
2016 Annual Report on Justices of Peace Visits

**Administration Wing
of the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office**

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE VISITS

2016 Annual Report

This Annual Report provides an account of the work of Justices of the Peace (JPs) in the year 2016. The JPs visited designated institutions under the JP visit programme, handled complaints from prisoners, inmates and detainees, and made suggestions and comments to institutions of their visit.

THE JP SYSTEM

2. The Justices of the Peace Ordinance (the Ordinance) (Cap. 510) provides the statutory basis for the operation of the JP system, including appointment, resignation and revocation of appointment, the powers and functions of JPs, and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith. JPs are appointed by the Chief Executive under section 3(1) of the Ordinance. For administrative purpose, JPs appointed by virtue of their holding of certain offices in the public service are often referred to as Official JPs while others as Non-official JPs.

3. In 2016, 55 and 37 persons were appointed as Non-official and Official JPs respectively. As at 31 December 2016, there were 335 Official JPs and 1 344 Non-official JPs. An up-to-date list of JPs is available in the JP website (<http://www.info.gov.hk/jp>).

FUNCTIONS OF JPs

4. The main functions of JPs, as provided for in section 5 of the Ordinance, are as follows –

- (a) to visit custodial institutions and detained persons;
- (b) to take and receive declarations and to perform any other functions under the Oaths and Declarations Ordinance (Cap. 11);
- (c) in the case of a Non-official JP, to serve as a member of any advisory panel; and

- (d) to perform such other functions as may be conferred or imposed on him/her from time to time by the Chief Executive.

5. The primary role of a JP is to visit various institutions, such as prisons, detention centres, hospitals and remand/probation homes. The objective of the visits is to ensure that the rights of the inmates in the institutions are safeguarded through a system of regular visits by independent visitors.

JP VISIT PROGRAMME

6. In 2016, there were 111⁽¹⁾ institutions under the JP visit programme. Statutory visits to 39 institutions were conducted on a fortnightly, monthly or quarterly basis while visits to 72 institutions were arranged on an administrative basis once every quarter or every six months. The list of institutions under JP visit programme in 2016 is at **Annex A**.

7. In 2016, JPs conducted 720 visits to 110 institutions. New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home was under renovation and JP visits have been temporarily suspended since May 2015. It was re-opened for JP visits in February 2017. On average, Non-official JPs⁽²⁾ each conducts one visit per annum while each Official JP conducts three to four visits each year.

VISIT ARRANGEMENTS

8. JP visits to custodial institutions are conducted under the respective legislation. For example, visits to prisons of the Correctional Services Department (CSD) are provided under the Prison Rules (Cap. 234A), visits to psychiatric hospitals are provided under the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136), visits to detention centres of ICAC and Immigration Department (ImmD) are provided under the Independent Commission Against Corruption (Treatment of Detained Persons) Order (Cap. 204A) and Immigration (Treatment of Detainees) Order (Cap. 115E) respectively and visits to remand/probation homes of Social Welfare Department (SWD) are provided under the Probation of Offenders Ordinance (Cap. 298) and Juvenile Offenders Ordinance (Cap. 226). Statutory visits are conducted on a fortnightly, monthly or quarterly basis. Visits to general hospitals of the Hospital Authority (HA), institutions for drug abusers operated by

⁽¹⁾ Compared to 2015, the number of institutions in the JP visit programme was down by one as the Ma Hang Prison was closed in late January 2015.

⁽²⁾ Excluding those who are exempted from visiting duties because of old age, health or other reasons.

Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) under the purview of Department of Health (DH), welfare institutions under the purview of SWD, and NGOs or charitable organisations providing social services under the purview of Home Affairs Department (HAD) are arranged on an administrative basis on a quarterly or half-yearly interval.

9. To ensure effective monitoring of the management of institutions under the JP visit programme, all JP visits are unannounced. The exact date and time are not made known to the institutions beforehand and JPs may conduct their visits at any reasonable time during their tour of duty. They may request to pay additional visits outside their tour of duty to follow up on or look into specific complaints if they so wish. Usually, two JPs are appointed to visit each institution according to the prescribed frequency. Non-official JPs may choose to pair with either an Official JP or a Non-official JP for the purpose of JP visits.

10. To help JPs focus on issues that require their attention during the visits, they are provided, before their visits, with checklists drawn up by the concerned departments which highlight the key areas that JPs may wish to cover when visiting different types of institutions. In addition, the JP Secretariat provides the visiting JPs with reports on outstanding complaint cases made by inmates of the institutions concerned so that the JPs may follow up on those complaints or other issues during their visits.

11. Upon arrival at CSD institutions, the visiting JPs usually receive from CSD staff a general briefing on the correctional institution and any requests for interviews that have been made by the persons in custody. During the visit, JPs have the opportunity to see all persons in custody within the institution and are free to speak to any of them. JPs may request CSD staff to provide other information about the correctional institution, such as the number of persons in custody in the institution at that moment, whether there are any persons in custody who have been temporarily transferred to other locations (e.g. for medical appointment at a hospital outside the institution or court attendance) on the visit day, etc.

12. Each year, the JP Secretariat organises a briefing to familiarise newly appointed JPs with the JP visit system as well as functions and duties of JPs. The last briefing was held in October 2016. 60 newly appointed JPs attended the briefing and heard from representatives of CSD, SWD and HA about their responsibilities as visiting JPs to institutions under the Department/Authority's management.

HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS/REQUESTS/ENQUIRIES

13. One of the important functions of JPs conducting visits to institutions is to ensure that complaints lodged by inmates are handled in a fair and transparent manner. In the interest of privacy, visiting JPs may choose to speak to inmates in private. In such cases, the institution management will make necessary arrangements to facilitate the interview with inmates in private and render assistance to the JPs as required. The visiting JPs can either conduct investigations themselves by making personal inquiries into the inmates' complaints (such as seeking background information from staff of the institutions and examining relevant records and documents) or refer the complaints to the institutions concerned for investigations. In the latter cases, the institutions concerned will carry out investigations and report to the JPs the outcome of their investigations in writing.

14. Other requests or enquiries made to JPs by inmates of the institutions are normally referred to the management of the institutions for consideration, and the relevant JPs are then informed of the actions taken by the management.

15. Complaints that concern treatment of persons in custody in CSD institutions are generally referred to the Complaints Investigation Unit⁽³⁾ (CIU) for full investigation. For check and balance, the Correctional Services Department Complaints Committee⁽⁴⁾ (CSDCC) is vested with the authority to examine the outcomes of investigation conducted by CIU. If CSDCC is not satisfied with the investigation results, it will direct CIU to re-investigate the case. CIU will notify the complainant if its investigation results are endorsed by CSDCC. The CSD will also report to the relevant JPs the investigation results in writing. If a person in custody is not satisfied with the investigation results of CIU, he/she may appeal to the Correctional Services Department Complaints Appeal Board⁽⁵⁾ (CSDCAB) within 14 days. CSDCAB will handle appeals against the findings endorsed by CSDCC and make final decision on the appeal cases. If the JPs are not satisfied with the investigation results and/or the follow-up actions taken, they may refer the case to other parties (e.g. The Ombudsman or the Police) for investigation as appropriate.

⁽³⁾ The Complaints Investigation Unit is responsible for conducting full investigation into complaints received by or referred to CSD concerning the treatment of persons in custody according to the complaints handling mechanism

⁽⁴⁾ The CSD Complaints Committee is chaired by the Civil Secretary of CSD (a civilian staff), with the Assistant Commissioner (Quality Assurance), a Chaplain and four senior officers in the CSD Headquarters as members.

⁽⁵⁾ At present, all ten non-official members of CSDCAB are Non-official JPs.

16. For other institutions, if the JPs are not satisfied with the investigation results and/or the follow-up actions taken, they may direct the institution concerned or refer the case to other parties (e.g. The Ombudsman or the Police) for investigation as appropriate. JPs are free to conduct any further visit or investigation personally as they consider necessary. They are also encouraged to discuss with the institution management and staff members, and inspect the complaint registers as appropriate to satisfy themselves that the management have handled previous complaints/requests/enquiries properly.

COMPLAINTS RECEIVED

17. In 2016, 192 complaints were received during JPs visits, as compared with 138 received in 2015. Majority of these complaints⁽⁶⁾ were related to services provided by the institution (32%) and treatment and welfare (21%). Having conducted on-site inquiry during their visits, the JPs who received the complaints directed that no further action be taken on 55 of the 192 complaints. 105 complaints were referred by the JPs to the institution management for investigations or follow-up actions, and all were resolved through improvement measures or explanations given to the complainants. As for the remaining 32 complaints, 25 were referred to the CIU of the CSD (including one further referred to the Police) for investigation and seven were referred to other relevant government departments for their handling. 115 (84%) of the 137 complaints that required further action were followed up within one month (as compared to 73% in 2015)⁽⁷⁾. A summary of the statistics is at Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Number and category of complaints received in 2016

Category of complaints	Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(i) Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	62	(32%)

⁽⁶⁾ CSD classifies as complaints any verbal or written expression of dissatisfaction, whereas requests are made to obtain assistance from the Department.

⁽⁷⁾ In view of the nature and complication involved in 22 complaints (representing 16% of the 137 cases that required follow-up action) received during JP visits in 2016 (relating to the conduct of staff, unfair treatment, etc.), the departments have to seek inputs from various parties to conduct investigation. Hence, they have taken more than one month to follow up the complaints.

Category of complaints	Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(ii) Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	41	(21%)
(iii) Complaints against other departments/organisations	34	(18%)
(iv) Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	29	(15%)
(v) Disciplinary action (e.g. unfair disciplinary proceedings, improper award of punishments, etc.)	13	(7%)
(vi) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	6	(3%)
(vii) Others	7	(4%)
Total :	192	

REQUESTS/ENQUIRIES RECEIVED

18. In 2016, 237 requests/enquiries were received during JPs visits, as compared with 257 received in 2015. Majority of these requests were for assistance related to early discharge (53%) and improvement on services provided by the institution (16%). 99% of the requests/enquiries (as compared to 95% in 2015) were followed up within one month. A summary of the statistics is at Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Number and category of requests/enquiries received in 2016

Category of requests/enquiries	Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(i) Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	125	(53%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	37	(16%)

Category of requests/enquiries	Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(iii) Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	27	(11%)
(iv) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	25	(11%)
(v) Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	10	(4%)
(vi) Others	13	(5%)
Total :	237	

SUGGESTIONS/COMMENTS MADE BY JPs

19. In addition to receiving complaints/requests/enquiries, the visiting JPs are required to record in the JP Visit Logbook their assessments as well as their suggestions/comments on the facilities and services provided at the institutions concerned at the end of each visit. Their suggestions/comments were mostly about the physical environment, facilities and equipment, and service quality of the institutions. JPs' assessments, suggestions and comments made in the JP Visit Logbooks help institutions focus on areas requiring improvement, and keep track of the general conditions of the facilities and improvements made.

20. As reflected in the Visit Logbooks, JPs were generally satisfied with the overall facilities and services provided by the institutions. In 2016, JPs have made 147 suggestions/comments, as compared with 144 in 2015. 64% of suggestions/comments (as compared to 73% in 2015)⁽⁸⁾ were followed up within one month. A summary of the statistics is at Table 3 below.

⁽⁸⁾ More JPs have made suggestions/comments relating to the redevelopment/large-scale renovation of institutions. In view of the scale of renovation work involved, the departments have taken more than one month to follow up with some of the suggestions/comments.

Table 3 – Number and category of suggestions/comments made in 2016

Category of suggestions/comments	Number of suggestions/comments in 2016	(%)
(i) Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	71	(48%)
(ii) Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	27	(18%)
(iii) Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	19	(13%)
(iv) Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	15	(10%)
(v) Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	1	(1%)
(vi) Others	14	(10%)
Total :	147	

21. Detailed statistics on the number of visits, complaints, requests/enquiries received and suggestions/comments made by JPs in the past three years are at **Annex B**.

22. Detailed statistics and information by groups of institutions, including those showing how complaints/requests/suggestions were received and handled by JPs and the effectiveness of JPs' recommendations are set out at **Annex C**.

CONCLUSION

23. The Government attaches great importance to the JP visit system which serves as an effective channel, in addition to other established mechanisms, for inmates of custodial and other institutions to lodge their complaints and requests. The unannounced nature of JP visits facilitates the effective monitoring of the management of institutions under the JP visit

programme. The rights of the inmates are safeguarded through this system of independent regular visits by JPs. Institutions concerned will look into complaints and report to JPs the investigation outcomes in writing. JPs are also free to conduct any further visit or investigation personally as they consider necessary or refer the case to other parties (e.g. The Ombudsman or the Police) for investigation as appropriate. In addition to ensuring that complaints lodged by inmates are handled in a fair and transparent manner, the JP visit system also provides an opportunity for JPs to make comments and suggestions on ways to improve the management of facilities and quality of services provided by the institutions. The Government will continue to keep the JP visit system under review and ensure its effectiveness.

Administration Wing
Chief Secretary for Administration's Office
September 2017

List of Institutions under JP Visit Programme in 2016

I. Statutory Visits

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
A. Prisons/correctional institutions for adults			
1.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital ⁽¹⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital ⁽²⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
3.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution ⁽³⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
4.	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre ⁽¹⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
5.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
6.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
7.	Pelican House ⁽⁴⁾	Monthly	CSD
8.	Pik Uk Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
9.	Shek Pik Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
10.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	Fortnightly	CSD
11.	Stanley Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
12.	Tai Lam Centre for Women ⁽⁵⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
13.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
14.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
15.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
B. Correctional institutions for young offenders			
16.	Bauhinia House ⁽⁵⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
17.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	Monthly	CSD
18.	Lai King Correctional Institution ⁽⁶⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
19.	Phoenix House ⁽⁴⁾	Monthly	CSD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
20.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
21.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution ⁽⁷⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
22.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution ⁽²⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
C. Institution for drug addicts			
23.	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre ⁽⁸⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
24.	Lai Sun Correctional Institution ⁽⁸⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
25.	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution ⁽³⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
D. Rehabilitation centres			
26.	Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁶⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
27.	Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁷⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
28.	Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁴⁾	Monthly	CSD
29.	Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁵⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
E. Detention centres of ICAC & Imm D			
30.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	Fortnightly	Imm D
31.	Independent Commission Against Corruption Detention Centre	Fortnightly	ICAC
32.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	Quarterly	Imm D
F. Psychiatric hospitals			
33.	Castle Peak Hospital	Monthly	HA
34.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	Monthly	HA
35.	Kwai Chung Hospital	Monthly	HA
36.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	Monthly	HA
37.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of the Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	Monthly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	G. Remand homes, places of refuge, probation homes and reformatory school of SWD		
38.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	Quarterly	SWD
39.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	Monthly	SWD

Notes:

- (1) Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital (No. 1) and Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre (No. 4) are to be jointly visited.
- (2) Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital (No. 2) and Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution (No. 22) are to be jointly visited.
- (3) Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution (No. 3) and Nei Kwu Correctional Institution (No. 25) are to be jointly visited.
- (4) Pelican House (No. 7), Phoenix House (No. 19) and Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre (No. 28) are to be jointly visited.
- (5) Tai Lam Centre for Women (No. 12), Bauhinia House (No. 16) and Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 29) are to be jointly visited.
- (6) Lai King Correctional Institution (No. 18) and Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 26) are to be jointly visited.
- (7) Sha Tsui Correctional Institution (No. 21) and Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre (No. 27) are to be jointly visited.
- (8) Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre (No. 23) and Lai Sun Correctional Institution (No. 24) are to be jointly visited.

Key :

- CSD – Correctional Services Department
- Imm D – Immigration Department
- ICAC – Independent Commission Against Corruption
- HA – Hospital Authority
- SWD – Social Welfare Department

II. Non-statutory Visits

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	A. Institutions for drug abusers of Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)		
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	DH
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	Half-yearly	DH
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	Quarterly	DH
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	Quarterly	DH
	B. General acute hospitals with 24-hour A&E services and hospitals with a mix of acute & non-acute services		
5.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
6.	Caritas Medical Centre	Quarterly	HA
7.	Haven of Hope Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
8.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
9.	Kowloon Hospital	Quarterly	HA
10.	Kwong Wah Hospital	Quarterly	HA
11.	North District Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
12.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	Quarterly	HA
13.	Pok Oi Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
14.	Prince of Wales Hospital	Quarterly	HA
15.	Princess Margaret Hospital	Quarterly	HA
16.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Quarterly	HA
17.	Queen Mary Hospital	Quarterly	HA
18.	Ruttonjee Hospital ⁽⁹⁾	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
19.	Shatin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
20.	Tai Po Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
21.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
22.	Tuen Mun Hospital	Quarterly	HA
23.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
24.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
25.	Tung Wah Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
26.	United Christian Hospital	Quarterly	HA
27.	Yan Chai Hospital	Quarterly	HA
C. Psychiatric hospital			
28.	Siu Lam Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
D. Non-acute or infirmery hospitals			
29.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	Half-yearly	HA
30.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	Half-yearly	HA
31.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	HA
32.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
33.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
E. Acute hospitals of special nature			
34.	Bradbury Hospice	Half-yearly	HA
35.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	Half-yearly	HA
36.	Grantham Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
37.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
38.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
39.	St. John Hospital	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
40.	Tang Shiu Kin Hospital ⁽⁹⁾	Half-yearly	HA
	F. Children's homes of NGOs		
41.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	Half-yearly	SWD
42.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
43.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
44.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
45.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
46.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
47.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
48.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
49.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
50.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
	G. Day and residential units for people with disabilities of SWD/NGOs		
51.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
52.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
53.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
54.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	Half-yearly	SWD
55.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	Half-yearly	SWD
56.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind ⁽¹⁰⁾	Half-yearly	SWD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
57.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	Half-yearly	SWD
58.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home ⁽¹¹⁾	Half-yearly	SWD
59.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
60.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	Half-yearly	SWD
61.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	Half-yearly	SWD
62.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
63.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	Half-yearly	SWD
64.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel ⁽¹²⁾	Half-yearly	SWD
H. Residential care homes for the elderly of NGOs			
65.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD
66.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
67.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	Half-yearly	SWD
68.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
69.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
70.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home ⁽¹²⁾	Half-yearly	SWD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
71.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD
	I. Charitable organisation providing social services		
72.	Po Leung Kuk	Quarterly	HAD

Notes:

- (9) Ruttonjee Hospital (No. 18) and Tang Shiu Kin Hospital (No. 40) are to be jointly visited.
- (10) The Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind (No. 56) was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016.
- (11) JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home (No. 58) have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation of the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in February 2017.
- (12) Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel (No. 64) and Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home (No. 70) are to be jointly visited.

Key :

- DH – Department of Health
- HA – Hospital Authority
- HAD – Home Affairs Department
- SWD – Social Welfare Department

**Statistics on Complaints, Requests/Enquiries Received and
Suggestions/Comments Made by JPs
from 2014 to 2016**

Institutions	No. of institutions under JP visit programme			No. of JP visits conducted			No. of complaints made to JPs			No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs			No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs		
	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016
Institutions of Correctional Services Department	30	30	29 ⁽¹⁾	450	431	426	133	115	162	85	65	41	28	23	26
Hospitals of Hospital Authority	41	41	41	152	154	152	21	20	20	134	150	107	50	49	57
ICAC Detention Centre	1	1	1	23	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1
Centres of Immigration Department	2	2	2	28	28	28	0	3	10	153	42	86	3	5	5
Po Leung Kuk	1	1	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Institutions for Drug Abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations under the purview of Department of Health	2	4 ⁽²⁾	4	8	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	9
Institutions of Social Welfare Department/ Non-governmental Organisations	33	33	33 ⁽³⁾	74	70	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	68	57	49
Total :	110	112	111	739	722	720	154	138	192	373	257	237	155	144	147

(1) Excluding Ma Hang Prison which was closed in January 2015.

(2) Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre and Au Tau Youth Centre of the Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers have been included under the JP visit programme since August 2015.

(3) JP visits to New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation of the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in February 2017.

Detailed Information on JP Visits to Individual Institutions

(from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016)

I. Institutions of the Correctional Services Department

A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	12	0	0	0
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital/Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre [♦]	24	21	2	3
3.	Hei Ling Chau Addition Treatment Centre/Lai Sun Correctional Institution [♦]	22	0	0	0
4.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution/Nei Kwu Correctional Institution [♦]	22	1	0	2
5.	Lai King Correctional Institution/Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre [♦]	24	0	0	5
6.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	24	13	12	1
7.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	23	1	1	3
8.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre [○]	12	0	0	0
9.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	24	0	0	0
10.	Pik Uk Prison	24	2	1	1
11.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution/Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre [♦]	23	0	0	1
12.	Shek Pik Prison	24	13	0	1
13.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	24	58	7	1
14.	Stanley Prison	24	44	14	2
15.	Tai Lam Centre for Women/Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre [○]	24	0	1	2
16.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	3	0	1
17.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution/Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital [♦]	24	0	0	1

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

○ Denotes visits covering three institutions.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
18.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	0	0	0
19.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	6	3	2
	Total :	426	162	41	26

B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities†		Overall grading on services†	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	12	12	0	12	0
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital [△]	24	23	0	23	0
	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre [△]		22	0	24	0
3.	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre [△]	22	22	0	22	0
	Lai Sun Correctional Institution [△]		22	0	22	0
4.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution [△]	22	21	0	22	0
	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution [△]		21	0	22	0
5.	Lai King Correctional Institution/Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre	24	23	0	24	0
6.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
7.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	23	23	0	23	0
8.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre	12	12	0	12	0
9.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
10.	Pik Uk Prison	24	24	0	24	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as facilities of the hospital, living accommodation, kitchen and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including training programmes, recreational activities and management services) provided by the institutions concerned.

[△] Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

† The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities ⁺		Overall grading on services ⁺	
			S	U	S	U
11.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution/ Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre	23	23	0	23	0
12.	Shek Pik Prison	24	24	0	24	0
13.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	24	22	0	23	0
14.	Stanley Prison	24	24	0	24	0
15.	Tai Lam Centre for Women [△]	24	24	0	24	0
	Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre [△]		23	0	24	0
16.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
17.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution [△]	24	23	0	23	0
	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital [△]		22	0	24	0
18.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
19.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	23	0	24	0
Total :		426	529	0	539	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

[△] Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

⁺ The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs

162 complaints¹ in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	45	(28%)
(ii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	38	(24%)

¹ Among these 162 complaints, 80 cases were raised by three complainants accounting for 49% of all cases.

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(iii)	Complaints against other departments/organisations	34	(21%)
(iv)	Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	27	(17%)
(v)	Disciplinary action (e.g. unfair disciplinary proceedings, improper award of punishments, etc.)	10	(6%)
(vi)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	4	(2%)
(vii)	Others	4	(2%)
Total :		162	

Upon receipt of complaints, JPs sought background information from individual institutions, and examined the facilities, environment, services, treatment and relevant arrangements as well as the relevant records where applicable. A summary of the actions taken in response to the complaints made to JPs is tabulated below.

Category of complaints	Actions	Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
Complaints against other departments/organisations (total: 34)	- No further action taken as directed by JPs after on-site enquiry	22	(14%)
	- Referred to institution management for follow-up and explanations given to complainants	5	(3%)
	- Referred to other government departments for handling	7	(4%)
Complaints against CSD (total: 128)	- No further action as directed by JPs due to incoherent nature or lack of solid information for further investigation	33	(20%)

Category of complaints	Actions	Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
	- Referred to institution management for investigation or follow-up (all cases resolved by improvement measures made or explanations given, which both JPs and complainants found satisfactory)	70	(43%)
	- Referred to the CIU of CSD for investigation (five cases referred by CIU to institution management for follow-up, of which four cases were resolved by institution management and one was referred back to CIU and concluded unsubstantiated; 19 found unsubstantiated after investigation by CIU; and one referred to Police which found no crime element after investigation; JPs duly informed of and satisfied with the investigation results)	25	(16%)
Total :		162	

Of the 162 complaints, 34 were related to category (iii): complaints against other departments/organisations, including complaints against court order, criminal investigation or detention by law enforcement agencies, etc. The JPs who received the complaints directed that no further action be taken on 22 cases after conducting on-site inquiry, given that the complainants had either gone through the appeal channels under the current legal system, were detained under the Hospital Order imposed by the court with unstable mental conditions, or the complaints involved criminal investigations under the jurisdiction of other

authorities instead of CSD. The JPs referred five cases² to the institution management for follow-up, and directed that the institutions provide explanations to the complainants of these cases. The remaining seven cases³ were referred to other departments (such as the Judiciary and the Police) for handling. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the actions taken, and they were satisfied and gave no further directive.

Apart from the above-mentioned 34 complaints against other departments/organisations, the remaining 128 were complaints against CSD and they were handled according to the circumstances of each case. The JPs concerned suggested no follow-up actions for 33 of these complaints, of which 26 were made incoherently by the complainants. Regarding the remaining seven complaints⁴, the JPs were satisfied that no solid information had been provided by the complainants to support further investigation or the allegations had already been addressed or dealt with by the institutions before the JP visits.

As for the remaining 95 complaints against CSD, 70 were related to medical treatment, dissatisfaction about the punishments imposed by Adjudicating Officer, assignment of cells, diet arrangements, transfer between institutions, facilities provided in individual institutions and grudges amongst persons in custody, etc. The institution management had looked into all the 70 cases. While improvement measures had been carried out by the institutions for cases related to cell re-assignment and maintenance works in response to the complaints received, the JPs concerned requested the relevant institutions to handle the remaining complaints by explaining to the complainants their arrangements or established mechanisms. The complainants were satisfied with the actions taken by the institution management after listening to the explanations. As regards those complaints related to medical treatment, the institutional Medical Officers (MO) had provided suitable treatments and explanations to the complainants who showed their understanding and made no further complaints. In parallel, JPs were also informed of the follow-up actions taken by institutions without raising further inquiries. All of the 70 complaints were thus resolved.

² These five complaints were related to conviction by court, receipt of appeal result from court and against the decision made by the Director of Immigration and had been followed up by the institution management. Follow-up actions include conducting interview with complainants concerned to further explain the procedures for applying legal aid, the sentence review mechanism, the legal rights to appeal against/review the court's decision and seek assistance from Duty Lawyer Service and the judicial system; and contacting complainant's family member for visit to assist with legal aid application.

³ These seven complaints were related to handing out of letter to other departments claiming innocence of criminal charges and threatening by the other authorities and had been referred to other relevant departments for handling.

⁴ One was on staff attitude for which no evidence had been provided; two cases were on the searching procedures and diet arrangement, which had been fully investigated and dealt with by the institutions concerned; one case was on the person in custody's preference on workshop, which the Work and Vocational Training Allocation Board had handled in accordance with the established mechanism; two cases were on unfair treatment, which had been addressed and dealt with by the institutions; and the last case was on the handling of letter addressed to the Office of the Chief Executive, which had been sent before the JP visit.

The remaining 25 complaints against CSD were referred by the JPs concerned to the Complaints Investigation Unit (CIU) of CSD for action. The allegations normally involved more complicated circumstances such as alleged staff misconduct and use of unnecessary force, etc. The complaints were handled according to the established complaints handling mechanism. Amongst the 25 complaints referred to CIU, five cases were found to be operational in nature and thus referred to the institution management for follow-up action. Four out of the five cases were resolved by the institution management. The remaining one could not be resolved by the institution management and was referred back to CIU for further investigation. The case was found not substantiated after investigation. As for the 20 complaints investigated by CIU, 19 of them were found not substantiated after investigation. The complainant of the remaining case indicated that he wanted his complaint to be referred to the Police instead of being handled by CIU. The case was referred to the Police and it was closed by the Police after investigation found no crime element. The complainant concerned was informed of the investigation outcomes without raising any further request or complaint. There has been no appeal lodged to the Correctional Services Department Complaints Appeal Board (CSDCAB) concerning any of the 24 complaints found not substantiated by CIU or the last case referred to the Police. The JPs were also duly informed of the investigation results of all 25 complaint cases, and they were all satisfied and gave no further directives.

D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs

41 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	17	(42%)
(ii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	15	(37%)
(iii)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	5	(12%)
(iv)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	3	(7%)
(v)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	1	(2%)
Total :		41	

The 32 requests made under category (i): services provided by the institution and category (ii): treatment and welfare were related to diet, specialist consultations at outside clinics or hospitals, making of additional phone calls, and assignments of dayroom/workshops, etc. Having examined the nature of the requests, the JPs concerned directed the institutions to provide explanations and/or assistance to the persons in custody as appropriate. The requests relating to medical treatments had been referred to MO for recommendation. The JPs and the persons in custody concerned were duly informed of the actions taken. JPs were satisfied and gave no further directive.

The five requests under category (iii): matters in relation to other departments/organisations were about the decisions made or services provided by other departments/organisations. Examples include the returning of passport by the Police, replies from other law enforcement agencies and request for the handling of several court cases in one go.

The three requests under category (iv) were about requests for early discharge. These requests had been referred to the relevant authorities for action according to the JPs' suggestions. The remaining one request under category (v): facilities and equipment provided by the institution was about the current provision of squatting type toilet for persons in custody. The management of the institution had explained to the JPs concerned that squatting type of toilet facilities were used having regard to security, hygienic and supervisory concerns. After receiving the explanation provided by the management of the institution and conducting site inspection, the JPs were satisfied and requested no further action.

E. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made 26 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2016	(%)
(i)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	10	(38%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	7	(27%)
(iii)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	5	(19%)
(iv)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	2	(8%)
(v)	Others	2	(8%)
Total :		26	

Majority of the suggestions were made under category (i): training programmes and recreational activities. JPs recommended CSD to provide more varieties of vocational training courses, such as food and beverage and construction-related ones, to persons in custody, and to work in collaboration with private sector to enhance employability of persons in custody after release. To take forward the JPs' recommendation, CSD has been committed to providing appropriate and diversified market-oriented vocational training courses with due consideration to skills level of the persons in custody, rehabilitation programmes

as well as the security and operational concerns of the institutions. In 2016, 20 vocational training courses were organised for young persons in custody, whereas more than 40 market-oriented courses, with a total of over 1 400 places, were provided for adult persons in custody due for discharge within 24 months. CSD would continue to design and organise suitable training courses for persons in custody.

To increase the chance of their job hunting success after release, CSD has been arranging persons in custody to participate in “Pre-release Re-integration Orientation Course”, in which training in job interview skills were emphasised. Since 2012, CSD had launched the programme “Employment Services” with caring employers from various industries to provide employment opportunities for persons in custody and rehabilitated persons. In 2016, a total of 574 registered employers had provided more than 1 500 job vacancies for persons in custody. Besides, CSD had collaborated with employers’ associations in organising the “Video Conferencing Job Fair” since 2014 to provide a platform for persons in custody to have job interviews through video conference to facilitate their job hunting prior to their release. The latest one was held on 7 December 2016 with 43 participating firms providing more than 800 job vacancies. In addition, CSD had jointly organised the “Employment Symposium” with Centre of Criminology of University of Hong Kong since 2001 to appeal to the public and employers to accept and give equal opportunities to rehabilitated persons and help them to reintegrate into community after release. In 2016, more than 200 representatives from around 80 business organisations, social enterprises, statutory bodies and social sectors attended the “8th Employment Symposium - Unleashing Rehabilitated Offenders’ Potential”.

To enhance community support for CSD’s rehabilitation work and help persons in custody reintegrate into community after release, CSD and the City University of Hong Kong held the “NGO Forum 2016 cum Outstanding NGO Volunteer Award Presentation Ceremony” (the Forum) on 22 December 2016. Through knowledge sharing and practical experience exchange, the Forum, with “Join hands to reduce crime” as its theme, aimed to help participants explore ways to combine social strengths to help rehabilitated persons and prevent crime. The Forum was attended by around 250 representatives, academics, volunteers and CSD staff. CSD would continue to work with employers and other stakeholders in the community to appeal for public acceptance of persons in custody, offer them job opportunities and facilitate their smooth reintegration into the community.

For category (ii): service quality and category (iv): manpower planning, some JPs suggested providing more interpretation service to persons in custody of other nationalities, while others suggested enhancing the language skills of staff to strengthen communications with persons in custody. CSD has all along put in place appropriate measures to assist persons in custody of other nationalities to

adapt to life in the institutions. These include arranging staff proficient in foreign languages such as Urdu and Punjabi to supervise those persons in custody, employing official interpreters, seeking assistance from consular officers to provide interpretation services and from Language Centres and Interpretation Hotline operated by NGOs. Induction talks and information booklet printed in 27 languages had been provided to all persons in custody upon their admission to help them understand their rights and discipline requirements in the institutions. Cantonese learning classes and self-learning kits are readily available for persons in custody of other nationalities if they wish to learn to speak and understand Cantonese.

CSD had also arranged regular meetings and sharing sessions with consular officers to foster mutual understandings. To enhance openness and transparency, they were invited to visit different institutions to learn more about the treatments provided for persons in custody.

As regards the training for CSD staff, various courses and seminars had been arranged to enhance their competency in communicating with persons in custody of other nationalities. Different language classes including Indonesian, Nepalese, Punjabi, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese had been organised for staff. Besides, consular officers had been invited to deliver cultural talks to CSD staff to strengthen their knowledge of different cultures.

A “Multilingual Phrasebook for Emergencies” containing a list of essential questions in 18 languages was made available in the institutions to strengthen the communication between MOs and persons in custody during medical consultations. Besides, another phrasebook “Commonly Used Phrases for Escort Duties in CSD (Multilingual)” containing commonly used phrases for escort duties in 27 languages was available to help CSD staff communicate with persons in custody during escort.

Some JPs suggested enhancing the library facilities with more reading materials. To cultivate reading habits of persons in custody, all institutions had their own libraries. Some of them had been newly renovated with enhanced facilities and more reading materials. With a view to providing sufficient reading materials for persons in custody, CSD had procured and borrowed books from public libraries and accepted donation of reading materials of different languages from various consulates and stakeholders. Currently, the total number of books available to persons in custody stands at nearly a hundred thousand. Institutions are making efforts to keep sufficient stock of library books at a ratio of one to ten of certified accommodation⁵ to library books.

⁵ Certified accommodation refers to the number of persons in custody an institution can accommodate.

For category (iii): physical environment, facilities and equipment, some JPs recommended conducting renovation work for old facilities and improving the congested environment in some institutions. As some of the institutions were not purpose-built and had been in use for decades, their facilities were ageing or overcrowded. CSD had been adopting different measures to improve and replace some of the aged facilities and alleviate the overcrowding situation. The redevelopment project of Tai Lam Centre for Women was completed in 2016, and the Centre had commenced operation in January 2017 with 128 additional penal places available to alleviate the overcrowding problem of high security female persons in custody.

As short-term solutions, CSD would continue to work with Architectural Services Department to conduct regular inspections and maintenance of the buildings and facilities within the institutions. CSD would also reshuffle resources corresponding to the changing penal population, including the transfer of appropriate number of remand persons in custody at Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre (LCKRC) to Stanley Prison since August 2016 aiming at alleviating the overcrowding situation of LCKRC. In the long run, CSD has planned for the partial re-development of LCKRC to enhance its operation and capacity.

For category (v): others, one JP commented that a part of the content of the “Guidelines for Visiting Justices” drawn up by CSD required updating. CSD had taken immediate follow-up action in updating the guidelines. CSD would conduct regular review on the guidelines to ensure that the most up-to-date information is provided to JPs.

II. Hospitals of the Hospital Authority

A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	2	0	0	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	2	0	0	0
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	4	0	0	2
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	12	2	4	2
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	2	0	0	1
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	2	0	0	1
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	2	0	0	1
8.	Grantham Hospital	2	0	0	1
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	2	0	0	0
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	2	0	0	1
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	2	0	0	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	4	0	0	2
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	12	1	26	5
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	12	2	4	6
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	4	0	0	3
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	1
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	12	9	33	5
18.	North District Hospital	2	0	0	1
19.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	2	0	0	2
20.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	4	0	0	1
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	12	6	40	3
22.	Pok Oi Hospital	2	0	0	0
23.	Prince of Wales Hospital	4	0	0	3
24.	Princess Margaret Hospital	4	0	0	1
25.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	4	0	0	1
26.	Queen Mary Hospital	4	0	0	2

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
27.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital [♦]	2	0	0	1
28.	Shatin Hospital	2	0	0	1
29.	Siu Lam Hospital	2	0	0	0
30.	St. John Hospital	2	0	0	0
31.	Tai Po Hospital	2	0	0	2
32.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	2	0	0	1
33.	Tuen Mun Hospital	4	0	0	0
34.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	2	0	0	2
35.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	2	0	0	2
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	2	0	0	1
37.	Tung Wah Hospital	2	0	0	1
38.	United Christian Hospital	4	0	0	0
39.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	2	0	0	0
40.	Yan Chai Hospital	4	0	0	1
	Total :	152	20	107	57

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities†		Overall grading on services†	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	2	2	0	2	0
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	4	4	0	4	0
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	12	10	0	11	0
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	2	1	0	1	0
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	2	2	0	2	0
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	2	0	0	2	0
8.	Grantham Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	4	4	0	4	0
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	12	9	0	11	0
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	12	11	0	12	0
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	4	2	0	3	0
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	12	9	0	12	0
18.	North District Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
19.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	2	1	0	2	0
20.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	4	4	0	2	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as facilities of the ward, outpatient department and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including patient care and catering/supporting/management services) provided by the institution concerned.

† The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities ⁺		Overall grading on services ⁺	
			S	U	S	U
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	12	9	0	11	0
22.	Pok Oi Hospital	2	2	0	1	0
23.	Prince of Wales Hospital	4	2	0	3	0
24.	Princess Margaret Hospital	4	3	0	3	0
25.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	4	3	0	3	0
26.	Queen Mary Hospital	4	1	0	3	0
27.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
28.	Shatin Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
29.	Siu Lam Hospital	2	1	0	2	0
30.	St. John Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
31.	Tai Po Hospital	2	1	0	1	0
32.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	2	2	0	1	0
33.	Tuen Mun Hospital	4	4	0	4	0
34.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
35.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	2	0	0	2	0
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
37.	Tung Wah Hospital	2	1	0	2	0
38.	United Christian Hospital	4	3	0	4	0
39.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
40.	Yan Chai Hospital	4	3	1 [@]	4	0
Total :		152	120	1	138	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

⁺ The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.

[@] The visiting JPs considered the building facilities could be further upgraded. Please refer to the last paragraph of Part E for details.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs

20 complaints in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to hospitals –

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	8	(40%)
(ii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. refusal to treatment, prohibited use of electric cord, etc.)	3	(15%)
(iii)	Disciplinary action (e.g. use of restraint)	3	(15%)
(iv)	Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	2	(10%)
(v)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	1	(5%)
(vi)	Others	3	(15%)
Total :		20	

All the 20 complaints were lodged by psychiatric patients. 15 were found unsubstantiated and related to patients' hallucination and unstable mental condition. Most of those patients complained about medication and prolonged restraint. The Hospital Authority (HA) responded that all cases related to medication had been reviewed by medical staff and were found unsubstantiated. Moreover, restraint would only be applied if necessary and all related details would be logged on patients' record. There was also one case where a patient claimed herself to be capable of self-care and requested to take a bath by herself. However, she was observed to be incompetent to take care of her personal hygiene and supervision by nurse/health care assistant was required.

For the remaining five cases, three were related to food quality. All cases had been referred to the Hospital Catering Department for follow-up action. One case was related to the use of electric cord for MP3 player and the other was concerning the loss of occupational therapy record book. As electric cord was considered to have potential hazard in acute psychiatric ward, the patient had been

recommended to use wireless recreation items instead. For the other case, the patient lost her occupational therapy record book and a new one with stickers previously awarded to her in recognition of her good performance had been re-issued.

D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs

107 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to hospitals, all of which came from psychiatric patients –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(i)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	42	(39%)
(ii)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	22	(21%)
(iii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	16	(15%)
(iv)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for more computer usage time, change of work assignment, etc.)	10	(9%)
(v)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	4	(4%)
(vi)	Others	13	(12%)
Total :		107	

All 42 requests for early discharge/home leave lodged by psychiatric patients in category (i) had been reviewed by the case doctors and senior clinical staff and handled in accordance with the relevant provision of the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136). Patients considered clinically not suitable for discharge had been advised of the rights to raise their concerns with the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

For category (ii): facilities and equipment provided by the institution, 13 requests were related to the provision of extra recreational facilities and permission to visit garden. Five were related to air conditioning, lighting and toilet facilities in ward area. Three were related to the request for provision of other facilities such as hair dryer, rubbish bin and wheelchair. All cases had been followed up by the Hospital Facility Management Department or ward administration staff. For the remaining case, a patient expressed concern on the inadequacy of resuscitation equipment at ward. The case had been referred to the Hospital Committee for review. It was confirmed that all wards were equipped with standard resuscitation kits.

For requests under category (iii): services provided by the institution, 11 were related to food provision, including enhancing the variety and quantity of food, in particular, fruit and night snacks. All requests had been followed up by the Hospital Catering Department. Some other patients requested more medical attention from doctor/dietician/nurses while one patient expressed concern about the inadequacy of manpower in the ward. All requests had been referred to case doctor/ward management for follow up.

For category (iv): treatment and welfare, a patient requested to keep personal shampoo in the ward, while another one would like to buy food with his own Octopus card. Other requests included increasing computer usage time, free dental service, referral to the “Extended-Care Patients Intensive Treatment: Early Diversion and Rehabilitation Stepping Stone (EXITERS)” Project, etc. The hospitals concerned had considered the requests and acceded to patients’ requests as far as practicable.

For category (v) which concerns matters in relation to other departments/organisations, three patients requested the provision of housing and Comprehensive Social Security Assistance after discharge, and the requests were referred to medical social workers for follow up. Another patient expressed concern about employment upon discharge. Counselling had been provided to the patients as appropriate.

For category (vi): others, one patient suggested having pockets on hospital clothing and the comment had been referred to the Hospital Linen Department for follow up. Regarding the requests from three patients to smoke, hospital staff had explained to them that it was illegal to do so within hospital premises. Other requests included separation from other patients, frustration with other patients, comment on previous treatment at another hospital, seeking advice

on whether the patient should inform his boss about his mental condition, personal preference on the colour of towels, and request for inspection of the food being brought to the hospital, etc. The ward staff had explained related arrangements to the patients and taken appropriate follow-up actions.

All JPs concerned had been informed of the follow-up actions taken by the institutions.

E. *Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs*

JPs made 57 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to hospitals –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2016	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises)	33	(58%)
(ii)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	9	(16%)
(iii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement to rehabilitation service and use of technology, etc.)	7	(12%)
(iv)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training and more recreational activities, etc.)	1	(2%)
(v)	Others	7	(12%)
Total :		57	

Concerning JPs' suggestions and comments on category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment, JPs expressed their support for repair/renovation/redevelopment of hospital premises. Funding had been secured for some hospitals. Meanwhile, HA would continue to ensure all hospital premises are maintained properly. In response to the suggestions by some JPs on minor improvement works, such as repairing the flushing system, the Facility Department of the hospital concerned had promptly taken follow-up action. Two JPs commented on the installation of barrier-free facilities. One suggested

installing those in the public area outside the hospital, while the other commented that the tactile might cause difficulties during patient transportation. The hospital concerned had consulted both patients and ward staff when installing the barrier-free facilities to ensure that both parties were satisfied with the facilities. Other comments in relation to physical environment such as crowded ward condition had been referred to the hospital management for follow up. It is worth noting that one JP made a positive comment about the prompt replacement of uncomfortable bed mattresses by HA.

Regarding category (ii): manpower planning, some JPs expressed concerns about the problem of staff shortage, especially at the minor/entry grade level. While staff recruitment would be an on-going process, HA had made efforts to review the remuneration package and consider offering night shift allowance to attract and retain staff.

A significant number of positive comments were made by JPs under category (iii): service quality. JPs were highly impressed by the enthusiasm and professionalism of the staff. In particular, JPs commended the hospital accreditation scheme, the application of information technology in educating patients, the well-trained staff, the clean and tidy hospital environment, as well as the good services and facilities provided to patients. Some JPs suggested HA planning ahead for the application of automation and off-site dispensing centre. One JP suggested that additional resources should be allocated to rehabilitation services so as to lower the re-admission rate. One JP commented that while restraint might be necessary, certain movement should be allowed for patients to extend their bodies. All comments had been conveyed to the hospital management for consideration.

In response to JPs' comment under category (iv): training programmes and recreational activities that more activities should be arranged for psychiatric patients, HA had explained to JPs that activities such as painting and gardening, chess and TV games had been arranged in the ward.

Comments under category (v): others were largely related to the transportation services provided to remote hospitals. JPs opined that shuttle bus/public transport should be provided to those hospitals. HA had referred such comments to Transport Department and District Council for follow-up action. In-house shuttle buses had also been arranged for staff during rush hours. One JP raised question as to whether oxygen intensifier⁶ could be brought on board public

⁶ Patients with breathing difficulties need to be supported by oxygen intensifiers.

transport. It would provide a stronger incentive for patient to travel back from home to the hospital for therapy sessions after discharge. The hospital concerned confirmed that non-pressured oxygen intensifiers would be allowed on public transport. The hospital would review its discharge arrangement as appropriate. Another JP commented that the Government should enhance sub-acute service. The comment had been referred to the Hospital Authority for follow-up.

JPs provided comment on the facilities of the Yan Chai Hospital after conducting visit to two wards, one of which had been recently renovated while the other was not. The JPs suggested that the second ward could be upgraded like the renovated one. The hospital explained to the JPs that ward renovation had been scheduled under a rolling plan for bidding funds from HA and the wards which had yet to be renovated had been slotted in the rolling plan already. JPs were satisfied and made no further remarks.

III. ICAC Detention Centre

A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments*

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
ICAC Detention Centre	24	0	3	1

B. *Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided**

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
		S	U	S	U
ICAC Detention Centre	24	24	0	24	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
 U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as cells, interview room, search/medical/charge room and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including food, bedding and management services) provided by the institution concerned.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs

Three requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to ICAC Detention Centre –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(i)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for access to recreational facilities, etc.)	2	(67%)
(ii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request related to food)	1	(33%)
Total :		3	

One of the two requests under category (i): facilities and equipment provided by the institution was related to the provision of physical exercises. To follow up, the detainee was arranged to visit the gymnasium and exercise yard of the institution for exercises. Another detainee indicated that there was dust in the detention room and requested cleaning. JPs considered that the dust found the detention room was probably due to the loosened fibre of the blanket provided to the detainee. The subject detention room was cleaned up with a new blanket provided to the detainee.

The request under category (ii): services provided by the institution was about the provision of meal. The detainee requested that food provided to him be butter-free. His request had been logged in his record.

The JPs concerned had been informed of the actions taken and made no further comment.

D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made one suggestion/comment in the following category during their visit to ICAC Detention Centre –

Category of suggestion/comment		Number of suggestion/comment in 2016	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. maintenance of suitable temperature in the centre)	1	(100%)
Total :		1	

JPs observed that the temperature inside the detention rooms was much lower than 25°C and requested ICAC to follow up. Adjustment had been made accordingly by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department to ensure that the temperature thereat would be maintained at around 25°C.

IV. Centres of the Immigration Department

A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	24	10	86	2
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	0	0	3
	Total :	28	10	86	5

B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	24	24	0	24	0
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	4	0	4	0
	Total :	28	28	0	28	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, sanitation and hygiene, security and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including meal/medical treatment arrangements, custody of detainees' properties and management services) provided by the institution concerned.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs

Ten complaints in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre (CIC) –

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2016	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. support for legal aid application, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	9	(90%)
(ii)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. poor hygiene and high room temperature, etc.)	1	(10%)
Total :		10	

Majority of the complaints were made under category (i): services provided by the institution (90%). Some detainees complained about the lack of legal assistance in respect of their non-refoulement claim. They requested meeting with the case officer to express concern about the adverse effect of lengthy detention. To follow up, CIC had arranged a meeting for representatives of detainees to meet senior officers of the Duty Lawyer Service to address their concerns about the screening process of their claim for non-refoulement protection as well as the treatment under detention at the CIC. They were informed by the case officer of the latest position of their cases and legal aid applications. Other detainees complained about meal provision. CIC had explained to detainees that their diet had followed approved scales of nutritional values with regard to health and religious requirements. A Senior Immigration Officer would be responsible for ensuring that the quality and quantity of meals provided to detainees are of satisfactory standard and for conducting spot check before the delivery of meals.

The complaint under category (ii): facilities and equipment provided by the institution was about the hygiene and room temperature within CIC. CIC explained that cleansing of floor is conducted by an outsourced contractor twice daily. To foster a clean habit and maintain personal hygiene amongst detainees, detainees had also been asked to carry out cleansing work in the dayroom/dormitory/ward areas. Staff would conduct daily inspection to ensure that the hygiene condition was maintained at a satisfactory standard. In respect of the concern about the high room temperature, sufficient electrical fans had been installed at every dayroom and dormitory for better ventilation.

All JPs concerned had been informed of the actions taken and made no further comment.

D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs

86 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to the CIC –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2016	(%)
(i)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	80	(93%)
(ii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention)	3	(4%)
(iii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for discharge from medical observation, etc.)	2	(2%)
(iv)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application to the court)	1	(1%)
Total :		86	

The 80 requests under category (i): request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance were mainly related to checking of case progress, requesting interview by case officers, release on recognisance and early repatriation. These requests had been referred to relevant sections of the Immigration Department for follow-up.

Three requests under category (ii): services provided by the institution were related to medical treatment. The detainees had been arranged to receive medical treatment and some had been transferred to specialist clinics in public hospitals for treatment.

For category (iii): treatment and welfare, a detainee who was under medical observation made two requests for discharge. His requests had been conveyed to MO for consideration. After thorough medical examination by the MO, the detainee was required to be under continual medical observation until his

release from the CIC.

For category (iv): matters in relation to other departments/organisations, one detainee requested for filing writ of Habeas Corpus under Section 22A of High Court Ordinance (Cap. 4). He was subsequently arranged to file the application to High Court accordingly.

All JPs concerned had been informed of the actions taken and made no further comment.

E. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made five suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to CIC and Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2016	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. provision of more reading materials, etc.)	4	(80%)
(ii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. arrangement of more activities)	1	(20%)
Total :		5	

For category (i), physical environment, facilities and equipment, JPs suggested providing more reading materials to detainees. The centre had followed up the suggestion by providing more books and magazines to detainees. In response to JPs' another suggestion, the centre had duly put up information cards in 17 languages at conspicuous places to inform detainees that JPs were visiting. As regards JPs' concerns relating to the crowdedness of individual dayroom and suggestion on provision of more facilities for detainees to move around and do exercises, CIC had explained to JPs that there was an established mechanism to monitor the welfare and treatment of detainees including the space they could use. JPs' suggestions were well noted and would be taken into account in future refurbishment work.

For category (ii): training programmes and recreational activities, JPs suggested that the centre liaise with NGOs to organise activities for detainees.

While explaining to JPs that activities had been regularly organised by NGOs, the welfare officers of the centre would continue to work closely with the NGOs and explore collaboration opportunities with a view to further enriching the training programmes and recreational activities for the detainees.

V. Po Leung Kuk

A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments*

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
Po Leung Kuk	4	0	0	0

B. *Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided**

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
		S	U	S	U
Po Leung Kuk	4	4	0	4	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, sheltered workshop and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including residential/day care/rehabilitation services) provided by the institution concerned.

VI. Institutions for Drug Abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations under the purview of the Department of Health (DH)

A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	2
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	2	0	0	2
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	4	0	0	2
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	4	0	0	3
Total :		12	0	0	9

B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities†		Overall grading on services†	
			S	U	S	U
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	2	2	0	2	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as living accommodation, kitchen and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including training programmes, recreational activities and management services) provided by the institutions concerned.

† The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities ⁺		Overall grading on services ⁺	
			S	U	S	U
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	4	4	0	4	0
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	4	1	1 [@]	3	0
Total :		12	9	1	11	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

- ⁺ The number of overall grading on facilities or services may not be the same as the number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services for each visit.
- [@] The visiting JPs considered that the centre seemed to be congested. Please refer to the last paragraph of Part C for details.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made nine suggestions/comments of the following categories during their visits –

Category of comments/suggestions		Number of comments/suggestions in 2016	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises)	6	(67%)
(ii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of more diversified training and outdoor activities, etc.)	2	(22%)
(iii)	Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	1	(11%)
Total :		9	

For category (i) concerning the physical environment of the centres, JPs commented that the buildings were generally old and upgrading works required. DH responded that they would continue to render necessary assistance and support in processing funding requests of the centres for the necessary resources.

Under category (ii): training programmes and recreational activities, JPs recommended the centre to arrange more diversified training programmes, hobby classes and outdoor activities for the inmates. DH responded that the centre had daily routine timetable comprising different educational and vocational classes for the inmates. The Centre would apply for necessary resources for arranging other programmes and DH would render support and assistance.

Under category (iii): channels of complaints and handling of complaints, JPs recommended the centres to update the notice to inform inmates that they could lodge their complaints to JPs if they so wish. The centre had revised the notice accordingly.

Regarding JPs' comment that the Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre was in need of repair and the dormitory seemed to be congested, the institution has attempted to bid funding from various sources for repairs and renovation work. DH would continue to render necessary assistance and support in the process.

VII. Institutions of the Social Welfare Department/Non-governmental Organisations

A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	0
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	2	0	0	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	2	0	0	5
4.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	2	0	0	2
5.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	0
6.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	2	0	0	5
7.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	0
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	3	0	0	0
9.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	2	0	0	0
10.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	0
11.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	2	0	0	2
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind	1 [#]	0	0	4

[#] JP visits to the Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind resumed in August 2016 after the completion of renovation at the Home.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
13.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	2	0	0	0
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	2	0	0	1
15.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	2	0	0	2
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home	0 [^]	-	-	-
17.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	4	0	0	4
18.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	2	0	0	2
19.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	0
20.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	2	0	0	2
21.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	2	0	0	1
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	2	0	0	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	2	0	0	1
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	2	0	0	0
25.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	2	0	0	0
26.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	2	0	0	2
27.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	0	0	7
28.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	2	0	0	3
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	2	0	0	0
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	2	0	0	1

[^] JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation at the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in February 2017.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/ enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/ comments made by JPs
31.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home/ Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel [♦]	2	0	0	1
			0	0	1
32.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	2	0	0	3
Total :		74	0	0	49

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	2	2	0	2	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	2	2	0	2	0
4.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
5.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
6.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	2	2	0	2	0
7.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	2	0	2	0
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	3	3	0	3	0
9.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
10.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	2	0	2	0
11.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	2	2	0	2	0
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind	1 [#]	1	0	1	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, kitchen/canteen, recreational facilities and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including academic/prevocational training programmes and medical/management services) provided by the institutions concerned.

[#] JP visits to the Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind resumed in August 2016.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
13.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	2	1	1 [@]	2	0
15.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	2	2	0	2	0
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home	0 [^]	-	-	-	-
17.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	4	4	0	4	0
18.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	2	2	0	2	0
19.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	2	0	2	0
20.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	2	2	0	2	0
21.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	2	2	0	2	0
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	2	2	0	2	0
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
25.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	2	2	0	2	0
26.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	2	2	0	2	0
27.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	12	0	12	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

[^] JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation at the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in February 2017.

[@] The visiting JPs considered the facilities ageing. Please refer to the last paragraph of Part C for details.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
28.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	2	2	0	2	0
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
31.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home ^Δ	2	2	0	2	0
	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel ^Δ		2	0	2	0
32.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	2	2	0	2	0
Total :		74	75	1	76	0

Key : S - Satisfactory
 U – Unsatisfactory

^Δ Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made 49 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2016	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, etc.)	22	(45%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	13	(27%)
(iii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	5	(10%)
(iv)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	4	(8%)
(v)	Others	5	(10%)
Total :		49	

In response to JPs' comments under category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment, institutions concerned had carried out renovation works including replacing broken tiles and installing handrails for all beds. With a view to creating a cozy and relaxed atmosphere, the institutions had used home-like facilities and colourful decorations in dormitories. The Guardian Visiting Room has also been decorated to provide a warm and friendly environment to facilitate parent-child communication. Besides, the dining hall had been installed with air-conditioners to provide a comfortable environment for the residents in hot and humid weather. As regards the wear and tear of facilities, institutions concerned had taken steps to seek funding for necessary refurbishment work. As regards JP's concern about energy-saving, the institutions would continue to run energy-saving projects and monitor electricity consumption. Guidelines on energy-saving measures were provided to staff to enhance their awareness and promote environmental friendliness.

Regarding JPs' comments on the quality and quantity of meal under category (ii) service quality, the institutions concerned would continue to review the food variety. The menu would be revised on a monthly basis to reflect seasonal changes, and festive food items would be provided for residents. Special meals would be designed to meet the religious, health or other needs of

individual residents.

In response to JP's suggestion of enriching the resources of library under category (iii): training programmes and recreational activities, the institutions concerned had followed up with Leisure and Cultural Services Department for loan and donation of books. Regarding JP's concern on vocational training courses, institutions has all along arranged suitable training courses for residents taking into account their interest, competency and the job market situation in Hong Kong. Talks and site visits were also provided for residents. Apart from job skills training, different outings and volunteers' activities had been arranged for residents to meet their social and development needs.

As for manpower planning under category (iv), the institutions had strengthened staff training by providing diversified training programmes in, for instance, counselling skills. To maintain stable manpower resources, the institutions would review the recruitment policy and implement measures including offering sound wages and transport services to reduce staff wastage and attract potential candidates.

Under category (v): others, a JP recommended fostering communication with HA. The institutions would continue to maintain close liaison with HA and share useful medical information to facilitate daily care of residents who had been discharged from hospitals. In response to JPs' suggestion of providing information and statistics on the nature of complaints received and how they were handled before touring around the institution, relevant information had been added in the introductory presentation to JPs accordingly.

JPs commented that the building of Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel was ageing. They noticed some leakage of water in the classroom, the toilet partition was worn out, and the floor tiles of the kitchen were broken. Immediate minor renovation work was conducted by the hostel to rectify the water leakage problem in the classroom, strengthen the toilet partition and replace the broken floor tiles in the kitchen. As the JPs also noticed fungus on the wall and the floor of the kitchen being wet and slippery, the hostel paid extra attention and efforts to clean up fungus in the hostel and mop the floor of the kitchen especially during the humid weather. In addition, Lotteries Fund had been approved to refurbish the hostel premises, and the hostel is arranging a contractor to proceed with the refurbishment works. In the longer run, the hostel (including the school on site) will be reprovisioned to purpose-built premises in Tuen Mun district. The new premises are under construction and scheduled for completion in 2019. On the JPs' advice, the hostel had also arranged more books in the activity areas for all the residents.