

during, the job evaluation exercise were of current validity and could not be related back to 1988;

- (c) the 5% pay increase proposed by the Rennie Committee for the rank of Chief Superintendent and equivalent, was intended to provide headroom for increases for the ranks immediately below only. It should not be interpreted as part of a pay review for this rank; and
- (d) we were informed that the Ross Committee recommendations on salaries for the heads of the disciplined services, the levels of which served as a ceiling for the rest of the disciplined services directorate, would be implemented with effect from 1 October, 1989. Backdating salaries for directorate ranks below heads of departments to 1 April, 1988 would result in the disruption of the differential between heads and their deputies for a period of 18 months, which would be unacceptable.

3.26 We advised the Governor in February, 1990 that new pay scales for directorate ranks in the disciplined services should be backdated to 1 October, 1989, in line with the implementation date for the Ross Committee recommendations. The heads of the disciplined services were informed of our advice to the Governor later the same month.



Visit to Police Headquarters in April, 1989.

**Pay for the Rank and File
in the Disciplined Services**

3.27 Between March and July, 1990, the Commissioner of Correctional Services, the Commissioner of Customs and Excise, the Commissioner of Police, the Director of Fire Services and the Director of Immigration submitted requests to us to revise the pay scales of non-directorate staff in their services. At the request of the Administration, we agreed first to consider the pay for the rank and file in the disciplined services and then to deal with the Officer cadre.

3.28 During our deliberations, we took into consideration the submissions received, the representations made by the services and staff associations at Sub-Committee meetings, and a large number of factors, such as qualifications, skills and knowledge, physical requirements, individual responsibility, scope and complexity of work, discretion/freedom to act, stress, hardship, danger, discipline, restriction on freedom, social segregation, hours of work, unpredictable calls, shift patterns, intensity of effort and problems related to the future. We evaluated these factors and considered the duties and responsibilities of each rank in each of the services.

3.29 We noted that in its Second Report on the 1989 Salary Structure Review, the Standing Commission had recommended, inter alia, that -

- (a) there should be a common benchmark at MPS 5 (new MPS 1) for all grades which do not require a full School Certificate; and
- (b) the benchmark for grades which require a full School Certificate for entry should be revised from MPS 5 (new MPS 1) to MPS 7 (new MPS 3).

3.30 The rank and file in the disciplined services are also recruited at the School Certificate level and below. We, therefore, considered it appropriate to apply the new benchmarks recommended by the Standing Commission to the disciplined services. In order to maintain the competitiveness of the starting salary in the disciplined services in relation to the rest of the civil service, we considered that the pay advantage which the disciplined services enjoyed over the general civil service on 1 October, 1989 should be maintained by adjusting the existing entry points of the disciplined services pay scales by an amount sufficient to maintain the then dollar pay advantage, which ranged from \$420 to \$590.

3.31 We considered that our proposals for new education benchmarks should not be applied to other recruitment ranks whose entry requirements are different or whose starting pay is substantially higher than the normal

entry pay specified at this level. In other words, Instructors (Correctional Services), Senior Firemen (Control) and the RHKAAF ranks would not be affected.

3.32 We also considered whether the existing four entry points for recruitment ranks should be reduced to two, in line with the recommendations of the Standing Commission for the general civil service. We noted, however, that the disciplined services recruit from candidates with a wide range of educational qualifications. In order to retain some of the flexibility which the disciplined services enjoy, we concluded that the existing four entry points should be reduced to three, by introducing one common benchmark for candidates with qualifications below Form 5 with three subjects, as follows -

- (a) minimum point - up to completion of Form 5;
- (b) second point - Form 5 with three subjects at Grade E or above in the Hong Kong Certificate of Education; and
- (c) third point - Form 5 with five subjects, including English, at Grade E or above in the Hong Kong Certificate of Education.

3.33 The combined effects of the new education benchmarks and the reduction from four to three entry points for recruitment ranks on the existing pay scales for disciplined service staff are set out at Appendix H for Assistant Officers II (Correctional Services), Customs Officers, Firemen and Ambulancemen; at Appendix I for Immigration Assistants; at Appendix J for Assistant Commission Against Corruption Officers and Commission Against Corruption Investigators (Main and Attendant streams); and at Appendix K for Police Constables. As a consequence of applying the new education benchmarks, we found it necessary to renumber the existing Police and GDS(R) Pay Scales and the ICAC Salary Scale. We took the opportunity to introduce minor adjustments to the pay scales to produce more even incremental increases.

3.34 We advised that the revised pay scales should be implemented with effect from 1 October, 1989, in line with the implementation date for the new education benchmarks for the general civil service.

3.35 Based on our evaluation, we also concluded that an additional pay improvement should be awarded to Junior Police Officers in order to recognise their heavier and wider range of responsibilities. We considered the following pay improvements appropriate -

- (a) approximately two increments for Police Constables at the lower end of their pay scale and one and a half increments for those at the top;

- (b) approximately one and a quarter increments for Police Sergeants; and
- (c) approximately one and a quarter increments for Station Sergeants at the bottom end of their pay scale and one increment for those at the top end.

3.36 The new pay scale for Junior Police Officers, incorporating both the benchmark improvements and these additional pay improvements, is set out at Appendix L. We advised that the additional pay improvements for Junior Police Officers should be implemented from a current date, since our evaluation was of current validity. We also advised that serving officers should transfer to the new pay points in accordance with the normal civil service conversion arrangements.

3.37 We advised the Governor along these lines in September, 1990. The Administration accepted our recommendations and the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council agreed that the revised pay scales for the rank and file in the disciplined services, including Junior Police Officers, should be implemented with effect from 1 October, 1989 and the pay improvements for the Junior Police Officers should be introduced with effect from 1 October, 1990. The disciplined services were informed of our advice to the Governor in October, 1990.

Pay for the Officer Cadre in the Disciplined Services

3.38 Having completed our work on the pay for the rank and file in the disciplined services, we then proceeded immediately to consider the requests for pay improvements for the Officer cadre, which formed part of the submissions we had received from the disciplined services between March and July, 1990 and which had been separated by us at the request of the Administration.

3.39 As in the case of the rank and file, we also conducted an evaluation of the duties and responsibilities of each rank level in the Officer cadre in each of the five major disciplined services. Based on the experience we gained during our evaluation of the rank and file, we decided to combine six factors which we used for the rank and file evaluation into three: stress and hardship combined as "hardship", because they are closely inter-related; restrictions on freedom and social segregation combined as "social segregation", because the effect of the former causes the latter; and hours of work and intensity of effort combined as "hours of work", because both factors were evaluated on the basis of similar data. We also took into consideration various other factors such as qualifications, skills and knowledge,

physical requirements, individual responsibility, scope and complexity of work, discretion/freedom to act, danger, discipline, unpredictable calls, shift patterns, and problems related to the future.

3.40 Based on our evaluation of the duties and responsibilities at each Officer rank level, the submissions received, and the representations made by the services and staff associations at Sub-Committee meetings, we concluded that, with the exception of the basic recruitment rank level (Inspector of Police and equivalent), the duties and responsibilities of the disciplined services are broadly comparable at each rank level. We, therefore, considered that their pay should reflect this. Since staff in the Correctional Services and Customs and Excise Departments enjoyed a one to two-point lead in pay at these rank levels, we concluded that the pay for ranks above the basic recruitment rank level in the Police Force and the Fire Services and Immigration Departments should be brought up onto par with equivalent ranks in the Correctional Services and Customs and Excise Departments.

3.41 At the recruitment level, (Inspectors of Police and equivalent), our evaluation placed Ambulance and Immigration Officers below staff of comparable ranks in the other services. Since the entry pay for these two ranks is lower than that for other services, we were satisfied that, by not changing the entry pay for ranks at this level, the existing pay relativities would be consistent with our evaluation. However, in keeping with our advice that above this level, Police, Ambulance, Fire and Immigration Officer ranks should be brought onto par with comparable ranks in the Correctional Services and Customs and Excise Departments, we concluded that the maximum pay for Ambulance and Immigration Officers should be brought onto par with the maximum pay for Officers in the Correctional Services Department and Inspectors in the Customs and Excise Department.

3.42 The proposed pay scales for Ambulance Officers are set out at Appendix M; for Fire Services Officers at Appendix N; for Immigration Officers at Appendix O; and for Police Officers at Appendix P.

3.43 We were conscious that in February, 1990, when we advised on pay for the directorate and ranks immediately below, we had recommended that there should be no increase in pay for Senior Superintendent and Superintendent of Police and equivalent ranks. However, we concluded then that, should the pay for the Inspectorate or equivalent ranks be increased as a result of subsequent evaluations, then the pay for Senior Superintendent and Superintendent of Police and equivalent ranks should be re-examined. Since we now proposed a change in pay for the Police Inspectorate and equivalent ranks in the Fire Services and Immigration Departments, our proposed pay adjustments for Senior Superintendent and Superintendent of Police and

equivalent ranks in the Immigration and Fire Services Departments are not inconsistent with our earlier advice on pay for senior officers in the disciplined services.

3.44 Although the ICAC and the RHKAAF did not make submissions on pay, we considered that the proposed changes should apply equally to these two services in the same manner as for equivalent ranks in the other services.

3.45 Because of the loose relationship between the pay scales of the ICAC and the Police Force, we concluded that the pay scales for Officer ranks in the ICAC should be revised in the same manner as for equivalent ranks in the Police Force. The proposed pay scale for the Commission Against Corruption Officers is set out at Appendix Q and for the Commission Against Corruption Controllers at Appendix R.

3.46 Having regard to the principle of broadbanding, we considered that where Officer ranks in the RHKAAF have common minimum and maximum pay points with other ranks in the disciplined services, their pay scales should be revised in the same way as the other disciplined services. However, we considered that -

- (a) there should be no change to the maximum point on the Senior Technical Officer pay scale in order to maintain the existing one-point pay differential between the ranks of Senior Pilot and Senior Technical Officer; and
- (b) although the rank of Chief Flight Technician does not have common maximum and minimum points with ranks in the other disciplined services, the maximum pay point for Chief Flight Technician should be increased by two points in order to maintain the internal relativity between the maximum of this rank and Senior Air Crewman and Pilot II ranks.

3.47 The proposed pay scale for RHKAAF officers in the Flying Squadron is set out at Appendix S and for officers in the Engineering Squadron at Appendix T.

3.48 Since the disciplined services made submissions to the Standing Committee on pay for both their rank and file and Officer cadres, and we considered them separately at the request of the Administration, we concluded that the pay increases proposed for the Officer cadre should be introduced with effect from the same date as for the Junior Police Officers i.e. 1 October, 1990. We also concluded that serving officers should transfer to their new pay points in accordance with the normal civil service conversion arrangements.

3.49 During our deliberations on pay for both the rank and file and the Officer cadre, a number of matters were brought to our attention. During discussions with the

disciplined services, we were told that the Correctional Services and Customs and Excise Departments were awarded their pay lead over the other services by the Rennie Committee because they did not have either a through-scale linking the first two ranks or a directorate rank on point 1 of the General Disciplined Services (Commander) (GDS(C)) Pay Scale. Although we considered these to be separate issues, and that through-scales should not be extended to other disciplined services, we were sympathetic towards proposals to improve the organisation structure in departments where necessary. We advised, therefore, that the Administration should give priority to requests from the disciplined services for the creation of a new rank at point 1 on the GDS(C) Pay Scale.

3.50 We advised the Governor along these lines in December, 1990. The disciplined services were informed of our advice to the Governor later the same month.

3.51 As part of their submissions on pay, the Commissioner of Correctional Services and the Commissioner of Police also proposed changes to long service increments. The Commissioner of Correctional Services proposed that the existing long service increments should be abolished and replaced by payment of incentive increments every three years to Assistant Officers I and Assistant Officers II who are on the maximum of their pay scales. The Commissioner of Police requested a third long service increment and the payment of the first two increments earlier, so that the increments would be paid after 12, 15 and 18 years of service rather than after 18 and 25 years. We did not support these proposals and considered that the existing provision and eligibility criteria for long service increments should continue.

3.52 The last comprehensive pay review for the civil service as a whole was conducted in 1979. A separate pay structure review for the disciplined services was carried out by the Rennie Committee in 1988, as a result of which a pay structure review for the rest of the civil service was considered necessary. The Standing Commission completed this review in December, 1990. The Rennie Committee recommendations were accepted by the Government on the understanding that a number of objections from the disciplined services would be considered by the Standing Committee. We have addressed these objections during 1989 and 1990; we also advised the Governor on pay for the directorate officers in the disciplined services in February, 1990; for the rank and file in September, 1990; and for the Officer cadre in December, 1990. Accordingly, in December, 1990, we also advised the Governor that there should be no more pay reviews for the foreseeable future for the disciplined services and that the cycle which began with the Rennie Committee should now be brought to a close.

3.53 For completeness, the current pay scales for the disciplined services are set out at Appendices U and V and the pay scales for each rank at Appendices W and X.