

CHAPTER 2

DELINEATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL CONSTITUENCIES

Section 1 : Statutory Requirements

Provisions stipulated under the Legislative Council Ordinance

2.1 In making the recommendations in respect of the delineation of GC boundaries, the EAC is required to adhere to the following provisions stipulated under the Legislative Council Ordinance (Chapter 542) (“LCO”):

- (a) there are to be **5 GCs** for the purpose of returning Members at elections for those constituencies [section 18(1) of the LCO];
- (b) at a general election, **35 Members** are to be returned for all GCs [section 19(1) of the LCO]; and
- (c) the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number, **not less than 5 nor greater than 9** [section 19(2) of the LCO].

Criteria stipulated under the EACO

2.2 In accordance with the EACO, the EAC shall:

- (a) ensure that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the number which results (i.e. “the resulting number”) when the population quota is multiplied by the number of Members to be returned to the LegCo by that GC [section 20(1)(a) of the EACO];
- (b) where it is not practicable to comply with paragraph (a) above in respect of a proposed GC, ensure that the population in that GC does not exceed or fall short of the resulting number applicable to that GC by more than 15% [section 20(1)(b) of the EACO]; and
- (c) ensure that each proposed GC is to be constituted by two or more contiguous whole District Council constituencies [section 20(2) of the EACO].

2.3 In making such recommendations, the EAC shall also have regard to:

- (a) community identities and the preservation of local ties [section 20(3)(a) of the EACO];

- (b) physical features (such as size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant area or any part thereof [section 20(3)(b) of the EACO];
- (c) existing boundaries of Districts¹ [section 20(4)(a) of the EACO]; and
- (d) existing boundaries of GCs [section 20(4)(b) of the EACO].

2.4 The EAC may depart from the strict application of the requirements set out in paragraph 2.2(a) and (b) above only where it appears that a consideration referred to in paragraph 2.3(a) and (b) above renders such a departure necessary or desirable [section 20(5) of the EACO].

Section 2 : Working Principles

2.5 Apart from the statutory requirements and criteria set out above, the EAC also adopted a set of long-established working principles (as shown below) for the current delineation exercise:

- (a) the boundaries of the existing 5 GCs should form the basis of consideration in the current delineation exercise;

¹ “Districts” means the 18 Districts as set out in Part II of Schedule 1 to the District Councils Ordinance (Chapter 547).

- (b) for those existing GCs where the population falls within the permissible range of the population quota requirement, their boundaries would be adopted as far as possible to form new GCs;
- (c) Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories are to be treated separately, as these areas have been traditionally regarded as distinct from one another;
- (d) splitting of Districts by District Council constituencies should be avoided unless there are very strong reasons. Where splitting is necessary, it should affect the least number of Districts; and
- (e) factors with political implications are not considered.

Section 3 : Name and Code of GCs

2.6 In determining the name and code reference for the GCs, the EAC considers that the name of GCs should comprise two easily distinguished components, namely the name of the area in which the GC is situated and a directional reference similar to those adopted for the existing GCs, i.e. Hong Kong Island (“HKI”), Kowloon West (“KW”), Kowloon East (“KE”), the New Territories West (“NTW”) and the New Territories East (“NTE”). The GCs are also distinguished by a code and numbering

system starting from “LC 1” and ending at “LC 5”, being arranged from south to north and from west to east. The EAC hopes that with the adoption of this naming and coding system, anyone who consults the maps would find it easier to understand them and locate the GCs concerned. These methods have also been adopted in the delineation exercises for the LegCo general elections since 1998.

Section 4 : Population Forecasts

2.7 Section 20(6) of the EACO requires that the EAC shall endeavour to estimate the total population of Hong Kong or any proposed GC in the year in which a LegCo general election is to be held for the purpose of making recommendations on the delineation of GCs. If it is not practicable to do so, the EAC shall estimate the population of Hong Kong or the GC having regard to the available information which is the best possible in the circumstances.

2.8 An Ad Hoc Subgroup (“AHSG”), formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections led by the Planning Department (“PlanD”), took up the task of providing the EAC with the necessary population forecasts. The AHSG was chaired by an Assistant Director of the PlanD and comprised representatives from the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau (“CMAB”), Census and Statistics Department (“C&SD”), Housing Department, Lands Department (“LandsD”) and Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”). Following the established

practice, the AHSB used the statistics of the latest official population projections (2011-based projected figures) released by the C&SD as the basis and provided a report to the EAC on population forecasts of each District Council Constituency Area (“DCCA”) in Hong Kong as at **30 June 2016**.

2.9 The report estimated that the total population of Hong Kong would be **7 370 500** as at 30 June 2016. The population projections in the report were adopted by the EAC for the delineation of GC boundaries. The **population quota** (defined in section 17(1) of the EACO as the total population of Hong Kong divided by the total number of Members to be returned for all GCs, i.e. $7\,370\,500 \div 35$) was **210 586** for the purpose of this delineation exercise.

Section 5 : The Process of Delineation

2.10 Based on the population forecasts mentioned in paragraph 2.9 above and adhering to the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles as set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 above, the EAC drew up its provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of GCs for the 2016 LegCo General Election.

2.11 The delineation exercise was basically composed of two parts. The first part concerned determination of the boundaries of GCs. According to the LCO, the number of GCs would remain at 5 for the purpose of returning Members at the 2016 LegCo General Election and the

total number of Members to be returned for all GCs would be maintained at 35. The EAC noted that the existing GC boundaries had been adopted since the first term of LegCo in 1998 and members of the public were generally well accustomed to them in elections. Any suggestion to re-delineate their boundaries would definitely cause unnecessary confusion to electors and risk upsetting the long-established identities and community ties within each of the GCs. Moreover, there had not been a major shift in the territorial population ratio² of the 5 GCs since the last LegCo general election. Therefore, in the absence of any obvious and fundamental change in circumstances justifying alteration of the boundaries, the EAC recommended that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained.

2.12 The second part concerned allocation of seats among the proposed GCs having regard to their projected populations. Following the established process of delineation, the EAC had adopted a two-step method to allocate the 35 seats among the 5 proposed GCs with a view to ensuring that the population in each proposed GC was as near as practicable to the resulting number as required under section 20(1)(a) of the EACO (see paragraph 2.2(a) above). This was to ensure that the important principle of “equal representation” could be complied with in the delineation of GC boundaries. Details of the steps on allocating the seats are shown below:

- (a) Step One: Seats were allocated among the 5 GCs by dividing the projected population of each GC by the population quota (see paragraph 2.9 above) and,

² The change of territorial population ratio among the 5 GCs is between 0.01% and 0.85%.

thereafter, allocating seats according to the integer of the calculated number subject to the statutory limits (see paragraph 2.1 (c) above). Accordingly, 33 seats were first allocated to the 5 GCs. For details of the allocation of seats, please refer to the table at paragraph 2.13 below.

- (b) Step Two: There were 2 remaining seats after Step One. As to the allocation of the remaining 2 seats, all the six possible options for seat allocation were set out in the “Summary of the Provisional Recommendations on GCs” of the consultative document. The relevant table is shown at **Appendix I**. Having considered the six options, the EAC adopted the option which gives the smallest range of the percentage deviations of the population from the resulting number in the individual GCs (i.e. Option E). In general, this option ensured that the variation between individual GCs in terms of the number of persons represented by a LegCo seat was reduced to a minimum.

2.13 Under the provisional recommendations, the number of seats allocated to each GC in accordance with the aforesaid method is as follows:

Proposed Name and Code of GC	Projected Population	Seats allocated in Step One	Seats allocated in Step Two	Proposed Number of Seats
Hong Kong Island (LC 1)	1 268 000	6	0	6
Kowloon West (LC 2)	1 141 900	5	1	6
Kowloon East (LC 3)	1 084 600	5	0	5
New Territories West (LC 4)	2 100 400	9	0	9
New Territories East (LC 5)	1 775 600	8	1	9
Total:	7 370 500	33	2	35

Details of the calculation are shown in **Appendix I**.

2.14 The provisional recommendations of the EAC fulfilled all the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 above. As the EAC recommended that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained, the existing names and codes for the 5 GCs were also recommended to be kept unchanged.

2.15 In drawing up the provisional recommendations on the boundaries of the GCs, the EAC had in accordance with the established practice invited the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) to provide views on the provisional recommendations of maintaining the existing boundaries and

names of the 5 GCs from the perspectives of community identities, local ties and physical features and developments of the GCs.

Section 6 : The Provisional Recommendations

2.16 The EAC considered that the provisional recommendations (i.e. maintaining the existing boundaries and names of the 5 GCs and allocating the 35 seats among the 5 GCs as set out in paragraph 2.13 above) were the most appropriate option, and proceeded to prepare for the launch of a public consultation exercise on the provisional recommendations. Details of the EAC's provisional recommendations, including the population and component DCCAs of each GC are set out in **Appendix II**. These provisional recommendations were then put forth by the EAC for public consultation.