

## Proposed Amendments to the Application Guidelines

Item	Existing Arrangement	Recommendation
<i>VETTING PROCEDURE</i>		
1	<p>Paragraph 13 of the Major Sports Events Application Guidelines (the Guidelines): <i>“Applicants wishing to apply for the “M” mark event funding support or solely for the “M” mark status may first contact the MSEC Secretariat. They should complete the pre-application form (PAF) (in Appendix VI) and return the completed PAF together with the relevant supporting information to the MSEC Secretariat”.</i></p>	<p>A “M” Mark application has to go through various vetting mechanism: Pre-Application Form (PAF) assessment and Formal Application vetted by LCSD, discussion at the Vetting Panel (VP) of MSEC, MSEC’s recommendation, and then Sports Commission (SC)’s endorsement. <i>It is suggested to streamline/shorten the vetting procedures by exempting the previous successful “M” Mark applicants from the submission of PAF.</i></p>
2	<p>Under Appendix IV of the Guidelines: Illustration on Vetting Criteria for “M” Event Applications, the existing vetting criteria number (1) Status of the event, there are four tiers of categories namely World, Asian, All China and Others.</p>	<p><i>It is suggested that one more category i.e. “Intercontinental”, should be included to suitably reflect the status of some events applied is above the Asian but under the World categories.</i></p>
3	<p>Paragraph 6 of the Guidelines: <i>“Application for “M mark event status to be considered by the MSEC must involve competition between overseas teams and/or individuals, preferably representing a number of nations/territories”.</i></p>	<p>Under Appendix IV of the Guidelines: Illustration on Vetting Criteria for “M” Event Applications, the category of “All China” should also be reviewed. According to paragraph 6 of the Guidelines, “M” Mark events must involve overseas teams/individuals, but “All China” events do not involve overseas participants. <i>It is suggested that paragraph 6 should be amended from “overseas teams and/or individuals” to “teams and/or individuals outside Hong Kong”.</i></p>

Item	Existing Arrangement	Recommendation
4	No specific arrangement on the handling of brand new sports events.	With the aim to encourage event organisers to bring in brand new events to Hong Kong, <i>it is suggested to add a new criterion under Appendix IV: Illustration on Vetting Criteria for “M” Event Applications of the Guidelines and give special weighting to the applications for new viable events such as the Hong Kong Beach Festival 2006.</i>
5	Under Appendix V of the Guidelines: Flow-chat for applying to become a “M” mark event under MSEC, MSEC’s recommendation to SC to become a recognized “M” mark event is needed for all “M” mark events.	For application applying for “M” Mark status without funding support, <i>it is suggested that endorsement by SC could be exempted.</i>
6	No specific arrangement on the vetting procedure for application applying for “M” Mark status without funding support.	For application applying for “M” Mark status without funding support, <i>it is suggested that the application should be vetted by LCSD.</i>
7	Under Appendix III of the Guidelines: Eligible Expenditure Items and Ineligible Costs.	As LCSD has been reviewing the existing eligible items and their ceiling amounts under the Sports Subvention Scheme so as to provide greater flexibility to the NSAs, <i>it is suggested that the eligible expenditure items and level of MSEC’s ceiling subvention to be re-examined accordingly.</i>
<b>FUNDING SUPPORT</b>		
8	Subvention on LCSD venue charge is not mentioned.	<i>It is suggested that the newly established subvention on LCSD venue charges should be added in the Guidelines.</i>

Item	Existing Arrangement	Recommendation
9	<p>Paragraph 19(b) of the Guidelines: <i>“Matching fund – it is an one-off, dollar-to-dollar, matching grant up to the maximum amount of \$3 million, \$2 million and \$1 million during the first, second and third year of the event respectively”.</i></p>	<p>Clear interpretations of first, second, and third year for granting of matching fund is required. For example, the amount of matching fund that MSEC should grant to an “M” Mark event is \$3 million, \$2 million and \$1 million in the first, second and third year of the event respectively. <i>It is suggested that in the case if the applicant applied for “M” Mark status only without funding support in the first year, it should be granted \$3M if it applies for funding support in the following year.</i></p>
10	<p>Paragraph 19(b) of the Guidelines: <i>“Matching fund – it is an one-off, dollar-to-dollar, matching grant up to the maximum amount of \$3 million, \$2 million and \$1 million during the first, second and third year of the event respectively”.</i></p>	<p>MSEC should define whether an applicant could stage one event i.e. World Championships in first year, then World Cup in second year, etc., but asking for \$3M matching fund for first year, and also \$3M for second year, on the basis that they are different events. <i>It is suggested that the applicant should commit to organise the same event for three consecutive years as the aim of the “M” Mark System is to help nurture more sustainable major sports events.</i></p>
<p><b>OPERATIONAL ISSUES</b></p>		
11	<p>No explicit requirement on the time to return the surplus of the funding if the amount has been left idle for more than two years.</p>	<p><i>It is suggested that the applicant should return the surplus of the funding granted within 3 months after the completion of the event if the amount has been left idle for more than two years.</i></p>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Existing Arrangement</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
12	Applicants for “M” Mark status only (funding support is not required) are not required to submit evaluation report on their events.	<i>It is suggested that a one-page simple evaluation form should be completed by the applicants for “M” Mark status only (funding support is not required) upon the completion of the “M” Mark event.</i>