

**Minutes of the 56th Meeting of
RTHK Board of Advisors
held at 9:15 am, 28 September 2020
at Conference Room, G/F, Broadcasting House
30 Broadcast Drive, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon**

Present

Dr LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Ms Dilys CHAU Suet-fung
Professor Ronald CHIU Ying-chun
Ms Linda CHOY Siu-min
Professor Anthony FUNG Ying-him
Ms Helen KWAN Po-jen
Ms Shirley LOO Marie Therese, BBS, MH, JP
Dr Thomas SO Shiu-tsung
Dr TIK Chi-yuen, SBS, JP
Ms Eva WONG Ching-hung
Mr Augustine WONG Ho-ming, JP
Professor WONG Kam-fai, MH
Ms Elaine WU Siu-ling
Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, Director of Broadcasting

In Attendance from RTHK

Mr Eugene FUNG, Deputy Director of Broadcasting (Special Support)/Deputy
Director of Broadcasting (Programmes)
Ms Jace AU, Assistant Director (TV & Corporate Businesses)
Mr Brian CHOW, Assistant Director (Radio & Corporate Programming)
Mr Vincent LEE, Controller (Production Services)
Ms Natalie CHAN, Controller (TV)
Ms Dawn TSANG, Acting Controller (Radio)/Head/Radio Administration,
Development and Programming
Mr David HO, Acting Controller (Radio)/Head/Chinese Programme Service
Ms Amen NG, Head/Corporate Communications & Standards
Ms Mayella CHEUNG (Board Secretariat)
Ms Sara FONG (Board Secretariat)

Secretary

Mr Enoc IP (Board Secretariat)

Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks by the Chairman

1. This meeting was the first meeting of the new term of the Board of Advisors (“Board”). The new Chairman introduced and welcomed the new Members Professor Ronald CHIU Ying-chun and Dr Thomas SO Shiu-tsung. He also introduced and welcomed Members who were re-appointed, including Ms Dilys CHAU Suet-fung, Ms Linda CHOY Siu-min, Professor Anthony FUNG Ying-him, Ms Helen KWAN Po-jen, Ms Shirley LOO Marie Therese, Dr TIK Chi-yuen, Ms Eva WONG Ching-hung, Mr Augustine WONG Ho-ming, Professor WONG Kam-fai and Ms Elaine WU Siu-ling.
2. The Chairman said he believed that the Board and RTHK shared the same goal. He hoped that the Board could join hands with RTHK during its tenure in the coming two years, so as to gain support from different social sectors for RTHK. He pointed out that the Board would provide constructive and pertinent advice to RTHK in accordance with the Charter of RTHK (Charter). He hoped that RTHK would adhere to the Charter regarding its operation and programme production, while the Board would properly carry out its monitoring work. Moreover, he hoped that the two parties could strengthen communication, strive for consensus and build up a good cooperative relationship, so that RTHK could continue to produce high quality radio and television (TV) programmes.
3. The Chairman stated that the quorum of the meeting was 7 persons. He hoped that Members would actively attend the meetings.

Agenda Item 2: Welcoming Remarks by the Director of Broadcasting

4. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing welcomed Members and briefly introduced to them the organisation structure and the officers-in-charge of different units of RTHK.

Agenda Item 3: An Overview of RTHK’s Broadcast Services

5. Mr Brian CHOW and Ms Jace AU briefly introduced the broadcast services of the Radio Division and TV Division to Members respectively.
6. A Member enquired about the changes in the results of RTHK’s audience surveys in recent years. Mr Brian CHOW responded that taking Radio 1 as an example, its audience reach in this year’s Radio Audience Survey attained a record high,

reflecting that although radio was a traditional medium, it still had a certain level of influence. Ms Jace AU added that the development of RTHK's TV service started relatively late compared with its radio service. The transmission coverage of its digital terrestrial television service reached 99 per cent of the Hong Kong population only in the latter half of last year. She hoped that a more large-scale TV audience survey could be conducted before this year end.

Agenda Item 4: RTHK Charter

7. The Chairman reiterated that RTHK should adhere to the Charter and fulfill its public purposes and mission, while the Board should provide advice to RTHK according to the Charter. As such, correct understanding and interpretation of the Charter is of much importance. He said that if RTHK did not adhere to the Charter, it was like failure to comply with traffic signals when driving, which might cause accidents easily. He pointed out that RTHK had a long history of more than 90 years, and it was the only public service broadcaster in Hong Kong. RTHK was closely related to the daily life of Hong Kong people, and accompanied them to grow up, showing the value and necessity of its existence. However, he noticed that in recent years, some RTHK programmes had received warnings from the Communications Authority ("CA"), and they had triggered disputes and conflicts in the community. The situation was unsatisfactory and was disadvantageous to the development of RTHK and even Hong Kong. Nonetheless, he was confident about the development of RTHK, and he hoped that through this discussion session, Members would express their views on the Charter, deepen their understanding of the scope of their work and clarify the content of the Charter that they did not understand, such that the Board could function accurately according to the Charter in the future.
8. A Member said that the incidents happened in the past two years enhanced Members' understanding of the Charter. She also noticed the public and the media's interpretation of the Charter. She opined that at first, there had been some discrepancies between RTHK and the Board in the understanding of the Charter, but both parties had reached consensus on their understanding on the whole subsequently. She hoped that the Board would continue to discharge its duties by providing advice to RTHK, such that RTHK's operation would get better and better.
9. A Member said that through the working group meetings in this year, the Board had attained consensus regarding some details. He attached importance to editorial

independence mentioned in Part C of the Charter, and considered that the Board should have clear demarcation and show respect to RTHK when providing advice.

10. Several Members agreed on the importance of editorial independence to RTHK. A Member said that paragraph 13 of the Charter stipulated the functions of the Board, which included advising RTHK on aspects such as the direction and quality of RTHK and complaints against RTHK. The Member expected RTHK to report to or provide follow-up progress for the Board whether RTHK accepted the Board's advice or not, in order to strengthen communication and feedback. Another Member said that the previous term of the Board had faced decisions made by CA on some RTHK programmes. Challenges that the Board had to face included how the Board should handle those decisions and how it should play its role during the process.
11. Another Member considered that the public purposes and mission of RTHK were the fundamental criteria of the programming standards and quality of RTHK programming. She pointed out that the Board may need to refer to programmes during discussions to avoid them being too general, but it should also avoid crossing the demarcation of editorial independence, which was not an easy job. She expected the Board would continue to maintain fact-based, open and transparent communication.
12. Another Member expressed respect to the editorial independence of RTHK. Nonetheless, he pointed out that under the framework of editorial independence, the Charter had accountability mechanism to ensure fair, just and comprehensive programming. Regarding that, the Board should provide advice, while the Director of Broadcasting (DB) should explain whether he accepted it. The process required communication and interaction, and he noticed in the Board that a better tacit understanding was being developed between the two parties. He suggested the Board to strengthen communication with external stakeholders, such as the unions, to avoid misunderstanding of the role of the Board. Furthermore, he opined that the Board should strive to achieve internal consensus and resolve problems as soon as possible, in order to avoid the embarrassment that decisions had to be made by CA.
13. A Member said that she had a clear understanding of the relationship between the Board and RTHK on the whole, but sometimes not of how the RTHK management would follow up on the Board's advice. She pointed out that RTHK was a public

service broadcaster with its unique public purposes and mission, for example, paragraph 4(c) and (d) of the Charter stated that RTHK should encourage social inclusion and pluralism, and promote education and learning. She understood that RTHK produced diversified programmes and it might be difficult for a single programme to cover all public purposes and mission. However, there should not be inaccurate information or content infringing the Charter, in particular the part related to sustaining citizenship and civil society stated in paragraph 4(a).

14. Several Members were concerned about how to strengthen communication between the Board and RTHK. A Member said that his understanding of the framework of the Charter was that DB exercised editorial independence according to Part C, while the Board provided advice according to Part E, in order to achieve the public purposes and mission stated in Part B together. He considered that a few rounds of communication were usually needed before achieving smooth exchange of opinions. As such, he hoped that the Board and RTHK would have more interactions and communication. Another Member said that the Board had always wanted to reduce external opinions on RTHK through discussions, but it backfired. It reflected that the communication might not be smooth enough and he expected the Board and RTHK could calibrate the positioning in the future. Another Member said that the Board and RTHK were “on the same boat”. The two parties were not opposing each other and the Board should strive to reach consensus. Regarding the public purposes and mission of RTHK, she opined that the Board had attached more importance to paragraph 4(a) and (b) of the Charter in the past, but paragraph 4(c) to (e) were also worth discussion. Regarding the relationship between the Board and RTHK, she advised on paragraph 13(f) of the Charter that besides discussing complaints, the Board could also help RTHK achieve its public purposes and mission from an appreciating and encouraging perspective.
15. A Member considered that under the current political atmosphere of the community, it would be impractical to request commentary programmes on current affairs of RTHK be accepted by all Hong Kong people. It was crucial for RTHK to adhere to the editorial principles stipulated in paragraph 7 of Part C of the Charter to ensure accuracy of information and impartiality of commentary programmes. He pointed out that the power of editorial independence stipulated in paragraph 6 of Part C of the Charter was granted by the Charter, therefore exercising of the power must be bounded within but not exceeding the Charter. He agreed that the Board and RTHK should not be opposing each other, but to fulfill the requirements of the Charter under common purposes.

16. A Member said that he noticed that Part B of the Charter consisted of many elements related to politics, including promoting the sense of citizenship, understanding of our nation, and promoting the understanding of the concept of “One Country, Two Systems” and its implementation in Hong Kong; while Part C emphasised that RTHK was editorially independent and being immune from commercial, political and / or other influences. He asked whether RTHK had encountered conflicts or problems in the process of meeting the requirements of both aspects at the same time. In addition, he enquired whether RTHK had produced other programmes to fulfil its mission to help the public understand our nation, apart from relaying the programmes of China Central Television (CCTV).

17. Mr Leung Ka-wing responded that Part B and Part C of the Charter were quite broad and general. The public purposes and mission under Part B were quite comprehensive, while the editorial independence under Part C involved the perspective of media producers and social reality. He opined that although there seemed to be conflicts between the two, RTHK colleagues had the ability to handle the issue. He said that as a public service broadcaster, it was appropriate for RTHK to relay the programmes of the CCTV channels. What RTHK 33 relayed was CCTV-1, the Hong Kong and Macao version of CCTV, in which the contents were specially processed to better suit the Hong Kong audience. He pointed out that RTHK had all along been producing programmes in accordance with its public purposes and mission, and making editorial decisions in accordance with the actual situation of the society. For example, RTHK would not provide live broadcast platforms for people who had obviously violated “One Country, Two Systems” to speak. However, as the social disputes continued, sometimes even if there were no political considerations behind the news images broadcast by RTHK, the message of the images often triggered different opinions or complaints. He said that RTHK would value all opinions, conduct serious reviews and respect the functions and advice of the Board. He recalled that in the turbulent social atmosphere during the past two years, there were many political issues, and many questions were raised by Members. He had tried his best to clearly explain to them, and he hoped that the Board would continue to maintain good communication with RTHK and the sophistication of interaction would increase.

18. The Chairman opined that thoughts and attitudes would affect work and then the results. As such, thoughts and attitudes adopted by Members and the RTHK management were very important. If one wanted to bring benefits to RTHK, one

must not adopt an adversarial or perfunctory attitude. Members should also be mindful of whether the advice provided was constructive and impartial. As the Board had a diverse portfolio and Members were from different backgrounds, he believed they could provide representative advice. He hoped that the two parties could communicate actively and sincerely, such that RTHK, as a precious asset with a long history in Hong Kong, could strive for excellence and reach new heights. He believed that RTHK must abide by the Charter and implement it with a proactive attitude, and RTHK must also exercise editorial independence on the premise that its public purposes and mission were fulfilled. He hoped that the spirit, thought and attitude of the Board and RTHK would gradually get closer, and he also looked forward to the Board having more formal or informal exchanges with RTHK management and even the staff unions, so as to deepen mutual understanding and communication.

19. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing explained again that editorial independence was only applicable to the actual operational level, and the current and previous RTHK management teams had attached great importance to RTHK's public purposes and mission. For instance, before and after the promulgation of the Law of the People's Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("National Security Law"), the RTHK management had closely reviewed the development and programme production arrangements of the issue, so as to deepen the public's understanding of the "National Security Law" and implement the related public purposes and mission. Regarding the communication between the Board and RTHK, he had always been maintaining close contact with Members; and after each board meeting, the RTHK management would follow up the issues mentioned within its scope of authority in a pragmatic manner. He welcomed different forms of gatherings and exchanges with the Board.

Agenda Item 5: Handling of Complaints Addressed to the Board

20. The Chairman said that in accordance with paragraph 13(b) of the Charter, the Board would receive reports on complaints against editorial principles, programming standards and quality of RTHK programming. He invited the representatives of RTHK to brief on the current arrangements for the handling of complaints addressed to the Board.

21. Ms Amen NG elaborated on the current complaint handling mechanism of RTHK. She said that if the content of the public feedback was negative, RTHK would need to respond and follow up, and if the feedback was specified as a complaint, it would be classified as a complaint. Under normal circumstances, RTHK would acknowledge receipt or issue an interim reply within 10 days upon receipt of a complaint, and provide a detailed reply within 30 days. Under the complaint mechanism, any complaint received would first be handled by a team led by a staff member of the rank of Principal Programme Officer. If the complainant was dissatisfied with the process, he / she could file an appeal, and the appeal would be handled by a team led by a staff member of the rank of Chief Programme Officer. If the complainant was still dissatisfied with the result of the appeal, he / she could appeal again. At that time, the case would be handed over to a review team consisting of three or more persons and led by a staff member of Deputy Director or above rank for the final decision.
22. The Chairman enquired how RTHK handled complaints addressed to the Board under the current mechanism. Ms Amen NG responded that if the complaint was related to the operation details or programme content of RTHK, the Board could simply reply to the complainant to acknowledge receipt, and then forward the complaint to RTHK for follow-up and reply. If the subject of the complaint was the entire Board or individual Members, the complaint must be handed to the Board for discussion and handling.
23. The Chairman agreed to handle complaints addressed to the Board under the current mechanism. He reminded Members that if they received complaints related to the Board, they should let the Chairman or the Secretariat know, so as to facilitate appropriate follow-up action.
24. A Member hoped that RTHK would do a better job in public relations and asked whether RTHK had a mechanism in place for dealing with negative messages appearing on other platforms or media. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that it was difficult for RTHK to respond to all the views or complaints of many platforms. Ms Amen NG added that RTHK would clarify to the relevant parties on statements that were untrue.

Agenda Item 6(a): Updates on Feedback and Complaints (BOA Paper 9/2020)

25. Ms Amen NG introduced the paper to Members. Members had no comment on

the paper.

Agenda Item 6(b): Updates on Programmes (BOA Paper 10/2020)

26. Mr David HO and Ms Natalie CHAN briefed Members on the updates on programmes of the Radio and TV Divisions respectively. Members had no comment on the paper.

Agenda Item 7: Any Other Business

27. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had circulated the draft minutes of the 55th meeting held on 31 July 2020 and the 2nd meeting of the Working Groups held on 10 August 2020 for Members' perusal, and no comments were received. The minutes of the two meetings were confirmed. The minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Working Groups are at **Appendix 1**.
28. After discussion by the Chairman and Members, unanimous consent was obtained for maintaining the arrangement of conducting the meeting every two months, and the date would temporarily be the working days on the last Monday or Tuesday in the odd months. The Board could further discuss on whether to keep the Working Groups or not.
29. The Chairman suggested that a guided tour of RTHK be arranged for the new Members to have a deeper understanding of the department. The date would be arranged by the Secretariat.
30. The Chairman stated that, according to paragraph 13(f) of the Charter, the Board would initiate studies and research on issues pertaining to the achievement of the public purposes and mission of RTHK. At the current stage, he would first make reference to the past survey reports and understand the relevant time frame. The details would be discussed in the next meeting.

Agenda Item 8: Date of Next Meeting

31. The next meeting was temporarily scheduled for the last Monday or Tuesday in November 2020. The Secretariat would coordinate and inform Members of the confirmed date.

32. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

The Secretariat

RTHK Board of Advisors

**Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of
Working Group of RTHK Board of Advisors
held at 9:30 am, 10 August 2020
at Conference Room 5, G/F, West Wing, Central Government Offices,
2 Tim Mei Avenue, Tamar, Hong Kong**

Present

Dr Eugene CHAN Kin-keung, BBS, JP (Chairman)

Ms Dilys CHAU Suet-fung

Mr Mohan DATWANI

Ms Helen KWAN Po-jen

Dr TIK Chi-yuen, SBS, JP

Mr Augustine WONG Ho-ming, JP

Professor WONG Kam-fai, MH

Ms Elaine WU Siu-ling

Mr LEUNG Ka-wing, Director of Broadcasting

In Attendance from RTHK

Ms Amen NG, Head/Corporate Communications & Standards

Ms Mayella CHEUNG (Board Secretariat)

Absent with Apologies

Mr Walter CHAN Kar-lok, SBS, JP

Ms Linda CHOY Siu-min

Professor Anthony FUNG Ying-him

Ms Shirley LOO Marie Therese, BBS, MH, JP

Ms Eva WONG Ching-hung

Secretary

Mr Enoc IP (Board Secretariat)

Agenda Item 1: Complaint Handling Process

1. The Chairman stated that, according to the Charter of RTHK (“the Charter”), the Board hoped that through this working group meeting, it could understand and exchange views on RTHK’s complaint handling mechanism, the selecting procedure of complaint reports for submitting to the Board, and how RTHK conducted reputational risk management with regard to programmes and views that brought great controversies to the society.
2. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing said that, according to paragraph 13(b) of the Charter, one of the Board’s functions was to receive reports on complaints against editorial principles, programming standards and quality of RTHK programming, and RTHK had all along handled complaints by following government procedures and the Charter. He invited Ms Amen NG to brief Members of the working group on RTHK’s relevant handling mechanism.
3. Ms Amen NG said that public feedback could be divided into four categories, namely enquiries, views, complaints and compliments. As for complaint handling, RTHK had followed government mechanisms, and the relevant internal administrative guidelines were mainly set out in “RTHK Programme Circulars No. 4/2011”, “RTHK Administrative Circular No. 5/2011” and paragraph 7 of the “Producers’ Guidelines”. Under normal circumstances, RTHK would acknowledge receipt or give an interim reply to complaints within ten days, followed by a detailed reply within 30 days. Under the complaint mechanism, upon receiving a complaint, an officer at the rank of Principal Programme Officer would lead the handling of the complaint. If the complainant was not satisfied with the handling, he / she could file an appeal. And if the complainant was not satisfied with the appeal result, he / she could make an appeal again, and then the case would be passed to a review group formed by three or more people and led by an officer at the rank of Deputy Director of Broadcasting or above, for making the final decision.
4. Ms Amen NG added that the complaints against RTHK were closely related to the social impulse. She pointed out that before the social incidents happened last year, the number of complaints against RTHK had been small. Moreover, much of the feedback received belonged to the category of personal views. RTHK provided various channels, including telephone, email, post, fax or visiting RTHK in person, for the general public to provide feedback. Furthermore, RTHK produced the

programme “Channel Heads’ Hotlines” every year for audience to call in and chat with the channel heads, so as to express their views on different channels.

5. A Member enquired about how to define whether the feedback were views or complaints. Ms Amen NG responded that, in general, feedback would be defined as complaints if they were negative while replies and follow-up were necessary, and when they were specified as complaints.
6. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing stated that the RTHK management attached great importance to the decisions made by the Communications Authority (“CA”) on broadcasters, and had read in details the reports on the decisions on different broadcasters published every month. Ms Amen NG added that RTHK would cover cases of decisions made by CA on broadcasters in its regular meetings and induction courses, so that colleagues would be more prudent and could learn lessons from those cases. Mr LEUNG reiterated that the processes of complaint handling by RTHK were basically the same as those of other government departments.
7. A Member pointed out that RTHK was restricted by the Charter, which made it different from ordinary broadcasters. And the public purposes and mission mentioned in the Charter fell outside CA’s ambit. He considered that the scope covered by the Charter was wider than that of CA’s, and RTHK should handle complaints from the Charter’s perspective. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that RTHK handled complaints from a holistic perspective, and the Charter, the Producers’ Guidelines and moral standards accepted by the society were taken into consideration.
8. A Member agreed that RTHK’s complaint handling mechanism was effective. He considered that the functions of the Board as the internal advisor and gatekeeper were discharged well, but he also concerned that the general public always had varied comments when it came to programme content. He asked how RTHK maintained an objective standard regarding the programme content, and how it made all colleagues judge with the appropriate standard. Ms Amen NG stated that professional editing could ensure that the programme content complied with the standards, and the Director of Broadcasting (“DB”), as the Editor-in-Chief of RTHK, was responsible for making the final editorial decisions.
9. A Member considered that an effective complaint handling mechanism should ensure that there was segregation of duties between the investigators and

complainees. And if the complaints were substantiated, follow-up actions should be taken. She stated that complaints were investigative in nature. What was more important was that the problems found should be turned into pre-emptive measures through follow-up and training. And the effectiveness of the measures could be seen by monitoring whether similar incidents had happened repeatedly. She suggested that RTHK could consider adding and revising work manuals as a regular pre-emptive measure. Ms Amen NG responded that CA played the role of a third party in RTHK's complaint handling processes, in which professionals and lawyers participated. She stated that the substantiated complaint cases in the past would be posted on RTHK's intranet for colleagues' reference, and reported in different meetings every week. Besides, they would be included in induction and on-the-job training courses.

10. Another Member suggested that people from a third party should participate in the handling processes. She enquired about whether the officers responsible for complaint handling would be related to the programmes receiving complaints. Ms Amen NG responded that if a complaint was related to editorial matters, RTHK would assign officers from a different programme section to handle the case.

Agenda Item 2: The Thought Process / Selection Criteria for Complaints to be Reported to RTHK Board of Advisors for Advice

11. Ms Amen NG stated that complaints against RTHK programmes could be roughly divided into three categories, which involved content, technology and administration respectively. For CA's decisions regarding the complaints against RTHK programmes, it was RTHK's current practice to report those complaints to the Board regardless of whether they were justified or not. She also pointed out that RTHK submitted the figures of feedback received to the Legislative Council for reference every year.
12. A Member enquired about the content included in the reports on complaints to the Board. Ms Amen NG responded that the reports on complaint included all decisions made by CA regarding complaints against RTHK programmes and breakdown of public feedback. She would also highlight matters which received more complaints for the Board. A Member suggested that RTHK could summarise the aspects of which compliments were received for the Board's more comprehensive understanding. Ms NG responded that RTHK had always reported feedback items which gained more attention to the Board subject to the situations.

13. A Member was concerned about the public complaint against “Headliner” earlier on. He enquired about the principles adopted for programme content by RTHK when handling that complaint. Another Member enquired whether RTHK would seek the Board’s advice regarding that complaint. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that the Board’s functions did not include handling of individual complaints, while RTHK would conduct a review on “Headliner” which covered programme content, form of expression, public expectation, etc. The production of the new season of “Headliner” would be suspended until the completion of the review.
14. A Member considered that RTHK might not need to seek advice from the Board regarding individual complaints. However, he suggested that when an important complaint was received, RTHK could notify the Board that investigation was in progress. Besides, substantiated complaints could be specified if they were of repeated nature.
15. A Member said that he noticed that some RTHK programmes, such as “Headliner”, received complaints repeatedly, but follow-up actions were not taken by RTHK until after quite a period of time. He enquired if RTHK could expedite the process of complaint handling, and if it would review the direction of programme production in light of the complaints. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that RTHK had always handled complaints speedily, such as the complaint against “Pentaprism” was immediately handled the same afternoon upon receipt; and immediately decided to suspend the production of “Headliner” after broadcasting the season of the programme until completion of the review upon CA’s making of the decision regarding the complaint against “Headliner”. He remarked that RTHK attached great importance to all decisions made by CA, and regularly reminded the colleagues and reviewed programme production in respect of the cases.
16. Another Member said that the Board had had discussions about complaints against programmes like “Headliner” and “Pentaprism” previously, but RTHK’s response back then was that different types of programme had different standards. He considered that reflected RTHK must strengthen colleagues’ understanding of the Charter. Ms Amen NG added that when handling complaints, the focus should be on the content instead of the object. She pointed out that a number of complaints against “Headliner” were unsubstantiated in the past. As for the recent complaints, RTHK had taken action once the complaints were decided to be substantiated.

17. The Chairman provided the following three suggestions to DB:
- (i) It was listed in paragraph 13(b) of the Charter that the functions of the Board included receiving reports on complaints. He hoped that RHTK would consider notifying the Board at the stage of investigation regarding complaints of great importance and public concern.
 - (ii) As the Editor-in-chief of RTHK, DB could expound more on the work of RTHK to the media regarding important issues, such that the public could have a clearer understanding of his decisions and directions, and know that RTHK had been handling complaints seriously.
 - (iii) DB should lead colleagues to deepen understanding of the spirit and purposes of the Charter for its better integration into RTHK culture, and engender the public's cherishing of the society and sense of national identity.
18. A Member considered that from the perspective of risk management, teamwork was crucial for RTHK to tackle challenges. He agreed with the Chairman's suggestion and expected that RTHK management would strengthen communication and interaction with the Board. He believed that RTHK management played a major role in leading internal reflection and public impression.
19. Mr LEUNG Ka-wing responded that RTHK was a government department, as well as a public service broadcaster. Therefore, as the Editor-in-chief of RTHK, it was inevitable that every decision he made would be challenged by various parties. As such, he would be prudent to make remarks and keep a low profile. Regarding the relationship between the Board and RTHK, he had been strictly following the requirements stated in the Charter. Ms Amen NG added that RTHK would give an unadorned account of all matters of concern to the society in appropriate channels.
20. The Chairman concluded the meeting and expected RTHK to implement the spirit of the Charter and strive for excellence.

Agenda Item 3: Any Other Business

21. Members did not bring up any other matter for discussion.

22. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Secretariat

RTHK Board of Advisors