

Harbourfront Commission

For discussion
on 25 June 2018

HC/06/2018

Consultancy Study on Suitable Model(s) for Managing and Maintaining the Harbourfront

PURPOSE

This paper seeks Members' views on the proposed study scope and consultant selection criteria for the consultancy study on suitable model(s) for managing and maintaining the harbourfront ("the Study"), which will be funded by the \$500 million dedicated funding earmarked for harbourfront enhancement.

BACKGROUND

2. Following the announcement in the Policy Address of January 2017 of earmarking \$500 million for harbourfront enhancement, the Harbourfront Commission (HC) decided at its meeting on 8 May 2017 to use the dedicated funding to finance the Study amongst other things.

3. Currently, most harbourfront open space in Hong Kong is managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) under the Pleasure Grounds Regulation (Cap. 132BC). This set of regulation has provided a uniform and equitable basis for park management over the territory and has been effective in managing a lot of district-based open space. Yet, for some larger-scale waterfront open space and promenades, especially those in prominent locations, their potential could be better realised if there is a tailor-made management and maintenance (M&M) model that could respond to the diversified needs of both locals and tourists on the usage of the harbourfront. For instance, with more flexible and tailor-made management rules, multiple uses and featured facilities like restaurants and cafes can be more widely promoted on the waterfront, thus breeding greater diversity. These tailor-made rules would also allow greater variety of activities, e.g. kite-flying, cycling, pet-walking, fishing, sitting/strolling on lawns, etc. through shared-use of space, resulting in a more vibrant and attractive waterfront open space.

4. It is against the above background that the HC has agreed to commission the current Study to identify more flexible and innovative approaches in the M&M of harbourfront sites so as to enhance its vibrancy for better public enjoyment.

PROPOSED STUDY SCOPE

5. We propose to task the future consultant with the completion of the following four working papers between the submission of an inception report and a final report –

(a) *Task 1 – Reviewing existing models and understanding aspirations*

The consultant should take stock of the different kinds of existing M&M arrangement of harbourfront areas in Hong Kong, covering their respective rules and guidelines, M&M agencies, and legal basis, etc. Apart from the traditional LCSD model, the stock-taking exercise should also cover those under the lead of different agencies, e.g. other government bureaux and departments, statutory organisations, non-profit organizations, the private sector, etc.

The consultant is invited to engage the public and relevant stakeholders in finding out their aspirations in using the harbourfront, especially on the type of activities preferred and their preference over a shared-use approach. It should also shed light on whether there are different preferences for harbourfront areas at different locations.

With the above findings, the consultant should identify the weaknesses and strengths of the existing models and assess to what extent they can meet the public aspirations.

(b) *Task 2 – Proposing suitable model(s)*

With a view to proposing suitable model(s) for Hong Kong, the consultant is invited to research into the different kinds of M&M arrangement overseas and assess their relevance to the situation of Hong Kong.

With all the available research findings, the consultant should recommend suitable M&M model(s) for the harbourfront areas in Hong Kong. The recommendations should cover the following key areas-

(i) *M&M guidelines*

How should we weigh up different considerations such as users' convenience, public enjoyment, harbourfront vibrancy, operational effectiveness, uniformity, clarity, flexibility, etc? In the light of this analysis, should we adopt a single set of M&M guidelines for across-the-board application, or allow different guidelines to be drawn up for different harbourfront areas, or a hybrid of both approaches, that is a generic framework with common M&M guidelines on key aspects to be applied universally while allowing adaptation to be made in certain areas to suit local circumstances?

(ii) *M&M model(s)*

What would be the optimal arrangements that can promote the long-term development of the harbourfront areas while enhancing harbourfront vibrancy and diversity? Are there any clear advantages from the harbourfront development, operational and financial points of view to continue the existing diversified arrangement of allowing different parties, both within and outside the Government, to take part in the M&M of harbourfront areas? If yes, how we can promote more non-governmental participation from local districts, the private sector, etc? Is there a need to have an over-arching body to oversee and upkeep the M&M quality if the responsibilities are outsourced to different parties? Which is best suited to be the over-arching body? Apart from the Harbour Office (an administrative set-up operating at HC's advice) or a statutory authority (say in the form of the proposed Harbourfront Authority), what are other options open to us as well as their advantages and drawbacks?

Apart from the existing diversified approach, are there any other viable options such as whether a single body should be entrusted with the M&M responsibilities of all

harbourfront sites and the pros and cons of these options?

(c) Task 3 – Devising M&M guidelines

The consultant shall devise the draft M&M guidelines following the recommendations in paragraph (b) above and advise on the interface between these guidelines as well as the existing legislation, rules and guidelines identified under Task 1.

(d) Task 4 – Assessing legal, financial and manpower implications

The consultant should advise on the steps and resources that would be needed in bringing about the recommended models and applying the guidelines. The assessment should include the legal basis and enforcement agents for the guidelines (e.g. whether the guidelines could be enforced through any existing legislation or a new legislative instrument should be enacted), the financial and manpower implications, the timeline for implementing the recommendations, etc.

6. To demonstrate the applicability of the recommendations, the consultant should provide case illustration(s) by applying their recommendations to suitable harbourfront area(s) in Hong Kong.

PROPOSED SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CONSULTANTS

7. Taking reference from past experiences and existing guidelines of the Government, we propose to select the consultant based on a set of combined assessment criteria according to the submitted technical and fee proposals. This would allow us to take into account the service quality of the consultant and make qualitative assessment during the assessment process. Specifically, we propose to include in the technical assessment criteria past experience of the consultants, quality of their proposal in responding to the assignment brief, relevance of the proposed approach and methodology, as well as suitability and adequacy of the proposed manpower support.

WAY FORWARD

8. Members are invited to comment on the proposed scope of the Study and consultant selection criteria. We will take into account Members' views in finalising the consultancy brief, with a view to inviting consultancy proposals in August 2018 for the appointed consultant to start work in October 2018. The consultant would be invited to brief and consult Members regularly, so that Members could provide continued and timely advice and guidance as the study progresses. In light of the extensive research work entailed and the multifaceted nature of the M&M issues, we anticipate that the entire study process would take about two years.

Development Bureau
June 2018