

Major Sports Events Committee

Proposed Recommendations of the Review on the “M” Mark System and Support Packages

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
<i>DEFINITION AND SCOPE</i>				
1	Definition of major sports events	Those involve competitions between overseas teams and/or individuals, attract significant public interest, both locally and overseas, and with international significance to the sport(s) concerned	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Members (2) and National Sports Association (NSAs) (11)]* <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. should include non-Olympic sports, such as the World Firemen Games or exhibition matches with top world-ranking athletes/teams participating [MSEC Members (2)]* 3. competitions should be world-class events with at least five world's top 20 athletes participating (including two world's top 10 athletes/teams) [MSEC Member (1) and NSA (1)]* 	<p>➤ At present, only competitions between overseas teams and/or individuals, attracting significant public interest both locally and overseas, are qualified for application for “M” Mark status and funding. It is suggested to expand the scope of the major sports events to also cover exhibition matches of specific sports with presence of top world-ranking players which can attract significant public interest. As these events are attractive and easy to obtain sponsorship, it is considered not necessary to provide funding support. Granting of “M” Mark status for these events would be considered.</p>

Note
 # On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.
 * The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>4. the events can be originated from any organisations from the sports, tourism and private sectors [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>5. should not limited to competitions with high international significance [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>6. too broad and vague, should be more specific [NSA (1)]*</p>	
2	Definition of NSAs	Those NSAs affiliated to the Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SF&OC).	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <p>1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Members (4), NSAs (14) and Sports Federation and Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SF&OC)]*</p> <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <p>2. should include those sports organisations recognised by relevant international sports federation [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>3. should include those sports associations which also make great</p>	<p>➤ Clear definition for NSAs is required. According to the Olympic Charter, NSAs should be:</p> <p>(i) affiliated to the respective International Olympic Committee (IOC) recognised International Sports Federations (IFs) or Asian Sports Federations (AFs) recognised confederations for regional sports; and</p> <p>(ii) recognised by National Olympic Committee (i.e. SF&OC).</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>contributions to sports development even though not affiliated to SF&OC [NSA (1)]*</p>	<p>➤ We have considered to expand the scope of sports organisations and accept applications of NSAs that are affiliated to IFs or AFs but not affiliated to SF&OC. According to the websites of IFs and AFs as at November 2007, there were eight sports organisations (at Appendix) under this category. Given that these eight sports are relatively less popular in Hong Kong, there are already 74 NSAs or sports organisations affiliated to SF&OC, and the eight sports organisations generally do not have established connections with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), it is considered not necessary or appropriate to expand the scope/definition of NSAs.</p>
3	Types of sports to be supported, e.g. those	Those sports recognised by the SF&OC.	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <p>1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC</p>	<p>➤ Based on the above recommendation under item 2, the organisers are</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
	included in Olympic Games, Asian Games, etc		<p>Member (1) and NSAs (6)]*</p> <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. the sports types of “M” Mark events should be as broad as possible. MSEC can support other spectator sports which are well received by the general public [MSEC Members (5)]* 3. should not be limited to events organised by NSA(s) [MSEC Members (2) and NSA (1)]* 4. apart from the sports recognised by SF&OC, MSEC should also support those sports included in the Olympic Games, Asian Games and National Games [NSA (1)]* 5. events of those sports recognised by SF&OC should be supported regardless whether they are Games sports or not [NSA (1)]* 6. MSEC should assess two types of events (events organised by NSA and 	<p>confined to NSAs and sports organisations that are affiliated to IOC recognised IFs and AFs. As such, there will be no change to the existing practice and the sports types to be supported will remain those sports recognised by IOC.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>non-NSA) on the same basis (potential entertainment value and the value they will bring to Hong Kong) while "sports development value" should be assessed separately in consideration of the unique nature of each sport [NSA (1)]*</p>	
<i>DIFFERENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</i>				
4	Role and responsibility of NSA's sanctioning for other sports organisations	<p>Paragraph 8 of the Guidelines: <i>"It is a requirement for the NSA concerned to play a leading role in the development of their sport through the event, and to assume key and active role in the event organisation structure."</i> MSEC's interpretation is that the NSA sanctioning the sports events should take a leading role to ensure proper and efficient use of "M" Mark System's funding which is public</p>	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Member (1) and NSAs (13)]* <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. provide only technical advice with the right to charge a fee by the NSA. Once financial arrangements are disputed, MSEC or an independent body should be given the right to arbitrate [MSEC Members (2)]* 3. as a sanctioning body, the NSA should be in an advisory and overseeing 	<p>➤ The existing practice is to be followed. Yet, the role of NSAs is clarified as:-</p> <p>the respective NSAs sanctioning the sports events should provide advice to the organisers in organising the events. In particular, the NSAs should monitor the financial aspects of the events to ensure the proper and efficient use of public money.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
		money.	<p>capacity and any sanctioning fee should be defined in the MSEC grant terms [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>4. the role of NSA should be confined to advisory with no responsibility to monitor any financial aspects of the event [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>5. no responsibility borne by the NSA under the condition that MSEC's approval can be attained [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>6. the respective roles and responsibilities of both NSAs and event organisers to be agreed between the two parties [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>7. should be accountable for any dispute in any aspect [MSEC Member (1)]*</p>	
5	Possible adjustment of the level of participation/ involvement of	Only applicants such as NSAs or organisations with events sanctioned by relevant NSAs are accepted.	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <p>1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Members (2) & NSAs (13)]*</p>	<p>➤ At present, the applicants (for “M” Mark funding support) are only required to submit a business plan on the organisation of the events. In</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
	stakeholders other than NSAs		<p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. accept an event not organised by NSA [MSEC Members (4)]* 3. should consider organisations with proven track record and it is necessary to monitor with constant checking [MSEC Members (3)]* 4. should consider each case on its individual merit [MSEC Members (2)]* 5. the decision should be made by the MSEC [MSEC Member (1)]* 6. views of relevant NSA should be sought, but NSAs do not necessarily have the right of veto [MSEC Member (1)]* 7. the sanctioning practice may deprive the opportunities of other sports organisations who are capable of organising the event while the relevant 	<p>order to assess the sustainability of the events, the business plan should also include the ways to ensure the sustainability of the event during the 3-year nurturing period.</p> <p>➤ For application of one-off international major sporting events, it is not necessary for the applicants to meet the above requirements.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>NSA doesn't have the skills and resources to do so [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>8. relevant NSA can have dual roles as the sanctioning body and co-organiser of an event. Regarding to its level of involvement in the organisation and its share of any profit or loss, this should be defined between the NSAs and its co-organiser [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>9. allow partnership between the NSA and the sports organisation to ensure the success of the event [NSA (1)]*</p>	
<i>FUNDING SUPPORT</i>				
6	Criteria for funding support to ensure the sustainability of the events	The ten Vetting Criteria stated in Appendix IV of the Guidelines.	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <p>1. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Member (1) & NSAs (7)]*</p> <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <p>2. the scale of the event should be maintained or extended since its initial</p>	<p>➤ The Vetting Criteria will be reviewed accordingly based on the proposed recommendations as endorsed by MSEC later.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>launching in order to qualify for continuous funding support from “M” Mark event [MSEC Member (1) and NSA (1)]*</p> <p>3. only expenses directly related to the event will be considered, and careful scrutiny is needed if the event's venue is not a government facility [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>4. for events without audited statements of previous events, development plans are needed. Besides, longer nurturing period should be allowed for innovative events [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>5. Criterion 4: to lower the weighting of economic impact; Criterion 5: the criterion of overseas media should be optional [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>6. the sustainability requirement should be immediately dropped as it is hindering the staging of major events in Hong Kong [NSA (1)]*</p>	

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			7. to lower the vetting standard [MSEC Member (1)]*	
7	Specific requirements on the organisers/NSAs, e.g. whether a ceiling amount is required for payment to agents/promoters, whether tendering procedure is required for procurement of agents/promoters, etc.	Nil	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. no ceiling amount on payment to agents/promoters is needed and the tendering process should be enforced [NSAs (6)]* <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. agree to the existing practice [MSEC Member (1) & NSA (3)]* 3. able to secure cash sponsorship of not less than \$1M in any one year [MSEC Member (1)]* 4. no more subvention support from LCSD for successful "M" Mark events after the nurturing period and NSA's track records of organising previous major sports events are required for new applicants [MSEC Member (1)]* 	<p>➤ At present, there is no specific requirement on the procurement procedures for the organisers. It is suggested to request the organisers to make close reference to the procurement practices of the Sports Subvention Scheme which is administered by LCSD.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			5. should have flexibility [NSA (1)]*	
<i>LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF "M" MARK EVENTS</i>				
8	Measures to enhance the sustainability of "M" Mark events, e.g. continue to support the successful "M" Mark applications after three years	A matching fund up to the maximum amount of \$3 million, \$2 million and \$1 million during the first, second and third year of the event respectively will be granted to the "M" Mark events which applied for the funding support. Funding support to "M" Mark events is up to a period of three years. Subvention on venue charges to "M" Mark events using LCSD venues is provided, subject to the scrutiny of LCSD.	<p><u>Majority View</u></p> <p>1. prefer to extend the supporting period beyond 3 years to facilitate the establishment of the event [MSEC Member (1) & NSAs (10)]*</p> <p><u>Proposed ways of funding:</u></p> <p>➤ should extend the period and scope of funding support:-</p> <p>(i) providing funding support as long as the event exists [NSAs (3)]*</p> <p>(ii) extend to 5 years with \$1M for the 4th and 5th years [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>(iii) extend to 6 years with \$1M for the 4th, 5th and 6th years [NSA</p>	<p>➤ It is considered that the event should be well footed after staging for three years (i.e. nurturing period) with the support of matching fund. For the sustainability of the events supported, it is suggested to provide a ceiling of \$1M matching fund each year for each event for a further support period of three years after the nurturing period, having regard to the performance of the organisers and public response to the events, and subject to availability of funding resources.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>(1)]*</p> <p>(iv) \$3M for the 1st year, \$2M for the 2nd year, \$1.5M for the rest of the year until the organiser ceases to run the event [MSEC Member (1) and NSA (1)]*</p> <p>(v) \$2.5M for the 2nd year and \$2M for the 3rd year [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>(vi) \$5M for the 1st year, \$4M for the 2nd year, \$3M for the 3rd year, \$2M for the 4th year and \$1M for the 5th year [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>(vii) be flexible with a total amount of funding support of \$6M among 5 years [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>(viii) be flexible and the funding support may extend to 7 years [NSA (1)]*</p> <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <p>2. agree to existing practice [NSA (1)]*</p>	

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. one-off events should be supported [MSEC Member (1)]* 4. support from the government in the form of services and subvention on LCSD venue charges after three years funding period [MSEC Member (1)]* 5. provide subvention on venue charges to NSA(s) [NSA (1)]* 6. waive the matching fund criterion for small NSAs, so that more sports can be featured in Hong Kong [NSA (1)]* 	
<i>OTHER ISSUES</i>				
9	Others		<p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. besides promoting the "M" Mark, a study group to oversee the review should be formed [MSEC Member (5)]* 2. since it is a major event and should be the largest one in scale for that 	<p>➤ Under the existing practice, the applications should be submitted at least 18 months in advance of the event date. Some organisers have expressed difficulties in securing sponsorship so early before the event date. It is therefore suggested to shorten the submission deadline to <u>12 months</u> before the event date for</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>particular sport held locally. A lot more work on publicity and PR have to be done in order to fulfill the requirement of sponsors so that there shouldn't be too many limitations imposed on both eligible items as well as ceiling amounts (e.g. broadcasting and printing expenses, etc.) [MSEC Member (2) and NSA (1)]*</p> <p>3. need to address the issue of late submission of "M" Mark application [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>4. suggest to shorten the period of application to 6 months or even shorter than 6 months [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>5. suggest the period of application to be shortened to 9 months. Also, for those Major Local International Events (MLIEs), which are already subvented by other government department, to be recognised as "M" Mark events even though funding support is not required</p>	<p>applications for funding support and six months before the event date for applications for "M" Mark status only.</p> <p>➤ The proposed project scope of the multi-purpose stadium complex in Kai Tak is being drawn up and MSEC will be consulted on the draft project scope when it is ready.</p>

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>from MSEC [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>6. Hong Kong still does not have a major tennis stadium, nor a multi-purpose stadium that can host major multi-sports events. Tennis stadium facilities in Hong Kong lags behind by 10-15 years. We strongly urge the HKSAR government to increase its shoe-string sports promotion and development budget to put Hong Kong back in the limelight of the South East Asian region [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>7. the introduction of the "M" Mark is a great success. It encourages the organisation of major sports events which otherwise difficult to materialise. On the other hand, it is suggested to shorten the approval period for placement of promotion banner. Besides, the number of banners allowed to hang up at all districts should be more. Ways to enhance the promotion coverage should be formed. Also, LCSD would</p>	

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			<p>give high priority for NSAs' booking the competition venues for all "M" Mark events [NSA (1)]*</p> <p>8. the government should enhance better logistics and liaison support such as license applications and venue booking. [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>9. the government should help arrange the highest possible ranked officials to be present at various PR functions for the events and the same protocol should be maintained for all events. [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>10. facilitate application for new major events [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>11. review the start-up funding for new events and agree to form study group [MSEC Member (1)]*</p> <p>12. be practical in the review [MSEC</p>	

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.

Item	Issue	Existing Practice	Gist of Comments Received #	Proposed Recommendations
			Member (1)]* 13. support to do the review [MSEC Member (1)]*	

Note

On top of SF&OC, 17 MSEC Members and 16 NSAs have responded to the Review.

* The number in bracket represents the number of MSEC Members/NSAs supporting that viewpoint.