



Hong Kong University Students' Union Council,
Session 2013
1st Emergency Council Meeting [ECM1]
Minutes

Date: 21/3/2013
Venue: G/F Foyer, Union Building
Time: 22:46

Attendance:

CC, HS, AS(a), ICAP, RICA, RICA2, HHR*, LCHHR, LHHR, LHTHR, MHR*, RCLHR, SCSHR, SJCR (Early leave with apology), SKYLHR, STHR, SWHR, UHR, WLHR, ASR, AAR, DSR, EDSR, ENSR, LAR, MSR, SSR, SSSR, ECU(a)

Absent:

SAP (No apology), CAP (No apology), RSA (No apology), RSA2 (No apology), RCA (No apology), RCA2 (No apology), RHR (with apology), BEAR (With apology), PP (No apology)

Late:

FS(a) (Early Leave with apology), LSKHR (Early Leave with apology), CTVC(a)

0. Meeting called to order and Sing the Union Song

Section A

1. To read out the correspondences

- RHR needs to be absent.
- BEAR needs to be absent.
- SJCR needs to leave early at 00:45.
- FS(a) needs to leave early at 00:30.
- LSKHR needs to leave early at 00:00.
- CTVC(a) needs to leave early at 00:00.
- AS(a) needs to leave early at 01:30.

2. To receipt and adopt the agenda

- AAR suggested adding agendum B3 “To discuss the other arrangements of the By-election”.
- CC asked whether agenda B4 & B5 should be delayed accordingly.
- AAR stated that since FS(a) will be leaving early, so the agenda should be added into B5.
- AS(a) suggested adding an agendum to adopt minutes of CM1, not to wait till CM2.

Motion 1

To add an agendum B5 “To discuss the other arrangements for the By-Election for Annual Election 2013 and the Election of Undergraduate Student Membership to the Boards of Faculties 2013.”

Proposer: Ng Wai Ka (AAR)

Secunder: Ngai Ting Hong (SSR)

Time received: 22:58

Resolution: No Objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 22:59

- CTVC(a) requested to change the agendum on Union Finance from B5 to B1, due to his need to leave early.

Motion 2

To add the agendum A3 “To receive and adopt the minutes of CM1” and to change the agendum B4 “To discuss the Union Finance” to B1.

Proposer: Sham Kwan Ho (SSSR)

Secunder: Li Chee Wing (LAR)

Time received: 23:03

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 23:03

3. To receive and adopt the minutes of CM1

- LCHHR suggested that the pronoun in point 3 under Motion 2 should be “His”.

- LHR could not find her abbreviation in the list of attended councilors, and suggested that she did attend CM1.
- UHR discovered that the pronoun “She” was used instead of “He” in the part of him delivering maiden speech.
- SSR suggested that there was a typo “CTVR”, which should be “CTVC(a)”.
- AAR suggested that in section B, on page 3 of the part on appointing members of standing committees, it should be “No Voting rights but Speaking Rights”, instead of “with neither voting nor speaking rights”.
- ICAP suggested that in the maiden speeches of the 3 representatives from the ICA, “20 independent clubs” should be used instead of “20 ICAs”.
- SSR suggested that the question in Session A Motion 1 on the relationship between CC and HS should be asked by SSSR, instead of SSR.
- MHR raised queries on Motion 3 point 7, CC clarified.

Motion 3

To receive and adopt the minutes of CM1, Union Council Session 2013.

Proposer: Sham Kwan Ho (SSSR)

Seconder: Li Chee Wing (LAR)

Time received: 23:15

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 23:15

Section B

1. To discuss the Union Finance

- CC reminded that budget of Undergrad and CTV have not been approved in the previous Council Session.
- CTVC(a) raised that the executive of Session 2011 also had an out budget of \$10000 that hasn’t been approved.
- ECU(a) raised that according to the Financial Regulation, budget must be passed before taking out money. But due to the fact that the budget has not been approved by the Union Council Session 2012, money could not be obtained. He also suggested another problem, which is the over-budget in session 2012: the budget suggested only \$160000 of expenditure, but Undergrad alone used over \$170000. He reminded that actually even the Council resolution might not be able to get recognized by the school, so the only thing that was to be accomplished in the

Union Council would be to double check whether there are problems in the reports of the campus media.

- CTVC(a) provided a piece of information that only about \$10000 was used by CTV in Session 2012, but there was already a problem of over budget in the fund for campus media (i.e. the \$160000).
- ECU(a) suggested that in fact over budget often happened in history, he felt sorry that he had not got enough time to contact previous executives for suggested remediation.
- LSKHR suggested that to be fair, the Undergrad and CTV should give an account of the reasons leading to over budget.
- CTVC(a) suggested the purchase of equipment as a reason leading to over budget.
- ECU(a) remembered that the media fund was less than their real budget, start from the very beginning. As suggested by the Financial Secretary in the Session 2012, Desmond, the budget usually is set stricter than the real situation. He instructed the councilors to check the detailed items by referring to the excel file.
- FS(a) asked whether or not there was a discussion on how to divide the fund between Undergrad and CTV, especially under the situation that the expected expenditure was already over the budget.
- EDSR asked about the method adopted to determine the amount of media fund.
- ECU(a) suggested that the excel file was extracted from Desmond's Union financial budget. But occasionally, for example in session 2010, less money was used, since only 2 issues of Undergrad were published. Since when the budget was set, the previous number would be used as a reference, it could be quite easy to get an over budget.
- MSR asked if the media fund alone would be the whole sum of money they spent, and she queried why there were 3 items of money consumed by Undergrad and CTV in total.
- CC asked if any councilors from the previous session could recall whether the media fund and campus media budget were discussed in the same ECM last year.
- ECU(a) stated that he was unclear on the final resolution also, but the budget of \$200000, queried by some other councilors, were not passed at last.
- LCHHR compared the budget and the actual expenditure. The former states that 6000 copies of an issue cost only \$36000, but eventually only 5000 pieces cost already \$43000. He asked for an explanation from the acting executives of the Campus media.
- ECU(a) explained that the cost of publishing an issue of Undergrad highly depends on the number of pages in that edition. Since the edition turned out to be much thicker than expected, the cost also increased in scale.

- WLHR asked whether an evaluation was held on the issue of over budget last year, in order to evaluate on which part is more likely to be overly spent.
- ECU(a) answered that since the 60th anniversary Special edition is not issued every year, Desmond suggested the executive to apply for special fund, but actually he was not clear about that. At last due to limited resources, the plan of such publication was cancelled.
- STHR asked for a reason on the cut of printed copies stated in point 2.3-2.4 in the report.
- CC reminded that in the ECM 5 held in July 2012, they discussed on an adoption of all budget, including the \$160000 of media fund and the \$200000 of Undergrad budget, both were passed at the same time. Some councilors did query on that, in which she forgot every tiny detail. Nonetheless as she remembered, the budget of Undergrad and CTV were not passed at last.
- ECU(a) quoted financial regulation and stated that the budget of Campus media can be handed in within a month after the Union budget was passed. The then UHR, But Tsz Long, also attempted to call an ECM to clarify on that, but the then Council Chairperson, Tam Chun Sing declined the request, stating that most councilors were still having exam.
- CTVC(a) stated that the whole sum of money to be claimed would be \$194387 in total. Actually only \$40000 of which would need to be passed in the future.
- LCHHR thought \$160000 could be claimed first.
- ECU(a) explained that \$169400 is a debt to outsider, which might imply legal action if could not be settled promptly.
- CC clarified the over budget in certain year should be settled with the year budget of that same year, which implied that the over budget in 2011 should be dealt with the fund of 2011.
- CTVC(a) stated that the CTV had a debt of \$24600 to outsiders.
- CC concluded that:
 - 1) Councilors should focus discussion on How the debt of Undergrad could be settled.
 - 2) The principle that debt generated in 2011 should not be settled with the fund in 2012 should be noted.
- CTVC(a) recalled that Desmond suggested 2011 fund had deficit.
- CC asked whether the deficit was already put in the 2012 budget. She remembered some financial reports had already been dealt with in the early CMs in session 2012.
- CTVC(a) suggested the immediate previous executives could not claim that \$12000 deficit, they did tell Desmond but no follow up actions from him were

observed.

- LCHHR suggested that the finance in session 2011 and 2012 should be dealt with separately, in order to at least get part of the problem solved.
- CTVC(a) agreed and suggested that the \$12000 could be borne by the executives themselves, the \$160000 debt owed by Undergrad was more urgent.
- AS(a) suggested also to focus on the \$160000, which was approved by the Union Finance Committee in the budget before. He would try to contact previous FS. He also asked Undergrad for proof on Desmond's persuasion misleading them to accept such a discrepancy in their budget and Media fund.
- CTVC(a) reorganized the facts: Desmond did promise that over budget would be accepted, and ensured that discrepancy often happened.
- ECU(a) provided a supplementary piece of info: the past executives of Undergrad had fit budget. According to the financial regulations, budget should have been approved by council but over budget could be accepted and settled by explaining to financial secretary and honorary chairperson. The problems that demand settlement would be:

- 1) The budget wasn't passed in the Union Council
- 2) The remaining reserve was insufficient to settle the debt.

Last year a cheque was issued by HKUSU directly to settle the debt. According to the financial regulation, indeed there was a contingency plan, but how it could be run was uncertain.

- FS(a) asked if Desmond mentioned which item could be picked out to apply for funds other than Media Fund. He also heard about contingency plans from past FS.
- ECU(a) answered that 60th anniversary special edition was in fact comparable to SU 100th anniversary souvenir. Desmond promised to ask the then CC, Tam Chun Sing, to convene meeting and would research on whether the Executive committee should bear the over budget. But no matter if it was to be taken away from the budget, there would still be an over budget.
- LCHHR stated that after reducing \$45000 from \$210000, there would still be serious over budget.
- SSR suggested the remaining other than the \$160000 might be borne by school.
- AS(a) suggested the Council to focus on the discussion on the \$160000 still, since debts to outsider should be settled first, then the remaining could be settled by the newly elected FS in the upcoming by-election.
- ECU(a) confessed that even the \$45000 had not been counted, the over budget was still on the printing cost still. The doubled pages definitely implied a doubled cost. Although the executives tried their best to recover the budget, for example

using cheaper quality of paper for the June 4th issue, still there was deficit.

- CTVC(a) suggested that only when a certain item could be found also in the budget, then the fund should cover on.
- LCHHR suggested consulting CTV on whether all of the \$160000 claimed should be given to Undergrad.
- CTVC(a) suggested passing a motion to recognize CTV's budget, then the claimed sum should be fully transferred to Undergrad first, due to the higher degree of urgency.
- AS(a) asked whether the division method of 160000 between CTV and Undergrad was compromised.
- FS(a) suggested that the division method to be discussed at the scene.
- AS(a) suggested that since the ratio of capital sharing between CTV and Undergrad did not change much in the past few years, the number might be used as a reference.
- ECU(a) suggested the claimed sum to be given to undergrad first, based on the degree of necessity. For the remaining over the \$160000, it shall be settled within the executives, so that legal responsibilities could be evaded. He also suggested amending the budget so that it would be more procedurally just, he demanded more time for discussion with CTV.
- CC asked whether the budget would be amended according to the eventual total sum spent or the \$160000 approved. She suggested granting the period of discussing on 1 agenda for compromise between CTV and Undergrad alone.
- ECU(a) hoped the \$160000 could be granted as soon as possible.
- CC suggested it is very strange to grant fund before having the budget approved.
- LCHHR quoted Dr. Albert CHAU's word of granting fund only if it is completely procedurally just.
- CC delayed this agenda.

Motion 4

To adjourn agenda B1 after a time that is after agenda B2.

Proposer: Chu Sin Po (MHR)

Seconder: Sin Po Lu (LHHR)

Time received: 00:23

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 00:24

2. To appoint the Election Officers for the By-election for Annual Election 2013 and for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013
- LSKHR requested to grant speaking right to Miss Tsui Lee Ka, the Chairperson of the Union Election Commission for the By-election of the Annual Election 2013 and the By-election of Undergraduate Student Membership to the Boards of Faculties 2013.
 - Tsui stated that the list of Election Officer had already been received, but the EO-to-be needed to be appointed in council. She also sent the softcopy of the EO list to councilors.
 - SSSR asked when the EO briefing would be held.
 - Tsui suggested the coming Saturday or/and Sunday, and remarked that it would be compulsory for the EO-to-be to attend.
 - UHR asked if the EO had to be absent, what would be the arrangement.
 - Tsui stated that at least 2 proposed officers from each society or association are needed, maybe 2 briefing sessions would be held if such requirement really could not be met.
 - SSR asked if the name of EO should be consistent with the one on his/ her Student card.
 - MSR suggested changes on the list she sent to Tsui. (Deleting Ms. Cheung Gar Woon Agnes, as she would be the candidate in the by-election of Undergraduate Student Membership to the Boards of Faculties 2013.
 - Tsui suggested that changes to be made in the file and send back to her.
 - LCHHR asked if the name of EO should be consistent with the one on his/her student card.

Motion 5

To appoint the Election Officers for the By-Election for Annual Election 2013 and for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Boards of Faculties 2013.

Proposer: Lui Chun Ying (SJCR)

Seconder: Lam Chun Yu Harvey (LSKHR)

Time received: 00:50

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 00:51

Motion 6

To adjourn agendum B1 to a later time that is after B3.

Proposer: Sin Po Lun (LHHR)

Secunder: Chu Sin Po (MHR)

Time received: 00:52

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 00:53

3. To discuss and adopt the voting method for the By-Election for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013
 - Tsui explained that the electoral method adopted by the Faculty of Business and Economics has not been stated clearly, after consulting the registry, they suggested going with a council resolution.
 - UHR asked for a detailed explanation.
 - Tsui referred to the session “Determination of Results” in the Election regulation, which states that the results shall be determined in accordance with the conditions stated in the Union Constitution. Then she moved on to Section VI Article 7 of the Constitution, which states that “The candidate shall be declared elected provided-
i) the candidate has secured a number of votes for him/her greater than the number of votes against him/her and ii) the candidate has secured a number of votes for him/her no less than 10% of the total Full Membership of the Union”.

Motion 7

To adopt the voting method for the By Election for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013.

Proposer: Li Chee Wing (LAR)

Secunder: Sham Kwan Ho (SSSR)

Time received: 00:58

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 00:58

1. To discuss the Union Finance (Cont.)

- ECU(a) stated that after reducing the money for the 60th anniversary special edition, the expenditure still exceeded \$170000. He emphasized that over budget was actually normal, when setting a budget, the actual expenses should not be used, or else it would seriously affect the budget drafting in the following years. Although the media fund only got the \$160000 approved, there should be another sum included in the capital investment fund, therefore he hoped that the part other than the \$160000 would be taken from the union development fund.
- AS(a) wanted to clarify if UFC advised \$160000 or \$170000.
- ECU(a) stressed that UFC, dominated by Desmond, advised the campus media could make use of other fund.
- AS(a) said that if the final conclusion approved was \$160000, he would recommend approving \$160000 as concluded in UC12 ECM 5, he believed that there could be no convincing reasons to enlarge the fund to \$210000 yet.
- ECU(a) stated that the expenditure of \$170000 only referred to Undergrad, another \$50000 was for campus TV. He reminded that
 - 1) No mix up on budget and fund.
 - 2) Budget for CTV this year shall not be used as reference for future years.
- AS(a) suggested that the then FS, Desmond, probably misled the executives of the Campus Media, the possible resolution present would be approving at most \$160000 at this stage.
- ECU(a) asked whether a budget within \$160000 should be handed in.
- AS(a) recommended picking out items that consist \$160000, then leaving the remaining \$10000 with some reference notes on how it was spent. He also asked which organizations should be responsible for paying the \$160000.
- LAR suggested approving budget and the claimed amount could be separated.
- LCHHR raised the unreasonableness on deliberately approving a fund which was less than the budget.
- ECU(a) queried that the budget of CTV would become zero then.
- LAR asked if the proportion between CTV and Undergrad in the can also be decided.
- ECU(a) wished the council to pass that 160000 can be used by the 2 media, but how to distribute they would discuss and asked hon chair.
- LAR asked whether adoption of budget should be carried out at the same time.
- ECU(a) looked forward to an action that at the same recognize the previous approval of \$160000 Media Fund.
- SSSR asked if we are going to recognize the budget after hand.
- ECU(a) stated that supposedly the \$160000 should be used with reasonable

reasons. He also raised the usefulness of such documents to negotiate with outsider.

- EDSR asked how the remaining amount should be settled, like how the remaining \$50000 for CTV could be given.
- ECU(a) wanted to discuss the details later, but instead, he demanded the Council to show a stance first.
- LAR could not understand why the budget would still not be passed, the difference between that and the claimed amount could be tolerated.
- ECU(a) stated that there might be controversy among councilors, so he hoped that at least \$160000 could be granted.
- LCHHR asked for the sequence of passage between Union Budget and Campus Media Financial Budget.
- ECU(a) stated that Union budget must be passed before media financial budget.
- CTVC(a) explained that in union budget, the media budget was more than campus media part in the union fund, that would be due to Desmond's negligence on their views when drafting on the media part, with his stress on "there could be tolerance over over-budget". He suggested approving original budget, since the action:
 - 1) Fit the principle of passing budget before letting the party claim for money.
 - 2) The application for media fund would be more referential for the following years.
- CC suggested making use of memorandum to procrastinate the dealing with the expenditure of CTV in the session 2012.
- ECU(a) thought the media fund of either CTV or Undergrad would not be adopted, as the name of the item, or the amount could not be over the original \$160000.
- LAR asked if there were any councilors who considered adopting the budget would be unacceptable.
- CC reminded that the key lied on whether the budget was \$210000 or \$170000.
- LAR stressed that the budget should not be deliberately minimized.
- LCHHR criticized the budget of CTV and Undergrad in total for being a lot larger than \$160000, and queried how to provide legitimate explanation to the students.
- MHR asked for an explanation on why the Union budget would be adopted.
- CC stated that the focus when passing was mainly on CAC , while the amount media fund was not even mentioned. They even directly jumped to the media budget.
- CTVC(a) stressed on Desmond's misleading message, and stated that over budget would be common.
- SKYLHR believed the UFC-approved \$160000 should be given no matter what.
- EDSR stressed that if the budget was problematic, even though it was approved,

did not mean money shall be given in the Union Council.

- LCHHR raised that students might query council decisions if money was given that easily.
- UHR believed that the street debt must be dealt with, students would want to evade legal procedures too.
- FS(a) suggested using 2/3majority to revoke previous decisions of passing the \$160000 budget.
- CTVC(a) suggested that since the budget was put down in the campaign booklet, students should be well notified.
- ECU(a) agreed that student should have no queries over the budget, but he confessed that granting money should be independent of the budget.
- LCHHR asked if GP already imply students' unconditional approval, what the use of approval of union budget would be.
- MSR suggested revoking the passage of union budget, due to Desmond's misleading message.
- LCHHR suggested 2/3 majority to pass this motion due to the huge controversy.
- CC refuted as it was not a previous decision.
- UHR suggested reorganizing the order of motion, firstly revoke the union budget , then adopt the campus media budget, in order to avoid contradictory.
- MSR asked whether there could be other explanation for the remaining budget apart from the \$160000.
- LCHHR queried that if the union budget was revoked, the originally approved \$160000 might be lost also.
- CTVC(a) suggested either revoking union budget or considering the budget of CTV and Undergrad as invalid.
- ASR disagreed with revoking union budget, or else adjusting budget would become a remediation for any over budget in the future, setting a bad example.
- LAR wanted to clarify that they are separate logics, revocation this time would not be due to over budget, but Desmond's misleading message.

Motion 8

To adjourn Agendum B1 after a time of after agendum B4.

Proposer: Tso Kwan Yi (LHTHR)

Secunder: Chan Tsz Chun Rachel (WLHR)

Time received: 02:14

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 02:15

4. To discuss the finance of the By-Election for Annual Election 2013 and for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013
 - FS(a) gave a brief account of the budget for the By-Elections, which would be \$43800 on candidates' subsidy, and several hundred on the travelling expense for transporting ballots back to HKU, and another \$14000 on ballot printing.
 - AS(a) asked for description of the special characteristic of the ballot paper.
 - Tsui suggested the paper will be thicker, each with an individual code, with bar for anti-fraud will be added at the back, due to the fact that only 2 companies had the technology to make such bar transparent under light, and it was not even for this use, the UEC could not adopt this kind of ballot paper.
 - AS(a) asked whether an ultra-light need to be used to differentiate the real ballot paper from the fake ones.
 - Tsui explained that she needed to explain that with real object, but it could not be fraud printed with any printer. The principle the UEC held when choosing the anti-fraud measures would be that, even if a person took a ballot, it should not be able to be duplicated within the 4-day election period.
 - CTVC(a) asked whether the cabinet name would be printed on the ballot paper, he was especially concerned about the cabinet formed by the Popularly elected councilors.
 - Tsui replied that only names of individual candidates and their curriculum would be shown, but not the cabinet name, since the electoral system was not in cabinet form. She also added that the number of ballot paper was calculated with member base $\times 0.8$, each person would definitely get one vote of the by-election of faculty board, not to mention the by-election for executive committee members.
 - AAR demanded a clarification on why the election subsidy for various candidates differed from each other, some 800 while some only 400.
 - Tsui explained that more was granted to candidates running for the seats in executive committee, due to their preparation for the central campaign, while less was granted to candidates running for faculty board, she provided the information that the candidate did not even have to borrow movable board from the UEC.
 - UHR asked how such expenses could possibly be settled.
 - AS(a) explained that administrative power and financial power had not yet been attained, but possibly they would be granted after the by-election, the councilors themselves needed to prepay the expenses. There could be further discussion on that.
 - AAR suggested that there could 1 month of grace period for taking care of the bill,

so there should be no hurry.

Motion 9

To adopt the budget of the By-Election for Annual Election 2013 and for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013.

Proposer: Ng Wai Ka (AAR)

Secunder: Wong Wai Yan Phoenix (MSR)

Time received: 02:34

Resolution: No objection. Motion Carried.

Time resolved: 02:34

1. To discuss the Union Finance (Cont.)
 - ECU(a) explained that since even the budget had been passed by council, the campus media executive still needed to negotiate with the honorary chairperson, he suggested that it could be better if the negotiation with school was carried out first.
 - CTVC(a) reminded that a revocation of the budget might be complicated, so they wished to negotiate with school first, and hopefully they could set a sum to claim for CTV exclusively, then the issue would be brought back to council.
 - RCLHR asked whether the campus media could be provided funding before having the distribution method decided.
 - MSR queried that the \$160000 was already passed previously, only not endorsed to be claimed, there should be no reason for not granting, he believed that there should be no more discussion on the amount.
 - ECU(a) clarified that no matter what, there could be only a show of stance to support the amount of \$160000 to be solely used by the campus media, the action of practical claim would take place only after discussing with honorary chairperson anyway.
 - CTVC(a) expressed his wish to have ECM to pass the budget once finished compromising on the distribution between CTV and Undergrad.
 - ECU(a) showed gratitude for every councilor's help in settling this matter.
 - CC demanded the negotiation with honorary chair to take place soon.
5. To discuss the other arrangements for the By-Election for Annual Election 2013 and the Election of Undergraduate Student Membership to the Boards of Faculties 2013

- AAR explained that it was impossible to have a card system installed because only CEDARS could provide such technology. And the glass room on LG of the composite building would act as the ballot keeping place, and the key should be kept by the UEC Chairperson. He also reminded that some election arrangement was passed in council in UC12 ECM9 I, for example, each polling station should be given a number, and the person in charge of a certain polling station should not be the one who transport the ballot paper from that polling station back to the center for storage.
- STHR asked for an account of the outline and operation method of the excel file, recording the voters' personal data.
- MSR replied that there would be a google document, with a master list with all registered UID, which the EO would search once a certain student came to vote. The UEC chairperson would adopt the setting that the UID could not be changed by anyone else except herself.
- AAR provided supplementary information that there would be 2 separate section in the excel file, not only the UEC chairperson could amend, every EO should have the right to do so. The second column would be a record of who edited the document. He ensured that a detailed explanation would be given in the EO briefing session.
- SSSR asked whether the rights to be EO would be lost if they could not have attended the briefing.
- AAR ensured that once the person was appointed by council, they would be EO. He also reminded that every society and association should at least send two EO.
- DSR wished that at least the councilors would be familiar with how the elections would be run.
- SSSR asked when the details of the EO briefing would be released.
- AAR explained that a UEC meeting should come first, in which consensus would be attained.
- AS(a) questioned that since the following day would already be Friday, the notification might be too urgent.
- AAR stated that the briefing session would probably be held on Sunday.
- MSR wished there would be at least 2 executive committee members from her society being available on both Saturday and Sunday.
- AS(a) demanded at least the time of the briefing session to be announced in this ECM1.
- AAR stated that UEC meeting needs a 24-hour notice, so he could only suggest that to be on Sunday, in the afternoon or at night.

- MHR reminded councilors that there would be hall retreat held at 1-5 pm that day, in which the executive committee members of Hall Students' Association would be occupied.
- AS(a) strongly recommended an exact time to be announced. He also raised a question of where the suitable venue would be, he believed that a lecture room would be more formal, but booking needed to be done at that time.
- AAR could not contact the UEC chairperson at that moment, but he suggested that to be held on Sunday 7 pm.
- STHR agreed with Sunday 7 pm, as most hall-mates would have been back by then.
- AAR stated that hopefully another session could be held on Monday night, for those EOs who could not attend the session on Sunday. He deemed that would still be suitable because some EOs would only start helping on Tuesday.
- SSR suggested the Sunday session to be solely for EOs from Faculty societies, and the Monday session for those from hall students' associations.
- AAR reminded that what I said could not be the confirmed resolution. And he raised that more contingency plans must be better, Sunday 3,5,7pm or Monday 3,5,7pm could all be choices, but he needed to confirm with others, including the UEC chairperson.
- LAR pointed out that the briefing should be held in weekend, it could be safer in the sense that everything would be settled before the election starts.
- AAR stressed on the 24-hour notice for a UEC meeting, which means the meeting could be held earliest on Saturday, so the briefing must be happening on Sunday.
- AS(a) suggested an informal meeting to be held first. And concerning the EO briefing session, he believed that half an hour should be enough for one session, and 2 sessions in total would be enough, but he would not recommend anyone who did not attend any briefing to become EO.
- LCHHR questioned if there would be exchange of duty session among societies and associations, so the Monday session might be unfeasible.
- AAR reminded that when the timeslots were arranged, they were already chosen by societies at their convenience
- SSSR asked if email and telephone would be considered as means to brief the EOs.
- AAR confirmed, and he deemed that even face-to-face meeting would be acceptable.
- AS(a) highly recommended not to use email or telephone as means, he believed cutting EO instead.
- LCHHR raised a suggestion of video-taking in the briefing sessions and asked the

EOs to watch by themselves.

- AS(a) deemed that to be acceptable, but it should not be an excuse of evading responsibility. Their attitude when watching, or even if they really watched that, could not be certain.
- AAR recommended as many attendees in the briefing sessions as possible.
- AS(a) requested the UEC to confirm with the Returning Officers on their duties, like when and how they shall sign the documents. He also demanded suggestion concerning the security problem.
- AAR stated that the UEC had already asked CTV for direct broadcast, he was sure that the CTV had been informed but no response was received yet. Councilors should also get on duty to look after.
- LCHHR asked what would be recorded in the video, whether or not it would be the ballot boxes.
- SSR raised the concern that whether or not the unused ballot paper should be put in the same room with the ballot boxes.
- SSSR ensured that the ballot box would be locked every single day, so that nobody would be able to put fraud votes into the box.
- SSR emphasized on the need to complete the election in fairness, there might be destructive actions still, as real votes and fake votes would not be able to be distinguished if someone broke the seal and put in fake votes.
- AS(a) suggested that taking video would enable the council to recognize the identity of the devastator, and the guarding would be able to prevent damage to fairness. He deemed that would already be enough.
- SSR questioned again on where the unused ballot paper would be put.
- SSSR raised that the problem rested on how safe the room would be, since never could all the ways they adopted to frappe to be predicted.
- WLHR asked how many security guards would be present every night, and the possible ways they could be recruited.
- AAR suggested them to be councilors.
- AS(a) questioned on the way to confirm that the guards would act just and fair.
- AAR suggested that they had already done their best to ensure, and personally he would stay behind every night
- LCHHR asked should the polling station be closed every night.
- AAR quoted the election regulation that, the ballot box should be locked and delivered to CC, and into the central storage room under the supervision of CC, and locked up by the UEC chairperson.
- CC suggested all polling stations to be completely removed every single day.
- AS(a) provided information that materials were nearly all ready, except the stamps

and movable boards. He deemed that Medical campus and dental campus would have their own. He also reminded that the borrowing of desks and chairs must be done by societies but not HKUSU.

- AS(a) overallly commented that the briefing details had to be confirmed soon. And all EO shall be compulsory to come. The security of the room should be of high priority.
- LCHHR restated the importance of the election, he wished there would be no mistakes occurred.
- AAR: suggested all councilors to be responsible for monitoring all the time.

- CC reminded councilors to notify cc when they hand in motions by circulation.
- CC wished to have CRWG soon.
- CC also demanded councilors to double confirm the council correspondences, as council handbook 2013 would be made by her and HS soon.

The Meeting ended at 03:42 on 22/3/2013.

Prepared by,

Approved by,

Leung Lai Kwok Yvonne
Honorary Secretary
HKUSU Council, Session 2013

Li Wai Yan, Vivian
Council Chairperson
HKUSU Council, Session 2013