
2020 Annual Report on Justices of Peace Visits

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

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE VISITS

2020 Annual Report

This Annual Report provides an account of the work of Justices of the Peace (JPs) in the year 2020. The JPs visited designated institutions under the JP visit programme, handled complaints from persons in custody, 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 2020, 70 persons⁽¹⁾ were appointed as JPs, with 27 of them as Official JPs and 43 as Non-official JPs. As at 31 December 2020, there were 323 Official JPs and 1 450 Non-official JPs. An up-to-date list of JPs is available in the JPs website (<https://www.info.gov.hk/jp>).

FUNCTIONS OF JP^s

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

- (a) to visit custodial institutions or 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

⁽¹⁾ While 66 JP appointments were published in the gazette on 1 October 2020, the remaining four JP appointments were gazetted on 6 November 2020.

- (d) to perform such other functions as may be 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 2020, there were 112⁽²⁾ institutions under the JP visit programme. Statutory visits to 38 institutions were conducted on a fortnightly, monthly or quarterly basis while visits to 74 institutions were arranged on an administrative basis once every quarter or every six months. The list of institutions under the JP visit programme in 2020 is at **Annex A**.

7. In 2020, JPs conducted 482⁽³⁾ visits to 112 institutions. On average, Non-official JPs⁽⁴⁾ each conducts one visit per annum while each Official JP conducts three visits each year.

8. In view of the COVID-19 pandemic and on the advice of relevant departments/organisations, statutory visits to the custodial wards of hospitals under the management of Correctional Services Department (CSD) and psychiatric hospitals under Hospital Authority (HA), and non-statutory visits to institutions under HA, Department of Health (DH), Home Affairs Department (HAD) and Social Welfare Department (SWD) have been temporarily suspended while the Emergency Response Level of the Preparedness and Response Plan for Novel Infectious Disease of Public Health Significance remains in force. The Government shall continue to keep the situation under review and make appropriate adjustment to the JP visit arrangement having regard to the development of the pandemic.

VISIT ARRANGEMENTS

9. JP visits to custodial institutions are conducted under the respective legislation. For example, visits to prisons of CSD are provided

⁽²⁾ Including Cape Collinson Correctional Institution which was closed in early November 2020.

⁽³⁾ In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

⁽⁴⁾ Excluding those who are exempted from visiting duties because of old age, health or other reasons.

for under the Prison Rules (Cap. 234A), visits to psychiatric hospitals under the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136), visits to detention centres of ICAC and Immigration Department (ImmD) 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 SWD 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. Furthermore, visits to hospitals of HA, institutions for drug abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) under the purview of DH, welfare institutions under the purview of SWD, and charitable organisation providing social services under the purview of HAD are arranged on an administrative basis at a quarterly or half-yearly interval.

10. 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.

11. 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 JPs Secretariat provides the visiting JPs with reports on outstanding complaints made by inmates of the institutions concerned so that the JPs may follow up on those complaints or other issues during their visits.

12. 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.

13. Each year, the JPs 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 November 2020. 48 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

14. 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.

15. Complaints that concern treatment of persons in custody in CSD institutions are generally referred to the Complaints Investigation Unit⁽⁵⁾ (CIU) for full investigation. For check and balance, the Correctional Services Department Complaints Committee⁽⁶⁾ (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 in writing 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⁽⁷⁾ (CSDCAB) within 14 days. CSDCAB will

⁽⁵⁾ The Complaints Investigation Unit (CIU) is an independent establishment 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. CIU will endeavour to complete its investigation of a complaint within 18 weeks.

⁽⁶⁾ 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.

⁽⁷⁾ The CSD Complaints Appeal Board (CSDCAB) is chaired by Deputy Commissioner of Correctional Services and comprises non-official members from outside CSD who are familiar with the operations of CSD. At present, 27 out of 31 non-official members of CSDCAB are Non-official JPs.

handle appeals against the findings endorsed by CSDCC and make final decision on the appeal cases.

16. CSD will inform JPs of the outcome of all complaints in writing after the cases have been concluded (i.e. after the completion of investigation by the institution management or CIU and any appeal process thereafter). 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. In cases where the complaint has been referred to The Ombudsman, the Office of The Ombudsman will contact the complainant directly. CSD will inform the JPs if the investigation outcome of The Ombudsman is related to CSD. For cases referred to the Police, CSD will inform the JPs of the investigation outcome of the Police in writing when it is available to CSD.

17. 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.

18. For non-CSD 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

19. In 2020, 134 complaints were received during JP visits, as compared with 190 received in 2019. Majority of these complaints⁽⁸⁾ were related to treatment and welfare (41%) and services provided by the institution (26%). Having conducted on-site inquiry during their visits, the JPs who received the complaints directed that no further action be taken on 34 of the 134 complaints. 55 complaints were referred by the JPs to the

⁽⁸⁾ CSD classifies complaints as any verbal or written expression of dissatisfaction, whereas requests are made to obtain assistance from the Department.

⁽⁹⁾ In view of the nature and complication involved in 40 complaints (representing 40% of the 100 cases that required follow-up action) received during JP visits in 2020 (relating to the conduct of staff, unfair treatment, etc.), the department has to seek inputs from various parties to conduct investigation. Hence, it has taken more than one month to follow up the complaints.

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 45 complaints, 39 were referred to the CIU of the CSD for investigation and six were referred to other relevant government departments for handling. 60 (60%) of the 100 complaints that required further action were followed up within one month⁽⁹⁾ (as compared to 59% in 2019). A summary of the statistics is in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Number and category of complaints received in 2020

Category of complaints	Number of complaints in 2020	(%)
(i) Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	55	(41%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	35	(26%)
(iii) Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. use of impolite language, etc.)	14	(10%)
(iv) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	7	(5%)
(v) Disciplinary action (e.g. unfair disciplinary proceedings, improper award of punishments, etc.)	6	(5%)
(vi) Complaints against other departments/organisations	6	(5%)
(vii) Others	11	(8%)
Total :	134	

REQUESTS/ENQUIRIES RECEIVED

20. In 2020, 529 requests/enquiries were received during JP visits, as compared with 452 received in 2019. Majority of these requests were for assistance related to early discharge (67%) and services provided by the institution (13%). All requests/enquiries (same as 2019) were followed up within one month. A summary of the statistics is in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Number and category of requests/enquiries received in 2020

Category of requests/enquiries	Number of requests/enquiries in 2020	(%)
(i) Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	354	(67%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	69	(13%)
(iii) Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	62	(12%)
(iv) Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, enquiry about medical appointment at outside hospital, etc.)	25	(5%)
(v) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	7	(1%)
(vi) Others	12	(2%)
Total :	529	

SUGGESTIONS/COMMENTS MADE BY JPs

21. In addition to receiving complaints/requests/enquiries, the visiting JPs are required to record in the JP Visit Logbook their assessment as well as suggestions/comments on the facilities and services provided by 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 are also invited to provide an overall grading on the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. JPs' assessment, 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.

22. As reflected in the Visit Logbooks, JPs were generally satisfied with the overall facilities and services provided by the institutions. Most of them provided “satisfactory” grading on facilities and services⁽¹⁰⁾. In 2020, JPs made 73 suggestions/comments, as compared with 199 in 2019. 93% of suggestions/comments (as compared to 56% in 2019) were followed up within one month⁽¹¹⁾. A summary of the statistics is in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Number and category of suggestions/comments made in 2020

Category of suggestions/comments	Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
(i) Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	25	(35%)
(ii) Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	17	(23%)
(iii) Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	9	(12%)
(iv) Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	3	(4%)
(v) Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	3	(4%)
(vi) Others	16	(22%)
Total :	73	

23. 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**.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Out of the 482 visits, JPs attending 478 visits (99%) and 479 visits (99%) considered the services and facilities satisfactory respectively. JPs attending the remaining visits did not provide an overall grading.

⁽¹¹⁾ Some 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 some of the suggestions/comments.

24. 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

25. 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 the 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
December 2021

List of Institutions under JP Visit Programme in 2020

I. Statutory Visits

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned* have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
A. Prisons/correctional institutions/half-way house for adults offenders			
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	Fortnightly	CSD
5.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
6.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution ⁽²⁾	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/half-way houses for young offenders			
16.	Bauhinia House ⁽⁵⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
17.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution ⁽⁶⁾	Monthly	CSD
18.	Lai King Correctional Institution ⁽¹⁾	Fortnightly	CSD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
19.	Phoenix House ⁽⁴⁾	Monthly	CSD
20.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
21.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution ⁽⁷⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
C. Correctional institutions for drug addicts			
22.	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre ⁽⁸⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
23.	Lai Sun Correctional Institution ⁽⁸⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
24.	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution ⁽³⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
D. Rehabilitation centres			
25.	Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre ⁽¹⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
26.	Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁷⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
27.	Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁴⁾	Monthly	CSD
28.	Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre ⁽⁵⁾	Fortnightly	CSD
E. Detention centres of ICAC and ImmD			
29.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	Fortnightly	ImmD
30.	Independent Commission Against Corruption Detention Centre	Fortnightly	ICAC
31.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	Quarterly	ImmD
F. Psychiatric hospitals*			
32.	Castle Peak Hospital	Monthly	HA
33.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	Monthly	HA
34.	Kwai Chung Hospital	Monthly	HA
35.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	Monthly	HA
36.	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 home, places of refuge, probation home and reformatory school of SWD			
37.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	Quarterly	SWD
38.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	Monthly	SWD

Notes:

- (1) Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital (No. 1), Lai King Correctional Institution (No. 18) and Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 25) are to be jointly visited.
- (2) Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital (No. 2) and Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution (No. 6) are to be jointly visited.
- (3) Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution (No. 3) and Nei Kwu Correctional Institution (No. 24) are to be jointly visited.
- (4) Pelican House (No. 7), Phoenix House (No. 19) and Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre (No. 27) are to be jointly visited.
- (5) Tai Lam Centre for Women (No. 12), Bauhinia House (No. 16) and Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 28) are to be jointly visited.
- (6) Cape Collinson Correctional Institution (No. 17) was closed in early November 2020 and no JP visit has been arranged thereto since then.
- (7) Sha Tsui Correctional Institution (No. 21) and Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre (No. 26) are to be jointly visited.
- (8) Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre (No. 22) and Lai Sun Correctional Institution (No. 23) are to be jointly visited.

Key :

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

II. Non-statutory Visits

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
A. Institutions for drug abusers of Non-governmental Organisations			
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	Half-yearly	DH
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	Half-yearly	DH
B. Hospitals with accident and emergency services			
5.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
6.	Caritas Medical Centre	Half-yearly	HA
7.	Kwong Wah Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
8.	North District Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
9.	North Lantau Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
10.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
11.	Pok Oi Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
12.	Prince of Wales Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
13.	Princess Margaret Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
14.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
15.	Queen Mary Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
16.	Ruttonjee Hospital ⁽⁹⁾	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
17.	St. John Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
18.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
19.	Tuen Mun Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
20.	United Christian Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
21.	Yan Chai Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
C. Psychiatric hospital			
22.	Siu Lam Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
D. Other hospitals			
23.	Bradbury Hospice	Half-yearly	HA
24.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	Half-yearly	HA
25.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	Half-yearly	HA
26.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	Half-yearly	HA
27.	Grantham Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
28.	Haven of Hope Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
29.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
30.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
31.	Kowloon Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
32.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	HA
33.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
34.	Shatin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
35.	Tai Po Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
36.	Tang Shiu Kin Hospital ⁽⁹⁾	Half-yearly	HA
37.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
38.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
39.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
40.	Tung Wah Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
41.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
E. Residential services for children and youths of Non-governmental Organisations			
42.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	Half-yearly	SWD
43.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
44.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
45.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
46.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
47.	Society of Boys’ Centres – Chak Yan Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
48.	Society of Boys’ Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
49.	Society of Boys’ Centres – Shing Tak Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
50.	Society of Boys’ Centres – Un Chau Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
51.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
F. Day and residential units for people with disabilities of SWD/Non-governmental Organisations			
52.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
53.	Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong – Home of Love – Yung Shing Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
54.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
55.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
56.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	Half-yearly	SWD
57.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	Half-yearly	SWD
58.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind	Half-yearly	SWD
59.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	Half-yearly	SWD
60.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home	Half-yearly	SWD
61.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
62.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	Half-yearly	SWD
63.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	Half-yearly	SWD
64.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
65.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	Half-yearly	SWD
66.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel ⁽¹⁰⁾	Half-yearly	SWD
	G. Residential care homes for the elderly of Non-governmental Organisations		
67.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD
68.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
69.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	Half-yearly	SWD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
70.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council Limited – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
71.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
72.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home ⁽¹⁰⁾	Half-yearly	SWD
73.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD
H. Charitable organisation providing social services			
74.	Po Leung Kuk	Quarterly	HAD

Notes:

- (9) Ruttonjee Hospital (No. 16) and Tang Shiu Kin Hospital (No. 36) are to be jointly visited.
- (10) Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel (No. 66) and Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home (No. 72) 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 2018 to 2020**

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		
	2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020
Institutions of Correctional Services Department	29	28 ⁽¹⁾	28 ⁽⁵⁾	414	399	391	187	155	114	101	105	88	32	27	18
Hospitals of Hospital Authority	42	42	42	154	131 ⁽⁶⁾	5	14	23	4	75	83	19	98	99	7
ICAC Detention Centre	1	1	1	24	24	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	2
Detention Centres of Immigration Department	2	2	2	28	28	25	3	12	16	218	260	422	5	9	17
Po Leung Kuk	1	1	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutions for Drug Abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations under the purview of Department of Health	4	4	4	12	8 ⁽⁷⁾	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	1
Institutions of Social Welfare Department/ Non-governmental Organisations	33	34 ^{(2), (3), (4)}	34	75	76	36	0	0	0	2	3	0	70	59	28
Total :	112	112	112	711	670	482⁽⁸⁾	204	190	134	397	452	529	223	199	73

(1) Excluding Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution which was decanted in June 2018.

(2) Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong – Home of Love – Yung Shing Hostel has been included under the JP visit programme since January 2019.

(3) JP visits to the Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel were temporarily suspended from July to December 2019 due to re-provisioning of the Hostel to Tuen Mun District. The re-provisioned Hostel was opened for JP visits in January 2020.

(4) JP visits to Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre were temporarily suspended from July to December 2019 due to renovation work at the Centre. The Centre has been re-opened for JP visits in January 2020.

(5) Including Cape Collinson Correctional Institution which was closed in November 2020.

(6) The frequency of JP visits to 11 hospitals has been adjusted from quarterly to half-yearly with effect from 1 January 2019.

(7) The frequency of JP visits to two institutions for drug abusers has been adjusted from quarterly to half-yearly with effect from 1 January 2019.

(8) In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been suspended since late January 2020.

Detailed Information on JP Visits to Individual Institutions

(from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2020)

I. Institutions of the Correctional Services Department (CSD)

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 [^]	10	0	0	0
2.	Hei Ling Chau Addition Treatment Centre/Lai Sun Correctional Institution [♦]	21	0	1	0
3.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution/Nei Kwu Correctional Institution [♦]	23	0	5	3
4.	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre	23	7	4	1
5.	Lai King Correctional Institution/Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre/Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital [○]	24	0	0	1
6.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	23	18	14	0
7.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution/Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital [♦]	24	0	2	0
8.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre [○]	12	0	0	1
9.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	22	0	0	1
10.	Pik Uk Prison	23	3	3	2
11.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution/Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre [♦]	23	0	0	2
12.	Shek Pik Prison	24	13	6	0
13.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	21	3	9	0
14.	Stanley Prison	24	69	34	0
15.	Tai Lam Centre for Women/Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre [○]	22	0	8	0
16.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	0	2	1
17.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	1	0	4
18.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	0	0	2
	Total :	391	114	88	18

[^] Cape Collinson Correctional Institution was closed in early November 2020 and no JP visit has been arranged thereto since then.

[♦] Denotes visits covering two institutions.

[○] Denotes visits covering three institutions.

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned[#] have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. All of them considered the facilities and services satisfactory.

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 [^]	10	10	0	10	0
2.	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre [△]	21	21	0	21	0
	Lai Sun Correctional Institution [△]		21	0	21	0
3.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution [△]	23	23	0	23	0
	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution [△]		23	0	23	0
4.	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre	23	23	0	23	0
5.	Lai King Correctional Institution/ Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre [△]	24	24	0	24	0
	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital ^{△#}		2	0	2	0
6.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	23	23	0	23	0
7.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution [△]	24	24	0	24	0
	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital ^{△#}		2	0	2	0
8.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre	12	12	0	12	0
9.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	22	22	0	22	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

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

[^] Cape Collinson Correctional Institution was closed in early November 2020 and no JP visit has been arranged thereto since then.

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

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
10.	Pik Uk Prison	23	23	0	23	0
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	21	21	0	21	0
14.	Stanley Prison	24	24	0	24	0
15.	Tai Lam Centre for Women [△]	22	22	0	22	0
	Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre [△]		22	0	22	0
16.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
17.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
18.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
Total :		391	461	0	461	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

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

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

In 2020, 114 complaints⁽¹⁾ 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 2020	(%)
(i) Treatment and welfare (e.g. shower and prayer arrangements, etc.)	54	(47%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. quality/quantity of food, medical care and treatment, etc.)	26	(23%)
(iii) Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. misbehaviour whilst on duty, unfair treatment, etc.)	13	(12%)
(iv) Disciplinary action (e.g. being placed on disciplinary report, unfair disciplinary hearing, etc.)	6	(5%)
(v) Complaints against other departments/organisations	5	(4%)
(vi) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. television in dayroom, liquid soap dispenser in toilet, ventilation in cell, etc.)	3	(3%)
(vii) Others (e.g. misbehaviour of other persons in custody, grudges amongst persons in custody, etc.)	7	(6%)
Total :	114	

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 –

⁽¹⁾ Among these 114 complaints, 52 cases were raised by two complainants, accounting for 46% of all complaints.

Category of complaints	Actions	Number of complaints in 2020	(%)
Complaints against other departments/ organisations (total: 5)	- Referred to other government departments or organisations for handling/follow-up	3	(3%)
	- Referred to institution management for providing explanation to the complainant	2	(2%)
Complaints against/related to CSD (total: 109)	- No further action as directed by JPs (23 due to lack of solid information for further investigation and nine due to JPs being satisfied that the complaints had already been addressed or dealt with by the institutions before the JP visits)	32	(28%)
	- Referred to institution management for investigation or follow-up (all cases resolved by explanations given or improvement measures made, of which both the JPs and complainants concerned were duly informed; and there was no further action as directed by JPs and no further request or other complaints raised by complainants)	35	(30%)
	- Referred to Police for investigation (complaints subsequently withdrawn by complainants)	3	(3%)
	- Referred to Complaints Investigation Unit (CIU) of CSD for investigation (one case referred by CIU to	39	(34%)

Category of complaints	Actions	Number of complaints in 2020	(%)
	institution management for follow-up and resolved; 16 cases investigated by CIU were concluded as unsubstantiated, false or curtailed; no further action taken on 22 cases as the complainants declined to provide information or stated that they had no complaint to lodge with CIU. Both JPs and the complainants were duly informed of the above investigation results. No further action was directed by JPs and no further request or other complaint was raised by the complainant)		
Total:		114	

Of the 114 complaints, five were related to category (v): complaints against other departments/organisations, including complaints about the treatment by Police, legal aid application, long waiting time for medical appointments provided by visiting practitioner of HA/dentist of DH, medicine prescription and professionalism of Medical Officers (MOs) of DH. The JPs who received the complaints directed that three cases be referred to the Complaints Against Police Office (CAPO) and DH for handling or follow-up⁽²⁾. The JPs also directed the institution management to provide explanation to the complainants of the remaining two cases⁽³⁾. The complainants were satisfied with the actions taken by the institution management, and all of them did not raise further complaint or request. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the follow-up actions taken and gave no further directive.

⁽²⁾ One complaint was about being assaulted by police officers during arrest, which had been referred to CAPO for investigation in early June 2020. Two complaints (raised by the same complainant) were related to the medicine prescription and professionalism of MOs of DH. The complainant subsequently withdrew his allegations by stating that his medical problem had been resolved by the institution management and thus he had no complaint to lodge.

⁽³⁾ One complaint was about the long waiting time for medical appointments provided by visiting practitioner of HA/dentist of DH; while the other was related to the dissatisfaction about application being rejected by the Legal Aid Department (LAD). As per the directive of the JPs, the established mechanism on medical appointment arrangement and relevant procedures on lodging appeal against the decision of LAD were explained to the complainants accordingly.

Apart from the above-mentioned five complaints against other departments/organisations, there were 109 complaints against/related to CSD, which were handled according to the circumstances of each case. The JPs concerned suggested no follow-up action for 32 of these complaints, of which 23 were made without solid information provided by the complainants to support further investigation. Regarding the remaining nine complaints⁽⁴⁾, the JPs were satisfied that the allegations had already been addressed or dealt with by the institution management before the JP visits.

As for the remaining 77 complaints against/related to CSD, 35 were related to quality/quantity of food, accommodation, prayer arrangement and grudges amongst persons in custody, etc. As per the directive of the JPs, the institution management handled these 35 complaints by explaining to every complainant the established mechanism and/or the follow-up arrangements that had been made. The complainants were satisfied with the actions taken by the institution management after listening to the explanations. As regards those complaints related to medical care and treatment, the MOs of the institutions had provided suitable medical treatments and/or referred the cases to public hospitals for handling with explanations rendered to the complainants. The JPs concerned were also informed of the follow-up actions taken by the institutions and did not raise any further inquiry. All of these 35 complaints were either resolved or suitably handled.

Three complaints about being injured/splashed with water by other persons in custody as well as alleged staff misconduct⁽⁵⁾ were referred by the institution management to the Police for investigation as per the directive of the JPs. However, all the complainants eventually withdrew the allegations during the interviews with the Police and thus the investigations were terminated. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the complainants' decision and did not raise any further comment.

⁽⁴⁾ Nine complaints had already been addressed and dealt with by the institutions concerned according to the laid-down handling procedures. Amongst them, four cases were on treatment-related issues such as noise disturbance in early morning and arrangements of phone call/shower/hand-in articles; two were on services provided by the institutions such as medical treatment and food quality; two were on the dissatisfaction towards the results of disciplinary hearings. The remaining case was about being assaulted by another person in custody. The JPs concerned were satisfied with the actions taken by the institution management and directed that no further follow-up action was required.

⁽⁵⁾ Amongst the three complaints, two allegations were raised by one complainant about being injured/splashed with water by other persons in custody. After checking with the complainant on the spot, the JPs concerned concluded that despite the institution management had already looked into the matter and disciplinary actions had been taken against the persons in custody involved, the complainant was not satisfied with the findings and expressed her wish to pass the case to the Police. As regards the remaining complaint against staff, the JPs concerned inquired into the matter on the spot and concluded that the case be referred to the Police for handling.

The remaining 39 complaints against/related to CSD were referred by JPs to CIU for actions. The allegations involved more complicated circumstances such as alleged staff misconduct. The complaints were handled according to the established complaints handling mechanism. Amongst the 39 complaints referred to CIU, one was related to the operation of the institution and had thus been referred to the institution management concerned for follow-up actions, and was resolved eventually. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the follow-up actions taken and did not raise any further inquiry.

As for the remaining 38 complaints investigated by CIU, 22 complaints could not be followed up further as the complainants declined to provide information on their accusation or stated that they had no complaint to lodge during their interviews with the CIU investigators. The complainants made no other complaint or request thereafter. The JPs concerned were duly informed and they gave no further directive. 16 cases investigated by CIU were concluded as unsubstantiated, false or curtailed. All complainants were informed of the investigation results and they did not raise further complaint or request. There had been no appeal lodged with the Correctional Services Department Complaints Appeal Board. The JPs concerned were also duly informed of the investigation results and gave no further directive.

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

88 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 2020	(%)
(i)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. requests for purchasing canteen items, making additional phone calls, change of work assignment and exercise arrangement, etc.)	48	(55%)
(ii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. requests for change of dietary scales, provision of food and medical attention, etc.)	16	(18%)
(iii)	Matters in relation to other departments/ organisations (e.g. requests for expediting the legal proceedings of court cases, enquiries about obtaining medical report from outside hospital, etc.)	16	(18%)
(iv)	Request for early discharge from institution	4	(5%)
(v)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (i.e. provision of additional TV sets in dayroom)	1	(1%)
(vi)	Others (e.g. expression of personal feelings, interpersonal relationship with other persons in custody, etc.)	3	(3%)
Total :		88	

The 48 requests/enquires made under category (i): treatment and welfare and the 16 requests made under category (ii): services provided by the institution were related to purchasing canteen items, making additional phone calls, change of work assignment and dietary scales, food provision, medical care and treatment, accommodation and exercise arrangements, etc. Having examined the nature of the requests/enquiries, the JPs concerned directed the institutions to provide explanations and/or assistance to the persons in custody concerned as appropriate. The requests related to medical care and treatments had been referred to MOs of the institutions/visiting specialists for assessment and recommendation. The

persons in custody concerned were satisfied with the explanations and assistance rendered by the institutions. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the actions taken and gave no further directive.

The 16 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 requests for expediting the legal proceedings of court cases, meeting with legal clerk for advice, referring cases to other law enforcement agencies or consulate, obtaining medical report from outside hospital, seeking dental treatment by visiting specialist of DH, etc. Having examined the nature of the requests, the JPs concerned concluded that no follow-up action was required for two of the requests. As for the remaining 14 requests, either referrals were made to the bodies concerned or explanations/assistance were given by the institution management. The persons in custody concerned were satisfied with the referrals made and/or the explanation/assistance rendered by the institution management. The JPs concerned were informed of the actions taken and gave no further directive.

The four requests under category (iv) were about requests for early discharge. Having examined the nature of the requests, the JPs concerned concluded that no follow-up actions were required for three of them. As for the remaining case, the JPs directed the institution management to provide the person in custody with explanation on the existing sentencing and discharge mechanism as well as psychiatric treatment as appropriate. The person in custody concerned was satisfied with the explanation and/or assistance rendered by the institution management. The JPs concerned were informed of the actions taken and gave no further directive.

The request under category (v): facilities and equipment provided by the institution was about installing additional TV sets in the dayroom. The institution management had explained to the JPs concerned about the prevailing guidelines and practices about the provision of TV sets in dayrooms for persons in custody. After listening to the explanation provided by the institution management, the JPs directed that no follow-up action was required. The person in custody concerned was subsequently interviewed by the institution management and given due explanation about the prevailing practice and arrangement, to which he showed understanding. The JPs concerned were informed of the actions taken and gave no further directive.

The last three requests under category (vi): others include expressing personal view about family and interpersonal relationship with other persons in custody during incarceration. The JPs concerned interviewed the persons in custody concerned on the spot and asked the institution management for background information of the requestors. They directed that one of the cases did not require follow-up while the remaining two should be followed up by the institution management concerned, either by rendering psychological/psychiatric treatment to the requestor(s) continuously and/or handling the relationship problem amongst the persons in custody. The requestors were satisfied with the actions taken by the institution management. The JPs concerned did not give further directive.

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

JPs made 18 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 2020	(%)
(i) Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. refurbishment of ageing premises/facilities, using online facilities/technology for service provision during pandemic, etc.)	8	(44%)
(ii) Training and rehabilitation programmes (e.g. provision of more vocational trainings/learning opportunities, etc.)	5	(28%)
(iii) Service quality (i.e. enhancement of library service, rebuilding relationship between persons in custody and their families, etc.)	2	(11%)
(iv) Others (i.e. enhancement on community education, promotion of public's acceptance of rehabilitated persons, etc.)	3	(17%)
Total :	18	

Nearly half of the suggestions were made under category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment. Some JPs suggested continuing to conduct regular maintenance or refurbishment works in institutions with ageing

facilities/premises. With an aim to ensuring a safe and healthy environment of the institutions, CSD has been implementing various measures to improve institutional facilities and optimise its daily operations, having regard to security and resource considerations. Inspections and maintenance of the facilities and premises within the institutions are conducted regularly in close collaboration with Architectural Services Department and Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD). Institutions concerned have timely reviewed their situation and upgraded ageing facilities/premises through reshuffling of resources and refurbishment works as appropriate. For instance, the installation of cell safety fans to improve the ventilation of single cells in Stanley Prison as well as the installation of CCTV with video analytic function at the sterile area of Shek Pik Prison were completed in 2020. Other upgrading works projects in progress included, amongst others, the installation of the Electric Locks Security System in Stanley Prison and non-redevelopment area of Tai Lam Centre for Women.

Some JPs suggested the use of online facilities/technology to organise activities/services for persons in custody during the COVID-19 pandemic. In view of the local pandemic development and echoing with the policy direction of the Government, CSD took every necessary, resolute and stringent measure to combat COVID-19, during which some of the face-to-face rehabilitative services and religious gatherings in institutions concerned had been temporarily suspended. Having said that, CSD remained steadfast in catering for the rehabilitation needs of persons in custody through all viable means, including but not limited to the introduction of various technologies to assist in the delivery of services. For example, having regard to the importance of spiritual fulfilment through religious services during the incarceration of persons in custody, the institutions concerned have been arranging the “Religious Time” every week to broadcast video provided by the religious organisations to provide continuous spiritual support to persons in custody. Besides, by integrating the video application and sports game programme, an online activity “Cyber Cycling” was launched on the Christmas eve of 2020 for persons in custody in Stanley Prison and their family members in Mongkok Counselling Centre. The rehabilitation activity was implemented with an aim to enhancing the participants’ family relationship as well as assisting them to cultivate a positive lifestyle. CSD would continue to explore the feasibility of introducing suitable technology, with regard to security and resource considerations, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons in custody, especially during the pandemic.

For category (ii): training and rehabilitation programmes, some JPs suggested providing more vocational training opportunities, especially practical

computer courses, for persons in custody to enhance their employability upon discharge. CSD has all along been collaborating with various training bodies such as the Employees Retraining Board, the Construction Industry Council and the Vocational Training Council to provide diversified and market-oriented vocational training courses to persons in custody, with regard to the local employment market situation. More than 40 market-oriented vocational training programmes are provided every year, covering diversified industries such as construction, business, food and beverage, logistic, retail, beauty care, environmental service and computer application, etc. Apart from the current Foundation Certificate Course in AutoCAD in Renovation Drawings, Computer Aided Design Course and 3D Interior Design Software Training Course, new courses in 3D Designing and Printing Skills, Virtual Reality Logistics Management and Specialty Cake Making were also provided to persons in custody. CSD would continue to review the vocational training programmes in institutions with regard to the penal regime, variation in characteristics of penal population, rehabilitative needs of persons in custody and availability of resources.

Some JPs suggested extending the psychological treatment programme “Mindfulness” to more institutions. The programme was first introduced in Nei Kwu Correctional Institution as a pioneer initiative in 2017, and extended to Hei Ling Chau Drug Addiction Treatment Centre in July 2020. CSD would explore the feasibility of extending “Mindfulness” to other institutions subject to the satisfactory result of the initiative and availability of resources.

For category (iii): service quality, some JPs suggested enhancing library services, such as increasing the number of English books. CSD has all along been encouraging persons in custody to cultivate interest in and spend their leisure time on reading. Libraries have been set up in various correctional institutions to provide persons in custody with suitable reading materials in different languages. The total collection of the libraries in correctional institutions now stands at over 110,000 copies of reading materials, amongst which 11% are English books. CSD also borrows books from public libraries to facilitate loans by persons in custody and replaces the borrowed books on a regular basis. CSD would continue to increase the quantity as well as categories of reading materials through direct procurement, accepting donations from outside organisations or individuals, etc. so as to cater for the different learning needs and reading interests of persons in custody.

Some JPs showed support for CSD’s initiative to rebuild the relationship between persons in custody and their family members. To encourage family

members' participation in the rehabilitation of persons in custody, CSD has all along been organising a series of family-engaged activities under "Rehabilitation Family Programme (RFP)" and "Inmate-parent Programme" at respective institutions. The family activity held in Tung Tau Correctional Institution under RFP was one of the examples. Through attending the sharing talks and doing craftworks in collaboration with family members, the participating persons in custody were given the opportunity to have better communication and closer interaction with their family members, thereby building a stronger bonding. Another example was the inmate-parent activity launched in Pik Uk Correctional Institution during Lunar New Year. With the assistance of volunteers from CSD and the Hong Kong Police Force, the participating young persons in custody made glutinous rice balls to convey their festive greetings to their family members, and in return received very motivational and supportive words from their families. CSD would continue to organise suitable activities with an aim to helping persons in custody to build closer relationship with their family members and improve their communication, so as to bolster their determination to start anew.

For category (iv): others, some JPs suggested enhancing the personal hygiene of both persons in custody and frontline staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. CSD has been adopting comprehensive prevention and disinfection measures to protect frontline staff and persons in custody, including distributing sufficient filter masks to all persons in custody, staff members and visitors, providing appropriate and adequate personal protective gears and equipment for staff members whilst on duty, and introducing various disinfection technology such as fogger specially used for aircraft, air purifiers with high efficiency particulate air filters, infra-red thermometer robots, ultraviolet disinfection robots, and ultra low volume fogging machines, etc.

In March 2020, CSD set up the Cleansing and Disinfection Task Force (Task Force) specialised in coordinating departmental resources as well as implementing relevant precautionary measures in fighting against COVID-19 in correctional facilities. On top of regular cleaning routine, Task Force members would carry out intensive cleaning and disinfection programmes, conduct regular site inspection to correctional facilities and provide feedbacks on anti-epidemic measures to institution management, etc. Regarding publicity and educational work, relevant educational posters have been displayed in institutions and pamphlets had been issued to all persons in custody and staff members to equip them with tips and knowledge to fight against the virus. CSD would continue to maintain close liaison with the Centre for Health Protection, taking its advice and updating the infection preventive measures with a view to providing a safe and

healthy custodial environment for persons in custody.

Some JPs showed support for CSD's publicity work to promote public's acceptance of rehabilitated persons and community education. Community acceptance is a crucial factor to facilitate the rehabilitated offenders to better integrate into the society after release. In recent years, CSD has been promoting the message of public support and acceptance to offender rehabilitation via different social media channels including CSD Facebook page, YouTube, radio and TV, etc. As regards community involvement, CSD has been actively providing community education to young people through the Rehabilitation Pioneer Project (RPP) which includes, amongst others, the activities of "The Reflective Path" and interactive musical drama "Own Your Life", etc. The RPP aims at cultivating the youths and the public to develop positive values, gain awareness of the dire consequences of committing crimes and help them become law-abiding citizens. The latest community education programme under the RPP was "Mission in Prison" launched in early January 2021. CSD would continue to reach out to the community to solicit public's acceptance of and support for offender rehabilitation.

II. Hospitals of the Hospital Authority (HA)

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

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	0	0	0	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	0	0	0	0
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	0	0	0	0
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	1	0	0	1
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	0	0	0	0
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	0	0	0	0
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	0	0	0	0
8.	Grantham Hospital	0	0	0	0
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	0	0	0	0
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	0	0	0	0
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	0	0	0	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	0	0	0	0
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	1	1	0	3
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	1	0	0	1
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	0	0	0	0
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	0	0	0	0
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	1	0	9	1
18.	North District Hospital	0	0	0	0
19.	North Lantau Hospital	0	0	0	0
20.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	0	0	0	0
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	0	0	0	0
22.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	1	3	10	1
23.	Pok Oi Hospital	0	0	0	0

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
24.	Prince of Wales Hospital	0	0	0	0
25.	Princess Margaret Hospital	0	0	0	0
26.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	0	0	0	0
27.	Queen Mary Hospital	0	0	0	0
28.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital♦	0	0	0	0
29.	Shatin Hospital	0	0	0	0
30.	Siu Lam Hospital	0	0	0	0
31.	St. John Hospital	0	0	0	0
32.	Tai Po Hospital	0	0	0	0
33.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	0	0	0	0
34.	Tuen Mun Hospital	0	0	0	0
35.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	0	0	0	0
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	0	0	0	0
37.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	0	0	0	0
38.	Tung Wah Hospital	0	0	0	0
39.	United Christian Hospital	0	0	0	0
40.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	0	0	0	0
41.	Yan Chai Hospital	0	0	0	0
	Total :	5	4	19	7

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. Out of the five visits, JPs considered the facilities and services for four visits (80%) satisfactory. JPs did not provide an overall grading on facilities and services for the remaining visit.

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	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	0	0	0	0	0
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	1	1	0	1	0
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	0	0	0	0	0
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	0	0	0	0	0
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Grantham Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	1	1	0	1	0
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	1	0	0	0	0
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	0	0	0	0	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 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
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	1	1	0	1	0
18.	North District Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
19.	North Lantau Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
20.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
22.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	1	1	0	1	0
23.	Pok Oi Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
24.	Prince of Wales Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
25.	Princess Margaret Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
26.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
27.	Queen Mary Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
28.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
29.	Shatin Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Siu Lam Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
31.	St. John Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
32.	Tai Po Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
33.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
34.	Tuen Mun Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
35.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
37.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
38.	Tung Wah Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
39.	United Christian Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
40.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
41.	Yan Chai Hospital	0	0	0	0	0
Total :		5	4	0	4	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.

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

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

Category of complaints	Number of complaints in 2020	(%)
(i) Services provided by the institution (e.g. application of restraint)	1	(25%)
(ii) Treatment and welfare (e.g. arrangement of treatment, provision of food)	1	(25%)
(iii) Complaint against other departments/organisations	1	(25%)
(iv) Others	1	(25%)
Total :	4	

All of the four complaints were lodged by psychiatric patients. Under category (i): services provided by the institution, a patient complained about being restrained for over ten hours. The patient was admitted to the hospital due to acute manic psychosis and had conflict with another patient. In view of his repeated aggressive acts, he was restrained and secluded in a separate room for four hours twice. HA confirmed that all detentions had been made in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136).

Under category (ii): treatment and welfare, a patient complained against a doctor for preferential treatment and considered that the hospital should not transferred him to another ward. Having reviewed the case, the JPs concerned considered the complaint unsubstantiated and directed that no follow-up action was required.

Under category (iii): complaint against other departments/organisations, a patient complained against the breast cancer operation she received in another hospital some years ago. The JPs concerned noted that the complaint was not related to her present admission and recommended the hospital to arrange follow-up consultation for her. The hospital had immediately arranged in-house medical check-up for the patient on the same day.

For category (iv): others, a patient claimed that a male patient had been sexually assaulted by another patient in the ward, and three patients claimed that they had also witnessed the assault. As per JPs' directive, the case was handled

according to the prevailing procedure of the hospital: family members of the patient concerned had been informed and the case was immediately reported to the Police for investigation and follow-up. The patient was interviewed by the Police on the same day. Besides, the patient and the suspected offender had been separated and put in different wards once the incident was made known to the hospital. Upon discharge from the hospital, the patient had been advised to contact Chai Wan Police Station for follow-up action. Nonetheless, the patient declined to seek assistance from the Police without disclosing any reason and the case was eventually closed by the Police. To avoid recurrence of similar incidents, the hospital concerned has implemented a series of preventive measures, including (a) reviewing guidelines relating to prevention of sexual offence; (b) displaying posters and notices relating to prevention of sexual offence in common areas and ward cubicles; (c) enhancing patient’s awareness through bi-weekly patient educational talk; and (d) enhancing staff alertness through departmental meeting and senior nurse meeting. The JPs concerned were duly informed of the follow-up actions taken and did not raise any further comment.

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

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

Category of requests/enquiries	Number of requests/enquiries in 2020	(%)
(i) Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	8	(43%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for medical treatment, etc.)	4	(22%)
(iii) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	2	(10%)
(iv) Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for outdoor activities, etc.)	2	(10%)
(v) Matters in relation to other departments/ organisations (e.g. request for public housing, etc.)	2	(10%)
(vi) Others	1	(5%)
Total :	19	

All requests under category (i): requests for discharge from hospitals, all cases were handled in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136). The requests had been reviewed by the case doctors and senior clinical staff. One patient was discharged from the hospital, and two would be discharged to half-way house. The remaining five were considered clinically not suitable for discharge and had been advised of the rights to raise their requests to the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

For the requests under category (ii): services provided by the institution, three were related to medical treatment. One patient requested gastrointestinal check-up and the hospital had scheduled a medical appointment for the patient accordingly. Another patient requested no injection and discharge with condition. The institution explained that the patient had not received antipsychotic injection for some years. Since she was uncooperative during treatment, the medical team could not rule out the possibility of resuming antipsychotic injection. The third patient requested removal of the physical restraint applied. The institution explained that physical restraint was applied at the initial stage of treatment for placing urethral catheter and to ensure effectiveness of treatment. As the condition of the patient became stable, the limb holders were subsequently removed. The urinary catheter was also removed as her condition improved. The patient of the last case requested to have dessert on weekly basis and his request had been conveyed to the catering department for consideration.

For category (iii): facilities and equipment provided by the institution, two patients requested more opportunities for making paper/hand crafts. The hospital concerned has arranged paper/hand craft activities in the monthly recovery-oriented programme accordingly.

Under category (iv): treatment and welfare, a patient requested outdoor activities. The patient was allowed to walk around in the hospital under the supervision of nurses on Saturdays. Another patient requested transferral to another ward. To avoid possible conflict with other patients, his request was acceded to.

The requests under category (v): matters in relation to other departments/organisations were related to public housing. One patient refused to be discharged to half-way house or shelter workshop and wished to retain his public housing unit. Due to lack of support from the patient's family, the medical team considered that hostel supervision would be more appropriate in view of the patient's condition. His case had been followed up by social worker. For the

other case, a patient requested fast-track processing of her public housing application. Her case had been referred to social worker for follow-up action.

For category (vi): others, a patient expressed her concern on study. She had applied for sick leave from the university upon admission to the hospital but only two weeks of sick leave had been granted. In view of the patient’s concern, a meeting had been arranged for the patient and her parents to discuss her future study and career plan. The hospital also encouraged the patient to take the initiative to contact and seek further advice from the counselling team of the university.

All JPs concerned had been informed of the follow-up actions taken by the hospital and raised no further questions.

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

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

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. replacement of sofa, etc.)	3	(44%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. set up of adolescent section)	1	(14%)
(iii)	Manpower planning (e.g. maintain close communication with frontline staff)	1	(14%)
(iv)	Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	1	(14%)
(v)	Others	1	(14%)
Total :		7	

Positive comment had been made by JPs under category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment. JPs were impressed by the “Mind Space”, a Mental Health Experience Museum which was put into service in 2020 with an aim to deepen public’s understanding of mental illness and allow visitors to experience psychiatric symptoms with virtual reality simulations. One JP

suggested that the podium garden in a psychiatric hospital should be re-opened after enhancing the safety facilities. While certain improvement works had been completed, the hospital had applied additional funding for further enhancement on the facilities. In response to JPs' suggestion on the replacement of sofa, arrangement had been made to complete the replacement within one week's time.

Under category (ii): service quality, a JP suggested the hospital to consider introducing an adolescent section for under-aged psychiatric patients. The provision of Children and Adolescent (C&A) service had been included in the annual plan of the hospital concerned in February 2020. It was expected that the C&A service would be made ready by October 2021.

Under category (iii): manpower planning, a JP was concerned about the manpower situation during hospital redevelopment and encouraged the hospital management to communicate more with frontline staff in order to understand their needs and develop a new mode of operation such as enhancing medical-social collaboration. The suggestions had been passed to the hospital management for consideration. Regular meetings were held between management and frontline staff to review service needs and address frontline issues. The concerns of frontline staff were taken into account when planning for hospital redevelopment. Hospital management would secure additional manpower to cater for future service expansion.

For category (iv): channels of complaints and handling of complaints, JPs suggested the hospital to put up notice informing patients of the channels for lodging complaints. In response to the JPs' comment, ward managers had been reminded to ensure that posters are displayed at prominent locations inside the hospital so that patients are well informed of their rights to complain and the channels available.

The comment under category (v): others is a positive feedback from JPs on the dedication and professionalism of staff.

III. Independent Commission Against Corruption (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	23	0	0	2

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

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institution. Out of the 23 visits, JPs considered the facilities and services for 22 visits (96%) satisfactory. JPs did not provide an overall grading on facilities and services for the remaining visit.

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities [†]		Overall grading on services [†]	
		S	U	S	U
ICAC Detention Centre	23	22	0	22	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.

† 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 suggestions/comments made by JPs

JPs made two suggestions/comments in the following category during their visits to ICAC Detention Centre –

Category of suggestions/comments	Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment, etc.)	2	(100%)

Whilst positive comments had been received by JPs in respect of the overall hygiene condition of the facilities, some JPs suggested improving the appearance of the toilet facilities as rust was found in some toilet bowls. In response to the JPs' suggestions, the rust had been removed and an epoxy coating had been applied. ICAC Detention Centre would keep the situation under review and upgrade the toilet facilities if necessary.

IV. Detention Centres of the Immigration Department (ImmD)

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	21	16	421	17
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	0	1	0
	Total :	25	16	422	17

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

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. All of them considered the facilities and services satisfactory.

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	21	21	0	21	0
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	4	0	4	0
	Total :	25	25	0	25	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 institutions concerned.

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

16 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 2020	(%)
(i) Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, etc.)	8	(50%)
(ii) Facilities and equipment (e.g. poor ventilation, etc.)	4	(25%)
(iii) Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. impolite attitude)	1	(6%)
(iv) Others	3	(19%)
Total :	16	

Under category (i): services provided by the institution, detainees complained against the medical treatment received at CIC, quality of food, provision of necessities, etc. According to prevailing arrangement, detainees would receive medical examination provided by MOs upon admission. Based on their medical examination results, MOs would arrange detainees to receive general or specialist treatment provided by public hospitals. CIC had explained to the JPs that appropriate medical services had all along been provided to the detainees. Concerning the complaint against the quality of food provided, CIC had explained to detainees that their diet had followed approved scales of nutritional values with regard to health and religious requirements. Senior officers would be responsible for ensuring that the quality and quantity of meals provided to detainees are of satisfactory standard and they would conduct spot check before delivery of meals. Concerning detainees' complaints relating to the provision of necessities such as slippers, bed sheet, soap and toothpaste, arrangements had all along been made by CIC to take care of the personal need of all detainees. To follow up, necessary assistance had also been rendered to the detainees concerned after the JP visits.

Under category (ii): facilities and equipment, some detainees complained about the illumination level and lack of space for exercise. Due consideration had been taken to balance the personal needs of detainees and the security of CIC while designing the facilities of CIC. Concerning the complaints against the ventilation of single cell, CIC had enlisted the assistance of EMSD to install a fan outside the single cell to improve the ventilation.

For category (iii): staff attitude and conduct, a detainee lodged a complaint against a staff for being impolite to him. Acting on the allegation, interview was subsequently conducted with the staff concerned. There was no evidence indicating that the detainee was being treated impolitely. The detainee had withdrawn the complaint eventually.

For category (iv): others, a detainee complained about not being informed of the reason of his detention. Records revealed that the detainee had been informed of the reason and the latest position of his case on three occasions since his admission. After the JP visit, the detainee was once again interviewed by the case officer and informed of the reason of his detention and latest position of his case. Two detainees complained about the detention condition of Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre (MTKDC). While one of them had never been detained at MTKDC prior to his admission to CIC, the other detainee was admitted to MTKDC and transferred to CIC for further detention. MTKDC is a designated place of detention under the Immigration Service Ordinance (Cap. 331) and the Immigration Ordinance (Cap. 115). As per JPs' directive, the detainee concerned was interviewed by the welfare officer and explained of the treatment provided during his detention at MTKDC.

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

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

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2020	(%)
(i)	Request for early discharge/release on recognisance	342	(81%)
(ii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention)	49	(11%)
(iii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for discharge from in-centre Sick-bay, etc.)	12	(3%)

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2020	(%)
(iv)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. request for retrieving properties from the Police, etc.)	7	(2%)
(v)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for internet access, etc.)	4	(1%)
(vi)	Others	8	(2%)
Total :		422	

The 342 requests under category (i): request for early discharge/release on recognisance were mainly related to checking of case progress, request for interview by case officers, release on recognisance and early repatriation. These requests had been referred to relevant sections of ImmD for follow up.

The 49 requests under category (ii): services provided by the institution were mainly related to medical treatment. The detainees had been arranged to receive medical treatment and some had been referred to specialist clinics in public hospitals for treatment. Some detainees requested more choices of food and cold drinks, and the welfare officer had explained to them the prevailing arrangements.

For category (iii): treatment and welfare, some detainees had requested discharge from in-centre Sick-bay. Their requests had been conveyed to MOs for consideration, who later concluded that those detainees would have to remain under continual medical observation at the in-centre Sick-bay on medical ground. A detainee requested making long distance call to the Mainland and necessary assistance had been rendered to him. Another detainee requested sending out registered mail, and the welfare officer had acceded to the request.

For category (iv): matters in relation to other departments/organisations, some detainees requested retrieval of their properties from the Police. Those detainees had received their properties shortly after the JP visits. A detainee requested the appeal result against the refusal decision of his non-refoulement claim filed to the Torture Claims Appeal Board/ Non-refoulement Claims Petition Office. Another detainee requested filing an application for judicial review against the refusal decision of his non-refoulement claim. After the JP visits, those detainees were interviewed by the case officers and informed of the latest position of their cases. A detainee requested a complaint form to the Office of the

Ombudsman and it was provided to him on the same day after the JP visit. A detainee requested lodging a complaint against the Police and the contact means of the Complaints Against Police Office was provided to him accordingly.

For category (v): facilities and equipment provided by the institution, a detainee requested provision of cleaning tools. CIC explained that cleaning service for CIC has all along been provided by an outsourced cleaning service provider and cleaning tools were not normally provided to detainees for security reason. A detainee requested photocopying service and internet access. Due consideration had been taken to balance the personal needs of detainees and the security of CIC. To follow up the request, the welfare officer had explained to the detainee the prevailing arrangements and rendered necessary assistance to him. A detainee requested installation of additional fans in dayroom. The enhancement work had been completed in collaboration with EMSD.

For category (vi): others, a detainee requested his medical record in CIC. Necessary assistance had been rendered to the detainee in retrieving his medical record. A detainee requested proper record of his refusal of taking meal. MO of CIC had conducted medical examination for the detainee on a daily basis to closely monitor his health condition with proper records. CIC staff had also provided counselling service to the detainee concerned. A detainee made repeated requests for assistance to look for his lost properties. CIC had conducted a thorough investigation. There was no evidence indicating any of the detainee’s personal belongings were missing in CIC. The detainee was informed of the investigation result and he did not raise further request.

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 17 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to CIC –

Category of suggestions/comments	Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
(i) Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. carrying out maintenance works, etc.)	5	(29%)

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. provision of medical services, etc.)	2	(12%)
(iii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of more sports equipment, etc.)	2	(12%)
(iv)	Others	8	(47%)
Total :		17	

For category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment, JPs suggested upgrading the ventilation system. Arrangement had been made with EMSD to carry out improvement works by installing additional electric fans at various locations of CIC to enhance overall ventilation. In response to JPs' suggestion about carrying out maintenance works for certain areas at CIC, arrangement had been made with the Architectural Services Department to carry out the renovation work including repainting the walls and metal gates of detention cells and corridors.

As for service quality under category (ii), JPs expressed concern about the privacy of detainees during medical examination. According to CIC, medical privacy screen had been used for protecting the privacy of detainee. Taking into consideration the nature of the medical examination, the medical staff would continue to observe all of the privacy measures including closing the door of the medical consultation room or making use of the privacy screen during the examination. In addition, the medical examination should be conducted in the presence of a registered nurse of the same sex with the detainee. Some JPs suggested the medical services of CIC be provided by DH. CIC explained to the JPs concerned that the medical services had been provided by outsourced medical service provider instead of DH owing to the resource constraint of DH. All MOs in CIC are qualified doctors registered under the Medical Registration Ordinance (Cap. 161) while the registered nurse in CIC also hold valid practising certificates issued by the Nursing Council of Hong Kong under Nurses Registration Ordinance (Cap. 164). The JPs concerned gave no further directive. CIC has all along maintained close liaison with the outsourced medical service provider with a view to maintaining the medical service at a reasonable standard.

Under category (iii): training programmes and recreational activities, some JPs suggested providing more recreational activities and sports equipment to detainees. CIC explained to the JPs concerned that detainees were encouraged to

participate in a wide range of recreational activities including sports and chess, etc. Furthermore, some Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) had been arranging regular recreational and religious activities for detainees. CIC would continue to review the recreational activities for detainees taking into account their needs and the security of CIC. The JPs concerned were informed of the actions taken and gave no further directive.

For category (iv): others, JPs suggested providing assistance to a detainee's wife through SWD or NGOs. The detainee was released on recognisance and humanitarian assistance would be provided to him and his wife by NGO commissioned by SWD. Some JPs suggested reviewing the existing detention policy. CIC explained to the JPs that a well-established mechanism had been in place to ensure that detention is transparent to detainees. Detention must be justified with sufficient reasons and for a reasonable period. Each case is considered on its own merit. CIC has all along maintained effective communication with case officers to enable the detainees to have a better understanding of their case progress. Some JPs showed concern about the body and baggage search procedures. CIC explained to the JPs that a well-established mechanism had been in place to monitor the body search procedures. Searches are conducted with due regard to decency and self-respect. Concerning the legal right of detainees, an "Information Leaflet for Detainee" is issued to every detainee upon admission informing them of their rights, including their legal right, welfare, treatments and channels of complaints during their detention. Following their admission, an induction programme is conducted for the detainees to explain the rights to contact legal aid and legal representative. Welfare officer would continue to render necessary assistance to detainees in this regard. Concerning JPs' comment on legal and official visits during the COVID-19 pandemic, CIC explained that all official visits were suspended for 14 days due to a confirmed COVID-19 case in CIC in early September 2020. Nevertheless, legal and official visitors might apply for official visits when necessary. The JPs concerned were informed of the actions taken in the above cases and gave no further directive.

V. Po Leung Kuk

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institution have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

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	0	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	0	0	0	0	0

Key : S – Satisfactory
U – Unsatisfactory

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

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	0	0	0	0
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	1	0	0	0
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	1	0	0	1
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	0	0	0	0
Total :		2	0	0	1

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. Out of the two visits, JPs considered the facilities for one visit (50%) satisfactory. JPs did not provide an overall grading on facilities for the remaining visit. All of them considered the services provided satisfactory.

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	0	0	0	0	0
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	1	0	0	1	0
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	1	1	0	1	0
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	0	0	0	0	0
Total :		2	1	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.

C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestion/comment made by JPs

JPs made a comment in the following category during their visit –

Category of suggestion/comment	Number of suggestion/comment in 2020	(%)
Physical environment, facilities and equipment	1	(100%)
Total :	1	

JPs commented that the Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre provided a good environment for rehabilitation and encouraged the centre to keep up its effort in maintaining the facilities thereat. DH would continue to render assistance and support in processing funding requests of the centre for necessary resources.

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned[#] have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

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 [#]	0	0	0	0
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home [#]	0	0	0	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall [#]	1	0	0	1
4.	Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong – Home of Love – Yung Shing Hostel [#]	0	0	0	0
5.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
6.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre [#]	0	0	0	0
7.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled [#]	1	0	0	0
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	1	0	0	0
9.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women [#]	1	0	0	1
10.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
11.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	0	0	0	0
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind [#]	1	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
13.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind [#]	1	0	0	1
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
15.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home [#]	0	0	0	0
17.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home [#]	1	0	0	1
18.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	3	0	0	3
19.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre [#]	0	0	0	0
20.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	1	0	0	1
21.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre [#]	1	0	0	1
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre [#]	0	0	0	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre [#]	1	0	0	1
25.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
26.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building [#]	1	0	0	1
27.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service [#]	1	0	0	1
28.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	0	0	6
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel [#]	1	0	0	1
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex [#]	1	0	0	1

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 – Wing Yin Hostel [#]	0	0	0	0
32.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home [#]	0	0	0	0
	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel ^{♦#}		0	0	0
33.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home [#]	1	0	0	0
Total :		36	0	0	28

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

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

In view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and public health considerations, JP visits to the institutions concerned[#] have been temporarily suspended since late January 2020.

During the JP visits, JPs assessed the general state of facilities inspected and the adequacy of the services provided by the institutions. All of them considered the facilities satisfactory. Out of the 36 visits, JPs considered the services for 34 visits (94%) satisfactory. JPs did not provide an overall grading on services for the remaining two visits.

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 [#]	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home [#]	0	0	0	0	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall [#]	1	1	0	1	0
4.	Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong – Home of Love – Yung Shing Hostel [#]	0	0	0	0	0
5.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
6.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre [#]	0	0	0	0	0
7.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled [#]	1	1	0	1	0
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	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.

† 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
9.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women [#]	1	1	0	1	0
10.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
11.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	0	0	0	0	0
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind [#]	1	1	0	1	0
13.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind [#]	1	1	0	1	0
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
15.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home [#]	0	0	0	0	0
17.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home [#]	1	1	0	1	0
18.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	3	3	0	3	0
19.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre [#]	0	0	0	0	0
20.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly [#]	1	1	0	1	0
21.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre [#]	1	1	0	0	0
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre [#]	0	0	0	0	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	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.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities †		Overall grading on services †	
			S	U	S	U
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre [#]	1	1	0	1	0
25.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
26.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building [#]	1	1	0	1	0
27.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service [#]	1	1	0	1	0
28.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	12	0	12	0
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel [#]	1	1	0	1	0
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex [#]	1	1	0	1	0
31.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel [#]	0	0	0	0	0
32.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home [#]	0	0	0	0	0
	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel [#]		0	0	0	0
33.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home [#]	1	1	0	0	0
Total :		36	36	0	34	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.

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

JPs made 28 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2020	(%)
(i)	Service quality (e.g. provision of rehabilitative services, etc.)	12	(43%)
(ii)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, etc.)	6	(22%)
(iii)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of adequate manpower, etc.)	2	(7%)
(iv)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of training and educational opportunities, etc.)	2	(7%)
(v)	Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	2	(7%)
(vi)	Others	4	(14%)
Total :		28	

Positive comments had been made by JPs under category (i): service quality. Apart from showing appreciation to the dedication and professionalism of staff, JPs were impressed by the provision of rehabilitation services and the implementation of environmental protection policy to reduce food waste problem. JPs encouraged the institutions to keep up the good work, and the institutions would endeavour to enhance service quality and apply funding for additional resources where necessary.

In response to JPs' concern about the damage caused by flooding under category (ii): physical environment, facilities and equipment, the institution concerned had arranged contractors to repair the lift and carry out other renovation works. In response to JPs' observation on the defects of newly constructed premises, the institution concerned had requested ArchSD to conduct checking and the improvement works had been duly completed. Some JPs suggested providing reading lamp in the dormitories. The institution explained to JPs that adequate lighting has been provided in the dormitories to cater for various activities of residents, including reading and writing. Taking into consideration the space available in the dormitories and safety reasons, provision of additional reading

lamps was not feasible.

As for manpower planning under category (iii), some JPs expressed concerns about the workload and pressure of staff during the pandemic and suggested seeking additional manpower resources where appropriate. The institutions concerned advised that regular review on manpower had been conducted for the betterment of service provision and additional manpower resources would be sought where necessary.

Apart from showing appreciation to the provision of wide range of activities, some JPs suggested providing more opportunities for the residents to communicate and exchange with the community under category (iv) training programmes and recreational activities. The institution concerned explained that different programmes have all along been provided with a view to widening the horizon of the residents. It would continue to make earnest effort to explore exchange opportunities with different organisations for the residents.

Under category (v) channels of complaints and handling of complaints, some JPs commented that a comprehensive complaint handling system is already in place to deal with verbal and written complaints. Some JPs expressed concern on protecting the identity of complainant. The institution explained to the JPs that they had guidelines on handling complaints and suggestions from the residents, their family, members of the public, staff and statutory bodies. These guidelines covered basic principles on complaint handling that serve to protect the complainant, including confidentiality and sensitivity to the needs of individuals. They listed out the personnel designated for complaint handling, time frame, recordkeeping, supervision management, review and appeal procedures, etc. to ensure that the complaints are properly handled.

Under category (vi): others, some JPs suggested encouraging the residents to communicate in writing with their mentors. The institution shared the same view and has all along encouraged residents to do so as their continuous ties with others would be beneficial to their social rehabilitation in the long run. The institution would continue to encourage and facilitate the residents to communicate with their parents, guardians, social workers, mentors and friends. Concerning JPs' concern on the residents' reconviction after leaving the the Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home (the Home), the Home explained that it has all along been reviewing the reconviction figures in order to enhance the effectiveness of its rehabilitation programmes. The Probation Officers and Aftercare Officers would also render statutory supervision on the probationers or the discharged

residents and provide counselling and guidance on their study, employment, living habits, etc. with a view to fostering a law-abiding life after leaving the institution. Some JPs showed concern on the Home's arrangement of providing care to infants from Po Leung Kuk. The Home explained to the JPs that it has put in place a backup support arrangement to the Po Leung Kuk' New Comers' Ward, a gazetted place of refuge under the Protection of Children and Juveniles Ordinance (Cap. 213) to provide emergency placement for children between the age of 0 to 18 years old. The Home was well equipped with childcare facilities and care staff to look after the infants and it would continue to enhance its quality of service to cater for the infants' needs. A JP expressed concern on the possible intake of juveniles of different backgrounds. The Home explained to the JP that it had a segregation arrangement in place for different types of residents admitted under different ordinances so as to fulfill the requirements of international covenants and the relevant ordinances. The Home had paid close attention to individual residents and addressed their training and development needs. Tailor-made programmes had been provided to foster positive values and prepare the residents for re-integration into the community to lead a healthy and disciplined life upon their leaving.