03) decline to re-visit SS's points of concern in GSR, but could arrange courtesy visit to Atg Chairman
2008-11-07	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCS claimed that SS's concern is noted
2008-11-13	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to Atg Chairman, agree to attend courtesy visit
2008-11-25	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to invite SS to a reception on 2008-11-27 pm
2008-11-27			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denise YUE, SCS met SSs of DSCC & PFC (am session), telling the SSs that SCDS would submit the GSR reports to the Mgt and she decided to announce deferment in implementation of recommendations which required additional financial input.
	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barry CHEUNG, Atg Chairman SCDS, met SSs of DSCC, ICAC & PFC (pm session) briefed and distributed the GSR reports. SCS invited SS to give comment on the report and the deadline for comment submission is at 28 Feb 2009.
2008-12-12	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to SCS, giving SS's disappointment on the GSR Report and ask for meeting with SCS on GSR concerns
2008-12-12	PFC SS	LegCo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS submitted paper to the LegCo Panel on Public Service for their information in the meeting scheduled on 2008-12-15
2008-12-15			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LegCo Panel on Public Service meeting discussed the Reports on GSR
2008-12-15	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informed PFC SS on the new membership of SCDS
2008-12-17	CP	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Force Management commenced the Force-wide Consultation on SCDS's GSR report.
2008-12-18	SCS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim reply from SCS in response to PFC SS's letter of 2008-12-12

2009-01-08	PFC SS	CP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS seeking endorsement from CP to use the content of his letter to SCDS dated 2008-10-13 on GSR, in meetings and consultations in relation to the GSR.
2009-01-12			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCS met PFC SS in response to PFC SS's letter of 2008-12-12
2009-01-12	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS provided SCS with a list of information and the bundle of documents that relevant to the discussion between PFC SS & SCDS on GSR.
2009-01-13	CP	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP agreed to forward a copy of the letter (dated 2008-10-13 to Chairman of SCDS) to SCS for her information.
2009-01-13	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letter to the new Chairman of SCDS, Mr. Barry Cheung, asking for a meeting on GSR.
2009-01-16	PFC SS	LegCo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS submitted the second paper (PFC SS GSR Paper 2) to LegCo Panel on Public Service
2009-01-19			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS attended the meeting of the Panel on Public Service and gave PFC SS's comments in the meeting
2009-01-21	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letter to Mr. Barry Cheung, Chairman SCDS again, asking for a meeting on GSR.
2009-01-22	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply letter from JSSCS on behalf of SCDS, claiming will arrange meeting with the Staff Sides.
2009-01-23	PFC SS	SCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS asking for the commencement of a proper dialogue between SCS & PFC SS on GSR before end of consultation period, i.e. 2009-02-08
2009-01-23	PFC SS	S for S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letter to S for S, telling him the real picture of staff morale & staffs' expectations on GSR, and asking for a meeting to Mr. LEE himself.
2009-02-02	PFC SS	18 DFCCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letters to the Chairmen of the 18 DFCCs, attached the PFC SS GSR Papers 1 & 2 (i.e. the two submitted to the LegCo Panel on Public Service), telling them the real picture of the existing difficulties that the Force is facing, and asking them to give their comment on GSR to the Gov't.
2009-02-05			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS meeting CP, with Ms Chang King-yiu (Permanent Secretary for Security) sit-in upon her request.
2009-02-06	PFC SS	SCCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letter to Mr. Nicky LO, the Chairman of the Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Condition of Service, asked him on the Starting Salaries Survey 2009.
2009-02-10	PFC SS	SCDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFC SS letter to Barry Cheung, Chairman SCDS, proposing to meet on 2009-02-19
2009-02-11	SCDS	PFC SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JSSCS on behalf of SCDS insisted to have meeting with PFC SS on 2009-02-17.

2009-02-12	PFC SS	FS	● PFC SS's letter to FS, giving PFC SS's comment on the Budget 2009
2009-02-12	PFC SS	S for S	● PFC SS letter to S for S, asking for a meeting with him personally.
2009-02-12	SCDS	PFC SS	● SCDS agreed to meet PFC SS on 2009-02-26 am
2009-02-12	TW DFCC	PFC SS	● Chairman of Tsuen Wan DFCC replied PFC SS, giving his support to the stand and comment from the Police Officers on GSR.
2009-02-13	SCCS	PFC SS	● Reply letter from SCCS on Starting Salaries Survey 2009.
2009-02-18	S for S	PFC SS	● Reply letter from S for S, opined that Ms CHANG, the Permanent Secretary for Security had met the PFC SS, i.e. did not propose to have further meeting. with the Staff Side and referred GSR concerns for SCS's action.

PFC Staff Side – Summary
(Staff Sentiment during the GSR consultation period)

Our staff association regional representatives have consulted widely amongst staff gathering feedback from Police Districts and Major Formations. The force management has also gathered comments through monthly staff relation's reports and their own consultation process. The GSR and the structure of the PPS remains a hotly discussed topic, one that is uppermost on the minds of our officers. There are areas of the GSR report that are on track, areas that need to be improved and areas that are lacking explanation or where things are simply not covered.

'Most JPO's are dissatisfied that the GSR process has taken so long whilst they have suffered a great deal.... SCDS has failed to properly define the basis for the police incremental scale. Frontline police officers need to understand the basis and value of their incremental scale.' Kowloon East

Constable rank suffers the long-standing problem of unfavourable career progression. This situation puts our officers in a disadvantageous position in comparison to other disciplined services in particular CSD and Immigration who enjoy more favourable progression. There is generally good support and sentiment for the recommendations for improving the number of LSI for mid-career constables, although there is comment on how does this realistically recognise police professionalism, distinct from the other disciplined services. Also the implementation arrangements need a better fit with the actual career profile for this rank.

'The recommendations of raising the maximum pay and enhancing the number of Long Service increment (LSI) from two to four are fully supported. Officers consider the LSIs for completion of the 30th year are too long and not suitable for officers who join the Force after 25 years of age.' – Crime Wing

'Most PC/SPC are happy with the recommended percentage of pay improvement. The introduction of early advancement and service increments are welcomed for improvements to career motivation to underpin the experience and morale of mid-career frontline Police Officers. But the mid-career should run from the 12th to 25th year of service.' - New Territories North

Frankly many officers feel the whole process to update the police career structure has taken too long and they are most disappointed at the work of the Secretariat and then the result and findings of the SCDS. There is insufficient detail in the report to distinguish the work of the various disciplined services and this is hard to understand when so much information and detail was provided in the case of the Police.

‘Officers are generally not satisfied with the GSR report, as many recommendations are too superficial and indistinct’ – Security Wing

‘There are substantial gaps between the recommendations made by the SCDS and the submissions made by the Force management. The report is regarded as simplistic and shallow and has failed to address the key problems of the police pay structure and recognize the special factors of police work and considerable changes these past years.’ – New Territories North

‘In para 3. The executive summary (on the GSR process) it is stated that the SCDS had endeavoured to provide adequate opportunities for the management and staff to express their views.However grand this may appear the fact that there was limited dialogue in the consultation process is disappointing. Such a review, being one, which was commissioned 20 years since the last one, would naturally call for its members to adopt a proactive and inquisitive attitude throughout the process. But as it turned out, it has inevitably led one to believe that the SCDS has only resorted to reviewing the findings of previous reviews, paying little heed to well supported submissions’. - Police College

‘There was overwhelming sentiment that SCDS had taken a simplistic if not minimalist approach to the GSR of the Force...There was a feeling that the recommendations presented short-term answers only to the problem and were insufficiently forward-looking and at present represented a wasted opportunity to undertake a meaningful review of the pay structure and of other matters of central relevance to the Force’ – Hong Kong Island

‘The outcome of the GSR on Police are disappointing. The lack of enhancement to pay relativities over other disciplined services is most discouraging’ – Operations Wing

Many police officers simply feel they are being taken for granted. The scope of police duties is broad and this is not shared by other disciplined services. It was inappropriate for the GSR report to take the distinct and unique work of the police force (**Chapter 2.11 paragraph c**) and represent these as some responsibilities of all the disciplined services. The SCDS needs to appreciate and properly distinguish the roles and responsibilities of each disciplined service

and the unique role of the police force separate from the various services but part of the civil service as a whole.

‘Officers consider that in order to reflect the rising challenges and difficulties encountered by police, the pay advantage over other disciplined services is justifiable. The report and its recommended pay scale have failed to fully recognize the special factors of the Force’. – Crime Wing

‘The outcome of the review is disappointing in that it fails to give the proper degree of recognition to the Force’s expanded scope of duties and workload. Although it recommends increasing maximum pay points at various ranks, the fact that other Disciplined Services are receiving similar increases tends to suggest that the SCDS is seeking to pacify calls from all seven Departments for pay increases rather than adopting an impartial and objective attitude in tackling the review’ – Police College.

‘Officers are happy the SCDS has recommended a regular Grade Structure Review in order to rationalise our police grade structure and avoid present distortions situation. Officers are disappointed and angry at the gap between the SCDS recommendations and the Force management and Staff Side submissions. They understand the SCDS submitted the very limited report after awareness of the coming of so-called financial tsunamiThe report content and recommendations have failed to provide a package of effective measures to ease the low morale.’ – New Territories North

The generalisations that are in the SCDS GSR report when outlining inherent characteristics of the Disciplined Services (**Chapter 2.10**) make the mistake to take things as a whole. This is wrong and unacceptable to Police and needs a more detailed examination of each disciplined service. Not all disciplined services have all these inherent characteristics and certainly not to the same level. **A weighting system to fairly and properly distinguish the various disciplined services is needed.** It is the Police Force alone that has the ‘special factors in policing’ in terms of its role in replacing the military since 1997 and its Position and role of HKP in Hong Kong (agency of first and last resort), the breadth of professional knowledge required for policing and law enforcement and Organisational factors (secondary duties, incident command, readiness and contingency planning). The Police when compared to other services has, as a whole, a higher level of overall risk and hardship, more developed practices in discipline and accountability and greater restrictions on personal life. There is greater likelihood of disruption by irregular work schedules and call out than in other services.

'It is clear from the GSR Report that the SCDS has given no consideration to the uniqueness of Police Work. It is suggested that many important elements should be taken into consideration including the professional knowledge, special training, hardship, stress, inherent danger, restriction of rights and freedom available to the general members of public and even other government servants, the strict discipline required of the Police and most importantly the high expectation from the public to maintain stability and safety of Hong Kong. Some officers suggest listing out all kinds of duty related allowances and the amounts which are already incorporated in their basic salary since the Rennie's Review for the purpose of fair comparison with other disciplined services'

– Kowloon West

The pay component for “special factors” needs to be properly considered. The GSR recommendations provide inadequate pay relativities with other Disciplined Services and civilian grades. SCDS comments and thinking is inconsistent and not well laid out in the GSR report. **(Chapter 8.22 to 8.25)**. On the one hand SCDS accepts the force (some 80 % of whom are JPO's) is unique in many ways but then goes onto make a case to show the restrictions on police officers (all ranks) are no different from Administrative, Information and other senior ranks, which form only a small part of the 400 civil service grades. Put in perspective restrictions on JPOs are being acquainted with senior government posts and so Police JPOs expect due recognition of their unique situation within the civil service. Officers would argue that it is in the long-term general public interest **(Chapter 8.24)** to achieve an incremental scale that properly fits the career structure and uniqueness of the Police and this can be different from other Disciplined services rather than a one-fits all solution.

The internal pay relativities for SGT rank are adversely affected by the SCDS proposals. The issue of the need to improve upon the SCDS recommendations for the SGT increment structure has been the subject of widespread comment.

' SCDS have not been walking the talk as is clearly stated in Chapter 1.18..Each Disciplined service is unique in its own right. Against this background we (SCDS) have the following general viewsdirect comparison among the Disciplined services or between the disciplined services and the civilian counterparts is neither possible nor appropriate. To impose an artificial ceiling to a SGTs pay to avoid potential discontent over inequality likely to be raised by members of the Immigration (or other) department would therefore not be appropriate and the SCDS should not feel their hands are tied in recommending more realistic adjustment to SGT.' - Police College

‘Officers in the rank of SGT are totally disappointed that the SCDS has paid no respect to their command role and its associated responsibilities.’ – Hong Kong Island

‘The ultimate pay differential, if the recommendations are fully implemented of a SGT over a SPC of less than \$3,000 does not commensurate with the role and responsibility of the SGT rank over that of a SPC. The PCs felt that this could become a demotivating factor when considering career advancement, particularly with the lack of vacancy and severe competition also taken into account’ – Operations Wing

*‘Officers fully appreciate and share the sentiments of SGTs who are most upset by the drastic reduction of pay differential between PC/SGT and SGT/SSGT. They feel the experience, professionalism as well as contribution of SGTs to the Force and the community are insufficiently recognized and reflected in the GSR Report. Some SGTs even remark bitterly that they would rather be reduced in rank to be free from any supervisory burden because of the meagre salary increase and opportunities for further advancement (some 70% of SGTs will not progress to SSGT in their police career)’
– Kowloon West*

‘Sgt are very disappointed by the one further increment to their maximum pay, which would dramatically reduce the pay differential of SGT from SPC. This recommendation is considered unjustified and discouraging PCs to seek promotion to SGT. All officers recognize the importance of SGT role in maintaining the quality of frontline policing and opine that sufficient pay differential between the maximum increments of PC, SGT and SSGT is essential’ – Security Wing

‘Sergeants form the backbone of frontline supervision, quality of police service and interface with the public. Being given increasing responsibilities and designated as supervisors at the frontline, the proposed one increment is considered a major disappointment. All Officers across the ranks agree that significant increases are needed in the sergeant pay scale if it is to be a meaningful motivating factor for incumbent sergeants, and for constables seeking career progression’ – Support Wing

The lack of thinking, rationale and explanation of the SCDS methodology and approach to adjust the Police increment structure comes through in a number of comments, particularly relating to incremental steps for all ranks and Officer cadre Pay IP to SSP;

‘Now the SCDS arbitrarily proposes to cut four increment points for IP which in effect divides the IP and SIP into two different ranks. This proposal that comes with no supporting arguments....’ - Kowloon West

‘SCDS has not addressed the inequities and poor management of the career structure by allowing the uneven incremental scale at various ranks to persist. The increment steps are less than those existing in the Master pay scales MPS where increments of 4% and 5% are provided’. – Kowloon East

*‘Most are disappointed with the levelling of maximum pay with other disciplinary services. The unique command role and special factors of policing need to be given recognition for IP to SSP rank, so that police ranks should have some additional increment advantage over other ranks in the general disciplined services.’
– New Territories North*

The SCS proposal to defer the implementation of recommendations of the GSR report that carry financial implications has met with a strong negative response. Recent staff relations reports have highlighted a growing intolerance towards the lack of progress on the GSR:

‘The recent force staff relations report has reflected the frustration and dissatisfaction with SCDS recommendations and SCS proposal to defer implementation. Officers disagree to the administration using the financial crisis as an excuse to delay implementing the GSR’

‘Officers also strongly demand that the administration introduce a timeframe and spell out clearly the specific conditions under which recommendations are to be implemented.’

‘Staff at all ranks continue to discuss the SCDS report and are increasingly concerned about the lack of substance in the report, which has been made worse by the inappropriate comments from the SCS. The report is supposed to set long term (6 years) trends in police pay yet it appears to have been compiled with only the current credit crisis in mind, when the two issues are not necessarily related. It is therefore hoped that the current consultation exercise will have a positive impact on the SCS so that she can fully take account of the views of both staff and management’

‘The GSR remains a very hot topic. Resentment and frustration continues to build regarding the slow progress towards a satisfactory resolution of the matter. The three-month consultation on the subject currently underway is just seen as more ‘foot-dragging’ and a convenient way of prolonging the issue further, when staff on the other hand want to see a very speedy conclusion on the issue. It is apparent that the administration has clearly underestimated the strength and depth of feeling that the GSR

has generated amongst staff. Staff goodwill and tolerance are fast diminishing. The administration should heed the signs’

‘The SGT ranked officers are very disappointed because of the ever more narrowing gap between SPC and SGT. What is needed is improvement in the SCDS recommendations on the PPS for SGT. All other officers who are (recommended) getting only one increment point increased are disappointed as they feel they deserve much more. ’

‘Inspectorate officers (SIP) are also disappointed to see their maximum salary to be the same as their counterparts of other disciplinary forces. This averaging of responsibilities appeared so broad that the uniqueness of the PPS seems to no longer exist. This one fit all solution is considered not appropriate as each service has quite different roles and responsibilities. It is considered that the force should have sufficient pay lead in these ranks to recognize the special factors of policing. The SCDS methodology is flawed and a logical and rational system of job comparison between the disciplined services is needed. ‘

‘The GSR continues to be the hot topic for discussion amongst officers. It is felt that the Government takes its agency of first and last resort for granted and does not properly reward police officers. Specifically officers at SGT rank consider their rank has not been fairly examined regarding the incremental increase’

‘Officers are disappointed at the proposal of SCS to defer the implementation of recommendations with financial implications until the local economy achieves a steady state. The vast majority, if not all officers, fully supports the Police Staff association’s submissions and the recommendations by the Force management that the special nature of police work warrants proper recognition within the Grade Structure review. SGTs in particular are most dissatisfied.....During consultation some officers suggest staff associations should not rule out overt action by officers to advance their proposals’

The Police Staff Side is interested in the public sentiment on the GSR and is actively outreaching in local communities. In our contacts with the LegCo members, through the panel on Public Service meeting on 19th January and in discussions at the local community level and with District fight crime committees we are encouraged by the fact that there is now a general understanding that the GSR is something that is structural and longer term and to be differentiated from annual market adjusted pay adjustments. The fact that the last review was 20 years ago is well understood, as is the need to deal with the issue at this time. The level of discontent now shown by frontline police

officers with the report and the work of SCDS and low morale has community leaders concerned. They question the quality of the GSR report and seek SCS action to put things right. They recognise that there are dangers to the safety and stability of our local communities when the police force has such low morale and an unresolved dispute with the Administration on their remuneration and conditions at work. They are well aware of the challenges facing their communities in 2009 and look towards the administration, particularly SCS, to engage in an open and pragmatic dialogue with frontline police staff to find a solution. They appreciate time is critical and the Administration has the resources to assure policing in their communities by enabling police officers to get a reasonable and fair outcome so they can put their hearts and minds back into policing issues, rather than concerns on morale and the GSR. Community leaders are able to fully distinguish the police service and complex job they do in the fight against crime and all manner of tasks when compared to general civil service grades and the other disciplined services.

‘I do have great concern regarding the issue (GSR) and would like to offer my earliest reply.... I do appreciate the morale of the police force is a critical factor affecting the efficiency of the force in crime fighting. I note the staff side is ‘sorely disappointed and very angry’ about the disparity between the recommendations by the Standing Committee on Disciplined Salaries and Conditions of Service and views of the force management and the staff side is something that cannot be ignored, and to this end I strongly encourage continuous and direct communication between the staff side and the Administration prior to any final decision on the grade structure review.’

- Tsuen Wan District Fight Crime Committee 12th February 2009

- 中譯本 -

資料文件

警察評議會職方職系架構檢討文件 2 / PPS
(2009年2月25日修訂本)

警職系架構檢討 — 香港警隊

背景

香港警隊有 27 000 名現職男女警務人員。警察評議會職方(警評會職方)為大多數警隊成員(由警員至總警司級)的代表。我們已仔細審閱 2008 年 11 月 27 日發表的《職系架構檢討報告書》(檢討報告書)，並已就報告書積極徵詢警隊成員的意見。政府已表示會對任何建議繼續持「開放態度」，並就職系架構檢討展開為期 3 個月的諮詢，諮詢期將於 2009 年 2 月底結束。

2. 警評會職方在 12 月 12 日曾去信公務員事務局局長和立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會，闡釋我們對檢討報告書的全面失望和不滿。我們關注公務員事務局局長提出有關暫緩執行建議的意見，以及職級轉換辦法和落實職系架構檢討建議的安排。職方在 2009 年 1 月 12 日曾與公務員事務局局長會面，較詳盡地向她解釋現職警務人員的意見和觀點。

3. 我們現促請公務員事務局局長改善紀律人員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會(紀常會)在檢討報告書中提出的建議。

警務人員的觀點

4. 香港警隊需要「職系架構檢討－香港警隊」提供一個可行及可持續的方案，以支持其工作，而有關政策須適用於未來 6 年(即直至下次 2013 年的檢討)。該方案必須解決現時士氣低落的情況，以及排解我們與政府之間持續因警隊職級增薪架構的不足之處而存在的爭議。尊貴的議員必須明白一點，職系架構檢討並不等於「加薪」，這一點至為重要。是次職系架構檢討的原意是從

結構方面檢討警務人員薪級表，這是廿年來首次進行的同類檢討。

5. 對於檢討報告書現時就警務人員所提出的建議，我們認為不可接納。在這時期，該報告只會加深警隊上下的負面情緒。二十多年來，我們一直期待着一個適當的檢討。我們一直忍耐着，期望得到一個有效職系架構的支持，以肯定我們的工作，並提供晉升機會和足夠的價值。我們曾經接受無數的行動任命挑戰，過去數年亦能完成各項提高效率和節省資源的目標，而且成效卓著。

6. 警隊職方的立場是不會純粹接納或否決紀常會在檢討報告書中提出的建議。檢討報告書的建議並非有效的方案，有關建議太過流於表面，且未能清楚交待紀常會的想法，以及職系架構檢討如何能在未來數年為警隊提供一個適當的遞增薪點職制。

7. 報告書並非如其所說般務實，在考慮所有相關因素後提供最佳的判斷。該報告書未能提供足夠的緩解方法解決現時警隊增薪架構的不足之處，以反映我們的複雜角色與職責(包括工作因素與特殊因素)。它沒有就建議提出的調整或紀常會對警隊職系架構的研究結果提供足夠的邏輯理據，亦未能顧及警隊須吸納最優秀人才的需要(如警隊管理層所要求)、人員所面對的高要求，以及警隊有別於其他公務員隊伍等情況。報告書寧願建議實施損害性的平庸做法，**建議以足夠薪酬聘用才幹僅屬適合的人員提供警察服務**。如果政府落實報告書現時的建議，對香港警隊的專業精神來說，是一種倒退的舉步。

8. 警隊管理層及職方曾就制定適當的香港警隊職制向紀常會提交多份意見書，提出多項建議及意見。對於紀常會的建議與警隊管理層及職方所提的建議及意見之間存在分歧，警務人員感到極度失望，而且非常憤怒。職方自職系架構檢討過程在 2007 年 11 月展開以來所提交的多份意見書，摘錄於**附錄「A」**。我們已把該些文件一併送交公務員事務局局長，以便其重新仔細考慮有關事宜。我們知道警務處處長亦會提供警隊管理層提交紀常會的意見書，包括處長在 2008 年 10 月 13 日就曾提出的問題發給紀常會主席的摘要信函。

9. 報告書的建議令我們非常關注紀常會的討論，因為紀常會看來把現時金融動盪的宏觀環境納入考慮，以致局限了他們對這次職系架構檢討所持的想法及方針。檢討報告書的質素亦受到影響，因為它提供的方案只可帶來不超過一年的成效。紀常會十分明白員工等待這次職系架構檢討至今已有 20 年，而兩次檢討相隔這麼長的時間，也提高了員工對是次檢討的期望。紀常會未能符合期望，為下次檢討之前的 6 年間提供未來路向(**建議 3.15**)。該報告書如不作出所需的澄清及修訂便付諸實行，結果只會造成不公平情況，致使所有問題及不足之處在不出 12 個月內便須再次進行研究，並且會造成某些職級之間出現分化及不滿情緒。

10. 檢討報告書的建議未能提供一套可在未來數年(假設 3 至 6 年)支持警隊發揮效率的措施。我們仍在尋求一個公平合理的結果。

職系架構檢討報告書－職制的未來路向

11. 報告書的部分內容方向正確，但假如有關建議將於未來 6 年內推行，則有部分內容仍有不足之處。此外，尚有多個問題仍未獲適當處理。整體而言，檢討報告書在多個範疇上遠遜於預期所需。因此，公務員事務局局長、警隊管理層和職方現需共同努力，以解決有關問題。有關紀常會提出的職制及建議，我們促請當局就其中多個範疇作出澄清及改善：

定期進行職系架構檢討

12. 紀常會建議日後定期進行職系架構檢討(**建議 3.15**)。由於行政長官會同行政會議已通過制定一套更完備的公務員薪酬調整機制，包括每年進行薪酬趨勢調查及每 6 年為文職職系進行一次薪酬水平調查，故調整這個機制以正式落實以警務人員職系架構檢討取代薪酬水平調查的安排，實屬恰當。因此，每 6 年進行一次職系架構檢討(下次為 2013 年)以定期檢討職制，以及參考每年薪酬趨勢調查報告的適當薪酬趨勢指標，把警務人員薪酬調整至與市場指標及經濟情況相稱的水平，員工同意這是合理的做法。所以，這次職系架構檢討就警務人員提出的建議需能經得起考驗，即能在未來 6 年支持推行一個有效的職制。

鼓勵性的增薪－警員／高級警員

13. 管理層及職方認為有需要提升工作動力，以加強處於事業發展中期的員佐級前線警務人員的經驗和士氣，紀常會對此亦表同意(**建議 8.3**)。事業發展的中期為服務期的第 12 年至第 25 年。我們支持引入提早晉升至高級警員和提早發放長期服務增薪點的措施。對警員而言，紀常會提出在警員服務的第 30 年發放增薪點的建議，對職制並無帶來任何實際的好處。職方提議把紀常會的建議調整如下：

- ◆ 服務滿 12 年的警員可獲第一個長期服務增薪點，並於其後每隔 4 年(分別為第 12、16、20、24 年)再獲加一個長期服務增薪點。
- ◆ 根據服務年期條件發放長期服務增薪點，但有關人員須符合現行的工作表現和操守準則。
- ◆ 以良好／優良成績通過警長晉升考試，可獲提早升至高級警員服務滿 12 年的長期服務增薪點。這可激勵服務期少於 12 年的人員。然而，人員如在專業考試考取良好或更佳成績，則除可獲提高至等同服務滿 12 年的長期服務增薪點外，更可晉升為高級警員。
- ◆ 目前，警員通常在服務滿 18 年後獲晉升為高級警員，這方面可就配合新訂長期服務增薪點的發放時間作出調整，例如改為在服務滿 16 年之時。
- ◆ 長期服務章獎不會受這些安排影響。它以另一個機制運作，在服務期滿 18、25、30 及 33 年時頒發，而非透過發放長期服務增薪點作為職業發展的一環。

遞增薪點及大致相若的對比指標

14. 紀常會(**建議 8.4**)的建議未能符合期望，適當界定警務人員遞增薪級的基準。前線警務人員有需要了解其遞增薪級的基準及價值，以便在計及警務工作的特殊因素、輪班工作、辛勞及較長工作時數(警務人員每星期工作 48 小時，而文職職系則為 44 小時)等情況後，可把本身的薪酬與一般職系公務員作大致相若的對

比。當局在 2006 年的薪酬水平調查中把一般職系公務員的遞增薪級與香港市場情況作出對比，進行了有效的研究，有關結果並獲得行政長官會同行政會議確認。這次職系架構檢討令人失望，是因為它未能適當地處理對比指標與警務人員的特殊因素。職方認為紀常會在這次檢討提出的建議首先需透過大致相若的比較來加以闡明；

- ◆ 警員與助理文書主任職系大致相若：24,729 元－進行比較時已把該職系每星期 44 小時工作時數調整至警隊每星期工作 48 小時，並加入辛勞津貼和輪班津貼。警員的頂薪點應再增一個薪點，以修正與文職職系比較時的增薪不利情況。
- ◆ 警長與文書主任職系大致相若：32,447 元－進行比較時已把該職系每星期 44 小時工作時數調整至警隊每星期工作 48 小時，並加入辛勞津貼和輪班津貼。警長的頂薪點應由紀常會所建議的警務人員薪級表第 23 點，進一步提高三個薪點至第 26 點，以修正與文職職系比較時的增薪不利情況。
- ◆ 警署警長與高級文書主任大致相若：42,080 元－進行比較時已把該職系每星期 44 小時工作時數調整至警隊每星期工作 48 小時，並加入辛勞津貼和輪班津貼。警署警長的頂薪點應再增一個薪點，以修正與文職職系比較時的增薪不利情況。

其次，在上述比較中未有充分處理的特殊因素，是非常重要的部分，有需要充分研究及納入考慮。

充分肯定警長職級的經驗

15. 警長職級十分着重監督和指導工作，以確保前線警務工作的質素。警長的職業概況(服務年期及年齡)顯示大約 70% 的警長不會進一步晉升至警署警長級。檢討報告書在研究警長的遞增薪級時有所不足。警員、警長及警署警長的頂薪點有需要保持足夠的差距。簡而言之，紀常會似乎沒有充分研究警長職級的遞增薪幅，這可能是因為該會誤以為警長職級是警員與警署警長之間一個直通薪級的職級，但事實卻不然。另一方面，紀常會可能純粹因提高其他紀律部隊警長級一個薪點，而以同一方式處理警隊的警長級，卻沒有注意到因而造成的不利情況。紀常會有需要根據

各紀律部隊本身的特點，研究每一紀律部隊的情況。就職業晉升機會的因素而言，警務人員的職業發展受到 55 歲退休及警署警長空缺有限這兩方面所局限。警長職級人員有必要獲得肯定及鼓勵，其頂薪點應提高三個薪點至大約 32,000 元〔即根據警署警長頂薪點(警務人員薪級表第 31 點：40,900 元)與警員頂薪點(警務人員薪級表第 15 點：23,805 元)之間的中間點，釐定為警務人員薪級表第 26 點(32,255 元)。〕

- ◆ 假如警署警長的頂薪點能如上文第 14 段所建議的提高至警務人員薪級表第 32 點，則警長的頂薪點應提高至警務人員薪級表第 27 點(33,720 元)，而警署警長的起薪點亦應提高至警務人員薪級表第 25 點(31,285 元)。

遞增薪級－處理不利情況及冗贅的警務人員薪級表

16. 紀常會只繼續容許各職級內存在遞增薪級不公平的情況，而沒有處理職制中不公平及管理不善之處。除了警署警長與督察級重疊的數個薪點外，初級警務人員的遞增薪點間的增幅介乎 2.34% 至 3.47%，較現時總薪級表的為少。總薪級表的遞增薪點間提供 4.57% 至 6.24% 的增幅，較初級警務人員的多出一倍。主任級警務人員的遞增薪點間的增幅分布並不平均，介乎 3.1% 至 5.26%，大多低於 4%；而總薪級表的則大多超過 4%，介乎 3.58% 至 4.73%。警務人員薪級表遞增薪點增幅較低的情況並不合理，而且遞增薪點分布不均的模式對警隊各職級之間造成分化。職方承認過去 20 年的每年薪酬調整和以整數為本的計算機制，使警務人員薪級表的遞增薪點偏離根本和欠缺支持論據。因此，是時候透過每次職系架構(每 6 年一次)以下列的標準百分比來合理調整警務人員的遞增薪點：

- ◆ 警員至高級警司級的遞增薪點間的增幅應劃一為 4%。

17. 紀常會的建議(建議 8.1 及 8.2)承認警務人員薪級表存在冗贅遞增薪點，以及有需要把最低入職學歷要求設定為中學會考五科及格。職方認為現時的警務人員薪級表可純粹透過把增薪點重新編號來修正；

- ◆ 刪除警務人員薪級表第 1、1a 及第 2 點。

- ◆ 警務人員薪級表第 3 至 54a 點則按紀常會的建議，把薪點重新編號為警務人員薪級表第 1 至 53 點。

主任級職級(督察至高級警司級)

18. 紀常會(**建議 8.6**)以過於簡單的方式看待各紀律部隊職級的角色及職責。就單一部門一個職級內的不同職位及職責應用「平均計算方法」，是可以接受的，但紀常會將之應用於各紀律部隊的職位或總薪級表的遞增薪點，則並非合理的方法。警隊的主任級職級不應直接與這些職級比較，我們強烈反對紀常會表達的那些思想局限的觀點(**第 1.18(b)段**)。正如警隊職方在提交給紀常會的意見書中表示，警務人員的指揮角色及警務工作的特殊因素需要獲得適當的肯定。警務工作的特殊因素包括：

- 香港警隊在香港的地位及角色(作為最先和最後的倚傍力量)；
- 執行警務工作和執法的專業知識；
- 所面對的危險和辛勞；
- 紀律和責任承擔；
- 個人生活受到的限制和不定時工作及出勤對生活的干擾；
- 組織架構因素(兼任職務、事故的行動指揮工作、隨時候命，以及策劃緊急應變計劃)。

19. 為使這次職系架構檢討提供的未來路向(涵蓋未來 6 年)能對特別適用於警隊的指揮職責因素予以肯定，調整督察至高級警司的頂薪點是可接受的方法，以使

- ◆ 警隊職級較一般紀律部隊名稱等同的職級最少高一個薪點。

督察職級－督察至高級督察

20. 紀常會試圖獨斷地在這次職系架構檢討提出建議，以改變督察－高級督察職級直通薪級的現行安排(**建議 8.5**)。雖然有關建議只擬應用於新招聘的人員，但會要求督察須通過專業考試，而

非透過服務表現及經驗，才可達至相等於高級督察薪酬的頂薪點。這建議會使未能考取專業資格以晉升為高級督察的督察級人員被削減 4 個督察薪級的薪點。長久以來，督察及高級督察一直被視為合併編制，即督察及高級督察會互相交替職位和執行同一工作、職務及職責。紀常會的這項建議雖可提升督察至高級督察職級的專業精神及推動力，但它必須能確保督察及高級督察職級的增薪制度行之有效。該建議需要作進一步的改善，這可根據下列各點達至：

- 督察及高級督察職級繼續為合併編制；
- 透過現職人員可獲豁免的原則，對新入職人員實施必須通過檢定考試才可獲晉升至高級督察的規定；
- 透過把增薪薪級提高兩個薪點來改善高級督察薪級，從而提供足夠的增薪點反映處於該層級人員的服務年資及經驗。

首長級警務人員－增薪點

21. 首長級警務人員是警政工作的專家，他們在事業發展的較後期晉升至這些職級。相對於首長級一般職系人員在 60 歲退休，首長級警務人員須於 55 或 57 歲(警務處高級助理處長及以上職級)退休，使其可獲發放的增薪點有限。首長級警務人員在其職級服務滿第 0、2、4、6 年時，可獲發放增薪點，這表示許多首長級警務人員在退休前不會獲發放其職級的各個增薪點。紀常會提出把頂薪點設在服務滿第 6 年的建議，較現時頂薪點設在服務滿第 5 年的規定更為不利。對比之下，有關職制較適合政務職系首長級人員，因他們較早有職業晉升機會，故從首長級薪級第 1 點擢升至首長級薪級第 3 點時，可在每一職級的 5 或 6 年服務期內獲得增薪點。無一方案可適合所有的情況。為了消除不公平的情況及承認各職制有所不同，增薪點應根據下列三個方案作出調整：

- ◆ 維持現狀，各職系的首長級人員在服務滿第 5 年時可獲發放頂薪點，即在第 0、1、3 及 5 年每兩年獲發放一個增薪點；
或

- ◆ 在第 0、2、3 及 4 年獲發增薪點；或
- ◆ 總警司至警務處高級助理處長職級的人員每年可獲發增薪點。

首長級職級的增薪點及與文職職系的對比指標

22. 紀常會就首長級職級所提出的建議(第 11.6 條)並不符合現時的職業晉升情況，亦沒有反映警務工作的特殊因素改變和增加的情況。警隊高層指揮中首長級職級的政策及管理職責，可能與其他部門及政策局的文職和紀律部隊首長級職級大致相若或更為複雜。但除了這些職責外，首長級警務人員還須加上適用於警務人員的特殊因素及指揮官角色，這明確的增薪優勢必須透過增薪級作出反映。警隊指揮官的獨特工作，是須就大型事故及行動額外肩負指揮職責。要維持警隊指揮職級的效率，便必須確保首長級警務人員較其他公務員隊伍的首長級職位具有下列增薪優勢：

- ◆ 考慮到警務工作和指揮職責的特殊因素，以及與其他公務員職系／職級相類似的管理職能－提供增薪優勢；
- ◆ 警務處高級助理處長和助理處長的增薪應較其他職系高出 3%；
- ◆ 總警司的增薪優勢應由 3% 增至 5%。

士氣問題

23. 紀常會未有適當地注意和深入研究警隊士氣低落的問題，警隊上下對於政府這位僱主的信心程度已經減弱。不過，警隊成員一直忍耐着，並以認真盡責、敬業樂業的態度繼續執行職務，關心社會各界。職方繼續本着真誠，期望取得一個公平和合理的結果，可惜人員逐漸發覺他們的努力純粹被當作是理所當然的東西。

24. 2008 年 12 月 6 日舉行的撲滅罪行委員會聯席會議旨在尋求方法，使香港成為一個安全、和諧的家，並特別着眼於法律方面，以及青少年罪案和青少年濫用藥物、家庭暴力、「搵快錢」

罪案、詐騙、爆竊、家居保安和商業罪案等問題。香港需要紀律良好、士氣高昂和專業的警察服務，而提供服務的警隊成員無須再為其工作的薪酬和按年遞增薪級而擔憂。

25. 早前，職方已就人員士氣低落的問題提交意見書(分別為**2008年3月3日的職方文件第4號**和**2008年8月26日的補充信件**)，意見書的內容與2004年和2007年的員工意見調查相符。調查的結果顯示人員的士氣低落，只有少於四成的警隊成員感到滿意，整體的數字偏低。(2004年和2007年兩項調查的研究方法稍有不同，但結果均一致顯示警隊士氣非常低落。2004的調查中只有28.8%受訪者對員工士氣感到滿意，而2007年的調查則只有37.1%。)這情況顯示有需要非常審慎地考慮警隊的士氣問題。公務員事務局局長須考慮即時以正面方法，提升警隊的士氣，以及為警隊提供有效及能夠持續至2013年的職制。職系架構檢討於2008/09年度完成時必須公開地處理職方在本文件提及其有所保留事項，並採取行動。紀常會在是次職系架構檢討中採用「以足夠薪酬福利聘用合適才幹的人士」，以及一個適用於各個紀律部隊的通用方案來貶低警隊，這可能會帶來令士氣更加低落，從而影響香港警隊效率的風險。警隊管理層就2004年及2007年的員工意見調查提供了兩份參考文件。2004年及2007年的意見調查分別指出「員工薪酬」和「薪酬」是士氣低落的主要成因。員工的觀點須透過警隊諮詢聽取，亦是各職方總區代表、所有職員關係聯繫及報告討論的熱門話題。員工對職系架構檢討的觀點和意見概要現載於附件「B」。

工作時數

26. 紀常會並無適當地處理有關工作時數的問題，亦不應任意向警隊施加一套有關於日後考慮減少工作時數的規定。警察工作一向被視為壓力沉重，而警務處處長必須平衡行動效率和警務人員的生活與工作。當部署、策略和警隊行動有所改變時，將有可能在不影響服務的同時容許減少工作時數。在1998年至2001年期間，警隊嘗試把工作時數由51小時減至48小時。是次職系架構檢討和紀常會不應向警務處處長施加任何限制，以影響其考慮和着手推行把工作時數減至低於48小時的試驗計劃。警務工作的壓力最為沉重和需要體力勞動。因此，規定工作時數應進一步減

至每周 44 小時(懲教署：49、香港海關：51、消防處：54、入境事務處：44)。職方認為在這次職系架構檢討後，應隨即詳細研究縮減每周工作時數至 44 小時的未來路向。在取得建議後，有關事宜應再提交紀常會審議，以期盡早實行。此事無須等待下次職系架構檢討在 2012 年進行時才作處理。

醫療

27. 紀常會觀察到當局未能提供適當的醫療支援，特別是因公受傷警務人員的醫療問題亟需公務員事務局局長即時處理。有關問題是如何為我們的同僚提供有效和更佳的治療和支援。(每年因公受傷的同僚達 1 200 人左右，其中約 700 人是在執行拘捕或類似行動時受傷的。)這個問題已拖延了很久，因此公務員事務局局長必須採取行動，優先予以解決。紀常會建議的臨時措施包括讓警務人員在公立醫院和診所獲優先診治，或特別制訂集體醫療保險為警務人員提供醫療保障。這些措施是務實的解決方法。職方期望當局早日為警隊制定具體方案及盡早改善這方面的問題。我們促請紀常會在未來 12 個月內檢討有關事宜的進展。

轉制和實施

28. 當局必須釐清轉制和實施的日期。這是各人員關心的事項，特別是到達頂薪點已有多多年，以及於 2008/09 年度退休的人員。檢討報告書已於 2008 年 11 月 27 日完成，在處理釐清事項及作出修訂後，應於 2008/09 財政年度實行。如把建議暫緩至日後本港經濟「回復穩定發展」才予執行，便應在實行時把生效日期追溯至報告書發表日期，才屬公平合理。

29. 有關修訂警務人員增薪架構的轉制安排必須肯定紀常會的建議目標，即是在執行當日，會為超過八成人員的事業帶來影響。人員將於執行日期轉往新的警務人員增薪架構，然後在下一個或將來的增薪日期跳升到更高的支薪點。

財政影響

30. 我們相信政府的財政狀況基本上穩健，可實行職系架構檢討就警務人員所作的建議，更可在投資基建項目及其他計劃的同

時，對人也作出適當的投資。政府現時正繼續就新基建項目、建築工程、新設的首長級文職職位提供資源及經費。警務人員事業的基礎建設與香港的保安和穩定同樣重要。鑑於上次檢討(1988 年的凌衛理檢討)至今已延遲多時，因此當局必須展開檢討周期，並實施更合適的職制。當局(公務員事務局局長)可與警務處處長緊密合作，共同在現時環境決定職系架構檢討所需的撥款額和來源。

31. 2008 年 11 月 27 日，公務員事務局局長表示她會提出初步暫緩執行任何牽涉額外財政開支的建議，直至香港的經濟回復「平穩發展」。她在檢討報告書公開之前，以及在向人員進行真正的諮詢前，單方面作出這項決定，實在令人感到遺憾。我們完全明白社會對本港經濟的關注，也可以理解作出有關預警的背景。我們尋求盡快落實職系架構檢討。

警察評議會職方
2009年2月(修訂本)

警評會職方 – 摘要
(香港警隊職系架構檢討 – 2007 年 11 月至 2009 年 2 月)

提交日期	發件人	收件人	詳情
2007 年 11 月			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會-職系架構檢討(立法會 CB(1)206/07-08(03)號文件)
2007-11-19	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函職方，邀請職方出席 2007 年 11 月 23 日有關展開職系架構檢討的簡介會
2007-12-05	警評會職方	紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函主席，表示歡迎展開職系架構檢討
2007-12-14	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函職方，提供紀常會 2008 年的委員名單
2007-12-21	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 回信及邀請職方就職系架構檢討提出意見
2008-02-01	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函職方，表示紀常會會考慮有關入職資格的建議
2008-03-03	警評會職方	紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函紀常會主席，並附上警評會職方所提建議的摘要(中英文本) 警評會職方文件第 1 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本) 警評會職方文件第 2 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本) 警評會職方文件第 3 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本) 警評會職方文件第 4 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本)
2008-03-18	警評會職方	紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函紀常會主席，說明職方對職系架構檢討的期望
2008-06-30	警評會職方	紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函紀常會主席，附上第 1 號文件的補充資料(中英文本)
2008-07-09	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 來信表示提交意見書的限期設定為 2008 年 7 月 18 日
2008-07-11	紀常會	警評會職方	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 邀請警評會職方出席 2008 年 8 月 26 日的非正式會議
2008-07-17	警評會職方 警評會職方 (警司協會)	紀常會 紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 就提交第 5 號文件去信紀常會主席(中英文本) 警評會職方提交文件第 5 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本) 就提交第 6 號文件去信紀常會主席(中英文本) 警評會職方提交文件第 6 號職系架構檢討意見書(中英文本)
2008-07-24	警評會職方	紀常會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 致函紀常會主席，要求舉行更多諮詢會議(中英文本)

2008-07-29	紀常會	警評會職方	● 覆函拒絕在 2008 年 8 月 26 日之前進一步舉行會議(中英文本)
2008-08-14	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席重申有需要舉行更多諮詢會議(英文本)
2008-08-21	紀常會	警評會職方	● 覆函拒絕舉行進一步的諮詢會議(英文本)
2008-08-25	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 致函警務處處長，表達警評會職方的意見及職方對紀常會的失望(英文本)
2008-08-26	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，附上第 2 及 3 號文件的補充 資料(英文本) ● 致函紀常會主席，附上第 4 號文件(內容有關士氣)的補充 資料(英文本)
2008-08-27	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席提議進一步舉行諮詢會議的詳情
2008-09-02	紀常會	警評會職方	● 覆函提供進一步諮詢會議的詳情
2008-09-03	警務處處長	警評會職方	● 警務處處長在覆函中表示在職系架構檢討事宜上支持警評會職方
2008-09-03	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，表達職方對諮詢時間不足感到失望
2008-09-08	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 致函警務處處長，表達職方對職系架構檢討諮詢的意見
2008-09-08	警評會職方	紀常會	● 就諮詢事宜去信紀常會主席
2008-09-09	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，提供 2008 年 9 月 6 日上午舉行的會議的摘要
2008-09-10	紀常會	警評會職方	● 回覆警評會職方 2008 年 9 月 8 日的信件
2008-09-12	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函主席，提供第 2 及 3 號文件的補充資料，並附上直至高級警司級的薪酬調整要求
2008-09-16	警評會職方 (警司協會)	紀常會	● 就首長級警務人員的薪酬調整要求去信主席
2008-09-24	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，就(擬議的)薪酬表作出澄清
2008-09-24	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函主席，就薪酬調整要求提供補充資料
2008-09-24	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 就職系架構檢討事宜去信警務處處長
2008-10-03	警務處處長	警評會職方	● 回覆職方，支持職方提出的薪酬調整要求
2008-10-06	紀常會	警評會職方	● 回覆職方 2008 年 9 月 24 日的信件，邀請職方出席 2008 年 10 月 15 日的另一會議
2008-10-09	警評會職方 (警司協會)	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，就高級警務人員及首長級警務人員的擬議薪酬調整要求提供補充資料及作進一步的澄清
	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，同意在 2008 年 10 月 15 日會面，並提供 2008 年 9 月 9 日及 2008 年 9 月 18 日會議的摘要

2008-10-09	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 請警務處處長就職方提出的警務人員薪酬調整要求表明其立場
2008-10-24	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會主席，表達對職系架構檢討的諮詢過程感到失望
2008-10-24	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函俞宗怡女士，表達職方對范鴻齡處理職系架構檢討的表現感到失望
2008-10-24	警評會職方	范鴻齡	● 致函范鴻齡，表達職方對其表現感到失望及要求他退位讓賢
2008-10-24	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 感謝警務處處長的支持，請處長提供於 2008 年 10 月 13 日發給紀常會的信件的副本
2008-10-29	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會署理主席，要求他檢討整個諮詢過程，因諮詢工作成效不彰
2008-10-31	警務處處長	警評會職方	● 回信並提供其在2008年10月13日發給紀常會的信件副本 (警評會職方在 2009 年 1 月 8 日曾就提供該信副本給公務員事務局局長而聯絡警務處處長)
2008-11-03	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函紀常會署理主席，要求他在 2008 年 11 月 6 日接收從警務人員收集得的職系架構檢討意見信
2008-11-06	警評會職方 警評會職方	紀常會 紀常會	● 致函紀常會署理主席，把 19,220 封在警隊「一人一信」運動中收集得的信件轉交給他 ● 把(從「一人一信」運動收集得的)信件交給紀常會主席，申明警務人員對職系架構檢討所持的立場
2008-11-06	紀常會	警評會職方	● 回覆職方的信件(2008 年 10 月 24、29 日及 2008 年 11 月 3 日)，拒絕重新研究職方就職系架構檢討提出的關注事項，但表示可安排禮節性探訪署理主席。
2008-11-07	公務員事務局局長	警評會職方	● 公務員事務局局長表示備悉職方的關注事項
2008-11-13	警評會職方	紀常會	● 致函署理主席，同意出席禮節性探訪
2008-11-25	紀常會	警評會職方	● 致函邀請職方出席 2008 年 11 月 27 日下午舉行的招待會
2008-11-27	公務員事務局局長	警評會職方	● 公務員事務局局長俞宗怡會見紀律部隊評議會職方及警評會職方(上午會議)，告知職方紀常會會向管理層提交職系架構檢討報告書，以及她決定公布暫緩執行需要額外財務開支的建議。 ● 紀常會署理主席張震遠與紀律部隊評議會職方、廉政公署職方及警評會職方會面(下午會議)，簡介及派發職系架構檢討報告書。 ● 公務員事務局局長邀請職方就報告書發表意見，提交意見的截止日期為 2009 年 2 月 28 日。

2008-12-12	警評會職方	公務員事務局局長	● 致函公務員事務局局長，表達職方對職系架構檢討報告書感到失望，並要求就對職系架構檢討的關注與公務員事務局局長會面。
2008-12-12	警評會職方	立法會	● 警評會職方就訂於 2008 年 12 月 15 日舉行的會議向立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會提交資料文件
2008-12-15			● 立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會討論職系架構檢討報告書
2008-12-15	公務員事務局局長	警評會職方	● 通知警評會職方紀常會的新任委員名單
2008-12-17	警務處處長	所有人員	● 警隊管理層就紀常會的職系架構檢討報告書在警隊上下展開廣泛的諮詢
2008-12-18	公務員事務局局長	警評會職方	● 公務員事務局局長就警評會職方 2008 年 12 月 12 日的信件作出初步回覆
2009-01-08	警評會職方	警務處處長	● 警評會職方徵求警務處處長批准在有關職系架構檢討的會議和諮詢活動中引用其於 2008 年 10 月 13 日就職系架構檢討發給紀常會的信件內容
2009-01-12			● 公務員事務局局長因應警評會職方 2008 年 12 月 12 日的信件與警評會職方會面
2009-01-12	警評會職方	公務員事務局局長	● 警評會職方向公務員事務局局長提交有關警評會職方與紀常會就職系架構檢討進行討論的一些資料和一疊文件
2009-01-13	警評會職方	紀常會	● 警評會職方致函紀常會新任主席張震遠先生，要求就職系架構檢討舉行會議。
2009-01-16	警評會職方	立法會	● 警評會職方向立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會提交第二份文件(警評會職方職系架構檢討文件 2)
2009-01-19			● 警評會職方出席公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會會議，並在會上發表警評會職方的意見。
2009-01-20	警務處處長	警評會職方	● 就警評會職方希望警務處處長將其於 2008 年 10 月 13 日就職系架構檢討發給紀常會的信件副本交公務員事務局局長一事，表示同意及跟進。
2009-01-21	警評會職方	紀常會	● 警評會職方再次致函紀常會主席張震遠先生，要求就職系架構檢討舉行會議。
2009-01-22	紀常會	警評會職方	● 薪諮會聯合秘書處以紀常會名義作出回覆，聲稱會安排與職方會面。
2009-01-23	警評會職方	公務員事務局局長	● 警評會職方要求公務員事務局局長在諮詢期完結前(即 2009 年 2 月 8 日)，就職系架構檢討與警評會職方展開適當的對話。

2009-01-23	警評會職方	保安局局長	● 警評會職方致函保安局局長，講述有關人員士氣的真實情況和人員對職系架構檢討的期望，並要求與李局長會面。
2009-02-02	警評會職方	18 區撲滅罪行委員會	● 警評會職方致函 18 區撲滅罪行委員會主席，隨信夾付警評會職方職系架構檢討文件 1 和 2(即提交立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會的兩份文件)，向他們講述警隊現時面對困難的真實情況，並要求他們就職系架構檢討向政府發表意見。
2009-02-05			● 警評會職方與警務處處長會面，並應張琮瑤女士(保安局常任秘書長)的要求，讓其列席會議。
2009-02-06	警評會職方	公務員薪常會	● 警評會職方致函公務員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會主席羅家駿先生，詢問有關 2009 年入職薪酬調查的事宜。
2009-02-10	警評會職方	紀常會	● 警評會職方致函紀常會主席張震遠先生，建議於 2009 年 2 月 19 日會面。
2009-02-11	紀常會	警評會職方	● 薪諮會聯合秘書處以紀常會的名義堅持於 2009 年 2 月 17 日與警評會職方會面
2009-02-12	警評會職方	財政司司長	● 警評會職方致函財政司司長，發表警評會職方對 2009 年財政預算案的意見。
2009-02-12	警評會職方	保安局局長	● 警評會職方致函保安局局長，要求與他單獨會面。
2009-02-12	紀常會	警評會職方	● 紀常會同意於 2009 年 2 月 26 日上午與警評會職方會面
2009-02-12	荃灣區撲滅罪行委員會	警評會職方	● 荃灣區撲滅罪行委員會主席回覆警評會職方，表示支持警務人員在職系架構檢討中的立場和意見。
2009-02-13	公務員薪常會	警評會職方	● 公務員薪常會就 2009 年入職薪酬調查的覆函
2009-02-18	保安局局長	警評會職方	● 保安局局長覆函，表示保安局常任秘書長張琮瑤曾與警評會職方會面，故不建議與職方再次會面，並把有關職系架構檢討的關注事項轉交公務員事務局局長採取行動。

警察評議會職方 — 概要
職系架構檢討諮詢期間人員表達的意見

我們的職方協會總區代表已經進行廣泛諮詢，並收集了各個警區和主要單位人員的意見。警隊管理層亦已通過每月的《職員關係報告》和部門內部的諮詢過程，收集意見。職系架構檢討和警務人員薪級表的架構仍然是熱門的討論話題，在警務人員的心目中佔着重要的位置。職系架構檢討報告書的部分內容正確，但亦有些內容有待改善，另外有些地方則缺乏解釋不足，也有些地方並未包括在內。

「大部分初級警務人員對於職系架構檢討的過程冗長表示不滿，令他們大受影響……。紀常會未能合理地為警隊的按年遞增薪級釐定基礎。前線警務人員希望知道其按年遞增薪級的基礎和價值。」—東九龍

警員級人員長期受不利的工作晉升機會所影響，這情況令我們的人員與其他紀律部隊比較時處於不利位置，特別是享有更佳晉升機會的懲教署和入境事務處。人員大致上支持和同意有關改善處於事業發展中期警員的長期服務增薪點數目，但他們卻不知道這如何能真實地反映警隊有別於與其他紀律部隊的專業精神。此外，執行安排亦須更妥善地與這職級人員的實際工作模式配合。

「我們完全支持提升頂薪點和把長期服務增薪點由兩個增至四個的建議。不過，人員認為為年資滿30年的人員加設的長期服務增薪點時間太長，而且不適用於25歲後才加入警隊的人員。」—刑事部

「大部分警員／高級警員均對建議的薪酬調整百分比感到滿意。他們歡迎引入提早晉升和提早發放長期服務增薪點的措施，以提升工作動力，以加強處於事業發展中期的前線警務人員的經驗和士氣。不過，事業發展中期應界定為提供第12年至25年服務。」—新界北

誠然，很多人員都認為當局檢討警隊職制的時間過長，他們對秘書處的工作最為失望，其次是紀常會的檢討結果和建議。報告書中欠缺詳盡的資料來分清各支紀律部隊的工作，因此，我們難以理解有關警隊的大量資料和詳情是於何時提供的。

「人員大致上不滿意職系架構檢討報告書，因為其中許多建議均流於表面和不夠清晰。」－保安部

「紀常會的建議與警隊管理層所提交的意見書之間存在很大分歧。報告書被視為過於簡單，內容空洞，未能正視警隊薪酬架構的主要問題、肯定警務工作的特殊因素，以及確認過去多年來的轉變。」－新界北

「(關於職系架構檢討過程的)摘要第3段指出，紀常會致力提供足夠機會，讓職管雙方發表意見。……這番話看似冠冕堂皇，但事實上，在整個諮詢過程中，對話十分有限，這着實令人失望。上一次的檢討於廿年前進行，因此，今次的檢討自然會要求各成員在整個過程中採取積極和探究的態度。不過，結果是這難免令人相信紀常會只是單靠檢討上次檢討的結果，一點也沒有留意理據充分的意見書。」－警察學院

「人員大都認為紀常會在警隊職系架構檢討中採取一個簡單甚至是精簡的取向，又認為有關的建議只是為問題提供短期的答案，不夠前瞻性，白白浪費一個為薪酬架構和其他對警隊息息相關的事項進行有意義檢討的機會。」－港島

「警隊職系架構檢討的結果令人失望，特別是未能改善警隊與其他紀律部隊的薪酬對比關係，這着實令人感到灰心。」－行動部

很多警務人員純粹感到他們的努力被當作是理所當然的東西。警務工作範圍廣泛，與其他紀律部隊截然不同。因此，職系架構檢討報告書以警隊的與別不同和獨特的工作〔**第 2.11(c)段**〕來代表所有紀律部隊人員的某些職責是不恰當的。紀常會必須明白和適當地分清各支紀律部隊的工作和職責，以及警隊作為公務員一分子，但有別於其他紀律部隊的獨特角色。

「為了反映警隊面對日益增加的挑戰和困難，人員認為警隊較其他紀律部隊享有薪酬優勢的理據充分。報告書和建議的薪級表未能完全肯定警隊的特殊因素。」－刑事部

「檢討的結果令人失望，因為它未能適當地肯定警隊擴大了的職責範圍和工作量。雖然報告書建議提高警隊各個職級的頂薪點，但事實是其他紀律部隊的頂薪點也同時獲得提高，這一點顯示紀常旨在尋求安撫七個紀律部隊有關加薪的訴求，而不是採取公正無私和客觀的態度來進行有關檢討。」－警察學院

「人員欣悉紀常會建議定期進行職系架構檢討，以便合理釐定警隊的職系架構，避免現時的失實情況。不過，紀常會的建議與警隊管理層和職方所提交的意見書卻出現分歧，人員對此感到失望和憤怒。他們知悉紀常會是在意識到所謂的金融海嘯來臨之後，才提交該份非常有限的報告……報告的內容和建議未能提供一套有效的措施來激勵低落的士氣。」－新界北

紀常會職系架構檢討報告書在概述紀律部隊固有特點的推論(第 2.10 段)時，犯了一個錯誤，就是把所有東西視為一個整體。這是不對的，而且令警隊難以接受。有關檢討必須更仔細地就各支紀律部隊進行研究，因為並非所有紀律部隊都擁有這些固有特點，而且也肯定屬於不同水平。**因此，當局需要設立一個衡量制度，以便公平和合理地分清各支紀律部隊的特點。**只有警隊才擁有『警務工作的特殊因素』，因為警隊自 1997 年起取代了軍隊的角色，加上其在香港的地位和角色(作為率先回應和最終求助的機構)、警務和執法工作須具備多方面的專業知識，以及組織架構因素(兼任職務、事故的行動指揮工作、隨時候命，以及策劃緊急應變計劃)。與其他紀律部隊比較，警隊須面對整體較高程度的危險和辛勞，遵守更多有關紀律和問責性的既定守則，以及個人生活受到更多限制。警隊較其他紀律部隊有更多機會受不定時工作時間表和出勤對生活的干擾。

「職系架構檢討報告書已清楚顯示紀常會沒有考慮警務工的獨特性。有意見認為紀常會應考慮多項重要因素，例如專業知識、特別訓練、辛勞、壓力、潛在危險、權利和自由受到限制(不能像市民大眾，甚至是其他政府僱員般享有同等權利和自由)、警隊須嚴守紀律，最重要的是市民對維持本港穩定和安全方面有很高期望。部分人員建議列出自凌衛理檢討至今，警務人員基本薪金所包括與職務有關的所有津貼和金額，以便與其他紀律部隊進行公平的比較。」－西九龍

「特殊因素」的薪酬成分必須獲合理地考慮。職系架構檢討的建議為警隊與其他紀律部隊和文職職系之間提供的薪酬對比關係不足。紀常會的意見和想法不一致，而且沒有充分地在職系架構檢討報告書(第 8.22 至 8.25 段)中列出。紀常會一方面同意警隊(當中約八成為初級警務人員)在多個方面的獨特性，但另一方面卻又舉了一個例子說明(各級)警務人員所受的限制與 400 個公務員職系中一小撮行政、資訊及其他高級職級人員所受的限制無異。鑑

於初級警務人員須受觀點限制，情況與高級政府職位人員相同，因此初級警務人員期望當局會適當地肯定他們在公務員隊伍中的獨特地位。人員的論據是提供一個能妥善地配合警隊職制和獨特地位，而不是切合各個部隊需要的按年遞增薪級，這可能有別於其他紀律部隊的按年遞增薪級，但卻符合市民大眾的長遠利益(第8.24段)。

紀常會的建議對警長級人員的內部薪酬對比關係造成不利影響。因此，有關修訂紀常會就警長級人員增薪結構所提出的建議，已成為廣受評論的議題。

「紀常會一直只是空談，報告書第1.18段已清楚表明：每支紀律部隊都有本身獨特之處。在這背景下，我們(紀常會)有以下意見……我們不可能也不宜直接比較各個紀律部隊，或直接比較紀律部隊與文職職系。因此，紀常會不宜為警長薪酬加設模擬上限，以避免入境事務處(或其他部門)人員可能就不平等表達不滿，而紀常會在為警長級人員建議更實際的薪酬調整時，亦不應覺得其雙手被綁。」－警察學院

「對於紀常會毫不重視其指揮角色及相關職責，警長級人員感到全然失望」
－ 港島總區

「如建議完全落實，警長最終較高級警員高出少於3,000元的薪酬差距，相對於警長較高級警員所須額外承擔的角色及職責，兩者並不相稱。警員認為在考慮晉升事宜時，這點會使他們失去上進動力，特別是加上空缺不足及競爭激烈等情況。」－行動部

「對於警員／警長及警長／警署警長之間的薪酬差距被大幅收窄令警長最為不滿，人員完全理解和認同警長的感受。他們認為，職系架構檢討報告對警長的經驗、專業，以及其對警隊及社會的貢獻，並無予以足夠的肯定及反映。部分警長更憤而表示寧可降至不用承擔任何督導職責的職級，因為該等職責只換來微薄的增薪及些微的晉升機會(約70%的警長在服務警隊期內不會獲晉升至警署警長)。」－西九龍總區

「警長對於只獲提高一個頂薪點感到十分失望，因為這大幅收窄警長與高級警員之間的薪酬差距。這建議並無理據支持，而且會降低警員尋求晉升至警長的意欲。所有人員均認同警長在維持前線警察服務質素方面擔當重要角色，並認為警員、警長和警署警長的頂薪點之間必須有充足的薪酬差距。」－保安部

「警長在督導前線工作、維持警察服務質素和與公眾接觸等方面均為警隊的骨幹。他們的職責持續增加，而且被指派督導前線工作，只建議提高其一個薪點，令人非常失望。如提高薪級是鼓勵現職警長士氣和激勵警員尋求晉升的重要元素，各職級人員均贊同有需要大幅提高警長的薪級。」 - 支援部

紀常會提出的調整警隊增薪制度方法及方式欠缺深思熟慮、理據和解釋，引起不少批評意見，尤其是有關各職級的遞增薪點，以及督察至高級警司級的薪酬；

「紀常會現獨斷地建議刪除督察級四個遞增薪點，實際上是把督察及高級督察分為兩個不同職級。這建議並無理據支持。」 - 西九龍總區

「紀常會只繼續容許各職級內存在遞增薪級不公平的情況，而沒有處理職制中不公平及管理不善之處。警務人員薪級表的遞增薪點較現時總薪級表的為少，總薪級表的遞增薪點間提供 4% 至 5% 的增幅。」
- 東九龍總區

「大部分人員對於頂薪薪酬與其他紀律部隊的相同感到失望。督察至高級警司級人員的獨特指揮角色及警政工作的特殊因素必需予以肯定，所以警察職級應較其他一般紀律部隊的職級存在若干額外增薪優勢。」 - 新界北總區

公務員事務局局長建議暫緩執行職系架構檢討報告中牽涉額外財政開支的建議，這引起強烈的負面回應。近期的職員關係報告重點提到，由於職系架構檢討毫無進展，人員日益感到無法忍受：

「近期的警隊職員關係報告反映出人員對紀常會的建議及公務員事務局局長提出暫緩執行有關建議表示失望和不滿。人員反對當局以金融危機為藉口，拖延執行職系架構檢討的建議。」

「人員亦強烈要求當局設定時限和清楚說明有關建議將在何具體條件下予以執行。」

「各職級人員繼續討論紀常會的報告，並愈加關注該報告的內容有欠根據，而公務員事務局局長提出的不恰當意見令情況更形惡劣。該報告應當釐定警務人員的長遠(6 年)薪酬趨勢，但看來卻只顧考慮目前的金融危機，而這兩者並非必然相關。」

因此，人員期望現時的諮詢可正面影響公務員事務局局長，使她能充分考慮員工和管理層的意見。」

「職系架構檢討仍是非常熱門的話題。由於就有關檢討尋求圓滿方案的進展緩慢，人員的不滿及失望情緒與日俱增。

現正進行為期三個月的諮詢期看來只是故意拖延的計策，在員工期望有關檢討能盡早完成之時，為當局進一步拖延有關事宜提供方便之門。當局顯然低估了人員對職系架構檢討所產生的不滿情緒的強度和深度。人員的友好態度及容忍度迅速下降。當局應注意有關跡象。」

「由於高級警員與警長之間的薪酬差距收窄至前所未見的程度，警長級人員表示非常失望。紀常會的建議有需要就警長的薪級作出改善。所有其他只獲(建議)提高一個薪點的人員亦感到失望，因他們認為他們理應獲得更大幅的調整。」

「看見頂薪薪酬與其他紀律部隊相若職級人員相同，督察級人員(高級督察)亦表示失望。這平均分擔職責的方式似乎過於概括，使警務人員薪級表的獨特性看來已不存在。這通用處理方法並不恰當，因為各紀律部隊的角色和職責相當不同。警隊在這些職級應有足夠的薪酬優勢，以肯定警政工作的特殊因素。紀常會建議的方法存在不少缺點，故需制定一個合乎邏輯理性的制度，以比較各紀律部隊的工作。」

「職系架構檢討繼續是人員的熱門討論話題。人員認為政府理所當然地視警隊為「最先和最後的倚傍力量」，但卻無警務人員適當獎勵，警長級人員尤其認為有關檢討沒有公平地研究其職級的薪酬遞增。」

「關於公務員事務局局長建議當局暫緩執行牽涉額外財政開支的建議，直至經濟回穩，人員對此表示失望。大部分人員全力支持警隊職方提交的意見書及警隊管理層提出的建議，即警務工作的特別性質理應在職系架構檢討中獲得適當的肯定。警長尤其最為不滿……在諮詢期間，部分人員表示職方協會不應阻止人員透過公開行動來提出建議。」

警隊職方很想得知公眾對職系架構檢討的意見，故現正積極接觸社會各界。我們曾在 1 月 19 日的立法會公務員及資助機構員工事務委員會上，以及社區層面和地區撲滅罪行委員會的討論中，與立法會議員接觸。他們現普遍理解職系架構檢討是關乎架構和較長遠的事宜，與每年按市場情況調整薪酬的措施有別，我們對此感到鼓舞。他們明白到，上次檢討至今已有二十年，故現時有需要處理有關問題。前線警務人員對檢討報告和紀常會工作所顯示的不滿程度和警隊士氣低落的情況，已備受社區領袖關注。他們

質疑職系架構檢討報告的質素，並促請公務員事務局局長採取行動以糾正有關問題。他們承認，警隊如此低落的士氣，加上與當局在薪酬和工作條件方面尚未解決的糾紛，會對本港社會的安全及穩定構成危險。他們十分明白其社區在 2009 年所面對的種種挑戰，並期望當局，特別是公務員事務局局長，能與前線警務人員進行公開務實的對話，以尋求解決方法。他們明白時間十分重要，亦相信當局有資源保證他們社區的警政工作，方法是為警務人員帶來公平合理的檢討結果，使他們可把全部精神轉回警政工作上，而不用憂慮士氣及職系架構檢討的問題。各社區領袖能完全分辨出警察服務、警隊在撲滅罪行方面的複雜工作及在其他各方面的種種任務，與一般公務員職系及其他紀律部隊的工作有別。

「本人對有關事宜(職系架構檢討)非常關注，故此盡早回覆……本人明白
警隊的士氣是影響警隊撲滅罪行效率的重要元素。

本人注意到，紀常會的建議與警隊管理層及職方的意見存在分歧，
令警隊職方感到「極度失望和憤怒」，這情況不容忽視。為此，
本人積極鼓勵職方與當局在職系架構檢討作出任何最終決定前，
繼續及直接進行溝通。」

- 荃灣區撲滅罪行委員會 2009 年 2 月 12 日