INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMITTEE ON HONG KONG'S FRANCHISED BUS SERVICE

INDEX OF BUNDLE FOR TRANSCRIPT ("TSCP")

TSCP-1 to TSCP-9

No.	Document	Bundle	Date
Day 1 (Oral Evidence of THB & TD)			
1.	Transcript in English	TSCP-1	07/05/2018
2.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-1	07/05/2018
Day 2 (Oral Evidence of TD)			
3.	Transcript in English	TSCP-1	08/05/2018
4.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-1	08/05/2018
Day 3 (Oral Evidence of NWFB/CTB)			
5.	Transcript in English	TSCP-2(A)	29/05/2018
6.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-2(A)	29/05/2018
Day 4 (Oral Evidence of NWFB/CTB)			
7.	Transcript in English	TSCP-2(A)	30/05/2018
8.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-2(A)	30/05/2018
Day 5 (Oral Evidence of NLB)			
9.	Transcript in English	TSCP-2(B)	19/06/2018
10.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-2(B)	19/06/2018
Day 6 (Oral Evidence of Tai Po District Council, Sha Tin District Council, Sham Shui Po District Council and ZF Friedrichshafen AG and its subsidiary Openmatics s. r. o.)			
11.	Transcript in English	TSCP-3(A)	14/07/2018
12.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-3(A)	14/07/2018
Day 7 (Oral Evidence of Community for Road Safety)			
13.	Transcript in English	TSCP-3(A)	16/07/2018
14.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-3(A)	16/07/2018
Day 8 (Oral Evidence of Community for Road Safety and Mr. Alok Jain)			
15.	Transcript in English	TSCP-3(B)	17/07/2018
16.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-3(B)	17/07/2018
Day 9 (Oral Evidence of Motor Transport Workers General Union and The Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions)			
17.	Transcript in English	TSCP-4(A)	30/07/2018
18.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-4(A)	30/07/2018
Day 10 (Oral Evidence of KMB Employees Union, Staff Rights Association of KMB,			

No.	Document	Bundle	Date
Monthly-Rated Drivers Union and Part-time Drivers Union)			
19.	Transcript in English	TSCP-4(A)	31/07/2018
20.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-4(A)	31/07/2018
Day 11 (Oral Evidence of Ms. Debby Wong, Mr. Kelvin Yeung, Mr. Raymond Cheng and The Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions)			
21.	Transcript in English	TSCP-4(B)	01/08/2018
22.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-4(B)	01/08/2018
Day 12 (Oral Evidence of KMB & LWB)			
23.	Transcript in English	TSCP-5	07/08/2018
24.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-5	07/08/2018
Day 13 (Oral Evidence of KMB & LWB)			
25.	Transcript in English	TSCP-5	10/08/2018
26.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-5	10/08/2018
Day 14 (Oral Evidence of KMB & LWB)			
27.	Transcript in English	TSCP-6	11/08/2018
28.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-6	11/08/2018
Day 15 (Oral Evidence of KMB & LWB)			
29.	Transcript in English	TSCP-6	12/09/2018
30.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-6	12/09/2018
Day 16 (Oral Evidence of Professor John Stanley)			
31.	Transcript in English	TSCP-7	15/09/2018
32.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-7	15/09/2018
Day 17 (Oral Evidence of the Hong Kong Police Force)			
33.	Transcript in English	TSCP-7	24/09/2018
34.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-7	24/09/2018
Day 18 (Oral Evidence of Mr. Mike Weston)			
35.	Transcript in English	TSCP-8	27/09/2018
36.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-8	27/09/2018
Day 19 (Oral Evidence of TD)			
37.	Transcript in English	TSCP-8	04/10/2018
38.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-8	04/10/2018
Day 20 (Oral Evidence of TD)			
39.	Transcript in English	TSCP-9	06/10/2018
40.	Transcript in Chinese	TSCP-9	06/10/2018

Monday, 7 May 2018

(10.06 am)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

The Independent Review Committee on Hong Kong's Franchised Bus Service was set up by the Chief Executive on 13 March 2018. Its terms of reference, which are displayed for you to see, are these, and it is important that we all understand what the terms of reference are, so I will read them out:

"From the point of view of safety, in the light of the fatal accident on 10 February 2018 and other recent serious incidents involving franchised buses in Hong Kong:

(a) to examine the operation and management of bus franchises under the current legislative, franchise and other contractual requirements;

(b) to examine the present regulatory and monitoring system for franchised buses; and

(c) in relation to the above, to make recommendations to the Chief Executive on safety-related measures with a view to sustaining a safe and reliable franchised bus service in Hong Kong.

The Committee may invite submissions from interested parties and from the public on the above matters and should use its best endeavours to submit its report

within nine months. Issues relating to the causes and liability of persons involved in the fatal accident on 10 February 2018 will be investigated by the Police and fall outside the Committee's terms of reference."

It follows that it is the duty of the committee to obtain information in respect of, first, the operation and management of bus franchises, and secondly, the regulatory and monitoring system of bus franchises. Most importantly, the ultimate objective of the committee is to make recommendations to the Chief Executive on safety-related measures with a view to sustaining a safe and reliable franchised bus service.

The committee intends to be and to remain focused on attaining that objective.

Significantly, it is to be noted that the committee has been directed that issues relating to the causes and liability of persons involved in the fatal accident on 10 February 2018 on the Tai Po Road fall outside the committee's terms of reference. That of course is because the incident is the subject of a separate police investigation.

On 28 March 2018, the committee commenced its work, and on that date issued a public invitation to passengers and family members of the victims of the fatal accident on Tai Po Road and other recent serious

incidents involving franchised bus services, together with members of the public generally, to make written submissions to the committee.

Today, we acknowledge and welcome the presence of some of the surviving passengers and their family members, and the family members of others who have lost their lives in the incident on the Tai Po Road.

On 28 March 2018, the committee issued letters to specified interested parties, requesting or inviting them to make written submissions to the committee on the matters identified in the terms of reference. The committee requested some of those specified interested parties to provide responses, addressing issues and questions set out in annexes to the committee's letters. Amongst the specified interested parties asked to respond in that way were the Transport and Housing Bureau, the Transport Department, the five franchised bus companies, and no fewer than 16 trade unions representing franchised bus drivers, and one bus driver association, the LegCo Panel on Transport, the Community for Road Safety, and others.

Subsequently, the committee wrote to the Commissioner for Police, requesting the Hong Kong Police Force to make a written submission and asking them to address the issues and questions posed in an annex

attached to the letter.

During April 2018, the committee received helpful submissions, written submissions, from the Transport and Housing Bureau, the Transport Department, all five franchised bus companies, and from or on behalf of various trade unions.

On 27 April 2018, the committee requested the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department to make further written submissions, addressing specifically identified issues and questions.

On 3 May 2018, the committee invited the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department to provide a representative to give oral evidence before the committee at today's and tomorrow's hearing. Today, we acknowledge the presence of Mr Joseph Lai, Permanent Secretary for the Transport and Housing Bureau, and his colleagues, Mr Kevin Choi and Ms Crystal Yip, who are representatives of the Transport and Housing Bureau, and in due course we would welcome representatives of the Transport Department, who are providing no fewer than six representatives to assist the committee.

The committee is grateful to those bodies for having accepted the committee's invitation to give oral evidence, and is pleased that they are here today to assist the committee in its work.

On 4 May 2018, the committee requested all five franchised bus companies to make further written submissions, addressing specifically identified issues and questions. On the same date, the committee received written submissions from the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department, and we are awaiting written submissions from the Commissioner of Police.

We acknowledge that the time frame in which those various parties have been asked to respond has been short, and we are grateful that they have obviously worked under time pressure to provide us with the information we have requested.

On 4 and 5 May 2018, the committee uploaded to its website paginated versions of the letters it had sent to interested parties and the written submissions that it had received, and they are available for all to access as they wish.

Finally, before we begin to receive the oral evidence, it is appropriate that we should acknowledge and mark the tragic circumstances that have led to this committee being set up. As a mark of our respect, for the 19 persons who died in the Tai Po Road incident on 10 February 2018, and in commiseration to their family members for their grievous loss, and as a mark of respect for others who have died in recent incidents

involving franchised buses, may I ask that we all stand and observe a short moment of silence.

Thank you.

At the outset, I am going to ask Mr Duncan, senior counsel of the counsel assisting the committee in its work, to open proceedings.

Mr Duncan.

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT AND HOUSING BUREAU:

MR JOSEPH LAI, MR KEVIN CHOI AND MS CRYSTAL YIP

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, thank you.

Mr Choi, Mr Lai and Ms Yip, thank you for attending this morning, and thank you for providing your written submissions. Would you care to take your seats, please, at the table.

As the chairman has already noted this morning, the invitation has been issued to the bureau to provide oral submissions today, in addition to the written submissions that you have helpfully provided the commission.

In the absence of your being represented by legal counsel this morning, who would normally lead you through any oral evidence that you wish to give, can I ask whether any of you do wish to take the opportunity of making any oral submissions?

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lai?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, if I may, I would like to make a short opening statement.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

Opening statement by MR JOSEPH LAI

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman and members of the committee, good morning. Thank you for inviting the Transport and Housing Bureau to attend before the committee and to give us the opportunity to make an opening statement.

Before I deliver the statement, I would like to convey a message from the Secretary for Transport and Housing. It has always been the intention of the secretary to personally attend before the committee. Regrettably, by the time the invitation from the committee arrived, the secretary already had a commitment firmed up some time ago with the Legislative Council. At this very moment, the secretary is attending a meeting of the Bills Committee which is set up to scrutinise the bill to provide for customs, immigration and quarantine co-location arrangements in the West Kowloon Station. The secretary has asked me to send his apologies to the committee for not being able to be here today.

Chairman, there are two characteristics of Hong Kong's public transportation system which stand out in any global comparison. These may form the backdrop

to the issues which are being reviewed by the committee.

The first characteristic is that Hong Kong has a highly developed public transport system to cater for the daily commuting needs of the population. Our basic transport policy can be summarised as "public transportation is the primary means of transportation with railway as the backbone". Chairman, if you allow me, I will just translate that particular policy into Chinese, because it is a very familiar term in the local community.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Thank you, Chairman. That is "(Chinese spoken)".

Of all the daily trips undertaken by commuters every day, over 90 per cent, in other words 12 million or so, are made by way of public transport. This percentage, as far as we are aware, is by far the highest in the world. Within those 12 million trips, about 39 per cent are by heavy rail, 31 per cent by franchised buses, 14 per cent by public light buses, 7 per cent by taxis, 4 per cent by Light Rail, and other modes of public transport account for the remaining 5 per cent.

The other way to look at it is that on a typical day, franchised buses carry some 4 million passenger trips.

The second characteristic is that, unlike almost all other overseas jurisdictions, public transport services in Hong Kong, including franchised buses, are operated by private companies in accordance with prudent commercial principles, generally without government's direct subsidies. This reflects government's overall policy thinking, established over many years, that running public transport through prudent commercial principles would help ensure efficiency and competitiveness.

At the same time, franchised bus operators and other public transport operators are not just any other commercial entities. Many aspects of their operation are subject to government regulation, control and monitoring. These include, for example, fares, service level and frequency, as well as the all-important issue of safety.

In this connection, government has two roles. As policymakers, government formulates standards and requirements and seeks to reflect these in legislation, franchise terms, and other contractual commitments. In the process, government seeks to balance different, sometimes competing, interests. Different stakeholders include, for example, franchised bus operators, the operators of other public transport modes, the

travelling public, other road users, politicians, and so on.

The Legislative Council also plays an important role, in particular where laws need to be introduced or amended or where financial resources are required.

The other role of government is that of regulator, to ensure that the franchised bus operators do comply with the prevailing legislation, franchise terms, and other contractual commitments.

Policies and thus the details and focus of the regulatory regime change over time. Sometimes this can be the result of change in public expectation. At other times this can be due to changing technologies or the changing mode of operation of the franchised bus operators. At still other times, policies can change in response to certain events or incidents.

But throughout the years, an overarching constant emphasis is always this. Franchised bus operators must provide proper and efficient service. This requirement for the provision of proper and efficient service is set out in the Public Bus Services Ordinance enacted in 1975. Safety is always a crucial element when considering whether the service is proper. Indeed, safety is of uppermost priority in our transport policy, and this is publicly documented. For instance, in the

2016 Hong Kong Yearbook, it is stated, and I quote:

"The Government aims to provide a safe, efficient, reliable and environmentally-friendly transportation system ..."

In the controlling officer's report of the Transport Branch of the Transport and Housing Bureau for this year, ie 2018 to 2019, it is stated that one of the aims of the Branch's work in relation to land and water-borne transport is to promote road safety. The website of the Transport and Housing Bureau states that one of the policy objectives of the bureau is to promote safety, and in this context I would say that this refers to the safety of passengers.

Furthermore, the Road Safety Council was established in 1973 to promote road safety in Hong Kong. Various promotion and publicity programmes were launched by the Road Safety Council over the years. For example, the Road Safety Council supports the Transport Department's signature event which is called Safe Driving and Health Campaign for Commercial Vehicle Drivers. This event is held each year on an annual basis, with a view to enhancing the safe driving skills and health awareness of commercial vehicle drivers, including of course franchised bus drivers.

The campaign includes a wide range of activities,

including radio programmes, health checks, and advice provided for commercial vehicle drivers, as well as community promotion by goodwill ambassadors.

Safety-related standards and requirements can broadly be categorised into output-based, input-based and process-based.

To give just a few examples, accident rate in terms of, for example, involvement in accidents per vehicle-kilometre travelled; customer satisfaction as reflected through, for example, the number and nature of complaints received and the outcome of passenger surveys; type approval for any new bus model; annual and spot-checks of buses in service; mandatory bus equipment, such as the installation of black box and speed limiter; licensing requirements for bus captains; and maximum working hours and minimum rest time for bus captains.

As I alluded to a moment ago, standards and requirements evolve over time, as environment and community expectations change. Again, just to quote a few examples, Guidelines on Bus Captain Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks was first introduced in 1998, and then they were revised on several occasions, the latest being earlier this year, 2018.

Two or three other examples I would quote would

include the installation of speed limiters and black boxes following a fatal accident in 2003; the installation of an additional horizontal guard bar on the exit doors, following a few accidents in 2016; and the requirement for newly purchased franchised buses must comply with the prevailing statutory emission standards.

With regard to the overall road safety in Hong Kong, the total number of accidents involving franchised buses has remained relatively stable in the past five years or so, which averages at about 2,200 per year, as compared with the total number of traffic accidents in Hong Kong, which averages at about 16,000 per year. The number of accident involvement for franchised buses in fact dropped slightly from 2,292 in the year 2013 to 2,187 in the year 2017, at a time when the number of franchised buses increased by 3.3 per cent. The involvement rate per million vehicle-kilometres of franchised buses also remained stable over the past few years.

Chairman, I should perhaps also mention that franchised buses are run, by definition, on the basis of franchises. These are to be differentiated from services that are provided directly by government and from services that are run purely as ordinary private businesses.

A franchise is awarded to a franchisee on the basis that the franchisee would be able to fulfil all the standards and requirements set out in law, the franchise, and so on. The regulatory authority scrutinises the performance of the franchisee at a broad overall level. There are checks and balances, sort of overall quality control, to ensure that franchisees are able to deliver and do deliver. A quick example is the spot-checks conducted every day on buses in service. At the same time, in terms of day-to-day performance, the primary onus and responsibility is on the franchisee to deliver and to meet its basic obligations.

Generally speaking, a franchisee is expected to have the maturity, the resources and the general capability to provide its services without the regulator having to look over the shoulder of each and every minute detail, day in and day out.

Chairman, the last point I would like to make is this. Whilst every effort has been made continuously by government to improve the safe operation of franchised buses, we are fully conscious that there is always room for further improvement. We constantly look for ways to bring safety to the next higher level, and any comments and suggestions from different stakeholders are always gratefully welcomed.

Chairman, this concludes my statement. My colleagues and I will be happy to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Lai.

Might I acknowledge on behalf of the committee that we were aware of the Secretary's commitment in LegCo, but given the urgency that we should examine and receive material, we, the committee, decided that we must press ahead, even without his attendance. But we thank him for his apology.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Thank you, again, Mr Lai, for those comments.

There are a number of matters that I wish to explore with the bureau. Before I start with those, can I just recognise a point which has been made in your written submissions, and that is the differentiation of duties and responsibilities between the bureau on the one hand and the Transport Department on the other.

The point that has been made in your submissions is that it's the bureau's task to formulate policies and initiate proposals, whereas the role of the department is to implement those policies, enforce the laws, and provide services generally to the community.

I recognise that distinction.

Accordingly, my questions of you this morning will be aimed, as far as I can, at the role you perform. We will of course have the benefit of personnel from the Transport Department later, and a lot more of the detail will be covered with those persons.

I would like to actually start with the terms of reference themselves, to which the chairman has already referred, and bring to your specific attention item (b) in the terms of reference. You will see, at the risk of repetition, that the committee is charged with the examination of the present regulatory and monitoring system for franchised buses.

So the first matter which I wish to explore with you a little this morning is the extent to which the current regulatory system truly addresses the issue of safety. As I understand it, again, from your written submissions, the basics of our regulatory regime consist firstly of the ordinance, to which Mr Lai has referred to this morning, the Public Buses Ordinance, Cap 230, I believe; secondly, the regulations which are made under that ordinance; and then, thirdly, the franchise document issued to a grantee as provided for in the ordinance.

What I would like to do is take you to the

ordinance. I'm going to run through -- quickly, I hope, because all of these provisions will be well known to you -- identify those which seem to us to be the significant ones with regard to the committee's terms of reference; and then, having regard to those provisions, explore with you a number of matters.

The ordinance, I believe, is being brought up on the screen. If you wish to have access to the hard copy of that, it's in the THB-2 bundle at page 104.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The first version to which I would bring your attention is section 9 of the ordinance. It gives the power to the Chief Executive to appoint not more than two persons as additional directors of any of the grantees under a franchise.

Moving from section 9, we go to section 12. That is the provision which requires, as Mr Lai has already referred to this morning, the franchisee or the grantee to provide a proper and efficient bus service.

Subsection (2) of section 12 refers to the fact that the grantee shall not be treated as maintaining that sort of service unless it maintains the service and operates it in accordance with the franchise, and any direction or requirement under the franchise or under the ordinance and any programme or any approval under

section 16A.

Now, the reference to the programme is picked up in the following section of the ordinance, section 12A, "Forward planning programme". There is a requirement in subsection (1) for a grantee, in each year, to prepare a programme of the operations of the grantee for the following five years in respect of the matters set out in the schedule.

I will take you to the schedule in just a moment, but if you look down to subsection (4), there is a provision whereby if the franchisee concerned and the Commissioner for Transport are unable to agree as to matters to be included in the programme, then that is a matter which has to be resolved by the secretary.

If we go through to the schedule, at the end of the ordinance, it's page 126 on the marked bundle, the contents of a programme are set out in detail there, items (a) to (h). As far as I can tell, there is nothing specific within the schedule pertaining to the matter of safety. However, item (h) appears to be a catch-all, in that it states "any other matters, whether or not specified in paragraphs (a) to (g) inclusive, as may be required by the Commissioner".

Going back to the substance of the ordinance, the next section which is I think of relevance is that at

section 18, page 112 of the bundle, the requirement for the grantee to keep proper records in respect of particular matters. At item (e), there is reference to accidents.

Then, following on from that, the next provision I wish to refer you to is section 22. This is on page 114, the provision for the Chief Executive-in-Council to require the payment of a financial penalty under certain circumstances. Those circumstances are set out in subsection (2):

"... may be imposed in respect of any failure by a grantee to comply with its franchise or this Ordinance or any direction or requirement under [the franchise or the ordinance], or with any programme ..."

With reference back again to the forward planning programme in section 12A.

Then section 24 on page 115 provides for fairly drastic measures in the case of a grantee having failed to maintain a proper and efficient public bus service, and the steps that are available to the administration to withdraw the franchise if that extreme situation were to develop.

Then section 35, if I could take you to that, please, at page 124 of the bundle:

"The Secretary for Transport and Housing may make

regulations for [a number of matters set out there] ..."

If I could bring your attention to three of those provisions in the context of this Committee's terms of reference, first of all, at item (c):

"regulating the conduct of ... drivers, conductors and authorised persons" employed by the bus companies.

At (d):

"generally as to the conduct of passengers and intending passengers on buses used by a grantee".

And thirdly, at (j) over the page:

"regulating, in relation to the drivers of buses used by a grantee --

(i) the maximum number of hours during which any such driver may be permitted to drive ... a bus; and

(ii) the intervals to be provided by a grantee for the rest and refreshment of such drivers ..."

Then the following section, section 36, provides for a grantee, not the administration but the bus operator itself, to make by-laws for a number of matters, and at item (c) there is reference to, and I quote, "the safe and efficient operation of the grantee's public bus service".

Before I leave that, at subsection (3), there is a provision to enable those by-laws to provide that a contravention shall be an offence and can provide

penalties.

Perhaps it's also worthy of note, in subsection (2), that any by-laws passed by a franchisee are subject to the approval of the Legislative Council.

So they are the provisions to which I wish to refer you to in the ordinance itself.

Then you have the regulations, which commence from page 128. Very quickly, you will notice that there are some regulations already passed with regard to the conduct of the driver and also the conduct of passengers on buses.

At page 130, we have regulation 9, which has some provisions for the conduct of driver; they are continued on page 131, under regulations 11, 12 and 13. I notice in passing that regulation 11 addresses the general conduct not just of the driver but also of the conductor, and to my knowledge bus companies these days do not employ conductors, so perhaps that is a reflection of how ancient perhaps these regulations may be.

Nevertheless, let's move on. At page 132, we have regulation 13A which pertains to the topic of the general conduct of passengers and intending passengers.

With regard to the regulatory landscape, we can see important provisions there in the ordinance and in the

regulations.

I would then like to take you, please, to the franchise document itself. For this purpose, I'm going to refer to the latest franchise which has been issued, which I understand was last year to the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd. You will find that document in the hard copies at THB-2 at page 137.

Do you have that in front of?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, I do. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The first provision perhaps I could bring to your attention would be clause 7, one of the franchise documents which can be found at page 141. A relevant clause appears there:

"The Grantee shall, as far as practicable, acquire, provide, adopt, maintain, or modify to the satisfaction of the Commissioner such safety or service enhancement facilities, installation, fixtures, fittings, apparatus or equipment on its buses as may be reasonably required by the Commissioner after consultation with the Grantee."

So there is a specific reference there at clause 7 with regard to facilities on the buses of the franchisee.

The ordinance, we have seen, refers to directions or requirements which may be required under the franchise

document. That also is reflected in the franchise document itself, in clause 1 at subclause (3) at page 139 of the bundle. We see at the bottom of that page:

"For the avoidance of doubt, unless there is express provision to the contrary, the Grantee shall at no cost to the Government comply with any direction and requirement given under this franchise by the Commissioner, the Financial Secretary or any ... public officer."

The next issue one turns to is what sort of direction or requirement is the commissioner, the Financial Secretary or any other public officer, able to issue, within the terms of the franchise.

If we look through this document, as far as counsel can tell, there is no general power to issue any sort of direction or any sort of requirement. There are specific matters in respect of which the administration can issue a direction or a requirement.

I will give you some examples of those. Page 141, paragraph 7, with regard to the provision of facilities, that is a typical example of a matter which can be the subject of a direction or a requirement; at item 9, the shared use of bus stops; item 12 at page 143, parking facilities at terminal points, display of routes and

fares, and so on.

I won't take you through them all, but if you go down to number 28, clause 28 of the document, you will see a provision, 28(1):

"provide to the commissioner the information relating to and records kept by the Grantee in respect of the Bus Service in accordance with Schedule II ..."

And you will see that schedule at page 168 with regard to the sorts of records and information which has to be provided according to the terms of the franchise.

What I would like to note in passing is that it would appear to counsel that there are probably a number of safety-related issues which are not specifically addressed in the franchise document and which would not therefore be able to be the subject of any particular direction or requirement. The one that occurs to counsel as being an obvious one is the matter of the training of bus captains. There would appear to be nothing specific in the franchise which might set out requirements for the training of bus captains, either when they commence work as a bus captain or when refresher training might be required at a later date.

We will see undoubtedly later during the hearing that there are some arrangements between the administration and the bus companies with regard to

training, but whether these arrangements have the teeth which some persons may think appropriate is a matter which may call for some questions.

I would now like to take you back to the ordinance, if I could, leading on to some of the matters now that I wish to explore from those provisions that I've taken you through.

Can we go back to the ordinance at page 124 of the bundle. If I could pick this up at section 35, the power of the secretary to make regulations. In particular, the item at (j), which is "regulating, in relation to the drivers of buses used by a grantee --

(i) the maximum number of hours during which any such driver may be permitted to drive such a bus; and

(ii) the intervals to be provided by a grantee for the rest and refreshment of such drivers ..."

The first matter I would like to ask the committee is whether it is true that this topic has for some years been a bone of contention between bus franchisees on the one hand, and employees and trade unions on the other? Is that something which has been an issue for the administration for some time?

CHAIRMAN: So your question is directed at Mr Lai?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN: You said "the committee".

Mr Lai, can you respond to that?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, counsel, for the question.

I think the way I would put it is that it is an issue which has been reviewed from time to time since the guidelines which all franchised bus operators are supposed to observe, and they do observe, I should add. If I could use it in a very loose sense, it was made mandatory since 1998. Prior to that, for over ten years, as I recall it, there were guidelines on a voluntary basis, to be observed on a voluntary basis.

I would say that this is an area which we have always been trying to improve. In doing so, of course, we need to consider all sorts of factors, including the feasibility of any changes and improvements, in terms of the impact on the actual operation of the operators, how they would deal with the need for any additional drivers that may be required as a result, how they would recruit and train the necessary drivers, and so on. At the same time, according to my understanding, whilst the bus drivers would perhaps welcome an improvement in that aspect, at the same time there is also the concern that the take-home pay should not be affected in a negative sense.

So there are a whole range of issues that will need

to be taken on board.

The other issue, for completeness, I should mention, is the financial implications of any changes to the status quo and how those financial implications should be addressed.

MR DUNCAN: I think those guidelines have been amended on something like six occasions since 1998. Is that true?

MR JOSEPH LAI: If my recollection is correct, yes, counsel. 1999, the year 2000, 2004, 2007, 2010, and then most recently earlier this year.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Now, they are guidelines. The ordinance itself enables regulations to be passed in that respect. Why are these the subject only of guidelines and not of regulation?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, in answer to counsel's questions, I actually do not have an immediate answer to that. What I can say, first of all, with a fair degree of firmness, is that the guidelines, although they are classified as guidelines, they are meant to be observed strictly by the operators. As I said a moment ago, they are in fact observed by the operators, and they know that the Transport Department will carry out surveys to ensure that the guidelines are observed, and that if for any reason the guidelines have not been observed fully on occasions, the department will come after them for

explanation, and the operators are obliged to provide the explanation.

As to exactly why there have not been regulations in the sense of subsidiary legislation being made, I am afraid I don't have an immediate answer to that, but I suppose -- and I am surmising here now -- that it is the way we approach the whole regulatory regime, we seek to do that through various means, and if one means, ie the issue of guidelines, has proved feasible and workable, then to us that is also a means of achieving the objective of ensuring that the drivers will have the necessary rest time, and so on.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lai, you have said twice that you are unable to give an immediate answer. Would you like the opportunity to give a considered answer, perhaps by supplying your answer in writing?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I will certainly take that up, although I should add that because we are talking about guidelines which were first laid out in 1998, I do not have full confidence that I will be able to dig out the written record at the time.

But yes, of course, Chairman, we would be more than happy to give it a go.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: You do appreciate, of course, that if this

matter was the subject of regulation, that would enable a regulation to be passed, according to the terms of the ordinance, to make it an offence, if the content of the regulation was not conformed to.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, as I mentioned in my opening statement, we see the need for the franchise operators to ensure safety in the operations, very much part of the proper and efficient requirement test, perhaps not the "efficient" part of it but most certainly the "proper" part of it. We take the view, we have always taken the view, that if the operator are unable to provide safe operation, either through taking initiatives on their own or following initiatives, guidelines, directives, however we might want to put it, or even legislative provisions set out by the government to ensure safety, then we would argue that, if that failure is on a consistent basis, the franchisee's ability to provide proper service is in doubt.

MR DUNCAN: But then your only remedy would, as I understand it, be to take action under that what I described as the drastic provision of withdrawing the franchise?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: You are referring to the revocation provision?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Remind us, if you would -- where do we find that?

MR DUNCAN: Section 24 of the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN: Which page do we find that on?

MR DUNCAN: Page 115 of the bundle.

There would have to be certain procedures followed, and the matter would have to be ultimately considered by the Chief Executive-in-Council, quite a long and cumbersome process, I would imagine?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JOSEPH LAI: In response to counsel's question, I would say that, yes, apart from revocation of the franchise, either the whole of it or perhaps part of it, the financial penalty provision in section 22 of the ordinance, in my opinion, could also come into play, because that refers to failure by the grantee to comply with, maybe if not the franchise, then certainly the ordinance. The ordinance does require the franchisee to provide proper and efficient service.

MR DUNCAN: Just referring to that, over the weekend, when the final submissions came in, it was clarified by the Transport Department that the guidelines did not constitute either a direction or a requirement under the terms of the ordinance. So would that not inhibit the ability to invoke the financial penalty provisions of section 23?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, not being a lawyer, the way I read section 22(2) is this. Subsection (2) says the financial penalty may be imposed for failure to comply with franchise or this ordinance or any direction of or requirement, and so on and so forth, or with any programme or any approval.

So there is a series of "ors", alternative scenarios. I have noted the Transport Department's written submission which says that the guidelines do not constitute direction or requirement. I was alluding a moment ago to the reference in section 22(2), to this ordinance, and this ordinance being the PBSO, in that the franchisee is obliged to provide a proper and efficient service.

The proper service, I would say, I would suggest, includes the safety requirement.

MR DUNCAN: That would not entitle the administration to invoke the provisions of section 22; would you agree?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman --

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, let me -- I'm sorry for being a lawyer. We will leave this perhaps to the lawyers. But if it is only invoked by virtue of the fact that it's a breach of the franchise generally, or the ordinance, for failure to provide a proper and efficient service, the remedy of the administration in those circumstances would be

limited to the revocation clause; would that be right?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, as I was trying to suggest just now, not being a lawyer, my reading of section 22(2) should give us room, if necessary, to invite the Executive Council to impose a financial penalty, because section 22(2) refers specifically to failure by the grantee to comply with this ordinance, and this ordinance imposes the obligation on the operators to run a proper and efficient service.

The proper service, I would argue -- the proper service requirement, I would argue, includes the requirement to provide a service which is safe, otherwise it cannot be proper.

But, Chairman, as I said, I am seeing this from a policy point of view. This particular scenario has not been tested.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Lai.

Can we move on to --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Duncan -- by that do you mean no financial penalty has ever been invoked?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, by that I mean the question of safety issue leading to an attempted use of this particular section concerning financial penalty has never been invoked thus far, so it's not tested.

MR DUNCAN: So do we understand correctly from that answer

that no financial penalty has ever been imposed for any of the reasons set out in that section, section 22?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, not to my recollection or understanding. I would be more than happy to come back with a written confirmation of that, but certainly not in recent times.

MR DUNCAN: Has any application ever been made to the Chief Executive-in-Council for such a penalty to be imposed?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, not that I am aware of in recent times, and I think the explanation for that is that we do not see that that provision needs to be invoked, having regard to the circumstances of everything.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you now to section 36, please, page 125, which gives the power of a grantee to make by-laws for certain matters, including the safe and efficient operation of the grantee's public bus service.

Have any of the current grantees made any such by-laws?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I personally can recall certain by-laws having been made, but I cannot answer right now whether each and every item set out in section 36 are the subject of by-laws which may currently be in force. I do not have the information in my hand and I would need to come back to the committee on this point.

MR DUNCAN: That would be helpful, because from our search

we can't find any such by-laws, of any of the franchisees.

CHAIRMAN: Please do. Your shopping list for written submissions is growing.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: I believe in the case of other transport providers, specifically the Mass Transit Railway Corporation, they have passed their own by-laws?

MR JOSEPH LAI: The MTR do have their by-laws, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Of course the advantage of that is that the MTR can take its own action, backed up by appropriate by-laws and offences under those by-laws, in respect of conduct by drivers and in respect of conduct by passengers who may be on the bus?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, yes and no. As counsel reminded us a moment ago, there are regulations, Cap 230A, which provide for the regulation of the conduct of drivers and passengers. So there are already provisions in the law as it stands.

The only way I could put it is that it's not as if there is a total vacuum in law on this particular subject.

MR DUNCAN: Who, then, would be responsible for enforcing the regulations?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, generally speaking, the police, as

far as I understand, will be responsible. As to whether any other authorities might be responsible, I can confirm. But generally speaking the police would be responsible.

MR DUNCAN: Would you see advantages in the bus companies themselves being able to take action in this respect, rather than relying on the police?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, a very off-the-cuff response: the mode of -- if we use the MTR as the reference point, Chairman, the mode of operation of buses and railways are rather different, because of the way MTR or rather the railway works, in a confined place, generally, with a lot of staff around, where backup and support will be generally -- can be made available generally rather quickly, and so on and so forth. Not being a trained law enforcer, to my mind, it may be easier to enforce whatever by-law that's in place regarding passengers' behaviour, and so on and so forth, without unduly affecting the movement of other passengers.

In a bus, particularly in this day and age where there is only the bus driver in control of the bus, and if something untoward were to happen during the journey, it might be in operational terms rather more tricky to expect the driver to enforce the law.

But that's really my very off-the-cuff response, but

that might also be the reason why having the police enforce the law might be the present arrangement.

MR DUNCAN: The committee, in its submissions, has received a number of comments with regard to the conduct of drivers, on the one hand, and also with regard to the conduct of what might be called unruly passengers on the other.

How often are prosecutions instituted under the regulations relating to the conduct of drivers and passengers?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if you could just give me a second.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, perhaps it might assist everyone else's understanding of what you are raising, if you were to take us to one of the submissions -- I think it's KMB, is it not? -- where there is reference to increasing abuse drivers suffer from passengers.

MR DUNCAN: I will find the reference to that, Mr Chairman. Thank you.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if I could answer counsel's question just now.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR JOSEPH LAI: According to the police -- and this is a piece of information which in fact was made public in 2016, in reply to a question from the Legislative

Council -- the advice by the police at the time is that when there are incidents involving assault, they would investigate, regardless of, obviously, the location, and so on and so forth.

But the police do not maintain figures on cases of assault on bus captains or passengers, for that matter, nor do they keep the respective prosecution and conviction statistics.

The police also advised at the time that if there were cases of assault in a bus, for example, involving whatever parties, then apart from relying on Cap 230A, they could also use other pieces of legislation as may be appropriate, to investigate and to prosecute. There are a good number of criminal legislation which the police could make use of.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I know the provision is there. My question really is aimed at how often is it actually invoked. It looks as though figures are not available.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, the short answer is that according to the police, they do not keep such figures.

MR DUNCAN: Just going back to the chairman's question, I think the reference -- you will probably be aware, Mr Lai -- to KMB's comments on this is to be found in the KMB bundle number 1 at page 95, at paragraph 35.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would be kind enough to read that out, or the relevant parts.

MR DUNCAN: I quote:

"A recent phenomenon which has been causing considerable concern to KMB is the increasing incidence of assault by passengers or other road users on its bus captains. This has often resulted from tension arising directly or indirectly from worsening traffic congestion. While we have been doing our best to institute legal proceedings against the culprits, we observe that the penalties meted out in such cases have generally been insufficient to have much deterrent effect."

I think that is the matter, and I think it's fair to say that the submissions have referred not just to physical abuse but also to verbal abuse of passengers. Is the bureau aware of those allegations?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, we are aware of the concern of bus companies and bus drivers in that respect, and I could add that one of the things which the Commissioner for Transport and her colleagues are working on is an education plan, to educate the travelling public on the sort of behaviour expected of them, and also the sort of complaints channels that they could or they should resort to in case of any dissatisfaction with

either bus service generally or with the service of a particular driver.

So the Transport Department is working on that already.

We tend to think that education is perhaps more important, if not equally important, than looking purely on the question of enforcement. The law is already there. It's to be observed. And, really, the important thing is to educate the public to behave in a civil manner, even though, when they feel upset, there are other channels rather than resorting to physical or verbal abuse.

MR DUNCAN: When were these regulations last considered with regard to their applicability to current circumstances?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Sorry, Chairman, can I ask what regulations counsel is referring to?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps you can more specific.

MR DUNCAN: The regulations provided for to which I am referring, which is the regulations made under the ordinance, talks about the responsibilities of drivers, conductors, passengers, and I'm just wondering when they may have been the subject of review by the administration, as to whether they cater for current-day circumstances?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I believe, when -- I expect, when

the Transport Department in due course presents the bureau with an overall plan on education and publicity, they would also look into the question of, you know, how the existing criminal penalty provisions in the legislation should be more widely promulgated, and in that connection, perhaps the need for any review.

CHAIRMAN: If I could ask you to respond directly to the question. The question was: when were the regulations last reviewed?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, we have not actually taken out this particular piece of legislation for, shall I put it, a thorough review, because the assumption has always been that the provisions therein are not insufficient.

CHAIRMAN: So there has been no review?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, we have not done a review because we do not think that the provisions therein are insufficient. But, as I said, we do expect that when the Transport Department come up with the education plan, in that context they will also look into the sufficiency of the provisions with a fresh pair of eyes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand from those answers, Mr Lai, that the bureau has actually already charged the department with coming up with an education plan?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman, that is correct.

MR DUNCAN: When was the department given that directive?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, that directive followed shortly after the very tragic accident in Tai Po, when there were a number of reports coming to us which suggested that there seemed to be some occasions of rising tension between drivers and passengers.

MR DUNCAN: In essence, what is the education plan designed to address?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, as I said, as regards the details, I need to await the proposals from the Transport Department, and so I would not wish to pre-empt what they will come up with for the bureau's consideration. But the overall sense of it should be, and they are aware of it, that we should remind passengers to behave in a civil and orderly manner at all times, that if they are dissatisfied with either the provisions of the bus service generally or in relation to a particular bus driver, and so on, there are complaints channels that they could go to, and that is the far more sensible way than to take out their dissatisfaction on a particular bus driver.

MR DUNCAN: Has the department been given a time schedule for the plan?

MR JOSEPH LAI: They have not been given a deadline as such, but the department is fully aware of the urgency, so

they are working on it expeditiously. This is what I have asked the department to do, and they are working on it.

MR DUNCAN: Can I raise another matter with you, going back to the ordinance, please, at page 108.

This is section 9 and the power of the Chief Executive to appoint additional directors of the grantees. Is this a power that the Chief Executive has exercised?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, yes, it is a power which the Chief Executive has exercised, and it's been exercised for a number of years.

The Commissioner for Transport and the deputy secretary responsible for bus service, the incumbent being Mr Choi to my right, they have been appointed by the CE as government directors to all the franchised bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: I believe at the moment there are five franchisees. Do I understand those two individuals sit on the boards of each of the five franchisee companies?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, that is correct.

MR DUNCAN: And to what extent do the directors so appointed become concerned with safety issues on those boards?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, the directors are appointed to represent the government. I would argue that by

extension to represent the Government's interests. So safety issues are one of the issues which are of concern to the government directors, and where necessary or where appropriate they will in fact raise the issues at board meetings. That has been set out in our submission to the committee dated 4 May.

MR DUNCAN: We are aware that some companies from time to time may have subcommittees of the board, for example an audit committee or a safety committee, those sorts of committees. Have the government directors come across, in any cases of the franchises, to a particular committee of the board devoted to safety matters?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if you will allow me, can I invite Mr Choi to answer the question, Mr Choi being the government director?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR KEVIN CHOI: Thank you, Chairman, thank you, Mr Lai, and thank you, counsel.

As Mr Lai said, I, as the incumbent Deputy Secretary for Transport, and also Commissioner for Transport, Ms Mable Chan, we are the two persons being appointed as the directors representing by the government, appointed by the Chief Executive to sit on the board of the five franchised bus companies as such.

We perform as one of the directors, so of course we

represent the Government's interests, but at the same time we are also one of the many directors to look after the company matters in a strategic manner. So we do participate in the business as one of the many directors.

As far as I know, because I have been in post since September last year, I have been attending board meetings bi-monthly or quarterly of these boards. They do run audit committee or some form of audit programmes in their daily life or their everyday operations, which cover proper and efficient service part of it and also the safety part of it.

So indicators like accident rates and lost trip rates are examined by -- reported from the management to the board, through board papers, and we are also copied in and have a copy for reference.

Unfortunately, I would say that we don't really sit on the audit committee per se.

MR DUNCAN: Would you see value in these companies operating safety committees on which government directors might be members?

MR KEVIN CHOI: Well, chairman and counsel, thank you for your question. As Mr Lai has mentioned in the opening remarks, franchisees are given the duty and the responsibility for it to run its franchise properly and

efficiently, to this extent. And of course, if there are improvements in the governance and also especially in the aspect of safety, we will see how best the government directors should join efforts on this end.

Of course, we do look forward to better governance and also more focused on the safety part of it, for the franchisee to discharge its duties in carrying out a proper and efficient franchised bus service in Hong Kong.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Choi.

Can I refer now the members from the bureau to the forward planning programme provisions of the ordinance, in particular section 12A.

CHAIRMAN: If you are going to move to another topic, we are intending to take a short morning break, to give the witnesses some recovery time. Would this be a convenient moment?

MR DUNCAN: Indeed it would, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: We will take 15 minutes now.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

(11.32 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.48 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Lai, I was going to refer you to section 12A of the ordinance, please, at page 109.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You will recall I had taken you to this when we went through the provisions initially. This is the section that deals with the five-year forward planning programme.

We saw that the matters that could be contained in the programme are set out in the schedule, at page 126.

If you look at page 109, subsection (4) -- I brought your attention to the provision whereby if there was any disagreement or a failure to reach agreement, between the commissioner and the franchisee, the point of disagreement could be referred to the secretary for his resolution.

Has the secretary ever been called upon to resolve such a disagreement?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, no, not that I am aware of, because -- I suppose the way to explain it is the forward planning programme is often a result of many rounds of iterative or reiterative discussion process between the Transport Department and the franchised bus operators, so that -- usually, by the time the programme is finalised, it will have obtained the consent of both

the department and the bus operators.

MR DUNCAN: Could I ask you to turn to the schedule, please, page 126, where you will see the contents of the programme set out.

Has the bureau issued any proposals to the department with regard to what the programme should contain over and above the specific provisions of clauses (a) through to (g)? I brought to your attention the catch-all provision of item (h), "any other matters", and my question is whether the bureau has at any time suggested to the department what matters should be included in the five-year plan. Was that something you leave to the department?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, we do know, from the content page of the most recent FPP provided to the committee, the committee will also know that there are certain broad subjects, or broad subject headings in at least some of the FPP, which are over and above what is strictly required as set out in the schedule.

For example, one of the bus companies, they do provide certain information on staff training, bus driver training to be more exact. I have been given to understand that this is the result of discussion between the department and the bus operators, but I cannot confirm one way or another whether that is very much the

department's initiative or whether the department was acting under some specific request by the bureau.

I suspect it's more than likely to be the former.

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Duncan's question was directed to another issue, and that is whether or not the bureau has issued any proposals to the Transport Department as to what should be contained in a five-year plan.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, the short answer to that is I cannot recall any specific directive of the sort you suggested or you alluded to. The starting point, the basic point, is always that everything in the schedule should be in the programme, and if the department is able to secure, through discussion with the bus companies, further information, then that would be reflected in the individual programmes.

CHAIRMAN: So no directive to the Transport Department?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Not in this context.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Lai, I'm going to leave the regulatory regime now, and if I could take you back to the terms of reference again.

Just to remind us all, with regard to paragraph (b) of the terms of reference, the committee is also charged to examine the monitoring system for franchised buses, and it's that that I wish to explore with you briefly,

if I could.

It is clear from the submissions that the committee has received that the companies, as a matter of practice, furnish the department with quite a significant supply of written documentation, either on a monthly or on a quarterly basis, with regard to the operation and the management of the bus franchisees. You are no doubt aware of that?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Does the bureau require the department to undertake any sort of verification process with regard to the written documentation which is provided to the department?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if I seek a clarification on counsel's question. Counsel is asking whether the bureau has asked the department to check that the information provided by the companies, the information itself is truthful or accurate.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, that is so.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's Mr Duncan's question.

MR JOSEPH LAI: The short answer to that is that we expect the department to take the necessary action to ensure the truthfulness of the information, without the bureau having to actually ask or remind the department to do that.

Of course, under the franchise, if I recall correctly, there is also the requirement, in broad terms -- and I'm not sure it will cover each and every scenario or each and every piece of information to be provided by the operators -- but I do recall there is a provision which requires the bus companies to ensure that information provided to the commissioner is accurate and is truthful.

So there is also that requirement on the part of the operators to follow, to observe.

And I know, for example, that the department, as a matter of fact, on certain issues at least, that they will take action on its own, just to double-check to ensure the veracity of the information. For example, in the case of the bus drivers' rest time and working hours, for example, they do provide -- the department does engage contractor to conduct independent survey, ie independent of the bus companies, to check that the bus companies do observe the guidelines, quite apart from whatever information is received by the department from the bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, and of course that's a matter that we will explore further with the department.

But leading on from that answer, can I ask you this. A lot of the monitoring process is carried out,

obviously, by receiving and considering the records prepared by the bus companies. A considerable amount of the monitoring process is done in that way. Has the bureau issued any proposals/suggestions to the department as to the extent to which the department should be monitoring the activities of the bus companies directly, rather than relying on records that the bus companies provide to the department?

MR JOSEPH LAI: I suppose the answer to this is perhaps a rather long-winded one, counsel, if you would allow me, and Chairman, if you would allow me.

There are checks and balance features built into the overall regulatory and monitoring system, and all those checks and balances are basically either endorsed by the bureau or, at the very least, are initiatives which the bureau is aware of. Those include, for example -- just to quote a few examples -- I referred a moment ago to the survey on bus captain rest hours, rest time. There are also daily spot-checks conducted by the department on buses in service. So every day they will pick 14 buses which are supposed to go into service, they will pick the 14 buses at random, and they will be subject to testing/examination by the Transport Department's own vehicle examiner. This is again quite apart from whatever information bus companies provide on the safety

of their buses.

These are just two examples I can think of offhand of the sort of mechanism that we have built in with the policy endorsement of the bureau, to check against what's provided as a matter of course by the bus companies.

Of course, as you will have noticed from the written submissions by the Transport Department, if there is doubt on either the accuracy or the comprehensiveness of whatever information is provided by the bus companies, then the Transport Department does go after the bus companies and ask for more complete information.

That has been built up very much over the years, as very much part and parcel of the overall mode of operation of the department, and I think we have come to a stage when, you know, certain things are being done because colleagues know what is expected, without the need for any further specific written directives.

CHAIRMAN: So does it come to this, that there have been no such directives to the Transport Department because they are doing the job that you would expect them to do?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Basically, Chairman, I think that would be a fair way of putting it.

MR DUNCAN: I want to move away from monitoring, about which we will ask the department more later, but turning from

monitoring to the general topic of safety policies. There are a number of matters I would like to explore with you in that respect, Mr Lai.

The submissions from the bus companies indicate that they themselves will explore from time to time new safety technology that might be available, new safety measures that might be introduced. Does the bureau itself undertake research, domestically or internationally, to understand what new initiatives might be available with regard to technology or general safety measures?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, the division of labour between the bureau and the department is such that generally the research which counsel alluded to is done by the Transport Department rather than by the bureau, because at the bureau we really do not have the necessary expertise to do that, whereas in the department we have a team of traffic engineers who are, you know, more -- and also electrical and mechanical engineers who are more well-versed, shall I say, in this sort of thing. And they do carry out research of that sort, as evidenced, for example, by the adoption and introduction of the black box and the speed limiters installed in all buses. Also as evidenced more recently, as this committee will be aware, following the tragic accident

in Tai Po, the setting up of a working group, chaired by the Transport Department, with participation by the franchised bus operators, to look into possible additional safety equipment or safety features that could be installed on our franchised buses, the details of which are already set out in one of the Transport Department's submissions.

So, yes, we do that.

MR DUNCAN: Has the bureau considered the possibility of a requirement whereby the individual bus franchisee should be required to draw up a composite approved safety programme, as opposed to dealing with individual safety issues on an ad hoc sort of basis?

I'm suggesting the possibility of a safety programme equipped with suitably qualified personnel with a safety background and with the requisite qualifications and experience.

Is that a matter that has been considered at all by the bureau?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, no, not in a structured or detailed way. However, since the question is put to me this morning by counsel, my first instinct would be, yes, we would be more than happy to look into that.

MR DUNCAN: As I understand the current situation, one of the bus franchisees might have a totally different

safety programme, looked at overall, from one of the other franchisees. Could that be the case?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I do not know enough about the exact details of how things are done on a day-to-day basis at the company, to say definitively "yes" or "no". But I would not be surprised if there is some difference.

So if we were to request or to require the setting-up of a safety programme of the sort counsel has in mind, there are of course a few things we would need to discuss with the operators, including, for example, what the programme should look like, should we insist for one size fits all, or should we accept that company A may come up with certain programme with different emphasis and focus, company B with a slightly different set of focus.

So those are sorts of the things obviously we would need to sort out.

MR DUNCAN: Many countries have adopted the international standard ISO -- I think it's 39001 -- road safety management system, and if I'm not wrong the Road Safety Committee has constantly advocated for the adoption of that in Hong Kong.

Has the bureau considered adopting the road safety management system for Hong Kong?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, this is a rather new standard, as far as I know. It's a standard which -- again, if I haven't got it wrong -- is normally used by transport and logistics companies, rather than by public authorities per se.

The question of whether we would encourage or we would ask bus companies to adopt this particular ISO, I would suggest could perhaps be looked at in conjunction with the earlier idea, counsel, you put across to me, ie the safety programme, whether -- I suppose there is some logic in policy terms to look at the two issues together.

No, I wouldn't rule that out as a matter of principle. I think really the question to ask is, you know, what the cost and benefit of the adoption of the ISO is. Again, if we have companies with different stages of readiness regarding the adoption of the ISO, what should done about that, and so on?

We would like to look into that and we have an open mind about it.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take it from that that that's not really been a matter considered to date by the bureau?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I think that is not an unfair way of putting it, because it is a relatively new ISO, as far as I'm aware. It's been around for only a few

years. In terms of standard and so on, it is still relatively new. But we are happy to look into new ideas.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, we have a copy of the ISO 39001, do we not? Does it state on its face when it came into being?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, the document can be found at miscellaneous bundle 2 at page 645. According to that document, at page 646, it was issued in 2012.

CHAIRMAN: And that's the first edition. Yes, thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Hong Kong, the geography of Hong Kong, Mr Lai, is such that we have almost a peculiar situation whereby double-decker buses are visible on very steep and very narrow roads onto which pedestrians often spill.

How much of those sorts of situations are taken into account by the bureau with regard to the general topic of safety in Hong Kong?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, road design and how it affects safety is one of the tasks which our colleagues in the Transport Department, in particular the transport engineering team, look into very much as part of their routine. By "routine" I do mean as a day-to-day task.

So either after a particular accident or a particular spate of accidents, or as part of their normal review process, they will look into the safety of a particular stretch of road and see what can be done to

improve the safety situation and whether, if necessary, certain restrictions should be placed on that particular stretch of road, restrictions including speed limit, including the type of vehicles which can access the particular stretch, and so on and so forth.

So, again, this is part of their ongoing job. For example, if a place has been designated a black spot -- there is a very objective yardstick for determining whether a particular spot is a black spot, usually by reference to the number of accidents within a certain period -- then they will take a particularly closer look at that spot to see whether any of the changes I referred to a moment ago should be considered.

As I say, it's not a purely reactive process in the sense that they also take the initiative to look at other stretches of roads which are not black spots as such but they feel would require looking into or reviewed.

MR DUNCAN: I take it from those answers that there have to date been no discussions between the bureau and the department with regard to the responsibility of introducing into Hong Kong, either directly or through the bus companies or other transport companies, the road safety management system to which I have referred? Is that correct?

MR JOSEPH LAI: You are talking about the road safety --

MR DUNCAN: The ISO system, yes.

MR JOSEPH LAI: This ISO 39001, no. I think -- sorry, yes, it is correct to say that there have not been any discussion on this as such. As I explained, this is, to us, a relatively new ISO, although introduced in 2012, still at a relatively youthful stage, shall I say. But we also note that a growing number of transport and logistic companies are using that.

So, yes, now that the matter has been drawn to our attention on this particular ISO, as I said, we will be more than happy to look into its applicability in Hong Kong, in conjunction with the franchised bus operators.

MR DUNCAN: Can I turn to the topic of manpower supply. The submissions that the committee has received would indicate that there has been a shortage of persons who are either qualified or willing to undertake the duties of a bus captain, and this shortage has been with us for some time now.

Is that a fair summary of the situation?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I would say that this is perhaps a reflection of the rather tight labour supply situation in Hong Kong. Yes, it exists not only in franchised bus companies but also in other transport-related companies,

and in fact in logistics-related companies as well.

MR DUNCAN: One of the matters the department has brought to the attention of the commission -- and I'm sure you are aware of this -- is that, as a result of the latest guidelines to which you have already referred, something like 250 additional bus drivers would need to be employed. Are you aware of that?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, I am aware of that, Mr Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: In your submission, you stated that Hong Kong is one of the few places in the world where the franchised bus service is provided by private companies, without any direct subsidies. Do you recall that being in your submission?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman, although, if the chairman would allow, to be absolutely precise, I said "generally without direct subsidies".

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would like to refer to the passage to which Mr Duncan is referring.

Is that on the screen now, Mr Duncan?

I think that deals with a separate issue, does it not?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, that's a related but separate issue, Mr Chairman. I think it's --

CHAIRMAN: Your qualification is that that is a general observation, Mr Lai?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, I was just trying to clarify -- sorry for appearing to be pedantic. I heard Mr Duncan say that in my opening statement I said there was absolutely no government subsidies. I was trying to clarify that it's not absolutely no subsidies. It's generally no direct subsidies.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, I'm sorry.

Let us go to paragraph 14. Or perhaps you could locate where you have referred to this in your submission. The passage relates to the question of subsidies and the fact there are no direct subsidies. Is it paragraph 14?

MR JOSEPH LAI: It is paragraph 14, that might be the one, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Let me quote directly from that.

MR JOSEPH LAI: In our submission dated April, yes.

MR DUNCAN: "It should be noted that Hong Kong is one of the very few cities/jurisdictions in the world where the franchised bus service is provided by private companies without direct government subsidies."

That was the passage to which I was referring.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Does the government provide indirect subsidies to the franchisees?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, there are a few examples which

I could cite. For example, franchised buses are exempted from, first, registration of tax. That is perhaps one of the more clear examples.

The other reason, Mr Chairman, why I said in my open statement that government generally does not provide subsidies is sort of -- it's meant to be elaboration of the written submissions we provided. In recent times, over the years, we do provide some form of financial assistance to franchised buses, to pursue a particular initiative or to pursue a particular programme.

To give this committee an example, the trial and testing of electric buses, this is an initiative by the Environment Bureau rather than by the THB, but nonetheless it is a government subsidy, and the subsidy is provided to the bus companies to procure a certain number of electric buses, on a trial basis.

So it is a form of subsidy, if you will, for a targeted means.

We also provide --

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in remembering that that involves four buses, four electric buses?

MR JOSEPH LAI: That involves 36 single-deckers, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Another more recent example is that we

provide subsidy to help the company put up realtime arrival display panels at bus stops. That is on a matching basis, a dollar-to-dollar matching basis.

But otherwise, apart from the few specific targeted subsidies, yes, it is fair to say that the government does not provide subsidy to the operators as such.

MR DUNCAN: Does the government provide subsidies to certain ferry companies?

MR JOSEPH LAI: We provide special helping measures, that is the terminology of the programme -- in counsel's wording, it's "subsidy", and I will not dispute the use of word -- for ferry service to outlying islands, specifically to outlying islands. The specific policy consideration is that ferry is the only transport means for people who live in the outlying islands, and those ferries are financially not viable, and that is a chronic problem, unless we go for a huge hike in the fare, which we do not think the public will be able to afford.

So there is a particular background to that special helping measure programme.

CHAIRMAN: How is that special helping measure implemented?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Could I invite Mr Choi, who looks after that on a day-to-day basis, to explain?

CHAIRMAN: Mr Choi.

MR KEVIN CHOI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and thank you, counsel, for that particular question.

As Mr Lai has said, the outlying island ferry routes are a specific case for which the government has provided some special helping measures. There are six such routes that we are providing special helping measures, and the scheme is under review for the time being.

Basically, the government, as Mr Lai said, recognises that unless we have a very huge hike of ferry fares for these outlying islands, residents who rely on these ferry services to come to town, say for their office and other duties, otherwise these ferry services are not viable.

Under these special helping measures, the government undertook to subsidise individual items. For example, maintenance fees, electricity bills, some concession costs or insurance premium, or like also revenue forgone when they are introducing elderly or child concessions, so the costs of such measures.

The special helping measures identified individual items and subsidised these areas. The government undertook to the Legislative Council to get the funding approval from the Finance Committee of LegCo, and then we provided this public money to ferry operators, as

I said, over those items, and we have an audit programme through the Transport Department to consider whether those costs are true or not and also to ensure that the public moneys are well spent.

So that's the case for the special helping measures.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Going back to the manpower separation, Mr Lai, I wonder if you could be shown bundle TD-5 at page 1510. This is a document that came to the commission just over the weekend, and you may or may not have seen this.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes. It's notes of a meeting; is that right?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, minutes of the meeting. It's in the Chinese language.

It appears to be extracts from a special meeting held by the Sham Shui Po District Council on 28 September 2017, following from the tragic accident in Sham Shui Po.

My interest is in particular with regard to page 1523 of the document.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: It's paragraph 203(iii).

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I could read the translation with which I've been provided. It reports a chief transport officer of

the department saying that the government is concerned about manpower shortage and that bus companies had responsibilities to increase salary, fringe benefits and promotion prospects, in order to attract new blood.

Is that a fair translation of what you are reading in the Chinese?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, yes, I would say so.

MR DUNCAN: Does that reflect the Government's position accurately with regard to the manpower shortage?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, I think it reflects what we expect the franchise companies to do. It does not reflect the full picture, because this is meant to be a summary of what Mr Leung, the chief transport officer, was supposed to have said. All I can say is that it is part of what our position is.

The other part of our position, regarding the chronic problem of shortage in commercial drivers, is that we are taking steps to try to -- a full legislative amendment, and I would be happy to elaborate on that in a moment or two -- full legislative amendment to relax the licensing requirement for commercial drivers.

So, basically, what happens is that, at present, if you want to apply for a licence, a driving licence, to be a commercial vehicle driver, you will have to have had a private car driving licence for three years before

you are eligible to make the application, ie the application for a driving licence for commercial vehicles.

Because of the chronic manpower shortage, we have proposed, and the trade as well as Legislative Council have agreed, that the three-year period could be reduced to a one-year period. So in future, all you need is to have a private car driving licence for one year before you can apply for a driving licence for a commercial vehicle. Commercial vehicles include, of course, buses, and that includes of course franchised buses.

We are drafting the amendment legislation, and we hope to be able to introduce that into the Legislative Council before the end of this year. If that is passed by the Legislative Council, that should also go some way towards relieving the private shortage problem. It may not provide a total answer, but hopefully it will provide some relief.

On our part, that's what we have been doing. But yes, having said that, we do also think that it's part of the franchised bus companies, as the franchisee, to take all reasonable measures to ensure that they have the necessary number of drivers to provide service.

MR DUNCAN: Given the statement to which I referred, what steps has the administration taken with the bus

companies to persuade them to increase the remuneration for bus captains?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, most recently there has been some, shall I say, restructuring in the pay package of the bus drivers, with a view to enhancing the package or at least improving the certainty of bus drivers that they would be able to take home X amount of dollars every month bus drivers.

That is a result of a discussion between the government and the bus companies, although it also has to be said, in fairness to the bus companies, that they reacted very quickly to the Tai Po accident, which is a very tragic one, and realised that something must be done very quickly about that.

MR DUNCAN: Have the bus companies undertaken that they will increase the remuneration?

MR JOSEPH LAI: I think the restructured package has already been announced.

MR DUNCAN: Given what you described as a chronic shortage, would the government consider providing a subsidy in respect of the added remuneration which appears to be desirable?

MR JOSEPH LAI: When we talk about subsidy for the long-term basis, we will have to consider that most carefully. It does represent a rather fundamental departure to the

basic philosophy of how the public transport system is run in Hong Kong. Speaking sort of off-the-cuff, I do not think that for recruitment of bus drivers we have come to that stage. I think there can be means through which bus companies can recruit and retain the necessary number of qualified drivers.

As I went through some of the documents provided by some of the bus companies to this committee, it can also be seen that they are doing quite a lot to improve the situation.

So, no, I don't think we have come to that stage of having to provide subsidy for recruitment of bus drivers. There are ways through which we can help ease the problem, apart from what I just explained about the licensing requirement. Another is about, for example, the 250 drivers, counsel, you alluded to. You will be aware that there is the agreement that the guidelines will be introduced progressively, starting from later this year, to sometime next year, 2019, and the whole purpose being to enable the bus companies to have the necessary turnaround time to recruit the necessary number of people.

The other thing we have done in the past one or two years is to give priority to the driving exams of rookie bus drivers. They are given priority over people who

want to take driving exams for, for example, a private car driving licence. This is against the backdrop of a big and rather sustained increase in the number of people who apply for driving licences, and against that background the Transport Department have redeployed driving examiners to give priority to bus driver applicants.

MR DUNCAN: Have the bus companies indicated to you that the requirement for increased remuneration which has been referred to in that minute is going to entail considerably more expense?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, this will be a fact anyway. As you recruit more drivers, then of course the cost generally speaking will go up. But this has not stopped the bus companies from agreeing to the latest guidelines.

MR DUNCAN: So does the bureau have any other initiatives, apart from speaking to the bus companies, lowering the licence qualifications; any other initiatives whereby the manpower shortage might be alleviated?

MR JOSEPH LAI: We have been encouraging them to look for new, unexplored or at least under-explored possibilities, the recruitment of women drivers, for example, and of course this is something that they have been doing more in recent years; and, I have to admit,

the rather sensitive subject nowadays, since the Tai Po accident, of part-time drivers. That was meant to provide some relief for the manpower shortage problem, but of course, as the committee will be aware, since the accident, the facts means it has been suspended by the companies themselves.

MR DUNCAN: What proportion of the bus captains are female?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Sorry, Chairman, I don't have the answer with me. I don't know if my colleagues have the answer. No.

MR DUNCAN: Would it be very low?

MR JOSEPH LAI: It would not be high, definitely, but, Chairman, it's growing. From our point of view, we would welcome more women joining the ranks.

MR DUNCAN: Has the bureau taken any particular steps to attract the fairer sex to the position of bus captain?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, not us directly. It's very much a responsibility of the companies to recruit drivers. But we have put across that message to them in more than one or two occasions, and I know the Transport Department has also been in discussion with them. And, as I said, I do know for a fact that they have stepped up recruitment, in fact, in that process, as evidenced by, anecdotally at least, the probability of us running into women driver as we take the buses.

But no, sorry, I don't have the exact figures with me.

MR DUNCAN: What I'm interested in is any particular substantive step that either the administration or the bus companies may have taken to attract females to their position?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, maybe this is a question which the bus companies themselves would be best placed to answer.

CHAIRMAN: So the direct answer to Mr Duncan's question is that there has been no such initiative?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Sorry, Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: There has been no such initiative because this is a matter for the bus companies?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Initiative --

CHAIRMAN: By the Transport and Housing Bureau.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, the short answer is that we do not do the recruitment ourselves, but we do encourage the bus companies to do that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: One of the reasons for the inquiry is the unfortunate spate of accidents over the years involving buses. Does the bureau conduct its own research into any common causes attributable to these accidents?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I was explaining a moment earlier that the task of researching into the causes of

accidents are the job of the professional colleagues in the Transport Department. Quite frankly, in the bureau, we are not equipped to do any research.

However, there have been cases when we note that something properly should have been done, and we then ask or task of department to look into that.

If I could quote two examples. One is the most recent update of the Guidelines on Working Hours and Rest, and here I am making a factual correction to the written submission we made in April, because we have since been able to ascertain that that review, which started in 2017, was triggered from a request by the bureau. So that is one example.

The other example is, somewhere in our submissions and also in TD's submission, we refer to the cases of the broken glass doors, the exit doors in the buses with glass panels, and there were a spate of accidents in 2016, where the glass was broken, leading to injuries suffered by passengers.

As it gradually became what looks like to be a pattern, not one accident but two accidents and then three accidents -- if I remember correctly, that was within a spate of maybe two months, more or less -- we suspected something might not be entirely right; there might be some weaknesses in either the bus design or the

quality of the glass or whatever. So we asked the department to take a look at it, and they looked into it, in conjunction with the bus companies, and in the end the safety feature that was put in place was an additional horizontal handrail across the width of the glass door, to prevent -- sorry, not to prevent -- but to reduce the possibility of passengers suffering major injuries such as that would be suffered if the passenger was thrown out of the bus.

So, yes, we do try to keep track of things, and where we can, when it comes to our attention, sometimes we will initiate, request a review by the Transport Department. Still other times the review or study would be initiated by the department itself, direct, because they are really at the coal face, so to speak. They are the frontline department, and they have a better sense sometimes than we do on what needs to be done or what needs to be looked into, having regard to their day-to-day interaction with the bus companies, the District Council, members of the public, and so on.

MR DUNCAN: Understanding that it's their domain, if they found any common causes, would you expect them to relate those back to the bureau?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if we are talking about causes of accidents --

MR DUNCAN: Yes.
MR JOSEPH LAI: -- then particularly if the operation of buses is involved, then, yes, we would expect there to be some communication between the department and the bureau.
MR DUNCAN: Has the bureau drawn any conclusions as to whether there's any common causes threading their way through these spates of accidents?
MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if I could ask counsel, when he refers to "these spates of accidents", what spate of accidents?
MR DUNCAN: There were a number of accidents. Go back to 2003, I think it was in Tuen Mun. There was an accident in Chai Wan. There was an accident in Sham Shui Po. And then we had this one, this year, in Tai Po. A number of quite serious fatal accidents involving buses. They are the sorts of accidents I'm referring to.
MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, if you would allow me, I would leave out the accident in Tai Po in my response, because obviously it is subject to legal processes, and I would not want to infer or suggest that we have any particular view on what might have caused the accident. But generally --
CHAIRMAN: No. The committee has been directed not to

consider issues as to the causes and liability, but it doesn't mean that we can't have regard to the accident.

MR JOSEPH LAI: No. I do understand that point, Mr Chairman.

Generally speaking, each accident will have a specific reason for it.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR JOSEPH LAI: They could be categorised either into mechanical failure on the part of the buses or the design of the buses or the design of the roads, or driving behaviour or passenger behaviour. Some of the causes might be what we would call active involvement of the bus or the bus drivers, in the sense that the bus drivers are responsible or it's a mechanical failure of the bus which is responsible. Some of the other accidents would be the result of passive involvement of the buses, in the sense that the bus, shall we say, is the victim, is being rammed into from behind, for example, when it's travelling perfectly normally.

So there are different causes, and after each accident or spate of accidents, the Transport Department/THB, would look into those accidents and see what improvements we might make, what lessons we might learn from that.

The speed limiter and the black box was a direct

result of another very tragic accident in Tuen Mun in the year 2003.

CHAIRMAN: And as a result of the experts' report, because the experts recommended both those safety measures.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, and, as a result of that, the government accepted the expert report, and that was put into practice very quickly. So by now all the buses are equipped with both devices, the black box and the speed limiter.

MR DUNCAN: You have mentioned a number of factors there: mechanical failure, design of roads, driver behaviour, passenger behaviour. Has the bureau been able to discern a predominant feature?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, no, not that I am aware of.

MR DUNCAN: The chairman has just referred to measures which were taken after the 2003 accident in Tuen Mun. Is it correct that the accident in Sham Shui Po in September 2017, that was the matter which prompted a review of the guidelines which was concluded in February of this year?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, yes. I think it's fair to say that that particular tragic accident prompted the review.

MR DUNCAN: The previous guidelines --

CHAIRMAN: That is the working hours of bus captains guideline?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Chairman, that's right.
MR DUNCAN: The previous guidelines I think had been in force since 2012; is that correct?
MR JOSEPH LAI: 2010, Mr Chairman.
MR DUNCAN: 2010. Thank you.

And the new guidelines were issued, if I understand it correctly, on 23 February this year. That's just a couple of weeks after the unfortunate accident in Tai Po. Is that the position?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Chairman.
MR DUNCAN: Now, if I understand correctly, the Sham Shui Po accident also prompted the department to require more monthly information from the bus companies; is that correct?
MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, yes.
MR DUNCAN: For example, matters such as the traffic offences of bus captains, on-board monitoring by the bus companies, random checks on the black boxes, alcohol breath tests of the drivers, those sorts of things.

Do I understand correctly also that since the Tai Po accident, a working group has been established?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman, that is correct.
MR DUNCAN: And that is to review the technical feasibility of installing new safety devices on buses?
MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman, that's correct too.

MR DUNCAN: Was that also prompted by the unfortunate incident at Tai Po?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Yes, Mr Chairman, that would be a fair way of putting it.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you this, in conclusion, Mr Lai. What would you say to the suggestion that the administration has adopted a reactive approach to matters of safety rather than a proactive approach?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Mr Chairman, I would say that after particularly serious accidents, it falls to the government to try not only to look into the cause of it but also to see how such accidents could be prevented in future or at least to reduce the likelihood of recurrence.

But, as I said in my opening statement, we also seek to improve safety in response not only to particular accidents or incidents but in the light of changing technologies, different expectation and demands, and so on.

So I would not say that our approach is purely a reactive one, although I would agree that after an accident, you have to react, and in that sense it's a reactive one, and it's always tragic that you could not have prevented it in the first place, but at least you should try to see what might be done to prevent it

from happening again.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Lai.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any questions?

MEMBER LO: I just have some minor questions. The working hours guidelines talk about still keeping the special shift of 14 hours. Has the bureau done any research or study into if you were to totally remove the special shift, what is the impact on drivers needed; how many more drivers would the companies need?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I do know that the Transport Department has done the research. I do not have the findings at the top of my head. The commissioner is right behind me. If you would allow, Chairman, the commissioner could answer that question in the next session.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JOSEPH LAI: But yes, something has been done.

CHAIRMAN: If she has the information, of course, that's sensible.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: One more question. You mentioned about driver supply is a chronic problem. That means it has been for a long time. So why haven't more drastic measures been put up to address the problem more directly? Because

that has led to severe consequences in the work hours, in the tiredness of drivers. Has there been any policy that looks directly at this problem?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, I believe over these many years the bus companies have, you know, come up with different measures, from the recruitment of more women, to recruitment of part-time drivers. I know, as I said, this is now becoming a rather sensitive subject. But it was introduced to help relieve the shortage problem. The introduction of more benefits to the drivers; to the initiative to step up recruitment locally, "locally" meaning recruitment of drivers living near where the depots are, because my understanding is that drivers usually don't want to travel far to report for duty and to travel far to get home after work. So they have been looking at all those sorts of things.

So these are different measures. And also, recruitment of retirees, to get them working again, with suitable remuneration, and the improvement in remuneration package, bonus and all that.

Prof Lo might have in mind the question of importing labour, importing drivers. On this particular one, we have looked into this every now and then. Our conclusion is that it might not be suitable in the context of bus drivers, because bus drivers need to have

very often and close interaction with passengers, where the ability to communicate in the passenger's language is most important.

So importing drivers from other places outside Hong Kong may create a communication problem between the imported drivers and the passengers.

Also, the other thing is we are right-hand drive in Hong Kong, which is a rarity.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

The question I have to Mr Lai is -- I think in your opening statement, you mentioned that one of the safety measures is that you have 14 spot-checks a day. Considering the thousands of buses on the street every day, can you provide some more insight into how you determine this number, 14?

MR JOSEPH LAI: Chairman, again, this is a question which I believe the commissioner would be better placed than I to answer. But regardless of the exact number, how it came about and the exact rationale for it, I suppose the reason why the number is not bigger is that you have to bear in mind, first of all, that it is a surprise check, in the sense that we call in the buses on the day. So there is no prior notification, no prior warning. You can imagine the effect it will have on bus deployment on the day.

So, on the day, the bus companies will have to make alternative arrangements to replace that bus by another bus. I suppose this operational consideration is one factor that has to be taken into account.

The other is that this is on top of the annual check, the monthly check, and whatever check which the bus companies have, which the buses have to undergo; and also the daily examinations which the bus companies themselves are to undertake every day, before the bus is sent out for service and at the end of the day when the bus comes back to the depot.

So this surprise spot check of 14 buses is an additional check and balance safeguard measure, in addition to everything that's been done to ensure that the bus is in a sound and proper state.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. For my own part, I have no questions, so it remains for me to thank you, Mr Lai, and thank you, Mr Choi. We haven't heard from you, Ms Yip. But thank you for attending, and we are grateful to the help you have provided the committee in having a better understanding of how the system works.

We will take a lunch break now and we will resume at 2.30, when we will hear from Ms Chan.

MR JOSEPH LAI: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, members.

Thank you, counsel.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(1.04 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS RACHEL KWAN, MS MACELLA LEE, MR REGINALD YK CHAN, MR TONY YAU

CHAIRMAN: Ms Chan and your representatives from the Transport Department. May I invite you to take your seats, all together, as you wish, or one at a time. It's a matter for you.

MS MABLE CHAN: We will sit as a team.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan, if you would commence proceedings.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for providing written submissions to the committee, and thank you also for attending today, having been given the opportunity of making any oral submissions you may wish.

In the absence of any legal representatives of yours who would perhaps normally take you through any oral submissions, do you wish to make any oral submissions to

the committee?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, counsel, I would like to make an oral submission in front of the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do so.

Opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman, members of the committee, good afternoon. Thank you for giving us the opportunity today to appear before the committee to give oral submission on matters relating to the Transport Department's regulation and monitoring of the franchised bus operations in Hong Kong, in support of the committee's important mission in reviewing Hong Kong's franchised bus service following the occurrence of the tragic accident on Tai Po Road on 10 February 2018.

Today with me is my team, including my deputy, Ms Macella Lee, and three assistant commissioners overseeing the monitoring of franchised bus, Ms Rachel Kwan, Mr Reg Chan, overseeing vehicle licensing and examination, and Mr Tony Yau, who is the chief engineer overseeing road safety and standards.

We are happy to facilitate the committee's proceedings today by giving truthful and detailed evidence in order to facilitate the committee's understanding of what we know and more importantly what

we have been doing as a regulator.

The Transport Department, headed by the commissioner, is the main authority for administering the Road Traffic Ordinance and its subsidiary legislation for the management of road traffic, regulation of public transport services, and operation of major transport infrastructures, as well as the Public Bus Services Ordinance and the public bus services regulation. Both constitute the key statutory tools for the regulation of franchised bus operation in Hong Kong.

The policy objective and public expectations on the Transport Department in ensuring proper and efficient franchised bus service is clearly embedded in the statute.

Safety-related aspects are of utmost importance in sustaining a safe and reliable franchised bus service. The fact that safety-related defects per bus examination and number of buses involved in accidents per million vehicle-kilometres are two of the nine key indicators adopted in the annual performance assessment of the franchised bus operator speaks for itself.

To ensure the roadworthiness and operational safety of franchised buses, the Transport Department, in short "TD", keeps track closely of the conditions and

performance of franchised buses, from their design and build stage, to the in-service period, through periodic examinations and inspections of vehicles as required under the regulatory framework.

All of the 5,900-plus licensed franchised buses are subject to annual inspection, monthly inspections, as well as spot-checks by the Transport Department at the average rate of 14 franchised buses per day, or around 3,400 buses per year.

The TD conducted monthly review on bus operation safety by analysing the accident statistics derived from a database on all traffic accidents, jointly maintained by the police and TD. Should the TD find that there is a rising trend or abnormality, the TD will follow up with the respective bus operators for explanations and follow-up actions, remedial actions.

We would also examine the accident trends of each bus operator annually, as part of the systematic review on the performance of the bus operators.

To enable the delivery of public bus service through grant of franchise to private operators, the six franchises currently signed with the five operators have empowered the Commissioner for Transport to regulate the bus service performance levels in highly prescriptive terms, in the form of a schedule of service, ranging

from the greeting and timetable, location of bus stops, fares and concessions, to the number and types of buses deployed for each route.

Pursuant to the relevant clause in the franchise, grantees are required to keep and provide information and records relating to the number of buses, passengers, journeys, as well as driver duties and establishment and strength, in order that the TD can monitor the delivery of service in accordance with the approved schedules of services.

Chairman, the regulation and monitoring of bus franchises is an ongoing and evolving process. Over the years, for better delivery of franchised bus service and to enhance safety and service, the TD has signed commitment letters with bus operators pursuant to the relevant franchises, requiring them to install safety and service enhancement measures.

While ensuring the delivery of franchised bus service according to the approved schedules of service, the TD pays importance to the working conditions and environment of bus captains, while reckoning that bus captains are employees of bus companies and their working conditions are parts of the latter's manpower policy.

In the form of administrative requirement reached

with mutual agreement with franchised bus operators, the TD promulgated a set of Guidelines on Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks in 1998, and revised it six times over the years, with the latest in 2018, for franchised bus operators to follow in bus captain deployment for their respective bus routes.

Bus operators are required to submit regular reports on the compliance with the guidelines to the Transport Department, which also conducts regular surveys to assess compliance with the guidelines.

As far as bus captains are concerned, franchised bus operators have also voluntarily made performance pledges on providing training to all new recruits, and training once every three years for in-service bus captains. They submit information on training to the TD on an annual basis for monitoring.

It is obviously not realistic for the TD to perform day-to-day checking of compliance of the franchised bus operators and the accuracy of information and records, each and every one submitted by the bus operators. As far as bus service is concerned, there is check and balance through monitoring by way of TD's on-site surveys, passenger satisfaction surveys, and monitoring of public complaints received.

As far as safety is concerned, we monitor franchised

bus operators' performance by analysing the nature, severity and contributing factors of accidents involving franchised buses, coupled with black spot investigation, trend analysis, and benchmarking with other commercial vehicles in territory-wide accident statistics.

Follow-up actions include quarterly reporting to and monitoring by the Road Safety Council. We will also follow up recommendations and our own findings through road safety review, vehicle safety enhancements, and regular meetings with bus operators to discuss measures and proposals to improve bus captains' driving behaviour.

Chairman, franchised bus services have been expanding over the years in terms of fleet size and patronage. While the local licensed bus fleet has grown by 3.24 per cent as compared with that of ten years ago, to meet the increase in patronage by 37 million passenger journeys in absolute terms, franchised bus operators are facing an increasingly acute problem of manpower shortage. It is inevitable that the bus companies are exploring various means to meet manpower needs by increasing the remuneration package to attract new recruits, extending the retirement age of bus captains, and recruiting part-time bus captains.

It is against such background that the Transport

Department sees the need to enhance bus captains' safe driving by institutionalising the monitoring of bus companies' training arrangements, including those for the new recruits, the in-service, be they full-time or part-time, as well as special or remedial training for those who are found to have improper driving behaviour or who have been away from driving duties for a long period because of sickness or other reasons.

What we intend to do includes the formulation of a set of new guidelines on the manpower training framework, with basic requirements on modules, duration and weighting, so as to provide a common basis for internal monitoring and audit within individual franchised bus companies.

We have indeed shared our thoughts with bus companies at our first two meetings of the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses on 13 March and 21 April 2018.

The feedback has been positive. The working group has pledged to complete its work by the end of June.

Taking advantage of the latest technological know-how on driver-assisted devices, we are also discussing with the bus companies and bus manufacturers to examine the feasibility of installing on new buses seat belts for all passenger seats, electronic stability

control, speed limiter to cap the maximum speed for buses travelling downhill, and put on trial driver monitoring device, in order to assist bus captains to drive safely and improve passenger safety.

All in all, the Transport Department will continue monitoring of the public transport services in the territory and will spare no effort in enhancing the safety operation of public transport operators in Hong Kong.

Chairman, this concludes my statement. My team and I will be happy to answer questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, thank you.

Ms Chan, I am very interested to hear your remarks just at the end of your submission with regard to monitoring, because I think as you probably know from the terms of reference of the committee, one of the prime matters they have to consider -- it's item (b) of the terms of reference -- is first of all the regulation of the bus companies' operations, and secondly the monitoring.

This morning, I think you were in the auditorium when questions were asked of the bureau with regard to

regulation. I would just like to ask a few more questions, please, about the monitoring process, as it is at the moment, and how the monitoring process as presently conducted might be in the process of change from the remarks that you've made this afternoon.

First of all, if I could understand the current process by which the monitoring is carried out. It may be useful if you were to turn up, please, one of the exhibits to your submission. This will be TD-2, page 293.

You will see there a document which is tabbed appendix L, and it's headed, "Records and information submitted by franchised bus operators". It's one of the documents that the department helpfully provided to the commission.

Are you able to have that in front of you?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: This, as I understand it, summarises the records and information which, by arrangement with the operators, they are required to supply the department from time to time. I think sometimes it's on a monthly basis; sometimes it's on a quarterly basis.

Would it be true to say that, at the present time, this represents the principal methods by which you monitor the operation of the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, senior counsel, the records and information highlighted in appendix L actually flows from the requirements as specified in schedule 2 to the relevant franchises we signed with the bus operators, and this formed the basis for the regular monitoring by TD, either on a daily or quarterly basis.

For those which relate to passengers, buses, journeys, things like that, they are actually submitted by the bus companies, through an electronic system, so that -- and they are also required to upload the information within seven days from which those trips are made, so that the Transport Department can monitor them on a frequent basis as well as on an ad hoc basis.

As we have stated in my opening statement, the franchise has specified and empowered C for T power to regulate and monitor the delivery of franchised bus service in highly prescriptive terms. So this list of information actually helps us to monitor the delivery of the services in terms of the routes, the passengers, the bus deployment.

But I would also like to add that this only forms the basis. In order to verify whether this is actually happening on the ground, the Transport Department has been conducting regular on-site surveys, which include inspections on trips on board the buses and also at the

bus stops. Those on-site surveys will help us to sort of do it on a random basis, in order to verify the information supplied by the bus operators are on valid and accurate terms.

Apart from that, we also conduct passenger satisfaction surveys, through which we will also gather feedback from the passengers on the various performance levels in a more systematic manner.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So those on-site surveys to which you have just referred, are they referred to here in this appendix L?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say that the on-site surveys actually cover most of the items in appendix L.

MR DUNCAN: Right. But if I take you to, for example, page 297 of the bundle, you see in the first box on the right-hand side, "Survey conducted by an independent consultant". That's a different type of survey, is it, from the one you've just referred to?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. This one is a special survey that we employed an independent contractor to do special checking on the compliance with the guidelines.

MR DUNCAN: Right. So what I want to clarify for the committee's consideration at the moment is what are the monitoring steps over and above what is in this appendix. So you mentioned during your statement

spot-checks, about 14 buses a day. Can you tell us a little bit more about that, please?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure. For the spot-checks, it's actually on top of the annual inspection and also the monthly inspection of the vehicle fleet.

The bus operators are actually required to do their monthly inspection, but as a statutory requirement, the Transport Department oversees the safety and the construction and maintenance fitness of the buses. So, to facilitate the Transport Department in monitoring, we conduct annual inspection and also monthly inspection.

But on top of that, in order to ensure the robustness of our monitoring, the vehicle licensing and inspection team will carry out unannounced spot-checks of an average 14 franchised buses from the fleet in the bus company. That is unannounced and that is to ensure that apart from the regular inspection which the bus companies may have geared up to prepare for the inspection, we can conduct on a spot-check basis to make sure that the buses are safe and fit for running.

MR DUNCAN: You mentioned regular on-site surveys. What do you mean by that?

MS MABLE CHAN: For the regular on-site surveys, they relate to the delivery of the services, including the bus journeys, the passengers on board from the first stop or

at individual stops, and also the destination, the number of passengers alighting or boarding, and also the bus driver deployment on the individual bus, as well as whether there is any delay or change in frequency of the bus deployment according to the specified frequency in the approved schedule of routes.

MR DUNCAN: Who carries out the surveys?

MS MABLE CHAN: Transport Department.

Perhaps I can invite my deputy to fill in some details about how it is actually conducted from the ground, if I may.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MACELLA LEE: Thank you, Chairman.

Because of the resources required, we also contract out these surveys to independent consultants or contractors. But of course our officers sometimes would also go and look for the demand situation himself, so as to better understand the situation or to go with the district councillors, and so on.

Basically, the bulk of them is contracted out to independent consultants.

MR DUNCAN: Are written records kept of --

MS MACELLA LEE: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I don't recall this, but have any samples of

those records been provided to the committee?

MS MACELLA LEE: As the commissioner has explained, these are all on the service side, whether the services are provided according to those approved by C for T.

So these are on the service side and we can supply some examples of these surveys if required.

MR DUNCAN: I don't think we have seen those. That's the point. So are they available if we require them?

MS MABLE CHAN: I can confirm that through the bundles we have not provided those samples, but we can surely do.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

In your remarks, Ms Chan, just a few moments ago, I believe you mentioned monthly undertakings by the Road Safety Council, in the context of monitoring.

MS MABLE CHAN: Quarterly.

MR DUNCAN: Could you give us some details about that, please.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure. The Road Safety and Standards Division, headed by Mr Tony Yau, who is a traffic engineer, they will monitor and analyse the data about accidents from a common database jointly maintained by the police and the Transport Department. The purpose of the monitoring is to analyse the nature, the severity and also the contributing factor of the accidents. Then, based on the analysis, they will provide a report

on a quarterly basis to the Road Safety Council.

In that report, they will analyse whether there is any common factor in those accidents, in order to prepare for necessary improvement or remedial actions. The aspects covered will include road safety, vehicle safety, or human factor, including driver behaviour or whether there are any common phenomena of pedestrians crossing in a very dangerous way.

So, on a quarterly basis, we submit the report to the Road Safety Council, and we will then take the follow-up actions accordingly.

Worth noting is that should any trend or analysis involving franchised bus companies, in particular the driver behaviour, they will also highlight those actions that need to be taken to the Bus and Railway Branch of the Transport Department, and my team will then raise the issue with the franchised bus operators in their regular meetings, to remind them of necessary actions to remind the bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: The portion which caught my attention was what was recorded in the transcript.

The transcript has you recorded as saying this:

"Follow-up actions include quarterly reporting to and monitoring by the Road Safety Council."

Now, is the Road Safety Council distinct from the

Transport Department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. The Road Safety Council is distinct from the Transport Department. Actually, can I take this point to correct the flow of my wording?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, please.

MS MABLE CHAN: Actually, I would like to say that the Transport Department conduct a quarterly analysis of the accidents and analyse the contributing factor, the nature and severity, and then we will produce quarterly report to the Road Safety Council. Then the follow-up actions arising from our analysis and report to the Road Safety Council will include road safety review, vehicle safety enhancements, and then regular meetings with the franchised bus operators, to discuss means to improve bus captains' driving behaviour.

MR DUNCAN: So that initial work that you do and provide to the Road Safety Council, that's done by your conclusions from the documentation that the bus companies provide to you; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Basically, it's from the analysis done by the Transport Department's road safety and standards team on the accidents data collected in the common database managed by the Transport Department and the police.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS MABLE CHAN: So it is an independent source, not from the bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: Right. What I'm trying to understand is any steps the department takes to monitor the operations of the bus companies, apart from relying on the records of the bus companies.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, this is true. We have our own database. We do not rely just on the bus companies' data.

MR DUNCAN: Right. At the risk of asking you to repeat a few things, can you just identify what steps you take over and above considering the written information provided to you by the bus companies?

CHAIRMAN: Whenever there is an accident, in a particular fatal accident occurred, the police will timely input those data into the database. The Transport Department and the police jointly maintain that database. Then the Road Safety and Standards Unit, they will regularly monitor that database and analyse the accidents from that database. They do it independently, without reliance on the bus company's information on the accidents, because the bus companies' reports on the accidents, they may come a bit later, or they may come in the context of their annual programme provided by the TD.

So we actually look into that database maintained by the police and the Transport Department and then we will do a quarterly review to the Road Safety Council.

MR DUNCAN: Right. There, you are relying on the records from the police. I'm trying to find out what work the staff of the Transport Department might do independently to assess the operations of the bus companies, not relying on documentation of any sort. Your own work, that's what I would like you to identify.

MS MABLE CHAN: In that regard, I will invite Tony Yau, the chief engineer, to respond.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR TONY YAU: Thank you, Chairman, counsel.

As the commissioner mentions, we directly derived the accident data from a computer system which is input by the police, and we have accessibility to the system, and we retrieve the accident data in doing our monitoring and analysis work, including the trends, number of accidents, severity, collision type, vehicle types, and mainly the contributory factors.

The contributory factors can be driving factor, casualty factor, vehicle factor and environmental factors. So if we find out any common factors or any observations, we will quarterly report to the Road Safety Council.

The Road Safety Council consists of members from different bureaux, including Transport and Housing Bureau, Education Bureau, police, Highways Department, as well as other representatives from external members, such as Hong Kong Medical Association, Hong Kong Road Safety Association, Hong Kong Automobile Association, Institute of Logistics, to formulate -- what we are going to do then, the Road Safety Council will formulate -- help the different departments, initiate the department and the bureau to formulate the policy, and maybe implement road safety improvement measures such as updating or introducing new legislation, priority in enforcement, education and publicity campaign, et cetera.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Those remarks I think have been made in the context of accidents. My enquiry is more operations generally. We've got an abundance of written records which are supplied, but over and above that, as I understand you, there is different work that the Transport Department actually undertakes with regard to the operations of the bus companies.

You have mentioned spot-checks, about 14 buses a day. I understand that. You have mentioned feedback you get back from passenger surveys; I understand that.

You have mentioned regular on-site surveys. Could you tell me just a little bit more about that: what does that consist of, who does the work, what conclusions do you draw from that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will invite Ms Lee to elaborate.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS MACELLA LEE: Thank you, Chairman.

Because of the requirement in the law about the service to be delivered by the franchised bus operators, those approval by C for T include a timetable, routing, stops, and also some patronage figures.

What we do is we either do terminal surveys, so we choose -- in a particular route, we station people in the terminus to time the departures, whether the bus companies have adhered to the schedules, and then on the same occasion record the number of passengers boarding.

In another end of the terminus, we will have the arrival time, so we know the journey time, we know if there are any delays in the trips, and so on. These are terminal surveys or stop surveys.

Another type is on-board surveys. We have surveyors on the bus. At each bus stop, they will record how many passengers getting down, setting down and so on. So we have the detailed operational data. These data are very important because all along we have to make sure that

the operators adhere to the schedules, and especially if there are complaints saying that there are missing trips, then we will examine these reports and take up with bus companies.

Another angle is the planning angle, because there are often requests for re-routing or to combine some routes, and so on, so for planning purpose we also need this data.

Actually, we got these data from the bus companies, but we verify them and also do -- sometimes we will need updated figures, especially for planning purpose. So because with these records and also our on-site survey we perform this operational performance monitoring and also planning purpose.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

I understand a lot of that work. A lot of it of course is not related to safety requirements. Is there any work done by the Transport Department independently of the records provided by the bus companies aimed at independently checking safety provisions undertaken by the bus companies? For example, the training of bus captains. Are you totally dependent on what the bus companies to inform you, or do you undertake independent assessments of safety

requirements?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can try to answer on that. The safety-related aspects, I have mentioned two of them, two of the nine key indicators, including safety-related defects per bus examination. Senior counsel has asked a minute ago about our 14 spot-checks. Perhaps on that I can ask the assistant commissioner to elaborate a little bit.

MR DUNCAN: I don't think you need to do that. I think we understand that one.

MS MABLE CHAN: The other is on the number of buses involved in accidents per million vehicle-kilometres. This is one of the indicators that we monitor. In this regard, we will check the information supplied by the bus companies on the number of buses involved in accidents per million vehicle-kilometre. Then we will compare the performance year-on-year.

In meeting that indicator, training is also an important aspect that the bus company has mentioned as an important aspect to ensure that the driver has received sufficient training. In this regard, the bus company has voluntarily made two performance pledges. One is provide training for all new recruits, and the other is provide training for in-service bus captains once every three years.

The bus companies have provided information in this regard in their annual programme to meet their voluntary performance pledges. We take note of the information supplied in that programme and we review their work on an annual basis.

But I would like to emphasise that the Transport Department does not, as in the previous case, perform our independent checks on that, because I must admit that the training is not a requirement that flows from the franchise or that flows from the ordinance. It was actually formulated by the bus company on a voluntary basis as part of our discussions with them to improve and enhance bus safety, but there is no such legal requirement nor requirement in the franchise.

So, up to the present moment, the Transport Department does not do any spot-checks or independent checking on the training provided by bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: Do I take it also that there is no direction or requirement, as stipulated in the ordinance, with regard to training?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: It's all done on a voluntary basis?

MS MABLE CHAN: No direction or requirement.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to go back to the records, this table, in a moment, but are you able to inform the committee as

to any other independent steps that the Transport Department might take, outside of the records supplied to you by the bus companies, with regard to matters of safety?

MR YK CHAN: I would like to supplement. The commissioner has mentioned about the spot-checks on vehicles. That's one thing. Another thing is, for all the buses run by bus companies nowadays, they have to do a complete check or repair once a year, and after that the Transport Department needs to check every one of them. So this is really an independent complete check to the standard, as spot-checks, really. So this is an aspect that the Transport Department do have independent information obtained by carrying out our own works by our inspectors, our vehicle examiners, at the depots.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Let us go then back to this document, appendix L, "Records and information submitted by franchised bus operators". We can see the records and information which are supplied, the reference to the ordinance or the franchise, the relevant clause, the time frame for submission, and then the follow-up actions.

What we have done is been through the follow-up actions to try and identify where it is that matters beyond what the bus operators have provided you have

been checked or investigated in some way.

The first one I've come across appears at page 296. If you look at the second-last box on that page, there is in the second paragraph reference to:

"Survey conducted by independent consultant ..."

Do you see that reference?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. In fact the same reference is made in the next box, at the bottom of page 196, and another one at the top of page 297.

I believe that although there's three references, they all refer to one survey; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Can you tell us a bit more about that, a survey conducted by an independent consultant? Who is the independent consultant and what does the survey indicate?

MS MABLE CHAN: Again, Ms Lee, please.

MS MACELLA LEE: Thank you, Chairman. These surveys are to check the compliance of the franchised bus companies, whether they follow the guidelines in arranging the duties for the captains.

As you are aware, the original guideline, not the one just revised, there are four parts of the guideline. Basically, there are two types. One is the driving --

the rest breaks, rest breaks and driving hours. This type of survey, we need to follow -- actually, the surveyor followed -- we select the drivers randomly and then the surveyor follows the driver the whole day. So we can check whether really rest break is given to him or whether, say, sometimes -- the rest break and the driving hours, whether the driving hours within that duty is within the maximum.

So this kind, we follow the surveys. But for breaks between two consecutive duties, for example, we check the sign in and sign out record of the drivers.

So there are basically two teams of surveyors. So where do we find these surveyors? We do it by an open tender, for qualified consultants to do it. We have a study brief, we select the most appropriate consultants, and then we follow up with the consultant to do this.

So, with these samples and we can see the compliance, and in fact, as we have included in the bundle, over the years the compliance rate is quite high, and for those items or guidelines that we found a small percentage of non-compliance, we have asked the bus company the reasons and explanations, and most of them are outside their control. This is the way surveys are done, and I must say these are very labour

intensive. We do 12,000 bus drivers altogether, the bus companies.

So the surveys are done like that. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, you do 12,000?

MS MACELLA LEE: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: What does that mean?

MS MACELLA LEE: I mean we select samples and we take -- the six companies as a whole, we do 12,000 samples of these --

MR DUNCAN: You speak to 12,000 drivers?

MS MACELLA LEE: Sorry, 1,200.

MR DUNCAN: Per year?

MS MACELLA LEE: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: When did this system commence? When did you first engage surveyors for this?

MS MACELLA LEE: At least when the current guideline is implemented in 2010, and for those before 2010, I cannot give a definite answer here.

MR DUNCAN: If I refer the commissioner now to page 297, there is another box in the middle of the page:

"Survey conducted by independent consultant ..."

That is the same survey that's referred to, is it, earlier on?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I can confirm it's the same.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. The other one that we have located

is on page 299. This refers to the report on the passenger liaison group, and it refers to sending of representatives to attend PLG meetings. Could you give us a bit more detail about that, please?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps on this I can ask my assistant commissioner overseeing bus to explain the details.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS RACHEL KWAN: Mr Chairman, each of the bus franchisees arrange their passenger liaison group meeting once in every two months, and once they have determined the location of the PLG meeting, we will be informed and we will send our representatives to attend the meeting as well, and to monitor that the franchised bus operator will do their own PLG meeting properly and to listen to the views collected from the meeting.

We will take records and after the meeting the franchised bus operator will also send us the record for our forward bus planning purpose.

MR DUNCAN: Who selects --

CHAIRMAN: Before you proceed, Mr Duncan -- so are you saying there are two sets of records, one taken by your representative and another taken by the bus company?

MS RACHEL KWAN: We will do our own -- because we will only send one representative to attend the meeting, we cannot follow all the passengers' opinions collected. So

whenever we collect, we listen to the passengers' views, we will jot our own notes, and we will not put it formally into a record but we will report to our senior when they come back to the office.

But actually, all the information collected will be recorded by the franchisee, and they will send us their report afterwards to countercheck our own handwritten record.

CHAIRMAN: So are there two sets of records?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Have we been supplied with these records?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Not yet.

MR DUNCAN: Could they be made available as well?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Samples.

How many persons typically attend these PLG groups, meetings?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Mr Chairman, it all depends on the location of the PLG meeting. If it is held at a popular location, more than 20 passengers will attend.

MR DUNCAN: Who determines the make-up of the passenger liaison group?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Pardon me?

MR DUNCAN: Who determines, who makes up, the passenger liaison group? Are they selected by the Transport

Department? Are they selected by the bus operator?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes. They are determined by the bus operator.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. You can put that document away. I think I've finished the questions on that particular topic.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on from that, at these passenger liaison group meetings, are issues of bus safety raised?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Depends on the passengers' opinion. There is no definite topic for the passengers, for them -- in fact, they can raise whatever comments they would like to put forward.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. Perhaps the question is better put this way. Do they ever raise questions of bus safety?

MS RACHEL KWAN: In my mind, most of the comments received are service related or fare concession related, not much --

CHAIRMAN: So questions of bus safety not raised?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Very little.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Turning to another topic, Ms Chan -- reference has been made already this afternoon to the Guidelines on

Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks for the bus captains, and one of your colleagues mentioned the guidelines in 2010, and we know that they were revised very recently and the guidelines issued in February of this year.

I would like to refer you, please, to your supplemental submission, the one that came in, I think, on 4 May. You will find this at TD-1 at page 157. In answer to a query from the committee, at paragraph (d) you mentioned that the department received a suggestion from a bus captains' union suggesting a revision of the guideline. It goes on to say that the department discussed the suggestion with the bus operators and another bus captains' union and both expressed objection to the suggestions. After further discussion with the proponent, it was concluded that the guidelines would not be changed.

Is it not the case that even before 2015, there had been requests and suggestions to the department that the guidelines be changed; do you recall that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can start -- the guidelines' development process is quite a long one.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: It dated back to 1993, when we sort of developed the guidelines for voluntary following up by

the relevant bus operators. It was not until 1998 that we promulgated the guidelines and required the bus companies to follow.

Since the promulgation in 1998, the guidelines were revised six times.

I would like to highlight that throughout the years and as the process, there have been ongoing suggestions and views from the staff union side, to further improve the working conditions and shorten the working hours of the bus captains; and, on the other hand, we are also mindful of ongoing and increasing public expectations to enhance the service level of franchised bus service.

So senior counsel's referral of our written statement in March 2019 [sic], I would say that is an example to illustrate that the staff union all along, they have a genuine request for further improvement in the working hours and conditions of the bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Just in that respect, I would ask you to pick up bundle SEC-1, and go to page 437.

These are minutes of a meeting of the Panel on Transport of the Legislative Council on 27 November 2012. Do you see that?

Then if you look through, please, to page 441, at the bottom of the page you will see that the chairman refers to:

"... a serious traffic accident had taken place in Chai Wan on 19 November 2012 involving two buses and a taxi and this had aroused extensive public concern on the health and driving attitudes of professional drivers, particularly bus captains."

So that was the context in which that meeting took place.

Then if you go through, please, to 442, there's reference in paragraph 2 to the secretary and the commissioner giving a brief account on paper which had included reference to details of the health check and the working hour arrangements for bus captains of franchised bus companies.

Then at 447, if I could refer you to that, paragraph 24, there's reference to the secretary undertaking that the administration would review the guidelines in conjunction with stakeholders, including franchised bus companies and their staff unions. He added that the department was liaising with major staff unions of the bus captains to discuss the problems arising from that accident.

Then there is, at page 454, a summing-up by the chairman of the meeting, where he thanked the parties and, amongst other things, indicated that members considered that the administration should review the

operation of franchised bus services, the captains' rest times, working hours and remuneration, as well as measures to improve the existing traffic network.

Now, it would seem that notwithstanding the contents of those minutes, there was no change to the guidelines from 2012 up until the time of the Sham Shui Po accident in 2017. Are you able to assist the committee with regard to what determination and for what reasons that determination was made of the administration regarding the guidelines as they were at that time?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can give a general answer first and then I will invite Ms Rachel Kwan to supplement on the thinking and review process.

Following the tragic accident back in 2012, actually there are two major follow-up actions. The first one is the enhancement of the health check requirement of the bus captains. It is following from that incident that we have required all the bus operators to step up the health check requirements. In addition to the annual health check for bus captains aged 50 or above, we actually stipulate additional health check requirement for those bus captains who have declared significant health illness, so that the companies can arrange more frequent health examination and also including the cardio checking on the bus captains.

We also require the bus companies to arrange health check for bus captains at the 54 and 60, things like that.

On the other hand, on the review of the guidelines, I understand that the department has actually, at that time, taken another look at the guidelines on the working hours of the bus captains. But, at the end of the day, there is no specific change made to the guideline at that moment. But the department did undergo a review of the guidelines to see whether any parts of it would need to be enhanced at that moment.

CHAIRMAN: You said there were two follow-up actions that followed the incident in November 2012, one was increased health checks. What was the other?

MS MABLE CHAN: The other is the review of the guideline, though it does not lead to any specific revision at that juncture.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would invite Ms Kwan --

MS RACHEL KWAN: Mr Chairman, I would like to supplement. The working hours guidelines was last reviewed in 2010. At that time, a new guideline was introduced. That is on the meal break. At that time, when we promulgated the guidelines in 2010, we allowed the bus companies to

implement the new guideline E on the meal break in two years' time. That means, for full implementation of the revised guideline in 2010, that will be in 2012 already.

So I cannot give a definite answer right now why, after the review in 2013, there is no change to the guideline. May we have some time to check our record? Maybe it's due to the fact that the new guideline for full implementation has just been implemented in 2012, in the latter part of the year, so maybe this is one of the reasons for perhaps at that time to look at the performance of the franchised bus operator for a longer period of time.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Ms Chan, you were present this morning, I think, when I asked representatives from the bureau as to why these guidelines with regard to working hours are simply guidelines, as opposed to regulations, given that the ordinance expressly stipulates that this topic can be the subject of regulation.

Are you able to assist the committee as to the reason why this has not been a regulation or has not even achieved the status of a direction or a requirement?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can try to. Because I was present at this morning's session and the context in which this

issue was raised was on whether or not it should be better implemented or enforced under the law or as a franchise requirement.

First perhaps I can express my view from an operational and monitoring point of view. As I see it, the history of the working hours guidelines is long and it is an ongoing process. As revealed from the few times that the guidelines are revised, the beauty of the requirements as set out in the guidelines is that it could be reviewed and revised in a more timely basis as compared to if it is stipulated as the ordinance or in the regulation; though I must admit that as and when necessary, we should not spare ourselves from the effort in reviewing the legislation or taking it through the Legislative Council.

The fact remains that, being guidelines, it can be more flexible and it can be sort of enhanced in the light of the prevailing circumstances. Franchised bus service is a very labour-intensive service. There are also highly prescriptive requirements on the service levels of franchised bus. So I think from the government perspective, we are trying to strike a balance in ensuring the delivery of bus service according to franchise requirement on the one hand and the enhancement of the working environment of bus

captains on the other.

That being the case, while the working hours guidelines are guidelines as such, administrative requirement in our words, in our written submission, we also require the franchised bus operators to supply information on their compliance, and we do independent checking on their compliance, so as to ensure that the franchised bus operators will comply with those guidelines as a product following ongoing and mutual discussions with the franchised bus operators.

So we would see it as a contractual requirement in that sense, because it is a product of ongoing discussions between the government and also the bus operators.

On the other hand, I also note from the franchise document signed with the franchisees, under clause 28(1)(a), the grantee shall provide the commissioner information relating to records kept by the grantee in respect of the bus service in accordance with schedule 2 to the franchise.

Under that schedule 2, item (l), we have stipulated in the franchise that the grantee shall provide records and information on, inter alia, the percentage of bus drivers selected on the sample size as specified by C for T in compliance with the guidelines on

arrangements in relation to working hours and rest time of bus drivers issued by C for T after consultation with the grantee.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on any further, forgive me for interrupting -- Mr Duncan, may we see one of these franchise clause 28(1)(a) so we can follow this?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly. The franchise, Mr Chairman, is at THB-2 at page 137.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: And I believe Ms Chan is referring to page 169.

CHAIRMAN: She referred first of all to clause 28, subsection (1), that's page 158, is it not? And schedule 2 is at 168.

Yes, Ms Chan, if that helps you with your explanation.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: I don't want to get into a legal debate, but that seems to be a requirement to produce records?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: As opposed to a requirement to keep to the guidelines?

MS MABLE CHAN: Absolutely. I'm not a legal expert on that, but I'm trying to explain how we would make use of the provision.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, in a practical sense.

MS MABLE CHAN: In a practical sense, I would see that the commissioner should exercise my authority to ensure that the bus operators do the checking and submit data according to the sample size and specify the commissioner according to item (l) of schedule 2 to the franchise.

So, in this respect, should we find that the bus operators cannot provide the information pursuant to this requirement, and should that lead us to any suspicion or cast doubt on whether the franchisees are providing proper and efficient service, we would also undertake necessary action, follow-up action, with the bus operators.

MR DUNCAN: So you gain flexibility on the one hand. On the other hand, it would appear that you may lose the force of a regulation providing for an offence, or action under section 12A, namely the imposition of a financial penalty.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say that it does not constitute a statutory requirement as such in case of any failure of the bus operator in compliance with the guideline that leads to a strict triggering of the relevant clause, ie section 22, in regard of the imposition of the financial penalty.

But I would ride on the relevant item (l) in

schedule 2 to ensure that the bus franchise operators are providing the information as required, and we would also do independent checking on the data provided, and then will take that into account in assessing whether a bus operator is providing proper and efficient service.

MR DUNCAN: Could we turn to the ordinance itself, which I think is in the bundle that you may have in front of you now. This is at page 104. This is the reference to the forward planning programme.

Do you see section 12A?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you this. To what extent does the department require bus operators to include detailed safety provisions in the forward planning programme?

MS MABLE CHAN: The forward planning programme flows from the legal backing in the law. The forward planning programme serves as a planning tool and it covers, by and large, the service aspects of the bus operators in fulfilling the requirement under the franchise.

I think we have provided the committee, in our bundle, a contents page of the forward planning programme. As one of the chapters in the forward planning programme, there is a chapter on bus safety. This actually arises from the past experience of the

analysis of bus accidents involving franchised buses and our discussions with the franchised bus operators on important aspects to ensure bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: If you just pause there for a moment, I think an attempt is being made to put up this contents page which does have, as you say, in the index, references to bus safety, I think it's called. Perhaps we could have that on the screen.

Is this not something that comes from a letter sent to Citybus by the Transport Department?

Mr Duncan, where do we find the latest written submissions from the Transport Department?

MR DUNCAN: I think the document Mr Chairman is looking for is TD-4/1038. TD-4/1035, I believe.

CHAIRMAN: What I had in mind was what was sent to the bus operators, saying, "For your forward planning programme, please address the following matters." Is this the document?

MR DUNCAN: No. What I'm looking at is the document referred to by Ms Chan, which is the index document, indicating what was expected to be found in the forward planning programme document, the converse.

Could we go to TD-4 at page 1035. This is the contents page, is it not, that you were referring to?

And if you look at page 1038, there's a heading,

"Bus safety". That's what you're referring to?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Now, you have not yet provided the committee with the report itself and the programme itself, you say for commercial confidential reasons.

Would there be any problem in your supplying that section which deals just with safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: We can certainly take that up and make sure that we can get the consent from the bus company on that part.

CHAIRMAN: Before we go ahead, Mr Duncan, let's take this step by step so that this can be followed by others who are not aware of what you are talking about.

Could we go to the submission where we have the passage that you just have in mind about the inability to furnish this material.

I'm looking at the document that was made available to me on Friday and it wasn't paginated but it's in the appendix at paragraph 22. Item 22, paragraph 34(a):

"All FB operators provided the TD a five-year plan. As the five-year plan contains commercially sensitive information of individual FB operators ...", and so on.

Do you have what I have in mind?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. That's actually been tabulated now. It's TD-1 at 164.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Because this is what your question is aimed at, is it not?

MR DUNCAN: It is indeed.

If I could just remind you, Ms Chan, of the response of the department:

"As the five-year plan contains commercially sensitive information of individual FB operators, the FB operators agree to disclose the information to the IRC provided that prior agreement from IRC is obtained for not disclosing the information to the public."

All the committee will need is that portion -- for present purposes, anyway -- of the programme which is concerned with safety.

If I could ask you again, perhaps overnight, to try and speak to the bus operators, gain their consent to that part of the programme being provided to the committee.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. The basis of our response to the committee as highlighted on the screen now is we have sought the bus operators' view on the disclosure of their five-year plan and it's not made on the basis of just an extract of the relevant chapter. But knowing what the senior counsel has just asked me, we will certainly take that up and ask the operator again, to

seek their consent and see whether that particular chapter on bus safety can be provided to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: That's a matter we will take up directly with the bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: I think I can still ask this, though, if I may.

Could you look at TD-5, page 1599.

This is the index for the five-year forward planning programme for the New Lantao Bus company, one of the five franchisees.

If you turn the page to 1600, we have the contents page there. Do you see the contents page?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: There is no reference to the topic of safety there, for that particular company.

So my question is this, and I think you can answer this perhaps even though we are awaiting the full details. To what extent does the department require the franchisee to include in the forward planning programme details as to safety requirements?

MS MABLE CHAN: Actually, regarding this contents page, the bus safety is covered in part 1, "Route development programme".

MR DUNCAN: It's part of that, is it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, it's part of the route development programme.

MR DUNCAN: So could you answer my question, perhaps a bit more directly: what details does the department require of the bus franchisees with regard to safety requirements in the context of this programme?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will invite Ms Lee to give the details.

MS MACELLA LEE: Thank you, Chairman.

The preparation of the forward planning programme is a requirement under the PBSO, and in the PBSO there's a schedule setting out the content which the bus company must provide. So you can see from the law that it is emphasised on the route development programme, on the buses, purchasing and scrapping programmes, maintenance facilities, et cetera. Of course, at the last item, it mentions about other materials that C for T considers appropriate, and other matters that C for T may specify.

Some years ago -- just now my colleagues already said that we have analysed accident data, et cetera, and we find, actually, when we do this annual exercise, we look at the trends of the accident data and we found that it's good that we require the bus companies to provide a chapter -- not a chapter -- provide in the FPP their own analysis of traffic accidents and tell us what improvement measures that were made. It is in this context and for this purpose we asked them to include in

the FPP, and since then it is included.

So now, for submission of this FPP every year, the bus companies will include an analysis of data, of their own accident statistics, and then tell us their proposed improvement measures. This is the background.

Of course, there are others that we added over the years. For example, because of the public aspiration for using more environmentally friendly buses, we added a chapter about environmental initiatives. So we have an environmental initiative that is outside -- I mean using the last item about "Other matters". This is the way that we add. And the commissioner has just mentioned that the bus companies also voluntarily make some performance indicators and targets. Some of them are on safety and some of them are on training.

This is the way that we deal with the forward planning programme. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Just before I leave this topic, it would be very helpful if you made contact with the bus companies this evening to obtain that safety information, so that we could ask you questions about it tomorrow. We don't want to wait until the bus companies come.

MS MACELLA LEE: Thank you. We can do that.

CHAIRMAN: Before you leave the topic, the matter is addressed in the some of the other five-year plan

material that's in the bundle. That is TD-5 at page 1602. We see "Forward planning", where "Bus safety" is section 5; do you have that? We see "Bus safety" is item 5 at page 1604.

Then we have the five-year plan for Long Win Bus, and we have more detail here because at 1607 we see a chapter dealing with safety review.

There are eight items there in "Safety review" -- are all of those items addressing requests that were made by the Transport Department of the bus company?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would try to answer this. As a statutory requirement or the franchise requirement, we do not specify specific requirement on training or on specific measures to be taken. That said, as an ongoing monitoring and discussions with franchised bus operators to assess their performance on an annual basis and also on top of the road safety quarterly review, we have asked the bus companies to include in their forward planning programme a safety chapter, to analyse their own accident data, and also to provide their improvement measures in bus operation.

Those improvement measures relate to vehicle safety, bus maintenance, as well as the measures taken to address drivers' behaviour, driving behaviour, and also training.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Moving on to the point about training. You have said I think a couple of times now that there is no specific requirement in the franchise document, nor do I think you say it anywhere else, that contains any particular requirement of the department with regard to what the actual training should be.

Is that a correct understanding?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So do I take it that the department has not issued any particular directives to any of the franchisees as to how they should conduct their training?

MS MABLE CHAN: No, we did not issue any directive on that.

MR DUNCAN: So that's a matter left entirely to the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Does it vary then from one bus company to the next?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on the information they provide in the context of bus safety and also training on bus captains in the forward planning programme, we have gathered that in terms of the arrangements for new recruits, in-service bus captains and also refresher course, remedial course, basically in terms of the contents,

they are the same.

But the duration of the individual training courses and modules may vary. So, in very specific terms, all the bus companies provide training for the new recruits. For the in-service bus captains, they provide training once every three years, and actually these are all which the bus operators have pledged to do so.

For those drivers which have been absent from the driving duties for a long period of time, they will provide refresher course or remedial courses for the drivers before they are taking up the driving duties again.

In terms of the refresher course, we know that, except one operator which does not provide refresher course for part-time captains, all the other bus operators provide refresher course for the part-time bus captains.

It is actually against this background that we think that there is merit in aligning the basic requirements in terms of the contents and modules for the training to be provided to the bus captains. While noting that it may not be realistic or reasonable to stipulate the duration or the frequency of such courses to be provided, bearing in mind that operators actually vary in terms of scale and also the bus routes operated, in

terms of the manpower strength of the various bus operators.

So it is on this basis that we are developing a set of guidelines to devise a framework for the delivery of this kind of training, and we think that it is very important to have a common basis for the bus operators to perform internal monitoring and audit, to make sure that trainings are actually provided as pledged.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: When did you commence the development of these proposed guidelines?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have formulated our thinking on these proposals with the bus operators following the Tai Po accident in February, and the working group was formed in March. This is one of the proposals that we have noted in the first working group meeting held in March.

MR DUNCAN: So this is a matter of discussion with the bus operators at the moment?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is under discussion.

MR DUNCAN: Now, you mentioned earlier this afternoon health checks of the drivers. What is the current arrangement or directive, whatever it may be, between the department and the franchisees with regard to health checks?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps on health checks I can invite Ms Kwan to elaborate on the details.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MS RACHEL KWAN: Mr Chairman, before joining the service, all full-time and part-time bus drivers are required to declare their health conditions and to pass a health check, to prove that he or she is medically fit to drive buses.

The health check includes a chest examination, eyesight, hearing, diabetes, blood pressure, blood and urine test. And now, all the franchised bus operators currently require bus drivers aged 50 or above to undergo an annual health check which covers chest examination, eyesight, hearing, diabetes and blood pressure, blood and urine test.

For the bus drivers at the age of 50, 54, 57 or 60 or above, they are also required to undergo an electrocardiogram as part of their health check. Moreover, for the bus drivers who have suffered stroke or cardiovascular diseases or are on medication due to diabetes or hypertension, they are also required to declare such illnesses to their employers and undergo an electrocardiogram in their annual health check.

This is the current arrangement.

MR DUNCAN: When you say it's an arrangement, is it a requirement or is this simply an understanding that you have with the bus companies?

MS RACHEL KWAN: The health check requirement is not a direction or a requirement under the bus franchise or under the PBSO. It is a requirement made known to all bus drivers.

MR DUNCAN: How long have these arrangements been in place?

MS RACHEL KWAN: The arrangements are evolving. I remember, since 2007, the health check requirement for all bus drivers aged 50 or above to undergo annual health check started from 2007.

MR DUNCAN: There are some observations in the submissions received by the committee that it would be beneficial for the checks on respective bus captains to include test as to their suitability in coping with the stress which is involved in the task of driving a bus.

Has that been brought to the attention of the department, that sort of proposal?

CHAIRMAN: I take it, Mr Duncan, you have in mind the submissions of KMB, where this matter was dealt with specifically?

MR DUNCAN: I think it is from KMB, Mr Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: It might be useful if you were to draw our attention to it.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

Would you turn up, please, KMB-1, page 81-1.

You see the reference there to "Remedial training"?

We are looking for another reference as well, but that concept --

CHAIRMAN: If you are doing a word search, find the word "psychologist" because that's the passage I had in mind.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: What I have in mind -- it's the report to the Commissioner for Transport. It's the third of the documents that was provided in the first of the submissions, and it's paragraph 38. That's at page 113.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have that, Ms Chan?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Paragraph E, referring to "Psychological support", and this is the KMB submission:

> "A task force ... has been formed to look into enhancing the provision of emotional support for [bus captains] and frontline staff. The task force will engage a professional consultant to provide a comprehensive review of the current practice and make recommendations in areas including but not limited to recruitment, assessment on [bus captains'] emotional intelligence and stress tolerance, training, counselling and performance management. It is expected that the recommendations will be implemented phase by phase to address immediate concerns."

So is the department aware of that initiative?

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, senior counsel. We have not received such kind of suggestion from the KMB as such, and this is also not raised in our working group in discussing possible enhancements or alignments in the training to the offered to the bus captains.

But I can offer that in terms of training for new recruits and in-service bus captains, the bus companies have included stress handling and counselling as one of the modules in the courses for the new recruits and also the in-service bus captains. It is actually one of the topics that we will include -- that we intend to include in the future guidelines on the content framework for training to be offered. But that one does not address the point about emotional assessment for possible candidates applying for the job of bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: It could be considered, could it not, as part of any training regime which might be suggested?

MS MABLE CHAN: The suggestion to beef up the stress handling as part of the training modules was discussed in the working group, and this will be part of the topics that we will look into, in setting out possible guideline on the training framework.

But if there are any suggestions to make the emotional and stress as an assessment for new recruits, I think this will have to be carefully deliberated

amongst all bus operators. Obviously, we note that KMB, as one of the bus operators, have raised this. We will need to flag this up and discuss with other bus operators, because this will also affect their recruitment policy, particularly the manpower supply situation in the current local market.

MR DUNCAN: So do I take it that this is a new concept as far as the department is concerned?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think so, yes.

MR DUNCAN: I would like to turn to the topic of part-time drivers. It's a fact, is it not, that many of the bus companies have, over the years, engaged part-time drivers, especially in view of the manpower issue. Is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: The manpower issue has long been an issue of concern in bus operation. This has particularly been so with the ever-increasing public expectations on the increase and enhancement of bus services in terms of bus routes and also frequency.

While we have been trying hard to discuss with the bus operators and the local district councils on ways to review the frequency and also the service of the bus routes, the fact is that over the ten years there has been an increase in percentage of the bus routes concerned. This will also imply an increasing need for

recruiting more bus drivers to meet with the expectations of the franchise.

We are aware of this situation in our annual review and also in the board meetings, that especially in the annual review with the bus companies, we have encouraged them to look into various ways to increase the manpower supply. The Transport Department has, together with the Labour Department, helped the bus operators to stage recruitment exercises and campaigns in the various districts to help them recruit bus drivers, and we have also encouraged the bus companies to review their remuneration package so as to provide a more attractive and reasonable package to attract new blood into the industry.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

As far as the department is concerned, does the engagement of part-time drivers create any particular safety issues?

MS MABLE CHAN: In the past review, there is no obvious phenomenon or trend revealing that part-time bus captains is a cause for concern in contributing to franchised bus accidents.

MR DUNCAN: What checks are undertaken by the bus companies, as far as you are aware, as to what a part-time bus driver might be doing before he commences his work or

after he finishes his work?

MS MABLE CHAN: In terms of training, the bus companies are expected to provide training for the in-service bus captains, be they full-time or part-time.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry to interrupt you. I'm not concerned about training so much. I'm concerned about whether they are fresh enough to undertake the duties of a bus captain, if they are working on a part-time basis, and there is no knowledge as to what they may be doing for other parts of the same day. Is that a matter that has been considered by the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: From the Transport Department's perspective, we do not have the information as to the bus companies in monitoring the part-time captains in their driving -- in delivering their driving duty. The part-time bus captains are recruited by the bus companies as a relief, to help the bus companies meet the bus services, particularly in the hours where there are peak service demands.

So, over the years, we know that, at the present moment, the percentage of part-time bus captains ranges from 3 per cent in some companies to 31 per cent in one company, and that latter company actually has a lot of routes being operated on holidays, and that they need, in addition to their basic team members of the full-time

bus captains, it is an established practice for them to recruit part-time drivers to meet the holiday peak demands.

MR DUNCAN: Has the department conducted any analysis as to the relationship between part-time drivers and accidents, whether there's more accidents as a result of driving by part-time drivers as opposed to full-time drivers? Has that analysis been carried out?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the information at hand, but perhaps we can do some research on that and then we will supply the committee with information.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, hasn't one of the bus companies given us the information as far as they are concerned? That there's no incidence of a greater rate of accidents of part-time drivers?

MR DUNCAN: I'm not up to the play with that. It might have come in very late.

CHAIRMAN: If you are about to leave this topic of part-time bus drivers.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I can ask you this. The question I think Mr Duncan was asking you was this. By its nature, if you are part-time in one job, bus driver, perhaps you are part-time in another job, taxi driver, truck driver,

coach driver. Does the Transport Department require the bus companies to first of all gather any information about what other jobs the part-time bus driver might have?

MS MABLE CHAN: At the present moment, we do not have such requirement on the bus operators to gather such information and support to us.

CHAIRMAN: So I take it that it follows, then, that you have no information as to what these part-time drivers might be doing in the rest of their day?

MS MABLE CHAN: No, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Could I ask you to turn up, please, the CTB-1 file, page 26, please. This is part of the submission received by one of the bus franchisees, Citybus. At the bottom of page 26, there's reference to "New technological aids". Do you see that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I quote from page 26, at the bottom:

"We plan to include the following features on new buses for delivery from June 2019 onward".

And there's a series of headings, "Electronic stability control", "Dynamic stability control, "Roll-over prevention", "Active speed limiting system".

I wonder if I could ask you this. Does the

department itself conduct any research, locally or overseas or with bus companies, whatever, with regard to what new technology or what new safety aids may be coming into the system and which could be considered for improving safety requirements? Does the department itself conduct that sort of research?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can invite Mr Chan, who oversees the vehicle licensing and hardware, to advise on that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

The Transport Department is always mindful of having new technology applied in buses, particularly those that can make the operation of buses safer.

Of course, there are ways of doing it. You can do it in-house or you can do it in collaboration with bus companies. To us, I think we will always take the path that -- I think it's more useful actually to work with the bus companies, because they actually do the operations and actually have different types of buses to actually test out all this equipment, which is whether they are suitable for the type of buses they operate.

So, for us, your question is we always look out for improvements, and if there's any particular equipment that could be useful, then we will bring this up to discuss with the bus companies, to see whether there is

any way we can ask the bus company to try them out and discuss with the vehicle manufacturers.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. When you say you look out, where do you look?

MR YK CHAN: There are always developments search on the web and our engineers actually do it quite often, doing the web search, and also we have magazines. We do subscribe to magazines of equipment and we try to read them and see whether there are things that are worthwhile taking or trying out with bus companies.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any contact with your counterparts overseas, regulators in other countries, in this context?

MR YK CHAN: Not regularly, but from time to time, if we want to do some research on equipment, we try to contact our counterparts in different countries, particularly in Singapore, UK, Japan, all these kind of Western countries. But of course we don't have sort of regular contact with them.

MR DUNCAN: The ASLS system referred to here by Citybus, was that something which was identified by them or was it identified by the department?

MR YK CHAN: I think this is something that was identified by them, but from the description of it, I think this is something like the system we talk about, the ESC, the

electronic stability control.

CHAIRMAN: I think ASLS is an active speed limiter, as opposed to a passive one.

MR YK CHAN: Okay. So this is another initiative that we are also discussing with bus companies concurrently. This is the features that on top of the current speed limiters which cap the speed at 70 kph at the moment, but we do need more functions when it's going downhill, to cap the bus to run on 70 kph.

What I think Citybus mentioned, talking about, is something like similar equipment but with a different name.

MR DUNCAN: Currently, the speed limiter comes in at 70 kilometres per hour, I think. Is there any provision to limit the speed of a bus --

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: -- going, say, 60 kilometres per hour in a 50 kilometre zone?

MR YK CHAN: A bus going 60 kph in a 50 kph zone is speeding.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Is there any way of limiting the bus in that respect? Is there any technology available?

MR YK CHAN: This is something that people are talking about, if you can have something automatic GPS system, coupled with the operation of a limiter like this, and

also the base map, that have charted out the whole area, and with the speed limit imposed on, yes, theoretically, you can do that.

But we have also touched base and discussed with bus operators on this, and the consensus is, yes, theoretically it can be done, but in the Hong Kong environment, the application of the GPS signal may have problems in areas, because the signals may be blocked out by skyscrapers.

So this is something that we are still asking the bus companies to explore, and hopefully one day, hopefully not too long in the distant future, you can adopt it as a safety measure, a safety device, which is reliable and functional.

At this point in time, probably they are still experimenting or exploring it.

CHAIRMAN: Is this system called geo-fencing?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, can I add that --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- actually, these items as flagged up by Citybus are part of those items that we have included in the discussing under the Working Group on Enhancement of Bus Safety.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: While we note that there may be proposals from the bus companies on new devices and technology advancements, we would discuss with them very thoroughly on the technical feasibility, on the safety application, and also on how it could be put in a context of local franchised bus operation.

So we have actually covered this in our Working Group on Bus Safety Enhancement and will continue to look into that.

CHAIRMAN: May I come back to a question Mr Duncan asked earlier and I don't think he got an answer. Who has identified and suggested these various technical devices to be discussed in the working group? Was that done by the bus companies or by the Transport Department, or by both?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, we have, in the first meeting, flagged up a number of possible devices and technology for discussion with the bus operators. The ideas could be suggested by various parties over the years, but it is the Transport Department to put out a paper to discuss with the bus operators on possible technology or devices to be discussed under that context.

CHAIRMAN: Who invited the bus manufacturers to be parties to the working group?

MS MABLE CHAN: The Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, did you wish to add to that?

MR YK CHAN: That's all.

MR DUNCAN: I was going to ask you this. The geo-fencing to which the chairman referred, in what jurisdictions is that functioning, do you know?

MR YK CHAN: You mean currently in the world?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: We don't have this information in hand. Actually, I think this technology -- by concept, it may not be new, but in actual applications or actual formal application in other parts of the world, we don't have any information on that.

But from my information, I gather from the transport operators in Hong Kong, they are actually running this sort of management system, which you can check -- even now, they can check the buses on the computer utilising the GPS system, which partly nowadays people can find out where they are and has estimated arrival time from the application today.

One thing they do inside, internally, is to sort of mark out certain roads that they consider sensitive, or say they should be operating more safely, and they actually can find out whether those buses are operating above the speed limit. That is something very similar

to geo-fencing, but I think at the moment, for them, it's not entirely accurate. But this is something that they might think about and are testing out, whether it will be applicable in the future.

To answer your question, I don't know anybody actually formally adopting -- using the geo-fencing successfully, but of course we are now all working towards this goal.

MR DUNCAN: What you've just described would tell you what the bus is doing, but it wouldn't necessarily stop the problem, if there's a problem. What I'm trying to explore with you is whether the geo-fencing would actually provide a measure equivalent to the speed limiter over 70, if the bus was going more than 50 in a 50 zone.

MS MABLE CHAN: As Mr Chan just supplemented, it appears that the application of this kind of technology is more for fleet management and for tracking of buses or other vehicles over a territory. As to whether this technology can be further applied as to limit the speed or retard the speed, and prohibit the bus driver in speeding beyond 70 or even 50 in some cases, we don't have the information on successful experience overseas.

We do recollect that some individual bus operators have cautioned that with the availability of technology

and driver-assisted devices, we should bear in mind that we should not go to the point that the bus drivers rely fully on such kind of devices, to the extent that they are being so accustomed to the device and they do not exert extra care or personal judgment in certain critical situations. This is one thing the bus operators have flagged up in examining the technical feasibility of any technology and devices.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, I understand, but just for the avoidance of any doubt, is the possibility of a speed limit within the geo-fencing system on the table for discussion?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is on the table for discussion.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, I see we have reached 4.30. If that a convenient moment or not an inconvenient moment?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Chan and the rest of your team, we are going to adjourn our proceedings for the day now, and as you were invited earlier to make yourself available for tomorrow and you have kindly done so, may I invite all of you to come back at 10 o'clock tomorrow to continue with your testimony.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 10 o'clock tomorrow.

(4.32 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT AND HOUSING 6
BUREAU: MR JOSEPH LAI, MR KEVIN CHOI AND MS CRYSTAL YIP

Opening statement by MR JOSEPH LAI 7

Examination by MR DUNCAN 15

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: 84
MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS RACHEL KWAN, MS MACELLA LEE, MR REGINALD YK CHAN, MR TONY YAU

Opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN 85

Examination by MR DUNCAN 92

[blank page]

香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

日期 ： 2018 年 5 月 7 日

時間 ： 上午 10 時 07 分

主席 ： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高）

委員 ： 歐陽伯權先生

： 羅康錦教授

代表大律師 ： Peter N. Duncan（鄧樂勤）資深大律師，
黃佩琪大律師及陳政龍大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，
代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

出席人士 ： 黎以德先生，運輸及房屋局常任秘書長 （運輸）

蔡傑銘先生，運輸及房屋局副秘書長 （運輸）2

葉倩菁女士，運輸及房屋局首席助理秘書長 （運輸）1

陳美寶女士，運輸署署長

李萃珍女士，副署長／公共運輸事務及管理

陳英傑先生，助理署長／行政及牌照

關翠蘭女士，助理署長／特別職務

邱國鼎先生，總工程師／道路安全及標準研究

李美鳳女士，總運輸主任／特別職務

以下內容乃數碼錄音謄本

主席：（經傳譯員）香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會係由行政長官成立嘅，當時係 2018 年 3 月 13 號，佢嘅職能範圍而家已經係打咗上畫面，就係咁樣樣嘅。我希望大家都明白呢個係重要嘅，所以我就係將佢讀出，讓大家明白。從安全角度而言，鑑於香港專營巴士涉及 2018 年 2 月 10 號發生嘅致命意外以及其他近期發生嘅嚴重事故：

（一） 審視巴士專營權喺現行法律專營權同埋其他合約規定下嘅運作同埋管

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

理模式；

（二） 審視現行對專營巴士嘅監管及監察制度；以及

（三） 就上述事宜向行政長官提出與安全相關嘅建議，以維持香港嘅專營巴士服務安全可靠。

我哋係可以邀請相關人士同埋公眾人士就上述嘅事宜提交意見書，亦都會盡力就係希望儘量可以喺九個月之內提交我哋嘅報告。關於有關 2018 年 2 月 10 號致命意外呢件事件嘅成因同埋所涉及人事嘅法律責任呢啲事宜會由警方進行調查，佢哋係唔屬於委員會嘅職權範圍。所以我哋委員會嘅責任就係要獲取一啲資訊，首先就係關於巴士專營權佢嘅運作同埋管理；第二，亦都要睇下專營巴士嘅監管同埋監察制度。最重要嘅就係我哋最終個目標，委員會最終嘅目標就係向行政長官提出建議，而係同安全相關嘅，希望係維持香港嘅專營巴士服務安全可靠。委員會希望一直都會聚焦，係達致呢一個目標。

重要嘅亦都係下面嘅一項事宜，有關呢一個意外嘅成因同埋係相關人士佢嘅法律責任，即係我係指 2018 年 2 月 10 號大埔道呢一宗意外，呢啲事宜就唔屬於我哋專責委員會嘅職權範圍裏面嘅。當然，呢個另行係由警方進行調查嘅。喺 2018 年 3 月 28 號，我哋開始我哋嘅工作，喺嗰一日我哋就係發出咗一項邀請，係向公眾人士邀請嘅，係相關嘅團體以及大埔交通意外死難者嘅家屬，以及係近期其他嚴重事件嘅相關人士。我哋邀請佢哋就係向我哋提交意見書，我哋今日係見到有一啲傷者同埋死難者佢哋嘅家屬，佢哋今日係到場嘅，佢哋係喺大埔道嘅交通意外裏面受傷或者死亡。

喺 3 月 28 號，我哋發出函件係畀嗰啲指名嘅團體，要求佢哋或者係邀請佢哋就係向我哋委員會提交意見書，呢個係關乎我哋嘅職權範圍裏面嘅事宜。我哋亦都係曾經同佢哋有函件嘅來往，咁就喺我哋嘅附件嗰度，喺我哋函件嘅附件嗰度列出啲問題嘅。喺嗰啲指名團體裏面，我哋希望佢哋就係有一啲回應，其中包括就係運房局、運輸署、五間專營公司同埋係不少於十六個公會，佢哋都係專營巴士公司嘅公會、立法會交通事務委員會，以及道路交通安全委員會以及其他嘅團體。之後，我哋係寫信畀警務處處長，要求警方嗰方面提交書面意見書，同埋同我哋講一講就係喺我哋函件裏面，附件裏面所列出嘅問題，請佢哋回應。

喺 4 月份，我哋得到好多意見書，書面嘅意見書，係嚟自運房局同埋運輸署嘅，同埋係五間專營公司，以及係代表各個公會佢哋提交上嚟嘅意見書，都係非常有用嘅資料。喺 4 月 27 號，我哋檢討委員會係請運房局以及運輸署係作進一步嘅書面陳述嚟到回應我哋係鑑別出嘅某一啲事項或者問題。喺 5 月 3 號，我哋委員會係邀請運輸及房屋局以及運輸署就係話畀我哋聽，係有邊一位做佢哋嘅代表，喺今日同聽日嘅聽證會嗰度作呢個口述證供。我哋今日好高興係有運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（運輸）黎以德先生同埋佢兩位同事蔡傑銘先生同埋葉倩菁女士，佢哋都係代表運輸及房屋局嘅。稍後我哋亦都會係介紹同埋歡迎運輸署嘅代表，佢哋總共係有六位代表出席協助委員會。我哋委員會亦都感謝局同埋署同埋

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

其他團體就係上嚟畀口述證供我哋，感謝佢哋今日上嚟協助我哋嘅工作。

喺 5 月 4 號，我哋委員會係請所有五間專營權公司作進一步嘅陳述，嚟到回應我哋提出嘅一啲事項同埋問題。喺同一日，我哋接到運房局同埋運輸署畀我哋進一步嘅陳述，我哋而家就等緊警務處處長嘅書面陳述，我哋明白相關各位係畀佢哋回應嘅時間係好短嘅。當然，佢哋亦都受到好大嘅壓力，就係要提供我哋所要求嘅資訊，呢點我哋係明白嘅。喺今年嘅 5 月 4 號、5 月 5 號，檢討委員會我哋就係將文件編碼同埋將佢上載咗去我哋嘅網站，呢啲都係各方交畀我哋嘅陳述書，呢啲都係讓大家可以如果有需要嘅話，去取覽嘅。

最後，當我哋開始進行呢一個聽證會之前，我哋有一點好重要嘅，就係要理解成立呢一個委員會個背後嘅慘劇。呢個慘劇當中，就係喺大埔道嘅巴士意外，2018 年 2 月 10 號，導致到十九人死亡。我哋亦都明白死者家屬嘅哀痛，仲有喺近來一啲專營巴士嘅意外當中嘅死難者嘅家屬，希望大家而家起立去默哀。唔該。

喺一開始，我首先會邀請鄧樂勤資深大律師，佢就係協助呢個委員會嘅代表大律師，請佢開場發言。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，唔該晒。蔡先生、黎先生、葉女士，多謝你哋今朝嚟到聽證會，亦都好多謝你提供咗書面嘅陳詞，而家請你去到個檯前面就座。剛才主席先生已經提到，曾經係發信件邀請運房局今日就作一個嘅口頭取證，除咗之前已經向檢討委員會提交過書面陳詞之外，今朝早亦都係有律師代表，通常如果有律師代表就會係引導你點樣做一個口頭證供嘅，希望亦都畀呢個機會就睇下你會唔會想做一個口頭嘅陳詞先。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）可以。主席、委員，早晨。多謝你邀請運房局嚟到呢一個聽證會，亦都有機會講一個開場白。我首先想代表運房局局長去講以下嘅說話，局長一向都希望係親身能夠嚟到呢一個獨立檢討委員會，但係喺訂定呢個聽證會時間表之前，其實局長已經係承諾咗喺立法會出席一個會議，其實呢一刻局長係出席緊一地兩檢嗰個嘅法案委員會，即係呢一個委員會就係關於喺西九龍高鐵總站一地兩檢嘅安排，所以首先要同委員會道歉，佢冇辦法今日出席呢個聽證會。

主席，香港嘅公共交通系統係有兩個特色，比起全球各地有呢兩個特色，咁亦都可以作為一個背景資料畀委員會參考。

第一個特色，香港嘅公共交通系統係有好高嘅載客量嘅，去滿足乘客嘅要求。我哋基本嘅公共交通政策就係可以咁講嘅，公共交通係作為交通嘅主要工具，我哋係以鐵路為骨幹，亦都容許我用中文去再強調呢一個嘅政策，因為喺本地，公眾都係好明白，「公交為主，鐵路為骨幹」。喺每日，乘客搭嘅交通工具超過百分之九十，即係話 1,200 萬乘客人次都係用公共交通工具嘅。據我哋所知，全球嚟講係最高嘅載客率，有百分之三十九係重型鐵路，百分之三十一係專營巴士，百分之十四係公共小巴士，百分之七的士，百分之四輕鐵，而其他嘅交通模式就佔其餘嘅百分之五。用另外一個角度睇，日常嚟講，專營巴士每日載客

量係 400 萬嘅。

第二個特色就係同其他國家唔同嘅，喺香港嘅公共交通模式，包括專營巴士，係由私營嘅公司營運，係根據審慎嘅商業理財原則，一般嚟講，係冇政府直接資助。呢個亦都反映政府整體嚟講，當年呢一個諗法都係用私營嘅方式營運公共交通，就可以確保有競爭性同埋有效率。其他嘅公共交通營運者都唔係一般嘅經營者嚟嘅，佢哋都係要受到政府嘅規管、監察同埋監管嘅，譬如話喺車費方面、服務水平、班次同埋係要確保安全。

喺呢方面，政府有兩個角色，作為決策局，政府係制訂政策，亦都喺法例入面反映，譬如話仲有係專營權同埋其他合約嘅協議。喺呢個過程當中，政府有時要平衡各方利益嘅，譬如話專營公司嘅利益、其他交通工具嘅營運者、公眾、政客等等。立法會亦都有一個重要角色嘅，尤其係如果要引入法例或者修改法例，需要更多嘅財政資源等等。

政府另外一個角色就係一個規管角色，去確保專營巴士公司嘅營運者係可以符合到專營權入面嘅內容同埋係合約嘅內容。而有關呢個規管架構喺個政策上都係與時並進，有時都係因為公眾嘅期望係唔同咗，又或者係科技嘅發展，又或者係營運者佢個營運模式改變，所以政策亦都可能係因為某啲事件而有改變嘅。

但係多年嚟，我哋一直致力都係強調呢個大原則，就係專營巴士公司嘅營運者必須要提供適當而有效率嘅巴士服務，呢一個要求，即係要提供適當而有效率嘅巴士服務，呢個係喺 1975 年訂立嘅《公共巴士服務條例》入面指出嘅。當考慮到底呢一個服務係唔係適當嘅時候，安全就係喺我哋運輸政策入面至為重要，呢一樣嘢亦都係各個公眾文件嗰度可以見到嘅。譬如喺 2016 年嘅報告，喺個年報入面就係話政策嘅目標就要提供安全、有效率、可靠同埋環保嘅運輸工具。而喺運房局嘅運輸嗰方面嘅觀察人員報告，即係今年 2018 及 19 年財政年度入面，亦都係話其中一個運輸科喺陸上運輸嗰方面嘅目標就係要推廣道路安全，而運房局個政策其中一點亦都係推廣安全嘅，我意思即係話係乘客嘅安全。

另外，道路安全議會係喺 1973 年成立，亦都係推廣喺香港嘅道路安全，我哋有唔同嘅推廣活動，咁多年嚟都係由道路安全議會提出嘅。譬如道路安全議會都係支持運輸署一啲嘅活動，譬如係「至 fit 安全駕駛運動」，呢一個運動係每年都會舉行嘅，目的就係提高商業司機安全駕駛嘅標準同埋佢哋嘅健康，亦都包括專營巴士嘅司機。有好多節目，包括電話節目、健康檢查，同埋係有啲意見畀商業司機，亦都都有一啲嘅大使。

有關嘅安全標準可以大概分為向外型、向內型同埋呢個過程嘅安全嘅，可以舉幾個例子：意外率，譬如話以行車公里計算嘅涉及意外率；顧客嘅滿意率，譬如話係收到幾多乘客嘅投訴，同埋係調查咗幾多位乘客；有冇一啲新嘅巴士嘅型號，同埋一啲突擊檢查，有啲必須要安裝嘅巴士嘅儀器，譬如係話限速器同埋

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

個黑盒；車長牌照方面有冇符合批准，同埋係車長嘅工作同埋休息時間。呢啲嘅標準亦都一樣與時並進，因為隨住時日改變，公眾嘅期望亦都可能唔同。

我亦都可以舉個例子，有關於車長工作、休息同埋用膳時間指引，就首先喺 1998 年引入，然後經過幾次修訂，最近一次修訂就係今年年頭，2018 年嘅時候。仲有兩三個例子，譬如安裝限速器同埋黑盒，呢個係因為喺 2003 年一次致命嘅意外之後要求嘅。另外，就係喺落客嘅車門嗰度，喺 2016 年嘅意外之後，就裝咗一個橫向嘅護欄。另外，巴士亦都要符合法定嘅排放標準。

至於整體香港嘅道路安全方面，牽涉專營巴士嘅意外率，過去五年其實個數字都係穩定嘅，平均大概每年 2,200 宗，呢個係相比起香港整體嘅交通意外數字，平均就係一萬六千多宗。專營巴士涉及意外嘅比率其實係輕微下降嘅，由 2,092 宗，呢個係 2013 年嘅時候，咁到 2017 年，個數字係 2,187 宗，但係同時間專營巴士嘅數目亦都上升咗百分之三點三，每百萬行車公里嘅意外涉及率對於專營巴士嚟講，過去幾年亦都係維持穩定。

主席，或者我都要提到，專營巴士係以專營嘅方式去營運—專營權。呢一個比起政府直接提供嘅服務係唔同嘅，亦都同純粹商業運作唔同嘅，專營權就係由政府批與一個公司，而呢個公司就必須要符合喺法例入面提出嘅所有要求，專營權條約入面嘅要求等等。規管當局就會喺一個較廣、較高嘅層面去監管公司嘅運作，有制衡嘅機制，可以話整體嚟講，係一個質管控制去確保專營嘅巴士公司佢哋係能夠提供有關嘅服務。其中一個例子就係每日對於行走中嘅巴士，我哋有突擊嘅檢查，同時每日嘅表現方面，主要嘅責任就係由專營巴士公司去提供服務同埋達至要求。一般嚟講，專營公司係應該有呢個成熟程度，有呢一個資源同埋有呢個能力去提供服務，而唔需要每一個細節每日都需要由政府去看管。

主席，最後想提嘅一點係咁樣樣嘅，我哋係盡一切嘅努力，恒久咁樣去做，政府係致力改善專營巴士嘅安全。我哋亦都完全明白總係有足以改善嘅地方，我哋不斷去尋求方法嚟到將安排嘅水平將佢再提升，任何嘅建議或者意見嚟自各方嘅人士，其實我哋都係衷心咁樣去觀迎嘅。主席先生，我作嘅開場白就係到此為止，我本人同埋我兩位同事都樂意回答大家嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，黎先生。讓我代表委員會，我哋知道局長係需要去立法會嘅，知道佢係需要出席，不過鑑於就係咁趕急，所以我哋委員會覺得都應該係縱使佢無法出席，就係都要開始我哋嘅工作，不過亦都感謝佢係作出致歉。係，鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）黎先生，多謝你嘅發言。有幾樣嘢我就係想同局方探討一下嘅。或者我未開始之前，或者咁，我就想係表明一點，你喺書面陳述書嗰度係提過嘅。你話其實局係一方，以及署係另一方，兩者就喺個責任上面係有一個區別。你哋有咁講過嘅，就話局方負責制訂政策，同埋就係建議一啲提議嘅。至於運輸署嗰個責任就係去執行呢一啲政策，落實呢啲政策，同埋就係去執法嘅。我明白兩者係有個分別嘅，因此，今朝我向你提出嘅問題，我儘量去就係集中喺

你哋嗰個角色嘅。當然，我知道今日稍後亦都會有運輸署嘅代表上嚟，我哋亦都會向佢哋提出相關嘅問題。

其實咁，不如我先講一講我哋嘅職權範圍，其實主席剛才已經係提過嘅。或者我就特別係想請你睇番第二項，職權範圍裏面嘅第二點，我相信你喺呢度會睇到嘅，我好似都喺度重覆緊剛才主席所講嘅。不過，我要指出就係話職權範圍係咁嘅，就係審視現行對專營巴士嘅監管及監察制度，所以我想同你探討嘅第一個事項就係咁樣樣嘅，我就係想知道目前嗰個監管制度喺幾大程度上係能夠處理到呢個安全嘅問題嘅呢？而且從你嘅書面陳述嗰度，我知道我哋嘅監管制度就包括係有關嘅條例，今朝你都提過嘅，就係《公共巴士服務條例》。另外就係有關嘅規則，而呢啲規則都係喺嗰條條例底下就係制訂嘅。仲有第三，就係嗰個專營權嘅文件，呢個就係發畀專營權公司嘅，呢個都係根據條例之下係發出嘅。

剛剛就係有人提醒我，我頭先講錯咗，唔係 430 章，係 230 章嘅。或者咁，等我係請你去睇一睇嗰個條例，我都會好快嘅，因為你應該都好熟悉嗰條條例。不如咁，我哋就係搵出嗰啲重要嘅條文，有關乎我哋呢個委員會嘅職責範圍，職權範圍嘅。我就同你睇睇嗰啲條文，然後就再幾項事宜同你係探討一下，我而家先將有關嘅條文打咗出嚟，唔知你會唔會係想睇番有關嘅文本呢？咁就係喺運房局嘅 THB-2 嗰個文件夾嘅 104 頁嗰度。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係，得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先，第一條條文想你睇嘅，就係條例嘅第 9 條，呢個就係讓行政長官係有權去委任不多於兩人為專營公司嘅額外董事，即係呢個係喺嗰個專營權底下嘅安排嚟嘅。

係，睇咗第 9 條之後，亦都想你揭去第 12 條，嗰度就係有一條咁嘅條文，呢度就正如黎先生剛才講過，就係話專營公司係需要提供一個適當而有效率嘅公共巴士服務。12(2)嗰度亦都係提及一點事實，就係話專營公司除非佢係按照佢嘅專營權，本條例如任何根據其專營權或者根據本條例所作出嘅指示、要求或者規定，以及任何計劃，或者係根據 16A 條作出嘅批准，以維持同埋經營，否則不可以被視為維持適當而有效率嘅嘅公共巴士服務。

仲有 12A 呢條就講及遠期嘅計劃，呢度 12A 下面嘅第(1)款就咁有咁嘅要求，就話專營公司喺每一年就係需要已備佢嘅經營計劃，係涉及之後嗰五年嘅經營計劃，咁涉及咩嘢事宜呢？其實就係要睇番嗰個附表嗰度就會講。我等一陣就會同你睇呢個附表，即係你睇番落去第(4)款嗰度。第(4)款嗰度就咁講嘅，如果有關嘅專營公司同埋運輸署署長係無法就已備計劃裏面某項事宜達成協議嘅話，咁就係需要由運房局局長去處理同埋解決。

講到嗰個附件，附件就係喺條例嘅後面嘅，咁大家可以睇番第 126 頁嘅，如果係我哋嘅文件夾。嗰度就係講及究竟計劃裏面應該有啲咩嘢內容，好詳細嘅，有啲細節嘅，由(a)至到(h)咁多項嘅。照我所知，其實喺嗰個計劃裏面，就

冇任何一樣係提及安全嘅事宜。不過，(h)嗰項似乎就係包羅萬有嘅，嗰度就係話其他事宜，不論該等事宜是否(a)至(g)段所指明者。呢個就係話要應署長嘅要求包括落去嘅。

好，我哋講番呢個條例，下一條條文，而我認為係相關嘅就係第 18 條，112 頁，嗰度就係要求專營公司備存妥當嘅紀錄，咁有各項事宜嘅。(e)嗰度就係涉及意外嘅。

跟住請睇下一條條文，就係第 22 條，114 頁。嗰度就係話行政長官會同行政會議就可以喺某一啲情況底下要求專營公司係繳付經濟罰則。呢一個就係喺第(2)款嗰度講咗嘅，就係話若果專營公司冇遵從其專營權或本條例，或沒有遵從根據其專營權或本條例作出嘅指示或規定，或者冇遵從任何計劃，或者任何根據 16A 給予嘅批准。當然，我哋剛才就係提及 12A 跟住所睇嘅附表。

另外，第 24 條，呢個就係睇 115 頁。嗰度就係有啲好犀利嘅權力，就係話如果專營公司佢唔能夠係維持一個適當而有效率嘅公共巴士服務嘅話，究竟政府當局係有啲咩嘢權力呢？呢度就係話喺極端嘅情況之下，係可以撤銷佢嗰個專營權嘅。

跟住第 35 條，請你去睇睇第 35 條，124 頁。呢度就係話運輸及房屋局局長係可以訂立規條，就一系列事宜有權訂立規例嘅，嗰度係列咗出嚟嘅。我就係想請你睇睇其中三點嘅，呢個係關乎我哋呢個委員會嘅職權範圍。首先就係：

(c) 嗰項，規管該等司機、售票員或獲授權的人在如此受僱時的行為。

(d) 一般地關於某專營公司所使用嘅巴士上嘅乘客或擬成為乘客的人的行為。

然後就係跟住嗰版，喺：

(j) 嗰點，就駕駛某專營公司所使用嘅巴士嘅司機而言，規管在本規例所指明嘅任何期間：

(i) 該公司可准許駕駛該類巴士嘅最多時數；及

(ii) 該專營公司給予該等司機休息和用茶點的相隔時間。

跟住就係第 36 條，呢個就話專營公司，即係話巴士嘅經營者，佢係獲得授權去訂立一啲附例，而(c)嗰項就係有提及，我要將佢引述出嚟，就係講到安全和有效率運作，就係該專營公司的公共巴士服務的安全和有效率運作。另外，第(3)款嗰度亦都係有一個條文，就係話如果違反咗嘅話，就會係一個屬於犯法，而且亦都可以係罰款。或者大家亦都可以睇番呢個第(2)款，就係話如果係專營公司係提出呢啲附例嘅話，都需要經過立法會嘅批准。

我剛才讀出咗一啲條文，我希望你睇番呢一啲條文嘅。當然，亦都係有嗰啲規例，由第 128 頁開始嘅，咁好快你會見到，其實係有一啲規例就已經係通過

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

咗，係關乎係嗰個司機嘅行為，同埋乘客喺車上面嘅行為。第 130 頁，就係第 9 條，嗰度就係關乎司機嘅行為。另外，你可以繼續落去，就係 131 頁，就係第 11 條、12、13。我知道 11 嗰條就唔係淨係司機嘅，售票員都係嘅，所以我知道今時今日其實就係都冇乜售票員，所以你就可以反映出，其實嗰個規例已經過時。132 頁，我哋有 13A，就係話乘客嘅一般行為，同埋擬成為乘客嘅人嘅一般行為。

講到嗰個監管，其實你見到條文，你見到嗰個條例同埋個規例裏面嘅條文，跟住我就想請你睇睇個專營權文件。喺呢一方面，我就係想睇番最新嗰份專營權嘅文件，嗰個係發出咗，呢個係去年向九巴發出嘅。呢份文件，你可以睇到呢個副本就係喺運房局嘅文件冊第 2 冊嘅第 137 頁。你面前見唔見到呢個文件？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇下呢啲條文，第 1 條--其實我想睇嘅係第 7 條，其中第 141 頁睇到呢一個專營權文件入面，佢就話專營公司應該喺合理可行嘅範圍內係令到運輸署署長信納去購置、提供、維護等等，係任何安全同埋提高服務嘅裝置、設施、儀器等等，就係喺同專營公司商討之後，合理地由運輸署署長提出嘅要求，呢個就係提到喺專營公司嘅巴士上面應該安裝啲乜嘢嘅安全措施或者係儀器。

我哋睇過個條例，條例入面就講到喺專營權文件入面要求嘅嗰啲嘅要求。呢個專營權文件入面其實自己都有提到，就係喺第 1 條第(3)款，呢個係第 139 頁。我哋見到呢頁最底就係話為免呢一個混亂，除非係另有明確指明，專營公司應該係根據運輸署署長、財政司司長或者任何公務人員喺呢一個嘅專營權文件底下要求嘅任何指示或者要求嘅。

如果我哋繼續睇呢份文件，據我理解，冇一啲一般嘅權力去作出咁嘅指示同埋要求，佢講政府係喺點樣嘅情況底下係可以發出呢啲指示或者要求。我可以畀啲例子你，譬如第 141 頁，第 7 段，關於話要提供啲設施，呢個係一個好通用嘅例子，政府可以提供要求嘅。譬如話巴士站，即係第 143 頁嘅第 12 條就提到，就係話喺總站嘅時候，會提供一啲停泊設施之類之類。

我唔會逐個講，但係如果你睇到第 28 項嘅話，即係第 28 條，睇番呢份文件，你會見到就係運輸署署長需要獲提供有啲嘅資料，係由專營公司保管嘅紀錄，咁係關係喺附表二入面巴士服務。168 頁就睇到呢個附表二，呢度提到需要有啲乜嘢紀錄同埋資料係要由專營公司根據專營權文件要求提供嘅。我順帶一提，我哋覺得似乎有幾項都係同安全有關，喺專營權文件係冇明確提出嘅。因此，亦都唔會係任何指示或者要求入面會提到，其中一點就譬如係話車長嘅訓練，似乎冇任何喺個專營權文件入面係仔細講及點樣要培訓車長嘅要求，無論佢哋係已經擔任緊車長嘅工作，或者係一啲培訓新人，以便佢日後做車長嘅工作，都冇嘅。我知道政府同埋巴士公司喺培訓方面都有啲安排，但係呢啲安排

到底係咪有力呢？令到即係有人覺得係或者佢係咪合適嘅培訓呢？有人都會提出啲疑問嘅。我而家就想你請睇番個條例，我而家打算就某啲範圍問一啲問題。頭先我已經講解咗某啲條文畀你聽，而家我哋可以返番去第 124 頁，文件冊 124 頁，個條例。我想講下呢一點，第 35 條，運房局局長訂立規例嘅權力，特別我想講(j)款嘅，關於就駕駛某專營公司所使用嘅巴士司機而言，規管呢個條例所指明嘅任何時間，該司機可准許駕駛該類巴士嘅最多時數，同埋專營公司給予司機休息同埋用茶點嘅相隔時間。

第一點，我想問嘅，事實係咪咁呢？呢一個題目已經多年嚟都係有啲爭拗，一方面巴士公司同埋佢嘅僱員，又或者係公會之間都有啲爭拗，呢一點係唔係政府一段時間都知悉嘅呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你問嘅問題係問黎先生？問黎先生，你可唔可以回應？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）唔該主席，唔該律師。我會咁樣形容嘅，呢個問題不時都會有人提出，即係自從引入一個指引，係所有專營巴士公司都應當遵守。或者我可以咁講，其實喺 1998 年引入之後，差唔多係一個硬性嘅指引嚟嘅，必須遵守。而十年嚟，呢個指引就係叫做一個自願意性嘅一個指引，我就會咁樣講，我哋一直致力改善，而當中亦都要考慮多種因素，包括任何改變係有冇改善呢？係咪可行呢？對於營運者嘅實際運作有冇影響呢？如果需要額外司機嘅話，佢哋點樣應付到呢？或者佢哋點樣會可以聘請同埋培訓有關嘅司機呢？同時，據我理解，巴士司機或者喺呢方面都會要求有改善嘅，都會歡迎。同一個時間亦都要關注嘅，就係佢哋嘅薪酬唔應該受到影響，即係話係減少咗咁嘅意思，所以係有一系列嘅問題都需要一併考慮。為咗完整性，我仲要提到另外一點，就係任何嘅改動對於公司狀況嘅財務影響，而呢個財務影響係應該點樣解決。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗嗰個指引應該有六次嘅條訂，喺 1998 年引入之後，係咪呀？如果我記憶係冇錯嘅話。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，你講得啱。1999 年、2000 年、2004 年、2007 年、2010 年，最近就係今年年頭。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰啲係指引嚟嘅，條例本身就容許制訂規例嘅。喺呢一方面，點解只係以指引嘅方式而唔係以規例嘅方式實施呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，回答番律師嘅問題，我其實即時亦都冇一個答案。我只能夠咁樣講，首先我都可以幾確定咁樣講，雖然呢個指引只算係一個指引性質，叫做，但係意義上係營運者要嚴格遵守嘅。我頭先亦都提到的而且確營運者都係有遵守，佢哋亦都知道運輸署會進行調查，睇下係咪有符合呢個指引。如果有任何原因，冇完全遵守呢個指引，有咁嘅情況，運輸署係會要求公司解釋嘅，而呢個營運者就會被運輸署要求提供個解釋。

至於點解冇用附屬法例方式喺規例入面包含呢樣嘢，我恐怕我都即時畀唔到個答案。我只係猜測，喺我哋整個規管制度嘅底下，我哋希望係用唔同嘅方式。

如果我哋嘗試用某一個方式，譬如話係引入指引嘅時候，都係可行，已經係運作良好嘅話，呢個亦都係能夠達到我哋目的嘅其中一個手法，我哋個目的就係要確保司機要有足夠嘅休息時間等等嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黎先生，你講咗兩次，你話你即時都回答唔到，你想唔想要有啲機會諗咗，再畀個書面答案呢，遲啲？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我呢一方面會跟進嘅，但係我都要補充，我哋講緊呢個指引係喺 1998 年初次引入嘅，我就唔係有百分百信心可以搵番當年嘅書面紀錄。不過，當然，主席，我哋好樂意返去試下嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，你都會明白如果呢一件事係 包括咗喺個規例入面，根據職權範圍，就可以被列作一個罪行，即係話如果巴士公司冇遵守嗰個規例嘅內容嘅話，就會係犯罪。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，正如我喺開場發言入面提到，我哋見到專營巴士公司係有需要喺運作上確保安全，我哋視為呢個係適當而有效率服務嘅其中一部分嚟嘅，或者唔當係即係有效率嗰方面，但係起碼係適當嗰方面嘅。我哋一向嘅睇法都係如果營運者係唔能夠提供安全嘅運作嘅話，無論係佢哋自行去做一啲措施，又或者係跟從任何我哋施行嘅，或甚至係政府以立法嘅方式施行嘅指示、安全嘅規則等等，如果佢哋持續係做唔到呢個要求嘅話，我哋嘅睇法就係專營公司係咪有能力提供適當嘅服務呢？我哋就會有懷疑。

MR DUNCAN：即係話我形容去到一啲極端嘅條文入面，係可以採取行動，譬如話係撤銷佢個專營權。

主席：（經傳譯員）講到撤銷，咁你可唔可以提一提我哋，就應該係搵番邊條款文呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係第 24 條條例嘅第 24 條。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講番邊一頁呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 115，文件夾嘅 115 頁。呢度要跟番某一啲程序嘅，而最終嚟講，係要有行政長官會同行政會議去考慮，所以都相當繁複嘅一個程序嘅。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）喺回答係大律師嘅問題嘅時候，我會話「係」㗎，除咗呢個撤銷專營權之外，即係可能係專營權嘅全部或者係一部分，另外亦都係有經濟罰則呢一個條文。大家可以睇番第 22 條，呢條條例嘅第 22 條。而我嘅睇法就係呢一個施加經濟罰則亦都可以應用，因為呢度就係講及就係專營公司係需要遵從嗰個專營權同埋條例。條例就講明咗就係專營公司係要提供一個適當有效率嘅服

務。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，喺週末嘅時候，你哋亦都提交咗進一步嘅書面嘅陳述，你哋亦都係澄清咗，就話嗰個指引就唔構成呢度所講嘅指示或規定。會唔會因此你哋就無法就係去施加嗰個經濟罰則呢，即係話第 23 條所提及嘅經濟罰則呢？或者第 22 條呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我本身唔係一位律師，我自己點樣去詮釋呢個第 22(2)呢？22(2)嗰度就咁講，「可以施加經濟罰則，如果沒有遵從其專營權或本條例，又或者係根據其專營權或本條例所作出嘅指示或規定，又或者係冇遵從任何嘅計劃或者係批准」，所以呢度有好多個係或乜嘢，「或」即係話有好多個選項。

其實運輸署亦都有作出過陳詞，佢就話「嗰個指引不屬於指示或者規定」。不過較早之前我係提及喺呢個 22(2)條底下，呢度就講話「本條例」，嗰個「本條例」就係指《公共巴士服務條例》。呢度就係話係經營呢個專營權嘅公司係需要維持適當而有效率嘅服務。講到適當嘅服務，我會咁樣睇嘅，就係包括咗係嗰個安全嘅要求，

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係都唔能夠係令到政府當局就可以引用呢個第 23 條或者第 22 條個嘢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我係律師，所以其實係咪呢條題目應該留番畀律師呢？如果你純粹話因為佢冇遵從或者佢違反咗嗰個專營權或者係條例，因為佢冇維持一個適當而又有效率嘅服務，政府當局嗰個補救，就只能夠係去番嗰個撤銷嗰個條文，撤銷專營權嗰個條文。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我剛剛其實係想咁講，我自己唔係律師，但係我自己點樣去睇呢個第 22 條第(2)款呢？其實你咁樣睇嘅時候，應該我哋就係有咁嘅能力，就係去向行政長官會同行政會議申請，就係要求施加係經濟罰則。

因為呢度講得好清楚，就話專營公司係冇遵從本條例。講到本條例，本條例其實就係施加咗個責任畀嗰個經營者，就係話必須係維持一個適當而有效率嘅服務。適當嘅服務，我會話適當嘅服務係即係要求啲咩嘢呢？適當嘅服務就係要求你係提供一個係安全嘅服務，否則嘅話，不能視之為係適當嘅服務。

主席，正如我所講，我當然係從一個政策嘅角度去睇。其實一個咁樣嘅情況係冇出現過，未經考驗。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，或者你意思係咪從來都冇施加過經濟罰則呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我剛才咁講意思係話，因為安全嘅事宜而引致我哋係嘗試去援引呢條條文，即係關乎經濟罰則嘅，我哋從來未試過去援引過，

所以我就話佢未經考驗，冇測試到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？即係話其實從來就冇施加過經濟罰則，而個理由即係冇話係因為呢個 22(2)款需要施加經濟罰則呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，如果照我嘅記憶所及同埋照我嘅理解所知，就係咁樣樣。不過我好希望你畀機會我返去就係查咗，然後書面確認。不過最近應該冇，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）行政長官會同行政會議有冇施加過咁嘅罰則呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，以近期嚟計，我當然--即係我就係唔知有個咁樣嘅情況，就冇嘅。即係我哋冇遇過係一啲情況而需要係援引呢條文嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家係想請你去睇呢個第 36 條，125 頁。文件夾嘅 125 頁，呢個就係 36 條，對唔住，係講係附例。就話專營公司就可以係訂立附例。我就想問，目前嘅現有嘅專營公司有冇制定過呢啲咁樣樣嘅附例呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我本人記得係有一啲附例係有訂立過，不過現時未必能夠講到係咪第 36 條裏面嘅每一點都係有一啲係而家執行緊嘅附例嘅。我而家係返去查一查，然後再返嚟向大家匯報。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，請你幫我哋手。因為我哋自己查，就係查唔到有啲咁樣專營巴士公司嘅係附例，我哋自己就查唔到。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，唔該你。你即係已經需要再補充嘅書面資料係不斷增加。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗其他嘅係公交嘅專營--或者營運者係佢哋有附例。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，地鐵公司有自己嘅附例。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）因為地鐵就可以自己採取行動，因為佢係有附例，附例下面有訂明邊一啲事情係犯法，同埋有啲咩嘢罰則。譬如話如果係巴士嘅司機，係巴士嘅乘客，有冇類似嘅安排？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，可以講話係，亦都可以講話唔係。我諗你剛剛提醒我，我哋有規例㗎。其實嗰度係有附例，230A 就係可以規管司機同埋乘客嘅行為，所以法例上面其實係有咁樣嘅條文。所以我要指出，其實唔係話就呢一個具體嘅課題唔係完全係一無所有㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊一個去執行呢一啲規例呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，一般嚟講，照我嘅理解就係警方就會係負責係執法。至於話有冇其他嘅權利當局係都可以負責呢，咁我要再查核一下。一般嚟講，警方係負責執法㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會唔會覺得就係巴士公司自己去做，巴士公司自己喺

呢方面都可以執法係會更好，亦都係好嘅咩？就唔使淨係靠警方。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我--你即時問我，我即時答呢，就係可能大家都以地鐵嘅附例作為一個參考點。嗰個其實巴士公司同埋係鐵路公司佢個營運模式係相當不同，因為地鐵或者鐵路公司佢個運作係點呢，佢係一個密封嘅環境裏面嘅，一般都喺密封嘅環境裏面㗎，而且佢下面就係有好多職員作一個支援。佢哋提供支援嘅職員，一般都好快可以到場處理㗎。或者講到係執法嘅話，即係如果係乘客嘅行為有問題，而需要執行呢個附例。其實佢哋比較容易去執法，就唔使就係妨礙其他嘅乘客嘅進出。

但係巴士又唔同嘞，巴士就係現場係只係得一位巴士司機係喺度控制住嗰部巴士。如果係有啲係唔妥當嘅地方嘅話，係行走中、喺旅程中係有啲問題嘅話，咁樣樣一般嚟講，你可以諗到，其實就比較難去預期嗰個司機喺嗰度去進行執法㗎。呢個純粹係我--即係你問我，我即時嘅一個回應，呢個可能亦都係點解需要由係警務人員去執法，呢個就係現時嗰個安排。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會喺嗰啲收到嘅意見書，好多人都有提及--一方面提及司機嘅行為，另一方面亦都有人提及一啲係比較粗魯或者係唔聽話嘅乘客嘅行為。我就想問嘞，究竟根據現有嘅規例，關乎司機同埋乘客嘅行為係幾多次進行過檢控呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，畀少少時間我。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係鄧大律師，或者你話番畀我哋聽，究竟係邊一個陳述書嗰度係有講呢，係咪九巴呢？係咪好似我諗佢哋嗰度就話係越嚟越多人，就係有咁嘅做法嘅，可唔可以話番畀我哋聽係邊一段呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我可以回答番律師頭先問嘅問題。根據警方嘅資料，而呢個資料其實都有公開嘅，喺 2016 年，就係我哋回覆番立法會嘅質詢。警方當時嘅意見就係話，如果係牽涉襲擊嘅事件，警方會調查，不論地點之類。但係警方就冇就住襲擊--即係對車長襲擊嘅個案數字，又或者關於乘客方面嘅數字，亦都冇去做一個統計嘅，有關嘅數字。警方當時亦都有個意見，就係話如果喺巴士上面有襲擊嘅事件，無論牽涉嘅係邊一方，除咗係倚賴法例 230A 章之外，亦都會倚賴其他嘅法例條文去恰當咁樣調查，同埋去提出檢控，亦都有幾條刑事嘅法例，警方係可以引用。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我知道有呢啲條文，但係我想問嘅就係有幾常去提出檢控呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，簡短嘅答案，根據警方，佢哋冇記錄呢啲數字。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番主席嘅問題，我諗頭先講到一啲參與文件，黎先生你都應該知道嘞，呢個係九巴嘅書面意見，就係喺佢哋嘅文件夾嘅第 95 頁第 35 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者請你讀番有關嘅部分出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）「最近有一個現象對九巴嚟講都係相當關注，就係似乎係有更多嘅事件係由乘客或者其他道路使用者對巴士嘅車長係襲擊。呢個好多時候係由日漸惡化嘅交通意外--交通擠塞，直接或者間接造成一啲嘅緊張嘅情況。我哋儘量係對於犯事者係採取法律行動，我哋亦都明白喺呢一方面嘅罰則係唔足以有阻嚇作用。」

我相信呢一段唔單只--所謂「襲擊」，唔係講緊話用武力嘅襲擊，仲有譬如係乘客粗言穢語辱罵司機。你知唔知道係有呢啲指控呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋知悉巴士公司同埋車長對呢方面有關注。我可以講下，運輸署署長同佢嘅同事而家就係致力一啲公眾教育嘅工作，就係指出喺公交具上面係唔應該有呢啲行為嘅。另外投訴有咩嘢渠道，而乘客如果想投訴唔滿意巴士服務又或者係某一個司機嘅行為嘅時候，可以用咩嘢渠道去投訴，運輸署係喺呢方面已經有工作。我哋就認為教育或者係重要，甚至比起純粹考慮執法係更重要。法例就有㗎嘞，大家應該遵守法律，但係重要嘅一點就係教育公眾文明嘅方式去使用交通工具，就算佢哋不滿，其實係有投訴嘅渠道，唔應該係動武，或者係粗言穢語㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅規例，對上一次係幾時考慮過能唔能夠仍然適用喺今時今日嘅情況呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，唔好意思，我可唔可以請律師講清楚講緊乜嘢規例？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰啲規例，我頭先講緊嘅，即係根據條例底下制定嘅規例提到巴士車長、票務員、乘客嘅責任等等，政府係幾時檢討過呢？睇下到底佢哋仲對於今時今日嚟講係咪適用呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我預期運輸署即將會向運房局呈交佢哋推廣同埋教育方面嘅工作嘅計劃嘅時候，亦都會提出現行嘅刑事刑責嘅條文，喺法例入面點樣應該進一步去推廣，或者去考慮下需唔需要檢討。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我可以請你直接回答番個問題，個問題就係話嗰啲規例對上一次係幾時檢討過？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋冇單獨就住呢一條法例去徹底檢討。因為個假設一直都係入面嘅條文並非不足。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係冇做過檢討？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋冇做檢討，因為我哋唔覺得入面嘅條文係唔足夠。不過正如我頭先講，到運輸署提交一個教育嘅計劃嘅時候，佢哋亦都會去考慮番重新去審視番嗰啲條文係足唔足夠。

主席：Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）黎先生，以你嘅答案，係咪運房局已經係指示運輸署要提交一個公眾教育計劃？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時畀咁嘅指示畀運輸署呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個指示就係喺剛剛發生喺大埔呢一個巴士意外之後，因為我哋收到一啲嘅報告，似乎有更多嘅時候，我哋發現車長同埋乘客之間嘅緊張嘅氣氛係增加嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）簡單嚟講，有咩嘢教育計劃去解決呢個問題呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，正如我講，細節方面，我哋都要等運輸署提交，所以我唔想而家先一步去講，到底佢哋會提交啲乜嘢畀局方考慮。但係整體嚟講，個方向應該係咁，佢哋亦都知道嘅，就係我哋應該提醒乘客係要文明有禮，有秩序，任何時候都係。而如果乘客唔滿意巴士服務嘅提供，又或者係就住某一個司機嘅不滿嘅話，係可以透過投訴嘅渠道去跟進，呢個係更加合理嘅做法，而唔係因為自己不滿，就對某一個司機出氣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇--你哋有冇畀一個時間表？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇畀限期，但係運輸署都知道呢件事嘅--有幾緊張㗎嘞，佢哋已經係加快進度進行緊。我已經叫咗運輸署咁樣做，佢哋亦都係做緊㗎嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以同你提另外一點，而家講番第 108 頁嗰個條例，呢個第 9 條，第 9 條就提到話行政長官係有權就住專--可以委任額外嘅董事嘅。呢個係唔係行政長官曾經有行使過嘅權力呀？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係嘅。呢個就係行政長官擁有嘅權力，佢亦都曾經行使過，有幾年嚟都行使過。運輸署長以及副秘書長，即係負責巴士服務嘅副秘書長，而家就係坐我右手邊嘅蔡先生，都係獲得行政長官委任作為所有專營公司董事局嘅額外董事嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我相信而家係有五間專營公司，我理解係咪就係呢兩位嘅官員都係呢五間專營公司嘅董事局嘅成員？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委任咗呢啲額外董事，佢哋係點樣喺董事局入面提出安全嘅事項嘅關注呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，委任嘅額外董事係代表政府，所以以此延伸，即係話係代表政府嘅利益，或者關注。如果係講到安全問題，呢個係其中一個我哋政

府嘅董事關注嘅事項。喺適當嘅時候，適當嘅場合，佢哋會喺董事局開會嘅時候提出，喺我哋提交畀檢討委員會嘅書面陳詞亦都有提到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋知道有啲公司不時喺董事局會有啲嘅譬如係核數嘅委員會，安全委員會，有啲嘅小組委員會嘅。政府嘅額外董事有冇就住呢啲嘅專營公司，要求董事局成立一啲嘅小組委員會會關乎安全嘅呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，如果得你准許，我想邀請蔡先生回答，因為佢係代表政府嘅額外董事嚟嘅。

蔡傑銘先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席，唔該晒律師。就好似黎先生所講，我就係運房局嘅副秘書長，同埋連同陳美寶女士，即係運輸署署長，都係獲行政長官委任作為額外董事嘅，去代表政府參與五間專營公司嘅董事局。我哋作為其中一個董事，我哋係代表政府嘅利益，我哋其中亦都係即係喺專營公司嚟講嘅其中一個董事，睇番公司嘅策略嘅發展，我都可以話係其中一個公司董事。

我由去年 9 月上任，每兩個月或者每季，我都會去參與董事局嘅會議。佢哋係有一啲嘅核數嘅小組委員會，又或者係有啲會議去睇番每日嘅運作，以確保係提供適當而有效率嘅服務，同埋係安全嗰方面，譬如係意外率、巴士脫班率。管理層都會係透過提交畀董事局嘅文件，係要向董事局匯報，同埋一啲參考嘅資料。可惜，我哋就冇參與佢嗰個嘅核數小組委員會嘅會議。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會唔會建議成立一啲安全運作嘅小姐委員會，而政府嘅董事係可以參與做委員嘅呢？

蔡傑銘先生：（經傳譯員）感謝你提出呢個問題。正如係黎先生剛才喺發言嘅時候講過，就專營公司有咁嘅責任係妥善咁樣樣去做好佢嘅專營權嘅工作。其實講到公司管治同埋講到安全，我哋會睇下政府董事究竟喺呢一方面可以做啲乜嘢嘢。當然我哋亦都係希望佢哋嘅公司管治係更好，而且係更聚焦喺安全嘅事項。希望就專營公司喺去履行職責嘅時候，喺佢係致力係維持喺香港有適當而又有效率嘅服務嘅時候，都會關顧呢一點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你，蔡先生。我而家係想問下局方一啲問題係關於呢個係遠期計劃，特別就係呢個 12A。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋未落去另一個課題之前，我打算就係今朝早有一個小休。我就想請--亦都讓證人有少少時間休息一下，呢個係咪一個適當嘅時間呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家係休息十五分鐘，休息十五分鐘，唔該。

上午 11 時 32 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 46 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席。黎先生，頭先我想你睇番，就係呢個條例嘅第 12A，即係 109 頁。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你應該記得，頭先我同你都提到過嘅，我哋最初頭講呢個條例嘅條文嘅時候， 12A 條就係講緊一個五年嘅遠期計劃。我哋見到呢個計劃入面嘅內容應該有啲咩嘢呢？就係喺個附表度有寫嘅，呢個就係 126 頁嘅附表。

而家睇番 109 頁嘅第(4)款，我就想你睇番呢個條文嘅，就話係「如果係唔能夠達成協議，又或者有唔同意嘅地方，專營公司同埋運輸署署長要將有歧見嘅事項嘅細節呈交畀運房局局長，等運房局局長去解決」。

有冇需要過運房局局長解決呢個有歧見嘅事項呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，冇㗎，據我所知冇試過。我相信應該咁樣解釋，遠期計劃好多時都係經過多輪嘅一個討論嘅過程，就係運輸署同埋專營公司嘅討論過程，通常到計劃敲定細節嘅時候，就已經係得到運輸署同埋巴士公司嘅同意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你揭去附表第 126 頁？你可以見到計劃內容。運房局有冇向運輸署發出過任何建議，呢個計劃應該有咩嘢內容呢？即係話除咗喺附表入面提到呢一啲特定嘅條文，即係由(a)至(g)咁多之外，我提--我同你提到過嘞，就係(h)嗰一款，就係有提到「其他事宜」，似乎係包含所有包羅萬有個條款。有冇任何時間，運房局曾經建議過運輸署，呢個五年遠期計劃內容應該係乜嘢呢，定話係由運輸署決定呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋知道由最近嘅遠期計劃，其實委員會亦都會知道起碼其中嘅遠期計劃入面都有某啲嘅比較廣義嘅標題嘅，就係符合附表入面提到嘅計劃內容嘅。譬如其中一間巴士公司就可能要提供一個訓練員工嘅資料，據我理解，呢個亦都係運輸署同埋巴士公司嘅多番商討之後擬定嘅，但係我就唔可以確定到底係唔係由運輸署主動提出，定話係因為局方某啲特定嘅要求而行事嘅。我懷疑應該係前者。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗鄧樂勤大律師嘅問題，其實係問第二樣嘢，就係運房局有冇向運輸署提交任何建議，去講呢個五年遠期計劃內容應該包括乜嘢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，簡短嘅答案，就係我唔記得有冇主席你提到你解釋呢啲嘅指示嘞。基本上所有喺附表入面提到嘅內容都應該係包含喺個計劃入面，如果運輸署能夠透過同巴士公司嘅商討有進一步資料，亦都會喺嗰個遠期計劃入面反映。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話運房局冇發出任何指示畀運輸署？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）唔係喺呢一個範圍入面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）得嘞，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）黎先生，我而家就唔再講呢一個嘅規管嘅制度，我而家想講番我哋委員會職權範圍。

再提醒番所有人，第(b)嗰一點就係職權範圍就係話委員會係要檢--係要審視現行對專營巴士嘅監管同埋監察制度。希望就住呢一方面，我進一步向你發問。

根據委員會收到嘅書面陳詞，好清楚巴士公司作為一個慣常做法，都會提交一啲資料畀運輸署嘅，就係一啲近期嘅好新近嘅文件，可能係按月、按季咁樣去提交，內容就係呢一個專營公司嘅營運同埋管理嘅。我都相信毫無疑問你都知道嘅。

黎以德先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）局方有冇要求運輸署去採取任何核實嘅步驟呢？睇下提交畀運輸署嘅定期嘅文件嘅真確性呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我希望澄清一下律師嘅問題。律師係咪問緊局方有冇要求運輸署去查核一下巴士公司提交畀運輸署嘅資料，嗰啲資料本身係唔係真確呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，係呀，鄧樂勤大律師就係問呢個問題。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）簡短嘅答案，就係我哋預期運輸署採取適當嘅或者需要嘅步驟去確保收到嘅資料嘅真確性，而唔係需要由局方去提醒運輸署咁樣做。當然喺專營權底下，如果我冇記錯嘅話，有一個要求，廣泛而言，我唔知道係咪可以即係包括晒每一項提交畀運輸署嘅資料，但係我記得有一條條文，就係要求巴士公司確保提交畀運輸署嘅資料係準確、真確。的確係對運營者有施加咁嘅要求，佢哋需要遵守。

而我都知道譬如運輸署實際上喺某啲事項上，佢哋都會採取行動，主動採取行動去查核一下收到嘅資料係咪真確。舉個例，就係巴士司機休息時間、更次時間等等。運輸署係有聘請外判商去做一啲獨立調查，即係喺巴士公司個調查以外，自己做調查，去睇下巴士公司有冇跟從指引。呢個係除咗運輸署由巴士公司收到嘅資料以外會做嘅嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當然我哋進一步都會再同運輸署去查問呢樣嘢，但係你頭先咁樣答之後，我想繼續問你。

監管嘅過程，或者監察過程，大部分都係其實睇巴士公司提交嘅紀錄文件，呢個係所謂監察嘅過程就係咁樣做。運房局有冇發出過任何建議，運輸署應該某程度上，應該點樣監察巴士公司嘅活動呢？點樣直接去監察，而唔係淨係睇一啲巴士公司提供嘅紀錄呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我相信呢個答案都會係幾長，主席，希望你畀時間我解釋。

整體嘅監管同埋監察制度入面係有制衡，所有呢啲嘅制衡基本上都係得到運房局嘅許可，又或者起碼運房局係知悉嘅。

或者講幾個例子，較早時間我就講過，譬如話調查一下車長佢嘅休息時間。另外亦都每日係會進行呢個突擊檢查，呢個係署方去做㗎，就會睇下現役巴士嘅情況，所以每一日佢哋會抽十四部巴士。呢十四部巴士本來就係要投入服務，佢哋係隨機咁抽呢十四部巴士。呢十四部巴士就係要通過署方自己嘅驗車主任嘅檢驗，呢個就係除咗巴士公司所提供嘅安全方面嘅事之外，我哋會再做呢啲抽樣嘅調查。

我而家即時隨手就諗到呢兩個例子，就講及究竟我哋喺機制入面係有啲乜嘢嘢，而呢一啲亦都係局方所批准咗嘅，去核對一下究竟有冇做到，即係話核對一下係巴士公司係做成點㗎。當然，你亦都會喺書面意見書嗰度睇到，就係署方講過，就話如果有疑問嘅話，譬如話如果懷疑嗰啲資料係咪唔準確，又或者啲資料係唔夠全面嘅話，運輸署係可以，亦都有去追問有關嘅巴士公司，要求佢哋提供更全面嘅資料。呢一個其實係多年嚟所建立嘅一個機制，亦都係我哋整體嘅做法嘅一個環節，係署方嘅安排嚟嘅。

呢個就係同事都知道係應該點樣做，因此就唔需要進一步需要有一個書面嘅指示。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你哋冇一啲咁樣樣嘅係指示畀運輸署，因為你係預期係期望咗佢哋係會咁做㗎嘛。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生，我諗你講得好公道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，監察我而家就唔講住，稍後會問署方多啲監察方面嘅事宜。跟住我就講下一般嘅安全政策呢個事宜。黎先生，嚟自巴士公司嘅意見書顯示就係巴士公司本身都不時係會研究一下有一啲乜嘢新嘅安全嘅技術、安全嘅措施都可以係引入嚟應用。我想問下，局方本身又有冇係進行一方面嘅研究呢？睇下本地或者海外有啲乜嘢嘅進展、有咩嘢發展、睇下有冇啲咩嘢新嘅措施就可以係引用，即係話一般嚟講係指嗰啲科技同埋嗰啲係安全嘅措施喇。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）律師，局同埋署嘅分工係點呢？一般嚟講，如果話你剛才提及嘅嗰類型嘅研究就會由運輸署去進行，就唔係局方去進行，因為喺局嗰方面，我哋其實真係冇所需嘅專材嚟到去進行呢啲研究，相反，署方就會係有一隊運輸工程師以及就係機電工程師，佢哋係更熟悉呢一方面嘅事情，而且佢哋亦都有係進行你所講及嘅嗰類嘅研究，其實你都睇到一啲證據，譬如話係採納咗嗰個黑盒喇，同埋係車速限制器呢一啲嘅要求嘅建議，而最近我相信委員會亦都會知道㗎喇，就係因應大埔所發生嘅巴士慘劇，運輸署就係組成咗一個工作小組，佢係做主席㗎，咁同埋就你有專營巴士公司嘅成員加做委員，就去研究一下有冇一啲係進一步嘅安全嘅設備可以係加入去我哋嘅專營巴士嗰度㗎。咁我相信運輸署嘅意見書嗰度都有提及呢點㗎。係呀，我哋有㗎，有咁樣做㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問下，局方有冇考慮過以下嘅可能性，即係話個別嘅專營巴士公司係要制訂一個計劃，而又得到你嘅批准，而唔係只不過係時不時耐唔中就某一個單一嘅項目去係引入一啲安全措施呢？換句話講，譬如話搵一個係有資歷嘅人士係關於安全嘅事方面有相關嘅資歷同埋經驗嘅人士去草擬一份咁樣樣關乎安全措施嘅計劃書咁呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，冇。冇話好有組織或者好詳細咁樣去咁樣做，不過既然你問我呢一個問題，今朝早你問我呢個問題，律師，我諗我即時嘅回應係，係呀，我哋會好樂意去探討呢一個可行性。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照我所知，目前個情況係咁㗎，係嘛？其中一家嘅專營巴士公司佢所推行嘅一啲安全措施就可能會同另外嗰幾間係巴士公司嘅好唔同㗎喎，會唔會有咁嘅情況出現呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，究竟喺日常運作裏面點樣樣去做，我諗我唔掌握個情況，不過如果佢哋之間係有一個差別，我唔會感到奇怪。如果話要求佢哋係寫好一份係安全計劃，即係好似律師所講嘅咁樣樣，咁當然我哋係有幾樣嘢係要同營運商就係傾㗎，譬如話究竟嗰個計劃係點樣樣嘅呢，係咪所謂一本通書睇到老，大家個個都係一樣吖，定抑或係不同嘅係營運公司，係因為嗰個重點不同而略有一啲不同呢？當然係如果要做嘅話，我哋都要處理呢啲事宜。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有好多國家，佢哋採納咗一啲國際嘅標準，譬如ISO39001，關乎一個係道路安全管理系統，咁另外係道路安全議會亦都不時就係促請話應該喺香港係採納呢一套標準㗎，咁究竟係局方有冇諗過都係採納一個咁樣樣嘅道路安全管理系統呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，照我所知，呢一套標準係都幾新下㗎，如果我冇搞錯嘅話，一般係運輸及物流公司所採納，就唔係就係政府當局去採納㗎。至於話我哋會唔會鼓勵佢哋咁樣做，會唔會請巴士公司去採納呢一套嘅 ISO 國際標準，我諗不如咁喇，我哋應該係同你較早時候同我講嘅嗰樣嘢一齊去睇，即係話要唔要寫一個係安全計劃書。我諗從政策嘅角度，係兩者應該係一齊去

睇嘅，我唔會喺原則上就係排除個可能性，而其實要睇嘅係究竟嗰個成本同埋個效益係點樣樣呢，如果我哋採納呢一個國際標準。如果公司之間佢哋嗰個準備嘅程度係有所不同，咁我哋又應該如何處理呢？另外我想講就係，我哋係保持個開放嘅應度，樂意去睇睇㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你哋局方到今日嚟講係未有考慮過呢樣嘢㗎，係嘛？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，你咁講都唔係話唔公道嘅，其實係新嘅事物嚟嘅，係只係有幾年嘅歷史，講到標準嚟到計，佢都係一個新嘅事物，不過我哋好樂意係去研究下一啲，探討下呢啲新嘅事物嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師，我哋有冇呢一個係 ISO39001 呢？呢度佢有冇講明話係幾時係出版㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，大家可以睇雜類文件二，645 頁、646 頁，咁根據 646 頁嗰度講，就話 2012 年嘅時候出版嘅，呢個就係第一版。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）黎先生，香港嘅地理環境係咁嘅，個情況比較係奇怪嘅，我哋就有好多雙層巴士行走喺一啲糾斜喇、狹窄嘅道路，好多時乘客有呢個超載嘅情況添嘅，我就想問喇，呢一個安全嘅問題你又點睇呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）道路嘅設計同埋佢如果影響個安全，運輸署嘅同事，特別係交通工程師或者運輸工程師，佢哋嘅日常嘅工作都會係處理呢啲事宜嘅，即係佢哋每日都做㗎。一係就可能發生某件事件又或者一系列嘅意外，又或者係佢哋平時做嘅檢討工作，佢哋都會睇睇某一段路係咪安全，又再睇下究竟有啲咩嘢可以做，去進一步係令佢更加安全，又或者睇下係咪應該喺嗰段路嗰度係施加一啲限制，所謂限制可以包括係車速嘅限制喇，可以係限制某一類嘅車輛使用喇，諸如此類，所以呢個係佢哋不斷做緊嘅工作嚟嘅。譬如話有一笪地方已經被列為係黑點喇，咁呢個就其實我哋有一個好客觀嘅標準就去界定一個地方係咪一個黑點㗎，一般我哋就會參考究竟喺某一段時段裏面係發生咗幾多宗嘅交通意外，如果係黑點嘅話，我哋會更加密切咁去留意，去睇下究竟我剛才所提及嘅改變係咪可以係加以考慮。所以我可以咁講，呢個唔係話完全一個被動嘅程序，佢哋亦都會採取主動去睇睇其他嘅路段，縱使佢哋唔係黑點佢哋都會去睇嘅，即係如果佢哋發現就係都有咁嘅需要去睇睇嗰個安全情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照你嘅回答就係話局方同埋署方係冇傾過就係直接又或者係透過巴士公司，或者其他嘅運輸公司呢一個係道路安全管理系統呢一套嘅 ISO 國際標準，係嘛？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）你意思係指個 ISO 呢一個係國際標準？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，呢一個 ISO39001。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我相信咁樣講係啱嘅，呢一方面冇傾過，正如我解釋，因為有個新嘅國際標準係 2012 年引入嘅，都叫做係相對比較新鮮嘅事，但係我哋都知道物流公司同埋啲其他嘅運輸公司都有用呢一個國際標準，呢件事而家我哋關注喇，呢個國際標準，正如我頭先解釋，我哋都好樂意探討下喺香港嘅適用性嘅，對於籠港嘅交通運輸系統嚟講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以而家同你講下人力嘅供應嘅問題？委員會收到嘅書面意見書就係顯示合資格嘅員工，特別係巴士車長方面係有短缺嘅，呢個問題已經持續咗一輪㗎喇，我咁樣簡述個情況公唔公道呢，咁講？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我會話其實呢個情況係都反映番整體香港勞動市場嘅問題，唔單只係專營巴士公司出現咁嘅現象，其他同運輸有關嘅公司等等都有呢一個情況嘅，物流嘅公司亦都一樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁其中一點運輸署有令到委員會知悉嘅，相信你都知道嘅，就係係最新嘅指引，頭先我哋傾過㗎喇，就係需要--因為有新嘅指引要多聘請二百五十個嘅額外司機，你知唔知道？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我都知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺你嘅書面意見書你提到香港係全球少數嘅地方係專營巴士嘅服務係冇獲得任何政府嘅直接補貼，而由私人嘅營運商去營運嘅，你記唔記得喺你嘅陳詞入面有提到呢一點？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，主席，雖然--如果主席准許嘅話，我想即係準確啲去講，係一般嚟講，冇政府補貼。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講番頭先鄧樂勤大律師指緊係邊段呢？係咪律師而家已經係喺嗰個畫面嗰度見到喇？但係呢個應該係講緊另外一部分，呢個係一般嘅觀察嘅，黎先生。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，唔好意思，我想澄清下，即係或者我比較執著，我聽到鄧樂勤大律師話喺我嘅開場白入面提到我話完全冇政府嘅資助，我想即係澄清一下，一般嚟講係冇政府資助，唔係話絕對冇政府資助。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，咁請大家睇第 14 段。或者你可以指畀我哋睇，當你講番頭先呢點嘅時候，喺書面意見書邊部分？關於冇政府直接資助嗰方面係邊段？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）第 14 段，應該係第 14 段。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家可以等我引用番呢一段，應該要留意嘅就係香港係全球嘅國家或者城市當中極少數專營巴士服務就係由私人營運商提供，係冇直接嘅政府資助嘅，你頭先提到係呢點，係咪？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）政府有冇喺非直接嘅提供資助或者補貼畀專營公司？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，有幾個例子，我而家可以引述嘅，譬如專營巴士公司喇，就唔需要交首次登記稅，呢個似乎都係其中一個比較清晰嘅例子。主席，另外一個原因點解喺我開場發言嘅時候咁樣講呢？政府一般嚟講係唔會提供資助，其實我係想解番喺書面意見書入面呢度提供嘅說話嘅，咁多年嚟，喺近年喇，尤其，我哋係有提供一啲嘅某啲形式嘅財政嘅資助--援助係畀專營公司嘅，去達至某一個政策或者達至某一個計劃，畀個例子畀委員會參考，譬如電動巴士嘅試驗計劃，呢個措施屬於環保局嘅，而唔係運房局，但係呢個都係政府嘅資助之一，就係提供資助畀巴士公司購置一定數目嘅電動巴士，以試驗性質運行，所以呢個某程度上都係一種資助嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另外，我咁樣--我記憶啱唔啱，係咪有四架電動巴士？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係三十六架單層巴士，主席。一個更新近嘅例子，就係我哋提供資助，幫助巴士公司設置喺巴士站有啲實時嘅資訊板，咁係一個配對資助嘅計劃嚟嘅，一個自願性嘅資金配對資助嘅計劃。除此之外，除咗呢幾個有特定目的嘅資助計劃方面，整體嚟講，的而且確政府係唔會直接提供資助畀專營公司嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）政府係咪有提供資助畀渡輪公司？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我哋提供啲特別支援措施，呢個係嗰個計劃嘅用語，咁律師用嘅「資助」呢個字眼我都唔會有爭議嘅，但係意思就係話對於係離島嘅渡輪服務，我哋提供資助，但係呢個有特別嘅政策考慮嘅。渡輪對於住喺離島嘅居民係唯一交通工具，而呢啲渡輪財政上因為唔可行喇，呢個係一個長期嘅問題，除非佢哋渡輪大幅加費喇，我哋認為公眾亦都未必能負擔。有一個特定背景，所以我哋先對渡輪公司係有一個特別嘅援助措施。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個特別援助措施施行咗幾耐？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以講蔡先生回答？因為佢係負責日常嘅運作嘅，蔡先生。

蔡傑銘先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席。律師問呢個問題，正如黎先生講，離島嘅渡輪航線係一個特別嘅情況，政府係有提供一啲嘅特別支援措施，有六條航線都係接受緊我哋嘅特別支援嘅措施嘅。基本上，正如黎先生所講，政府亦都明白，除非渡輪服務大幅加費，因為離島居民係要倚賴渡輪嘅服務去返工、出去市區或者係做其他嘅事，如果唔大幅加費，佢哋呢啲服務財政上不可行嘅，喺咁嘅情況底下，政府嘅資助個別計劃，譬如話係維修費、電費、有啲嘅補費嘅扣減喇，同埋如果係有小童同埋長者嘅半價優惠嘅話，亦都係明白佢哋減少個收入嘅，呢啲係我哋就住呢方面提供嘅資助。政府都需要向立法會財務委員會申請撥款，然後就將公帑資助呢啲渡輪嘅營運商，咁我哋亦都有透過運輸署去核實呢啲原因係咪真確，去確保公帑係用得其所，咁呢個係關於對於渡輪公司

嘅特別支援計劃措施嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。講番人力嘅問題，黎先生，我想畀你睇下 TD--即係運輸署嘅第 1510 頁，呢個就係啱啱週末先會收到嘅文件喇，你可能係睇過，可能未睇。

黎以德先生：Yes. It's notes of a meeting; is that right?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呢個會議紀錄嚟㗎，係寫中文嘅，呢個似乎就係一個特別會議嘅會議紀錄，深水埗區議會，2017 年 9 月 28 號，就喺深水埗發生慘劇之後開嘅特別會議。我就有興趣睇 1523 頁。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 203 段，羅馬數字 III，我讀番呢個我收到嘅英文譯本，佢就係咁講㗎，佢就會係「運輸署嘅總運輸主任就話政府關注運輸業人手不足的問題，巴士公司有責任透過增加薪酬、福利和晉升機會吸引新人入行及挽留人才。」你中文睇嘅版本同我頭先英文講嘅係咪都係脗合？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）都係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪都反映--準確反映政府就住人手不足嗰個問題嘅立場呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗係反映我哋預期專營公司要做啲乜嘢，佢唔係反映整體嘅情況，因為呢一個係一個即係梁先生，即係總運輸主任一個綜合回應嘅一部分，我只能夠話呢個係我哋立場嘅部分，我哋嘅立場其餘嘅部分，譬如話關於長期人手不足嘅問題，我哋通過立法嘅程序，我都會再解釋番嘅，提交修訂嘅法例去--嘅建議去--譬如放鬆對於商業司機嘅牌照規定等等，所以基本上現時如果你想申請一個牌照做商業司機嘅話，你需要持有私人駕駛執照三年先可以有資格申請--即係話申請做商業車輛嘅司機，咁亦都因為長期人手不足嘅問題喇，我哋已經提出建議，同埋立法會亦都同意㗎喇，同業界一樣都同意三年呢一個要求可以縮減為一年。日後你只需要係擁有私家車嘅駕駛執照一年，咁你就已經可以係申請商用車輛嘅駕駛執照，呢一個就係包括咗巴士嘅駕駛執照，亦都包括埋係專營巴士嘅駕駛執照。我哋而家正係草擬緊嗰個修訂嘅條例草案，希望係今年嘅年尾之前可以引入立法會。如果立法會係通過嘅話，亦都可以喺某程度上幫我哋舒緩司機人手不足呢個問題，未必係可以完全解決個問題，不過希望都可以係緩減一下嗰個問題，所以我哋喺呢方面係做咗呢個工夫。另外，縱使係咁講，我哋都話專營公司--佢作為呢個專營巴士公司，佢作為一個專營公司，佢要採取一切嘅步驟嚟到確保佢有足夠嘅司機人手去提供服務。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我剛才係提及係呢一個講法，咁究竟政府係同巴士公司跟進過咩嘢工夫嚟到去係促請佢哋係要有足夠嘅司機呢？有足夠嘅車長呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，好近期呢--我可唔可以咁講呢？就話喺佢哋嗰個薪酬方案嗰度係有一啲重組，即係我係指巴士司機嘅薪酬方案，佢哋嗰個重組都係希望係將個薪酬變得更有吸引力，或者起碼等佢哋巴士司機更加確定究竟係每個月係有幾多收入，希望可以有一個更大嘅保障，呢一個都係因為政府係同埋巴士公司之間嘅商討嘅結果㗎，當然，我哋都要對巴士公司係公道嘅，我一定要指出，佢哋係反應好快、好迅速，喺大埔意外之後，喺大埔嘅巴士意外呢個慘劇之後，佢哋亦都係反應非常之迅速。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，巴士公司係咪已經承諾咗會係提升佢哋嘅薪酬？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我諗嗰個重組咗嘅薪酬方案已經係公布咗㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鑑於你講嗰個人手不足都係長期嘅問題，我想問下政府會否就係提供--或者會否考慮係提供一啲補助、補貼，即係薪酬嗰方面咁做呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋講話補貼，如果係長期咁樣提供一個補貼，我諗我哋必須非常之小心咁去考慮呢件事宜，因為如果咁做嘅話，其實對於我哋認為喺香港點樣樣去營運公共交通服務嘅一個好根本嘅政策嘅改變。另外或者你而家問我，我即時嘅回應係我諗巴士司機嘅招聘問題未去到嗰個階段，我諗仲係有方法，巴士公司係可以用嗰啲方法去招聘同埋挽留足夠嘅合資格嘅司機嘅。我亦都有睇過一啲巴士公司提交畀呢個委員會嘅一啲文件，我諗喺嗰啲意見書，喺嗰啲文件裏面，你都可以見到喇，佢哋亦都好盡力咁樣樣去改善個情況，我諗我哋未去到嗰個階段、嗰個地步就係話要係提供補貼係畀巴士公司去招聘人手㗎。我哋可以透過其他嘅方法嚟到去舒緩呢個人手不足嘅問題，剛剛我提過，就係喺呢個係牌照嘅申請資格喇。剛才你亦都提過二百一十五名嘅司機，我哋嗰啲指引就會今年稍後時間就係陸續咁推出嘅，一路係去到 2019 年，嗰個目標就係希望巴士公司有足夠嘅時間去招聘足夠嘅人手，佢哋所需要嘅司機嘅數目。另外，過去嗰一、兩年，我哋亦都有做過呢啲工作㗎，就係話我哋優先處理係新嘅司機嘅牌照考試，我哋會優先就係處理呢啲巴士司機嘅駕駛執照嘅考試，就係同處理私家車嘅駕駛執照考試係唔同嘅。其實我哋就係--運輸署就已經係調動咗嗰啲考車官嚟到係優先處理嗰啲申請駕駛巴士嘅照牌嘅考生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果話增加薪酬，其實剛剛我哋都提過喇，你認唔認為增加薪酬就係會引致嗰個支出係大大增加呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）其實事實就係你招聘得愈多司機，咁當然一般嚟講嗰個成本就會上升，不過咁樣並冇令到巴士公司係唔肯就係去跟從最新嗰個指引。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以我想問，局方有冇其他嘅措施，除咗係同巴士公司講以及係降低嗰個考牌嘅申請嘅資格，有冇其他嘅措施去企圖去舒緩嗰個人手不足嘅問題？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我哋都喺度鼓勵巴士公司喺招聘嗰方面或者諗下一啲潛在

嘅人手嘅，譬如話婦女，其實而家佢哋呢方面都做多咗好多呢方面嘅工夫㗎喇。即係佢哋可以考慮一下聘用婦女係做司機。自從係大埔嘅慘劇之後，當然以下呢個課題就更加係具敏感性，即係話招聘兼職司機嚟到去喺某程度上就係緩解一下呢個人手不足嘅問題，我相信委員會係會知道㗎喇，就係自從慘劇之後，呢一個方法其實巴士公司已經係暫停咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問下，車長嗰方面，有幾多--或者嗰個比例上係幾多係女性？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）我自己就冇嗰個答案，唔知我啲同事知唔知呢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會個比例好低？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）肯定就唔高。主席先生，嗰人數字有所上升嘅，個比例有所上升嘅，我哋個角度就係我哋歡迎更多就係女士去駕駛巴士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，局方有冇採取任何嘅措施嚟到係鼓勵女士去申請駕駛巴士？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）唔係我哋去做㗎，因為係巴士公司佢負責招聘，但係呢一個訊息我哋係唔止一次係提過出嚟嘅，而運輸署我亦都知道有同佢哋討論。我知道就係巴士公司方面--喺呢方面嘅程序都係有加強個工作嘅，起碼譬如都聽聞就係話--其實你大家如果去搭巴士嘅時候，你會見到多啲--遇上多啲係女性嘅司機，你都可以係明白呢一點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）局方、政府又或者係巴士公司，究竟有冇採取步驟嚟到係吸引女士去揸巴士？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個留番係畀巴士公司去答。不過你都要直接回答鄧樂勤大律師嘅問題，係咪冇作出咁嘅--冇主動去做呢一方面嘅工作？即係話係問下局方有冇主動咁樣去促進呢件事？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，簡短咁回答，我哋自己唔係負責招聘嘅，不過我哋的而且確係有鼓勵巴士公司去咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋進行呢一個檢討，就係由於過往嗰幾年涉及巴士都有多宗就係慘劇，多宗嘅意外，我諗想問下，局方自己有冇進行過研究，有冇去睇下有冇啲共同嘅係成因呢？即係喺呢啲嘅意外背後，有冇一啲共同嘅成因？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我較早時候解釋過，研究意外嘅成因呢個係運輸署裏面嘅專業嘅同事嘅工作嚟㗎，坦白講，我哋喺局方，我哋冇咁嘅能力去做呢方面嘅研究，不過過往曾經有咁嘅情況，我哋認為應該都有做過咁嘅工作或者係應該做呢方面嘅工作嘅話，我哋就會叫署方就係去睇一睇嘅。譬如係讓

我提兩個例子喇，一個就係最近係修訂咗嗰個工作休息及用膳時間嘅指引。呢度我就係要為我哋喺 4 月交上嚟嘅書面意見書就係作一個更正，因為交咗之後，自此我哋就知道係 2017 年嘅時候開始做嗰個檢討，而且亦都係由局方去係提議嘅，呢個係其中一個例子。另外喺我哋嘅意見書裏面嘅某處同埋喺運輸署嘅意見書裏面亦都有寫嘅。講到話車門--落車嘅車門玻璃爆裂，當時喺 2016 年有幾宗咁樣嘅事件，當時玻璃就爛咗，導致乘客係受傷。咁喺逐漸我哋睇得出有個咁樣嘅模式，因為意外接二連三咁發生嘅時候，我都記得喺兩個月之內都有連續發生嘅，我哋就思疑可能有啲地方出咗問題，可能係巴士設計方面喇、係咪巴士用嘅玻璃吖等等。我哋就敦促運輸署去睇下呢個情況，然後運輸署就同巴士公司研究，到最尾就有增加咗一啲嘅安全措施嘅，譬如話喺車門--玻璃門就打橫係有一個嘅護欄喇，去減低乘客重傷嘅可能性，因為如果乘客被拋出巴士外嘅話，係會重傷嘅。我哋都儘量去跟緊呢件事，有時我哋亦都會主動要求運輸署檢討，呢啲檢討、研究好多時候其實亦都會由運輸署直接提出嚟，因為佢哋其實係前線日常接觸呢啲事嘅部門，有時佢哋嘅判斷比我哋更加準確，佢哋更加明白要做啲乜嘢事、要研究乜嘢嘢嘅，因為佢哋每日都會同巴士公司、區議會、公眾等等有來往。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解就係佢哋嘅範圍嚟嘅，如果發現有一啲共同嘅成因嘅話，咁佢哋係會匯報畀局方聽？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，如果係講緊意外原因嘅話，尤其如果巴士嘅運作係牽涉其中嘅呢，冇錯，我哋預期運輸署同埋運房局之間係應該有溝通嘅 。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁局方有冇任何嘅結論？多宗嘅意外，一連串嘅意外，有冇咩嘢共通嘅成因？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我可唔可以請律師--問下，所謂「一連串嘅意外」係講緊咩嘢一連串意外？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪有一連串意外吖？我哋講番 2003 年喺屯門有一--後來柴灣有巴士意外喇，喺深水埗喇，然後就今年喺大埔，都有數宗非常嚴重嘅致命巴士意外，我提到嘅「一連串意外」就係呢啲。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，如果你容許嘅話，我回應就唔想提今次呢一個大埔嘅巴士意外住，因為仲有法律嘅程序，我就唔想作出任何推斷或者有任何嘅指稱呢一次意外成因係乜嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，調查委員會已經係講清楚我哋唔會係喺呢個調查釐清邊一個嘅係有咩嘢責任嘅，但係我哋亦都可以去探究一下一般嘅情況。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，每一宗意外都有一個特定嘅意外嘅原因嘅，可以將佢分類，機件故障吖，係咪巴士機件故障，或者巴士本身個設計，或者道路設計，又或者駕駛態度、乘客嘅行為，有啲嘅成因我哋就會話巴士同埋巴士司機係有積極嘅參與嘅，意思即係話巴士司機又或者係巴士嘅機件故障就係直

接導致意外嘅原因，有啲嘅意外就係一啲被動嘅方式，即係話架巴士--譬如話都係有一個受害嘅涉事車輛喇，就係譬如係後面架車撞上嚟咁樣，有唔同嘅意外成因。喺發生一連串嘅意外之後，運輸署、運房局就會睇番有關啲意外，睇下我哋可以吸取咩嘢教訓，有咩嘢改進。黑盒同埋車輛限速器就係有一次喺屯門，係 2003 年嘅巴士慘劇意外之後提倡㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁亦都係根據當時專家報告，專家報告建議呢啲安全措施嘅？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，係，政府採納專家嘅報告，亦都好快實施咗呢一個做法，而家所有巴士已經係有黑盒同埋有限速器兩個裝置㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你提到幾個原因喇，係道路設計、機件故障、司機操守、乘客嘅行為，有冇一個比較係佔大嘅比重係個成因呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，據我所知就冇喇。主席，啱啱提到有啲嘅安全措施喺 2003 年嗰個意外之後實施嘅，喺屯門發生嘅巴士嘅意外。咁講啱唔啱呢？喺深水埗，2017 年 9 月發生嘅巴士意外之後，就亦都導致檢討咗有關嘅指引，咁嗰個指引就喺今年 2 月修訂嘅，主席，咁講亦都係公道嘅，發生咗嗰次慘劇之後，就係導致我哋做咗個檢討。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係車長嗰個工作時間嗰個指引吖嘛？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前嘅指引我相信就係喺 2012 年開始實施嘅，啱唔啱？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）應該係 2010 年，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，2010 年，唔該。新嘅指引據我理解就係 18 年 2 月 23 號就修訂嘅，即係發生咗喺大埔道嘅咁不幸嘅意外嘅幾個星期之內，係咪呀？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我冇理解錯嘅話，深水埗嗰次意外亦都導致部門係要求巴士公司每月提交更多資料，啱唔啱？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）譬如車長干犯交通違例事項喇、喺巴士公司車上監察嘅工作喇、突擊檢查黑盒、司機要做嗰啲呼氣測試，測試酒精含量喇呢啲，我理解啱唔啱？喺大埔嗰次意外之後就係成立咗一個工作小組㗎？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一個工作小組嘅目的係檢討安裝--喺巴士上安裝新嘅

安全儀器嘅可行性？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪都係因為喺大埔道呢個不幸嘅意外導致咁樣做呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）係，咁樣講亦都係公道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以總括嚟講，黎先生可唔可以咁樣問你呢？如果有咁嘅講法，你同唔同意呢？政府其實係用一個被動嘅反應式嘅方法去處理呢件事，而唔係一個主動嘅方法呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，喺一個尤其嚴重嘅意外之後，政府有責任唔單只係找出成因，更加要睇下以後點樣避免類似嘅意外，或者起碼減低再次發生嘅可能性，但係正如我喺開場發言所講，我哋亦都希望加強安全，唔單只係就住某件事、某次意外，而係因應科技嘅轉變、公眾期望嘅同埋要求嘅轉變，所以我唔會話我哋純粹係被動作反應嘅。雖然我都同意喺一次意外之後當然政府係要有反應喇，發生意外一定係悲慘㗎，因為冇辦法防止到佢發生，但係重要嘅就係點樣可以防止佢再一次發生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，黎先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，鄧樂勤大律師。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我仲有幾條好短嘅問題關於個指引，即係話特別更次係可以做到十四個小時，運房局有冇做過任何研究，可以睇下取消呢一個嘅--完全取消個特別更次嘅話，會點樣影響司機人手方面呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我知道運輸署係有做研究嘅，我就冇--而家冇研究嘅結果喺度，署長而家就喺我身後，如果主席容許嘅話，下一節可以由署長回答，但係有啲做㗎，係，可以問下署長有冇做過任何嘅工作。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）仲有一條問題，你提到司機人手不足係一個長期嘅問題㗎喇，個問題已經喺度咁耐時間，點解冇採取更加即係強烈嘅措施去處理呢個問題呢，因為喺工作時數方面，司機駕駛過勞都會有好大影響，有冇政策去直接研究呢個問題呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我相信多年來巴士公司制訂過唔同嘅措施，譬如話聘請更多女車長、兼職司機，不過我頭先提到喇，而家呢個係敏感話題，之前引入呢個做法就係解決人手不足嘅問題，又或者係提高車長嘅福利，仲有措施去加強本地僱用公司，本地即係本區咁解，即係話住喺巴士廠附近嘅人士可以聘用做車長，因為我理解，好多人就唔想話長途跋涉去當班，然後收工之後又長途跋涉返屋企嘅，佢哋亦都有考慮所有呢啲嘅措施。呢啲係唔同嘅措施喇，另外仲有聘用番退休嘅車長或者退休人士喇，令佢哋再次投入勞動市場，提供適當嘅報酬，譬如話改善佢哋個報酬嘅計算方法同埋係有一啲嘅特別獎金咁。

可能盧教授（羅教授？）就係有諗到呢個輸入外勞嘅問題，喺呢一點，我哋不時都會研究嘅，我哋嘅結論都係不適宜即係喺車長方面引入外勞係不適合㗎，因為車長需要非常--好多時候非常近距離同乘客接觸㗎，所以同乘客能夠以乘客嘅語言去溝通都係好重要。如果話由香港以外引入勞工擔任車長嘅話，就可能會引發乘客同埋外勞司機嘅溝通問題喇。另一點，我哋香港係・右軚嘅，呢一點亦都係比較少見啲嘅。

唔該晒，主席。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想問下黎先生嘅就係喺你嘅開場白--對唔住，因為我有啲感冒所以把聲比較沉，你喺開場白嗰度有講過，就話你每一日就會特別抽樣檢查十四部巴士嘅，咁但係喺街上每日有數以千計嘅巴士，咁可唔可以解釋一下點解係定咗係每日抽查十四部車呢？

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我相信--再次喇，就喺呢條問題上面，署長應該可以係答得更好。我講番嗰個具體嘅數字，即係點解係十四，咁同埋點樣樣達至呢個數字，至於話點解個數字唔係再多啲，你要明白，呢一個係一個突擊嘅檢查。換句話講，我哋當日即時係睇嗰架車嘅，即係之前冇預先嘅通告，冇預先嘅警告㗎，你可以想像一下，其實咁樣樣對於當日巴士嘅調動係會有影響，喺嗰一日嚟講，就係巴士公司就要調動一下嚟到搵另一部巴士去代替嗰部抽中咗嘅巴士㗎，所以喺營運上面嚟到考慮，你都要睇埋呢一點。

另外就係呢一個係喺年檢同埋月檢之外，或者係其他嘅巴士公司係做--或者係需要做嘅檢查以上再做嘅。而且巴士公司自己本身每一日都會有係檢查嘅，喺架巴士係出去服務之前就會做檢查，夜晚係返去車廠嘅時候都有，所以我哋呢一個係突擊係抽樣調查十四部車輛，呢一個係一個制衡嘅保障嘅措施，呢一個就係喺其他嘅所做嘅嘢以外再做嘅，所以我哋認為呢個做法都可以確保啲巴士就係穩妥嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我自己就冇咩嘢問題要問㗎，所以我就係感謝黎先生同埋蔡先生喇。葉女士，雖然你冇發言，但係亦都感謝你出席，我哋非常感謝你哋係協助我哋委員會，讓我哋係更好咁理解嗰個制度點樣運行。

我哋而家就係會小休午飯，我哋會兩點半再返嚟嘅，咁兩點半嘅時候就會聽陳女士嘅發言。

黎以德先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒主席，唔該晒，係，律師。

下午 1 時 04 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 27 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳女士同埋你哋運輸署嘅各位代表，我想邀請你哋坐上前面嚟。或者你哋可以逐個上嚟，我哋會係整隊人一齊坐喺度嘅。鄧樂勤大律師，你可以開始喇，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）各位先生女士，感謝大家提供咗書面嘅意見書畀我哋，交咗畀檢討委員會，亦都感謝大家今日出席，讓我有機會係問下大家一啲口述嘅證供。你哋係冇律師代表嘅，如果有嘅話，一般就會帶你哋係講番嗰啲係口述證供嘅，你哋會唔會係想係作一個口述嘅證供呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我想嘅，我就想喺席前就係作一個陳述。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你開始，唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席先生，委員會嘅成員，午安，感謝你哋畀我哋呢個機會今日喺你哋席前，讓我哋作一個口述證供，呢個就係關乎係運輸署如何去監管同埋監察係香港嘅專營巴士服務，我哋知道你哋係進行呢一個檢討嘅，呢個係喺大埔公路發生係巴士意外慘劇之後所組成嘅一個檢討委員會，係 2 月 10 號所發生嘅。

我自己以及係李萃珍女士同埋其他嘅助理署長，佢哋都係幫手係做呢個監察同埋監管嘅。我哋有陳英傑先生，佢係助理署長／行政及牌照；關翠蘭女士，助理署長／特別職務；同埋邱國鼎先生，佢係總工程師／道路安全及標準研究；同埋李美鳳女士，係總運輸主任／特別職務。我哋樂意係協助檢討委員會，我哋會如實作證，希望就係可以回答係你哋想問嘅問題，亦都係想話畀大家聽我哋作為一個監管機構，係如何工作嘅。

運輸署嘅首長係運輸署署長，佢係負責呢一個係《道路交通條例》，我哋亦都係會係睇呢一個公共交通服務，我哋亦都睇埋係主要嘅係交通基建嘅。我哋係有《公共巴士服務條例》同埋有關嘅規例嘅，呢兩者都係我哋最主要嘅係工具，讓我哋去監管同埋監察香港嘅公共巴士服務。我哋嘅政策嘅目標同埋公眾嘅期望，即係對我哋運輸署方面，都係要確保係專營巴士服務都係適當同埋係有效率嘅，呢一點亦都係喺條例嗰度寫明嘅。

講到安全方面嘅事宜，對我哋嚟講，都係好重要嘅，否則嘅話，就唔能夠係有一個係有效同埋可靠嘅服務。其實我哋喺驗車嘅時候，我哋會睇下有冇毛病，我哋亦都會睇下每一百萬行車公里係有幾多係意外率，呢啲都係我哋每年去評估一下究竟專營巴士公司係如何運作呢一啲都係不言而喻嘅。

為咗確保專營公司佢哋就係安全運作，我哋署方就非常之密切咁留意佢哋嘅表現，我哋會睇下佢哋喺設計、建造嘅階段，去到係投入服務嘅階段，我哋都會定期去檢查同埋檢驗佢哋嘅車輛，呢個都係喺我哋個規管框架底下係有咁嘅

要求嘅。

喺五千九百多部持牌嘅專營巴士，佢哋都係要係通過我哋年檢、月檢，同埋我哋就係每日抽查十四部專營巴士嘅，呢個都係每日十四部，其實我哋每年就總共有三千四百部咁嘅巴士受到檢查嘅。我哋亦都係每個月都檢討一下佢哋嘅安全表現，譬如話我哋去分析嗰啲意外嘅數字，呢一啲都係嚟自一個數據庫嘅。數據庫就係由警方同埋運輸署聯合係輸入嗰個資料同埋製作嘅，如果發現有咩問題或者一啲唔妥嘅地方，我哋都會跟進，都會同有關嘅經營者跟進，要求佢哋作一個解釋同埋作一個補救嘅。我哋亦都會去睇一睇每一間公司每年佢嗰個交通意外嘅趨勢嘅，我哋會睇嗰啲數字嚟到睇佢嗰個表現係如何嘅。

為咗讓公共巴士服務可以得以提供，我哋係批出一啲專營權嘅，而家總共就係有六個專營權係畀咗五家公司嘅，呢啲專營權都係授權係署長就可以係監管巴士公司嘅表現，我哋都係有一啲係服務嘅細節嘅，講及係巴士站嘅地點、票價，以及係每一條路線係要派幾多部巴士，呢啲都係有所指明嘅，其實係專營公司都係有咁嘅責任，就係要提供一啲紀錄，話畀我哋聽究竟有幾多部巴士、有幾多乘客、車程、巴士司機嘅職責、佢哋嘅編制同埋佢哋實際嘅人手，讓我哋署方可以就係根據番係嗰啲已經係批咗出嚟嘅服務表就係去跟進佢哋嘅表現嘅。

其實我哋嘅監管嘅工作都係不斷進行嘅，過往好多年，為咗我哋更好咁樣去監管巴士嘅服務同埋係提高呢一個服務嘅水質同埋安全，其實我哋係同巴士營運商就係有一啲係函件嘅，呢個都係根據係專營權去發出嘅，去確保佢哋就會增加嗰個安全嘅意識、提高個安全嘅水平同埋服務水平嘅。

我哋係有一個批准咗嘅一個服務詳細表，而我哋亦都係關注車長佢哋嘅工作環境，但係車長都係公司嘅僱員，而佢哋嘅僱用條件都係公司嘅人手政策之一嘅。我哋係有一啲行政嘅要求，呢個就係同專營公司係雙方協定咗嘅，我哋署方就係有一啲指引嘅，呢啲指引係關乎係工作、休息同埋用膳時間嘅指引，就係喺 1998 年嘅時候引入嘅，過去咁多年係修正咗係六次嘅，最新嘅係 2018 嘅，就係呢個畀佢哋喺呢個調派係車長去唔同嘅路線嘅時候有所依循嘅。巴士公司係需要經常咁樣樣話畀我哋聽，提供報告，話畀我哋聽究竟佢哋係咪遵從咗呢啲方面嘅指引嘅。另外我哋亦都就去進行調查，去睇下佢哋係咪跟從嗰個指引去做事嘅。

講到巴士車長嗰方面，其實係專營權公司亦都自願咁樣樣係作出一啲服務嘅承諾，亦都為所有新入職嘅車長就去提供呢個培訓，亦都每三年一次為現役嘅車長提供一個培訓嘅。佢哋亦都提供咗培訓方面嘅資訊，係每年咁樣向署方係交呢啲係資料，讓我哋進行呢個監察嘅。呢個當然係喇，如果話署方係每日咁樣去睇住佢哋係咪係跟從所有嘅指引，同埋嗰個資料紀錄係咪每一項都係準確無訛，呢個當然係一個不切實際嘅期望。

講到巴士服務方面，我哋係一個制衡嘅機制嘅，我哋就係透過係現場嘅調

查，亦都會睇下係乘客嘅滿意調查，以及係睇下有冇收到一啲係投訴嘅。

講番呢個安全，其實我哋係監察住專營巴士公司嘅服務。點樣做呢？就係睇下嗰個係意外嘅性質、因素等等嘅。此外，我哋亦都係會對一啲交通黑點進行調查，睇下嗰個趨勢，我哋亦都會同其他嘅商用車輛，係以全港嚟計佢嗰個意外率，係互相比較一下嘅。

我哋有跟進嘅工作嘅，譬如話每季都會有交通安全議會嘅係監察嘅；另外，我亦都會跟進其他嘅提議，我哋亦都有自己嘅觀察，譬如話我哋經常咁樣係同巴士公司去會面，去研究一下有啲咩嘢措施、有啲咩嘢建議係可以就係提升巴士車長佢嗰個駕駛嘅態度同埋係表現嘅。

其實我哋知道巴士嘅車隊同埋乘客量都不斷有所係擴大嘅，我哋知道同十年之前比較就係多咗百分之三點二四嘅，我哋嘅乘客量亦都係去到係三千萬人次嘅，其實係專營權公司係面對一個非常嚴峻嘅人手不足嘅問題嘅，所以無可避免嘅就係巴士公司係要尋求不同嘅方法嚟到去滿意呢個人手嘅需要。譬如話佢哋透過調查一個薪酬，希望係令到新入行嘅人士係覺得更加吸引，亦都將退休年齡係延長，以及係聘請呢個兼職嘅司機嘅。

就係喺一個咁嘅背景底下，我哋運輸署係見到有咁嘅需要去加強一下巴士車長佢嗰個安全駕駛嘅意識，我哋亦都係透過係監察佢哋嗰個培訓嘅安排嘅，包括係新入行嘅車長、在職嘅車長，無論佢係全職定係兼職嘅車長，以及係一啲特別嘅培訓或者一啲係補救嘅培訓，如果發現佢哋就係嗰個駕駛行為係唔好，又或者佢嗰個駕駛嘅工作係因為生病或者其他原因係暫停咗好一段時間嘅，我哋係希望係有一啲新嘅指引，呢個就係關乎係人手培訓方面嘅新嘅指引，希望裏面有一啲基本嘅指引，佢有啲咩嘢元素、係有幾長同埋就係嗰個比重嘅，好讓我哋可以係內部同埋係出面都可以監察住佢哋嘅表現嘅。

我哋已經同巴士公司就係喺頭嗰兩次係召開工作小組會議嘅時候講咗我哋嘅睇法，因為我哋有一個工作小組係喺3月13號同埋係4月30號就係舉行過呢啲會議嘅。我哋就希望係喺呢個 6 月尾嘅時候完成呢個工作小組嘅工作，係關乎安全嘅問題嘅。

講到話有啲乜嘢係設備可以協助車長嘅工作呢？我哋亦都同巴士公司同埋係巴士製造商係研究過，睇下譬如話新嘅巴士係咪所有嘅座位要有安全帶，同埋一個車速限制器，亦都係可以喺落斜嘅時候都做到，以及係有一啲係設備可以監察住車長嘅表現。我哋最終嘅目標都係希望安全駕駛，提高乘客嘅安全。

總括嚟講，我哋繼續係會監察呢一個公共巴士嘅服務，香港嘅公共巴士服務，我哋係會不遺餘力咁樣樣去提升呢一個安全嘅水平。

主席先生，我要作嘅開場白係到此為止，我同埋我嘅同事都係樂意回答大家嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席。陳女士，我哋剛剛係聽到你嘅開場白，你講到呢一個監察嘅工作。我相信你都記得我哋呢個委員會佢嘅職權範圍，其中一項--大家可以或者睇番一個第 2 嗰項，即係關於呢個職權範圍，就係講到監管，即係監管專營巴士公司同埋係監察專營巴士公司。我知道今朝早你都係在席嘅，你都聽到我哋係向局方係問一啲問題，就係關乎係監管嘅工作嘅。我就監管嗰方面亦都係想問一問你嘅，有幾條問題問你嘅。目前嚟講，嗰個監察嘅工作係點樣進行嘅，或者你哋而家都喺度睇緊一啲轉變，因為聽你剛才所講，監察嘅工作係會有啲會有啲改變嘅，係咪呀？

或者首先咁，我嘅理解啱唔啱呢？目前嗰個程序，即係你做監察嗰個程序係咪係咁樣樣嘅呢，或者你可以睇番你嘅書面陳詞，就係 TD-2 第 293 頁嘅，你會見到呢度就有一份文件，就係附錄 L 嘅，就係有一啲嘅由專營巴士公司提交嘅紀錄，呢個就係運輸署交畀委員會嘅文件之一，你係咪已經搵到呢一頁呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）正如即係以我理解，呢個表就係綜合咗各項嘅紀錄，就係呢啲就係專營巴士公司需要定期向運輸署提交嘅資料嘅，有時可能係每個月呈交，有時係每季呈交。喺現時嚟講，可唔可以咁樣講呢？呢個就係你主要監察巴士公司營運嘅方式呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。鄧大律師，呢個係附錄 L 嘅資料，就係符合咗同專營巴士公司簽署協議附錄 II 嘅或者附件 II 嘅要求，呢啲資料就係每月或者係每季呈交嘅。至於關於啲巴士乘客等等嘅資料，呢啲就係巴士公司透過一個電子系統去呈交嘅，而佢哋亦都需要係喺七日內係上載呢啲資料，咁樣運輸署就係可以定期去監察佢哋嘅工作，亦都可以係喺--即係以一個隨時嘅--即係隨時都可以去檢視佢哋嘅情況。

而運輸署署長就係可以定期係好嚴格地去檢視專營巴士公司嘅運作，而呢啲資料係令到我哋可以監察巴士服務、巴士路線、乘客或者係人手調配方面嘅問題嘅。我哋係可以--為咗確保係咪實際係有進行咗呢啲安排，運輸署亦都係有定期係有一啲實地嘅抽查，包括就係喺巴士上面、巴士站嗰度，而呢啲實地嘅檢查就會係以一個隨機嘅形式進行嘅，目的就係確保佢巴士商呈交嘅資料都係正確同埋準確嘅。

除此之外，我哋亦都有做一啲乘客嘅滿意度調查，我哋就會從乘客收集一啲服務水平嘅資料，係比較有系統咁樣做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲實地嘅調查，即係你啱啱所提到呢啲調查，喺呢一個附錄 L 入面有冇提及到㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會話呢啲實地嘅調查其實已經係包含咗附錄 L 嘅大部分項目。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想帶你哋去睇 297 頁嘅，喺文件冊入面。喺右面

1 嗰一欄，你就見到係獨立顧問所進行嘅調查，呢個係咪另外一項調查嚟嘅呢？

2 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個就係一項特別調查嚟嘅，我哋就係委託咗一個獨立嘅
3 公司係去檢視呢一個指引嘅執行嘅。

4 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會而家考慮嘅點就係即係究竟係呢一個附錄上面所-
5 -即係有啲咩嘢係喺呢個附錄嘅進行嘅基礎上面去做嘅呢？陳美寶女士：（經傳
6 譯員）你講到呢啲突擊檢查，而突擊檢查就包括一啲突擊嘅檢查同埋每月嘅檢
7 查，而巴士營運商係需要每月進行檢查嘅，但係根據法定嘅規定，運輸署係有
8 監管巴士車隊嘅運作同埋狀況嘅，而運輸署有進行每年同埋每月嘅檢查。

9 但係除此之外，為咗確保我哋監管嘅工作係穩妥，而我哋驗車嘅隊伍亦都係
10 會進行一啲突擊檢查，就係每間巴士公司嘅車隊平均係會檢查十四架巴士嘅，
11 呢個係唔會事先通知，目的係確保除一啲常規檢查之外，因為巴士公司可能已
12 經準備好接受呢啲常規檢查，我哋除此之外，亦都係會有突擊檢查去確保呢啲
13 巴士嘅狀態係良好嘅。

14 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你講到一啲定期嘅實地嘅一啲檢查，呢個係咩嘢意思
15 呢？

16 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係關於服務嘅提供，包括係嗰個巴士嘅車程，喺某
17 啲嘅巴士站，上車或者落車嘅乘客嘅數目、個別巴士嘅車長調配，同埋有冇任
18 何嘅延誤或者係人手調配上面有冇變更等等，同埋原本嘅計劃有冇任何嘅出
19 入。

20 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個係會進行呢啲調查？

21 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係運輸署嘅。或者我可以講多少少詳情究竟實際係點樣進
22 行嘅。

23 李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）因為資源問題，我哋亦都係將呢啲調查服務係外判畀某一
24 啲嘅公司嘅，但係有時我哋係會睇下實際嘅情況係點樣，去睇下需唔需要係回
25 應某啲區議會嘅要求等等，而呢啲服務就係外判畀一啲獨立嘅承辦商嘅。

26 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇書面嘅紀錄㗎？

27 李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

28 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅書面紀錄有冇呈交畀檢討委員會？

29 關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）正如署長所講，呢啲全部都係同服務有關嘅，就係睇下呢
30 啲即係實際提供嘅服務同運輸署署長所指定嘅係咪一致。

31 MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋未見過呢啲資料，其實有冇--係咪--如果我哋想
32 睇呢啲資料，係咪有呢？

33 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）文件冊入我哋冇包括到呢啲資料嘅，但係如果有需要，我

啲可以提供嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）陳女士，你啱啱講到，你提到就係道路安全議會進行每月嘅檢查，係咪？或者係即係喺監管方面。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係每季進行嘅，每季進行。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀多啲詳情我哋呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺道路安全同埋標準科就係由邱國鼎先生係處理嘅，佢哋係會負責係去睇一啲交通意外嘅數字，呢啲就係由警方同運輸署共同提供嘅。而工作嘅目標就係去監管道路或者交通意外嘅成因同埋詳情，而佢哋係每季係向道路安全議會提交一個報告嘅，喺報告入面，佢哋係會分析喺呢啲意外之中有冇一啲共通點，目的就係可以提供一啲改善或者解決嘅措施，而範疇係包括道路安全、車輛安全或者係人為因素嘅，包括司機嘅行為或者譬如話會唔會有行人係以一啲好危險嘅方式過馬路等等，呢啲就會呈交畀道路安全議會，然後我哋係會有相應嘅跟進行動嘅。

如果有任何關於專營巴士公司嘅分析，特別係關於車長嘅行為或者表現，相關嘅資料亦都係會交畀運輸署嘅道路同埋鐵路科嘅，而我哋亦都係會提醒佢哋去提醒巴士車長有咩嘢需要注意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰個謄本入面有冇提到呢？就係喺呢一個跟進嘅行動，就係包括每季嘅報告同埋係由道路安全議會係監察嘅，道路安全議會係咪獨立於運輸署？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，道路安全議會係獨立於運輸署嘅。我想更正一下頭先頭先所講嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Yes, please.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）就頭先話運輸署係會就住呢啲交通意外進行每季嘅報告，同埋會分析佢哋嘅嚴重性同埋性質，然後我哋係會向道路安全議會提交每季嘅報告。而我哋分析所衍生嘅建議，就係會包括道路安全嘅檢討、車輛安全嘅改善同埋定期係同專營巴士公司會面，就係會討論車長嘅行為嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你向道路安全議會提供嘅報告就係根據巴士公司向你提供嘅資料，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）基本上係根據運輸署道路安全及標準科進行嘅分析，係會從一個共同嘅資料庫度係去獲取一啲資料嘅，所以呢個來源係嚟自警方同埋運輸署，唔係來自巴士公司嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就住運輸署監察巴士公司，除咗係即係呢...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係有自己嘅資料庫，我哋並唔係只係依賴巴士公司嘅

資料嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想請你講一講除咗--即係喺巴士公司提供嘅資料之上，你就有做咗啲咩嘢或者提供咩嘢資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）如果有啲嚴重嘅意外或者致命嘅意外，一啲相關嘅巴士嘅公司就會將呢啲資料就入咗落呢個資料庫，而運輸署同埋警方係會共同係維護呢個資料庫，亦都係會定期監察呢個資料庫，同埋係會分析呢一個資料庫嘅。佢哋係會獨立去進行呢啲資料，而唔會係依靠巴士公司提供嘅資料嘅，因為巴士公司就住意外嘅報告可能係會遲一啲先至出現，或者可能係佢哋每年嘅報告之中先至會提及嘅，所以呢個資料庫係由警方同埋運輸署共同維護。而我哋每季係會呈交畀道路安全議會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你係要依賴警方嘅資料，我嘅問題就係運輸署有啲咩嘢工作係獨立去進行去幫助啲巴士公司，而唔係去依賴其他嘅資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會邀請邱國鼎先生我哋嘅總工程師去回應嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Thank you.

邱先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席、律師。正如署長所講，我哋係由一個電腦系統直接係去取得啲資料，而呢啲資料係由警方輸入嘅，而我哋係可以攞到呢個系統上嘅資料嘅，我哋係會進行一啲監管同埋分析，包括係一啲趨勢、意外嘅數目、嚴重性、車輛嘅類別同埋成因等等。

而意外嘅成因可能係同駕駛有關、環境、車輛等等有關嘅，如果我哋發現有一啲共通嘅成因或者係觀察，我哋係會每季向道路安全議會匯報，而議會嘅成員係包括唔同局嘅官員，包括係運房局、教育局、警務處、路政署同埋一啲其他外在嘅成員，譬如話由醫委會、道路安全協會、香港汽車會等等。

而道路安全議會就會係訂立政策同埋去執行一啲嘅改善措拖，譬如話係訂立新嘅法例、進行一啲宣傳工作等等。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你剛才講嘅就係意外嗰方面嘅情況，但係我問嘅就係一般嘅係營運上嘅情況，我呢度就睇到你哋有啲文件嘅，如果我嘅理解冇錯，你就係話運輸署會做唔同嘅工作嚟到睇下巴士公司佢嘅運作嘅，你頭先有提過係突擊檢查，每日就有十四部，呢個我哋明白嘅。另外你亦都有提過，就係話嚟自係乘客調查嘅意見，你亦都有提過話定期係實地進行呢個調查，可唔可以係詳細啲講一講係乜嘢一回事呢？邊個去做嘅呢？同埋會得出啲咩嘢結論呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我係請李女士去講。

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒主席。由於法例有咁嘅要求，就講到話係公交營運商佢哋嘅服務表現係有規定嘅，署長嗰方面就要求有時間表、路線、係巴

士站等等嘅，我哋做啲咩呢？一係我哋喺總站嗰度進行調查，譬如話我哋喺某一條路線，我哋就會派啲人去到總站嗰度，就會睇睇佢幾多點鐘開車、睇下巴士公司係咪跟番個時間表，另外我哋亦都會睇下有幾多乘客上車；咁喺另一個車站，我哋亦都會睇埋嗰個到達時間，即係話佢用咗幾長嘅時間，亦都知道究竟有冇延誤等等，呢啲係總站同埋車站嘅調查。

另外亦都有車上嘅調查嘅，我哋有調查人員上咗車上面，每一個站佢就會記錄低有幾多人落車、有幾多人上車，我哋會有啲詳細嘅營運嘅資料，好重要嘅，因為一直嚟講，我哋一直係要確保巴士公司係跟番嗰個時間表嘅，因為好多時都有投訴，就話有脫班，我哋就係要係檢查嗰啲報告，然後同巴士公司跟進。

另外就係一個規劃嘅角度，好多時係有一個要求，就話要改嗰啲路線，將啲路線合併等等，所以喺規劃嗰方面亦都要靠呢一啲數據。呢啲數據，我哋喺巴士公司嗰度有嘅，但係我哋都想去核實一下同埋我哋亦都需要一啲更新嘅、更合時嘅資料畀我哋進行規劃。呢啲係啲紀錄，我哋亦都有實地嘅調查，去睇下佢嗰個系數，讓我哋係知道點樣樣規劃，亦都可以進行呢一個服務表現嘅監察。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當然好多呢一方面嘅工作未必係同安全有關嘅，我就想問運輸署有冇獨立咁樣樣就巴士公司所提交嘅紀錄去睇一睇呢，或者獨立咁樣去查核一下，去睇一睇佢哋喺安全方面所做嘅工夫，譬如話培訓車長，定抑或你完全係倚賴巴士公司講啲咩畀你聽呢，定抑或你自己會自行獨立咁樣樣去睇睇佢嗰個係安全要求有冇做到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）讓我嘗試回答一下。講到安全有關嘅方面，其實我亦都提咗兩點嘅，九個重要嘅指標裏面有兩個，一個就係話每一次檢查巴士係有幾多個係安全上面嘅問題，另外就係每日係抽查十四部巴士嘅，或者我請呢一個係助理署長去補充。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰方面唔使喇，我哋明㗎喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）另外係有幾多巴士係涉及意外？即係每百萬行車公里嘅涉及意外率，呢個都係我哋睇住嘅一個係數據。我哋會睇巴士公司所提供嘅數據，譬如話究竟每一百萬行車公里有幾多部巴士涉及意外，然後我哋會逐年逐年咁去比較嗰個表現。

培訓亦都係好緊要嘅，巴士公司亦都有提過，巴士公司就話係車長嘅培訓係重要嘅，係要確保係車長有足夠嘅培訓。喺呢一方面，巴士公司自願咁樣樣就係作出兩個服務承諾，一個就係話所有新入職嘅車長係有培訓，另外就係所有在職嘅車長都會係每三年再會有一次嘅培訓。

巴士公司提供咗一啲資料畀我哋嘅，喺呢一方面，喺佢哋每年嗰個計劃嗰度都有話畀我哋聽係點樣樣去落實佢哋自願作出嘅呢一個服務承諾，我哋會睇佢

啲呢啲資料，而且亦都每年去檢視佢哋嘅表現嘅。

我要係強調一點，運輸署並唔會係再自己獨立咁進行去查核嘅，因為呢啲培訓嘅工作唔係源自嗰個係專營權或者係嗰個條例嘅，其實就係巴士公司係自願咁樣樣係提出呢一個就跟進我哋同佢哋講係如何去加強巴士安全。其實喺法例上面就係冇咁嘅要求，專營權嗰度亦都冇咁嘅要求嘅，所以到目前為止，我哋運輸署就係冇抽樣調查、突擊檢查或者係自己獨立咁去調查佢哋嗰個車長方面嘅培訓。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你就冇好似條例要求嗰度咁講話有任何嘅指示或者要求，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：It's all done on a voluntary basis?

陳美寶女士：No direction or requirement.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我等陣間亦都會再睇番呢一個表裏面嘅資料，但係我想而家問你嘅，就係話運輸署有冇獨立咁樣樣去再跟進呢？即係除咗佢哋所交畀你嘅紀錄之外，有冇再自己獨立咁去睇佢哋嘅安全表現呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，等我補充一下。署長剛才提過呢個突擊檢查，呢個就係檢查啲車輛嘅。另外巴士公司今時今日嘅巴士都要接受每年嘅檢查同埋維修，然後我哋運輸署就會再檢查嘅，所以可以話係一個獨立嘅檢查，呢個亦都係同係抽樣調查係不同嘅。運輸署的而且確係會有一個獨立嘅資料，因為我哋自己係有由自己嘅驗車主任去進行呢個檢查嘅，呢個就係喺車廠嗰度做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，好，或者係睇番呢個附件 L，講到係巴士公司，專營巴士公司佢哋提交啲乜嘢嘅紀錄同埋資料嘅。呢度可以見到，你就講番話--即係睇番係條例嘅邊一條或者係咪跟呢個專營權，你另外亦都有講到話有咩嘢跟進嘅行動。我睇過嗰啲係跟進嘅行動，運輸署嘅跟進行動，我就想去睇下，你有冇做一啲工作去進行一個調查等等。我首先睇嘅就係 296 頁嗰度，屘二嗰格，嗰度有第二段，嗰度就話獨立嘅顧問進行一個調查，睇到嗰句未呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。其實下一個格仔，即係話 296 頁最底下嗰度亦都有一樣咁嘅講法，落去 297 頁頂頭嗰個格亦都有咁講，我相信呢度三處嘅地方都係講番同一個調查，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以再講多一啲，究竟呢度所講嘅獨立顧問所進行嘅調查係邊一個顧問同埋究竟佢做啲咩嘢調查？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我亦都再想請李女士去答嘅。

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。呢啲調查就睇下係專營巴士公司佢哋有冇跟從我哋嘅指引，呢個就係關乎巴士車長嘅安排嘅指引嘅。其實唔係最新嗰份，而係就係有--之前嗰個係四個部分，主要就係講嗰個休息嘅時間同埋工作嘅時間嘅。

呢一類嘅調查嗰個調查人員就會隨機咁樣抽查一啲司機，然後嗰個調查人員就會整日咁跟住嗰個司機嘅。我哋會睇住究竟佢係咪真係得到嗰個休息時間呢？有咁長嘅時間呢？亦都會睇埋嗰個駕駛嘅時間--嗰個更次裏面嘅駕駛時間係咪冇超過嗰個上限，所以我哋會跟住嗰個司機嘅。

至於話兩更之間嘅休息時間，我哋會睇下佢簽到同埋走嘅時候簽名嗰個時間，所以就會有兩隊唔同嘅調查人員去做嘅。呢啲調查人員係點呢？喺邊度搵番嚟嘅呢？我哋會係公開招標，搵一啲合資格嘅顧問幫我哋做嘅，我哋就搵最適合嘅顧問公司同我哋做，就係請佢哋進行呢個調查嘅。我哋有呢啲嘅資料，我哋就會睇到佢哋究竟係咪有跟從嗰個指引嘅。其實嗰個遵從律多年嚟都幾高嘅，我哋見到有少量就係未有遵從嘅個案，我哋會問公司點解有咁情況，好多時都係因為一啲佢哋控制唔到嘅因素嘅。我要指出就呢個係勞工密集嘅一項工作嚟嘅，我哋係有萬二個係巴士司機嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Sorry, you do 12,000?

李萃珍女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話萬二個，「萬二」係乜嘢？

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）我哋抽查嘅，將呢六間公司縱合嚟到一齊睇，總共就有萬二個調查嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你即係同萬二個...

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，係一千二百，每年係一千二百個司機，我哋睇一千二百個司機。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時開始做呢啲工作？第一次搵調查人員去做呢啲工作係幾時呢？

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）我諗起碼係喺 2010 年有呢個指引嘅時候就開始做嘅，之前我就唔係太肯定。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）署長，而家請你睇呢個 297 頁，嗰頁中間嗰度有一個方格嘅，嗰度亦都係講係獨立顧問進行調查，係咪就係你較早時候所提及嘅嗰個調查呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我可以確認，係講番同一個調查。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另外喺 299 頁，呢個就係乘客聯絡小組嘅報告嚟嘅，佢講到就係派一啲代表去出席乘客聯絡小組嘅會議，你可唔可以講多啲詳情？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我想邀請我哋嘅助理署長係去講一講。

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）主席，而每間巴士專營公司會每兩個月係安排一次乘客聯絡小組嘅會議嘅，當佢決定咗小組會議嘅地點之後，就會通知我哋，而我哋就會派代表去出席呢啲會議嘅。我哋會監察呢啲專營巴士公司就會係即係好妥當地進行呢一啲嘅小組會議。喺呢啲會面之後，佢哋亦都係會將呢啲紀錄就會呈交畀我哋作規劃嘅用途嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思係咪有兩組嘅資料，有一套就係由你嘅代表去做，另外一組就係由巴士公司去準備嘅？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）我哋只會派一位代表去出席呢啲會議嘅，因為我哋唔可以個別去問晒每一個乘客意見嘅，所以我哋會係聽乘客嘅意見，我哋會自己去做一啲筆記，即係我哋唔會有一個好正式嘅紀錄，但係我哋係--即係當我哋嘅同事返番去公司之後，就會向上級匯報嘅，但係雖然巴士公司係會有晒紀錄，而佢哋事後係會向我哋呈交嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話會有兩組嘅紀錄，係咪呀？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）之前有冇呈交呢啲紀錄畀我哋，可唔可以之後畀我哋？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）通常會有幾多人係出席呢一啲乘客聯絡小組嘅會議呀？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個係視乎小組會議嘅地點喺邊，如果係一啲比較受歡迎嘅地點進行，可能會有二十幾個乘客。

MR DUNCAN：Who determines the make-up of the passenger liaison group?

關翠蘭女士：Pardon me？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個係--即係由邊個去決定乘客聯絡小組嘅成員係--嘅組成係由邊個決定嘅呢？係咪由運輸署選擇嘅呢，定係由巴士公司去選擇嘅呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）佢係由巴士公司去決定嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我就問完呢一份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺我哋繼續之前，我想知道呢啲乘客聯絡小組會唔會提及到巴士安全嘅問題呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）呢個好視乎乘客嘅意見，係唔會有一啲特定嘅議題去規限

啲乘客嘅，乘客係可以表達任何嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我個問題應該係咁問，啲乘客有冇曾經提到巴士安全嘅問題呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）喺我印象中，大部分嘅意見都係同一啲車費、優惠同埋服務有關。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪巴士安--即係冇提及過巴士安全嘅問題呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）係好少嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。係，鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想講另外一個話題，今日下午我哋有講到呢個巴士車長工作、休息及用膳時間指引，你嘅同事就提到 2010 年嘅指引，我哋知道呢個指引最近亦都係有修訂，喺今年 2 月係有一個修訂本嘅，我想講番你喺 5 月 4 號提交嘅額外嘅陳述，你呢個就係第 157 頁，你回應委員會嘅問題之中，喺 D 段，你就提到運輸署就係從一個巴士車長嘅聯盟係收到一項嘅建議，就係表示指引係應該修訂嘅。然後就講到運輸署係有同專營巴士公司同埋另外一個巴士車長嘅工會係傾過呢個意見，而兩者都係反對呢個建議嘅。喺同呢個提建議人嘅討論之後，就係決定唔會修訂指引。喺 2015 年之前，係咪已經收到一啲要求或者係建議，係去修訂啲指引，即係運輸署有冇收到呢啲建議，你有冇印象？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）首先訂立指引嘅過程係好漫長嘅，係由 1993 年開始，就係當時我哋去開始訂立一啲指引，係以自願性質係畀一啲巴士公司去遵從嘅。係到 1998 年先至正式係頒布啲指引，係要求巴士公司係跟隨嘅。而喺 98 年頒布指引之後，指引已經係修訂咗六次，喺咁多年嚟，一直都係有唔同嘅意見，就係嚟自一啲職員嘅工會，就係希望係改善工作嘅環境同埋縮短車長嘅工作時間。

我哋亦都係明白一直都--即係外間都係希望專營巴士嘅服務得以提升嘅，所以根據我哋嘅書面陳述，我哋提到 15 年 3 月呢一個就係一個例子係去說明職員工會一直都係有一個確切嘅要求，希望係改善車長嘅工作條件同埋工時嘅。唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你撳去文件冊 SEC 1 號，我想你睇第 437 頁，呢份係立法會交通事務委員會嘅會議紀錄嘅，就係 2012 年 11 月 27 號，你見唔見到呀？請你撳去第 441 頁，喺最底嗰度，你就會見到，佢就話主席就話一個喺柴灣，喺 2012 年 11 月 19 號嘅嚴重交通意外係涉及兩架巴士同埋一架的士，係引致公--即係大眾嘅憂慮，就係對於呢啲專業司機嘅健康同埋駕駛態度嘅，特別係巴士車長。

請你撳去第 442 頁，第 2 段就有提及運房局局長同埋運輸署署長，就係簡單介紹事件，就係包括係專營巴士公司車長嘅健康檢查同埋工時安排。

而喺第 447 頁第 24 段，局長係承諾政府係會檢視呢啲指引嘅，就會同相關嘅持份者合作，包括係專營巴士公司同埋佢哋嘅工會。佢表示運輸署係有同一啲主要嘅巴士車長工會係溝通，去討論嗰一宗意外所引申嘅問題。

而第 454 頁，呢個就係由主席去總結，佢就感謝各方出席會議，而佢表示議員一般都係對巴士公司車長嘅健康檢查方面係有擔憂嘅，而佢認為政府係需要檢視各個方面嘅，包括係改善一個現有嘅交通網絡。

喺 2012 年至到深水埗交通意外，即係 17 年嗰宗意外，期間係冇任何修訂過，即係嗰份指引。而政府係幾時或者係點樣決定去--即係當時係修訂指引嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以畀一個比較一般嘅答案，然後我就會交畀關女士去講啲詳情嘅。講番 12 年嘅交通意外慘劇，當時有兩項主要嘅跟進行動嘅，第一係就係提升巴士車長健康檢查嘅要求，喺嗰一宗意外之後，我哋係要求所有嘅巴士公司係去提升呢一個健康檢查嘅要求，除咗每年為 50 歲或以上嘅車長進行健康檢查之外，就住一啲已經申報有重大健康問題嘅車長亦都會再進行年檢嘅，就令到車長嘅健康檢查更加頻密，同埋亦都係會包括車長嘅心臟檢查嘅。我哋都係要求巴士車長，係為 54 至 60 歲嘅車長安排健康檢查。

至於檢討指引方面，我係明白當時運輸署係有檢視巴士車長工時嘅要求，但係最後係冇--即係喺當時係冇修訂到指引，但係運輸署係有檢視指引，去睇下有冇任何部分係需要改善嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你表示就係有兩項嘅跟進行動，就喺 12 年 11 月之後嘅交通意外，第一項係檢視呢個健康檢查嘅安排，第二就係？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）第二項就係檢視指引，但係當時係冇進行任何嘅修訂嘅。多謝主席。

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）我想補充一下，呢個工時指引對上修訂係 2010 年，當時係有一啲新嘅指引，就係關於用膳時間嘅。而我哋喺 2010 年頒布指引嘅時候，我哋係允許巴士公司就係喺兩年之後先至係實行呢個用膳時間嘅指引，即係話喺 2012 年係全面實施咗相關嘅指引，至於話點解 2013 年檢討之後指引冇修改，我諗我而家係唔能夠準確咁去回答，畀少少時間我哋返去查核一下，有可能就係剛剛先至係喺 2012 年嘅下半年先至係全面實施對上一次嗰個係修訂嘅要求，有可能就係話想有一啲時間去睇睇係專營巴士公司佢嗰個表現，畀多啲時間睇咗佢哋表現，然後再作呢個修訂都唔定嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。陳女士，我諗今朝早我向係局方提問嘅時候，你都在場嘅，當時我哋就問過，就點解呢啲指引就純粹只係指引嚟嘅呢？就唔係成為一部係規例呢？因為條例度係有講，就呢一啲事宜係可以訂定規例嘅，你就呢一個問題，你可唔可以幫到手呢？可唔可以講出嗰個原因點解呢啲只係指引，就唔係一個規例呢？甚至乎唔係一個指示，亦都唔係一個要求呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）讓我嘗試，我今朝都在場嘅，我亦都係理解剛才你喺咩情況之下提出呢個問題，你就係話其實係咪應該用一個更好嘅方法去實施呢一個要求呢？譬如話作為法例嘅一部分，又或者作為一個專營權嘅條文嘅一個部分，讓我係從呢一個係營運同埋係一個監察嘅角度去到睇。

講到呢個工作時間嘅指引，佢係一個好長嘅歷史，亦都係一個不斷演化嘅係情況，呢個指引已經經過多次嘅修訂，指引裏面所列出嘅要求，用咁嘅形式嘅好處就係我哋可以更適時咁樣去進行檢討同埋修訂。如果係喺條例或者規例裏面訂明嘅話，就冇咁容易去檢討同埋修訂。當然我雖然咁講，我亦都覺得我哋應該不遺餘力咁樣樣去係檢討我哋嘅條例，同埋係如果有需要，去修訂。

佢係指引，指引佢可以更有彈性，亦都可以係因應當時嘅情況係加以係提升。其實專營巴士嘅服務係非常之勞工密集嘅，而且亦都有好多規範性嘅要求，係要求巴士公司喺服務裏面係做得到嘅，喺呢一個角度，其實我哋希望作出一個平衡，一方面希望佢哋係根據嗰個專營權嘅要求，提供一個巴士嘅服務，另一方面，我哋亦都希望能夠係提升係車長佢哋嘅工作嘅條件。

指引，佢而家係指引嚟嘅，但係喺我哋嘅係意見書嗰度就講咗，喺行政上，我哋亦都要求係專營巴士公司話畀我哋聽佢哋有冇遵從呢一個指引，而且我哋亦都獨立咁樣去調查啲指引有冇得到遵從，嚟到確保係巴士公司係有遵守嗰個嘅指引嘅。

而呢個指引係點樣制訂出嚟呢？呢個就係長時間雙方商討係同意之後得出嘅結果嚟嘅，所以我哋就覺得喺呢一方面嚟講，都可以作為一個合約嘅要求，因為呢個係政府同巴士公司之間不斷嘅對話而得出嘅成果。

另一方面，同巴士公司所簽訂嘅專營權，28(1)(a)條嗰度就有講嘅，就話巴士公司係需要係提供一啲紀錄嘅，呢個係跟乎就係專營權附表 II 嗰度提供嗰啲文件嘅，呢一個附件 II 嘅(l)嗰項，我哋其實喺專營權嗰度係講咗，專營公司係要畀資料、畀紀錄我哋，包括以下：就係有幾多係--即係我哋係署長所講及嘅巴士司機嘅係百分比，讓我哋知道佢哋嗰個工作時間、佢個休息時間等等，而呢個都係同專營公司同意咗嘅指引。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我想打斷一下，可唔可以攞其中一份嘅專營權嘅文件嘅 21(sic)(1)(a)嗰度出嚟呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以嘅，可以。THB-2，睇番 THB-2 嗰個文件夾裏面嘅相關嘅頁數，係 137 頁，佢係講到 169 頁，陳女士係講 169 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係 158 頁，係咪呀？嗰個第 28 條，然後第 168 頁就係附件 II 嘅。係，打番出嚟，咁可能幫到你答呢個問題，係咪呀？陳女士。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）似乎呢一度就係要求去提出呢一個係紀錄，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes。Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就唔係...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔係一位法律嘅專家，不過我就想嘗試去解釋我哋點樣樣引用嗰個條文，喺實際上點樣係運作。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）署長--我作為署長，係要運用我嘅權力嚟到確保係巴士公司係會係根據我哋所要求嘅百分比嘅樣本就係提供嗰啲紀錄嘅，呢一個就係睇番呢一個係(l)嗰項嘅，即係話如果我哋認為巴士公司係冇或者無法提供嗰個係紀錄，即係根據我哋呢度(l)呢項嘅要求去做，又讓我哋就感到懷疑、有疑問，究竟呢一個係專營權公司係咪真係提供一個適當而有效率嘅服務，我哋亦都可以採取係相關、適當嘅行動，針對呢間公司。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話你有一個彈性，一方面係有個彈性，另一方面，睇嚟就係你亦都可能冇嗰個規管嘅力度。12A，條文 12A 嗰度就講係可以施加呢個經濟罰則，就變咗係無法做到，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會咁講，佢就唔係構成一個法定嘅責任，即係話如果巴士公司喺冇遵從指引，嗰度就唔係構成一個係法定嘅責任，就唔會話即時就係引致就係 12A 嗰度係有問題，就話可以係要求佢交一個經濟嘅罰則。不過喺呢個附件 II 嘅(l)嗰項，我哋有呢一點，就係想確保巴士公司係會係應我哋嘅要求，提供嗰個資料，而且我亦都可以進行呢個獨立嘅調查嘅，根據佢畀我哋嘅數據。我哋亦都會喺評估究竟嗰個巴士公司係咪提供咗適當而效率嘅服務嘅時候，亦都可以以此作為一個根據。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想睇番有關嘅條文嘅，我諗你面前都有嘅，104 頁，有關嘅條文喺 104 頁嗰度，呢個就係講及嗰個遠期計劃，12A，睇到嘛？

陳美寶女士：Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問你呢個問題，署方係喺呢個遠期計劃嗰度，會要求專營巴士公司講及安全方面嘅嘢會去到咩嘢程度嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個遠期計劃其實就喺法例嗰度係有一個係條文嘅，遠期嘅計劃係作為一個規劃嘅工具，而佢基本上就會講及係呢一個係巴士公司營運者佢嘅--係喺專營權底下究竟要提供咩嘢服務嚟到滿足嗰個要求嘅。我相信喺我哋嘅文件夾嗰度都有嗰一個內容表係講咗出嚟嘅，喺嗰個遠期計劃嗰度，其中一個項目就係關乎巴士安全嘅，其實呢個係睇番過往我哋分析咗係涉及專營巴士嘅巴士交通意外，亦都係完善我哋同巴士公司就一啲重要嘅事項商討嘅結果，呢啲都係關乎安全事宜嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你等等，我諗佢哋嘗試係打番嗰個目錄表出嚟嘅，嗰度就係

有--你話係有一部分係關乎安全嘅，或者我哋搵番嗰一個部分出嚟先。呢個係咪嚟自運輸署發畀城巴公司嘅一封函件裏面嘅內容呀？鄧樂勤大律師，喺邊度呢？喺佢哋嘅意見書嘅邊一度呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係喺 1038 頁，TD-4，1035。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度你就係話--係咪咁樣樣㗎？你寫封信畀嗰啲公司，就話「遠期計劃，你要包括以下各點」？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔係，係陳女士就提及就係話有一個索引嗰頁，就講及係遠期計劃應該包括邊一啲係要點，我諗呢個啱啱調轉，係咪呀？或者去我哋 TD-4 1035 嗰頁。呢個係目錄嗰頁，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）睇番 1038，嗰度有啲標題嘅，其中一個標題就係巴士安全，我諗你剛才係講呢一樣，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你未有向委員會係提交嗰個計劃，你話因為裏面就係涉及一啲商業敏感資料嘅。可唔可以單單就嗰一段係抽出嚟畀我哋睇呢？淨係想睇嗰個安全嗰部分。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可以跟進一下嘅。我哋要確保係得到巴士公司同意我哋發放呢一個部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你未落去之前，不如我哋逐步逐步咁去睇喇，好讓其他人士都知道，否則嘅話，佢哋跟唔到你喇。你頭先講到話係攞唔到呢一份文件，我就睇番係上個星期五即係畀我嘅文件，就係冇頁數嘅，就係 22 段 34(A)條嘅，佢就話所有嘅巴士經營公司都係向運輸署呈交一個五年計劃，因為呢個計劃就會有一啲商業上敏感嘅資料等等、等等嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想大家睇番文件冊 TD-1 嘅第 164 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。即係呢個就係你所問嘅問題，係咪？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇錯。陳女士，我就想畀你睇番運輸署嘅回應，佢就話因為呢個五年計劃就係有個別巴士公司嘅商業敏感資料，營運商係同意向獨立檢討委員會係呈交呢啲資料，即係條件就係委員會唔會向公眾係披露呢啲資料。其實委員會所需要嘅就只係嗰個計劃嘅關於安全嗰一部分嘅啫，或者我就再問一次，可唔可以向巴士公司係去尋求佢哋嘅同意，去向委員會呈交嗰一部分嘅資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋向委員會嘅回應，即係正如而家螢幕所顯示，就係我哋已經係諮詢巴士公司佢哋係咪願意去披露一個五年計劃，但係睇番--即係根據

鄧大律師嘅意見，我哋係會再次係去徵詢巴士公司去尋求佢哋同意係咪可以去提交關於巴士安全部分嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪委員會可以會直接問佢哋去攞呢個資料呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你睇番文件冊 TD-5 第 1599 頁嘅，呢個就係新大嶼山巴士公司嘅五年計劃，而後面嗰一頁，你睇番第 1600 頁，呢個就係目錄，你見唔見到呢一頁目錄？

陳美寶女士：Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就冇提及過安全嘅問題嘅，即係就住呢一間專營巴士公司。我嘅問題就係運輸署對專營巴士公司要求佢哋喺五年計劃入面關於安全嘅部分個要求係點嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）就住呢一頁目錄，第一部分即係路線發展計劃已經係包含咗安全嘅問題㗎喇，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以直接回應我嘅問題呀？運輸署係會要求專營巴士公司提供啲咩嘢詳情呢，就住安全要求方面？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會請李女士去回答呢個問題。

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。喺《公共巴士服務條例》底下，必須要巴士公司係要準備一個五年嘅計劃，所以呢個係包括一啲巴士或者車隊嘅維護、安全等等，而佢亦都係需要提供一啲運輸署署長需要嘅資料。我同事啱啱已經解釋到，我哋有分析到一啲交通意外嘅資料，當我哋每年進行呢項工作嘅時候，我哋亦都會分析啲意外嘅趨勢，我哋係會要求巴士公司喺呢個五年計劃入面係提供佢哋自己對交通意外嘅分析，同埋佢哋要話畀我哋知佢哋會進行一啲咩嘢改善嘅措施，喺呢個前提底下，我哋係要求佢哋喺五年計劃入面包括呢啲資料，所以而家每一間專營巴士公司都會係包括咗佢哋自己對交通意外嘅分析，同埋亦都話畀我哋知佢哋會做咩嘢改善措施嘅。

當然我哋係會隨住時間，亦都係會增加一啲要求，例如公眾對環保巴士係有一個要求，所以我哋喺五年計劃之中亦都要求有一個環境嘅章節。

署長啱啱講到巴士公司亦都係有自願地去提供一啲表現嘅指標或者目標，有一啲同安全或者係培訓有關嘅，呢個就係我哋即係處理呢一啲五年計劃嘅方式。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你係今晚係去接觸呢啲巴士公司去要求佢哋攞呢啲安全嘅資料，係會好有幫助嘅，就唔使--即係我哋聽日就可以問。

陳美寶女士：Thank you. We can do that.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺有一啲嘅五年計劃入面係有提過呢個問題嘅。即係喺文件冊

TD-5 第 1604 頁，或者 1602 頁，我哋有見到第五--即係喺呢一個計劃中嘅第 5 章，就係有巴士安全，就係喺 1604 頁。而龍運巴士嘅五年計劃之中，亦都係有多一啲詳情嘅，喺 1607 頁，就係有一章係關於安全檢討嘅，就總共有八項嘅，喺安全檢討底下，係咪所有嘅項目都係回應運輸署嘅要求呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會嘗試答呢個問題。根據法定要求或者係專營權嘅要求，我哋冇特別係指明對培訓或者係某啲措施嘅一啲--去訂明我哋嘅要求，而專營巴士公司係需要每年去檢討佢哋嘅表現同埋每季亦都會有一個道路安全嘅檢討，我哋係要求專營巴士公司喺佢哋嘅五年計劃入面係包含一個安全嘅章節，佢哋係需要分析佢哋自己嘅意外嘅資料，同埋亦都係要提供一啲巴士行車安全嘅改善建議嘅，呢啲係同車輛安全、巴士維護、車長嘅行為同埋培訓等等嘅範疇都係有關係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋講講培訓嘅問題，你提到喺經營權文件入面係冇特別針對培訓係有要求，或者係--而運輸署亦都係唔會有特定嘅要求去講培訓--即係要做一啲乜嘢培訓嘅，我咁理解啱唔啱呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以咁講，運輸署係冇發出任何嘅指示畀呢一啲嘅專營巴士公司嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，我哋係冇提供指引。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以呢啲就係由巴士公司決定嘅。

陳美寶女士：Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪每間巴士公司嘅做法都唔同呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據佢哋提供嘅關於巴士安全嘅資料同埋訓練車長嘅資料，即係喺佢哋嘅五年計之中，我哋見到喺新入職同埋現職車長嘅培訓方面，或者係一啲補救或者係溫習嘅課程，基本上係一致嘅，但係個別培訓課程或者單元嘅長度係會有唔同嘅。所以嚴格嚟講，所有嘅巴士公司都會向一啲新入職嘅司機係進行培訓，而至於現職嘅車長，佢哋亦都係會每三年進行培訓，所有嘅專營巴士公司係都承諾咁做。

至於長期冇執行駕駛職務嘅車長，巴士公司亦都係會提供一啲溫習嘅課程，然後車司先至會再投入佢哋嘅職務嘅。至於一啲溫習課程，除咗一間巴士公司之外，佢哋係冇為兼職車長係提供溫習課程，其他所有嘅巴士公司都係會向呢啲嘅車長係提供--或者一啲退咗休嘅車長提供一啲溫習課程嘅。

如果係劃一呢啲標準，即係就住為車長提供嘅課程，係有好處嘅，但係如果係要訂明呢一啲課程，即係提供嘅頻度或者係長度未必係可行，因為呢啲課程

嘅規模係唔同，亦都係會視乎巴士路線、人手數目等等嘅因素，喺唔同嘅專營巴士公司有所唔同嘅。

所以我哋係訂立緊一啲嘅指引，係去制訂一個框架係提供呢啲培訓，我哋認為巴士營運商係需要有劃一嘅標準係進行一啲內部嘅審核嘅，即係就住佢哋嘅培訓課程。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋幾時開始係制訂呢一啲擬議嘅指引？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋同巴士經營公司喺 2 月嘅大埔交通意外之後，就係著手去做呢個工作，而 3 月就係成立咗工作小組，我哋喺 3 月嘅第一次工作小組會議已經係有提到呢一點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢件事就係係同巴士營運公司喺度討論緊，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，而家係討論緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）今日下午早前你提到畀車長嘅健康檢查，現時嘅安排或係指令係點樣㗎？即係喺運輸署同埋專營公司之間，關於健康檢查嘅要求係點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會邀請關女士去講講，關女士。

主席：Yes. Thank you.

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）全職同埋兼職嘅車長喺入職之前，佢哋係必須申報佢哋嘅健康情況，佢哋亦都係要通過健康檢查去證明佢哋係健康係良好，可以去揸巴士嘅，呢個包括係心腔嘅檢查、視力檢查、血壓、尿液、糖尿病檢查等等。而所有現時嘅專營公司亦都係要求所有 50 歲或以上嘅車長係接受每年嘅健康檢查，係包括胸腔檢查、糖尿病、視力、尿液、血壓檢查等等嘅。50 歲、54 歲、57 歲、60 或者以上嘅司機，佢哋亦都係要做埋嗰個心電圖嘅檢查，呢個係佢哋嗰個係體檢嘅一部分。

另外就係講到有一啲巴士司機如果試過中風又或者有過心血管病嘅話，又或者佢哋要食藥，係因為有糖尿病或者係高血壓食藥嘅話，亦都需要就係向佢哋嘅僱主作出呢一方面嘅申報，亦都係要做嗰個係心電圖嘅檢查嘅，如果做嗰個每年嘅體檢，呢個目前嘅安排係咁嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲安排係安排吖，定抑或係你同巴士公司之間嘅一個理解吖，定抑或係一個要求嚟嘅呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個身體檢查嘅要求唔係一個專營權或者係條例底下嘅一個指示或者要求，呢個要求就係巴士司機個個知道係要做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係呢啲安排做咗有幾耐呢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）我哋不斷有所演變嘅，我記得自從 2007 年呢一個身體檢

查，即係所有 50 或以上嘅巴士司機每年要做呢個體格嘅檢查、身體檢查係由 07 年開始實施嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇到一啲係交畀委員會嘅意見書就有講，就話如果係有關嘅車長佢哋嘅身體檢查係包括埋佢哋能否應付駕駛巴士嘅壓力，呢個係會好啲嘅，我想問呢啲咁樣嘅建議，有冇人同署方係提過呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師，我相信你指嘅就係咪具體地處理這事項的九巴嘅書面意見呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你話畀我哋聽究竟係喺邊一頁或者邊度？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你睇 KMB-1，81-1 嗰度。嗰度就係講及一啲補救性質嘅培訓。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你用“psychologist”「心理學家」呢一個字眼嚟到搜尋嘅話，就會搵到。

MR DUNCAN：Thank you, Mr Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）係，因為我諗心目中即係應該用嗰個字嚟到進行搜尋。係喺第一份嘅意見書嘅第 3 項嗰度嘅，第 81 頁，就係交畀署長--對唔住，係第 38 頁，交畀署長嘅一份文件，113 頁，搵到嘛？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）搵到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）E 嗰個部分講到係心理嘅支援，嗰度就話有一個小組，提及就係要為車長同埋前線人員提供呢個情緒嘅支援，小組就會搵一個專業嘅顧問去全面咁檢討目前嘅做法，同埋提供一啲意見，包括但係並不限於呢個係招聘，睇下係車長佢嗰個情緒智商能否係應付壓力、佢嘅培訓、輔導、係表現嘅管理，希望佢可以逐步逐步咁樣樣去實行嚟到係處理一啲係而家已經係有嘅一啲關注嘅，咁呢方面有冇做呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋喺九巴嗰度冇收到一個咁嘅建議，而且喺我哋工作小組工作小組--即係我哋工作小組就係話，係咪應該車長之間嘅培訓作一個統一，呢方面亦都冇收到咁嘅建議。不過我知道係新入職同埋現役車長佢哋嘅培訓，我知道公司亦都會包括就係輔助同埋係如何應付呢個壓力，呢啲都包括咗喺新入職同埋在職車長嘅培訓課程裏面嘅，其實呢啲嘅課題我哋亦都打算係喺日後嗰個指引嗰度包括埋嘅，即係話如果講到培訓，培訓嗰個框架應該包括啲咩嘢課題，我哋就都係有咁樣嘅諗法嘅。至於話係申請入職嘅人士，係咪應該睇埋佢哋嗰個情緒智商，我哋就冇睇埋嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）不過或者係咪可以作為培訓嘅一個部分呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）加強佢哋如何應付壓力作為培訓嘅一個部分，呢一個睇法係工作小組有提過嘅，亦都會係我哋會考慮嘅，即係喺我哋如果要訂定一啲培訓方面嘅指引嘅話，我哋都會考慮埋呢一點嘅。如果話有任何嘅建議就係要睇埋嗰個人嘅情緒、智商同埋佢應付壓力嘅能力，作為考核一個申請人係咪取錄佢呢？九巴係巴士公司之一，諗係要同其他巴士公司亦都一同係研究一下，因為呢個亦都會影響佢哋嘅招聘嘅工作嘅，特別係而家嗰個人手供應嘅問題，現有個勞工市場嗰個人手供應嘅問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，對署方嚟到講，呢個係一個新嘅概念，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗都係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家就想轉到去講下兼職司機或者兼職車長呢樣嘢，呢個係事實嚟嘅，係咪呀？好多巴士公司過去咁多年都有請兼職嘅司機，特別係因為人手嘅問題，我咁講啱唔啱呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）人手嘅問題其實一直都係大家所關注嘅，喺巴士營運方面都係一直受人關注嘅，特別係就係公眾嘅期望不斷有所提升，佢哋都希望巴士嘅服務係有所改善，講到路線、班次、公眾嘅期望都有所上升嘅。我哋好努力咁樣係同巴士公司係商討，亦都係同當區嘅區議會係商討，搵下有啲咩嘢方法可以增加個班次、提升個服務，但係過去嗰十年，嗰個事實就係巴士嘅路線係有所上升，換句話講，我哋係需要招聘更多嘅巴士司機嚟到去係應付嗰個專營權嘅要求。

我哋係知道嗰個情況嘅，我哋喺周年個檢討同埋喺董事局開會嘅時候都好明白呢個情況，特別係我哋每一年同巴士公司檢討嘅時候，做周年檢討嘅時候，我哋都有係鼓勵巴士公司係搵唔同嘅方法去增加人手嘅供應。喺運輸署嗰方面，同埋勞工處一齊，我哋協助巴士公司係做呢一個招聘嘅工作，喺各區係搞一啲招聘會去招聘巴士司機，亦都鼓勵巴士公司去檢討佢哋嗰個巴士司機嘅待遇，好讓嗰個薪酬就更加係有吸引力，而且嗰個待遇就係更為合理，可以吸引新血入行嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。兼職司機--因為聘用兼職司機有冇引致一啲安全方面嘅問題呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺過去嘅檢討裏面，我哋唔見到有啲咩嘢特別嘅情況或者個趨勢就顯示兼職司機係要讓人擔心係導致巴士意外嘅成因。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）究竟照你所知，巴士公司做過啲乜嘢嘢嚟到去睇下究竟兼職巴士司機返工之後或者放工之後究竟佢係做啲咩嘢嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）講到培訓，巴士公司--我哋期望巴士公司係提供培訓係畀在職嘅車長，無論佢係全職或者係兼職...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，係，對唔住，打斷。我唔係講培訓，我意思即係話佢哋係夠唔夠精神去開始去返工、上班同埋係去揸車嘅，即係話佢係兼職嘅司機吖嘛，佢一日裏面其他嘅時間佢會係做啲乜嘢嘅嘢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）從呢個運輸署嘅角度嚟到睇，我哋冇咁嘅資料究竟巴士公司點樣樣去監察兼職巴士司機點樣樣去駕駛，兼職巴士司機呢啲車長就係巴士公司招聘嘅人手，嚟到去幫手係舒緩嗰個問題同埋係去滿足嗰個巴士服務嘅需求，特別係有某一啲時候就係一個服務需求嘅高峰期嘅，過去咁多年，我知道講到嗰個兼職車長嘅百分比係有啲公司係百分之三至到係去到百分之三十一，其中一家公司就係百分之三十一嘅，而嗰間公司就因為佢有好多路線都係喺假日嘅時候行使，所以佢哋係需要除咗基本嘅人手之外，佢哋係全職嘅，之上佢哋一直有咁嘅安排，就係搵兼職嘅司機嚟到去應付係假日嘅額外嘅需求。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇提供一啲分析畀你哋，就話係兼職司機同意外之間有冇關係呢？即係話會唔會話因為啲巴士係由兼職司機揸對比起全職司機揸，就多咗意外呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我冇咁嘅資料，手頭上冇咁嘅資料，不過我諗我哋可以喺呢一方面做一啲研究，然後提供資料畀委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，其中一間巴士公司有提供到佢哋嘅資料，係咪呀？即係嗰個涉及兼職司機嘅意外率就並冇特別係高嘅，你問完關於呢個兼職司機嘅問題未呀？

MR DUNCAN：Yes, I am.

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗鄧大律師想問嘅就係如果你係一個兼職司機或者你可能會做一啲其他嘅兼職嘅工作，譬如話係兼職的士司機，兼職貨車司機等等，運輸署有冇要求巴士公司係去收集佢哋嘅兼職司機有啲咩嘢其他嘅兼職工作呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）目前我哋係冇咁嘅要求，即係冇要求巴士公司係去搜集呢啲資料同埋向我哋呈交嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我即係假設你係冇資料，你哋係唔知道呢啲兼職司機喺日間仲做緊啲咩嘢其他工作？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想大家睇 CTB-1 嘅文件冊第 26 頁嘅，呢個就係其中一間專營巴士公司，即係城巴所呈交嘅陳述，喺第 26 頁嘅最底就講到一啲新嘅科技輔助儀器，你見唔見到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第 26 頁底，就話我哋係計劃去包括以下嘅技術，就係由 19 年 6 月開始付運嘅新巴士入面包括嘅，就係有電子穩定系統，一個--另一個穩定系統，一個防翻滾嘅系統，一個主動嘅速度限制系統，我問題就係運輸署有冇進行任何本地或者海外嘅研究，或者有冇同巴士公司去合作，有冇研究過有啲咩嘢新嘅技術或者新嘅安全措施係可以係考慮採納係去改善安全呢？運輸署有冇進行呢一類嘅研究？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我請陳先生，佢係負責呢一個硬件嘅部分嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署一直都係好留意係將新技術採納喺巴士上面，特別係一啲可以改善巴士安全嘅技術，至於我哋嘅做法可以係內部去做，或者係同巴士公司去合作嘅，對我哋嚟講，我哋認為同巴士公司合作係會更加有效嘅，因為佢哋係有運作嘅經驗，同埋佢哋有唔同種類嘅巴士係可以測試呢啲儀式嘅，佢哋可以睇下究竟呢啲技術係適唔適合佢哋嘅車輛。

我哋係一直都會尋求改善，如果有一啲儀器係幫到手，我哋係會同巴士公司去傾，睇下有冇辦法係可以測試同埋引入呢一啲儀器，我哋亦都係會同一啲車輛製造商去傾嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話你會留意，你喺邊度留意或者點樣留意呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會喺網上會搵資料，而我哋嘅工程師都係經常喺網上搵資料，我哋係會睇一啲嘅雜誌，我哋會--有訂閱一啲關於儀器嘅雜誌，我哋會睇下有啲乜嘢可以同巴士公司一齊去測試嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇聯絡你哋一啲海外嘅其他嘅監管機構呢，喺呢一方面？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係經常嘅，但係耐唔耐我哋係會做一啲關於儀器嘅研究，我哋亦都係會聯絡唔同國家嘅監管機構，特別係新加坡、英國、日本等等，但係我哋係唔會有一個恆常嘅接觸。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個主動嘅限速系統，呢個就係城巴提到嘅系統係咪由佢哋去建議嘅呢，定係由運輸署去建議嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係由佢哋建議嘅，我覺得，根據佢哋嘅描述，呢個就係同一個電子穩定系統相若嘅系統嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗呢一個主動嘅限速系統係一個主動嘅限速系統，而唔係一個被動嘅限速系統。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係同巴士公司亦都係有提過--即係有傾緊呢一個系統嘅，除咗一啲現有嘅限速器，即係最高嘅時速係每小時九--七十公里，我哋亦都係會引入多一啲嘅功能，當架車係落坡嘅時候，所以個車速上限係每小時 70 公里。城巴所提嘅就係一個類似嘅儀器，只不過個名唔同嘅啫。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前呢個車速限速器係上限係時速 70 公里，

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）如果一啲行緊--即係譬如話喺一個車速限制 50 公里嘅地方，如果有架巴士係行緊 60 公里嘅話，如果係咁嘅情況，即係架巴士超速。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇任何方法係限制巴士超速，喺科技或者技術上？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）如果你一啲有自動嘅全球定位系統，加上一啲某種嘅限速系統，再加上呢個地圖，如果係有車速限制，理論上係做得到嘅，我哋亦都係有同巴士公司去討論過呢一點，而個共識就係理論上係行得通嘅，但係喺香港嘅環境，全球衛星定位嘅訊號喺某啲地方可能會有啲問題，因為可能有一啲--喺某啲地方啲訊號可能畀啲高樓大廈係擋住，所以我哋仍然係要求巴士公司係去探討啲技術，希望喺不久嘅將來係可以採納呢一啲安全系統係有效嘅，但係目前佢哋仍然係試驗緊或者係探討緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪叫做地理圍欄嘅系統呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我想補充，城巴所提嘅呢啲技術除咗我哋喺改善巴士安全嘅工作小組亦都係有睇過呢一啲嘅技術，我哋係會同巴士公司係會睇新嘅儀器同技術，我哋亦都會詳細同啲巴士公司睇呢啲技術上嘅可能性、安全同埋點樣可以應用喺本地嘅專營巴士上面嘅。我哋喺工作小組入面，即係呢個改善巴士安全嘅工作小組我哋係有睇過呢個問題，我哋係會繼續探討嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師之前問過一個問題係未答到嘅，係邊個去建議、討論--即係喺工作小組上面係去討論呢啲嘅技術呢？究竟係由運輸署建議吖，定係巴士公司建議吖，定係兩者都有建議呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，喺第一次會議，我哋係有提及一啲新嘅技術同埋裝置去預備同巴士公司去傾嘅，呢啲嘅建議可能係多年嚟各方提出，但係最後係由運輸署去草擬呢個文件去提呢一啲技術嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個邀請呢啲巴士公司係出席呢個工作會議小組呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇嘢想補充？

陳英傑先生： You mean currently in the world?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢個地理圍欄嘅技術，正如主席所講，係有用乜嘢嘅法理基礎去運作呢？或者喺邊一個嘅司法管轄區去運作呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋手頭上冇呢一項嘅資料，我諗呢項技術就唔係新嘅，但係喺實際應用方面我哋冇資料响手嘅，但係根據我知道嘅資料，香港嘅運輸--作為啲交通工具營運商係有一個咁嘅系統嘅，佢哋可以喺電腦上就用呢一個全

球定位系統就可以睇到啲巴士喺邊度，即係啲人可以知道佢哋响邊度或者幾時會到站，即係用啲手機應用程式可以睇到嘅。而內部嚟講，佢哋可能覺得--即係會見到某一啲嘅路線可能係營運得比較好啲或者安全啲，呢個同地理圍欄呢一個技術係相似，但係巴士公司係有留意到呢一方面，佢哋會睇下啲技術以後係能唔能夠應用嘅，所以回應番你嘅問題，據我所知，就冇人係--即係成功係應用地理圍欄技術，但係當然大家都係向住呢個方向去做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你所講就即係可能係--即係我哋知道啲巴士嘅情況係點，但係你防止唔到問題， 如果有巴士喺呢個時速限制 50 公里嘅地方度開--即係超過 50 公里係會點樣呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅技術主要係為咗管理車隊同埋檢查巴士或者其他車輛嘅情況，至於呢項技術可唔可以用嚟去控制--限制速度或者去減慢速度或者係防止巴士司機係駛超過時速 50 公里或者 70 公里，即係我哋知道有一啲嘅巴士營運商就表示如果有呢啲輔助駕駛技術或者技術，佢哋係警告我哋嗰啲司機唔應該係純粹倚賴一啲技術或者係儀器，因為佢哋可能會過份倚賴呢啲儀器，而係會失去咗一啲--即係喺有一啲關鍵嘅時刻，可能會失去咗個人嘅判斷嘅，呢啲係專營巴士公司係特別提到嘅呢一點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）為免生疑問，其實呢一個係車速限制係咪喺嗰個地理圍欄呢一個係概念係檢討嘅時候都有包括埋睇埋嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師，我哋而家已經到咗四點半，係咪一個啱嘅時候就今日係暫停呢？陳女士同埋你嘅同事，我哋今日就會暫停，我諗較早時候已經係邀請咗你亦都係明日就係再嚟嘅，請你預留咗明日嘅時間，所以請你哋明天係 10 點鐘再嚟到呢度繼續係作呢一個口述嘅證供。

好，明天 10 點鐘再繼續。

2018 年 5 月 7 日

下午 4 時 32 分聆訊押後

[blank page]

Tuesday, 8 May 2018

(10.00 am)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

Ms Chan, might I invite you to resume your seats at the table.

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS RACHEL KWAN, MS MACELLA LEE, MR REGINALD YK CHAN, MR TONY YAU

CHAIRMAN: Overnight, the Transport Department has provided the committee with material relating to the forward planning documents that the various bus companies have provided to the Transport Department on bus safety. I think at the outset we ought to afford you an opportunity -- and I do -- if you wish to make some statement about those documents. Otherwise, I will ask Mr Duncan to pursue it in examination.

MS MABLE CHAN: Good morning. Thank you very much, Chairman, for giving me this opportunity. I would just like to say a very few words on that.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

Further opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN

MS MABLE CHAN: Actually, I thank the chairman for raising this and giving us the opportunity to have a go with the bus operators last night, because I do appreciate that the request came from the IRC secretariat for sight of

the whole FPP, but on the basis of the document containing commercial value, that's why we did not disclose it at the outset, but also noting that it comprises an important chapter on bus safety which does not comprise commercial value, we actually took the opportunity to run it past the bus operators last night and we managed to provide the IRC secretariat with copies.

In fact, I would like to say a few words, that the forward planning programme is part of the statutory requirement that the bus operators would have to submit for discussion and agreement with the Transport Department.

It is part of the two-pronged process which the Transport Department monitor and regulate the bus operators. The bus operators are expected to provide an FPP comprising the route development programme as well as other operational aspects to the Transport Department by the end of June of each year.

It is since 2003 that the Transport Department has required the bus operators to include a dedicated chapter on bus safety, and since then that chapter forms part of the programme and serves as a planning tool for the Transport Department to discuss and monitor the accident statistics of each franchised bus operator in

their own analysis, and we expect the bus operators to propose improvement measures and we expect them to include in that programme the implementation timetable for the various improvement measures.

Apart from this forward planning process, we also conduct an annual performance assessment by the end of each year. That exercise, we will take into account nine indicators, of which two are related to safety. As I replied to the senior counsel during yesterday's oral session, we also maintain an independent database on the overall territory-wide accident statistics, in which there is also analysis of accident statistics in respect of each franchised bus operator. We will also conduct independent analysis of the accidents by its nature, by its contributing factor, in order to conduct our annual performance assessment of each franchised bus operator. This assessment is done annually based on independent data from the database, independent of the forward planning exercise. So the two run in parallel. And the annual performance assessment report will also be submitted to the Transport Advisory Committee for discussion and reference.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued)

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning, Ms Chan, and ladies and gentlemen. Thank you again for your homework last evening. What I would like to do is just note the documents which have been provided overnight, first of all, and then ask you a couple of questions about those.

With regard to the forward planning programmes, the safety parts of that, I will have questions on those later this morning. So I won't spend any time on those at the moment.

You have also, via your submission overnight, provided us with a number of other matters that were raised during the evidence yesterday, and for those I thank you.

There is just one of those matters referred to in your submission that I would like to ask you a little bit about. If you could turn to paragraph 8 of the overnight supplementary written submission, there is reference there to the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses. The committee has been informed that that group was formed after the Tai Po accident in February of this year, and contains as its membership, amongst others, representatives of bus companies.

You mentioned right at the end of the submission that the first meeting of that group was held on 13 March this year. My question is: how many meetings have been held since that date?

MS MABLE CHAN: Two meetings.

MR DUNCAN: Since then, so three meetings in total?

MS MABLE CHAN: Two meetings at the working group level and then two meetings at the technical meeting, focusing on bus safety devices and technology.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So one meeting on 13 March and one subsequent meeting?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I think on 24 April, if I remember. 23 April.

CHAIRMAN: I think you gave us that date yesterday. You mentioned two dates.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, in the opening statement.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

And the technical meeting, who attends the technical meeting?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will ask Rachel, because she convened the technical meeting.

MS RACHEL KWAN: Thank you, Ms Chan, and good morning, Mr Chairman.

The bus companies and the bus manufacturers, representatives of them have attended the meeting.

MR DUNCAN: The technical meetings?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Now, are minutes kept of these meetings?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Would the committee be able to obtain copies, please, of the minutes?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Sure.

MS MABLE CHAN: As far as minutes are concerned, because as a general rule it is comprised of internal deliberations, and our general principle is that we will not disclose the internal deliberations which may comprise incomplete analysis and research and may affect candid discussion within the government.

But we can surely provide some relevant extracts of the deliberations in terms of the measures being proposed and also actions being explored for the IRC's information.

MR DUNCAN: I know the committee is particularly interested in the technical considerations being given by those two groups, and it's in that context that I ask that the minutes be provided.

MS MABLE CHAN: If the committee considers it important to see the minutes, we may be able to provide to the committee in confidence.

CHAIRMAN: No. We are operating transparently, with

everything on our website. We are not taking any information from anybody that is not disclosed publicly.

But what we have in mind -- one imagines, when there is a technical meeting and you are discussing what technology might be used in Hong Kong, and bus manufacturers come to help in the meeting, are we correct to assume that there would have been papers put forward by them? For example, speed limiters, you can do it passively by cutting off fuel but you can also do it actively, for example, by engaging gears and applying brakes. Are there any papers of that nature, saying, "These are the technological advances" -- is there material of that kind?

MS MABLE CHAN: There have not been papers as such so far. We have tabled a scope of work and also the items to be discussed and explored at the meetings. But the attendees haven't proposed or tabled any papers so far.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps "papers" is too technical. Anything in writing? It's hard to believe that you have meetings with nothing in writing about these kind of obvious issues, because I think it's the Transport Department that's identified the various technological devices that might be used.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, because at the first two meetings we have listed out possible devices and technological

matters to be explored and discussed, and we are attending the attendees to go back and study and then to come back. So I would have thought that for facilitating the discussion in future meetings, there will be analysis papers for us to consider.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: There is one other matter which I referred to you yesterday during the evidence, and in respect of which I did not ask for any particular reports. That was a matter which you mentioned during your evidence, when you mentioned quarterly undertaking -- quarterly reports to the Road Safety Council, in the context of monitoring.

Could I make a request, please, that we obtain copies of, or samples, of those quarterly reports?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: That can be arranged?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, samples of quarterly reports, sure.

MR DUNCAN: If we just go back to that matter that I have raised, and you had a discussion with the chairman, the minutes of the four meetings. I understand your reluctance. I think at the early stage of the exchange with the chairman, you indicated that there would be no

problem with some parts of the minutes being communicated to the committee. Is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will seek further legal advice as to how to facilitate the committee to appreciate the work of the working group and also the technical meeting.

MR DUNCAN: Right. We will leave that in your court for the moment.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And would be grateful for your response in due course.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

There were two other matters, just dealing with yesterday's proceedings, before I proceed this morning, that I wish to raise. The first related to the reason why no changes were made to the guidelines following the administration's undertaking to look at the guidelines again after the 2012 accident. That was a matter I think that you said you would look into further.

Have you had the opportunity of looking further into that as yet?

MS MABLE CHAN: I'm sorry, but in the interests of time we have not been able to do thorough file research, but we will do that as quickly as possible and we will provide written response on that.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

One other matter was the question of the full-time/part-time drivers, when I asked whether the department had conducted any analysis as to the relationship between the two and accidents as a whole, whether any analysis had been carried out, and you indicated that you did not have the information at hand, but perhaps some research could be done on that and the information supplied.

Is work being undertaken on that particular issue?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can clarify on that. Based on the analysis provided by the companies over the years, especially in the forward planning programme, in the bus safety section, in analysing the accident by its category and its nature, there is no analysis or information pointing towards part-time bus captains as being the contributing factor to the accidents. In other words, there is no information as revealed from those analysis that there is a correlation between the deployment of part-time bus captains with the accidents.

So this is the basis based on which I mentioned yesterday that there is no information leading to such kind of correlation.

CHAIRMAN: Having had an opportunity briefly to go through the forward planning papers provided by the various

franchised buses, the phrase "no correlation" is repeated frequently when one looks at more or less anything: bus models, ages of drivers, number of hours working.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, as I have said, those analyses are conducted and prepared by the bus companies. In our own independent analysis for reporting to the Road Safety Council, we do analyse the accidents, be it fatal or serious, and then in our analysis we will try to identify common factors, for example driver behaviour or the involvement of vehicles in those accidents.

CHAIRMAN: And that's a separate independent report?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And you are making that available to us?

MS MABLE CHAN: In the Road Safety Council quarterly report.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Let's turn then to the bus safety contents of the forward planning programmes, the documents that were sent to us over the break.

I have looked at these in three groups, because although I think there are five franchisees, Kowloon Motor Bus and Long Win provide the same sort of reports; Citybus and New World First Bus Services, they supply the same sort of reports, that's the second type; and then the New Lantao Bus Company provides a third form of

report.

Can I ask you first this: the type of information which is contained in these reports relating to bus safety, is that determined by the department or is it left to the bus companies to say, "This is what we will put in the FPP"?

MS MABLE CHAN: As I have mentioned in my opening statement this morning, the requirement for including a bus safety chapter in the forward planning programme dates back to 2003. Since 2003, as an annual exercise, the department will keep track of the information supplied by the bus operators in terms of bus safety, accident analysis in the forward planning programme, and then we will write to the bus operators in around April or May on issues to be covered and provided in the upcoming forward planning programme.

In terms of bus safety, there are occasions at which the department will make special request on certain areas to be covered. So, basically, the scope of information, and sometimes on an occasional basis the specific areas provided by the bus companies are made on the advice of the TD.

MR DUNCAN: So who prepares the first draft of the document?

MS MABLE CHAN: The colleagues in the Bus and Railway Branch.

MR DUNCAN: Right. And have they been given a list of topics that need to be covered, or do they generate their own list of topics that the department then examines?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is an evolving exercise. So it starts off with framework on the coverage of the areas to be included in the various chapters. But over the years, there are also topics, list of topics, in those letters, as and when needed, to be provided to the operator, to guide them to include certain things in the chapter.

MR DUNCAN: Now, we have noticed that these programmes, the safety parts of these programmes, contain quite an amount of statistical information relating to accidents and to accident causes. You will be aware of that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: They also contain information from the companies as to what they describe as their safety measures, and their proposed safety measures.

If I could take you to one example of the proposed measures, by asking you to turn to that of the New World First Bus Services Ltd, which is annex 3 to your material overnight. I'm looking at page 6, internal numbering, of that document., which has been apparently noted now as page 200 of the bundle.

Do you see on that page clause 5.3, "Measures and implementation programme to enhance safety"? Are you looking at that page?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Then if you look at the text:

"Apart from disciplinary actions taken, measures and programmes planned to reduce common types/causes of accidents are listed below".

And there's a series of measures, no less than 14 measures described there by the company.

You mentioned yesterday and again this morning, in fact, the annual performance assessment of the franchised bus operators, and the fact that -- and I think what you were informing the committee was that safety is taken very seriously because if you look at the nine indicators, two of them are concerned with safety matters.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Could we just go to those. I think you will find that in TD-2 at page 316.

Are you at the page that reads, "Summary of performance of the franchised bus operators in 2016"?

Do you have that in front of you?

MS MABLE CHAN: (Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Do you see the nine key indicators,

as they are described? And the two you have noted, are they respectively "Safety-related defects per bus examination", and then "No. of buses involved in accidents per million vehicle-kilometre"? Are they the two that you have referred to?

MS MABLE CHAN: (Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

When the department conducts that annual assessment, does it carry out any sort of check on the individual matters which a bus operator has indicated it is going to pursue during that particular year? For example, the 14 items which are contained in the New World submission.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say yes.

MR DUNCAN: When you say you would say yes, why would you say that? Does it or does it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: The annual performance assessment was made on a company basis. So the Transport Department will look at the accident performance of the individual bus operators, in terms of the safety, by means of the two indicators. And the forward planning programme, in particular bus safety chapter, actually serves as a tool for us to study and examine better the circumstances faced by the bus companies and also their performance in terms of safety.

So this actually serves as the basis for the Transport Department to assess the annual performance assessment of that company.

MR DUNCAN: There is nothing in this summary that indicates that the department reaches into the individual companies' statements as to what they are going to do during a particular year. It's confined to accidents per million vehicle-kilometres and safety-related defects which are picked up during the oral examination.

MS MABLE CHAN: I can ask my colleague to search in our covering paper, paper number 2, but I think there is -- yes, may I refer to paper number 2, appendix -- sorry, paper number 1, appendix M, "Performance of franchised bus operation in 2016". This is a sample of an annual performance assessment we did for the franchised bus operation; appendix M to paper 1.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr Duncan, can you give us a page number for that?

MR DUNCAN: 305.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes. You were speaking to this document, "Performance of franchised bus operation"?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. In paragraph 19, "Bus safety measures", it summarises our assessment in overall terms on the franchised bus performance in terms of the bus

safety aspects, and also the common factors identified in those accidents. In particular in that year, the 2016 performance:

"[The] accidents typically involved passengers losing balance inside bus compartment due to various reasons, such as not holding the handrail tightly, or falling down when boarding or alighting. The operators have made efforts in enhancing safety of bus operation through various measures."

Then we include in the summary the performance of individual bus operators in that particular year.

Then in annex B to that paper, we also mention the various measures to enhance safety of bus operations.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand you to say that they are specifically taken into account during the annual performance review?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, I'm going to leave those safety provisions now of the forward planning programme, so you can put those to one side.

I want to turn now to the topic of passenger behaviour, which has been a topic in many of the submissions made to the committee. The committee has

been alerted to what is said to be an increasing occurrence of both verbal and physical assaults on bus drivers in recent times.

The committee has heard these allegations from different sources, so from trade union movement, from LegCo itself, and also from one of the bus companies, KMB.

If I could just put this matter in perspective. Can I ask you to go to the TU bundle at page 256, please. In fact it's 256-1, the document which I ask you to look at, which is -- forgive me, but it's an English translation, and not certified, of minutes of a meeting between the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions and the Department. Do you see that document?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If you want to look at the Chinese, I will give you the reference to that. 250 for the Chinese.

Now I wish to take you to the translation, 256-5, which is under the heading, "Issues on personal safety of bus captains". If I could read from the translation:

"Representatives of the union expressed concern on the recent incidents where bus captains were attacked, although the bus captains under attack reported to the police, in many cases, the police upon arrival would suggest the parties to settle the matter, without

prosecuting the perpetrators. Union representatives also expressed that, apart from the general insurance that bus companies provide to its employees, there is no other support to frontline bus captains."

If you would bear that in mind, and then also refer, please, to 256 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, this was a meeting on 4 October 2016?

MR DUNCAN: That's correct.

Then at 256-8, you will see minutes of a meeting on 27 March 2017. The Chinese of that will be at page 245. If I could refer you to the translation at 256-13, where we have the heading under (vi), "Bus captains being assaulted and prosecution standard for the perpetrators":

"The representative of the union paid close attention to incidents of assaults on bus captains. Even though the bus captains being assaulted reported to the police, most of the times when the police arrived they suggested the parties to settle the case instead of prosecuting the relevant persons. Besides, the bus company only provided insurance coverage for its staff.

The police expressed that they will not tolerate the use of violence, and asked that if the bus captains encounter such situation they must call for police and

endeavour to seek witness(es) for the police's further handling."

Perhaps I should have mentioned, if you go back to the minutes of the meeting, you will see there the persons present: the government representatives, the District Councillors and the Federation of Unions, and so on.

Then thirdly, for the trade unions' complaints, page 256 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, it is said that the police expressed a view. Was a police officer present at the meeting?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Where is he identified?

MS MABLE CHAN: Mr Tsang Moon Lun, chief inspector on traffic safety from the police department, 256-8.

CHAIRMAN: Ah, yes. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then if you go to page 256-16, please. That's the translation. The Chinese is at page 250. If I could take you to the translation, 256-18, you will see the minutes of a meeting on 20 July 2017, again a meeting with representatives of the Transport Department, the police force and the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions for the Bus Industry.

If I could bring your attention, please, to 256-18, and the entry at item (ii), "Assault incident on bus captain". It's long, so I won't read that out, but if you could just read through it quickly, please, and I will pick it up at the last couple of paragraphs. In fact, I will pick it up at the last paragraph:

"Further, the police and the trade union recommended to install protective equipment during bus captains' driving. The Transport Department will address the trade unions' concern to the Transport Department."

I'm sure that's not particularly well expressed. The Transport Department no doubt was alerted to the concern of the unions.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, if I may, I am also looking at the original, the Chinese version of the minutes --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- which is on page 251. On that particular item, it is recorded that the Transport Department will relay the trade unions' concerns to the bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So there's an infelicity in the translation?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I am grateful for that. Thank you. I will come back to that in a moment.

But if I could just go to some of the other examples

of this being brought to the attention of the department.

Can we go to SEC-2, please. There is, again, a translation at 815 of a communication in Chinese, at page 814. This is a document actually addressed within LegCo. Do you know whether the department became alerted to this matter?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the information at hand.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could give us more information, the date and between whom the communication is made?

MS MABLE CHAN: Because this letter was not addressed to us, but we can check.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I'm asking Mr Duncan.

What is the date of this communication?

MR DUNCAN: This is dated 19 May 2016, and it is addressed to the chairman of the Panel on Transport Affairs within the Legislative Council. But if you haven't seen this, I won't ask you any further questions about this.

Then finally can I take you, please, in this context, to KMB bundle 1, at page 62.

This document is part of the submission made by the Kowloon Motor Bus Company to the committee. I'm not sure whether you've had the opportunity of reading this, Ms Chan. Have you?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have done a cursory reading of the submissions. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Can I take you to page 62, please, and the top of the page, perhaps you can just read to yourself the first entry there, indicated by the indicator, commencing with, "In response to increasing number of assaults against [bus captains], we have taken the following measures".

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, to assist those who are following this with simultaneous translation, given that the document is displayed only in English, perhaps I could invite you to read what you say are the relevant parts of the document.

MR DUNCAN: There is a reference in that passage, I think, Ms Chan, to "Surveillance cameras, including forward-looking cameras and a camera covering the driver seat, have become standard features on all new buses since 2015."

Do you see that reference?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

Q. And:

"Up to February 2018, surveillance cameras were installed in 2,319 KMB buses and 146 [Long Win] buses. The remaining buses will be equipped with surveillance

cameras phase by phase. Surveillance cameras capture the behaviour (with audio recording) of difficult passengers. It will protect the interest of [bus captains] in subsequent investigation by the police or legal proceedings."

Then there is reference to the fact that the company intends to install a protective shield near the driver seat starting from June 2018, and they say:

"We have added more on-board announcements to advise passengers not to do certain acts that will affect the [bus captains] and other passengers."

Finally, they indicate that they "offer legal support to [bus captains] after they have been assaulted."

With that background, from those papers, could I ask you a few things.

First of all, when I raised this issue, the issue of passenger behaviour, with the bureau yesterday, we were told that the department has been directed to prepare an education plan in respect of this matter. What is the status of this education plan?

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, senior counsel. The issue of passengers' behaviour or aggression towards bus captains was particularly discussed in the context of the Transport Advisory Committee's meeting in March, when we

presented our actions to be followed for the Tai Po accident.

As we reported to the Transport Advisory Committee at that meeting in March, we reported that the department or the government is aware of the concern of the bus captains of incidents of passenger assault or aggression towards bus captains, and we reported that this matter was actually followed through in the Road Safety Council, in which both Transport Department and also the police are members.

We also reported that, as an ongoing education and publicity campaign, there are radio APIs, TV programmes, in Chinese it's "ging sun", educating the public on the appropriate behaviour of passengers when aboard buses.

At the meeting, after the discussion at the Transport Advisory Committee meeting, we are tasked to look into that and devise a more comprehensive publicity and education plan in this particular matter. Since then, in the 77th meeting of the Road Safety Campaign Committee, which is a committee formed under the Road Safety Council to look at campaign matters, in the meeting held on 13 April 2018, it has been agreed that the attitude of passengers will be one of the themes for the road safety campaign in 2018-19. The first publicity activity is to produce the radio API for the

purpose of educating passengers on appropriate behaviour, and disseminating the road safety message in the third quarter of this year.

From the Transport Department's side, we also raised this issue with other public transport operators, for example the taxi trade. This is also one of the issues raised by the taxi drivers, and we are devising a code of practice and guidelines for quality taxis, to improve the taxi quality of the existing 18,000 taxis under the existing regime.

Apart from the chapters on drivers, we will also include a chapter on passengers' responsibility and attitude.

I have also raised with the MTRC at our annual operational review committee that we are planning to launch a comprehensive education and publicity campaign territory-wide, involving the various public transport operators. That means not only bus operators but also MTRC and taxis, et cetera.

We are considering the details of the plan and we hope to be able to launch the relevant publicity activity towards the end of 2018.

Thank you, senior counsel.

MR DUNCAN: So, by an education plan, we are really talking about a series of measures, are we? Is that it amounts

to?

MS MABLE CHAN: By education plan, we think that education is a very important element in bringing out the key messages that passengers should bear in mind when they are aboard public transport vehicles.

One of the messages that we have been deliberating with the operators and within ourselves is that it is the joint responsibility of the driver and the passengers to ensure a safe and decent journey from the origin to the destination.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: KMB have indicated that they have installed, and will continue to install, surveillance cameras in their buses. Is that a requirement of the Transport Department to KMB?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: Have you had discussions with any of the other bus companies with regard to the installation of surveillance cameras?

MS MABLE CHAN: Personally, I am aware of the KMB's measures such as the installation of surveillance cameras. They have raised it with us at regular discussions, and also at the board meeting level. This issue was not particularly raised at the board meetings of the other bus operators, as far as I am aware, but we are also

aware that they are thinking of various ways to help the bus drivers deal with this issue, in order to facilitate, in the occasions whereby the passengers have any aggressive attitude towards the drivers, and that may lead to dispute on the spot, would there be any device to help to have some objective evidence?

On the other hand, the Transport Department has not, up to this stage, required this kind of installation, knowing that there may be implications on other aspects, the sentiments of the drivers towards this kind of device.

So this is an issue which is ongoing discussed within the bus operators. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So the Transport Department is not pursuing this matter? You are leaving it to the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: We consider that, as I have said at the meetings between the Transport Department and the trade unions, we have relayed the concerns to the bus operators and we expect the bus operators to look into ways to address the occasions and incidents happening involving the bus drivers of the companies and seeing what suitable facilities or measures can be taken, having taken into account the employees' concerns, sentiments.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is yes, it's being left to the bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would not say so, because we consider the passengers' attitude towards the drivers is an important issue, and we have over the years taken efforts to promote this message and do education and publicity exercise. We are aware that the trade unions have expressed this kind of concern to the bus companies and to the Transport Department, and we have relayed this matter to the bus operators. We take a keen interest on how the bus companies will address this concern, and we welcome the measures that will be produced by the bus companies.

On the other hand, to answer the chairman's question, we do not totally refer the matter to the bus companies, because we know that specific devices such as surveillance cameras may have its own implications. So we do want the bus companies to look into this carefully.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, can I ask you what you mean by surveillance cameras have their own implications? Can you amplify what you mean by that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on our understanding and discussions at the board meetings of KMB, as an example, there are

some concerns expressed by the bus captains that with the installation of the surveillance cameras in front of the driving seat, it may intrude into their personal privacy, and we have also received some complaints on that front.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: From bus captains, through trade unions?

MS MABLE CHAN: Trade unions, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have that documented anywhere, in any of the material that we have?

MS MABLE CHAN: We may not be able to find it but we will try to locate.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

So, on the one hand, bus captains or at least some of them are concerned about their own safety and being abused, and yet others are concerned about privacy? Is that it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: What about the matter of protective shields? Is that a matter which is being considered by the Transport Department as a suitable measure?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is also an initiative of the bus company, in this case the KMB.

MR DUNCAN: Right, but my question is whether it occurs to

the Transport Department as a matter worth pursuing, and if so whether the Transport Department is suggesting this to any of the other bus companies.

MS MABLE CHAN: This is a measure taken by the KMB in response to the concerns and suggestions from the bus captains towards the management, and we are aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: The question was have you suggested to other bus companies or operators that they look at this?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have suggested this measure to the other bus companies for consideration.

MR DUNCAN: So it would be entirely up to them as to whether they engage with it or not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: It would be their decision?

MS MABLE CHAN: At the present moment, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, do we have any photographs in the material that we've got as to what is meant by a protective shield?

MR DUNCAN: We will try and locate that, Mr Chairman.

One of the questions I raised with Mr Lai from the bureau yesterday was whether or not any of the bus companies had passed its own by-laws so that it could act in respect of the conduct of its drivers or passengers, and he wasn't sure precisely what the

position was with regard to by-laws.

What is the position? Have any of the bus companies passed the by-laws provided for by the ordinance?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have checked on this specifically. At the present moment, the bus companies have not passed any by-laws at the present moment. As our colleagues have recalled, it appears that at least for the past ten years this issue has not been raised by the bus operators.

MR DUNCAN: It hasn't been raised by the bus operators, but has the department considered that the passing of by-laws by the bus companies may be able to provide some assistance in respect of the problem which seems to be reasonably prevalent and for which the police have apparently found difficulty in taking prosecution?

MS MABLE CHAN: The current legislative requirement under the Public Bus Services Regulations and also the Road Traffic (Public Service Vehicles) Regulations have provisions stated about the general conduct of passengers, prohibiting bus passenger disorderly conduct on public bus, including not to obstruct or distract the driver.

So there is a legislative basis for overseeing this matter. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: You might understand a comment that this may not

be the top of the police force's priorities, whereas the bus companies would be far more concerned about it.

MS MABLE CHAN: I am not in a position to respond on behalf of the police.

MR DUNCAN: Now, to the knowledge of the department, are drivers provided with any training with regard to how they should deal with an unruly passenger?

MS MABLE CHAN: I am aware that the bus companies have included modules on handling passengers and during stressful situations as part of their training courses for in-service bus captains, as well as new recruits.

MR DUNCAN: Given the fact that trade unions have complained about this, has the department looked into those modules to see what sort of training procedures might be available?

MS MABLE CHAN: The mentioning about the inclusion or enhancement of stressful courses, handling courses, as part of their training is mentioned in the forward planning programme, and we also take that into account and it is actually our plan to formalise the alignment of the training framework, to ensure that this will form part of the modules in the training for the new recruits as well as the in-service bus captains.

At the present moment, the bus companies are offering such kind of training courses to handle

passengers during particular occasions whereby the drivers may feel offended.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware of any protocols that are in place for the drivers that they should follow if there is an incident arising from the behaviour of a passenger?

MS MABLE CHAN: I can speak from my personal knowledge, that the KMB have set out some rules, basic rules, for their drivers to follow and to observe in handling such kind of situations.

MR DUNCAN: Have you examined those?

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me, Mr Duncan. Whilst this is fresh in my mind. You say you intend to formalise alignment of training framework. What do you mean by that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, the Working Group on Enhancement of Bus Safety formed in March, the terms of reference and the scope of work included the enhancement of training as one of the areas to be looked into. As mentioned in our paper 11, TD paper 11, "Training and health checks of bus captains", we have reported that our intention is to set out the guidelines on the training framework in order to align the content and the modules of the training.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time to locate what you are looking for.

MS MABLE CHAN: Let me try to locate it.

It is shown on the screen, page 131.

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 15?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: The training of bus captains to handle this kind of situation involving passengers is a very important issue to be addressed. We know that at the present moment various bus companies have included such kind of module, but we think that it is very important to align and formalise the requirement, to make sure that this module is included in the training for new recruits as well as in-service captains, and we want to set out a guideline on the weighting and the contents of this relevant module, to make sure that there are appropriate training to be provided for bus captains, to equip them with the necessary skills and to prepare them psychologically for such kind of distressful situations.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: So when you say "an alignment", and you say "formalise", you mean issue guidelines so that they are the same for all bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. In a way, we plan to issue a guideline requiring all the bus operators to include this kind of training as their training framework, and we will also plan to set out the basic duration and also the relative

weighting of each of the modules, so it will form a framework for the bus operators to follow, so that there will be a common basis for the individual bus operators to conduct internal monitoring and audit. By such kind of device, we can align the practice of the various bus operators.

Although the duration and the frequency may vary in very detailed way, but there will be a basic minimum duration required, and also the weighting to be accorded to the various modules under the broad training framework.

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by "weighting"?

MS MABLE CHAN: The relative weighting of, say, the module on handling passengers, relative to the other modules on driving skills, route training, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

This working group, it is anticipated, would report by the end of June; am I correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, you are correct, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is it intended that the guidelines be issued at that stage?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are trying very hard to formulate the guidelines as early as possible. The pledge of the working group currently is to complete the report by the end of June. We will consider as to whether a draft of

the guidelines can be included as part of the report. But I think the detailed guidelines may take a little bit of time.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: I just noticed that particular paragraph, Ms Chan, doesn't actually mention the problem that I've raised with you. It doesn't specifically address the question of the behaviour of passengers towards captains, does it?

MS MABLE CHAN: The paper does not make specific mention of that, but in our discussions at the two working group meetings, the various modules were actually discussed, and we have also sought the agreement of the bus operators to work towards having a common framework, comprising the modules that they are providing.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Let me try and finish this topic. With the complaints having been made, as we can see, by the trade unions, amongst others, and with meetings held involving the Transport Department, the unions and the police, and so forth, has the department itself developed any ideas as to how this problem might be overcome, as opposed to leaving ideas for the bus companies to pursue?

MS MABLE CHAN: The department considers this issue as a very important issue to be addressed, and as demonstrated by the various efforts that the Transport Department is taking, we believe that equipping the drivers with necessary skills and preparing them psychologically to handle such kind of situations, coupled with education and publicity campaign to impress upon them the important message of passengers' responsibility, are two-pronged measures to tackle this issue.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any specific ideas, apart from a general approach?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think this is a very specific approach. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Now, I want you, please, to go to your supplementary submission. You will find this at TD-1, page 163. May I just ask you to clarify a matter. Page 163.

The committee raised a question with you, and it was in these terms:

"'[The Transport Department] would review the results of random checks to ascertain that the [bus] operators have been monitoring the driving behaviour of their drivers and have taken/will take follow-up action

against those drivers with improper driving behaviour.' Please describe the process by which those random checks are reviewed. If their process is recorded in writing, please provide copy samples of such documents."

The answer that you gave was this:

"The requirement for the submission of the results of random checks ... has been implemented only since January 2018. The [Department] reviewed the monthly report submitted by the [bus] operators to ascertain that the ... operators have been monitoring the driving behaviour of their drivers ..."

What is the arrangement between the department and the bus operators with regard to these random checks?

MS MABLE CHAN: The requirement of installing black box and also the arrangement for onboard plain-clothed employees of the bus companies to inspect the driving behaviour and attitude of the bus captains have been required over the years. I do not have the specific year at the present moment, but perhaps colleagues can check and supplement on that.

So, in order to equip and facilitate the bus companies to have a better knowledge and to better monitor the driving behaviour and attitude of the bus drivers, the installation of black box, coupled with the arrangement on onboard plain-clothed inspectors, would

help them to analyse and monitor and to devise relevant improvement measures to be followed through by the bus companies.

This is a requirement set by the Transport Department, and we expect the bus operators to, based on this kind of observations, on an ongoing basis, and then they will devise the suitable measures.

Since January 2018, it is the initiative of the Transport Department to step up our monitoring of the bus operators, to ensure that they have done this kind of analysis and monitoring on a regular basis. We take the initiative to do so not because of any particular accident but we think that that will give us information, a basis, for us to consider whether any step-up monitoring can be conducted by both the bus companies or at the TD level, in order to ensure that there will be more informed basis to consider any appropriate measures to address improper driving behaviour of drivers.

We think that over the years, when we analyse the accident data, driver behaviour is one of the key contributing factors of many of the accidents, be it serious or less serious. So we consider this as a step forward for us to step up the monitoring on a more regular basis.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: My question is just aimed at what is constituted by the random check. What is this random check system?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on my understanding and recollection, the bus companies are required to conduct random checks on the black box data, as well as random checks onboard the buses.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Let's just keep to onboard the buses. Is this a directive from the Transport Department or what?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is a requirement of the Transport Department.

MR DUNCAN: In writing?

MS MABLE CHAN: I can check. I can check on that and then supplement.

MR DUNCAN: I am interested in the details of what random checking may be conducted by the bus companies themselves of drivers' behaviour.

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the record at hand, but we can certainly check and try to locate whether there is anything in writing on this.

MR DUNCAN: Is there any random checking of passengers' behaviour?

MS MABLE CHAN: The random checking is focused on the driver behaviour.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Turning away from --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so.

The request made of you, the Transport Department, was to describe the process by which those random checks are reviewed, and that is a reference to the Transport Department. How are they reviewed by the Transport Department, the random checks?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, if I may, I will locate the form, the compliance form, and then I will refer you to that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Take your time.

MS MABLE CHAN: May I refer you to annex 11, to paper 4, in TD's bundle. Perhaps counsel's team can mention the page number.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr Duncan can help us as to where we find annex 11.

MR DUNCAN: Page 1020.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, this monthly report was issued since January 2018. It comprises four aspects.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: The part (B), "Mysterious ride checks for monitoring of driving behaviours of bus captains", is relevant to our discussion just now. So we have stipulated in the monitoring report the number of routine mysterious ride checks conducted, number of

ad hoc mysterious ride checks conducted, and the number of malpractice cases found on a monthly basis, as well as the follow-up actions taken. This return will help us to check and monitor the number of routine and ad hoc mysterious rides conducted by the various bus companies, and to monitor whether there are any malpractice cases found and the follow-up actions taken.

In this sample provided in January 2018, you can see the various follow-up actions taken by the bus companies. On this return, we will look at it and then we will see whether the bus companies have regularly conducted such kinds of mysterious rides and whether the number of checks fluctuate by monthly basis, and on the other aspect, if we identify any trend in driver -- inappropriate behaviour, from our independent analysis, in respect of the various bus operators, we will use this as one of the tools for us to follow up with the bus companies, to see whether they have taken appropriate actions to address the driving behaviour of bus captains.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So just dealing with, say, black boxes, this particular form details the fact that there were 8,552 checks on black box data as at the end of the month; yes?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And that had produced speeding in 271 incidences.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And that had resulted in what's described as a verbal warning, 187; a written warning, 78; and a final warning, 6.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So the Transport Department reads this document, that's what's meant by "review", and presumably that would satisfy you, the entry here, that a system is in place, and that's the extent of the review?

MS MABLE CHAN: This monitoring mechanism by means of a monthly report serves to provide us with basic information on how the bus companies conduct the checks, either on mysterious ride or black box data, and the follow-up actions. This serves as one of the tools for us to do the assessment on the bus company on an annual basis, coupled with our independent analysis based on the accident data in respect of the bus operators and the contributing factors, if any, say in relation to the driving behaviour of bus captains.

So with all this, we will take issue with the bus companies and consider any appropriate improvement measures to be taken by the bus companies.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to tell us, Ms Chan, how often police have prosecuted passengers in respect of their behaviour on buses, say over the last five years?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the information.

MR DUNCAN: Does the department not maintain that information?

MS MABLE CHAN: We do not maintain such kind of information, but I am not sure whether such kind of information is presented to the Road Safety Council, because the police is one of the members, and they also chair the Road Safety Council -- the deputy director of operations chairs the Road Safety Council.

MR DUNCAN: What about under the regulations made under the Public Bus Services Ordinance: how often are prosecutions instituted under the regulations?

MS MABLE CHAN: We do not have the information at hand.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, if I may just interrupt, the protective shield photographs are apparently not in the bundle. We don't have any of those available within the bundle.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I missed the first part?

MR DUNCAN: The protective shields for the drivers, there are no copies of those photographs in the bundles, as far as we are aware.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, perhaps we can help on that. I think I have seen such photo in our file records. Perhaps we can try to locate and supply the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That would assist.

MS MABLE CHAN: I will try. I cannot commit, but we will try.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. If you can find one, please give it to us so that we can understand what it is that has been installed or will be installed.

MS MABLE CHAN: Because they are actually installed in the buses and when we ride on the buses, we actually see such kind of shield beside the driver.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Now, spot-checks on vehicles. This was raised with Mr Lai yesterday, and he was asked a question by one of the committee members as to how the figure of 14 per day had come about.

Are you able to assist us in that respect?

MS MABLE CHAN: The 14 vehicles under spot-check by the Transport Department is one of the indicators in the controlling officer's report under the Transport Department.

In devising the pledge or the indicator, we have to consider it in the context of a robust vehicle

inspection exercise conducted by the TD. Every franchised bus vehicle is inspected on a monthly basis. On top of that, it is also inspected on an annual basis. Only in those cases whereby that bus vehicle is not under an investigation of a monthly inspection at that particular moment -- I would like to phrase it again -- we would conduct monthly and annual inspection of each and every bus vehicle. It is only in those cases whereby the bus vehicle is not subject to a monthly inspection --

MR YK CHAN: Not recently --

MS MABLE CHAN: Can I ask my colleague to supplement on that detail?

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. I think the real question is why 14, why not 24, why not 214?

MS MABLE CHAN: In very simple terms, the spot-check is conducted on top of the regular monthly and annual inspection, and the monthly and annual inspection is on a planned basis. The spot-check is really to exercise a more robust and unplanned random check.

CHAIRMAN: But why 14? Why not some other number?

MS MABLE CHAN: 14 buses per day, equivalent to 3,400 buses per year, and this is against the total fleet of 5,900 bus fleet of all the bus operators. There is not a very specific or scientific basis to arrive at 14, but

obviously this is also derived having regarded to the resources available and also the size of the fleet and also the size of the fleet of vehicles to be inspected by TD under the monthly and annual programme in our vehicle examination centre.

So far, the check results of the annual and monthly checks, as well as the spot-checks, give us a reasonable, confident basis to say that in general the construction and maintenance of the bus vehicle is under a satisfactory situation, and should there be any safety-related bus defects, those are immediately rectified and detected.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Ms Chan, I want to turn now to a different topic, if I could. It's concerned with the department's contact with trade unions. It's clear from your evidence that there is a lot of communication between the department and the bus companies. What I'm keen to explore is the contact that you have from time to time with the trade unions.

The trade unions, many of them have made submissions to the committee for these proceedings. Have you had

the opportunity of reading some of those submissions?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have read some of them.

MR DUNCAN: You have read them? Thank you.

Do I understand the position to be that, from time to time, trade unions will come to the department or write to the department and indicate matters of concern to them to the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will say time and again we have received letters or requests from the trade unions expressing their issues of concern.

MR DUNCAN: How does the department deal with those approaches?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will start by saying this. As an ongoing basis, should the trade unions express any issues of concern relating to the benefits and working conditions of the bus captains, we will, depending on the nature of their request, consider whether it relates to the employment or manpower policy of individual bus companies, and then we will consider referring the matter or discuss the matter with the bus company on a case-by-case basis.

More frequently, relatively speaking, some of these requests relate to the working hours and the rest times of the bus drivers, because while the ordinance does not require us to stipulate specific requirements of working

hours and conditions, the department over the last 10 to 20 years have devised the guidelines requiring the bus companies to follow, insofar as the working hours, the driving hours and the rest and meal breaks are concerned.

In that context, it has developed to the present moment that the trade unions may raise their concerns in that context to us.

So the ongoing implementation of the working hours guideline actually enables the trade unions to express their suggestions or views time and again to the Transport Department, and we will take that into account and reflect upon them as an ongoing basis.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Earlier on this morning, we saw minutes of three meetings that you had held at which trade union representatives were present. They were respectively in October 2016, March 2017 and July 2017.

What prompted those meetings?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I may invite my assistant commissioner, Ms Kwan, to try to respond to that question.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS RACHEL KWAN: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so, just to remind ourselves, these

were meetings where you took us to the issue of the safety of bus captains?

MR DUNCAN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Your question now is more general --

MR DUNCAN: It is.

CHAIRMAN: -- as to what led to the meetings being held?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS RACHEL KWAN: So, Mr Chairman, over the years, we met the staff unions from time to time, in response to their request. They would raise issues that concern them most, such as working hours, implementation of the working hours guideline, the working conditions, and also their practical difficulties in their driving duties, such as they encounter some on-street obstructions to their bus operation, something like that. They will raise with us some congestion black spots to us, for us to liaise with other concerned departments to resolve the problems.

MR DUNCAN: So how regularly would you meet the trade unions in a meeting such as we have seen from the documentation?

MS RACHEL KWAN: There is no such fixed pattern. Usually, when we have some items to raise with them, we will discuss with them, we will arrange meeting to discuss

with them; or, on the other hand, if they have matters that concern them most, they will ask us to arrange meeting for them.

MR DUNCAN: So could you give the committee some idea as to how many times in a year you would meet with the trade unions?

MS RACHEL KWAN: It's about two to three times a year.

MR DUNCAN: Was it typical that persons from the police and other bodies would attend those meetings?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Yes. It really depends on the agenda, on the items to be raised at the meeting. We will invite, for example, the police to attend the meeting if necessary.

MR DUNCAN: I want to refer you, Ms Chan again, back to bundle TU-1, at page 80 this time.

This is part of the submission from the Kowloon Motor Bus Staff Union to the committee. I assume, Ms Chan, that this is one of the documents you have been able to read?

MS MABLE CHAN: Mm-hmm.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention, please, to paragraph 1 of the letter.

The translation is at page 80-1.

Item (1), could you just read that to yourself, please.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Have you read that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You can see some sentiments, quite strongly worded there, from the trade union, sentiments that have been communicated to the committee.

What is your response to those sentiments?

MS MABLE CHAN: From the English translation of that letter, it actually -- the first paragraph mentions a number of issues, like high wastage rate, low remuneration package, overlong working hours, et cetera. These are the issues that have been raised by the staff unions, both to the bus operator and also during their discussions or meetings with the Transport Department.

On the high wastage rate, I think this was also mentioned in the first session yesterday, about the acute manpower shortage.

The low remuneration package is also one of the areas that the government has asked the bus operators to look into that as one of the measures to attract new blood and to retain the in-service bus captains.

The overlong working hours is a longstanding issue, and that is actually one of the issues that we have been looking into time and again over the years, when we formulate or revise the working hours guidelines.

The tight bus trip schedules is another issue concerning the operation, and this relates to the increasing public demand on public bus service, coupled with on-the-ground traffic congestion issues in certain areas, that will lead to the tight deployment of bus trip schedules.

As far as the management, they have raised the issue about the management issue, this is more an issue between the management and the staff as far as the individual bus companies are concerned.

So, in short, these areas relating to the general bus operation in Hong Kong, the manpower issue, the remuneration issue and also the working hours of bus captains, the government is aware of that and that is why we are taking various measures to discuss with the bus companies.

The working hours guideline is one of the measures that we would want to improve their working conditions, by further shortening their working hours. And the remuneration package, we have also asked the bus companies to devise various means to attract new recruits and to retain the in-service bus captains as far as possible.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: How would you describe the department's

relationship with the trade unions? Is it a healthy relationship? Is it a tense relationship? Just how would you describe it?

MS MABLE CHAN: The Transport Department is a regulator of the franchised bus operators. Bus captains are an important asset and an important component in the operation of franchised bus operators. The Transport Department, though not being a labour department, we maintain an ongoing and close relationship with the staff unions of the bus captains under various bus operators.

I would say that we maintain an ongoing relationship and we stand ready to meet with them, on their request or on our own initiative.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I wasn't really asking whether it was ongoing or not, but is it a good relationship? Do you get on well together?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is difficult to generalise, to reply to your question in very short manner. I do not want to say so. But I would say that we keep an ongoing dialogue and we maintain a cordial relationship with them, to discuss issues of mutual concern, and we take into account their views and concerns, amongst other factors, in devising our guidelines on working hours,

and also in asking or facilitating the bus operators to improve the rest facilities in the depots and in the bus stops to address their very basic needs during the day.

MR DUNCAN: How does it compare with the relationship the department has with the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is difficult to compare. We are the regulator of the bus operators. We take a very serious attitude in regulating and monitoring the bus operators. As far as the staff unions are concerned, we consider them as important stakeholders in the process to ensure a proper and efficient service. The employees are key components of the bus operators, so we consider them as important stakeholders and that we have to maintain a close and ongoing discussion and dialogue with the staff unions.

MR DUNCAN: Just before the break, could I ask you again to look, please, at the heading, the introductory words to clause (1) of that submission. That was the sentiment to which I was referring earlier.

Does that sentiment come as a surprise to you?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will not comment on that.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps for the purpose of the record you want to read it out, then it will be in our transcript.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. It reads this:

"Serious negligence of duty by officials of the

Transport Department and their ineffective monitoring".

Does it surprise you that the trade unions have made that suggestion to the committee?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will not comment on that. What I can respond is that we have done our part in regulating and monitoring the bus operators, and we also take into account the views and concerns of the staff unions in devising the various measures that relate to the bus captains. We have maintained an ongoing discussion channel with the staff unions and we stand ready to meet them and hear their views, and we take seriously their views into account when we devise the various measures.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms Chan. After the break, I will take you to just some of the particular matters that the trade unions have raised with the committee. I'm not going to go through them all, but some of them, and I will be anxious to find out whether they have been raised with the department and, if so, how they have been resolved. But we will do that after the break.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We will take a break for 15 minutes. Thank you.

(11.38 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.58 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Ms Chan, before we turn to some of those issues that the trade unions have raised with the committee, there are just a couple of other matters I would like to ask you about.

The first arises from something you said this morning, during your evidence, pertaining to the guidelines on working times, and so forth.

If I could just quote from your evidence this morning. You said:

"More frequently, relatively speaking, some of these requests" -- and you are talking about requests from the trade unions -- "relate to the working hours and the rest times of the bus drivers, because while the ordinance does not require us to stipulate specific requirements of working hours and conditions, the department over the last 10 to 20 years have devised the guidelines requiring the bus companies to follow, insofar as the working hours, the driving hours and the rest and meal breaks are concerned."

Now, of course it is true that the ordinance does not require those matters to be dealt with, but you are aware, are you not, of the regulation in the ordinance which specifically provides for these matters to be the

subject of regulation? You are aware of that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So I'm going to ask you the same question --

CHAIRMAN: Could you take us to where we find that?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly. It's in the THB-2 bundle, Mr Chairman, at pages 124 and 125.

CHAIRMAN: And what are we looking at there?

MR DUNCAN: At 124, we are looking at section 35 of the ordinance, which is introduced by the words:

"Secretary for Transport and Housing to make regulations."

And the provision then within section 35 for:

"The Secretary ... [to] make regulations for all or any of the following matters".

If I can refer you over the page, 125, to item (j), regarding "in relation to the drivers of buses used by a grantee":

"(i) the maximum number of hours during which any such driver may be permitted to drive such a bus; and

(ii) the intervals to be provided by a grantee for the rest and refreshment of such drivers, in any period specified in the regulations".

Are you able to tell us is there any particular reason why the working hours schedule is governed by guidelines as opposed to regulations?

MS MABLE CHAN: As a matter of fact, the Transport Department first formulated the guidelines for compliance by the franchised bus operators on a voluntary basis back in 1993. The formal promulgation of the guidelines was in 1998. Since then, the guidelines were reviewed and as a result revised six times since 1998.

The process of implementation of the guidelines and review of the guidelines is an ongoing, evolving process. So far, the formulation of the guidelines and the revision to the guidelines were arrived at through discussions with the bus operators and also through our meetings with the staff unions, taking into account the views expressed by various stakeholders.

In implementation of the guidelines, we have required the bus operators to do the regular monitoring and supply us with regular information. The Transport Department has also employed independent contractor to do the independent survey and checking, to monitor the compliance.

Over the years, we can observe that the compliance by the bus operators to the guideline is significantly high. We do not detect any significant deviation from the bus operators from the guidelines.

So, from the operational point of view, we think

that the existing arrangement under which the working hours and the driving hours and the rest break and meal break are set out in the form of guidelines works well. Should there be any persistent non-compliance of the bus operators, we will take necessary follow-up actions, including issuing advisory letters, warning letters, to make sure that any non-compliance is rectified as early as possible.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: So do I take it from that that it has never even occurred to the department to do this by way of regulation?

MS MABLE CHAN: Under the existing framework, the guidelines serve as an effective tool for us to monitor the bus operators in deploying the bus drivers' driving duties, to meet the requirements under the guidelines, the guidelines provided for requirement on rest breaks and meal breaks for the bus captains. Coupled with that, we will also discuss with the bus operators and require them to provide necessary rest facilities. The whole process is an ongoing process and needs to be implemented in a pragmatic manner.

So we think that the guidelines at the present moment serve well and we will surely take that into account in assessing the bus operators' performance in

providing a proper and efficient service.

MR DUNCAN: Now, it is true, isn't it, that from time to time the trade unions and the staff unions have complained that the bus companies have not been complying with the guidelines? That has been a source of complaint from the unions and the staff members, has it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are aware that there may be individual complaints on particular occasions, but we have our own independent checking on the compliance of bus operators according to our guideline. We have tried our very best to institute independent checking mechanism, and we also expect the bus operators to make sure that those requirements are complied with.

Up to the present moment, we are reasonably satisfied that the bus operators regard those guidelines seriously and also fulfil the requirements as we required, to comply with the relevant guidelines, in formulating the bus driver duty shifts on an ongoing basis.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Do you accept that if they were the subject of regulation, the department would have more teeth to enforce the arrangements than it does with simple guidelines?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on our experience so far, we are satisfied that the guidelines are followed through and there are checks and balances to ensure independent checking, and should there be any non-compliance on a particular occasion, we would take it up with the bus operator and see what are the causes for those non-compliance in a particular case, and then we will take it up with the bus operator accordingly.

So far the mechanism to ensure compliance and follow-through works effectively.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The question was: do you accept that the regulations would give the department more teeth than guidelines, not whether or not guidelines are working, but whether or not the regulations would give the armoury available to the Transport Department more teeth?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think this is an issue to be looked at in the overall scheme of things and the legislative framework. At the present moment, the monitoring of TD and also the regulation of TD of the bus operators actually flows from the statutory framework under the PBSO and the Road Traffic Ordinance, under the franchise, and also there are other commitment letters and administrative requirements.

So I think, overall, in the overall scheme of things, it is how the Transport Department performs our monitoring and mandatory role.

So I will not comment at this stage as to whether a particular requirement to be set out in the regulation will particularly give us more teeth in that particular sense, because the monitoring and regulation by TD on the bus operators' operation is performed under the overall scheme of things, with statutory requirements, franchise provisions, and also other directives or notices issued by the Commissioner for Transport.

CHAIRMAN: So does it come to this: although the legislature thought it was sensible to give you the power to make regulations, you have not found it necessary to do so because the informal system that you have works?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would respond that, as I mentioned just now, the existing framework or regime under which we enforce the compliance of the guidelines and follow through and take rectification system works to our satisfaction at the present moment.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The other matter I want to ask you about before we go to the trade unions' points is something that arises from your supplemental written submission. It's at TD-1 at page 163. Could you turn up that, please.

Could I refer you to the first item on that page, item 17.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: The question that was asked by the committee was that "If the requisite capabilities of the tachograph/black box were communicated to the [bus] operators in written form, please provide copy samples of such documentation. Has the [Department] revised the requisite capabilities of the tachograph/black box from the time that the [Transport Department] first required [bus] operators to fit the device on franchised buses?"

So that was the matter which was posed.

If we look at your response:

"The [Department] have issued a 'Basic minimum requirements for electronic recording devices (also known as black box) on new buses' to the [bus] operators and a copy is enclosed ..."

We will go to that in a moment.

"Based on these requirements, the vehicle examiners would conduct random checks on the functionality of the black boxes during bus inspections.

We understand that over the years with the advancement of technology, the ... operators have taken initiative to work with the supplier of the device to widen the scope of information being kept by the black

box to facilitate their fleet management, which may include records of route number, door bell pushing, opening of the doors, GPS location, brake application, et cetera."

Now, if I could take you, please, to annex 15. You will find that at TD-5 at page 1597.

Do you see at that page, 1597, the letter that the Transport Department sent to a number of franchisees? Is that the letter requiring the use of the so-called black box?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. It was at a time when the black box requirement was imposed.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

If you turn over the page --

CHAIRMAN: So that is 17 October 2003?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Then over the page, the "Basic minimum requirements for the electronic data recording device" are set out.

Is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, I beg your pardon?

MR DUNCAN: Over the page, you will see the "Basic minimum requirements" set out.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Since 2003, of course, technology has moved on

and black boxes are able to provide all sorts of information now which wasn't available in 2003. You will be aware of that.

Has the department issued any further directives to the bus companies as to the sort of information that it needs to collect from these black boxes in today's technology world?

MS MABLE CHAN: I just confirmed with my colleagues that since 2003 we have not issued similar directive regarding the electronic data recording device.

MR DUNCAN: So this is something simply left to the bus companies, to keep up with technology?

MS MABLE CHAN: The advancement of the technology has evolved over the years, and we are in the process of discussing the enhancement of the black box system in our working group which I mentioned this morning, which we started to commence deliberation in March 2018.

This is one of the issues that has been included in the scope of work for discussing with the bus companies and bus operators. Over the past years, we have not issued any similar directive on enhancement over the years. But we would expect that as the technology advances, the bus companies, they are also prepared to consider and examine any possible means to enhance their existing devices in the buses.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is yes, it's been left to the bus companies in the intervening 14 years?

MS MABLE CHAN: In the intervening 14 years, as my colleagues mentioned yesterday, there is ongoing contact with the bus manufacturers and the bus companies, and they keep in view any new technological data and advancement in the various devices.

We have not issued any particular additional note to supplement on this directive, but that doesn't mean that we did not look into that.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Now I want to go, please, to some of the matters that --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, if you are moving away from black boxes?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could help the committee with this. Is the Transport Department aware of the devices that are now in use, the black box devices, in the various franchised bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: I beg your pardon? Is it are we aware of any --

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of the capability of the devices now being used, that are called black boxes, by the various companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will invite Mr Chan, our expert, to --

MR YK CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I think I will just roughly go over the various functions of the black box that various companies are now adopting.

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer the company directly, "yes" or "no" to start with, and then by all means give us your explanation. Are you aware of the capabilities of the devices described as black boxes, as a general sort of term, used by the various bus companies?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is yes?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Please explain.

MR YK CHAN: A black box -- I think basically the first thing is the device is capable of sort of monitoring the movement of the vehicle by each time interval, by a certain time interval, perhaps second by second.

CHAIRMAN: That was the 2003 requirement.

MR YK CHAN: It's the 2003 requirement.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: And really, in the old days, it's sort of analogue type of black box, tachographs, but nowadays

it's become electronic, so there are developments that you can utilise this basic information in various ways.

I understand from the bus companies nowadays, they actually -- apart from recording, the braking, the speed, the opening of doors, the sounding of bells are all recorded in that gadget -- we call it black box nowadays -- and actually the bus companies are utilising this information as a driver monitoring or fleet management tool, to conduct their day-to-day monitoring.

That is the basic function of it. Of course, with the development of other type of technologies, like GPS or other --

CHAIRMAN: That's hardly a new technology, is it?

MR YK CHAN: I think the technology itself is not new.

CHAIRMAN: American mothers were buying their sons in the military in the Gulf War in 1990 Magellan GPS machines so they could find their way across the desert.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, the technology itself may not be new, the basic information it produces may not be new, but with the advance of technologies and the development of various uses of the information, in the context of fleet management, the bus companies are actually utilising this sort of information, as I said, as a tool to monitor the operation of the vehicles day in and day out, and also they can also monitor the driving

behaviour of drivers day in and day out.

So you can say fleet management is not new either, because actually it has been deployed by various transport companies for a long, long time, and this information, for our bus companies in Hong Kong, as I said, as the commissioner said, we have not just left it to the bus companies to look into what they want to do.

Over the years, as I mentioned yesterday either, we have been sort of looking around, new technologies and new applications or utilising technologies that are available. Now, black box, although it is producing very basic information, but we actually over the years have been communicating -- talking to bus companies, asking them to study and investigate the feasibility of applying this sort of technologies and the information produced by the black box to better manage their bus operation and drivers.

I think they have been doing that, and I understand also from a couple of companies, bus companies, recently they are actually upgrading their software and systems to better utilise the black box information.

CHAIRMAN: These requests that were made of the various bus companies, that they investigate the improved technology and consider using them, were these made in writing?

MR YK CHAN: I cannot answer this question right now. I can go back and check. But certainly we have various meetings and also discussion and even when -- our staff all go over to the depots to see the management over maintenance or construction and maintenance of vehicles, we do raise out this sort of discussions.

But whether these questions or requests have been recorded down formally, then we will have to check again.

CHAIRMAN: Whether it's formal or not, were there any minutes taken of meetings, were there any letters evidencing what you say was communication over the years? If you are able to find them, would you be kind enough to first of all locate them and give us sample copies?

MR YK CHAN: Sure.

MS MABLE CHAN: We will try to do our hard work again.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you, please, to bundle TU-1 at page 185.

I think I have to introduce this page by asking you to go back to page 147. We don't have a translation of this but it's a very small portion I'm going to ask the committee to consider. The start of the document is at page 147. Do you have that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. If you go back two pages to 145, you will see the covering letter. This is a written submission to the committee by the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions.

If you could go through then, please, to page 185 of the document, and if I could bring your attention, please, to the last paragraph which starts on page 185.

The translation that I have suggests that the content of this paragraph is as follows:

"In order to receive a bonus payment, the bus captains must pass the assessment. The bus operators use the attendance rate as an important criteria in determining whether to grant a bonus. Bus captains would continue driving even when they are sick."

Do you see that in that portion that I have brought to your attention?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have yet to locate the specific statement in the Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time.

MS MABLE CHAN: I can locate the paragraph, although the order of the expression of the views may not totally --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can give us your interpretation, if you are able to. If not, say so.

MR DUNCAN: As it's been put to me -- you can agree with

this or you can comment on it -- I will put to you --

MS MABLE CHAN: Can you put your English translation --

MR DUNCAN: I will read it to you again, yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- again so I can hear --

MR DUNCAN: So you can understand it and see whether that's reflective of what you have read:

"In order to receive a bonus payment, the bus captains must pass the assessment. The bus operators use their attendance rate as an important criteria in determining whether to grant a bonus."

So the bus companies (sic) have to continue have to continue driving in order to keep their attendance rate up, in order to get the bonus, so they will drive even when they should be on sick leave?

CHAIRMAN: That's bus captains do that?

MR DUNCAN: Bus captains, yes.

You need to read 185 and on to 186.

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can try to help.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: Because the paragraph starts to mention about the new recruit employed on contract basis and the bus company takes into account their attendance performance, their attendance rate, as one of the factors in considering whether to renew the contract. And such contract staff very often, in order to hope

that the company will renew their contract, may attend while they are sick or have illness.

You consider this attendance as a factor in considering the renewal of the contract is unreasonable, then it's the second part of this paragraph mentioning that the bus company in recent years introduced a year-end bonus for new recruits, and the bus company has introduced an assessment mechanism for awarding of such bonus, and the bus company will also consider this attendance rate as one of the indicators in the assessment.

So there are two parts of the statement.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Let's not quibble with what is in there. Let me ask you this, though. Is this a matter that the trade unions have brought to the department's attention?

MS MABLE CHAN: As I have said, because I have seen this submission, and this is also one of the issues recently raised by the staff unions in various occasions, so I am aware of that.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: But as to whether they have formally raised this in their submission or letter to the Transport Department, I will have to check on that.

CHAIRMAN: But it's been brought to the Transport Department's attention?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will have to check on that because I am aware of that and my colleagues are also aware of that, because this concern has been raised by the staff unions, particularly following the Tai Po accident, but I would have to check on that and then revert to the committee with our written response.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Please do so. What I'm interested in is, first of all, whether it's been communicated to the department and then, secondly, if so, what steps have been taken by the department to look into this matter. Could you cover that in your written response, please?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, because we are aware of these kinds of concerns through the various occasions the media has widely reported and following the Tai Po incident. But I'm not sure whether this has been formally communicated to the Transport Department. This relates to the recent introduction by the bus company on the year-end bonus and also on their indicators to assess newly recruited staff on contract basis.

So it relates to the terms of the employment and the recruitment of a bus company.

CHAIRMAN: If you are aware of it, I think the broader question is what have you done about it, if anything, so far?

MS MABLE CHAN: I was aware of it in very recent months, following the Tai Po incident, as widely reported, but I will revert with further information as to the department as a whole is aware of this concern and through formal channels.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Another matter raised by the trade unions can be found at page 311 of the same bundle.

This, you will see, at page 310, is a document received from the Federation of Hong Kong & Kowloon Labour Unions. Do you see that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I'm referring you, please, to the paragraph which is the last paragraph to commence on page 311. For the purposes of the hearing this morning, I've had a translation of that particular paragraph prepared, and I'm going to make it available now. (Handed).

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a copy for the stenographer? (Handed).

MR DUNCAN: Could you take the time to read through that, please.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: In this particular part of the submission, the union has raised a matter pertaining to the advertising revenue of the franchised bus operators. Do you see

that?

MS MABLE CHAN: (Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN: There's a request of the government to review the regulation with regard to the non-fare revenue of the bus company.

Is this a matter which the unions have raised with the Transport Department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Not that I'm aware, no.

MR DUNCAN: So this is the first that you've come to know of this issue?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: The submission to the committee?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Could you just read out the part that you say is the request for a review.

MR DUNCAN: It's the last sentence of the first paragraph:

"The Federation of Hong Kong & Kowloon Labour Unions demands the government to review the regulation on the non-fare revenue in the franchised bus ['policy', I think it must be] to avoid the repetition of the aforementioned vicious cycle."

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I guessed correctly, "policy".

CHAIRMAN: So you are not aware of this request, Ms Chan?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: Can I then refer you back to another matter, this time at page 71.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, Chairman, apart from giving the answer that we are not aware, can I comment on that?

CHAIRMAN: Of course you can, yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on the submission, and the issue they raise about the companies' definition of the non-fare revenue, may I say for the record that the bus companies are expected to prepare their annual accounts and budget according to the international accounting standards, and they are subject to the internal audit of the department. Should they suggest any fare increase proposal, those will be scrutinised by the department and also the Financial Monitoring Unit of the Transport and Housing Bureau.

In considering the justification and basis for any fare increase, we will take into account the financial position of the company, projections of the cost and revenue; the non-fare revenue and fare revenue will both be taken into account.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I now wish to refer you to page 67 of the same bundle, please.

This is an email which encloses a submission to the committee from the Monthly-rated Drivers Union.

Could I bring your attention, please, to page 72 of the translation. You may wish to read the Chinese at page 68. Would you read to yourself, please, paragraph 3, headed, "Training of bus captains".

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I have read that.

MR DUNCAN: This concerns the matter of training.

MS MABLE CHAN: Mm-hmm.

MR DUNCAN: Have trade unions from time to time raised these sorts of issues with the department?

CHAIRMAN: Could you be more specific, when you say "these sorts"?

MR DUNCAN: The particular complaints that are set out in this paragraph, has the department been apprised of these particular matters?

CHAIRMAN: For my benefit at least, can you identify what you regard as the significant points?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman.

If I could quote from the translation, at the bottom of page 72, it's alleged as follows:

"At present, each training course consists of one or two trainees and an instructor, who will get along with one another for 17 days. Besides teaching proper driving skills and manners, the instructor will also observe the character of the trainees. However, the company neglects relevant comments under the existing

system. In fact, there is an abundant supply of trainees in the KMB bus captain training school. Nevertheless, only a few stay after a year. High work pressure ... and the discrepancy between the claimed salary in recruitment advertisements and actual income ... are reasons for wastage."

Have those sorts of allegations been brought to the attention of the department in the past?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?

MR DUNCAN: My question is: have those sorts of complaints been brought to the attention of the department in the past?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have read the Chinese version as well as the English version.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: The first part of the paragraph describes a particular case in which a new recruit candidate goes through the training process and also the driver licence examination, and it happens that after one week of service there is an accident happened and the bus company organised training course for this captain.

The Chinese says the company, under the existing system, they did not take into account relevant opinion. So this is not sure how they said that the company does not take into account the relevant opinion, because at

the outset it described the training course provided by the bus captain.

But the latter part of this paragraph actually mentioned about for those new recruits who continue to work for the first year, they may have to pay some training fees for the company. So, in this particular form, we have not received such kind of complaint, as to the specific occasion and also the specific arrangement of the training for individual companies, no.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: You haven't received those sorts of complaints?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: Moving to another topic: have trade unions or staff associations from time to time made comments to you about safety technology and safety provisions that might be introduced on buses? Have they themselves made suggestions?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will have to ask my colleagues to check from their memory.

Maybe I will ask Rachel to help out.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS RACHEL KWAN: When we met the staff union in the past, say, two years, they seldom raised question or suggestions about safety device.

I remember once upon a time they raised about

demister on the windscreen, because they find in spring time the foggy situation is serious. After that, we have followed up with their employers to see what solution could be made. This is the only item that relates to safety matters that I can remember.

MR DUNCAN: Have the unions from time to time raised matters pertaining to reflective mirrors and demisting devices, those sorts of things?

CHAIRMAN: I think that's what you just said that they have raised, some years ago; is that right?

MS RACHEL KWAN: Maybe two or three years ago, yes.

MR DUNCAN: What about display monitors and warning devices, sensors, to facilitate reversing? Have they been raised with you by trade unions at all?

MS RACHEL KWAN: I'm sorry, I'm not aware of that.

MR DUNCAN: Are trade unions represented at all on the working group which is looking at the new technology that might be available?

MS MABLE CHAN: No. The working group, the focus of the working group is to look at the bus safety enhancement device and also the training framework. We discussed with the bus companies and the bus manufacturers. In providing their views, insofar as the bus companies are concerned, we will expect the bus companies to take into account the company's circumstances and their other

stakeholders' views as necessary to provide the feedback to us.

As colleagues have just recalled and mentioned, our ongoing discussion with the trade unions arises from our ongoing process in developing the working hours guidelines, so in that context, it is more often that they raise the working hours and the conditions and their concern about remuneration and take-home pay. It is not common for them to raise specific issues regarding their remuneration arrangement and the contractual terms which falls into the purview of the individual bus companies and their employees.

The bus operators are expected to fulfil the statutory requirements under the Employment Ordinance, to devise their employment terms for the recruitment of the bus captains.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why the trade unions were not involved in the working group, if one of the things you are considering is training?

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

The working group started its scope of work to look at the bus enhancement device, and also see whether there are any ways to improve the monitoring and formalisation of the training framework.

The working group is not tasked to look into imposing new training requirements as such or modules on the bus companies. What we are trying to do is to get hold of the existing training arrangements and then to formalise it and align it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: One of the technological devices being considered was a speed display unit in the bus, like the PLBs, as I understand it. Do I understand it correctly?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Isn't that a matter that would be something that bus drivers themselves might contribute to?

MS MABLE CHAN: The speed display unit, the feasibility of such kind of device or the speed display unit in the bus is one of the topics being considered in the working group. But we are also aware of the bus companies' feedback that perhaps it may impose burden and pressure on the bus drivers, with passengers on board monitoring the driving behaviour of the bus captains.

Should there be any particular new proposal that may have implication on the staff, Transport Department is more than happy to involve the staff unions to explore feasibility of new measures.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Rather than having the bus operators tell you

what they think the bus captains might react to in terms of having a speed display unit, is there any reason why the bus drivers themselves were not asked or their trade unions?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are prepared to meet with them and discuss with them.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Which are the stakeholders then which are represented in this working group?

MS MABLE CHAN: The working group comprises of the bus operators and the bus manufacturers, and it also comprises the Vehicle Licensing Examination Unit, the electrical and mechanical engineers involved overseeing the technology side, and also the Road Safety and Standards Unit within the Transport Department, overseeing the territory-wide road safety matters.

CHAIRMAN: So the group is constituted by the Transport Department on one side, bus operators on the other side, and for technical purposes bus manufacturers are brought in; do I understand it correctly?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Has the department given any consideration at all to involving trade union representatives in that working group?

MS MABLE CHAN: At the present moment the working group does not comprise representatives from the trade unions. The working group is tasked to look into possible ideas, in order to formulate proposals. As with our usual practice, when there are more systematic thoughts and proposals, we can discuss with the other stakeholders, including the trade unions, and we are ready to do so.

MR DUNCAN: I take it that the answer to my question is no, you haven't considered that?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have considered that, because at the present moment the working group has just discussed the initial thoughts on the devices and the training framework, and the training actually involves the bus captains. So, after the working group has come up with more concrete proposals, with our ongoing dialogue and discussion with the trade unions, we are ready to share with them, and I have this in my mind.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So it has been determined, for current purposes, not to involve the trade unions at this stage?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, at this initial formulation stage.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Have you communicated that intention to the trade unions?

MS MABLE CHAN: No, because the working group was initiated

by us in order to take stock of various suggestions, requests, and various ideas initiated by the department. We want to scope the work and the task involved with a view to formulating more concrete proposals. It will be by then that we have a more clearer and more systematic framework in order to consult various stakeholders.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Now could I take you, please, to one other matter raised by the unions. This you will find at TU-1, page 174. Sorry, this is a matter which has not been translated.

CHAIRMAN: Is this the document that begins at page 147?

MR DUNCAN: Indeed it is, Mr Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And it's the submission of the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, with a cover letter at age 145. I've referred to this document before. I'm going back to the same document.

Can I bring to your attention, please, the bottom part of page 174, that paragraph. Could you read that to yourself.

MS MABLE CHAN: I beg your pardon, is it at the bottom of the page, the second paragraph?

MR DUNCAN: Correct, the second paragraph on page 174, yes.

CHAIRMAN: With the words "Alexander Dennis Enviro"?

MR DUNCAN: That's correct.

MS MABLE CHAN: We have read that paragraph. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is that paragraph bringing to the attention of the committee the danger in trying to control buses that have rear-wheel steering functions, and also problems involved in 12.7-metre buses?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. If I may go into -- try to answer this question. I believe the question is about that recently there has been introduced 12.8-metre buses, with the turning circle may be -- well, some of the drivers find it is difficult to handle for them.

First of all, any buses introduced in Hong Kong will have to comply with all the construction and maintenance regulations, and also all those buses imported into Hong Kong, nowadays they -- I think over 99 per cent actually come from Europe, and they have to comply with all the European standards.

The question is whether these buses are sort of applicable in Hong Kong. This is the main question. So, in our system, any new buses introduced into Hong Kong, the first thing we do, it has to go through a type of approval procedure. Those procedures, apart from looking at the technical part, technical aspects of the vehicles, and also the vehicle, we also look into

whether these vehicles are suitable to be used on roads in Hong Kong.

Having assessed those technical requirements, those buses, as we see, they are technically sound and feasible to be used in Hong Kong. On that, we notice actually some of the drivers feel that because the bus is longer than the existing -- most of the buses we use are 12 metres, and this one is 12.8 metres, so in the sort of turning handling, there is a slight deviation, slightly -- they have to sort of, I would say, get accustomed to the handling of those vehicles.

In this respect, we have actually asked -- we have done a few things. One, the bus company will have to sort of train their drivers to be accustomed to handle this vehicle. So there's no question of the bus is dangerous, if the buses can be handled properly.

The second thing is, if this bus is longer than most of the buses we use in Hong Kong, so in deploying these buses we have to actually look into the routes they are actually deployed, and it is -- at the moment when we deploy these 12.8-metre buses, they are route-specific. So we have to try those routes first and see if they are safe to be operated before we allow the bus companies to deploy them.

Not all buses used by the bus companies are

12.8 metres. Some of them may be restricted to 12 metres and some even to shorter buses, like those going up to The Peak.

So this is a matter of training and also deployment of the routes in the right place, and there is no question of these buses are dangerous.

That's my reply.

CHAIRMAN: Earlier on you said that they are 99 per cent from Europe and they comply with European standards?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Has this been a matter which the trade unions have raised with the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. We are aware of that and we have looked into that.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, actually this has been raised by the union to the department, and that's why my division actually studied in detail on the turning circles and turning path, to see what the problem was.

We have actually mentioned that this is something that the bus companies should look into, because the complaint from the drivers is that they feel it is not comfortable to drive a new vehicle with that length. That's why we impress upon the bus company to do their job in driver training, and also on our part, when we improve these buses, we deploy them on a suitable route.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps one last question from the chair before we have our lunch break.

Presumably there is some advantage to having a longer bus. Does it give greater passenger capacity? Is that the reason?

MR YK CHAN: Strictly speaking, if it's a longer bus, they provide more seats. But for this particular model, I would expect that this model does have the advantage to be deployed in Hong Kong. Apart from sort of a few seats, there may be other advantages in the manoeuvrability and the new technology deployed.

CHAIRMAN: You can tell us about the advantages after lunch.

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can add one point?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: The bus companies have pledged to enhance the accessibility facilities, like wheelchair passengers. So the greater room for manoeuvrability within a bus vehicle will enable them to improve in this aspect. This is also one of the indicators we look into in assessing the performance of the bus operator.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will adjourn then and we will resume at 2.30 this afternoon.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

(1.02 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Chan, I think you were going to add some comments with regard to the advantages of these rather large buses.

MS MABLE CHAN: I have nothing to add.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, Mr Chan. Is it Mr Chan?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. You were telling us that there were some advantages to large buses.

MR YK CHAN: Yes. I think my colleagues already supplemented that longer buses will be able to make the bus have low-floor features and also accessible to wheelchairs.

CHAIRMAN: Easier access, in those circumstances?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chan, I want to raise another question with you, which was raised with Mr Lai from the bureau yesterday, and again he was unable to assist us. This is a matter raised I think by Prof Lo during the hearing. It relates to the number of drivers who are required, given the special shift provisions in the

working hours.

The question was whether any research had been done into the impact that there would be if that 14-hour special shift was removed, given that the current estimate of the Transport Department is that, with those new guidelines, there is going to be a need for something like 250 or so additional drivers. We were led to believe by Mr Lai that that sort of research had been done by the department, and I'm just wondering whether you are in a position to provide us with the results of that research.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would be pleased to do so.

We commenced a review of the working hours guidelines in September 2017. That was made on the initiative of the Transport and Housing Bureau. The starting point is to explore room for further improvement in the working conditions, in particular the working hours of bus captains.

In considering room for improvement and noting there have been changes and revisions in the past, we have taken a comprehensive review of the guidelines, taking into account the operational needs of the franchised bus operators, passengers and members of the public's demands for increased bus service level, staff unions' ongoing requests and demands for improvement in working

conditions, et cetera.

In conducting the review, we have also taken into account a number of factors, including the manpower implications of the implementation of the guidelines.

As I mentioned, the starting point is to improve the working conditions, in particular including the shortening of the maximum duty shift hours as well as the driving hours of the bus captains.

The latest products or the latest revised guidelines have involved research into the demands for the additional bus captains, and that ranges in the order of 250-something, 260, and we have included it in our bundle, paper 5, on the working conditions.

In the process, we have explored the possibility of reducing the maximum duty hours of the prevailing long shifts which are in current operation by some of the bus operators. It is our understanding that some of the bus operators have arranged for longer shifts in order to cater for the morning and the peak demands of certain bus routes, especially in those bus routes which are long and may span across various districts, from the New Territories, to cross harbour, to the Island.

We looked into the possibility of shortening the maximum duty hours and driving hours for these kinds of special duty shifts as well. Based on the information

provided by the bus operators, and having regard to those statistics that we have collected from our own surveys on the onboard bus trips as well as the driver deployment and establishment, we have conducted an analysis of the additional manpower implications should the maximum duty hours of this kind of special duty shifts be further shortened.

In very high-level summary terms, the ballpark estimate of the additional manpower implications for reducing the maximum duty hours of this kind of special duty shifts will range to the level of 1,600 additional bus captains amongst all the franchised bus operators.

Manpower implication is one of the factors that we have taken into account, because we are also very mindful to ensure a satisfactory level of bus service, as well as the practicality of the bus companies in recruiting additional bus captains, to ensure a timely implementation of the guideline.

We very much hope, and we have actually proposed to the bus companies throughout our meetings with them, to achieve a reasonable time frame for the full implementation of the guidelines.

Having regard to the manpower implications, the practicality of implementation, as well as the time frame for achieving the full implementation of the

guidelines, we eventually consider that we will include in the revised guidelines a section on this special duty shift. The special duty shift maximum duty hour will be maintained at 14 hours as the maximum cap, but the driving hours of bus captains who are on the special duty shift will be reduced to ten hours, which is on par with that of the driving hours of the normal duty shift.

In addition, we also impose a requirement on the bus companies to provide a break of no less than three hours within the shift duty. This is to ensure that while the bus captain may be deployed for such kind of routes which are operated under special duty shift arrangement, there will be enough rest break for the bus captain, and the driving hours, ie the bus drivers who are on the road, the maximum hours will be reduced to ten hours.

We provided our research and also assessment to the Transport and Housing Bureau and discussed with them. After the discussion, and noting the relevant implications, the guidelines were finalised and promulgated earlier this year, in February 2018.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, I just really want to deal with the numbers, if I could. I may have misunderstood some aspects of your earlier submission. So, at the risk of having you to repeat some matters, could I just clarify

some numbers?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure.

MR DUNCAN: Currently, how many people are engaged as bus captains, across all of the franchised companies, the approximate number of all bus captains?

CHAIRMAN: When you locate the information, perhaps you could tell us and we can follow it in the written submission.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure. I am actually trying to refer to paper 5, TD bundle, table 1.

The total adds up to more than 12,000.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find that? Which paragraph?

MS MABLE CHAN: Paragraph 9. Below paragraph 9, there is a table 1, showing the breakdown of the bus captains in respect of the individual FB operators.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: So the total of each of the captains employed by the respective bus companies will add up to some 12,000-plus.

MR DUNCAN: Assuming the implementation of the guidelines, what is the department's estimate as to the additional number of captains required?

MS MABLE CHAN: Let me refer to paragraph 7 of this paper:

"Based on the crude projections by the FB operators, it is estimated that a total of 250 additional bus

captains will be required for full implementation of the [currently revised] guidelines."

We have also studied this figure and compared with our own information regarding the bus captains' strength and numbers in respect of the FB operators. So it is in the order of a total of additional 250.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. And if the special shift, which is provided for in the new guidelines, was done away with, how would that impact the figure of 250?

MS MABLE CHAN: It will be increased to a total of 1,600 additional bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: So instead of 250, read 1,600?

MS MABLE CHAN: 1,600, yes. More than 10 per cent of the total establishment of the FB operators added together.

MR DUNCAN: We may be able to work this out for ourselves, but given your position, can you explain very succinctly why the number would increase so significantly?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can invite my deputy, who will have the knowledge about the shift duties and the hours and deployment, in order to help the committee to appreciate in simple and direct way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MACELLA LEE: I will try to be simple. Because the operating hours are very long and there is a peak demand in the morning and the evening peak, so if we don't

allow these drivers to have longer duty hours covering the two peaks, it means you have to have two drivers to meet the extra demand at the peak, and these drivers will have to have shorter duty hours. That means it can be six hours and seven hours. This, to some extent, is not efficient, in a sense.

Because we have to cover the demand in the morning peak and the evening peak, so we don't have one person doing that now, you have two people, so the headcount is not just 250 plus two, because -- actually, the heads are more but each one will do a shorter time, much shorter duty shifts, maybe six hours, seven hours or even five hours.

So that's why it's not 250 times two. More heads, each one doing -- you may say that a normal driver drives ten hours, but if we have to cancel the split shift, it means that those extra -- about 13 per cent of the drivers have to double, because they can't work so long, and when you double the head, each one of them doing not 14 hours but even shorter, like six hours. So the mathematics is like that. So it's up to 1,600.

I hope I can clarify the situation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: I wonder if I can ask a question.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MEMBER LO: I'm just thinking about very simply how many drivers were involved in special shift, multiply that by two, that would be the answer; right?

MS MACELLA LEE: No.

MEMBER LO: How come it's not?

MS MACELLA LEE: I have to explain that. There are 12,000 drivers, but this is the establishment, to me the daily service needs, it is about 9,000 duty shifts. You have more headcounts because everybody does only six days a week, you have leave, and so on.

I can tell you it's every day we need 9,000 duties, driving duties, or you can say 9,000 duty shifts, and among them about 1,200 are special duty shifts, 13 per cent, about 13 per cent.

MEMBER LO: Okay.

MS MACELLA LEE: So these 1,200 duties have to be times two, so it's 2,400, but of course there's no need to have a double in that sense, so it ranges at about 1,600. So we have to look at the matter in terms of duty shifts.

MR DUNCAN: Is a special shift a new initiative, or was it in play before the latest revised guidelines?

MS MABLE CHAN: The special duty shift has been operated by the individual bus operators to meet the morning and peak demand. In our review of the guidelines, we consider it necessary, in the first place, to look at

whether the maximum duty hours can be reduced, no matter they are normal or special duty.

We take the opportunity of the revision of the guidelines to specify in clearer terms on our requirements on the maximum duty hours and the driving hours. It is under this perspective that we introduce the subsection of requirements in the guidelines to illustrate more clearly on the special duty shift arrangement, and for this kind of arrangement what is our requirement on the maximum duty hours, driving hours and rest break for this special duty shift.

MR DUNCAN: So the previous version of the guidelines made no reference to the special shift?

MS MABLE CHAN: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: It's something that evolved within the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is evolving. We know this as a matter of fact. And more importantly, in our discussion with the bus operators and in meeting the staff unions, there are also views and suggestions that for those drivers who have been deployed for these special duty shifts, those drivers are also concerned about the remuneration or the take-home pay that they can get from the bus companies, in particular those working on these special duty shifts.

While we are looking at ways to shorten the duty hours and the driving hours, another concern that comes out during the discussion is the staff side, some of the staff side's anxiety about possible reduction in their take-home pay they then get from the bus companies.

So this is the whole process that we tackle the issue and it is an evolving process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: How were those concerns expressed by the staff about a reduction in their take-home pay?

MS MABLE CHAN: They make them in written submissions and also raise them with the meetings with the Transport Department, because during that period from October 2017 to February 2018, the Transport Department have met with the various staff unions and there were a series of meetings held during that period.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms Chan.

I want to move to another topic now, if I may.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan -- I think Mr Duncan was trying to ask you this question: when did special duties come into operation with bus companies? How long has this practice been in place?

MS MACELLA LEE: I think it exists at least 10 or 20 years before.

CHAIRMAN: A longstanding practice?

MS MACELLA LEE: Yes, a longstanding practice?

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Could you turn up, please, SEC-2 at page 664.

Are you looking at a document which is headed, "Community for Road Safety", and the heading, "Comments on the scope of the Public Transport Strategy Study (PTSS) for LegCo's Panel on Transport"?

Does this document appear to bear a date in 2015?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Was there a public transport strategy study in 2015?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, there is a study conducted in 2015.

MR DUNCAN: Did the department participate in this study?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. It was led by the bureau and involved the Transport Department's input.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Would this paper have come to the attention of the department during the course of the study?

MS MABLE CHAN: In the usual practice of LegCo, they include this submission as the deputations to LegCo, and the bureau and also the department appear before that meeting of the deputations, and we note that this is one of the deputations made during that occasion.

MR DUNCAN: So this would be one of the documents that would have come to the attention of the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention down to the second subheading on page 664, "Opportunities and strategy for better safety".

Can you read the second of the black marks there, reference to the ISO standard, "Road traffic safety management". If I quote from the document:

"... a new member of ISO launched in 2012 to target at transport fleets of public transport operators and the logistic industries. This would follow the steps of other ISO quality assurance systems in the future to help deliver far more responsible transport operation from the road safety perspective."

Perhaps I should have read the introductory words:

"With the advent of new measures or practices, the PTSS [that's the study] should examine all opportunities afresh to improve safety and quality of service."

Then those examples are set out.

At any time before this paper was issued, before 2015, or during the course of the study, did the department give consideration to supporting the introduction of this standard?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are aware of the remark made by the

Community for Road Safety, in particular on the suggestion regarding the adoption of ISO 39001 in the context of the PTSS. Actually, this Community for Road Safety have also raised this in other occasions of LegCo.

The ISO 39001 was one of the subjects flagged up in yesterday's oral session as well. We note that this is a road traffic safety management standard, and it was finalised in 2012, after rounds of discussion. Over the years since 2012, there are a number of transport companies or logistics companies in certain jurisdictions, including Japan, Korea, and some of the European companies start adopting this kind of standard. We are aware of that.

We take an open-minded approach towards this ISO 39001. The Transport Department at the present moment, we also maintain and establish our road safety management system. As we explained yesterday, we keep track of the accident data from a common database, we analyse it, we identify common factors, and also try to develop preventive or remedial actions, as part of that system.

This ISO 39001 stipulates in a more sophisticated way, an elaborative way on how a road traffic safety management system can be formulated having regard to

data and objective criteria. So we take an open-minded approach. We do not rule out the possibility of improving our standards of road traffic management system within the TD, towards a more sophisticated world standard.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So, when you say you have an open mind, does that mean you are not for it, nor are you against it?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are not against it. As I said --

MR DUNCAN: Are you for it?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have our established road traffic safety management in the department. It's always a positive move for the department to take into account latest and prevailing standards, in order to improve our system or to adopt latest standards in improving our system.

So any improvement in the standards, I would say, we would welcome and we would be ready to consider and look into it and see how our existing system can be further improved.

MR DUNCAN: Has the department at any time since 2012 considered the standard, to see whether it might improve the department's own current standards?

MS MABLE CHAN: Since the standards were first developed and promulgated in 2012, we noticed that it is quite new at that stage, and mostly it's the transport and logistics

operators who are considering the adoption of such standard.

So, upon its promulgation in 2012, we see that it is the start of a newly developed standard, at its early stage.

This submission by the Community for Road Safety was made in 2015 in the context of the PTSS, so our department currently established our road traffic management system and at the present moment we take an open-minded approach to this standard and see whether there is scope for improvement or even the adoption of this standard.

MR DUNCAN: As I understand this document, this would be a standard which would not actually be adopted by the department; it would be adopted by the transport company, ie the bus operator. Is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So has the department taken any steps to refer this to the bus companies for their consideration?

MS MABLE CHAN: We do not. We do not. This standard was raised by the community for road traffic in the overall study of the public transport strategy. It is very comprehensive and it's fully-fledged, and there are a lot of different suggestions and views made in the overall scheme of things.

So we did not at that juncture refer this particular standard to discuss with the bus operator.

MR DUNCAN: Can I move further into the bundle at page 778.

Are you looking at a communication from the Community for Road Safety, this time dated 16 June 2016?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Does it appear to be a response to the public consultation which was conducted leading up to the question of whether KMB's franchise should be renewed in 2017?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I'm aware of that.

MR DUNCAN: No doubt this letter and the document enclosed with this would have come to the attention of the department --

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: -- during that consultation exercise?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I could bring your attention to the letter, page 778, and in particular the first and second paragraphs -- the letter in total actually. Let me read it:

"In response to the above public consultation, we submitted a document to Government on 18 April 2016. Our comments focus on continuous safety improvement for bus operation. The contents cover a safety management

system in conjunction with a series of specific topics.

The document submitted by Government to LegCo's Panel on Transport ... 'Administration's paper on new franchise for bus network of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd -- report on the public consultation on the new franchise' only consists of a short paragraph on safety with two simplified points, namely 'to monitor bus captains' driving behaviour more closely' and 'to improve safety facilities on buses'. These clearly fail to reflect the much broader issues we raised.

Bus safety is a very important topic. For this reason we consider that it is necessary to submit our original document directly to LegCo's Panel on Transport for reference."

Then you will see what I understand to be the original document, which runs from page 779 through to 783.

Could I ask you to go to page 781. You will see the heading on that page, "Bus safety -- road safety management system", and there is reference again to the ISO 39001 standard, and there is reference, if I could quote it:

"This quality assurance system encourages fleet operators to be far more accountable and proactive in reducing accidents and risks."

Then the recommendations, there are two:

"Under the new franchise requirements encourage the bus companies to adopt a more advanced road safety management system towards the ISO ... standard."

Then:

"Government shall collaborate with the bus companies to study bus accidents and risks in details, with the view of setting targets of accident reduction."

Now, having received this document, did the department take any steps to encourage the bus companies to adopt the ISO standard?

MS MABLE CHAN: This submission was made as part of the submissions from the other stakeholders to LegCo, and this was made in the context of the discussion of the renewal of franchise for KMB in that year.

The discussion in LegCo at that juncture focused on a number of issues, as reflected in our LegCo Brief submitted to the IRC. I can ask my colleagues to refer to that paper in a moment.

There are a number of issues flagged up in the LegCo Brief to address the various key suggestions and issues raised in the renewal of the franchised buses. This recommendation made by the Community for Road Safety relates to the encouragement of bus companies of a more advanced road traffic safety management system and a new

standard.

At that juncture, we need to say that we did not bring this issue specifically to the bus company, but on the other hand, because the bus company, over the years we have required them to institute an internal monitoring system for the accident -- and also the safety performance of the bus company. On the other hand, the Transport Department has also established our own safety management system with independent analysis, to achieve the principle of "plan, do, check, act", which is very similar to the ISO 39001 standard.

So while the ISO 39001 standard is pretty new in relative terms as compared to the ISO 9001, and also the certificate or the adoption of the ISO 9001 is on a more widespread basis as compared to the adoption of the 39001, we treat it as a relatively new standard. That is why we did not raise this specifically with the bus companies at that juncture.

MR DUNCAN: How does the 39001 standard, as a standard, compare with the management systems that the bus companies operate? Which is better?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will invite the chief engineer on road safety to highlight a few key features of 39001 and then to try to address the --

MR DUNCAN: I don't think we need, with respect, to go into

a lot of detail with regard to what the standard contains.

What I think the committee would be interested in is the respective merits of one against the other.

MR TONY YAU: Chairman, as the commissioner mentioned, I think our system is actually doing the same thing, our safety management system is doing the same thing, that we have the planning process and we have the monitoring process -- we analyse and monitor the accident statistics, and then we report to the Road Safety Council to formulate policy on relevant road safety management measures, such as legislation enforcement.

Then, after these measures are delivered or implemented, the result will be reflected in the accident statistics, which is the result of our performance, and then we monitor the statistics again and then review to see if any of our existing policy or measures need to be reviewed.

The management system I think is quite similar in principle, but I cannot compare the details between the two systems, which one is better or which one is not so good as the others.

But in principle, I think for the Transport Department as an authority, our existing safety management system can achieve the same purpose.

MS MABLE CHAN: May I add that the Legislative Council Brief on the renewal of the franchise for KMB can be found on page 1100 in bundle TD-4.

The discussion in LegCo at that juncture actually involved a lot of the service enhancement initiatives, including enhancing ancillary facilities for passengers to disseminate information and provision of fare concessions and other issues relating to profit-control scheme.

MR DUNCAN: Has the department actually sat down and made a comparison between the ISO standard 39001 and its own systems?

MS MABLE CHAN: Pardon me?

MR DUNCAN: Has the department actually conducted a proper comparative analysis of the ISO standard on the one hand and the systems in place in the Transport Department on the other?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have yet to conduct a very comprehensive and systematic study and review at this present stage, especially given that we have mentioned the ISO 39001 is, relatively speaking, new as an adoption as a tool for the transport sector. We have yet to conduct a very systematic and elaborative study on that.

MR DUNCAN: It did come into force in 2012.

MS MABLE CHAN: In relative speaking terms, since its

promulgation in 2012, the rate of the adoption of the standard by the transport operators and logistics companies is small as compared to the prevailing adoption of the ISO 9001 by the other transport operators.

I have some figures or perhaps Tony can supplement on the statistics, as regards the adoption.

MR TONY YAU: Yes. You may say that 2012, just a few years ago, is quite a long time, but for a management system it's very new and the time is very, very short. What we are talking about is the overall management system.

With reference to the overseas experience, the system so far is mainly adopted by the operators. Even in Singapore and the UK, they are still studying, start studying or may not try to commit to adopt the system.

So you may say 2012 may be a long time ago, but for a policy system or for a management system, it's very new, especially for a department, for an authority to adopt it, it needs some time to get more information and experience, the implementation experience, so that we can do a more meaningful analysis.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Can I ask this: has the department conducted any comparative analysis of the ISO standard 39001 and the management systems apparently in place within the bus

companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any plan in that respect?

MS MABLE CHAN: In any initiatives in improving or making the management system more robust, we would be ready and prepared to look into that.

MR DUNCAN: Do you think that would be a way of possibly improving matters?

MS MABLE CHAN: We will be ready to look into that as a possible way to improve the traffic management system in the bus operators.

MR DUNCAN: If I could refer you, please, to page 782 of the submission of the Community for Road Safety.

There are a number of suggestions there, under the heading of "Bus safety -- driving standard". They are under the heading "Recommendations".

Did any of those suggestions of the Community for Road Safety lead to any consideration of those sorts of matters by the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will ask my colleague to read them in a minute and then to give a response.

MR TONY YAU: Yes, Chairman. We receive the Community for Road Safety -- we occasionally receive their suggestions to introduce some lower speed limits to different areas.

I think I need to refer to our existing speed limit

structure in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong we implement a quite simple three-tier speed limit structures. We have a low-band, medium-band and high-band speed limit. For low-band, we are talking about 50 kilometres per hour; that will be adopted for urban or new town built-up areas. Then we have the middle band, it's 70 or 80 kilometres per hour; it's for areas or for some trunk roads outside the urban and new town areas. And the last one is the high band. High band is 100 kilometres per hour. It's usually for the high-standard expressway.

In Hong Kong, the highest speed limit is 110 kilometres per hour, which only exists in North Lantau Highways.

We base on this speed limit structure, this three-tier structure, actually we have done a review on this speed limit structure by consultants, and the existing structure is generally in line with overseas jurisdictions, with proven safety records. These three tiers are simple for the motorists to be familiar with the speed limit. We are talking about the speed limit, it's not the motorist, you need to follow, or you forget the traffic condition, just simply follow the speed limit. The speed limit is the legislative requirement that you cannot exceed the speed limit at any time, and

the motorists have to have the duty to make reference to the traffic condition, their vehicle condition --

CHAIRMAN: The speed limit's not compulsory. If it's 50 k, you don't have to drive at 50 k; that's your point, isn't it?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. So for a particular point, say a bend or some road with a hazard or need to slow down, we will not simply just lower this bend or short section of road to a lower speed limit. Instead, we provide sufficient advance warning signs, road markings, to inform the motorist ahead that there may be a hazard in front of you and you have to slow down.

So that with all the information provided to the motorist, the motorist has a duty to choose a safe speed for travelling.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, may I supplement that the statements made by Mr Yau were actually stated in our paper 10 in TD bundle, paragraphs 12 to 17. There is a section on the designation of speed limits on roads and also our structure on a regular review of the speed limit.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I remember reading that. You made the same point: the speed limit isn't mandatory. It's not exceeding it that's mandatory.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: The part of page 782 that I was particularly interested in was the commencement of the recommendation, not so much the speed matters.

The commencement reads as follows:

"Incorporate into franchise requirement the need to set up a comprehensive standard and driver monitoring system using the installed black boxes."

Is that something which caused consideration within the department? Given that black box technology of course has moved on considerably since 2003.

MS MABLE CHAN: The black box and the related updated technology and devices is one of the subjects we discussed this morning, and there is a basic minimum requirement on the black boxes issued to the franchisees. Over the years our vehicle licensing team have taken stock of the possible advancements in black boxes and have been exploring on an ongoing basis with the franchisees and also the bus manufacturers, to see how the black box installation can be upgraded and deployed for better safety measure.

This is one of the issues that is keen in our heart and it is actually included in our scope of work under the working group under discussion currently, at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: But that hasn't resulted in any revision of the basic minimum requirement, which has its origins in 2004.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yet to be reflected, yes, Chairman, you are right.

CHAIRMAN: And it doesn't incorporate GPS, does it? It simply requires that speed be measured.

MS MABLE CHAN: The basic specifications do not reflect that.

MR DUNCAN: If we can move to page 783, please, and the Community for Road Safety's suggestion with regard to bus safety and bus fleets, and the observation which was made by that organisation was:

"KMB has been investing in new modern buses. It is well agreeable that these buses are comfortable and well designed. However, attention is still required for safety risks including ..."

And then a number of safety risks are set out.

As matters stood at the time of this consultation in 2016, would the department have agreed with this observation of the Community for Road Safety, that attention was still required for those risks which have been set out?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say yes, because this is actually an ongoing process, as reflected and included in our

requirements for the bus companies to include in the forward planning programmes. There are a number of improvement measures that we have discussed with the operators and suggest them to retrofit and to include in their forward planning programmes a retrofitting programme. Past examples include installation of double handrailing along the staircases, horizontal guard bar on the upper deck windscreen, and also strengthened glass on the upper deck windscreen as well.

We note the suggestions by the Community for Road Safety. In fact, it is an ongoing close partner with us, the Road Safety and Standards Unit, and we actually take note of the various suggestions and this is on the agenda when we discuss with the bus operators to explore ways to further enhance bus safety within the vehicle.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, when you say it's on the agenda, it's on the agenda currently or has been on the agenda?

MS MABLE CHAN: It has been on the agenda, yes.

MR DUNCAN: So if these matters which the Community has suggested should be incorporated into the franchise agreements, if they exist they would be found in the forward planning programmes?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: That's where we would look for those?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. You can look for those in past forward planning programmes, or we have also issued a requirement to sum up the safety and enhancement initiatives and requirements, and we got the confirmation letter from the bus companies to install, retrofit the related service or safety enhancement measures in the past.

So as and when our discussion with them is mature and those are technically feasible for application, we will issue updated service enhancement list for them to confirm for retrofitting or for installation, and we also will include those in our requirement in the letter towards the bus operators, so that they will include a retrofitting programme in their upcoming forward planning programmes.

MR DUNCAN: We can leave that document, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, could you help me at least with who are the members of the Community for Road Safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: Tony has the information.

MR TONY YAU: Mr Julian Kwong.

CHAIRMAN: One member?

MR TONY YAU: I know he has his friends. Maybe -- to my information, it's only a few members, and the founder is Mr Julian Kwong.

CHAIRMAN: And how long has the organisation been in existence, as far as you are aware?

MR TONY YAU: Maybe less than ten years but I'm not sure.

CHAIRMAN: Has LegCo received papers over a period of time from the Community for Road Safety, a number of years?

MR TONY YAU: Did you mean LegCo?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, the LegCo Transport Panel.

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Over what period of time?

MR TONY YAU: To my memory, it's only in these few years when we had some topic that was related to road safety would be discussed in the Transport Panel, and Community for Road Safety would submit the document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I have been doing my own research and I'm trying to get some time parameters of when these papers first appeared.

MS MABLE CHAN: Past few years, past couple of years, I think, in LegCo.

The chairman's question is for how many years has this Community for Road Safety put in papers for LegCo; right?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: This is the question.

MR TONY YAU: I have no information. Not sure.

MS MABLE CHAN: Do you need us to do some --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if you could come back to us with something in writing as to that.

MS MABLE CHAN: Okay, sure. No problem.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: Just on that, Ms Chan, what reputation does this organisation enjoy; are you able to say?

MS MABLE CHAN: I cannot comment on this.

MR DUNCAN: As far as the department is concerned, does the department respect the views of this organisation?

MS MABLE CHAN: We do not have any comment on the reputation or the standing of this Community, but being a stakeholder, which will submit deputation and submission to LegCo, we will take into account all the submissions, including the submission from this Community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: At least you could say perhaps this, that it does appear to present reasonably well thought-out -- whether or not you agree with them -- suggestions?

MS MABLE CHAN: They show interest in the road safety and make a number of recommendations on various occasions.

CHAIRMAN: And appears to be informed? Whether or not you agree with the recommendations, they are based on an informed understanding, it appears?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have no particular comment on that.

CHAIRMAN: Just a smile, nothing else; is that it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Any deputation or submission submitted by groups or bodies in the deputation meetings, we will take into and account and read over that.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, you were moving on.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The committee has been informed, as you know, of these new initiatives, if I could call them that, or the latest initiatives, which have been prompted by the Sham Shui Po accident in September 2017, with the revision of the guidelines, and the further proposals following on from the accident in Tai Po in February of this year, with the added information you're getting from the bus companies and the working group, and so on.

So we understand that in recent times, new matters are being considered by the department.

Apart from those recent initiatives, would it be fair to say that since, say, 2012, up until the time of the Sham Shui Po tragedy, there were really no significant changes at all in the way in which the department addressed matters of safety; it was the same system throughout that period? Is that a fair observation?

MS MABLE CHAN: Let me get my papers.

In terms of the overall road traffic safety

management and monitoring, I wish to reiterate that we have an established system to take stock of the data from the accident database, analyse them, and take preventive or corrective or remedial actions.

I would like to quote a few examples arising from the discussion and analysis of that independent analysis of accident data and for reporting to the Road Safety Council.

A number of legislative amendments have been actually made over the years arising from discussion in the Road Safety Council, after monitoring and analysing the accident statistics. The recent one is being in June 2015, regarding the provision of the attendance of pre-service course for the issue of a full driving licence of public light bus, and in 2004, December --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, what is a pre-service course?

MS MABLE CHAN: Pre-service course for the issue of a full driving licence of public light bus drivers.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: And in 2014 --

CHAIRMAN: I still don't understand. What is a pre-service course?

MS MABLE CHAN: Pre-service course is the requirement for them to attend a pre-service course after -- the public light bus driver is required to, after going through the

driving test, they should have to attend a pre-service course before we would issue a full driving licence for the driver.

CHAIRMAN: So before he is let loose on the roads he has to attend this course?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, I may not have made my question clear, because I don't want to get involved with public light buses, unless it's relevant to these proceedings.

MS MABLE CHAN: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: What I'm really trying to get at is whether, if you compare the system as it was, system for safety as far as the department is concerned, safety in public buses, the system was more or less the same, from, say, 2012 right down to 2017. There are no significant changes during that period to the system. Is that fair?

MS MABLE CHAN: The system is established, but under the system we have an ongoing and robust monitoring and regulatory framework to monitor and regulate the franchised bus operation, and under that system we have time and again analysed the bus safety performance of individual bus operators, and then we would issue requirements for the bus operators to enhance the safety measures.

So this underpins the robustness of the system on an ongoing basis. The system is there, and we are exercising the control and monitoring under their system.

The other system that I want to mention is about the overall road safety traffic management system. It is also an established system under which there will be monitoring and follow-up actions. Some of the follow-up actions may lead to legislative amendment exercise to tackle the relevant issues as revealed from those accidents.

CHAIRMAN: The first of the examples you gave about actions taken was June 2015.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You wanted to mention some others?

MS MABLE CHAN: There are a couple of other legislative amendments in 2014. One is requiring the public light bus to install approved electronic data recording device. The other one is to require --

CHAIRMAN: Recording what kind of data?

MS MABLE CHAN: Public light bus.

CHAIRMAN: To record what data?

MS MABLE CHAN: Electronic data recording device, like black box.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have -- first of all, was that direction

given in writing?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is a legislative amendment.

CHAIRMAN: I see. Can you give us then the legislative reference? Where do we find this?

MS MABLE CHAN: We will try to locate it under the Road Traffic Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN: In due course --

MS MABLE CHAN: In the THB bundle, there should be the Road Traffic Ordinance. Let us try to locate it.

CHAIRMAN: If one of your colleagues locates it at some later stage, you can come back and tell us about it.

So that's black boxes for PLBs, 2014. Yes?

MS MABLE CHAN: And also the attendance of the pre-service course for the issue of the full driving licence, it is also a legislative amendment exercise. We will try to locate it as well.

In 2003, we also introduce breath analysing for drink-driving.

CHAIRMAN: For all drivers of all vehicles?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

So there is a long list dating until 2010, based on cursory research, but I don't want to bother the committee with all the details.

CHAIRMAN: We want to give you an opportunity to say what you want to say.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: So can I put it this way: restricting it to public buses --

CHAIRMAN: Franchised buses?

MR DUNCAN: Public franchised buses, just looking at those, do I understand from what you have said that essentially, between 2012 and 2017, the same robust, in your words, system, regulatory and monetary, was utilised during that period?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I would say so, not to mention during the 2012 to 2017 period, apart from legislative amendment exercise, there are also measures to improve the road design and also the road markings. After we have conducted black spot investigation and analysis of the accident data, then we will take appropriate either preventive or remedial actions in terms of road safety enhancement.

MR DUNCAN: Now, could I ask this. At any time up until the time of the Sham Shui Po accident, had you engaged in consultation with any of your overseas counterparts as to what sort of safety management systems they required of their public bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on the colleagues' recollection, there is not any specific discussions with the overseas bus regulators in this regard.

MR DUNCAN: What about since these two tragedies in September last year and February this year? Has the department made contact with any of its counterparts to see what provisions they have with regard to safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: I did not recall we have particularly contacted the overseas regulators or bus regulators, but in the context of the working hour guidelines we have actually done the research into overseas experience and requirements. Examples include Singapore, the United Kingdom, United States, Australia, and EU countries.

The working hour guidelines, the important factors that we have taken into account is how the local operators operate and also the request from the staff unions for improvement. But we also did research into the overseas experience and requirements, in order to assess our comparability with overseas standards as well.

MR DUNCAN: When was that done?

MS MABLE CHAN: September 2017 to March 2018, in that review of the working hour guidelines leading to the current revised version.

MR DUNCAN: So it was just restricted to the working hours issue?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You realise that the Community for Road Safety

has made submissions to the committee. Have you read those submissions?

MS MABLE CHAN: You mean the Community for Road Traffic -- sorry, I beg your pardon?

MR DUNCAN: The Community for Road Safety.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could bring them up.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find that?

MR DUNCAN: TU-25.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I have read that.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to take you through a few of the points that they made, and I'm bearing in mind the chairman's remarks that they are just one view, and everybody is entitled to a view. The question will be of course as to what your view of these is and what the committee may think are practical and worthwhile considering, having heard perhaps from the Community itself and having heard your response to it.

But can I ask this general question of you: having read this paper, have any of the ideas in this paper occurred to you as good ideas that the Transport Department might take into consideration, serious consideration?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have read this submission when we received it in the bundle provided to us. The purpose of my

reading is to take note of that for preparation of the IRC's proceedings. It does not amount to a serious and detailed examination of the proposals as spelled out in this submission that will bring us to a level of giving very considered and conscious response.

In a very general remark, any suggestions made by bodies such as the Community for Road Safety, especially this has been a body which has been providing views in the past, we will also take note of that and I expect our colleagues will also take note of that in their upcoming discussions and deliberations with the various bus companies and manufacturers in our working group.

I would like to just say that for the purpose of the IRC proceedings, I have read that, but I think that does not give us sufficient time and opportunity for us to go through it one by one and to give very detailed and informed remarks and response on the individual recommendations.

MR DUNCAN: I understand. Notwithstanding that, what I'm going to do is take you through perhaps just a summary of the paper, and invite you to make any preliminary comments you may wish to make, and if you feel, because you haven't had time consider this properly, you will have the opportunity of making further written submissions on the matters.

Does that sound in order for you?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would be inclined not to give any response at this stage in response to the recommendations.

What I can respond to the committee is that we will also treat this submission to the IRC as a note and a list of recommendations so that we can take it back and look into, but I think we may not be in a position to provide further written submission, further to today's meeting, at this juncture.

We treat the recommendations and suggestions very seriously, and we have to go through the due process within the department to look into the technical feasibility and applicability of each and every one.

In general terms, any recommendations that may help, we will take an open-minded approach to looking into that, but it may not be fair for us to rush to any preliminary observations in regard to those recommendations for the IRC's purpose.

MR DUNCAN: I don't wish to be unfair to you, so would you prefer to be given the opportunity of responding to these suggestions in writing?

CHAIRMAN: I think the Commissioner for Transport has answered in the negative to that.

MR DUNCAN: She would not?

CHAIRMAN: No.

MR DUNCAN: I think first of all you are saying you don't wish to be asked questions about this today; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Let me try to restructure, in a way, my response.

We take note of this submission from the Community for Road Safety for the IRC, and I read this in preparation for the deliberations. We would not wish to provide our written submission for the IRC on our analysis and the observations on the applicability of the recommendations within such period of time, because we have to go through the due process.

On the other hand, I wish to assure the IRC that while we also see this submission to the IRC, we will treat this as suggestions and recommendations for the department to take it back and look seriously into in our system, and in particular in the working group on the enhancements of bus safety, and I can assure that we can go a step further in discussing with the Community for Road Safety, to hear further views from them in that context.

MR DUNCAN: Let me understand this properly. First of all, you don't wish to answer questions today relating to the proposals of the Community for Road Safety; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: I can try to answer but my answer should not be regarded as the department's considered view as to the applicability of the individual devices, because we haven't prepared in that regard.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MABLE CHAN: But I'm sure, to help the IRC and give our preliminary view, on a preliminary basis, if that can help the IRC.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, let's proceed on that basis.

And you, Ms Chan, indicate if you feel unable to respond.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: And you don't wish to advance any written submissions, as Mr Chairman observed a few moments ago. You are saying that rather than supply written submissions to the committee, you will take these away and give them consideration; is that your position?

MS MABLE CHAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: And go through due process?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, that is correct.

MR DUNCAN: Let me then take you to the points which occurred to me as perhaps being worthy of some consideration.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure.

MR DUNCAN: First of all, in the summary at page 27, the

fifth paragraph down, there's the observation that:

"The safety risks of buses are diversified in terms of scenarios and severity. Scenarios of particular concerns include ..."

And there are a number set out:

"-- Passenger losing balance: most frequent.

-- Collision with pedestrians (cyclists): common and potentially severe.

-- Rear-front collision: common and potentially severe.

-- Head-on collision: less frequent but potentially severe.

-- Collision with roadside objects: common and potentially severe.

-- Rollover: sporadic but potentially catastrophic."

Would you agree that that's a fair scenario of particular concerns?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say that it is a fair description of some of the scenarios of particular concern. In fact some of the aspects mentioned were also flagged up in our independent accident data analysis and also in our monitoring of the franchised bus operators' analysis of the accident data in the forward planning programmes.

MR DUNCAN: And they are not inconsistent with those observations?

MS MABLE CHAN: These are some of the common issues of concern.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then the next paragraph:

"Over the years various measures have been introduced to improve bus safety. However, without an insight into the problems involved, further substantial improvement is unlikely and current patterns will continue."

Do you wish to respond to that?

CHAIRMAN: It may be that you can't respond to that, it being so general.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. The chairman is correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

We can turn the page, and let me take you straight to the recommendations:

"The 'Safe System' approach should be adopted to cover the interactions among vehicle factors, road factors, human factors and management. Active measures aim at preventing a crash and passive measures aim at limiting injury consequences. They are equally important.

In the short term, active measures based on operational protocols and deployment of monitoring systems can be quickly implemented. The risk of severe

rollover at some locations without safety barrier, [for example] Peak Road, Repulse [Bay] Road, Tai Tam Road, is very high and interim measures must be implemented swiftly.

In the medium to long term, passive measures aiming at limiting the consequences of crashes are very important. These measures fall into two primary groups, namely bus design and road design."

I appreciate that's a very general comment as well, but the issue with regard to safety barriers in respect of some locations and examples there, is that an issue that you consider is worthy of attention?

MS MABLE CHAN: Incidentally, because the road safety, in particular roadside safety on Hong Kong Island with bends and curvatures has been a longstanding issue of concern. In the past, we will look into the particular circumstances of the spot and also the relevant road section, then we will review whether there is a common factor in order to take remedial or preventive measures.

In parallel, it just happened -- I just reported to the committee -- that the Transport Department and Highways Department have commissioned a consultancy study on review of potential roadside safety hazards in Hong Kong road network to investigate and identify roadside safety hazards in a more proactive manner, in

a thorough and systemic safe-track approach, taking into account overseas technology. The study will actually commence in mid-May for completion in 30 months.

MR DUNCAN: When you say it has issued a study, is there a document which --

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, there is a consultancy brief.

MR DUNCAN: Can that be provided to the committee?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Will that address things such as the safety barriers on these narrow, hilly roads?

MS MABLE CHAN: Without divulging any commercial information, my colleague reminds me that this Community for Road Safety is one of the sub-consultants, for the consultant to conduct the study.

MR DUNCAN: I think the committee would be content with some sort of brief as to what exactly is involved in the study.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, we can provide that information, on the scope and also the coverage and objective of that study.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Then we have the heading, "Operational protocols and monitoring systems", and at the top of page 29, two particular types of protocols are suggested. First of all:

"-- General protocols -- addressing typical

scenarios including speeds on busy urban streets.

-- Route-specific protocols -- addressing specific safety risks such as sections of narrow hillside road lacking a safety barrier."

Do these sorts of protocols exist at present?

MS MABLE CHAN: I'm not aware of that. But --

MR DUNCAN: How does that strike you? Does that strike you as a good idea or are you unable to --

MS MABLE CHAN: I think the Community has come up with some suggestion on how to address various scenarios in a more systematic way. The route-specific protocols address the sections of narrow hillside road lacking safety barrier, and I think the study that I mentioned just now is very important in mapping out the relevant road sections involving hillsides and curves and to devise relevant safety measures, and that will form a basis for us to consider as a step forward whether there should be any measures or protocols in that sense to address specific safety risk scenarios.

I think this is the preliminary observation that I can make on the spot.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

We then see the ISO standard creeping in again. I won't ask any further questions about that.

Then the issue of bus design, and a number of safety

features "are recommended as a priority".

Are these matters which commend themselves to the department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I can invite Mr Chan to comment on this. I have some knowledge about a few of them but perhaps he can give a more systematic and comprehensive response, in a simple way.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR YK CHAN: I will try to make it simple.

For the "safer bus front", actually all the double-decker buses currently operating in Hong Kong are in compliance with the European requirements, as I mentioned earlier.

CHAIRMAN: Because 99 per cent of them come from Europe.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, that's the magic figure, and confirm the body structures on the franchised buses used in Hong Kong are the same as those apply to other countries, such as the United Kingdom, USA and Singapore.

The major double-decker buses suppliers have also confirmed that the use of aluminium alloys on the bus body has been an international trend in recent years, and they explain that the use of the material is stronger, but nowadays all these bodies are aluminium body, and they are, as explained, the use of materials

stronger than aluminium may not be beneficial during accidents and it may cause other types of casualties.

So the buses we use nowadays, it's already up to international standard, and I would say it's safe, but in terms of the "safer bus" at the front, you will notice that in recent years we have strengthened our -- put the seat belt in front on those seats in front of the window, to prevent passengers from being thrown out.

In connection with the construction of those seats, the bus company has to actually strengthen the floor and fittings at the front of the buses in order to support those seats and the anchorage of the seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: This is if it was necessary to retrofit them --

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- because the bus frame itself is not strong enough to sustain the anchor points for the seat belts?

MR YK CHAN: That's right, because those originally -- the old buses are not supposed to be fitted with that sort of safety seat belt, so they have to not only provide the seat belts in the seats but have to actually strengthen the anchorage and also the support inside the frontal part of the buses.

So, in that respect, I would say nowadays people travelling in front, with the seat belts on, are really safe.

Do you want me to go over the others as well?

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR DUNCAN: If you can, please.

MR YK CHAN: But safety seat belts, actually this time we discuss in the technical group, they agree to fitting -- all the seats in the bus will be fitted with seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: On new buses?

MR YK CHAN: On new buses, as just mentioned, because retrofitting is not just providing a seat and a seat belt.

CHAIRMAN: No, no, we understand that point.

MR YK CHAN: "Treatments of hazards of bus interiors: including" -- that has always been -- proper design of buses should not have that sort of sharp edges that actually people bump into and get hurt. This is something that we do look into very seriously.

CHAIRMAN: I think in fact it might assist us more if you were to move to what is described as, "The following safety features should be explored": IAS and ESP.

IAS.

MR YK CHAN: Intelligence speed adaptation?

The look of the terms, I'm not sure exactly what function is going to be provided. But if you are talking about the old thing, sort of integrating the speedometer with GPS and the base, the roadmap, in order

to sort of provide an overall monitoring of the driving behaviour and the vehicle's operating status --

CHAIRMAN: That's what I understand this system to be.

MR YK CHAN: If it is the system is meant to be used for, then yes, we have been -- in the technical group we did discuss about this, and obviously at the moment the discussion is still going, because there are sort of technical and also management considerations that have to be sorted out.

CHAIRMAN: What are the technical issues?

MR YK CHAN: Today, as I mentioned earlier, in the session yesterday, the sort of merging of the function of the speed limiter and also the GPS system, to provide accurate positioning of the vehicle, and interface with the base map, and this sort of matching -- I think mainly it's because GPS is not accurate in the moment, in the operating environment of Hong Kong, but --

CHAIRMAN: What is the problem?

MR YK CHAN: Because the height of the buildings and all the surrounding area, that may, in some patches of road, in particular like if you are in Central, when both sides are covered by buildings and we only have a little bit of sky you can pick up the GPS, then --

CHAIRMAN: The GPS antenna needs to be able to pick up the satellites in the sky; that's the problem, isn't it? If

it can't see the satellite because of a building, the signal fails. Is there any research on this?

MR YK CHAN: Actually, we are discussing with the bus companies and in conjunction with the supplier of those systems, to see whether there's any sort of reliable and more functional system that can be adopted.

So I would say, at this moment, under the working group, we are not ruling out this particular application. This is still ongoing.

MS MABLE CHAN: And we ascertained that this is actually a very intelligent way of controlling speed and mapping it with the geotechnical features on the road. We are certainly alive to the benefit and advantage of this system, but in the process we have to make sure that it can work in the local context of Hong Kong.

We do not rule it out. We will try our very best to see whether it can be adopted in the medium term or in the not-too-distant future. We will put it on trial.

Actually, the electronic stability programme is an issue that they have agreed to install on new buses as an immediate measure.

The autonomous emergency braking system is another example that we will also look into.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

If you turn to page 55, you may get a little bit more assistance with regard to the intelligent speed adaptation system and the autonomous emergency braking systems, which seem to be under active consideration at the moment by Transport for London, which is your counterpart, I think, in that city.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I would just like to mention that personally, as commissioner, I haven't had an opportunity to contact the overseas counterpart or visit them, but my colleagues in the Transport Department have in the past visited London, United States as well, for different various issues under Transport Department's purview.

I would just like to emphasise that we will make use of opportunities available to make contact with them and visit them, and to go through various issues under our purview.

MR DUNCAN: Have those contacts in the past been concerned with safety matters?

MS MABLE CHAN: My deputy has conducted a visit to London.

MS MACELLA LEE: For example, I went to visit the authority of Transport for London and also Singapore, but at that time our focus was more on service rationalisation, on the service side more, and also the use of realtime bus arrival systems, and those more new technologies for

provision of passenger information, more on the service side, I'm afraid. On that occasion, it was not on bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: But you are aware that Transport for London have conducted tests on this IAS system?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, from the engineering side, they have kept me informed of this.

Actually, my colleague have been drafting a programme for me to visit other overseas jurisdictions. The issue is that there is not -- we have yet to plan on that basis. We have to deal with a number of competing priorities at the moment.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Finally then on page 29, "Road design":

"The following improvements related to road design and traffic management are crucial for bus safety".

And there are some particular matters there. Would you be able to respond at all to those, Ms Chan?

MS MABLE CHAN: You mean paragraph 2?

MR DUNCAN: Paragraph 3 on page 29.

MS MABLE CHAN: These areas relating to road design and traffic management are actually our task and on the agenda of our regular road safety monitoring and audit, under the Road Safety Council agenda, and as part of the follow-up or as part of the preventive actions we looked

into ways to improve road design, which includes safety barriers and widening of blind bends.

The imposition of some safety barriers actually is one of the measures that we have adopted to improve the Tai Po Road section as well.

The safe crossing facilities or conditions around bus stops is actually an ongoing task for us to provide on a district basis. We conduct regular district visits and meetings with district councillors and we will take the opportunity of new developments and redevelopments on the district. Should there be any provisions of bus stops, bus lay-by, then we will look into the need to provide suitable pedestrian crossing to enhance the safety of pedestrians.

MR DUNCAN: You mentioned an audit under the Road Safety Council agenda. What is that?

MS MABLE CHAN: By means of audit, I'm referring to our established system of the road safety monitoring and analysis, with a quarterly report to the Road Safety Council.

MR DUNCAN: That's the one that I asked you about this morning?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I should not use the word "audit". I have to be careful with this word. So the road safety monitoring system relating to the Road Safety Council.

MR DUNCAN: Ms Chan, that brings me to the end of the questions that I was going to ask and the matters that I wish to explore.

The committee may have some further questions for you. I would like to thank you and your colleagues for assisting the commission.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you very much, senior counsel, for assisting me and my team to answer the questions. Thank you.

Questioning by THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER LO: I just have some clarification questions on the statistics provided by your bundle last night on the accident statistics.

If you flip to page 91, I think it's KMB or Citybus. KMB, I think.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, has this been given pagination now, overall pagination? I think Prof Lo is working from internal pagination.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, it has now.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find it?

MR DUNCAN: TD-1.

MEMBER LO: Yes, starting at page 182.

MR DUNCAN: 176 onwards.

CHAIRMAN: They are yet to find their way into our bundle.

MS MABLE CHAN: It should be the forward planning

programme -- the safety chapter in the forward planning programme of KMB.

MEMBER LO: Yes. The numbers are categorised, for example, at the bottom of page 91, by "Hours on duty before accident". The table seems to indicate that those working over ten hours have a lower involvement rate in accidents, because it's the lowest bar. But I think, to be fair, we have to divide or normalise by the population in that bar. If there were very few drivers driving over ten hours, of course the accident rate would be lower. So this way of presenting information could be made clearer, so we can understand the causes of that.

The same for also bus captain service period, the figure above. The table indicates that the year zero to one year has the highest accident rate. Maybe there are simply more drivers belonging to that category.

To be fair for the analysis and also to expose the issues underlying the figures, would it be possible to regenerate this graph and to normalise it, so that we know exactly the risk exposure, instead of simply categorising it. I know the data is from KMB. I'm not sure if this thing can be done by TD or we can ask KMB to redo it.

CHAIRMAN: If it's a KMB document, perhaps it lies for KMB

to address whether or not it's appropriate to rectify it, if that's necessary.

MS MABLE CHAN: I agree with the chairman.

MEMBER LO: Okay. So I raise with KMB? Okay.

The question I have is would TD actually write out the specification for future reports, so as to report accordingly, not using this particular format?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. It is an ongoing requirement, and I take your point. Although we are -- sort of this analysis is done by the bus company, your point is -- we will take that back and then look into how the accident rate analysis can be more accurate and concise in reflecting the picture. We will consider that.

Thank you.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. I have one request or maybe question. This refers back to the report that Mr Duncan referred to earlier, named Community for Road Safety.

On page 29, talking about road design, as we all know, we have many new buses coming in which are of much larger size than before, and when I look at the road design, and you did mention, Ms Chan, that the government has widened some roads before, in view of all these new vehicles coming -- can you give us some examples in writing later on, just to show that we

actually -- your department has actually widened some roads in consideration of all the new buses coming in which are as large as 12.8 metres long?

MS MABLE CHAN: The widening of some roads is not particularly to cater for the new buses with that extended length. But we can go back and ascertain -- try to locate whether there are some examples, like the cul de sac, which we have to make sure -- I have to sort of explain. The cul de sac is --

CHAIRMAN: The turning circle.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- yes, the turning circle for buses or other vehicles to turn around, and how we have to ensure the design, the width and the turning curve on the cul de sac can accommodate buses of, say, 12.8 metres, for those bus stops nearby or in the vicinity, especially in those new residential developments, where we have the cul de sac for buses and other vehicles to turn around before going out to the main road.

I will see if we can give some example to illustrate that, in order to answer the question.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Also, if possible please cover the New Territories area, because, as we understand, New Territories have a different set of design of roads, so I would like to know how are we accomplishing accommodating those buses.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Chairman.

MS MABLE CHAN: That is doable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: There are one or two matters I would like to take up with you.

Since you've got the KMB paper that you provided us with, the forward planning paper -- I think that's still in front of you -- at KMB internal pagination 96, "Bus captain training and monitoring". Of course, this is a KMB paper, but presumably the Transport Department understand what they are talking about when they give it to you.

Can you help us -- it's the last two lines on the page -- what are "Realtime driving indicators are installed in all buses which can help bus captains to utilise the driving skills learnt in the eco-safe driving training course"? What are these realtime indicators?

MS MABLE CHAN: In our discussions with the KMB and also at the KMB board meetings, on some occasions they will update us on the monitoring device to assist or enhance the driving behaviour of the bus captains, because at some point they also identify the driver behaviour factor, including the incidence of harsh braking, and there is some realtime -- as I understand, these

realtime driving indicators will first help to identify those bus captains with this high incidence on a particular route, then they will sort of install this kind of indicator in the bus, so as to -- as a reminder for the bus captains to utilise the driving skills in order to remind them of the necessary skills along a particular route.

Perhaps the KMB will be in a better position to elaborate how it functions and how it serves the purpose of improving the drivers' behaviour, in those circumstances.

CHAIRMAN: The use of the word "indicator" doesn't suggest a flashing light or a device; it is an analysis done on a tachograph to see heavy retardation or heavy acceleration?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At KMB again, page 98, paragraph 8.4.2, the statement is made that in terms of assignments to new bus captains, they are given, it states, "easy routes". Are you aware of any designation of routes by KMB as being easy, difficult; any other system?

MS MABLE CHAN: There are some description of routes which are complicated, complicated routes, so other not designated as complicated routes should be considered as

easy routes.

More often, they refer to complicated routes.

CHAIRMAN: So this is their system of determining the difficulty or otherwise of a particular road or route?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, because the complicated routes, as I understand, may cover areas with more turns and bends, or there are more stops along the routes, with more passengers boarding or alighting, so it will not be straightforward driving and short route. Some of the routes involve more stops and cover a lot of various districts and there may be some routes covering some common or black spot accident areas.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Page 99, paragraph 8.5.7. That's the internal pagination.

The references there to there having been a survey of "44 buses installed with 3-point seat belts on all seats by the end of April 2017. Survey will be conducted to assess the utilisation rate of seat belt on buses which are installed with [those kinds of seat belt]."

Are you aware of the results of such a survey?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are aware that this is an initiative done by the KMB themselves and they would like to conduct a survey to ascertain the utilisation rate. But we are

not aware of the findings of the survey yet.

CHAIRMAN: Would you expect to be told the results?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, because this is actually raised in the board meetings as well, and we would expect the company to report on the utilisation rate of seat belts. If they do not report, we will certainly raise.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

One final matter. In the TD-1, it's your paper 8 where you look at technology, and one of the items at page 102, paragraph 21, is a speed display unit.

What is said about that is that it is technically feasible to install it. That's paragraph 22:

"The ... manufacturers have advised that it is technically feasible ..."

Then there are the comments made in the latter part of paragraph 22:

"... the FB operators are concerned that [the speed display unit] would create conflicts and arguments between the bus captain and passengers, and impose additional pressure on the bus captains which in turn would affect the safety for bus driving. The FB operators consider that the SDU is not conducive in enhancing bus safety."

Am I correct in understanding that this kind of units, speed display units, are used and have been used

on PLBs for some time?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us as to when they were installed on PLB?

MS MABLE CHAN: A few years. We will try to be more specific.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: A few years. This device was installed in public light buses in the light of the concerns about speeding in public light buses. This issue was actually also discussed in the Transport Advisory Committee, and we include this as an agenda item in the scope of work to be discussed with the bus manufacturers and bus companies, to ask them to seriously consider the feasibility and applicability of installing the speed display unit.

The statements that we make here in paragraph 22 reflect the current status of discussion.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that, because at the moment the discussion is confined to a tripartite group, is it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Namely the franchised bus operators, yourself, and the bus manufacturers, when required to be brought in technically.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. We are also aware from the feedback

from the bus operators that the bus captains may consider this device may impose additional pressure on them. So this is a sensitive area that we will have to seriously consider and we may as well have to explore it with the bus captain associations to tap their sentiments on it before we can take it further.

CHAIRMAN: Will you be doing that?

MS MABLE CHAN: We will be doing that.

CHAIRMAN: Will you also be consulting the public as to whether or not this is something they think is a good idea, as being passengers whose safety is in the hands of a bus captain?

MS MABLE CHAN: We will surely need to take into account any public views on that. We haven't thought of any particular way to do that, but a possible and usual way is to sort of first discuss with the staff unions and also the bus captains to get their reaction, and then we may have to see whether we can get further views or feedback from the Legislative Council Panel on Transport, which may serve as a forum to flesh out the proposals to be taken forward in enhancing bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: How was it that the Transport Department came to learn that the public were concerned about speeding in PLBs? How was the public opinion learnt in that case?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is not just a public concern but it is

also the accident rates involving public light bus. One of the contributing factors is also speeding and driver behaviour, so the accidents of the public light bus actually over the years is relatively high. Actually I would say that the rate of involvement of public light bus is higher than the franchised bus as well. So we have taken the effort to require the installation of the speed display units inside the public light bus.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to help -- and say so if you are not -- as to whether or not the installation of these devices on public light buses led to any conflicts and arguments between passengers and drivers? I'm paraphrasing from what the franchised bus operators have said is their concern about installation on franchised buses. Was there any increasing conflict?

MS MABLE CHAN: Following the installation of the speed display unit inside the public light bus, we are not particularly aware of any surge in public complaints on such kind of installation during their journey over the public light bus.

CHAIRMAN: I was thinking more about conflicts resulting from the fact that the information is available to the passengers that the bus is speeding. Has that resulted in conflicts, for example?

MS MABLE CHAN: Not to our knowledge that there is any

significant increase in such kind of complaints about the installation of the units in the public light bus.

Chairman, to supplement, the imposition of the speed limiter for public light bus was commenced since June 2010 as part of the licensing conditions for public light buses.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

In that case, that brings me to the end of the questions I have for you. May we thank you and your colleagues for all the assistance you have given us, and we look forward to receiving the material that you said you would endeavour to provide to us in writing in due course.

Thank you very much.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you very much. Thank you again, Chairman, for your guidance during the deliberations, and the senior counsel as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: In those circumstances, these proceedings will be adjourned. For general information, these are the first of the oral hearings, to which we intend to invite others to attend in due course. When we make those invitations, if they are accepted, then information will be displayed on our website as to when those hearings are to take place.

Thank you very much.

(4.27 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: 1
MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE,
MS RACHEL KWAN, MS MACELLA LEE,
MR REGINALD YK CHAN, MR TONY YAU

Further opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN 1

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued) 4

Questioning by THE COMMITTEE 150

[blank page]

2018 年 5 月 8 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，早晨。陳女士，請你哋係上前就座。琴晚運輸署向我哋提交咗一啲資料，呢個就係關於各間巴士公司提供畀運輸署關乎巴士安全嘅遠期計劃。如果你就呢啲文件係有乜嘢想發言嘅話，你可以而家做，否則嘅話，我會請鄧樂勤大律師係繼續提問嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席，或者我咁喇，我講幾句喇，就此。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你開始。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）實質上，我感謝主席係提出呢一點，讓我哋有機會就同巴士公司琴晚係傾過，我亦都當然好明白呢一個係嚟自秘書處，就係話希望可以睇晒所有嘅遠期計劃，但係鑑於佢裏面係有一啲商業嘅資料，所以我哋最初嘅時候就話唔能夠發放。但係我哋睇番嗰個重要嘅章節，就係巴士安全，裏面就係冇任何商業價值牽涉在內嘅，我哋就係藉呢個機會同巴士營運商就係琴晚討論過，而最後就係提供咗資料畀秘書處嘅。

我就想先講幾句嘅，講到呢個遠期計劃，佢係呢個法定要求嘅一個部分，即係話巴士營運商係需要提交畀政府當局，係讓運輸署可以同巴士營運商談判嘅。其實呢個喺我哋嚟講，就係我哋監察同埋監管巴士營運商兩個方面嘅其中一個部分。巴士營運商，我哋對佢有咁嘅期望，佢哋要有呢個遠期計劃，裏面係要有路線發展計劃同埋其他營運方面嘅資料，係讓運輸署知悉，呢一個係每年嘅 6 月尾係需要交到畀我哋。

自從 2003 年開始，運輸署已經係要求巴士營運商有一個專章就係講及巴士安全。自此之後，呢個章節一直都係遠期計劃嘅一個部分，亦都作為運輸署一個計劃或者規畫嘅工具，嚟到同佢哋商討同埋監察每一間巴士公司佢哋嗰個意外率，佢哋當然自己亦都會分析。巴士營運商係應該提議一啲改善嘅措施，我哋都期望佢哋係將有關建議落實嘅時間表，即係各項措施嘅時間表，亦都係包括在內。

除咗呢個遠期計劃嘅程序，我哋每年亦都進行呢個評估，每年嘅年尾之前都會做呢個評估嘅。呢啲嘅工作做嘅時候，我哋會睇九個指標，其中兩個就係同巴士嘅安全有關。我喺回答大律師昨日嘅問題嘅時候，我哋亦都係講咗我哋自己本身有一個獨立嘅數據庫，講及全港嘅意外嘅數字，裏面亦都分析咗一啲意外嘅統計數字，係關乎每一間專營巴士公司嘅。我哋自己亦都係進行獨立嘅分析，分析有關嘅意外嘅性質、成因，以助我哋係每年評估每一間公司個表現。呢啲評估嘅工作係每年去做，係根據一啲獨立嘅數據，嚟自呢一個數據庫嘅。而我哋係遠期

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

計劃同埋呢個意外分析就係並行嘅，有關嘅報告亦都會交畀交通諮詢委員會參考嘅，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。陳女士，早晨，各位先生、女士，早晨。再次感謝你哋琴晚係做咗功課交畀我哋，我而家想做嘅就係想拆析你哋昨晚交畀我哋嘅文件，然後就問你幾條問題係關乎呢個文件嘅。關於遠期計劃，特別係安全嗰個章節，我今朝稍後會有問題問你，暫時我就唔會係問嗰方面嘅問題。你哋亦都係昨晚提交咗一啲文件係涉及其他嘅事宜，咁都係源於昨日提出嘅問題，我亦都感謝你係交咗呢啲資料。

你喺你嘅意見書嗰度係提出一樣，我就想跟進嘅。或者請你就係睇番呢個第 8 段，係昨晚交上嚟嘅補充資料嘅第 8 段，呢度有提及一個工作小組，呢個工作小組就係加強專營巴士嘅安全。委員會獲悉呢一個工作小組係喺大埔公路交通意外 2 月發生咗之後成立嘅一個工作小組，而嗰個成員就係包括咗所有嘅巴士公司及其他人士。你喺呢一個陳詞嘅最後嗰度就有咁講嘅，呢一個工作小組第一次開會就係喺今年嘅 3 月 13 號，我個問題要問嘅就係話其實自此之後係總共開過幾多次會呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）兩次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）自此就兩次，即係總共三次？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）兩次就係工作小組嘅層面，另外就係有兩個就技術小組嘅層面，咁就係講及嗰啲裝備同埋科技嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係之後有一次會議，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，4 月 24--對唔住，係 4 月 23 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）琴日都有提過呢個日子嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，喺嗰個開場白嗰度有提過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到嗰個技術會議，技術會議係邊個出席嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我問一問我嘅同事，因為係關小姐就係負責嘅。

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）係，早晨。主席，早晨。巴士公司同埋巴士製造商係應邀請出席會議。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你指嗰個技術會議？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇係會議紀錄？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會可否得到係一份呢個會議紀錄嘅副本？

關翠蘭女士：Sure.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）講到會議紀錄，因為一般嚟講，裏面係涉及一啲內部嘅討論，我哋一般嘅原則就係唔會將佢披露，因為呢啲係內部嘅討論，亦都有涉及一啲係未成熟嘅研究，亦都如果係將佢披露，可能就會妨礙大家好開放、好坦白咁樣係交談。或者我哋可以抽出其中嘅部分，又或者講及就有啲乜嘢係我哋探討緊嗰個可行性嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我諗委員會係特別關注嗰個技術方面嘅考量，即係話你哋呢兩個小組考慮咗啲乜嘢嘢，所以係因此，我先至話要求係得到一份會議紀錄嘅副本。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）如果委員會認為係有需要攞嗰個會議紀錄嘅話，或者我哋以保密嘅形式係交出。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，我哋好透明嘅，我哋行事透明嘅，乜嘢都上載喺網站，我哋唔會接收任何嘅嘢係唔能夠披露畀公眾。你講到話有個技術小組嘅會議，就講喺香港可以應用啲乜嘢嘅科技，你就話巴士製造商亦都有出席會議嚟到幫手。我可唔可以假設你哋都喺佢哋嗰邊收到一啲文件呢？譬如話一啲車速限制器，你可以被動咁樣樣係截斷嗰個燃資料嘅供應，亦都可以主動形式，譬如話將嗰個傳動嘅裝置影響佢，又或者係制動架車，即係煞車咁樣樣呢？呢度當然就係關乎科技嘅進展，有冇咁嘅文件呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）到而家為止，冇乜咁樣嘅文件。我哋可以將喺會議探討過嘅課題嘅名目係交出嚟嘅，到而家我哋未有任何嘅文件嚟到我哋嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者啲文件都太過技術性強嘅，咁即係有咩嘢係書面寫低嘅呢？其實呢啲咁嘅課題即係好明顯，一定係會有文件，我即係覺得如果你話冇，就好奇怪，會唔會你哋大家有提出過話可以考慮邊一類嘅設備去應用啲科技呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺嗰兩次會議，我哋係有列出話可以加以考慮嘅設備或者科技去進行呢個研究同埋討論。我哋要求與會人士返去係考慮，然後再返嚟開會嘅，我諗就或者係讓日後便利開會，我相信日後都會有一啲分析文件係畀大家參考嘅，好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）昨天，我亦都提過另外一件事，我冇特別要求你交任何嘅報告，不過就係你作證嘅時候提過嘅，你當時就話有一啲季報就會交畀道路安全議會，讓佢哋進行監察嘅。我而家想作出一個請求，我哋想得到係一啲樣本，即係話你交畀呢一個議會嘅季報。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，係，我哋呢啲季報嘅樣本，係，可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才你同主席討論嘅事宜，即係話剛才提過嗰四個嘅會議紀錄，我理解你係唔願意將佢交出，你不過就講過，就話會議紀錄嘅部分應該係冇問題嘅，可以交上嚟委員會度，係咪咁呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我相信我要係問一問律師，得到法律意見先至知道究竟呢個工作小組同埋技術會議嘅會議紀錄可否披露嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我等你去問一問先。

陳美寶女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：That can be arranged?

陳美寶女士：Sure.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另外，仲有兩件事嘅，即係跟番琴日嘅兩點，然後先至去問今日要問嘅問題。我哋就問過，就係點解嗰啲指引縱使就你哋係承諾咗，喺 2012 年交通意外發生之後，承諾就話要修訂嗰個指引，點解係冇做到呢個修訂嘅工作，我哋就問你點解，你有冇做到呢方面嘅工夫呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，因為時間緊逼，我哋琴日未有做到嘅，我哋會儘快去做，亦都會係交番個書面嘅回覆畀你。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。另外仲有一件事就係全職同兼職司機，我曾經有問過部門有冇進行過分析，睇下兩類司機同埋意外之間嘅關係，問下有冇咩嘢分析，你就話你手頭上冇呢個資料。或者係咪可以係進行研究，然後再交嗰個資料畀我哋呢？你哋著手做呢一個工作未呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者讓我澄清一下，根據公司多年嚟畀我哋嘅數據，特別喺嗰個遠期計劃裏面，關乎係巴士安全嘅章節，我哋就會係分析嗰個交通意外嘅性質等等，我哋就係冇資料顯示，就話兼職巴士司機就係一個造成交通意外嘅成因。換句話講，係冇由呢啲分析入面得到任何資料顯示兩者有關連嘅，即係話聘用兼職巴士司機同發生意外，呢一個係我琴日提到話冇資料去指出有咁樣關連嘅基礎。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有機會好快睇番嗰啲遠期計劃，遠期計劃係各個專營巴士公司提供嘅。你話冇關連，你經常重複呢句說話，巴士型號、巴士司機嘅年歲、工作時數。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，正如我講，呢啲嘅分析係由巴士公司製備。喺我哋自己獨立而分析嚟講，就再交畀道路安全議會，我哋就會分析意外係咪致命，係咪嚴重交通意外，然後我哋嘅分析亦都會嘗試找出一啲共通嘅因素，譬如話係駕駛態度，又或者係涉案嘅車輛。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係另一個分開獨立嘅報告？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會交畀我哋個呵？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋喺交畀呢一個道路安全議會季度報告入面有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家講下巴士安全，喺遠期計劃入面，即係交咗畀我哋--琴晚交畀我哋嘅遠期計劃，關於巴士安全嘅內容。我睇過，有五間專營公司，九巴、龍運都係交同一種報告，然後城巴同埋新巴又係都係交同一份報告，呢個第二款。另外仲有係新大嶼山巴士公司，就係有第三種格式嘅報告。首先，我想咁樣問你，關於巴士安全方面，資料類別，要交啲乜嘢係運輸署決定，定係巴士公司決定呢？即係話喺遠期計劃入面要提供咩嘢內容。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正如我喺開場發言，今朝早提到，喺遠期計劃入面，我哋有個要求係 2003 年引入嘅，要提供關於巴士安全嘅內容。而運輸署就會睇番巴士營運者喺巴士安全，意外率方面嘅有關資料，然後我哋就會寫信畀巴士營運商，大概 4 月、5 月嘅時候，就會寫番我哋要求要啲咩嘢資料，喺嚟緊嘅遠期計劃應該包括啲乜嘢嘅。關於巴士安全，有啲時候運輸署會有特別嘅要求，要求提供某啲範圍嘅資料，即係基本上資料嘅範圍，又或者係某啲時候，我哋會要求啲地區咁樣，咁呢個係運輸署會提供建議畀巴士公司嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁文件係邊個交第一份嘅草稿？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係鐵路部門嘅同事。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有冇係有一份嘅草稿吖定或係佢哋自己寫低有啲咩嘢嘅題目需要準備呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係雙向嘅工作嚟嘅，首先就會寫番個範圍喺唔同章節需要包括啲乜嘢，但係多年嚟，亦都有某啲題目或者係一個題目嘅清單，附隨信件嗰度，有需要係可以交畀營運商，去指導佢哋要喺報告某一章節包括咩嘢內容嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋留意到呢啲遠期計劃嘅安全嘅部分都有頗多統計數字，係關於意外嘅數字同埋意外成因嘅數字，你都知道，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁亦都由巴士公司就提供一啲嘅資料，佢哋形容嗰啲叫做安全措施，同埋佢哋擬議實施嘅安全措施。我可以同你舉個例子，佢哋提議有咩嘢安全措施呢？而家就請你揭去新巴嗰一份嘅遠期計劃，呢個就係你琴晚交嚟嘅附件三嘅部分，我睇緊第 6 頁，呢個係該分文件嘅第 6 頁，應該就係文件冊而家係第 200 頁嘅。你見唔見到呢一段呀？就係 5.3 段，即係話實施咩嘢嘅措施去加強安全嘅。

陳美寶女士： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你睇番啲文字嘅話，除咗係採取紀律行動之外，仲有計劃以下嘅措施，同埋計劃去減低某類型意外嘅成因或者係種類。然後就總共列咗有 十四項嘅措施，呢個係巴士公司嘅描述嚟嘅。

琴日同今朝早你都有提過，每年表現評估，即係評估巴士營運商嘅表現，你同委員會講就話安全係好重要嘅，因為如果你睇番九個指標嘅話，有兩個指標都係關乎安全。我哋亦都可以而家去睇下，應該係喺運輸署第 2 文件冊嘅 316 頁。你而家會睇到呢一頁，就係話 2016 年專營巴士營運商表現嘅一個撮要，面前見到嘛？

陳美寶女士：（點頭示意）。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你見到有九個主要指標喇，我哋頭先講過。你提到有兩個同安全有關嘅，就係例如與安全有關嘅，喺巴士檢查中發現與安全有關嘅缺損，另外就係每百萬行車公里涉及巴士嘅意外率。運輸署喺每年進行服務表現評估嗰時有冇查核過巴士營運商佢哋提出某一件事，喺某一年佢哋打算做嘅，譬如頭先講到呢十四項，即係喺新巴嗰份嘅遠期計劃入面嗰十四項。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會答有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話「我會答有」係咩嘢意，即係有定冇咁做？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）每年嘅表現報告就係--評估就係按照每間公司去做嘅，運輸署會睇番意外嘅表現，每一間營運商，睇番佢個安全嘅情況，就係用呢兩個指標嚟睇。遠期計劃，尤其關於巴士安全嘅章節，就係畀我哋去仔細研究，睇清楚巴士公司佢個情況同埋佢哋喺安全方面嘅表現，呢個就係作為一個基礎畀運輸署評估呢間公司嘅表現。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係喺呢個撮要入面，冇任何部分顯示運輸署係有逐間營運商睇佢哋個報告話每一年佢哋打算實施乜嘢喎，呢度只係指每百萬行車公里有幾多次意外，同埋係喺檢查巴士嗰時發現同安全有關嘅缺損。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我請你睇番我哋嘅第 2 號文件。我想請你睇番第 2 號文件，附件 F--對唔住，應該係運輸署第 1 號文件，另外就係 2016 年嘅巴士營運商嘅表現報告。咁應該...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以再講下邊一頁呀？

MR DUNCAN：305。

主席：Thank you。（經傳譯員）你頭先講到呢份文件，係嘞，就係 2016 年嘅專營巴士公司運作嘅表現。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇到同安全措施有關嘅段落，咁就簡述專營公司嘅安全嗰方面嘅表現，同埋喺呢啲意外入面係搵到嘅共通成因。尤其喺 2016 年嘅表現，意外通常都包括係譬如因為唔同原因，乘客喺呢個巴士車廂入面失衡，譬如話係

有扶穩扶手，或者係落緊樓梯咁樣跌嘅，而巴士公司就以唔同嘅方式實施措施，加強安全嘅。然後我哋就再睇番嗰一年嗰間巴士公司嘅表現，然後呢份文件嘅附錄 B，我哋亦都有提到有啲乜嘢措施去加強巴士運作嘅安全性。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我理解啱唔啱呢？即係有特登喺每年嘅評估入面考慮嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家我暫時唔講呢個遠期計劃入面嘅安全有關部分，你可以將文件搦開先。而家想同你講下乘客嘅行為方面，委員會亦都收到好多有關嘅書面意見，亦都委員會知悉，又據稱對車長近來亦都多咗係用武力嘅對待，或者係粗言穢語嘅，有唔同嘅團體，譬如係公會、立法會、其中一間巴士公司，即係九巴，都有呢啲嘅指稱。我再解釋一下個情況，請你睇番第 256 頁，應該係 256-1 頁，我就請你睇番，呢個係一個英文譯本，未鑑證嘅譯本嚟嘅，就關於呢一個會議紀錄，就係呢個巴士業職工會聯盟同埋運輸署嘅會面。

陳美寶女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你如果要睇中文嘅話，我可以畀番中文嗰個頁數你，中文版係 250 頁，英文譯本就係 256-5，呢度係講及就係車長嘅人身安全。我就讀番嗰個翻譯本出嚟，嗰度就講及車長擔心就係話好多時佢哋受到襲擊，但係警方嚟到嘅時候，就係唔告嗰個犯案嘅人，就叫佢哋自行解決。而公會就問下，就係究竟有冇啲乜嘢嘢嘅保障，即係前線嘅車長，究竟遭遇呢啲情況有啲乜嘢保障嘅，所以就你記住呢一點先。另外就 256-6。

主席：（經傳譯員）2016 年 10 月 4 號所舉行嘅一次會議嚟嘅，係咪？先搞清楚呢點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。256-8，你呢就會見到就係呢一個 3 月 27 號 2017 年嘅一次會議紀錄。中文就係 245 頁嗰度見到。或者我就係想請你睇番呢一個譯本，嗰度就係講到話車長受到襲擊，同埋施暴者嘅檢控準則。工會就表示關注近日車長被襲擊，即係使被襲擊嘅車長報警，好多時候，警方到場就提議雙方和解，就係冇檢控有關人士。另外，巴士公司只係為員工提供保險。警方表示就係唔會容忍任何人使用暴力，並同係呼籲車長如果遇到有關情況，就必須報警，並且儘可能係尋找證人，以便警方跟進。或者我想話畀你聽，就不如你睇番嗰個會議紀錄，會議紀錄嗰度就有話畀你聽有邊個出席嘅，嗰度就係有政府代表，有議員同埋巴士業職工會嘅代表咁樣樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）講番佢哋嘅投訴，256 頁，你呢度就話警方就係表達一個意見，警方有冇人在場代表嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度可以見到佢個名呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）曾滿麟先生係警務處嘅總督察（道路安全），256-8 嗰頁，英文版。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好，唔該，好。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）256-16 嗰度，嗰個就係中譯本嚟嘅。中文版係 250 頁，我就想請你睇一睇。英文譯本就係 256-18 嗰度嘅，你會就係見到 2017 年 7 月 20 號一次開會嘅會議紀錄。係，當時亦都有係運輸署、警方嘅代表出席，亦都係有巴士業職工會聯盟嘅代表出席嘅。或者我想請你睇番 256-18 嗰度，嗰度第（ii）嗰項就係講到巴士車長被襲事件，嗰度比較長嘅，我就唔會逐句讀出嚟，或者你自己好快咁睇一睇嗰幾段，然後我就係想講番屘嗰兩段。或者不如我講最後個--呢一個部分最屘嗰段。另外，警方及工會建議巴士公司喺司機駕駛間加裝保護設施，運輸署會就公會嘅關注向巴士公司反映，好似嗰個書面翻譯嗰度係有啲唔係好清楚。當然，就係呢度，運輸署係知悉公會嘅關注。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我亦都睇番中文嗰個原本嗰個版本，呢個係喺 251 頁。就呢個部分，嗰度就咁講，運輸署會就公會嘅關注向巴士公司反映。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，好。嗰個書面翻譯嗰度就係有啲問題，係咪呀？我稍後會再返番嚟呢度。不過，我再想係講及其他嘅例子，就係話運輸署其實都知悉呢一啲關注。請你睇 SEC 2 嘅文件，亦都睇番嗰個翻譯本，係 815 頁，佢原本就係中文嘅，中文嗰個版本就喺 814 頁。呢份其係提交畀立法會嘅文件，你知唔知道其實部門都--即係有人係話畀部門聽，話發生呢件事呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我手頭上冇呢啲資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）不如咁，你可唔可以講多啲資料畀我哋聽，就係日期同埋係邊個寫畀邊個嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢封信唔係寫畀我哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白，我係想請鄧樂勤大律師講講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個日期就係 2016 年嘅 5 月 19 號，咁係一封函件係致函畀立法會交通事務委員會嘅主席。如果你冇睇過呢一封信嘅話，咁我唔問你任何問題。最後就呢一方面，我亦都想請你睇一個係--九巴嘅第一份文件，係喺第 62 頁嗰度，呢個就係九龍巴士有限公司向委員會提交嘅意見書。我唔知道你有冇時間，有冇機會係睇過呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我只係攞一攞嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，好，唔該。我想請你睇呢個第 62 頁，喺頂頭嗰度，或者你自己睇一睇。或者先睇第一點，即係話因應就係愈嚟愈多車長受襲，我哋就係採取咗下列嘅措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）由於即時傳譯就係都需要做翻譯，但係我打上嚟嘅，就只係嗰個

英文個版本，你係咪都將佢讀出嚟方便啲呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度係有講過就係一啲偵察嘅相機，就包括向前嘅相機，同埋有相機就係睇住，就係影住嗰個司機位嘅，呢個都已經係所有嚟自 2015 年新嘅巴士都會裝呢啲咁嘅鏡頭，咁係一個標準設備嚟嘅。2018 年嘅 2 月，其實就二千三百一十九部九巴同埋一百四十六部龍運巴士都有呢啲鏡頭。其餘嘅巴士就會逐步逐步係加裝嘅，呢一啲嘅監察鏡頭就可以係睇到嗰啲如果有麻煩嘅乘客佢嘅行為係點，亦都包括埋錄音嘅，咁就會保障喺事後警方嘅調查或者法律行動嘅車長嘅利益。我哋亦都會係喺 18 年嘅 6 月開始，就係喺近司機位嗰度加個保護罩，我哋亦都會有更多車上嘅宣布，就係促請乘客唔好做某一啲嘢係會影響車長或者其他嘅乘客，我哋亦都會就係提供一個法律支援畀車長，如果佢哋係遇襲嘅話。

大家就睇到呢啲文件，作為一個背景，我想問下你幾個問題。首先，當我提及呢一個乘客嘅行為嘅時候，即係琴日我都同局方就講呢個乘客嘅行為，當時佢哋就話部門獲得指示，就係要草擬一啲呢方面嘅公眾教育嘅計劃。我想問下，你哋做呢個公眾教育，究竟而家程度--嗰個進展係如何呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）講到係乘客嘅行為，即係佢哋點樣對嗰啲車長，其實我哋喺 3 月分交諮會開會嘅時候，我哋當時就係提交咗我哋有啲咩嘢跟進嘅行動，即係跟進番大埔公路交通意外有咩嘢行動。交諮會當時喺 3 月開會，當時我哋就作一個報告，就係話部門，即係政府就係知悉車長嘅關注，即係話曾經發生過一啲事件就係乘客襲擊車長，或者就係對佢哋有暴力咁樣嘅。其實就係道路安全議會亦都有跟進嘅，而當時--其實呢個議會亦都有運輸署同埋警方嘅代表作為成員，以作為一個係持續嘅宣傳同埋教育嘅工作，我哋係有電台嘅宣傳片，亦都有電視嘅宣傳片，亦都喺警訊嗰度話畀大家聽究竟就係如果你搭巴士嘅時候，作為一個乘客，你點樣做先係屬於一個適當嘅行為。而交諮會開會嘅時候，當時我哋就係--佢哋就係叫我哋睇一睇有冇一啲裝置係好啲嘅，同埋就係有冇一個好嘅教育同埋宣傳嘅工作。喺交通安全運動委員會第七十七次嘅會議，呢一個委員會就係交通安全議會底下嗰個工作小組，佢哋喺 4 月 13 號嘅時候開咗會，佢哋就係話乘客嘅態度應該就係道路安全運動喺 2019(sic)年嘅主題之一。第一個推廣活動就係製造一啲公共宣傳，就係推廣乘客喺公交上嘅操守，同埋係今年第三季就會推出。

喺運輸署方面，我哋亦都有同其他公共交通嘅營運商或者行業溝通，例如係的士業，呢個亦都係的士司機提出嘅關注，正在製備一啲嘅守則同埋指引去推行優質的士服務，改善現行嘅制度底下一萬八千架的士嘅服務質素。除咗司機嗰方面，我哋亦都有一個章節係關於乘客嘅責任同埋態度。我亦都有同港鐵公司提出喺我哋每年嘅運作檢討委員會提出，我哋係打算推行大型嘅公眾教育推廣活動，係牽涉不同嘅公交營運商，唔單只係巴士公司，亦都有港鐵、的士之類。我哋考慮緊計劃細節，希望可以呢一個有關嘅推廣活動喺 2018 年底推出。唔該晒，大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）教育計劃其實即係講緊話有一系列嘅措施，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）教育計劃嘅意思就係我哋覺得教育係好重要嘅一個元素，可以帶出一個主要信息，乘客乘搭工具交通工具嘅時候需要留意乜嘢。其中一個訊息，我哋一直都係同營運商同我哋自己之間都有討論，就係話司機同乘客之間都有個共同嘅責任去確保旅途係安全舒適嘅，由出發地至到目的地都係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）九巴已經表示，佢哋已經安裝同埋會繼續安裝一啲嘅監視鏡頭喺佢哋嘅巴士上面。呢個係咪運輸署要求嚟㗎？係咪運輸署對九巴嘅要求？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇同其他巴士公司商討過安裝監視鏡頭？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我個人嚟講，就知悉九巴嘅措施，譬如話安裝啲監視鏡頭，佢哋喺日常嘅討論入面有同我哋講過，喺董事局嘅層面都有提過。呢一點喺董事局，即係其他嘅巴士營運商嘅董事局會議就冇提出嘅，據我所知，但係我哋都知道佢哋考慮用唔同嘅措施協助巴士司機處理呢個問題。如果出現一啲情況，乘客對司機有啲侵犯嘅行為嘅話，喺車上有啲爭議嘅話，車上有冇一啲裝置可以收集證據呢？另外一方面，運輸署直至現在係冇要求安裝鏡頭嘅，我哋明白喺某啲方面會有啲關注，譬如話司機對於呢啲鏡頭會有乜嘢嘅情緒反映，呢點而家喺巴士營運商之間都係討論緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話運輸署而家唔會係跟進呢件事，係交畀巴士公司做？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正如我提到，運輸署同公會開會入面，都聽到有關嘅關注，將佢轉交咗畀巴士公司，亦都請巴士公司尋找一啲方法去處理一啲咁樣嘅事件，即係牽涉巴士司機嘅，就睇下有啲乜嘢嘅設施，有咩嘢措施可以解決，但係亦都要考慮到職員嘅士氣同埋佢嘅情緒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁即係個答案係喇，你係交畀巴士公司自己決定。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔會咁講嘅，因為我哋要考慮埋乘客對司機嘅態度亦都係好重要嘅問題。多年來，我哋致力透過教育同埋推廣嘅活動，發放呢個訊息，我哋亦都知道公會同公司同運輸署都有反映佢哋嘅關注，呢件事我哋亦都有將關注轉交畀巴士公司，我哋明白巴士公司係會處理呢一項嘅關注，我亦都歡迎巴士公司制訂一啲措施係處理呢個問題。再回答番個問題，我哋唔係完全話交畀巴士公司處理就算嘅，因為我哋都知道有啲特定嘅儀器，譬如係監視鏡頭，可能本身都有某啲影響嘅，我哋係要求巴士公司小心去研究呢一方面。

主席：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以請你再解釋，你話監視鏡頭會有啲咩嘢影響，可唔可以解釋下？

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）據我哋理解，同埋同九巴董事局開會，舉個例子，車長有啲關注嘅，安裝咗監視鏡頭嘅話，喺佢哋司機位前方安裝嘅話，係會侵犯佢哋個人私隱，我哋亦都有收到一啲投訴嘅，呢方面，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係車長透過公會投訴？

陳美寶女士：公會，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇文件，呢啲投訴，有冇任何資料？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可能搵唔到，我哋會儘量去搵下。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係一方面有啲車長喇，起碼，就係關注可能侵犯個人私穩，另一方面，車長亦都擔心可能係被襲嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）保護罩，呢一方面有冇考慮？係咪運輸署考慮嘅，覺得係合適嘅措施呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個亦都係巴士公司主動提出嘅，喺呢個情況，即係九巴提出嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我個問題係運輸署覺得值唔值得研究加裝保護罩呢？係咪由巴士--係咪運輸署研究之後，可以向其他巴士公司都提出呢啲要求呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係九巴提出嘅措施，佢哋係回應番車長對於管理方面嘅一啲建議同埋關注，我哋都明白嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題係你有冇同其他嘅巴士公司提議，或者營運商提議，佢哋都考慮呢個措施呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有對其他嘅巴士公司提呢個建議畀佢哋考慮。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係都係由佢哋自己決定繼唔繼續去實施呢個措施，係佢哋考慮嘅，呢個現階段係。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，有冇任何相片可以睇下你所謂嘅保護罩係點樣嘅呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我會儘量搵下。琴日我同局方嘅黎先生就問咗呢個問題，到底有冇邊一間巴士公司有自己成立附例去規管，譬如話車長或者乘客嘅行為？黎先生就話呢一方面，附例方面佢唔係十分清楚個情況係點樣，你答唔答到呢？有冇任何嘅巴士公司係根據條例底下制訂附例呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢一方面我哋有檢查過嘅，係現階段，巴士公司係冇喺呢一個階段就制訂任何嘅附例，我哋同事就記得似乎起碼過去十年，巴士營運商都冇提過呢一點。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）巴士營運商冇提過，但係你作為運輸署，有冇考慮過巴士公司訂立附例，可能係可以幫助到解決近來都頗為猖獗嘅問題呢？因為警方顯

然都覺得提出檢控係有困難。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據《公共巴士服務規例》同埋係道路交通嘅規例，咁已經提到有關係乘客嘅操守，喺公共巴士上面嘅一般操守，係唔可以阻礙司機嘅，呢個已經係一個立法嘅基礎，規管呢一方面嘅事情。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你或者唔係好明白，呢個意見可能就係話唔係警方嘅首要任務，但係巴士公司就可能會好關注。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔可以代表警方回答呢個問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）據運輸署所知，有冇提供訓練畀司機呢？對於一啲不守禮嘅乘客點樣處理。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）據我知，巴士公司喺課程入面有一啲部分係關於點樣處理乘客嘅，係，呢個佢哋培訓嘅部分嚟嘅，對於現行嘅車長同埋新入職嘅車長都有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公會已經投訴過，運輸署有冇考慮過呢個培訓課程入面嘅部分，睇下有咩嘢措施可以提供培訓呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我提到，就係喺有啲處理壓力嘅培訓內容，就係喺嗰個遠期計劃入面提到培訓部分都有嘅。我哋本身亦都係計劃將培訓嘅框架，大家睇齊，令到畀新入職同埋現職嘅車長都有同一個培訓嘅模組，而家亦都有呢啲培訓課程提供，喺某啲情況，車長如果覺得受侵犯嘅話，點樣處理呢啲乘客。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道對於巴士車長嚟講，如果發生一件事係涉及乘客行為嘅話，一般個準則應該點處理呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）據我所知，九巴係有訂立一啲基本嘅規矩畀車長遵守同埋係處理喺呢啲情況。

MR DUNCAN：Have you examined those?

主席：（經傳譯員）等一等，大律師。趁我仲記得，你就話你打算將培訓嘅架構係將佢體齊，係咩嘢意思？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有一個工作小組 3 月成立，係增強呢一個巴士安全嘅。佢哋嘅工作範圍亦都包括增強培訓，呢個係其中一個佢哋研究嘅題目。正如喺我哋文件亦都有提到，文件 11 號，即係話關於巴士車長嘅培訓同埋健康狀況，我哋已經匯報咗，我哋就打算訂立指引係關於培訓嘅架構，將培訓嘅內容同埋組成嘅部分都係一致嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你花啲時間去搵番文件嘅邊部分喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）畀啲時間我。係第 131 頁嘅螢幕上都有顯示。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 15 段？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）培訓車長處理有關情況，即係牽涉乘客係十分重要，需要處理呢個問題。現時有好多巴士公司已經提供有關嘅培訓嘅課程，但係我哋覺得呢啲嘅課程係需要有一致性，去確保喺畀新入職同埋現職車長嘅培訓入面有呢個內容，我哋想制定指引，睇下呢一個有關嘅模組培訓課程嘅比重，去確保有合適嘅培訓提供畀車長，令到佢哋有相關嘅技能，心理上亦都可以處理到呢啲有壓力嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）當你講話要睇齊同埋將佢常規化，你意思係咪話發出啲指引，好讓就係所有嘅巴士公司喺呢方面都係一致呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋打算發出指引。呢個指引就要求所有巴士營運商，就係將呢一類嘅培訓係加入去佢哋嘅培訓框架嗰度，而且我哋亦都打算係將基本嘅要求，譬如嗰個係時間，佢個比重等等，就係列出嚟嘅，制作成為一個框架，就係讓巴士公司去遵從。換句話講，就係有一個框架，亦都係讓各家巴士公司就係進行監察。希望有咁樣嘅做法，就可以將各家巴士公司佢嘅做法係一致。

當然可能喺細節上面，佢嗰個係期間等等可能係有所不同，但係有啲基本嗰個時間同埋不同單元個比重，亦都應該係差唔多。

主席：（經傳譯員）你所謂嘅「比重」係咩嘢意思？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）相對嘅比重，即係譬如話處理乘客呢一個單元，相對其他嘅單元，譬如話關乎呢個駕駛技術、路線嘅訓練咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。呢一個工作小組，我知道你哋預期佢哋係喺 6 月尾就係完成工作。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席，你啱㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪預計到時就可以發出啲指引？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋好努力㗎嘞，我哋儘早希望制定到嗰啲指引。而家喺工作小組個承諾，就話希望喺 6 月尾嘅時候寫好嗰個報告。我哋就會睇下嗰個指引嘅草擬本係咪可以喺報告嗰度係包括埋，但係嗰個詳細嘅指引可能都需要一啲時間添。

唔該你，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。係，鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實呢段文字，其實都冇處理到我同你提嗰個問題，冇

具體咁樣樣去回應到嗰個乘客嘅行為，即係啲乘客點樣對嗰個車長呢一個問題。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，呢份文件冇具體特定咁樣係回應呢一點，但係喺工作小組兩次開會嘅時候係有講過呢一個單元。我哋亦都係取得巴士營運商嘅同意，就係大家同意就係有一個一致嘅框架，而裏面就係有所需嘅單元。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想即係結束呢一方面嘅討論。我想問下就係我哋都見到，工會同埋其他人都有提出過投訴，我就知道運輸署、警方同埋工會都開過會嘅。我想問下部門本身有冇構思係點樣樣去解決呢個問題，就唔係話將佢留番畀巴士公司自行去解決？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）署方認為呢一個係一個好重要嘅課題係需要處理，你哋亦都可以見到，我哋運輸署係喺各方面作出努力。我哋相信係讓車長有所需嘅技巧，同埋讓佢哋心理上係作好一個準備，可以處理呢啲情況。另外仲有教育同埋宣傳嘅工作係話畀大家聽，就最重要就係要知道自己乘客有啲咩嘢責任，都係一個雙管齊下嘅方法嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇啲係比較具體嘅措施，即係除咗你剛才所講比較係一個廣泛嘅手法？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我相信我剛才講嘅已經係好具體。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想睇番你嗰個補充嘅資料，TD-1 嘅 163 頁。就有一點係想你澄清一下，163。

委員會係曾經問過你一個問題，就係咁樣問嘅，運輸署就係睇過嗰啲抽樣調查嘅結果，就去確保專營巴士營運商就係有監察佢哋司機嘅駕駛嘅行為，同埋就會採取跟進行動。如果有啲司機就係駕駛態度或者行為不良，請你講一講，你係用啲乜嘢嘅程序嚟到進行呢一個檢討或者檢視嘅工作？如果係書面嘅話，請交出嚟。

你呢度就係話，突擊檢查或者抽樣調查嘅結果係需要呈交，呢個就喺 04 號文件嘅附件十一嗰度睇到，就係指係 18 年嘅 1 月先開始推行。運輸署就係檢討營運商所提交嘅每月嘅報告，去確保佢哋有監察住呢個司機嘅駕駛行為。我想問呢一方面，究竟你有做過啲咩嘢，即係關乎呢個抽樣嘅調查？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個要求佢哋係設置呢個黑盒，同埋係要有係公司自己嘅便衣嘅職員上車嗰度，嚟到監察車長嘅行為。其實過去多年，就係進行咗，不過我唔記得係具體邊一年嘅，或者我嘅同事都可以查核一下，然後再補充。

為咗係讓巴士公司係有能力係知道得更多，同埋更好咁樣樣去監察車長嘅駕駛行為，我哋就話呢一個黑盒，同埋就係車上嘅便衣嘅督察都可以協助公司分析，同埋監察行為，同埋亦都可以建議一啲改進嘅措施。呢個要求係運輸署訂定。

我哋預期--或者我哋期望巴士公司就根據呢度觀察所得，而呢樣嘢亦都係不斷咁去做，希望佢哋喺呢個基礎之上，就係訂定一啲適當嘅措施。

18 年 1 月之後，運輸署就係採取主動，就要求係做好呢個監察嘅工作，嚟到確保巴士公司係真係有做分析，亦都有做監察，亦都係定期咁樣做。我哋採取主動去做，唔係因應有乜嘢意外，而係話我哋覺得咁樣樣可以讓我哋得到一啲資料作為一個基礎，去諗下究竟係咪可以巴士公司又或者係運輸署嗰方面都可以加強嗰個監察，嚟到確保我哋--如果要考慮一啲適當嘅措施嘅話，都係一個知情嘅情況之下去做嘅。

呢個就關乎係駕駛嘅行為，過去多年，我哋都喺度分析嗰啲意外嘅數據，而好多時係意外裏面，無論係嚴重或者冇咁嚴重嘅意外裏面，司機嘅行為都係一個重要嘅因素，所以我哋認為係有需要加強嗰個定期嘅監察。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實我嘅問題就只係問你所講嘅係隨機抽查係點樣樣嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）據我嘅理解同埋我所記得，巴士公司係要應我哋嘅要求係就黑盒嘅數據進行呢個隨機抽樣調查，同埋亦都喺車上進行隨機嘅抽查。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，講番車上嘅抽查。呢一個係咪運輸署嘅要求定點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）其實運輸署要求。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪書面要求？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我可以查下，然後再補充。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我好想知道你呢個隨機嘅抽查究竟嗰個詳情係點，同埋巴士公司係咪佢哋自己去進行，係咪係針對呢個司機嘅行為？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我冇有關嘅紀錄喺手邊，不過我哋可以返去查下，同埋睇下有冇咩嘢係已經寫低咗落嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就係想問會唔會隨機抽樣抽查一下乘客嘅行為？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個隨機抽查就係焦點在於車長嘅行為。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我去另一個題目。

主席：（經傳譯員）不過你未去第二個題目之前，其實我哋係請運輸署形容一下，你哋點樣樣去檢視嗰啲隨機抽查嘅報告，或者嗰啲紀錄。究竟你哋點樣去即係睇番檢討番、檢視番佢哋交上嚟嘅報告？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）讓我係搵一搵番有關嗰個遵從嘅報告表格，然後話畀你聽。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，慢慢嚟。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）請大家睇一個 04 號文件嘅附件十一，喺運輸署嘅文件夾嗰度，或者律師嘅團隊可以話畀大家聽嗰個頁碼。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，可唔可以話畀我哋聽喺邊度搵到嗰個附件十一？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）1020 頁。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個月報嚟，係指 18 年 1 月開始發出，係涉及四個方面。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）(B)部嗰度就係便裝嘅檢查，就去睇下車長嘅駕駛行為。我哋喺嗰個監察報告嗰度，就係講明係需要知道有幾多個係常規嘅便衣檢查，有幾多個係隨機做，同埋每個月係發現到有幾多宗不良嘅行為，同埋跟進嘅行動。有個咁嘅報告，就讓我哋係知道同埋監察到，究竟佢哋常規係做幾多呢個便衣嘅視察，同埋幾多係非常規。亦都知道係有幾多宗個案係涉及不當嘅行為同埋有咩嘢跟進行動。呢個係 18 年 1 月嘅報告，你亦都見到佢哋係有啲咩嘢跟進行為。

喺呢個報表嗰度，我哋會收到之後就睇，我哋就睇下究竟巴士公司係有冇定期咁樣樣去喬裝乘客咁樣去睇佢哋個情況，亦都睇下嗰個數字會唔會係波動得好緊要，亦都更重要嘅，就會睇下有冇一個趨勢，就係話車長嘅行為係不當。我哋自己會進行呢個分析，就會睇到各家巴士公司嗰個情況，我哋亦都用佢作為其中一個工具，等我哋就可以同巴士公司就跟進，就問下佢哋，睇下佢哋有冇採取適當嘅行動，嚟到去處理一個車長嘅不當行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如講下黑盒，喺呢個表格度就有寫到「八千五百五十二次」喺月尾--截至月尾，就有八千五百五十二次嘅檢查黑盒？

陳美寶女士：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後超速就有二百七十一宗。

陳美寶女士：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）跟進行動就包括一百八十七次嘅口頭警告，七十八次書面警告，同埋六次嘅最後警告。

陳美寶女士：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署即係睇呢份文件，所謂檢視嘅情況，相信睇到呢個記項，你都就係即係知道有咁樣嘅儀器，有咁嘅檢查，你嘅檢視工作就係咁？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係以月報嘅形式提供嘅，提供資料畀我哋，一啲基本資料，睇下巴士公司係以乜嘢方式去檢查，譬如話係查嗰個黑盒嘅數據，又或者

係便裝去監察司機，呢個係等我哋喺每年評估巴士公司表現嘅時候嘅一個理據，再加埋我哋有個獨立嘅分析。我哋分析番巴士營運商嘅意外嘅數字，同埋有冇乜嘢嘅成因，譬如話係咪巴士車長個行為嘅問題，所有呢啲問題，我哋會再同番巴士公司跟進，睇下巴士公司要提出咩嘢改良嘅措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）陳女士，你可唔可以同我哋講下，有幾常見係檢控乘客？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）關於佢哋喺巴士上嘅行為，過去五年，我冇資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署冇保存呢啲資料？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇保存呢一啲資料，但係我唔肯定啲資料係有冇提交畀道路安全議會。因為警方就係其中一個議會嘅成員，另外仲佢哋亦都係即係做主席，去主持呢一個嘅道路安全議會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺啲規例底下呢？即係根據《公共巴士服務條例》底下制定嘅規例？根據呢個規例底下有幾常提出嘅檢控呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋現時亦都冇資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，我想打斷一下。嗰啲嘅保護罩，就喺文件冊入面，就冇呢個相片嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我聽唔清楚，唔好意思。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）關於巴士車長嗰個位置嘅保護罩，喺文件冊入面係冇相。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我哋可以呢方面協助。我相信我有見過呢一張相嘅。或者我哋可以搵下喺我哋啲紀錄入面，提交畀委員會，我會盡力嘗試嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好吖，總之你搵到一張就交畀我哋，等我哋明白係咩嘢嚟嘅。因為話已經有安裝咗，同埋亦都會繼續安裝。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋其實搭巴士嗰陣時都可以見到有咁嘅保護罩，有啲已經安裝咗，就喺個司機位旁邊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）突擊檢查車輛，尋日同黎先生亦都有講呢個問題。其中一位委員亦都有問，有個數字，每日十四架，點解會有咁嘅數字呢，呢一方面你可唔可以協助我哋？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署檢查十四部車係突擊檢查，就喺《管制人員報告》入面提出嘅，係喺運輸署嗰個《管制人員報告》。制定指標或者承諾，我哋要考慮一個穩建嘅車輛檢查嘅制度，係屬於運輸署。每一架專營巴士都要每個月檢

查，除此之外，每年亦都有檢查。如果有一架巴士係當時每月冇做檢查嘅話--等我再重講一次，我哋會每月、每年就住每一架巴士都會檢查嘅。如果有啲情況，有架巴士唔係每月或者每年有檢查嘅話...

陳英傑先生：Not recently...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我請我同事補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）可以。我諗個問題其實話點解淨係得十四架，唔係二百四十架，譬如咁講？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）簡單嚟講，突擊檢查就係喺每月同埋每年例行檢查之外嘅突擊檢查工作嚟嘅。每月、每年就係一啲已經計劃咗嘅檢查工作，突擊檢查就係令到個制度更加完善，因為係以突擊、隨機嘅性質嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，點解十四架，而唔係其他數目？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）每日十四架，即係等如每年三千四百架巴士，總數就係有五千九百架巴士係屬於唔同嘅專營巴士公司。呢個唔係一個特別有科學根據嘅數據嘅，每日十四架。但係我哋亦都考慮到有嘅資源，巴士車隊嘅數目，同埋運輸署喺每年或者每個月例行檢查嘅時候，喺驗車中心需要檢驗嘅車輛數目。

每月、每年嘅檢查同埋突擊檢查加埋嘅數據，就畀一個基礎畀我哋去考慮巴士嘅車輛嘅構造係咪安全嘅情況。同埋找出如果巴士嘅基件有咩嘢缺失嘅話係要能夠辨認到，同埋係更正番嘅。

主席: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，我而家想講下另外一個範圍，關於運輸署同工會嘅聯繫。你嘅證供就顯然運輸署同埋巴士公司就有好多嘅來往嘅、連繫嘅，我想知道你哋接觸--即係不時會接觸工會嘅情況又係點？好多工會都有提交文件畀我哋聽證會嘅，你有冇機會睇，呢啲書面嘅意見書？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我理解啱唔啱呢，行業工會不時係會接觸運輸署或者寫信畀運輸署，提出佢哋嘅關注畀運輸署知道？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會話我哋不時會收到工會嘅信件去提及佢哋嘅關注嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署係點樣處理，對方接觸你嘅時候？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以咁樣講，係一個持續嘅工作嚟嘅。如果工會提出某一項關注，譬如係員工福利，或者係巴士嘅車長工作情況嘅話，我哋會睇下佢哋提出要求嘅性質，睇下係咪同各自巴士公司嘅聘用僱員政策有關，再考慮同巴士公司就住個別個案進行商討嘅。

相對嚟講，更常見嘅就係有啲要求係關於工作時數同埋休息時間嘅。雖然條例並冇要求我哋指明一啲特別要求關於工作環境同埋工作時數，過去十至二十年，我哋已經制定咗指引係要求巴士公司遵守番更次時間、駕駛時間、休息時間，同埋用膳嘅時間。發展到現時，工會可能都係就住呢一個指引嘅範圍同我哋提出關注嘅。呢個工作時間指引一直係實施嘅，令到工會可以向我哋不時表達佢哋嘅意見，同埋建議。我哋亦都會考慮佢哋嘅關注嘅，即係一直都會咁做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）今朝早啲嘅時候，我哋睇到有三次會議。你哋係同工會代表開會，我哋睇到個會議紀錄。2016 年 10 月、2017 年 3 月，同埋 2017 年嘅 7 月。係有咩嘢原因要開呢啲會？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以請阿關女士，助理署長去回答呢個問題嘅。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you.

關翠蘭女士： Thank you, Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺你開始回答之前，就要提醒大家。呢啲會議，你係同我哋講番巴士車長安全問題嗰啲會議？

MR DUNCAN： That's right.

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你而家問一個比較概括性嘅問題，就係點解要開呢啲會，係咪？

MR DUNCAN：Yes.

主席：Thank you.

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）主席，多年來我哋係不時同行業工會會面嘅，回應佢哋嘅訴求。佢哋會提出一啲切身關注嘅問題，譬如係話實施呢個工作時間嘅指引，工作環境，以及佢哋實際上遇到嘅困難嘅。譬如話喺街上可能對於佢哋巴士嘅運作有啲阻礙咁樣，都會同我哋提出嘅，譬如話有邊啲係交通擠塞黑點，等我哋可以同有關嘅部門去聯絡，解決問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有幾常見工會代表？係咪就好似我哋文件睇到嗰啲嘅會議？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）就唔係話有固定嘅時間表嘅，通常當我哋有一啲事項要同佢哋提出嘅時候，就會同佢哋開一個會見面傾下。如果有啲事項，佢哋覺得係設身關注嘅，佢哋亦都會要求安排會議嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以解下畀委員會聽？譬如話一年開幾多次會，你會同工會？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）大概一年兩至三次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）警方又或者其他嘅代表都會參與會議，呢個係咪亦都係好經常發生嘅嘢？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係視乎喺會議個議程入面將會討論咩題目，譬如話如果有需要，我哋會邀請警方出席會議嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我想請你睇番行業工會嘅書面意見書第80頁，呢一份係九龍巴士公司，即係九巴員工協會交畀委員會嘅書面意見書，相信你都有機會睇過呢份文件。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你睇番信件第1段，翻譯就係第80-1頁，第(1)項，你可唔可以自己睇一睇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可以見到呢度語氣都幾重，即係工會提出佢哋嘅即係情緒，話畀我哋委員會聽。你嘅回應係點樣？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我睇嗰個英譯本，呢封信嘅英譯本，其實第1段佢就提及幾個問題，譬如話嗰個待遇低、留失率高，工作時間長等等，呢啲都係即係工會係向巴士公司同埋運輸署開會嘅時候，佢哋所提過嘅問題嘅。

講到流失率高，琴日我諗大家都有講過，大家就講及係人手短缺嘅嚴重--人手短缺嘅問題；講到係待遇太低，政府亦都有請巴士公司就係考慮係咪要處理呢個問題，嚟到係吸引更多嘅新血係入行；工作時間過長，呢個亦都係一個好耐嘅一個問題。其實我哋過去多年，就時不時咁樣去睇，我哋亦都有去修訂咗嗰個工作時間嘅指引。至於話編訂行車時間緊迫，呢個就係關乎巴士公司嘅事宜。其實公眾對於公共巴士服務嘅期望不斷提升，另外喺路上某啲地區交通十分擠迫，就令到編定行車時間係好緊迫。跟住又講管理層嘅手法，管治嘅手法，呢個更多係管理階層同埋員工之間嘅關係，係指某一啲巴士公司。

所以係有人手問題、待遇問題、工作時間問題，即係車長嘅工作時間問題，政府係知悉。所以我哋係採取不同嘅措施，亦都係同巴士公司傾，我哋有嗰個工作時間指引，正正就係我哋其中一個方法，希望係再縮短佢哋嘅工作時間，嚟到改善佢哋工作環境。薪酬待遇，我哋係請巴士公司用各種嘅方法嚟到吸引新人入行，亦都希望佢哋係改善現職車長嘅待遇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署同呢一啲工會嘅關係，你係會點形容？就係健康，定抑或好緊張？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署係監管專營巴士公司嘅監管當局，車長係一個重要嘅資產，亦都係一個重要嘅一環，如果唔係，就無法做呢個營運。當然我哋運輸署唔係勞工處，但係我哋亦都係一直係同車長--即係工會保持一個關係，一個

持續不斷嘅關係。呢個關係一直都喺度，我哋亦都隨時係預備好同佢哋會面，一係佢哋要求，又或者我哋自己採取主動係要求開會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我其實唔係問呢個關係係咪一直都係喺度定抑或點樣，我哋係問即係個關係是否良好？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗好難去一概而論，然後去回答你個問題，或者係簡單去回答你嗰個問題，我好難咁樣去講。我只能夠話我哋嘅對話係持續不斷，而且我哋嘅關係都係融洽，我哋大家傾一啲大家都關注嘅問題，我哋亦都考慮佢哋嘅意見，同埋佢哋嘅關注，再加埋其他嘅睇法，然後先至草擬嗰個工作時間嘅指引。講到話佢哋喺車廠、喺巴士站嘅休息嘅設施，我哋亦都有同巴士公司講，就希望可以照顧到車長日常嘅需要。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋同巴士公司嗰個關係又點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好難去比較，我哋就係巴士營運商嘅監管當局，我哋好認真嚴肅咁樣樣去監察佢哋嘅表現。講到職工會，我哋認為職工係喺呢一個程序裏面，佢哋係重要嘅資產。如果冇嘅話，就無法有呢個有效率嘅服務。所以員工就係佢哋一個重要嘅一環，所以我哋都認為佢哋係一個重要嘅持分者，因而我哋係持續同佢哋保持一個對話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋就快會有一個小休，我想請你睇一睇呢一度嗰個標題，呢份意見書嘅呢段文字嗰個標題。我諗呢個就係佢哋嘅感受，我較早時候亦都提過佢哋嘅感受。佢哋有咁嘅感受，你覺唔覺得出奇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔會講。

主席：（經傳譯員）要為求記錄起見，請你將佢讀出，亦都方便傳譯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度標題就話「政府運輸署官員嚴重失職，監管失效」，即係工會佢哋有咁嘅睇法，即係咁樣寫上嚟委員會，你覺唔覺得係出奇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔會作一個回應，不過我哋覺得係喺監管呢個巴士公司方面，我哋已經盡責。我哋亦都有考慮職工會嘅意見，然後先至制定同車長有關嘅一啲政策。我哋亦都係同佢哋保持呢個溝通嘅渠道，我哋亦都時常就係願意會見佢哋，而佢哋表達咗意見嘅時候，我哋亦都認真考慮，然之後先至制定我哋各項嘅措施。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。我諗小休之後，我諗我哋同你再講一講係一啲比較具體嘅事件，而係職工會就係已經提咗出嚟嘅，唔係全部要你逐個去答，我就會抽其中一部分，就睇下運輸署有冇回應同埋如何去解決呢啲問題，我哋小休之後會處理。

陳美寶女士：Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我哋會小休十五分鐘，唔該。

上午 11 時 38 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 58 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該，主席。陳女士，喺我哋講番公會向委員會提出嘅一啲關注之前，我仲有幾點想問下你嘅。第一，就係你今朝早作供嗰時提到工作時間等等嗰個指引，我而家想講番你今朝早嘅口述證供係咁嘅。唔該晒，而家要呢個科技做到先，就係更加常見嘅係相對嚟講，頭先就講到話公會有啲嘅要求就係關於車長嘅工作時間、休息時間嘅，因為雖然條例係冇寫明要我哋指定車長嘅工作時間同埋工作環境，我哋亦都有制訂指引係要求巴士公司追求--跟從呢一個車長嘅工作時間、休息、用膳時間等等嘅，雖然你話即係條例就冇要求要處理呢啲事項，但係你都知悉有規例--喺條例底下有規例係指明呢啲事項係需要規管嘅，你係知道，係嘛？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽喺邊度搵到？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當然喇，局方嘅文件 125 頁，局方嘅文件嘅 125 頁，係 124、125 頁，係局方嘅第二份嘅文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋睇嘅又睇邊度呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番呢一個條例嘅第 35 條，嗰度就講及由運輸及房屋局局長訂立規例，咁第 35 條嗰度就講就係話係局長就可以就以下所有或任何事宜訂立規例嘅。我想請你睇番跟住嗰版喇，就係 125 頁喇，就去到 J 嗰行嘅，嗰個就係「就駕駛某專營公司所使用嘅巴士嘅司機而言，規管在本規例所指明嘅任何期間(i)該司機可准許駕駛該類巴士的最多時數；及(ii)該專營公司給予該等司機休息同埋用茶點的相隔時間」，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽有冇咩嘢特別嘅原因，點解佢哋嘅工作時間係只係由指引規管，而唔係由規例嚟到去規管呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）事實上，運輸署喺呢個指引嘅制訂其實係畀專營公司係自願咁樣遵從㗎，係喺 93 年嘅時候係做㗎，咁 98 年嘅時候先至正式係有呢啲指引嘅，自此之後，我哋有檢討過嗰個指引喇，亦都係修訂咗六次嘅，自從呢個 98 年以嚟，但講到話指引嘅係落實同埋係檢討喇，呢個係一個不斷進行嘅一個程序喇。咁講到話係制訂嘅指引同埋修訂個指引，我哋都係透過係同巴士營運商商討喇，亦都係透過我哋同職工會係開會商量喇，咁我哋就會係考慮晒所有持份者嘅意見嘅。

喺實施呢啲指引嘅時候，我哋需要專營巴士公司係做嗰個監察工作，亦都提供嗰個數據畀我哋嘅，運輸署本身亦都有聘請係獨立嘅承辦商幫我哋做一個獨立嘅調查，去查下睇下佢哋有冇遵從嘅。過去多年，我哋可以見到巴士公司遵從呢個指引嗰個比率都相當高㗎，我哋冇睇到佢哋係大幅咁樣偏離咗呢一個指引。所以從呢個營運嘅角度嚟到睇，我哋認為目前嗰個安排，即係話工作時間以及係駕駛時間，以及係休息同埋用膳時間，係用指引嘅形式嚟到定出係恆之有效㗎。咁如果係見到係持續不斷巴士公司係唔遵從嘅話，我哋就會採取跟進行動，包括就係發出呢一個警告信或者勸喻信，嚟到確保佢不遵從嘅情況可以儘早得以糾正，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪咁講呢，就係部門根本冇諗過係要透過規例嚟到做呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據現有嘅框架，呢啲指引係一個有效嘅工具，讓我哋可以監察巴士公司嘅表現，監察巴士公司點樣樣去調派車長去工作喇，呢啲指引講出咗係工作、休息同埋用膳時間有咩嘢要求，呢個係關乎車長嘅情況㗎。我哋亦都有同巴士公司講，亦都係同佢講，一定要畀足夠嘅休息設施係畀啲車長㗎，呢個係不斷咁喺度一直做緊嘅工作。落實嘅時候、施行嘅時候亦都係要實際嘅。我哋繼續指引而家係有效㗎，係我--當然，我哋亦都會睇埋呢樣嘢嚟到去評估專營公司係咪真係提供到個適當、有效率嘅服務。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁講啱唔啱呢，是不是職工會都有投訴，就話巴士公司其實冇遵從到嗰個指引㗎，呢個都係職工會同埋職員同埋係職員方面--員工方面不時都有係投訴呢一點㗎，係嘛？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道喺某啲時候曾經有個別嘅投訴，不過我哋自己本身亦都係有獨立嘅調查，睇下巴士公司係咪真係有遵從我哋嘅指引㗎，我哋好盡力咁樣樣去用呢一個獨立嘅查核機制，我哋亦都預期或者期望巴士公司係會確保我哋呢啲要求佢哋係會遵從㗎。喺目前嚟講，喺個合理程度上，我哋都覺得係滿意嘅，我哋都覺得巴士公司就係認真咁樣去對待呢啲指引喇，亦都有係遵從有關嘅指引㗎。有遵從呢啲指引嚟到--喺佢哋嗰個調配工作嗰方面有遵從指引嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係做咗規例嘅話，你哋部門更有牙力去係執法，就唔係單單係靠指引喇，係咪？同唔同意？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據我哋一直以嚟嘅經驗，我哋都覺得滿意嘅就係呢啲指引佢哋係有遵從，而且亦都一個制衡嘅機制嚟到確保我哋自己亦都有一個獨立嘅查核，如果某一個時候、某一次係有不遵從，我哋就會同巴士公司係跟進，問下佢點解有不遵從嘅個案，咁亦都會係採取適當嘅行動跟進。到而家嚟講，呢一個機制都係恆之有效㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔係，個問題就係話規例就會讓你哋係更有力--更有牙力，就唔係淨係指引，問你同唔同意，唔係問你個指引係咪恆之有效，而係話如果用咗規例，就係讓運輸署就係有--更有牙力去執行呢一個要求喇，同唔同

意？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗呢一點係要整體咁去睇，亦都睇番嗰個法律框架，目前我哋運輸署嘅監察--我哋監察呢啲巴士公司，其實係沿自嗰個道路交通同埋公共巴士服務呢兩條條例底下畀我哋嘅法定權力，所以以整體嚟到去睇，呢一個就係我哋運輸署係點樣樣去履行我哋嘅職責，去扮演我哋嘅監察嘅角色，喺呢個階段，我唔會評論究竟某一個要求係咪應該薑喺規例更好，讓我哋更有牙力，因為我哋監察巴士公司嘅表現，我哋都係要睇番整個框架去做嘅，裏面有法定嘅要求喇、有專營權嘅條文喇同埋亦都有其他嘅指引喇同埋係通告㗎，都係我哋發出㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）立法會就覺得應該係畀呢個權力你哋，咁但係你覺得冇需要運用呢個權力，因為你認為呢一個非正式嘅機制你覺得係恆之有效，係咪咁講？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我剛才講過，目前嗰個框架我哋就係用呢個框架嚟到去係執行呢個指引喇，咁同埋係請佢哋糾正喇，如果有問題，我就認為而家係恆之有效㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。我哋未講職工會嘅關注之前，我就係想同你再跟進另一點，呢個就喺你哋嘅補充文件嗰度㗎，咁就係 TD-163 頁，請你哋將佢打出嚟喇。我想請你睇番呢一版嘅第一個項目，就係第十七，嗰度委員會問嘅問題就係話，如果呢一個黑盒或者車速紀錄儀嘅所需嘅係功能或者能力就係以書面係話咗畀專營權公司聽，咁可唔可以畀啲副本我哋睇喇，咁同埋你有冇修訂過佢嗰個功能？即係話由你一開頭要求佢哋去加裝呢一啲設施到而家，中間有冇修訂過嗰個要求？呢個就係委員會問你哋個問題，咁或者我哋睇番你哋嗰個回應，你就話部分就發出咗一個咁嘅文件㗎，咁就係話基本最低要求呢個係電子紀錄儀，新巴士嘅電子紀錄儀器，亦即係黑盒嘅最低嘅基本要求，咁你就畀咗營運商喇，咁就係附錄咗呢個附件喺度嘅，根據呢啲要求，咁驗車主任就會抽查佢哋嗰個功能㗎。

我哋知道就多年嚟就由於科技係有發展喇，咁而專營公司就已經主動咁樣樣去同呢個供應商去擴充嗰個黑盒保存嘅資料嘅範圍，嚟到讓佢哋就可以更好咁管理個車隊，包括就係車嗰個路線號碼、門鈴、開門、地點、係就係--地點等等嘅。我想請你睇呢個 TD-1597 頁。喺 1597 頁嗰度喇，咁你見到有封信嘅，咁呢個係運輸署發出去畀多間專營公司嘅一封信，呢封信係咪就係你所講嗰封信，就要求佢哋係要裝呢個黑盒呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個就最初係要求要有黑盒㗎，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇下你跟住嗰版。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係 2003 年嘅 10 月 7(sic)號，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺跟住嗰版就開列咗係呢一個電子數據紀錄裝置嘅基本最低要求，係嘛？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你再問一次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，喺跟住嗰版你就見到係列咗嗰個基本嘅最低要求出嚟，係嘛？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）自 2003 年開始，科技一直發展喇，黑盒而家可以提供好多嘅資料㗎喇，2003 年當時可能未發展到提供到，你都知道嘅，咁運輸署有冇再發出進一步嘅指引去畀巴士公司，關於由黑盒度應該收納咩嘢嘅資料呢，考慮到科技嘅發展？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我同同事啱啱確認咗，由 2003 年之後，我哋係冇再就住呢個電子嘅數據紀錄儀係再發出指引。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係係要靠巴士公司自己去追上個科技喇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）的確咁多年嚟科技發展嘅，我哋而家係商量緊點樣可以加強黑盒嘅功能，我今朝睇到喇，就喺個工作小組嗰度而家討論緊，就係 2018 年 3 月開始工作嘅，呢個係其中一個喺佢哋工作範圍嘅一個要點嚟嘅，係我哋--係同巴士公司商討，過去咁多年我哋就冇再就發出呢個修訂嘅指引去加強黑盒嘅功能，但係我哋亦都會同巴士公司溝通喇，佢哋亦都願意去睇下有咩嘢方法去加強巴士上嘅裝置。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話個答案係冇錯，的確過去十四年呢樣嘢係交畀巴士公司自己做喇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正如我同事琴日睇到，呢十四年間我哋亦都有同巴士嘅製造商同埋巴士公司一直保持聯繫，佢哋亦都知道科技嘅發展嘅，各項儀器有咩嘢新嘅科技發展，我哋係的確冇發出任何嘅備考，就住呢一個嘅指引，咁但係唔等於我哋冇研究過呢方面嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Now I want to go, please, to some of the matters that --

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你而家唔再講黑盒呢。

MR DUNCAN：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我想喺你講第二個範圍之前問呢個問題，或者你可以協助委員會嘅。運輸署知唔知道而家用緊嘅譬如黑盒--數據盒喇，咁係各個專營巴士公司用緊嘅係乜嘢呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，係咪問我哋知唔知道...

主席：（經傳譯員）我問你知唔知道而家各間巴士公司用緊嘅所謂黑盒，佢嗰個能力係點樣嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者請我哋專家陳先生回答呢個問題嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）或者我好簡單講下喺黑盒而家用緊嘅功能係咩嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以回答，直接回答，答咗知或者唔知先，跟住你再畀你嘅專家意見喇，你知唔知道而家各間嘅專營巴士公司用緊嘅所講黑盒嘅儀器個功能係點樣嘅？

陳英傑先生：Yes.

主席：So the answer is yes?

陳英傑先生：Yes.

主席：Thank you. Please explain.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）基本上，黑盒呢個儀器係可以監察車輛嘅移動，係每隔某一個時刻㗎，呢個 2003 年嗰陣時係--冇錯，係每一秒嘅方法去監察嘅。

主席：That was the 2003 requirement.

陳英傑先生：It's the 2003 requirement.

主席：Yes.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）以前就係用一個即係非數碼嘅方式嘅，係一個製圖嘅方式，今時今日就係電子嘅方式㗎喇，就基本上係可以用唔同嘅方式使用番呢個數據嘅，我理解今時今日巴士公司除咗係紀錄之外，譬如話嗰個剎車喇、嗰個嘅車速或者嗰個門、門鐘咁等等，都係有紀錄㗎喇，咁然後可以使用番喺黑盒呢啲嘅數據去作為一個管理駕駛嘅工具去進行每日嘅監察嘅，呢個就係黑盒嘅基本功能。當然喇，亦都有其他嘅科技嘅發展，譬如係全球定位系統喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係呢個都唔係新嘅科技喇？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）個科技本身未必係新。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺 1990 年，喺美國嘅時候已經係有啲--即係有啲媽媽都識得買啲全球定位系統儀器畀佢啲仔去海灣嗰度服役嗰時可以搵到方向。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個科技本身未必係新，但係嗰個用嘅資料個方法就係唔同㗎喇，喺管理數據方面，而家管理層係可以用番嗰啲嘅數據可以監察番每日車輛嘅運作喇，同埋司機嘅操守、駕駛態度都可以每日去監察嘅，你可以話對於巴士嘅管理，呢個唔係新嘅科技喇，因為有唔同嘅運輸公司好耐以嚟都有用呢一個嘅技術，由於香港嚟講，正如我所講，或者正如委員會講，並唔係--即係唔係好似署長所講喇，我哋唔係就咁交畀巴士公司做嘅，多年嚟我哋都有去四圍睇下

有咩嘢新嘅科技嘅應用。黑盒係提供一啲好基本嘅數據，但係咁多年嚟，我哋亦都有同巴士公司溝通，請佢哋--即係話要利用數據--喺黑盒入面嘅數據去更好管理巴士嘅行走同埋車長個態度嘅。佢哋亦都有咁做，據我知道，有啲巴士公司最近其實都係將佢哋嘅系統同埋軟件升級，去更好利用黑盒數據資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）對於不同嘅巴士公司你有咁嘅要求，叫佢哋投放資源去用多啲新嘅技術，咁呢個係咪用書面提出㗎？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）而家我回答唔到呢個問題，我可以返去睇下，但係肯定我哋有同佢哋成日開會傾，商討嘅。有時我哋嘅職員去個車廠睇番佢哋整體嚟講車輛嘅構造同埋維護喇，我哋亦都有提呢一類型嘅討論嘅。但係呢啲嘅討論或者要求有冇正式書面，咁我要返去睇下。

主席：（經傳譯員）無論係咪正式提出都好喇，有冇會議紀錄吖，有冇任何書信來往吖，可以去顯示咁多年嚟你哋溝通之間有提過，如果你搵到嘅話，首先你搵出嚟，就都畀啲副本畀我哋。

陳英傑先生： Sure.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會儘量嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁請你睇番行業工會嘅文件冊喇，第 185 頁。我諗我先要請你睇番第 147 頁，呢一份文件我哋係冇譯文嘅，但係我將會請委員會係調--研--去考慮一小段。呢份文件係 147 頁開始嘅，如果睇番第 145 頁，你就可以見到呢一個附隨嘅信件，呢個係巴士業職工盟交畀檢討委員會嘅書面意見。咁而家請你睇第 185 頁。而家睇番最屘嗰段，185 頁最屘嗰段。我有嘅翻譯嘅版本就係話呢段嘅內容係咁樣嘅「為咗要收到花紅，車長必須要係通過一個評核，而巴士公司成日用一個出勤表現作為畀唔畀花紅嘅因素喇，所以車長好多時候就算生病都會繼續帶病上班嘅」，你見唔見到嗰部分？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我仲搵緊有關嗰個段落。我搵到一個段落，但係嗰個表達嘅方式似乎就...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你譯畀我哋聽吖。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可以睇下你同唔同意吖，我知道嘅版本係咁樣嘅，

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以讀你英文嘅譯文讀多次出嚟？

MR DUNCAN： I will read it to you again, yes. （經傳譯員）係，等我睇下係--「員工要收到年中獎金嘅話，必須要經過評核，巴士公司卻將出勤率作為其中一項評核指標去決定巴士員工能夠全數取得年中獎金，巴士員工往往為咗得到整筆嘅年中獎金便儘可以帶病都會上班」，即係話就算佢哋應該本來請病假，佢都繼續會去揸車嘅。

主席： That's bus captains do that?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係講緊係巴士嘅車長。可能你需要睇第 185 至 186 頁喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者等我協助一下。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你提到嗰個段落係關於新入職員工以合約方式聘請嘅，巴士公司會考慮佢哋出勤率作為其中一項評核指標是否續約，而員工往往為咗得到公司續約，就算係生病都係會繼續執勤嘅。即係話出勤率係作為考慮員工續約嘅因素，而工會覺得係不合理嘅。然後呢一段仲有第二部分嘅，就係話近年巴士公司設立年中獎金畀新入職員工，咁樣巴士公司就係有一個評核嘅制度嘅，先至--要通過先可以獲得個年中獎金，但係巴士公司亦都會將出勤率作出其中一個評核指標。即係其實係有兩部分嘅，呢個段落。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋唔需要爭拗入面嘅內容喇，或者我咁樣問你，工會係咪曾經同運輸署反映過呢個問題㗎喇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正如我所講喇，我哋都有睇過呢一封意見書，而最新職工會喺不同嘅場合亦都有提過呢個關注，所以我係知悉嘅。

MR DUNCAN： Yes.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）不過至於話佢哋有冇正式咁樣 樣你向運輸署係有書面嘅意見或者係講過，我要返去查核嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係佢哋已經係話咗畀運輸署聽有咁嘅情況個喎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我都要再查一查。我自己係知嘅，我嘅同事亦都知嘅，因為呢個關注其實係職工會特別係喺大埔嘅意外之後都係有提出過嘅，不過我要返去再查下，再返嚟書面咁回覆你哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，麻煩你。我呢度要問嘅就係，第一，佢哋有冇同部門講過；第二，如果有嘅話，咁究竟部門係採取一個乜嘢措施、咩嘢步驟去研究呢件事呢，麻煩你回應嘅時候跟番呢一點。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係知道佢哋有咁嘅關注嘅，喺不同嘅場合，我哋知道嘅，媒體亦都有廣泛報導喇，呢個係喺大埔意外之後有咁嘅廣泛報導。不過至於話有冇正式咁樣樣係同部分溝通過呢，因為呢度講及係新近推出嘅年中獎金喇，同埋係講及呢個員工續約，新入職嘅員工續約嘅情況。咁呢個就係關乎埋佢哋嘅招聘事宜嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果你係知嘅話，咁更--嗰個大啲嘅問題就係話，既然係知

喇，到而家為止做過啲咩嘢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呢幾個月，自從大埔意外之後，由於廣泛報導，咁所以我係知嘅，我要再睇睇究竟部門整體嚟講係有冇透過正式嘅渠道係知悉呢一個關注嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）職工會亦都有另一樣嘢就係提過出嚟嘅，就係同一個文件冊嘅 311 頁。310 頁就係港九勞工社團聯會寫入嚟嘅。我想請你係睇最屘嘅一段，喺 311 頁嘅最屘嗰段。我亦都有一個英譯本喺度嘅，就有關嗰一段係有個英譯本我係將佢打出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀一份我哋嘅速記員？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你慢慢睇咗先喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢份意見書嘅呢一個部分，工會就講及廣告裏面嘅收入㗎，廣告收入㗎，咁就話要求政府就係要檢討嘅，呢個就係指嗰個非票務收入。呢樣嘢我想問下喇，工會係咪已經係同運輸署係提過呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我冇聽聞過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話你而家先係首次係知道有咁樣嘅意見，而佢哋就係將呢個意見交咗畀呢個委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以將佢係讀出嚟？邊一度係講話要求檢討？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 1 段嘅最後一句，「勞聯要求政府必須檢討非票務收入嘅規管，呢個係指巴士專營權政策裏面嘅呢個部分，以免係上述惡性循環，不斷重複」。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。所以你之前係唔知道佢哋有咁嘅要求，係嘛，陳小姐--陳女士？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，啱㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）再請你睇番另一個項目，係 71 頁。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，主席，除咗係講話我哋之前係唔知，我可唔可以亦都補充一下，講下我哋嘅睇法？

主席：（經傳譯員）當然可以喇，請你講吖。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據佢哋嘅意見同埋佢哋提及就係公司對於係非票務收入嘅定義，我就想係紀錄在案，公司係要擬備佢哋嘅周年賬目同埋佢哋嘅報告，呢個都要跟番國際嘅標準同埋做法，而且佢哋亦都有內部嘅稽核喇，即係有我哋部門嘅內部稽核嘅。如果佢哋係提議票價要增加，咁我哋部門就會係檢討喇，另外

就係運房局裏面有關嘅小組亦都會去檢視嘅。如果佢哋想申請加價，我哋會睇埋佢哋嘅財務嘅情況喇，佢哋預計嘅收入同埋支出喇，以及係票務收入、非票務收入，兩者我哋都會考慮埋嘅。唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家想請你睇同一沓文件嘅第 67 頁。一封電郵，裏面就係嚟自月薪車長大聯盟所提交畀委員會嘅一份意見書，我就想請你睇呢個 72 頁，72 頁就係嗰個翻譯本，或者你想睇番個中文版，就係第 68 頁嘅。麻煩你睇一睇呢個第 3 段，個標題係「車長培訓」。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係喇，我已經睇咗喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個關乎培訓嘅事宜嘅。我想問下喇，工會有冇時不時咁樣樣係同部門係提及呢一啲關注？

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你可唔可以講得具體一啲？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢段裏面佢哋都係一個投訴嚟嘅，咁我想問喇，部門係知唔知悉佢哋有呢個咁嘅情況？

主席：（經傳譯員）起碼你話畀我聽，究竟你講嘅邊一樣係嗰個重點？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當然可以喇，主席。我想喺嗰個譯本嗰度係引述，嗰度就咁講，「目前訓練就由一至兩名學員同埋導師組成，導師會同學員相處十七日，除咗教導學員正確嘅駕駛技術同埋態度，亦都會觀察學員嘅性格，可怕公司現行嘅制度無視相關嘅意見，其實九巴駕駛訓練學院嘅學生源源不絕，川流不息，無奈一年之後，剩下嘅寥寥可數。工作壓力大，包括精神壓力。招聘廣告與實際收入不相稱等都係流失嘅原因。」呢啲嘅指稱、指控，有冇係喺過去曾經已經同部門講咗呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我嘅問題係，呢啲嘅投訴有冇話過畀運輸署聽？即係過去。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我睇咗嗰個中文版，亦都睇咗個英文版，呢一段文字嘅開頭嗰度提及一個個案，有一個個案就係一個係新入職嘅應徵者喇，咁就係接受培訓同埋考咗牌，咁一個禮拜之後--入職一個禮拜就發生交通意外，而公司係為呢一個車長提供培訓，中文嗰度咁寫嘅，就話公司喺現有嘅制度底下係唔會考慮相關嘅意見㗎，嗰度話無視相關嘅意見，其實佢最初嘅時候就講，係話車長個培訓，但係呢一段文字嘅後面嘅部分其實就係講呢啲新入職嘅人士佢哋係工作一年喇，咁佢哋可能係要賠款嘅，喺呢一方面嚟講，呢一類嘅投訴關於嗰個具體嘅安排喇，呢個咁嘅投訴就冇喎，我哋冇收過咁嘅投訴，冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講下第二部分喇，咁呢啲行業工會會唔會不時同你反映呢個意見呢，關於有咩嘢安全技術，又或者有乜嘢安全嘅條文可以引入規管巴士

呢，佢哋自己有冇就畀過意見你？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我要請同事去查一查先。或者請關女士回答吖。

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）我哋過去兩年同工會聯絡，係好少提出咁嘅問題嘅，係講關於安全嘅儀器嘅，我記得佢哋曾經講過，喺擋風玻璃有除霧裝置，因為佢哋覺得春天嘅時候就好多霧，個情況嚴重喇，之後我哋亦都同佢哋僱主跟進，睇下有乜嘢解決方法。呢個係唯一一個關於安全嘅事項我記得係有傾過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會有冇不時提出，譬如係話嗰個嘅車鏡或者係擋風玻璃個除霧裝置？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢頭先係講咗，係幾年之前曾經提過呢樣嘢，係咪？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）又或者兩、三年前，係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）顯示屏呢，同埋一啲警告嘅裝置呢，或者一啲嘅譬如倒後嘅感應器咁樣，工會有冇提過？

關翠蘭女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我自己就唔知喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會代表係咪喺你嘅工作小組都係有一個代表㗎，去睇下有冇咩嘢新嘅科技可以應用？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇㗎，工作小組個重點係睇下有咩嘢嘅加強巴士運作嘅裝置喇，同埋培訓嘅框架，我哋同巴士公司同埋廠商商量，喺巴士公司角度而言，我哋預期佢哋會考慮番公司本身個情況，其他嘅持份者嘅意見，再畀番佢哋嘅回應我哋嘅。好似我頭先同事咁講喇，我哋同工會持續嘅溝通都係喺制訂嗰個工作時數指引嗰方面嘅發展嘅，喺咁嘅情況，我哋比較通常傾嘅就係工作環境，同埋佢個工作時數、薪酬等等，就唔係話好常見會去商量佢哋嘅合約條款、工資，因為呢個係個別公司個佢嘅僱員嘅安排。巴士公司係要根據《僱傭條例》去符合入面嘅僱傭嘅要求喇，亦都係制訂工作時間、合約條款咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢原因點解冇巴士工會嘅代表係喺你個工作小組呢，尤其是你考慮緊其中一樣嘢係培訓？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔該，主席。工作小組個工作範疇就係本身係睇巴士嗰個安全裝置，同埋睇下有冇咩嘢方法增強或者監察培訓嘅架構。工作小組個職權範圍就唔包括引入新嘅培訓要求或者係單元要求公司跟從嘅，我哋做嘅就係對於現有嘅培訓嘅安排，我哋將佢達至一致性嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中一個考慮嘅科技嘅裝置就係一個顯示車速屏嘅，喺巴士上面嘅，我嘅理解啱唔啱？呢一樣嘢係咪會--即係巴士司機本身都會有參與呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）顯示個速度嘅顯示屏，其中一個工作小組考慮嘅儀器嚟嘅，但係我哋亦都明白巴士公司一個反應，就係話可能會令到巴士司機係更加大

壓力嘅，因為乘客都喺車上可以一直監察巴士司機點樣揸車，如果有個咁嘅建議，係會對職員係有影響嘅話，運輸署亦都好高興可以即係請職方參與去商量嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔單只係話巴士公司話畀你聽佢哋車長可能覺得如果裝個車輛顯示屏會有咩嘢問題嘅話，你點解冇直接問下佢哋職方睇法呢，同工會見面呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係樂意同佢哋見面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁喺你個工作小組有乜嘢持份者代表？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有巴士營運商喇，同埋巴士嘅製造商，亦都有車輛牌照及檢驗組喇、機電署喇去睇番科技或者技術嗰方面嘅問題喇，同埋道路安全同埋標準，呢個都係運輸署底下其中一組去睇番全港嘅道路安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁一方面你就係有運輸署、巴士公司同埋亦都有啲技術上嘅問題就係請巴士嘅製造商都參與嘅，我理解有冇錯？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：咁運輸署有冇考慮過請埋工會嘅代表參與工作小組嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）而家嚟講就冇工會代表喺工作小組嗰度嘅，工作小組嘅職權範圍就係考慮下有可行嘅建議喇，睇下我哋一般嘅做法喇，如果係有啲有系統嘅諗法或者建議嘅話，我哋就會同持份者溝通㗎，就係包括職方、工會，我哋樂意咁做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你嘅答案係冇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇考慮到--我哋考慮咗嘅，因為呢一刻工作小組先至啱啱喺度傾呢啲嘅儀器同埋培訓嘅初步諗法，咁而呢啲亦都係牽涉巴士車長嘅培訓嘅，到我哋有更加多細節嘅建議之後，我哋就會可以會見工會，同佢哋分享我哋嘅建議喇，呢個我都有諗過㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你而家諗下呢個階段就係唔牽涉工會先嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯㗎，喺最初草擬一個建議嘅階段。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你有冇將呢個諗法同工會溝通過？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇，因為呢一個工作小組係由我哋成立嘅，去考慮所有唔同嘅--由署方提出嘅建議、諗法，咁我哋就係等待制訂一啲更多細多嘅建議嘅，我哋有一個更加系統性嘅架構嘅時候，我哋就會諮詢有關持份者。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家想請你睇下第二個問題喇，都係工會提出嘅，喺工會嗰個文件冊第174頁。同樣喇，呢份文件都係呢部分冇譯到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪就 174(sic)頁開始嗰份文件？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）的確係。呢個係巴士業職工盟嘅書面意見嘅，其實我會--其實睇番嗰個成個文件開頭，145 頁嘅，咁我都會繼續講番。而家想請你睇番 174 頁頁底，你可唔可以自己睇下先？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，係咪頁底？

主席：（經傳譯員）第 2 段，174 頁，第 2 段。你會見到呢個 Alexander Dennis Enviro E500NG 系列。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇咗喇，呢段。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢段係咪解釋番畀委員會聽，如果係有尾軸轉向功能嘅話，巴士□起上嚟有個咩嘢危險，尤其是係 12.7 米長嘅巴士？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）或者我嘗試回答呢個問題。我相信個問題就係最近就係引入 12.8 米巴士嘅，咁而嗰個轉向有啲司機就覺得轉彎嗰時係好難操控嘅。首先，任何喺香港引入嘅巴士都要符合所有嘅車輪構造及維修嘅規例嘅，而喺香港呢啲巴士，超過百分之九十九都係嚟自歐洲車廠㗎喇，都係要符合歐洲嘅標準。個問題係到底呢啲巴士喺香港係咪適用呢，呢個先係主要問題，喺我哋嘅系統當中，任何引入新巴士嘅時候，第一件事都係要經過一啲嘅程序嘅，個程序係咩嘢呢？除咗係睇車輛技術嘅問題之外，都要睇下呢個車輛喺道路上係咪適宜香港使用，符合咗技術要求之後，我哋見到嘅呢啲嘅巴士，佢係技術上係可行，係可以喺香港路上行走嘅，而我哋都留意到有啲司機就認為因為呢啲巴士比起現有嘅長，而家現有嘅都係 12 米，但係新引入嘅係 12.8 米，喺轉彎嘅時候，車輛控制方面--即係佢哋比較適應舊款嘅巴士嘅駕駛方法喇。

咁我哋就要求佢哋做幾樣嘢，第一，巴士公司要訓練佢哋嘅員工適應新嘅巴士，並唔係話架巴士本身危險，又或者只係係可唔可以係好好控制好架巴士啫；第二，如果呢架巴士比起大部分香港現行嘅巴士都長嘅話，喺使用新嘅巴士嘅時候，我哋又要睇下個路線喇，會派啲車行咩嘢路線喇，而家當我哋派 12.8 米嘅巴士行走路面嘅時候，係行某啲路線嘅，我哋要試過，要確保係可以安全咁樣行走先至會准巴士公司派呢啲車行嗰啲路線嘅。唔係所有巴士都係 12.8 米，有啲巴士公司都係用番 12 米嘅車，有啲甚至--可能係上山頂、上山嘅就用一啲巴士更加短，呢個係培訓問題同埋係恰當咁樣調派呢啲巴士行走某啲路線，並唔係話啲巴士本身係危險嘅，呢個係我嘅回應。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話百分之九十九係嚟自歐洲，亦都符合歐洲嘅標準，係嘛？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，職工會有冇同運輸署提過呢件事呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有嘅，我哋知道嘅，亦都有睇過嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）其實工會有同運輸署講過㗎，咁因此我嗰個組別係有好仔細咁樣樣去睇過佢嗰個轉彎個弧度同埋轉彎個路線嗰個問題嘅。我哋有講過就話係巴士公司都要睇嘅，因為司機有投訴，佢哋就覺得就唔穩陣，即係咁長嘅一架新車，佢哋覺得就係揸得唔好，咁所以我哋就話巴士公司要做多啲培訓，咁而當我哋嗰部分，我哋做呢一個係類型評估嘅時候，只能夠批准佢做某一啲路線嗰度用嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者最後一點，然後我哋就小休午飯。有長啲嘅巴士，當然有優點喇，咁其中係咪包括即係載客量係高啲，呢個係咪長身啲嘅巴士嘅一個原因呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）嚴格嚟講，如果架巴士更長，咁可以安多啲座位，咁但係以呢一個型號嚟到計，呢個型號本身如果喺香港行走，都有一啲係好處，一啲優點嘅，除咗多幾個位，佢嗰個新嘅科技，同埋就係可以駕駛得更好。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係午後我哋可以再講。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）其實--譬如話係輪椅嘅乘客，坐輪椅嘅乘客，佢可以就係出入容易啲嘅，所以係呢一類嘅巴士係喺呢一方面係有所改善嘅，所以我哋喺評估巴士營運商嘅時候，呢一點我哋都睇埋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家就係小休，就係兩點半再繼續嘅，唔該。

下午1時02分聆訊押後

下午2時30分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席。陳女士，我相信你係想有啲補充嘅，係咪呀？關於話用呢啲比較大型嘅巴士嘅好處。

陳美寶女士：I have nothing to add.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗陳先生，係，對唔住，係咪陳先生？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你頭先啱啱講到話用呢啲大型啲嘅巴士係有好處嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我諗我哋同事就係已經講咗㗎喇，就話大部啲嘅巴士就係可以有低地台，讓輪椅可以上嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，就係上落係容易啲，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就係想問，琴日係黎先生問過佢，不過佢就係答唔到，我諗就係羅教授喺聆訊嘅時候有提過嘅，呢個就係講及係需要幾多司機，因為話有一啲叫做特別更，當時問嘅問題就係話有冇做過任何嘅研究，去睇下有冇影響，即係話如果呢個特別更十四個鐘呢一個上限係取消嘅話，對司機嘅數目有咩嘢影響，琴日就講過話需要多二百五十位司機嘅，黎先生就同我哋話，就話呢個研究就係部門進行嘅，我就想問下，唔知你係咪可以同我哋講一講就嗰個研究嘅結果係點？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我可以嘅。我哋就呢個工作時間嘅指引嘅檢討係喺 17 年嘅 9 月係開始檢討嘅，呢個係因為局方請我哋去做嘅，我哋就希望就睇下係咪有空間可以進一步改善係車長嘅工作嘅條件，特別係車長嘅工作時間，講到話要改善佢哋嘅工作情況，亦都睇番過往嘅改變同埋修訂。我哋就係比較全面咁樣去檢討過嗰個指引，我哋考慮咗佢哋嘅營運嘅要求，即係話專營巴士公司嘅營運要求，以及係乘客，以及公眾，係希望巴士嘅服務水平有所提升，另外車長亦都希望工作嘅情況，工會亦都係希望嗰個工作嘅條件有所改善嘅。

我哋做指引嘅時候，考慮咗數個因素嘅，其中係包括對人手嘅影響，即係話如果實施呢一啲指引對人手有咩嘢影響，我其實講過，其實嗰個出發點就希望改善車長嘅工作條例，特別就係希望將嗰個更次嘅時間縮短，同埋車長嘅駕駛時間係縮短嘅。

最新嘅修訂指引其實就係涉及我哋一個研究，研究一下係需要額外係增加幾多個車長嘅，大概就二百六十個，我哋就係喺我哋嘅文件夾或者意見書，5 號文件嗰度嘅。

我哋亦都研究過目前長嘅更次嘅工作時間係咪可以縮短，而家有一啲巴士公司係有一啲比較長嘅更次嘅，我哋嘅理解就係咁嘅，有一啲巴士營運商佢哋係有一啲長嘅更次時間嚟到去滿足呢個早上同埋係傍晚嘅繁忙時間，特別係一啲係路程比較長嘅路線，以及係會係跨越幾個地區嘅，譬如話由新界嗰度係去到港島呢一啲嘅路線。我哋睇過，睇下係咪可以將嗰個更次時間同埋駕駛時間係將佢縮短，呢啲就叫做係特別更次。我哋根據巴士公司畀我哋嘅資料，同埋亦都睇過嗰啲嘅數據，我哋手頭上係已經係從自己嘅調查嗰度收集咗一啲數據，呢啲就係上咗車上面就去收集嘅數據。

另外亦都係睇番車長嘅編制同埋實際嘅人手，我哋就分析過，究竟係對增加人手方面嘅影響有幾大，然後睇下呢啲嘅特別更次嘅係--最長嘅更次時間係咪可以進一步縮短嘅，或者係好概括性咁講，我哋可以話粗略嘅估計，對人手嘅影響，即係話將呢啲嘅特別更次嘅最高嘅時間就係會要增加一千六百名嘅司機，係

指係所有嘅專營巴士公司加埋一齊嘅。

我哋睇過呢啲因素，當然我哋亦都係要確保巴士嘅服務水平係令人滿意嘅，另外亦都要睇下巴士公司實際上係咪能夠招聘到額外嘅人手，好讓佢哋可以適時咁樣樣去落實有關嘅指引。我哋亦都好想，亦都向巴士公司係建議過，我哋不斷同佢哋開會，就話我哋希望佢哋可以有一個合理嘅時間嚟到全面落實嗰個指引。

我哋考慮過嗰個人手嘅影響、係咪可行以及嗰個時間，即係話全面引入呢個指引嗰個時間表，我哋最終就認為喺個修訂本嗰度，就特別更次係有一個特別嘅提述嘅，呢個特別更次最長嘅時間，我哋就話都依然係上限喺十四小時，但係呢啲做特別更次嘅車長佢嘅駕駛時間應該將佢減至係十小時，呢個十小時就係同一般正常更次嘅駕駛時間係一樣。

此外，我哋亦都有多一個要求嘅，就係要求巴士公司係提供一個休息時間，而呢個休息時間係要不少於三小時嘅，亦都喺嗰個更次裏面，呢個去確保車長可能係要調派到去揸啲咁樣嘅路線，而係要有特別更次嘅安排。都希望佢哋有一個足夠嘅休息時間，而嗰個駕駛時間，即係話佢坐埋個軚盤嗰度開車嗰個時間就係將佢減至十小時。

我哋係將嗰個研究同埋評估就係交咗畀運房局，亦都同運房局係傾過，討論過之後，亦都留意到係對各方面嘅影響，嗰個指引就最終定咗稿，亦都係頒布咗，係今年年初嘅時候頒布咗，係 2018 年嘅 2 月。唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對唔住，或者我再想講一講嗰啲數字，我恐怕我可能就係喺你嗰個陳述書嗰度就或者係有啲誤解嘅，我想請你澄清一下某一啲數字嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好呀。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前，而家有幾多人係請咗係做車長嘅呢？即係所有嘅專營公司，所有加埋有幾多人係車長呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）等你係搵嗰頁出嚟嘅時候，係咪都答咗先，等我哋可以理解一下？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我想請大家睇嘅就係運輸署嘅文件夾嘅 5 號文件，第一個表，表 1，總數加埋係多過萬二。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度搵到呢？喺邊一段？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）第 9 段，第 9 段下面就有表 1，嗰度就係分別列出個別專營權巴士公司嘅車長嘅數目。

主席：Thank you.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）嗰個總數，個別公司佢嘅車長嘅數目，如果將佢全部加埋，就係萬二。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）假設嗰個指引係落實，你哋嘅估計係點呢？即係話要增聘幾多嘅車長呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）不如大家睇番呢個第7段，同一份文件嘅第7段。好粗略咁樣樣睇過，係營辦商佢粗略嘅係一個預測，就話總共係要二百五十位嘅車長，先至可以係全面落實嗰個指引嘅，我哋自己亦都係睇過呢個數字，我哋亦都比對我哋自己手頭上嘅資料，即係話睇番係車長嗰個編制同埋嗰個實際人手嘅數字，所以大概係要增加二百五十位車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。如果特別更次，特別更次喺嗰個指引嗰度嘅，如果係冇特別更次嘅話，對二百五十嗰個數字有咩影響呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）就會增加，增加到要額外多一千六百位車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話唔係二百五十，就變咗係一千六百，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。換句話講，係編制嘅多於百分之十，即係所有公司加埋一齊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋自己都計到嘅，不過我諗你亦都可以好精簡咁樣樣係介紹一下，點解會個數字大增到係嗰個水平呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我係請我嘅副手佢就係好熟悉呢一個更次同埋人手嘅問題，等佢解釋，係讓你哋係好簡單、好直接咁樣去理解個問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）我會儘量係簡單嘅。呢度講緊嗰個佢哋營運嘅時間好長，一早一晚亦都有一個繁忙時間，我哋唔畀司機就係咁長嘅更次嚟到係包括咗一早一晚嘅繁忙時間，即係話要有額外嘅司機先至可以做晒嗰兩節嘅繁忙時間，佢哋就要有短啲嘅時間，即係話六個鐘或者七個鐘，咁樣樣就冇效率嘅，即係換句話講，因為我哋要有照顧朝早嘅繁忙時間同埋傍晚嘅繁忙時間，與其係一個人做，就要分兩個人去做，計人頭，就唔係二百五十嘅兩倍，而係就係多啲人，因為每一個人做嘅更次時間係短啲，可能係六個鐘、七個鐘，甚至乎係五個鐘，所以就唔係二百五十乘二，我哋要更多嘅人手。

你可能會話一般司機係駕駛時間係十小時，但係如果係冇咗呢個特別嘅更次，呢個分開兩節嘅更次嘅話，咁樣就係有百分之十三嘅司機就係需要係將佢乘二，而每人就唔係十四個鐘，就係更短嘅時間，譬如係六個鐘，所以計數就係咁樣計嘅，所以就去到一千六百。我希望我就澄清咗嗰個計算方法。

主席：Thank you.

羅先生：I wonder if I can ask a question.

主席：Please do.

羅先生：（經傳譯員）喺特別更次有幾多司機，將嗰個數目乘二唔係就係答案喇咩？

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）唔得。

羅先生：How come it's not?

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）我要解釋一下，有一千二百個司機，呢個係個編制，即係去滿足每日個需求，就有九千個更份，但係人數要多啲，因為每人返工返六日，仲要放假等等。我可以話每日我哋需要九千個駕駛嘅更份，而當中大概一千二百個就係特別更次嚟嘅，即係百分之十三，大概百分之十三。所以呢個一千二百個更次，要將佢乘二，即係二千四百，但係咁又唔需要雙倍嘅，即係話大概一千六百個，我哋要用更次呢個概念去睇呢件事。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）特別更次係咪一個新措施嚟㗎？定或喺最近嘅修訂指引之前已經存在㗎喇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）特別更次係由個別嘅專營巴士公司去營運嘅，去處理一早一晚嘅高峰期，我哋就考慮下最高嘅工作嘅時數，無論係咪特別更次都好，可唔可以縮減。喺呢次修訂指引，我哋都藉機會去澄清我哋對於最大駕駛同埋工作時間，我哋嘅要求係點，喺咁嘅角度底下，我哋就加入咗喺指引入面一個要求，去清楚解釋呢一個特別更次嘅要求係乜嘢，而呢一個安排，我哋個要求係點呢？即係關於係最高嘅工作時數、駕駛時數同埋係休息時間。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係呢個指引之前就冇提到特別更次嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）只係喺巴士公司營運期間係慢慢演變出嚟，係有演變過程嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋都知道更重要嘅係喺同巴士公司商量嘅時候，同工會見面嘅時候，我哋都聽到有啲意見，有啲司機係被指派做特別更次嘅時候，呢啲司機亦都關注薪酬或者係實際上賺取嘅酬金係幾多嘅，尤其係做特別更次嘅同事，我哋一方面探討點樣可以縮減駕駛同埋工作時間，另外一個喺商討嘅時候提出嘅關注，就係職方有啲焦慮，會唔會係咁樣影響到佢哋收到巴士公司發畀佢哋嘅薪酬嘅減少，呢一個過程我哋都要處理呢啲問題嘅，呢個過程都不斷演變。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一種關注係點樣表達出嚟呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）即係話驚影響佢哋嘅薪酬，喺書面意見書入面同埋同佢哋見面，同運輸署都有提到嘅，因為由2017年10月至到2018年嘅2月，運輸署有同不同嘅工會會面，喺嗰段期間，我哋亦都有一系列嘅會面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒陳女士。我而家想同你講第二個範圍，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你開始講之前，鄧樂勤大律師，應該律師想問嘅問題就係咁嘅，呢個做法係已經維持咗幾耐喇？

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）我諗呢個問題已經有十年、二十年㗎喇之前。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係一個係長久以嚟個做法都係咁？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家請你睇下秘書處嘅文件第 2 冊第 664 頁，而家係咪睇緊呀？呢個係道路安全研究小組嘅文件，佢哋畀咗啲意見，就係關於係呢一個公共交通策略研究，簡稱英文 PTSS，係佢哋將呢個意見書交咗畀立法會嘅交通事務委員會嘅，似乎個日期就係 2015 年嘅，呢份文件。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪有公共交通策略研究 2015 年嘅時候？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，係有一個策略研究，係 2015 年做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇參與呢個研究？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，由局方帶頭嘅，就有運輸署嘅協助。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署喺進行研究期間有冇留意到有呢份文件？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺立法會一般嘅情況，一般嘅做法，呢一個係當係公聽會嘅團體嘅書面意見嚟嘅，亦都會邀請署方、局方去參與呢一個嘅會議，我哋就知悉呢一個係其中一個團體提交嘅書面意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話部門都係知悉有呢一個書面意見嘅。

陳美寶女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家想請你睇下第 664 頁嘅標題第 2，即係話提升安全嘅機會同埋策略嘅，你可唔可以睇番第 2 點？入面提到國際標準，應該係話道路交通安全管理，呢度就咁講嘅，國際標準喺 2012 年有一個新嘅標準，係針對公共交通營運者同埋物流業嘅，呢個亦都係跟從國際標準其他品質保證系統，喺將來可以由道路安全嘅角度幫助建立一個更加負責任嘅交通嘅運作，我讀番呢一個嘅引言，就係話因為有新嘅做法，新嘅措施，公共交通策略研究係應該研究所有有機會--嘅機會可以提供--即係提升安全同埋服務質素嘅。喺 2015 年，呢份意見書提出之前，又或者喺你研究期間，運輸署有冇研究過引入呢一個國際標準呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知悉道路安全研究小組提出嘅意見，尤其係喺採用呢一個嘅國際標準組織 39001 呢一個嘅標準，道路安全議會其實喺其他嘅--或者

呢個小組喺立法會喺其餘嘅時間都曾經向立法會提出嘅，其實喺尋日嘅口頭聽證會亦都有提出過呢一點，

我哋知道呢一個係關於道路交通安全管理嘅標準，喺 2012 年係最後定稿嘅，喺多番商量之後，喺 2012 年之後，有幾間嘅運輸公司同埋物流業就喺日本、韓國或者仲有一啲歐洲嘅國家都有採納呢個標準。我哋知道，對於呢個 ISO 39001 嘅標準，我哋保持開放態度，而家我哋亦都維持自己嘅道路交通安全系統。

正如我尋日解釋，我哋用一個通用嘅數據庫追蹤意外率，我哋去辨認出有冇一個模式或者係再制訂一啲補救措施或者防禦策略，呢個國際標準嘅 39001 號標準係一個更加複雜嘅、仔細嘅標準，關於道路交通安全管理嘅，係要考慮數據同埋係啲客觀嘅標準，呢方面我哋持開放態度，我哋唔會排除以咁嘅方式喺運輸署內係提高安全同埋呢個服務質素嘅，令我哋邁向國際化。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當你話持開放態度，即係你唔係話贊成定反對嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋唔係反對。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你係咪支持？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋運輸署內已經有既定嘅道路交通安全管理系統，運輸署當然都會考慮現行嘅或者最新嘅標準去改善我哋嘅系統，又或者係採用英國標準去改善我哋嘅系統嘅，所以我話我哋歡迎任何措施可以改善我哋嘅系統，我哋亦都隨時可以研究一下，睇下我哋現行嘅系統可以點樣提升

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）2012 年之後，運輸署有冇曾經考慮過呢個標準，睇下能唔能夠採納呢個標準之後係改善運輸署自己嘅系統嘅標準呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺 2012 年發展同埋頒布呢個新嘅國際標準之後，我嘅理解，當時都係算係好新嘅一個標準，運輸同物流業都係考慮緊會唔會採用呢個新標準，所以 2012 年頒布標準之後，我哋所見都係一個新發展嘅一個系統同埋係一個新嘅--仲係好新嘅。呢一個道路安全研究小組，佢係就住公共運輸策略研究提出呢個意見，係 2015 年嘅，我哋自己係有個道路交通安全管理系統，我哋而家亦都係持開放態度，睇下可唔可以採納呢一個標準或者點樣可以改善我哋嘅系統嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）據我理解，呢份文件唔會係話實際上運輸署去採納呢個國際標準，而相反，就係啲運輸公司，嗰啲營運者去採納呢個標準嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇採取任何嘅步驟去同巴士公司傾下，提出畀佢哋考慮呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇。呢個標準就係道路安全研究小組佢哋提出嚟，作

為整體嘅交通策略之一，係好全面、好成熟，亦都有唔同嘅建議同埋意見包含喺呢個意見書入面，我哋呢一刻就冇將呢一個國際標準轉介畀--同巴士公司商量嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想睇第 778 頁，同一份文件冊，我哋都係睇緊道路安全研究小組嘅一封信，就係 2016 年 6 月 16 號嘅，似乎係回應緊一個公眾諮詢嘅活動，就係諮詢喺 2017 年九巴嘅專營權續期嘅事情嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）毫無疑問，呢一封信同埋佢夾附嘅文件，我相信部門都係知悉嘅，係咪呀？喺嗰個嗰個諮詢嘅過程裏面。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇一睇嗰封信，778 頁嗰封信，特別係第一同埋第二段，其實封信都只係有幾段嘅，呢度就話「回應上述嘅公眾諮詢，我哋就係喺 16 年嘅 4 月 18 號提交咗一份文件畀政府，我哋嘅意見就係集中係巴士營運要不斷咁樣係改善個安全，內容就係涉及就係一啲具體題目嘅安全管理系統。政府交咗畀立法會交通事件委員會嘅文件，就係叫做『政府文件』，係關於係九巴嘅巴士網絡嘅新專營權，即係話嗰度就只係得一段好短嘅文字，就係講安全，而且兩個好簡單嘅論點，一個就係話更緊密咁樣樣、去密切咁樣去監察係車長嘅駕駛行為，同埋就係改善巴士上面嘅安全措施，呢個顯然就係未能夠就係更廣泛咁樣去睇剛才所講嘅問題嘅，巴士安全係一個好重要嘅題目，所以我哋認為係有需要將原本嗰份文件直接交畀立法會嘅交通事務委員會參考嘅。」

佢所謂原本嘅文件，你可以睇番嘅，就 779 頁，一路就去到 783 頁嘅，我想麻煩你睇一睇 781 頁。你會見到嗰個標題就係巴士安全--道路安全管理制度嘅系統，呢度就係有提番係 ISO 39001 國際組織標準--國際標準組織 39001 嘅，呢度就話一個質素保證嘅系統就係鼓勵車隊嘅營運商就係更加問責同埋就係更主動咁樣去減少意外嘅出現同埋嗰啲風險減少嘅。

呢度就係有兩個建議嘅，就話根據新嘅專營權嘅要求，就應該鼓勵巴士公司係去採納一個更加先進嘅道路安全管理系統，而且應該就係更加靠近 ISO 39001 嘅，亦都話就政府應該同巴士公司一齊就去研究一下呢個巴士嘅意外同埋嗰個風險，更加詳細咁睇，希望有一啲係減少意外呢一啲嘅目標嘅。

我個問題就係話部門有冇採取呢啲步驟去鼓勵巴士公司去採納呢一個係 ISO 嘅標準呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢份陳述書係其他嘅持份者係交畀立法會交通事務委員會嘅，當時就係要睇呢個九巴專營權續期嘅問題，當年要處理嗰個問題嘅，當時立法會嗰個焦點就係喺幾樣嘢嗰度嘅，或者大家都可以再睇番我哋嗰個交畀立法會嘅文件嘅，我哋亦都交咗畀委員會嘅，我可以叫我嘅同事等陣間啲番嗰份文件出嚟嘅，另外喺我哋交畀立法會嘅文件嗰度亦都提咗幾個關鍵嘅建議，即係話喺同

佢哋續期嘅時候有啲咩關鍵嘅論點。

呢一度係道路安全研究小組嘅陳述書，佢講到就係講到話要求就係我哋鼓勵巴士公司係採納一個更加先進嘅道路安全管理系統，係更加貼近呢個 ISO 39001。我哋冇好具體咁樣係叫巴士公司做呢樣嘢，但另一方面，多年嚟，巴士公司都係畀我哋要求係要有一個內在嘅監管制度嚟到去睇嗰個意外同埋係睇佢哋嗰個安全表現，一方面運輸署亦都有自己嘅安全管理系統嘅，我哋亦都獨立進行呢個分析嚟到係規劃、做同埋係達致目的，呢個都好似 ISO 39001 嘅。

39001 比對嚟講，對比呢個 9001 就係新一啲嘅。其實 9001 就係更加係闊嘅，即係對比起 39001，我哋就覺得佢係一個比較新嘅一個標準，所以我哋未有係特別係具體咁樣喺嗰個時候同巴士公司提呢一個標準。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）39001 呢個標準係同巴士公司做開嘅管理系統係點樣比較呢？邊一個係好一啲呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者係請總工程師係講一講呢個 39001 有啲乜嘢特色。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋唔需要嘅，唔需要講好多細節嘅，唔需要講好多細節話個標準係包括啲乜嘢嘢，我哋好想知道兩者點樣比較，嗰個優劣喺邊度。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）主席，正如剛才署長講過，我諗我哋嗰個制度，我哋嘅系統，我哋嗰個安全管理系統都係做緊同一樣嘢嘅，我哋有一個規劃嘅程序，然後有一個監察嘅系統，跟住就係分析，我哋會監察同埋分析嗰啲意外嘅數字，然後就會作一個匯報，報告畀交通安全議會，亦都會係建議一啲措施嘅，譬如話立法同埋執法。

落實咗呢啲措施之後，我哋嗰個結果應該--或者成效應該會喺嗰啲數字嗰度反映出嚟，我哋會再次監察住個情況，再去睇下究竟現有嘅政策係咪--措施係咪需要再進一步檢討嘅。我諗嗰個係原則上大家嗰個管理制度係差唔多嘅，但係如果話要比較邊個係好啲，我諗就好難嘅，但係原則上運輸署作為一個政府當局，而我哋認為我哋嗰個安全管理系統都可以做到同樣嘅功效。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）其實我哋畀咗文件畀立法會就講呢個專營權嘅續期，大家可以睇 1100，喺 TD-4 嗰個文件夾嘅 1100 頁嗰度，喺立法會當時嗰個討論係講好多點樣去改善嗰個服務，包括一啲輔助嘅設施，係畀乘客用嘅，以及就係去發放資料，以及係呢個票價嘅優惠咁樣嘅，亦都有其他同係嗰個利潤管制計劃有關嘅事宜。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，部門究竟有冇去比較過 39001 同埋你哋自己嗰個系統呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，講一次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇比較過 ISO 39001 同埋係你哋自己已經係有嘅嗰套系統呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋仲未有係全面或者有系統咁樣樣進行呢一方面嘅檢討嘅，特別係我哋都提過 ISO 39001 相對嚟講都係比較新嘅，對比起--同埋就係比交通行業嚟講，就係比較一個新嘅標準，我哋仲未進行呢個檢討。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）不過係 2012 年嘅時候已經係引入咗個囉嗦？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。我諗佢喺 2012 年頒布咗之後，其實係運輸、物流嗰個界別嗰個採納率係對比起 ISO 9001 嗰個佢哋採納嗰個比率就係比較慢嘅、低一啲嘅。或者邱先生都可以講一講嗰個係有幾多人係採納嗰個比率嘅。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）2012 年只不過係幾年之前，你可能覺得一個好長嘅時間，但係從管理個角度，幾年只係一個好短嘅時間，講番海外嘅經驗，其實呢一個系統只係營運者就係採納嘅，就算喺星加坡或者係英國，佢哋仲喺度研究緊嘅，佢哋都仲未係承諾話會係採用呢一個系統嘅。你可能話自從 2012 年到而家已經係一個好長嘅時間，但係從呢個政策個角度嚟到講，特別係以一個部門、一個政府當局係要係採用某一個系統嘅話，呢一個唔係一個長嘅時間，我哋仲要有多啲資料，亦都要睇下其他人嗰個經驗，我哋仲要去進行分析嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我可唔可以問一個問題呢？我就想問究竟部門有冇進行過比較呢？比較呢個 ISO 39001 同埋就係睇嚟你哋所見到巴士公司自己所採納咗管理系統，有冇進行過兩者之間嘅比較呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇打算做呢個比較呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）改善嗰個交通安全系統，其實我哋係成日都想做呢啲嘅，我哋係樂意去做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會做？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可以考慮嗰個係咪可以用呢一個方法嚟到去改善佢哋嘅管理系統嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者咁，我想請你睇呢個 782 頁，呢個就係道路安全研究小組嘅陳述書，782 頁，其實嗰度有多個建議嘅，或者可以睇番嗰個標題，有呢個係巴士安全，以及係駕駛嘅水準，同埋亦都有嗰個建議咁樣樣。我就想問，呢一個道路安全研究小組所作嘅任何建議有冇係令你哋部門係進行呢方面嘅研究呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我請我嘅同事就睇一睇，然後就係畀一個係回應。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）好，主席。係呀，我哋係收到道路安全研究小組佢哋嘅意

見書，時不時都收到佢哋嘅意見書，佢哋係譬如話叫我哋喺某一啲地段、路段就係有一個低啲嘅車速嘅限制。

喺香港，我哋有一個比較簡單嘅三級嘅車速限制，如果係第一層嘅話，就係嗰個時速限制，係每小時 50 公里，就係市區同埋就係新市鎮嘅市區部分；另外就係去到係每小時 70 公里或者八十--至到 80 公里嘅，呢啲就係喺嗰個市區同埋新市鎮以外嘅地方嘅；最後就係最高層就係每小時係 100 公里嘅，呢個一般嚟講，就係畀一啲係高標準嘅快速公路嘅，喺香港，我哋最高嘅時速限制就係每小時 110 公里，呢個就只係喺北大嶼幹線嗰度先至有嘅。

我哋有一個咁樣嘅三級嘅制度，我哋其實做過一個檢討嘅，呢一個三級嘅車速限制，我哋搵咗顧問去做嗰個就係檢討。我哋知道呢一個都同海外嘅司法管轄區而嗰個安全紀錄良好嘅都係差唔多嘅，呢個三級嘅制度對駕駛人士嚟講係一個好簡單嘅制度，佢哋亦都係好容易熟悉嗰個有關嘅限制。

我哋講緊嘅速度限制就唔係話叫道路使用者唔需要理道路狀況，只係跟從嗰個車速限制就得，只係話呢個係最高嘅車速，任何時候，但係始終司機都要考慮番當時嘅路面情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話車速限制唔代表你一定要揸到去限制嘅時速 50 公里嘅，只係話一個最高速嘅限制。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）某一個位置，譬如話一個彎位或者一個路段係有啲隱患需要減速嘅話，唔單只係淨係減速嘅，我哋仲有譬如話係預先有啲嘅道路標記或者係路牌通知司機「前方可能係一個彎位，有一啲嘅危險，你需要慢速嘅。」我哋提供充足嘅資訊，但係司機就有責任去確保係安全車速行駛嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我想補充，邱先生講嘅說話其實喺我哋文件第 10 號，運輸署嘅文件冊第 10 號第 12 至 17 段係有解釋到道路嘅車速限制嘅定義同埋我哋嗰個設計嘅，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）我記得我有睇過嘅，都係同一點，即係話嗰個車速限制就唔係話一定要揸到去最高嘅速限嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想睇第 782 頁就係佢哋嘅建議，唔係講速度嗰方面，佢就話要喺呢個嘅專營權文件度加入呢個要求，要設立一個全面嘅標準，同埋利用安裝咗嘅黑盒去監察司機，要製造一個咁嘅系統，呢點係咪都係喺運輸署入面都較為關注㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）當然都考慮到黑盒嘅科技已經係由 2003 年之後都有相當嘅發展，黑盒以及有關嘅更新嘅科技同埋其他嘅儀器今朝都係有傾過嘅，喺黑盒方面有啲嘅基本要求，我哋有向專營公司發出嘅，而我哋嘅車輛牌照組亦都有留意黑盒嘅技術發展，亦都持續去同專營巴士公司同埋廠商研究，安裝黑盒點樣可以提升去加強安全，呢個就係其中一個我哋好關注嘅課題，喺我哋工作小組嗰個嘅工作範圍亦都包括咗嘅，佢哋亦都有商討呢件事嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係結果冇修改過畀--即係喺 2004 年向巴士公司發出嘅基本黑盒嘅要求

陳美寶女士：Yet to be reflected, yes, Chairman, you are right.

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話冇包括全球定位系統，只係要求量度個速度。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個只係基本嘅最低嘅要求。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇下第 783 頁，道路安全研究小組就都有研究過巴士嘅安全、巴士隊伍，呢個小組嘅建議就係話九巴一路係有投資更新佢嗰個巴士隊伍，現代化，亦都同意而家啲巴士係舒適同埋設計好好嘅，但係仍然有啲安全嘅隱患嘅，有啲風險，跟住就有幾點就係呢啲安全嘅風險，喺 2016 年做呢一個諮詢嘅時候，運輸署會唔會同意道路安全研究小組呢一個嘅觀察呢？即係佢列出嚟嘅呢啲所謂安全風險呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會話同意嘅，因為呢個其實係一個持續嘅過程嚟嘅，我哋一路都有要求巴士公司喺準備遠期計劃嘅時候要包含呢啲元素，有啲改善嘅措施嘅，但係我哋要同營運者商討，譬如建議佢哋加裝某啲設施，同埋喺佢哋遠期計劃入面要包括一個加裝嘅計劃嘅。有啲例子，譬如係話雙層嘅--喺樓梯嗰度要裝雙層嘅扶手，喺上層嘅擋風玻璃要有一個橫向護欄，另外係喺上層嘅擋風玻璃要用強化玻璃。我哋被悉道路安全研究小組嘅建議，不過一路我哋都係喺--同我哋嘅道路安全標準小組都係好好嘅合作夥伴嚟嘅，我哋亦都有採納佢哋好多嘅建議，當我哋同巴士營運商開會嘅時候都有呢啲議題，傾下喺車輛內點樣加強車輛嘅安全。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話喺議題係--喺個議程係咪即係話而家先係一個議程？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔係，一直都有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）小組就建議呢啲嘢應該係加入去專營權文件嗰度嘅，但係你就係話係好似一啲開會嘅過程咁樣？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你可以睇番過去嘅遠期計劃，又或者我哋都有發出一啲要求，係增強安全嘅措施，亦都有巴士公司寫信回覆，承諾佢哋會加裝譬如話安全帶等等嘅，加強安全嘅，所以到我哋同佢哋商討係成熟嘅時候，可以應用嘅時候，我哋就會發一個清單，就係有一啲嘅提升服務嘅事項，畀佢哋加裝或者安裝嗰啲儀器，當中亦都係包括我哋嘅信件入面提出要求，巴士營運商要做乜嘢，等佢哋喺嚟緊嘅遠期計劃入面要加設一啲嘅加裝計劃嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家暫時完成呢份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺講完呢份文件之前，我想請你協助我，呢個道路安全研究小組嘅成員係乜人呀？

陳美寶女士：Tony has the information.

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係一位鄺先生，據我所知，係幾個成員嘅啫，主席，就係呢位鄺先生，Julian Kwong。

主席：One member?

邱國鼎先生：I know he has his friends. Maybe -- to my information, it's only a few members, and the founder is Mr Julian Kwong.

主席：（經傳譯員）成立咗幾耐呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係唔夠--應該唔夠十年嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）立法會之前有冇--係咪過去幾年都有收到呢一個嘅小組嘅文件呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）就係鄺子憲先生做主席嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咩嘢時間呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）據我印象，都係近幾年，當我哋喺交通事務委員會提供--即係商討關於道路安全嘅時候，呢個小組都有提交意見書，我自己都有做過啲研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想知道個時間性嘅問題，第一次係幾時提交一啲建議，大概？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席嘅問題係呢一個道路安全研究小組係有幾多年嚟都有提交意見書畀立法會嘅事務委員會？

主席：Yes.

陳美寶女士：This is the question.

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我冇資料。

陳美寶女士：Do you need us to do some --

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你可以書面回覆番我哋。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以。

主席：Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）陳女士，你可唔可以評價一下呢個道路安全研究小組個評價係點樣呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔可以畀評語。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署嚟講，運輸署有冇尊重呢一個機構嘅意見呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋對於佢個聲譽或者佢個地位係有乜評語嘅，不過作為持份者，佢哋會提交書面意見畀立法會嘅，我哋亦都考慮所有呢啲嘅意見，包括呢一個小組嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者起碼你可以咁樣講，視乎佢哋嘅書面意見似乎都係好似係一啲深思熟慮嘅建議嘅，無論你同唔同意佢建議都好。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋對於道路安全係好有興趣，亦都有係多次係提出一啲嘅建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）無論你同唔同意佢哋建議都好，似乎係做足資料搜集嘅，似乎佢哋係充分知悉一個議題嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我呢一方面冇特別嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）你微笑一下，冇其他喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）任何團體、機構喺立法會聽證會提交書面意見，我哋都會考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師，你係繼續講第二個範圍，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會都知悉係有啲最新嘅措施，係因應深水埗喺 2017 年 9 月嘅意外之後就有嘅，就係譬如修訂咗個指引，同埋喺大埔嘅交通意外，2 月發嘅交通意外之後，亦都有一啲嘅嘅建議嘅，由巴士公司你索取更多資料、成立咗工作小組等等，我哋理解最近又有新嘅事情，運輸署考慮緊嘅，除咗新措施之外，咁樣講公唔公道呢？喺 2012 年之後一路至到深水埗嗰個慘劇，運輸署喺解決安全嘅問題其實冇重大改變，喺嗰段期間冇重大嘅改變，咁樣嘅講法你覺得公唔公道？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺整體道路安全管理監察方面，我想強調我哋有既定嘅系統，由意外嘅數據庫係分析數據同埋採取一啲更正補救嘅措施，我想畀幾個例子，就係我哋利用過採集數據之後，做獨立分析，向道路安全議會提交我哋分析嘅結果。其實咁多年嚟係有一啲嘅嘅建議，都係同道路安全議會商議之後，係因為監察咗有啲嘅數據，其中 2015 年 6 月關於公共小巴係發放一個嘅牌--小巴司機牌照之前。

主席：（經傳譯員）你再講多一次。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係入職前嘅課程，係為公共小巴司機攞正式牌照而設嘅，喺 2014 年...

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係好明白，呢個叫入職前嘅課程係咩嘢意思呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）即係話學員要先上一個入職前課程，就算考完駕駛測試之

後，公共小巴司機都要上呢個入職前嘅課程，先至會獲發正式牌照嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話佢哋可以正式揸車出路面之前就要上呢一個嘅課程嘅？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，可能我冇解釋清楚我嘅問題，因為我其實唔係想講公共小巴嘅牌照嘅，唔係同呢個嘅聽證會有關嘅。其實想問嘅，就係話你係咪可以比較一下嗰個系統或者制度，你係咪想比較呢個小巴嗰個制度？其實 2012 至到 2017 基本上期間都冇咩嘢重大嘅改變嘅，係咪呀？我咁講啱唔啱呢，公唔公道呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個系統我哋一早係設立咗，我哋會好嚴謹咁樣去規管、監管同埋監察佢哋嗰個表現嘅，喺呢個系統底下，我哋不時會分析個別巴士公司佢嗰個安全嘅數據，而且亦都會發出要求畀巴士公司，要求佢就係加強嗰個安全嘅，所以呢個係我哋嘅制度嘅一個部分，個制度有喺度嘅，系統有喺度嘅，亦都係健全嘅，所以我哋就係有做嗰個規管嘅工作。

另外就講番嗰個整體嘅道路安全管理系統，亦都係既定㗎喇，我哋就會做監察，就會做呢一個跟進嘅，有時可能係需要修訂法例，嚟到係處理--係喺意外發現咗一啲問題，要去處理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）2015 年 6 月個情況你講咗，有冇其他嗰啲你想講呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）都有其他嘅改例嘅，譬如話 2014 年，有要求就係公共小巴就係就有一個電子紀錄嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢紀錄呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋要有一個電子紀錄儀器，即係黑盒，黑盒。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個指示係咪書面嘅要求嚟㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係法例嘅修訂。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好。可唔可以講番畀我哋聽有關嗰個資料喺邊度可以搵到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋會睇番嘅，應該喺《道路交通條例》底下。

主席：（經傳譯員）陣間話畀我哋聽。喺嗰個運房局嘅文件夾嗰度會有嗰個條例嘅，稍後你哋同事可以話畀我哋聽嘅，而家搵咗，然後之後話畀我哋聽。2014 年，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。另外就係話喺發出正式牌照之前要有一個入職前嘅課程嘅，呢個亦都係法例嘅要求嘅，我哋亦都會搵番相關嘅文件畀大家睇。喺 2013(sic)年，我哋亦都有嗰個因為要處理呢個醉酒駕駛，我哋有嗰個呼氣測

試嗰方面嘅修訂法例。

主席：（經傳譯員）係所有車輛類別嘅所有司機都係受佢嘅管轄嘅，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。其實個名單都好長嘅，即係我查過㗎喇，就係由 2010 年開始，不過我唔想講晒咁多出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，不如咁喇，我哋只係講公共巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）專營巴士？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係專營公共巴士，我哋淨係睇專營公共巴士，你剛才所講嘅，我嘅理解咁啱唔啱？2012 年至到 2017 年期間，你就話你嗰個制度好健全㗎嘛，你嗰個監管、監察嘅制度，一直嗰幾年都係用你所講嘅一個好健全嘅制度嘅，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。12 至到 17 年間，除咗係立法方面有修訂之外--法例有修訂之外，其實亦都有一啲措施去改善嗰個道路嘅設計、路面嘅標誌或者道路嘅標記，另外我哋亦都有一個黑點方面嘅調查工作，我哋去分析係嗰啲意外嘅數據，就睇下有啲乜嘢補救或者係防範嘅措施嚟到去提升嗰個道路安全嘅水平。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，直到去嗰個深水埗交通意外，直到嗰陣時為止，當時有冇係同你哋嘅海外嘅對口部門係討論過，就話有啲乜嘢嘅安全管理制度、安全管理嘅系統佢哋係要求佢哋自己嘅公共巴士公司去建立、制訂咁嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）根據同事記憶所及，冇同對口嘅海外嘅巴士監管者喺呢方面有討論過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰兩宗悲劇發生之後，慘劇發生之後有冇做過呢？即係最近一宗同埋之前嗰宗，你哋有冇同海外嘅規管當局就係問下佢哋喺安全嘅管理嗰方面有啲咩嘢做過呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔記得我哋有特別就同海外嘅規管當局或者巴士規管當局就係傾過嘅，不過係我哋睇嗰個工作時間指引嘅時候，我哋係有研究過海外係有啲乜嘢嘅要求嘅，其中包括睇咗星加坡、英國、美國、奧大利亞同埋係歐盟嘅國家嘅。

講到呢個時間--工作時間嘅指引，我哋睇過一啲好重要嘅因素，譬如話睇下佢哋當地嘅營運者點樣營運，亦都睇下佢嘅工會有啲乜嘢要求、要求點樣改善法。我哋自己亦都有睇過海外嘅經驗，嚟到去睇下我哋同人哋比較，係點樣樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係幾時做？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）17 年嘅 9 月至到 18 年嘅 3 月，我哋就係檢討嗰個工作時間嘅指引，而後嚟就係有嗰個修訂。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係只係講及工作時間，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知道呢個道路安全研究小組都有向呢一個委員會就係提交意見書嘅，你有冇睇過？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你指邊一個？可唔可以再講一次？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）道路安全研究小組...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者將佢再打番出嚟

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）TU-25。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有，我有睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我當然謹記主席所提醒，就係話呢個係其中一個睇法，每一個人都可以有自己嘅睇法，我亦都想知道你嘅睇法，然後委員會就會諗下邊一個就係一個比較實際可行嘅做法。當然我哋或者會都聽下道路安全研究小組佢嘅講法，聽下你嘅回應。我就想問你呢個問題，你睇咗呢份文件，我就想問下，呢份文件裏面有冇任何一個主意、一個概念對運輸署嚟講都係一個好嘅睇法，而運輸署都應該認真去考慮嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我睇咗呢份意見書，我哋係--你哋交嗰個文件夾畀我哋嘅時候，我哋都有睇到嘅，我睇就係為咗要準備呢一個聽證會，所以我就去睇過嘅，就唔係話好認真、好詳細咁樣逐個去睇佢哋意見書裏面個別嘅建議，所以就唔能夠話係作出一個知情嘅回應嘅。

不過一般咁嚟講，任何一個團體，譬如話好似道路安全研究小組，特別係呢一個團體就過往都有交意見畀我哋嘅，我哋一定就會去睇，我哋嘅同事亦都會去留意，然後日後我哋同巴士公司同埋巴士製造廠喺嗰個工作小組嘅層面都會去睇嘅。

我有睇過嘅，不過我冇足夠嘅時間去逐點、逐點咁樣去睇，所以而家唔能夠作一個係充分嘅、詳細嘅回應嘅，如果係逐個建議去睇嘅話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當然，我明白。我就係或者係想你睇一睇呢份文件嗰個總結，然後就請你就係去作一個初步嘅回應，因為你話你冇時間去充分咁去考慮，或者係之後，亦都可以畀一個係比較詳細嘅回應，咁樣你覺得可以嘛？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我傾向就唔喺呢個階段係回應佢哋嘅建議。其實呢個意見書，佢哋係交畀呢個委員會，我哋覺得都可以作為好似畀我哋嘅建議咁樣，我哋

可以帶返去去睇下嘅，但係我恐怕就未可以喺呢個時候返去再寫一份書面嘅回應，我哋係認真咁對待佢哋嘅建議嘅，我哋亦都要喺部門裏面係跟番既有嘅程序，去睇下佢每一項建議究竟係咪可行嘅。其實一般嚟講，任何有用嘅建議，我哋都持開放嘅態度，我哋都會去睇嘅，但係如果叫我哋匆匆忙忙咁樣樣去交一個初步嘅回應，咁樣去問我哋嘅話，就未必係好公道嘅，如果係喺今日呢一個聽證會嘅咁嘅場合。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想問，你願唔願意係書面係回應呢？因為我都唔想對你唔公道。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗其實佢已經講咗話唔好，唔會咁樣做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢話唔會？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你剛才嘅意思係話你唔想我今日喺呢一方面問你問題，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）不如等我再重組一下我嗰個答案，我哋係留意到呢一個道路安全研究小組交畀委員會嘅意見書，我做今次嘅準備工作嘅時候，我亦都有睇過，不過我唔想係而家向委員會交一個書面嘅分析或者係講一講究竟呢一個研究小組佢個別嘅建議究竟我哋嘅回應係點，因為我哋要走過嗰個既定嘅程序嘅，不過我可以向委員會係確保，我睇過佢哋呢一份嘅意見書，我會將佢視為係一啲意見、一啲建議，而部門係會認真咁去考慮嘅。我哋會喺我哋自己內部嗰度就去睇，特別係有嗰個工作小組亦都會係認真去睇嘅。我哋亦都會再進一步係會同道路安全研究小組係傾，就會係希望聽取佢哋進一步嘅意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）等我睇下我嘅理解啱唔啱，第一，你今日唔想就呢一方面係佢哋嘅提議就回應我嘅問題，係咪呀？即係道路安全研究小組嘅建議，我今日問問題，你唔願意回答，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我可以嘗試去回答，但係唔應該被視為係部門深思熟慮係諗清楚係個別嘅建議是否可行嘅一個回應，因為喺呢一方面，我哋未有作咁嘅準備

MR DUNCAN：Okay.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）但我哋願意係協助委員會，我哋可以係初步咁樣作一個回應嘅，如果咁樣做可以係幫助到檢討委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，佢可以隨時話畀我聽有邊一部分佢係答--唔答到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你唔想提交嗰個書面嘅陳詞，據主席嘅講法，即係你寧願係--係咪即係話會返去再仔細研究呢？

陳美寶女士：Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）經過政府既定嘅程序？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家帶你睇番一啲部分，都應該大家關注嘅，首先27頁撮要，第5段，佢嘅觀察，就係話關於巴士嘅安全風險係要考慮個嚴重程度同埋個情景，然後有唔同嘅情景，下面就講，譬如係話乘客失平衡，同埋係同行人或者係踩單嘅人士相撞，呢個都係可以潛在嘅、好嚴重嘅風險，譬如話係追尾嘅撞車，或者係對頭撞車，或者係撞到路邊嘅物件，因為常見同埋潛在係嚴重嘅，另外就係翻側都係不常見，但係可以係潛在非常之即係災難性嘅。邊一方面係特別關注呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會覺得咁樣去形容大家尤其關注嘅意外都係好公道嘅，尤其是頭先提到嘅一啲情況，的確喺我哋嘅獨立數據分析都有提到，同埋喺我哋監管專營公司佢哋喺遠期計劃提供嘅分析亦都係一樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪亦都係類似呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲係一啲大家都關注嘅事項嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住嗰段，就話過去咁多年曾經係引入唔同嘅措施去改善巴士安全，但係唔透徹理解問題所在嘅話，係好難獲得好大嘅改善，而而家呢個情況會繼續嘅，你同唔同意咁講呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你唔可以回應到，因為佢講得咁概括。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席講得啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）揭去跟住嗰頁，我請你睇番建議，呢個安全系統嘅方法應該係採納呢個方法，即係話包括車輛、道路、人性嘅因素同埋管理，仲要有一啲主動嘅措施去防止有撞車同埋一啲被動嘅措施就係要減低受傷嘅程度，大家一樣重要嘅，短期方面有啲主動嘅措施，譬如係根據一啲運作上嘅標準，同埋係監察系統係可以儘快實施嘅。喺某啲道路--某啲地點係譬如冇安全撞欄嘅、會有嚴重翻側嘅風險，譬如話山頂道、淺水灣道、大潭道係非常之高嘅風險，呢啲短期措施必須要儘快實施。

中至長期，啲被動啲嘅措施，啲減低撞車帶嚟嘅後果都--嚴重性都係好重要嘅。呢個主要就係有兩方面，我讀番呢一段，就係--冇錯喇，中至長期，有啲被動嘅措施要減低撞車帶嚟嘅嚴重後果，呢啲好重要嘅，可以有兩方面去做，譬如話係巴士設計同埋道路設計。你可能都會話呢個係好概括嘅一個評語。講到安全欄或者防撞欄，喺某啲地點，譬如頭先講嘅，你覺唔覺得都值得關注嘅事呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）順帶一提，因為某啲喺香港島嘅地方係彎位多，我哋持續都係關注個道路安全嘅，過去我哋會睇番嗰個地點個道路情況，同埋會考慮各個

因素，睇下採用啲乜嘢嘅補救或者防禦措施嘅。

同時，我亦都想同委員會匯報，運輸署同路政署其實係有做一個嘅顧問研究，就係睇下喺香港嘅道路網絡入面係邊一度嘅路邊行人係會有啲安--即係嘅風險，去用一個更加主動嘅方式去查出路面嘅隱患嘅，亦都考慮到海外嘅技術，呢一個研究其實喺 5 月中會開始，會持續三十個月嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話會發出一個研究，即係係咪一份文件？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）一個顧問研究。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提交畀委員會？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪會回應呢啲好窄嘅山路入面冇安全防撞欄呢個問題呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔可以透露任何商業嘅資料，不過我同事提醒我呢個道路安全研究小組其實係個顧問佢會做呢個研究。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗委員會都希望會聽到好簡單嘅個研究內容嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以研究範圍或者研究目的都可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住就有一個標題，就係運作嘅準則同埋係監察系統嘅，第 29 頁，頂部提到有兩種嘅準則，一種就係一般嘅，就係講述一般嘅情景，譬如係喺繁忙嘅市區街道嘅車速問題，有啲係關乎路線嘅，某一啲，譬如係好窄嘅山路冇防撞欄嘅安全風險，而家有冇咁樣嘅準則㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你覺得點？你覺得係咪一個好嘅主意？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗佢哋提出咗係用一個更加有系統嘅方法去回應呢啲嘅關注嘅，呢個準則就係譬如話處理喺某啲路段係好窄嘅山路，冇防撞欄，我覺得呢個亦都係要先喺地理上找出邊一啲地方係有咁樣嘅情況，再制訂安全嘅措施，作為一個基礎畀我哋進一步考慮要唔要實施一啲措施或者一啲準則去解決一啲特定嘅安全嘅風險嘅情景。我可以初步講嘅，對呢件事嘅觀察就係咁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住就講話國際標準 ISO，我唔繼續講喇。然後就到巴士設計，有幾個安全嘅措施，佢哋建議應該優先採用嘅，呢啲措施運輸署個睇法又係點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以請陳先生回應嘅。我有某啲我都有認知，但係我諗等陳先生畀一個更加整體嘅、好簡單嘅回應。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我嘗試簡單地講，譬如話巴士前方更安全呢一點，其實所有雙層巴士而家喺香港運作嘅，都係跟從歐洲嘅標準嘅，正如我頭先提過，...

主席：（經傳譯員）百分之九十九都係嚟自歐洲。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，而專營巴士用嘅巴士車身亦都係符合譬如話英國、美國、星加坡嘅。雙層巴士都係個趨勢都係用鋁鋼身嘅，呢個係近年嘅全球趨勢。用嘅物料係強韌啲，即係起碼都係用鋁。

我可以解釋下，如果用比起鋁更加強硬嘅物料，喺音意外嘅時候未必係最好嘅，可能會導致到第二種嘅意外嘅。今日用嘅巴士車身嘅材料已經係國際標準㗎喇，但係至於巴士前方更安全方面，近年嚟我哋都有啲措施，譬如話前座嘅座位喺擋風玻璃前面嘅係有安全帶，令乘客唔易拋出車外，而巴士公司都要加強車前面嘅嗰個構造，令到佢可以支持到嗰個安全帶同個座椅嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係意思話佢本身嗰個支架唔係咁夠力嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）因為最初舊嘅巴士唔諗住要裝安全帶嘅，只係諗住係有座位，但係你要加強個繫固，呢個係巴士前方嗰度要做㗎喇。喺呢方面，今日大家坐巴士前方，扣安全帶嘅就好安全㗎喇。我要唔要討論埋其他嘅要點吖？

主席：Please.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）安全帶方面，我哋喺技術小組有討論過係咪所有嘅巴士座椅都要加裝安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）係新嘅巴士？

陳英傑先生：On new buses。（經傳譯員）我都提過，因為加裝嗰方面唔係就咁話係裝一張凳、加個安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋理解嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢段係話巴士嘅內裝有咩嘢隱患要處理呢？呢個係我諗如果巴士設計得好，唔應該係有一啲尖凸嘅邊、物件會令人撞到。呢一個我哋都好小心去睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗有一點可能對我哋更有幫助嘅，或者你可以睇下，佢話以下嘅安全嘅措施都可以考慮嘅，譬如係IAS、ESP。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）IAS就係呢個智能嘅速度控制或者調適，就咁睇，我都唔係好知道嗰個功能係乜嘢嘅，但係如果你係講緊話舊嘅方法，譬如話係將速度計同全球定位系統同埋個路面嘅地圖係一個整合嘅，提供司機--即係監察司機嘅情況，同埋係提供數據嘅話，...

主席：（經傳譯員）據我理解係咁樣。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）如果係咁嘅意思，設計嗰個系統係有呢個功能嘅話，喺技術小組，我哋都有傾過嘅，現時都仲係商討緊嘅，因為有一啲技術同埋管理方嘅考慮--即係有啲問題要處理。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢係技術問題？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）正如我頭先提到或者尋日提過，融合呢一個車速限速器、全球定位系統去提供嗰架車輛嘅準確位置，然後再同地圖比對，我諗因為整體嚟講，全球定位系統喺香港嘅操作環境唔係咁準確。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題係咩嘢呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）因為高樓大廈、四周嘅環境，可能有啲路段，譬如你喺中環嘅話，兩邊都有高樓大廈，得好少嘅露天範圍。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係佢係可以收到衛星嘅訊號，如果係話有大廈喺度就會收唔到訊號？咁有冇做過研究呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋同巴士公司研究緊，同埋嗰啲系統嘅供應商，睇下有冇啲有效啲嘅系統我哋可以採用嘅，所以喺呢一刻，工作小組唔會排除應用呢一個科技，仍然都係討論緊嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好智能嘅方法嚟到去控制嗰個時速，亦都將佢就係同路上嗰個地理環境就配對嘅。我哋有講過呢一個系統嘅好處，不過亦都要確保喺香港本地嘅環境係真係行得通，我哋冇將佢排除，我哋好盡力咁去睇下究竟係中期或者唔係太遠嘅將來可以係做到，我哋都想去進行呢個試驗嘅。講到嗰個電子穩定控制系統，我哋就話喺新嘅巴士嗰度已經即時係做㗎喇，至於話自動緊急剎車系統，我哋都喺度考慮緊嘅。

主席：Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，麻煩你揭去第 55 頁，講番話呢一個智能嘅車速適應系統，或者我哋可以睇番嘅，倫敦佢哋係做緊嘅，呢個都係你哋嗰個對口部門嘅，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我就想講我個人作為呢一個署長，我自己本人未有機會係同海外嘅對口當局就係接觸或者係探訪過佢哋，不過我哋嘅部門嘅同事過往有去探訪過倫敦、美國，佢哋就係因應就係運輸署其他職責範圍--包括其他職責範圍，有同佢哋係交流過嘅。我哋會係儘量係搵機會同佢--就我哋嘅職責範圍，就係去交流嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）關乎安全嘅問題？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我嘅副手係去過倫敦嘅。

李萃珍女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，譬如話我有去過倫敦同埋星加坡係同當局嘅--當地嘅運輸署就交流嘅，但係就嗰個重點有些少唔同，我哋就更多就係睇嗰個實時巴士到站嘅資訊，以及係其他嘅新嘅科技，係讓乘客係得到更多嘅資訊，我哋當時係睇嗰啲多過就係巴士安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）不過我諗你會知道就係倫敦嘅巴士規管當局係有試驗過呢個 IAS 呢個智能車速調適系統嘅，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，其實就我啲同事就幫我喺度係睇緊--就草擬緊一個行程，讓我去海外參觀係交流嘅，不過我哋仲未落實嘅，因為而家仲有好多其他嘅事就係要優先處理咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，好，第 29 頁就係講到呢個道路嘅設計，呢度就係話巴士嘅設計、道路嘅設計，呢度講道路嘅設計同埋係交通嘅管理都係對巴士嘅安全係起關鍵嘅作用。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你講係第 2 段？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 3。第 29 頁嘅第 3 個部分。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）道路設計，呢啲關乎係道路嘅設計同埋交通管理，呢個都係我哋常規嘅道路安全議會嗰個議程嗰度都會睇嘅，我哋就會跟進，我哋亦都想有一啲防範嘅工作，我哋會睇嗰個道路嘅設計，亦都會睇嗰個防撞欄，亦都會拉闊嗰啲彎位等等嘅。

講到話呢個防撞欄，安全嘅防撞欄，呢個我哋亦都採納咗--即係因應就係大埔嘅巴士意外之後有咁樣做嘅。至於話巴士站附近嗰個係提供一啲安全嘅過馬路嘅設施，我哋不時都係睇嘅，我哋經常都會落區嗰度去睇，亦都同區議會係交流嘅，我哋會因應有新嘅發展，去睇下要唔要有巴士站，係巴士嘅彎位等等，咁去睇下係咪需要有合適嘅行人過路設施嚟到係保障行人嘅安全。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有提過，就係剛才提過話道路安全議會嘅議程，咁究竟係乜嘢嘢呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你講個審核，其實我哋道路安全監管同埋分析，就係我哋同道路安全議會一直有咁做嘅。或者我唔應該用「審計」或者「審核」呢樣，因為我諗用呢個字都要比較小心嘅。呢個係我哋嘅道路安全嘅監察系統。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我要問嘅問題嘅後面嘅部分，已經去到尾聲㗎喇，或者委員會係有問題要問你嘅，我自己要問嘅係咁多。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）感謝你，資深大律師，感謝你協助我同埋我嘅團隊係回答你嘅問題。

委員會的提問

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我係有啲問題想問，就係想作澄清嘅，就係你琴晚交上嚟嘅，就係關乎嗰啲統計數字，不如你揭去呢個第 91 頁，我諗係九巴或者係城巴，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問，有冇編到頁碼？我諗羅教授就係講番佢自己內部嗰個頁碼，但係整體，即係跟番我哋嗰個文件嘅頁碼又點樣樣呢？

MR DUNCAN： Yes, it has now.

主席： Where do we find it?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）TD-1。

羅先生： Yes, starting at page 182.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）176 打後。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁佢已經入咗我哋嗰個文件夾，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）哦，呢個係關乎係呢個遠期計劃巴士安全嗰個章節，係九巴嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係，好，呢度嘅數字，譬如話下面嗰幅圖就係講係意外之前究竟係當更咗幾耐嘅，呢度睇下，超過十個鐘嘅，佢嗰個涉及意外率係最低嘅，不過我哋亦都要睇番嗰個數字，即係譬如話得好少司機係揸超過十個鐘，當然嗰個比率就係低，所以喺呢方面嘅數字應該係搞清楚啲，讓我哋可以知道嗰個因果。

另外，你亦都有--上面嗰個圖表，就話佢喺公司服務咗幾多年，你有呢個零至到一年，可能純粹係更多嘅司機係屬於呢個類別，所以嗰個比率就高啲，我諗就係要公道嘅，同埋讓我哋就係更好咁樣去知道背後嗰個成因。我就想問你，你可唔可以就將呢啲表就係再做過？讓我哋知道究竟嗰個風險係幾多，就唔好純粹係去咁樣樣分類。當然我知道呢啲數據係嚟自九巴嘅，運輸署可唔可以做番嗰個表，又或者九巴可唔可以做呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係九巴嘅文件，不如我哋係請九巴話畀我哋聽係咪可以係將佢係修正下呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我都同意主席嘅講法。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係，好。我想問運輸署嘅，就係講日後嘅報告，就希望你哋日後唔好用呢一種咁樣樣嘅形式。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係我哋一直都要求佢要經常提交呢一啲數字嘅，呢啲係巴士公司自己做嘅分析。你剛才嘅建議，我哋一定會謹記嘅，我哋會睇下嗰個意外分析嘅數據係如何可以係編寫得更好，更精確咁樣樣係將嗰個情況反映番出

嚟。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我有一個未必係問題，係一個要求，呢個係關乎係鄧大律師係較早時候提及嘅嗰個報告，係 29 頁，係呢一個道路安全研究小組嗰個報告嘅第 29 頁，講到道路嘅設計，我哋知道有更多嘅新巴士嗰個設計都係比以前嘅尺寸為大嘅，講到道路嘅設計，其實有冇話鑑於有呢啲新嘅巴士，就會係擴闊啲道路，你可唔可以之後書面回覆下我哋，畀啲例子我哋知道即係睇下運輸署會唔會因應呢啲新嘅巴士，而你哋就係擴闊啲路呢？因為新嘅巴士有啲長到係 12.8 米嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）擴闊路面唔係單單係為咗就係符合呢一啲新嘅車身嘅長度嘅標準嘅，不過我哋可以返去搵一搵嘅，譬如話有時有啲倔頭路。

主席：The turning circle.

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我要解釋一下，即係話嗰個譬如話巴士或者其他車輛佢哋點樣樣喺倔頭路嗰度轉彎，我哋要確保巴士如果佢係 12.8 米咁長嘅話，譬如話佢喺附近嗰度嘅巴士站，特別係一啲新發展區、新嘅住宅發展區，如果佢哋係有一啲倔頭路，無論係巴士或者其他車輛，我哋都要確保係有足夠嘅空間畀佢哋去駕駛嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）如果得嘅話，亦都係睇埋新界地方，因為照我哋所知，新界就係嗰個道路嘅設計係有所不同嘅，所以我好想知道我哋如何去可以就係讓呢啲巴士就係可以喺嗰度行駛嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）有一、兩樣嘢我就想同你跟進一下嘅，因為你有呢個係九巴嘅文件，嗰度就係佢哋嘅遠期計劃嘅，我諗仲係喺你面前嘅，係咪呀？就係九巴佢哋自己嘅內部嘅頁碼就係 96 頁，就講及係巴士車長嘅培訓同埋監察，當然呢一份係九巴嘅文件，不過我都假設運輸署都應該睇得明佢哋講緊乜嘢嘢嘅，當佢哋交份文件畀你嘅時候。呢一頁嘅最屘嗰兩行，乜嘢叫做「實時駕駛指標」？呢啲全部都喺所有嘅巴士嗰度安裝咗，就可以係讓巴士司機係可以就係引用係佢哋嗰個環保安全駕駛訓練學番嚟嘅駕駛技術用得著。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋同九巴係傾過，亦都係喺九巴嘅董事會嗰度開會，佢哋有時都會同我哋講佢哋有啲咩嘢新嘅監察設備，嚟到就係加強或者改善車長嗰個駕駛嘅技術或者行為嘅，佢哋亦都有時睇到，佢哋可能就係有陣時好大力咁樣去踩嗰個 brake 嘅，我哋知道呢一方面就係話首先就係睇下，有冇一啲司機就係揸某一條路線嘅時候成日會咁樣做嘅，然後就會係安裝咗一啲駕駛提示器，提醒呢啲車長要佢改善駕駛嘅技術，喺嗰一條路線應該用乜嘢駕駛技術，或者九巴可以更加好咁樣解釋呢一個儀器嘅功能，點樣可以幫助司機改善佢嘅態度。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提到就係話可能喺個儀器度有一個閃燈，然後就開咗個電子紀錄儀器，睇下會唔會有啲急剎嘅情況嘅，或者係急劇減速嘅情況嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）都係九巴文件，8.4.2 段嘅，第 98 頁，呢個講法係咁嘅，對於新入職車長嘅工作，會安排佢哋揸一啲容易啲嘅路線，你知唔知九巴係有冇指明邊啲路線係容易，有邊啲係難呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）有啲比較複雜嘅路線係有咁嘅形容嘅，如果冇指明係複雜路線嘅話，就可以當成係容易嘅路線，好多時候佢哋提到係複雜嘅路線。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係佢哋有個系統決定路線嘅難度嘅，某一條路或者某一段路嘅難度？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）因為據我理解，有啲路線可能包括更多彎位，或者要停多啲站嘅，更多客嘅，要上落更多嘅客嘅，就唔會話好直接嘅揸一條好短嘅路線，有啲可能係停好多個站，又會包括唔同區域，有啲路線就亦都會經過一啲嘅交通黑點、意外黑點嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 99 頁，8.5.7 段，呢句係咁講嘅，就話做咗一個調查，有四十四架巴士係所有嘅座位都係安裝咗一啲三點繫固嘅安全帶，已經喺 2017 年 4 月底嘅時候，然後亦都會做一個調查去評估一下喺巴士上已經安裝咗所有座位都有安全帶嘅使用率嘅，你知唔知道有咁樣嘅調查？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道九巴係自己有做呢一個調查，佢哋想調查一下使用率係點，但係我哋就唔知道調查嘅結果，我哋未知。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋係咪預期對方會通知你？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，因為喺董事局嘅會議有提到。我哋預期九巴會向我哋匯報安全帶嘅使用率情況，如果佢唔匯報，我哋都會一定追問。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。最後一件事，喺運輸署 1 號嘅文件冊第 8 號文件，睇番技術嘅度，第 21 段，第 102 頁，就係有一個嘅車速顯示屏，呢方面，我想問嘅就係技術上係可以安裝嘅，呢個係第 22 段，就話巴士嘅廠商就畀咗意見話技術上係可行嘅，但係 22 段較後就有個咁嘅意見，巴士公司關注用咗呢個車速顯示屏係會增加車長同埋乘客之間嘅磨擦同埋拗撬，亦都會令到車長有更大壓力嘅，可能影響巴士嘅安全駕駛，巴士公司認為呢一個嘅車速顯示屏對於加強巴士嘅安全係冇幫助。

我咁樣理解啱唔啱呢？呢啲嘅顯示屏喺公共小巴都已經用咗一段時間，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以解釋畀我聽幾時喺公共小巴度安裝？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）幾年，我哋想講得準備啲，不過係幾年。呢個裝置係安裝

喺公共小巴上面，原因係之前有個關注小巴超速嘅問題，呢件事其實喺交通諮詢委員會都有討論過，喺工作小組工作範圍都有包括呢一方面嘅，要同巴士嘅製造商、巴士公司再商討下安裝車速顯示屏嘅可行性。我哋 22 段咁寫其實就係而家討論嘅狀態。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋明嘅，因為而家係個討論只係牽涉三方，即係話巴士嘅營運商、你哋同埋巴士嘅製造商，佢哋考慮技術上嘅可行性。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）另外仲有巴士公司嘅回應，車長覺得安裝呢個儀器會令佢哋更大壓力，呢個係好敏感嘅地方，我哋要小心考慮，或者要同車長嗰啲工會組織去睇下佢哋嘅意見係點樣先。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會咁樣做？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪都會諮詢公眾，睇下公眾認為係咪作為乘客，佢哋認為係咪一個好主意呢？因為佢哋作為乘客，佢哋嘅命都係車長控制。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會考慮所有公眾嘅意見，我哋而家未諗到用咩嘢方式進行，不過一般有可能嘅做法就係首先同職方工會傾、車長，睇下佢哋嘅反應，再睇下點樣進一步由立法會嘅交通事務委員會作為一個平台去聽下佢哋意見，再敲定最終嘅建議點做。

主席：（經傳譯員）小巴呢個例子，運輸署又點樣知道公眾都關注超速嘅問題呢，小巴？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個唔單只係公眾關注，而係意外率，因為牽涉小巴嘅意外率嘅問題就係超速，但係多年嚟小巴嘅意外率都係幾高嘅，其實我可以話比起專營巴士，公共小巴嘅意外率係更高，所以先要要求小巴入面安裝呢個速度顯示屏。

主席：（經傳譯員）你睇下你可唔可以協助下，喺公共小巴上加裝呢一個儀器，有冇導致到司機同乘客更多衝突同埋拗撬呢？就好似呢度巴士公司嘅講法，佢哋係反對安裝呢個車速顯示屏，你知唔知道小巴司機同乘客有冇爭執？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇特別留意到喺--即係話我哋冇特別留意到喺搭公共小巴嘅時候有冇增加投訴，啲乘客。

主席：（經傳譯員）我係關注有冇衝突，根據有安裝咗個顯示屏之後，乘客可能有較多資料知道司機有冇超速，咁有冇增加衝突吖？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）據我所知，就冇特別增加關於安裝呢一個小巴嘅速度顯示屏嘅投訴。主席，我補充，公共小巴嘅限速器係 2010 年開始安裝嘅，作為公共小巴嘅發牌條件。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。我都問完我需要問嘅問題，我感謝你同埋你嘅同事盡力協助我哋，我哋亦都會繼續等你哋提交--你承諾會提交嘅書面嘅資料嘅，唔該晒。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席，多謝你嘅指導同埋資深大律師嘅協助。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺咁嘅情況底下，而家會押後呢個程序，我哋嘅口頭聽證會就係第一節到呢度，遲啲我哋都會邀請其他各方出席、我哋要先發出邀請，如果對方接受嘅話，喺我哋網頁會發放資料，睇下幾時會再開聽證會，唔該晒。

2018 年 5 月 8 日

下午 4 時 27 分聆訊押後

[blank page]

Tuesday, 29 May 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM NEW WORLD FIRST BUS SERVICES LTD AND CITYBUS LTD: MR SAMUEL CHENG, MR WILLIAM CHUNG, MR PAUL LI, MR GARETH NG, MR KENNETH LIT, MR KENNY SO (given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning. Today we welcome and thank Mr Cheng and his colleagues for responding to our invitation to assist the committee by giving evidence, and he and his various colleagues are available to answer as they choose the different questions that counsel to the committee pose for them.

But first of all, Mr Cheng, if I can address you directly -- make yourself comfortable with the translation, first of all. I understand first of all no request has been made of the committee that lawyers appear on your behalf, and in those circumstances I understand that you wish to make a brief statement at the outset, and you propose doing so in Cantonese.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Please do make your statement.

Opening statement by MR SAMUEL CHENG

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you.

Mr Chairman, members, ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I would like to thank the committee for

inviting us to attend today's hearing. On behalf of New World First Bus and Citybus, I would like to make the following brief statement.

New World First Bus and Citybus have been operating franchised bus service for many years. Our core value is to provide safe and quality bus service. We have all along been in strict compliance with all the legislation, regulations, franchise terms governing franchised bus service, as well as all the guidelines issued by the Transport Department to franchised bus operators.

New World First Bus and Citybus take a positive stance towards the present review of franchised buses by the Independent Review Committee. In the past few months, we have been reviewing the operation of our companies, in particular the safety aspect, so as to identify room for improvement.

Recently, New World First Bus and Citybus have formed a safety committee, to specifically examine all matters related to operational safety. Initially, we have identified the following areas for improvement.

First, strengthening driver training on new bus routes for all in-service bus captains.

Second, increasing the number of driving training hours for newly recruited part-time bus captains.

Third, providing classroom training, including training on customer service and EQ management for newly recruited part-time bus captains.

Fourth, providing refresher training, including training on customer service and EQ management, for in-service part-time bus captains.

Fifth, from 1 June 2018 onwards, all part-time bus captains will be required to provide information about the working hours of their principal employment to enable the companies to better understand whether they have sufficient rest time.

Sixth, upon upgrading the companies' black box system, in the third quarter of this year, when a bus captain exceeds the speed limit, the on-board black box will automatically give out alert signal to the bus captain.

Seventh, we have started to explore the feasibility of conducting psychological assessment of bus captain applicants.

Eighth, we will continue to explore the feasibility of introducing new technologies for enhancing safe driving.

Apart from the above, regarding the recommendations to be made by the Independent Review Committee, subject to the availability of our financial resources, where

feasible, we shall actively consider them.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Cheng.

I'm now going to ask Mr Duncan, senior counsel, to pose questions to you. He will be asking questions in English. They will be translated to you into Cantonese. And then your answer in Cantonese will be translated into English. So we will have to learn together how to do this successfully. It will require shorter questions, and it will require pauses in answers. So if we can all bear that in mind.

Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Cheng, good morning, and good morning, gentlemen, and again thank you for attending the committee this morning.

Thank you for your opening statement, Mr Cheng. There are a number of matters that I would wish to explore with you arising from the submissions that you have already supplied to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, are you able to confirm whether or not this is being translated into Cantonese? On which channel is the translation?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It's on channel number 1.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The first matters arise from the franchise agreement under which the company operates. I'd like you to turn up the franchise agreement, if you could. We will find this at bundle reference TD-2 at page 386.

Mr Cheng, I'm aware of the fact that you appear on behalf of two companies. When I ask you questions, I will probably be referring mainly to "the company", but by that I will be referring to both companies. If you wish to distinguish between one company and the other, please feel free to do so.

The document which you should now have in front of you is the franchise agreement under which Citybus Ltd operates many of its routes, the latest, I believe, of the franchise documents under which the company operates. Do you understand that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I understand.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Can I bring your attention, please, to clause 7, which you will find on the bundle reference at page 389. Could you just familiarise yourself with the provisions of clause 7(1).

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have read it.

MR DUNCAN: We will see reference in that clause to the grantee providing, amongst other things, such safety or service enhancement facilities or equipment on its bus

as may be reasonably required by the Commissioner for Transport from time to time. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: I understand from the submissions that you have provided to the committee that back in 2003, the committee determined that a black box system, as it's often referred to, should be introduced on all public franchised buses. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you this question: apart from that determination by the Commissioner in 2003, has the Commissioner required any specific safety features to be installed on any of your buses?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, there were.

Let me cite two examples. The Transport Department did ask the bus operators -- allow me to use English to talk about this term -- in relation to exposed seats, seat belts must be fixed.

In addition, a small number of our buses had a straight and long flight of steps, so the Transport Department asked us to fix an additional handrail.

MR DUNCAN: We are aware that amongst the features carried on your buses are speed limiters. Do I understand from your answer that the introduction of a speed limiter is a matter decided by the company, not required of you by

the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This was not a requirement from the Transport Department. The bus manufacturer added this facility to the bus.

MR DUNCAN: So the only requirements which have come from the Department are the black box system, seat belts, and the guardrails to which you have just referred?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. Just now I mentioned two examples that I can recall, but I'm not sure whether there were just these two facilities. There might be other facilities but I'm afraid I cannot mention them; I don't know about that.

Let me put it this way. I defer to Mr Li, head of engineering, to provide you with more information.

MR PAUL LI: Chairman, in the annex of our submission, page 29, annex 1.6, that is annex 1.6 of the first submission, therein is the agreement between the bus company and the Transport Department with regard to the safety features. When we order new buses, they have to be installed and they have to be considered. They include the seats, the design of the seats. For the exposed seats, three-point seat belts have to be provided. The seats have to have headrests. The design of the seats and the design of the seat belts and the anchoring points of the seat belts and the design will

have to measure up to the European standard.

For other safety features, for staircases of double-decker buses, we have to provide double handrails, guardrails, so that passengers going up and down will have the guardrails to hang on to.

We have to bear in mind the safety of the glass. We have to provide a hammer with which to break the glass. In an emergency situation the hammer will be needed to break the glass. We also need to provide CCTV. When buses are reversed, the captain would be able to use the camera, and the bus captain will also be able to see what's happening upstairs and also the passengers going up and down the staircase.

In terms of fire prevention, all the materials have to fulfil the relevant regulations. The relevant regulations are set out in a table on page 31.

In the engine area, we need to install high-temperature detector. When a bus catches fire, when a bus experiences high temperature, there will be alarms emitted in the cabins, in the bus captain's cabin.

In terms of air-conditioning, if the engine area catches fire, there is a partitioning between the engine area and the air-conditioning. Between the bus compartment and the engine area, we need to have metal

partitioning wall. If it catches fire, it will not spread into the compartment of the bus.

As regards other features, we need to have a meter and a speed limiter. The area designed for wheelchair, no seats, should be installed. For air-conditioning system, we have to have an all-weather control mechanism. Near the passenger seats, we have the air-con fans, for which they can regulate the flow of the air and the direction.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Li.

I notice that this document bears the date February 2012. Is this the latest document to be issued in this respect?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, indeed, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: When would the previous document in this respect have been dated?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Chairman, we don't have that document with us now. What you are looking at is the document that we first received.

MR DUNCAN: Do you know whether this document is reviewed from time to time between the Transport Department and the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Li?

MR PAUL LI: With the publication of this document, indeed

it was reviewed.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, there was a review leading up to the publication of the document; is that what you mean?

MR PAUL LI: Well, this document was discussed at our regular meetings many times, and in 2012 we finalised this document.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Just before I leave the document, I notice also it does refer to a speed limitation function. Can you see that in paragraph 4(a)?

MR PAUL LI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: There doesn't appear to be any specifications with regard to the limiting function; is that correct?

MR PAUL LI: As we all know, for our buses, we have the limiting function, limiting the speed to 70 kilometres per hour, and we all know that the speed limit is 70 kilometres, that's the limit.

MR DUNCAN: So there's simply an understanding between your company and the Transport Department but which hasn't been recorded in detail in the document; is that correct?

MR PAUL LI: Indeed, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me if I interject. Was the requirement for a speed limiter to be fitted to franchised buses not introduced in the aftermath of the Tuen Mun bus tragedy

in 2003?

MR PAUL LI: Chairman, many years ago the buses had this functionality for the buses, earlier than 2003.

CHAIRMAN: Can you tell us when it was first introduced?

MR PAUL LI: In terms of diesel engines, diesel engines have the functionality of cutting the fuel, and 30 or 40 years ago the functionality was there, although we couldn't limit the speed to 70kph, maybe 75, 80kph. It depends on the design of the gearbox and the engine.

When Euro II engines came about, we had the electronic control, and it was easily achievable. We could limit the fuel supply at the speed of 70.

MR DUNCAN: Leaving clause 7 now, could I take you through, please, to page 393 of the bundle, still with the franchise agreement.

In your submission, you have referred to the matter of passenger liaison groups, and I just want to ask a couple of matters with regard to those groups.

Could I ask you, please, to have in front of you clause 15(3) of the franchise agreement, which deals with the matter of passenger liaison groups.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I beg your pardon. We can't see this on the screen. What you are referring to we can't see, sorry.

MR DUNCAN: TD-2, at page 393.

Could you just familiarise yourself, please, with clause 15(3).

CHAIRMAN: I take it you are able to see that now?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir. Yes, I can.

Yes, I have done so.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

The franchise clause provides for the grantee to promulgate rules for membership and meetings.

Has the company promulgated any such rules?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, head of operations.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Chairman, this passenger liaison group holds meetings every two months. We will hold the meetings at different bus terminus and passengers will be invited to come in and express their views. At the meetings, we will invite the Transport Department representatives, and our company's representatives will engage passengers and discuss the relevant issues.

CHAIRMAN: I think the question was more specific: has the company promulgated any rules that govern such meetings?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We did talk to the Transport Department as to how this would be done.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Have any rules been issued in writing?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, we didn't.

MR DUNCAN: You will see in the same clause provision for the Commissioner for Transport to direct or approve

matters in writing. Do you see that reference?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.
MR DUNCAN: As far as you are aware, has the Commissioner issued any such directions or approvals?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I'm not sure, because that was quite a long time ago.
MR DUNCAN: But these meetings are held, are they not, from time to time, even today; is that correct?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.
MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you to refer to another page in the bundle, this time CTB-2 at page 170. There's a translation of this in the bundle at page 172-1.

You will see that this is annex 4.1 to one of your submissions, and it seems to constitute notes of the meeting of one of these passenger liaison groups on 27 February 2018. Do you see that?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.
MR DUNCAN: Now, I cannot see, at least on the translation, any record as to how many passengers attended that meeting. Is there any entry?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The minutes didn't record the number.
MR DUNCAN: Would the minutes normally record the number of people attending?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: These minutes doesn't mention how many people attended.

MR DUNCAN: If you go through to page 173 of the same bundle, CTB-2, page 173, that's apparently notes of a meeting on 28 February.

Are there any indications from those notes as to how many passengers attended that meeting?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No.

MR DUNCAN: How is it decided which passengers would attend such a meeting?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We didn't restrict as to which passenger may attend. Two weeks before a meeting is to be held, through the company's website and at the bus terminus where the PLG meeting will take place, a notice will be put up to inform passengers about the time and date of the meeting. On the relevant date, the passengers can freely attend the meeting.

MR DUNCAN: Typically, how many passengers would turn up?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It depends on the location. Generally speaking, there would be eight or ten.

MR DUNCAN: When you say it's at a terminus, is there a room at which the meeting would take place, or does it take place outdoors or ...?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We will make arrangements so that there would be a bus parked at the bus terminus. On the bus body we will put up a notice saying there is a passenger liaison group. There are also staff members outside the

bus, urging passengers to attend the meeting.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you back to page 170 again, and bring your attention to entry number 3 on that document, the translation at 172-1. The translation reads:

"Proposed to add a bus speed indicator (similar to that of the minibus) to all buses and emit noise when they exceed the speed limit."

Do you see that reference?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention to what is recorded as the company's response:

"In response to the installation of certain facilities on the bus, the company will carry out assessments based on factors such as operation costs, economic benefits and the technical front. Currently, there is no plan to install the relevant facilities."

Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company, since February 2018, carried out any assessments as referred to there?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, we carried out an assessment in another area. We are worried that there would be a greater likelihood that the passenger may have a confrontation with our bus captain.

In recent years, we have had confrontation between

bus captains and bus passengers, so we are concerned. Say, for example, for a particular stretch of road, the speed limit may be 50kph, and then at that time a bus captain may be driving at, say for example, 52kph. From the perspective of the bus passenger, he would regard it as speeding, exceeding the speed limit. If the passenger chooses to take this up with the bus captain right on the spot, this will cause a nuisance to -- this will disturb the bus captain.

Therefore, our company has chosen to work through the black box system so that we can become aware of the performance of the bus captains, like whether he has exceeded the speed limit, and then we can work through our internal disciplinary mechanism, and we will follow our internal instructions to discipline bus captains who have been caught speeding.

We believe that in this way we won't be creating a scenario in which there will be confrontation between the bus captain and the bus passenger, while at the same time we can monitor whether our bus captains have been exceeding the speed limit.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand from that, Mr Cheng, that the company has actually decided not to install the speed indicators?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At this moment, our assessment is that there is no need to install such a speed limit display unit.

Regarding the monitoring of the bus speed, we will rely on our black box system. We believe that this is more effective.

MR DUNCAN: The committee is aware that these indicators have been installed as per a requirement of the Transport Department in public light buses in Hong Kong. You would be aware of that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have seen public light buses equipped with such display units.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company made any enquiries as to whether that has caused confrontation between the PLB drivers and their passengers?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, many people take public light buses, all because they are driven at a high speed. So I don't think that when passengers see that there is an exceedance of the speed limit, there will be a confrontation.

For the people in Hong Kong, for those who take public light buses, especially during nighttime, this is quite common. So, when compared with taking a ride on a franchised bus, this is different.

MR DUNCAN: Can we go back to the franchise document,

please.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan -- it appears, then, Mr Cheng, that the companies have decided not to install the speed indicators on buses at the moment?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Unless this becomes a requirement, otherwise we do not have the plan to install such a speed limit display unit.

CHAIRMAN: Have you communicated this decision to your passenger liaison group, in view of what was said in February?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung will answer this question.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I think on the spot we have given a reply to that passenger, as indicated in the response. That is, at this moment we do not have a plan to install such a facility.

CHAIRMAN: Have you communicated the results of your assessment as to the factors such as operation costs and economic benefits and the technical front?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: When we answered the passenger's question, we did mention those factors.

CHAIRMAN: Well, you were carrying out an assessment; that's what the minute says. Have you carried out an assessment, and if so have you communicated that to the passenger liaison group?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, we did not. That's because we do not have the contact details of the passenger.

CHAIRMAN: Did you carry out an assessment?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, we have not started this assessment. This is because we tried to look at it from another perspective. The concern instead is on the possible confrontation between the bus captain and the bus passenger. We believe that this is the main reason as to why we do not plan to install such a speed limit display unit.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Could I ask you to go back to the franchise again, and move this time to bundle TD-2 at page 410. Can I bring your attention to clause 33 of the franchise document and just ask you to familiarise yourself, please, with its terms.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have done so.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Can I then ask you to have in front of you a document from CTB-2 at page 32.

At page 32, you should be looking at a document, it's a little hard to read, but it's annex 2.1 to one of your submissions, and it's headed, "NWFB Fuller Disclosure 2017". Do you have that in front of you?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then could you go through, into the document, at page 42 of the bundle. It's CTB-2 at page 42.

Do you see on that page a heading which reads, "Corporate social responsibility"? Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly that that is the document, the corporate social responsibility, which is required under clause 33 of the franchise document?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

This page, I think it's a page, the corporate social responsibility, is part of this wider document called "Fuller Disclosure 2017". I haven't been able to find reference in the franchise agreement to the requirement for this "Fuller Disclosure" document.

Could you inform the committee the basis on which this document is issued, the "Fuller Disclosure" document?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Chairman, this document, we publish it every year, October every year in fact.

MR DUNCAN: Is that a requirement, or is it a voluntary thing on behalf of the company, or what? Because I can't see it in the franchise agreement. That's the

only reason I ask.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This is a requirement of the Transport Department.

MR DUNCAN: When did this requirement come about?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If I remember correctly, it's been more than ten years.

MR DUNCAN: So it's issued annually by the company; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention to page 39 of the bundle, so CTB-2/39, which is headed, "Financial information".

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I can see that, sir.

MR DUNCAN: In particular, does it contain a profit and loss account for the year ended 30 June 2017?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention to the heading, "Turnover". The turnover is constituted by two items: first of all, fare receipts, and then advertising income.

Where does the company generate its advertising income from?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In that year, the advertising income came from three sources. First, the advertising at the bus stops. Second, the advertising on the side of the

buses. Third, inside the buses we have the monitor, the screen monitor, on which we also have advertising. Starting from last year, we discontinued that, because this mode of advertising wasn't popular so we discontinued that. So from now we have only two sources of income from advertising.

First, that's the advertising from the bus stops, and the second is the advertising on the bodies of the buses.

MR DUNCAN: Does the company have any plans to generate advertising revenue from any other source?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: As a matter of fact, where we can get advertising revenue, we have already explored all the sources.

MR DUNCAN: If I could take you back again to the franchise document, please, TD-2, at page 410. Can I on this occasion bring your attention to clause 34. Could you please familiarise yourself with that provision.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I'm done, sir.

MR DUNCAN: This clause refers to an annual system report. Does the company issue an annual system audit report, as required by this clause?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Has that been referred to in your submission?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR DUNCAN: Could you please, if you can, just take me to the reference.
MR SAMUEL CHENG: It is in the first submission. That's page 15, paragraph 6(a)(iii).
MR DUNCAN: Thank you. That contains the name of the auditing body who attends to the report; is that correct?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir. That is Hong Kong Quality Assurance Agency, HKQAA.
MR DUNCAN: Would the company be prepared to provide the committee with a sample of one of its latest reports?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir, no problem. We can supplement the information.
MR DUNCAN: Thank you.
I'm going to leave the franchise document. Thank you. And I'm going to ask you now to turn to another document in CTB-2, this time at page 64.
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR DUNCAN: Are you looking at a document headed, "Organisational chart"?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR DUNCAN: Does this illustrate the senior management structure of the company?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Does the company have a dedicated safety department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, in this document, there is the head of operations. Under this particular division, there is a department which is responsible for service quality. If there are bus captains whose service leaves something to be desired or he has committed some wrongdoing or if he was involved in any traffic accidents, that department would be responsible for investigation and disciplinary actions.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Does the company have a department which is looking proactively at the matter of safety, as opposed to reacting to breaches of safety requirements?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, for the past practices, if there is new technology available, my colleagues would make a report to me, and if necessary I would gather together the senior management to explore the feasibility of these ideas.

If there is a major traffic accident, for instance, my colleagues, Mr William Chung, head of operations, Mr Paul Li, head of engineering, and all the relevant managers, will review and investigate into the causes of the accident.

Recently, we have formally set up a safety

committee. This safety committee is tasked to review and scrutinise all the safety issues in the company.

For this safety committee, the membership includes myself -- I'm the chairman -- as well as the head of operations, the head of engineering, the head of human resources and administration, as well as the senior operations manager and senior engineering support manager. So I've just mentioned the membership of the safety committee.

In the bus operating environment in Hong Kong, I think the members are very experienced. I mentioned a few members. Each of us has had more than 20 years' experience in bus operations.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: If I understand it correctly, the formation of that safety committee is a very recent development; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So just when?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Roughly three weeks ago.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Prior to that, was there any particular person employed within the company whose responsibility was safety?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No. We didn't have a specific employee for that purpose. This is because, for safety-related

matters, we who are seated here today from the senior management share such responsibility.

MR DUNCAN: The committee appreciates that as time goes by, technology with regard to safety devices can change, can evolve. Up until the time of the formation of this new committee, who in the company had the responsibility of keeping up with changes in technology?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For safety-related technologies, as to the source of our information, it mainly comes from the suppliers of our buses. For the bus suppliers, if they become aware of new technologies, and if it has been proven to be effective, they will tell us when they have meetings with our people from the engineering department.

Of course, we have to find out about the details, as to how the new technology will work, and we will find out whether it is relevant to the application in Hong Kong.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you to your second submission, at CTB-1 at page 54.

Are you at page 54? This is the first page of your submission dated 18 May. CTB-1 at 54.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I'm there.

MR DUNCAN: Is it in the second paragraph of this letter that you have referred to the establishment of the

safety committee?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Is it your intention to employ anybody or nominate anybody who would have specific responsibility for matters pertaining to bus safety?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: You mean getting somebody from outside or getting somebody from the company itself?

MR DUNCAN: Either. Either way.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Okay. Well, as of now, we do not have plan to engage anybody from outside to join this safety committee. As I have said, for this committee, all the members have a long history of experience working with bus operators.

As far as the company itself is concerned, my personal view is as follows. For safety-related matters, the scope will cover many departments. We may very well be talking about the facilities on board the bus. It may be related to the training of bus captains. It may also cover the recruitment of bus captains. Therefore, for this safety committee, when we talk about the primary responsibility, the person will be I myself, because I do oversee all the departments. I am the chair of this safety committee. So the person in charge is myself.

MR DUNCAN: Are you familiar with the ISO standard

ISO 39001?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I only learnt about it recently. I wasn't aware of it prior to that. No, I'm not familiar with it.

MR DUNCAN: I wonder if you could be shown one of the documents that has been provided to the committee, which we will find at TU-1 at page 18.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Let me tell you, Mr Cheng, this is an extract from one of the submissions that the committee has received, this coming from an organisation called the Community for Road Safety. Are you familiar with that organisation?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, I do not know that organisation.

MR DUNCAN: Could you please just look at the last entry on that page, headed, "Bus safety -- road safety management system", and just read that to yourself, please.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, whilst that's being done, did we not receive something in the middle of the night from the Transport Department setting out the membership of this body?

MR DUNCAN: I think we did, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: That might help the witnesses, if some of the names are drawn to their attention.

MR DUNCAN: Have you been able to read that, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No. I cannot read the membership on the screen.

Well, I can see it now.

MR DUNCAN: Do the names of the members of that community mean anything to you?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: There is only one among the many names that I have seen before.

MR DUNCAN: And that is?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Paul Zimmerman.

MR DUNCAN: Very good.

Can I take you back, please, from the membership, to the document that I wished you to read, which is TU-1 at page 18. It's the last paragraph on that page, Mr Cheng, which continues over the page. Can you just read that to yourself, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. I've finished with that page.

MR DUNCAN: Could you also look, please, at TU-1 at page 53. This is a separate document also issued by the Community for Road Safety, and I'm asking you to read the paragraph immediately before paragraph 3.5. The paragraph is headed, "ISO 39001 road traffic safety management system". I would like you to read that paragraph to yourself, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have done with that.

CHAIRMAN: It might help, to put things into context,

Mr Duncan, if we have page 25 on the screen. That is the front page of the document, is it not? So it's a April 2018 report.

MR DUNCAN: Can you look at the front cover of that, Mr Cheng, "Community for Road Safety. Report on bus safety in Hong Kong".

Can I perhaps ask you this: are you familiar with that report? Have you seen it?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, I haven't read it.

MR DUNCAN: Those extracts I have shown you suggest that that particular standard would encourage fleet operators to be more accountable and proactive in reducing accidents and risks. Have you seen that in those two extracts? Have you seen reference to that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I read it.

MR DUNCAN: Having read that, do you consider that that would be worthy of consideration by the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: First of all, Mr Chairman, this ISO 39001, we don't have any knowledge of it. In Hong Kong, in the public transport sector, I have never heard of any large companies that have adopted this ISO.

Earlier, at the hearing involving the Transport Department, it was then that I became aware of ISO 39001, and obviously I didn't have any idea what this was all about, so I cannot say whether we will be

adopting it.

As far as our company is concerned, if there is anything that can be done to help safety, as long as it is feasible, as long as we have the financial resources to adopt it, we keep our options open.

So, going forward, I think we have to try and understand what ISO 39001 is all about, what country and what company has adopted it, and as a result of the adoption what the effectiveness is. Then we will be in a position to consider adopting it.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: In the context of safety, does the company from time to time ascertain from companies overseas --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr Duncan, forgive me for interrupting, but I think it would be fair to Mr Cheng to draw his attention to how the Transport Department have dealt with this in their overnight submission.

It's at paragraphs 24 and 25 of annex 1, which is on internal pagination 8 and 9.

MR DUNCAN: I think if that can be brought up on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think the problem is that because the material came in overnight, we haven't been able to make arrangements to do it, but I think it's important that you should see what view the Transport Department take.

Yes, I think that's it. So if you scroll down, 23

and 24. Take a moment to read that, Mr Cheng, 23 first. Could we have paragraph 23 on the screen, and then 24. I'm sorry, it's 24 and 25 that I want.

Perhaps to assist you, Mr Cheng, when we received evidence from the Transport Department and the Transport and Housing Bureau, although this standard was introduced in 2012, they regarded that, so they told us, as at an early stage of the development of such a system, and that's perhaps the point they are making here. In other words, they are waiting to see whether or not it is effective, and to what extent it is adopted.

It may be that you have nothing to add to your answer. I just wanted you to be aware of what this other material was.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, for this ISO 39001, I have no knowledge of it, so I'm afraid I don't have anything to add, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Just before I leave this topic, can I take it, Mr Cheng, that given your coming to know of this earlier than today's hearing, it is something that the company will at least consider in the future?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, in future we will explore what this is all about. We will consider it, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think you have already said, if it's feasible, you keep your options open.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: I want to turn now to the matter of recruitment, something you have referred to already this morning. The committee has been informed, through submissions and through its hearings, that over the years there has been a shortage of persons willing to take up the position of a bus captain. Do I assume correctly that that's the experience of your company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, in recent years, we do experience difficulties recruiting bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: Could I refer you, please, to CTB- 1 at page 24. This is an extract from your first submission.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention to the very last paragraph on that page. In that paragraph, have you referred to the fact that in order to comply with the latest guidelines issued by the Transport Department, and in order to meet your own internal targets, the companies will need to engage some 121 additional bus captains?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Does the company have any plan to increase the remuneration of bus captains, in order to attract them

to a position in your company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In March 2018, the company, for the bus captains, in particular the new recruits, has already put up the remuneration. The salaries package of the company has to be in keeping with the labour market situation.

MR DUNCAN: What was the increase in March?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For the new recruits, it was 8 to 9 per cent increase. Sorry, for new recruits, they have had about 6 per cent increase.

MR DUNCAN: The committee has received a number of submissions which suggest that the remuneration available to bus captains is not competitive with the general transport market. I would like just to refer you, please, to two of those submissions.

The first you will find in the miscellaneous bundle, MISC-2, at page 644. It's actually a document that starts, I think, at page 643. It's a two-page document, received from the Democratic Alliance.

Have you seen this document before, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, sir. I'm reading it now though.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Take your time. The particular aspect I want to bring to your attention is on the second page, and is headed, under item 2, and in particular 2.1, which talks about the current salary of

franchised bus captains.

So by all means familiarise yourself with the document, but I'm going to ask you specifically about the entry in clause 2.1.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheng, if you would like to take up Mr Duncan's offer and familiarise yourself with the whole document, we are about to have a morning break and it may be that you could use that time so that you can achieve that. Is that what you would like to do?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. What we will do is we will take our morning break for 20 minutes. We will resume in 20 minutes' time.

Yes?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Chairman, sir, I've got a request. Could we have the Chinese version, please, for our reading?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course. I'm sure a hard copy can be given to you.

Mr Duncan, can we do that, a hard copy of the Chinese?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN: So a 20-minute break.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, sir.

(11.29 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.51 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Cheng, did you get a chance to read that document?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I have done it, sir.

MR DUNCAN: The clause I was going to ask you about is clause 2.1 on the second page, and in particular the assertion that, according to the Democratic Alliance, the current salary of franchised bus captains is around 15,000, which is around 2,000 less than that of a non-franchised bus captain, 17,000.

Does that accord with your understanding of the situation?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, I'm not sure how many hours of duty they are referring to. There are two figures being cited, $15,000 and $17,000. For non-franchised buses, we don't have any information. Then why don't we focus our attention on the remuneration of our company?

In our company, the remuneration package of our bus captains is in our first submission.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. I don't want to interrupt you. I'm going to go to that in a few moments. So by all means, you will have a chance at that time to explain all of that.

Is there anything else you want to say about that

claim, that there's a difference of about $2,000 between franchised bus captains and non-franchised bus captains? Is there anything that you would wish to say about that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For our company, I dispute the figure 15,000. That's because, for our bus captains, on average they have two hours of additional duty. So let's take ten hours of work on average, this is the figure. And for the monthly salary, they are making something like $20,000. That's on the basis of ten hours of work.

For the non-franchised buses, $17,000 cited, I don't have any idea how many hours they are referring to for this amount of money. So I don't think I can make any meaningful comparison.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Just before I take you to your own remuneration figures, there's one other matter I would like to refer to you, it having been provided to the committee. That's to be found also in the MISC-2 bundle, this time at page 632.

There's a translation, Mr Chairman, at 642-2.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Could the original Chinese be brought up, please, at page 632.

CHAIRMAN: And who is the author of this document?

MR DUNCAN: The author of this document, as I understand it,

is the Confederation of Trade Unions, the Labour Party, and the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Cheng, there is just one page to contend with on this occasion. Could you familiarise yourself with the document. I wish to ask you a question or two with regard to the paragraph which appears towards the bottom of the page and which is headed, "Protect the wage level of bus captains, protect bus service quality". Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Please take your time to read that, and I'm going to ask you a question or two.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I'm done, sir.

MR DUNCAN: The assertion in this document is:

"Currently the basic salary of newly joined bus captain of the three bus companies is $15,364, which is far lower than the 'median range of land transport', $18,200, bus captains have no choice but work overtime to sustain their living, it is not surprised that the workforce of bus captains has been diminishing continuously."

Just leave aside the comment, but the comparison which the author of that document has advanced, does that accord with your understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, I defer to Mr Gareth Ng, head of human resources and administration.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR GARETH NG: Mr Chairman, as Mr Cheng said just a moment ago, for a bus captain, every month, if he is doing two additional hours of overtime work, the pay will reach something like HK$20,000.

So here they are talking about the basic salary and also the median wage. They are not comparing apples with apples.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: We'll get into a little bit more detail on this in a few moments, but one way of interpreting what has been said here is that the base salary of a franchised bus captain, leaving aside overtime, is 15,364, or thereabouts, compared with the base salary of the median wage of land transport at 18,200.

Are you able to comment as to whether that's a proper comparison? Leave aside overtime for the moment.

MR GARETH NG: Mr Chairman, our understanding is as follows. For this land transport median wage, it does include overtime work, so it is not just covering the basic salary.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is it true that the Transport Department does not lay down at all what the salary, remuneration conditions of bus captains should be? This is a matter entirely for the company to determine?

MR GARETH NG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So let us have a look, if we could, just for a few moments, at some of the remuneration figures with which you have supplied the committee, Mr Cheng, and to which you were referring a few moments ago.

I think we will find these at CTB-1, page 34.

You have set out for the committee there, in paragraph 9, the remuneration packages of your full-time bus captains. We first see those for Citybus, recruited on or before March 1999, and a base salary of $17,106. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then if we turn the page to page 35, there's a second group, recruited between 1999 and 8 March 2004, with a basic salary of 15,874.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then there's a third group, those who are recruited on or after 9 March 2004, with a base salary of 15,364 up to 15,764.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then we have, not exactly the same, but we also

have classifications for New World First Bus Services Ltd, continuing on pages 35 and 36.

If I understand matters correctly, the remuneration on or after 9 March 2004 is identical for both companies. So if you look at item (iii) on page 35, the amounts are the same as appear under item (iv) for New World First Bus; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So let us just keep with page 35, if we could. And please, I need to understand this a little further.

If one looks, as I no doubt have done, superficially at this, one would get the impression, perhaps, that the basic salary of bus captains is actually diminishing rather than increasing. I get that simply by looking at the basic salary of persons recruited between March 1999 and March 2004 at 15,874, and then recruited after 9 March 2004, 15,364 to 15,764. Are you able to explain that? Are they in fact diminishing or what?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Bus captains were recruited at different times and their basic salary was different. This is because we looked at the prevailing demand and supply in the labour market.

MR DUNCAN: So there was in fact a decrease post-March 2004 from the position which had preceded that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Now, why is the basic salary of 15,364 -- sorry, let me ask you this again. What is the basic salary today, 2018? Where we read "15,364 to 15,764", what is it today?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This is the basic salary that they are getting, but our company is currently negotiating with different trade unions as to the pay rise for 2018. After the pay rise, the figure will be different.

MR DUNCAN: So are you able to give an estimate of what the difference will be, in percentage terms?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could say what the difference is between the two sides.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, I have heard from the trade unions that they have this claim. Well, some unions have asked for an 8 per cent increase, other trade unions have asked for an increase of 10 per cent.

For the company, we have yet to decide on the rate of increase. Therefore, at this moment, I cannot guess as to how much more they were getting. Otherwise, I will be sending out a wrong or misleading signal to our trade union representatives, because I just now saw representatives of the trade unions in the audience.

MR DUNCAN: I understand, Mr Cheng.

Today, is the prevailing basic salary rate or the

actual basic salary rate 15,364 to 15,764, today?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So do I read this correctly that there has been no increase in the basic salary since 2004?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No. Well, every year our company negotiates and meets with the trade unions and staff representatives over pay rise. For the figures that you see here, in fact you are reading the pay levels for 2017. For the year 2018, we have to decide on that after discussion with them. For the past ten years, every year we have provided a pay increase. In fact, I can say that for the past 20 years, other than the time when Hong Kong's economy was in a poor shape, the pay level was frozen. Otherwise, every year we did increase the pay levels for our staff.

MR DUNCAN: So in 2017, the basic salary for a bus captain is 15,764; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For a new recruit, 15,764 for 2017. Sorry, it should be 15,364.

MR DUNCAN: So why have we got "to 15,764'? Who gets 15,764?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, for a new recruit, he will be getting 15,364, and then there will be an increment, depending on the length of service. The longer you have worked for the company, then the more you will get, and

you will reach 15,764.

MR DUNCAN: So that's the maximum, 15,764, in 2017?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then, if I understand it correctly, that's less than the bus captain would have been getting back in 2004, 15,874; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I don't think you can draw such a comparison. This is because they were recruited at different times and they were subject to a different remuneration structure.

Now, you can see from the figures from our company, for those recruited many, many years ago, they were paid more. That was because at that time it was even more difficult to recruit bus captains in Hong Kong than now. With the improvement of the economy of Hong Kong, the demand and supply in the labour market has also changed. So, at that time, we offered a lower level of pay and we were still able to recruit bus captains. Therefore, for staff members recruited at different times, they are having a different pay level.

MR DUNCAN: I understand that, but is this the case -- to make sure I have a correct understanding of this -- a new recruit who joined the company on 7 March 2004 would have received a basic salary of $15,874; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Is it also correct that if a new recruit joins the company today, his basic salary is $15,364, some $500 less than his counterpart joining in 2004; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, there are other allowances to which you have referred on page 35. You have indicated just a few moments ago that your best bus captains, if I understand you correctly, generally, with overtime, would earn about $20,000 per month. Is that a correct understanding of your evidence?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Could you just break that down so we understand how he gets from 15,364 to 20,000?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: So the basic salary is 15,364. Lower down you can see that for the overtime pay per hour, it's derived from this formula: basic salary to be divided by 240 and multiplied by 1.5. So you get a figure. It would be around $96 an hour. That is, if you do overtime work, you get $96 an hour.

For our bus captains, he works 25 days in a month. Every day, on average, he has two hours' overtime work. In other words, 50 hours' overtime per month. Then you

apply the figure I mentioned, $96 per hour, and then you will get a figure of $4,800 a month. That's the overtime pay. $4,800, and to that you add 15,364, which is the basic salary, and you will get the figure 20,164.

That's the basis of what I said earlier on, roughly $20,000 a month.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: If you look back at page 34 of the bundle, the overtime rate which prevailed before March 1999 was different from the overtime rate which applies today; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, they are different, correct.

MR DUNCAN: Likewise, for the period between March 1999 and 8 March 2004, the overtime rate is different from that which applied in 1999?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So has the overtime rate increased or decreased?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Before March 1999, those who joined would have the overtime rate multiplied by 1.75. March 1994 to March 2004, the overtime rate, it is multiplied by 1.5. After March 2004, the rate is multiplied by 1.5. That's for Citybus.

For New World First Bus, it is somewhat different. For NWFB, for those who switched over from CMB, the rate was multiplied by 1.35; that was in 1998. In September

1998, thereafter, until now, all of them had the rate multiplied by 1.5.

MR DUNCAN: So, given the differences, the 1.75, the 1.5 and the 1.35, have the overtimes rates increased over the years or have they decreased?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Whether there has been a decrease or increase, as I said for the Citybus, for the earliest stage, they had 1.75 and then 1.5. For First Bus, for those who switched over from CMB, it was 1.35, and thereafter they all had 1.5.

So, for the same staff, if he enjoys 1.5, then he's always on 1.5. Depending on the basic salary, the overtime rate will also increase per hour.

So, for the same person, for instance, with the passage of time, the overtime pay will not experience any decrease.

MR DUNCAN: What about page 34:

"Overtime paid per hour: basic salary/240 x 1.75".

That's a higher rate, is it not, than basic salary divided by 240, times 1.5?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: There is a difference when it comes to the sum worked out from that.

MR DUNCAN: The basic salary, if I understand you correctly, is reflective of eight hours' work; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: In fact, do any of your drivers work just for eight hours?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: They are in the minority. On average, they work for ten hours.

MR DUNCAN: Is it a significant minority or a tiny minority?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: My colleague has to have a look at the information first.

CHAIRMAN: Please take your time.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If their duty hours are eight hours to eight hours and 30 minutes, then the percentage is about 12 per cent.

MR DUNCAN: Is there a dynamic here at all? I mean, do most drivers want to work the overtime, or is it a situation of the bus company saying, "You have no choice, you must work the overtime"? What's the climate in that respect?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The company makes the arrangement for the shifts for the bus captains. If the shift involves overtime, then the bus captain will have to work overtime.

MR DUNCAN: He doesn't really have a choice?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, they don't have a choice. However, for our bus captains, between them, they can swap their shifts or their duties with mutual consent.

MR DUNCAN: In your view, Mr Cheng, is the amount of remuneration that the company is able to provide to bus

drivers an inhibitor to people wanting to apply for a position as a bus captain?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's not the main reason. Obviously, what level of pay will attract people to join, it varies from person to person. Some may consider 15,000 reasonable, whereas some others consider that on the low side. So it varies from person to person.

The difficulty with recruitment lies, amongst others, in the fact that those who are willing to sign up to become bus captains are mostly living in remote areas, like in housing estates. If they are required to travel all the way to turn up for work and then travel back after work all the way, then they consider that unsuitable.

It is, to our knowledge, the main reason. There are people turning up wanting to be bus captains every day, but there is a difference between the number of people turning up and the number of vacancies. We have consistent vacancies. It doesn't mean that they don't want the salaries.

MR DUNCAN: The matter to which you have just referred, the people living in public housing estates in the New Territories, that is something which is in your submission, I think, at page 29, CTB-1/29.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I did indeed, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company given any consideration to ways in which that problem might be overcome, apart of course from changing all the routes? I'm thinking of shuttle buses, other means of transport for the drivers, things such as that. Has the company addressed measures which might ameliorate that situation?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We have all along provided vehicles to take the staff to and from work. But we will not pick them up at their doorstep. We have different zones in our pickup service.

MR DUNCAN: What sort of vehicles do you provide for that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Our buses.

MR DUNCAN: On regular routes?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, indeed, at fixed points, fixed routes.

MR DUNCAN: What about shuttle buses, direct routes, so that people can go quickly from their housing estate to the terminus? Has that been considered?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me elaborate a little bit further. These are staff buses. They are not the buses for the franchised routes. These are the buses that are deployed to areas where we have a large number of bus captains living there. We pick them up and we will come back to the depot. Our depot is the place where they sign in.

MR DUNCAN: Mention has been made already of remuneration, mention is made of the difficulty because people live in the outlying areas of the New Territories. Are there any other particular factors which have contributed over the years to what seems to be a shortage of bus drivers?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: As a matter of fact, we have difficulties recruiting bus captains. It happens over the past few years.

I would like to take this opportunity to make available some information to the committee.

For the past few years, we have found that for the spare bus captains, for the purpose to cover staff members on sick leave, have to be increased in the number all the time. I think -- we believe -- well, let me say this. I think the reason being that our bus captains are applying for more and more sick leaves over the past few years, and therefore we have had this problem of not having enough bus captains. This is one of the reasons. We have to recruit bus captains but then there are bus captains who have applied for sick leave, and some of them, we have reason to believe or we have suspected that it's a matter of abuse of sick leave.

Of course, when this happens, and if we have hard evidence, we did dismiss the relevant bus captain

immediately. In other cases, it was highly suspicious, we thought it was a matter of abuse of sick leave and we have acted on them.

Now, it is always said that there aren't enough bus captains. So it isn't the case that we haven't got any applicants. In fact, every day we have applicants, and for our bus driver training section every day we have new recruits joining the training section and get trained.

I think the main point is that the issue of sick leave is causing us a headache.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you to page 29 of your first submission. So that's CTB-1/29.

At the bottom of the page, there's reference to unsocial working hours.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Just before I ask a question about that, could I take you, please, also to page 28, the previous page, where you talk about operational efficiency leading to a splitting of 14 hours between a full-time bus captain working for ten hours and a part-time bus captain working for four hours.

So, in the light of those comments, could you give the committee some idea of a typical working day for

a bus driver who works the ten hours? When does he start, when does he finish, when does he take his rest time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: May I defer to Mr Chung, head of operations.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, for a normal duty shift, at about 6 am --

INTERPRETER: Sorry, the speaker is not close to the mic enough.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: -- for those on the morning shift, they start at about 5 or 6. Generally speaking, at about 1 or 2 o'clock, he will finish the duty, and then he will be or his work will be taken over by someone from the night shift. So we have the morning shift as well as the night shift.

So, for a night shift bus captain, he will start at 2 or 3, up to 12 midnight. In addition, we have got shifts which run longer, so they start at about 6 or 7 and work until 7 or 8 in the evening, covering the peak hours. Some would also knock off at 6 or 7 o'clock, and after that, as we have said, we will get part-time bus captains to work for a few more hours so as to cover the evening peak hours.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: So those hours would necessitate some rest times

for the drivers during those different shift periods; is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct. We follow the guidelines on bus captain duty hours and rest times, so as to arrange for their duty hours and meal hours.

MR DUNCAN: So a rest time, if I understand, could be up to two to three hours in the course of a shift; is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Could be, but just for a minority. Generally speaking, if we are talking about a longer shift, having 12 or 13 hours, then our arrangement will be such that there will be a tea break, at least 30 minutes of tea break. Then there is also a meal break with at least 60 minutes.

If we talk about a ten-hour shift, then perhaps he will only get one meal break no less than one hour's length.

MR DUNCAN: Right. So, if he is working ten hours from start to finish, for what period would he be driving through those ten hours, approximately, on average? Eight hours? Nine hours?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Well, if somebody is on a ten-hour shift, then the driving hours would generally be about eight hours or so, because you have to take out an hour's meal break, and before he starts he will be given time to

make preparation, like inspecting the bus. For every trip, one-way trip, when he comes back to the bus terminus, there is time for layover, so a brief pause. So then he can alight from the bus to go to the restroom or to have a sip of water.

MR DUNCAN: So his tea break and his meal break, he is paid overtime for that; is that correct? So, if he works ten hours, an hour or so of which is a meal break, he's getting eight hours at the standard rate plus two hours of overtime; is that a correct understanding?

My question is aimed at the meal break. Is he paid for the meal break?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct. The meal break as well as the rest times are paid.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

Look at page 30, CTB-1, page 30. The writer has referred to "demands and aspirations of bus captains", and amongst them are the aspirations for more facilities at the bus terminals.

What exactly are the aspirations in that respect?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At the bus terminus, generally speaking there's a room for the bus captains to take a break. Generally speaking, it is rather small. This is because the company doesn't own the land. Usually, it would be on the property, on a private property. We always want

to provide a larger room for our bus captains, and this is exactly what our bus captains would like to get.

There is one other point. At the bus terminus, you may not have a toilet nearby, but then our bus captains do have to use a toilet. So there's the demands and aspirations of our bus captains. They are the sort of facilities they want the company to provide.

MR DUNCAN: We will look later on at the special shift arrangements that exist under the new guidelines. We will explore those later. But if I could just touch on those for the moment.

If I understand things correctly, the company is going to try and limit the duty hours under those guidelines to something like 13 hours as opposed to 14 hours, which is the guideline, but there is going to be a limitation within those 13 hours as to the actual amount of time the driver has to spend driving the bus. Is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And built into that arrangement are rest times for the drivers; is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So where would the bus company expect the driver to spend his rest time during those duty hours? Are there any facilities made available to him to have

a rest?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Currently, we don't have such special shifts and therefore we haven't got such facilities. But then, in the light of the new guidelines, there's a need on our part to introduce the special shifts, and we have already talked to our staff representatives and trade union representatives, at our depots and at places where we park our buses we are going to provide such facilities, so that bus captains may take a rest at such facilities.

In addition, they don't necessarily have to stay at such a facility. If, say for example, their homes are nearby, they may go home.

MR DUNCAN: Given the issues that Mr Cheng has raised, with toilets and lack of land that can be occupied at the termini, what prospects are there of having appropriate facilities for a bus captain who's on duty for 13 hours that wants, as he is entitled to under the guidelines, to have a rest for two to three hours? What facilities are likely to be available?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Just now, I mentioned our depot as well as the places where we park our buses. At such locations, the site constraints will be different from that at bus termini. So, at those locations, we are able to provide a larger room for them to take a rest.

It will be air-conditioned, there will be refrigerators and facilities like microwaves, microwave ovens, and there will be chairs for them to take a rest.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand that these facilities do not currently exist but when the special shifts are introduced they will be available?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct, because it will take time to make preparation.

MR DUNCAN: Just before we leave page 30, TD-1/30, there seems to be some demands and aspirations from bus captains for fringe benefits. What sort of fringe benefits have they sought?

Sorry, I'm looking at the top of page 30, and (ii) at the top, "In our view, the demands and aspirations of bus captains include the following", and item (ii), "Better remuneration and more fringe benefits".

What sort of fringe benefits have they sought in the past?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, for fringe benefits, they want more holidays and they want bus passes for family members, and they want less restrictions. For instance, their children should have bus passes. There are some suggestions that there should not be any age limit. Their child can be 40 years old, they still want a bus pass for him. That's something I've heard of.

There are some suggestions to the company that there should be more allowance for doctors' visits, more visits to the doctor.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I don't need details, but is there a bus pass system of some sort? Is there a bus pass for families?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. We do provide staff members with free bus passes. At the moment, they are available. However, I have heard from some staff members the request that they want one or two additional bus passes, and they want less restrictions on the bus passes. This is what I have heard.

MR DUNCAN: There is no medical cover for your employees, as I understand it; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, there is medical cover. That includes GP visits and also hospitalisation.

MR DUNCAN: Again, I wonder if your HR department could provide the committee with details of that medical cover. Would that be possible?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, certainly, sir. My colleague Mr Ng, Mr Gareth Ng, can supplement.

MR DUNCAN: We don't need it now. There is no doubt -- something in writing which the committee can digest.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No problem, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You mentioned a few moments ago depots and

termini. How many depots does the company have?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Altogether six, big and small -- or more than six in fact. Some are smaller, or smaller scale.

MR DUNCAN: Are they on Hong Kong Island?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. On Hong Kong Island there are three depots, and on Lantau we have two, and in other places, in Kowloon also, but of a smaller scale. Mainly on Hong Kong Island, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Just go back to the question of salaries for a moment, remuneration. Could you look at page 36, so CTB-1/36, please.

There is, at the bottom of that page, reference to a reward for good performance. CTB-1/36. Do you see the reference there, "Reward for good performance"?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: And there's reference to a safety bonus, performance bonus and attendance bonus, and there's reference to a demand by staff unions "these bonuses were reclassified to basic salaries".

So do I understand from that that these are paid irrespective of whether it's safety or performance or attendance; it's simply a supplement to the basic salary?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, correct.

MR DUNCAN: So does it follow then that at the moment,

there's no remuneration incentive for a person to maintain a safe driving record?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We do have a discipline system here. If there are problems with safety, there may not be any safety bonus. That can be deducted. However, we will mete out disciplinary action to them. For those who are subject to disciplinary action and they are not making improvements, then the disciplinary action would be escalated, and if it persists, they will be dismissed.

MR DUNCAN: So how long were these safety bonuses in place?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, this safety bonus has been around for many years. Until March 2018, we merged that into the basic salaries.

MR DUNCAN: When you say you merged it into the basic salaries, do the basic salaries then go up?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: There are two aspects here. First, there will not be any deduction of the bonus, because it's been reclassified into the basic salaries, and this has become part of the basic salaries. When it comes to working out the overtime pay, the base factor would increase.

MR DUNCAN: But also the basic salary would increase reasonably significantly, would it not, if there was a safety bonus of 1,285 to 1,552 a month, that would have quite an effect on the basic salary, would it not?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Previously, that's not part of the basic salary, right.

MR DUNCAN: What drove the staff unions to have this reclassified as a basic salary?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: There are three reasons. First, for the three bonuses, if they are not reclassified into basic salaries, then it is likely that there will be deductions. Say, for instance, if a bus captain is unsafe in his driving, it is likely that the safety bonus will be deducted. If a bus captain is impolite to the passengers, then the performance bonus will go. If a bus captain doesn't observe the attendance, then the attendance bonus will be deducted.

So, for these three bonuses, if they are incorporated into the basic salaries, then there will be no prospect of deduction. That's reason number one.

Second, as I said just a moment ago, the calculation of overtime pay.

Third, each year, when it comes to pay hikes, we will adjust the basic salaries.

For these three bonuses, there is no adjustment, with the exception of 2017, when we made the adjustment. Prior to 2017, all these bonuses, the level remained unchanged for many years. Now they have been incorporated into the basic salaries. Effectively each

year, when it comes to pay adjustment, there would be an increase as a result of that merge.

MR DUNCAN: So if we go back to the day when a safety bonus existed --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, before we get involved in that, I think we should take the break now for lunch. But can I ask you to ask Mr Cheng or one of his colleagues to provide us with details of how these systems worked. It appears to be something that was in place that you lost or it was deducted if you didn't fulfil certain criteria, and I would invite you to explore that after lunch.

MR DUNCAN: Certainly.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, sir.

MR DUNCAN: We will adjourn now until 2.30. Thank you.

(12.59 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.31 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Good afternoon, gentlemen.

Mr Cheng, I think before the break I had asked you to look at CTB-1, page 36 -- if we could just bring that up, please -- and I had begun to ask you some questions about the "Reward for good performance" part of this

page, at the bottom.

You told us just before the luncheon break that the safety bonus had been there for quite some time, and we know from your submission that it has now been reclassified to part of the basic salary.

Prior to that reclassification, what were the criteria which were to determine whether or not a particular individual was entitled to the safety bonus?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung, my colleague, will answer this question.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, in relation to the safety bonus, we try to see if the bus captain has committed any mistakes when it comes to driving, and then there will be deductions. Maybe it is due to a traffic accident or he has been complained by passenger for improper driving. It may also be the case that we have found exceedance of the speed limit as a result of the black box data.

We have got driving instructors or inspectors. They are on board to assess his performance. If it is found that there has been improper driving, then depending on the extent, there will be deductions.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: When you say there would be deductions, this is

actually termed to be a bonus. It's a plus, isn't it, a bonus?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, if a staff member has not committed any mistakes, then he's going to collect the full amount of the bonus. However, if he has committed a mistake, depending on the extent, then the bonus will be deducted to a certain extent.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I understand.

What about the performance bonus; what were the criteria for the performance bonus?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, for the performance bonus, we mainly look at the customer service. Say, for example, he has been complained by a passenger for poor attitude, and if it has been established, then his performance bonus will be deducted.

MR DUNCAN: So no complaint, no deduction; it would be an automatic payment?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Attendance bonus: what was the criteria for that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This is the attendance bonus. Say, for example, for that particular month, he has full attendance. That is, after then the leave he has been

assigned, if he has been attending on all the days assigned to him, then he will get the full amount of the attendance bonus. However, had he been absent, then the bonus will be deducted proportionately.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: With regard to the situation post the reclassification, I would like just to ask about a couple of matters.

Is it the position at the moment, then, that there's no financial incentive offered to any driver to adopt safe driving measures?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: As far as financial incentives are concerned, yes, I agree, there would no longer be an incentive as you have said.

But let me say this again. Safe driving is their duty. If a bus driver fails to do that, then we will look at the breach that he has committed, we will look at the degree of seriousness. Depending on the severity, we will hand out different degrees of disciplinary action.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: If I was to take you, please, to CTB-2 at page 209 -- the translation at 209-1 and -2.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Do we see set out there the guidelines of New

World First Bus Services Ltd for disciplinary actions against normal bus terminus supervisor and bus captains who are in breach? Does that contain the guidelines?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do see the guideline.

MR DUNCAN: If you look at the end of the guidelines, that's page 209-2 in particular of the translation, you will see guidelines which deal with breaches of speed limits by the bus driver?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: And the sanctions can be seen there as well.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Oral warnings, written warnings, and ultimately perhaps dismissal, without the need for payment in lieu. Are those the sorts of sanctions that the company might consider?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly that under the current system, post-reclassification, there is no provision for any loss of income with regard to a speed breach?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: You are correct.

MR DUNCAN: That is a different situation from that which prevailed prior to reclassification, in that previously, if a person had breached the speeding limit, then amounts otherwise payable to him would be withheld. Is

that a correct understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Just with regard to the effect of the reclassification, if we go back to page 36 of CTB-1, if we start with the new recruit at the moment, his basically salary, if I understand correctly, would be $15,364. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then he would have added to that a reclassified safety bonus of at least 1,285?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, for the various bonuses, they have already been included in the sum of 15,364.

MR DUNCAN: What about the performance bonus of 362 per month?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The three bonuses covering safety, performance and attendance, they have already been included in the sum of $15,364.

MR DUNCAN: I see. When did this reclassification actually take place?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: 1 March 2018.

MR DUNCAN: So when you have at (iv) on that page, "Recruited on or after 9 March 2004", the figure of 15,364 would in fact be much less prior to 1 March 2018? You would have had a figure plus these other bonuses; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: All the three bonus have been added and then you will get 15,364.

MR DUNCAN: Right. That's today, isn't it?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Let's go back 12 months. What would the basic salary have been 12 months ago?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung, my colleague, will do the sums now.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Take your time.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR GARETH NG: I beg your pardon, Chairman. Let me give an example.

The bonus reclassified into basic salary went into effect on 1 March. On 1 February, prior to this reclassification, the basic salary was 12,536.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So on what basis is it asserted on page 36 that if you were recruited on or after 9 March 2004 your basic salary was 15,364, and you now tell us that if you were recruited on 1 February 2018, your basic salary was 12,536?

MR GARETH NG: Mr Chairman, would you repeat, please?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm looking at page 36. In the middle of that page, it asserts:

"(iv) Recruited on or after 9 March 2004.

Basic salary: 15,364."

You now tell us that if you were recruited on 1 February 2018, your basic salary is 12,536.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If I may explain once again.

Starting from 1 March, the three bonuses were reclassified into basic salaries. Let's say in February 2018, the basic salary was 12,536, and the bonuses amounting to 2,328 was reclassified to basic salaries, and the basic salaries were put up by $500. Adding all together, it amounts to 15,364. Let me repeat the numbers again. 12,536, 2,328 and 500. Adding them together would amount to 15,364.

CHAIRMAN: I hear what you say, but I don't understand what you say.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me repeat. In February, before the changes took place, the new recruits had the basic salary standing at 12,536. And I mentioned the three bonuses. The three bonuses together amounted to 2,328.

On 1 March, this 2,328 by way of bonuses were classified to basic salaries. At the same time, we added or we increased the basic salaries by $500 for all the bus captains. So, in March, the basic salary comes to 15,364, but the bonuses were not there because they had been incorporated into the basic salaries.

CHAIRMAN: I've heard you again.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Cheng. I'm going to move from remuneration now, but keeping with the topic of recruitment, the question of female or lady drivers -- what proportion of your drivers are females?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Less than 10 per cent. However, I would like to stress one point. When we mount recruitment, we give equal treatment to male and female and we don't give any priority to any particular gender. So those who turn up for employment, the number of males outnumbers females.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company considered any initiatives to increase the interest in bus captaincy amongst the female population?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We have recruitment advertisements. There are three faces of our bus captains. One of the faces is a female bus captain. That way, we hope that the members of the public will know that female population would be welcome to join as bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: Are there any female part-time drivers?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We are not sure, but even if there are, the number would not be high.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you to look at page 29 of the bundle, again on your submission. So CTB-1/29. It's on that page that you have informed --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: -- the committee as to the number of part-time bus captains registered with the companies. We can see that these, at the time of the submission, totalled some 346 bus captains.

I understand also from your submission -- this is at page 36 of the bundle -- that the part-time bus captains are paid an hourly rate of $80. Is that the sum total of their remuneration?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, because each hour, they get paid on an hourly basis.

MR DUNCAN: How long has that rate prevailed?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This rate started from 1 March.

MR DUNCAN: This year?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: 2018.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. What was it previously?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: It was 75, if my memory serves any correctly.

MR DUNCAN: Is this something which is subject to an annual review?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not necessarily, because we have to look at the market. We have to look at the prevailing market rate for part-time then we have the corresponding number.

MR DUNCAN: Do any of your office workers at Citybus or New World act from time to time as part-time bus

drivers?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: When they finish the work or when they are on holiday, yes, sometimes.

MR DUNCAN: What sort of numbers would be in that category?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At the moment, it is 179.

MR DUNCAN: So roughly half of the current part-time establishment are office workers at the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No. If you look at -- in our previous submission which you quoted, 314 is the number for First Bus, and there is another number for Citybus, 346. Altogether the number stands at 660.

MR DUNCAN: Oh, I see. Sorry, could you take me to that number again? I've got 346 at page 29.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir. 346 for Citybus, 314 for First Bus. Altogether, 660.

MR DUNCAN: Of which approximately -- you gave a figure -- 179 would work in the offices of either of those two companies?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Leaving aside the office workers, most of the other part-time works presumably would have other employment; is that your understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: If we look, please, at page 59 of the bundle, CTB-1 at 59.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.
MR DUNCAN: I bring your attention, please, to paragraph 5(b) on that page.
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I've read that.
MR DUNCAN: In that paragraph, have you stated, amongst other things, that at the moment the company does not "specifically require part-time bus captains to declare if they have adequate rest time before commencing their duties"; do you see that?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.
MR DUNCAN: And I think it's fair to say that in the third paragraph under item (b), you have signalled changes that you intend to adopt with regard to that aspect of recruiting part-time bus captains. Would that be correct?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.
MR DUNCAN: If I could take you, please, to CTB-2 at page 401 -- actually, 400 I think the document starts -- there is a form which runs over four pages, 400 to 403, "Job application form (driving)".
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.
MR DUNCAN: Is this a form which is used for both full-time and part-time applicants?
MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, correct.
MR DUNCAN: Relative to this issue of other employment or

rest time, could I ask you to look at page 401, please, the second page of the document. You see the first heading, "Important information", and item 3. Does that read, "Are you currently working part-time? If yes, what is the work nature and the working hours?"

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So each applicant, either for full-time or part-time work, would be required to complete that part of the form?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Then if you go through to page 402, page 3 of the document, we see a declaration, pages 402 and 403.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly that that is also required to be filled out at the time of the application?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: May I defer to my colleague Mr Ng?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly.

MR GARETH NG: Mr Chairman, yes. For this particular form, the applicant has to fill out this part. But let me supplement. If he has omitted anything, it means that we will not be able to know. Say, for example, if he applies for a post with us, on the right-most side it talks about supplementary information. For that particular column, if the candidate doesn't write

anything, we won't insist that he must fill out all the parts.

MR DUNCAN: So I take it there's no independent verification of anything that a person might say in this form?

MR GARETH NG: You may say so.

MR DUNCAN: Apart from the application form, if the person is accepted for a position with the company, is he required to sign a formal employment contract?

MR GARETH NG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And is there a standard form for that, for the case of a bus captain?

MR GARETH NG: It's an employment contract in the form of a letter rather than a form.

MR DUNCAN: Does that address at all the question of working in outside employment beyond the company?

MR GARETH NG: No.

MR DUNCAN: Would you be able to provide the committee with a sample of one of those employment letters, as you have referred to it?

MR GARETH NG: Yes, we can.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Is this letter the same for both full-time and part-time employees?

MR GARETH NG: Not the same.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have sample then of a part-time employee

contract as well, the letter?

MR GARETH NG: We can provide the information to the committee later on, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I'm asking. This will be something that we would invite you to provide subsequently. We will give you a list of what it is you have undertaken to provide.

MR GARETH NG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Could I bring your attention --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Duncan --

MR DUNCAN: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN: -- has the format of this letter changed, say in the last several years?

MR GARETH NG: I'm not sure.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can check and, if there is a change, because new references have been made in the current letter, provide us with examples of older letters that will illustrate to us what the change has been.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention now to --

CHAIRMAN: Is there something you wanted to say, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, no. No problem at all. We can provide that information.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Could I ask you to look at one other document, please, in this context. Page 404 of CTB-2. The translation is at 404-1 and 404-2.

You should be looking at a document which is headed, "Employee code of conduct and discipline/declaration for external works". What is the function of this document?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Say we have a full-time employee working for us. If he has part-time work outside the company, then we ask him to inform the company.

In addition, if he is a part-time employee with us, so if he has got a principal employment, again he has to give us the information.

MR DUNCAN: Now, we can see that, according to the document, it's annex 7 to your submission, your second submission, I believe. If we go back to page 59, please. So CTB-1 at page 59.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: And I think you will see a reference to annex 07 right at the end of paragraph 5(b).

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: It's referred to there as an annual declaration.

Is there any requirement within any of these documents or any employment letter that an employee is obliged to inform you if he changes his outside employment or undertakes new outside employment?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For full-time employee, they must do so. For part-time employees, if they don't declare, as of now, we don't have the mechanism to go after them. But then, starting from 1 June 2018 onwards, at the time of taking up the post and on a yearly basis, a declaration must be made.

MR DUNCAN: When you say the full-time employee must do that, obviously he has to fill out a form annually. What is the position if he takes on outside work halfway through the year? Is there any obligation on him to report that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For the details, I would like to defer to Mr Ng.

MR GARETH NG: Mr Chairman, just now the counsel referred to this scenario. Well, the employee has the duty to make a declaration to us, and upon approval by us he can then take up other part-time work.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: Where is the provision for that, which requires the employee to do that?

CHAIRMAN: It might help if you have a look at page 72-1 in the English, and no doubt the preceding pages in the Chinese. CTB-2, page 72.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Does that help, Mr Ng?

72-7 in the English, paragraph 26.

CHAIRMAN: The form that I'm looking at is headed, "Employee code of conduct ... declaration of outside work". In the middle of the page it reads:

"I would like to apply for/have the following outside work (in accordance with article 26 of the employee code of conduct and discipline, full-time employees shall apply to the company before accepting outside employment and do so annually thereafter)."

Then there are various headings which provide for information to be supplied.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Which page is that?

CHAIRMAN: On my version, it's got "72-1" at the bottom. It's described as annex 3.1.

MR GARETH NG: Thank you, Chairman. Here in this form, we have made it very clear that the employee has to make the declaration.

I would also like to say, if I remember correctly, we will review this later on. My impression is that in the employment letter, we do have the same requirements specified.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Ng.

I think also, if you look at page 72-7 of the translation, and if you are looking at the original

document, paragraph 26, there is reference to the same point, as I understand it.

Is my understanding correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

So the improvements or the changes that you are considering implementing in this respect are designed more at the part-time employees than the full-time employees; is that a correct understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir, because for full-time, we do have adequate declaration system.

MR DUNCAN: Could I ask you, please, to --

CHAIRMAN: Are you moving to another topic, Mr Duncan?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so, what is it that you propose asking part-time employees to do once they are employed, if they are going to take up different or extra other part-time work? What are you asking them to do?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Starting from 1 June, if an applicant comes forward to apply to be a part-time bus captain, he has to fill out a form which spells out the principal employment, the working hours, what hour to what hour, and what days of the week he's supposed to work and what days he is not supposed to work. Then we will be in a position to ascertain whether he is suitable to become

a part-time bus captain.

Say, for instance, if someone has to be working for a dozen hours of work every day, then we will not employ him because there would not be enough rest time. If somebody has to work eight hours a day, and if he were to tell us that maybe he would be making himself available on Saturdays and Sundays to become part-time bus captain, then there will be no problems and we would put him through the normal procedures. If he is suitable, then he would be taken on as part-time bus captain.

Other than making the declaration when he first took up the job, every year he has to make the same declaration. If there are no changes, he would fill out the same stuff in the form. If there are some changes, then the new nature of work will be declared to the company. That's what we are going to do starting from 1 June.

CHAIRMAN: So this is an enquiry you make when you recruit somebody, and then a year later he's got to confirm what the position is?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, that's correct, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any obligation, proposed obligation, to be imposed on such a part-time bus captain if he was to take up part-time employment or additional part-time

employment in that one-year period?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If he takes up other extra work, he has to make the declaration to us. That way, we will be able to understand the working hours he's putting in, whether he would have the energy to become part-time bus captain with us.

CHAIRMAN: Is this requirement reflected in forms, documents?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Starting from 1 June, yes, there will be.

CHAIRMAN: Right. Have we been provided with this prospective form or not?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not for the time being. We will make these available.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Could I take you back to the document, "Employee code of conduct and discipline". The original Chinese version is at page 66 of CTB-2, the translation from page 72-2.

Could I ask you this. This employee code of conduct and discipline, does it apply to both full-time and part-time employees?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, all of them, yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I could take you back to paragraph 26 -- the translation at page 72-7 -- there's a heading there, "Outside work", and a reference to what a full-time

employee should do if he's going to take up concurrent employment, either on a regular or consulting basis. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: Given what you have told the chairman just a few moments ago, is there any reason why that sort of provision should not apply to part-time employees?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, the part-time staff in our company, they are mainly bus captains. Bus captains are working part-time for us. Whatever their principal employment is, the likelihood of any conflict of interest would be negligible. It would be zero, in fact.

MR DUNCAN: So the intention is to provide a different sort of form for the part-time employee who changes his outside work during the course of the year between the annual declaration; you would have a different sort of form for that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. That's when conflict of interest arises or the potential of conflict of interest arises, that's where they have to fill that out.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Let us move away from that and back to your submission, CTB-1, this time at page 61.

May I bring your attention to paragraph 7, headed, "Customer service and EQ management training"; do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: It's paragraphs (b) and (c) in which I'm interested at the moment. Could you just read through those paragraphs to familiarise yourself with what is being communicated to the committee, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We have read it, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You refer to the fact that in March of this year, a study was commenced to explore the feasibility and effectiveness of conducting a psychological assessment in order to screen out applicants who either have an inclination to drive aggressively or who are easily provoked and therefore lose control and drive in an aggressive manner.

What is the progress that has been made with regard to that step?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Gareth Ng, please.

MR GARETH NG: Chairman, after March, we have started the study. Other than downloading the information online regarding the evaluation in the public domain out there, we also had meetings with a practising clinical psychologist and also a psychologist academic. We had meetings with these two people about the feasibility and effectiveness of this kind of assessment.

At the present moment, we are trying to meet a mechanical engineering professor who has been having

a lot of expertise regarding the EQ management vis-a-vis driving, and we try to meet him about this.

Thank you, sir.

MR DUNCAN: The meetings that you have had, are these with local psychologists?

MR GARETH NG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And the professor, have you actually identified the professor? Do you have somebody particular in mind? I don't need a name. I just need whether you have actually identified somebody.

MR GARETH NG: He is a professor from CUHK, Chinese University of Hong Kong, in the faculty of psychology.

MR DUNCAN: Has he been given a brief?

MR GARETH NG: It was on an exploratory basis. We are exchanging ideas, our background purposes, our purposes, and what areas we want him to enlighten us on regarding the practices in the industry, in the field.

MR DUNCAN: When you say "the practice in the industry, in the field", what does "the field" comprise of? Is it a Hong Kong field? Is it a China field? What's the field?

MR GARETH NG: As a matter of fact, the world over, we are looking for some psychological assessments that can be applicable to bus captains, and our discussion surrounded this area.

MR DUNCAN: Have you explored this issue with any other local bus companies?

MR GARETH NG: Not in that area, no.

MR DUNCAN: Have you explored this issue by making contact with any overseas bus companies?

MR GARETH NG: No, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to give the committee any idea as to when you think you might be able to make progress with regard to this study?

MR GARETH NG: As I have said, there is a professor from the mechanical engineering faculty who has said that he could only meet with us in June, so I believe that the earliest would be end of June that we would be able to come back to the committee in relation to the progress.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm going to move now from recruitment to the matter of training, the training of bus captains. If I could ask you this. Do I understand correctly that what training is required is entirely a matter for the company? It's not a matter where you receive any directive from the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, decided by the company.

MR DUNCAN: And there is no scheme, there's no training of any sort, offered by the government authorities over and above or separate from any training scheme which the

company operates? Is that a correct understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And because of that, do I understand correctly that whatever training you provide is totally independent of what training might be provided by other franchised bus operators in Hong Kong?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We are only responsible for the training of our own company.

MR DUNCAN: With regard to what training is required, are these decisions made solely by your company, or would you make them after consultation with perhaps some of your counterparts in overseas jurisdictions, other bus companies? Is it entirely your decision or do you check out with other bus companies how they might go about their training?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Entirely decided by our company.

MR DUNCAN: If we look, please, at CTB-1, page 37. I just want to run through what the current situation is with regard to the training, first of all of persons who become full-time bus captains.

Do we have page 37 available?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. We can see that.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So we see that at (i), full-time bus captain without a bus driving licence has 15 days' driving training before attending the driving

examination which is required by the Transport Department. If he doesn't pass, he has another five days of training. Once he's passed that and obtained the licence, employment is offered and induction training is arranged.

Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. And that induction training consists of two parts. The first is a one-day classroom training, and the second is 10 to 15 days of driving training.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then if we go down to (ii), those who become full-time bus captains but already have a bus driving licence, they will be provided with the induction training.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: The one day in the classroom and the 10 to 15 days of driving training?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: As a matter of interest, is there much movement amongst bus captains from one bus company to another in Hong Kong?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, they do transfer, but not too many.

MR DUNCAN: Just going back to page 37, moving to the

question of part-time bus captains who have a bus driving licence, do I take it from the headings here that you wouldn't take on a part-time bus captain unless he held a bus driving licence? You wouldn't provide him with the 15 days' driving training which you make available to full-time applicants; is that a correct understanding? You only take part-time people on if they are already holders of a bus driving licence?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct. All part-time bus captains must possess bus driving licences before we would consider employing them.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, as far as those persons are concerned, they will be provided with two days of driving training; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: As opposed to the 10 to 15 days of driving training which the full-time driver gets. Is that a correct understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, your understanding is correct. This is because for someone who would like to become a part-time captain with us, he must be somebody who is already driving a bus or a heavy vehicle. In other words, he is already experienced in driving large vehicles.

So, for the two-day driving training, it's mainly route training.

MR DUNCAN: So he would receive two days' training irrespective of the degree of experience that he's had in driving a bus? It doesn't matter whether he's had one month or ten years; he still just gets the two days?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In relation to the driving experience of heavy vehicles or large vehicles, if he is not too experienced, we are not going to take him on. In other words, for those who would like to be part-time bus captains, those that we engage, they are all experienced.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, do you want to refer to something else there?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. Well, while we are still on this page, towards the end, we have got some supplementary information. Whether we are talking about full-time or part-time bus captain, after the bus captain has completed all the training, he will be assessed by our driving instructor. If the assessment is not satisfactory, there will be further training for the bus captain.

Therefore, as far as part-time bus captains are concerned, yes, indeed they get two days, but after training them for two days, if they cannot pass the

assessment, such a bus captain would not be deployed to drive on the road.

MR DUNCAN: You said a few moments ago that you wouldn't employ somebody on a part-time basis unless they were very experienced. Can you give us some idea as to what sort of experience would be required? Is there any criterion for that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not so much a particular criterion. For experience part-time bus captains, some of them were previously bus captains. They were former franchised bus captains. They might have worked for us in the past; they left for a period of time. But in fact they have had a lot of experience. That's the first group.

The second group, they may be retirees who used to be franchised bus captains for other companies.

So these are the two main sources, and we believe they possess adequate experience in driving buses.

MR DUNCAN: They don't get the classroom training before they are able to take up their duties; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not as of now, but later on we are going to make arrangements for them to be given classroom training which will cover customer service and EQ management as well.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The question of driving instructors. How does

one become a driving instructor in your company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: First of all, he must have obtained a driving instructor licence from the TD for driving vehicles of the same type as that in our company. Then he may become a driving instructor. And for our driving instructors, most of them or all of them have been very experienced bus captains and they have been driving instructors for a long time.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: How many driving instructors does the company employ?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Currently, there are 15 who are full-time driving instructors, two part-time driving instructors. In addition, we have five bus captains in the near future will take an examination with the Transport Department so as to get the driving instructor licence.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Now we turn the page to page 38 of the bundle, so it's CTB-1/38. We see the topic of "Refresher training", and the statement that you provide refresher training to in-service full-time bus captains, and it is said:

"We pledged to the [Transport Department] that the refresher training should be provided to every in-service full-time bus captain at least once every

3 years.

Only classroom training is provided ..."

And you then go on to describe the course contents.

Now, the classroom training, is this the same classroom training that is provided as part of the induction training, when a person first joins the company? Is that the sort of material which is covered?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, most of them are the same. However, in the last sentence of this submission, we look at the analysis of traffic accidents. From the first inception with us to the training, it may be one or two years already, and within these one or two years, maybe something had occurred that would be of reference value to them, some traffic accidents, and we would bring up these cases and share with them during the classroom training. That way, we will try to tell them how to avoid these kinds of accidents.

MR DUNCAN: When was the pledge given to the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That was many years ago. We don't have the precise information with us now.

MR DUNCAN: Just going back to the previous page for a moment. Right at the end of the page, page 37, you state:

"After passing the assessment, they are sten

assigned to the routes that they have been trained."

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, correct.

MR DUNCAN: In the course of being trained to be a bus driver, how many routes would a bus driver be required to undertake?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung who has detailed information.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It would depend on which depot he is assigned to. Some three routes, some four, some five. Even for five routes, some of the routes are duplicated. In other words, the starting point and the end point may be different but a lot of the routes will be overlapping. Let's say Moreton Terrace, they start from Moreton Terrace in Causeway Bay, going to the south, and will go through the Aberdeen Tunnel, and the route before the tunnel would be the same, and then they split up, some would go to Wah Kwai, Wah Fu, and some would go to South Horizons.

MR DUNCAN: So would he be then stuck with those routes forever?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: They would be driving on these routes for some time, maybe a couple of months, and thereafter they will be redeployed to other routes.

For these routes, we categorise them as more straightforward routes. The number of stops would be

smaller, and the road conditions would be less complicated. Things would be more straightforward. We would let them familiarise themselves with the driving skills and the routes, and then they would be deployed to other routes.

MR DUNCAN: So if a driver is required to take on a new route, is he provided with familiarisation process, or does he, to coin a phrase, learn on the job?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For new routes, we have a number of ways. We see whether he has been instructed about the route or whether he has declared that he is familiar with the route. If he is familiar with the route, then we will let him drive on the route, but if he is unfamiliar with the route, then we will arrange him to ride on a serving bus to get him familiar with all the bus stops en route and how he should go about taking on this route. This is how we deal with it now.

MR DUNCAN: If I understand correctly from your submissions, the company utilises buses from three different bus suppliers. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Li.

MR PAUL LI: Yes, that's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Just for the record, which companies are those?

MR PAUL LI: Mainly the main suppliers: Alexander Dennis,

Volvo and MAN.

MR DUNCAN: Again, if I understand matters correctly, these individual companies will have different models from time to time?

MR PAUL LI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So, when a bus captain undertakes his initial training, how is it determined which bus he does his training on, which model?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We look at the routes that are going to be deployed and the types of buses that will be used. For a new recruit, we would coach him on a number of models. For the 15 days, other than coaching him about the routes, every day we would coach him on the different models of buses.

So, for the 15 days of training, he would be familiar with different models of buses.

MR DUNCAN: I think you mentioned a few moments ago perhaps four to five routes during the course of the training. Is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So how many different models of buses would you expect a trainee to encounter during his training period?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, a moment ago we said that there are

three suppliers. Most of the buses are the Alexander Dennis model, to be followed by Volvo. These are the main suppliers. In the course of the training, mostly we would use ADL, Alexander Dennis, for training purposes.

MR DUNCAN: Any reason for that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mainly because most of the buses are Alexander Dennis's bus.

MR DUNCAN: And what if a driver is required to drive a new bus on a new route subsequently in his career? Is there any training provided for the new type of bus?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: If there are new models that the bus captain has to drive, we will arrange for training to be provided.

MR DUNCAN: What does that training consist of?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The driving instructors would show the meters, the seats and all the instruments, all the buttons, on the meters, all the warning signals, warning lights, and under the guidance of the instructor they would be allowed to drive some distances to familiarise themselves with the operation.

MR DUNCAN: So would that be half a day's work, a day's work or ...?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It would depend on the model and how different it is from the original buses that he's

familiar with. Let's say there are some electric buses, the control, the buttons and everything are different, so it would take a longer time.

When we order the buses, we require the suppliers, for the control panel and so on, we try to have the system standardised instead of having different control mechanisms. That's to facilitate the familiarisation.

MR DUNCAN: If we go back to page 38 of the bundle, so CTB-1/38, you then provided the committee with a section on "Remedial training".

CHAIRMAN: Before you embark on that, Mr Duncan, now you have gone back to that page -- Mr Cheng, can I ask you this. Under the heading "Refresher training", and from what you've said in evidence, the refresher training is provided for full-time bus captains at least once every three years. How is it that that time period was decided, rather than, for example, once a year?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We don't feel that there is a need for them to come back every year, not that frequent.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of the practices of other bus companies in Hong Kong in this regard?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, as far as I understand, other bus operators have the pledge with the TD that it is once every three years.

CHAIRMAN: And are you aware of practices in overseas

jurisdictions as far as this is concerned?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We didn't make the comparison.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Another point with regard to refresher training. Do I understand correctly from that section that no refresher training is currently provided to part-time employees?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not for the time being, no. However, later on, we are going to provide that to the part-time workers.

MR DUNCAN: When you say "later on", when?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Well, that we have to discuss with the part-time drivers, because they hold down a principal employment. We have to work out the time. But we hope we can arrange for a suitable time as soon as possible, to facilitate the part-time drivers to come for these refresher training.

MR DUNCAN: Have you made any contact with the part-time drivers yet in that regard?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Not yet, no.

MR DUNCAN: If you then turn to "Remedial training", please, page 38. In the first paragraph, you refer to the fact that both companies require full-time and part-time bus captains to report their driving offence points, and there is then a points system which will determine

whether a remedial training course is required.

Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Now, are you totally reliant then on the bus captains to report their driving points?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For the precise operation, I defer to Mr Ng, please.

MR GARETH NG: Chairman, for the bus captains, they have the obligation to make the declaration. That's number one.

Number two, every single month we would random check. We will randomly select some bus captains and they have to sign a consent form for us to check the points record with the Transport Department.

Thank you, sir.

MR DUNCAN: How long has that system been in place, that system of registration with the Transport Department?

MR GARETH NG: My recollection is it has been so for a few years. It should be five years.

MR DUNCAN: Have you encountered any faults in the system at all? Have people suffered from incurring points but not reported to you? Have you come across that at all?

MR GARETH NG: Yes. When we find this out, we will resort to disciplinary action.

MR DUNCAN: You have a need for that from time to time, do you? Has that actually happened?

MR GARETH NG: I remember that it did happen. Sorry, it did happen but not too many.

MR DUNCAN: If I could refer you to the third paragraph under that heading, "Remedial training", please:

"In 2016, 198 bus captains attended the remedial training."

I just want to understand the sentence which follows:

"76.3 per cent of these bus captains did not have been disciplined for blameworthy accidents in the subsequent 6 months."

I think there's a grammatical error in there somewhere, but do I understand this correctly, that if 76.3 per cent have not been disciplined for blameworthy accidents in the subsequent six months, does it follow that some 23.7 per cent have been disciplined, even after remedial training; is that how I should read that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, you are right.

MR DUNCAN: So these persons have incurred eight or more points, they've been through remedial training, and notwithstanding that, they've had to be disciplined subsequently?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, they did, but of course we have to understand the degree of severity of their mistakes.

If it is serious and if they have already had

a similar incident, then we will escalate the disciplinary action. It may even result in dismissal.

MR DUNCAN: Is that figure a cause of concern for the company, that that proportion would be disciplined for blameworthy accidents subsequent to receiving remedial training? Is that a matter of concern?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I agree, it is a matter of concern.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company addressed how the situation might be improved? Does something need to be done to the remedial training, for example?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I think this is one of the directions. We need to carry out a further analysis as to why, despite attending the remedial training, they are still involved in accidents. In fact, each accident has its own cause. They are different, and we need to go back to carry out a more detailed analysis.

MR DUNCAN: Are you planning to do that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Now, could I raise the matter of simulator training. We all know that pilots of aeroplanes, as part of their training, operate simulators. Is there a similar system available for a person who wishes to take on the responsibility of driving a bus, which often involves as many passengers as you would find on an aeroplane? Is there such a system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We don't have such a system, because we believe that for someone to practise driving, it is better to drive a real bus on a real road in reality. That's the better version.

CHAIRMAN: But to answer the question directly, do such systems exist?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We don't have it in our company, but I have heard that it does exist.

MR DUNCAN: What have you heard?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In the past, I heard there was another bus company which had such a simulator.

MR DUNCAN: Which was this company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: KMB. I heard about that. I didn't see it myself.

MR DUNCAN: Have you heard of any bus companies overseas operating a simulator system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have heard that Singapore has got this system.

MR DUNCAN: And where did you hear that from?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Just now, my colleague sitting next to me, Mr Chung, told me so.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware that in Singapore the government takes on the responsibility for training bus captains?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Perhaps I would like to defer to Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, yes, we have heard about

that. Well, two years ago my colleague went to Singapore to visit their simulator system, and he also looked at the operations of the Land Transport Authority in Singapore.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So your colleague went to Singapore?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Is this sent by the company?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sent by our company.

MR DUNCAN: And what level was he at? Was he a senior manager in the company?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, a manager.

MR DUNCAN: Did he come back and write a report as to what he had seen, and so on?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: After they have returned, they did give a presentation to me.

MR DUNCAN: Was that in writing?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No. It was a presentation. Other than looking at the simulator, they also looked at the bus operation in Singapore.

MR DUNCAN: And what was the thrust of what he had to say about the simulator?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: As the chair has said, for this simulator, it was subsidised by the government. This is because the simulator is rather expensive. Then, for

this simulator training, different scenarios would be shown on the screen, so as to test the response of the driver.

MR DUNCAN: I'm sorry, this was two years ago, did you say?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Whose idea was this? Was it your company's idea or was it the idea of the government that this be looked at?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I'm not sure whether it was an initiative from the Singaporean government or an initiative from the Singaporean bus company.

MR DUNCAN: Was it an initiative of your company or some other organisation?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: You mean the Singapore visit?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. I mean was this something that your company came up with, or was it provided to you by somebody else as a proposal?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For this visit, our black box supplier had a UITP conference in Singapore, so they invited us to go there to participate. So outside of the conference we made arrangements to visit the authorities and look at the simulator.

MR DUNCAN: So it was the bus supplier who suggested you look at the simulator, or was it your company which decided off its own bat to look at the simulator?

CHAIRMAN: I don't think we were told it was the bus supplier. It was the black box supplier.

MR DUNCAN: I beg your pardon.

CHAIRMAN: The black box supplier is NEC, is it not? Is that right?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: (Nodded head).

CHAIRMAN: So NEC invited you to this UITP. Can you give us the meaning of that acronym?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: UITP, the international transport organisation.

CHAIRMAN: What's the acronym? International Transport?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I'm not too sure but I can provide the information later.

CHAIRMAN: It has a website, doesn't it, public transport?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: My colleague is trying to look it up right now.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. If you get the answer, tell us.

And it was on the occasion of this visit that you took the opportunity, because you were in Singapore, to examine the bus simulator, and at whose suggestion was that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It was NEC which made the suggestion.

MR DUNCAN: Did you yourself attend that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I didn't.

MR DUNCAN: It was your colleague who subsequently gave you a report; is that correct?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.
MR DUNCAN: But did I understand you to say earlier that the government had provided some sort of subsidy for this?
CHAIRMAN: I think he was suggesting the Singapore government subsidised the use of this training facility. Is that right?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, that's how I understood it.
CHAIRMAN: Because they provide the training of bus captains; it's not done by the bus companies, it's done by the government of Singapore, through the Land Transport Authority. Is that correct?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.
CHAIRMAN: Before we leave the topic -- if that's what you were about to do, Mr Duncan --
MR DUNCAN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN: -- your colleague came back and reported to you, and so far you have told us one element of the report, that it was rather expensive. Was there anything else he reported?
MR WILLIAM CHUNG: My colleague reported that the simulator wasn't real enough, the simulator couldn't move, and there was the absence of the 3D element there, or 4D.
CHAIRMAN: Do you know who were the manufacturers of this

bus simulator?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That I'm not aware of.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

So, after that, did you carry the matter forward at all within the company, as to whether any further consideration should be given to engaging some sort of simulation?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, we didn't consider adopting it.

CHAIRMAN: That's because of a preference you have for reality practice driving; is that right, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Now, if we could move from the current training to what you propose for the future, and you have indicated, Mr Cheng, in your submission that there are some changes afoot.

Could I ask you to look at page 54, so CTB-1/54. If you look first of all at paragraph (a) on that page.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I've done it, sir.

MR DUNCAN: The first thing I notice is that you said:

"In our recent review of various safety-related matters, we identified the following areas for improvement".

Could you tell us a little bit more about this review? Who took part in it? How long did it take?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That review, I referred to the safety committee this morning, and that's part of it. Our company has set up the safety committee which has not been around for so long and the membership of the safety committee is set out in our submission.

Basically myself, Mr Chung next to me, Mr Ng, Mr Li, Mr So, and also the one who cannot make it today, Mr Fung, the six of us are standing members.

MR DUNCAN: How did you go about the review?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, we have identified what we set out in the submission, (a) to (f), and these are the areas that we have identified for improvement.

As to the specifics, how we are going to go about it, and the time frame, we have assigned the job to different departments to carry out the review. But there are things that can be undertaken straightaway, like, for example, the part-time bus captains, they have to declare the working hours of the principal employment, these can be undertaken immediately. We have decided this would go into effect come 1 June.

There are other areas where it would be rather difficult to get on top of, like for instance the classroom training being made available to the part-time bus captains. As Mr William Chung said just a moment ago, we have to tie in with the timing of the part-time

bus captains when we make arrangement for them to sit through this kind of training. And in each of these areas, we have to look at the actual timing.

MR DUNCAN: So the review itself, was this done in writing, through communications, memos, and so forth, or did you have a sit-down meeting, or what was the process?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We have just had the first meeting. We do have the minutes. After the meeting, we have the supervisor or the senior manager who would be following up. Maybe there would be more than one supervisor would be in charge. And they would be tasked to see when these are implemented, all the details that will be involved.

Once we have identified all the details, then they will come back to the safety committee and make a report there, and the whole committee will be discussing the issues and work out the actual implementation timetable. That's how we plan to proceed.

Other than conducting the review at the committee, we also discussed the fact that once a review has been undertaken, once implementation has been undertaken, the follow-up work would also be terribly important. How we are going to follow up this, the safety committee will take the decision also.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is there a proposal for a second meeting?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Our committee would like to have the meeting every two months. If the managing director sees fit, then we can have extra meetings scheduled.

I have been enquiring my colleagues, of course, in the office, how they are progressing and whether there are any difficulties they encounter. If I see the merit of having additional meetings, I will do so; I will convene extra meetings.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Would it be possible to provide the minutes of the first meeting to the committee?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Most certainly, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

In paragraph (a) on that page, there is indication that the committee proposes to "enhance new route driving training for all bus captains".

Sorry, we are still on page 54.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Both for full-time and part-time drivers.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Have you been able to detail just exactly how that training is to be enhanced as yet?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For the details, I defer to Mr William Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For the new route, the bus captain will have to ride on the bus of the relevant route. Other than riding on the bus, we would let him drive a bus on that route. Now, that's not a passenger-carrying bus. That will familiarise him with all the route details.

MR DUNCAN: And the plan to increase the driving training hours for newly recruited part-time bus captains, what is the plan?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For new part-time bus captains, the driving hours will go up from eight hours to 16. And also we will have a four-hour classroom training which will include customer services, EQ management, traffic safety awareness and knowledge, and the relevant laws and regulations, drug driving, drink-driving, and also the Discrimination Ordinance regarding disability, and so on.

MR DUNCAN: Do we see other proposals at the bottom of page 54 under (b)(i) and (ii)?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. What's your question, sir?

MR DUNCAN: I'm just asking you to confirm that the enhancement that you have referred to includes what we can all read in paragraph (b)(i) and (ii) on pages 54 and 55.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir, they are included.

MR DUNCAN: Now, at page 55, the provision of refresher

training to all in-service bus captains, will that apply to both full-time and part-time bus captains?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The earlier page, (b), we are talking about enhancing the training for part-time bus captains. For the part-time bus captains training, it is divided into two parts, (i) and (ii). As a matter of fact, we are talking about part-time bus captain training, because full-time training for full-time bus captains, they will already have this kind of training.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I see. Thank you very much.

The chairman asked you a question earlier on with regard to the period between one refresher training and another, and I think in the case of full-time bus captains it's once every three years. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, at least they have to have one every three years.

MR DUNCAN: Do I assume that the same period is proposed to be applied to the part-time bus captains?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In future, yes. At the moment, that doesn't include the part-time bus captains, but in future, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Right. The chairman asked why three years was selected. Is there any proposal to review the periods at which refresher training should be provided to the bus captains in order to keep them reminded as to the

need to undertake procedures which can minimise safety concerns?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: As a matter of fact, for the refresher training, we feel that it doesn't have 100 per cent correlation with driving safety. It is partially related to that. The thing is, we have to monitor the driving behaviour of the bus captains. That's far more important.

For the once every three years refresher training, we haven't heard from the bus captains any suggestion that it is too long a cycle, but when we meet the unions, we will explore with them and hear their views as to whether there is a need to increase the frequency. We would like to hear from them because they are the beneficiaries. We would like to hear from them.

MR DUNCAN: The reason that I ask that is that we seem to have encountered a situation where the remedial training doesn't seem to be as successful as perhaps it might have been intended to be. Does that alert you to the fact that some more training of a remedial fashion might be considered? Sorry, refresher training might be considered.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Having heard your suggestion today, when we go back to our safety committee meetings, we will explore the idea.

MR DUNCAN: Just before we finish today, you have touched on a matter that I was going to ask you about. The safety committee has been set up. You've had one meeting. You've delegated certain work to other people. What sort of communication has there been with the bus captains and/or the unions so far with regard to these different proposals?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not yet. We haven't, not yet, because we have only just had our first meeting. In fact, in future, for the safety committee, if we are to conduct a review, if there are changes, we will only communicate with the trade unions once they have been finalised. This is because before it is finalised, and if we start to talk to them, it may cause confusion in the messages.

MR DUNCAN: When you say "finalise", do you mean you've made the decision and you tell the unions, or you've made a preliminary decision which you are then going to discuss with the unions, and then make a final "final" decision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: It depends whether it is controversial in nature. If it is not controversial, say for example, I suggest that I would like to increase the number of training hours, I believe it is not going to be controversial. In this case, I don't think there is a need to have prior discussion with the trade unions.

However, for other matters which may be controversial, then, depending on the circumstances, if there is a need, then perhaps we need to engage the trade unions at an earlier stage and communicate with them.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, that would be a convenient moment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

Mr Cheng and your colleagues, we have reached beyond 4.30, so we are going to adjourn proceedings today, and I'm going to ask you if you would be kind enough to come back tomorrow so we can resume our hearing at 10 o'clock.

Thank you for your attendance today.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you.

(4.34 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM NEW WORLD FIRST BUS SERVICES LTD 1
AND CITYBUS LTD: MR SAMUEL CHENG, MR WILLIAM CHUNG, MR PAUL LI, MR GARETH NG, MR KENNETH LIT, MR KENNY SO

Opening statement by MR SAMUEL CHENG 1

Examination by MR DUNCAN 4

2018 年 5 月 29 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士 ： 鄭偉波先生，董事總經理（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

鍾澤文先生，營運總監（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

李廣威先生，工程總監（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

吳智光先生，人力資源及行政總監（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

列俊華先生，營運支援經理（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

蘇國健先生，高級工程支援經理（新世界第一巴士服務有限公司和城巴有限公司）

主席：（經傳譯員）各位早晨，今日我哋係歡迎同埋感謝鄭先生同埋佢嘅同事，佢哋回應咗我哋嘅邀請，我哋邀請佢哋上嚟作證，協助我哋。佢同埋幾位同事今日都出席，係回應咗我哋嘅問題。我哋嘅律師就已經向佢哋提咗啲問題，今日律師亦都會再向佢哋問題，佢哋係樂意今日回答嘅。

首先，鄭先生，或者讓我直接同你講，首先我哋會有傳譯服務，或者你帶好個耳機。首先，我明白我哋冇要求你哋係請律師代表你哋嘅，所以我明白你希望一開始嘅時候，就係作一個短嘅開場白，同埋用粵語進行嘅，用廣東話嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：主席，係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你而家開始發言。

鄭偉波先生：多謝。主席先生、各位委員、女士們、先生們，早晨。多謝委員會邀請我哋今日嚟到呢個聽證會，我現在代表新巴同埋城巴作出以下嘅簡短陳述。新巴同城巴經營專營巴士服務已經好多年，提供安全及優質嘅巴士服務係我哋嘅核心價值，我哋一向嚴格遵守規管專營巴士嘅所有法例、規例、專營權條款，以及所

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

有運輸署對專營巴士公司所發出嘅指引。就今次獨立檢討委員會對專營巴士所作出嘅檢討，新巴同城巴嘅取態係正面嘅。過往幾個月，我哋對於公司嘅運作，尤其是安全方面作出檢討，查找不足。近日，新巴同城巴已經成立咗安全委員會，專責檢討所有有關營運安全嘅事項，我哋初步確定有以下嘅範圍會作出改進嘅：

第一， 就係加強所有在職車長嘅新路線駕駛訓練；

第二， 增加新入職兼職車長嘅駕駛訓練時數；

第三， 向新入職嘅兼職車長提供課堂培訓，內容包括顧客服務同埋情緒管理（EQ Management）；

第四， 向在職嘅兼職車長提供重溫培訓（Refresher Training），內容亦都包括咗顧客服務同埋情緒管理；

第五， 由今年 6 月 1 日起，規定所有兼職車長必須提供佢正職嘅工作時間，以便公司更了解佢哋是否有足夠嘅休息時間；

第六， 喺今年嘅第三季，當公司嘅黑盒系統完成提升之後，每當車長超速駕駛，佢車上嘅黑盒會自動發出警號提示車長；

第七， 我哋已經開始探討對車長職位嘅申請人作心理評估嘅可行性；

第八， 我哋會繼續探討引入新嘅科技，以提升駕駛安全。

隨咗上述嘅事項，對於獨立檢討委員會將來所作出嘅建議，喺我哋有足夠財政資源，並且可行嘅情況下，我哋都會積極考慮，多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，鄭先生。我而家就係想請鄧樂勤資深大律師向你提出問題，佢就會用英文係向你提問嘅，我哋就會係有傳譯將佢譯番做廣東話，然後你用廣東話作答，亦都會將佢傳譯番做英文嘅。我諗我哋大家都要學下點樣樣好成功、好順利咁樣去做呢一樣嘢嘅，我相信就係要問嘅時候問得比較短，同埋就係答嘅時候，可能中間亦都有稍為一個停頓，希望大家謹記。鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席。鄭先生，早晨。各位先生，早晨。亦都再一次感謝你哋今日出席檢討委員會今朝嘅聽證會，感謝你剛才所作嘅開場發言，鄭先生，有幾樣嘢我係希望可以同你探討一下嘅，呢個都係源自你哋已經提供咗畀委員會嘅陳述書。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，係咪可以確認一下，係咪已經係傳譯咗做廣東話？係邊一個頻道呀？唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到呢個專營權嘅協議，你哋就喺呢個專營權協議底下去運作㗎嘛，關於呢件事，我就想請你就係揭番去呢個專營權協議嗰度嘅，你可以喺 TD-2 呢個文件夾第 386 頁嗰度搵到嘅。鄭先生，我知道你係代表兩間公司出席，當我問你問題嘅時候，我相信我會講係「間公司」咁樣樣，其實我講話

「你間公司」嘅時候，我都係講及你哋嘅兩間公司嘅。如果你想特別係指明兩間公司裏面嘅邊一間，請你隨時話畀我聽。你前面嘅嗰份文件就係嗰個專營權協議，而城巴有限公司就係喺呢一份專營權協議底下營運嘅，講及嗰個路線，我諗就係你哋係最新嗰份專營權協議畀你哋去運作嘅，就係靠呢一份，你明唔明白我講㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我明白。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。麻煩你睇第 7 條，請你揭去第 389 頁。或者你睇一睇番嗰個條文第 7 條第(1)款，7(1)嗰條，請你睇睇。

鄭偉波先生：我睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會睇到喺嗰條條文嗰度係有提及專營權公司要提供一系列嘅東西，其中包括就係一啲提升安全或者服務嘅設施擺喺嗰個巴士上面，而呢一啲都係應運輸署署長所作嘅合理要求，而且佢係有權不時咁樣提出呢啲合理要求嘅，睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋係提供咗嗰個陳述書，你話畀我哋聽，就係話喺 2003 年嗰陣時，運輸署已經決定就係要--我哋成日都係叫做黑盒，當時運輸署署長就話所有嘅公共專營巴士都要安裝呢個黑盒嘅，咁講啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住想問你呢一個問題，除咗 2003 年當時嘅運輸署署長作出咁嘅決定之外，運輸署署長有冇要求係其他指明嘅安全裝置要安喺個巴士上面呢？

鄭偉波先生：係有嘅，我舉兩個例子，就運輸署係有要求巴士公司喺車上面有啲較為--我諗我用英文先講到呢個字，啲“exposed seats”就要加裝安全帶嘅。而另外，我哋有小部分嘅巴士就係條樓梯係一條長嘅直樓梯，運輸署有要求我哋就要加裝額外嘅扶手。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋知道，講到你哋巴士上面嘅裝置，亦都有個車速限制器嘅，你剛才咁樣答，意思係咪車速限制器係公司自己嘅決定，就唔係運輸署嘅要求，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：呢個不是運輸署嘅要求嚟嘅，係嗰個巴士生產商佢加落去嘅設施嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以部門唯一嘅要求就係嗰個黑盒、安全帶同埋嗰個扶手，係咪呀？你剛才所提及嘅。

鄭偉波先生：我剛才提及嘅就係兩個我記得嘅例子，但係我唔可以肯定就只係得呢幾樣嘢，即係可能仲有其他嘅嘢，我而家呢度就未必答得到你。或者咁樣，我畀我

啲嘅工程總監李先生提供多少少呢部分嘅資料。

李廣威先生：主席，喺我哋嘅 submission 嘅 Annex page 29。第 29 頁，Annex 1.6，係第一次 submission 嘅 Annex 1.6，裏面係一啲巴士公司同運輸署達成嘅一啲協議，裏面亦都係包括咗一啲嘅安全設施，喺我哋訂購新車嘅時候，係需要加裝，需要考慮嘅。裏面包括咗座位嘅設計，其中包括咗一啲無遮掩嘅座位係需要安裝三點式嘅安全帶；座位係儘量需要有頭枕；座位嘅設計同埋安全帶嘅設計，安全帶嗰個嘅定位同埋車身嘅結構需要符合歐盟嘅標準。

喺另外一啲嘅安全設施方面，喺雙層巴士嘅樓梯係需要有雙重嘅扶手，令到乘客上落嘅時候，可以有足夠嘅扶手可以搵扶嘅。我哋亦都需要考慮到玻璃嗰個嘅安全，亦都需要提供一啲打破玻璃嘅錘仔，係有足夠呢啲嘅設施喺緊急嘅情況底下可以打破玻璃。

我哋亦都需要提供一啲閉路電視系統，可以協助巴士喺倒車嘅時候，可以畀車長佢睇得到，亦都需要畀車長可以睇到上層嗰個嘅情況，同埋乘客上落嘅情況。

喺巴士嘅防火方面亦都需要所有嘅物料係符合一啲相關嘅規例。相關嘅規例亦都係列咗喺第 31 頁嘅嗰個表嗰度。

喺引擎室嗰度，我哋亦都需要係安裝一啲高溫嘅探測，係當巴士預到火警或者高溫嘅時候，就會喺車長室度會有一啲嘅警號。

至於冷氣系統方面，假如巴士喺引擎室發生火警，就需要有一個自動嘅閘去令到引擎室嗰度同個冷氣系統係分離。引擎室同埋車廂之間亦都需要加裝一啲金屬做嘅防火牆，令到當發生火警嘅時候，火勢唔可以容易蔓延到車廂裏面。

至於其他方面，我哋亦都需要提供咪錶同埋車速限制。另外，就係輪椅位嗰度個位置唔可以提供座位。

喺冷氣方面，我哋個冷氣系統亦都需要去有一個全天候嘅控制，乘客座位附近需要提供嘅冷氣出口亦都需要係可以調節風量或者方向，多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，李生。我留意到呢份文件就係 2012 年 2 月份嘅，呢份係咪最新嘅文件嚟㗎嘞？即係喺方面，係咪最新嘅文件嚟㗎嘞？

李廣威先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）以前嗰啲文件，即係上一份嗰啲文件係幾時㗎，即係對上嗰啲文件，日期係幾時呀？

鄭偉波先生：主席，而家我哋手頭上就冇嗰份文件嘅，而家大家睇到嗰份文件係我哋第一次收到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係咪經常檢討㗎嘛，係咪呀？即係運輸署同你

哋大家經常檢討住呢份文件㗎嘛，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：李生。

李廣威先生：呢份文件出咗之後，冇再檢討過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係檢討完之後先至出呢一份，係咪咁嘅意思？

李廣威先生：呢份文件係喺多次嘅例會大家商討咗之後，就定咗呢一份文件，就喺 2012 年嘅時候，就係定咗出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。離開呢份文件之前，就我知道你提到嗰個即係限速嘅功能，其實你係睇到第 4(a)段都有講嘅。

李廣威先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇嚟冇一啲嘅規格喺度個喎，就係呢個限速嘅功能嗰方面，係咪㗎？

李廣威先生：其實大家都知道，或者係過往我哋嘅車都已經係有一個限速喺 70 公理嘅功能，不過喺呢度定咗就係一個正規化，所以大家都理解巴士嗰個限速就係 70 公里。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實呢個係一個理解，你哋公司同運輸署之間有一個理解係咁樣，其實就冇一啲具體咁樣寫明喺文件入面嘅，係咪咁嘅意思？

李廣威先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我係加多句，嗰個限速器喺呢啲專營巴士喺屯門嗰個 2003 年慘劇之後係咪先至裝，定係點樣㗎？

李廣威先生：主席，其實喺好多年前，巴士已經有呢一個限速嘅功能，早過 2003 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講幾時開始裝嘅呢，咁樣？

李廣威先生：其實喺柴油引擎方面，喺柴油引擎其實本身係已經有一個收油嗰個功能嘅。以我記憶，其實喺三、四十年前已經有呢一個功能，不過就當時未必係可以指定限制到 70 公里嘅時候收油，可能就係譬如話 75 或者 80，係視乎嗰個引擎嗰個設計同埋波箱嘅設計。到咗歐盟二期嘅引擎嘅時候，因為可以有呢個電子控制，所以就可以好容易做到限制喺 70 公里嘅時候會收油呢一個功能。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋講完第 7 項，我哋而家睇睇第 393 頁，都係嗰個專營權嘅協議，393。喺你嘅陳述書嗰度，你係提到嗰啲乘客聯絡小組。乘客聯絡小組，咁想問幾方面嘅，喺呢一度係關於呢個小組嘅。或者想請你係睇睇面前 15(3)，專營權嘅第 15(3)條。

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，我哋而家喺個畫面度睇唔到你所講嗰一頁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以就係睇一睇第 15(3)，393 頁，15(3)嗰度？我相信睇到，你而家係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。我哋睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。呢條條款就係規定公司就要制定一啲規則係關於嗰個會議同埋成員嘅，你有冇頒布呢類咁嘅規則呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我請我嘅營運總監鍾先生回答。

鍾澤文先生：主席，我哋呢個乘客聯絡小組就係每兩個月嘅會舉行一次嘅，我哋會喺唔同嘅巴士總站嗰度係邀請一啲乘客，佢係喺--入嚟呢個會議係發表佢嘅意見。同埋喺呢個會議裏面，我哋會邀請運輸署嘅代表同埋呢個我哋公司嘅代表係同乘客去商討佢哋提出嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗個問題較為具體嘅，你哋公司係有冇頒布呢啲乘客聯絡小組嘅規則，關於個成員同埋開會？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係有同運輸署講咗究竟點樣做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇係書面咁樣制定咗一啲規則呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺同一條條文嗰度亦都講咗話係運輸署署長可以作出指示，或者書面就係作一啲批准嘅，睇唔睇到嗰幾個字呀？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照你所知，運輸署署長有冇係出過啲咁嘅指示，或者係作出咁嘅批示呢？

鍾澤文先生：我唔肯定，因為都較耐之前嘅事。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲開會呢就係時不時召開嘅，即使今時今日都仲係咁，啱唔啱呀？

鍾澤文先生：啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）亦都想請你睇另一頁，係 CTB-2，170 頁。亦都係有一個翻譯本，係 172-1 嗰頁就係嗰個翻譯本。你會見到附件 4.1 就係你嘅陳述書，係附件 4.1，嗰個就係其中一個乘客聯絡小組開會嘅會議紀錄，日期就係 2018 年 2 月 27 號開會嘅會議紀錄，睇唔睇到呀？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）起碼喺翻譯本嗰度，我就睇唔到話究竟有幾多位乘客係出席當次嘅會議，有冇嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：呢個會議紀錄冇寫低。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一般會唔會係提及有幾多人出席嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：呢個會議紀錄冇提及有幾多人出席嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你揭到去第 173 頁，同一個文件夾嘅 173 頁，173 頁，CTB-2 嘅 173 頁，嗰度睇嚟就係 2 月 28 號嘅會議紀錄嚟嘅。我想問，呢個會議紀錄嗰度有冇顯示話有幾多位乘客係出席該次會議呢？

鍾澤文先生：冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實點樣決定係邊位乘客出席呢啲會議嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係冇限制咩嘢乘客嚟出席嘅。喺開會之前兩個禮拜，我哋會係透過公司嘅網頁，同埋喺個將會舉行呢個聯絡小組嘅巴士站係張貼啲通告，就通知乘客嗰個會議嘅日期同埋時間。咁當日，乘客就會係自由去出席嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，有幾多乘客會係出席嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：會視乎地區，一般都會有十個、八個嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你講係巴士總站，會唔會係有一個會議室係開會，定抑或喺戶外進行嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係會安排一架巴士就係停喺嗰個巴士站嗰度嘅，咁個巴士嘅出面亦會張貼咗嗰個乘客聯絡小組會議，亦都有同事喺個巴士出面就係叫嗰啲乘客就參與咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）再請你翻番去第 170 頁，麻煩你睇第 3 項，喺嗰一頁，嗰份文件嘅第 3 項，翻譯本就係喺 172-1 嗰頁嘅。翻譯嗰度就咁講嘅，就話建議係增加一個巴士車速顯示器，即係類似小巴嗰種，係安裝喺所有嘅巴士嗰度，同埋如果係超過嗰個車速限制，就會發出聲響嘅，睇唔睇到嗰項嘅紀錄？

鄭偉波先生：我睇到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就想請你睇睇，呢度就話係公司嘅回應，講到話係回應番喺車上係安裝某一啲設施，公司就會評估嘅，咁就係睇番一啲因素，譬如話係運作嘅成本、經濟效益同埋嗰個技術嘅問題。目前嚟講，就係冇計劃安裝所講嘅有關設施，睇唔睇到嗰項紀錄？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問下，自從 2018 年 2 月開始到而家有冇進行過你呢度所講嘅評估呢？

鄭偉波先生：其實我哋就係進行咗另一方面嘅評估，因為我哋就擔心個乘客會有更大嘅機會同我哋嘅車長喺架巴士上面發生爭執，因為即係而家其實近年都有啲乘客同車長有磨擦嘅情況出現。我哋就係驚，比喻嚟講，嗰段嘅路段嘅限速係 50 公里，而當時我哋嘅車長譬如佢係揸緊 52 公里，喺乘客嘅角度，佢就覺得呢個係超速。如果個乘客選擇即時同我哋嗰個車長理論嘅話，呢個會滋擾我哋嘅車長，所以我哋公司選擇就係透過個黑盒系統，咁就得知我哋嘅車長駕駛嘅時候有冇超速，繼而我哋就會有啲內部嘅懲處，就跟番我哋公司內部嘅指引嚟到懲處有超速嘅車長。我哋覺得呢一個方法就唔會製造一個機會畀車長同乘客發生磨擦，而同時我哋亦都可以監察到我哋車長有否超速，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鄭生，你意思係咪話你哋決定咗係唔會安裝呢一啲車速顯示器？

鄭偉波先生：喺現時，我哋嘅評估就係冇需要安裝呢個車速顯示器，反而對於監察車速，我哋會著重喺透過我哋嘅黑盒系統，我哋覺得呢個係更加有效。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會就係知道嘅，呢一啲顯示器就會係按呢個運輸署嘅要求喺公共小巴嗰度安裝，香港嘅情況係咁嘅，你知唔知道呀？

鄭偉波先生：我見過公共小巴有呢個顯示器。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，公司有冇查詢過，即係話係咪咁樣樣係有引致到公共小巴嘅司機同乘客之間係有磨擦呀？

鄭偉波先生：其實好多人搭公共小巴就係貪佢開得快，咁變咗啲乘客--即係我唔覺得啲乘客見到佢有超速嘅情況底下，就走去同佢磨擦嘅，即係呢個喺我哋香港人真係有去搭公共小巴，尤其是喺夜晚嘅時候，呢個係經常嘅現象嚟嘅，變咗就同搭我哋專營巴士係唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋講番嗰份專營權文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，鄧大律師，你未繼續之前--鄭先生，似乎公司就係決定咗就唔會喺巴士上面，喺呢個時候安裝車速顯示器，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：除非呢個係一個規定，否則我哋冇計劃去安裝呢個顯示器。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇將呢一個決定係話番畀你哋嘅乘客聯絡小組知呀？即係 2 月嘅時候開會吖嘛。

鄭偉波先生：鍾生回答呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鍾澤文先生：我諗我哋喺即場已經係回答咗嗰個乘客，就係我哋喺嗰個回應嗰度寫嘅，就係話我哋現階段係暫無計劃加裝有關設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇將你嘅評估結果，包括係嗰啲因素，即係話營運成本、經濟

效益同埋技術問題係話畀個乘客知呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋話畀乘客聽嗰陣時係有講埋呢啲原因嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰個會議紀錄就係話你哋進行評估，有冇進行過評估？如果有進行過評估，評估咗之後，有冇通知番呢個乘客聯絡小組呢？

鍾澤文先生：冇嘅，因為我哋係冇佢哋嗰個聯絡方法。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇進行過評估呢？

鄭偉波先生：主席，我哋係未進行呢個評估嘅，因為我哋喺另一個角度嚟到睇呢件事，嗰個關注反而就喺嗰個車長同乘客之間可能發生磨擦，嗰個我哋覺得係一個最主要嘅因素，我哋唔打算去安裝呢個顯示器。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，主席。或者而家想睇番嗰個專營權協議，而家就想睇一睇第 TD-2，410 頁。或者想大家睇一睇第 33 條，呢份文件嘅 33 段，或者請大家係睇一睇當中嘅內容。

鄭偉波先生：我哋睇咗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。或者想你哋睇一睇另一份文件 CTB-2，頁數就係 32 頁。CTB-2，32 頁，喺第 32 頁，呢度係比較難睇嘅，附件二，2.1，係你嗰個陳述書嘅當中嚟嘅，NWFB，寫住“Fuller Disclosure 2017”咁樣嘅，個版面係咁樣，大家睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：我哋睇到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。可唔可以係睇一睇嗰份文件，就睇第 42 頁，文件嘅第 42 頁。CTB-2，第 42 頁。咁睇唔睇到喺呢一版，有一個標題就係“Corporate Social Responsibility”，即係企業社會責任，睇唔睇到呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁理解啱唔啱呢？即係話呢個企業社會責任呢一份文件，就係嗰個專利協議嘅第 32 條當中係有咁規定嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。呢一版，喺呢一版嗰度，企業社會責任其實就係喺呢一個即係更全面披露呢一份文件當中係有關嘅，喺呢一個專利權嘅協議嗰度就冇睇到呢一個即係更全面披露呢一份嘅文件，即係城巴概覽，咁可唔可以同我哋講講，即係幾時係出呢一份文件嘅？即係呢一個 Fuller Disclosure，即係全面披露呢一份嘅文件。

鄭偉波先生：主席，呢一份文件係我哋每一年出一次嘅，就每一年喺 10 月嘅時候出嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪一個規定嚟㗎，還是係自願咁做，公司自願咁做定係點？因為我睇唔到喺嗰個專營權協議當中有咁樣講嘅？

鄭偉波先生：呢個係運輸署嘅規定嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁幾時係有咁嘅規定㗎？

鄭偉波先生：以我嘅記憶，都有超過十年。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁每一年出，係咪呀？即係公司每年出嘅，呢一份，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇一睇 39 頁，文件夾嘅第 39 頁。CTB-2，39 頁。當中就係有個標題就係「財務資料」咁樣。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當中就有一個損益表 2017，6 月 30 號嘅。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想你睇一睇營業額嗰一個部分，營業額就有兩項，車費嘅收入同埋廣告嘅收入。公司嗰個廣告入收入嗰個來源係點樣㗎？

鄭偉波先生：喺當年，我哋公司嘅廣告收入就係分開三部分嘅，有三個來源：第一，就係喺我哋啲巴士站上面嘅廣告；第二，就喺我哋嘅巴士車身上面嘅廣告；第三，就係喺巴士裏面，就有啲電視機咁樣嘅嗰個--嗰啲愛嚟賣廣告嘅。但係第三種就喺舊年開始就冇咗，因為呢一個嘅廣告模式就唔受歡迎，所以冇咗。喺現時，我哋就只係有兩種廣告嘅收入來源，第一，就係巴士站嘅廣告收入；第二，就係巴士車身嘅廣告收入。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁公司有冇計劃從其他來源係開源，咁係攞一啲廣告收入番嚟呢？

鄭偉波先生：其實可以攞到收到嘅來源，我哋都已經探討齊晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者而家想你睇一睇嗰個專營權嘅協議，TD-2，第 410 頁。而家想大家睇一睇第 34 條，或者大家睇一睇個內容。

鄭偉波先生：我睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢條條文就係講到有一個每年嘅報告，公司有冇一個即係每年經審核嘅一個報告，喺呢度規定嘅報告有冇每年出㗎？

鄭偉波先生：有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。咁你喺個陳述書有冇提到呢一點呀？

鄭偉波先生：係有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講講係邊一度呀？

鄭偉波先生：係喺我哋第一個 submission，first submission 嘅第 15 頁第 6 段嘅 A3。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。呢個係有講到審核機構嘅名稱，即係睇個報告，係咪？有講，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：有，係香港品質保證局，HKQAA。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁公司係咪可以向委員會提供一啲報告嘅一啲樣辦？

鄭偉波先生：可以嘅，我哋可以後補呢個資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而家講完呢一個--暫時講完呢個專營權協議先。我而家就想問--或者想請你睇 CTB-2 嘅另一份文件，呢一份文件就喺第 64 頁嘅。CTB-2，64 頁。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。你而家睇嘅文件就係嗰個架構圖。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個架構圖係咪顯示出嗰個高層管理層嘅架構呢？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司其實係咪有一個即係專門管安全嘅部門㗎？

鄭偉波先生：喺呢個文件就有一欄就係 Head of Operations，營運總監。喺呢個 Operations 嘅 division 轄下，其中有部門就係負責 service quality 嘅，而呢個部門就係譬如話我哋有車長嗰個服務唔好，做咗啲違規嘅事情，或者有交通意外，都係由呢個部門負責調查同埋懲處嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇一個部門係好積極咁樣睇安全嘅問題，即係唔係話單係咁樣被動式咁樣係睇嗰啲安全有違反嘅情況，有冇積極咁睇嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：主席，呢個公司以往嘅做法，以往就係如果即係有啲新嘅譬如話科技咁樣，我哋嘅同事就會嚟報告番畀我知，我覺得有需要就會搵埋其他高級嘅同事，就愛嚟研究呢啲嘢嘅可行性。而另外如果有大型嘅交通意外發生咗，我哋相關嘅同事就包括埋我、營運總監鍾先生、我哋嘅工程總監李先生同埋佢轄下相關嘅經

理都會去檢討嗰個意外嘅成因。

我哋係喺近排就正式成立咗一個安全委員，呢個安全委員會嘅職能就係去檢討同埋去審視所有我哋公司有關安全嘅事項。而呢個安全委員嘅成員就包括我就係個主席，跟住就係營運總監、工程總監、人力資源總監同埋高級營運經理，同埋高級工程支援經理。而頭先我述嘅呢個安全委員會嘅成員，其實喺香港個巴士行業嗰個工作經驗係非常豐富，頭先我講過嗰幾位成員，每一個人喺香港巴士嘅工作經驗都超過二十年，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我個理解係正確嘅話，你提嘅係安全委員會係最近先至成立，係咪？非常近期先成立嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係近到幾時呢？

鄭偉波先生：大約係三個星期之前。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前有冇邊一位人士係你公司嘅僱員，而佢嘅職責就係專注安全嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇特定話係邊一位僱員，因為有關安全嘅嘢，其實就係我哋即係今日坐喺呢處幾位公司嘅高級嘅人員大家都有責任。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會明白隨住時間，我哋有新嘅係唔同嘅安全有關嘅係技術，咁直到係你成立呢個安全委員會之前，我就想問下，公司裏面有邊個人係負責睇住跟進住不時變化係安全有關嘅技術嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：有關呢啲安全嘅技術，我哋嗰個信息嘅來源主要都係嚟自我哋巴士嘅供應商。巴士供應商如果佢係知道有呢啲嘅新科技，而又已經證明到有成效嘅話，佢哋喺同我哋公司工程部嘅同事開會嘅時候就會話畀我哋知，我哋當然就要詳細去了解到底嗰啲新科技係點樣去運作，同埋是否適合香港嘅應用，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想請你睇番係 CTB-1，第 54 頁。你去到第 54 頁未呢？呢個係你嘅 5 月 18 號嘅陳述書嘅第 1 頁。

鄭偉波先生：去到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係喺呢封信嘅第二段，你就係提及話成立咗一個安全委員會？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇打算係聘用任何人士，又或者係提名任何人士讓佢係有專門嘅責任嚟到去睇呢一個巴士嘅安全呢？

鄭偉波先生：你嘅意思係外面嘅人士定係我哋自己內部呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）兩樣是但一樣都得嘅。

鄭偉波先生：就現時我哋就冇計劃去聘任外面嘅人士入呢個委員會，因為頭先我哋亦都講過，其實我哋喺呢個委員會裏面嘅所有嘅成員，其實都喺香港有好長嘅巴士公司工作嘅經驗。而至於喺內部，我哋公司嘅內部，因為我自己嘅睇法，就係話有關呢啲安全嘅嘢其實牽涉嘅範圍就係跨部門性，可能係個車裏面嘅設施，亦都包括車長嘅訓練，亦都包括車長嘅招聘。所以喺呢一個委員會裏面，嗰個叫做primary responsibility 嗰個人就係我自己嚟嘅，因為我係睇晒咁多個部門，因為我係呢個委員會嘅主席嚟嘅，所以個負責人就係我嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）國際機構標準，你熟唔熟呢？ISO39001，你熟唔熟悉？

鄭偉波先生：我係近日先至聽過，之前我係未聽過，唔熟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者將其中一份文件係畀你睇睇，咁我哋委員會係有收到呢一份文件。請你睇番TU-1嘅第18頁。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，其中我哋收到嘅一份意見書就係抽咗呢一度出嚟，我哋就係有道路安全研究小組所提交嘅意見書，你熟唔熟呢一個係道路安全研究小組（Community for Road Safety）？

鄭偉波先生：唔認識。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好。麻煩你睇一睇嗰一頁嘅最後一項，個標題就係「巴士道路安全－安全管理系統」，麻煩你自己睇一睇先。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，其實我哋半夜係咪運輸署有交過啲資料上嚟，就講及係嗰個成員嘅呢？

MR DUNCAN：I think we did, Mr Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以協助係證人，咁可以將啲名畀佢睇一睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，剛才有機會睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：我而家睇到嘅，就係而家呢個screen我睇唔到嗰啲成員。而家見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一個機構話呢個組織嗰啲名字係你認唔認識？

鄭偉波先生：裏面只係有一個名字我係見過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊一個名？

鄭偉波先生：（經傳譯員）係司馬文。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。而家唔睇嗰個成員，就睇番剛才嗰份文件。

我就先想請你睇嘅，TU-1 嘅第 18 頁。嗰一頁嘅最後一段，鄭先生，佢會係繼續到跟住嗰版嘅，請你繼續自己再睇一睇呢一段文字。

鄭偉波先生：呢一版睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）麻煩你亦都睇睇 TU-1 第 53 頁。另一份文件嚟嘅，不過亦都係一個道路安全研究小組發出嘅。我想麻煩你睇 3.5 段之前嗰一段嘅，佢嗰個標題就係 ISO39001 道路交通安全管理系統，我想請你自己睇一睇嗰一段文字。

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，或者我哋亦都打埋第 25 頁出嚟。呢個就係呢份文件嘅首頁，係 2018 年 4 月--對唔住，2015 年 4 月嘅文件嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，想麻煩你亦都睇一睇呢份文件嘅首頁嗰個封面，道路安全研究小組一個關於香港巴士安全嘅報告。我想問你自己有冇睇過呢個報告？你熟唔熟佢嗰個內容嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：冇睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才係抽咗一部分出嚟畀你睇，嗰啲內容就係話講及嗰個標準，如果有嘅話，就會讓嗰個車隊嘅經營者就更加就係問責，同埋係更加主動咁樣去減少個意外同埋風險，有冇睇到剛才所提及嘅嗰個部分？

鄭偉波先生：有睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你睇咗之後，你會唔會認為係值得你哋公司去考慮呢？

鄭偉波先生：首先，呢個 ISO39001，就我哋對佢完全冇任何認識嘅，就喺香港公共運輸行業，我亦冇聽過有邊一間大間嘅公司係有應用到佢呢一個 ISO 嘅。我其實就係喺之前，就呢個委員會同運輸署嗰個 hearing 嘅時候，我喺嗰處先至得知有呢一個 ISO39001 嘅。

當然我完全唔知道佢係乜嘢嚟嘅，咁我就答唔到話是否會去用呢一樣嘢。我哋公司對於任何可以幫到我哋嗰個安全嘅嘢，只要係可行嘅，同埋我哋有足夠嘅財政資源愛嚟應用佢，我哋都係持開放態度嘅。呢一個我諗將來我哋要真係去了解一下，呢一個 ISO39001 到底喺乜嘢國家，乜嘢公司係有應用到，而應用咗之後嗰個成效又到底係點樣樣，咁我哋先至可以就較為深入咁樣去考慮佢，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺安全嗰個角度嚟講，你公司係咪都是不是即係睇下外國嘅公司...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，等一等先。我諗對鄭生嚟講，就係即係我睇喺呢一個即係嗰份陳述書，即係 24、25 頁嘅陳述書嗰度。呢個係第 8、第 9 頁嘅號碼。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗係可以打出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為尋晚好夜先至出，就未有準備得咁好，咁大家可以應該睇到運輸署嗰啲資料，我相信係，或者落啲，第 24、25，或者係花少少時間。鄭生，花少少時間睇下第 24 段先。23 段可唔可以打埋出嚟呀？然後就睇埋 24 段--對唔住，應該係 24、25 先啱。

鄭生，可以幫幫你手。我哋喺運房局同埋運輸署嗰度都畀個證供，咁呢個就係 2012 年係提出呢啲，其實呢個系統就係 2012 年嗰度係引進嘅，佢就而家就係睇下係唔係有效咁樣，同埋係咪即係應該係要採納嘅，採納幾多咁，或者呢方面你可能冇嘢補充嘅，即係你未必咁熟悉呢一方面。

鄭偉波先生：我其實係對於呢個 ISO39001 係冇認識嘅，所以對唔住，我係冇嘢補充嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者離開呢個課題之前，或者鄭生想講講，你就係喺今日聆訊之前係冇睇到呢度，咁將來會唔會考慮呢？

鄭偉波先生：將來我哋會去探討一下到底係乜嘢嘢嚟嘅，我哋係會考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你話如果可行嘅話，你都係會保持開放態度，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家想睇睇招聘嗰方面，咁其實你今朝亦都係有提過嘅。委員會係得到知會，係透過啲陳述書同埋透過聽證會咁樣，就係多年嚟係的確有短缺，係比較少人鍾意想揸巴士，想投入呢個行業，可唔可以假定就係你公司都係有同樣嘅問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：主席，喺近年我哋招聘車長係有困難。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我要想你睇一睇 CTB-1，第 24 頁。呢份就係喺第一份嘅陳述書當中抽出嚟嘅。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）最後嗰段，呢版嘅最後嗰段。喺呢一段你提到要符合最新運輸署嘅指引，同埋係要達到內部嗰個嘅目標，公司就係需要係請多一百二十位嘅車長咁樣。

鄭偉波先生：係，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司其實有冇一啲計劃係增加車長嘅工資，希望係吸引到更多人係投身呢個行業呢？

鄭偉波先生：公司喺 2018 年嘅 3 月就已經對於我哋嘅車長，尤其是新入職嘅車長就

有個特別嘅加薪嘅，我哋公司所訂立嘅薪金制度，其實都係要因應個勞工市場嘅情況嚟到訂立嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）3 月係加咗幾多？

鄭偉波先生：喺新入職嘅車長嚟講，就加咗係大約 8 至到 9%--sorry，新入職嘅車長係大約加咗 6%。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會係收咗一啲嘅陳述書，就係講到話嗰個嘅巴士車長嘅收入其實係唔夠競爭力，喺呢個運輸界其實唔夠競爭力。我就想請你睇一睇呢兩份嘅陳述書。第一份就係喺嗰個雜項嘅文件夾 MISC-3(MISC-2?)，644 頁。份文件就係 643 頁開始嘅，係兩版嘅。係民主陣線嘅一份陳述書嚟嘅。鄭生，有冇睇過呢份文件？

鄭偉波先生：我冇睇過嘅，但係而家我係睇緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。仲一度我想係你留意下，不過你睇一睇喺第 2 頁嗰度，第 2 項嗰度，2.1，係講到目前係專營巴士車長嘅薪酬待遇，你花少少時間係睇一睇，跟住我就會好具體咁樣係睇 2.1 嗰段嘅內容。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄭生，或者係你可以聽下鄧律師講就睇一睇份文件，咁我哋而家會有個小休嘅，或者喺小休嘅時間，你就花啲時間就再深入啲去睇，可唔可以咁樣？咁樣好唔好？

鄭偉波先生：好。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好。或者而家可以係小休二十分鐘，我哋係廿分鐘之後再開會。

鄭偉波先生：主席，我有個請求，可唔可以畀我哋睇到中文版本，呢份文件？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，冇問題嘅。

鄭偉波先生：多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）亦都係有紙張嘅版本畀你嘅，可唔可以係畀一份文本畀鄭生睇睇？

MR DUNCAN：Certainly.

主席：（經傳譯員）休息廿分鐘，唔該。

鄭偉波先生：好，多謝主席。

上午 11 時 29 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 51 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。鄭生，有冇機會睇到份文件呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才想問嘅就係 2.1 段，第 2 頁，特別係有提到就話根據呢個民主陣線就係話啲專營公司嘅車長就係 15,000 蚊嘅薪酬待遇嘅，咁就係比--對於非專營車長嘅$17,000 就係少咗 2,000 蚊嘅，咁呢個係咪你嘅理解嚟㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我其實就唔清楚佢講緊嘅人工係幾多小時嘅工作，因為佢呢度就只係引述咗兩個數目字，就一個就$15,000，一個就$17,000，就非專營巴士嗰處我就冇嗰個資料，不如我哋集中講一講我哋公司嗰個薪酬嘅情況。我哋公司嗰個車長薪酬情況，就喺我哋嘅 first submission。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我唔想係打斷你，鄭生，我哋一陣間就會講到呢一方面嘅。

鄭偉波先生：好。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你一陣間係有機會就係進一步解釋呢一方面嘅資料，但係就住呢一點，呢一個聲稱，佢話係有賸咗 2,000 蚊吖嘛，公營嘅巴士車長同呢個非--專營同非專營係賸咗 2,000 蚊咁樣，咁呢方面你有冇嘢想講呢？

鄭偉波先生：喺我哋公司喇，嗰 1,500 蚊呢個數字我係不同意嘅，因為...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解呢？

鄭偉波先生：...我哋公司嘅車長就一般嚟講，平均一日都有兩小時嘅加班工作嘅，所以如果以十小時嚟到計喇，十小時工作時間嚟到計吖，佢哋一般個平均都係呢個數字嚟嘅，佢哋嘅月薪就大約係有兩萬蚊左右嘅，咁呢個就係喺我哋公司十小時工作嚟到計，咁而非專營嗰處，佢話嗰 17,000 蚊，我就完全冇概念，唔知道佢係講緊幾多小時嘅工作嘅，所以就我唔能夠作出個比較。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你。我就講你哋公司嗰個待遇之前，仲有一樣嘢我就想係你睇一睇嘅，就係咁亦都係 MISC 第 2 號嘅文件夾，咁今次就係 632 頁。係有份翻譯本嘅，就係 642 頁第 2 號，642 嘅 2。可唔可以打埋呢一個 642 嘅中文版--632 嘅中文版？係邊個寫㗎，呢一份文件？照我理解就係係工

盟同埋工黨，同埋呢一個嘅職工會嘅一個聯會。鄭生，一版嘅啫，或者想請你係睇一睇呢份文件嘅內容，咁跟住我就會係向你問一、兩個問題，係關於下--比較底嘅段落，係保障車長公工資水平、保障巴士服務質素嗰一段，大家睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：睇到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。花少少時間係睇一睇，鄭生，一陣間我就會問問題嘅，好唔好？

鄭偉波先生：睇完喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，呢份文件所指稱嘅就係目前新入職嘅車長嘅底薪就係 15,364 蚊，咁就係低於陸路運輸工資中位數嘅$18,200 嘅，咁車長就係惟有超時工作嚟到養妻活兒喇，咁難怪車長嘅人手係不斷流失。或者後面嗰度唔好講喇，咁呢份文件其實所作出嘅比較，咁你其實個理解係咪都係咁樣呢？

鄭偉波先生：主席，呢個問題我會畀我哋嘅人力資源總監吳先生嚟到回應嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。

吳智光先生：好，主席。正如頭先鄭先生所講，喺嗰個整體入息嚟講，一個車長一個月如果佢做大概係有每日多兩個鐘頭嘅超時工作嘅話，佢嘅總體入息水平大概已經係去到港幣兩萬蚊左右嘅，咁所以如果喺呢個通告所寫嘅，用底薪嚟比對呢一個中位數，呢個係唔公平嘅，並不是蘋果對蘋果嘅一個比對嘅。多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者係一陣間會講得詳細少少喇，但係正話所講嘅其中一個睇法就係嗰個底薪，一個專營巴士嘅底薪，唔好計嗰個嘅超時補水喇，就係$15,364 嘅，咁相對於嗰個嘅陸路運輸工資中位數$18,200，你可唔可以係講--評論一下，即係點解唔係一個合理嘅比較呢？其他加薪唔好講，補水唔好講。

吳智光先生：好，主席，據我哋嘅理解，呢個陸路運輸工資中位數係包含埋超時工作嘅，並不是淨係個基本底薪嘅，多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁講啱唔啱？運輸署係完全冇規定車長嘅薪酬嘅，薪酬完全就係由公司去決定，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大家睇一睇其他嘅薪酬嘅數字，你哋係交咗呢啲數字上嚟畀我哋嘅，鄭生睇過嘅，你亦都有睇過嘅，有關嘅數字可以睇番 CTB-1，第 30 頁--實質上應該係 34，第 34 頁先至啱㗎，CTB-1，34 頁。你睇第 9 段，你話畀委員會聽，就係你哋嘅全職車長嘅薪酬係點樣樣㗎，咁我哋見到首先係城車嘅資料㗎，如果係喺 1999 年 3 月 9 號嗰日或之前受聘嘅話，咁嗰個底薪

就係 17,106 蚊，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）揭去跟住嗰版第 35 頁，呢個就係有第二個組別喇，係喺 1999 年嘅 3 月 10 號至到 2004 年 3 月 8 號期間受聘嘅，佢嗰個底薪就係 15,874 元？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有第三個組別嘅，受聘嘅日期係喺 2004 年 3 月 9 號或之後，佢哋嘅底薪就係 15,364 元至到 15,764 元？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住個資料唔係完全一樣，不過你哋亦都有分類嘅，就係講及係新巴，嗰個資料係由第 35 頁係去到第 36 頁嘅。如果我嘅理解冇錯嘅話，2004 年 3 月 9 號之後嘅薪酬，兩間公司嘅係一樣㗎。你可以睇番第 35 頁嘅第 3 段，嗰個數字就係同新巴嘅第四項嗰度嘅數字係一樣㗎，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋而家睇番 35 頁喇，我想係進一步了解一下呢度嘅資料，我初步睇過嘅，如果你睇，你就會得出一個咁樣嘅印象，巴士車長嘅底薪其實就冇加，反減咗個嘢，我有咁嘅印象，因為我就淨係睇嗰個底薪喇，即係話你比較 99 年 3 月同係 99 年 3 月嘅--同 2004 年 3 月之後嘅數字係唔同㗎，一個就係$17,166 同埋$15,364、一個$15,874，咁係咪係減少緊呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個係唔同時期入職嘅車長佢哋嗰個薪酬係不同嘅，呢個就係我哋因應當時勞工市場嗰個供求情況嚟到制訂嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）實質上係下降咗，04 年 3 月之後對比起之前，嗰個數目係減少咗㗎，係嘛？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，點解嗰個底薪$15,364--咁等我再問一次，再問過，我想問，今時今日，2018 年，今日今日嘅底薪係幾多？呢度寫「$15,364 至到$15,764」，咁今時今日，2018 年嗰個底薪有幾多吖？

鄭偉波先生：現時佢哋嘅底薪就係呢個數字，不過我哋公司現正係同唔同嘅工會商討緊 2018 年度嗰個加薪嘅，咁到加咗薪之後就嗰個數字會係唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以估計一下？即係大概會跳咗幾多，可唔可以話畀個百分比我哋？你可唔可以講下雙方各自嗰個睇法係幾多呀？

鄭偉波先生：我就聽到工會就有個睇法，有啲工會就要求要加 8%，有啲工會就要求就要加 10%，咁而公司就都未定得到會係加幾多，所以我唔可以喺呢度猜測就會多幾多錢，因為如果咁樣嘅話，可能就畀咗一個錯誤嘅信息我哋工會嘅同事，因為頭先我都見到我哋有啲工會嘅成員而家都喺觀眾席度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我明白嘅，鄭先生。今時今日嗰個現行嘅底薪都仲係$15,364 至到$15,764，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解又啱唔啱？以底薪嚟到計，自 2004 年到而家，係冇調整過--冇加過㗎？

鄭偉波先生：不是，而家呢個二零--我哋--其實我哋公司喺每一年都會同我哋嘅工會同埋員工代表嚟到商討嗰個每年嘅加薪嘅，咁現時你喺呢處見到嘅數字就係我哋公司 2017 年嘅薪金水平嚟嘅，咁 2018 年就要等我哋同佢商討咗之後先至會定到嗰個數字喇，咁我哋其實每年都係有--喺過往十年喇，過往十年，每年都有加人工嘅，甚至喺過往二十年，除咗係即係香港個經濟特別差嘅時候就會凍薪，否則，我哋每一年都係有加人工畀我哋嘅員工㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）2017 年嗰個底薪，作為一個車長係$15,764 喇，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：新入職嘅車長係$15,764，2017 年。Sorry，係$15,364 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁又有一個數字$15,764，...

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個先攞到$15,764 呢？

鄭偉波先生：佢哋入職嘅時候就係$15,364，咁佢就有個增薪點嘅，就係根據佢哋嘅年資，咁個增薪點就做得耐啲嗰啲就會去到$15,764 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個$15,764 就係以 2017 年嚟到計，就係最高係咁㗎喇嗲，係嘛？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我理解係啱嘅話，咁呢個係少於 2004 年嘅時候嗰個薪酬喇嗲，當時係$15,874 吖嘛，咁講啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：唔可以咁樣嚟到比較，因為佢哋係唔同時期入職就係唔同嘅薪酬架構㗎，咁我哋公司呢度我哋睇到個數據喇，就係啲好多年前已經入職嘅，佢哋嘅人工就係高啲嘅，因為當時喺香港請人係比起而家更困難㗎，咁隨住香港個經濟環境有所改變，咁喺嗰個勞工市場嗰個供求情況亦都有所改動，咁我哋當時就係用一個較低嘅薪金都可以請到人返嚟㗎，咁所以唔同時期入職嘅人，佢嗰

個--喺去到今日嗰個人工係唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我都明白嘅，咁我要確保我嘅理解係啱㗎，即係對於你所作嘅證供。一個新入職嘅車長，如果佢係 2004 年 3 月 7 號入職，係會攞到 15874 作為佢嘅底薪，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）以下所講嘅都啱㗎，係嘛？如果係今時今日作為一個新入職嘅車長，佢嗰個底薪就係$15,364 喇，係咪呀？即係話少咗 500 蚊喇，...

鄭偉波先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就對比佢嘅--同時係 2004 年嘅時候入職？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。我知道係有其他嘅津貼，你亦都有提過㗎，喺第 35 頁嗰度有呢啲津貼，剛剛有提過，即係如果我理解係啱嘅話，最好嘅時候，一個車長加埋補水係會去到係賺到一個月 20,000 蚊㗎，係咪呀？咁嘅理解啱唔啱？你嘅作證係咪咁講？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點樣由$15,364 係變咗做 20,000 蚊，可唔可以將佢細分？

鄭偉波先生：個底薪就係$15,364，咁喺下少少嗰處我哋寫咗，就話嗰個加班，每小時個加班嘅薪金，就係由個底薪除以 240，就再乘番 1.5。咁呢個得咗出嚟嘅數字就係九十幾蚊嘅，係 96 蚊一個鐘頭嘅，即係如果係加班就有 96 蚊一小時。我哋嘅車長一個月係工作二十五天，每天平均係兩小時嘅加班，換言之，一個月就有五十小時嘅加班總數，就乘番頭先講嘅 96 蚊一小時，得出嘅數字就係 4,800 蚊一個月，係加班嘅薪金。4,800 蚊加番底薪$15,364 就得出就係$201,641，呢個就係剛才我所講嘅大約兩萬蚊一個月，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你睇一睇 34 頁，文件嘅第 34 頁。超時工作，99 年 3 月之前就係唔同嘅，即係同今日嗰個超時嗰個補水係唔同嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：係唔同嘅，正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）同樣，99 年 3 月到 04 年 3 月之間，咁就亦都係唔同嘅，即係同 99 年嘅時候係唔同嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個率係加咗定係減咗，其實？

鄭偉波先生：喺 99 年 3 月之前入職嘅，佢哋嗰個加班就係乘 1.75 嘅，99 年 3 月至

到 2004 年 3 月，嗰個加班就係乘 1.5 嘅，咁而 04 年 3 月之後入職嘅，都係乘 1.5 嘅，呢個就係城巴嘅情況。喺新巴，嗰個同城巴都係有少少唔同嘅，如果新巴喺 98 年 9 月 1 號，由中巴轉職過嚟新巴嘅同事，佢哋嘅加班就係乘 1.35 嘅，而喺 98 年 9 月之後去到而家，全部都係乘 1.5 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁由於有咁樣嘅分別喇，1.75、1.5、1.35，咁喺超時補水咁多年嚟，整體嚟講，係加咗還是減咗？

鄭偉波先生：我哋呢個就要--即係所謂加咗、減咗，喺個制度上就係頭先已經講咗出嚟喇，喺城巴就最早期嘅車長就係乘 1.75，之後，由 99 年開始請番嚟嗰啲就係 1.5，而新巴就有兩種嘅，一種就係由中巴轉職嘅，就係乘 1.35，咁之後請嘅就全部係 1.5。咁我諗唔係應該話用--即係如果對一個--同一個員工嚟講，同一個員工嚟講，佢如果係 1.5 嘅，咁就一路都係 1.5，就要隨住佢個底薪增加，佢每小時嗰個加班嘅薪金亦都會係增加嘅，即係喺同一個人嚟講，就唔會隨住時間，佢嗰個加班，每個小時嘅加班收入係減少，就不會有呢個情況發生嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 34 頁嗰度，嗰個每個鐘頭嘅超時工作，薪酬除 240 再乘 1.5，咁其實呢個就比起即係底薪除 240 乘 1.5 係有唔同㗎喎，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：計咗出嚟嘅答案係有唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）底薪，照我理解就係反映咗八個鐘頭嘅工作，係咪㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實你哋嘅車長係咪淨係八小時工作嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個佔絕少部分，平均嚟講佢哋係工作十小時嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，咁即係絕大部分少數還是係即係只係少數，定係點呢，可唔可以量化一下？

鄭偉波先生：我同事要檢視一下啲資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，花少少時間，唔緊要嘅。

鄭偉波先生：如果佢哋嘅工作時間係八小時至到八小時三十分，就嗰個百分比大約係12%左右。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁其實大多數嘅車長係咪都係有超時工作嘅呢，還是公司就話「你冇得揀㗎喇，你必須係要超時工作」嘅呢，定係點樣？即係嗰個情況會係點樣㗎？

鄭偉波先生：就係公司安排嗰個更分畀個車長，如果嗰個更分係要有超時工作，嗰個車長就要做超時工作。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢冇得揀㗎喇喎，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係冇得揀嘅，但係我哋嘅車長佢哋互相之間就可以調更嘅，即係大家雙方同意就係可以調更嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照你所知喇，鄭先生，咁呢一個公司所提供畀車長嗰個薪酬待遇，係咪令到啲人唔係好想去投身做呢個巴士車長呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我諗唔係個主要原因嚟㗎，即係當然，就幾多錢人工先至可以吸引到一個人去做一份工，就個個人就唔同嘅，即係同一份工，有人可能就話 15,000 蚊就覺得合理，有人就可能覺得係低，個個人唔同嘅。其實我哋而家請人嗰個困難，其中有一個原因，就係我哋發現嗰個--即係願意應徵做巴士車長嘅人就多數就住喺啲新界偏遠嘅地方，例如係啲公共屋邨，咁但係如果要佢哋每日來回咁長時間搭車返工、放工，咁呢就令到佢哋就覺得係唔適合嘅，即係呢個我哋覺得係其中一個原因嚟嘅。其實我哋每日我哋公司都有人嚟應徵做我哋嘅巴士車長嘅，但係個問題就係話應徵嘅人同我哋嘅空缺都仲有一個距離，就所以我哋而家持續都係有空缺喺處嘅，就不是就話而家呢個人工就冇人肯嚟做，就唔係咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係你正話所提嘅，啲人就住喺新界嘅屋邨咁樣，咁其實喺你陳述書係有講嘅，第 29 頁嗰度，CTB-1，29。

鄭偉波先生：我係有講嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇考慮過一啲方法嚟到克服呢一個問題？即係當然喇，即係除咗改變啲路線等等之外，我諗緊譬如話一啲嘅穿梭巴士畀啲車長咁樣，提供穿梭巴士畀佢哋，公司有冇有一啲嘅措施嚟到去緩解呢個問題呢，解決呢個問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋一向有提供員工車接載佢哋返工、放工，但係當然喇，就唔係話每一個同事都去到佢門口度嚟到接載喇，係分開一個一個地區咁樣嚟到接載佢哋嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咩嘢車嚟㗎，你派啲咩嘢車出去接佢哋？

鄭偉波先生：係我哋啲巴士嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有一定嘅路線㗎，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：有嘅，有定嘅地點、定嘅路線嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係穿梭巴士又得唔得？直接嘅路線，等啲人可以快啲咁樣由屋邨上車就去到總站，可唔可以考慮呢一點？

鄭偉波先生：或者我想講解多一次吖，呢啲係員工巴士嚟嘅，就唔係我哋平時嗰啲喺街見到專利路線嘅巴士嚟嘅，就係我哋特定安排咗，就去比較多我哋員工居住

嘅地區，就去接佢哋返工嘅，咁而接咗佢哋之後，就係多數就返番嚟我哋嘅車廠，因為我哋嘅車廠係一個主要嘅簽到點嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你提到即係嗰個薪酬待遇，提到嗰個嘅即係招聘困難，因為啲人住得比較偏遠嘅地方，咁有冇一啲嘅因素係多年嚟即係令到點解係咁難請呢啲車長呢？

鄭偉波先生：其實我哋話難請車長就並不是多年來嘅，係近年來，即係近呢幾年。咁另外一樣喇，就我都想喺呢一處就同委員會提供一啲資訊喇，我哋喺過往呢幾年就發現我哋安排嘅後備車長愛嚟填補啲員工嘅病假，係要不斷嚟到增加，咁其中我哋相信--唔係相信先喇，個原因就係因為我哋嘅車長佢哋攞病假係一路增加嘅，喺過往呢幾年，就變咗我哋所謂有唔足夠車長其中一個原因，就係我請人返嚟，跟住又有多啲人就走去攞咗病假，咁而呢啲病假有部分我哋係有懷疑過係騙取病假嘅。咁當然喇，有呢啲情況，公司如果係有真憑實據就試過係即時解僱呢啲車長嘅，而另外有啲都係我哋覺得係高度懷疑係騙取病假嘅，我哋亦都作出處理嘅。但係我哋喺呢處就話--經常就話唔夠車長，其實就唔係話完全冇人嚟應徵，每一日都有人嚟應徵，我哋嘅車長訓練部每一日都有新嘅車長係加入嚟到培訓，但係最主要就係嗰個病假嗰度係一個令我哋覺得係一個好頭痛嘅問題嚟嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想麻煩你睇第 29 頁，係你第一份嘅意見書，第 29 頁嘅，係 CTB-1 嘅 29 頁。喺嗰頁嘅底下嗰度提到話嗰啲工作時間就不利社交生活嘅，喺我未問你呢個問題之前，想麻煩你亦都去睇睇之前嗰頁，第 28 頁。你有提及呢個營運嘅效率，因為營運嘅效率，咁所以就係將佢係分開嗰個十四個鐘，即係如果係全職嘅話，就十四個鐘嘅話就係變成十個鐘，咁然後兼職嘅就四個鐘，睇番呢度所講嘅，你可唔可以話畀委員會聽，究竟一個巴士車長如果佢做十個中頭嘅話，典型嗰個分布係點樣樣，幾時開工、幾時收工，同埋幾時會有休息時間？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我畀我營運總監鍾生嚟到回答。

鍾澤文先生：主席，一個正常嘅更分通常會係朝頭早六點零鐘就會開工，咁我哋會分咗係有一啲叫做「早更」，早更嘅同事佢哋喺六點零鐘開工或者五點幾鐘開工喇，一般係會喺兩點鐘--點零兩點鐘就會收工，咁佢哋就會係由夜更嘅夜車長就會去接替佢哋嘅工作，咁就分咗早更同夜更，咁夜更係兩、三點鐘開工就會做到夜晚黑嘅 12 點、1 點鐘嘅。除此之外，我哋有啲更分係會比較長一啲嘅，咁佢哋會做係 6、7 點鐘開工喇，就做到夜晚黑嘅 7 點鐘、8 點鐘嘅，咁就 cover 咗繁忙時間，咁亦都有一啲會係六點零鐘、七點鐘收工，之後我哋會--頭先所講，會搵一啲 part-time 嚟係去做多幾個鐘，去 cover 埋嗰個尾嘅繁忙時間。多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲時間就需要係車長係喺唔同嘅更分裏面有一啲休息時間㗎，啱唔啱？

鍾澤文先生：啱嘅，我哋係會跟番運輸署畀我哋嘅車長工作同埋休息時間嘅指引去編排佢哋嘅休息時間同埋用膳時間。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）休息時間，呢個係喺一更裏面可能去到係兩、三個鐘㗎，係咪呀？啱唔啱？

鍾澤文先生：會有，不過都--我哋係會佔少部分，一般嚟講就係如果長--比較長嘅更分，譬如有十二、十三個鐘嘅，咁我哋會編排有一個茶休嘅時間，最少有三十分鐘，咁同埋亦都會有一個食飯嘅時候，係最少有六十分鐘，咁但係如果係譬如話你係一個十個鐘頭嘅更分，咁佢可能淨係只係得一個食飯嘅時間係--即係唔少過一個鐘嘅食飯時間。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，呢啲做十個鐘嘅，由開始至到結束係十個鐘嘅，咁係邊段時間或者佢一般嚟講平均係做幾多個鐘頭係駕駛嘅呢，係八個鐘吖，定九個鐘？

鍾澤文先生：如果佢係做十個鐘嘅更分，佢哋嗰個駕駛嘅時間一般係八個零鐘嘅啫，因為扣除咗一個鐘頭嘅食飯時間喇，同埋喺佢開工之前我哋亦都有啲時間畀佢去準備，譬如檢查架車咁樣，咁而每一個--每一轉車或者每一個單程嘅車，返到總站亦都有一啲 layover 嘅，即係一啲休息站--即係短暫停留嘅時間畀佢哋落車可以去下洗手間或者係飲杯水咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，佢嘅飲茶時間同埋用膳時間，佢係有呢個係人工㗎，係咪呀？譬如話佢工作十小時，其中一個鐘頭係一個用膳時間喇，咁佢有係八個幾鐘頭就係底薪嘅人工喇，另外有兩個鐘頭就係超時補水，係咪呀？我主要就係講呢個用膳時間，用膳時間佢係咪有人工㗎？

鍾澤文先生：係，用膳時間同埋啲休息時間都係有人工嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，請你睇第 30 頁喇，CTB-1 嘅第 30 頁，你喺嗰度有講過係巴士車長嘅要求同埋佢哋嘅訴求，其中就包括咗希望有多啲嘅係--總站嗰度有多次設施畀佢哋，呢一個可唔可以講清楚啲，佢哋係要求啲乜嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：就喺個總站嗰處喇，其實我哋一般嗰個車長嘅休息室都係偏細㗎，因為嗰啲地就唔係屬於我哋公司嘅，即係好多時係啲私人嘅物業嘅地方嚟嘅，咁我哋其實都想整啲大間少少嘅休息室畀我哋嗰啲車長嘅，咁呢個亦都正正係我哋啲車長嘅要求。而另一樣，就係好多時喺個總站嗰處，就附近就冇洗手間嘅，咁而我哋嘅車長亦都係有呢個嘅需要嘅，咁呢啲就係我哋一向聽到番嚟，我哋嘅車長希望公司可以提供到嘅設施畀佢哋嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）稍後我哋會講及呢個特別更次嘅，你喺新嗰個指引底下有講及特別更次㗎，我之後再講。如果我嘅理解係啱嘅話，公司都希望係將嗰個更次嘅時間將佢最高係限於十三個鐘，就唔係指引所講嘅十四個鐘，不過喺嗰十三個鐘裏面係有一啲限制嘅，即係話究竟十三個鐘裏面，究竟嗰個車長係用幾多時間去駕駛，咁講啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁喺咁嘅安排底下，嗰個休息時間--就包括咗休息時間嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁巴士公司諗住車長喺佢當值嘅時間，喺個更次時間裏面嘅休息時間，你諗住佢哋會係喺邊度打發嗰個時間㗎？有冇任何嘅設施提供畀佢哋，等佢哋喺嗰度休息一下咁？

鍾澤文先生：我哋而家就係冇呢啲特別更嘅，所以我哋就未有呢啲設施，咁但係我哋而家因為呢個新嘅指引，我哋有需要要引入呢個特別更分，咁我哋亦都係同咗我哋嘅員工代表同埋工會代表講咗，我哋會喺我哋嘅車廠同埋一啲泊車嘅場地係增設呢啲休息嘅設施，等佢哋可以喺呢段時間裏面，喺呢啲設施裏面休息嘅。咁另外，其實佢哋都唔需要一定要留喺呢啲設施，如果佢哋嘅屋企喺附近嘅，其實佢哋都可以返屋企休息嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鑑於鄭生有提及洗手間同埋冇地方可以喺總站嗰度使用，我就想問喇，你講到話提供一啲適當嘅設施畀做十三個鐘嘅車長去得到佢哋係兩、三個鐘應得嘅休息時間，咁究竟嗰個可能性或者個前景係點？

鍾澤文先生：我哋會係喺--因為我頭先所講嘅，喺我哋嘅車廠同埋一啲泊車嘅場地，咁嗰度嘅地方嘅限制同會喺巴士總站就有分別嘅，咁變咗就我哋可以喺呢啲地方設置一啲大啲嘅休息室，咁休息室裏面會有冷氣、雪櫃、微波爐呢啲設施，咁亦會有一啲類似安樂椅嘅座椅畀佢哋可以係攤咁嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁就照我理解，就而家係未有呢啲設施嘅，咁但係當呢個特別更行嘅時候就會係有呢啲設施，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：嗯，冇錯，因為都要需要時間去準備。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋離開呢一頁之前，TD-1，30，睇嚟車長係有一啲訴求，一啲嘅附帶福利方面都有啲訴求嘅，咁佢哋要求啲咩嘢附帶福利？係，而家我睇緊就係第 30 頁，羅馬數字第 II 嘅，即係巴士車長嘅訴求喇，包括以下：薪酬待遇好啲喇，同埋附帶福利係好啲咁樣。咁係乜嘢嘅附帶福利，即係其他嘅福利佢哋係希望係要求得到嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：（在低聲的說話）如果講話附帶福利喇，咁就係佢哋要多啲假期，就同埋就係要嗰個家屬乘車證就要多啲，就同埋裏面嗰啲限制就少啲，舉個例，譬如話個子女就有呢個乘車證喇，就曾經有人就提議過就唔好有年齡限制，即係個仔女去到 40 歲都仲有張子女乘車證，呢一類我都聽過，咁同埋就係又亦都有人向公司提議過，就係要增加睇醫生嘅次數，即係免費睇醫生嘅次數，主要都係呢幾樣嘢，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我唔需要個細節，咁但係即係其實呢個巴士乘車證嗰度係咪有一個咁嘅制度喺度㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）乘車證。

鄭偉波先生：我哋係有向我哋嘅員工就發出家屬嘅免費乘車證嘅，現時係有嘅，不過我聽過有員工就要求就係要畀多一張、兩張咁樣，就同埋啲限制就減低，呢啲我係以前有聽過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你嘅員工係冇醫療㗎，係咪呀？而家係咪冇㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係有醫療福利嘅，就包括門診就同埋住院保險。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想知道人力資源部門可唔可以係即係嗰個醫療嗰度嗰方面嘅資料畀多啲我哋，得唔得？

鄭偉波先生：可以，我交畀我同事吳生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔使而家講，或者喺書面--你可以書面畀啲資料我哋喇，你等委員會係消化一下咁得唔得？

鄭偉波先生：Okay，冇問題，可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你剛才就講到啲車廠同埋總站，咁有幾多個總--有幾多個廠㗎，你哋公司？

鄭偉波先生：大大細細加埋都有六個嘅--六個以上，即係有啲細啲喇，有啲係主要㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪全部喺港島區㗎？

鄭偉波先生：喺港島區車廠就有三個，咁跟住就喺大嶼山又有兩個，咁同埋有其他嗰啲地方就比較小，喺九龍又有，比較小型嘅，主要都係喺香港島。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者返番去薪酬待遇嗰度嘅情況先喇，或者請你睇一睇第 36 頁，TD-1，36。喺底下嗰度有提到一個表現良好嘅獎項嘅，嘅獎賞咁樣嘅，係喇，TD-1，36--CTB，對唔住，CTB-1，36，對唔住。你睇到良好表現嘅獎賞嗰度，睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有提到就係嗰個安全嘅獎金、表現獎金同埋勤工獎咁樣，咁呢個就係話員工工會係要求嘅，咁嗰啲獎金就重新納入到去嗰個底薪，咁我嘅理解就係而家佢哋都係不管佢哋安全好唔好、表現好唔好、勤工好唔好，咁全部都係納入咗去底薪，係唔係？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁目前嗰個薪酬待遇嗰度有冇一啲誘因，等啲車長就係要維持一個良好嘅安全紀錄㗎喇喎喎，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：但係我哋有個紀律制度喺處嘅，如果佢個安全係有問題嘅話喇，雖然而家就冇咗個安全獎愛嚟扣，但係我哋係會對佢哋作出紀律處分嘅，咁而如果受到紀律處分嘅話，佢又唔去改進，咁嗰個紀律處分就會向上提升，到最後如果真係好差嘅一個人，我哋就係會係解僱佢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢個安全嘅獎金維持咗幾耐，即係行咗幾耐㗎喇？

鄭偉波先生：呢個安全獎金就喺我哋公司行咗好多年㗎喇，咁就直至到係 2018 年嘅 3 月我哋先至將佢歸納咗落去底薪裏面嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你納入去底薪，咁但係即係個底薪就會高咗，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：呢個有兩方面嘅效果嘅，就第一，就唔會有機會畀公司扣減喇，因為納入咗去底薪喇；第二，因為佢係底薪嘅一部分，就所以計算嗰個加班薪金嘅時候嗰個基數係增大咗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁個底薪都會增加咗囉，係咪呀？都增加咗好多㗎喎，係咪呢？以前就係有個$1,285、$1,552 一個月嘅安全嘅津貼吖嘛，咁呢個唔係底薪嚟㗎嘛，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：以前唔係底薪。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解工會係要求咁樣將佢納入去底薪？

鄭偉波先生：係有三個原因嘅，第一，如果嗰三個嘅獎金係冇納到入去底薪，咁就有機會就畀公司扣錢嘅，例如如果佢揸車不安全嘅話，就有可能扣佢個安全獎喇；如果佢對乘客唔禮貌嘅話，我哋就有可能會扣佢個表現獎喇；如果佢有缺勤嘅話，就有機會會扣佢哋嘅勤工獎，如果呢三個嘅獎金全部納入咗底薪裏面嘅話，咁我哋就係冇機會會扣佢喇，呢個係第一個原因嚟嘅。第二個原因就係頭先我所講解過嘅，就係嗰個超時薪金嗰個計算喇。第三，就係我哋以往每一年嘅加薪就只係調整嗰個底薪嘅，而呢幾項嘅津貼我哋都冇調整嘅，即係除咗一個例外，就係喺 2017 年就係有調整過，喺 2017 年之前，我哋呢啲嘅獎金嘅數目就維持不變咗好多年㗎喇，咁而家將佢歸納咗入去底薪裏面，就變咗每一年嗰個薪金調整，呢啲數字都相等於係有增加到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，講番呢個安全嗰個嘅獎金先喇，即係當時喺度嘅時候喇...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋講呢度之前，或者應該而家係要食飯時候喇。或者想請鄭生同埋你嘅同事就關於個制度個運作畀多啲資料我哋。咁其實即係呢個點樣扣，有啲唔符合某啲嘅標準點樣扣咁樣，我哋想即係攞多啲資料嘅，我哋食完

飯先再講喇，呢方面。

鄭偉波先生：好，多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，而家暫時休會，兩點半返嚟，唔該晒，各位。

下午 12 時 59 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 31 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。係，鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席先生。各位，午安。鄭先生，喺小休之前，我就請你去睇一睇 CTB-1 嘅第 36 頁。唔該打番出嚟。我剛剛開始咗問你一啲問題，係關於表現良好嘅獎勵，我就問你呢一頁紙嘅下面嗰部分，我哋未去食飯之前，你曾經同我哋講過呢個安全獎金就其實行咗好耐嘅，根據你嘅意見書，你就話咗畀我哋聽已經將佢納入咗去底薪裏面，喺未納入底薪之前，我就想問下，究竟有乜嘢準則去決定個別嘅車長係可以攞到個安全獎金嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我同事鍾生會回答呢條問題。

鍾澤文先生：主席，嗰個安全獎金係會因應嗰個司機佢喺嗰個駕駛嘅方面有冇犯錯而去扣減嘅，佢犯錯嘅情況可能係因為交通意外，亦都可能係因為佢嗰個畀乘客投訴佢駕駛不當，亦都會係如果係我哋喺黑盒嗰度係發現佢係有超速同埋如果佢係有一啲我哋一啲駕駛嘅導師或者督察喺跟車去評估佢個表現嗰陣時發覺佢係有駕駛不當，我哋就因應佢嗰個駕駛不當嘅程度而去扣減嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話會扣減，咁呢個係一個獎金，其實係獎金就話喺原本嘅嘢之上加上去㗎嘛，唔係咩？

鄭偉波先生：主席，如果嗰個員工係完全冇犯錯嘅情況底下，佢哋會全數支取嗰個獎金嘅，但係如果佢係有犯錯，咁要睇下唔同程度嘅犯錯，呢個獎金係會扣減嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）明白喇。至於話嗰個良好表現嘅獎金，又用咩嘢準則呢？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生，唔該。

鍾澤文先生：良好表現嗰個主要係睇佢哋嗰個顧客嗰個服務，譬如話佢畀乘客投訴佢

態度唔好，而我哋亦都引證得到佢係態度唔好嘅，我哋會扣減佢嗰個服務表現獎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果冇投訴，就冇扣減，就自動會得到呢個獎金，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）勤工獎個準則又點樣嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個就勤工獎嚟嘅，如果佢係嗰個月返足工，即係個意思就係除咗佢公司編咗假期畀佢之外，其他應該要返工嘅日子佢全部都有返工，就會全數攞到呢個勤工獎嘅，但係如果佢有缺勤嘅話，就會按比例嚟到扣減呢個勤工獎嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺納入底薪之後嗰個情況，我而家就想有幾條問題問一問，目前個情況係咪咁呀，而家喺金錢上、財政上對車長冇咩嘢誘因令到佢就係會係安全啲㗎？

鄭偉波先生：喺錢銀方面，我同意嘅，呢度就唔會再有你所講嘅 incentive 嘅，但係我要重申，就係佢哋安全駕駛係佢哋嘅責任嚟嘅，如果佢唔能夠做得到呢件事，咁就要睇下佢所犯嘅規則係有幾嚴重，我哋視乎嗰個事情嘅嚴重性，就會對佢哋作出唔同程度嘅紀律處分嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇 CTB-2，209 頁，翻譯就可以睇番 209-1 同埋 209-2，好，唔該。睇唔睇到新巴有限公司一般站長及車長違規事件違例處分指引？呢度就係有係講站長同埋一般嘅司機如果違例嘅話就點樣樣咁嘅，係咪嗰頁有嗰個指引？

鄭偉波先生：我哋見到個指引嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺個指引後面嗰個部分，英文版就 209-2，嗰度就有一啲指引嘅，係關乎係超速，如果車長係超過咗嗰個車速限制就係點樣樣嘅。

鄭偉波先生：係，見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）罰則都有列出嚟嘅。

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）口頭警告、書面警告，以及係最終就係可能係將佢辭退，就唔需要補番薪金畀佢嘅，係咪就係呢一啲咁嘅罰則呢，即係公司就會考慮上述所講嘅各類罰則，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？根據係現有嘅制度，即係話將佢

納入咗做底薪之後，其實你哋冇任何嘅條文，即係如果有人超速嘅話，就佢嘅收入都唔會被扣減㗎喎，係咪呀？冇咁嘅條文嘅？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個情況就同係將佢納入底薪之後係唔同喇，之前如果有個人就係超速咗，咁本來畀到佢嘅嗰啲錢就會係扣起咗，啱唔啱呀？咁樣嘅理解啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）將佢納入底薪之後嘅一個影響，或者請你揭番去第36頁，CTB-1嘅第36頁，我哋睇番新入職嘅車長，佢目前嗰個底薪，如果我理解係啱，佢底薪入職就係$15,364，啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）再加上一個已經納入咗底薪嘅安全獎金，起碼就會1,285蚊，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：嗰幾個獎金已經包括咗喺$15,364裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）良好表現獎金又點呢？362蚊一個月嘅。

鄭偉波先生：嗰三個獎金包括安全獎、表現獎同埋勤工獎，全部已經包咗喺$15,364裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）明白。呢個改組或者納入咗去底薪嗰度究竟係幾時開始實施嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：2018年3月1號。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺2004年3月9號嗰日或者之前入職嘅，$15,364嗰個數字就仲少囉嗦，係咪呢？因為你嗰個數字係會有一個數再加呢一啲獎金㗎嘛，啱唔啱呢？

鄭偉波先生：係加晒呢三個獎金之後先至係$15,364。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）今時今日係咁樣，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）去番十二個月之前嘅情況，當時個底薪係會點嘅呢？十二個月之前嘅底薪係幾多？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我同事吳生會而家計一計。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，你慢慢。

吳智光先生：多謝主席。唔好意思，主席，我想舉個例，譬如話喺我哋--因為嗰個嘅津貼轉入去底薪其實就係 3 月 1 號就生效嘅，咁譬如話喺 2 月 1 號嘅時候，未有呢一個嘅歸撥嗰個嘅津貼嘅時候，其實當時嘅底薪，一個入職嘅車長就係 12,536 蚊。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁樣喺第 36 頁嗰度，因為 04 年 3 月 9 號入職--之後入職就係$15,364，咁而家你講就係--咁 2018 年 2 月 1 號之後入職就係$12,536，係咪呢？

吳智光先生：主席，我請問可唔可以再重複一次？

主席：（經傳譯員）你睇第 36 頁中間嗰度第羅馬 IV，04 年 3 月 9 號之後入職就係$15,364，而家你講就係如果佢哋 2018 年 2 月 1 號入職嘅就變咗係$12,536 嘅底薪，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：或者呢度我再講解一次喇，我再講解一次，我哋就係 3 月 1 號開始就將嗰三項津貼就納入去底薪嘅，好喇，咁即係話譬如話係 2018 年嘅 2 月嘅時候嘅情況，喺 2 月嗰個底薪就係$12,536 嘅，$12,536，咁我哋就將$2,328 嘅津貼，呢個總數嚟嘅，就加咗落去呢個底薪，另外佢哋嘅底薪亦都另外再增加 500 蚊，咁幾個數加埋就係$15,364 嚟㗎喇。或者我再重複嗰幾個數字，$12,536、$2,328 同埋$500，呢度全部加晒就係$15,364 嚟㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我聽到你講，但係我又唔係好明嗰個點樣計出嚟。

鄭偉波先生：或者我再重複一次，喺 2 月份嘅時候，即係未作出呢啲改動嘅時候，我哋嘅新入職嘅車長，佢嘅底薪係$12,536，而佢有頭先講過嗰三項嘅獎金，呢三項獎金嘅總數係$2,328，咁我哋喺 3 月 1 號嘅時候就將呢$2,328 由獎金改為納入咗去底薪裏面，而同時我哋另外再加 500 蚊人工個底薪，再加 500 蚊底薪畀每一位車長，咁樣嘅情況底下，佢喺 3 月份佢嘅底薪就係$15,364，但係就冇咗頭先講嗰三項嘅津貼，因為已經納入咗去個底薪裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我都聽多呢一次喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該你。好喇，而家就講完嗰個待遇，就講番嗰個嘅招聘女性嘅車長。其實女性嘅車長佔車長總數係有幾多呢？

鄭偉波先生：係低過 10%嘅，不過我要喺呢度要重新一樣嘢，我哋公司係招聘嘅時候係男女平等嘅，就唔會話因為係男士或者係女士佢有任何優勢嘅，但係就--即係呢個咁樣嘅結果，即係我相信就係嚟到應徵嘅人係男士多過女士。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁公司有冇諗過一啲措施就增加嗰個車長嗰個興趣呢，就係女性嗰個車長嘅數目嗰度，有冇提高佢哋嘅興趣參加、加入呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋現在我哋嘅招聘廣告--現時我哋嘅招聘廣告，我哋都有三位車長嘅

相擺咗喺我哋嘅廣告嗰處嘅，嗰啲相其中一位就係女車長嚟嘅，我哋希望咁樣就等公眾嘅人士就知道女士亦都係歡迎加入我哋新巴、城巴成為車長嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲女性嘅兼職車長？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我哋唔肯定，但係就算有，都唔會多。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想請大家睇一睇第 29 頁，文件第 29 頁，係閣下嘅陳述書嚟嘅，CTB-1，29，你就話畀委員會聽，喺呢一版嗰度，係關於嗰個兼職嘅車長，公司兼職車長嘅數目，我哋睇到總共就係三百一十四嘅車長數目，係兼職嘅，好喇，我理解到，從你嗰個嘅陳述書嗰度，即係第 36 頁嗰度，就係話個兼職嘅車長就係有時薪嘅，就係 80 蚊時薪，呢個係咪即係佢哋嗰個待遇嘅數目嚟㗎？

鄭偉波先生：正確，因為佢哋係每一個小時嚟到計算薪金嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一個率係即係行咗幾耐呀，呢個數？

鄭偉波先生：呢個數係 3 月 1 號嘅時候開始嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）今年？

鄭偉波先生：2018 年。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前係幾多？

鄭偉波先生：係 75 蚊，如果我冇記錯嘅話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪每年檢討㗎？

鄭偉波先生：唔係一定嘅。因為我哋呢個要去睇市場嗰個時薪或者個兼職嘅人工大約係幾多，咁我哋就要出番個相應嘅人工嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋喺寫字樓嘅員工，即係城巴嗰度或者係新巴，會唔會係即係有時都兼職做埋呢個司機？

鄭偉波先生：喺佢哋放咗工或者放假嘅時候，有時係會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁個數目又幾多喫呢，呢個裏面？

鄭偉波先生：現時係一百七十九人。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁差唔多係一半，即係而家個兼職車長數目嘅大概一半，即係你哋寫字樓嗰啲人就係做兼職咁係一半喫喇，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：不是，因為而家我哋睇番呢度，我哋之前個 submission，頭先你有引述過嗰一頁，314 只係新巴嘅數字，而城巴另外有 346 嘅，即係總數就係 660

嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）哦，我明喇。可唔可以講番邊一個數目？講多次數目，好唔好呀？呢度係 346，咁講多次個數目，好唔好呀？

鄭偉波先生：城巴 346，新巴 314，總數 660。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。咁當中即係 179 就係寫字樓做嘅，咁就係其中兩間公司都有，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係，正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。好喇，暫時唔講嗰啲寫字樓嘅員工先，大多數嘅其他嘅兼職車長，我相信佢哋有其他嘅職業嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嘅理解係咪咁？

鄭偉波先生：係，正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，或者我想你睇一睇第 59 頁，文件 59 頁，CT-8，59 頁，CT-1，59 頁，CTB-1，59 頁。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇下嗰一頁嘅 5B 嗰一段。

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰一段裏面你講咗啲嘢，其中就包括就話目前公司就冇特別要求職位嘅車長去申報佢哋喺開工之前有冇足夠嘅休息時間，睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗我咁講係公道嘅，喺呢度嘅 B 底下嘅第三段，講到--你就講咗就係話有一啲改變嘅，你就話打算係會有所改變嘅，呢一個係關乎招聘兼職車長嘅，咁講啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇 CTB-2，401 頁，應該係第 400 頁嘅，文件係喺第 400 頁嗰度開始嘅，CTB-2 第 400 頁，嗰度有個表格嘅，總共有四頁紙，由第 400 去到第 403 頁嘅，個名就叫做係職位申請表--「駕駛職位申請表」。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，呢份表格係咪全職、兼職嘅車長都係用呢一份申請表嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到係佢哋其他嘅職業同埋休息時間，我想你睇呢份文件--呢份表格嘅第 2 頁，你睇到個標題就叫做「重要資料」，第 3 項，嗰度係咪咁講，「現時有否兼職工作？如有，工作類型」同埋「時間」？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係每一位申請人，無論係全職定抑或兼職嘅申請人，都需要填寫呢一個部分嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你落到去 402 頁，即係嗰個表格嘅第 3 頁嘅，我哋見到嗰度有一個申報或者聲明書嘅，402 頁同埋 403 頁。

鄭偉波先生：係，見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？呢個亦都要填報嘅，呢個要喺申請嘅時候就要填報㗎喇，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：呢一部分我交畀我同事吳生作答。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

吳智光先生：主席，係嘅，就呢張表格嘅時候，嗰個 applicant，即係話個應徵者係需要寫嘅，但係我想補充一點，就係如果佢真係有填漏嘅時候，我哋亦都唔會話確信知道嘅。又舉個例，如果佢係申請我哋嘅工作職位嘅時候，如果譬如話喺表格最右手面寫住「補充資料」嗰一個欄裏面，如果佢唔填，我哋亦都唔會話一定要佢填晒嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁即係話唔會係獨立咁樣去查核一下嗰個人所填報嘅資料，係咪呀？

吳智光先生：可以咁講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）除咗呢個申請表格之外，如果你係招聘呢一個人擔任你公司嘅一個職位，我想問要唔要係填番--簽番一份正式嘅聘用書嘅呢？

吳智光先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇係就車長嚟講，有一份標準嘅咁樣樣嘅招聘書呢？

吳智光先生：係一個僱傭合約，係一封書信嘅形式啫，就並不是一個表格嘅形式。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會係兼顧到喺外間工作--兼職工作呢一啲嘅事宜呢？

吳智光先生：不會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀個咁樣樣嘅係僱傭合約嘅樣本畀我哋呢？

吳智光先生：可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔會晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢封信係咪全職、兼職嘅僱員都係一樣嘅呢？

吳智光先生：不一樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇係兼職嘅僱員即係嗰一封嘅招聘信，有冇嗰個樣本呢？

吳智光先生：我哋稍後可以提供畀委員會嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我要求嘅就係咁。我哋邀請你哋就係事後係補充嘅，我哋會開一個清單就係話你應承係提供啲咩額外嘅資料。

吳智光先生：多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：Could I bring your attention...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，未繼續...

MR DUNCAN：Sorry.

主席：（經傳譯員）...我想問下，過去嗰幾年，你哋呢封招聘書嗰封信嘅內容有冇改變過呢？或者形式有冇改變過呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋唔肯定。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你返去查下，如果有改變到嘅話，因為--若果你係有係新同舊唔同嘅版本嘅，麻煩你都畀我哋，等我哋知道有咩嘢改變。

MR DUNCAN：Can I bring your attention now to...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪有啲嘢想講，鄭生？

鄭偉波先生：冇問題嘅，我哋可以提供。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。係，律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席先生。我想請你睇另一份文件，都係關於呢一個課題嘅，CTB-2，404頁，個翻譯喺404-1同埋404-2嗰兩頁嘅。嗰個標題應該就僱員嘅行為守則同埋係紀律處分，然後斜哋，就話外間工作嘅聲明書，我想問，呢份文件嗰個目的係做咩嘢嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢一個如果我哋有個全職嘅員工喺我哋嗰度做嘢，如果佢又喺外面係有兼職嘅話，咁我哋要佢要話番畀公司知道嘅，而另外如果佢係一個喺我哋度嘅

兼職員工，佢如果有份正職嘅喺外面，佢亦都要填寫嗰個資料畀我哋嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據份文件嗰個係你嘅意見書嘅附件 7，我諗係你第二份嘅意見書嘅附件 7，或者我哋睇番第 59 頁，就係 CTB-1 嘅 59 頁。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你呢度見到就提及係附件 7，係喺第 5B 嗰段最尾嗰個部分講及係附件 7。

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度就提及一個每年嘅聲明或者每年嘅申報，我想問你哋有冇咁嘅要求呢啲文件又或者係僱傭合約有冇要求就係話僱員有咁嘅責任就報告畀你聽，即係如果佢喺外間嘅工作唔同咗，又或者係開始喺外面有其他工作，有冇規定要佢哋向你哋匯報嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：如果係正職員工就一定要報，如果係兼職員工，就唔--如果佢唔報番返嚟，我哋都喺現時嚟講，都冇去追佢嘅，但係喺 2018 年嘅 6 月 1 號開始，我哋就係無論佢入職嘅時候同埋每一年都一定規定佢哋要作出申報嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你講到係全職嘅員工一定要咁做，咁明顯就係佢每年就要填番一份表格，如果佢做外間嘅工作，即係喺嗰年嘅中間嘅時候先至去做外面嘅嘢，兼職嘅話，咁佢有冇責任係向你哋報告呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個詳細嘅情形吳生會作答嘅。

吳智光先生：主席，頭先律師所講嘅情況，個員工係有責任要向我哋作出申報，在得到我哋嘅批准之後，佢先至可以去接受其他嘅兼職工作。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁喺邊度見到呢個規矩、見到呢個條文就話要求僱員咁樣做呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）你或者可以睇 72-1 嗰版，嗰個係英文嘅譯本，72-1，我諗應該之前嗰幾版就係嗰個中文，CTB-2 嘅第 72 頁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）吳生，睇番呢度會唔會係幫到你答呢個問題呢？72-7 嗰個係英文譯本，或者 72-6。我睇緊嗰度就係員工守則係申報外間工作，嗰度就寫住按就係申請係做以下嘅兼職工作，嗰度就第 26 段就講及就係話應該--如果全職嘅話，就應該就係要先申請咗，先可以做外間嘅兼職工作，之後係每年要申報嘅，下面有不同嘅標題就講及，就係話要求提供啲乜嘢嘅資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒主席，係，究竟係邊一頁呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）我嗰度就係下面個角落嗰度寫住“72-1”嘅，係嗰個頁碼嘅。

吳智光先生：多謝主席。係嘅，喺呢一張嘅表格裏面，呢個附註我哋亦都講得好清楚，嗰個同事係需要作出申報嘅。同埋我都想講，如果我冇記錯，呢個我哋之後--稍後會返去再檢視一下，我印象就係喺我哋嗰個 employment letter，即係話嗰個招聘書--嗰個聘用書嘅時候，我哋都有同樣呢一個嘅要求寫咗喺度嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒吳生。如果你睇埋 72 頁 7，翻譯版本嗰度，你睇原本嘅版本第 26 段，係有提到同樣一點嘅，照我理解，我理解啱唔啱呀？

吳智光先生：對的。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。好喇，嗰個你考慮嘅更改其實就係針對嗰啲兼職嘅員工，就唔係呢個全職嘅員工，係咪呀？咁理解啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確，因為我哋全職員工而家已經有足夠嘅申報制度㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想請大家...

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪講另一個課題呀？

MR DUNCAN：Yes, I am.

主席：（經傳譯員）等一等先，嗰啲兼職嘅僱員，你係要求佢哋點樣做呢？即係佢哋一招聘之後，然後就係做額外嘅其他嘅兼職工作，你會要求佢哋點樣做呢？

鄭偉波先生：由 6 月 1 號開始，如果有一個工作申請者嚟我哋公司申請做兼職嘅車長工作，佢就首先就要填一份表，而呢份表就要講得出就係佢自己嘅正職係乜嘢嘢嚟嘅，嗰個工作時間係幾多點至幾多點，同埋星期幾係返工、星期幾係放假，咁我哋就可以掌握得到就係呢個人是否適合嚟我哋公司度做兼職車長。舉個例，如果有個人佢日日都要返十幾個鐘頭工嘅，佢嚟我哋度應徵兼職車長，我哋係不會僱用佢嘅，因為呢個一定係唔足夠休息時間。另外，如果有個人，譬如佢係一日係返八小時嘅工作，佢就同我哋講就話主要係星期六或者星期日嚟我哋嗰處做兼職車長嘅，咁我哋睇番個個案，我哋覺得係冇問題嘅，呢個我哋就會經過我哋一貫嘅程序嚟到考核，如果係得嘅話，就會請佢做兼職車長；佢除咗呢個入職嘅時候申報之外，以後每一年都要作出同樣嘅申報，如果佢係冇變到嘅，佢就填番同舊年一樣嘅嘢，如果佢嘅工作係變咗嘅，佢就要將佢新嘅工作嘅模式要申報番畀公司知。呢個就係我哋喺 6 月 1 號之後將會做嘅嘢嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實當你係請人嘅時候，你就會咁樣查詢，之後一年後，咁就即係睇下個情況係點樣，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個責任嚟嘅，咁佢哋即係做啲兼職車長係有咁嘅責任，如果佢係做呢啲兼職嘅工作或者係有其他嘅兼職工作，喺一年之內，佢有個責

任，係咪，匯報？

鄭偉波先生：佢有其他嘅工作，佢都要報畀我哋知，等我哋就可以了解到佢嗰個每一日嘅工作嘅時間係幾多，有冇足夠嘅精神嚟我哋度做兼職車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個規定有冇一啲表格、一啲文件係反映咗出嚟？

鄭偉波先生：喺 6 月 1 號開始係會有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家有冇一啲嘅資料，即係嗰啲表，呢度有冇喺度，有冇提供到？

鄭偉波先生：現時係冇提供到嘅，我哋可以後補。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想大家睇番一份文件，僱員嘅紀律同埋係守則--行為守則，中文版就係 66，CTB-1 嘅 66 頁，翻譯就係喺 72 頁嘅 2，想問一問，就係呢一個行為守則同埋紀律係適用於全職、兼職都適用嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：全部都適用嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想睇番第 26 段嗰度，翻譯就喺 72 頁，嗰度就話「外間工作」嘅，有個標題係咁寫嘅，提到全職嘅員工應該點樣做，即係如果佢係做呢啲其他嘅工作，喺呢度有講嘅，睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）正話主席就提到一點，其實有冇特別原因呢啲咁嘅條文唔適用喺兼職身上嘅？

鄭偉波先生：我哋公司嘅兼職員工其實主要就係車長嚟嘅，而車長喺我哋度兼職，就無論佢個正職係做乜嘢工作都好，而可以出現到呢個利益衝突嘅機會係等於零嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嘅諗法就係有不同嘅表格係畀兼職嘅員工，即係喺一年之內，申報之前佢哋有一啲兼職嘅改變，咁呢度係有不同嘅做法，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：呢個係出現咗有利益衝突或者有機會有利益衝突嘅時候先至需要填寫嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我哋暫時唔講呢度先，就講番你哋嘅陳述書，CTB-1 第 61 頁，或者想大家係留意第 7 段顧客服務同埋情緒智商嘅管理訓練咁樣，睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）B 同 C 嗰度，咁我哋係想睇一睇嘅，或者係睇一睇呢兩

段，等大家熟悉一下嗰個內容，好唔好？即係關於個內容係點樣。

鄭偉波先生：係，我哋睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你提到今年 3 月就係開始一個研究，係睇下一個可行性或者係可唔可以做一個心理嘅評估，等你可以係識別一下一啲申請者可能就係有一啲揸車上嚟比較躁狂或者係佢哋嗰個揸車嘅態度就比較粗暴咁樣，而家喺呢一方面嗰個進展係點樣呀，喺你做嘅研究方面有冇進展，進展成點？

鄭偉波先生：係吳生會作答嘅。

吳智光先生：多謝。其實我哋喺 3 月之後就開始咗呢個嘅 study，我哋除咗喺網上係下載有關文件，即係睇下喺出面坊間嗰啲嘅評估係點做之外，我哋其實亦都同一啲嘅專業人士開過會討論過，其中包括咗就係一個執業嘅精神科醫生，另一位就係香港一間大學心理系嘅一個教授，我哋同呢兩位專業人士都分別開會討論過就係嗰個評估嘅可行性同埋嗰個嘅收效--成效，而我哋亦都而家係約見緊一位--另外一位大學嘅機械工程系嘅教授，而呢位嘅教授素來就係喺呢個情緒影響駕駛方面係有研究嘅，咁我哋亦都想同佢約見，了解下佢嗰個嘅研究嘅成效。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你提到呢啲會議，佢哋係咪本地嘅心理學家嚟嘅？

吳智光先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一位教授，咁其實係邊位教授？有冇諗到邊一位㗎，其實？我唔需要你講名，或者即係咩嘢教授？

吳智光先生：係中文大學心理系嘅一位教授。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係畀咗簡介佢要點樣做㗎喇？

吳智光先生：係一個探討性質嘅，其實就係我哋交換緊我哋嘅背景、我哋嘅目的同埋我哋想佢 enlighten 我哋究竟而家坊間或者喺嗰個行業裏面嗰個做嘅範圍咁樣樣嘅情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你話呢個做法，佢哋喺呢行行內嘅做法，其實即係呢個範圍係乜嘢呀？係香港嘅範疇吖，中國嘅範疇吖，定係邊度呢？即係邊個範圍呢其實？

吳智光先生：其實我意思就係話喺世界各地有冇呢啲嘅心理嘅評估，亦都係喺--套用喺呢個巴士車長方面嘅，我哋嘅討論係圍繞住呢個方面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇係探討過--即係同本地嘅其他巴士公司探討過呢一方面呀？

吳智光先生：呢方面我哋冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個問題有冇接觸過海外嘅巴士公司呢，喺呢方面？

吳智光先生：沒有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話到畀委員會聽關於呢一個研究幾時會有啲進展呢？

吳智光先生：因為正如我頭先所講，我哋睇到第--另外有位機械工程系嘅教授，佢話要喺 6 月嘅時候先至可以同我哋見面，所以我諗最快我哋都要喺 6 月底嘅時候先至可以再同委員會講述番嗰個嘅進展。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。而家就由招聘轉為講去訓練嗰方面，培訓車長。我想問你，唔知以下嘅理解啱唔啱呢，其實要求點樣培訓完全係公司嘅事，就唔係話運輸署有作出過任何嘅指示嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係由公司決定出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）政府當局就冇提供過任何嘅係計劃或者培訓係多過你哋自己自行所提供嘅，咁樣講啱唔啱呀？只係由你哋自己公司所提供嘅，政府冇喺之上再提供其他嘅培訓，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）因為係咁，你所提供嘅培訓完全係獨立於其他專營巴士公司所提供嘅培訓嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：我哋淨係負責我哋自己公司嘅培訓嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，關於話要求啲乜嘢嘅培訓，作決定嘅純粹係你哋公司自己決定定抑或係你會同你哋其他海外嘅巴士公司傾過先至決定吖，定抑或點呢？係完全自己決定，定抑或你會問下其他巴士公司點樣做，然後你哋先至係制定嗰個計劃嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：完全係由我哋公司自己去決定嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想請你睇 CTB-1，37 頁，想同你講一講究竟目前嗰個情況係點嘅，即係關乎培訓方面嘅，首先睇番嗰啲嘅係做全職車長嘅。37 頁，打咗上去未呢？

鄭偉波先生：係，我哋睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。喺羅馬數字 I 嗰度，就係全職車長而冇一個係駕駛巴士嘅牌照嘅，有十五日嘅駕駛訓練，然後先至去考運輸署所舉辦嘅駕駛考試，若果佢唔通過嘅話，就會有多五日嘅培訓，通過咗嗰個考試之後，佢就有嗰個牌照，就會係請佢，就會開始做嗰個入職嘅培訓，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而呢個入職嘅培訓就包括兩個部分嘅，首先就係一個一日嘅課堂嘅培訓，第二個部分就係十至到十五日嘅駕駛培訓。

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）落去羅馬數字 II，如果想做全職車長，但係佢自己本身已經有巴士嘅駕駛執照嘅，佢哋就會參加嗰個入職嘅培訓喇？

鄭偉波先生： 正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話係一日課堂，十至到十五日就係駕駛培訓喇？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我有啲好奇，想知道喺香港會唔會啲車長係喺一間巴士公司轉去第二間巴士公司，即係喺巴士公司之間咁樣轉職，多唔多呢？

鄭偉波先生：係有，不過就唔多。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）又返番去第 37 頁，講到兼職嘅車長，如果兼職車長佢本身已經有巴士嘅駕駛執照，睇番嗰個標題，我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢，除非嗰個申請者佢已經有巴士駕駛執照，否則你都唔會請佢做兼職嘅巴士車長，亦都唔會係畀嗰十五日嘅培訓畀嗰啲申請做全職巴士車長嘅人嘅，咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？請兼職嘅話，係要請嗰啲已經擁有巴士嘅執照嘅人，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確，全部兼職車長佢都需要擁有巴士駕駛執照，我哋先至有可能會請佢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而呢一個類別嘅人士，你哋係提供兩日嘅駕駛培訓，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就同全職車長所得到嘅十至十五日嘅駕駛培訓就唔同，咁嘅理解啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：呢個理解係啱嘅，原因就係我哋--如果嚟我哋度做兼職車長嘅人，佢一定係平時都係揸開巴士或者揸開重型車嘅，即係大型車嘅，就變咗佢揸大型車嘅經驗就已經喺處㗎喇，咁嗰兩日嘅訓練就主要係路線訓練嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話佢有兩日嘅培訓，無論佢有幾多經驗都好，都係畀兩日嘅培訓佢，即係究竟佢係揸過巴士一個月吖，定抑或揸過巴士十年都好，佢都只係得到兩日嘅駕駛培訓，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：如果佢揸大型車嘅經驗係淺嘅話，我哋係不會請佢嘅，即係換句話嚟講，嚟到做兼職嗰啲，我哋請得佢嘅，佢哋都係有足夠嘅經驗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係咪想提及啲乜嘢嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：係，就喺而家大家睇緊呢一頁，就喺最底嗰處，我哋亦都有啲補充嘅資料嘅，當嗰個兼職車長--當啲所有嘅車長，無論佢係全職或者兼職，完成咗嗰個駕駛訓練之後，佢哋就要通過我哋駕駛導師嘅評核嘅，如果嗰個評核嘅結果係不滿意嘅，就會再有額外嘅培訓會畀佢哋嘅，所以喺嗰個兼職車長嗰處，佢係兩日，但係如果培訓咗佢兩日，佢係過唔到呢個評核嘅話，佢都唔會出去執勤嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你剛才就話除非佢哋係好有經驗，否則嘅話，亦都唔會請佢哋嘅，可唔可以講一講你話好有經驗係乜嘢意思呢？有冇準則嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：就唔係話一個準則嚟嘅，呢啲嘅有經驗嘅兼職車長，有啲就係以前就係揸開巴士嘅，係專營巴士，即係可能喺我哋公司做過，就離開咗一段時間，其實佢揸咗好多年巴士嘅，呢度有嘅；第二，就可能係其他巴士公司退休嘅車長。主要就係呢兩類，就係我哋覺得佢哋係有好足夠嘅駕駛巴士嘅經驗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢哋就冇課堂培訓，喺佢哋開工之前就唔會有課堂嘅培訓畀佢哋，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：現時係冇嘅，不過我哋遲下就會安排佢哋會有課堂培訓，就係裏面包括顧客服務、情緒管理呢啲嘅環節嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到係駕駛導師，你公司嗰度點樣樣先可以成為呢個駕駛導師呢？

鄭偉波先生：佢首先就要取得運輸署嘅駕駛導師執照，即係駕駛我哋嗰啲型號嘅車嘅導師執照，就先至有可能喺我哋嗰處就做到導師，而我哋嗰啲導師佢哋大部分或者全部都係以前好有經驗嘅車長，同埋亦都做咗好多年導師嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋公司總共聘用咗幾多位嘅駕駛導師呢？

鄭偉波先生：現時係有十五位全職嘅駕駛導師、兩位兼職嘅駕駛導師，另外我哋再有五位車長就喺不久嘅將來就會去運輸署嗰度考試，就考取嗰個導師嘅牌照。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我哋睇下一頁，第 38 頁，CTB-1，38，個標題就係「重溫課程」或者係「復收課程」，你就話係提供呢個重溫培訓畀嗰啲全職嘅、在職嘅車長，你亦都話就向呢個運輸署係作出咗承諾，呢一啲嘅重溫課程就會係起碼至少就每三年就會向在職嘅全職車長係提供畀佢哋嘅，然後就話係只係有課堂嘅培訓，跟住就講及嗰個培訓嘅內容。講到課堂嘅培訓，呢個係唔係同入職嘅培訓所講嘅係課堂培訓一樣呢？即係一個人新入職，就得到嘅課堂培訓同呢度嘅係咪一樣呢？所涉及嘅材料或者內容係咪一樣呢？

鄭偉波先生：大部分嘅內容係一樣嘅，但係我哋嗰個 submission，喺呢一段最後嗰句，就係嗰個交通意外嘅分析，由佢入職至到佢嚟到重溫培訓課程可能係已經經過咗兩年嘅時間或者兩年幾嘅時間，喺呢兩年幾時間裏面，可能就已經喺香

港發生過一啲值得佢哋去有參考性嘅交通意外，我哋就會將呢啲嘅個案就喺個課堂裏面就同佢哋嚟到分享嘅，就等佢哋知道點樣去避免呢啲交通意外嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時係畀運輸署嗰個承諾㗎？

鄭偉波先生：呢個都好多年前喇，我哋而家手頭上冇呢個準確嘅資料，對唔住。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番之前嗰一頁，喺最後嗰度，37 頁，你話通過嗰個評估之後，跟住就係派佢哋去某啲嘅路線就訓練。

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺培訓嘅時候嘅過程當中，其實佢哋會係睇到幾多條線㗎？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生會畀呢個詳細嘅資料。

鍾澤文先生：呢個就會視乎佢將會派去邊一個廠嗰度去做嘅，有啲係三條、有啲四條、有啲五條，不過就算五條嘅路線，有啲路線係重疊嘅，即係個意思佢雖然話嗰個起點或者個終點係唔同，但係喺中間好多部分係相同，舉個例，譬如話佢喺銅鑼灣嘅摩頓臺開車去南區，佢可能就係喺銅鑼灣摩頓臺南區經過香港仔隧道之後嗰段路都係一樣嘅，之後有一架車可能就去咗海怡半島，有架車就可能去咗華貴邨，咁就喺尾嗰段係唔同嘅啫。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實佢哋都係一路揸呢啲線嘅囉喎，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：佢哋會喺呢啲路線裏面揸一段期間，可能係幾個月嘅，之後就會調佢去其他嘅路線㗎喇，喺呢啲路線我哋--一般我哋介定為一啲比較簡單嘅路線，可能佢嗰個站--停嘅站比較少啲，或者係佢嗰條路就冇咁複雜嘅，係比較直接啲嘅，咁等佢係熟習咗嗰個路線同埋熟習咗個駕駛技巧，我哋就會調派佢去做其他嘅路線。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，有一個司機係要揸新路線嘅話，咁係咪會有一啲熟習嘅一個過程嘅呢，還是係佢一路揸一路學定係點呢？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生。

鍾澤文先生：新嘅路線，我哋會係睇下佢會--我哋有幾個方法嘅，第一就係話佢係咪之前會係有導師係教過佢行嘅，另外就係佢或者佢自己即係宣稱佢已經係熟悉嗰啲路線，因為佢如果係熟悉個路線嘅話，我哋就可以直接畀佢去揸嘅，但係如果佢係話佢唔識呢條路線嘅話，我哋會安排佢就係去乘坐係一個服務中嘅巴士就去認識嗰一條路線嘅呢啲巴士站嘅巴士站位，同埋喺嗰條路線係點樣行法。呢個就係而家我哋嗰個做法嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）從你嘅陳述書嗰度，如果我理解得正確嘅話，公司就係會有三間不同嘅供應商，喺巴士嚟講，三間不同嘅生產商，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：李生。

李廣威先生：係，正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊啲公司呀？可唔可以講一講？

李廣威先生：主要嘅供應商--主要供應商係 Alexander Dennis，即係亞歷山大丹尼士，第二就係富豪，另外就係 M-A-N，即係 Youngman。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我理解冇錯嘅話，呢啲個別嘅巴士生產商佢哋係有不同嘅型號，係咪呀？

李廣威先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，當車長係接受初步訓練嘅時候，你點樣決定佢揸邊類車呀，喺訓練期間，邊個型號，點決定㗎？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生。

鍾澤文先生：我哋會睇番佢將會派落去嗰啲路線，嗰啲路線係用邊一類型嘅車，我哋都會教佢嘅。如果係一個新入職嘅車長，其實幾種類型我哋都會教，即係喺嗰十五日裏面，我哋除咗話係教佢行嗰啲路線之外，每日都可能係教佢唔同類型嘅巴士，等佢喺呢十五日裏面係熟悉各種類型嘅巴士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才你提到四、五條線嘅，即係喺訓練、培訓期間有四、五條線㗎嘛，係咪呢？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有幾多種型號嘅巴士，一個受訓嘅人喺訓練期間會接觸到㗎？

鍾澤文先生：頭先我哋講過其實我哋有三個供應商，其實主要我哋大部分嘅巴士就係 Alexander Dennis 嘅型號，亦都有富豪，呢兩個係我哋最主要嘅，喺嗰個訓練裏面，我哋多數都會係用 Alexander Dennis 嘅車去訓練我哋嗰啲司機嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有咩嘢特別原因點解係咁樣呢？

鍾澤文先生：主要因為我哋大部分嘅車都係 Alexander Dennis 嘅車。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果司機係需要揸一個新嘅路線咁講，即係喺之後佢可能揸新路線，新嘅模型--型號，有冇一啲訓練嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：如果我哋有新嘅型號嘅車，我哋係會即係再安排訓練畀啲車長嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲訓練訓練啲乜嘢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋嘅駕駛導師會教佢哋呢啲新型號嘅巴士嘅司機位嗰個儀標板嗰啲所有嘅控制嗰啲掣，標板裏面關於一啲警告燈嘅燈號同埋就會畀佢哋喺個導師嘅指導下係駕駛一段嘅路程去熟習架巴士嘅運作咁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係半日吖，一日吖，定點呢？

鍾澤文先生：呢個要睇下嗰個巴士--即係呢個型號嘅巴士同原有我哋嘅巴士嗰個分別有幾大，即係舉個例，譬如話我哋之前有啲電動巴士咁樣，咁嗰啲--因為全--嗰個操控或者啲掣都好唔同嘅，所以嗰個時間就會長啲。因為我哋喺訂巴士嗰陣時，其實我哋都要求供應商喺呢啲控制嘅譬如話嗰個標板各樣嘢都儘量係標準化，就唔會咁多唔同嘅操控嘅方式，就方便我哋嘅車長係去熟習嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋返番去第 38 頁，CTB-1，38，你就向委員會提到一啲矯正嘅訓練咁樣，...

主席：（經傳譯員）等等先，鄧律師。鄭生，想問一問，喺呢一個即係嗰個復修嘅訓練、重溫嘅訓練嗰度，就畀呢啲全職嘅車長，係三年起碼有一次嘅，其實呢一個--點樣定呢一個嘅時間嘅呢？點解唔係一年一次呢？點定㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋覺得就冇需要一年一次返嚟返得咁密。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道其他巴士公司嘅做法係點㗎，喺呢方面，佢哋點樣做㗎？

鍾澤文先生：主席，據我理解，其他巴士公司同運輸署嗰個承諾都係每三年一次呢一個重溫課程嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道海外嗰啲巴士公司喺呢方面又點樣做㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇去對比過。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另一點就講到呢啲嘅重溫培訓，而家就係兼職嘅就冇重溫培訓嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：現時係冇嘅，不過我哋遲下亦都係會提供呢個課程畀兼職車長嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話遲啲，係幾時呀？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我哋要同啲兼職車長去商討，因為嗰個時間性，因為佢哋--要就到佢哋，因為佢哋可能有份正嘅職業，咁要睇下嗰個時間嘅安排，咁但係我哋希望可以儘快係搵到一個合適嘅時間方便呢啲兼職車長係返嚟上呢個重溫課程嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有冇接觸過呢啲兼職車長，有冇接觸過佢哋，喺呢方面？

鄭偉波先生：未嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，講到呢啲矯正嘅培訓，即係第58頁，第1段嗰度，你都睇到兩間公司就需要全職、兼職嘅車長係如果有一啲違例扣分，就要向公司匯報嘅，跟住就有一個計分嘅制度，就要決定究竟需唔需要係上呢啲咁樣嘅矯正嘅訓練課程咁樣嘅，睇唔睇到呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你其實係咪全倚賴車長本身係匯報呢啲咁嘅扣分畀你哋聽呢？

鄭偉波先生：個具體運作，吳生會同大家講解。

吳智光先生：主席，車長嚟講，佢係有責任向我哋申報嘅，呢個係第一；而第二，我哋亦都每個月係會隨機抽樣係搵一啲嘅車長出嚟，而我哋就抽咗佢之後，係要求佢讓我哋--簽同意書畀我哋去有關嘅政府部門去查核佢而家記分嘅紀錄。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個制度行咗幾耐呀？

吳智光先生：我印象起碼有幾年嘅，應該有五年嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇問題呢，即係呢個咁嘅制度？即係話佢哋係扣咗分，但係又冇向你呈報，有冇發現咁嘅事情呢？

吳智光先生：有試過，如果我哋見到有呢啲咁嘅情況嘅時候，我哋會作出紀律嘅懲處。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）時不時亦都曾經需要過咁做，有冇實際上發生過咁嘅事情呢？

吳智光先生：我印象係有嘅，亦都有啲嘅情況就係--睇下先，對唔住，應該係有嘅，不過亦都唔多。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想睇番第3段，即係標題係「矯正培訓」嘅第3段，喺2016年一百九十八位車長係參加過呢一啲嘅矯正培訓，我就想問下跟住嗰句係點解嘅，佢哋裏面嘅百分之76.3嘅車長就喺之後嗰六個月冇再係因為佢哋需要負責，而所以有紀律處分，可能嗰度英文嘅文法上面有啲錯誤，百分之76.3就冇話因為佢哋有交通意外而佢哋需要負責而受紀律處分係講之後嗰六個月，換句話講，減一減個數，就即係話就算係上過呢啲糾正嘅課程之後都仲有百分之廿三點幾佢哋再有呢啲咁樣樣佢哋係做錯咗而引致交通意外，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，佢哋有扣咗8分或者更多，佢哋就參加咗個糾正課程，縱使係咁，即係縱使佢哋係咁都好，之後都仲有再犯錯，需要紀律

處分，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係有嘅，但係當然，就要睇下佢哋嗰個再犯錯係犯得有幾嚴重，如果係犯咗嚴重嘅錯，而之前又有類似嘅錯，呢個我哋就會再提升嗰個處分嘅，甚至係有可能係解僱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一個比例對公司嚟講係咪需要關注呢？即係話有咁嘅百分比嘅車長縱使係接受咗矯正嘅培訓，但係之後依然涉及一啲佢哋需要負責嘅交通意外，而又要接受紀律處分，你哋關唔關心、擔唔擔心呢個問題？

鄭偉波先生：我同意係需要關注嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁又點樣樣去--係咪需要係譬如話試下修改一下你哋嗰個糾正課程，咁先至可以將呢個百分比係做得更好呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個係其中一個方向，我哋係需要再去分析佢哋係點解上完呢個堂都繼續會有意外嘅，因為呢個每一單意外個成因都係不相同嘅，我哋係需要返去再作詳細嘅分析嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係咪打算咁樣做㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）模擬訓練，我想講一講呢個安排，我哋都知道飛機師佢哋培訓嘅其中一個部分就會係揸個模擬駕駛嘅，我想問呢一啲咁樣嘅系統有冇嘅呢？如果有人係想做係車長，有人想揸巴士，即係其實佢哋都--巴士上面都載住好多乘客㗎，你哋有冇一個咁樣嘅系統嘅呢？模擬駕駛巴士嘅系統，有冇？

鄭偉波先生：我哋沒有呢個系統嘅，因為我哋覺得如果要練習駕駛巴士，係駕駛一架真嘅巴士，喺真嘅路面上面嚟到去行駛先至真係學到嘅。唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）不如你答番個問題，直接問嗰個問題，咁樣樣嘅系統有冇嘅呢？即係有冇咁嘅系統喺度嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋公司冇，不過我就聽過係有嘅，有呢一類嘢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁聽到嘅係咩嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：我以前聽過香港有--另外有巴士公司有呢個 simulator 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係邊一間公司？

鄭偉波先生：九巴，我係聽過嘅啫，我冇見過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇聽過海外嘅巴士公司有用到呢一啲嘅模擬駕駛嘅系統？

鄭偉波先生：我有聽過星加坡有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺邊度聽番嚟嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我剛剛喺我隔籬同事鍾生度聽番嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道喺星加坡政府佢哋都係會負責嗰個巴士車長嘅培訓，部分嘅責任都係政府做番嘅，有冇聽過呢？

鄭偉波先生：我畀我嘅同事鍾生答。

鍾澤文先生：主席，我哋係聽過嘅，其實我哋喺兩年前，我嘅同事亦都去過星加坡嗰度就係參觀過呢一個 simulator，同埋了解過喺星加坡嗰個 Land Transport Authority 佢哋喺呢一方面嘅運作、嘅工作係點樣嘅。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你同事去過星加坡，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係公司派佢去嘅？

鍾澤文先生：係我哋公司派佢去嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢係咩嘢職級嘅呢？係咪公司裏面嘅高層管理嘅人士呢？

鍾澤文先生：佢係我哋公司嘅經理級同事嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢返嚟有冇寫番個報告畀你哋，話畀你哋聽佢睇到啲乜嘢嘢呢？

鍾澤文先生：佢哋返咗嚟之後係有做過一個 presentation 畀我睇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪書面㗎？

鍾澤文先生：唔係，係一個 presentation 嚟嘅，佢係當時除咗話去睇呢個 simulator，仲係睇咗其他嘅--即係喺星加坡嘅巴士嘅運作嘅嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）關於呢個模擬訓練，佢主要係講咗啲咩嘢呢？

鍾澤文先生：主要，好似頭先主席講，呢一個模擬訓練，呢啲都係政府嘅一啲資助去做嘅，因為嗰個 simulator 都非常之昂貴嘅；同埋喺嗰個模擬訓練裏面係--都係會用--有一啲唔同嘅情況係喺嗰個螢光幕嗰度會播出嚟係去考核個司機嗰個反應咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係兩年前嘅，你咁講嘅，頭先，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當時係邊個嘅主意呢？係公司嘅主意吖，定抑或係政府嘅主意就係要睇一睇呢一個模擬訓練呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋唔清楚係星加坡係星加坡政府吖，定係星加坡嘅巴士公司嘅主意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪你哋自己公司嘅睇法，定抑或係其他機構或者組織嘅主意嚟嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：你係指去星加坡參觀呢一個？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀，係你公司自己諗到呢一個主意吖，定抑或係其他人提出呢一個咁樣嘅建議呀？

鍾澤文先生：呢一個 visit 係其實係我哋個黑盒嘅供應商喺星加坡因為有一個 EYTP 嘅 conference，佢請我哋去參--去 participate，咁喺嗰個 conference 之外，我哋另外再安排去參觀呢一個 simulator 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係巴士製造商定抑或係你哋係決定--自己決定話都想睇下模擬器呢--模擬？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢唔係話巴士供應商，係嗰個黑盒嘅係供應商，係咪 NEC 呢？係咪 NEC 邀請你哋去 UTIP，UTIP 其實係咩嘢意思？可唔可以講一講呢個簡稱其實代表乜嘢嘢呢？

鍾澤文先生：係一個 UITP，佢係一個國際嘅運輸...

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個簡稱究竟係--即係嗰個英文嘅縮寫係乜嘢嘢呢？係咪 International Transport 呢？

鍾澤文先生：我...

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪國際運輸...

鍾澤文先生：好似係，我唔 sure，我可以補番畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢自己有個網站嘅，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係關乎公共交通？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

鄭偉波先生：其實我嘅同事而家查緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒，你搵到個答案，就話畀我哋聽喇。

鄭偉波先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係當時就係你去參觀嘅時候，因為你喺星加坡，所以你就係借嗰個機會去睇過星加坡嗰個模擬訓練系統喇，當時係邊個提出一個咁嘅建議呢？

鍾澤文先生：係 NEC 建議我哋去睇一睇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇親自出席去睇過？

鍾澤文先生：我冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係你嗰個之後畀番個報告你嗰個同事自己去睇過，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你較早時候係咪咁樣講㗎，政府提供一啲資助㗎，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢意思係話星加坡政府係資助係使用呢一類嘅培訓，咁講啱唔啱呀？

鍾澤文先生：我嘅理解係咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。因為佢哋就係培訓嗰個車長嘅，係政府係培訓車長，就唔係巴士公司培訓車長嘅，呢個係透過佢哋嘅陸上交通當局去做嘅，係啱唔啱呀？

鍾澤文先生：啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）未離開呢一個題目之前，我就想問，你個同事去完之後返嚟向你匯報，你剛才所講嘅就係話其中報告裏面嘅一個元素就話都相當貴，除此之外，佢仲有冇匯報其他嘅嘢呀？

鍾澤文先生：我同事就匯報咗嗰個 simulator 就唔係咁真實，因為架車嗰個 simulator 係唔會識郁嘅，即係冇咗嗰個 3D 嗰個--4D 嘅感覺。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢一個模擬機器嘅製造商喺邊一度呀？

鍾澤文先生：我哋唔知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，之後你公司入面有冇進一步跟進，睇下會唔會考慮用呢類咁樣嘅模擬訓練嚟到去做培訓呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇考慮會採用嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）因為你係想真正實際嘅駕駛體驗，係咪呀？你係希望做呢方面，係咪呀？鄭生。

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家想講一講目前嗰個嘅培訓同埋將來你打算點樣做，鄭生，你嘅陳述書嗰度有講到就話會有一啲改變嘅，短期內，咁或者想你睇一睇 54 頁，CTB-1 第 54 頁，或者首先睇一睇 A 嗰段，呢一版 A 嗰段。

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我留意到你講到話最近有檢討即係一啲安全嘅問題，跟住就係搵出以下嘅範疇係可以加以改善嘅咁，可唔可以同我哋講一講呢一個檢討邊個參與呢個檢討㗎，同埋檢討咗幾耐呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個檢討其實就係我今朝有講過嘅安全委員會嚟嘅，我哋公司成立咗唔係太耐嘅安全委員會，而呢個安全委員會嘅成員就都已經寫咗喺我哋個陳述書嗰處㗎喇，就其實就係我、我隔籬嘅鍾生、吳生、李生、蘇生，就同埋今日有一位嚟唔到嘅同事馮生，就係我哋六位係常設嘅會員。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，你點樣進行呢個檢討呀？

鄭偉波先生：我哋就而家已經搵到出嚟，就係喺呢度個 submission 寫咗出嚟，就係 A、B、C、D、E、F、G--E、F 咁樣，就係呢一啲嘅嘢，初步我哋搵到呢啲嘅位置，就覺得需要改善嘅，咁而個具體嘅改善係點樣做法同埋嗰個時間性，咁我哋就會係分派咗畀我哋嘅唔同部門嘅同事而家去檢討緊嘅，有啲如果可以即刻做得到嘅，舉個例，就係我哋嗰啲兼職車長，就要佢申報佢嗰個正職嘅工作時間，呢啲比較可以快做到嘅，我哋就決定咗係 6 月 1 號就要實行。而有啲就要牽涉到就係唔係--有啲我哋唔係咁容易可以控制到嘅嘢嘅，舉個例，就係我哋嗰個培訓，課堂嘅培訓，提供畀兼職車長嘅課堂培訓，頭先鍾生都講解過，我哋就要時間，要就番嗰啲兼職車長佢自己嘅時間，就安排啲課堂畀佢哋返嚟上嘅，我哋就係每一個呢啲範疇，我哋都要睇嗰個實際嗰個時間性係點樣樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以檢討就係有書面嘅，係咪呀？即係有大家溝通、有便箋呀咁樣，還是坐低大家開會，就咁算，個程序係點㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋剛剛開咗第一次嘅會議，就我哋係有會議紀錄嘅，咁開完個會之後，每一個事項就要有唔同嘅總監或者高級經理係要負責跟進，有可能係一位總監，亦都有可能係跨部門係多過一位總監，佢哋就係要去睇一睇，就真係去實行呢啲嘢嘅時候，個細節--個執行細節到底要係點樣樣，好喇，知道咗，咁樣喺下個會議就會返番去嗰個安全委員會，就報番返去，就大家成個委員會就去要商討一下，再檢討一下，就有個真真正正嘅實行時間，呢個我哋就係我哋打算咁做嘅。除咗話去檢討之外，我哋亦都喺個委員會有傾過，就話檢討咗、實行咗，將來我哋嗰個跟進嘅工作亦都係好重要嘅，到底到時點樣嚟到跟進呢？我哋會繼續喺嗰個委員會裏面嚟到做決定嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會有第二次嘅會議？有冇建議第二次嘅會議呀？

鄭偉波先生：我哋嗰個委員會就暫定就每兩個月就開一次會，而董事總經理如果覺得係有需要嘅時候，就可以加開會議嘅。就而家其實我都一路問緊我身邊嗰啲同事，即係當然喺公司問，就係佢哋嘅進展係點樣樣同埋有冇遇到困難，咁如果我--去到我認為值得要加開會議嘅時候，我就會召開呢個會議㗎喇。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會係第一次開會個會議紀錄畀唔畀到我哋委員會參考呢？

鄭偉波先生：可以，我哋畀你。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。好喇，第 8 段，呢一版嘅第 8 段就提到就提升嗰個新路線嘅培訓嘅，即係對車長嚟講，係 54 頁，應該 54 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）全職、兼職都係有㗎喇，你喺呢方面有冇一啲細節，咁呢個訓練點樣係提升？

鄭偉波先生：細節鍾生係會提供嘅。

鍾澤文先生：咁而家新路線嘅安排就係個司機就係去搭一次嗰架車嘅路線，將來我哋會係除咗佢搭完呢一程車之外，我哋會再畀呢架車佢揸一次，呢架車當然唔係載客嘅，等佢可以熟習晒成條路嘅行法咁樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰個培訓嘅時數方面，即係啲新請番嚟嘅兼職車長嗰方面，個計劃又係點樣呀？

鍾澤文先生：新車長嗰個--即係兼職車長嗰度，我哋嗰個駕駛嘅時數會係由而家嘅八個鐘增加到去十六個鐘，另外我哋亦都會係增加一個四個鐘嘅課堂訓練，呢個課堂嘅訓練係會包括咗顧客嘅服務、情緒嘅管理、一啲交通嘅安全嘅知識同埋一啲相關嘅法例，例如話酒駕、毒駕、藥駕或者係嗰啲《殘疾歧視條例》等等呢一啲條例嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，有冇其他嘅建議？即係呢度喺底嗰度，第 54 頁，底嗰度，B，I 同埋 II 嗰度。

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，我唔明個問題，可唔可以重複？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以確定一下呢啲咁樣嘅提升嘅培訓，你正話所講，咁係咪包括埋我哋而家睇到喺第 B I 同埋 II 嗰度當中所講嘅細節呢？即係 54 頁同埋第 55 頁嗰度，係咪包埋呢啲㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係包埋呢啲。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，第 55 頁，嗰個重溫培訓就畀嗰啲車長嘅--在職車長嘅，呢個係咪全職同埋兼職都有份㗎？

鄭偉波先生：之前一頁嘅 B，我哋係講緊我哋係會增強兼職車長嘅培訓，而呢個兼職車長嘅培訓就係分開兩部分，就係羅馬數目字 I 同埋羅馬數目字 II，其實我哋一路而家講緊係兼職車長嚟嘅，因為全職車長一向已經有兩方面嘅訓練。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，我明喇。主席剛才問你一個問題，就係問到即係嗰一個矯正培訓嗰一方面，佢哋係得三年一次咁樣，呢個啱唔啱呀？係咪咁講呀？即係嗰個重溫培訓嗰度，三年一次，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：至少喺三年裏面要有一次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁我相信呢個期間，即係呢個咁嘅訓練期間，兼職嘅車長都係一樣，係咪咁樣？

鄭偉波先生：將會係，現在兼職車長係冇，將會係，將來。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係主席就問點解三年，點解揀三年呀？有冇一啲建議就話係可以檢討一下佢哋接受呢啲重溫培訓嗰個嘅期間，等佢哋就係得到一啲知識，就係需要採取一啲嘅步驟咁樣，等佢哋可以係--等啲乘客可以減低嗰個安全嘅顧慮呢？

鄭偉波先生：其實嗰個重溫訓練，我自己覺得就係同嗰個駕駛安全就唔係有百分之一百嘅關係嘅，係有部分有關係，反而我哋日常係點樣監察我哋啲車長嘅駕駛行為，呢個係更重要嘅。而嗰個三年一次嘅課堂重溫訓練，我哋暫時都冇聽到車長反映返嚟話隔得太長，不過呢個我哋可以同工會開會嘅時候探討下、聽下佢哋嘅意見，睇下佢哋覺得係有冇需要係加密啲呢個培訓，我哋要聽一聽，因為佢哋係受眾嚟嘅，我哋一定要聽一聽佢哋嘅睇法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我點解問呢個問題呢？就係由於似乎我哋遇到一個咁嘅情況，就係話嗰啲糾正嘅培訓似乎唔係好似你預想中咁有效用喎，會唔會促使你就係去考慮一下或者有一啲係又重溫、又矯正咁樣樣嘅形式嘅培訓會唔會有用呢？你會唔會係考慮係加密啲嗰個重溫嘅培訓呢？

鄭偉波先生：今日聽咗你嘅意見之後，我哋返去會喺我哋嘅安全委員會嚟到探討嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋今日未結束之前，我亦都提過一下你哋成立咗呢個安全委員會，你哋開過一次嘅會議，你亦都將一啲工作下放咗畀其他人士，我想問下，有冇同車長以及係所有嘅工會係溝通過呢，即係關於你哋安全委員會所提出嘅建議，有冇同車長、同工會提過呀？

鄭偉波先生：係冇佢哋提過或者未有同佢哋提過嘅，因為而家只係剛剛開咗第一次會議，同埋將來我哋打算就係喺個安全委員會有任何檢討、任何改動，有定案嘅時候先至會同工會講嘅，因為如果嗰個事情未成熟之前就走去同佢哋講，咁可能會製造到嗰個訊息混亂嘅。唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話定案，即係話你作咗決定，你就通知啲工會，定抑

或你作一個初步嘅決定，然後就同工會去討論呢，然之後先至作最後嘅定案呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢一個就要睇嗰個事情是否有爭議性嘅，如果嗰件事情係沒有爭議性嘅，譬如我話要加長佢哋嗰個駕駛訓練嘅時數，呢個我相信一定冇爭議性，如果咁樣嘅話，我唔覺得就需要話事先要同工會講嘅，但係如果有啲事情有可能係有爭議性嘅，我哋就要視乎嗰個情況，就有需要就同嗰個工會喺比較早嘅階段，就要溝通嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我諗係差唔多時候喇，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，大律師，鄭先生同埋你嘅同事，我哋而家嚟到四點半，我哋今日就係暫時到此為止，係想邀請你哋明天再繼續出席，我哋會明天10點鐘再恢復嘅，感謝你哋今日出席。

鄭偉波先生：再見。

2018年5月29日

下午4時33分聆訊押後

[blank page]

Wednesday, 30 May 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM NEW WORLD FIRST BUS SERVICES LTD AND CITYBUS LTD: MR SAMUEL CHENG, MR WILLIAM CHUNG, MR PAUL LI, MR GARETH NG, MR KENNETH LIT, MR KENNY SO (given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued)

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Cheng, good morning.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Good morning.

MR DUNCAN: Good morning, gentlemen.

I would like to start this morning by asking some questions relating to the devices that are available to the company with regard to bus safety.

The first matter that I would like to address is the question of what's commonly referred to as the black box.

In that respect, could I ask you to turn up, please, CTB-1 at page 55.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: Could I bring to your attention item 1 on that page, "Introduction of black boxes to our buses". Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Do those paragraphs contain a brief history as to the installation of black boxes in the buses?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: It seemed to have commenced in October 2003, with a requirement from the Transport Department for the devices to be installed.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then that would apply to buses first registered after July 2004.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could have the letter from the Transport Department, which I think is October 2013, which details this, so that this can be followed by others. I think it's annex 1, is it not?

MR DUNCAN: It would be, I think, at TD-2, page 205.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: So the buses registered after 2007 came with black boxes; is that a correct understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For the first batch of buses first registered after the effective date, that was in 2007, in other words between 2004 and 2007, we didn't have any batch of new buses. In 2007, we had the first batch of buses equipped with black boxes when they were first registered.

MR DUNCAN: Right. So did the bus companies themselves then provide the black boxes as part of the delivery of the bus?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

If I go back to CTB-1/55, it was stated that in 2010, your companies took the initiative to upgrade the black boxes to an integrated system, with automatic bus stop announcement capability.

Is that the position?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, before you pursue that line, perhaps we could establish what was the base requirement. It's the second page of the document we just looked at, the 2003 letter, and it's on the next page that the requirements are stipulated.

MR DUNCAN: So can we take you back to that page, please, TD-2 at 206.

In paragraph 2, do you see the requirements of the Transport Department as they were when the requirement was issued --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: -- in 2003, headed under (a) and (b) -- first of all, the operation times, the start time, rolling time,

idle time and finish time; and secondly, the speed of the vehicle.

Now, if you go back to --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me again, Mr Duncan -- item 1 stipulates the purpose of this requirement, does it not, in these terms?

"The purpose of the Electronic Data Recording Device is to provide tools for the bus company to monitor and manage the on-road speed- and safety-related behaviour of its buses, and indirectly to encourage better driving behaviour."

Do you see that, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

CHAIRMAN: What did you understand was the role, if any, that was to be played by the Transport Department in response to this requirement?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, the TD had a role. The TD took the initiative to promote the idea of installation of black boxes by the bus company.

CHAIRMAN: And thereafter?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thereafter, the bus company has to meet this requirement under the guideline. The technology at that time was such that those items were available, but then, a few years later, there was new technology. When our company became aware of that, we upgraded the system

of our black boxes.

CHAIRMAN: And how did you become aware of the development of new technology?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: May I defer to Mr Chung, my colleague?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, at the time we had a study. We were studying the idea of a bus stop announcement facility. We didn't want the bus captains to have an increase in their workload. Therefore, we studied the idea of making use of GPS so that there would be automatic bus stop announcements.

When we were studying the matter, we came to understand that the two systems could be integrated so that, in addition to meeting the requirements of the TD in relation to provision of data, we could also have the positions, the locations of the buses.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

So do I understand that it was the company which took the initiative to increase the available technology?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly that between 2003 and 2010, when according to the letter the company took

that initiative, the Transport Department itself did not require any further advances in the technology in the black box, beyond what it set out back in 2003?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung will answer this question.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, there wasn't.

MR DUNCAN: If I go again to your submission at page 55, at the bottom of the page you have set out the second-by-second data which is available from the black box.

Is that the data which is available today from the black box?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: For such a question relating to the technology, my colleague Mr Lit will take it.

MR KENNETH LIT: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Have there been improvements to the system between the time that the automatic bus stop announcement capability was integrated with the system?

MR KENNETH LIT: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: What are those improvements?

MR KENNETH LIT: Last year, in 2017, we started to install a new system. We call it RTS2, real-time system 2. We have added new functions, including the following. As Mr Cheng mentioned yesterday, in the third quarter, when the entire fleet has been fitted with this system, then we will able to provide a display; that is, we will

alert the bus captain when the bus is speeding.

MR DUNCAN: That's the real-time system which is yet to be implemented across the whole fleet; is that right?

MR KENNETH LIT: Correct. We haven't completed the fitting of the entire fleet.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Apart from the real-time system, were there any other improvements to what was available from the black box between the time of the integration of the system, of the bus stop announcement, up until the present time?

MR KENNETH LIT: No. For that period of time, no, no improvement.

MR DUNCAN: Now, when was it that the company decided that the real-time system would be implemented?

MR KENNETH LIT: Round about 2015, when the franchise of the Citybus was granted by the TD, among the clauses there was this requirement on us. That is, we have to provide a real-time -- to provide estimated time of arrival.

As a result of this requirement of the ETA system, it means that we require a real-time function. Therefore, round about that time, we started to prepare for the fitting of the entire fleet with this real-time bus stop announcement or the ETA.

MR DUNCAN: I would like you to look, please, at a document --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- you said earlier that this RTS2 system would be fully installed in the third quarter. Is that the third quarter of 2018?

MR KENNETH LIT: That's correct, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Could you look, please, at a document which you will find at BM1 at page 35.

Are you looking at a document which is headed "News release"?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we're reading it.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time to familiarise yourself with it first.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We are done, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Now, is it headed, "NEC won the contract of the integrated automatic bus stop announcement and data logger system by New World First Bus Services Ltd and Citybus Ltd"? Is that the heading?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Is it dated 13 January 2012?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Does the first paragraph announce, on the part of NEC, that it has won a contract in respect of 702 buses of New World First Bus Services Ltd and 172 buses

of Citybus Ltd?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see.

MR DUNCAN: And does it refer to the deployment of the integrated automatic bus stop announcement, ABSA, and the data logger, DL, system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. This is about the specific details. I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That is correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Then if I take you down to the third paragraph, does it refer to the fact that, "The BSA and DL system combines the Global Positioning System ('GPS'), bus odometer signal and proprietary snap-on-route technology to overcome the 'ghost' GPS signal caused by the unique environment of narrow streets and skyscrapers in Hong Kong"?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Then the last paragraph on that page, does it refer to the fact that, "The control unit also logs the position and speed of the bus throughout the day"?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: And that the data will be uploaded to the server via WiFi when the bus is returned to the bus depot?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: I want to understand exactly what this contract achieved for the company. If you go back to your

submission at page 55, CTB-1/55.

CHAIRMAN: Before you embark on that, Mr Duncan, might I ask this question.

Paragraph 1 has two parts to it. One is the contract which has apparently been recently won; and secondly, it states this:

"... after its successful implementation of the same system across 760 buses of Citybus, the only large-scale deployment of GPS and ABSA system in Hong Kong."

Of that statement, can I ask this: first of all, is that accurate; and secondly, when was this system implemented?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, this system was first implemented in the Citybus franchise 1. We started with franchise 1 and then we extended it to Citybus franchise 2 and also First Bus.

CHAIRMAN: The question was when was it installed, in terms of time?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Citybus franchise 1, it was June 2011. Citybus franchise 2 and also New World First Bus, the installation was towards the end of 2012; they were completed then.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

If you go to page 55, there is reference there at the bottom to the fact that:

"In 2010, our companies took the initiative to upgrade the black boxes to an integrated system with automatic bus stop announcement capability."

Is this via the NEC project?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, correct. That was done by NEC, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So was it 2010 or 2011?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: In 2011, we started discussion with NEC and developed this system. In June 2011, the installation took place in the Citybus fleet franchise 1.

MR DUNCAN: Right. So when you refer at the bottom of that page to something happening in 2010, is that the same as the NEC system you have just been referring to, or is it a separate integration?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Your question again, please, sir.

MR DUNCAN: I am trying to ascertain what happened in 2010, as we can see from the bottom of page 55. It is stated there:

"In 2010, our companies took the initiative to upgrade the black boxes to an integrated system with automatic bus stop announcement capability."

It would appear that that's what NEC did, according to your testimony a few moments ago, in 2011. Is that

correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So for "2010" here, should we be reading "2011"?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, if we have to develop a new system, it would take time, and in 2010 we took the initiative to get in touch with NEC to design the new system. With the new system, we have to install them in 700 or so buses, and that again would take time. We can manage a couple of them per day, because the buses are deployed on the road every day.

So, from the installation to the end of the installation, it took about a year's time. So, in our submission -- perhaps please turn to the next page. Here we say:

"The whole fleet of CTB (F1) was equipped with this integrated system in June 2011. The whole fleet of CTB (F2) and NWFB were equipped with the same integrated system at the end of 2012."

That's the same system that I'm talking about, because CTB (F1), during the franchise renewal, the government imposed a requirement that we have to provide the bus announcement system, so we had to complete the CTB (F1) fleet first.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you for clarifying that. So the initiative was taken in 2010 but the installation

commenced in 2011, with the help of NEC; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Duncan -- you say that in the course of the renewal of the CTB (F1) franchise, the government imposed a requirement that you provide a bus announcement system. Have we been provided with documentation that evidences that requirement?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In the franchise document, it doesn't specifically refer to this bus announcement system. But when the franchise was renewed, other than the franchise document, through exchanges of letters, there was an undertaking that something else would be done.

In our company, we do have that document with us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Would you be in a position to provide us with copies of those documents -- perhaps there were a series of documents -- so we can follow this point?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No problem, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I think there was reference earlier on to another document, a franchise, which first raised a question of real-time capability. Was that mentioned earlier, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, that was.

MR DUNCAN: Is that a separate requirement from the one that you just mentioned?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, that's a separate requirement.

MR DUNCAN: Was that expressed in a franchise document?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Like Mr Cheng said a moment ago, that was a separate issue. That wasn't inside the franchise document.

MR DUNCAN: So was there documentation backwards and forwards which would evidence that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, we do have the information. We can make available the information afterwards.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, if you would do so.

Can you give us the time frame of when there was this -- in the course of which franchise renewal was this, and what was the time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We had exchanges of correspondence with the Transport Department. That was a couple of days before, in fact, the franchise was awarded, we had to make these pledges.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Which year was that? Was this franchise 2 or franchise 1?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The franchise started to take effect in 2016.

CHAIRMAN: Was that franchise 2?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Franchise 1.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I want to move on now and explore what data the black box actually provides and what use is made of that data.

In that respect, can I ask you, please, to look at your first submission. So it will be CTB-1 at page 33.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: At the moment I'm concerned with the system as it is at the moment. I'll ask you about the real-time capability later, but I'm just concerned with the system prior to the real-time capability.

At the bottom of that page, 8(a)(i), there is reference to this:

"Data captured by black boxes installed on buses is uploaded to our server every night for generation of reports to monitor the driving behaviour of bus captains."

Do you see that reference?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So, no doubt, if a driver is driving at an excessive speed, let's say 80 kilometres per hour, that is something which will show up on the server; is that correct.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No. Before we get the real-time function -- let me explain how it works. Every night, the bus will return to the depot, and then, only at that time, will the data be transmitted to our computer system of the company. So it won't be a question of letting us know in real-time. In future, there will be a real-time function, and then, once every 15 seconds, such data will be transmitted to our company system. So the two are different.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Just keeping with the non-real-time system, the current system, once the data is uploaded on the server at night, it will show if the bus driver has exceeded the speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Perhaps let me elaborate. When the bus is in service during daytime, if there has been an exceedance of the speed limit, the black box on board will record this incident of speeding. At night, this piece of information will be uploaded or transmitted to

our computer system, which will then collate the data. On the following day -- sorry, well, in fact, in about five days' time, a report will be generated in relation to exceedance of speed incidents.

So what happens to those five days? Our system has to match the speed exceedance incident with our Octopus card system, so as to identify the name of the relevant driver. So it takes a few days' time to do that. So we have a report on the speed exceedance and then our colleagues will follow up on that.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So what about other faults that the driver may have caused or may have -- his conduct may have been at fault? For example, if he had braked excessively or if he had accelerated too fast, would that sort of information appear on the server in the same way as excessive speed appears on the server?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we do get such information, but we do not generate such reports.

MR DUNCAN: So the only reports that are currently generated are speed reports; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And when that report is available, what happens to it? Does it just sit there, or is there somebody who is required to examine each and every report?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: When the report is available, our system will automatically generate an email to our operations division. In fact, there are three operation divisions: CTB1, CTB2, and New World operations. So, for each of them, when such an email is received, then it will be known that within the relevant division, which drivers are involved in such cases of exceeding the speed limit.

Thereafter, we will follow the guideline, the internal guideline, on disciplinary action, and appropriate disciplinary action will be taken. For a first offender and not too serious, then a reminder will be issued. In the case of a serious incident or in the case of a repeat offender, then a warning will be issued.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly that the current monitoring system, monitoring of the drivers' conduct, is limited to speed only?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, there are two aspects. Every day, we have the routine monitoring, and that's about the speed. On the other hand, if there is a passenger complaint or when there is a traffic accident, then we will have colleagues who will look up the relevant data and then will carry out an investigation. The findings of the investigation, if say the case is established,

then the relevant bus captain will be disciplined.

MR DUNCAN: Right. As far as the black box is concerned, it monitors only speed, no other conduct of the driver?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The black box isn't just about monitoring the speed.

MR DUNCAN: I'm sorry, let me rephrase that. I understand what you were about to say.

As far as the report is concerned, the report which comes up on the server from the black box is concerned only with speed; it does not reflect any other driving fault of the driver. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Our server will issue routine reports, and that would just be about exceeding the speed limit. However, for the data, for the information that we have recorded, that goes beyond vehicle speeds. Well, in fact we cover the following information as well, like the G force generated when the vehicle is in motion. That will be recorded as well. And of course other behaviour of the bus captain, say for example whether he has opened the bus doors, that would also be recorded as well.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: But do I understand correctly, those sorts of matters are not the subject of any report currently?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: There won't be an automatic report, but

then if we find the need to carry out an investigation, then such information can be retrieved from the system, to facilitate our investigation.

CHAIRMAN: I think we understand your evidence, Mr Cheng. A report is generated in respect of speed only, but other data is available if you wish to investigate. Is that the position?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Now, sticking with the matter of speed, could I ask you please to refer again to your submission, and this time page 26 of CTB-1.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

May I bring your attention to the page just under the heading "Bus ignition" -- so you will see item (ii), "Bus ignition (on/off)", and then a portion which commences:

"The black boxes are used to monitor the speed of each bus and over speed exception report[s] are generated automatically."

Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: I think, if you read through that, it covers some of the matters that I have just been asking you

about.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: So if there is the speed of over 70 kilometres per hour, that would be caught in the black box or be recorded in the black box, and will automatically become part of the report; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Is it not 75 kilometres per hour generates a report?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We are monitoring the speed limit of 70, but then the black box is set in such a way that there has to be 70 kilometres per hour for 10 consecutive seconds before an event would be generated.

CHAIRMAN: So there are two qualifications, one is 75 kilometres and the other is 10 consecutive seconds?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: That would occur whatever route and whatever road the bus is on; is that right?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Dealing with the situation where the speed limit is 50 kilometres per hour, the reference you will see there is:

"Speed of over 55 [kilometres per hour] for 10 consecutive seconds on road section[s] with speed limit[s] of 50 [kilometres per hour]".

Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Now I wish to ask you about these road sections that exist. Do I understand, these are just random sections of road which the company has chosen from time to time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's incorrect. In our company, we have selected 25 road sections with a speed limit of 50kph. For these 25 road sections, they include the continuous downhill slope road sections, and also these road sections involve sharp bends. For these road sections, there were major traffic accidents that occurred before; it wasn't random per se.

MR DUNCAN: I think if I could bring your attention, please, to page 56. This is your second submission. So CTB-1, page 56.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: There has been a question asked and you have responded in that submission in 2(a) with "Criteria for identifying road sections for speed detection". Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: It is said in the response:

"Among these 25 road sections, 11 road sections were identified for monitoring in June 2013, 3 additional

road sections ... in September 2014, and 11 road sections ... identified for monitoring in March 2018."

How long are these road sections?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Generally speaking, they are more than 100 metres.

MR DUNCAN: Why have you increased these from time to time? There was 11 initially, then three additional, three added, and then 11 added. Why are you adding to them from time to time?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: When we first introduced this method to monitor the road sections, we discussed with the unions' representatives. We discussed with them the road sections. We need them to know what sections we are dealing with so that they will observe the speed on these sections. As we increased the number, we also kept them posted of the development.

MR DUNCAN: Would it be fair to say that the total of these 25 road sections would be a very, very small proportion of the area covered on all the routes on which the buses of the company ply their trade?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, you may put it this way, but we feel that these are rather dangerous sections; if they go beyond 50kph, it would pose some danger.

MR DUNCAN: What is actually involved in identifying these

road sections?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: As Mr Cheng said a few moments ago, we basically look at the three criteria, continuous downward slope, sharp bends, and also there were frequent traffic accidents that occurred in the past or some serious ones. So we identified these road sections on the basis of these criteria.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, I understand that you identify them, but how do they then get into the system? What is involved technically?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Technically, we have the electronic map in the system. We just set these into the system and we set all these 55kph for 10 continuous seconds -- we set all these criteria and set it into the system.

MR DUNCAN: Is there any reason why all the routes couldn't be fed into the system, so that you could monitor not only speed in excess of 70 kilometres per hour but also speeds in excess of 50 kilometres per hour wherever it occurs?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: In theory, yes, but it would involve a lot of efforts, because then we would have to separate all the different routes and everything would be separated out. In the electronic map, we have to split the 50kph and 70kph. That would take a lot of efforts.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, if I may supplement. I agree

with that. At the present moment, these 25 road sections cannot cover all the routes that we serve, all the routes that the buses are deployed to. Right now, we have 25 identified that we consider prone to danger.

In addition to that, in the days to come, we will be randomly selecting additional road sections for speed detection purposes in relation to the 50kph sections. This is something we plan to do. That would be similar to what the police do with regard to speeding detection. They have the cameras that are mounted at certain locations, and the police would also randomly put the mobile cameras to detect speeding.

This is the inspiration that we got from the police initiative. This is something that we are going to do. But until that happens, we do need to have a word with the unions.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Do the unions know currently which are the 25 sections?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, they do, because this has been published in the appendix of the captains handbook.

MR DUNCAN: Would it improve your monitoring system --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, just so we can confirm we are talking about the same thing -- you are referring to, for example, annex 1 of CTB-2 at page 169-88? That's

the English version, where the sections are identified. Is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir.

CHAIRMAN: So these are the 25 sections of road that are currently monitored in your system to produce a report of a vehicle going greater than 55 kilometres per hour, your buses going greater than 55 kilometres per hour?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: With the advent of the real-time system, is there any proposal to increase the number of road sections from 25?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: With the real-time system, it doesn't have any direct relationship with the number of sections. As regards the increase in the number of monitored road sections, that doesn't present any problems to us, but we have to discuss with the unions. So that's why I said that we do have the plan to randomly identify road sections in an electronic map to detect the speed limit -- speeding on the 50kph sections.

MR DUNCAN: But do I understand you correctly, that would be done in conjunction with the unions, so they would know the outcome of any proposals in that respect?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we have to notify the unions. We are not asking them for permission, but they have to be kept posted.

MR DUNCAN: Let us turn then to the proposal for real-time capability. If I could ask you to go back, please, to page 33 of your submission. So CTB-1/33.

At the bottom of the page, in the third line of the last paragraph on the page:

"We schedule to replace the black box system with real-time capability by the third quarter of 2018. By then, we will be able to monitor the driving behaviour of bus captains in real-time and take immediate action as appropriate".

In that respect, could I ask you to turn to your second submission at page 58.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Do we see at the bottom of the page this entry:

"The real-time ... system will emit an instant audio warning (ie a beeping sound) automatically through the black box control panel in the driver cab to alert the bus captain whenever an over speed event occurs."

Is that a summary of the real-time capability of the system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. This can only be done with the real-time capability.

MR DUNCAN: So is the real-time capability concerned only with the matter of speed?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chung, my colleague, will answer the question.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For the real-time capability, it isn't just about the speed. Just now, we have already said that one of the functions of the real-time capability is to enable us to estimate the arrival time of the bus. So that's one of the functions of the real-time feature.

MR DUNCAN: Right. So speed is one aspect. The arrival time is another. What about other faults of the driver? Would any of those be picked up in real time? I'm thinking of things such as sudden braking, excessive acceleration, those sorts of things. Would they be picked up in real time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I need to consult my colleague.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do so.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Lit will answer the question.

MR KENNETH LIT: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Cheng mentioned that data will be transmitted once every 15 seconds, and that's about simple information like the speed. For the transmission of data for over 25-second sort of cycling, that's not the second-by-second data. For second-by-second data, it will be sort of based on a 15-minute cycle, and it will come from the bus to the server of the company.

MR DUNCAN: One of the advantages of the real-time system is

that there is an instant audio warning to alert the bus captain that he's speeding. Would the driver receive any alert for any matter other than speeding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Lit will take the question.

MR KENNETH LIT: Other than speeding, no, we are not having any other alerts for the bus captain.

MR DUNCAN: When it is said at page 33 that immediate action as appropriate can be taken, what is meant by "immediate action"?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The immediate action that we refer to is actually what we have just referred to. That is the beeping sound so as to alert the bus captain.

MR DUNCAN: Now, I need to understand this, please. If the driver is exceeding 50 kilometres per hour in one of the 25 road sections, clearly the new system will result in his receiving an alert; is that correct?

MR KENNETH LIT: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If, say, he is going 60 kilometres per hour on a road which is not caught by one of the 25 road sections, will he be alerted in that situation?

MR KENNETH LIT: No.

MR DUNCAN: Would your system of monitoring be far better if there were a lot more road sections covered than simply 25?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, it would have been better, but

currently we are not able to get a digital map which includes all the speed limits of all the roads in Hong Kong. Currently, there isn't such a digital map. So what we have to do is to manually mark such road sections onto our digital map.

MR DUNCAN: The fact that there's no digital map available, is that something which has been the subject of discussion at all between the company and the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, we didn't.

MR DUNCAN: Would that be a matter worth discussing with the Transport Department, do you think?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We will try.

MR DUNCAN: Now, unless anybody has some further questions, I'm going to leave the matter of black boxes and move to the matter of speed limiters.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Lo.

MEMBER LO: I just have a question on the real-time alert. Would that be part of the report generated about the bus captain's performance, or is it just an alert without record, without permanent record?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In real time, the bus captain will be alerted if the over speed continues for continuously 10 seconds, then the black box will record such an event. And as I have mentioned earlier on, later on

the information will be transmitted to our system, and then it will be listed in the over speed report.

MEMBER LO: So they are kind of independent?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, I don't understand your question.

MEMBER LO: The real-time warning is independent of the report generated offline five days later?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, the two are separate.

CHAIRMAN: In your approach to generating an alert to the driver, would it not be easier to set the system to generate a report at 55 kilometres per hour for all roads, except those that you then identify as being 70 kilometre per hour roads, rather than doing it the other way around?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I think technically your idea is feasible, but then the work to be done will be equal in terms of the volume. Our current system is such that we have pre-set all the road sections to have a speed limit of 70, and then for 25 road sections we have marked it as 50. If we have to reverse it, it means that the digital map of our system has to be set in such a way that it would be 55 throughout, and then we have to identify those road sections which permit 70 or above, so as to make it 70.

In other words, either way, the workload will be heavy. So just now we have said that we are thinking of

adding randomly picked road sections so as to monitor the speeding of our bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Broadly speaking, what is the proportion of the roads that your buses travel that are subject to a 70 kilometre per hour speed limit rather than 50? What is the general proportion?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, Mr Chairman, I'm afraid I don't have the information with me just off the cuff. However, in Hong Kong, for road sections allowing 70kph, we don't just have expressways.

Allow me to cite an example for you, sir. Say for example, along Gloucester Road westbound, part of it has a limit of 50, while other parts 70. In other words, for the speed limit of 70km/h, our buses would not be having too few in relation to such road sections, but I'm afraid I haven't got the percentage that you asked for.

CHAIRMAN: What's your off-the-cuff feeling? Are there more 70 kilometre per hour roads that you travel on or 50 kilometre per hour roads?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Maybe Mr Chung, head of operations, is more familiar with this.

Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, really, it would be difficult for me to give you an answer on the spot.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

Professor?

MEMBER LO: I'm just thinking about speed limit. Other than freeways, they should be all on 50, basically, mostly? For urban arterials, typically it's 50?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I'm afraid that's not my understanding. Earlier on, I gave you the example of westbound Gloucester Road. It's not an expressway, but for certain parts of it, they have a speed limit of 70km/h.

MEMBER LO: One further question on the rapid deceleration and sudden braking. They don't depend on speed limits, so there should be no technical issues of implementing that.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, in which way?

MEMBER LO: In case of sudden stopping, sudden braking, sudden acceleration, they should be independent of speed limits of the roads the buses are travelling on; they can be done without knowing speed limits?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: They are unrelated. Yes, we can monitor such scenarios. Say, for example, we have a bus and there is a need to step on the brake suddenly. It may not necessarily be a fault on the part of a bus captain. Say, for example, there may be a pedestrian stepping onto the road suddenly and then the bus captain has to

respond properly, which means stepping on the brake suddenly. If we start to collect all the information about sudden deceleration, it means that we have to follow up on such cases and we have to make enquiries with the bus captains, and that will mean quite a large amount of work and it would be rather time-consuming.

So what we are doing now is that the system does collect such information. In the event of a traffic accident or there is a complaint against us, then in the course of investigation, we will retrieve the data from the system.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman. Just one other matter --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr Duncan.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Sorry, Mr Duncan -- I just want to clarify one thing.

The 10 seconds report on speeding, is this report -- sort of anything over 10 seconds generating a report -- is this 10 seconds determined by your company or by the manufacturer?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: (Chinese spoken).

MEMBER AUYEUNG: So if there is a desire to change the 10 seconds to 15 or five, it's doable, technically?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, indeed, this can be done.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Let me say this, 10 consecutive seconds, when we discussed this with the unions, we got input from them, and they indicated that they do not look at the speedometer all the time. When they become aware of speeding, they have to react, but when they are behind the wheel, it would be hard for them to slam on the brakes to decelerate and they have to react. It would take time for them to make the adjustment. That was the discussion with the unions. That's one of the considerations why 10 seconds for over-speeding.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

CHAIRMAN: It is the case, is it not, that the legislation that deals with black boxes on PLBs prescribes a period of three seconds' consecutive speeding? Are you aware of that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We are not aware of that, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that's something Mr Duncan can deal with in due course.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Just before leaving the black boxes, one other point, if I may, Mr Cheng.

In the press release that I referred you to, the press release of NEC, the company stated that the system that they had installed, or were installing, would "overcome the 'ghost' GPS signal caused by the unique environment of narrow streets and skyscrapers in Hong Kong".

Do you remember reading that in their press release?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I did, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to tell the committee as to whether that has been effective? Has that system coped adequately with the unique environment, narrow streets and tall buildings in Hong Kong, so that you don't get these "ghost" GPS signals? Has the system been effective in that respect?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: First of all, this press release was released by NEC. What they say there doesn't represent the stance of the CTB and NWFB.

As regards the accuracy of the system, how accurate it is, I would say that it is not 100 per cent accurate. It all depends on the road sections that the bus goes through, and the high-rises, the number of high-rises, whether there are any buildings with curtain walls; that would have a bearing on the accuracy of the GPS system.

I can tell you that it is not 100 per cent accurate, but the level of accuracy is acceptable to us though.

MR DUNCAN: Do I take it that this not regarded as a major problem by the company with the system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At the present moment, the system that we are using, we do not see any major problems at all.

MR DUNCAN: I said I would move to the matter of speed limiters.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan -- Mr Cheng, presumably you have available a map which depicts all of the routes that your buses travel on. Is that the case?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Lit, my colleague, who is more familiar with this.

MR KENNETH LIT: Yes, Mr Chairman. In our system, in our interface, we can show all the routes on the map.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide such a map to us, so that we can see every route that you travel? I'll tell you what I have in mind. Somebody must know what the speed limits are on the roads of Hong Kong, whether it's the Transport Department or the police or somebody else, and what I propose doing is being in a position to compare both your routes with speed limits.

So can you provide us with a map of your routes, all your routes?

MR KENNETH LIT: Most certainly, sir. However, Mr Chairman, it all depends on the data that you are looking for, because if we provide in hard copies, then you may not

be able to get what you want.

CHAIRMAN: What I'm seeking, as I suspect is obvious, is to know which roads you travel down. Somebody else could tell us what the speed limit is on those roads.

MR KENNETH LIT: I understand. No problem, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: Can I take you to your submission at page 26, so CTB-1, page 26.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: The matter of the speed limiter is referred to there, two-thirds of the way down the page. So:

"When the vehicle speed reaches 70 [kilometres per hour], the speed limiter functions by restricting fuel supply to the engine even if the bus captain presses hard on the thottle. However, vehicle speed may exceed 70 [kilometres per hour] on a downward slope."

Do you see that reference?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: If we go to the following page, there's reference on that page to an active speed limiting system, ASLS, and it is stated:

"In the event that the speed of the bus exceeds 70 [kilometres per hour] when travelling on a downward slope, the [system] will automatically apply the gearbox retarder and/or the service brake to limit the bus speed

to 70 [kilometres per hour]."

If I understand the submission correctly, it is planned to introduce that feature on new buses delivered from June of next year. Is that the position?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Li, director of engineering.

MR PAUL LI: Chairman, that's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Is this a requirement of the Transport Department or is this an initiative of the company?

MR PAUL LI: With this system, we have discussions with the Transport Department and the working group, and we agree that for new buses that are delivered, we have this requirement.

Starting from next year, June, all the vehicles delivered will be equipped with this.

MR DUNCAN: When you say "the working group", is that the working group which was formed after the Tai Po accident in February of this year?

MR PAUL LI: That's correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So before that, had the company considered the question of this ASLS system?

MR PAUL LI: No, sir, not before that.

MR DUNCAN: So whose idea was it within the working group? Was it the company's idea? Was it the Transport Department's idea? Was it somebody else on the working group who came up with this proposal?

MR PAUL LI: That was something arising out of the discussion at the working group; Euro VI vehicles, they do have the technology to provide that.

MR DUNCAN: So it was the bus manufacturers who came up with this proposal?

MR PAUL LI: It was the working group. There was a request that was made to consult the manufacturers to ascertain whether this would be achievable, and they said that for Euro VI buses, it is doable.

CHAIRMAN: Who convened the working group?

MR PAUL LI: It was Transport Department, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Did they produce an agenda for the first meeting?

MR PAUL LI: There was, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a copy of the agenda?

MR PAUL LI: We can make this available afterwards, sir.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is you do?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN: Were technological advances/devices identified in this agenda?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, on the agenda there are some suggestions regarding new technological devices.

CHAIRMAN: So this came from the Transport Department?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would you be kind enough to provide us with the agenda?

MR PAUL LI: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: With regard to the possibility of retrofitting this facility, this is something which has been addressed in your second submission, at CTB-1, page 61. Do you see at 60 the heading number 8, "Speed limiters", and the entry:

"We have enquired with our bus suppliers on the technical feasibility and cost implications in retrofitting our buses with the [ASLS] system."

MR PAUL LI: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. And you see all the details that have been provided there.

First of all, with regard to the Dennis buses, I notice that the company apparently has 876 buses which are of the model E500 MMC, and it would, according to the company, be feasible to retrofit those buses with that facility.

What's the company's intention with regard to retrofitting that model?

MR PAUL LI: Your question again, sir?

MR DUNCAN: Is the company proposing to retrofit the ASLS system on its 876 Alexander Dennis E500 MMC buses?

MR PAUL LI: We need further details from the bus supplier

about the feasibility of retrofitting the device. We need the details.

Moreover, we haven't been told about the costs involved in retrofitting it on each and every bus. So we have yet to consider that.

MR DUNCAN: Is this a matter which is under consideration by the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not yet. As stated in our submission, we are told by them that it would be feasible, that is ADL thinks that it is feasible, but then it would require 12 months' time to develop the product.

Therefore, at this moment, they cannot provide the retrofitting cost at this stage. Before we know how much it will cost to retrofit such a device per us, we are not able to give an answer as to whether we will consider it or not. First of all, we need to know the cost before we can consider the matter.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So, to the extent that you are waiting on the cost, it is a matter still under consideration; is that correct?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: What about the Volvo B9 buses, 117, an entry of "Feasible", with the asterisk we can see over the page, "Volvo requires 18 to 24 months for product

development"? Is this something that is under consideration by the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Given the cost indicated, if they are able to deliver the product and if we are happy with the test result, we are going to retrofit it.

MR DUNCAN: How long would a bus like this, a B9, a Volvo bus, for example, be in service?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Our buses would be put into service for 17 years or more. Of course, I must supplement. Here we talk about 117 B9 buses. They are around three years old. In other words, we can use them for another 14 years.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Just one other matter on speed limiters, if I could, before the morning break.

Could I ask you to go to TD-1 at page 94.

I don't know whether you've seen it --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: I'm not sure whether you have read this document, Mr Cheng. Let me explain what it is.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: It's part of the submission received by the committee from the Transport Department, which is headed, "Application of new devices or technology on franchised buses", and the purpose is described as:

"This paper gives an account of the feasibility and desirability for application of new devices or technology on franchised buses."

Have you seen this document before?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, we haven't read it.

MR DUNCAN: Right. In that case, what I might do, if the chairman is minded to take the morning break -- I just refer you to page 101 of the bundle, and read the section (c) which is headed, "Speed control by Global Positioning System ('GPS') or geo-fencing". Would you be able to do that during the course of the break, read paragraphs 19 and 20?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Can you also show paragraph 20 for us? So two pages. In that case, it means I can't read paragraph 19. Would you mind giving me a hard copy?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you can be provided with a physical copy so that you can see the context.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR DUNCAN: It deals with the situation where there is no speed limitation at the moment. In other words, a bus travelling, say, 60 kilometres per hour in a 50 kilometre zone, it deals with that situation, something which is not covered currently by the speed limiters in the buses, and that's what I'm interested in.

What I would ask you to do, perhaps, is read to yourself paragraphs 19 and 20 of that paper, which you will see on pages 101 and 102 of the bundle.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we will do so.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We will take a 20-minute break now. Thank you.

(11.37 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.59 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr Cheng, have you had a chance of reading that extract?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I did, sir.

MR DUNCAN: This is the matter of speed control by GPS, or as is it's sometimes called, geo-fencing. Is this something which has been discussed in the working group?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to my colleague, Mr Chung, if I may, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, we did.

MR DUNCAN: First of all, if this sort of system was to be implemented, there would be the requirement again for the digital mapping; is that correct?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: At paragraph 20, the Transport Department has

referred to the fact that all of the bus manufacturers have given the opinion that the technology was being controlled by GPS is theoretically feasible.

The Department say:

"However, they do have concerns on the accuracy of the signals as it would be affected by the high-rise buildings of Hong Kong."

Do you see that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Is this consideration to go no further, or is somebody going to be looking into whether those concerns about the GPS system are justified and, if so, whether they can be overcome?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Our view is that we know that the system is available in the market. However, in the past, when we worked on the black box, the accuracy of the GPS signals was indeed a matter of concern to us.

So currently we think that we need to get some devices from the suppliers and we need to test the devices so as to ascertain the functionality as well as their accuracy first. So it's not a matter that we are ruling it out at this moment.

MR DUNCAN: So can we take it that that's under active consideration?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, you may say so.

MR DUNCAN: And who is considering this? Is it your company? Is it all of the bus companies, or what?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It was discussed within the working group and we said that we would consider it. Other companies also said they would consider it.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Now I'm going to move from speed limiters, please, to another of the devices. This is the electronic stability control.

You will see reference to this in CTB-1 at page 26, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see that.

MR DUNCAN: At the bottom of page 26, there's reference to the company planning to include the electronic stability control system on new buses for delivery from June 2019 onwards.

And at page 27, we can see a description of the two aspects of the mechanism. First of all, dynamic stability control, and then roll-over prevention.

Is this something which has been decided as a result of the working party discussion?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I would like to defer to Mr Li.

MR PAUL LI: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, indeed, that's true.

MR DUNCAN: So this was not something which was considered at all prior to the formation of that working group; is that correct?

MR PAUL LI: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: The proposal is to have this installed on new buses supplied after June 2019. Has the possibility of retrofitting this facility onto existing buses been considered?

MR PAUL LI: We are now asking our bus suppliers to examine our buses to see whether retrofitting such systems would be feasible. That is, whether it is technically feasible.

We would also like to know about the cost implications for the retrofitting. We are awaiting replies from the bus suppliers.

MR DUNCAN: Have those sorts of requests been made in writing of the bus suppliers?

MR PAUL LI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I wonder if you could provide a couple of samples of that correspondence also to the committee.

MR PAUL LI: Mr Chairman, we will go back and look for the relevant records.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, Mr Chairman, Mr Li may not be too certain as to whether we have the correspondence. We need to go back to check whether we did have the correspondence.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please provide an answer in writing in due course. If you have it and you are prepared to supply

us with a copy, please do so.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Moving to another of the devices, TD-1/103, could I bring your attention to that page, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: This, Mr Cheng, is also part and parcel of that document I asked you to look at just before the break, the Transport Department document, "application of new devices or technology on franchised buses".

At page 103, from paragraphs 23 through to 26, there is reference to this sort of facility, collision prevention and lane-keeping devices.

I wonder if you could just read through that to familiarise yourself with what's contained in paragraphs 23 to 26, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I think Mr Chung, my colleague, can answer the question, because he has already read it.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Mr Chung, if I could then ask you to look at paragraph 26. It records the fact that "the ... bus operators do not consider that the installation of collision prevention and lane-keeping devices are effective for enhancing the safe operation of franchised bus services", and I believe this for the reasons that you can see earlier in paragraph 26. Is that the case?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly then that as far as the company is concerned, it is not proposing to pursue that possible device any further?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Let me first of all explain. Such a device, in the year 2014, our company did carry out a test of such devices. This is called Mobileye. Mobileye is a driving assisting device. At that time, it was mainly applied to private cars. What was involved was that they would use the visual aid to detect what is in front and then the system will carry out an analysis and then calculations would be made as to the distance between the subject vehicle and the preceding one and the following one, and then come up with an idea about the time of collision, then warning signals would be sent to the driver.

At the time we fitted this Mobileye on three of our buses, we carried out a trial scheme for four months. We made arrangements for representatives of different trade unions, that is bus captain representatives, as well as 50-plus bus captains to drive such buses, that is three of them, in their normal service, and after that they were asked to fill out a questionnaire for us, telling us what they think about this device called Mobileye.

So the findings were such that some of the alerts were not quite suitable for use on buses. Say, for example, when the bus pulls up at a bus bay, since it is detected that there are people in front of the bus, as you know there are passengers waiting at the bus stop, so when people are detected then there will be an audio signal. Well, in fact the driver hasn't yet straightened the bus and so a signal would also be sent.

Moreover, when the bus is stopped too close to the preceding bus, this will be a signal to be sent out in the case of when the traffic is slow. As a result, it means that the warning signals are emitted many times during a journey. 46 per cent of the bus captains told us in the questionnaire that there were too many warning signals and it was causing a nuisance to their driving, and as a result they ignored the signals, and then 50 per cent of the drivers told us that the Mobileye didn't help in their safe driving.

So having considered the functions of this Mobileye and having taken into account the views of our bus captains, moreover there is a high cost involved in the installation, we as a result decided against following up on the idea.

So that's our experience. We shared our experience at the meeting.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So that exercise that was conducted in 2014, was that of your own initiative or was that something requested by the Transport Department?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: At that time, it was our own initiative. This is because the supplier approached us and told us about this safety device, saying that it could help to reduce the number of traffic accidents. Therefore we on our own carried out this trial scheme.

MR DUNCAN: Was this supplier one of the bus manufacturers or was it independent of the bus manufacturers?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: An independent supplier, the device supplier.

CHAIRMAN: Who is that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It is an Israeli company, Neshtech Pty Ltd. There is an agent in Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Moving down, still on the Transport Department's document at page 105 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- were the results of your testing of this device produced into some paper which gave an opportunity for the decision to be made?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, Chairman. We have a report as a result of the test.

CHAIRMAN: Are you in a position to provide us with a copy

of that report, the salient features as to why it was not thought to be useful?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Most certainly, sir.

CHAIRMAN: If you could provide us with that, we would be grateful.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Moving down page 105 to another of the safety devices, this time the driver monitoring device. Can you familiarise yourselves with paragraphs 27 and 28 of that document, please.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: My colleague Mr Li can take the questions. He has already done the reading. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Can I ask you this: is the company, either Citybus or New World, one of the two operators who have advised that they would install a system of this nature in four of their buses for a trial of three months, tentatively starting from early May of this year?

MR PAUL LI: No, sir.

MR DUNCAN: So there's been no commitment from the company to become involved in this system?

MR PAUL LI: Correct. We haven't made any commitment, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Have you decided against it?

MR PAUL LI: No. We are enquiring about the three

suppliers, we are liaising with the suppliers, and trying to get hold of some information there.

MR DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention to your submission at page 62. It's CTB-1, page 62.

At paragraph 9, have you set out the suppliers with whom you have already met with regard to the potential for installing this facility?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, correct.

MR DUNCAN: What is the current situation with regard to this study?

MR PAUL LI: The latest situation is Consolidated Parts & Accessories Sales Centre Ltd, they gave us a demonstration of the product, but the videoing process is not sufficiently sophisticated. It's not good enough, and in June they are going to be coming again for the demonstration of the videoing process.

The second, Guardian, they said they would put forward a proposal to make available 10 devices on loan and will give us a quotation. We have received a quotation and it is being considered at the moment.

The third supplier, BYD Auto Industry Co Ltd, they haven't shown us any products yet. They are going to be showing us some products for testing.

Other than those three, we will explore whether there are other devices available.

MR DUNCAN: I would like to refer you, please, to the website of the Ming Pao newspaper, which carries an article relevant to this particular matter. This is not in the bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find that?

MR DUNCAN: This is not in the bundle, Mr Chairman, but it's available on the screen now, I believe, with a translation.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Could you just read through this publication on the website dated 27 May. Could you read that to yourself, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We've seen it, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Have you seen this article before?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, I was given this yesterday.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware, because of that article, that it's proposed to introduce some sort of monitoring device for the benefit of the bus driver on the buses which will ply between Hong Kong, Macau and Zhuhai, on the new bridge? Are you aware of that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, I am.

MR DUNCAN: Were you aware of that before you read this article?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I learnt about it from the news.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any plan with regard to exploring

what this system, apparently researched and developed in the mainland, might provide for the company?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We will see whether we can get in touch with the shuttle bus company for this Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge and see if we can get more information from them about the system.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to give the committee any idea as to when it's likely that you will make a decision on this sort of device? When do you think you will be in a position to make a decision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At the moment, we haven't been able to get in touch with the relevant company regarding the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, and we are not sure about all the actual operational details. We are not sure about the cost implications. So, at this present stage, I find it difficult to say precisely when that decision will be taken, until such time as we have all the relevant information, before we can consider it and take a decision.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: When was it that the company first started to consider the possibility of utilising this sort of facility?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We haven't started considering it yet, in the absence of any information.

MR DUNCAN: Right, but you made contact with various suppliers. When did you make contact with those suppliers?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Your question is about the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge company, or which part are you referring to?

MR DUNCAN: The earlier companies referred to in your submission.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Li, please.

MR PAUL LI: It was about April this year.

MR DUNCAN: So, again, was that as a result of the discussions amongst the working group?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, correct, sir.

MR DUNCAN: And had it not been considered before the formation of the working group?

MR PAUL LI: No, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Could I ask you now, moving to another safety matter, to go to TD-1.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that and before we move on -- at page 63 of your second submission, CTB-1, page 63, it is stated in that paragraph that Guardian, I think the Australian manufacturer of the device, indicated that Singapore Land Transport Authority had stipulated that the device be deployed in their new public buses.

Have you contacted the Singapore Land Transport

Authority for any information?

MR PAUL LI: We were made available this information through Guardian. We haven't got in touch with SLTA.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Could I ask you please to go to TD-1/195.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You will probably recognise this, Mr Cheng, as part of --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: -- the forward planning programme of Citybus that you have provided to the committee. It's that part of the forward planning programme which is concerned with the topic of bus safety, item number 5. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Could I bring your particular attention to page 202 of the bundle.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. In particular, item 5.13, "Feasibility of installation of seat belts on (a) all seats and (b) all seats on the upper deck on new buses".

Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: If I could read it quickly:

"It is feasible to install seat belts on all seats

or on all seats on the upper deck. However, our observation shows that very few people wear the seat belts currently available at the exposed seats. Without any legislation to mandate the wearing of passenger seat belts on a franchised bus and the enforcement authority to strictly enforce the legislation, installing seat belts on all seats will be a waste of resources because vast majority of passengers will not wear seat belts even though they are provided."

That was a statement that you made in the latest forward planning programme for Citybus.

Could you now look at, please, TD-1/95, again the same document, and the heading on this particular page, "Installation of seat belts for all passenger seats". Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Sorry, which paragraph, please?

MR DUNCAN: TD-1, page 95.

CHAIRMAN: 95, not 195.

MR DUNCAN: TD/95, sorry.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I've got it.

MR DUNCAN: I wonder if you or one of your colleagues could read through what's contained in paragraphs 5 to 9 of this matter.

CHAIRMAN: This is paper 8 of the Transport Department's submissions to the committee, Mr Duncan.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: My colleague is reading it.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you this question: has this been a matter which has been discussed amongst the working group?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, it was.

MR DUNCAN: If I could bring your attention to paragraph 7 in particular. Is it the case that the company has indicated that it now agrees to incorporate the requirement for all new buses to be equipped with seat belts for all passengers?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, our company has agreed that, starting from June 2019 onwards, those buses delivered should get the seat belts, that's the three-point safety seat belts.

MR DUNCAN: As far as retrofitting seat belts into existing buses, have you read the content of paragraph 8 of the document?

CHAIRMAN: Before you embark on retrofitting, might I ask this question. In your earlier answers, you said that it was a waste of resources to fit seat belts because the vast majority of passengers simply wouldn't wear them, so that it required enforcement. Given that you have now indicated that you have agreed to incorporate them, what view do you have about whether or not this is a waste of resources if there isn't enforcement?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If it is not mandated by law, then it is

impossible to enforce the law. Currently, there is no requirement that when you are on a bus you have to put on your seat belt. Even if it is mandated by law, in the absence of law enforcement, I'm afraid it is also a waste of resources. We maintain the same view.

CHAIRMAN: Have you raised this view with the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We did. Our colleagues did raise it with the TD.

CHAIRMAN: And what, if any, response did you get?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I can defer to Mr Chung. He was there at that time.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mr Chairman, at that time, the TD said that it should be fitted there and then it is up to the passenger to choose whether to put on the seat belt. If the passenger worries for his safety, he will have a seat belt available for use, but if it is not there, then even if he is worried, he can't have one to use.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Have you actually raised with the Transport Department whether they would endeavour to have the appropriate legislation passed?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We did mention to the Transport Department, that is, if there isn't any statutory

backup, then the seat belt may very well be a waste. But then the TD didn't promise that there would certainly be the passage of the relevant legislation.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you to refer, please, to TD-2 at page 58.

You will see there an extract from the Public Bus Services Ordinance, and in particular section 36 of the Ordinance. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Are you familiar with that provision, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, I am not.

MR DUNCAN: Is this the first time you have come across it?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, the first time.

MR DUNCAN: You see that it --

CHAIRMAN: Take your time to read it so that you understand what you are being asked.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I have taken a look of that.

MR DUNCAN: Do you understand that it provides that subject to the Ordinance and the franchise, the grantee may make by-laws for a number of matters which are therein set out?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I read it.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company ever considered passing by-laws pursuant to this provision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In relation to the making of by-laws and

the related laws involved, I'm not familiar with that, and therefore I'm afraid I cannot give you an answer, that is, whether we could consider and whether we would make the by-laws, because we haven't considered this particular area.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is the behaviour of passengers on your buses sometimes a matter of concern to the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Which aspect do you mean?

MR DUNCAN: In their abuse of drivers, verbal abuse of drivers. Does that happen from time to time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, it did happen.

MR DUNCAN: Do you think that the company would be better equipped to cope with that situation if it had its own by-laws which itself could enforce?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I'm not familiar with things like by-laws as well as what you mentioned. That is, with the by-laws, we can then enforce the law. I don't know how it will work. In particular, law enforcement. Our bus captains would not know how to enforce the law. Moreover, if it is left to the bus captain to enforce the law, then all the more there will be a greater conflict between the bus captain and the bus passengers. There is only one bus captain on board. The rest are all bus passengers. He is on his own.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any bus inspectors?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we do have bus inspectors, but we won't have a bus inspector on each and every bus. Bus inspectors are there to monitor the work performance of our bus captains. Moreover, at the bus terminus, bus inspectors also carry out their work.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware of the fact that the Mass Transit Railway has its own by-laws?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I've heard about that but I don't know about the details.

MR DUNCAN: If seat belts were installed on all buses, and if passengers refuse to wear a seat belt, do you think that by-laws passed by the company might be able to assist with regard to enforcement?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I believe our bus captains do not have the ability to enforce it, because if the bus passenger insists on not wearing the seat belt, first of all, the passengers are seated on the upper deck; it is impossible for the bus captain to see whether each and every passenger has worn a seat belt. Even if he can, it means he has to stop the bus and then the bus captain has to turn off the engine.

Now, for a public bus, if the engine is on, it is impossible for the bus captain to leave his cabin, so he has to switch off the engine, he has to walk upstairs,

identify the passenger not wearing the seat belt, and then ask him to do it. If the passenger refuses to do it, it means then, right on the spot, there will be a confrontation between the passenger and the captain. Our service will be affected, and the bus captain may even have a fight with the bus passenger.

So I don't think our bus captain can actually enforce the law.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: The bus inspectors whom you say are there just to monitor the driving of the bus, how many bus inspectors are employed in that capacity?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: First of all, let me correct a fact. Inspectors don't just go to monitor the driving of bus captains. Monitoring of bus driving is one of the duties of the bus inspectors. Bus inspectors are at the frontline to manage the bus operation.

As to how many bus inspectors we have and what they do, I would like to defer to Mr Chung, my colleague.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

We have more than 100 inspectors, and they have different areas of work. Some will be in the control centre. Others are on the road, making their rounds. They may be at the bus terminus, assisting the passengers or maintaining order.

We have a thousand or more buses on the roads. It is impossible for the inspectors to be on hand, if anything happens, to give assistance to the drivers. The MTRC has the by-laws but there is a difference here. For the MTR stations, they have a certain number of staff who can offer assistance. If anything happens on board the train, their drivers will be driving into the station, into the platform, to seek assistance. But for our bus captains, if anything happens, like we said, he cannot drive the bus to look for the inspector. If a dispute has already occurred, then this simply cannot happen.

So there is a bit of difference between the two.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: If we go back to the Transport Department document -- I had you at page 96 of the bundle, paragraph 7, which is concerned with seat belts on new buses.

In paragraph 8, the question of retrofitting seat belts on seats of existing buses is raised, and at the end of that paragraph there's an indication that the franchised bus operators will further study this proposal.

Is this something which is under study by the company?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Li, please.

MR PAUL LI: Our company is consulting the suppliers regarding the feasibility of retrofitting the existing buses with seat belts. The preliminary reply is that for ADL buses, post-2013, buses in 2013 and post-2013, the upper deck seats can be retrofitted. But we do need to have structural reinforcement and all the seats have to be replaced, because the existing seats cannot be used for the retrofitting purposes.

The preliminary cost, estimated cost, is for each bus, it would be 15,000 to 20,000 pounds per vehicle. We estimate that we have 1,100 buses in a fleet that belong to this category or this model. If retrofitting has to happen, the price tag is going to be $180 million to $240 million. That's a vast sum of money, and some money will be wasted.

CHAIRMAN: It will be wasted because passengers won't use the seat belts?

MR PAUL LI: Correct, sir, because we noticed, for our existing buses, for the exposed seats, we do have the three-point seat belts available, but we noticed the passengers can't be bothered putting on the seat belts.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company in the past received any form of subsidy from the government authorities?

MR PAUL LI: In the past, the government or the EPD in fact

subsidised the installation of some emission-reduction devices. And there were some hybrid vehicles, three, that were funded for trial purposes.

Also, there are 10 single-decker buses, electric buses, that were tested.

Thank you, sir.

MR DUNCAN: We have seen that a number of these initiatives for safety devices or improvement to safety devices have been raised as a result of the working group which has been set up.

In the course of those deliberations, has it occurred to the company to raise with the government the possibility of subsidies being made available in order to meet some of the cost of what might be regarded as improved safety provisions?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We never talk to the government, but if the government is prepared to offer subsidy with a view to enhancing safety, we will work on that.

MR DUNCAN: Why would you never talk to the government about this?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We didn't know that we could ask for subsidy from the government.

MR DUNCAN: I want to ask you just a few questions, please, about the disciplinary process, to which reference has been made already. If I could ask you in that respect,

please, to turn up page 39 of the CTB-1 bundle. So CTB-1 at page 39.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: We can see reference to this at the bottom of the page, (b), under the heading "Background checks and penalties for traffic convictions":

"(b) Our service quality department is responsible for administering disciplinary sanctions for any misconduct by bus captains, as per the guidelines set out in the bus captain manual."

Then there is further detail provided to the committee with regard to the disciplinary process.

Now, the reference to "the bus captain manual", could we just turn this up, please. CTB-2 at page 85.

CHAIRMAN: Which year of the manual is that, Mr Duncan?

MR DUNCAN: 2018, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

We have extracts from the bus captain's handbook at page 85, and a translation of the extracts from page 169-1.

If I could ask you to look, please, at the list of contents, which I believe you will see in original version at page 87, and in the translation at 169-3.

Are you at the list of contents?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I see them.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Would you agree that this is a very long and a very detailed document?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: And the English version -- both versions, we have seven different sections, with a number of different paragraphs in each section.

What steps are taken by the company to ensure that a bus captain is familiar with all the provisions in the handbook?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: In this bus captain's manual, when they first join the induction training, they are briefed on most of the details of this handbook, and in the refresher training we also brief them on the details again. So this handbook is there to facilitate them, after attending all these training courses, to go into detail about them. If they don't remember anything, they can go back to this manual.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: In answer to the chairman, I indicated that this particular handbook bears the date of April of this year. When was the previous version of this issued?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The previous version was July 2017.

MR DUNCAN: Is this handbook reviewed from time to time?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: How often is that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: There is no fixed time frame, no fixed cycle. It depends on whether there are changes that have to be added or made.

MR DUNCAN: Could you give the committee some idea as to how many bus captains have been subjected to a disciplinary process, say in the last 12 months?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, at first we thought we will be asked questions about driving safety, so we haven't prepared the information about the number of disciplinary actions. We can certainly provide the information afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do so.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Mr Chairman, that would be a convenient moment, if it suits the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it does.

We will now adjourn and resume the hearing at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr Cheng, I would like to ask you a few questions, please, arising out of the 2018 Guidelines on Bus Captain Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks.

You will find the actual guidelines at CTB-2 at page 2, and the previous guidelines you will find, if you want to refer to those, at TD-5 at page 1556.

But just for the ease of this afternoon's questions, I'm having distributed what is a comparison table of the various guidelines, which seeks to compare the guidelines as they evolved between 2004 and 2018.

So could I perhaps ask you just to have a look at that chart, first of all. You should be looking at a document which is headed "Comparison table of the guidelines", with a date of 4 May 2018. Do you have that in front of you?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

What I would like to do first is just identify some of the more important changes which have been made between the guidelines passed in this year with those passed back in 2010. Do you follow that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

What I would like to do first of all, on the chart, is bring to your attention the third entry down on the page, the maximum driving hours. Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: We can see the change, that as far as maximum driving hours are concerned, the new guideline is that it should be 10 hours in a shift, as opposed to what was, in the 2010 guidelines, as 11 hours in a working day.

Do you see that difference, first of all?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I can see that the wordings are different.

MR DUNCAN: Does that accord with your understanding of the changes?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I would like to defer to Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, it is.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, the second matter I would like to bring to your attention is the maximum duty hours, which is the entry just above that. Do we see the change there to the effect that, from the 2018 guidelines, the maximum duty hours are 12 hours in a shift, as compared with 14 hours in a working day? Does that accord with your understanding, Mr Chung?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If we turn the page, we will see, however, that in the context of maximum duty hours and driving hours, there is a new arrangement arising out of what is described as a "special shift duty". Do you see that on the second page?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So there is a provision whereby the duty hour of the driver may in fact exceed the 12 hours provided for, as we can see on page 1, and it can be as much as 14 hours; do you see that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Again does that accord with your understanding of the new guidelines?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And the driving hour within that special shift duty, is that subject to a maximum of 10 hours?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And is there a further condition with regard to the special shift duty, that there should be a rest break of no less than three consecutive hours?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Is that again your understanding?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Having taken you through those, could I ask you this, first of all: do I understand correctly that

notwithstanding the provision that there can be a special shift duty of maximum duty hours of 14 hours, it is the company's intention not to operate a shift duty in excess of 13 hours? Is that the company's intention?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Earlier on, we noted that according to the information that you've given to the committee, in the light of these new guidelines, some 121 additional drivers would be needed. Do you recall seeing that figure?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Has the intention to invoke the maximum of 13 hours been taken into account in reaching that figure?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: If in fact you availed yourself of the ability to have maximum duty hours of 14 hours, as opposed to 13 hours, would that reduce the number of additional drivers that you would need?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, it would.

MR DUNCAN: So what has prompted the company to decide to restrict its maximum duty hours just to 13?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Because we are aware of the public's concern about safety.

MR DUNCAN: And how will this help safety?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Regarding the daily hours of the bus captains, that won't be too long, because it will be capped at 13.

MR DUNCAN: But the driving hours would be the same in either case, wouldn't it? The maximum driving hours would be 10 hours, irrespective of whether the shift was 13 hours or 14 hours?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So it's just the extra hour in a long day, is it, that the company takes into account?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes. In other words, if he can knock off earlier, then he will have more rest time between two consecutive shifts.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

Now, you told us earlier that typically a driver, a bus captain, apart from the part-time drivers, of course, would be working for something like 10 hours, eight hours at normal time and two hours of overtime. Do you recall telling the committee about that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, I recall.

MR DUNCAN: A person who is required to work the special shift duty -- in other words, be on duty for 13 hours but who drives just for 10 -- on what basis is he paid? Does he get eight hours of normal time and five hours of

overtime, or does he get eight hours of normal time and two hours of overtime, as per the usual arrangement, with no payment for the rest break?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: He will get eight hours' basic salary, and then, for the five hours, that would be overtime pay.

MR DUNCAN: Have you started to introduce the operation of the new guidelines?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Not yet.

MR DUNCAN: When are they going to start?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We plan to do so in the third quarter of this year.

MR DUNCAN: Why the delay?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: First, we need to recruit sufficient bus captains before we can launch it. Second, we have to increase facilities for bus captains to take their rest for those three hours. They need to have a place to take a break.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to give the committee any idea as to how often a driver will be required to be on duty for the 13-hour period which you indicated would be introduced?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For New World First Bus and Citybus, they have different arrangements. For the New World First Bus, for the bus captains, they have a fixed shift. If

a bus captain has applied to be on special shift duties, then he will always be on a special shift duty, unless and except when he's on leave.

For Citybus, for their bus captains, they have a roster system. So every week he will be having a different shift. So it depends. It depends on the deployment of the roster.

So it would be difficult to say how often he would be on such a shift.

MR DUNCAN: With regard to New World First Bus, do I understand you to be saying that some drivers would be permanently on a 13-hour shift, special shift?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: How many days a week would they be working?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Work for five days or six days per week, with one day off.

MR DUNCAN: When you say five or six, is that the driver's choice or ...?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: They have to apply for the shift that they prefer. There are some shifts that would go on from Monday to Saturday and they would have to work for six days, with Sunday being off. There are other shifts that we go on from Mondays to Sundays and then they work for five days and then they will have a day off.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand that many of the drivers in

that company, New World First Bus, would be on duty 13 hours a day for five or six days in a week?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: There are some bus captains who are like that, but not all of them. We estimate that there are 10 or more per cent of the shifts that are special shifts.

MR DUNCAN: So approximately what proportion of drivers would be working those hours, a 13-hour special shift each day, for five to six days; approximately what percentage of the New World First Bus contingent?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: With indulgence, sir.

10-odd per cent, about 144 shifts.

MR DUNCAN: Going to Citybus, could you explain again, please, the difference between New World First Bus and Citybus in this respect?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For Citybus, the bus captains do not have a fixed shift per day. Each week, they will -- every five days, they have a shift and then they have a day off, and when they come back from the day off they will rotate to the next shift, for five days, and then they have a day off and then they come back for another shift. It works like this.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly that within a week, one day they might be on duty for a maximum of 10 hours and another day they might be on duty for 13 hours? It

changes day-to-day?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Every five days. They rotate every five days.

MR DUNCAN: I see.

CHAIRMAN: So what are the variables? You have a 10-hour day. You've got a 13-hour day. Is there any other different category?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, there are -- 10 hours is the average number. There are some shifts that would involve eight hours, some nine hours, 10 hours, 11 hours.

MEMBER LO: The whole five-day shift has the same pattern, so you don't change from eight, 10, 13? So the five days, exactly the same shift?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to give the committee some idea as to what practical effect this will have, the new guidelines will have, on the duty of the average, if I can call it that, the average bus captain's working hours? Is this going to be a shift change within the companies, or is it going to be other than significant, with regard to their working hours?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Well, if they are on special shift, then the rest time would be concentrated on the three hours. Before we changed the guidelines, the maximum working hours would be 14 hours, with driving hours 11 hours.

For a 14-hour shift, they have three hours' rest time, but this rest time would be broken up during that stretch. For a special shift, the rest break will be concentrated in a particular three-hour or more than three-hour stretch.

MR DUNCAN: The old 14-hour shift, was that popular with your drivers?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Some. It is popular with some captains.

MR DUNCAN: Were any bus captains required to work a maximum of 14 hours or be on duty for 14 hours against their wishes?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We assign them the shifts and they have to observe the shifts. However, if they can find a colleague to swap the shift with and it is in keeping with the guidelines, then this would be granted.

MR DUNCAN: And if a person was not happy with the 14-hour provision, would he find it easy to undertake that exchange?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I'm not sure whether they find it easy to exchange, but the swap arrangement is quite common.

MR DUNCAN: What do you anticipate with regard to the special shift duty? Do you think it will be popular with your employees or other than popular?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I heard from some union representatives that it is popular, but other representatives that it is

unpopular.

MR DUNCAN: So you've got mixed reports, have you?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Whether it is half-and-half, I'm not sure. I heard some bus captains that they would like to have longer shifts because they want more money.

MR DUNCAN: What makes it unpopular with some?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: There are some bus captains who don't need so much money. There are some, for instance, who've been with us for a long time and they are not the breadwinner in the family, and eight hours/nine hours would be enough for them, and therefore they don't prefer any shifts which are long.

MR DUNCAN: Do you anticipate requiring people to be on duty for up to 13 hours against their will? Do you expect that to happen?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I don't think so.

MR DUNCAN: Right. In the absence of any further questions, I'm going to leave the guidelines now.

I want to go back to the forward planning programme, please. This is what we will find at TD-1, at 195. We've seen this document this morning, Mr Cheng, in the context --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I did, yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: -- of seat belts. There are just a few other matters I wish to explore with you, if I could.

First of all, if you would look at page 199 of the bundle, and "Analysis of accident by nature in 2016". Do you see that entry?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do, sir.

MR DUNCAN: We can see table 4 there. The nature of the accidents have been classified under a number of heads, with the table reaching over to page 200. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: The nature of the accident which is the greatest by quite a long way is the last on page 199, and that is the non-collision accident involving a passenger injury. Do you see that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: And that point is picked up on page 200:

"As about 60 per cent of the accidents were non-collision accidents involving passenger injury, further analysis was made on this type of accidents as shown in table 5 below. The analysis revealed that accidents caused by passengers losing balance in the bus has always been the major cause of accidents."

As far as you know, does that remain the case today, that that proportion appears to be the highest with regard to the nature of accidents?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not much different, yes.

MR DUNCAN: So, if I'm reading from the paragraph above table 5:

"The analysis revealed that accidents caused by passengers losing balance in the bus has ... been the major cause ..."

What has the company been able to do with regard to this particular matter?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, please.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes. Passengers falling over on buses, this has always been the major cause. In the past, we had publicity together with the Transport Department. The government had some APIs which were broadcast on TV to remind the passengers that when they are on board they have to hold onto the handrail, and if they are loaded down with a lot of stuff, they should not move upstairs. Our company has also put up some signs on board, to remind passengers that as soon as they get on board, they should find a seat to sit down on or they should hold onto the handrails.

Other than the signs or notices, we have also made use of the bus stop announcement system, to show messages and to broadcast messages, to remind passengers to hold onto the handrails. So this was what we had done in the past.

Other than enhancing publicity for the public, for

our passengers, when we train our drivers, we also remind the bus captains that when they drive, they need to note the activities of the bus passengers on board. In particular, before they leave the bus stop, they have to check whether passengers have already reached their seats or whether they have held onto the handrails, and they have to pay particular attention to the elderly passengers. And before they stop, they need to be gradual and smooth in the manoeuvring, so as to avoid braking the vehicle and causing injuries to passengers, when they fall.

MR DUNCAN: Does the mode of driving by the driver contribute to these passengers falling over? Is that your experience?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The driving attitude of bus captains may contribute to the passengers falling. Yes, this is one of the causes.

As to whether a bus passenger has held onto the handrail after boarding, it's also part of the duty or the responsibility of the passenger himself. And for the roads of Hong Kong, from time to time, there may be emergencies and they are beyond the control of the bus captains. Therefore, sometimes there is indeed a need to brake suddenly and this may cause a passenger to fall.

MR DUNCAN: Are there rules and regulations as to how many people can travel on a bus, over and above those persons actually seated in a spot on the bus? Are there rules and regulations as to how many people are permitted to stand in a bus?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For each and every bus, the number of seats as well as the number of standees are subject to a limit, and such limits are already sort of written on the side of the body of the bus, near to the door. Depending on the model and the length of the bus, the carrying capacity would vary, in terms of the number of seats as well as the number of standees.

MR DUNCAN: And who is responsible for determining whether there is more than the required number of standees on the bus? Whose responsibility is that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For each new bus delivered to Hong Kong, the TD will carry out the process of type approval. As part of this process, consideration will be given to the size of the passageway on the lower deck of the bus, before coming up with a figure for the number of passengers who can stand. We would also take into account the load of the bus, and that would come into the calculations as well.

CHAIRMAN: I think the question is more specific: whose job is it to decide that the number of standees is in excess

of the stipulated limit?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The bus captain has the duty to make sure that the carrying capacity hasn't been exceeded.

MR DUNCAN: How would you expect the bus captain to discharge that duty?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me answer this question. For every bus, the number of standees will be stated and stipulated. When a bus captain is driving a bus, it is impossible for him to be distracted, to count the number of passengers boarding his bus. When a bus passenger boards a bus, I think probably he will first of all try to sit down. When all the seats have been taken up, then passengers have to stand. But at any one time, the bus captain will not know how many passengers he is carrying on his bus. He can only observe. And such an observation would be based on how near the standing passengers are to the front of the bus. If there are many people standing, that means it's quite full. However, if you have ever made the observation on the street or if you have taken a ride on a bus during peak hours, you would notice that towards the further end of the passageway of the lower deck, passengers don't like to stand there. They would rather stand near to the door, that is, the exit door in the middle of the bus. And then, when there are more and more people standing,

they would rather stand near the front of the bus. They are reluctant to go further inside.

Now, the bus captain can only make an observation. He will only notice that many people are standing near to the front of the bus. He would not know whether there is in fact a lot of space available further down the passageway but nobody is willing to take up that space. That is common during the peak hours.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I understand those difficulties, Mr Cheng. Does it mean that in fact it's really virtually impossible for the driver to enforce the standing limits that are written on the side of the bus?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: First of all, the bus captain would not know when he has to enforce it, because it is not possible for him to count how many people are on the bus. I think we all need to understand one point. There are always people boarding and alighting. As to the net number of passengers on board, I don't think you can expect a bus captain to do the calculations using a calculator. He can't have an accurate idea. The most he can do is to rely on visual observation. All right? If he sees that there are many people standing quite near to the front of the bus, there is no way and nothing that he can do. This is because passengers are

all anxious to go to work and they have already paid for the bus fare. For passengers standing inside the bus, they have all paid by using the Octopus card or inserted coins into the fare box.

Now, if the bus captain is to start a headcount one by one, and say, for example, he finds that there are two passengers above the limit, it will be difficult for him to identify which two passengers should be persuaded to alight. So that's a practical difficulty.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is overcrowding on buses an issue for the company? Overcrowding meaning more people standing on buses than the limits imposed on the bus. Is that a problem?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me repeat once again. In fact, we don't have any data to prove that we have got having more standing passengers than the standee limit. We don't have such a figure. We don't have such data.

So I can't say with certainty as to whether we have got this question of overcrowding.

MR DUNCAN: So that is something unknown to the company; is that correct? You don't know whether you have an overcrowding problem or not?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me say this once again. Near to the front of the bus, or for the first half, first part of

the bus, there may be cases of overcrowding, but then for the further end of the bus, on many occasions nobody is standing. So in certain parts of the bus, there may be overcrowding, but then it's an impression only. As to whether there is an excess of the carrying capacity, it is something objective. We don't have such information, that is whether and how many buses have got passengers exceeding the carrying capacity. We don't have this sort of figures.

MR DUNCAN: I would like to refer you, please, to another of the submissions that the committee has received, by taking you to MISC-1, at page 124-1.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. We have already read that.

MR DUNCAN: You've read this letter from the Hong Kong Police Force dated 7 May 2018?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we have read it.

MR DUNCAN: Have you read paragraph 5 on the second page?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, we did.

MR DUNCAN: In that particular paragraph, the writer has referred to five main causation factors. Do you see that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Can I ask you this: does the company receive from time to time reports of this nature from the police?

This is of course addressed to the committee, but I'm just trying to ascertain what information, if any, the company might receive from the police from time to time.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, we haven't received from the police information like this.

However, when we prepared the five-year forward planning programme, the Transport Department gives us guidelines for preparing the forward planning programme, and information like this has been given to us, and on a yearly basis.

MR DUNCAN: So you get this sort of information but through the Transport Department; is that a correct understanding?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Can I just ask you this with regard to paragraph 5, with regard to the main causation factors: does that indication come as any surprise to you? Is it consistent with your own understanding?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, it accords with our understanding; not surprised.

MR DUNCAN: Right. Now, I'm going to ask you to look, please, at another document that the committee has received from the Transport Department, this time very recently. I'm not sure whether you will have seen this.

We can locate it at TD-5/1649. This, I believe, is a communication to the committee received just a couple of days ago, headed, "Road safety management system", and the purpose of which is described, it is to outline "the road safety management system currently adopted by the government".

Have you or your colleagues been able to read this document?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

If I could then take you slowly to just a couple of aspects of the document, please.

Could I bring your attention first of all to the first page, page 1649, and paragraph 4 of that page, commencing with, "Apart from the follow-up actions by the TD". Could you just read that to yourself.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I've done so.

MR DUNCAN: It refers to a sample of the quarterly traffic accident situation report, submitted by the Transport Department to the Road Safety Council, a sample of which is at attachment I.

In that respect, could I ask you to go to page 1658 of the document, please, of the bundle, 1658. Do you see at 1658 the heading, "Traffic accident situation report for Road Safety Council meeting on 7 March 2018"?

Do you see that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Then if you look at the next page, 1659, you see appendix I with a heading, "Summary of traffic accidents status in 2017".

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: If you go down that page, you get to "Appendix 3 franchised bus involvements", still at 1659. "Appendix 3 franchised bus involvements"; do you see that paragraph?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Not yet, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Do you see it now?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: "Appendix 3 ...

For franchised bus involvements in Q4 2017, Kowloon Motor Bus, Long Win Bus, New Lantao Bus and Citybus (franchise 2) recorded increases while New World First Bus and Citybus (franchise 1) recorded decreases over Q4 2016."

If I could then take you to appendix 3 which has been referenced there, which you will find at 1664 of the bundle. Do you see the heading "Appendix 3" and "Franchised bus involvements"?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: And then a box for each of the franchisees?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: One of the ways in which the Transport Department measures road safety is the involvement rate, as they refer to it, per million of vehicle-kilometres. Are you aware of that?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: If you look at the first entry, Kowloon Motor Bus, and if we look at the last two entries, the fourth quarter of 2016 and the fourth quarter of 2017, you will see the involvement rates at 2.979 and 4.005 respectively. Do you see those entries?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: If you look then through the rest of it, do you see that the figures for New World First Bus and Citybus franchise 1 seem to be amongst the highest with regard to the involvement rate per million vehicle-kilometres. Can you detect that from reading through the document?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Does that come as any surprise to you?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No, sir. Well, because for each franchise, the network is different, and the traffic situations that they serve also varies. Citybus, for instance, Citybus franchise 1 and Citybus franchise 2, the accident rates differ vastly. These are the two franchises managed by the same company. Why the vast

difference? That's because the networks that they serve are different.

Citybus 2, most of the buses are running on highways and the mileage is pretty high for them. Also, they don't serve much in busy road sections. So we feel that we cannot simply make the comparison like this in relation to the accident rate per million kilometres. We cannot simply make a comparison like that.

CHAIRMAN: This is a point you have made in one of your submissions, is it not, apples with apples?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the reference where this point is made? Or perhaps you can come back to it in due course.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Sorry, Mr Chairman, we haven't got this in the submission, we didn't say this in the submission, but in the five-year forward plan, in 5.1, in the introduction, we have made this point.

MR DUNCAN: It will be at page TD-1/195.

CHAIRMAN: Yes:

"The significant difference in accident statistics of Citybus [franchise 1 and franchise 2] is a good demonstration of the effect of network composition and operating areas of Citybus [franchise 1] and Citybus [franchise 2] are both operated by Citybus.

What are the highways on which Citybus franchise 2

operate mostly?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Mainly North Lantau Highway and also West Kowloon Corridor.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: There is one other point I wish to explore with you or raise with you, Mr Cheng, before I leave this Transport Department document recently received.

Could you look at page 1650. So it's TD-5/1650.

This morning, the chairman raised the matter of black boxes on public light buses, and I would just like you, please, to read through paragraph 7 on that page, page 1650.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I've done it, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

The chairman also referred to the fact that, according to his understanding, there were provisions applicable to public light buses which had an over speed threshold of three seconds as opposed to the 10 seconds we were discussing this morning. Do you remember his raising that with you?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do, sir.

MR DUNCAN: I'm just going to tender for the record schedule 19 to the Road Traffic (Construction and Maintenance of Vehicles) Regulations. I think that's on the system now.

If one was to look at paragraph 3 of the schedule, you will see there a requirement with regard to the capability of an EDRD, or black box, with regard to its installation in a public light bus. And in paragraph 3(d) there's reference to "records of vehicle activity when the actual speed of the vehicle exceeds an over speed threshold stored in the EDRD for a continuous period of more than three seconds".

I simply bring that to your attention because of the chairman's comment this morning.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I've read it.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Let us go now back to the forward planning programme and the bus safety report. So it's TD-1 at page 200.

At 5.11 -- and of course this was written before the working group was set up --11 there is a heading, "Measures and programmes planned to enhance safety". We can see on that page, 200, going right through to page 201, a number of measures that have been identified.

Just one matter I would like to raise with you in (iv) on page 201, please. The fourth-last line:

"Harsh braking reports generated whenever deceleration is beyond threshold are used to identify drivers with harsh braking habit. Remedial training or

disciplinary action will be taken to rectify the misbehaviours."

How are these harsh braking reports generated?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I would like to defer to Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes. If we receive a complaint from a passenger saying that the bus driver has had harsh braking, then we will get hold of the data, to find out whether he does have such a habit of harsh braking. If it is established, then we would take follow-up action.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So no complaint, no report; is that the situation?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then page 202, 5.12, in the middle of that paragraph we have this entry:

"Proper and fair disciplinary procedure and reward mechanism are in place to deter bad driving behaviour and to encourage good driving attitude."

Do you see that reference?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Not yet. Now I see it.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, post-reclassification of the safety bonus, the attendance bonus, the performance bonus, what reward mechanism is now in place to deter bad driving behaviour and to encourage good driving attitude?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I think I have answered this question

before. If they have a poor driving attitude, if they are not having a high standard of driving safety, then there will be different degrees of disciplinary action.

CHAIRMAN: I think the real question perhaps is this, Mr Cheng. At one stage you had a stick and a carrot, and now you have given up the carrot. Is that the situation?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. Correct.

MR DUNCAN: We can leave the forward planning report now, please, and go back to your submission, which is -- the entry I wish to take up is at CTB-1, pages 27 to 28.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I see it.

MR DUNCAN: At page 27, we have a heading provided by the company, "Maintenance and inspection", and that runs through to most of page 28.

The pre-service check, item (d), which is a requirement on the bus captain, is the bus captain required to keep a written record of this check?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No.

MR DUNCAN: To what extent have maintenance matters contributed to bus accidents involving company buses over the last few years?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I would like to defer to Mr Li.

MR PAUL LI: I haven't got the figures with me. I believe it is quite unlikely and there are just very, very few

cases.

MR DUNCAN: The very, very few cases have revealed what? What sort of problems?

MR PAUL LI: As far as I can recall, some parts have been broken, causing damages to the bus, but it was minor.

MR DUNCAN: Are there written reports made of these sorts of incidents?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, there are.

MR DUNCAN: I wonder if you could provide the committee with samples of reports which have led to any sort of incidents, say in the past two years. Would that be possible?

MR PAUL LI: Yes, we will go back to check.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan, is this not a matter that has been addressed in the LegCo papers dealing with the renewal of the franchise, where the overall record of the company, for example Citybus, was examined, and the success of their maintenance programme described?

MR DUNCAN: I think that is right, Mr Chairman. We'll try and find the reference to that. We'll try and locate that.

Just moving away from that topic, could I ask you this, Mr Cheng. In the context of safety, are there any matters where you would consider that the government

could assist your company materially, in a way in which it doesn't assist the company at the moment? We understand that primarily safety is a matter for the bus companies, but is there anything which occurs to you whereby you could be assisted by the government in your endeavours?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, as far as we are concerned, anything to enhance safety would involve expenditure. It will cost money. In future, should there be requirements incurring a vast amount of money on our part, to install certain devices so as to enhance the safety standards of our service, I do hope that the government will provide some financial support to us.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Can you point to anything specific which you would regard as beyond your financial capabilities at the moment, but which, if it could be could funded, would add materially to the matter of safety? Is there any specific matter?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I cannot give any examples which will substantially enhance the safety. Rather, there are certain things which the public would think that, when done, the safety would be enhanced.

I can give examples. Say, for example, this morning, you explored the idea of retrofitting safety

seat belts for the upper deck. This morning, Mr Li talked about the cost. It will be 15,000 to 20,000 pounds per bus, and we have got 1,100 buses falling into this category. If they all have to be retrofitted with safety belts on the upper deck, the total cost, as we have given, will be HK$180 million to HK$240 million.

The two companies are registering a very low level of profits. We don't know how many years we have to operate before we can earn that amount of money so as to retrofit the safety belts. So this is one of the examples that our financial capability cannot afford.

So, for such kinds of expenditure, I believe we have to be very cautious, and find out whether it can really very effectively achieve the purpose.

This morning, we have said that currently there are certain exposed seats on board and they have been fitted with seat belts, but then in fact I ride on the buses many times. I seldom see passengers occupying such seats put on the seat belts. In future, if you ask our company to spend $100 million to $200 million, or more than $200 million to work on this, while we query very much the effectiveness, of course, if the administration would like to impose such a requirement, that is to retrofit the seat belts, then I very much hope that the

government will provide a subsidy so that we can install the seat belts.

So this is one of the examples. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So your point really is this: if the government thinks that it's worthwhile doing because it gives passengers who might want to put a seat belt on the opportunity to do so, but it's your experience that if they don't do so, then it's up to government to fund this, rather than impose it on your own? Is that the point?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If the government sees the need for seat belts, in order for the passengers to put on the seat belts if they want to, if that's the case then I hope the government would fund the exercise because if we fund it, it would be a waste of resources.

Sorry, if I may, Mr Chairman, most importantly, if you think of the situation in Hong Kong, we do have standing capacity. If you feel that it is not safe enough to sit down and you need the seat belt, what about those who are standing up? They don't have a seat belt. For the standees, I think it's a bit of a contradiction.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I think your other point was -- I will leave that point.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Can I refer you to page 40 of your submission. So that will be CTB-1 at page 40 of the bundle.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You should be looking at a page which has the heading in the middle, "Other relevant information". Do you have that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You have said:

"To assist the committee in understanding the franchised bus industry, we also wish to take this opportunity to explain our operating environment and challenges we have encountered in providing franchised bus services".

And you have set out there a number of issues. Can I just bring your attention to item (b), "Route rationalisation". You have said at the end of that paragraph that what has happened has led to a waste of money and resources at your end.

CHAIRMAN: Might I invite you to read out the short paragraph?

MR DUNCAN: Certainly. I quote:

"To tackle the competition posed by the railway, we proposed route rationalisation plans to the [Transport

Department] to scale down or cancel low demand services. Due to the objection of district councils, a number of our route rationalisation plans could not be computed to match the decrease in passengers demand. This has led to a waste of money and resources on our end."

Could you just appraise the committee of the system that operates, first of all with regard to the routes you are required to support, and then the system, if you wish to change a route?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, if I may.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

If a railway line is coming on stream, we will make proposals to the Transport Department. If there are routes that are overlapping with the rail alignment, then we would propose a cancellation of these routes or, alternatively, scale back the frequency of these routes or have diversion.

With the proposals being put in, then we have to submit the route rationalisation plans to the district councils for discussion. Normally, the councillors would have a lot of comments and they would raise a lot of objections. These bus routes have been around for some considerable time, and many of the residents have been using these routes. With the railway coming on stream, some passengers will be lost to the railway and

we are running short of patronage, although there will still be passengers using them. Still, the councillors would object to the cancellation or the scale-back of the services.

If the objection is particularly strong, the Transport Department may not necessarily approve the plan.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is the MTR link to Ocean Park or Wong Chuk Hang an example of how a railway system arriving affects passenger usage on buses, just as an example?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir. Yes, indeed.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Mr Chairman, if I may, the impact was significant because prior to the railway coming on stream, we had a route, that's the 629, bus 629, running between Admiralty and Ocean Park. At that time, if anybody wants to go to Ocean Park by public transport, they will be using this particular route.

Ever since the MTR line has come on stream, we had to cancel the route altogether because we have lost all the passengers to MTR.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So the Transport Department has the final say; is that the position?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Indeed, sir.

MR DUNCAN: You don't have any right of appeal to any further authority with respect to that sort of matter?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: No. We never tried.

CHAIRMAN: Is there an avenue of appeal?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We don't realise there is such a channel.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any -- have you ever considered --

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I would like to correct this. It's we don't aware of such a channel, not realised, we don't aware of.

CHAIRMAN: Is there not an appeal to the Secretary of Transport and Housing, or am I thinking of another provision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung. He is more familiar with this.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: According to Cap 230, PBSO, if there is dispute over the rationalisation plan, then the THB would be the authority for settlement, but we never tried this.

CHAIRMAN: But specifically the Secretary for Transport and Housing?

Don't worry. We can check that. But that's the provision I have in mind.

MR DUNCAN: Moving from the route rationalisation to another matter you have raised, the fare adjustment arrangement, item (f) on page 41.

Perhaps I could read quickly through this before I ask you a couple of matters:

"The approval of franchised bus fare adjustment applications is governed by the fare adjustment arrangement ('FAA'). Under the FAA, there is a basket of factors that the government would consider. Public acceptability and affordability is one of the factors. In our view, this factor is highly discretional and subjective and has been conveniently abused by politicians.

We had our last fare adjustment in 2008. Since then, we have not applied for any fare adjustment until August 2017 when [Citybus, the first franchise, and New World First Bus] submitted applications for fare adjustments to mitigate the substantial revenue loss due to railways competition in recent years and cost increases over the last 10 years. As mentioned in (c) above, the cumulative inflation rate in Hong Kong over this ... period was 31.2 per cent and we have awarded a cumulative increase in wages of 39.9 per cent. Although we were fully justified to seek fare adjustments under the FAA on various occasions, no application had been made mainly due to the ineffectiveness of the FAA and the highly politicised environment against fare/price increases of public

utilities.

In addition to the difficulty in obtaining a fair deal in FAA applications, the fare adjustment approval process has been excessively long. By way of example, our current fare adjustment applications submitted in August 2017 are still being scrutinised by the government.

Unlike the MTR, which has automatic fare adjustment made annually in accordance with a prescribed formula, franchised bus companies do not have the same certainty in fare adjustments. Without such certainty, it is difficult for franchised bus companies to formulate comprehensive future plans."

You have identified in those paragraphs a number of matters which can perhaps be summed up by your phrase "the ineffectiveness of the FAA". Have you --

CHAIRMAN: Before you embark on any questioning, Mr Duncan, do we have that document available, the fare adjustment arrangement?

MR DUNCAN: I think we do.

Mr Chairman, if we are able to turn up SEC/373.

CHAIRMAN: SEC-1 at page 373?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

This is an example of one of the fare increase applications --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: -- and its treatment.

Back to you, Mr Cheng, if I could. Given your description of the FAA being ineffective, the process, have you made any overtures to anybody with regard to changing what you see as an ineffective system?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we did. Last time, when the FAA was reviewed -- allow me to paraphrase it. Every time when the government reviews the FAA, we point out that the FAA has certain inadequacies and it is not transparent enough, in the eyes of the bus operators.

Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: How long has that situation existed?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Ever since the FAA came into existence, so far we have only applied for one fare increase, and that was in 2008. On that occasion, for Citybus (F1), it was only for the jointly operated cross-harbour routes were allowed to put up the fares. For the Hong Kong Island routes, we were not allowed to increase the fare levels.

As to the rationale, and then as to the financial forecast data submitted by us to the government, whether the government has taken on board all our financial projection data or which part of our data was not acceptable, nothing was said to us.

At the end of the day, all we knew was that for

CTB (F1), all the Hong Kong Island routes were not allowed to increase their fare levels. In fact, the last time we increased the fares for the Hong Kong Island routes, it was 1998. That's because in 2008 our application was rejected. And we didn't know the reason.

So, for this FAA, I believe that the transparency has to be enhanced.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that you simply get the result without any reasoned decision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Just for the record, Mr Chairman, there is another reference to the fare adjustment arrangement at THB-2 at 23, a fuller description.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So, Mr Cheng, when did this arrangement come into existence?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: It was 2005 or 2006, round about that time. I think 2006.

MR DUNCAN: As far as you are aware, have there been any changes made to the adjustment mechanisms since that time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, there were some changes, but I'm afraid I cannot state the specific changes. But at

least I can remember that originally it was not called FAA. It was not called -- it was at first called fare adjustment mechanism. Later on, the name was changed, together with other changes, and it is now called FAA.

As to the specific changes, I'm afraid offhand I don't have the information for you.

MR DUNCAN: I'm sorry, did you say in 2008 you made an application which was unsuccessful?

CHAIRMAN: Well, it was successful for the harbour route but nothing else.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In year 2008, for CTB (F1) and New World First Bus, there was an application for fare increase from both. The result was, for New World First Bus, the fare increases were approved. But then for CTB, for our Hong Kong Island routes, we were not allowed to increase the fares. For the harbour routes, when they were jointly operated with KMB, since KMB was given approval to increase the fares, and as a result we were also allowed to increase the fares. But of course most of our operations are on Hong Kong Island, and for those we were not allowed to increase the fares.

MR DUNCAN: Were you given any reasons at all as to why that application was rejected?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, no specific reasons were given.

MR DUNCAN: Well, any reasons? Did you receive anything in

writing, beyond the fact that it had been unsuccessful?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No.

MR DUNCAN: Since we are moving to the MISC bundle, can I raise another matter with you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you moving on to another matter?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so -- at page 42 of your first submissions, paragraph (g), "Reasonable return", the last three lines say this:

"We are given to understand that the government is in the course of reviewing the FAA, and we earnestly hope that the above-mentioned issues can be addressed in the review."

Perhaps, Mr Duncan, I can invite you to read out the whole of that paragraph as being relevant to the conclusion.

MR DUNCAN: "Due to the difficulties regarding fare adjustment as described above, the chance of being awarded a fare adjustment and the increase rate are full of uncertainties. We forecast that the return on [average net fixed assets of CTB franchise 1 and New World First Bus] will be below 1 per cent for the financial year ending 30 June 2018. This is taken into account that the status quo can be maintained in regard to our overall expenditure. Should there be any

significant increase in staff and fuel costs, both of these franchises may well become loss making. Therefore, let alone earning a reasonable return, when the companies' commercial viability is at stake, it will be impossible for our companies to continue to provide the high quality and efficient services expected by the public, and to offer attractive pay packages to recruit and retain staff. We are given to understand that the government is in the course of reviewing the FAA, and we earnestly hope that the above-mentioned issues can be addressed in the review."

Do you maintain those sentiments today, Mr Cheng?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I maintain this view.

MR DUNCAN: Your information that the government is in the course of reviewing the FAA, on what basis have you formed that understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We have had meetings with the government.

CHAIRMAN: Specifically with whom in the government?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Transport and Housing Bureau.

CHAIRMAN: When were those meetings which led to this understanding?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me say this. I say "we are given to understand", and so on and so forth. I think I have made it rather indirect. Allow me to rephrase this sentence. I should say, "We understand" or "We know

that".

CHAIRMAN: As a result of meetings?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: When were the meetings?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I have to go back to check the meeting date.

CHAIRMAN: Were they this year or last year?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Last year.

CHAIRMAN: Nothing this year?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I don't recall having any more meetings this year, but I really have to go back to check my diary.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so, if you would be kind enough, and inform us what the position is, as to whether there were meetings this year, on this subject.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. Certainly, I will do that.

MEMBER LO: Can I ask a question? The question, is it about the FAA or it's about the formula? According to the formula, have you calculated how much fare increase you could ask for or request?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: The FAA itself.

MEMBER LO: But there's a formula you can apply?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We don't have an automatic mechanism. According to the FAA, we may submit an application, and after that there will be a process, a series of

examination and approval. Ours is different from that of the MTR.

MEMBER LO: So is it about the procedure or is it about what is the change that you request for reviewing the FAA?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Well, to us, if we have more certainties about the fare adjustment, and if the transparency is enhanced, then at least it will be better. I hope at least in those two areas there will be improvements.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, just for the record, I referred to the fact that the fare adjustment arrangement had been the subject of one of the THB documents, THB-2/23.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: The matter of the review of the FAA is a matter which the bureau has also addressed at the ensuing pages, THB-2, pages 24 and 25, for the record.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we ought to turn to that, since it's the subject matter of this evidence.

MR DUNCAN: Certainly.

Just before we do that, Mr Cheng, do I understand correctly from your evidence that you had discussions about a change in the FAA, but you have not yet been informed by the government as to the outcome of those discussions? Is that the position?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. The review is with the government. It's in the government's court.

MR DUNCAN: And you don't know what the outcome of that review is at the present time?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: At the moment, we don't know. We don't.

MR DUNCAN: So can we have on the screen, please, THB-2, pages 24 and 25. We want bundle page 24. Yes.

I will read through, if you can follow me. Perhaps if we go back to the previous page, just to get the full flavour, page 23 of the bundle. Do you see item (d) on that page, "Fare adjustment arrangement", and then a subheading, "Current arrangement"?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Then if I could pick it up at the following page, bundle page 24, paragraph 4.28:

"The aforesaid existing arrangement was put in place in 2006 after consultation with the LegCo. The arrangement was subsequently fine-tuned having regard to the outcome of the review in 2009. As the existing arrangement can basically strike a balance between the sound operation of bus service as well as public affordability and acceptability, there is no need for an overhaul of the FAA.

In this regard, the government has conducted a review of the FAA. The initial findings indicate that the arrangement should be kept intact, while the data could be updated on two fronts:

(a) Productivity gain value ...

(b) Passenger reward arrangement".

Unless the chairman wishes me to go to that, I will leave out the detail of that, but then move to item 4.30:

"The government has initiated discussion with the franchised bus companies on the initial review outcome and the details of the above two data updates. We will announce the discussion outcome and expect to implement them in the first half of 2018 upon approval by the Chief Executive-in-Council."

Now, according to that statement, Mr Cheng, the government has initiated discussions with the bus companies, obviously including yours, on the initial review outcome and what they propose, namely that the arrangement should be kept intact but with the data being updated on two fronts. Have you in fact been informed of the government's view with regard to those matters?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I am aware that the government is conducting a review.

MR DUNCAN: But has the government indicated to you their findings --

CHAIRMAN: I think they are called "initial findings".

MR DUNCAN: Yes, the initial findings that indicate that the

arrangement should be kept intact but with the data being updated on two fronts, as it's suggested in paragraph 4.29. Has the government informed you of that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, at the meeting, yes. But as to the updating of the data on two fronts, what new figures would there be, we are not sure. We don't know. For these two figures, they are terribly important.

MR DUNCAN: And you are still awaiting details with regard to those figures; is that the position?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm going to leave the fare adjustment arrangement now and go to MISC-2.

Could I bring to your attention again a document we saw yesterday at page 643 of the bundle, with the translation at 644-1.

If we could pull up the Chinese document, please, at page 643. Thank you.

Do you recall my referring this submission to you yesterday from the Democratic Alliance?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, I do.

MR DUNCAN: That was in the context of the salary of franchised bus captains. Today, I want to bring to your attention a matter which they have brought to the attention of the committee. That appears in the third

paragraph of the first page, beginning with the words:

"The industry actions of bus captains that took place in February 2017 and 2018 aroused the concern of different sectors of the community over problems such as illegal parking at bus stops, bus captains' treatment and working hours."

It goes on to say, "Below are reasons for illegal parking at bus stops", and there are four items which are mentioned. Do you see those?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Then if you go to the second page of the original document, page 644 of the bundle, and the translation, the last paragraph on page 644-1:

"To eradicate illegal parking at bus stops, it must be dealt with from its roots and by formulating suitable policies, revising the outdated laws. The problem can only be resolved by multipronged measures."

Then there's a paragraph:

"Suggestion 1: Following Singapore and installing cameras on all bus fleets."

Before we go further into this, does the company regard illegal parking at bus stops as a problem?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I defer to Mr Chung, if I may.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Could you perhaps just describe the extent of

the problem?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: In many bus stops, there is illegal parking, and these vehicles are getting in the way of the buses, in a way that they cannot pull up close to the kerb for loading and unloading. There may be markings for the bus stop. Our buses require a certain distance to pull into the bay. If there is illegal parking on the front end or back end of the bay, it would be getting in the way of the bus operation, and sometimes the buses would have to pick up and set down passengers in the middle of the road. This is quite a commonplace and serious problem.

MR DUNCAN: Does it cause safety concerns?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Indeed, yes.

MR DUNCAN: In what way?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: For instance, illegal parking would reduce the width of the road when the buses drive past. Because of the large size of the bus, it's likely to get into problem, and if the passengers cannot get on and off on the kerbside, there is a likelihood of them being hit by vehicles or they may fall over.

MR DUNCAN: If we go back to the letter -- sorry, before we go back to the letter, has the company endeavoured to overcome this problem?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We notified the Transport Department

about the black spots of illegal parking. We hope that these sections, they will have 24-hour restricted zone. We also notified the police to do enforcement work.

MR DUNCAN: Has that eradicated the problem?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: It doesn't help much.

MR DUNCAN: If we go back to --

CHAIRMAN: Did it result in any action?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: The police would take action, but as soon as the police back is turned, then the illegal parking problem would recur. Say, for instance, in Causeway Bay, Yee Wo Street, near SOGO, outside SOGO, in fact, this is a problem that occurs very often. Earlier, a taxi driver got into a confrontation with a bus captain.

MR DUNCAN: If we go back to the letter, there is then reference to a system which appears to exist in Singapore. I'm quoting from the letter to the committee:

"Following Singapore and installing cameras on all bus fleets. Singapore has since 2008 installed cameras on buses and the cameras are installed next to the driver's seats. When drivers discover cars parking inside the bus stop, they can press the button and record a video of 5-10 minutes. The bus companies will then hand the recording to the police, thereafter the

police can review the recording and in around two weeks' time the ticket will be sent to the car owner's home. Each penalty ticket costs nearly HK$800, there is an additional charge of HK$5,000 and imprisonment of 3 months for late payment of penalty.

For the first year, Singapore has recorded 2,112 incidents of drivers driving into the bus lanes or bus stops to pick up and drop off customers. For 2014, the number of cases of driving into the bus lanes and illegal parking has already reduced to 886, it has successfully deterred most drivers not to stop at the bus stops."

Is that a method which has any appeal to you?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Regarding this proposal, I have doubts about the credibility of such an arrangement. If I understand it correctly, what it means is that on board the bus, near to the bus driver's seat, there is a camera, so that when the bus approaches the bus stop, if it is found that there is somebody who has parked his vehicle there, then the bus driver would press a button and then there would be an automatic recording of a clip running for five to ten minutes. That's how I understand it.

But then, first of all, in Hong Kong, when the bus driver reaches a bus stop, it is impossible for us to

stop there for five to ten minutes, not for our buses in Hong Kong. For the approach in Singapore, I think they have something similar to that in Hong Kong. I don't quite think that you will see a bus pulling up in a bus stop, it is found that there is illegal parking and then the bus doesn't pull up into the bus bay and then the camera is on for five to ten minutes. Well, I don't think this is going to be feasible, at least not in Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: Five to ten seconds?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Here, in the Chinese version, it's five to ten minutes.

CHAIRMAN: I'm asking you what you think about five to ten seconds.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: It depends whether a bus can move further up and stop by the bus stop. If we don't and yet we just stop our bus there and then make a recording of that offending vehicle for five to ten seconds, I'm afraid this will cause delay to our passengers. It will also obstruct the traffic on the road.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We saw from the demonstration at the Chai Wan depot that you have forward-looking cameras in buses, did we not?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN: We saw a lady for whom the bus driver waited and opened the door again so she could board.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That kind of camera could capture what is being described, could it not?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, it can capture images for one to three seconds. However, if it is just for one to three seconds, I'm not sure whether it is adequate to establish a case and penalise the driver for having stopped the vehicle at a bus bay. I'm not familiar with the criteria on the part of the police to prosecute. Will somebody be booked and issued a summons for just stopping there for two seconds? I'm not sure.

CHAIRMAN: That's a matter for the prosecuting authorities, but at least you would be providing them with evidence. It's for them to judge whether it is sufficient.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: In that case, it means that our bus captain has to be doing both at the same time. While driving, he has to note down at what time and at which bus stop somebody has parked illegally there, and then, when he finishes work, he hands over such a logbook to the company, and then the company tries to identify this car and tries to download the video clip. In other words, we have to go through a series of steps before that can be done.

I think, for this matter, it should be the police that should be doing something about it, because if that stretch of the road should be an urban clearway and nobody should park there, then the police should enforce the law. Our bus captains are already very busy while driving. If you ask them to remember doing such, it means adding to the burden of their work.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware that the police suggested to I think the Transport Department and LegCo that cameras should be used, fixed, perhaps lamppost, cameras, to record what you are describing, and that that should be the source of the evidence?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: If we have cameras on lampposts, I think it's a very good idea. I really hope that you won't be involving the bus captains in this kind of work.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, that would be a relatively simple thing to do, because you would provide the police with details of the bus stops that are black spots and they would simply install a camera.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I think that's feasible.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of vehicle number recognition systems, so that a computer that takes a photograph, or rather a camera that takes a photograph of a number plate, can match it with the registered owner?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: This is very technical. I would like to defer to Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, we are aware of such a system, but I don't think it is affordable by us.

CHAIRMAN: No, I'm suggesting that this is something that might be considered by the Transport Department and the police: A camera takes a photograph of the stationary vehicle impeding the photograph; the computer matches the vehicle registration owner; and the third step is to issue a ticket by email.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: We welcome such an idea.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: It's getting on a bit, but there is just one other substantive matter that I want to raise with you, Mr Cheng, if I could.

This arises from a document which we can find at page 822 of SEC-2. Again, I'm not sure whether you have seen this document. You will see from the screen that it starts as an information note relating to franchised bus services in Seoul and Singapore, and it is apparently a production of the research office at the Legislative Council Secretariat here in Hong Kong.

Have you seen this document at all?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, we haven't.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to take you directly to page 826 of

the bundle, and bring your attention to paragraph 2.11, and the heading, "Implementation of the bus signal priority system". Do you see that heading?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I can read the entry:

"The bus signal priority ('BSP') system, which has been deployed in many cities around the world, is a traffic signal enhancement strategy. The strategy facilities efficient movement of buses through signalised intersections which allows an approaching bus to have priority on using the limited intersection capacity over other vehicles entering the intersection. The Seoul Metropolitan Government has implemented the BSP system to permit the optimisation of traffic signals to speed up buses."

Are you aware of such systems in different cities around the world?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, we are aware of such a system in the world. We are aware that in Singapore they do have a similar system.

MR DUNCAN: Do you think this sort of system might have some relevance as far as Hong Kong is concerned?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We would welcome it very much.

MR DUNCAN: Have any steps been taken to have this considered?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: All the time, we believe that it is what the government should do.

MR DUNCAN: Have you raised it with the government?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: We haven't raised it with the government.

MR DUNCAN: I think in some cities around the world, buses are accorded general priority, are they not? If a bus is pulling out of a bus stop, cars are required to make way for the bus. Is that the situation in some countries, some cities?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Let me defer to Mr Chung.

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, indeed. We are aware, say for example, that in Singapore, when a bus leaves the bus bay, other vehicles have to give way.

MR DUNCAN: Is that something which the company would regard as a good thing?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Yes, we regard it as something which is good. However, in Hong Kong, the road conditions may not permit this. Say, for example, we have bus-only lanes. In the past, as a result of complaints, some of them have been cancelled.

CHAIRMAN: Complaints by whom?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Citizens, complaining that the bus lanes were not put to optimal use, and as a result they have to be scrapped.

CHAIRMAN: Citizens who are car drivers?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: I'm not sure, but then we were informed by the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably not citizens standing on a bus with 130 other passengers.

MR DUNCAN: Just going back to the system in Seoul for the moment, the bus signal priority system. Given your response to my question, is that something that would be worthy of your taking up with the Transport Department?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes, sir.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any plans to do that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: As a result of today's hearing, we have been enlightened. We are going to do it.

MR DUNCAN: Can I just bring to your attention a couple of other matters that have come up during the course of the questions this afternoon. First of all, may I bring to your attention section 33(1) of the Public Bus Services Ordinance, which reads as follows --

CHAIRMAN: Do we have that in the papers?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. It will be in THB-2 at page 124, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: THB-2, page 124, section 33(1). You can probably read that for yourself, Mr Cheng. It reads as follows:

"A grantee which is aggrieved by any decision,

direction or requirement of the Secretary for Transport and Housing, or a public officer given directions under section 3, or the Commissioner, or any person authorised by him, under this Ordinance or its franchise may, within 28 days of the giving or making of the decision, direction or requirement, appeal by petition to the Chief Executive-in-Council, and the decision of the Chief Executive-in-Council on any such appeal shall be final."

Hitherto, have you been aware of that provision?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I am aware of that.

MR DUNCAN: Has the company ever availed itself of its rights under that?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Never, sir.

MR DUNCAN: One other matter, just a reference, if I could, with regard to the issue I raised as to whether maintenance of facilities had contributed at all to accidents.

I just refer the committee to another of the documents, TD-2 at page 183, which is the Brief of the Legislative Council considering the new franchises and the bus networks of Citybus Ltd, that's for Hong Kong Island and the cross-harbour bus network, and the New Lantao Bus Company.

You will see, in the course of the assessment of the

applications, references to accidents, maintenance, and so on, pages 183 and 184. That may be the provision that the chairman had in mind.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: I beg your pardon. You mentioned the maintenance and repair. I can't see any mention of maintenance and repair here.

CHAIRMAN: I think what I had in mind was the inspections, the random checks on buses, detected a very low rate of defects, and that was the observation that was made.

MR DUNCAN: By the Transport Department?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: We will look for that, Mr Chairman, and find it for the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, unless the committee has any further matters that you wish me to explore, they are the questions.

CHAIRMAN: There is one matter, and I will raise the question directly with you, Mr Cheng. It's simply this. You have told us about a safety committee that was put into being I think in April in the companies, to address safety issues, of which you are the chair, and on which some of your fellow representatives here today also sit. My question, first of all, is this. It's right, is it

not, that a director or perhaps two of your directors are Transport Department employees?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Yes. This safety committee is composed of our senior management. We have not invited the government officials to sit on this committee, because if the company has issues to discuss with the Transport Department, then it would be meeting between the company and the Transport Department. It's not for us to invite the Transport Department to sit on this safety committee.

CHAIRMAN: So although they are directors of the company, you specifically decided not to invite them because of, what, a potential conflict? Is that it?

MR SAMUEL CHENG: No, it's not because of the conflict; because the operation of our company is the responsibility of the management. The Transport Department has two officials sitting on the board, and generally speaking, the operation is a matter for the management of the company. We have non-executive directors. They are not involved in operation of the company.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your answer to that. Those are the questions that counsel has to ask you and those are the questions that we have. I understand that there is a final short statement that you wish to make, and if

that's so, please do so now.

Closing statement by MR SAMUEL CHENG

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr Chairman, on behalf of New World First Bus and Citybus, I would like to thank the following members over the past two days: first, I thank the IRC for inviting us to this hearing; Mr Duncan and his team has raised questions to us and that allowed us the opportunity to talk about the operation of the company; third, I would like to thank the secretariat of the IRC for the arrangement over the past fortnight; finally, I would like to thank the simultaneous interpreters for their service.

Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Thank you, members.

CHAIRMAN: Finally, then it remains for us to thank you for your oral evidence and to remind you of the various matters that you said that you would provide us with in writing in due course. To assist you with that, the secretariat will identify those matters and give you the transcript references so that you will see what it is that is sought from you.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Most certainly, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR SAMUEL CHENG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

(4.55 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM NEW WORLD FIRST BUS SERVICES LTD AND CITYBUS LTD: MR SAMUEL CHENG, MR WILLIAM CHUNG, MR PAUL LI, MR GARETH NG, MR KENNETH LIT, MR KENNY SO (given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation) ...1

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued) 1

Closing statement by MR SAMUEL CHENG 134

2018 年 5 月 30 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位早晨。鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。鄭先生，早晨。

鄭偉波先生：早晨。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）各位先生，早晨。今朝早我首先想問一啲問題係關於一啲裝置嘅，係關乎巴士安全方面嘅裝置。首先，我就想講下嗰個俗稱係黑盒嗰個裝置，我就想請你睇 CTB-1，55 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。想請你睇嗰一頁，寫住“1”，係喺我哋個巴士嗰度引入黑盒嗰個部分，請你睇一睇。睇到嗎？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰幾段文字就係咪講及喺巴士嗰度安裝呢個黑盒嘅歷史呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）似乎就係喺 2003 年嘅 10 月開始，當時運輸署就係有一個咁嘅要求，就要求呢啲裝置就要係安裝喺巴士嗰度嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁就係適用於 2004 年 7 月 1 號之後首次登記嘅巴士，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係將 2013 年 10 月運輸署嗰封信亦都打上嚟，好唔好呀？應該就係附件一。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 TD-2，205 頁。

鄭偉波先生：我哋睇見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）2007 年之後註冊嘅巴士就係有埋黑盒，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：喺嗰個生效日期之後，我哋首批登記嘅車就係喺 2007 年嘅。換句話嚟講，喺 04 至到 07，即係我哋登記啲車之前，有一段時間我哋係冇新車嘅。而喺 2007 年，我哋首次登記嘅車係有黑盒嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，巴士公司係咪就係你哋接收啲巴士嘅時候，你自己有埋嗰啲黑盒呢？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。CTB-1，55 頁，你就話喺 2010 年嘅時候，你哋公司採取主動就將黑盒係提升，咁係成為一個綜合系統嘅一部分，裏面係有埋一個功能，就係自動有嗰個到站嘅廣播嘅，係咪咁呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）律師，請你停一停。講番嗰份文件嘅第 2 頁，就講及係嗰個基本嘅要求係乜嘢嘢，但係係 2003 年嗰封信嘅，下面嗰頁，嗰個要求就喺嗰一頁嗰度列咗出嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，不如係請你睇番嗰一版，TD-2，206 頁，第 2 段。請問你睇唔睇到嗰個要求呢？即係話運輸署嘅要求。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係當時嗰個情況。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁就係 2003 年發出嗰個要求嘅時候嘅細節，就有分開 A 同埋 B 兩項嘅。首先，就係嗰個營運時間開始，就係結束時間，中間係冇開引擎嘅時間，行緊車嘅時間。B 嗰項就係車速。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，律師。第一項嗰度講出就係點解有咁嘅要求嘅，係咪呀？佢呢度就話係電子數據記錄系統嘅目的就係希望讓巴士公司係有呢個工具去監察，同埋管理喺路上嘅車速，同埋佢嘅巴士同安全有關嘅表現，係間接就希望鼓勵駕駛嘅行為係更好嘅。鄭生，睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅理解係點呢？你嘅理解係運輸署喺呢方面，佢扮演咩嘢角色呢？如果有嘅話。即係話佢有咁嘅要求，你回應佢嘅要求，咁喺你眼中，運輸署係咪有一個角色？同埋個角色係咩嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：運輸署係有個角色嘅，係由佢推動巴士公司去安裝呢個黑盒嘅裝置。

主席：（經傳譯員）之後呢，個角色係點呢？

鄭偉波先生：之後，巴士公司就要符合呢一個指引嘅要求。而呢一個喺當時嚟講，嗰個科技就係去到呢啲嘅內容，但係喺幾年之後有再新嘅科技，當我哋公司知道咗之後，於是我哋就提升我哋嗰個黑盒嘅系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）你點知道係有新科技嘅發展呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我畀我同事鍾生嚟到答大家。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，鍾先生。

鍾澤文先生：冇錯，當時我哋亦都係有研究緊喺一個巴士上面嘅報站裝置。因為呢個報站裝置，我哋當時就考慮到唔想令啲司機係加重佢嗰個工作負擔，所以我哋就係研究一個利用衞星定位嘅方法係去自己動報站嘅。喺研究呢樣嘢嗰陣時係理解到可以將兩個系統串連咗一齊嘅，咁就可以除咗話提供運輸署所要求嘅一啲資料之外，亦都可以加埋嗰啲巴士嘅位置，係咁樣產生出嚟嘅，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。我嘅理解啱唔啱呢？就係公司係主動提升嗰個科技，用更多嘅科技，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁講啱唔啱呢？喺 2003 年至到 2010 年之間，因為你話 2010 年嘅時候，你主動係提升吖嘛，03 至到 10 年之間，運輸署冇要求喺黑盒嗰方面係採取新啲嘅科技，除咗係早喺 2003 年已經作出嘅要求之外，冇要求有新嘅科技，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：我同事鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我又想睇番你嘅意見書，亦都睇番第 55 頁，喺嗰版嘅下面嗰度，你就講出就係話逐秒逐秒嘅數據，呢個黑盒可以提供逐秒逐秒嘅數據嘅，呢啲數據今時今日喺黑盒嗰度係咪都係有嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個技術性嘅問題，我同事列先生回答嘅。

列俊華先生：係正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問下，你哋有嗰個係自動嘅巴士到站廣播入咗去個黑盒嗰個制度之後--個系統之後，直至而家有冇新嘅提升或者改進呢？

列俊華先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有提升，有改進係邊啲呢？

列俊華先生：我哋喺上一年，2017 年，我哋開始安裝新嘅系統，我哋簡稱係“RTS2”，Real Time System 2，裏面我哋加入啲新嘅功能，包括正如鄭生喺昨天講，提及過嘅，我哋會喺第三季當所有車隊完成安裝呢套系統之後，就會可以提供一個顯示，當車輛係發覺超速嘅時候，我哋會提供一個顯示通知車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個係實時嘅系統，呢個係未做嘅，係咪呀？即係仲未喺整個車隊嗰度係安裝呢個實時系統嘅，係咪呀？啱唔啱呀？

列俊華先生：正確，未完全安裝喺所有車隊裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）除咗嗰個實時系統之外，我想問有冇其他方面係有所提升呢？即係喺黑盒嗰方面。我所講嘅時間就係你將黑盒同埋到站廣播結合咗之後，到而家中間有冇啲咩嘢地方係有提升，有改進呢？

列俊華先生：冇，暫時喺嗰段時間係冇改進嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司係幾時決定將呢一個實時嘅系統加落去呢？

列俊華先生：係，我哋大約喺 2015 年，當我哋城巴專營權由運輸署批准，政府批准之後，其中一條條款係要求我哋提供一個實時到站畀乘客，英文係“Estimated Time of Arrival”。由於呢一個系統提供呢一個 ETA 嘅系統需要有一個實時嘅功能，所以我哋喺嗰段時間開始就籌備去完成為所有新巴、城巴嘅車隊提供實時報站。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就係想請你睇番份文件...

主席：（經傳譯員）不過你未繼續之前，我就想問，你較早時候就講過 RTS2 呢個實時系統就會喺第三季係落實嘅，係咪 2018 年嘅第三季呀？

列俊華先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。或者想你睇一睇呢份文件 BM-1，35 頁。你睇緊份文件就係有一個新聞發布咁樣嘅，而家係咪睇緊份文件？

鄭偉波先生：我哋而家睇緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者花少少時間係睇睇個內容，唔該。

鄭偉波先生：我哋睇完嘞，份文件。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。佢就係話 NEC 就係攞到嗰份合約，就係一個綜合嘅自動報站系統同埋嗰個數據紀錄嘅系統，咁就係城巴、新巴嘅系統嚟嘅，個標題睇到，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係，冇錯，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 2012 年 1 月 13 號嘅。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第一段就係宣布，代表 NEC 宣布就係話中咗一份合約係關於七百零二部巴士嘅，呢啲就係新巴嘅巴士同埋一百七十二部城巴嘅巴士。

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）同埋佢講到就係運用呢一個嘅報站系統 ABSA 同埋嗰個數據嘅儲藏 DL 嘅系統，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：因為呢個係去到啲具體嘅操作，我畀我同事鍾生答。

鍾澤文先生：係，正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。或者第 3 段，係咪講到呢個 BSA 同埋 DL 嘅系統就係結合咗呢個衞星定位嘅系統，巴士嗰個車速計嘅訊號同埋有關一啲特別嘅技術係可以克服到一啲街道狹窄或者高樓大廈所產生嘅一啲假嘅訊號嘅問題，係咪呢？

鍾澤文先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）最後嗰段，呢一版，係咪提到就係話有一個控制嘅裝置，咁就記錄咗嗰個巴士位置速度全日都係做㗎嘢，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）同埋呢個數據就會係用 Wi-Fi，就係巴士回廠嘅時候，就會係加番入去個數據庫嗰度咁樣？

鍾澤文先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）究竟呢份合約對公司嚟講係點樣呢？如果你睇番你嘅陳述書第 55 版嗰度，CTB-1。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，等一等，我想問一個問題，第 1 段嗰度就有兩部分嘅，第一，就係最近係佢哋中咗標；第二，就係提到喺成功推行呢一個系統之後，就係城巴嘅七百六十部巴士之後，佢哋係有呢一套嘅 ABSA 同埋 DL 嘅系統。我想問一條問題，就係第一，呢個係咪準確嘅？第二，就係呢個系統幾時係推行嘅？

鍾澤文先生：主席，我哋呢個系統係首先喺城巴嘅專營權一嗰度先做先嘅，當時我哋做咗專營權一之後，係再去推廣到喺新巴同埋城巴嘅專營權二嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係幾時安裝呀？喺嗰個時間性，幾時裝？

鍾澤文先生：城巴嘅專營權一就係喺 2011 年嘅 6 月完成嘅，城巴嘅專營權二同埋新巴嘅安裝喺 2012 年嘅年尾就完成安裝嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。好，而家想睇番第 55 版嗰度，底嗰度就有講到 2010 年我哋公司就採取步驟就係提升嗰個黑盒，就做一個綜合嘅制度，咁結合埋嗰個巴士報站嘅系統能力咁樣，呢個係咪 NEC 係有份㗎，呢度？

鍾澤文先生：係，都係 NEC 幫我哋做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 2010 年定 2011 年，個實際日期？

鍾澤文先生：2011 年我哋開始同呢個 NEC 去商討同埋研發嘅，咁 2011 年 6 月係裝好咗城巴嘅專營一嘅車隊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。你講到呢版最底嗰度，你講到話即係 2010 年就係有啲咁嘅情況發生，呢個係咪 NEC 嗰個系統，還是呢一個係另一套嘅呢個結合嘅系統，係咪 NEC 個系統定係點呀？

鍾澤文先生：你可唔可以重複個問題？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實我就係要去確定一下，究竟喺 2010 年嘅時候，我哋睇到呢版最底嗰度，就係 55 頁，佢就話喺 2010 年嘅時候，我哋公司就採取咗措施係提升嗰個黑盒，咁就變成一個結合嘅系統，可以結合呢一個報站嘅系統，睇嚟呢個係即係 NEC 做，根據你正話所講嘅，NEC 有份做，咁 2011 年就係 NEC 做咗好多呢啲咁嘅安裝喎，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺 2010 年嘅時候，其實係咪應該係 2011，唔係 2010 呢？我問題係咁。

鄭偉波先生：主席，如果我哋去研發一個新嘅系統，係需要時間嘅，我哋喺 2010 年嘅時候就採取個主動，就搵 NEC 去設計呢個新嘅系統。而有咗呢個新嘅系統之後，我哋要安裝七百多部嘅巴士係需要時間嘅，就因為每日可能安裝幾部咁樣，因為我哋啲車就需要每日運作嘅。由佢開始安裝至到安裝完成就都要成一年時間，所以喺我哋個 submission，請可唔可以去下一頁呢？係，我哋呢度就講咗，就係我哋城巴專營權一就喺 2011 年嘅 6 月就完成咗安裝呢個系統。而至於城巴嘅專營權二同埋新巴就去到 2012 年尾先至完成安裝呢個系統，就係同一個系統嚟嘅。因為當時城巴專營權一喺佢嗰個 franchise renewal 嘅時候，政府就有個要求要我哋提供嗰個報站系統，所以城巴專營權一係首先要完成呢個安裝嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒，你澄清呢一點。當時你哋採取咗措施，10 年嘅時候，就話安裝呢一個系統，11 年就裝好，咁就 NEC 幫手裝嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，等等先。喺嗰個城巴第一號嘅專營權續期嘅時候，政府就有個規定，就話你係需要一個報站系統咁樣，而家呢啲資料有冇文件畀我哋，有冇一啲證供係話有咁樣嘅規定呢？

鄭偉波先生：喺嗰個專營權--喺專營權文件裏面，就冇提及到呢一個報站系統嘅，但係當我哋當時係續嗰個專營權嘅時候，除咗個專營權文件之外，我哋亦都透過書信來往嘅形式就承諾有啲其他嘅事項需要做嘅，呢個就我哋喺公司係有呢份文件嘅，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係將嗰份文件畀個副本畀委員會呢？應該係有幾份文件嘅，係咪？我哋可以跟進呢一方面嘅情況。

鄭偉波先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗剛才都有提到另外一份文件，就係話嗰個專營權，咁提到就話嗰個實時嘅能力咁樣嘅，實時功能咁樣嘅，係咪呀？正話係咪有提到？鄭生。

鄭偉波先生：有提到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢份係咪即係另外一個要求嚟，唔係同一個要求嚟呀？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生會回答呢個問題。

鍾澤文先生：係，嗰個係另外一個要求嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪喺嗰個專營權文件當中有講嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：都係好似頭先鄭生講，我哋係另外書信，就唔喺個專營權嘅文件裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰啲文件你哋大家書信來往嗰度係咪有證據喺度嘅呢，有資料呢？

鍾澤文先生：係有嘅，我哋可以事後提供番。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。嗰個時間係點樣呢，邊一份嘅專營權嗰個時間係點樣嘅，即係續期嗰啲資料，時間性係點樣㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋同運輸署呢啲嘅書信來往，就係喺政府頒發個專營權畀我哋之前幾日，我哋就要作出呢啲嘅承諾，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁邊一年呀？鄭生，呢個係一號定二號專營權嚟㗎？

鄭偉波先生：係 2015 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鄭偉波先生：而個專營權就係 2016 年開始先至係生效嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪二號嘅專營權呀？

鄭偉波先生：係專營權一。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。係，律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想繼續，跟住想睇下究竟呢一個黑盒就係提供啲乜嘢嘅數據，同埋呢啲數據係攞嚟點樣用。我想請你睇番你嘅第一部分嘅意見書，CTB-1，33 頁。

鄭偉波先生：我見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。目前我想睇而家嗰個系統現有嘅功能，遲啲我先至會問嗰個實時嘅功能。而家我想關注就係未做到嗰個實時功能之前嘅現況，喺嗰版下面嗰度，8(a)(i)嗰段，你有咁提到嘅，就話安裝喺巴士上面嘅黑盒所收集到嘅數據就係會上番去嗰個伺服器，咁就每晚都做嘅，嚟到係去做一啲報告出嚟，啲報告愛嚟就去監察我哋車長嘅駕駛行為嘅，睇到呢句嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）無疑嘅就係如果有一個車長係超速，譬如話開到 80 公里一小時，咁肯定就會喺嗰個伺服器嗰度係顯示到出嚟，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：不是。喺我哋未有 real time 嗰個系統之前嘅情況，我先講一講，咁就係每一晚架車返到嚟我哋嘅車廠，我哋先至會將嗰啲數據就傳輸去我哋公司嘅電腦系統，就唔係實時我哋知得到嘅。而將來我哋係有個實時系統嘅時候，呢啲資料就係會每十五秒就傳輸一次上嚟我哋公司嘅系統，兩者係有分別嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）明白。我哋先集中睇嗰個未有實時功能，即係現在嗰個系統。上傳咗嗰啲數據，夜晚上傳畀個伺服器，嗰度都可以睇到話一位司機就係超過咗每小時 70 公里嗰個車速，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：或者我再詳細少少嚟到講一講，當架車喺運作緊嘅時候，個巴士喺日頭運作嘅時候，如果係發生咗超速嘅情況，我哋車上面嘅黑盒就會記錄低呢一個超速嘅事件，當呢啲資料喺夜晚上傳到我哋公司嘅電腦系統，我哋嘅電腦系統就會將呢啲嘅數據嚟到整理，而第二日--對唔住，係大約五日之後，就會可以出到一個超速嘅事件嘅報告。咁呢五日到底係咩嘢事呢？我哋嘅系統就係需要將呢個超速嘅事件去配對番我哋公司另外一個嘅八達通系統，就去搵出相關嘅車長名

字，呢個就需要幾日嘅時間。咁有咗呢一個超速事件嘅報告，我哋嘅同事就會作出跟進，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁其他嘅問題，即係譬如話車長可能係有其他嘅失誤，或者佢嘅行為係唔妥，譬如話佢加速加得太快，又或者佢嗰個踩剎動器，即係踩 brake 係太犀利，會唔會亦都好似係超速咁樣樣，喺你嗰個公司個電腦系統，喺個伺服器嗰度係睇到呢啲資料呢？

鄭偉波先生：係有呢啲資料，但係我哋個系統冇去編製個報告出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前唯一會產生嘅報告就關於個車速嘅報告，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個報告出到嚟嘅時候，咁就會點嘅呢？就咁躉咗喺度，定抑或會有人係有咁嘅責任，就係要逐個呢啲報告去睇嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：當呢個報告出咗嘅時候，我哋個系統就會自動產生電郵去畀我哋嘅營運部門。我哋公司係有三個營運部門嘅，係城巴一部、城巴二部同埋新巴嘅營運部。喺每一個部門，佢當收到呢個電郵之後，就知道喺佢個部門嘅車長有邊啲嘅人係牽涉咗喺呢啲超速嘅事件裏面，之後就會根據我哋公司嘅內部紀律處分指引嚟到作出合適嘅處分，可以係--如果係初犯，唔係嚴重嘅話，就係用提示嘅形式。如果係嚴重或者係再犯嘅，就會係用警告嘅形式，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？目前嗰個監察嘅系統，即係你監察住車長嗰個行為係只限於個車速嘅啫，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係呢兩方面嘅，喺每一日嗰個慣常嘅監察就係車速方面，而另外一方面，當有乘客投訴或者有交通意外發生，我哋有同事就會搵番相關嘅行車紀錄資料作出調查，咁調查嘅結果如果係成立嘅，相關嘅車長係會受到紀律處分。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番嗰個黑盒，淨係講嗰個黑盒。個黑盒其實只係監察嗰個車速嘅，係咪呀？就睇唔到，亦都唔會監察車長嘅其他行為，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：嗰個黑盒就唔係淨係監察車速，喺我哋嗰個遞交嘅...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對唔住，或者等我再問過個問題，我諗我知你想講乜嘢。講到嗰啲報告，報告即係話喺呢個伺服器嗰度嚟自黑盒嗰啲報告，嗰啲報告就只關乎係車速，就唔會係反映到其他車長嘅失誤嘅，係咪呀？咁講啱唔啱呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋恒常性電腦系統產生嘅報告就只係有關超速嘅，而喺我哋個系統裏面所記錄嘅數據資料就唔只係超速嘅，就包括當時駕駛嘅時候，嗰架車所產生嘅 G force，咁都有記錄低喺處嘅。當然，就仲有其他個車長嘅行為，例如有冇開到車門，都會有記錄到喺處嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呢？嗰啲講嘅就唔會係喺報告嗰度，即係唔會產生一個報告係報告呢啲嘢嘅，啱唔啱呀？目前嗰個情況係咁。

鄭偉波先生：係唔會自動產生呢個報告。如果我哋公司覺得有需要做調查嘅時候，就可以將呢啲嘅資料喺個電腦裏面攞出嚟愛嚟做調查工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋嘅理解就咁嘅，係咪呀？有報告，只係關乎車速，就可以產生一個報告，但係如果你想做調查，亦都可以有其他嘅數據，其他資料嘅，啱唔啱呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席先生。我哋集中番講車速，我想請你再睇番你自己嗰個意見書，今次係想睇 26 頁，CTB-1，26 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。想請你--嗰個講到係開動引擎，開同關，你呢度就話啲黑盒係用嚟監察每部巴士嘅車速，同埋就會係自動係產生呢一個超速嘅例外報告出嚟，睇唔睇到嗰句呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你繼續睇落去，你就會見到係其實都講及一啲剛剛我問及你嘅一啲情況嘅。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果嗰個車速係超過咗一小時 70 公里嘅話，咁就係嗰個黑盒嗰度會有一個紀錄，同埋會自動成為嗰個報告嘅一個部分，係咪呀？啱唔啱？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜唔係 75 咩？呢度唔係 75 就會有報告？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係監察 70 公里嘅限速，但係我哋 set 咗落去嗰個黑盒，就係要 75 公里就連續十秒鐘先至會產生一個 event 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話嗰度係有兩樣嘢睇嘅，一個就 75，同埋仲要連續十秒，要符合兩個條件先得㗎，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊條線，邊條路都好喇，咁都係會咁樣，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番嗰個速限即係 50 公里，一小時 50 公里嗰個速限咁講，你睇到就係超過 55 公里係連續十秒，而嗰個路段個速限就係每小時 50 公里，你睇到呢句嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問一個問題，就係嗰啲路段，即係而家嗰啲路段，我嘅理解啱唔啱呢？呢啲係隨意咁抽嘅路段，係咪？即係公司其實係隨意咁樣係不時揀呢啲路段出嚟嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：不是，我哋喺公司--就我哋公司揀咗二十五個路段，佢限速係 50 公里嘅路段，而呢個二十五個路段就包括咗係落長嘅斜路，長嘅斜路，係落斜嘅。第二，呢啲路段係有啲急彎嘅。第三，呢啲路段以前曾經係有啲比較大型嘅交通意外發生過嘅，就不是隨意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想請你係睇一睇第 56 版，係你第二份陳述書嘅第 56 頁，CTB-1，56。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）正話有問題問到，你喺呢度--即係以前問過問題，你喺呢度答咗嘅，2a)嗰度就係有啲準則搵出呢啲偵速嘅一啲嘅路段，係咪？你睇唔睇到呢句？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度有講，呢廿五條嘅路段有十一個路段就係喺 2013 年 6 月嗰度係搵出嚟嘅，另外就係有 14 年 9 月就係有另外三條，跟住 18 年 3 月就有十一條嘅路段咁樣。咁呢啲路段有幾長㗎，其實？

鄭偉波先生：我畀我同事鍾生答你。

鍾澤文先生：一般呢啲路段都會係超過一百米嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解你不時咁增加呢啲路段呢？初期，十一，跟住三，跟住加多十一，點解不斷咁加呢？點解嘅？

鍾澤文先生：（經傳譯員）喺我哋初初引入呢個方法去監控嗰個路段嗰陣時，我哋係有同我哋嘅工會代表去商討，亦都同佢哋就傾談過有啲咩嘅路段，因為我哋都要佢哋知道係邊啲路段，從而佢哋會係去跟番嗰度路段嘅車速咁樣。我哋亦都日後喺度一路加，我哋都有同佢哋--即係去話畀佢哋聽，等佢哋知道嘅，嗄。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以咁講呢，係咪公道呢？呢廿五個路段其實就係所有呢啲巴士所行嘅路線嘅路段係一小部分嚟嘅啫，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：可以咁樣講，不過就呢啲都係我哋覺得係比較危險啲，如果佢係超過

50 公里嘅超速嘅話，呢啲路段係比較危險嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實喺搵呢啲路段嘅時候，係點樣搵㗎，係做啲乜嘢？

鍾澤文先生：正如頭先鄭生所講嘅，我哋都係跟番嗰三個準則，佢如果係落長斜，或者嗰段路係好多急彎嘅，或者我哋發覺呢段路段過往都經常發生一啲交通意外，或者發生過嚴重交通意外，我哋去搵呢啲路段係即係用呢三個因素去考慮嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我明白，你咁樣搵。但係喺技術上，你點樣係將佢加入去個系統入面呢？

鍾澤文先生：技術上，我哋喺嗰個系統嘅電子地圖上面，我哋喺嗰個路段，我哋畫咗落個地圖裏面，咁 set 番頭先我哋所講嗰啲準則，譬如話 55 公里十秒連續咁樣，咁佢就會加咗落去嗰個系統裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解你唔將所有嘅路線都加晒入去個系統入面，你咪全部都睇晒囉，即係 70 或者 50 嘅情況你都可以睇晒，所有路段，邊度都好，都睇到晒，咁得唔得？

鍾澤文先生：理論上係可以嘅，不過嗰個要花嘅工夫就會好長，因為我哋要分番我哋所有唔同路線，或者香港嘅道路係全部要喺嗰個電子地圖裏面就分番邊啲係 50 公里，邊啲係 70 公里，咁嚟去做，呢個比較花嗰個工夫。

鄭偉波先生：主席，我有少少補充。我同意嘅，現時我哋呢二十五個路段就唔能夠涵括晒我哋所有路線所行經嘅路段。而家我哋就係已經有二十五個揀咗係比較我哋覺得係高風險嘅位置。除此之外，我哋打算就係喺將來就會係以隨機嘅形式就再劃一啲附加嘅路段愛嚟偵測呢啲 50 公里限速嘅駕駛情況。其實呢個我哋打算做呢一樣嘢，就同警察去捉快車係類似嘅，現時有啲影相機就固定裝喺某啲嘅位置嗰處。而除此，警察亦都係會以隨機嘅方法，有啲流動嘅快速攝影機，即係愛嚟捉嗰啲快車嘅攝影機，我哋其實都係由呢度啟發到出嚟，我哋而家就打算係會咁樣做嘅，但係我哋咁樣做之前，我哋亦都需要同我哋嘅工會溝通嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會其實目前佢哋知唔知嗰廿五段嘅路段，佢哋知唔知㗎？

鄭偉波先生：知道嘅，因為呢個係刊登咗喺我哋嘅車長手冊嘅附件裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，等等先。我哋即係確定一下先，譬如話附件一嗰度，係咪？CTB-2，169-88 頁，英文版就係呢度，你係咪講緊呢一拃嘅地點？而呢啲路段係列咗出嚟嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係嗰廿五個路段，所有呢啲路段而家就喺呢個系統嗰度係

監察緊嘅，同埋係會出報告。如果個車係制動 55 咁樣，即係巴士去到 55，咁就會有報告出，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家你準備有實時系統，咁有冇一啲計劃就係增加呢啲路段嘅數目呢，就超過二十五個呢？

鄭偉波先生：實時系統同幾多個路段冇直接關係嘅，而我哋對於增加呢啲監偵嘅路段，喺我哋公司嚟講，係覺得冇問題嘅，但係我哋亦都要同我哋嘅工作嚟到商討，所以就頭先我有講過，我哋有個計劃就係以隨機嘅形式嚟到畫落去我哋個電子地圖嗰處，愛嚟偵測更多嘅 50 公里限速嘅路段，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係話呢個係同工會一齊傾，等佢哋知道嗰個結果係點樣呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋要先話畀佢知，當然唔係問佢哋攞批准，要佢哋要知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家就睇睇嗰個實時系統嗰個建議，或者想請大家睇一睇第 33 頁，即係 CTB-1，33，係閣下嘅陳述書嚟嘅。底嗰度，第三行，最後嗰度第三行，我哋打算就係取代嗰個黑盒系統，咁新嘅系統就係一個有實時嘅能力，個時間就係 2018 年第三季咁樣做。到時我哋就能夠係監察車長嘅駕駛行為，係實時可以做到，同時就係有需要，就係即時咁樣係採取行動嘅。喺呢方面，我就想請你睇睇你第二份嘅陳述書，就係第 58 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你睇到最底嗰度又係有一項嘅，嗰個實時嘅系統就會係發出一啲即時嘅響號，即係一啲嗶嗶聲嘅響號，咁係喺嗰個控制台嗰度就會自動發出呢啲訊號係知會嗰個車長，即係話如果佢哋係有超速嘅話，就會有咁嘅情況。呢個其實係咪可以話係總結咗呢個系統嘅實時功能嘅做法呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢一個係嗰個實時功能先至做得到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個實時嘅功能係咪只係關乎嗰個車速嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我同事鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：嗰個實時功能唔係淨係做車速嘅，頭先我哋講過個實時功能其中一個作用，就係畀我哋去預計架巴士嘅到站時間，就係 estimated arrival time，咁呢個其實就係嗰個實時嘅其中一個功能嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）車速係其中一方面，到站時間亦都係另一方面，咁有冇其他車長嘅行為失誤會唔會亦都喺呢個實時功能嗰度係察識得到嘅呢？我諗下譬如話佢突然間係剎掣，又或者係加速加得好緊要，咁呢啲咁樣唔妥當嘅地方會唔會亦都可以用嗰個實時嘅功能嚟到係即時知道呢？

鄭偉波先生：我要問一問我嘅同事。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你問喇。

鄭偉波先生：我嘅同事列先生會回答呢個問題。

列俊華先生：係，主席，鄭生提及過嘅每十五秒傳送數據係指一啲關於車速簡單嘅資訊，佢哋數據以十五秒嘅傳送方法傳送上嚟嘅數據，並非每秒嘅數據。至於每秒傳送上嚟嘅車輛數據係以十五分鐘為一個單位，由車輛傳送到公司嘅伺服器當中，thank you。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個實時嘅功能嘅一個好處，就係咪即時係會發出個聲響嚟到係提示嗰個車長，就話你而家超速嘞。我想問車長會唔會係收到係除咗係超速之外，有冇其他方面亦都會收到個提示嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：列先生，請你答。

列俊華先生：我哋除咗呢個超速之外，未有其他嘅提示畀車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺 33 頁嗰度，你就話如果有需要嘅話，就可以即時採取行動，咁你所講嘅「即時行動」係咩嘢意思呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋所講嘅即時行動就係我哋頭先講緊嗰個「嗶嗶」聲，愛嚟提醒嗰個車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我需要多啲理解呢一方面嘅事宜嘅。若果嗰個司機係超越咗每小時 50 公里嘅車速，即係喺嗰二十五個道路嗰度，咁就會收到一個係提示，係咪？即係如果喺嗰廿五個路段裏面佢超過咗 50 公里，佢就會收到提示，啱唔啱呢？

列俊華先生：係，正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果佢去到 60 咁又點呢，喺一段路，但係嗰段路又唔係屬於嗰廿五個路段，佢又去到 60，咁有冇提示畀佢呢？

列俊華先生：沒有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嗰個系統如果要做到監察嘅話，其實係包括更多嘅路段，就唔係單單廿五個路段，咁樣樣個監察嘅作用係咪更好呢？

鄭偉波先生：會係更好嘅，但係因為而家我哋都搵唔到有一個電子地圖有晒香港所有路段嗰個限速，而家係冇呢一樣嘢嘅，就變咗我哋現時個做法係要人手將呢啲路段寫落去我哋嗰個電子地圖上面嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪因為冇電子地圖就有咁嘅問題。我又想問係你哋公司有冇同運輸署講呢個問題，話冇一種咁樣樣嘅電子地圖？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實你唔會覺得係值得同運輸署係商量下呢件事咩？

鄭偉波先生：我哋會嘗試。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）若果冇其他人係就黑盒有其他問題嘅話，我打算就係問其他嘅事宜，譬如我會問呢個係車速限制，或者係想問下呢個問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我想問你到時就係有一個報告會產生，定抑或係淨係只係一個「嗶嗶」聲係提示個司機呢？有冇一個報告嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢一個就實時就會提示司機，而如果佢嗰個超速係連續超過十秒，我哋個黑盒就會將呢一個嘅 event 記錄低，咁就同之前我講過，就係會之後入番去我哋個系統，就喺個超速報告嗰度就會列出嚟嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係獨立嘅，係咪呀？就唔係獨立嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，我唔明嗰個問題。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）呢個實時嘅警告係獨立於嗰個係報告嘅，係咪呀？嗰個報告係離線㗎嘛，係五日之後先至產生嗰個報告，實時嗰個提示就同佢兩個係分開嘅，獨立嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：係兩樣分開嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）向司機產生一個提示，係咪所有嘅路都喺 55 嗰度就設個提示，除咗嗰啲係 70 嘅，就唔係調轉，你而家係調轉咗㗎嘛？所有除咗 70 嗰啲嘅路段都設喺 55 就有提示，會唔會好啲呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個技術上係可行嘅，但係我哋需要做嘅工作係同樣咁多，因為而家我哋嗰個系統就預設咗就全部嘅路段都係用 70，咁而有廿五個路段我哋就劃咗佢係 55，就係咁樣嘅。如果我哋要調轉嚟到做，就要將我哋成個系統嗰個電子地圖就全部設咗佢係 55，就要搵番晒所有嗰啲 70 或以上嘅路段，就將佢改為 70，咁其實兩方面所做嗰個工作都係多嘅，所以我哋就頭先有提過，我哋諗緊就係話係加一啲嘅隨機嘅路段愛嚟監察我哋車長超速嘅行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）大體嚟講，我想問下你哋巴士所行嘅路有幾多就係屬於係車速係 70，就唔係 50 嘅呢，嗰個比例大概係幾多呢？

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，主席，我手頭上係冇呢個數據。不過，其實喺香港行 70 公里嘅路段，就唔係淨係只喺啲快速路嗰處嘅。我舉一個例畀主席知道，就係例如喺告士打道西行，喺呢個路段就有部分就係 50 嘅，有部分就係 70 嘅，咁所以其實嗰個 70 限速嘅路段喺香港，我哋巴士有行經嘅地方都唔會係太少，但係我就

有嗰個資料就係佔個百分比係幾多，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）你即是可以講到嗰個係印象係點呢，係多啲係 70 定抑或多啲係 50 嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我諗我哋營運總監鍾生會比我更熟悉，鍾生。

鍾澤文先生：主席，我都真係好難話即時可以畀到一個答案你。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，係，鄧律師--教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我有另一個問題。除咗係喺呢個高速公路，你講到嗰個時速，我諗除咗高速公路，應該大部分都應該係時速限制係 50 嘅，係咪？即係喺呢個係市區，基本上一般個典型嗰個都係 50 嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：以我個理解就不是嘅，頭先我舉咗嗰個例子，告士打道西行佢不是一條高速公路嚟嘅，但係佢有某啲路段限速係 70 嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）亦都有多一個問題想問嘅，就係突然之間係加速，又或者突然之間係踩 brake 嘅，咁呢個就係同嗰個車速限制無關嘅，所以喺落實嗰方面應該冇問題嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：邊一方面呀？對唔住。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）突然間停車，突然間係踩腳掣，突然間係加速，呢啲係咪都係應該同嗰個車速限制係無關嘅，唔需要知道個車速限制你都可以去嘗試去監察呢啲突然加速、踩 brake 嗰啲嘅事宜嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係無關嘅。如果要監察係可以，但係譬如我哋有部車係突然間要踹 brake，呢個未必係代表我哋個車長係做錯嘢。例如有個行人突然間衝出馬路，我哋嘅車長就要即時剎停架車，咁而呢一個就係佢個正確嘅反應。咁如果我哋去攞晒所有嗰啲突然間去減速嘅數據，我哋去跟進嘅時候，去問番個車長，我哋做嘅嘢就會係好多嘅，同埋就係亦都頗浪費時間嘅。所以我哋而家個做法就係個系統有記錄低晒呢啲嘅數據，如果當時係有交通意外或者係有人投訴我哋嘅話，咁我哋就係喺個調查嘅階段，就會攞番呢啲數據出嚟睇嘅，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：Thank you, Chairman. Just one other matter...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，對唔住，律師。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，律師，我亦都想再有一點係要澄清一下嘅，你講到嗰個係十秒嘅係超速報告，任何超過十秒就會有報告，呢個十秒係你公司就係設定，定抑或係嗰個製造商設定係十秒嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：係我哋公司設定嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）咁如果你想係改嗰十秒，譬如話改到十五秒、五秒都做到嘅，係咪呀？技術做到嘅，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：我畀鍾生回答呢個問題。

鍾澤文先生：係做到嘅。

歐陽先生：Thank you。

鍾澤文先生：我想解一解即係點解我哋十秒，當時我哋同公會去商討嗰陣時，佢哋有畀到意見我哋嘅。咁因為就佢哋亦都表示佢哋唔係成日睇住嗰個咪錶，同埋當佢哋知道係超速嘅時候，佢哋都要做反應。咁但係揸住架巴士亦都唔可以話好急速咁樣剎車去減低個車速嘅，咁佢都柔順去反應，所以佢哋要有一個時間畀佢哋去調整，咁呢個係當時我哋同公會去商討嘅時間，其中一個考慮點解要用十秒呢個時段嚟去先至記錄佢嗰個超速。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，鄧律師。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，法例就係即係喺小巴嗰度就係三秒，係咪呀？法例嗰度係三秒，即係佢超速嗰度，小巴。你知唔知，小巴嗰方面？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係唔知嘅，對唔住。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者鄧律師可以係處理一陣間。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你，主席。或者離開黑盒之前，仲有一點嘅，就或者鄭生，我想係睇一睇，喺嗰個新聞發布嗰度，剛才我就係提到 NEC 嗰份新聞稿，公司提出就話佢哋安裝嗰套嘅系統，即係當時安裝嘅系統就可以克服到一啲 GPS 嘅訊號嘅問題，譬如香港高樓大廈、道路又窄，咁可能出現啲問題，咁佢呢個系統克服到呢啲問題，你記唔記得睇過呢一句，喺嗰個發布嗰度？

鄭偉波先生：有睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講講究竟呢個係咪有效呢，嗰套嘅系統係咪好有效咁樣嚟到應付到香港呢個咁獨特嘅環境街道狹窄、高樓大廈，咁引致嗰個 GPS 嘅訊號問題，就係唔會出錯咁呢啲問題，咁嗰套系統係咪好有效咁克服到呢個問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：首先，就呢一個新聞發布係 NEC 出嘅，就佢哋講嘅嘢就並不代表係我哋新巴、城巴嘅睇法。至於呢個系統嗰個準確度係有幾高，我覺得就一定唔係百分之一百準確，咁要視乎就所經過嘅路段，佢側邊嗰啲高樓大廈，甚至有冇玻璃幕牆嘅大廈，呢啲都係會有影響到嗰個 GPS 嗰個定位嘅準確性嘅。咁我可以答你就唔係百分之一百準確，但係嗰個準確度我哋覺得都可以接受。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係話唔係有咩嘢重大問題，公司唔覺得有一啲重大嘅問題喺呢個系統入面？

鄭偉波先生：現時我哋用緊嗰個系統，我哋睇唔到有重大嘅問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，而家講嗰個限速器...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師--鄭生，我相信你其實係有一個地圖就係顯示你哋巴士嘅路線嘅，係咪？係咪有個地圖有巴士路線喺度嘅，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：我畀我個同事列生答，因為佢喺呢方面係比較熟悉嘅。

列俊華先生：係，主席，喺我哋呢一個系統，我哋嘅操作介面裏面係可以顯示各巴士路線嘅地圖嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係畀個地圖，提供畀委員會，等我哋可以睇到晒你哋嗰啲公司嘅路線呢？或者點解我咁講，咁相信有啲人就知道香港道路嘅速限喺邊度，運輸署或者警方佢哋都知嘅。我打算做嘅就係可以將你啲路線同嗰啲速限係比較一下咁解。可唔可以將嗰啲資料提供畀委員會呢，嗰啲路線嗰啲個地圖咁樣？

列俊華先生：當然可以，不過，主席，要視乎你需要嘅數據係喺一個咩情況，因為如果我哋以紙張去提交，可能係未必得到主席所想得到嘅嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）我希望就係即係你嗰啲路，即係有啲人可以話畀你聽嗰啲路上面嘅速限係幾多咁解。

列俊華先生：好，明白，我哋會提供有關數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，想你睇睇第 26 頁，CTB-1，第 26 頁係閣下嘅陳述書。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個速限嘅裝置，中間嗰度有限速器，當車就去到 70 公里，咁嗰個限速器就會係限制咗個供油量，即使係踩油都好，都係限咗個油，但係車速就喺落山段就可能會超過 70 咁樣。你睇唔睇到呢一段呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，睇番下一頁。咁呢一版就係有提到一個自動嘅減速系統咁樣嘅，英文就係“ASLS”。咁嗰度講呢，就係話即係如果個車速過咗 70，係落山落斜咁計，咁呢個 ASLS 就會自動咁樣係有一個波箱嘅減速嘅系統，咁就或者係收油，咁等佢個車速係去限到去 70 嘅。如果我個理解係正確嘅話，咁打算就呢個系統係喺新巴市嗰度就會安裝，明年 6 月開始新嚟嘅巴士就會裝，係咪？

鄭偉波先生：呢個我哋工程總監李先生會回答呢一部分嘅。

李廣威先生：係，主席，係正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係咪運輸署規定，還是係公司自己主動咁做？

李廣威先生：呢一個嘅系統係我哋同運輸署喺度嘅 working group 一路傾嘅時候，就係大家都同意喺新車嘅時候，我哋需要要求呢一個規格，咁喺明年 6 月開始運送嘅車就會有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你提到工作小組，咁係咪即係話喺大埔意外，今年 2 月意外之後成立嗰個工作小組呀？

李廣威先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前公司有冇考慮過呢個 ASLS 嗰個系統，有冇考慮過呢一個系統，之前？

李廣威先生：之前係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係邊個嘅諗法嚟㗎，工作小組嗰度嘅諗法，還是係公司嘅諗法，定係運輸署嘅諗法，還是工作小組入面有人提出咁樣嘅做法呢？

李廣威先生：呢個係喺工作小組裏面商討嘅時候，大家覺得歐盟六型嘅車係係可以有咁嘅技術提供到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係製造商係提出呢個建議嘅，係咪？定係點樣？

李廣威先生：係工作小組裏面我哋去提出呢個要求，去諮詢巴士個供應商佢哋可唔可以提供到呢一樣嘢，咁佢哋嘅答覆係歐盟六型嘅車係可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。邊個召集嗰個工作小組？

李廣威先生：係運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋第一次開會有冇議程出㗎？

李廣威先生：係有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇嗰個議程嘅副本喺度呀？

李廣威先生：我哋試下可以提交番。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有，係咪即係話？

李廣威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實喺議程上面有冇話即係睇一啲新嘅科技嘅裝置咁樣，有冇呢個議程？

李廣威先生：議程上面係有一啲嘅建議去考慮新嘅裝置嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個其實係運輸署嗰度係提出嘅，係咪？

李廣威先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。咁麻煩你就畀嗰個議程我哋參考下，好唔好？

李廣威先生：好。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好嘞，講到嗰個係裝番呢啲咁樣嘅設施喇，呢個問題就係喺你第二份嘅陳述書嗰度係有講嘅，個頁數就係 CTB-1，61 頁。喺 61 頁嗰度你睇到第 8 段嗰個限速器，同埋即係我哋係同呢個供應商講過個技術可行性，同埋成本，就話即係喺呢啲車上面安裝呢啲 ASLS 嘅系統，你睇到呢段嘛？

李廣威先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，你睇到晒嗰啲細節喺度喇。好，首先，關於個 Dennis 嗰款車，我知道公司有八百七十六部係 E500 MMC 嘅，根據公司就話係可以裝到呢啲設施嘅。公司對於呢一個型號，佢哋嘅講法係點樣，即係佢哋關於呢一個型號安裝嗰個設施？

李廣威先生：對唔住，可唔可以重複個問題？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司係咪建議係呢啲 ASLS 呢個系統，就喺八百七十六部 Alexander Dennis E500 MMC 呢啲巴士係咪諗住喺度裝？

李廣威先生：我哋需要供應商提供畀我哋有詳細嘅資料，後裝嘅可行性嘅詳細嘅資料，同埋因為我哋未曾收到佢哋講後裝嗰個每一部車所牽涉嘅費用，所以我哋需要去考慮。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你公司係咪考慮緊呢件事？

鄭偉波先生：未係考慮嘅，因為喺我哋嗰個文件上面亦都講咗，就佢話係可行嘅，即係 ADL(ASLS？)覺得係可行，咁但係就要需要十二個月嘅時間就要發展呢個產品，就所以喺現階段就未能夠提供到嗰個安裝嘅價錢畀我哋。咁喺我哋未知道每部車需要幾多錢嚟到安裝嘅時間，即係現在，我哋就唔能夠答得到就係話考慮定係唔考慮嘅，我哋首先要知道嗰個價錢先至可以考慮嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話你喺度等緊佢哋價錢嗰個問題先至去考慮，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）富豪 B9 一一七部係話咗可行嘅，就係講話係需要十八至廿四個月去發展嗰個產品，公司係咪考慮緊？

鄭偉波先生：喺呢一個價錢就嘅情況底下，如果到時佢嗰個產品係做到出嚟，而我哋測試又滿意嘅話，我哋係會安裝嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一部咁樣嘅車，B9 嘅巴士，佢會係可以行到幾多年車？

鄭偉波先生：我哋架車係用十七年或者十七年幾左右。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鄭偉波先生：當然我要補充少少，而家我哋講緊呢一百一十七部 B9 嘅車，佢已經係大約係三歲，咁即係話我哋再可以用多十四年左右，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）關於呢個車速限制器我想問多個問題，然後我哋大家先至有早上嘅小休。想請你睇呢個 TD-1，94 頁。TD-1，94 頁。

鄭偉波先生：我係見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。我唔知道你有冇睇過呢份文件，鄭先生，或者我解釋一下。

鄭偉波先生：多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係委員會喺運輸署嗰方面收到嘅呢一份意見書，嗰個標題就係話喺專營巴士嗰度應用一啲係科技嘅發展。呢份文件就係話畀我哋聽究竟係咪可行，亦都係咪可取嘅，即係話究竟係咪可以用一啲新嘅裝置或者新嘅科技喺嗰個專營巴士嗰度。呢份文件你之前有冇睇過？

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，我哋係冇睇過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，如果咁因為我諗主席都係諗住係有朝早嘅小休，我不如係請你睇呢個係 101 頁。請你係閱讀(c)嗰個部分，個標題就係話用全球定位系統或者係地理圍欄去控制嗰個車速，喺呢個標題底下嘅文字可唔可以麻煩你等陣間小休嘅時候睇一睇呢，即係讀一讀呢個第 19 同埋第 20 呢兩段呢，可以嘛？

鄭偉波先生：可唔可以出埋第 20 段畀我睇到？嗰兩頁喎，哦，咁樣第 19 段我又睇唔晒。可唔可以印一張畀我哋？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，可以畀份實物你嘅，咁樣你係知道嗰個上文下理。

鄭偉波先生：多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前一部巴士佢如果係行緊 60 公里，不過佢嗰個地段就嗰個車速限制係 50 嘅，呢度就係講話點樣樣可以處理到呢個情況，因為係而家巴士上面嘅裝置就處理唔到呢個問題，所以我哋請你等陣間自己睇一睇第 19 同埋第 20 呢兩段嘅文字，呢個就係佢哋嘅意見書嘅第 101 同埋 102 頁呢兩頁嘅。

鄭偉波先生：好，我哋會睇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家就係小休二十分鐘，唔該。

上午 11 時 37 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 59 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

MR DUNCAN：係，唔該你，主席。鄭生，正話有冇機會係睇過嗰段文字？

鄭偉波先生：有睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，呢個係用 GPS 同埋呢個地理圍欄嚟到控制車速，咁喺工作小組有冇討論過呢個問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：我畀我同事鍾生嚟到發言吖。

鍾澤文先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先，呢類系統如果要做嘅話，就首先要有一個電子地圖，係嘛？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）製造商就話對於嗰個 GPS 嘅信息嘅準確性就係話有啲係關心，因為香港好多高樓大廈，睇唔睇到？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，呢一方面嘅考慮係咪就已經唔再考慮，定抑或係會有人係睇下究竟 GPS 呢樣嘢係咪真係要--即係真係做唔到，定抑或係會考慮下 GPS 嗰個問題係咪可以克服到咁呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋嗰個睇法就係我哋都知道呢一個系統喺坊間都會有嘅，咁但係我哋喺過往做呢個黑盒嗰陣時，嗰個 GPS 嘅準確度確實都係令我哋有個關注嘅，咁所以我哋而家係認為需要係將我哋搵一啲供應商係攞一啲咁樣嘅儀器返嚟，做一啲測試，去確認佢嗰個功能同埋佢嗰個準確性先。咁呢個我哋唔係話而家就話唔做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以咁講，你哋仲係積極考慮中？

鍾澤文先生：可以咁講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁邊個負責考慮？係你哋公司吖，其他所有巴士公司都考慮中吖，定抑或點？

鍾澤文先生：喺嗰個工作小組裏面討論，我哋話我哋公司都會考慮嘅，其他公司亦都話會考慮。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好。我而家就係唔係呢個車速限制器喇，就講另一個裝置喇，呢一個就係電子穩定控制系統，你可以睇番 CTB-1 第 26 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第 26 頁嘅下面嗰度係有提及話你哋公司就計劃係包括以下嘅系統嘅，就係一個電子穩定控制系統喇，就係話會由 2019 年 6 月之後所收嘅新巴士就話會有一個咁嘅系統嘅，咁喺 27 頁嗰度我哋就睇到喇，你哋就描述咗兩個方面，即係話嗰個機制有邊兩方面嘅特色，一個就係動態穩定控制，另一個就係防止翻車嘅特色嘅。我想問，呢個係咪都係因應嗰個工作小組開會同埋討論之後你哋先有咁嘅決定嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我同事李生會回答。

李廣威先生：係，主席，冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，喺嗰個工作小組成立之前，你哋係冇考慮過呢啲事㗎，係嘛？啱唔啱？

李廣威先生：係，冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度個建議就係話係喺新巴士嗰度安裝，係指嗰啲喺 2019 年 6 月之後係畀你哋嘅車，有冇諗過話對現有嘅巴士都加裝番呢一啲系統，有冇考慮過？

李廣威先生：我哋而家係要求緊我哋嘅巴士供應商去檢視我哋嘅車係咪可以加裝呢啲嘅系統，喺技術上面係咪可行，同埋有冇一個嘅財政上面嗰個嘅需要，即係話加裝係需要幾多錢。咁我哋而家係等緊供應商嘅答覆。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪書面咁作出一個咁嘅要求，向巴士供應商作出咁樣嘅書面要求？

李廣威先生：係，冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可否係畀一啲咁樣樣嘅書面往來嘅紀錄畀我哋睇睇，畀啲樣本我哋睇？

李廣威先生：主席，我哋會返去再搵番啲紀錄。

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，主席，我諗李生未必肯定係唔係有書信來往㗎，我哋係要返去要 check 下係唔係有書信來往。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好吖，請你係喺適當嘅時候書面話畀我哋聽，係咪如果有，同埋有嘅話係咪願意畀一個副本畀我哋。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。好，而家講其他嘅裝置喇，TD-1，103，請你睇番嗰一頁吖。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）鄭生，呢個亦都係剛才我請你喺小休嘅時候請你睇嘅嗰份文件嘅其中一個部分嘅，呢個就係運輸署嘅文件，就話就係專營巴士嗰度可以應用一啲乜嘢新嘅裝置或者新嘅技術㗎。103 頁第 23 段一路落到去第 26 段，呢度就係有提及呢一種嘅裝置，就係避免碰撞同埋係保持喺嗰個行車線嗰度。我想請你自己睇一睇，讓你係熟悉第 23 至到 26 段嗰個內容。

鄭偉波先生：呢個問題會係由我哋同事鍾生答，佢已經睇咗㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鍾先生，如果咁嘅話，我就想請你睇呢個第 26 段喇，呢度就話巴士公司唔認為裝置呢啲防碰撞同埋保持行車線係會提升嗰個巴士服務嘅，我諗其實就喺第 26 段前啲嗰度你就睇到佢哋講嗰個原因㗎，係咪咁？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪你哋公司嚟講，你哋都唔打算去跟進係裝置呢一種咁樣樣嘅設備呢，即係你哋都唔會再跟進，唔會做呢樣嘢㗎喇，係嘛？

鍾澤文先生：我想先先解釋一下關於呢一種裝置，咁我哋公司喺 2014 年都曾經做過一個測試係呢一啲咁樣嘅裝置嘅，咁呢一個裝置係叫做「神眼」，英文係叫做“Mobileye”，咁呢個神眼係一個駕駛輔助嘅系統，當時係主要係應用喺私家車上面嘅，佢係利用視像嘅科技去偵測前方嘅影像，再由系統進行分析同埋計算前後車之間嘅距離同埋相撞嘅時間，從而係對嗰個司機係發出一啲警示嘅。當時我哋喺三架巴士上面就裝咗呢個神眼進行測試，就為期四個月。咁我哋安排咗唔同工會嘅代表，即係司機代表喇，同埋有五十幾個車長去揸呢三架車，係如常咁樣工作。咁之後佢哋係要做番一份問卷畀我哋，就係佢哋對呢一個神眼嘅意見嘅。

咁喺結果顯示，有部分嘅警示就唔係咁適合喺巴士裏面使用嘅，例如架車係駛入個巴士彎個站嗰陣時，嗰個警示器因為偵測到前面有人，因為喺巴士站裏面好多人企喺度等車嘅，咁偵測到人，佢就即刻發出呢個聲響嘅，咁但係當時架巴士係轉緊入個彎度，個司機係未將架巴士拉番直，咁就出現咗呢啲咁樣嘅響聲。

咁亦都有就係停車嗰陣時係太近距離，同前車太近距離，喺慢車嗰陣時亦都會出現一啲咁樣嘅警示。咁因為咁樣，就喺嗰個車程裏面都出現咗好多次嘅呢啲警示，有 46%嘅司機佢哋喺佢問卷就認為太多嘅警示，對佢哋嘅駕駛造成滋擾，甚至乎佢因為咁樣佢係唔理呢啲警示。咁 50%嘅司機認為呢一個神眼對佢哋嘅駕駛嘅安全係冇幫助。咁喺考慮過神眼呢啲功能之後，同埋我哋車長嘅意見，亦都考慮要裝呢個神眼嗰個費用亦都幾大嘅，咁當時我哋就即係決定唔繼續去搞呢一樣嘢喇。咁呢個就係我哋嘅經驗嚟嘅，咁喺嗰個會議裏面我哋亦都分享咗我哋呢個經驗。多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋係喺 2014 年嘅時候進行㗎，係自己係提出呢一個主意吖，定抑或係應呢個運輸署嘅要求去做呢個測試嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：當時係我哋自己主動嘅，因為呢一間公司就佢哋嚟我哋嗰度就係提出有個咁樣嘅安全嘅系統可以幫助到我哋去減低交通意外嘅，咁所以我哋就自己進行咗一個測試。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你意思係咪嗰三家巴士供應商嘅其中一間吖，定抑或係另外一個獨立嘅呢種儀器嘅供應商？

鍾澤文先生：係一個獨立嘅儀器供應商嚟㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊間公司？

鍾澤文先生：係一間以色列嘅公司嚟嘅，個公司喇叫做“Neshtech Pty Limited”，咁佢係喺香港嘅代理嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。好喇，亦都係運輸署嗰份文件 105 頁...

主席：（經傳譯員）等等先，鄧生。嗰個測試呢個儀器嗰個結果有冇一啲的文件喺度㗎？可唔可以係有機會等你作出決定咁樣㗎？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係有一個報告，即係測試後嘅報告嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁可唔可以向委員會係提供一份副本，有關嗰啲重點，點解係覺得唔係好有用咁樣呢？

鍾澤文先生：可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果係可以嘅話，係好感激你。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，105 頁，講到另一個嘅安全嘅裝置，咁呢個就係司機監察嘅裝置，或者你係--請你睇一睇第 27 段同埋 28 段嘅內容，係請你睇一睇，唔該。

鄭偉波先生：呢個問題係我同事李生會答，佢睇完咗份文件喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。或者想問一問，公司，城巴、新巴係咪話會安

裝呢一類咁樣嘅設施，咁就即係試辦三個月，咁就應該係今年 5 月開始，係咪咁樣？

李廣威先生：唔係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係冇作出任何承諾嘅，係咪？即係公司冇作出承諾，就話係裝呢啲設置，係咪呀？

李廣威先生：對，公司冇作出任何承諾。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，咁係咪決定唔裝喇？

李廣威先生：唔係嘅，我哋會--我哋都同唔同嘅供應商同埋--我哋都問緊三間巴士供應商，亦都同唔同嘅供應商聯絡緊，係攞緊一啲資料嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我想請你留意一下你嘅陳述書第 62 頁，CTB-1，62 嘅。好喇，第 9 段嗰度，你就係列出咗有關嘅供應商，咁你亦都係見過㗎喇，咁呢個就係關於睇下可唔可以安裝呢類咁嘅設施嘅，係咪？

李廣威先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前嗰個情況係點樣呀？即係關於呢個研究。

李廣威先生：最新嘅進展就係 Consolidated Parts，即係呢個大聯合零件銷售中心有限公司，佢哋曾經嚟做過產品嘅示範，但係嗰個錄影嘅程序就係未曾完善嘅，咁佢哋將會喺 6 月份會再嚟再做一次嘅錄影程序嘅示範。第二間，Guardian，佢哋話會提供一個嘅建議，係租借十套嘅設備同埋畀我哋有報價，咁我哋最近係收咗個報價，而家正在考慮當中。第三間，比亞迪有限公司，咁佢哋係未曾有一個產品畀我哋嘅，咁佢亦都係將會係有一個產品畀我哋去測試。另外，除咗呢三間之外，我哋亦都會搵--繼續去睇下有冇其他嘅產品可以供應到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請大家睇一睇呢個明報嗰個嘅網頁，咁嗰度有一篇文章就係同呢個係相關嘅。呢個文件當中冇㗎，主席。咁而家喺螢幕嗰度係打咗出嚟㗎喇，係有翻譯。或者想請大家睇一睇呢個係 5 月 27 號嘅一篇文章，或者請大家睇一睇先，好唔好？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係睇咗㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）以前睇過㗎喇？

鍾澤文先生：琴日你哋畀咗我哋睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，咁喺呢篇文章就係關於一啲嘅監察裝置，監察嘅司機嘅，咁佢係港珠澳大橋嗰度行駛嘅一啲司機嘅監察咁樣嘅，你知道㗎？

鍾澤文先生：知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你睇呢篇文章之前知唔知道呢件事㗎？

鍾澤文先生：之前我喺新聞睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，有冇計劃就係探討一下呢套制度，喺國內即係研發嘅一套咁嘅制度係咪可以喺公司提供？

鄭偉波先生：我哋睇下可唔可以聯絡到呢個港珠澳大橋穿梭巴士公司，去問佢哋攞多啲關於佢哋啲監察系統嘅資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向委員會係講講，咁幾時係會作出決定係關於裝唔裝呢類設備呢？幾時可以即係作出到決定，講唔講到？

鄭偉波先生：我哋而家係未聯絡到嗰個港珠澳嗰個營運嘅公司，咁而嗰個裝置嘅具體運作我哋係唔清楚嘅，而牽涉嘅成本係幾多，我哋亦都係未知道，所以喺現階段，我哋答唔到係幾時可以做到決定，我哋要有足夠嘅資訊我哋先至可以做到考慮，做咗考慮之後先至可以做決定嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司係幾時開始係考慮用呢類咁樣嘅設施㗎，幾時？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係未開始考慮嘅，因為我哋未有資料㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，咁但係你會係接觸不同嘅供應商㗎嘛，咁你幾時開始同佢哋接觸㗎？

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，我想知道你而家問緊嘅係同港珠澳有關嗰啲設施，定係邊一部分？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺最早嗰間公司，即係你喺陳述書嗰度講咗幾間公司，最早嗰啲公司係幾時開始接觸㗎？

鄭偉波先生：呢個李生會答。

李廣威先生：係大約今年嘅 4 月嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁呢個係咪其實喺工作小組傾完之後，你先開始咁做㗎？

李廣威先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁工作小組之前係冇考慮過，係咪呀？

李廣威先生：係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家講另一項嘅安全嘅問題，TD-1...

主席：（經傳譯員）等等，鄧律師，我哋--第 63 頁，你第二份嘅陳述書嗰度，CTB-1，63，咁有講到就話 Guardian，澳洲嘅製造商，於提到就話星加坡嘅

土地運輸局佢哋就話喺新嘅巴士嗰度就會有呢啲咁樣嘅裝置嘅，你其實有冇接觸過星加坡嗰個當局係關於呢方面嘅資料？

李廣威先生：呢方面嘅資料其實我哋係經 Guardian 話畀我哋聽嘅，我哋冇接觸過 LTA。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，想請大家睇睇 TD-1，195 頁，TD-1，195 嘅。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你應該係睇到，鄭生？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係嗰個即係長遠計劃，即係呢個城巴嗰個嘅長遠發展計劃係提供畀委員會，咁喺呢一個遠期計劃嗰度係有第 4 項係講到安全嘅，你睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇 202 頁，文件嘅 202 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該，5.13 嗰度，安裝安全帶嘅可行性同埋即係所有座位，同埋係上層嘅所有嘅座位，咁呢個係(b）嗰度喇。你睇到？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者好快咁讀一讀喇，「其實就安裝喺所有座位同埋喺上層座位安裝安全帶係可行嘅，但係我哋嘅觀察就係話好少人係會纜安全帶嘅，而家喺一啲即係比較空曠嘅位置，咁如果冇法例嚟到規定喺專利巴士上面係戴安全帶同埋執法當局係嚴格咁執行法律，喺所有座位安裝安全帶就係浪費資源嘅，因為大多數嘅乘客根本都唔會係纜呢個安全帶，即使有都唔纜嘅」，咁呢一個其實係之後喺嗰個遠期--城巴遠期嘅計劃嗰度係你有咁嘅說話喇。咁其實你可唔可以睇一睇 TD-1，95 頁？同一份--同一套文件夾㗎喇，嗰個標題就係講「為所有嘅乘客嘅座椅係安裝安全帶」嘅，睇唔睇到嗰一段？

鄭偉波先生：睇唔--係邊一段？第幾段，請問？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）TD/95，係 95，唔係 195。係 TD/95，對唔住。

鄭偉波先生：睇到嘅。我同事睇緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 TD-08 號嘅文件嘅，第 95 頁，第 5 至到第 9 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鄭偉波先生：有，有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問你呢個問題喇，喺工作小組裏面有冇傾過呢件事？

李廣威先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想你特別睇睇呢個第 7 段。想問下，你哋公司係咪顯示話已經同意咗嗰個要求，就話所有新嘅巴士都要為所有嘅乘客座椅係安裝呢一個安全帶，係咪你哋同意咗？

李廣威先生：係，我哋公司同意咗由 2019 年 6 月開始付運嘅車係會有安全帶嘅，三點式安全帶。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到話事後補裝，即係現有嘅巴士再加裝番呢啲安全帶，唔知道你有冇睇到第 8 段，呢份文件嘅第 8 段，唔知你睇咗未呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）未講番加裝之前，我自己就想問一個問題喇，你哋較早嘅時候答過，就話如果係裝呢個安全帶就係浪費資源，因為大部分嘅乘客都唔會纜安全帶嘅，咁而且亦都要靠有人去執法先至得㗎。你而家就話你同意係將呢個要求加落去，咁如果冇人去執法嘅話，又會唔會係浪費資源呢？你喺呢一度嘅睇法又點呢？

鄭偉波先生：如果法例冇規定嘅話就冇得執法喇，因為現時就冇規定坐巴士要纜安全帶嘅，就算法例有規定，如果到時冇執法嘅話，咁呢個都係浪費資源嘅，我哋仍然係呢個睇法。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你有咁嘅睇法，你有冇同運輸署講？

鄭偉波先生：有㗎，我哋同事有同運輸署講過嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁運輸署有冇回應？係咩嘢回應？

鄭偉波先生：我同事鍾生，當時係佢負責，佢會答一答，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鍾澤文先生：主席，當時運輸署就話裝咗喺度就畀個乘客自己去選擇嘅，佢纜唔纜，即係如果佢係擔心自己嘅安全嘅，佢就有得纜，但係如果我哋係冇嘅話，佢擔心都冇得纜，呢個就係佢哋嘅 response。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇同運輸署講過，就話佢哋都打算係引入相關嘅法例要求？

鍾澤文先生：我哋有同運輸署提過，就話如果佢唔立法，根本條安全帶就可能係真係

浪費咗嘅，咁但係運輸署冇應承話一定會立法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想麻煩你睇番 TD-2 第 58 頁，TD-2 嘅 58 頁。呢度就係《公共巴士服務條例》其中嘅一個部分，特別就係第 36 條，有關嗰個條例嘅第 36 條，睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有關呢個條文，鄭先生你熟唔熟悉佢個內容㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我係唔熟悉嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪第一次睇到呢個條文？

鄭偉波先生：係第一次。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你慢慢，畀少少時間自己去睇清楚呢個內容，咁先至答到陣間嘅問題嘅。

鄭偉波先生：初步睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據嗰個專營權協議同埋呢個條文就可以係制訂附例嘅，睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：剛剛睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇諗過就係制訂呢啲附例呢？即係根據呢條嘅條文去制訂附例呢？

鄭偉波先生：因為我哋對於制訂附例所關乎嘅法例，我係唔識嘅，咁所以我哋係今日喺度就答唔到話我哋會不會制訂附例，因為我哋係冇接觸過呢個範疇嘅，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你以巴士上面嘅巴士乘客嘅行為，係咪有陣時你哋公司都係關注，都係擔心嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：你係指邊一方面？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）譬如話佢哋有陣時鬧啲巴士車長喇，係咪時不時有咁嘅事發生？

鄭偉波先生：係有發生過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你認唔認為如果你有自己嘅附例，就自己可以執法嘅話，咁樣係可以更好咁樣，更有效咁處理呢啲場面，同唔同意？

鄭偉波先生：我係唔認識呢啲附例嘅嘢，同埋剛剛你講過，話如果有附例就我哋自己可以執法，但係我唔清楚係點樣執法喎，因為我哋個車長佢唔識得執法喎，同

埋如果由個車長去執法，就更加會同個乘客就產生更加大嘅衝突，一架車裏面淨係有一個車長，一個人㗎咋喎，其他全部乘客嚟㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋係咪有稽查㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係有稽查，但係我哋就不會係每部車上面有個稽查㗎，稽查係負責去監察我哋車長嘅工作，同埋喺巴士總站嗰度工作嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道其實地鐵有自己嘅附例嘅，你知唔知㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我有聽過，但係詳細係點樣，我係唔清楚㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果所有嘅巴士都有安全帶，又如果乘客拒絕纜安全帶，你認唔認為你哋公司自己制訂嘅附例可以幫到手去執行呢一個咁嘅要求？

鄭偉波先生：我相信我哋嘅車長冇能力去執行，因為如果個乘客堅持唔戴安全帶，首先，佢係坐喺樓上嘅，我個車長唔可能係睇得到每一個乘客有冇戴安全帶，就算睇到，就要停低架車，跟住個車長就要熄咗架車。因為一架公共巴士如果著咗車，唔可以冇車長喺個駕駛位嘅。要熄咗部車，跟住就行上去樓上，就搵番冇戴安全帶嗰位乘客，咁就叫佢戴安全帶，咁假若嗰個乘客拒絕戴安全帶，咁就當場就會同我哋嘅車長就發生爭執㗎喇，咁呢個又影響到我哋個服務，同埋即係可能會車長同個乘客打交都唔定㗎，所以我唔覺得我哋嘅車長可以執法。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）稽查，你講到稽查就只係去監察嗰個巴士嘅駕駛，我想問喇，你哋係有幾多個稽查就係受你哋僱用，又履行呢一方面咁嘅職責嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：首先就我想 correct 一個 fact 先，就稽查並不是只係去監察巴士車長嘅駕駛，監察駕駛係佢一部分嘅職能，稽查係負責管理，係我哋嘅前線管理我哋個巴士嘅運作嘅。至於我哋有幾多個稽查，係做啲乜嘢嘅工作，我交畀我同事鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：係，多謝，主席。我哋有百幾個呢啲所謂 inspector 嘅稽查，咁但係佢哋嘅工作係有唔同嘅，例如有一啲佢哋係會喺個控制中心嗰度負責調配，有一部分會喺街上面做巡邏，或者喺總站嗰度係協助一啲乘客嘅秩序。咁相比我哋有千幾架車喺街嗰度行緊嘅話，啲稽查係唔可能即時可以去到發生事故嘅巴士裏面係提供協助畀啲車長。呢個同譬如話港鐵有附例有好大嘅分別，因為喺港鐵嘅車站都有相當數量嘅職員可以提供協助，如果係港鐵喺架車上發生事故嘅話，佢哋嘅司機係會揸番架車去到個站度，係尋求個站務員幫佢協助嘅，咁如但係我哋嘅車長如果發生事故，頭先都講，已經停咗架車，佢唔可以就走番去架車嗰度揸架車去搵個督察，或者如果係咁嘅情況喇，已經係有個爭執喺度嘅話，就做唔到嘅，咁呢個就有個分別喺度。多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋返番去運輸署嗰份文件，96 頁第 7 段，就係關於安全帶嘅，新巴士嘅安全帶。第 8 段講到加裝安全帶，即係現時巴士上面

加裝安全帶呢個問題係有提出嘅，咁最後嗰部分就係提到，就話專利巴士公司係會進一步咁研究呢一項嘅建議咁樣，咁而家公司係咪諗緊呢樣嘢，係咪研究緊？

鄭偉波先生：我同事李生會答。

李廣威先生：我哋公司係諮詢緊我哋嘅巴士供應商，對於一啲嘅舊車係可唔可以加裝安全帶嘅。初步嘅回覆係 ADL 嘅車係 2013 年之後--2013 年或之後嘅車嘅上層係可行嘅，但係需要加裝好多嘅結構上面嘅鞏固，同埋需要將所有嘅凳係更換，因為現時嘅凳係唔可以再用。咁嗰個初步估計，估算嗰個價錢係每一架車可能係需要 15,200 磅至到 20,000 磅一架車。我哋估計我哋嘅車隊入面大概有一千一百架車係呢一類型，如果真係要加裝嘅，嗰個價錢係會可能去到一億八千萬至到二億四千萬。呢一個係好巨大嘅數目，係會造成好大嘅浪費。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）浪費係因為啲乘客唔纜安全帶，係咪呀？

李廣威先生：：冇錯，因為我哋都留意到乘客而家--其實我哋而家嘅車嘅無遮擋座位都係已經有三點式安全帶，但係我哋留意到乘客係冇用呢啲嘅安全帶嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司喺過去有冇一啲嘅補貼，係即係政府當局畀任何補貼㗎？

李廣威先生：喺過往政府只係補貼過--即係由環保署係補貼我哋係安裝一啲嘅減排裝置，亦都係曾經出資係買過幾架嘅混能嘅電車--混能車去試驗，有三架。另外亦都係有提供有十架單層嘅電動巴士係畀我哋作測試嘅。係，多謝，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）：我哋睇到呢啲咁嘅措施，就安全措施嘅設施喇或者係改善安全嘅措施喇咁，但係呢啲其實就係喺工作小組成立咗之後先提出嘅，咁喺考慮嘅過程當中，公司係咪有冇諗過同政府講，就話睇下可唔可以有一啲嘅補貼畀公司，等你哋可以係照顧到部分嘅成本，咁等你哋可以提升嗰個安全？

鄭偉波先生：我哋係未同政府講嘅，但係如果政府係願意補貼我哋提升--令到我哋可以更加提升安全，我哋係非常歡迎嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解你唔同政府講一講，點解？

鄭偉波先生：我哋唔知道可以咁樣問政府攞津貼㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我想問多幾個問題添，就係關於嗰個紀律處分嘅程序，咁其實都係有提過㗎喇，或者想請大家睇一睇 39 頁，CTB-1 嘅 39 頁，CTB-1，39。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇到底下嗰度，(b）嗰度就係背景檢查同埋係定罪嘅刑罰咁樣，咁其實就係服務質素嘅部門就係負責嗰個紀律處分嘅，即係有違

規行為，咁呢個係根據嗰個車長嘅手冊嚟到做，仲有，委員會就係收到一啲嘅資料，就係關於嗰個紀律處分嘅程序咁樣嘅。好喇，講到個車長嘅手冊，咁或者而家等我打一打出嚟，CTB-2，就係 85 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，係幾時㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 2018 嘅。咁車長手冊嗰度係有一啲嘅節錄，第 85 頁，翻譯就係 169-1。或者想大家睇一睇嗰個目錄喇，就應該係第 87 頁嘅，喺翻譯個版本嗰度 169-3。你係咪睇到個目錄嗰一版，睇唔睇到？你同唔同...

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你同唔同意就係呢個係好詳盡，有好多細節嘅文件嚟嘅，同唔同意？

鄭偉波先生：同意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）英文嘅版本，即係兩個版本喇，有七個唔同嘅章節嘅，咁就當中係包括不同嘅段落喇，每一章都係有不同嘅段落咁樣。好喇，其實公司係採取咗乜嘢嘅步驟去確保車長係熟習所有呢個手冊當中嘅條文嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我同事鍾生會答嘅。

鍾澤文先生：喺呢本車長手冊裏面所講嘅嘢，其實我哋喺--有大部分喺佢哋入職嗰個訓練嗰度係已經講過畀佢哋聽，咁亦都有一部分係喺嗰個重溫課程裏面亦都會喺--再講解嘅。咁呢一本手冊就係方便佢哋上完呢啲課程之後再去詳細睇番嘅，或者佢如果係真係唔記得嘅，佢可以睇番。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，答番主席喇，呢個手冊就係今年 4 月嘅，個日期係。咁之前嗰個版本係幾時出㗎？

鍾澤文先生：上一個版本係 2017 年嘅 7 月。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢個手冊係咪不時咁樣檢討㗎？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾耐檢討一次？

鍾澤文先生：呢個都唔係一個定期嘅，咁就要睇下我哋喺嗰段時間有幾多嘢有改動或者需要加番落去。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同委員會講一講，有幾多車長係曾經係受過紀律處分，即係譬如過去嗰十二個月，有幾多位車長係遭受到紀律處分嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：因為今次我哋嚟，就以為主要就係講交通安全呢一部分嘅，即係駕駛安全，所以我哋冇準備到資料就係整體紀律處分嘅數字，呢個我哋可以後補番畀

委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你之後補番，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席先生，而家會唔會係一個適當嘅時間係小休？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，係，啱。我哋而家就係休息，就會係下晝兩點半再繼續㗎，唔該晒。

下午 1 時 01 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。鄭先生，有幾條問題係想問一問你嘅，呢個就係關乎 2018 年嘅指引，呢個就係巴士車長工作、休息及用膳時間嘅指引，2018 嘅版本。有關嘅指引，CTB-2 嘅第 2 頁嗰度就會見到嘅。至於話之前嘅版本，你就會係--如果想睇番嘅話，可以喺 TD-5，喺 1556 頁嗰度見到。或者為求今日係問題嘅時候比較係容易理解，我而家就分發咗個比較表，係將不同嘅指引，將佢進行一個比較，因為啲指引就係有改變嘅，喺 04 年至到 2018 年之間呢啲指引係有個變動嘅，或者咁，我想請你係睇一睇我呢一個表，嗰份文件嗰個標題就係嗰份指引嘅比較表，嗰個日期就係 2018 年嘅 5 月 4 號，你面前係咪已經有呢份文件呀？

鄭偉波先生：有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。首先，我想講番一啲比較重要嘅變動嘅，呢啲係今年嘅指引，同以前 2010 年所通過嘅指引之間嘅不同之處，你跟到我所講嘅說話嘛？

鄭偉波先生：跟到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。首先喺呢個表嗰度想請你係睇第 3 項，即係話嗰個係總嘅或者最高嘅駕駛時間，見到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個變動，如果以呢一個係最長嘅係駕駛時間嚟到計，新嘅指引就咁嘅，喺一更裏面係十個鐘，之前喺 2010 年嗰個指引係講喺一個工

作日裏面十一個鐘，首先見唔見到佢兩者不同之處呀？

鄭偉波先生：我見到個指引唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個腳唔腳合你自己所理解嘅變動呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢一部分我請鍾先生負責回答。

鍾澤文先生：係腳合嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。第二點想請你睇嘅就係嗰個最長嘅更次時間，呢個就正正喺剛才所講嗰項嘅上面，你睇唔睇到嗰度嘅變動呀？個變動就係 2018 年最長嘅更次時間就一更裏面係十二個鐘，對比起一個工作天裏面係十四小時，呢個係咪亦都腳合你嘅理解呢，鍾先生？

鍾澤文先生：腳合嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋揭去後面嗰版，你會見到最長嘅更次同埋呢一個駕駛時間由於係有一個所謂嘅特別更次，所以就有啲變動，喺第 2 頁嗰度，見唔見到呀？

鍾澤文先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度就有一個要求嘅，就話嗰個更次嘅時間，嗰個司機嘅更次時間係實質上可以超過嗰個剛才第 1 頁所講嘅十二個鐘，係可以最多去到十四個鐘嘅，睇到嘛？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）亦都腳唔腳合你對新指引嘅理解呢？

鍾澤文先生：腳合。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到個駕駛時間，即係喺嗰個特別更次裏面嘅駕駛時間，係咪有一個上限㗎？個上限係十小時，啱唔啱呀？

鍾澤文先生：啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度亦都有多一個條件嘅，如果係呢個特別更次嘅話，就係話應該係有一個休息，嗰個休息唔可以少於連續三小時。

鍾澤文先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪都係你嘅理解係咁㗎？

鍾澤文先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我請你睇咗剛才嘅資料之後，首先我想問，我嘅理解啱

唔啱，縱使可以係有一個特別更，而個特別更就係上限嗰個時間可以去到十四個鐘，但係你哋公司就唔諗住係多過十三個鐘嘅，係咪你哋嘅計劃或者你哋嘅打算係咁呀？

鍾澤文先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）較早時候，我哋留意到，根據你哋提交畀委員會嘅資料，有鑑於新嘅指引，係需要增加一百二十一位車長嘅，你記唔記得曾經提過一個咁嘅數字呀？

鍾澤文先生：記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你計算出呢個數字嘅時候係咪已經考慮埋你哋打算最高嗰個時數係十三個鐘呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你哋係用到嗰個上限十四個鐘，就唔係用十三個鐘嚟到計嘅話，會唔會減少你所需要增聘或者增加嘅車長嘅數目呀？

鍾澤文先生：會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，咁點解公司而家決定係將嗰個最長嘅時間係定喺十三嗰度呢？

鍾澤文先生：因為我哋理解到公眾對嗰個安全嘅關注。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嘅安排又點樣樣可以有助安全呢？

鍾澤文先生：車長佢個每日工作時間都唔會太長，去到十三個鐘。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係無論如何，最高嘅駕駛時間都會係十個鐘，即係無論嗰個更係十四個鐘定十三個鐘，嗰個駕駛時間嘅上限都係十個鐘嘅，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話係嗰個--你指係就係講到話而嗰日係好長嘅話，你就係考慮到嗰個多咗一個鐘嗰個問題啫，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係，冇錯，即係佢可以早啲放工嘅話，咁佢同下一個更分嗰個相隔時間，休息就會多啲。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。早啲時候，你講過一位車長，即係當然唔計嗰啲兼職車長，一般車長一般會係工作十小時，八個鐘頭就係正常嘅，兩個鐘就係超時嘅，你記唔記得曾經同我哋咁樣講過呀？

鍾澤文先生：記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，如果有一個人佢要做呢個特別更次，你哋要求佢做特別更嘅，換句話講，佢當值就係十三個鐘嘅，但係裏面駕駛嘅時間就只係十個小時，我就想問，佢係攞八個鐘頭正常時間嘅工資，另外五個鐘頭嘅超時補水，係咪咁樣計嘅呢？佢點樣出糧嘅呢？定抑或係佢係有八小時嘅正常工資，另外兩小時嘅超時補水，即係好似平時咁樣樣，而嗰個休息嘅時間就係冇工資嘅，係邊一種安排呢？

鍾澤文先生：係佢會獲得八個鐘頭嘅基本底薪，跟住嗰五個鐘就係一個超時嘅補水。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，你哋係行咗新嘅指引未呢？

鍾澤文先生：仲未嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時會開始呀？

鍾澤文先生：我哋打算會喺今年嘅第三季。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係點解要遲啲先做呢？

鍾澤文先生：第一，因為我哋要請到足夠嘅車長，先至可以推行；第二，我哋亦都要增加一啲休息嘅設施畀嗰啲車長喺嗰三個鐘嘅休息時間裏面有一個地方去休息。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同委員會講下司機幾常係需要做嗰個十三個鐘嘅更次呢？即係你遲啲就會有呢個十三個鐘嘅更次，幾頻密、幾常佢哋要咁做呢？

鍾澤文先生：新巴同城巴就係有唔同嘅安排嘅，新巴嘅司機佢哋係返梗一個更次嘅，如果佢申請咗做呢啲特別更分嘅話，咁佢就係每一日都會係做呢個特別更分，除咗佢係休息。而城巴嘅車長，因為佢哋嗰個返工係輪更嘅方式嘅，佢哋係每一個禮拜係會輪一個唔同嘅更分，咁就要睇下嗰個更分嘅編排係點樣，就好難講話究竟佢係有幾頻密。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到新巴，你嘅意思係咪話有啲司機就係恆常都會係做十三個鐘呢一啲嘅特別更次嘅，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一個禮拜做幾多日呢？會返幾多日工呢？

鍾澤文先生：一個禮拜會返五日或者六日，就會有一日嘅休息時間。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話五、六日，係咪佢哋有得揀㗎？

鍾澤文先生：要佢申請去做邊一個更分，有一啲更分因為係一至六都會有嘅，佢哋就會返六日，就星期日會休息，有一啲更分係星期一至星期日都會有嘅，佢哋就會返五日就放一日假，咁嚟休息嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解就係有好多嘅喺新巴嘅車長就會係十三個鐘一日，就一係五日、一係六日一個禮拜咁計，係咪呢？

鍾澤文先生：會有一啲車長係咁樣，但係唔係全部嘅，我哋估計就大約係會有十幾個 per cent 嘅更分會係呢啲特別更嘅更次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概有幾多比例嘅車長係做呢啲更分--呢啲時間，十三個鐘特別更，每一日，就五至六日，大概個百比分係幾多呢，車長嘅數目，喺新巴嚟講？

鍾澤文先生：等我睇一睇。有十幾個 per cent 喽，大約係一百四十四個更分。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，講到城巴嗰方面，可唔可以解多次新巴同城巴之間喺呢方面嘅分別係點樣呀？

鍾澤文先生：城巴嘅車長佢哋唔係每一日都固定返嗰一個更分嘅，佢哋係每一個禮拜返一個更分，或者五日返一個更分，跟住就會放一日假，放完假之後，佢就會係 rotate 去下一個更分，又做五日，之後又放假，又去第二個更分咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話喺一個禮拜之內，佢哋就會係十個鐘咁計，跟住下一更就可能係十三個鐘，係咪即係每一日都唔同，一日就十個鐘，一日十三個鐘，係咪咁樣唔同㗎？

鍾澤文先生：係每五日就轉一次更。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我明。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係可以係一日十個鐘，一日係十三個鐘，仲有冇其他嘅類別呀，有冇其他做不同鐘數嘅類別呀？

鍾澤文先生：有嘅，十個鐘其實係一個平均嚟嘅，我哋有一啲更分，有啲係八個幾鐘，有啲係九個鐘，十個鐘又有，十一個鐘又有咁樣嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁呢個即係五日嗰度，就即係個模式係一樣嘅，係咪呀？即係五日之後先至轉嘅，即係每五日嚟講係完全一樣嘅，個時數，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以就畀委員會一啲嘅講法呢，其實呢啲新嘅指引對一般車長嚟講，有啲咩嘢嘅具體影響？有冇一啲具體嘅改變、實質嘅改變呀咁樣呢？還是係喺佢哋工作時數都冇乜特別嘅轉變呢？

鍾澤文先生：如果佢係轉咗做一個特別更咁先算，佢嗰個休息時間就會係集中咗喺嗰三個鐘或者三個幾鐘嘅安排裏面，未改呢個指引之前，其實最高工作時間係十四個鐘，而嗰個駕駛時間係十一個鐘，其實佢如果係一個十四個鐘嘅更分，佢都係有三個鐘嘅休息時間，不過呢啲休息時間其實就會分開咗係唔同嘅時間畀

佢啫。但係喺一個特別更嚟講，嗰個休息時間就會連續集中咗喺同一段時間，即係嗰三個鐘裏面或者三個鐘以上嘅裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）舊時就十四個鐘嗰個嘅更係咪車長好鍾意㗎，鍾唔鍾意㗎？

鍾澤文先生：有部分車長係鍾意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇車長就係需要做到十四個鐘--最高十四個鐘，而係唔想咁樣做嘅，違背佢哋嘅意願咁樣做嘅，有冇㗎？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係編排咗個更分畀佢，佢就需要去做嗰個更分嘅，不過佢哋如果係搵到同事同佢去調更，而又合乎個指引嘅話，我哋係會批准嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果嗰個人對十四個鐘嘅安排唔滿意嘅話，係咪即係好難搵人調呢，其實？

鍾澤文先生：我唔知道佢哋難唔難，不過我哋車長調更嘅安排都幾普遍嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你估計--對於呢啲特別更嚟講，你覺得對員工嚟講係咪都係受歡迎吖，還是真係唔受歡迎㗎？

鍾澤文先生：我聽過有工會話歡迎，亦都有工會話唔歡迎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）都係兩樣都有，係咪呀？一樣一半咁樣，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：係咪一樣一半，我唔知，但係我又聽過一個，有啲車長佢係鍾意做長啲嘅更分，因為佢要搵--想搵多啲錢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果唔受歡迎，點解唔受歡迎呀？

鍾澤文先生：有啲車長佢唔需要搵咁多錢，譬如話有一啲車長佢都做咗好多年，可能屋企佢唔係一個主要嘅經濟支柱，佢可能佢做八個鐘、九個鐘，佢已經足夠㗎喇，所以佢哋就唔鍾意做一啲較長嘅更分。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你估計要求員工係做到十三個鐘其實係咪即係違背佢哋嘅意願，佢哋係唔想嘅，係咪呢？你覺唔覺得係咁呢？

鍾澤文先生：我唔覺得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，或者如果大家冇問題，我哋就講完嗰個指引。我就想講番嗰個遠期嘅計劃，呢個就喺 TD-1，195 嘅，今朝都睇過呢份文件，鄭先生。

鄭偉波先生：有睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。係喇，就係講嗰個安全帶咁樣，或者我再講多少少，呢一度。首先或者想請你睇一睇第 199 頁，文件嘅 199 頁，呢度係有

一個意外嘅性質嘅分析，係 2016 嘅，睇唔睇到，鄭生？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，表 4，意外嘅性質係有不同嘅類別咁樣嘅，呢一度，就一路係去到 200 頁嘅，睇唔睇到呀？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）意外嘅性質係 199 頁最後嗰度就係一啲非碰撞嘅意外就係有呢個乘客受傷嘅咁，你睇到，鄭生？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一點就係喺 200 頁嗰度都係有跟進嘅，六成嘅意外都係非碰撞嘅意外而係有乘客受傷嘅，就有進一步咁樣嚟到去分析呢一類嘅意外，喺表 5 嗰度係有列出嚟嘅，個分析就係話有啲乘客就係失咗平衡，呢個係一個主要嘅意外嘅成因嚟嘅，就你所知，呢個今日都係咪--即係都係咁樣呢？嗰個比例睇嚟係最高嘅，即係對於呢個意外嘅性質嚟講，係咪今日嘅情況都係一樣，冇變呀？

鄭偉波先生：冇大分別。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，喺表 5 嗰度上高個段落，個分析就係話乘客就失平衡咁樣，呢個就係個主要嘅成因，公司嚟講，係可以做啲乜嘢呢？對於呢類咁嘅事情，可以做啲乜嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：我畀鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：乘客喺呢個車度跌到嘅，我哋一向都睇得到佢係最主要嘅原因嚟嘅，我哋過往都同運輸署係做一啲宣傳嘅工夫，包括政府就拍咗一啲宣傳嘅短片，喺電視嗰度播嘅，就係提醒啲乘客上車咗之後，就要緊握扶手，同埋就係如果搦住太多嘢嘅話，就唔好行上去樓上坐；另外我哋公司亦都喺車上面加貼咗一啲標示，提醒啲乘客係去上車之後，係儘快去搵位坐或者係扶手--緊握扶手嘅；除咗標貼之外，我哋亦都有利用車上面嘅報站系統係出示一啲--顯示同埋廣播係提醒啲乘客緊握扶手，呢啲都係我哋過往有做嘅嘢嚟嘅；除咗話係加強乘客嘅宣傳，我哋亦都有喺我哋嘅司機嘅訓練裏面係提醒啲司機，喺駕駛時要留意乘客喺車廂入面嘅活動，尤其是喺停完站開車之前要睇下啲乘客佢哋係行到埋去位未，或者係扶穩未，同埋係留意有啲老人家佢哋嗰個狀況，同埋喺開--即係停車之前，都要柔順一啲，呢啲我哋都有提醒啲車長係儘量避免因為剎車而令到乘客係跌到嘅，呢啲係我哋做嘅嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）巴士車長嗰個駕駛態度會唔會就係都導致到乘客會跌到呢？你嘅經驗、去嘅體驗係咪咁呢？

鍾澤文先生：車長嘅駕駛態度係會導致乘客跌到嘅，呢個係其中一個原因，乘客佢自

己上咗車之後有冇緊握扶手，呢個都係佢哋自己--即係乘客嘅一個責任嚟嘅。當然喺香港嗰個駕駛路面亦都有好多突發嘅事情，車長係控制唔到，變咗有時佢真係需要緊急剎車而令到乘客係跌到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇啲規例或者規則講到話一架巴士可以載幾多乘客呢？即係話除咗係有座位坐嘅乘客之外，有冇規例、規則講除此之外仲可以多載幾多乘客，換句話講，可以係有幾多乘客係企喺度嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：每一架巴士佢嘅座位數目同埋可以企立乘客嘅數目都係有限制嘅，而呢個數目亦都寫咗喺架車嘅出面，喺近住車門嗰度，唔同巴士嘅種類或者佢嘅長度，佢嗰個載客量都會有唔同嘅，企位嘅人數亦都會有唔同。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個負責去決定係可以載得多過係巴士所容許嘅站立乘客呢？邊個負責嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：每一架新入到嚟香港嘅巴士，運輸署都會做一個所謂叫做 type approval 嘅程序，喺呢個程序裏面就會因應架巴士嗰個喺樓下嘅通道嘅面積去計算嗰個可以企嘅乘客嘅數目，同埋呢個亦都要考慮埋嗰個車嘅總載重量，亦都有一個重量去計算。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗嗰個問題係比較係具體嘅，邊個可以決定就係嗰個企喺度嘅乘客嗰個上限過咗，邊個可以決定，邊個有咁嘅責任呢？

鍾澤文先生：司機有責任要確保佢架車唔會超載。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你諗住巴士嘅車長點樣樣可以履行到呢個職責呢？

鄭偉波先生：呢個由我負責回答，我哋每部車就係有定咗嗰個企位嘅總數嘅，但係當我哋個車長佢揸住架車嘅時候，佢就冇可能分心就去一路數住有幾多乘客上咗車，因為乘客上咗車，首先佢哋係應該選擇係會坐位先，如果冇晒座位嘅話，就啲乘客就需要企，但係喺任何一個時間，我哋巴士上面嘅車長佢係唔可能知道自己架車上面係載咗幾多乘客嘅，佢只係可以憑觀察嘅，而呢個觀察就係啲乘客企到幾近車頭嗰度，即係如果企到好近車頭，即係好多人企，但係--即係如果大家喺街上面有留意嘅話，或者平時有喺繁忙時間搭巴士嘅，就會有呢個體驗㗎喇，喺架巴士樓下嘅後面嘅部分，乘客係唔鍾意企喺嗰處嘅，佢哋就選擇就企喺近住個門口嗰度，即係架巴士中門，即係個 exit door 嗰度，同埋就再企下企下就企咗去車頭，就唔行入去，如果喺咁樣嘅情況底下，嗰個巴士車長佢只係憑觀察見到好多人企喺佢近住車頭，但係佢唔會知道喺後面嘅位置會唔會有好多嘅空間係冇人願意入去企，呢個就係普遍我哋喺繁忙時間嘅情況嚟嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我明嘅，我明呢啲困難嘅。換句話講，係咪話實質上巴士車長係無法去執行嗰個係企位嘅上限，縱使佢喺車身嗰度已經寫明咗只可以企咁多個人，但係佢其實係無法去執行嘅，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：第一，個車長佢不知道幾時要去執行，因為佢數唔到有幾多個人喺架車上面，因為大家要注意嘅，一架車一路有人上車，一路又有人落車，到底剩番喺架巴士裏面嘅係幾多人呢，個車長唔可能拎住部計數機一路去計住嘅，唔可以咁準確做得到嘅，佢就只可以憑肉眼嘅觀察。好喇，如果佢觀察到話好多人企到去近住車頭，佢亦都冇嘢可以做得到嘅，因為啲乘客係趕住去返工，同埋已經畀咗錢，因為企喺架車裏面嘅乘客全部已經一係入咗錢，一係拍咗八達通㗎喇，如果個車長真係去逐個人、逐個人去數，數完係多咗--譬如多咗兩個人，佢唔可能去執行到嘅，佢唔知叫邊兩個人落車，即係呢個就係嗰個實質上嗰個困難嚟嘅。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）巴士過份擠逼係咪你哋公司面對嘅難題之一呢？過份擠逼而令致就有好多人係要企，而企嘅人就多過嗰個企位嘅上限，對你哋公司嚟講，呢個係咪你哋嘅問題之一呢？

鄭偉波先生：我再重申一次，我哋其實係冇任何數據去證明到係有呢個所謂超載，即係個企位多過個準許上限呢個情形，我哋係冇呢個數字嘅，所以我唔能夠可以好清楚咁樣答到你我哋有冇呢個超載嘅情況嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係公司係唔知嘅，即係你哋有冇過度擠逼呢個問題，你哋就唔知，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：再重申一次，係喺車頭，近住車頭，或者架車嘅前半部係有可能有過度擠逼，但係喺架車嘅後半部，係樓下後半部好多時係冇人企喺度，呢個就係架車有部分嘅位置係過度擠逼，但係過度擠逼就係一個觀感嚟嘅，有冇超載就係一個客觀嘅計算，我哋就冇呢個資料就係話啲車有幾多部係超過咗嗰個車容許嘅上限嘅，我哋冇呢個資料嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇委員會所收到嘅另一份意見書，MISC-1，124-1 嗰頁。

鄭偉波先生：我哋係睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。呢個係嚟自警方嘅，喺 18 年 5 月 7 號嘅嗰封信，你睇咗，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 2 頁嘅第 5 段。

鍾澤文先生：有睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰段裏面，寫呢封信嘅人就講到係五個主要嘅成因，睇到嘛？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問你呢個問題，公司會唔會時不時收到咁樣性質嘅報告，係警方交畀你哋嘅，當然呢封信就係特登係寫畀專責委員會嘅，但係我嘅問題就話你哋公司會唔會喺警方嗰度時不時都收到類似咁樣樣嘅資料呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係冇同警方嗰度係收到呢啲資料嘅，不過我哋喺做頭先嗰個五年發展計劃嗰陣時，運輸署佢哋畀我哋嗰個--做嗰個發展計劃個指引嗰度係有提供類似嘅資料畀我哋嘅，係每一年一次。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一類嘅資料係有嘅，不過係透過運輸署攞到，係咪呀？咁樣講啱唔啱，咁嘅理解啱唔啱？

鍾澤文先生：啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到第 5 段，講到嗰五個係主要嘅成因，佢哋指出呢五大成因，你覺得啱唔啱呢？係咪胎合你哋平時嘅理解，定抑或你都感到意外呢？

鍾澤文先生：胎合嘅，唔感到意外。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，跟住就想請你睇另一份文件嘅，亦都係委員會係從運輸署嗰度所收到嘅資料，係好近期嘅，不過就唔知道你哋有冇機會係睇過，呢度就係 TD-5，1649，TD-5，1649 嘅，我相信就係委員會幾日前先至收到嘅啫，道路安全管理系統，呢度就係講到而家政府所採納嘅嗰一套制度，你同同事有冇睇過呢份文件呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，或者睇幾方面，呢份文件，首先第一版 1649 第 4 段，呢版第 4 段，“Apart from”嗰段，或者請大家睇一睇呢段先。

鍾澤文先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度有一個嘅樣辦，即係每一季嘅交通意外嘅情況，係運輸署係提交畀道路安全議會嘅，咁個資料就係喺附件 1 嗰度，或者喺呢方面就請大家就睇去 1658 嗰一版，1658，大家睇唔睇到 1658 呀？個標題就係交通意外嘅報告，係畀呢個道路安全議會嘅，日期就係 2018 年 3 月 7 號，睇到喇呵？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，下一版，1659，就係交通意外情況嘅總結，係 2017 年嘅。

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，睇落啲就係附件 3，專利巴士，牽涉專利巴士嘅，

係 1659，附件 3，牽涉到專利巴士，睇到嘛？

鍾澤文先生：未睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇到喇呵，而家？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）附件 3，專利巴士，第四季，17 年第四季，九巴、龍運、大嶼山、城巴（第二），就係記錄到係有增加嘅，而新巴、城巴（專利一）就係有下降嘅，呢個係相對 16 年第四季嚟講。好喇，而家想請大家係睇附件 3，呢度係有講附件 3，我哋睇埋附件 3，就係文件嘅 1664 頁，睇到呢度附件 3 專利巴士嘅情況，有冇睇到？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然後每間專利巴士公司都有個表喺度嘅，係咪？

鍾澤文先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，其中一個方法運輸署量度或者衡量道路安全嘅就係睇嗰個嘅每一百萬公里行車嘅數目嚟到去睇，你知唔知道咁樣計法㗎？

鍾澤文先生：知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇九巴嗰欄，屘嗰兩項，16 年第四季同埋係 17 年第四季咁睇，2.979、4.005，係兩季嘅，大家睇到嘛？

鍾澤文先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你一路睇埋其他，你睇唔睇到新巴嗰度同埋城巴一嗰度，睇嚟好似係最高㗎喎，即係咁多間嚟講，講到話嗰個牽涉嘅比率，即係每一百萬公里咁計，睇嚟好似係呢兩間係最高，你睇呢個表嘅時候，係咪睇到咁樣嘅情況呀？

鍾澤文先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你睇到呢啲數字，覺唔覺得好出奇呀？

鍾澤文先生：唔覺得，因為每一個專營權嘅路線嘅網絡都唔同嘅，同埋佢哋所行走嗰個地區個交通情況都好大分別嘅。就以城巴嚟睇，城巴嘅專營權一同城巴嘅專營權二，呢一個意外嘅比率都係差別好大嘅，兩間公司都係同一個管理層去管理嘅，點解會有咁大嘅差別呢？就係因為兩個專營權嘅網絡係好唔同，城巴二嘅專營權網絡嘅車唔係--大部分會係喺一啲高速公路行走，佢所行嘅咪數亦都好高；除此之外，路線比例喺一啲繁忙嘅路段亦都係相對低嘅，所以我哋覺得唔可以就咁樣去比較呢一個 involvement rate per million km 去比較唔同專營權嗰個安全度。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個其實你喺陳述書嗰度都有講過，係咪呀？即係唔係蘋果比蘋果咁樣，係咪呀？你話。

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講一講喺邊一度你講過呢一個觀點呀？或者一陣間可以再返番嚟講呢一點嘅。

鍾澤文先生：對唔住，主席，我哋 submission 係冇講過。但係喺我哋嗰個運輸署提交我哋嗰個五年發展計劃嗰度喺 5.1 我哋嗰個 introduction 係有提過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 TD-1-195。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個第城巴一、城巴二，都係顯示出就係佢哋嘅網絡組別同埋營運嘅地點，即係城巴一、城巴二，兩者都係城巴運作嘅，其實你講嗰啲公路，城巴二嗰啲公路大多數係咩嘢公路呀？

鍾澤文先生：主要係北大嶼山公路同呢個西九龍走廊。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）仲有一點我想同你探討一下嘅，鄭生，我講埋呢點先至係講其他嘅運輸署嘅文件，或者最近收到嘅文件。而家想請你睇一睇 1650 嗰份 TD-5-1650，今朝主席就睇到黑盒嗰個問題，即係喺小巴嘅黑盒嘅問題，我而家就想請鄭生你睇一睇第 7 段，呢一版嘅第 7 段，1650 第 7 段。

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。主席亦都提到，根據佢嘅理解，就係小巴嗰度嗰啲情況，佢哋係有一個超速嗰度嗰個時間就係三秒鐘嘅，佢哋係三秒嘅，今朝主席提過嘅，你記唔記得主席今朝講過呢一點？

鄭偉波先生：記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者係為咗紀錄，呢一個道路交通車輛構造保養規例嘅附表 19 嗰度，而家係打咗出嚟，如果或者大家睇一睇第 3 段，附表第 3 段，大家睇到就有個規定嘅，就係一個電子數據紀錄儀器，即係黑盒，呢個係關於喺小巴安裝呢一類嘅黑盒嘅情況嘅，同埋仲有，就係第 3D 嗰段，就有提到就係所有該汽車嘅實際速度超過呢一個超速限制持續多於三秒嘅紀錄咁樣嘅，呢度咁寫，或者想你係留意下呢一點，今朝主席都提過下嘅。

鄭偉波先生：睇咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。等我哋而家又睇下嗰個遠期計劃同埋你哋嘅巴士安全報告，TD-1，200 頁，喺 5.11 段，當然寫嘅時候就係仲未成立咗嗰個工作小組嘅，5.11 嗰段就講及係有啲乜嘢嘅措施同埋計劃係規劃咗嚟到去加強個

安全嘅，喺呢度可以睇到，200 頁嗰度落到去後面 201 頁，嗰度就係羅列咗一啲你哋已經鑑別咗出嚟嘅一啲措施，相睇下羅馬數字(iv)，係 201 頁嘅羅馬數字(iv)，請你睇一睇嗰段，屘四嗰行就話大力踩 brake 嘅報告就係會產生出嚟嘅，就會用嚟係睇下有邊啲司機就成日有咁嘅習慣就係會急剎掣嘅，就會係有呢個糾正嘅培訓或者係紀律處分嘅，嚟到係糾正呢啲情況，我想問呢啲報告係點樣樣產生到嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我嘅同事鍾生會負責答呢啲題目。

鍾澤文先生：如果我哋係收到有乘客投訴，係話嗰個車長佢嗰個 brake 係好重嘅，我哋就會係攞番呢一個車長佢過往喺使用 brake 嗰個情況嚟去睇下佢係咪有呢一個咁樣嘅習慣，從而就係會--如果真係有嘅，我哋就會去跟進番。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。即係話冇投訴就唔會有嗰個報告出，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）5.12 段，我哋有呢一個嘅講法，就係話有啲乜嘢嘅紀律處分同埋有啲咩嘢獎勵嚟到係鼓勵佢哋唔好有啲壞嘅習慣同埋鼓勵佢哋有好嘅駕駛態度，見唔見到呢一個提述呀？

鄭偉波先生：未見到 。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。

鄭偉波先生：見到喇而家。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰個安全獎金、勤工獎同埋係表現獎金，將佢歸撥咗之後，我想問，有啲乜嘢嘅獎勵制度係可以係避免佢哋駕駛態度唔好同埋鼓勵佢哋駕駛態度要好呢？

鄭偉波先生：我之前都答過㗎喇，就係如果佢哋個駕駛態度唔好、駕駛個安全度唔夠高嘅話，我哋係對佢哋會有不同程度嘅紀律處分嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能個問題其實係咁，你就即係有獎、有罰，但而家就只係得獎，係咪呢？即係蘿蔔同棍嗰個嘅比喻。

鄭偉波先生：正確嘅，係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋而家可以將嗰個遠期計劃係躉開，跟住就講番你嗰個意見書，想大家睇下呢個 CT-1 第 27 至到第 28 頁。

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）27 頁嗰個標題就係維修同埋檢查，係你哋落嘅標題，嗰度一路去到 28 頁嘅大部分都喺呢個標題底下嘅，講到話開工之前嘅檢查，即係(d)嗰項，呢個係要求巴士車長去做嘅，我想問巴士車長係咪需要係有一個書面

嘅紀錄呢，即係檢查咗之後？

鍾澤文先生：唔使嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問下，維修嘅事宜有冇係引致過去嗰幾年你哋公司嘅巴士係涉及意外呢？維修係咪一個成因之一呢？

鄭偉波先生：李生會答呢條題目嘅。

李廣威先生：我而家冇呢啲嘅數字，相信係好少機會、又好少嘅情況係出現過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話好少、好少係乜嘢呢？係顯示出一個乜嘢嘅問題呢？係邊一類嘅問題呢？

李廣威先生：曾經試過，呢個我記憶所及係有試過一啲嘅零件損壞而造成另外一啲嘅車輛嘅損毀嘅，不過呢個係輕微嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇書面嘅報告呢，呢一類事件有冇書面嘅報告呢？

李廣威先生：有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪都可以係畀一啲樣本我哋呢，呢啲報告嘅樣本？譬如話過去嗰兩年係引致事件發生嘅，得唔得呢？有冇咁嘅樣本呢？

李廣威先生：我哋會返去睇一睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該，唔該你。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，我想問下，喺立法會嘅文件，即係關乎呢個專營權嘅續期，講到話公司嘅整體嘅紀錄，即係話睇下城巴佢嗰個維修嗰個紀錄，係咪嗰度處理咗呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗啱嘅，我而家會嘗試去搵搵究竟係喺邊一度，我哋會嘗試搵番嗰一頁出嚟嘅。離開呢一個題目喫喇，但係鄭先生，想問下，講番安全嘅時候，我想問有冇咩嘢事情你認為政府可以幫到你哋公司嘅呢，可以好實質上幫到你哋公司嘅呢，而現時又冇係做到、冇幫到公司嘅呢？當然，我哋知道安全都係你哋公司嘅責任，但係你有冇諗到一啲嘢就話政府其實可以係幫你哋手，喺呢度，係當你哋致力尋求安全嘅水平嘅時候，係咪有啲嘢你認為政府都可以幫到手嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：主席，其實喺我哋嘅睇法，所有要提升安全嘅嘢，全部都係要用錢嘅，如果將來係有啲嘅要求我哋係要用大額嘅金錢去安裝一啲嘅裝置以提升我哋嘅服務嘅安全，我好希望政府可以畀到個財政嘅資助我哋，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以較為具體咁講下呢？有啲乜嘢嘢係你哋目前嘅財政能力係做唔到，但係就如果係有政府資助就會大大咁樣係提升嗰個安全呢？可唔可以講得比較具體嘅事項呢？

鄭偉波先生：我就舉唔到有啲嘅例子就可以大大咁樣提升安全嘅，其實就係有啲嘢就係大家或者個公眾覺得做咗就會提升安全嘅，呢啲就有，舉一個例子，就今朝大家都有探討過，就係話巴士會唔會加裝番啲安全帶喺個樓上嘅，今朝李生都有引述過嗰個成本，個成本就係 15,000 英鎊至到兩萬英鎊一部巴士，我哋就一千一百部巴士係呢一個類別，如果全部要加裝安全帶喺樓上嘅話，嗰個總開支就會係港幣係 180 個 million，就至到港幣 240 個 million，我哋其實兩間公司而家嗰個利潤係好低嘅，我哋而家嘅利潤係好低，我哋唔知道要營運幾多年先至賺到個錢可以去安呢啲嘅安全帶，呢個就係其中一個例子，就係我哋嘅財務資源係唔足夠或者不存在去做呢件事嘅，所以呢一類嘅開支，我覺得就要好審慎咁樣嚟到睇，就是否真係好有效嘅。

今朝有提過，就係話而家我哋嘅車上面都有啲嘅 exposed seats 就有安全帶喺處嘅，但係我好少、好少，我自己經常有搭巴士嘅，係好少、好少見到車上嘅乘客坐喺呢啲位置有扣上安全帶嘅，而將來如果真係話叫我哋公司拎億幾、兩億，甚至兩億幾出嚟愛嚟做呢件事情，而我哋就非常質疑佢個成效嘅。當然，如果政府真係到時有個要求要我哋去加裝安全帶嘅，我就好希望就政府就會提供資助嚟到畀我哋安呢啲安全帶，呢個係一個例子。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係如果話政府覺得係值得嘅，因為乘客可能係想纜安全帶，都有機會係纜到安全帶，但係根據你經驗，佢哋通常都唔會咁樣做，就你覺得政府應該係出錢嚟到去做，唔係你哋做，係咪咁嘅意思呀？

鄭偉波先生：如果政府覺得我哋有必要要加安全帶，就係為咗乘客要纜安全帶，就有條安全帶，如果係咁樣樣嘅話，我就希望政府就出錢愛嚟安呢啲安全帶上去。因為如果喺我哋自己嘅角度，我哋就覺得呢個係一個浪費嚟嘅，同埋最重--sorry，我仲有少少補充。同埋最重要，大家再諗一諗喺香港嘅巴士係有企位嘅，如果坐位坐喺度都覺得唔安全，要有個安全，咁我車上面企喺嗰度嗰啲人佢唔可以有條安全帶畀佢嘅，呢個就其實係一個都幾自相矛盾嘅做法嚟嘅。多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，好，暫時我都冇嘢講。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，請睇大家嘅陳述書嘅第 40 頁，CTB-1，40。

鄭偉波先生：我見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。你睇到中間嗰度，「其他相關資料」“other relevant information”嗰段，睇唔睇到？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你就話「協助委員會了解到專營巴士呢個行業，我哋都希望藉呢個機會係解釋一下我哋營運嘅環境同埋個挑戰」，即係喺提供呢啲專營服務嘅時候嗰啲挑戰同埋環境，下低嗰度你講咗幾個事項嘅，或者我想請大

家睇(b)嗰度，路線嘅重組，你就話最後嗰度就講，其實就係有浪費嗰個金錢同資源嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係讀一讀出嚟，鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）「要處理鐵路造成嘅競爭，我哋建議就係做呢個巴士路線重組計劃，係建議畀運輸署係將某一啲需求低嘅服務係取消或者係減低嗰個規模，由於區議會嘅反對，我哋有若干嘅巴士重組嘅計劃係做唔到嘅，嚟到配合番嗰個乘客下降嘅情況，呢個就導致金錢同埋資源上嘅損耗咁樣。」可唔可以同我哋講一講而家嗰個制度係點樣㗎？即係嗰個你需要支援嘅一啲嘅路線，即係嗰個制度如果你係話想改呢啲路線嘅話，個制度係點樣㗎？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生會回答。

鍾澤文先生：多謝主席。如果係有新嘅鐵路落成，我哋會同運輸署係提出一啲建議，有一啲路線如果係同嗰個新鐵路係重疊嘅，我哋會建議取消啲條線或者係將呢啲路線嘅班次係削減或者有一啲係改道。建議咗之後，呢一啲路線嘅重組方案係需要提交畀區議會去討論，一般議員都會有好多意見或者係反對嘅聲音，因為我哋行呢啲巴士線都有一段時間，有部分嘅居民都係會採用，只不過當新鐵路開通，有啲乘客就會流失咗，形成呢啲路線嘅客量係不足，但係亦都唔可以完全話冇晒人搭，喺咁嘅情形之下，區議員佢哋都會反對我哋去做一啲取消路線或者係大幅削減班次嘅。如果議員嘅反響係好強烈嘅話，運輸署就未必會批准畀我哋去做呢啲路線重組。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果地鐵係喺黃竹坑嗰度譬如話去到海洋公園，佢哋呢一個咁樣嘅鐵路安排係咪影響到巴士嘅服務呢，舉個例咁講，係咪有影響㗎？

鍾澤文先生：係，有影響嘅。

鄭偉波先生：主席，其實係好大影響，因為未有呢條地鐵之前，就我哋有條路線就係 629 號嘅路線，就係喺金鐘去海洋公園嘅，而當時喺香港，如果有人要去海洋公園，搭公共交通工具主要就係搭呢條線嘅，自從呢個地鐵通車咗之後，我哋係成條線要取消咗，因為全部嘅乘客流失晒去地鐵嗰處。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，運輸署就有最後決定權嘅，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你冇得上訴、咩嘢嘅囉喎？冇更高嘅權力係可以處理，係咪呀？

鍾澤文先生：我哋冇試過。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇上訴渠道㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我哋唔察覺有呢個渠道。

MR DUNCAN：Do you have any -- have you ever considered...

鄭偉波先生：Sorry，個翻譯嗰處，我覺得有少少要更正嘅，係“we don't aware of such a channel”，就唔係“not realize”，“we don't aware of”。（經傳譯員）係「唔察覺」嘅，係「唔察覺」。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實呢個運房局嗰度有冇得上訴嘅呢？有冇得上訴？有冇渠道上訴？

鄭偉波先生：呢方面鍾生會比較熟啲，由鍾生答。

鍾澤文先生：根據嗰個《公共巴士服務條例》Cap. 230，係如果嗰個五年即係路線發展計劃係有 dispute 嘅話，係會係去呢個運房局嗰度係做一個 settlement 嘅，但係我哋未試過。

主席：（經傳譯員）具體上，個局長，係咪運房局局長係可以處理，係咪？唔緊要，我哋可以查一查嘅，但係我就即時諗到係咁樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家係講完巴士重組路線，就而家講一講嗰個 f 嗰度，就係票價調整，就係第 41 頁嘅，或者好快咁係讀一讀，然後就係想請大家評論一下。

「專營巴士票價調整嘅批准就係根據嗰個『票價調整安排』嚟到去做嘅，喺根據呢個安排底下，就有一籃子嘅因素政府會考慮嘅，公眾嘅接受同埋負擔能力係其中，我哋認為呢啲都係好主觀同埋係有酌情性質嘅，同埋從政人士就往往都係好容易係用咗呢啲嘅理由嘅。

我哋就係 08 年就係上次調整過，之後我哋係冇申請過票價調整，直至到 17 年 8 月，當時就城巴一同埋新巴就係提交申請係進行票價調整，嚟到去緩減嗰個收入嘅損失，因為鐵路嘅競爭同埋成本增加，喺過去十年，正如(c)嗰度講，嗰個香港嗰個累積嘅通脹率喺呢十年就係百分之 31.2，而累積嘅增加喺嗰個工資嗰度就百分之 39.9，儘管我哋係有理由係根據呢個安排，不同時候係要求調整票價，但係我就冇係提出咁樣嘅申請嘅，因為呢個安排就唔係好有效，同時個環境係好政治化，係反對公共設施係加價嘅。

除此之外，喺嗰個『票價調整安排』嘅申請嗰度，係好難係取得一個公平嘅待遇嘅，而票價嘅調整程序亦都係非常之冗長。舉個例子，目前嘅票價調整申請就喺 2017 年 8 月提出，政府而家都仲係睇緊嘅。

同地鐵唔同，佢哋就係每年係根據佢哋嘅方程式就係有自動嘅票價調整，專營巴士公司就並冇咁樣嘅肯定性可以作出票價調整，冇呢一個肯定性，專營巴士公司其實好難係制訂一個全面嘅、長遠嘅計劃。」

就係搵出咗呢啲段落，就係有一啲嘅因素，你就講到呢一個即係票價調整安排就唔係好有效嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，嗰份文件有冇㗎，呢個票價調整嘅安排嗰份文件會唔會有喺度呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋有嘅，係咪呀？主席先生，SEC 373。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪 SEC-1 373 呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個例子，講到其中一次嘅係票價調整申請...

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）...同埋係點樣處理咗嘅。鄭先生，我想繼續問，你剛才係提過，就話呢個票價調整安排呢個過程就唔係好有效嘅，你有冇向任何人提議過就係將呢一個你認為係冇效嘅安排去作一個調整呢？

鄭偉波先生：係有嘅，呢個喺上一次就佢哋去檢討呢個票價調整安排嘅時候--或者我再講過，喺每一次當政府去檢討票價調整安排嘅時候，我哋都係有指出呢個票價調整安排裏面有啲地方係唔理想嘅，同埋唔夠透明度嘅，對於我哋巴士公司嚟講。多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嘅情況係持續咗幾耐呢？

鄭偉波先生：從一開始有呢個票價調整安排到而家，我哋就只係申請過一次加價，就係 2008 年嗰一次，而嗰一次加價，我哋城巴專利一就只係聯營嘅過海線可以有得加價，而本地，即係香港島嘅路線全部就冇得加價，但係到底個原因係點樣樣，或者我哋當時提交咗一啲財務嘅預測數據畀政府，政府又有冇全盤接納我哋提交嘅財務預測數據，而係邊一部分嘅數據佢唔接受、佢反對，冇同我哋講過，我哋到最後只係知道城巴一喺香港島所有路線都冇得加價，所以呢個其實呀，其實城巴一香港島嘅路線上一次加價其實係 1998 年嚟㗎喇，因為 2008 年嗰次佢係冇得加嘅，而點解冇得加我哋都唔知道嘅，所以呢個票價調整安排，我覺得嗰個透明度要提升嘅。多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪話你淨係得到個結果，就冇畀個原因你就點解有一個咁嘅決定，係咪咁嘅意思呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，其實亦都有提過嗰個票價調整安排底下嘅申請嘅，係喺呢個 THB 嗰度 2 嗰度亦都有提過嘅，23 嗰度嘅。

主席：Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時係開始有呢個票價調整安排㗎？鄭生。

鄭偉波先生：係喺 2005 年或者 2006 年左右，大約係 2006 年。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照你所知，呢個調整安排自此之後有冇係改變過呢？

鄭偉波先生：係有改變過嘅，但係而家具體我講唔到畀大家知嗰個具體嘅改變，因為最少一樣嘢，我記得佢個原名就唔係叫做「票價調整安排」嘅，就叫做“Fare Adjustment Mechanism”嘅，就係「票價調整機制」，就後來就有改動咗之後，同埋個名都改咗，就係叫 FAA，就係咁樣嘅，而具體嗰個改動，我對唔住，我喺呢處 off hand，我畀唔到個資料大家。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你係咪講過話 2008 年申請過加價，但係就唔成功呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係過海嗰啲線就得，但係其他嗰啲就唔得。

鄭偉波先生：2008 年就係城巴專營權一同埋新巴都有申請加價嘅，而個結果就係新巴就全部路線都有得加價，新巴係有嘅，而城巴喺香港島嘅路線就冇得加價，而嗰啲過海路線如果係同九巴一個聯營嘅過海路線就因為九巴有得加價，所以到帶到我哋嗰啲聯營過海路線有得加，而我哋主要就其實係香港島嘅路線嚟嘅，嗰啲就冇加到價。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇畀到個原因你就點解該次申請係被拒絕呢？

鄭偉波先生：係冇畀到具體原因嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇畀過任何原因？有冇係除咗係話唔成功之外，有冇書面上係畀過啲理由你呢？

鄭偉波先生：係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋去 MISC 嗰個文件夾...

主席：（經傳譯員）你而家轉去另一樣嘢，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你未去第二個項目之前，喺第 42 頁，即係你第一次提交嘅意見書 42 頁 g 嗰項，即係「合理回報」最屘嗰三行就咁講嘅，「我哋嘅理解就係政府而家正在喺度檢討呢個巴士票價調整安排，我哋熱切希望上述所講嘅事宜係會喺檢討嗰度處理到嘅。」或者係鄧律師，你係咪可以將呢段成段係讀出嚟呢，作為係問下係咪一個合理嘅一個結論呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）「鑑於就係喺呢一個剛才上述嘅票價調整所遇到嘅困難，即係話如果得到票價調整同埋嗰個加幅其實都係有不肯定性嘅。我哋預計講到嗰個城巴專營權一，同埋新巴佢嗰個資產淨值嘅回報就會係喺 2018 年 6 月結束嘅財政年度嚟講，係會低於百分之一嘅，呢個就係考慮到目前嗰個現狀就會係關於我哋整理嘅支出係維持到，但如果喺嗰個職員嘅支出同埋嗰個燃料費有重大增加嘅話，就呢兩個專營權就會蝕錢，所以唔好講話有合理回報，公司嘅商業可行性都甚至乎係岌岌可危，因此就無法話我哋公司可以繼續維持一個高質素同埋有效嘅服務提供畀公眾，同埋就係有一個有吸引力嘅薪酬去招聘同

埋挽留職工。我哋理解就政府而家正在喺度檢討呢一個巴士票價調整安排，我哋熱切希望上述提及嘅事項會喺檢討工作裏面係處理到嘅。」你會唔會係都而家依然係話你嘅睇法都係咁呀，鄭先生？

鄭偉波先生：我仍然係咁嘅睇法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話知道政府就正在喺度檢討嗰個票價調整安排嘅，你係基於乜嘢嘢就係有一個咁嘅理解呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋有同政府開過會。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以具體啲講係同政府嘅邊位係開會呢？

鄭偉波先生：係同運房局嘅人開會。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲會議幾時開，而令到你有一個咁樣嘅理解呢？

鄭偉波先生：或者咁，而家我嗰個文字上，“we are given to understand”，即係我覺得呢個講得比較間接嘅，就或者我重新 rephrase 呢一句嘢，就係“we understand that”或者“we know that”。（經傳譯員）「我哋明白到」。

主席：（經傳譯員）係因為同佢哋開會，所以就有咁嘅理解，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時開會？

鄭偉波先生：我要返去檢視一下嗰個開會日期。

主席：（經傳譯員）係今年吖，定去年吖，定點呢？

鄭偉波先生：係舊年嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）今年冇？

鄭偉波先生：我印象當中，今年係冇再開過會。不過我要返去就要檢視我嘅日記簿。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你--麻煩你咁樣做，然後話番畀我哋聽究竟個情況係點，即係話究竟今年就呢件事、呢個課題有冇開過會。

鄭偉波先生：好，一定。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係講嗰個調整安排定抑或係嗰個方程式呢？因為如果你有計過嗰個方程式，你就可以有一個要求㗎嘛。

鄭偉波先生：係整理個票價調整安排。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）但係嗰度有一個方程式又可以計出嚟㗎嘛，然後就申請嘅。

鄭偉波先生：但係我哋嗰個唔係一個自動機制嚟嘅，我哋係根據嗰個 FAA，可以去遞交個申請，而申請咗之後，就有一連串、一系列嘅審核同埋批准嘅程序嘅，我哋同地鐵係唔同嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係咪就係嗰個程序定抑或係有邊啲方面你係想佢喺檢討嘅時候作出一個改動呢？

鄭偉波先生：其實我覺得如果我哋嗰個票價調整嗰個肯定性係加強同埋透明度係增高，最少喺呢兩方面我覺得係可以改進嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，為咗紀錄，我就睇到嗰個票價調整安排，呢個係運房局嘅文件，THB-2，23 嘅，嗰個檢討就係運房局係有處理，有講嘅，跟住嗰頁 THB-2 24、25 頁嗰度係有嘅，呢個為咗紀錄嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以打埋出嚟，呢個係一個證供。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋講呢方面之前，鄭生，咁理解啱唔啱呢，就係你其實就係討論過一個票價調整嘅安排嘅更改，但係政府就冇話畀你知嗰個結果--討論之後嘅結果係點，就冇講嘅，係咪？係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係嗰個檢討仍然係喺政府嗰處進行緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你唔知道嗰個檢討嘅結果係點樣嘅，目前唔知，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：目前係唔知道嘅，係未知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，可唔可以打出嚟就係 THB-2 嗰度 24、25 頁？我哋睇 24 頁嘅，第 24 頁嗰一版，冇錯，或者我讀一讀，你可以跟住睇。我哋睇番前一頁先，等我哋睇晒，全面啲，第 23 頁嗰度，你睇到(d)嗰度，係咪？「票價調整安排」，然後就目前嘅安排咁樣，睇到嘛？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想睇下一頁，第 24 頁，4.28，「上述嘅安排就係由 06 年係制定嘅，就係經過同立法會諮詢，個安排之後就係有微調嘅，就考慮到嗰個 09 年嘅檢討嘅結果，由於目前嘅安排基本上就係平衡咗巴士服務嘅有效運作同埋公眾人士嘅接受程度同埋負擔能力，係冇需要係檢討或者修改呢一個票價修訂安排嘅。

喺呢一方面，政府其實做過一個檢討嘅，檢討過呢個票價調整安排，初步嘅結果就係顯示就唔變，而嗰個數據係兩方面可以係修訂或者更新嘅，第一，就係嗰個生產力嘅因素，(b)就係乘客嗰個獎勵嘅安排。」詳細唔講喇，呢度。

好喇，講到係 4.30 嗰度，「政府就係同專利巴士公司就有一個嘅討論，就係講嗰個檢討嘅，而有關嘅兩項數據係會更新嘅，佢哋就會係宣布嗰個嘅結

果，同埋喺 18 年上半年就得到呢一個行政長官會同行政會議嘅批准，就會行。」㗎喇咁。

好喇，根據呢一個聲明，鄭生，政府其實就係有開始同巴士公司係討論嘅，你都知喇，就係根據嗰個初步嘅檢討結果，同埋佢哋所建議嘅，即係話個安排應該係維持不變嘅咁樣，但係嗰個有關數據兩方面就會係更新，其實你有冇得到知會就係話政府喺呢方面嘅睇法呢？

鄭偉波先生：我知道政府係做緊檢討嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係政府有冇同你講過就係佢哋嘅結果...

主席：（經傳譯員）初步結果喇，不如話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個初步結果就係顯示嗰個安排就應該維持不變嘅，但係有關嘅數據兩方面係會更新嘅，正如喺第 4.29 嗰段有講，政府有冇同你講過呢一方面呢？

鄭偉波先生：係開會嘅時候有講過嘅，但係至於嗰個兩個數據嗰個更新，會更新成為係乜嘢數字呢，我哋就係未知嘅，而呢兩個數字其實就係好重要。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你而家仲係等緊有關嘅細節嘅數字，係咪呀？你立場係咪咁呀？

鄭偉波先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋而家講完嗰個票價調整嘅安排，而家想講 MISC-1--MISC-2 嘅，應該係，或者想請大家留意一份文件，琴日都睇過㗎喇，就係文件夾嘅第 643 頁，翻譯版就係 644 嘅，644-1 嗰度，或者係搵埋嗰個中文嘅文件，就係 644-3 嘅，唔該晒。你記唔記得我就曾經提過呢一份嘅意見書，尋日同你講嘅，記唔記得？就係呢個民主陣線嘅一份意見書，記唔記得呀？

鄭偉波先生：記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係關於嗰個專利巴士車長薪酬嘅，今日我就想你留意一下佢哋係想委員會注意嘅一點，就喺第三段，第一版嘅第三段，就係講個巴士車長工業行動，就係 17 年 2 月同埋 18 年發生嘅，就引起社會各界關於巴士站違例泊車、車長待遇、工作時數等等問題咁樣，跟住就講到以下就係一啲巴士站違例泊車嘅原因咁樣，有四項嘅呢一度，睇唔睇到，鄭生？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者睇落去下一頁，文件嘅下一頁就係 644 嘅，翻譯版就係 644-1 嘅最後嗰段，就係解決巴士站嗰度違例泊車，就係有一定嘅政策，就要修訂過時嘅法例，同埋就係多方面嘅措施先解決到個問題咁樣，跟住有一

段就係睇到星加坡嘅例子，同埋就係巴士上面就係安裝攝錄機咁樣嘅。其實公司係咪認為巴士站嘅違例泊車係一個問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：鍾生會回答。

鍾澤文先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋描述一下究竟問題有幾嚴重呀？

鍾澤文先生：有好多巴士站因為有一啲違例泊車就阻礙咗我哋巴士係可以停近嗰個行人路邊上、落客，就算係有一個 bus stop 嘅 marking 係 mark 咗喺度都好，因為我哋架巴士需要一段距離去轉入嗰個彎道嘅，如果有違例泊車喺嗰個巴士彎嘅前、後泊咗喺度，亦都會阻礙到我哋嗰個巴士嘅運作，逼使有時啲巴士係要喺路中間畀個乘客上落咁樣，呢個問題都幾普遍同嚴重。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪有安全嘅顧慮喺呢方面？

鍾澤文先生：都有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊方面呀？

鍾澤文先生：譬如違例泊車會令到路面嗰個闊度係減少咗，架車經過嗰陣時嗰個情況就好容易因為架車--巴士大，轉彎係會揩碰到，或者乘客唔可以喺呢個路邊嗰度上、落客，形成佢喺上、落客嗰陣時可能有車撞到佢或者係佢會容易跌到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋返番去嗰封信--等陣先，公司其實係有冇致力去刻服或者解決呢個問題呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋有通知運輸署一啲違例泊車嘅黑點，希望佢哋可以喺呢啲路段嗰度增設一啲廿四小時嘅禁區，亦都有通知警察去執法嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有冇解決到個問題呀？

鍾澤文先生：幫助不大。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋返番去...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇採取過行動--有冇任何行動採取過㗎？

鍾澤文先生：警察會採取行動，但係當警察係離開咗嗰個地點之後，嗰一個泊車問題--即係違例泊車嘅問題又返番嚟嘅。舉一個例，譬如話喺銅鑼灣怡和街崇光百貨公司門外就經常出現呢啲問題，早前亦都出現過的士上客，同我哋啲車嘅車長係發生衝突呢啲嘅問題嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家返番去嗰封信，就係有提到星加坡嗰個嘅制度咁樣，我而家係引述番嗰封信，即係星加坡安裝咗呢啲鏡頭，即係喺巴士線嗰度，星加坡自從 2008 年安裝咗喺巴士上面嘅鏡頭，就近住呢個司機位嘅，佢

啲就可以睇到有車係違例泊車，就亦都係有啲紀錄就係十分鐘嘅紀錄咁樣，佢係可以搵警方嚟到去處理，警方可以係睇番嗰個紀錄，兩個禮拜之後就會將個告票送畀嗰個司機，呢個就係香港紙 800 collect，然後就係如果唔交，仲有 500 collect 嘅罰款，有監禁嘅。呢個係 2012 年，佢啲就好多時就喺巴士站嗰度係上、落客咁樣嗰啲，啲私家車，2014 年個數目就減低到係 886 嘅，亦都係好有效咁樣係阻止到一啲司機喺呢啲巴士站嗰度停車嘅。係咪呢種方法對你嚟講，都覺得係幾好呢，有吸引力呢？

鄭偉波先生：我對於呢一個建議裏面嗰啲內容嗰個可信性，我係有疑問嘅，如果我嘅理解係正確嘅話，佢係講緊就係部巴士上近住個司機位就安裝一部錄影機，而駛到去車站，發覺有人喺個車站度泊低咗架車，於是個巴士司機就撳個掣，就會自動就錄影五至十分鐘嘅影片，即係我嘅理解就係咁嘅，首先喺香港我啲啲巴士駛到去一個車站，我意思係中途嘅車站，係永遠冇可能停喺度五至十分鐘嘅，我啲架巴士。而星加坡嗰個運作模式其實同香港都有類似嘅地方，我就唔係太覺得喺星加坡可以有架巴士駛到去個站就見到有架車就阻--泊咗喺處，仲要嗰架巴士就唔好駛入個站，係咁影住嗰架車就影五至十分鐘，即係呢個我聽起上嚟就不可行嘅，即係至少喺香港我啲嘅運作係不可行。

主席：（經傳譯員）五至十秒呀？

鄭偉波先生：我呢度中文版係五至十分鐘，5 to 10 minutes。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果五至十秒又得唔得呢？

鄭偉波先生：就要視乎我啲架巴士係能唔能夠譬如駛前啲就去停到個站，如果可以，而我又唔使前少少，就停住架車喺處就係咁影住人啲嗰個違例架車，影佢五至十秒，呢個其實會阻慢咗我啲乘客，亦都會阻礙到路上嘅交通。多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺柴灣車廠嗰度，你啲就有啲係示範，就話你啲有啲向前--個鏡頭向住前面嗰種裝置㗎嘛，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我啲就見到就係有位女士佢喺嗰度等，然之後就再開門，就讓佢可以上車，係咪呀？

鄭偉波先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲咁嘅鏡頭就可以捕捉到剛剛所提及嘅情況，係咪呢？

鄭偉波先生：會係捕捉到可能係一秒、兩秒、三秒嘅畫面，但係如果只係一、三、兩秒嘅畫面，我就唔知道係唔係足夠可以罰呢個私家車，話佢停咗喺巴士站度，我唔熟悉嗰個警方檢控嗰個準則，即係係咪停兩秒鐘喺處就可以出告票，我唔知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係檢控當局嘅事，但係起碼你啲就可以提供到啲證據畀佢

哋，讓佢哋自己去判斷夠唔夠證供去告。

鄭偉波先生：但係如果係咁樣做，我哋個車長係要去自己一路揸緊車，就要記低喺幾多點鐘喺邊個巴士站曾經有人就停咗架車喺處，到放工嘅時候就將呢一個嘅 logbook 或者呢個 log 就交畀公司，就公司就再去搵番呢部車，就去 download 條影片，要一系列嘅程序先至做得到，其實我覺得呢件事，最應該要做嘢嘅係警方，因為嗰個路段如果係唔准停車嘅，就應該係警方去執法，因為如果唔係呢，我哋個車長已經係好忙㗎喇佢個工作，揸緊車嘅時候，仲要再去記埋呢啲嘢，就加重佢哋嗰個工作負擔嘅。多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道警方其實有咁嘅建議，我諗係運輸署同埋立法會就係建議就係用--喺燈柱嗰度有啲鏡頭嚟到處理你剛才所講嘅情況，就會係有一個來源，就讓我哋可以搜集到證據喇？

鄭偉波先生：如果喺燈柱嗰度愛嚟做，我覺得係非常好嘅，但係就希望唔好搞到我哋啲車長都要做埋呢一個工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗相信都好簡單嘅啫，要做嘅話，因為你純粹就話畀警方聽邊一啲巴士站就係黑點，然後警方就去裝設嗰啲鏡頭。

鄭偉波先生：呢個係可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你又知唔知道其實係有一啲系統係可以幫你辨識嗰啲車牌秣巴，就個電腦或者係有一個鏡頭就會影張相，影咗個車牌張相，然後就再將佢配對番、搵番出嗰個係車主？

鄭偉波先生：呢個好技術性嘅嘢，我畀鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：我哋知道係有嘅，不過即係呢個系統都唔係我哋可以--喺我哋負擔嘅範圍。

主席：（經傳譯員）我係提議或者運輸署同埋警方可以考慮呢一點，即係有個鏡頭就拍低嗰個係停咗喺度嘅車，即係霸住咗嗰個巴士站，將呢架車嘅相影咗，然後個電腦就會係睇下個車牌秣巴係幾多，然後配對番、搵番出嗰個車主，第三步，就係用電郵就係發出一張告票。

鄭偉波先生：我哋歡迎嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）仲有多一樣嘢係想問鄭生嘅，如果我可以嘅話，我哋見到一份文件嘅，822 嗰頁，DM-1 嘅 822 嗰頁嗰度可以搵到呢個資料嘅，對唔住，係 SEC-2 嘅 822 頁，我亦都唔肯定你之前有冇睇過呢份文件，你喺螢光幕上面見到呢個就係話係一份係資料文件嚟嘅，係關乎喺首爾同埋星加坡嘅專營巴士服務，睇嚟就係立法會秘書處佢哋嘅研究部嘅，你有冇睇過呢份文件呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇睇過嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想請你直接去睇第 826 頁，826，我想你睇呢個 2.11 段，嗰度就係話實施一個巴士訊號優先系統，睇唔睇到個標題？

鄭偉波先生：睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我將嗰度係讀出嚟，「呢一個巴士訊號優先系統其實全世界有好多城市都有做嘅，呢一個係一個交通訊號嘅提升策略，呢一個策略就係讓巴士可以有效咁樣樣係進出嘅，就係透過嗰個有燈號嘅路口，就讓一架嚟緊嘅巴士就可以係對比起其他入嗰個路口嘅車輛係有優先權使用嗰個路口嘅。首爾嘅政府就係有用到呢一個咁嘅系統嚟到係讓嗰個交通訊號可以優化，嚟到係等巴士可以行得快啲。」你知唔知道有咁嘅系統，係世界各地嘅城市係有做嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋知道世界上係有呢啲系統嘅，同埋我哋知道星加坡係有類似嘅系統嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你認唔認為咁樣樣嘅系統喺香港都用得著呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋會非常歡迎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇採取過任何嘅步驟係讓人考慮呢一個咁嘅建議呢？

鄭偉波先生：我哋一向覺得呢個係政府要做嘅嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇同政府提議過？

鄭偉波先生：我哋冇同政府提議過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗喺世界上有一啲城市巴士一般嚟講都係得到優先嘅，係咪呀？譬如話巴士係入站，就係私家車就係要讓畀巴士嘅，係咪世界有啲地方係有啲國家係有咁樣嘅優先嘅政策嘅呢？

鄭偉波先生：我畀鍾生回答。

鍾澤文先生：係嘅，我哋都知道譬如星加坡咁樣，佢哋係譬如巴士離開站，其他車係要讓畀佢出先嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢係咪你哋公司都會覺得係好嘅呢？

鍾澤文先生：我哋係覺得係好嘅，但係喺香港，可能嗰個路面嘅環境未必許可嘅，譬如話我哋有啲巴士專線，過往都因為有人投訴而要取消咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個投訴？

鍾澤文先生：有市民投訴話嗰個巴士專線嘅使用量低，而令到就要取消。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰啲自己本身係駕駛人士嘅市民呀？

鍾澤文先生：我唔清楚，但係呢個係由運輸署去通知我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）假設唔係企喺巴士--同其他一百三十個乘客一齊企喺巴士上面嘅市民啩。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番喺首爾嘅嗰個系統，就即係話佢哋有一個巴士訊號嘅優先系統，如果你正話嘅回應，其實你覺得係咪值得同運輸署係討論呢個問題呢？

鄭偉波先生：值得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇計劃點樣做呀？

鄭偉波先生：經過今日呢次會議之後，我哋係被 enlighten 咗，我哋係會咁做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想講講其他嘅問題，今日下晝係有提到嘅，第一就係想請你留意一下第 32 條第(1)款，呢個係喺《公共巴士服務條例》嘅，32(1)。

主席：（經傳譯員）文件有冇㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺 THB-2，就係 124 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）THB-2，124 頁，33 條(1)，你自己可以睇一睇先，鄭生。「任何專營權公司如果因為運輸及房屋局局長或者係因為根據第 3 條獲給予指示嘅公職人員，又或者因為署長或者署長授權嘅人，根據本條例或者該專營公司專營權所作嘅決定、指示、要求或者規定感到受屈，可以喺給予或作出該項決定、指示、要求或規定嘅廿八日之內，以呈請方式向行政長官會同行政會議提出上訴，而行政長官會同行政會議嘅上訴所作嘅決定係最終嘅決定。」你知唔知有呢項條文㗎？

鄭偉波先生：我係知嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇曾經用過呢個條文？

鄭偉波先生：冇用過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）仲有一項，就係關於我都提過嘅一點，就係嗰個保養，係咪對意外係有一個--造成一個因素，我就想委員會係睇另一份文件嘅，TD-2，第 183 頁，TD-2 183，呢個就係畀立法會嘅資料摘要嚟嘅，係考慮一個城巴港島嘅一啲嘅路線同埋新大嶼山巴士公司，大家可以睇到就係有提到一啲意外一啲保養，就喺 183、184 嗰度係有講嘅，而主席亦都係考慮過呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。

鄭偉波先生：對唔住，你頭先有講過話係同--講維修嘅事情，但係我呢一頁，我係睇唔到同維修有關嘅事情。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我諗緊嘅就係嗰個抽樣檢查，就即係嗰個問題，即係個問題嗰度嗰個數目係低嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係運輸署嗰度嘅資料，可能可以睇一睇，睇下可唔可以提供畀委員會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，除非委員會有任何其他嘅事項想提供，我就冇其他問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有一樣嘢，就係鄭生，我想直接問一問嘅，就係你同我哋講到一個安全委員會，我相信係 4 月成立嘅，係公司成立㗎喇，嚟到去處理安全嘅問題，你作為一個主席嘅，你嘅今日嘅代表亦都係喺呢個委員會上面嘅，我問題首先就係咁樣，係咪正確嘅，就係話你哋嘅董事或者兩位嘅董事運輸署嘅僱員？

鄭偉波先生：我哋呢個安全委員會純粹係由我哋嘅 senior management 嚟到組成嘅，就冇--我哋冇邀請到政府嘅官員喺呢個委員會嗰處，因為如果我哋公司有需要有事情要同運輸署商討，我覺得係應該係公司同運輸署之間嘅會議嚟嘅，就唔係話邀請運輸署入嚟我哋呢個安全委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，就有公司董事喺度，你就決定唔請運輸署，係咪因為有衝突定乜嘢呢？

鄭偉波先生：完全同有衝突係冇關係嘅，因為我哋公司嘅運作就係由我哋公司嘅管理層負責嘅，而運輸署佢有兩位嘅--而家有兩位政府官員就喺我哋嘅董事會嗰處嘅，我哋一般我哋嘅運作就係番我哋自己嘅管理層嚟到負責嘅，就我哋嘅--譬如喺我哋公司嘅非執行董事都唔會參與我哋公司嘅運作。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。好喇，我哋問都問得七七八八。我知道你係有一份聲明想講嘅，係咪呀？而家可以講，鄭生。

鄭偉波先生：多謝主席。主席，我代表新巴、城巴就過往兩日嘅聽證會多謝以下嘅人士：一，獨立檢討委員會邀請我哋出席呢兩日嘅聽證會；第二，鄧樂勤資深大律師同埋律師團隊喺呢個聽證會對我哋嘅提問，而等到我哋有機會講解我哋公司嘅營運情況；三，係獨立檢討委員會嘅秘書處喺過往兩星期所作出嘅安排；最後，我亦都要多謝負責即時傳譯嘅人士所提供嘅服務，多謝主席，多謝各位委員，多謝各位。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，最後，我哋都係好感激大家口頭作出陳述，同埋就希望有

啲資料就你可以進一步書面咁樣提供畀我哋嘅，秘書處就會係指明邊一類嘅問題，就會畀嗰個謄錄嘅文本畀大家，等大家可以係清楚啲嘅。

鄭偉波先生：一定，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

鄭偉波先生：多謝主席。

2018 年 5 月 30 日

下午 4 時 55 分聆訊押後

Tuesday, 19 June 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM NEW LANTAO BUS CO LTD: MR JAMES WONG CHEUK ON, MR TIMOTHY WONG CHEUK TIM, MR BENNY CHAN TIN LUNG, MR PATRICK YEUNG KA PO, MR RICHARD LEE CHUN FAI, MR BILLY WONG LEONG TING (given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning. We thank Mr James Wong and the other representatives of the New Lantao Bus Company who have attended today to assist the committee by supplementing what they have provided already in written submissions with answers to questions that counsel to the committee will ask of them.

Before we reach that stage, I understand, Mr Wong, that you wish to make a short statement orally in opening, and I would invite you to move to that now.

Opening statement by MR JAMES WONG CHEUK ON:

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, members, counsel, ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I am Wong Cheuk On, James. I am the managing director of the New Lantao Bus Company (1973) Ltd. My colleagues and myself would like to thank the committee for inviting us to attend today's hearing to give oral evidence.

We are open-minded on the examination of the franchised bus system by the Independent Review

Committee on Hong Kong's Franchised Bus Service. We have all along been operating our bus service in strict compliance with the relevant legislation, franchise terms as well as the guidelines issued by the Transport Department. In recent months, we have implemented and will implement the following measures in our daily operation as well as administration, with a view to enhancing the safety level in operating our bus service.

First, increasing the number of hours and the instructor-to-trainee ratio of driving training for our bus captains; second, requiring the part-time bus captains to declare more information about their principal employment; third, setting up a Bus Captain Training School to assist qualified persons in obtaining bus driving licences; and fourthly, making reference to international standards in raising the standard of safe driving.

We apologise for not being able to provide written information in time on the aforementioned measures to the committee. We are pleased to provide detailed information at today's hearing. If necessary, we can submit more detailed information after the hearing.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Wong. I'm sure, from what you've said in your statement, that counsel will be asking you

questions on those new matters, but I would ask counsel, Ms Wong, to begin questioning.

Examination by MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Wong, good morning, and good morning, gentlemen, and thank you for attending the committee this morning, and thank you for your opening statement, Ms Wong.

There are a number of matters that I would wish to explore with you arising from the submissions that you have already supplied to the committee.

In your submissions, the number of part-time bus captains employed by your company, if we can see at NLB bundle 1, page 17 -- we can see in the table the number of part-time bus captains employed by your company has nearly tripled in the past six years. As we can see, 13 part-time bus captains in 2012, that is about 9.4 per cent of 137 total bus captains, to 2017, where we have 53 part-time bus captains, constituting 27 per cent of the total 183 bus captains employed by the company. And we can see throughout the years the employment and proportion of the part-time bus captains has been constantly rising between 2012 and 2018.

Can you first of all tell us why there has been such a substantial increase?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. First of all, let me make

a point. From the perspective of the company, whether a bus captain is full-time or part-time, in relation to the safety requirements of the driving skills, we don't make a distinction. In other words, we won't harbour the thinking that part-time bus captains would drive more dangerously. We don't think this happens.

And regarding the counsel's question, that is between 2012 and 2017, why the number of part-time bus captains has been increasing all the time -- well, for full-time and part-time bus captains, I think the major difference is that part-time bus captains can turn up for work for fewer days. In other words, they have more flexibility concerning their work as well as their leave. They can make their own arrangements.

And we are different from two other companies. For part-time bus captains and full-time bus captains, they were very different in their case, but for the case of the New Lantao Bus Company, other than salary, we are not able to give too many fringe benefits to our full-time bus captains. Say, for example, for other bus companies, for the full-time bus captains, they do have a concessionary fare card for their family members. In our case, as of today and as a result of the use of Octopus cards, we are not able to share such concessionary cards with the other two bus companies.

In other words, the fringe benefits for our bus captains is such that their family members can have a free ride on New Lantao buses but not on other buses of other bus companies.

Of course, I won't know the details about the number of such cards given to the family members, but you can see that there is a very clear distinction between full-time and part-time bus captains.

I also mentioned that in the case of part-time bus captains, they are able to have a greater flexibility in terms of the number of working days, and that's why many colleagues are interested in becoming part-time bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thanks for your answer, but my question is actually: do you know why there has been such a substantial increase in terms of the number of part-time captains over the years?

MR JAMES WONG: When we recruit our staff, we recruit both full-time as well as part-time bus captains. It won't be because of financial reasons or any other work-related reasons we are interested in part-time rather than full-time bus captains. No, that's not the case.

A candidate will approach us for recruitment. We tell him about the package for full-time as well as

part-time bus captains. Of course we welcome him as a full-time bus captain, because in terms of deployment, it's easier for the company because we are certain about the number of working days from this full-time bus captain. For part-time bus captains, it's uncertain, and of course the decision is in the hands of the candidate. If somebody would like to be a part-time bus captain, we can't impose a wish on him and say, "You must be full-time." You may ask why we haven't been employing more people. Well, in fact, it was only in recent years we have seen a greater number of routes and we have recruited more people and that's why we have seen an increase.

You ask why more part-time and not more full-time bus captains. That's the explanation. It's up to the candidate to choose. So it is not for us to make a choice.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, if I understand correctly, it's because of the manpower shortage, or there are other reasons, or because of the pay? Or there is increase in manpower supply because of the increase in demand of bus captains?

MR JAMES WONG: You asked for the reason. As I have said in the outset, I don't think, if you say there is a shortage, it means we would not even be able to get

part-time bus captains. That's my view.

On the other hand, as I have said, in fact we did think about it and some colleagues also told us about the small difference between the pay for full-time and part-time bus captains, and then to individual bus captains, since our franchised service is rather focused on the Lantau district only, so if somebody isn't living on Lantau Island, then, as I have said, the concessionary card for the family members will not be attractive.

So, in the trade, somebody has said that such a concessionary card would have the value of $1,000 if you take a ride every day. For us, for our full-time bus captains, this isn't something that they have when they compare with other bus captains from other bus companies.

When you asked for the reason, of course, on our part, we can't be sure about the reason in individual cases. It is up to them to make a choice. But I think probably it is due to the fact that the pay isn't really that different, among other reasons.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Does your company regularly recruit full-time bus captains who have retired, to take up employment as part-time bus captains?

MR JAMES WONG: Counsel, was it your question that whether

we recruit our retirees?

INTERPRETER: Yes.

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, we did. When a colleague retires, and if his health condition is still fit for taking up the duty as a bus captain, then we will offer to him that he should stay with us.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the approximate percentage?

CHAIRMAN: What is the retirement age for full-time bus captains?

MR JAMES WONG: 65.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JAMES WONG: Can we provide the information after the hearing? At this moment, I'm afraid we don't know how many retired bus captains have become part-time bus captains. But initially I don't think there are too many of them at this moment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your introductory remarks, you stated that in recent months your company has implemented and will implement measures in your daily operation and administration, with a view to enhance safety level in operating buses. This includes requiring the part-time bus captains to declare more detailed information about their principal employment.

You also stated you are pleased to provide further information to the chairman and members at the hearing

today.

Can you tell us, first of all, what are the new measures?

MR JAMES WONG: May I defer to Mr Benny Chan?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR BENNY CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Mainly speaking, we have enhanced the requirement that part-time bus captains must declare to us their principal employment as well as the number of working hours, so as to safeguard us, so that we can meet the requirements of the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So since when did you implement these measures?

MR BENNY CHAN: For this measure, it was introduced recently in June.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I understand it correctly, before June, there is no requirement for part-time bus captains to declare information about their principal employment?

MR BENNY CHAN: Well, when a bus captain joins us, we do require the bus captain to make a declaration about his work. Now, the difference is that within a certain period of time, we will ask the bus captain to make a declaration again to update the information.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do all part-time bus captains have to fill in a form?

MR BENNY CHAN: The part-time bus captain, upon joining the company, has to declare, by filling out the information, as shown on the screen, there is a form.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We will come to that form in a moment, but after June, do you have a new form requiring the part-time bus captains to declare their working hours, before their employment?

MR BENNY CHAN: Yes, we do. We have already prepared a new form for the bus captains to declare their work details.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we have a sample of that form, if convenient?

MR BENNY CHAN: Yes. Later on, we can provide it to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so, and there's an earlier matter that you indicated that you would supply information. That was Mr James Wong, who said that you would provide information as to the number of retired full-time bus captains who work part-time. So that's the second item on the shopping list, as it were.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, Mr Wong, you earlier referred to your current application form. If I can take you to bundle 2, NLB-2, page 468.

If we look at the form, the form itself does not require part-time bus captains to provide information as

to whether they are currently working part-time or the work nature and the working hours. And earlier, when you gave evidence, you said the form itself does provide declaration for that kind of information. Can you tell us where?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. I would like to say that in this form, when they are required to fill in, at the time when they join us, we require the person to declare to us where they have worked before. But indeed, in this form, there is no requirement to do so, because their employment may be clerical and not related to driving. So there is no requirement of stating the number of work hours in the old form.

And in the new form which Mr Chan mentioned, it has this added.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it's not simply a form but a new employment contract, if I understand correctly? Or it is two different things?

MR JAMES WONG: It's not a contract. Serving part-time bus captains will have to file this declaration.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And have you revised this employment contract since June?

MR JAMES WONG: No, not this one.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may take you to the declaration paragraphs in the current form at page 472, in all these

paragraphs of your existing form, it does not specifically require the part-time bus captains to declare if they have adequate rest time before commencing their duties? Can you confirm that?

MR JAMES WONG: That is right. I confirm that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And just now you said there would be certain period of time where you would require part-time bus captains to declare the information. Under these new measures, how regularly or what is the period of time would you require part-time bus captains to declare principal employment and working hours?

MR JAMES WONG: At this stage, our plan is to ask the colleague to, starting from June -- well, because they are part-time bus captains, they won't come to work every day; they will have to furnish all the information to us. That is to start with.

Just now, you asked about the frequency of making such a declaration. Our thinking at this moment is once a year. Say, for example, in a year's time, they will have to update the record.

But this is a new measure, after all, so we think that perhaps in three months' time there will be a review on the frequency and whether this measure is appropriate and sufficient.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in your new form, is there any

requirement which requires an employee to oblige to inform you if he changes his outside employment or undertakes new employment, given it will be an annual declaration?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. Yes. It's there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I could go back to the previous practice --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that -- are we to understand that this process has begun with you asking part-time bus captains to declare their principal employment and their working hours, that you've already started asking some bus captains, part-time ones, those questions?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. Yes. We have begun doing that.

CHAIRMAN: Have any of these part-time bus captains declared that they do have other employment and have given you their working hours?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, indeed, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Have any of them told you they have other employment involving driving?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to illustrate, by reference to one of the bus captains, what kind of employment and how much driving was involved in this other job?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, the initial information we have got -- well, I hope that you would give us some time to

collate the information. From the initial information we have received, there are part-time bus captains, according to them, that they are bus captains working for a hotel. According to the information supplied to the company, they work on average five days a week. Per working day, the average driving time is about eight hours. That is just an example.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us some idea of how many of your part-time bus captains you have asked these questions of, so far?

MR JAMES WONG: There are 30 or so of them who have replied to us. It's about 80 per cent of our part-time bus captains, those 30 or so bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Wong.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Wong.

If I may take you to your submissions at NLB bundle 1, page 31, the third box from the right. You submitted that you:

"... require the applicant to submit their past and existing employment information in the application form ... During the recruitment process, we will explain to applicant, no matter he/she apply for part-time or full-time bus captain vacancy, their working arrangement is regulated by [the guidelines] ... and verbally convey

[ed] to part-time bus captain applicant that they have to ensure sufficient rest time and separation time from other external employment."

My question is this. Apart from verbally conveying to these part-time bus captains that they have to ensure sufficient rest time and separation time, are there any requirement or disclosure made by part-time bus captains as to the number of hours they worked prior to coming to their duties in your company?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. At the time when we furnished the information, there was no such thing. It was only verbally. It was the information we have supplied. There is a new measure that we require them to declare the information.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So prior to June 2018, there was no way you could ascertain if the part-time bus captains have been working over the working hours as stipulated in the guidelines, apart from this verbal assurance?

MR JAMES WONG: That is right. Prior to June -- well, to a certain extent, today -- we rely on face-to-face communication with bus captains in relation to their working hours of the principal employment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, if I may take you to some of the documents that we have seen from other bus companies. If I may take you to CTB bundle 2, page 400.

At page 401, that's page 2 of the original document, headed, "Important information", item 3, it reads:

"Are you currently working part-time? If yes, what is the work nature and [the] working hours?"

This is the Citybus application form, and as one can tell, it requires the employee to specifically state in the employment contract whether they have other part-time employment.

Would you consider adopting this form, in revising your employee application form?

MR JAMES WONG: The document you just showed me -- well, I will have to look further into it with my colleagues. My initial thinking is it is of high reference value. We will consider adopting or enhancing such measures.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and also, if we continue on page 404 in Chinese, and English at page 404-1 to 404-2, we can see that is a requirement, perhaps similar to your new form, called "Employee Code of Conduct and Discipline/Declaration for External Works", setting out in details not only the employment, the employer's company, working hours, salary, and we can see at the bottom, part C, "Signature", it requires specific declarations, requiring the employee to strictly comply with the terms of disclosure.

Would you consider adopting this in your new form,

if it hasn't contained similar paragraphs?

MR JAMES WONG: Well, we have just seen this form. We have to look further into it. Any good suggestions will be adopted by us, but I don't have time to go into it. I would need time to go into it when we go back.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I move on to another topic, I would like to ask something about disclosure of driving offence points during recruitment.

In your submission, you state that you request all bus captains, full-time or not, to compulsorily declare their driving offence point record annually and report to company when their points records changed, and then there would be random cross-check to be conducted, to make sure information provided by staff is true and accurate.

My first question is, would you check the driving offence points of your bus captains before you employ them?

MR JAMES WONG: I will defer to Mr Benny Chan.

MR BENNY CHAN: Chairman, at the time of recruitment, before we employ them, we will require the bus captain to obtain a record. This record will show the driving-offence points.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If I may take you to TD bundle 1. It is a paper submitted by the Transport

Department at page 135, paragraph 4. It states in the first sentence:

"All FB operators, except the New Lantao Bus Company ..., will also check the driving offence points of their bus captain applicants."

It appears from what is stated in the Transport Department's submission that apart from your company, all other operators will check the driving-offence points of their bus captain applicants.

Do you have any comment as to this sentence?

CHAIRMAN: From what you've said earlier, this statement is inaccurate. Is that the position?

MR JAMES WONG: I believe -- well, Mr Chan talks about the check. It started at the beginning of 2018, and we have to go back to check when it was formally implemented. I think it was the beginning of 2018. When we supplied the information to the committee, we would not communicate with the Transport Department first.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I understand.

MR JAMES WONG: Perhaps in their record, this information is not updated. After all, this is internal measure of the company. Perhaps we did not mention this to the Transport Department in a meeting. That's why there is this misunderstanding.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I understand correctly --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Ms Wong -- would you provide the information as to when it was that this check took place?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes, sure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Apart from providing the information, can you tell us about this checking of driving offence points? When is this new policy, or what is the policy before June 2018? Do you know?

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Wong has told us that this began, he thinks, at the beginning of 2018, not June, but the beginning of the year.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) That's right. Should be.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Now, if we look at paragraph 4, it states that:

"... Citybus ... and New World First Bus Services Ltd ... will not offer employment to applicants who have incurred 9 or above driving-offence points in the recent 2 years."

Whilst:

"... KMB and Long Win Bus ... will not offer employment to applicants who have incurred 9 or above driving-offence points in the recent 3 years ..."

Can you tell us what is your company's policy in

relation to this?

MR JAMES WONG: We don't have detailed information for the time being. We are not like the other two companies whereby we have clear stipulation as to, say, in the recent two to three years, whereby you have certain points deducted, then you will not be hired. At this moment, we don't have such a policy.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you consider adopting this policy?

MR JAMES WONG: We will consider doing so.

Now, we want to look at whether the bus captains have driving-offence points deducted, and actually we can observe that through their normal driving attitude. We will consider adopting such a policy, but at this moment, if you are to say specifically whether it's seven points, nine points, two years or three years, I cannot give you a definite answer. We will consider doing so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Based on your answer, do I understand correctly that prior to 2018, your company have not checked the driving-offence points of part-time bus captains at all?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, can you give us some time to collect the relevant information and pass the same on to the committee later?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. Thank you.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, moving on to another topic, the use of non-franchised buses.
MEMBER LO: I have a question.
CHAIRMAN: Prof Lo wishes to ask a question.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.
MEMBER LO: I just want to clarify that the use of higher percentage of part-time bus captains, is that a strategy of the company or is it a consequence of your ability to hire full-time, that you cannot hire enough full-time, so you become hiring part-time? So which is which?
MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Professor. Is it the company's policy to hire part-time bus captains? Definitely not. The counsel has also asked why there is a high ratio of part-time bus captains. Before the committee's hearing, for myself, I don't know the number of part-time bus captains in other companies. Only after the hearing did I learn about the higher ratio of part-time bus captains in our company versus other bus companies.

So we've been pondering what the real issue is here. Of course, we are inclined to hiring more full-time rather than part-time bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Following on that question, Mr Wong, in your submission at page 18, NLB bundle 1 at page 18, and if we can see the paragraph right below paragraph 6 and

above section 5, "Journey time", it started with the words:

"During the years, we are actively resourcing manpower from different means, such as joining career day organised by Labour Department and local charity communities, job referral ..."

And the end of the paragraph states:

"Together with employment condition improvement as mentioned in previous paragraph, we believe these measures can strengthen our manpower resourcing status ..."

And you mention a number of measures from 1 to 6. Apart from those measures, have you considered other improvement measures, in terms of remuneration and benefits to part-time -- or full-time bus captains?

MR JAMES WONG: For our company, every year, basically, there will be an adjustment of the salary. As for benefits, starting 2018, we are giving an extra five days of leave to our bus captains, in the trade generally. We will give labour days 12 days and we are giving them an extra five days, which is on a par with that of the white-collar workers.

We hope the colleagues can enjoy more holidays and they can take more rest and they are given the flexibility to choose their leave days.

As for a pay rise, we will do it on an annual basis depending on the actual circumstances.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About this extra five days, that applies to all full-time employees? Is that the case?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, that's correct, all full-time bus captains enjoy that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I move on to another topic, use of non-franchised bus. At page 17, bundle NLB-1, if we can see right below the table, you stated, your company stated, that with the approval of the Transport Department, you:

"... hire at least 30 non-franchised bus with bus captain from our contractor on every weekends, and this surplus of bus is almost 25 per cent extra of our fleet."

First of all, you state "our contractor" -- is it one contractor or multiple suppliers?

MR JAMES WONG: Just one contractor.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And who is that contractor?

MR JAMES WONG: It's called Kwoon Chung Motors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, these franchised buses is to cater for upsurge in passenger demand only in weekends and public holidays, is that correct? It does apply to weekdays?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in your supplementary submission filed

on 15 June 2018 at page 38, NLB-1, you attach the "no objection" letter from the Transport Department dated 19 December 2017. Your letter, if we go back to page 37, also stated that the initial approval from the Transport Department was issued over the past 20 years, and that you have been locating or searching this document by different means.

Have you been able to locate this initial approval document?

MR JAMES WONG: No, I haven't been able to retrieve the information.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Will you continue with the attempt?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, we will try to retrieve the initial letter. I joined the company in 2011 myself and I have asked the colleagues that have worked longer than myself. The letter was approved, I mean it was given, in 1990 and 1991, and on Lantau, back then, during holidays, there was a great surge in demand, but on weekend days there wasn't such a huge demand. We were talking about trips to Po Lin Monastery. At that time, not even a cable car was put in place or built, so the New Lantao Bus was given approval by the Transport Department to hire non-franchised buses to operate on public holiday to deal with the passenger demand peak.

Our company, compared to the two bus companies, in

terms of our scale and the structure of our route, it was very different from them. So conversely, actually, the holidays, we are seeing a passenger demand peak, and on weekdays we don't see such a big passenger demand.

So our starting point or rationale here is if just for the sake of coping with the demand on weekends and public holidays to procure an extra 20 to 30 per cent of buses -- well, in the 1990s, the Tsing Ma Bridge was not even built. I could not give you the exact size of our fleet back then. So that's the arrangement put in place back then and it lasts until today.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, this letter from the Transport Department was dated 19 December 2017, but in the first paragraph it makes reference to "your letter", presumably your application on 4 December 2017, and the first paragraph states that the Transport Department has no objection to your application for deployment of a maximum of 80 non-franchised buses on every Sunday and public holidays for six months from 1 June 2018, suspension period of Ngong Ping 360, et cetera; and 50 non-franchised buses on every Saturday in the periods mentioned in subparagraph (2).

My first question is, who decides the number of non-franchised buses to be deployed for those periods?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. It is our company which made the

decision as to the extra number of buses needed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I understand correctly, your total amount or total number of franchised buses that you operate are 130; is that correct?

MR JAMES WONG: More or less. Around 100, 130 or so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the percentage is quite significant, and have you considered deploying or purchasing more buses in future, to be managed by your company exclusively?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. In this letter, the Transport Department approved the number, 80 and 50. That's the maximum number. And in actual fact, why were we making an application for a larger number? Usually, because the contractor would sometimes tell us that because of certain deployment situation or reasons, we need a closed road permit to go into Lantau South for these 50 buses and the administration's approval is required for them to provide the service.

So that's why we asked for more. Your question, on whether we would be procuring more buses ourselves -- for the time being, we don't have such a plan. That's exactly because of what I just said. Even if we procure more buses, it's just for the sole purpose of certain passengers, on Saturdays and public holidays and Sundays. But we are just talking about two days in a week.

Even -- it's not the case that for a Saturday and a Sunday there would be a lot more passengers. For example, if the weather is not that good, then the situation would be affected. Now, the buses going to Tai O and Ngong Ping will see passenger rise in public holidays, but in, say, bad weather, the passenger number will significantly drop. So at this juncture we don't have plan to add more buses.

Say, however, if in the long term, if we see that there is an increase in passenger demand from Monday to Friday, then we will of course consider procuring our own buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Who decided the six-month period as set out in paragraphs (1) and (2) for the deployment of non-franchised buses?

MR JAMES WONG: I believe it's the Transport Department, half-year, you talk about half-year, that is the Transport Department's decision.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, at the bottom it set out six conditions by the Transport Department, (a) to (f), and if I may summarise:

"(a) the buses must be below six years of age;

(b) the same franchised bus maintenance standard must be adopted for the hired buses."

Now, what does it mean by "the same franchised bus

maintenance standard must be adopted for the hired buses"; what does that include?

MR JAMES WONG: Can I defer to Mr Yeung to take that question?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Yeung.

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. For all non-franchised buses, they will be treated the same as the franchised buses in terms of repair and maintenance. Every month, there will be a monthly inspection called MI, and they have to go through an annual examination as well, the same as franchised buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Does this include -- do you know if all these non-franchised buses have black box or speed limiters?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Yes, they do. Yes, they do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that a contractual requirement in the contracts that you signed with this non-franchised bus contractor?

MR JAMES WONG: We asked our contractor to fit out the non-franchised bus to the same degree as our franchised bus. So that's our original intention.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So prior to today is there a requirement for all these non-franchised buses to have black box or speed limiters installed?

CHAIRMAN: Whose requirement?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Whether your company requires the non-franchised bus operators to install speed limiters and black box before today.

MR JAMES WONG: In fact, you can refer to item (d). It says "similar on-vehicle facilities". Of course, we are referring to those buses engaged by us to assist us. My understanding is that as of today, in relation to non-franchised buses, the TD does not have such a requirement. So it is different in the case of franchised buses.

Here, it has already been said that if the non-franchised bus is to be used by us and serving us, then that bus should be equipped with the same on-vehicle facilities as a franchised bus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would there be any document --

CHAIRMAN: Just allow me a moment.

Do you read paragraph (2)(d) as a Transport Department requirement that you have a black box and a speed limiter, or not?

MR JAMES WONG: For item (d), of course, the term "black box" hasn't been included. But my understanding, our understanding, is that this is the requirement; it has to be fitted. That's our understanding.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide us with a sample of the

contract between your company and Kwoon Chung in respect of the arrangement to use the non-franchised buses, specifically the safety features?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, we can provide the information afterwards.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe I should clarify. Before today, is there a contractual requirement for Kwoon Chung to provide non-franchised buses with black box and speed limiters, contractual requirement? The question is "contractual requirement".

MR JAMES WONG: I think we need to go back to check the document. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, if we go to the sixth requirement, (f), it states:

"non-part-time drivers should be arranged to operate the Tung Chung Road bus routes. They must have been given proper and adequate training by your company."

Can you tell us: why single out the Tung Chung Road bus routes?

MR JAMES WONG: As I have said, for South Lantau, the routes for South Lantau, will certainly go via Tung Chung Road, because for you to go from Tung Chung to Tai O and Ngong Ping and South Lantau, you have to go past Tung Chung Road. For this to be singled out -- well, of course we are not trying to get a bus to travel on

Tung Chung Road. Rather, we are getting buses to travel in South Lantau. I think that's what is meant here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Well, it appears that it set out a must condition, that you have to have full-time drivers to drive the Tung Chung Road bus routes. Is there anything special about the Tung Chung Road bus routes? And also it requires a specific condition that it has to receive proper and adequate training by your company.

MR JAMES WONG: I am not too sure. We are not too sure about the reason for this condition. For us here, our initial view, we believe that prior to the reconstruction of Tung Chung Road, it was very, very narrow, very different from what you see today as far as the road conditions are concerned. But then back then, I was too young to recall what it was like. But we believe that as far as this condition or this requirement is concerned, I think the prevailing road conditions back then should be relevant. Perhaps we will ask, "Tung Chung Road has been reconstructed, you want to know why this particular condition remains there?" Let me go back to check with my colleagues for the details.

My understanding is this is a letter issued by the Transport Department on a half-yearly basis. It's a routine document. Perhaps we haven't reviewed as to

whether certain conditions no longer apply.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And it says that --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, Ms Wong -- perhaps, this being a Transport Department letter, it's the Transport Department who can tell us why the condition is there.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Maybe.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It also states that they must have been given proper and adequate training by your company. Have there been any arrangements to ensure these full-time drivers of these non-franchised bus operators or bus company should receive training by your company, any arrangement?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, may I defer to Mr Lee?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Lee.

MR RICHARD LEE: Mr Chairman, let me answer the question. As far as training is concerned, for bus drivers plying Tung Chung Road, from FB or non-FB, well, for South Lantau, the roads are narrow and there are many bends. Therefore, for bus captains travelling on such routes, they have to receive a two-day route training to make sure they are familiar with the road conditions and they are alert.

So, so far as the route training is concerned, during that time our instructor will check if the bus captains are skilful at manoeuvring the bends and they

are assessed. Therefore, for the non-FB bus captains carrying out the duty for us, we do provide a route training for them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe the full-time bus captains require five days' training, is that correct, if they are to drive this route?

MR RICHARD LEE: If I may add a word here, counsel. For the five-day training, that's for the new recruits, that's the induction training. For serving bus captains, depending on the needs, will adjust. Like for South Lantau Road, we provide an extra two-day training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Now, is there any measure in place to monitor the qualifications and driving records of these non-franchised bus drivers?

MR JAMES WONG: We have the same treatment for franchised buses and non-franchised buses, as far as our measures are concerned. In other words, the answer is yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: As of today?

MR JAMES WONG: Mmm.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So prior to 2018, is there any measure in place to check the qualifications and driving records of this non-franchised bus operator, or is this a contractual requirement in your contract with Kwoon Chung?

MR JAMES WONG: Today, we do not require our contractor -- well, just now, in the letter, you see the registration numbers with information about the buses. As to the bus captains -- well, it will involve a larger number of bus captains rather than just 80 or 50 respectively. Therefore, as of today, we do have a specific requirement to ask for the details of the captains involved. So we haven't got this as a current requirement.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I don't understand that. Do you have this requirement today or is this something you are going to impose in the future?

MR JAMES WONG: We haven't got such a requirement as of today.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. I want to stay on this letter from the Transport Department. If I read this letter correctly, this provision they have given you will expire the end of June. Have you received a new letter from Transport Department on similar arrangement?

MR JAMES WONG: Not yet.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Okay. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you apply?

MR JAMES WONG: We did. We have.
MS MAGGIE WONG: When? When was that?
MR JAMES WONG: I have to go back to check. I believe it must be end of May or early June. Say, for example, for the letter shown on the screen, so it expired towards the end of December, and we wrote in early December to apply.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide us with a copy of your letter to the Transport Department?
MR JAMES WONG: Yes.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Have there been follow-up discussions about this arrangement with the Transport Department since you wrote the letter?
MR JAMES WONG: I don't quite understand your question.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Have there been discussions with the Transport Department since you wrote the letter to renew this arrangement? Any meetings?
MR JAMES WONG: We did meet with the Transport Department. Well, as to the letter we wrote, as to the application we have made, I don't think they are related to such.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, about this arrangement, do you wait until you have received the approval from the Transport Department before you sign the contract with Kwoon Chung to provide non-franchised buses?
MR JAMES WONG: Well, as to our contract with the

contractor, it is for a longer duration. I don't have the information with me, but if my memory serves me right, it's a three-year duration. So it won't be the case that for every six months I get the approval from the TD and then I sign a contract with the contractor. No. It is a three-year contract, for -- if we need to hire vehicles from them, then we do so. So that's the arrangement.

So the TD requires renewal once every six months. I think it is mainly because the TD would like to know whether the vehicles are in line with their requirements, like the year of age.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, you talked about the measure, earlier on, that you would require the Kwoon Chung operators to install speed limiters and black box from now on. Can you tell us what is the measure to ensure that?

MR JAMES WONG: The installation of such devices would have to be notified to us upon completion.

MS MAGGIE WONG: From now on.

MR JAMES WONG: It has been so all the time. After they have installed the devices, they would inform us. Like in the case of black boxes, of course we can check from the system, in relation to the transmission of data or data uploaded. So if you ask me as to whether we regularly verify the arrangement, that is whether, when

the vehicle arrives, I will check it every time, we didn't, because we believe that the hardware installed will not be dismantled, so they would notify us the first time it has been installed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is there any written record of such notification?

MR JAMES WONG: I can go back to get it and give it to you. We haven't come prepared with that.

CHAIRMAN: Please supply that, if you would.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the measure, the current existing measure, to monitor the qualifications and driving records of these non-franchised bus drivers?

MR JAMES WONG: Existing, as was mentioned, at this moment of time, we do not require the contractor to supply us with the information. For part-time bus captains, we would obtain the information, and we have plans to get the information from them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you ask for a similar requirement as you impose on your part-time bus captains, namely to sign a declaration form from all these non-franchised bus drivers, before they would be allowed to drive those buses?

MR JAMES WONG: At this moment of time, we haven't made a decision as to how to implement the measure. We don't

have a definite decision yet. I believe that we will adopt the same practice whether they are permanent staff or not. We don't have a decision yet.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So at this moment, do I understand correctly, your company would not know as of today whether any of these non-franchised bus drivers used on any particular day have any previous driving-related records, nor their experience?

MR JAMES WONG: When it comes to Kwoon Chung Motors, it's not completely independent from us. It's not the case that we don't know anything about them. Kwoon Chung Motors is a shareholder of New Lantao Bus Company. In relation to staff of Kwoon Chung Motors, when it comes to New Lantao Bus Company -- well, we don't have their files, but when it comes to recruitment, we have adopted certain measures to ensure that they are qualified bus captains. We will collate the information and give it to you.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

Yes, Professor.

MEMBER LO: The question -- there are three types of drivers: full-time, part-time, and also drivers driving on those non-franchised buses. They have different treatments in terms of the last group.

Now, the question is, the non-franchised buses also

have a black box. When will this black box information be used? Because they are driven by non-franchised operators, drivers. So would that ever be used to monitor their performance?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. In our system today, we can see black box records of non-franchised buses. We have access to such records today.

MEMBER LO: But are they used? Are such information ever used to assess their performance?

MR JAMES WONG: It's not just the non-franchised buses. In our fleet, black box has already been installed. Let's leave the non-franchised buses aside first. We use random checks to check every month whether there are problems with the buses or with the driving of the drivers.

For non-franchised buses, I believe that we use the same approach, but I have to go back to ask my colleagues as to random checks are conducted on their 80 buses during Saturdays and Sundays, because I can't give you a definite answer now. But that is our general approach in relation to random checks.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, are there none of the six of you who are able to answer that question? It's a simple enough question. Do you actually check the black boxes of the non-franchised buses?

MR BENNY CHAN: I would like to supplement, Chairman. At the moment, we don't really take the initiative to check the information in the black box. When we receive complaints, we will conduct random checks of the information of the black box to investigate into the incidents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Following from your --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me -- so you respond to complaints; is that it?

MR BENNY CHAN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: And accidents?

MR BENNY CHAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN: But do you do random checks on black boxes on non-franchised buses?

MR BENNY CHAN: Yes, we do that too.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At some stage, Ms Wong, we are going to take a 20-minute break. It's a matter for you when it's convenient.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Maybe I will follow up with the question on the safety performance.

Mr Wong, apart from this question, any measures in place to monitor the safety performance of these drivers of non-franchised buses whilst they are being used by your company? For example, mystery rides, or would you

put your staff on these buses to monitor performance?

MR BENNY CHAN: Chairman, every month we have used mystery shoppers. We don't distinguish between New Lantao Bus Company's or non-franchised buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So these secret checks of bus captain performance apply to all three types of bus captains?

MR BENNY CHAN: That is right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So if you find there are performance that are substandard or over-speeding, what disciplinary actions would you take on these non-franchised bus drivers?

MR BENNY CHAN: If we find, let's say, for example, speeding, we will issue a warning letter. We may even suspend the bus driver from working on Lantau Island.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, that may be an appropriate time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, very well.

Mr Wong and your fellow colleagues, we are going to take a 20-minute break now and then we will resume at 11.50 by that clock. Thank you.

(11.29 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.50 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR JAMES WONG: Excuse me, Chairman, I would like to provide some supplementary information. Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please supplement.

MR JAMES WONG: In relation to new bus captains, our checking of their records, I would like to supplement that we did not start doing that only in 2018. This has been a long-established practice. We have been doing it for many years. What we meant by starting in 2018 is that in the past, we used to select some bus captains by random and check on their records, and what we started in the beginning of 2018, for all bus captains we checked, on all of them.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JAMES WONG: So we will do it annually.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mean the driving offence records or other records?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just a few follow-up questions, Mr Wong.

Earlier on, you said on the safety features that the physical hardware on the non-franchised bus -- you said earlier on that these buses are equipped with the same on-vehicle facilities as franchised buses.

May I take you to bundle NLB-2, page 453. It set out a list of bus safety features adapted in NLB buses, and that includes 24 features.

Are you able to confirm, or based on your understanding, whether all these non-franchised buses are equipped with the same safety features as set out at page 453?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, it will take a while for me to confirm this. For these 24 items, say, for example, for double-decker buses -- excuse me, yes, I confirm that. I just tried to check with my colleague. We did indeed hire double-deckers as well, and all these safety features are there. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Now, just a few follow-up questions on -- you mentioned that you hired non-franchised buses from Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings; correct? You hired non-franchised bus buses from Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings?

MR JAMES WONG: Kwoon Chung Motors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Kwoon Chung Motors?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it correct that New Lantao Bus is a 99.99 per cent owned subsidiary of Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings, a listed company?

MR JAMES WONG: The parent company is Kwoon Chung Holdings. Maybe other companies are used to hold shares of NLB. I have to check. But ultimately the parent company is Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is your company, in other words, renting non-franchised buses from your parent company?
MR JAMES WONG: Correct. We have gone through an open tender exercise.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it correct that both Mr Wong, yourself, and Mr Timothy Wong, are senior management of Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings as well?
MR JAMES WONG: I am the managing director of Kwoon Chung and Mr Timothy Wong is the operations director of Kwoon Chung.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. As of 2017, the chairman of Kwoon Chung is Mr Matthew Wong Leung Pak, who is your father; is that correct?
MR JAMES WONG: Correct.
MS MAGGIE WONG: My question is this. How is the hiring price delivered when your company is renting non-franchised buses from its parent company, Kwoon Chung, or agreed? How is the price agreed?
MR JAMES WONG: As I said, once every three years, we will have an open tender exercise.
MS MAGGIE WONG: And how is the hiring price determined?
MR JAMES WONG: The tenderer makes a decision about the pricing, and for us, NLB makes a decision as to the number of vehicles to be deployed.
MS MAGGIE WONG: And who is the tenderer?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, what is your question? Kwoon Chung Motors is the tenderer.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know whether the Transport Department has any requirements or guidelines on the price at which these non-franchised buses are hired?

MR JAMES WONG: No. As far as pricing is concerned, the Transport Department does not have any requirements for us.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If I may continue --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- is this arrangement with Kwoon Chung Motors Company, by which non-franchised buses are leased, is that an arrangement that came into place on 1 May 2018?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, for the existing one, it is dated August 2016. It came into effect since August 2016, up to now.

CHAIRMAN: Prior to that date, did you have other contractors providing you with non-franchised buses?

MR JAMES WONG: No. All the time it was Kwoon Chung Motors.

CHAIRMAN: Give us some timescale, if you would, as to "all the time".

MR JAMES WONG: Well, I have this understanding, from what I have heard. When Kwoon Chung acquired NLB, it was in 1992. Kwoon Chung started to provide service to NLB, I think it was in the year 1990 or 1991.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, if I may continue. Any measures in place to monitor these non-franchised bus drivers' physical condition before they start driving for your company's purposes, for example any medical checkups?

MR JAMES WONG: Can I confirm with you as to your question? You mean every time they drive for us or prior to taking up duties from us?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Either way.

MR JAMES WONG: If you refer to the scenario every time before they drive, certainly not. We won't. Not to mention the bus captains from non-franchised buses, even for our own bus captains of NLB, it is impossible for us to carry out a medical checkup every time before they start work.

As to the other arrangement in relation to medical check, well, upon joining us, they will undergo such a medical checkup. If I may also add to the answer, for Kwoon Chung Motors -- well, Kwoon Chung Motors and NLB are sister companies, so to speak. Well, for NLB, it is of a smaller scale, having 130 buses only, and then a lot of our back-office officers and management staff, we must rely on the parent company's support. Otherwise, NLB cannot do what the other two franchised bus companies have been doing. We won't be able to put

up a similar performance because we are one 13th or one 33rd of their scale.

So for a Kwoon Chung bus captain, for him to drive an NLB bus, if you ask prior to taking up the duty as to whether there is a formal document being sent to NLB to confirm a medical checkup has been done, I am afraid I have to ask my colleagues as to how it actually works. But for us, for Kwoon Chung to recruit the bus captains, it has already gone through all the procedures like checking the records and going through the medical examination.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would make those enquiries and provide us with a formal document, if one is sent to NLB.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In respect of these non-franchised buses used for your company purposes, any measures in place to ensure these buses are mechanically fit for use?

MR JAMES WONG: If I may defer to Mr Yeung.

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Thank you. Regarding the non-franchised buses, they undergo regular checks and every year they go through the government's vehicle examination. So they are subject to the same requirement as our franchised buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What documentation would you ask from all

these non-franchised bus companies to verify this information?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. Well, as I have said, as of today, NLB and Kwoon Chung are sister companies, so for documents in black and white, we don't actually demand them from Kwoon Chung. This is the current arrangement. But of course, for the management, in particular, we are aware of the conditions in both companies. We provide passenger service. We provide safe passenger service to our customers.

In future, maybe we will review and see if there is a need to do so. Of course, sometimes we may not be talking about an associate company. In future, we may have a non-associate contractor providing the service to NLB. So perhaps we have to think more about whether there is a need to have more documents from the contractors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your supplemental annex 2A, 2B and 2C -- that's NLB bundle 2, pages 474 to 480. Annex 2A is at pages 473 and 474; 2B at 476; and 2C at 479.

Who conducts these surveys?

CHAIRMAN: To which surveys are you referring?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Three surveys.

CHAIRMAN: What are the titles of the surveys?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Annex 2A is the "Monthly report on

scheduled and actual compliance with guidelines on bus captains' working hours, rest times and meal breaks".

Annex 2B is "On-board survey to check NLB's driver rest time".

And annex 2C is a "Survey on franchised bus captains' working hours (Guidelines B & D)".

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Regarding the three surveys mentioned, they were conducted internally by ourselves, that is NLB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at page 474, annex 2A, the "Monthly report on scheduled and actual compliance with guidelines on bus captains' working hours, rest times and meal breaks", it states the number of captains surveyed at 115. So does it mean that 115 captains were surveyed on that single day, ie 21 February 2018, by a single person?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct. 115 on that day, on a single day. A day was picked and we tried to have a look.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So would they be surveyed by a single person of your company?

MR JAMES WONG: If I may supplement. The format wasn't so much that he followed each and every 115 bus captains. Rather, our colleagues checked the driving records. We try to check against that record.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So that would be based on driving records submitted to your company by who?

MR JAMES WONG: It was the Transport Department who picked the date, and then we checked against our internal records. So that's the record provided by the operating division.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to annex 2B, "On-board survey to check NLB's driver rest time", pages 477 to 478, how would this be conducted?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, please give us a bit of time to read through the record.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please take your time.

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, for this form, it was prepared by the company internally.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to page 480, the third annex, "Survey on franchised bus captains' working hours", how would this be conducted? Or, to put it another way, would someone follow the driver for that day?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, with this form, it talks about "Employee No. of bus captain". For this column, it was picked by the Transport Department as well as the survey date, and then on the right-hand side we tried to retrieve the record. So it wasn't that somebody was on board to follow, because it was provided afterwards, so we tried to look up our records and we tried to find out

the working hours of that particular colleague.

CHAIRMAN: How were these records created in the first place, sign-off time, sign-on, and so on?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, currently, what we do is that at the bus terminus, we have a card reader, so the colleague will clock his time by tapping his card on the reader and that would record his sign-on time and sign-off time. For others who are at remote locations and not at the bus terminus, then we rely on the telephone to ask him to report the time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise for that. I should have asked page 477 the same question, because the title is "On-board survey to check NLB's driver rest time", so it was a survey on board. So my question is, would someone follow the driver for that day?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman. For this on-board survey, we did have a colleague on board. It was a requirement from the Transport Department. So for ten days, five holidays and ten weekdays, we carried out the survey.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us whether, during the rest time or meal time provided under the guidelines, is a bus captain, be it those three types of bus captains, hired by your company required to perform any non-driving duties, like updating duty or shift rosters,

undertaking other administrative tasks, or inspecting vehicles?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman. When it comes to rest time, they are not required to perform those administrative duties mentioned, because these administrative duties are carried out by regulators, terminal regulators. There may be other staff members at the terminus to deal with such duties.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The same applies -- would travelling under the instructions of your company to another location or to attend to another driving shift be included in the rest time or meal time?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. The scope of our service is rather confined. There is no need for our bus captains to travel to a different district, say for example to Kowloon, to provide services. If your question is whether that is counted towards rest time -- well, basically, under normal circumstances there is no such duty, but should there be, it would be counted towards one's duty hours instead of rest time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to DC bundle 1, page 71. The Chinese is at page 71, the last five lines; English at page 75, last six lines. If I may read out --

CHAIRMAN: What are you reading from, first of all?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm sorry. This is a submission by the

Islands District Council submitted to the committee in relation to this review of Hong Kong's franchised bus service.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may read out the last five lines:

"... NLB's bus routes are mainly composed of mountainous routes to and from the south of Lantau Island and long-distance routes along the highways to and from the main areas, which require high level of attention in order to handle these routes, therefore, more rest time is required in order to prevent accidents caused by fatigued driving."

Mr Wong, just one question, about the bus routes in South Lantau. What is the approximate length or duration for each shift?

CHAIRMAN: Can you help me as to what you mean by "shift"? Is that the completion of a route or a working shift?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, completion of a route. Say, for example, the route 3M from Mui Wo Ferry Pier to the Tung Chung, I believe, town centre.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman. Using 3M as an example, from Tung Chung to Mui Wo or Mui Wo to Tung Chung, it takes about 30 or 40 minutes, depending on whether there are a lot of passengers getting on or off on route.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what do you --
MR JAMES WONG: 35 to 40 instead of 30.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, it states that it requires long-distance routes and requires a high level of attention. Do you agree with that statement, first of all?
MR JAMES WONG: This document was first shown to me just now.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Oh, I apologise for that.
MR JAMES WONG: I don't really understand what is meant by "long-distance routes along the highways to and from the main areas". For Lantau Island, the scope of our franchise is limited to Lantau Island. We don't go to other areas, say for example urban areas. From Shenzhen Bay Port, we provide a service to Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, but they don't go to Lantau Island. So I am not too sure what is meant by the district council.

Perhaps -- well, I will only focus on what I know instead of speculating what it means. When it comes to south of Lantau Island, in terms of journey time, compared to the route of the other two bus companies', ours are not too long. The scope of our service and the road's condition is rather free from congestion. So when it comes to the scheduled journey time, compared to the actual journey time, it won't deviate too much.

For 40 minutes, compared to feeder bus services to train stations, say, for example, that of Yat Tung which takes only about several minutes, a 40-minute journey time would be longer. But when it comes to comparison with other routes, say for example from New Territories to the urban area, ours are not that long. Compared to airport routes, if you add congestion time, those would be even longer.

That's my view.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and --

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, do you have any more questions arising from this document? Because if you do, Mr Wong should have the opportunity to read it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, I will have a few questions.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Wong, take the time that you need to read these two or three pages.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: If you do that now, we will wait.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe if you read the Chinese version. It's at pages 71 to 72.

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JAMES WONG: I have read the Chinese translation.

Perhaps there is some translation error, because in the Chinese version it says "Lantau Island buses", but they don't refer to our bus company but bus services serving Lantau Island. So it's not routes of NLB. Of course, for south island, some of the routes are ours, but when it comes to routes that ply highways, I think they are referring to Long Win Bus or Citybus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If I may refer you to paragraph 3, English at page 76, it expressed certain concerns raised by the Islands District Council about NLB's bus routes, and if I read it out:

"As stated in the submissions above, NLB's bus routes are mainly composed of mountainous routes to and from the south of Lantau Island and long-distance routes along the highways to and from the main areas, nevertheless currently the facilities in bus cabin and the regulation are not able to ensure the safety of passengers. For instance, taking the example of NLB route 3M that runs to and from Tung Chung and Mui Wo, I, at various times, found that the buses were [fully loaded], and even the aisles of the bus cabin were packed, for buses that run urban bus routes, other than the very front row, the very last row and seats facing backwards ... other seats are not installed with seat belts; [compared] to the regulation of the European

Commission, regardless of the bus type, whereby all captains and passengers must fasten their seat belts to ensure driving safety. This reflects that Hong Kong is very behind on passenger safety."

And we see some photographs on pages 78 and 79. May I ask what is your view on this matter?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman. I see that two points have been raised. First, in relation to the fact that no safety belts have been installed on our buses, and second, that's in relation to some photographs depicting a crowded bus compartment.

I will first reply to the first point -- well, to the second point, that is the bus that is packed. We do notice that in Mui Wo, during morning peak hours, for route 3M, plying to and from Tung Chung, there are more passengers compared to other times. In our previous analysis, we found that it's because there are more people going there to work in construction sites. These projects will be completed soon. Our approach is to increase bus frequency for these routes. The bus type we use is different from other companies, because there are more mountainous routes. It's been a few years that we have stopped using double-deckers, so during peak hours, given the limited capacity of a single-decker, in 2017 we decided that for route 3M, we would use

double-decker buses, because in 2018-19 there will be population intake for their home ownership scheme flats, so we used double-decker buses in 2017 to address the problem of limited capacity during peak hours. From Mui Wo to Tung Chung, for a 40-minute journey time, well, a double-decker bus can only take so many passengers, so we have specifically procured buses that are shorter in length. We have done some road tests, to ensure that the use of double-decker buses along these routes would not be problematic.

In relation to the point of seat belts, currently there is no requirement that all seats are to be fitted with seat belts. So we have retrofitted seat belts for exposed seats. We keep an open mind. If there is a view that all seats should be fitted with seat belts, we will keep an open mind.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If I may take you to the minutes, again by the Islands District Council, dated 23 October 2017 -- Chinese at page 252; English at 256 -- Mr Wong, on the first page, this is the minutes of the meeting of the Islands District Council dated 23 October 2017, and we can see the persons in attendance include, if we go to page 257 and page 258, I believe your company was also present, Mr Benny Chan Tin Lung, deputy general

manager of New Lantao Bus Co Ltd, was present at this meeting.

If I may take you to paragraph 41. The Chinese is at page 254. If you may read that first.

If I may also invite you to read paragraph 43 as well, as to the district councillor's suggestion, Mr Eric Kwok. If you may read that first.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: One of the matters he raised is that:

"... the EU rules limited the working hours of drivers to 9 hours ... The present 14 hours of work was excessive and bus captains would be tired and prone to accident. He was concerned about the safety of Lantau buses and opined that the Guidelines of the Transport Department were inadequate. If the bus accident occurred on Tung Chung Road or Keng Shan Road of Lantau Island, the consequence would be too ghastly to contemplate. It was hoped that the Transport Department and the bus companies could handle the long driving hours of bus captains and the functionality of their buses seriously."

As to this suggestion, what is your view on this, or what is your company's view on this?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, it will take a while for us to read through the information.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Take your time.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman. For Southern Lantau, the bus captains who are working on 14-hour duty shift, we call these special shifts. The number of bus captains on special shift is relatively small. There are just eight routes on special shift. Out of 100 or so routes, out of in fact 113 routes, eight are on special shift duty. We would ensure that the bus captains have sufficient rest time. Many of our bus captains live in that district, in Lantau. We believe that we have done our best to make sure that bus captains on special shift are not exhausted; they should have sufficient rest time.

And Mr Kwok referred to the EU standards. I have not looked at the standards myself. If they drive continuously for nine hours, I believe they would be very tired. For a 14-hour duty, or a duty with less hours, we have to look at the rest time and the driving time and the proportion of these different periods.

In Hong Kong, many people do not work in places where they live, and for the service sector -- well, for bus captains, they have to go to work earlier than the normal people because they have to take them to work, and when people get off work, bus captains have to work even later to take these people back home. So we are

talking about these 14-hour duties, special shift, and if you want to cut it to nine hours, the arrangement is not that simple, because you can imagine, say, during the peak morning we need the most people and during the evening peak hours we need the most people, our bus captains.

So we would go beyond nine hours. We just cannot simply change the 14-hour shift to a nine-hour shift.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Wong, I'm going to move on to another topic, facilities and support to bus captains.

You just gave evidence that many of your bus captains live in the Lantau district; correct?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes, but I don't have the numbers, actual numbers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Does your company provide any bus shuttle service to bus captains between their living area and their working place, for example the bus terminus?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, we don't provide bus services for our colleagues. That's mainly because most of our colleagues live where they are supposed to take their buses. If they, say, live further away, we would arrange for the buses to be parked near where they live, say in the bus terminus near their homes or maybe some other appropriate locations as well. So there is no

need for us to provide shuttle bus service for our bus captains, to take them to work.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Apart from the rest facilities at the major service hub that you mentioned in your submissions -- if you want the reference, that's at page 20 -- would toilets or break rooms be available in the proximity of your company's every bus terminal during breaks in between for bus captains?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It's not the case that for every bus terminus there will be toilets and rest rooms. We will have to look at the land titles and other issues. We don't have the exact information on hand, but on the application -- indeed, we have applied for such facilities to be installed at bus termini, but then we have to go through many government departments which are there to supervise the procedure and it takes a lot of time for our application to be processed, and actually we failed in some of our applications.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may refer you to your forward planning programme --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, perhaps I could ask this: could you provide the committee with samples illustrating your applications to provide facilities, be they toilets or places to rest, and letters that illustrate, on the one hand, perhaps, success, but the

length of time it took, and then, on the other hand, failure, where you were refused.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps indicating, for our benefit, what is the ratio of success as against failure, and the length of time it all takes.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to TD-1, page 241. Mr Wong, this is a forward planning programme of your company, and if we cast our eye down to the bottom, it states that all terminals are facilitated with toilets, but in the cases of Yat Tung, Tin Tsz and Tin Yiu, they could only be accessible within walking distance to public toilets.

Can I ask you, what is the "walking distance", do you know?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The bus termini is adjacent to a shopping centre. Say, for example, for Yat Tung, there is a shopping centre next to it, so the colleagues are asked to go inside the shopping centre. So, after the colleague has parked the bus, he goes to the shopping centre and he returns, and the whole thing, the whole process, will take around ten minutes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, thank you, Mr Wong, because I want to

ask this question. It's the new guidelines imposed in 2018 by the Transport Department. If I may take you to TD bundle 4, page 1086.

If you can see that the new guidelines state that within six-hour duty, they should have short rest breaks, ie rest times, of less than 40 minutes:

"... totalling not less than 20 minutes, of which no less than 12 minutes should be within the first 4 hours of duty."

So my question is: can we do better, in terms of this provision of toilets, or to extend the rest time if necessary?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The counsel mentioned about the provision of facilities and whether more facilities could be provided. The company's stance is that we are more than happy to do that, because we treasure our colleagues, respect them as human beings, and if they are asked to walk a long distance to go to the toilet, I believe that those who are seated here would not like to have that kind of experience, and maybe after that, after the hearing, we will provide you with additional information on our application, that we have been refused to provide facilities. So there seems nothing much that we can do.

You talk about Yat Tung Estate and the shopping

centre. The shopping centre has been newly renovated -- is being renovated, rather, and the toilet is not being put to use, so our colleagues need to go to another toilet, and this places a great impact on our colleagues; we will try our best to help them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Wong.

CHAIRMAN: Have you made any application at your terminus at Yat Tung to provide your own toilet facility?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Was that refused? Or is that one in the waiting queue?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes, it should be in the queue.

CHAIRMAN: How long ago did you make that application?

MR JAMES WONG: We will provide you with the information later.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just one last question on this document. If Mr Wong may refer to page 242. I apologise, it's TD-1, page 242. Again, this is the forward planning programme. It states at the top:

"Toilet and dining facilities are all within walking distance from the terminals, with the exception of Shenzhen Bay Port, where there is no dining facilities."

So may I ask what would be done to ameliorate the situation, to ensure there are sufficient facilities?

MR JAMES WONG: At Shenzhen Bay, that's a port, that's a boundary crossing facility. Permission was not given to us to provide a facility for colleagues to take a rest. For that particular route, it runs from Shenzhen Bay to Yuen Long or Tin Shui Wai. The current arrangement is such that colleagues have to take their meals in Yuen Long or Tin Shui Wai so as to resolve the problem. At Shenzhen Bay Port, they have toilet facilities.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I see the time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We will now adjourn for lunch and we will resume at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Wong, we are going to the topic of training of bus captains. You referred in your introductory statement that in recent months you have implemented or will implement measures, including increasing the number of hours and the instructor-to-trainee ratio of driving training for your bus captains, and setting up a Bus

Captain Training School to assist qualified persons in obtaining bus driving licences.

My question is this: what is the situation on this aspect before this change?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, if I may defer to Mr Lee to answer the question.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Lee.

MR RICHARD LEE: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

There are a number of aspects here. First of all, in the past, as far as bus captain training was concerned, for new recruits and for serving bus captains, there were different cases. For new recruits, in the past, there was a five-day training, route training, bus-type training and classroom training. Recently, for the five-year training programme, we have added an additional day, so that there will be six days.

Mainly speaking, for classroom training, there used to be theory during the five-day training. Now we have a whole-day classroom training. Therefore, for new recruits, currently we are giving him six days' training, five days at the wheel.

In the past, the instructor-to-trainee ratio was one-to-two or one-to-three, depending on the elements involved. Now we have decided that for the instructor-to-trainee ratio, it should be set at

one-to-two. With a one-to-two ratio, it means that the instructor will spend more time with the trainees when compared with the past.

And for in-service captains, there are different kinds of training. Say, for example, route familiarisation, bus-type training, supplementary training and refresher training.

In the past, for route training and bus-type training, both lasted for a day. Currently, we would examine the bus type involved. This is because in future most of the buses will be double-deckers, and with the introduction of the double-decker buses, we think the training should last for two to three days. This is because we want to allow the trainees to get familiar with the manoeuvring of the double-decker buses, including making a turn.

Then, for refresher training, we ask each and every bus captain to return to the training section or the training school to attend a class.

As to the establishment of a training school, we have done some preparatory work. Earlier on, we have applied to the Transport Department that we could have GP2, that is the restricted instructor licence for franchised buses. We're waiting the TD's reply. So that's the GP2. We are also trying to recruit more

instructors. Currently, for the instructors of the NLB, they do not possess the GP2 qualification. In other words, we have only got those with class 1, class 2, and who's been licence holders. In other words, in future, if our application is to be granted, we can become self-sufficient; we will get qualified driving instructors to help the candidates, the new recruits, to sit the bus driving licence. In other words, we can have an expanded source, instead of confining ourselves to applicants holding a class 9 and class 10 bus driving licence.

Of course, for the setting up of the school, we need other support measures, like parking training venue and also route training venues. If we can get the restricted licence, then for the six-day training, it will be lengthened to nine days. For those without a bus driving licence, for those with a private car licence only, we are providing 18 days' training. For the number of trained hours, currently we have a mere six days. In future, there will be a much larger number of training hours.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to bundle NLB-2, page 467. It is a table setting out the bus captain -- annex 10, setting out the Bus Captain Training schedule. Section A is the regular training for newly recruited

bus captain; section B is the regular training for serving bus captains.

Can I firstly ask, is this the old training or the new measures as you have just told us?

MR RICHARD LEE: The previous arrangement.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So this is the old training?

MR RICHARD LEE: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us who provided this training, as you have told us that the training school was not established yet.

MR RICHARD LEE: You are correct. We are preparing for the establishment. Our driving instructors are giving the training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if you look at section A, "Induction Training", below "Classroom lectures on company rules", there is "accident black spot analysis"; do you see that?

MR RICHARD LEE: Yes, I see it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: "Classroom lectures on company rules, passenger safety, accident black spot analysis ..."

Can you tell us what this is, or what empirical data did you compile to make this accident black spot analysis?

MR RICHARD LEE: To us here, first of all, case studies from previous instructors, like the black spots for accidents

along South Lantau Road, and then other than relying on the experience-sharing of instructors, we would also look at the locations where there were traffic accidents. We shared with the trainees as to the cause of the accident and ways to prevent an accident.

In addition to classroom lectures, during the driving training session, the instructor would also make explanations about ways to prevent accidents at the bends and they have the defensive training.

MR JAMES WONG: Ms Wong, Mr Chairman, if I may add to the answer. Just now, you talked about preparing for the establishment of the training school and you want to know how we are training the new recruits today. I just want to add to Mr Lee's point.

Mr Lee was talking about how we could do it when we have the new school so that those who don't have a bus driving licence, that is those only having a private car licence or a goods van licence but they want to become a bus captain of franchised buses, when we get the approval from the TD to set up the school, then we can help such drivers to sit for the bus driving licence exam. So that's the difference. Other franchised bus companies have already got such an arrangement, that is they help drivers who haven't got a bus driving licence to take the exam.

I just want to add this point. For our regular training, that is whether we have got the training school or not, we have already got the capability to train up our drivers.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: How many people work in your current training regime?

MR RICHARD LEE: Four, four driving instructors who are providing the training.

CHAIRMAN: And the future training school, how many people is it envisaged will work in that?

MR RICHARD LEE: Recently, we have applied for a licence from the TD, and the quota will be six.

CHAIRMAN: Six driving instructors?

MR RICHARD LEE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Lee, for your explanation.

About this accident black spot analysis, is there a copy that you can provide to us about the analysis that your company has carried out?

MR RICHARD LEE: Well, in addition to what we have said -- well, in fact, we can give you a report. During the course of training, we have printed some handbooks or leaflets. There are ten units. The first five are about safe driving, and for the other five, that's about

quality service. Then, for the second unit among the first five, it is about the major causes of traffic accidents, among which we talk about slippery roads, wet weather, the health condition of the drivers, the vehicle features, as well as the design of the roads. On such basis, we talk about the cause of accidents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You talk about the design of the roads. Where did you get information concerning this design of the roads and which parts of the roads would be selected for your analysis?

MR RICHARD LEE: We rely on the suggestions of the instructors, like the hilly roads of South Lantau, they have alerted us to the bends that we need to pay attention, the gradients; the usual one is 1 to 6 and then a motorist has to pay attention at certain points for such steep-hill roads then when making a turn, what is needed to make it a safe driver.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, may I also refer you to another document, which is the forward planning programme, at TD bundle 1, page 237.

If you can cast your eye to paragraph (g). This is your company's forward planning programme, which states that your company --

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in recalling that this was June 2017?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, this was June 2017.

Your company states that it:

"... may seek to cooperate with fellow franchised bus operators to achieve the above, by sending bus captains to the training programmes offered by other operators, subject to mutual acceptance and cooperation."

Have you liaised with fellow franchised bus operators on this matter with.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Mr Chairman, at the level of the driving school, for us to get somebody who's experienced, it is very difficult in this trade. Mr Lee joined the NLB earlier this year. In year 2017, in addition to relying on our own instructors who are experienced instructors, we have also asked an institute to help us with smart driving. At that time, we didn't have very qualified or professional instructors, so we tried to get input from a third party. That's why we have got this institute to help us, and in fact every driver has one such opportunity. It was done in 2017. Mr Lee joined us in 2018. He had over 20 years' experience in training. So we have become more sort of positive in trying to get from the TD an instruction licence, so as to get six instructors to do this.

So what we want to do is to be more positive, more active, to make use of our resources internally to

enhance our training. I was talking about the Institute of Advanced Motorists.

CHAIRMAN: When you say that every driver had an opportunity in this respect, what was that opportunity?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Thank you, Chairman. The opportunity to take part in the smart driving programme offered by the Institute of Advanced Motorists Hong Kong, IAM. So it's about awareness, mainly about the driving attitude, and talking about the different road conditions and they try to give lectures to help our instructors. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a classroom source, or classroom plus road?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) It's on road.

CHAIRMAN: And how long, duration?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Three hours.

CHAIRMAN: Is this opportunity offered to instructors or to all your bus captains?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) So there are two types of classes. The first part will be instructor to drivers, which is driving behaviour, and also there will be classes offered by IAM -- I'll be telling you the full name in a moment -- so IAM could provide a trainer course, we also call it an instructor course, back in 2017; early 2017, about 20 of our experienced drivers actually had an instructor course. And for NLB, we have

four instructors, as Richard was saying.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to bundle TD-1 -- it's still the forward planning programme -- at page 239, paragraph (c). I understand this is back in 2017, and the proposal is to have a:

"Regular review of bus drivers' performance [and to encourage them] to register for driving enhancement programmes, which NLB would be prepared to reimburse, subject to prior approval."

About this, has this been overtaken by your recent measures about setting up of training school and training courses, or is this still in place?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: As we have mentioned before, last year we used a partnership with IAM. At the beginning of this year, we have recruited Mr Lee. As a result, the training school will replace paragraph (c).

MS MAGGIE WONG: I come to another topic, and that would be on the topography of Southern Lantau.

Can I take you to a document by the Islands District Council minutes of meeting on 19 March 2018. The Chinese is at DC bundle 1, page 264; English at page 272. And I think Mr Benny Chan on behalf of your company was also present, if you can see at page 265 in Chinese and English at 273.

May I summarise some of the points raised in these minutes? The first issue they raised is whether it is safe to use double-decker bus in Southern Lantau. That would be at paragraph 30; Chinese at 266, English at 275.

Can I trouble you to read paragraphs 30, 35 and 36, so three paragraphs first.

Paragraph 30 raised concerns about using double-decker buses to serve on route 3M. Paragraph 30 is by Ms Sherman Choi. She is the senior transportation officer of Islands, and she said that:

"... the Transport Department has conducted two on-site tests ... with the police, Lantao Bus and the bus manufacturer, in November 2016 in Tung Chung Road section and in November 2016 on the entire route 3M ..."

Can I confirm that has been done, the two road tests have been done?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, I can confirm that the two site tests have been done.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are the two tests in writing?

MR BENNY CHAN: At that time, we require manufacturer of buses to furnish us with a report.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at --

CHAIRMAN: Did they do so? Did they furnish you with a report, the bus manufacturer?

MR BENNY CHAN: We have the report. We can give you the report after today's hearing.

CHAIRMAN: Which bus manufacturer was this?

MR BENNY CHAN: For the one in November 2016, it's MAN. The second one, June 2017, it's ADL.

CHAIRMAN: Alexander Dennis?

MR BENNY CHAN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at paragraphs 35 and 36, by Mr Fan Chi Ping, he was one of the committee members, and he expressed that one should not simply use sand bags during simulation tests as in actual situation, because the passengers are not evenly distributed and they may concentrate on one side. And he urged to conduct another test and in bad weather condition.

If I may also take you to another paragraph, just to complete this. It's at paragraph 44(b) [sic], in which I believe Mr Chan, Benny Chan, provided a reply, at 40(b).

CHAIRMAN: 40 or 44?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 40(b). I apologise for that. Your reply is set out at paragraph 40(b):

"During the two above mentioned road tests, the said company acted in accordance with the Transport Department's requirement to place metal boards, each

assuming the standard person weight ... to simulate the situation that the vehicle is fully loaded."

And if we go on to look at paragraph 44, by Mr Randy Yu, one of the committee members:

"He suggested that before official commencement of service of the double-deck buses in end of June, the department and the Lantao Bus should arrange two double-deck buses of the same model type to conduct another on-site test, especially for the turn in Silver Mine Bay? All stakeholders, including district council members, the committee members, the rural committees and village representative(s), to monitor the entire process and make improvement suggestions."

Lastly, paragraph 51, in which Ms Sherman Choi on behalf of the Transport Department:

"... replied that as to arrangement for another road test, the department will make appropriate follow-up with the Lantao Bus after the meeting, and committee members who are interested can participate."

If we turn over the page:

"... [as to] the suggestion that the road test shall be conducted under bad weather condition ... [the department said it] needs to coordinate with [other] departments ... But the department understood the relevant proposal and will try to arrange. [They]

understood the committee's concern about the use of double-deck buses to serve on route 3M, and will continue to keep in close contact with the bus company to strengthen the safety of the bus service."

May I ask, has this road test been carried out after the meeting?

MR BENNY CHAN: Chairman, that bus was newly procured. The first one was delivered today to Hong Kong. There are some formalities to be done, say for example to get a registration mark as well as vehicle examination. After we have completed the formalities we will liaise with the district council to arrange for the road test.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if that test is carried out, would you be able to provide a test report to the committee as well?

MR BENNY CHAN: Of course.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In this meeting, they also raised a second matter.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- do you have in mind a time frame during which this test is likely to be conducted?

MR BENNY CHAN: I think it is in about one month's time.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second matter I raise is about the installation of a tilting alarm system. If you look at paragraph 32, Chinese at page 266, English at 275.

If you read paragraph 32, Mr Kwong suggested about installing:

"... a tilting alarm system within the bus compartment, when the bus tilt angle reaches tipping point, the alarm will be triggered to remind the bus captain. On the basis island that most roads on Lantau Island are narrow with lots of turns, he suggested the bus company to consider installing the same."

We also see the Transport Department's response at paragraph 38(b). Ms Sherman Choi stated:

"The department understood the proposal to install tilting alarm within the bus compartments, and will research for its feasibility with Lantao Bus."

So has this tilting alarm system been explored by your company?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, I will hand over to Mr Yeung.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Yeung.

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Thank you.

Chairman, in relation to this system, we have been having meetings with the Transport Department. We propose that all new double-decker buses will be installed with ESP system. There are two functions. One is to stop over-steering and to improve the steering. The other one is anti-tilting. Before the critical point is reached, the speed of the vehicle will

be reduced to maintain stability of the vehicle.

In relation to the alarm system, if necessary we can ask the supplier to add that function.

We have this concern about the alarm. It may disturb the bus captain. Say, for example, it's an alarm for speeding and there is another alarm for door opening and closing. With too many alarms in place, it may disturb the bus captain. So instead of installing another alarm system, we aim to enhance the stability of the vehicle itself.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. The third matter --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- you say that before the critical point is reached, the speed of the vehicle will be reduced. How is that achieved?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: We make use of two devices. The injection to the engine will be reduced, and there is also a retarder, speed retarder, to reduce the speed of the vehicle.

In relation to the monitoring of the speed, we have a sensor. The sensor is installed on the chassis, right in the middle of the chassis. The function is to detect lateral speeding and calculation of centrifugal force, so that it will have the function of stabilising the vehicle before it reaches a critical point.

CHAIRMAN: So there are two aspects: one is fuel injection

is reduced. Is that a reference to diesel or whatever the fuel is?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: (In English) Correct.

(Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Reduce but not cut off?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Well it's from reduction to halting of injection, depending on the speed of the vehicle. On top of that, there is also the retarder which will reduce the speed of the vehicle.

CHAIRMAN: The retarder, does that involve the use of lower gears and/or brakes, or both?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Both.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The third matter the Islands District Council members raised is the topography of Southern Lantau. They raised the fact that there are many turns and speed roads, particularly the turns in Silver Mine Bay are very rapid, and they mentioned a problem that even single-deck buses have to give way to each other for there to be enough room to pass through, and there is no parking bay installed.

If I may invite you to read a number of paragraphs. It's 34(a), first of all, and then 45(a), stating that that particular road requires bus drivers:

"... to be equipped with experience and driving

techniques and shall be on high alerts in order to handle the roads ... especially the Silvermine Bay turn, because the slightest mistake can cause accident."

And at paragraph 52 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, could you identify the status of the person making the observation?

MS MAGGIE WONG: He is Mr Wong Fuk Kan. I believe he is also a member -- yes, he is also a committee member of the Islands District Council, at page 272.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we can go to paragraph 48, that's the vice-chairman, Mr Cheung Fu, also mentioned this problem. He mentioned that:

"... the biggest problem came from the roads and not the buses, therefore the priority is to improve the turns of the roads."

And stating that there is simply not enough room to fit two buses to pass through at the same time, "especially the rapid turn of Silvermine Bay".

May I ask you your views on this matter: is this a problem that caused concern to your company?

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the roads themselves are the problem?

MS MAGGIE WONG: First of all, the roads themselves, and secondly, some of the members expressed that it required

highly skilled drivers to drive that particular road.

CHAIRMAN: So there are two questions there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There are two questions.

CHAIRMAN: And the first question is: what view, if any, do you have about the observation about the roads being the problem?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman. First, I would like to take this opportunity, and actually at various occasions, including the meeting of the district council as cited by the paper. We understand that there have been road accidents in Hong Kong giving rise to worries about safety of double-deckers. But I must remind all of us here that for the road now, buses are already operating on that road. It's not the case that the roads are not used by the buses. So that's number one.

We don't have the plan to have double-deckers running the entire area of Southern Lantau. Our judgment is that, say, in places like Ngong Ping, Tai O -- well, for these places, they are not suited to the -- not suitable for double-deckers' operation. But in Mui Wo, double-deckers are suitable.

We have finished the tendering exercise and we have decided to procure a certain model of double-decker. Those of us who are here will understand that, say, for Hong Kong Island, there are also hilly terrains,

including, say, Stanley, The Peak, Shek O, et cetera, and these double-deckers also run in these places as well.

So the car model that we are going to procure will have a shorter length than single-deckers. It's 10.4 metres in length. For single-deckers, their length is between 11 metres to 11.5 metres or 11.6 metres. So it is shorter in length compared to the single-deckers.

Of course, we understand that there is this perception that double-deckers are more prone to overturning. Theoretically speaking, that may be so. But then we think what matters most is the driver's driving attitude.

Of course, single-deckers will have less risk of overturning than double-deckers, but does it mean that for all hilly roads double-deckers should not be used? No, that should not be the case.

So we think what matters most is the driver's attitude, and in terms of the hardware, we also have to consider what can be done. This time, we decided to procure a shorter double-decker. In the market, there are longer double-deckers, but we opted for a shorter double-decker which also comes with a lesser height, and we believe that given that this is the model and coupled with the appropriate training to be provided to bus

captains, the risk can be lowered.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean, Mr Wong, when you say, "What matters most is the driver's driving attitude"?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

We have a traditional way of doing things here. For every bus, we need a bus captain to operate the bus, and after all he is a human being. It's not like rail or an aircraft. There are so many automated processes in place. There are automated devices to help the pilots and, say, the drivers of trains.

In buses, as you mentioned, our chairman of the company is my father and we have been operating in the transport business for three generations. We started the business with my grandpa, and they used to say that vehicles in the old days were not as advanced as today's. Maybe I was not born when, say, the old vehicles were being used. But we deeply believe that the most important thing to ensure safety -- of course, it will be good that we have technology to help us, but what matters most is the driver's attitude. He must be professional. He must have the mindset that he should drive very safely. This is the core value that we embrace.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned earlier that the double-deck buses, in terms of length and height, are less than the normal single-deck buses. For completeness, actually, your Mr Chan did say that in the minutes at paragraph 40(a) at page 278, for the committee's reference.

CHAIRMAN: They were less in length than singles, but surely not less in height?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Not less in height but --

CHAIRMAN: But shorter.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) But the height is less than those normal double-deckers.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There is another minute I would like to refer you to. This is based on an accident that happened on 6 April 2015, when a bus of your company nearly fell off the hill when it was travelling down a slope on its way from Tung Chung to Tai O.

Do you remember this incident? We can show you the news article, if it may assist you.

That's the Keng Shan Road.

CHAIRMAN: What is the source of this material?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is from the Oriental Daily News, and that would be on 30 May 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you mind taking a look at the article, or do you recall this accident happening on 6 April 2015?

CHAIRMAN: And where is this to be found in the materials, the bundles?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Chairman, this is not found in the bundle but it is on the website link. We have provided a translation for your ease of reference.

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, I just read this article. It mentions that there is an accident which happened 42 years ago, and there was another accident which happened 12 years ago, and it didn't mention about the accident happening in April 2015.

Well, I can remember this particular photo. For these three accidents, they came with different causes. For the accident 42 years ago, the road condition back then was very different from today's.

I, of course, could not confirm the situation on the road 42 years ago, but as far as what I've heard, the road situation has improved a lot today.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time to read the material before you answer.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes.

(Via interpreter) It mentioned an accident in 2003. We have to go back and look for the information, because

we are not sure about the location of the accident, and also how it happened.

For the accident in 2015, it was not mentioned in this article at all. But the photo that was shown and the vehicle is stranded there -- yes, that's the one -- I remember that this happened in 2015. For this accident, fortunately, no one was seriously injured; there was no injury or death. Some passengers sustained minor injuries and had to be sent to the hospital. This photo looks rather appalling. The front part of the bus actually landed on a piece of land. After the incident, we tried to conduct a review on how we could improve on things. We have to check into the details further.

We looked into a speed limiter, so we just don't count on the braking system. Because we are talking about a downward slope, so we are looking into the possibility of adopting a retarder. So in future, whether we are using a double-decker or -- right now, for the single-deckers, they are retrofitted with retarders.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, do I understand you to say that the photograph of the bus that we can see displayed on the screen now is, as you remember it, a photograph of the 2015 April 6 accident; is that correct?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes.

(Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: But the article itself doesn't give any description of that accident; it's just a photograph?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct. The article doesn't mention about this particular accident. Maybe it's not reported by this article here.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any report, Ms Wong, of the 6 April 2015 accident for Mr Wong to remind himself about the details?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Chairman, I think this matter was discussed at the minutes of meeting on 18 May 2015 by the Islands District Council; Chinese at page 203, English at page 208.

This was in response to a question raised at page 201, in Chinese, and page 202 in English, a question raised by district council member Mr Randy Yu in relation to the safety of North Lantau Highway.

CHAIRMAN: So we should start with the question --

MS MAGGIE WONG: We should start with the question.

CHAIRMAN: Page 201 in the Chinese and 202 in the translation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Take a moment to familiarise yourself with that, Mr Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Wong, if you look at page 204, I believe your company's representative, Mr Wong Wah, was present. In English, it's at page 209. And the committee members in the Islands District Council on 18 May 2015 identify three main issues.

First, they mentioned the road design. That's at paragraph 79(c) by Mr Lou Cheuk Wing. He is also a committee member. He identified that the road design on Lantau Island is not safe, such as the South Lantau Road and the Keng Shan Road between the reservoir and Tai O, and it states that the Transport Department had conducted several improvement construction and that there are more than ten turns but only three received improvements.

The second problem is at paragraph 79(d):

"The Transport Department approved 30 tour buses to operate on Lantau Island, but the vehicle body of these tour buses are relatively longer than regular buses and when driving through substandard turns on Keng Shan Road, accidents will be caused more easily."

The third is at paragraph 81, by Ms Lee Kwai Chun. She's also a committee member, and she identified that the request to expand the road, South Lantau Road, for more than 20 years, but still the situation had not improved.

And in relation to the first issue, I believe Mr Wong Wah of your company have enquired about the exact location of the three improvement spots, and if we can go to paragraph 90:

"Mr Wong Wah enquired about the exact location of the 3 improvement spots to be carried out. He was of the opinion that the entire Keng Shan Road has about 30 spots that needed improvements."

My question is, did your company identify those 30 spots to the Transport Department?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, at this moment, we cannot be sure as to whether we have formally taken up the matter with the TD in the form of correspondence in writing, that is asking the TD to tell us which locations will get improvements.

For Mr Wong Wah, who was at this district council meeting, he is not present today and has also retired. I'm afraid I have to go back to check the information to see what has transpired between ourselves and the TD.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do so, and if you are able to obtain anything which casts light on this, please provide it to the committee.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes, sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your provision of information, I wonder if you could also assist by telling us whether these 30

spots are within the accident black spot analysis in your training programme that you are going to provide to your bus captains.

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, at this moment, as to the 30 locations -- I think it's roughly 30 spots -- for those 30 spots requiring improvements mentioned by Mr Wong Wah, at this moment we are not sure of the locations, so offhand it is impossible for us to tell whether they are the same as those covered in our training programme where we need to enhance the training. I'm sorry, I'm afraid I have to go back to check and clarify, that is those 30 spots mentioned by Mr Wong Wah.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please do so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next topic I'm going to go to is the illegal parking problem, and if I may take you to miscellaneous bundle 2, page 63 in Chinese, and the translation at 644-1.

If you can look at this page, the third paragraph, at page 644-1. This is a letter from the Democratic Alliance provided to the committee, a matter brought to the attention of the committee. It begins with the words:

"The industry actions of bus captains that took place in February 2017 and 2018 aroused the ...

different sectors of the community over problems such as illegal parking at bus stops, bus captains' treatment and working hours."

They identified a number of reasons for illegal parking, and if we go over to page 644, English at 644-1, it states:

"To eradicate illegal parking at bus stops, it must be dealt with from its roots and by formulating suitable policies, revising the outdated laws. The problem can only be resolved by multipronged measures."

Then one of the suggestions --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, where do we find that in the translation?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 644 at the bottom, 644-1, the last four paragraphs.

CHAIRMAN: The final paragraph?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The final paragraph.

Then over the page at 644-2, they made one suggestion:

"Following Singapore and installing cameras on all bus fleets. Singapore has since 2008 installed cameras on buses and the cameras are installed next to the driver's seats. When drivers discover cars parking inside the bus stop, they can press the button and record a video of 5-10 minutes. The bus companies will

then hand the recording to the police ... the police can review the recording ... in around two weeks' time the ticket will be sent to the car owner's home", et cetera.

Before we go further into this, does the company regard illegal parking at bus stops as a problem?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Well, in the case of the NLB, all the time we have been talking about the roads in South Lantau. You need a closed road permit before you can drive in South Lantau. So when compared with the case downtown, we have less traffic. For the information received by us from the colleagues, as far as illegal parking at bus stops, we don't have as many instances. Currently, this is the case. But then in individual cases, say for example at the bus terminus at Tai O, recent years have seen a lot of construction works going on, and at the bus terminus, where we set down and pick up passengers, space is limited. Sometimes there may be vehicles nearby, especially on festive days. Well, in fact, they don't have enough private parking spaces. We do have this scenario to a lesser degree, but when compared to the urban area, the problem isn't as bad.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reason why I raise this is because the minutes of meeting, again from the Islands District

Council on 21 March 2016, if you go to page 98 in Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: DC bundle 1, page 98 in Chinese, paragraphs 143 to 144, and in English, page 103-1. So paragraphs 143 and 144.

Both concerns were raised by the committee member, and they talked about the illegal parking problem or the double parking observed at Tat Tung Road. I wonder if -- what is your comment on the problems raised by these two district councillors?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, if I may defer to Mr Chan, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR BENNY CHAN: Mr Chairman, well, for us to operate bus service in Tung Chung, we have seen that for Tat Tung Road, the traffic situation there is quite bad. We have only got a single direction for traffic and a single lane.

For the points raised by the district council members, of course we are talking about the town centre of Tung Chung, and whenever there is the congestion, the entire Tung Chung will be blocked, and for our bus operation, it creates a difficulty. This is because our bus stop is at Tat Tung Road, and then it is sometimes

difficult for buses to depart from the bus terminus.

I think it is a problem for the community as a whole, and in fact this is a problem that is known to the district council for quite a long time.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the problem for your buses, in that they find it difficult to leave from the bus terminus, is directly because of illegal parking, or is caused indirectly by traffic caused by illegal parking elsewhere?

MR BENNY CHAN: Indirectly affected. As I have said, for this particular road, it is very busy. It is in the town centre of Tung Chung. Whenever there is double parking or whenever there is a traffic accident, then the town centre of Tung Chung will suffer from congestion.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are you aware that the police suggested to the Transport Department and LegCo that cameras should be used at black spots, fixed at the lamppost, to record this illegal parking at the bus terminus, and that could be the source of the evidence? Do you know about that?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Yes, I have heard about such a suggestion in the news reporting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you welcome such an idea?

MR JAMES WONG: From the standpoint of the company, of course we very much welcome any means that can resolve the problem of roadside illegal parking.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm going to another topic. It's about disciplining of bus captains. If I may take you to NLB-1, page 23.

Your company states that bus captains involved in serious accidents will be suspended from driving duty.

May I ask how long will they be suspended?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I think page 13 of the same document -- well, I think the page following the one shown on the screen -- I think we have explained. You can refer to item 3. If it is so unfortunate that there is a very serious accident, we have to spend time to carry out an investigation, to find out whether our colleague is to be blamed or whether it is not his responsibility. During that period of time, we may very well be suspending his driving duty. He's still being paid, because first of all we want to find out about the facts. In the past, there were cases in which something very unfortunate happened and the bus captain himself also asked for a break; he would like to take a rest. So suspension pending investigation is of assistance.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If I may take you to page 23.

It also makes reference to bus captains who are suspected to suffer from mental -- who require mental attention. Can you tell us how are these bus captains identified, those who require mental attention?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, I won't say that today we have any mechanism to investigate into bus captains who are suspected from having some mental problems, because it would take professionals to be qualified to give such views. As to how we find those who are in such need, we will have to wait for our colleagues to approach us, because it's not something physical. If they need more attention, they need someone to talk to, our company has engaged an outside company to work with us. Colleagues may call that company to receive professional help.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You have made reference in this paragraph to counselling service. Would this counselling service be provided by your company and paid for by your company?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

At this moment of time, we have provided a hotline for our colleagues. If our colleagues think there is a need, they may call a consultant service hotline. After talking to their operator, because some screening may be required, if that consultant is of the view that

counselling service may be needed, the case will be referred to more professional organisations. All these are paid for by our company. Our employees don't have to pay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you like to introduce a system for regular assessment of whether a driver is mentally and emotional fit to continue to be a bus captain?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

After the hearing with Citybus, I noticed that they are looking into it, to see if it's suitable. I have some friends who are psychologists. I would like first to find out how to help them, from a professional point of view. Well, we don't -- even for a psychologist, it's not easy for them to tell us who is suitable to be a bus captain. However, after conducting psychological assessment, the psychologist may be able to tell us what further assistance or support is required by a particular bus captain, and we can start to help from that point.

It's not an across-the-board approach where, like a medical checkup, a doctor can tell you whether someone is fit to drive or not. Everything I have said just now is something that I have learned from my friends. We are aware that sometimes our colleagues are under pressure because they deal with many different people

every day. We do need to provide different channels for our colleagues to vent or to talk. We will look further into it. Is it helpful to have some psychological assessment before they join us? Is it necessary to have regular assessment? Do we need random checks? I can't say because we don't have much information at this point of time. I can't give you a concrete answer. I will have to look further into it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I am going to the topic of remuneration and welfare. If I may invite you to look at two pages of your submission, NLB-1, page 17 and page 21.

At page 17, the second paragraph from the bottom, your company states:

"To enhance job attractiveness and retain existing bus captain, apart from wages and welfare package adjustment ..."

If I may invite you to look at page 21, which sets out the remuneration packages. Are they before or after the adjustment?

MR JAMES WONG: The adjustment you just referred to, when was it? Which adjustment?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm just referring to your company's submission at page 17, the second paragraph from the bottom, line 3. You make reference to "wages and welfare package adjustment" and --

CHAIRMAN: Could you read out the sentence?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes:

"To enhance job attractiveness and retain existing bus captain, apart from wages and welfare package adjustment, our company is developing some measures, include but not limited to the following items of enhancing their job satisfaction".

So it is this word "adjustment" I'm referring to.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

In relation to that table, it's July 2017. We haven't done the adjustment this year. Just now, Ms Wong mentioned about an adjustment. You find a number of measures following the paragraph she just read out. Apart from take-home pay, we have introduced some enhancements. So that's what it was about. And for that table, it's from July 2017 to now. We are preparing for the adjustment for 2018. We are still looking into it, about the rate of increase.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When will this rate of increase be determined for 2018?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

Under normal circumstances, there will be a pay rise on 1 July. This year, at the beginning of April, we announced that there will be a one-off special bonus. It is because we noticed that the two other bus

operators in the market, in around February or March, I think it was March, they have changed the pay structure of their employees. We are concerned that if we wait until July to have the pay rise, there will be a huge gap.

That's why, in April, we announced the one-off arrangement. The bonus will be released in September. In relation to the wage adjustment in 2018, just like we have done before, we are talking to the labour union and we are also looking at the company's situation.

There is actually an indicator for our reference. The scale of our company is the smallest, so we will draw reference from the two major operators in the market, in order to gauge the rate of increase, because their wage adjustment will be of reference to us.

Today is 19 June. We hope that in around July or August we will be able to do that. If it's after July, then it will have a retrospective effect.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be able to provide us with an updated table after the review has been carried out in 2018?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, of course.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Now, if we look at the table, we can see that the remuneration package, a significant part of the driver's

monthly pay appears to derive from per-day duty allowance, that is item 2. Do you agree?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many days a month would a driver be typically required to work?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

On average, it's 24 to 25 days.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So a rough calculation would be 5,500-odd, if it is a 24 days' duty allowance. So if the driver was sick, would that mean he would not get that allowance?

MR JAMES WONG: Right. You are referring to duty allowance, item 2?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, correct.

MR JAMES WONG: If on that day the bus captain is not working, absent from work, there won't be any duty allowance.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So let's quote an example. If he was sick for three days, he would lose about $700-odd; is that correct? About $700, assuming it's $230.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

Yes, I confirm. Assuming that a colleague has been sick for three days and not reported duty, he would not be given the duty allowance.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the attendance bonus at item 4,

which is given on a monthly basis --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, is the duty allowance that is lost, the $230 for each of the days that he doesn't work, or does he lose an overall package of duty allowance?

MR JAMES WONG: If you're referring to the duty allowance, it's on a daily basis. It's counted on a daily basis. Say, for example, if that person -- well, there are 25 working days, then it's $230 times 25 for that month. For whatever reason, if that person has worked less than that number of days, then we will times 230 by the number of days he has worked.

CHAIRMAN: So if he doesn't work one of the 25 days, then he only loses one day's $230 daily duty allowance?

MR JAMES WONG: If you're talking about duty allowance, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the attendance bonus, $750, awarded on a monthly basis? If he was sick for three days, would that be deducted pro rata?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Chairman.

When it comes to the attendance bonus, in Chinese it's (Chinese spoken). It's given to the employee on a monthly basis. If the colleague has missed work, for the first day there will be a deduction of 200; second day, 250; the third day, 300, and so on, and so forth.

So if that person has missed work for three days, that means the $750 will not be given to that person. That means if that person has not come to work for three days, the attendance bonus will not be given. If it's just one day of work, then what's missed is $200.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, if my calculation is correct, if the bus captain is sick for three days, then he would in total lose 1,500? Is that an accurate calculation? 750 plus 750?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, I confirm that. If the colleague has not turned up for work for three days, just like what was said, $690 deduction from the duty allowance -- well, not deduction but that will not be paid, and another $750 under attendance bonus will not be paid to that colleague.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung has a question.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Am I right to assume then that both duty allowance and attendance bonus is having the same objective; it's to encourage the employee to report to work?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Auyeung.

In response to your question, like you said, when we set the duty allowance, the objective is to encourage colleagues to work hard, and for the attendance bonus, it has undergone some changes, just like the safety

bonus. Maybe I have to check into old records to come up with a more exact picture. It used to be, say, once every year or twice every year, but colleagues told us that they had to wait for too long if this is distributed, say, once or twice a year. Later, it was changed to a quarterly disbursement. Now, it's a monthly disbursement.

Indeed, the aim is to encourage colleagues to work hard. So the objectives of the two allowances are similar.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer was "yes", in the short form?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is not the only bonus that incentivises workers to allowance. If we look at item 6, "Rest day work allowance", the worker or the bus captain will be awarded $625 per working day if they work on a rest day; is that correct?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

Maybe I can give you the rationale behind. I would like to use the best words to describe this. As I said, our chairman, Mr Wong, has been working in the transport sector for many, many years, and he had some practical thoughts. When the grass-roots and frontline workers

would like to work on a rest day, this $625 is an additional amount. They should already have the duty allowance, and then another $625 would be given to them.

Say for this colleague, maybe he should be working 25 days and then he would like to work on the 26th day as well, so he's sacrificing his rest time to work, so if we are not going to give him the rest day work allowance, indeed, it is easy for the colleagues to find some part-time driving duties outside, say driving lorries and taxis, et cetera. So instead of having them doing that, we would be giving them a good return to our colleagues, if they work for us.

Like we said, compared to other bus companies, we are offering an extra five days' leave, and honestly speaking, we allow the colleagues to choose to take leave or not. So sometimes a colleague would not like to take leave; they would opt to work. So, in other words, it's an increase in the pay for the colleague, in effect.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Lo.

MEMBER LO: For the rest day, is it by invitation or can the bus captain invite himself to work on a rest day? For example, he's one day sick and wants to make up the loss, can he, say, work 27 days?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Professor.

If, say, the colleague would have one less day on rest day, he would like to drive, we would have to look at when he applied for that. Say, for example, he said, "Tomorrow I have an appointment with a friend", but then, "The friend would not like to meet with me", then all of a sudden he said, "I have nothing better to do tomorrow so I will work tomorrow", so we will look at whether there is an actual need for him to work tomorrow. Normally, that application will be declined because it is a sudden request, because we have the duty roster drawn up in advance.

Then we would also be looking at the guidelines issued by the Transport Department and also we will be mindful of the actual circumstances, whether he is exceeding the duty hours, et cetera. So all these will be looked into.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So would this structure of pay provide incentive for the driver to work longer hours or working even if he was sick?

MR JAMES WONG: Now, first, when you mentioned he was sick, does it mean he's seriously ill or he's not fit for driving, or he is still fit to drive, although he suffers from minor illness? Our system is that if the colleague has some minor illnesses -- well, we would actually look at the extent or the degree of sickness.

If he is not fit to drive, then even if he doesn't want to take the rest day he shouldn't be driving.

Also, our core belief is that the more you work, the more return you will get. This is very much a servicing industry, and for the newly joined bus captains, they think it's a complicated system and we have to spend efforts to make the calculations for the colleague. But what we want to do most is for colleagues who are dedicated and hard-working, they will be given the pay they deserve. That's our aim.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Moving on to another topic. It's about passengers' behaviour. We have heard other bus operators, that their bus captains have experienced problems of passenger behaviour. Do you or does your company receive similar complaints?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, I would like to defer to Mr Timothy Wong to take that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Wong.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: James has said that we provide localised services, relatively speaking. Routes are centred around Southern Lantau and Tung Chung, and for the passengers, they are normally the local residents, and our colleagues and bus captains our regulators will meet with the passengers every day, so we receive relatively fewer complaints.

Another source of our passengers is tourists. Tourists' intention really is to sight-see Hong Kong, so there are fewer disputes involving tourists. And for the regulators, the problems that they encounter mostly have to do with whether passengers can carry luggages on board, and also if people go into Lantau, when they are carrying surfing boards and bicycles, et cetera. The regulators will also tell the passengers if they are too bulky, they should not be carried on board.

If there are luggage racks on board, then we will assist the passengers to take them on board. So we experience fewer disputes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We note that earlier we have seen one of the bus safety features adapted in NLB buses include CCTV at driver console with video-record function. Does this camera include or have audio facility?

CHAIRMAN: Firstly, can you take us to where this dealt with in the written submission?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, the submission is at page 20, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the bus safety features is at page 453 of the NLB-2 bundle.

CHAIRMAN: And page 20, would you read out the relevant passage?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes:

"In-bus [CCTV] video may also be retrieved in real-time to monitor the bus captain or passenger situation in restricted to emergency and security purpose."

CHAIRMAN: And page 453 of NLB-2.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, page 453, NLB-2, item 16.

Does this CCTV system or cameras have audio facility?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Well, let me explain what kind of cameras we have. We have two types of buses. One is single-deckers, the other is double-deckers.

Let's talk about double-deckers first. For the newly procured double-deckers, they come with CCTV functions. Your question just now is about audio recording. The audio function -- the CCTV with audio function will be placed on top of the bus captain, and for existing single-deckers, for the time being, no CCTV has been installed. If we are to retrofit such CCTV cameras, it takes a long time, and this system will involve recurring costs as well. We have to pay monthly fees.

Given our existing financial burden, we don't have plan to retrofit every bus with CCTVs, but for new buses, we will actively look into retrofitting CCTVs.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You just mentioned that the CCTV with audio function will be placed on top of the bus captain. What is the purpose of that?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: The audio function is mainly to help, say, if there are passengers making complaints and then, say, at our customer service hotline we receive calls about disputes with the bus captain, we will retrieve the relevant information to look into the real situation. We would not on our own initiative retrieve such files.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it is reactive to complaints rather than on a random checking purpose?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next topic is the design of buses and safety devices and if I may invite you to go to NLB-2 bundle at page 2.

The franchise agreement starts at page 2. If we go to page 5, clause 7.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, which bundle is this?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is the NLB-2 bundle.

Could you familiarise yourself with the provisions of clause 7(1) at page 5.

It makes reference to the grantee providing, amongst other things:

"... such safety or service enhancement facilities, installation, fixtures, fittings, [et cetera] ...

apparatus or equipment on its buses as may be reasonably required by the commissioner of transport after consultation with the grantee."

So, in other words, the Commissioner for Transport can reasonably require your company to install service enhancement facilities from time to time?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have any discussions recently with the government about service enhancement facilities?

MR BENNY CHAN: Mr Chairman, I want to say this. When we discussed with the Transport Department on the new franchise, the Transport Department has asked us to provide certain facilities, and recently, in our meetings with the Transport Department, we discussed safety devices to be installed on buses. We had discussed those with the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: When was that?

MR JAMES WONG: For the new franchise, that came into effect in 2017. We had to look into the exact date. We started discussing with the Transport Department towards the end of 2015/early 2016, and we discussed what enhancement should be made under the new franchise.

Mr Chan referred to our discussions with the Transport Department on safety devices and there was a meeting. The meeting was held several months ago. In

fact, we held two meetings in the past several months, and going forward we will have a third meeting.

CHAIRMAN: And when were these meetings?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Mr Chairman, if I may add to the answer. There should have been three such meetings. After the IRC has been established, there was this second working group, on 27 March, 30 May and 12 June respectively.

CHAIRMAN: And these were meetings at which the franchised bus operators, bus manufacturers and the Transport Department attended; is that correct?

MR PATRICK YEUNG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You refer to the discussions about the safety devices. What safety devices were discussed with the Transport Department at these three meetings?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could leave you with that question for the moment because I think it's appropriate we take a short break now, because we are going to sit until at least 5.30, but I think, given the imposition placed on you, that we give you a break. So we will take ten minutes now. Thank you.

Ten minutes.

(4.32 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.41 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just a while ago, Mr Wong, we have provided you with the TD bundle 1, page 98.

CHAIRMAN: What is this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is the paper of the Transport Department, TD_Paper_07, with the title, "Vehicle safety -- design, build, examination and inspection of franchised buses". It started at page 81. I'm focusing on page 98, as to the safety devices of franchised buses.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, Mr Wong, you have had an opportunity to read, in particular, paragraph 10?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, I read it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are these the safety devices that you discussed with the Transport Department in its three meetings?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. At those three safety-related meetings, we had a discussion of the above-mentioned safety devices.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to focus your attention to three particular safety devices. First is the geo-fencing at (c), "Speed control by GPS or geo-fencing".

Can you give your views or feedbacks regarding the

Transport Department's suggestion of implementing a geo-fencing system, ie a speed limiter that uses a GPS system to limit the speed of buses at specific road sections?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Mr Chairman, for us to discuss the GPS system, I think we need to talk about the background of the black box. As early as 2015 and 2016, when we had a negotiation about the new franchise, we identified a new supplier of black box. As Mr Chan has already said, GPS is nothing new. However, as far as operators are concerned, we have to bear in mind the frame point to the long-term. For the data collected by GPS as well as the black box, we have to transmit the raw data to the server of the company.

Between 2012 and 2015, at that time there was another black box supplier for our company. Many suppliers in the market provide the maintenance on a recurrent basis in the form of a monthly cost. For our long-term development, in 2016 we acquired the black box. Of course the black box has got important functions. At that time, under the new franchise agreement, we had to provide the ETA function. We looked at two suppliers and we chose our current supplier, called Openmatics. For the GPS of this supplier as well as the raw data produced, they can be

uploaded onto our server.

For geo-fencing, for this to be used to monitor the speed or to control the speed, we are open-minded. We hope in the future we can develop a way so that on specific road sections we can control the speed.

So when compared with other operators, I believe that we stand a higher chance to do this. This is because we have fewer interferences for the road sections on Lantau. I think for our black box system, I think it would be easier for us to send the GPS data correctly to our server.

What is important is that for the real-time transmission of the data from the GPS, and for it to interface with the computer on board, it takes time to develop the arrangement. This is because currently the black box is directly connected to the bus cam. For this to be done, however, we have to cooperate with the bus manufacturer.

Of course we welcome the new direction, but as far as NLB's IT department is concerned, the scale is such that probably it will take it more time to have it researched and done, but we certainly welcome such a move.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, since we are on the black box, may I refer you to your submissions at NLB-1, page 14, first

of all. The second-last paragraph, you stated:

"Through our in-house information technology team, we planned to develop an exceptional report system of using 'on-bus' black box data log to generate reports actively to spot any bus captain with potential hazard of their driving habit."

If I also take you to page 20 of your submission, second-last paragraph:

"As per commencement of 2nd generation black box system in late 2017, it provides lowest level of raw data of its data log. Additional application such as generation of exceptional report of vehicle speed at certain location is not included. We are now developing our in-house software to provide such information for bus captain performance monitoring purpose. At present, we will check and consolidate the raw data from data log manually upon traffic incident and passenger complaint investigation."

Now, do I understand this to suggest at the moment your company does not have an over-speed exceptional report generated automatically?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: At this point of time, no. When we were writing this document, we have considered introducing the exceptional report function in relation to speeding.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may also take you to NLB-1, page 33,

the first box on the right. In response to the committee's further questions, you provided supplementary information, and you stated:

"Refer to our existing black box system, it can record multiple bus operations information, which includes geographical location, speed, orientation, gear, door, bell push, [et cetera] by every second. To record and manipulate all these large number of data, it is require heavy capital investment of data transmission, data storage system and sophisticated software to do so."

Now, it made reference to this "heavy capital investment". May I ask if your company is prepared to invest on this system, as you stated there?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you.

When it comes to our finances, out of the bus operators, our company is of the smallest scale. When it comes to development of softwares or new systems, the cost involved, whether it is one bus or 1,000 buses, the development cost will not differ much. The major difference is hardware on board our buses. In our work to continuously strengthen our input in this regard, say for example what Tim has said, generation of exceptional report, we are willing to make such investments.

But you must understand that if we calculate the

cost per bus, our cost will be much higher than other operators.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: I would like to add that our current investment is on mainly two areas. First, hardware. Black boxes on board buses, and the transmission of black box data to our server. When it comes to software, as we have said, we buy black box for our back-end system software development, there is a fee. In the new franchise, we are required to provide ETA; there is a development fee. Every month, the upload fees or transmission fee of bus data, all these are development cost, and there is also manpower required to maintain this system.

Just now we said that the black box is able to record information by every second. Currently, our system will upload the information once every 30 seconds. If it's changed to every second, the fees and the server size will have to be enhanced. That is what we mean by capital investment. It's mainly the software development fee.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Wong, you made reference to the development of this software. When would you expect your company --

CHAIRMAN: Before you get involved in that, perhaps I could ask this.

You say there are two elements of cost. One is the black box and the other is software. Do I understand you correctly?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: What is the cost of a black box, in ballpark figures?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) When we first purchased it in 2016, per unit, it's EUR800 per unit, which is approximately HK$8,000-something back in 2016 and --

CHAIRMAN: Do I take it the black box side of the cost isn't the significant cost?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Significant.

CHAIRMAN: You say it is significant?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) It is significant, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Right. What about software?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Software, at the moment we have three headcounts maintaining this programme. Actually, the ETA apps and system we developed back in 2016 up till now, total cost around HK$1 million, and there's another issue that I would like to raise up, the installation cost, installation cost of the black box, because it requires skilful professional technician to install this black box. It requires connection with the supplier, who are teams from Czech Republic.

CHAIRMAN: This is Openmatics?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Openmatics, yes, in Czech Republic.

Back in 2016, when we have not acquired our in-house technician, per bus, installation per bus, it's up to HK$4,000 per bus.

CHAIRMAN: Up to?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Up to. It depends on the amount of buses that we can provide for the company to install black boxes.

CHAIRMAN: You were dealing with software and you said there are three accounts. You dealt with installation of the ETA requirement. What about the other accounts?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Sorry, Chairman, do you mean the other headcounts for IT department, or do you mean the installation?

CHAIRMAN: No, the other accounts, as you called them.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Oh, headcounts.

CHAIRMAN: As in head?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) As in number of employees, sorry. So we need three --

CHAIRMAN: Who are the other two?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) A total number of three persons have been deployed to develop the programme. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: So the cost is three people; is that it? That's

what "headcounts" means?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Yes, exactly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You earlier stated that your company planned to develop this exceptional report system to generate reports, to spot bus captains' potential hazard behaviour.

When would you expect this to be done?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) 2018, quarter 3 -- sorry, quarter 4 of 2018.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So later this year?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That will be an exceptional over-speed report, 4th quarter 2018?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We've heard other bus companies setting the criteria at speeds of over 5 kilometres per hour for every road section with certain speed limit, say over 55 kilometres per hour for ten consecutive seconds, for road sections with speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour. We have heard a bus operator using this criteria.

Can you tell us what criteria your company would be using for these Openmatics generated reports?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) We have to confirm the

criteria. We will be negotiating with our labour union to come up with a final decision, but we will take the other operator as a consideration as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And whether your company would consider this real-time capability to be concerned only with the matter of speed, or would you take into account other faults of the driver, for example sudden braking, excessive acceleration, that sort of thing; would that be picked up?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) At the moment, we consider speeding as a priority for the exceptional report, but we could also look at hard braking, harsh turn. Yeah, we will need to study further. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you also consider giving real-time information or monitoring alerts to the particular bus driver when that occurs?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Again, we will consider and we will need to speak to our labour union to discuss whether this will affect the driving -- it might affect the attention of the drivers, if there are too many alerts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If we go back to your submissions at page 14.

CHAIRMAN: Just before you do that, this exceptional over-speed report, which is the one that is planned to

be introduced in the 4th quarter of 2018, is that one that is intended to be done real-time, or is this something that will be generated subsequently?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Real-time.

CHAIRMAN: And the system, as I understand it to be in place, is an upload every 30 seconds from a bus; do I understand you correctly?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Currently, yes, but we are hoping to upload data from the black box per second in the coming future.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, and you indicated that there was a cost attached to doing it every second?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What is that cost?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) The network fee, so it requires more gigabytes to upload data every second. At the moment it's being uploaded every 30 seconds because all the data have been zipped and been uploaded to our server, so it requires less gigabytes to do it every 30 seconds rather than every second.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a ballpark figure for the extra cost?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Not right now, sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Nothing at all? No range?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Around HK$100 per bus.

CHAIRMAN: Per what?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Per black box.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MEMBER LO: Per month?
MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Per month, yes.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, before you move on, have you discussed these issues of cost with the Transport Department?
MR JAMES WONG: I don't think we did, no.
CHAIRMAN: Because we've looked at the list of the devices that the special group, the Transport Department convened I think in March this year where there have been three meetings. One thing that is missing from the six items that have been discussed is the black boxes or Openmatics devices. Am I correct?
MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) It's not on the agenda but I suppose all bus operators have installed black box on it.
CHAIRMAN: But it's not on the agenda -- has it been discussed?
MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) I think they discussed about the black box indirectly, relating to geo-fencing.
CHAIRMAN: And who set this agenda, if that's what one can call it?
MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) The Transport Department.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at your NLB submission at page 14, it's the third paragraph from the top, the last sentence:

"At present, a random selected 50 trips of black box data will be retrieved every month and this random check report will [be sent] to TD for their record."

And this was put in place in March 2018. Can I first of all ask -- it talks about selecting 50 routes at random -- who selects these routes?

MR JAMES WONG: Our company. It's 50 trips.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the criteria for selecting these 50 trips?

MR JAMES WONG: It's random. It's at random.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what, if anything, would be checked by your company in this report? For example, speeding, or any information you can provide us?

MR BILLY WONG: Chairman, in our second submission, in the last page, you will find a table in relation to black box data that we checked.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's page 487 of NLB-2 bundle.

MR BILLY WONG: Yes, it's the one shown on the screen, this report. As per the request of the TD, we have randomly checked 50 trips of black box data. We will look at the speed, whether there is any hard braking and any

abnormal driving behaviour. In this report, we only report a number we have -- a number of normal behaviour and abnormal behaviour.

In relation to more detail, say location, time, what happened, that is the raw data, they are not required in this report.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: How do you define "hard braking"?

MR BILLY WONG: Our information shows that if the G force reaches 0.2, then there is serious hard braking. So that we count as hard braking.

CHAIRMAN: Is that one of the requirements in the 2003 Transport Department requirements in respect of black box, 0.2G?

MR BILLY WONG: Yes, that is correct. The guidelines mention that, say, if there are accidents, then we have to provide data on G force.

CHAIRMAN: Abnormal driving behaviour is monitored in these 50 random trip checks?

MR BILLY WONG: Mr Chairman, the black box will also record the topographical location of the buses, the X/Y axis, et cetera. So we can look at the geographical location and the orientation that the bus is supposed to be in, and then we can compare that against the actual situation. If these two do not match, then that means

the buses are taking the wrong route or taking the wrong timing, then that means the bus drivers or bus captains are, you know, having abnormal behaviour.

CHAIRMAN: When you refer to X/Y axis, do you mean latitude and longitude?

MR BILLY WONG: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: And the orientation, is that the magnetic direction of the bus?

MR BILLY WONG: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to your forward planning programme submitted by your company at TD bundle 1, page 236 to 237. 236 is at the bottom.

We can see that there is a "Plan for automation of monitoring bus captain driving behaviour through data captured in black boxes or similar devices."

It mentioned about retrieval of data that requires special analysis, and if we go to page 237 at the top:

"Analysis results could be put forward for prevention studies to avoid accidents of similar nature."

Has your company carried out any prevention studies or any reports of that nature?

MR JAMES WONG: Can we look at the previous page?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, it is at page 236.

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

When we drew up the five-year plan, we did have such a plan, but as of today we haven't been able to deliver the plan. At this moment in time, we haven't worked on it. As we said, we have hope that by the end of this year we could strengthen work in that area.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I could go back to the TD bundle at page 198 -- I have finished the topic on the black box.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move away from the black boxes, may I ask that NLB-1, page 33, be put up on the screen. It's that top box on the right-hand side. You speak there about the existing black box system. You speak about the recording and manipulation of the data. and the "heavy capital investment of data transmission, data storage system and sophisticated software".

Then you say this:

"At the time being ..."

I think it perhaps means this: "At the moment, it is not a mandatory requirement for franchised bus operators to perform real-time bus captain performance monitoring by black box system ..."

I take it that's a reference to the 2003, 15 years old, requirement of the Transport Department.

Am I correct?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, correct. That was the 2003 standards.
CHAIRMAN: And the position being taken is that this is not a requirement of the Transport Department, so am I right to interpret this as, "And therefore we have a choice as to what we do"?
MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, my colleague has mentioned this. After 2003, while we were required to install black box, so all along we have been using an old model of black box. We couldn't upload certain data to our server, and when we started discussing the new franchise in 2016, we needed to work on ETA, so we replaced the old black box with a new model of the black box.

Now, once the new model of black box was put in place, we realised that we could do more. Of course, you mentioned -- I believe that if I understand you correctly, for NLB, could we do more? The answer is always in the affirmative. We can always do more. We will continue to review and we want to progress.

And honestly, given our scale, we were not in full grasp of the latest developments in the sector, and so please allow us some time for us to keep abreast of the developments and catch up.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: It was the requirement that you provide an estimated time of arrival of buses, the ETA system

that you refer to, that led to the enhancement of the black boxes; am I correct?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Could we have back on the screen the 2003 Transport Department guidelines.

So being able to monitor real-time the behaviour of drivers comes as a side-wind from having to do estimated time of arrival of buses for the benefit of passengers; is that right?

I'm coming to the other document in a moment. I'm just establishing what I think is the position, that it is ETA that produces by a side-door the ability to do things real-time?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) I think the ETA system gave us a doorway to look into more sophisticated black box systems. As I have mentioned earlier, the old one we used, we are not able to retrieve the data to our server; we have to speak to the supplier and get all the reports. So, yes, the ETA system gave us a doorway to look into a new system.

CHAIRMAN: Because if one looks at this document, the 2003 guidelines, the Transport Department spell out in the very first sentence what is the purpose of this equipment, and it is this, is it not:

"The purpose of the electronic data recording device

is to provide tools for the bus company to monitor and manage the on-road speed- and safety-related behaviour of its buses, and indirectly to encourage better driving behaviour."

That was the initial purpose. Do you still regard this as the purpose of this equipment?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may move on to the Transport Department's suggestion of installing speed display unit in passenger compartment.

If I may take you to the TD bundle 1, page 102 to 103, paragraphs 21 to 22.

21 states:

"It is a device which can be installed in the passenger compartments. It captures the real-time signal from the vehicle speed sensor and provides a visual display of the current speed to the passengers on board ... The existing SDU installed on a public light bus which may resemble the installation of the proposed device on a [franchised bus] ..."

If we go to paragraph 22, the last five lines:

"In addition, the FB operators are concerned that SDU would create conflicts and arguments between the bus

captain and passengers, and impose additional pressure on the bus captains which in turn would affect the safety for bus driving. The FB operators consider that the SDU is not conducive in enhancing bus safety."

Do you accept the summary made by the Transport Department at paragraph 22 as to your company's position?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman.

Regarding the speed display unit, I would like to supplement. Of course it would be up to the committee to verify the truth of what I am going to say. We understand that for public light buses which have installed this speed display unit, these SDUs were installed in 2005 and then in 2010 or even afterwards, it was decided that the speed limiter and the black boxes were installed afterwards. When they installed the SDU, the main reason was that for public light buses, their operation is very different from the buses. They are mainly operated by small and medium sized operators. But for franchised buses, there are mainly three operators. And the bus captains of public light buses may not have an employment relationship with the operators. Maybe it's just the owners of the PLBs will handle the management of some managers who in turn lease the public light buses to the drivers. So there is

no one to monitor the drivers' attitude and the driving habits. Well, in extreme cases, that is like that.

And in 2005, the SDUs were installed and the passengers on board, before the SDUs were installed, felt they were in danger because of speeding and they lodged a number of complaints and there were a series of accidents and ultimately the administration believed that speed limiters should also be installed on the public light buses.

Our view is that if SDU is installed in bus compartments, it means that the passenger will know about the speed every second. So let's take a step backwards. If the passengers know that there is speeding, do they have a brake to press on that they can retard the vehicles? Then what would happen is that the passengers will talk to the bus captain and ask him to "Drive more slowly because you are speeding". We all have to be mindful about the passenger's attitude. They may be angry passengers and they may display very good behaviour. We don't know.

Should we be posing a notice on the bus compartment, asking the passengers to call a certain number if they find there is speeding? Maybe some passengers will do that. But there is a high possibility, however, that the passengers will confront the bus captains.

Given today's technology, if there is a technical means to make sure there is no speeding of the buses, then we would prefer to do that, instead of asking the passengers to confront the bus captains and have conflicts with them. This is the last thing that we would like to see.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The last matter in the safety device at page 98 of TD-1 is the driver monitoring device.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on to that, perhaps just dealing with what you've just had to say -- of course it's an offence, is it not, under the regulations to the ordinance, to talk to the bus driver whilst he's driving; it's an offence, criminal offence?

MR JAMES WONG: He must not disturb the bus captain.

CHAIRMAN: Or the word might have been "distract" but yes, that's the spirit of the regulation.

At the moment, you respond to complaints that you have received from passengers, and that's when you might do, as I understand it, a search of the black box, to see if the complaint is made out?

MR JAMES WONG: It depends on the nature of the complaint, whether it is about the speed or the driving performance. If the complainant is not complaining about such matters, even if we turn to the black box, it

won't help us.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Let's assume it is a complaint about speed. "This bus driver was going too fast." Would you accept that if there is a speed display unit, one thing a passenger could do was simply take a photograph of the speed display unit, so there would then be empirical evidence to substantiate the complaint?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, as to the scenario that you refer to, so there is a speed display unit indicating the speed of the vehicle, the passenger takes a photograph. If it can clearly show the location, the section of the road, then perhaps it can achieve the effect that you mentioned, so using that photograph as a piece of evidence. But if it only shows the speed of the vehicle, it will still be difficult to tell with certainty as to when and where the photograph has been taken.

CHAIRMAN: Let's make it simple. A franchised bus is not permitted to do more than 70 kilometres per hour; is that correct?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So if the speed display unit showed 80 kilometres per hour and the passenger took a photograph, that would be objective empirical evidence of the behaviour of the

bus at that time?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, you said that a photograph has been taken, it indicates 80 km/h. Initially, I think you need to take a photograph of the registration number, to indicate who the bus captain is, because after all it's an allegation, it's a complaint from the passenger, saying he's on a particular bus. I haven't thought through this or think in this direction, but you outlined a scenario as to whether this can become the evidence for this. I'm just sort of giving you some initial response.

CHAIRMAN: So you mentioned the possibility of putting a number up for the passengers to call, earlier on in your evidence. If this was displayed, an email address could be provided so that the passenger whilst he's on a bus could email the speed of the vehicle to the Transport Department, to your headquarters; do you accept that?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. Say, for example, in future, if we have to install a speed display unit on board, we would accept the arrangement that we allow the passenger to inform the company directly, so that we can resolve the problem. I'm sure this is much better than the passenger taking it up with the driver, because there may be a confrontation.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would this not have a deterrent effect on the bus captain in not over-speeding? Because the real source of the problem is not to over-speed, so if you put on a speed display unit, the drivers know, the passengers know, everyone knows. Wouldn't that discourage the bus captains in not driving excessively or over-speeding?

MR JAMES WONG: In reality, I believe of course, as the Chinese say, your fingers are of different lengths. The majority of our bus captains in our company are good drivers. But of course there may be some who are more aloof or they are more impatient.

Ms Wong, just now, you mentioned that perhaps many people see that a driver is speeding; will this create a lot of pressure on him? I won't say that, but of course good colleagues, they will never speed, they will never over-speed. But for others who are more impatient -- just thinking off the cuff -- it all depends on what happens. Say, for example, when we receive an over-speed report, it all depends on whether we are being harsh about the penalty given in relation to the safety bonus, and some colleagues may care a lot about that. But I don't think that just because many

people witness the speeding, so he has the pressure. On the other hand, it depends on how he sees it himself. Say, for example, he's worried that driving points will be deducted or he's worried that there may be an accident. Sometimes, excessive speed may be the result of overconfidence on the part of the driver, or he may be a bit impatient or he thinks that he is in control of the bus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Moving on to the driver monitoring device. Can I take you to the website of the Ming Pao newspaper. The article talks about the anti-dozing device. Could you just read through briefly the publication on the website. It is dated 27 May this year.

The article, in summary, provided some sort of monitoring device for the benefit of bus driver on the buses which will ply between Hong Kong, Macau and Zhuhai on the new bridge. Are you aware of that?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes. Yes. I have come across this in the news.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have any plan with regard to exploring what this system -- apparently researched and developed in the mainland -- might provide for the company?

MR JAMES WONG: Mr Chairman, at this moment, we will continue to pay attention. We won't say no to anything

that would enhance our overall safety. We will continue to keep an open mind and we will watch the development.

However, if you ask me, my initial understanding of the news report is as follows. If you ask for my priority, of course we want to make good use of our existing resources, because, after all, the service that we provide covers a shorter distance, so perhaps this is not the most urgent item for us at this moment in time, but we will be watching the development.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm going to the last topic. It's the financial information of your company.

If you look at NLB bundle 2, page 71, it is a document of fuller disclosure of financial and operational information, and that's for the year 2012/2013.

If we go to page 72, it stated that for the year ended 31 March 2013, the total turnover was approximately 145.5 million, with a profit of approximately HK$9.52 million. Do you see that?

And if we go to page 132, that's for 2014 and 2015, and if we see the income, the revenue, we see there are three sources of income or revenue: the fare revenue, advertising income, and the sundry income.

Can you tell us where the advertising income comes from?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Mr Chairman, for the advertising income, it is drawn from the bus body. Different from the other two bus companies, we don't have a lot of advertisements at our bus stops. The main source of income for advertising comes from the bus body, the advertisements.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the sundry income?

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

In NLB, say for example, we have an agreement with Ngong Ping 360. If the cable car system has to be suspended suddenly, say for example due to weather or other reasons, then we will provide immediate support.

In addition, at our bus depots, we have got the arrangement to provide annual inspection for the non-franchised buses, and we charge a fee for that.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we see on this page, at page 132, we see the advertising income was $493,000, and in 2014/2015 it is $438,000.

But if we go to 2016 and 2017, that's at page 182, we see the advertising income dropped significantly; in 2015/2016 to 190,000, and in 2016/2017, to 87,000.

Can you tell us the reasons?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: If you look at the case 2012/2013 to 2013/2014, at the time the advertising income was relatively high because we had the Shenzhen Bay Port

route. On the part of the company, it was rather attractive to the clients in advertisements. For 2015/2016 and up to now, for this kind of advertisements on the bus body, relatively speaking they aren't as attractive to our clients who like to place advertisements.

Take Shenzhen Bay as an example. Many clients have stopped placing advertisements. This is because the production cost to put the advertisements on the bus body are expensive, and then for the media agencies, for this traditional form of advertisements, this is no longer attractive and therefore we see a huge drop. Very soon, we will have the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge being commissioned. We believe there will be an increase in the advertising income because many clients have become interested in the new port. Therefore the advertising income in relation to our routes, since we are running along hilly routes and they are not so visible, and so for Lantau routes and for South Lantau routes they cannot attract advertising income. For Tung Chung, we can have some local advertisements, say for example related to markets, but they are not going to draw a lot of income.

For Shenzhen Bay Port, currently, since it has already got a long history now -- for others who would

like to place advertisements, they would rather opt for other forms of transport, like the cross-boundary buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If I may take you to bundle NLB-2, page 27, that's your franchise agreement clause 34. This clause refers to an annual system report, and may I ask what is the name of the auditing body for you to comply with this clause 34?

MR JAMES WONG: Allow us a bit of time to look up the information for you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, take your time.

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, Mr Chairman. It is a local accountancy firm called Tony Yau & Company. We can give you the full name after the hearing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Would you be able to provide us with a sample of the latest annual system audit report by this company?

MR JAMES WONG: Of course, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Lastly, if I can take you to the same bundle, NLB-2, page 196. That's your organisational chart. It shows the senior management structure of your company.

Can you tell us whether the company has a dedicated safety department?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: Mr Chairman, as far as bus safety is

concerned, our company is of the idea that it covers all departments. Every month or on a bi-weekly basis, all the management as indicated on this organisation chart, the management staff will come together and talk about it. Every time we talk about bus safety. In a recent meeting we focused on training schools, so you can't see a particular person dedicated to safety.

Bus safety is the duty of the entire team of the entire bus company.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Can I ask a question on that. If a terrible accident happens, what would happen within your organisation?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: You mean should there be an accident, what our team will do? There is an established system in place to deal with accidents, regardless of the size of the accident. So we have a complete structure to deal with that. I can't tell you off the top of my head, but I can supplement information in relation to our procedures dealing with accidents. I apologise.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt you can provide that to us in due course.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Okay.

(Via interpreter) And I would like to add -- well, what I would like to say is that ISO 39001 has been

mentioned by the committee. The stance of our company is that we strongly support achieving that standard. Back in 2017, when we used on a trial basis double-decker buses on route 3M, we would like to achieve this international standard.

First of all, in our Mui Wo depot, we have done three ISOs. That is ISO 39001 quality system, 14001 environmental system, and ISO 18001, occupational safety and management.

In May 2018, that is last month, we have been authorised to use it starting from the middle of 2017, we have in our depot updated our system for the verification. BSI, that is the company responsible for ISO, told us about ISO 39001.

Our view at that time was we were concerned that if ISO 39001 is to be implemented company-wide, the cost will be high. However, when we talked further with the company, we found that it can be put on a trial basis by route.

So when it comes to B4 and B6, in relation to the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, when it is commissioned, we will take the initiative to cooperate with BSI to obtain ISO 39001 for these two routes.

If we achieve success for these two routes, then we will use it on the route that we use a double-decker bus

in order to achieve the ISO 39001 accreditation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In what way does ISO 39001 standard improve or raise the level of safe driving? Can you be more specific about this?

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) Sorry, I will use English because I have been reading it and understand it in English.

CHAIRMAN: You can use whatever language you like.

MR TIMOTHY WONG: (In English) The scope of the ISO is to develop and implement road traffic policy to improve the company's performance. In order to establish and implement such system, most important is to have the organisation, to have a standard between the organisation. So, in other words, there is no uniform standard from BSI or anyone.

So what the organisation needs to do is to create a uniform standard which could promote and implement road traffic safety system.

We cannot guarantee -- using this system, we cannot guarantee zero accidents, but the new system could help reduce the number of incidents and also improve whenever there -- improve our back-end system and our support whenever there is an accident.

One of the key issues or one of the key elements of ISO is the importance of internal audit. Having the

internal audit could help us improve and sustain our safety management system within the company in the longer run.

So, in the meantime, we have confirmed with BSI that we will go ahead with the ISO examination with our new routes, B4 and B6. The whole process is yet to proceed because the bridge hasn't been opened yet, so hopefully by year-end we could give the committee good news that we will be able to acquire the standard for our new routes.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I have finished my questions. Thank you.

Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN: One matter, Mr Wong, I would like to come back to you on, and that was the information you gave us about the use of special shifts. They are the 14-hour shifts. You told us that they were used on eight routes, that is eight of the 113 routes that you have.

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) That's for those trips at South Lantau, eight out of 113 South Lantau routes. We will provide the total numbers, because we still have some other routes at Tung Chung and Shenzhen Bay.

CHAIRMAN: So there are more than eight special shifts?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) The total number should be more

than that, the total number.

CHAIRMAN: Let me just confirm this. You have altogether 113 routes; is that right?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) No, should be more than that.

CHAIRMAN: More than that?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Yes, More than that.

CHAIRMAN: Then perhaps you can come back to us. What I'm interested in is being told what proportion of your routes are special shifts, and perhaps you can answer this now, if not, say so, but with a special shift, where the bus captain has a three-hour rest break, can you tell us where on these special shifts he would get out of his bus and he would come back three hours later? Because relevant to that is what are the rest facilities that you provide at that place.

So are you in a position to answer that now or would you prefer to come back with a written explanation?

MR JAMES WONG: Well, it involves a lot of information. Perhaps we will collate the information before we send it to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Please provide that information. And if there are no facilities or limited facilities for rest, no doubt you can explain if this is one of the places where you have applied for facilities but haven't been granted permission, so that we can understand the

situation in context.

Prof Lo.

MEMBER LO: I just have one question on the income statement. You have a fairly sizeable rental for non-franchised buses, so in the income statement, which part is for that non-franchised buses? Is it in the category of "Other expenses"?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, under "Other expenses".

MEMBER LO: About what proportion? What is the amount paid for these non-franchised buses?

MR JAMES WONG: Sorry, Professor, we don't have the information at this moment. Do you mind if we supply it to you afterwards?

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

Would this information appear in your interim results for the six months ended 30 September 2017?

MR JAMES WONG: Chairman, do you mean the interim report of the listed company? Because NLB doesn't have an interim report.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that's what I do mean. Do we find it in something that's published?

MR JAMES WONG: For NLB, there will be the fuller disclosure -- it's once a year -- we set out all the details.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can provide it to us subsequently

with the answer to Prof Lo's question, the cost of the non-franchised buses. Thank you.

MR JAMES WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That concludes the questions that we have, and obviously it concludes the questions that counsel assisting the committee have.

I understand that you wish to make and we are happy to receive a concluding statement. So over to you, Mr Wong.

Closing statement by MR JAMES WONG

MR JAMES WONG: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

When it comes to the provision of safe bus service, we think it is our responsibility. Our level of service is always regulated by the government under the bus franchise. There are changes in society as well as the travel pattern of the public. We have to keep pace with these changes. We have to keep improving and enhancing our service to achieve expectations.

The key management personnel of our company are also shareholders of our company. Therefore, we don't just focus on short-term performance or profit. We also focus on long-term development and sustainability of our company. To carry on the tradition of the company, we have been maintaining long-term and good relationships with our bus captains, and we think that that is of

particular importance to quality service and safety of our bus service.

The scale of our company is significantly different than that of our companies. As I have explained already, our fleet is only one 13th or one 33rd of other bus companies. When it comes to development of new systems or software, or the implementation of such, the cost incurred and the difficulties we encounter will be much higher and more than other companies.

Given the current bus franchise system, it is difficult for us to develop our fleet. Using Lantau Island as an example, our catchment is just the Lantau residents. There are two other franchises for Chek Lap Kok and Tung Chung, going outside to the urban area. We are different from other franchised bus operators who have different routes operating in different areas and the number is increasing.

So, from the perspective of operational efficiency, it's not easy for the market to accommodate a small-scale franchised bus company. However, having regard to the overall interest of the community, I do believe that the existence of our company can enhance the competitiveness of the industry and provide more options for Hong Kong residents.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned constraints, we

are willing to invest in the company and support government policies to enhance our capability to better serve the public in the future.

Lastly, on behalf of New Lantao Bus Company (1973) Ltd, I would like to thank the chairman and the two members for their invitation to our company to come here to explain to you our situation. I thank Ms Wong's questions, the secretariat and relevant parties, for their arrangements.

I would like to also thank my colleagues, especially frontline colleagues, for their contribution to the bus industry.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Wong, it remains for us to thank you and your colleagues for attending this hearing to assist the committee in its deliberations, and we look forward to receiving what I think is quite a bundle of material that is promised to us. It would assist if we could receive that sooner rather than later, whilst the details of this hearing are actively in our minds.

Thank you for your help. These proceedings then are concluded.

(6.06 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

[blank page]

2018 年 6 月 19 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士 ： 黃焯安先生，董事總經理（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

黃焯添先生，董事（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

陳天龍先生，副總經理（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

楊家寶先生，維修部總監（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

李春暉先生，培訓經理（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

黃亮霆先生，助理經理-營運支援（新大嶼山巴士（一九七三）有限公司）

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，早晨。我哋感謝黃焯安先生同埋新大嶼山巴士公司其他嘅代表今日出席，協助我哋委員會，因為佢哋除咗書面嘅陳述書之外，佢哋今日上嚟就係會回應律師同埋委員會嘅問題，嚟到協助我哋嘅工作。喺未開始提問之前，我知道黃先生你係想作一個簡單嘅開場白嘅，我而家係邀請你係發言嘅。

黃焯安先生：主席、各委員、律師、女士們、先生們，早晨。我係黃焯安，係新大嶼山巴士有限公司嘅董事總經理。今日好多謝委員會給予我哋機會嚟到今日嘅聽證會提供陳述資料。我哋對專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會審視巴士專營權制度持開放嘅態度，我哋一向都按香港相關嘅法例、專營權條款、運輸署嘅指引去營運我哋嘅服務。近月，我哋喺日常運作以及行政上做咗一啲同埋將會做一啲措施去加強營運巴士嘅安全水平嘅，措施係如下嘅：提升車長訓練時數及導師與車長學員嘅比例；要求兼職車長申報更詳細、正式嘅資料；成立車長訓練學校以協助合資格人士考取巴士駕駛執照；以及引用國際標準提高行車安全水平。

就上述嘅措施，非常之抱歉，我哋未能及時準備書面嘅資料畀委員會，我哋樂意喺今日嘅聽證會度詳細講解，如果有需要，我哋可以喺今日嘅聽證書之後去遞交詳細嘅資料嘅。唔該，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，黃先生。剛才聽到你嘅開場白，我知道大律師就會就新嘅措施就係向你提問嘅，而家我想係將時間交畀黃佩琪大律師，佢會提問嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒，主席。黃先生，早晨，各位代表，早晨。亦都感謝你哋今早係出席委員會嘅聆訊。感謝你作咗開場合，裏面係有一啲問題我係想同你探討一下㗎，呢個都係源於你哋係已經較早之前向委員會提交咗嘅陳述書嘅。

首先，喺你嘅陳述書裏面講到係兼職車長嘅數字，或者大家可以睇番係你哋嘅陳述書一嘅第 17 頁嘅。大家可以睇番嗰個圖表喇，講番嗰個兼職巴士車長，即係你哋所聘用嘅兼職巴士車長嘅數字喇，喺過去嗰六年，差唔多係三倍於之前㗎，咁呢個就係講 2012 年嘅時候就係一百三十七位車長裏面係佔咗百分之九點四嘅。咁去到 2017 年，當時--你見到喇，就係有一百八十三位嘅車長喇，咁裏面有五十三位係兼職嘅，就佔咗百分之廿九嘅，呢個係你哋嘅公司係聘用嘅情況。我哋亦都可以見到喺嗰幾年裏面，如果你睇番就係聘用兼職巴士車長係一直係上升嘅，由 2012 年至到 2018 年嘅情況都係咁樣樣㗎。所以首先問你呢個問題喇，點解係會嗰個升幅咁大？

黃焯安先生：唔該。咁首先關於--我想先係講一點，就係喺我哋公司嘅角度，不論佢係正職或者兼職嘅同事，我哋對佢駕駛嘅要求，包括安全等等，係冇分別嘅。就唔會存在喺一啲諗法話兼職嘅同事駕駛會唔會危險啲，我哋相信係唔會有咁崌情況嘅，呢個第一點。咁啱啱律師嘅提問就話，咁點解喺 12 年到到 2017 年其實呢個兼職嘅車長係會即係持續嘅上升，我哋嘅睇法就--本身我哋係全職同兼職嘅車長，其實佢最大分別就係佢哋兼職嘅車長可以係返工嘅日數少啲，返工嘅日數少啲，咁變咗佢哋可以喺工作上同埋佢哋自己嘅假期嗰個彈性，即係佢哋自己有個彈性去自己安排。

咁而本身我哋同其他另外兩間公司有個好大嘅分別係正職嘅同事同兼職嘅同事，其實佢哋嘅福利係差好遠嘅，但係喺大嶼山巴士嚟講，即係薪酬以外，其實本身嘅嗰個福利，其實我哋畀唔到話太多福利我哋全職嘅同事，以一個例子嚟比喻，其他嘅巴士公司佢哋全職嘅同事係有嗰個乘車--家屬係有個乘車證，咁但係喺我哋嘅情況，喺今天我哋個八--因為係八達通系統嘅原故，其實我哋亦都冇辦法同另外兩間巴士公司去共用呢個乘車證，變咗我哋嘅員工--全職員工嘅福利，其實佢係只係可以免費乘坐番大嶼山巴士嘅車，而佢唔會可以免費去乘坐其他巴士公司嘅車。

咁喺呢一方面，我相信係同--即係喺另外--即係當然我唔會好詳細知道另外兩間佢哋實際嗰個乘車證畀咗幾多個家屬吖，但係係有個明顯嘅分別嘅，喺全職同埋兼職嘅員工。咁另外就係頭先我提及到，兼職嘅員工佢哋係可以有一個彈性啲嘅工作日數，咁我相信呢個就係點解會都有好多同事係想去做一個兼職，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你嘅回答，不過其實我嘅問題就係想知道點解嗰個增幅咁大，你知唔知？即係話兼職車長嘅數目係咁多年嚟係有咁大幅嘅增加。

黃焯安先生：當我哋去招聘嘅時候其實我哋係長工、兼職同一時間招聘嘅，我哋唔會話因為財政嘅原因，定係我哋自己工作個原因，就淨係請兼職，唔請全職，主要都係畀嚟到嘅--即係嗰個人嚟到見工，咁我哋就話畀佢聽全職係咁樣嘅薪金，兼職係咁樣嘅薪金，咁當然我哋係希望佢揀全職喇，咁但係--因為全職其實對公司嚟講，當然嗰個調動會係--喺公司嚟講係舒服啲嘅，因為我可以確定佢一個月個工作日數係幾多，兼職始終都有個不穩定性，咁但係始終最終嘅決定權其實喺嗰個車長度，當佢係決定話「我想做兼職」，咁我哋都冇得話一定

要佢做長工，咁但係當然喇，即係如果律師你話點解我哋會即係請多咗人呢，因為本身我哋即係都係呢幾年嘅線路有增加，咁所以我哋都要一路增加人手。係喇，就--即係你話如果人手多咗就呢個原因囉，咁你話點解會係多咗喺兼職，唔係多咗喺長工，咁我哋個分析係咁樣，即係都係我哋會畀佢揀囉，係喇，就唔係話即係喺我哋去選擇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我嘅理解係正確嘅話，呢個係由於人手短缺又或者係有其他原因，又或者係嗰個薪酬，係咪因為--你呢度請多咗人，就係因為對巴士車長嗰個需求大咗？

黃焯安先生：你話個原因就好似頭先我喺第--一開頭咁講吖，我就唔覺得係話--即係如果其實短缺嘅話，我哋連兼職都請唔到喇，即係我會--我認為係咁樣喇，咁反而係--頭先咁講，就係佢--即係我哋自己都有諗過嘅，做兼職、做長工，好似個--都有同事反映過，即係嗰個薪酬其實唔係賸太遠，而福利本身亦都喺--即係個別同事喇，如果佢哋係真係喺當區--因為我哋嗰個專營嗰個服務其實就係好集中喺大嶼山嗰個區域嘅，咁如果佢本身唔係居住喺大嶼山，其實變咗--頭先我講嗰個乘車證嗰個問題，佢就唔會覺得話做全職員工好吸引，係喇，因為呢個係--因為佢哋其實係行內會講話一張乘車證係等同可能係 1,000 蚊咁樣嘅，如果佢哋每日都去搭車等等咁樣，咁但係正正我哋就係--即係全職嚟講就係同另外啲公司比較係少咗呢樣嘢喇。係，咁至於你話咩嘢原因，我相信就我哋自己去--當然唔能夠好確實知道每一個人嘅諗法係點樣吖，因為都係畀佢揀嘅，咁但係我相信都不外乎係本身全職同兼職嗰個--佢哋可能覺得個工資比較又唔係話真係賸咁遠，即係等等呢啲原因喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想問下喇，你哋公司會唔會係經常定時咁樣樣去招聘一啲已經退休嘅全職司機去喺你哋嗰度做番兼職司機、兼職車長嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：律師，請問你個問題係咪話我哋自己請番我哋公司退休嘅同事？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃焯安先生：呢個情況係有嘅，當我哋嘅同事佢退仔，而係佢係嗰個健康情況係繼續適合去做呢個車長嘅工作，我哋係都會去 offer 佢，都會邀請佢留低繼續提供服務。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）大概係佔百分幾？

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋嘅退休年齡係幾多歲，如果係全職嘅話，幾多歲退休？

黃焯安先生：65。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃焯安先生：呢個可唔可以後補畀委員會？因為呢一刻我哋唔係好掌握到究竟我哋有幾多退休嘅同事轉咗做兼職，但係我哋初步睇就嗰個唔係--應該唔係太多嘅，

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

暫時嚟睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，喺你嘅開場白嗰度，你有講過喺近月你哋公司係落實咗，亦都將會落實係一啲措施，呢個係指喺呢個日常運作同埋行政上面係有一啲措施，係希望能夠係加強嗰個營運巴士嘅安全水平嘅，呢個就包括係要求兼職車長係申報更加詳細嘅正職嘅資料嘅。你亦都係有講過，就話係樂意喺今日嘅聽證會係向主席同埋委員講解資料嘅，首先，可唔可以講一講有啲咩嘢嘅新措施？

黃焯安先生：我交畀陳天龍先生去回答，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你講，陳生。

陳天龍先生：主席，係，其實最主要我哋而家係會加強咗就係要求我哋兼職車長佢哋申報番佢哋個正職係乜嘢，同埋佢哋個工作時數有幾多，咁嚟到保障番我哋符合運輸署所訂出嚟嘅指引嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係幾時開始你哋係落實咗呢項措施？

陳天龍先生：呢個措施係我哋最近喺6月份開始嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱，喺6月之前冇咁嘅要求，冇要求兼職車長去申報佢哋正職嘅資料？

陳天龍先生：其實我哋喺嗰位車長佢入職嘅時候有要求佢申報佢嘅在職嘅情況嘅，但係而家個分別係我哋係會喺一段時間之內就會要番佢重新再申報番佢，update番佢嘅資料。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問下喇，嗰個僱員，即係指呢個兼職巴士車長喇，需唔需要係填寫一個表格㗎？

陳天龍先生：嗰位兼職車長佢喺入職嘅時候係需要填報佢嘅資料嘅，就好似而家喺畫面上面見到嗰張form咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋稍後就會講下呢個表嘅，6月之後有冇一份新嘅表要求兼職車長去申報佢哋嘅工作時間？即係話未入職之前有冇係另外一張表係叫佢哋申報咗佢哋嘅工作時間？

陳天龍先生：係有嘅，我哋已經整咗一張新嘅表去畀呢啲車長去申報番佢哋嘅在職嘅情況。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀個樣本畀我哋睇下，如果方便嘅話？

陳天龍先生：我哋可以喺稍後交番畀委員會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你提供呢個表畀我哋喇。咁同埋較早時候你亦都講過話會提供資料嘅，呢個就係黃焯安先生佢就話會話畀我哋聽係有幾多已經退休嘅全職車長係而家成為你哋嘅兼職車長，咁換句話講，呢個名單上面就有兩個項目要畀補充資料我哋喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃先生，較早時候你提及現時現行嘅係申請表嘅，咁我哋就係睇番一個係你哋嘅補充資料或者附件嘅第 468 頁，或者我哋睇番嗰份表喇，個表本身就並冇要求兼職車長係提供啲資料，即係話究竟佢哋目前係唔係做緊兼職，又或者工作性質係乜嘢，又或者有點樣嘅工作時間嘅。而頭先你作證嘅時候你就話呢個表格係有要求佢哋係申報呢一類型嘅資料㗎，喺邊度搵到？

黃焯安先生：係，唔該，律師，咁我想補充番，喺我哋呢一張入職填嗰張係有要求個入職者佢去填番佢喺邊度或者曾經工作喇，咁喺呢一張上面的而且確係冇話要求佢寫今--即係每一日，因為佢其實個工作唔一定係駕駛㗎嘛，佢有機會係做緊文職嘅工作嘅，咁就冇話要求佢寫番嗰個每日嗰個工作時數，喺遠--即係舊嗰張，咁喺新嗰張，頭先陳生提嗰個就係我哋開--即係有加番呢樣嘢上去。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係唔係淨係一個表格，係一個新嘅僱員嘅合約嚟㗎，以我所理解，定係兩樣唔同嘅嘢嚟嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：我哋嘅--唔係一個合約嚟嘅，即係係另外係在職嘅兼職同事都要佢去申報，即係有個申報表，係喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你有冇喺 6 月之後改過你哋嘅僱傭合約？

黃焯安先生：冇，呢份冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你睇番有關於申報嗰一段，即係而家嗰個嘅表格，係呢一個 472 頁，喺呢一段聲明裏面，現有嘅表格裏面冇特別要求兼職車長申報有冇足夠嘅休息時間先至開始替你哋工作㗎，可唔可以確認一下？

黃焯安先生：係，冇嘅，確定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）剛剛你話係有一啲嘅時間你會要求兼職車長去申報呢啲資料嘅，喺呢個新嘅措施底下，你哋隔幾耐要求兼職車長申報正職嘅資料同埋有關嘅工作時數？

黃焯安先生：我哋喺現階段，現階段個計劃就係要個同事先係喺 6 月份開始要--因為兼職佢都唔係日日喺度嘅，咁先要佢第一階段就係填番晒，報番返嚟，呢個係第一喇。第二就係啱啱你問到，例如要佢幾頻密去做，我哋暫時個諗法就係一年，暫時嘅諗法，即係可能要佢例如一年後都要將我哋嘅紀錄更新番，咁但係當然，我哋呢一刻--因為呢個都係個新嘅措施嚟嘅，咁我哋就諗住喺三個月後就再作檢討，睇一睇嗰個時間同埋呢個措施適唔適合同埋足唔足夠。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺個新表格裏面你有冇任何嘅要求僱員有責任係如果佢正職係

有改變嘅時候或者轉咗工，要話番畀你聽，即係要喺呢一個嘅聲明裏面講番畀你聽？

黃焯安先生：有嘅，喺上面係有寫，上面。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想返番轉頭之前，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你咁做之前，我想理解一下，呢個過程其實你係要求兼職車長申報正職同埋工作時數，已經開咗咗要求某啲嘅兼職車長去咁做㗎喇，係嘛？

黃焯安先生：係，開始咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何嘅兼職車長申報的確係有其他嘅工作，亦都畀咗工作時數你哋？

黃焯安先生：有嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇任何呢啲嘅車長話畀你哋聽佢哋嘅其他職業係有駕駛嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以譬如講番其中一位嘅車長係乜嘢嘅職業同埋啲咩嘢類型嘅駕駛？即係喺佢呢個嘅另外一份工裏面。

黃焯安先生：主席，我哋初步嘅資料--即係呢個都希望畀啲時間我哋詳細整理畀委員會喇，咁我哋初步就有--例如喇，係有--我哋兼職嘅同事佢係根據佢寫，佢例如係做一個酒店嘅車長嘅，例如。咁佢--根據佢去報畀公司，佢每周平均嘅工作係五天，咁每個工作日平均嘅駕駛時間就係八小時，例如呢啲咁樣，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀多啲資料，你哋兼職車長裏面有幾位即係你有問--你係問過呢類型嘅問題，係幾多位兼職車長，目前嚟講？

黃焯安先生：當而家已經回覆嘅就有三十幾位，接近我哋兼職嘅八成嘅喇，係喇，即係三十幾位喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，係，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，黃生。想請你睇一睇 NLB 第一號文件喇，31 頁，第三個文件冊，右手邊。你提供嘅資料就話你要求申請人將過去同現有嘅職業資料係喺申請表裏面填寫㗎，咁喺呢一個就聘用嘅過程裏面，我哋會解釋畀佢哋聽，無論係全職定兼職都好喇，嗰個工作嘅安排係受呢個指引去規管㗎，咁亦都就係要確保要係同外間嘅工作係要分得好清楚，同埋係要有足夠嘅休息時間，咁除咗口頭上將呢啲資料講畀兼職車長聽之外，即係話要佢哋係確保有足夠嘅時間同埋係同外面嘅工作有適當嘅分隔之外，仲有冇其他嘅要求或者係要求兼職車長去提供資料，即係話係喺你公司返工之前就係--即係嗰個嘅工作時

數等等。

黃焯安先生：好，唔該，咁喺我哋遞交呢個資料嘅時候，嗰陣時係未有嘅，只係係口頭上嘅啫，咁就係頭先我哋正正頭先提及到嗰啲就係一個新嘅措施，咁就要求佢哋去申報番，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係 2018 年 6 月之前喇，你係冇辦法去確保呢啲兼職車長係咪工作超過咗指引上面嘅工作時間，即係除咗係口頭同你講之外？

黃焯安先生：係，之前--6 月前我哋都係--即係或者到有一部分喇今天，係喇，都係要靠主要係同佢面對面去溝通喇，咁去了解佢嗰個即係作息、工作，即係正職工作嗰個時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想叫你睇番就係其他巴士公司嘅資料，就係呢一個嘅城巴嘅文件夾嚟㗎，第二號文件夾嘅第 400 頁、401 頁，呢個就係嗰份文件嘅第 2 頁嚟㗎，係一啲嘅重要資料，第 3 項就話「你現時有否兼職工作，如有，工作類型及時間」，呢個係城巴嘅申請表，我哋睇到係要求僱員係喺呢一個合約上面表明有冇其他嘅兼職工作，你會唔會考慮採納呢個申請表呢一項嘅資料去更新你自己嗰個嘅入職申請表？

黃焯安先生：啱啱睇到嗰個文件，咁即係當然我要再詳--返去同同事再詳細啲睇，咁初步咁睇，我覺得都係好值得去參考嘅，會考慮，即係我哋返去都會係考慮將呢啲措施加強。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋繼續，404 頁，係中英對照嘅，404 頁，404-1 同 404-2，我哋就見到係一啲嘅要求，可能同你哋嘅新表格差唔多，係僱員嘅守則，就係關於外間工作㗎，裏面有一啲詳細嘅資料，唔單只係有嗰個公司、薪酬、工作時間喺底下喇，仲有一個特定嘅聲明添㗎，呢個聲明就要求僱員係要確保遵行呢個資料嘅披露㗎，你會唔會考慮採納呢個嘅措施喺你哋新嘅表格裏面？

黃焯安先生：我哋自己如果而家初步去睇呢張 form，因為都要再詳細啲睇喇，咁我哋都--好嘅建議我哋都一定會去接納吖，因為--係，即係都未能夠好詳細睇，係喇，呢個都要返去再詳細啲睇一睇先。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）未講另外一個事項之前，我就想講一講關於係一個違例駕駛記分嘅披露㗎，喺你資料裏面，你就話要求所有嘅車長，無論係兼職、全職都好，係硬性規定要將自己違例駕駛記分嘅紀錄係講畀公司聽，如果有改變亦都要講，同時，公司係會隨機去抽樣檢查㗎，即係確保呢啲資料係正確。我第一個問題就係你會唔會係喺僱用佢哋之前先查下佢哋嗰個有關嘅駕駛罪行或者記分紀錄？

黃焯安先生：我交畀陳天龍先生去作答。

陳天龍先生：主席，我哋喺我哋請人嘅時候，如果申請咗入職之前，我哋係會要求個車長去攞一份所謂叫做「查底紙」嘅，咁上面係會睇到佢曾經被扣分嘅紀錄喺

度嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。想請你睇下有關運輸署文件夾一號，呢個就係運輸署嘅文件嚟㗎，第 135 頁第 4 段，喺第一行就話喇，所有嘅專營巴士經營者就係除咗大嶼山，就要求佢哋嘅車長申請人係會 check 下佢哋嗰個嘅記分紀錄㗎，咁你哋--即係除咗你哋公司之外，其他嘅巴士公司都會係會查一查佢哋個紀錄㗎，對於呢一個資料呢一句，你有冇任何嘅意見想表達？

主席：（經傳譯員）你頭先所講喇，呢句說話係不正確㗎，係唔準確㗎，係咪咁嘅意思？

黃焯安先生：我相信因為本身我哋其實呢一個--頭先啱啱陳生講話查牌嗰個措施，我哋係今年 2018 年初嘅時候開始嘅，咁我哋呢個都要返去睇清楚係幾時係即係正式係推行呢樣嘢喇，係喇，應該就 2018 年初嘅。咁可能就係喺呢度--即係話因為本身我哋交呢個資料上委員會嘅時候，咁我哋就唔會同運輸署溝通，即係大家填啲乜㗎嘛，係喇，呢個都大家獨立㗎喇，咁可能喺佢個紀錄度就未有我哋呢方面嘅更新咗喇，咁或者我哋自己更新咗，亦都--因為我哋自己個定位呢啲都係公司內容嘅一啲措施，咁我哋亦都可能冇去--即係當開會嘅時候又冇同運輸署提番呢樣嘢，咁所以可能大家有咁嘅誤會。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講之前--黃女士。你會唔會提供資料係幾時開始做呢個檢查㗎？

黃焯安先生：Yes, sure。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，可以，請你繼續吖。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗提供呢個資料，你可唔可以講下有關於呢一個係查下佢哋嘅違例駕駛記分，喺 2018 年 6 月之前，你哋嘅措施係咩嘢嚟㗎，知唔知？

主席：（經傳譯員）黃先生同我哋講就係話 2018 年初開始嘅，而並非 6 月開始嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番第 9 段或者係第 4 段吖，呢度講新世界、城巴兩間公司就會話如果嗰啲申請人佢喺過去三年之內就係有九分扣咗嘅時候，佢哋就唔會聘請呢啲申請人嘅，咁而九巴同埋龍運就係話如果呢一個嘅申請人喺過去兩年係扣咗九分嘅時候，佢哋就唔會獲聘用㗎，咁你哋嘅政策又係點樣，喺呢方面？

黃焯安先生：我哋暫時冇呢一方面嗰個好詳細嘅資料，不過我哋呢一刻相信就我哋冇話好似另外兩間公司咁樣，有個明確定咗話例如對上兩年或者對上三年佢係有幾多分扣減咗，我哋就一定唔請囉，咁呢一刻我哋就--我相信我哋冇呢一個 policy 喇，即係...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會考慮係實施有相關類似嘅政策？

黃焯安先生：呢個會考慮嘅，因為咁我相信就咁--即係就咁好表面去睇落去，其實最

主要我哋諗呢一個車長嘅--佢有冇畀人哋去扣咗分，咁主要都係想--即係呢個因為係正正就係其實佢平時個駕駛態度等等，可以好實際反映出嚟囉，咁呢個我哋都會考慮，咁但係當然你話要我哋喺呢一刻去答你話係兩年吖、三年吖、九分吖、七分吖咁樣，我就即係答唔到喇，不過會係咪--考慮下係咪同佢哋一樣囉，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，根據你嘅答案，喺 2018 年 6 月之前，你哋間公司係冇去查核兼職車長佢哋個違例駕駛記分紀錄㗎，係唔係？

黃焯安先生：主席，呢個我哋希望畀啲時間我哋返去搜集番啲資料再交番畀委員會，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就想去另一個課題，係關於租用非專營巴士嘅，...

羅先生： I have a question.

主席：（經傳譯員）羅教授係想問一個問題。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我想澄清一點，你係用更多非全職或者兼職嘅車長，呢個係你間公司嘅政策吖，還是因為你係唔能夠係聘用足夠嘅全職，所以你就係用更多嘅兼職㗎，係邊一方面呢？

黃焯安先生：你話係咪我哋公司嘅策略去請兼職，呢個就一定唔係，咁至於你話--即係頭先律師都有問到，點解會嗰個兼職個比例咁高，因為其實以往--即係亦都去講番喇，喺今次委員會之前，其實我都--我自己本人喇，亦都唔會知道其實其他巴士公司嗰個兼職人數，我都係睇到先知原來我哋嗰個兼職比例係比起其他公司係高咁多嘅，咁呢個我哋都會即係再去--即係我哋自己內部都會去--即係一路都有--呢一刻，就去諗番其實嗰個即係實際嘅問題係喺邊度喇，係喇，當然，我哋自己梗係請到想--傾向係想請全職嘅員工多過想請兼職嘅員工，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想跟進呢一個問題，黃先生，喺你個陳述書第 18 頁之中，第一號文件第 18 頁，第 6 段之下嗰一段同埋喺行車時間之前嗰段，佢呢度就講話--呢個講就係話「我哋好積極係希望能夠增加我哋嘅人手，譬如--例如可以係參加勞工處嘅職業招聘會同埋其他等等嘅相關嘅活動」，咁同埋你就講話「我哋喺呢一個聘用條件改善咗之後，我哋相信呢一啲嘅措施可以係增強我哋嘅人力資源」，你亦都提到有一系列嘅措施，包括係第一至到第六點。除咗呢一啲第一至六嘅措施之外，你有冇考慮過其他改善措施，譬如話薪酬方面或者福利方面等等，就係改善兼職或者全職車場嘅待遇？

黃焯安先生：咁本身喺我哋公司，其實每年都會--基本上每年都會去做一個薪酬嘅調整喇，咁至於你話福利嚟講，我哋喺 2018 年開始其實就畀多咗五日嘅假期我哋啲車長嘅，因為普遍其實行業嚟講，佢哋嗰個假期就叫做勞工假喇，就十二

日，咁我哋就係畀多五日佢哋，就同白領睇齊囉，因為我哋都覺得即係我哋自己嗰個出發點都係希望即係同事係多啲假期，咁有個多啲作息時間，亦都畀個彈性佢哋去選擇係工作定係休息咁樣囉。咁當然，你話人工加幅嗰啲，我哋就每年去睇番個實際情況囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個另外五個假期就係咪所有嘅全職嘅車長都適用？

黃焯安先生：係，所有全職嘅車長都有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就去另一個課題，係關於係租用非專營巴士，係第一號文件嘅第 17 頁。我哋喺個表格下低我哋睇到，你就話就係如果運輸署係同意嘅時候，咁你就會喺租用--係起碼向承辦商租用三十架非專營巴士，係有埋車長㗎，喺每一個週末都會咁做，咁呢個嘅數量係等如你嘅成個車隊數目大概係百分之二十五。首先我想問一問，就係關於承辦商，你係講緊一個承辦商，還是係多個供應商？

黃焯安先生：一個，one contractor。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁係叫做乜嘢名？

黃焯安先生：嗰間公司個名叫做冠忠遊覽車有限公司，Kwoon Chung Motors。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲係非專營巴士，就係係去應付喺週末嘅時候嗰個乘客量嘅增加同埋假期，就唔係喺平日嘅，係咪？

黃焯安先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你補充嘅陳述書之中講，喺 2018 年 6 月 15 號提交嘅時候，第 38 頁裏面，係呢個一號文件夾第 38 頁，咁你就係附夾咗運輸署不反對嘅書信，就係 2017 年 12 月 19 號嘅日子，咁呢一封信--我哋睇番第 37 頁，你信件裏面講就係話運輸署嘅同意書其實過去二十年都有同意嘅，咁你就係用唔同嘅方法就去搵番相關嘅資料，咁你就有冇搵過首封嘅准許信？

黃焯安先生：暫時未搵到，都仲係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會再繼續？

黃焯安先生：會，我哋會繼續嘗試去搵番呢個文件出嚟嘅。因為--不過--即係當然我哋--因為我自己加入公司就係喺 2011 年嘅時候嘅，咁我照我嘅理解去問番啲做得耐啲嘅同事，係喺--我哋知道就應該係 1990 或者 1991 年嘅時候已經有呢個批准嘅，係，咁嗰陣時亦都係因為主要就係嗰陣時喺大嶼山假日係有個好大嘅需求，但係平日就冇咁嘅需求嘅，嗰陣時係講緊去呢個寶蓮寺，因為嗰陣時轉吊車都未起嘅。咁所以就大嶼山巴士就得到運輸署嘅同意，咁就向--租用一啲非專營巴士，喺假日嘅時候就去幫佢哋高峰囉。

因為我哋嗰個公司其實同另外兩個公司都--不論喺規模上同埋其實我哋嗰個

--即係啲線路嘅結構都好唔同，咁我哋都係其實主要就係倒番轉，假日先至係我哋嘅高峰嚟嘅，反而一至五就其實係相對地嗰個客量就冇咁多嘅。咁變咗我哋嗰個出發點就係如果要我哋公司去為咗星期六或者日嘅高峰而去採購額外，都講緊兩至三成嘅車吖，咁嗰陣時當然係唔止添喇，因為我哋今天先有今日咁嘅數量啫，喺 90 年嘅時候，咁嗰陣時連青馬橋都未起嘅，咁當然我答唔到嗰陣時係嗰個車隊係幾大喇。咁變咗就有呢一個安排囉，就時至今日。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個運輸署嘅信件就係 2017 年 12 月 19 號嘅日期，咁但係你嗰個信件--你就係 2017 年 12 月 4 號嘅時候發出嘅，咁你就話嗰個運輸署就講，就話唔會反對你喺假日同埋週日--星期日嘅時候係租用不超過八十個非專營巴士，就係由 2018 年 1 月 1 號至到 6 月 30 號嘅。咁然後喺五十架就係非專營巴士就係每一個嘅星期六，就由 2018，1 月 1 號等等，呢個就係第 2 段嘅。咁我嘅問題就係邊個決定究竟係租用幾多㗎非專營巴士喺呢啲嘅時期裏面係邊個做決定嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：係，唔該。係我哋公司去決定有幾多部車，即係需要多幾多部車。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，如果我冇理解錯誤，你嘅專營巴士嘅數目一共總數係一百三十嘅，係咪正確？

黃焯安先生：係差唔多咁--一百三十嘅，一百三十幾咁樣，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）所以嗰個比例係幾高㗎喎，你有冇考慮過就購置更多嘅巴士，喺將來就由你哋自己嚟管理嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：因為本身喺--唔該先。喺本身喺呢個信度，運輸署批准八十、五十呢個數字係 maximum 吖，即係最高，咁實際我哋其實就點解要即係叫做申請多啲呢，因為我哋係以往試過係嗰個非專營嗰邊去同番我哋講，就係嗰個--可能佢哋臨時嘅調動或者攞咗--因為呢個要個禁區證入去大嶼山南，其實呢五十部車係要有個額外嘅禁區證同埋得到署方去准許佢去提供呢個服務，咁所以我哋叫做攞多啲，其實主要係呢個出發點囉。

咁至於你啱啱問，話我哋會唔會考慮採購多啲車喺自己車隊度，咁暫時就未有呢個計劃嘅，因為最主要就係正正頭先我咁講喇，如果就算我哋去買多啲車，其實都係為咗星期六或者星期日，咁一個禮拜七日裏面，其實係淨係得嗰兩日，同埋係就算係星期--唔係每一個星期六、星期日都會係有咁多客嘅，例如係天氣唔係咁好嘅時候吖，因為咁主要我哋其實今日喺星期六、日較為--即係個客量比平日較為多嘅線路，其實就係例如去大澳同埋去昂平呢兩條線。咁當一打風落雨或者天氣唔係咁好嘅時候，其實嗰個客量就會係大大咁減少，咁所以我哋呢一刻係未有呢個計劃去加多啲。咁當然，如果你話如果未來係講緊連我哋星期一至五都會係--長遠嚟講，星期一至五都睇到係有個咁嘅增長或者個需求係有喺度嘅話，咁我哋當然係會考慮去自己採購車。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邊個去決定呢個六個月嘅時期，就喺第 1 段同埋第 2 段所陳列

嘅，係關於租用非專營巴士？

黃焯安先生：呢個就我相信係運輸署嗰邊喇，就半年，即係你講嗰個問題係半年吖嘛，係喇，就運輸署嗰邊嘅--係喇，即係我哋都係入半年咁樣，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺下半部分就係運輸署就羅列咗六個條件，(a)至到(f)嘅，我哋可以咁樣就係講一講喇，就係「嗰啲巴士個年齡係六歲以下喇；咁我哋就係--我哋係採用相同嘅維修標準喇，好似呢一個嘅專營巴士一樣」，呢一個係咩嘢意思？就係「我哋租用嘅巴士係同呢一個我哋專營巴士個維修水準一樣」，咁呢個確切嚟講係咩嘢意思？

黃焯安先生：我想請楊先生去幫我作答呢條問題。

楊家寶先生：主席，多謝。所有呢啲非專營巴士，我哋都係會將佢納入為好似我哋專營巴士咁樣嘅處理方式，喺個保養同埋維修方面，咁包括係每一個月有一個我哋叫做"MI monthly inspection"，月檢嘅保養喇。同埋佢會--佢需要通過一個年檢嘅檢查嘅，呢個同專利巴士一樣嘅做法。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢啲所有嘅非專營巴士佢哋有冇黑盒？又或者限速器？

楊家寶先生：係有嘅，係有嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪一個合約嘅要求嚟嘅呢？喺你哋係同呢啲--同呢一間非專利巴士承辦商簽嘅合約係咪有一個咁嘅要求？

黃焯安先生：因為我哋今天係會要求我哋呢個營辦商去將呢部非專營巴士係要將佢去配置到等同我哋一部專營巴士，要佢咁樣安排喇，係，即係嗰個原意就係要做到呢樣嘢喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）今日之前，即係以前又點？以前有冇咁嘅要求，就要求所有呢啲非專營巴士都要有埋呢個黑盒或者係限速器係安裝好？

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個嘅要求？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）無論係你哋公司嘅要求定--即係話你哋間公司有冇要求呢個非專營巴士公司係裝配呢一個係黑盒同埋限速器，即係講以前有冇咁嘅要求？

黃焯安先生：其實你可以睇番呢度(d)嗰項，咁係喇，其實佢呢架車嘅要求係"similar on-vehicle facilities"喇，係喇，咁但係當然係佢入嚟提--即係幫我哋去提供服務嗰啲車喇，因為本身喺我嘅理解，今天喺運輸署對非專營巴士係冇咁嘅要求，即係同專營巴士係唔同嘅，咁但係就係正正呢一度都已經係提出咗，如果嗰架非專營巴士係去幫我哋去提供服務，佢就係要將呢架車係要裝備到同一架專營巴士一樣咁嘅要求。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，等等。(2)(d)嗰個係咪視為係運輸署嘅要求，呢一句

你嘅解讀係咪就話要求車上有一個黑盒呢，你嘅理解係咪咁㗎？

黃焯安先生：因為我嘅理解喺(d)嗰項當然佢係冇寫到"black box"喺(d)嗰項嗰度，但係我哋自己個理解，即係都係要去要求佢裝呢樣嘢囉，我哋自己嘅理解係咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係畀個樣本我哋睇下，即係睇下你間公司同冠忠關於使用非專利巴士嘅服務嘅合同嘅樣本，特別係我哋想知道有關嘅安全設備嘅。

黃焯安先生：呢個我哋後補番畀委員會，唔該，係，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者讓我澄清一下喇，以前，以前，我想問下，有冇咁嘅合約嘅要求嘅呢？即係話要求冠忠提供一個非專利巴士畀你哋嘅時候，佢係有埋呢個黑盒同埋限速器嘅，想知道合約裏面有冇咁嘅合約要求呢？

黃焯安先生：呢個我唔--我哋都要返去睇番嗰個文件先，係，係喇，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。好，去到第6項嘅要求喇，(f)嗰度，嗰度就係話應該係安排非兼職司機去行呢個東涌道嘅巴士線，之前亦都係要得到恰當同埋足夠嘅訓練嘅，由你哋去訓練嘅。好喇，想問下喇，點解東涌路就係嘅路線就特別係要抽出嚟講嘅？

黃焯安先生：因為喺--頭先我講就係喺嶼南，即係大嶼山南面嘅線路其實佢就係一定係會經東涌道，因為嗰邊啲路其實係主要係靠東涌到嘅啫，即係從東涌入去嶼南，包括去大澳同去昂平，咁我相信佢喺呢度咁樣去列出嚟，係即係主要係呢個--因為我哋唔係話去搵部車嚟去行東涌嗰邊嗰啲線路吖嘛，就係行嶼南嘅線路，大嶼山南面嘅線路，咁我相信係呢一個意思喇，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇嚟呢度就講出一個必定要遵守嘅要求，即係話必定要搵全職嘅車長去行呢啲東涌道嘅巴士線。我想問下喇，東涌道嘅巴士線有冇咩嘢特別嘅呢，有乜嘢嘅特別呢？同埋呢度亦都有一個好具體嘅要求，就話啲車長係要由你哋公司係畀足夠同埋恰當嘅係培訓啲車長嘅。

黃焯安先生：呢個我哋唔係肯定嗰個條款嘅原因，咁我哋在座我哋自己去初步去諗，就覺得係因為喺東涌道重建之前，其實係一條好窄好窄嘅路，而係同今天嗰條路就好唔同，個路況，咁但係我嗰陣時太細個，我冇印象係點樣。咁但係我哋相信即係其實喺即係呢個條款度，其實主要係--係喇，即係因為嗰陣時東涌道嘅路況喇。咁當然，你話如果係咁，咁而家都重建完喇，咁點解都仲喺上面呢？咁呢個都要再返去我哋自己同啲同事去詳細啲去傾一傾，因為喺我哋嘅理解，其實呢封就係運輸署出畀我哋，就每半年出一次咁樣嘅，咁就可能一啲恒常啲嘅文件，我哋亦都冇好--即係定期去檢討番其實會唔會有啲條款裏面係唔適用呀點樣，係，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你未繼續問之前，黃律師，呢個係運輸署嘅信件嚟嘅，運輸署或者可以話畀我哋聽點解嗰個條款係喺嗰度嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，好。呢度亦都講咗㗎，一定係得到你哋公司嘅妥善同埋足夠嘅培訓，我想問喇，你哋有冇咩安排嚟到確保呢啲全職嘅車長--係呢一個非專利巴士嘅全職巴士車長係會得到你哋公司嘅足夠嘅培訓先至去揸嗰啲車？

黃焯安先生：主席，我會交畀李先生幫我哋作答。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，李先生，請。

李春暉先生：主席，咁我講番喇，咁其實喺培訓嗰方面，非專利同埋專利嘅車長行呢個東涌道，其實我哋都有特別嘅安排嘅，我哋都同運輸署--都覆番佢喇，呢個嶼南路喇，由於嗰個路面比較窄同埋彎位比較多，我哋會行經呢類嘅同事車長都要接受兩日嘅路線訓練，目的就係要佢熟習喺路面上嗰個嘅操作熟習性、嗰個警覺性。咁喺呢一個路線訓練嘅同時，我哋嘅駕駛導師係會睇一睇車長本身喺呢啲彎位嗰個嘅技巧，咁我哋都會有個評估嘅，咁所以喺非專利車長去幫我哋做呢個嘅責任嗰陣時，我哋都會同佢做一個路線訓練。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信嗰個全職車長係需要五天嘅培訓㗎，係嘛？即係如果佢哋要行呢條線，佢哋就接受五天嘅培訓㗎，係嘛？

李春暉先生：我補充律師先，五天嗰個培訓係 for 新入職嘅車長，而現職車長我哋會因應番佢嗰個嘅需要，譬如頭先我所講，嶼南路我哋會額外提供兩日嘅路線訓練。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想問，有冇咩措施嚟到去睇下呢啲係非專營巴士嘅車長佢哋嗰個資歷同埋佢哋個水準咁呢，或者佢哋個扣分紀錄咁呢？

黃焯安先生：今天我哋去對待呢個非專營巴士同我哋專營巴士嗰啲會係一樣嘅，係喇，即係嗰個措施等等嗰啲都係一樣，即係有，有嘅，係，即係都係一樣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係今日，今時今日？

黃焯安先生：唔。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁之前？2018 年之前又有冇咩措施嚟到去查核佢哋嗰個資歷同埋佢哋嗰個駕駛嘅紀錄？即係關乎呢啲非專營巴士嘅車長，定抑或你哋基本--根本就係喺合約上已經係有咁要求，要求冠忠做到呢點？

黃焯安先生：因為今天我哋就冇即係要求我哋個承判商佢係將每一個佢嗰個--即係個車--頭先嗰封信有個車牌喺度喇，即係呢一封後面就有啲車牌喇，咁車我哋就有資料喇，咁但係佢係咪每一個人--因為其實人--就會涉及多啲人嘅，就唔一定係八十個人定五十個人咁樣嘅，咁本身今天我哋就冇特別安排要佢去提交番嗰啲人嗰個資料，即係今天就冇呢個安排。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）較早時候，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔明白，你今時今日有冇咁嘅要求，定抑或你將來係會係要求咁樣做？

黃焯安先生：今天未有呢個安排。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。係，歐陽委員。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒，主席。我想講番係呢封信，呢個係運輸署嘅函件嚟嘅，如果我嘅理解係啱嘅話，佢呢度就係畀你嘅呢個批准就會係 6 月尾就係到期㗎喇，你哋收到運輸署另一封函件係作出咁嘅類似安排嘅未？

黃焯安先生：未收到。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇申請？

黃焯安先生：有申請，申請咗。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時？幾時申請？

黃焯安先生：呢個要返去睇番先，呢個你可以例如--我相信都係喺 5 月底、6 月頭嘅時候，因為例如喺啱啱而家喺螢光幕上面嗰封信，咁我哋都係喺嗰陣時係--例如 12 月尾到期，我哋就係 12 月初嘅時候就寫入去續咁樣囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀個係副本我哋睇？即係畀運輸署封信。

黃焯安先生：可以，係呢...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇係就呢啲安排係同運輸署就係有啲跟進嘅討論？即係除咗寫咗信寄咗畀佢哋之外。

黃焯安先生：我唔係太明你個問題係咩嘢意思。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）同運輸署有冇進行過商討？即係寫咗信申請係續期之後，有冇再同佢哋商量過？又或者有冇開過會去跟進？

黃焯安先生：因為我哋有同運輸署見面呀、開會呀，但係就唔--你話相信係同我哋入嗰封信或者個申請而去開會，我相信就冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，關於呢項安排喇，我想問喇，你係咪每一路等，等到係運輸署作出批准，然後你先至係同冠忠係簽合同，係請佢哋係提供啲非專利巴士畀你哋㗎？

黃焯安先生：因為我哋同個 contractor 個合約就係長啲嘅，係講緊--我印象中--因為呢一刻冇個實際資料喺手，但係應該係三年期嘅，咁就唔係話我每半年當

我收到運輸署嘅同意喇，咁我先至再同個 contractor 去簽，即係其實係一個簽咗三年嘅合約，如果我哋需要同佢租車就同佢租車，咁樣嘅安排囉，咁但係就本身署方就係--係囉，就有--一路有呢個安排，就要我哋每半年去續呢個申請，係喇，我諗主要就係佢要去睇番啲車係咪符合番頭先講嗰啲要求，包括年份嗰啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你剛才就有提到，你提到就會係要求冠忠就係安裝一個限速器同埋黑盒㗎，即係由而家開始就要求佢安裝呢兩樣嘢喇，你可唔可以講多啲？你有啲咩嘢措施去確保佢哋會裝一個黑盒同埋限速器？

黃焯安先生：因為佢裝呢個儀器，咁佢裝咗上去，我哋就即係要佢通知番我哋佢裝咗咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪由而家開始？

黃焯安先生：之前都--即係一路嘅做法都係佢裝咗就通知我哋咁樣，係，咁而我哋--因為例如好似黑盒咁樣，我哋係可以即係睇番，即係從一啲系統度都可以睇番究竟嗰啲叫做上傳嘅數據㗎嘛，咁變咗都即係呢方面我哋就--即係你話我哋喺我哋自己有冇去話定期再去核實佢，即係係咪話例如佢每次嚟到，我哋都會睇下佢有冇呢，呢個就一定冇嘅，咁因為我哋都相信佢裝咗上去，嗰啲硬件其實佢唔會拆番落嚟，係喇，咁我哋就係會咁，即係佢第一次裝咗就通知我哋咁樣囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇書面嘅紀錄，就係記錄低佢哋係咁樣樣通知你哋？

黃焯安先生：可以，我哋返去補充番畀你，一係呢個，係，因為冇準備得咁充足，唔好意思。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，好吖，唔該你。

主席：（經傳譯員）麻煩你都提供呢啲資料。

黃焯安先生：Okay，sure。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問下喇，而家有啲咩嘢措施去監察呢啲非專營巴士嘅車長佢嗰個駕駛嘅資歷同埋佢嗰個駕駛嘅紀錄？

黃焯安先生：係，唔該。Existing，即係頭先都有提到喇，呢一刻我哋就冇要求我哋個承辦商去將呢啲資料提供畀我哋嘅，咁我哋都即係會--頭先例如我哋講，我哋兼職嗰啲同事去攞喇，咁我哋都下一步係即係有呢個計劃去向佢哋索取呢啲資料。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁會唔會有類似嘅要求，即係好似要求兼職車長咁，即係簽一個嘅聲明書，即係要求呢一啲嘅非專營巴士車長簽類似嘅聲明，先至可以畀佢哋駕駛呢啲嘅巴士？

黃焯安先生：我諗我哋呢一刻未有個決定究竟係點去即係實施嗰個措施喇，呢刻未有個確定點去做，咁但係就我相信會係啲即係同我哋本身不論請長工或者兼職，都係一啲類似嘅做法喇，咁呢個會--但係呢一刻未有嗰個決定，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係而家以我嘅理解，你嘅公司今日就唔知道呢啲非專營巴士司機即係喺任何一日用嘅，之前有冇試過係違反一啲嘅交通條例，你亦都唔知道佢哋嘅經驗㗎？

黃焯安先生：因為本身呢一個 Kwoon Chung Motors，其實佢同我哋嘅關係就唔係一個完全獨立，即係完全係一個我哋唔識佢咁樣嘅關係嘅，即係本身 Kwoon Chung Motors 亦都係其實係新大嶼山巴士嘅嗰個控股股東嚟嘅，即係持股，係喇，咁變咗其實我哋亦都係對於佢 Kwoon Chung Motors 下面嘅嗰個員工，佢嗰啲我哋都係即係知道佢本身係--即係當然喺大嶼山巴士，我哋係唔會話好詳細知道每一個同事嘅嗰個--即係我哋本身大嶼山巴士冇存檔吖，但係我哋知道佢本身喺招聘等等都係有去即係採取一定嘅措施去確保嗰個係一個 qualified 嘅車長。咁呢個都可以我哋整理一下啲資料，再補充番嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）有三類型嘅巴士喇，全職、兼職同埋駕駛非專營巴士嘅司機，就有唔同嘅待遇㗎，即係對於最後嘅一種。我問題就係話呢啲非專營巴士都有黑盒嘅，呢啲黑盒嘅資料幾時會用到？因為呢啲巴士係由非專營巴士嘅司機駕駛㗎嘛，咁所以係幾時會用到黑盒嘅資料去監察佢哋嘅表現？

黃焯安先生：係，唔該，委員。咁喺今天我哋個系統度係睇到呢啲入嚟幫我哋大嶼山巴士做嘢嘅呢啲非專營巴士嘅黑盒嘅紀錄，我哋係 access 到呢個紀錄嘅。即係今天已經係我哋係接觸到，係。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁但係呢啲資料有冇試過用到去監察或者評估佢哋嘅駕駛表現？

黃焯安先生：因為本身講番唔係淨係呢啲非專營巴士喇，我哋自己喺我哋嘅車隊度已經裝咗黑盒，咁本身我哋去檢視呢啲我哋自己--即係先唔好講話 non-franchised 先，我哋都係用一個 random check 嘅方式，每個月咁就去檢查究竟我哋呢啲車有冇一啲--或者啲車長有冇啲駕駛嘅問題嘅，咁喺非專營巴士呢啲，我哋相信都係用一個同樣嘅--即係喺我哋自己嗰邊，去同樣去一個方法，但係呢一刻我要即係返去都要問番啲同事，究竟呢個 random check 呢一個抽查係有冇抽查到嗰八十部車喇，喺星期六、日嘅時候。因為呢一刻我抱歉，未能夠去確定答到你，但係本身我哋整體都係咁樣去抽查。

主席：（經傳譯員）講其他嘢之前我想問，你哋六個人冇一個可以答到呢個咁簡單嘅問題？即係話會唔會去檢查下呢啲非專營巴士上面嘅黑盒。

陳天龍先生：主席，我想補充少少，而家我哋就暫時未係好主動咁去 check 個黑盒

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

裏面嘅資料嘅，但係裏面嘅資料我哋會點樣用？我哋如果收到投訴嘅時候，我哋就一定會抽查裏面黑盒嘅資料去調查個事件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，即係你係有投訴先至會採取行為，係嘛？

陳天龍先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係同埋有意外嘅時候？

陳天龍先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁會唔會隨機抽樣查呢啲非專營巴士嘅黑盒㗎？

陳天龍先生：我哋亦都有做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師，喺適合嘅時間我哋想休息二十分鐘。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我想係先講一講關於呢一個安全表現方面先。黃生，除咗呢一個嘅問題之外，仲有冇其他嘅措施去監察非專營巴士佢哋嘅安全表現？即係你哋公司用緊呢啲呢類型嘅巴士司機，譬如係一啲神秘嘅乘客，或者會唔會係將你哋嘅員工係要佢哋搭巴士去監察呢啲巴士司機嘅表現？

陳天龍先生：主席，我哋其實每個月都有做 mystery shoppers 嘅，咁其實呢一方面都係唔分我哋大嶼山嘅車吖，定係入嚟幫手嘅非專營巴士嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個神秘嘅檢查就會係即係三種嘅巴士車長都會用嘅？即係如果你發現一啲唔合標準、低於標準嘅表現，或者超速，又會採取咩嘢嘅紀律行動，即係關於非專營巴士司機呢方面？

陳天龍先生：如果我哋發現有譬如係超速嘅情況，咁我哋會有一啲--我哋會發警告信畀--甚至乎我哋會 suspend 佢哋，唔畀佢入嚟大嶼山嗰度做嘢嘅，如果嚴重起上嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個係一個適合嘅時間。黃生同埋你嘅同事，我哋而家會休息二十分鐘，跟住喺呢個 11 點 50 分再繼續。

上午 11 時 28 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 50 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。

黃焯安先生：Excuse me，Chairman，我有啲資料想補充番，係關於頭先講--excuse me。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，可以，可以補充。

黃焯安先生：關於頭先我哋講話新入職嘅同事去做嗰個查底嗰個紀錄，我想補充番，我哋唔係由 2018 年開始嘅，我哋呢個做法已經係一個好長嘅時間，即係好多年㗎喇。我哋 2018 年做嗰個係因為以往我哋每年可能只係會揀一部分嘅車長出嚟去抽查佢哋嗰個紀錄，喺 2018 年我哋做嘅，年初係講緊我哋全體嘅車長，我哋向佢哋再攞--即係去查多次全體車長，我哋自己個計劃係每年...

主席：Thank you.

黃焯安先生：係喇，都去查，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講緊就係呢啲關於係違例駕駛記分嘅紀錄，係咪？

黃焯安先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外仲有啲跟進問題，黃生，之前你講過，關於嗰啲安全裝置方面，嗰啲非專營巴士嘅硬件，你話佢哋係有同專營巴士相同嘅裝置，我哋就睇番第 453 頁，就係文件冊嘅第 2 號，呢度就係有講到所有喺新大嶼山巴士公司嘅安全嘅裝置嘅，呢度一共有二十四個裝置嘅，你可唔可以確認又或者基於你嘅理解，呢啲所有嘅非專營巴士都係有裝置所有 453 頁嘅所列出嘅一啲嘅裝置？

黃焯安先生：唔該，抱歉，要少少時間去確定番。因為喺呢廿四個 item 嗰度，有一--例如講雙層巴士嗰個，就--唔好意思，係，確認有嘅。因為頭先我問清楚同事，我哋都有租用雙層巴士嘅，裏面嘅係有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。亦都有跟進問題，你話你會租用非專營巴士，就有冠忠公司，係咪？你係從呢個冠忠遊覽車公司去租用嘅？

黃焯安先生：Kwoon Chung Motors。

黃女士：Kwoon Chung Motors. （經傳譯員）你係咪新大嶼山巴士公司百分之九十九點九九都係冠忠遊覽車有限公司所擁有㗎喇，呢個後者係一間上市公司嚟嘅？

黃焯安先生：個母公司係 Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings，但係中間可能係有用其他公司嚟持有新大嶼山巴士嘅股份，我嘅喺呢度--係喇，要去睇番，但係最終嗰個母公司就係 Kwoon Chung Bus Holdings，冠忠巴士集團。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你間公司，換句話嚟講，就係向你嘅母公司去租用非專營巴士？

黃焯安先生：係，正確，係，但係我哋係有公開去投標嘅，呢個過程係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃先生，你自己同埋 Timothy Wong 就係黃焯添先生都係呢一個嘅冠忠遊覽車有限公司嘅股東呢？

黃焯安先生：係，正確，本身我自己冠忠巴士集團係個職銜係行政總裁，黃焯添先生係冠忠巴士集團嘅營運總監。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。喺 2017 年冠忠嘅主席就係 Mr Matthew Wong，係你嘅爸爸，啱唔啱㗎？

黃焯安先生：係，正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我個問題就係話當你間公司係租用非專營巴士公司，係同母公司去租用嘅時候，嗰個佢哋嗰個租金係點樣去取得大家去同意個租金嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：頭先正如我咁講，就我哋每三年會係去投標。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）個租金係點樣去釐訂嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：係落標嗰間公司去決定嗰個定價咁樣，而我哋 NLB 就去決定用幾多部車。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）落標嘅公司係指邊個？

黃焯安先生：唔好意思，你嘅問題係講緊--即係落標嗰間就叫做 Kwoon Chung Motors。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道運輸署有冇咁嘅要求又或者有冇指引就講及如果用上呢個非專營巴士嘅租賃嗰方面，喺定價嗰方面佢哋有冇乜嘢指引嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：冇嘅，關於價格上嘅，運輸署就冇呢個 requirements 或者 guideline。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。等我繼續，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，我就想問下，呢個咁嘅安排，同冠忠巴士呢個安排，你就透過呢個安排，你哋就係租嗰啲非專利巴士，我就想問，係咪 2018 年 5 月 1 號開始嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：Chairman，我哋手頭上最--而家 existing 現有嗰份係 2016 年 8 月生效嘅，到而家，2016 年 8 月。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺嗰日之前，我就想問，你哋有冇其他嘅供應商係提供呢一啲非專營巴士畀你哋用呢？

黃焯安先生：冇，係一直都係 Kwoon Chung Motors。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀我哋知道乜嘢叫做「一直以嚟」？係幾時呢？

黃焯安先生：我都係聽番--我哋嘅理解，就係喺--因為冠忠收購大嶼山巴士嘅時候就係 1992 年嘅，冠忠開始向大嶼山提供服務就應該係 1990 或者 1991 年嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）等我繼續。想問下，你哋有冇咩嘢措施去監察住呢啲非專利巴士嘅車長佢哋嘅身體狀況，有冇監察咗，睇咗，然後先至係畀佢哋上班呢？譬如話有冇驗身嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：我想確定個問題係講緊佢每一次駕駛吖，定係佢開始駕駛，即係入職前咁樣，即係駕駛--幫大嶼山巴士駕駛前？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）兩者，兩者都問。

黃焯安先生：如果你話每一次駕駛前，呢個冇嘅，一定唔會話每一次駕駛前，因為包括唔好話係非專營巴士提供嘅車長，我哋自己大嶼山巴士嘅車長，我哋都冇可能每一次開車前去幫佢做一個檢查。至於你講話另外嘅身體檢查，就係例如喺入職嘅時候，佢就會去做身體檢查。

因為我都想補充，其實頭先即係本身，因為 Kwoon Chung Motors 同大嶼山巴士係一個姊妹公司嘅關係，其實佢本身都有好多今天--因為大嶼山巴士其實規模係較為細嘅，得一百三十部車，而有好多後勤嘅工作人員或者一啲主要嘅管理人員其實都係要靠母公司嗰面去支援嘅，如果唔係，係冇可能去可以跟到另外--即係大嶼山巴士去做到可以好似另外兩間專營巴士公司咁樣嘅相近嘅表現出嚟嘅，我哋大嶼山巴士只係佢哋嘅十三分之一或者三十三分之一咁嘅規模。

所以係當你話如果喺冠忠嗰個車長佢去駕駛大嶼山巴士之前會唔會話真係有一個文件正式存入去大嶼山巴士個紀錄度話佢做咗身體檢查，呢個我都要返去問番我自己嘅同事佢哋嗰個實際嗰個操作係點樣，但係本身我哋嘅了解，喺冠忠佢哋自己去聘請呀盛，都係有做足頭先講嗰啲去查底、身體檢查等等，係有做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你查番之後，就再正式咁畀份文件我哋喇，即係佢哋點樣樣正式咁將個文件交畀你哋新大嶼山巴士公司嘅。

黃焯安先生：Sure。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢啲非專營巴士，即係利用呢啲非專營巴士嚟到係做巴士營運嘅，我想問你哋有冇咩嘢措施嚟到確保呢一類嘅巴士喺機器上面、機械上面都係適宜係你哋使用嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：我交畀楊生代我作答。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，楊生。

楊家寶先生：Thank you。關於呢啲非專利巴士，佢哋都會定期做一個檢查，同埋每一年佢哋都會 go through 政府嗰個驗車嘅，因為呢個係完全同我哋專營巴士係一樣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢啲非專營巴士嘅公司，你會要求佢哋畀啲咩嘢文件嘅證明你哋，就去證明呢啲嘢都做咗呀？

黃焯安先生：唔該。因為本身--正如頭先我咁講，喺今天大嶼山巴士同冠忠係一個姊妹公司嘅關係，可能有好多 black and white 嘅文件我哋係冇話係由大嶼山嗰邊係向冠忠去索取嘅，今天。但係當然我哋自己本身係--尤其是我哋管理層呢方面亦都係知道兩間公司佢哋係--因為我哋都係提供客運嘅，亦都係會提供呢個安全嘅服務去畀我哋嘅乘客嘅，當然呢一方面我哋如果往後係我哋自己都返去檢討一下，覺得係咪真係有需要係就算係--即係當然唔一定嗰個係一個我哋有關連嘅公司，如果往後係一個冇關連嘅公司去幫大嶼山巴士提供嘅服務，變相我哋都可能要諗清楚往後會唔會係需要多啲文件係需要番呢個營辦商去提供番畀我哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你嗰個附件 2A、2B 同 2C，即係話你哋文件嘅 474 至到 480 頁，473、474 頁就係附件 2A 嘅，2B 就係 476，之後嗰個就喺 479 頁嘅。我想問，呢啲嘅調查係邊個進行嘅呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問一下你講邊一個調查？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）三個調查。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講嗰個係標題呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2A 就係呢個每月嘅報告，就係講及就係編定咗嘅服務同埋實際嘅服務就係佢哋究竟係咪符合到嗰個休息時間、用膳時間；2B 就係呢個車上嘅調查，去調查一下就係大嶼山巴士車長嘅休息時間；2C 就係提及專營巴士車長工作時間嘅調查，就關乎係 B 同 D 嗰兩項嘅指引嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該你。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。呢三份啱啱提到嘅 survey 都係由我哋公司 NLB 內部自己去做嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個 2A，474 頁，呢個就係每月嘅報告，就講及就係嗰個巴士車長嗰個工作時間個指引，編定咗嘅同實際嘅，嗰度就係有一百一十五位車長係接受調查嘅，換句話講，你意思係咪話一百一十五位車長就係喺嗰一日

單一日裏面都畀你哋調查，即係話 2018 年嘅 2 月 21 號嗰日單一個人係調查晒一百一十五位車長呢？

黃焯安先生：係，正確，係當天嘅一百一十五個，係喇，喺嗰一日，係喇，抽一日去睇番嗰日。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）會唔會係單一位公司嘅職員去進行晒呢個調查呢？

黃焯安先生：因為我想補充番，佢呢一個形式，佢唔係話去逐個、逐個一百一十五個司機去跟住佢去見，而係我哋嘅同事去對番當天喺我哋自己嘅人事--即係嗰個車務嘅紀錄--行車紀錄，去對番當天嘅工作。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）換句話講，即係睇番嗰個係交畀你哋公司嘅駕駛紀錄，係咪呀？邊個交出嚟嘅紀錄呢？

黃焯安先生：Thank you，Chairman，我哋係呢個日子係運輸署去定畀我哋嘅，而我哋就去同我哋自己個--即係對番我哋自己內部嘅紀錄，喺嗰個營運--即係主要係營運部門嗰方面提供嘅紀錄。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者你去睇番附件 2B，就話車上嘅調查，去查核一下大嶼山巴士公司嘅司機嘅休息時間，請你睇番 477 至到 478 頁嘅，呢個又點樣進行嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：唔好意思，我哋要少少時間去睇番個紀錄，唔好意思。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，慢慢。

黃焯安先生：Chairman，呢一個表係我哋公司內部自己做嘅都係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去 480 嗰頁，附件 3 就係調查番專營巴士車長嘅工作時間，呢個又係點樣進行嘅呢？又或者調轉去咁問，會唔會有個人係嗰一日整日跟住個車長，然後作出呢個調查呢？

黃焯安先生：好，主席，喺呢個表度，“Employee No. of bus captain”呢一項就係運輸署去選取嘅，同埋嗰個“Survey Date”都係，而我哋喺右邊呢度，我哋就係搵番嗰個紀錄，即係都唔係話有個人去坐喺架車跟住，因為呢個係事後去填報番出嚟嘅，我哋就填番究竟--搵番我哋自己個紀錄，佢當天嗰個同事嘅工作時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）當初係點樣樣有呢一啲嘅紀錄呢？即係呢個又係簽到同埋簽走嘅時間，最初呢啲時間係點樣樣係記錄低嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：主席，喺我哋嘅今天嚟講，主要就係喺呢個總站，即係站頭嗰度有個拍卡機咁樣，個同事就攞個員工證去打卡，即係拍卡，就係去記錄番佢嗰個上、下班時間。如果有啲係 remote，唔係呢個站頭，就靠個電話去報番。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我其實係應該問 477 頁都同一個問題嘅，因為嗰個標題就係話車上嘅調查你都係查核大嶼山巴士公司司機嘅休息時間嘅，呢個都係就係車上嘅調查，都想問同一個問題，係咪當日係有人跟車去調查嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。呢一個 on-board survey 呢個就我哋係有同事喺車度嘅。佢呢個係運輸署要求我哋有十日就係喺平日，有五日就喺假日嘅時候去做嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講下喺休息或者係用膳嘅時間，即係根據呢個指引，嗰三類嘅巴士車長需唔需要做任何嘅非駕駛嘅職務，譬如話係要更新佢哋嗰個當更時間或者其他一啲行政嘅工作？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺啱啱提及嘅如果休息時間，係唔會需要去做你講嘅呢一類我會當佢係行政工作咁樣，因為主要行政工作係會由我哋一啲例如喺個站站長--即係喺個站頭嗰度就有個站長去處理呢啲工作，或者喺個總站嗰度係有其他一啲職員去幫手。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果根據你公司指示，要去到另外一個地點，或者係要去進行另外一種嘅駕駛工作，會唔會包埋喺呢個食飯或者休息時間裏面呀？

黃焯安先生：唔該。因為本身我哋嗰個服務嗰個範圍其實係較為集中，就唔會話出現一個要跨區喺大嶼山搭車去到九龍提供服務呢啲咁嘅情況，所以如果你嘅問題係話嗰啲會唔會都當咗係一個 rest time 呢，因為本身呢啲情況基本上係冇嘅，我哋相信，但係如果有都好，我哋都要計，當係一個工作時間畀我哋嘅同事嘅，就唔會當佢係一個休息時間咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。或者想睇下，就係呢一個第 71 頁，係區議會嘅文件夾，中文係 71 頁最後嘅五行，英文就係 75 頁最後嘅六行，我會讀出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係由邊度讀出嚟呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係離島區議會嘅意見書，交畀委員會，有關於呢次嘅專營巴士獨立檢討委員會嘅聆訊嘅。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想讀出最屘嗰五行，「大嶼山巴士路線主要係一啲山路，係大嶼山南同埋就喺高速公路來往主要地區嘅長途，呢啲嘅路線係需要高度集中，所以需要更多嘅休息時間，防止因為疲勞引致交通意外。」黃生，我有一個問題，係關於大嶼山南嘅一啲路線，每一更嗰個嘅時間、時數或者長度係幾多？

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講下，一更？係指一個工作嘅更數定係行完一條路線呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）行完路線，譬如話 3M 呢條線，由梅窩碼頭到東涌應該市中心

喇。

黃焯安先生：Thank you，Chairman，如果以梅窩呢個 3M 為例，佢由東涌去到梅窩或者梅窩去東涌，就大概係三十五至四十分鐘，睇下沿途多唔多--即係要上落咁樣。

黃女士：And what do you...

黃焯安先生：三十五至四十，唔好意思，三十五，唔係三十。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度就話呢啲嘅長途路線係需要高度集中，你同唔同意呢一句咁講呢？

黃焯安先生：因為啱啱呢一個文件我都係第一次睇，即係...

黃女士：Oh, I apologise for that.

黃焯安先生：唔緊要，唔緊要，我自己就唔--我都唔係太明其實佢嗰個“long-distance routes along the highway to and from the main areas”嗰個意思係點，因為其實我哋本身大嶼山嗰個--我哋就--我哋嗰個專營權嗰個範圍其實就淨係喺大嶼山，就冇話去其他例如市區咁樣嘅，我哋另外就係喺深圳灣口岸嗰度就有服務去到元朗同埋天水圍嗰度，亦都唔連去大嶼山嘅。

我唔係太肯定議員嗰個--我唔知係咪講緊--或者如果你就咁--我集中番講番，我唔去揣測佢嗰個意思係點先，如果就咁講嶼南嗰面，我相信以嗰個車程嚟講，其實比起一啲喺另外兩間巴士公司嘅路線嚟講，就我諗對比起上嚟，就唔算話係好長。

同埋本身因為我哋嗰個服務嘅範圍嗰個路面情況其實就係較為暢通嘅，就好少會遇到嗰啲擠塞嘅問題，所以就我哋編排嗰個時間通常都唔會話同實際行車時間睜太遠。當然你話四十分鐘同一啲好近好近，例如一啲我哋叫 feeder bus，係去地鐵站嗰啲咁樣，即係另外--例如逸東邨去地鐵站嗰個車程只係講緊幾分鐘，比較起上嚟，佢會係長啲。但係如果你話真係同--我相信其他，例如喺新界去市區嗰啲咁，我諗我哋又唔算好長嘅。或者係同一啲喺機場，機場去市區嗰啲，其實嗰啲可能就跨區再加埋喺市區擠塞嘅，嗰啲個車程會更加長，我個睇法會係咁。

黃女士：Yes, and...

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，呢份文件仲有冇其他問題呀？因為如果有，應該畀個機會黃生睇過先。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有呀，我有幾個問題要問。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃生，你去睇番呢三頁，你可以而家睇嘅，用幾多時間都冇問

題，我哋會等你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者睇中文，中文就係 71 至到 72 頁。

黃焯安先生：主席，我...

主席：（經傳譯員）係，黃生(sic)。

黃女士：Thank you. And...

黃焯安先生：Sorry，excuse me。因為我睇咗個中文譯本，可能佢翻譯嗰度係搞錯咗，因為佢個中文譯本嗰度係寫「大嶼山巴士」，嗰個「大嶼山巴士」唔係講緊我哋公司，係講緊喺大嶼山度服務嘅巴士，係包括--即係佢話加上第--佢話「加上大嶼山巴士路線」其實唔係講緊係新大嶼山巴士公司嘅路線。當然我會有一部分，大嶼南嗰啲就係我哋公司，你話往來高速公路嗰啲就係講緊城巴或者龍運嘅線路。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。請你睇番第 3 段，英文就喺 76 頁，呢度就表達咗啲嘅關注，係離島區議會，關於大嶼山巴士公司嘅路線，讀出嚟，就係話「正如先前嘅意見書所講，大嶼山巴士公司嘅路線主要都係呢一個來往大嶼山南嘅一啲山路同埋一啲來往主要區域嘅高速公路，長途嘅，無論如何，目前嚟講，嗰個巴士車廂同埋嗰個嘅規定嘅設施都唔能夠係確保乘客嘅安全嘅，譬如話 3M 呢條線，來往梅窩同埋東涌，我有時候就發現啲巴士就係載滿客嘅，連呢一個嘅車廂裏面嘅通道都滿晒客嘅，而一啲來往市區嘅，除咗前面嗰幾行座位之外，後面嗰幾行同埋係向車尾嘅嗰啲座位都冇安全帶嘅，呢個相比起歐盟嘅規定，即係話無論任何嘅類型都好，巴士乘客、司機、乘客都係要戴安全帶，呢個顯示到香港係落後好多嘅。」

跟住我就睇番 78 同埋 79 頁，我想問，你對於呢件事有咩嘢嘅睇法？

黃焯安先生：好，唔該主席，如果簡單去睇，我睇到佢提出有兩個疑問，第一個疑問就係對於我哋啲車冇裝安全帶呢個問題，第二就係佢另外有去影咗啲相，喺啲相度就見到企得好滿咁樣，即係呢個情況。我首先回應第二個疑問嘅，就係關於佢話啲車好似企得好滿咁樣。

因為我哋其實都有留意到喺梅窩每日一啲較為繁忙嘅時間，正正呢條 3M 嘅路線其實係去呢個東涌--往返東涌，其實係比起以往嗰個人係多咗嘅，之前我哋嘅分析就係因為佢多咗人入去起樓，因為嗰面而家係起緊啲居屋咁樣嘅，都應該係將會起完，或者都差唔多起完咁樣。我哋之前嗰個做法就係都係儘量喺啲繁忙時間去加密嗰個班次，因為本身我哋同平時各位喺市區見到嘅提供嘅車款就較為唔同嘅，我哋本身因為嗰度行嗰個山路較為多，其實我哋已經係好多年冇去採用呢個雙層巴士，所以就當一有啲去到一啲繁忙嘅時間，一個單層巴士始終個載客量就冇咁高，我哋喺 2017 年嘅時候就決定就係想喺 3M 嗰度就係去用番呢個雙層巴士。

因為都見到嗰個，同埋嚟緊嘅都知道本身梅窩係會有呢個居屋喺 2018、19 年去入伙，我哋喺 2017 年嘅時候其實就試埋車盛呀咁樣，個目標就係希望去解決番一啲喺繁忙時間，就即係喺個車度即係唔夠--都始終我哋都明白例如喺四十分鐘，由梅窩去到東涌，如果你話個坐位咁少，因為單層嘅車始終個坐位係比較少嘅，我哋就去專登係喺市面度都採購咗一啲車身較為短啲--車長較為短啲，都係我哋做過路面測試，都確保係上述嘅呢部雙層巴士係去投入服務都唔會有問題。

至於你話議員佢有提到話安全帶嗰個，我哋嘅本身，因為今天係冇要求我哋所有座位都安裝安全帶嘅，我哋就主要喺一啲較為署方認為即係叫做 exposed seat 嗰啲座位度去加番安全帶，我哋都係開放態度嘅，如果你話係當覺得係真係有需要去喺所有嘅座位度加安全帶，我哋都覺得呢個建議係可以，我哋好開放嘅，對呢個建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家我想請你睇番會議紀錄，係同樣，離島區區議會嘅，係 2017 年 10 月 23 日嘅會議紀錄，中文係 252 頁，英文係 256 頁。黃生，呢個係第一頁嚟嘅，係離島區議會嘅會議紀錄，日期係 17 年嘅 10 月 23 號，我哋可以睇到出席人士，睇番 257 頁同埋 256，仲有 258 頁，你間公司係有出席嘅，就係陳天龍先生副總經理，係大嶼山巴士公司，有出席嘅，現在想請你睇第 41 段，中文就係 254 頁，可以請你睇，你自己睇下。我亦都想請你睇第 43 段添，就係區議員郭平先生佢嘅建議。

黃焯安先生：唔，okay。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢提出嘅其中一個事項，就係話歐盟嘅規例就限制巴士車長工作時間係九小時嘅，如果係連續工作嘅時間就係十四小時就太長，會引致可能會有呢一個意外發生嘅，所以佢就關注呢一個大嶼山巴士公司同埋呢一個嘅運輸署，有關於呢個羌山路、東涌道，即係大嶼山嗰個嘅情況嘅，因為後果係不勘設想嘅，所以佢希望巴士公司同埋運輸署就可以係做啲嘢關於呢一個嘅工作長嘅時間，對於呢方面，你有咩嘢嘅意見呀？或者你哋間公司對於呢方面有咩嘢意見？

黃焯安先生：唔好意思，我哋要少少時間睇番啲資料先，唔好意思。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，你慢慢。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。本身我哋公司，講番喺即係嶼南呢面，我哋嘅嗰個--因為而家其實規定做，可以提供十四--即係駕駛--即係工作十四個小時嗰啲車長，我哋稱呼嗰啲叫做「特別更」，特別更嘅車長，本身因為我哋嗰個呢類型嘅車長就比較少嘅，其實係得八條，因為我哋自己編咗路線嘅，即係叫做「字軌」，我哋個行業簡稱。我哋係當中係百幾條裏面係有--一百一十三條裏面就有八條係要去即係呢種特別更嘅工作嘅。

特別更佢中間我哋係確保佢有足夠嘅休息時間同埋係--因為本身我哋都有好多車長其實係喺當區居住嘅，因為我哋較為係集中喺番大嶼山嗰面，變咗就我哋去相信就算係呢一種特別更，我哋都會確保佢哋唔會話係過勞咁樣，就係安全嘅，呢個可以放心。

當然你話郭議員佢提出話係 EU 嗰個 standard，因為我自己就冇睇過嗰個 standard，你話如果真係佢連續駕駛九個小時，我相信都會係好攰，呢個係事實嚟嘅，連續駕駛，但係我覺得都要真係睇番究竟係如果係一個十四小時嘅工作或者少啲或者以下嘅，究竟當中嘅駕駛時間、休息時間等等係點樣。因為始終香港係我哋好多居民其實都係工作嘅地點同埋佢真係居住嘅地點其實係有距離嘅，而我哋作為服務性行業，其實係要喺大部分嘅市民佢哋去工作之前我哋已經喺早啲上班，去送啲市民去工作，到佢哋收工，我哋就去接佢哋放工。

你可以諗下假設今日係用十四個小時一個叫做特別更嘅安排去處理呢一個咁嘅結構，如果你話「唔得，太長，一刀切。」佢係例如九個鐘，但係就嗰個人手就唔係咁簡單話係用呢個比例，九個小時同十四小時咁樣嘅比例，因為你可以想像到係例如我哋喺朝早最繁忙嘅時間，你要最多嘅人，到到傍晚放工時間嗰個最繁忙時間又要最多嘅人，隨時嗰個--你話真係九個鐘咁樣嘅安排係好大機會就--即係一定會高過你就咁樣咁簡單話係十四轉九咁樣嘅一個比例。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃先生，我而家就會講第二啲嘅課題，就關於係設施同埋對於車長嘅支援，你啱啱就講到，就係話你好多嘅車長都係喺大嶼山居住嘅，係咪呀？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）但係我冇嗰個正確嘅數字。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你嘅公司會唔會提供穿梭巴士畀車長，就將佢哋從佢哋嘅屋企就係去番嗰個總站咁樣佢哋工作嘅地點？

黃焯安先生：主席，我哋今天係冇提供呢個即係叫做員工車去車我哋啲同事，因為最主要個原因就係我哋大部分同事都住得同佢哋嗰個攞車嘅地點係好近嘅，有啲可能住得遠少少嘅，佢可能架車就係--我哋都係安排咗係泊喺佢哋可能係屋企附近嘅一啲巴士站頭或者係搵個合適嘅位去泊車，變咗我哋就冇呢個需要去話提供一個返工車咁樣嘅安排。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗話休息嘅設施，喺啲主要嘅服務嘅地點嗰度，呢個係第 24 頁嘅，喺你嗰個文件夾當中，係咪喺每個總站都會係有呢一個嘅洗手間，就係讓一啲車長喺小休嘅時間可以去使用洗手間呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺我哋今天嘅情況，就唔會話所有嘅站都有呢啲休息或者我哋去安排咗洗手間畀啲同事嘅，因為都要真係睇番實際嗰個地權等等嗰啲問題嘅。我哋亦都係有經驗，當然呢一刻我哋冇準備喺手究竟係實際係邊一個申請

同埋係用咗幾多時間，但係以往的而且確係我哋有喺一啲站等等想去申請去起嗰啲設施，但係就礙於係都要經過唔同，因為係唔同政府部門去監管嘅，亦都係需要我哋花費好多嘅時間先至申請到，亦都有啲係試過係申請唔到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你嗰個遠期計劃嗰度...

主席：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以問一問呢？你可唔可以提供畀委員會就係一啲你個申請書嘅樣本，就話你希望能夠係提供休息室、廁所等等嘅設施，就可以話到畀我哋聽就係究竟需要幾多時間，同埋另一方面就係話你啲申請被拒嘅情況？就亦都可以話清楚畀我聽究竟成功同失敗嗰個申請嘅比例係點樣同埋嗰個所需嘅時間係幾多。

黃焯安先生：Okay。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就想去運輸署嘅文件夾第 241 頁，呢個係遠期計劃，呢度寫到你間公司嘅遠期計劃，我哋睇到最後呢一版嘅呢個部分，呢個講就係話所有嘅總站都係有廁所嘅，但係喺逸東、天慈同埋天耀邨佢哋只不過係嗰個總站就會附近係可以行到去一個公共廁所嘅，你知唔知道大概嗰個要行幾耐呢或者係幾長呢嗰個距離？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。嗰個我哋呢一刻問到，就係本身嗰個巴士總站隔籬係有商場嘅，例如以逸東為例，佢側邊係商場嚟嘅，我哋就要個同事行入去個商場度，由佢放低部車，泊低咗，行到去商場，返番嚟，個時間我哋粗略估計係十分鐘嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝黃生。2018 年就運輸署出咗一個新嘅指引，就係運輸署嘅文件資料夾 1086 頁嘅，第 4 號文件夾嘅 1086 頁，喺新嘅指引嗰度就係車長駕駛六小時後最少係有一啲嘅小休，就應有四十分鐘休息時間，而該六小時內應有合共不少於二十分鐘嘅小休，其中不少於十二分鐘嘅小休應該安排喺首四小時內提供。我個問題就係話呢個可唔可以改善多啲呢？特別係關於嗰個洗手間嘅設施方面。如果有需要嘅時候，可唔可以延長嗰個休息時間呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。啱啱律師提到嘅我哋--你話提供呢個設施，我哋可唔可以提供多啲，喺公司嘅立場，我哋係非常之樂意去做呢樣嘢嘅，因為我哋都希望我哋嘅--即係我哋嘅同事其實都係人，就大家都係人，你叫我要去洗手間要每次要行到咁遠，我相信在座都希望唔需要去有咁嘅經歷嘅。我啱啱問番我哋嘅同事，但係就真係喺--我哋之後都會補充番資料畀委員會，喺申請嗰度，而又有好多嘢都係喺我哋公司能力範圍以外，即係嗰個地方係唔批准我哋去裝置呢啲設施嘅，我哋都冇咩嘢可以做到。

我哋之前嘅--即係有亦都係一啲咁嘅--例如遇到啲問題，因為啱啱講話逸東嗰個商場，正正就係個商場係啱啱裝修緊，變咗嗰度個洗手間亦都係用唔到

嘅，我哋就惟有係要我哋同事去另外一面嘅--即係其他洗手間，我哋亦都係好清楚對我哋嘅同事係好大嘅影響嘅，我哋都會盡力去協助佢哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝黃生。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇逸東邨嗰度嘅總站就有冇申請話「我自己要去裝置啲洗手間。」呢？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係有冇--係咪申請被拒絕呢？或者係而家等緊批呢？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）應該係等緊審批嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾耐之前去提出申請㗎？

黃焯安先生：我哋後補番呢個資料，因為就呢一刻答唔到。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢一個嘅文件，最後一個問題，請你睇下第 242 頁，對唔住，呢個係運輸署嘅第 1 號文件冊嘅第 242 頁嘅，呢個亦都係遠期計劃嗰度就講到就係話喺呢個嘅總站附近都係步行距離就係有廁所同埋餐飲設施，除咗話喺深圳灣口岸嗰度就係冇餐飲設施，我就想問你哋會唔會做啲乜嘢嘢係去改善個情況，確保有足夠嘅設施呢？

黃焯安先生：Chairman，因為本身喺--深圳灣做一個例子，嗰度係個關口，嗰度係唔批准畀我哋去配置例如一個休息室去畀同事，所以我哋--因為而本身嗰條路線其實係從深圳灣去元朗或者去天水圍，我哋今天嘅嗰個安排就係要同事喺元朗或者天水圍嗰面去食飯咁樣，去解決呢個問題，佢哋喺深圳灣入面就嗰度有洗手間呢啲設施。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我睇到個時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我哋而家就小休，讓大家食飯，我哋會喺下晝嘅兩點半再繼續，唔該晒，唔該。

下午 1 時 01 分押聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位午安。係，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。黃先生，我哋而家係講到巴士車長嘅培訓，你喺嗰個開場白嘅時候就講咗喺最近幾個月係已經引入咗又或者將會引入呢一啲新嘅措施，係包括下面嘅措施嘅，第一，就係將巴士車長嘅訓練時數同埋導師與培訓學員嘅比例提升，亦都話會成立一所巴士車長嘅訓練學校去協助合資格嘅人士取得巴士駕駛執照嘅。我而家嘅問題係咁嘅，喺呢方面，而家個情況係點呢？未改變之前，你原本嗰個安排係點㗎？

黃焯安先生：主席，我會交畀李先生代表我去作答。

主席：（經傳譯員）李先生，請你答。

李春暉先生：主席，幾方面，第一，喺以往嚟講，個車長訓練喺新人同埋喺現職車長都略有唔同嘅種類去提供呢個培訓嘅，喺新入職嘅車長嚟講，過往係有五日--五天嘅車長訓練，包括路線、車型、課堂嘅訓練。喺最近嚟講，我哋喺呢一個五天嘅訓練就加咗一日，變為六天嘅訓練，主要嚟講，喺邊度加咗呢？就喺嗰個課堂嗰方面，我哋由以往嗰五日喺車上嘅理論就加咗一日，全日嘅課堂理論，所以而家喺新車長入職嚟講，我哋喺而家嚟講係提供六日嘅訓練，包括五日嘅掂車。而呢個掂車喺以往嘅導師同呢一個學員個比例係一比二或者一比三，視乎當時嗰個入職嗰個嘅成分而定嘅，但係我哋而家去決定嗰個導師同學員嘅比例係定喺一比二。一比二嚟講，學員同導師嗰個相處嘅時間亦都會多咗，比以往嚟講。

喺現職車長嘅訓練嚟講，我哋會有幾種嘅，包括路線訓練、車種嘅訓練、輔助訓練同埋重溫嘅訓練。喺以往嚟講，路線同埋車型嘅訓練都係一日，但係而家我哋會檢視番嗰個車種嗰個種類，因為日後嚟講，我哋嗰個車種大部分都可能會係雙層巴士。雙層巴士嘅引入，我哋會喺培訓嗰方面定喺兩至三日嘅訓練，因為呢種訓練係要畀學員嗰方面係要熟習嗰個雙層車嘅操作，包括轉彎嗰陣時嘅技巧。而喺重溫班嗰方面，我哋都要求每個學員--每個車長都要喺一年之內係要返嚟學校或者返嚟我哋培訓部去上堂嘅，就有關車長訓練學校成立一事，其實我哋有幾個準備工夫做咗，包括較早前向運輸署申請要求有呢一個限制導師執照考巴士--專利巴士，俗稱“GB2”嘅駕駛執照，而家就等候呢一個回覆。

我哋喺內部嚟講，亦都會招聘更加多嘅駕駛導師，由於而家現時我哋大嶼山個駕駛導師係並非擁有呢一個 GB2 嘅資格，即是話我哋本身而家嚟講係未有培訓，只有持有私家車牌、1 號牌或者 2 號牌、貨 van 牌嘅人士去考取巴士牌，如果日後我哋嘅申請係接納嘅話，我哋可以自給自足，我哋可以有資歷嘅駕駛導師去考取--去幫持有--即係應徵者--新應徵者嘅車長應徵人士去考取呢一個巴士牌，我哋嗰個來源，即係我哋嗰個嘅來源會更加廣闊，並非而家限制於 9 號、10 號私家車同埋巴士牌嘅人士申請。當然呢一個訓練學校嘅成立仲需要一啲配合，包括我哋嗰個泊位、路線、個場地去訓練嘅地方。

而如果個牌照係攞到嗰個限制牌照嘅話，我哋會喺而家持有巴士牌嘅六日訓練係會增加到九日嘅訓練，而未有巴士牌，只係持有私家車牌嘅人士，我哋暫定係會提供十八日嘅訓練，喺訓練嘅時數係會比而家純粹只係六日嚟講係多好多嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該，或者咁，我想請你睇番 NLB-2，467 頁，呢度係一個圖表嚟嘅，個圖表就係列出就係車長嘅培訓嘅時間表，呢個附件 10，A 就係新入職嘅巴士車長嘅恒常嘅訓練，B 嗰項就係現職車長嘅恒常嘅訓練嘅，我想問下呢個係咪舊有嘅安排定抑或你剛剛所講及嘅新嘅安排呢？

李春暉先生：呢個係舊有嘅安排。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係舊嘅訓練，係咪呀？

李春暉先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽係邊個提供呢啲培訓嘅呢？你有講過你哋嘅訓練學校係仲未成立嘅，係咪呀？

李春暉先生：係，冇錯。而家籌備中，我即係話喺而家嚟講，呢啲訓練係由我哋嘅駕駛訓練導師係教緊嘅，in service 嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你睇番 A 嗰個部分，即係入職嘅訓練，你就係喺呢個課室嘅上堂下面嗰度，你呢度就有講及就係喺呢個意外黑點嘅分析，睇唔睇到呀？

李春暉先生：睇到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你呢度就話課堂--上堂講公司嘅規則、乘客嘅安全同埋意外黑點嘅分析，你可唔可以解釋一下你用啲咩嘢實證嘅數據作為基礎嚟到去做呢一個意外黑點嘅分析呢？

李春暉先生：兩部分，一部分係由過往嘅駕駛導師所提供一啲嘅過往經驗，包括喺嶼南路嘅交通意外所發生嘅地點。除咗係導師過往經驗個分享之外，我亦都會根據番實質喺個意外嘅真實地點嗰方面係同啲學員分享番個成因--意外個成因係乜嘢、點樣去預防。而且除咗係課堂嗰個理論之外，喺真實嘅行車訓練當中，導師亦都會講解一啲彎位、一啲嘅防衛性駕駛嘅技巧。

黃焯安先生：Ms Wong、Chairman，我想補充一點，頭先你嘅問題係話當我哋準備成立嗰個 training school，我哋今天點去培訓，因為我想補充番一點，係啱啱頭先李生提嗰個係可以 set up 咗嗰個 training school，嗰個用意就係變咗我哋可以去幫一啲冇巴士牌，今天可能淨係得私家車或者客貨車嘅人士，而佢又想去做一個專營巴士嘅車長，佢就可以經過我哋，當我哋係正式向署方申請到，就變咗我哋都可以幫嗰啲人去考到個駕駛執照，巴士嘅駕駛執照，即係主要嗰個分別喺呢度。

而今天呢一個安排係喺另外嗰啲專營巴士公司佢哋都已經係有做緊，即係

去幫一啲未有巴士牌嘅車長去考呢個巴士牌，想補充呢點。但係本身我哋恆常一啲基本嘅訓練，即係嗰個係不論我哋有冇呢個叫做學--即係駕駛學堂咁樣，呢個 training school 呢個考牌呢一個，我哋本身都係有呢個能力去同佢做一個訓練。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）目前訓練嗰度，你哋有幾多人係做緊訓練嘅工作㗎？

李春暉先生：我哋而家有四個--四名嘅駕駛導師係進行呢個培訓嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）日後嘅訓練學校，你諗住係會有幾多人做培訓㗎？

李春暉先生：我哋最近向署方申請嗰個牌照係六個配額。

主席：（經傳譯員）六個係駕駛嘅導師，係咪呀？

李春暉先生：係，係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒李先生，唔該晒你畀我哋嘅解釋。關於呢一個意外黑點嘅分析，我想問你可唔可以畀個副本我哋睇下呢，即係睇下你哋公司係點樣進行嗰個分析嘅？

李春暉先生：其實除咗頭先我所講，我哋可以畀個副本你，因為其實我哋而家喺個培訓當中，我哋自己都印有一啲小冊子或者叫做手冊，當中我哋會有十個單元，頭嗰五個單元係講關於安全駕駛，另外嗰五個單元係講呢一個優質服務，而喺第二個單元，即係頭五個單元嘅第二個單元係講交通意外主要成因，當中我哋會講解天雨路滑、天氣影響、駕駛者嘅身體狀況、車輛嘅設備同埋路面嘅設計呢四大方向去討論意外嘅成因。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講到路面嘅設計，關於呢一點--關於路面嘅設計，你喺邊度係攞資料呢？你會係選取路面嘅邊一個方面嘅特色嚟到進行你嗰個分析呢？

李春暉先生：其實呢度我哋都係主要攞番導師畀我哋嘅意見，包括喺嶼南路呢啲山路邊啲彎位係要特別留意同埋佢嗰個斜度，嗰個斜路個波幅同正常係一比六，作為一個駕駛者，喺呢一個斜度入面要留意啲乜嘢，如果喺轉彎嗰陣時嘅車速同埋嗰個扭力要幾多先為之安全。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李先生，我想請你睇另一份文件嘅，呢個就係你哋嘅遠期計劃，大家可以睇呢個 TD-1 嘅 237 頁，麻煩你睇一睇(g)嗰一段，呢個就係你哋公司嘅遠期計劃，呢度就咁講嘅，就話你哋公司...

主席：（經傳譯員）我咁寫低，好唔好呀？係 2017 年嘅 6 月嘅，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，2017 年嘅 6 月。你公司就咁講嘅，就話公司就可能就會係尋求係其他嘅專營巴士嘅營運商合作嚟到係達致上述所講嗰點，就係話將自

己嘅巴士車長就係送去接受人哋嘅培訓，當然要雙方接納同埋合作嘅，我想問，有冇同其他嘅專營巴士公司就呢件事展開商討呢？

黃焯添先生：主席，其實我哋喺一個駕駛學校嘅層面上面要搵一個好有經驗同事去做係喺呢一個行業係非常之困難嘅，李先生係今年年初係去加入我哋大嶼山巴士，喺 17 年嘅時候，其實我哋一路都--除咗係一啲用我哋自己本身嘅導師以外--一啲有經驗嘅導師以外，我哋亦都會去搵咗一間叫做香港汽車高級駕駛協會，去做一啲叫精明駕駛嘅訓練嘅，當時我哋因為喺冇一個咁專業嘅導師嘅情況下，我哋希望用一啲第三者嘅角度去畀一啲培訓我哋嘅司機，所以我哋就特別去搵咗呢間協會去做一啲培訓，係當時我哋係每一位司機都做過一次嘅，當時係 2017 年。

啱啱李先生就係 2018 年係加入我哋公司嘅，李先生就有超過二十年係呢個培訓嘅經驗，所以我哋就積極啲再向運輸署署方去申請一個駕駛學校嘅牌照，希望可以增加到六個嘅 instructor 去做到呢一樣嘢嘅。我哋其實公司都係希望可以積極啲用內部嘅資源去加強番本身我哋嘅訓練。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話每個車長就有一次機會，喺呢方面究竟係咩嘢意思呢？乜嘢有一次呢，每位車長都一次呢？

黃焯添先生：個機會就係去參與由 IAM 去設計嘅，sorry，高級駕駛協會去設計嘅精明駕駛訓練，個訓練內容其實最主要都係講番一啲駕駛嘅 awareness，即係佢唔係教個司機點揸車嘅，最主要係駕駛佢哋嘅--個駕駛態度，同埋本身佢哋喺個路面嘅--唔同路面嘅情況，講下路牌，佢用一啲口述嘅方式去幫下我哋嘅師傅嘅，所以呢個訓練係--sorry。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪課堂㗎，上堂㗎，定抑或又有上堂，又有去路面嗰度學習嘅呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）路面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾長時間呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）三個鐘頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪畀教車師傅定抑或係畀你哋所有嘅車長呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）有兩類嘅課堂嘅，一個就係畀車長，就講佢哋嘅揸車嘅態度，另外亦都係呢個高級駕駛協會，佢叫做 IAM，IAM 呢個香港汽車高級駕駛協會就會畀一個培訓者嘅課程嘅，即係話教嗰啲導師嘅，係參與呢個導師嘅訓練嘅，正如頭先李生所講，就係我哋呢個大嶼山巴士公司喺 2017 年初就有二十位嘅具經驗車長參加嗰啲導師訓練。

主席：Thank you。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家請你睇番就係運輸署嘅文件，1 號文件夾，就係關於你哋

遠期嘅計劃，第六段，239 頁，我知呢個係 2017 年嘅事嚟嘅，建議就係有個定期嘅檢討關於巴士車長嘅表現同埋鼓勵佢哋去參加一啲駕駛提升嘅培訓訓練，而你哋巴士公司係會畀番呢個課堂錢佢哋嘅，呢個係關於你哋設立培訓課程同埋呢一個駕駛學院，呢樣嘢係咪仍然存在嘅呢？

黃焯添先生：正如頭先所講，上年我哋係用 IAM 呢個夥伴合作嘅，今年嘅年初我哋有機會請到李先生，所以我哋嚟緊嘅呢個 paragraph (c)，係會我哋嘅 training school 會取代。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講另外一個課題，就係關於大嶼山南部嘅地勢嘅，想請你睇番呢一個離島區 2018 年 3 月 19 號嘅區議會文件，文件夾 1 號，中文版係 264 頁，英文版係 272 頁嘅，你哋公司陳天龍先生係有出席，你可以喺中文嘅 265 頁見到，英文 273 頁就見到，我就想將呢一次嘅會議紀錄其中一啲要點提出，第一個議題就係話你哋喺呢一個大嶼山南部係咪用雙層巴士，呢個係關於第 30 段嘅，中文係 266 頁，英文係 275 頁，請你睇一睇第 30 段、35 同埋 36 段，即係你睇番三段先。

第 30 段，呢個就關於使用雙層巴士喺 3M 路線，30 段就係一位嘅蔡小姐，佢係離島區嘅運輸署嘅主任嚟嘅，而運輸署佢係就於呢一個--同埋運輸署、警方同埋大嶼山巴士喺呢一個嘅 2016 年嘅 11 月，就喺東涌道嗰一段，同埋係 2017 年 6 月係成段嘅 3M 路線係做咗兩次嘅實地測試嘅，呢個係蔡小敏女士。

陳天龍先生：主席，我可以確認嗰兩次嘅試路係確實有做到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢兩個嘅測試係咪書面有寫嘅呢？

陳天龍先生：係，我哋當時有要求到巴士嘅生產商提供番一份報告畀我哋。

黃女士：And if we look at...

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係咪有真係交畀你吖？有冇真係交到份報告畀你吖，嗰班巴士嘅製造商？

陳天龍先生：個報告我哋喺手嘅，我哋可以喺會後提供番畀委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊間巴士製造商嚟㗎？

陳天龍先生：2016 年 11 月嗰次嘅測試係 MAN，而喺第二次，2017 年 6 月嘅測試就係 ADL。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪 Alexander Dennis？

陳天龍先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番 35 同埋 36 段，就係一位樊先生嘅，佢係樊志平先生，佢係議員嚟嘅，佢就表達話唔應該單單使用沙包去做呢個模擬測試當係真實，因為真實係乘客可能側埋一邊，唔會平均分佈喺巴士，佢就促請做多一次，喺呢一個天氣差嘅時候嘅測試。

我再請你睇另外一段，就係 44 段(b)，當時就係陳天龍先生回答咗嘅，44--40(b)。

主席：（經傳譯員）40 定係 44 呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）40(b)。你嘅回覆係喺 40(b)寫咗出嚟，話喺呢兩次嘅道路測試嘅時候，呢一間公司就根據運輸署嘅要求去做嘅，即係就將一啲嘅金屬板，每一塊就係代表一個人嘅重量喺個座位嗰度嘅，去模擬巴士係載滿乘客嘅。

跟住 44 段，一位嘅余先生，余漢坤先生，佢係議員嚟嘅，佢就建議，喺開始服務--正式服務之前，即係呢啲嘅雙層巴士喺 6 月服務之前，運輸署同埋大嶼山巴士應該係安排兩架嘅雙層巴士用番同一個嘅巴士型號就係做道路測試嘅，尤其就係銀礦灣嗰個嘅彎位，所有嘅持份者，包括議員、鄉士委員會、村代表會睇晒成個嘅過程，同埋作出建議。

跟住最後，第 51 段，呢位嘅蔡小敏女士代表運輸署就回答話關於安排另一次嘅道路測試，署方就會同大嶼山巴士公司喺會後作進一步適當嘅跟進，委員係如果有興趣，可以參與。

揭去跟住嗰頁，道路測試就根據佢哋嘅要求，就係喺一個天氣差嘅時候做，署方需要同其他嘅部門作安排嘅，其他嘅部門都明白呢一個建議會嘗試安排嘅，署方係明白委員對於使用雙層巴士係用作 3M 線係有關注，亦都會係密切同巴士公司係跟進，確保加強安全性嘅。有關於呢一次建議嘅道路測試，喺會後有冇真係做到呀？

陳天龍先生：主席，因為嗰架巴士係我哋新購買嘅，其實第一架巴士其實先至喺今日先至送到嚟香港，喺今朝早，所以就佢仲有一啲手續要做，要上牌或者其他驗車嘅手續要做，所以我哋喺完成晒呢啲手續之後，我哋會再聯絡番區議會嗰面，會安排番一個試車嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。如果係進行呢一次嘅測試，你可唔可以係都將嗰個嘅試車報告交畀委員會呢？

陳天龍先生：呢個當然可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢次會議仲提出...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，等一等。你心目中會唔會知道大概幾時會進行呢一個測試呢？

陳天龍先生：應該係大約喺一個月後左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二個課題就係關於一個傾側嘅警號系統，請你睇番中文第266頁，英文係第275頁嘅，你睇咗32段，鄺官穩先生就話有關於安裝喺車上呢一個嘅傾側警報器，如果個巴士嘅車身係斜到某一個程度就會響警號去話畀車長聽嘅，係大部分大嶼山嘅道路都好窄，同埋係好多彎嘅，佢就建議巴士公司安裝呢一個警報器嘅。

睇番運輸署嘅回覆，就係38(b)段，蔡小敏女士就話署方理解呢一個建議，喺車廂上面安裝警報器嘅，亦都就會同大嶼山巴士公司睇下嗰個可行性。呢個嘅傾側警報器，有冇真係去由你公司去詳細了解一下？

黃焯安先生：主席，我交畀楊先生去作答。

主席：（經傳譯員）楊生。

楊家寶先生：主席，thank you。關於呢一個系統，我哋一路都有同運輸署嗰邊做一個檢討同埋開會咁傾嘅，焦點而家就係基本上係會所有--我哋建議所有新嘅雙層巴士都會安裝一個系統，叫做ESD嘅系統。而呢個系統就有兩個功能嘅，一個功能係防止架車過度轉向同埋改善轉向，另外一個功能就係防滾嘅，即係防反車嘅，喺嗰個臨界點之前，嗰架車有自動一個反應就係將個車速減慢，而令佢保持喺一個穩定嘅狀態。至於講嗰個警號嗰度，就如果有需要嘅話，可以叫生產商加埋落去都得。

基本上嗰個警號可能我哋有個concern就係佢會影響到個司機，即係太多警號嚟講，因為我哋講緊over speed，即係超速一個警號，有時啲門嗰啲開閂又一個警號，變咗有時司機太多警號，佢哋會有一個混淆，變咗所--與其將佢提出一個警號，倒不如將佢控制喺穩定嘅情況之下。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好--未講第二樣嘢住。你就話係臨界點嗖之前，嗰架車速就會係減慢嘅，點做到呢樣嘢呀？

楊家寶先生：佢嗰個係用有--包括有兩樣嘢嘅，就係車速嘅，佢會將個injection，即係嗰個噴油就係減少，同埋就會用嗰個叫做減速器將個車速減慢嘅。至於嗰個速度嘅嗰個監測，佢哋因為有個sensor，嗰個sensor一個感應器，就裝咗喺嗰個底盤嗰個中間位置，佢嘅作用就係感應嗰個車嘅本身嗰個側向加速同埋呢一個離心力嘅計算，而提早計算出一個當時到達嗰個臨界點未呢，而產生一個功能嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係有兩方面，一就係會將嗰個噴油減慢，係咪講緊關於呢一個汽油，或者無--即係睇下嗰架車用咩油？

楊家寶先生：係，correct。

主席：（經傳譯員）係減慢嘅啫，唔係將佢直情切斷？

楊家寶先生：基本上佢係有一個減慢至到停止 injection 嘅，因為視乎嗰個車嘅速度同埋再加埋嗰個 retarder，嗰個叫做「減速器」嘅功能將架車收慢。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個車速減慢器係咪將個檔次減低或者用制動器或者兩個都用？

楊家寶先生：兩個都用。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第三樣，離島區議會嘅委員就講過一樣嘢，關於大嶼山南部嘅地勢，佢哋就話有好多斜嘅路同埋好多彎道，尤其係銀礦灣路，係好崎嶇同埋好多彎，佢哋就話單層巴士都要讓路畀對方先至夠位過，而且係冇任何嘅避車或者泊車處嘅。我想請你睇番 34(a)，跟住就 45(a)，就係呢一個磩石灣路，呢度就話呢條路係需要巴士司機要具備經驗同埋技巧同埋要係好警覺，尤其係呢一個磩石灣嘅彎，因為好細微嘅錯誤都會引致意外。跟住 52 段...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講第二樣之前，可唔可以講番，講呢句說話嘅係咩嘢人呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係黃福根，佢都係議員嚟嘅，以我所知，佢都係呢一個委員會嘅委員。272 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去睇一睇第 48 段，呢個係副主席張富先生，佢亦都係提出相同嘅問題，佢話最大嘅問題係出於道路，而唔係巴士，因此首要係改善道路彎位，佢亦都講，就根本就唔夠位就係兩架巴士一齊通過呢段路，尤其係磩石灣嘅彎位十分急速嘅。我想聽一聽你對呢件事嘅睇法，呢個對你嚟講--對你哋公司嚟講，係咪都係一個關注點呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思就係話個問題係個道路？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先就係個道路，另外有啲嘅委員亦都講到，就係需要嗰啲車長需要足夠嘅經驗。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以呢度有兩條問題嘅。

黃女士：There are two questions.

主席：（經傳譯員）第一個問題就係話，就住呢個觀察，就係話個問題在道路本身，你哋嘅立場係點樣呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。首先我哋想都藉呢個機會，其實喺好多唔同嘅場合，包括係啱啱喺呢份文件見到嗰個區議會嗰個會議，我亦都係明白喺之前嘅一啲--即係喺香港嘅交通意外係令到公眾係擔心雙層巴士--即係整體嚟講，雙層巴士嗰個行車安全嘅。不過首先我想喺度先係再去補充--即係提醒番，其實本身今天嗰

條路我哋已經係有巴士行緊嘅，即係唔係話一條路係本身冇巴士去行駛嘅，呢個係首要先。

我哋亦都唔係計劃整個嶼南都去行雙層巴士嘅，我哋嘅判斷有一部分係向例如大澳、昂平嗰面係都唔適合行雙層巴士嘅。而去梅窩嗰面，我哋認為係可以行嘅，雙層巴士，因為我哋今天打算--即係今天我哋之前已經開咗標，去採購嗰種巴士其實喺市面度，我相信在座好多人都會了解，例如喺港島，都一樣係有好多山路好險要，好多彎路係行，包括赤柱、山頂、石澳等等嘅路段嘅，而我哋打算採購嗰一種嗰款車個車長都係甚至乎係比我哋今天嘅單層巴士係為短嘅，嗰部車係 10.4 米，我哋今天嘅單層巴士係介乎 11 米，接近 11 米 5 左右，11 米 3 至 11 米 6，所以變咗個長度嚟講，佢係短咗嘅，同單層巴士嚟比較。

當然我哋都好理解有個感覺話雙層巴士嗰個會唔會反車個風險大咗等等，當然可能喺科學上、理論上可能會，但係我哋覺得最重要、最重要就係駕駛個車長個態度。當然你話呢架車單層永遠都係比雙層去反嗰個風險會為低，咁係咪全港所有嘅山路都唔可以行雙層巴士呢？我相信都唔會係一個咁嘅情況。所以我哋認為最重要嘅係個車長嘅態度。

當然我哋喺嗰個車個硬件上面，我哋亦都要去諗有啲乜嘢係--例如好似我哋今次就係覺得用一架短啲嘅車，因為我哋其實喺市面上係有長啲嘅雙層巴士嘅，但係我哋都係選擇例如用一部短啲嘅雙層巴士，個高度亦都係矮啲嘅，而我哋相信呢一個配置，再加上我哋畀到適合嘅培訓畀我哋啲車長，係可以將呢個風險係減低。唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃先生，你話最重要嘅就係呢個車長嘅駕駛態度，嘅意思係乜嘢呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。可能我哋個做法比較傳統啲，始終喺巴士--每一架巴士都需要一個車長去操控，始終佢都係一個人，我哋唔同話係飛機或者鐵路，有好多--今天嘅科技已經有好多好自動化嘅儀器去幫嗰啲機師或者火車上嘅車長。喺巴士嚟講，我哋呢個咁--我哋自己本身亦都係--頭先你有提及到我哋公司嘅主席黃良柏先生，佢係我嘅父親，我哋自己經營咗呢個交通運輸行業，係我已經去到第三代，由阿爺開始去做。而當然你話以前嘅車，佢哋成日都去講以前嘅車係咪好似今日咁樣咁先進呢？當然我可能都根本都未出世，可能以前嘅車我都未睇到，但係我哋深信最緊要、最緊要嗰個元素，今天要去安全，當然有科技去幫到我哋梗係好，係一個輔助，但係最重要嘅一定係我哋車長嘅嗰個態度，即係佢要係有個心去專業嘅，佢有個心係去真係去安全咁去駕駛嘅，呢啲係相信係最核心嘅價值。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你早前講過就係雙層巴士無論係長度同埋高度嚟講，就係會係就短過同埋矮過就係單層巴士嘅，但係陳先生就喺第 48 段嗰度講，喺 278 頁嗰

度講，...

主席：（經傳譯員）佢就當然係長度係比較短，但係如果喺高度嚟講，一定唔會係低過或者矮過嗰個單層巴士。

黃女士：Not less in height but...

主席：But shorter...

黃女士：...shorter.

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）但係就係嗰個係比較一般嘅雙層巴士係比較矮嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就想睇一睇另外一個會議嘅會議紀錄，呢個係有關就係2015年4月6號發生嘅交通意外，就係你哋嘅公司嘅一架巴士就差啲跌落山，就係落緊斜嘅時候，就由東涌--大澳嘅時候，你記唔記得呢個事件呢？我哋可以就係畀你睇一睇個相關嘅新聞報道嘅，係幫你去睇一睇，呢個係講緊羌山道。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係個來源喺邊度呢，呢個嘅文章？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係《東方日報》2015年5月30號嘅一個報道。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇一睇呢一個報道，你或者記唔記得呢個意外係2015年4月6號發生嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個喺我哋嘅聽證會文件之中喺邊度搵到呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個就冇擺落個文件冊嗰度，但係就係喺個網站嗰度嘅，我哋亦都係將佢翻譯咗出嚟，等你容易啲去參考嘅。

黃焯安先生：唔該。主席，因為如果我就咁睇呢個報道，其實佢裏面提及到首先有一單係四十二年前嘅意外，跟住另外有一單就係十二年前，另外就反而佢冇提到話2015年4月嗰單，但係張--即係如果你話張相呢個，呢個我哋有印象嘅，呢單意外。三單意外，我相信都係唔同嘅成因嘅，你話喺四十二年前嗰單，嗰條路同而家個路況相信都已經係改變咗好多，當然我唔--四十二年前嘅，我唔能夠確定嗰陣時個路況係點，但係我一路嘅理解，就係聽番啲同事講嗰個今天喺大嶼山嗰面嘅路況已經係改善咗好多。咁十二...

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，你慢慢睇，睇完先至回答。

黃焯安先生：Yes。至於裏面提及到03年嗰個意外，就我哋要返去再搵一搵資料先，而家嗰個都唔係太過肯定當時嗰個事發地點同埋嗰個事發經過。至於你話15年嗰個，就喺內文--呢度內文就冇提及到嘅，係張相嗰度--有見到張相係喺嗰個--即係有架車揦住咗喺嗰度咁樣，係喇，呢個，呢個就應該係我粗略記得

都係 15 年時候去--好似 15 年嗰陣時發生嘅，好似係，應該係，係喇。

呢一單意外嗰陣時就冇--即係慶幸係冇人係嚴重受傷或者--即係死傷都冇嘅，係當日有乘客係受咗輕傷，而要去送院。當然喺呢張相嗰個角度去睇係即係好似好驚險咁嘅，但係其實前面嗰度唔係一個--即係佢嗰個位係嗰啲--嗰個平，即係其實佢前面車頭嗰個位係--即係其實都係一個陸地嚟嘅，其實平嘅，但係當然係我哋事後去了解番嗰個--即係呢一單意外，我哋之後都去檢討係要去點樣做好啲呢，就係嗰陣時嗰個--即係再 detail 啲，真係要返去搵下，但係就本身嗰個車款同埋我哋之後都要求咗係用另外--即係可以用一個--個中文應該係叫「減速器」，就變咗可以唔使淨係靠個剎車系統去--因為嗰度係個斜路落嚟，就唔需要淨係靠嗰個剎車系統去剎車。

呢啲裝置，即係呢一個減速器呢個裝置，我哋都係會喺--就算我哋之後用雙層巴士又好，或者我哋自己今天用嘅單層巴士都好，都係有配備咗呢個裝置。

黃女士：Thank you. Actually the...

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問一問，呢張喺螢幕上嘅巴士，呢個你係會係 2015 年 4 月 6 號嗰個交通意外嘅情況嚟嘅，係唔係呢？

黃焯安先生：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰個文章本身就冇講到呢一單意外嘅，但係淨係幅相係關於呢單意外嘅啫？

黃焯安先生：係喇，如果我就咁睇呢個新聞，就冇提到嗰單新聞，可能唔喺呢個報道度。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，你有冇 2015 年 4 月 6 號嗰一單意外嘅報道呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係 2015 年 5 月 18 號呢一個離島區議會嘅一個會議紀錄嗰度，就中文版 203，然後英文版係 208 嘅，呢一個就係有關於回應一個 201 頁嗰個問題，就係英文版係 202 嘅，係余先生係一個區議會議員嘅時候就係問到呢個北大嶼公路嗰個嘅安全嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋就應該係...

黃女士：We should start with the question.

主席：（經傳譯員）就係中文版係 201，英文版就係 202 嘅，黃先生，或者你自己睇一睇先。

黃焯安先生：Yes。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃先生，你睇一睇第 204 頁，我相信你個公司嘅代表係黃先

生都有出席嘅，喺英文版就係209頁嘅，喺離島區議會嘅2015年5月18號嘅時候就發現有三個主要嘅問題嘅，佢哋講及嗰個道路嘅設計，呢個就係喺79(c)嗰段，當時就係劉焯榮先生，佢都係委員之一，佢就提出呢點嘅，佢就話嗰個係大嶼山嘅道路設計就唔安全嘅，譬如話嶼南道同埋係羌山路，即係喺水塘同大澳之間嗰段路都唔安全嘅；另外，佢就話運輸署就已經係多次就係作出改善嘅，但係都有超過十個彎位嘅，但係只係得三個真係有所改善嘅。

跟住佢就講出第二個問題，你可以睇到79(d)嗰段嘅，運輸署就係批准係有三十條嘅旅遊路線就喺大嶼山嗰度行走嘅，但係呢啲車嘅車身就係比起正常嘅巴士稍為長嘅，同埋行呢個係羌山道一啲唔合標準嘅彎位嘅話，就更加容易係發生意外。

第三個成因，佢就話--你可以睇呢個第81段，李桂珍女士就咁講嘅，佢亦都係委員之一嚟嘅，佢就話要求擴闊嗰條道路，即係嶼南路，其實要求咗超過二十年，但係嗰個情況依然係未有改善嘅。

而關於第一點，我相信黃華先生，即係你哋嘅代表，當時就問過究竟嗰三個改善地點係邊三個，或者我哋可以睇一睇呢個第80段--對唔住，第90段。黃華先生就問究竟嗰三個改善咗嘅地點係喺邊度，或者將要改善嘅邊度嘅，佢嘅意見就認為係羌山道有三十個地點係需要改善嘅。

我而家個問題係你公司有冇係搵出運輸署所講嗰三十個地點呢？

黃焯安先生：Chairman，關於呢一個，呢一刻我哋唔能夠確定有冇同運輸署嗰面去喺一啲正式嘅文書或者書信往來係畀佢哋話我哋係希望佢去--即係去將話邊啲位置去改造咁樣，呢個都要返去--因為本身喺區議會代表我哋嗰位黃華先生今日就唔在場，同埋佢都已經退咗休其實，我哋都要返去搵一搵番啲資料，睇下佢去--即係我哋都搵番究竟係同署方嗰面嗰個往來係點樣先。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，好，請你返去搵一搵，如果係攞到啲咩嘢資料可以幫我哋理解嘅話，就麻煩你係交畀我哋委員會。

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）好呀，主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提供資料嗰方面，麻煩你亦都係幫我哋手，話埋畀我哋聽呢度嗰三十個地點係咪都係你哋喺培訓嘅課程裏面所提及嘅交通意外黑點分析嘅名單上面呢？

黃焯安先生：主席，因為呢一刻我哋手頭上冇--即係唔知究竟係黃華先生嗰陣時講嗰三十個--約略喇，佢話“has about 30 spots”，約呢三十個需要改善嘅位置係喺邊個位，所以我哋都唔能夠一時間去回覆到究竟呢三十個位係咪等同我哋而家自己喺培訓嗰度覺得需要特別加強嗰三十個位，我都真係抱歉，呢度我都要返去真係先搞清楚喺黃華先生佢講嘅呢約略三十個位係邊三十個位先。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒，麻煩你返去咁樣查下喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我亦都想講一講一個違例泊車呢一個課題，想請你係睇一睇呢一個雜項文件夾嗰度嘅第 643 頁，如果係翻譯，就係 644 嗰頁嘅。想請你睇睇呢度呢一頁嘅第三段，644-1 嗰一頁嘅，呢度係有一封信，就係民主陣線係寫畀委員會，係請委員會就係要留意嘅，呢度就開頭嗰句就係話係巴士車長喺 2017 年 2 月、2018 年所採取嘅工業行動，就係令到係社區嘅不同界別嘅人士留意到一啲咁嘅問題，例如就係喺巴士站違例泊車、車長嘅待遇同埋嗰啲工作時間；跟住佢哋就係列出幾個原因點解係有人違例泊車--喺巴士站違例泊車。

我哋落去跟住嗰頁，644，英文版就 644-1，呢度就講嘅，如果要係取締巴士站嘅違例泊車，一定係要連根拔起同埋要有適當嘅政策，亦都係要將嗰啲過時嘅法例係修訂嘅，呢個問題要解決嘅話，一定要多管齊下。佢哋其中一個建議...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你未繼續之前，英文版喺邊度呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）644-1，下面嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）最後嗰段，最後嗰段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，最後嗰段。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住嗰頁，644-2 嗰頁，佢哋作一個咁嘅建議嘅，就話可以跟隨星加坡嘅例子，就喺所有車隊嘅巴士嗰度都係安裝呢個相機，自從 2008 年星加坡已經係咁做，巴士上面同埋車長個座位側邊嗰度嘅，如果司機發現有車停咗喺巴士站嗰度，就撳個掣，然後錄係五至到十分鐘，巴士公司跟住就將嗰個錄影帶交畀警方，警方跟住就可以檢視，然後喺兩個星期之內就會將告票係送去畀呢個車主屋企嗰個住址嗰度。或者我哋未繼續落去之前，我就想問你哋公司覺唔覺得喺巴士站有違例泊車係一個問題呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺大嶼山巴士嘅情況嚟講，本身我哋--因為頭先例如一路講緊嶼南嗰面嘅路係一個禁區，係需要禁區紙先可以進入嘅，喺巴士--即係嗰面嘅車其實同市區比較，係少啲嘅，即係冇咁繁忙嘅，喺你話一啲--即係我哋同事--我哋收到返嚟嘅訊息，你話巴士站呢啲違泊嘅情況係較為少嘅，喺我哋自己嘅暫時嘅一啲路。

當然你話反而係個別--一啲好個別，例如去到喺大澳巴士總站嗰度，因為近年都係一路做緊啲工程等等，喺個巴士總站嗰度就即係個上落客個位置就唔係好足夠，亦都本身可能旁邊有啲車，有少少--尤其是係一啲大時大節咁樣，因為有咁禁區紙，即係嗰度可能當區其實係一啲私家車泊位又唔係好足夠，會有少少啲咁嘅情況，但係你話真係--我相信同市區比較，我哋嗰面嘅嗰個情況就唔係咁惡劣嘅。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解我提出呢件事呢？就係因為離島區議會 2016 年 3 月 21 號嘅會議紀錄嗰度，或者睇番第 98 頁中文。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一度呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）DC-1，第 98 頁就係中文，第 143 至到 144 段，英文就請你睇呢個 103-1 嗰一頁嘅，143、144 兩段，呢兩段都係委員會嘅成員提出嘅，佢哋就講到話泊車--違例泊車同埋雙行泊車，呢個都係指呢個達東路嘅，我想問下，你對於呢兩位區議會嘅委員所提出嘅問題，你有咩睇法？

黃焯安先生：主席，我交畀陳先生代我去作答，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你講。

陳天龍先生：主席，其實喺近年我哋喺東涌營運巴士，都睇到喺達東路其實嗰個交通情況都頗為惡劣嘅，因為嗰度係單向行車，得一條路嘅啫，相信喺區議會裏面嗰啲 member 所提出嚟嘅意見，其實係因為嗰個係一個東涌嘅市中心嘅道路嚟嘅，如果嗰度有擠塞起上嚟，就會成個東涌區都會塞晒嘅，亦都對我哋巴士營運亦都有相當嘅困難，因為我哋嘅巴士站就係喺達東路，變咗有陣時有啲情況可能連我哋架巴士駛出總站都有困難。但係呢一個問題，其實我相信係成個社會個問題嚟嘅，呢個議題其實都喺區議會裏面都存在咗好耐㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係咪話你哋嘅巴士所面對嘅問題就係話喺總站嗰度都難以開出，呢個都係直接係由於係違例泊車，定抑或係間接係因為違例泊車而引致有交通問題所造成呢？

陳天龍先生：係有間接嘅影響嘅，正如我頭先所講，因為呢條路係非常之繁忙嘅，喺東涌市中心嚟講，其實呢條路只要有 double parking 或者有交通意外發生，就會影響到成個東涌市中心都會擠塞。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道警方就係向運輸署同埋立法會嗰度建議，就話應該喺黑點嗰度就係用呢個相機，即係話喺燈柱嗰度係安裝一啲攝影機，嚟到係應付呢一個巴士總站附近嘅違例泊車，咁樣樣就可以收集到啲證據，你知唔知道有咁嘅建議呀？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席，喺新聞度有睇過呢啲關於呢個建議。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你歡唔歡迎一個咁嘅提議呢？

黃焯安先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁嘅建議你覺得好唔好呀，歡唔歡迎呀？

黃焯安先生：當然我代表喺公司嘅立場，當然係非常之歡迎，如果係有方法去解決到

呢啲喺路邊嘅違泊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家講去第二個題目，就關於就係巴士車長嘅紀律處分，我就想請你睇番呢個 NLB-1，呢個第 23 頁嘅，你哋公司就有咁講過嘅，巴士車長如果佢係涉及一啲嚴重嘅交通意外，就會就係唔畀佢繼續揸車住，會暫停駕駛嘅，我想問下，究竟呢個暫時係唔揸車係會維持幾耐嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺我哋--應該喺同一個文件嘅第 13 頁，應該呢個螢幕而家睇緊嗰度之後嗰版，我哋都有去講解番當有啲--即係喺第三樣咁嘅情況，當然其實通常如果真係咁不幸發生一啲好嚴重嘅事故，我哋都當然要先--都要花啲時間去調查究竟係同事嘅問題吖，定係唔係佢嘅責任吖，定係--即係係咪佢個責任。而亦都係呢段時間，其實我哋即係雖然係暫停咗佢個駕駛職務，但係我哋都會係繼續支薪畀佢，即係先我哋了解清楚晒成件事，亦都係--因為亦都試過過往有啲情況係可能係發生咗啲好不幸嘅事件，而個車長係自己要求都係想話要停一停，休息一下先，即係想去啲一啲先咁樣，我哋覺得呢一個先叫佢停工，調查咗先呢個安排係有幫助嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，好，或者想請你睇呢個第 23 頁，你就提及到話一啲車長，懷疑佢哋需要係一啲精神上嘅支援，你可唔可以講下點樣可以搵出呢一類嘅車長？即係話嗰啲需要精神上去特別照顧佢嘅車長。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺今天，我哋就唔會話有一個機制或者調查去睇下我哋啲同事佢會唔會有喺你啱啱提到嘅 mental problem 咁樣，呢個都係我相信要好專業嘅人士先至可以畀到呢個意見，而我哋--即係你啱啱講話我哋點去--即係呢啲人係--呢啲同事喺邊度嚟，就都係要等個同事自己主動提出。倘若例如佢係一啲唔係一啲 physically 嘅問題，佢係覺得有啲咩嘢心--即係個心裏面有啲咩嘢唔舒服，想好似搵人哋去傾下偈，去傾訴咁樣嘅，我哋公司就搵咗一個出面嘅機構去合作，就係可以畀我哋嘅同事去打電話嗰度，就去得到一啲專業啲嘅幫助。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提及就係一個輔導嘅服務，呢個輔導嘅服務係咪由你公司提供，由你公司支付嘅，畀錢嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該。呢一刻我哋係將呢個服務係有個熱線畀咗我哋嘅同事嘅，而個同事如果覺得有需要，就可以致電去嗰個一個顧問服務熱線咁樣，當佢喺嗰個熱線嗰度去同嗰面個 operator 去傾完，而嗰面佢覺得佢係有需要，因為可能佢都要先篩選下或者了解下個問題係啲咩嘢嘅，佢係覺得佢係有需要係做一啲--即係一啲叫做輔導性質，佢會再將佢轉介去另外一啲再專業啲嘅機構，以上呢啲都係由我哋公司去畀嘅費用，就唔需要我哋嘅僱員去自付。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你想唔想引入一個系統就係定期評估巴士車長心理、精神上係咪適合繼續做車長？

黃焯安先生：好，唔該。因為本身喺上一次城巴上完嚟委員會之後，我亦都留意到其

實佢有去研究緊究竟合唔合適，我自己就都有去--因為我自己有啲朋友係有去一啲--即係叫做心理學家，咁我都即係先係想去搞清楚其實究竟喺從一個真係叫做話專業啲嘅角度係點幫到我哋呢？即係初步，我諗--不過我哋只係一個好初步咁樣，而我嘅了解到，就係我哋又唔好話會覺得係咁容易會話去搵到話--即係就算心理學家都好，佢都唔會可以話到畀我哋聽有邊啲人係合適定係唔合適去做一個巴士嘅車長嘅。

反而心理學家可能係做咗一啲適當嘅評估之後，佢係可以話到畀我哋公司聽可能呢一個同事佢係喺邊一方面係較為弱，係需要即係有啲--或者係需要一啲額外嘅支援或者協助嘅，就從而係向嗰方面去著手，就唔--即係我相信未必會存在係可以好清一色，好似一個--當係你好似去驗身咁樣，而個醫生可以好清晰咁話到畀我哋聽呢個人係適合揸車定係唔適合揸車咁樣。

但係只係一個好--因為其實頭先我講嘅都係一個口頭上我同--即係我自己嘅一啲朋友去了解嘅，我哋都喺呢一方面，你見到其實我哋自己喺本身都已經係有去--都意識到其實有陣時係同事嘅壓力，尤其是我哋都係較為好日常面對好多唔同嘅人，都了解其實有陣時都要搵啲渠道去畀同事去表達佢哋嘅即係心中嘅一啲壓力嘅，我哋亦都好樂意如果係往後即係繼續會再深入啲了解，如果你話喺心理輔導呢方面，例如係--即係甚至乎你話係一啲入職前去做一啲評估等等，係咪真係有幫助呢？都要真係再了解下先。

或者你話定期嘅去有啲嘅抽查一啲同事咁，但係因為呢一方面就我哋暫時未真係掌握太多資料，就唔能夠話去有個好確實嘅答案，不過就要再研究一下先。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講就係呢一個薪酬同埋福利，我想請你睇你自己嘅文件NLB-1，17同埋21頁，17頁，第二段，由屘數上，你公司就話就係要提高你哋公司個職位嘅吸引力去吸引車長，就會有一個嘅薪酬同埋待遇嘅調整。我想請你睇第21頁，上面就講咗你哋公司嘅薪酬待遇，呢個係調整之前定之後嘅事嚟㗎？

黃焯安先生：請問你講嗰個adjustment係講緊幾時嘅，即係邊個，咩嘢嘅adjustment？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我提及嘅就係你公司嘅意見書，第17頁屘數上第二段第三行，上面就提及過，就係“wages and welfare package adjustment”，薪酬同埋福利嘅待遇調整...

主席：（經傳譯員）你成段讀，成句讀。

黃女士：Yes。（經傳譯員）佢就話「為咗提升我哋職位嗰個吸引力同埋挽留現有嘅車長，除咗就係調整薪酬同埋福利，我哋公司就係發展緊一啲嘅措施，就係包括就不限於係以下嘅一啲項目，以提高工作嗰個嘅滿足感嘅」，呢個就係我所提及嘅嗰個調整。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺呢個薪酬嗰個表嗰度，就係 2017 年 7 月份嘅，今年就未做呢個調整。至於頭先嗰句，即係你啱啱--黃小姐提到嗰個 adjustment，即係嗰個成個安排就係喺頭先嗰段後面就有幾樣--有幾個措施，就係即係我哋除咗喺 take-home pay，即係佢真係喺個薪酬嗰度，另外我哋就去加強咗啲係希望--我諗主要係講緊後面呢度，你話本身佢哋嗰個--上面嗰個表嗰個人工就係 2017 年 7 月到暫時為止，我哋都而家一路喺度都準備緊 2018 年嗰個人工，就都而家準備緊，睇下--即係未--都仲傾緊都係個加幅嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係幾時決定 2018 年嘅加幅呀？

黃焯安先生：唔該，本身我哋正常嚟講，就係 7 月 1 號嘅時候加人工嘅，今年個情況就我哋本身喺 4 月初嘅時候就公布咗會發放一個一次性嘅特別獎金先嘅，因為我哋其實係留意到喺個市場度其實另外兩間巴士公司喺 2、3 月嗰陣時咁上下，佢哋就--應該 3 月份嘅時候，就佢哋將一個佢哋薪酬度有啲--個架構有啲改變咗，就我哋擔心如果我哋等到 7 月份先至加人工，就會同佢哋嗰個距離太遠，就所以我哋喺 4 月份就有個一次性嘅--有個咁嘅安排，就去到 9 月底嘅時候發放。

至於 2018 個人工，我哋呢一刻就都係正常，其實每年都係會同工會嗰面去商討，第一；亦都係我哋自己睇番我哋自己公司嗰個情況，同埋其中一樣，我哋都會係有個指標性去參考，就係因為我哋嗰個規模就係最細嗰間，我哋都會係睇番市場另外兩間主要嘅公司，睇一睇佢哋嗰個大概個加幅係點樣嘅，我哋又再去--即係都有啲參考作用。

因為今年--其實今日已經係 6 月 19 號，暫時嚟講，我哋睇可能都係會--應該希望喺 7 月份、8 月份咁上下做到，如果你話過咗 7 月 1 號嘅，我哋就會--即係往時都係叫追加番咁樣。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀一個更新咗嘅表，即係你喺做咗 2018 年嘅覆核之後，畀番一個更新版本我哋？

黃焯安先生：當然可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇番個表，可以見到薪酬待遇，有大部分，即係車長嘅月薪，大部分似乎係來自一個每日嘅值日津貼嘅，即係第 2 項，你同意嘛？

黃焯安先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）每個月有幾多日車長係需要工作嘅呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該，就平均而言，就二十四至二十五日。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）大概計到就係五千五百零釐嗖，即係二十四日嘅值日津貼的話，如果車長係病咗，係咪佢唔會得到呢一個--呢項嘅津貼㗎喇？

黃焯安先生：係，請問你係咪講緊第 2 項嗰個 duty allowance？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃焯安先生：如果嗰日個同事個車長係冇上班，就唔會攞到個 duty allowance。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）譬如如果佢係病咗三日，就會失去七百零蚊，係咪呀？大概700蚊喽，假設就係一日$230。

黃焯安先生：係，thank you，Chairman，係，確認，如果嗰個同事係假設你啱啱講嗰個例子，佢係三日病咗，冇上到班，係，嗰三日嗰個 duty allowance 係唔會攞到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第4項嗰個勤工獎，就係每個月咁計？

主席：（經傳譯員）未講呢樣嘢之前，個失去咗嘅值日津貼，即係每一日$230 就係逐日計，定係佢成套嘅值日津貼冇咗？

黃焯安先生：如果係講緊個 duty allowance，我哋係逐日去計算畀個同事嘅，佢一日--即係佢例如係叫做佢係嗰日--嗰個月佢有二十五個工作天，嗰個 duty allowance 就係用$230 乘以25咁去計算，如果佢係咩嘢緣故都好，而佢係少--即係叫做係嗰個日數係少咗嘅，個收入就會係用番$230 乘番幾多日咁去減少咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係如果佢二十五日裏面有一日冇返工，只係喪失 230 蚊嘅，即係嗰日嘅津貼啫，係咪呀？

黃焯安先生：如果係用第2種嘅 duty allowance 嚟講，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃焯安先生：係，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）勤工獎呢？750 蚊就係月計嘅，如果佢病咗三日，會唔會扣咗--即係會按比例咁樣扣番呀？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺嗰個講到去呢個 attendance bonus 呢度，本身係我哋呢個中文係叫做勤工服務獎，係每月去發放畀個同事嘅，如果佢係有--即係冇上到班，第一日就會係少發兩百蚊，第二日就少發$250，第三日就少發$300，如此類推，就如果佢三日--即係咁樣，你將佢加埋，三日就係 750 蚊就唔會發畀個同事，個獎金，即係三日都個同事係冇上到班，呢個 attendance bonus 都係唔會發畀個同事嘅，變咗，如果佢一日，就係$200。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我計得啱，如果車長係病咗三日，總共就會喪失 1,500 蚊，我咁樣講，計得啱唔啱？$750 加$750。

黃焯安先生：唔好意思，主席。係，確認，如果嗰個同事佢係三日--如果佢三日冇上到班，就會係好似頭先咁講，喺 duty allowance 嗰度有 690 蚊嘅扣減--唔

係扣減，即係少發咗。同埋就係喺 attendance bonus 嗰度又$750 亦都係唔會發畀個同事。唔該。

黃女士：Now would this -- sorry.

主席：（經傳譯員）歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我咁樣講，就係話值日津貼同埋勤工獎服務都係同一個目標，就係希望鼓勵嗰啲員工係儘量都返工嘅？

黃焯安先生：唔該歐陽先生，如果回應你嘅提問，我哋去--好似你咁講，去訂立呢個 duty allowance 嗰個用意係想同事係積極啲去工作，呢個第一；第二，你話去--因為嗰個勤工獎嗰個其實佢有個變化嘅，本身以往係即係同安全獎都係，其實係一個--當然嗰陣時我唔係好--即係呢一刻我都可能都要搵番啲舊啲嘅資料，可能以前係一年發一次或者發兩次咁樣嘅，但係慢慢因為同事都反映番，如果咁樣，要等太耐，第一，呢個獎金要去到一年或者半年先攞到，就變咗季度，季度再久而久之轉咗就月發，就咁樣。

好似你咁講，如果你話嗰個--我哋個目的係咩嘢呢？的而且確我哋當然就係想我哋嘅同事係即係積極去工作。驟眼睇，都你可以話佢哋嗰個出發點係相近。

歐陽先生：Okay，thank you，thank you。

黃焯安先生：唔該。

歐陽先生：Thank you，Ms Wong。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以個答案係即係簡單嚟講，就「係」喇？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係唯一嘅獎金就係鼓勵嗰啲同事係工作嘅，如果你睇番第 6 項，關於休息日嘅津貼，車長就會係每一日嘅工作日就係 625 紋嘅，如果佢哋喺休息日都工作，佢哋就會獲發 625 紋，係咪呢？

黃焯安先生：係，我諗喺度都想講一講我哋背後嗰個理念，可能講出嚟會--希望個字眼表達得可以好啲，因為本身--正如我頭先咁講，我哋嘅主席黃良柏先生佢從事咗交通運輸行業係好多年，而佢亦都有個較為--即係佢覺得係一個實際啲嘅想法，當如果我哋一啲咁基層前線嘅同事，如果佢想去喺嗰個你啱啱講嗰個 rest day 嗰個--其實呢$625 係另外去發畀啲同事，即係佢會本身嗰日已經係有當天嘅 duty allowance，另外再發嗰個$625 畀佢嘅，係因為佢知道如果嗰個同事，例如佢係嗰個月 suppose 佢原先佢應該要返廿五日工，變咗佢肯額外返多一日，返第二十六日咁嘅，打個比喻，當然就係正正個同事犧牲咗佢嘅

休息嘅時間，而我--如果倘若我哋唔去叫做畀一個 rest day allowance 嗰個同事，可能嗰個同事只係會--因為其實喺出面其實要去搵一啲兼職揸車嘅工作，其實都市場上有好多嘅，包括可能喺出面揸貨車、的士等等，我哋公司嘅諗法就係覺得倒番轉，與其係咁，不如我哋畀個好啲嘅叫做少少回報咁樣去畀我哋同事。

正如我哋再之前有提及到，其實我哋同其他巴士公司比較，係多咗五日嗰個假期，其實嗰五日假期，好坦白講，好坦白講，個同事其實未必--因為我哋會係容許個同事去選擇放假，有啲同事佢不嬲都係冇放開咁多假嘅，可能佢會選舉去寧願係想工作嘅，佢就變相喺呢度都係一個加咗人工畀個同事咁樣。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）羅教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）關於休息日嘅呢度，其實我哋--你係邀請嗰個車長係去工作，還是個車長自己要求呢？譬如話我係有一日係放咗病假嘅，我就喺番我嘅休息日去工作番，我咪彌補番囉咁樣，會唔會係咁呢？

黃焯安先生：好，唔該晒教授。本身如果個同事佢係--例如佢想話休息--即係少一日休息咁樣，佢想話嗰日去開車咁嘅，當然要實際睇番佢幾時同公司申請，即係如果佢例如係無端端話聽日畀人哋--約咗人，人哋俗啲咁講，放咗佢飛機，唔知應該點可以簡單講，就佢突然間話佢冇嘢做，想開番工，我哋都要實際睇番究竟我哋有冇需要，通常嚟講，即係咁嘅情況，其實就都唔會有工作畀佢做，即係咁即時，因為本身我哋其實嗰個更分係編好晒。當然我哋亦都係再睇番其實我哋自己運輸署嗰個 guidelines，睇下佢有冇話--亦都睇番實際情況，佢有冇超咗工作時間等等，呢一類型。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，總結嚟講，就係呢個咁樣嘅工資嘅結構，就會令到嗰啲車長會係就工作長啲時間，甚至乎當佢病嘅時候佢都想工作呢？

黃焯安先生：我諗首先，要睇下你講話“he was sick”，即係佢唔舒服嗰度，究竟佢係真係非常之唔舒服而係唔適合駕駛，定係佢有少少唔舒服都仲可以駕駛，因為我哋相信我哋今日呢個制度就係倘若嗰個同事佢係有少少唔舒服嘅，因為你話 sick 都可以係睇下嗰個程度去到邊，如果本身佢真係都唔適合駕駛嘅，佢當然係唔能夠話就算佢唔想去休息，佢都係--即係佢都不能駕駛，佢都唔可以去開車㗎。

同埋我哋--當然我哋自己個信念本身嘅核心，就係覺得多勞多得，因為我哋呢個係一個服務性嘅工種，當然可能我哋裏面都係有啲例如新嚟見工、入職嘅同事有反映話好似好複雜，有陣時我哋都要花好多唇舌去計算畀個同事，但係當然我哋嗰個希望最緊要做到出嚟嘅就係真係畀到一啲勤力嘅同事，佢哋係用心去做嘅同事，佢哋係攞到佢哋應有嘅薪金，就係我哋嗰個目標係咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，我就想去另外一個課題，就係關於乘客嘅表現，我哋聽到

其他嘅巴士公司就佢哋話一啲車長係曾經係同呢個顧客嘅行為係有問題，就係有困難嘅，你哋有冇係有收過類似嘅投訴呢？

黃焯安先生：主席，我交畀黃焯添先生去作答。

主席：Yes, Mr Wong.

黃焯添先生：唔該主席。頭先 James 都有講到，我哋嘅服務係相對比較地區性，我哋大部分嘅路線都係圍繞住喺東桶區或者嶼南區嘅，所以大部分平日嘅乘客都會係一啲本地嘅住客，我哋嘅同事或者係車長、站長都基本上係每日都見到呢啲乘客嘅，所以我哋遇到呢啲所謂爭執或者係投訴係相對地較少。

另外我哋最主要另外一個收入嘅來源或者係客路就係旅客。旅客相對地嚟講，因為佢哋本身嚟嘅 intention 都係遊覽香港，佢哋比較少會係遇到呢啲爭執嘅問題嘅；相反之，我哋喺前線嘅站長遇得比較多問題嘅就係可能喺車上可唔可以攜帶行李或者係如果入大嶼山嘅話，可唔可以帶一啲 surfing board、單車，呢啲我哋喺前線嘅站長嘅處理都儘量係會同啲乘客講如果太大件嘅，亦都唔可以攜帶上車。如果可以嘅，我哋一啲旅遊巴係有一啲行李櫃可以放到入去嘅，我哋都儘量會幫啲乘客去放入去。所以對於我哋公司嚟講，呢一類型嘅爭執係比較少見。唔該主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其中一個就安全嘅設施，喺你哋嘅巴士，就係有閉路電視--喺嗰個司機位嗰度就係有閉路電視係有錄影嘅功能嘅，呢度有冇一個嘅錄音系統嘅呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽喺邊度，喺個陳詞度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第 20 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就關於嗰個安全裝置，就喺佢哋嘅文件冊第 2 號嘅第 453 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講一講第 20 頁嗰度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，喺呢一個嘅閉路電視都可以實時嗰啲資料抽取，就可以去監察車長同埋乘客嘅情況，特別係喺一啲安全同埋緊急嘅情況有關嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 453 頁嗰度呢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺第 16 項嘅安全裝置。呢個嘅閉路電視系統又或者呢個攝錄機佢哋有冇一啲錄音嘅功能？

黃焯添先生：先解釋番有啲邊類型嘅鏡頭先喇，我哋有兩款嘅巴士嘅，第一款就係單層巴士，另外一款係雙層嘅。先講雙層，我哋新買番嚟嘅雙層巴士都會有配備

到CCTV嘅功能嘅，剛才你嘅問題係audio，有audio function嘅都會係只係放喺司機頂頭上面嗰個，司機頂頭上面嗰個。至於我哋一啲現有嘅巴士，existing嗰啲單層巴士，我哋暫時係未裝CCTV嘅，因為要retrofit呢啲CCTV嘅鏡頭係需要好多時間，同埋其實本身呢一個系統係需要一啲叫recurring cost，就係我哋每個月都要畀一啲可能monthly fee，相比起現時我哋嘅財政嘅--即係我哋financial burden，我哋未有咁樣嘅方向，每一部車會retrofit CCTV，但係新車我哋係會積極考慮裝晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你剛才提及個閉路電視係錄音嘅功能，就係會擺喺車長個頭頂嘅，嗰個目的係乜嘢呢？

黃焯添先生：個錄音嘅裝置最主要係當有一啲乘客有投訴或者係喺我哋嘅CS hotline係講番同司機有爭執嘅情況，我哋先至會攞番呢啲嘅數據出嚟去睇番件事係點樣嘅。本身我哋自己唔會主動去retrieve呢啲--唔會主動去攞番呢啲嘅file去睇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你即係被動，就話如果係有投訴，你哋先至會睇，所以你就唔會話係抽查嘅，係咪？

黃焯添先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：The next topic is the design of buses and safety devices and if I may invite you to go to NLB-2 bundle at page 2. The franchise agreement starts at page 2. If we go to page 5, clause 7.

主席：Sorry, which bundle is this?

黃女士：This is the NLB-2 bundle. Could you familiarise yourself with the provisions of clause 7(1) at page 5. It makes reference to the grantee providing, amongst other things:

> "... such safety or service enhancement facilities, installation, fixtures, fittings, [et cetera] ... apparatus or equipment on its buses as may be reasonably required by the commissioner of transport after consultation with the grantee."

So, in other words, （經傳譯員）運輸署署長嘅要求同埋就係係經過諮詢過專營公司，所以就係運輸署署長就係可以有合理咁樣去係要求你哋係裝置一啲可以提升服務質素嘅設施嘅？

黃焯安先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最近你有冇同政府有討論關於係點樣係裝置一啲提升服務嘅設施呢？

陳天龍先生：主席，我想交代，就係其實我哋喺同運輸署傾新 franchise 嗰陣時，都有一啲 facilities 運輸署要求我哋 provide 嘅。另外喺最近我哋同運輸署嘅會議上面都有講到一啲安全嘅設施係安裝喺啲巴士上面嘅，呢個我哋都有同運輸署有討論。

黃女士：Can you tell...

主席：（經傳譯員）請問係幾時呢？

黃焯安先生：新嗰個專營權，我哋係講緊喺 2017 年嘅時候正式去實行嘅，當然嗰陣時去傾，我哋要睇番啲資料先，但係約略係 2015 年底、2016 年頭嗰陣時開始去同運輸署接觸，要去--即係有啲咩嘢再喺新嗰個專營權嗰度去加強。至於頭先啱啱陳生提到嗰個一啲關於同署方嗰面去傾關於一啲安全嘅設施嗰個會就係喺最近呢幾個月開過兩次會，喺最近呢幾個月開過兩次會，嚟緊會開第三次。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時開呢啲會嘅呢？

楊家寶先生：主席，有少少補充一下，嗰個會議應該係有三次咁多嘅，就係就呢個獨立調查委員會之後成立嘅第二個工作小組，第一次會議就係喺 3 月 27 號，第二次喺 5 月 30 號，第三次喺 6 月 12 號嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲會議就係專營巴士公司、巴士製造商同埋運輸署係出席嘅會議嚟嘅，係咪呀？啱唔啱呀？

楊家寶先生：Correct，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有講過話一啲安全嘅裝置，其實你哋係同運輸署係討論過邊一啲嘅係安全嘅設備呢？即係你頭先提及三次會議，係講及邊一啲嘅安全設備呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者暫時可以係唔答呢個問題住，我諗我哋起碼都要係做到五點半，不如而家作一個小休，我諗我哋都要畀少少時間你休息，我哋而家休息十分鐘，唔該，休息十分鐘。

下午 4 時 32 分聆訊押後

下午 4 時 41 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）不久之前，黃先生，我哋剛剛就係畀你睇咗 TD-1 第 98 頁，TD-1 第 98 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係咩嘢文件嚟㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢份文件就係運輸署嘅文件嘅，文件 7 號，嗰個標題就係話係專營巴士公司，喺 81 頁嗰度開始嘅，就係「車輛安全 – 設計建造、檢查同埋驗車」嘅，我哋就想睇番呢個第 98 頁嘅，就係使用科技嚟到就係加強專營巴士嘅安全。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：Thank you。（經傳譯員）黃先生，想問下，你剛才有冇時間就係睇一睇呢一份文件，特別係第 10 段呢？

黃焯安先生：係，睇咗。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅安全裝置係咪就係你哋同運輸署喺嗰三次會議裏面所提及、所討論嘅安全裝置呀？

黃焯安先生：係，係嗰啲三個安全會議嗰度係有討論過上述嘅一啲儀器。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你就係特別睇其中嘅三項嘅，首先就係呢個地理圍欄，即係(c)嗰項，就話靠呢個係全球定位系統或者係地理圍欄嚟到控制嗰個車速。可唔可以話畀我哋聽關於運輸署呢一個建議，即係話要引入呢一個地理圍欄，換句話講，就係使用呢一個全球定位系統，嚟到去限制巴士喺某一啲路段上面嘅車速，你哋個睇法係點呀？

黃焯添先生：主席，要去討論呢個 GPS system，我諗我哋要先帶出個黑盒個 background 先，因為早喺 2015 年同埋 2016 年，喺我哋討論我哋新嘅專營權嘅時候，我哋有去特別搵咗一個新嘅黑盒嘅提供嘅 supplier 嘅，最主要其實之前主席都有講過，其實 GPS 唔係一個好新嘅技術，但係對於我哋營辦商嚟講，我哋最重要同埋要長遠考慮到就係必須要將呢啲 GPS 同埋本身黑盒攞到個數據要以 raw data 嘅形式去上傳番去我哋本身公司嘅 server 嘅。

喺 2012 年至 2015 年嘅時候，其實我哋本身係有另一個黑盒嘅 supplier，但係好多市面上呢啲嘅公司佢哋係以一個 recurring 嘅方式去做一個 monthly cost 嘅 maintenance，對於我哋公司長遠嘅發展，因為其實喺 16 年點解會採購黑盒呢？當然黑盒本身嘅功能係好緊要，另外就係當時我哋新嘅專營權底下，我哋要做一個叫做 ETA 嘅功能，即係實時到站嘅功能，當時

我哋睇咗兩間公司之後，選擇咗而家我哋嘅 supplier，係 Openmatics，呢間公司佢哋嘅 GPS 同埋本身一啲 raw data 嘅數據係可以上傳上去我哋嘅 server 嘅。

講到用 geo-fencing 去監察或者係去限速，呢個我哋係 open-minded 嘅，即係我哋係希望會可以嚟到將來可以研究到一個方式，喺我哋一個特定嘅路段去做呢一個限速嘅。喺度咁講，即係相比起其他嘅營辦商，我相信我哋做到嘅機會亦都會較大，因為本身我哋大嶼山嘅道路相對係少啲 interference，我哋嘅黑盒係可以應該做到容易啲--或者係容易啲將呢啲準確啲將啲 GPS 嘅數據可以上傳到我哋 server。

但係最主要一樣嘢就係將呢一個 GPS 嘅數據實時去同我哋本身架車嘅電腦去做到個配合，呢個係需要時間去研究，最主要係現時我哋嘅黑盒係會直接駁落去車嘅電腦，即係簡稱“bus CAN”。呢一個嘅動作係需要去同車嘅製造商有啲嘅合作去傾嘅，我哋就當然係好 welcome 呢一個新嘅方向去做，但係以我哋而家暫時大嶼山巴士嘅 IT 部門嘅規模，我哋可能係會比起其他公司可能要花多少少嘅時間去做呢一個嘅研究工作，但係絕對係歡迎去做呢一樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）既然我哋都係講緊呢個黑盒，我哋而家講緊個黑盒，我就想請你睇番你哋嘅陳述書 NLB-1 第 14 頁，屘二嗰段，喺嗰度就講咗，「透過我哋內部嘅資訊科技嘅隊伍，我哋係計劃係會發展一個例外報告嘅系統，呢個就係使用就係車上嘅黑盒嘅數據嚟到去產生呢啲報告，就係主動咁提出啲報告，嚟到睇下有邊一啲車長就係佢駕駛嘅習慣係唔好，會引致問題嘅。」

另外就想睇下呢個第 20 頁，就係你哋嗰個陳述書嘅第 20 頁，係屘二嗰段嘅，呢度就話「喺呢一個 2017 年尾有第二代嘅黑盒製造引入咗之後，佢就係會就係最低嗰個層次嗰度有一啲原數據嘅。另外有進一步嘅應用，就譬如話喺一啲例外報告，呢啲就係冇包括在內嘅，即係話車速嘅例外報告就冇嘅，而家我哋就內部就想發展一啲軟件，嚟到提供呢一類嘅資訊，就畀我哋監察住車長嘅表現，目前我哋而家喺度檢視緊同埋綜合緊嗰啲數據嘅，就人手去做嘅，即係如果有交通事件或者有乘客投訴，就會咁做。」

我咁樣理解啱唔啱呢，目前嚟講，你公司係冇一個超速嘅特別報告--自動產生呢啲特別報告嘅功能？

黃焯添先生：呢一刻係冇嘅，但係我哋寫呢份 supporting document 係考慮到嚟緊嘅將來我哋係會加呢一個 exceptional report，係特別喺 over speed 方面，我哋會做多啲工作嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇番 NLB-1 第 33 頁，第一格右手邊有關於委員會進一步嘅問題，係要求你哋提供資料，你喺呢度就話「睇番現有嘅黑盒系統可以記錄到幾個巴士運作嘅資料嘅，包括地理位置、速度、方向檔次、門、有冇人撳鐘等等，係要秒計嘅，如果需要記錄同埋係使用呢啲咁大量嘅數據，係需要大量嘅資金投入有關於呢一個資料傳送同埋儲存同埋要有一個好先進嘅軟件

嘅。」有關於呢一個大量嘅資金投資，你公司係咪願意投資喺呢一方面嘅系統裏面呀？

黃焯安先生：係，唔該主席。喺財務方面，因為我哋喺咁多間巴士公司嗰個規模就最細，當要去發展呢啲軟件或者係一啲新嘅系統，其實需要到嘅嗰個成本，坦白講，不論係一部車同一千部車，其實嗰個發開成本，我相信係唔會睇得太遠嘅，嗰個主要嘅分別就可能喺嗰個硬件，即係喺架車上面嗰個硬件個分別啫，變咗係當我哋嚟緊要去繼續去加強我哋喺呢方面嘅投入，不論頭先 Timothy 提到嘅喺嗰個 exceptional report 等等，呢啲我哋係好樂意去投入嘅，但係都希望係即係會各位係了解，就係當我哋要去做呢啲嘅時候，其實我哋每用--如果你按每部車咁去計嗰個成本，就一定會係比起其他公司係高出好多。

黃焯添先生：同埋我想補充，其實現時我哋嘅投資係投資咗喺啲咩嘢度呢？尤其最主要係兩方面嘅啫，第一方面就係 hardware，喺車上面嘅黑盒，同埋黑盒上傳數據去我哋公司上面嘅 server，呢兩個最主要嘅 hardware cost；另外一啲 software 嘅，就係剛才講到，我哋買呢個黑盒去做一個 back-end system 個 software development fee，本身我哋喺個新專營權度講到要我哋用嘅 ETA 嘅 development fee，每個月巴士--呢啲數據嘅上傳嘅數據費用，呢啲都係一啲 recurring cost 嚟嘅，因為本身要去 maintain 同埋去維繫呢一個系統都需要人力去做嘅。

剛才講到話呢一個黑盒係可以每秒去記錄呢啲嘅數據，但係現時我哋嘅系統係每三十秒，集晒所有數據，每三十秒上傳一次，當如果我哋改到每一秒上傳一次，其實嗰個數據嘅費用同埋本身個 server 個 size 都要相對地係提升，所以講到話會有個 capital investment，其實就喺呢一方面上面係最主要嘅，當然就係本身我哋嘅 software development fee，係主要呢兩方面。唔該主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你提及呢個軟件嘅發展費用...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好講呢樣嘢之前，你話有兩個元素，一個就係黑盒，另外一個就係軟件，我咁講啱唔啱？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）黑盒嘅大約成本係幾多？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）當我哋喺 2016 年開始採購嘅時候，每一件--每個單位就係 800 歐羅一件，大約八千零釐港紙，係 2016 年嘅事。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個係咪最大嘅成本呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係呢一個主要嘅成本，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）軟件呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）目前我哋有三位人員去負責維護呢個系統嘅，有關於嗰個係預計到暫時間嘅發展費用，大概係要一百萬港元。另外有一個事項，我都想提一提，就係安裝費用，安裝費用係關於黑盒嘅，呢個係一啲要有一啲高技術嘅專業人士，呢類嘅技術人員去安裝，需要將佢係同個供應商係連繫，供應商係來自捷克嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係 Openmatics 呢間公司？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。喺 2016 年嘅時候，我哋係冇請到自己公司嘅技術人員嘅，每架巴士嘅安裝費大約係要 4,000 蚊港元。

主席：（經傳譯員）係要去 4,000 蚊？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，睇下係公司裏面有幾多架巴士係提供去安裝黑盒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講過話係軟件就有三項，安裝呢個--預計到站時間嘅要求，仲有另外嗰兩項係咩嘢嚟㗎？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）你指係另外嗰兩位人士呀定係...

主席：（經傳譯員）另外兩位人士，係咪呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係，另外兩位人士，即係人員。

主席：（經傳譯員）另外兩位係咩嘢人？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）總共有三個人員係請咗嚟去發展呢個軟件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係有三個人佢哋嘅費用，你所指人頭就係呢個意思，係咪呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）早前你提及你間公司計劃發展呢個特別報告系統，就會係如果巴士車長係有一啲潛在危險行為，就會發出呢個特別報告嘅，你預期係幾時會做呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）第三季，2018 年嘅第四季。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係今年嘅較後時間？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呢個超速嘅特別報告系統係 2018 年嘅第四季？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽過其他巴士公司，就定咗一啲嘅標準，就係話係車速超

過每一段路段，係每小時過咗五公里，譬如話連續係十秒超過喺一段係限速 50 公里嘅路段，行駛 55 公里，就會係用到呢個嘅系統喇，你哋公司定咗咩嘢標準使用呢個自動發布報告嘅系統呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）我哋要確認一下嗰個條件係乜嘢，我哋要同工會傾過先有最後決定，但係另外嗰兩間巴士公司做嘅嘢，我哋都會考慮。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你問公司會唔會考慮呢個實時係只係同車速有關，定係會考慮埋車長其他嘅問題，譬如話突然耷車，過份係加速，會唔會都包埋喺裏面呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）目前我哋考慮超速係發布報告嘅條件，另外大力剎車、扭軚扭得太犀利，呢樣我哋會進一步再研究。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你會唔會考慮--你一個實時嘅資料可以利用嚟監察某一啲嘅車長嗰個駕駛行為嘅，即係如果發生啲咁嘅事嘅時候？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會考慮，但係我哋要同工會傾一傾，因為呢個係有關於話會影響到車長嗰個嘅集中度嘅，如果太多警報系統的話。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講番第 14 頁你哋嘅交嚟嘅資料，第 14 頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，呢個係超速嘅特別報告，你係打算 2018 年第四季推行，呢個係咪實時做嘅呢，定係話之後事後先至會發出報告㗎？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）實時嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個系統以我所理解，係每三十秒就上傳一次資料嘅，係嘛？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）目前嚟講，係，我哋希望可以做到從黑盒每秒上傳資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講過其實如果要咁做，係有更高成本，呢個成本係乜嘢呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）淨網絡費用就需要多啲嘅寬頻，而家係每三十秒，因為所有資料全部都係壓縮咗先至上傳去我哋嘅伺服器，所以我哋就係暫時做都係每三十秒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道大概額外嘅費用係幾多？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇，連一個範圍都冇？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）每架巴士 100 港元。

主席：Per what?

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）每個黑盒計。

主席：Thank you.

羅先生：（經傳譯員）每個月呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）係，每個月。

黃女士：Thank you. And...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，未講第二啲嘢之前，你有冇同運輸署講過關於成本嘅問題？

黃焯安先生：應該就冇，冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為我哋睇番一啲儀器嘅清單，就係呢一個今年 3 月傾過三次，其中一樣，嗰六項裏面冇講嘅，就係黑盒，即係行車紀錄儀，但係你哋有傾過嘅，係咪呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）唔喺呢個表上面，但係我認為所有嘅巴士公司都有安裝。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢上面冇記錄到嘅，但係有冇傾過呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）有間接傾過黑盒，呢個就係同講呢一個地理圍欄嘅時候提到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個議程係邊個定㗎？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番第 14 頁你哋自己嘅文件，頂數落嚟第三段，最屘嗰句，「目前就係隨意揀選五十程嘅黑盒資料，就會每個月去攞到，而呢個隨機嘅檢查報告係會發送畀運輸署畀佢哋作紀錄嘅。」呢一個嘅 2018 年 3 月。我想問先問，呢度講就話揀咗就係隨機五十程嘅，邊個揀㗎？

黃焯安先生：係我哋公司去揀，我哋公司去選擇。

黃女士：And what is...

黃焯安先生：同埋係五十個 trips，唔好意思，sorry，五十個 trips。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）選擇呢五十個車程嘅條件係乜嘢呀？

黃焯安先生：隨機去揀，random。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你間公司有檢查任何嘢嘅話，係檢查啲乜嘢呢？喺呢個報告裏面，譬如話超速或者有冇任何資料你可以畀到我哋嘅呢？

黃亮霆先生：主席，個資料就係我哋响第二次個 submission 入面嘅 annex 最屘嗰

一版，就有一個報表嘅，就係關於抽查呢啲黑盒嘅數據。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係第2號文件嘅487頁。

黃亮霆先生：係，就係螢光幕而家顯示緊呢個報表，我哋就因應番運輸署嘅要求，就係抽查正話我哋提--見到個段落所提及嘅隨機抽查五十班車嘅黑盒嘅數據，入面就喺嗰個格仔入面都有提到，就係睇啲咩嘢呢？就係睇個車速、佢有冇做過hard brake 嘅動作，或者其他有啲唔正式嘅駕駛嘅行為嘅，喺呢個報表度就我哋淨係就報告番我哋抽查嘅數量，有幾多係正常或者唔正常嘅，至於就話入面會唔會細睇究竟每一單個抽查入面嗰個譬如咩嘢時間、咩嘢位置、究竟發生啲咩嘢，個 raw data 就喺呢個報表入面就冇要求到我哋要同時去遞交嘅。報告係咁多，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）你點樣去釐訂或者界定乜嘢叫做「突然剎車」呢？

黃亮霆先生：我哋嘅資料顯示，就係如果個 G force 係達到 0.2 嗰陣時候，就嗰個hard brake 都係相當之嚴重嘅，我哋會 count 呢個就做一個 hard braking。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪運輸署 2003 年發出關於黑盒嘅自願嗰個指引方面，就係話 G force 去到 0.2 呢？

黃亮霆先生：係嘅，以我哋嘅印象，就係嗰個指引入面係有提及如果萬一架車發生咗交通意外嗰陣時候，就我哋要提供呢一個 G force 嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有啲咩嘢其他嘅不正常嘅駕駛嘅行為你會係監察嘅呢，特別係呢個五十個車程之中？

黃亮霆先生：主席，因為個黑盒同一時間可以記錄到架車當時嗰個地理上嘅位置，即係嗰個 X、Y，我哋叫做，嗰個地理上嘅位置，我哋可以根據番我哋抽查嗰啲車輛究竟佢嗰陣時應該係行緊咩嘢巴士路線、應該係行緊咩嘢方向，我哋可以睇到佢哋係咪出嚟嗰個 raw data 係同佢哋而家執行緊嗰個駕駛職務係相符嘅，如果係個地理位置係唔相符嘅，即係話嗰架車其實係行錯咗路，或者係可能喺時間方面唔吻合，可能佢可能係開錯車諸如此類咁樣樣。唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係講 X、Y，你係咪講緊經度同埋緯度？

黃亮霆先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）個方向呢，係咪講緊嗰個巴士嘅方向呢？

黃亮霆先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃焯安先生：Excuse me，sorry。我呢個同事唔係叫 William Chung，因為佢

嗰度出咗個名係出錯咗個名，我想澄清番，佢係 Billy Wong，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係遠期計劃，就你哋公司提交嘅，係運輸署第 1 號文件夾，係第 236 頁嘅去到 237 頁嘅，236 頁就係下底嘅部分，呢個就係講，就話有一個係透過黑盒嘅錄得嘅數據，就令到希望能夠更好係可以監察車長嘅行為嘅，而呢度就係話啲數據應該係更加詳盡去分析嘅，呢度二百--下一頁就係講，就話應該係呢啲嘅分析嘅資料，就希望能夠係防止以後有類似嘅意外發生嘅，你哋公司有冇做過呢一方面嘅就係分析呢，係致使到相同嘅意外唔會喺將來發生？

黃焯安先生：可唔可以睇番前一頁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第 236 頁。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。喺我哋去訂立呢個 five-year plan 嘅時候，我哋有呢個計劃，但係就到呢一刻為止係未實現到，即係嗰個--頭先喺後面嗰段嗰度，係喇，preventive 嗰度我哋未--暫時呢一刻未做到，個計劃就好似頭先我哋一路講，就希望喺今年年底可以喺呢一方面加強啲。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）亦都係呢一個運輸署嘅第 1 號文件夾第 98 頁，就關於黑盒嘅，我哋係繼續講黑盒。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 33 頁就佢哋嘅文件冊嘅第 1 號，可唔可以將佢打出嚟呢？喺右上角嘅嗰個格裏面，你就話而家就有--目前有個黑盒嘅系統，就講緊點樣去處理同埋去記錄呢啲嘅數據，同埋就係需要傳送數據或者一啲儲存等等，都要好花費嘅，你就話目前嚟講，就呢個就唔係話強行要求就係話專營嘅巴士公司就需要係實時去用黑盒去監察車長嘅表現嘅。我相信你呢個係講緊就係 2003 年，即係十五年前運輸署嘅要求嘅，我係咪正確呢？

黃焯安先生：係，2003 年嗰個時候嘅標準，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋嘅立場就係話因為唔係運輸署嘅要求，所以我咁樣演繹啱唔啱，所以我哋就有個選擇，究竟我哋係點樣做法，我哋有個選擇嘅？

黃焯安先生：Chairman，喺我哋本身頭先我哋同事都有提及到，喺 2003 年之後，我哋當然係嗰陣時要求我哋去裝黑盒，我哋以前係有去即係用--一路--一直用一個舊式嘅黑盒，其實係連一啲資料我哋想去上傳番返去我哋個 server 度，都做唔到。

亦都係喺 2016 年我哋開始去傾個新專營權嘅時候，因為係去做個 ETA，而我哋就換咗一個新款嘅黑盒，喺呢一度，當有呢個新款黑盒嘅時候，我哋就亦都係意識到我哋可以去再做多啲咁樣。當然你頭先提及到，就係--即係我諗個意思都係--如果我冇意會錯，就係我哋喺大嶼山巴士呢一方面係咪可以做多

啲呢，當然係我相信呢個答案永遠都係「係」嘅，我哋永遠都係可以去做多啲嘅，我哋會去一路去檢討，盡力去行前啲。

亦都係好坦白講，亦都係以往有好多我哋亦都唔會知道行業度究竟係--其實有好多發展我哋--以我哋嘅規模，其實我哋有好多嘢係唔能夠完全掌握嘅，係喺呢方面亦都係希望畀啲時間我哋去追番我哋落後咗嘅系統。唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）個要求就係話你就係應該係有個預計實時到站嘅系統嘅，就令到你就係改良嗰個黑盒嘅，係咪咁樣呢？

黃焯安先生：Yes，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以打番出嚟 2003 運輸署嗰個指引呢？你係可以實時係監察嗰個車長嘅表現，其實只不過係--唔係--你主要都係話有個實時到站系統，而監察車長嘅行為只係一個輔助嘅啫，呢個預計實時到站系統令到你其實你亦都有能力係可以做其他實時嘅系統嘅報告嘅？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）呢個預計實時到站系統畀我哋一個機會就睇下可唔可以有啲先進嘅黑盒，嗰啲舊式嘅黑盒其實就令到我哋唔可以取回一啲嘅資料就可以上載，冇錯喇，預計實時到站系統畀我哋有一個機會可以睇一啲新嘅系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇番呢個 2003 年嘅指引，運輸署第一句就係話呢個咁樣嘅裝置有啲咩嘢嘅目的，呢個目的就係提供一啲嘅工具令到巴士公司可以去監察、管理道路上面關於呢個車速同埋一啲呢一個安全有關嘅行為，而係間接係鼓勵一啲更加好嘅駕駛行為嘅，呢個都係一個目的嚟嘅，你同唔同意呢？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署亦都係有提議就喺車廂裏面係有一啲嘅車速顯示器嘅，就係我哋睇番運輸署第 1 號文件冊嘅第 102 至 103 第 21 至 22 段，第 21 段就係「呢個係一個裝置，就可以喺車廂裏面裝置，佢就係知道就係有實時可以喺呢一個嘅嗰個監察器嗰度攞啲資料，而亦都係將嗰個現存嗰個速度就係可以展示出嚟。而家就係有小巴有裝置嘅，亦都係建議喺巴士裝置。」

第 22 段最後屘嗰五行，「此外，嗰啲巴士公司就係好擔心就係呢個咁樣嘅巴士速度顯示器就會令到呢一個車長同埋巴士(sic)就有拗撬，亦都致此令到個安全受影響，所以巴士公司認為呢個車速顯示器都幫唔到提高個巴士安全嘅。」

你會唔會接受運輸署呢個第 22 段嘅結論呢？你公司嘅立場係點樣呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該。主席，喺關於呢個 display unit，我有少少都想補充嘅，但係當然可能嗰個資料都需要委員會去事後核實番，因為我哋亦都去理解番，其實喺小巴佢哋去安裝呢個車速顯示器，其實係安裝咗呢個喺二零零--好似係

2005 年咁上下，係先安裝車速顯示器，跟住去到 2010 年定係再打後先至係去決定去加裝個黑盒同埋嗰個限速器。

我哋嘅理解嗰陣時當佢哋安裝個車速顯示器嗰個原因，就係因為其實專線小巴或者--即係就喺公眾小巴，其實同我哋嗰個巴士嘅營運都幾大分別嘅，佢哋好多都係主要由一啲中、小型嘅營辦商去組成嘅，就唔同我哋專營巴士其實主要係三間公司，第一；第二，佢哋好多都係嗰個車長--小巴嘅車長同嗰個車公司未必係有嗰個僱傭關係，佢哋只係可能係個車主將嗰個車交咗畀一啲管理人，而將嗰個車租咗畀個車長嘅啫，變咗其實當中係冇人喺後面去監管嗰個車長個駕駛嗰個態度、表現等等咁樣，即係一啲極端啲嘅例子。

而當嗰陣時去安裝咗--呢個 05 年安裝顯示器之後，正正就係好多市民坐喺車度感受到--我相信其實未裝之前，嗰陣時都可能已經感受到危險嘅，就見到係常常超速等等，衍生好多投訴同埋係一連串嘅意外，就最終署方就決定要將黑盒、限速器呢啲都加裝落去小巴嗰度。

講番喺我哋嘅睇法，就係如果去將呢個顯示器加裝喺車度，的而且確乘客係會每分每秒都會睇到架車嘅車速，但係各位褪後一步去諗番，乘客知道架車超速，佢係咪有個 brake 畀佢剎停架車，減慢個車速呢？係唔會㗎嘛，其實佢都係直接去同番嗰個車長--喺現場去同番個車長講話「喂，你揸慢啲喇，超速喎。」當然亦都要睇嗰個乘客個態度，有機會好，有機會好惡劣，而我都唔相信到時我哋就算藐張紙話叫乘客「如果超速，你打去呢個熱線喇。」可能會有啲乘客會咁做，但係我相信最大嘅機會都係直接去 confront 嗰個車長嘅。

反而我會覺得如果係喺今天嘅技術上，頭先提及嘅嗰啲技術係可以做到真係有個方法去令到架車係唔超速，我覺得個效果係會好過係要個乘客去出聲，一個我哋變咗唔係太控制到嘅情況之下去同嗰個車長去產生一啲磨擦，我哋最唔想係見到呢個情況嘅。唔該主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後關於安全裝置嘅一樣嘢，就係想請你睇番呢個 TD-1 嘅 90 頁嗰度，呢個就監察呢個司機嘅行為嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你未落去之前，當然我就想問，呢個係違例事項嚟嘅，係咪呀？即係其實就係法例裏面有規例，就話如果司機開緊車嘅時候你同司機談話嘅話，其實係一個刑事嘅違例行為嚟嘅，啱唔啱呀？

黃焯安先生：佢唔可以騷擾個車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係唔可以去令佢分心、干擾佢，係呀，呢個就係嗰個精神，係咪呀？目前如果乘客有投訴，你就會作出回應，喺嗰個時候，照我嘅理解，就係你就會去番個黑盒嗰度，去睇下嗰個投訴係關乎幾時嘅事，係咪呀？同埋睇下佢講得啱唔啱？

黃焯安先生：都要睇下嗰個投訴係同--係咪例如係同車速或者嗰個駕駛表現有關，倘

若嗰個投訴人嘅投訴同嗰啲冇關，就我哋去睇番個黑盒都幫唔到我哋。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）假設，假設就係投訴呢個車速，就話嗰個司機就係開得太快，我想問，你同唔同意我嘅講法，如果係有一個車速顯示器，就係嗰個乘客純粹咪影張相，喺嗰度影咗張相，影咗顯示器係幾多車速，然後就係作為佢嗰個投訴嘅證據喇？

黃焯安先生：喺主席你提到嗰個情況，佢去一邊有個車速顯示器顯示可能嗰個一個車速，佢去影相，如果你話好清晰影到係邊個位置、路段等等，都可能會做到你講嗰個效果嘅，即係以嗰張相去做一個證據，但係我亦都要--即係始終其實佢如果就咁影住嗰個車速，我哋都唔能夠確定究竟係幾時、幾刻同埋喺邊度去影嗰張相，我就咁即時去諗嗰個情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）不如將佢簡化一下，專營巴士就唔可以係超過每小時 70 公里嘅，係咪呀？啱唔啱呀？

黃焯安先生：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，如果嗰個車速顯示器就係打出嚟就係每小時係 80 公里，有乘客影咗張相，呢個就係客觀嘅證據，就係證明到當時巴士車長嘅行為，係咪呀？

黃焯安先生：啱啱主席講到，好喇，佢影到係 80，我哋都要可能影埋個--我就咁好快咁諗，可能都要影埋個車牌，我哋亦都知道係邊個車長或者--即係咁可能都係一個例如，因為咁都係嗰個人講，個乘客話佢喺邊部車等等咁樣，因為我就從來冇咁諗過呢個方向，不過啱啱你咁提問，我諗你話係咪真係做到證供，就可能要--例如有咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）不過你都有提過，就話譬如話寫個電話號碼出嚟，等呢個乘客打電話，你較早時候係咁樣講過嘅，係咪呀？如果係顯示咗出嚟，或者有個電郵嘅地址，當佢仲係喺車上嘅時候，係咪可以將嗰個車速就係電郵畀運輸署或者電郵畀你哋嘅總部，你會唔會接納呢？

黃焯安先生：如果係--倘若未來真係要擺呢個車速顯示屏喺個車上面，我哋會接受畀乘客去直接通知我哋公司去解決，我相信咁就一定係好過個乘客去同個車長去有個--驚有個衝突。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁樣唔係會對呢個司機有阻嚇作用咩？因為其實嗰個問題就在於唔好超速，如果你係有個車速顯示器嘅話，個司機知，乘客知，個個都知有呢樣嘢喺度，你唔覺得係會令到車長就因而就係會係小心，就唔會係超速駕駛？

黃焯安先生：喺實際嘅情況，我相信--當然十隻手指有長短，大部分嘅車長，就算喺

我公司旗下都好，大部分都係好嘅，但係當然就係有啲可能個個性孤僻少少，可能個人急躁啲咁樣，你啱啱 Ms Wong 去提到就係假設有好多人都見到佢超速、做得唔啱，係咪會對佢構成好大壓力呢？我又唔敢講，即係有啲極端啲嘅情況，我相信，即係當然你話一啲好嘅同事，佢根本都唔會超速嘅，梗係冇問題，有啲心急啲嘅同事，我就咁諗，我又唔會特別覺得--即係可能都好睇我哋公司到時倘若你話係好--即係叫做倘若收到佢哋呢啲超速嘅情況，我哋會有啲可能喺個安全獎金會有個好嚴重嘅懲處定點嘅，可能會有啲緊張啲。

但係個情況我就唔覺得會話因為好多人都睇到佢超速，反而我覺得每個人其實倒番轉，佢哋主要都係喺番自己嗰個角度去睇啫，佢究竟會唔會話畀人--驚畀人扣分，或者會唔會真係危險、發生意外，好多時其實超速係--有陣時係個同事嘅即係有少少過度自信嘅，即係佢哋覺得可能有少少急，亦都係覺得自己會操控到部車。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰啲監察司機嘅裝置，我想請你睇睇《明報》嘅網站，嗰度有一份報道--有一篇報道就講及就係避免啲人係瞌眼瞓嘅，請你睇番有關嘅報道，係今年嘅 5 月 27 號嘅，嗰篇報道。呢篇文章就係話畀我哋聽係有一啲監察嘅裝置嘅，其實呢個都係講及香港、珠海、澳門，即係話港珠澳大橋上面行走巴士嘅司機之用嘅，你知唔知道有呢篇嘅報道呀？

黃焯安先生：係，喺新聞度有見到呢個報道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇打算去研究一下呢一種嘅系統，睇嚟就係喺內地係進行研究同埋開發嘅，你有冇諗過話--有冇打算都自己係引用入去你公司嗰度用呢？

黃焯安先生：主席，喺現階段，我哋會繼續留意，當然我哋唔會對任何對本身整個安全提升嘅系統 say no，一定會--我哋都會保持住開放態度，睇一睇到時成個演變。不過當然你--即係本身如果你問我，我會覺得係--我淨係好表面去初步了解個即係喺個新聞度嘅一啲--即係去咁睇，當然你問我哋嗰個 priority，當然係希望先做好咗我哋現有一啲已經有嘅資源，呢個我哋會再--因為始終我哋提供嘅服務其實係嗰個車程較為短啲，我相信嗰個--即係未必係我哋呢一刻最迫切覺得係要立即做嘅嘢，不過我哋會留意住嗰個事態發展。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我去到最後一個課題，就講及係公司嘅財務情況嘅，請你睇番呢個 NLB-2 嘅 71 頁，呢份文件就係透露更詳盡財務及營運資料，呢個就係 2012/2013 年嘅情況嘅，請你睇番第 72 頁，呢度就講就話係 2013 年 3 月 31 日為止嘅年度，就係話你哋嗰個財務就係咁樣樣嘅，就係你嗰個係一億四千五百五十萬，而嗰個盈利就係九百五十二萬元嘅，係咪呀？

黃焯安先生：唔。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你去呢個 132 頁，嗰個係 2014/2015 年度嘅，你睇睇嗰個收入，你個收入，你見到就係有三個來源嘅，你嘅收入，首先就票務嘅收入，廣

告收入同埋係雜項嘅收入，可唔可以話畀我哋聽嗰個廣告嘅收入係嚟自邊度呢？

黃焯添先生：主席，我哋廣告嘅收入主要來源都喺我哋車身，巴士車身，同兩間巴士公司唔同之處，我哋係好少巴士站嘅廣告，我哋主要嘅廣告收入都係巴士車身，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）雜項收入又點呢？

黃焯安先生：唔該主席。本身我哋新大嶼山巴士同--例如，同昂平 360，係簽咗一個協議，就係當嗰個吊車例如佢係突然要停駛，即係可能因為天氣或者種種原因，我哋會係去立即去支援佢咁樣，譬如。同埋另外就嗰度例如係有喺呢個我哋嘅車廠去幫我哋頭先提及嗰啲非專營巴士去做嗰個年檢嗰類嗰啲服務，我哋就收番佢費用咁。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢版嗰度，132 頁講到嗰個廣告嘅收入係四十九萬三千元嘅，2014/2015 年就係四十三萬八千元嘅，但係如果你去番 2016 年/2017 年，就係就係睇番呢個 182 頁，我哋見到嗰個廣告嘅收入就係下降，大幅下降嘅，喺 2015/16 年度就係十九萬，喺 2016/17 年就係 87,000 元，可唔可以話畀我哋聽點解？

黃焯添先生：12 至 13、13 至 14，當時個廣告收入會相對地偏高，係最主要因為我哋有條深圳灣線，深圳灣線喺我哋嘅公司立場嚟講，係相對地吸引，對於廣告商。當去到 15/16，特別係 16/17 同埋而家，呢一類型我哋巴士車身嘅廣告係相對地冇咁吸引，即係對於一啲落廣告嘅人嚟講。我哋而家最主要譬如我哋深圳灣咁講，我哋好多嘅廣告商都已經冇落廣告，最主要原因係本身巴士車身廣告嘅製作費係相當之昂貴，而對於一啲落廣告嘅人，即係而家嘅 media agency 嚟講，我哋呢一類型嘅傳統廣告係比較唔吸引，所以係有個相對大嘅跌幅。

但係譬如嚟緊港珠澳大橋嘅開張，我哋嘅廣告係應該會有個提升嘅，係因為已經有唔少嘅廣告商係對一個新嘅口岸係有興趣，所以我哋嘅廣告嘅收入係同我哋本身路線相對地唔吸引，因為我哋行嘅路，特別係大嶼山，我哋行嘅路係山路，係唔會有人見到嘅，所以基本上大嶼山、大嶼南嘅路線係唔會有人落廣告。東涌係有機會有啲地區性嘅廣告出現嘅，譬如係街市，呢啲嘅廣告係唔會有好大嘅收入嘅。

至於深圳灣，本身深圳灣係個關口，而家係比較耐，所以想落廣告嘅人都有機會選擇其他嘅交通工具，譬如可能係跨境巴士等等，所以我哋係有見到咁嘅跌幅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我想請你睇呢個 NLB-2 第 27 頁，呢個就係你哋嗰個專營協議嘅第 34 條，呢項條款就講到一個每年嘅一個報告嘅制度，我想問下，究竟你哋嗰個核數嘅機構係叫咩嘢名呢？如果你要符合第 34 條，係搵邊一個做

呢個核數嘅，佢叫咩嘢名呢？或者係審核嘅機構。

黃焯安先生：畀少少時間我搵番個資料先，抱歉，搵一搵先要。

主席：（經傳譯員）你慢慢喇。

黃焯安先生：主席，嗰間公司係一間本地嘅會計師樓，係叫做 Tony Yau & Company 咁，或者可以我哋之後將個全名補番上畀你睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，係咪可以畀個樣本我哋，即係睇一睇你哋係最新嘅一份呢間公司幫你哋做嘅年度審核？

黃焯安先生：當然可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後或者係想請你睇番同一份嘅文件，第 196 頁，呢一個就係你哋嗰個組織架構表，呢度就係顯示你哋嘅高層管理，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽你哋公司有冇一個專責嘅安全嘅組別或者部門呢？

黃焯添先生：主席，對於巴士安全，喺我哋嘅公司立場嚟講，其實係包含晒所有部門嘅，其實我哋每個月，有機會係甚至兩個星期，我哋所有嘅管理層，即係所有喺呢個 org. chart 見到嘅大部分嘅管理層都會坐低去傾嘅。每一次我哋都會當然會講到巴士安全，譬如最近我哋會 focus 喺 training school 上面。所以喺呢個 org. chart 上面我哋係見唔到一個特別嘅人係 dedicate 去做 safety 嘅，而其實 bus safety 呢樣嘢就係整個公司，成個團隊嘅 duty 嚟嘅，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想問一個問題，如果有一個係好可怕嘅意外發生咗，你哋公司裏面會發生啲咩嘢事嘅呢？

黃焯添先生：唔好意思，委員，你嘅意思係咪我哋當有意外發生嘅時候，我哋嘅團隊會做啲咩嘢？

歐陽先生：Yes。

黃焯添先生：Okay，其實我哋本身對於交通意外已經有個既定嘅制度嘅，不論大小，我哋本身有個完整嘅 structure 去做，呢一刻我喺個頭度即刻講唔到畀你聽，但係我哋可以後補一個我哋本身當遇到意外成個 procedure 可以點樣做、點樣面對，呢個我哋可以做到，交到畀你嘅，唔該，唔好意思。

歐陽先生：Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）冇錯，你係可以儘快交番畀我哋嘅。

黃焯添先生：Okay。其實我想再補充多少少，其實我想講番，就係最近我見到嘅關於呢個獨立委員會有提及到 ISO39001 嘅，其實我哋本身公司嘅立場係好支持

同埋好積極去做到呢一個 standard 嘅，其實個 background 都要講番，就係喺 2017 年，當我哋去試行呢啲新嘅雙層巴士，即係喺 3M 嘅雙層巴士，我哋公司都有個目標，係希望可以做到呢一個國際水準。

我哋首先就喺我哋嘅梅窩廠房係做咗三個嘅 ISO，分別就係 ISO9001 質量管理體系、ISO14001 環境管理體系同埋 ISO18001 職業安全健康管理體系，呢三個嘅認證，我哋喺 2018 年嘅 5 月，其實即係上個月，係正式授權係可以用嘅。我哋 17 年嘅年中開始就開始有喺我哋嘅廠房度做一啲嘅 system 嘅更新，去做一啲考核嘅。

當我哋喺 17 年嘅年中開始做考核嘅時候，BSI，即係嗰間 ISO 嘅公司亦都有同我哋講過 ISO39001 嘅，當時我哋嘅睇法就係擔心如果將 39001 去畀全公司用嘅話，我哋嘅成本會好高，但係再去同 BSI 呢間公司傾落去，其實就發現原來一個 ISO 係可以用一個路線上面去試行嘅，即係用個 routes 去分嘅，所以嚟緊我哋港珠澳大橋 B4、B6 線，當然而家條橋未開，但係當條橋開咗之後，我哋係會主動去同 BSI 合作係儘快幫 B4、B6 呢條路線去攞到 ISO39001 嘅。

當攞咗成功--呢個 trial 成功咗之後，我哋會積極去幫 3M 呢條路線，即係頭先剛才大家都好擔心我哋行雙層巴嗰條路線，我哋都會好積極去做呢個 ISO39001 嘅認證。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思。

黃焯安先生：我想補充番，嗰個係 39001，唔係 3900。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個 ISO39001 點樣可以提升安全駕駛呢，可唔可以詳細啲講呀？

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）或者我用英文進一步講。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇所謂，用咩嘢語言都得。

黃焯添先生：（經傳譯員）ISO 其實就係要訂定一啲嘅道路交通安全去提升公司嘅表現，為咗要執行呢個系統，公司係要有一個好清晰嘅標準，唔係一個單一嘅標準，即係唔係 BSI 或者任何一間機構嘅單一標準，公司要做嘅就係要做一個統一嘅標準，要提升同埋係推廣道路交通安全，用呢個系統，我哋唔能夠確保係零意外，但係新嘅系統係可以幫助我哋提升表現，同時改善我哋嗰個終端嘅系統同埋我哋嘅支援嘅，即係如果出現意外。其中一個主要嘅元素，即係 ISO 嘅主要元素就係內部審核，有內部審核可以幫助我哋改善同埋維持安全管理系統，呢個就係我公司內部同埋長遠嚟講。

喺呢段時間，我哋已經同 BSI 確認咗係會進行 ISO 嘅 B4、B6 兩條線嘅認證，整個過程係未開始，因為港珠澳大橋未通車，希望喺年尾可以將好消息講畀委員會聽，即係我哋呢一個新線會有一個國際標準。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我已經完成晒我所有嘅問題，唔該晒主席，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃生，我有一個問題，就係想講番你話用特別更嘅資料，即係一個十四個小時嘅更，你就話係八條線有用，即係一百一十三條裏面八條線係有用特別更？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係大嶼南--就係一百一十三條裏面嘅八條係大嶼山南部，我哋會將總數交畀你，因為仲有其他嘅路線喺東涌、深圳灣。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係超過八條線有用？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）總數會多過呢個數嘅，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想確認一下，你總共就係一百一十三條嘅路線，係咪呀？

黃焯安先生：（經傳譯員）應該係多過呢個數。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以之後講番畀我哋聽。

黃焯安先生：Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想知嘅就係你哋嘅路線裏面有幾大部分係用呢個特別更？睇下你答唔答到，用特別更，巴士車長就會有三個小時嘅小休，咁可唔可以講喺呢啲特別更，佢係會離開架車，跟住三個小時後返嚟呢？呢個有關係，因為我哋想知道你喺嗰個地方提供嘅休息設備，你想而家答吖，定係之後先至再提供呢個資料呢？即係可以用書面解釋。

黃焯安先生：主席，或者我哋--因為嗰度都涉及多啲資料，我哋一次過整理好，再送去委員會度。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你將呢啲資料提供。如果冇任何設施或者係有限嘅設施，你要解釋一下，等我哋知道係整個嘅情況，即係你哋係--即係有關於特別更同埋休息設施等等。Professor Lo。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）關於嗰個嘅收入嘅申報方面，我有啲資料想問嘅，來自非專營巴士嗰個嘅收入都幾多，我就想知道喺呢個數字裏面有幾多係來自非專營巴士呢？係咪就係話其他嘅支出呢方面？

黃焯安先生：係喺 other expenses 嗰度。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個比例係幾多？即係支付用作非專營巴士嘅數額係幾多？

黃焯安先生：教授，抱歉，因為我哋呢一刻未有呢個資料係，你介唔介意我哋之後補充番畀你？講番畀你？

羅先生：Yes, please.

黃焯安先生：係，好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你咁做。呢個嘅--會唔會喺你嗰個中期即係六個月嘅報告裏面有呢？即係嗰個係截止於 17 年 9 月 30 號嗰個嘅資料。

黃焯安先生：主席，你係咪講緊個中期報告？係上市公司定係大--因為大嶼山巴士應該有獨立有個中期報告，係，我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）可能我真係呢個意思，係咪可以喺一啲公開資料裏面搵到㗎？

黃焯安先生：如果大嶼山巴士嚟講，就每年會喺 fuller disclosure 個文件度去--一年一次，就去詳細顯示番出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係請你提供番盧教授嘅資料，有關於非專營巴士嘅支出。

黃焯安先生：Okay，好。

主席：（經傳譯員）今次就完成咗律師要問嘅問題，我哋亦都--如果你有嘅話，我哋都係會係開始聽你嗰個嘅總結發言，黃生。

黃焯安先生：唔該主席，喺我哋巴士公司提供安全嘅載客服務係責無旁貸，喺專營權底下，我哋嘅服務水平一直受到政府嘅監管，不過隨著社會嘅變化，市民出行模式係改變，我哋自身亦都要與時並進，改善同埋優化服務，以滿足市民對巴士服務嘅期望。

我哋公司主要嘅管理層都係公司其中一個股東，因此我哋唔係淨係著眼於好短期嘅表現或者利益，而係更著眼於公司長遠嘅發展同埋可持續性，而繼承公司嘅傳統，我哋同車長嘅關係係保持長遠同埋良好嘅關係，而呢個係我哋認為對營運巴士嘅服務同埋安全水平係尤其重要。

但係基於我哋公司嘅規模同其他巴士公司嗰個差距係好大，頭先有提及到，我哋如果以車輛去比較，係只有佢哋十三分之一至到三十三分之一嘅，當要發展新嘅系統或者軟件，不論係從開發硬件，甚至乎係去 implement 呢啲系統，其實我哋嘅成本都係會遇到嘅困難會比起其他巴士公司係多好多。

而我哋預期喺現有嘅專營巴士制度之下，我哋想去發展我哋嘅車隊係好困難嘅，以今天喺大嶼山為例，我哋可以服務嘅區域其實只係喺大嶼山入面，而大嶼山出去以外嘅範圍係有另外兩個專營權，即係喺赤臘角、東涌去市區咁，我哋就唔同其他嘅專營巴士公司，本身佢哋係有好多路線已經喺市區度係一路去運行或者一路加緊咁樣。

可能從營運嘅效率呢個角度去考慮，其實社會係好難去容納一間規模咁細嘅專利巴士公司，但我相信係從整體嘅社會利益角度，我哋公司嘅存在係可以提升業界嘅競爭力同埋係畀市民多一個選擇。

縱使係受到我剛剛提及嘅條件去限制，我哋係好樂意繼續投放資源同埋配合政府嘅政策，以便我哋有更好嘅條件去為未來嘅服務去加強去服務市民嘅。

最後，我喺度代表新大嶼山巴士有限公司再次多謝主席、兩位委員邀請我哋公司上到嚟聽證會去講解我哋嘅情況同埋意見，亦都好多謝 Ms Wong 嘅提問，亦都多謝秘書處同埋相關人員嘅安排，亦都想藉呢個機會去多謝我哋一班嘅同事，包括我哋前線嘅同事一直去對巴士行業嘅付出同埋努力。多謝主席，多謝各位，thank you。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃生，我哋多謝你同你嘅同事出席今次嘅聆訊嘅，我哋期待接到你應承畀我哋嘅資料，其實如果儘早畀到我哋，係會幫助到我哋嘅，因為我哋而家仲仍然係進行緊呢一個嘅聆訊，所以今次嘅聆訊完結。

2018年6月19日

下午6時06分聆訊押後

[Blank Page]

Saturday, 14 July 2018

(9.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM TAI PO DISTRICT COUNCIL: MS WONG PIK KUI, MR CHAN CHO LEUNG, MR YAM KAI BONG, MR CHAN SIU KUEN, DR LAU CHEE SING

(given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning. We welcome the representatives of the Tai Po District Council. We thank them for responding to our invitation by coming today to assist us with their evidence.

I'm going to ask Ms Wong to begin by posing questions to the representatives. If Ms Wong wishes one of the other representatives of the council to respond to a particular question, please feel free to identify that person, and that person can then deal with the particular question. But I will ask counsel assisting the committee to begin her questioning now.

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming to this hearing today. I have a few topics and areas of questions.

First of all, may I draw your attention to a letter sent by the Committee on 4 May 2018, inviting you to address three accidents. That would be DC-2 page 759.

It is in Chinese. I will just summarise the three accidents.

The first accident is at Dai Kwai Street on 10 August 2011, at footnote 1; the second incident is at Tai Wo Service Road West on 12 May 2013; and the third is the Tai Po Road accident on 10 February 2018. And by that letter the committee invited you to provide documentation in relation to these three accidents.

Is that correct?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Good morning.

So is it now for the Tai Po District Council to give our views on the three accidents?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is just a general question, that by that letter the committee invited you to comment or give documentation in relation to these three accidents. Can you confirm that, first of all.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes. In this document, it is true, on those three days there were the accidents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the reply, I believe the Tai Po District Council, its committee and working group, was able to confirm that you have only discussed about the Tai Po accident on 10 February 2018. If I invite you to look at the document at page 762 in Chinese, English at page 764.

Do you see that? It is in the second paragraph. If

I may read you. It is a letter from the Tai Po District Council, replying to the committee. Dated 23 May 2018. The letter states that:

"Among the records, the Tai Po District Council, its Committees and Working Groups had only discussed about the traffic accident that occurred on Tai Po Road near Tai Po Mei on 10 February 2018."

Is that correct?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes. Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I take it that according to your records, the discussion, you were only able to retrieve documents in relation to the Tai Po accident, but not the other two accidents?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes. For the accident on 10 February 2018, we had a special meeting to discuss it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. And may I first of all refer you to the minutes of the special meeting on 12 February 2018. The Chinese is at page 766, English starts at page 782. If I may refer to English version, we can see that the persons in attendance at page 768 in Chinese and 783 in English, that includes Ms Mable Chan, Commissioner for Transport, and also Mr Chau, amongst others, Chau Chung Mun, superintendent of police, do you see that? 768 in Chinese and 783 in English.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to paragraph 5, English at 785, Superintendent of Police, Mr Chau Chung Mun stated in that paragraph as to that particular road section, that:

"In 2017, the police had made 4 arrests involving 2 drunk drivers, 1 case of dangerous driving and 1 case of drug-related crime. The police had issued a total of 32 fixed penalty tickets at the road section in 2017 for speeding and traffic violations. A total of 29 traffic accidents had occurred in the Chek Nai Ping to Wong Yee Au section on Tai Po Road, out of which 2 are more serious. Although there were no speed enforcement cameras installed at the above mentioned road section, the police could carry out operations to detect speeding from time to time by placing detection equipment a few designated spots along the road section."

Do you see that?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now in relation to this, is this enquiry made in response to the Tai Po District Council's query, or questions as to the number of accidents that happened in that particular Tai Po Road accident that the police provided those information?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And as a matter of fact, your minutes state at paragraph 16, if I may take you to paragraph 16, page 772 in Chinese and English at 789, if you see at 16 (iv) it stated that:

"Some district councillors had made suggestions on how to improve the design of the road section involved in the past. But the Transport Department cited technical factors as a reason and did not follow up, he [that is Mr Lo Hiu Fong, I believe he is a member of the Tai Po District Council] hoped that after this accident, the Transport Department could respond to the demands of the district councillors and install road-side speed detection equipment and signage to improve road safety."

In relation to that paragraph, can you elaborate on the first sentence that some district councillors had made suggestions in the past how to improve the road design, but the Transport Department did not follow up. Can you elaborate on that.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes, thank you. Now, today, we have district councillor from the constituency Mr Chan Siu Kuen attending the meeting. Perhaps he could give his views on this paragraph.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: May I speak please?

As the district councillor of that constituency I received comments from residents. On holidays there

are often cars speeding along the Tai Po Road and it causes great disturbance to residents and they go at great speed. So after I received complaints from residents I wrote to the Transport Department asking for speed cameras at the road section.

On 24 July 2015 and also on 5 June 2017, as mentioned in the letter, I wrote to the Transport Department, and the police respectively, the first letter to Transport Department, the second one to police, and I made it clear in the letters that near the Savannah Garden on weekends there is car speeding.

The Transport Department responded to me orally, and they said they would consult the Owners' Corporation first to see what the response is. For the Savannah Garden it is not a major traffic black spot, accident black spot. That's why there has been no follow-up.

On the second letter from Tai Po Mei to this Green Wood Villa, that's a slope, so when cars go up, you know, for ordinary cars they can't speed, but of course sports cars could. When they come down that bend, cars come at a great speed and it is scary. That's why I wrote to police directly to ask the police to put a speed camera there. The police responded to me saying that that is not a traffic black spot, but they would put some police officers there to set up speed traps.

After that incident people asked me whether I have looked at that particular section of road. Fortunately, as a district councillor I have been monitoring the government's work all the time so I was able to produce the two letters at once at the District Council meeting.

I'm the District Councillor of that constituency, when the media asked me questions I could produce proof that I did ask the Transport Department to put up a road sign slowing down, and also speed cameras there and I made the request both to the Transport Department and the police. That's why you now ask how come there is no response to my two letters.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Chan.

You mentioned a few letters. The first one is 24 July 2015. May I first of all take you to that document. It is a letter to the Transport Department. Chinese at 840-72 in DC-2-bundle. English at 840-75.

That's the first letter in which you wrote to the Transport Department project in Tai Po section, engineer, Mr Wong Kwok Leung, stating that you have received request for assistance from the residents in the vicinity of Tai Po Road, and there was an absence of speed limit traffic signs around the bend of Savannah Garden. Then you stated that:

"To ensure the safety of road users, your department

is now requested to expeditiously install the '50km' speed limit signs at the above location to remind the motorists to pay attention to driving at safe speed for prevention of unnecessary incidents."

Is that the first letter you refer to in your answer?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chan, you mentioned that about expeditiously install the 50-kilometre speed limit signs, but in fact during that time, for that particular road section, the speed limit is actually 70 kilometre per hour. In that regard, why did you write 50 kilometres per hour?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: 70 kilometres -- one step down from 70 is 50 under the laws of Hong Kong, there is no 60 or 65 kilometres per hour of speed limit. And for residents living near Savannah Garden they said to me that "Please write on behalf of us as the District councillor", and so I wrote on their request.

And also there were some minor traffic accidents, at the biggest bend. I believe for that section a speed limit of 50 kilometres is reasonable. But of course I'm not the expert, that's why I have asked the Transport Department, asking them to help me do a consultation and see whether it is possible to put up this 50-kilometre

sign.

CHAIRMAN: Do we understand that this was a request that the speed limit be reduced from 70 kilometres per hour to 50 kilometres per hour?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes. Yes. I have just listened to residents' views. Residents called me up, and I also believe that for that bend it is rather dangerous. That's why I have stated specifically for that particular bend the speed limit should be reduced from 70 to 50 kilometres per hour.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In relation to this letter the Transport Department no written response was received from the Transport Department in reply to this letter before the Tai Po accident, is that correct? I believe you stated that in the further submission to the committee by letter dated 11 July 2018. Chinese at 840-76, and English at 840-86.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: That is right. At that time, the Transport Department did not give me a direct reply. However, I have spoken to them on the phone. They said that if the speed is to be reduced to 50 they would have to consult residents as well as owners corporations. And in 2014, near the Japanese International School there was a traffic accident at the signal junction, as a result a person was injured, and the TD, Transport

Department replied to me. He said for the speed to be reduced to 50 the TD would have to conduct a study, and after the accident they have appealed to the public to abide by road traffic regulations. They said that from the perspective of the TD, for the speed to be reduced to 50, they would have to do a lot of consultation and to liaise with the police.

I have been waiting. And I have been in contact with them. Well, Mr Wong of the Transport Department has been transferred out. And regrettably we had the traffic accident at Tai Po Mei. And I approached the police, because the TD could not help us. I asked the police to install speed cameras and I have been following that up.

CHAIRMAN: Who was it that you spoke to the telephone at the Transport Department about this matter?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: It was Mr Wong Kwok Leung, an engineer of the TD.

CHAIRMAN: What was his status or rank within the Transport Department?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: At that time I think he was a senior officer in the department.

CHAIRMAN: When did you have this conversation in relation to the letter of 24 July 2015?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I can't remember. I'm a district

councillor, every day as soon as I receive calls for assistance I would deal with departments as soon as possible. I urged them to erect the sign and reduce the speed as soon as possible. However, the government is very serious about following procedures, I understand that they have to follow the procedure if the sign is to be put up. I have been following the matter up, and I have a lot of work as a district councillor. Residents from time to time would call me to say that in that road section where there is a bend, they ask for the speed to be reduced.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, before we go any further, could we see a photograph of this area of road, and perhaps we could see a map so that we can all understand what we are talking about?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I wonder if we may pull up the map of the Tai Po Road section. And first of all, Mr Chan, if you look at the map, the section where you propose to reduce the speed limit is in relation to Savannah Garden. And it appears it would be around the location between numbers 26 to 29 on the map. Is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes. It is before the Hung Lam Road, at the bend.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you point out the parts that you propose to the Transport Department to look into the

speed limit or reduction of the speed limit from 70 to 50 kilometres per hour by reference to the number shown on the map?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I think it is 30, 28 and 29. That's the bend. So going from 30 to 29 and 28, and for that road surface, as soon as there is heavy rain it would flood. That is at location 28. I have just sent a letter to the Highways Department asking for them to do something about the underground water, because as soon as there is heavy rain there will be accumulation of water under the road surface. In the mornings on Saturdays and Sundays there are cars racing and doing that bend, and it is very dangerous.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe we can show you the photographs of number 28, 29 and 30. So that we know which bend or curve we are talking about.

Photo 28, Mr Chan, I believe is the area near the Hung Lam Road, is that correct.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: That is a bit too forward. You have to go back a little bit. This is the Kowloon-bound section. I think you have gone the other way. You should go the other way.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 27?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I think you have to go further back.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 26?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: You have overshot.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it should be between 26 and 27; is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Not this one. This is a different residential development. Go back a bit.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Or photo 29?

Mr Chan, maybe we will show you a video about the relevant locations, so that you can ask us to pause when the location we talked about is the location mentioned.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: It is close, it is close. Keep going. Keep going.

(Video played)

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: It is after this bend. Stop. And all the way, when you continue, if there are two double-decker buses servicing this bend, it would be very dangerous. And just now at the position where someone was standing, as soon as there is rain, it would flood. So it is particularly dangerous here.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on. Can we identify this from the still photographs?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Maybe we would print out a photo of that particular photo that you have identified.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a physical album of photographs?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have selected a few photographs, but this does not happen to be one of them. We will mark

the time, we can look at the time, and we will print out that particular photo in due course. Or with those particular coordinates.

And Mr Chan, you mentioned another incident about a Japanese International School accident, and if I may refer you to the letter of complaint from the Japanese International School, that was dated 10 February 2015. English at page 840-84, and Chinese at 840-85.

The original version is 840-84, and Mrs Juliet Ashton wrote to you stating:

"Last year, outside our school a lady was killed whilst crossing the road. The speed limit is 70 [kilometres an hour] which probably contributed to the severity of her injuries."

In the fourth paragraph she also mentioned that:

"Along the Tai Po Road there are other areas where the speed limit has been adjusted to 50 [kilometres per hour] and I would ask that the same adjustment is made for outside our school."

So that's a plea made by Ms Juliet Ashton on behalf of the Japanese International School to reduce the speed limit from 70 to 50 kilometres per hour. Is that the letter you mentioned earlier on?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I mentioned this letter, which is in front of me. I am aware that someone talked about

a traffic accident. I was concerned about it, that's why I wrote a letter about the area near Savannah Garden asking for the speed to be reduced to 50. I asked the TD about details of the accident, whether the person dashed into the road, or someone did not obey the traffic light. If the person involved rushed into the road, well, that one might be different. The TD was asked by me to make some improvement at the signal junction to facilitate pedestrian crossing to make that location safer to cross.

And as to whether that location is suitable, I have actually talked to the TD about it.

CHAIRMAN: This was a letter addressed to Mr Man; how did you come to be dealing with it?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes, it is just that I see it here.

Oh, yes, it is written to the chairperson, Mr Man, who is the chairperson of the Tai Po Transport and Traffic Committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And this matter was discussed at the District Council meeting on 13 March 2015. Chinese is at page 840-81, and English at 840-92. And we can see the chairman's name there, Mr Man Chen Fai. If you look at paragraph 79, the chairman made reference to the letter of the Japanese International School stating

their request to reduce the speed limit from 70 kilometres per hour to 50 kilometres per hour, and actually invites the district council members to go there to visit their school to discuss about the transport issues. Do you see paragraph 79?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes, I can see it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you go to paragraph 80, that's at page 840-92, a Mr Wong Kwok Leung responded. I believe that is the Mr Wong Kwok Leung referred to in your letter that you addressed to in July 2015. Is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes, it is related. At that time when I wrote to him it was when I received complaints from residents of Savannah Garden, especially on the mornings of Saturdays and Sundays, there were a lot of cars racing. Around that area, it is very dangerous, that was a different matter.

And I wrote to him to ask for the speed to be reduced to 50, around Savannah Garden. And I was aware of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in that paragraph 80, Mr Wong Kwok Leung responded that he knew that the Japanese International School suggested the reduction of speed limit of the road section in front of the school in view of a traffic accident in the section of Tai Po Road in

front of the school in 2014, in which a member of the public was killed.

It also stated that the Transport Department and police were examining the cause of that traffic accident which might not necessarily be related to the speed limit of that road section, including issues of some motorists' driving attitude and problem as to whether pedestrians observed traffic light signals. But it also stated that the Transport Department would examine whether the present speed limit of that road section was appropriate.

Furthermore, the Transport Department has sent an interim reply to the school, and will provide a detailed reply letter.

So Mr Chan, it appears that the Transport Department stated back in March 2015 that they are going to examine the speed limit of that road section.

Did they follow up with the district council, with your district council about their proposal or suggestion since that meeting?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes, I was shown this by the deputy chairperson. They said the case is sub judice, so it was not appropriate for them to discuss the case. There might be a prosecution against the driver. It was mentioned in paragraph 87 in the district council.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But my question is not about the cause of the accident, but the fact that the Transport Department would examine whether the present speed limit of that road section was appropriate. Did you see that sentence in paragraph 80 where Mr Wong Kwok Leung stated that?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Every day we have a lot of meetings. As far as I know, we asked them -- we told that we could only wait, because they are dealing with the procedure or the proceeding.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So is the answer no, that after the minutes, or after the meeting in March 2015 the Transport Department did not approach the district council discussing about the speed limit of that road section. Is that the case?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I don't know whether they have talked to the chairperson, Mr Man, but I was the councillor of that constituency, so I would talk to them. They said there needed to be consultation. They needed to consult if the speed limit is to be reduced to 50.

CHAIRMAN: The question really is this. Did they tell you what was the result of this consultation? This happened three years ago.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: No, they did not. If there was a result, I would not have sent a second letter to the police. From the letter dated 2015, there wasn't much result.

That's why in 2017 I sent a letter to the police.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before we move on, can I show you the map identifying where the location of the Japanese International School. I believe the location is around -- it is between number 21 and 22. If we can pull up the photo, 21 and 22, I believe it is 21. This shows the site of the Japanese International School. Is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: This one is correct. This one, near the traffic signal.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. And you referred to the letter to the police, and if I may refer you to the bundle at page 840-70 in Chinese, and 840-74 in English. It was a letter dated 5 June 2015, written by you to the Hong Kong Police.

We can see that the letter stated that there were a lot of people over-speeding during holidays and then requesting for installation of speed enforcement cameras. Is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And there was a reply from the police --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. The reference here is generally to the Tai Po Road. Was there any particular part of the Tai Po Road where there was this problem with speeding?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I think just now I said that Tse Lai King(?), uphill, when they approach the bus accident location, the first bend, there are a lot of accidents there. So in that section I had specified all the way up to Ng San Jong(?) that there are some residents who wrote a letter in Dragon Hill Bay -- Deerhill Bay, where they say there is a lot of speeding from sports cars, and in the first bend, that's where the bus accident occurred, when they turn right, there is a drifting, and vehicles can flip very easily. So that's why we want a 50-kilometre speed limit and also a speed camera.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have a map pulled up. Can you first of all identify the location of the Deerhill Estate mentioned in your letter. Or your evidence. Deerhill Bay. Is that around the location of the Japanese International School?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: This is the second letter. The first letter was referring to Savannah Garden. This is the second letter, and this letter does not mention the Japanese school. The first letter involved the international school.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. So that's the location that you are referring to on the map, the Deerhill Bay, which is behind the Japanese International School on the map.

Can you confirm that?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Let me see. It is not very clear. It is between 22 and 20, right? Kon Hang is also on the map. This is Cheung Shue Tan, the bus stop before we reach Deerhill, that would include -- this is Deerhill. That is correct. This is approaching Deerhill, the approach, the entrance to Deerhill.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your letter stated that there are often speeding and unlawful motor racing on the Tai Po Road, but there appears no reference to the speed limit in this letter. Can you tell us why? Or request in relation to the speed limit.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Well, in the heading I said that I request a 50-kilometre speed limit sign, and I also wanted -- I had written that, I had requested that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I refer to a letter dated 5 June.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can put that letter up on the screen.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Well, this speeding camera, the -- typically it is 70 kilometres, if you have a speeding camera they will take pictures, if it exceeds the speed limit. A typical motorist when they see the camera they will slow down, it is very natural, so what I wrote was they needed to heed our residents' request to add a speed camera -- you are correct, I did not add that there, but the purpose is that if you have a speed limit

of 50 then it would activate the camera if it exceeds 50, and if --

MS MAGGIE WONG: There was a reply from the police on 16 June 2017.

If I may take you to 840-71 in Chinese, English at 840-73. The police stated that:

"The locations for installation of fixed speed monitoring cameras are mainly determined by the Transport Department. After installation, the Police is responsible for taking enforcement action. This office understands that the Transport Department currently has no plans to install fixed speed monitoring cameras in the captioned road section. At the same time, the Police will continue to closely monitor the traffic situation of the road section concerned."

This letter was copied to the Transport Department, Mr Paul Chiu, Traffic Control Division, Technical Service Branch, and the district commander at Tai Po. Do you see that?

This letter was addressed to you personally.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: That is correct. I issued the letter and they should have responded to me. I had submitted them the letter, and I have a record of all the letters I send, so all these three letters were disclosed by myself, and the fact is we -- I see the Transport

Department have not concluded their work, so I wrote directly to the police to see if they could install the speeding camera at the end of where the slope is going downhill, and that was my request.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So in other words they said that the Transport Department refused the request, and the police is simply the enforcement department. So they can't do anything about it unless the Transport Department install the fixed speed monitoring cameras; is that correct?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: That is correct. It is clear that's what they responded, and subsequently, after this serious accident, I had contacted a police officer, we went to the site, and they promised that at the end of the year they would install a speeding camera.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I refer you back to the minute dated 12 February 2018. That would be at page 790 in English. Chinese at page 772.

In this paragraph 17(ii), Dr Lau Chee Sing raised the following views, and he stated that:

"Half a year ago, some district councillors had proposed installing speed enforcement cameras in the road section where the accident had occurred but were rejected by the relevant departments. He opined that despite there were sufficient signage at the scene,

a vehicle's speed would increase as a result of the impulse and centrifugal force generated as the vehicle went downhill and made a turn. Relevant departments should review on whether it was appropriate to keep the speed limit of the road section in concern at 70 [kilometres per hour]. He said, for example, there had been an accident at Sai Kung ... [and] Clear Water Bay ... as the vehicle failed to brake in time. The speed limit was then lowered from 70 kph to 50 kph, and speed enforcement cameras were also installed. He suggested to lower the speed limit to 50 [kilometres per hour] and install speed enforcement cameras in the road section concerned to deter drivers from speeding."

This is perhaps a question directed at Dr Lau. Reference was made to the fact that half a year ago district councillors had proposed installing speed enforcement cameras in the road section where concerned in relation to this accident. Was that in writing? Was this request made in writing?

DR LAU CHEE SING: So it was not my request. At the time they were aware that district councillors had written a request.

CHAIRMAN: Were you referring to Mr Chan's request, is that what this is a reference to?

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Yes, that was Mr Chan's

request, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And when you made reference to "rejected by the relevant departments", that was the letter of rejection by the police that we have just seen; is that correct?

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Correct, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we continue, if we look at paragraph 24(iii), English at page 794, Chinese at page 776, paragraph 24(iii), that's the response by Mr Au Chun Wah stated that:

"He agreed that the speed limit of the road section concerned should be lowered from 70 [kilometres per hour] to 50 [kilometres per hour]. Yet, the attitude of the driver was just as important. Some bus drivers who knew the route extremely well might drive at a higher speed. To add one, the road section was sloping downwards. Even if the bus would be 'locked' when the speed exceeds 70 [kilometres per hour], there would be an impulse generated from the slope and the weight of the vehicle, causing an increase in the speed. He suggested that the bus company should remind bus drivers to be patient at all times, and to slow down when going downhill. In addition, he hoped that the bus company would instruct all bus drivers to maintain a good attitude while driving."

Then at (vi):

"He enquired the police for the number of traffic accidents that had happened ..."

Not only for the road section concerned, but also for the entire length of Tai Po Road, and he asked whether there were speed enforcement cameras at Tai Po Road, and if yes, the number and the locations.

And now may I ask, first of all, about this speed limit lowering from 70 kilometres to 50 kilometres per hour. After this meeting, did you and the Transport Department have a site inspection of the location of the accident, in order to discuss about this request of reduction of speed limit?

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) You asking me? Or ask Mr Chan?

CHAIRMAN: It is a matter for you, amongst yourselves, to decide who should answer a particular question. Perhaps Ms Wong could indicate who might best reply.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe Ms Wong, if --

MS WONG PIK KUI: I will invite our TT group chairman Dr Lau.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) That question was raised by Mr Au, another district councillor. I think that should be better answered by Mr Chan, because he is the district councillor of that area.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, can you help us? The question is, was there a site visit?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Well, I personally did, now whether the district council chairman, he spoke at that -- on that occasion, he just raised the question, but whether there was any follow-up, that was another issue. Now, as a councillor, I definitely went to examine the scene before and after the accident. I definitely went myself, and Dr Lau Chee Sing, as chairman, whether he attended I could not recall.

CHAIRMAN: Did you go with the Transport Department, I think is the question. Was there any joint site visit?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I went personally with the Transport Department.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Let me also answer, well, we -- the Tai Po District Council, the chairman, Mr Cheung Hok Ming, the Home Affairs officer DO, Ms Cheung, together with us, the whole Tai Po Transport Traffic Committee, all our members went to the site to visit once. And Au Chun Wai had also attended.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Out of this site visit was it agreed amongst Transport Department and the persons in attendance at this site visit that the speed limit has to be reduced? For that particular road section in

relation to the accident?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes, when we were at the site we had raised two requests. The first was to bring in the 70 kilometres speed limit and lower it to 50 kilometres per hour, and we also wanted signage, and the second request was that in this section where we needed the speed limit to be slowed down, they should also install the speeding cameras.

MS MAGGIE WONG: During the site visit did you discuss about where the speed enforcement cameras should be installed, or the location of the cameras?

MS WONG PIK KUI: We, yes. We did identify the location. We had a whole coach, tour bus coach, some 40 people visiting the site, and we had more than 40 people on that section, and we felt it was dangerous to conduct our site visit under those conditions, so we took our request, and raised that in our district council meeting room in our Traffic and Transport Committee.

So if we wanted a precise location for the speeding cameras, we handed that over to the TD and the police, and our Councillor Chan Siu Kuen would follow up.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: I did. I was with the police officer responsible for traffic at the site, and I identified and designated the site -- that is the stretch that is going downhill where the cameras should be installed,

and we did have a discussion.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So was all this in writing? Or recorded in minutes, apart from the ones that you produced to us?

MS WONG PIK KUI: No. These were not listed out in such details at the meeting, because on the locations of the cameras, the district councillor of the constituency had to liaise with the village heads of the three villages at Tai Po Mei, he had to listen, consult them on the views, because there are also bus stops involved, maybe they need to be repaired and then need to remove the lamp post, and so on. So these are all details which are left to Mr Chan Siu Kuen to follow up by making appointment on another occasion with the relevant parties. That is why it was mentioned repeatedly, Mr Chan said he and the department went to the site several times afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: Can we have the date of the communal visit, the 40-odd people in the coach. When was that?

MS WONG PIK KUI: I think it should be 12 April. Perhaps our colleagues could all help out. I think it was 12 April. On that day we hired a coach bus to go there. Yes. 2 pm on 12 April. We started from the Tai Po government offices and then we went up to the Tai Po Road bus stop for a site inspection. We arrived at 2.15 at the scene at Tai Po Mei.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes, and then ... then at 3.30 there was a DMC, the district management committee meeting. At that meeting, we had a discussion after the site inspection. Now only the chairman and deputy chairman of the district council and the chairman of the five committees, so altogether seven district councillors who met with the district office and the departments of Tai Po. So that's a meeting for these people. And yes, there is a minute for this meeting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I take you back to -- still in the February 2018 minutes, as to the response by the KMB. That would be at 798 in English, and 780 in Chinese. At paragraph 35 it stated that:

"Mr Godwin So's views and responses to the questions raised by the district councillors were as follows ..."

And 35(ii) stated:

"The KMB will consider the views of the District Councillors on the routes, schedules, and dispatches of Route 872, and will submit proposals to the Transport Department and the district council for future considerations."

First of all, what views of the district councillors was he referring to?

MS WONG PIK KUI: The route 872, I proposed that it

shouldn't continue to go via the racecourse, and then on to Tai Po Road to the terminus. I hope there would be a new route. And then the new route could take the Tolo Harbour Highway.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did they submit any proposal to your council for consideration? Since -- (Simultaneous speakers - unclear) --

MS WONG PIK KUI: After the end of the meeting, well, it was close to the Chinese New Year, there was no further meeting. The Transport Department colleague called me, and asked if I agreed to this, that is for route 872X, it will go from the racecourse via the Tolo Highway to Tai Po centre.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may refer you to paragraph 12 at page 788 in English, and 771 in Chinese. This request was made by Mr Kwan Wing Yip, at paragraph 12(iv). He stated that:

"Since he began serving as District Councillor 18 years ago, there had not been any large-scale road widening or improvement works carried out on Tai Po Road. He understood that Tai Po Road was subjected to geographical limitations, but he still hoped that the relevant departments could try their best to work on improvement plans. He also hoped that the Transport Department could also consider improvement plans of

other roads (eg Ting Kok Road, Lam Kam Road, Sai Sha Road) proposed by the Traffic And Transport Committee of the Tai Po District Council ... so as to prevent traffic accidents caused by road defects."

In relation to this request by Mr Kwan, he mentioned that the Tai Po Road had not had any improvement works carried out during the past 18 years.

What is your view on that, when he stated that?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Now I think, perhaps it is best to get a response from the district councillor of the constituency, Mr Chan Siu Kuen.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: For the Tai Po Road, there are quite a number of bends. Yes, there have been widening works, for example the bend near Savannah Garden, this slope was cut before. There were not too many serious accidents there, it is true. But really, I think in this case, it is the bus driver, who drove carelessly. For this whole section, now as the district councillor of the constituency, most of the complaints were about speeding, and the residents were worried that might lead to serious traffic accidents, but for that particular location, best of course if it could be widened. You know, in Hong Kong there are many such roads with such bends, but for Tai Po Road it is not particularly dangerous, but of course if the widening could be done

we could support it.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, Mr Chan, may I remind you, in view of the remarks that you just made, that the causes and liability of the accident on 10 February are not within the terms of reference of this committee. We are interested to find out about the circumstances, but we are precluded from making any determination about that, for obvious reasons in light of prospective litigation.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Yes. I got it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chan, that paragraph made reference to improvement plans. Can you tell us when did the Traffic and Transport Committee of your district council propose the improvement plan? When?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: There is no mention here. On widening of Tai Po Road, it is not mentioned.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Dr Lau --

MS WONG PIK KUI: Perhaps I could say this here. Mr Kwan said he has been a district councillor for 18 years, actually I am in the same case.

Now, at the district council, for all these years, it is true, there are widening works at some sections of Tai Po Road, for instance, Ting Kok Road has been widened and is open to traffic already, it is a very successful case. The roundabout at Lam Kam Road, again widening works have been completed. Sai Sha Road, there

is now consideration of an option. Next time, when we talk about road improvement works again, we would ask the Transport Department to submit proposals together with others for the consideration of the Traffic and Transport Committee. That should be the case.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have anything to supplement?

DR LAU CHEE SING: Yes, I would like to add this. At the Traffic and Transport Committee meetings we discussed requests made by a particular member. When that is the case, it is not necessarily that the committee would submit plans. Usually at meetings we would ask the Transport Department to make improvements, and we would wait for the Transport Department to make proposals. Because they are the experts on transport matters. So it is for them to respond to members' requests, and come up with some improvement proposals for our consideration. Because district council councillors are not experts in this area. So usually when we make request at the Traffic and Transport Committee meetings, then we hope the Transport Department or the relevant departments would then put forward proposals for improvement for our consideration.

That's the point I would like to clarify.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In other words, you propose a certain idea, but in terms of execution, you leave it to the Transport

Department as experts, to execute the improvement works. Is that what you are saying?

DR LAU CHEE SING: Yes. Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And may I also refer you to paragraph 26, page 796 in English. And 778 in Chinese.

Paragraph 26(ii). Mr Yu Chi Wing, councillor, commented as follows. He said that:

"The staff of the Transport and Housing Bureau and Transport Department often refused to implement the suggestions put forward by the District Councillors, and they are often biased in favour of KMB at the meeting. In addition, there are often personnel changes in the Transport Department, which has led to a slow progress in handling cases."

First of all, when Mr Yu made reference to suggestions put forward by the district councillors are they referring to safety-related measures in relation to the road section of Tai Po Road? Or can you tell us what those suggestions were?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Now, I think, perhaps I should say this. Mr Yu Chi Wing expressed his views at the meeting so it should be for him to explain and clarify his views. We really cannot speak for him and interpret what he meant here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have there been meetings with the Transport

and Housing Bureau and Transport Department after suggestions had been put forward by the district councillor each time?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes. Now let me put it this way. District councillors receive complaints from residents. So through various channels they would convey these complaints. Going through the district council is one way, then writing is another way, or calling up someone is also a possibility. And then district councillors would speak with the Transport Department on their proposals or suggestions.

Perhaps other departments could also express their views on the matter. Mr Yam, thank you.

MR YAM KAI BONG: Now, on Mr Yu Chi Wing's views, and the counsel just asked about the views of other members, for example on how the Transport Department views members' views. I would like to give my opinion as well.

Now, the Transport Department, the police, and relevant departments did respond expeditiously including reducing the speed limit from 70 to 50, or undertaking to install speed cameras, speeding cameras, but then as Mr Chan Siu Kuen said, he has actually followed up on such proposals for a long time. Let me say this, it's a fact which may not be pleasing to the ear, it is only when someone is killed or injured then the would

actively respond to our views, and we don't want to see that.

Now, there's mention of questions asked by district councillors and often the Department would reject district councillors' demands, and that's true. It is not just on this particular subject. For example, in Tai Po district we would like to build a flyover at Kwong Fuk Road, we have talked about it for 10, 20 years, but because no lives were lost -- and then for district councillors of the Tai Po town going into Tai Po town or Kam Shan Village there is just a single road section, and if there should be a traffic accident and ambulances or fire engines prevented from entering it would affect rescue effort. So because nothing happened, that's why this demand of the district council for many years could not be addressed.

Now, you have to understand it. You know, district council is rather passive, especially when departments often cite technical reasons to block our request, and it is hard for us to question those technical considerations, and technical considerations include a lot of data, or a thousand reasons why something cannot be done.

Now we are very unhappy about it, but we feel rather helpless too -- and I must say this too.

Now, district councillors collect views from the public on traffic and transport issues, whether it be about professional drivers or pedestrians or after accidents have happened. Yes, of course those are minor accidents, but after minor accidents have happened does it mean that there could be more serious accidents in the future? This is something we can see. That's why Mr Chan Siu Kuen or other district councillors here have put forward these views. It is not groundless, because we predict something could happen so we want to make improvements as earlier as possible.

As to how improvements could be made, we don't have the capacity or the expertise to deal with it. But if certain measures are taken, could it then reduce the chance of accidents happening? This is what the district council could like to achieve.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, perhaps we could move forward to the improvements that did actually happen. And as I recall, there was a paper dated 9 April which was discussed by the district council on 11 May.

And I think that we might have received the approved minutes yesterday.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Chairman. Maybe I should jump immediately to the proposals made by the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe after this meeting there was another meeting on 9 March 2018, also in relation to the Tai Po Road accident. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could bring up the minutes of the meeting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The Chinese is at page 801 and the English is at page 815.

Maybe I will summarise some of the key matters in this minute before I go straight to the Transport Department's proposals.

This meeting was on 9 March 2018, and paragraph 4. Mr Cheung Wai Fung representing the Transport Department --

CHAIRMAN: Slow down a bit, Ms Wong, so that the representatives can see what you are addressing. I think you have hard copies, do you, of these minutes? You don't. In that case, take time, so that we can show them to you on the screen.

You are going to ask some questions about paragraph 4?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Paragraph 4. Mr Cheung Wai Fung representing the Transport Department made four suggestions in that paragraph. First, to study whether to revise speed limits. Second, to strengthen traffic

signs, and road markings. Third, installation of speed enforcement cameras, and fourth, to examine the topography of the site of the accident and explore how the bus stop could be optimised.

So those are the four issues the Transport Department would comprehensively review as stated in paragraph 4. Do you confirm that?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe in that meeting some members voiced their discontent about the progress in general terms because some district councillors considered that the reduction of the speed limit of the particular road section where the accident occurred could be reduced at a shorter time, and to have the road section, the entire length of the road section reviewed comprehensively later.

Can you recall that?

CHAIRMAN: Can you take us to an example of such a suggestion?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If you look at paragraphs 11 and 12, by Councillor Yam Kai Bong, and in the first paragraph he expressed discontent or disappointment about the progress.

And he mentioned that there are many sharp bends or slopes at paragraph 12 in the section of Tai Po Road

between Chek Nai Ping and Kwong Fuk Road to Savannah Garden.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it is paragraph 12(ii) that captures what you are saying.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The suggestion was that the department should first install a speed enforcement camera on this road section.

"Do it now, don't wait until later."

Wasn't that the suggestion.

Yes, Doctor?

MS WONG PIK KUI: I defer to Dr Lau.

DR LAU CHEE SING: I was chairman of that meeting. The first item for discussion was about the traffic accident, we would like to know the progress of follow-up of improvement measures by the Transport Department.

Their representative on that day mentioned the four items mentioned. However, what he said was there was no confirmation as to when they would be implemented. We are district councillors, something major happened in February. In March there was still nothing to respond to our request. That is, reduction of speed. Because that was something simple and could be done immediately.

The representative of the Transport Department at that time still said that it would be under consideration. District councillors expressed discontent and disappointment. That was because even though they have mentioned four items, they did not say anything about implementation date.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Mr Yam is here, maybe we can hear from him.

MR YAM KAI BONG: I agree what Dr Lau said. It was not that I was not happy with the recommendation of the Transport Department. I was not happy about the lack of timetable, and the date of installation of speed camera. The meeting took place on 9 March, and on 12 April during the site visit they then gave us a report saying that there would be speed camera and improvement to facilities and the locality of the bus stop as well as speed reduction. So it was only on 12 April that they gave us a confirmation about the improvement.

However, at that time the Transport Department used words like they would consider "whether" there would be an adjustment to the speed limit, as well as "whether" there should be improvement to road signs.

So it was "whether" they would do it or not. That's why I myself and other councillors were not happy and

were disappointed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think, Dr Lau, you have also recorded your sentiments at paragraph 31 of the minutes, just for completeness. That's at page 811 in Chinese, and 825-2 in English. By the time of this meeting you had not received the proposal from the Transport Department, and you complain about reducing speed limits and the fact that installing speed cameras are not difficult to implement. The matters that you have averred to earlier.

If we may look further at the Tai Po District Council paper dated 9 April 2018 -- that's at TD-1 page 354 in Chinese, and 360-1 in English.

This paper lists out a number of measures that they proposed to the Tai Po District Council. If you can see the first section -- the second section is the review of the speed limit, and it is proposed that the speed limit of certain sections be reduced from 70 kilometres per hour to 50 kilometres per hour.

If we could go to subparagraphs 4(a), (b) and (c). Subparagraph 4(c) is the part where they proposed the section between Chek Nai Ping and Yun Yi Road of Tai Po Road be adjusted, the speed limit be adjusted from 70 kilometres per hour, be lowered to 50 kilometres per hour. That's subparagraph 4(c).

And if we could -- if you could read it first, and then we will pull up the map for you to look at. Subparagraph 4(c). If we enlarge it, the section that we are referring to where the speed limit is reduced is the section starting from number 15 to number 31. The line marked in orange or brown colour.

Can you confirm that's the Transport Department's proposal?

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Yes. By Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And they also proposed other measures including the road traffic signs be put up and other road markings. That's at subparagraph 8(a). If we may look, first of all, at the map showing where the road traffic signs are proposed by the Transport Department. That's TD-1 page 360.

So they proposed to add two "Ahead" sign at the bottom, and then warning traffic sign, you can see the first, "Reduce speed now", "100 metres", and "Bend to the right ahead"; and then the second traffic sign, then we can see nine signs of sharp deviation of route, used with amber border. Then we can see the enlargement of the building, or construction of the pedestrian, and other road markings, or more markings on the road indicating the reduction of speed limit.

Can you confirm that's the proposal you have discussed with the Transport Department?

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Yes. Actually that was presented by the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) And we discussed that at the TTC meeting.

CHAIRMAN: So the paper was 9 April, and the meeting was on the 12th.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) That was the -- the meeting was on --

CHAIRMAN: I'm talking about the site visit. As I understand the evidence, that was 12 April: then there was a meeting on 11 May.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) No.

DR LAU CHEE SING: It was mentioned during site visit and then it was mentioned later.

(In English) The meeting on 12 April.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: As to this proposal, I believe there was draft minutes of the meeting dated 11 May this year. If we may go to Chinese at page 840-9.

CHAIRMAN: Before we do that, were we not told that they would be considered and approved in a meeting that was held yesterday? The 13th?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Have they been approved?
MS MAGGIE WONG: Have they been approved?
DR LAU CHEE SING: So Mr Lunn would like to know whether it was discussed yesterday?
MS MAGGIE WONG: No because what we have here is a draft minute. Has that been approved, this draft minute, or have there been changes?
DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) That was approved.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Without changes?
CHAIRMAN: Without changes?
DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Without changes.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you. In which case we can go to the draft minutes, if that is what you were going to do.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.
If we go to page 840-09 in Chinese, and 840-20 in English. And at paragraph 5 --
CHAIRMAN: Which bundle are we in now?
MS MAGGIE WONG: We are at DC-2, page 840-23 in English, and 840-12 in Chinese.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MS MAGGIE WONG: And maybe we should go back one page to see who is present. At page 840-22, the chairman welcomed a few representatives, including Dr Lau and Mr Hui Kam Nin Henry, the senior engineer of the Transport

Department. If we go to paragraph 4:

"The chairman said that the Transport Department had earlier submitted documents to the committee introducing the latest traffic control measures on Tai Po Road ..."

And it made reference to a Tai Po District Council paper. That is the paper I took you to earlier on.

"The secretariat had also sent the same by e-mail on 10 April 2018 to the members ... Further, the secretariat had assisted the Transport Department in arranging the members of this committee to conduct a site inspection of Tai Po Road with the District Management Committee on 12 April this year, and the Transport Department had explained the traffic control measures to be implemented shortly. He invited the Transport Department to report on the implementation of the various measures."

And paragraph 5 is the response from the Transport Department by Mr Henry Hui. He made five updates of work progress. First, he stated that: The speed limits of the Tai Po Road between Chek Nai Ping and Yung Yi Road had been lowered from 70 to 50 kilometres per hour from 27 April this year.

Second, that they have added the traffic sign and road sign with yellow fluorescent on the background on the signs to enforce reminder to drivers. Third,

widening of the bus bay that was damaged in the accident with protective barriers. The works were expected to be completed in this month, in July 2018.

The fourth is optimise the bus stop near the Tai Po Mei. The work is supposed to be completed in August 2018.

Fifth is to improve the traffic sign and road markings near Hung Lam Drive, Dragon Fountain and Yin Tse Lane. The relevant works expected to be completed by the end of this year.

Can you confirm the suggestions or the work progress reported by the Transport Department?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Counsel, Mr Chan can respond.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: (No interpreted answer).

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to paragraph 14. Mr Henry Hui also reported that the Transport Department endeavoured to complete installation of speed enforcement cameras by the end of this year. As to operation matters, it would be the responsibility of the police.

So the Transport Department has reported on the work progress thus far. Is that correct? Or is this an ongoing process?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: It is not ongoing, it is a single project. They had installed the camera and they were restoring the bus stop to its previous condition. That

was the end of the project.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we could go further to see Henry Hui's observations after the reduction of the speed limit. At paragraph --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. Was the committee given any explanation as to why it would take until the end of the year to install a single speed camera, one camera?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: There was an explanation given. They said that it took time to order the camera, they couldn't order just one camera, they had to order a whole batch, and second, it had to go through EMSD, Highways, Transport, Police, they had to go to visit the site. They had to dig up the road site, they had to get permits, they could not do it for one project, so that's why they had to take until the end of the year. I asked why they couldn't speed it up, and they said that they received the permit, after questioning by district councillors they promised by the end of this year that they would install a speed camera for us.

CHAIRMAN: They had various procedures to go through in order to lower the speed limit, did they not? But they had managed to achieve that by 27 April.

DR LAU CHEE SING: Because the speed reduction is simple, and it does not involve a lot of government departments, so I think regarding the speed reduction it was just the

Transport Department, they could make the arrangements themselves. And Highways Department -- they are also an executive, or a branch of the government. It is easier to coordinate the work.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: So when you order the speed camera you cannot order one unit. I recall from memory that they had to order a whole batch, and there are still a lot of areas in Hong Kong where they need to install these camera heads and they were ordering a batch then, they couldn't just order one single camera ahead, and there were a lot of procedures, government department procedures. They had to consult the different government departments, they had to contact EMSD, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department to get the power supply for the camera. That was the response I had at the site.

CHAIRMAN: Are we to understand that although there are 4,200 kilometres of roads in Hong Kong, the Transport Department has no inventory of speed cameras?

Perhaps you can't answer that.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Let me add. The incident occurred on 10 February, and after that, in our special meeting on 12 February, and then in March, we had our regular session at the district council meeting, and then the third meeting was the Traffic and Transport Committee

meeting, and the subsequent discussion on 12 April, and then in May, July, we focused on urging for the installation of a speed camera vociferously and up until now we still have not accomplished this request.

So perhaps our councillors could also add.

MR YAM KAI BONG: I agree with the honourable judge. We do have a question why there isn't inventory. It is such a large traffic department. How come they don't have back-up, or even parts, because the government said they were going to respond to the issue very promptly, and the honourable judge said just now, or Mr Chan Siu Kuen said that the changing of the speed limit, that could be done very quickly in terms of works, but the Transport Department said that they had to purchase the components, and use that as a reason, and the district council found that unreasonable.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Madam Wong, I would like to take you to paragraph 19 in this minute. At page 840-29, and that's paragraph 19. I would like to ask a few observations you made in this paragraph.

The first paragraph, you make reference to the lowering of the speed limit. After it came into effect, you received feedback from school coach drivers, bus

drivers, and traffic accident victims, et cetera.

May I know what feedback you have received?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Well, the incident had been discussed thoroughly in the district council and we were focused on reducing the speed from 70 to 50 kilometres per hour and I received feedback from school bus drivers regarding this road section. And they say that this is an incline, and if you want to travel uphill and then you want them to brake and brake to 50 kilometres, they say it is very hard to control or maintain the speed of the bus. But they understand that the incident needs to lead to some improvements, but they are worried that if they have to reduce the speed, their school bus, they have more than 40 passengers, so such a large vehicle, it is very hard to keep it under 50 kilometres speed. So I heard different drivers' input, and I reflected that in the district council.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At (iii), you mentioned that some bus drivers reflected that double-decker buses are not suitable to operate on Tai Po Highway since the speed limit will easily exceed 50 kilometres per hour, even the bus is accelerated when not at a full capacity.

Can you elaborate on this. Are you suggesting that double-decker buses are not suitable for this road section? Or are you making other suggestions here?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Well, I have visited the injured, after they were discharged from hospital -- one of the victims was a bus driver, there were also lorry driver victims, so they had -- they were victims, and they told me that double-decker buses on this road is very dangerous because a double-decker bus is so large. When they accelerate uphill they have to step on the gas, and such a large double-decker bus compared to a single-decker bus, they told me that they don't want to see double-decker buses running on this section. They say it is very dangerous, and they were asking for single-decker buses. So that's the opinion that I brought back to the council.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before we move on, can we look at the map with some of the photographs to identify the location as to how -- what it looks like now with the improvement works? That would be photo 14 to 19. That's the first reduced -- that's the first "ahead" traffic sign.

And then that's the reduction of limit 50 kilometres per hour and the road markings.

And I believe just now what we saw is the -- what you said is when the bus is driving uphill and then slightly downhill, that's the part you referred to earlier on. Is that correct? The 50 speed limit.

MS WONG PIK KUI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And then we see the first warning sign, "Reduce speed now", "100 metres". And then the next is the second sign, and then we see a lot of -- nine of them, nine signs with amber background asking drivers to be alert to slow down.

CHAIRMAN: I think they are described as "chevrons", are they not? Nine chevrons.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to the next photo we can see the reconstruction of the bus stop and the expansion of the pedestrian area.

We also see there are three new lamp posts installed in that bus stop. This is something I wish to ask. What is the lighting condition before the Tai Po accident, for this area? Do you know?

CHAIRMAN: You mean by that the street lighting? Or the road lighting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, for this particular bus stop. Because we can see there are three new lamp posts installed.

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Basically, the lighting is sufficient, there is a requirement of a street lighting every 60 feet, and there was a tree that had shaded the bus stop, but now with three extra lamp posts there is sufficient lighting, but we are most concerned about the bend. There is a slight incline on the bend, and that is where it is most dangerous, but now with three extra

lamps or street lighting it is sufficient.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did your council have any comments on any of these improvement measures, whether they are sufficient to address the concerns that you have expressed previously in the previous meetings? Would they be sufficient to address your concerns?

MR CHAN SIU KUEN: Well, basically, I personally had discussed with the relevant government departments including TD, so the bus stop is now moved forward, it is widened, they have removed, they felled the old tree, they widened that piece of road. And I also asked for a traffic signal, but they were not able to do that. They created some pedestrian crossing, and so the village entrance has been widened a little bit. They cannot do that right now.

So is it 100 per cent meeting the villagers' requirements, no? The village head also asked whether the bus stop could be moved further ahead, make it more visible. So TD, after looking at the actual site they said they can't do it. They said there is a very steep incline. After the improvement they have to consider the actual usage and conditions before they make further decisions.

MR CHAN CHO LEUNG: Honourable judge, I want to say that they cannot meet our requirements. Even when we provide

input regarding safety, I feel this kind of signage, the arrows, the chevrons, are only visual information, but a lot of our colleagues have provided input that when you are going downhill the most effective input is not visual input, you would need a small speed bump, or yellow stripes, when you go downhill. You can feel there is a palpable sensation, and it helps you meet the safety needs.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you relate the request that you made about putting speed bump or yellow stripes to allow people to feel, or there is a palpable sensation so that people feel they have to slow down. Did you relate this request to the Transport Department?

MR CHAN CHO LEUNG: We did. All councillors had expressed this, but the response was the Hong Kong TD have some constraints. The constraint is installing the yellow stripes, they can only do that at say the interchange going downhill, for example in Sai Kung where they have an incline, they have installed it there. But it is not in front of the interchange, if it doesn't go down towards the interchange they cannot do it.

MS WONG PIK KUI: I had visited this site, and in another picture where we have these nine chevrons, this is the highest point. The bus drivers say if you are driving a double-decker full of passengers they need to step on

the gas to -- and then they start going downhill. There is a sharp bend, and we also feel it is dangerous, so on this road surface, as Mr Chan Cho Leung said, can we have some yellow stripes, we had mentioned that on the site, but TD said it is not easy to implement, and the reason was given by Mr Chan Cho Leung.

We also said that the rest area, could it be relocated, and they said it couldn't, because that little resting area, that is the entrance to the Tai Po village, they need to cross the road to access the bus stop, but the bus stop is at the steepest point in this indented area, and the buses turning into that bend from the high point you have to decelerate, and then you have to turn into that indentation, so you need to consider the bus driver's skills, can they accomplish this manoeuvre. So that is something we do not wish to see repeated.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

I'm going to refer to the last document. It is the 25 May 2018 minutes. In Chinese it is at page 826, English at page 827, where you enclosed the 25th minutes at page 828 in Chinese, and then English starts at 834.

In this minute you made a number of suggestions or expressed certain opinion. I would like to explore that with you. First, it is paragraph 4 of this minute.

Reference was made to the working hours, the Transport Department's current guidelines which state:

"The maximum duty hours of bus captains shall not exceed 14 hours."

And then it is stated there:

"It was thought that the maximum duty hours as stipulated in the guidelines is too long and caused safety concerns to passengers. It was hoped that the committee could review the issue of the overly long working hours of bus captains."

It also states at 835 in English and 830 in Chinese that:

"Irrespective of how duty is arranged it was thought that it was in fact too long for bus captains to work 14 hours on a daily basis."

My question is, can you explain why you consider 14 hours too long?

MS WONG PIK KUI: In a day, there are 24 hours, and how we distribute the 24 hours, well, they should be divided into three parts, 8 hours for work, 8 hours for rest, and 8 hours for us to, you know, take care of family, or do studying and so on. That's reasonable.

But then for 24 hours in a day now, the KMB has divided that into just two parts. In fact it is more than half of a day, it's 14 hours, they ask staff to go

to work, and here we are talking about drivers. We are not talking about someone just sitting there, and you can just close your eyes if you want, or when you are tired you can just stretch or something. No, they can't do that.

So we are talking about 14 hours, in such an important position. He is responsible for the lives of over 130 passengers on a bus, and this is totally inappropriate.

I can invite my colleagues also to give their views on this.

MR YAM KAI BONG: Thank you, Ms Wong.

On working hours we would like to say this. Especially in the New Territories, I hope you will appreciate this, for New Territories residents early in the morning they will go from New Territories to Kowloon or Hong Kong Island and then in the evening they go from Hong Kong Island or Kowloon to go back to the New Territories or Tai Po. Now this is the way of commuting. So, say, we are talking about 10 loaded buses going to Kowloon, then there won't one or two loaded buses going back to Tai Po.

In fact, bus operators said in their evidence that there are especially during peak hours, that is why there is this special shift. Maybe in the morning they

work four or five hours, then in the evenings they work another three or four hours, in between. So 14 hours is not 14 hours straight in a row driving. But they are on duty, or the so-called rest break.

Do they really get to rest during that break? Sometimes bus drivers will tell us maybe they live in Tuen Mun or Yuen Long but they are assigned to Tai Po to work, let's say they finish at 10 am, that is the peak morning shift, they may have three or four hours to take a rest, but can they really get home to take a nap, for instance? If they go from Tai Po to go home to take a nap they may spend two hours or so commuting, and then they have to come back to Tai Po, pick up the bus and then take the second shift of driving duties.

And then in between they have a few hours of free time, but can they really take a rest then? That's the question.

Now we learned this from bus drivers for the break in between there is not a proper environment for them to take a rest.

Ms Wong led us to the mainland some time ago on a study visit, we went to Hangzhou and visited a bus company. The bus company actually had a proper rest facilities, similar to dormitory for drivers to rest.

All around the world people usually work from 9 to

5, so that's why there are peak hours for travelling. But in between, probably few people take the bus, so there are such a special arrangement, but then in between, do staff really get to go home to take a rest? Probably not.

But then shouldn't the bus company have the duty to provide a good environment for drivers to take a rest? Maybe they start working at 5 am and then they have to work again until 8 to 9 pm in between do they get to take a rest.

So shouldn't the bus company have the responsibility to provide proper environment for their drivers to take a rest during their breaks?

Now I hope members of the committee will appreciate this, especially for empty bus routes, this is even more important.

Because after 9 am or 10 am, for passengers going to Hong Kong Island or Kowloon there are far fewer in number, and then probably the peak hours start again at 4 or 5 pm when people start to come home from work.

So let's say we just remove the special shift altogether, it will actually affect bus services in the New Territories, unless the bus company is to hire double the number of drivers so there would be drivers from the morning shift, another batch of drivers for the

evening shift, but if the bus companies cannot do that and they just reduce the special shifts, then for residents of the New Territories, or many of the bus routes in the New Territories will be affected, so please appreciate that.

You have to understand the way NT residents commute and how bus services are provided as a result.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

I would like to ask four proposals set out in your minutes --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, on this issue of the Guideline of Bus Captain Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks, in September of 2017, the Transport Department announced that it was reviewing the then guidelines, which was the 2010 version. Were you asked to give your views as a district council about the proposed changes to guidelines?

MR YAM KAI BONG: (In English) No.

MS WONG PIK KUI: No. We were not consulted.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to ask four proposals set out in your minutes. The first one is at page 836, second bullet from the bottom, in English, and then page 830 in Chinese, also the second bullet from the bottom.

You quoted Singapore as an example where the local

government is responsible for hardware assets such as bus depot, vehicles, operation system, and operators are responsible for operation. So the operators are simply responsible for the operation, and that could have additional bonus.

So first, why do you think the Singapore model, or do you advance the Singapore model as suitable for Hong Kong?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Can I invite Mr Yam Kai Bong to respond, please.

MR YAM KAI BONG: Thank you, Ms Wong.

Yes, I raised this suggestion. We have looked at studies done in the market on how bus services should be run, should buses be totally privately run as is done here now? Or should bus services be owned by the government, and they could hire staff as civil servants or it could be a public-private partnership, the Singapore model, the London model. That is, the government buys the bus depot, the vehicles, and so on, and then the routes are contracted out to contractors. Why did I suggest that? For franchised bus services, we count there are all together five operators.

So they each have their own turf, if I could put it that way. KMB, Kowloon; New World Bus, New Territories, Hong Kong Island, blah, blah, blah.

So they will just focus on profit-making routes. For loss-making routes, because they are franchise operators, they may overlook the service to the public on these routes. Perhaps Mr Chan Siu Kuen could say a bit more later.

Now, if the companies could be split up further, that is we have more companies, that means there would be more competition, then would there be a possibility of improvement? For the Singapore model, the services are contracted out to a few operators, so for the bus routes, the fare level, or staff, wages, it is for the government to decide. So their consideration is not just about profit then. They will consider whether the wage level is reasonable, for instance, and so on.

And then you can look at another place, Taipei. In Taipei there are many different companies operating different bus routes. Even for routes that are similar, there could be different operators and that leads to competition. With competition, it leads to two things.

One, because they have to, you know, fight for staff, so there may be an increase in wage, and if the routes are similar, that could also bring about competition, maybe they will offer concessions, so passengers will benefit from that.

Why we are proposing that the government should buy

up the whole bus system and then contract out the routes to different operators? Because then we could consolidate certain routes, let's say for some profit-making routes they could be packaged together with some of the less profitable routes to meet the needs of smaller groups of residents, because the needs of these residents are now overlooked, and they cannot provide more bus services in such cases.

But if a route is profitable the bus company will just focus on that.

That's why we believe the Singapore model is more flexible. If it is a totally privately run bus service, of course, first of all, companies will put profits first. They will exploit -- maybe I shouldn't say "exploit", they will see where they could save costs, they can't save fuel costs, you know, as for costs of vehicles, there's probably a world standard, so there is not much room for reduction. So they could save only staff costs, or at least they won't increase wages, and that's why some staff or unions say that the pay and conditions of service of bus drivers have always been kept on the low side.

Why is it that, it will change, that's why we say if we change the models, maybe we can bring about changes in the services provided.

MR CHAN CHO LEUNG: Let me provide two facts by way of supplement. Of course there are merits for the model proposed. One fact is there are buses without patronage, so these are the loss-making routes. Of course, bus companies are not keen on them. Let's say there are popular routes like the Lam Tsuen route, there is just one bus route so it is heavy patronage. But the bus company will still just make use of existing resources for that route to redeploy bus services to meet our needs.

These are the two facts I would like to share with you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

The second suggestion you made is using the real time technology, or real time information, and you asked that information be released as similar application.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find this suggestion?

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at page 838 in English, and 831 in Chinese at the bottom. And 838 is the second bullet.

It states that:

"Some members indicated that because Hong Kong buses has high loss trip rate, if the bus companies are to provide this information, the passengers will discover the loss trip problem more easily and this is the reason why this realtime information has not been fully

released. He is of the opinion that the passengers' oversight will be of certain use to improve the operation of buses. It is hoped that the committee will consider to [require] bus companies to release similar application, to use technology to monitor bus service."

Can you elaborate on this about how the passenger could use this technology to monitor the loss trip rate, if I understand it correctly.

MR YAM KAI BONG: Well, let me explain that. Because it is from me. I found this information on line or it is also from my own experience. And that's why I expressed this view at the meeting.

I mentioned the Taipei Citybus information system. That's a mobile app, and on that app you can see on the map where the bus is, say, the bus is at a certain junction, or it has arrived at a certain bus stop. For the KMB's mobile app it can only show that the bus will arrive in three minutes or five minutes.

But we cannot see how long the distance is, where the bus is.

Now, why do we want to know that? If they say it is just three minutes but maybe there is traffic congestion, so it doesn't mean that the bus will actually arrive at three minutes.

The mobile app only tells us it is three minutes

journey time but maybe for the three-minute journey, if it is totally congested then maybe the bus will not arrive in 15 minutes. But if it is like the Taipei bus information system the public can see that the bus is trapped in traffic congestion two blocks away. It is like when you read the Google map you have realtime information on traffic condition whether the road is congested or not, we see there is true traffic and the bus still does not arrive in three minutes then we can ask what the problem is.

Or if we want to monitor bus service many we should say the next bus should have arrived, why is it that it is still not here after so long? Is it because of a road condition, like traffic congestion, or traffic accident, or is it a case of loss trip?

For the KMB mobile app we can't see such information and there is limited information provided. If we could follow the example of other countries or places with realtime display of information, then we can see this clearly for ourselves, we see there is a bus two blocks away, it will arrive in about three minutes and traffic condition is fine, but maybe there is another bus at a junction five minutes away but it is actually, you know, trapped in traffic congestion, for instance, and then the passenger may decide not to wait for the bus,

instead I'll take the MTR so I get a choice. But now we don't see that information.

MR CHAN CHO LEUNG: I could give you an example of loss trips. Again, I will use Lam Tsuen as an example. For the past 20 years the problem of lost trips could never be addressed. You know why? From Yuen Long, going through Kam Shan Road to Tai Po, there are so many bus stops along Kam Shan Road, by the time the buses come to Lam Tsuen there are just two or three services left and this problem can never be addressed.

The problem now is for the KMB mobile app, it may show it is arriving in 10 or 15 minutes but that is totally inaccurate. So far many have complained about the mobile app to say that the ETA is totally inaccurate.

Counsel just mentioned the paragraph, Mr Yu Chi Wing just said, the Transport Department is biased towards the KMB. Now they cannot address this problem for so many years, so TD is just defending KMB or speaking up for KMB. That's how we see it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The third proposal you made is at page 839. At the fourth bullet, and in Chinese at page 833, the second bullet. You proposed a penalty mechanism for bus companies similar to the MTR mechanism. In other words, a fine will be imposed when an accident occurred. And

I would like to explore this.

Why do you think it would be suitable in the franchise operations environment in Hong Kong?

MS WONG PIK KUI: It was proposed by a number of members. Perhaps I will defer to Mr Yam Kai Bong. Thank you.

MR YAM KAI BONG: A number of members were of the view that when it comes to the renewal of franchise and a penalty system, there can be a mechanism put in place. We see that for the MTRCL where there are service delays as a result of incidents, they will be fined.

However, when it comes to bus companies, providing substandard service or where there are lost trips, it seems that there are no penalties.

We can't see why the government would continue to renew the franchise, say for example, for the KMB about three years ago or so when the franchise was renewed, it wasn't discussed at the district council.

For a franchised bus service using KMB as an example, the service coverage is Kowloon and New Territories. Members of the public and district councillors should be given an opportunity to speak, but I can say with certainty that district council has not been consulted when it comes to whether to renew the franchise of KMB.

In this case, KMB doesn't have to pay attention to

views of district councillors. We have, as some others members said, we have made suggestions by saying that there should be increase of service, of routes, bus companies did not respond to us actively, because we are not effectively their boss, we don't have the say when it comes to franchise renewal. The Transport Department, or the government, do they effectively monitor whether there are lost trips, and what is the service level of bus companies? We think that the Transport Department has not done their job.

For 64K from Yuen Long to Tai Po via Lam Tsuen there have been a number of problems. They remain unresolved. Bus services from Tai Po to Hong Kong Island, it seems that bus service cannot be increased. We think that it is because there is no monitoring mechanism. We do think that by introducing a penalty mechanism we will be able to, hopefully, reduce lost trips and the occurrence of incidents.

We can't stop bus companies from renewing their franchise or focusing on making a profit. With the penalty mechanism we can urge bus companies to do better.

It seems that we don't have any measures to monitor bus companies. With a penalty mechanism, members would be able to find a way to penalise bus companies should

their bus service fall below standard.

MS WONG PIK KUI: I would like to say something as the chairperson. Franchise of bus companies in Hong Kong, once they have the franchise, the government tasks the Transport Department to monitor their service and to work with them in the formulation of bus routes.

We think that the Transport Department has not devoted enough manpower to do this. In Tai Po we have over 100 routes. We have the Transport Department with us in meetings, only one representative overseeing the entire Tai Po area. We have over 100 bus routes, many buses and many drivers, and even more passengers.

We don't speak too often about this in district council meetings, but it is an important livelihood issue, because when you go to do your shopping, to go to hospital, to go to work, you always have to take a bus.

Airport bus service is very important to us as well. We have A47X from Tai Po. I use this as an example. There are lost trips. However the Transport Department, especially the higher echelons of the department don't even know that the bus driver has fallen ill so the bus remains at the terminus. If there is no one there to drive the bus, passengers will have to wait for three more buses to go to the airport.

I'm talking about between 6 and 7 am.

We couldn't find anyone when we make a phone call to try to get the problem solved.

And that's when people had to go to the airport.

We visited Hangzhou, we really appreciated the supervision of Hangzhou, because there is one single centre with many computers. You only have to key in a bus route number when information such as number of passengers waiting for a bus and all the different situations will be displayed by these computers. When it comes to Hong Kong, there is nothing like that. We have not progressed at all. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I move on to the fourth proposal, because it is also on the same page, 839, the second bullet from the bottom, that the district council as a stakeholder of bus route planning and services has a close relationship with bus companies. And it is proposed that a marking scheme be added during the process of renewal with bus companies to allow district council to rate and to provide comments on the performance of bus companies.

I believe that's the fourth proposal that your counsel made.

MS WONG PIK KUI: I would defer to Mr Yam Kai Bong.

MR YAM KAI BONG: Thank you.

As I said previously, regarding franchise renewal,

it seems that the district council doesn't really have the power to make decisions. We hope that we can increase the say of district council as a stakeholder. Regarding franchise renewal, they would just come to the district council for a brief consultation, but if district council can make comments on, say, poor service of the bus company and the say of the district council would affect the government's decision when it comes to franchise, it would be good.

As mentioned in the review committee regarding the Tai Po accident, district councillors have made a lot of comments.

District council is both passive and active. When it comes to bus service we have a working group in the Tai Po District Council. We have made a lot of suggestions. But how much have the bus company and the Transport Department responded to them? If there is a scoring system, if we can make comments, and these comments would influence the government's decision on franchise renewal, then I think the bus company would listen and respond to views expressed by district councillors.

I would like to draw the attention of the Independent Review Committee that district councillors' views are not groundless. We have collected views from

the public. We are returned by voters, we speak for them in council meetings. But if our views are not addressed properly by departments and companies, then there is nothing we can do.

We think that if district council can be involved in the scoring system in franchise renewal, then bus companies would definitely listen to our views.

We think that our views can be incorporated in your review of bus service. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Thank you ladies and gentlemen, I have completed my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. I want to follow up a comment, Ms Wong, you made earlier, about you have heard comments that Tai Po Road may not be suitable for double-decker buses. Would you agree to that statement?

MS WONG PIK KUI: Well, the views I have received came from one of the injured persons. It was a bus driver. I spoke to that person. They said that there was Tai Po Road before Tolo Highway. The route number is called 872 because there was a bus route called 72. Later, there was the racecourse, this route will be used to take residents from Tai Po to the racecourse, and the bus route was therefore called 872. Later, the KMB

started to turn single-decker buses to double-decker buses.

The buses that KMB procured would be used for route 872. I said that we only asked for residents to be taken to the racecourse, and there is the Tolo Highway. If it is a point-to-point service then it is simple. You can use the other way. So that was the 872X. Do we still need to use double-decker buses for route 872? Are there so many passengers, over 100 of them? If that is the case, you can increase the service by using three single-decker buses.

CHAIRMAN: That's on the assumption that you have enough bus drivers to drive the buses.

Do you have any questions?

MEMBER LO: I just have one clarification question, Ms Wong.

You mentioned about when the speed limit was reduced from 70 to 50 certain drivers of coaches expressed some concern. Is their concern that lowering the speed limit does not deliver, or what is their concern?

MS MAGGIE WONG: They said to me that at the highest point, well, they have to use 70 kilometres per hour because when the bus is fully loaded they couldn't effectively control the bus at 50k per hour. However, I think that for this section of the road, safety is paramount. So we asked for the speed limit to be reduced to 50.

That's the view they expressed to us in this regard.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it remains for the committee to thank you, Ms Wong, and gentlemen, for assisting us with your evidence. The committee is interested in receiving the views of the district councils, which is why we have invited you and two other district councils. We are charged to make recommendations in relation to safety of buses, to enhance bus safety, not wider issues.

But it is in that context that we have been most interested to receive your evidence, Mr Chan, about the concerns that you have expressed specifically about this very stretch of road in terms of the speed limit and the need for cameras. And we thank you for your evidence on that subject.

We are now going to adjourn the proceedings for 20 minutes.

Dr Lau.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Will we be given a chance to express some other issues regarding the bus service?

CHAIRMAN: If they relate to safety, please do.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) Should be related to safety.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) After the adjournment?

CHAIRMAN: Well, we have already been under way for 2.5 hours. But how long do you expect to take? Because

we have given you an opportunity to give us written submissions.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) In that case let me express some views which I received regarding the bus drivers' view.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

DR LAU CHEE SING: (In English) I will express it in Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course.

DR LAU CHEE SING: Chairman, it is unfortunate that we have had the Tai Po Mei accident. People have the impression that it was the bus driver who has committed careless driving. When it comes to franchise bus service, bus drivers play a very important role. As my colleagues said, there are over 100 passengers on board, so the professional knowledge as well as the driving attitude of drivers are very important.

There are some friends of mine who are bus drivers, they expressed my views to me when they knew I was going to come here.

They said that it is about management and staff deployment of bus companies. They don't have sufficient experience. That may be the reason.

They said that when it comes to deployment of bus captains, if bus captains are deployed to unfamiliar

routes, there will be tremendous pressure. They asked for a chance to familiarise themselves with the route before they are deployed. That is something about staff training.

If they can be given an opportunity to familiarise the route before they drive a bus load of passengers, it would be better.

And if they are deployed to drive new buses, they should be given a chance to familiarise themselves with the new bus. That's the view they expressed to me.

There is a third point. It is about bus schedules. There is a pre-set time. Bus drivers think that the time is not enough, and if that is the case, they will have to speed up to catch up. And as a result, there may be dangerous situations.

These are the three points I would like to say.

And I hope the committee can take note of these issues and you could follow up with bus driver associations and other related associations, and hear their views as well, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. One matter on that last point you raise, Dr Lau, this is a generic complaint that we have heard about, that journey times are too short. But what we need is evidence that the times are too short. So if your bus driver/captains can communicate with us with

specific examples that the route from A to B is set at a one-hour journey time, but in fact can it take more than that, that's the kind of information the committee needs.

DR LAU CHEE SING: The honourable judge, in my constituency, 75K, since I have been in office, the bus travel time has been adjusted. The timetable was roughly 35 minutes from Tai Mei Tuk to Tai Po, and they felt that is too rushed. So ultimately it was adjusted to 45/50 minutes, it allowed the bus drivers during the journey they would not feel that it was an unreasonable demand for bus drivers. So if you ask KMB for the timetable, that is a fact. So they had made some adjustments.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is really the ones that remain a problem that, if somebody gives us evidence about that, then we can take that up.

DR LAU CHEE SING: Do you mean I need to provide this evidence?

CHAIRMAN: Somebody needs to give us evidence. We have anecdotal or generic assertions that are made that journey times are too short, bus drivers therefore speed up, they are worried about losing rest time, but we need to have evidence to support that, not just sweeping statements.

DR LAU CHEE SING: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR YAM KAI BONG: I would also like to supplement. The request for evidence, well, if you look at the bus companies, the average travel time, well, I recall there was a statistic, but I cannot recall where it originated from. In the last 10-plus years, the average travel time has been slower and slower. So the bus speed is slower, and have the companies deployed sufficient drivers to maintain the service? Because when vehicle speed is slowing down that will lead to longer travel time, and if you maintain the frequency of service, then you need to add drivers and add to the fleet.

So that is in direct proportion, so as councillors we feel that you need to maintain the service, you cannot have loss of service, but then the road is more and more congested, we have more and more vehicles on this road. So TD, did they communicate with the bus company, to deploy more staff, deploy more resources? That is something that needs to be looked into.

There are statistics, but I cannot recall or cannot confirm the source, the average bus speed has been slower and slower. So district council has asked for special bus routes, and other measures, so we could look into that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr Chan.

MR CHAN CHO LEUNG: (No interpreted channel recorded) -- when they look at signs that is insufficient, so as a motorist we feel if there is a palpable sensation, if you can feel a speed bump you can slow down. So I hope for village roads that are going downhill that there can be some speed bumps.

Another suggestion is that in villages downhill areas where there are bus stops, there should be barriers. These barriers are very important. For example, on the last occasion we have a wishing tree, there is a bus stop, and I asked for a few years to add a barrier railing, and they had neglected us. But that is necessary because it is going around a bend and it is going downhill, so it is very treacherous for a double-decker bus if it is a full of passengers, and if they skip the bus stop they are travelling at even higher speeds. So passengers waiting at the bus stop feel terrified. So we need some barriers.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

If that concludes the various views that you wish to give us, and we have made our invitation, Dr Lau, the committee is open to receiving further information that addresses the topic that you have raised.

But it remains for us to thank you very much for attending today to assist us, and to encourage those

that are waiting to give evidence, that we will hear their evidence soon, but we are going to take a 20-minute break now. Thank you.

(11.46 am)

(A short break)

(12.05 pm)

EVIDENCE FROM SHA TIN DISTRICT COUNCIL: MICHAEL YUNG

(Given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: We will now move to receive evidence from Mr Yung on behalf of the Sha Tin District Council.

Thank you for accepting our invitation on behalf of the council to attend to give evidence, and I will ask Ms Wong to begin by asking you questions.

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you for coming, Mr Yung.

I have a few areas of questions for you. First of all, may I take you to your discussion paper dated 8 January 2013. Page 631 in Chinese and 637 in English.

CHAIRMAN: Which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: DC bundle 2.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yung, if you take time to read this page, this is a question raised by I believe district councillor Ms Yeung Sin Hung, and she raised questions

on behalf of the Sha Tin District Council relating to the lost trips and working hours of bus captains.

She said that she received first complaints from residents that there was a situation of lost trips of buses during peak hours; and secondly, she observed that some bus captains had no rest time between too long a bus trip.

Can you tell us something about this complaints, Mr Yung?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Let me first of all say this. Ms Yeung Sin Hung is a former district councillor. Now I would like refer to the minutes of the meeting, the Chinese version, because the Chinese version is the one confirmed by members. As for the English version, it is just for summary reference.

The government counsel would like us to talk about rest hours, and lost trips, right?

Ms Yeung Sin Hung referred to E42, this is Long Win bus route. My understanding that Long Win operates franchised bus services to the airport.

So Long Win, compared to its parent company KMB, is much smaller in scale. Therefore, it has fewer bus captains, and so if bus captains are absent from work then it is easy to have lost trips.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, I am more concerned about the problem

about the journey time being too short, and then the driver have to speed up and to make up the time, for example there may be traffic jam and then there may be other problems on the road. And by the time he got to the station, it is unrealistic the journey time, let's put it this way. And then he has to make up the time, and by doing that he has to speed up. I'm concerned about this issue. Maybe you can enlighten us. During your time as district councillor have you received complaints in that regard?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Now, the journey time you mentioned, perhaps I could put it this way. I understand that during different times of the day, let's say the morning peak hours, the morning non-peak hours, the evening peak hours, and the evening non-peak hours, in theory there are different bus schedules or there are -- there is a different journey time rather, on that basis they would compile a schedule. So it is possible that one driver may use one or more than one vehicle to go on the same route. So they could achieve the standard schedules on the bus schedule.

Now there is a system. They call it, you know, hopping planes, that's the jargon bus drivers use. Let's say bus captain takes the E42 route primarily, but then, say, at Ma On Shan there is another route, A41P,

it goes from Wu Kai Sha to the airport, ETC, that is the transport centre of the airport. So sometimes they may need buses from the E42 route to drive on the A41P route, and if there should be problems with the A41P route, that means the E42 routes would also suffer at the same time.

There could be two scenarios. One, for this reason, during the highway section bus drivers may have to make up for the lost time. But I understand there is a limit on bus speed. So when it is approaching 70 kilometres per hour there should be a speed limiter to prevent the bus from going any faster, but on other sections along the route, or on road sections where the speed limit is lower than 70, if the buses go faster we cannot control that.

That's the first scenario.

Another case is, say, if they couldn't catch up with the lost time, then it is possible that for the next bus service there is a delay, or they need to take special measures to make up for part of the trips. Let's say instead of starting from the airport, maybe the bus service would start midway along the route to make up from the journey time.

So it depends how much time is lost when the bus arrives it the terminus. My understanding is that the

bus stop officer on duty would decide on that, or there is a rostering system from the bus company and then the bus captain would be told from where to start his service.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And on this page, there is another issue that touches upon the long working hours of bus captains, and when the Transport Department in September 2017 reviewed the guidelines, did they consult your district council as to those guidelines, as to the proposed revision of those guidelines?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: From my recollection, I am the deputy chairman of the transport and traffic committee of the Sha Tin District Council. Of course I have no power to decide on the agenda of our meetings, but from what I recollect, since 2016, that is for this term of the district council, of all the TCC meetings we have had, I don't recall having discussed the Guideline of Bus Captain Working Hours, so our views have not been sought.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what was your district council's opinion on these guidelines?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Since we have not had a discussion, as in a formal discussion, there is no formal records. If you ask me personally, I believe the working hours of bus captains are on the long side.

Let's say for security guard, the longest working hours are 12 hours, and as some colleagues from the Tai Po District Council said just now, we only have 24 hours in a day. If the working hours are longer than 12 hours, that means the rest time and time for other activities would be reduced. Let's not forget, for colleagues of bus companies, they have to start early in the morning, and finish late at night, and there may not be a convenient mode of transport for them to go between their place of work and their home. So if you take out the travels hours as well, do they really have eight hours of rest a day? That remains a question mark.

So if you ask me personally, I believe a maximum of 14 working hours for someone who has to look after road safety as well as being responsible for the safety of passengers on board, then the hours are far too long.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reason I'm asking is because if you look at your district council's minutes, TT paper 23/2017, Chinese at page 709 to 710, English at bundle DC-2, page 714 to 715. It is a question from Mr Chiu Man Leong, in relation to the bus accident.

And the comments from Mr Chiu was that the guidelines in terms of the working hours are too long, and the drivers do not have enough time for rest. He expected the Transport Department, and bus company to

make a review so as to reduce the maximum working hours of drivers to 10 hours.

So --

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of this meeting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Chairman, I believe this date of the meeting is.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) March 8th, 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it appears that your council has made certain position on the working hours. Did you consult trade union about the maximum number of working hours?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: I have not consulted the trade unions on what would be the suitable working hours. But as a passenger, or as someone from the local community -- now I have been in contact with some of our residents, they are bus drivers as well. In general, they start the day early and finish late. Let's say we take the morning shifts. Now my constituency is Tai Shui Hang, Fu On Garden. The nearest bus depot is in Sha Tin, Yuen Shun circuit, opposite Yu Chui Court. The journey time is about 15 minutes.

Now, usually, bus captains will have to take their company coach at around 4-something in the morning, and then they arrive at the bus depot at about 5-something in the morning to report to duty. And then they would

take their bus or they go on some other buses, and then get to the point where they would pick up their bus. In between, actually, for the shifts arranged, it could be about them starting off only at 6 or 7 am in the peak hours.

So in between there is no way they could take a rest, because at the bus depot there may not be an ideal environment for them to take a rest. That's the first point.

There is also this situation. In order to set out punctually, they would have to drive the bus to a relevant terminus, or substation. There may not be a staff rest kiosk for them to rest inside. So they will have to stay in the bus to rest.

Under the requirement by the Environmental Protection Department to turn off your engine when the vehicle is idling, that means bus drivers cannot start the engine to keep the air conditioning working.

So they will have to be stuck in a very close and stuffy environment when they are waiting to start their driving duties. So bus drivers don't have a place to rest, and they can't properly rest. That would result in a drop of their driving performance. So if you ask me whether there should be more rest kiosks or a place to rest before they start their driving duty. I think

we can look into that.

In relation to work hours, I know that there is a dilemma. Tai Po District Councillors have talked about work hours and the transportation, or traffic pattern of the New Territories. In the morning you will find a lot of people travelling from the New Territories to urban areas, for example Kwun Tong, Wanchai or Chai Wan. There needs to be really frequent bus services to take passengers to work. However, these buses will have to return to do the next trip. But the return trip is not as frequent. When it comes to planning the working schedule for bus drivers, they would require a lot of people to drive buses.

However, during non-peak hours they don't need that many people.

Then later in the evening peak they will need a lot of people to drive buses to take passengers from urban areas back to their own homes. So the actual driving hours may not be as long as 10 hours. But the work hours, that is the time on standby and the time on driving duties, can be as long as 10 to 14 hours. Without a proper place for them to rest, bus captains can only find a place to rest in shopping malls, or stay in a rest kiosk cramming up with other bus drivers trying to rest. I do think that bus companies should

provide suitable rest facilities for bus drivers to take on special shifts.

CHAIRMAN: Can you identify a place that does not have a proper rest facility?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Perhaps I can do it this way. There are not many places where there is rest kiosk for staff members. In my constituency, at one point, bus companies asked us for our views about increase of rest facilities. It was about six months or nine months ago. Well, these staff rest kiosk is not just to partition an area. They will have to connect water supplies, electricity --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Yung --

MR MICHAEL YUNG: If you ask me --

CHAIRMAN: We are familiar with what the problems are, because we have received a lot of information about the difficulties in constructing these kiosks: water, sewage, electricity. Just give us an example of a place and we will go and visit it.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: For large terminus, say for example New Town Plaza, Sha Tin train station. There are no large-scale rest kiosk. So you can --

CHAIRMAN: Sha Tin train station?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Sha Tin PTI under New Town Plaza is the public transport interchange, and also Sha Tin train

station, the rest kiosk is small, and there is only one.

There is also another bus company, Citybus. They don't have a proper staff rest kiosk for bus drivers of another bus company to use.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that one of the bus companies asked your views, your council's views about the facility. Is it in writing?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: At that time it was asked verbally. If I remember correctly, there was a consultation paper. It was done via the Transport Department and the district office. I think it was around March or April this year. I have to find the document, and I will give it to you after the hearing.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Yung, I'm going to ask a few questions about accidents that happened at a few locations. First is the Lei Yue Mun accident, which I believe your council has raised a lot of questions. If I may take you to page 709 in Chinese, and in English at paragraph 133. In English at page 714.

CHAIRMAN: What's the date of this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: March. I believe it is also in March 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now this accident happened, and then -- one of the questions raised by Mr Chiu --

CHAIRMAN: When was the accident?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The accident was in January 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And Mr Chiu Man Leong raised a question regarding the accident. And one of the questions he asked is whether the companies allowed drivers to work part time for long hours after their normal work.

And he quoted some examples, for example as part-time bus or minibus drivers.

If we look at the reply of the Transport Department at page 707.

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The paragraph at the top. "Reply from the Transport Department".

If I may go back, actually, it is 706, the question is at 706, and it identified the vehicle accident on 14 January 2017 of number 681 bus of KMB. And the bus drove to Lei Yue Mun.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) It is Citybus, not KMB.

CHAIRMAN: That's a typographical error.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that is a typographical error.

"When the bus travelled to Lei Yue Mun Road and approached the Lam Tin bus station, it bumped into the

ramp stone crack in the middle of the road and turned over towards left as it was out of control. Tens of people were thrown out of their seats ... and several people were trapped ..."

Regarding this incident, they raise a number of matters.

First, is the condition of passengers on scene. Second, bus company, did the company follow up? But I'm more concerned about (c), (d) and (e). The (c) issue is about the health condition of the driver, whether it conformed to standards.

Second is the existing design of the pavement and ramp stone crack increase.

And the third is the design of the bus running in Hong Kong, whether it guaranteed passenger safety.

And the Transport Department gave a reply on the next page.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, surely the question that is relevant to our topic is (c):

"Do the government and bus companies allow drivers to work part time for long hours after their normal work as part-time bus or minicab drivers for example?"

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we see the reply from the Transport Department over the page at page 707, the Transport Department did not appear to answer the second part of

the question that the chairman just read out. Instead, they made quite a generalised answer if we look at page 707.

The second paragraph:

"We have formulated guidance on the shifts of bus drivers, including working, rest and meal time. The shift arrangement of the driver involved as well as his schedule before work conforms to the requirement specified in our guidance."

Et cetera.

Then he did not address the question whether part time drivers can work for long hours after their normal work.

In relation to this issue, did your district council follow up on the Transport Department's reply?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: From my recollection, in the meeting our focus was on the traffic accident. We did not discuss in detail about part-time bus drivers are allowed to carry out driving duties for how long. As I recall, during the renewal of a franchise of bus companies, the community was very concerned about lost trips. As a result, bus companies introduced a lot of part-time bus captains to deal with the situation. There are two groups of part-time bus captains. For one, they have a job during the day and then they will drive for a few

hours in the evening.

Administration staff of bus companies have driving licence to drive buses. That is what I know.

If the Transport Department only focused on the driving hours then they would always meet the requirement. Because they don't take into account the working hours of their main job. But if there are ways for bus companies to record their own driving duties, if the part-time bus captains have a principal employment, you won't be able to find out whether the principal employer allows these people to take up driving duties after work. I don't know whether these part-time bus captains are required to report the exact number of hours they work in their principal employment.

So it is very difficult for bus companies to know whether these part-time bus captains are working exceedingly long hours.

The guidelines they have don't target part time duties, and the problem is that bus companies do employ part-time bus captains, so I think it is a matter of chicken and egg.

CHAIRMAN: The problem is if the bus companies don't ask the questions about what their part-time drivers do in the rest of their day?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Given this is a concern, did your council raise these matters with the Transport Department as to the monitoring mechanism?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Of course district councillors expressed the view. After the meeting we asked for guidelines on working schedules, and that guideline does not cover part-time bus captains and that is the focus.

We tried to follow up on this matter but they never dealt with it, so there are no ways for us to pin them down to get them to resolve it.

CHAIRMAN: Did you do so in writing?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: In the meeting, apart from moving a motion -- well, if there was a motion, then the department will be asked to follow up. As to whether other councillors have been chasing for a reply, I don't know, so I don't have the information as to whether it was done in writing. I believe that district councillors of different parties have mentioned this in unofficial meetings of the Transport Department, and I have raised this issue as well. I've raised it with Citybus, First Bus, KMB and the Transport Department. And as to whether bus companies have actually implemented anything to address the problem, I think it is for bus companies to answer.

CHAIRMAN: When you raised these matters with those parties,

you did so orally, rather than in writing?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) Orally. Orally during meeting.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second issue identified at page 706 is the design of the pavement and ramp stone crack increased the probability of serious bus accidents, that's (d), page 706 at (d). And the reply from the Highways Department and Transport Department is at page 707. It states, if we start from line 2:

"The open end of the fence railing uses an inclined stone crack, which can reduce injury to drivers and passengers when any vehicle runs into the fence railing, if it is out of control. The Highways Department, together with the Transport Department, continue to inspect the protection facilities on the existing public roads and install appropriate protection facilities on new and existing public roads according to the actual conditions and needs."

It states that the Transport Department and the Highways Department will continue to inspect these protection facilities. Did you follow that up with the Transport Department?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: In the minute, paragraph 135(a) and (b), it was mentioned at that time that the design of the

road does not allow that to happen. We have been asking them to do something that is similar to a U-shape, so when there is a crash the vehicle will be made to go a certain way. I know that on highways this design would be adapted. If I remember correctly, in the part of Tai Po District Council, there is this design in the new bus stop in Tai Po. On that day, the Transport Department told us that it could only happen on highways.

If that is the case, we then understand that from Kwun Tong bypass there was the speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour. That would be suitable to have this kind of protective facilities installed, because the design is to absorb the impact.

So what we are saying is these locations should be reviewed as soon as possible. I recall there was an engineering diagram just now, there was a location where it was installed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we continue, I'm moving on -- I think you may be referring to TD bundle, bundle 5, page 1617.

If we enlarge the --

MR MICHAEL YUNG: That is correct. We are talking about the crash barrier. In my understanding, that location is suitable for installing this type of equipment. It is not a highway, and I should put it this way. The TD

highway design is based on transport design and planning manual. They have different paragraphs describing highway design. So if you ask me whether the initial design was up to standard, that I can reserve for the experts to comment on, but if we are talking about access roads leading up to the highways, these crash barriers were not installed. Now, if a barrier is installed and if a car or vehicle crashes into it, it will be stuck in that material, and they won't create a serious accident.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that what you are referencing in paragraph 135(a) and (b)?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the Transport Department, I believe is set out at paragraph 138. English is at page 717:

"Mr Fung Ka Chun, regional engineer of ... Highways Department ... indicated in his reply that the Lei Yue Mun Road is designed as ramp type, aiming to reduce the injury to drivers and passengers when any vehicle bumps into the fence as it is out of control."

Then on, over the page, 718:

"On the highways with maximum vehicle speed of 70 [kilometres per hour], the Highways Department also installs organ type safety fences. As the Lei Yue Mun Road does not satisfy the conditions, the existing stone

crack design conforms to relevant standards. The Highways Department will improve the facilities here according to actual conditions."

In other words, they refused your suggestion. Is that correct?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Correct. But take note, you said in bundle TD-5. The original speed limit was 70, and because of this traffic accident the speed has now been reduced to 50. So that means we have one country, two systems.

So highways, when they have a 70 kilometres standard, they had not reviewed this location and whether it was suitable to install a crash barrier. So the committee in our special meeting, we had requested all the government departments regarding their previous responses, they should have reviewed those responses and see whether a new response was appropriate. In my understanding, the Highways Department did not provide an updated response.

In other words, essentially I can only say that TD and highways they did not look at it from a comprehensive safety perspective. They only dealt with the issues as they arose. They did not implement further designs to ensure motorist safety and pedestrian safety, and I expressed my regret regarding this

situation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I will now move on to the A Kung Kok Street, which relates to another accident. The minutes or the discussion paper is dated 8 May 2018, entitled "TT paper number 26/2012". It is at page 610, in English, and Chinese at page 607.

In the second paragraph, I believe it is Mr Yeung Cheung Li in the Traffic and Transport Committee of Sha Tin District Council, raised questions about the safety at A Kung Kok Street. In the second paragraph he pointed out that there had been many serious traffic accidents taken place at A Kung Kok Street.

Do you know about all the complaints or these accidents mentioned by Mr Yeung?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Mr Yeung Cheung Li was an ex Sha Tin councillor. He did not raise specific questions regarding a specific accident, but I recall that there was a traffic incident that had a lot of fatalities and injured people. I recall that in the morning an 89D bus heading towards Kowloon, they couldn't brake in time rammed into either a 85K or 86K bus, and it led to some 30-plus people being injured. And at the time, after the accident, I had visited the site and I had seen the injured people, and I also helped with the claims, the injury claims of the victims.

So that was a bus accident, and subsequently there were some other accidents relating to minibuses, and there were also some fatalities. I think Mr Yeung's question about fatalities and injuries was not just limited to buses. There were other accidents in that question. So that is my understanding.

Second, why A Kung Kok Street is accident prone, that is because A Kung Kok Street is a dual lane dual carriageway road, and from my constituency, Fu On Gardens to the interchange, there are two crossing lanes and one traffic light, if I remember correctly, and there are also three T-sections to Mui Tsz Lam Road, Ah Kung Kok Fisherman Village, and to Sha Tin Hospital. There is also another road heading up to A Kung Kok Street. So there are four branches of the road, and the design of all four sections have a yielding -- has priority junctions, it is not a signallised junction, and this yielding design has to accommodate low traffic flow. But a lot of times, the motorists, when they use these sections, they are not very careful, and that leads to traffic accidents.

So that is one of my understandings that I have regarding that situation. So aside from the morning and afternoon busy hours where there are a lot of trucks and lorries, there is not a lot of traffic, because we have

another highway, Ma On Shan highway, and that is a dual-lane six-carriageway highway and they can travel at 60 to 80 kilometres, so normally private vehicles will not traverse that section of road. But in the morning, maybe people want to avoid congestion so some private vehicles will use that road. But typically, the incidents, traffic incidents don't occur in the morning. Usually it is smooth driving, there is no speed camera, and there is only one traffic light, it is also a manually controlled light where that leads to Sha Tin hospital. So the motorist might not be complying with the 50 kilometres speed limit. They might be going at more than 50 kilometres.

So it is relatively easier to have traffic accidents there because of that design.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at page 611, there are certain figures provided by the Hong Kong Police from 2007 to 2011.

Is it within your council's knowledge, whether the occurrence of the accident has increased, decreased, or remained constant in the years after 2012? Did you make enquiries?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at the question raised by Mr Yeung at page 610, he asked whether the Transport

Department have any short-term or long-term plans to resolve the problems at A Kung Kok Street, and the Transport Department advised four matters. And that's at page 611. First, question (d). The Transport Department mentioned there is no obstruction to driver's line of sight, the design conforms to the present road design standards.

And then the third, it had been considering whether to enhance the traffic control over this section.

Lastly, the 16 April 2012 incident, the Transport Department had reminded the bus companies to enhance the training of drivers and would make further improvements upon knowing the results of the police investigation.

So did your council follow up with this? Or you are satisfied with the answer provided -- first of all, are you satisfied with the answer provided by the Transport Department?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Well, on page 613 of the minutes of meetings, paragraphs 67(c) and (d), I had made some recommendations. So they say they want to have double white line to prevent traffic violations. So in Texaco Road, there was a fatal accident near the bridge, and they had added these double white lines, so we thought that that was very good improvement, but I recall that that suggestion hasn't been taken up.

And in paragraph (d), the police don't have a laser gun, they will use their unmarked vehicles, and they would deploy these unmarked vehicles on highways. They don't deploy unmarked vehicles on local roads. But after that question the police in fact did deploy more laser guns to detect speed on A Kung Kok Street, and the installation, if I remember correctly, was the exit of A Kung Kok fisherman new village, and they would test vehicle speeds for vehicles entering Ma On Shan, because after Sha Tin hospital, after the traffic light, it is a straight road, and motorists tend to drive at a higher speed. But TD, at the yielding area, they had issued a works order to widen that area, but even if the yielding area is widened, because there is a hospital there, there are visitors or people queuing.

So even if you increase the yielding space, sometimes the buses, they have to wait, or they might even have to allow passengers to embark, disembark at the road side. So it is not very effective.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I can see at page 615 there was a provisional motion passed by Mr Yeung demanding for a -- paragraph 73 in Chinese, and at 618 in English, paragraph 73.

There was a provisional motion passed by Mr Yeung demanding a comprehensive review of the road design of

A Kung Kok street, including making the street wide and installing additional speed camera. So did the Transport Department respond to this request?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: In paragraph 13(1) the police had stepped up law enforcement. There was not any patrolling, and they started to patrol, and the design of A Kung Kok Street, regarding the widening of A Kung Kok Street and installing speed cameras, and up until now we still don't have the cameras. The widening of A Kung Kok Street, next to it is the Ma On Shan road, there is a divider, and that is where the Ma On Shan rail is located. So by widening A Kung Kok Street we need to start from Fu On all the way to Sam Mun interchange.

But I think it would be difficult to identify suitable locations to widen the road because widening a road according to the planning standards, 3.6 to 3.7 metres is required to accommodate an extra traffic lane. But my understanding is the pedestrian minimum width is 1.5 metres so. That means, given limited space, if you widen the vehicle's space, and if the pedestrian space is not wide enough, then the Transport Department will not proceed with the works because if the pedestrian sidewalk is too narrow they cannot accommodate wheelchairs, so they did not install cameras, they did not widen the area, and I think the

widening was constrained by the space, so relatively speaking, the cameras are easier to install.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I see the time.

CHAIRMAN: We will carry on.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Carry on.

CHAIRMAN: I think we are moving into areas that are a long way away from making recommendations about bus safety.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, I believe there will be one or two topics, and I will complete the documentation.

Mr Yung, you referred to in your minutes of the meeting, I believe it is TT paper 3/2017. If you go to page 710, Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: What is the document we are going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is a minutes of meeting of Sha Tin District Council. TT paper --

CHAIRMAN: We don't need the paper number. What is the date?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is still March 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at paragraph 134(a), it raised the suggestion that bus companies should assess annually if bus captains suffer from sleep disorder.

CHAIRMAN: Sleep apnea.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and did you follow up with that suggestion? Or did your council follow up with that

suggestion?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: I need to check with that. Because we have some colleagues following up on whether the suggestions were acted upon, and if there were some motions the government departments would respond at a later date, and in the next meeting in the matters arising, it would be dealt with. And if not, then my understanding is the government department would take note and would see whether the opinion could be implemented.

I do not have the document at hand. That is the paper on the matters arising. Maybe I have to go and check whether it is covered under matters arising.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if you can locate it in due course you can provide it to us if it is relevant.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yung, I'm coming to near the end of the topic. It is the Tai Po Road which you have expressed in a discussion paper at page 727.

This is a question raised by Mr Yiu Ka Chun in question (b) and (c). And the problem is, they raised the question about Tai Po Road, Sha Tin Heights section, that it has a number of potentially dangerous locations and bends. At Chinese it is at page 719.

Do you know how Mr Yiu came to the view that this

particular section is potentially dangerous, that it is a dangerous location and bend? Is it because he received complaints, or can you tell us why?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Are you asking me this? That is for that location on Tai Po Road why we consider it dangerous, is it because we have received complaints, right?

Now, Mr Yiu is not here. Please give me some time to read the document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, take your time.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: I believe, having read the document, the location referred to by Mr Yiu Ka Chun is -- well, because there are different locations along the Tai Po Road, and the section referred to falls within Sha Tin district, that's the Sha Tin section. I believe you are talking about question (c), the location mentioned in question (c), right? Is it question (c)?

(In English) Is it question (c)?

CHAIRMAN: I think it is, yes.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Okay, because for the entire Tai Po Road, of course there are various sections. If I recall, within Sha Tin, there is the Sha Tin section, the Sha Tin Heights section, the Piper's Hill section, and so on. And I think Mr Yiu is referring to the Sha Tin section near the Luk Hop new estate, and there have been fatal accidents there involving buses. But if I recall

correctly, I believe it is someone ramming into the buses, not the other way around.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at page 728, question (b) at the bottom. The answer from the Transport Department. In spite of the speed limit from Tai Po Road, Sha Tin Heights section to Tai Po Road Piper's Hill section is 70 kilometres. And this section is about 1.7km long with two sharp turns. The remaining 1.4km is close to Sha Tin and the speed limit is 50 kilometres with three sharp turns. The locations of sharp turns are set out on the next page.

Then it states that:

"A number of traffic signs on speed limit have been erected in the proper location on the Tai Po Road ... to and from, including road sections where the speed limit has been changed. Furthermore, the warning traffic signs have been erected in front of sharp turns and the 'slow down' road markings have been added on the road to remind the driver to decelerate before the sharp turns."

Now the Transport Department was aware of the sharp turns, and the speed limit of this road section. Are you satisfied with the Transport Department's answer that it is sufficient in terms of road speed limit and in terms of traffic -- sufficiency of traffic signs.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Perhaps I would speak as a motorist.

Because sometimes I would go via Tai Po Road to drive between Sha Tin and Kowloon. Now, the location in question, here there are sharp bends. In addition there are uneven road levels, it could be slanting in one way or the other.

If a car travels at 70 kilometres per hour, along this section, and if we have weather like today, that is a rainy day, then it is possible that there could be a crash.

So this is a little similar to the case, you know, under your investigation at Tai Po Road. The sharp bend is not the main consideration, but rather you can feel that the cars, you know, are travelling at different levels, so for people with lesser driving skills there is a chance that they may cause traffic accidents. And that explains why there are so many traffic accidents along that section. Because if I recall correctly, I think on both sides -- no, no, for the Luk Hop Village, going out 70 kilometres coming back 50 kilometres, if I recall correctly.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Lastly, I would like to refer to you a minutes of meeting, page 736 in Chinese, and 743 in English.

It is also by Mr Yiu Ka Chun.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of this meeting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is minutes of meeting, but it does not bear a date, but it has the paper number 2/2018. I assume it is in February 2018. Following the Tai Po Road accident.

It starts, in Chinese, page 735. And in English at 742.

If we look at paragraph 128(c), the comments by Mr Yiu Ka Chun was that there were three different speed limits in different sections of the Tai Po Road, which would make it hard for drivers to adapt.

And he asked whether the Transport Department would review this situation and mount additional speed monitors.

Can you see that?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Yes. I see that. So you are asking after that meeting whether the Transport Department conducted any review, is that your question?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, but I think to facilitate your consideration the Transport Department did respond at the meeting at 132, paragraph 132. English at page 746. Chinese at 739. In short they said that the section had been provided with clear signs for speed limit and turns to alert drivers.

So did your district council follow up or did your district council deal with this matter after this

meeting?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: I have to go back to what I said before. If there is a motion, yes, they will follow up on it. If there is not a motion, then we will have to look at whether there is response in the supplementary information. Because in this bundle, it does not include supplementary information after the discussion, so I can't see it now. Do you want me to check now or what?

CHAIRMAN: If you are able to find something that is relevant later, by all means provide it to us in writing.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: Fine. Perhaps I can do this later. Later on I will liaise with your committee to see what information you want me to provide. And then I will instruct the secretary to look up the information and see whether there are relevant meeting documents that we could provide later.

CHAIRMAN: That would be most helpful, thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I have completed my questions.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Yung, thank you for coming to assist us with your evidence, and we look forward to your communication if you do find any relevant documents, that we should have sight of. Thank you very much.

MR MICHAEL YUNG: (In English) Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We now have representatives from the Sham Shui Po district council. May we ask Mr Lam and Ms Chan to come forward.

Just allow us a moment, we will change the names over and provide you with fresh glasses.

EVIDENCE FROM SHAM SHUI PO DISTRICT COUNCIL: MR LAM KA FAI AND MS CHAN WING YAN, JOEPHY

(given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam and Ms Chan, thank you for accepting our invitation to give evidence today. Apologies for the delay before we reached you, but I would now ask Ms Wong to pose her questions to you.

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Lam, and Ms Chan for coming.

May I first of all deal with the topic on the working hours for bus drivers. If you would turn to DC-2 bundle page 986 in Chinese and in English at 988.

CHAIRMAN: What are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We are going to questions for discussion to Sham Shui Po district council in relation to the fatal traffic accident at Sham Shui Po. Cheung Sha Wan Road near Yen Chow Street. It was on 25 September 2017.

CHAIRMAN: This is in consequence of the accident on 22 September.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's 2017.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And one of the matters raised in this document, if you look at paragraph 3, is to strengthen the management of working hours of bus captains. And in this document, it states that:

"In a foreign country, such as the EU, there are restrictions on drivers from driving more than 9 hours a day, whereas the bus captains in Hong Kong work for a maximum of 14 hours per day, amounting to 360 plus hours per month."

If I may also refer you to the minutes of the first special meeting, after the Sham Shui Po accident, dated 28 September 2017, Chinese is at page 1026, English at page 1043.

And I --

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: DC-3.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at paragraph 168, Councillor Yeung Yuk added that:

"He required the government to revise the guidelines, reducing working hours from 14 to

12 hours ..."

If we look at paragraph 170, Councillor Tam Kwok Kiu added that the:

"... relevant rules and regulations stipulate that driver cannot work over 14 hours ... many labour union had pointed out 14 working hours are not humane:

And at paragraph 201, Councillor Tam Kwok Kiu commented that Citybus shall reduce all driver's work hours to 12 hours.

My question is, it appears that the Sham Shui Po district council proposed 10 working hours. Can you tell us why you propose 10 working hours?

CHAIRMAN: Where do we see that? Which paragraph?

MS MAGGIE WONG: You see that at the letter at page 986, English at 988, paragraph 3. We asked --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just read it out.

MS MAGGIE WONG: "We asked the Transport Department to reflect that the longest driving time per day is 10 hours."

Can you tell us why you proposed 10 hours as the longest driving time?

MR LAM KA FAI: After that accident, the council in relation to this matter discussed for a very long time the location where the accident took place was right in front of the district council. It was a junction. From

the window of the conference room you would be able to see the tragedy. The wreckage was not cleared immediately. It was done only after a long time when the injured were rescued.

The bus was stuck and wedged at that location, and it took a lot of engineering staff to dislodge the bus. The district council discussed for a very long time the cause of the accident. The district council concluded that one of the major reasons was that the bus driver has been driving for too long.

Regarding 14 hours, no one in the meeting was of the view that it was a suitable length. We discussed it from 14 to 12 hours, and then to 10 hours. We thought that the suitable length of driving duties given the fact that bus captains were in control of a large bus, were responsible for picking up passengers and letting passengers alight and on top of their driving duties they have their family lives. There should be a balance.

If bus captains could have just 10 hours of maximum driving duties, well, we thought that caretakers in public housing estates only worked for eight hours. Security guards under the Housing Authority work eight hours per shift. The workload, the pressure faced by security guards can't possibly compare with that faced

by bus captains. That is, bus captains face tremendous pressure and in recent times customers very often scold bus captains. In the past month or two, we found incidents where seats are planted with needles. So we see that there is tremendous pressure faced by bus captains.

In that meeting, we thought that if the working hours of bus captains could be reduced to 10 hours, it would be ideal.

We also thought that this would reduce the possibility of traffic accidents involving buses. That is also another area of concern. Assuming that the work hours can be reduced from 14 to 12 to 10, we would think whether they would be paid a sufficient wage to support their families.

We were concerned about that as well.

Bus captains is not an easy job. If they are not paid a wage that can support the family, we think there will always be a shortage of bus captains, and as a result, then work hours can never be reduced. Bus companies would use various ways to continue to increase their work hours.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There were some minutes of the meeting on 28 September 2017. The 5th Sham Shui Po district council meeting. The English starts at 1041, and

Chinese at 1026.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, which paragraph?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Paragraphs 167 and 168, and I would like to draw your attention to two sentences. 167, at the end, Councillor Vincent Cheng Wing Shun at the end:

"... inquired why the driver work hour instruction was not amended over past 7 years."

And 168, the second sentence in (i), Councillor Yeung Yuk:

"He required the government to revise the guideline reducing working hours from 14 to 12 hours and increasing rest hours and salaries."

If we look at the reply from the Transport Department at page 1044, paragraph 171, Mr Leung Cheong Kit stated that:

"After the accident, drivers' work hour and rest hours drew public attention."

Then over the page:

"To guarantee drivers' enough rest time, the Transport Department and all bus companies made ... bus companies have to follow the instruction ... and the department engages in independent investigator ... to investigate drivers' work ..."

And then (iv):

"Transport Department is preparing to review the

guideline, and plans to consult bus companies and labour unions, and respond to public concerns about drivers' work hours. The department has no established position on the review, and will then consider comments of bus companies, labour unions, and public."

I have two questions.

It appears the revision of guidelines was triggered by this September 2017 incident, and because of the complaints received from the public about the concerns of drivers' work hours. Do you agree?

MS JOEPHY CHAN: Thank you. Perhaps I will supplement.

In relation to your question, perhaps you refer to paragraph 196. I said, because I am a representative of a labour union, we always been expressing our views to bus companies and transportation companies in relation to the conditions of employment and working hours of bus captains. It was only after the accident that the Transport Department and bus companies seriously considered our views.

The last time, when there was a real amendment was seven years ago. That is seven years before the accident. It was 2010. I believe that labour union representatives have been expressing their views but they were not responded to until the accident.

You mentioned about work hours of 10 hours. I know

that representatives of labour unions have been advocating no more than 14 hours of maximum driving duties. They would like that to be revised to 12 hours. As to the proposed 10 hours, perhaps it was the result of studies conducted by district councillors. The general view of the district council was that 14 hours was too long.

I represent labour unions. I think that we should not just focus on work hours, because that is related to conditions of employment as well as salaries.

I understand that the driver involved in the accident has just over five years of experience. On that day he was scheduled to work earlier than he was supposed to because he wanted to make up for work hours in order to earn a wage that can support him and his family.

I understand that for the KMB they offer just over $10,000 for bus captains. For First Bus it is slightly better. It would be around 12,000. However, you will have to take into account various allowances in order to make a salary comparable to other jobs that have to deal with a lot of pressure.

So the review should not be just focused on work hours, we have to attach importance to conditions of work as well.

We have mentioned about rest as well. I have heard other councillors talk about rest kiosks. I can't say how many estates or locations are without rest kiosk, but using Lai Kok Estate as an example. That estate has been in place for over three decades. However, it was only at the end of last year that the bus terminus had a rest kiosk for our bus routes. That is not desirable. For Kowloon East Lok Wah Estate, I know it was with the intervention of Jonathan Ho, a legislator, that a rest kiosk was installed for bus captains.

So I think we should not just focus on work hours. We have to look at salaries, conditions of employment as well as the rest facilities.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Lam, Ms Chan, you say that you are a representative of labour unions. What do you mean by that? Explain that.

MS JOEPHY CHAN: I came from the FTU.

CHAIRMAN: What was your position in the federation?

MS JOEPHY CHAN: I am a district councillor.

CHAIRMAN: You said you came from the FTU. What do you mean by that?

MS JOEPHY CHAN: (In English) That's my political association.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Lam.

MR LAM KA FAI: Just now I was asked by the counsel about this review of the Transport Department, whether it was a result of the traffic accident or complaint made by the council or members of the public.

I think that is the case. In the community, when it comes to road safety, traffic accidents, of course members of the public are very concerned. Every day we see traffic accidents, minor ones or major ones, happening every day. It may not be as serious as that one.

But if a serious accident takes place, it would shake the community. We see very often that as a result, the government and the public would try to do something. I think the establishment of this Independent Review Committee might be a result of a number of major accidents.

I do think that it is really worthwhile to have this Independent Review Committee. We have to consider the scale of the accidents and the number of fatalities and casualties and hope that it will not happen again.

Regarding the location of accidents, there may be inadequacies in the design of the road or the facilities provided. Say, for example, the locality of this accident, it is the centre of Sham Shui Po, it is right in front of the government office, right in front of the

district council.

Regarding transportation services, road users, we see that when there is a change of traffic light, thousands or hundreds of pedestrians would be waiting at that junction waiting to cross. And at that junction, there may be dozens of buses waiting to pass that junction.

For Sham Shui Po district, it is the centre point between New Territories and urban areas. Well, you will have to go via Sham Shui Po, wherever you are going to or wherever you are travelling from. It is unfortunate that we have seen this accident. The district council has been making a lot of suggestions to transportation operators and the Transport Department about the heavy traffic at this junction, and the fact that pedestrians have to compete for space with vehicles.

We don't want bus companies to deploy their buses in a way that they would all have to travel along this road. We know that bus routes will have to pick up passengers from various places. I'm sorry to see that this accident has happened, but I hope that with this hearing there may be a policy change.

We have made a discussion, say, for example, building foot bridges at this junction so that pedestrians don't have to congregate at road crossings.

A lot of people --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting. But may I ask you to help me with the other suggestion you made, and that was in terms of the review of the guidelines of working hours for bus captains.

Can I ask you this. Having made the suggestion, and having received the Transport Department's answer, that they were going to review it, that's at the meeting of 28 September of 2017, did the Transport Department consult you again before, I think it was 23 February, they announced the result of the review? Were you consulted in the meantime?

MR LAM KA FAI: No, they did not.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If you look at page 1053 of bundle DC-2, paragraph 203, Mr Leung Cheong Kit made a comprehensive reply stating that:

"The Transport Department will work together with bus companies and labour union stakeholders to review the instruction on drivers' work hour and rest hour to reach a consensus."

But the Transport Department never approached the district council, your district council to seek your views. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN: I think he just answered that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

May I move on to another accident which is on 26 April 2016 at Kwong Lee Road. If you look at bundle page 991, English, and in Chinese, 990.

MS JOEPHY CHAN: Before we move on, we would like to express the view regarding the accident in Yen Chow Street. Aside from work hours, our union members also tell us that would it be possible to assist bus drivers through road design, for example the minutes also mention that if you look at other cities, they have diagonal crossing or X crossing, in Japan, UK, in busy areas they have road design --

CHAIRMAN: We have read the minutes, and this matter was canvassed at some length in the minutes.

MS JOEPHY CHAN: Just now it was mentioned why did we have an accident. It is because the crossing -- people want to cross diagonally, but the pedestrians when they wait too long, they can only cross diagonally, it is a L crossing, so when they are waiting at the junction they are waiting a longer time, and that increases the chances or odds of an accident. That's why we mentioned the X crossing idea. The Transport Department needs to consider this, and the bus drivers also tell us that they hope that there can be some countdown at the

crossing lights, and that can remind them, remind the pedestrians they can get ready, when they need to stop.

So if you look at the other cities, there is a lot of technology that helps reduce pressure from motorists, but Hong Kong is lagging behind. We have not even attempted the X crossing, so the committee needs to consider this.

Thank you, chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Go to document page 990 and 991. It relates to a fatal accident on 26 April 2016 on Kwong Lee Road. If you see at the bottom there were certain requests. And one of them is that:

"KMB and Transport Department should carry out detailed investigation of this serious traffic accident and provide a detailed explanation to the public."

And at paragraph 4:

"The Transport Department should properly handle the follow-up work and improve traffic conditions on Kwong Lee Road against potential traffic hazards."

Did your council follow up on these two requests?

MR LAM KA FAI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before you answer, are they in writing? This follow-up? Are they in writing?

MR LAM KA FAI: The district council practice, for example our councillors, they would write -- there was an

accident in So Tsuen bus stop, and we would have a discussion in the council and the Transport Department representative would respond to these documents, and in our practice after the discussion there might be motions, maybe not on this occasion, but it could be followed up in matters arising in the next meeting.

So in future meetings we would have a list of matters that need to be followed up and in the next meeting we can have further discussions.

So on that occasion, we requested the government to do certain items, they were able to respond to some of the points on the spot, and they might have to go back and consider our other requirements, so they would have documents in preparation.

So regarding the So Uk Estate bus accident, that gave rise to a discussion topic that the So Uk Estate bus stop had been in operation for more than 50 years, so whether its design, its usage, because new bus routes are continuously added, there are more and more bus routes, so the suggestion was to rebuild the bus stop, and there were even other calls for multipurpose uses, where other community facilities could be built.

Whether a building could be built, there could be maybe be a government clinic or even a social welfare office and so on.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I've finished my questions for this district council.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I missed the first part?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I completed my questions.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

Those are the questions that we have posed for you, you have made some general statements, and we thank you for that. You have made some specific statements as well. If there is anything more you wish to raise, do so now.

But I will tell you this. We have a video link with a witness in Germany at 3 o'clock and we would like to take some break before that, but if there is anything you want to say, you can have the last word.

MR LAM KA FAI: Okay. Thank you, honourable judge.

Regarding traffic accidents, one is too much. And I sincerely anticipate that this IRC under your leadership can come up with innovative ideas or new measures for the government to allow the public transport service -- and can modernise and move to a higher level of service. That is my expectation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS JOEPHY CHAN: I wish to say that the committee here today, I think the role it will play is a positive one,

and I hope these regular reviews can be routine practice rather than occurring after accidents. We would like our views to be accepted, but the franchise arrangement, because of its heritage, the bus companies, whether we are talking about the reprovisioning of bus routes, about public convenience, or when you talk about public safety, bus captain safety, a lot of times our views are ignored, because I understand that bus franchise won't be affected because of our views. And that is regrettable and not ideal.

When we talk about bus routes we have continuously provided our input. We even talked about bus safety, but unfortunately in the past we didn't have platforms, and routine venues, so in the past our views have never been acknowledged. So we hope after this there can be a new practice, a new venue where our views regarding improvement can be made.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR LAM KA FAI: Just now Tai Po District Council made a point and I agree with them, regarding bus policy or franchise issues. If the 18 district councils could have some input before the expiry of the franchise, if they could be consulted, if their views could be adopted formally, then the bus companies would respect community

views even more.

So given the government structure, we do have some examples, for example the Town Planning Board. Even the Urban Renewal Authority or other land use changes, developments, the Town Planning Board needs to seek the support of the district council, and they might also have to take on board other views. They have to take on board -- it is the majority view, before they decide on a change of land use.

So there are precedents, and I hope the honourable judge can provide some strong impetus to an improvement in bus company service and management such that our views can be conveyed through our counsel and taken seriously. And it should be greatly respected.

CHAIRMAN: May I ask you this. In the context of the Transport Department's, Transport and Housing Bureau's consultation about whether or not to recommend the renewal of a bus franchise, has your district council made submissions in response to invitations to the public to forward their views?

MR MICHAEL YUNG: When the franchise is about to expire, in our existing policy they don't need to consult the district council.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. But they do make a general invitation. I was looking at a document yesterday, when

the KMB franchise was being renewed. And it starts off with an invitation to the public to make representations, and has the district council, your district council, not contributed to that general invitation?

MR LAM KA FAI: I was not aware of that response. But if there is a mechanism that is part of our agenda or all the 18 district councils' agendas, then it would be taken much more seriously. If it is a regular agenda item, of course the franchise does not come up for reapplication on a frequent basis, it is every five, 10 years, then ...

CHAIRMAN: Nowadays.

MR LAM KA FAI: So, in the 9th year, the 18 district councils could place this on our agenda. Then all district councils, we can discuss that in earnest, a year before the application. That would be more conducive to enhancing bus service.

MS JOEPHY CHAN: Mr Lam means that the bus companies should take the initiative in contacting the 18 district councils and consult us.

I know there are general invitations, but if you want to stimulate a discussion, then they need to reach out to our district councils. I'll give you an example.

The bus companies, whether it is a franchise, or

whether it is during the operation, when they talk about the bus route reorganisation, our views are not respected, they don't even bother listening.

I'll give you a bus route example. You asked whether there are written submissions. So I have written to the Commissioner for Transport Department, bus route 6F, about a route change, because it travels along -- it passes a hospital. So they shouldn't just consider the passenger numbers, because a lot of the elderly take that bus route to visit hospital services, but unfortunately our views are ignored, and they might cut bus service or even change the routes. So the district councils have no way or no incentive to have them heed our views.

So when the franchise is up for renegotiation, they need to consider the DC views before a decision is made. That would be appropriate and in the public's interest. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I'll ask the secretariat to communicate with you about the document that I had in mind which sets out the public consultation that the government says it has before a franchise is renewed. The first step. There are a number of papers that follow. But I would ask that you be given a copy of that in due course.

It remains for me on behalf of the committee to thank you for giving up your time on a rainy Saturday to come and help us with your evidence.

Thank you very much. And we will resume at 3 o'clock.

(1.58 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(3.16 pm)

EVIDENCE FROM ZF FRIEDRICHSCHAFEN REPRESENTATIVE:

MR JAN KULIS

(Given via video link)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, Mr Hui. We welcome you and your colleagues as the legal representatives of ZF Friedrichschafen and its subsidiaries, including Openmatics, and we welcome you, Mr Kulis, and thank you for accepting our invitation to assist us with understanding how the technical devices work.

I'm going to ask counsel for the committee, Mr Chan, to begin posing questions of you.

Now, if there are any difficulties in your accessing material, if you need time to read material, please say so, and we will do what we can to help you.

Do you understand?

MR KULIS: Okay, perfect, I understand, thank you.

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN

MR DEREK CHAN: Good morning, Mr Kulis. My name is Derek Chan, and I'm counsel for the committee.

I will be asking you questions on behalf of the committee, and the committee members themselves may also ask you questions directly during this session.

Can I start first by thanking you, Mr Kulis, for attending today. Your evidence is important to the committee's task in considering from a technical perspective the safety-related measures that are available for franchised buses in Hong Kong.

Mr Kulis, can I start first by asking you several basic questions about your current position in your company.

Now, if I may, I will use the term "ZF" in short, to collectively refer to your company and its subsidiaries, including Openmatics.

So I will just use the term "ZF" collectively.

MR KULIS: Yes, of course.

MR DEREK CHAN: I understand you are an employee of ZF; what is your current position in the company?

MR KULIS: My current position is team leader of system engineering and I'm an employee of the company Openmatics, which is the subsidiary of the ZF. So that's the correct technical status.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you just give us a very general

description of your responsibilities as a team leader of systems engineering?

MR KULIS: Yes. So my work is consisting mainly from the technical support for deploying the Openmatics systems for current customers, new customers, and in general the job of the system engineer is to tailor our system to customer needs, because our system is pretty much configurable so we are always trying to find the best technical way how to fit our system into some customer solution.

MR DEREK CHAN: And I understand that you have a degree in electronic engineering and telecommunications from the University of West Bohemia; is that correct?

MR KULIS: Yes, that's correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Kulis, the committee had previously been in correspondence with a law firm in Hong Kong that represents your company, and through correspondence the committee has already asked some questions and your company gave some answers through this law firm. Are you aware of that?

MR KULIS: Yes, I am aware.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Do you have the answers provided by your company through this law firm in front of you?

MR KULIS: Yes, I have it in front of me.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman and members, the correspondence

in our bundle is located at the bundle for bus and technical devices manufacturer. I think it is BM-1, in short.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: And the letter from Zhong Lun Law Firm starts at page 64.

Mr Kulis, can I just confirm that we are reading the same thing?

Do you have in front of you a letter from a law firm for Zhong Lun Law Firm dated 26 June 2018?

MR KULIS: Yes, and I can see it on the screen also.

MR DEREK CHAN: You can see it on the screen also. Great.

Mr Kulis, the hard copy you are reading off, is it paginated in the bottom right-hand corner.?

MR KULIS: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: It is not, no problem --

MR KULIS: -- (Simultaneous speakers - unclear).

MR DEREK CHAN: I see.

Mr Kulis, I'll be asking you questions today from two perspectives, and I'll tell you what they are, so you know where I'm coming from. Firstly, I will be asking you questions about the technical capabilities of the black boxes that had already been supplied by your company to Hong Kong bus operators.

So for this, I will be asking you to clarify and

explain to the committee some of the matters that arise from the written answers that your company has very helpfully provided.

That's the first perspective.

Secondly, I will be asking you questions about technical capabilities of other hardware or software systems that your company provides, or are able to provide, that are relevant to the issue of bus safety.

These are the two perspectives I will be asking you questions from.

So with that in mind, Mr Kulis, can I ask you to look at the submissions in front of you at paragraph 1.

Does the page that you are looking at start with the word "Annex III" at the top?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The answers provided by your company are in blue, and can I draw your attention to the second paragraph -- sorry, paragraph 1, in the three blue paragraphs, the second one:

"Openmatics entered into a supply contract to deliver telematic systems ... with Kowloon Bus Company and Long Win Bus Company."

And then your company states here:

"Openmatics started offering telematic services by using the first black box system called the 'Mozart

Box'. Later on, Openmatics replaced the Mozart Box by a successor platform black box called the 'Bach Box'. Clients can use both systems in parallel as KMB does."

Now can you first tell us when were the Mozart Box and the Bach box first introduced to the market?

MR KULIS: If I remember correctly, the Mozart Box was introduced to the market in 2011.

MR DEREK CHAN: What about the Bach box?

MR KULIS: The Bach Box, it was -- I think it was in summer of 2015.

MR DEREK CHAN: So a Bach Box is more advanced than a Mozart Box? Can you --

MR KULIS: Yes, it is an advance of technical evolution.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you tell us in general terms what are the key differences between the two boxes or the advances that have been made to the first generation?

MR KULIS: Yes. As the technology develops, then the Bach Box is the second generation of our telematic product, so it was designed to be smaller, cheaper, faster and it have more interfaces. That's the major difference.

MR DEREK CHAN: More interfaces, what do you mean by that?

MR KULIS: Yes, our device can read different data from different sources, and different ports. You can -- it mentioned the situation with your laptop, where you have maybe USB port, the video port and so on, so the Mozart

Box and the Bach Box, we have the interfaces for the vehicle systems, to the cameras, serial line and tachograph interface, GPS, and so on and so on. So the Bach Box have more of them.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is the Bach Box currently the most advanced black box system offered by your company?

MR KULIS: The current moment, yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, can I go on in the submissions provided by your company. Your company talks about the driver feedback device.?

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: Over the page, after that, there is a screen grab of certain driver feedback thresholds?

MR KULIS: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, your company says here that the thresholds were initially defined by Kowloon Motor Bus and then calibrated by Openmatics to fit the defined parameters. My first general question is, after your company has calibrated these threshold values, can the end user, for example, the bus operator, can they change or redefine these values by themselves, or do they have to go back to your company?

MR KULIS: Yes. The general concept is that customer can change the threshold if he wants to.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, just going through the threshold

values, one by one.

The first two parameters, or the first two thresholds, relate to acceleration and deceleration. Can you tell us what is the time frame within which the acceleration or deceleration is measured before the threshold is considered crossed?

MR KULIS: Okay. I think the acceleration -- in general all the thresholds are measured in the time frame of one second.

MR DEREK CHAN: Of one second. Is the system -- and I'm talking about the system supplied to the Hong Kong bus companies, is it capable of incorporating different measures of acceleration and deceleration over different time periods, for example a constant acceleration over three second or five second intervals? Is that possible under this current system?

MR KULIS: Yes, this is possible, I think this option is configured.

MR DEREK CHAN: So this type of measuring acceleration, and deceleration, is capable to be recorded under the both the Mozart Box and Bach Box, or just one type of them?

MR KULIS: Yes. On the both, it is the same software, to be correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: If that's the case, is there any reason why we don't see that type of threshold definition in this

screen grab here? If it is possible?

MR KULIS: Excuse me, I didn't get the point of your question.

MR DEREK CHAN: I will just start again. If I can draw your attention to the screen grab in the middle of the page?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: You just told us that the acceleration and deceleration rates are measured per second?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And my question was can the acceleration and deceleration threshold values be measured at variable time periods over a longer period, three seconds, five seconds, so that you can measure a more constant acceleration or deceleration? Is it possible under this system? Or do you need something else?

MR KULIS: Yes. To be absolutely correct, this is possible, but the configuration of this parameter is not public. So the current application is not designed to be configurable in this time frame of the (unclear), but the system is capable to be configured in this way. It is just not designed for the end customer like that.

MR DEREK CHAN: The reason I'm asking this question is because when I look at your company's website, and in the Vivaldi on-board unit, one of the thresholds for acceleration/deceleration is speed increase by more than

50 per cent within three seconds, or an increase of more than 32 kilometres per hour over five seconds, so you have a variable way of measuring sudden or extended acceleration and deceleration.

So my question is really, is that sort of more sophisticated way of measuring acceleration and deceleration available with the current technology that is supplied to the Hong Kong bus companies?

MR KULIS: Yes. Now you are talking about the Vivaldi unit, this is the unit we are providing for passenger cars and which we introduced to the market in 2017, or beginning of 2018, so the software is more sophisticated on the Vivaldi unit that compared to the Mozart and the Bach.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, I understand that. So do I take it that the most sophisticated way of measuring acceleration and deceleration is not available in the current Mozart or Bach units?

MR KULIS: I think it is available because we have the open application concept. It was just not requested by any customer so far. But it can be changed any time.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. On the issue of acceleration and deceleration still, can I take you to a few pages on --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. Mr Kulis, can I just ask you, from that page where you have the data displayed, just above the data display there is a narrative

describing what is being displayed. Can I ask that that be brought up on the screen.

The sentence that I want to draw to your attention is this:

"The driver feedback thresholds for the accident bus were initially defined by KMB and then calibrated by Openmatics to fit KMB's defined parameters."

And the question I wanted to ask you is, which is the accident bus? What is meant by that?

MR KULIS: I think this is referring to the recent fatal accident on the Tai Po Road, if I'm correct.

CHAIRMAN: The Tai Po accident bus?

MR KULIS: Yes, which happened ...

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Kulis, on the issue of acceleration and deceleration values, can I draw your attention a couple of pages on from the submissions at paragraph 5.

Chairman, members of the committee, page 69 of our bundle. Paragraph 5.

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the middle of the page, again, in blue, that is the answers from your company, it is stated that:

"The telematics system installed at KMB is capable of recording speed, deceleration and acceleration of the

buses. However, the deceleration and acceleration of the buses as feature recording this on an ongoing basis is not enabled."

Are you able to elaborate or explain to us what is meant by this paragraph, especially the part about recording acceleration and deceleration on an ongoing basis?

MR KULIS: Yes, I'm also not sure if I will get the point of this sentence correctly, but I think the sentence is referring to the situation that these values, acceleration and deceleration, for the KMB we are using to raise realtime warnings, not for recording them to the data. This is my understanding of this declaration. So we have the system, the driver feedback device, which is warning the drivers in the realtime if they accelerating too much or decelerating too much. For this propose we are using the values of acceleration and deceleration, we are not storing these values for the historical data. That's my understanding of this sentence declaration.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. Okay.

So your understanding is that the acceleration and deceleration are not recorded in the black box data systems?

Is that correct, Mr Kulis?

MR KULIS: Yes, that's my understanding. Because another function of the -- our box is the record, the several data, as the black box feature. There are maybe 20 different values, but not the acceleration and deceleration.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is there a reason, a purpose for not enabling the storing of such data?

MR KULIS: If definitely there must be a reason, but it is not known for me, and I think the data set which is recording for the customer, KMB for example, most definitely by the customer KMB, so whatever data they can read, we can store. Obviously it has some impact on the data volume transferred and so on. That might be the reason, but it is not, at least for the moment.

MEMBER LO: I have a question on acceleration, deceleration, is it measured by an accelerometer or is it calculated by velocity change over time?

MR KULIS: As we can also see on this screenshot from the configuration, the very first parameter is the acceleration signal source, in this situation the signal source is changed in the vehicle speed, and from that over the one second is calculated acceleration or deceleration, in this case. But it can be also switched to the internal accelerometer of the Mozart Box or the Bach Box.

MEMBER LO: So is it directly measured or is it derived from velocity changes over time?

MR KULIS: From this configuration, which we are looking on, it is derived from the vehicle speed --

MR DEREK CHAN: So did the signal come from the speedometer, is that correct, in this case? So the signal source of the acceleration and deceleration calculation, the signal source comes from the speedometer of the bus, and then the computer or the system calculates the acceleration and deceleration based on the changes in the vehicle speed as recorded by the bus itself; is that correct?

MR KULIS: Yes, that's correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: Moving on to the next parameter, which is the tilting angle, in terms of degrees?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: In this case we see that the tilting angle is set at 44 degrees in this case?

MR KULIS: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: From a technical perspective, do you know why the angle of 44 is selected, why not some other figure?

MR KULIS: I think value of the 44, as you can imagine, is not a real value for the operating bus. So my understanding of this configuration is that it means

that deactivation of the tilting angle warning in this example.

If you do not want to be notified on the tilting, then you can set it up to the value which you will not reach during the normal operation, and this, for example, is 44.

MR DEREK CHAN: The next parameter under tilting angle is the configuration of excessive speed values.

In this screenshot we can see two parameters under that. One is speed and one is speed in areas, and this this case, both are set at 75 kilometres per hour.

Now, firstly, a more basic question. Just to see if my understanding is correct. So if the bus in this case exceeds 75 kilometres per hour, the threshold would be considered crossed; is that correct?

MR KULIS: That's correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: What is the difference between these two parameters, speed and speed in areas?

MR KULIS: The application driver feedback is capable of handling the areas where you can set up different speed limits. For example, you can have some areas with 50 and some with 70. So if you want to configure this application in that way, that you are respecting that in some areas you have different speed limit, then this particle configuration parameter, speed in area, should

be different.

And then, of course, you need also to configure the areas in some other window, or enter some geofencing into the system.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm interested in that last bit of your answer.

Obviously the bus, if you wish to take advantage of the speed in areas parameter, the system would have to know where the bus is to trigger that parameter. How is that done, technically?

MR KULIS: This is currently done by the GPS technology, both on the Mozart and the Bach Box, and in the Hong Kong commission, the GPS technology is also supplied with data recording feature which is helping to recover the GPS position when the signal is lost.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is this capability of setting different speed thresholds in different areas, is this capable in the current systems that are supplied to the Hong Kong bus companies? Or do they have --

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- to add something extra to utilise this feature?

MR KULIS: No. Of course they need to configure or in cooperation with us, we need together to configure the areas, we need to define results, the rules, then the

system is capable.

MR DEREK CHAN: In this case, we have the same speed, 75, for both parameters. What would be the use of, or the purpose of configuring both parameters at the same speed in this case?

MR KULIS: I think that also means that this feature is not used for this particular configuration.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. Now in Hong Kong, I'm sure you realise, that we are generally a very dense city, with lots of high rise buildings. To what extent would the stability or reliability of the GPS signals in places such as Hong Kong with a lot of high rise buildings, how would it affect the efficiency of such a system?

MR KULIS: Of course the -- let's say the precision of the positioning is affected by the Hong Kong environment, it is called (unclear), you have very high rise buildings, so the efficiency and let's say the error in the meters is higher than on the free land, but I think our positioning system was generally accepted by the customers after some several trials of examination and fine tuning, so as I was recently speaking about the data recording, we have the special algorithm which is trying to input the position, the value when the GPS signal is lost or not recorded. So we are trying our best to provide a good position.

MR DEREK CHAN: As far as you are aware, how widespread or how common is it for commercial fleet operators around the world to take advantage or to configure different speeds thresholds, when the vehicle moves into a for example a lower speed zone? How often is that used?

MR KULIS: According to our experience, it is not used so widely. Most likely we have the operators which are using only the higher limit, and that's it. It doesn't matter if you are talking about buses or trucks, usually the interest is about one general high rule, and it is I think because they don't want to introduce too complex system to the drivers.

MEMBER LO: If the system can set different speed thresholds for different areas, the input interface got to be more complicated than one number. It got to define the area and the threshold, right? So in this simple interface, it cannot handle different speed thresholds for different areas; is that correct?

MR KULIS: In this interface you can set up the two different speed thresholds, and then you need define the areas in the next window which is not shown, but next to the headline of this configuration window, you have the details, settings, messages, and areas configuration. So you can --

MR DEREK CHAN: So does this --

MR KULIS: -- particular areas to this configuration, and maybe you want to limit the speed and the depth only for some numbers, so you can do it through that.

MEMBER LO: So the system is already designed for that, it is just the interface shown here does not show that feature?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I have a digital map that is able to show different speed limits on different roads, would I be able to use that combining with the system currently available here, to configure to set different speed thresholds depending on where the bus is on the digital map? Or is that not possible under the system?

MR KULIS: Definitely it is possible. Of course we will need some software which will convert the file format of your map, which we don't know, to the file format of our configuration, and at the current moment I also need to highlight that we are supporting only two different speed limits, not unlimited values of the limits.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see, so the limit of the system is just two speeds, not multiple speeds; is that correct?

MR KULIS: I think this is, to be correct, this is limit of the current application. It can be easily extended to support more limits, it is just a software change, but it is not supported right now because the request was

just a low band and a middle band of the speeds.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, just staying on this screenshot and focusing on the equipment currently supplied to the Hong Kong bus operators, am I correct to understand if one or more of these threshold values are crossed, the driver feedback system would provide visual and acoustic feedback to the driver immediately? So a light would come on and there would be a beeping sound of some sort, is that correct?

MR KULIS: Yes, that is correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, what I'm interested in is this.

In addition to alerting the driver who was driving the bus, if these threshold values are crossed, do the systems presently supplied by your company to the Hong Kong bus operators have the capability of automatically generating reports for the crossing of threshold values to alert those monitoring the driver's behaviour that these values had been crossed?

MR KULIS: Yes, the system is capable.

MR DEREK CHAN: Of automatically generating reports?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Would the bus company need to have additional software applications in order to take advantage of this automatic generation of reports?

MR KULIS: No, actually, this is supported directly in the

application bundle which we got driver feedback. To be exact, the driver feedback is not also meant for the device, it is also the application bundle we are providing. Part of the application is running on the device in the bus, but another part of the application is also running on the server, and it is capable of receiving events as they appear, so together with the position information where it happened. Then, for example, if you have the speeding event, you can see on the bottom there had been the speeding event recently on this road, and so on, or you can check the statistics of it.

MR DEREK CHAN: So it is a matter of how the end user or the bus operator wants to use the data that is being collected; is that correct?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: In addition to these basic threshold values that we see in this screenshot, do the systems provide any other threshold values that relate to safety or safe driving?

MR KULIS: Not the application driver feedback currently. We have also another application which we can just upload to these boxes, and then we can measure -- basically, any parameter which we can technically read we can analyse, so if you realise that some maybe bridge

somewhere is important parameter to monitor, then we can start monitoring such parameter, and make the notifications, something like that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I then move on to the next topic, which is the transmission of the data collected by the black boxes to another place.

So for that, can I first take you to our page 69, which I think in your bundle would be under paragraph 5. If you have the correct page, at the bottom of the page there should be a small (ii) at the bottom of the page.?

MR KULIS: Yes. I have it.

MR DEREK CHAN: And the blue answer given by your company refers to the system collecting the defined data every second. And then sends that data to a defined FDP server every 30 seconds.

MR KULIS: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: My first question is is the setting of a 30-second data transmission time gap, is it a matter of choice, or a matter of the limitations of the hardware capabilities offered by your company?

MR KULIS: It is a matter of choice. It is a configurable parameter.

MR DEREK CHAN: So if the end user wants he can configure the system to send the data to a defined server every second, for example?

MR KULIS: For example, then I will assume there will be some technology limitation, because the transfer protocol is FDP file transfer protocol and it needs some seconds to check and establish a connection and upload the file, so I think the technology limitation for the FDP can be about two or three seconds for this --

MR DEREK CHAN: So delay --

MR KULIS: Just I think the lowest useful value for the FDP transfer rate should be around 5 seconds. That's my feeling.

MR DEREK CHAN: Taking into account the speed of data transfer, is my understanding correct?

MR KULIS: Exactly.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now if the data is capable of being transmitted and received at, say, 5-second intervals, does your company provide the technology either in hardware or software to facilitate realtime monitoring of the data collected by the black box?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So let me see if I get this right. Your company supplies the black box, it collects the data, and the system is able to transfer that data, say, every five seconds, to a defined server?

MR KULIS: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: So as a supervisor, I'm sitting in my

office, how do I monitor the driver, realtime? Do I need additional software, or does your company already provide the software for me to do so?

MR KULIS: There are two options, we can provide our software solution, which consists of the Openmatics portal and additional applications on the server side. That is one option, but some customers they are preferring just to get the data, and they have their own IT systems behind. In that case we are just the data provider and we don't care about the utilisation or operating of that. Utilising that.

MR DEREK CHAN: In this case, KMB, is it the case that ZF only works as, as you describe it, a data provider, or are you aware of any more advanced use by KMB of your company's realtime monitoring capabilities?

MR KULIS: I think in this case KMB is the customer, at current moment, they are using their own IT system to handle the data and work with the data. But, yes, it's by agreement, we can also change it if we want.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. In your experience, how common is it around the world in terms of commercial fleet management for the company to monitor the driving behaviour of its drivers realtime? How common is that?

MR KULIS: I think this is quite a common request. Both from the safety and economic reason, the companies

usually want to monitor the drivers. In some countries there is the conflict with the law regulation and protecting the driver safety, like in the West European countries, sometimes it is not so easy to introduce monitoring system, but the demand is always there.

MR DEREK CHAN: Moving on, then, Mr Kulis, to another topic. You mentioned a bit earlier, or I mentioned actually, the Vivaldi unit that is offered by your company. When was this unit first introduced to the market?

MR KULIS: I think that was at the end of 2017 or beginning 2018 I'm not sure exactly, but it is relatively new hardware.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is it a more advanced version of the Mozart and Bach boxes or something completely different?

MR KULIS: This is something completely different. The Vivaldi unit is designed for the passenger cars, it cannot work in the buses because of different interface.

MR DEREK CHAN: So this unit is more for passenger cars not for buses?

MR KULIS: Or maybe light commercial vehicles, but not big buses. Not for the heavy --

MR DEREK CHAN: In that case I'll move on.

The next item that I'm interested in, or I am going to ask questions on, is the ability or the capability of using software analysis to provide a report on

acceptable or unacceptable, safe or unsafe driving behaviour.

Does your company provide the software that is capable of assessing, based on the data collected by the black box, capable of assessing or coming up with a report of what is acceptable or unacceptable driving behaviour? Is that possible?

MR KULIS: Yes, it is possible.

MR DEREK CHAN: How is that possible? What do I have to do? If I'm a bus operator and I come to you and say I want something that allows me to generate a report of a particular driver? How would you tell me that can be done, how can that be done?

MR KULIS: In that case, I will introduce you to our application driver feedback, together with the portal parts, together with the software solution which we are providing, so then you can regard the parameters as we were talking about, then, and you can get also the statistics, so then at the end of the day, or some period, you can make your own analysis, for example, which driver have most warnings, thresholds, speeding events, and so on.

This is one option.

And then we can also design the solution for you, if you are not satisfied with the driver feedback only, if

you want to have more sophisticated calculations, we can log the driving data, the parameters, into the database and make the analysis relevant for you. If you are more focused on different inputs, maybe some other parameter is concerning you, we can make analysis and score it on that.

It depends how you feel the logic. If you want to calculate the bonus points and evaluate the best driver, or if you want to introduce, let's say, the negative restriction, it is just check they are better drivers, or better behaviour, and so on. There are multiple ways to achieve it.

Also depends what the drivers are open for, or the unions, it can have more solutions.

MR DEREK CHAN: So it is just the software capabilities. Because the hardware itself is just the data collected by the black boxes. Is my understanding correct? I don't need to buy new equipment? In order to come up with such a score card of a driver's behaviour?

MR KULIS: No, you don't need new equipment. If, for example, now you are the customer, and you already have our boxes we can just talk about new possibilities and we can give you the new software and you will use the same hardware for that.

MR DEREK CHAN: In your experience, how common is it around

the world in commercial fleet management for the operator to use software to come up with a score card of the driver's driving behaviour? How common is it around the world?

MR KULIS: It is -- based on my experience it is relatively common in the West European countries. On the other hand, in some other regions, they want to keep the system simple, like is the driver feedback negative. Only a simple warning, and that's it. Because still we need to consider that drivers need to understand what they are scored for. So if you introduce more complex calculation, to evaluate the score cards, we need to provide the training of the drivers, need to understand it. So it differs by the countries and regions.

MR DEREK CHAN: But I think you said it is quite common in Western European countries?

MR KULIS: Definitely.

MR DEREK CHAN: Moving on then from this driver score card --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. If it is quite common in Western European countries, what thresholds do they use to monitor driver behaviour if they are scoring the driver "good" or "bad", or "average". Whatever the score card might be?

MR KULIS: To give you the example, for example the truck

companies in Germany, they are using the parameters as we have here, the basic parameters, so the speeding events, acceleration, deceleration, but on top of that they are, for example, evaluating if the driver is using the (unclear) for the driving, so he is saving the brakes, or they even have the analysis of the speed value shape in time, and the brake application. So if they are not using the aggressive driving style or if they are not -- how to say, if they are driving more effectively. There are multiple analyses for this.

CHAIRMAN: So the basic model would be to start with analysing speeding, acceleration and deceleration, that's the basic model?

MR KULIS: Yes. Also the idling, if you keep the engine running, if you are standing, then you are wasting money obviously. That's the basic model. And then on top of that, maybe saving of the brakes and so on.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: I have another question on the 30 seconds. So when you send information every 30 seconds, do you send second by second of the last 29 seconds, or do you average everything for the last 30 seconds and send one number?

MR KULIS: We are sending second by second.

MEMBER LO: So you get second by second of the last 30

second, and not one every --

MR KULIS: Each second is recorded.

MEMBER LO: Okay, good.

MR DEREK CHAN: Moving on to the next topic, which is automatic logging of a driver's driving or rest times.

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: I understand that your company offers the hardware and software to enable a driver's driving time to be automatically logged or digitally; is that correct?

MR KULIS: To be exact, we are offering the Mozart and Bach boxes where you can upload the software which is logging the driver's driving time. We are not selling the tachographs by the definition of the European law because the tachographs in Europe are produced and sold by different companies, and to that kind of the tachographs we can connect and download, but we are not selling them.

MR DEREK CHAN: Let me see if I understand it correctly. So what your company provides is the software to be able to record the driver's driving time based on the data collected by the Mozart and Bach boxes; is that correct?

MR KULIS: That's correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: And I think, is the software application called Digi Tacho Download, or is that something

different?

MR KULIS: That particular application is used to download the data from the digital tachograph that needs to be installed in the vehicle. It is widely used in Europe, where we have the tachograph rule, tachographs are mandatory, and to avoid manual downloads from the big fleets, we can download the data through the Mozart or Bach Box. For that we have this application.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. What about the application called the Driving Times app? Does that perform the same sort of function or is it something different?

MR KULIS: It is a little bit more advanced sort of function. This application is also connected to the digital tachograph in the vehicle, but the scope of the application is that you will see on the screen the remaining driving time for each driver in your fleet, so you will get the fast overview which driver needs to be exchanged, which drivers can drive, where they are, so on. So kind of that.

MR DEREK CHAN: So if in Hong Kong we do not have a tachograph system in the way that Western European countries may have them, can Hong Kong use this electronic recording of the driver's driving time through the data collected by the Mozart and Bach boxes?

MR KULIS: Yes. This is generally possible. Because we

need just the information about the driver identification, and the speed. Then we can easily get the information how long the driver is driving. So we can make our own implementation of measuring the driver and times.

MR DEREK CHAN: How widely is it used in the world in terms of systems for electronically logging driver's driving times? Is it very common or not common?

MR KULIS: It is very common in Europe, because we need to have the tachographs from law. It is not so common in north or south America, these countries are just considering if they need the tachographs or the measuring of the driving times in general or not. Same in Asia Pacific I think. It is still under discussions.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you.

Moving on then from the electronic logging of driving times, the next topic I want to cover with you is the braking systems that are offered by your company.

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: The two braking systems that we saw from your company's website being offered by your company, the two systems that we found are called intarders, and the second one is called integrated brake control.

Now, firstly, what are they, and secondly are they suitable for use on commercial buses and in particular

in Hong Kong, double-decker buses?

MR KULIS: Yes, so the --

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can ask you to explain those matters one by one, firstly the intarder. What is it?

MR KULIS: I think the intarder, this is the additional brake system which is part of the gearbox. For example, the echo live gearbox, which is the product that is used, is also in some Hong Kong buses. It is mostly equipped with this brake system and its commercial name is intarder. So it is kind of additional device on the gear box which can provide the braking power.

MR DEREK CHAN: So let me see if I understand it generally. The device, does it use the engine to slow down the vehicle, or am I getting it completely wrong?

MR KULIS: No, no, the braking function or the braking power is done in the gear box in this intarder device.

CHAIRMAN: So effectively it is going down into lower gears, is that it?

MR KULIS: It is actually not going to lower gears, it is using another kind of gear which is there only for this braking. But the principle is something like that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is the intarder capable of being retrofitted to existing buses or do they have to be incorporated in the manufacturing stage?

MR KULIS: It is definitely part only of the transmission,

so you can use the intarder only in the buses where you have modern sort of transmissions. So the retrofitting, I'm not sure if this is possible. Probably not in every bus.

MR DEREK CHAN: And how does the intarder enhance safer driving? Does it help the driver brake in certain circumstances? How does it help safe driving?

MR KULIS: Let me check. If you can give me a few seconds, I need to browse the training manual.

CHAIRMAN: Please take your time.

MR KULIS: I think the main advantage is that intarder have, let's say, bigger braking effect at the higher speeds, if we will check the brake diagram which shows the braking power based on the vehicle speed, then the -- if you are braking by the intarder, then you have higher braking power at higher speeds, and even available to the lower speed range.

Maybe later I can provide you with the official diagrams and documents for this.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you. That would be helpful.

MR KULIS: If you are fine with that, I can give some PDFs or something.

CHAIRMAN: Please do that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just on the issue of providing us with material explaining how the intarder works, can you also

provide something similar in relation to the driver feedback app, the app with which you create a score card for the driver. Can you provide the committee later on, as well, with presentation materials, PDFs to explain how it actually works.

MR KULIS: For the driver feedback application I can send you the application manual, the official instruction, how to use the application, how it works.

MR DEREK CHAN: That would be very helpful, thank you.

I have asked you questions about the intarder. Can I move on to the same type of questions about the integrated brake control.

Again, firstly what is it, and how does it help safe driving?

MR KULIS: For the integrated brake system, I didn't find the relevant information so far. So I need to excuse myself, I will prepare information on that and later I will give you the connection to the expert on this field. Still my specialisation is more on the Openmatics side.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. It would be helpful if you could forward those materials to us on a later stage.

MR KULIS: Yes. Just give me a bit more time and I will give you something on that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, those are the questions I had

for Mr Kulis.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, do we know which franchise bus companies in Hong Kong ZF have supplied equipment and what equipment they have supplied?

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Kulis, firstly, in relation to the equipment that is supplied to the bus operators in Hong Kong, can I take you to your submission at page 65.

It is page 65 for us, but it would be the first page of your submission.

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: That has the heading "Annex III".?

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, you have noted -- or at least your company has noted in this submission that your company has entered into supply contracts with Kowloon Bus Company, and Long Win Bus Company. And the black box systems installed are the Mozart Box and the Bach Box. Are these systems supplied to both KMB and Long Win, or are the systems supplied a bit different for each company?

MR KULIS: As far as I know, our customer is called KMB, but I'm not specialist for this business question, so I cannot say it for sure.

MR DEREK CHAN: Do you personally, or at least do you have access to information which tells us what equipment has

been supplied to Kowloon Motor Bus and Long Win Bus Company?

MR KULIS: You mean which kind of hardware?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.?

MR KULIS: I think also as is stated below we were supplying the Mozart Box in the past, and then the Bach Box is the successor to the Mozart. Plus the driver feedback device and the accessories, that means cables, antennas and all the stuff which you need to run the system.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I also refer you to what in our bundle is page 52. For your purposes, what I'm looking at is a letter from the Committee to your company dated 25 May 2018, which contains a number of annexes, and I want to look at annex II. So perhaps you can look at the screen.?

MR KULIS: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: The screen talks about Kwoon Chung, which is a company in Hong Kong that runs buses, to put it generally?

MR KULIS: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: Do you have any knowledge about what is being described in this page?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps for the purpose of the record, Mr Chan --

MR KULIS: I didn't see this text before, but it is definitely true that Kwoon Chung is also our customer

and they are also using some telematics services in a similar case to the customer KMB.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could read it out, Mr Chan, because when one comes to read the transcript, it is difficult to understand what one is following unless at least some of it has been read out.

MR DEREK CHAN: Certainly. Firstly, the page refers to a system that has been supplied to Kwoon Chung, and at the bottom paragraph of this page it is stated that:

"We got a tailored app for data collection to substitute the Black box. Now we receive telematics and also diagnostics data about our vehicles. Openmatics telematics solution was integrated in our BSAS (bus stop announcement system) so our passengers get up to date information. We were able to increase safety and reduce costs by changing particular behaviour of our drivers. We are planning to move forward to Openmatics platform 2.0 soon. We would like to use more smart solutions from Openmatics in our company and are currently considering an entertainment solution with on-board hotspot and depot management to monitor vehicles entering and leaving depot with bluetooth smart TAGs."

So firstly, are you able to tell from the paragraph what system had been supplied to Kwoon Chung?

MR KULIS: I think to Kwoon Chung we supply the Bach boxes

as the hardware plus the cables and so on, and the software downloads. They do not have the Mozart boxes because I think --

MR HUI: If I may assist, the witness is more responsible on the technical side. So on the business side, he may not be able to provide useful information to this commission. But if Mr Chan wants to ask, we can continue the questioning.

CHAIRMAN: I don't understand the difference between the business and the technical side. The question simply is this. When the statement says "We plan to move forward to Openmatics platform 2", what does that mean to you?

MR KULIS: Ah, okay. They are going to release soon the new portal version, or we to all Openmatics customers, we will provide access to the new Openmatics portal, because the old portal, the server solution was designed five or six years ago, and it uses old technologies, it is not so nice, so the 2.0 will mean the new server solution for the Openmatics system.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can see if I'm understanding this correctly, in terms of hardware being supplied to the Hong Kong bus operators, you are talking about the Bach and the Mozart boxes that are responsible for collecting data?

MR KULIS: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: How that data is then subsequently used is a software problem, not a hardware problem, is that correct?

MR KULIS: That's correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: And your company develops certain software to take advantage of the data collected by the Mozart and Bach Boxes?

MR KULIS: Yes, that's true.

MR DEREK CHAN: Do you know if your company is supplying the software to analyse the data? Is your company supplying that software to the Hong Kong bus companies and, if so, what software had been supplied, do you know?

MR KULIS: I think they are not supplying software to the KMB as far as I know, for this analysis but we are in negotiation with Kwoon Chung to develop some common solution how to analyse, for example, the driver behaviour and some other parameters like maybe some diagnostics services and so on.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Kulis, thank you for your help.

Mr Chairman, those are the questions I have for Mr Kulis.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: I just have a clarification. The paragraph mentioned about Openmatics platform 2.0. Is that

a hardware platform or is it a software app platform?

MR KULIS: It is the software app platform. It is the server side of the solution.

MEMBER LO: So that's a software platform, that will manipulate the data collected for various purposes.

MR KULIS: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much for your assistance, Mr Kulis, it has been an educational experience. And we hope to put the information to good use.

Thank you for accepting our invitation to assist this enquiry in its work.

MR KULIS: Okay, it is my pleasure to help you.

MR HUI: Mr Chairman, I have a short closing remark on behalf of ZF.

CHAIRMAN: We will happily receive it.

MR HUI: On behalf of ZF I wish to thank this Commission for its invitation to assist. ZF will continue to try their best to assist this Commission on a voluntary basis. ZF is determined and committed to make a contribution to the improvement of road safety in Hong Kong and around the world.

We hope the information provided by ZF, and Mr Kulis, is helpful to this Commission, and for further information and documents, we will continue to work with the Secretariat. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that statement, and thank you for the undertaking to continue to assist us. It is most gratefully received.

Mr Kulis, thank you for your assistance, and these proceedings are now closed, for the current hearing. Thank you.

(4.30 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to Monday, 16 July 2018)

I N D E X

P A G E

EVIDENCE FROM TAI PO DISTRICT 1
COUNCIL: MS WONG PIK KUI,
MR CHAN CHO LEUNG, MR YAM KAI
BONG, MR CHAN SIU KUEN, DR LAU
CHEE SING
Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG 1
EVIDENCE FROM SHA TIN DISTRICT 83
COUNCIL: MICHAEL YUNG
Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG 83
EVIDENCE FROM SHAM SHUI PO DISTRICT 116
COUNCIL: MR LAM KA FAI AND
MS CHAN WING YAN, JOEPHY
Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG 116
EVIDENCE FROM ZF FRIEDRICHSCHAFEN 136
REPRESENTATIVE: JAN KULIS
Examination by MR DEREK CHAN 136

2018 年 7 月 14 日

上午 9 時 01 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 黃碧嬌議員，BBS，MH，JP，大埔區議會副主席和交通及運輸委員會轄下跟進公共巴士及小巴服務工作小組主席（大埔區議會代表）

劉志成博士，交通及運輸委員會主席（大埔區議會代表）

陳笑權議員，MH，JP，環境、房屋及工程委員會主席（大埔區議會代表）

陳灶良議員，MH，地區設施管理委員會主席（大埔區議會代表）

任啟邦議員，交通及運輸委員會委員（大埔區議會代表）

容溟舟議員，交通及運輸委員會副主席（沙田區議會代表）

陳穎欣議員，環境保護工作小組主席（深水埗區議會代表）

林家輝議員，BBS，JP，地區設施委員會主席（深水埗區議會代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，我哋歡迎大埔區議會嘅代表，我哋多謝佢哋接受我哋邀請今日嚟到協助我哋提供證供。我首先會請黃女士向代表提問題，如果黃女士想請區議會嘅邊位特別嘅代表回答問題，請你可以指出係邊一位嘅代表，然後請佢答問題。而家可以請黃女士協助委員會提出問題。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席，歡迎各位先生、女士出席今日嘅聽證會，我有幾個題目方面係想提問題嘅。首先我想邀請大家睇一封信，係委員會喺 2018 年 5 月 4 號所寫嘅，就係請你就住三宗意外提供證供，就係 DC 文件夾第 2 號 759 頁，係中文嘅，我想提嗰三宗嘅意外，就係大概講一講，第一宗就係大貴街，2012 年 10 月 10 號，就喺註腳 1 嗰度嘅；第二，就係大窩西支路，2013 年 5 月 12 號嘅；然後第三宗意外就喺大埔公路，喺 2018 年 2 月 10 號嘅。喺呢封信嗰度，委員會請你就住呢三宗意外提交文件，係咪正確呀？

黃碧嬌女士：早晨。係咪而家係屬於由我哋大埔區議會係就住呢三宗嘅 case 係表達意見呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）仲未係嘅，而家只係一般嘅問題，就關於嗰封信，就話委員會喺封信裏面邀請各位發表意見或者提供文件，係同呢三宗交通意外有關嘅，你可唔可以首先證實呢一點呢？

黃碧嬌女士：係，喺大埔，喺呢一份文件裏面，上述三個日期都係有呢啲交通意外嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺回覆嘅時候，我相信大埔區議會同埋佢嘅委員會同埋工作小組都可以證實，就話你只係就住大埔嗰宗意外，即係 2018 年 2 月 10 號嗰宗意外有討論過，請大家睇文件 762 頁，而英文版就係 764 頁，睇唔睇到？中文版 762 頁，第二段，或者可以讀出嚟，就係大埔區議會所發出嘅信件，係回覆委員會嘅，日期就係 2018 年 5 月 23 日，信裏面提及喺相關嘅紀錄當中，大埔委員會同埋佢嘅屬下委員會同埋工作小組只係討論過喺大埔公路接近大埔尾嗰宗交通意外，即係 2 月 10 號嗰宗交通意外，係咪正確呢？

黃碧嬌女士：係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以咁講，就係根據你嘅紀錄，或者你哋嘅討論，你哋只能夠可以搵番同大埔交通意外有關嘅紀錄，就冇其他交通意外嘅紀錄呢？

黃碧嬌女士：我哋都係就住 2018 年 2 月 10 號呢一個嘅巴士意外事件係進行過一個嘅特別嘅會議係討論嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。首先我想請你睇番呢個特別會議嘅會議紀錄，就係 2018 年 2 月 12 號，中文版就係 766 頁開始，英文版就由 782 頁開始。或者我用英文版本，我哋可以睇到出席會議嘅人士名單就喺 768 頁中文版，然後英文版就係 783 頁，就包括就係運輸署署長陳美寶女士，仲有鄒頌滿先生，就係警司嚟嘅，就係 766 頁開始，中文版。

黃碧嬌女士：係呀。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者就請大家睇第 5 段，英文版就 785 頁，鄒頌滿警司喺嗰段提到，就話有關嗰段路段喺 2017 年警方喺嗰度有四次拘捕行動，就係牽涉到兩名醉駕嘅人士同埋一宗同毒品有關嘅罪行，即係兩宗就危險駕駛，然後喺嗰個路段，2017 年警方就一共發出咗三十二張告票，涉及超速或者其他不遵守交通規則嘅罪行，喺赤泥坪到黃宜坳段喺 2017 年一共發生咗二十九宗交通意外，其中兩宗比較嚴重，雖然嗰段路段就冇路面偵速攝影機，但係警方不時會喺嗰個路段幾個特定地點擺放偵速工具，進行偵測超速嘅行動，你睇唔睇到呢段？

黃碧嬌女士：睇到。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）好，有關呢一點，呢個係咪因為回應大埔區議會嘅問題，就話問到嗰段路段，大埔公路嗰個特別路段發生嗰幾宗意外，所以點解警方就提供呢啲資料，係咪？

黃碧嬌女士：係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）而事實上，你嘅會議紀錄第 16 段，或者請大家睇第 16 段，中文版 772 頁，英文版 789 頁，你可以睇到喺第 16 段第 (iv) 小段提到話過去曾經有區議員提出建議點樣改善有關肇事路段嘅道路設計，但係運輸署以

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

技術理由就冇跟進，佢，即係羅曉楓議員，我相信佢係大埔區議會嘅區議員，佢希望署方喺發生呢次意外之後能夠回應區議員嘅訴求加裝路面測速儀器同埋指示牌，令到呢個路段更加安全。喺呢段裏面，你可唔可以再詳細啲解釋一下第一句說話，就話過去曾經有區議員提出建議點樣改善道路設計，但係運輸署就冇跟進，可唔可以再詳細啲講一講呢一段呢？

黃碧嬌女士：好呀，唔該。我哋今日都有我哋當區嘅區議員陳笑權議員係出席嘅，喺呢度都可以請佢就住呢一段係表達一下意見。

陳笑權先生：可唔可以由我講解？

主席：（經傳譯員）係可以嘅，請講。

陳笑權先生：好。就我作為當區議員，就收到啲居民就反映，有時啲假期就好多啲快車就喺嗰個大埔公路嗰度就擾民同埋佢嘅車速非常之快，我收到啲居民投訴，我就去信畀運輸署，要求嗰度就加番啲快相機，喺信件都有提及，喺2015年7月24號同埋喺2017年6月5號分別我都去咗兩封信，第一封就畀運輸署，第二封就畀警方。我封信都寫得好清楚嘅，第一封信就關乎就喺翡翠花園附近嗰度逢係星期六、日朝頭早好多啲快車，就我就畀咗封信運輸署，運輸署就佢都有口頭上有回覆我嘅，首先都一定要諮詢當區啲居民、啲法團，睇下佢哋個回應先，由於上面嗰度就--翡翠花園嗰度就唔屬於係一個嚴重交通意外嘅黑點，所以一路一路就未有去跟進到。

至於第二封信嗰度，就喺大埔尾至到嗰個鹿茵山莊嗰段，由於喺赤泥坪嗰面一路上斜坡，個車速一般普通車係快唔到嘅，除非嗰啲係一定係啲跑車先可以快得到。上咗之後一落，落個彎位個車速就一定好快，所以我見到嗰個彎位好得人驚，我知，我就去信畀直情係警方，要求警方喺度加個快相機，警方就都有覆我嘅，佢就話嗰度唔屬於一個好交通黑點，不過佢都會派人去睇或者派嗰啲快相機，喺嗰度裝啲快相機就喺度監控，呢度都有做。

上次經過呢個意外之後，佢哋問我有冇睇過呢條路，我即時--好在我自己有作為一個議員，不斷都有監察政府嘅運作，所以我即時就攞番兩封信就呈現番喺區議會度，同埋好多傳媒、啲媒界就都係我作為當區議員，我係有事實當然係有要求運輸署同埋警方喺嗰個路段就要求佢做一個減速標誌同埋加快相機嘅，所以羅曉楓睇到我呢兩封信，佢先至有追問，佢話「點解議員寫咗封信，你哋冇反應呢？」就咁嘅一封信得嚟嘅，唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：唔該陳笑權議員。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該陳先生。你提到有幾封信，第一封就係2015年7月24號嘅信件，或者我哋首先睇嗰份文件，呢個就係寫畀運輸署嘅，中文就係840-72頁，英文就係840-75頁。

陳笑權先生：係，啱。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢封就係第一封信你寫畀運輸署嘅，大埔組王國良先生就

係負責工程嘅，嗰度就提到話你係收到喺附近居民要求協助，就話嗰度就冇足夠嘅慢駛嘅道路標誌喺近住翡翠花--嗰度嘅，所以你就要求佢哋儘快加裝50公里時速限制嘅道路標誌喺度，然後以提醒駕駛者就要小心安全駕駛，呢個係咪你第一封信得到個回覆？

陳笑權先生：正確嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）陳先生，你提到話要儘快加裝時速50公里嘅速度限制標誌，喺嗰段時間，嗰段車其實個車速限制係70公里嘅，所以點解你會寫到話係50公里呢？

陳笑權先生：由於70就再減落去，香港法例係得50嘅，佢冇65，又冇60，所以得50，同埋佢哋啲居民--住喺翡翠花園一帶嗰啲居民都向我嗰個求助，佢話「你作為一個議員，就幫我去信。」我應佢哋要求。亦都之前有少少嗰啲插曲，有啲嗰個--有些少交通意外，同埋個彎位--個手臂彎係最彎嗰個位，我覺得喺嗰段嚟講，就50就都係合理嘅，我就唔係專家，我就交番畀運輸署嗰面就幫我做一個諮詢同埋去睇下可唔可以喺上面路段可以裝番個50咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅理解，就係話呢個即係你係有要求將嗰個時速限制由70公里減到50公里呢，即係每小時？

陳笑權先生：係，我都係聽民意，市民畀電話畀我，我都覺得喺嗰個彎位係危險啲嘅嗰度，所以我係特別註明嗰個彎位一帶嗰度就由70減為50嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）有關呢封信，運輸署或者--應該話運輸署冇畀過書面回覆係回應呢封信嘅，即係喺大埔意外之前，係咪正確呢？我相信你喺你進一步提交文件畀本委員會時候有提到嘅，就係一封信18年7月11號嘅，中文版即係840-76頁，然後英文版就係840-86頁。

陳笑權先生：係，就當時就運輸署就冇好正面，不過我都有電話同佢傾嘅，佢哋都係要口頭上都要--如果係要減嗰個改為50，都要去諮詢番一帶嗰個居民同埋嗰啲法團嘅意見。亦都喺2014年嗰度，亦都喺國際嗰個--日本人國際學校嗰個紅綠燈對出嗰度有單交通意外嘅，導致一名市民就會傷亡，運輸署亦都有回應過嘅，就係王國良先生。佢始終就嗰個車路就限制50，運輸署與警方要研究後個意外，包括埋駕駛者嘅態度同埋遵守嗰個交通燈嘅問題，個意外就--即係喺嗰個路段要做一個70改50，可能喺運輸署嘅角度，佢要做好多好多諮詢同埋要同警方聯繫，咁樣先可以改到。我就一路一路喺度等，都有聯絡，而家都王國良先生都調咗，都有不幸就呢個大埔尾嗰個交通意外，好在我之前亦都提示警方，我話運輸署做唔到，我話不如試下警方，由警方負責去裝呢個快相機嘅，呢度就係一路跟進緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺電話上面，同運輸署關於呢件事，你同邊個通過電話？

陳笑權先生：王國良，嗰個運輸署嗰個工程師。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢喺運輸署入面，佢嗰個嘅官階職級係乜嘢呀？

陳笑權先生：嗰陣時應該係運輸署嗰個高級主任嚟嘅，好似高級主任。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同佢講關於2015年7月24號嗰件事通話嘅時候就係講啲乜？係幾時同佢通電話？

陳笑權先生：唔係好清楚，我哋每一日做議員，都一收到啲個案，都儘快都同佢哋傾，希望佢哋儘快裝嗰個標誌同埋嗰個減速嘅，由於佢哋嗰個程序上，政府好多個程序上嘅，我都明白嘅，我哋一路一路去跟進，佢要去裝嗰個50呢，佢真係要去地區諮詢嘅，我都明白到有個程序喺度，一路一路一路跟，尤其是我哋喺地區上係好多好多工作，呢個係其中之一嘅工作。呢度就都居民都耐唔耐都有畀下電話我，都想將呢一段路段，嗰個手臂彎位嗰度一帶就係想減速為50，呢個好清楚嘅呢度。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，我哋未講其他嘢之前，可唔可以睇一睇呢段路段嘅地圖、相，等我哋知道我哋究竟講緊乜嘢呢？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係。或者可唔可以睇番大埔公路路段嘅地圖？首先，陳生，我想你睇下呢個地圖，有關嘅路段，話你建議將車速減低係喺呢一個翡翠花園附近嘅，似乎就係喺26同29呢兩個數字中間嘅，係嘛？

陳笑權先生：係，嗰個紅林路之前嘅手臂彎位嗰度。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者你可以指出你向運輸署建議，叫佢哋睇番減速嘅嗰段路段，即係由呢一個70公里減到50公里嗰個路段，可以講一講嗰個數字，顯示畀我哋睇。

陳笑權先生：係30、29至28嗰個彎位嗰度，即係喺30進入29至28嗰個彎位嗰度，同埋佢地下嗰度一大雨就會水浸，嗰個彎位，28嗰度個彎位，我啱啱亦都去咗信畀路政署，要求佢將嗰個地下水--就佢一大雨就養住啲水，就喺個路面度係非常之危險嘅，所以嗰個彎位，我特別好重視呢個彎位嘅。同埋朝頭早，星期六、日，嗰啲跑車入呢個彎位好危險，所以我就係重點就喺呢一帶嘅。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以畀你睇下28、29同埋30嗰啲嘅相，等我哋知道你講緊嘅係邊一個彎，第28號嘅相，呢一度就影到嗰一部分，就係近住紅林路嘅，係咪呀？

陳笑權先生：呢個係前咗，後番少少，呢個係出番九龍方向，你而家再前--你係啱啱倒番轉頭，應該係向後。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者27，係咪呢？

陳笑權先生：我諗褪多一格。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）26？

陳笑權先生：你又過咗龍，30，29。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）應該係26同27之間？

陳笑權先生：呢個蔚海山莊，唔係呢個，你後番，後番。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係咪29呢？

陳笑權先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）陳生，或者我哋畀條片你睇，就係有關路段，等你可以話--到咗嗰度，你就叫我哋停。

陳笑權先生：再向前啲，就到㗎嘞。（上午9時27分委員會播放影片）

陳笑權先生：再向前啲。

（上午9時27分委員會繼續播放影片）

陳笑權先生：就係過咗呢個--喺呢個彎位，停，呢個彎位，一路轉落去，個彎位有陣時兩架雙層巴士一過都好--呢個就好危險，同埋地下呢個彎位，即係啱啱有個人企喺度嗰度就好容易養水嘅呢度，一落雨就有堆水喺度，所以呢度係特別危險嘅呢度。

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，我可唔可以就係從呢一個嘅照片嗰度搵到呢個地點呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者可以我哋係印出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁相，有冇一本相簿？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋揀咗幾張相嘅，但係就冇影到呢個位，不過我哋可以寫低個時間，然之後就印嗰張硬照出嚟嘅，即係搵番呢一個座標，然之後印番嗰個地點出嚟。

陳生，你就提到有一宗意外，就喺日本人學校嘅，我想請你睇番一封嘅投訴信，就係來自香港日本人學校嘅，日期係15年嘅2月10號，英文就係840-84頁，中文就係840-85頁，正本就係一橫84，就係840頁嘅，呢度見

到係一位 Ashton 先生就寫信畀你哋，就話之前嗰年喺學校外面有位女士過馬路嘅時候就被撞死，嗰度嘅車速係 70，每小時 70，可能因為咁樣而令到佢嘅傷勢嚴重。喺第四段，佢亦都提及喺大埔公路有啲路段車速已經調低到係時速 50 公里，所以佢懇請將學校外嘅嗰段路段車速都要調低到同一水平，呢個係由 Ashton 太太代表香港日本人學校請求將嗰段路段由每小時 70 調低至每小時 50 嘅，呢個係咪就係你之前提及嘅嗰封信呀？

陳笑權先生：就我提及呢封信，即係我檯面封信，我知道就有人提及就話上次有個交通意外，我都關注到嘅，所以我呢封信就係寫喺翡翠花園一帶附近減至 50。上述嗰個意外，我都問咗運輸署嘅，屬於係一個什麼交通意外，係佢自己衝出馬路吖，定喺紅綠燈畀車撞到呢，係屬於邊個責任呢，我哋亦都要問一問署方嘅。如果佢自己衝出馬路，我哋就都要睇佢點樣做。我上次都同運輸署同警方都--運輸署，我都要求佢將而家上述嗰個紅綠燈嗰度改善佢嘅，即係畀佢哋啲行人過路就更加安全、更加適合去過馬路，係咪上述嗰個位置係咪真係適合呢，我都同運輸署都同佢提過下嘅。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢封信係寫畀一位嘅文生或者萬生嘅，點解會係去到你手呢？

陳笑權先生：唔係，我睇到呢份嘢喺度，呢份文件喺度。佢寫畀文春輝主席，當時佢係交通運輸委員會主席，係呀，係呀，應該係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢封信就喺區議會會議，15 年 3 月 13 號係討論過嘅，中文係 840-81 頁，英文就係 840-92 頁，我哋就見到主席嘅名文春輝，如果睇番 79 頁的話，主席提及日本人學校嗰封信，就話佢哋要求將時速 70 減至 50，要求區議員去探訪佢哋學校，同佢哋傾關於交通嘅事項嘅，你見唔見到 79 段？

陳笑權先生：我睇到，係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果睇番第 80 段，呢個就係 840-92，王國良先生就回應，我相信呢位王國良先生即係喺封信裏面提及到嘅，就係即係你寫信畀佢，當時就係呢個 15 年嘅 7 月時候你寫過信畀呢位王生嘅，係咪呀？

陳笑權先生：呢個都係有關連嘅，當年我寫信畀佢嗰時就係收到翡翠花園一帶啲居民就投訴話嗰個車速，有朝頭早星期六、日好多快車喺度奔馳，好危險，呢單係另外一單嚟嘅，我都知道連貫帶一帶，我要求佢就要喺嗰個翡翠花園一帶就將嗰個車速減為 50，就呢個係我都知嘅呢單。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺第 80 段，王國良先生回應話佢知悉日本人國際學校要求喺學校門口嘅嗰段路段係將嗰個嘅車速係降低嘅，因為曾經發生過呢一個嘅係意外，當時係 2014 年，有一位嘅公眾人士係因而死亡嘅。佢就話運輸署就係究研過呢個嘅意外原因，未必係同當個路段嘅車速有關，因為可能就係同駕駛

人士態度、行人有冇遵守燈號係有關，呢度亦都同時有講話署方會研究呢個路段嘅車速限制係咪適合。另外署方亦都係作咗一個嘅簡覆畀學校，稍後會係再詳細回覆嘅。似乎 3 月，即係 2015 年 3 月，運輸署話會研究該路段嘅車速限制，佢哋有冇同區議會跟進番呢個嘅意見、呢個嘅要求，即係喺嗰次開會之後？

陳笑權先生：係呀，佢嗰日都有寫嘅，呢一段，副主席畀我睇，佢已經進入嗰個司法程序，所以就唔方便討論，因為可能嗰陣時檢控緊嗰個--唔知係咪檢控個司機定係咩嘢，都有寫，喺 87 段嗰度係區議會都有提過。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）陳生，但係我個問個問題唔係講關於意外嘅原因，就係話運輸署話佢哋會研究目前嗰段路嘅車速係咪適合，你見唔見到喺 80 段裏面呢一行呀？係王國良先生講嘅。

陳笑權先生：每一日我哋開好多會，真係我就冇乜印象，不過據我所知，我哋要求佢做，就係佢哋進入佢哋嘅程序，就由佢哋決定，我哋都係等嘅啫，我哋作為一個議員就。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）即係喺會議之後，當時係 2015 年嘅 3 月，會議之後，運輸署係冇搵區議會同佢哋傾關於時速限制嘅，係咪呀？

陳笑權先生：有冇同文主席講，我就唔係好清楚，即係佢寫信畀文主席，我作為當區議會，就而家我都係不斷都有同佢傾嘅，始終都係話嗰度一定要諮詢，要成個路段--即係喺嗰一段個彎位要改個 50，都係要諮詢嘅，佢話唔係咁簡單嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題其實就係問佢哋有冇同你講呢一個諮詢之後嘅結果呀？因為係三年前嘅事嚟㗎嘛。

陳笑權先生：冇呀，如果有結果，我就唔會再去第二封信去畀警方，就係 17 年--唔係，17 年--2015 年嗰封信到而家就係冇乜結果，所以我先至再喺 2017 年嗰度先再畀封信畀警方。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺我哋繼續之前，我想畀個地圖你睇睇嘅，係畀你睇睇日本人學校個位置嘅，個位置就係响 21、22 之間嘅，如果可以攞番照片 21、22 號出嚟，應該係 21 嘅，21 係顯示到日本人學校個位置嘅，啱唔啱呀？

陳笑權先生：呢張係鹿茵，呢張就啱喇，呢張啱，嗰個紅綠燈嗰度。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你就將封信係交咗畀警察，麻煩你睇睇文件夾係 840-70 嘅，呢個係中文版，840-74 係英文版嘅，呢封信係 2017 年嘅 6 月 5 日嘅，係由你寫畀警察嘅，我哋見到封信就話好多人係超速嘅，係响假期會超速，你要求係有啲影快相嘅攝影機安裝嘅，係咪呢？

陳笑權先生：係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）警察亦都有回應嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）喺你繼續問之前，呢度係講緊大埔路嘅，會唔會係有某個路段係有超速呢個問題呢？

陳笑權先生：嗰個我頭先都講咗，由赤泥坪上斜路嗰度，佢進入嗰個大埔尾，而家巴士意外涉事嗰個位置，嗰個手臂彎位都好多交通意外嘅，所以我喺嗰個路段指明就大埔尾至鹿茵山莊嗰段，呢封係第二封信，我亦都收到鹿茵山莊有啲居民就不斷畀電話我，就話嗰度星期六、日又係一樣，就嗰度好多啲快車，超速，尤其是手臂個彎位，啱啱巴士個意外嗰度，佢一落一轉過去右手嗰度，架車會飄，你普通車就好容易反嘅，所以嗰段我就註明咗喺嗰度，就要求佢做一個 50 公里同埋做嗰個快相機嘅，呢度我第二封信出去嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）而家係有個地圖係可以顯示出嚟，你可唔可以講一講嗰個--頭先你封信提到嗰個鹿茵山莊？呢個係咪接近日本人學校嗰個位置呀？

陳笑權先生：呢封信係第二封嚟嘅，第一封就係翡翠花園一帶，呢封係第二封嚟嘅，就你呢封就唔係提及嗰個日本人國際學校嘅，第一封就牽涉到國際學校。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢個就係你講緊嗰個位置，地圖呢個鹿茵山莊就响日本人學校後面嘅，喺地圖上顯示出嚟嘅，可唔可以確認呢？

陳笑權先生：地圖嗰度，咪住先，我就睇得唔係太清楚，應該係咪喺 22 至到 20 嗰度嗰段，定係--乾坑都屬於係咩嘢㗎喎。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋放大個圖片畀你睇睇。

陳笑權先生：呢個就係樟樹灘，樟樹灘個路口巴士站，未到鹿茵，包括埋在內，呢段路，係喇，鹿茵，呢度係鹿茵，至到鹿茵呢度啱，鹿茵嘅入口。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你封信就講到話成日有超速、賽車响大埔路嘅，你就喺封信就冇提到嗰個車速限制，可唔可以講一講點解呢，點解要有個咁嘅車速嘅要求呢？

陳笑權先生：我 heading 已經寫咗，要求加設 50 公里車速限制標誌，同埋加埋嗰個時速--係呀，有寫喎。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我而家係講緊係 6 月 5 號嗰封信。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個封信可以打埋上屏幕吖不如。

陳笑權先生：呢個快相機，一般嚟講，嗰度係 70，如果你加個快相機，佢超過個車速就會影相，一般駕駛者嚟講，佢一見到快相機會收腳，好自然嘅，我就寫咗上去，係都係要--應我哋啲居民，要加個快相機上去嘅，你啱嘅，呢度係我冇寫上去，不過快相機個作用，如果佢寫 50，就超過 50 就會著，如果佢寫 70，超過 70 就會影到佢嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）警察就响 2017 年嘅 6 月 17 號係有個回應嘅，麻煩你睇

睇 840-71 頁，英文版就 840-73 嘅，警察就話個安裝呢個定點嘅快相機主要係由運輸署嗰度去決定嘅，喺安裝咗之後，警察就係負責係執法嘅，而運輸署係知道目前係冇一個安裝固定偵察車速嘅一個意圖嘅，喺相關嘅路段。同時警方就會繼續密切留意住呢個路段嘅交通嘅情況嘅，呢封信係抄送畀趙鏡波先生，又係運輸署技術服務交通控制組嘅，同埋亦都畀咗大埔分區指揮官，你睇唔睇到呢封信嘅內容？呢封信亦都係發咗去你本人嗰度嘅。

陳笑權先生：就呢封信我出嘅，佢都應該都要回覆番我嘅，呢封信都係我交出嚟嘅，我每一封信我都有紀錄嘅，就呢三封信全部都係我攞出嚟畀大家睇嘅。亦都事實係，佢哋就--我哋就同--運輸署，我見到佢都仲未搞得掂，我所以我直接就寫信畀警方，睇下佢哋嗰面可唔可以加一個快相機就喺大埔尾同埋啱啱落斜路之間嗰個位置嘅，呢個係我要求。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）換句話說，佢哋就話運輸署就係拒絕咗你個要求，而警察只不過係一個執法機關嚟嘅，所以佢哋係無能為力嘅，除非運輸署係安裝呢個固定嘅偵察車速攝影機，係咪咁呢？

陳笑權先生：係，清楚嘅，佢都咁回覆，事後我都有經過呢一次咁嚴重災禍，我都直接再同警方一位警司都落去現場睇過，亦都佢哋都承諾咗就會喺呢個年尾就會裝番個快相機。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）主席先生，麻煩你睇番個會議紀錄，係 2018 年嘅 2 月 12 號嘅，呢個就會係响英文版嘅 790，中文就係 772 頁嘅，喺第 17 段有個羅馬數字(ii)嘅，劉志成博士就有以下嘅意見嘅，佢就話大概喺半年前，有啲區議會議員係建議安裝一啲快相機嘅，就响意外發生嗰個路段安裝嘅，但係就被相關嘅當局係拒絕咗嘅，佢嘅意見就話係--即係佢話政府部門就話有足夠嘅一個車速嘅限制嘅牌，當車行落山嘅時候，佢話有關嘅政府當局就應該考慮番係咪應該係維持一個 70 公里咁嘅速度嘅，佢話舉個例子，喺西頁有過意外，清水灣又有意外，因為個車未能夠及時剎車嘅，所以個車速其後由時速 70 公里調低到 50 公里，同埋亦都加裝咗偵速嘅攝錄機，佢建議調低大埔公路調低到 50 公里同埋加裝呢個偵速嘅攝錄機嘅，係讓啲駕駛人士就唔好超速嘅。呢個問題其實應該係問番劉志成博士嘅，佢係提到大概半年前區議員係已經建議係喺有關路段安裝呢個偵速機嘅，呢個要求係咪以書面形式提出嚟嘅呢？

劉志成先生：你話個 request 係--即係唔係我嘅 request，而係我當時係知道有當區議員寫咗一個 request 出去嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊陳先生嘅要求？呢個係咪個問題？呢個係陳先生嘅要求嚟嘅。

劉志成先生：Yes, that was Mr. Chan's request, yes.

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）當你相關嘅政府部門拒絕，係有警察嘅一封拒絕信，我哋剛剛見過嗰封，啱唔啱？

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋接住睇落去，睇第24段(iii)，英文喺794頁嘅，中文776頁嘅，第24段羅馬數字(iii)，呢個區鎮樺議員，佢就話認同要將肇事路段嘅車速限制由70公里調到50公里嘅，然而司機嘅駕駛態度亦都十分重要，部分巴士司機可能因為係十分熟悉路段，就會以較快嘅車速行駛，加上該路段係斜路，就算巴士喺車速達到時速70公里時會鎖車，但係落斜同埋車身嘅重量會產生衝力嘅，令到車速係更快嘅，佢建議巴士公司係應該提醒行駛危險路段嘅巴士司機係應該更有耐性嘅，同埋落斜路要減慢車速；另外佢希望巴士公司係會訓示所有巴士司機，提醒佢哋要保持良好嘅駕駛態度嘅；而响羅馬數字(vi)嗰度，佢就問警方過去一年該路段或者整段大埔公路發生嘅交通意外數字嘅，佢就問大埔公路係咪應該設有呢個偵速嘅攝錄機呢，如果係嘅話，個數量同埋位置係幾多。而家我想首先問一問關於呢個車速限制，由70公里下調到50公里，喺嗰次會議之後，你同運輸署有冇去考察過現場呢？去番個意外個現場嗰度考察，去討論你呢個下調車速嘅要求嘅。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）你係問緊邊位呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋之間要商量下究竟係邊位要回答，或者黃小姐係可以提示邊個會作答。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）黃小姐。

黃碧嬌女士：好，我請我哋交通運輸委員會主席劉志成博士答吖，係。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係區先生同埋另一位區議員提出嘅，我覺得應該係由陳先生回答會好啲，佢係嗰區嘅區議員--當區區議員嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生，可唔可以幫幫忙呢？個問題係就係有冇去考察。

陳笑權先生：我本人就有，你話區議會佢委員會主席當日喺個會講，議員就個個都有提問嘅，佢提問啫，不過佢有冇跟進就另外一 part。我作為自己當區議員，我就一定係有去睇過嘅，事前、事後、之前、之後我都有睇過嘅，我本人一定有，劉志成博士就佢作為一個主席，有冇出席，我唔係好記得喇咁就。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪同運輸署一齊去？嗰個係問題呀，嗰個問題係有冇聯席嘅一個考察活動？

陳笑權先生：同運輸署有嘅，我私人有。

黃碧嬌女士：好，或者等我回答一下，我哋係同埋我哋大埔區議會張學明主席、我哋民政事務專員呂少珠女士，就聯同我哋全體大埔交通運輸委員會全體嘅委員係實地係視察過一次嘅，當中區鎮樺議員都有出席嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。喺嗰次嘅實地考察，現場考察，你哋同運輸署同埋出席嘅人士係去做嗰次考察，係咪同意就係嗰個車速限制應該下調嘅，係為嗰個路段係需要下調，係因為出咗交通意外，應該下調個車速？

黃碧嬌女士：係，我哋喺現場就提出咗兩個要求，第一個就將呢一個嘅車速由 70 公里下調至 50 公里，就要落番一個車速嗰個嘅指示牌；第二個要求就係要喺呢一個嘅減速呢個路段係加裝一個就係嗰個叫做快相機。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺考察嗰個時間有冇討論到應該邊度安裝呢個車速攝錄機，個位置，即係邊度安裝呢個攝錄機？

黃碧嬌女士：係有睇到呢一個嘅位置嘅，跟住因為嗰日都一部旅遊巴嘅人數，接近有四十人去到現場，其實嗰個嘅路面有超過四十人喺度，我哋都覺得大家喺度咁樣視察都係比較危險，因此我哋就再係將有一啲我哋要求嘅嘢就帶番喺嗰個嘅區議會嘅會議室度，再喺我哋嘅 T and T 裏面繼續跟進嘅，而好準確要放嗰個嘅快相機喺邊一度呢，我哋就交咗畀運輸署同埋警方係再聯絡當區區議員就係陳笑權議員係再去跟進。

陳笑權先生：我有嘅，我同負責嗰個交通個警司喺現場睇過嘅，都有指定嗰個位置，喺嗰個啱啱落斜嗰個位係安裝嗰個攝錄機嘅，都有傾過嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲係咪全部書面寫低嘅呢，或者喺會議紀錄嗰度有記錄嘅呢？即係除咗你提交畀我哋嘅紀錄之外，有冇記錄呢？

黃碧嬌女士：呢一個就冇係再喺嗰個會議裏面逐項咁細節寫出嚟，因為要去到擺呢一啲位，當區嘅區議員仲要連絡埋喺呢一個嘅大埔尾佢有三條村嘅村長嘅，亦都要聽番村長嘅意見同埋呢一個巴士站嘅一啲--即係再將佢維修同埋燈柱點樣種番，呢一啲好細節嘅嘢就真係由番當區區議員陳笑權議員係繼續喺現場再約一啲嘅時間去跟進，所以你剛才都聽到陳議員係講咗好幾次之後佢係自己同不同嘅部門都落過去睇過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀番個日期，即係嗰四十個人嚟去考察係幾時呢？

黃碧嬌女士：應該係 4 月 12 號，我諗我哋各位同事一齊協助下，應該係 4 月 12 號，因為我哋就租咗架旅遊巴上去，睇完之後，我哋就--係喇，4 月 12 號嘅兩點鐘，我哋喺大埔政府合署集合，跟住就上到去大埔公路巴士站就進行視察嘅，嗰個時間就係兩點三個字去到大埔尾呢一個事發嘅現場嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：係，okay，唔該。跟住我哋就係喺番三點半有一個叫做 DMC，地區管理委員會嘅會議上面就進行我哋視察之後嗰個嘅討論嘅嘢，呢一個嘅會議就只係區議會嘅正、副主席同埋我哋五個委員會嘅主席，有七位嘅區議員就同我哋民政事務署同埋係大埔嘅部門係一齊開會嘅。亦都再補充，呢一個嘅會議係有一份會議紀錄嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）繼續講2018年2月嘅會議紀錄，即是九巴嘅回應，798頁英文，780頁中文，35段提到蘇偉基先生嗰個意見同埋佢回應區議員嘅意見，35段第(ii)小段就話九巴會考慮區議員有關782路線嘅建議同埋會提交建議畀運輸署同埋區議會，畀佢哋考慮嘅，即係日後。首先九巴--或者應該話，首先九巴提及區議員嗰個意見係咩嘢呢？

黃碧嬌女士：872呢個路線，我係建議唔好繼續係行番由馬場行大埔公路再返大埔嘅呢條路線，我希望佢係再有一條新嘅路線，而呢條新嘅路線就可以係行吐露港公路。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋有冇提交任何建議畀區議會考慮呢？即係自從嗰次之後。

黃碧嬌女士：係，由佢--就我哋呢一個會完咗之後，就接近係過年，就冇再會議㗎喇，運輸署嘅同事就有打過電話畀我，就問我同唔同意就係改為872X，就由呢一個馬場經吐露港就返到去大埔中心嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）想請你睇第12段，英文版788頁，中文版771頁，呢個建議係關永業先生提出嘅，第12段第(iv)小段，佢就話自從佢出任區議員十八年嚟，一路都未試過有大型嘅大埔公路擴闊或者改善工程，佢明白大埔公路受到地理環境嘅限制，但係佢仍然希望有關部門可以盡力喺今次意外之後研究改善方案；佢亦都希望運輸署能夠一併研究大埔區議員轄下其他嘅公路嘅改善方案，例如係汀角路、林錦公路同埋西沙路，認真處理區議員提出嘅訴求，避免發生因為道路缺憾而引致嘅交通意外。喺有關呢個要求，係關議員提出嘅，佢提到大埔公路從來都喺過去十八年進行過--都冇進行過大型嘅擴闊同埋改善工程，你嘅睇法係點呢，當佢咁講嘅時候？

黃碧嬌女士：我諗就聽番呢一個區嗰個嘅區議員回應下，好唔好呀？陳笑權議員，唔該。

陳笑權先生：大埔公路本身有個先天性就係個彎位就都多嘅，有擴闊過嘅，佢之前翡翠花園嗰個彎位都有削過嗰個斜坡嚟嘅，事實上喺嗰個路段嚟講，佢嘅嚴重交通意外就唔係太多嘅，咁係事實。唯一即係我哋睇到嗰個巴士嘅司機真係佢自己係不小心駕駛，如果整個路段嚟講，即係我作為當區議員，就係好多投訴就係佢哋揸快車，而驚影響有發生嚴重嘅意外嘅啫。嗰個現場嗰個位置，如果你真係話去擴闊梗係最好，香港整體嚟講，好多呢啲咁嘅彎位嚟講，大埔公路都唔算好特別嘅危險，如果真係可以做嘅，我哋都支持嘅。

黃佩琪女士：This paragraph ...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你繼續之前。陳先生，我想提醒你，你剛才所作嘅講法，有關於2月10號嗰個意外個成因同埋邊個負責任，呢個唔係我哋委員會嘅職權範圍裏面嘅，我哋想知道嘅就係點樣去處理當時嘅情況，但係我哋就唔會係會處理邊個要負責任嘅問題嘅。

陳笑權先生：知道。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）陳生，嗰段就提到話改善嘅方案，交通運輸委員會，即係你哋區議會下面嘅交通運輸委員會係幾時提過呢啲嘅改善方案呢？

陳笑權先生：呢度就冇提過嘅，擴闊嗰個大埔公路係冇提過。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）其他嘅改善方案呢，有冇任何改善方案？

黃碧嬌女士：或者呢度講下，關議員所講，因為佢做十八年議員，佢同我同一齊做十--即係我哋一齊做議員做到而家嘅，喺我哋區議會裏面，咁多年，的而且確係喺大埔有一啲嘅路段係做緊擴闊公路嘅，例如汀角路已經擴闊咗同埋行緊，好成功㗎喇，林錦公路就迴旋處亦都係完成咗擴闊嘅，西沙路就係研究呢個方案嘅，佢嘅意思係講應該再喺下一次我哋再有提到改善公路嘅時期，應該將大埔公路都請運輸署係一併畀我哋交通運輸委員會係作一個考慮嘅。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）劉博士，你有咩嘢要補充？

劉志成先生：我想補充就係我哋喺交通運輸委員會討論某位同事提出嘅一啲嘅要求，我哋委員會就未必會係提交一個計劃畀大家嘅，通常我哋都係喺個會嗰度提出一啲要求運輸署去做一啲嘅改善嘅建議，我哋都係等運輸署嚟到去提出，佢哋作為運輸嘅專家，點樣去應議員嘅要求嚟到去畀一啲改善嘅建議畀我哋考慮嘅，即係我哋作為議員，就唔係喺呢方面嘅專家，所以喺交通運輸委員會通常我哋提咗出嚟，就希望運輸署或者有關部門係可以畀到我哋去考慮嘅就係由佢哋提出一個改善建議，我想澄清一點，喺呢方面。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）換言之，你哋會提出一啲諗法，然後--但係講話實際執行，你就會交畀運輸署，因為佢哋係專家，由佢哋去執行有關嘅改善工程，你講嘅係咪咁意思呢？

劉志成先生：係，都應該係正確嘅，係呀。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你睇第26段796頁英文版，778頁中文版，第26段第(ii)小段，余智榮議員發表以下嘅意見，佢話運房局及運輸署嘅人員經常拒絕落實區議員提出嘅建議，而且經常喺會議上偏幫九巴；另外運輸署人員經常變動，導致個案嘅處理進度十分緩慢。當余議員提到話區議員提出嘅建議嘅時候，呢啲建議係咪同安全有關嘅措施呢？即係指有關大埔公路嘅路段，你可唔可以講一講嗰啲建議係咩嘢嚟呢？

黃碧嬌女士：我諗咁，因為喺會上面余智榮議員佢自己去表達呢個意見，需要由佢自己喺呢度作一啲嘅解釋同埋澄清同埋表達，我哋喺呢度就唔可以代表到佢演繹呢一段嘅深化嗰個意思嘅。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）同運輸房屋局同埋運輸署喺提出建議之後，即係每一次議員提出建議之後，會唔會有同佢哋開會嘅呢？

黃碧嬌女士：有，係，我哋喺--咁樣講，區議員佢係接受市民嗰一個嘅投訴，佢就會將呢個投訴係應該喺不同嘅渠道去表達佢哋嘅建議，透過區議會係一種，佢哋自己用信件亦都係一種，打電話亦都係一種，運輸署嘅同事係會有同區議員係一齊商討佢哋提出嘅建議嘅。或者我都可以畀--我哋有其他嘅議員，我都或者請佢可以表達一下呢樣嘢，任啟邦議員，唔該。

任啟邦先生：好，唔該。我諗就住余智榮議員或者頭先剛才律師盤問嘅時候講緊其他一啲議員同事個意見，就住運輸署點樣睇議員嗰個嘅建議，我都想表達一下。當今次嚴重嘅事故之後，運輸署或者相關嘅政府部門，包括警方、路政署咁樣，的而且確係作出好快嘅回應，包括係減呢個嘅速度，由 70 轉 50，包括係承諾係會加呢個快相機，但係呢啲訴求，陳笑權議員頭先嘅發言嗰度都已經講咗，其實佢係跟進咗好耐嘅。我亦都可以講番一句，都唔係幾好聽，不過可能係一個事實，係見到有人命傷亡，部門先至會去積極考慮、積極嘅回應，呢個我諗我哋係唔想見到嘅。頭先律師提到呢一個即係呢啲引述到議員提問嘅時候，佢就會講話--即係議員話好多時都拒絕咗區議員提出嘅訴求，呢個係事實。

喺區議會嘅文件裏面，我諗唔係淨係呢個議題，譬如話我哋喺大埔區我哋希望起一條行車天橋，一個廣福道嘅行車天橋，講咗十幾、二十年，因為嗰個問題唔會牽涉到一個人命損失，但係當當區嘅議員--大埔墟嘅議員講到話因為入去大埔墟或者入去錦山村係單一嘅路段，如果當地有交通意外，阻礙咗消防車、救護車進入嘅時候，如果又冇呢條橋，咁樣係咪會影響救援呢咁，因為冇呢件事發生，所以唔能夠催生到區議會多年嘅訴求。

我諗希望主席閣下或者法官閣下即係呢個要明白，區議會嘅運作可以咁講係非常之被動，尤其是部門係提出好多技術嘅阻礙，技術因素我哋係好難係去抗拒或者去質疑，呢個技術嘅因素包括好多數據，包括係好多即係千萬種唔能夠做到嘅理由，呢個係我哋議會覺得係好不滿，亦都係相當之無耐嘅一個情況。

我想講多一句，就係尤其是我哋議員提出嘅就係收集咗市民嘅意見，如果講交通嘅，講緊係無論係職業車司機、行人，以至到甚至係有時一啲意外發生咗之後，當然嗰啲意見係比較輕微嘅意外，但係我哋會睇到輕微嘅意外出現咗，係咪未來日子會有啲更嚴重嘅意外會出現呢？呢個我哋係睇到，所以陳笑權議員或者我哋在席我哋所有區議員點解會提出呢啲意見，都唔係空談，而係希望將一啲可能預測到嘅事故係早日去作出改善。當然點樣去作出改善，我哋冇一個能力或者冇一個技術去能夠去處理得到，但係如果做咗嗰啲措施係咪可以減輕或者減少呢啲意外出現呢？呢個當然係我哋想--即係區議會所做得到嘅工作，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，或者我哋可以講其他，即係真係有發生嘅一啲改善，我知道喺 4 月 9 號有一份嘅文件，由區議員喺呢一個 5 月 11 號傾過嘅，或者可以就係同佢哋講一講。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係，我可以跳去講運輸署嗰個嘅建議。喺呢個會議之後，喺3月9號即係18年嘅時候有另外一個會議，同樣亦都係有關於大埔公路嘅意外，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你可以攞番嗰個會議紀錄出嚟。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）中文就係801，英文就係815頁開始嘅，815-82就係個英文版。或者我講番呢一個會議紀錄嘅一啲重點，跟住先至講運輸署嘅建議，呢個會議喺2018年3月9號進行嘅，第4段張偉鋒先生，佢係代表運輸署嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）慢慢，慢慢，等代表可以睇到你究竟講緊乜嘢。其實你都會議紀錄係有呢一個嘅--有文件印咗出嚟嘅，如果冇嘅話，就可以睇個顯示屏嘅，你頭先講緊嘅就係第4段，係咪呀？

黃佩琪女士：Paragraph 4.（經傳譯員）張偉鋒先生，佢係代表運輸署嘅，佢提出四個建議嘅，喺呢一段，第(i)，就係會研究嗰個嘅速度限制會唔會修訂；第(ii)，就係加強交通標誌同埋道路標記，同埋進一步促進道路、安裝偵速攝錄機、睇番肇事附近嗰個嘅地形環境同埋點樣優化巴士站；呢個就係四項運輸署會全面檢視嘅事項嚟嘅，係咪呀？

黃碧嬌女士：係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我相信喺呢一次會議裏面有啲議員就係爭議呢一個--呢一啲改善項目嘅進度嘅，區議員就話減低車速限制，即係喺肇事嘅嗰段路段係咪真係可以喺較短嘅時間內將個車速限制調低，同埋係咪可以之後先至去將整段路段嗰個嘅車速限制全面檢視？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可唔可以講一講個例子呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）請大家睇下第11同埋12段，呢個就係任啟邦議員嘅意見，首先佢就表示對於運輸署報告失望，佢提及喺嗰段路段有好多急彎同埋斜路嘅，就係大埔公路赤泥坪至廣福道到翡翠花園嘅一段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係12段嘅羅馬數字(ii)，佢就話首先就係要安裝一個嘅偵速攝錄機，就叫佢哋而家係要即刻要裝，唔好等到之後，係咪咁嘅意思呀？劉博士。

黃碧嬌女士：劉博士回應。

劉志成先生：我係嗰個會議個主席，就安排咗第一項就即係話呢個交通意外，想了解下運輸署跟進一啲改善措施嘅情況，其實喺當日運輸署嘅官員代表係有提過頭先講嗰四樣嘢，但係佢嗰個表達係未曾確實會幾時落實，當日佢講嘅時候。站喺我哋區議員發生咁大件事，喺2月份發生咁大件事，去到3月份都冇一啲即係話我哋要求嘅要求，即係話我哋嘅要求就係減速、加相機，呢兩樣嘢係好基

本可以即係話儘快落實嘅嘢，運輸署嘅代表都冇--當時係仍然係話喺考慮中嘅話，我哋議員同事係表達不滿，呢個表示失望或者表示不滿係呢個前設就係話因為佢當其時--雖然佢講咗四樣嘢，但係佢冇講到話係落實嘅時間。我想表達呢個意見，喺度。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：任啟邦議員都喺度，佢可以直接表達一下。

任啟邦先生：係，我同意頭先劉志成博士嗰個演繹嘅，因為我唔係話不滿運輸署個建議，我係不滿佢個回覆係未有一個時間表，未有一個係確實係安裝快相機嘅日期，因為呢一個會就係3月9號開，直至到4月12號，即係剛才頭先都講過喺一個實地視察嘅時候先至有一個正式嘅一個匯報，就話畀我哋聽會加快相機、會改善巴士站嗰個位置同埋設施同埋會將嗰個限速調低，係直至到4月12號先有一個比較明確嘅答覆話會做出呢啲改善。當時即係如果佢運輸署用嗰個字眼，都係話「包括研究應否修訂速度限制」，「應否」即係唔知有冇，「與及係是否需要加強現有嘅交通標誌或者道路標記」，都係「應否」嘅啫，即係都係研究階段。但係我哋會覺得咁嚴重嘅意外之後其實係咪應該比較落實啲去答呢個答案呢，所以先導致到我或者當中其他議員好不滿嘅一個原因或者係好失望嘅一個原因就係咁解。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）劉博士，你都記錄低咗你嗰個嘅感受嘅，就喺呢一個嘅第31段，中文係811頁，英文係825-2，喺開呢個會嘅時候，你冇收到運輸署嘅建議書，你就投訴話係減低車速限制同埋安裝車速攝錄機唔難做嘅。

可以再睇番大埔區議會文件，日期係18年嘅4月9號，中文就係354頁，英文就係360-1，呢份文件寫咗幾個嘅措施，係佢哋向大埔區議會建議嘅措施嚟嘅，睇番，第一部分就係目的，第二部分就係檢視速度限制。建議就係話某啲路段車速限制就係會由時速70減低到時速50嘅，我哋睇番第4 (a)、(b)、(c)，即係4(I)、(II)、（III），（III）就係關於赤泥坪至雍宜路嘅一段路段，就話可唔可以將車速限制由時速70減到時速50嘅，呢個就係第4嘅(III)段。

我哋先睇一睇，跟住再畀個地圖你睇下，係4嘅小段(III)。如果我哋撐番大嚟睇，頭先我哋提及過嗰個嘅路段，即係建議車速限制減低，就由15去到31呢兩個數字之間嗰段嘅，即係呢個啡色嗰段路段，可唔可以確認一下就係運輸署嘅建議嗰個路段嚟嘅？

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係由運輸署建設嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋亦都提出咗其他嘅措施，包括道路標記、交通標誌，呢個係第8小段(1)，我哋睇番，首先係顯示到交通標誌，即係運輸署建議嘅，係頁數係運輸署嘅文件360頁，佢哋就建議增加兩個嘅標誌，另外就係其他嘅一啲警告標誌，即係譬如話慢速，而家有一個見到就係100米，跟住就話右邊

有彎；第二個交通標誌就係見到就係有個--又係黃色同埋呢一個嘅係紅色嘅標誌嘅；跟住就係其他嘅道路標記表示道路嘅車速限制係減低嘅。可唔可以講畀我哋聽呢個係咪同運輸署所傾過嘅建議呀？

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係運輸署提出嘅，我哋喺交通運輸委員會同佢哋傾過。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話文件就係9號，但係開會就係12號？

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）會議係...

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家講緊嗰個嘅係--真係去睇嗰個道路段，另外開會就係5月11號，係咪呢？

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就喺4月12號會議嘅時候有提出嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）有關於呢個建議其實係有一個草稿嘅，係今年嘅5月11號會議紀錄嘅議稿，係咪...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，我哋講一講，就係咪話即係之前嗰日，13號係咪已經就係批准咗㗎喇？

劉志成先生：喺琴日你--法官想知道喺琴日我哋開交通運輸委員會個會議有冇再傾呢一個proposal，係咪呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔係呀，呢個只不過係一個會議紀錄嘅草稿嚟嘅，係有冇批准--係咪已經核准咗嘅呢？

劉志成先生：That was approved. Yes.

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）冇改到？

主席：Without changes?

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）冇改到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋就可以嗰個嘅議稿。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）中文係840-9，英文就係一橫20，第5段。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一沓嘅文件呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係區議會文件2號，840-23頁英文版，中文係840-12頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋講番之前嗰一頁，睇下邊個出席，就係840-22

頁，就係主席係歡迎出席人士，包括係劉博士同埋係 Henry Hui，佢係運輸署嘅高級工程師，請睇番第 4 段，主席話運輸署早前向委員會提交文件，介紹大埔公路最新嘅交通管理措施，提及到一個係大埔區議會文件嘅號碼，就係之前我向你展示嘅文件，秘書處亦都係經電郵喺 4 月 10 號將呢個發畀委員會參閱；另外秘書處協助運輸署安排委員會嘅委員係大埔公路做現場視察，就係聯同呢一個地區委員會喺 4 月 12 號做嘅，運輸署亦都即場講解即將實施嘅交通管理措施，佢請運輸署報告各項措施嘅落實情況。

第 5 段就係運輸署嘅回應，係由許錦年先生回應嘅。佢就係講咗四方面嘅工程進展，首先，佢話大埔道介乎赤泥坪至雍宜路嘅車速限制已經由時速 70 減到 50 公里，係由 4 月 27 號開始。第(ii)，佢哋亦都就係安裝咗一啲係黃色螢光背景嘅安全標誌。同埋路牌，亦都就係擴闊喺呢一個意外中損毀嘅巴士站停車彎。（直接用英語說）The works were expected to be completed in this month, in July 2018. The fourth is optimise the bus stop near the Tai Po Mei. The work is supposed to be completed in August 2018.

第(v)，（經傳譯員）就係署方會改善紅林路、觀海崇庭同埋燕子里一帶嘅交通標誌同埋道路標記嘅，呢個工作會喺年底完成嘅。

你可唔可以確認呢個係運輸署嘅一個進度報告？

黃碧嬌女士：當局陳笑權議員回應下。

陳笑權先生：唔係，佢運輸署係咁講嘅，係，確認嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇一睇第 14 段，許先生亦都回應就係運輸署就致力喺年底完成呢個安裝偵速嘅攝錄機，但係至於個運作事宜就要交畀警方。運輸署就已經提供咗呢個進度報告，還是係一個持續嘅工作嚟嘅呢？

陳笑權先生：呢個應該唔係持續工作嚟嘅，呢個係單一個工程，佢裝咗嗰個攝錄機之後同埋而家還原番嗰個肇事嗰個巴士站，就會完㗎喇。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋再睇一睇許錦年先生嘅一啲觀察，...

主席：（經傳譯員）喺你繼續之前，我喺會--有冇聽到一個解釋，點解要等到年底先安裝到一部咁嘅偵速嘅攝錄機呢？一部攝錄機喎。

陳笑權先生：佢有解釋過畀我聽嘅，佢話訂貨就整體嘅，就唔會話訂一部嗰個攝錄機，仲有要經過機電署、路政署、運輸署、警方、到現場實地掘路、攞permit，好多複雜嘅問題，佢唔會單一做一個，我問過佢呢個問題，所以佢一定要年尾，我話點解唔快啲呢，我話，佢話已經批准咗，畀我哋區議會好多議員都質詢佢之後，最後佢都承諾咗話今年年尾就會加個快相機畀我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係有唔同嘅程序，先至係可以降低嗰個車速，係咪呀？佢哋

就响 4 月 27 號就已經完成咗呢個工作，係咪呢？

劉志成先生：因為個減速係比較簡單同埋佢係賣憲報，就唔牽涉到好多個部門，我諗減速嗰度係主要係運輸署佢哋即係話可以安排得到，又搵路政署，亦都係佢哋喺工程上嘅一個執行嘅部門，佢哋兩面係比較容易協調到嘅。

陳笑權先生：嗰個訂嗰個快相機個頭，安裝個頭，佢話冇單一嘅，佢話一訂，好似據我所知，我問過佢嚟嘅，我記憶之中，佢就話訂一批嘅，香港仲有好多地方需要加啲快相機頭，佢話而家訂緊嘅，係一批過，單一就暫時就冇嘅，同埋要經過好多程序，好多政府部門嘅程序，諮詢好多部門，又要放電--要搵機電署畀電嗰個快相機，先至可以做得到嘅，呢個佢當時，我同佢對答，就係咁覆我。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋係咪要理解，就係話全港有 4,200 公里嘅路，而運輸署係唔會有存貨嘅，即係有呢啲咁嘅攝錄機嘅存貨，係咪咁樣理解？或者你答唔到呢個問題喇。

黃碧嬌女士：或者我都講下，呢件事情 2 月 10 號發生咗之後，我哋喺特別會議，2 月 12 號有個特別會議，跟住就 3 月我哋有區議會嘅大會，就第二次會議，跟住就係第三次就係交通運輸委員會會議，跟住再去討論就係 4 月 12 號嘅 DMC 會議，跟住 5 月、7 月，我哋都係集中好強烈地要求儘快安裝呢一個嘅車速嘅攝錄機，但係到而家應該都仲係未曾能夠完成嘅。或者我哋啲議員可以發表下。

任啟邦先生：係，我同意法官閣下所講嘅，因為我哋都有個質疑，就話點解冇存貨呢個問題，或者咁大個運輸署嘅部門，點解會一啲後備嘅一啲零件--唔係，即係後備嘅一啲嘅裝置都冇呢？因為呢個政府話到要好快去回應呢個問題，其實頭先法官講話更改--唔係，頭先陳笑權議員講因為更改地面嗰個--即係更改個車速可能喺工程上可以就好快做得到，但係呢個運輸署曾經係用呢一個訂貨呢啲理由，我哋區議會嚟講，都認為係一個不合理嘅理由。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。黃小姐。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）黃女士，我就想你睇一睇第 19 段嘅，會議紀錄嘅 19 段，係 840-29，呢個係第 19 段嘅，我就想問係關於呢一段嘅一啲幾個問題，你第一樣嘢講到就話要下調個車速，車速下調咗之後，你就得到一啲校巴司機、巴士司機同埋意外康復者嘅一啲意見，我就想知道你收到啲咩嘢回應呢？

黃碧嬌女士：因為呢一件事，我哋都比較集中喺議會度討論，就係要求嗰個現階段嗰個 70 公里降至到 50 公里，就係我係收到係喺呢一段道路嘅校巴司機同我講，佢話由於有一個好--佢嗰個係斜路嚟嘅，斜路佢哋如果係要由一個咁高嘅地方，佢踩上到去最高，跟住要佢踩低收油落番嚟去到 50，佢話好難控制到呢一個嘅車速，就都希望我哋--佢哋好理解呢一單嘅意外係必須要有一啲嘅改善，但係如果純粹就係要減嗰個嘅速度，佢係驚影響--因為佢哋嗰部嘅校巴，佢載嘅客都超過四十個嘅，佢話咁大嗰個嘅車輛唔容易控制到去壓低過 50。所以我

都喺接收到不同嘅司機，我都喺番嗰個區議會度表達嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）而你第二個觀察，就係羅馬數字(iii)嗰度，你就提到有啲巴士司機--有啲雙層巴士司機就唔適合係行走大埔公路，因為佢哋係好容易係超過每小時公里嘅，就算係巴士裝唔滿人，都係好容易係加速嘅，你係咪知道有咁嘅情況，你係咪意思話雙層巴士係唔適宜行走呢個路段呢，還是你係有第二啲嘅意見呢？

黃碧嬌女士：呢一度就咁嘅，我就去探嗰啲嘅傷者，個傷者出咗院之後，其中有一個傷者佢就係揸巴士嘅，同埋揸貨--亦有揸巴士嘅傷者，亦都有揸貨車嘅傷者，佢哋喺呢段路裏面，自己都係其中一個受傷嘅乘客，佢都有同我講，佢話喺呢一段路係行雙層巴士係好危險嘅，因為一架雙層巴士佢咁大，佢嗰個嘅油門係--佢上斜路嘅時期，佢哋踏嗰個油門係會大力啲去踏落去加油嘅，一部車咁--雙層巴士，唔係一般嘅單層巴士，所以佢哋都同我提議番，佢話而家唔想再睇到喺呢一個公路上面係有雙層巴士，佢話其實係好危險，能唔能夠再係去畀番一啲嘅單層巴士行呢咁樣。我喺呢一次嘅會議上面，我係將佢哋嗰個意見表達出嚟。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺我哋繼續之前，我哋睇睇啲相片同埋個地圖，睇睇有咗改善之後個情況係點，個圖片就係 14 至 19 號嘅，呢個係第一個交通標誌，呢個係減速之後嘅新嘅時速限制 50 公里同埋地下有啲標誌嘅，剛才我哋見到就係巴士上斜同埋有少少落斜嗰部分嘅，呢個就係你較早前講嘅部分，啱唔啱？

黃碧嬌女士：係，係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）見到第一個警示嘅標誌，前面 100 米要減速，接住就有第二個標誌，有九個標誌，有呢個黃色框提醒啲駕駛者要小心嘅，係有九個箭嘴標示嘅。

主席：I think they are described as "chevrons", are they not? Nine chevrons.

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋見到巴士站重建，同埋行人區擴大嘅範圍，呢度個巴士站亦都加咗三盞燈嘅，我都想問大埔交通意外之前個燈光個照明個情況係點㗎？

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係街燈路段嘅照明係畀呢個嘅巴士站？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）因為而家見到有三盞新嘅燈安咗上去...

黃碧嬌女士：陳議員回應下。

陳笑權先生：基本上佢個照明就可以嘅，佢規定有 60 呎一支街燈嘅，之前就有棵樟樹喺度，個樹蔭就遮咗個巴士站上蓋嗰度，就較為黑啲嘅，而家加咗三支燈，基本上 okay，最危險就係架巴士站嗰個彎位，即係我哋成日講就係嗰個彎位，

就有少少暗斜嗰度，就係講嚟講去就係最危險嗰個路段，而家可以嘅，而家加咗三支燈，okay。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）有晒呢啲措施，議會對呢啲改善措施有冇反映話係足夠--係咪足夠，係咪滿足到你哋之前嗰啲擔憂，係咪能夠解決咗你哋之前嗰啲擔憂㗎？

陳笑權先生：基本上我本人我都有同運輸署相關部門都有傾過，佢而家將嗰個巴士站就拉前、擴闊，將嗰棵枯萎嗰棵樹都移咗，將個現場個巴士站係擴闊咗嘅，係事實。我要求佢做一個手按式紅綠燈嗰度，佢做唔到，不過就做咗一個行人輔助線，就喺大埔尾個入口嗰度將嗰個出口--個村嘅出口就想擴闊番少少，暫時都做唔到住，你話係咪百分之百應佢哋村民嘅要求呢，係未係嘅。亦都有村長提及將個巴士站可唔可以褪番前去嗰個位置就容易睇得到，運輸署即係佢哋睇嗰個現場嗰個實際情況，佢話暫時喺呢刻係做唔到住嘅，佢話本身個後面好大個斜坡，而家就改善咗之後，要睇日後嗰個實際用落先至知道嘅。唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：陳議員補充下。

陳灶良先生：法官，我想講其實滿足唔到，因為就住安全嗰方面去畀意見，我就覺得呢啲咁嘅標示同埋呢啲咁嘅箭嘴都可能都係畀一啲駕駛者去睇，用眼嚟到去睇呢個--即係去警示呢一個嘅車速等等，但係我哋好多同事都畀一個意見，就係尤其是喺呢啲咁嘅落斜路，其實最有效唔係用眼嚟到去睇，最有效就係喺地面用一啲減速嘅，即係好輕微減速嘅一啲黃間，即係我哋有陣時見到落斜都有啲「戤戤戤戤」，即係有個感覺，用呢個感覺嚟去呢個減速可以達致呢個安全呢個要求嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇去表達安裝呢個減速帶、呢啲條，畀人有個體感係感覺到係需要減速，係覺得係要減速，你有冇將呢個要求係表達畀運輸署呢？

陳灶良先生：我哋都有嘅，我哋所有區議會都有表達呢個，但係佢哋嘅回覆，因為香港運輸署佢係有一個局限嘅，個局限要設立呢啲咁嘅黃間減速只能夠喺一啲交匯處，即係落交匯處嘅斜路，例如西貢嗰單交通意外嗰個暗斜嗰度，佢而家加咗，但係唔係喺交匯處嘅前面，即係唔係落交匯處呢，佢哋係做唔到呢一個嘅。

黃碧嬌女士：我哋喺現場，我自己都有睇嘅，因為佢去到另外一張圖，我哋有九個嗰個--係呀，呢個牌，其實呢度已經係最高點㗎喇，佢哋即係揸巴士嗰啲司機就話如果揸住一架雙層巴士，載滿客，佢係要有一個踩油門大力加油先至可以去到，跟住佢呢度就衝落去嘅，呢個就係斜路，有一個急彎，呢一個彎就係會--我哋自己都覺得係危險，能唔能夠喺呢一個路面，就正如陳灶良議員講嘅，就畫一啲黃色嘅斜線，喺現場有提到嘅，但係佢哋都表達咗就係唔容易，嗰個原因就陳灶良議員都有講嚟嘅。

同埋我哋都有講過將呢一個亭再移上去上面呀咁，亦都佢哋都表示咗係做

唔到，因為你呢個亭喺度，就係前面就係大埔尾嗰個村民嗰個嘅路口嚟嘅，佢哋就係要由嗰度去過馬路去入到去嗰個巴士站，嗰個巴士站其實凹咗落去，喺最斜路嘅呢一個位裏面過馬路，你話係咪好危險呢？係呀，仲要架巴士扭入去，你喺最高處要減速，減速之餘，你架巴士係扭埋入去落客。即係我哋要諗下呢一個司機嗰個嘅駕駛嘅技術能唔能夠做到呢樣嘢，所以即係意外我哋就希望唔好再有第二次㗎喇。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒陳女士嘅。我而家要畀最後一份文件你睇嘅，係 2018 嘅 5 月 25 號嘅會議紀錄嘅，中文就係响 826 頁，英文係 827 頁嘅，你係有個附件，英文版就係 834，中文版係 828，喺呢個會議紀錄，你係作出一啲建議嘅，同埋發表咗一啲意見嘅，我想同你探討下嘅，第一個就係會議紀錄第 4 段，係提到運輸署目前對司機嘅工作時數，就話車長更次就唔應該超過十四小時嘅，就覺得就最長嘅工時，喺呢個指引嘅工時太長，係對乘客係有啲安全嘅擔憂嘅，就希望委員會係可以檢討呢個車長嘅工作時間嘅過長嘅；亦都講到喺 835 段，英文，同埋中文 830，就不管工作點安排都好，個工作時數係太長，個車長要佢做十四個鐘，每日十四個鐘係太長嘅。我個問題就係你可唔可以解釋下點解你會覺得十四個鐘係太長呢？

黃碧嬌女士：我哋一日係有二十四小時，二十四小時嗰個嘅分配就應該係用三分去分嘅，八個鐘頭就係工作，八個鐘頭就係休息，另外八個鐘頭就係畀自己係做一啲係家庭或者係自己嘅學習咁樣樣先至係合理嘅，而家九巴就將一日嘅廿四小時，佢係將二分一嘅一半仲要多嚟成為十四個小時畀一個員工去返工，佢承擔嘅工作係一個司機嚟㗎喎，你十四個鐘頭唔係坐喺度可以你鍾意就瞇埋隻眼或者係「我好攰喇，咁樣攤一攤條腰。」完全係冇，絕對我諗如果十四個鐘頭喺做呢一個咁重要嘅崗位，承擔住整架巴士超過一百三十個人嘅生命嘅安全，我諗絕對係不適合。呢個我都可以請我哋其他議員同事都去表達一下嘅，任啟邦議員。

任啟邦先生：係，唔該晒黃碧嬌副主任。我就住工時嗰個問題，我哋都要表達番一個意見，因為日常喺--尤其是新界區，我希望各位都了解，就係新界區嗰個市民出行模式就係朝頭早就好多人喺新界出九龍或者出港島，黃昏放工時間就喺港島、九龍就返入新界，呢個運輸模式就其實喺--我相信喺--即係嗰個比例，可能十架車出九龍，即係十架車裝滿人出九龍，都未必有一架車或者兩架車裝滿人返番入大埔；所以變咗嗰個運輸模式就運--即係其實之前嘅委員會嘅一啲嘅其他，譬如巴士公司嘅作供都講到，就話其實都有一啲繁忙時間嘅需要，而家正正就係出現一啲特別更嘅情況，就係朝頭早可能做四個鐘、五個鐘，跟住黃昏時間可能做三個鐘、四個鐘，但係中間有一段係所謂叫做唔需要，即係十四個鐘頭未必係十四個鐘頭全部係揸緊車嘅，但係佢一啲所謂叫做 on duty 或者叫做待命，即係叫做所謂嘅休息時間，其實係咪畀到佢哋休息呢？

當我哋有時接觸到啲巴士司機就會講佢可能係住屯門，可能住元朗嗰面，佢分派到嚟大埔區揸啲特別路線，好喇，佢 10 點鐘，佢完咗上晝嗰個繁忙時

間，佢可能有三、四個鐘頭佢係可以休息嘅，但係嗰個休息佢返唔返到佢屋企瞓覺呢？佢如果由大埔返屋企瞓覺，可能佢要花兩個鐘頭、兩個幾鐘頭一個搭車時間，好喇，跟住之後又要返番嚟大埔度攞車，就再做埋下半場嗰個嘅工作，所謂駕駛嘅工作，而導致到佢哋其實中間有幾個鐘頭所謂空閒時間，其實係咪真係畀到佢休息呢？呢個我哋都會覺得係有個問題。

而巴士公司，我哋又唔係好清楚，不過我聽番啲司機講，就係佢中間嗰橛嘅時間其實係未必有一個好好嘅休息環境，我要講一講，其實黃碧嬌主席帶領我哋喺早前去到中國大陸就去參觀考察，其中去到杭州嘅一個巴士公司嗰度講，就係其實佢都有一啲休息室或者一個--直情一個--類似一個宿舍咁樣樣嘅性質，係畀到巴士司機係作一啲休息。

我諗甚至我可以講大啲，全世界返工、放工時間都係朝九晚五、晚六，peak hour，即係嗰個高峰時間亦都喺嗰個時段，中間嘅時間我相信係比較少人去搭車，呢個亦都可能係事實，好喇，其實佢哋都有類似啲所謂特別更嘅模式，但係中間嗰啲職員佢係咪返到屋企瞓覺，係咪返到屋企休息呢？呢個我哋覺得係未必，但係巴士公司有冇一個責任去畀一啲特別更嘅員工有一個好嘅休息嘅時間，佢朝頭早五點幾揸緊部車，要佢可能揸到夜晚十點--八、九點嘅時候，佢係咪有足夠嘅精神呢？中間冇一個好嘅環境休息，呢個我哋覺得係一個問題。所以巴士公司係咪應該有個責任喺所謂呢啲特別更嘅員工休息嘅地方或者時間係畀到一個好啲嘅環境佢哋呢？

法官閣下，我哋或者幾位委員會嘅成員，我希望大家明白，特別更對新界區，我可以咁講，尤其係新界區嘅巴士路線係特別嘅重要，因為好明顯過咗九點零、十點鐘之後出九龍、出港島嘅乘客係明顯減少咗好多嘅，而放工返嚟，就亦都係可能係四、五點個高峰期開始，之前嘅時間其實係比較少人嘅，如果一刀切將特別更嘅巴士司機即係切除咗，即係叫做冇咗呢個特別更分嘅話，其實亦都會幾影響新界區嘅巴士服務嘅，除非佢係大幅度即係請多一倍人，早上有一班司機，下午黃昏又另一班司機，呢個其實如果佢唔係咁樣做得到嘅話，佢就將特別更嘅服務就減少嘅話，其實對於新界區，唔淨只大埔，係新界區嘅好多路線都係可能會因此而受到影響，希望委員會係明白新界區居民出行嘅模式同埋巴士服務嘅需要嘅情況。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想問關於你哋會議紀錄裏面提到四個建議...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者喺你繼續之前。關於話嗰個指引，即係巴士車長工作休息用膳嘅時間指引，喺2017年9月嘅時候運輸署就檢討過當時嗰個指引，即係講緊2010年嗰個版本，當時你作為區議會，有冇諮詢你哋嘅意見，就係話佢哋建議點樣修改個指引呢？

黃碧嬌女士：冇諮詢過我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）跟住我想問關於會議紀錄裏面提到嘅四項建議，第一，836頁，第二點，即係英文版本，然後830頁就係中文版本，都係第二點，由下數番上去。你提到星加坡作為一個例子，就話當地政府佢哋負責一啲硬件嘅資產，例如話巴士車廠、車輛、運作系統等等，營運方面就由營運商負責，所以營運商只需要負責營運嗰部分，佢哋仲可以額外得到獎金，點解你認為星加坡個模式喺香港係合適呢？

黃碧嬌女士：呢個請任啟邦議員回應一下。

任啟邦先生：好，唔該黃碧嬌副主席。就呢個題目其實--呢個意見係我提出嘅，其實我亦都參考過一啲市面上一啲嘅研究，就住究竟巴士嘅服務係應該點樣樣去經營呢咁樣，究竟係全私營，全私營即係好似現在嘅模式吖，定係話我國營，由政府去擁有，包括係聘請員工，變成咗公務員呢？定係話公、私營模式，即係話好似而家講緊星加坡或者倫敦嘅模式，即係話政府就係購買咗佢哋嘅車廠、車輛咁樣樣，跟住就去再外判一啲路線畀一啲承辦商呢咁？

點解會咁樣講呢？因為我哋會覺得而家專營巴士嘅服務係分咗四間--如果計埋龍運，五間公司，其實係各有一啲路線，即係俗啲講，就係一個各有地盤，九巴係九龍、新界，新巴、城巴就係港島區，大嶼山巴士公司諸如此類。其實佢哋一個咁大嘅組合，其實佢好明顯就會著重咗一啲賺錢嘅路線，而一啲蝕錢嘅路線，佢因為其實專營，佢對於市民嘅服務可能係會有個忽略，陣間陳灶良議員可以講一講呢一方面嘅情況。

我哋都睇到就話如果佢能夠將佢拆散成為更多公司嘅話，喺一啲互相競爭嘅情況之下，有冇機會係可以做到啲改善呢？譬如星加坡嘅模式就係話佢外判咗畀幾間巴士公司去做營運，令到嗰個譬如話路線、票價或者員工嘅薪酬佢都可以由政府係去做一個編制，就未必係完全純粹用盈利個考慮，而係講緊有冇需要同埋工資係咪一個合理或者係一個能夠滿足到個工人嘅一個水平。

第二，就係話其實我哋睇番另一個地方，台北，其實佢台北就係好多唔同嘅公司係去營運緊唔同嘅巴士路線，台北嘅巴士路線就係可能會有啲好接近嘅路線係由唔同嘅公司去做嘅，其實互相係作出一個競爭，競爭會帶嚟兩個情況，第一，就係工資可以係更加係--因為搶員工，可能會有個上升，令到佢個工資嘅回報係會好啲，第二個路線如果係一個相近嘅路線嘅話，佢係可以帶來一啲競爭，帶來一啲優惠，乘客可以得益。

第三，其實我哋會建議就係點解會由政府去買起晒成個巴士公司嘅系統，去再交畀去其他公司--即係再外判一啲公司去營運呢？就話可以將一啲路線做一啲整合，譬如話賺錢嘅一啲路線，再搭一啲冇咁賺錢，但係有居民--可能少數嘅居民需要，而家就係少數居民嘅需要或者佢嘅服務係被忽略，當某啲地區佢成日爭取希望加多啲車嘅時候就加唔到，但係就有啲地方可能係覺得--即係佢政府--巴士公司認為有錢賺，佢就係咁去做。

所以點解我哋覺得所謂呢個星加坡模式係比較彈性，因為如果全私營嘅模式

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

嘅話，巴士公司就好明顯就第一，就以盈利掛帥；第二，就係話佢可以剝--我唔用「剝削」，即係可能會可以減低嘅開支係邊度呢？油價佢減低唔到，嗰個購買車嘅成本其實都可以咁講係世界嘅一個標準，其實都冇得點樣減，減就可能係減，或者唔能夠加到員工嘅人工，呢個就係喺度就向佢哋開刀，所以點解先至會有一啲員工或者工會就話巴士司機嘅薪酬、待遇係一直係被壓低個情況。可能陳灶良議員都講，即係點解會出現咗點解--即係其中有啲人講到話模式上面嘅改變可以帶動到一啲服務嘅改變。唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：陳灶良議員。

陳灶良先生：或者我補充兩個事實，一個事實就係正話講嗰個--當然佢建議嘅模式喺個好處方面都係有嘅，講兩個事實，就一個，一個就係冇人搭，即係蝕本嘅，蝕本嘅路線，佢梗係唔係幾想做喇；好喇，講一個多車有人搭嘅，譬如好似林村咁，得一條巴士線嘅啫，好多人搭嘅，但係佢都只能夠用番現有嗰條路線嘅資源去調動嗰啲班次嚟到去滿足我哋，變咗呢兩個係事實嘅情況都要大家分享下。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。第二個建議，你就話用實時技術--即係實時資料嘅技術，你話要求實時訊息可以發放，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個建議喺邊度搵到呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）英文版 838 頁，中文就係 831 頁，喺底下嗰度，即係中文版底下嗰部，838 就係英文，第二點，就提到有啲議員提到因為香港嘅巴士脫班情況嚴重，如果巴士公司可以提供呢個資訊嘅話，政府就能夠更好咁監控嗰個脫班嘅問題，可能呢個就係原因點解實時嘅資料冇全面發放，佢認為如果由乘客嚟監察就可以改善嗰個脫班嘅情況，所以佢希望委員會會考慮要求巴士公司發放類似嘅應用程式，利用呢個技術去監察巴士服務，你可唔可以再解釋一下乘客點樣可以利用呢個技術嚟去監察脫班率呢？即係如果我理解正確嘅話。

任啟邦先生：呢個都我去講一講嘅，呢個建議或者呢個資料都係我去喺網上面去搵到或者我哋自己一啲經驗去睇到嘅，喺嗰個會議上面去表達番，我引用呢個台北市公車動態資訊系統作一個例子，就係佢係喺個手機嘅應用程式裏面係實際上睇到嗰架巴士喺個地圖上面顯示緊佢係行到邊個位置，即係譬如話行到邊一個街口、邊一個站頭，我哋睇到嘅。而家九巴嗰個手機應用程式，佢只係 show 到--即係佢顯示到係仲有三分鐘就嚟到，仲有五分鐘就嚟到，但係而家呢個資料其實係睇唔到佢仲有幾遠嘅途程。

呢個資料點解會我哋要知道比較清楚呢？就係話如果佢仲有三分鐘，但係其實原來係好塞車嘅話，其實嗰三分鐘係唔等於三分鐘之後到達，因為嗰個巴士嗰個手機應用程式只係睇到三分鐘嘅路程，但係如果三分鐘嘅路程係全部塞死咗車嘅話，其實可能係十五分鐘都嚟唔到，但係如果我哋能夠喺嗰個 app--如果好似台北嗰個系統嘅話，市民係能夠睇到嗰架巴士原來就塞咗喺兩個路口之

前，但係佢係--嗰個系統亦都睇到埋當時嘅實時嘅交通狀況，好似大家而家睇Google Map咁樣，都會睇到實時嘅交通狀況究竟係擠塞定係暢通呢咁。

如果睇到其實條路係暢通，但係三分鐘嚟唔到係咪有咩問題呢？或者亦都可以監察到巴士嗰個服務，就話其實我哋下一班車係應該要有嚟到，點解隔咗咁耐都嚟唔到，究竟係咩問題呢？究竟係道路嘅路面嘅擠塞、交通意外所導致吖，定係巴士公司脫班嘅情況出現呢？而家嗰個九巴嗰個apps，即係嗰個手機應用程式係睇唔到嘅，亦都資訊係比較有限。

如果可以引用到譬如其他國家地區嘅一啲實時嘅一啲嘅顯示嘅模式嘅話，我哋好清楚睇到有一架巴士喺兩個街口，約莫三分鐘後嚟到，佢係好暢通嘅；約莫有一架巴士五分鐘之後可能嚟到，不過原來係塞死咗喺條路上面嘅。我哋市民無論作為監察又好，作為旅客，我唔等，我搭地鐵，我都可以有個選擇。而家就睇唔得好清楚呢方面嘅資料。

陳灶良先生：或者我補充呢一個脫班一個嘅事實嘅例子，亦都好似林村咁樣樣，佢咁多年嚟，即係講緊超過二十年嚟，個脫班解決唔到，個原因就係點解呢？大家都知道，喺由元朗經錦上路嚟到林村，嚟到大埔，佢喺錦上路太多巴士站，停下又等下，停下等下，分分鐘嚟到林村兩架、三架，咁多年都解決唔到。好喇，出現一個問題係咩嘢呢？而家佢九巴嗰個應用程式佢可能show十分鐘、十五分鐘，其實佢完全係唔準嘅，個例子就係咩嘢呢？到而家為止，都好多人投訴佢嗰個應用程序係已經完全係唔準時到達，第一樣嘢。

點解會之前有一個--即係正話律師講嗰個證供呢？點解好似余智榮議員咁講呢？運輸署偏幫九巴個情況就係咁樣樣，點解呢？我哋係作為一個橋樑同運輸署講，佢咁多年都解決唔到呢個問題，惟有用一啲維護或者去幫佢--即係我哋感覺上佢係幫佢講嘢，咁覺得即係幫緊佢，即係個意思咁樣。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你提過第三嘅建議，就係呢個839頁，第四點，中文就833頁第二點嚟嘅，你就建議一個懲罰機制畀巴士公司，類似港鐵嘅懲罰機制，即係話如果發生意外就要交罰款。我想進一步講下，點解你認為喺專營巴士嘅經營環境，呢樣嘢係適合呀？

黃碧嬌女士：其實呢一度就幾個成員提嘅，任啟邦議員都可以繼續嘅。

任啟邦先生：係，唔該主席。我哋多位嘅成員其實都覺得巴士公司呢一個是否去續牌又或者係嗰個懲處嘅時候有冇一個機制去處理呢咁，而家我哋睇到港鐵如果佢係因為一啲事故而導致到延誤嘅話，佢係要罰款，但係巴士公司如果出現咗脫班或者出現咗一啲服務欠缺理想嘅情況嘅話，其實佢好似就冇一個罰則，我哋亦都睇唔到或者冇一個好清晰嘅公眾知道嘅情況就係究竟政府點樣或者點解會繼續續一啲專營權畀巴士公司。即係譬如九巴咁，幾年前，應該三幾年前，即係呢個續到佢個專營嘅時候，其實冇拎過嚟區議會討論嘅。

一個專營嘅巴士服務，對於--如果用九巴嚟計，整個九龍同新界區嘅服

務，咁多個區議會，咁多個區議員，咁多個市民，其實係咪應該有一個發聲嘅機會呢？但係我所了解，就肯定喺區議會上面係冇被諮詢過九巴應唔應該去續呢個專營權，呢一個情況其實就似乎巴士公司咪唔需要理議員嘅一個意見囉。如果佢唔需要理議員嘅意見嘅話，我哋就當然我哋其實喺議會裏面講嘅嘢，正如頭先幾個議員都講，我哋係有提出一啲唔同嘅意見，要求佢改善服務、增加班次、增加路線，但係似乎都唔能夠得到巴士公司好積極嘅回應，個問題就係我哋係咪佢嘅老闆，我哋係咪佢嘅一個能夠有操一個生殺大權嘅一個持份者呢？似乎區議會就唔係。

但係而政府作為運輸署，作為一個行政部門，有冇有效監察到、監督到巴士公司有冇脫班、服務嘅質素係點呢？似乎我哋又覺得運輸署亦都有啲不力。即係好似頭先陳灶良議員所講，64 號 K，元朗去到大埔，經過林村一個唯一嘅巴士服務，講咗好耐嘅問題都似乎解決唔到，又或者我哋議員希望由譬如大埔區去某一啲地方、去港島區嘅巴士服務，似乎都唔能夠增加得到。個原因我哋就睇到其實佢都冇一個監察嘅機制。

我哋希望引入呢啲所謂罰則嘅話，除咗係希望改善服務之餘，就係希望減少譬如脫班又或者譬如話一啲事故咁樣樣，令到巴士公司--我哋阻唔到佢繼續去搵錢，阻唔到佢繼續去攞呢個專營權，但係都希望製造一啲條件，等佢做好啲。因為而家佢做得好定唔好，其實即係佢自己睇住盤數，但係對於我哋市民嚟講，或者對於我哋議會嚟講，似乎冇乜嘢可以監督嘅板斧嘅話，我哋覺得引入呢啲懲罰嘅機制，我諗我哋議會裏面即使未必有就住呢個題目嘅發言，但係我相信議會裏面議員都有一個咁嘅希望，就係佢做得唔好，我哋咪罰佢囉，我哋咪要佢承擔番做得唔好嘅後果，呢個就係我哋嘅意見。唔該。

黃碧嬌女士：我都想喺度講幾句嘅，主席。其實我哋去到睇而家香港嗰個嘅巴士嗰個專營權，而佢就係攞咗個專營權之後，政府就係搵運輸署去監管，同埋就係同佢哋開會去制訂不同嘅路線嘅，而我自己覺得運輸署喺呢一面真係放嗰個嘅人力係太薄弱，好似我哋大埔咁樣，我哋係超過一百條嘅巴士路線，同我哋開會嘅就係運輸署一個同事，佢就係睇晒大埔區㗎喇，但係你諗下，超過一百條嘅路線，牽涉到嘅肯定係好多嘅巴士，亦都好多嘅巴士嘅司機，而當中亦都好多嘅乘客，我哋都唔敢喺個區議會嘅會議上面提得咁多，但係呢個事實上係一個民生上面係一個好重大嘅問題嚟嘅，我哋一落街就係要--返工你就係要搭巴士，買餸你又要搭巴士，去醫院亦都要坐巴士。

而特別去機場嘅巴士，我覺得就係喺呢度嗰個專營權--不過而家大埔就多咗一架叫做 A47X，我用呢個舉例，而佢嗰個嘅脫班，你冇一個--而家嗰個嘅--佢睇唔到，即係佢運輸署高層亦都睇唔到，佢嗰個專營權龍運直情唔知道呢一個巴士司機係病咗，而嗰架巴士就喺嗰個嘅站頭冇人開，好喇，我哋嘅尾站嘅乘客等三架車都冇，但係係要去機場嘅。喺呢啲嘅監管裏面都唔能夠係好順暢。而呢一啲嘅時間--我講緊呢啲時間係上晝 6 點至 7 點嘅，我哋去到現場打一個電話，你都搵唔到嘅，但係係去機場。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

我哋區議會去杭州做咗一個嘅視察，我哋係好讚賞杭州佢哋嗰個嘅公交嗰個嘅監管，可以喺一個控制中心裏面好多部電腦，而一條線，你打一條線嗰個嘅秣巴係我哋睇到二十部嘅電腦係可以睇到成條路線嘅巴士站，呢個站裏面有冇人等客，而個客嘅程度係去到邊度。如果係好多客嘅，佢哋即刻係調動特別嘅巴士去解決呢啲乘客嘅問題，但係香港喺呢一方面冇進步過。係喇，我就係咁講，即係要表達呢個意見。唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢個就係講嘅第四個建議，就係呢一個尾數上第二點，839 頁，就話區議會作為巴士路線規劃同埋服務嘅持份者，同巴士公司嘅合作非常之密切，所以建議係呢一個續牌嘅過程引入評分制度，等區議會可以就於巴士公司嘅表現評分同埋提供意見。我相信呢個就係第四個建議。

黃碧嬌女士：呢度都請任啟邦表達一下。

任啟邦先生：係，唔該。就正如頭先我所講嘅發言裏面講，即係話喺個續牌或者係延續個專營權當中，其實區議會似乎冇乜一個決定，咁嘅話，其實我哋希望未來嘅日子能夠增加區議會作為呢個專營權是否續牌畀邊間巴士公司係可以有一個即係參與，係一個持份者。

極其量，即係你而家可能所謂續牌，可能嚟一嚟區議會，咁就過一過諮詢，但係如果譬如話就住我哋議會能夠係畀到一個意見，或者如果嗰個意見係覺得某個巴士公司做得非常之差，係咪可以係影響到政府續唔續牌畀呢啲巴士公司呢咁。又或者譬如頭先大律師講到，喺呢一段嗰度，喺個規劃上面，正如呢一個聽證會講呢個大埔公路嘅意外，其實議員喺好早時間亦都提咗好多嘅意見，不過我所講嘅就係區議會其實某程度上係主動，但係喺一啲事實上面亦都係被動。

被動嘅就在於我哋提出咗唔同嘅意見，如果大家搜集資料嘅時候可以睇到，尤其是譬如話巴士服務嘅話，我哋大埔區有個叫做巴士服務工作小組，小組裏面係有好多唔同嘅意見，但係巴士公司或者運輸署回應咗有幾多呢？如果我哋區議會能夠係喺呢一個續牌嘅時候能夠去評分，能夠去有一個意見嘅表達，而呢個意見表達真係可以令到政府係決定畀唔畀牌巴士公司嘅話，我相信巴士公司係必須要聆聽同埋履行區議會議員所提出嘅意見。

我諗希望委員會知道就係區議員嘅意見就唔係天方--唔係，應該咁講，即係唔係空談出嚟嘅，其實我哋係收集咗民意，即係點解要搞代議政制呢？就係市民選議員出嚟，議員喺議會反映意見，但係當議員喺議會反映意見嘅時候又得唔到行政部門即係運輸署與及營運者嘅同意嘅話，其實我哋覺得都係好無奈，呢個無奈亦都係一個憤怒，但係我哋仍然要同佢繼續合作，所以我哋會覺得如果喺續牌嘅時候能夠加入區議會作為一個評分，又或者係令到巴士--咁係必定會令到巴士公司係會重視同埋聽取我哋嘅意見。

所以呢個我係覺得未來可能委員會要檢討呢個專營權嗰個--或者整體專營巴士服務嘅時候，呢一個意見我希望能夠納入在內。唔該主席。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。唔該晒各位，我已經完成提問，唔該。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席，我就想跟進一下黃女士之前講過嘅意見，就話你聽過一啲嘅意見，大埔公路未必適合使用雙層巴士，你會唔會同意咁樣嘅講法呀？

黃碧嬌女士：我聽嘅意見就係其中一個傷者，係喇，其中一個傷者佢就係巴士司機嚟嘅，佢而家已經係--即係同佢傾偈，佢自己就--佢話呢一條路係我哋大埔未有吐露港公路，先有大埔公路嘅，點解會叫 872 呢呢架巴士？就因為大埔公路有條 72 嘅巴士線行嘅，後期有咗馬場，有咗馬場，咁咪要將大埔嘅居民，我哋啲想去馬場嘅，咪車佢哋過去，所以就行呢一條路，就係行 872，但係都係用單層嘅。

後期--應該咁講，就係九巴慢慢將佢嘅「熱狗」巴士--其實佢嘅單層多數都係「熱狗」嚟嘅，佢嘅「熱狗」都冇晒喇，佢就要變雙層巴士，喺呢一個嘅階段，佢哋購入嘅巴士其實就無形中成為咗 872 嘅其中一部。但係我就問番，其實我哋只係需要將我哋大埔嘅居民去馬場啫，我哋咪有條--跟住咪有條吐露港公路囉，如果你話要服務呢一段嘅居民嘅，我哋就冇辦法講，如果你諗住點到點嘅，就好簡單，就係行下面，所以就多咗個 872X。

而家又有 872X，其實仲有 872，係咪有需要繼續呢架 872 用雙層巴士？我講緊呢架 872 呢一度，係咪有咁多客？每次都超過一百個客？如果超過一百個客，你可以用三架單層巴士㗎，你加密班次都得㗎。係，唔該。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係假設要有巴士司機去搵巴士先得㗎。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）黃女士，我想澄清一下，你就講過車速限制就由時速 70 減到 50 嘅，有啲嘅旅遊車司機就顯示佢哋係關注嘅，係關注啲乜嘢？關注啲乜嘢呀？係咪冇減車速限制訂係乜嘢呢？

黃碧嬌女士：佢就係同我講，正話去到最高嗰個地方，佢話佢哋而家點解係要踩 70 時速呢？就係呢架巴士載滿晒客嘅時期，佢一踩落去，佢話控制喺 50 嗰度係唔得嘅，佢問我「如果你有 60 就最好。」我話冇 60，但係喺呢一單意外裏面，我哋面對住呢一條嘅公路，我哋必須係以安全，就冇辦法，我哋一定只會喺區議會裏面我哋多番討論，都係要調低去 50，佢應該講係對呢一個我哋呢個討論係有一個嘅意見畀番我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）委員會就想多謝黃女士同埋各位人士協助我哋，委員會係有興趣收到區議會嘅意見，所以就邀請你同埋其他兩位嘅議員嚟到，我哋嘅職責就係要就於改善巴士安全，提出建議，就唔係其他嘅議題嘅，所以就係喺呢一方面，我哋邀請你哋嚟講關於唔同路段你哋嘅關注，就係就於車速限制同埋需要安裝呢一個嘅車速攝錄機，我哋而家會休息二十分鐘嘅。劉博士。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）會唔會有機會畀我哋去講其他有關巴士嘅議題呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果同安全有關，就可以。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）應該係關於安全嘅。係休息之後定係點呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋已經係進行咗超過兩個半小時，你預計會用多幾多時間？因為我哋已經係畀機會你哋係畀書面意見。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）係講番一啲我收到嘅意見，有關於巴士司機嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，可以。

劉志成先生：（經傳譯員）我會用廣東話講嘅。（直接用本地話說）法官大人，今次大埔尾嗰個車禍係好不幸嘅，就其實就喺呢一個車禍，關鍵嗰--即係都畀人感覺就係個司機嘅不小心駕駛。而作為司機，喺專營巴士嚟講，個司機嗰個責任係好重，因為正如頭先我哋啲同事講，有百幾個乘客喺架車上面嘅時候，佢嗰個駕駛態度同埋嗰個專業嘅知識係好緊要。

我有啲車長朋友知道我嚟呢個委員會，都向我表達咗一啲意見，就係話其實就佢哋覺得即係話呢個其實係成個專營巴士嗰個管理同埋佢嗰個調配人員，即係嗰啲車長調配人員同埋嗰個方面嘅經驗不足可能有關嘅。就其實喺兩、三方面，佢哋表達到個意見就係第一，就係如果調配啲人員去行啲唔熟悉嘅路線，佢畀佢哋一啲比較大嘅壓力，就希望喺嗰個調配新路線之前有一個熟習嘅機會。呢個其實係純粹係巴士公司內部嗰個佢哋對員工嘅培訓，咁嘅時候，如果係能夠即係話保障到佢係即係話正式揸架車，有咁多乘客喺上面嘅時候，佢要去熟習嗰條路線。

另外一方面，就係話揸嗰架車亦都係--如果調配一啲新嘅車可能亦都係需要去熟習嗰架車嘅性能。呢兩方面佢哋係表達即係話都希望能夠喺呢個檢討嚟到去即係話都關注一下呢方面。

第三樣就係呢個喺嗰個行車時間表，佢哋有預設一啲時間可能佢哋有陣時話行車時間不足夠，如果係唔足夠，嗰啲車長就可能會加快嚟到去追番個即係話所失去嘅時間。而喺呢個過程容易即係話因為你要加快，所以可能會係引致一啲嘅比較--可能會係有啲危險嘅情況會出現都唔定。

喺呢三方面，我簡單咁樣喺呢個委員會嗰度表達，代表佢哋，希望委員會係聽到呢一方面嘅意見，可能你哋亦都會去問番有關嘅團體--嘅車長團體嚟到去讓佢哋都表達下意見嘅。好，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）就頭先你最後嗰段，劉博士，呢個係一個一般嘅投訴，我哋係聽過行車時間係短，我哋要有個證據顯示個行車時間係長定短，如果你個車長係能夠畀到啲具體嘅例子我哋，譬如話由甲去乙點係定咗一小時嘅行車時間，但係如果事實上經常係要多過一小時，呢個就係我哋委員會需要嘅訊息。

劉志成先生：法官大人，就住呢一樣，喺我個選區，75 號 K，喺我做議員--接手做嗰區嘅議員，係有調整過嗰個巴士行車時間嘅，佢哋當其時就話個時間表大約係應該係三十五分鐘，由大尾督到大埔，佢哋覺得呢個時間係太短，擸屘所以就調整去到大約接近好似係四十五至五十分鐘嘅。咁讓司機即係話喺個駕駛過程，即係佢哋就唔會話覺得你 set 呢個時間係真係--根本對佢哋嚟講，揸車、作為一個司機，係一個好大嘅壓力。呢個係如果你問番九巴講嗰個時間表，呢個係一個事實嚟嘅，係有將呢一方面調整嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，咁而家係有問題嗰啲路線，要有人喺呢方面作供，我哋就可以跟進喇。

劉志成先生： Do you mean I need to provide this evidence?

主席：（經傳譯員）有人係需要作供嘅，而家係得一個口頭嘅聲稱，就話啲行車時太短，司機因此就會加速，擔心唔夠足夠嘅休息時間，我哋需要就係證據，唔可以就咁一般性咁描述。

黃碧嬌女士：任啟邦議員。

任啟邦先生：法官閣下，我補充一下。頭先你所講嗰個，即係要求一個實證，其實可以你哋翻查番巴士公司喺過去嘅嗰個平均行車時速，即係咩嘢意思呢？即係話我記得有個數據，不過我唔係好記得喺邊度搵得到出嚟。過去十多年嗰個巴士嘅平均行車時速係每況愈下，即係越行越慢。究竟呢個行車時速越來越慢，亦都同時間有冇擺番足夠嘅巴士司機落去個時間表裏面，即係維持番足夠嘅班次喺裏面呢？因為呢個巴士嗰個行車時速越嚟越慢呢個情況係會令到嗰個行車時間長咗，如果維持現在嘅班次嘅話，佢必定係要加人手、加車，呢個係一個直接嘅一個正比例嚟嘅。

我哋作為議員，我哋梗係覺得你必定要維持番現有班次，唔能夠脫班，但係同時間條路係塞咗嘅，多咗車嘅，運輸署喺呢一方面有冇同巴士公司作出一啲協作，令到佢加番足夠嘅人手，加番足夠車嘅資源呢？呢個我覺得係值得去研究嘅地方。有呢個數據，不過我唔係好肯定喺邊度搵出嚟，係巴士車速平均喺過去十幾年裏面係越行越慢。其實我哋區議會都提議過，譬如話會唔會可以設立巴士專線等等嘅一啲措施，其實都即係呢方面可以去再研究一下。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。陳先生。

陳灶良先生：主席，我想建議一個--我一分鐘講完㗎喇。個建議因為都係一個安全嘅問題，安全，因為我正話都講到喺鄉村落斜嗰個情況，用一個嗰個眼嚟到去睇一啲嘅交通標誌，一個警示，我覺得係不足嘅，但係如果我哋喺路面有一啲不平嘅，即係我哋揸車嘅人士都 feel 到嘅，一 feel 到佢路面不平，自動會減速，所以我都好希望喺一啲鄉村落斜嘅地方都能夠有一啲減速嘅警示。

而另外一個建議，就係希望喺鄉村落斜附近有巴士站嗰啲，就加一啲防

撞。點解呢？呢個防撞好緊要嘅，例如我上次開會，我都講咗，例如好似許願樹好出名，許願樹對出嚟有一個巴士站，我要求咗幾年，叫佢加一個欄杆畀我哋等巴士嘅人有一個安全感，佢都唔加嘅，但係呢個係必須嘅，因為點解呢？佢一路彎，一路斜落嚟，係好得人驚嘅，尤其是啲雙層巴士一路咁樣落嚟，如果佢係客滿的話，佢唔停站的話，個車速仲快，變咗我哋上唔到車，喺度等車嘅巴士嘅乘客係好驚，呢一個所以我建議都希望能夠加啲防撞欄。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。如果大家表述完，我哋亦都係邀請咗其他有關人士如果係想作供，係能夠表述你想講嗰個題目，我哋係歡迎佢哋嘅，而家多謝你哋出席係協助我哋，同埋亦都要鼓勵，喺度等待緊作供嘅人，我哋暫時係要休息二十分鐘嘅。

上午11時46分押聆訊押後

下午12時04分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家跟住聽取容溟舟議員，佢係代表沙田區議會嘅嚟畀證供，首先多謝你代表區議會接受我哋嘅邀請嚟出席我哋嘅聽證會。而家黃女士可以問問題。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）好，多謝容生。我有幾方面嘅問題想問你嘅。首先可唔可以請你睇你哋嗰份嘅討論文件，係2013年1月8號嘅，中文版631頁，英文版637頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一沓文件呢？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）就係區議會文件夾 2。容生，或者請你花啲時間睇一睇呢一頁，呢度有個問題，我想相信係區議員楊倩紅女士提出嘅，佢係代表沙田區議會提問，係有關脫班同工作時數嘅，即係指車長嘅工作時數。佢話首先佢係聽到居民嘅投訴，就話有咁嘅情況，巴士喺繁忙時間脫班；而第二，就係佢觀察到有啲嘅車長喺兩段長嘅車程之間係冇休息時間。你可唔可以講一講畀我哋聽關於呢啲嘅投訴，再講啲呢？

容溟舟先生：我講番先，因為就楊倩紅係一個前區議員，就我都想睇一睇番，你畀少少時間我睇一睇番當其時嘅會議紀錄，我會睇番中文版，因為我哋嘅中文版嘅會議紀錄係一個經我哋同事確認嘅會議紀錄，而英文版係 for 你哋簡單嘅 reference。我想政府嘅律師就想我哋講番就究竟嗰個休息時間同埋嗰個脫班率嗰個問題，係咪？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

容溟舟先生：其實因為就楊倩紅女士所講嗰個就係E42，係一條龍運嘅巴士線，據我嘅理解，就因為龍運本身係一個機場對外嘅專營巴士嘅專營權，佢個公司嘅規模係比番佢母公司九巴係為之細嘅，所以可供調動嘅車輛同埋司機會比較少，亦都容易係有呢個車長缺勤導致到有脫班呢個情況。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者想問一問容生，就話嗰個行車時間太短，所以司機就要加速嚟可以賺番啲時間，因為可能話有交通擠塞或者路上有其他嘅問題，所以到佢去到總站嘅時候，嗰個--可以咁講話嗰個行車時間就唔實際，因此佢就要追番啲時間，而咁做，佢就等於佢要加快個車速，我係關注呢個問題嘅，或者你可唔可以再講一講畀我哋聽，你作為區議員嘅時候有冇收到投訴係關於呢方面嘅呢？

容溟舟先生：你所講嗰個行車時間，其實就應該咁講嘅，喺巴士公司，據我嘅理解，喺唔同時段，譬如可能係早上嘅繁忙時間、早上非繁忙時間、晚上嘅繁忙時間同晚上非繁忙時間，理論上佢哋都會有唔同嘅行車時間去制訂，跟住就會有一個行車時間嘅制定之後就會做一個編更表。就喺佢哋嘅術語就係一啲嘅「字軌」，就係可能係一個司機會用一架車或多於一架車去揸唔同嘅路線以達致嗰個服務詳情表所列嘅標準嘅班次。

如果你話因為有一個制度，佢哋係譬如類似叫做--即係術語叫做「跳飛機」，我舉個例子，可能係個司機可能係主力係揸E42，但係有一啲時段，譬如喺馬鞍山有一條路線叫做A41P，係由馬鞍山嘅烏溪沙站去呢個機場嘅呢個GTC，即係呢個機場嘅運輸中心嗰個站，其實係有機會佢哋係需要借用E42嘅車輛去做A41P嘅班次嘅，如果喺A41P個行程--嘅車程嘅時候出現咗問題或者係有啲未能夠預計嘅情況之下，係會令到E42嘅班次都會同一時間係會suffer。

咁會有兩個情況，一，個司機可能係基於呢個原因，佢哋要喺高速公路嘅路段去追回一啲時間，但係據我嘅理解，巴士嘅車速其實係有限制嘅，係會去到接近70公里嘅，應該會有一個系統去截油，令到佢架車唔會再行得快，但係喺其他嘅路段或者係其他標示低於70嘅路段佢行快咗，呢個係冇辦法可以控制到嘅，呢個係第一。

第二，就係佢哋可能就要--如果做唔番--即係趕唔番個--追唔番個時間，係有機會令到下一更車係缺咗更，或者係要採取一啲特別嘅措施去補回部分嘅班次，例如可能嗰架車唔係直接由機場開出，而係由呢個中途站點去開出，而去追番一啲行車時間嘅。咁要視乎佢去到總站嘅時候嗰個時間究竟係損失咗幾多，而我嘅理解，係由當值嘅站長去決定呢架車究竟去邊度或者係佢哋巴士公司嗰個派更系統話畀個車長聽究竟去邊一度站起載咁嘅情況。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢一頁，仲有另外一個問題，就關於巴士司機工作時數長嘅問題，運輸署喺2017年9月檢討指引嘅時候，佢哋有冇諮詢你哋嘅區議會

呢，就係話有關嗰個建議嘅修訂係點，有冇諮詢你哋呢？

容溟舟先生：我嘅憶述所及，喺--因為我就係沙田區議會嘅交通運輸委員會嘅副主席，雖然我冇權去審視一個會議嘅議程，但係我憶述所及，喺2016直至到呢一屆--直至到今日為止嘅開嘅區議會，我嘅印象中，係冇同我哋傾過呢一個嘅巴士車長嗰個嘅編更個指引嘅，其實係冇問過我哋嘅意見嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你哋區議會對呢個指引有咩嘢睇法呢？

容溟舟先生：因為冇傾過，冇一個 formal--即係冇一個正式嘅紀錄，如果你問我，就個人而言，我哋覺得巴士司機嘅工時係比較長嘅。個原因其實好簡單，以一個保安員最盡嘅工時其實係講緊十二小時，即係行業所講嘅「12 碼」。其實正如頭先亦都有大埔嘅同事講，一日只係得廿四小時嘅啫，如果嗰個工時係超過十二個鐘頭，其實佢變相係佢嘅休息時間同埋佢嘅起居生活嘅時間其實係少嘅。唔好忘記，巴士公司嘅同事係要早出晚歸嘅，佢哋未必有一個好便捷嘅交通可以好迅速由佢嘅工作地點往返呢一個屋企嘅，所以喺咁嘅情況之下，七除八扣，究竟佢有幾多嘅休息時間、夠唔夠至少八個鐘其實係一個疑問嚟嘅。所以你問我，我個人覺得十四小時嘅最高工作時間對一個需要兼顧路面嘅安全同埋掌控緊全車人嘅安全嘅情況之下，個工時係過長嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）點解我問呢個問題呢？因為如果你睇番你哋區議會嘅會議紀錄TT23/2017，中文版就係709至710頁，英文版就係714至715頁，就係區議會文件夾2，呢個問題係招文亮先生問嘅，就關於係巴士意外。招生嘅意見就係有關於指引裏面提及嘅工作時間太長，所以巴士司機係冇足夠時間休息，佢建議運輸署同埋巴士公司檢討可以減低巴士司機最長嘅工作時間到十個鐘頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個會議日期係幾時呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我相信個會議日期係2017年3月8號。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）所以似乎你哋區議會就住工作時數係表達咗一個立場，你哋有冇諮詢職工會話點樣為之--應該最長嘅工時係幾多呢？

容溟舟先生：我係冇問過工會究竟應該係幾多工時係為之恰當嘅，但係作為一個乘客或者作為一個社區人士，我亦都接觸過係我嘅居民，亦都係巴士司機嚟嘅，其實佢哋都普遍係早出晚歸，我舉個例子嚟到講，如果以早上嘅更分嚟到講，其實我嘅選區係大水坑，係富安花園，喺距離最近嘅巴士廠，沙田嘅源順圍，即係榆翠苑對面，其實講緊個車程約莫係大概十五分鐘嘅車程，通常巴士嘅師傅係四點幾鐘就要搭佢哋嘅廠車，就係去到佢哋嘅廠，大概五點零鐘係要報更嘅，然之後就去等，揸佢哋嘅車或者係去再轉乘其他嘅車輛去適當嘅位置攞番佢嘅車輛嘅，但係喺中間嘅時間其實係有機會，可能佢編嘅更次或者編嘅--我

哋叫做俗稱嘅「字軌」，可能係講緊6點、7點，去到嗰個繁忙時間，佢哋先有人出車嘅。喺咁嘅情況之下，其實佢中間嗰個時間係冇辦法係有休息嘅，因為喺嗰個車廠裏面其實未必有一個充足或者理想嘅休息空間，呢個係第一個地方。

第二個地方就係其實有一啲情況，佢哋為咗要準時喺外站開出，其實佢哋要將架車輛係駕駛到去相關嘅總站嘅或者係嗰個分站，其實嗰啲地方未必有一個員工嘅休息室畀佢哋可以喺度休息嘅，變相佢哋可能要逗留喺架車嗰度或者喺架車嘅駕駛室裏面去休息，但係亦都基於呢個環保署嗰個停車熄匙個情況，其實佢哋唔能夠著--即係尤其是夏天，佢哋唔能夠著住架車去令到佢哋嗰個車輛嘅氣溫係下降，即係話其實佢哋喺一個悶熱嘅環境裏面去等候或者待命嘅。

其實喺一個--即係如果我諗可以想像到，就係喺一個咁嘅情況之下，其實佢哋係既唧神，亦都冇地方去休息嘅時候，其實變相係降低咗佢哋嗰個駕駛嘅質素，喺咁嘅情況之下，你問我其實係咪可以增加一啲嘅休息室或者係有一啲地方可以畀佢休息，直至到佢哋出車為止，從而令到佢個精神可以集中呢？呢個係可以研究。

至於嗰個工時嘅時間，確實有兩難嘅，因為喺頭先亦都有大埔嘅同事去闡述佢哋嗰個工時或者係新界區嗰個交通嘅--即係我哋叫佢做 pattern，係其實係比較特別嘅，因為朝頭早係一個單向，由新界區去市區嘅，譬如我諗觀塘、灣仔或者係荃灣一帶，佢係一個傳統嘅工商業區去返工，嗰陣時係需要極集--即係高度集中嘅頻密嘅班次，將啲客流係帶山去呢啲地方嘅。好喇，但係喺調番轉頭，因為車出咗去，都要入番嚟先至可以做到班次吖嘛，如果你話嗰啲車出晒去，又唔需要做咁密嘅班次嘅，喺個司機嚟講，喺個巴士公司喺編更嚟說，咪只能夠去用最多嘅人手去做呢一個嘅班次囉，喺咁嘅情況之下，過咗繁忙時間其實就冇需要咁多司機，好喇，但係問題係另外一個晚黑嘅繁忙時間你又確實又需要呢啲司機將一啲乘客由嗰啲工商業區帶番佢哋去住宅區返屋企。

所以你問我喺咁嘅情況之下，實際嘅揸車嘅工時其實可能未必去到十個鐘頭，但係佢哋返工嘅時間，即係佢嘅揸車時間加埋佢嘅叫做 standby 嘅時間其實係可能超過十個鐘或者去到十四個鐘。喺咁嘅情況之下，其實如果冇一個休息嘅地方，對佢哋嚟到講，其實佢就只能夠可能喺一啲商場去啲，或者喺一啲好迫挾嘅員工休息室裏面去休息。呢個我覺得如果係需要編配一啲特別更嘅更分畀一啲司機，其實巴士公司係要提供足夠嘅休息地方畀呢啲巴士司機，先至可以推行到呢啲特別更嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）容生，你可唔可以講一個地點係冇一個適當嘅休息設施嘅地點呀？

容溟舟先生：法官大人，不如我調番轉講，其實喺現時嘅地方其實並不多一啲嘅員工休息室嘅。個情況喺以我選區為例，就係曾經巴士公司都有問過我哋增設休息室嘅意見，約莫接近係半年前至九個月，但係就其實到而家，我哋初步都覺得

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

冇問題㗎喇，但係到而家其實佢哋--因為員工休息室唔係擺一個間格落去咁簡單，係要申請電或者係一啲流動電話嘅設施嗰啲，其實嗰啲係需要時間，正如電嗰方面可能係需要申請各類紙嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）係我哋知嘅。

容溟舟先生：所以你問我，其實沙田區所以...

主席：（經傳譯員）容生，容生，我哋知道問題係乜嘢嘅，因為我哋收到好多資料關於設置呢啲休息室，即係排污、電、水嘅問題，你可以講個例子，就係一個地點，等我哋去睇。

容溟舟先生：其實一啲嘅大嘅站，譬如新城市廣場或者沙田火車站，其實都冇一啲呢一類型嘅一啲大型嘅員工休息室嘅，唔好講啲屋邨嘅細站，譬如我自己嗰區富安花園、...

主席：（經傳譯員）沙田火車站？

容溟舟先生：沙田嘅公共交匯處 under New Town Plaza，okay，亦都喺沙田嘅火車站，其實個員工休息室係偏細嘅，只係得一個嘅啫。亦都有--因為嗰度亦都有另外一間嘅巴士公司，叫做城巴，亦都--其實佢哋亦都未有一個好完備嘅員工休息室係畀另外一間巴士公司嘅司機去休息嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你提及其中一間巴士公司，就問你哋區議會嘅意見，係關於員工設施嘅，係書面問呀？

容溟舟先生：佢當其時係以口頭諮詢，跟住我冇記錯，係曾經出過諮詢文件問過佢哋嘅，即係經過運輸署透過民政署嘅諮詢嘅系統去問我哋嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係幾時嘅事呀？

容溟舟先生：我諗應該係今年嘅 3、4 月左右，我要啲番份文件出嚟後補番畀番委員會，係可以嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該，唔該晒。容生，我想問幾個問題係關於意外，呢啲意外就喺幾個地點發生，首先就係鯉魚門道嘅意外，你哋區議會曾經係問過好多問題嘅，想請你睇一睇 709 頁，中文版，英文版就係--133 段嘅中文，英文版係 714。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢份文件嘅日期係幾時呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我相信都係喺 3 月 17 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢次意外就發生咗，其中一個招...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個意外係幾時發生㗎？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係17年嘅1月。招文亮先生就問咗一個關於呢次車禍嘅問題，其中佢問嘅一個問題就係嗰間公司係咪容許司機係以兼職嘅形式做長嘅時間，即係喺佢哋做完自己正職，就做兼職，佢就提出咗--講咗一啲嘅例子，一啲兼職車長，係即係做巴士嘅兼職車長。睇番運輸署嘅回應就係707頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）第幾段呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺頂部，就係運輸署嘅回應，我想睇番其實就係706頁嘅問題嚟嘅，就講咗話17年1月14號嗰次嘅車禍，就係九巴嘅618號，巴士去到鯉魚門道...

容溟舟先生：It is Citybus, not KMB.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個打錯咗嘅，係呢一個嘅城巴，唔係九巴。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）就嗰架巴士去到鯉魚門道近藍田巴士站就係撞到路邊嘅石壘嘅，跟住就係翻側嘅，十位嘅乘客就被拋出車外--就係被拋離座位，亦都係困住咗嘅，有關呢件事，有幾件事項，就係話係現場嘅時候傷者嘅情況，同埋巴士公司點樣跟進。我想問嘅就係有關於就係(c)、(d)同埋(e)呢幾項嘅，(c)項就係巴士司機嘅健康狀況係咪符合標準；跟住就係有關於而家呢一個嘅路面同埋係斜台石壘嘅設計；第三，就係本港行駛嘅巴士喺設計上面有冇有效嘅保障到乘客安全。跟住...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，有關我哋工作嘅問題就係(c)，就係話巴士公司係咪容許巴士車長喺正職完咗之後，係做呢一個長時間嘅兼職車長？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番運輸署嘅回應，喺之後嗰頁，就係707頁嘅，運輸署似乎就冇答到問題嘅第二部分，即係頭先主席讀出嚟嗰個嘅問題，佢就畀咗一個係好一般嘅答案嘅，睇番呢一個嘅707頁英文版，第二段，就話就以車長嘅更分，包括工作、休息同埋用膳食係有指引嘅，肇事巴士車長喺意外當日嘅更分編排同埋上班前嘅作息時間係符合運輸署指引嘅要求等等，佢就冇答到話兼職車長係咪可以喺做完正職之後再係做長嘅時間工作嘅，呢一個議題區議會有冇跟進番運輸署嘅回覆呀？

容溟舟先生：我印象中就喺個會議上面大家嘅焦點喺嗰個嘅交通事故嗰個意外上面，就冇好細緻去商討過呢一個兼職車長究竟係可以容許佢會揸幾多嘅時間。我嘅理解，引入兼職車長嘅原因其實係確實喺幾間巴士公司續專營權時間，社會對佢嘅脫班率係非常關注，結果就巴士公司就引入咗都唔少嘅兼職車長去處理。

兼職車長理論上應該係分兩批嘅，有一批真係可能係日頭有一份工，夜晚揸幾個鐘，我舉個好簡單嘅例子，就係巴士公司裏面嘅行政人員其實都會有巴士

嘅巴士嘅駕駛執照，係可以駕駛巴士嘅。個問題出咗嚟，就係如果運輸署只係針對巴士車長嗰陣時揸嘅時間去處理，佢哋係永遠達標嘅，因為佢哋唔需要計算正職嗰個工作時間，呢個係第一個問題。

第二個問題就係呢個就係如果係同一間公司，都倘有辦法可以記錄到究竟佢做幾多個鐘，但係如果一個情況就係佢可能係打第二--即係喺出面有另外一份工嘅，你叫嗰個出面嘅僱主會唔會容許佢嘅職員去兼職做車長呢？呢個第一個問題。第二個問題就係你容唔容許究竟嗰個車長會唔會如實申報究竟佢日頭嗰份工做咗幾多個鐘呢？

你就算有呢啲資料，你巴士公司都未必能夠可以好清楚計算到究竟佢會唔會超過一個長工時。亦都喺呢一個指引裏面其實係冇針對兼職車長嘅安排，但係運輸署確實容許巴士公司可以請兼職車長。所以呢個係一個雞同蛋嘅問題嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實係有問題，巴士公司係冇問呢啲嘅問題，即係話問兼職車長喺其餘嘅時間做啲乜嘢，呢個係一個問題嚟嘅？

容溟舟先生： Yes.

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你哋議會係關注呢樣嘢，亦都同運輸署講，你係有冇跟進？

容溟舟先生：我哋嘅同事當然有表達過呢個意見，但係問題係就現時我哋喺會後要求佢後補畀我哋嗰個編更個指引，確實係冇處理到兼職嗰個問題，呢個係重點嚟嘅，佢冇處理過。即係我哋想繼續去追問，其實佢冇處理過，我哋都老鼠拉龜，我哋根本無從入手去追。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇用書面去嘗試去追問呀？

容溟舟先生：我哋同事因為喺個會議上面除咗有 motion 以外，如果有 motion，我哋就會畀番一個動議畀番相關嘅部門，私底下其餘嘅同事有冇就呢啲嘅意見畀番巴士公司呢？喺我呢一刻，同事冇畀到任何資料我，我暫時答唔到你究竟有冇以 writing 去講。不過喺我哋唔同--我相信喺唔同黨派嘅同事同運輸署一啲非正式嘅會議其實都有提，以我自己嘅政治嘅組織，都有講過呢一個問題出現過嘅，不論同運輸署、九巴同埋城巴、新巴，我哋都有傾過呢個問題，但係巴士公司究竟有冇去切實去執行或者去處理呢？呢個就要交番畀巴士公司。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以咁樣理解呢，當你同唔同嘅人員去提出呢樣嘢，係口頭去提出嘅，唔係書面提出嘅？

容溟舟先生：（經傳譯員）口頭，係會議上嘅口頭提出。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）第二個事項，就係呢一個 706 頁，就係關於呢一個石壆同埋行人路嘅路邊嗰個設計會好容易引致有意外嘅，呢個係 706 頁，路政署同

埋運輸署嘅回覆就喺 707 頁，上面就講，由第二行開始，就係話呢個嘅護欄嘅開端係用傾斜式石壆，可以減低失控車輛撞擊護欄開端時對駕駛者同埋乘客嘅傷害。路政署聯同運輸署會繼續檢視現有公共道路嘅防護設施，同埋按實際情況同埋需要係為新建同埋現有嘅公共道路安裝合適嘅防護設施。上面就話運輸署同埋路政署會繼續檢視呢個防護設施，你有冇同運輸署跟進番呀？

容溟舟先生：喺個會議紀錄嘅 135(a)段同埋(b)段，其實當其時我已經有指出呢一個嘅道路設計係並不容許--一個容錯嘅設計嚟嘅。其實我哋都當其時有要求--一路都要求，叫佢哋做番一啲嘅類似一個 U 型嘅，一個撞埋去係會吸咗落去嗰個嘅設計，因為呢個設計其實我嘅理解，係一啲比較高速公路嘅地方或者高速公路嘅分岔位佢哋會裝置呢啲嘅設計。

如果我冇記錯，頭先我睇住大埔嗰個聽證會嘅申述，其中有一幅圖喺新個巴士站嘅設計上面確實係有呢一個嘅設計，但係當日運輸署答我哋就係嗰啲一定要喺高速公路做。如果喺公速公路做個標準係咁嘅話，我哋唔明白點解一條喺觀塘繞道落去呢一個嘅東區海底隧道嘅位置其實係行 70 嘅車速嘅，嗰個位置其實理論上都適合安裝嗰一類型嘅防撞欄，因為嗰個類型嘅防撞欄一撞咗埋去之後，架車就會凹陷咗喺個防撞欄裏--裏面係有一啲嘅設計係將嗰個震嘅物料吸咗落去嘅。所以我哋嘅講法，就係其實應該係要儘快檢視番呢一啲位置嘅。頭先有張工程圖嘅，我憶述頭先有張工程圖，我係睇到喺張工程圖裏面係有一個位置係裝咗嗰個嘢。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家繼續落去，你可能講緊嘅係 TD 文件 5 號 167 頁嘅，...

容溟舟先生：冇錯，我哋就係講緊嗰個防撞欄，其實嗰個位置我哋嘅理解係適合安裝呢一類型嘅，因為而家呢個位置，第一，呢條唔係快速公路嚟，其實呢個係快速公--應該咁講，運輸署嘅道路設計，我嘅理解，係根據 transport design and planning manual，即係佢哋係有唔同嘅 volume 去講述一啲嘅道路嘅設計或者係一啲嘅情況，呢一個其實你問我原本嘅設計合唔合標準，呢個有待專家去講，但係我哋要求咗好耐嘅一啲高速公路或者鄰近高速公路嘅出入口裝置啲防撞欄，係冇裝到嘅，如果裝咗個防撞欄，架車撞埋去，係會凹陷咗喺裏面，就唔會話劏上咗個壆跟住導致反車造成呢個嚴重嘅交通意外。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你而家係咪响 135(a)段係建議呢樣嘢呢？

容溟舟先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）而運輸署我相信喺 138 段嗰度係有佢哋嘅立場，係咪呢？馮家晉，138，英文版係 717 頁，馮家晉先生佢係路政署新界區區域工程師，個回應就話鯉魚門個石壆設計係斜台式嘅，目的係要減低失控車輛撞擊護欄嘅時候對駕駛者同埋乘客造成嘅損害係可以減少嘅。跟住喺下一頁，就話如果 70 公里時速限制嘅高速公路，路政署都會裝設啲風琴式嘅防撞欄嘅，由於鯉魚門唔屬嗰個條件，所以現時嘅石壆設計係符合有關嘅標準嘅，路政署就會同

運輸署按實際情況改善嗰度嘅設施，換句話，佢哋係拒絕咗你嘅要求嘅，啱唔啱呢？

容溟舟先生：係，但係你留意番你頭先講過 TD-5 嗰個 bundle，上址嘅道路速度原本係 70，後屘就係因應呢次交通意外改變咗做 50，即係話一國兩制。路政署喺道路 70 嘅標準冇因應呢一個嘅檢視覆檢呢一個位置究竟係唔係適合去裝設番呢一個嘅防撞欄，其實委員會喺我哋嘅特別會議係有要求所有嘅部門就佢之前嘅回覆畀一個檢視番有冇一個新嘅回覆嘅，我嘅理解，應該路政署係冇就呢一個嘅提問裏面嘅答案做一個 update 嘅回覆，即係話其實基本上我只可以講一句，對運輸署同埋路政署用頭痛醫頭、腳痛醫腳、冇針對整個道路安全嘅情況之下去檢視番道路上面嘅設施或者係增加一啲叫容錯嘅設計去保障道路使用者嘅安全，我極度遺憾嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）而家我就想亞公角道嘅問題嘅，呢個係有另外一宗嘅意外嘅，個會議紀錄係 2018 年嘅 5 月 8 號，係 TT26 嘅文件，係 2012 年嘅，就喺 610 頁嘅喺英文版，中文版就 607 頁嘅，中文 607，英文 610，喺第二段，楊祥利先生喺交通運輸委員會，係呢個沙田區議會，就提咗啲亞公角道嘅安全問題，第二段佢就指出，就喺亞公角道係發生過好多嘅嚴重交通意外，你知唔知悉呢個咁嘅投訴，楊生所講嘅交通意外，你熟唔熟悉呢？

容溟舟先生：楊祥利先生亦都係一個前沙田區議員，佢冇就一個嘅交通意外就去針對即係去提問，但係喺我嘅記憶所及，係有一個嘅交通意外嘅傷亡人數都比較多嘅，可能都要稍後補充番資料。

嗰個交通意外，我記得就係朝頭早有一架 89D 號嘅巴士就往九龍方向，就因為收掣不及，就撞咗落去之前應該唔記得咗係 85K 還是係 86K 一架巴士度，就造成都有成三十幾人受傷嘅，而當日其實就事發之後，其實我到過現場，係見到傷者嘅情況，亦都有處理過傷者嗰啲嘅索償。我憶述所及，呢個係第一單關於巴士嘅交通意外，亦都斷斷續續喺一啲過路處其實有一啲嘅交通意外係同小巴係有關連嘅，亦都導致過一啲嘅致命交通意外，我相信楊先生問嘅，喺嗰個交通意外同埋傷亡數字其實並不限於係巴士嘅意外嚟嘅，亦都有其他嘅意外集合咗喺嗰度。呢個係我嘅理解。

第二，就初步嘅理由，點解會有亞公角街會較為多交通意外出現呢咁樣，因為亞公角街係一條雙線雙程嘅一條嘅行車路嘅，就途中由我嘅選區富安花園去到石門交匯處就大概係有兩個過路處同埋一支嘅交通燈，我冇記錯嘅話，同埋亦都有三組嘅 T 字路口，分別去梅子林路、入亞公角漁民新村同埋呢個沙田醫院，仲有一個，係上亞公角山路嘅，係有四組唔同嘅路口嘅。呢四組嘅路口全部嘅設計都係一啲讓線嘅設計，啲 priority junction，就唔係 signalized junction 嚟嘅，呢啲讓線嘅設計嘅路口其實係兼顧一啲比較行車流量少嘅地方，但係好多時就可能係駕駛人士喺過呢啲路口嘅時候冇好小心、謹慎去駕駛，而導致到係有交通意外發生嘅，呢個係其中一個我理解嘅原因。

第二個原因就係因為其實亞公角街除咗朝頭早同埋晚黑嘅繁忙時間比較多重型車輛，包括巴士去使用，其實喺其他時間路面嘅車輛其實不多，點解呢？因為喺馬鞍山去呢個嘅石門交匯處其實仲有一條高速公路，叫馬鞍山路，嗰度係一條雙程六線行車嘅一條高速公路嘅，而時速係行緊 70 至 80 公里，即係如果平時嚟到講，冇乜特別嘅--即係私家車其實唔會走入去嗰條街度行呢一個路面嘅，但係喺朝頭早因為可能有機會避免擠塞，所以有少部分嘅私家車會走咗入去，但係通常呢一啲嘅交通意外都好少發生喺朝頭早嘅，通常喺一個好路面暢順嘅地方，因為嗰度既冇測速嘅相機，亦都得一眼嘅交通燈，仲要係手掀嘅控制嘅交通燈，去過沙田醫院嗰個路口，其實相對路面暢順嘅，駕駛者未必係好守規矩揸 50 公里，甚至乎可能係揸超過 50 公里嘅，所以係比較容易出現交通意外，呢條道路嘅設計。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果你睇一睇 611 頁，嗰度就係有警察提供嘅一啲數字嘅，係 07 年到 2011 嘅，就區議會嘅所知，個交通傷亡數字係喺 2012 年之後個傷亡數字係增加咗、減少咗定維持不變呢？如果我哋睇一睇楊先生喺 610 頁嘅提問，佢就問就運輸署有冇啲短期或者長期措施去解決問題，即係解決亞公角道嘅問題，運輸署提咗四點嘅，就响 611 頁，第一，運輸署就話駕駛者個視線係冇障礙嘅；亦都符合道路設計標準；第三，就話已經有考慮會唔會喺呢個路段增加嗰個交通燈嗰個控制，佢哋就話 4 月 16 號嘅交通意外，運輸署已經提醒咗巴士公司要加強車長嘅培訓嘅，同埋要作出更進一步嘅改善，係當警察係作出個報告之後，佢哋要繼續改善。你哋區議會會唔會跟進呢？又或者你對運輸署嘅答案是否滿意？

容溟舟先生：喺我嘅--喺個會議紀錄嘅第 613 頁 paragraph 67(c)同埋 67(d)，我係有啲建議嘅，佢哋話要求做雙白線，避免越線同埋爬頭，我哋當其時係建議佢種一啲膠 bollard 嘅，嗰個膠 bollard 就正如當年喺荃灣德士古道天橋嘅一個致命對頭車交通意外之後，佢哋係裝咗落去嘅，我哋覺得呢個係可以值得借鏡嘅一個交通安全改善嘅措施，其實到而家我嘅憶述其實係冇裝過嘅，即係我哋建議，係冇裝過。

第二，就係(d)嗰度，其實當其時警方嘅回答就係冇鐳射槍--佢話用隱形戰車嘅，其實我嘅理解，警方隱形戰車其實係會係不定時、不定期喺主要嘅主幹道同埋高速公路去做偵查，係好少喺呢啲嘅 local road 喇我哋叫做，即係本區嘅道路裏面去使用嘅，但係喺嗰一次嘅提問之後，警方確實係增加咗喺亞公角街使用鐳射槍去偵測嗰個速度，而擺嗰個位置，我冇記錯，就係大概喺亞公角漁民新村出口往馬鞍山方向個電箱後面，佢哋通常就係測返入馬鞍山嘅車，因為嗰個位置過咗沙田醫院嗰個燈控嘅交通燈其實係一條大直路嘅，車司機係好容易地比較會去揸快咗都唔出奇，所以我記得就係咁。

但係就 TD 其實係避車處嗰度其實係後尷係出咗一個叫做 Works Order 去拓闊咗個避車處嘅，但係因為個避車處就算拓闊咗，因為嗰個上址係因為一間醫院，亦都有唔同嘅探訪者去用或者去排隊，所以其實就算增大咗個避車處，

其實都有陣時啲巴士要等候入站，或者喺條行車線度去作上落嘅，所以個作用係有，不過效用不大。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我見到 615 頁係有個臨時動議，係楊先生作出嘅，佢中文版係 73 段，英文版 618，73 段，有個臨時動議，係由楊祥利先生提出，就要求係要對亞公角道係作一個全面檢討，要擴闊佢，同埋要安裝啲攝錄機嘅，運輸署就呢個要求有冇作出回應呢？

容溟舟先生：喺 73 段嘅：

第（一）就其實警察係加強咗執法嘅，因為原本由冇到有吖嘛，咁實加強咗喇。

第（二），就係亞公角街嘅道路設計，包括擴闊亞公角街同埋裝置呢個超速攝影機，我憶述所及，係成立亞公角街到現在呢一刻為止都係冇超速攝影機嘅。另外，包括擴闊亞公角街，因為亞公角街隔籬係條馬鞍山路，馬鞍山路嘅中央分隔，但係就起咗一條馬鐵。其實你問我喺適當嘅位置拓闊條亞公角街，其實係有需要係由富安花園一路去到石門交匯處去拓闊，但係我相信係比較困難去搵一啲適合嘅位置去拓闊條路。

因為拓闊一條嘅行車嘅--因為根據個標準，應該要有 3.6 至到 3.7 米嘅闊度，你先至可以有一個比較合適嘅道路去畀多一條行車線，但係喺我嘅理解，就係行人路最低嘅 minimum width 係要留番 1.5 米，即係話如果喺一啲有限嘅空間，你拓闊條車路，而行人路嗰個闊度不足，佢哋未必會 proceed 去做，因為行人路如果太過窄嘅時候，可能連輪椅都推唔到，運輸署係未必會執行去做呢啲拓闊嘅，所以第二個其實攝影機冇做到，擴闊其實都冇做到嘅。我估可能係擴闊嗰度係因為呢個道路嘅限制，即係道路空間嘅限制，而攝影機其實係相對嚟講，係可行嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）主席，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可以繼續嘅，而家我哋仲係有排先會講到作出巴士安全嘅建議嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）仲有一、兩點係需要問，我就可以完成我嘅提問嘅。容先生，你喺會議紀錄 TT 文件 23/2017，如果你睇中文 710 嘅嗰頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）而家睇嘅係咩嘢文件呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係會議紀錄嘅，係沙田區議會嘅會議紀錄。TT...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要，個日期呢？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係 2017 年嘅 3 月嘅。如果睇番 134 段，就有個建議嘅，就巴士公司應該每年係檢查車長有冇...

主席：（經傳譯員）睡眠窒息症嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，睡眠窒息，同埋你有冇跟進呢個咁嘅建議呢，或者區議會有冇跟進呢個建議？

容溟舟先生：我要睇一睇番，因為我哋嗰個做法就係我哋有同事提出咗呢一啲嘅意見，喺個會議上面，如果會議上面有一啲動議，部門係會有一個嘅稍後嘅回覆嘅，喺下一次會議嘅續議事項有回覆嘅。如果冇嘅話，其實就我嘅理解，部門係會記錄在案，然之後就去睇番究竟有冇呢一個嘅意見或者係可以點樣去落實嘅，我嘅理解就係咁樣。因為而家我手頭上就冇嗰份嘅文件，即係究竟--嗰個續議事項個文件，我都可能要上去睇番嗰個嘅續議事項究竟有冇講過。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你如果可以搵到呢份文件，你可以提供畀我哋嘅，如果係相關嘅話。

容溟舟先生：Okay.

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）容生，我已經去到呢個課題嘅最後部分，就係你提到大埔公路，就喺討論文件嗰度嘅，係 727 頁，呢度係姚嘉俊先生提問題，(b)同(c)，個問題就係佢哋提呢個問題就係關於大埔公路沙田段，就話有唔少存在嘅危險位置同埋彎位，中文就係 719 頁，你知唔知點解姚先生有咁嘅睇法，就話特別呢一段係有潛在危險呢，即係沙田嶺段？就有潛在危險同埋彎位係咪因為佢收到投訴定係點，你可唔可以講一講呢？

容溟舟先生：你而家問我係咪即係話番大埔公路嗰個位係點解會覺得係一個危險，係收到投訴吖，定抑或點，係咪？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係。

容溟舟先生：因為姚議員就唔喺度，我都要--你畀少少時間我望一望份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你慢慢。

容溟舟先生：我相信，睇番份文件，而姚嘉俊議員講嗰個位置因為大埔公路就有唔同嘅位置嘅，嗰度佢講過就喺沙田區裏面嘅沙田段，而佢所指出嘅--應該講緊提問(c)嗰個位置，係咪呀？

黃佩琪女士：Yes.

容溟舟先生：佢所講--因為咁講--因為--係咪提問(c)？（經傳譯員）係咪(c)？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗係嘅。

容溟舟先生：Yes，okay。因為其實整條大埔公路會有唔同嘅段數嘅，喺沙田嚟講，我冇記錯，有沙田段，亦都有一啲沙田嶺段、琵琶山段咁樣，其實姚議員所指

出就應該係沙田嶺段嘅位置近六合新村嗰個位，其實嗰度曾經都有出現過一啲嘅致命交通意外嘅，亦都有牽涉過巴士嘅，不過就係我冇記錯，就係如果我憶述所及，就應該係巴士畀人撞，就唔係巴士撞人。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果你睇番 728(b)個問題底部個答案嗰度，就係運輸署嘅，佢就講出大埔公路沙田嶺段去到琵琶山段嗰個時速限制係 70 公里，呢段大概係 1.7 公里有兩個急彎，剩番嗰 1.4 公里路段就比較接近沙田，嗰個車速限制係每小時 50 公里，有三個急彎，呢個就喺下一頁嗰度有列出嚟；然後就提到話喺適當嘅地方已經係設立咗一啲慢駛嘅道路標記，特別係嗰個車速限制改咗嘅地方就已經有擺咗出嚟，同埋喺急位之前亦都樹立咗警告性嘅交通標誌同埋喺路面加設咗慢駛嘅道路標記提醒駕駛者喺急彎之前減速。運輸署係知道呢度有啲急彎，亦都知道呢段路嘅車速限制，你係咪滿意運輸署嘅回覆，就話已經足夠，即係話講車速嘅限制同埋話有冇足夠嘅交通標誌嗰方面，你係咪滿意呢？

容溟舟先生：或者我用一個道路駕駛者嘅身分去同你分享，因為嗰個位置其實我有陣時都會係透過大埔公路係往返沙田同埋九龍，所講嗰個位置其實除咗係有急彎以外，其實嗰個--一條路嘅水平唔係直嘅，係可能係會傾斜去某一個方向或者係另外一邊嘅，如果架車係以時速 70 公里去行嘅時候，其實係有機--如果遇著一啲好似今日嘅天氣，落雨天，其實有機會會會“ball out”咗或者係會撞嘅，呢個情況有點兒似一似到大埔公路你哋今次調查嗰個情況，因為條路轉急彎唔係重點，而係個情況係架車你會感受到架車係會有高有低或者會啷嚟啷去，即係駕駛技術稍為遜色嘅朋友係有機會會有交通意外，亦都好容易解釋到點解嗰個位置咁多交通意外嘅原因。因為我冇記錯呢，嗰個位置其實係兩邊都係--睇下先，六合新村嗰個位置出去係行 70，入番嚟係行 50 嘅，我冇記錯嘅話。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。最後我想請你睇一份會議紀錄，736 頁中文版，743 頁英文版，都係姚嘉俊先生嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個會議日期係乜嘢呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個會議紀錄，但係冇顯示個日期，但係就有個文件編號 2/2018，所以我就假設應該係 2018 年 2 月，即係喺大埔公路交通意外之後，中文版就由 735 頁開始，英文版就係 742 頁。如果我哋睇番第 128(c)段，呢度就係姚嘉俊先生嘅意見，佢就話嗰度有三個唔同嘅車速限制喺唔同嘅路段，即係指喺大埔公路，所以對於駕駛者嚟講，就好難適應，佢就問運輸署會唔會檢討呢個情況同埋增加車速偵測機，你睇唔睇到呢段？

容溟舟先生：我睇到，你其實想即係問番我哋究竟運輸署嗰件交通意外，即係喺嗰次嘅提問之後有冇做一啲嘅檢討？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）或者係可以幫助你去考慮答案，其實喺會議上運輸署都有回應，就係第 133 段，英文版就 746 頁，中文 739 頁。簡單嚟講，佢話嗰段已經有好清晰嘅車速限制嘅標誌，亦都有標誌係提醒司機嘅，你哋區議會有冇跟

進呢或者有冇處理呢個問題，喺呢次會議之後？

容溟舟先生：我都係講番頭先個情況，如果有動議嘅話，其實佢哋會跟嘅，但係如果冇嘅話，就要睇番補充資料有冇回覆，因為呢個 bundle 確實係冇交到一啲嘅討論事項之後嘅一啲嘅補充資料，我暫時睇唔到。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以去查呀？

容溟舟先生：你想我而家 check 吖，定係點呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，如果你可以搵到一啲相關嘅資料，之後請你以書面提交畀我哋。

容溟舟先生：咁喇，我或者可以咁嘅，我稍後同番你哋嘅調查委員會確認番你哋想交番啲乜嘢嘅意見，即係我會用番--指示番秘書處去就嗰啲意見，執番出嚟，睇下仲有冇相關嘅會議文件可以再補遺番。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁就會好有幫助，唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我完成咗我嘅訊問。

主席：（經傳譯員）容先生，多謝你出席嚟協助我哋提供證供，我哋希望可以收到你嘅進一步嘅資料，即係如果你搵到有啲相關嘅資料，請你提供。

容溟舟先生：好，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）跟住就係深水埗區議會嘅代表，或者請林先生同陳先生係上前，或者畀少少時間我哋改番嗰個名牌，同埋畀新嘅水杯你。林先生同陳女士，多謝你接受我哋嘅邀請，今日出席作證，對唔住，我哋係延誤咗啲時間，或者而家請黃女士向你哋提問。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）好，多謝林生同陳女士嚟出席，或者首先我可唔可以處理就係關於工作時數呢個課題，即係指巴士司機喇當然。或者請你睇區議會文件夾2嘅986頁，呢個中文版，英文版就係988頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度我哋想睇啲乜嘢呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係想討論深水埗區議會嘅討論，就係關於話喺深水埗嗰宗致命交通意外嘅，就係長沙灣道近住欽州街，發生喺2017年9月22號晚嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係2014年9月22號所發生嘅意外？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係喇，係2017年9月22號晚發生嘅意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）2017年呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係，2017年。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢份文件其中提到嘅一個問題，如果睇番第3段，就話要加強規管巴士車長嘅工作時數，喺呢份文件就提到話喺其他外國嘅地方，例如歐盟，就會限制司機每日唔可以揸車多過九小時，而香港嘅巴士車長每日最長可以做到十四個鐘頭，每個月即係超過三百六十小時。我亦都想請你睇番第一次特別會議嘅會議紀錄，就係喺呢個深水埗嘅意外之後，就係17年9月28號，中文版就係1026頁，英文版1043頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一沓文件呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）區議會文件夾2。唔好意思，係區議會文件夾3。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇番168段，楊彧議員補充，佢要求政府修訂個指引，將嗰個工作時數由十四小時減到十二小時，如果我哋睇番170段，譚國橋議員補充相關嗰個規例，規定司機唔可以工作超過十四小時，好多職工會都有提到其實十四小時嘅工作時間都唔人道，而喺201段亦都有譚國橋議員亦都話城巴應該係將所有司機嘅工作時間減到十二個小時或者以下。所以我個問題就係似乎區議會--即係深水埗區議會建議嗰個工作時數係十個鐘頭，你可唔可以講畀我聽點解你哋建議係十個鐘頭？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺邊度睇到？喺邊一段睇到？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）係喺986頁嗰封信裏面，英文版就係988頁第3段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）「我哋要求運輸署規定每日最長駕駛時間係十小時」，你可唔可以解釋點解你哋建議十個鐘頭應該係最長嘅駕駛時間呢？

林家輝先生：喺嗰次意外發生之後，我哋議會就就住呢一個議題就傾咗都相當多嘅時間嘅，因為其實發生交通意外嗰個位置就啱啱喺我哋區議會門口，响個十字路口嚟嘅，如果喺區議會個窗口望出去，見到個慘劇嘅現場嘅，簡直係驚心動魄，係咪呀？同埋嗰個巴士撞過去，唔係可以即刻清走，經過好長時間嘅拯救同埋處理傷者，個巴士撞咗入去個建築物裏面，插實咗，攞番出嚟都係要好多工程人員、工程師喺現場處理。

就我哋議會就要諗下辦法點樣搵到出嚟呢個交通意外嘅成因嘅，呢份文件喺嗰個討論過程之中，綜合而言，我哋整個議會係都覺得其中一個重要嘅原因就係巴士司機喺駕駛個時間係頗長嘅。至於係呢個十四小時，我哋喺嗰個會議上面，冇一位議會嘅議員同事係覺得呢個係一個巴士司機合適嘅服務工作時數嚟嘅。就由十四小時去到十二小時，跟住就係再一路呢份文件所講嘅十小時，其實我哋覺得係一個合適嘅巴士司機嘅服務時數係應該就住佢哋嗰種工作嘅模

式，即係駕駛住一個咁大型嘅巴士同埋係兼顧住乘客嘅上落同埋家居嘅生活，係要作出一個平衡嘅。

我哋覺得喺個平衡裏面，如果係一個車長能夠去到十個鐘頭嘅工作時數，頭先之前有啲議會都提過，其實而家就係就算做呢一個看更，喺一啲公屋上面嘅看更佢哋都係八個鐘嘅啫，我哋呢個全香港嘅公共屋邨嘅保安員嘅服務，喺房委會下面係廿四小時有看更，每一更都係得八個鐘嘅啫，看更同事其實就佢嘅工作嗰個壓力同埋嗰個量同呢一個巴士司機嗰種工作壓力係冇得比嘅，即係換言之，巴士司機個工作壓力同埋量係好大，同埋近年巴士司機都會周時畀啲乘客指責，即係就算今時今日，呢兩個月，巴士上面有毒針添，係咪先？巴士司機譬如受到呢啲咁樣嘅--處理呢啲意外嘅，其實佢哋要好大嘅心力。喺個會議上面討論都覺得係如果係嗰個巴士司機嗰個時數去到十個鐘，呢個係比較理想，同埋我哋覺得會係令到個巴士嘅意外嗰個機率係會減低嘅。

當然我哋其實仲有一樣嘢關注嘅，就係巴士司機十個--即係假設真係去到--由十四個鐘、十二個鐘去到十個鐘，佢哋嗰個薪酬係可唔可以足夠養活佢哋一家人呢？呢個都係我哋關注嘅，因為都係投身車長服務其實都呢個工作都幾艱辛，如果唔係有足夠嘅人工去養妻活兒，我覺得亦係令到呢一個行業越嚟越人手短缺之下，可能係永遠都唔會將個時數減低，因為唔夠人，就車長--即係喺個巴士公司裏面可能就係要用一啲政策令到嗰啲車長係繼續增加佢哋嘅工作時數。呢個我回應。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）有一份會議紀錄嘅，就係呢一個嘅 2017 年 4 月 28 號嘅，係深水埗區議會會議紀錄，英文就係 1041 頁開始，中文就係 1026 頁開始嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一段呀？

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）167 同埋係 168 段嘅，呢個會議係 9 月進行嘅，我想你睇番兩項嘅，167 段就係呢一個係鄭泳舜議員就話，就係呢一個嘅過去七年，對於巴士車長工時嘅指引係冇任何嘅修訂嘅。跟住係(i)嗰度，楊彧議員就話車長必須留意路面安全，同埋就要修訂指引，嗰個工作時數由十四減到十二，薪酬亦都要提高，休息時間亦都要增加。

呢一個嘅第 171 段嘅時候，梁昌杰先生回應就話喺呢件意外之後，其實個巴士車長工作同埋休息時間係受到社會關注嘅，運輸署同埋巴士公司係制定咗指引，巴士公司係需要喺編更時候遵行指引。運輸署每季亦都會聘請獨立調查員去睇番車長嘅工作、休息時間等等。

羅馬數字第(iv)，運輸署現正籌備有關指引嘅檢討工作，計劃諮詢巴士公司同埋工會，回應公眾對於車長工時嘅關注。運輸署冇既定立場，會考慮巴士公司、工會同埋公眾喺呢一次檢討嘅意見。

我有兩個問題要問嘅，似乎指引檢討係因為呢一個 2017 年 9 月嘅交通部意

外，仲有公眾人士投訴關於巴士司機嘅工作時數而引致嘅，呢次有檢討工作嘅，同意嘛？

陳穎欣女士：係，唔該主席。或者我都補充一下，其實針對番你而家呢個問題，可能你都睇番我哋嘅會議紀錄第 196 段，喺我哋發言度其實都有講，因為我都係一個工會嘅代表，其實工會一直都有就我哋一啲車長嘅權益同埋工時嘅問題向運輸署同埋巴士公司去反映嘅，但係好可惜，就係正正--回應你呢個問題，係意外發生咗之後，政府與及巴士公司嘅代表先至有意去考慮唔同持份者包括我哋一啲工會代表嘅意見。因為其實呢一個工時嘅問題，我哋見到對上一次我哋有一個真正嘅修訂其實係講緊七年前，即係意外發生之前嘅七年，喺 2010 年嘅時候嘅一個版本。其實呢一個問題，我相信一直以嚟，我哋工會代表都有去反映嘅，但係可惜得唔到一啲正面嘅回應，直至到有不幸嘅事故出現咗之後至願意去做一個修正。

另外頭先有關你嗰個問題，提及到有關十小時工時嘅問題，其實我所知道，一路以嚟工會嘅代表佢哋都希望最高嘅上限嘅駕駛時間其實係唔好超過十四個鐘，亦都希望可以修訂到去十二個小時嘅。至於十小時點樣得嚟呢，就可能係我哋議會其他嘅同事佢自己研究出嚟嘅，但係我哋其實整體個文件，我諗我哋成個議會嘅方向，大家都認為十四小時係太長，而我自己嚟睇，亦都係代表住工會嘅意見，我哋唔應該淨係著眼於個工時嘅問題，因為其實工時嘅問題同佢哋嘅待遇以至薪酬其實都係環環相扣嘅。

我所知道發生意外，其實當時嗰個情況，嗰個車長佢入職咗已經五年多㗎喇，當日其實佢都係應該原定提早咗去開工嘅，個原因就係因為佢要維持生計，如果佢返唔足夠嘅一啲工時，其實佢係唔能夠賺取到佢可以為生嘅工資嘅。即係我哋攞一啲數據嚟睇，其實一路以嚟，九巴佢哋嘅薪金都係一點幾萬，即係萬零蚊，可能新巴就會好少少嘅，佢哋都會去到萬二蚊左右，但係要計埋一啲津貼，先至嗰個薪酬係及得上我哋現時好多同類型，亦都係承受住巨大壓力嘅一啲行業，其實呢一個情況並唔理想，亦都係間接導致到今次呢個意外，我相信如果我哋要去做一個檢討，唔單只係講緊工時嘅問題，其實薪酬嘅問題同樣我哋都要重視嘅。

而至於有關嗰個待遇，其實我哋都講緊提及到休息嘅問題，頭先有其他嘅議會同事我都聽到都針對一啲有關休息室嘅問題去提出意見，其實我唔能夠講話全港有幾多個屋邨或者巴士站係未有休息室，因為呢啲我哋可能部門都畀唔到一啲嘅數據我哋睇到，但係我以我自己邨為例，我麗閣邨其實已經開邨咗三十幾年，但係我哋嘅 6F 巴士站其實都只不過喺去年年底先至可以開始設立一個休息室畀我哋 6F 巴士嘅一啲車長。其實呢個情況係唔理想，我知道其他嘅屋邨，我哋宏觀番睇番甚至乎九龍東，喺樂華邨，我知道係要有立法會議員何啟明嚟介入，先至可以喺屋邨嗰度成功幫到車長去爭取到一個休息室。所以其實成個情況，希望我哋睇嘅唔係淨係著眼於工時，亦都要睇埋佢哋薪金嘅待遇同埋休息嘅情況。唔該主席。

林家輝先生：你頭先問我呢個問題，就...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，林生。陳女士，你話你係工會嘅代表，你嘅意思係指乜嘢呀？可唔可以解釋？

陳穎欣女士：我嘅政治聯繫係工聯會。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺呢一個工聯會裏面嘅職位係乜嘢呀？

陳穎欣女士：我係一個區議員。

主席：（經傳譯員）我知，但係你話你同呢一個工聯會有聯繫嘅，你意思係乜嘢呀？

陳穎欣女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係我嘅政治嘅聯繫嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。唔該，林生，你可以繼續。

林家輝先生：頭先就即係律師問我個問題，就係話呢一次嘅政府嘅部門有關嘅檢討係咪就住啲交通意外或者係我哋議會或者公眾人士係發生咗意外之後就係會做一系列嘅呢個係好似今日嘅公聽會或者檢討，我覺得係嘅。當然喺社區、社會上面係對交通服務或者交通安全、意外等等都一定會有關注嘅，其實交通意外每日都會發生，有輕微嘅，有嚴重，好似今次咁嚴重嘅交通意外等等，但係你話係發生咗一啲重大嘅交通意外嘅事故令到個社區、社會震撼，跟住無論政府、公眾作出積極嘅處理或者回應，呢一種處理嘅方法係常見嘅，但係唔等於話社會一路唔關注嘅，但係今次，就算衍生咗今一次嘅公聽會都係可能係有好幾單好大型嘅不幸所衍生出嚟，所以我覺得--所以我哋係嚟到呢個公聽會係好值得嘅，我哋都要諗辦法令到呢啲意外個規模、傷亡人數唔會重蹈覆轍。

每一個交通嘅意外嘅地點都係可能喺設計上面、設施上面係有所不足嘅，好似我哋發生意外呢一笪地點係我哋深水埗最核心嘅地帶，頭先我提到喺我哋政府合署門口，喺議會嘅前面。呢一啲咁嘅咁人同巴--無論係公共交通服務、普通市民嘅汽車同埋行人過路嗰啲擠逼係好嚴重嘅，每一眼燈轉燈可能係有一千幾百個市民喺呢個十字路口嗰度準備過馬路嘅，同時期亦係有可能係十字路口有幾十架巴士等住去越過呢個十字路口嘅，因為我哋個區有啲特別嘅，深水埗區，法官大人，就係新界同市區嘅一個轉駁嘅區域嚟嘅，即係新界出嚟嘅車又會經過我哋區去其他市區嘅各區，另外其他各區入新界亦係經過我哋嗰區，所以呢個十字路口係我哋嘅交通核心嘅路口嚟，好不幸發生咗呢一次嘅意外。

但係我哋議會不斷都就住呢個交通十字路口佢嘅繁忙係有好多意見畀運輸部門、巴士公司等等，即係運輸部門就係點樣去疏導呢個十字路口令到人、車爭路呢個問題係解決，巴士公司就係希望佢哋將啲巴士唔好集中去呢個路口，其實仲有幾條路可以行，但係因為呢個路口又係好多乘客，所以啲巴士公司就唔肯將啲巴士路線移去第二條路行嘅，因為佢哋要接載乘客，所以就係有啲死結喺度嘅。

但係不幸發生咗呢個交通意外，亦去到今日呢個公聽會，我都希望透過呢個公聽會令到呢啲社會政策係有所改變，即係我哋包括頭先都提出咗譬如喺呢條十字路口會加多啲行人天橋，令到唔使咁多市民企喺呢一個每一次轉燈嗰陣時嗰個等候咁多人口。其實喺個路中心仲有啲位係畀嗰啲人喺路中心嗰度等嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，唔好意思，打斷你，可唔可以就係請你講一講關於其他嘅建議，即係關於檢討巴士車長工時、休息嘅指引，我就想問，可唔可以同你講，你就係講咗一啲嘅建議同埋收到運輸署嘅答案，就話佢哋話係會檢討，呢一次係 17 年嘅 9 月 28 號，之後運輸署有冇喺呢一個嘅--喺 2 月 23 號之前係諮詢過你先呢？

林家輝先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。黃律師。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）請你睇番就係區議會文件 2 嘅第 1054 頁，就係第 302 段，梁昌杰先生綜合回應，就話運輸署會同巴士公司同埋工會持份者檢討指引，即係關於係車長工時、休息時間嘅指引，以達致共識，但係運輸署係冇再同呢一個嘅區議會傾過，問你哋嘅意見嘅，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）佢應該答咗㗎喇。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我想再接住講另一宗意外嘅，2016 嘅 4 月 26 號嘅，係廣利路嘅，如果你 991 頁，中文 990 頁。

陳穎欣女士：唔好意思，我哋喺 move on 之前，其實都想表達一下意見，針對番我哋頭先講緊喺欽州街嗰個意外嘅，因為我知道大家除咗關注有關工時嘅問題，其實有好多巴士司機，即係我哋一啲工會嘅會員都同我哋反映番其實可唔可以喺一個道路設計上其實都可以幫助到巴士司機去減低佢哋可能平時駕駛嘅壓力，特別係我哋提到，其實會議紀錄都有講過嘅，就係有關我哋--其實參考番其他嘅城市，我哋見到都有一個叫做 X crossing 或者 diagonal crossing 嘅，我哋見到日本、英國一啲比較繁忙嘅區域其實都有咁樣嘅一個道路設計嘅裝置响度，頭先輝哥提及到...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋已經睇咗個會議紀錄嘅，已經有討論。

陳穎欣女士：係，頭先輝哥提到點解有講有關行人天橋嗰個問題，其實正正就係點解會發生意外呢，係因為喺嗰個過路處，大家可能其實經常我哋會係想過斜對面對角嘅，但係市民就應該佢要喺本身嗰個位置停留得比較耐嘅時間，過咗去對面先至可以過到去斜對角，即係可能就係一個 L crossing，佢哋平時停留喺我哋而家嗰個過路處嘅時間變相就會長咗，咁樣亦都係令到意外嘅機會提高咗嘅，所以其實點解我哋提到有關 X crossing 嗰個做法，其實運輸署都要去考慮。

亦都可以考慮下，特別係一啲巴士司機同我哋反映番，佢哋其實都希望可以有一啲倒數裝置喺佢哋嘅過路燈嗰度嘅，其實都係可以提醒到佢哋去作準備究竟幾時要開車、幾時停車。

我哋而家講緊宏觀我哋好多唔同嘅城市其實而家都用咗好多嘅科技去幫助司機去減低佢哋嘅駕駛壓力，但係我哋香港仲係比較落後，而家我哋連 X crossing 呢個做法其實亦都未係嘗試過嘅，我覺得其實委員會應該要考慮呢個意見。唔該主席。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以睇一睇 990 同 991 頁，呢個係 2016 年 4 月 26 有個致命意外嘅，係廣利道嘅。喺下面就提咗一啲要求嘅，其中一個就係九巴同運輸署要作一個詳細嘅調查嘅，同埋要向公眾作出一個詳盡嘅交代嘅，而運輸署應該係負責呢個跟進工作同埋改善廣利道嘅交通，要減少嗰度嘅危險嘅。區議會有冇跟進呢啲要求呢？

林家輝先生：有嘅，...

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）喺你回答之前，係咪以書面形式跟進呢，呢個跟進係咪書面形式跟進呢？

林家輝先生：咁樣嘅，類似呢啲--即係區議會嗰個議政嗰個形式，好似呢一份文件係我哋啲議會同事就寫出嚟，就因為有一個交通意外，呢個蘇屋邨巴士總站呢度，之後就我哋會喺議會嗰度討論，就即席運輸署同事就係就住呢啲文件就係逐點回應，我哋嘅會議嘅常規，我哋就係會完咗呢一次討論，有時就會有動議添嘅，可能呢一次冇，就會擺落去跟進事項嘅，喺下一次--即係呢一次嘅會議嘅往後嘅會議就會有一個明細表嘅，因為將成個區發生或者需要跟進嘅事項就擺落去跟進事項，然之後喺下次又會討論。

喺呢一次嘅會議要求部門係做乜、做乜、做乜，即係佢有啲佢即時答到，有啲未必即時答到，或者有啲會再研究一個新嘅政策係去點樣應對呢件事件呢，下一次會議就有晒所有文件嘅。好似呢一次蘇屋嘅巴士意外，跟住就衍生到個議題，就係話蘇屋邨巴士總站用咗超過五十年，呢個巴士總站無論喺個設計，喺個需求使用，因為不斷會加咗巴士線，以前就得兩條巴士線，而家一路加咗其他好多，就係衍生到話要重建呢個巴士總站，甚至乎再衍生落嚟就係一地多用，就下面做巴士總站，上面可唔可以做社區設施，整一個大廈式嘅巴士總站，上面係可以做其他政府診所或者社會福利署等等。所以係有嘅。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我個問題問完，係就呢個區議會嘅問題問完。

主席： Sorry, I missed the first part?

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）我已經問完想問嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）剛才係已經向你提問嘅要求，你已經作出一般嘅回應，你亦都作咗啲個別嘅回應，如果有額外嘅補充，你可以而家講，但係我哋 3 點鐘同一個

德國嘅證人係有個取證嘅，所以我哋希望係有足夠嘅時間準備嘅，但係你可以補充嘅。

林家輝先生：好呀，多謝法官閣下。對於呢個社會上發生呢啲交通意外，一宗都嫌多，我衷心期待我哋呢個獨立嘅檢討委員會由閣下帶領係諗到啲新嘅方法或者係一啲新嘅政策出嚟畀政府，同埋令到呢一個我哋呢個城市就住交通意外、公共交通服務能夠係走向更現代化同埋走向世界前列上面，我有呢個期望，多謝你。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝。陳小姐。

陳穎欣女士：我想表達嘅就係其實有今日呢一個委員會，我覺得係對未來嘅發展，我哋巴士、任何其實公營嘅交通工具，我相信對未來嚟講都係一件好事嚟嘅，但係我希望其實呢啲定期嘅檢討係可以恆常化嘅，而唔係我哋發生咗事故之後我哋先至去邀請持份者去表達意見。

其實我哋議會同工會嘅角色其實一直都好希望我哋嘅意見可以得到尊重同埋接納，但係好可惜我哋見到因為呢個巴士專營權其實成個議題亦都因為佢有一個模式，所以令到巴士公司其實基本上喺不論我哋講緊巴士路線重組計劃嘅時候係牽涉到市民嘅便利或者大致牽涉到市民嘅安全、司機嘅安全都好，其實我哋嘅意見往往都係唔被接納嘅，因為我嘅理解，其實佢個巴士專營權係唔會因為我哋嘅意見而受到影響嘅，呢一個係好可惜同埋一個唔理想嘅情況。

我哋往往講緊好多嘅巴士線，其實都一直有去表達意見，甚至乎一啲安全嘅指標上其實都有表達意見，但係好可惜我哋因為以往冇呢啲平台，亦都冇一啲恆常可以表達意見嘅一個機會，所以令到以往一直以嚟我哋嘅意見不被接納，我哋都好期望今次之後我哋可以有一啲新嘅做法、有啲新嘅模式喺我哋公營嘅巴士路線上面可以得到改善。唔該主席。

林家輝先生：主席，我...

主席： Yes.

林家輝先生：頭先大埔議會同事都提到一點，我認同嘅，就住係啲巴士政策或者專營權嘅問題，就如果可以十八個區議會都係就住專營權到期嘅時間之前係作出諮詢或者正式畀呢一個專營權續期嘅意見，其實係會令到巴士公司係會更加尊重區議會嘅意見。

其實喺而家政府嘅架構裏面係有呢啲例子嘅，就係城市規劃委員會喺地區裏面，就算市建局、所有嘅--或者其他用地嘅改變同埋發展，城市規劃委員會都要睇區議會支持或者唔支持或者對呢個發展係有其他嘅意見，然之後先至--係一個主要嘅意見，然之後先至係再去決議呢一個轉變或者使用嘅，所以係有先例。

我都希望閣下能夠就住對巴士公司佢嘅服務能夠積極去提高、作出一啲有

力嘅推動嘅方案，令到巴士公司同市民之間透過議會嗰個意見係得到佢哋認真去看待同埋去對我哋嘅意見係多加尊重。

主席：（經傳譯員）我不如咁問你，喺運輸署、運房局佢哋有啲諮詢關於是否應該讓巴士專營權續期，你嘅區議會有冇作出意見呢，去提供你哋嘅立場嘅意見呢？

林家輝先生：當呢個續期嗰陣時，喺而家嗰個政策上面，係唔使諮詢我哋區議會，我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個我知，但係佢哋一般都會有邀請嘅，我琴日先睇一份文件，九巴要續期嘅時候，一開始就會廣邀市民係作啲表述嘅，區議會，你嘅區議會有冇回應過呢份咁嘅諮詢呢？

林家輝先生：我冇聽到有，但係如果係一個機制係納入咗我哋嗰個議程裏面或者十八區區議會嘅議程裏面，係積極好多嘅，成為一個常規性嘅議程，當然專營權唔係成日會去續期，但係可能五年、十年，喺一年前...

主席：（經傳譯員）好似係每十年。

林家輝先生：係喇，喺第九年嗰陣時，我哋十八個區議會就係放呢個議程喺我哋嘅議會裏面，十八個區議會或者早一、兩個月或者早一年我哋去積極去討論，就會係更加方便去推動巴士服務。

陳穎欣女士：主席，輝哥--我補充林生嘅意思其實就係話其實運輸署同埋巴士公司係應該主動去到我哋十八區嘅區議會嗰度去提交文件，向我哋諮詢嘅，我呢度會有一啲 general 嘅 invitation，但係如果希望可以促進到我哋十八區嘅討論，更加希望佢可以 reach out 去我哋嘅區議會嗰度，向我哋做一啲諮詢。

我簡單講一個例子，其實巴士公司一般不論係專營權又好，抑或佢營運緊嘅時候，講緊巴士路線重組都好，我哋嘅意見係唔被尊重嘅，亦都其實基本上係唔需要聆聽我哋嘅意見。簡單我哋攞一條巴士線為例，當時其實你經常都會問有冇一啲 written 嘅 submission，其實我寫信寫埋去運輸署署長嗰度，就一條巴士線，6F 嘅巴士線去改道嘅問題，因為呢條巴士線佢係途經醫院，所以我哋認為佢唔應該只係考慮盈利，唔應該只係考慮佢當時嘅載客量，因為好多長者係要乘搭呢條巴士線去一啲醫院嘅服務，但係好可惜都係唔會聽我哋嘅意見隨意去做一啲改道，甚至乎削減班次。

喺呢啲層面上，其實我哋嘅區議會完全係冇任何令到佢要聆聽我哋嘅意見嘅一啲誘因，所以點解講到話可以喺個專營權去考慮續期嘅時候係需要考慮到我哋十八區區議會嘅意見先至去再做決定，我認為呢一個係比較恰當，亦都係最合乎公眾利益嘅做法。唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，多謝你，我就叫秘書同你溝通，關於我想要嗰份文件，就係關於政府話嗰個專營權到期前嘅公眾諮詢嘅，亦都有一系列嘅文件係會要你要索取嘅。我要多謝委員會--我要代表委員會係感謝你出席嘅，我哋會 3 點鐘繼

續嘅。

下午1時56分押聆訊押後

下午3時16分恢復聆訊

出席人士： Mr JAN Kuliš，系統工程組長（ZF Friedrichshafen AG及其附屬公司Openmatics s.r.o代表）

中倫律師事務所律師許卓傑先生，代表ZF Friedrichshafen AG及其附屬公司Openmatics s.r.o

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。許生，午安。歡迎你哋出席，你哋就係ZF同埋Openmatics嘅律師代表嘅，Kulis先生，感謝你係接納我哋嘅邀請，係幫我哋手，讓我哋係知道係有關嘅技術裝置係點樣運作嘅。我哋係會請陳大律師，係我哋嘅委員會嘅代表大律師係提問嘅，如果你睇唔清楚嗰啲文件或者需要時間去睇嗰啲材料嘅話，請話畀我哋聽，我哋會儘量係幫忙嘅，請問你明白嘛？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，冇問題，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Kulis先生，早晨，我係陳政龍，我係委員會嘅代表大律師，我會係代表委員會向你提問，委員本身亦都可能有問題問你嘅，喺今節嘅聽證會裏面。首先就想感謝你，Kulis先生，感謝你今日係幫我哋作證，你嘅證供對於我哋委員會嘅工作好有用嘅，讓我哋從一個技術嘅角度去睇下現存係對專營巴士喺香港運作有啲乜嘢嘅技術裝置、科技裝置可以用得著嘅。

首先想問你幾個基本嘅問題，關乎係你現時喺你公司裏面你嘅職位嘅，如果得嘅話，我就用“ZF”呢個簡稱嚟到係總括你間公司同埋係附屬公司，包括係Openmatics嘅，所以我以下就會“ZF”嚟到係作一個簡稱。我知道Kulis先生你係ZF嘅僱員，請問你而家公司裏面嘅職位係乜嘢呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我目前嘅職位，我就係負責呢個系統工程嘅，我係公司嘅僱員，我係Openmatics嘅僱員，Openmatics就ZF嘅係附屬公司。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係簡單咁講出一下你有啲乜嘢嘅職責呢，你係呢一個系統工程嘅組長，你有啲咩嘢職責，簡單可唔可以講一講？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，我哋寫字樓負責技術支援，技術支援Openmatics呢一個系統嘅，新、舊嘅客戶我哋都進行呢個支援嘅，我哋工程

師就會開發我哋嘅應用程式，係滿足我哋客戶嘅需要，我哋如果有問題嘅話，就希望能夠搵出個辦法去解決嗰啲問題，係協助我哋嘅客戶，幫佢哋尋求解決方案。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我知道就係喺電子工程方面就係有個大學嘅學位嘅，係咪呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Kulis 先生，呢個委員會之前就同一個律師就係有書信來往，佢就係代表你嘅公司嘅，我哋已經係問咗一啲嘅問題，你嘅公司就係畀咗一啲嘅答案，就通過呢個律師事務所，你知唔知呢件事㗎？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，我知嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇透過呢個律師事務所提供嘅答案，有冇喺你手頭上面？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，主席同埋委員，喺我哋嘅文件夾之中，就係呢一個巴士技術製造商，就係 BM-1 嗰個嘅文件夾之中嘅，呢個中倫律師事務所嘅信件就係第 64 頁開始嘅。Kulis 先生，我可唔可以同你確認我哋係咪讀緊同一個文件呢？你喺你嘅前面就有冇一個中倫律師事務所嘅信件，就係 2018 年 6 月 26 號嘅一個信件，有冇？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）有，我哋亦都喺屏幕上面見到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Kulis 先生，你睇嗰個文本就喺右下角係咪有個頁數嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，冇嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，明白。Kulis 先生，我就會問你一啲嘅問題嘅，今日，就從兩個角度，咁所以你就知道我究竟係問啲咩嘢問題，第一方面，我就會係問就係關於黑盒嗰方面嘅技術嘅功能，就係已經係你公司係提供畀香港嘅巴士營運者嗰啲嘅黑盒，我希望你能夠澄清同埋解釋到就關於嗰個你答案裏面嘅一啲嘅細節嘅，你間公司就已經提供咗啲答案，呢個就係第一個角度。第二個角度，我就會問關於其他嘅硬件或者軟件嘅功能，你公司係有提供嘅又或者可以提供，可能對於巴士嘅安全係有關嘅，所以從呢兩個角度，我就會去提問嘅。就我就想請你睇一睇就你面前嗰個文件夾，就係第 1 段，你而家睇緊嗰個頁係咪附件 3㗎，上面寫住「附件 3」？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係嘅，冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你公司就係提供嘅答案就係藍色，我可唔可以睇一睇第二

段或者係第一段，呢個第三段藍色嘅就係第二段，就話 Openmatics 就係簽約係提供呢個遠程通訊系統畀九巴同埋龍運巴士公司，然後你間公司就話 Openmatics 就係開始提供呢啲嘅遠程系統就係使用第一代嘅黑盒，叫做「莫札特黑盒」，之後就係代替佢，就用一個叫做「巴克黑盒」去代替嘅，然後同時間顧客係可以兩個系統一齊用嘅，就好似九巴咁樣樣。你可唔可以首先話畀我哋聽嗰個莫札特個盒同埋巴克盒係幾時係推出市場嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）如果我冇記錯嘅，係2011年係莫札特盒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）巴克盒呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）2015年嘅夏季嘅時候推出嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）所以巴克盒就相對於莫札特盒係比較先進嘅？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽一般嚟講佢哋主要呢兩種嘅黑盒其實係有咩嘢主要嘅分別呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）可以嘅，係科技越嚟越進步，唔好意思，就呢一個巴克就係第二代嘅，佢係比較外型係細啲、平啲、快啲同埋有更多嘅介面嘅，所以呢個主要分別就喺呢度。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你話更多介面咩嘢意思呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅裝置係可以閱讀唔同嘅數據，同埋去到接駁唔同嘅電腦，呢個喺莫札特就可以係同呢一個車嚟去接駁等等；巴克盒就可以接駁去更多唔同嘅介面，譬如好似全球定位系統咁樣嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而家嚟講，巴克盒其實係咪你間公司裏面最先進嘅一種型號呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，而家係最先進㗎喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以再睇一睇你哋個陳述書？就係你公司提供嘅陳述書，你嘅公司講就係關於就係司機嘅反饋裝置，係再翻開後面嗰版，呢度就係有一個就呢一個螢幕嘅走出嚟嘅一個節錄，就係關於某一啲嘅界限值嘅，你個公司就講話就個界限起初就係應該係由九巴佢自己制定嘅，就由呢個 Openmatics 就去調校去到一個適合嘅一個界限嘅，我個一般性嘅問題就係話你間公司就係將佢校正咗呢啲界限值之後，嗰個最終嘅使用者，譬如話嗰個巴士嘅營運者，佢哋可唔可以係改變或者係再自己去制訂一啲新嘅價值，還是佢要返番嚟你間公司度呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）一般嘅諗法就係嗰個嘅顧客可以能夠改變呢啲嘅界限值嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋睇一睇嗰啲每一個個界限值，頭嗰兩個嘅指標，就係關於係加速同埋減速嘅，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽佢嗰個其實講嗰個時間係點樣樣呢？就係點樣去量度個加速同埋減速，就去致使到就話已經係超越咗個界限值呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我覺得就已經喺呢度列咗出嚟㗎喇，已經係，係呢個每二次方秒嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我就講緊呢一個嘅系統就係提供畀香港巴士公司嘅，可唔可以就係裏面係講係唔同嘅時段用唔同嘅方法去量度呢，譬如話係三秒或者五秒，其實嗰個加速嘅情況係點樣樣？喺而家嘅系統底下可唔可以嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係可以嘅，呢個係可以嘅，呢個係一個選項嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個咁樣嘅量度加速、減速其實喺莫札特同埋巴克盒嘅制式底下都係可以有咁嘅量度嘅？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係兩個系統，兩個制式都係可以用呢個嘅量度方法嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果係咁嘅說話，點解喺呢一個嘅屏幕之中我哋冇清楚表明係咁樣樣呢，如果係可以嘅說話？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我就唔係好明你嗰個問題。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我再開始，如果我哋睇番呢一個屏幕，屏幕嗰個啱啱摘錄，喺你就頭先就講話嗰個加速同埋減速嗰個量度就係每秒去量度嘅，我問題就係話嗰個加速同埋減速嗰個界限值會唔會就係譬如話三秒、五秒你去量度，而唔係每秒，致使到你就可以睇得更清楚嗰個加速同埋減速嘅情況，係可唔可以嘅呢？或者你需要其他嘅裝置先可以做到？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係可以嘅，但係呢個而家嗰個應用程式其實都唔係可行嘅，就其實嗰個系統都唔係咁樣設計嘅，就唔係畀嗰個客咁樣去調整嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）點解我問呢個問題呢？因為我睇番你嗰個公司嘅網頁，係呢一個嘅車載監察系統之中，其中一個嘅界限值就係三秒之中就係多過或者減少嘅，就係超過百分之五十又或者係喺呢一個每個鐘頭裏面五秒之內就增速咗32 個公里，所以你一個唔同嘅方法去量度突然之間點解會加速或者減速，所以我個問題就係話其實而家有嘅科技底下其實你有一個更加先進嘅方法去量度加速同埋減速嘅？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）其實你係講緊呢個 Vivaldi 嗰個單位，呢個就係我哋係畀呢一啲客車嘅，呢個係喺 2017 年嗰陣時我哋製造或者係 2018 年，嗰個軟件就更加嘅先進嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我明白喇，呢個相對於莫札特同埋巴克係更加先進，我明

白嘅，你其實係咪講緊呢個莫札特或者係巴克嘅盒，其實呢一種嘅量度方法係唔得嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）其實係可以有嘅，但係就係問題就係話嗰個嘅顧客有冇咁要求嘅，目前為止其實就冇乜顧客係咁樣要求嘅，其實係隨時可以係改變嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）仍然係加速或者減速嗰方面，我哋再睇之後嗰幾頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）Kulis 先生，唔好意思，你呢度有啲數字就喺呢一個頁數，喺啱啱佢上高，你呢度有一段文字就係解釋點解呢啲數字就係點樣去解釋嘅，我哋係可唔可以係睇一睇呢啲數字呢？呢個我哋想睇嘅就係話嗰個嘅司機反饋裝置，就關於嗰個意外嘅巴士，其實起初就係個界限值就係由九巴自己制定嘅，後來就係由 Openmatics 校正咗，然後就去符合嗰個九巴嗰個要求嘅，你個意思係嗰個牽涉喺嗰個意外嘅車輛係乜嘢意思呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個喺大埔公路嗰個嘅交通意外嘅，有人命損失嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）關於個加速同埋減速嘅方面，我可唔可以睇一睇就之後第 5 段？第 69 頁嘅，喺我哋嘅文件夾之中，第 5 段。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，見到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢個頁嘅中間，再係喇，藍色嗰段就係你哋公司嘅答案，呢一個嘅遠程通訊系統就喺九巴用嘅，就係可以記錄嗰個速度，加速同埋減速嘅啲巴士，但係嗰啲加速或者減速就係持續咁樣去個記錄其實就冇啟動到呢一個功能嘅，你可唔可以再進一步係解釋畀我哋聽呢個係咩嘢意思呢？特別係講就係話持續去記錄嗰啲加速同埋減速，呢個係咩嘢意思呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）如果我冇理解錯嘅時候，呢個係就係講緊就係話嗰個情況就係呢啲界限值、加速同埋減速就係喺九巴嗰度就係愛嚟實時嘅監察，但係就唔係愛嚟記錄嘅，呢個就係我個理解。冇錯，我哋係有個系統嘅，但係我哋就冇去啟動嘅，我哋所建議--我哋就冇記錄到呢啲加速同埋減速嘅界限值，就冇記錄到一啲數字嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你嘅理解就係加速同埋減速就冇喺個黑盒系統裏面係有記錄嘅，係咪咁呀？係咪正確？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）正確嘅，呢個都係我嘅理解。另外一個功能就係我哋嘅黑盒就有記錄唔同嘅數據嘅，就有二十種唔同嘅界限值嘅，但係就唔係加速同埋減速嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢原因冇啟動到話要去儲存呢一啲嘅數據呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我相信一定有原因嘅，但係我就唔知道，我覺得就係可能係按住九巴佢個客戶嘅要求究竟係需要啲乜嘢，可能就對於嗰個儲存量都有啲嘅關係嘅，一定有原因，但係我就唔知個原因係乜嘢。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我有一個關於加速同埋減速嘅問題，呢個係直接去量度吖，還是係根據嗰個時間而去--嗰個嘅動力嚟計出嚟嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）你可以睇到我哋喺呢一個嘅屏幕嗰度，我哋係我哋第一個嘅指標嚟嘅，喺呢個情況底下，嗰個訊號嘅來源就係嗰個車速，然後喺嗰度，我哋就會計到每一秒嗰個加速同埋減速嘅速度嘅，亦都係可以佢哋係用一啲內置嘅咪錶去使用嘅、應用。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）其實係咪直接去量度還是係以佢嗰個動力嗰個改變去計出嚟嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）喺我哋呢個嘅系統之中，係用個車速嗰度計出嚟嘅，所以嗰啲嘅訊號...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，Kulis 先生，就係嗰啲嘅訊號就係用嗰個量度車速嗰個嘅裝置係攞出嚟嘅，係咪呀？嗰個訊號嘅來源就係由嗰個車嘅車速嗰個咪錶嗰度攞出嚟啲資料，然後嗰個系統就係計到，從呢啲嘅車速計到嗰個加速同埋減速嘅速度嘅，係咪呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯嘅，正確嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，Kulis 先生，我哋就去睇下一個指標，就係關於嗰個嘅傾側嗰個角度，而家呢度就寫係 44 度嘅，從一個技術嘅層面嚟講，你知唔知道點解係用 44 度，而唔係用其他嘅度數？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我諗 44 度你就可以想像呢一架係一架運行之中嘅巴士，佢唔係一個真正嘅數值，即係根據我嘅諗法，呢一個嘅配置就係表示喺呢一個傾斜角度嗰度係會發出警告嘅，如果你想係因為呢個傾斜角度而被通知，你可以將呢個界限值係定喺嗰度嘅，即係喺一個一般嘅營運操作嘅時候。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）另外一個參數，講到呢個傾斜角度嘅，就係呢個嘅配置，就係過速嘅配置，喺呢一幅圖入面，我哋可以見到有兩個嘅參數，一個就係速度，另外一個就係喺地方中嘅速度，呢兩個都係每小時 75 公里嘅，首先一個比較基本嘅問題，睇下我係咪明白得清楚，如果架巴士喺呢個情況之下係超過咗每小時 75 公里，佢就會超過咗個界限，係咪？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁有咩嘢唔同呢，就係呢兩個嘅參數，即係速度同埋嗰個地區嘅速度？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢一個嘅應用就係話有一個司機嘅反饋系統，就可以

去處理一個嘅地方嘅，譬如你係可以喺就住嗰個地方去定立一啲唔同嘅限速，如果你想將佢配置，因為有一啲地方係50，有啲地方係70，如果你配置呢一個應用嘅方法係咁樣做嘅話，喺某一啲地方亦都係有唔同嘅速限制嘅，所以呢一個參數亦都唔同。當然你亦都需要再去配置其他嘅一啲嘅窗口或者係去輸入一啲有關嘅資料入到去嗰個系統度。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我對於你個答案嘅後半部係比較有興趣嘅。架巴士如果你係想利用呢一個嘅地方速度嘅參數，係首先要知道架巴士喺邊度，就先至話可以觸發呢一個嘅參數嘅，喺技術上係點樣做嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢一個就係而家喺我哋用全球定位系統嘅技術，喺莫札特同埋巴克盒嗰度都係嘅，而喺香港嘅情況，呢一個嘅全球定位系統嘅科技亦都係有供應嘅，呢一個嘅功能就可以幫助我哋知道嗰個位置，咁樣我哋知道嗰個訊號喺邊度。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個嘅可以訂定唔同嘅速度嘅界限，喺唔同嘅地方，而家喺目前嘅系統嗰度係咪可以用得到呢？即係你供應畀香港呢啲公司嘅呢個系統嗰度，或者定話佢哋要加落去嘅呢，係咪一啲額外嘅嘢嚟嘅呢，如果佢哋用呢一個功能嘅話？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）當然佢哋需要去配置或者同我哋合作，我哋要一齊去配置呢一啲嘅地方，就係我哋係可以去界定嘅，喺個系統入面係做得到嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢個情況之下，我哋亦都係同樣嘅速度就係兩個參數都係75，有一啲咩嘢嘅目的，而家呢兩個嘅速度都係一樣嘅話，係點解呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我諗即係話呢一個嘅功能就係冇喺呢一個特別嘅配置入面使用嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺香港，我諗你都知道我哋係一個非常稠密嘅城市，有好多嘅高樓大廈，你覺得嗰個穩定性或者嘅可靠性，即係關於呢個全球定位系統係其實喺香港係咪真係咁可靠呢？因為香港有更加多嘅高樓大廈，會唔會影響呢個全球定位系統嘅效率呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）當然，我哋知道香港嘅環境係會有啲唔同嘅，所以係會有啲影響嘅，因為好多嘅高樓大廈，對於呢個定位嘅準確性係有啲影響嘅，而嗰個效率嗰方面，可能喺呢一個高度，以米數嚟到講，係會有一啲嘅錯誤嘅，比起一啲空曠嘅地方，但係我諗我哋嘅定位系統一般而言，對於客戶嚟講，都係可以接受，因為我哋都經過幾次嘅測試，同埋一啲精準嘅調校嘅。最近，我都係傾過呢一個問題，我哋亦都係進行過一啲嘅計算，令到我哋係可以去輸入嗰個位置、有關嘅數值，同埋如果個全球定位系統嘅訊號消失咗嘅時候我哋可以做啲咩嘢嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你覺得有幾常見就係話全球嘅呢一啲嘅商業車隊佢哋係去

配置或者去採用唔同嘅一啲嘅速度嘅界限，就係當一架車進入一個較低限速嘅地方嘅時候，佢哋有幾經常使用呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）根據我哋嘅經驗，佢並唔係咁廣泛被使用嘅，嗰啲營運商佢哋係會喺較高速嘅時候使用，巴士或者係貨車咁樣樣，佢哋都係唔想有一個太複雜嘅系統嘅，對於司機嚟講，可能會係太複雜。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）如果呢個系統係可以去訂定喺唔同嘅地方有唔同嘅限速嘅，就會係更加複雜㗎喇，你首先要去界限嗰個地方同埋嗰個界線，呢一個嘅簡單嘅介面就唔可以去處理唔同地方嘅唔同速度嘅界限嘅，係咪？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）喺呢一個介面嗰度，你係可以去訂定兩個速度嘅界限嘅，然後係需要界定嗰個喺下一個窗口嘅地方，呢度係冇顯示出嚟嘅，但係喺嗰個另外呢一個配置嘅窗口嗰度，你就會見到嗰啲嘅細節同埋有關嘅設定以及嗰啲嘅配置，亦都係有某啲地方係可以有唔同嘅配置嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢個系統就唔係特登設計做呢樣嘢嘅，就係我哋見到呢個介面就冇見到呢一個嘅功能？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果我有一個數碼地圖係可以顯示出唔同道路上面嘅唔同嘅限速嘅，我可唔可以去使用佢就去加上埋而家呢一個嘅系統，就去配置、訂定唔同嘅時速嘅限制，就係可以為唔同嘅巴士嘅制訂嘅，定話喺你個系統入面呢樣嘢係不可能嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係可能嘅，當然我哋係會需要一啲嘅軟件，佢哋係可以將嗰啲檔案去到編制佢，亦都係可以同嗰個地圖嚟到對接，而喺我哋嘅配置入面，我哋就可以進行一啲檔案嘅改變嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢一個嘅系統嘅限制只係兩個速度，唔係多種速度？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係嘅，呢個係目前嘅應用嘅限制，但係好容易就可以將佢擴展，去加埋第二啲嘅限制嘅，呢個只不過係個軟件嘅改變嘅啫，但係而家暫時係並不支援嘅，因為佢嗰個速度嗰個頻度係比較低嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而家我哋係聚焦講下而家你哋係提供畀香港巴士嘅一啲嘅儀器，我咁樣講啱唔啱呢，就係話如果呢一啲嘅界限係多過一個以上係被跨越咗嘅，呢個系統就會即刻嗰啲聲音同埋喺視覺嗰度就係會畀一啲反饋係畀嗰個司機嘅，係咪？即係例如有啲嗶嗶聲咁樣？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢度我有興趣嘅就係除此之外，即係除咗去警告嗰個揸緊巴士嘅司機之外，呢一啲嘅界限值，即係你哋公司提供呢一啲嘅儀器有一啲嘅界限值，佢哋有冇一個嘅能力就係話可以自動咁樣樣去發出一啲嘅報告，就係

話如果有人跨越咗呢啲嘅界限值，就係可以通知嗰啲去監察緊嗰個司機行為嘅人就係話而家呢一啲嘅界限值已經係被超過咗？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，呢一個系統係可以嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）即係話可以自動出一啲報告嘅，係咪呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）巴士公司係咪需要一啲額外嘅軟件應用，先至可以去使用呢一個嘅自動產生報告嘅程序呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）而家係直接支援嘅，喺呢個反饋嘅系統嗰度，而呢個司機嘅反饋系統就唔係話淨係嗰個儀器本身，而係一系列嘅應用程式，其中一啲嘅應用程式就喺呢個巴士上面嘅儀器使用嘅，但係另一方面，就係喺嗰個伺服器嗰度嘅，所以係可以做得到嘅，所以例如喺呢度講到超速嘅問題，你都係可以見到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）所以就係話嗰個最終使用者，即係個巴士公司想點樣樣去使用嗰啲數據，即係佢點樣使用去收集啲數據，係咪？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）除咗呢一啲基本嘅界限值，我哋喺呢一張圖入面所見到嘅之外，呢個系統會唔會提供其他嘅界限值係同安全駕駛有關嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）並唔係喺呢個嘅應用程式嗰度，即係話呢個司機反饋系統，但係我哋有其他嘅應用程式，係我哋可以上載去呢一啲嘅盒嗰度嘅，我哋就可以去量度任何嘅參數，喺技術上，我哋係可以去閱讀嘅，亦都可以去分析，我哋就可以去監察呢一啲重要嘅參數，然後可以開始監察。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我而家想去問另一個題目，就係關於呢個數據嘅傳輸，即係由呢個黑盒收集咗啲數據之後嘅傳輸係去另外一個地方嘅。首先我就想你揭去第 69 頁，喺你嘅文件入面應該係喺第 5 段嗰度嘅，你如果去到正確嗰一頁，喺嗰頁嘅下面應該有一個羅馬數目字嘅(ii)字，藍色嗰啲答案就由你公司提供嘅，就係講到嗰個系統去每一秒鐘收集嘅數據，然後就將呢個數據傳輸去到某一個嘅 FDP 伺服器，每三十秒鐘一次。我第一個問題係呢一個嘅訂定，即係三十秒鐘傳輸數據一次嘅定立，呢個係咪有得選擇嘅呢，定話係呢個你間公司嘅硬件嘅一個限制嚟嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個係選擇嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果個最終使用者係想嘅話，佢就可以去校正嗰個系統，將嗰啲數據係每秒鐘都送去嗰個伺服器嘅，係咪呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）例如其實我會認為係會有一啲技術上嘅限制嘅，因為

嗰個傳輸嘅方法，即係嗰啲檔案嘅傳輸等等，佢哋需要一啲時間去檢查同埋去建立一個嘅連繫，然後上載嗰啲檔案，我諗呢個 FDP 係有一啲科技上嘅限制嘅，需要兩到三秒嗖，...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）所以係會稍遲嘅，...

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）...我諗最低嘅使用值係 FDP 嗰度係呢個傳輸係應該係五秒嗖。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）即係講到呢一個數據傳輸嘅速度，呢一個就係我對你嘅問題嘅認知，係咪？即係話係有一啲嘅限制？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果呢一個數據係可以傳輸同埋被接收嘅，可能係每五秒鐘一次，你嘅公司有冇提供有關嘅技術呢，無論係硬件或者軟件去支援一個實時嘅監察，即係監察呢一啲黑盒所收集到嘅數據？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）睇下咁樣講啱唔啱喇，你公司提供一個黑盒，佢收集數據嘅，呢個系統就可以傳輸呢啲數據，例如每五秒鐘一次，去到每一個嘅伺服器嗰度，而我作為一個主管，我就坐喺我嘅辦公室入面，我點樣樣去監察個司機呢，喺實時嗰方面，我係咪需要一啲額外嘅軟件，定話你嘅公司就可以提供呢一啲嘅軟件嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我哋係其實有兩個選擇嘅，我哋可以提供我哋嘅軟件解決方案，呢一個就係包括 Openmatics 嘅入門嘅門戶同埋一啲其他嘅伺服器上面嘅嘢，係另外仲有一個嘅選擇嘅。有一啲嘅顧客佢哋就係想得到嗰啲數據，佢哋有自己嘅資訊科技系統去做嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而喺九巴嗰方面，佢哋就將佢--即係佢哋淨係用你哋嘅呢一啲提供嘅儀器呢，定話佢哋有用其他公司所提供嘅一啲嘅實時監察呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）九巴佢哋有自己嘅資訊科技系統嘅，佢哋就係會處理佢哋收集到嘅數據嘅，但係我哋如果想嘅話，都可以改變嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）根據你嘅經驗，有幾常見呢，喺全世界嚟到講，就係話講到呢一啲商用車隊嘅管理，啲公司佢哋係實時咁樣樣去監察佢哋嘅司機行為嘅，有幾常見嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我諗而家係頗為常見嘅，因為都係有安全同埋經濟嘅原因，啲公司係想監察住佢哋嘅司機嘅，有一啲嘅公司喺某一啲嘅地方可能咁樣係同法例係有衝突嘅，因為係要保--但係有時要保障司機嘅安全，喺西歐嘅一啲國家有時係並不容易嘅，要推行呢一個嘅監察系統，但係仍然係有咁嘅需求。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我而家繼續，去講另一個嘅主題，你較早前提及過或者其實我都提及過，一個叫 Vivaldi 嘅儀器，亦都係由你公司所提供嘅，呢一個嘅儀器最初係幾時推出市場嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我諗 2017 年底或者 2018 年頭，我唔係好肯定，佢係比較新嘅一個硬件嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係咪比起莫札特同埋巴克嗰個係先進定抑或完全不同呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個係完全唔同嘅，呢個 Vivaldi 就係唔同嘅，係作為係客戶用嘅車輛嘅，呢個就唔係畀巴士嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就係畀嗰啲客戶車嘅，唔係大巴士？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）可以係商用車。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果係咁嘅話，我會繼續講其他嘅題目。下一項我想講嘅，想問嘅問題嘅就係係咪可以用軟件分析嚟到去製作一個報告，就睇下嗰個司機嘅行為係可接受定不可接受，即係講到佢係咪安全嗰方面。我想問下，你哋公司有冇提供嗰個軟件，係有咁嘅功能就去評估一下，即係當然係根據黑盒所收集嘅數據，而有咁嘅功能，就可以係做下評估同埋編製一個報告，就係界定嗰個司機嘅行為是否可以接受？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，係可以有嘅，得。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你話得係點樣做嘅呢？譬如話我係一間巴士營運商，我嚟搵你，就話我想搵啲嘢就可以係編製一個報告，想知道某一個司機佢個表現嘅，你會講啲咩嘢畀我聽，就話畀我聽點樣做法嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）咁樣我就會話畀你聽我哋有咁嘅責任就係畀嗰個--話畀你聽我哋有嗰個係司機反饋嗰個程式嘅，同埋一啲係入門嘅--入門戶，咁你就可以睇番我哋剛才睇過嗰啲參數，你亦都可以得到嗰啲資料嘅，最終你就係可以做你自己個分析嘅，譬如話邊一位司機係有最多嘅警告、有冇超速等等，呢個係一個方案；另外亦都可以係認為我哋係淨係收到司機嘅反饋嘅話唔夠，想要啲更加先進嘅話，我哋可以幫你設計一個新嘅解決方案嘅，我哋可以將嗰個駕駛嘅數據嗰啲參數就係輸入、記錄，如果你想係有更加集中咁睇其他嘅數據同其他參數，亦都可以嘅，亦都可以據此嚟到進行分析，咁睇下你想點樣樣嘅，如果你--究竟你係想搵嗰個最佳嘅司機吖，定抑或你係想睇嗰個係負面嗰方面嘅限制嘅，所以都係可以做得到嘅。呢個亦都係要睇番你有啲咩嘢嘅選擇，我哋有更多嘅解決方案嘅

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）講到嗰個軟件嘅功能，講到嗰個硬件，硬件純粹就係嗰個黑盒就係收集數據嘅，係咪呀？換句話講，就係如果想做頭先嘅嘢唔需要買新嘅機件，都可以係收到一個報告，編製到一個報告，係關乎一個司機嘅表現嘅，啱唔啱呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）唔需要。譬如話你係客戶，你有嗰個黑盒嘅數據，你想有啲新嘅功能，我哋可以幫你做嘅，用番同樣嘅硬件都可以做到嘅，我哋就畀啲新嘅軟件你就得喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）根據你嘅經驗，我想問，喺世界上嚟講，講到係管理商業嘅車隊，營運商有幾常見係會用呢啲軟件嚟到編製報告去睇住嗰啲司機嘅行為，睇住佢嘅表現呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）根據我嘅經驗，喺西歐嘅國家，相當之普遍嘅。另一方面，有其他嘅地方佢哋都儘量係簡單嘅，譬如話只係有嗰個司機嘅反饋嘅系統嘅，就係咁，就比較負面嗰方面嘅，即係只係有一個警示，因為就係司機都需要明白佢哋係畀人哋監察啲乜嘢嘅，如果你用一啲好複雜嘅功能嘅話，你亦都需要就係要培訓嗰啲司機嘅，所以嗰個情況係根據不同國家嘅需要，有不同嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你就剛才講，就話西歐係普遍，係咪呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，除咗係司機嘅報告...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你未落去第二個報告之前，你就話西歐國家相當普遍，咁樣樣我想問，佢哋用啲乜嘢嘅界限嚟到去監察司機嘅表現呢？即係如果好似話幫啲司機係評分、打分，去評估一下究竟佢係好司機、唔好嘅司機定抑或一般嘅司機。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我可以畀啲例子你嘅，譬如話喺我哋德國嗰度係一啲貨運嘅公司，佢哋就會有嗰啲基本嘅參數嘅，譬如話車速、加速、減速，但係除此之外，佢哋都會睇下佢用嗰個腳掣、剎車掣定抑或少用，佢哋亦都會睇嗰個幾時會用嗰個剎車掣，會唔會話佢哋就好放肆咁樣樣嘅揸車嘅方式嘅，所以亦都可以嚟到去睇下佢哋揸成點嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，最基本就睇到個超速、加速、減速嗰個就係基本嘅型號，係咪呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，同埋空轉，即係如果你將個引擎空轉，你都喺度係浪費金錢嘅，呢個係嗰個基本嘅型號嘅。除此之外，就睇下你用嗰個剎車掣有冇係錫住嚟用咁樣樣。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）講到三十秒嗰樣嘢，你就話每三十秒先至傳輸嗰個數據，係咪逐秒咁樣樣將過去嗰三十秒嚟到去傳送或者將每逐秒逐秒將過去嗰九秒嚟到傳輸，定抑或點呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係逐秒逐秒。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你逐秒逐秒咁睇到過去嗰三十秒，之前嗰三十秒？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係呀。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Kulis 先生，我轉去下一個項目，呢個就關乎就係自動咁樣記錄司機嘅行車同埋休息時間。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解就係你哋公司有咁樣嘅硬件同埋軟件，就係讓司機嘅駕駛時間就係自動咁樣數據化咁樣樣係記錄低嘅，啱唔啱呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，講得清楚啲，即係莫札特同埋巴克嘅盒我哋都會記錄到佢嗰個駕駛時間。我哋有歐洲嘅一啲規定嘅，呢個就符合歐洲嘅法律嘅，如果係根據佢嗰個要求嚟到，就可以有咁樣嘅紀錄嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）讓我睇下我嘅理解啱唔啱，你公司所提供嘅就係提供嗰個軟件，讓大家可以記錄司機嘅駕駛時間，呢一個就係根據你哋係用莫札特或者係巴克盒嚟到收集到嘅數據嚟到作一個紀錄，啱唔啱？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個軟件嘅程式係咪叫做 Digi Tacho Download，英文，定抑或唔同呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）其實我哋有一個軟件嚟到將佢下載嗰個數據嘅，呢個係要喺車嗰度裝咗先得嘅，喺歐洲係好廣泛應用嘅，呢一個係車速記錄儀嚟嘅。我哋就係強制就係要嘅，就避免就係要人手去下載嘅，因為唔需要人手咁去下載咁大個--龐大車隊嘅數據嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）另外仲有一個駕駛時間嘅流動應用程式，係咪一樣呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢一個係較為先進嘅，亦都係同嗰個電子行車紀錄儀就係連繫咗嘅，但係佢嗰個範圍，你可以喺呢度見到，就係睇到佢剩番嘅駕駛時間，因為你會好快知道邊個司機就係要有人替佢，邊個仲可以繼續駕駛等等。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果係香港，我哋冇咁樣樣嘅記錄儀，即係冇好似西歐佢哋嗰一種嘅行車記錄儀嘅。香港係咪可以用呢一啲嘅電子記錄儀嚟到去記錄低司機嘅駕駛時間，而佢個做法就係透過呢個莫札特盒同埋呢個係巴克盒呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，一般嚟講係可以嘅，我哋只需要係知道嗰個司機嘅身分同埋嗰個係速度咁樣嘅資訊，我哋好容易就知道佢揸車揸咗幾耐，我哋就可以自己就係進行嗰個量度，即係計算一下佢係揸咗幾耐。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想問呢個喺世界上嘅應用有幾廣泛呢？即係講到話係電子咁樣係記錄低司機嘅駕駛時間，呢個係常見定不常見呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我只可以講歐洲嗰度，因為佢有法例嘅規定，但係北美嗰方面或者南美嗰方面，就佢哋而家仲喺度考慮緊要唔要呢一樣嘢嘅，我諗亞洲同埋太平洋呢方面都應該係咁，都仲係喺度研究當中。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔該。繼續落去，剛才講咗駕駛時間，下一個想同你討論嘅課題就係嗰個你公司所提供嘅嗰個剎車嘅系統，我知道，我哋見過係有兩種，你哋公司嗰個網站話你哋提供嘅兩個系統嘅，一個叫 intarders，另一個叫做綜合剎車控制系統。首先我就想請你解釋一下係咩嘢嚟嘅？另外喺商用嘅巴士，特別喺香港雙層巴士，用唔用得著呢？或者先請你係逐項逐項解釋一下，首先係 intarder，係咩嘢嚟嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）Intarders 係一個額外嘅剎車系統，呢一個係嗰個波箱嘅系統之一嚟嘅，譬如話我知道香港亦都係有啲巴士係用嘅，呢個係一般都係喺商用車嗰度用嘅一個剎車系統，係一個額外嘅裝置，躉喺嗰個波箱嗰度，將佢有係嗰個剎車嘅能力嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）等我睇下我理解啱唔啱，呢一個裝置就係用嗰個引擎嚟到去將架車拖慢，定抑或我完全搞錯咗？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）唔係，嗰個剎車嘅系統係喺波箱嗰度做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，就係將佢轉落嗰個低波啲，係咪呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）唔係去低波啲，而係用另一種嘅波箱傳動嚟到進行個剎車，但係嗰個原則係咁樣樣。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想問 intarder 係咪可以事後咁樣裝番喺現有嘅車上面，定抑或一定喺製造架車嘅時候已經係造埋呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個就係自動波嗰度嘅，如果你係用呢種嘅傳動方法嘅話，就可以嘅，如果話你話事後裝番，唔係話部部都可以。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Intarder 點樣樣去加強嗰個巴士嘅安全駕駛呢？係咪會喺某啲情況之下幫嗰個司機就係更好咁剎車，係咪可以有助安全駕駛呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）等我睇一睇，畀我幾秒等我係搵番嗰個資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，慢慢。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）Intarder 最好嘅好處就係話喺高速啲嘅時候，嗰個制動都係大啲，我要查番嗰啲圖，就係話如果你靠 intarder 嚟到去剎車，你就嗰個剎車嘅能力就喺高速嘅時候都係大啲嘅，就算係低速啲都可以，或者我遲啲可以將我哋正式嘅文件同埋嗰啲圖係交畀大家睇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好，唔該，有呢啲資料都好有用嘅。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我可以有畀有關嘅電腦檔案你嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）講到 intarder 點樣係運作，你剛才就應承畀一啲資料我哋，關於嗰個司機反饋嘅流動應用程式，你話亦都可以幫呢個司機出番個報告，好似成績表咁嘅，你可唔可以亦都係提供啲資料呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我可以將嗰個手冊係交畀你嘅，嗰個係應用程式嘅手冊都可以畀你嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我同你問過嗰個 intarder，我就想問下另一個系統就係綜合剎車控制系統，首先想問下呢個係咩嘢嚟嘅呢？同埋點樣樣係有助於呢個安全駕駛呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個綜合剎車系統，我仲未搵到嗰個資料嘅，對唔住，你要畀機會、畀時間我去搵到個資料嘅，因為我嘅專長唔係呢面嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果你可以之後就係畀番啲資料我哋，就會好感謝你嘅。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，不過麻煩你要畀啲時間我嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇問題。主席先生，我想問嘅問題係咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生，我哋知唔知道香港邊一間嘅專營巴士公司係有 ZF 所提供嘅裝置同埋係邊一種？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，Kulis 先生，首先講到嗰個提供畀香港巴士營運商嘅裝置，想麻煩你睇番呢個第 65 頁，我哋嘅文件夾裏面嘅第 65 頁，即係你哋嘅陳述書嘅第 1 頁嘅。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你或者起碼你公司就喺呢個陳述書嗰度咁樣講，就話你哋公司就係有一個供應合約，就係同呢個九巴同埋龍運係有呢個供應合約嘅，就係供應係黑盒，分別係莫札特盒同埋呢個巴克盒嘅。我想問，兩者都有提供畀九巴同埋龍運定抑或係點呢？定抑或係每一間公司所得到你哋嘅供稱嘅裝置係略有不同呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）就我所知，其實佢哋都係有呢一啲嘅裝置嘅，但係我唔好肯定，因為基本上我都唔係呢方面知好多。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你自己會唔會攞到啲資料，就係話有啲咩嘢嘅設備或者裝置就已經提供畀九巴同埋龍運嘅呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）你話嘅意思即係話我係邊一種嘅硬件？

陳政龍先生：Yes.

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）就我所知，我哋都係有提供呢一個莫札特同埋同埋巴克盒嘅，就係因為之後嘅就係巴克就係代替咗個莫札特嘅盒嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以再問一問，我哋嘅文件夾就係第 52 頁嘅，喺你嚟講，就係我睇番，就係我哋個委員會寫畀你公司，就係 2018 年 5 月 25 號嘅，裏面有好多嘅附件嘅，我就想特別睇下附件 2，或者你可以睇一睇嗰個屏幕。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，可以，睇到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢度個屏幕講到就係講到冠忠呢間公司就係營運巴士嘅，你呢度所描述嘅，你知唔知道呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大...

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我之前就冇睇過呢一版嘅，但係呢個係肯定就係冠忠巴士就係我哋嘅客戶嚟嘅，佢哋亦都係用緊呢一個嘅遙訊系統嘅--遠程通訊系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我哋就咁睇謄本嘅時候，我哋就唔係好知道發生咩嘢事，不如或者你讀出嚟，好唔好呀，呢一段？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好呀。呢個就係關於冠忠巴士，呢個係佢哋嘅被提供嘅一啲嘅系統，喺呢個最後一--「我哋就係話有一個度身訂造嘅呢一個嘅應用系統就係代替嗰個黑盒嘅，我哋而家就係有收集好多唔同嘅資料，呢個 Openmatics 就係已經係加入咗我哋嘅巴士到站嘅宣布系統，所以我哋啲嘅乘客就有更多更新嘅資料，我哋就可以係加強我哋嘅安全性同埋減省成本，我哋希望能夠好快就移去呢個 Openmatics 第 2 個平台，我哋嚟緊就會用更多關於 Openmatics 嘅方案，我哋亦都係考慮緊用緊喺我哋嘅車廠嘅管理，用更多嘅車載嘅系統，尤其是當啲嘅車輛離開同埋駛入啲車廠嘅時候。」你可唔可以講一講冠忠嗰度，你係畀咗啲咩嘢系統佢哋呢？

MR JAN KULIS:（經傳譯員）我哋就係應該畀巴克盒佢哋嘅同埋一啲嘅硬件，同埋一啲電線等等，同埋一啲嘅軟件嘅。

許先生：（經傳譯員）證人其實佢係比較負責嗰個技術嗰方面，而喺商業嗰個生意嗰方面，其實佢未必係好能夠畀好多資料，陳大律師就要考慮下究竟應唔應該繼續問。

主席：（經傳譯員）我就唔係好明白嗰個技術同埋生意嗰方面有咩嘢分別，嗰個問題好簡單，就係話你就話你越嚟越--你會將佢係去做呢一個 Openmatics 第 2.0 嘅平台，呢個咩嘢意思呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢個會係新嘅平台，我哋會希望就有一個新嘅方案，

我哋之前個方案係五、六年之前嘅設計㗎喇，嗰啲嘅科技已經係一啲舊嘅科技嚟嘅，所以 2.0 嗰個方案就會有一啲新嘅伺服器嘅方案嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我睇下我有冇理解正確，如果係講緊硬件，係提供畀香港嘅巴士營運者嘅時候，你就係講緊巴克同埋莫札特盒，就係會收集資料嘅、數據嘅，嗰啲數據之後點樣用，係一個關於軟件，而唔係一個硬件嘅問題，係咪呀？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）正確。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而你嘅公司亦都係有開發某一啲嘅軟件，就可以好好利用，就莫札特同埋巴克個盒所收集嘅數據嘅，係咪呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）正確嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道你間公司係有冇提供一啲嘅軟件去分析數據，你嘅公司有冇提供嗰啲嘅軟件畀香港巴士公司？如果係，係邊一啲軟件係被提供嘅，你知唔知道？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）我相信--就我所知，我哋就冇提供軟件畀九巴嘅，但係我哋就而家就係同冠忠磋商緊就係開發一啲更好嘅方案去做一啲分析嘅，譬如話特別係關於司機嘅行為同埋其他嘅參數，例如話一啲其他嘅--冇話方面。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）多謝，主席，我所問嘅就係咁多。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）呢度就係講 Openmatics 2.0 平台，呢個係一個硬件吖，還是係軟件嘅應用程式呢？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）呢一個係軟件嘅應用程式嘅平台嚟嘅，係喺伺服器嗰度嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢個係一個軟件嘅平台，就會可以係幫你去分析一啲已經收集咗嘅數據，係作唔同用途嘅，係咪？

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）正確嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝 Mr Kulis ，多謝你嘅幫助，呢個對我哋嚟講，都有好大嘅教育意義，我哋希望能夠將你啲資料就係好好咁嘅去利用，多謝你接受我哋嘅邀請去協助我哋嘅調查嘅工作嘅。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）係，好，好，唔該晒。

許先生：主席，就係 ZF，我哋最後有一個嘅-- ZF，我就特別想係多謝呢個委員會，其實我哋幫手，我哋就會係自發性就會係幫助呢一個嘅委員會，我哋就係致力係能夠係改善香港嘅道路安全嘅，同埋世界嘅道路安全，我哋希望呢一個

Mr Kulis 提供嘅資料就會有幫助，我哋就會繼續同呢一個秘書處緊密合作嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好多謝你剛才嘅陳述，多謝你就係承諾會繼續去幫助我哋嘅。Mr Kulis，多謝你嘅協助。我哋而家嘅程序就係完結，多謝晒，多謝。

MR JAN KULIS：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

2018年7月14日

下午4時28分聆訊押後

Monday, 16 July 2018

(9.07 am)

EVIDENCE FROM COMMUNITY FOR ROAD SAFETY REPRESENTATIVES:

MR KWONG TSE HIN, JULIAN AND DR KOU SIO KEI.

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

This morning, we thank the representatives of the Community for Road Safety for responding to our invitation to assist the Committee with evidence, and I'm going to ask counsel, Ms Wong, to begin asking questions.

Examination by MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Kwong and Dr Kou for coming.

I will be asking questions as counsel on behalf of the Committee in relation to the safety-related measures for franchised bus service. May I start with some introduction about your organisation.

From your submission, if we look at the letter from Mr Kwong dated 28 March 2018 in the MISC-2-bundle, page 754.

This is a letter addressed to you dated 28 March 2018 inviting you to make submissions, and we can see at page 757, in the first paragraph in your reply to the letter you stated that:

"The Community for Road Safety is an organisation dedicated to road safety since 2004."

And your information, the information on the organisation is also set out in the TD-5 bundle at page 1699 to 1670. At the bottom it has set out the information including the background, the names, the posts held by different persons.

Can you confirm those persons listed there are the same as of to date. You may need to go over to the next page as well.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. That is the case. Except that some of the members are not that active. I need to confirm their interest to be members anymore.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And Mr Kwong, you also provided your curriculum vitae --

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to that, can you give us some background about your committee, how long have you been in existence, how often do you meet? What is your purpose?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Chairman.

Well, the organisation is actually a small organisation. We are interested in road safety issues, and we want to have a group of people, actually a small group of people, and working together, and giving recommendations to government, and organising activities, for example organising forums, doing some campaigns, and that is it.

We are not a very -- we are not an organisation which are like a charity, or a major organisation, but we can -- we would sit together from time to time and also we communicate through e-mails.

CHAIRMAN: What is your legal status?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Legal status is a society, registered society.

CHAIRMAN: When were you registered first?

MR JULIAN KWONG: 2004.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

How often does the committee meet, if there is a pattern?

MR JULIAN KWONG: We do not meet very often, we communicate more through e-mails.

CHAIRMAN: So you circulate papers by e-mail?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a convener?

MR JULIAN KWONG: We don't have a convener as such. Sorry, do you mean a convener for --

CHAIRMAN: Somebody who organises matters?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Usually it is myself organising the matters.

CHAIRMAN: And the composition of the committee, if that's the right word, how is that determined? The range of skills that you bring to focus on the issues, how did

you come about choosing that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, well, the composition, we do not specifically select people who would contribute to our ideas, but basically people or friends of our committee members who are interested in this matter, and we welcome them, especially if they come from a diverse background in road and traffic. And therefore, you can see that our members usually consist of professionals, with interest, or a background in road traffic, or injuries.

CHAIRMAN: Can you just help us with a thumb sketch of the range of skills that your members have?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. The skills we have up to date, include civil engineering, traffic engineering, drivers training, trauma surgeon, and also the landscape architect.

CHAIRMAN: That being relevant to road design?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would say so.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Now I interrupted counsel who was asking you to help us with your own CV.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If you look at MISC bundle 2, page 820-4, Mr Kwong, you set out your own curriculum vitae setting out your education, membership and road safety training and also the ongoing projects from 2008

until present.

If we could look at your education, it is set out there that you have a civil and environmental engineering degree, and then you also have a number --

CHAIRMAN: That's from the University of Newcastle?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That's true.

CHAIRMAN: When were you awarded that degree?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, the first degree in civil and environmental engineering was awarded in 1986.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And then you have, a believe is that a master's degree studying fatal road traffic injuries at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, that's true. That was awarded in 2004.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 2004. And I can see that you also have a Highways England Approved Certificate of Competency In Road Safety Audit. Can you elaborate what is this road safety audit?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, road safety audit is a procedure initiated in 1988 in the United Kingdom. And now it has become a very well adopted procedure in many countries. The idea is to have an independent audit team looking at the design of road projects. Traditionally the design of road projects will be the responsibility of

authorities and consultants, or designers, but with road safety audit, we conduct independent audit giving recommendations to the project clients, and also to the consultant.

For the Certificate of Competency, that is a certificate enabling me to be able to participate in highways projects for the Trans-European road network. That is projects funded by the EU and also projects in many other countries.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What is the process by which you obtained that certificate?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That certificate requires attendance of training, and also the requirement of evidence that I have participated in an adequate number of audits.

CHAIRMAN: So it is a combination of training and experience?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That's true.

CHAIRMAN: Where was the training conducted?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That training was conducted in London.

CHAIRMAN: At what institution?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That was awarded by a training company called TMS Consultancy.

CHAIRMAN: Is that an acronym for something? TMS?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I'm not aware of that. It is just TMS,

and they give that certificate of competency of course with the accreditation of Highways England, and Highways England is the authority responsible for the highway network in the United Kingdom.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We can see at the road safety training, there are four courses or four trainings that you have undertaken. The first is road safety two-week training in France. Was this course undertaken in France or Hong Kong?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That course took place in Paris, France.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That was in the year of 2009.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The two-week training, can you briefly tell us what it entails.

MR JULIAN KWONG: That training entailed all aspects of road safety, including policies in the European Union and also in France, that also include most of the subjects of road safety such as the highway safety on major highways, safety in urban areas, traffic calming, but also in road safety audit.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and the second one is the Advanced Road Safety Engineering. It is a five-day training in UK by TMS. When was that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That was in 2007.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that the course that you have taken for the Certificate of Competency In Road Safety Audit?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The history was that by year 2007 I started attending courses in road safety engineering in order to be able to conduct road safety audit. And after I have attained adequate experience in road safety audit, in 2016 I attended the course to obtain the certificate of competency.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And the third one is the International Road Assessment Program training for five days. Who organised this programme?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The training was organised by iRAP, that is the International Road Assessment Program, which is a charity based in the United Kingdom, which is now very well known in the area of road safety throughout the world.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Lastly is the Road Safety Audit that you mentioned, training by TMS. When did you have that training?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That was the training in 2016 preceding the award of the Certificate of Competency. That is the same course.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Mr Kwong, if you look further down, it set out the

ongoing projects that you are now undertaking.

And one of them relates to review of potential roadside safety hazards in the Hong Kong road network, an investigation by the Highways Department. Can I take you to a document to see what this is about.

This is in bundle TD-5, page 1653.

If we look at (f), it set out -- it is a paper submitted by the Transport Department in May 2018 attached to the Transport Department's letter dated 28 May 2018. This view stated that:

"The TD and Highways Department have commissioned a consultancy study on 'review of potential roadside safety hazards in the Hong Kong road networks investigation' in mid May 2018 to identify roadside safety hazards of all public roads in the Territory in a thorough and systematic approach taking into account the latest overseas technology, through which suitable road safety enhancement measures would be formulated."

And the consultancy brief, and the scope coverage and objective of the study is at attachment VI, which we can find at page1685.

If we look further down, it sets out the objective of this project.

Firstly, Mr Kwong, are you involved in this very project?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. I have been involved since mid-May this year.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is your role in this project?

MR JULIAN KWONG: My role is road safety team leader under the main consultant.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Under the main consultancy --

MR JULIAN KWONG: Which is AECOM.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, the main consultancy is?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The main consultant for this project is AECOM.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: According to this agreement, if we look at 2.3, one of the tasks to look at is:

"To minimise the risk of the existing roads, TD and [Highways Department] have been jointly conducting road safety check for identifying and rectifying potential roadside safety hazards on existing roads with speed limit 70 [kilometres an hour] or above."

So is the scope of the project limited to roads with a speed limit 70 kilometres per hour or above?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

Chairman, as regards to this project, due to the terms of my agreement with the main consultant, I am not able to comment on the project in this hearing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Can you tell us, when is it likely that the review will be completed, or the expected completion date? Is there a fixed completion date for this review?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, this consultancy, similar to any work I'm doing, has a limited time. But regarding the exact programme, I think I'm not in a position to provide here.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt the Transport Department are, and we will ask them.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, Mr Kwong, your Community for Road Safety organisation also has a website posting articles that your members have worked on from time to time regarding road safety; is that correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. That's true.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Throughout the years, your organisation has written no less than 11 articles, I believe, to the government, setting out your views on various issues relating to road safety.

If I may take you to, just, for example,TD-5, page 1700.

CHAIRMAN: What are we being taken to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is a submission by the Transport Department in May 2018, annex 1, submitted in May 2018 annexed to the Transport Department's letter dated

28 May 2018.

It set out --

CHAIRMAN: Where is the letter dated 28 May?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The 28 May letter is in TD-1 bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could just describe the letter. Is the letter a letter to this Committee?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. This is a letter from Transport Department to this committee, and it was a supplementary written submission. And the reference is at TD-1, page 361. The submission followed on from the oral hearings held on 7 and 8 May 2018.

CHAIRMAN: So you are taking us now to an annex to this submission and we find that at which page?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 1700.

CHAIRMAN: Of TD-5?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if you look at paragraph 8, it set out -- I believe there is at least 11 submissions or comments that your organisation made to either the LegCo Panel on Transport or the government, voicing our your views or comments in relation to the public transport strategy study or the renewal of licence of KMB and Citybus. If we go over to page 1701 as well, it sets out the subjects and also the reference links in the

LegCo.

Can you confirm that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now --

CHAIRMAN: If you wish to follow this in paper form, the lever arch box files are behind you.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Then you can always look ahead or behind if you need to do that.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In all these articles, I think earlier on you have been asked questions about the circulation of papers and the drafting of documents, and you informed us, normally it is by e-mail. I notice in all the submissions it was written relatively close to each other. For example the 2016, if you see on this page, on comments on the fire alarm system, and also in the same year, 14 April 2016, on the public transport strategy study, and also on 16 June 2016 on the renewal of licence for KMB and Citybus.

Now, in all the submissions, how would you circulate, or how would you draft the comments, or how would your members discuss about the issues and come up with the paper submitted to the Administration or the LegCo?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Usually for these papers, we would circulate to parties which we think are important. For example, we started off by sending the paper to government, to Transport and Housing Bureau, and later we started sending letters to the LegCo. But in terms of circulation, we are not systematic as such, in that we would not usually circulate to too many parties or to the media. It depends on whether the subject has been raised in LegCo or has been raised by government.

For the compilation of these papers usually that is myself. If any other members are interested they are welcome to participate.

In terms of the discussions, sometimes, admittedly, I have not been able to discuss with the other members in time, but say for the recent report, then we have been discussing the paper.

Sometimes the papers are discussed in advance but sometimes I can only afford to send to them afterwards for comments and if there are more comments and we can resolve them, then we can -- the idea is that we can supplement the information to the parties we were sending to.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Kwong, you just mentioned the submission that you have submitted. I'll take you to this document first,

it is MISC-2-bundle, page 782.

This is a report on bus safety submitted by your organisation in April 2018, in reply to the Committee's request.

And your submission is separated into a summary of five points, and if we look at page 783, it sets out five topics: bus operation, safety risks, current efforts and concerns, and comparison with overseas practices, and lastly conclusion and recommendations.

So can you confirm this is a collective project of all the members of your organisation?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would like to explain it like this. Due to the time constraint to prepare this document, it is actually me drafting the document, and for some particular issues I did consult one or two members.

But after the submission of this report, I circulated this report to all members for comments. In case they wished to make any additional suggestions or if they do not agree with some points, then I would still have a chance to supplement information to the Independent Review Committee.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Kwong, if I may take you to your paper at page 785, it sets out the recommendation, in the first paragraph:

"The 'safe System' approach should be adopted to

cover the interactions among vehicle factors, road factors, human factors and management."

So you identify four factors as essential to your safe system approach; is that correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. That's true. In the document.

I would like to also add that of course the safe system would also cover policies, which in the report I have opted not to put in, for simplicity reasons.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If we look at the first factor that you mentioned, it is the operational protocols and operating systems.

You stated:

"The most important measure is the formulation of new operational protocols for safe driving, and this protocol should cover speed, acceleration, deceleration."

And you set out two primary categories. First is the general protocol and the route-specific protocols.

Could you elaborate on what you meant by general protocol, as to what factors you would take into account in considering general protocols.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Without an insider knowledge of what at the moment the bus companies are doing with their rules for driving, among the drivers, we have been looking at the issues from the safe system approach,

that we think that the driving of bus would need more regulations or control, and I put it as general protocol here meaning that, for example, driving a bus on a busy urban street, what kind of behaviour, what kind of speeds should be adopted.

And also another example is, for example, driving along a highway, I mean what kind of speeds do we expect from the drivers, and that could be different from the legal speed limit. Because as a road engineer, I'm well aware that road designs are very much diversified, and we cannot rely entirely on speed limit or what we call design speeds. On urban streets, for example, there are always a lot of interactions between traffic and pedestrians, and therefore we need far more stringent control on speeds and also on acceleration and deceleration.

And that is what I meant by general protocols, that I'm not talking about a specific street, but any busy urban street.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If we look for the moment at page 817, first, in this MISC-2 bundle. Page 817. If you look at the top, it sets out what you consider as the precise criteria to be further developed in considering general operational protocols. You have divided it into four criteria. The

first is the urban areas; second is the high-speed road; third is the narrow, hilly roads; and lastly, the cyclists.

Now on the urban areas, you advocate a certain speed limit for urban streets as 40 kilometres per hour for urban streets in general. Then you advocate for busy urban streets 30 kilometres per hour maximum.

Can you tell us the logic behind this 40 kilometres per hour speed limit that you are advocating?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Bearing in mind that these criteria are recommendations at the moment, and subject to further investigation, the idea of having lower speed, lower speed than the legal speed limit on urban streets is based on the safety criteria, safety being the conflict between traffic and pedestrian, and also between one vehicle and another vehicle.

On urban streets, the major risks of conflict come from vehicle and pedestrians, and also vehicles at junctions.

Looking at the speeds, we need to take into account many criteria. For example, how quickly can a driver decelerate, that is to stop, in order to avoid an accident? We also need to look at the tolerance of a human being, for example an elderly person; what kind of speed can he still tolerate before sustaining serious

injuries or fatalities?

These are very important considerations when we talk about speeds in an urban area.

And we looked at many overseas reports, and also the trend in many countries throughout the world, that on busy urban street there has been a trend to adopt lower speed limit, and for example 30 kilometres per hour in a dense, urban area.

Some countries adopt 40 kilometres per hour speed limit, some only 30, some both 30 and 40.

We also need to look at the --

CHAIRMAN: Which countries do have in mind?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Chairman. I would like to explain that in Europe, in European countries, starting from the Netherlands, for urban streets and residential streets, 30 kilometres an hour; in Scandinavian countries, that is also the case. But in Norway, for example, and Denmark, in addition to 30 kilometres per hour they also have 40 kilometres per hour for the more major streets. In Australia it is quite common nowadays to have 40 kilometres per hour, for example throughout the central business district of Sydney.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong --

CHAIRMAN: And the United Kingdom?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. In the United Kingdom they

have been adopting the 20 miles per hour. That is equivalent to 32 kilometres per hour. But in the United Kingdom they do not have the equivalent of 40 kilometres per hour. The next step would be 30 miles per hour, equivalent to 48 kilometres per hour speed limit.

CHAIRMAN: And this is the subject of a paper, to which you referred, from the Department for Transport in January 2013, guiding local authorities about the applicability of such protocols?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. In 2013, and actually starting from 2011, we have been advocating this idea as recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I'm referring in particular to the UK Department of Transport's paper entitled "Setting Local Speed Limits". That is when it was formulated, and has been adopted in various cities, in particular in London, in multiple areas; am I correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. In the United Kingdom actually the 20 miles per hour speed limit zone has a long history. Longer than 2013. But in 2013 the document which you mentioned entitled "Setting Local Speed Limit", has been updated. That document, as far as I understand, further confirmed the concept of adopting 20 miles per hour speed limit. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, you mentioned earlier on about advocating this speed limit. If I may take you first to one of the articles --

CHAIRMAN: Before we do that. You are describing this as general protocols that are recommended. I'm looking at the top of page 817. Who do you envisage is responsible for recommending such protocols?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, during the compilation of this document we have not worked out in depth who should be responsible, but our recommendation is that there should be a general operation protocol, and that is not a legal speed limit, and that is a recommendation of having internal control by the bus company, or as imposed by government.

The idea is that changing speed limit takes time, and that requires the legal process, and also change of the way, how speed limits are defined in Hong Kong. But we think that changing the protocols or changing the driving rules within the bus company can be much faster. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We have received evidence that after the accident on the Tai Po Road on 10 February of 2018, by 27 April 2018 the speed limit had been changed from 70 kilometres an hour to 50 kilometres an hour. So in some circumstances it doesn't take all that much time.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, you are right. I read from the news that for that section of Tai Po Road, the speed limit has been reduced.

As regards our proposal to have 30 kilometres per hour, or 40 kilometres per hour, that is the new concept where the speed limit is applied as a zone, what we call the speed limit zone, and that means that speed limit will be applied in a very wide area in the urban areas.

There are two issues here, the first one being that according to the current design manual, actually 30 kilometres per hour speed limit is not encouraged. The second point is that probably the 40 kilometres per hour speed limit is not yet in the Road Traffic Ordinance, so we cannot apply that directly, but for this point I think I need to further verify.

CHAIRMAN: You are referring to the Guidelines on Speed Limits in volume 6 of the Transport Planning And Design Manual, are you not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's to be found at our bundle at 820-57, just to remind you. You have quoted there from the two clauses that are relevant to what you have just -- I'll just pause.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, sorry? TD-1?

CHAIRMAN: This is MISC-2 at page 820-57. Perhaps I can

just quote what you have written:

"In Hong Kong, the standard urban speed limit is [50 kilometres per hour]. Guidelines on speed limits is given in volume 6 of the Transport Planning and Design Manual ... published by Transport Department.

Clause 6.4.2.5 of [that manual] states that 'Generally, speed limits lower than 50 [kilometres an hour] are not recommended for public roads as they require a higher level of enforcement to ensure compliance, and it is doubtful that the lower speed limit imposed will contribute significantly to accident prevention'."

Now that last statement is challenged, is it not, by the modern approach to speed limits?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, that is the case.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date at which this provision was formulated?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, you mean the TBDM?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, does it have its origins in the United Kingdom Transport Department's papers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. The origin is not from the 2013 edition, as you mentioned, the document entitled "Setting Local Speed Limits", but there are some other references which that document refers to.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find the first formulation of this

proposition? Does this come from 1974, UK transport provisions?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I do not have the exact references here, but broadly speaking, many of the references I would say are outdated.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you. Sorry for the diversion, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. One of the papers that you explained about this is we can see that at page 820-57.

This is a paper, I believe you presented at the second United Nations Global Road Safety Week on 7 May 2013, advocating safer and attractive streets in Hong Kong with lower speed limits.

And if --

CHAIRMAN: Where do we see the reference to where it was presented?

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look at page 820-25, it is at the bottom: "Second United Nations Global Road Safety Week".

CHAIRMAN: I see, the numbers are in the top right-hand corner. Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If you look at this paper, did you present this paper for the second United Nations Global Road Safety Week, Mr Kwong?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at some of the speed limits that you have been advocating, based on zones, that would be 820-35. We can see that you have set out 20 speed limit, 30 and 40. And then divided into different zones, like new development areas, hospital, housing estate, tourist areas, residential districts and villages, it is not exhaustive, but in effect you have divided it based on zones, in determining which speed limit should be applicable; is that right?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The idea of this slide is a vision. Because I was advocating this idea. So it is a vision that what types of urban developments are we talking about, that these speed limit zones would be able to apply. And that doesn't mean that -- that is not the case at the moment.

The speed limit zone, I would like to just briefly explain. Traditionally, to adopt a speed limit we need to put a sign, a traffic sign stating the speed limit for every street. Unless it is 50 kilometres per hour. That is the default speed limit, we don't need to put any sign. So if it is not 50, if it is 30, then it means that we need to put a lot of signs in the urban areas. The idea to have a 30 kilometres per hour zone with the sign which I propose, that also needs to go through the legal process of defining this sign. And if

we have this sign, meaning 30 kilometres per hour speed limit zone, then we will not need to put such sign on every street. We only need to put the sign at the entrance and the exit of the zone. That is very much the practice, for example in the Netherlands, France and the United Kingdom.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the idea behind it is of course to promote safe driving, and if we can see an example at page 820-36, for 30 kilometre per hour zones you have explained why you promote this, basically it is applicable to crowded streets, one-way streets, and housing estates where people would frequent those areas.

If we look at 40km per hour on the next page, this is on dual carriageway or for primary distributors, where the roads are wider and people less frequently walk on those roads, and when we come to 50 kilometre per hour zone, 820-38, we can see in the fourth paragraph you are advocating -- it is where there are fewer pedestrians, more footbridges and good visibility.

And then, of course, when you advocate this, if we look at the next page, 820-39, the reason you suggest 20 on this page is because all these areas are, first of all, the road condition is quite different, and it is narrower, and a lot of people walking around, with shopping districts, entertainment, village centre and

open market. So these are the areas that you are promoting 20km per hour, is that the logic behind it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, that's true. The logic of these slides, they have been especially tailored to the situation in Hong Kong. For example, as I mentioned, a 40 kilometre per hour speed limit is not adopted in all the advanced countries, but in Hong Kong, for the specific situations, I think that would be necessary.

I also wish to mention that for the shared surface, with 20 kilometres per hour, streets like this will only account for a small proportion in the urban areas. Usually in the core areas, say, in Causeway Bay, in Central, but the idea is usually most roads will be covered by 30, 40, or 50 kilometre per hour speed limit. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

And your study is also based on some statistics from the Department for Transport in France, if you look at 820-46, it set out the probability of fatality for elderly pedestrians, and you stated you based this on the sources from the UK Department for Transport 2010, and Certu France 2006.

Can you explain a little bit as to this diagram, what it meant?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. By the year 2010 the Department for

Transport for the United Kingdom published a report summarising and reconfirming some of the previous studies on the risk of injuries, fatal injuries and serious injuries for different groups of pedestrians. I used the information from that document.

As for the information from France, I think that is just general, meaning that I would consider one second of reaction time and 7 metres per second squared of braking, deceleration. That is very much adopted in other documents as well.

Basically what this diagram shows is that if an elderly person is impacted by a small passenger car at 30 kilometres per hour, he would have 4 per cent probability of being killed. But if the same person is collided by the same car at 70 kilometres per hour, then he would have 97 per cent probability of being killed.

The idea is that between 30 and 70, or even between 30 and 60, the difference is very big.

And the relevance of reaction time, as I indicated here, is that when a driver sees a pedestrian coming out from a road, he needs at least one second before he starts to apply the brake. At 70 kilometres per hour speed, that one second already means almost 20 metres. So, during that 20 metres of distance, the driver has not even start braking.

So within that 20 metres, if an elderly comes into that position, he would almost certainly be killed.

To briefly summarise, this diagram shows that on the one hand, having lower speed will be less likely to result in fatalities: this is due to the tolerance of human beings.

The second point is that the higher the speed, the longer the time a driver needs to stop the vehicle completely; and also the time to react is very relevant.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Shall we go back to your report in April 2018, page 786, where we have touched upon the general protocol. Now it is about route-specific protocol.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get there, as far as matters generally are concerned, when I asked you who do you say is responsible for recommending protocols, you said that that hadn't been worked out as yet, but it wasn't something that was applicable to the legal speed limit, what you had in mind was that bus companies could do this, or this could be imposed on them by government.

Have I summarised you correctly?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, that's true.

CHAIRMAN: So how do you envisage that the bus companies would go about -- because that is what we are tasked to recommend -- measures for bus safety, how would the bus

companies go about recommending drivers drive at lower than the legal speed limit in particular areas?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The legal speed limit is the highest speed which a driver should adopt, but they are also required to adopt appropriate speed at any time, appropriate to the road conditions.

The proposal here is that I presume that the bus company can always produce guidelines for the drivers in respect of certain road conditions and what speeds they should adopt, and that can be in the form, say, of a document or in training, but as I said, the exact speed, whether it is 40, or 35, or 45, that also needs more investigation.

Monitoring is a different story. First of all, we need to have the rules. And then next, we can talk about monitoring. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So, for example, we have received some information about how certain black spots were identified by one of the bus companies where difficult bends are involved, and they have come up with a formula for the speed that should be adopted by drivers going around those bends. Is that what you have in mind, as a general indicator of how you might do it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, for the general protocols, then it is general. But what you just mentioned, that

can be, say, a particular bend, and that would be referred to the route-specific protocols which I stated in the document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong, you were moving to that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, I'm moving on to that.

But following on the question from chairman, on this page at the top, you stated that the purpose here is to promote safer driving. That's the second paragraph after the second bullet. The second line:

"The purpose is to promote safer driving conforming to these protocols rather than being a tool to penalise drivers."

So your idea is to invite the operators to conform to these protocols, rather than being a tool to penalise driver; is that the logic behind it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, that's true. In the compilation of this report we do not want to talk about too much on responsibility or anyone breaching any responsibility, and for drivers, we understand their difficulties. Our whole idea is to promote safe driving, so that everyone is safe, the management would be happy. So I put that point just to emphasise this. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. How do you suggest that monitoring can be used to promote confirmation to these protocols or conforming to these protocols, rather than to

penalise? How do you suggest we can achieve that in the monitoring process?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would like to say that the purpose of monitoring is to identify those drivers constantly breaking the rules, and also to identify those drivers who consistently break the rules in an excessive way.

I would presume that the second group of drivers would be the ones who contribute to the largest risk among all drivers.

So the idea is not to say if a driver breaks the rule just by a small extent, for example if we set the safe speed as 40 kilometres per hour, and then at some point say he went to 42 or 43, that is not the point -- unless that location is particularly dangerous.

We need to identify drivers who consistently break the rules, and also those who break the rules in a very dangerous way and then to timely rectify their behaviour.

That, I think would be the whole idea. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How would you suggest to achieve this, by identifying those who consistently break the rules dangerously?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you. Traditionally I presume that there is -- it has been worked by, say, having plain-clothes inspectors to sit on a bus, or sometimes

it depends on complaints, and they send inspectors. But that is not a very efficient way. As technology has advanced, I believe there can be better ways, and monitoring system based on black box, which can be automated, which can be real time, and that would be I think far more efficient. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: This is technology that has been available for some years, is it not? The mystery riders and reacting to complaints is not unlike the system that first obtained when cars were driven, and a man walked in front of the car with a red flag. It is a very old system, is it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I agreed that we should now rely far more on advanced technology. For monitoring. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Now, in your report you put it this way, that:

"Monitoring will need to be based on advanced, real time and automated black box systems."

Would you like to speak to those three items?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, thank you. Well, first of all, I would like to declare that I'm not an expert in black box system, or in the advanced technology they are using. But I am purely --

CHAIRMAN: Was your attention drawn to the evidence we received on Saturday from an engineer from a black box

manufacturer, ZF? Have you seen the transcript of that evidence?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I have scanned through the transcript.

CHAIRMAN: You have declared your lack of expertise in this matter, but what is it you had in mind, answering these three criteria: advanced, real time, automated?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. I have looked at the current status of these black boxes, well, what I meant was that I am not an expert in the technology and also in how the softwares can be developed. But I look at it in a way that what objectives we want to use this black box system, and on the understanding that they can collect a lot of information that would be of the greatest interest for us; namely acceleration, deceleration, tilting angle, speeds, et cetera.

So in this report actually, given the advanced functions of these technologies, we think that they can be adopted, and we also looked at some other operators which have started to use this for management of their traffic fleet.

So in the compilation of this report we think that it is fair to recommend an advanced, real time and automated system.

CHAIRMAN: What is the advantage of real time?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, some behaviours, which are grossly inappropriate, need to be identified and regulated in a very timely manner. We cannot rely on, say, passengers making complaints, and then having inspectors to investigate, and then only making recommendations, say, after a few weeks.

That is the whole idea why I mentioned about the importance of real time monitoring.

CHAIRMAN: What is the advantage and significance of automated reports of this kind of inappropriate driving?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, in my opinion, such black box systems are likely to generate an enormous amount of data, and if we solely rely on manual identification, or processes which are not fully automated, I presume that would require a lot of manpower, to the extent that the process is not sustainable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: From the information that we received on Saturday, and you have read, this technology is available, is it not, automated reports of inappropriate driving?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. That's true.

CHAIRMAN: And it is available on the devices that are currently on the buses.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, from my reading of the document, I presume yes.

CHAIRMAN: So the effect of this would be, if one was to put a threshold trigger, let's take a 50 kilometre an hour speed zone, if one was to put a trigger of 55, that's a 10 per cent over the limit, that would generate an automated real time alert of driver misbehaviour.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, I read about this.

The question now I would consider is what criteria we should set, what are the thresholds, and then also about what control we are looking to. An alarm, or reminder is one possible control measure, but there could be others.

So the whole process of how we can use this black box, this technology, to the full extent, and also with respect to the risk of crashes and injuries, I think that would be a focus of any future investigation of using the technology. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of any direction or mandate from the Transport Department to the franchised bus operators as to how they should use this technology to produce real time automated reports?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I have not studied in detail with respect to the question you just asked.

CHAIRMAN: Have you seen it in any of the documents that discuss the renewal of franchises?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I have not seen anything like

this.

CHAIRMAN: You have made recommendations, have you not? And I think we are going to be coming to them in due course, about what should be included in franchise documents for renewal?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. We made recommendations, but those are more or less general recommendations on the directions.

CHAIRMAN: We will see how some of them are actually quite specific and resonate with what we have just been talking about.

Ms Wong, please resume the questioning.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

We'll come back to that topic, maybe we will finish this area first.

We are coming to the route-specific protocol. In your submission, you make reference to route-specific protocol. at page 786, in the second black bullet it addresses specific safety risk such as sections of the narrow hillside road lacking a safety barrier. And you elaborate this further at page 817. And you identify some examples at page 817, right above section 5.4, that you would like to formulate the route-specific operational protocol to address particular high risk conditions along specific road sections, including long

steep/exceptionally steep gradient road, sharp bends, risk of falling from heights where existing safety barrier is absent, risk of falling from heights on the basis of tested level of existing bridge and narrow road sections with poor visibility, and road sections with elevated risk of conflicts with pedestrians.

Those are the examples you have given. Are these the examples that is -- apart from the general operational protocol, those are more specifically directed at the specific roads or condition of the road concerned?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. This paragraph explains our whole rationale, that compliance with the legal speed limit, although it is globally important, it is grossly inadequate to address the safety of individual sections, and we understand that certain road sections in Hong Kong, for example the historical hilly roads on Hong Kong Island, they are not designed for heavy bus usage, because they were built a very long time ago, and from my understanding, in my profession, I can tell you that for example there is no safety barriers, or the safety barriers are inadequate to stop a bus travelling at, say, 40 or 50 kilometres per hour.

For this reason, we need to pay particular attention to those identified road sections so that the bus

company and the bus drivers are well aware of that, and those sections can be subject to special control, say a speed, for example, 30, 35 kilometres per hour.

Another example is that on a high-speed road, subject to higher speed limit, a public bus can go at 70 kilometres per hour. However, not all high-speed roads have the same safety level. Say, for example, a particular flyover has the safety barriers not reaching the standards for stopping a bus to travel at -- to impact at 70 kilometres per hour. In that situation then we may need to impose on the bus drivers that they should go a bit slower, say, 60 kilometres per hour.

So the whole idea is actually to tie up the speed, and also other behaviour of bus operation, in conjunction with the road conditions based on engineering criteria and also injury criteria.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: But approaching this again, this is to impose controls on the bus drivers, although the legal limit permits them to drive at this speed, as you put it, that's grossly inadequate from a safety point of view, again, is this a control that is to be imposed by the bus companies?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I think in the compilation of this report

as I mentioned, I did not specify who is going to impose that, but I presume that both bus companies and the government can work together to formulate these protocols, and for the bus company to implement.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But presumably identifying all these road sections that have those characteristics as you mentioned earlier on, would it not be easier if the government undertake that task? Because I was wondering if you would know, do you know the Transport Department actually keeps a digital map of the entire territory of Hong Kong. Are you aware of that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Excuse me, you mentioned about Transport Department keeping --

MS MAGGIE WONG: A digital speed limit map for the entire territory in Hong Kong.

MR JULIAN KWONG: I am not sure whether there is a speed limit digital map, but in my opinion -- yes, sorry, in my opinion, the changes of speed limit in Hong Kong are not excessive, and it shouldn't be that difficult, because most of the roads are subject to a 50 kilometre per hour speed limit, and certain roads are subject to different speed limit, and I'm not sure whether they are already on digital maps.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to one document. It is

TD-1, page 368.

That's a letter from the Transport Department dated 12 June 2018, in response to questions raised by the Committee requesting for digital maps on statutory speed limits. If you can read from the second paragraph of that letter, it states that:

" ... we enclose a map showing the whole territory of Hong Kong ... and another one with a larger scale showing the Hong Kong Island only with the roads of speed limits at 70km/h or above ...

For your information, the dataset of speed limits under the road networks managed by the Transport Department ... in the Geographical Information System ... format is already available for downloading from data.gov.hk ... of the Hong Kong SAR government. By using GIS software, members of the public, including the bus operators, can import the dataset of speed limits on to the base map dataset of the [Hong Kong] road network, which is available from Lands Department or alternatively online maps such as Google Map or Open Street Map, to prepare the digital speed limit map of roads in HK."

Over the page:

"The [Transport Department] has put forward the use of the above mentioned GIS datasets on speed control by

the method of 'geo fencing' for consideration by the bus operators. It will be followed up in the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses."

So what is suggested in this letter is we have actually the utility of a digital map showing the speed limits, and if you can combine the digital map with the geofencing or the GPS system that the bus operators are working, then you can identify which routes may require special attention.

Do I understand that correctly from -- I believe based on your experience?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay. I would like to comment like this.

Yes, if such data is already available on digital maps, then it is very useful. Of course that would help a lot for the geofencing concept. But if we start from the basic concept, the idea is that we need to let drivers be aware of which particular sections of roads they need to slow down, or what speeds they should adopt, and even without advanced technologies we can do that already. We just tell them.

But the geofencing, of course, if it is digitised, then it can be tied up with a monitoring system to remind them. But such kind of system would be very useful in the long term, but in order to give immediate attention to the problem, I think we can start from the

simplicity that we formulate locations for the most dangerous sections, and we can already inform the drivers and train the drivers.

Of course in the long term, that can be far more automated with the systems you just mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: That's the whole point of monitoring, is it not? The easier monitoring is made, the more the drivers are disciplined into driving appropriately, particularly if monitoring is real time and automated? And with a digital map with speed limits, and where it is known where the bus is physically, latitude, longitude, it is possible to put in certain thresholds for driving in certain areas?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. And I presume that would help a lot. But also we need to understand that perhaps drivers are under stress, and the whole idea is to help them, rather than putting a lot of constraints on them, and how we do that in the most rational way, I think we still need to look into the details.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of one of the bus operators in Singapore operates a score card for its drivers, deploying these kind of parameters that you have discussed: that is speeding, deceleration, acceleration, as examples, and the driver who drives his bus without exceeding speed, without braking harshly, without

accelerating harshly, scored a good score, he is a green driver. Then you have the other driver who speeds regularly, brakes harshly, throws the passengers around when he accelerates away from the bus stop, and he is a red driver. And in order to help the drivers, you give the green driver a bonus.

It is a pretty simple system, isn't it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I agree. We need to encourage and to reward those drivers who are driving in a safe way. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe in the UK that has been the system. Have you heard about the system called "Green Road" in UK? Have you heard about that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Sorry, I have not heard about this.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is a software that was used both in the United Kingdom by Abellio on their franchise in London, and it is the same one used in Singapore, that I was just describing.

MR JULIAN KWONG: I see, thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In short, the Green Road monitors the harsh braking, harsh acceleration, and excessive engine idle time. So the bus operators in England use this system on peer-to-peer assessments, and drivers are given different score cards, as the chairman stated, green, amber and red score cards, based on the number of events

they obtain.

And drivers with amber and red scores receive further guidance and retraining. And the system is able to pinpoint the location of events so drivers can learn the hot spots, and this system is also used to reward drivers in the form of financial bonus for good driving scores.

So it is used as a way not only to penalise drivers, but also a national measure to measure who are the top drivers being awarded elite status who are then entered into local or national Driver of The Year competition.

So the way they go about it, instead of penalising them, they give them carrots, to reward them, to give them incentive to drive better and more safely.

Have you heard about this system using score cards to reward drivers rather than to penalise them?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you. I have not heard about this, but it seems that this or similar system would be the way to go, provided that it is not too complicated, and sustainable. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have gone through these protocols, and now may we go to the bus design as set out on page 786 of MISC-2 bundle.

You mentioned a number of safety features that you recommend as priority, and you set out six of them.

One of them is the safer bus front; second, safety seat belts; and using more protective pads; corrugated walls on stair ways in the bus interior; speedometer; improvement on driver's vision; and features to alert pedestrians staying away from a moving bus.

Can I ask something about this improvement to driver's vision, about improved mirrors and CCTV cameras. How do you suggest, or what equipment would you suggest in terms of improvement to driver's vision?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Large vehicles usually have a lot of problems for vision. For heavy vehicles, heavy goods vehicles, that is a big problem. For the buses we are using today, I presume that they are better, because there is a large window.

Nowadays, I presume many buses or most buses would have a CCTV camera monitoring the rear for reversing safety. But still, occasionally, we have severe pedestrian fatality cases. Apparently the bus driver failed to see a pedestrian crossing, just in front, or just on the side of the bus.

Now there are more CCTV cameras installed on buses, as far as I understand, but I notice that the CCTV monitor displays are positioned on the top above the bus driver, and I'm not too sure whether that location is the best for bus drivers to observe what is happening at

the blind spots. I'm not going to say that it is not going to work satisfactorily, but I'm just suggesting that we should look at the CCTV cameras, the location of the monitor display, whether they really address all the blind spot problems.

But on the other hand, I learned from the Transport for London website that they are also looking at the visibility problems for bus drivers.

I just want to give you an example. For goods vehicles, there is big problems, because drivers cannot see a pedestrian directly in front of the vehicles due to blind spots, and traditionally drivers will rely on the side mirrors, so they need to look at the side before starting the vehicles. But that is not a very natural way of look and driving. And drivers may fail to look at the side mirrors.

The current move in some countries led by London in the United Kingdom is to encourage vehicle manufacturers to make the vehicle far more friendly for the drivers to see what is happening in the front, and also on the side, and they called it a direct vision initiative. And they are already driving changes.

For the buses, as I mentioned, they can be better, because compared to a heavy goods vehicle, the bus drivers usually sit at the lower position.

But gathering the information I collected, as I mentioned, I think there is still room to improve the direct vision for drivers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Of a bus?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Sorry, for bus. For bus drivers.

CHAIRMAN: One of the problems with lorry drivers is the problem looking through the door, as it were, to see the cyclist right next to where the driver is; is that not one of the problems?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. Yes, to see the cyclist, and also to see someone walking just in front of the vehicle.

CHAIRMAN: And it was the inability to change that requirement on vehicles that led Boris Johnson to determine that "If the EU could not allow me to put windows into truck doors, then I should be leaving the EU"; was it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I'm not able to comment on this, thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think you gave us an example by one of your articles, I think it is dated 17 March 2018, "Road Safety at the [heart] of Workability". It is at page 820-78.

This is the first page of the article. If we go to page 820-82, this is an illustration of the "Direct

Vision" initiative that you talked about earlier on. Can you explain a little bit. What is meant by "off-road HGV" and "Direct Vision HGV"?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Gathering from the information from the source I quoted here, heavy goods vehicles actually are designed for highways, for running on the highways. Meaning that there are few pedestrians, so the vehicles will travel without stopping a lot. I gather that is what is meant by "off-road". But in reality, in many parts of the world, including Hong Kong, we have such heavy vehicles running on virtually every street, including the very crowded residential streets, and central business districts, and that is where the problem comes in.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If we go back to your report earlier on page 786 where you mentioned all the six factors, one of them relates to features, the last one:

"Features to alert pedestrians staying away from a moving bus."

What features are we talking about?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Here in the report I did not specify the features, but in some countries, for example quoting the Transport for London, they are looking at new features including alarms or flashing lights.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So where would the alarm and flashing

lights be placed?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I have not studied this in details, but I presume that they can be placed, say, around the blind spot areas of the bus, for example just on the side of the bus in the front, where pedestrians can be obscured by the vehicle body of the bus.

CHAIRMAN: Would this be a sensor that sounds an alarm when the pedestrian is picked up as being close to the vehicle?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think that is a possibility, but I presume that those features can be activated even without an accompanying sensor, so, say, as long as the bus is turning. So that needs investigation.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mention also on this page about safety belts. Can I take to you page 805, where you elaborate on safety belts, in the section where you stated that:

"seat belts are generally available at limited number ... of exposed seats."

And you have calculated 14 exposed seats in a double-decker bus. The bus driver, upper deck front seats, lower deck front seat facing the corridor on both upper and lower deck, and you stated that seat belts are deemed useful subject to detailed evaluation.

Are you aware that actually the new design of the

buses nowadays, so far as the upper deck front seats are concerned, the new buses have already installed seat belts, the upper deck.

CHAIRMAN: At the front?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The front seats, upper deck front seats.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Upper deck front seats. Yes.

As mentioned in the report, I'm well aware that those seats on the upper deck front are already equipped with seat belts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: One of the matters that was discussed with the Transport Department was in relation to this topic. If we can go to TD-5, page 1688.

CHAIRMAN: What are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is a document, annex 2 document prepared by the Transport Department in response to the Committee's enquiries, following the oral hearing.

The title of the paper is "Application of New Technologies in Franchised Bus Operation".

CHAIRMAN: Is this paper 8?

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's annex 2. That's an additional supplementary submission.

If we scroll it down, it mentioned something about -- 1693, I think.

Can we go back to 1691, paragraph 12. It is stated that:

"At the [Working Group] meeting held on 13 March ... the TD proposed and all FB operators agreed to install seat belts on all seats for new buses, whilst the feasibility of retrofitting seat belts on all seats on the existing buses is to be ... explored in the technical sub-working group."

So it appears from the discussion that there will be new seat belts installed on all seats for new buses in future. Are you aware of this?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I read from the documents of the previous hearings about this. So I'm aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: I think the overall context, it may be you have read this as well, would help. The Transport Department convened a working group to examine the application of what they called new technology, whether or not that's the right description, in March of 2018. And this was the subject of a paper -- I think I'm right in remembering paper 8; is that right?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that's paper 8.

CHAIRMAN: Where a whole range of different aspects of technology, but not black boxes or tachomatic devices was considered. And it is this group that has been meeting with bus operators, bus manufacturers, Transport Department, in the last three months, considering at this stage how these devices might be used. Are you

aware of that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I'm aware of that committee, but I'm not aware of the detailed discussions.

CHAIRMAN: That's the context I wanted you to understand. So now seat belts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we may go to that paper, TD paper 8, that's in the TD-1 bundle page 94.

It is a paper by TD, Transport Department, setting out the feasibility and desirability of certain features for franchised buses, and at the bottom it states it set up a working group on bus safety following the Tai Po Road bus accident.

Over the page, 95:

"... the TD set up a working group ... with representatives from all FB companies and bus manufacturers in mid March 2018 to review the technical feasibility and desirability of installing some new safety devices ..."

And one of them is in relation to installation of seat belts for all passenger seats, that's at paragraph 5, from paragraph 5 to paragraph 9.

During the hearing, we heard some evidence that some bus operators commented that even if you install seat belts, most of the passengers are unwilling to put on their seat belts. How would you propose to assist the

public to understand this, and use it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, I understand that even with existing buses equipped with seat belts the usage is very, very low. That is a difficult question. We need to do it in a number of ways. I think requirement by law is certainly one possibility. And another one is that we need publicity. And the contents of the publicity would be really important. Because we are not just trying to impose something on the passengers. We need to explain to them and have them understand, have them understand the importance of having the seat belts fastened, not only to protect themselves, but say in case for those seats where there are passengers facing them, that if they are thrown forward they would injure other people, and even in a rollover, if they do not wear seat belts, they can also injure other people.

So how to translate this technical knowledge to public understanding, I think that is a real challenge, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That was the formula adopted with seat belts in motor cars, was it not? To start with, it was voluntary, and nobody used them, and then eventually it was made compulsory, and everyone uses them now.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, I agree. But I think we also need to look at the model of public light buses.

It is compulsory by law to have the seat belt fastened, but today I can see that the compliance rate by passengers is not very high. We certainly need far better ways, I think, to convince and also to require passengers to wear seat belts.

But how to do that, I'm not able to give very definite answer, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: It is illegal to park a vehicle on double yellow lines, but we know from walking around the streets of Hong Kong, that enforcement is the problem.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. Enforcement is an issue, but I'm also sympathetic with those charged with the responsibility for enforcement. Because in terms of road safety, every day, everywhere, there is so much violations in one way or another, including seat belts, and it is very difficult to have enforcement conducted all the time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps some of the time would be beneficial.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, I agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In this paper, it also mentioned other safety devices that have been touched upon in your paper, including, if we look at page 98 of TD-1, the use of technology on the safety devices of franchised buses. It mentioned electronic stability control and roll stability control, which is also mentioned in your paper

at page 818, called the electronic stability programme.

Do you know --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, if you are moving to devices, in your piece on bus design, you mentioned at 786, in fact it is the first matter that you address, it is a safer bus front, and you give details of it.

What is it that is unsafe at the moment about the front of a bus, or relatively unsafe?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman, the upper deck of a bus, at the front, there is very limited space, what we call the concept of crumple zone. Safety belts on the upper deck front seats are beneficial for certain types of incidents, for example a bus braking abruptly, or a bus colliding with a safety barrier, colliding with a small passenger car. But considering that the double-decker bus collides with a container vehicle in the front, or colliding with a bridge pier, then the upper deck front passengers, even if they are restrained by seat belts, they will suffer severe injuries.

And in this respect, maybe I also invite Dr Kou to supplement the information.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Dr Kou.

DR KOU SIO KEI: Mr Chairman. So in an unrestrained or restrained passenger, if the occupant compartment collapses, say for example in the upper front part of

the bus, it is the interior posterior type of compression that causes serious injuries to the occupant in the chest, which we have all the major organs inside, and also the abdomen and the pelvis, and we know that by this type of compression injuries, especially in the chest and pelvis, it would result in very severe and even fatal internal bleeding.

That's the reason why Mr Kwong noted that the upper front seats of a double-decker bus, the occupants sitting over there, whether they are restrained or unrestrained, they are at a higher risk. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: It is right, is it not, from the photographs that I have seen and perhaps you have seen, that the front of the bus in the Tai Po Road accident on 10 February, that was severely damaged, was it not, the upper front of the bus?

If you have not seen the photographs, by all means say so.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman. I have seen the photographs.

For that --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that's a different cause of damage.

MR JULIAN KWONG: I'm not always sure of the exact mechanism of that incident. When the bus rolls over, or topples, whether the buses topple directly onto the bus shelter, and it is the bus shelter structure intruding into the

bus body that contributes to the high number of fatalities.

And that could be a reason, but I'm not always sure, until there's adequate evidence. As I mentioned in the report, we need to understand injury patterns and mechanisms. Because, say, if we are trying to introduce a particular measure, including seat belt, we need to understand that they can be very helpful for certain kinds of crash and injury mechanisms, but they may be not very useful for certain mechanisms. So that is the precise directions we are advocating, that we need to understand crashes and injuries in a much better way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And on this topic, Mr Kwong, and Dr Kou, may I refer you to your April 2018 paper at page 805, at the bottom. The topic on compartmentalisation, and also the rollover test to UNECE Regulation No. 66 at the bottom.

It referred to a:

"... widely accepted regulation requiring bus superstructures to have sufficient strength to maintain a defined volume of residual space integrity during and after a rollover test with the objective to promote passengers' survival."

Can you elaborate on this? Are you suggesting it is in fact a regulation requiring a bus manufacturer or operator to have a specific material used to ensure there is sufficient space/integrity? Maybe you can elaborate on that.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay. While admitting that I'm not an expert in vehicle design, I did try to study a number of documents related to bus superstructure design, and I came to understand that the rollover test to UNECE regulation No. 66, that is required for single-decker buses. The idea is that when a bus rolls over, it is very important that the superstructures does not deform excessively, otherwise the passengers inside will be compressed, and there is a real risk that they come into contact with the road because they are compressed during the rollover.

So they require that the superstructure remains more or less intact. But I also came to understand that this test applies to single-decker buses. There was a proposal in 2009 by an expert to the UNECE that double-decker buses should also be included.

I'm not sure whether the regulations have been updated, and I'm not sure whether double-decker buses have indeed been tested for rollover.

But I would like to add a point, that my

understanding is that this rollover test is a simple rollover test, that means the bus toppling onto one side, without toppling onto objects like a bus shelter, a wall, a safety barrier, and railing, et cetera.

And secondly, the main emphasis is that the objective is to maintain the residual space integrity, passengers are subject to injuries in a number of ways when a bus rolls over. And this test will help a lot. But that is not the entire story. It cannot prevent all kinds of injuries.

In this sense maybe I would also like to see if Dr Kou has something to supplement.

DR KOU SIO KEI: In the case of a toppled double-decker, we need two things. One is that the superstructures remained intact, as Mr Kwong has mentioned. The second thing is we try to prevent the occupants inside the compartment to move excessively, either out of the window of the vehicle, or onto the other passengers inside the same compartment. Because if we know that if a person becomes unconscious but is still breathing, but then if there are two people of similar size on top of him or her, then he or she would very likely suffer from suffocation as a result of that external pressure by others.

That would be some of the points of consideration in

cases of a toppling bus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go back to the TD paper, TD-1, page 98, we were onto the electronic stability control and roll stability control system which is also mentioned in your paper at 786 as the electronic stability programme. Do you know much about this programme?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Again, I would like to say I am not an expert in vehicle design, but having read about the electronic stability control and the rationale, and also seeing that it is actually a mature technology, I consider in the report that it is something we would recommend, at least to be investigated in detail.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, in fact the Transport Department has advocated this. If we look at page 100 in bundle TD-1, still in the same bundle, but in paragraph 15, same paper. If we look at paragraph 15 it stated:

"One of the bus manufacturers have advised that their new and existing buses have already been equipped with the [electronic stability control system]. As such, about 2.8 per cent of the [franchise buses] ... in Hong Kong procured from this manufacturer have been installed with the ESC."

That is the electronic stability control:

"The bus manufacturer further advised that one of

the functions ... [is to use] electronic-controlled suspension for rollover protection ...

Based on the bus manufacturers' advice, their [electronic stability control] could already assist the vehicle back to track before the rollover situation begins. However, the bus manufacturers pointed out that even with the installation, a bus can still lose control due to inappropriate driving behaviour, eg aggressive driving. The bus would roll over if it is being driven off-road and the body angle is too high ... To improve bus safety, all FB operators agree to incorporate the requirement of installing ESC system ... for procurement of new buses."

That's the electronic stability programme. Do you know whether it has been widely used in UK, and in France, and in the programmes that you have undertaken?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I do not have information regarding the current extent of usage and for applications to public buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The other thing that you mentioned in your paper is the autonomous emergency braking system. That is in your paper at page 786. Can you elaborate on what this is.

MR JULIAN KWONG: For this paragraph, I mentioned that these features should be explored. Autonomous emergency

braking system, as I understand, of course it is an intelligent system. When a vehicle detects that a collision is imminent, for example colliding with a pedestrian or colliding with a vehicle in front, then the system will be automatically activated to stop or to slow down the vehicles.

And I recommended this for a number of reasons. Rear-front collision is one of the most serious concerns. A bus rolling over, or falling down a cliff, of course that is a major concern, but rear-front collisions are more common, and that often happen on highways, often resulting in a lot of injuries, and the upper deck front passengers usually suffer severe injuries. Another one is pedestrian collision.

So on the understanding that some bus companies are already introducing such systems, whether definitely or as trials, I thought that that would be a good feature to be explored. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if we go back to the TD paper, page 102, that's TD-1, page 102, on speed display unit --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, what was the result of the consideration by the working group on adopting advanced technology as far as this is concerned?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe they have not touched on this

subject. Can I go back to ...

CHAIRMAN: Is this addressed under the heading "Collision prevention" at page 103 of TD-1? There are two matters being dealt with there, one is keeping lanes, but the other seems to be dealing with what Mr Kwong has been calling front to tail of a collision.

So one is keeping you in a lane, and the other is avoiding a collision with a vehicle in front because you are too close, or the vehicle has stopped and you have not, and also with pedestrians.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that's correct. That's page 103 to 104.

If we look at page 103 at the bottom, the last three lines, paragraph 24:

"When the bus gets too close to the vehicle in front, a signal (audible and/or visual) will alert the driver. Some systems offer collision warning with the brake support. If the driver does not react after the collision warning, the brake support function will activate the braking system to react quickly and hence the brakes will be applied. In the event of an imminent crash and the driver has not applied the brakes, some of the new systems that are available in the market would apply heavy braking automatically to help reduce the impact of the crash."

Then it sets out a photo show activation of the collision prevention system. The Transport Department is also mentioning the three bus manufacturers' reaction to this. It is at paragraph 26:

"All the three bus manufacturers advise that there are in-built or third-party lane keeping systems ... However, they have reservation in the installation of such device on the [franchise buses] as the traffic in Hong Kong is heavy and frequent lane changing is required ..."

CHAIRMAN: Isn't this dealing with a separate topic?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: One is avoiding front-tail collision and the other is lane keeping. Is there any response to avoiding collisions?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is at the last line:

"In sum, the FB operators do not consider that the installation of collision prevention and lane keeping devices are effective for enhancing the safe operation of FB services."

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the FB operators, that's the franchised bus operators, seem to take a different view as to the efficiency of this prevention collision system. That's why I would like your experience in this. Because in

your paper you did raise this as one of the devices that you consider of some use.

How would you respond to this?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Of course, the introduction of any new systems would need to be thoroughly discussed with the bus operators, and also to have the feedback from bus drivers.

It can create problems if we have too many systems causing distractions and difficulty of usage or any unwanted effects.

However, I recommend the study of collision prevention system, that is the autonomous braking system, is based on the prevalence of rear-front collisions, and the implications, and also that a number of operators overseas have introduced the system or are seriously having trials of the system. What I'm not sure from this paragraph is the rationale that the FB operators do not consider them effective.

Whether the discussion is just they do not want it, or they have some good justification of not doing that, or whether they are willing to at least conduct some trials, so I cannot comment on this due to the lack of information. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Well, to help you, it is my memory that we received some information from Citybus that they had

conducted a trial of such a system, and they had found it distracting, too many alarms going off, and so on. But perhaps that could be found after we take a break, and you can be taken to what that evidence was so that you can see what the rationalisation was.

If I could ask you to look that up, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It is my memory it came in the oral evidence of Citybus. I know one of these devices is called Mobileye, but there may have been another device that was used by Citybus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to take a break of 20 minutes, and then we will resume with your evidence. Thank you.

(11.17 am)

(A short break)

(11.41 am)

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before the break, we were discussing about a number of issues. In response to the chairman's question about the evidence of one of the bus operators, Citybus, of this collision or lane keeping device, can we go to transcript bundle TSCP-1, at Day 4 of the oral session at page 49.

It should be TSCP-2 bundle, at pages 49 to 51.

The question by Mr Duncan, that's the counsel,

leading counsel for the Committee, at line 19. Mr Chung is representing the Citybus in relation to technological device, and he asked Mr Chung:

" ... if I could then ask to you look at paragraph 26 [which is the paragraph we have looked at]. It records the fact that 'the ... bus operators do not consider that the installation of collision prevention and lane-keeping devices are effective for enhancing the safe operation of franchised bus services', and I believe this for the reasons that you can see earlier in paragraph 26. Is that the case?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly then that as far as the company is concerned, it is not proposing to pursue that possible device any further?

MR WILLIAM CHUNG: Let me first of all explain. Such a device, in the year 2014, our company did carry out a test of such devices. This is called Mobileye. Mobileye is a driving assisting device. At that time, it was mainly applied to private cars. What was involved was that they would use the visual aid to detect what is in front and then the system will carry out an analysis and then calculations would be made as to the distance between the subject vehicle and the preceding one and the following one, and then come up

with an idea about the time of collision, then warning signals would be sent to the driver.

At the time we fitted this Mobileye on three of our buses, we carried out a trial scheme for four months. We made arrangements for representatives of different trade unions, that is bus captain representatives, as well as 50-plus bus captains to drive such buses, that is three of them, in their normal service, and after that they were asked to fill out a questionnaire for us, telling us what they think about this device called Mobileye.

So the findings were such that some of the alerts were not quite suitable for use on buses. Say, for example, when the bus pulls up at a bus bay, since it is detected that there are people in front of the bus, as you know there are passengers waiting at the bus stop, so when people are detected then there will be an audio signal. Well, in fact the driver hasn't yet straightened the bus and so a signal would also be sent.

Moreover, when the bus is stopped too close to the preceding bus, this will be a signal to be sent out in the case of when the traffic is slow. As a result, it means that the warning signals are emitted many times during a journey. 46 per cent of the bus captains told us in the questionnaire that there were too many warning

signals and it was causing a nuisance to their driving, and as a result they ignored the signals, and then 50 per cent of the drivers told us that the Mobileye didn't help in their safe driving.

So having considered the functions of this Mobileye and having taken into account the views of our bus captains, moreover there is a high cost involved in the installation, we as a result decided against following up on the idea.

So that's our experience. We shared our experience at the meeting."

So that's the transcript.

And if I may also take you to the report, that it is mentioned in the evidence. That is in CTB-3. Page 601.

That's the first page, that's the Mobileye trial result.

At page 603 it referred to the time when this trial was carried out: Background, second paragraph you can see it was carried out in 2014, and if you look down at paragraph 2, the second paragraph, Mobileye trial:

It was split into two phases, and the second paragraph:

"Questionnaires were sent to 13 union representatives and 54 bus captains who had driven the test buses to collect their feedbacks ..."

And then if we go to page 609, it is setting out the conclusion and recommendation. Paragraph 5:

"Bus captain's acceptance.

50 per cent of bus captains opined that the Mobileye was not helpful for driving safety and 44 per cent of bus captains opined that the alerts of the Mobileye caused usance to driving. The suitability and usefulness of the Mobileye is questionable. Hence it is not recommended to go ahead with the Mobileye."

Lastly, in the recent paper submitted by the Transport Department in May 2018 for completeness, that's at TD-5, page 1691 at paragraphs 12 to 13, you can see at paragraph 12, the fifth line from the bottom of paragraph 12 it mentioned:

"... the collision prevention lane keeping device ... were tabled for discussion at the [working group]. It was agreed at the [working group] meeting that the feasibility and applicability of the ... on-bus devices would be further deliberated in the technical sub-working group."

And paragraph 13, I believe right in the middle. It stated that:

"... no final decisions have been made on the proposals of the new technology. It is expected that a report on the recommended safety-enhancement measures

and facilities to be installed on buses will be released in June/July 2018."

So for completeness, no final decision has been made, but only Citybus has done a trial result, based on the 54 bus captains' experience.

Given the information in front of you, would you like to comment on the information, because in your report you recommended this autonomous braking system, emergency braking system, would you like to make further comments on this area?

CHAIRMAN: I think to be fair to Mr Kwong he recommended that it be tested, not that you gave a blank cheque that it was recommended to be used.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. We have recommended that it is explored, and everything is subject to evidence and practicality.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in remembering, Ms Wong, that Mobileye or Mobicon is in use with other bus companies elsewhere in the world? Is it not in use in London?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, it was an equipment used I believe in England, in a study, and that is why it was proposed to be used in Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: But has it not been used more recently in London, subject to this 2014 test?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. In a recent report. We will find out

the relevant references for you in due course.

May I move on to another --

CHAIRMAN: One reason it may not be useful in Hong Kong is bus drivers drive centimetres away from the bus in front of them, particularly when they are slow moving, and no doubt that does cause irritating alarms, but presumably one can set a distance setting for the alarm going off, and if you are driving so close that a pedestrian can't even walk in front of the bus as the bus is stationary, it is not surprising there are lots of alarms.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I think we need to understand more about the threshold and criteria, and also this equipment will be advancing all the time, the technology, so I recognise that Citybus has done a very good trial, and they did a survey afterwards, and I have no comment on that, but the main reason we are recommending that such systems are explored is based on a need, the need being that we have rear-front collisions which are really serious, and then we also have the risk of collisions with pedestrians, and such systems, if they are matured enough, may be a very good measure to mitigate our problems.

But, of course, everything will be subject to trials, and also we need to prove that it really works. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. And before we move away from this TD paper, may I ask a few questions about some of the proposals suggested by the Transport Department.

One of them is the speed display unit, at page 102 of TD-1. That's the paper 8 in relation to the new technology. At paragraph 21, the last line, it mentioned that the existing speed display unit installed on a public light bus may resemble the installation of the proposed device on a franchised bus is shown in figure 6. And then if we go over the page at paragraph 22, it sets out the response of the franchised bus operators, near the end of paragraph 22:

"In addition, the FB operators are concerned that SDU would create conflicts and arguments between the bus captain and passengers, and impose additional pressure on the bus captains which in turn would affect the safety for bus driving. The FB operators consider that the SDU is not conducive in enhancing bus safety."

We all know that the speed display unit has been installed in public light buses, but what would you say about the response made by franchised bus operators as to the efficiency of this unit in terms of enhancing bus safety?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you. I understand the standpoint,

but from our point of view it would be whether such installation would be really helpful to road safety. That would be our major concern.

May I just point out that in our report submission we did mention about the term "speedometer", but in our submission, we were talking about speedometer in digital display for the driver, as opposed to the current analogue display for the drivers.

That is important because we need to first make sure that drivers are aware of what speeds they are using. Sometimes they may not be deliberately exceeding the speed excessively. But current display, it seems that drivers would find it difficult to read the analogue display, because of the position, and also it is not digital. So that was our recommendation that there needs to be a fairly prominent digital display for the driver at the right position.

But then coming to the second point about speedometer installation for passengers. After we came to know about this proposal, I also had some thoughts.

For passengers to make complaint or to tell the drivers, I'm not too sure whether that will be an effective way. But one possible use of such speedometer display is to enhance inspectors. To quickly gather information where, whether bus drivers have been grossly

violating speed limit, or the pre-defined protocols for speeds at different location or in general.

And that could be a possible benefit. But as I mentioned, relying on passengers to make complaints, from my experience, I'm not too sure whether that would be really effective, given the cost of installation.

So that needs to be -- I think it would be better always to study it in more details, maybe to have some trials. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: When you say passengers' complaints are not too useful. Do you have in mind passengers complaining to the bus on the stop to the bus captain?

MR JULIAN KWONG: You mean according to my experience?

CHAIRMAN: No, when you say you don't think it would be too useful to enable passengers to complain, do you have in mind that the passengers might complain to the bus captain in real time on the spot?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. I would like to say that I would not make a conclusion now, but it is not easy to decide on that, because we have to look at the behaviour, and also to look at how it works in reality. Because most passengers I presume they do not care -- as long as the bus is not going as crazy speeds. They may not be aware that, say, for example, I mentioned that on busy urban street, going at 45 or 50 kilometres per hour

is already dangerous. Passengers may be more interested in getting to their destination in time, and they may not be so sensitive to small variations in speed.

Of course if the bus driver is going at a grossly excessive speed, then that is a problem. That may help passengers talking to the bus drivers, and to stop his behaviour in time.

But that is also going to be difficult, because in that situation the driver would already know very well that he is going at much faster speed than his company, or the legal speed limit would permit: and the passenger talking to him directly whilst he is driving, that could be seen as an aggression.

So these issues could be complicated. So to conclude, I would like to say that if we concentrate on this usage of the speedometers, I am not yet sure whether that is going to contribute a lot to bus safety, but we can always investigate this issue in more detail, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The Transport Department has a complaint telephone number, does it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I think --

CHAIRMAN: Have you examined the mechanism for this complaints? How one makes the complaints?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, as far as I understand, there

are a number of channels.

CHAIRMAN: There is a form, isn't there?

MR JULIAN KWONG: There is a form and you can --

CHAIRMAN: Does that form have a box that says "bus excessive speed"?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I'm not aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: I have looked at it, and I can't find it. But perhaps you might consider this scenario: if a passenger was concerned about the speed at which a bus was being driven -- and the manner, because speed by itself is not necessarily dangerous, is it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Can you repeat?

CHAIRMAN: Speed by itself is not necessarily dangerous.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, it is not only speed, it is the degree of conflict, and in what context.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, since there is a complaint mechanism, would it not assist if the passenger on the bus would have his suspicions confirmed that the bus was actually going, say, 65 kilometres an hour and not 50 in a 50 zone, and all the passenger has to do is use the iPhone that he is already using for other purposes, to take a photograph, and then he e-mails the photograph to the transport complaint unit, and then you have a photograph of the speed, and perhaps also where the bus was.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, that is a very good idea, and in

that case I think there needs to be some thought on how we position that speedometer display, considering, for example, you take the picture, and together you take the picture of the road ahead, so that there can be a proof of where the bus is, and maybe the display also has the number of the bus, the registration plate, and also that that is positioned at a location where the bus drivers will not be able to see that the bus passenger is taking the photograph, to avoid any direct conflicts between the driver and the passenger.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, if I may take you to the last proposed device proposed by the Transport Department. It is the driver monitoring device at TD-1, page 105. Paragraph 27.

This was a device that was said to monitor driving performance and alert the driver if it detects a lack of attention or drowsiness, and if we jump a line:

"When the system detect potential unsafe behaviours, such as 'looking aside', 'dozing', 'drowsiness' or 'bad posture', the system will give visual warning and voice alert to the driver."

We go over the page:

"All three bus manufacturers have advised that these systems are third-party system and standalone ... It is

technically feasible to monitor the bus captain's status but will also pose unnecessary nuisance to the bus captain when there is a false alarm. Two FB operators advise that they would install a similar system in four of their buses for a trial of 3 months tentatively starting from early May 2018. The TD, in collaboration with the FB operators concerned, will assess the effectiveness of the system upon completion of the trial."

First, Mr Kwong, have you heard about this driver monitoring device system before?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I am aware of such systems, but I have not gone into the details of such system. Fatigued driving, or inattention certainly is a possible factor for road crashes.

But again, whether such systems would be beneficial, then we need to look at whether such problems mentioned, back posture, inattention, et cetera -- really account for large proportions of our crashes for buses.

So I am open to that, but I cannot give too detailed comments at this stage, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Is fatigue an issue, a risk, in Hong Kong franchised bus drivers? How do you assess that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I presume that fatigue will be related to the number of hours of driving, rest hours,

but it would also depend on individuals. For one reason or the other, that he is tired. On this topic, in our report we have not devoted a lot of writing on that, because I have not studied this issue. Although in some other parts where I have been working, for long distance driving we need to care a lot about the possibility of fatigue driving. In Hong Kong I think we need to look at that. Because any system we are trying to introduce, that should be tied up with the real crashes we are facing, and also the risks we are facing. So I can only say this for the moment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of any attempt to study the risk factor of fatigue driving, in questionnaires? Any surveys? The examination of accidents? Are you aware of anything like that? Empirical data.

MR JULIAN KWONG: You mean in Hong Kong?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I'm not aware of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Prior to the break, Mr Kwong, we are discussing about the structural strengths of the upper deck front of the buses, and the potential hazards to passengers sitting at the front of the vehicle, upper deck of the vehicle.

And I would like to show you a photo of the Tai Po accident which touched on this. May we pull up the

photo. We can see a photo of the incident showing, I think the upper deck, the front portion has been completely damaged. And does this help you to explain your statement about having safer bus fronts as set out in paragraph 5.5 of your April report?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Looking at this picture, I would consider that to be a composite collision. There are many possibilities of crash scenarios. The simple one would be the bus colliding directly with an object, with a tall object like a container truck in the front, colliding with a bridge pier, colliding with a lighting column, colliding with a projected canopy of a building. But for this one it is probably a composite collision. Maybe the bus has collided with the bus shelter, which is high enough to damage the upper deck structure. Maybe it has also collided with a lighting column, but at the same time the bus also rolls over.

As I mentioned earlier, the bus could have rolled over directly onto the bus shelter, and in this process the bus shelter also contributed to the destruction of the bus front and also the side of the bus, or even directly intruded into the bus compartment, directly injuring the passengers inside.

But without further evidence, this is just speculation.

CHAIRMAN: We don't need to speculate. Others can tell us the result of their examinations.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, hopefully. We consider that understanding crash mechanisms and also injury mechanisms is really important for the formulation of evidence-based strategies and measures. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Kwong, the Committee has made further enquiries after your submission in relation to some of the articles published on your website, because we are on this topic about transport data.

If we look at page 820-1, and if we scroll down, paragraph 8.

It is stated that in your web page there is a section called the "Traffic Speed Data". And you explained that you agreed to publish this on the Committee's website, but due to resources you state this task is intermittent and not systematic at the moment:

"We are doing it ourselves and in partnership with interested parties. Tonight, (11 July ...) we are meeting some interested group of young people to conduct new surveys."

And you have done, I believe, a few selected locations. TST, Sham Shui Po, Route Twisk, and then over the page, Lyttleton Road, and Tai Hang Road, and you stated that:

"In support of the Fourth United Nations Global Road Safety Week with the theme 'Save Lives Slow Down' in May 2017, CRS collaborated with a district councillor and a professional producer to produce a short movie to raise awareness. The target road site is Tai Hang Road. Below is a captured photo of the video. The speed of some vehicles was even well beyond 80km/h at night."

May I first of all ask, Mr Kwong, this is obviously a study you have done on your own initiative in collaboration with other interested parties, yes?

MR JULIAN KWONG: For this Tai Hang Road, yes, we are happy to collaborate with any parties interested in the topic. We make it non-profitable, politically we are neutral. So we just need people to collaborate because we are trying to bring the message out to increase the awareness within the society. And conducting speed limit is very time consuming, it is manual work. So that is why we have not been doing that systematically as we would like.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. What equipment -- we have seen a photo here. Is that a laser gun that you use by your partners in detecting the speed limit of certain vehicles?

MR JULIAN KWONG: That's true, it is a laser gun with the model name Tru Speed, so that is a speed gun which I own

myself.

CHAIRMAN: Who is the manufacturer?

MR JULIAN KWONG: The manufacturer, as I understand, is Laser Technology.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a device that is used by law enforcement organisations either here or elsewhere?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, as I understand, that is correct, but it also depends on the model.

CHAIRMAN: Is it used in Hong Kong?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: What is the model that you were using?

MR JULIAN KWONG: This model, as I mentioned, that would be the Tru Speed model. The exact number I cannot remember, but I understand that this model has been used by the police as well. There are some newer models which they are using.

CHAIRMAN: How old is this model?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, this model, I purchased probably in the year of 2011.

CHAIRMAN: In this or in any other survey, have you deliberately sought to monitor the speed of franchised buses?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, we have not conducted speed surveys specifically for franchised buses, although this is ideal, because if we look at bus safety, then I would

really want to look at the speed of buses specifically. But I did conduct some casual speed check for buses from time to time.

CHAIRMAN: Did you choose particular locations to do this at?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, one location that I would like to quote is that some years ago, I went to Des Voeux Road Central, I looked at the -- because I wished to look at the speed of buses going from the direction from east to west, to see exactly what type of speeds they are using. And this section of Des Voeux Road Central is where many pedestrians cross the road without a pedestrian crossing. And the purpose of my doing this exercise was to see what speed a bus driver will use if they are trying to overtake a bus stopping at the bus stop.

The reason I am interested in this is that the stopped bus will obscure any pedestrian trying to cross in front. If the bus is going at excessive speed it is not going to be able to stop in time, and I compared some guidelines, for example, from Canada, there is a recommendation or a rule saying that if the bus, the transit bus has to overtake a stopped bus or a stopped vehicle, then it should not go beyond the speed of 30 kilometres per hour.

And that was a very casual exercise for me, but then at that time the highest speed I noted was 49 kilometres per hour. But admittedly, I did not check too many buses. I only check five or six buses.

Recently I also did some speed check, because a newspaper reporter invited me to do a filming, an interview on Des Voeux Road Central. So again, I used the speed gun to have a casual check of the buses going buy, and on that occasion many buses will go in the range of 30 to 35 kilometres per hour. That is the buses going freely, they are not obstructed by anything.

One bus, the highest speed I recorded was 42 kilometres per hour.

The rationale of my doing this is not to prove that buses are going at excessive speed. Another main purpose is to see what speeds the sensible drivers will be using.

So from my point of view, 30 to 35 kilometres per hour is sensible. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, thank you for sharing this with us.

About this radar gun, have you maintained it from time to time when you use it, or is it in good maintenance?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. That is in good maintenance. I have

to do calibration from time to time. From my understanding, laser guns -- I mean this one is a laser gun as opposed to a radar gun, normally it does not require calibration all the time, but for accuracy purpose I need to do two tests. If I pass these two tests then normally there shouldn't be any particular problems.

I would usually do these tests from time to time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: What is the margin of error of this device, according to the manufacturers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I do not have the exact figures, but my understanding is that laser guns are very accurate. That means the error would be well within the need as far as our purpose is concerned.

CHAIRMAN: Can you put a figure on that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would presume that would be 1 to 2 per cent, at most 3 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Apart from the locations that you have identified in the document at pages 820-1 and 820-2 of MISC-2 bundle, have you in collaboration with the other interested parties considered exploring other locations as well?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would like to give you an example.

We were referred to by a social worker in Tsuen Wan, that residents were concerned about the safety of a zebra crossing near their village. They considered the traffic speed too high. And at that time I have some free time, so I agreed that we collaborated to do a speed survey at Route Twisk in Tsuen Wan, around the zebra crossing.

The way it worked is I trained the villagers up to use the speed gun correctly, and then they conducted the surveys by themselves.

In the end, for that exercise, they conducted the survey for 800 vehicles.

Normally, at any single location in order to produce a speed distribution graph we need at least 100 vehicles.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have a report of that Route Twisk data, the speed data report?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. That report, I think I have supplied to you. I would like to declare that because of some difficulties of transforming the report from simplified Chinese to traditional Chinese font, and the report I replied to you is in simplified font, but that is still the one I handed into them. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If I may go back to your report, and continue with

the third area, which is the road design. That's also at page 786 of this bundle, MISC-2 bundle, the road design.

And you suggested also a number of suggestions, six in total, about the road design and traffic management that are crucial for bus safety. The first is adequate safety barriers; second is the elimination of sloping end terminals or similar features at high risk sites; third is the widening of blind bends on certain old roads; fourth, reduce speed limit in urban areas; fifth, safe crossing facilities; and lastly, better protection of waiting passengers at bus stops on major busy roads.

Can we go to safety barrier first. I think you elaborated on that at page 808. In this section you referred to this as important to contain an errant vehicle from colliding with roadside hazardous objects falling off the slope.

And you use the Tuen Mun bus crash report in 2003, and you make reference to a parapet. And I'm going to refer you to that Tuen Mun report. If we may go to bundle SEC-1, page 1 is the first page, and then if we go to paragraph 16 and 17 at page 10 to 11: if we look first at paragraph 15, it states that:

"Parapets are protective devices designed to reduce the severity of an accident. They provide a passive

line of defence and are not the cause or a contributory factor of an accident.

16. After examining local and international standards, the panel considers that the existing parapet design ... adopted by the Highways Department ... are generally in line with the international practices."

Then if you jump a few lines:

"However, there is room for enhancement at critical locations where penetration of the vehicular parapet may result in catastrophic consequences. The panel advocates a total safety management approach ..."

And if we go to paragraph 17, it mentioned something about:

"... a strong parapet designed to a high containment level may stop a heavy vehicle in the desired manner, but may cause considerable damage to a small vehicle ..."

And then if we jump a few lines:

"For enhancement of parapet design in the long term, the panel recommends that the [Highways Department] expand the range of containment levels, in particular at the high end, and review the parapet height ... The panel also recommends that [Highways Department] continue to monitor the development of multiple containment parapet overseas ..."

If we go to page 109, at paragraph 9.38 it sets out the figures mentioned there for a double-decker bus, the simulation result for a double-decker bus for a speed of 60 kilometres an hour, the angle of impact is 10 degrees.

I believe you stated these figures in your report at page 808, MISC-2 bundle. In this section at paragraph 3 you stated that:

"Some viaducts are not yet equipped with L3 safety barrier. According to the Tuen Mun Road report ... the earlier generation of 'P2' has been verified by simulation to contain a bus at 60km/h at 10 degrees. The significance of such knowledge is to set route-specific operational protocols for bus operation. As an example, where P2 parapets are used, the speed of buses will be limited to 60km/h and travel on the left lane. This will ensure that an errant bus will not exceed the performance of the parapet."

Can you explain this. So if a bus is driving at 70 kilometres per hour, does it mean this parapet is not going to work?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay. Thank you. Chairman, first of all I would like to declare that I myself, as put forward right in the beginning of this session, I am involved in this project at the moment for government. But what I'm

going to say, actually relates to what I have been raising all the time since probably at least 10 years ago. So I'm not going to touch on anything related to the project I'm working on. But anything I'm going to quote, I have the knowledge independent of the project I'm working on.

So to answer your question, the idea here is to set protocols or rules for bus driving, we need to understand the capacity of our road design, for example in relation to the capacity of the safety barriers. For this particular case, it is just an example, if the bus is going at 70 kilometres per hour, at the same impact angle, that I think according to the report would be 20 degrees. The report said that it has been tested, but only by computer simulation, at 60 kilometres per hour and 20 degrees. So I would like to see that there is an increased risk that the bus will overcome the barrier.

But of course we need to understand that these tests are often based on a particular speed, particular angle of collision, and also a particular weight of the bus. It depends on the number of passengers inside.

So it means that in the case I quoted, it is not certain that there could be a chance of the bus overcoming the parapet.

I believe that if there is more information about different parapets, and safety barriers on different roads, that would provide a very good indication and good data for the government or the bus operators to formulate better route-specific protocols for their drivers. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And on page 808 you identify eight roads where there are no safety barriers at all. That's Repulse Bay Road, Tai Tam Road, Peak Road, Stubbs Road, Pokfulam Road, Tai Po Road, Clear Water Bay Road, Keung Shan Road.

Of course I'm not going to the consultancy brief report, but have these matters been raised by you with the Transport Department before the consultancy brief, or is this the first time you raised this, in this report?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, these issues and what is stated in this report have been raised for a number of years, and also compilation of this report was prior to my involvement in the consultancy study you just mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: With whom did you raise these concerns?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, usually we would raise the concern to relevant government departments, such as Highways Department, Transport Department. I have forgotten whether I did raise it, say, to the Bureau.

CHAIRMAN: What response, if any, did you get? We are looking at a road with what looks like a stone wall on a steep slope. What response did you get when you said, "Why isn't there a safety barrier here?"

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I have forgotten the exact reply I got, but I presume that they understood, and I can remember that there was an interest in that, and that they have done something about that, but then of course the problem is very extensive. And I have to keep on repeating the same message to these departments.

So it is an ongoing issue. My only interest is whether something has been improved. So I do not know exactly what is going on inside government, but I only make the comments out of what I see at the site.

CHAIRMAN: And that's why it is ongoing? Because you see the same thing, year after year?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. That's true.

But of course there may have been local improvements for some particular sites, but this is one site, the pictures show one site which I would consider to be highly risky. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I just show one specific example of the Tai Po Road section where -- as we have stated earlier, the Tai Po accident happened in February and the Transport Department was able to reduce the speed limit,

make changes to the road traffic signs, and on the road markings within two months.

And if I can show you the Tai Po District Council paper, in TD-1, page 354.

CHAIRMAN: What's the date of this report?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The date of this report is 9 April 2018.

CHAIRMAN: This is the Transport Department paper provided to the Tai Po District Council for their meeting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, for their meeting.

And we can see this paper, first of all, set out the review of the speed limit, and then right in the middle, they suggested at the subject road section the traffic signs and road markings are set along the road to remind motorists to take heed of road condition by adding warning traffic signs, reduce speed now, bend to right ahead, and some chevrons showing the deviation of route to right.

If we go over the page, 360-2 at paragraph 4(c). It referred to this section of the road -- the current speed limit is 70km per hour, and stated there are developments, et cetera, and if we go over the page, they recommend that the speed limit be lowered to 50km per hour, and then if we go down this page, there are other improvement measures over the page, suggesting about certain improvements, and if we look at some of

the photos concerning some of these measures that have been implemented, as of to date, we see photo 13, we see the first "ahead" sign, photo 14, we see another "ahead" sign, photo 15, speed limit changed to 50km per hour, and then the marking on the road. And then photo 16, the first "Reduce speed now" sign, and then photo 17, the second speed sign, and then we can also see nine chevrons. And then photo 18, showing the location of the chevrons.

So the point that I would like to ask you is, if the Transport Department wants to do something, they can, because within two months they were able to achieve this.

What is your view about all these improvements given your study on this Tai Po Road that you mentioned? Do you think all these measures are enough, or sufficient, or have you explored this?

CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, Mr Kwong, you are working on this particular section of road; am I right?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, the project, the consultancy study I'm working on, that covers roads in Hong Kong, so I'm not working on these particular improvement works, and I have not studied it in detail.

CHAIRMAN: So you don't have any problem in answering whatever the question was?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, no problem.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would reformulate the question.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, we have heard some complaints -- not really complaints, but some of the other concerns expressed by the Tai Po District Council last Saturday, commenting that there are certain improvements that could be done for the latter part of this road section, and if we can pull up the map, if we can see that this road, the brown, or the brown/orange colour section is the section where the speed limit has been reduced from 70km per hour to 50km per hour, and one of the matters they raised in this section is they said that when you change the speed limit from 70 to 50km per hour, around the location of number 15 to 17, you are in effect going slightly uphill -- sorry, it is from 13 to 14, you are in effect still going 70km per hour. So if you change the limit at that point of 15, that is reduced to 50km per hour, in effect it is difficult.

Some of the comments made are because you are going uphill and you obviously have to increase your gear to go uphill, and then when you immediately go down your bus may not be able to immediately shift or reduce the speed to 50km per hour.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could see a photograph of where the new speed limit sign is.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Maybe we can pull out 15.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could go back to show the photograph before, so one is coming up an incline towards the crest of the hill, and then at the crest that is the view looking down towards what is the downhill, and then the bend where the chevrons are -- and the complaint was?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The complaint was that if your speed is maintained at 70km per hour and then you change to 50km per hour, your vehicle would still be travelling at a speed that is higher than 50km per hour.

So one of the suggestions they made is whether you can pull it -- like, I think, if I understand correctly, is pull it a little bit down before you move up the hill, so that you could reduce the speed before you reach the top of the incline.

I think that's one of the suggestions made by the Tai Po District Council.

I wonder if you have any views on this.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, largely speaking it is a bit difficult for me to give solid comments on these kinds of improvement schemes. But I would to say that one important concept of highway design is to make the road as self-explaining as possible, so that we can keep the number of signs and markings to a minimum.

The reason is that the excessive use of warning

signs can defeat the whole purpose of the signing system. But whether the signs here would be excessive, I'm not going to give comment.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can have a look at them again. We have two warning signs before you get to the crest of the hill. Can we see that.

So ahead there is a 50 kilometres zone; ahead there is a 50 kilometres zone, and then we get to the crest of the hill, and we are now downhill. What is the problem about braking in those circumstances?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think from 70 to 50 is not a big problem for braking, but whether drivers -- our main interest would be whether drivers will really conform to the speed limit. They need a solid reason. If they can see the danger by themselves they are far more willing to slow down their vehicles.

For these types of roads, personally I would consider that perhaps a good compromise would be to have a speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour. However, we also have the thought that we do not wish to complicate the signing system too much, and that is one reason why I think the best choice which can be 60 kilometres per hour has not been adopted in Hong Kong.

And I have a bit diverged from the discussions, but my main emphasis would be that we want to keep drivers

willing to drive at a speed which is safe. And speed limit of course is a tool which has legal status. We need to monitor the speed of the drivers, and to verify if the comments, say, from the district council, are valid.

What we are going to do, for example, is to conduct speed surveys of the vehicles to see if they truly conform to the speed limit signs. Because we want to help the drivers. We are not trying to impose something which they cannot easily comply with. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So what you are saying, perhaps, is demonstrated by the photos we have just seen. If you want the drivers to understand why there has been a change in speed limit, and by changing the speed limit after you have gone over the top of the hill, it shows you why there is a change in speed limit, because ahead of you is an array of chevrons and a bend, down an increased gradient. Isn't that consistent with accommodating the driver's understanding of why there has been a change?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, your observation, I think, is correct. Basically the whole idea is that any signs or any speed limit, they should appear to the driver to be consistent with an imminent hazard or change of road conditions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Another suggestion the Tai Po District Council made is adding speed bumps or adding speed humps on the road beneath. Because they considered that by doing that you would have palpable sensation that you would have to slow down, more effective than a road sign or road markings. What would you say to that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay, Chairman. Speed humps come in all kinds of shapes, and some are more aggressive, and some are more gentle, but usually the adoption of speed humps on a highway has to be very carefully validated.

The main concern is that if drivers are going too fast and they are not aware of the presence of the speed hump, then they may brake abruptly or lose control. Usually speed humps have to be introduced in conjunction with speed reduction measures on the approach. And as I mentioned earlier, drivers have to see a reason why they have to slow down. Usually, according to my experience, for using speed humps on main highways, we have to especially create a zone of speed reduction prior to introducing the speed hump so that drivers' speeds would have slowed down, most of the drivers will have slowed down to not more than 50 kilometres per hour and ideally 40 kilometres per hour. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and another topic I would like to explore with you is ISO 39001, the Road Traffic Safety

Management System referred to in your report, at the top of page 786.

In the third paragraph you stated that:

"It is highly recommended that ISO 39001 'Road Traffic Safety Management System' will be made a requirement for franchised bus operators."

First, this ISO 39001, can you tell us whether it is widely used throughout the world?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, okay. Let me explain this. The ISO 39001 was introduced in 2012. At this moment, about 500 enterprises have adopted the ISO. Not every country. Certain countries are more enthusiastic, for example the United Kingdom, Sweden, Japan, et cetera.

So this is the fact at the moment.

In Hong Kong, as far as I understand, there have been no certification. We would recommend that this ISO is explored, because at the moment nobody has been using it, but the interesting point of this ISO is that it has been developed by top experts, and the World Bank and the World Health Organisation are supporting it, and it is based on the safe system approach.

I would like to emphasise that this ISO standard is not a technical standard. I would say that it is a high-level framework, encouraging high-level management to work towards no serious injuries and

fatalities in road safety, as far as they can control or influence. And so that is very visionary.

The standard does not specify a particular technical system, it doesn't specify the particular monitoring system or how to achieve that exactly. So the standard itself is not adequate. It also needs to be complimented with technical systems. And that is quite agreeable.

Of course this standard is new to Hong Kong, and compared to other ISO standards worldwide, the number of certified enterprises is admittedly not as numerous. But looking at the standard, and the way it is shaped, and I have the standard here, I would like to say that the important point of this standard is its more visionary and progressive approach, encouraging the enterprises to proactively be engaged in reducing risk and reducing road accidents to the end of having no serious injuries and fatalities as the long-term aim. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Can you just help us with this. You say that it has been adopted by about 500 enterprises.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Are we to understand the adoption has been done by companies in various countries as opposed to the regulatory authority requiring it to be adopted?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, in that case, I would like to quote from the ISO standard. My understanding is that it is targeted at any enterprises or companies which have to deal with road transport, whether that is a public transport operator, a logistics company, or any company having a vehicle fleet, a taxi company, a public light bus company.

But from my understanding, in the text, in reading the text of this document, that can also apply to regulatory authorities. But I am not too sure that at this moment whether in reality throughout the world, whether regulating authorities or similar have adopted this standard.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of any bus companies in United Kingdom, Sweden or Japan, the countries you mentioned, that have adopted this standard?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I'm not aware of a particular name or company, but from some of the information I gathered, that in Japan, probably there are a few companies, but not a lot, engaged in public transport. But I think that needs to be validated. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We see from some of the documentation that KMB has been adopting an ISO standard 9001. If I may just refer you to a document. KMB-3, page 676. It is

a 2011 annual report.

If we look at the left column, 1999, the section on 1999:

"KMB became the first public bus company in Hong Kong to receive ISO 9001:1994 certification on a corporate-wide basis for its quality management systems. In fact, KMB is the fourth organisation in Hong Kong to achieve such corporate-wide certification."

Can you tell us what is the difference between this ISO 9001 standard and the 39001?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you. Chairman, while I'm not an expert in management systems, my understanding is that the ISO 39001 has been specifically written to address road traffic safety in the perspective of the safe system approach, which is being advocated by the World Health Organisation, by United Nations, and by a number of advanced countries, very serious with road safety. So this standard is specifically written to address road traffic safety as far as the organisation or enterprises can control or can influence. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, I'm going to another topic. It is about your submissions made in relation to the renewal of the licence, or your comments made in relation to the renewal of the licence --

CHAIRMAN: By "the licence" you mean the franchise?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The franchise, and on the new franchise for bus network for Kowloon Motor Bus, it is your submission on 16 June 2016 at SEC-2, page 777.

Now, Mr Kwong, that's a document in Chinese and I believe the whole report was written in English.

May I read just the first paragraph to explain --

CHAIRMAN: So this begins at 775?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Where the purpose is stated to be to provide insight to further improve the performance of Citybus Ltd and New Lantao Bus under the new franchises, and reference is made to the consultation document.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The date is 16 June 2016.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your first paragraph you reacted to a public consultation, and submitted a document commenting on the Administration Paper on New Franchise for Bus Network of KMB, report on the public consultation on the new franchise.

And in the second paragraph you -- I think it is not a complaint, but you made an observation that the administration paper only consists of a short paragraph on safety, with two simplified points, namely to monitor

bus captains' driving behaviour more closely and to improve safety facilities on buses. But then you mentioned that these clearly fail to reflect the much broader issues that you raised.

Can you elaborate on what you meant by the much broader issues you raised?

CHAIRMAN: Which paragraph and which page are you reading from?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm reading from 778, second paragraph.

CHAIRMAN: But before we get there, but at some stage, if not now, ought not we deal with the consultation document, and what it is that Mr Kwong had to say about its emphasis? I'm looking at the second paragraph of 775. Maybe you are going to come back to it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, I will come to it now.

To put it in context, maybe if I refer you to the letter from the Transport and Housing Bureau to the LegCo.

CHAIRMAN: Is this the consultation paper?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Shall we go to the TD-3 bundle. Pages 661 to 768. This was dated, I think it is the third LegCo paper to update the LegCo on the position of franchise renewal as of February 2012.

And then this is later followed by a brief stating that the decision of the Chief Executive in April 2012

was adopted.

But if we look at this LegCo brief, just to give the background before the 2016 paper, the introduction stated that (a):

"A new franchise ... conferring upon New World First Bus ... the right to continue operation of its bus network ... from 2013 July to 0400 hours on 1 July 2023 ..."

And then:

"A new franchise ... conferring upon Long Win Bus ... from 2013 to 2023."

Then rolling down, a new franchise for Citybus also from the same period, May 2013 to May 2023.

Then if we look over, if we roll down, it sets out all the conditions, and the assessment criteria at paragraph 4:

"To assess whether NWFB, LW and Citybus ... have been providing proper and efficient public bus services, the Transport Department has been conducting regular reviews of ... [a number of factors] through passenger satisfaction surveys, site surveys, vehicle inspections, examination of regular returns and public feedback."

Then it simply stated that in light of the assessment given in paragraphs 5 to 8 below, we consider that they have fulfilled the criteria, and the service

performance in the NWFB include the accidents and the average of lost trips scheduled as against the scheduled buses.

If we turn over the page, the Long Win Bus and Citybus also calculated by the annual average number of complaints per million passengers, or the number of bus accidents per million vehicle-km as a basis to calculate whether the accident rate has been normal or within range or acceptable level.

And I believe you have written a few papers on this as well.

If I may take you to --

CHAIRMAN: May I just enquire this. To what is the document at MISC-2 page 775 a response? To which paper?

MS MAGGIE WONG: MISC-2 is in relation to another paper, but because that paper also referred to Citybus, so I have to put this document in context, because it also referred to the Citybus comments on the Citybus paper.

CHAIRMAN: Well, this document is dated -- 775, as I read the date in numbers by Mr Kwong's name -- 16 September 2014.

Just a moment, let's put it up on the screen.

The question I'm asking is, to which paper is Mr Kwong responding?

MS MAGGIE WONG: He is not responding to this one. This

paper is responding to a document at page 784.

CHAIRMAN: 784 is part of the April 2018 report, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That's the 17 June 2016 LegCo report on the updated background brief on the franchise of KMB.

784.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Of SEC-2 bundle.

CHAIRMAN: That was the bit that was missing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm sorry, Mr Kwong, can you also -- I think --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. Are we perhaps at cross purposes?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Page 784 of SEC-2 addresses KMB and its franchise. Page 775 of MISC-2 is addressing Citybus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think I might have referred to the wrong document. The chronology is a bit -- I went wrong on this.

Maybe I should refer to this document first. It is SEC-2 bundle, at page 748. It is the consultation paper. The paper is in January 2016. If we go --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to page 748, and it is for the new franchise for bus network of the new Kowloon Bus

Company. And at 754, paragraph 16 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. 748 is the discussion paper for the -- the government is informing LegCo that it plans to engage with KMB to discuss the granting of a new 10-year franchise for its bus network on the expiry of the existing franchise.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that right?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: And at paragraph 4, the -- it is stated -- is this a document from the Transport Department? Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department. Paragraph 4 of this document states this:

"The Government's key consideration in granting a bus franchise is whether an operator is capable of providing a proper and efficient public bus service."

Now, Mr Kwong, that is something you take issue with, is it not, in the report that we looked at some time earlier?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I remember that at that time government was inviting the public to give their opinion on the new franchises for KMB and separately for Citybus and New Lantao Bus.

CHAIRMAN: But the sentence I have just read out is a sentence that recurs in these proposal documents by

government, whether or not it is KMB or Citybus.

So the issue you were taking in MISC-2 at 775 is this:

"The consultation by government states that ..."

You then quote what I have just read out:

"The Government's key consideration in granting or extending a bus franchise is whether a grantee is capable of providing a proper and efficient bus service."

Then your observation:

"We are concerned that other important values, notably road safety ..."

The first one you put down:

"... quality of service, environmental friendliness, and social responsibility, are not mentioned."

That's your first response, is it not, to the way in which Government consults on renewal of a franchise.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. Because we didn't see the word "safety", we were not sure whether the word "safety" has been embedded into the word "proper". We didn't know. But in any case, from what I interpreted from the document, at that time we were concerned that safety may not be a major issue to address, which is why we compiled a number of comments for them to consider. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And of course there were the different franchises, on the one hand, if you like, the Citybus group, and then on the other hand the KMB group.

So Ms Wong, which one are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Shall we go to KMB first now that we are on this document, and I found -- I apologise for that, Mr Kwong. I found your Citybus submission in relation to that, but we'll come to that later. Now that we are on KMB we will deal with KMB first.

If we may go to KMB's submission where you respond to the administration paper in MISC-2 page 770.

The first matter is at 770, below the paragraph: "Road Safety is of Paramount Importance".

And you mention that in clause 6(c) of the consultation document:

"... [it] indicates that KMB's accident rate was 2.95 accidents per million vehicle-km which is lower than 4.16 of the overall industry performance. While this indicate better overall performance of KMB, we consider it grossly inadequate to look at a single parameter ie accident rate ... to conclude on KMB's safety performance. Due to the scale of its operation, KMB accounts for more than half of the bus-related casualties. This justifies a major effort to further bring down the casualty toll.

It will be necessary to analyse the number and rates of KMB buses involved in fatal and serious accidents, pedestrian accidents, multi-casualty accident ... from a much wider perspective. It is also important to identify and address any major safety risks involving KMB's operation."

Now the observation you made is it is not fair, if I put it correctly, to simply look at the accident rates, because it is just a single parameter. You have to look at the broader picture. Is that what you are suggesting here, first?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. This is the case. And I have demonstrated this in our report, the report on bus safety we submitted to the review committee.

I have compiled some tables in this report, and I have expanded to using other rates, for example crash involvement rate per million passenger trips, for example pedestrian injury rates per vehicle-kilometre, number of serious injuries per million vehicle-kilometres, number of fatalities per vehicle-kilometre or per passenger trip. So the whole idea is if we want to understand the current pictures of road safety we need to look at multiple parameters.

And that is the whole idea. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In this report, I think if I would like to

go to a few recommendations that you made. The first is page 772 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you get to that. You expand on why it is necessary to look at multiple parameters, do you not? When, for example, you look at rear-front and junction collisions?

Perhaps, Ms Wong, would you be kind enough to read that out?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. You stated:

"Given the prevalence of bus routes using high-speed roads and expressways, KMB buses are particularly susceptible to rear-front collisions involving multiple casualties. During the three-year period 2011 to 2013, there were over 40 multi-casualty crashes each with 5 or more casualties involving KMB buses. Historically, a single event with more than 100 casualties has been recorded. Such collisions could lead to very severe casualties, especially for passengers taking up certain seats, eg upper floor front row. Furthermore, these events often put enormous strain on the emergency and medical service. Nevertheless, such events would only be classified as a single accident and therefore their severity cannot be reflected in the accident rate. In July 2015 alone, there were at least three multi-casualty collisions involving KMB buses resulting

in 45 casualties."

CHAIRMAN: And that is one of the reasons, is it, Mr Kwong, why you say you must look at multiple parameters?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. That's true.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You made a few recommendations. The first one is at page 772. You stated that:

"We recommend that past accident data and potential safety risks of bus operation are studied in detail, with a view to identifying opportunities for improvements under the new franchises. Government should take the lead to emphasise the importance of road safety of bus operation. The franchise requirements should incorporate these aspects in addition to proper and efficient service. Consideration could be given to rewarding the bus companies for achieving pre-defined goals, such as reduction of certain accident types by 20 per cent per year."

This first point is that it reinforces that you shouldn't look at one accident data, but look at whether it involved multiple casualties as you mentioned in relation to the rear-front and junction collision; is that correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, that is correct.

In the way I work, I always like to understand issues in a more comprehensive way. Because that is

critical. It is critical to, first of all, understand the overall picture, and secondly, that is crucial to the formulation of strategies and measures. And in this respect, I wrote those recommendations including mentioning something like rewarding bus companies -- that is just a suggestion -- the reason being that in all these letters, or submissions to government, or LegCo, we wish to encourage those responsible or involved in bus operation. We are not trying to make everything negative. We need to encourage the people working in it, we need to motivate them. That would be far more sustainable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: How do you envisage that a bus company might be rewarded for reaching a pre-defined target?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, that is only a suggestion. We have not gone into the details of the mechanism for rewarding. But the whole idea is that we need to encourage bus companies and encourage bus drivers for a good reason.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have in mind a financial reward, or some other kind of reward? Good Citizen of Hong Kong, or something like that. Or money? What do you have in mind?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Anything which is reasonable and which works I think can be considered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The opposite of reward is penalty. Do you consider that that would be appropriate. If you fail to reach a pre-defined target, for example, accident rate?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, penalty is also a possibility for sure. But I would also like to emphasise that we understand that not every accident is the responsibility of the driver or of the bus company. An accident may be due to third party, or that may be due to a combination of causes which several parties to have bear the responsibility for. So penalties can be useful in certain circumstances, but whether it is fair I think we still need to look at it seriously. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware that in Singapore the Land Transport Authority has a penalty accident rate provision in the franchises they grant?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I'm not aware of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go on in the middle paragraph, you make reference to the safety performance of bus companies, as to the modern approach to be introduced, how to assess the safety management performance.

And you make two recommendations in this section. It is first to introduce or encourage the bus company under the new franchise agreement to adopt a more advanced system towards the ISO 39001 standard.

And second, the government is to collaborate with

bus companies to study bus accidents and risks in detail with a view of setting targets of accident reduction.

I believe this is not the first time you mentioned this 39001 standard to the government, but in relation to the new franchise to KMB you specifically raised this with the Transport Department to incorporate this requirement to the franchise. Can you confirm that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. But I think this is not the first time we mentioned about the ISO standard. What I have been trying to do is to encourage them at least to look at it and to study whether that should be adopted. Bearing in mind that, say, if they have an equivalent system then maybe that is fine. But the main reason is that the standard is based on the safe system approach which is the latest thinking in many advanced countries, and also that it is progressive. It looks at the ultimate elimination of serious injuries and fatalities. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the third one is in relation to the black box. And if we go down to the bottom, bus safety, driving standard, if I read the whole section:

"It would be fair to say that many public bus drivers are professionals and are performing reasonably well. However, this does not necessarily imply that risks have been minimised ... a certain proportion of

bus drivers do behave aggressively and dangerously, contributing to undue risks. Clause 8(d) of the consultation document states that KMB has completed retrofit of speed limiters and black box ..."

But then you commented this line:

"There is vast potential of using black box in buses but it is not clear how these are being used."

And then over the page you stated that:

"We wish to point out that the urban speed limit of 50km cannot be taken as the golden rule."

And the weight of the bus. And then there came the recommendations:

"Incorporate into franchise requirement the need to set up a comprehensive standard and driver monitoring system using the installed black boxes. Monitoring systems should be automated with streamlined procedures to educate and retrain drivers."

You stated a number of key monitoring controls. One of them include acceleration and deceleration characteristics. And you refer to a British Columbia Transit Infrastructure Design Guidelines.

Can you first of all explain this? What is meant by acceleration and deceleration characteristic, making reference to this British Columbia Transit Infrastructure Design Guidelines?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, a driver abruptly accelerating or abruptly decelerating, can cause passengers to lose balance. And another problem is some drivers similarly accelerating or decelerating in a very unpredictable way, and that is something we wish to control.

In the design of, say, the MTR trains, there are certain parameters for train acceleration so that passengers inside will not be so easily destabilised or lose balance. In bus operation there is the problem because theoretically a bus driver can accelerate or decelerate very rapidly, and the idea here is that we need to control that in a reasonable way.

Normally, I would say that there is no need to accelerate or decelerate excessively, but of course in an emergency situation, maybe the bus drivers have to decelerate very rapidly. And that is also related to the recommendation on speeds. If bus drivers are allowed to go at higher speed, then there is more likelihood that he has to decelerate very rapidly, because there are many unforeseeable conflicts, say, on the urban streets. And looking at the guidelines from British Colombia, there are certain objective values which they recommend transit buses should accelerate or decelerate at. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Ms Wong, let me ask Mr Kwong

this.

At the outset you say this under the heading "Recommendations", page 773. You have recommended that there be incorporated into the franchise requirement the need to set up a comprehensive standard and driver monitoring system using the installed black boxes.

What did you mean by "a comprehensive standard"?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I would presume that what I meant by comprehensive standard in the text means the protocol. That is what type of speed, what degree of acceleration or deceleration bus drivers should adopt, whether that is general or route-specific. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And that should be a comprehensive standard, but it also should be incorporated into the monitoring system. You set the standard, and this is what you monitor?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, that is the case.

CHAIRMAN: For argument's sake, the standard might be set at 0.2G for decelerating or accelerating. That might be set lower, but that's the idea, is it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. We need to set the standard first, based on evidence base, based on the safety problems we are facing and the risk, and then we use the monitoring system to enforce it.

But to what degree we enforce, that is another

question. Whether just occasional violations already trigger disciplinary action, that is not covered. That needs further study. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And this resonates with what you were saying earlier, it should be done real time, and it should be automated.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, the more automation, the more features of real time notification of course is good. But at that time when I wrote this recommendation I think the first step would be, first of all, we need protocols, and the second point is that we need better monitoring. I did not go further into the precise wordings.

CHAIRMAN: But your primary recommendation was that it should find a place in the franchise requirement?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman. Yes. This is exactly our recommendation.

CHAIRMAN: Did it find a place?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, as far as I understand, probably not.

CHAIRMAN: We can investigate that on another occasion. But I think we have used up our time today.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: One of our members has engagements that take him elsewhere, so we are unable to carry on sitting.

As I understand it, Mr Kwong, Dr Kou, one or both of you will be available tomorrow morning, have I got that right?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Tomorrow morning it will be only me. Dr Kou has some other engagement.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. In that case, we ought to thank Dr Kou for coming today to help us give evidence on behalf of the Community for Road Safety, and we will welcome you back tomorrow morning.

Can somebody remind me what time we are sitting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 10 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN: We tried today to get in as much as we could and sitting as early as we did and as late as we did, and it has been most helpful, so we will adjourn now, and we will resume tomorrow at 10 o'clock, Mr Kwong.

Thank you.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

DR KOU SIO KEI: Thank you, Chairman.

(1.33 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to 10.00 am on Tuesday, 17 July 2018)

I N D E X

P A G E

EVIDENCE FROM COMMUNITY FOR ROAD 1
SAFETY REPRESENTATIVES:
MR KWONG TSE HIN, JULIAN AND
DR KOU SIO KEI.

Examination by MS WONG 1

2018年7月16日

上午9時07分恢復聆訊

出席人士 ： 鄺子憲先生，道路安全研究小組主席（道路安全研究小組）

高兆祺先生，道路安全研究小組成員（道路安全研究小組）

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，早晨。今朝早上，我哋感謝道路安全研究小組嘅成員佢哋應邀今日上嚟協助我哋委員會佢哋係會係作證㗎。咁我哋會請代表大律師，黃佩琪大律師就係幫我哋提問嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生、高醫生，感謝你哋今日出席，我今朝早就係代表檢討委員會就係以律師嘅身分呢就同大家係研究一下專營巴士嘅安全事宜嘅。首先，我想作一個係簡介，就介紹一下你哋嘅組織，從你哋嘅陳述書喇，咁如果睇番鄺先生2018年3月28號係嗰日所交上嚟嘅陳述書，我哋睇到你哋貴會嘅簡介㗎，係754嗰頁㗎。其實呢度係一封係寄畀你哋嘅信，咁日期係2018年嘅3月28號，就係邀請你哋係提交陳述書㗎。

喺757頁嗰度，喺第1頁，喺你嗰個回應嗰度喇，你就係講出咗你哋道路安全研究小組就係一個組織，就自從2004年開始係成立，係一個就係關注道路安全嘅一個組織，而你哋組織嘅資料亦都喺TD-5嗰個文件夾嗰度㗎，大家可以喺1699至到1670呢兩頁嗰度見到㗎，係TD-5嗰個文件夾，1699頁至到係跟住嗰版㗎，喺下面嗰度。嗰度就係列出你哋嘅資料㗎，包括嗰個背景喇、唔同成員佢喺會裏面嘅職位，你可唔可以確認一下呢度所列出嘅成員嘅名字喇--或者你需要睇埋跟住嗰版嘅，係咪今日都係有呢一啲成員喺貴會嗰度？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係㗎，啱㗎，除咗有部分嘅成員就唔係話咁活躍㗎，佢有一啲就係唔再係成員喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，你亦都係將你嘅履歷交過畀我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，未落去前，係咪可以講講你哋個組織嘅背景呢？成立咗幾耐、你哋幾頻密見面一次，同埋個目的係乜呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，好，主席，我哋嘅組織係一個好細嘅組織，我哋嘅興趣係在於道路安全，我哋希望有一班人，其實係一細班人嚟嘅，我哋想一齊做嘢，我哋希望向政府進言，希望係組織一啲活動，譬如話組織一啲論壇、推廣一啲運動，就係咁樣樣喇。我哋唔係一個善慈組織，亦都唔係一個大型嘅組織，不過我哋會時不時走埋一齊，我哋亦都會係透過電郵係互相通訊。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你嗰個喺法律上面個定位係點呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係一個組織，一個註冊嘅社團組織。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時係成立㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）2004年。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。咁請問你哋係有冇一個開會見面嘅模式？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我哋唔係經常見面嘅，較多就係以電郵嚟到聯絡。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你哋會透過電郵嚟到傳閱文件，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問你有冇一個召集人嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇咁樣樣話有一個召集人嘅。對唔住，你嘅意思係咪話...

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會有人就係負責係組織個會務咁？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講都係我去進行呢啲組織嘅工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你哋嘅成員係點樣介定嘅呢？咁你哋都想聚焦睇啲有關嘅事宜吖嘛，咁你哋係以乜嘢準則嚟到揀選嗰啲成員嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，講到嗰個成員，我哋冇話係特別揀選邊一啲人嚟到係提供意見㗎，我哋自己成員嘅朋友如果佢哋對呢啲都有興趣，我哋都歡迎佢哋加入嘅，特別係如果佢哋嚟自不同嘅背景，譬如話對於道路、交通都有興趣，有咁嘅興趣嘅話都歡迎㗎。所以你見到我哋嘅成員一般都係專業人士喇，佢哋係對道路、道路交通、創傷呢一啲係有咁嘅背景嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係你講述一下你哋嘅成員有邊一方面嘅專長或技能吖？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）好，我哋有土木工程嘅人士喇、交通工程喇、駕駛訓練、創傷外科嘅醫生，亦都有園景設計師或者園景建築師。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係涉及道路安全，係咪？即係同道路安全有關喇，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我都係有咁嘅睇法嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我剛才就係打斷咗黃律師係問緊你嗰個問題，佢就問你嗰個履歷。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，或者請你睇番呢一個雜項嘅文件夾喇，就係820-4嗰頁嘅。鄺生，你就係將你自己嘅履歷就列咗出嚟㗎，你講咗畀我哋聽你有咩嘢教育嘅背景喇、你喺邊啲會嗰度有會員嘅身分喇，同埋由08年到而家係進行過啲乜嘢嘅工作或者做過啲咩嘢嘅項目㗎。睇番你嘅教育背景喇，見到你就係有一個土木及環境工程嘅學士學位喇，呢個就係紐卡素大學得到嘅學位，...

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾時取得呢個學位呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個土木及環境工程嘅學士學位我喺 1986 年係取得嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住我相信係一個碩士課程，係嘛？你就係專注研究係致命交通意外，咁就喺港大嘅醫學院嗰度取得呢個碩士嘅學位嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，啱，2004 年係取得㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，04 年。我見到你亦都係喺呢一個英國路政方面係有一個證書，就關乎就係道路安全審核嘅，係咩嘢嚟嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）道路安全審核係 1988 年英國開始做㗎，而家就已經係廣泛係喺各國應用嘅。嗰個概念係點呢，就希望有一個獨立嘅審計或者審核，就睇睇一啲道路工程嘅項目，傳統嚟講，道路嘅設計嘅項目都會係政府當局去做同埋係由顧問、設計者去做。但係呢度講到道路安全嘅審核，我哋係獨立咁去做嘅，我哋亦都會提供一啲意見，係讓我哋嘅項目嘅客戶同埋嗰啲顧問係聽到我哋嘅意見嘅。呢度有一個能力證明書，咁呢個就係話有咗呢張證書就讓我可以係參加一啲喺歐洲當佢哋係做道路網嘅呢方面嘅工作，咁呢個就係歐盟同埋好多國家都有推行呢個工作㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你靠個咩嘢途徑、咩嘢程序係得到呢一個證書嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個證書係需要出席一啲訓練，係要接受培訓，亦都要有證據證明就係話我係有參與足夠嘅項目嘅審計工作嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話培訓加上經驗，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個培訓喺邊度進行？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）培訓就係喺倫敦嗰度做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一間院校？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）TMS 顧問公司就係有關嘅培訓嘅團體喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）TMS 係乜嘢嘅簡稱嚟嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我唔知道 TMS 代表乜嘢，只係知道叫做 TMS。佢哋就係會頒授呢一個證書嘅，咁就係由英國嘅路政署就係批准㗎，咁佢就負責英國嘅道路網絡嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋落去睇喇，道路安全培訓，見到你係參加咗四個培訓嘅課程嘅，第一個就係法國嘅為期兩週嘅道路安全嘅培訓，咁地方係喺法國定喺香港？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員） 嗰個課程就喺法國巴黎嗰度上堂㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係幾時嘅事？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係喺 2009 年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰個兩週嘅培訓，可唔可以簡單咁講講就係涉及啲咩嘢內容？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）道路安全嘅方方面面，包括政策，歐盟嘅交通政策喇、法國嘅交通安全政策喇，亦都涵蓋咗道路安全嘅大部分嘅課程嘅，譬如話喺主要嘅高速公路、市區道路、舒暢交通等等，亦都係同交通安全審核有關嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁第二個訓練就係五日嘅訓練喇，係英國嘅高級嘅道路工程嘅，呢個係 TMS 提供，係咩嘢嚟㗎？幾時發生㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）2007 年係上嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪頭先你講你嗰個能力證書，即係道路審核所進行嘅訓練？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）2007 年我就開始上堂，即係道路安全--道路工程嘅訓練課程，以便你能夠進行呢個道路安全嘅審計、審核嘅。咁 2016 年我就參加咗呢個課程嚟到攞到呢個咁樣嘅能力嘅證書。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就三個就係國際道路評估訓課程，係五日嘅，邊個組織者？邊個安排呢個訓練嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個訓練係由 iRAP 國際道路評核計劃機構呢個組織，呢個係英國嘅慈善機構嚟嘅，而家都係好--响道路安全--全世界嚟講，响道路安全方面都係好知名機構嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後一個，頭先你講過個道路安全嘅審核嘅訓練喇，呢個係由 TMS 呢間機構提供嘅，其實係幾時進行訓練㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個訓練係 2016 年嘅訓練嚟嘅，就係响嗰個能力證書發嘅之前，即係都係同一個課程嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，响下面睇到有講過你而家參與嘅一啲進行中嘅項目，其中一個就係審核香港道路網絡嘅潛在嘅路邊安全隱患嘅，咁呢個係由路政署就係負責嘅，我想睇番去第五個文件夾 1651 頁，睇下(f)呢度呢一段，呢度有講過呢個咁嘅顧問，呢份係一份文件嘅，係由運輸署 2018 年 5 月係嗰個運--係一封信嘅附件嚟嘅，2018 年 5 月 28 號，咁你話就路政署就係進行咗呢個顧

問研究，嚟到睇下香港道路網絡有啲咩潛在路邊嘅安全嘅隱患嘅，呢個係一個調查嚟嘅，時間係 2018 年 5 月，嚟到睇睇究竟所有新界嘅--即係喺香港境內所有路邊嘅安全隱患、公共道路嘅安全隱患，同埋要透過一個有系統嘅方法嚟到考慮最新嘅科技、有啲咩改善嘅措施可以係制定嘅。

有關嗰個顧問研究嘅範圍、目的，都係响第--即係附件四嘅，頁數就係 1685 頁。我哋再望過下面嘅一段，你有講番呢個研究嘅項目嘅目的嘅，鄺先生，你有冇係參與呢一個咁嘅研究㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係有嘅，我係自從今年 5 月中開始就參與喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你係參與嘅時候係咩嘢角色呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我嘅角色就係一個道路安全嘅一個領導人，呢個係一個大嘅顧問研究之下，係由 AECOM 進行嘅研究--顧問研究之下嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個名係點？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）最主要嘅顧問，主要顧問 AECOM，即係串出嚟就係 A-E-C-O-M。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）下一頁--唔好意思，係同一頁嚟嘅，2.3 呢一段，其中一個要做嘅事就係減少現有道路嘅危險--嘅風險，運輸署同埋路政署就係聯合進行一個道路安全嘅檢查，以便搵出或者係改正番、修正番現有嘅道路，而嗰啲道路嘅嗰個速度限制係 70 公里或以上嘅帶來嘅一啲道路安全嘅隱患嘅。即係話呢度係講明係嗰啲道路係要嗰個安全速度限制係要 70 公里或者以上嘅，係咪？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，關於呢個研究項目，根據我同個總顧問艾康（譯音）--艾--奕康（譯音）嘅合同，我就唔能夠喺呢個聽證會呢度就提出呢方面嘅意見嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽，幾時可能--即係呢個研究幾時可能會完呢？你哋預計--或者係咪有一個固定咗嘅完成研究嘅日期嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個顧問研究同我所做嘅其他工作一樣喇，都係時間係有個限度嘅，但係關於實際上有幾多時間，我就--唔好意思，我冇辦法畀到講法㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署會嚟嘅，我哋會問佢嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺生，你都係有一個網頁㗎，你擺咗啲文章上去嘅，你啲會員就不時就會係就住道路安全小組提出你哋嘅睇法嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋--我諗相信都已經交咗唔少於十一篇文章畀政府嘅，就講

清楚你哋對於道路安全嘅各種嘅睇法嘅，或者我可唔可以舉個例，舉個例喇，即係譬如話TD-5呢個文件夾裏面嘅1705。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咩嘢--關於咩嘢㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個關於嗰個運輸署提交嘅文件嘅，2018年5月提交嘅，即係附件一，佢哋係响嗰一封信嘅附件就係夾咗㗎，佢哋係--嗰封信嘅日子就係2018年5月28號嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢封5月28號嘅文件--嘅信係响邊度嚟㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）5月28號嘅呢封信可以响TD-1呢份文件裏面--呢份文件夾裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你可唔可以講一講呢封信，呢封信係畀我哋呢個委員會㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係運輸署寫畀檢討委員會嘅，咁裏面係有一個--其實一個附加嘅陳詞嚟嘅，咁裏面有一啲附件嘅，呢個係嗰個5月7號、8號之後嗰個研訊之後提交嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁而家係講緊呢個係運輸署嘅文件嘅一個附件，係嘛？邊一頁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）1700頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係TD-5文件夾1700頁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。你睇番第8段，佢哋係列出咗十一份文件或者係你哋提出嘅十一份嘅意見，一係就係交咗畀運輸--立法會嘅運輸事務委員會或者係政府，即係話提供你哋嘅意見，而意見係有關公共嘅交通嘅研究嘅策略或者係嗰個九巴嘅牌照或者城巴牌照嘅續期。大家亦都可以睇埋第1701頁，呢度有講清楚你哋嗰個意見嗰個題目同埋有關個立法會文件嘅參考。係，睇唔睇到？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，睇到。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以用文件嘅形式或者你使唔使睇番後面嗰啲印出嚟嘅文件㗎？嗰啲文件夾响你後面嗰度。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，多謝你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）响呢啲咁嘅文章，之前問過呢啲問題嘅，即係話呢啲文件點樣傳閱、邊個負責草擬文件，你就話畀我哋聽一般係用電郵嘅，我見到呢啲咁樣嘅意見書裏面，似乎佢嘅時間都好接近，譬如話2016年，你可以見到呢一頁，又有啲意見係關於嗰個火警鐘。2016年4月14號，呢個有一個係關於公共運輸策略研究嘅。跟住有一個講九巴嘅，佢哋嘅九巴個牌--專營權要係續期嘅等等。咁呢啲咁樣嘅或者係意見書，你係點樣草擬㗎？點樣係傳閱畀委員呢？咁嗰啲會員係點樣提供意見，等你哋可以寫好呢個交畀立法會或者係政府嘅意見

書嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，一般呢啲咁嘅文件，我哋會傳閱畀我哋覺得重要嘅當事人喇，譬如話我哋先首先將文件交畀政府或者係運房局，咁之後我哋又再有交文件畀立法會。咁至於我哋傳閱文件方面，我哋就唔係真係好有規--即係好有制度嘅，我哋通常唔會畀太多人嘅，亦都唔會去交畀媒體嘅，我哋睇下究竟立法會有冇係討論過有關課題，或者政府有冇提出咁嘅課題喇。至於話呢啲咁嘅文件係點樣草擬，通常就係我有份做喇，咁如果其他嘅會員係有興趣，都係歡迎佢哋參與嘅。至於討論方面，有時候我要承認嘅，我係冇辦法同其他會員係响當時討論嘅，但係最近嗰啲報告我哋都有係討論嘅，好多時係事前討論，但係有陣時只能夠喺事後先送畀佢，睇下有咩嘢意見，如果有好多嘅--更多嘅意見，而我哋解決到，咁我哋嘅做法就係話會將嗰個附帶嘅意見就係再交畀有關嘅各方面嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝你，鄺先生。你話你交畀嗰啲意見書、文件，你睇睇呢份係响個雜項二，782 嗰一頁。呢個係關於巴士安全嘅報告嘅，你哋喺 2018 年 4 月提交嘅，呢個係回應委員會嘅要求嘅。你提交嘅文件係有五個--有五個重點嘅總結嘅--摘要嘅。架巴士嘅營運、安全隱患、而家嘅做法同埋同海外嘅做法嘅比較，同埋最後一個結論同埋建議嘅。而家可唔可以話畀--證實呢個係你哋委員嘅集體嘅一個成果嚟嘅，集體編寫嘅成果？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）由於嗰個時間有限喇，其實係由我草擬文件嘅，有特別嘅課題，我的確係有諮詢一、兩個委員嘅--一、兩個成員嘅。咁交咗呢個報告之後，我就將呢個報告就交畀所有我哋嘅成員，睇下佢哋咩嘢意見喇，睇下佢哋需唔需要有啲額外嘅建議、睇法，或者佢有啲--有冇啲論點佢唔同意，咁我就有機會--可以有個機會可以再向呢個獨立檢討委員會再提交啲附加意見。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，請睇 785 頁，係你呢份文件嘅，呢度係個建議嗰部分。呢度係第一個--建議嘅第 1 段，應該係安全系統嘅做法，嚟到係照顧唔同因素嘅交雜喇，係汽車、道路、人管理，咁呢度你有講咗四個重要嘅因素喇，即係關於安全四個重要因素，啱唔啱？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，係嘅，喺我份文件係咁寫嘅。或者我就補充，當然喇，安全系統嘅呢個模式亦都要照顧埋--要包括埋政策嘅。但係我就選擇--為咗係即係簡化，我就冇擺落去喇，冇寫落去。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你睇番第一個因素，呢個就係嗰個運作嘅規則、規條同埋監察系統嘅，你話呢個係需要一個新--關於安全--有需要就制定一個新嘅安全嘅駕駛嘅操作方面嘅規定嘅，咁呢度有講明喇，係有速度等等，呢個係一個一般嘅規則同埋有啲關於個別路線嘅規則嘅，可唔可以係解釋一下？譬如話一般嘅規則係咩嘢意思？咁你有冇--你會响呢一方面考慮咩嘢因素嘅呢，一般嘅規則？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我如果冇--唔知道究竟巴士公司而家其實佢哋做緊啲咩嘢，譬如話司機駕駛嘅時候應該遵循啲乜嘢嘅規則，我係冇內部嘅消息嘅，我

哋係從一個安全系統嘅角度嚟睇呢個問題嘅，我哋覺得駕駛巴士嘅工作係需要多啲嘅控制呀、管控嘅。我就呢個擺响個--我叫做一般規則喇，即係意思駕駛巴士，响市區繁忙嘅道路駕駛巴士，應該係咩嘢行為或者係速度應該係點樣樣，行為應該係點樣樣。另一個例子就係你响公路度駕駛，咁速度應該係點、我哋預期巴士司機應該係咩嘢速度，呢個同嗰個法定嘅道路嘅限速係唔同嘅。我作為一個道路工程師，我知道道路嘅設計係各種各樣都有嘅，好多元化嘅。我哋唔能夠完全依靠嗰啲道路速度嘅限制或者係設計方面嘅速度嘅限制嘅。如果係市區道路，呢度有好多所謂交通同行人之間嘅一啲互動嘅情況嘅，咁所以我哋需要要有更加嚴謹嘅速度嘅管制嘅，同埋關於加速或減速方面嘅監控嘅，即係呢個就係我所講嘅一般嘅規則，我就唔係講緊某一條街嘅規則嘅，而係所有繁忙嘅市區道路。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋睇番 817 頁吖，呢個係雜項二呢個文件夾，817 頁，响頂嗰度。你認為係一啲設計嘅準則嘅，要考慮呢個一般營運嘅規則嘅，呢度分開四個準則嘅，第一個就係市區地區；第二，高速嘅道路；第三，就係比較窄嘅山路；最後就係嗰個單車駕駛者嘅。喺市區道路你就建議有一個某一個嘅車速限制，就係最高係每小時 40 公里，咁你亦都話喺一啲繁忙嘅市區道路就係時速 30，最高。咁你可唔可以解釋一下呢個 40 同埋 30 呢兩個嘅時速限制係點解你會有咁樣嘅意見呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）記住，呢兩個準則其實係建議嚟嘅，仲要進一步再研究。一個較低嘅時速限制即係比起法定嘅時速限制較低，其實都係因為安全嘅考慮，安全就係因為行人同埋車嗰個嘅互動，仲有車之間嘅互動。喺市區道路最主要嘅衝突係來自行人同汽車，同埋汽車喺十字路口。咁所以我哋要睇番唔同嘅因素，譬如話司機減速，可以有幾快令到唔會撞車呢？同埋亦都要考慮人嘅忍耐度，譬如話一個老人家，佢係被撞到整親嘅時候，嗰個車嘅時速最高可以係幾多而呢個人係唔會受到傷害或者死亡呢？咁我哋亦都要睇番海外嘅報告喇、世界一啲嘅趨勢喇。一啲較繁忙嘅市區道路，其實有個趨勢就係採納較低嘅時速限制，譬如話每小時 30 公里，呢個講緊嘅係一啲比較密集嘅市區，有啲地方可能就會係採納 40 喇，有啲就係 30，有啲地方就係同時有 30 同埋 40 嘅時速限制嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢國家，你心目中諗緊係？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我想解釋一下，喺歐洲，歐洲國家，由荷蘭開始，市區道路同埋住它區就係時速 30 公里，喺一啲嘅北歐國家喇，譬如話丹麥、挪威，除咗係時速 30 公里之外喇，佢哋亦都有採納時速 40 公里。後者就係用一啲比較主要嘅道路，澳洲而家好常見嘅就係每小時 40 公里，譬如話喺中央商業區，悉尼嘅中央商業區就會見到呢個情況。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺生...

主席：（經傳譯員）英國呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）英國就採納呢個嘅係每公里 20 里㗎，即係大約每小時時速 32，喺英國，佢哋冇每小時 40㗎，因為再上就係呢一個嘅 30 英里嘅，呢個就係等如大約 48 公里。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係你考慮到呢一個嘅 13 年 1 月英國道路當局講番就係所適用嘅規則呢方面嘅資訊㗎，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）喺 2013 年，係吖，2013 年。喺由 2011 年開始，我哋一直提倡呢一樣嘢，呢個係我哋建議嚟㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我提及嘅就係英國道路局--交通局有一份嘅文件就話係制定當地嘅時速限制，咁喺唔同嘅城市都有採納，尤其喺倫敦，唔同嘅地方都有咁做㗎，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係，喺英國就係每小時 20 英里，呢個嘅區域其實已經歷史悠久㗎，喺 2013 年之前已經有㗎喇，喺 2013 年嘅時候，你提及過嘅呢份文件，即係話訂定當地車速係其實已經係講咗話關於--咁係有更新嘅，咁當時以我理解，其實就係確定咗話採納 20 英里作為時速限制呢一個概念。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺生，你就提及--之前你講過，提倡訂定車速限制，我想請你睇其中一份嘅文件，...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講嗰樣嘢之前，你形容就話一個一般嘅規則--睇番個頂部，817 頁，你其實預期係由邊個負責去建議呢一個咁樣嘅規則？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，喺制定呢份文件嘅時候，我哋冇深入去釐清究竟邊個負責，我哋建議係應該有一個一般嘅操作規則，呢個唔係法定嘅時速限制，呢個係一個建議，就係話內部監控，係九巴公司內部嘅監控或者由政府向佢哋施加嘅監控條件。咁但係改變時速限制需要時間，亦都係需要經過法定程序，同時涉及係香港點樣去訂定、點樣去解釋呢個時速限制㗎，咁但係如果係公司--即係巴士公司自己內部改變就比較容易。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺關於呢一個嘅係 2 月 10 號，18 年嘅巴士意外嘅時候，咁其實我哋就知道喺 4 月 27 號嗰個路段嘅時速限制已經由 70 減到去 50㗎喇，咁所以其實可以見到需時都唔係太耐。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，你啱嘅，我喺新聞得知關於大埔公路嘅嗰一個路段時段限制已經改變，咁我哋建議係時速 30 或者 40，呢個係一個新嘅概念，就話係以呢一個嘅區域，即係一個時速限制區域咁樣去制定。即係話呢個時速限制係適用於喺市區嘅道路比較大嘅範圍。咁呢個其實係有兩點，一，根據現行嘅設計手冊，其實時速 30 公里係不被鼓勵；第二，時速 40 公里並未係《道路交通條例》嘅其中一部分，所以呢一個我要再進一步印證。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提及嘅就係呢個車速限制嘅部分喇，咁係呢個第 6 章，係《道路交通條例》設計方面㗎，咁可以喺 820-57 頁嗰度搵到㗎。你就引用咗其中

兩部分，就同你頭先所講嘅有關。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）應該係運輸署文件一號？

主席：（經傳譯員）應該係雜項文件嘅二，係 820-57 頁。或者我係引用番你頭先所講嘅，就係話香港嘅市區道路係時速 50㗎，有呢一方面嘅指引，其實就喺運輸署嘅交通設計同埋交通規劃設計手冊嘅第 6 章裏面搵到嘅，其中一項喺 6.4.2.5 喇，就係話呢一個嘅係建議喺公共道路係嗰個嘅時速限制如果低過 50 公里就唔建議㗎，因為咁樣就係需要加強執法㗎，咁對於再進一步調低嗰個道路限制嘅話，可能係就未必對防止交通意外有太大嘅影響㗎。咁但係呢一最尷嗰句你就質疑喇，係咪呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有關呢一部分，呢一個嘅規則係幾時制定㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）你所講嘅就係交通規則設計手冊？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，咁呢個係會唔會同英國嗰個嘅文件有關呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）其實呢個來自邊度喇，唔係來自 2017 年嘅版本㗎，即係唔係來自 2013 年訂定當地時速限制嘅文件㗎，咁但係仲有其他--呢份文件有提及過其他地方㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁但係我哋可以喺邊度搵到咁樣嘅諗法？係咪來自 1974 年呢一個嘅英國運事局嘅文件？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔肯定，咁但係你其實有好多參考資料㗎，好多都已經係過時。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。唔好意思，我岔開咗，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其中一份你解釋過嘅文件，我哋可以喺 820-57 頁嗰度見到嘅。呢個其實喺--呢一個嘅係第二屆--2017 年第二屆聯合國嘅國際道路交通安全日嗰度提及過嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我喺邊度可以見得到係邊度提過？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺呢個 820-25 頁底部嗰度見到嘅，就係第二屆嘅國際道路交通安全週。820-25。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我見到㗎，我見到嘅，喺角落頭。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番呢一份嘅文件喇，呢個係咪你係交畀呢一個第二屆嘅聯合國道路交通安全--國際道路交通安全週嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果睇番其中你提倡嘅一啲以地區嚟計嘅時速限制，呢個就係 820-35 頁。可以見到有 20、30 同埋 40 呢三個區域，譬如話新發展區、住宅區、遊客區、醫院、鄉村等等，其實你就將佢用唔同嘅區域區分，即係話唔同嘅區域就應該適用唔同嘅時速限制，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢份文件其實係我哋嘅願景，我提倡呢一樣嘢，呢個係我嘅願景，即係話市區發展係唔同嘅區域用唔同嘅車速限制，但不代表目前情況係咁。時速限制區域我想簡單解釋一下，傳統嚟講，要採納一個時速限制，我哋需要整個--即係每條街都要有一個嘅車速限制標意誌，譬如話係時速 50 公里，如果係時速 50 公里，咁就唔使擺喇，咁但係如果係 30，就需要擺好多呢一個嘅時速限制標誌喺市區喇。咁我想講話如果係時速限制 30 區域，即係根據我嘅建議，其實都要經過法律程序去界定呢個標誌，如果有呢個標誌就係話譬如時速 30 公里嘅區域，喺呢一個區域裏面就唔需要每條街都擺個時速限制標誌，只需要喺進入呢個區域同埋離開區域嘅時候整個標誌，呢樣嘢喺荷蘭、法國、英國都有咁做。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係話係要推動安全駕駛，例子可以係 820-36 可以見到喇，譬如話 30 區域你已經解釋咗點解你推動呢樣嘢喇，因為就你係適用於一啲嘅單程路、雙程路、好多人嘅地方、密集嘅地方。如果睇番 40，時速 40 公里嘅區域，跟住嗰頁喇，就係一啲嘅雙程道路同埋係一啲主要嘅交通幹道，即係話比較少人行嘅地方。去到時速 50 公里區域喇，就係-38 呢一頁可以見到，就適用於--即係你嗰四段，就係比較少行人嘅地方，多啲行人天橋同埋視野比較清晰嘅地方，即係唔會有阻礙嘅地方。再跟住嗰頁喇，-39，你建議時速係 20 適用於呢個區域，因為首先呢啲嘅道路好唔同喇，比較窄同埋好多行人，係一個購物區、娛樂區、一啲嘅露天市場或者係鄉村中心，所以你就建議時速係 20 公里喇，呢個就係你嘅理據，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢啲嘅理據其實就係特登為香港情況而訂定嘅，譬如我所講，40 公里嘅區域唔係喺所有嘅已發展國家用㗎，咁但係香港喺一啲特定嘅情況係需要咁做。我亦都想一提，關於一啲嘅係 20 公里區域，即係人車都會用嘅街係比較會佔少嘅部分嘅地方，通常係一啲中心嘅地方、核心地方，譬如話銅鑼灣、中環，但係大部分嘅道路都係車速 30、40 或者 50 嘅，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你嘅研究亦都係基於一啲統計，即係署方嘅統計，就係呢個法國嘅運輸部嘅，請你睇番一個嘅 820-46 頁，睇番嗰個年長行人致命嘅或然率嘅，咁呢個係來自英國嘅交通部 2010 年同埋法國嘅研究--法國嘅數據，2006 嘅。你可唔可以解釋一下你嘅意思係乜嘢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。2010 年嘅時候，當時就係英國嘅交通當局發表咗一份報告，總結咗亦都再次引證咗佢哋之前所做嘅一啲研究，呢個就關乎致命或者係嚴重嘅受傷嘅可能性，即係話喺不同嘅行人組群裏面佢哋嗰個或然率嘅。喺關於法國方面嘅資料比較一般性喇，我咩嘢意思呢？就話譬如我哋睇下一秒嗰個反應時間，同埋係需要幾多時間嚟到去剎掣，呢個喺好多文件嗰度

都回應用呢一個假設嘅，即係話係要7公尺嘅時間。

我哋就睇下喇，如果一部細嘅乘客車，咁而開車嘅速度係30公里，咁嗰個或然率如果係致命交通意外嘅話，或然率係百分之四喇。咁如果但係如果行人--係同一部車，但係佢行緊40公里嘅話，咁樣就唔同喇。咁最後如果佢係70公里嘅話，咁嗰個或然率就去到百分之九十七。咁嗰個就睇下30同70又或者30同60公里，你都可以見到嗰個分別係好大嘅。嗰個反應時間，我呢度已經顯示咗出嚟喇。當一個司機見到有行人喺馬路度行出嚟，佢需要起碼有一秒鐘嘅時間作出反應，佢要一秒然後先至可以踩落嗰個剎車掣嗰度。

咁如果係30公里嘅話都已經差唔多有二十--如果40公里嘅話，佢已經係20公尺喇，即係話喺嗰20公尺嘅時間裏面，如果嗰個行人就係出現嘅話，就差唔多好肯定係會被撞死嘅。咁換句話講，若果係嗰個車速低啲嘅話，就應該就冇咁大可能會引致一個致命嘅交通意外，呢個就係講及人嗰個--係限制人嗰個能力嘅問題嘅。車速越高，咁司機需要更長嘅時間先至能夠將部車完全停得低，而且亦都需要係睇埋嗰個反應嘅時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。咁或者係講番你係18年4月嗰份陳述書喇，係786頁嘅，咁我哋剛才提及嗰個一般嘅規定，我哋而家可唔可以講埋路線呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我再講番轉頭喇，講番一般嘅事宜，當我問你，你認為邊一個應該負責係建議有啲乜嘢嘅規則，你話就仲未係諗通㗎，咁但係如果講到係法定嘅車速限制，咁究竟係巴士公司去做吖，定抑或係政府係實施嘅一個強制規定呢？咁你話巴士公司可以做㗎，係嘛？咁講啱唔啱？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）啱㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你覺得巴士公司會點樣做呢？我哋要建議點樣去提高巴士嘅安全，咁巴士公司方面應該係點樣樣去建議啲司機就係喺某一啲特定嘅地方唔好係揸車揸到去嗰個法定嘅最高嗰個時速呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）法例上面嘅時速限制就係嗰個法定嘅要求，咁司機就要睇住嘅，不過其實司機亦都係有咁嘅責任，任何時候，揸車嘅時候應該係以適當嘅行車速度去行車，即係因應當時個環境嘅。我哋呢個個建議係點呢？我假設巴士公司其實任何時候都可以係制定一啲指引話畀啲司機聽，喺啲乜嘢嘅道路情況之下就應該係以乜嘢嘅車速去行車。咁佢可以係用文件、可以以培訓咁嘅形式去推行嘅。至於話具體係40定35，定抑或45公里，咁呢一方面係需要進一步嘅調查先可以制定嘅，監察就係另一回事喇。首先我哋要有嗰啲規則喺度先，下一步然後先可以講嗰個監察嘅，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，譬如話我哋有一啲資訊就知道就係其中一間巴士公司就係有一啲交通黑點嘅，咁亦都係有一啲彎位比較急嘅，咁佢係咪可以就係話畀啲司機聽，就喺嗰啲咁嘅彎位行車嘅時候就應該係行咩嘢車速，你大概意思係咪咁？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，以一般嘅規則嚟講，呢個係一般嘅，但係剛才提及嘅就係譬如話可能某一個特定嘅具體嘅一個路彎喇，咁樣就係去到路線--特定路線嘅規則喇。我喺文件嗰度都有提過㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，你係咪諗住係去問嗰方面嘅問題？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席，因應你問嘅問題。你喺呢頁嗰個頁頭嗰度，你就話嗰個係喺第二點嘅第 2 段第二行嗰度，你就係話就係希望推廣更安全嘅行車，呢個係一個規則，就唔係一個懲罰司機嘅工具，換句話講，你係希望請巴士營運商係可以遵守有關嘅規則，就唔係話用呢一個工具嚟到去懲罰嗰啲巴士司機㗎，你嗰個邏輯係咪咁？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，啱㗎。我喺寫呢份報告嘅時候，我哋唔係話想講太多嗰個責任嘅問題，又唔係講話邊一個係違反咗嗰個--冇盡佢嗰個責任㗎，其實我哋嗰個整體嘅概念都係推廣交通安全，希望大家都係行車安全喇，大家都開心㗎，我係好想強調呢一點㗎。好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁你又有咩嘢建議？即係如何去監察？點樣利用監察嚟到去推廣大家都遵守呢一個嘅規則，而唔係用佢嚟到去懲罰啲人？你認為喺監察嘅過程裏面係可以點樣做？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我想話監察嗰個目的就係要搵出邊一啲司機係經常都違反嗰個規則㗎，亦都想搵出係邊一啲司機佢係經常係嚴重咁樣違反咗嗰啲規則㗎。第二類嘅司機，我認為就係呢一類嘅司機就係帶嚟極大嘅風險嘅。換句話講，我哋唔係話譬如話有個司機只不過係稍微係超速咗嗰個時速限制，違反咗個規則，譬如話我哋定咗每小時 40 公里，咁喺某一個時候佢就揸到 42、43，就唔係話呢樣嘢有問題，除非嗰個地點係特別危險嘅。我哋要搵出邊一啲司機呢？就搵嗰啲就係經常違反規則嘅司機，同埋佢違反得嚟嗰個程度非常之嚴重㗎，咁如果我哋可以及時搵出佢哋，亦都及時咁樣樣係糾正佢哋嘅行為，咁就最好喇，呢個就係我嗰個概念。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你認為--你話要搵出邊一啲人係經常好危險咁樣樣去違反啲規則嘅，咁點樣去可以達至你嘅目的？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我諗傳統嚟講佢哋就搵便衣嘅人員就上車嗰度去監察喇，有時亦都係靠收到投訴之後就搵稽查去查喇，咁但係我覺得呢一個唔係好有效嘅，其實科技亦都好先進㗎喇，我相信有更好嘅方法去做㗎。有一個監察嘅制度、一個監察嘅系統，如果係以黑盒為本嘅話，係可以自動化，實時。咁樣樣就更加係有效率喇，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個科技其實都好多年㗎喇嘛，係嘛？其實另外你講及呢一個神秘乘客嘅計劃，以及就係根據投訴去做嘢。譬如話呢一個係一個好舊--歷史好耐嘅制度㗎喇，譬如有個人行出去就係翕一支紅旗？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係，不過我認為今時今日應該更加倚靠一啲先進嘅科技去進行監察。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺報告嗰度咁講㗎，監察應該係根--係應該係以一啲先進嘅、實時嘅自動化嘅黑盒系統為本嘅，可唔可以講一講？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，首先我就想講--我就想申報，我喺黑盒系統方面我唔係一個專家，講到佢哋而家所用嘅先進嘅科技我都唔係專家。

主席：（經傳譯員）星期六我哋係做咗聆訊喇，我哋有一位黑盒製造商 ZF 嘅代表就係作證嘅，你有冇係去睇過我哋嗰個紀錄本？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）有，我都有攞過下嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你剛才就話你喺呢方面就冇一啲專業嘅知識，咁但係你可唔可以都答一答呢三點？即係話先進嘅、實時嘅、自動化嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席。我睇過呢一啲黑盒而家嗰個情況，當我講過我喺呢方面唔係專家嘅時候，我話我喺科技同埋喺嗰個軟件點樣係開發我唔係專家，不過我哋可以睇睇我哋用呢啲黑盒嘅系統係想達至啲乜嘢目標。我嘅理解就係呢啲黑盒就可以收集好多嘅訊息嘅，對呢方面我就最感興趣喇，譬如話知道佢加速、減速、傾側嘅角度、車速等等。喺呢個報告裏面，由於呢啲科技有好先進嘅功能，我認為係可以應用呢個系統嘅，而且有一啲營運商佢哋已經用咗黑盒嚟到去管理自己嘅車隊，咁所以我寫呢份報告嘅時候，我覺得如果我推薦--我建議話用一啲先進、實時同埋自動化嘅系統，應該都係公道嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你所講嘅「實時」係咩嘢意思？係有咩嘢好處？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，有一啲行動係極為不當嘅，係需要係適時咁樣樣去發現同埋糾正嘅，我哋唔能夠話靠乘客嚟投訴，咁然後就係派人去調查，咁然後就係幾個星期之後先作出糾正，咁係唔得嘅，所以我就建議就係話要明白實明監察嘅重要性，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你話自動化，自動咁樣編製呢一啲嘅報告係有乜嘢好處同埋重要性喺邊度？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，根據我嘅經驗，黑盒系統係可以產生大量嘅數據嘅，如果我哋單單係靠人手去搵出嗰個問題，又或者有關嘅程序唔係完全自動化嘅話，我相信涉及嘅人手資源好大嘅，咁樣做亦都唔能夠持久，唔能夠持續㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺星期六收到嘅資訊，咁而你亦都睇過㗎，咁其實就係呢一啲嘅功能而家都有㗎喇，即係話自動化嘅監察？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）亦都係而家車上嘅裝置係冇㗎，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我睇過文件就話係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話你就係要界定嗰個界限喇，譬如 50 喇，咁然後你就將佢係話 55 就會係一個臨界點喇，咁就係超過咗百分之十佢就會即刻自動、實時咁樣樣係警示嗰個司機喇，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席，我有睇過㗎，我都睇到呢點㗎。我而家呢度諗嘅就係話究竟應該個準則定喺邊度，係邊一個先至係嗰個門檻，係用邊個界限去促發嗰個警示嘅，或者嗰個警示或者個提示係其中一個控制嘅辦法。至於話我哋點樣用一個黑盒嘅科技去善用、盡用佢，同埋點樣樣去應付呢一個碰撞同埋受傷，我諗應該會喺日後我哋進行調查呢一個科技嘅時候嘅重點㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你知唔知道運輸署有冇係強制嗰啲巴士公司係點樣用呢啲科技去有一啲實時同埋自動編製報告呢一個程序？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我冇詳細咁去睇過--關於你問嘅問題，我冇詳細研究過。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲文件就係講到佢哋新嘅專營權嘅時候，裏面有冇提及呢一個建議？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我冇，我冇睇過有啲呢方面嘅建議㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你自己係有作出建議㗎，我諗遲啲我哋會睇到㗎，我諗你曾經作出呢個建議，就話喺續約嗰個--專營權續約嘅時候應該包括啲乜嘢嘢。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席先生，我哋有作出建議，但係嗰啲基本上係一個方向性嘅比較一般嘅建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我又睇過一啲比較係具體嘅建議嘅，亦都同我哋剛剛探討個問題好有關嘅。黃律師，你係咪--你繼續喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席先生，我哋稍後會返番嚟呢個課題嘅，或者先讓我係完成手頭上呢一個問題先喇。我而家講到係嗰啲路線為本嘅規則㗎，你嘅陳述書亦都有呢方面嘅建議嘅，786 頁第二點嘅，咁你講到就話香港就係有啲好窄嘅山路喇，就冇足夠嘅安全嘅防護欄--防撞欄嘅。你就係 817 頁，喺 5.4 嗰段上面剛剛就係--嗰度就係有提及一啲建議嘅，你話希望就係就個別嘅路線就係制定一啲操作嘅規則嘅，譬如話佢哋有啲好高風險嘅路況喇，譬如話長命斜喇、特別陡斜嘅坡道喇、急彎喇，就係會埋去嘅時候--入彎嘅時候好容易係超速喇，又或者係可能係冇呢一個安全防撞欄或者係好唔夠，又驚會跌落去，喺高處跌落去，又或者就係佢係嗰個現有嗰個橋嗰個防護欄就係唔夠喇、路面好窄、視線唔好，又或者係會有路人或者係翻車嘅人士嘅。咁我想問下喇，你講到話有特別嘅路--路線方面，唔同嘅路線應該有特別嘅規則嘅，或者唔同嘅路

況應該有唔同嘅規則，你可唔可以講清楚一啲呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢一度就係講及我哋嗰個理念嘅，雖然整體嚟講係符合法定嘅速度係重要，但係都仲要講講個別路段嘅安全嘅。我知道香港有啲路段，譬如比較--香港島嗰啲比較傳統--起嘅山上嘅路，佢哋設計唔係畀巴士用嘅，因為起嘅時候好耐喇，咁據我嘅理解，即係喺我本人嘅專業，我可以話畀你聽，譬如話佢冇防護欄嘅，或者防護欄係唔能夠防止巴--即係一個巴士，譬如話佢嘅速度係每小時 40、50 公里，佢係保護唔到嘅。咁我哋要特別留意呢啲，我哋搵到出嚟嘅一啲咁樣嘅路段，咁巴士公司--巴士嘅司機係要好清楚係有咁樣嘅路段，咁呢啲路段應該有一個特定嘅一啲管控嘅、控制嘅，譬如話速度係每小時 30、35 公里。

另一個例子就係响一個高速公路，咁佢個限速係高啲嘅，咁公共巴士又可以係去到每小時 70 公里嘅速度嘅，但係唔係所有高速公路都個安全水準都係一樣嘅--安全水平一樣嘅，譬如某一個天橋，佢嘅防護欄就唔足以就達到一個標準嚟到防護巴士用 70 公里嘅速度撞上去嘅情況嘅。咁响咁嘅情況，我哋可能需要要個巴士司機慢一啲，譬如話係每小時 60 公里，個速度要低啲，咁個意思就係話要處理速度同埋巴士司機嘅一啲行為嘅問題，就我哋要照顧道路狀況，基於即係一啲工程嘅準則或者係引致受傷嘅情況嘅準則嚟到係施加管制。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係為咗管制巴士司機嘅行為，即係話法例上准佢有某個速度，咁但係咁樣係唔夠嘅，譬如話安全考慮唔夠嘅時候，咁呢個管控應該係由巴士公司實施吖，啱唔啱？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我哋做呢個報告，正如我所講，我就冇指明係邊一個做呢件事，咁我假設巴士公司同埋政府可以合作制定有關嘅準則、規定，等個巴士公司係實施嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我假設即係辨識呢啲咁樣嘅路段，有啲咁樣嘅特徵嘅路段喇，頭先你都提過又係咩嘢特徵喇，咁會唔會係如果你政府做係咪容易啲？我就係諗緊運輸署係咪有一個--你知唔知道有一個--成個香港有個電子嘅地圖嘅一個資料㗎，你知唔知有呢件咁嘅事？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你係講緊係運輸署係有一個...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）哦，佢有一個係數字方面嘅係--道路速度嘅係一個係--好似地圖，全港嘅道路嘅速度限速嘅地圖資料嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔知道有一個咁樣關於係道路速度嘅地圖嘅，因為香港就唔係成日改嘅，即係嗰個速度唔係成日改嘅，大部分嘅路就係限速係每小時 50 公里喇，有某啲路係有唔同嘅限速嘅。我就唔知呢啲資料已經係用一個電子地圖嘅方式係保存喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番運輸署嘅 368 頁，呢個係由運輸署 2018 年 6 月 12 號寫

嚟嘅，佢係回應我哋委員會提出嘅問題，要求有一個關於係法定限速嘅電子地圖嘅資訊嘅，呢度你睇番呢個信件嘅第 2 段，呢度有講嘅，第 2 段。我哋而家係附交一個地圖，就係全港嘅，另一個係一個關於香港島嘅，淨係涉及 70 公里或者以上限速嘅道路嘅，畀你參考。咁佢就話--我哋想通--話畀你聽呢個有關嘅數據，即係關於限速嘅數據係由運輸署保存嘅，用一個 GIS，就即係話係地理嘅資訊系統嚟到係保存嘅，係可以响嗰個 data.gov.hk 即係呢個咁嘅網站係下載嘅，咁呢個就可以用呢個軟件令到將嗰個速度限制就係覆蓋响地政署嘅一個地圖嘅，或者亦都可以用一個係 Google 地圖或者係其他地圖軟件嚟到係使用，就知道個路段嘅限速嘅情況。

而家我哋--運輸署係建議使用以上嘅地理嘅資訊系統嘅數據庫嚟到畀--交畀--要求巴士考慮使用呢個咁樣嘅數據庫或者地圖嚟到係畀巴士公司嘅，呢個係一個地圖圍欄嘅方法嘅。咁你覺得巴士營運者係咪--如果係用咁嘅方法，你就會知道係响邊啲地方係話--或者邊一個組別嘅路段係可以係要特別處理㗎？呢個--我嘅理解，根據你嘅經驗，係咪適合？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）或者我有個咁嘅睇法、意見喇，如果已經係用電子地圖嘅方式，有咗咁嘅資料，咁係好有用嘅。呢個地--當然，呢個所謂地理圍欄嘅概念係好有用嘅。但係我哋一定要等司機知道邊一啲路段係需要減速，佢哋或者應該用咩嘢速度行駛，就算冇一啲先進嘅科技，我哋而家都做到㗎喇，可以話畀佢哋聽㗎喇。但係呢個地理圍欄當然係一個數字式喇，可以同嗰個監控系統係結合起嚟喇，嚟到提醒佢哋，咁樣嘅系統喺長遠嚟講會好有用處嘅。但係為咗能夠即時處理有問題，我哋應該可以用一個簡單嘅方法開始嘅，先係講清楚比較危險--最危險嘅位置，我哋應該可以話咗畀司機聽，就提供訓練，當然喇，長遠可以比較自動化，用自動化系統，即係好似你講嗰啲系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁當然喇，如果我哋監察--你做得--監察做得好，咁佢哋就--司機嘅行為就應該做得更加好喇，咁特別係實時喇，如果有一個係電子地圖，咁又係速度限制，咁你都知道個司機喺邊度喇，咁你都比較容易監察，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我相信咁樣好有幫助嘅，但係我覺得司機都有啲壓力嘅，我哋其實想係幫助司機，而唔係要施加好多唔同嘅限制，點樣用最理智嘅方法嚟到做呢啲嘅事，都需要係考慮細節嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道其中一間巴士--星加坡嘅巴士公司佢有一個係積分嘅卡㗎，即係個司機嘅行為係有個積分卡㗎，譬如話講緊佢嘅速度或者係減速、加速，如果係司機冇話突然加速、突然減速，佢就會攞到啲高分，咁呢個所謂嘅--佢就係一個所謂綠色積分嘅司機嘅。如果你一個司機就係經常忽然加速、忽然減速，咁將嗰個司機好似就拋出車站外面喇，咁佢就係一個紅色積分嘅司機喇，咁如果幫佢哋，佢哋就畀一個綠色積分司機，司機有獎金嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我同意嘅，司機如果安全駕駛，應該係得到獎勵嘅，

要得到鼓勵嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）英國佢哋就係咁嘅制度，有冇聽過呢個英國呢個叫做綠色道路嘅呢個措施，有冇聽過？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我未聽過。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個軟件嚟嘅，响英國倫敦嘅一個專營商--亦都係星加坡都有用嘅，我頭先都描述過係點樣做嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）多謝。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個綠色道路嘅監察，即係話睇下有冇啲突然加速、突然減速，或者係經常令到引擎空轉好長時間嘅，咁响英國嘅巴士就係話佢哋有一個係同偕之間--即係司機之間嚟到係監察嘅，咁佢哋有所謂嘅積分表喇，有唔同嘅顏色嘅，綠色嘅、黃色嘅、紅色嘅，就視乎佢哋究竟有幾多積分喇，或者有幾多--發生過幾多事故喇。咁就視乎佢--如果係黃色、紅色就要額外訓練嘅，咁呢個系統就容許司機知道有啲乜嘢係一啲所謂重要嘅地點喇，咁亦都係如果係佢哋嘅積分良好，係可以有獎金嘅。咁就唔係淨係罰巴士嘅，亦都係一個全國使用一個嘅監察系統，睇下邊個係個最好嘅--即係優質嘅司機，咁佢有個全國嘅每年嘅最佳司機競爭嘅。即係話唔係淨係罰嘅，即係都有獎嘅，即係有個誘因，等佢哋可以即係駕駛態度更加好、更加安全。你有冇聽過呢個用一個積分卡嘅制度嚟到係獎勵司機，而唔係罰佢哋嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我未聽過呢個制度嘅，但係我相信一個類似嘅制度都係一個出路嚟嘅，只要唔好太複雜，或者係要能夠持續嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋頭先講過有關嘅規則，或者可唔可以講講 786 頁嘅巴士設計嘅？呢個係响另一個文件夾，係雜項二嘅。呢度有講過一啲安全嘅特徵喇，你建議係作為優先處理嘅，呢度其實有六個特徵嘅，第一個就係前部要比較安全喇；第二就安全帶；就係使用更多係保護嘅軟墊；嗰個樓梯用一啲--牆裏面有凹凸坑紋；亦都係要提警示有冇路人响個巴士嘅某個範圍度出現；同埋改善司機嘅視野，譬如話係鏡同埋閉路電視。你嘅建議係--或者使用乜嘢儀器、設備嚟到去改善司機嘅視線、視野？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）大嘅車通常好多視野方面嘅問題嚟嘅，重型嘅貨車嚟講，呢個係一個大嘅問題嘅。今日我哋用嘅巴士，我相信佢哋就比較好啲嘅，因為個窗係比較大啲嘅。而家我相信大部分巴士都有閉路電視去監察車後嘅，即係等佢倒車嘅時候安全啲，但係有陣時偶然都係有啲嚴重嘅係涉及路人死亡嘅重大事故嘅，似乎嗰個巴士司機係睇唔到有人响後面、喺前面或者係車嘅側邊過路。而家响巴士，就係照我--據我了解，更多有裝閉路電視嘅。咁嗰個監察器係响上方嘅，即係巴士司機嘅上方嘅，我就唔知道究竟啲咁樣嘅位置對於巴士司機係咪最適合，即係最能夠幫佢哋睇番有關嘅盲點嘅。我就唔打算講話咁樣係唔能夠令人滿意咁樣運作嘅，我只係話建議應該要睇睇呢個咁樣嘅閉路電視

嘅攝影嘅機，同埋嗰個監察嘅監視器係咪能夠處理晒所有盲點引起嘅問題。

另一方面，我從倫敦嘅運輸當局嘅網頁嗰度知道，佢哋都係有喺度研究緊巴士司機嘅視野問題嘅，視線問題。有個例子就係貨車有個大嘅問題，因為巴士司機如果有行人响佢前面直接行過，由於個盲點係睇唔到嘅，一般嚟講，個司機就會利用個側鏡嘅，即係未開車之前睇番側邊嘅鏡嘅，咁但係呢個唔係一個司機好自然嘅行為，有時佢係做唔到嘅，即係佢冇睇到嗰個側鏡嘅。

而家有啲國家，由倫敦作為一個帶頭人喇，英國倫敦就帶頭做一樣嘢嘅，就要求汽車嘅製造廠，即係要啲設計係更加方便司機睇到前面或者側邊係發生咩嘢事，呢個叫做直接視線嘅--直接嘅視野嘅一個要求嘅，咁對於巴士嚟講，咁即係同貨車比較喇，巴士司機坐嘅位置比較低一啲嘅。從我收集到嘅資料，我相信仲係有改善嘅空間嘅，即係等司機有個直接嘅視...

主席：（經傳譯員）哦，你係講巴士司機？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，巴士司機，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）貨車司機嗰個問題就係話佢要睇--要响門嗰邊先見到係咪有一個騎單車嘅人經過，呢個係咪其中一個問題？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係㗎，你要見到人踩單車或者係就直接响佢前面--車前面行過都係問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁要改變呢樣嘢，我哋要--你係咪要求--或者 Boris Johnson 話--我唔--佢話你就--「歐盟唔准我將一啲巴士嘅窗就裝响貨車度，咁所以我要離開歐盟」。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道有咁樣嘅情形。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就想舉一個例子，就來自你嘅文章㗎，咁就係呢一嘅 18 年 3 月 17 號，關於道路安全就係呢一個嘅好難係--即係行人好難就暢道通行呢一樣嘢嘅，頁數係 821-78。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）78。呢個係第 1 頁，我哋睇番 820-82。呢個顯示到就係話直視嘅問題，即係嗰個直視措施，你頭先講過嘅，直接可以睇到嗰樣嘢，可唔可以解釋一下喇，就係話呢一個嘅道路外嘅重型--HGV 或者呢一個嘅直視 HGV？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）從我搜集嘅資料可以睇到，重型貨車 HGV 其實設計係喺公路上用㗎，意思即係話會比較少啲行人，車可以一路行，唔需要成日停，呢個就係講話呢一個道路以外嘅情況，咁但係喺香港，有好多街道都有好多行人，包括係一啲行人密集嘅地方、中央商業區，呢個就係問題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番之前嗰頁喇，就係 786 頁，就係嗰六個因素，其中一個

就係講話有關於行人嘅一個嘅特徵喇，就係話行人係可以得到警示，遠離行走嘅車輛，你意思係指咩嘢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）喺報告裏面，我冇特登--我冇即係特定講明嗰個特徵嘅。喺某啲國家，譬如倫敦運輸局，佢哋研究緊一啲新嘅做法，包括警示器或者一啲閃燈。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個警示器同埋閃燈會擺喺邊呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我冇詳細研究，但係我估計可以安裝喺一啲盲點地方，即係巴士盲點、盲區。譬如喺車身近前，行人好多時喺呢啲地方就會因為車身阻擋，司機睇唔到佢哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個會唔會係一個感應器話畀--即係觸動咗之後就會係有警示，就話畀人聽話係有人喺車嗰度行過？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個其實係有可能嘅，不過我預期呢啲嘅功能唔需要感應器都可以做到㗎，即係嗰架巴士轉緊彎嘅時候就會知㗎喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一頁你亦都講過話安全帶，可唔可以睇番 805 頁，你喺呢一頁上面就有進一步解釋嘅，係安全帶方面。喺呢一部分你就話喇，一般嚟講，即係安全帶只係喺某部分冇遮擋嘅座位先至有㗎喇，咁即係譬如話十至十四個喇，就係雙層巴士按--司機喇、上層有四個喇，另外就下層嘅前面喇，就係面對住走廊嘅，咁同埋就另外就係下層嘅向前嗰啲座位，咁你就話呢啲其實就係要再進一步研究下先知道佢哋係咪有用。而家嘅巴士設計，有關於上層前座嘅新巴士已經裝有安全帶㗎喇，...

主席：（經傳譯員）講緊係上層，前面？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，上層前座。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）上層前座，係。喺報告裏面有講，我知道呢啲座位喺上層前座已經裝有安全帶。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其中運輸署研究嘅一個事項，就係有關於呢個議題嘅，可以睇番運輸署五號文件，168-8。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢嚟㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係附件二，由運輸署撰寫㗎，有關於委員會喺口頭證供之後所做嘅文件嘅，關於使用--關於喺專營巴士使用新技術。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係邊度㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係附件二，呢個第-8 頁嗰度嘅，係一啲補充資料。如果我哋睇落去，就提及過就應該就係呢一個嘅 1693 頁嘅。可唔可以睇番 1689 頁？另

外16--睇番1691頁第12段喇，上面就話喇，運輸署喺工作小組，3月13號嘅時候，署方建議同埋所有嘅專營巴士經營者都同意話新嘅巴士所有座位都要有安全帶嘅，咁而現有巴士嘅座位如果要安裝番安全帶就需要再進一步研究㗎。咁似乎喺呢一個討論裏面，就會係新嘅巴士喺將來所有座位都會有安全帶，你知唔知呢樣嘢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我從文件，喺之前嘅聆訊裏面喇，呢方面我都睇到，所以我知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）整體嚟講，即係你可能都有睇過喇，我講埋畀你聽上文下理，署方就開咗一個工作小組會議去睇，話使用新技術嘅討論嘅，我唔知咁樣講啱唔啱喇，咁但係喺呢一個18年3月嘅時候就傾過嘅，呢個就係文件所講嘅嗰個會議，呢個係第八，文件八，係嘛？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）裏面就係提及過一系列嘅技術㗎，咁就冇考慮黑盒，即係或者行車紀錄儀㗎，咁呢個就係同運輸署專營巴士經營商同埋呢一個嘅製造商係討論過㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我知道有一個咁樣嘅委員會，但係我就唔知道討論詳情。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係我想講畀你聽個背景資料嚟嘅，係關於安全帶。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想睇番運輸署文件八號，咁就係呢一個嘅第94頁，裏面就--呢份文件係運輸署嘅文件嚟㗎喇，上面就講咗話喇，就係一啲專營巴士嘅一啲措施、一啲儀器嗰個嘅使用嘅可行性同埋可取性嘅，即係喺大埔意外之後嘅事。咁睇番喇，其中一段就講喇，95頁裏面就話係同呢一個3月，經營商同埋製造商係傾過就係--討論番有關於使用一啲新嘅安全設備嘅，咁曾經就係睇過有關於話所有嘅乘客座位要加裝安全帶，呢個喺第5段可以見到。由第5段開始可以一路去到第9段。喺聆訊嘅時候，我哋聽到證供，話有啲經營者講過話就算裝咗安全帶，大部分嘅乘客都唔願意戴安全帶嘅，咁你建議點樣可以幫助公眾理解呢樣嘢，鼓勵佢哋使用安全帶呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我理解現有巴士就算有裝安全帶，使用率都係好低，呢個係一個好嘅手嘅問題，我哋需要用唔同嘅方法去處理。我認為法例規定係其中一樣可以用嘅措施，另外就係宣傳。咁措施--即係宣傳個內容係好重要，因為唔單只係要令乘客知道呢樣嘢，亦都需要同佢哋解釋，令佢哋明白戴安全帶嘅重要性。戴安全帶唔單只係保護到佢哋自己，如果你坐嘅位置有另外嘅乘客對住你喇，如果佢哋拋出嚟嘅話就會傷到你或者你會傷害到對方。點樣將呢啲技術性嘅資料真係令公眾知道，其實係有難度。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁其實可以跟番同一個做法喇，就好似其他汽車咁喇，開始嘅時

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

候係自願性，冇人做，跟住法例規定硬性要做喇，而家所有人上車都會戴安全帶？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席，我同意。但係同時亦都要睇番公眾小型巴士，其實法例規定硬性係需要戴安全帶嘅，但係我今日可以見到乘客真係去符合法例規定有做嘅係好低，所以有其他更好嘅方法說服公眾，要佢哋戴安全帶，但係點做到，我就畀唔到一個好肯定嘅答案。

主席：（經傳譯員）正如好似話雙黃線唔可以泊車，咁但係我哋見到喇，其實喺香港行就見到喇，法律執行係一個問題。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，執行法例係另外一個嘅問題，我其實係同情執法機構或者部門，因為睇番道路安全，無時無刻，喺任何嘅地方都會見到有好多唔同嘅人犯唔同嘅法例，包括安全帶，所以如果係淨倚賴執法係好難㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁其實--但係有時--即係做得到都會有好處--有益處，係咪？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我同意。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢份文件裏面，亦都有講過其他嘅安全設備嘅，睇番第 98 頁喇，就係喺專營巴士上使用安全設施，咁呢一啲嘅電子穩定控制系統喇、傾側穩定控制系統喇。同時，喺你文件裏面，818 頁都有見到類似嘅建議嘅，就係電子穩定控制系統，...

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）喺未講設備之前喇，有關於巴士設計嗰部分你提過，喺 786 頁，其實呢個就係你第一樣講嘅，就係話呢一個巴士前面係令佢設計得更加安全，目前喺巴士前方有咩嘢唔安全嘅地方呢，即係比較唔安全喇？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）上層，巴士上層前方係空間好少，呢個就係嗰個嘅撞擊吸收力區。巴士上層前座有安全帶，其實係對於某啲情況係有用㗎，譬如當巴士突然奪車，或者撞向防撞欄或者係同一啲比較細嘅汽車撞埋，但係雙層巴士如果喺追撞貨車、貨櫃車或者撞橋墩，上層前方嘅乘客就算有戴安全帶都會受重傷。呢方面我或者有請高醫生作進一步嘅解釋。

高兆祺先生：主席，如果--即係就算有冇戴安全帶都好喇，如果嗰個車廂係被壓扁，譬如話係呢一個巴士嘅上層前方，其實就係內部如果冇足夠空間係承受呢一個車廂壓縮嘅話，就會壓到個乘客，令到乘客會內傷。咁通常我哋見到嘅就會係呢一個盤盆骨、胸腔係會有受到呢啲嘅傷害嘅，如果個撞擊力吸收區係唔受的話。所以鄺生提及到就話巴士上層前座嘅乘客有冇戴安全帶都好，佢哋其實受嘅風險係較高嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁從我哋睇到嘅相，大埔交通意外，即係 2 月 10 號嗰宗嘅交通意外喇，係巴士嘅前方係嚴重損毀㗎，係嘛？你冇睇過啲相嘅話，可以出聲。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我有睇過啲相。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能呢個係另外一個即係損毀嘅原因。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）其實對於嗰一次意外，實際係因為咩嘢原因我就唔知㗎，究竟係巴士翻側，直接翻側砸咗落去巴士站上蓋，定係話巴士站上蓋嘅建築物插咗入去巴士車身，因而令到傷亡人數較高，呢個我其實就唔係好肯定㗎，要等到有一啲嘅嘅確實證據先知。咁但係正如喺報告裏面所講，我理解到呢啲傷勢嘅--傷勢喇，咁同埋嗰個嘅機制，咁但係我哋可以就引入一啲特定嘅措施，包括安全帶，咁我哋其實要明白對於某啲嘅安全措施可能係有個特定嘅機制，喺某個特定嘅情況先至會有用㗎，咁所以我哋係需要先理解，要進一步理解係撞擊同埋呢一個傷勢嗰個關係先至知嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生同埋高醫生講到呢一點，我就係想睇番第805頁，即係話你哋2018年4月嘅陳述書，底下嗰度講到話係將佢分區，咁同埋嗰個翻側嘅測試，呢一個就係聯合國嘅規則，2006年嘅規則㗎。你就係話嗰個規則就係好多地方都採用咗喇，要求巴士嘅架構就有足夠嘅強度嚟到就係進行咗呢個翻側測試之後，佢嗰個剩餘嘅空間都仲係有去到某一個標準嘅，要確保乘客唔會係死亡㗎。你意思係咪話我哋應該引入呢一個規則，要求巴士製造商或者巴士營運商係要用某一啲物料嚟到去製造嗰架巴士，嚟到確保就係喺相撞之後仲係有足夠嘅剩餘空間，個空間唔會被擠壓呢，可唔可以解釋一下？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我唔係巴士設計嘅專家，我嘗試去研究一啲文件，有幾份文件都係關乎巴士嘅上層結構㗎，我知道就係聯合國佢2006年嘅UNECE 66嗰個規則就係講及嗰個翻側嘅測試就係用呢個單層巴士嘅，咁個概念係點呢？就係當架巴士就係翻側嘅時候，至為重要嘅就係佢嗰個結構就唔會就係嚴重變形，否則嘅話，坐喺車上嘅乘客就會被壓扁嘅，咁好容易就佢哋就會係因為喺翻側嘅時候就係個空間收窄喇，佢哋就會撞落個路面嗰度。咁係要求佢哋個空間係唔會被擠壓嘅。

但係我知道嗰個測試係應用於單層巴士嗰度㗎，其實喺2009年嘅時候，曾經有一位專家，係聯合國嘅專家都係有建議，就話應該包括埋雙層巴士嘅。我唔肯定究竟而家嗰啲規則更新咗未，我亦都唔肯定雙層巴士究竟有冇做過呢啲翻側嘅測試嘅。但係我嘅理解就係呢個翻側嘅測試係一個簡單嘅翻側測試，換句話講，就係巴士向一側就係跌落去喇，就唔係講話係會首先跌落嗰個巴士站上蓋或者係跌落一埲牆，又或者係跌落個安全防撞欄嗰度嘅。另一點就係話嗰個重點係在於嗰個測試嗰個目標就係話希望係確保剩餘空間依然係保存到㗎。

乘客，如果佢嗰架巴士係翻側嘅話，佢會受不同程度嘅傷勢嘅，做呢個測試都係有助，不過亦都唔係就係靠咁就得喇，因為係會有各種不同形式嘅受傷㗎，所以或者呢方面想問下高醫生，唔知有冇嘢補充喇。

高兆祺先生：如果雙層巴係翻側嘅話，有兩樣嘢要睇，第一就係佢個上層架構係唔係好似鄺生所講咁樣係保持冇變形喇；第二，我哋要確保車上嘅乘客會唔會就係移動得好利害，即係會唔會喺窗外拋咗出去呢，又會唔會就係衝咗去砸落去第

二啲乘客身上㗎。因為如果一個人佢係昏迷，但係仲係有呼吸，咁但如果佢身上有兩、三個第二啲嘅乘客砸住佢嘅話，其實佢可能就係因為人哋其他乘客嘅重量壓住佢，令到佢係窒息㗎。所以我哋要考慮嘅亦都要考慮埋呢一點，即係話萬一有一架巴士係翻側嘅時候。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。或者等我哋再睇番運輸署嘅文件 TD-1 98 頁，我哋就係講到係電子穩定控制系統同埋傾側穩定控制系統㗎，我諗你自己份文件就係喺 786 頁嗰度亦都有係講過㗎。對於呢一啲嘅系統，你知得多唔多？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）再一次我想講喇，喺車輛設計方面我唔係專家，不過我係有睇過呢啲電子穩定控制系統嘅資料嘅，我明白佢嗰個理念喇，咁同埋呢一個科技亦都已經相當成熟嘅。我認為--我喺報告嗰度我就認為我哋係會建議係起碼去詳細啲睇一睇呢一個控制系統㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，實質上運輸署亦都有提倡使用呢一個系統嘅，或者大家睇一睇呢個第 100 頁吖。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個文件夾呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-1，我仲係喺同一個文件夾，不過就係想請你睇第 15 段。我哋睇睇第 15 段吖，嗰度就話其中一位係巴士製造商咁有咁嘅建議，就係話佢哋新嘅現存嘅巴士都已經係有呢個電子穩定控制系統㗎。咁香港嘅專營巴士大概百分之 2.8 就係又喺呢一個製造商採購嘅，就已經有埋呢個電子穩定控制系統喇。製造商亦都再進一步講，佢哋嗰個電子穩定控制系統其中一個功能就係傾側穩定控制系統，就係用電子控制嘅懸掛系統嚟到保障呢個翻側嘅，以免翻例㗎。佢就話佢--不過就係話縱使就係有咁樣嘅裝置，係其實如果嗰架巴士駕駛不當，譬如話放肆咁樣駕駛，都依然係難免係翻側㗎，個巴士依然就會係因為佢離開路面--脫離路面同埋嗰個角度--車身角度太高都會翻側嘅，咁所以就唔能--而呢度就係話所有嘅運營商就係同意係有裝埋呢一個系統㗎，即係當佢哋買新車嘅時候。我想問下喇，英國、法國，你話進行話一啲項目研究吖嘛，你知唔知佢哋嗰方面嘅情況係點呢？有冇呢一個電子穩定控制系統？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我呢方面冇資料，我知道佢哋用得有幾廣泛，我亦都唔知道佢哋有冇喺公共巴士嗰度用。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺文件裏面亦都有講過，話自動嘅剎車系統，你文件嘅第 786 頁，786 頁你嘅文件嗰度你有提過㗎。你可唔可以進一步闡釋一下？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢一段裏面我就提過話應該係進一度研究呢一個系統㗎，自動緊急剎車系統，當然照我嘅理解係一個智能嘅系統喇，如果係偵測到係好快就要相撞喇，譬如話同行人相撞或者就係同前車相撞，咁部車就會自動啟動咗嗰個系統，就係將車停低或者慢低落嚟㗎。我建議要睇下呢一個研究，因為前後相撞係我哋認為最嚴重嘅事項，最需要關注㗎。另外，巴士翻側同埋巴士喺懸崖嗰度跌落去，當然亦都係要關注喇，不過前後相撞係較常見，亦都往往

喺高速公路嗰度發生，亦都往往引致多人傷亡，而上層嘅乘客往往亦都係受嚴重嘅創傷嘅。所以我嘅理解係話有啲巴士公司已經係引入咗呢一啲嘅系統㗎喇。或者係肯定咁去做，或者係作為一個試驗咁去做。我認為呢個係一個好好嘅一種功能係需要去進一步研究嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋又睇番運輸署嗰份文件喇，係102頁，TD-1嘅102頁，呢個就講車速顯示器。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋未繼續落去之前，我想問下工作小組--有一個工作小組就係睇下嗰個採納先進科技嘅，佢哋嗰個結論係點？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信佢哋未睇呢一個議題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問避免相撞，喺103頁底下嗰度係有冇提及呢件事？嗰度就有兩件事情嘅，一個就講保持嗰個行車線，另一樣就係關於--好似鄺生所講喇，即係頭尾相撞嗰樣嘢嘅，一個就係要保持你架車喺嗰個行車線度，另一個就係避免你同前面係太近又或者前車停車你又唔停，咁你又撞埋落去又或者係撞到行人。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，啱，103至到104頁。或者我哋睇呢個103頁喇，底下嗰度，當架巴士就係太貼前車--第24段，當架巴士係同前車太貼嘅時候，就會有一個訊號，係聲音同埋影像嘅，就會有個訊號提醒嗰個司機。有啲系統就會有埋嗰個剎車嘅支援嘅，咁若果佢唔係--喺嗰個警告嘅之後都唔作回應，嗰個剎車支援功能就會係啟動嗰個剎車系統嚟到係儘快回應喇，因此嗰個就會踩嗰個腳掣㗎喇。咁若果係就嚟要撞車喇，咁佢又冇去踏個腳掣嘅話，有啲新嘅系統就會就係大力咁樣係自動剎車嚟到去避免--嚟到係等嗰個撞擊力係減弱嘅。

我哋亦都知道嗰三家巴士製造商對呢一個睇法係有咩嘢建議嘅，第26段，佢哋三間製造商都話其實亦有啲已經係有嘅，或者係第三方嘅保持行車線嘅系統，新車、現有嘅車都可以有嘅，不過佢哋有保留嘅，因為香港嘅交通繁忙喇，咁而且經常就會係換線嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係咪講緊另一個題目？一個就講頭尾相撞，一個就係轉換行車線或者唔轉換行車線，我想問下喇，佢哋究竟嘅睇法係點呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係喺最後嗰段嗰後嗰句嘅，有一啲係--嗰個巴士營運商就唔認為係安裝咗呢個碰撞避免裝置或者係保持行車線裝置係有效咁樣樣，令到佢哋嘅服務更加安全。似乎佢哋就係個睇法係唔同嘅，對於話呢一啲係避免碰撞嘅系統係咪真係有效、有用，佢哋嘅睇法係唔同嘅。我就想問下你嘅意見喇，因為喺你自己嗰份文件嗰度，你又提出呢一個建議嘅，你就覺得有咁樣樣嘅系統就會係有助嘅，咁想問你而家嗰個回應係點喇？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）當然，引入任何一種新嘅系統首先都需要係用巴士營運商係有一個透澈嘅討論，而且亦都要有巴士司機嘅回饋先至可以做嘅。亦都有可

能就係話太多系統嘅話，就係分散咗佢嘅注意力，又或者因為係好難用，或者有其他唔想要有嘅作用而係帶嚟唔好處嘅。講到呢一個自動嘅緊急剎車系統，呢個建議就係由於我哋真係有好多前後嘅碰撞以及佢引致嘅問題，而且好多海外嘅營運商亦都已經引入咗呢套系統，又或者好認真咁樣樣去考慮係進行呢個試驗。呢度呢一段我唔係太肯定係咪話營運商認為佢係冇乜用、冇乜效，究竟係嗰個討論嘅結果係就話佢哋唔想要吖，定抑或佢哋有一個良好嘅理據，就係覺得唔好用，又或者--定抑或係佢哋起碼都想進行一下一個試驗計劃呢？由於呢度資料不足，我就好難作回應㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）我幫下你手喇，我喺城巴度有啲資訊嘅，佢哋話就係進行過一個試驗嘅計劃嘅，佢哋就發現呢一個就係太多警號就發出嘅話，就會好分心㗎。或者我哋休息之後係可以再係話畀你聽有邊個部分就可以睇一睇嘅。或者黃律師，喺城巴嘅口述證供嗰度其實係有提過㗎。佢哋係有一啲系統就係可以或者參考番，咁之後你可以係再回應喇。我哋大家都休息一下喇，你休息下，我哋又休息一下，休息二十分鐘，唔該。

上午11時16分聆訊押後

上午11時41分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺我哋小休之前，講緊關於一系列嘅事項㗎。主席問咗問題關於其中一家巴士營運公司城巴嘅問題，就係話即係呢一個係車輛呢，係保持行道嘅設施。咁請大家睇番呢一個嘅TSCP-1號49頁嘅，咁呢個係當時嗰個嘅聽證會謄本嚟㗎。應該呢就係TSCP文件49至到呢51頁。

咁鄧樂勤資深大律師代表委員會問問題，第19項。鍾先生係代表城巴有關於一啲嘅技術設備，佢就話--我請你睇番26段，呢一段呢就係我哋睇過嘅。上面紀錄話巴士營運商呢係冇考慮到防撞同埋呢係將汽車保持行車線嘅設施係考慮安裝，呢樣嘢其實係會提升巴士操作安全。咁係呢樣嘢喺26段喇，佢話「你係咪睇過呢？」佢話「係。」跟住鄧樂勤律師就話嘞「咁我嘅理解，咁講啱唔啱呢？即係有關於公司嚟睇，係冇準備考慮安裝呢啲設備㗎。」

咁鍾先生就話等我首先解釋喇，係呢一啲嘅設施喺2014年嘅時候，公司當時真係有進行測試㗎，呢個呢其實係叫做神眼。神眼係一個係協助駕駛嘅設備嚟㗎。當時呢主要適用於私家車，其實呢就係會利用視覺嘅幫助，去感應前面有啲

乜嘢，跟住系統就會進行分析，然之後呢計算係汽車同埋前面嗰個物件嘅距離，同埋後面嘅距離，然之後再計下幾耐時間就會相撞，然之後發出一個嘅警號畀駕駛者。咁我哋其實就喺其中三架巴士安裝咗神眼，進行測試咗四個月，咁亦都安排唔同嘅職工會，即係巴士車長代表，同埋係另外五十多位巴士車長係去駕駛呢啲嘅巴士，咁同埋呢就喺呢個正常嘅服務時間就進行，咁跟住就會叫佢填番問卷，畀番意見我哋。咁我哋最後發現呢，其實呢啲設施就唔係咁適用㗎，譬如話如果係車進入呢一個巴士停車處嘅時候，咁咪感應到前面有人，因為你都知道巴士站係有人等車㗎喇，咁所以跟住就會響聲嘞。

但係其實當時嘅巴士車長都未拉直架車，咁所以就會有警號。咁如果架巴士係停得好近前面架巴士嘅話呢，咁其實呢就會係--即係話呢如果交通係行得慢嘅時候，又會響警號嘞，意思即係話呢，成日都會響警號。咁有四成六嘅巴士司機同我哋講，就話咁樣成日響警號，其實就會係滋擾，所以最後佢哋就唔理呢個警號嘞，而有五成嘅巴士司機就話畀我哋聽，神眼係冇幫助到佢哋安全駕駛。咁所以睇番呢個神眼嘅功能，同埋巴士車長嘅意見，仲有就係話安裝價錢非常之貴，所以我哋就決定唔再跟進，呢個係我哋嘅經驗，咁我哋喺會議上面亦都有講到呢樣嘢。

咁想請你睇番嗰份報告，報告就喺證供裏有提到。就係呢一個城巴文件 3 號，係 601 頁。呢個首頁就係神睇嘅試用結果，601 頁。603 頁提及到進行測試嘅時間，背景第 2 段可以見到嘞，喺 2014 年嘅時候進行試用。睇番第 2 段，第 2 段，「神眼試用」咁就係分開兩期。咁第 2 段嘞，問卷就係發出咗畀 13 個員工表同埋係 54 位有駕駛呢一架試驗車嘅巴士車長去收集佢哋意見。跟住繼續睇番 609 頁。寫出咗呢一個試用結論同埋建議嘅，第 5 段。接受率方面嘞，五成嘅車長，意見就話神眼係冇幫助到提升駕駛安全，四成四嘅巴士車長意見就話，神眼警號就會係造成滋擾，咁所以呢對於呢一個成效係存疑，所以決定就唔會再進跟使用神眼。

咁喺最近嘅一份文件，由運輸署喺 5 月，今年 5 月呢就係提交畀我哋嘅文件係 TD 運輸署嘅 5 號文件 1691 頁，咁呢一個第 12、13 段可以見到，13 段呢仍然有提及。由 12 段嘅尾數上第 5 行就話，呢一個防撞同埋呢保持行車線嘅設施，咁其實就係詼呢個工作小組佢有睇過，工作小組嘅意見就係話，喺呢啲車上嘅設施可行性同埋適用性，咁其實就要進一步再研究。

13 段中間就話係冇一個嘅係最後嘅決定，即係關於使用新技術方面，我哋預計係呢一啲提升安全措施同埋設備，安裝喺車上面嘅結果應該喺 2018 年 6、7 月就會詼發布，咁所以為咗完整起見，就咁講番畀你聽，係冇一個最後嘅決㗎，只有城巴係有進行過測試，咁係測試呢就係根據 54 位有駕駛呢一架巴士嘅意見。咁睇番喇，你面前嘅資料，咁你係對於呢即係有關於呢一個嘅自動煞車系統喇，同埋呢一個緊急嘅系統，你嘅意見係咩嘢？

主席：（經傳譯員）鄺生，你嘅意見係唔係話係要試用，而唔係直接話喇，你建議使用。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋建議進一步研究所有嘢都要睇番嗰個證據同埋實用性。

主席：（經傳譯員）我咁樣講啱唔啱呢，我有冇記錯，阿黃律師。神眼或者有關嘅呢一個詼遙距嘅溝通系統，係咪淨係香港呢？倫敦有冇用呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信喺英格蘭喇，係喺一個研究裏面有試過，所以就有建議喺香港使用。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁最近喺倫敦係咪有用過，即係呢個 2014 測試之後。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，係一個最近嘅報告有，我就會搵番有關嘅參考號碼畀你。或者我想再...

主席：（經傳譯員）香港唔適用其中一個原因，就係巴士司機，其實就係同前車嘅巴士距離呢係非常之近嘅，尤其就係即係行緊車嘅時候，所以就會成日響聲囉。咁其實可以再調查嗰個同前車嘅距離，如果你同前車行得咁近嘅話，咁行人都過唔到嘞，咁尤其就喺呢一個停緊車嘅時候，咁當然就成日會響喇。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋冇錯，係需要理解多一啲嗰個準備，基準，呢啲設施呢個技術會不停改進，我明白城巴有做咗一個好好嘅測試，之後亦都有做調查，咁呢方面我冇任何嘅意見。我哋建議呢啲嘅系統係需要進一步研究，係基於有需要，因為一啲嘅前後撞車，係好嚴重㗎，咁同埋呢係對於行人有風險，咁如果呢啲系統係夠成嘅熟話呢，係可以解決到我哋嘅問題，但係當然所有事都係取決於試用，同理要證明到真係有效。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我哋未講另外一樣嘢之前呢，我想問你幾個問題，就係一啲運輸署嘅建議，其中一個呢就係車速顯示器。就係呢一個連輸署文件 1 號 102 頁，就係 8 號文件嚟嘅，即係關於新技術嘅 8 號文件。21 段最後一行喇，就提及到話現有行車車速顯示器喇就係喺呢一個嘅小巴上面有加，咁其實就喺第 6 圖，圖 6 號嗰度顯示到。

跟住睇番第 22 段嘞，上面就講咗專營巴士經營者嘅意見，喺廿二段最後嗰部分。咁就話有關於呢一個嘅加裝顯示器喇，咁其實佢哋就話會因裝呢個顯示器呢，會引起乘客同埋司機嗰個嘅衝突同埋爭拗嘅，咁所以呢令到巴士司機呢會有更大嘅壓力，安裝呢一啲嘅設備，其實對於提升巴士安全未必有用㗎。咁我哋知道小巴其實已經安裝咗呢個車速顯示器，所以對於專營巴經營商呢，佢哋對於呢方面嘅意見，即係話關於使用呢個設施提供巴士安全有咩嘢意見呀你？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我理解佢哋嘅立場，但係就我哋嚟講，就係要睇下安裝呢啲儀器係咪真係提升到安全。我想指出喺報告裏面曾經有提過呢個速度儀嘅，速度計，咁其實就係用呢一個數字顯示畀司機睇，而唔係話呢一個詼模擬嘅形式去顯示畀司機睇，因為我哋要確保司機知道自己揸緊幾快。有啲車長，可能

唔自覺就揸快咗，但係而家我哋覺得如果係而家呢個模擬制式呢，司機係好難睇得到自己揸緊行得幾快，因為唔係數碼化，所以呢方面我哋認為呢如果可以將速度計喺一個適當個位罝用數碼顯示形式出嚟，就話比較好。咁有關於將車速顯示畀乘客睇呢，我哋當知道有咁樣嘅建議之後，其實我有諗過，乘客投訴要話畀司機聽，話佢太快呢，其實我覺得咁樣做就唔係太有效，車速顯示器其中一個用法，其實就係幫助稽查員好快知道呢個巴士司機係咪嚴重超速，或者超過咗既定嘅車速限制，呢個係有好處嘅，不過正如我頭先所講，如果依賴乘客去投訴，就我經驗嚟講，對於係咪真係有效喇，我就有懷疑，因為要睇番安裝其實係有成本，所以我哋需要進一步研究，可能要再試行一下先知，當你話嘞，乘客投訴就唔係咁有用嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你嘅意思係咪指呢，即係乘客當場向司機投訴呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，你意思指我嘅經驗呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，頭先你話你覺得呢，用乘客投訴唔係咁有用，你當時諗嘅係咪話，乘客即時同當場向司機投訴佢揸得太快？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我唔會而家作出結論，要決定係唔容易，因為我哋要睇番司機嘅行為，同埋實際操作係點，因為好多嘅乘客呢，我假設佢哋都唔理，只要巴士唔係揸到瘋狂地快，佢哋都未必會留意到譬如一啲好繁忙嘅市區道理，可能行緊45、50公里已經好危險，但係乘客可能只係有興趣要準時到達，對於一啲車速細微嘅變化呢，佢哋唔係咁有興趣知嘅，咁當然喇如果司機係揸得嚴重地快，就係問題嘞。如果係喺咁嘅情況，乘客同司機講聲，等佢唔好再揸得咁快，係有用嘅，不過如果係咁嘅情況底下，其實司機本身都知道自己揸得係太快，即係快過佢哋公司或者法例規定嘅限速，如果乘客喺揸緊嘅時候，乘客喺司機揸緊車嘅時候呢，咁樣同佢講可能就會引致有衝突，咁樣會令件事複雜化，所以我想講嘅就係話，如果我哋集中番即係速度顯示器喺呢一方面嘅使用，我就覺得對於提升巴士安全就唔係咁肯定嘞，咁但係不過要詳細再研究。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署有一個投訴嘅熱線號碼，係咪呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇研究過嗰個機制，即係點樣樣係可以進行投訴？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，照我所知，其實有多個途。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，有個表格呀，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，有個表格喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個表格有冇一個格仔，就係話係巴士超速行駛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，其實我自己睇嗰份表，就搵唔到有咁嘅格仔嘅，或者你哋可以考慮下咁嘅情景，有一個乘客就係擔心就係司機嘅車速，亦都係擔心佢嗰個行為。因為車速本身有陣時都未必一定係危險㗎，係咪吖？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，主席先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）單單車速本身並不一定係就係危險嘅，係咪吖？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生，係唔單單係車速，而係嗰個衝突嘅程度，同埋睇下佢嗰個情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）由於已經係有一個投訴嘅機制，如果車上嘅乘客佢懷疑架車就係行到65，就唔係喺嗰個50公里嗰個區嗰度行50，如果佢有懷疑嘅話，咁嗰個乘客譬如話佢已經用緊個iPhone喇，就係佢可以即時影張相，然後將佢用電郵發送畀運輸署，咁呢或者係投訴嘅熱，咁你就有張係影到嗰個車速，咁咪得囉。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我諗都好主意嘹㗎，咁係亦都要睇下究竟將一個將係車速顯示器放置喺邊一個位置。你要考慮到你影相，你要影埋呢前面條路，你先至可以證明到架巴士個位置喺邊，嗰個顯示器或者要有埋巴士嘅路線號碼，巴士個車牌號，同埋佢嗰個位置。如果睇唔到嘅話，就可能會司機同顧客之間就有正面衝突，司機又要睇唔到嗰個乘客喺度影緊相先得，如果唔係有衝突。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，我想請你睇埋呢係運輸署所探討過另一個裝置。咁呢就係睇TD-1，105頁，第27段，就關乎呢個司機監察裝置。呢個裝置呢就話呢係愛嘹監察司機嘅表現，咁如果見到佢注意不足嘅話，又或者佢昏昏欲睡呢，就會係警示嗰個司機，咁譬如話見到佢有一啲可能係詼不安全嘅行為，譬如話佢望側邊，瞌眼瞓，昏昏欲睡，姿勢唔好呀，咁你就會畀一啲係聲音，同埋影像警告佢。

你跟住睇後嗰版嘞，3間嘅巴士製造商就話，佢哋呢啲係第三方嘅系統，而且係獨立於巴士系統，喺技術上呢就可行嘅，就可以監察車長嗰個情況，咁但係如果係虛報嘅話，誤報嘅話呢，就會有不必要咁干擾到個司機。咁另外呢係兩間營運商，就話佢哋呢喺佢哋4部巴士嗰度呢，做過3個月嘅係試驗，咁呢就應該會喺2018年5月初嘅時候開始去做，運輸署呢就會同營商呢就係一齊合作，就睇睇呢個系統呢係有冇效嘅，即係話喺試驗完咗之後，睇下有冇效嘅。鄺生，你有冇聽過呢啲係司機監察系統呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我係知悉有呢啲系統嘅，不過呢我冇研究嗰個詳情。譬如話司機疲勞，或者係注意力不足，呢啲都係可能引致交通意外嘅成因，不過再講一次，究竟呢啲系統係咪有助，我哋要睇番剛才所提及嘅問題，譬話姿勢不

好，注意力不足等等，係咪真係引致我哋香港巴士碰撞以外嘅主要成因，我而家持開放態度，我仲係注意呢聽下大家詳細嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）講到疲勞，如果係一個風險嘅因素，我想問嘞，你認為唔認為係司機疲勞係香港巴士以外嘅主要成因呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）疲勞，就會視乎呢就係駕駛時數，休息時數，亦都係視乎個別人士佢可能有種種原因，引致有咁嘅問題，而令到佢好疲倦。關乎呢個課題呢，我哋喺我個報告嗰度篇幅並唔係好長，我冇寫好多，因為我冇研究呢一個課題，雖然我做嘢嘅工作嘅其他環節，譬如話係揸呢個長程車，我哋都當然係要關注呢一個司機疲勞嘅問題。喺香港呢我哋都要睇，因為如果你引入任何嘅系統，都應該係要睇番我哋喺現實生活裏面，究竟有邊一類嘅係撞車嘅意外，同埋我哋面對嘅係邊一類嘅風險，我諗目前我講嘅就係咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道有冇人係打算呢就去研究一下，係呢個司機疲勞呢個風險因素呢？有冇人做過研究，有冇人做過呢個問卷調查呢？知唔知呢，有冇呢啲嘅係實證呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）你講喺香港呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我唔知有咁樣嘅工作做緊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）小休之前，鄺先生，我哋呢就喺度講緊就係巴士上層車頭部分嗰個結構，同埋呢對於坐喺上層前排嘅乘客佢嘅潛在風險，我呢度呢係想係將大埔巴士意外嘅一張照片畀你睇，請大家將佢打番出嚟。呢張相你可以見到當時嘅事件，你見到呢係上層車頭全部係毀壞，睇番呢張相，幫唔幫到你去講及話車頭應該更加穩固？你呢就係喺 4 月份交嗰份諗陳述書，有一個部分係咁講。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）睇番呢張相，我諗呢一個碰撞喇，其實呢當然一架車撞車嘅時候，可能有不同嘅情況，可能有一部車就係撞一個高嘅物件，譬如話前面嘅貨櫃車撞埋去橋躉，又或者係同燈柱相撞，係同突出嚟嘅簷篷相撞，係即係建築物突出嚟簷篷撞埋去喇，但係呢度呢一個個案呢，我諗係一個綜合嘅因素造成嘅撞車，可能架巴士係撞咗落嗰個巴士站上蓋，嗰個上蓋就個高度就係高度呢係撞爛咗佢嗰個車頭上層嘅結構，又或者佢撞咗埋去條燈柱，但同時亦都係㗎巴士係有翻側。正如我所講，架巴士可能係直接呢翻側跌落去個巴士站上蓋度，喺呢個過程，巴士站上蓋本身亦都呢係破壞咗，撞爛咗巴士個車側嘅車身，車頭，或者甚至乎係直接呢係撞擊呢係巴士車箱嘅內籠，直接呢係撞到，係傷害到啲乘客，不過我只能夠作一個揣測。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋唔需要喺度揣測，其他人可以喺佢哋進行調查之後話畀我哋聽，佢嗰個結果係點樣樣。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，主席先生。我諗我哋要明白嗰個碰撞嘅基理，亦都要明白嗰個受傷基理，咁樣先至可以讓我哋以實證為本，咁樣樣去制定一啲策略同埋措施，好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，委員會--你畀咗陳述書之後呢，我哋再向你問過一啲問題，問及呢你喺網上所披露發表嘅一啲文章。820-1 嗰頁，第 8 段，或者我哋將佢掃落去下面，第 8 段，嗰度呢就咁講，你喺你個網頁嗰度係有一個部分就係講及，交通車速數據，你話呢你同意呢就係畀我哋呢係登上呢個網站嗰度，不過你話由於嗰個資源嘅問題，而你呢一個工作呢就唔係有系統嘅，只不過係間中做嘅，同埋你哋自己係有相關嘅人士就去做，你話「今晚」，即係 7 月 11 日號，你就會見面呢就會進行新嘅調查，你話呢就會去做尖沙咀、深水埗、係全錦公路、禮頓道同埋大坑道。咁你呢就係話為咗支援或者支持聯合國全球交通安全周第 4 次咁嘅工作，咁而就係話拯救生命慢車，呢個 2017 年 5 月嘅，你話呢你哋就同一個區議員同埋一個係專業製作人呢，就係做咗一段短片嚟到係提升大家嘅意識。咁嗰度就係大坑道，嗰度就係見到好多車呢，甚至乎夜晚係個車速係超過咗 80 公里。我想問，當然你呢一個係一個研究，係你自己自發咁樣去做，你呢就去同其他有興趣嘅人士一齊去做，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）講到呢個大坑道呢一個工作，係。我哋係樂意呢同任何同呢個課題有興趣嘅人士合作，協助嘅，我哋呢就係唔係盈利嘅，唔賺錢嘅，喺政治上我哋亦都係中立，我哋只係需要有人幫我哋手一齊去做，因為呢我哋好希望將嗰個信息呢係傳揚出去，希望呢係社會裏面都提高呢一個意識嘅。我哋睇呢啲車速呢，其實係人手嘅工作，係好花資源嘅，所以呢我哋唔能夠好有系統咁樣去做，我哋想做得更多，不過做唔到咁多。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度睇到一張相，我想問係咪鐳射槍，係咪你所用嘅鐳射槍呢？嚟到係去睇睇嗰啲車，去偵查嗰啲車嘅係車速呢，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，“Tru Speed”就係嗰個牌子 T-R-U Speed 就係嗰個牌子名，係鐳射槍，咁呢個係車速嘅鐳槍，係我自己擁有。

主席：（經傳譯員）〉製造商係邊間？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我諗係 Laser Technology。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問，執法機構係咪都係用呢一啲工具呢，本港嘅，外海嘅係咪都用？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我理解都係㗎，咁亦都不過視乎嗰個型號。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港係咪都用？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你用嗰個型號係邊一種型號呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係型號叫 Tur Speed，但係個型號個號碼係咩嘢呢，我就記唔得準確，我嘅記憶呢就係呢一個型號呢，警方都有用，有一啲新啲嘅型號警方都有用。

主席：（經傳譯員）你呢個型號有幾新呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我買嘅時候，應該係 2011 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個調查或者喺其他嘅調查嗰度，想問下，你有冇係特登去睇下監察一下專營巴士佢哋嘅車速呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我哋冇專門為專營巴士係進行車速嘅調查，雖然呢個係好應該去做，因為我哋關注呢個交通安全，我哋都應該係專門去睇一啲專營巴士嘅車速。我都耐唔中係會隨時都有去研究過，去睇過佢哋嘅車速。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇揀一啲特別嘅地點去做呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，有個地點我想講嘅呢，就係幾年之前我去德輔道中，因為我想去睇巴士嘅車速，我想知道呢由東向西行嘅巴士車速，我想知道佢哋係行乜嘢車速，呢一段嘅德輔道中呢，就係好多行人呢係過馬路，就唔喺行人過路線嗰度，就直接喺嗰度過馬路嗰一個路段，咁而我做呢一個工作呢，我做呢個調查呢，就係想去睇下，究竟一個巴士司機若果見到巴士站有架巴士停咗喺度，而佢要越過呢部巴士嘅時候，個司機會行咩嘢車速，其實嗰個停咗喺度嘅巴士，就會係遮擋咗想過馬路嘅行人，如果有架巴士係高速過去嘅話，或者超速咁行過嘅話呢，根本就唔能夠及時係停到車。

我有一啲加拿大嘅指引，嗰度佢哋有咁嘅建議，或者佢有個咁嘅規則，就係咁講，如果佢哋嘅公共巴士係要超越一部停咗喺度嘅巴士，又或者停咗喺度嘅車輛嘅話，佢哋係唔能夠呢行駛呢係快過 30 公里，我只係隨意咁去睇過一下嗰個情況，但當時見到嗰個最高嘅車速呢，就係 49，每小姐 49 公里。當然我必須承認，我冇係調查咗好多部巴士，譬如話我當時只係睇咗五、六部巴士。

但係主席先生，最近我都係做過一啲車速嘅偵查，因為有一份報章嘅記者，係邀請我去接受佢嘅訪問，喺德輔道中嗰度拍條片，我再用呢一個係鐳射槍呢，就係隨意咁樣去睇一睇德輔道中所路過嘅巴士，佢嗰個車速㗎，見到呢好多巴士呢行到 30、35，每小時 30、35 公里，呢啲呢就係冇任何嘢阻礙佢哋，係自由行車嘅情況，有一架車呢就見到呢紀錄到呢就係每小時 42 公里。我點解佢咁做呢，即係嗰個係最嗰個車速，我咁做唔係想話係話啲車係超速行駛，其實另一個主要目的，就係想講，究竟巴士司機應該行幾多先至啱，對我嚟講 30 至到 35 呢，都係一個係理智嘅一個決定嚟，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺生，多謝你同我哋提供咁多意見，關於呢個鐳射槍呢個速度計呢，你有冇不時咁樣係進行維護，即係係咪有人做好嗰個維修維護？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係維修同嗰個保養都好，不時都仲會做一啲校

正。呢個係鐳射槍嚟嘅，即係唔係一個雷達嘅設備嚟嘅，正常就唔要成日校正嘅，咁但係為咗要保持個準確度呢，我會做兩個測試，如果兩個測試都通過，即係正常，咁就應該唔會有咩嘢特大嘅問題。我就會不時咁樣做嗰個測試。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個誤差嘅幅度係幾呢？根據個製造商所顯示，嗰個誤差率係幾多呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我冇嗰個實際嗰個數字嘅，就我知道鐳射係好準。咁即係話個誤差呢係會係响某一個幅度。係會對我哋要達到目的嚟講呢，係個誤差係絕對係响我哋要求個範圍裏面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講一個數呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我假設大概係百分之一至二，最多最多都係百分之三。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗個地點，你搵到啲某一啲地點，文件 820-1、820-2 呢個係嗰個雜項 2 嘅文件夾所講嘅之外呢，你有冇同其他合作嘅各方嘅人士考慮探討有冇其他嘅位置你哋可以去做測試呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）或者我想畀一個例子，有個社工就喺荃灣，社工就轉介一個市民嘅意見，佢就比較關心佢屋邨附近一個斑馬線嘅安全情況，佢覺得嗰度個車速太高，咁我就同意做一個測速度，呢個荃錦公路，响嗰個斑馬線過嗰附近嘅地點做嗰個速度嘅測試調查，我就訓練咗嗰個邨民，用正確方法使用呢個鐳射槍速度計，咁佢哋就自己去調查嗰個車速，咁最後呢佢哋就測試咗 800 架車嘅速度，通常喺某一個位置呢，如果你係要有一個係速度分布圖呢，我哋起碼要有 100 架車嘅速度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇報告，有冇呢方面嘅報告呢？即係呢個全荃錦公路嘅速度數據同埋報告响唔响度呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）個報告呢我諗我已經交咗出嚟畀你哋，我想聲明。因為將簡體轉做繁體字有啲問題，咁所以我就只係提供咗簡體字嘅報告。呢個亦都係我交咗出嚟畀佢哋嘅報告嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去番呢個雜項，或者你個報告，講緊第 3 部分，就係嗰個道理設計，呢個都係 786 頁，雜項 2 文件夾，關於道路設計。你有幾個建議，諗總共 6 個建係關於係道路設計，交通管理，呢個對於巴士安全你覺得係好重要，事關重要。第一，就有個足夠係安全嘅保護欄，同埋減少嗰個係斜路尾嘅一啲係斜台嘅石壘，咁就減少市區裏面嘅速度，同埋安全嘅過程設施，巴士站附近，同埋對於等候嘅乘客提供更好嘅保障。

你响 827 頁亦都有一個係--807 頁都有一個諗更進一步嘅闡述，808 頁都係，你就提過係重要嘅，即係防止出事嘅車輛係會同路邊嘅一啲製成危險嘅物件

係相撞，或者係响嗰個斜坡度跌落去，你就提過一啲矮牆。我相信喺睇番個屯門個報告 SEC-2 呢一個文件夾，第 1 頁，咁跟住去到 16 段，係 10 至 11 頁，先睇第 16 段。或者係第 15 開始，呢啲矮牆一啲安全保障措施，防止發生意外嘅時候，會有啲係嚴重嘅程度，佢哋一個係即係個被動式嘅防護設施嚟嘅，就唔會係引致交通意外嗰個因素嚟嘅。

咁呀研究過國際同埋本地嘅標準呢，個委員會覺得而家路政署嘅標準呢，都係同國際嘅做法一致，不過我哋响睇落幾行，呢度响啲關鍵嘅位置呢，有改善嘅空間。因為呢詨嗰度如果係撞咗入去嗰個底牆裏面呢，可能會引致啲致命嘅後果，咁佢就要求有個係採取一個全面嘅管理嘅策略嘅。

咁好嘞跟住 17 段嘞，如果一個堅固嘅設計呢，就可以停止--可以令到重型車輛係根據設計，根據我哋想要嘅方法呢去停低，但係對於個小型車輛呢，可能會製造嚴重嘅係損害嘅，咁所以呢個委會建議呢，為咗改善呢個設計呢，佢建議路政署係研究嗰個所謂佢哋係喺邊笪地方停止嗰個撞離嘅車輛，特別係個响高端嘅地方呢，係睇下個高度係點樣設計，考慮到係好多係雙層巴士。

第 109，第 9.38 段，呢度有啲數字嘅，就係撞擊，如果係雙層巴士，有一個係模擬嘅係意外呢，如果係意外嗰個速度呢 60 公里嘅，咁嗰個撞擊嘅角度係 10 度嘅，我相信呢個報告你有提過呢個嘅，你話 808 你個雜項 2 個文件夾提過，喺呢一段係第 3 段。你就話有啲高架道路呢係冇一啲 L-3，即係第 3 層嘅安全屏障嘅，呢度有話嗰度 60 公里 10 度嘅嚟到撞嘅一個模擬，我哋知道呢啲嘢就係個重要性呢，就係話我要有一啲係特定路線嘅運作嘅規則，咁所以有巴士嘅速度可能需要限制响 60 公里嘅，同埋要响左線，咁就會令到嗰啲揸得唔好嘅巴士呢就唔會係超過呢個矮牆所能夠達到嘅效果。你可唔可以講講呢個設計方面係應該要點樣考慮？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我就要先聲明，我本人正如我响今次個聽證會講清楚，我係涉及一個研究項目，呢個政府個研究項目嘅，咁呀呢個同我一路都係詨所講嘅，我諗都同十年前開始，我一路都係咁講嘅，我就唔會講任何關於我而家從事嗰個研究項目嘅，不過我係响呢個研究計劃之外呢，我係有一方面嘅知識嘅。咁回答番你個問題，呢度所講嘅意念呢，就係要制定一啲係駕駛巴士嘅規則，响咁做嘅時候呢，我哋要明白，我哋嘅道路設計嘅一個所謂嘅用容嘅能力，譬如話嗰啲係安全圍欄，佢哋有啲咩嘢作用，作用去到邊個程度。如果巴士係嘅速度係每小時 70 公里，咁同一個撞擊嘅角度，根據個報告，即係 20 度。

報告就話曾經做過測試，不過只係用一個電腦模擬嘅，即係佢曾經做過模擬，就係詨速度係 60 公里，角度係 10 度嘅，咁就變咗嗰個巴士可能會撞穿咗個圍欄，但係呢啲咁樣嘅測試呢，好多時候呢根據某一個速度，某一個撞擊嘅角度，同埋某一個車輛嘅重量嚟到係做根據，亦都視乎有幾多乘客裏面應該個重量就。正如我所引述，咁樣係唔確定嘅。咁可能嗰個巴士可能會撞爛嗰個矮牆。咁應該有多啲資訊關於唔同嘅矮牆，唔同嘅圍欄响唔同嘅道路嘅情況，咁呢個就可

以提供一個好好嘅指引，等政府同埋巴士公司制定一啲特定路線嘅駕駛嘅規距，呢個係為巴士司機提供嘅一啲規則嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度提及 808，你提過有 8 條路，係冇安全嘅圍欄嘅，淺水灣道、大潭道、山頂道、司徒拔道、薄扶林道、大埔道、清水灣道同埋羌山路。當然喇我唔係講會提及你嗰個研顧問個報告嘅。即係話你响嗰個顧問研究發出個指示之後，之前有冇同運輸署提過呢啲路呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）响呢個報告提個情況，其實都講咗好多，好幾年㗎嘞，咁同埋呢個報告編撰呢，係早過你頭先所講嗰個係顧問研究嘅時間嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同邊個提你呢方面嘅關注呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，通常呢我哋提出關注呢，我哋會係向有關嘅政府部門提出，譬如話路政署，運輸署，我就唔記得咗有冇同嗰個局方提出。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇攞到咩嘢回應呀？我哋睇到一條路，即係好似一個石牆，又斜嘅路，咁政府有咩嘢回應呀，點解嗰度冇一個圍欄嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我唔係好記得佢哋實際上具體點樣回應，我假設佢哋明白係咩嘢事，我就記得佢哋都對呢件事有興趣知，做過一啲係詼研究嘅，不過呢個問題係廣泛嘅問題，我就要係不斷重複同樣個，即係向嗰啲部門重複我同樣嘅知悉，呢個問題係一個持續嘅問題，我所關注嘅地方呢，就係冇有改進到？我其實唔知道政府內部現在做咩嘢呢，咁我淨係睇住基於我所見到嘅，就係現場睇到，我提出我意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個都係我想做嘅，咁多年都係一樣。你係咪都係話咁多年都係見番同樣嘅情況？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，不過有啲特別嘅地點呢，可能有啲改進嘅，呢個相片呢，我就覺得比較風險比高嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想或者係請你睇一睇大埔道呢個某一個路段嘅，作為例子嘅，我哋提過大埔嘅意外係 2 月發生嘅，咁運輸署呢就即係減嗰個速度，就限制速度，同埋將嗰個路嘅標誌改變咗，道路嗰個地下嘅標示都改咗，兩個月內就做咗嘞。咁我想你睇一睇，呢份係大埔區議會文件，係 354 頁，TD-1，354 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢日期呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2018 年 4 月 9 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係運輸署提供畀大埔區議會嘅文件呀，係為區議會會議提供嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可以睇到，首先呢就話檢討過嗰個速度限制，中間佢就話有

關嘅道理呢，嗰個標誌同埋標記呢，就係要提醒--就擺咗响度就提醒司機，即係現在減速，前面有向右嘅彎，前面有個急彎向右等等，同埋要叫佢慢，咁呢個諗 360-2，第 4(c)段。呢度有講呢個路段而家嘅速度限制呢，就每小時 70 公里，咁呀話有啲係新嘅發展項目，佢哋就建議將個速度呢就減到每小時 50 公里。

跟住其他呢有其他嘅改善措施。下一頁，呢度建議有啲改善嘅措施嘅，我哋睇番一啲係相片，就睇一睇佢哋點樣實施有關嘅改善，第 13 張相，相片 13，你見到前面幾多公里，咁呢度有個前面幾多公里，呢度有個就速度變咗做 50 公里嘞，地下有個標記。第 16 張相叫開始減速嘅標示嘞。第 17 有第 2 個開始減速嘅道路標誌，咁呢個有 9 個嗰啲係箭嘴標示。18 亦都有顯示嗰個方向，個箭嘴個展示方向，即係我意思呢，就係運輸署如果想做呢，係可以做到嘞，响呢個個案呢，佢兩個月內就做完嘞，咁所以你覺得呢啲咁嘅改善，同埋你都研究過大埔道，你覺得呢啲咁嘅措施做得夠唔夠呢？足唔足夠呢？有冇研究過呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，你而家做緊關於呢個路段嘅一啲嘢，啱唔啱？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個顧問嘅研究呢，即係嗰個項目，我參加嘅呢個項目，係涵蓋香港一啲道路嘅，我就唔係涉及响呢一條路段嘅改善措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你回答問題應該冇問題，係嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你再重新組織下你個問題呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋就聽到一啲投訴喇，未必真係投訴，係大埔區議會提出嘅關注，咁係星期六嘅時候講㗎，佢哋嘅意見就話係可以做一啲改善，係就於呢一個路段嘅尾部，咁可以睇番個地圖。呢條路啡色，就係車速由 70 公里減到 50 公里嗰一段路嚟㗎，其中佢哋提出嘅一個議題就係話，當改車速限制由 70 減到 50 公里嘅時候，即係大約係呢一個嘅號碼 15 至到 17 嗰一段，其實就係上緊斜㗎--唔好意思，係 13、14，其實行緊 70 公里，如果時速限制喺 15 呢個位置改變，由 70 減到 50 公里的話，其實係好難㗎。

其中一啲嘅意見就話因為上緊斜，咁好多時你就要係行高啲嘅波，先至可以做到㗎。咁但係你又要減速嘅話，你好難就係轉波。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者睇番新嘅車速限制標誌喺邊度見到，畀啲相我哋睇下。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）15 號相。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者向番之後，係之前嗰段路段，上緊斜，向呢一個山頂，跟住去到山頂再向下望，跟住就係有個彎位，有啲箭咀嘅標誌㗎。嗰個投訴係咩嘢呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）投訴就係話，如果保持車速 70 公里的話，然之後將車速改到

50公里，架車其實行緊嘅車速喇係會高過50公里㗎。

所以佢哋其中一個建議就係話，如果我冇理解錯的話，就係將佢拉落啲，未上斜之前，可以係未上到頂最高嗰段嗰個點，就要要求你將個車速減低，呢個係大埔區議會嘅建議。

對於呢方面，你有冇任何意見呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，大致上嚟講，要我畀一啲確實嘅建議係好難㗎，但係有一個好重要關於公路設計嘅概念就係，道路設計要唔使解釋人哋都明，咁所以就可以將標誌同埋標記減到最低。

如果用太多嘅警示，可能係會將呢一個嘅道路標記系統嗰個作用減低，咁但係我好難即係確實咁講畀你聽。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁或者再睇一睇喇，有兩個嘅警示路牌先至上到山頂㗎。

呢度前面 50 公里，呢個又係嘞，前面 50 公里，跟住去到山頂，跟住就落斜。咁喺呢一個咁嘅情況之下，剎車有咩問題呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，由 70 去到 50 公里，唔係好大嘅問題嘅，喺剎車方面，但係我哋要注意嘅就係司機係咪真係會跟從呢一個嘅限制喇，如果佢哋見到有危險，佢哋係好願意慢車。

咁喺呢一類型嘅道路，我個人意見係話，一個較好嘅做法就係將佢減低到車速 60 公里，但係我哋亦都諗過，唔想將道路標示系統變得太複雜，咁所以較好嘅做法，即係60公里所--因為呢個原因冇採納。

但係咁樣講就可能係扯開咗少少嘞，但係我想強調，我哋係要連到司機願意以安全車速行駛，當然車速限制係法例規定喇，因為有一個法定嘅要求。咁但係我哋需要監察司機嘅車速，先至可以知道區議會所講係咪有根據㗎，咁我哋要做嘅就係做一啲汽車車速嘅調查，睇下佢哋係咪真係跟番標記所示嘅車速限制行駛，唔可以施加一啲佢哋容易跟循嘅要求㗎嘛。

主席：（經傳譯員）頭先睇到嘅相㗎嘞，咁如果要司機知道明白係改車速限制嘞，咁喺過咗山頂之後，咁就係先至改善嘅話，佢就會明白嘞，因為有一個彎，咁同埋係當時係落緊斜，咁同埋係見到有啲箭咀嘅標示嘅，咁呢個就唔係即係其實話令到司機明白點解要改車速限制，令佢哋明白嗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，你嘅觀察係正確㗎。咁但係其實任何嘅道路標誌同埋時速，其實對個司機嚟講，係要同佢哋所見到嗰個危險相乎先得㗎。

主席： Ms Wong.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）大埔區議會另外一個意見就係加一啲嘅限速墜，但係如果咁樣做嘅話，如果你揸得太快，你就會--即係架車就會拋，所以你好自然就會慢番

車嘞。對於呢方面，你有咩嘢嘅意見呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）限速壆其實有好多唔同嘅種類嘅，有啲就即係嗰個--有啲就溫和啲，有啲就會嗰個效果就會大啲。咁喺公路上面，如果要加限速壆嘅話，就一定要好強嘅理據，因為如果行車車速好快嘅話，而司機又唔知道有限速壆，可能就會失控，或者突然間要剎車。

通常限速壆係要聯同一啲限速嘅其他措施一同使用呀。正如我之前所講，司機係要見到有理由要慢車，將架車速減慢先至得。

根據我嘅經驗，如果使用限--喺公路上用限速壆的話，用減速壆的話，我哋就要特別去設計一個區域，係要將個車速減慢，先至可以有呢一個嘅減速壆，等司機知道慢番車，慢到唔會超過 50 公里，最好就係 40 公里，先至過呢一個減速壆㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外我想同你講嘅就係，ISO 39001 就係呢個道路交通管理系統呀。

另外就係呢一個，睇番就係 786 頁頂部，第三段呀，你就話：

「ISO 39001 道路交通安全管理系統，將佢變成專營巴士經營者嘅一個要求係最好嘅做法。」

呢個國際標準組織 ISO 39001，你可唔可以同我哋講下，係咪喺世界各地都有廣泛使用呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）首先等我解釋，ISO 39001 係 2012 年引入㗎，目前大概有五百個機構係採納咗呢個標準，唔係每一個國家都有，有啲嘅國家就比較熱心喇，譬如英國、瑞典、日本等等，呢個係目前嘅情況。

喺香港嚟計，以我所理解，係冇一個呢方面嘅認證。我哋建議進一步研究呢一個國際標準組織嘅標準，因為目前香港冇人用。但係對於呢個標準，其實係由一啲頂尖嘅專家研究出嚟㗎，係世界銀行、世界衞生組織都支持，覺得係一個安全系統嘅做法。

我想講，呢個標準唔係一個技術標準嚟嘅，係一個高階嘅框架，鼓勵高層盡力做到道路安全冇傷亡，即係就於佢哋嘅能力可以做到，呢個其實係一個願景嚟㗎。

呢個系統冇講出一套嘅技術，系統，監察系統，或者點樣做得到，呢個標準其實本身係不足，需要有其他嘅技術系統輔助。

當然，呢個系統對於香港嚟講係新嘅，比起其他嘅世界各地嘅國際標準組織嘅標準，認證機構為數不多。睇番標準同埋嗰個標準嘅模式，我呢度有個標準喺度嘅，我想講就係呢一個標準嘅重要性就係，比較前尖同埋有遠--係一個遠景嚟㗎，鼓勵機構企業喇，係主動參與減低風險同埋減低交通意外，做到係冇嚴重受

傷，亦都冇人死亡。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講下嘞，你話有大概五百個企業係採納咗。

鄺子憲先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我想講係咪一啲公司呀，即係唔同國家嘅公司，而唔係一啲嘅監管機構要求企業咁做？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我想引用，引番呢一個標準，呢個 ISO 嘅標準。以我所理解，係佢哋嘅目標，就係任何嘅公司或者企業，呢啲公司、企業就係同道路交通有關㗎，無論係一啲嘅公共交通經營者、物流公司，或者任何有車隊嘅公司，譬如話的士公司、小巴公司。

我根據呢啲文件嘅理解喇，呢個其實亦都適用於監管機構㗎。但係我就目前嚟講，唔係咁肯定世界上，喺現實嚟睇，監管機構或者類似嘅機構有冇採納呢個標準。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你知唔知道有冇任何嘅巴士公司，譬如話瑞典、日本、英國，你提過嘅國家有冇採納呢個標準呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就唔知道即係某一間公司唔知道佢哋嘅名，但係從我收集到嘅資料，我就知道喺日本好可能有幾間公司，為數唔多，呢啲公司都係同公共交通有關嘅，不過呢個我要再印證一下，唔該。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺一啲嘅文件裏面，我哋就見到公巴有採納 ISO 9001㗎。想請你睇番九巴文件 3 號，767（原文照錄）頁，係一個 2011 年嘅年報。

睇番左邊嗰欄呀，1999 年：

「九巴成為香港第一間巴士公司，係得到 ISO 9001:1994 年嘅認證，呢個係全公司適用㗎，關於質素管理系統方面嘅。咁其實九巴係世界--喺香港係第四間公司，得到呢一個全公司嘅人嘅人嘅認證㗎。」

咁呢個嘅 ISO 9001 同 39001 有乜嘢嘅分別呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）對於管理系統，我唔係專家，我嘅理解 ISO 39001 其實係特登寫嚟改善道路交通安全㗎，咁就係從一個嘅安全系統角度去睇㗎，呢個係世衛喇、聯合國同埋好多已發展國家推薦嘅，咁佢呢啲國家，或者機構，全部對於道路安全係好嚴肅咁去睇㗎。

咁呢一套嘅標準其實特登係寫嚟係畀一啲公司或者一啲嘅機構係去採納，等佢哋可以有一個正面嘅影响。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我就想請你--我就睇番另--睇另外一個嘅項目，就係有關

於九巴嗰個經營專營權續約嘅呢方面嘅事項嘅。我想問你嘅意見...

主席： By "the licence" you mean the franchise?

黃女士：（經傳譯員）...咁就係16--呢個係16年6月16號嘅，咁係777頁呀。

呢份文件係中文㗎，整個報告其實就係英文寫嘅，我知道。

或者首先就係睇...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢份係咪775開始㗎？

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個其實就係話係想畀一個意見，係對於新嘅專營權嗰個嘅意見㗎，咁同埋係就於一個公眾諮詢文件所畀出嘅意見。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢份文件嘅號碼係幾多呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）6月16號，係2016年㗎。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺第一段，你就話係有一個公眾諮詢喇，你就入咗一份嘅意見書，呢個係就於九巴嘅新專營權事宜，咁呢一個嘅諮詢報告結果，你提供嘅文件。

第二段，呢個其實就唔係投訴嚟嘅，咁就話政府嘅文件只係包含一小段關於安全，就有兩個簡述，分別係更嚴格監察巴士車長的駕駛行為，同埋改善車箱內的安全操施。

但係你就提過嘞，呢個其實係冇確實反映呢一啲嘅涵蓋嘅觀點，你可唔可以再詳細解釋一下，就係涵蓋嘅觀點呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，係係邊一頁嗰度讀？同埋邊一段呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）778頁，第二段。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋未去到嗰度之前，我諗遲下，即係唔係而家，或者我哋都應該睇番嗰份諮詢文件，就問下。我知道第二段嗰度，鄺先生就話係嗰份諮詢文件個重點係喺邊一度吖嘛。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，或者我想請你睇番嗰封信，咁就係房運局係寫畀立法會嘅嗰封信。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪就嗰份嘅諮詢文件呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。不如咁喇，我哋睇睇 TD-3 嗰個文件夾，661 至到 768 頁，TD 運輸署嘅文件夾，661 至到 768 頁。

我諗呢個係第三份嘅立法會文件，就係話畀立法會知，究竟最新嘅情況係點嘅，咁就係講到係 2012 年嘅 2 月嘅情況，之後亦都有講及係行政--特首會同行政會議嗰個係決定㗎。

或者我哋先睇一睇呢一份係立法會文件，咁然後我哋先至去睇嗰份 2016 年嘅文件。嗰個引言嗰度就話，第一，就係：

「係有新嘅專營權，亦都係有附加嘅條件就係，向一個新巴就係批一個專營權，去經營呢一個專營巴士服務喇，就係喺 13 年嘅 7 月 1 號至到 2023 年嘅 7 月 1 號。

咁又跟住就係話：

「係批專營權係畀龍運巴士。」個(b)段。

(c)嗰段就係城巴嘞，咁就係 13 年嘅 5 月 1 號至到 23 年 5 月 1 號嘅專營權。

跟住睇後面嗰版，或者落去下啲，嗰度就列出嗰個係條款喇，以及就係嗰個評估嘅係基制嘅。嗰度就係話要評估一下，究竟新巴同埋龍運，以及城巴，有冇提供一個適當有效率嘅服務，咁運輸署就係經常就係檢討佢哋嘅表現嘅，透過幾個方法，第一就係乘客滿意度調查喇，現場調查喇，係檢查車輛喇，檢驗車輛喇，同埋睇番公眾嘅反應㗎。

有鑑於係五至八段，喺下面五至八段嘅嗰個評估嘅結果喇，而見到佢哋已經係滿意嗰個表現嘅。

咁又睇番新巴嘅表現，包括埋嗰個係意外率喇，失--脫班率喇，即係話同定咗嗰個時間表比例一下個脫班率等等喇，咁龍運嗰度，亦都睇番佢哋每年有幾多個係投訴，即係以每百萬個係乘客有幾多宗嘅投訴喇，咁同埋就係每一百萬行車公里嘅巴士意外嘅平均數字喇，就睇下佢係咪正常吖，喺嗰個幅度範圍之內定抑或係超咗--係超出咗嗰個範圍嘅。

我仲想請你睇...

主席：（經傳譯員）我就想問下嘞，問呢一樣嘢，十項文件二，775，嗰個係一個回應嚟㗎？係跟進邊份文件嘅一個回應呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰份文件亦都係講呢個城巴嘅，所以我就要講番呢份係咩嘢文件嚟嘅，因為呢度係有講番，回應番城巴嗰份文件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢度係 775 頁喇，咁我睇番嗰個日期，咁嗰度就話 2016 嘅 6--係 9 月 16 號㗎，775 頁，就係 2014 嘅 9 月 16 號。我或者將佢打番出嚟

先。

我問就係問，究竟阿鄺生佢係回應邊一份文件㗎，然後就寫咗呢一度呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢唔係回應緊呢一份文件㗎。呢份文件就係回應 784 頁嗰份文件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）784 係 2018 年 4 月文件嘅一部分嚟㗎，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2016 年 6 月 17 號會議，係 784。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個文件夾？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）SEC-2。

主席： That was the bit that was missing.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）784。

主席：（經傳譯員）等等。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，鄺先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）等等先。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家 SEC-2，784 頁就係講九巴㗎，雜項嘅 775 就講城巴㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可能我就係講咗份唔啱嘅文件嘞，我諗嗰個時序我可能搞錯咗㗎。

或者我應該首先睇嘅睇呢一份呀，就係 SEC-2 個文件夾，748 頁，嗰個就係諮詢文件嘞，文件就係 2016 年嘅 1 月嘅文件嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者麻煩你等一等，等一等。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢頁係 748，講及係嗰個新嘅專營權，就係講九巴嘅巴士服務網絡。754 頁，第十六段...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未落去之前，748 頁就係一份討論文件嚟嘅，政府就係告知立法會，就話打算就係同係九巴係商討就係就佢嘅巴士服務網絡，就係批出一個係十年嘅專營期，因為現有嗰個係專營權就係就嚟係屆滿嘞。

黃女士： Yes.

主席： Is that right?

黃女士： Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺第四段嗰度，嗰度就係話航運局同埋運輸署--第四段咁樣講㗎，就話：

「政府最主要嘅考慮係咩嘢呢，如果要批出個專營權，就係話要睇下個營運商係咪可以提供一個適當有效率嘅公共巴士服務。」

鄺先生，我諗呢個就係你關注點嘞，即係話我哋較早時候所睇嗰份報告，你提出你嘅關注點就係在此，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我仲記得當時政府就邀請公眾人士係表達意見，對於九巴新嘅專營權同埋之後城巴以及再大嶼山巴士佢哋嘅新專營權，係邀請公眾表達意見嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋剛才嗰度所讀出嘅，其實亦都政府成日重複一句說話㗎，無論九巴呢個係，城巴都係重複嗰句嘅。

而你係有其他意見嘅呢，喺雜項嗰度 775 嗰度有講嘞，你就話政府嘅諮詢文件就咁樣樣㗎。

而你咁嘅睇法，你話政府嗰個喺批出個係新嘅巴士專營權嘅時候，就純粹只係睇究竟嗰個係專營權公司，係咪可以提供到適當而有效率嘅服務。

而你就話你嗰個係睇法就話，有其他重要嘅事項，譬如話交通安全、道路安全，以及係環保喇，係企業嘅社會責任等等，都係冇提到嘅。

我諗你首先就作出個咁嘅回應，你認為政府喺諮詢係經營權續約嘅時候，政府嘅呢方面係不足。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為我哋根本睇唔到「安全」嗰兩隻字，我哋係好想確保就呢樣係照顧到，我哋唔知道究竟當政府講話適當服務嘅時候，係咪已經包含咗安全㗎。因為當時我哋所睇嘅文件，我關心嘅地方就係話，安全會唔會就已經係作為一個重要嘅事項，係照顧到呢，我就擔心嗰點，所以我就提出我嘅睇法，就希望佢哋去考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）當然喇，呢度有唔同嘅專營權喇，一個就係城巴嗰個集團喇，另外就有九巴嗰個係專營權喇。咁黃律師，究竟係邊度呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋先講九巴，我哋而家喺呢一份文件嗰度。我要致歉呀，鄺先生，我已經睇到你係講及城巴嘅嗰個意見書嘞，我哋遲啲會講你對城巴所表達嘅意見。而家既然講開九巴，就講番九巴先。

或者我哋先睇九巴嘅陳述書喇，而你就係有回應過政府嘅諮詢文件嘅，喺呢個720頁嗰度嘅--對唔住，係770頁。

咁喺嗰度就話係：

「道路安全係至為重要㗎」。

喺嗰度就提及就係嗰份文件嘅6(c)嗰一個條：

「嗰度就係顯示九巴嘅意外率，就係每百萬行車公里就有 2.95 宗交通意外，呢個就係低於係整個行業嘅4.16。」

呢個一方面就顯示九巴嗰個表現較佳喇，但係我哋就認為，如果只係單睇一個參數，就係十分之不足㗎，唔能夠單睇嗰個每百萬行車公里嘅意外率，就話九巴嘅喺安全表現係點樣樣，由於佢嘅運作嘅規模，咁九巴就係佔咗係超過一半同巴士有關嘅傷亡數字㗎。

所以就係因而就要係更加盡力咁樣去減低嗰個傷亡數字㗎，要分析嗰個係意外率喇，個數字喇，即係如果佢哋係涉及呢個嚴重同埋係致命嘅意外、涉及行人嘅意外、多人傷亡意外等等，應該從更廣嘅角度去睇㗎。你意思係咪話如果單單淨係睇一個意外率，咁就唔公道嘞？因為呢個係一個單一參數，你認為要睇呢個比較全面先至得㗎，你係咪咁嘅意思呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生，的而且確係咁。其實我哋喺報告嗰度，亦都已經係寫咗出嚟嘞，我哋交畀你哋嗰個報告裏面，就係有呢一方面嘅分析㗎。

我哋亦都係有一啲表--我覺得應該睇埋其他嘅百分比，其他嘅數字嘅。譬如話每一百萬乘客人次嘅意外率喇，每百萬行車公里嘅行人嘅係涉及意外率喇，以及就每百萬行車公里嘅嚴重意外數字喇，每百萬行車公里嘅致命意外喇等等㗎。所以我哋如果要理解目前嗰個安全嘅情況，我哋要睇多個參數㗎。

即係我概念就係咁樣樣嘞，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個報告嗰度，其實我就想睇一睇你所作嘅數個建議，772頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺你未落去之前，你可唔可以再解釋一下，點解係要用多項嘅參數呢？譬如話你有講過，前後碰撞同埋喺路口嘅碰撞，諗黃律師，可唔可以將佢讀出嚟呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）前後相撞同埋路口碰撞，呢個由於好多巴士路線都係用呢個高速公路喇、快速公路喇，九巴就特別容易就係涉及喺前後碰撞，而裏面亦都會引致多人傷亡㗎。

喺 2011 至到 2013 年嗰個三年期間，當時係有超過四十宗嘅係撞車事件，

係涉及多人傷亡，裏面係有五個或者多於五人係傷亡嘅，而係涉及九巴嘅巴士㗎。

咁而歷史上，係有試過單一宗事件有超過一百人傷亡㗎。咁樣樣嘅碰撞就會引致就係好多人嚴重受傷，特別就係如果坐某啲位嘅乘客，呢個上層前排。此外，就係亦都對我哋嘅係醫療系統，係急症室就造成好大嘅壓力。呢啲事件就只係會歸類成為一個單一宗嘅意外，所以佢嘅嚴重性就唔能夠單睇意外率就睇到佢幾嚴重。

喺 2015 年 7 月，單單嗰個月就起碼有三宗係相撞嘅事件，係涉及九巴嘅巴士係有多人傷亡，裏面其實總共有四十五人就係受傷或者死亡㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄺生，你就話要睇多個參數，你可唔可以解釋一下，係咪就係因為考慮埋呢一段文字所講㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有幾個建議㗎，首先就係睇 772 頁。你就講過就話：

「過去嘅係意外率同埋就係一啲潛在嘅安全風險，就係要係詳加研究，睇出有咩嘢機會，喺邊度可以進行改善嘅，即係透過新嘅專營權。政府應該帶頭去重視係巴士運作嘅道路安全。喺專營權嗰度，亦都應該包括埋呢一點，就唔係淨係睇適當同埋有效率嘅服務。亦都應該要睇下，譬如話預先定咗一啲目標，巴士公司係做到嘅話，就應該係得到獎勵，譬如話將某一類嘅意外嘅數字每年減少百分之二十。」

咁你呢度係咪就係話，唔應該淨係睇一類嘅交通意外嘅數字，而係要睇埋就係咪涉及多人傷亡，係咪呀？因為你頭先就講及頭尾相撞嘅時候，都有講及呢一點，多人傷亡嘅意外事件。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生，啱。

我做嘢嘅時候，我總係希望分析一件事，理解一件事嘅時候，都係好全面，好全盤咁去睇㗎。首先，至為重要嘅，你係以整局嘅全局去咁睇喇。另外，到你要制訂一啲策略同埋措施嘅時候，咁嘅角度就更加係緊要嘞。

我係因此寫低咗一啲建議喇，我亦都包括係一啲建議，譬如話獎勵一啲巴士公司喇，當然呢個只係其中一個嘅建議，點解呢，因為喺呢一啲寫畀政府、寫畀立法會嘅文件同埋信件裏面，我哋都希望鼓勵嗰啲負責嘅涉及嘅係人士，係想鼓勵佢哋，我哋唔想樣樣都好負面，好消極㗎，我哋想鼓勵行裏面嘅人士，我哋想係畀啲動力佢哋，係推動佢哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇諗下，如果巴士公司能夠達到嗰個目標，點樣獎勵佢哋呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個只係一個建議嘅，我哋未曾睇過有關嘅詳細嘅細節，

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

或者係獎勵嘅基制嘅，不過個意念就係需要鼓勵巴士公司，鼓勵巴士司機，要有個理由就獎勵佢。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇諗過係一啲財務呀定係點呢？又或者好市民獎，或者係錢方面，呢啲獎勵係有冇諗過係咩嘢呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，合理嘅或者係行得通嘅，都我覺得都應該加以考慮嘅，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）獎勵嘅相反就係懲處喇、懲罰喇，你覺得如果佢哋未能夠達到預定嘅目標，係咪應該都有懲罰嘅呢？譬如話意外率唔達標。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，當然喇，懲罰都係一個考慮嘅可能性嚟嘅，但係我哋要明白，唔係所有意外都係司機嘅錯，或者係巴士司機--或者巴士公司嘅錯，意外可能係因為第三者引起嘅，或者係一啲唔同嘅成因，或者係有唔止一方面，有幾方面係需要負責嘅。懲罰喺某一啲情況下有用嘅，不過係咪公平呢，就都仲要係驗證--即係仔細考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道新加坡，佢嘅交通嘅當局，佢哋有個睇交通意外嚟到考慮佢哋嗰個專營權嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道呢方面嘅情況。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰個中間嗰一段，你係提到巴士公司嘅安全表現嘅，同埋要有一個現代嘅係辦--制度呀，現代方式呀，應該引入嘅，咁點樣監--咁樣嚟到監察佢哋嘅表現嘅。

你提過就係引入一啲措施，係根據個新嘅專營權嘅安排，鼓勵佢哋係引入一啲新嘅安全管理措施，即係符合呢個 ISO 39001 嘅標準嘅。

咁就係巴士應該同--巴士公司應該--政府應該同巴士公司合作，嚟到去研究巴士意外，同埋涉及嘅詳細嘅風險嘅，以便係設一啲目標嘅，關於減少意外嘅目標嘅。

呢個你唔係第一次提㗎嘞，ISO 39001 嘅標準喇，不過呢個特別今次就住九巴，你係同運輸署就話提出，希望專營權合約裏面，係要引入呢個標準嘅，係咪你第一次呢，你可唔可以證實呢樣嘢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我相信唔係第一次提 ISO 39001 嘅--ISO 標準嘅。我就其實鼓勵佢哋起碼都要研究下，睇一睇究竟係咪應該採納呢個標準嘅。但係要--如果佢哋--即係我哋都留意到，可能都有個相約嘅標準嘞，都已經係可以嘅。

但係呢個就係根據一個安全系統嘅模式嘅，同埋照顧到先進國家所採納嘅最新嘅一啲概念嘅，同埋係一個--係有個向前望嘅，即係點樣減少個安全意外呀，同埋死亡受傷嘅比率嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個關於嗰個係黑盒喇，去到呢頁嘅底，安全嘅駕駛巴士嘅標準嘅。我睇到，你係話：

「好多嘅巴士公司都係好專業嘅，同埋表現都係良好嘅，但係呢個唔等於話佢哋已經係將個風險減到最低喇，同埋有部分嘅巴士公司，佢哋表現係比較係進取同埋危險嘅。」

咁就呢度個檢討文件--諮詢文件就話：

「即係佢哋已經係加咗個係黑盒同埋個限速器嘅。」

咁你就話：

「响巴士度使用黑盒仲有好大嘅潛質嘅，但係我哋就唔知道究竟呢啲黑盒而家係點樣運用嘅。」

咁就呢度咁講，你話就係：

「我哋唔可以將呢個市區嘅巴士嘅限速 50 公里作為一個黃金標準嘅。」

所以你有啲建議嘅：

「即係將响嗰個係專營權嘅要求，係需要有一個全面嘅標準同埋就監察個司機系統嘅，使用一啲安裝嘅黑盒可以做到呢樣嘢。監察系統應該係自動化，嚟到係令到個程序係順暢，同埋可以教育同埋重新訓練啲司機嘅。」

特別嘅仲關鍵嘅標--監察嘅措施就係第一，加速同埋減速嘅行動嘅特點嘅，咁你需要一啲嘅--你有講過係英屬哥倫比亞嗰個係指引嘅。

你可唔可以講講，有啲咩嘢特質呀，你特別提到呢個英屬哥倫比亞嘅指引？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）如果佢係好急速，即係好急速咁樣加速，好急速咁樣減速，就令到乘客可能會失去平衡嘅。有啲司機亦都係可能係加速、減速，响個即係大家意料唔到嘅情況之下加速、減速，咁我哋想有啲管制㗎。

譬如話地鐵嘅車箱，佢哋係有訓練佢哋點樣加速嘅，有啲參數嘅，咁就令到個地鐵乘客唔會咁容易失去平衡嘅。巴士方面就有一個問題，因為理論上，巴士司機係可以好快速咁樣又加速又減速嘅，但係我哋就要係用一個--管制呢啲行為，就係响個合理範圍。

一般嚟講，其實係冇需要加速--即係過份加速、過份減速都唔需要嘅，咁當然喇，如果係緊急，咁司機可能要好快速咁樣係減速或者剎車嘅。呢個亦都係同佢哋--同嗰個關於巴士速度嘅建議有關嘅，如果巴士司機可以高速啲嚟到係駕駛，咁就個--佢會有個大嘅可能性係需要係快速咁樣加速或者係減速嘅，因為有啲係未能夠預計嘅，一啲响繁忙嘅道路上，有啲衝突嘅情景嘅。

如果係响英屬哥倫比亞嗰個交通嘅設計嘅指引，佢哋嗰啲係--佢哋有一啲所

謂嘅數值嘅，即係話究竟嗰啲巴士係點樣加速、減速。

主席：（經傳譯員）未曾繼續之前，我想問下鄺先生，一開始嘅時候，你哋嗰個建議773嗰度你係咁講嘅，我哋呢個建議，呢個係擺入嗰個係專營權合約嘅，即係成--設立一個全面嘅標準嘅，同埋監察司機嘅系統，就運用嘅呢就係裝置黑盒嘅。你所謂嘅「全面標準」嘅意思係咩嘢呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我假設我所講嘅「全面標準」，其實係講緊頭先嗰啲各種規則，即係速度係點樣，加速、減速嘅速率係幾多，司機應該係咁樣喇，同埋一般嘅規則係點樣樣，關於個別路線嘅標準係應該點樣樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係應該係--呢個標準就係擺哋嗰個監察嘅系統嘞，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生： Chairman, yes, that is the case.

主席：（經傳譯員）係為咗免--即係我哋可以辯論一下喇，譬如話 0.2G 加速、減速，係咪可以咁樣--係咪咁嘅意思呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋要設立咗個標準先，基於證據--基於我哋面對嘅安全同埋風險，跟住利用呢個監察系統去作為一個執行喇。

咁同埋究竟執行到咩嘢程度呢，即係譬如話--咁係另一個問題嘞。即係會唔會話偶然違反，就有係紀律嘅行動，呢個就冇--呢度冇講到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就同你頭先所講嘅都係一樣喇，應該係實時進行喇，同埋自動化嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，越自動化，或者越係實時嘅監察，就更好嘅。咁當我寫呢個建議嘅時候，我覺得第一步就係，一定要有啲一套規矩喇，另外，需要有更好嘅監察嘅。我就冇再進一步係--當時冇再進一步睇下究竟應該用啲咩嘢字眼嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你嘅意思即係話，哋個專營權協議，應該有某一個位置畀佢㗎，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，係，呢個係我哋嘅建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇呢？有冇擺到落去呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，照我所知，都應該冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可以調查一下嘅，哋另外一個場合做喇。咁我呢度--但係今日嘅時間就大概係咁多嘞。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有位委員，佢有其他嘅事要處理嘅，咁我哋唔能夠繼續落去

嘞。

我了解，鄺先生、顧醫生（高醫生？），聽日係晏晝，係咪呀，可以再繼續？啊，聽日上晝。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，聽日上晝嘅，淨係我嘅啫。顧醫生（高醫生？）有其他嘅事。

主席：（經傳譯員）好嘞，多謝顧醫生（高醫生？），多謝你代表呢個道路研究小組。聽日幾點鐘開始呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）十點鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋今日儘量做多啲，咁儘量做好，同埋儘量做多啲，咁我哋而家就暫時休會，我哋聽朝十點鐘復會，多謝你。

鄺子憲先生： Thank you, Chairman.

高兆祺先生： Thank you, Chairman.

2018年7月16日

下午1時33分聆訊押後

Tuesday, 17 July 2018

EVIDENCE FROM COMMUNITY FOR ROAD SAFETY REPRESENTATIVE:

MR KWONG TSE HIN, JULIAN (continued)

(10.00 am)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

Mr Kwong, I will ask Ms Wong to resume her questioning on behalf of the Committee.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG (continued)

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you, Mr Kwong, for coming today.

Yesterday we were on documents concerning the KMB renewal of licence documentation. We are going to continue with this exercise.

If I may refer you back to the document, MISC-2. Page 770. It is your submission in response to the public consultation, dated 16 June 2016. We were on page 773 yesterday.

At the section on recommendations, the first bullet, about incorporating into franchise requirement the requirement to set up a comprehensive standard and driver monitoring system using the installed black boxes.

And can I ask, why do you propose including this as a requirement in the franchise agreement?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, at that time I thought the

renewal of the franchise would be a very good opportunity for the introduction of any new ideas, and that is why we had made an effort to make as many suggestions as possible in as far as they are reasonably feasible. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The point of this is that if it is included in the agreement there can be some sort of mechanism to monitor their compliance. Is that the logic behind the suggestion?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I think so. That would also represent -- I would it see as progress. Certainly the bus companies and the government has been making an effort to make bus operation in Hong Kong safe, and we are appreciative of that. But we are not satisfied at any point as long as there are injuries, especially serious injuries and fatalities. So we are always trying to push something which we see as major progress. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You suggested in the second bullet, "Key monitoring controls". Who would you suggest this monitoring be done by? Done by whom?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Similar to an operation like this, usually I would assume that would be the bus companies initiating the monitoring system, but the government acting as a regulatory body.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And you made quite a number of suggestions there. We have gone through the acceleration and deceleration characteristics yesterday, and you make other suggestions concerning speeding through risky hilly roads, and you suggest certain km per hour. Are you suggesting this suggestion be put into the franchise agreement, or it was simply a suggestion that the government should keep control about all these roads?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, about this specific recommendation, that is the principle, that if we identify certain road sections with exceptional risk, which I would call critical sections, then the logical way would be to specify certain speed, whether it is 25, 30, or 40, through these sections, and make these known to drivers, and because we want to control the safety of these critical sections.

In this recommendation I did not specify which sections, but I am trying to introduce this concept, that they cannot just follow the legal speed limit when we are talking about these critical sections. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Who should identify the critical sections?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think that should be identified probably between government and the bus

companies, and also with the help of experts. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the third suggestion --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry. How would this be then regulated by government, if the bus companies identified particular sections of road, they told government, government agreed, and how would this be then monitored and, more importantly, how would it then be regulated?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think, without going into a sophisticated monitoring system, if we are trying to go back to the basics, that would be, first, issue a notice to drivers riding on a particular route which critical sections they should pay particular attention to and what speed they are using. And secondly, they can have their inspectorate to check it, to check drivers from time to time, but of course we are trying to introduce a more sophisticated monitoring system that would be based on the black box data, and then preferably integrated with the GPS so that drivers grossly exceeding the said requirements will be identified automatically and in time.

CHAIRMAN: So the monitoring, rather than using an inspectorate, which is an old-fashioned way of doing it, is it not, would be done by real-time automated reports?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. That would be recommended.

As far as the technology permits.

CHAIRMAN: That's what you had in mind with these recommendations?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. That is the case.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In the third bullet you made the recommendation:

"Through systematic and targeted safety training, drivers, should be trained to understand typical accidents scenarios and specific risks."

Who would you suggest to carry out this recommendation?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, this is a general recommendation. Of course that would need the initiative of government, and possibly inviting experts to join, and organisations such as ours would always be happy to assist government. For this particular point, my original thinking is that drivers may not be entirely aware of what accidents may happen. As I explained yesterday, it is not reasonable -- I mean, at this moment, that drivers know what the capacity of the safety barrier is, or that they understand what speed an elderly pedestrian can tolerate without having serious injuries or fatalities, but we can always translate such information or such knowledge into a simple way, and to make drivers far more aware, so that they know why and

how they can behave better. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At 4.4 you set out a vehicle performance, using the Canadian Transit Handbook, with certain guidelines or thresholds set out. Can you explain why you used the Canadian Transit Handbook in the first place, suggesting desirable rates for standard bus and articulated bus?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, this is one of the handbooks which I obtained with the information of interest to me. As I mentioned, abrupt acceleration and deceleration could be a major factor contributing to the large number of passengers losing balance inside the bus. We also know that the design of the metro, of the MTR, has also some parameters relating to acceleration and deceleration, in order that passengers will not easily lose balance. So that is the same case for buses.

And I see that these parameters are quite reasonable. You may want to refer to the deceleration for emergency condition, as I mentioned. It is specified as 2.7 metres per second squared. As you can see, that is much smaller than the 7 metres per second squared I mentioned yesterday for emergency braking of a passenger car.

The dilemma we are facing is that if a bus driver has to apply the brake in an emergency, in order not to

knock down a pedestrian, he has to decide that very quickly. And whether he would rather have the passengers losing balance, or to protect the pedestrian from being knocked down.

And I think that overall, worldwide, acceleration rate and deceleration rates have been accepted as an important parameter for safety for bus operation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: What are the parameters set in the MTR for acceleration and deceleration?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Normally, Chairman, that would be in the order of 1.15 metres per second squared. There may be some deviation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And may I just refer you -- because you talked about this deceleration and acceleration rates. Can I take you to BM-1 bundle, page 66.

CHAIRMAN: What are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is the submission of the black box manufacturer ZF, the screen capture showing the acceleration and deceleration rates. I will just ask if Mr Kwong can comment on one of the matters. It is the deceleration rate at 2.3 as stated in this screen capture.

Can you comment on this figure, given the suggested

rate in the Canadian code is 2.7.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, in this regard I have not studied this in detail, but as you can see, the value of 2.3 is higher than, I think, 1.1 for the Canadian Transit Handbook for normal deceleration. I think the exact value has to be determined on the basis of the realistic operation in Hong Kong. Whether in Hong Kong for one reason or the other we would accept a higher deceleration rate, I have not studied this in detail. But what I can say is that, in general, on urban streets if the running speeds of buses is not as high, I mean that we are having bus operation at moderate speed, then there will be far less requirements for drivers to decelerate at excessive rate. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The requirement that the Transport Department stipulated for tachograph capabilities in the 2003 requirement was that it be capable of measuring 0.2G. Is that not correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: 0.2G would be equivalent to 1.96 metres per second squared.

CHAIRMAN: So what is the significance of the fact that the Transport Department required the machine to be capable of measuring that level of deceleration?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, sorry, do you mean that Transport Department have the requirement that the

mechanism in the bus can measure to the accuracy of 0.2 or --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I can ask Ms Wong to put it on up the screen. It is the requirement from 1983 that buses be fitted with a tachograph with various capabilities, new buses by 1 July 2004.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be TD-5, page 1598.

If you look at paragraph 3:

"The software for analysing on-board or downloaded data should be capable of reporting the following:

(a) Accident Report -- vehicle speed profile at time interval of 1 second for the 3 minutes period preceding detection of a 0.2G deceleration."

MR JULIAN KWONG: I see, Chairman. I think this clause considers that if the bus is decelerating at 0.2G, that means equivalent to 1.96 metres per second squared, then it would be an event justifying an accident report.

CHAIRMAN: This would be harsh braking, would it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would say so.

CHAIRMAN: So the parameter that you were taken to, 2.3 metres per second squared, is more than 10 per cent higher than this requirement.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, from what I read from the document, that would be the case.

But I think -- it would be good if we can have more

evidence, and especially based on events involving passengers losing balance, and then we can, say, compare the deceleration rate at that time, and then if we can collect this data in future, then we could fine-tune the values in a more evidence-based -- with more evidence of what the parameters should be. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: But we can get a pretty good rough idea if the MTR stipulate 1.15. 2.3 is a lot more than 1.15, is it not?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I presume that would be the case. But also on the understanding that bus operation is less predictable, but still I agree that we need to have deceleration rates closer to what the MTR is using, although it may not be entirely realistic in emergency situation. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. The other matters of course are the bus safety and the bus fleets. At page 773 at the bottom to page 774, you made some recommendation there in particular the first one about -- 774, at the top:

"Upper deck front seats -- in the absence of any reasonable deformation zone, front row bus passengers could be crushed despite the use of safety belts. This is particularly important with the number of KMB buses using high-speed roads."

And also seat belts, bus door safety, et cetera.

And you made a recommendation to ask for these suggestions to be incorporated into the franchise agreement, to be studied and improved with timetable.

Again, who would you suggest initiates this task to incorporate these suggestions into the franchise agreement?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, again, we would assume that in the franchise requirement government to specify or to regulate. Government can also study these issues and impose on the bus companies to have a timetable for improvement.

Of course it would also be the responsibility for the bus companies to conduct such studies in conjunction with the bus manufacturers, and what I was suggesting here, of course, we are advocating a far more proactive approach, that both government and the bus companies are interested in these matters, and they would see that they have the responsibility to look at these issues and to make improvements in a very proactive way.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Just anticipating the questions you will be asked later, you say that what you were looking for is that the bus companies and the Transport Department act in a very proactive way. Do they do so?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, to be fair, they are proactive

in some issues, but for those issues we consider very important, I would say that they are not proactive enough. Chairman, I would say in some cases they would be quite reactive. And we do not wish to see that certain issues are handled in a reactive way, especially for those incidents involving serious injuries and fatalities. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean, presumably, reacting to a catastrophic event, but only after the event. Reactive not proactive. Is that your point?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I would like to add to that point that it is not uncommon, not only in Hong Kong, that progress is made after major accidents or catastrophe. From my point of view, if the catastrophe or accident cannot be reasonably predicted, then it may be fair. However, if there is already ample evidence, or ample number of accidents happening, or there have been historic accidents, or theoretically the risk is very high, then we should not act in a reactive way, but we need to be far more proactive. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Based on your report, you have highlighted the issues, obviously, that you consider there is ample evidence in which you make these suggestions. Is that correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I presume that the counsel

refers to those items I mentioned. I would say yes, there is already ample evidence. Of course when we talk about evidence, there can be a number of levels. There would be surface evidence. There could be evidence according to our knowledge, from accident data, or from news reports. And the highest level, of course, the evidence will be academic evidence, that is published conclusions and results in journal papers.

As far as the evidence I am talking about here, that would be at the level that to our knowledge, from news reports, from basic accident data, that, and also from the theoretical point, I think the evidence is clear enough.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may just go through the last suggestion, is your mentioning about bus safety, bus stops. In this paragraph you mentioned that waiting passengers at certain roads are left exposed to heavy and fast-moving vehicles. And you suggested or recommended here to incorporate into the franchise agreement that bus companies will collaborate with government to reduce the risk for waiting passengers at bus stops.

Now, how would you suggest a bus company to collaborate with the government to reduce this risk for waiting passengers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. Bus stop safety is a problem worldwide, I would say, not only in Hong Kong. Admittedly, many countries, including the advanced countries, have not been paying adequate attention to the issue.

We have bus stops located along high-speed roads, major roads, such as this, the one in this photograph, on Lung Cheung Road, with a speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour, on Gloucester Road, and on other major roads.

In theory, if we have a large group of passengers waiting at the bus stop and we have such fast moving vehicles running alongside, there is always the risk of an errant vehicle crashing onto the roadside and they will be trapped by the bus stop shelter, and that can lead to severe injuries.

Only a few countries have paid attention to this particular problem and acted seriously. One of the countries is Singapore. They have introduced measures, but whether that measure is effective or is really working well, then I still need to further confirm.

However, theoretically we need protection for the waiting passengers. The bus company has been responsible for introducing these bus shelters, and they do get revenues from that, with the advertisements they place on the shelter. And government is responsible for

the road. So naturally, I would imagine that the bus company should collaborate with the government and to examine the design of bus shelters, and whether there is the need to have ancillary facilities, or equipment to better protect bus passengers.

Admittedly it is not easy, because at the same time we need to have bus passengers being able to get into the bus and to alight, but at the same time we need to have measures protecting them, so we cannot put a continuous barriers at these bus stops. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: No, but presumably you can construct barriers that have gaps in them so that people can alight and board buses?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. Although we cannot have a continuous safety barrier, there may be possibility to have safety barriers aligned in a certain angle, or else there is the possibility to install what we call bollards. In Singapore, the solution is to have bollards at these bus stops, and they have installed these at several thousands of bus stops.

However, I would like to point out one thing is that normally for highways design, we need to also protect the occupants of the errant vehicles. That means any safety barriers designed in such a way should not incur severe injuries to the occupants.

If we have discrete sections of safety barriers then the terminal or the ending point of the barriers could become a hazard. The second point is that bollards need to be what we call energy-absorbing. If we just put a steel post or a very heavy concrete post, it is certainly good for the waiting passengers, because it will certainly stop the car. But at the same time the occupants of the errant vehicles will probably suffer severe injuries.

To conclude, I think there are solutions. Ultimately, we may be able to work out solutions which achieve the best balance of this dilemma. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: In the road works being done on the Tai Po Road accident scene, is there not a barrier being created to protect passengers waiting at that bus stop?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, sorry, do you mean the remedial works which have been carried out there?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, aren't they creating a barrier to protect the passengers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I see what you mean. There is another solution what we call the protected bus stop. That means the bus stop is shifted away from the road, and the main road is separated from the bus stop with the traffic island.

That is a good solution, and that has been

introduced on the other direction of Lung Cheung Road, and also for the bus-to-bus interchange on Tuen Mun Road. But this solution requires lots of space as well.

So in the end, the starting point will be a review of different types of bus stops, and also to look at different types of roads and speed, and then probably we need to have different solutions, including engineering solutions and non-engineering solutions. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The bollards that you mentioned in Singapore, do you know who is responsible for installing these bollards, the government or the operators?

MR JULIAN KWONG: In Singapore that would be the Land Transport Authority, and I have studied some of the design, and they specifically mentioned that in 1998 there was a severe accident involving a vehicle crashing onto the bus stop, and then some more happened thereafter, and they started to introduce these bollards. I'm very interested actually to further obtain information from them regarding the precise design of these bollards.

But at the same time in Australia there is the bollard called the energy-absorbing bollard, which is designed for stopping an errant vehicle at up to 60 kilometres per hour. Not a bus, not a heavy vehicle, but just a passenger car. But the bollard also moves

a bit, so that the occupant of the vehicles will not be excessively injured. This product is quite unique, so I have been doing some search in other countries. So it appears that it is the only one available in the market.

I would also like to point out that at the University of New South Wales, one of the professors also shares this idea. He suggested there should be more research on the usage of bollards at bus stops, and also in urban areas where we cannot put a continuous barrier, because people may need to get out to the road.

I have not discussed with this professor, but I think he shares the same idea, and he thinks that that should be the way to go. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, Mr Kwong, this is the submission that you submitted in relation to the KMB in June 2016.

Afterwards, the LegCo did make some discussion. I'm going to take you to some of the papers in the LegCo. The first one is in June 2016, 17 June 2016, SEC-2, page 784.

This is an updated background brief on the franchise for the bus network of the Kowloon Motor Bus. It started at page 784.

If I may briefly summarise what this paper is about. It is a paper providing information on the franchise for KMB and it summarises major views and concerns expressed

by LegCo members in the past discussions. And if I may take you to paragraph 12 with the heading "Enhancing standard of bus service", and it made reference to:

" ... the Fifth LegCo, members raised concern over the performance of franchised bus service at the panel meetings, special financing committee meetings as well as the council meetings. They urged the Administration to take the opportunity of franchise renewal to require service improvement by bus companies, including provision of real-time bus service information to passengers, provision of priority seats and barrier-free facilities, improvements in bus lost trips as well as bus service frequencies during peak periods."

It made reference to the real-time bus service information. I believe at this time they have not had this real-time bus information yet. But can you tell us what this idea is about?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I believe it is referring to displaying, say, the time of arrival for the next bus, I mean how many minutes before the arrival of the next bus or the bus after, that can also be related to the use of the mobile phones to obtain information about the arrival of the next bus, and I think this would be the main idea.

CHAIRMAN: So there are two ways of communicating the

information. One would be a display panel at a bus stop or a terminus, and another would be by accessing an app on your mobile phone?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And this system had been introduced some years earlier had it not? Step by step?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think so.

CHAIRMAN: By KMB?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. But also by other companies as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go on to paragraph 17 it stated that:

"Furthermore, an additional clause had been included in the three franchises ... NWFB, [Long Win] and Citybus (Franchise 2), commencing in mid-2013 to empower [Transport Department] to require bus companies to enhance safety facilities and design."

It made a few examples here. Can you see that?

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the examples, please?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think the examples are simply referred to, in the next sentence:

"This included purchasing new buses with barrier-free and elderly-friendly design."

And it was suggested in the last sentence:

"The Administration would incorporate a similar

provision to promote barrier-free facilities in the other three bus [companies] ..."

Now Mr Kwong, even though there is such a clause in the franchise agreement it appears there has not been any improvement on the black box design or requirements in terms of the black box.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get involved in that. A barrier-free entry is not a safety feature, is it? Is that not simply a service facility?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, the barrier-free facility is -- well, that is both for convenience and safety, of course. Anything inside the bus can be unsafe. So I would have wished to see explicit description of other safety facilities. So I hope that has answered your question?

CHAIRMAN: How is a barrier-free entrance a safety facility?

MR JULIAN KWONG: I would presume that for someone who needs more space to enter the bus, the barrier-free facilities would mean probably not to have a handrail on the way, say, at the entrance, so that it is wide enough for example for wheelchairs, or for people with other particular needs, to have adequate space to enter the bus.

So it is not very explicit, but that is, I presume, both for convenience and safety.

But I'm looking of course to a focused description of safety facilities which is not existing here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and if I may take you to a document showing what clauses or what specific clauses have been asked to be included in the new franchise in relation to KMB --

CHAIRMAN: Before you get to that, in paragraph 10 of this paper, there is reference to a discussion that had taken place in 15 January 2016 about the franchise network; do you see that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes; I'm reading it.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, do we have the minutes of that meeting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We only have a letter from THB stating the follow-up actions of the meeting on 15 January, but not the actual minutes.

CHAIRMAN: The minutes appear to have been signed off on 26 August, and they refer to 15 January.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Perhaps if we may refer to the SEC-2 bundle, page 990. This is a document from the Transport and Housing Bureau dated 9 March 2016 to the LegCo, setting out what happened at the meeting on 15 January 2016.

CHAIRMAN: I'm holding a copy of the minutes. May I ask that these be given to you?

I'm told that we can show it as a soft copy on the

screen.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise for that, it should be in the SEC-2 bundle, page 967, it is a new document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's the document I have in mind.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's the minutes of meeting on 15 January. If you may turn to internal page 5.

CHAIRMAN: I think if we go to paragraph 13, you can see the tenor of the purpose of this real-time bus service information. It is, as becomes clear reading it, a service facility, no doubt to meet the requests of passengers that they get better information of how long they are going to have to wait in the rain before the bus arrives. That seems to have been the driving force behind this development.

Perhaps you would like to have a look at the minutes, Mr Kwong.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay.

Chairman, yes, I have read it. Do you want me to comment?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JULIAN KWONG: To me, real-time arrival information system is always desirable because it will reduce frustration for passengers, and actually it is providing a good service so that passengers can decide whether to wait for the next bus, or for example to access a bus

stop, whether they have enough time, et cetera.

I think that also has something to do with safety, but not directly. Certainly I welcome that. I have no particular comment on this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: What does it have to do with safety, knowing when the bus is going to arrive?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, as I mentioned, I would believe that if a passenger knows when the bus is going to arrive, they will be less stressed. If a passenger does not know when the bus is going to arrive, he will be less relaxed, and there may be more frustration, and he or she may try to stand very close to the bus stop, to the curb, in order to see whether the bus is coming.

So overall, I would say that it is not a direct safety measure. There may be benefits in terms of safety, but of course I do not have any references to prove this point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, one of the consequences of having to provide this information was to provide information to bus companies about where their buses were, and what speeds they were going at. Is that not a consequence?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Do you mean that this system can be used in conjunction with a system for locating the bus, and also for checking the speed of the buses?

CHAIRMAN: In order to come up with information about ETA,

you need to know where the bus is, and you need to know what speed it is doing, don't you?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes.

CHAIRMAN: So by a side wind, it produced access to other information that might be used for another purpose.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. I would presume that often we should try to utilise the information for multiple purposes, including safety and also level of service.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt Ms Wong will explore with you how this alternative multiple purpose was pursued or not pursued.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have seen the minutes about this real-time information. May I take you to the document itself now, because we have raised the question what has been asked to be included in the franchise agreement, and how the government perceives this facility.

May I take you to the TD-3-bundle.

CHAIRMAN: What are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is a LegCo document. It actually starts at 496, but the pages I'm going to is at 542. It is a LegCo brief on new franchise for KMB dated 28 March 2017. It set out the clause and service-related commitment to be added to the newly granted licence. It is the annex C to this paper.

This is the LegCo paper suggesting the clauses and

service-related commitments to the most recently granted franchises placed before the LegCo. If we see the first paragraph:

"KMB will fully take on board the clauses and commitments adopted in the two most recently granted franchises in 2015 (ie the franchises for Citybus ... and New Lantao Bus ... details of which are set out below ..."

So the first is the bus service. So the emphasis is on bus service, and then the first paragraph:

"The new franchise will empower the Commissioner to require KMB to provide facilities and installation for enhancement of bus safety, and provide a barrier-free and elderly-friendly travel environment. Specific initiatives are as follows ..."

The first is service quality. So I believe the clause speaks for itself, it is about service quality.

And the barrier-free and friendly features for the bus design, that's the subparagraph (i), and also the bus stop announcement system, and paragraph (ii) is:

"providing facilities ... to ... enhance safety, such as facilities and installation that can reduce potential fire hazards on all new buses."

So the emphasis is on the fire hazards.

And paragraph (iii) is on:

"Allowing foldable bicycles which ... will not cause ... hazard to other passengers ..."

Again a service facility.

(iv) is about providing passenger seating facilities.

And then over the page it's about passenger information:

"the new franchise will enhance the regulatory power of the Commissioner over the type, form and manner of information to be provided by KMB to passengers to ensure provision of suitable service information to passengers through better means ..."

(ii) Providing real-time bus arrival information through website and smartphone application, and installing display panels at suitable bus stops ... for disseminating such information."

Now these two paragraphs are, again, about service, providing passenger information, and even in provision of passenger information you can see the Commissioner is exerting its regulatory power as to what to convey to passengers.

So even from the agreement perspective, this is not about safety, this is about providing sufficient information to passengers, it is about service.

And the next one is the enhancement of government

regulation. The first one is about publishing the service pledge, the time frame for responding to complaints, and also the achievement rates of passenger service pledge.

The second about is the financial, strengthen control or regulation over the financial and accounting arrangements of KMB.

The third is about conducting open tendering requiring KMB to reluctant open tendering for all material procurement contracts.

Lastly, it is about the improvement in environmental performance, in terms of the air quality, low-emission buses, et cetera.

Now in all these new clauses there was nothing, or there was no clause whatsoever about the enhancement of the black box requirements or black box capability in all these clauses. Do you agree?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, I agree.

CHAIRMAN: In fact there is only one mention of a safety issue, and that is in relation to fire prevention.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. Related to fire hazards and also it mentioned that the new franchise will empower the Commissioner to require KMB to provide facilities and installation for enhancement of bus safety, but this clause does not explain what these

facilities are.

CHAIRMAN: The reference to fire hazard is a requirement to isolate the engine, is it not, that had been provided earlier for Citybus? There had been engine fires, and this was a way of reducing the risk from engine fires.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I have not studied this. That could be the case, but my interpretation is that when we talk about fire in a bus, we also need to consider the speed of evacuation of bus passengers, and there may be other possibility of having a fire, although it is a bit remote, say, for example, a bus colliding with a dangerous goods vehicle, with combustible materials.

So the whole subject of fire hazards, I think it can be very wide, and of course it is a specialised subject. But certainly this is of interest to us as well as a potential safety risk. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, I know I am a bit out of sequence now, because I have taken you to the clauses that the government proposed to KMB, or requiring KMB to include. But I wanted to show you back a document as to what the government knows or rather what the government set out as to the public concerns, and whether it is properly reflected in the clauses themselves, and if I may take you back to the LegCo file, it is the SEC-2, page 799.

It is a document, a LegCo paper on the new franchise

of KMB, in June 2016. It is the first page. The first page, the first paragraph set out what the paper is about:

"The government invited the public to offer views on the requirements of the new franchise for the bus network of The [KMB] ... This paper briefs members on the views received."

Now the public expressed a lot of views, and we can see at paragraph 4:

"A total of 135 submissions were received during public consultation. 27 of them were from [District Councils], different political parties, individual members of ..."

I'm sorry, it is page 799, paragraph 4.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: "A total of 135 submissions were received during public consultation. 27 of them were from [District Councils], different political parties, individual members of the [LegCo] and [District Council], as well as various groups. The remaining 108 submissions were from individual members of the public."

And they set out in five categories what the comments are about, and summarised them in the annex.

I'm going to take you to the annex starting at page 802.

Over the page, in paragraph 4, there is a section on bus safety. And there are two suggestions, one is to monitor bus captains' driving behaviour more closely. Second, to improve safety facilities on buses, such as by installation of additional horizonal bars and stronger materials to build the bus body.

It appears both suggestions are not reflected in the franchise agreement clauses that we have just seen.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think this clause number 4, yes, I did read it at that time, and I would consider the two points very vague, which certainly did not reflect our concern, which I would consider to be more sophisticated. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think we have finished the KMB. And if I may just go back a little bit to the Citybus, for franchise 1 and franchise 2.

I think you have made submissions on Citybus for franchise 1 only. Because in the document you provided us I can only locate one submission in relation to Citybus on 16 September 2014. Is that correct?

That's in the MISC-2- bundle, at page 775.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman. Yes. This was a submission made in 2014. So this was the first time we tried to make suggestions to government, taking the opportunity for the renewal of franchise of bus companies.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may --

CHAIRMAN: Give me a moment, please, while I locate the document.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 775.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This submission is in response to the public consultation paper by the government. And if we look at this document, at the second paragraph:

"The consultation document by government states that 'the government's key consideration in granting or extending a bus franchise is whether a grantee is capable of providing a proper and efficient bus service'. We are concerned that other important values, notably road safety, quality of service, environmental friendliness and social responsibility, are not mentioned."

So you are responding first to the consultation document by the government, and second, you raise concern that the road safety and other issues are not clearly expressed in the consultation document such that you are not sure whether they gave sufficient importance to this issues; correct?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman, that is the case. Because we interpreted the text in the government document as it was. So it didn't give any reference to safety. So we

have to raise it. But of course they can explain it. If they indeed consider that the word "proper" already covers safety, and they can explain that, I mean we will be happy to accept that. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And on that page, paragraph 5, you mentioned that:

"It is understandable that bus companies do not have sufficient incentives for many important initiatives. As stated in clause 17, this could be due to high operating costs and competitions. Yet it will not be acceptable to tolerate certain problems, in particular safety issues. In this respect government should not preclude providing more incentives through subsidies and partnership programmes."

I wanted to explore this paragraph with you. You made specific reference to safety issues that bus companies appear to lack sufficient incentives. And you suggest providing more incentive through subsidy and partnership programme.

So what suggestions are you making? What exactly are you suggesting here?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, in this clause I pointed out that safety is of paramount importance. It should not be sacrificed for reasons of, say, financial reasons, and I could see that the bus companies have been running

on a commercial basis, and they do not receive any financial subsidies, except for the elderly concession fare scheme in recent years. That is just an idea which -- and as I said, government should not preclude. I have not come to the point that government should, or what types of subsidies they should provide, but in general I'm looking into financial subsidies. But, of course, that means we are suggesting that this issue should be explored. But we have not studied this in more details. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: What kind of incentives did you have in mind related to safety issues?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think there are many possibilities. For example, to understand what safety measures and what safety strategies we should introduce, we need to have quality data, and studies conducted. As I explained yesterday, we need to study these in details: historic crashes, injury mechanisms. And then also to work with the bus manufacturers, to tell them what kind of safety problems we are having.

Bus manufacturers have been producing buses according to standards. For example the European standards, the UN standards. They may not know what problems we are facing in Hong Kong.

So in order to change the design of a bus, we need

research, the buses can cost more and so this would be areas, for example, where the government can perhaps help to finance, even for a certain -- may not be full subsidy, maybe in partnership, so government finance part of it, maybe the bus company also shared it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: But for what kind of safety provision?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, okay, for research into, say, the problem of the bus front, as I mentioned.

The bus front at the moment does satisfy European standards, or the UN standards, or there is no standard. But as I pointed out, there are safety issues.

So if we want to initiate a programme to redesign the bus front in cooperation with the bus manufacturers, then who would bear the cost? Because the bus would cost more, would be more expensive, and to do the research, it also would incur the cost. So that would be an example.

CHAIRMAN: The buses in Hong Kong are all made, are they not, by European manufacturers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. To my --

CHAIRMAN: Franchised buses.

MR JULIAN KWONG: To my understanding, yes. There are probably two dominant manufacturers, European, but based in the United Kingdom.

CHAIRMAN: Alexander Dennis, MAN, and Volvo; are those bus manufacturers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, to my understanding, that is true.

CHAIRMAN: And the buses are designed to EU standards.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, to my understanding, yes, and also the UNECE, United Nations.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any other safety incentive that you suggest consideration ought to be given to government subsidising?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, for example concerning bus stops, as I mentioned, okay, bus stop -- at the moment they are subsidised by the bus companies, of course with revenues coming from the advertisement. And other changes to the bus interiors, et cetera. I cannot think about any more, but there should be many more which I think would be necessary. The ultimate idea is that we do not want the bus companies to be under unreasonable financial pressure because we want them to be able to make a profit, and to be happy, so that is the idea.

But I cannot provide more information at this stage.

CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps there is one area you could help us with. The representatives of Citybus spoke about the proposals, considerations that seat belts be fitted for

everybody. Their observation was, "Nobody will use them. If you are going to require us to install them, then government should subsidise them." Do you have anything to say about that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, without going into details of this issue, I have read about the response from Citybus, I mentioned yesterday that we need to look at every safety provision in a scientific way, whether the measure does address the important safety issues we are facing, and seat belt certainly is an issue.

It is not incorrect what Citybus said, that passengers may not use them. If passengers do not use them it is not very satisfactory.

There are other measures we have discussed yesterday, such as the electronic stability control, and there are many other measures. However, every measure, if they are applied to every bus, it will cost. We need to select those measures which can help us to reduce the safety problem, especially those causing serious injuries and fatalities.

So the safety belt is certainly a possibility. But I have not studied the real financial implication. So I cannot comment on whether we are looking to devoting all the resources to seat belts. I would say that we should look at all the measures as a whole, and we need

to carefully compare the different measures as regards the merits and the drawbacks, and ultimately the effectiveness. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. And in this paper on page 775 at the bottom, with the heading "Road Safety is of Paramount Importance", you made reference to certain statistics of Citybus at clause 6(c), and you made this observation that the government:

"... appears to quickly attempt to justify the figures by stating that 'This is mainly because most routes ... by Citybus ... are plying relatively [busy] road sections in the urban area. It is thus more [likely] for accidents to happen. Notwithstanding, most of the accidents are mild in nature. They involved, for example, injuries arising from passengers losing balance inside the bus compartment or on the stairway, rather than collision with other vehicles'."

And you state:

"We do not concur with this paragraph given the paramount importance of bus safety. In fact, the consultation document has not included breakdowns, analysis and trends of accidents involving the bus companies to substantiate the statement. We consider it necessary for the document to first provide figures on the number of buses involved in fatal and serious

accidents, pedestrian accidents, multi-casualty accidents etc. Thereafter, risk factors should be discussed and feasible solutions ... and safety improvements under the new franchise."

So you expressed here that again what you have expressed similarly in the KMB, that you shouldn't look at one single parameter, but instead the consultation paper should provide more information on how the figures or the accident rates were arrived at; is that the point you were driving at?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. This is exactly the point. Because from the consultation document, it is obvious that it is far too simple. In my way of working, we need to look at historic accidents, and to learn from them. We also need to look at risk. Sometimes, for major risk, for example the bus falling off a cliff, these kinds of accidents do not happen all the time, but if it does happen, then the result can be catastrophic. So both historic accidents and risk we need to look at. But obviously the consultation document is far below my expectation. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In fact, you made a suggestion at page 776, the recommendation section.

You stated there:

"We recommend that past accident data and potential

safety risks of bus operation are further verified and studied in detail, with a view of identifying opportunities for improvements under the new franchises."

And you stated at the end:

"Consideration should be given to rewarding the bus companies for achieving pre-defined goals, such as reduction of certain accident types by 20 per cent per year."

And can I invite you to elaborate on this rewarding scheme that you are advocating?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think we discussed this point yesterday. It is a crude recommendation, but the whole idea is that we do not always talk about penalties, we also need to motivate and encourage bus companies and drivers to work together to achieve better safety.

As regards, for example, the reduction of certain accident types by certain percentage, I think this is also in line with the ISO 39001 philosophy I quoted yesterday, that we are looking to sustainable improvements of bus safety. In many of the discussions that I followed, it seems that the society, or government appears to be happy so long as the bus accident rates remain stable. For me that is not adequate. We want to look at sustainable improvements,

especially in line with the safe system, and also the current trend globally from UN, from WHO, that we are targeting at no serious injuries or fatalities, rather than having the figure stable, and we are satisfied.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may summarise what you have stated in this paper, at pages 777 and 778, you made similar suggestions as you have in the KMB submissions in terms of the bus safety standard, the bus safety bus fleets and also the bus stop, as well as the ISO 39001 standard. Can you confirm that?

First is page 777 at the top, recommendation on the ISO 39001 standard.

In terms of bus safety, in the middle, you made similar recommendation about comprehensive standard and driver monitoring system using modern technologies, including in-vehicle GPS and black boxes to be incorporated into franchise agreements.

And also page 778, the bus fleet bus safety suggestions which are similar to what we have seen in the KMB.

MR JULIAN KWONG: So Chairman, does the counsel want me to confirm these recommendations?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay, Chairman, yes. These recommendations remain valid. As for the ISO 39001, as

I mentioned yesterday, it is relatively new. For me that is certainly something to explore. My standpoint is always that we cannot impose something, and insist that something must be the right way to go. I would suggest that relevant parties, including government and bus companies explore this possibility, and whether this ISO would acceptable to them, whether they can implement them, or whether they would suggest equivalent standards which are in line with the same principles.

Where I see the value of this ISO is that it is set in a way that we give prominent attention to road safety management system involving the very high level, we look at sustainable improvements towards zero serious injuries and fatalities. It advocates plan, do, check, act cycle in line with other ISO standards.

But I understand there are many certification systems which companies nowadays have to follow, and sometimes I can understand some enterprises would consider that having a lot of certification, they to devote a lot of manpower, and ultimately we recommended this standard because we want to see a good result in terms of road safety.

We are not trying to advocate something which increases the workload, and perhaps it perhaps doesn't have an evident effect.

To conclude, I think these are all recommendations, but whether in the end that is practical, then I would invite the authorities and the bus companies to look at every recommendation in detail. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have seen this response to the public consultation. I'm going to take you to the SEC-2 bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, may I just ask you to revisit what is at page 776, your recommendation about considering rewarding bus companies for achieving pre-defined goals.

You went on to say that, understandably, there ought to be incentives for bus drivers, as well as bus companies.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We have received evidence that KMB and Citybus reached an agreement with the trade unions with this result, that as of 1 March, the bonuses that they allowed for, amongst other purposes, safety achievements, were amalgamated with what was called basic salary. So the bonuses became the salary.

If it be the case that that means that drivers no longer have a safety bonus incentive, what, if any, comment do you have to make about that?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I am not in a position to

comment on this.

In any case, whether this is an explicit bonus, or whether that is a penalty, after all, we want to see drivers voluntarily and happily seeing that it is their responsibility to drive in a safe way, and also according to the safety criteria we are advocating. That is a more complicated question as regard to the exact mechanism of how to reward them -- I can only say that that needs some study into whether we do achieve the results or not.

CHAIRMAN: As I understand what you were saying, is it is worth looking at incentivising bus companies but also incentivising drivers. If that has been removed, the bonus side of it has gone, is that a good or a bad thing? That's a simple enough question, isn't it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay, Chairman. This is the first time I learned about this. Let me have a think.

CHAIRMAN: Well, let me suggest that we take the morning break now, and you can come back to us in 20 minutes.

Is it a good or bad thing, to remove from drivers the incentive of a bonus for driving safely.

20 minutes.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

(11.29 am)

(A short break)

(11.49 am)

CHAIRMAN: So, Mr Kwong, is it a good or a bad idea to incentivise bus drivers?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, first of all I would like to say this is a good idea.

Secondly, I would like to point out that the reward will also need to be in other form, for example the status of bus drivers, and we certainly need to increase the status of bus drivers, because they are doing a very good job of providing service for our population, and day by day and year by year.

The last point I would like to make is that any rewarding scheme will need to be carefully worked out. For example, if we just reward drivers for having no accidents, say for the past month or past year, then is it the best way? Having no accidents could be due to luck, or having an accident may not be due to his fault, it may be due to somebody's fault.

So whether the reward should be based on, say, driving most of the time, conforming to the company's -- to the safety criteria we have been advocating, that would be a possible direction. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, do we have access to the material relating to, is it GreenRoad?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, we can pull that up on screen. Thank

you.

Mr Kwong, this is an article from the Straits Times that we extracted. And we can see, first of all, the title is "Tracker helps bus drivers to better their performance". I think it is a Singapore system, and if we roll it down, it is:

"The Tower Transit bus driver ... showing how his driving performance can be tracked and collated on a mobile phone app, which he can then review. A colour-coded panel in the bus will flash red, amber or green, according the driver's driving patterns."

So that's what we have discussed yesterday about a system where you can use a driver's app or driving habit to monitor the driving habit of a particular driver.

This is also based on the data extracted from the black box to analyse the data.

If we look at the article itself:

"The ... Anglo-Australian operator Tower Transit was prone to jerky stops and seat-sliding corning. His safety demerit score on the company's GreenRoad vehicle-tracking system was 165 last October -- more than eight times above the recommended 20."

And the system helps drivers -- not only for the company to monitor the driver's behaviour, but also

informs the driver as to how they behave by looking at -- each of them have their own mobile device.

So what do you say to this system?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I think this system would be a good reference, but exactly how we do it, then of course that needs further examination. But I think the whole idea is that we -- the system is trying to encourage drivers, and also to make them feel that they are good professionals, and then if they have been driving in a safe way, then they would be very well respected professionals.

I think I have no -- well, I am positive about it, but just that we should explore this in more details. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just for the record, we can see in the middle paragraph it started with the Tower Transit:

"Tower Transit said the GreenRoad telematics system had made the drivers smoother and safer on the road. Between last July and May this year ..."

Actually they have carried on this service for about a year:

" ... the system -- which tracks how a vehicle is driven in real time via GPS and sensors -- has significantly improved safety scores."

So it is not simply a one-off incident, they have

been doing this constantly, so that when I showed you the article I thought I should let you know about this.

The company has 750 drivers, for the record.

And may I go back to your submission on Citybus, at MISC-2, page 779.

We have been through this, but I just wanted to alert you to what you have submitted earlier on. It is the passenger information. And one of the things you suggested in Citybus in that paragraph, Passengers Information", is that most passengers would be content if they know the timetable of their buses.

And jump to the next paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the above progress, bus passenger information ... is not consistently provided."

Then you asked that there be more commitment to develop a modern integrated system:

"The lack of a modern real-time information system, at least for more major bus facilities, is far below the expectation for Hong Kong as an international city."

And you recommended that:

"Government negotiates with the franchisee a programme to initiate pilot projects and to develop a modern bus passenger information system."

So actually, the real-time bus information is part of the thing that you are advocating in relation to the

Citybus, which at that time has not been fully implemented.

And if we may look at your submission on what is the government's attitude towards the public views. And if I may take you to SEC-2 bundle, page 655.

It is a paper, public consultation paper on requirements of new franchises.

This paper was issued in December 2014, setting out the outcome of the public consultation on requirements of new franchises, in relation to Citybus franchise 1.

And at the bottom, paragraph 3, we see the public consultation was between 25 June and 16 September 2014. And the Transport Department invited views from the 18 district councils, the traffic and transport committees of the 18 district councils. Five district councils commented at their meetings. And over the page at paragraphs 4:

"A total of 47 submissions were received during public consultation. 18 of them were from political parties ... remaining 29 ... were from individuals."

They commented on three topics: service quality, fare concessions and government regulation.

And paragraph 5, the annex set out the major comments.

If we go to 657. Paragraph 3, it made suggestion on

bus safety. And one of the suggestions is:

"to introduce monitoring mechanism to strengthen monitoring on the driving attitude of bus captains ...

... to improve on-board safety facilities ...

... to improve the management on ... safety equipment."

That's the major view expressed from the public consultation.

If we go to the minutes of the meeting, that is in SEC-2-bundle at page 93 -- sorry, before I go to that, there is another LegCo paper. It is at page 700.

This is also a paper on the background brief. Summarising the major views and concerns. And if I may just take you to paragraph 16, page 703. The heading is called:

"Driving safety of buses of NLB".

That is in reply in paragraph 15:

"In reply to a question raised by a member at the council meeting of 29 April 2015 regarding the driving safety of buses of NLB [that's the New Lantao Bus] subsequent to an accident happened in early April 2015 ..."

And if you see at the bottom of the footnote this is an accident where the NLB bus nearly fell off the hill on its way from Tung Chung to Tai O. It was suspected

that there was a failure of the braking system.

" ... the Secretary for Transport and Housing ... said that all newly-recruited bus captains ... would receive training for three to five days ... and familiarise themselves with the bus ... routes ..."

And if we go to the next paragraph, it is the Secretary for Transport and Housing stating that:

" ... NLB had installed an electronic tachograph (commonly known as 'black box') on its whole fleet to record the operational data of vehicles to help monitor the bus captains' behaviour and investigate accidents."

So this paper is also touching on this black box requirement, as you can see from the Secretary for Transport and Housing's response.

And if we now go to the minutes of meeting on 17 July 2015, that's at page 937 of the SEC-2-bundle.

That's a minutes of meeting on 17 July. If we go to page 943, if you read from paragraphs 11 to 16, the focus is on the provision of service of real-time bus arrival information, and not so much on the bus safety or other issues explored in the public views.

Can you see that? If you take your time to read that.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you confirm that it is all about the

real-time provision of service of the real-time information to the passenger, and not on the topic about monitoring of drivers' behaviour as reflected in the public views.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman, I have been reading it on the screen.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you finished reading?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you confirm the statement that I made, that it is all about provision of real-time information, nothing about the bus safety monitoring of drivers' behaviour, in that regard?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, from what I have been reading, this text is mostly related to the real-time information system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's nothing to do with monitoring driver behaviour, is it?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, no. I cannot see any.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Finally, if we go to the LegCo brief setting out the terms and conditions of the new franchise for Citybus, it is in TD-3 bundle, page 570.

This is a LegCo brief setting out the new franchise conditions of the Citybus and New Lantao Bus, and if we go to page 572 --

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The date is 22 September 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if we go to page 572, paragraph 5, it makes reference, first, to Citybus, the service performance, and over the page, NLB. And then at page 574, the public opinion on bus service.

Down at paragraph 8 it sets out the new franchise conditions and commitments. Page 574, paragraph 8.

First, we see "Incorporating Franchise Conditions and Commitments of the Most Recently Granted Franchises".

And at the bottom:

"The government has secured the agreement of Citybus ... and NLB to accept fully the franchise conditions and service/facility commitments in the most recently granted franchises ..."

And in the section or paragraph 9 it sets out the new franchise conditions and commitments.

And it boils down to three. First, provision of real-time bus arrival information; second, fare concessions; and third, enhancement of regulation on bus service.

Paragraph 10 deals with the provision of real-time bus arrival information, but there is nothing there

about bus safety issues.

If you take your time to read that.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman, I cannot see anything referring to safety here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The third condition is the enhancement of regulation of bus services at paragraph 15, page 577. Again, there is nothing there about bus safety issues, or monitoring of driving behaviour.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes, that's true.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwong, if I may refer lastly, this is the last topic I'm going to take you to, to your document on 12 December 2014. That's in the MISC-2 bundle, page 780.

This is a letter that you wrote to the Secretary for Transport And Housing commenting on the scope of the public transport strategy study. Page 780, at the bottom.

You stated there, first of all, about the safety performance and risk of public transport based on published accident statistics.

And at the bottom you mentioned that:

"... the PTSS [that's the Public Transport Strategy Study] should examine all opportunities afresh to improve safety and quality of service."

You quoted some examples, and one of them is:

"Black box and GPS driver monitoring system ..."

You stated that there should be:

" ... systematic monitoring of driving parameters such as speed, acceleration, braking etc to reduce the risk of all types of accidents. Such system would be operated in conjunction with new protocols eg speed restriction on high risk road sections and urban streets, gentler acceleration/deceleration values etc."

You were advocating there amongst other suggestions about improvement on the black box and GPS driving monitoring system?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. That is basically consistent with what we have been recommending in many of the papers we have been submitting to government or LegCo.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Chairman, I have completed my questioning. Unless I can assist further.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, there is one matter.

We have a letter, do we not, that Citybus put in, in which they were asked to confirm their commitment in relation to this franchise. Can you bring that up on the screen?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

I believe that's CTB-3 bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 582 to 585.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I had in mind.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you see this, this is a letter from the Transport Department to Citybus concerning its commitment to provide real-time bus information. If you take your time to read this document, from page 582 to 583.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes.

Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So this letter made no reference whatsoever to the monitoring of drivers' attitude or the improvement on the black box requirement, or the GPS driving monitoring as you proposed eight months ago, more than eight months ago.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I would like to note that, for example, in clause (b)(1) the term "safety enhancement features for new buses", that may be relevant.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, clause what?

MR JULIAN KWONG: (b)(1), it is the top paragraph you are reading on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Clause 7?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Clause 7 of the new franchise. The point number (1), that has the words "safety enhancement features". So ...

CHAIRMAN: Set out in annex 2. Do we have annex 2?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe that's the document we earlier -- it is not in this bundle, or we have not been provided, but if we cross-reference to the earlier document, in TD-3. Page 614. TD-3, page 614. That's clause 7, provision of the facilities.

CHAIRMAN: Don't we have annex 3?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Not in this bundle, we have not been provided with annex 2 or annex 3. It is just the letter, and also page 586, the undertaking letter by Citybus.

But if we can cross-reference this clause with the TD bundle, we can find the relevant clause.

If we cross-reference to TD-3 bundle at 614.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And also 652, together.

Clause 7 is the provision of the facility.

Page 652, under clause 7, it sets out:

"The new sub-clause (1) empowers the Commissioner to require the grantee to acquire, provide, adopt, maintain or modify facilities, installation, fixtures ... on its buses to enhance safety ... including provision of barrier free facilities for the elderly and persons with disability."

So based on what we see, Mr Kwong, it has nothing to

do with the driving monitoring behaviour.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, I would like to say, these clauses are not precise enough. As far as our comments were made, so it is not something exactly coinciding with our expectations. Although we understand that normally in such a public consultation there are many submissions, and ours is only one of those. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That complete --

CHAIRMAN: Do we not have a similar letter from KMB where one has to see what was the commitment that isn't articulated in the franchise agreement, one has to look at the letter that is not a public document that passes between the bus company and the Transport Department?

Yes, it is on the screen now. This is what I had in mind. Can we scroll down to "Enhanced safety features". It is item (iii).

Is that at KMB volume 9?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that's the extract of the Transport Department's letter to KMB dated 10 March 2017.

Now, in relation to this, we can see that the KMB stated that under the enhanced safety features it simply -- at the bottom, (iii), electronic data processing device, and also the speed limiter, amongst other things.

So, in effect, electronic data processing device is

a black box. But apart from stating there the installation of this device, there is nothing specific about what information should be contained in this device, to monitor the driver's behaviour?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. These features quoted in the document, of course I appreciate them, they may be very relevant, and --

CHAIRMAN: They could be anything, couldn't they? Because we are not told what the enhanced feature is?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, yes. Everything can affect bus safety, but some are more important than the others, and I think this probably has not addressed some of our more major concerns.

CHAIRMAN: You were asking that there be real-time, automated monitoring of driving behaviour. And all we are told here is that an enhanced safety feature which this company has committed to is in respect of electronic data processing device, but utterly bereft of any stipulation whatsoever.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, that is true. That is lacking the reference for a monitoring system in conjunction with the development of safety criteria for bus driving. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: You have concluded your questions?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I have concluded my questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Mr Kwong, for coming yesterday and today to give us a lot of opinions.

I have do have two questions to seek your insight further.

The first one is regarding the Hong Kong different types of roads. As you can imagine, driving in New Territories is very different driving from driving on Kowloon side, or even the Hong Kong Island side. My question to you is, do you support further regulation or more clear-cut criteria to determine the type of buses to be driven on different types of road condition?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Mr Auyeung. Certainly, different roads will have different safety implications on bus driving. And I believe at this moment already there have been some considerations on which types of buses, the size, and also sometimes the features to be incorporated into these buses for using a particular road.

For example, as I understand, new buses using roads on Hong Kong Island, with the risk of having tree trunks causing damage or injuries, now they have metal bars, like a tree guard. On expressway, only on certain roads, an expressway, is it permitted to use the larger

size of the buses which can carry 148 passengers.

However, I think your question is showing a good direction, that perhaps we should look closer into this issue. Not only that we are looking to the type of buses in terms of size, capacity, and especially the length, we also need to look at it far closer. For example, I mentioned that rear-front collision is one of our major concerns, especially on high-speed road, because the upper deck front seat passengers cannot be protected by the seat belt alone if the bus collides with a container vehicle, for example.

So it seems that there needs to be much more elaborate thoughts on what types of buses should be allowed for certain routes, which is tied up with the risks we identified, both the theoretical risks and also the historic happenings.

Do I answer your question adequately?

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Yes, following similar thought, Mr Kwong, my second question is regarding comments you made earlier, that on narrow and hilly roads in Hong Kong, your recommendation was to reduce the driving speed, and also create more safety barrier. Would installing cameras produce similar results, in your thinking?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Do you mean cameras --

MEMBER AUYEUNG: To sort of deter drivers from

over-speeding, or even catching people for driving over the speed limit?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Theoretically, that is a possibility. I mean we are actually looking to a very simple objective. We want bus drivers to be particularly careful when they are passing through these critical sections of the road, because we cannot afford any bus, say, from falling off the cliff. To that aim, I think a camera can be a suitable measure, but bearing in mind that with current technologies, we can do it in a more efficient way.

So I think that would be my answer.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

MEMBER LO: Thank you. We learned a lot from you in these two days. You covered a lot of ground: bus design, road design, management and monitoring systems, and many deserve further investigation.

I'm just wondering in your mind, can you identify one or two items which is a low hanging fruit, if you will, that the evidence is clear, and which is also appropriate for Hong Kong. So what are these one or two things, that are very clear we should do it ASAP?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Professor. There are a number of areas which I have expressed I think clearly in all

these documents.

The most imminent danger, as I see, would be the critical sections: some sections say along Peak Road, to give you an example. A cliff of 20 to 30 metres high, and we have so many buses going to The Peak nowadays, and also coaches, school buses, minibuses.

I mentioned yesterday that certainly we need to have a safety barrier. But we also understand that many of these roads are historic roads, and there needs to be funding, adequate investment. The immediate measures would be to raise the awareness of drivers and to set up the controls we mentioned.

The second issue I would like to point out, as I did already, is to reduce the risk of rear-front collisions on highways.

That can also be done immediately, by raising the awareness of drivers. And especially to identify those drivers who have a habit to follow the vehicle in front too closely, especially if their bus route is on a high-speed road, including expressway or other rural roads.

And I think that can help to reduce the risk. Because we know that these would be the accidents usually resulting in multiple casualties.

Other measures, other type of accidents, let me have

a quick look.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes. Okay.

Can I refer to my submission which is in bundle MISC-2. It is actually my submission report on bus safety, page 784, because this would remind me of the accidents I am trying to refer to.

Okay, the first one, passenger losing balance, is most frequent.

Raising the awareness of drivers, that could be implemented fairly quickly, I would suppose. We cannot reduce all the risk, but at least we can reduce it reasonably.

The second one, collision with pedestrians.

So again, we have talked about regulating the speed of buses in urban areas, particularly targeting drivers who are habitually going at grossly inappropriate speed.

The last one, I think the Committee would be particularly interested is, in rollover. I would like to point out that there are many scenarios of rollovers. And I would like to draw your attention, in the same document but to page 796. So these are all rollovers.

Rollovers can be due to a number of causes: driving the bus too fast around a bend is only one of the causes. Another cause, of course, is dropping off

a cliff, that is clear enough. But there is another situation that a bus rises up the sloping end terminal of a safety barrier, and that already accounted for a number of bus rollover accidents in the past.

According to this table, the accident happening on 14 January 2017, the Citybus rolled over on Lei Yue Mun Road at Lam Tin, the casualty, yes, it's correct, one fatal and 19 casualties, and the bus actually was launched by the sloping end of the safety barrier.

You can see that there is another situation, similar accident, in 2003, 17 October. On West Kowloon Highway. Again, that is related to the sloping end terminal.

And again, you can see on 12 June 2015, yes, this one again launched by the end terminal of the safety barrier, but there was no passenger, nobody injured, and few people realised this.

So end terminals, we need to look at this issue. And especially on a highway. Because sometimes a bus driver driving too close to the roadside, and accidentally the bus went up these terminals, and it can lead to rollover. So this is another issue which we need to pay attention to fairly quickly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwong, if there are any other final matters that you want to address, please do so now, otherwise we will thank you for your evidence.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman.

Actually, in the past two days I think what I need to express has been expressed.

I would just like to clarify some of my opinions in order that the concept and the idea is clear.

The first one relates to what I mean by highway, and what I mean by the urban road network.

Also in terms of Chinese, highway is (Chinese spoken), and urban street network, I would call it (Chinese spoken). We talk about having lower speed limit, and mostly we have been talking about the urban street network, or urban road networks, because we are talking about 30 kilometre per hour or 40 kilometre per hour speed limit.

I want to make it clear that yesterday I did not imply that highways should be subjected to such speed limit normally. Highways are roads linking urban areas, so usually there is a higher expectation.

The second point I would like to raise is that speed limits have to be reasonable and be consistent with what drivers expect, and what they perceive the environment.

So it is a very sensitive issue. And I do not wish to give the impression that whenever we find a problem then immediately we turn down the speed limit to a value which may become not quite reasonable.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps in that context you might like to explain the 85th percentile approach to a speed limit.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, thank you.

We have a number of concepts in traffic engineering pertaining to speed. The main idea is that the speed of vehicles is not a single value. Usually we have to determine the speed profiles. That means, say, we look at 100 vehicles, and we would obtain the value we call it 85th percentile speed. For example, if the value is 48 kilometres per hour, the meaning is that 85 per cent of the vehicles are going at or below 48 kilometres per hour. And at the same time, 15 per cent of the vehicles go at a speed higher than 48 kilometres per hour.

But I would also like to say that 85th percentile speed is not the only value we are looking at. According to the document which the chairman quoted yesterday, the document entitled "Setting Local Speed Limit, 2013", issued by the Department for Transport of the United Kingdom.

In this document actually they are advocating the use of average speed. Average speed is clear, meaning that, say, we have all the 100 vehicles counted, and we have the average of the speed. So they are not using 85th percentile speed anymore to determine speedy. They are now actually using average speed.

The idea is the average speed probably reflects what the majority of sensible drivers wish to travel at, the speed which they want to travel at.

The significance is that if we use 85th percentile speed, then it may not be in favour of, say, pedestrians. If we use average speed, that can be a better solution.

Up to now I presume that in Hong Kong we have not been discussing this very important point enough. It will have a major implication of how we should set speed limits.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the reference to where average speed is addressed in this document?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you, Chairman. Can I first get the bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us which document you are looking at?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is SEC-3, page 1003.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, may I draw your attention to page 1014.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Clause 35.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would be kind enough to read out the relevant part.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman. It states that:

"Mean speed and 85th percentile speed ... are the most commonly used measures of actual traffic speed. Traffic authorities should continue to routinely collect and assess both, but mean speeds should be used as the basis for determining local speed limits."

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would read on at 36.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes:

"For the majority of roads there is a consistent relationship between mean speed and 85th percentile speed. Where this is not the case, it will usually indicate that drivers have difficulty in deciding the appropriate speed for the road, suggesting that a better match between road design and speed limit is required. It may be necessary to consider additional measures to reduce the larger than normal difference between mean and 85th percentile speeds or to bring the speed distribution more in line with typical distributions. The aim for local speed limits should be to align the speed limit to the conditions of the road and road environment."

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, should I continue?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Thank you. As you can see, speed limits, it has a lot of considerations based on sound traffic

engineering considerations. I do not wish to go into too much into this, but just to point out that this document would be a particular reference if we want to explore this subject in more detail.

And after that, I would just like to clarify a few other points.

The first one refers to speed humps. I would like to quote the Chinese name. I would consider speed humps to be (Chinese spoken).

Another name is (Chinese spoken). The meaning of this is that speed hump is a physical measure, that it protrudes above the ground. And we have other concepts, like rumble strips, or transverse markings. And these would be more or less visual -- for the markings, they are more or less visual measures. That means the drivers will not actually experience the uncomfortable feeling if they go at too high a speed over a speed hump.

I note that in some of the reporting that the speed hump was translated as (Chinese spoken). So that is in relation to my answer to the counsel yesterday, whether there should be a speed hump on Tai Po Road, and I was more on the conservative side yesterday, because I sensed that you were referring to having a physical measure above the ground, which can be 12 centimetres

high. That would be a (Chinese spoken), or a (Chinese spoken), in Chinese. A speed hump.

But of course I am open to any ideas. I would like to clarify that according to my experience on main highways, usually we do not provide a speed hump as a physical, as such. Because if a vehicle approaches it too fast, then there is safety concern.

But sometimes we do provide speed humps on a main road, subject to certain conditions. Usually we would first convert the main road, the main highway into a special section. Because the main road is passing through a village or residential district. So I only want to clarify that I do not want to dismiss a proposal, say, by a district councillor, in a simplified way in this meeting. I'm open to any ideas. But just that there needs to be study in detail.

Just two more points.

Red light speed cameras can be a possibility in future to enhance road safety in Hong Kong.

In Hong Kong in the urban areas we have a lot of red light cameras. These cameras can only determine if a car jumps a red light. But imagine if the car passes through the signallised junction on Nathan Road, passes through a green light at 80 kilometres per hour. These cameras cannot enforce the law, because they only catch

the drivers who jump the red light.

In countries like Australia, they have combined the function of the red light camera with the speed camera. So the same camera will catch drivers who either jump a red light, or who is adopting excessive speeds.

If the driver jumps a red light and at the same time the excessive speeds, he will get two tickets. In Australia this technology is called red light speed camera.

And I understand that the supplier of these red light cameras in Hong Kong, they already can have the speed enforcement function incorporated into the same cameras. Of course subject to further study, I think that would be a very good solution, in addition to any lower speed limit we propose, to enhance the safety of urban streets in Hong Kong.

The last point I would like to clarify refers to the bundle MISC-2. Page 808.

Referring to this photograph, Chairman was very interested in this, because we have always been discussing about the possibility of vehicles or a bus falling off the cliff. And yesterday, I have expressed the point. We have been raising these questions for a long time, sometimes letters, but sometimes we just post it on our website without notifying anybody. And

I also raised it through the district council.

I believe that government has paid attention to this issue and over the years, there are many similar issues on our roads with safety problems. Some have higher priorities, and some have lower priorities, and I would like to acknowledge that government has been paying attention to many of these issue, especially on bridges. Because after the accident on Tuen Mun Road, many of our bridges have been --

CHAIRMAN: You are referring to 2003?

MR JULIAN KWONG: Yes, Chairman.

That is the continuous programme. I would just like to acknowledge that since then, and over a long time, our bridges, which is also another source of potential catastrophe, have been equipped with safety barriers of adequate protection.

And also we discussed that there is a new consultancy by government on road safety hazard. And our organisation is aware of this consultancy, and it appears it is exactly this consultancy which is going to address this particular problem.

The last point I would like to make is that probably many of these problems are on existing historic roads, and certainly that needs adequate funding for improvements, rather than using the funding for regular

maintenance or small-scale works.

Certainly, I think we would be in a position to continue addressing these issues and to draw the attention to stakeholders and government.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: If I may say so, Mr Kwong, you have timed your conclusion perfectly. But we thank you for your evidence, we will now adjourn these proceedings, and resume at 2.30, when we will receive the evidence of Mr Alok Jain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for all the time you spent assisting the Committee in providing your evidence.

Thank you.

MR JULIAN KWONG: Chairman, thank you very much, it is a pleasure, and also thank you to the counsel and all the supporting staff and the members. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 2.30 pm.

(1.00 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

EVIDENCE FROM FORMER KMB EMPLOYEE: MR ALOK JAIN

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MR JAIN: Very good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Jain, for accepting our invitation

to attend to give evidence to assist this Committee in its considerations of the factors relevant to our making recommendations to enhance bus safety.

I'm going to ask Ms Wong to begin asking you questions.

MR JAIN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Examination by MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Good afternoon, Mr Jain. Thank you for coming. I'm counsel acting on behalf of the Committee, I'll be asking some questions in relation to the safety features of franchised buses.

May we start off with some introduction.

Mr Jain, you have made two submissions in response to the letters from the Committee to you. The first submission you made is dated 25 May 2018. That is in bundle FE-1, page 39.

The second submission, we can find that also in the same bundle, at page 44, dated 18 June 2018. I'll be asking questions based on the two submissions that you have made.

If I may set out your background, first, Mr Jain, you have provided us with a curriculum vitae, and the curriculum, or the CV, can be found at page 46-1, bundle FE-1.

Mr Jain, you are currently the managing director of

Trans-consult Asia, a management consulting firm, specialising in traffic and transport advisory, new technology, data analytics and clean fuel technologies.

Is that correct?

MR JAIN: That's correct, counsel.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe you have worked in the MTR Corporation in Hong Kong, or the KCR Corporation for 12 years.

MR JAIN: That's correct, counsel.

CHAIRMAN: Can we have the time period, please.

MR JAIN: I joined them in 1997 and I left them in 2008.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to your CV at page 46-5, it set out, I believe, the period and the work -- and your position at the time you worked for MTRC and the Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation. It is stated there as 2006 to 2008, as general manager, marketing, transport division, correct?

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Over the page, 46-6, you mentioned something about the development of a real-time passenger information display system.

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to that, can we establish Mr Jain's academic qualifications.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Mr Jain, can we go to your academic qualifications

at page 46-8.

MR JAIN: Should be in the back, actually.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 46-8. It is right in the middle. Academic qualifications and professional training.

Mr Jain, I believe you obtained a bachelor of engineering, civil engineering, from Indian Institute of Technology in India.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then in 1994, I believe you obtained a master's programme, also on transportation engineering from Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In 2005 you have taken an integrated management course for senior executives, in the Richard Ivey School of Business.

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Those are the academic qualifications you have done. I believe you are also a member of the UITP.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you explain a little bit about this organisation?

MR JAIN: Sir, UITP is actually a French acronym for International Association of Public Transport. It is based out of Brussels and it has close to 1,000 members, over 100 countries, and in Hong Kong MTRC, and KMB --

KMB used to be a member, I'm not aware if they are still a member, but MTR is a member of UITP.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we may go back to the page where we talked about the MTR Corporation, where you referred to the development of a real-time passenger information display system. 46-6. Right above the year 2004 to 2006, there is a paragraph stating that you led the conceptualisation to the implementation of a real-time broadcasting system which was winner in best networking category and best lifestyle category.

That section. Is it in relation to the development of that system for the MTRC?

MR JAIN: This was KCRC at that time, yes. And this was known as Newsline Express.

CHAIRMAN: What information did the system deliver?

MR JAIN: Sir, this was basically in-train on-board television screens which provided infotainment which included programming, news, as well as passenger information.

CHAIRMAN: What kind of passenger information did it provide?

MR JAIN: On a normal operational day it would provide what is the next station, and some educational messages about, you know, watch for the platform gaps, stay away from the doors, and things like that. During non-normal

operations days, when we had an incident, this means was also utilised for directing passengers in the right direction.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That was in 2006 to 2008?

MR JAIN: That was when I was heading the marketing department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And then if we go to page 46-3 you were the --

CHAIRMAN: 46-3? Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You were employed as --

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, I'm not sure if it is your microphone or the angle you are at the microphone, but the sound is muffled when it comes from your direction.

Can it be moved around? Is it volume sensitive?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe I'll raise my voice. Is that better?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Jain, if you look at page 46-3, it relates to your employment at Kowloon Motor Bus, and you were employed as the head of planning and development between June 2013 to December 2015.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then you were promoted to be the deputy operations director between January 2016 and December 2016.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your CV I believe you also stated that you spearheaded research and development work on implementation of technology, data analysis, and SMART mobility.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we see that?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is --

MR JAIN: Those are the areas I'm working on -- I mean, I these days work on.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe I'll find the reference in due course.

But you were also Associate Professor in institutions in Hong Kong.

MR JAIN: Assistant Professor, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Professor of what?

MR JAIN: I have been teaching in Urban Planning Department in Hong Kong University.

CHAIRMAN: Over what period?

MR JAIN: I started teaching in 2004, and I still do some part-time subjects. Guest lectureship.

CHAIRMAN: What is the ambit of what you teach?

MR JAIN: Public transport operations and planning, primarily.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You set out your academic engagements at page 46-8 at the bottom, stating that you are part-time Assistant Professor, Department of Urban Planning, Hong

Kong University, from January 2007, to present.

MR JAIN: That's what I just mentioned.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The earlier reference, Mr Chairman, is at page 46-1. At paragraph 2. The last line:

"He spearheaded the R&D work on the implementation of new technology, data analytics and SMART mobility."

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, what is "SMART mobility"?

MR JAIN: Primarily use of technology in transport operations.

CHAIRMAN: Is this in the period 2013 to 2016?

MR JAIN: That's correct. Primarily up to 2015. Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you explain a little bit more on the use of technology in transport operations? What does it cover?

MR JAIN: So I was involved in the early discussions for real-time operation management system, the telematics, I also led a contract, which never completed, which was about putting this data analytics platform within KMB. SAP was our consultant at that time, and we were putting the whole data into one platform, creating a data warehouse and data extraction system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. I believe you are currently a consultant for the Land Transport Authority or undertaking consultancy studies for the Singapore Land Transport Authority; is that correct?

MR JAIN: I have not been directly engaged by Land Transport Authority but I'm working with a consulting firm advising LTA.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and what is the scope of the advice?

MR JAIN: I'm bound by confidentiality rules there, unfortunately. But it relates to public transport operation and management.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It relates to public transport operation?

MR JAIN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And Mr Jain, may I now go to your submissions. Your first submission dated in May 2018, dated 25 May 2018, in FE-1, page 39.

Mr Jain, in your first submission at paragraph 2 -- you started at page 39 explaining your involvement in KMB as head of planning and development department, and the scope of your work. I can see that it includes "technological applications in relation to our activities and data management".

That would include the telematics and real-time monitoring system you referred to.

MR JAIN: Not precisely. Telematics and real-time operations management system had two aspects, one was the hardware part of the services -- three aspects, hardware part, software part and the data handling part. And I was primarily involved from the data handling

perspective.

CHAIRMAN: What was the hardware? What was that?

MR JAIN: The hardware was supplied by Openmatics. This was a telematics device which was being installed on the buses. And then at the back end, the ROM system, which was the software aspects of data extraction from this telematics device, and putting that into a real-time operations management system, and the third part was how to analyse this data and then extract intelligence and knowledge out it of.

CHAIRMAN: Let's deal with them one at a time.

Hardware, Openmatics, what was the equipment? Take it slowly.

MR JAIN: Well, it is commonly referred to as a black box in common parlance. This is --

CHAIRMAN: What was its technical name?

MR JAIN: It is a CAN bus system which is something, as far as I understand, which sits on the engine, connects to the engine, collects all the operational information about the bus, vehicle performance.

CHAIRMAN: What kind of data?

MR JAIN: It has speed-related information, acceleration, deceleration, braking, tilting, fuel consumption, location.

CHAIRMAN: What was the name of the model?

MR JAIN: I can't recall the name of the model.
CHAIRMAN: Software. What was the software?
MR JAIN: The software at that time, the intent was to develop it in house and it was termed as real-time operations management system. ROM for short.
CHAIRMAN: How was it to work?
MR JAIN: So telematics device was supposed to transmit data on a near real-time basis to back end OCC, operation control centre, and this ROM system was supposed to translate this data into understandable or comprehensible format, and then there was a platform for data analytics which will then allow us to analyse all this data and create, put it into our planning parameters when we were doing the bus route planning, scheduling, rostering, and all those things.
CHAIRMAN: Where was the operation control centre?
MR JAIN: The intent was to incorporate it into Lai Chi Kok Centre.
CHAIRMAN: How was the data to be transferred from the telematics to the operation control centre?
MR JAIN: It was over a GSM network using the mobile technology basically, 3G technology.
CHAIRMAN: That's the system that mobile telephones used?
MR JAIN: That's correct, yes.
CHAIRMAN: So that is the software side of things. And then

finally, what was to be the data analysis?

MR JAIN: So until then, a lot of data in KMB was residing in silos in individual departments. They were collecting -- for example, engineering information was available in engineering, operational information was available in the operations department, and they were all in different systems. The plan was to put this all into a single data warehouse and create a single version of truth.

CHAIRMAN: What use was to be made of the data contained in this single data warehouse?

MR JAIN: So there were three stages. The first stage was to establish the static, what is real, what is happening on ground. The second stage was to put into some level of modeling, where we could use it for planning purposes, in short term. And the third objective, eventually, was to take it into a predictive level, where we could apply statistical tools and do some forward projections.

CHAIRMAN: What use was to be made of the first step, the real time?

MR JAIN: That was primarily for management information purposes, as well as for any investigations, reporting, so on and so forth.

CHAIRMAN: Investigations into what?

MR JAIN: For example we used to receive a lot of passenger complaints about services, we could go back and look into the data and verify that information.

CHAIRMAN: So if the complaint had been made that the bus had been driven at an excessive speed and braked harshly, could that be investigated by analysing the data that had been put into this single data warehouse?

MR JAIN: Potentially, yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's a response to a complaint. Was there any plan to use the data proactively?

MR JAIN: So the second stage was where we went into real-time operations management system, because once we built the data models on the historic data we could translate the similar level of information and analyse on a real-time basis, and the idea was of course to monitor the whole operation on a real-time basis using what we normally call an exception management, where anything that goes beyond the threshold of normal operation you start to actively manage it.

CHAIRMAN: How was it envisaged, if it was, that this approach could address the manner in which a bus was doing driven?

MR JAIN: For example, if any bus that was being driven beyond the parameters that were set as normal operation, then it would raise an alert, and normally the

companies, or examples that I have seen around the world, they use this green, amber, red approach. So green is normal operation, anything that goes on the outlines of threshold boundaries it starts to raise the alert as an amber, and then of course once it crosses, it is a red alert. So at that time some intervention is necessary.

CHAIRMAN: Was it envisaged that this alert raised by a parameter being breached would occur real-time?

MR JAIN: The intent certainly at that time was that.

CHAIRMAN: When did discussions about the use of telematics in this way first begin in which you were involved?

MR JAIN: The discussion regarding this started most likely before I joined. But when I joined the company in 2013 in my early part of the involvement we were already discussing this. So I can't remember the exact date when it started.

CHAIRMAN: Who was involved in such discussions?

MR JAIN: At that time -- the senior management was involved, my immediate superior was the transport development director, he was involved. IT department was involved, operation department was involved.

It was done across the company, multiple departments were involved into that discussion.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You said a lot of people were involved. Can you give us an estimate of how many people?

MR JAIN: I think every different meeting had different number of people. It is not like a constant, but as I said, the departmental representations were -- these were the key departments who were involved in these discussions. There were quite a few, sizeable amount. Sometimes it used to be, depending on the issue, it could have been three or four people, or it could have been 20 people.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In any event, as you said in evidence, it was intended that the Lai Chi Kok Centre to put in all this data to be analysed by different departments' personnel; is that the idea?

MR JAIN: The idea was Lai Chi Kok would be the real-time operation management centre, the operation control centre, the data analysis was not necessarily at Lai Chi Kok Centre, it would be company wide.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it is simply a centre to keep the information, or do you mean the real-time monitoring would be carried out in the Lai Chi Kok Centre?

MR JAIN: Yes, real-time to be carried out at Lai Chi Kok -- so this was more of screens and visualisations of where the buses are on a real-time basis, and of course data is processed through different servers and different

processes within the organisations so data was meant to be available to a lot more people within the company.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I can go to page 40, FE-1 bundle, paragraph 2. You mentioned in paragraph 2(a) about this real-time operational management system. And in (a) you mentioned you were:

"... involved in many meetings and discussions about the technical specifications, features, technology selection and so on in relation to ROM right after I joined the company."

But you were not involved in discussions related to funding, tendering and project management.

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it the case that throughout the time you joined the company until the time you left, you were involved in this ROM project?

MR JAIN: I wouldn't say until the time I left, but during that period when it was being discussed as a part of implementation process, yes, I was involved in the project very actively.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And I notice in (i) of that paragraph (a) you stated that the primary reasons to implement the project were to improve safety through real-time alerts and feedbacks to bus captains.

The feedbacks to bus captains, can you tell us

whether it is intended to be real-time feedback or a reactive feedback to bus captains after the complaint has been received.

MR JAIN: There were two things that happened. The idea was to develop a two-way communication system between the bus itself and the operation control centre, and the bus drivers were supposed to have what we call a DDU, driver display unit, and through this DDU there are two ways to intervene with a driver. One is done at the bus level where the bus, you can pre-programme the parameters that bus -- any time transcends, it creates an alert for the driver.

The second level of alert could be triggered by somebody sitting in the operation control centre. Let's say, for example, if a bus is running too fast, but still within the speed limit, and the on-board device does not detect any anomaly. However, at the OCC, a supervisor detects that on a particular section the bus driver, probably because of weather conditions or because of any accident or road conditions, they should be driving slower, then a supervisor can technically intervene and alert the driver or remind the driver to go slow in that section.

So there are two levels of interventions that can be done.

CHAIRMAN: On the second intervention, that is the supervisor in the OCC, how would he communicate his intervention to the driver?

MR JAIN: So we had many options being discussed at the time. We were talking about just a display system. The second was we were also talking about an audio system.

CHAIRMAN: So there were two possibilities. One was through the display system or otherwise by audio?

MR JAIN: Well, display was almost there, and audio was considered as an additional possibility.

CHAIRMAN: Was audio going to be by radio or by some other means?

MR JAIN: Primarily by radio, or even 3G communication. We had not gone that far, I think, at that time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned there were many meetings or discussions about this ROM features. Can you recall if there are minutes or documents recording what was discussed?

MR JAIN: There were a lot of presentations, if I recall, and there were e-mails post meeting summarising what was discussed, the key agenda, or key tasks to be done by respective people. But as formal minutes, as we know them, I cannot recall if they were prepared.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: These presentations of which you say there were

lots, were they in writing?

MR JAIN: These were PowerPoint presentations.

CHAIRMAN: On computers?

MR JAIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Not on paper.

MR JAIN: Primarily on computer, PowerPoint presentations.

CHAIRMAN: Who made the presentations?

MR JAIN: Sometimes IT department, sometimes operations department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us who in the operations department would be responsible for compiling these presentations or materials?

MR JAIN: Who in the operations?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Or --

CHAIRMAN: If you can't remember say so, but if you do, tell us.

MR JAIN: There was a dedicated team of people in operations who were working on this. They left the company. I can't recall the name immediately. But there was a central team in the operations department, traffic department, which was looking at it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is called the traffic department?

MR JAIN: It was called the traffic section.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Traffic section in the operations department?

MR JAIN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned in paragraph (b) in line 3:

" ... the telematics data was still available even after the scrapping of the project, there was some level of monitoring but the real value of ROM system was 'real-time' and that capability was sacrificed."

Now I would like to ask you this. What do you mean by "some level of monitoring" here?

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to it not being implemented, can you tell us how it came about that all this planning stopped? What happened?

MR JAIN: I was not involved in those discussions about scrapping this. But I do understand that ROM, because it was being developed in-house, it was running behind schedule.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR JAIN: And that had caused some level of -- I'm looking for the right word -- some level of frustration within the company why we are not keeping up to the schedule, and then it was later announced that we are not going ahead with it anymore.

CHAIRMAN: Was this technology in any way linked to anything else that was being developed or used on the buses at that time?

MR JAIN: We were talking about a number of things that

could happen on the buses. We were talking about having real-time transmission of fare collection information. We were talking about automatic people counters on board the buses, we ran some trials with some university professors on WiFi detection. Ultimately the idea was we could detect how many people were on board the bus, where they were on the bus, and then we could provide this information in advance to the passengers, so they knew whether they could get on the bus, or whether they can get a seat on the bus or not.

CHAIRMAN: Was there a system developed perhaps prior to when you arrived, of giving estimated time of arrival of buses?

MR JAIN: That capability was developed during my time. Actually the trial was launched in, if I recall correctly, 2014, last quarter, and then eventually it was rolled out in early 2015.

CHAIRMAN: And the equipment that was necessary to develop that system, was it in any way relevant to the ROM system?

MR JAIN: It is actually the same equipment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So it was another use of the data that was obtained?

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you recall who announced or who

conveyed the decision that the project would be scrapped?

MR JAIN: Nobody announced, as such. But when we knew, as I said in my letter, when Lai Chi Kok, the OCC, the facility was converted into office space, then it was kind of -- the message was clear. There was no formal announcement as such.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Okay.

MR JAIN: I cannot recall any formal announcement.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. About this real-time system, was it part of the function to monitor the driver's behaviour in their performance?

MR JAIN: Among other things, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reason I mentioned this is you mentioned GreenRoad, about different scorecard system. When you were thinking about this ROM system, or in your discussions, was this one of the ideas that your company at that time initially wanted to implement?

MR JAIN: That was certainly one of the intents.

Sir, in fact, when I mentioned improved fuel efficiency, this was directly linked to what we call eco-driving, green driving. There were a number of names you could call it, it is the same thing.

The idea was you could somehow nudge the drivers to drive in a better way on the road by creating some kind

of a system where we could give them the feedback about how they are driving and whether they are outliers or whether they are falling within the normal pattern, or whether it's good behaviour or bad behaviour, and you could nudge their behaviour in a specific way without penalising them, and that would eventually yield some kind of fuel efficiency, because fuel efficiency is directly linked to acceleration and deceleration.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. You mentioned about penalising them. What about rewarding them?

MR JAIN: At that time we didn't really go into details of this. The idea was not to penalise, that was certainly clear. And that was the kind of conversations we were having, but we were trying to generate the data how we were going to reward or whether we want to monitor. Those mechanisms we had not gotten around to.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, but that idea was certainly conveyed during one of the meetings?

MR JAIN: Yes, we discussed those ideas, we discussed actually many possibilities at that time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes --

CHAIRMAN: Did you discuss what parameters to stipulate?

MR JAIN: Basically we were looking at London as one of the examples at that time, and the way London does it is they basically look at all the -- they call it

incidents, and anything that goes into the outliers of those thresholds, which is behavioural response such as acceleration, deceleration, braking, tilting, then the driver would get an incident on their record. And the less incidents they had, the better performance it would be considered for the driver.

CHAIRMAN: But did you consider stipulating excessive speeds at a certain level, or excessive braking or acceleration at certain levels? Did you condescend to that detail?

MR JAIN: We didn't put in the numbers, but we were trying to do a bit of statistical analysis, and at that time it was still being debated what kind of threshold or parameters or standard deviations we needed to look at.

Some discussions that did happen was about whether we should have a general blanket rule around the whole network, or whether we should define them on a route-specific, road-specific manner. Again, we were having those kinds of discussions.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned about route-specific manner. How do you pick the routes?

MR JAIN: Every route has different characteristics, whether they pass through traffic junctions, whether they pass through TST urban area, whether they are on highways, so the behavioural responses are different on different type of routes. So there are more chances for a driver

to brake hard on a stop-and-go kind of environment where they are pulling in and out of lay-bys quite often and they have to watch out for other traffic, whereas on a highway those incidents are much less.

We were discussing at that time what is the best equitable way to define these parameters which could meet the expectations of the management as well as deliver real value in the end without upsetting the drivers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I go back to your paragraph (b) about there being some level of monitoring even after scrapping the project. What level of monitoring are we referring to?

MR JAIN: As I understand, telematics data are still being used but they are being used most as a post-event, or T plus 1, on the next day, or after the event has occurred.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So reactive rather than proactive?

MR JAIN: You can say that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It also mentioned that the real value of the system is real time but that capability was sacrificed. So is what you are talking about reactive to the complaint rather than proactive --

MR JAIN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- in that sense?

MR JAIN: So data is available real time, but nobody is analysing this data in real time or reacting to this data in real time or quasi real time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR JAIN: It is the kind of -- whether you can have a 20-second response or a 24-hour response.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In paragraph 3, starting from line 2, you refer to:

"Even at the time when KMB was drawing up the plans, we were drawing heavily on the experiences from Seoul, Singapore, London ..."

And just on this, what experiences are you drawing from these countries?

MR JAIN: So just before I joined, I understand that KMB senior management went on a study tour and they visited all these cities, they looked at the systems, and when we were designing -- we were having these meetings, we were extensively talking about what Seoul is doing, what London is doing, the best practices, and how we can adopt this best practices to bring to Hong Kong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you quote an example? Like what experience are you deriving from Seoul or Singapore?

MR JAIN: For example, Seoul had done this central traffic management centre, TMC, and that was something that was -- our idea of doing at the OCC level, operation

control centre level. Transport for London were actively managing their drivers' behaviour using telematics advice. That was something we wanted to bring over. So we were looking at different examples and how they could translate for our environment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And when you discussed or when you had all these meetings, can you recall if it involved any participation of the Transport Department? Or did you relay the message that you are planning to do this with the Transport Department?

MR JAIN: I cannot recall exactly whether Transport Department was involved in any of this discussions, but I do feel that they were aware of what we were planning to do, because we made in those days a lot of public presentations to various chambers of commerces and all that, and we were talking about the future direction of KMB on how technology is going to transform the company.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You made a lot of public presentations?

MR JAIN: Me as well as other senior management of the company made on lot of presentations and we talked about these things.

MS MAGGIE WONG: "These things" is the ROM system?

MR JAIN: ROM was one of them. Estimated time of arrival, we were talking about, which was all centred around telematics device.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So in all these public presentations, you are saying some Transport Department people were present?

MR JAIN: I can't answer that authoritatively, but I would say this was public knowledge in a way, because we were not really trying to keep it under closed doors, so we were making public presentations.

CHAIRMAN: What you are saying was this was being disseminated widely and you would expect Transport Department might have heard about it?

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I move on, because you made some references to this centralised management system, can I take to you a document. It is SEC-2 bundle. It is page 822.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, I'm going to ask that we take a short adjournment, I would like to see if we can address the sound system, because we are getting a very muffled sound from Ms Wong, I see Mr Jain has the same difficulty. It may be the location of the speaker or we may need to swap the microphone.

May I ask that we address it and take five minutes. Feel free to leave the room if you want to, Mr Jain, but we will take five minutes. Thank you.

(3.15 pm)

(A short break)

(3.22 pm)

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Jain, I'm going to refer you to the Information Note by the LegCo. It is "Franchised Bus Services in Seoul and Singapore", and it is in the SEC-2 bundle at page 822. It starts at page 822.

If we go to page 823, that's the start of the Seoul system. And over the page at page 825, paragraph 2.8 --

CHAIRMAN: Before we get there, what is the date of this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This document was made between 2014 and 2015, although it does not actually bear a date. It is a research paper done by the LegCo Secretariat. But you can see the IN05/14-15.

MR JAIN: At the back it is dated 3 February 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at page 825 it talks about the establishment of the bus management system at 2.8:

"To coordinate bus services on a comprehensive and system-wide basis, the Seoul Metropolitan Government has established a new bus management system ... using advanced intelligent transport system technology ... GPS terminals installed in every bus allow a central bus control centre to monitor all bus locations and speeds,

adjust the number of buses travelling on any given route, communicate with bus drivers, and provide real-time information to passengers waiting at bus stops or checking bus schedules on the Internet."

Mr Jain, is this the system that you were referring to earlier on?

MR JAIN: It was a similar system, but if I may correct some of the things here. GPS terminals can't on their own allow all those things that are mentioned here.

GPS is just a location-based system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR JAIN: So it has to be more than GPS, which usually is telematics. So I'm not sure whether they are referring to telematics there, but ...

CHAIRMAN: So GPS tells you where you are?

MR JAIN: Just the location.

CHAIRMAN: Then you need telematics to tell you speed or deceleration, acceleration?

MR JAIN: That's correct. The actual vehicle-related performance comes from an on-board device which is usually a telematics system. And telematics systems range from very simple type of devices to complex devices. Openmatics, the one that we are referring to here is quite a sophisticated one. But you can get a much simpler cheaper version of that device which can

just give you basic information about the vehicles. There are a lot of those available in the market too.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Openmatics model Mozart mean anything to you? Openmatics model, telematics, called Mozart?

MR JAIN: The only Mozart I know relates to music. I have not heard of that, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: What about Bach? He is also a musician. Does that mean anything to you in terms of Openmatics?

MR JAIN: No. At that time we only referred to as Openmatics or telematics.

CHAIRMAN: Have you been invited to read the evidence that we received from the ZF engineer?

MR JAIN: I received it, Chairman, but that was late at night yesterday, and I didn't get much time to go through that.

CHAIRMAN: We have been told about two models that they produce, in the wrong chronological order. The first one was called Mozart, and then the second one was called Bach. In musical terms that is the wrong way around, isn't it?

MR JAIN: I can think of quite analogy to those things. The data they produced looked a lot like musical notes!

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Jain, since we are on this Mozart and Bach business, can we go to BM-1, page 64.

This is a letter by a law firm acting for ZF, and Openmatics, to this Committee. It is a submission. The submission starts --

CHAIRMAN: Just give Mr Jain a moment so that the document can be put before him in paper form.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Jain, if you would turn to page 65. This is a reply by Openmatics to the questions raised by this Committee, and black is the question, the answers in blue are the answers provided by ZF and Openmatics.

If you look at the second paragraph it made reference to the fact that:

"Openmatics entered into a supply contract to deliver telematics systems, dated 16th of April 2013 with Kowloon Bus Company ... and Long Win Bus ..."

So we can see the date there is April 2013. I believe that's prior to the time you arrived.

MR JAIN: That's right. I joined in June 2013.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and they continue by stating that:

"Openmatics starting offering telematics services by using the first black box system called the 'Mozart Box'. Later on ... replaced ... by a successor platform black box called the 'Bach Box'. However, clients can use both systems in parallel as KMB does."

Mr Jain, I know you don't know much about the name of the black box system, but have you seen, during the

time in one of your discussions, one of the black boxes? Was that shown to you? The actual physical black box? Was that shown to you?

MR JAIN: I can't recall, no.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. So would it help if I showed you the photo? Would it remind you --

MR JAIN: But having said, I have seen black boxes. I have seen the device.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR JAIN: Not exactly by Openmatics in KMB context, but I've seen the device.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You have seen one, yes. And if we go to the next page at 66, it made reference to a driver feedback system, and the thresholds set by KMB for that vehicle, and it set out certain acceleration rates, deceleration rates and tilting angle and certain configuration of speed and speeding areas.

Do you know much about thresholds in this telematics system, Mr Jain, or setting up of thresholds?

MR JAIN: Well, one thing that stands out to me is tilting angle here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, why?

MR JAIN: That it is an outlier.

CHAIRMAN: The bus is already falling down, isn't it?

MR JAIN: That's right. 44 degrees is beyond control.

CHAIRMAN: So it is intended not to give any alarm?

MR JAIN: Possibly.

CHAIRMAN: You set a position that is beyond purpose.

MR JAIN: That's correct, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the deceleration rates?

MR JAIN: Is this a global parameter or is this route specific?

CHAIRMAN: I think we are to assume it is global.

MR JAIN: I would assume that 2.3 in a sloping situation would be considered acceptable because that is sometimes needed in Hong Kong. On a flat road possibly this would be too much.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. And if we go to page 68, right above paragraph 4, there is a reference to the Openmatics -- what the Openmatics system installed at KMB can identify. It states that it can identify records of speeding recorded every second and stored together with the related GPS data. Malpractice of harsh braking --

MR JAIN: I'm sorry, I cannot locate where you are reading.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 68 -- I'm sorry about that, Mr Jain, the blue section, if you see the third paragraph:

"The Openmatics telematics system installed at KMB ..."

Do you see that?

MR JAIN: Yes, I have read it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. It says:

" ... can identify:

Records of speeding; recorded every second and stored together with the related GPS data;

'malpractice' of harsh braking;

Abrupt acceleration;

The corresponding bus registration numbers with the assistance of other systems

The Openmatics telematics system installed at KMB cannot identify:

Route numbers of certain buses.

The data are collected as defined by the system. Every second, the system collects the defined data and sends that data every 30 seconds -- if connected to Wi-Fi or to ... the defined FDP server. The information is also stored locally on the telemetry unit (black box) for 30 days."

I would like to ask a few questions about this system installed at KMB being able to identify the four matters.

Are these the four matters that in one of your discussions that you have explored as part of your real-time monitoring of the drivers' behaviour?

MR JAIN: As far as I understand, the telematics device

gives you the speeding -- not speeding data, but the speed data.

Also it gives you the braking performance, which you can define as harsh or non-harsh. But what you define them as are configurable parameters, whereas the data generated are the exact data from the device that are performance-related data.

Similarly, acceleration is given by them, but what is abrupt or what is non-abrupt are configurable parameters.

This is my understanding of their device.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, and we have seen that illustrated on a previous page where we see the data parameters that have been put into the machine, including that non-performing tilt angle.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the clients can choose the parameters?

MR JAIN: So technically, these parameters can be route-specific, can be location-specific, and also you can design your thresholds based on specificity of a particular route or a particular road section, rather than having a global parameter.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, so you could define your threshold depending on where the bus is?

MR JAIN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, you know where its latitude and longitude is, you know that puts it in a 50-kilometre per hour zone, and you put a threshold at whatever you might decide, perhaps 55, but when it goes into a 70 zone, you put another value, 75, perhaps.

MR JAIN: Absolutely, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So in all these meetings you were discussing about these parameters and the capability of what the black box can do?

MR JAIN: That's correct, yes. What we were discussing at that time is how best to utilise this information to improve safety and improve the operation the performance.

CHAIRMAN: As you said, this had a monetary incentive because if you drive in a better fashion, you don't indulge in unnecessary acceleration, you don't brake, you come to a stop gently, then you use less fuel.

MR JAIN: Absolutely, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the second matter I would like to ask is this 30 seconds. According to this information, the data can be collected every second, but in here, the system only collects data every 30 seconds.

So this is also --

CHAIRMAN: No, it transmits data every 30 seconds.

MR JAIN: But that is also a configurable parameter. You

can have a constant stream of data, or you can do every 10 seconds, every 30 seconds, or you can even not have that transmitted.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that was the effect of Mr Kulis' evidence, which you have yet to read. But that was what he said, that you can configure this as you can the other things.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's what you earlier said, that's the benefit of the real-time capability that was sacrificed.

If I may go back to your submissions at FE-1, page 40. And we were on to these countries that your company at that time was deriving experiences from.

You also made reference to New Zealand, the GreenRoad.com where reference was made to bus companies having the advantages or benefit of the system and, in particular, halving of incidents of poor driving behaviour. And it also states that the accidents from collisions fell by half, while accidents caused by bus drivers plunged by 70 per cent.

At that time was this matter or this GreenRoad system discussed in one of the group meetings?

MR JAIN: Not exactly. This information is something that came to my knowledge only I think last year.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Last year?

MR JAIN: And I have quoted it here.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may show you an article about

GreenRoad.

It is the article dated 12 July 2012, making reference to GreenRoad as "a leader in driver performance and safety management".

And in the second paragraph it states that:

"GreenRoad has already --"

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of this document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 12 July 2012.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In the second paragraph it states:

"GreenRoad has already reduced driving risk 60 per cent for the 70 buses in London where it has been in use by 110 drivers since 2010."

And then jump to the next paragraph:

"Using mobile and cloud technology, GreenRoad helps drivers self-improve. It provides drivers with instant feedback about their manoeuvres using the traffic light LEDs on the dashboard as well as detailed analysis and recommendations for drivers and depot managers."

This system was set out in your paper, but at that time was this -- because I see the article is dated 2012 but wasn't explored, was it, in one of your meetings?

MR JAIN: Not exactly this company, but I think the concept that is mentioned in this article, we are certainly aligned with these concepts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go back to your submission, FE-1, page 40, paragraph 4. It made reference to the scrapping of the project. And you also stated that:

"One of the fundamental changes in management after 2015 was that instructions and decisions were seldom documented and often reversed arbitrarily without discussion or consultation with other internal stakeholders."

Internal stakeholders, who do you mean?

MR JAIN: I mean people working in various other departments.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Over the page, page 41. You mentioned at paragraph 2:

"Due to the specific nature of questions ... are specific to KMB, but a lot of what is happening in the franchised bus industry in Hong Kong is also a direct result of systematic problems such as outdated regulatory framework, lack of open competition, lack of adoption of technology, lack of transparency, and a ... [the] relationship between the regulator and the franchisee."

So you have identified five problems here.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get involved in the details, you used the word "systematic "', but in fact do you mean "systemic"?

MR JAIN: Yes, that's correct. Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The first one is the outdated regulatory framework. Can you elaborate on why you consider the current regulatory framework outdated?

MR JAIN: The regulatory framework that is prevalent in Hong Kong at the moment, I think that was adopted decades ago. At that time, the technology for monitoring various things didn't exist. Now, we have obviously gone to a much different level of data that is available from operations. We are talking about artificial intelligence, autonomous buses and all those things. The current regulatory framework in Hong Kong does not really allow for anything that is something that fits into the norm of 20/30 years ago.

For example, autonomous vehicles is a classic example. If any bus company in Hong Kong would like to introduce autonomous buses, the regulatory framework or the legal framework does not even exist, whereas other cities have gone ahead and adopted or they have modified their systems or regulatory frameworks, to allow for these innovative new ideas or innovative practices. Hong Kong still lacks those things.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Which cities are we talking about?

MR JAIN: We are talking about China, Singapore, Dubai, Abu Dhabi, a lot of cities around the world have adopted or

reformed their regulatory systems to adopt open data framework, they have reformed to allow for autonomous test trials, e-bus, electric bus, solar buses --

CHAIRMAN: Just dealing with autonomous vehicles, is the point you are making this, that in Hong Kong you are required to have a person in a vehicle, and it can't be driven by a computer; is that the point?

MR JAIN: That's one. Second is if you want to put any kind of vehicle on road in Hong Kong it has to go through a type approval process, and the type approval process itself does not allow anything beyond, I would say, post-war specifications.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is more concerned about the nature of the bus. In terms of regulatory framework, what about the black box system? Do you know much about how one or whether one knows anything about what can be installed in the black box system for buses? I think in Hong Kong it is completely lacking. What about, in your experience, in other countries?

MR JAIN: I think it is more of a norm these days, rather than exception. If we go to any of the developed cities, they are very widely adopting a telematics system, places like even Turkey, I was there and Turkey has these things in place. European cities, they all have telematics devices on board. Again, going back to

Singapore, Dubai, Seoul, Tokyo, all these cities which are very comparable to Hong Kong, high public transport usage, they are adopting telematics devices and it has yielded significant benefits in terms of operational performance and efficiency.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and we have touched on regulatory framework.

The second complaint is about lack of open competition.

Can you elaborate on that?

MR JAIN: For example I would look at Singapore, and quote that example. In Singapore they were running their bus system almost in an identical manner to the way we do in Hong Kong until 2012, 2013, when they started looking at reforming the bus operation in Singapore based on the changing environment of public transport.

And at that time they looked at it and they realised the bus operation in its present form in Singapore was unsustainable, and they completely changed the model and adopted a new regulatory framework, which has now brought in much better services, much better performance, a lot of innovation, and they have, I would say, assumed leadership in bus operation at least in this region at the moment.

That is the kind of thing that has happened because

they have opened the market for international players to come in, and participate in the process, and bring in best practices from around the world.

Once you have no competition in Hong Kong, we have been working with the same operators all throughout without any risk of them being -- there is nobody upsetting the apple cart here, which means that those incentives to bring innovation, incentives to bring efficiency, don't exist. And that is what I mean here with the open competition.

CHAIRMAN: By that, do you mean that Singapore invited tenders to run bus routes, and that produced competition, and new international players, as it were, came in to run buses in Singapore?

MR JAIN: That's correct. I'll give you one example of a company called Tower Transit there. Prior to Tower Transit coming into the market, in Singapore they always complained about driver shortage -- because of the same reasons as we quote in Hong Kong.

Today, Tower Transit has surplus application of people who want to drive their buses.

CHAIRMAN: How has it achieved that?

MR JAIN: Because they have adopted a completely new type of HR engagement, human resource engagement with the drivers, and I have visited their depot, and it is

a very pleasant experience, where literally everybody greets everybody, it is a flat management structure, and drivers consider themselves to be really part of the whole delivery process.

CHAIRMAN: That is Singapore?

By contrast how would you describe Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: In Hong Kong, I would say that it is a very "us and them" mentality. The management thinks the drivers are an entity which is troublemaker, which is always asking for this, and asking for unreasonable things, whereas if you ask the drivers -- and I'm a qualified licensed bus driver, and I can tell you the drivers think that the management people who sit in this air-conditioned office know nothing about bus operation, they are the ones running the whole show.

You can see there is a lack of mutual trust there, and this is what I mean, we need to reform this industry, make sure this industry is attractive, for people to come and join as an employee, and of course also need to understand that this is something which becomes the fabric of the city. Bus operation is moving -- KMB moves 3 million people in Hong Kong, total bus operation is about 4.5 million people.

And if we can't address these issues, this is, if you ask me, we can buy the best buses, but if we can't

have the proper good drivers to run these buses, the whole exercise is futile.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Since you have touched on it, what is your opinion or assessment of the quality of the buses and the way in which they are maintained, generally, in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: I would rate it quite highly. I think the Hong Kong buses are very well engineered, they run for 17, 18 years, and even at the end of their life they are in a very good condition.

CHAIRMAN: Because they have been maintained properly?

MR JAIN: That's correct, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about training? The drivers' training?

MR JAIN: There are two aspects of training. One is the classroom training. The second is the motivational aspect of training. And I do feel that, and I have looked at documents that have been submitted in the first lot, which were sent to me last Friday, and it is a fact at that there is a lot of effort people are putting, ticking a lot of boxes in terms of number of hours, this and that, there are enough manuals there, but the motivational aspects of training where people feel part of the company -- one fundamental aspect of

service quality is where the employee considers it's not just his job to deliver a service, but it is his duty to deliver a service. And I think that is the kind of level that one needs to transcend in terms of training, which personally I feel is lacking at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: You spoke of the contrast with Singapore with competitive tendering. What is the position in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: In terms of?

CHAIRMAN: For tendering for the renewal of franchises. What happens in Hong Kong, compared with Singapore?

MR JAIN: In Hong Kong, there is -- first of all, I have not seen any tendering in last 20 years. And two, whenever there is a renewal, usually the approach that our regulator has taken here is to say: this company has been performing well, hence we should renew their franchise. Whereas they have not really looked at benchmarking the companies on what is happening internationally. Are we up to the speed to the international level of innovation, international level of efficiencies, and can we push or nudge the existing operators into that direction, or bring new players into the market which will eventually uplift the whole game?

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the next complaint you said is lack of adoption of technology.

We have heard one example about telematics. Apart from that, what other comments can you make about this?

MR JAIN: In terms of technology, we are now talking about -- I'm currently involved in a study of artificial intelligence, use of artificial intelligence in public transport, I'm doing that on behalf of UITP, and I can tell you the kind of things people are doing in bus industry are superb. In Singapore SMRT has developed a system called Prolearn. What they do is they have installed cameras in the buses and they collect all the real data points of individual driver behaviour on the road and they predict which driver is going to have an accident.

And then they customise that learning process for that driver, so the driver is retrained and avoids that accident.

So it is an intervention and prevention process in the safety management that has drastically reduced -- now I have the figures with me. If you want I will be happy to provide those, but they have significantly reduced the incidents that the driver would otherwise have on the road because of this training system.

It is just a simple data collection and training system for the driver.

CHAIRMAN: Are these figures compiled by Singapore's Land

Transport Authority?

MR JAIN: This figure was -- I have -- I came to know of these figures in Germany when SMRT CEO was making a presentation.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would be kind enough to provide them to the Secretariat.

MR JAIN: Absolutely.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was this study carried out?

MR JAIN: The study is ongoing at the moment, as we speak.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And can I understand correctly, is it a system that you have collected all the data, and then making analysis and prediction that certain drivers are prone to accidents, and then that driver will be picked out for retraining?

MR JAIN: Yes. Before they have an accident.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR JAIN: So this is just one example. The second example is predictive maintenance, automation in the depots, so a lot of hazardous processes in the depot could be automated.

So a lot of companies are doing a lot of things around the world to uplift these technological aspects of operations.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since we are on technology, may I ask you about a few other equipment or technological devices.

One is called electronic stability programme. Have you heard about that?

MR JAIN: Yes, I have.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How do you find that programme?

MR JAIN: I mean, it is something which certainly enhances the vehicle performance, especially on roads where it would have a higher tilting and those things, so it is basically an electronic device which will change the centre of gravity of the bus, or adjust the centre of gravity of the bus. So yeah, it certainly enhances the vehicle performance, no doubt about it.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps a short way of dealing with this would be to take Mr Jain to the working group paper on this. The Transport Department have told us that in March of this year they convened a group made up of franchised bus operators and bus manufacturers, to consider a range of technological advances. And this is being done at some haste because it is apparently going to be able to report this month. And they set out the various matters being looked at.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That is in TD-1, page 98. That's the Transport Department paper.

Mr Jain, if we look at page 98, it sets out from (a) to (f) certain technology, or safety devices that the working group has been exploring.

CHAIRMAN: If you have the paper version in front of you, if you go to page 94 and have a look, you will see how this is explained by the Transport Department. As you can see, the paper is entitled "Application of New Devices or Technology on Franchised Buses".

Then we get a history of what they have been looking at.

But this working group was set up in the middle of March, I think it was, of this year, to examine these matters, and as I have told you already, they are doing so in some haste.

MR JAIN: Chairman, I think it is a good initiative by Transport Department, but I think what triggered was something that should not have triggered this. They should have done this nevertheless. This is what I mean about being a bit outdated on these aspects, where we are reacting to things instead of acting in advance and being proactive about this.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Paragraph 10 refers to a number of on-vehicle safety devices that have been explored. The first one is the electronic stability control and roll stability control.

At paragraph 12, this particular device is elaborated on. And we can see how the braking system

helps steer the vehicle on its intended track. But in terms of the use of this device, is it widely used in the world so far as your experience is concerned, or at least in Singapore?

MR JAIN: I think in the new buses that they are purchasing, this is certainly there. I'm not very sure whether they have retrofitted the older fleet of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look at the second suggestion at page 98, it is "Capping the maximum speed at [70 kilometres per hour] on downhill by the speed limiter".

It was elaborated on at page 101 that this is also reactive to the 2003 Tuen Mun accident. And it states at paragraph 17 that:

" ... the speed limiters are in-built systems of modern buses geared to the electronic engine management system. The setting or activation of the speed limitation function is controlled by a software ..."

Then in the last line:

"In a free rolling situation, the vehicle speed is not determined by engine revolutions or gearing but rather by the force of gravity acting against the rolling assistance of the vehicle."

Then:

"The three bus manufacturers have initially advised

that it is technically feasible to engage retarder to slow down a bus when the speed limit is over 70 [kilometres per hour] under the downhill situation."

So my question is this, Mr Jain. Hong Kong's geographical condition is quite unique because we do have a lot of steep downhill roads, and if one is setting, for example, the telematics to 70, configuring the speed limit to 75km per hour, it would mean that when the bus is driving downhill it would be much faster than 75. And this suggested solution by using speed limiter, how would you consider this suggestion, or what is your comment on this?

CHAIRMAN: Before you answer that question, isn't the speed limiter set at 70 kilometres per hour?

MR JAIN: It can be set at any speed --

CHAIRMAN: In Hong Kong, isn't that what is required?

MR JAIN: That is right, yes. 70 is the maximum that is allowed under the Road Traffic Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN: I think the question is this. If you are going down a steep hill the vehicle can go more than 70. Because all that is happening under the current system is your fuel is being starved.

MR JAIN: That's correct. If you asked my opinion this is a device that is of course needed in Hong Kong. Retarders, if I recall correctly, retarder was almost

evented in Hong Kong 20 years ago because of this downhill issue where a double-decker bus was coming down the hill and, if I recall, there was an incident on Hong Kong Island because a bus could not stop in time and it just went into the junction.

Having said that, in these modern times, again, there are systems which can go beyond this, as in not just 70 kilometres an hour, they can be dynamic limiters. Basically you can geofence the areas where the bus speeds can be regulated to the road speeds.

So in a 50-kilometre zone the speed limiter can set itself to 50, whereas in a 70-kilometre zone it would limit itself to 70. So you will not have a situation where a bus can still drive at 70 in a 50-kilometre zone.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think that's the next proposal suggested by the Transport Department about speed control by GPS, or geofencing.

MR JAIN: Yes, that's what -- yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But we know there are certain problems about geofencing or GPS in high rise buildings.

CHAIRMAN: In roads surrounded by high rise buildings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: On roads surrounded by high rise buildings.

Do you know if there is any recent technology where this problem can be solved or rectified or ameliorated?

MR JAIN: Some of these are addressed by having multiple data sources to capture the same information.

GPS is one source. And sometimes in bus operation, because we are running fixed-route operation, you know exactly where the bus is going, and you know the number of turns that the vehicles are making, you can do a process called dead reckoning.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the number of revolutions of the wheel?

MR JAIN: Yes, of the wheel. So you know the exact distance of the wheel, you know the exact route, so even if you don't have a GPS position, you can literally work out where the bus is.

CHAIRMAN: By dead reckoning?

MR JAIN: By dead reckoning. That's one way of doing it. The second way is -- because all the buses, because of the telematics device, they already have a 3G device on board, you can also use the GSM network and using your telecom towers to locate the bus.

So GPS is only one point of reference, the second point of reference comes from the GSM device.

And, as I said, dead reckoning could be your third points.

Once you have three data points you can triangulate and you can with a high degree of confidence tell where

the bus is.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You raise a point that with this technology you can actually adjust the speed in the telematics programme. If you have a digital map, if the -- we know that the Transport Department has a digital map of the speed limits of the whole territory in Hong Kong. Can you combine the system of the digital map with the telematics system so that the system itself can automatically adjust the speed limit without the operators configuring it, but automatically it would adjust its speed limit based on the location where the bus is?

MR JAIN: Theoretically the answer is yes. But you will need to built that infrastructure of communication between TD and the bus operators, whereby any changes by the Transport Department on the speed of a particular road would be automatically transmitted and goes into the system.

I would say the possibility goes even beyond that, because bus operation is not always directly correlating to the traffic restrictions imposed, speed restrictions imposed by the Transport Department. There are sections in the bus operation, and I can tell you, where the drivers are trained to slow down because it is a black spot, because the visibility or sight lines are poor.

Even in those sections you can limit the speed of the buses without affecting the rest of the traffic.

CHAIRMAN: So you could fit in variable thresholds depending on where the bus is, depending on, one, the legal speed limit, but two, the exceptional limit that you, the bus company wants the bus to have as a maximum going around a particular bend, or whatever it is?

MR JAIN: If it is a sharp, 90-degree turn, you can actually limit the speed to 20kph or 30kph for those turns.

CHAIRMAN: Then you could generate an exceptional report if there was an infraction of any of those various thresholds?

MR JAIN: That's correct.

There are two ways of doing it, one is you can limit the bus not to even cross it. So even when the driver tries, it just does in the work.

The second is you can allow the driver to drive at a higher speed but you would generate an exception report and then take a post-event action.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of this digital map that sets out the speed limits that are imposed in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: I do understand that that is available in the public domain, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Even before I asked you, you already knew about this digital map?

MR JAIN: Yes, I think it is public knowledge, as far as I know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

The next device they suggested is the collision prevention device, which is at page 103, and Mr Jain, may I refer you to the comments made by the franchised bus operators at paragraph 26, which is at page 105.

The last line:

"In sum, the FB operators do not consider that the installation of collision prevention and lane-keeping devices are effective for enhancing the safe operation of FB services."

And the first question I would like to ask is, Mr Jain, do you know whether it is common to use this collision prevention device in the world?

MR JAIN: The answer is yes, it is common, I think it is a very relative term. But it is used in many places. But I would also say that I would disagree with this statement here.

We are tending -- I mean, what I'm hearing right now, are we are looking at this technology as something which is very static, which means it is a one-size-fits-all, whereas I completely agree, you know, I just had a quick glance at paragraph 26, and I agree that in certain situations in Hong Kong, because

Hong Kong lanes are very narrow, the traffic is very close to each other, these devices would become a nuisance in a way. But today, the technology allows us to customise this device, make them even self-learning devices. If you know how artificial intelligence or machine learning systems work, every road, section by section, you can define parameters and road conditions and you can set the alert levels accordingly.

So you don't have to apply exactly the same alert levels on the highway when a vehicle is travelling at 70 kilometres an hour, to a vehicle when it is running at 30 kilometres an hour in Nathan Road in a stop-and-go situation. So, you can apply different parameters of proximity. Or you can even deactivate at 30 kilometres an hour because you know the type of accidents it would -- even if it has, it won't be fatal, but at 70, the fatalities could be very high.

There are different things you can set, which could be completely dynamic based on the section of the road, the route, the type of the bus, a lot of things you can do, even the number of passengers on board the bus.

CHAIRMAN: We have been referred to a paper produced by Citybus in 2014 after they had a trial of, I think, they called it Mobileye.

MR JAIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Have there been developments since 2014 to date in this kind of technology?

MR JAIN: Chairman, if I can resort to some rhetoric, the world has changed since 2014.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the last device that was mentioned --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could -- have you been referred to this paper before, the Citybus paper?

MR JAIN: In fact, during my KMB period I -- I have not referred to this paper, but I met Mobileye people at that time. We have had meetings with them. And I have seen at that time -- I think they also did a trial with KMB, but that was prior to when I joined, if I recall correctly.

CHAIRMAN: It might help if you just glance at the report, because -- we take what you say, that the world has changed since 2014, but perhaps we can refer you to where it is.

MS MAGGIE WONG: CTB-3, page 601.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the question really I'm inviting you to answer is this. Having seen what the concerns are in that report, are these concerns that are now addressed by the developments in technology?

MR JAIN: I had, again, a quick look at one of the numbers which I would consider the most relevant here. It is

the accuracy of Mobileye. When I look at that table, even the unions say that the accuracy was 69 per cent.

Anything which is 69 per cent accuracy and can save lives, I would look at adopting that system and fine-tuning it instead of abandoning the system.

CHAIRMAN: So your answer really is, as with other devices, you can now configure variable thresholds which would make the technology of use; is that how you would put it.

MR JAIN: Precisely. Because there are two things we look at in these aspects, one is the severity of the collision and the frequency of collision. So, severity at high speed is much higher, the frequency may be lower. Whereas in urban areas, you can have more frequency, because the proximity is higher, but the severity is much less.

This is part of the risk management exercise that a bus company should adopt. So every time you introduce a new route -- and this is the part of safety culture, safety management systems, that the bus companies need to adopt, where they can look at the data which is coming from various devices, as well as the traffic conditions. So it is a part of the risk management in advance.

If it is a more stop-and-go, the number of traffic

lights are more, the speed is less, the risk profiles are different from when the bus is running on a highway, unhindered at 70 kilometres an hour.

So in operating terms these are two different buses, two completely different types of things.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And as you said, the technology has moved on since this report. So now, as far as you understand, this technology has been moved on so that you can customise the fittings to configure it to make sure it is less of an annoyance in busy streets. Is that what you are telling us in terms of this device?

MR JAIN: That's correct. And if you look at the kind of trials that are happening in the autonomous device world -- so in fact there is a journey to autonomous driving, which is called level 1 to level 5. If you look at levels 3 and 4 of autonomy, these are really not autonomous vehicles, these are still driver-on-board, but there are so much assistive technologies to the driver that the driver is really there to do manual overdrive. So he only intervenes in exceptions.

At level 4 the driver is literally basically watching out. He is not driving/driving, the bus drives itself. At level 3, the driver drives, but there is so much assistive technology he has in terms of proximity detection, in terms of any hazards, a lot of

pedestrians, for example. So all these cameras and sensors they are actually providing you the information to adapt to a particular environment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and the next device is the driver monitoring device. It appears to be quite a new device in terms of detecting unsafe behaviour. That is at page 105, and it states:

"... unsafe behaviour like dozing, drowsiness, bad posture".

Then we see at page 105, that at least two operators advised that they would install a similar system and do a trial from early May 2008.

Mr Jain, my question is this. We know in Hong Kong that drivers drive a long period of driving hours. This device is intended to detect drivers who are fatigued.

Is this device commonly used in the world? And how effective is this device throughout the world?

MR JAIN: I have not seen a very widespread use of this device yet. But I am aware of a number of trials that are happening.

In my opinion, this technology is still at the evolutionary phase. It will eventually come, certainly, it is not perfected yet. Because there are a lot of false positives that it is generating, which makes, I would say, a situation -- it has the potential to make

a situation worse than making it better. Because it alerts the driver at the wrong time, sometimes, and it distracts them from focusing on driving, because too many false positives can distract you.

Having said that, there are three technologies that are working here. One is a camera-based technology, which is looking at the driver's face and detecting the micro-expressions on his face. The second is one that comes into the category of variables. There are variables which are like glasses, like Google Glass, which look at their cornea, the dilation, and movement of the eyes. And the third is you can wear it like a watch.

So there are multiple types of technologies being tested. I'm pretty sure in a year or two, we would see some convergence, we will see some success there. However, at this moment, I have not seen very widespread operational deployment of this.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Apart from these devices mentioned, do you have any other suggestions --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. You will be aware, no doubt, of the tram accident in Croyden in 2016, where the findings were that the driver had fallen asleep having started work early in the morning. Are you aware that Transport for London recommended that one of these

anti-drowsiness cameras be deployed. I think Guardian. Are you aware of that?

MR JAIN: Yes, I know.

CHAIRMAN: So that is one of the deployments of the technology, but there are not very many, is that what you are saying?

MR JAIN: I know this was deployed, but I'm not sure of the success in terms of data that is coming, whether this is really a success story or not. Because if you are dealing with 40 or 50 per cent of false positives, that gives you technology fatigue, so you tend to ignore the technological interventions, which is what I meant, yes, the technology is there, but it has not yet come to a convergence where we can have the confidence of 95, 97 per cent on this.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In terms of the technological devices mentioned in this paper, do you have any other suggestions from your experience that may be useful in terms of ensuring safety of bus driving in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: There are N number of good examples around the world which are being deployed at the moment, people are testing, trying. Artificial intelligence which is, to me, a progression of good data analytics system. You take it to the next level, machine learning, and then

you take it to the next level, where you bring it to an AI-based system, more predictive.

So basically, what it does, let's say hypothetically in this Tai Po incident, if the bus was tilting -- even before it starts to tilt, driving behaviour, it would detect a very minute level of data and it would create that intervention framework. It would even tell the supervisor what kind of prescriptions, it would provide the prescriptive information to the supervisor on what kind of intervention is necessary.

So what we are doing now is we are removing a lot of human factors from these things. Because many times what happens is supervisors are making split-second decisions and sometimes it is affected by their emotions, personal state, psychological state. Once you have these AI-based systems -- I wouldn't say they are very intelligent systems, but they are very rational systems. So they give you very rational advice and that allows you to act in a much accurate manner, in a way.

This is the new frontier that has opened, and a lot of companies are working in these areas, they are going towards operations, customer interface, engineering, safety, security, all these areas you see very widespread adoption of these technologies now.

CHAIRMAN: So this use of technology would enable

a supervisor to pick up, or rather the data would be presented to him, in exceptional reports, excessive braking, excessive acceleration, speeding, more excessive braking, a pattern would be emerging, and the supervisor could intervene real time.

MR JAIN: Yes, I would go a level ahead of this. Because currently the supervisor in a normal ROM system I described, he sees whether a bus is an outlier, what it does, what the AI kind of system does -- I mean, our human brain can process only a few variables, and mankind has also evolved in a way that we can learn, unlearn and relearn, whereas an AI-based system never forgets anything. We tend to forget, they never do.

So what it can do is it can look at the conditions of the vehicle, the conditions of the road, at that time what kind of weather conditions, prevailing weather conditions are, what kind of traffic conditions are in the surrounding, and what kind of driver characteristics are, and it can bring all these parameters into one framework and customise a response for that situation.

So we are talking about not just bus speeding, we are talking about before a bus even speeds it can do a risk assessment based on all these parameters and create an intervention framework.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Intervention framework in a sense that the

system takes over, or it would simply inform the supervisor?

MR JAIN: It can even tell the driver: be careful today, it rainy, there is a lot of traffic, a water pipe has burst at this particular section, so don't drive above 30 kilometres an hour. You know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Okay. Got it.

So it is informing you in advance how to drive?

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the next complaint you made is the lack of transparency, and a hand-in-glove relationship between the regulator and the franchisee. That's at FE-1, page 41.

The lack of transparency and the relationship between the regulator and the franchisee, can you explain a little bit on the transparency?

MR JAIN: Lack of transparency, when I wrote that, I meant a lot of data not being in the public domain. I can relate to a personal example. I was standing at a bus stop near my house, it's a reliable bus service, and I had a bus coming on my app in two minutes' time, and the bus came and went on my app, and I never saw the bus.

And there is no way I can go back and check and no way I can verify this kind of information so I can write

a complaint -- and I have written quite a few complaints about bus services in my area, and usually what I receive, and I classify them as cooky cutter responses, they are very standard responses "We are looking into it", "We constantly review it", but nothing is changing, and that is what I mean, that because there is a lack of transparency, what is actually happening is something that as a customer, I am at the receiving end most of the time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Compared to Singapore, can I ask this: about all these technological devices that were suggested to be put into buses, would the government in Singapore give any subsidy directly or indirectly towards the improvement in adding this new technology to buses?

MR JAIN: So in Singapore the current model is that government buys all the buses. So the asset belongs to the government and it is given to the operator to operate. The operator is held accountable to very stringent KPI, key performance indicators, and if they exceed those indicators there is a mechanism for incentives. So that perpetuates itself into an investment in innovation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: By keeping the asset of the buses, they control the technology or the standards of the buses by

doing that, or are there any reasons behind the Singapore government having all these buses purchased?

MR JAIN: So the reason for them to purchase buses is actually not relevant to technology or anything. They wanted to create a different kind of model and their objective was to at that time run buses more from a social perspective rather than commercial perspective.

I'm not sure whether you want to cover that aspect of their reform. But as far as the technology is concerned, the government defines the baseline technology, which means these are a requirement as a part of the franchise, but then they also offer incentives to the bidders to exceed these parameters, and that's where the innovation comes.

So base line is there. So on-board devices, giving data streams directly to their OCC or central control centre, those things are defined in the contract, those are requirement.

CHAIRMAN: In the franchise agreement?

MR JAIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that the case in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: In Hong Kong the definitions of these are very loose, I must say. We call that a light touch regulation, but which means that the parameters are so wide that there could be a high degree of manipulation,

which is what I mentioned in my letter as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At page 41, you mentioned about lost trips, reporting system has gaping holes which allow a very high degree of manipulation. So my question is: how would this lost trips reporting system affect the safety aspect of the operation of buses in Hong Kong?

MR JAIN: This is not related to the safety, I must say.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Okay.

If we go now to your second submission dated 18 June 2018, page 44.

You made reference in the first black bullet about Hong Kong lacking a central traffic command centre --

MR JAIN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- which can monitor the real-time operations of all transport operators. So what you are suggesting is the government itself should have a central traffic command centre. But in what way could it monitor the real-time operations of all transport in Hong Kong given the volume of buses in Hong Kong and the number of operators? How would you suggest it operate?

MR JAIN: Counsel, actually, I would make reference to the paper you have shown earlier about Seoul and Singapore. If you refer to that, there are two levels. One is a bus management system, and then there is a central traffic management centre, they call it GMS or

something, I can't remember.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, perhaps we could refer Mr Jain to that.

MR JAIN: That's exactly what I'm talking about. At the bus operator level you have a bus management system which is looking at the bus assets, whereas at the central traffic control centre you are looking at bus as an asset, but also its interactions with the rest of the transport system, rest of the traffic, traffic lights, the road infrastructure, all kinds of things which is really in the public domain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may refer you to the SEC-2 bundle, page 825, paragraph 2.8 makes reference to a new bus management system, but in this case, it is a central traffic command centre. So what you are suggesting is apart from the -- there are two levels, the first is the bus management system, which is managed by whom, if I may ask?

MR JAIN: By the bus operator.

MS MAGGIE WONG: By the bus operators.

MR JAIN: If you refer to paragraph 2.10 on the same paper, that is a central traffic command centre.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ah. So it would require the connection between the bus management system and the transport operation and information service system in order to get the data from the bus management system to monitor. Is

that the case?

MR JAIN: That's correct, yes. But it looks at it from a city perspective, looks at the entire transport assets on the road, whether it is a moving asset or a fixed asset.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And is that also the system in Singapore?

MR JAIN: They have a similar system. I'm not exactly sure the extent of it that it entails, but they have a significant number of these functionalities in that system.

As far as I know, one thing that I have recently gathered as a part of my study on artificial intelligence, they are even deploying drones on traffic situations to collect real-time traffic data and then adjusting traffic lights or creating response systems or variable messaging systems to direct traffic and balance the traffic flow on the network.

So there is a very wide-scale application and adoption of these things. Especially -- this is normal operation but if you look at those one in a million eventualities where you have an emergency situation, this is the kind of system which can save a lot of lives.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And I can see in that paragraph, this system appears to be instead of the bus operator giving

information to the public about the real-time information, it would be this central traffic command centre releasing the information from the government source to the public. It appears it works like that. Do I understand that correctly?

MR JAIN: They work hand in hand, they are not discrete entities, they have a relationship between them. If you really want to know which bus has how many people in it, I think it is the BMS which would look at these things, whereas at the higher level, getting the traffic information, getting information about junctions, incidents that have happened, which is beyond the remit of the bus operator, that information would be available from this traffic command centre, which would be then used by the bus companies to verify their information.

So there has to be a two-way flow of information to create a better response in the end.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Understand.

At page 45 at the first bullet you make reference to the:

"Current regulatory model in Hong Kong where there is a cap on profit without a cap on losses is designed to suit continuity of incumbent operators."

Can you explain that as to what it meant?

MR JAIN: So in the past this regulatory framework when it

was created, the bus companies used to have a guaranteed profit model, in those times. And it was, I think, in the '90s sometime, this was changed to a profit cap model.

I put myself in a bus operator shoes, and this is what happened in KMB up to 2012. Because of the railway expansion, the KMB ridership started to go down and KMB started to lose money. The only way to come out of this, from losing money is either you give up the franchise when it doesn't work, or you start raising fares, which is not the right way.

Because the government controls the topside, regulatory framework controls the ceiling of the pricing, and then it should also give some kind of a floor for pricing. Otherwise for commercial operators around the world it would be of no significance.

So, for example, imagine a scenario where the bus operator cannot make profit in Hong Kong, what will they do? Being a commercial operator, mostly part of listed companies, they would have to terminate the franchises. What are we going to do as a city? Because if the bus operation is not making profit you can't even attract international players to come into the market. So there has to be, I would say, a reasonable degree of commercial framework which covers both the upside and

low side.

Why I'm saying it only favours the incumbent operators is because the incumbent operators they have already incurred a lot of expenses and fixed costs, so they can make the system work for them, whereas a new operator cannot enter this market and have the same level field to operate.

But if you have a sustainable commercial model there, then you can attract international entities because then they will look at the longer-term play of the bus operation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the bullet from the bottom at page 45, you refer to:

"Current reporting and monitoring system is archaic and was designed in an era when technology to monitor buses and drivers did not exist."

Can you explain a little bit on this statement.

MR JAIN: This goes back to the regulatory framework. So, for example, now it is increasingly around the world, the bus regulators are managing the bus operation based on what I mentioned. EWT, schedule adherence, and all these things. In Hong Kong we are only looking at when the bus leaves the terminus, and after that we are not monitoring its performance along the journey, so the bunching happens a lot in Hong Kong. There are a lot of

problems because of traffic and stuff and we are not able to address it. As a customer, if you are standing in a stop, intermediate stop somewhere, you may have three buses coming at one time and then for the next 20 minutes or 25 minutes you may have no buses coming.

So what others have adopted, they are using technology to create space between these buses, so if you go to London, the bus may stop at a particular stop for a little while, just to create that separation, and even services to customers. So when you are at a bus stop you are getting continuous even services. So every three minutes, it does not mean zero minutes and then six minutes, it means maybe 3.3, 3.5 minutes. So the variance of those things is reduced. And this is the kind of monitoring that regulatory agencies are doing around the world now.

So Singapore, when I mentioned the KPIs, they are directly related to these kind of parameters, which are exact data points along the journey on a bus route rather than you just start from the depot and that's it, and after that you forget about it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned here about excess waiting time, EWT, at stop-by-stop level, and monitor punctuality of each trip end to end with telematics and real-time operation management system making this

possible.

So you have got to have telematics and real-time operations together in order to achieve this excess waiting time. Is that the case?

MR JAIN: Telematics is already there. Real-time operations is a software layer over this hardware. So it is not a very difficult exercise on top of that.

I normally would not -- I would marry these two because most of the people I have seen who have invested in telematics have also invested in real-time operation. So it is a natural progression to telematics. As far as I know, even Openmatics, they supply you a real-time operation management system as a part of their offering.

So most of the system providers they are putting it as a package. At KMB we decided to do it on our own for other reasons.

This is one package, once you have these kind of systems, which in Hong Kong we already have, it allows us to have -- those data points are available, but we are not monitoring or regulating that. We don't have the regulatory framework for those data points.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, understand. Another thing I would like to ask you is the five-year forward planning programme. And you mentioned, if I could go back to your submission at page 39, FE-1. At the bottom, you

said that:

"As the person responsible for coordinating, preparing and submitting 5-year forward planning programme including the route development plan ... to Commissioner of Transport, one of my roles was to vet the coherence of our safety-related plans with the rest of the operational plans."

I would like to ask, were you involved in any way with the forward planning programme for the years 2018 to 2023?

MR JAIN: The one that was submitted recently?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No. Previously.

MR JAIN: So I made the submissions in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Okay. But not --

MR JAIN: So 2016 submission theoretically included plans for 1018 and 2019 in a way, but they were not firmed up. They were notional in that sense.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If I may just show you the forward planning programme to see if you have seen or whether you have any input on some of the matters there.

If you go to TD-1, page 180 -- the reason I'm asking is, first is the new KMB licence was discussed in 2016, in the course of 2016, but in fact the actually granting

of the licence was in March 2017. Of course when you planned this forward planning programme you have to look into the accident rates and everything two years before.

So if I can ask you to take a look at this report, in particular -- this was the KMB forward planning programme.

CHAIRMAN: For what date? When was it prepared?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This report was prepared in June 2017, at page 1035. In bundle TD-4.

And may I first of all ask whether you have made any input whatsoever to this report?

MR JAIN: I have not, counsel.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then I don't need to ask you --

CHAIRMAN: But presumably the topics came up year after year? The same sort of topic?

MR JAIN: That's correct, Chairman. So after 2016 submission I was involved, and I left KMB in December 2016 --

CHAIRMAN: So you were not involved in June 2017.

MR JAIN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: But perhaps the point can still be made by reference to a particular topic?

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I can take you to page 187, I am interested particularly on the bus captain training and the monitoring, planning programme.

Perhaps I can do my question this way. If you look at this paragraph, or this particular section, it made certain references to the:

"... KMB dedication to provide safe, reliable and comfortable services ..."

And then they mentioned something about elements of defensive driving, good driving attitude. And then:

"Driving performance monitoring is carried out with systematic checking by driving instructors and followed up with disciplinary actions if required. Moreover, real-time driving indicators ... will also help to identify those bus captains who have a higher incidence of 'harsh braking' on a given route than is normal. This information can be used to ensure that appropriate proactive feedback is given to a bus captain with aim of promoting improved driving behaviour that will in turn serve to prevent/reduce 'loss of balance' cases ... "

It made reference here to real-time driving indicators to help to identify those bus captains that have bad driving habits in a way. And then they emphasise the proactive way or proactive feedback. But without -- when I discussed with you about the lacking of this real-time indicator, or real-time information back to the Lai Chi Kok Centre, is it achievable?

MR JAIN: It is achievable, but I think what it means here

is that they use data generated real time at a later date using in a proactive manner, but using reactive data, to then train the driver.

So this is something that is happening, as I said, it is a T plus 1 response.

CHAIRMAN: This is historic review of real-time data?

MR JAIN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: But it is historic.

MR JAIN: It is historic, so it is using data generated real time, and then somebody analyses it and then tells the driver, "Last month you have not been driving very nicely", so it is a proactive feedback, yes, but it is based on reactive data.

However, what I referred to is that you can generate it on a real-time basis and real-time response.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And they also mentioned something in 8.3.2 above the first bullet:

"The electronic tachographs are being used to monitor bus captain performance, especially with regard to speeding."

And then the second bullet:

"Real-time driving indicators are installed in all buses which can help bus captains to utilise the driving skills learnt in the Eco-safe Driving Training ... "

And then:

"As denoted above, the benefits of such Eco-safe driving to the bus captains are:

1. Reduce the risk of accidents ...

2. Reduce stress levels ...

3. Increase confidence in vehicle control ... "

Again, this of course is also reactive to the historical data, but not --

MR JAIN: And this eco-driving is actually exactly analogous to green driving, or GreenRoad, what you were referring to. It is just a terminology.

CHAIRMAN: Eco-driving means don't accelerate sharply, don't brake sharply, use the fuel you have already put into the engine to glide you to a stop.

MR JAIN: A lot more coasting, yes, so you burn less fuel.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next section I am interested in is the 8.3 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, whilst you were with KMB, were there any parameters inputted into creating thresholds for automatic reports of driver misbehaviour, for example speeding?

MR JAIN: Okay. Automatic reports, to --

CHAIRMAN: Were there automatic reports?

MR JAIN: No, as far as I know, there were no automatic reports, but their people were analysing driver data based on their performance. So it was more of

a statistical analysis. People were analysing it.

CHAIRMAN: But the equipment was capable of generating, if you put in the input, an automatic report?

MR JAIN: It could, yes.

CHAIRMAN: But it was not being used to do that?

MR JAIN: It was not being done that way.

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR JAIN: I think there are people who are better suited to answer that question.

This "why not" is one question that even I have in my mind why we abandoned that system, which is something that would have benefited immensely to the bus operation in Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to take you to another document. Sorry, there is one more question. In paragraph 8.3.7, where it mentioned:

"As a safety enhancement measure, the company has appointed a professional counseling service provider ... for staff and ... immediate family ... to raise ... problems or difficulties they ... encounter in their daily lives."

I have a question about this.

Is there a system, in perhaps Singapore, for example, to detect drivers that have behavioural

problems or that have psychological problems that are not suitable for driving? Do you have similar system, or do you have a system?

MR JAIN: Psychological state of a driver is one of the biggest challenges in bus operation around the world at the moment. People are trying for different things, again I will resort to artificial intelligence, where people are looking at your biological data, which is micro-expression analysis, your eye dilation, your eye movement analysis, to generate some kind of intelligence on what state of mind you are in. This is still a work in progress, I must say.

So this Prolearn system in Singapore tends to go in exactly that direction. It looks at a driver's response to real-time traffic situations, and predicts the propensity of this driver to cause an accident. And hence it goes into an intervention mode and retrains the driver.

So it is, in a way, a psychological response where either you became too complacent whilst on the road, or you are going through a certain situation.

But if you had, let's say, an argument with your spouse and you turn up for work, I doubt if there is any system at this moment in the market which can detect your state of mind.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There is another document that I would like to refer you to. It is in MISC-1 bundle at page 127-5. It is the letter from the Road Safety Council to this Committee dated 31 May 2018.

MR JAIN: May I know the page number?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, page 127-5. That's the first page of the letter. 127-5. MISC-1.

MR JAIN: I'm on that page.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may refer you to one paragraph. It is 127-6. They mentioned about:

"The second system is known as a type of 'telematics' and was installed in vehicles under a pilot scheme to assess the technological interface."

They mentioned RIBAS, which is basically about speeding, idling, harsh braking and harsh acceleration. And the parameters are set for various features, which are considered normal operating limits, and then whatever occurs outside the parameters is flagged automatically by the computer to a supervisor. And then:

"Follow-up action depends very much on management policy but can range from advice, through counseling to retraining and even discipline measures."

So it appears the Road Safety Council is stating that the police is starting to do the system.

Is this a system similar to what you have in Singapore in terms of the use of telematics?

MR JAIN: As I said, most of the telematics systems do these things. There are many suppliers around the world. The functionalities differ a little bit in each of the models and each of the supplier, but fundamentally they are all trying to do the same thing, they are trying to give you the vehicle health and vehicle performance data on a regular, real-time basis at the back end. That allows you to monitor the performance of the vehicle, the location of the vehicle, and basically, as I say, asset performance in general terms.

CHAIRMAN: Now, LKW Parts and Services Limited is a Hong Kong company, is it not? Are you familiar with it?

MR JAIN: No, never had any dealings with them.

CHAIRMAN: We have.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Another topic I would like to ask you is about black box.

If I may take you to the bundle TD-1, page 393.

This is a letter setting out certain responses to issues raised by this committee. This letter is dated 13 July 2018.

If I may invite you to page 394. The question was this. Inviting the Transport Department to:

"Identify the occasions of such communications in

respect of the better management of bus drivers, rather than bus operations. In such communications, has TD given any directions to [franchised bus] operators to explore using any specific new applications? If those communications were in writing, please provide copies of the communications to and from the [Transport Department] and [franchised bus] operators. If the communications were made orally, please describe when, by and to whom the communications were made ... [and] the nature of those communications."

CHAIRMAN: I think it would help Mr Jain if you were to take him to the statement in the Transport Department paper which gives rise to this question. Then he would understand the context.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is annex 2. The TD paper is in TD-5 bundle, page 1688.

Mr Jain, this is a paper prepared by the Transport Department, and the heading is "Application of new technologies in franchised bus operation".

And this note set out the:

"...actions taken by the Transport Department in enhancing safety of franchised bus ... operation in recent years by working with the FB operators in applying new technologies."

And in one of the paragraphs, one of the sections,

if you look at page 1689, it makes reference to black box electronic tachographs. You can see in paragraph 5 it states that:

"Since 1 July 2004, electronic tachographs (commonly known as 'black box ') have been installed on all new [franchised buses] in compliance with the requirements imposed by the [Transport Department] in October 2003. Currently all [franchised buses] are equipped with black boxes."

If you go to paragraph 7 it states:

"While there has been no further formal and written enhanced requirement on the specifications of black boxes from the TD since 2003, during the TD's ongoing contacts with the bus manufacturers and the FB operators, both the TD and the FB operators have been keeping in view the new technological advancement to enhance their existing devices on the buses."

Then they stated at paragraph 8:

"The FB operators have actually started widening the scope of information kept by the black box as early as 2006 such that apart from the basic functions for monitoring the driver behaviour, the black box can also record the operation of braking, opening of doors, the sounding of bells ... to assist the FB operators in managing their fleet."

Then in paragraph 9, it makes reference to:

"Over the years, the TD has been communicating with the FB operators, requesting them to study and investigate the feasibility of applying new technologies and the information kept by the black box to better manage their bus operation and drivers. For example utilising the global positioning system signal received by the black box, coupled with the enhanced capacity for data transfer, the TD has required the FB operators, as a new franchise commitment, to provide real-time bus arrival information through mobile platform ... to better serve the travelling public in the 2015 franchise negotiation exercises ... and subsequently the 2017 franchise negotiation with the Kowloon Motor Bus ..."

It was in context, given their statement about the ongoing negotiations with the franchised bus operators that there was this follow-up question --

CHAIRMAN: No, it is ongoing communication. That's what was claimed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, ongoing --

CHAIRMAN: The context is this. In 2003 in November the Transport Department stipulated what had to be in a tachograph, and that had to be on new buses from 1 July onwards. The question is, well, what have you done since then in the ensuing 15 years to update the

requirements for tachographs or telematic equipment?

That is what led to this response.

You were working in KMB were you not, responsible for this equipment generally?

MR JAIN: But if I can just add something here. What happened in 2003 is not what we are referring to what is happening today.

CHAIRMAN: No, we understand that. We are trying to fill in the dots. 2003 is the last bit we have in writing. So that was the purpose of the questions from the Committee: What have you been doing since then?

MR JAIN: So the biggest change that happened since 2003 -- so tachograph, having bus generate data about vehicle performance, that existed in early 2000, because buses were generating -- using electronic chips to control the bus systems.

So the moment that happened, the data was available. What was not available in 2003 is a reliable means to bring this data backwards, real time. So the communication system was not available.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Jain, what we are trying to find out is what the Transport Department did to mandate the use of this kind of equipment. That's the purpose of these questions.

MR JAIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: And these are the answers that you are now being taken to at TD-1 at page 394.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think maybe, Mr Jain, should I put it this way, the Transport Department only issued one guideline, it is in 2003. They have not revised the guideline in any written form between 2003 until to date.

And what they are saying is there are ongoing communications between the operators and the Transport Department about adding more functions and technology in relation to this black box.

So we are asking has this happened throughout the years, or is this by your own initiative that the bus operators on their own initiative do this upgrading of the black box?

MR JAIN: I can only speak for KMB what we were doing at that time. A lot of this that was being done at KMB was on its own initiative and it was primarily driven by the commercial reasons. Because if you see KMB's profit and loss accounts in 2012, KMB made a loss, somewhere in the region of $120 million, and the ridership was constantly declining for last 10 or 15 years, since the opening of West Rail line, really, 2002/2003, all the way up to 2012, the ridership was in a constant decline, the company's financial performance was in a constant

decline.

So in 2012, the objective at that time was to either turn around the business or do something drastic with it. Any shareholder's commercial response has to be like that.

So basically, at that time, we started looking at all kinds of parameters, technology, any possible means that could improve performance of the bus operation, performance of the systems, and which can reduce the cost of operation and improve the delivery of operations.

So if you see the data from 2012 to 2015 -- and I think they are available in Traffic and Transport Digest, the bus miles of KMB, I think we managed to reduce something like 22 million miles of bus operation in these two years and we increased the ridership by 3 per cent, so we cut out a lot of unproductive mileage and converted that into productive mileage.

This is the kind of thing that we were doing, telematics was a part and parcel of this whole global initiative we were doing. Because we were not just looking at the bus device, we were looking at route planning, we were looking at driver deployment, scheduling, rostering, all aspects of the bus operation and trying to optimise the bus operation and generate

efficiencies, which did yield results if you look at KMB's performance from 2013, 2014, 2015. From a loss-making company it slowly changed into a profit-making company.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to ask you a particular answer made here in the TD's response at page 394.

MR JAIN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look at the last line, it makes reference to the fact that the TD also discussed the same, meaning to step up regular checks on the data recorded by the black box to monitor bus driving, bus captain's driving manner and behaviour with KMB at the regular meeting held on 27 June 2016.

Do you recall there was such a meeting?

MR JAIN: I cannot recall to that extent, exact date, but I can only say by this date KMB's entire fleet was already equipped by telematics devices.

CHAIRMAN: The real question is this. Was the Transport Department involved in urging you, KMB, to use your telematic equipment to step up regular checks on data recorded by the black box to monitor bus captains' driving manner and behaviour?

MR JAIN: They possibly could have, but it was already an intent within KMB to do so.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR JAIN: I mean --

CHAIRMAN: I think to help you --

MR JAIN: I'm afraid I can't go back and recall every statement from the meetings.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. But to help you, I think it would help if you were shown the documents that show this was in part, perhaps, related to the renewal of the franchise, because there were papers I think from this month that are part of that; am I right, Ms Wong?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think there was a paper on this.

MR JAIN: There was a whole slew of measures that were being discussed at that time, and I know this part, fairly confidently, that for the first time this requirement of having a real-time reporting device, and estimated time of arrival, was inserted into franchise documents for KMB for the first time in 2016.

CHAIRMAN: The ETA --

MR JAIN: Appeared before that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That was a requirement, but we are trying to find some requirement that bus companies should use the data in the black box to monitor driver behaviour, and we can't find that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to the renewal of licence document as to this matter.

First of all, may I take you to SEC-2 bundle,

page 735. This is a LegCo paper dated 11 January 2016.

It relates to the background brief on the franchise for the bus network of Kowloon Motor Bus.

And if you go to paragraph 11, "Enhancing standard of bus service":

"... members raised concern over the performance of franchised bus service at the panel meetings, special financing committee meetings as well as the council meetings. They urged the Administration to take the opportunity of franchise renewal to require service improvement by bus companies, including provision of real-time bus service information to passengers, provision of priority seats and barrier-free facilities, improvements in bus lost trips as well as bus service frequencies during peak periods."

And then we have the whole section on the provision of real-time bus service information to passengers. That's paragraphs 12 and 13. But none of them relates to the improvements on the black box or any reference to black box.

CHAIRMAN: Well, to the use of black box to monitor drivers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's the point.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I wouldn't trouble you with the things in the middle. By the time we got to June 2016, that's in

the same bundle, SEC-2 bundle, page 799. That's in June 2016.

It made reference to the public consultation, and the views it received. And one of the issues they raised at page 803 is the bus safety, section 4, bus safety, 4(a):

"To monitor bus captains' driving behaviour more closely ..."

So this is the view, if you look at the previous page, 802, it was the major comments received during public consultation, and in section 4 it summarised their views in terms of bus safety. It is to monitor bus captains' driving behaviour more closely.

So that's what we have reached.

And by the time of the March 2017 licence, I wouldn't take you to the terms, but I will take you to the document that the TD asked the KMB to undertake to perform. If I may take you to the TD-5.

That would be KMB-9 bundle. Pages 3997.

MR JAIN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The only reference here to this franchise operation is in relation to enhanced safety feature in subparagraph 3. That is the electronic data processing device.

Not a single word about using it to monitor bus

drivers' behaviour more closely.

So it is very loose term saying, oh, there is this enhance safety feature, but how is it going to be used, it is not specific, or not even spelt out.

So by stating that, it appears that the TD's suggestion that there are ongoing communications about having this to specifically monitor drivers' behaviour, doesn't appear to be reflected in all these documents.

Do you agree with that statement?

MR JAIN: On the face of it, when I look at these documents, you are absolutely right, and it goes back to my assertion that the franchise document in Hong Kong is a very loosely written document in the sense that it is a very wide range of things that you can do within that, which makes it subject to manipulation to some extent.

But having said that, in all my interactions with Transport Department, I mean, I can say that the intent was right. Sometimes the knowledge was not available, sometimes the drive was not there. So that is different from intent. I think the intent was not wrong from Transport Department, in any of the meetings that I have attended.

I have never seen them -- they have asked the right questions, they want to improve things, but it may not have been that specific, it may not have been -- or

that -- I would say prescriptive to bus companies.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So not prescriptive and not documented?

MR JAIN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Loose?

MR JAIN: Yes. But this is not just this parameter, I can go on, in the whole franchise document, there are a lot of things here which are very loose in that sense.

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment.

But overall you characterise it as not prescriptive, and you acknowledge from what you have been shown, not documented.

MR JAIN: That's correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If one considers bus safety is of paramount importance, it would be usual and normal to include it at least in the franchise agreement, would you agree with that statement?

MR JAIN: I think I'll just go back to your statement, if one considers, that should not be part of that conversation. Bus safety is of paramount importance and it should be the top priority both from a regulator perspective as well as operator perspective, because we are here talking about public safety, people's safety, are staff safety, and to me that is uncompromisable.

CHAIRMAN: And the context in Hong Kong is this, that unfortunately over the years, we have had a series of catastrophic bus accidents. That's the context in which the regulator operates.

MR JAIN: It is extremely unfortunate, but yes, that is the reality, and I think the intent of the entire transport system, we run a very good transport system in Hong Kong, and this is one area which needs to be addressed sooner than later.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

That leads me to one specific question I would like me to ask you, the annual report.

I wanted to do certain comparison between two particular years of annual report as to why certain things are missing, or appears in 2016 annual report but missing in 2017. If you look first in KMB-5 bundle, page 1719.

MR JAIN: Counsel, may I know the page you are referring to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 1719.

CHAIRMAN: This is the annual report for which year?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is the annual report for 2016.

CHAIRMAN: So published in March 2017?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Should be the end of 2016.

CHAIRMAN: I think you will find that if you find the chairman's letter --

MR JAIN: Published in March, I think.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In March, yes, I apologise for that.

If we look at this annual report, page 1719, on the right part, it made reference to two features. One is the bus on-board monitoring system, and the second is the operations communication management system:

"BOM records the driving performance of bus captains for analysis by depot and department with the aim of raising driving standards with a particular focus on safety and passenger comfort."

And second:

"The operations communications management system.

OCM streamlines the handling of real-time information on operational incident such as traffic accidents, road congestion as logged by our radio control section, thus improving the speed and accuracy of message dissemination to the depot and departments."

On this page, it also made reference to a personalised Octopus card introduction of a personalised Octopus card for bus drivers as they report for duty.

That's the terminus management system.

My question is this: if you look at 2017, annual report, at page 1926. If you look at both those pages, perhaps, 1925 and 1926, we cannot find similar

information in the 2017 annual report.

Maybe if you can comment on, first of all, the 2016 annual report, the BOM system. Is this one of the systems that your company at that time was considering implementing as the real-time alerts to drivers, or is this something else?

MR JAIN: In my opinion, this is not referring to any real-time system. This is something -- it is part of this bus operation management which was collecting the data and then using for driver feedback. That is BOM.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But we can't find similar reference in the 2017 annual report. Even though they have a more generalised statement at page 1940, for completeness, 1940.

MR JAIN: Is does mention on-board monitoring system, BOM, but of course the level of detail is much less.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: This was after you left KMB, was it not?

MR JAIN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Both of these reports?

MR JAIN: Both of the reports were published after I left KMB. 2017 annual report, as a general observation, I would say the level of detail with respect to KMB and Long Win were much less than compared to previous years in annual report.

As an external party, I look at annual reports and try to analyse data and performance for my own satisfaction. And 2017, I did find that a lot of information was not available that was available in previous years. That is a general observation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Chairman, I have concluded my questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

I have one quick question for you, Mr Jain. First of all, thank you very much for coming to share your views.

We spent a lot of time this afternoon talking about all the technology and all the advances which can improve or enhance bus safety. But one topic I would like to hear your views is on resources.

From your experience, with all this technology and everything we are talking about, from a resource perspective, whether it is monetary or human resources, what is your view? Can we get your sort of assessment on how expensive it is? Do we have the right people in Hong Kong to implement all those technologies that we discussed earlier?

Thank you.

MR JAIN: It is a very interesting question.

This is something that I always talk about. You know, the first time I went to KMB, Long Service Award Dinner, there were roughly 300 people who were getting an award for serving the company for more than 30 years. I had never seen anything like that in my life.

So there was a significant number of people who gave their entire lives to this company.

I'm sure there was something in the company that fostered that loyalty in these people.

So to me that was a fantastic part of the cultural learning for me.

Why now people don't want to join KMB? Now that is the question.

Has it tarnished its image? Is it not providing the same level of family welfare that it used to provide? There could be many factors there which needs to be addressed.

That's the human aspect of it which I think is addressable, if -- I mean, KMB I'm using because I'm familiar with KMB, but when I say KMB it goes all across the bus industry in Hong Kong. And I think there are means and mechanisms whereby you can generate enough conduciveness and attractiveness in the driving, bus driving. I have met a great number of people who are fans of buses, who are dedicated to the bus industry,

they really feel for it from their heart. But they go out and they are criticising the bus companies, if you look at the mood and sentiments, these are die-hard fans and they are still criticising. We need to ask how we can bring them on board and make them part of the process.

That's the human side.

On the technological side we are still stuck with very old style of technological management where we give a key to the driver in the morning and he drives the bus the whole day, literally on the same route up and down, and kind of does not more than that.

There are some bits of interlining and intertiming is being done, but nothing beyond that at the moment.

If you think about it, a driver needs a rest, a vehicle does not need a rest.

If we can optimise in such a way -- if we can separate three layers of resources. So your human resource, vehicle resource and infrastructure resource, and if we can optimise across these three levels, which we are not doing at the moment, or we are doing very little in Hong Kong, but if we can optimise at three levels through modern tools, I personally feel we can do more with less.

My back-of-the-envelope calculation, I think KMB

system can be delivered, the whole system, the existing routes, exactly the same way, can be delivered with about 2 to 3 per cent less buses and less drivers, which would completely solve the manpower problem.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: I just have one question. Thank you for sharing your thoughts on technology especially.

I'm just thinking about how come Hong Kong is so slow in adopting new technology for improving safety. Perhaps our technology readiness is something that could sound good on paper but doesn't deliver in practice? Maybe incentive for companies to invest, they don't see value? Maybe regulations not requiring them? I just want to get your thought on what are the major barriers, and how should we go about making Hong Kong more receptive to adopting new technology for safety improvement in our public transport system, as an insider, you worked for KMB and MTR for a long time.

MR JAIN: It is a basket of reasons. I think the biggest reason is the environment we are operating on. I think one way innovation is encouraged in most of the world is where you are allowed to fail. You have to accept failure, and our tolerance in Hong Kong has become extremely low for failure. Innovation only thrives when you allow that kind of environment.

So that is a big environmental issue, it could be a cultural issue, can whatever you want to call it. That is a major reason.

And proven technology that was our mantra until a decade or so, which we very successfully adopted in our public transport systems, unfortunately that worked really well when technology was working slow. Now the technological innovation and adoption is moving at such a rapid pace that by the time you wait for proven technology it is outdated.

So you are always waiting for something new because the proven one has really something that has become historical reference, in a way.

So there is a cost of adoption which then as a company you would say if there is new coming why don't I wait for something new. And that also hinders innovation.

If you look at what China has done, they have taken this leap of faith, they have gone ahead, they have implemented a lot of stuff, they have allowed their companies to fail, if you look at electric bus adoption, every possible configuration of battery and the battery charging that is possible around the world has been experimented.

Now they know what works and what does not, and they

have become global leaders in electric bus manufacturing and operations. This is the kind of environment we need in Hong Kong.

We have been, I think, if you ask me, I would rate the technological know-how for Hong Kong engineers, Hong Kong operators, at really at the top end of the curve. We have been extremely good. So our operational performance within those parameters has been exemplary to the world. But our technological adoption has been pathetic, for want of a better word. It has just been so slow. We have been left behind in many aspects, the data availability that I see is happening in third world countries, is not happening in Hong Kong.

So what can be done? I think we need to create an environment where we have to allow -- we need to incentivise people to innovate and apply these technologies. There are a lot of partnership and collaborate models. There are a lot of Hong Kong start-ups who are doing experimentation in China, Taiwan, in other countries, we should allow these people to come and do experiment and create that partnership model with local companies.

We do hackathons here and all these, I have been part of multiple hackathons as a judge, as an observer, as just an audience, and I see there is no dearth of

knowledge in Hong Kong, there is no dearth of zeal, the entrepreneurship in Hong Kong. What is lacking is an environment to foster them. And that is where these big operators need to create an environment, adopt some of these, create some incubation units, incubation labs, where they come in and they work in their depots, MTR depots, KMB depots, and create new kind of systems altogether. That's where I think we would have something to offer to the rest of the world.

CHAIRMAN: A little while ago you mentioned the need for bus drivers to rest.

Now you worked with KMB for about four years, did you not?

MR JAIN: Yes, I did.

CHAIRMAN: Are you in a position to help us understand better the facilities made available by KMB to allow its drivers to rest, in particular we have in mind the drivers who are doing special shifts and working 14 hours, and allowed to have three hours break in the middle. Are you in a position to help us as to how adequate or otherwise the rest facilities are?

MR JAIN: One is a physical facility for rest, which to me is very easy, you can do lot of driver surveys and ask them whether they are adequate, comfortable, whether they see any improvement areas.

But then there is a second area for resting, and this is one area which I in fact see completely lacking in Hong Kong.

It is that every person is not the same, their fatigue levels, their response to things, their psychological level is not exactly the same. So instead of saying 14 hours is too much, we should reduce it to 10 hours, we need to create statistical framework and look at the reality indicators where what point the driver fatigue becomes an issue, we can use a lot of data points.

In fact if you do an accident analysis, look at the data, look at the drivers, you can create a reasonably good history for each driver and create a parameter that this driver is usually very good for three-hour duty, short routes, not good for long routes, not good for long duties, not good for night duties, and you can then customise your duties that you allocate to the driver, which would then make the duties more palatable to the driver because they think this is something they will do.

Today what happens, you put them in a morning shift this month, next month they go to the evening shift, next month they go to the night shift, and it is an irregular pattern in the name of creating an equitable

framework.

But it is completely ignoring an individual's capability to do something, or their personal performance levels. If we do enough analysis we can create this environment. If you look at a management scenario in a business, we do a performance assessment, we say this guy has a bright analytical capability, hence he should be the analyst. This guy is very good with physical work so maybe he should be doing this. That is the same thing we need to do within the driving work force, we need to customise and personalise those mechanisms.

CHAIRMAN: Would you suggest that the data necessary to make that analysis, for example with a driver, be collated from the driver's performance as recorded in real-time automated reports?

MR JAIN: That is one point of reference.

We could also look at a driver's education level, we can look at their physical performance, their medical visits, there are a number of data points.

So this is -- to me, what we are collecting as a part of real-time operation management from this telematics device is one point of reference, which is their actual driving performance, but this can be then correlated to their personal parameters, and you can

actually create a reasonably decent model for an individual.

And this is a Singapore model, Prolearn that I talked about. They are doing exactly that. The training they give to the driver is not identical to everybody. They customise to that person, because they see his individual performance on certain situations and they customise the training.

This is what needs to be done. The cooky cutter approach is no longer working.

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me if I come back to my question. During the time you were working with KMB can you help us with how adequate or otherwise the facilities were, given that there perhaps was not this analysis that you have described that could happen, how adequate or otherwise the rest facilities were for drivers, particularly those doing split shifts.

Are you in a position to help us?

MR JAIN: Yes, when I joined KMB, I would say these were deplorable facilities at that time.

CHAIRMAN: So 2013?

MR JAIN: At 2013. The facilities were very substandard to any modern work force.

Having said that, there was a concerted effort after that to improve those facilities in many places,

wherever possible. In fact, I remember we submitted a lot of suggestions to Transport Department on creating kiosks, creating facilities for drivers, but Hong Kong has, again, a very unique framework where land is one of our most expensive resources. And many of these public transport interchanges, they are, although available for operating buses, they are owned by private developers, private entities, or Link Reit, or whatever, and they are not willing to provide that space where a driver's resting facility can be created.

I'm sure KMB would probably be in a better position to give you this, but they receive complaints even for drivers using toilets in shopping malls. To me that is a basic human need, how can anybody complain about use of toilet, a public toilet for that matter?

CHAIRMAN: If the facilities were deplorable in 2013, how would you categorise them in December 2016 when you left KMB?

MR JAIN: There was a significant improvement from that baseline. I won't say that they were impressive in any way. But I think there was a significant improvement that was made. There was a management intent to address that issue.

CHAIRMAN: What is the worst facility as of December 2016?

MR JAIN: There are quite a few.

I don't know what happened after that, but 2016 there were many places where the drivers were actually resting inside the buses, they were eating inside the buses because they didn't have any place to sit outside.

I think there was one housing estate near Kowloon City, where it is in a private development, and they refused to provide even a kiosk facility.

CHAIRMAN: Is that the Lok Wah Estate?

MR JAIN: Yes. And there are many examples scattered all around the city.

CHAIRMAN: That's the place where KMB built their own structure and were required to remove it?

MR JAIN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So problems encountered because of the inability to require those that had power in places where bus termini were located to provide facilities; would that be one way of putting it?

MR JAIN: Correct. And it could be part of the development rights, it could be part of the land leases, I'm not sure what is the right way to do it.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure there are multiple reasons why it came about, but for one reason or another the facilities could not be provided, were not provided.

MR JAIN: That's correct. Yes. There are many examples like that where there are no adequate facilities for the

drivers.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your assistance and your evidence, Mr Jain. We are most grateful to you.

We are also grateful to all those who have been working a long day in transcribing our words, and for those that have been interpreting them. But our hearing is concluded now. We thank you for your attendance, we will have other hearings in due course, and we will give notice in advance of those hearings.

Thank you very much.

MR JAIN: Thank you, Chairman, and my thanks to the whole committee, all the staff, counsel, I think you are up to a great challenge, and I really hope to see something nice coming out of it in the end, and something that transforms our public transport industry.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JAIN: Thank you very much.

(5.46 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

I N D E X

P A G E

EVIDENCE FROM COMMUNITY FOR ROAD 1
SAFETY REPRESENTATIVE:
MR KWONG TSE HIN, JULIAN
(continued)

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG (continued) 1

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE 60

EVIDENCE FROM FORMER KMB EMPLOYEE: 74
MR ALOK JAIN
Examination by MS WONG 75
QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE 176

[blank page]

2018 年 7 月 17 日

上午 9 時 59 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 鄺子憲先生，道路安全研究小組主席

主席：（經傳譯員）各位早晨。鄺先生，我係想請黃大律師繼續代表我哋委員會向你提問嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，鄺先生，感謝你今日繼續上嚟作證，琴日我哋就係講及一啲文件，嗰啲文件就係九巴個專營權續約嘅文件嘅，我今日會繼續係探討呢一方面嘅事宜。想請你睇番雜項文件嘅第 2 個文件夾 770 頁，呢個係你自己嘅陳述書，你就係回應當時嘅諮詢，2016 年 6 月 16 號，琴日我哋就喺 773 頁嘅，喺嗰個建議嗰一欄嗰度，第一點，嗰度就話喺嗰個專營權嘅協議裏面應該係有一個比較全面嘅標準嘅要求同埋係有一啲司機嘅監察系統係使用黑盒嘅，我就想問下你，點解你就建議係要包括呢一個裝置落去嗰個專營權協議嗰度呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，當時我認為將專營權續期其實係一個大好機會讓我哋可以探討一啲新嘅構思，所以我哋當時係盡力希望係提供越多嘅意見越好，當然我哋都係提一啲係合理嘅建議同埋一啲係合理可行嘅建議嘅，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪話如果落咗嗰個專營權協議嗰度就會有一個機制去睇下係是否獲得遵從，嗰個邏輯係咪咁呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係呀，我諗係呀，呢個亦都對我嚟講，我覺得會係一個提升嚟嘅，政府嗰方面係希望令到巴士更加安全，我哋都好感恩嘅，不過我哋就覺得如果一日都仲係有人受傷，特別係因為意外而嚴重受傷嘅話，都仲未係理想嘅，所以我哋希望大力推動，希望喺呢方面有更大嘅改進。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺第二段嗰度亦都講及一啲主要嘅監察管控嘅措施，你嘅建議係應該係由邊個去進行呢啲監察呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）類似嘅營運嘅話，我相信應該會係由巴士公司自己係主動提出，而政府當局就作為一個規管當局。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其實呢度有唔少嘅建議嘅，譬如話喺呢個高風險嘅山路嗰度嘅車速限制等等，我哋琴日亦都探討過，你亦都有講過話如果係山路高風險嘅話，你曾經有建議過嗰個時速應該係幾多嘅，你意思係咪話呢一個咁嘅建議應該加入嗰個專營權協議嗰度，定抑或你純粹係一個建議就係話政府總言之就係應該係要係規管呢一啲咁嘅道路呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我都話具體嘅建議，其實我強調嘅就係嗰個原則，個原則就係如果我哋搵出有某一啲路段佢係特別高風險嘅，我會話呢啲係

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

關鍵嘅路段，合理嘅做法就係應該係講明應該嗰個車速係定喺幾多，25 吖，30 吖，40 吖咁，我哋就希望可以喺呢啲關鍵嘅路段施加控制，令到司機安全駕駛。喺呢度，我冇講明係邊一個路段應該係幾多公里嘅，但係我希望有一個咁嘅概念，希望佢哋唔好淨係單單係睇嗰個法律規定嘅時速限制，因為我哋講緊一啲關鍵嘅路段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邊個係去負責搵出邊啲係關鍵嘅路段呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我相信應該係政府同巴士公司係一齊去做，當然亦都係要靠專家去幫手，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，跟住政府又如何去監管呢？如果巴士公司係搵出某一啲路段，話畀政府聽，政府又同意，之後又如何去監管呢？因為呢樣先至係更重要㗎嘛。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我諗我哋而家唔會講一啲好複雜嘅監管系統或者制度，譬如講番個基礎，講番啲基本，首先應該發出一個通知，係通知啲司機，如果佢係揸某一條路線，而嗰度就係有一啲咁緊要嘅路段嘅話，佢哋要特別留心同埋要知道自己揸幾多、揸得有幾快；另外佢哋係有巡查嘅人員，有稽查去查核司機嘅表現，佢哋時不時會咁做。當然我哋亦都希望引入一啲更加先進嘅監察系統，呢一個應該係以黑盒搜集嘅數據為本，我諗最好就係同呢個全球定位系統結合，就係如果啲司機過份咁樣係超出嗰個車速嘅話，我哋就可以係自動同埋實時、即時咁樣樣可以搵出個情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）舊時古老嘅方法就係用稽查，你就話與其係咁，就不如要一個自動化嘅、實時嘅報告系統，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生，係呀，我哋會有咁嘅建議嘅，只要嗰個科技上做得到，我哋係咁嘅建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實你作呢啲建議嘅時候，心目中就係有咁嘅概念，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）啱，主席先生。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰度嘅第三點，你嘅建議就係話係透過有系統同埋聚焦嘅安全培訓，應該將啲司機訓練到係明白究竟典型嘅意外情景係點樣樣同埋有邊一啲具體嘅風險，你諗住係邊個會做呢啲嘢呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，呢個係一個一般嘅建議，當然係需要政府主動去做，相信亦都要搵專家去幫手，有一啲團體，譬如我哋呢一類嘅組織亦都樂意隨時係幫手嘅。講番呢一點，我原本嗰個構思就咁嘅，司機其實未必係真係好清楚係會出現一啲乜嘢嘅意外，正如我琴日所講，喺呢一個階段，如果話司機知道埋安全防撞欄嗰個防撞能力係幾多，又或者係以咩嘢嘅車速，一個老人家過馬路，如果真係畀車撞又唔會引致嚴重傷亡，佢哋係唔知道嘅，但係呢一啲嘅資訊、呢一啲嘅知識其實可以將佢轉化為一個簡單嘅教材，讓司機更加容

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

易知道--讓佢哋知道點解同埋佢哋可以點樣樣係揸得更好。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺 4.4 嗰段，你就講及車輛嘅表現，你就用咗加拿大公交嘅手冊，嗰度係有指引同埋有一啲界限嘅，可唔可以話畀我哋聽點解你係引用咗加拿大嘅公共交通手冊嚟到提及究竟如果係標準嘅巴士或者係一啲掛接式嘅巴士佢哋應該跟從乜嘢嘅指引？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，呢一份手冊，我就係有好多嘅文件，呢一份係其中一份我覺得我係好感興趣嘅，講到加速同埋減速，加速同減速往往都係乘客失去平衡，喺車廂裏面失去平衡嘅主因嚟嘅，我哋亦都知道地鐵嘅設計係點呢？就佢哋有啲係關乎加速同減速嘅參數，好讓乘客唔會係因此而容易失去平衡嘅，我覺得巴士亦都係應該一樣。

我哋見到佢呢度嘅參數都相當之合理嘅，或者係睇一睇就係如果係緊急情況之下減速，呢度就講咗就係 2.7 米嘅，即係每方秒 2.7 米嘅，其實我琴日就講過，就係如果係一部私家車佢緊急嘅情況之下去剎車係 2.7 米，即係每方秒，個問題就係話如果巴士司機喺緊急情況之下要剎車以免撞到一名行人，佢需要反應好迅速，佢要諗下究竟就係令到車上乘客係失去平衡定抑或係要保障出面嗰位行人，唔好讓佢就係被車撞到。我諗全世界嚟講，加速率同埋減速率大家都接納係一個巴士營運嘅一個重要嘅安全參數。

主席：（經傳譯員）究竟係地鐵喺加速、減速嗰方面佢哋定咗一啲咩嘢嘅參數呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，應該係每方秒 1.15 米，不過當然有啲情況之下有啲出入嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我亦都想請你睇一睇，因為你剛才講過加速同埋減速，可唔可以請你睇番 BM-1 嗰個文件夾第 66 頁？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋係睇緊乜嘢呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係黑盒製造商 ZF 嘅陳述書，嗰度就係有一個截圖，講及加速率同埋減速率嘅。我想問一問，鄺先生，你可唔可以就係講一講呢度嗰個減速率佢就係 2.3，呢度嗰個截圖，你見到係 2.3 嘅，你可唔可以講一講你嘅睇法呢？因為剛才你亦都提過喺加拿大嗰度就係 2.7 米嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，喺呢方面，我冇詳細咁研究過，不過你亦都睇到，呢度 2.3 呢個值就係高於 1.1，呢個就係加拿大嘅公共交通手冊，嗰個就係一般嘅普通嘅減速嘅。至於應該係定喺邊一度呢，我諗係要決定於、取決於喺香港嗰個實際嘅操作環境嘅。喺香港，基於某一啲原因，我諗我哋都會接納一個稍高嘅減速率嘅，我冇詳細研究過，不過我要指出嘅就係話一般嚟講喺市區嘅道路，如果巴士行走嘅速度唔係好高，即係話巴士行走嘅速度係中等嘅話，就會少啲時候係需要個司機好快速咁樣樣去減低個車速嘅。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署 2003 年有啲要求--係技術方面嘅要求，嗰個係即係要個記速嘅--黑盒嘅記錄速，係咪 0.2G 呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）0.2G 即係等如 1.96 米每平秒。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解佢要求嗰個黑盒係記錄呢方面咁樣嘅減速嘅水平呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，你嘅意思係運輸署係有一個要求嗰個巴士上面嗰個紀錄要係要--準確度要 0.2...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者請黃小姐--1993 年就要求有一個速度嘅記錄儀嘅，即係可以能夠記錄，去到 2004 年 7 月 1 號開始就要生效。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係 1598 頁，1598 頁，3 段(a)，「呢個嘅軟件應該係記錄一啲--响嗰個意外報告係可以係响一秒之間--三秒期間裏面嘅一秒可以察覺一個 0.2G 嘅減速嘅。」

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）如果巴士係响減速係 0.2G，即係話每平秒 1.96 米嘅，呢個就已經係一個事件，呢個係一個應該要交意外報告嘅事件嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係好緊急咁剎車呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我都認為係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你頭先 2.3 米，即係每平秒 2.3，就比呢個要求係即係再多過百分之十㗎喎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，從文件睇，係，的確係咁。如果我哋有啲證據，係基於涉及乘客失去平衡嗰啲事件，得到一啲資料、證據，我哋可以比較一下當時嘅減速率，跟住同將來可以微調有關嘅數值嘅，就係一個根據證據嚟到進行調查呢個參數應該係點樣制定或者調整。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我哋都有一個概略嘅睇法，地鐵係 1.15，2.3 就高過 1.15 好多，係咪？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我諗係嘅，主席，不過我哋又要了解到巴士嘅營運冇咁可預測試嘅，我同意需要制定一個減速率嘅數據係比較接近地鐵嘅，雖然現實上唔可能响緊急嘅情況之下係應用。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另一件事當然就係巴士安全，响下面 773 去到 774 頁嗰度，我哋睇一睇，你有一個建議，特別係第一個建議，774 個頁頂嘅，「上層嘅前排座位，因為你冇任何一個配置咗合理嘅嗰個陷塌嘅區域，前排嘅巴士乘客可能雖然有用到安全帶，都可能比較擠壓嘅，呢個特別係九巴嗰啲使用高速公路嘅巴士都係咁樣樣嘅。」你就有一個建議，要求將呢個要求擺番去個專營權嘅協議，跟住有一個時間表嚟到係進行改善嘅，你覺得邊個應該採取主動將呢個建議納入嗰個專營權協議呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，同樣我哋都係假設响專營權協議裏面政府會係指定或者係規定，政府亦都係可以進行研究呢個課題，然之後就係要求巴士公司畀一個時間表嚟到改善，當然呢個亦都係巴士公司有個責任嘅，係進行有關嘅研究，即係佢哋應該可以同巴士嘅製造商聯合進行嘅，我哋建議就應該係要比較--政府同埋巴士公司都應該更加主動進行呢啲研究嘅，我認為佢哋有責任係研究呢啲課題，積極主動咁樣尋求改善。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家預計你稍後可能會問呢個問題嘅，你就想達到嘅就係運輸署同埋巴士公司就係好積極咁樣做事嘅，佢哋過去有冇咁做呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，要公平起見，佢哋响某一啲課題上面係好積極嘅，但係我哋覺得好重要某一啲課題，我可以話佢哋並不積極主動嘅，主席，响某啲情況下，佢哋都係回應式嘅，我哋唔想有啲課題佢哋只係回應，特別係涉及嚴重傷亡嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋即係回應譬如一個慘劇，之後佢哋就唔會再係主動，佢淨係回應式嘅，佢哋嘅動作淨係回應式嘅，係咪咁講呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係。我想補充一點，呢個並非不尋常嘅，即係話唔係淨係香港嘅，我哋要取得進步，好多時候都係有個大嘅意外，先至可以取得嘅。用我哋嘅角度睇，如果嗰個慘劇或者大嘅意外，事情係冇法子預計嘅，可能咁樣做都係合理嘅，但係如果係之前已經有好大數量咁樣嘅意外或者係有歷史數據或者係嗰個理論上嗰個風險程度係高嘅，就應該唔好一個回應事件嚟到做事，係應該要好積極嘅、主動嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）基本呢個報告你就係強調咗呢度有好多好多證據嘅，你做出呢個建議係基於大量嘅證據嘅，你係咁樣講，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我假設呢個--頭先我哋提及嗰個事項，我會話係嘅，我哋的確係咁樣嘅，我哋個小組提出，或者有好多證據係睇得到嘅。但係證據有唔同嘅層次嘅，有啲係表面證據，有啲係根據我哋嘅知識，或者從嗰個意外嘅數據，或者係新聞報告所得到，有啲就當然更高一層，就係學界、學術界向一啲係學術期刊進行研究得到嘅結論，我呢度講嘅證據係個層次就係根據我哋嘅知識，根據我哋從新聞報告同埋一啲係意外嘅數據同埋從一個理論出發，嗰個證據都係好清楚明確嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想講講最後一個建議，你提及巴士站嘅安全，你話等候巴士嘅乘客喺某啲路段係要暴露啲風險之下，即係有啲重型就行得好快嘅車輛嘅，你就覺得應該响嗰個專營協議要求巴士公司同政府合作減低呢個等候巴士嘅乘客所面對嘅風險嘅，你點樣建議呢？你建議巴士公司可以點樣同政府合作嚟到減低呢方面嘅針對等候巴士乘客嘅風險嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）巴士站嘅安全係全球問題，即係並非只係限於香港嘅，但係我哋要承認好多國家，包括先進國家，都冇足夠咁樣重視呢個問題嘅，我哋

有啲巴士站係喺啲好高速路嘅旁邊嘅，大型嘅路，譬如話呢張相，係龍翔道，嗰個限速係每小時 70 公里嘅，告士打道亦都有，其他嘅主要道路都有，理論上如果有一大群等緊巴士嘅乘客，跟住隔籬就係好多嗰啲好高速嘅車輛，有一架車如果係撞咗上路面，佢哋就會畀嗰個巴士站同埋個車中間夾住，就會係受傷嘅情況好嚴重嘅。只係得幾個國家係重視呢個問題，亦都係採取行動嘅，其中一個就係星加坡，佢哋引入咗一啲新嘅措施，呢個措施係唔係有效或者係有好好嘅效能，都仲要進一步證實嘅。

不過理論上嚟講，我哋應該要保障等車嘅乘客嘅，巴士公司佢哋係起呢啲巴士站嘅，佢哋係從嗰個廣告度係得到收入嘅，即係佢哋從呢方面攞到收入去起呢啲巴士站嘅，而政府係負責個道路嘅，所以好自然我就覺得巴士公司應該同政府合作，嚟到係審視一下巴士站嘅設計同埋係咪需要有啲附屬嘅一啲設備、設施嚟到更好咁樣保障巴士乘客。我承認呢樣嘢唔容易做嘅，因為同一時間我哋都要讓巴士乘客上車、落車嘅，但係我哋需要有啲措施保障乘客嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係嗰面唔可以有一個圍欄咁樣圍住嘅，即係話我哋係咪應該嗰啲圍欄中間係有空隙嘅，等人可以上車、落車，係咪咁嘅意思呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係，我係咁嘅意思，即係話雖然我哋唔能夠有個安全圍欄係冇空隙嘅，但係有可能係建設一啲有某個角度嘅安全護欄嘅，亦都有可能安裝即係一個圓柱型嗰啲保護裝置嘅，星加坡就係佢哋有啲咁樣嘅護柱，就有幾千個巴士站都有嘅。

我要指出一般嚟講，係公路嘅設計，我哋都要保障嗰個車--即係揸車揸得唔妥當個車上嘅人嘅--失控車輛上面嘅人嘅，即係唔可以令到响嗰個失控車輛上面嘅人受到係嚴重傷害嘅，如果我哋有一個安全嘅圍欄，嗰個尾端可能會對嗰啲車輛上面嘅人造成危害嘅，呢啲護柱應該係吸收能量嘅，如果淨係一個鋼柱，一個鋼嘅護柱或者係三合土嘅護柱，當然對等候嘅巴士乘客係好嘅，因為會停到架車，唔可以向前，但係嗰個失控車輛上面嘅人就可能會係嚴重受傷。

呢個總結嚟講，我相信一定係有一啲解決嘅辦法嘅，最終嚟講，我哋都應該可以搵出一個解決嘅方案，可以係喺兩者之間，喺呢一個矛盾裏面得出一個平衡。

主席：（經傳譯員）大埔公路意外現場嗰度有道路工程，見唔見到係有呢個安全防撞欄起咗喺巴士站嗰度係保護啲乘客避免佢哋被撞到呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，主席先生，你意思係咪指嗰度嘅補救工程呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，就想問下，嗰度有冇起一個安全防撞欄嚟到保護嗰啲候車乘客？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我明白你嘅意思，我哋有一個解決方案，所謂保護性嘅巴士站，換句話講，個巴士站就會係遠離嗰個馬路嘅，主要嘅道路就

係會有一個交通安全島隔開嗰啲巴士站嘅，呢個其實喺龍翔道嘅相反方向嗰度係有咁樣嘅設計嘅，另外屯門公路嗰個巴士轉乘站嗰度都有咁嘅設計，不過咁係用上好多嘅空間，好多地方嘅，所以最終嚟講，嗰個出發點就應該係研究一下不同巴士站嘅設計，亦都係要睇下唔同類型嘅道路所需要配設嘅唔同嘅車速，然後就係諗出不同嘅解決方案，可以包括一啲工程方案同埋非工程嘅解決方案。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你剛才提及嗰啲護柱，你講係星加坡嘅經驗，你知唔知道係邊個負責做呢啲樹立呢啲護柱呢，就政府定抑或巴士呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）喺星加坡，就係陸上交通當局，我研究過佢哋部分嘅設計，佢哋講過就喺1998年佢哋曾經發生嚴重交通意外，係有車輛係剷上行人路嘅巴士站，之後亦都有類似嘅意外，之後佢哋就開始引入呢一類嘅護柱。其實我好有興趣，我好想得到進一步嘅資料嘅，希望佢哋可以話畀我哋聽究竟嗰個護柱嗰個設計係點樣樣嘅。

另一方面，喺奧大利亞，佢哋有一啲吸收能量嘅護柱，個設計就係要可以造到行緊時速60公里嘅車輛撞埋去都可以停到嗰部車，當然就唔係一啲重型車或者係巴士，係一啲普通嘅客車嘅，我哋就希望車上嘅乘客或者司機亦都唔會因而係受到嚴重傷害。呢個產品都相當獨特嘅，我係做緊一啲搜查嘅工作嘅，之前就只係見市場上只係有呢一個產品嘅。

我亦都係想指出喺新南威爾斯大學佢哋其中一位教授亦都係有同樣嘅意見，佢就覺得應該係做多啲研究，去睇下係咪可以喺巴士站嗰度用多啲呢啲護柱，同埋喺市區嗰度如果我哋無法係有一個連續不斷嘅防撞欄嘅時候，係咪可以用下呢啲護柱呢？因為啲人要係行出去個馬路嗰度。

我就仲未係同呢一位教授討論過，不過我相信佢同我嘅意見係相同嘅，佢亦都認為應該係朝住呢個方向去做研究。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，你呢一份陳述書寫嘅時候就係回應係2016年6月係關乎九巴嘅諮詢文件，之後立法會曾經進行過一個討論嘅，我想請你睇番立法會嘅文件嘅，第一份就係喺2016年嘅6月17號，你可以睇SEC嗰個文件夾嘅784頁，呢個就係關乎九巴巴士網絡專營權嘅一個更新咗嘅背景資料嘅，或者我講一講，就呢份文件就有關嗰個專營權係提供一啲背景資料嘅，佢嗰度亦都係總結咗立法會議員喺過往討論嘅時候所提出嘅關注。

我想請你睇第12段，嗰個標題就係話提升巴士服務嘅水準，呢度佢哋係提及係「第五屆嘅立法會嘅會期，嗰陣時議員就關注專營巴士服務嘅表現，喺佢哋嘅委員會嘅會議，特別財委會嘅會議同埋立法會嘅大會嘅會議都有提及嘅，佢哋促請政府就係借呢一個專營權續期嘅機會去要求巴士公司改善佢哋嘅服務嘅，包括就係向乘客提供巴士服務資訊，係實時咁提供，亦都就係有一啲優先座，以及呢個無障礙嘅設施，亦都唔好有咁多脫班，以及係嗰個繁忙時間更頻密嘅巴士服務嘅。」

講到嗰個實時巴士服務嘅資訊，我諗係仲未有嘅，不過我想問下，究竟呢個係乜嘢嘅概念呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我相信係指下一架到站車輛嘅資訊係顯示出嚟，即係話仲有幾多分鐘下一班車就會嚟到或者再下一班車係幾多分鐘之後嚟到，呢個亦都係涉及使用知能手機嚟到去獲取呢一個係下一班車到站嘅時間，我諗個概念就係咁喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）有兩個方法嘅，一個就係一個係喺巴士站或者總站嗰度有個顯示板，另一個就係喺你嗰個智能電話手機嗰度係靠呢個 app 嚟到去攞嗰個資料嘅，呢個已經幾年前已經陸續咁樣推出，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我諗係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）九巴做嘅，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，係，不過其他公司都有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋落去第 17 段，嗰度就話「此外，就係喺嗰三個專營權嗰度有加咗個額外嘅條款，係城巴、大嶼山巴士同埋新巴嘅，就喺 2013 年中開始嘅，就係授權畀運輸署就要求巴士公司去加強佢哋嘅安全設施同埋設計嘅。」係包括一啲要求嘅，睇唔睇到呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該，不如你將個例子讀出嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗佢哋講就係下面嗰句所講，買新巴士嘅時候係要有無障礙嘅設施同埋就係長者友善嘅設計，喺最屘嗰句就係話政府係會係喺其他嗰三家巴士公司嘅專營權嗰度亦都要求係無障礙設施嘅，鄺先生，縱使喺呢個專營權嗰度有一個咁嘅條款，都係唔見就係喺嗰個黑盒嘅設計或者黑盒嘅要求嗰方面有改善嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未落去嗰度之前，講到話冇障礙嘅車門等等其實唔係一個安全--同安全無關嘅，係咪呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，呢個無障礙嘅設施，呢個係方便，亦都係安全，車上任何嘅嘢都可以係一個不安全嘅物件嘅，所以我希望佢哋會清楚咁樣係講出其他嘅安全設施嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問，你話無障礙嘅上落車門係同安全有咩嘢關係呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我會咁樣睇嘅，譬如有啲人係需要個門口闊啲先上落到車，如果係無障礙嘅設施，就換句話講，就係喺門口嗰度唔會中間有個扶手處，就讓佢個門口夠闊係讓輪椅或者係其他人士佢有特別需要，佢就有個闊啲嘅門口係上車，所以呢度就唔係話好清楚咁講到出嚟嘅，不過我諗假設佢哋一個就係方便乘客，另一個就係安全起見嘅。我就希望佢哋就係有一個比較專門針對安全方面嘅要求，不過呢度就冇寫到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇另一份文件，嗰度就係講及究竟係要求喺新嘅專營權嗰度加啲乜嘢嘅條款，呢個關乎九巴嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者未落去之前，我就想睇番呢份文件嘅第 10 段，嗰度就提及喺 1 月份，2016 年 1 月 15 號曾經係進行討論，呢個係討論巴士公司巴士網絡嘅專營權，睇到嘛？廣生，睇到嘛？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，睇到嘅，主席先生，我而家睇緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，我哋有冇嗰次會議嘅會議紀錄呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋只係有一封信，就係嚟自係運房局，就講及 1 月 15 號會議嘅跟進事項，但係我哋冇嗰次會議紀錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗 8 月 26 號係有嗰份會議紀錄，就講及 1 月 15 號嘅事宜嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者睇番 SEC-2，990 頁，呢份文件係嚟自運房局嘅，2016 年 3 月 9 號，寫畀立法會，就係講及就係 2016 年 1 月 15 號係討論咗咩嘢事情。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家手頭上有一份會議紀錄嘅，可唔可以係將佢交畀你呢？有人話畀我聽呢個可以响嗰個螢幕度將嗰個文本顯示出嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）應該係 SEC-2 嗰套文件夾 960 頁，SEC-2，967。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個就係我頭先講緊嗰份。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係 1 月 15 號開會嘅紀錄，佢裏面嘅第 5 頁，大家可以揭去呢一份會議紀錄嘅第 5 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係第 13 段，你可以睇到呢個嗰個實時嘅巴士資訊系統係咩嘢用途嘅，呢個係一個服務提供嘅一個設施嚟嘅，即係可以等乘客知道究竟要等幾耐先至有一架巴士會到，呢個似乎係背後佢哋點解有咁嘅動機要做呢個實時嘅巴士資訊系統嘅，鄺先生，你可以睇一睇呢度。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席，我睇咗喇，你係咪想我係畀個意見呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）對我嚟講，呢個下一班車幾時到嘅實時嘅資訊都係可取嘅，因為會減少乘客嗰個不滿、沮喪，當然亦都係一個提供良好服務嘅一個方法嚟嘅，乘客可以決定等唔等，同埋佢哋夠唔夠時間、等唔等。呢個都同安全有關嘅，不過唔係直接有關，我歡迎有咁樣嘅服務嘅，就冇再其他嘅特別嘅評論。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果知道幾時下一班會到係咪同安全有關嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）如果個乘客知道架巴士會幾時到，我諗佢哋壓力係會低一啲，如果佢唔知道巴士幾時到，冇咁放鬆嘅，可能就有啲感到沮喪嘅感覺，可能會想儘量企近嗰個行人路嘅邊緣睇睇架巴士會唔會幾時到、望下。整體嚟講，呢個唔係直接嘅一個促進安全嘅措施，可能有好處，對於安全有好處，當然我冇任何嘅參考資料可以作為證實呢一點嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中一個提供呢個資訊嘅一個後果就係話巴士公司會知道架巴士喺邊度，同埋佢去緊邊度或者幾時到，係咪都有一個成果嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢個系統可以同一啲其他嘢一齊用嘅，即係等你可以知道巴士位置嘅系統或者係監察速度嘅系統一齊用嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話你知道幾時到，大概幾時到，你又知道佢喺邊度，亦都會知道巴士嘅速度，係咪？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個附加嘅好處就係佢會知道呢個資料，當然係為另一啲目的而設喇？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。好多時候，我哋應該係儘量善用有關嘅數據嚟到為唔同嘅目的運用，包括安全同埋服務水平嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我相信黃小姐一定會同你探討呢個多種用途嘅呢個目的，佢哋有冇實施或者有冇嘗試去實行呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個關於呢個實時系統，我就想請大家睇睇大家要求嗰個專營權嘅協議裏面加啲咩嘢落去，政府係點樣跟進，我想請睇一睇TD-3 文件夾。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋會睇乜嘢呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個立法會嘅文件嚟嘅，496 頁，不過我想請大家睇嘅係542，呢個係立法會嘅資料文件，係關於九巴嘅，係2017 年3 月28 號嘅，呢度有講嗰個有關嘅條文同埋新嘅嗰個專營權裏面嘅一啲新嘅要求嘅，呢個係嗰份文件嘅附件C，呢個係立法會文件，講番有關嘅協議嘅條文，係根據一個最新嘅專營權加入嘅條文，就係交咗畀立法會。

呢度係咁講，「九巴會全面實施有關嘅條文同埋個承諾嘅，响最近兩份嘅專營權，係2015 年發出嘅，即係話係城巴同埋大嶼山巴士公司嘅專營權協議，以下就係個詳細情況，第一就係巴士服務，個強調嘅地方係巴士服務，第一，話新嘅專營權會授權署長要求九巴提供促進巴士安全嘅設施同埋裝置嘅，亦都要提供一個無障礙同埋對老人友善嘅環境嘅，下面有啲措施嘅：

第(i) 係服務水準--服務質素，呢個係關於服務質素嘅問題，嗰個係無障礙同埋友善嘅設計，呢個係第一個分段。跟住就有一個係巴士站嘅一個資訊嘅系統。

第(ii) 個部分就係加強安全嘅，包括設備、設施、裝置，可以減少巴士上面嘅起火嘅危險，呢個係關於防火嘅。

第(iii) 就係容許嗰啲可以摺疊嘅單車上車嘅，即係話呢啲單車就唔會造成對其他乘客嘅危害，可以上車。

第(iv) 就係有個座位嘅，即係話巴士站要提供一啲座位嘅。」

下一段，關於提供畀乘客嘅資訊嘅。

「呢個新嘅專營權就會係增加署長所享有嘅規管嘅權力嚟到指定九巴為乘客提供嘅資訊同埋佢個形式，以確保乘客得到適當嘅服務嘅資訊，透過一啲更加好嘅方法得到呢啲資訊。

第(ii) 就係提供一個實時嘅巴士到站資訊嘅，透過綱站同埋嗰個智能電話嘅應用程式，亦都會喺巴士站係分期裝一啲指示嘅屏幕嘅。呢個服務係關於提供資訊畀乘客。

講緊資訊，署長都係得到加強嘅規管嘅權力，即係話講明、指明乜嘢資訊要提供畀乘客，從嗰個協議方面，呢個唔係關於安全嘅，而係嗰個提供服務嘅時候，要向乘客提供資訊。」

下一個題目就係加強政府嘅規管：

「第一，係要公布佢哋嘅服務承諾同埋回應投訴嘅合理嘅時間，同埋嗰個係要承諾嘅達到嘅成功率。

亦都有加強規管九巴嘅財務同埋會計安排。

第三項，就係要公開投標，即係九巴响採購啲重要嘅物料嘅時候係要公開投標。

最後一個係個環境表現方面嘅改善、空氣質素、低排放巴士等等。」

喺呢啲新嘅協議嘅條文--冇任何條文係關於加強或者係黑盒嘅能力，呢啲條文都唔涉及呢個巴士黑盒嘅性能嘅，你同唔同意呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我同意嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有提過安全係關於防火嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，冇錯，即係話會唔會引起火災嘅危害，新嘅協議就係容許署長可以要求九巴提供設施裝置一啲嘢，嚟到改善巴士安全，不過呢個條文就冇解釋呢啲咁嘅設施究竟係啲咩嘢設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢有提述防火或者火災嘅，係咪要將個引擎隔離、停閉嘅嗰個，係咪呀？頭先話城巴嗰度，因為之前引擎起過火嘅，呢個係咪為咗防止嗰個引

擎起火帶嚟嘅火災呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我冇研究過呢個課題，可能係咁樣嘅，我嘅理解，我詮釋呢度，我哋講緊巴士上面嘅火災亦都要考慮疏散乘客嘅快慢、速度，當然有其他嘅火災嘅成因嘅，不過又可能比較冇咁大嘅可能性，譬如話巴士同另一個載運易燃物品嘅車輛相撞，咁起火，所以火災嘅危害可以係一個好多--涉及好多嘢嘅，亦都係另一個專門嘅課題嚟嘅，呢個係一個潛在嘅安全嘅隱患嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，我而家可能就唔係咁順序，因為我係請你睇番政府向九巴建議嘅專營權嘅條文或者要求佢加入嘅條文，我想你睇一睇呢個文件，就係究竟政府點樣回應公眾嘅關注，同埋係咪响條文裏面反映到佢哋嘅做法，我想你睇 SEC-2，799 頁，呢個文件係畀立法會嘅，係講緊九巴嘅新專營權，日期係 2016 年 6 月，799 頁，第一頁嘅第一段就講及文件嘅目的，政府就邀請公眾人士就九巴巴士網絡新專營權嘅要求提供意見，呢份文件就係向議員報告係接收咗啲乜嘢意見嘅。

第 4 段嗰度就話一共係收到一百三十五份嘅陳述書，呢個就喺公眾諮詢期裏面收到嘅，其中二十七份嚟自區議會不同嘅政團以及係立法會，係 799 頁嘅第 4 段，對唔住。

主席：（經傳譯員）791？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）799。

主席：（經傳譯員）799？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，799 頁，第 4 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一共係喺公眾諮詢期收到一百三十五份嘅陳述書，其中二十七份係嚟自區議會不同嘅政黨、立法會，以及係區議會嘅個別嘅成員，以及係不同嘅團體，餘下嘅一百零八份嘅陳述書係嚟自公眾嘅人士嘅，下面就分咗五大類，就係話收到啲咩嘢意見，亦都係喺附件嗰度就係羅列咗出嚟。

802 頁就係個附件，我就想請你去睇一睇嘅，喺跟住嗰版，喺第 4 段，嗰度有一項就係叫做「巴士安全」，嗰度有兩個建議嘅，一個就係話要監察巴士車長嘅駕駛行為，要更加緊密咁去監察；第二，就係話要提升巴士車長嘅安全嘅設施，譬如話喺呢個係落車門嗰度係有一條橫杆，同埋巴士車身應該更加堅固。

呢度就係睇嚟，喺專營權協議嘅文件裏面，呢兩項都冇反映到出嚟，我哋剛剛提過㗎嘛。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，呢個 4 段，係呀，我當時都有睇過，我認為呢兩點係太過空泛，亦都反映唔到我哋嘅關注，我覺得我哋所表達嘅意見，我哋

嘅關注就係更為係具體嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋睇完九巴，讓我就講番呢個城巴，講番佢哋嘅係專營權一同埋專營權二，我相信就城巴嗰方面就只係涉及佢哋嘅專營權一你哋表達咗意見，因為喺你哋所提供嘅文件裏面，我就只係搵到一份嘅意見書，2014年嘅9月16號，係咪呀？喺呢個雜項文件夾嘅775頁。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，係嘅，呢份文件我哋就係喺14年嘅時候所呈交嘅，嗰次就係首次我哋嘗試就係向政府係提供意見，我哋希望借呢一個專營權續期嘅機會嚟到提供我哋嘅睇法。

主席：（經傳譯員）畀少少時間我搵番嗰份文件出嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）775。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個就係回應一份政府所發表嘅公眾諮詢文件嘅，我哋睇番第二段，「政府嘅諮詢文件就指出『政府喺睇下係批唔批出或者係咪為一個巴士專營續期嘅一個主要嘅考量就係究竟嗰個專營權公司係咪有能力提供一個適當而有效率嘅巴士服務。』我哋感到關注嘅就係其他嘅重要嘅因素，特別係道路安全、服務嘅質素、係咪環保以及企業責任、社會責任，都冇提到嘅。」我想問，係咪你第一次向政府進言呢？第二，你就話喺文件嗰度係道路安全同埋其他事宜都冇清楚咁樣樣係講出嘅，你係咪因此就覺得政府係唔夠重視呢啲因素呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席先生，啱，我哋嘅詮釋就係政府文件嘅文本，我哋就睇番佢所寫嘅文字，嗰度係冇提及係安全，所以我哋就要提出嚟，當然政府自己可以去解釋一下嘅，如果佢哋認為係適當，已經包括咗安全，我諗政府係可以解釋嘅，我哋亦都係樂意接受嘅，如果佢係咁嘅睇法。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番同一頁第五段，你嗰度就講「有一點係可以理解嘅，就係巴士公司未必有足夠嘅誘因嚟到做咁多重要嘅措施嘅，正如第17款嗰度講咗，呢個可能係由於營運成本高同埋就競爭，不過就係咁樣樣係去容忍嗰啲問題繼續存在，特別係安全事宜，係不可接受嘅，喺呢一方面，政府係提供更多嘅誘因，譬如話透過資助或者係夥伴計劃嘅。」我想同你係探討一下呢段文字，你呢度好具體咁講咗，就係話巴士嘅安全事宜，你就話似乎巴士公司就冇嗰個誘因，你亦都建議或者係透過資助或者係夥伴計劃嚟到提供嗰個誘因，其實你心目中係有啲乜嘢嘢嘅建議呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，喺呢度我指出安全係至為重要嘅，不可係因為財政嘅原因而作出妥協嘅，我見到巴士公司都係商業營運嚟嘅，佢哋係冇得到任何財政上嘅資助，除咗就係長者嘅乘車優惠計劃，呢個係近年推出嘅。正如我講，政府係唔應該排除呢一個可能性嘅，我未去到講話政府係應該做啲乜嘢

嘢或者應該係提供邊一類嘅資助，不過一般嚟講，我都係心目中係諗緊一啲財政上嘅資助嘅，當然我哋嘅意思就係話要探討嘅，我哋自己就未有再進一步好詳細咁去研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你心目中係有邊一啲誘因呢？如果講到安全嘅話，係邊啲誘因呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，其實可能性好多嘅，譬如話我哋要理解一下有啲乜嘢係安全措施、一啲乜嘢安全嘅策略係要引入，我哋首先係要有呢一個研究，亦都係要有啲係量嗰方面嘅--對唔住，質量方面嘅數據嘅，譬如話睇番過往嘅意外嘅數字、啲人係點樣會受傷，亦都係要同巴士製造商講，就係話我哋喺香港呢度有啲乜嘢嘅安全嘅問題。巴士製造商佢哋製造巴士嘅時候都係跟一啲標準去做嘅，譬如話跟番歐洲嘅標準同埋聯合國嘅標準，但係佢哋未必知道我哋香港本地係遭遇啲咩嘢問題嘅，所以要改巴士嘅設計，我哋首先要有研究。架巴士可能因而需要成本更高，所以譬如話喺呢方面係咪就可以睇下政府係咪可以幫手係資助一下呢？我哋未必係講緊就係全面嘅資助嘅，可能政府係資助部分，或者係政府亦都作為分擔一部分，一個夥伴計劃咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁邊一啲嘅安全要求呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我哋要睇下譬如話巴士車頭，要研究呢，我哋講過㗎喇，巴士車頭的而且確就係符合到歐洲嘅標準或者聯合國嘅標準，或者根本係冇標準，但係我講過，其實嗰個係一個問題嘅，因此如果我哋自己希望推動就話改良車頭嗰個設計，又同巴士製造商攜手嘅話，究竟呢方面嘅成本邊個去負擔呢？因為巴士因而就會更貴，咁做研究亦都係有成本嘅，呢個就係其中一個例子。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港嘅巴士佢哋全部都係歐洲嘅巴士製造商造嘅，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）我講專營巴士。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，我嘅理解就係大概係有兩大主要嘅巴士製造商，係歐洲嘅，就係喺英國為本嘅，就係亞歷山大丹尼斯。

主席：（經傳譯員）巴士嘅設計都係跟歐盟嘅標準嘅，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我嘅理解係嘅，同埋就係聯合國嘅 UNECE 嘅標準。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇其他嘅安全誘因你又認為可以係用得到嘅，會唔會係諗下係都係政府可以資助嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，譬如話巴士站，巴士站我提過，目前係有資助，當然巴士公司就係靠廣告收入就可以有呢個資助，另外就係巴士內部，車

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

廂裏面嘅情況都可以改動嘅。暫時未諗到其他，不過最終嚟講，我哋唔想巴士公司係受到不合理嘅財政壓力，因為我哋都想佢哋係賺到錢、佢哋開心，呢個就係嗰個概念。除此之外，喺呢一刻，我冇其他嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者有一方面亦都可以請問下你嘅，城巴嗰方面就有個咁嘅建議嘅，就係話每個座位都係有安全帶好唔好呢，佢哋就話係唔會個個都用嘅，如果要裝嘅話，就應該政府去資助嘅，你嘅睇法又點呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我唔想講及個細節，不過我有睇過城巴嘅回應，我琴日有講過，就話我哋要好科學化咁樣樣去睇每一項嘅安全嘅措施嘅，究竟係咪佢哋都係可以係解決我哋所面對嘅安全問題，安全帶的而且確係其中一項，城巴話乘客未必用--未必啱嘅--唔啱嘅，如果乘客唔用，當然唔令人滿意，我哋琴日都有討論過其他措施，譬如電子嘅穩定系統同埋其他嘅措施嘅，但係如果你要响巴士度採納有關呢啲設施或者設備，係有成本嘅。我哋要採納嘅就係特別要針對嗰啲會引起嚴重傷亡意外嘅一啲安全措施，安全帶係一個可行、可以採納嘅，因為我就唔係好清楚嗰個財務方面嘅影響係幾大，所以我就畀唔到我嘅睇法、評論，係咪應該將所有資源集中响提供安全帶呢？我會認為我哋應該要整體咁睇所有有關嘅安全措施嘅，要好小心比較唔同措施嘅好處、唔好處同埋有冇成效。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個文件，即係 775 頁，呢度有一個標題就係道路安全至關重要嘅，你就提過一啲嗰個關於意外率嘅，第 6(c)條，你有一個咁樣嘅觀察所得，政府「似乎好快想就話呢個意外率嘅原因，即係成因，就係話『城巴大部分嘅路線都係响市區裏面嘅繁忙道路度行走嘅，就所以意外容易發生嘅，但係大部分嘅意外係溫和性質嘅，譬如話响車裏面失去平衡、受傷，或者响個樓梯度失去平衡，而唔係同其他車輛相撞造成意外嘅。』」

你話你哋「唔同意呢個咁樣嘅段落嘅，因為巴士嘅安全至關重要嘅。佢諮詢文件冇講過嗰啲巴士壞或者分析個意外嘅成因、趨勢嚟到係支持呢個講法嘅，我哋覺得一定要首先提供一啲涉及巴士死亡、嚴重意外嘅數目，同埋嗰個行人受傷嘅數目，跟住先至可以再討論一下究竟响個新嘅專營權有啲新嘅建議、可行嘅安全措施改善嘅。」

你嘅意思，我哋唔可以淨係睇一個參數，而嗰個諮詢文件應該其實係提供更加多嘅資訊或者更加多嘅數據，同埋睇下點樣計算嗰個意外率背後有啲咩嘢數據，係咪你嘅意思呢，呢個？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席，係。因為係諮詢文件，你睇諮詢文件太過簡單，我嘅工作方式係需要睇番歷史上數據--意外嘅數據，從中汲取教訓，亦都要睇風險，如果係重大嘅風險，譬如話巴士响懸崖度跌落去，呢啲咁嘅意外唔會經常發生嘅，不過一旦發生，個後果係會災難性嘅，所以我哋要評估風險，亦都睇歷史意外嘅數據嘅。諮詢文件就遠遠達唔到我响呢方面嘅預期。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有一個建議嘅，响 776 頁，關於建議嗰一個部分，你有話

「我哋建議過去嘅意外嘅數據同埋巴士營運嘅潛在安全嘅風險係要係得到核實同埋仔細研究嘅，然之後就搵啲機會响個新嘅專營權係改善嘅，政府應該係考慮下獎勵巴士公司，如果佢哋達到某啲預定嘅目標嘅，譬如話每年減少某啲種類嘅意外係百分之二十。」我想請你係闡述一下你心目中諗嘅呢個獎勵計劃係點樣㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗我哋琴日都有討論呢個問題，呢個係好初步、粗略嘅建議，不過個概念就係我哋唔好成日話點樣罰人，亦都係要畀啲動力、鼓勵巴士公司同埋司機合作嚟到達成更高水平嘅安全，譬如話某一啲意外率嘅種類，減少某一個百分率，呢個都同嗰個 ISO30091 嘅呢個背後嘅理念一致嘅，關於道路安全嘅討論似乎社會或者政府好似都好滿意，只要嗰個巴士意外率係平穩，我就覺得唔足夠嘅，我哋要尋求持續嘅改善，呢個要符合嗰個安全系統嘅一個理念，同埋世界嘅趨勢，聯合國、世衛，我哋應該係希望達到係冇意外、冇傷亡嘅，就唔係淨係話一個平穩嘅意外率。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度你或者有一個總結嘅，係 777 同埋 778 頁，你都有一個類似嘅建議嘅，即係同嗰個--講關於九巴嘅意見書都係類似嘅，呢個係關於巴士安全系統，個巴士車輛嘅安全同埋嗰個巴士站，同埋 ISO39001 標準嘅，可唔可以證實呢個係你嘅睇法？

首先 777 頁，响頂嘅，建議，呢個關於 ISO39001 標準，巴士安全，中間亦都有建議，有啲類似即係話全面嘅標準同埋司機嘅監察系統，運用現代嘅科技，包括全球定位系統同埋黑盒，呢啲咁嘅要求都應該係納入作為專營權協議嘅一部分。

另外就 778 頁，嗰個巴士車隊有啲建議，都係類似頭先我哋睇九巴嘅情況，係有啲類似嘅建議。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）你係咪委員會係想我證實呢幾點呀？主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲建議而家都仲係有效嘅，至於話 ISO39001，琴日我講過，係比較新嘅一套標準嚟嘅。對我嚟講，我哋值得探究嘅，我嘅睇法就係話我哋唔可以堅持或者係施加某一種嘅要求，就係堅持一定要咁做，我就會建議有關嘅各方，巴士公司同埋政府探索一下係咪可能採納 ISO 呢個標準，對佢嚟講，睇睇究竟可唔可以接受、可唔可以實施，定係佢哋可唔可以提出一啲有相同嘅標準，類似或者係可以差唔多嘅標準。

我哋建議就係我哋要重視或者係小心睇一睇安全系統，要追求就係持續改善，又要循住一個嚴重意外零死亡率嘅目標進發，亦都可以睇下有冇其他嘅 ISO 標準可以同時研究，當然公司有好多符合唔同嘅認證嘅標準嘅，佢哋要遵守唔同嘅認證嘅標準。我都明白有啲企業會認為要有咁多認證嘅工作，要用好多人手，但係我哋最終都係建議採納呢個標準，因為我哋覺得响道路嘅安全係

達到好嘅成果嘅。我哋唔係想建議一啲會增加佢哋嘅工作量或者係冇乜嘢實證支持嘅一啲標準嘅。

總結嚟講 ，呢啲全部都係我哋嘅建議，但係最終是否可行，我就想請有關當局同埋有關嘅巴士公司仔細睇一睇逐項嘅建議都仔細研究睇一睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋見到呢個就住嗰個係公開諮詢嘅回應，我而家就想你再睇SEC-2...

主席：（經傳譯員）喺未開始之前，我想你睇番 776 頁，你嘅建議，就考慮獎勵巴士公司嘅，如果佢哋係達到一啲事先定落嚟嘅目標，你跟住又講，都可以理解嘅，亦都需要獎勵嘅，唔係淨係巴士公司，都要包括埋巴士司機嘅，我哋就收到啲證供，即係話九巴、城巴，今年 3 月 1 號開始佢哋同工會有啲協議嘅，佢哋嘅獎金係會係包括達到--即係佢哋响安全方面得到嘅獎金就會係納入嗰個基本薪金嗰度，即係獎金就變咗做底薪，如果係咁樣，即係話巴士再冇就住安全得到獎勵，你喺呢方面有咩嘢意見呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我諗我冇辦法評論呢個問題，講到底，呢個係一個好明確嘅一種--究竟係獎勵吖，獎金吖，定係一種懲罰呢？我哋希望車長自願好樂意咁樣接納佢哋有一個責任係用安全嘅方法駕駛嘅，亦都係符合我哋主張嘅安全嘅標準，呢個問題就呢個係比較複雜，就係同究竟點樣係畀一啲獎勵佢哋係比較係更加複雜嘅，我就會話應該要有一啲研究，睇下我哋可唔可以取得我哋想要成果嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）據我理解，應該係提供一啲誘因畀巴士公司，你都建議應該獎勵到車長嘅，而家嗰個獎金冇咗，究竟係好事吖，定係唔好事呢？呢個好簡單嘅問題啫，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個第一次我知道有件咁嘅事，等我諗一諗。

主席：（經傳譯員）我即係建議下或者上晝我哋都小休一陣。返嚟，二十分鐘之後，得唔得呢？可唔可以話畀我聽究竟係好事定唔好事呢，即係取消咗呢個獎金，即係安全駕駛嘅獎金？我哋停一停，我哋有二十分鐘。

上午 11 時 29 分押聆訊押後

上午 11 時 49 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，即係提供獎勵畀巴士司機，咁樣做係咪好定唔好呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我覺得就提供獎勵係好嘅諗法嚟嘅；第二，我就想指出個獎勵係應該用其他形式嘅，譬如話佢享有嘅地位，應該要令到車長嘅地位提高，因為佢哋做嘅工作、提供嘅服務係為我哋全社會每年每日咁樣付出嘅；最後一點，任何嘅獎勵計劃要小心設計，舉例，如果話淨係畀車長話過去一個月、一年冇意外就獎勵，係咪一個好嘅方法呢？冇意外可能係幸運，可能只係運氣啫，或者有意外都唔係一定佢錯嘅，可能係其他人錯。所以獎勵係咪應該基於大部分時間揸車嘅時候係符合公司嘅安全嘅要求--安全水準達到公司要求呀，呢個就係一個可能考慮嘅方向。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，我哋可唔可以睇到呢個所謂綠色嘅道路呢個咁樣嘅項目嘅資料呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋可以响螢幕顯示出嚟嘅。鄺先生，呢個係一個《海峽時報》嘅一篇文章嚟嘅，我哋就而家抽出嚟畀大家睇，你睇一睇，呢個係追蹤器，協助巴士車長改善服務，呢個係星加坡嘅一個系統嚟嘅，我哋就下載咗，呢個係一個車長就係話顯示究竟佢嘅駕駛係點樣可以追蹤，而且係响個智能電話度係收集嘅系統嘅。如果佢有一個會閃紅色、黃色、綠色嘅一個顯示屏，就視乎佢嗰個駕駛嘅行為嘅模式係點樣樣，呢個系統就係你可以用一個應用程式，就知道佢嘅駕駛行為，你可以知道某一個車長嘅駕駛行為，呢個係一個基於嗰個黑盒得到嘅數據，亦都可以進行數據嘅分析嘅。

睇番個呢篇報道本身，英澳嘅一個巴士營運商，叫做 Tower Transit，佢係話有一啲係會容易有一個問題嘅，譬如話嗰個車站會--同埋個車座位邊會蹦落嚟，就係佢個安全嘅績分就係上年 10 月就 165，就係話多過呢個建議嘅 20 嘅八倍嘅，即係話佢哋可以用智能電話嚟到追蹤呢個駕駛行為嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好好嘅參考資料嚟嘅。點樣做呢，當然係要進一步睇一睇，呢個系統就係話應該係想鼓勵車長，等佢哋覺得佢哋係專業人士，係一個好嘅專業人士，如果佢哋駕駛嘅行為好，佢係會受到尊重，亦都係有一個响專業上得到回報嘅，我對呢個好正面嘅，我就覺得我哋應該再進一步仔細點樣探索一下。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）為紀錄起見，我哋睇一睇中間呢個 Tower Transit 公司係有一個綠色道路嘅電子數據系統嘅，就令到佢哋司機揸車比較順暢、更安全嘅，响舊年 7 月到今年 5 月，佢哋就會可以利用系統嚟到實時透過全球定位系統同埋個探測器嚟到係追蹤個車輛嘅駕駛嘅情況嘅，就跟住就改善嗰個安全嘅得分嘅，我就想你睇睇呢度，等你知道，嗰間公司有請咗七百五十個車長嘅，呢個為我哋保存紀錄起見，我就提一提。

我哋係睇番你嗰個關於城巴嘅意見書，雜項 2 嘅文件夾 779 頁，我哋睇過㗎喇，不過我想你睇一睇呢個之前嘅意見書，就係為提供乘客嘅資訊呢一個段落，你關於城巴嗰度，你話「如果係好多大部分嘅乘客知道個時間表，佢哋就

已經滿意。」但係下一段，「雖然有咁樣嘅進步，响巴士站，唔係經常都提供資訊畀乘客嘅，應該係佢哋要承諾就發展一個比較現代嘅綜合系統，而家冇一個現代嘅實時嘅資訊系統，特別係主要嘅巴士設施方面嘅資訊系統，係不符香港作為國際城市大家嘅期望嘅。」你就覺得「政府應該同嗰個有關嘅營運商係商討一下可唔可以有一啲係試驗計劃，發展一個現代嘅巴士乘客資訊系統。」呢個就係關於你係倡議有一個實時嘅資訊系統，呢個當時係關於城巴，當時佢哋冇全面實施。

自從你交咗呢個陳述書之後，我哋睇一睇政府嘅取態係點樣樣，對於公眾嘅意見，佢响呢方面有咩嘢取態，我想你睇 SEC-2 呢個文件夾 655 頁，SEC-2 文件夾 655 頁，呢個係一份文件嚟嘅，係公眾諮詢文件嘅，係關於新嘅專營權協議有咩嘢要求，呢份文件係 2014 年 12 月發出嘅，就係列出公共諮詢嘅結果嘅，即係呢個關於新嘅營運權嘅協議，係關於城巴第一個專營權嘅。

第 3 段，你睇到，嗰個公眾諮詢就係喺 2014 年 6 月 25 號至到 9 月 16 號期間係進行嘅，運輸署就係邀請十八個區議會以及就係十八個區議會嘅交運會係提供意見，其中五個區議會就係有喺佢哋會上討論過嘅。

去番第 4 段，嗰度就話總共係有四十七份意見書就喺公眾諮詢期間係收到，十八份係嚟自政黨，其他就係嚟自個別人士，佢哋就係三方面表達意見：服務質素、票價優惠同埋政府嘅規管。另外喺附件嗰度就係列出嗰個主要嘅意見嘅。

我哋睇番呢個 657 頁第 3 段，嗰度就講及巴士嘅安全，其中一個建議就係話要引入一啲監察嘅機制嚟到加強就係監察巴士車長嘅駕駛態度，呢一個就係改善車上嘅安全設施，另外就係話要改善嗰個管理，特別係安全裝置嘅管理，嗰個就係公眾諮詢嘅結果。

又睇番嗰次會議嘅會議紀錄，SEC 嗰個文件夾--對唔住，未去之前，其實有另一份嘅立法會嘅文件嘅，喺第 700 頁嗰度，呢份文件亦都係一個背景摘要，總結咗過往嘅睇法同埋關注地方，或者你可以睇番一個 703 頁嘅第 16 同埋 17 段，個標題就係話巴士嘅駕駛安全，呢個就係新大嶼山巴士公司。

喺第 15 段嗰度，可以先睇一睇嗰度，就話喺立法會會議一位議員提問，當時係 2015 年 4 月 29 號，關乎就新大嶼山巴士公司嘅巴士駕駛安全，係因為 2015 年 4 月初曾經發生咗意外，所以就係提問嘅，嗰個就係附註嗰度就係有講嘅，就係話有一部係新大嶼山巴士公司嘅巴士喺東涌去大澳途中差唔多係跌落山嘅，當時就落緊斜，就係懷疑就係剎掣系統就係失靈嘅。當時運房局局長就話所有係新大嶼山嘅新招聘嘅車長都會係接受三至五天嘅培訓，呢個係新大嶼山巴士公司提供畀佢哋嘅。

跟住嗰段就係運房局嘅局長就指出話新大嶼山巴士公司已經係安裝咗一個電子行車記錄儀，呢個係俗稱叫做「黑盒」，係整個車隊都已經裝置咗，嚟到去記錄低車輛營運嘅數據，以助係佢哋監察車長嘅行為同埋係調查意外。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

好，呢份文件亦都有提及呢個黑盒嘅，提及呢個要求，相信你剛才睇到呢個局長嘅回應，或者我哋睇番個會議紀錄，呢個就係2015年嘅7月17號嘅，SEC-2嘅937頁，呢個係會議紀錄，就係7月17號2015年開會嘅紀錄嘅，我哋去番呢個943頁，你由第11段嗰度開始睇，一路去到第16段。

個焦點就係在於提供實時巴士到站嘅資訊，個重點喺呢度，就唔係話巴士安全或者其他事宜嘅，呢度就係講公眾提嘅意見就係頭先所講嘅結果呢方面嘅，睇到未呢？或者你可以用一啲時間去閱讀一下嘅。

鄺子憲先生：Okay。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以確認一下呢個都係關乎就係提供一個實時嘅資訊，就為乘客提供呢啲資訊，就唔係話監察就係巴士車長嘅表現，雖然公眾人士嘅一個意見就係關乎嗰方面嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家喺螢光幕上面睇緊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請問你睇完未呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，睇完，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以確認我剛才所講嘅，即係話佢哋呢度講嘅全部都係關乎就提供實時嘅資訊，就冇講及就係巴士安全或者係巴士車長嘅駕駛表現。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，係，我剛才所睇嘅呢啲文字大部分都係關乎呢個實時嘅資訊系統。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係同監察司機嘅行為表現就無關嘅？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，我睇唔到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後，或者我哋可以睇番呢一份立法會嘅文件，嗰度就係列出新嘅專營權嘅條款，呢個係城巴嘅，就係TD-3，570頁，呢份係立法會嘅摘要，裏面講及係新嘅專營權條款，係城巴同埋新大嶼山巴士公司嘅，我哋可以去572頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）想問下呢份文件係幾多號嘅呢，邊日嘅呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2015年嘅9月22號。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該你。或者我哋去呢個572頁，第5段，首先呢度就講及呢個城巴嘅表現，跟住嗰版就講及係新大嶼山巴士公司。

喺574頁就講及係公眾對巴士服務嘅睇法，下面第8段，嗰度就係講喺新

嘅專營權嘅條件同埋係佢嘅承諾，呢個 574 頁嘅第 8 段，首先，呢度就係話將新近批出嘅專營權嘅專營權條款同埋承諾係加入去，呢度係政府就係得到城巴同埋大嶼山巴士公司就全部係接納，就係話將最新近批出嘅專營權嘅條款係加入嘅。

喺第 9 段，跟住嗰段，嗰度就講及新嘅專營權條款同埋嗰個承諾嘅，嗰度總共有三項嘅，首先就係提供實時巴士到站資訊，第二，就係提供票價優惠，第三，就係提升巴士服務嘅規管。

喺第 10 段，就講及係提供實時巴士到站嘅資訊，不過嗰度完全係冇提及巴士安全嘅，呢個講緊第 10 段，請你花啲時間去睇一睇。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席先生，係呀，我睇唔到有任何地方係提及巴士安全嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第三個要求就係要求就係提升巴士服務嘅規管嘅。第 15 段，577 頁，再次，呢度冇任何地方提及巴士嘅安全又或者去監察係駕駛嘅表現。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席，啱嘅，講得啱嘅呢度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，呢個我要想請你討論嘅最後一個課題，2014 年 12 月 12 號嘅，喺雜項文件 2 嘅 780 頁，780，呢度係一封信，係你寫畀局長嘅，運輸及房屋局局長，你就提出你嘅睇法，就話關乎呢個係公共交通策略研究嘅研究範圍，係 780 頁，喺底下嗰度，你就話，首先你就講及嗰個安全嘅表現同埋公共交通嘅風險，你就話根據係已發表嘅意外統計數字係有咩嘢睇法。

跟住你呢度就話呢一個公共交通策略研究應該就係再展示所有嘅機會重新檢視嚟到去係提升安全同埋服務嘅質素，有啲例子就話黑盒同埋係全球定位系統、司機監察系統，你就話應該就係有系統咁樣樣去監察一啲駕駛嘅參數，譬如話就係車速、加速、剎車，嚟到係去減低各類意外嘅風險，呢啲咁樣嘅系統應該係用一啲新嘅規矩，譬如話限速，高速公路嘅限速、市區裏面街道裏面嘅限速，同埋應該係溫和咁樣加速、減速嘅一啲數值等等。

你就倡議，即係有一系列嘅倡議，你要求改善嗰個係利用黑盒同埋全球定位系統實施嘅監察系統呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個同我哋一路建議都係一致嘅，响好多文件、我哋提交畀政府嘅意見書我哋都係有咁講。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，多謝你。主席，我已經完成咗我提出嘅詢問，睇一睇我有冇咩嘢其他嘢可以協助委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）有一個城巴交畀我哋嘅信件嘅，我哋要求佢哋確定關於呢個協議裏面佢哋一啲承諾嘅，你可唔可以响個螢幕係顯示畀我哋睇呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信係 CTB-3，即係第 3 個文件夾，CTB-3 號，即係城巴

3號。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）582到585頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，我就心目中就係想睇呢封信。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一封信嚟嘅，係由運輸署寄畀城巴嘅，呢個就係話係咪叫佢哋確定係咪承諾提供實時嘅巴士到站系統嘅呢個承諾嘅，583頁可以見到。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我睇到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢封信亦都完全冇提述話監察車長嘅駕駛態度或者係改善嗰個黑盒科技或者係利用全球定位系統嚟到係監察車長嘅駕駛嘅表現，即係冇任何嘢關於你八個月之前提出嘅建議嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，譬如話(b)(1)呢一段，佢用嘅用字，增進安全嘅一啲特別嘅設施...

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一段話？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）(b)(1)，你响呢度讀嘅，而家响個螢幕上第一段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係第7條？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，第7個條文，新嘅專營權協議第7條條文嘅第(1)點，嗰度有講過安全--或者係增加安全嘅一個設施嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係話佢响附件2就列出嚟嘅，有冇附件2可以睇到呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔响呢個文件夾嘅，但係我哋可以參照之前一啲文件嘅，係响TD-3文件夾裏面第614頁，TD-3，614頁，呢個係第7條嘅條文，提供有關嘅設施嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有冇附件3？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔响呢個文件夾，即係話冇提供到附件2同附件3畀我哋，淨係得嗰封信，同埋586就係城巴有啲承諾嗰封信，但係我哋可以參照另一份文件，响嗰個運輸署嘅文件夾裏面，我哋係可以睇到有關嗰個條文嘅，如果你參照番TD-3嘅614頁，我哋就可以睇到㗎喇，同埋652頁一齊睇。第7條係關於提供設施等。

652頁係第7條，佢有一個新嘅分段(1)，就係授權署長可以要求個營運商係可以加裝一啲新嘅設施、設備，嚟到係改善安全同服務，包括提供無障礙設施，即係為老人家同埋傷殘人士提供無障礙設施，呢個就係個583頁裏面所

提述嘅有關嘅條文。

基於我哋所見到，鄺生，呢個係同嗰個監察嗰個駕駛表現、行為無關嘅呵？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我想講呢啲咁嘅條文唔夠準確嘅，即係唔係完全咁樣係回應番--或者係同我哋嘅期望係唔一致嘅，我哋覺得一般嚟講咁樣嘅公眾嘅諮詢就係好多意見書嘅，我哋只係其中嘅一份。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇另一封類似嘅信件，係九巴發出嘅呢？我哋可以睇一睇佢有咩嘢承諾，嗰份文件--因為專營權協議就唔係公眾可以睇到嘅文件，呢個係巴士公司同當局之間嘅一份協議。係，而家响嗰個投影嗰度見到，下面可唔可以睇一睇「改善安全設施」，羅馬數字第(iii)點，呢度咁講，係咪响九巴第 9 份？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係運輸署寫畀九巴嘅，2017 年 3 月 10 號，關於呢個文件，我哋見到九巴就係响呢個加強安全設施方面，佢係指明响羅馬數字第(iii)點，電子數據處理嘅裝置同埋嗰個限速器等等。所以呢個所謂電子數據處理嘅裝置其實即係黑盒，佢哋係會裝置呢樣嘢，就冇講究竟個裝置裏面會係收集啲乜嘢嘅數據嚟到係監察車長嘅駕駛表現嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，講得啱嘅，呢度文件所講嘅裝置，當然我係想有嘅，我都覺得好嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）不過係咩嘢都得嘅，因為佢冇講清楚呢啲嘅加強嘅安全嘅設備其實係咩嘢嚟。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）呢樣樣樣嘢都係關於安全嘅，不過有啲重要啲，有啲比其他重要嘅，我恐怕我哋比較重大嘅關注係得唔到回應嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你要求係實時自動嘅監察車長駕駛表現嘅一個系統，呢度所講佢係一個加強嘅安全嘅設備，呢個公司所講嘅，巴士公司，就係一個電子數據嘅處理嘅裝置，就冇講任何嘅裏面所講嘅配置或者係標準嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，佢就唔係回應話「我哋有一個監察系統，同埋亦都要發展一啲安全駕駛嘅準則嘅。」佢冇講呢樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你已經完成咗你嘅提問？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我已經問完。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席，多謝你，鄺生，多謝你琴日同今朝嚟到提供意見畀我哋。我有兩個問題，睇一睇你有咩嘢睇法，第一，香港有唔同類嘅道路，你可以諗到，响新界揸車同响九龍或者係港島揸車係唔同嘅，所以我問你

嘅問題，你支唔支持進一步或者係比較一啲清楚嘅準則去決定使用乜嘢嘅巴士，响唔同嘅道路嘅狀況應該使用唔同嘅巴士係咪應該有啲明確嘅規定？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你歐陽先生嘅問題。唔同道路會帶嚟嘅安全嘅問題係唔同嘅，對於揸巴士，而家都已經有考慮究竟使用邊一個種類巴士嘅準則㗎喇，譬如話個尺寸大細同埋佢哋嗰個設備有啲唔同嘅，即係唔同嘅道路可能有啲唔同嘅。

新嘅巴士，我試過，我理解响香港島嘅道路行駛嘅新巴士，譬如話有機會會撞到樹嘅，造成損毀或者係有人受傷，佢哋就有一個好似樹木嘅防護圍欄，即係一條橫杆，响某一啲路度，高速公路，佢哋會用一啲大一啲嘅巴士，一百四十八個乘客嗰啲大巴士。你嘅問題就係話呢個係一個方向或者應該係進一步仔細研究嘅，唔係淨係睇使用邊一種嘅巴士，即係唔係淨係講大細或者係乘客量或者係長度，我哋都要睇一睇其他啲仔細啲嘅嘢嘅。

我亦都有提過，頭尾碰撞都係我哋十分關注嘅，特別喺高速公路上面係頭尾相撞，因為上層前排嘅乘客就係只係有安全帶，都唔能夠係保障到佢哋嘅，譬如話巴士同一部貨櫃車相撞，呢啲乘客都係保障唔到嘅。所以睇嚟，我哋應該要更加慎密咁去考慮，究竟應該喺某一啲路段、某一啲路線派邊啲巴士去行駛，呢個當然就係要配合番我哋所搵到出嚟嘅潛在風險，無論就係理論上嘅一啲潛在風險定抑或係過往已經發生咗意外所鑑別出嚟嘅風險。

我唔知答唔答到你嘅問題呢？

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）鄺先生，我就係問第二個問題，就係講及，你講過，就係比較窄嘅山路，你就提議將嗰個駕車速度係降低同埋應該係有更多嘅安全防撞欄，我想問安裝鏡頭攝影機，你覺得係咪都可以達致同樣嘅果效呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）你意思係咪指鏡頭攝影機...

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）去防止司機係超速或者係甚至乎可以有證據捉到邊個人就係超速嘅。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）理論上，呢個係可以做嘅，我哋其實個目標好簡單，我哋就係想巴士司機小心駕駛，如果佢哋係駛過一啲比較關鍵嘅路段，佢哋係要特別小心，因為我哋唔可以容許有巴士係喺山坡碌落去、喺懸崖嗰度跌落去。有攝影機都係一個恰當嘅裝置，不過目前嗰個科技，我哋其實可以更有效率咁去做嘅，就我嘅回答就係咁。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。唔該你，主席先生。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒鄺先生，呢兩日我哋喺你嗰度就係聽咗好多意見，設計、道路設計、各類嘅安全嘅設施，我哋就值得係繼續去鑽研嘅。我就想問，你認為有邊一、兩項嘅事情係比較容易做得到，即係好似話係嗰個證據比較清楚嘅，亦都係適合香港去做，有邊一、兩項係可以好快、儘快去做嘅呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，羅教授。有幾樣嘢嘅，我諗我都喺呢啲文件裏面好清晰咁表達咗出嚟嘅，我諗我所見到佢即時嘅危機就係嗰啲關鍵、重要嘅路段，譬如話山頂道有啲路段，呢個係一個例子，我哋有二、三十米高嘅懸崖，但係今時今日有咁多巴士，有咁多旅遊車、校巴、小巴喺山頂嘅馬路行駛，我琴日講過，其實的而且確係需要有個安全防撞欄，但係我哋都知道呢啲馬路都係好耐歷史嘅，而我哋亦都需要係有資金，有足夠嘅投資，我諗首先係就係要提升司機嘅意識，亦都係要引入剛才所提及嘅嗰啲管控嘅措施。

第二點想提嘅，我亦都已經講過，就係將嗰個頭尾碰撞嘅風險減低，特別係喺高速公路上面，呢個亦都可以即時做到嘅，就係透過就係提升司機嘅意識，特別係搵出邊一啲司機係有咁嘅習慣，好鍾意係同前車跟車係太貼嘅，特別係如果佢哋嗰條巴士路線係行駛經過一啲高速公路同埋其他嘅鄉村路嘅。我諗呢一度亦都可以減低嗰個風險，因為我哋知道往往如果係發生交通意外嘅話 ，都會引致多人傷亡嘅。

其他嘅措施，其他嘅交通意外嘅類別，或者畀我睇一睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要急。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，我會慢慢睇。請大家睇一睇我嘅陳述書，雜項文件夾2，實質上係我嘅陳述書，嗰一個報告係關於巴士安全嘅，784 頁，因為呢個就係讓我想起我想提及嘅嗰宗意外，第一，就係乘客失去平衡，呢個就最常見嘅。提高司機嘅意識，呢個可以好快咁樣樣做到嘅，我哋唔能夠排除晒所有嘅風險，但係起碼都可以喺一個合理嘅範圍將佢減低嘅。

第二點就係話同行人相撞或者撞到啲行人，我都講過，就係話巴士喺市區馬路行走嘅時候將佢個車速係降低，特別係有啲司機往往係駛過呢啲地方嘅時候嗰個車速都係唔適當嘅。

最後一點，我諗你哋會特別係關注嘅，就係巴士翻側，我想指出，其實有好多不同嘅巴士翻側嘅情景嘅。或者大家可以睇番我同一份文件 796 頁，都係翻側，翻側可能係源自不同嘅原因嘅，譬如話入彎位嘅時候車速過高係其中一個成因；另外就可能喺懸崖碌落懸崖，呢個好清楚；另外亦都有其他嘅情況嘅，可能衝咗上嗰個安全防撞欄嗰個末端嗰個斜坡，其實亦都喺過往有多次巴士翻側都係因為咁樣樣而係發生嘅。

你睇番呢一個圖表，你可以睇到 2017 年 1 月 14 號，當時就係城巴喺藍田鯉魚門道就係翻側嘅，係一人死亡、十九人受傷，當時架巴士就係因為去到嗰個安全防撞欄嗰個斜嘅末端嗰度就係上咗去之後就翻側嘅。另外係 2003 年 10 月 17 號，當時就喺西九龍高速公路嘅，亦都因為呢一個安全防撞欄嗰個斜嘅尾端嗰度就係巴士喺嗰度係翻側嘅。另外就 2015 年嘅 6 月 12 號都係喺嗰個安全防撞欄嗰個斜尾端嗰度就係巴士就因而翻側，不過嗰度就係冇人受傷嘅，冇乘客嘅。

所以呢啲安全防撞欄嗰個斜嘅末端我哋要係關注，特別係喺高速公路嗰度，因為有時一架巴士可能佢會係駛得太貼嗰個路邊，咁佢剷咗上去呢個安全防撞欄嘅尾端呢度就會翻側㗎喇。

我諗呢一啲都可以係好快可以做到嘢嘅。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄺生，有冇其他嘅事宜你想講呢？請你而家講，否則嘅話，我哋就感謝你今日同埋琴日上嚟作證。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席先生。實質上，呢兩日我想表達嘅都已經一一講咗，我只不過係想澄清一下我嘅意見，好讓嗰個概念更加清晰嘅。

首先，我講嘅高速公路同埋呢個市區道路網絡係咩嘢意思，同埋以中文嚟講，“highway”就係公路，“urban street network”係市區街道。我哋講到話係要嗰個時速限制係降低，大部時候我哋係講緊市區嘅街道網絡，因為我哋講緊話每小時 30 或者 40 公里咁樣樣嘅時速限制。我想係講清楚，我琴日並冇咁嘅意思話公路都係一般嚟講要降到咁低嘅車速嘅，呢啲公路都係將不同嘅市區分區係連結一齊嘅，所以嗰個期望會高啲嘅。

另外，我就想講嗰啲車速限制係要合理嘅，係要同佢哋嘅期望同埋同周圍嗰個環境係要配合嘅，呢個係一個好敏感嘅一個課題，我唔想讓人係有一個咁樣嘅印象，就話一見到有問題，我哋就立即就係將嗰個時速限制係降低嘅，嚟到係降到去低到係唔合理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者喺呢方面，你係咪都想講一講嗰個話係第 85 個百分比嗰個概念呢？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）其實我哋係交通工程嗰度關乎車速有幾個概念嘅，首先，我哋車輛嘅車速唔係一個單一個值嚟嘅，我哋睇番嗰個車速嘅情況，譬如話我哋睇咗一百輛車，我哋會睇呢一個第 85 份，呢個其實話佢嗰個車速就係 48，換句話講，有百分之八十五嘅車輛都係喺呢個數值或者以下嚟到係行駛嘅，另一方面，有百分之十五佢哋係當時個車速係高於每小時 48 公里嘅。

另外，我亦都想講呢個 85 並唔係我哋所睇嘅唯一個值嘅，而根據琴日主席你所提及嘅嗰份文件，即係話 2013 年制定車輛時速限制英國當局所發出嘅嗰份文件。喺呢份文件，佢哋提倡一個係清楚嘅速度限制嘅，係平均嘅速度，佢哋唔係話用第 85 個百分位嘅嚟到決定嗰個速度限制嘅。呢個佢哋覺得要係反映大部分合理駕駛嘅駕駛者希望有嘅速度，佢哋想用咩嘢速度嚟到係駕駛，個重要嘅地方就係話如果用 85 百分位呢個數值可能對行人未必有利，如果係用一個平均值可能更好。香港就冇乜點樣討論呢個重要嘅事項嘅，呢個會有重大影響嘅，就係點樣設立一個速度嘅限制。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀一個參考？邊度地方會係講到話要睇平均速度--平均值㗎？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）我先攞番嗰套文件夾出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講一講你係睇緊邊個文件夾？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗SEC-3，第3套文件夾，1003頁。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我想請你睇一睇1014頁第34條嘅條文。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可唔可以請你讀番呢一段？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）佢話中位數嘅速度同埋85個百分位嘅速度係一個通常使用嚟到係量度嗰個交通速度嘅，當局應該繼續係作為常規係收集呢個數據，但係呢個中位數嘅速度應該係作為一個決定本地或者當地嘅局部嗰個速度限制嘅基礎。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以讀一讀36段出嚟？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係，好嘅，主席。36段，「大部分嘅路嚟講，就係話嗰個中位數同埋第85百位數係一個一致嘅關係嘅，但係如果當呢個唔成立嘅時候，最好就話係佢有個決定究竟係用咩嘢速度嘅，我哋覺得應該係用個道路嘅設計同埋個限速係要做一個更好嘅配對嘅，有時需要有額外嘅措施嚟到係減低嗰個差別嘅，即係話中位數同埋85個百位數嘅差別嘅，令到嗰個更加能夠係一個正常嘅分佈嘅狀況嘅，個限速應該係同嗰個道路嘅環境同埋嗰個路況係相匹配嘅。」我係咪應該繼續呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）大家見到我哋要考慮好多嘢決定嗰個速度限制嘅，要基於一個穩健嘅、合理嘅工程嘅考慮，我淨係覺得呢份文件係好好嘅參考，如果我哋想詳細嚟到係研究呢啲課題。

最後，我就係想澄清幾點嘅，第一個就係關於嗰個路上嗰個減速嗰個壆，我用中文就會叫做「減速壆」，有另一個名叫做「減速台」，個意思係減速壆係一個响個地上凸出嚟嘅一個壆，一個起出嚟。我哋亦都有啲標記嘅，呢個係一個視覺上嘅一啲標誌嚟嘅，即係話司機如果係揸得太快，唔會話好似經過減速壆咁樣感覺唔到唔舒服嘅。

我見到有時減速壆佢哋譯咗做「減速帶」，呢個係關於我琴日回答委員會嘅問題，就係話响大埔道應該有啲減速壆嘅，我就比較保守一啲喇琴日，因為我就意識到你係講緊一啲真係起咗出嚟嘅，响地下嘅，譬如話12厘米高嘅一個壆，你可以叫「減速台」或者係「減速壆」，即係英文叫做“speed hump”，不過我當然我係開放態度嘅，即係話响主要嘅公路，我哋係唔會有一個減速壆嘅作為一啲真係喺路度嘅一個實體嘅設施嚟嘅，因為如果真係揸得太快，會引起交通嘅問題。

我哋有時响啲大路度有減速壆，當然要符合一啲條件嘅，首先要分開唔同

嘅路段，即係主要嘅道路可能有唔同嘅路段，有一部分可能經過一啲村或者係主要嘅鄉村，我就唔想話咁簡單就話某個建議係唔可行，我其實係願意有開放態度考慮，不過需要進一步詳細研究。

講多兩點。捉紅燈嗰啲攝影機係咪用嚟改善香港交通嘅安全呢？响香港，市區有好多捉衝紅燈嘅攝影機嘅，佢只可以決定究竟架車係咪衝咗紅燈，不過你可以想像下如果架車經過嗰個燈號，譬如話彌敦道嘅路口有燈嘅，佢係綠燈或者係80公里嘅速度經過，呢啲攝影機係唔能夠捉到佢或者係要嚟做執法嘅，因為佢就唔係衝紅燈。

响澳洲，佢哋已經係同衝紅燈同埋捉快車係合而為一嘅，嗰個攝影機就會捉嗰啲衝紅燈或者速度太高嘅車輛都可以影到嘅，如果係同時衝紅燈又再超速，就會收到兩張告票嘅，佢哋叫做「捉衝紅燈及超速嘅鏡頭」。我知道香港呢啲攝影機嘅供應商係可以提供或者係一個攝影機可以同時做兩樣執法工作嘅，呢個如果係做到，係一個好好嘅解決方案嚟嘅，亦都可以配合我哋話減速--即係減低嗰個限速嚟到係改善香港市區環境嘅交通安全。

最後一點我想澄清嘅係關於雜項2呢個文件夾裏面嘅第808頁，係講緊呢幅圖，主席好有興趣研究呢個，因為我哋就討論嘅時候，係咪可能啲車或者係巴士响嗰個懸崖跌咗落懸崖度，尋日我話我哋已經係提出呢個問題都提咗好耐，有時係用信件，有時只係喺我哋網頁度就發布，又冇通知人，我係有向區議會提出嘅。

我相信呢個政府咁多年佢哋都有留意嘅，咁多年有一啲道路都有相類似嘅問題，有啲有高啲嘅優次，我想--即係話我係認知到政府係特別係有留意呢一啲咁樣嘅問題，特別响個關於橋嘅問題，因為自從屯門嗰個意外，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊2003年，係咪呀？

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，主席。係呀，呢個係一個持續嘅一個問題嚟嘅，自從嗰個時候，到我哋啲橋其實係另一種潛在會製造災難嘅問題嘅，因為佢哋嗰個--而家嗰啲路就已經有足夠嘅安全圍欄嚟到係提供保障嘅。我哋知道政府有一個新嘅顧問報告係關於道路安全嘅危害嘅，我哋知道有呢個咁嘅顧問嘅研究嘅，我哋亦都明白呢個研究係為咗針對呢個問題嘅。

最後一點，就係好多呢啲咁樣嘅問題都係响啲舊、起咗好耐嘅路，我哋需要改善嘅係需要資金、撥款嘅，就唔係撥款做一啲小型嘅改善工程。

我相信我哋係有能力不斷係考慮呢個問題，透過提醒各方面嘅持份者同政府留意嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你嘅時間，你已經做咗總結，多謝你提供嘅證供。我而家就暫時休會，去到兩點半再開始。我哋會有位叫做Alok Jain嘅先生提供證供嘅。多謝你係用咗咁多時間協助委員會嘅工作，提供你嘅證供，多謝晒。

鄺子憲先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席，我好樂意咁做，亦都多謝委員會同埋其他嗰啲提供支援同埋委員嘅努力。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，兩點半。

下午 12 時 59 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 程艾樂先生，九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司前僱員

主席：（經傳譯員）各位下午好。

程艾樂先生： Very good afternoon.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒程先生接受我哋邀請出席呢次嘅聽證會，畀口述證供協助我哋考慮有關事項。我哋要做就係要作出一啲建議，改善巴士安全，咁黃律師會開始問你問題，唔該晒。

程艾樂先生： Thank you, Mr Chairman.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程生，你好，多謝你嚟到，我係代表委員會嘅律師，我會問一啲問題係關於專營巴士嘅安全設備。首先，我會作一個引言，程生，你係寫咗兩份意見書，係回應委員會向你提出嘅問題。第一份，日期係 5 月 25 號 2018 年。係前僱員文件夾 1，第 35 頁開始。第二份呢，就係由 44 頁開始，日期就係 6 月 18 號，都係 2018 年，我會就呢兩份你寫嘅意見書問問題。

我先想講你嘅背景，程生，你向我哋提供咗你嘅履歷一份，呢份嘅履歷可以喺呢一個 46-1，亦都係前僱員 1 號文件。程生，目前你係 Trans-consult 亞洲公司嘅總監，呢間公司就係一個顧問公司，負責有關於運輸方面，一啲新嘅技術、數據分析，同埋清潔能源科技。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信你曾經為香港九巴工作過，同埋就係呢一個港鐵，總共就 12 年。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講埋邊段時間呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我係 97 年加入，離開嘅時候就係 08 年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想請你睇番你嘅履歷，係 46-5，上面就講咗嗰段時間同埋你嘅職位，就係呢一個嘅地鐵，九廣鐵路，咁就係呢一個嘅 06 年至到 08 年，就係呢一個總經理，係市場推廣部。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住揭一頁，一橫 6，你就提及過有關於發展一個實時車務資訊系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）未講呢個之前，可唔可講一講佢嘅學歷呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，程生，想請你講一講就係一橫 8 有關於你學歷方面。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）應該喺最屘嗰頁。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一橫 8，咁喺中間嗰度可以見到，學歷同埋專業訓練。程生，你係一個學士，係工程系，土木工程，咁就喺印度讀番嚟嘅。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺 94 年嘅時候，你就係相信係一個嘅碩士課程，都係有關於為運輸方面，運輸工程方面，咁就喺泰國嘅一間 Asian Institute of Technology。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）05 年時候，你就係讀咗一個綜合管理課程，係高級管理人員，咁就喺呢一個 Richard Ivey School of Business。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係你嘅學歷，你亦都係 UITP 嘅會員。

程艾樂先生： That's correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個國際公共運輸組織，你可唔可以解釋一下係咩嘢嚟㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個其實係一個法文，咁就係英文翻譯為 International Association of Public Transport，就係呢一個國際公共交通國際組織，咁就係包含好多好多國家，係亞洲等等。我知道其實呢一個港鐵係呢個組織嘅一員，九巴我就唔知係唔係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁想請你睇有關於係鐵路嗰個，係實時車務管理系統，咁係呢一個一橫 6 頁嗰度，有關嘅發展。係喺 2004 至 2006 年上面，嗰度有一段，就話你係帶領執行一個實時廣播系統，係將佢係概念化，呢個係贏咗一個獎，咁就係屬於呢一個最佳生活獎，咁呢個係咪地鐵呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）當時係九廣鐵路，呢個我哋叫做 Newsline Express。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個系統可以發布咩嘢資料？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）基本上嚟講係車上一啲廣播系統，係一個顯示器，有新聞，有啲節目，同埋係乘客資訊。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係乜嘢類型嘅乘客資訊呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）一個正常日子嚟講，就話下一站係乜嘢，同埋一啲教育嘅資料，譬如話係小心空隙，遠離車門。咁喺一啲非正常日子，譬如話有事發生，咁樣你就係可以呢係指導乘客去一個正確方向行。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係 06 年至 08 年嘅，係嗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，當時我係呢個市場推廣部主管。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你跟住睇番 46-3 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）一橫咩嘢 3？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，我唔知道係你個角度問題定係個咪問題，但係由你講嘅話呢，就好似矇矇地啲聲，可能需要人去搞一搞，可唔可以擰下佢呢？係咪嗰個聲量嘅問題呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我大聲啲，大聲啲得唔得呀？

主席： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程生，請你睇番 46-3，呢度係有關於九巴，受僱九巴嘅時候，當時就係策劃同埋發展部，咁就係呢一個 2013 至到 2015 年。

程艾樂先生： That's correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住升咗職，變成呢一個副車務總監，就係 16 年 1 月至到 16 年 12 月。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你嘅履歷裏面，你亦都講過話帶領研究發展嘅工作，即係就於使用科技，數碼分析同埋呢一個智能系統，智能流動系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度可以見到呢個資料呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲其實就係，我係喺某一段時間裏面有做。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一陣我再畀資料，咁你亦都曾經一段時間喺香港嘅一間教育學

院嘅教授。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係助理教授。

主席：（經傳譯員）係教乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我係香港大學嘅城市規劃學院嗰度呢，就係教㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊段時間呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）開始嘅時候，就係 04 年，我仍然係會做一啲兼職嘅工作去教某啲科。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你教係邊個範圍，係乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）主要都係有關於公共交通同埋規劃。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就講咗話你呢啲係學術方面嘅參與，咁係呢一個一橫 8 頁，咁就話係香港大學嘅城市規劃學院兼職助理教授，係由 07 年 1 月到而家？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，頭先都係咁講。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我頭先講過嗰個就係 46-1，第 2 段，最屘嗰行，咁就話佢係帶領研發有關於使用新技術，數據分析同埋智能流動系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）係代表乜嘢呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）即係喺關於公共交通上面使用一啲智能系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪 2013 至到 2016 年呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主要係 2015 年嘅事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以解釋多一啲係交通運作方面使用技術，包括啲乜嘢呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）譬如喺早期嘅時候，就係講一啲遠程資料通訊系統，咁同埋有一個合約就冇完成。咁就係關於呢一個九巴數據分析，咁當時呢就係我其中一間受僱嘅公司係有份參與，咁就係關於係存取數據，分析等等。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你目前係一個顧問，係一個陸上交通部，係星加坡一個政府組織，係咪？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔係直接受僱於佢哋，咁但係我係一間顧問公司嗰度工作，咁呢間顧問公司係畀意見佢哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁有關於你要畀意見個範圍係乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）因為有呢一個保密，所以我唔可以講。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁但係同公共交通嘅運作有關？

程艾樂先生： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我而家相睇番你嘅意見書，第一份意見書，日期係 5 月 25 號 18 年，就係呢一個前僱員文件裏面第 39 頁。程先生，喺你第一份嘅陳述書第 2 段嗰度，你就咁講，其實你由 39 頁開始解釋，當時你係呢一個策劃及發展部主管，九巴嘅時候，同埋你嘅工作範圍，就包括科技引用，特別係喺你哋運作同埋呢個資料管理方面，其實呢個包括係咪實時車務管理系統，同埋遠程通訊系統？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，遠程通訊系統同埋實時車務管理系統呢有兩個部分，一個就係硬件部分，其實而家講三個部分，軟件、硬件同埋就處理啲資料，咁我基本上我就係喺處理資料嗰方面呢我有參與。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰啲硬件係指係乜嘢呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）就係由 Openmatics 呢間公司去提供，呢個係一個遠程通訊系統，咁就喺巴士上面安裝，咁喺我哋公司嚟講呢，我哋就會開發一啲軟件，咁就希望能夠裝遠程通訊系統嗰啲資料就擺落實時車務管理系統，咁然後處理資料時候，就係點樣處理啲資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先，慢慢嚟，我哋首先係硬件，telematics 係大概係牽涉啲咩嘢設備呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我哋通常做黑盒。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢嗰個技術個名係叫乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個系統嚟，就係喺嗰個引擎裏面，亦都係連接喺引擎同埋其他部分，特別係睇番嗰個巴士嗰個表現係點。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁大致上係點邊數據可以搜集嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）例如關於車速、加速、減速、煞車，或者係使用燃料，傾側，同埋位置等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁佢嗰個型號叫做乜嘢名？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁軟件方面，係個軟件係啲乜嘢呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺當時呢，就係喺我哋自己公司開發，咁就係可以提供做實時車務管理系統，ROM 英文簡稱就係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁點樣去運作㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁 telematics 呢，就係遠程訊息系統呢，就係可以實時將呢啲數據就分番送番去營運控制中心嗰度，而嗰個實時車務管理系統呢，就將呢啲數據係變成一啲可以明白嘅數據，咁然後我哋亦都有個平台，就係可以處理啲數據，分析啲數據，擺落我哋嗰啲規劃嘅參數之中，令到我哋可以編更，編時間表，編路線等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個營運控制中心喺邊度㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）本來就原意就係喺荔枝角車廠嗰度設立。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰啲數據係點樣呢，就係由遠程訊息設備系統嗰度傳送去營運控制心？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係經過一個 GSM 嘅網絡，就用一啲流動通訊 3G，3G 科技就去做㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係基本上係嗰啲流動電話用嘅系統，係咪？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係關於軟件嗰方面，咁關於處理或者分析數據係點樣嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁好多數據喺九巴嚟講，都係獨立處理，譬如關於工程部，就有工程部嘅資料，或者車務部，就有車務部嘅資料。咁佢哋就喺唔同嘅系統裏面存儲，咁嗰陣時有計劃，就係將所有呢啲擺落同一個數據庫嗰度，亦都係大家可以一齊共用。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果呢個數據庫，你嗰啲資料會點樣用嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有三個部分，三個階段，第一個呢，就係首先，係睇下實時發生緊啲乜嘢。第二個階段，就係希望係擺落一個模型嗰度，我哋至少係幫助我哋可以規劃。第三個目標，就係希望能夠用一啲數據工具，就係做一啲未來預測。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁關於實時嗰方面第一點？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係會愛嚟管理啲數據，同埋可能去調查，紀錄等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁調查啲乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話有好多嗰啲乘客投訴某一啲情況，然後我哋就會睇番啲數據，確認係咪有類似嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果嗰啲投訴，譬如話就係突然之間煞車，或者係超速，咁攞咗呢啲數據，係咪真係可以分析到就係講緊呢個特別嘅呢個數據庫？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果關於點樣去處理啲投訴，會唔會主動去用呢啲嘅數據呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁第二個階段呢，就係會係有實時系統，咁我哋就攞咗啲過往數據，咁我哋就會係可以係實時去分析，咁個諗法就係話可以監管成個嗰啲車務係用實時嘅方法，我哋就可以講叫做一啲例外嘅情況嘅管理，如果譬如話一啲界限值已經係超越咗嘅時候，我哋就會主動去管理相關嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果真係成立咗嘅說話，咁你睇到呢個咁樣嘅系統，點樣可以去幫到嗰啲司機去揸車？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話我哋參數，我哋又定咗啲參數，如果係超越咗個參數，咁就會有警示，咁有啲嘅公司，世界各地嘅公司，佢哋就會用一啲係綠色同埋紅色嘅警號，如果綠色呢就代表係正常，紅色就已經係超越咗警戒線，咁如果佢係已經超越咗界限時候，咁我哋就需要積極去干預。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇預測到就係呢個警示系統，咁如係參數已經係超越咗嘅時候，會唔會係實時可以去做到警示？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）當其時嗰個諗法確實係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁關於遠程訊息系統話要咁樣用嘅時候，係幾時開始有相關嘅討論？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個討論就喺我加入九巴之前，咁我係 2013 年加入，咁喺我初初開始喺嗰度做嘅時候，咁我哋就已經係傾緊，咁所以我唔知道正確嚟講係幾開始有相關嘅討論。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁當其時有邊個參與相關嘅討論？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個高級管理層，我個老細，佢係呢一個交通發展主管，科技部門等等，咁其實成間公司唔同部門都有參與。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你覺得話有好多人有參與，大概係幾多人呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我聽唔清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你話有好多人都有參與，你可唔可以話畀我聽，大概係有幾多人參與？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）唔同嘅會可能有唔同人數，其實冇一個定嘅數字，咁每一個部門都有佢哋嘅代表參與，咁呢個就係剛才我講嗰啲關鍵嘅部門。咁都幾多人㗎，咁睇下傾緊啲乜嘢，可能係有 3、4 人，有可能係 20 個人。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺呢個陳述書嗰度講呢，就係話嗰個有一個荔枝角嘅營運控制中心呢，就會將呢啲嘅所有嘅據擺喺嗰度，就係有唔同嘅部門可以用嗰啲資料嚟就係分析。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁你其實呢嗰個荔枝角就會係一個營運控制中心，就係實時車務管理系統。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁其實呢佢係會係服務成個公司嘅，咁呢度基本上呢都係有一個去存儲呢啲數據嘅，又或者呢其實嗰個實時嘅監管，都會喺荔枝角中心嗰度進行嘅。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，喺荔枝角中心嗰度。嗰啲我哋知道巴士喺邊度實時嚟講，咁而呢個有唔同嘅伺服器會分析，處理器會分析，咁然後呢就係呢啲數據就會係提供畀好多公司裏面其他唔同嘅人士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去睇第 42，就係前僱員文件夾 1，第 2 段。你提到喺第 2 段 A，就關於呢個實時車務管理系統。喺 A 你就話參與好多嘅討論同埋會議，關於係技術規格，功能，選擇相關科技同埋等等等等，就你啱啱加入公司嘅時候就係做呢啲嘢，咁但係你就冇參與關於呢一個招標、款項或者係呢個項目管理嗰度。

程艾樂先生： Correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪就係話你加入公司至到你走嗰段時間，你都係有參與呢個系統㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺嗰時期，當我哋大家討論點樣去實施嘅時候呢，其實我都有參與。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我亦都留意到喺羅馬數字(I)，喺 A 段，但係你就話其實主要嘅原因，點解去實施呢一個項目呢，就係改善安全，通過實時預警同埋反饋畀一啲車長，咁關於車長方面嘅反饋嗰度，其實呢度會唔會都係實時進行嘅呢還是係之後先至話番，或者反饋畀嗰啲車長，特別係話呢一個嘅收到投訴之後？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁其實有兩樣嘢嘅，咁呢個就係一個兩方面嘅雙向嘅一個嘅系統，咁個車長呢就係有呢個叫做司機嘅顯示系統，咁就可以有一個雙向方法，一個就係一個巴士層面，咁我哋就係可以--如果一架巴士就係已經超越咗某個界限嘅時候，佢就要警告個車長。咁另外一個方法呢，就係話又喺個控制中心嗰度有人睇到呢架巴士，或者已經係超速，但係仍然都係喺個車速限制之內，咁呢個如果喺架車上面嘅時候，冇發現有異常嘅情況，但係喺個營運控制中心嗰度嘅時候，個督導睇到，見到可能係因為個天氣問題，或者其他呢一個意外或者係路面嘅情況，佢哋應該係揸得慢啲，咁嗰個嘅督導就係可以喺介入，就係提醒呢一個車長可以揸得慢啲，咁所以呢喺兩個層面嘅一個嘅干預。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果係第二層面干預嘅話呢，就係透過營運控制中心，咁係點樣向車長溝通呢個訊息呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有好多唔同嘅選項嘅當時傾過，咁譬如話一個顯示系統，第二就係一個聲音嘅系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係有兩個可能性，一個就係透過顯示系統，或者呢就係透過聲音？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，視像已經有喺度㗎嘞，當時其實就係有考慮埋呢個聲音。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係用咩方法，係呢個無線電？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，主要都冇無線電，或者有其他 3G 通訊系統，但係我哋未傾到嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提及過有好多唔同嘅會議，或者係討論關於呢個實時車務管理系統，可唔可以講下？記唔記得有冇任何文件，有冇會議紀錄係講--傾過啲乜嘢呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有好多唔同嘅講法，有電郵，有傾，有寫低咗究竟係當時講過啲乜嘢，總結講過啲乜嘢，主要嘅議題，職責等等，咁但係正式嘅會議紀錄，我就唔記得有冇嘞。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢啲嘅陳述，你就話有好多，係咪書面㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲全部都係投影片。

主席：（經傳譯員）係電腦呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，電腦上面。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係書面嘅？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）主要都係電腦囉，呢一個係投影片嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個整㗎呢啲資料？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有時係資訊管理部，有時就係車務部。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講下喺車務部裏面，邊個負責整呢啲資料，陳述咁㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）車務部入面邊個呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你唔記得話唔記得，如果記得就講係邊個？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有一組人專門負責係做呢樣嘢，係務部入面嘅人，不過佢哋離開咗，我唔記得佢哋啲名，有一個中央嘅組別嚟㗎，係嘞，咁就負責係交通。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係屬於車務部，係負責呢一個交通，佢係交通部。

程艾樂先生： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係 B 段嗰度呢就提及過話呢個遠程訊息系統，喺第三行，遠程訊息系統嘅資料，仍然係有，就算係放棄咗呢一個項目之後，都仍然有，咁所以仍然喺某程度上有監察，咁但係呢一個實務--呢一個就系統嗰個真正嘅價值呢，其實係要實時，咁但係呢方面呢就已經犧牲咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想講話某程度上嘅監察意思係咩嘢，未講呢嘢之前？你就話冇執行到，冇用到，點解係會停止策劃呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢方面嘅討論我冇參與，即係話關於話係放棄呢一個系統，但係我理解呢一個嘅管理系統係公司內部，亦都係遲過訂定嘅時間。

主席： Yes.

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁所以引致某程度--我搵一個正確嘅講法，公司裏面即係覺得即係失望，因為追唔到個時間，唔可以準時做到，咁亦都唔會再繼續進行。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個技術會唔會係同其他即係喺巴士上面，當時有應用嘅技術呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）可能有幾樣，就係巴士上應用嘅，有傾過一啲實時通訊，溝通，即係發收咗幾多嘅車資，亦都係一啲自動數人，亦都係呢可能係選擇一啲嘅大學教授同我哋講關於話呢一個無線上網嗰方面資料，咁但係最後其實，我哋就係會睇下究竟幾多人喺巴士上面，然之後呢事先畀個資料畀佢哋，等佢哋知道我哋幾時應該呢係上車，幾時應該落，即係幾時係可以係有位坐。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個系統，咁喺你加入公司之前，咁係咪已經有發展到一個系統，就係話畀你聽預計車幾時到？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢方面嘅功能，其實喺我加入咗嘅之後做，咁其實就喺呢一個 2014 年最後一季，其實係有試用過，咁但係 2015 年嗰嘅時候，就已經正式啟用。

主席：（經傳譯員）需要用到嘅技術方面，即係發展呢個技術，係同實時車務系統係咪有關嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實都係用番同一樣嘅嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話收到嘅數據可以有其他用法？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講番呢？記唔記得係邊個宣布或者決定，係唔再進行呢個項目㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇人真係去公布，不過即係正如我喺信上面講，喺荔枝角嘅係營運控制中心已經變成寫字樓，咁嘅訊息都好清楚，冇正式宣布。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得有正式宣布。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有關於呢個實時車務管理系統，係咪佢其中一個功能係咪監察車長嘅行為呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）仲有其他嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁樣提呢，因為你講過話係綠色道路，同埋一啲嘅記分卡，咁當你講緊呢個實時車務管理系統嘅時候，其中一個諗法，係咪即係你公司諗嘅用法呢，就係想做嘢呢樣嘢㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，其中一樣囉。咁我係提過過話即係關於呢一個油耗效率方面，咁其實就係一啲綠色駕駛，咁你可以講係同一樣嘢嚟。其實理想嚟講，就可以話畀司機聽，叫佢揸得好啲，譬如係整一個系統出嚟，講番畀佢聽個反應係點，佢哋揸成點，咁佢哋係咪跟番正常嘅模式，定係唔同咗，咁咪可以即係提一提佢哋，等佢哋揸得好啲，但係唔係罰佢哋。呢樣最終係可以令到慳到油，因為其實慳到油就係同呢一個加速、減速有關。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你話就唔需要罰佢哋嘅，咁獎勵呢。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）當時我哋其實就冇講詳情嘅，不過呢就係唔係懲罰佢，呢個好清楚，我哋當時傾嘅就係咁。其實我哋就想睇下點樣去搵呢啲嘅資料，去點樣去獎勵或者去監察嘅，咁但係其實就冇講到詳情。咁其實我哋傾過好多唔同嘅嘢，好多唔同嘅可能性。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你有冇傾過一啲參數，係定咗啲咩嘢參數呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）基本上嚟講呢，譬如話講倫敦，當時我哋有睇過呢個作為參考，咁基本上就係睇一啲嘅事件，即係話如果係喺呢一個嘅門檻，超過咗我哋訂定嗰個嘅門檻，就會係有啲乜嘢情況出現，譬如話加速、減速、傾側、煞車等等。咁如果少啲事件發生，咁即係話佢哋駕駛態度咪好啲，佢哋表現亦都

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

好啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇特登講明，有冇考慮到呢而係講明話，如果超速去到一個某個程度，加速到咩嘢程度，呢一個過份嘅煞車咩嘢程度呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇講明個數字，但係我哋想做嘅就係，做一個統計嘅分析，當時呢仍然係拗緊話究竟我哋擺啲乜嘢嘅即係門檻呢，有啲咩嘢參數呢，同埋一個嘅係即係偏離嘅標準，咁我哋有諗過話係咪要一個一般嗰個規則，定係話要講明喺某情況發生啲咩嘢事呢，咁其實我哋大部分嚟講都係傾緊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）頭先你就講過話呢，係針對某一個路線，咁你點揀呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）每條路線都有唔同嘅特徵，譬如話會唔會係去尖沙咀，去市區公路，咁所以係巴士司機嗰個嘅行為反應都會唔同，咁所以巴士司機呢，譬如話即係某一個情況，可能煞車大力啲，譬如話佢係抽番架車出嚟，入番架車去巴士站嘅時候，咁我哋當時呢就係傾過點樣可以最好，用一個公平個方法去符合到管理層嘅期望，咁同埋同時間係唔會令到司機覺得難受。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想請你講番 B 段，有關有某程度嘅監察，即係喺放棄咗呢個項目之後，都有某程度嘅監察，你嘅意思係指乜嘢呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）以我所理解，遠程訊息系統其實仍然有用，不過使用嗰個嘅個用法呢，就係 T+1 嘅，即係話發生咗事之後。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係其實係變咗係反應，唔係預示嘞。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）同時你亦都提及過話呢一個系統嘅真實價值，咁其實仍然喺度，不過呢實時呢一個功能已經就係犧牲咗，其實你講緊就係話係變成係對事，發生咗事件反應，而唔係預先？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實即係講緊係實事嘅資訊，咁但係呢冇人係實時分析當時嘅資料，而係係事後先至反應，咁其實可以話係 20 秒就反應到，定係話 20 個鐘頭之後先反應到？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第 3 段，由第 2 行開始，你就提及過話，就算喺當時九巴係策劃緊呢個計劃嘅時候，其實我哋好大量依賴韓國、星加坡、倫敦同埋幕尼黑嘅經驗。咁其實講緊你係乜嘢經驗呀？呢啲國家嘅經驗。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺我加入之前呢，以我所理解九巴高層，其實就係出國考察過呢啲城市，睇佢哋嘅系統，咁我哋設計嘅時候，就開會係大量討論過話係韓國做過乜嘢，倫敦做過乜嘢，佢哋嗰個嘅良好做法係乜嘢呢，點可以應用喺我哋度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀一個例子？譬如話係喺呢個首爾，或者星加坡。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）首爾有一個中央交通管理中心，我哋其實都係想營運控制中心可以做到呢樣嘢，倫敦嘅運輸局亦都係積極去管理司機行為，使用嘅係遠程訊息設施，呢個亦都我哋想係用到，所以睇番唔同例子，同埋點樣可以轉化為我哋用到嘅方式。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當你傾緊呢啲嘢嘅時候，同埋開咁多會喇，你記唔得有冇牽涉到運輸署？你有冇將你哋計劃做嘅嘢係講畀運輸署聽呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得實際運輸署有冇參與我哋討論，不過我覺得佢哋知道我哋計劃做啲乜嘢，因為當時我哋係做咗好多公開陳述，就係亦都同商會呀等等有講，有講話即係九巴將來係點使用技術去改變。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係你喺公開場合做咗好多陳述？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，我自己，仲有其他公司嘅高層喺公開場合就做咗好多陳述講呢啲嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘢就係呢個實時資訊系統？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係其中一樣嘢，仲有係預計到車時間等等，主要都係關於遠程訊息嘅設備。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你公開場有講過呢啲嘢喇，即係可能係有啲運輸署嘅人員出席呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我答唔到你，咁但係其實我可以話呢係公眾都知，因為我哋唔係想唔畀人知，我哋所以都公開都有講。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你嘅意思係咪就係話，其實訊息係有分發去畀好多唔同嘅人聽，咁運輸署可能都知。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我再繼續之前呢，你就講到關於呢一個中央交通指揮中心，咁我可唔可以睇一睇SEC-2文件冊嗰度，第822頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，可唔可以休息一陣先，因為我想搞一搞嗰個系統，因為黃大律師嗰個聲音就好矇，咁可能或者要轉一轉個咪都未定，咁我哋可唔可以呢就係休息五分鐘，咁如果程先生你想離開間房，都係可以。

下午3時15分聆訊押後

下午3時22分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程艾樂先生，就係呢個係關於呢個係立法會嘅一個文件嚟嘅，咁呢個係首爾同埋新加坡嘅專營巴士，呢個係SEC嘅第2號文件，就係第822頁開始嘅。

第823頁，呢個就係首爾嗰個系統嘞，呢個開始。咁喺825頁喇，2.8段...

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講呢個文件係幾多--咩嘢日期㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2014-2015年嘅撰寫嘅，呢度冇一個正確嘅日期，呢個係一個嘅研究部嘅報告嚟嘅，就係由立法會秘書處去編制嘅。呢個可以睇到IO05/14-15年咁樣㗎。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢度最後嗰度寫就係「2015年2月3號」㗎，寫咗個日子。

主席： Thank you very much.

Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇825頁吖，呢個其實講關於呢個巴士管理系統嘅成立，第2.8段嘞就係：

「去能夠統籌呢個巴士嘅服務，能夠全面嘅方法喇，咁呢一個首爾嘅城市政府就係設立咗個新嘅巴士管理系統，用一啲最新嘅智慧嘅交通系統喇，咁我哋有最球定位嘅系統喇，就令到呢一個嘅中央嘅控制中心就係可以完全監察所有巴士嘅地點喇，佢嘅速度喇，同埋就可以同呢一個巴士司機係溝通喇，同埋即係改變個巴士嘅數字，同埋就係讓呢一個嘅乘客係可以有一啲實時嘅資訊，知道究竟嗰個班次係點樣樣。」

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係其實類似㗎，咁呢個關於呢個全球定位嘅系統，呢個係一個以地點為本嘅系統。

黃女士： Yes.

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）所以一定係唔係淨係指係呢個嘅系統為--遠程通訊式系統都係需要㗎，咁我唔敢肯定佢哋係咪會做遠程訊息系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個全球定位話畀你聽嗰個地點？

程艾樂先生： Just the location.

主席：（經傳譯員）然後你就遠程訊息系統就話畀你聽，究竟加速、減速等等？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁關於呢個巴士實際個表現，就應該喺個巴士上面有一啲嘅裝置，咁呢個通常就係遠程訊息系統喇。咁佢可能係好簡單，亦都係可以係好複雜㗎。

Openmatics 嗰個系統就係一個好先進嘅系統嚟㗎，但係你同樣喇，其實呢啲嘅裝置都係會比較簡單，亦都係可以好--比較平啲，有啲好基本嘅資料，咁呢啲都係喺個市場上面有㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁 Openmatics 嗰個係冇--喺 2015 年嘅時候係莫札特盒，係咪嗰個，係咪叫莫札特盒呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我淨係識到莫札特係同音樂有關嘅啫，我唔係好...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個巴赫吖？巴赫都係一個嘅音樂家嚟嘅。咁 Openmatics 都有用呢個型號嘅，咁你有冇--識唔識呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁當其時我哋淨係講 Openmatics 同埋遠程訊息系統喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁其實就我哋係 ZF 嘅陳述書㗎，咁你有冇睇過呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我有尋晚好夜我先至收到，所以我冇乜時間睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋其實就--佢哋話佢有兩個型號嘅，咁就第一嗰代就叫做莫札特，第二代叫做巴赫嘅。咁呢個其實如果喺即係音樂史上面，其實係調番轉嘅，嗰個歷史就係。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁但係佢哋嗰啲數據睇落嚟都好似好有音樂感咁嘅。

主席： Yes, Ms Wong.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程先生，有關於呢個莫札特同埋呢個巴赫嘅人，我哋去到 BM-1 文件冊第 64 頁吖。

呢個係一封嘅函件，就係一個律師事務所喇，佢哋代表 ZF 嘅，同埋 Openmatics 嘅。佢哋呢個係提交陳述書畀我哋嘅委員會，咁呢個嘅陳述書...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，等等，等程先生可以就將個文件帶到佢面前嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程先生，請你揭去第 65 頁。呢個係 Openmatics 嘅回應嚟嘅，就我哋--向我哋嘅委員會嘅回應嘅。嗰個黑色部分就係問題嚟嘅，而呢一個藍色嘅部分就係 ZF 同埋 Openmatics 嘅回應。

如果你睇下第二段，呢度講到：

「Openmatics 就係同呢一個九巴就係有個供應嘅合約喇，就係喺 2013 年

4 月 16 號嘅，就係提供呢一個遠程訊息系統，就係畀呢個九巴同埋龍運嘅。」

咁呢個係 2013 年 4 月 16 號，咁呢個係你加入之前嘅。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我係 2013 年 6 月加入嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你--呢度繼續講就話：

「Openmatics 就係開始提供遠程訊息服務㗎，咁就使用第一個嘅黑盒系統，就叫做莫札特盒㗎，之後 Openmatics 就係用一個叫巴赫盒嘅較後--較新嘅型號係代替咗莫札特盒㗎，咁但係係即係好多嘅顧客好似九巴咁，都兩樣亦都有用嘅。」

程生，我知道你就對於黑盒嘅名稱唔係咁熟悉，但係你有冇喺你哋傾嘅時候，即係講黑盒嘅時候，有冇真係將個黑盒攞畀你哋睇呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我畀相你睇，會唔會幫到你喇？會唔會令你記得起呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）雖然咁講，其實我有見過嗰個儀器㗎，有見過個黑盒㗎，不過就唔係即係呢一個有關於九巴或者 Openmatics，但係其實我係有見過嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番之後嘞，66 頁之後嗰頁。呢度提及一個司機嘅反饋系統呀，就有個界限喇，就係由九巴就於嗰架車係訂定㗎，咁就有關於加速率、減速率同埋係傾側角度，同埋有關於車速，一啲其他參數。

咁對於界限方面，即係有關於呢一個遠程訊息系統設定界限呢方面，你有咩嘢嘅認識呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有一樣嘢就係我好記得嘅，就係個傾側角度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）因為--係，因為係其實對我嚟講，就係已經係好危險㗎嘞，因為架車已經係傾側緊喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）會跌㗎嘞？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）已經成 44 度，已經係唔可以再控制到㗎嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以就其實就唔係話係要畀出一個警號嘅，咁簡單嘅？

程艾樂先生： Possibly.

主席： You set a position that is beyond purpose.

程艾樂先生： That's correct, yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺減速率方面呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個全球嘅參數定係同路線有關呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）應該係講緊全球。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）2.3 係上落斜的話，其實可以接受㗎，因為有時係--喺香港係有咁嘅需要。如果平路，就太多嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。想請睇 68 頁呀，第四段對上，有提及過 Openmatics 喺九巴嗰個嘅--設置嘅系統可以搵到啲咩嘢，就話可以係搵到速度嘅紀錄喇，就係每秒㗎，亦都係連同嗰個全球定位系統嘅資料一齊儲存㗎。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我搵唔到你講邊度呀。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）68 頁呀，唔好意思，程生，藍色嗰部分，第三段，藍色嗰部分，就係關於呢一個係：

「Openmatics 嘅遠程訊息系統安裝喺九巴嗰度嘅。」

見到嗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）見到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就話：

「可以認出到一個速度嘅紀錄喇，係每秒㗎；

亦都係連同呢個全球定位系統嘅資料一齊儲存喇；

突然間剎車嘅不良做法喇；

突然加速；

同埋呢一樣嘢會連同巴士嘅車牌喇同其他輔助系統。

喺九巴嗰個嘅系統就唔可以認到某啲巴士嘅路線㗎，呢一啲其實就係每秒去認到，亦都就係將呢一啲嘅訂定嘅數據喇，每隔三十秒就會透過呢一個無線傳送或者係透過呢一個網絡傳送喇，咁係傳送去有關嘅伺服器嗰度㗎，即係呢個流動系統。

所以想問，咁就話九巴係可以認到四樣嘅項目㗎，咁你傾嘅時候，係咪有傾過呢四樣就係關於實時監察司機嘅行為呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）以我所知，遠程訊息系統嘅設備就唔係話佢超速或者係講緊車速嘅資料，亦都係有關於佢剎車嘅表現，可以知道究竟係咪大力剎車。

但係其實你要係睇下有啲乜嘢嘅--你要界定究竟係一啲乜嘢嘅參數，所以加

速--佢哋話畀你聽喇，咁但係乜嘢叫做突然加速，乜嘢唔係突然加速，就要你自己去界定嘞。

呢個係我嘅理解。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我喺之前嗰頁已經睇到佢哋嘅解釋，就話呢啲嘅數據參數係要輸入去個機嗰度嘅，但係呢個就係關於嗰個數--關於--關埋個傾側角度㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁即係話可以揀㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢啲係技術方面嘅參數喇，可以係適用於某一個路線，或者唔係即係路線專用喇，位置專用喇，你都可以係界定嗰個嘅一啲嘅界限，就係譬如話係一段路段咁樣嘅，就唔係用全球嗰個。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話你可以自己去界定嗰個界限喇，即係取決於嗰架車喺邊度喇？

程艾樂先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話喺咩嘢嘅經緯度喇，你就係喺咩嘢嘅區域裏面喇，譬如話係咪時速 50 公里喇，或者就係你可以決定--可以自己譬如自己訂定譬如 55 公里就喺一個 70 公里嘅區域裏面，就入 55（原文照錄）公里。

程艾樂先生：Absolutely, Chairman.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁當你哋傾緊喇，係可以--嗰啲參數同埋係黑盒可以點用？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）當時我哋傾緊嘅就係點可以最佳使用到呢啲嘅訊息喇，去改善運作喇，改善嗰個表現喇，同埋安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講喇，就係話如果揸車揸得好，就唔會唔適當咁樣加速，唔會突然間剎車，唔會突然間停車，咁個油耗就會好好多嘞。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問嘅第二樣就係呢個三十秒呢樣嘢。根據呢一方面嘅資料，係可以收集資料，每秒就收--逐秒收集，但係呢一度就話系統只係每三十秒收集資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，係話每三十秒發送。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個其實都係可以自己去改㗎，你可以不斷咁傳輸喇，或者每十秒、每三十秒，甚至唔輸出都得㗎，唔發出都得㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個其實就係 Kulis 先生所講嘅，係可以自己選擇去唔去訂定呀。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，你之前都講過話係實時功能喇，就係有咁樣嘅好處，但係呢一個好處，呢一個功能就犧牲咗嘞。

想睇番，前僱員文件夾 1，你嘅意見書，第 40 頁。我哋講緊係一啲嘅國家，即係你公司嘅當時就希望係從中可以得到一啲嘅經驗㗎。

你亦都提及過紐西蘭，喺嗰個 GreenRoad.com，綠色道路，呢啲就係關於巴士公司使用呢個系統得到嘅好處，尤其就係可以將不良嘅駕駛表現減半，同埋呢一個嘅相撞嘅意外係減半喇，而係巴士司機就係即係架車係撞人哋嘅話，就減少咗係七成㗎。

咁呢個係咪其中有傾過呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）唔係呀，呢個資料其實係上年我先知道嘅。

黃女士： Last year?

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁我亦都有引用㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想畀一份關於綠色道路 GreenRoad 嘅文件你睇。

呢個就係 12 年 7 月 12 號嘅文件嚟嘅，提及到：

「綠色道路其實係喺安全管理同埋司機嗰個嘅表現方面喇，係個領先者嚟㗎。」

主席：（經傳譯員）日期係幾時呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）12 年嘅 7 月 12 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二段嘞，嗰度就話嘞：

「綠色道路其實已經係可以喺倫敦將嗰個駕駛嘅風險，就於七十架巴士減低六成㗎，係由 2010 年係已經有一百一十位嘅司機用過㗎嘞。」

跟住嗰段嘞：

「利用流動同埋雲端嘅技術喇，綠色道路可以幫助駕駛者自己去改善㗎。因為會即時係將佢哋駕駛嘅表現，就係透過一個二極管嘅表板上面嘅顯示，同埋一啲詳細嘅分析，建議去畀--即時去話番畀司機，同埋係車廠嘅經理聽。」

當時，因為我睇到呢份文件喇，係 12 年嘅 7 月 12 號，但係喺你哋會議嘅時候，係冇傾過㗎，係咪呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）唔係呢間公司喇，咁但係個概念，喺呢份文件裏面所提出嘅概念，其實係同呢啲概念係一致嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋講番你嘅係意見書，就係呢一個 40 頁嘅第四段，提及到將呢個項目係放棄。咁你亦都提過嘞：

「其中一個主要嘅改變，喺 2015 年係管理層嘅改變就係話，呢一啲決定同埋指示喇，係好少用文件記低㗎，有時就係冇乜特別嘅理由，就會將佢係調轉㗎，亦都冇係同一啲內部嘅持份者傾過或者諮詢過。」

「內部持份者」，你指咩呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）即係唔同部門工作嘅人囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁跟住嗰頁嘞，第 41 頁。你提及喺第二段就話：

「由於問題嗰個嘅特定性質，即係指係關於九巴，同埋喺專營權界別方面，其實已經發生咗好多事㗎嘞，咁呢個其實都係由於過時嘅監管框架喇，冇公開競爭喇，冇使用科技喇，低透明度喇，同埋監管者同埋專營者佢哋嘅關係係有一個直接嘅系統性影響。」

主席：（經傳譯員）你講話呢個字係用咗「系統性」，其實你指嘅係一個根本，你用錯咗字，係應該「systemic，根本」，係咪呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第一個就係話過時嘅監管框架，可唔可以進一步解釋，你覺得而家嗰個嘅監管架構有咩嘢嘅過時地方？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）而家我哋嘅規管架構，喺香港，就係好耐之前嘅。當其時，我哋冇相關嘅科技可以監管，監察一啲唔同嘅操作喇。但係而家，我哋有好多嘅數據可以搜集到，譬如我哋講緊人工智能，或者自動駕駛等等。所以喺香港目前嘅規管架構，就冇--就其實同即係二十、三十年嘅時候已經好唔同嘞，個情況。

例如如果香港嘅巴士嘅公司，如果佢話佢哋係有自動駕駛咁樣，而家我哋嗰個規管架構就冇一個咁嘅相關嘅規管架構，但係其他嘅城市其實佢哋已經係進步咗，佢哋亦都係已經係改革咗佢哋規管架構，致使到有啲創新嘅概念可以得以實施，但係香港就冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講緊係邊個城市？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）例如中國大陸、新加坡、杜拜、阿布扎比等等，咁佢哋好多嘅城市都已經係改革咗佢哋嘅規管架構，譬如有開放數據，框架，咁同埋做咗好多嘅改革，譬如好似可以有自動駕駛，譬如話電動巴士，呢一個嘅太陽能巴士等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）關於呢一個自動駕駛嘅方面，你係--仍然我哋需要一個人喺架車度㗎，即使係自動駕駛，就唔係純粹係只可以係電腦操作。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，呢個係第一點。如果譬如你話--有好多時候，我哋又係需要有審批同埋批准，而嗰個批准嗰個過程，就係比較困難㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於嗰個巴士嘅性質，你就比較關注，但係關於嗰個總嘅規管架構，關於嗰個黑盒，你知唔知其實喺呢個黑盒嘅巴士--巴士黑盒佢裏面，其實有啲咩資料呢咁樣？咁香港就係缺乏呢方面，咁但係其他嘅城市係點？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個正常嘅情況，譬如你去到一個發展嘅城市，其實好多呢個遠程系統已經係採用，譬如甚至乎係土耳其喇，我就前排去過，譬如其他嘅歐洲嘅城市，全部都係有呢個遠程訊息系統。

譬如話首爾、新加坡、土耳其等等，呢啲城市同香港都係差唔多，咁佢哋都係有好多人用交通工具，咁佢哋有遠程訊息系統，令到佢哋成個嘅表現係即係進步咗好多，改善咗好多。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋就已經講過規管架構，第二個嘅問題，就係話缺乏公開競爭呀。你可唔可以仔細講講？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）譬如我睇番新加坡，新加坡係一個例子，喺新加坡，佢哋就同香港嗰個巴士嘅2012、13年嘅時候，同香港差唔多。

咁但係當其實佢哋開始改革嘞，佢哋開始睇番個唔同嘅環境嘅改變，當其時佢哋睇番個情況，佢知道而家嗰個其實繼續嗰個巴士嘅模式就係唔可以持續，咁佢就有一個新嘅規管架構，而家佢哋嘅服務已經改善咗，佢哋嘅表現改善咗，好多嘅創新，亦都佢哋而家已經成為一個喺呢個區裏面嘅領導者嘞，喺巴士營運方面。

點解會發生咁嘅事，因為佢哋係已經開放咗個市場，有好多嘅國際嘅人士亦都入咗佢哋嘅市場度。

如果喺香港，就冇乜嘅競爭，其實我哋一直都係呢一批嘅營運者，其實基本上冇其他嘅新嘅加入者，其實因此佢哋就缺乏一啲嘅誘因，係創新呀，同埋改善嗰個營運嘅效率等等。

咁呢個就係我所謂嘅缺乏公開競爭嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思就話新加坡其實係邀請一啲有做招標去營運巴士，咁亦都令到有個競爭，而呢一個國際嘅公司亦都係入到嚟新加坡嗰度，係營運嗰啲巴士㗎，係咪呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，我--呢個係有個叫易塔通公司喇，喺新加坡。咁喺佢哋入嚟之前，嗰啲人就成日話就係唔夠司機㗎，成日都投訴，咁同香港差唔多情況。

但係今日，呢一個易塔通巴士公司喺新加坡，其實已經有多過佢哋所需要嘅巴士司機嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋點樣做到嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）因為佢哋用咗一個好嶄新嘅人事管理嘅方法。我嗰日就去探訪過佢哋嘅車廠㗎，非常之舒服，非常之好，呢個係一個好平等嘅一個管理模式，嗰啲司機就覺得佢哋自己係成個嘅系統嘅服務之中嘅一員，重要一員嚟㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係新加坡喇。咁相比香港，你會點樣形容呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）但係香港，我就會話，就係一個--個管理層就覺得司機成日都係啲好麻煩嘅人，成日都係要求一啲好唔合理嘅要求喇。我自己都係一個持牌嘅司機嚟嘅，咁嗰啲司機就認為，嗰啲管理層坐喺個 office 度喇，佢哋完全都唔知道發生緊啲咩嘢事。

咁佢哋大家係缺乏互信㗎，所以我就話，我哋係要改革呢一個嘅行業，以確保呢個嘅行業啲人可以吸引到新血。

我哋亦都要明白，呢個巴士服務係我哋嘅城市嘅其中一員，重要嘅成員嚟㗎，每一日就係九巴載三百萬嘅乘客㗎，如果我哋唔能夠解決呢啲問題，就--我哋可以買最好嘅巴士，但係如果我哋冇好嘅司機，咁就冇用㗎，成件事係做唔到㗎。

黃女士： Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）好，咁既然你提到呢樣嘢嘅時候，咁你覺得我哋香港嘅巴士嘅質素，同埋佢哋嗰個維修嘅情況，你點樣睇？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我會--我對佢哋有好高嘅評價㗎，香港嘅巴士就係嗰啲工程方面係好好喇，佢哋會十七、十八年喺個路上面喇，即使佢哋就嚟要退休，其實仍然個狀況都好好。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為佢哋嗰個維修做得唔錯？

程艾樂先生： That's correct, yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁培訓方面呢，司機培訓方面又點呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢度係有兩方面嘅，一個就係課室嘅培訓喇，另外就係實際路上喇。我哋睇過啲文件，就係委員會送畀委員嘅，咁好多人就用咗好多嘅時間去做培訓，咁佢哋剔呢個盒呀，有好多嘅守則等等，但係究竟啲人有冇有個動力去接受培訓，有個問題。

一個好基本嘅野就係話，關於呢個服務質素，個僱員就唔係睇下呢個就係一個份工，而係佢哋睇到呢個係一個責任嚟嘅，呢個就希望我哋喺培訓能夠達到呢一點。咁目前嚟講，我哋係缺乏呢一點嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提到關於香港同埋新加坡嘅分別喇，咁香港，關於呢個招標嘅

方面，香港嘅情況係點㗎？

程艾樂先生： In terms of?

主席：（經傳譯員）招標，譬如話好似續牌，續呢個專營權續期，咁香港嘅情況同新加坡係點樣對比呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺香港，其實喺過去二十年都冇任何招標嘞。第二，通常如果佢續經營權嘅時候，咁嗰個規管就係，就會話呢個嘅公司已經做得唔錯嘞，咁所以我哋就應該係續佢哋嘅經營權。

咁但係其實冇睇番有啲嘅基準嘅研究，即係譬如話國際係點樣樣，其實佢哋係咪真係達得能夠國際標準，喺譬如創新方面，喺呢個效率方面呀。其實佢哋可唔可以再叫呢啲目前嘅營運者做得更加好嘅呢？又或者佢哋應該諗下，可以將一啲新嘅人加--新嘅公司加入嚟，就將成個行業嘅水平可以提升㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你下一個嘅投訴就係話，冇引進一啲技術㗎。你就提過一個例子，關於遠程訊息系統，咁除咗此之外，你仲--喺呢一點上面，你仲可以講啲咩嘢呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）關於科技嗰方面，我而家就做緊個研究，關於人工智能㗎，就使用人工智能喺公共交通嗰方面，咁我就係代呢個公共交通國際聯會去做㗎。咁其實而家喺巴士行業裏面都做緊呢啲嘢㗎，譬如新加坡喇，就係發展咗一個系統，叫做 SMRD(SMRT?)㗎。

佢哋就係攞呢一個--收集好多嘅資料喇，譬如話嗰啲司機嘅行為，咁佢哋就會係預測邊一個司機可能會有出意外，然後佢哋就將佢哋呢個司機嘅培訓就係度身訂造，咁個司機就會係再接受再培訓，就唔會有意外㗎嘞，所以其實係加入同埋就係再培訓，咁就係大大咁減低個意外率㗎。

而家我有啲數字嘅，佢哋就已經係大大減低個意外率喇，或者個事故喇，可能出現嘅事故，就因為嗰個培訓--接受咗培訓嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪由呢一個嘅新加坡嘅陸路交通管理局去制訂--去收集呢啲資料嘅呢--呢啲數據？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁就因為 SMRDC(SMART CEO?)喺德國有一個嘅陳述嘅，所以我就攞咗呢啲嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可能就畀--將啲數據交畀秘書處，好嗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅研究係幾時進行㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）而家都進行中㗎，進行中㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以問，嗰個系統你就收集所有嘅數據，然後分析數據，同埋去預測就有一啲嘅司機特別有可能出意外㗎，咁然後嗰個司機，你就會搵佢出嚟，然後就係再培訓嘅？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，佢哋發生--出意外之前。

黃女士： Yes.

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係第一個例子，第二個就係話關於預測性嘅維修，咁好多車廠裏面嘅程序其實都可以自動化㗎，其實好多世界各地好多嘅營運者做緊好多嘢去提供--引入科技，去提高嗰個服務質素。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係講過關於個科技，一個你係講緊就係電子穩定系統㗎，你有冇聽過呢？

程艾樂先生： Yes, I have.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你覺得呢個電子穩定嘅系統點樣樣呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係肯定就係令到嗰個車嘅表現更加好嘅，特別係一啲道路特別傾側嘅說話，呢個係好有幫助嘅。呢個係一個電子嘅裝置，就會令到嗰個巴士嗰個中心點喇，或者個重心係可以改變嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋去睇番嗰個運輸署嗰個陳述書，佢哋話畀我哋聽，3 月嘅時候話畀我聽，佢哋就係成立咗個特別嘅小組，就係裏面嘅成員包括營運者，同埋製造廠商喇，咁佢就係去睇唔同嘅科技嘅。咁樣又好似好趕忙係去做呢個工作嘅，咁佢哋就睇緊一啲唔同嘅課題嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係運輸署嘅文件冊嘅第 1 號，就係第 98 頁㗎，呢個係運輸署嘅陳述書嚟㗎。

程生，想請你睇一睇就 98 頁喇，(a)至到(f)，就係一啲嘅係安全設備同埋係使用技術方面嘅，佢哋有探討過。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁睇番 94 頁呀，你就會見到運輸署係點樣解釋。你就見到喇，呢一個文件個頂頭喇就係題目就係叫做喺專營巴士使用技術或者一啲--新技術或者新設備㗎。

咁我哋就講番--睇番--睇到佢哋之前係睇過啲咩嘢，考慮過啲乜嘢喇。

但係呢個工作小組係 3 月中成立㗎，今年嘅，係要睇番呢啲嘅事項喇，咁我就知道，其實佢哋都幾匆忙。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好嘅措施嚟嘅，係運輸署好嘅措施，但係唔應該係因為有意外先至做，應該無論如何都要做。因為呢幾方面，其實我哋已經係好落後嘞，係只係反應，而唔係話事前去做預防，去預視。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。第十段提及到一系列嘅車上安全設備，係工作小組睇過㗎。第一個就係電子穩定控制系統，同埋傾側穩定控制系統。

第十二段就有呢個特別嘅設備喇，有進一步解釋。可以睇到喇，嗰個剎車系統點樣可以控制到架車，行番佢嗰個既定嘅路線。使用呢個設備方面，係咪廣泛使用㗎喇，全球，即係以你嘅經驗所知，定係話至少喺新加坡有用呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋新買嘅巴士其實係有㗎，但係我就唔知道舊車佢哋有冇加裝番。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番第二個建議，98 頁，就係：

「將嗰個嘅最高速度限喺每小時 70 公里㗎，就適用於係呢一個落山嘅時候，就使用呢一個車速限制器，將佢限制住。」

睇番 101 頁，呢個亦都係就係話呢一個 2013 年--2003 年屯門公路嘅意外之後係考慮㗎。咁就話：

「其實呢啲就係喺--內部已經係有㗎嘞，就利用嗰個波檔，就用軟件去控制呢一個限速器嘅。」

跟住最後嘞，話：

「如果佢係架車流動嘅時候，咁車速就唔係因為嗰個引擎轉動或者波檔係去控--去決定㗎，而係地心吸力，咁所以係車廠，即係製造商咁就建議話，其實如果話即係安裝呢個嘅減慢--裝呢個減慢器喇，其實係可以係技術上可行㗎。」

但係香港係好獨特嘅情況，因為有好多落山嘅非常斜嘅斜坡㗎，譬如話訂定咗係車速 75 公里的話喇，其實如果架巴士落緊山，佢嘅速度係快過 75 公里㗎。

咁最好，如果話建議嗰個解決方法係用慢速器嘅話，你有咩嘢意見呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）你未講之前嘞，其實你講嗰個減速器--個減速器係咪定喺呢個 70 公里呀？

程艾樂先生： It can be set at any speed--

主席：（經傳譯員）喺香港係咪有咁嘅要求呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，根據呢個道路交通條例，70 係最高㗎嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係如果你落緊山嘅話，架車一定就會快過 70 公里㗎喇，因為其實係根據而家嗰個系統，已經冇注油㗎嘞。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實呢個係有需要用呢個設備，喺香港，因為減速器其實好似喺香港幾年前--廿年前嗰發明㗎，因為當時就發生咗一件嘅意外喇，就係雙層巴士落山發生意外，咁喺香港島㗎，因為巴士唔可以係及時停低，所以就係撞咗埋去嗰個嘅交通交界嗰度㗎。

如果講緊話時速 70 係一個動力嘅--即係講番，即係嗰個係地理圍欄等等，同埋道路限制，如果譬如話時速限制 50，可以將佢係定咗喺 50，如果喺 70 公里喇，咁將佢限為 70，唔會有--嗰個情況就唔會話巴士喺 50 係行緊--50 公里限速，但係時速係行緊 70。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住運輸署下一步--下一個嘅建議就係利用地理圍欄去限制速度㗎，使用呢一個嘅全球定位系統。

程艾樂先生： Yes, that's what -- yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）但係如果嗰個地方好多高樓大廈，其實用高--用呢一個嘅全球定位系統係比較困難。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，啲路係畀高樓大廈包住。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其實你知唔知嘞，有冇一啲最近嘅技術係可以即係將呢個--解決到呢個問題，或者減緩呢，至少？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）可以從唔同嘅源頭去攞同一樣嘅數據喇。

全球定位系統係其中一種喇，但係其實如果講緊一啲嘅既定嘅路線嘅話喇，咁其實你都知架車會係去邊度㗎喇，同埋轉緊邊度㗎喇，所以你可以係計到㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話係計番嗰個車轆呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，你可以知道嗰個車轆轉動喇，佢嗰個距離喇，其實你可以計到架車去到邊度。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話就咁一路係就咁計算？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為遠程訊息系統已經有 3G，所以我亦都可以用呢一個嘅 GSM 同埋呢一個手機嘅發送系統，所以全球定位系統其實只不過係其中一個知道位置嘅來源嚟嘅。

但係如果你一知道佢究竟喺邊--架車喺邊，你就可以幾肯定，可以計到架車究竟係發生緊咩嘢事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁即係話你係可以透過遠程訊息系統去調校㗎，如果你有一個數碼地圖，我哋知道運輸署係有數碼地圖嘅，咁佢哋會知道成個香港唔同地區有啲乜嘢嘅車速限制。

你可唔可以將數碼地圖同遠程訊息系統，將佢就係結合，等系統可以自動調

校車速限制，而唔使人手去輸入，咁即係話架車會就於佢當時嘅位置，而有個限速？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）理論上可以做到㗎，但係你要將運輸署同埋巴士公司有一個嘅溝通嘅基建，等佢哋可以知道當時嗰個嘅係車速可以自動輸入去系統。

但係其實仲可以做多啲，因為巴士營運唔係直接同交通嘅限制，車速限制係有關㗎，有啲嘅路段喇，我可以話畀你聽，巴士司機係受到訓練，知道當時係要減速，因為可能譬如話視線受阻，係交通黑點。咁所以，其實可以係唔需要喺影響其他嘅交通情況底下，去限制車速㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你即係話，其實係可以知道架車喺邊度，當時嘅法定限速，同埋就係如果係巴士公司係想喺某一個地點有一個特別嘅地方，有一個特別嘅係限速可以做到，係咪呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話可能係即係 90 度嘅彎位喇，咁你亦都可以將佢設為呢個 20 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果喺呢啲嘅界限係有超越嘅話，你亦都可以做一個嘅特殊報告？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，到時係可以做到話巴士唔可以過呢一個界限㗎。第二就係話，容許巴士司機係真係超過呢個嘅界限，不過會即刻會係發出一個特殊報告。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你知唔知有個咁嘅數碼地圖㗎，係適用於全香港㗎？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我知，我知道係公眾可以攞到嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係喺我未問你之前，你已經知道有呢個數碼地圖嘞？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，應該公眾都知㗎喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。跟住嗰個嘅設備就係防撞設施，即係 103 頁。程生，我想請你睇巴士公司嘅意見呀，咁喺二十六段，你可以睇得到㗎，105 頁第二十六段。最尾嗰段，話：

「總括嚟講，係專營巴士經營者不認為安裝防撞同埋係保持行車線嘅設備，對於提升佢哋嘅服務安全係有任何嘅提升。」

我想問你，程生，你知唔知道，使用防撞設備喺全球上係咪常見嘅呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，常見，「常見」其實都係即係比較嘅詞語嚟㗎喇，有好多地方都有用嘅，但係我就唔會唔同--我就係--即係我會唔同意你所講嘅呢啲嘢。

其實即係以我所知道，我哋睇緊嘅技術就係非常之固定㗎，靜止嘅，即係話

一個就套用晒所有地方㗎嘞。但係睇番香港，香港道路好狹窄喇，車亦都係好--行車距離亦都係好近，咁所以其實呢啲嘅設施可能會造成滋擾。但係技術係可以容許你去調校，令到佢哋可以識得自己學識應該點樣做㗎，就係人工智能喇。

每一個路段，你可以講佢嘅參數應該係乜嘢，設定界限，亦都可以訂定嗰個即係警示嘅水平㗎。咁譬如話公路行緊 70，咁喺彌敦道成日行下停下，行緊 30 都可以有唔同嘅參數，可以定唔同嘅參數。譬如定--咁你亦都可以話嘞，去到如果架車行到 30，就唔需要有任何嘅--唔需要啟動嘞，因為行得 30 嘅話，出事嘅機會係好低。

所以其實係睇番嗰個路段喇、路線喇、巴士嘅種類喇，同埋你係好多嘢可以做，甚至連乘客數量都可以係加埋落去。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁譬話喺 2014 年，城巴佢哋有用過一個--有一個嘅係試用神眼。

程艾樂先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁 2014 到而家，你知唔知道喺呢一方面有冇任何嘅發展呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實嗰個數字已經改咗㗎嘞，喺呢個 2014 之後，即係世界已經唔同咗喇嘛。

黃女士： And the last device that was mentioned--

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以--有冇人畀你睇過呢個文件㗎，即係關於城巴嘅文件？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺九巴工作嘅時間，我冇睇過呢個文件，但係當時我同神眼嘅人員係有傾談過㗎，咁同佢哋係開過會喇，當時係知道係可以係即係做一個嘅測試嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋都信你所講喇，世界自從 2014 年已經唔同咗嘞。又或者我哋可以睇一睇呢個報告。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係 CTB 第 3 號文件冊，係第 601 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實個問題就係咁嘅，你睇到嗰個報告嘅關注係點樣，咁而家就因為科技已經進步咗嘞，咁呢啲嘅關注其實係咪已經係--問題已經係解決咗呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我就好快睇咗一睇，就關於呢個神眼嗰個準確性㗎，個問題。咁嗰啲公會就係講個準確性就係百分之六十九，但係都可以去救人命㗎嘛，我就話唔會應該係擱置呢個計劃，反而應該係改良佢就真。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你嘅答案就係話，就正如其他嘅裝置一樣，你就可以--就會

係設計一啲唔同嘅界限值，令到呢個科技係可以得以善用嘅，係咪咁呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確嘅。我哋睇兩方面喇，就係關於嗰個撞嗰個嚴重嘅程度同埋嗰個頻密程度嘞。

個嚴重程度就係，如果你嗰個好高速嘅時候，就會係比較嚴重，但係如果喺一啲城市嘅區域裏面，可能嗰個數目係會多嘅，但係嗰個嚴重性係冇咁大㗎。

所以每一間巴士公司都要睇呢一方面嘅，佢哋睇番呢一個嘅安全管理系統嘅時候，佢哋就應該睇呢啲嘅數字，就係唔同裝置畀佢哋嘅收集到嘅數據喇，咁同埋睇番當時嘅交通嘅情況呀等等。

其實如果有好多嘅交通燈嘅時候，就可能成日要停下、揩下，咁嘅情況，從一啲嘅高速公路係你 70--行緊 70 公里係好唔同嘅。所以其實係講緊兩種唔同嘅巴士㗎，如果我哋講緊嗰個營運嗰個角度嚟睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）正如你所講喇，嗰個--呢個報告發表之後，科技又再進一步嘞。咁就你所知，呢個嘅科技已經係進步到，其實已經可以係度身訂造一啲嘅嗰個參數，令到其實如果喺即使係好繁忙嘅街道裏面，都唔會造成好大嘅滋擾㗎，係咪咁呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）正確㗎。如果你睇番佢哋做試驗計劃，特別係嗰啲自動駕駛嗰方面喇，其實係一個--我哋曾經經歷咗一個嘅歷程㗎，就係關於自動駕駛，係呢一個第一至到第五層級喇。

如果第一級喇，其實都唔係咁自動嘅，咁仍然有個人喺度，咁嗰個人仍然都係揸緊架車。但係喺第四級嘅時候，個司機基本上係就係睇緊嗰個嘅機器點樣去開車，咁其實--所以其實越高嘅級嘅時候，佢就有好多嘅輔助嘅駕駛幫佢㗎。

咁仲有好多呢啲嘅感應器呀，啲相機，咁亦都係畀好多嘅資訊你，致使到你更加清楚周圍嘅環境。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就下一個，就係關於監察司機嘅裝置。呢個似乎係一個幾新嘅裝置嚟㗎，特別係喺監察司機一啲不安全嘅駕駛。喺第 105 頁㗎，譬如話：

「佢恰眼瞓呀，或者係一啲唔好嘅姿勢等等咁樣。」

喺第 105 頁，兩個營運者就話畀我哋聽，佢哋會係喺 5 月，2015（原文照錄）年開始就會係裝置呢啲系統，就係做實驗㗎，做試驗㗎。

我哋知道香港嘅司機，佢哋通常就開車開好長時間㗎。咁呢個裝置就係希望能夠去搵出呢個疲勞、勞損嘅司機。

咁呢個咁嘅裝置喺世界各地，係咪都好常用嘅呢？同埋佢係有幾有效呢，喺世界各地嚟講？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實我就睇唔到呢度係有好廣泛嘅應用㗎，但係我知道其實都有啲試驗計劃嘅。

我認為呢個科技仍然都係喺度演變緊，最終都係會出現嘅，但係而家暫時嚟講，都未係好完善，咁可能有好多嘅誤差等等。

其實有可能會令到個情況更加糟糕，而唔係改善相關嘅情況，可能有時候喺個唔適當嘅時間，就係警示個司機咁樣，咁就更加危險嘞，咁可能有啲咁嘅誤差。

而家呢度就係有個攝錄機喇，睇緊個司機個面容，個表情喇。第二個嘅科技就係--就會睇下佢哋嘅--譬如話睇下佢哋隻眼睛呀，佢哋嘅瞳孔等等。咁亦都係可以好似隻錶咁樣帶上去手上㗎。

我覺得喺一、兩年間，我哋會見到其實兩種科技都會融合埋一齊，但係我喺呢一刻，我就話其實都未係好廣泛應用㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗呢個嘅裝置，你仲有冇其他嘅建議呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）喺繼續之前喇，我諗相信你都知道，有個纜車嘅--2016 年，有個電車嘅有個意外，就發現嗰個電車司機就係一早返工，所以佢就係恰眼瞓㗎，咁喺倫敦㗎，呢啲咁樣嘅防恰眼瞓嘅裝置就有人提議應該係使用㗎。

程艾樂先生： Yes, I know.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係講緊科技都係應用--呢個科技應用，但係就唔係好廣泛使用，係咪呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我知道就有呢一個--有擺呢一個裝置，但係我就唔係好知道其實係咪成功。如果你係百分之四十至五十嘅誤差嘅時候，咁就會令到我哋都好厭倦嗰啲科技，咁我哋就傾向於就唔理佢嘞。我哋就話呢個科技喺度嘅，但係我哋仲未係有信心佢係譬如百分之九十五、九十七係準確㗎。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢一個嘅科技嘅裝置，喺呢一個嘅文件提到，咁你仲有冇其他嘅意見呢，就你自己個經驗，可能係幫到去確保呢一個巴士司機開車嘅時候係安全呢，特別係香港？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁其實有--其實世界各地都有好多好好嘅成功嘅例子，譬如話人工智能方面喇，呢個都係進步緊，就有一啲嘅數據分析呀，然後我哋就等嗰啲嘅機械可以自己去自學，同埋有其他嘅人工智能嘅科技呀等等。

如果係大埔呢件事件嚟講，其實如果佢未傾側嘅時候，而係我哋知道啲數據，咁我哋就會有幫手--可以幫助係防止呢個意外，咁個督導亦都係可以知道有關嘅數據嘅時候，就可以即時去介入嘞。

其實我哋好多人為嘅因素，其實都係可以去剔除嘅。其實好多時候，個督導喺嗰刻，電光火石之間，佢哋就可以做一個嘅決定㗎。好多時候都會有啲人嘅行為會因為佢哋當時情緒所影響，咁人工智能會係一個方法喇，咁就有一個好--有一啲好理性嘅一個嘅意見畀到你哋嘅，亦都係好準確㗎。

呢個係一個新嘅地帶，我哋可以去探討，咁而好多公司其實都係睇緊，譬如話工程呀，同呢一個--同顧客之間嗰種嘅聯繫等等，咁其實呢啲都係人工智能可以做到㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）就我哋希望就係話，個督導就係話其實睇到嗰啲嘅異常情況嘅報告，然後或者係劇烈嘅剎車、加速、減速等等，然後佢睇到呢啲嘅資料嘅時候，數據嘅時候，佢就可以喺實時嘅時候即時去介入嘞，係咪咁嘅意思呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁我就會更加--去得更加遠一點。而家嘅督導如果佢實時車務管理系統嘅時候，佢攞咗啲嘅--睇到一啲嘅數據喇，咁但係人工智能喇--人嘅腦其實只係可以處理一定嘅數據嘅啫，我哋係可以學習，但係呢個嘅人工智能永遠都唔會忘記一啲嘢嘅，所以佢可以做嘅就係話，佢睇下嗰個車嘅情況、道路嘅情況、天氣情況，同埋個道--附近嘅交通情況等等，佢係將所有呢啲嘅參數擺落同一個框架嗰度，然後就係有一啲度身訂造嘅一個方案，提供畀當時嘅情況。

我唔係淨係講緊超速，就係個車尾開始超速嘅時候，就已經係可以做到個風險嘅評審，咁亦都係可以有個即時嘅介入嘅框架。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪意思係話由個系統接咗嚟做，還是係話畀個督導聽呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁可能就係--就話你就可以就勸喻嗰個司機就話「因為今日落雨呀。」或者「有好多嘅單車呀，小心啲呀。」等等，佢可以做呢啲嘅勸喻㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，明白。就係喺之前係話畀你聽，你應該點樣去開車？

程艾樂先生： Correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你下一個嘅投訴就係話缺乏透明度，同埋規管者同埋專營權持有人有啲親密嘅關係嘅，呢個就係第 41 頁，就係 FE-1 嘅文件冊嘞，就缺乏透明度同埋規管者同埋專營權持有人嘅親密關係。咁你可唔可以講講，關於「欠缺透明度」係咩嘢意思？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）就係好多嘅數據都唔係公開資料嚟㗎，譬如話我自己有個個人嘅例子喇，其實我就係喺我屋企門口就等架巴士，然後就我個程式話畀我聽，就話兩分鐘架巴士就會嚟到，但係我就從來就冇見到個巴士喎，雖然喺我個應用程式嗰度，佢就已經嚟咗，同埋走咗嘞，但係我就唔知道佢點樣去核實呢啲資料。

我當然可以係投訴喇，但係--呢個係即係佢哋通常佢哋就--我寫畀佢哋，咁佢哋有啲好標準嘅答案畀我，佢話「我哋會檢討呀。」等等，但係冇改變到喎。所以就呢個就係欠缺透明度嘞。我就係冇足夠嘅資料㗎，我作為一個嘅顧客。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）相比新加坡，我可唔可以問呢個，就係話所有呢啲科技嘅裝置，咁呢啲會擺上個巴士上面喇，咁新加坡政府會唔會資助--直接或者間接資助呢啲嘅改善嘅措施，去加裝一啲新嘅科技嘅裝置喺去巴士上面呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）喺新加坡現有嘅做法就係，政府買晒所有巴士，所以資產屬於政府，咁係畀經營者去經營㗎。

經營者係有一個非常之嚴謹嘅係主要表現指標去規管佢哋㗎，所以其實即係佢哋唔可以超越咗呢一啲嘅指標，呢個係一個即係方法去鼓勵佢哋咁樣做嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁即係話，如果係保留住巴士嘅資產呀，控制技術或者標準嘅話，其實係咪呢啲原因，所以新加坡政府買咗巴士呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋買政府其實同技術或者咩嘢係無關㗎，只不過佢哋想製造另外一個嘅模式，比較--佢哋嘅目標當時就係從一個社會嘅角度，而唔係一個商業嘅角度去經營巴士。

我唔知你想唔想講呢一部分，但係有關於技術嚟講，政府就係定咗基本嘅技術，即係話呢啲係要求嚟嘅，係專營嘅要求一部分，同時亦都有一啲嘅誘因，令到巴士經營者可以去做得更好，等佢哋去創新同埋投資，譬如話車上一啲嘅設施，直接將交通資訊係畀佢哋嘅控制中心，呢啲都係要求，喺合約上面寫咗㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺專營合約上面呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港係咪咁呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）香港其實嗰個嘅定義非常之寬鬆㗎，因為個規管係好寬鬆喇，即係話呢啲參數係非常之廣闊㗎，所以係有好多唔同程度嘅變異㗎，即係一個好高程度嘅即係人為嘅操作。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺 41 頁裏面喇，你就曾經講過話喇，係一啲唔同嘅系統，有好大嘅差異呀。喺呢個脫班嘅情況又係，即係所以好大嘅即係關於脫班有好嚴重嘅情況㗎。咁係呢個同--會唔會影響到香港嘅安全環境呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇關係㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁而家我想睇番，就係呢一個 18 年 6 月 18 號嗰份嘅意見書，44 頁。

你就提及過嘢，第一個黑點就話香港缺乏一個中央嘅交通控制中心...

程艾樂先生： Correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員） ...呢個中心就可以監管到所有嘅公共交通經營者嘅實時運作㗎。你係咪認為政府其實應該要有一個中央交通控制中心？咁但係係點樣可以監察到所有公共交通嘅實時狀況呀？因為睇番喇，香港嘅巴士量係好多㗎，所以你嘅建議係點做呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實之前你同我講話關於新加坡同埋首爾我有講過，其實有兩個層面嘅，一就係一個中央嘅控制系統喇，另外一個就係巴士管理系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）可以畀程生睇。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係我所講㗎嘞，喺經營者方面，就有個巴士管理系統喇，就係睇番呢個巴士嘅資產，但係另外一個層面，就係中央嘅交通控制中心，就睇番就係呢一個嘅整個交通系統喇，交通喇，交通燈喇，道路基建喇，呢啲就係公開嘅資料嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我想請你睇嘞，SEC-2號文件，825頁，825頁，第2.8段嘞，裏面就提及過一個新嘅巴士管理系統，呢度其實就係一個嘅中央控--交通控制中心，你建議嘅就係除--即係有兩個層面喇，第一就係巴士管理系統，由邊個負責呀？

程艾樂先生： By the bus operator.

黃女士：（經傳譯員） 巴士公司。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）如果你睇番2.10段，同一份嘅文件，一個中央嘅係交通控制中心。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係需要連接喺巴士管理系統同埋一個係巴士資訊--車務資訊系統，等嗰個中央控制中心可以監察到，係唔係？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）咁但係從一個城市嘅角度嚟睇，睇晒成個交通運輸嘅資產㗎，無論係有固定資產又好，一啲移動嘅資產都好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）新加坡係咪有呢個咁樣嘅系統呢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）有一個類似嘅系統，但我就唔係好肯定嗰個嘅範圍係有幾大，佢哋有大量功能喺系統入面㗎，我最近知道，即係我係研究人工智能方面嘅時候知道，其實佢係甚至用一啲無人機去收集實時交通資訊，然之後就可以做一個反應系統，去調較交通燈，所以係一個整體嚟睇，係等佢可以達到平衡，所以佢適用範圍係好大。如果睇番，即係譬如話係百萬分之一機會會發生嘅情況，其實呢一類型嘅系統可以救到好多人命。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一段就話呢一個系統似乎就唔係巴士公司畀實時資訊，而係呢個中央交通控制中心發放呢啲嘅資料，又即係話由政府係發布畀公眾，操作方

法係咁，係嘛？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實係攜手進行，即係佢哋唔係一啲話秘密機構，其實佢哋之間都有一個嘅關係。如果你想知道譬如話嗰架巴士有幾多人，就係巴士管理系統。如果係一啲高層次啲嘅，譬如話一啲交通資料、交匯處嘅資料、事件，就係巴士公司以外嘅資料，就會來自中央控制中心，佢就會將呢啲資料交番畀巴士公司，等佢哋去確認㗎，所以係雙向，等嗰個嘅係溝通會好啲，唔該。

黃女士：Yes，understand。（經傳譯員）45 頁，喺第一點，呢一頁嘅第一個黑點，你就提及到目前香港嘅監管制度呀。你就話，就係有限呢一個嘅利潤，但係就即係冇限到佢嗰個嘅虧損，你意思係指咩嘢呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實關於巴士方面，喺制訂呢一個嘅規管架構嘅時候，當時係話有呢一個嘅保證利潤，當時可能係 90 年代嘅時候，但係就有改變嘅。喺呢一個 2012 年嘅時候，因為鐵路擴展，所以九巴當時就開始蝕錢。一路蝕錢，一係就唔再做，一係就會加車費，但係呢個唔係一個正確嘅方向。因為政府係控制到呢一個控制監管，亦都係控制車資嘅。如果唔係嘅話，喺世界各地嘅巴士嘅經營者--譬如話，如果香港嘅巴士公司係一個嘅商業機構，佢賺到錢，佢要做咩嘢呢？佢就唔再經營專營。所以就係如果巴士經營係冇錢賺嘅話，其實你係就唔可以話邀請世界各地嘅經營者嚟你嘅城市嗰度經營。

其實所以如果你講嘅就係現有嘅經營者，其實係有佢呢個嘅好處，因為佢哋已經投資咗一大量嘅成本。但係新加入嘅經營者，其實就唔係咁公平，因為佢哋乜嘢都要由頭嚟過。如果有一個可持續經營嘅商業模式嘅話，其實你就可以吸引到世界各城嘅企業嚟經營，因為佢哋睇係睇得好長遠。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）尾嗰一點，45 頁，你又提及過，而家嘅報告系統同埋監察系統就係好古舊，而當時就係設計嘅時候係冇任何嘅技術去監察巴士同埋司機，你可唔可以解釋一下？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我想講就係話，而家世界各地，巴士嘅規管者其實都係會睇番即係用唔同嘅系統去管理。但係其實香港就要睇番話巴士幾時離開總站，同埋之後就冇理到佢哋嘅表現，所以就發生好多問題。

作為顧客，如果我企喺度等緊巴士，其實即係你可能走咗架巴士，你可能就要等二十分鐘、二十五分鐘都未有下一架嚟嘅。我想講嘅就係話，佢哋其他地方係使用技術去令到巴士之間有間距。譬如話如果你去到倫敦，譬如話你即係嗰架可能去到某一個地方停一停，等佢可以同之前個巴士嘅距離遠啲，所以對於乘客嚟講，嗰個服務就比較平均。就唔會話譬如話即係一架巴士嚟咗，一分鐘之後又嚟一架，跟住廿分鐘之後先嚟另外一架。其實呢個方法，就係而家規管者係做㗎，所以有啲係主要係表現指標。譬如話喺新加坡嚟講，喺巴士路線上面係一路睇住佢，而唔係話淨係睇佢幾時離開個站，跟住就唔理。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就呢度提過呢一個過長嘅等候時間，同埋就要監察番即係使

用到呢一個實時訊息，同埋遠程訊息，係佢呢個站與站之間都可以睇到，同埋即係前端、後端都會可以控制到、監察到。其實呢個係咪即係話可以減少到呢個過長嘅等候時間？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）遠程訊息其實已經喺度，實時運作其實即係呢一個硬件上面嘅一個軟件嚟嘅啫，所以其實唔係好難做。我會將呢兩個結合，因為大部分嘅人都係講，就話其實投資喺遠程訊息嘅，都有投資落去實時操作系統。因為係當啲遠程訊息系統，譬如 Openmatics 嚟講，佢哋係會畀埋呢一個實時管理系統你嘅。所以其實你係可以將佢結合埋一齊變成一樣嘢，就係九巴就決定自己去做。其實我哋有咁樣嘅技術，不過就冇監察，亦都係有監管，但係個監管係唔關於呢啲數據事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後我想同你講就係呢個嘅五年發展計劃，請你就睇呢個嘅 39 頁底部，係呢一個嘅五年遠期計劃，前僱員 1 號文件夾。你就話係負責統籌、準備同埋呈交呢個嘅五年遠期計劃，包括埋路線發展計劃去畀運輸署長。其實你其中一個嘅角色，就係要睇番呢一啲同安全有關嘅計劃，同其他嘅車務或者營運計劃係咪一致。你有冇參與 2018 至 2023 年嘅五年遠期計劃嘅制作？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）最近提交嗰個？

黃女士：Previously.

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我喺 2013、14、15 年呢幾年，我都係有提交嗰個計劃。2016 年就係有 2017、18 年規劃嘅，但係都係有個框架嘅啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我睇睇嗰個嘅遠期計劃，其實你有冇睇過，或者你有冇參與過畀意見？

去到運輸署嘅 1 號文件冊 180 頁。點解我會問呢個問題呢？首先就係九巴個經營權，就係 2016 年去討論嘅。嗰個經營權，就係 2017 年 3 月批出。當然你係制作呢個遠期計劃嘅時候，我哋都係要睇下個意外率，同埋之前嗰兩年嘅意外率係點樣樣。我哋睇一睇呢個嘅規劃，呢個係九巴嘅遠期計劃。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個日子，幾時去寫嘅呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺 2017 年 6 月嘅時候，1035 頁有寫到，係呢一個運輸署第 4 號文件冊嗰度寫明。

首先我想問一問，你有冇提供呢個意見，就住呢個報告？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）No，冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，我就唔需要去問。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係其實呢啲嘅課題，其實每一年都會係擺落去個報告度。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）2016 年嗰個報告，我就都有畀意見，我就喺 2016 年 9 月離開九巴。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以就住某個課題去傾一傾。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去睇番 187 頁，我就特別有興趣有關於呢個車長嘅培訓同埋監察計劃。我或者咁樣提我嘅提問，如果你睇睇呢個嘅呢一段，呢度有提到就係九巴係好致力係提供安全、可靠同埋舒適嘅服務，呢度係講緊就話啲好嘅駕駛嘅態度，同埋防衛性嘅駕駛。亦都有啲駕車師傅，亦都會去監察呢啲學院，亦都有需要嘅時候，有啲嘅罰則咁樣。我哋都會特別睇一睇喺某一個嘅路線，睇下佢會唔會嗰個司機特別多突然之間煞車。如果係有需要嘅時候，亦都係會將有關嘅建議提番畀個車長，希望能夠減低事故嘅情況。呢個係有實時嘅駕駛提示器，就係特別對於一啲車長佢個駕駛態度唔係咁好，就有幫助。你就話，亦都會有一啲主動去提示咁樣。

但係而家係冇一啲實時嘅駕駛提示器，或者係--嘅時候，可唔可以係有一啲實時嘅數據可以提番畀荔枝角嘅車廠？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）唔可以實時嘅，但係可能係之後幾日。但係佢哋會好主動去提示嗰啲司機，但係就用緊一啲已經落後嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話，其實係有啲實時嘅數據收集咗，只不過係之後先至睇番？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，係，嗰啲數據可以實時去收集，有啲人就可以分析。然之後有人講，就話「喂，呢位司機，你上個星期揸得唔係咁好」，我係會主動提出呢一啲嘅提示，但係就係根據係一啲已經過去嘅數據。我提議就係應該係有實時嘅數據收集，同埋實時嘅反映先至係最好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺 8.3.2 段，第一點嗰度，就係話嗰啲電子嘅行車記錄儀，就係我哋使用會係去監察車長嘅表現，特別係超速。第二點就係駕駛提示器，就係喺所有嘅巴士上面有裝置，就幫助車長可以喺佢哋個學習課堂之中嘅技能可以使用。呢啲嘅好處，就係可以減低意外嘅風險，減低嗰個壓力，同埋係增加車長對於控制車輛嘅信心嘅。呢個純粹都係睇番之前收集嘅數據，係咪呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個環保安全駕駛，其實唔等如真係環保嘅駕駛...

主席：（經傳譯員）其實呢個嘅意思，即係話唔好話突然之間煞車，唔好突然之間加速或者減速。

程艾樂先生：其實就係話慳油嗰方面嘅啫，所謂個環保。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二個部分，我係有興趣...

主席：（經傳譯員）當你喺九巴工作嘅時候，有冇喺個參數裏面，包括譬如超速嘅，有啲自動係會發一啲報告出嚟？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）就冇一啲嘅報告自動發出嚟，但係有啲人就會去分析呢啲嘅數據，睇番嗰個司機嘅表現，呢個係一啲數據嘅分析嘅，有人係做。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰啲裝置，其實就話如果你擺啲數據落去嘅時候，其實係會有一啲自動嘅報告可以發出，但係冇咁樣做喎。點解冇咁做？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實有其他人更加適合去回答呢個問題，其實我自己都有個疑問，點解我哋擱置咗嗰個計劃？其實對於香港嘅巴士營運嚟講，係會帶嚟莫大嘅利益，唔該。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去睇另外一個文件--仲有一個問題，第 8.3.7 段呢度有一個嘅安全嘅措施，其實係有一個輔導服務，就係去幫一啲嘅司機同埋佢哋嘅家庭成員，如果佢哋日常生活有啲咩嘢問題。我想問，呢個喺譬如新加坡嚟講，有冇一個嘅制度或者系統，就係搵出、去識別一啲司機，其實佢哋有心理嘅問題，佢哋唔適合揸車？有冇一個咁樣嘅制度或者系統？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個司機個心理質素，其實對我哋嚟講，或者係呢個世界各個嚟講，都係最主要嘅挑戰嚟。有啲人而家都係用緊呢一個人工智能去解決呢個問題，譬如去睇下你嗰個生物嘅指數，或者你嗰個表情係點樣，就係瞳孔擴大嘅情況等等。呢啲都會話咗畀我哋聽，究竟嗰個司機個心理狀態係點。而家呢個科技都係發展中，喺新加坡有呢一個嘅類似嘅系統，其實係喺呢個方向，睇下呢個司機對於一啲實時發生嘅情況有乜嘢嘅反應，然後就去預測呢一個嘅司機會唔會有意外，然後就去介入，同埋就係去幫呢個司機。呢個呢，一係其實你就太過自在，又或者你係太過大壓力，譬如話你啱啱同你嘅配偶拗咗交，然後你就返工。其實喺而家市場上面，其實都未有一個系統係可以完全偵察到你當其時個心理狀態。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外有一個嘅 Miscellaneous 1，就係呢個道路安全議會嘅一個信件，就係日子係 2018 年 5 月 31 號。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我聽係邊一頁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係呢封信件嘅第一頁，第 127-5 頁，係呢個 Miscellaneous 嘅第 1 號文件冊。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，我睇到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我講你睇睇第 127-6 嘅其中一段，佢哋講呢個就係關於一個遠程訊息系統，就係睇下嗰個介面係點樣樣。佢就話佢會監察以下嗰，R、I、B 同埋 A，呢個就係空轉、急劇嘅煞車，同埋加速，同埋超速等等咁樣。呢度其實又有一啲唔同嘅參數，就係喺一個正常嘅參數嘅價值。而佢如果唔係呢啲參數嘅數據以內，就會係自動就會喺個電腦嗰度展示出嚟，然後呢一個督導就會知，然後就會採取呢一個跟進嘅行動，可能係勸喻，或者輔導，或者甚至係再培訓，呢

個似乎係警方係做緊。呢個會唔會同新加坡嗰個遠程訊息系統差唔多？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋係有關於--有好多唔同嘅供應商，每一個供應商提出嘅產品都有少少唔同，但係佢哋希望所做嘅嘢都係一樣嘅啫，希望知道呢一個嘅車輛嘅情況、表現，同埋就係希望提供實時嘅資訊，讓你可以監察呢個嘅車輛嘅表現，同埋佢個地點係點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）LKW Parts and Services Limited 係咪一間香港公司？你識唔識呢間公司？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇，從來冇同過佢哋有過任何嘅來往。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外一個題目，就關於黑盒。去到呢一個運輸署文件冊嘅第 1 號，第 393 頁。呢一封信係寫出咗委員會提出嘅事項一啲嘅回應嚟，呢個係 2018 年 7 月 13 號，請你就係睇番呢個第 394 頁。

問題就係問，即係邀請運輸署去搵出一啲時候，就係關於通訊方面，就係話同巴士司機更佳嘅管理，而唔係巴士經營。喺呢一啲嘅信件來往裏面，運輸署有冇畀任何嘅指示畀巴士公司去講話使用一啲新嘅應用程式？如果呢一啲嘅通訊係書面嘅話，請你將呢啲書面就係交出嚟。如果係口頭講嘅話，亦都要講清楚，就係邊個講、嗰個性質，同埋幾時？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以先請佢講呢一個運輸署文件，即係點解會問呢啲問題，你畀咗嗰個背景資料佢先，可能佢就會更加易去理解個內容。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）應該係附件 2，就係運輸署文件夾 5，1688 頁。程生，呢份文件就係運輸署嘅文件。呢度講就係話，喺經營巴士營運上面，使用新嘅技術。呢個就係運輸署嘅文件，就於最近提升專營巴士營運安全方面，呢個就係同專營巴士公司係一齊合作做嘅，關於使用新嘅技術方面。

1689 頁就提及到黑盒，即係一啲嘅電子行車記錄儀。喺你第 5 段可以見到話，由 2004 年 7 月 1 號開始，電子行車記錄儀，通稱「黑盒」，喺所有嘅新專營巴士已經係符合運輸署喺 2003 年 10 月所施加嘅要求，應呢個要求係安裝咗，所以而家所有專營巴士都有黑盒。如果睇番第 7 段，就話雖然係冇任何正式同埋書面嘅提升嘅要求，即係關於黑盒嘅規格方面，即係自從 2003 年。但係運輸署就係不時同巴士製造商，同埋專營巴士經營者，就係一路去傾關於一啲新嘅技術去提升巴士上面現有嘅設備。第 8 段就話專營巴士經營商，其實就係喺呢一個早於 2006 年嘅時候，就係已經開始擴大黑盒裏面儲存嘅資訊，所以除咗話一啲基本上嘅功能之外，仲會睇下個巴士司機個表現，同埋記錄低就係有關於佢煞車、開門、鐘聲等等，去幫助佢哋管理嘅。第 9 段話喺呢幾年間，運輸署同巴士經營商有溝通，要求佢哋去研究，同埋去睇下使用新嘅技術嗰個嘅可行性，同埋就係關於黑盒儲存嘅資料去更佳管理佢哋嘅巴士運作，同埋巴士司機。譬如話使用全球定位系統，連同埋一啲嘅數據轉移。運輸署就要求巴士公司就係提供一個嘅巴士實時到站資訊，呢個就透過一個流動嘅平台去提供，

係可以更佳服務公眾人士，呢個就係 2015 年佢哋同巴士公司傾新嘅專營權--續經營權嘅時候，佢哋所講。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係個背景，喺 2003 年 11 月嘅時候就講過話，巴士係要月 1 號開始，全部都要有黑盒，所以講就係話之後同埋之後嘅十五年，有冇提升黑盒嘅功能，同埋呢一啲嘅訊息功能。你就喺呢段時間，就係喺九巴度工作，負責呢方面嘅。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以講講？喺 2003 年發生嘅事，其實就唔係你所講今日發生嘅事，冇關個喎。

主席：（經傳譯員）不過我哋就想睇番，2003 年係最後一次知道有書面紀錄，所以我哋就想知道，而喺 03 年之後，究竟做過啲乜嘢？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實最大喺 2003 年之後嘅改變，就係話行車記錄儀就係一個巴士發出嘅一啲資料，關於巴士嘅表現，其實就喺呢個 2000 年嘅時候已經有，主要都係使用一啲電子化嘅晶片去控制巴士系統。2003 年嘅時候冇嘅紀錄，就係話將呢啲資料變成實時，一係話係冇一個咁樣嘅溝通系統。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋想知道嘅，就係運輸署做過啲乜嘢，要求係使用呢一個嘅設備。其實個答案就係畀你睇嘅，喺呢一個嘅 TD-1 號文件，即係運輸署嘅 1 號文件 394 頁。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我咁樣講，程生。運輸署只係發出咗一份嘅指引，就係 03 年，冇修訂過，之後，03 年至到今時今日都冇修訂過嘅，得一份嘅啫。其實佢哋話，其實就不斷有同專營商去傾係加多啲功能，加多啲嘅技術，即係就於黑盒方面。我哋要問嘅，就係係咪真係喺咁多年間有做到呢，定係你哋自己主動，即係話巴士公司自己主動去將黑盒升級？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我淨係可以講關於九巴當時做過啲乜嘢。好多呢啲都係自己主動做，主要係因為商業嘅原因做嘅。因為睇番九巴喺 2012 年嘅損益表，你可以見到佢哋係虧損大約呢一個嘅 1 億 2 千萬嘅。乘客數量喺過去十至十五年，不斷下跌，即係自從西鐵開始之後，即係 2002、2003 年至到 2012 年，乘客量不斷下跌，所以喺 2012 年嘅時候，當時嘅目標就係要將佢轉虧為盈。其實正常公司股東都要要求做呢樣嘢，所以我哋當時就睇下有啲乜嘢嘅參數技術，有冇任何嘅可行方法，可以改善巴士運作嘅表現、系統嘅表現，可以降低成本，同埋提升服務。所以喺 2012 至到 2015 年嘅數據，其實可以喺有關嘅公司文件可以睇到，應該略略就係有呢一個 2200 萬公里嘅行車旅程，就喺即係嗰兩年。當時乘客數量亦都有加咗大約係百分之三嘅。

當時呢個嘅遠程訊息，其實就係我哋整體上面做嘅措施其中一項，即係唔係淨係睇呢啲巴士嘅設備，睇番係好多唔同嘅嘢，路線、規劃、巴士司機編更等等，所以係整個嘅營運同埋效率一齊睇。即係 2013、14、15 年嘅時候，我哋就慢慢轉虧為盈。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問你關於運輸署嘅一個特定嘅答案，就係呢個 394 頁。請你睇番最後一行，提及到運輸署亦都有提過同一樣嘅嘢，即係話黑盒儲存資訊係要提升，以監察車長嗰個駕駛表現。喺 2016 年 6 月 27 號嘅例行會議係同九巴傾過，你記唔記得有個咁樣會議？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得咁詳細，即係日期等等。我可以講嘅就係話，到呢一日，九巴整個車隊都已經有呢啲設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實個問題就係問，運輸署就係促請九巴使用遠程資訊系統定期監察車長嗰個行為，你用到黑盒嘅資訊。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）可能有，但係其實九巴都有意咁做。我諗唔返當時講過啲乜嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我明白。不過為咗幫你記，或者可以畀你睇番個文件，呢個可能係同續專營權有關。因為呢個都係當個月發生嘅事嚟㗎，係咪呀，黃律師，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢方面其實真係有一份文件。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）當時係有好多一系列嘅措施傾過，我都幾有信心咁講，我哋第一次即係要求一個實時嘅記錄儀器，同埋擬定到車時間，其實係呢一個嘅 2016 年嘅時候係加入去專營文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋其實就係想搵番一啲要求，啲要求就係話，巴士公司係需要使用黑盒裏面嘅資料去監察司機嘅行為嘅，但係我哋就搵唔到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇番關於續專營權嘅文件，即係關於呢方面嘅。首先想請你睇下 SEC-2 號文件，735 頁。呢份係立法會文件嚟，日期係 16 年嘅 1 月 15 號。呢個係有關於專營權嘅背景資料簡介，係九巴嘅。如果睇番第 11 段，提升巴士服務水平。議員提及關於專營巴士服務水平，就促請政府利用呢次機會要求佢哋提升服務水平，包括就係使用一啲實時嘅資料、巴士嘅服務資料畀乘客，同埋有呢個嘅優先座位，同埋係一啲嘅無障礙設施，改善脫班情況，同埋改善巴士喺繁忙時間嘅班次。另外一段就係講關於實時嘅資訊提供畀乘客，呢個係第 12 同埋第 13 段。呢度就係冇講到關於係黑盒嘅改善，或者冇提過黑盒。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者用黑盒嘅資料去監察司機，呢個係個重點嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）中間我就唔再多講，去到 2016 年 6 月，SEC 第 2 號文件嘅第 799 頁。呢個係 2016 年 6 月，呢度就係講到有一個公眾諮詢，同埋收集到啲咩嘢意見。其中一個佢哋提到嘅問題，就喺 803 頁有見到，就係關於第 4 段係巴士安全，A。就係更加緊密、密切去監察車長嘅駕駛行為，然後再睇番 802，其實喺嗰個公眾諮詢最主要嘅其中一個意見，就喺第 4 段就講到，就係話關於巴士安全，就話更加密切去監察車長嘅駕駛行為。

喺 2017 年 3 月嘅時候，我哋去續專營權嘅時候，運輸署就叫九巴係承諾某一啲嘅東西。我哋就去到運輸署第 5 號嘅文件冊--應該係九巴第 9 號文件夾，九巴第 9 號文件夾，第 3997 頁。呢個唯一有提到嘅，關於呢個新嘅經營權，就喺第 3 段嗰度，關於改善安全功能。呢個就係講到關於電子數據處理裝置，但係冇提到就係點樣用一啲黑盒嘅資料去監察司機嘅行為，呢度係講得好唔仔細。似乎運輸署就話佢哋一直都同你哋有溝通，就係話希望黑盒嘅資料可以愛嚟監察司機嘅行為，其實呢啲就完全冇喺我頭先所講出嘅文件出現。其實你同唔同意？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，喺開頭我講就係話，喺香港嘅經營權嘅文件，其實都係寫得好寬鬆，係寫得好闊。你就可能喺呢一個經營權底下，你可以做好多嘢。因此雖然係咁講，我同運輸署嘅交往之中，我感覺佢哋嘅意圖係好，但係有時候，佢哋唔夠有足夠嘅知識，亦都冇嗰個動力。所以同佢哋嗰個意圖，其實就唔同嘅。我有同佢哋開過會，運輸署，佢哋問好多問題，佢哋希望改善，但係可能唔係好具體，佢哋啲意見，亦都唔係話好指令地呢個嘅公司界線應該做啲乜、做啲乜。

主席：（經傳譯員）應該冇咩嘢記錄，所以好寬鬆，係咪呀？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。其實我都可以講下關於呢個專營權嘅文件裏面嘅其他部分，其實好多都寫得太寬鬆。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，等等。但係你可以總的嚟講，其實佢唔係話真係好有指令式，或者規範性係好強，係咪？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋覺得巴士嘅安全係非常之重要，其實就好正常就係話，就會係一個嘅清單喺呢方面，喺嗰個專營權嘅文件。你會唔會同意我呢個講法？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我就會講番，就如果呢個巴士安全，其實當然係十分重要，係首要嘅考慮。無論係個規管者嘅角度，或者係公司嚟講。我哋講緊係公眾嘅安全、乘客嘅安全，同埋呢一個員工嘅安全，就我哋一定唔可以係有任何嘅妥協。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實我哋喺過去好多年，我哋都有好多嚴重嘅巴士意外，呢個係真係好不幸，係咪？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係非常之不幸，我哋喺香港有一個好好嘅公共交通系統，所以我哋係對於呢啲問題，我哋應該及時去處理。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我跟住就會有一個好具體嘅問題，關於嗰個年報，我

就係想做一啲比較，係兩年嘅比較。點解某一年某啲嘢就係漏咗，喺2016年出現，但係2017年就唔見咗？你如果睇番九巴第5號嘅文件冊1719頁。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講係邊一頁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係九巴第5號文件冊，1719頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係邊一年嘅年報？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係2016年嘅年報。

主席：（經傳譯員）就喺2017年嘅3月去印製好嘅，係咪？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係去到2016年年尾。

主席：（經傳譯員）要喺呢個主席來函嗰度講應該係2017年3月印好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇下呢個年報，1719頁，喺右面，呢度就有講到有兩個嘅功能，一個係巴士車上嘅監察系統，第二個就係車務溝通管理系統，上面嗰個就係講緊車長記錄佢哋嘅駕駛表現，就係由車廠同埋部門去進行記錄，就希望能夠可以提高駕駛嘅水準，同埋安全水平，同埋乘客嘅舒服速度。下面嗰個就係話令到一啲嘅事故，有一啲實時嘅資訊，特別係喺一啲嘅道路車擠塞嘅情況、天氣唔好嘅情況，然後我哋有相當嘅控制中心，就係可以收集資料，就係能夠改善有關嘅措施。關於呢個，亦都有一個八達通嘅個人卡，就係呢一個巴士司機如果佢哋係當值嘅時候，佢哋就會可以用呢個八達通。呢個就係一個總站管理系統。

如果我哋睇番2017年嘅年報，係1926頁。我哋睇番1926同埋1925頁，我哋就搵唔到一啲類似嘅資訊，喺呢個2017年嘅年報就冇。你可唔可以就講一講2016年嘅時候個年報，即係關於個巴士車上嘅管理系統，係咪嗰陣時候個公司諗住會推出呢個系統，就係實時去警示一啲司機，還是係另外一啲嘅系統？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個都唔係一啲實時系統嚟，呢個係我哋純粹係想搜集資料，然後係希望反饋畀啲司機。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）但係喺2017年嘅年報嘅時候，我哋就睇唔到有一啲類似嘅提述喎。雖然佢嗰度就有--喺1940頁，其實都係有啲類似嘅...

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢度有講到話車上嘅管理系統，但係就冇咁多細節喺度寫咗出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實當其時你已經離開咗九巴，係咪？兩個年報。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我係離開咗之後，呢兩個報告先至出嚟。2016年個年報，係龍運同埋九巴嘅，就嗰個細節係比較少啲，2017年嗰個年報。我睇

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

啲年報，我就會睇下，去做下啲分析，同埋佢哋個表現。2017 年，我就發現有好多嘅資訊都冇出現，其實喺之前嗰啲年度就反而有出嚟，有寫出嚟，呢個係我嘅觀察。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我已經係完成我嘅提問。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我就係一個好快--有一個好嘅問題。多謝程先生你就嚟到我哋呢度。我哋今日下晝用咗好多時間關於呢個科技，就可以幫助我哋可以改善、提升巴士安全嘅。我想聽一聽關於你對於資源問題嘅睇法。我哋講緊好多科技，但係從一個資源嘅角度，無論係錢嗰方面，或者係人力資源方面，你係點睇呢？你有冇點樣去評估其實呢啲嘅科技係幾咁貴？我哋香港有冇一啲足夠嘅人才係可以推動呢啲嘅科技，你剛才提到嘅科技？唔該晒。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好有趣嘅問題，其實我都成日去傾呢啲嘢。首先我就去咗呢個九巴嘅長期服務獎嘅晚宴，大概有二百人就係已經服務咗三十年。其實我呢一生人都未見過咁嘅場面，有好大量嘅人，其實佢哋係讓佢哋一生貢獻咗畀呢間公司。我相信其實喺公司裏面係有啲嘢令到佢哋咁忠心，所以對我嚟講，呢個即係文化上，對我嚟講係非常之有意義。而家啲人點解唔想加入九巴，其實呢個就係一個好重要嘅問題，係咪因為佢哋嘅形象已經受損？係咪佢哋提供家庭友善嘅政策係已經冇咗？呢啲我哋需要去睇，呢個就係人方面嘅問題，其實係可以處理到，即係如果係九巴。因為我熟悉九巴，但係我所講話「九巴」，其實都適用於其他巴士公司嘅。

其實係有一啲嘅方法，有一啲嘅機制可以令到駕駛呢方面，係可以令得佢更加吸引。我有好多朋友，佢哋都係投身去呢個巴士界，佢哋真係好真心，係有熱誠。其實如果你去睇番，有好多都係一啲嘅巴士迷嚟嘅。其實可以點樣即係將佢哋包含埋一齊，令佢哋有份參與。

另外一方面，技術方面，其實仍然係用一啲好舊嘅問題，我哋只不過將條鎖匙交畀巴士司機，跟住巴士司機全日都係揸嗰架巴士工作。所以其實呢方面冇做到更多--係有好多可以做，而但係冇做到。其實巴士司機係需要休息，但係車就唔使休息。如果可以做得更好，譬如話有三層嘅資源，人力資源、巴士資源，同埋基建資源，如果可以三個層面都可以善用嘅話，就會做得更好。但係而家就係做唔到，可以就利用一啲科技做得到。其實我覺得可以用更少做得更多。如果成日話乜嘢都係要減成本，乜都減，其實可以就係即係巴士司機同埋車少百分之二都可以做到同一樣嘅服務水平出嚟，呢個就可以解決到人力資源嘅問題。

歐陽先生：Thank you.

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我有一個問題，唔該晒，你為我哋分享咗咁多關於技術嘅資料。我諗就話點解香港咁落後呢，喺採納提升安全嘅技術方面，係咪一個嘅意識嘅問題？可唔可以改善得到？譬如話公司，係咪因為公司冇誘因去投資，佢哋睇唔到有任何嘅價值，或者係根本冇法例要求佢哋咁樣做？呢個係一啲好主要嘅障

礙嚟，其實喺呢方面，我哋可以做啲咩嘢更多嘅事，令到整個界別係會更加願意使用多啲嘅技術去提升安全？因為你都係幫九巴同埋港鐵工作過。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實係好多唔同嘅原因，我覺得最大嘅就係嗰個環境。其實如果你係容許你失敗嘅話，你就好願意去創新。但係香港嘅情況，就係唔係好鼓勵你去嘗試失敗咁樣，呢個係一個環境嘅問題，一個文化嘅問題。其實主要嘅原因，喺過去嘅十年嘅，其實都有啲嘢證實係用到，但係技術採納方面就用得好慢。但係其實科技發展一日千里，但係你一路等緊用嘅技術就係已經過咗時，所以你永遠都係等緊一啲新嘢。其實採用呢啲嘅技術，其實係有成本，但係公司就覺得「嘩，如果不斷有新嘢，點解我唔等新嘢啫？」

喺中國內地，其實佢哋就真係去勇於嘗試去試一啲新嘢，容許公司失敗，譬如話係用呢一個電動車，你睇番係電池方面，充電方面有好多唔同嘅方法，你試過先至有啲咩嘢得，咩嘢唔得。而家中國大陸就成為呢一個電動車嘅經營同埋製造商嘅主要經營者。香港係需要咁樣嘅環境，即係我睇番香港嗰個嘅技術嘅知識方面，其實香港係非常之行得好前，但係採納技術方面，即係覺得退步得可憐。其實譬如話數據方面，我見到就算喺第三世界國家發生緊嘅，香港都未採納。可以做到啲咩嘢呢？要製造一個環境，即係會提供誘因，等佢哋創新，使用新嘅技術。譬如一啲合作模式，香港好多嘅初創企業都喺台灣，喺世界各地，喺中國內地不停咁樣去嘗試，所以你要容許人去嘗試，去大家合作。

我其實都係擔當過好多唔同嘅角色，觀察者、決定者，同埋係聆聽者。其實香港係需要有一啲企業家精神，即係香港唔係缺乏企業家，只不過就係缺乏一個好嘅環境。譬如可能有一啲嘅孵化、實驗室等等，即係喺裏面工作嘅人可能係九巴嘅人、港鐵嘅人，可以係創造好多嘢出嚟係畀世界各地使用。

主席：（經傳譯員）不久之前，你就提過話巴士司機需要休息。你就喺九巴做咗四年。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講到令我哋更加容易理解，九巴提供畀巴士司機休息嘅設施，我哋講緊嘅就係特別更嘅司機做緊係十四個鐘嘅嗰啲，只不過係中間可以休息三個鐘，你可唔可以講一講即係九巴休息嘅設施係夠唔夠？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）即係呢啲係實際嘅硬件，其實好容易，可以做一啲嘅調查，話佢哋覺得舒唔舒適，有冇地方需要改善，休息足唔足夠。但係你休息，其實仲有另外一個方面。

我見到有一方面香港係嚴重不足，每個人都唔同，佢哋疲勞程度，佢哋嘅心理反應不盡相同。好，十四個鐘係咪太長，要減到十個鐘？其實我哋需要先做一個統計，睇下一啲主要嘅參數、主要嘅指標。係到邊一個程度，巴士司機疲勞係一個問題。如果譬如話你只不過就係睇番個意外分析等等，你睇番即係每一個司機，佢嗰個過去係點樣，你要有一個參數，譬如話三個鐘好唔好，呢個

司機三個鐘就最好，短程就最好，夜晚做唔啱佢咁。你可以將嗰個職責就係度身訂造，令佢更加適合，更加願意做。如果今個月你要去早更，下個月你要做夜晚更，跟住嗰個要做下晝更，你咁不穩定嘅話，其實就好難--你個理由就係話要公平，但係其實係唔適合。如果做足夠嘅分析，其實可以做到呢個環境出嚟。如果你當係一個企業，其實我哋都會睇下佢嘅表現，譬如佢話即係呢個分析能力好好，所以佢就要做分析員；呢個人佢就係手工藝好好，佢又可以適合做呢樣嘢，所以呢樣同揸車都係一樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）你所講就係話需要有數據，譬如話一個巴士司機，其實就係同佢個表現就要記錄低，可以係一個實時記錄，同埋一個自動報告。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）呢個其中一個，譬如我哋可以睇番佢嘅教育程度，佢嘅醫療情況，係好多地方可以攞到唔同嘅資料，所以睇番就係話其實我哋收集嘅資料，其實只係一方面，譬如話佢嘅駕駛表現，但係其實可能呢個就係同佢哋其他啲個人參數有關。如果你將所有資料收集晒，其實就可以砌到成個人出嚟。新加坡嘅模式係一個即係支援學習，就係咁。每一位嘅司機接受嘅訓練都唔同，因為佢哋睇下個司機係點樣，然之後就係訂造一個適合佢哋嘅訓練課程。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我要再問番。你係喺九巴做嘅時候，你可唔可以講下佢哋嘅休息設施係夠唔夠？因為對於呢一方面嘅分析，你提過，但係就冇做過。所以譬如話對於車長嘅休息設計，尤其係做一啲特別嘅分開更嘅。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）我覺得係非常之差。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺 2013 年嘅時候？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係 2013 年嘅時候，啲設施係低於標準，即係完全唔適合一個現代化嘅車隊。但係佢哋之後就係有合作去改善，即係好多唔同嘅方面，即係盡力改善。我記得係向運輸署提供過好多嘅建議，譬如話係多啲嘅休息室，但係香港係一個好特別情況，因為土地非常之珍貴，好多嘅公共交通交匯處，雖然巴士公司可以用，但係其實屬於私人發展商，譬如話領展等等，佢哋係唔願意提供地方，即係可以整一個休息設施畀司機，但係我相信九巴回答會更佳。但係有時可能佢哋就係話，即係司機用商場嘅洗手間都會畀人投訴，但係呢個係一個人嘅基本需要嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就話，2013 年嘅時候，呢啲設施係非常之令人失望。當你走嘅時候，2016 年嘅時候，12 月，情況係點？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）其實如果用番呢一個基準，之後係有大幅改善。但係呢啲改善都唔係太過令人滿意，不過真係有一個大幅嘅改善，管理層真係有心去改善呢樣嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）最差嘅設施係咩嘢？即係喺呢一個 2016 年 12 月嘅時候。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）都有幾個，即係 2016 年嘅時候，有時就可能巴士車長其

實要喺巴士上面休息同埋食嘢，因為根本冇地方畀佢喺外面坐。應該大坑道有個公共屋邨--唔係，九龍城附近，係一個私人嘅住宅嚟，佢哋係唔願意畀空間去做一個設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪樂華邨？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係。仲有好多其他嘅例子，成個香港都係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係九巴自己起咗，跟住就要求佢哋整番走，移除。遇到呢啲問題係因為唔能夠要求有權嘅人士提供呢啲嘅設施咁樣講，啱唔啱？

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）係，可能就係嗰個發展權或者地契，佢有好多唔同嘅原因嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢原因都好，呢啲設施係冇提供。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，好多嘅例子就係唔足夠嘅設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，多謝你協助我哋，程先生。我哋亦都好多謝嗰啲人，佢哋係有做謄本嗰啲，同埋嗰啲做傳譯。我哋今日個聽證會到呢一刻為止，多謝大家出席。我哋會安排另外唔同節數嘅聽證會，我哋就住呢啲嘅聽證會，我哋會有公告。

程艾樂先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席，多謝委員會，多謝律師，我覺得你有一個好挑戰性嘅工作，我希望到最後屘你哋會有一啲好嘅有建設性嘅建議，亦都會為我哋嘅巴士行業帶嚟益處。

2018年7月17日

下午5時46分聆訊押後

Monday, 30 July 2018

(10.00 am)

REPRESENTATIVES FROM MOTOR TRANSPORT WORKERS GENERAL UNION.

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG, MR LAI SIU CHUNG, MR LAM TIN FU, MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI, MR LAU SIN TAT, MR LAM PO KEUNG

(Evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

We thank the Motor Transport Workers General Union for sending their representatives to assist us with their evidence today.

We thank you, Mr Cheung, as the principal vice-chairman, and the other representatives.

The method by which we would take your evidence is to have questions posed of you by Ms Wong, Senior Counsel, who is one of the counsel assisting this Committee.

If at any stage you, Mr Cheung, wish one of your fellow representatives to deal with the question, please defer to him, and we will hear from whoever it is that you wish us to hear from.

I'll ask Ms Wong to start asking questions now.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Good morning, gentlemen.

I would like to introduce a few remarks first, about

your organisation.

Was Motor Transport Workers General Union established in 1920?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we can see at TU bundle 1C at page 289-15 showing the membership of your trade union, and -- it is not translated, but I'll read out the actual numbers.

Your organisation currently has membership of 29,670 people, in which 11,868 people are members coming from franchised bus trade union, and 10,436 people are members of bus captains of franchised bus operators.

Is that correct?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your organisation has five sub-unions. It contains Kowloon Motor Bus, Citybus, New World Bus, Long Win Bus and New Lantao Bus.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I start questions, may I take you to the terms of reference for this Committee. It is in TU bundle 1C at page 263 in Chinese; and the English can be found at TD-1 bundle at page 3.

In essence, this committee's task is to look at the evidence from the point of view of safety in the light of the fatal accident on 10 February; and it is tasked

to examine the operation and management of bus franchises under the current legislative franchise and other contractual requirements; and to examine the present regulatory and monitoring system for franchised buses; and lastly, to make recommendation to the Chief Executive on safety-related measures with a view to sustaining a safe and reliable franchised bus service in Hong Kong.

So this committee's task is to look at the safety aspects of bus operation, franchised bus operations.

The why I raise this is, I understand that your submission raised a lot of issues concerning work, but this Committee is only tasked to look at safety-related measures in relation to the operation of franchised bus operation.

So I hope you understand that the questions will be focused along that area.

Your organisation previously made a number of submissions to the Committee. The first submission is dated 23 April 2018. The Chinese is at TU-1C page 277 to 289. English at 289-1 to 289-12.

This submission, the first submission, is made in response to the committee's letter to your organisation, to your union, dated 28 March 2018; is that correct?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your submission raised a number of issues. May I first take you to the broad areas first.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Ms Wong, might I say this, Mr Cheung, if it helps you.

There are available to you hard copies of your submissions in the files. They are being brought up on the screen, but if ever you want to have a look at the hard copy, so perhaps you can look at other parts of the document, then just ask to be provided with the hard copy.

Do you understand?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I understand.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong, what is the reference?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reference first is 289-14-7, and I'm making reference to the first 10 paragraphs which made reference to abuse of bus captains.

Your submission raised a few experiences, or actual experiences of many members showing that there were uncivilised passengers that ignore the laws and assault the bus captains by physical violence or abusive behaviour. That's the first topic that your submission raised.

And then in your second point that you made, it is about improvements to operational safety of franchised buses, and that's at paragraph 11 at page 289-14-9 in

English. The Chinese is at page 285.

And the improvements you made are in essence three essential improvements.

First, you asked that the traffic lights be improved by having count down timers or flashing device. Second, you asked that there be more yellow squares in bus stops to allow the buses to park into the bus zone. And third, the entry and exit of bus stops.

The third topic you raised in your submission is the working condition, and that is at paragraph 15 in the bundle TU-1C bundle at page 289-14-10, paragraph 15.

In Chinese, it's page 287; in English page 289-10.

And you raised three particular matters, if I may broadly summarise. That's the resting time facilities and training.

So those are the three topics that I'm going to explore with you in this session.

The second submission you made to the Committee is in response to letters from the Committee to you dated 8 and 13 June 2018. And your submission is dated 10 July 2018. The Chinese is at page 289-16 to page 289-23. That's the second submission.

And the English is also in 1C bundle, page 289-23-1 to page 289-23-10.

In this submission you expressed in the second

paragraph that you have gathered the responsible persons of the five branches of franchised buses to convene a taskforce and extensively collected the views of the managers, office, and members, and workers. You will see that at page 289-16 in Chinese, and page 289-23-1 in English. And in this submission you also extensively made submission on the assault or abuse of bus captain by passengers. You cited a number of incidents in the second submission.

You also made the third submission, but before I go to the third submission I would deal with the assault, abuse of bus captain by passengers first. That is the first topic which has been extensively covered in both your first and second submissions.

Mr Cheung, I believe in both of your submissions you mentioned that this complaint about assault has been raised by trade union and bus companies for a number of years.

You quoted a number of incidents in 2016 and 2017 and 2018. If I may go through this with you. Because you have identified nine assault incidents between 3 January 2016 to 29 April 2018. That's Chinese at page 289-16 to page 289-17. And English at 289-23-2.

This assault incidents took place at different places in Tuen Mun town centre, Tai Wai Mei Lam Estate

bus terminus, Eastern Hospital, South Horizons, Airport Ground Transportation Centre bus terminus, Castle Peak Road cafeteria bus terminus, Yat Tung Estate, Mong Kok railway station and Lantau toll plaza.

And you identify in each case that all the bus drivers that you mentioned have suffered injuries and have to take sick leave. Can you confirm those nine incidents were reported to your union and seek your help in liaising with the police or the relevant bus companies?

MR LAM TIN FU: Chairman, we quoted these nine cases, and in our submission we made it clear that these nine members sought help from our staff and then they sought financial assistance from the Occupational Safety And Health Association of the General Trade Union, but we have made it clear in our submission that some members were assaulted and they were widely reported in the media, and they did not seek help from our union.

We couldn't confirm whether they were our members and didn't know where they happened. So none of our staff provided assistance to them. So for the nine cases we have here, because they were seriously injured, and they had to take prolonged sick leave, they had financial difficulties. These were members who we got information from the occupational safety and health of

the union, and in our latest submissions, we supplemented cases reported by the media.

We wanted to talk about a case at number 9 bus of Shek O. A captain was assaulted by a passenger for about three to five minutes, it was widely reported in the media but he did not come to us for help so we could not tell his actual situation. That's what I have to add.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: May I add too.

Yes, we do have some statistics, but this is just the tip of the iceberg, these nine cases. However, assault against captains have become more serious, on average there are nine cases a day, and we do have some information, the number of cases are increasing. So we have just suggested to bus companies that protective devices be provided. There should be a membrane, or a panel to help us.

So this has always been happening. It is not confined to these nine cases, things have got more and more serious, and the passengers are very uncivilised. They use mobile phones to provoke and assault captains. There is a 230A regulation to protect captains but they have never been enforced.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, before you go on, it might assist you if we were to inform you that we have received on Friday,

I think it was, some information from Kowloon Motor Bus about statistics of complaints that they have received from their bus captains, from the period 2015 through to 2018, and I think I'm right in remembering that there are about 40 complaints that have been made so far this year.

Are you aware of that information? It is on our website.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, if I may tell you that in the past two years, things have been more serious so there should be more than 40 complaints. And it is only very recently that a legal division has been set up in the company to support bus captains.

For cases that came to us for help, we provided assistance, but 40 complaints is not an accurate figure. We should at least have eight or ten per month. So two years, there should at least be 200 cases.

CHAIRMAN: I think you might have misunderstood me.

40 cases in the six months so far this year, seven months this year -- from one bus company.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I don't dispute that. But I don't think the figure is reliable.

CHAIRMAN: Well, no doubt you can provide us with reliable figures, but before you do that, the nine cases you described here cover the period from beginning of 2016

until April 2018; is that correct?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us as to the bus companies where these nine victims worked?

MR LAM TIN FU: We have to check our information, but most of them were working for KMB.

For most of the cases known, they were from KMB. But for the specifics, we have to check the records.

And some bus captains did not tell us the company they worked for. Because in our form, we only required them to tell us the trade union he is from; we don't require them to tell us which bus company he is working for.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The chairman earlier referred to a list compiled by the KMB showing assaults on bus captains from January 2015 to 22 July 2018. Can I show you the list. It is at KMB1 bundle, at page 212.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I'm sorry, Ms Wong.

Chairman, can I have a copy? Can I have a Chinese copy of this?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that can be provided now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It may be that it was only provided in English.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Because we cannot see anything in front

of us.

CHAIRMAN: Of course we will provide it to you.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: (In English) Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: It may be easier if you look at the hard copy.

Take your time to digest the format. That's probably what you need. Are we able to show the whole page? Yes.

Would you be kind enough to go forward to 2018?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That would be at page 216.

It should be KMB-1 bundle, page 216.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, are you ready now for questions to be asked?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look at the KMB-1 bundle at page 216, item 148 onwards to 188 are the cases that were compiled by the KMB from January 2018 to 22 July 2018. That's just for KMB only.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Well, that was reported to you by KMB, but information was received from us that some minor pushing were not reported to KMB. These figures might be true, but we understand that some cases were not reported to the bus company, and that's why we say that these statistics are not very accurate. Some staff did not report to the company, but they told the trade unions.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt you can provide us with the complaints that you have received, that were not provided to the bus company.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, for example, just last week we had a station master who was newly employed. He was punched once by a Pakistani, and he fell to the floor. He reported the case to me and I reported it to the company. And then a report was compiled.

Now, because this is such a big company, if I have to tell each and every time, then you will find it troublesome, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: We are trying to act on evidence, and unless we are provided with evidence, mere assertions, sweeping assertions don't assist us.

If you can give us complaints that you have received that were not reported to the bus company, please do.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Okay, thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look at the list we can see, on my count, there were about 41 incidents. But we can see that very few cases result in any prosecution or meaningful result. And only two cases -- we can see at items 162 and 164 -- result in the defendant pleading guilty and fined for a sum. Out of 41, most of them are settled, or with verbal warning, or not pursued by the police.

If I may take this list and cross-reference to some of the cases that were mentioned in your nine assault incidents, I can find five of them.

The first case in your submission is case 2. At page 289-16. It relates to an incident of a Mr Ho on 3 January 2016 the at Tai Wai Mei Lam Estate. And we can see that would be case number 62 in the list compiled by KMB at page 214, case number 62.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Before I move on, there is in fact another incident which is not recorded in this table, but there was a notice of an incident on 16 May 2016 about an assault. And that's at page 289-114, and the English is at 289-23-2.

We can see there was another incident on 16 May 2016 that was not reported, or cannot be found in the table, but which was issued or a notification issued by your organisation or union, and if I may go back to the list, this is just quoted as one of the examples that would not be in KMB list, nor in your list that we can find.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: It is the same one as the one with the victim's surname Ho.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Oh. Same as. Thank you.

And the second case is case 5 on your list, at

page 289-17, and that's case 5 on your list, in relation to a Mr Yiu, who was attacked on 8 August 2016. And we can see this incident was also found in the KMB list at page 214 as case number 82.

We can see BC, bus captain, Mr Yiu, the date on 8 August, Long Win Bus, the location at the airport terminus, and the injury he suffered.

And the third incident in your submission is case 8 at page 289-17, concerning a Mr Lee injured on 9 January 2017, at Mong Kok station, where he was injured on the eye and the forehead. This case can also be found in KMB's list at page 215 as case number 113.

Do you confirm that?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And another example that was found on the list but not in your list, but in the KMB list, is the number 122 incident on 4 June 2017 in Tsuen Wan bus terminus, in which the case was settled. And that's in the KMB list at page 215.

Another case on your submission is case number 9 at page 289-17, in relation to a Mr Yeung, injured on 29 April 2018 at the Tsing Ma toll. And this incident was reported, or compiled in the KMB list as case number 170, at page 217.

Can you confirm that? 170.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes. Yes. The injured bus captain sought assistance from me. At that time he asked questions. He asked why the security officers at Tsing Ma toll plaza let the culprit go, because the culprit forced the door open, alight the bus, walked to take another transportation to leave. The control officers at the toll plaza did not do anything.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now we can see these incidents, these 41 incidents in the list were reported to the police, and on the most right column we can see some of the remarks stating that the police either requested them to settle, or not pursued by the police, and that was a point made in your submission at page 289-17, English at 289-23-3, at the bottom.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I would like to say something, Chairman. There are many incidents. It is impossible that they were all settled voluntarily. You can see that there were only a handful of cases where the law was enforced. There are so many cases, it is ridiculous that so many of them are settled. We have received a lot of complaints that the police did not enforce the law. Bus captains will not provoke passengers. There so many cases. Out of the 40 cases only a handful of cases resulted in prosecution. That obviously is a problem. You can see that from the table. There are

a number of injuries sustained in a lot of these cases, and a lot of them resulted in the case being settled, only a handful of cases resulted in prosecution. Bus captains have been assaulted, and they are asked to settle. That is to show that there is a failure on law enforcement.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Lai.

You raised that this matter has been raised a number of times. And one of the examples we can see is in one of the minutes of meeting you had with the Transport Department. That's dated 22 March 2017. We can see it in Chinese at page 289-61, paragraph 2 at the bottom; in English, at page 289-182.

In paragraph 2 you mentioned the attacks on bus drivers, and the verbal abuse and how it affected the driving, the work of the bus captains, and requested the Transport Department to execute the laws in accordance with the regulation.

This is just one of the examples.

If I may refer back to your submission. You made clear the point that the information of other attacks and injuries not reflected to the staff of your union is not collected in your submission. And you made that clear at page 289-18 in Chinese, second paragraph; in English, page 289-23-3.

In paragraph 2 you mentioned about -- in the previous occasion some of the members would come out to assist the bus captains, but because of the incidents that there may be certain implication about public fighting, or fighting in public place. So a lot of people are worried about their own condition, and not willing to offer assistance to bus captains.

And you mentioned an incident on 10 July 2015 about the typhoon incident leading to a number of violent behaviour of passengers. Can you explain a little bit as to how you would assist the bus captains and why you feel inhibited in assisting the bus captains in those circumstances?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I remember this case very clearly. At about 8.30, because of the typhoon, bus service ceased. And at that time perhaps passengers were quite anxious, as a result, they assaulted the bus captain. At the end, the passenger was arrested.

MR LAM TIN FU: Well, this is the view of the union. If other union members stepped in to help the bus captain, to stop the perpetrator from assaulting the bus captain, the police would book all parties involved.

That means all these people would be charged with fighting in a public place.

As a result, when union members see that someone is

assaulted, they would not go to help, and that becomes the trend now.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: And I would like to supplement. Verbal abuse, taking videos of bus captains, these all affect the emotions of the bus captain, which in turn affects driving safety, and this will have an implication on public safety. As a result, we do think that these kinds of assaults should be stopped.

CHAIRMAN: Could you just help the committee with the detail of this particular assault? Where did the assault take place? Was it in the bus? Or was it in the bus depot?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: It is at the bus stop, before the bus pulled off. Perhaps because passengers were quite anxious that typhoon No. 8 would be hoisted. We received an announcement that at 8.30 bus service would cease. My understanding was that passengers saw a bus captain, but the bus captain was about to knock off work. Passengers assaulted the bus captain. Some people helped the bus captain. However, all the people, even those who stepped in to help, were charged.

CHAIRMAN: Was the assault on the bus, or outside the bus?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: At a bus terminal, outside a rest kiosk of the bus regulator. Do you understand, Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: I do, now. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your further submission dated

10 July 2018, Chinese is at page 289-18, English at page 289-23-3 to 289-23-4, in paragraph 1 you highlighted the problems that you mentioned earlier, and that you have collected from the Internet, other information concerning bus drivers being harassed by passengers, and being unreasonably treated. And you also exhibited the relevant articles or website information on bus captains being abused by passengers.

The articles can be found in Chinese at page 289-24 to 289-30, and there is photographic evidence. And in English, at page 289-141 to 289-146.

And you identified the problem at paragraph 2 of your submission. And you went on to complain at paragraph 3 that you have not heard of law enforcement officers bringing charges against a relevant person under the Public Bus Services Regulations, chapter 230A. We can see that in English, 289-23-4, and in Chinese at 289-19.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Can you please respond. Cap 230A is for protecting bus captains, but in most cases it is used to protect passengers and our companies have not asked that protection be given to us. Now, we should enhance the penalty. Because I have not seen any charging of perpetrators under cap 230A.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For convenience, if I may take you to the

regulation to see the penalty. And that's in THB-2, page 131.

Do you have that? I'm sorry that there is only an English version. But we can see in regulation 13, power to remove passengers from a bus, where that person whom he has reasonable cause to believe has contravened these regulations.

And also 13A, at page 13. Regulation 13A states that:

".. no passenger or intending passenger shall:

(a) wilfully ... impede or distract the driver of the bus or any authorised person;

(b) wilfully obstruct the driver's view of the road or traffic;

(c) wilfully do or cause to be done with respect to any part of the bus ... anything which ..."

And then subparagraph (ii):

"causes injury, discomfort, annoyance or inconvenience to any other person ..."

and at (i):

"obstructs or interferes with the workings of the bus or causes damage."

And if we may go to regulation 25(3):

"Any person who without reasonable excuse contravenes any of the provisions of regulation ...

13A(1)" [that's the provision we have just looked at] "commits an offence and is liable to a fine of $3,000 and to imprisonment for six months."

So that's the section you are referring to that was not prosecuted throughout the years. Is that the case?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may invite you to look at paragraph 3 of your submission, further submission. In English it is at page 289-23-5; Chinese is at page 289-19. Do you see that?

Reference was made to civil claims that bus companies have initiated on the bus captains' behalf, but they have not published the results of the claim. So you requested to obtain information on bus captains in which civil claims were lodged. Is that the position? That you would like to recommend the Committee to seek information from the franchised bus companies in relation to this civil claims?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: A few months ago a female bus captain was assaulted. There was assistance by the bus company, there was a compensation of $5,000 in cash, and also bail, and he was bound over.

Yes, there was assistance, and there was requests for compensation.

MR LAM TIN FU: But as far as we know, bus companies would

only provide personal assistance, because these cases would affect all employees of bus companies and there was no announcement to all staff, the outcome of the assistance.

Some KMB colleagues told us that in their monthly newsletter the case was mentioned, but we haven't seen that. It was in the newsletter for KMB staff.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be able to provide us with the monthly newsletter?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: We have to find it out from our staff website. Perhaps you can ask KMB on our behalf. In their monthly newsletters for staff, and all the cases are reported, it is not that we cannot find it, but we may not be able to do it very quickly. Perhaps it would be faster if you ask the management of KMB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have seen the complaints. Can we look at how KMB responded to some of these complaints in their submission.

If I may take you to KMB-1, page 61 to 62.

It referred to 61 to 62. It referred at page 62 at the top that:

"[Following] the increasing number of assaults ... we have taken the following measures ..."

And they have identified four. First, surveillance cameras, included forward-looking cameras, and a camera

covering the driver seat, have become standard features on all new buses since 2015. Up to February 2018, surveillance cameras were installed in 2,319 KMB buses and 146 LWB buses. The remaining buses will be equipped with surveillance cameras phase by phase. Surveillance cameras capture the behaviour (with audio recording) of difficult passengers. It will protect the interest of [bus captain] in subsequent investigation by the police or legal proceedings."

That's the first measure.

The second is:

"We will install a protective shield near the driver seat [or cockpit] starting from June 2018."

Third:

" ... more on-board announcements to advise passengers not to do ... acts that will affect the [bus captains] and other passengers."

And the fourth:

" ... offer legal support to [bus captains] after they have been assaulted."

Now I would like to ask about these surveillance cameras. We have seen some examples in one of the site visits that these surveillance cameras were installed above the position or above where the driver was seated. And it would capture the driver's behaviour as well, and

it appears some of the drivers previously raised some concerns, as a result of these surveillance cameras.

What is your comment on this matter?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes. Recently, KMB has made these improvements when it comes to assaults against bus captains. The company has helped bus companies -- I mean captains, to provide legal assistance.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: If I may supplement. Our frontline captains and trade unions have reflected the view that sometimes surveillance cameras can help bus captains, but for minor issues, they will only say that the cases would be handed over to the police. Sometimes surveillance cameras cannot help bus captains. Now, we want to have our own cameras but KMB -- bus companies claim that there would be privacy issues, and when there are minor hiccups, we asked for the footage but we may not be able to have the footage covering the whole incident.

So the surveillance camera may capture minor incidents, but the footage would only be passed to law enforcement departments, but not to frontline captains for support. So we are saying that when we need support, the surveillance cameras may not be able to support us. And according to the company, they hope to complete the installation by the second quarter of next

year. Two thirds of our buses are not yet installed with these cameras. There are over 3,700 or 3,800 buses in KMB's fleet and two thirds of them do not have the surveillance cameras yet.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Let me supplement, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on. The figure that we are given here is: 2,319 buses as of February 2018 had surveillance cameras. So if there are 3,700 buses, two thirds do not, as you say, have surveillance cameras, that's not right.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, because the company has got buses that will only be used for two more years, and they will not be installed, they will be phased out very soon, and the company has indicated that surveillance cameras will not be installed for them, and the number is quite considerable. Because these vehicles are old, and the company has decided not to install cameras, and some frontline bus captains installed our own cameras, but the bus company use administrative measures to not allow us to do that. We want to protect ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide the Committee with information as to that latter matter? The prevention of bus captains using, I take it, their own cameras?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes, we can provide this. For BCs to install their own cameras they have received written

warnings, and there are announcements to tell BCs that they cannot install their own cameras. We are helpless, because there are many traffic accidents. When the police arrive at the scene they will ask you whether there is any camera. So we accepted these warnings, reluctantly, but we have always hoped that the management would accept the proposal from trade unions, because these cameras can protect BCs. For vehicles with the prefix H and J, they do not have any cameras, because they are over 13 years old and the company will not install cameras for vehicles with the prefix H and J, they are old models, we are told that they will not waste resources to install cameras in these vehicles.

CHAIRMAN: Will you provide documents that allow the Committee to understand how this has been dealt with by the company? You call it "administrative measures". Can you give us those documents?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I will try. We have had meetings with the company. They said that we are not allowed to install cameras because of previous issues.

Well, release of footage will have to be done with the consent of all the parties captured. We have had meetings with the company. They said that it involved privacy issues. Release of footage without the consent of all parties captured in the footage is a violation of

privacy. If you ask for documents or letters, or warning letters, I can give them to you afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: That's what we are asking for.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes, I will submit them to you afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Moving to another issue, do you support the installation of these surveillance cameras, that capture on audio and video what happens in and around where the bus captain's seat is?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: If it improves the working condition of bus captains without affecting their performance, trade unions will support that.

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer that "yes" or "no"? Do you support it?

MR LAM TIN FU: Chairman, the installation of a device that does audio or video recording may be conducive to evidence collection. However, some bus captains are of the view that if there is a surveillance camera they are being monitored all the time and it will create mental pressure. I have heard cases that for some bus captains with the camera sitting right above their heads, it distracts them and it will not be good for road safety. So there are concerns.

The installation of surveillance camera may be done

with good intentions but you have to take into account the actual conditions of bus captains. If all buses are fitted with such installations, some bus captains may find it difficult to adjust.

So I just say that it may be considered, but not all bus captains can adjust to having a surveillance camera monitoring them all the time.

Bus captains drive or work for about eight hours. If they are under mental pressure it will not be good.

There may be times where bus captains just holding steering wheel with one hand because they want to take a sip of water, and it will be captured on camera, so you will have to be very cautious before considering the installation of a video or audio recording devices.

CHAIRMAN: So do we understand it that the union takes the position that there is no consensus about this? You don't have a view?

MR LAM TIN FU: We think that it should be considered with caution.

Yes, it may help, but trade unions think that you will have to ask our members.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I would like to say that seven or eight years ago, at the start of installation of surveillance cameras, we have lodged complaints with the Privacy Commissioner, because we have received a lot of

complaints at our complaints divisions saying that it posed tremendous mental pressure on bus captains.

So, to a certain extent, some of our members oppose any devices that would make audio recording.

About six or seven years ago we went to the Privacy Commissioner to lodge a complaint and to protest. That was done by the General Union.

CHAIRMAN: What is the position now in 2018? Is this supported or not supported?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Perhaps I will answer.

The installation of a camera, I have at one point discussed it with the senior management of the KMB. Yes, with a camera, bus captains are protected in relation to what happens on the road. However, some administrative officers focus rather on some minor points, say for example a bus captain holding the steering wheel with one hand while trying to take a sip of water. That bus captain would be asked to go to see the management.

With things like that, it would affect the psychological state of bus captains. We have talked to the management of the company, we asked the company to give undertakings that there will not be unreasonable disciplinary proceedings, say, for example, minor incidents like holding the steering wheel with one hand

while trying to take a sip of water.

Of course, on the one hand we would very much like to have a camera to protect us, but if the management uses it to penalise bus captains for minor incidents then we would not like it.

CHAIRMAN: So are we to understand that your position is this: so long as the camera is used for the benefit of the bus captain you are in favour of it, but if it is used against him you are not? Is that it?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Right. Right. It is about unreasonable Draconian measures taken against us, or just unreasonable requirements.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Cheung, you mentioned about the management would sometimes look at this camera or surveillance footage to check on the behaviour of the bus captains.

In what circumstances would they do that?

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Cheung provided us with the answer several times. The graphic example of the one-handed steering wheel and the sipping of the water. It is that kind of interference with minor things, as you would categorise them, that you are concerned about?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Sorry, Chairman. I would like to say

something about holding the steering wheel with one hand.

Well, that's only done when it is perfectly safe. Say, for example in a very safe situation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it is just a random checking, or is it to react to complaints and as a result they look at surveillance footage?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: What we ask for is that the footage would only be viewed where there are incidents or traffic accidents. However, a number of years ago, some officers took the initiative to view the footage and found some bus captains eating biscuits or drinking water, and the bus captains were being chastised by officers. We do think that is unreasonable.

It happens quite often. As a result, bus captains feel that they are offended.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, allow for the translation. Perhaps bear that in mind in future.

I think Ms Wong's question really is this.

When, as you call them, administrators get involved in looking at the surveillance camera in these circumstances, is that because a complaint has been made by a passenger? The bus driver was eating biscuits or drinking water? Is it a response a complaint?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, not necessarily. There is one

case, the bus captain has finished his duties driving the bus back to the depot. There were no passengers on board, and that bus captain was being penalised by an administrative officer.

CHAIRMAN: So you infer from that that, on this occasion at least, use was made of the surveillance camera without there being a complaint -- spying on the bus captain, is that it?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How often was this being conducted by the management? How often, do you know?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: In recent times, such incidents has dropped in number, that's a result of trade unions complaining to the company a number of times, saying that such unreasonable measure would dampen morale even further. As a result, the number of such incidents has dropped.

CHAIRMAN: So has this problem resolved itself, did the bus company listen to you?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, well, there can be two interpretations. First of all, there is a shortage of manpower. Two, you can say that they have listened to us, but we don't know what will happen in the future.

CHAIRMAN: What was the last occasion when this kind of

spying took place without a complaint from a passenger? How long ago?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I believe that there will be complaints every day. Where there are cameras, the footage would be viewed, and there is also a black box on board. Say, for example, there is -- well, you can view the footage to see if doors have indeed been opened to let passengers on and off, or the bus captain has stopped at the bus stop. There is a black box on board. I believe that there are complaints every single day.

CHAIRMAN: But the question was, can you point to an example where spying took place without complaints? The most recent one, or has it solved itself?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I believe it was half a year ago since I last heard about something like this.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The second measure mentioned in page 62 is the installation of a protective shield. Can you tell us how many protective shields have been installed since June 2018? That's in KMB-1 submission, page 62, the second measure, about installing a protective shield near the driver seat, starting from June 2018. How many were installed?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I believe one-third of the fleet has been

covered, because there are many demerits. It may look to be some protection, but the opening of the shield is very big, it is not easy for you to switch it on and off, and it is very reflective and then there is a magnet at the very tip, and while the bus is moving there may be noise. And that would affect the bus captain. We have asked the management to improve that, and some bus captains would like that removed, because at night it is very reflective. But we are told that this is a political issue and it could not be removed.

Just last week we took this up with the management.

The protective shield is very problematic. The switching on and off of the shield, and it's reflective, it affects driving safety, and if it is not tightly fastened, then it would affect our driving.

CHAIRMAN: So the short answer, is about one-third of the KMB fleet have had these not very good shields deployed?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: The protective shield has got a lot of problems. From bus captains it is not that they don't support having a protective shield, but they have reflected the demerits of the protective shield to the trade unions, we have also reflected them to the management. But so far there seems to be no improvement.

We are told it was political issue, the protective

shield could not be removed. Bus captains are under great pressure. This morning I checked with a BC and was told that if the magnet is not tightly attached it would be noisy and your fingers can get caught, and some passengers might knock on the protective shield inadvertently. It is not easy to open the door.

And the protective shield may affect the sight line of bus captains. They cannot see clearly the getting on and off of passengers. At night the shield is reflective.

So if vehicles on the other lane have lights, then it may be reflected. We have reflected that to the management and the answer was it could not be removed. By April next year all vehicles will be installed with a protect he have shield.

I don't know whether Chairman has seen the protective shield himself.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have. I have also seen them deployed over the years in New York taxis and elsewhere in the world. There seems to be no simple solution.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And since when did you make these complaints, or since when the bus captains make these complaints?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: In the past few months, many bus captains have reflected that to trade unions, the last time I met

with Mr Leung of the management I relayed the complaints to them. They are saying that the protective shield was too reflective, and the switching on and off device, and also the shield has distracted bus captains. We have talked about the material, and then the switching on and off device is too tight, and some bus captains may not be strong enough to move it, but they told us that there is a trick you just push the door and it can be opened. But we see more problems.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, I think we have to try a make progress in other areas, because we have spent a lot of time on this area.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If I may move on to the second topic on traffic signal.

You mentioned in your submission at page 289-23-5, paragraph 12, Chinese at 289-19, you refer to a proposal about inviting the Transport Department to have flashing signal by numbers be added when a traffic signal changed from yellow to green, so that the driver knows what to anticipate, and to avoid the danger caused by sudden breaking.

And you made that submission a number of times, and if I just make the reference to you, but there is no need to go to those documents.

The first document is a letter submitted to the Transport Department in 1996, at page 289-31, paragraph 4.

The Transport Department did reply on 6 February 1996, and that's at page 289-38. The Transport Department responded at second paragraph that adding a flashing amber may confuse the motorist even more.

And then you made this submission or this proposal again on 15 March 2005. We can see that in Chinese at page 289-47; in English at 289-166.

If you look at page 289-50 to 51, in Chinese; and English at page 289-170.

So having heard the Transport Department's suggestion or proposal, or feedback, what is your view on having, or whether you still insist on having traffic signal counting by numbers?

CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of insisting, it is a question of requesting, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Requesting. Yes.

Do you still request, or are you satisfied with the reply by the Transport Department, or do you still wish to request the Transport Department to have this system of flashing signals added by numbers?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes, Chairman. With regard to Transport

Department's reply I am not satisfied. Because the department fails to understand the time required for a bus to be stopped. From the green to the red phrase, currently takes about three seconds, but if a bus is running at 50 kilometres per hour, to stop the bus stably, steadily within three seconds is very difficult. Therefore, some buses may rush through a green light, and this gives people the impression that bus captains like to do that.

In fact, at an awkward situation, if a bus captain has to stop a bus smoothly, then he may have to stop at a road junction. If he wants to pass the junction, that will be rushing through the green light, and if he has to stop and it would be very abrupt, that may cause injuries to passengers. These are difficulties associated with bus driving, but many motorists may not understand that. For a private vehicle it may be stopped within three seconds; for heavy duty vehicles it can be stopped abruptly and the goods inside might be disturbed. But we are talking about passengers on buses. So we want a countdown signal. Or at least there should be three to four flashes before the green phase turns to the amber phase to give us preparation. It is just like for passenger signal, there would be flashes when the green phase is going to turn to the

amber phase. This will enhance the quality of service and safety, it will benefit the public. But the Transport Department has time and time again ignored our aspirations.

CHAIRMAN: You are describing the flashing green man at a pedestrian crosses so the pedestrian knows that the green is going to become red soon; is that what you mean?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Correct, Chairman. We want an extra three to four seconds, so that before turning to the red phase, we can -- amber phase, we can have some preparation to allow sufficient time for bus captains to stop their buses smoothly.

CHAIRMAN: And are there other places in the world that deploy this system that you can point to?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I saw it in Singapore. They have a flashing of a green arrows. And more common in the mainland. They have countdown figures.

CHAIRMAN: That's the numerical countdown for the change of the phase?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have received submissions from the Transport Department about the statistics of all accidents involving franchised buses, that are

non-collision type. If I may take you to the Transport Department's submission at TD-9, filed in April 2018. At TD-1, page 111. Paragraph 6.

And we can see the statistics provided in paragraph 6. And at paragraph 5 and 6. Paragraph 5 states that:

"About 59 to 65 per cent of all the accidents involving FB during 2012 [to] 2017 are non-collision type accidents. These included accidents which typically involved passengers losing balance inside the bus compartment due to various reasons ..."

And if we see the forward planning programme of Kowloon Motor Bus for 2018 to 2022, in the same TD bundle at page 183, paragraph 8.2.7 stated that:

"The majority of the accidents, (51.5 per cent) were due to passengers losing balance while on the bus. More than half of these cases were caused by the bus braking in traffic."

Now, I would like to ask you this. It appears from these statistics, that more than 50 per cent of the injuries to people on or near bus are caused by losing balance.

So if you work back from losing balance, the most perhaps obvious reason given here is due to sharp braking. Would your union be agreeable to installing

a deceleration device, first, a deceleration device, which would retard the car at a certain rate when it reaches, for example, 50km per hour or 70km per hour. Would your union be agreeable to that kind of device?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I don't think you are very familiar with mechanics. Well, I don't think you are very familiar with the parts -- yes, there are device with deceleration, well, yes, there is a kind of decelerator, there has always been this device, but if the vehicle is travelling at 70kmp, and the vehicle will stop abruptly, that is impossible. But it can stop steadily, and that device has always been installed on buses.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, let me supplement.

More often than not passengers suffer injury on board a bus. It is because, like I said, at a traffic junction, signal traffic junction, bus captains might have to come to a sudden stop, and sometimes there are circumstances on the road forcing the bus captain to stop abruptly. On top of that, there are many passengers who are too busy looking at their phones without holding on to handrails, and some of them might even be thrown off the seat, because they don't sit properly.

MR LAM PO KEUNG: May I supplement.

For Lantau buses, there is this retarder function,

it is supplementary to deceleration. When we travel on hilly roads we use this device to help us go downhill. There are two segments of braking. The first one is deceleration. When we feel that the brake disc is secured and the bus can come to a halt steadily, well, this function has already been installed on buses.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Let me supplement, that for Lantau buses they may be single-deck bus, so the device may be different. We have a retarder, they have different device, so it is near the steering wheel, if they turn on that device, then there will be some air being released with that function, the speed of the bus will be reduced.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam, is there anything more you wish to say?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: I think that's it, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. Ms Wong, if that's not inconvenient we will take a morning break now.

How are we with making progress this morning?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We are slightly behind. But I'll pick up the speed after the break.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Gentlemen, we are going to take a break, give you an opportunity to have a rest, as well as the Committee.

Take a break for 20 minutes. Thank you.

(11.35 am)

(A short break)

(11.55 am)

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Gentlemen, I'm going to refer to the next topic, resting facilities.

In your submissions, this issue has been raised. Based on the documents provided to us, to the Committee, this issue appears to have been raised as early as 2010. But if I may refer to you the submission relating to the public transport strategy study, dated 9 February 2015, submitted by your union, that's page 289-76 to page 289-80.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: In the TU bundle.

The English is at page 289-200. It highlights two problems, since we are on this page. It highlights two problems, first is the illegal parking at bus terminus at paragraph 3. That's page 289-79 in Chinese, and English at 289-203.

And then the second problem you raised in this paragraph is paragraph 7, insufficient resting facilities. Chinese is at 289-79; English at 289-203.

Do you see that?

And if I may also take you to a letter of request

from the Committee dated 23 July 2018 at pages 289-331 to 335. It is only in Chinese. It sets out the request for information on insufficient facilities.

And if you look at page 289-333, paragraphs 28 to 29, as to the Transport Department's response on the toilet and resting facilities.

And in your reply, I believe you made a general remark that throughout these years the resting facilities are not sufficient, and you provided a number of documents since 2010.

The first is the notification dated 21 June 2010, Chinese at page 289-90. The second to the third paragraphs.

The English is at pages 289-221 to 289-222.

That's the second to third paragraphs, about the union collecting 139 bus stations, and about 56.5 per cent of the bus stops did not have toilet facilities. And on average, if the bus captain has to go to the washroom it would take about four minutes. And bus captain in fact have to take five minutes. And some even to have take up to 10 minutes or above before they could attend the washroom.

CHAIRMAN: These are observations made in 2010?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, these are observations made in 2010.

And my question is this. Since you have raised this

submission, by providing this documentation to the committee, is this problem still a serious problem, that your union considers it has to attend to? Or has the condition improved?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, there has been some improvement, but it is not completely resolved. For a lot of termini, there are still no toilets or rest kiosks available, especially for those in public housing estates. We ask for a rest kiosk and staff toilet. That is very difficult. We have been talking to the Transport Department, saying that for existing termini they have to be retrofitted, and for new ones, it must come with toilets and rest kiosk.

With these facilities, then they are considered to be a complete set of facilities at a terminus. Without such facilities, we would not be able to provide the services we are supposed to.

There has been some improvement in that previously at Lok Wah there was an industrial action, because the Housing Authority removed a rest kiosk from us. We need sufficient rest for us to provide good services. As a result of that incident, we staged an industrial action. There has been some improvement since. However, a lot of district councillors opposed the installation of a septic tank or rest kiosk. They made

things difficult for us. So this problem is not completely resolved.

CHAIRMAN: The Lok Wah kiosk, is that a KMB kiosk?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's right, KMB.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, at that time, I was responsible for dealing with the Lok Wah incident. We have received complaints from members that the Housing Authority require the rest kiosk to be removed completely, and they said that it will not be reprovisioned.

So we staged an industrial action by closing down the terminus for half an hour. We have spoken to district councillors and the Housing Authority. We have been subject to opposition from community members.

We are not provided with sufficient facilities. As a result, staff members will have to sit down, rest, eat wherever they can find a space.

We know that some problems can be resolved, however I know that from Citybus and New World First Bus this problem is rather serious.

Well, when it comes to Chi Fu Fa Yuen, I will defer to the representative from Citybus.

MR LAU SIN TAT: For Citybus and New World First Bus at Chi Fu Fa Yuen we have been raising this issue for over a decade. We ask for rest kiosk or toilet facilities. However, owners of Chi Fu Fa Yuen opposed that.

As a result, we still don't have toilets or rest kiosks for our staff.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, let's hear from Long Win Bus.

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: For E34B, from Yuen Long, in 2013, there was the bus route rationalisation. Originally, the route plied between Tin Shui Wai and Yuen Long. After rationalisation it start from Yuen Long to go to the airport.

After the rationalisation, we found that there were no rest facilities provided. We were told by the company that there were opposition from the community. Over a number of years, our staff members were subject to appalling conditions, say, for example, they couldn't find space to eat. In 2016, a female staff member ate some steamed rice rolls on board a bus. Some people took a picture of her, posted the pictures on Facebook, and there was bullying.

The female staff member was subject to tremendous pressure. She was crying her eyes out when relating the incident to us.

Our staff members don't have anywhere to go when they have their meals, and they had to walk a long distance to go to the toilets.

In the evenings or at night, they would have to walk past a very dark path, so there are security concerns

for female staff. And in August 2018, a rest kiosk was eventually provided. It was after a very long time that it was provided.

We have been asking for provision of rest facilities when there is a new bus stop or new terminus so that services can be provided with good quality.

CHAIRMAN: When were the rest kiosk provided? When?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: For E43B Yuen Long to airport, it was August 2017. In 2013 this route started. So for about four years, bus captains did not have toilets or rest facilities to use.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your submission relating to New Lantao Bus, dated 3 January 2018, that's at page 289-140 in Chinese, and English at page 289-317, paragraph 3 refers to the facility in the Sun Yuen Long Centre, Tin Shui Wai Estate. Has the condition still improved or is it still the same. In paragraph 3(i).

MR LAM PO KEUNG: I think several weeks ago a rest kiosk was provided, but I have not visited that place, so I cannot confirm.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide the information to us later?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Yes. I can.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam, you are the representative of New Lantao

Bus company, are you not? Has this been provided?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: In what respect are you referring to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The resting facilities.

MR LAM PO KEUNG: For the rest kiosk of Tin Tsz Estate, I will have to go to confirm, because this is Yuen Long area, not the catchment of Lantau. So I did not have a chance to go to have a visit to look.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your submission you also quoted another example at page 226-25, TU bundle 1A, internal page 24. The Chinese is at page 171.

The location is at Quarry Bay, Yau Man Street, and in that paragraph you stated that there were nearly 10 years' effort, but a small resting place is still not provided.

So has the condition improved?

MR LAM TIN FU: Sorry, it is not a submission from our trade union.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's the staff rights of KMB Association document.

MR LAM TIN FU: No, not from branches.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then I won't ask you about this.

So apart from the Lok Wah Estate in Kwun Tong, and the example that you provided, can you give us some other locations that you consider are places where bus

captains are unable to find a suitable resting place?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: For example, for KMB, they have been putting in some facilities. However, because of space constraint or management issues at some locations, some of the facilities have to be improved. Say, for example, there is a single rest kiosk and there are some double kiosks. For double kiosks, the space available may be bigger, but still not enough. I know that the KMB is striving to improve the facilities. I think that, well, for about 70 per cent of the termini, there are toilets with septic tank and rest facilities. However, there are still 30 per cent of termini that are awaiting for provision of these facilities, subject to negotiations of various parties.

We have been given undertakings that these facilities would be provided, but there are oppositions from the community. Say, for example, for Chuk Yuen Estate, we have been fighting for over 10 years for a rest kiosk to be provided.

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: I'm from Long Win Bus, let me supplement.

For E33P in 2016, the route runs around the clock, there are about 60 trips. The terminus is at Siu Hong station south. There are no rest facilities nor toilets.

Originally, this route was already in operation, in 2016 it became a full day route. Colleagues had to eat at the bus terminus, and to rest, at special space, location, we had to rest, but there was no rest kiosk.

After repeated efforts, to have one, the result was the local community and the Transport Department had not approved it. So it has been close to two years we have been asking for a kiosk, but still, to no avail.

We have not any notification as to when that can be done.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And about this E33P, was this request made in writing, about the rest kiosk?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was that?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: The trade union at our meeting with the company raised that in 2015. The company has been telling us that it is making applications with the relevant authorities, and then in 2016 the district council approved that the route should be a whole-day route to serve the residents of Tuen Mun, and we were saying that without a rest kiosk how can we improve the quality of service? Our views were relayed to the district council and the Transport Department. Even today, we have not heard anything from the parties.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Could you provide us with the documentation

as to the written request?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: I can do so later. Today I have not got the document with me.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, please provide it when you can obtain it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it the case that up until now, the location is still not provided with any toilet or rest facilities?

CHAIRMAN: I think that is the evidence.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Can you give us some photographic evidence about the location, if possible?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: I can do so later.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

May I go to the next topic, illegal parking.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Lai, can you help the Committee in this respect.

KMB operates split shifts, do they not?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, yes. Split shifting. We have three shifts. Morning, and also evening, and special and L shift, and there is also an overnight shift. Morning, evening, special, L, and overnight, there are different shifts.

CHAIRMAN: Split shifts have been operated by KMB for many years, have they not?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: It has always been the case. Since 1933. KMB has this arrangement. Right from the beginning. Back then there might not be overnight shift or special vehicles, but then in the past few decades it has always been the case.

CHAIRMAN: The revised guidelines that were promulgated as to working hours, meal breaks, rests, and so on, on 23 February 2018, made changes to the existing system, did it not?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: The system in place has always been the same.

Regarding the new arrangements starting from February of 2018, I don't quite get you. Are you talking about a change in the system? In the past two or three or four decades, it is just the same: morning, evening shift, special shift, and overnight shift.

There have been no changes.

For L vehicles, yes, it was introduced in the last five years.

So it was introduced in the middle, so that there is no need for the bus captain to drive the vehicle back to the depot or to collect it from the depot.

MR LAM TIN FU: I think the Transport Department announced new guidelines, and I don't think there is any change in the shifting arrangement of KMB since.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, could you put up the new guidelines? What I have in mind is the provision to be implemented over a period of time that if a 14-hour duty day was permitted, three hours of continuous break is required.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That's at CTB-2 bundle, page 2.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Now I get it, Chairman.

The guidelines were published in February 2018. Transport Department allowed time for bus companies to implement the guidelines, in the second quarter of 2019. Now I got you, Chairman.

Let me add. For the special duties and L shift, they are for captains to take their meals.

CHAIRMAN: The provision that I would like your help on is the requirement that is to be implemented of providing a rest break of no less than three consecutive hours for a special shift.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: For no less than three consecutive hours in a special shift duty has always been in place. This is most basic, and the company has followed strictly this guideline from the Transport Department. For a special shift duty there should be a rest break of no less than three consecutive hours. This has always been practised.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a KMB policy? Or is it a Transport Department requirement?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: This is a policy unique to KMB, may even be to Long Win Bus. But not for Citybus and New World Bus.

This has been in place for a number of times to allow bus captains to take meals and for the morning peak, so there will be a break together with meal, there will be a rest of three hours, and then the bus captain will continue with the second part of the shift.

This is arrangement for special shift duty and has always been in place, the case in the past few years.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, may we see guideline 4, I think it is, at the bottom of the page?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is there not a definition of what a special shift is? That it only can provide for morning and afternoon peaks? That's it. Guideline (1)(b).

Do you see guideline (1)(b), Mr Lai?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The provision that permits for a 14-hour working day during which you can drive 10 hours is restricted to demand created by morning and evening peaks; the morning rush hour and the afternoon/evening rush hour. Is that a new provision? A new restriction? Or not?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, in the revised edition in October 2010, guideline (b) said that it should be no

more than 14 hours.

And in 2018, there was a revision, may exceed 12 hours, but maximum duty hours should not exceed 14 hours, and there should be a rest break of no less than three consecutive hours, that was a revision.

But we have a fleet of over 3,000-odd vehicles, so there aren't too many vehicles that require more than 12 hours of operation -- maybe 10 per cent of them. But this duty of 14 hours, for two to three decades this has been the case, and bus captains have got used to it. The rest time in between may not necessarily be three. It can be four, or five hours.

So is that what you want to ask, about this 14-hour shift?

CHAIRMAN: No. What I want to ask you is about the places at which these bus drivers working 14 hours' duties come off their buses in order to start their not less than three consecutive hours' break. And I would like you to tell us about the facilities that are provided for resting at those places.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: That depends on whether there are sufficient facilities at the bus terminus or bus stop. Bus captains may choose routes that are close to homes so they can rest at home, but some may not be the case. For instance, when it comes to the Kowloon Bay bus

terminus, the bus driver may live in Tuen Mun so he has to find a rest kiosk or a rest on the bus or go back to the depot. He will have to choose the location.

Whether the facilities are sufficient, well, maybe around 70 per cent of them. But most bus captains would choose routes near their homes and they might have been driving that route for many years, they have got used to it, they might choose not to be deployed away from these routes, whether there are sufficient rest facilities, not always the case, the rest kiosk may be very noisy, they may go to 7/11, McDonald's to take a rest. We have received such cases from time to time.

Whether there are sufficient rest facilities I will say half/half. It depends on whether the bus captain can make arrangements for him to take a rest.

But because he has chosen to travel on this route, that will depend on whether he can find the right location to ensure he has sufficient time to rest.

CHAIRMAN: Can you suggest a place that the Committee could go to this week to look at facilities that are inadequate for bus drivers who are taking their not less than three hours consecutive break?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: For example, Chairman, in the past there was no rest kiosks in a bus depot, but there may be a sleeping area, and there may be a rest kiosk at bus

stops or bus terminus, or they may rest at home which is close by. There should be 1,500 such duties.

Now, you are talking about special shift duties, so this is the rough figure I can tell you. For special shift duties there are two sections, and for L vehicles there are also a morning and evening L vehicles. L vehicles serve the same purpose, that is to stand in for bus captains who have gone for meal breaks.

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: I would like to supplement, for E33P from Siu Hong station south there are no rest facilities at that terminus.

For this route, there is one bus captain who needs to take their rest there. If you would like to visit this terminus, we can make arrangements to go together.

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Mr Lai, wait for the translation.

So you suggest that we might go there to examine the fact that there are no rest facilities?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a place where drivers taking the not less than three consecutive hours break in a special shift come off their buses?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Now, Mr Lai, back to you.

Can you give us an example? Where should we go?

Just try and concentrate on the question. Where should we go to look at inadequate facilities for bus drivers driving 14 hours of duty, taking a not less than three-hour break?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: It is a depot, well, it is in Mei Foo, some bus captains would take their rests there, sometimes they would have to sleep inside the bus or just find any location suitable for them. I would supplement you with further details later.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, just give us three or four places that we can go and examine. And what we are looking for, if it exists, is to find that there are 10 bus captains having this three-hour break, and there are only three seats. Do you understand what we are looking for?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: Let me supplement.

For Long Win Bus, A43, from Luen Wo Hui, Fan Ling, there are rest facilities provided there. However, in that facility only three bus captains will have space to rest there. During a split shift, constantly, there are at least six bus captains during their break time to use the rest facilities. As a result, there is insufficiency.

Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: Repeat the place if you would?

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: Long Win Bus, A43, the bus terminus at

Luen Wo Hui, Fan Ling.

MR LAM TIN FU: Chairman, we are reminded that there are representatives of bus companies here. So I would like that, Chairman, you can see the actual situation at the location we have suggested.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: May I suggest you some other locations?

One is the Tsing Yi terminus, one at Tsing Yi station, one at Kwun Tong pier, where there are no facilities provided to us, rest facilities. These are four locations.

Our trade union has been talking to the company, asking for more facilities.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About this split shift, you mentioned earlier about KMB always have this special shift arrangement. Can you tell since when you have this special shift?

The reason why I'm asking is, I would like to show you a table in the miscellaneous bundle at pages 897 to 898. Comparison table.

If you look at this table, the guidelines have been revised four times: 2004, 2007, 2010 and the last time is 2018, February.

And this special shift arrangement, if you look over

the page, at page 898, was only introduced in February 2018. If you see the last column, "Special Shift Duty", and the footnote stated that it was arranged specifically to cater for service demand in morning and evening peaks. And this new special shift duty was only introduced in February 2018.

But your earlier answer seems to suggest that this split shift has been introduced a while back ago. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the guideline in relation to it?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The guideline in relation to it.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I would like to correct what you have said.

It is not the case that there are special shift duties in February, February, 2018. That has been there for a long time. The measures introduced in February 2018 are to be implemented in the second quarter of 2019. It takes time to make preparations and to make arrangements for the three hours of rest. But such arrangement has been in place for a very long time.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, may I supplement.

14-hour duty. Under the guidelines of the Transport Department, well, it is always there. Since the traffic accident, some people say that the 14-hour duty creates fatigue, causing the accident. However, there is no

distinction between 14-hour duty and special duty. Because for KMB, this has been taken up by special duty, and there is one-hour meal break and three-hour rest, so there are altogether four hours.

However, the 14-hour duty is not put in one single shift.

So in relation to the latest revision done in 2018, the 14-hour shift has been redefined as a special shift instead of one single shift.

The special shift has been in place for a very long time, mainly used for the morning peak and the evening peak. It usually takes place between 6 am and 6 pm.

For the special shift to cover the two peak periods, then it would be 14 hours, because at 6 o'clock when the bus captain starts the service, the bus captain will have to drive the bus back to the depot. So altogether, it will take about 14 hours to finish all the duties.

According to bus captains who are engaged in this shift, they said that although it is as long as 14 hours, it doesn't cause any fatigue, because it is easier than other shifts. That's what bus captains of special shift said.

There are two of us here who are engaged in special shift. One is from Long Win Bus. May we hear from him?

CHAIRMAN: We can in a moment, but please answer this

question first of all.

Following the accident on 22 September of 2017, the Transport Department initiated a review of the working guidelines, or the guidelines for working times, did it not?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Some trade unions suggested that the working limit for duty hours be limited to 12 hours; correct?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Duty hours, yes, that is the case.

CHAIRMAN: What was your union's representation to the Transport Department on that issue?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: We keep an open mind. We want improvement on the duty hours of our members, because it will affect their performance. Safety is very important to us.

MR LAM TIN FU: Chairman, when we met Frank Chan, the Secretary for Transport And Housing, we made it very clear that 14 hours is the maximum duty hours. It doesn't mean that all bus captains should have 14-hour duties.

The second point is that for the 14-hour duty to be reduced to 12 hours, it will have a huge impact on income. If there is a reduction by two hours per day, it will translate to a reduction of salary by $5,000 a month. If 14 hours is to be reduced to 12 hours that

means bus companies will have to give those reduced hours to some other staff members with shorter duty hours. Say there are 2,000 staff members with KMB, that means they will need another 2,000 staff members, and they will have to employ another 400 people, which cannot be done within a short time.

If they can't employ additional staff, that means the reduced hours will go to staff members with shorter duty hours.

We think that rest time, rest facilities are more important. This will provide a better working environment for bus captains.

So we should not just look at a 14-hour shift. This should not be demonised. We need flexibility. Bus captains will have to apply to work special shift. They are not just being assigned these duties.

You have to take all factors into account. If you single out the figure and look at it in vacuum, I think this will be a departure of the operation of bus companies.

CHAIRMAN: The meeting that you spoke about with the Secretary for Transport And Housing, was that on 17 October of last year?

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes. It is mentioned by the Transport Department as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you provided us with what you describe as a notice issued by the union, in which your position is stated. Perhaps we could have that on the screen.

In English it is at 289-274. Perhaps you could have the Chinese brought up on the screen.

MR LAM TIN FU: It is wrong, it should be in the latest submission, towards the very end.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 289- 337. Is that the submission dated 26 July 2018?

And if you go to page 289-336, the second-last paragraph. In English it's at 289-337-2.

CHAIRMAN: What I have asked to be put on the screen is the notice that is dated 17 October of 2017 issued by the union in respect of this meeting.

Just the notice. That's all I have asked for.

MR LAM TIN FU: 289-129 and 289-119.

CHAIRMAN: The document, so that we are looking at the same thing, begins:

"On October 17, 2017, the union led five bus branches to meet with Chan Fan ..."

Is that the document?

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The first bullet point is in these terms, is it not:

"It is not advisable to lower the upper limit of the

working hours in the work guidelines within a short period without considering the specific situations. Instead, the problem should be addressed by adopting transitional or interim measures ..."

MR LAM TIN FU: Well, you may say so.

Because Frank Chan, the Secretary -- right.

CHAIRMAN: What I'm trying to find out is this. Was this the union's position? Is this what you advanced?

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So whereas there might have been unions saying 12 hours of duty should be the new limit, you were not supporting that position. You are supporting a continuation of 14 hours of duty.

MR LAM TIN FU: You may say so.

CHAIRMAN: But as you say said, that was to be accompanied by better rest facilities and other measures. Was that your position?

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes, and rest time in between.

CHAIRMAN: And the other matter that you articulated is at the bottom of the English translation, bullet point in these terms:

"If planning to reduce working hours, they should avoid significantly lowering the income level of frontline employees ..."

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes. As I said, if the duty hours are to be

cut from 14 to 12, that may mean around $5,000 drop in monthly salary.

CHAIRMAN: Was this position that you took in 2017 as to changes in the guidelines for maximum duty hours the same position that you had taken in 2015 when the Transport Department asked trade unions about a possible change of the guidelines?

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Were you aware that there was the same, if you like, division between the trade unions in 2015 on this issue -- some advocating 12 hours maximum duty, and the position that you took, 14 hours continuing?

MR LAM TIN FU: We were aware of that only in 2017/18. Previously we rarely heard of such views.

CHAIRMAN: Just help me at least generally. When you met with the Transport Department or the Secretary for Transport And Housing, were there occasions when all of the various unions met in one session? Or were you always in different groups when you met with the Transport Department or the Secretary?

MR LAM TIN FU: We met them in batches. We never met with them together.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know of any reason why that was the case?

MR LAM TIN FU: Because we have irregular meetings, we have been having irregular meetings with the Transport

Department all along. This is our approach. And to reflect problems faced by captains of franchised buses, our general union is the one with trade unions from all five bus companies. And for some trade unions, they have been hostile and confrontational with our general union, so there is no room for cooperation with them.

And thirdly or fourthly, when discussing problems faced by employees of franchised buses, we have different views and positions. So we meet with officials separately, and whenever we meet with officials of Transport Department, we always consult our office bearers, and we also consult members on what to talk about.

And we have employees working in five different bus companies, so we believe we can grasp the situation of employees better.

Our general union has never criticised other trade unions in public, and we don't want this to continue to happen with the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I take you to an Apple Daily document, which shows the date as to when this matter was canvassed. That is at page 260 of TU-1B. Chinese at 260-257; English at page 260-258-2.

If you look at the highlighted part at the bottom, bold and underlined, it made reference to the Transport Department's current guidelines. But right before that bold paragraph it states that:

"Since 2013, the [Federation of Bus Industry Trade Union] has been requesting the Transport Department to revise the 'guidelines' for reducing the working hours and improving the meal break. However, the Transport Department replied that all bus companies had indicated that revision of the 'guidelines' would affect the existing roster system, and they would also need to employ extra more bus captains, leading to an increase in the long-term operating expenses. A consensus could not be reached."

And at the bottom, the Transport Department indicated that:

"... it was the Motor Transport Workers General Union ... a sub-union of HKFTU ... claimed the 'possibility of reducing the bus captains income' as the ground for refusing the reduction of working hours."

And:

"The Department has quoted and used the reasoning from MTWGU as an excuse, but has been avoiding the issue of the low basic salary of bus captains who have to incessantly work overtime for earning extra income. The

Department considers that the bus captains' salary is a matter for discussion between the bus company and staff, and to be adjusted by the market."

So it appears that the report quoted your union as the one that lead to the non-reduction of the guidelines to 12 hours.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that is an accurate way of putting it, because the article says that all the franchised bus operators were against it as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But at all events, this simply confirms what you have told us, that this was your position, was it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you confirm that's the position recorded in the Apple Daily, that's your union's position, that it is accurately reported?

MR LAM TIN FU: First, Apple Daily, I think is biased in reporting. Secondly, our general union submitted proposals to the TD in a package. You cannot single out one or two points so. What is reported here is not fair.

And thirdly, in devising the guidelines the TD has consulted us and met with us and the final position is to balance different parties. It will not simply listen to the views of the general union. So it is inaccurate to say that our proposal has been fully accepted by the

department.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. For completeness, there is another article by Oriental Daily --

CHAIRMAN: I think we have had the position articulated by the representatives. We don't need to go to newspapers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and if I may go to your submission to the Committee dated 26 July 2018, at page 289-337-2 in English; and 289-336 in Chinese, of the TU bundle.

CHAIRMAN: What topic are we going to now?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm just confirming one point is that in your submission, you stated that the Transport Department had not consulted union in launching the revised guidelines between the meetings on 6 and 17 October and before the announcement of the revised guideline on 23 February 2018. So it was --

CHAIRMAN: I think the point can be put like this, very simply. They talked to you, on 6, and 17 October 2017, but they didn't talk to you again until the result was announced on 23 February 2018, when the new guidelines were announced. That's your position, is it not?

MR LAM TIN FU: The paper is very clear. On 6 and 17 October we met with them. We expressed our views on the revised guidelines, and then they were announced on 23 February 2018. There was no communication with us in

between. And that's set out in the paper.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I see the time.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I know you were asked to attend this morning, but obviously we have overrun. Are you able to come back this afternoon to help us for a little while before we move on to other trade unions?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, there is an event that I have promised to attend. I would have to find someone else to replace me in that event. That's my position. I don't know about the others.

MR LAM TIN FU: Yes, I can. Thank you.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You are able to attend as well.

Are you happy to deal with it in that way, Mr Lai? perhaps not happy, are you prepared to do it that way?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, well, we have a lot of duties as members of trade union. There is an event. It is a junk trip with over 50 people attending. I occupy a leadership position in the union. I can stay a bit longer, and I will try to answer your questions as far as possible.

CHAIRMAN: We don't want to hold you up from a junk trip.

But what we are going to do then, would you prefer it if we continue for a little while now, Mr Lai?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes. If there is an actual point that

you can get at without beating about the bush, that would be good. I will be able to get straight to the point for another 10 or 15 minutes.

CHAIRMAN: As long as beating around the bush stops on both sides then perhaps we will proceed quicker. Yes?

Ms Wong, let's proceed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Can I refer you to a document submitted by the Transport Department on 20 July 2018.

CHAIRMAN: What is the document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is a document in reply to the Committee's further question dated --

CHAIRMAN: What does it deal with?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It deals with the practice note of the training of bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to page TD-1 page 427. That's the first page.

And the part concerning training of bus captain is at page 435. In the second box it states that:

"The Transport Department has recently issued a practice note to FB operators in respect of the training ..."

And it mentions a practice note.

So my question is, has your --

CHAIRMAN: Since it is in English, perhaps you ought to read

it out so there can be a translation at least.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes:

"The TD has recently issued a practice note to FB operators in respect of the training for bus captains to align the training arrangements of different FB operators and to lay down a common framework of the training system for their bus captains for phased implementation from October 2018. Although no similar document was issued on monitoring of bus captains' driving behaviour ..."

CHAIRMAN: I think that's another matter, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that's another matter.

And my question is this.

Was this practice note ever issued to your union for comment?

CHAIRMAN: Never mind for comment. Have you been given a copy of the practice note?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: You mean the training guideline? I don't think we have received anything. At least in relation to KMB, I have not received anything new guidelines.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Not for the five branches.

CHAIRMAN: Were you consulted as to changes in the way in which training would be delivered to bus captains, how it was going to be monitored, and the other matters that relate to that? Were you consulted?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Sorry, I see that it says a 2018 October. But it is now July. Is there a typo? It says that the implementation time is October.

So that means it has not been issued yet?

CHAIRMAN: No, I think the practice note has been issued, past tense; the implementation of the practice note lies ahead, future tense. October.

And the question is: have you been consulted about a revision of training, what is to be training? The modules? How it is to be monitored? How it is to be regulated? Has anyone come and asked you for your views?

MR LAU SIN TAT: For Citybus, yes, there has been consultation.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could give us details of that?

MR LAU SIN TAT: They told us about the method of training, that is bus captains, after training will have to drive the route once by himself. Without training, without anything similar, the captain should not drive this route.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: From KMB I would like to add. Previously, there was a practice where supervisor will accompany the bus captain. However, there has been some change. If it is Cross-Harbour, there will be three people watching the instructor. For other routes, six

people will be on board the bus watching.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lau, can I ask you to clarify this. You say that you were consulted. And you said "they told us". Who is "they"? "They told us about the changes".

MR LAU SIN TAT: Management of the company.

CHAIRMAN: That's from Citybus?

MR LAU SIN TAT: Citybus, yes.

CHAIRMAN: But were you consulted by the Transport Department?

MR LAU SIN TAT: No.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Cheung.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: No. So we don't know whether these measures are from the Transport Department. However, after the traffic accident, a few of the bus companies have introduced some revisions. But we don't know whether these revisions actually came from the Transport Department, because we were not clearly told.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "the traffic accident", are you referring to the 10 February 2018 Tai Po Road accident?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may move on to another topic, relating to the speed display unit.

We have heard evidence in this Committee that franchised bus operators are concerned that speed

display units would create conflicts and arguments between bus captain and passengers, and impose additional pressure on bus captain, in turn affecting safety bus driving.

We would like to know whether that view was shared by your union?

MR LAU SIN TAT: Yes, we share this view.

MR LAM TIN FU: We have not discussed about this point. We think, however, that bus captains of franchised bus operators will take into account the limitations and restrictions of each route to drive their -- it is a possibility that there will be disputes and conflicts.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I would like to add that when it comes to speed displayed on a minibus, that will just be conflicts between about a dozen passengers, but if it is installed on a bus, there will be over 100 passengers. The bus would not be able to be driven properly as a result. And I do think that experienced bus captains will know how to handle the situation.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Let me supplement, that on board of buses there are some alerts, alerting device, if it reaches 70kph it would sound, and for some buses the speed is limited to 70kph. So whether it is a straight road or just a flat stretch of road we would not drive above 70kph.

As to whether installation of a speed display, whether it will cause incidents, conflicts, when there is a slight exceedance, we can't tell what will happen.

CHAIRMAN: Alerts at 70 kilometres an hour, are not much use in a 50-kilometre-an-hour speed limit, are they?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Well, for our buses there is a GPS monitoring whether you are speeding at different sections. So most bus captains would not speed, otherwise they would be reprimanded at the office.

Is it worthwhile to devote the resources on this device? We have doubts. Would it be better spent on other areas? We think so.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your views.

I think we are going to have to take the break now.

If you are able to join us, do, Mr Lai, if not, thank you for your attendance.

Gentlemen, may I ask you to come back at 2.30 and we will resume our hearing then. Thank you.

(1.13 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.31 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Good afternoon. The next topic is about illegal parking.

We have heard evidence that there has been some illegal parking at the bus termini, or bus terminus, which affect the driving of the bus back to the bus terminus, and as a result it caused problems, or safety issues arising from illegal parking.

In relation to your union, do you find illegal parking an issue that has to be raised with the police and the Transport Department?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes, we did. For many times we have reflected to the Transport Department that at the bus terminus some outside cars are stopping, obstructing the boarding and alighting of passengers on buses.

And safety is a concern.

Up to now, the Transport Department has not come up with any solution to address the problem, and our union has made a number of suggestions to the Transport Department.

Number 1, within the bus terminus there should be double yellow markings on the road; number 2, within the bus terminus, there should be installation of CCTVs, to capture images of illegal parking; 3, at bus terminus all the yellow boxes, should be marked, so that buses can go in and out freely. This is all for the public interest.

And we have made reference to Singapore, which has

adopted similar practices. But in Hong Kong the Transport Department has said that the UK does not have any such practice, so they will not consider it here in Hong Kong.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: This suggestion in relation to Singapore, is this related to bus stops that are in the highway, where --

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, yes. Bus stops at highways. And there is usually a yellow line, and as long as the buses give the lights, the vehicles behind will stop immediately so that the buses can go out of the bus stops immediately, but in Hong Kong there is no such arrangement. Even if the bus gives the light, the vehicles behind will only accelerate to get past the buses. So it is made buses difficult to get out of the bus stops, and very often accidents occur as a result causing even further congestion on the roads.

There are places where the problem is serious, at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Princess Margaret Hospital, Mayfair Garden, Yen Chow Street, Un Chau Street, Austin Road, Reclamation Street, Star Ferry, Tin Shing Road South, Chatham Road South, Mody Road, and Mok Cheong Street.

These are places where there is serious illegal parking. And also Hennessy Road, King's Road.

CHAIRMAN: Are you describing illegal parking in bus stops or and/or in the approaches to bus stops?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Within the bus stop area. Very often vehicles are occupying the bus stops and these are also stopping behind and in front of the bus stop area, and there is only space left for just one bus to park or go into that. So with that kind of limited space it is difficult for the bus captains to go into the bus stop itself. So there can only be double parking. And passengers' safety is at stake.

CHAIRMAN: How do you suggest this be enforced, that is to say to prevent people from feeling free to park in bus stops and in the immediate approach to a bus stop?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, in accordance with overseas practices, say, for example, in the US, if you just park near bus stops the penalty is particularly heavy, the fine is particularly heavy. But in Hong Kong the fine is particularly light and the law enforcement has been particularly lax, and there are no double yellow markings on the road near the bus stops, and the drivers feel that they can be allowed to park at the approaches of the bus stops. I think installation of CCTVs will serve as a deterrent. This can be of reference to us.

Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you made some footage in relation to

some of the illegal parking problem?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes. Our footage has been submitted to the Secretariat. Let's take a look then.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, we are playing footage at the moment. Can you tell us, first of all, can we pause a little bit -- can you tell us first of all where is this, or where the location is this?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: It is northern Lantau near Yung Tung Estate.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So we can now see there are buses in the opposite lane?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: There are double yellow markings, no police officer to manage the situation at all.

CHAIRMAN: When was this video taken?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: That was taken afternoon yesterday. To the left is 37M and 37H, and to the right is another bus stop and taxi stand. And the buffer area is very limited. And as a result, the vehicles cannot get into the Ying Tung Estate car park, and there is another footage showing clearly how the buses cannot stop there --

Now, this bus stops here. It cannot get into the round about. To the right of the bus is a car park. And you can see the private cars at the right, they are preparing to go into the car parks but they cannot get

in, and they have to get -- the bus coming in the opposite direction is actually going in the reverse direction, beyond the refuge island, the safe island there, so it is actually driving in the opposite lane. This problem is serious.

Now, if the artificial island is going to be completed in the future, then more congestion will be caused in the vicinity of this area.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is this the same location as we have seen earlier, in the earlier footage, or is this a different location?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: The same location. I can also show you a few photos as well.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR LAM PO KEUNG: That's from the Google map, the photo taken from the Google map.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And this photo shown on the left side is the bus stop, is that a bus stop?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: If we go back to the previous photograph? That one. Is the grey vehicle on the left-hand side parked in a bus stop or immediately outside a bus stop? We can see it is in a bus stop.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Correct. The lorry opposite it, it is

also within the bus stop area.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And these photographs were taken yesterday as well?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: This is from Google.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This came from Google.

Those two footages, did you take them yourself or who took them?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Yes, myself. I took it yesterday.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Inside the bus?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Well, one was taken while I was in a private car, the other was taken while I was on the ground.

CHAIRMAN: I think we can see that from the movement of the camera.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, what I want to say is that in Hong Kong, well, this situation is rampant, it is seen everywhere in Hong Kong, and it is because the law enforcers have not been strictly enforcing the law.

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Can I supplement. Because for this particular location, at Ying Tung Estate, outside of it there would be reclamation, and before that is done, the roads have been opened up and built, and the Ying Tung Estate car park has insufficient car parking spaces. As a result, the private cars are lining up outside the car park and causing congestion, and you can see also behind

this photo there is a lorry unloading the goods. Because they can't get into the car park, they are unloading the goods outside the car park on the roads.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, may I add here. For any obstruction of the bus stop for whatever reason is unreasonable and illegal.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any views about the use of forward-looking cameras that are deployed on such bus stops in order to capture illegal parking of this kind?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Feasible. But the question is when that is being done, will the employer's side hand over the information to the police?

Number 2, and for the law breakers, if they don't think the information will be given over to the police, they will continue breaking the law.

But then, if there is the, say, a CCTV capturing the footage installed on the bus, then that would serve as a deterrent.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Can I ask a supplementary question. If in order to mark the time of such an event, it was necessary for a bus captain to press a button, activate something that marks this event, do you have any view about bus captains doing that?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: It is feasible.

CHAIRMAN: It is feasible, clearly, but do you have any objection to it, or would you support it?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Yes, I support it.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Related to this issue is priority bus lane. Your submission raised the point that the drivers are getting frustrated and irritated as a result of people making their job more difficult, and one of them is illegal parking.

And others, like passenger abuse, all add up to safety issues.

There are certain suggestions, in Singapore, to have priority bus lane; would you support that idea?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I support -- I agree with that. But over the past 10 years or so, regarding the government's attitude towards bus lanes, the government is trying to cut the bus lanes. Instead of having more bus lanes, we are given some very difficult paths to manoeuvre, for example Texaco Road flyover, at 6 in the morning, that is between midnight to 6 in the morning, franchised buses are not allowed to use that flyover. On the other hand, heavy vehicles are allowed to use the flyover, and also non-franchised buses, whereas for franchised buses they are disallowed from using the flyover, such that passengers would need to walk under

the flyover to cross the road.

It shows that the Transport Department is playing favouritism, and I reckon it could be because of noise complaints, and too many heavy vehicles are using the flyover, so they take the right away from franchised buses so that we need to use the road under the flyover.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Is this flyover a bus priority lane?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, this flyover isn't a bus lane: it used to be the case that any vehicle could use the flyover, instead of having buses go through the road under the flyover with traffic lights, but the Transport Department is adopting this attitude now. Instead of sticking to the old way, they are asking buses to use the inconvenient road under the flyover instead. Heavy vehicles and non-franchised buses are allowed to use the flyover, so they are putting the cart before the horse. I don't understand their intention.

CHAIRMAN: But concentrating on bus priority lanes, the existing ones, what is your perception of the Transport Department or the government attitude to their development?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I absolutely support the idea. I agree that there should be bus lanes for buses for public interest so that more people would opt for public

transport instead of driving their own cars, because we have too many private cars causing traffic congestion.

If we have smooth lanes for buses, there won't be traffic congestion and then more passengers would opt for public transport. So I hope that the Transport Department would face the issue squarely, and that is about public interest instead of stifling the room for operation of franchised bus companies.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The question is specific. What is your view of how government approaches bus lanes at the moment? Do they stifle them? Is that what you are saying?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I don't see new bus lanes being added for buses, and I'm not just talking about bus lanes -- and perhaps let me digress a bit. At the moment, for bus termini at housing estates they are poorly designed so that it is difficult for buses to park, and it is really difficult for buses to survive.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The last topic is salary.

We have heard evidence from Citybus operators that they have merged bonus into salary or reclassified it into basic salaries with effect from 1 March 2018, and I would like to explore with you on this system.

The downside from that recommendation appears to be

that there is currently no system of rewards. Can your union confirm that this is the case, as of to date, after the reclassification to basic salaries in March 2018?

CHAIRMAN: By a no system of reward, you mean for safe driving?

MS MAGGIE WONG: For safe driving.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, regarding the pay, since 1999 the management has been cutting our pay and our benefits, and in 2004 there was a substantial cut. Between 1999 and 2004, a three-tier system was introduced, and recently, we requested the management to restructure the system of salaries and benefits because otherwise it would deal a great blow on the staff moral.

For new recruits, just earlier, they earn merely 12,000 or less than 12,000. Later on, we requested the company to include the safety award, the service award, to the basic salary, such that the total pay would be $15,360, but the pay is still far lower than the average median wage in the transportation sector.

But regarding the workload of bus captains and their responsibilities, everything falls on their shoulders. We have a bus full of passengers and their lives are in the hands of the bus captains, and such low pay would directly affect recruitment and work attitude of bus

captains.

Very often drivers would come in and hone their skills, get a driving licence for heavy vehicles and then they will move on to driving other heavy vehicles in the sector. And this undermines service quality as a whole, because we have new recruits all the time.

And the pay is too low, so that they don't even care about the job. And this is the attitude they have at work. Very easily traffic accidents happen.

Coming back to the daily wages before 1998, the majority of bus captains care about the job a lot, because they knew that they wouldn't get another job with this pay outside, and they had increments, and with more years of service they would tend to stay in the position instead of moving to another company. They had a sense of belonging.

But since 1999, because of the change in the salary system, their pays were substantially lowered, so the quality of the bus captains deteriorated, which in turn affected public interest.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: You say that the union requested a restructuring of the salary structure. When did you request that in relation to the fact that it was changed beginning on 1 March 2018?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, we made this request. We have been making this request for 10 years, but our request was never acceded to, because of the circumstances. At the time in Hong Kong we experienced SARS, and the financial tsunami. The management, therefore, had not been willing to make any improvement until the recent two or three years. The management finally agreed to make progressive improvements, but they came in dribs and drabs.

Many employees, therefore, remain unhappy, and some industrial actions also took place. We understand that.

So we urge the management once again that they should substantially improve pay and benefits, and it should be on a par with the level in 1998 for daily paid workers.

This year in the upcoming meeting for pay hikes, the management already verbally promised us that there would be a substantial increase in terms of benefits. However, for salary, it is still below the median wage. New recruits earn $15,360. At the moment the management only agreed to increase the pay by $1,000. That means $16,360 -- still far below the earnings of drivers of heavy vehicles.

And yet we are not just driving heavy vehicles. We are driving buses with passengers. Our pay should not

be lower than other drivers, whereas the reality is our pay is extremely low and it is very unreasonable.

That is why we are still striving for it. We doing our best to strive for more rights for the sector.

MR CHAN KWONG NUNG: Let me also supplement. Long Win.

In January 2018, Long Win union conducted a survey regarding the number of recruits leaving and joining in 2017. 100 recruits joined in 2017 whereas for employees leaving in 2017, there were 120.

So according to our survey, among the 120, 60 per cent of employees left because of low pay.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheung, can I just ask you this.

In respect of the merger of the safety bonus and the other allowance into the basic salary beginning on 1 March 2018, was there any event that you attribute to that change by the bus operators?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I can tell you, categorically, that it has nothing to do with any event that happened, or any major accident triggering this pay rise.

Well, last year in May we had a round of negotiations on pay rise. It was in May 2017, and it was then confirmed that there would be a pay hike this year, meaning there would be an adjustment, and that the safety award would be added to the basic salary. The management, however, did not want to discuss it at that

meeting regarding pay hike.

They would only confirm with us about this new arrangement after the pay hike meeting had ended. And in fact, after that meeting, we did pursue it with the management, and the management said they would do it as soon as possible.

As I understand, in December the board of directors already approved an increase of the basic salary and addition of the safety award, and we have been striving for that for a long time.

That's also part of our plan, and that is we should increase the salary or the remuneration package. For the safety bonus and the service bonus, that has to be included in the basic salary, totalling $15,366, and that is the first step. And the second step, we would strive for double pay calculated based on the basic salary.

So this is what we want to achieve.

Well, they have already acceded to our request for double pay, and that is calculated on the basis of this amount, 15,366. If we don't add in the safety and service bonus, we can only get 11,000. So in other words, we have an additional $3,000 for the double pay. So that's our second step.

That has nothing to do with any event or any traffic

accident.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: So to summarise, this was agreed in May 2017, and as you understand it, the board of directors, as you put it, approved this change in December 2017?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Correct, Chairman.

In December 2017 the approval was granted.

However, the company didn't tell us then, it didn't give us a Christmas present. It was still putting this on hold yet, and inappropriately they just floated the idea after the accident, so there was a misunderstanding in the community that it is just because of this major traffic accident that this adjustment was made.

CHAIRMAN: Which board of directors approved this change?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: To my understanding, Chairman, it is the KMB board of directors, Mr Leung Nai Pang who actually approved it himself.

CHAIRMAN: No other company?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam, New Lantao Bus company didn't effect this change, did it, of merging safety bonuses into basic salary?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Instead, as we understand from their evidence, there was a bonus payment, a singular payment; do we

understand that correctly?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Yes, correct, there was. Our basic salary was $6,400. And every day there was a daily allowance. $230. So if you drive for nine hours a day every month and you also work on the Saturdays and Sundays, so we will end up with $16,200.

So compared to KMB, New World First Bus and Long Win we are lower, so our pay at the New Lantao Bus is on the low side compared to the others.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheung, can I ask you this, which I think is what Ms Wong was asking you: what is your view of the fact that this restructuring has resulted in there being no incentive payment for bus drivers to drive safely?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I don't agree.

A reasonable salary will serve as an incentive to the colleagues, they can have a stronger sense of belonging, and they will not just use their job as a springboard to find another better job. If they do have that kind of mindset then their working attitude would be very different.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If one were to recommend a system of monitoring drivers' behaviour, similar to perhaps Singapore's system, which has a system of red, amber and

green, based on the driver's driving pattern, and --

CHAIRMAN: I think that's one bus company in Singapore.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's one bus company. May we pull up the article of Tower Transit. The article is the Straits Times, 29 June 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a reference for this?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We don't have a reference. Because it is not in our bundle.

We can see on page 2 of the article, the fourth paragraph, it made reference to the driver:

"... who previously worked at SBS Transit, improved his score to 72. By December he managed to hit 20 points, qualifying him for a bonus of $130 for that month."

And there would be a monitoring system like a GreenRoad telematics system. And there will be a reward based on the driving behaviour.

And if one were to recommend such a system, would your union consider that would make sense, or would you support it, or worth pursuing it?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, I would like to add. I am a representative of the KMB branch. I would like to tell the chairman, for our company, the company has never attached importance to the pay and welfare benefits, and only until after the IRC has been

established that the company considered giving us more.

I've worked in this company for 18 years. I do not feel happy working here.

There is no employee-friendly policies. They have not put in the proper remuneration package to boost our sense of belonging. I've worked in this company for 18 years, I have been signing contract after contract.

How come that the trade unions have been striving for the safety and the service bonus to be incorporated into the basic salary? I have insisted on this. I've told the management many times, for the safety and service bonus.

For new drivers, if they don't have enough experience, their bonus may be deducted. The entire safety bonus of 1,200 can be deducted altogether, so there have been many problems with this safety bonus, but then the company has been telling us that the safety and service bonus are in huge amounts. So, before the accident happened, they would like to accede to the trade union's request, and that safety and service bonus be merged with the basic salary.

But, it doesn't mean that after the merging of the amounts our safety will still be upheld. Because we are a professional bus captain. We have to be accountable for what we do, and the safety bonus and service bonus

have been in place for many years, but then the arrangement has not been fair.

And especially to the new drivers, say, in the first half year to one year, they don't have enough experience. Their bonus in safety and service will be cut by the company and their income will not be stable.

So the trade union has considered this as a problem for many years, and we hope that the bonus will not be deducted. Maybe this month you are lucky, you are not involved in a traffic accident, but then in some other months you will be involved in a couple of traffic accidents and your safety bonus will be deducted.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lai, we are not talking about deduction. It is addition. What I'm suggesting here is not about deduction. It is on top of your basic salary. If you drive well you would receive an extra bonus. That's the system. It's not about deduction.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Well, KMB doesn't have such a system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Not about whether you have the system. If one were to recommend such a system, would you support that?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Chairman, we support any type of reward system or incentive system. Right now we are talking to the KMB on another kind of bonus system: there would be a 20-point increment system. So in other words, if you

achieve certain requirements then you will get an increment, an extra point. And that is beyond the annual salary increase. The KMB has verbally promised that there will be a 20-point system, it's calculated based on the performance, safety performance, attendance, discipline. If the bus captain does not achieve the standards then he will not get an extra point.

So that's a kind of bonus system.

Of course, if there are other reward systems we welcome them.

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Can I add?

An appropriate monitor of drivers' performance would not be by way of a penalty, we think. I think if a bus captain falls short of standard we should train him up more so he can drive safely, and that is more important.

If you have a bonus, and the bus captain will try to strive for it, and say, if he is involved in an accident, he would get frustrated. For NLB, there is a safety bonus. Well, if the safety bonus is deducted, we are talking about several thousand dollars. And that affects the livelihood of the family of the bus captain.

Thank you, Chairman.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Chairman, I have completed my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. I just have a quick question regarding the protective shield that we discussed this morning.

I hear from you gentlemen that you are not very much supporting this idea.

I just want to clarify. The reason why you are not supporting is because the material is not good enough because of creating reflection or squeaking sound, or you are against the concept of having a protective shield?

Thank you.

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: I am not saying that it is not good, but that if you have a protective shield, according to bus captains, when it is installed, well, bus captains say that they do have an independent driving compartment, so to speak, but there is something wrong with the transparent plate of the protective shield, and the management hasn't addressed the issue. And it is distracting for bus captains.

And there are other also issues stemming from it which get more serious. We would like them to improve the plastic plate as soon as possible. As I mentioned this morning, there is glaring, and then at the tip,

there is a magnet which gives off some squeaking sound, and according to the union, although there is a protective shield in a convex shape, if one is to attack the bus captain then one can still do so.

We have reflected the problems to the management many times. They just said that they cannot be taken down. But many drivers would like to have it taken down because you have safety problems, and it also produces glare. And because of the curve there would be a distortion of vision, and not to mention that the shield gives off some noise.

And these are the problems they have not resolved.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: But would you support it if management can come up with a protective shield that would not create any driving hazards?

MR LAI SIU CHUNG: Yes, I would. Previously we submitted some drawings to them. For example, in Korea they have an independent door with two tiny windows that could be opened and closed. We gave them drawings for reference.

But I think that for this kind of protective shield that they have come up with, there are problems. Perhaps they didn't think that there would be so many problems, but then they have to address the issues.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam, at New Lantao Bus do you operate special

shifts, 14-hour shifts?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And are you afforded, or are drivers afforded a minimum rest period during such a duty of three hours or more?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And on the occasions when a driver comes to that time of the day where he has that break, what are the facilities like that are provided at the place where the driver takes his break?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Nothing so far. They would at most take a break on the bus. They could rest inside the bus.

CHAIRMAN: No facilities?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Not for the time being.

CHAIRMAN: And where are these places, bus terminus depot, where are they? How many are there where people take these breaks?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Usually in the street, shopping malls, they would take a rest. If it is close to their home they would go home.

CHAIRMAN: What proportion, if you are able to answer this, of bus captains are in a position to go home when such a break occurs?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: I don't know. A half, I guess. Half of those who are on this kind of special shift, around

half.

CHAIRMAN: Do you do these special shifts yourself?

MR LAM PO KEUNG: Previously I did. But I would go home.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You anticipated my other question.

Ms Wong, the material that the Transport Department provided us in the form of a briefing paper to the LegCo transport panel. Could you give me the reference for that and could that be put up on the screen?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That would be page TD-1, page 403.

CHAIRMAN: Where is the LegCo briefing paper?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The briefing paper should be at page 403, TD-1, page 403.

CHAIRMAN: In English -- the briefing paper is in English, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, it is in English.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Cheung, this is a paper that was discussed on 25 July in the LegCo council by the Panel on Transport, and it deals with three matters, really: one is training, another is seat belts and another is technological safety advances.

And it is the product of a working group which was constituted by the Transport Department and comprised the franchised bus operators and three bus manufacturers, and they were convened in the middle

of March, and this is the product of their work.

Were your views sought on any of these three matters?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: No. No, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Have you had a chance to read the document to see what it is that they propose to do?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, I haven't read this paper before. This is the first time I'm reading it.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheung, given your answer, it seems to me that perhaps it would only be fair before I ask you any more questions if I suggested that you ought to read the document, and then you can give us your considered responses to some of the questions that I have.

What I would suggest is this: we have other trade union representatives who have been waiting patiently to give their evidence. May I suggest that we interpose them, and then at a later stage when you indicate to us that you are in a position to answer the questions, we will bring you back. Is that a proposal that meets with your agreement?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: No problem.

CHAIRMAN: Very well, in which case, may I ask you to vacate your seats. We will take a short break whilst there is a swap over of personnel, and then we will deal with the federation.

We will take a short break.

(3.25 pm)

(A short break)

(3.35 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS: MR HO YUI CHEONG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG

(Evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chung and gentlemen, we thank the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions for accepting our invitation to give evidence to the Committee, and I'll ask Ms Wong to ask questions of you.

Let me just explain this, that if at any stage you, Mr Chung, wish one of your fellow representatives to answer a question, please defer to him and we will hear from him. So it is a matter for you who it is that puts forward your view.

Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Chung, and gentlemen, for coming. And we have your written submissions.

The Committee's primary concern, as set out in the terms of reference, is to make recommendations which go to the issue of safety of franchised buses.

So my questions will be focused on safety aspects rather than the wider aspect of employment issues.

My first question is to go through the background with you about your union.

Mr Chung, I understand that Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions represents three trade union members; is that correct?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be Kowloon Motor Bus, New World First Bus and Citybus.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your union currently has 1,660 members.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are these members all bus drivers?

MR LAM KAM PIU: No. Some of them are the regulators and supervisors, mechanics in the depot. They are working as frontline staff.

CHAIRMAN: How many are bus captains?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Over 90 per cent.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chung, your union has submitted two submissions. The first one is dated 24 April 2018. And that can be found in TU bundle 1A, pages 147 to 226, in Chinese. In English, it is at pages 226-1 to page 226-80.

And you have made a second submission in response to

the letter from the Committee. The supplemental submission is at TU bundle 1B pages 260-28 to 260-67.

And you can see it on the screen. And the English is at TU1B bundle at pages 260-68 to 103.

And Mr Chung, I will just go through the issues raised in your submission by topic.

The first topic is illegal parking.

And we can find that issue was raised in your submission at pages 260-234 to 236.

This is annex 2, and it set out e-mail exchanges that you had about illegal parking problem, which you have provided to the Committee. And you have addressed a problem in particular in relation to Nam Cheong Street and a number of other streets, in your recent submission.

MR LAM TIN FU: Sorry, Ms Wong, are you asking Mr Chung to make a reply or Mr Lam to make a reply?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise. I'm sorry, maybe Mr Chung, you would assign the person that is most suitable to answer the questions raised in this area: illegal parking.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Ms Wong, I am the acting president. Mr Chung is my department. And on behalf of the federation, I'll ask Mr Lau to take the question.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Lau, you provided the Committee with an annex 2, which sets out the correspondence that you had with the Transport Department complaining about the illegal parking problem, and we can see at page 235 that you have annexed photographs, your union has annexed photographs showing the extent of the illegal parking.

And at the bottom we can see the e-mail showing the Transport Department received the photo stating that the colleagues of regional office will follow up.

So my question is: has there been follow-up or has there been improvement on this Nam Cheong Street in terms of illegal parking.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Starting from May 2015 we started discussing with the TD on the illegal parking at Nam Cheong Street, and a couple of months ago we received the final reply from the TD, saying that the situation has improved, and one more marking for bus stop has been added to prevent illegal parking on the bus stop area.

But it took us a very long time to communicate with the police.

And also because of the illegal parking issue a bus captain was attacked at this particular location, and after that, we wrote immediately to the Permanent Secretary for Housing Mr Lai, and the letter was included or appended to our supplementary submission,

and at the same time we have been chasing up the TD on the improvement works at this location. But the TD has been acting slowly, and they really, don't want to deal with it, it seems to us.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and maybe if we should first look at your submission on illegal parking, your first submission in relation to this issue. It is page 176 in Chinese, and the English is at page 226(30).

On this page we can see your suggestions, or rather your summary of what you have done for this illegal parking.

And we can see in the English version that:

"... the federation wrote to the Transport Department in May 2017 and required arrangements of more policemen to strengthen the enforcement and other feasible measures to prevent the bus stop from being blocked by vehicles illegally parked there. It is suggested that a 24-hour restricted area to be set up, the 'bus stop' road sign should be extended and iron railings should be added to reduce the number of vehicles illegally parked there and prevent the bus stop from being hindered ... after several rounds of [discussions] or communications, the Transport Department finally agreed to set up iron railings only on the grounds of the need for loading and unloading

goods ... however, because the Transport Department paid no immediate attention to this problem, a bus captain was attacked at this bus stop in August 2017, because he was passing the private vehicles illegally parked there and was misunderstood as 'skipping the stop'. This incident was exactly caused by blocking of bus stop by illegal parking vehicles."

And you stated that:

"If the Transport Department had taken the suggestion of the federation seriously and promptly arranged to set up road signs, this incident could have been avoided."

In your recent submission at page -- or second submission at pages 260-89 to 90, that's in English, and the Chinese is at page 260-53.

And your further reply stated at paragraph (d) that:

"The main reply of the Transport Department is to refer the matter to the transport officer of the relevant district for follow up, and to the police to take appropriate actions. Meanwhile, for certain districts, such as Nam Cheung Street as mentioned by the Federation, no only made oral questions, but also maintained communication ... In addition, concerning illegal parking, the Federation also expressed its concern and demanded enforcement at various black spots

in the meeting with Hong Kong police."

And it is stated there that:

" ... the police has in different meetings made verbal commitments to enhance its enforcement efforts, and ... the prosecution figures ... has increased [and] some illegal parking black spots, such as the Reclamation Street in Mong Kok, King's Road, Yee Wo Street and Wang Lung Street Tsuen Wan have not seen much improvement."

And you have also annexed a list of black spots to the police in one of your annexures, showing that there were a number of locations that you have asked the police to follow up -- and I believe that's in annex 14 -- in your letters dated 6 and 27 March 2017. That's at page 260-462, in Chinese, and page 260-468-1.

If we look at the letter, it was addressed to the Commissioner of Police at page 260-468-2 in English.

You have highlighted a number of black spots at page 260-468-5, for Hong Kong Island, New Territories and Kowloon.

So my question is: has there been any follow-up after these two letters?

MR LAU KAI HIM: After these two letters, in our regular meetings with the police and the Transport Department, on every occasion we reflected the problem of illegal

parking with them and regarding what we told the Transport Department, it can be seen in the minutes of the meeting.

As for follow-up action on illegal parking, it should not be done as a one-off exercise. It should be sustainable effort. There should not be follow-up action, just right after we mentioned one black spot. We will continue to follow up with the Transport Department on the black spot list and see if there have been new additions or improvements, but since March 2017 until now, we have not seen a lot of improvements regarding these black spots. But we have been taking follow-up action.

CHAIRMAN: What do you suggest is the way forward to deal with the illegal parking that causes problems for franchised buses?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, the police should take enforcement action. Very often the problem we encounter is illegal parking and the bus captain would call the police for handling and very often the police on many occasions would say that they are unable to handle the situation because of lack of manpower, and previously, we did suggest increasing the number of traffic wardens, as we understand in busy districts such as Yau Tsim Mong district the number of traffic wardens tend to be on the

low side, but the police could engage more traffic wardens to take enforcement action against illegal parking, because it is a traffic offence and the most effective enforcement is to prosecute the offending drivers, and there should also be signage at bus stops, because the signage will have binding effect on offending drivers.

And we also requested that there should be double yellow line. Apart from Nam Cheong Street the problem is also very serious in Fo Tan, et cetera, and there is a need to have yellow lines there. At the moment there is some room for improvement as far as our laws and regulations are concerned to take enforcement action.

CHAIRMAN: There are double yellow lines all over Central, and it does not stop illegal parking, does it?

MR LAU KAI HIM: That's true. Because according to the police they do not have sufficient manpower to take enforcement and it is difficult. We are very passive, we rely on the government to deploy officers to take enforcement action. But since 2017, what we have seen is that although the police figures suggest that they have stepped up enforcement, we don't see a significant improvement.

CHAIRMAN: What about enforcement by the use of CCTV?

MR LAU KAI HIM: We agree. We agree that police manpower is

limited, and it is difficult to deploy substantial manpower to tackle just one issue. We agree that technology can help, and in recent years we understand that the police has been deploying technology such as CCTV to take enforcement.

We support it because police manpower is limited, but police officers do give deterrents. I think deterrent is more important that punishment. If you have deterrents it will be more effective in stopping the problem, because drivers may also know that police officers would not patrol a certain area regularly to take prosecution, whereas CCTV and other similar technology could be deployed for enforcement purpose so that it can serve as deterrent and it would be much more effective.

CHAIRMAN: What about the use of forward looking CCTV cameras on buses in order to capture the fact of illegal parking?

MR LAU KAI HIM: As we mentioned in the supplementary paper, for cameras installed on buses, there are different kinds. For the latest model there are eight cameras showing bus compartments, as well as outside of the buses, and the video clips would be used for the investigation into accidents.

Of course if we are to use the video clips for law

enforcement purpose, the police has the power to retrieve the clips. But we should bear in mind the legal requirements, because there is privacy concern, and because the bus compartment cameras would capture what happens inside, so there is a privacy concern that we need to deal with carefully.

But on the whole, we agree it can be used for enforcement.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not asking you about CCTV inside the bus looking inside. It is forward looking CCTV that captures the problem the bus driver has as he approaches a bus stop and vehicles are parked illegally in it.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Agree.

CHAIRMAN: What, if any, view do you have about bus drivers assisting in enforcement by for example noting, perhaps electronically, the time at which they have captured a particular infringement, so that when the bus returns to the bus depot, someone can view that CCTV, because the time has been noted?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: I am Chung, and I would like to supplement.

About using bus cameras for law enforcement, after the bus returns to the depot, well, the company itself doesn't know. We need to write up a report, telling about the data and time of the incident, the relevant

time period, before somebody would retrieve the card or trip, but it would take two or three days, because of documentation. So it may not be very effective.

And when a bus approaches a bus stop, it is in motion, and even if you capture a vehicle, you have no idea whether that vehicle is in motion or whether it is stationary. So I do think it is difficult.

CHAIRMAN: Do you not think that in Asia's World City we could come up with a technological device where the bus captain simply presses a button which then alerts somebody who views the CCTV to go to a particular time, and then, of course, it is up to that person to determine whether or not the camera captures the stationary vehicle?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Well, I agree. But -- if it is technically feasible I agree, but I want to add that our federation is very concerned about illegal parking at bus stops. Because we have low floor buses introduced in the past 10 or eight years to serve the wheelchair-bound passengers, and if there is illegal parking at bus stops we can't stop at the bus stop to help passengers in wheelchairs, so there is a safety hazard, and that is why we are rather concerned about illegal parking particularly at bus stops. Because at any moment we can have passengers coming in wheelchairs

and if we can't reach bus stop there will be hazard.

CHAIRMAN: The question is simply this: that if possible, is it the union's view that bus drivers, bus captains could be deployed to assist in enforcement to alleviate those kinds of problems? Pressing a button to capture the time of the infringement?

MR LAU KAI HIM: If this technology is introduced, of course we will be happy to accept. Because bus captains are also affected by illegal parking, so if technology allows us to take enforcement action we will support it.

Bus captains, well, under cap 230A, are sufficiently empowered, that is Public Bus Services Regulations, but it may have to do with the regulations, the bus companies' views as well as the Transport Department's views.

So I think this is something that the Transport Department and the company can consider.

As for bus captains, using technology to assist the police in enforcement actions, of course we welcome that, because by pressing a button we will be able to capture the time but it has to do with technology if it is feasible, and second, whether the franchised bus companies would agree, and whether it is technically feasible.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe this is a matter that has been raised by the letter from the Democratic Alliance, using the Singapore's practice.

The letter was dated 30 April 2018 in miscellaneous bundle 2, page 644, and in English at 644-2.

If we see the first suggestion about this Singapore practice of installing cameras next to the driver's seat since 2008, and all the bus captain needs to do is press the button, and hand the footage to the police, and the police will send a ticket to the owner who breached the regulation with a fine, or extra fine.

So this is one of the suggestions made by the Democratic Alliance using Singapore's practice. Would you support this idea of enforcing the law in that way?

MR LAM KAM PIU: We support it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second topic I wish to explore with you is the special shift, the special shift problem. If I may take you first, to your submission at page 167, in Chinese, and in English at page 226-21.

And you highlighted the new guidelines requires the special shift, for special shift bus captains, they need to have a continuous resting period of three hours, and you stated at page 167 in Chinese, and page 226-20, at the bottom, that:

"... not all bus captains are resident near the

working places. Even if there is a resting period of three hours, they cannot find suitable resting place, finally resulting in fatigued driving in the long run working environment, which may definitely affect the security [I believe that is safety]."

And on the next page at page 226-21, the bottom paragraph, and that's 167 still, at the bottom, you stated that:

"... Kowloon Bus has set up the 'special shift' at present and no pay is provided for the rest time of the 'special shift'. The bus company uses the so-called allowance to substitute remuneration, which is extremely unfair for bus captains of the 'special shift' ... the Transport Department has not made any stance or given any comments in this respect ... the Principal Transport Officer mentioned in a meeting that the Transport Department did not have the power to supervise the ... company to set up the 'special shift'."

And based on your submissions, I believe your submission is against this idea of having long working hours. Throughout your submissions, I believe you have been advocating reducing the working hours from 14 to 12. Is that the position?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Yes, that's our position.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us why you would advocate this

position?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Can I ask Mr Lau to answer?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First, we have taken reference from practices of work hours in common law jurisdiction, in EU, US, Singapore, and South Korea, there would not be any special shifts lasting 14 hours. We have given the relevant information for reference, to the IRC, and it is annex 9 in the supplementary paper, and annex 10 also contains the relevant information.

Now, 14 hours are very long. And in between the bus captains get only 10 hours for rest, and you can imagine. Now, the bus captain gets off work, has to go, travel back home, and has to take a shower, et cetera, so we wonder whether the bus captain can sleep for six to seven hours. So it is grossly inadequate.

Bus captains need to have great concentration, and bus captains have to look after the passengers, road conditions, et cetera. Compared to driving an ordinary car, it is much more demanding.

So 10 hours in rest time is not enough.

If you look at common law areas, and also neighbouring cities of Hong Kong they don't have 14 hours. Compared to EU and Singapore, our work hours are long.

I'll see if Mr Chung has anything to add.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Yes, I would like to say something more.

Why are we against 14 hours, this special shift? First, so far, for the guidelines promulgated by the TD, there has never been any special shift, but this time, in order to accommodate the bus companies' request they told us that the ordinary trips will be cut to 12 hours, but then they have added in this special shift lasting 14 hours.

And they also emphasised that -- the guidelines also say categorically there should be no less than three hours and three consecutive hours in rest breaks should be provided in the special shift. But then the TD will not decide whether this three hours will come with pay or not.

Now the guidelines is that there should be no less than three consecutive hours in rest break. So in an extreme break they can give you six consecutive hours as a rest break. So they are paying you just, say, eight hours pay and 6 hours come without any pay, but then you are still spending 14 hours in that special shift. So that's an extreme scenario.

In other words, on this guideline, issued by the Transport Department, this is something that the bus companies can do, and they are exploiting the frontline

workers here.

And as our submission said, there is no proper facility or rest facility for us to take a proper rest. And the bus captains have to sort of roam around during the rest break, so how can they replenish during the rest break?

That's number 1.

Number 2. We can make some calculation, 14 hours, the bus captains, if they live further away, they will need to spend, say, some time in travelling to and from work, so maybe one hour, two hours, so they maybe spend 2.5 hours in travelling to and from work.

So they get up in the morning, they have to brush their teeth and so on, that takes half an hour, and then when they get off work to home, and they have to take a shower and have meals, so they have only five hours left. Does it mean that they will fall asleep immediately after they get in bed? Not necessarily. So you can imagine whether the drivers get enough rest time.

So we are all against this special shift.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, have we not received evidence from Citybus, who do not, but propose to use split shifts in the future, that they propose paying bus captains at the hourly rate, not an allowance, not a reduced amount, but

at the hourly rate?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And secondly, what is the position that KMB have taken for the future on this issue?

MS MAGGIE WONG: KMB's position at the moment, as I understand it, is given the number of people that raise objection, I believe their submission stated that they will explore that -- I'll find the reference -- that they will explore this special shift.

CHAIRMAN: The issue is simply this. Are they going to pay the hourly rate, or are they going to pay this reduced allowance that they have paid in the past?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I will find the reference before I answer that question.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Perhaps Mr Chung, if you could assist, we have heard evidence from another trade union called Federation of Bus Industry --

CHAIRMAN: No, that's the current representatives.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise.

We have heard evidence from the Motor Transport Workers General Union, who also comprise five branches of trade union and bus captains, that they support the special shift. That's the first point.

The second point they said is there are not many

people who are taking special shifts.

And third is if there is a reduction in special shifts, you would need to hire a lot more workers, and it would lead to a reduction of about 5,000-odd income for bus drivers.

So they have voiced out three reasons opposing -- or rather supporting this 14-hour special shift.

What is your reply to those submissions?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: My stance is this: we are now exploring safety of buses. That's most important.

I said going by common sense you would know that the driver in a special shift would not have sufficient time to rest, and that leads easily to driver fatigue. So that's number 1.

So if we are focusing on safety there should not be a 14-hour special shift. That's point 1.

Number 2, so if we cancel special shift, the income will go down, that's very much a cycle. Why a reduction in pay, why do we have to work extra -- a few hours to get a higher income, and that's mainly because our pay is too low? So that's why we have to work several extra hours.

If the pay is sort of linked to the median wage of the government survey, then bus drivers would not like to work that long.

If I remember correctly, the median is already $18,000. But for new drivers they are getting $15,000 only.

That's because of low salaries, our colleagues have a really heavy burden and they need to work extra hours, and in the same vein, does it mean that they need to work 16 hours to earn more? It is impossible to gauge it by working hours.

We can't simply work more hours to earn a bigger pay. Instead we should raise the pay to prevent fatigued driving.

And about breaks, allowance would be given, but this is not the problem with the bus companies. It is the Transport Department. The Transport Department has issued this guideline for bus captains, and the Transport Department therefore is responsible for protecting our pay. The department should not pass the buck onto both of us, otherwise the TD should not have issued the guidelines in the first place.

So I think the Transport Department is being irresponsible.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I go back to the question that the Chairman raised earlier as to whether the Kowloon Motor Bus are going to pay the hourly rate or are they going to pay this reduced allowance as they have done or paid

in the past for special shifts? And if I may take you to the bundle KMB-1, first is page 111.

If we look at the old daily rate, for (H), special shift duty allowance, we can see the rate, before 1 March 2018, the old daily rate is $21.90, and if we see the new daily rate, it is still no change.

And if we look at table 2 for the monthly rate, at page 109, we can see at (E), split shift duty allowance, the old monthly rate is employed before or after, is the rate of $1,951.50, and there is still no change from 1 March 2018.

May I ask, perhaps you may address this, is the split shift duty allowance per hour still the same for KMB after 1 March 2018?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Let me invite the KMB representative to take your question.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: To answer you, in short, $21.90, that's the rate per hour, but the normal rate should be $116 per hour.

CHAIRMAN: So the hourly rate, if that was what was paid, would be much greater, five times greater?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And that is why in your submission at page 226-21 in English, and Chinese at page 166, of the TU bundle, 1A, you stated that this special shift

allowance is extremely unfair for bus captains of special shifts; is that the reason?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the next topic is the -- related to this topic on cost, you mentioned in your submission that the bus companies are cutting costs by cutting remuneration and employee welfare benefits. If I may take you to your submission, page 158 in Chinese and pages 226-10 to 226-11 in English.

It refers to the bus company cutting costs by cutting the remuneration and employee welfare. Can you explain how, and in what way?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Lau can take this question.

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, regarding remuneration, we have the unfair situation regarding special shift, and bus companies would deploy bus captains to work for long hours to suppress the manpower need, and different companies would have different welfare systems, for example they have employees recruited before a certain time, and after a certain time receiving different benefits. Although the bus companies would like to improve employee welfare as a whole, because of the differential treatment for different employees they have different welfare benefits.

New recruits receive fewer benefits that old

employees.

MR LAM KAM PIU: I'll let Mr Lau supplement.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: For remuneration and welfare benefits for new recruits they earn 15,000 plus; for old employees they earn 18,000, whereas for benefits, for employees under the old system, we have a year end bonus equivalent to one month of pay; new recruits also have a year end bonus, but they are required to meet certain requirements.

Medical benefits, for example, for old employees, they can visit the clinic 20 times for free, whereas for employees under the new system only 10 visits free.

So you see, there is differential treatment. The bus companies try to suppress costs by cutting remuneration and benefits because they always talk about the meagre profit they are making. I don't understand how meagre they mean. They earn $100 million or $200 million of profit. I don't know when they would say it is profitable.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

The next topic is about lost trip.

Your submissions, both your first and your supplemental submission made a lot of references about phantom bus, or lost trips, and if I may refer you to the English submission at page 226-22 in TU-1A bundle,

in Chinese, page 168.

In the second paragraph, it made reference to:

"Lost trip is caused by various reasons, such as shortage of bus captains, traffic jam, vehicle malfunction, and so on."

And then you mentioned that:

"... lost trip mainly involves the three problems of manpower, bus and road. The former two problems should be faced squarely and dealt with by bus companies. However, for these problems [you question whether] the Transport Department ... perform its role as a supervisor?"

And you refer to:

" ... the 'Phantom Bus' is a short-distance bus created based on the grey area of the definition of the Transport Department, which travels for several stops to fill up the trips not duly made due to various reasons, and to lower the rate of the 'lost trip'."

Can I ask you something about this lost trip, first of all. Are there a lot of lost trips in Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR LAU KAI HIM: KMB at the moment, the target of lost trips has dropped by 3 per cent. I mean, it is at 3 per cent, because of manpower problem. So it is a long standing problem, but it doesn't just happen to KMB. For Citybus

and New World First Bus, for various reasons they also have the problem of lost trips.

So this is not a problem facing KMB alone. Many bus companies face the same problem.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You make reference here to phantom bus. Can you explain more, what is this phantom bus?

MR LAU KAI HIM: For each bus route, the FB operator signed a schedule of service with the TD, which regulates the journey distance, the fleet number, and the frequency. Basically bus should go from terminal A to terminal B to be regarded as a departure. But sometimes there would be special departure only apply in a few stops. So this would be used to make up for lost trips for various reasons.

And back then, after Oriental Daily, the newspaper, revealed the problem it was termed "phantom buses". In fact, it is making use of the grey area in the TD's definition.

Let me supplement. In terms of deployment of buses, manpower, bus routes, et cetera, the TD should have full knowledge in the schedule of service, and according to the Public Bus Services Regulations, the companies are required to provide the schedule of service so the schedules should be in the hands of the TD, and the TD should have full knowledge of the operation of these

companies.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reason I ask this is, in your supplemental submission you mentioned how this lost trip would lead to safety issues at page 260-81 in English.

In Chinese, it is at page 260-43 to 44.

If I may read this paragraph at page 260-81. You stated that:

"'Lost trips' or scheduled travelling time set by franchised bus companies being too short to accommodate variations in road conditions always lead to bus captains have insufficient rest during duty or driving hours. Different from 30 minutes break or 60 minutes meal time, bus companies will not issue special directions for the 12 minutes rest time. Therefore bus captains may not be able to fully understand the 12 minutes rest time. Since there are lots of variations on the roads ... travelling time will increase depending on the situation on the road. But the duty of setting travelling time rests on the bus companies."

And then:

"The union has not prepared statistics in terms of the bus captains' shifts where there is insufficient travelling time, but the relevant information can be found in Annex 8."

Can I ask you to elaborate as to why this lost trip

problem would lead to insufficient rest during duty or driving hours?

CHAIRMAN: If I understand it, what you are saying is journey times are set at too short to do the actual journey, and that leads to the bus captain arriving at the destination with insufficient time to have a proper break, is that the point? And lost trips is a consequential device used to deal with the fact that not enough trips have been made; is that it? So that the real issue, for safety, is that journey times are too short. Do we understand you correctly?

MR LAU KAI HIM: That is correct. Let me answer your question in several parts.

First, in the paper, the 12-minute rest time, that is in condition (a), and that is for every four hours of driving there should be a rest break of 12 minutes. But then the bus companies usually do not let the bus captains know about this. As said in our appendix 8, we suspect that there will be only three minutes. So there isn't sufficient time for bus captains to take a rest. And because of the busy road situation, bus captains usually arrive at the bus terminus late, and the passengers are waiting, so they would drive immediately, and they don't have sufficient time to rest.

For the journey time, can I ask Mr Chung to

elaborate more.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: About the driving time or the journey time, we have asked bus companies, New World First Bus and Citybus and also TD how do they come up, or set the travelling time for buses. They come up with the schedule of service not based on scientific data. What they do is they have a bus trying out the new routes, and see how long will it take for the bus to operate.

So that's not a scientific approach.

So we suggest to the TD and Citybus and New World First Bus that in coming up with a travelling time we must allow sufficient rest time for the bus captains, and we should make sure that the bus captains would not speed. Very often, because of insufficient travelling time the bus captains will tend to speed, and that's also very natural, as human behaviour.

We must come up with a scientific approach in determining the journey time. Say, for example, say if a bus travels at 40km per hour, then you come up with the expected journey time.

Now, in the urban areas the speed limit is 50km per hour, so if you set it as 40km or 30km really you should come up with figures like those. That I would call a scientific approach, and then also you have to be mindful about the number of bus stops, so how many

seconds you are allowing the bus captains to have passengers alighting and boarding the bus up.

Third, you have to be mindful about the rest time you would give the bus captains. That's also accountable.

And also in Hong Kong roads the journey time may differ depending on the period of the day. Say, in peak hours, it would take longer, non-peak hours, the journey time would be shorter.

I believe that the bus companies will be able to get information on the situation at peak and non-peak hours from the black box, and then factoring into the congestion situation, then come up with a journey time estimate. I think that's a more specific approach. I wonder whether TD will heed our views.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Lau.

MR LAU KAI HIM: In the earlier hearing, Mr Jain Alok has already said the black box is there to capture the journey information and journey time. And bus companies can be in full grasp of the relevant data, but then the bus companies, because it involves manpower, and the bus fleet, the bus companies would like to use less manpower and less number of buses to meet with the TD's requirements. So as a result, the rest time of the bus captains is reduced. And because there are many

passengers waiting, then very often the bus drivers do not have any rest at all even.

I believe that the bus companies do have sufficient information to help them come up with a more reasonable schedule. But that involves resources, buses and manpower, and in the August 2017 meeting with the TD we have asked the TD to monitor the journey time of bus companies. But then the TD said that they would only just scrutinise and look at the schedule of service, but I have also outlined the details in the schedule of service just now. I won't go into them.

But then information such as journey time is not included in the schedule of service. And very often the TD has not been doing -- its gatekeeping role properly, And the schedule is always so tight, and the bus companies -- I mean, the bus captains are under a lot of pressure so.

Can I ask Mr Hui to elaborate.

MR HUI HOU KIT: Citybus. For some routes of Citybus, N8X which has run for over a decade is an overnight route starting from 12 midnight to 6 am the next morning.

For this route, it runs from Siu Sai Wan in Chai Wan, to the Central ferry pier in Central. So the one hour is the journey time.

Let me give you my background. I used to be an

overnight bus captain. I have been working for over 10 years, and I have been driving N8X for over 10 years, and for the past 10 years the journey time has been set at one hour, so a return trip means two hours.

It is impracticable to finish the journey in one hour. It would definitely go over time. Why? Because for N8X, there are altogether 110 bus stops. Well, in the return trip. So for one way, 50 to 60 stops. So within one hour, it is to finish its trip, it goes through Chai Wan Road, Shau Kei Wan Road, King's Road, Hennessy Road, Admiralty Road, and Des Voeux Road, and then the Central Ferry Pier or the Macau Ferry Pier, so it is from Eastern District to Central District. It goes through all the signallised junctions so it would be quite impossible to finish the journey in one hour. Well, if you have to finish it in one hour, you have to go at great speed. And you even have to speed, in order to finish the journey in one hour. I have not worked on that route for quite some time, so I can't finish it in one hour.

And for the N8X bus captains now, because they have been working on the journey for a long time, and they know the operation of the traffic lights, so they try to manoeuvre a bit so that the journey can be completed in one hour. This is the best example. I'm

a representative of the CTB employees union and I've talked to the management, and I've told them one hour is definitely not sufficient for N8X. I have taken part in union activities for over 10 years.

This is an extreme example that I'm citing. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you --

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the one-hour journey time was never practical?

MR HUI HOU KIT: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if you cannot finish the journey within one hour scheduled time, what would be the consequence?

MR HUI HOU KIT: The colleague will have to continue driving, well, for N8X, the headway is half an hour, so if he arrives at the terminus late, then he still has to depart from the bus terminus 30 minutes later.

Or if there is a traffic accident, causing a delay of 15 minutes or more, then upon the company's instructions, he can try to -- I mean, depart later. But if it is just a delay for five to six minutes he has to continue with the next journey.

And there would not be some sort of interim journeys, in between.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This journey, would there be penalty in

terms of the income if you cannot meet the schedule time?

MR HUI HOU KIT: No.

CHAIRMAN: Only the rest time would be reduced?

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Yes.

MR HUI HOU KIT: Yes. Yes. For N8X, well, sometimes there may even not be any rest break at all.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Ms Wong.

Prof Lo has a question.

MEMBER LO: I am just curious, then how does the company enforce 12 minutes of rest time for the first four hours, if the bus is over run, over time every trip, so in four hours there will be no rest time at all, so how does the company ensure there would be 12 minutes of rest time as stipulated in the guideline?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Let me put it this way. There are several conditions in the guideline. Half an hour rest for six driving hours and one meal break, and in the schedule that is categorically written down, but in the 12 minutes for the first four hours, that is not specified.

Because of the tight schedule or the busy traffic, maybe the 12 minutes would already be cancelled because of the heavy traffic congestion, but the bus captains don't know that there is a 12-minute break within the

first four hours of duty.

But for the other requirements, the bus captains are in the know.

But the busy schedule is also very tight, and the bus captains very often don't know that they have lost this 12 minutes in rest break.

But we have been reflecting our view that there should at least be five minutes' break when the bus gets to the terminus, the bus captains can relax a bit and can go to the washroom. But the bus companies are not taking a humane approach in dealing with the issue.

MEMBER LO: One other question.

So on paper, this 12 minutes does not exist, not to talk about in practice?

MR LAU KAI HIM: And they must implement it. Because there would be random check on the part of the TD, that's what the TD told us.

The TD has been reminding individual bus companies from time to time, and in appendix 8, submitted to the Committee, there is no 12 minutes. But this is a guideline from the TD, but then in the bus captains handbook, there is no specification to the like.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Related to this topic is the resting facilities. We can see in your submission at page 226-25, in English, that you raised the topic about

insufficient area of lounge room or resting facilities. In Chinese it's at page 171.

You raised a specific problem, at the bottom of page 226-25:

"For many years, the Transport Department has not taken over charge of the lounge room issue, but pushed the responsibility to the Lands Department and the Home Affairs Department. In addition, some government departments have not supported the establishment of lounge rooms, such as the Housing Authority, so that this issue cannot be solved successfully."

And, of course, based on your example that you have given earlier, about this one-hour journey time, can I raise, before I ask, about this one-hour journey time, is there sufficient facility when you reach point B, leaving aside the journey time, from A to B, in relation to the bus route that you mentioned earlier on?

MR HUI HOU KIT: Yes. In Siu Sai Wan, Chai Wan, and for Hong Kong Macau terminal, there are resting facilities, but on the whole, for Citybus, resting facilities are insufficient. Let me give you some examples.

The rest lounge may be very small, and there may only be a temporary toilet, and sometimes there isn't any toilet at all.

Our union strived for a toilet, and then they began

to have toilets.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Well, in the supplementary submission we have provided a list of resting facilities, where facilities are sufficient, where sufficient facilities are not, and you can refer to the list.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm going to take you to that document.

I believe that is in annexure 7 of your submission at pages 260-342 to 346, in which you produce documentation showing the follow-up progress report for individual bus terminus. In English, it is in TU bundle, page 260-346-1.

And you produced a table not only showing the progress of application by KMB, Citybus, and NWFB, New World First Bus. You also produced a letter dated 28 June 2017 in which you highlighted the problems in relation to Chai Wan East bus terminal and Sham Shui Po So Uk Estate bus terminal.

Can I ask about this.

I note in particular that some of the applications have been dated back for a number of years. Perhaps if I can quote an example, it is 30 May 2016 at Lai Kok at page 260-346-4. At Lai Kok:

"TD received KMB's application at 30 May 2016 and has conducted site visit with KMB at the said location on 23 June 2016. As the pavement near the relevant bus

stop is relatively narrow, hence TD's engineer has requested KMB to revise the design of the rest room. KMB has not submitted the revised design to TD up till now."

Is that the most up-to-date progress, or rather has no progress been made since June 2016?

MR LAU KAI HIM: As we understand, on setting up of rest lounges, the KMB has been very active in the past two years. At a lot of terminals they have been installed. They may not be of sufficient size, but at least there is a space for bus captains to take a rest.

For the example you mentioned, we are not sure about the progress, but there are some other examples such as Tsing Yi pier, a rest lounge has been installed, and it is now in use. So in terms of this, KMB is fairing better than Citybus or New World First Bus. At least there is a small rest lounge. The space may not be sufficient but there is a lounge for bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Can you give us an example, or, if we have to do a site visit off some of the locations in which the resting facilities are grossly inadequate, which location would you suggest?

MR LAM KAM PIU: I suggest Quarry Bay terminus of New World First Bus. There is no resting facility at all for

drivers. And we have been striving for one for over 10 years.

All along, the Transport Department has been telling us that there is opposition from the local community and there is also dawdling by the Lands Department. So far, we still haven't got any resting facility. Well, the company has in fact given us an update -- it has been 10 years. We proposed the location for the resting lounge, and then we went back and forth, and ultimately they reverted to the original proposal floated by the union regarding location. It took us 10 years. And we have made a little progress so far, and it is said that the proposal will be discussed by the district council, and various government departments will also be consulted.

But we have no idea how much longer we should wait.

Mr Lau would also like to supplement.

MR LAU KAI HIM: The question with rest lounge is that the bus company will have to apply with the TD, the TD will need to approve the application, a lot of government departments will be involved, such as the Lands Department, the FEHD, Police, and Home Affairs Department, they will all have to consulted.

So a resting lounge would have to go through years of application and vetting procedures.

And there may be divergent comments from different government departments.

For the Quarry Bay example, it has taken us more than 10 years with little progress because of divergent views from different government departments. Some government departments might reject the application.

So this is a clear example that we are in such a bad situation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did the company do anything about this, like extending the rest time so that the bus drivers can go to the washroom, or go to all these resting facilities, by making certain adjustments on the time, did the bus company do something like that?

MR LAM KAM PIU: On this issue we reflected that to the bus companies because of the long journey time, there is not enough time for bus drivers to rest, and the bus companies said that they would look into the matter, but so far we haven't heard from them whether actually when we arrive at the destination there would be sufficient time for us to rest.

Because of the road condition, and traffic, by the time the driver reaches the destination he would need to drive again. So the first thing a bus captain does is to go to toilet, to answer nature's call, even if the next departure is a bit late. We have reflected this to

the company. So far we have not heard that there is any action.

Mr Hui would like to supplement.

MR HUI HOU KIT: I want to supplement that for facilities at the terminus there are two examples regarding Citybus that I would like to highlight. One is Chi Fu Fa Yuen in Southern district. Ever since Citybus started its operation there has never been any rest lounge, because the Owners' Corporation refuses to allow bus company to install a rest lounge.

We asked the TD to discuss with the Owners' Corporation. But the OC's position remains.

The second example is the bus terminus at Asia World Expo, near the airport.

The airport has been commissioned for so many years. For Asia World Expo it is temporary. Everything is temporary, including the toilet, and the facility has remained temporary for over 10 years.

I don't understand what kind of coordination this government has regarding facilities at a bus terminus. And there is no coordination to speak of among government departments.

When a bus company runs a route we need facilities. There is no coordination. A few years ago, we talked to the Transport Department, if there is a site, if there

is development, and if the TD is going to set up a PTI, public transport interchange, then the TD should inform us in advance how many routes would use the PTI, so that we can give them comments on the facilities to be provided. We mentioned it several years ago, but according to the Transport Department planning matters are not under their purview.

It is actually under other departments such as the Planning Department, the Lands Department, or the LCSD.

So we can see the total lack of coordination among government departments to facilitate the setting up of any facility.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, I have a question for you, because you are the representative from the branch involving KMB.

KMB runs special or split shifts and have done so for many years, do they not?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: That's true.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong was asking for examples of termini where the resting facilities are grossly inadequate. Are there such facilities that you can identify now, today, such that this Committee might go and visit the facilities, where drivers on these special shifts begin their three or more hours break but the facilities are inadequate. Can you give us places to visit?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: On the part of KMB, for special shift,

they will drive the buses back to the depot for the first -- after the first half of the shift. And then they will go out to have a meal, and to go to some other places to take a rest. So that's how the operation is like.

It is very seldom that the buses stay at the bus terminus after the first half of the shift. Maybe a few of the bus drivers will end the first half of their shift at the bus terminus, and then they will go back to the bus terminus to begin the second half of their shift.

There are a few people doing that. Well, there would be even less break time for these bus captains. They may travel to some of the places to take a rest, and take a meal, and then they have to travel back to the bus terminus to take on the second half of the shift. They lack rest time more than the others.

CHAIRMAN: So the facilities that I was asking you about, if a bus captain comes to the end of the first half of the shift, and he now has a three-hour break, and he is at a bus terminus, are there places where there are simply insufficient facilities to have a rest at that bus terminus? Has he got to go somewhere else?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: That's correct. Say, for example, in Tsuen Wan, the Allway Garden. In Tsuen Wan, you can

take a look at the facility in that garden.

CHAIRMAN: Do you recommend that as a place we could look at to see to find inadequate facilities for bus drivers who are finishing the first half of their split shift?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Anywhere else?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: No further supplement.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you would have been present when we asked the Motor Transport Workers General Union to read a document. I see they are now sitting at the back of the hall. They have been here all day, so I'm going to ask if you would permit us to interrupt the proceedings, where we are asking you questions, so they can finish their business.

So we will take a short break and they will swap places with you, if that's agreeable to you.

Thank you.

(5.04 pm)

(A short break)

(5.12 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES FROM MOTOR TRANSPORT WORKERS GENERAL UNION. MR CHAN KWONG NUNG, MR LAI SIU CHUNG, MR LAM TIN FU, MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI, MR LAU SIN TAT, MR LAM PO KEUNG

(Evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation) (continued)

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, can you remind me of the reference to the LegCo briefing paper.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's at TD-1 bundle at page 403.

The Chinese is at 416.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, have you had an opportunity to read this LegCo briefing document for the transport panel of LegCo?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, we have just read through the paper. We have some initial views here.

For paragraph 4(a), the electronic stability system, we don't suggest that it be installed. It is the electronic stability control system. We have query on the system, and we are worried that when there is a harsh braking there will be the blocking of the steering wheel and as a result the bus will get out of control.

And for 4(b) --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on. Let's just establish some basic material.

Were your views ever sought by the working group that dealt with this matter?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, the transport panel of the LegCo has not consulted us, and we have asked many times that our representatives be appointed to the working group. And then the TD has not consulted us on this.

We can only speak based on our working experience.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Well, please proceed to address the items you wish to address in this briefing paper where the recommendations are made.

You query the use of the electronic stability control. What about the other matters?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Thank you, Chairman.

4(b). On paper, as we see it, it is feasible, because it will limit the speed at 70 kilometres, whether uphill or downhill, and this will help us in our work, because for bus captains driving along Tuen Mun Highway, very often because of the unlevel terrain, they would exceed the speed limit, and sometimes be subject to disciplinary sanction.

So if there is a speed delimiter, we find this feasible as it would prevent the bus from travelling at speed downhill.

6(a), bus monitoring and control system.

We don't support it, because this is equivalent to the bus being controlled by the central system. For the speed limit on the road, if it suddenly changes to, say, 50 kilometres, then the bus will change the speed likewise, and for the vehicles that follow the bus, they won't understand why all of a sudden the speed of the

bus will change, and accidents would easily occur, and we do have some concerns that it may be prone to accidents. So we don't recommend this.

CHAIRMAN: Just to interrupt you there. One reason they might understand why the bus has slowed down is because the speed limit has changed, and the bus is obeying the speed limit. Why should that puzzle the driver behind?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Well, I think it is a matter of driving habit. Say, if we are travelling at 70, and if we reach a 50 kilometres speed limit zone, we will gradually decelerate by slowly lifting the gas pedal.

But according to the system, it is going to decelerate quite rapidly so that vehicles coming from behind may not understand, because of the normal driving habit of buses, and that the vehicle that follows may ram into the bus. That's our concern.

CHAIRMAN: Where do you discern the fact that the deceleration is going to happen rapidly, or quite rapidly? Where do you see that?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Let's say if we are to decelerate, we would say, step on the brake and there would be a brake light informing the vehicle that follows. But now, we make use of this system with GPS, and once a bus reaches the location, deceleration would take place automatically. If there is no preceding vehicle, the

vehicle that follows may not expect the bus to lower the speed rapidly from 70 to 50. And we are concerned that this may bring a safety hazard.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: 6(b), we don't recommend this.

Because the collision alert system and lane keeping device, I mean for drivers who have driven vehicles with these devices, it is really a nuisance, whenever there is an obstacle, the device would beep. Hong Kong is a small place with narrow roads, very often you may have objects on the road, on the side, that may not really affect the vehicle but the vehicle will -- the alert system will still go off causing a great nuisance to bus captains. So we don't recommend this.

CHAIRMAN: All that was being recommended was that there be a trial.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: I think the bus captain of Citybus who drove the bus before can answer this.

MR LAU SIN TAT: I don't remember, two or three years ago, the Citybus put this system to trial. This so-called magic eye system, and during the trial it was all right when the bus was travelling on a highway, but in city traffic the device kept beeping whenever there were people or objects around, and it was a great nuisance.

CHAIRMAN: We received evidence from Mr Alok Jain, a former

employee of KMB, and also from Julian Kwong, to this effect, that one should be alert to the fact that technology that doesn't work very well at one time period may have improved in a few years time, and perhaps this is all that is being addressed; in other words, there have been refinements to the technology.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Chairman, well, currently, for drivers who used this system before, they found it to be not really appropriate, the system is flawed. So in future, if there is improvement to the system, we will consider afresh making recommendations for installing these devices.

We are practitioners, so we can only give you feedback on practical problems we encountered at work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We are asking you for feedback. You have not been asked before, have you?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: That's true, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with the other devices.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: 6(c), driver monitoring device. We believe it is feasible because this directly detects whether the bus captain is dozing off. And I can say quite boldly that dozing off is really the enemy of bus captains.

Sometimes a bus captain may close his eyes for just

two or three seconds and he may lose his life. So with this device the bus captain can stay alert and it would be good for drivers on the road, for the bus captain himself as well as passengers. It is a safety measure. So we find this feasible.

However, some colleagues tried this device as well, and agreed that improvement is needed. Say, if the bus captain wears a pair of reflective sunglasses, then the device will not function properly. The device will believe that the driver is dozing off.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Thank you, Chairman.

Regarding installation of seat belts on passenger seats, we don't recommend the installation, because first of all, we have standing passengers, not all of them are seated. We are not a coach. For double-deckers, after installing seat belts, during an accident, I believe it would be quite chaotic. Let's say if a fire breaks out, it would be difficult for passengers to escape. It would be very difficult for somebody to take off the seat belt during an emergency.

We don't find this very feasible. Unless we are talking about certain front row seats or the middle seat of the back row, more hazardous seats, where seat belts should be installed. Otherwise, we don't recommend

installing seat belts for all.

Training for franchised bus captains. We believe that training should be enhanced. We should revert to the 1998 level. It took about a month to train a bus captain back then. There should be more on-the-road training, so that the bus captain would feel confident when he starts to drive on the road, instead of just having behind-the-wheel road training. We don't really recommend this, we don't think it is feasible, we think that there should be an academy for training bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: And who should operate this academy?

MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI: Thank you, Chairman.

An academy, well, it should be operated by a school, a bus company, with the assistance of the Transport Department.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, are there any questions that you wish to put arising from that evidence?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, thank you very much for the long day that you have spent here assisting us with your evidence. And we thank you for attending.

You are now free to go. We have the other gentlemen from the other union to return now, so we will take

another short break, couple of minutes, and invite you to withdraw. Thank you very much.

(5.28 pm)

(A short break)

(5.35 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS: MR HO YUI CHEONG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG

(Evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation) (continued)

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, thank you for your patience.

We have been able to deal with your colleagues in the other union, and we can resume now with some of the material left to be dealt with by your union.

But as I understand it, the Secretariat have spoken to you about adjourning these proceedings for you to come back on Wednesday, 1 August, in the afternoon. In those circumstances, I will ask Ms Wong to deal with some of the matters in relation to the LegCo briefing paper, which is what she was dealing with, before we adjourn, and then the remaining questions we would ask her to pose to you Wednesday, if that is agreeable to you?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, gentlemen.

Before you is a briefing paper by the LegCo prepared for the LegCo discussion, and it was a briefing paper prepared by the Transport Department for the enhancement of safety of franchised buses recently discussed in the LegCo on 25 July 2018.

The paper starts in English at page 403 and in Chinese, 416.

It provides a number of topics. The first topic is on retrofitting seat belts. The second topic is on the training of bus captains, which is at paragraphs 18 to 22. The third topic is on the safety technological device, the new technology device in relation to the franchised buses.

Was a copy of this paper ever given to your union to consider and comment on?

MR LAM KAM PIU: No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We understand this paper is discussed amongst three franchised bus companies, and the Transport Department, and it was to investigate the training and all the safety equipment that they proposed in this paper.

Have you --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, I think it more accurate to say this, that this paper appears to be the end result of discussions that took place between the Transport

Department, the three bus manufacturers, and the franchised bus operators. And this was a group that was convened in the middle of March, and reached these recommendations in this paper in late July.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you had a chance to read and digest this paper during the break?

MR LAM KAM PIU: We have read through the paper. And we have an initial understanding of the issues discussed in the paper.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Maybe we deal with the first topic on the safety devices at paragraph 4(a). It relates to the electronic stability control system.

Would your union support the use of this device?

MR LAM KAM PIU: We support.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what about the second one on retarder for capping the maximum speed of the speed limiters on downhill?

MR LAM KAM PIU: We also support.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go to 6(a), in relation to the bus monitoring and control system, giving or maximising the black box capability to provide real-time fleet supervision, bus speed recording and GPS location recording, et cetera.

MR LAM KAM PIU: We also support it. It is already being

used now.

CHAIRMAN: Who is using it? Which company is using it?

MR LAM KAM PIU: New World First Bus and Citybus are already using this system.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: The same for KMB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about 6(b), collision alert and lane keeping devices?

MR LAM KAM PIU: This issue, we support installation. During the trial the colleagues resented it, because whenever a minor problem surfaced and there would be the beeping sound, and bus captains are under certain pressure emotionally. This device is good, but we hope that it can be improved.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Is that the test conducted by Mobileye --

CHAIRMAN: I think the test was conducted by Citybus and the device is Mobileye?

MS MAGGIE WONG: A device by Mobileye?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Well, the Citybus and the New World First Bus conducted the trial, but in fact it was not that good.

To our understanding, the company said it will improve on the device. So we will see how the improvement goes, and whether there will be an improvement in the effect.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Because I believe the test was conducted back in 2014, so the technology would have moved on.

And what about 6(c), the driver monitoring device to detect drowsiness?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: In principle, we agree to this; but the question is if the devices are used to monitor the drivers, whether they are dozing off, and they are showing fatigue, I think you are putting the cart before the horse here. Rather we should give more rest time to the bus captains. That should be the best way.

There should not be any driving fatigue -- that matters most. But then the device can be installed.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Lau has something to add.

MR LAU KAI HIM: We should avoid driving fatigue, giving rise to accidents. We should not have devices monitoring the bus captains to make sure that they do not doze off. Well, the drivers should work in a healthy environment, and they should not work for long hours leading to driving fatigue.

We would like to put forward recommendations to prevent accidents. We should not be making proposals only after accidents have happened. I think you are putting the cart before the horse by installing such a device. You are trying to shy away from the problem of driving fatigue. Like air pilots, the airline

operators would be allowing sufficient rest hours for the pilots. Well, air flight is different from bus trip, but I think the consequences of bad driving will be the same.

So I think you are putting the cart before the horse by having this device to monitor the driver's performance making sure that they are not dozing off.

CHAIRMAN: But you agree in principle that there should be trials of this device?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about retrofitting seat belts for all seats in future on buses?

MR LAM KAM PIU: We support the retrofitting of seat belts. I think it is the responsibility of the Transport Department. It should not be the responsibility of the bus companies. It should be the full responsibility of the Transport Department, because the Transport Department knows best.

CHAIRMAN: When you say responsibility, do you mean that they should pay for it?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Well, it is about the law.

CHAIRMAN: I see. So it is their responsibility to arrange with government that the legislation be changed and then also arrange that it should be enforced? They should be fitted, people should be required to wear them, and that

law should be enforced; is that what you mean by responsibility?

MR LAM KAM PIU: That's right.

Mr Lau would like to supplement.

MR LAU KAI HIM: About installing seat belts, of course the purpose is to ensure passenger safety. I think this is beyond any dispute. But we may have installed seat belts and the passengers may not wear them.

So you need enact legislation to require passengers to wear a seat belt. This is the most important point.

For minibuses we see this example. Years ago seat belts have been installed and the legislation was changed to require passengers to wear seat belts, but then for passengers not wearing seat belts no prosecution was taken out. So we need to require passengers to wear seat belts to minimise the injuries when there is an accident.

More importantly, we need to remind passengers to wear seat belts, otherwise it will be close to no protection for passengers. Even if seat belts are installed, very often during bus accidents passengers got thrown out of the bus compartment because passengers sitting on the front row didn't wear a seat belt.

CHAIRMAN: And that resulted in changes. The metal bar on the upper deck at the front and seat belts in those

exposed seats?

MR LAU KAI HIM: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about training for franchised bus captains in paragraphs 18 to 22?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Hui can take this question.

MR HUI HOU KIT: Chairman, regarding training, two days ago I attended a two-day class and my company, Citybus, has included the element of emotional management.

For other companies, they all along have this element. But for this part, the company has engaged a non-professional to teach this course, and to my knowledge I don't think this is professional, and I think there is room for improvement.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Lau would like to supplement.

MR LAU KAI HIM: In our supplementary submission we quoted the Singapore example. In November 2016, Singapore set up an academy for training bus captains and they have really comprehensive courses, including maintenance, repair service, quality, et cetera. And they also mandate bus captains to undertake this course before they get a licence.

So in our neighbouring city we have the training courses for bus captains, and there is a need to have emotional management and other elements. I think we are lagging behind, but it is better than nothing.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Hui, you spoke about the course not being conducted by a professional. What kind of professional did you have in mind for an emotional management course?

MR HUI HOU KIT: To my knowledge, he should be somebody from the social worker profession or a psychologist.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Well, Ms Wong, if that's not inconvenient, that's probably enough for today.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, thank you for attending today, and thank you for agreeing to return on Wednesday.

We look forward to receiving your evidence on Wednesday afternoon. But the proceedings are now adjourned. Thank you.

(5.52 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to 10.00 am on Tuesday, 31 July 2018)

I N D E X

P A G E

REPRESENTATIVES FROM MOTOR TRANSPORT 1
WORKERS GENERAL UNION.
MR CHAN KWONG NUNG, MR LAI SIU CHUNG, MR LAM TIN FU, MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI, MR LAU SIN TAT, MR LAM PO KEUNG

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 1

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE 100

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF 105
BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS:
MR HO YUI CHEONG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 105

REPRESENTATIVES FROM MOTOR TRANSPORT 148
WORKERS GENERAL UNION.
MR CHAN KWONG NUNG, MR LAI SIU CHUNG, MR LAM TIN FU, MR CHEUNG TSZ KEI, MR LAU SIN TAT, MR LAM PO KEUNG
(continued)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF 156
BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS:
MR HO YUI CHEONG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG
(continued)

[Blank Page]

2018年7月30日

上午10時01分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 張子琦先生，汽車交通運輸業總工會第一副主席（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

林天賦先生，汽車交通運輸業總工會第二副主席（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

劉善達先生，城巴分會主任（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

黎兆聰先生，九龍巴士分會主任（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

陳廣能先生，龍運巴士分會主任（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

林寶強先生，新大嶼山巴士分會主任（汽車交通運輸業總工會（包括各分會，即城巴分會、九龍巴士分會、龍運巴士分會、新大嶼山巴士分會及新世界巴士分會）代表）

鍾松輝先生，巴職聯會務顧問，新世界第一巴士公司職工會會長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

劉啟謙先生，巴職聯會務幹事（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

林錦標先生，巴職聯副主席，新世界第一巴士公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

許漢傑先生，巴職聯司庫，城巴有限公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

郭偉光先生，巴職聯秘書，九巴員工協會副理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城

巴有限公司職工會）代表）

何銳昌先生，巴職聯會員，新世界第一巴士公司職工會司庫（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，我哋多謝汽車交通運輸業總工會派出代表嚟到幫助我哋今日係提供口述證供，咁我又多謝呢一個嘅張先生，佢係第一副主席，同埋各位代表。我哋就會由黃律師問你哋問題，黃律師係其中一位協助檢討委員會嘅律師。

如果張先生或者你其中一位代表想回答問嘅回題，咁可以就係出聲，我哋就會話畀你聽係可以回答，黃律師就會可以開始問問題㗎喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒各位，我想先做一個嘅介紹，關於係你哋嘅組織，汽車交通運輸業總工會係喺呢一個嘅 1920 年成立㗎，係咪呀？

林天賦先生：啱嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我哋可以見到，喺一個工會文件 1C，289-15 顯示咗，你哋工會嘅人數--呢個係冇翻譯為英文㗎，不過我就讀出個數目字。

你哋嘅會而家人數係有 29,670 人，其中 11,868 人係專營巴士分會會員，有 10,436 人係任職專營巴士司機嘅，係嗎？

張子琦先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋嘅總會有五個分會，九龍巴士分會、新世界巴士分會、城巴分會、龍運巴士分會同埋新大嶼山巴士分會，係嗎？

張子琦先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我未開始問問題之前，想先請你睇一睇，你哋嘅職權範圍，咁就係呢一個嘅係文件夾 263 頁，咁就係專營巴士嘅職權範圍嚟㗎，咁係翻譯本可以喺運輸署文件夾 1 號第 3 頁。其實就話--呢度寫檢討委員會嘅職權範圍：

第一，就係要檢視呢一個--咁就係從安全角度而言，鑑於發生喺呢一個 2 月 10 號嘅致命意外，同埋近期嚴重事故，審視巴士專營權喺現行法例專營權同其他合約規定下嘅運作同埋管理模式，同埋檢視現行對專營巴士嘅監管同埋監察制度。

最後，就係就上述事宜向行政長官提出同安全有關嘅建議，維持香港嘅專營巴士服務安全可靠。呢個委員會嘅職權範圍，就係要睇安全方面，即係巴士專營權運作安全角度嘅。

我咁樣講，因為我知道，係你嘅意見書裏面講咗好多關於係工作方面㗎，但

係呢一個委員會佢要睇嘅就係，睇番巴士專營權運作管理方面，安全角度嘅事宜，所以希望你明白，我哋問嘅問題都會集中於呢一點嘅。

你哋嘅工會之前係畀咗幾份嘅意見書畀檢討委員會，第一份就係 18 年嘅 4 月 23 號，中文就係文件 1C，277 頁至到就係 289 頁，英文版就係 289-1 至到 289-12。呢一份即係第一份嘅意見書，係就於檢討委員會發畀你哋工會嗰封信㗎，嗰封信日期係 18 年 3 月 28 號，係嗎？

張子琦先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋嘅意見書就提出咗幾個課題㗎，我就想請你先睇一睇啲大部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）未講呢樣嘢之前，張生，如果可以幫助你，其實有一啲係打印本，咁可以喺螢幕上面睇得到。同時，如果你想，亦都可以揭番呢一個嘅文件版本，如果你係需要睇其他部分協助自己嘅話，你就可以問我哋攞嗰個打印本，明白嗎？

張子琦先生：係，明白。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，係，想講一講嗰個頁碼？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）頁碼係 289-14-7。其實我所講嘅就係首十段，就係講關於係即係對呢一個巴士車長一啲不好嘅--一啲唔好嘅對待。

你講過一啲即係話會員裏面親身經歷過好多唔好嘅事㗎，顯示到其實乘客不文明嘅行為，佢哋唔理法例嘅規管，就會係打車長或者鬧車長，呢個就係你意見書第一項有講嘅事宜。

跟住喺你第二點，就係關於改善運作安全，有關於專營巴士方面，係第十一段，頁數就係英文 289-14-9，中文就係 285 頁嘅。

呢啲嘅改善建議基本上就係分三方面：

首先，你就要求交通燈應該要有呢一個嘅倒計器或者閃動裝置；

第二，你就要求增劃黃格，同埋就係希望呢一個巴士可以停喺巴士區，同埋有關於呢一個巴士站方面嘅；

第三方面，你嘅建議書就講話工作環境，第十五段，係工會文件 1C 號，第十五段，289-14-0（原文照錄），中文就係 287 頁，英文就係 289-10。

你嗰度就其實就講咗係三方面：

第一，就係休息時間，設施同埋訓練，呢三樣嘢我會進一步再問你問題嘅；

第二份嘅意見書就係回應委員會寄畀你嘅信，係 18 年 6 月--8 月 8 號同埋 17 號（原文照錄）寄畀你，你回應嘅文件嘅意見書日期係 18 年 7 月 10 號，英文版就係 289-16 至到 23 頁嘅，呢個係第二份嘅意見書。

英文都係喺 1C 號嘅文件，289-23-1 至到 289-23-10，喺呢份意見書裏面，你喺第二段就話，你搜集咗五間專營巴士分會嘅負責人，成立專責工作小組，廣泛收集幹事、工作人員同埋會員工友嘅意見，你可以喺 289-16 見到，另外就英文 289-23-1。喺呢份意見書裏面，你亦都大量講咗有關於係巴士車長被乘客暴力襲擊嘅問題，列出咗一系列嘅個案，呢個就係第二份意見書嘅；

同時，你亦都做咗第三份嘅意見書，但係未講之前，我就先講咗話巴士車長被乘客襲擊嘅問題，呢一部分喺你第一同第二份意見書已經有深入講過。

張生，我相信喺兩份嘅意見書裏面，你提及過投訴被襲擊係工會、巴士公司已經係多年投訴嘅問題嘞，你亦都列出咗幾個嘅事項，幾個個案係 2016 年、2017 年同埋 2018 年發生嘅。

我就想同你再講，因為你就列出咗九個襲擊個案，就係呢一個 2016 年 1 月 3 號至到 18 年 4 月 29 號發生㗎，中文就係 289-16 至到係 17 頁，英文版就係 289-26-2（原文照錄）。

呢個--呢次嘅襲擊事--呢啲嘅襲擊事件係喺唔同地方發生，屯門市、大圍美林邨巴士總站、東區醫院、海怡半島、機場地面運作中心、青山公路巴--咖啡灣巴士站、逸東巴士站、旺角鐵路站同埋呢一個嘅係青馬收費廣場。

每一個個案你都講咗話，係每一位巴士車長都係受傷同埋要放病假。你可唔可以確認呢啲嘅個案係有向你哋工會報告，係要求你哋協助嘅，就係幫你哋同警方同埋係相關嘅巴士公司嚟到係聯絡㗎？

張子琦先生：我哋係--我哋列舉呢九個個案，其實喺嗰個意見書入面都清楚寫咗，呢九個會員佢哋係透過我哋嘅--向我哋工作人員求助，然之後向工聯嘅職安健協會申請經濟援助，所以我哋掌握佢嘅情況。

但係喺意見書入面，我哋講得好清楚，因為有啲會員工友畀人打咗，其實報紙上面都好多，佢哋就冇工會求助，因為事後我哋唔知道究竟呢啲係咪我哋會員；

第二，我哋唔知道係邊度發生，所以我哋冇工作人員向佢哋提出幫手，所以我哋所掌握嗰九個個案係因為佢哋嚴重受傷，要放比較長嘅病假，而經濟上面又出現困難嘅人嘅會員，佢先至--我先至向工聯嘅職安健協會攞番啲資料先知道嘅啫。其他其實我哋喺之後嘅文件入面都補充咗好多喺報紙傳媒報道嘅個案，大家都可以睇到。

其實我哋可--想可以講一個個案，就喺石澳九號巴士，有一個司機畀嗰個乘客打咗好似三分鐘定五分鐘，報紙都賣晒，但係呢個人冇向我哋求助，所以我哋都唔可能知道佢實際嘅情況。

我補充咁多。

黎兆聰先生：我想補充下，我哋掌握嘅數字係有嘅，我哋有我哋李講師（？）。不過呢個係冰山一角九個，但係被打嘅車長係日益嚴重。就係近呢兩年來，我相信平均一個月起碼有幾單呢啲畀人打嘅車長嘅事件發生，我哋係有掌握嘅，不過只係暴力係開始日益增多。所以巴士--我哋有建議過巴士公司設立一啲保護嘅裝置，嗰個保護嘅膜可以保護到我哋嘅前線車長，但係有待改善，呢個係一路都有發生，唔係淨係九個，係呢兩年來日益嚴重。

同埋我可以同主席講，而家乘客係橫蠻無理，用手機挑釁啲車長，打啲車長，同埋有一個 230A 嘅運輸署一個條例保護車長嘅，從來冇執行過，亦都冇一個成功個案告一個打車長嘅乘客。我係講到咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，你繼續之前，如果話畀你聽，我哋收到一啲嘅資料，就係呢個九龍巴士工會，就係話佢哋所收到嘅資料，2015 年至到 2018，即係巴士車長受襲嘅一啲資料，大概係有四十個嘅投訴嘅，你知唔知呢啲資料喺我哋嘅網頁上係搵到嘅呢？

黎兆聰先生：我可以講畀你聽，呢兩年來係日益嚴重，四十單係唔止嘅，每個月都發生，同埋公司一年來先至開始有個法務部，有啲律師去支援下我哋車長，之前嗰啲向我哋求助嗰啲，我哋係有協助，嗄，但係四十單，主席，呢個數字唔正確㗎，每個月起碼閒閒地都十單、八單，咁你同我計兩年來，起碼都二、三百單喇，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝，可能你誤解咗我嘅意思，四十宗嘅投訴喺今年嗰六、七個月裏面係四十宗，係嚟自一間巴士公司嘅啫。

黎兆聰先生：但係我覺得呢個數字唔可靠。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁或者你可以畀我一啲可靠嘅數字，但係咁之前，呢度正話所講過九個個案就係 2016 年年頭開始至 2018 年 4 月，係咪呀？

黎兆聰：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以幫我哋講下，巴士公司，即係涉及呢九宗嘅受害人，佢哋係同--服務喺乜嘢巴士公司㗎？

林天賦先生：呢個我哋法規可以搵番啲資料，但係大部分所知道係九巴為多，九巴公司為多。

我補充到呢度，大部分嘅我哋所知嘅資料都係九巴公司為多，但係具體嘅情況，真係要睇番佢哋嘅紀錄，但係有部分嘅司機就喺個紀錄入面就冇寫自己巴士

公司嘅，因為我哋實際嘅嗰個表格入面，只係填佢嚟自邊間工會為多，冇填到佢係任職邊間巴士公司。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該，黃女士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席之前就講到一張嘅清單，係由呢一個九巴講嘅，就係佢哋一啲嘅車長，由2015年1月至到2018年係7月22號嘅一啲個案，喺九巴一，就係第212頁嘅，呢啲資料。

張子琦先生：黃律師，主席，可唔可以我要一份你嗰個中文嘅提案？因為我哋有啲提上嚟嗰啲議題...

主席：（經傳譯員）可以嘅，而家可以畀你嘅。

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）可能淨係得英文版本。

黎兆聰先生： Because we cannot see anything in front of us.

主席：（經傳譯員）可以畀你嘅。

黎兆聰先生：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能你有一個打印出嚟嘅版本會好--容易啲。慢慢喇，你慢慢用啲時間消化下呢一個嘅表達方式。第幾頁？係嘞，可能將佢咁樣嚟到係投影出嚟好啲。可唔可以去睇一睇2018年？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係216頁，就係喺呢個九巴一第216頁嗰一份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）你而家準備好未，準備好回答問題未？

張子琦先生：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你睇下KMB-1嗰份文件，喺216頁，148開始，第148項開始到到188，就係九巴嚟到係製備嘅資料，2018年1月開始，去到2018年嘅7月22號，呢個淨係九巴畀--提供嘅數字。

黎兆聰先生：我哋收到有啲資料，有啲同事畀人哋推撞，或者打咗，係冇報畀公司聽嘅，呢個數字佢報畀你，可能係如實報畀你，但係我哋收到有啲個案，啲同事怕事，係冇報㗎，係冇報畀公司啲--所以我就講話，佢個數字可能唔準確，因為有時啲同事係怕事，會同工會啲工作人員講，我哋之後會同公司講，咁佢冇一個紀錄係好正常，好嗎？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，咁如果你有收到咩嘢投訴，你可以交畀我哋，即係如果巴士公司係冇收到，而你收到，可以提供番畀我哋。

黎兆聰先生：主席，舉例，早上個星期，我哋有個站長新入職冇幾耐，畀個印巴籍嘅

人士打咗一拳，跟住掌咗佢落地下，佢冇報喫，佢同我講咗嘅，但係我都冇--我都係了解咗，同公司講咗嘅，咁可能都係寫份報告番去，唔知會唔會--如果我咁大間公司，成日要同主席講，主席你都幾麻煩，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）黎先生，我哋係要有證據先至可以行事，除非你提供證據畀我哋，如果淨係一啲嘅指稱，就幫唔到我哋嘅，如果你可以畀一啲投訴係冇報畀公司知，你知嘅請你畀我哋。

黎兆聰先生： Okay, thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你睇下呢張清單，我自己數過，大概有四十一次嘅事件。但係我哋睇到，好少嘅個案係最終係有檢控嘅，或者啲比較有意思嘅一啲結果、後果。162、164 呢兩個個案，就係最後就係被告認罪，被罰款。有四十一宗嘅個案，大部分都係和解，或者只係口頭警告，或者警方係唔追究。

如果我將呢張嘅清單就對比一下正話所提到嘅一啲嘅個案，即係你講到有九宗嘅襲擊個案，我就係嗰度搵到五宗：

第一宗，係你嘅個案第二，第 289-16 頁，呢個係關乎一位何（譯音）先生喺 2016 年 3 月 26 號，喺大圍美林邨，呢個就係喺呢一張清單嘅第 62 號嘅個案，就係九巴所提供嘅，喺第 214 頁，第 62 號嘅個案。

張子琦先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該，我未講第二樣之前，其實仲有另外一宗，就喺呢個表上面冇列出嚟嘅，不過有個通知，話發生咗事故，就係 16 年嘅 5 月 16 號，關於一次襲擊，喺 289-114 頁，英文版就係 289-23-2。

可以見到有另外一次嘅事件嘅，就係呢個 16 年嘅 5 月 16 號，喺呢個表上面搵唔到，但係就我哋知道你哋嘅工會發出咗一個通告。請睇番嗰個表，呢個就話係即係其中一個個案，係冇喺九巴嘅清單上面，但係喺你自己嗰個嗰度，我哋都搵唔到喎。

黎兆聰先生：姓何嗰個 case 一樣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）哦，同姓何嗰個一樣，唔該。

第二宗，就係第五宗，喺你嘅清單上面嘅，就係 289-17，第五個個案，呢個係你清單上面嘅第五宗個案，有關於一名姚（譯音）生，係喺 8 月 8 號 2016 年嘅時候被襲。

我哋可以見到，呢一宗嘅個案喺九巴清單上面 214 頁就搵得到嘅，呢個係--呢個個案嘅宗數係 82 號。可以見到，一位姚生佢係車長，係巴士司機嚟嘅，8 月 8 號，龍運公司就喺機場總站，同埋佢受咗咩嘢傷。

第三宗，喺你嘅清單上面就係第 8 號，289-17，有關於一位李（譯音）先

生喺 2017 年嘅 1 月 9 號被襲，旺角鐵路站，佢就係隻眼受傷，額頭亦都受傷，呢件嘅個案喺九巴清單上面都可以搵到，215 頁就係第 113 宗，可唔可以確認一下係咪呀？

黎兆聰先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外一個例子就喺清單上面，但係就唔係你嘅清單，但係喺九巴嘅清單上面可以搵到㗎，係 122 宗，日期就係呢一個嘅係 2017 年嘅 6 月 4 號，喺長宏總站，呢宗個案就係和解咗，喺呢一個九巴清單上面，215 頁可以搵到。

另外一宗，喺你嘅意見書裏面，就係第九宗嘅個案，就係 289-17，一位楊（譯音）生，就喺 2018 年 4 月 29 號被襲，喺青馬收費廣場，呢件嘅個案可以喺九巴清單搵到，就係第 170 宗，就 217 頁。可唔可以確認一下係咪呀？二百一十--係呢個第 170 宗？

張子琦先生：係㗎，呢單個案受傷嘅車長係向我求助嘅，亦都當時佢都提出啲問題，點解青馬收費嗰啲管理人員放走咗呢個襲擊者，因為當時呢個襲擊者係強行自己落咗車之後，係自己步去--步入去嗰個轉車站，乘車而去嘅，而嗰啲青馬管理人員係完全冇幫助過呢個車長，協助過呢個車長。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可以睇番，呢四十一宗就係有向警方報案嘅，呢個由最右手邊可以見到一啲嘅備註，有時就話警方係即係叫佢哋和解，有啲就話警方冇再係跟進，你嘅意見者 289-17 頁上面有講過，英文版就係 289-23-3，係喺底部。

黎兆聰先生：主席，可以睇到咁多個個案，冇可能我哋車長自願和解，你畀人打，會唔會自願和解？你睇下個執法嗰個不力，咁多單都係得幾宗執法，有冇可能一個車長畀人打，唔執法㗎？和解真係啼笑皆非，好唔好？

呢樣嘢我希望--我哋工會收到好多個案，我哋啲前線車長成日就講警方唔執法，冇可能我哋畀人打咗會和解嘅，我哋啲專業車長亦都唔會挑釁乘客，冇可能，你睇下我--我一睇到咁多單，都係--可能四十單，可能幾單先至會畀人哋可以告得入，有冇可能呢個問題衍生到出嚟，希望主席你可以--一睇個表就已經睇到，咁多單都有受傷，表面傷痕，點會和解呢？係咪？

冇去--即係冇去執法，個 230A 冇執法，咁多單都係幾單先至話成功告入，我哋嘅車長同我哋工會反映過無數次，畀人打咗就要和解，呢個係執法不力，好唔好？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你話呢啲嘅事項已經係提出過好多次嘞，其中一個例子可以係同--係喺同運輸署會面嘅時候，其中一次嘅會議紀錄上面可以見到，係 17 年嘅 3 月 22 號，頁數係中文 289-61 頁，就係呢個底部第二段，英文版就係 289-182。

喺第二段裏面，你提及過話襲擊車長同埋呢一個嘅係言語去鬧車長，同埋影車長--拍攝車長，你就要求署方執法，要跟番有關嘅法例係執法，呢個係其中一個例子。

講番你嘅意見書，你係好清楚指出其他受傷或者襲擊嘅個案係冇向你哋工會係反映到，喺呢一個嘅意見書上面冇收集到嘅，係，可以喺中文版 289-18 頁第二段見到，英文就係 289-23-3。

喺第二段裏面，你提及喺以前，有啲人見到發生事件，會出嚟幫助車長，但係有時可能因為會對涉及嘅人士被控公共地方打鬥，所以令到好多人係唔肯向遇事司機伸出援手。

你提及一個 15 年 7 月 10 號發生嘅一件事，就係一個同颱風有關嘅，令到係即係有啲乘客有暴力行為。你可唔可以講下，你可以點樣幫車長？而點解你會係覺得即係有啲--某啲原因，令到你唔可以幫車長手？

黎兆聰先生：我呢個個案我好有印象，就係因為可能呢個颱風去到八點半冇車，即係會收車㗎嘞，咁可能乘客焦急，言語之間就對呢個車長暴力襲擊，咁亦都之後都捉到呢個人嘅。

林天賦先生：呢件事，我哋工會嘅睇法係咁樣，警察對於呢啲襲擊者，如果係因為所有涉及嘅人士，即係如果我哋嘅會員工友幫呢啲同事，即係佢其他車長阻止呢啲乘客襲擊呢啲車長嘅話，我哋工會--因為我呢度冇資料，但係我哋好多嘅會員工友都話，因為警察將所有涉及呢件個案嘅人都會落案，如果係真係要追究嘅話，變咗係所有人都變咗係喺公眾地方打鬥，即係幫手嗰啲會員工友都係要去到警署，都係畀人落案，畀人告嘅。

所以好多人慢慢地就變咗佢哋唔知道--即係見到其他嘅同事畀人打，其他車長畀人打嗰時，佢哋就唔敢出手去幫手。呢個風氣其實呢幾年都比較嚴重。

張子琦先生：同埋我想補充一下，嗰個言語、嗰個攝影，對住個車長，係一啲用啲暴力嘅言語都係影響到個車長嘅情緒，係會直接影響到嗰個駕駛嘅安全，所以呢個係對公眾嗰個利益係直接受影響，所以應該係要制止呢啲行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講一講，呢一次襲擊事件嘅詳情喺邊度發生，喺巴士上面定係喺巴士嘅即係總站、車廠嗰度發生㗎？

黎兆聰先生：喺個巴士站，未開車嗰度，開始襲擊車長，因為當其時可能大家焦急，當八號風球正式懸掛，我哋公司有個慣例會通知乘客八點半冇車，當其時以我了解，應該係乘客睇到車長上車，但係個車長要收工㗎嘞，咁就襲擊佢咁嘅情況，就喺巴士站嘅外圍襲擊佢。

當其時有啲車長唔夠膽幫手，就係因為之前有啲暴力事件，係幫手嗰啲都告埋公共場所行為不檢，所以呢個問題係喺呢件事衍生出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰次襲擊係發生喺巴士上面定係巴士嘅外面？

黎兆聰：巴士站休--站長室外面。明唔明白呀，主席？

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家明白嘞，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你進一步嘅意見書，呢個 18 年嘅 7 月 10 號，中文就係 289-18，英文就係 289-23-3 至到 289-23-4。

喺第一段嗰度，你就強調話之前提及過一個問題，就係話你從網上收集到一啲資料，就係其他嘅資料，係關於車長被滋擾，即係被乘客滋擾，同埋不合理嘅對待，你亦都係將有關嘅報道，即係從網上攞嚟嘅資料就係話乘客點樣滋擾巴士司機，你係提供㗎。

呢啲嘅文件喺第 289-24 至到 289-30 呢啲嘅中文嘅文件度搵到，亦都有一啲照片，喺英文就係 289-141 至到 289-146 呢幾頁。

你就係喺第二段你嘅文件第二段就係提出呢個問題，跟住第三段就係話有啲嘅投訴，就話冇聽個執法人員對呢啲相關嘅人士，根據公共巴士服務規例嚟到起訴佢哋，呢個就係第 230A 章，喺英文就係第 289-23-4 頁，中文就係 289-19 頁，第 289-19 頁。

黎兆聰先生：回應下，佢 230A 章係保護我哋嘅前線車長，多數警員都係勸和解，公司亦都冇表明及支援我哋嘅，所以要求加強檢控呢啲施襲者，同埋加強個罰則，因為 230A 章，我相信冇一個個案成立過話告呢啲施襲者。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係嘞，或者我係引述一下嗰啲嘅規例，等你知道個罰則，喺 THB-2 第 131 頁，文件 THB 第 131 頁。

搵唔搵到？對唔住，淨係得英文版本。但係我哋睇到，喺規例第 13，就係移走--將乘客移走巴士，即係如果係有合理嘅理由相信佢違反咗呢啲嘅規例，就可以將呢個乘客係趕落車。

仲有第 38 條就係話，唔可以有一個嘅--第 132 頁，一個嘅乘客或者係準乘客，就唔可以係有意--故意咁樣嚟到係去遮住呢一個車長嗰個嘅視線，唔可以有意嚟到係喺巴士上面做任何嘢，第二段嗰度，就係引致呢一個嘅受傷，不適，或者係引致任何人嘅不便，第一嗰度，就係唔可以嚟到去影響呢一個巴士司機嗰個嘅工作。

第 25--規例 25(3)，任何人士如果冇合理嘅辯解，係違反呢啲 32A(1)（原文照錄）嘅規例，就係我哋正話啱啱睇過嘅，就係即屬犯法，係有可能被判三千元，同埋係入獄六個月。

呢個就係你所指導嘅情況，就係話冇--喺咁多年嚟，都係冇根據呢啲嘅規例係有檢控，係咪呀？

張子琦先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇下第三段，你哋文件嘅第三段，即係進一步提交嘅文件第三段，喺英文就係第 289-23-5 頁，第三段，中文就喺第 289-19 頁。睇唔睇到？

呢度講到一啲嘅民事索償，就係巴士公司就係代表車長提出民事索償，但係嗰啲嘅結果就係冇公布，所以你就要求得到呢方面嘅資訊，就係關於一啲巴士車長嚟到係提出民事索償嘅資料，咁就係想委員會係向專營巴士公司索取呢方面嘅資料，係咪呀，民事索償嘅資料？

黎兆聰先生：簡單回應，早幾個月，有位女車長畀人施襲，公司係有協助，得到對方賠償五千釐湯藥費同埋自簽守行為，係最近半年前嘅事嘅，應該，係喺藍田地鐵站畀個女乘客施襲，有協助過，要對方賠償。

林天賦先生：但係據我哋所知，巴士公司可能都係個人個協助，對於呢啲個案嘅影--因為影響所有嘅巴士員工，佢又冇喺個公開場合度向員工講述佢哋嘅對於協助呢位車長嘅結果。

而家我哋都睇到，而家，即係有啲九巴同事就講出，有喺嗰個月刊度有提出呢件事，因為我哋可能冇睇到呢個文件，但係都係近年先有嘅啫，即係喺九巴員工嗰個月刊入面有提過呢件事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀嗰個月刊我哋睇？

黎兆聰先生：要喺員工網慢慢啲，不如你同我問一問九巴啲管理層，佢有呢啲成功爭取個案，喺晒每一個月嘅員工嗰個月刊，畀我哋睇點樣幫啲夥記，點樣追討，係有嘅，如果我哋啲唔係啲唔到，不過可能未必咁快搵到，我諗搵九巴管理層攞可能會快啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇到呢啲嘅投訴，我哋不如睇下九巴點樣回應，對呢啲嘅投訴，我請你哋睇 KMB-1 第 61 至到 62 頁，九巴文件。

第 61 至到 62 頁，喺 62 頁，喺最頂嗰度，就話因為越嚟越多嘅襲擊，我哋就係採取咗以下嘅措施，我哋就係睇到有四樣。

第一，就係監察嘅呢一個相機，嗰啲係前置，同埋有一個係可以睇到車長座位，就自從 2015 年，所有嘅新巴士都有呢啲嘅設施，係直至 2018 年 2 月，我哋已經喺 2,319 個九巴嘅巴士同埋 146 架嘅龍運巴士就係裝咗呢啲監察嘅影相機嘅，我哋就係有埋一啲嘅加埋聲音嘅錄影，就係一啲比較麻煩嘅乘客，呢個就係保障到我哋嘅車長，如果警察後來有任何嘅調查，或者係法律程序；

另外我哋會喺呢一個車長座位附近，有一個保護罩，就會由 2018 年 6 月開始安裝；

我哋會有多啲係車上嘅廣播，就係提醒乘客唔好去做任何嘢會影響到車長同

埋其他乘客嘅；

另外我哋第四樣，就係如果巴士車長係受到呢一個襲擊，我哋會有法律支援。

講到呢一個監察嘅攝錄機，我哋喺一次嘅實地考察嘅時候，睇到一啲嘅例子，就係喺嗰個車長座位上面左近，就裝咗呢啲攝錄機，就會係影到車長嗰個行為一樣嘅，有一啲嘅車長就係因為裝咗呢啲監察嘅攝錄機，佢哋都係有一啲嘅意見，你覺得係點？

張子琦先生：近年嚟，九巴公司的而且確係改善咗呢啲嘢，對於乘--襲擊車長，佢哋都有去替個車長去討回公道，都會有律師去跟進。

黎兆聰先生：我想補充，我哋前線車長同埋工會有反映過意見，嗰啲攝錄機係有時幫到車長，但係當有時好輕微嘅嘢，佢只係會話交畀警方，咁嗰個攝錄嘅情況就係我哋啲前線嘅車長有時係幫唔到我哋，有啲問題我哋希望自己裝，但係公司話因為用個人私隱問題。

嗰啲鏡頭係好全面，但係有時我哋啲前線當有啲輕微交通意外，有時要同公司攞，亦都未必攞到呢啲整個發生意外嘅攝錄過程，所以佢啲鏡頭係可以睇到個意外發生，但係可能有時有啲輕微，佢只會交畀執法部門去處理，但係唔會攞嚟畀我哋前線可以提供一個支援。

所以我哋經常同管理層講，嗰啲攝錄鏡頭，有時我哋需要嗰時，未必支援到我哋。

但係公司話嗰啲攝錄嗰啲鏡頭，希望喺出年第二季會裝晒，因為始終三分二嘅車都仲未有呢啲攝錄功能嘅車，同埋唔係全面--全部嘅車都有，因為九巴嘅車隊相信有超過 3,700 至 3,800 嘅車，相信三分二嘅車都仲未有攝錄功能。

張子琦先生：我想補充下，主席，個...

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你未補充之前，我哋呢度個數字就係話有 2,319 直至到 2018 年 2 月，就已經係裝咗嘞，如果只係三千幾，咁你話有三分二嘅巴士仲未有呢啲嘅攝錄機，好似唔係幾夾喎，啲數字。

黎兆聰先生：公司有啲車，車齡剩番兩年嗰啲，佢唔裝，嗰度有一批數目㗎，即係佢認為嗰啲就嚟劃㗎嘞，即係唔愛，淘汰嘅車，佢表明係唔會裝呢啲裝置落去嘅，所以係有一定嘅數目㗎，嗰度係唔少㗎，為數，即係佢覺得嗰啲車齡佢認為唔想畀啲設置落去，係表明係唔裝㗎，所以我哋前線嗰啲工友就自己裝個鏡頭保護自己，但係公司都用好多行政手段，唔准我哋啲車長裝，都係想保護自己嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以為我哋提供一啲嘅資料，就係關於呢一點，就係話唔畀車長自己裝自己嘅攝影機呢個問題？

黎兆聰先生：可以提出，主席，我哋嘅車長，前線車長自己裝 cam，係受到警告㗎，

有書面警告，亦都有通告告知過啲車長唔准自行裝呢啲 cam，不過我哋啲車長係無奈，因為而家好多交通意外，警方第一時間到現場就問你有冇 cam，所以我哋啲前線車長就無奈接受呢啲警告信，但係我哋向管理層多次--呢咁多年來都希望佢接納我哋工會嘅方案，因為呢啲 cam 係必切性去可以保護到車長。

同埋主席，喺 J 字頭同埋 H 字頭打後嗰啲年歲嘅車嘅英文字母嘅車牌，多數都冇 cam，嗰啲比較係已經係可能係十三、四年嘅車齡，公司係回應我哋係唔裝呢啲 cam㗎，喺 H 字頭或者 J 字頭都有，係舊款嘅車係唔會裝 cam 嘅，呢個係同我哋講咗係唔會啲啲資源去裝。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會提供文件，等我哋理解公司係點樣處理？你就話一啲嘅行政手段，可唔可以畀呢啲文件我哋？

黎兆聰先生：儘量配合，主席，因為我哋同公司開過會，因為佢話點解唔畀我哋裝呢啲鏡頭，因為涉及第三者私隱，因為你攝錄佢，你係要經過呢啲人同意，先可以發放呢啲嘅影像。所以我係同啲工友講過，亦都知道，同私隱公署亦都開過會，佢都回應過，係呢啲係涉及私隱問題，因為攝錄未經第三者同意，你發放出去，係可以犯咗呢個私隱條例。咁呢個受--你話要嗰啲警告書，我可以稍後呈交。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我哋就係要呢啲嘞。

黎兆聰先生：有呀，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。咁我哋而家講另外一個事項，你支唔支持安裝監察鏡頭，就係錄音同埋錄影，就裝喺巴士車長坐嘅地方附近，你支唔支持呢個做法？

張子琦先生：對於改善車長嘅工作環境，而唔影響到個車長嘅，我哋工會都係支持嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁可唔可以答支持定唔支持呀？

林天賦先生：主席，因為裝一個具有錄音、錄像嘅功能嘅攝錄機，冇錯，喺某程度上面，係對搜集證據係有幫助，但係喺揸巴士嗰陣時，有部分嘅車長覺得長期畀人一路監視、監察住佢，會造成佢嘅精神壓力，所以唔係個個車長可以接受到呢樣嘢。

我哋都聽過有啲工友因為嗰個攝錄機對正喺佢頭上面，佢覺得對佢揸車會令到佢分神，所以唔一定話即係會對交通安全會有幫助，所以我覺得呢個可能另外一個角度睇，係一種隱憂。

所以呢個裝攝錄機，可能佢個出發點係好事，但係要顧及每一個車長實際嘅情況，所以如果一刀切，所有車都裝晒呢啲 cam 嘅話，可能部分車長適應唔到，所以我覺得委員會提交政府部門建議嗰陣時，應該清楚諗下--諗一諗，唔係所有人都適應到有個 cam 對住你，當你揸車嗰陣時有個 cam 對住你。因為一日揸車嘅時間係可能有--工作時間可能八至十個小時，所以不斷對住你嘅話，可能佢哋

覺得有心理壓力就比較大，尤其喺某程度下面，佢未必係揸緊車，譬如可能飲水，又單手揸車，呢啲全部可能發生嘅，係咪？但係可以畀公司--畀有其他行政上面嘅壓力。

所以我哋覺得，應該係審慎考慮喺裝呢個--所有車上面裝呢個具有錄音同埋錄像嘅設施。我補充咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋嘅理解咁，咁理解啱唔啱喇，工會嘅立場就係話對於呢方面冇共識嘅？

林天賦先生：我哋覺得應該係會審慎去考慮呢件事，唔好淨係覺得可以--喺心理上面覺得係可以幫助到佢，但係我哋工會覺得，係要--真係要問一問啲會員工友接唔接受，係咪？

黎兆聰先生：唔好意思，主席，我補充，我哋喺七、八年前嗰陣時，開始有 cam 嗰陣時，佢係有 cam 對住我哋，有咪嘅，我哋去過私隱公署投訴嘅，因為我哋受到廣泛嘅工友反對，當其時我哋係有申訴過嘅，我哋有個立場係收到好多廣泛嘅會員工友提出反對，令到佢哋心理有--心理壓力好大，所以我哋某程度上，我哋嘅會員係反對有鏡頭同埋有個收咪嘅功能，咁就呢個係我哋係--應該係早六、七年前去過私隱公署同埋議員去過抗議嘅，我哋做過嘅，總工會有做過嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁而家嘅立場係點，即係 2018 年嘅立場，你哋係支持定唔支持？

張子琦先生：我或者喺度再回應下，主席，呢個裝鏡頭嘅問題，就我曾經同九巴嘅高層都商討過，有鏡頭的而且確對住出面街外嗰啲路面嘅情況係保障到車長，但係有啲行政上有啲主任，或者就將一啲好細微嘅嘢，譬如正話第二副主席講過，佢單手扶軑，飲水，咁就可能要被召見，呢啲咁嘅問題會直接影響到嗰個車長嘅駕駛情--嗰個情緒。

呢方面我哋已經同公司管理層反映過，希望公司要喺呢一方面作出一啲承諾，唔好對車長一啲無理採取嘅紀律嘅處分，因為個鏡頭見到佢單手飲水、單手扶住個軑等等呢啲好小節嘅嘢。

呢啲係的而且確我哋係有矛盾，第一，我哋係好希望有個鏡頭，保障到自己，但係如果係一啲管理層攞啲好小節嘅嘢嚟懲罰啲車長，我哋的而且確喺呢度有啲矛盾。

主席：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解啱唔啱？你哋嘅立場就係話，如果鏡頭就係幫助到你哋嘅，就係支持，但係如果對你哋不利，就唔支持嘞，係咪咁呀？

張子琦先生：係一啲係無理嘅，對我哋嘅過份落刻個要求就係不合理。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）張生，你提及過管理層，話有時就會睇番影片去睇車長嘅行為

嘅，係咩嘢情況之下會咁做？

張子琦先生：我--主席，我哋要求...

主席：（經傳譯員）張生已經講咗個答案，講咗幾次㗎嘞，佢即係係詳細咁提話，就係一係單手揸軚，另外嗰隻手就飲啖水，呢個就係呢一啲咁小嘅事，佢哋就去干擾，所以令到工會好關心。

黎兆聰先生：回應，佢單手揸軚，單手飲水，係安全情況下，有時個燈位轉紅燈嗰陣時先會做，唔會話揸緊車嗰陣時去做，好唔好？我回應呢一樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係隨意去檢查定係話有人投訴，所以先至就睇番嗰個鏡頭嘅影片？

張子琦先生：我哋要求就係有投訴或者有交通意外先至去睇番鏡嘅，但係好早幾年前，有啲主任佢哋就主動去睇，發現咗有啲人攞住件餅乾食，就已經係要佢上嚟見。

當然呢啲主任都係畀一啲高層人員都斥責佢嘅，係苛刻咗啲，但係呢啲係好普遍嘅現象，而令到我哋車長真係有啲困境。

主席：（經傳譯員）等等，你要--黃律師，你要等人譯完先可以開始問㗎，要記住呢樣嘢。

黃律師嘅問題其實--呢啲你話係行政手法介入睇影片㗎，喺呢啲情況底下，係咪因為有人投訴--有乘客投訴話車長飲水或者食餅乾，係咪因為有人投訴，所以先睇番影片？

張子琦先生：唔一定，有一個已經係收工，冇載客，只不過係私牌，即係由巴士總站完咗佢個工作之後，揸番部車返廠途中，而被一個主任去檢控佢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你從而推斷，喺呢一次，至少呢一次，係有人利用--有人就係冇--唔係因為有投訴，就睇番嗰個影片，即係好似係去監視嗰個車長咁樣，係咪呀？

張子琦先生：正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）通常係管理層係會隔幾耐做一次呢樣咁嘅嘢，你知唔知？

張子琦先生：近期呢啲個案就少咗，因為經過工會多次向公司嘅投訴，呢啲苛刻嘅處理方式只會令到車長嗰個工作嘅情緒更加低落，近期係少咗呢啲情況嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個問題係咪自行解決咗㗎？即係公司聽你哋嘅講法？

張子琦先生：有兩種解讀，一就係佢唔夠人手，二或者係聽到我哋嘅訴求，但係未來係點，我哋唔清楚。

主席：（經傳譯員）對上一次發生呢啲咁嘅監視嘅情況，即係冇乘客投訴監視車長，對上一次發生係幾時嘅事？

黎兆聰先生：相信每一日都有人投訴，有投訴有 cam 就睇下係咪事實。同埋車上有個黑盒嘅，譬如例如講舉例講飛站，佢有黑盒會證明到佢有冇埋站，有顯示個頭尾閘有冇開過，係咪事實，有 cam 就配合睇 cam，冇 cam 就睇黑盒，而家嘅黑盒基本上佢會喺辦公室都睇到㗎嘞，每一日都發生嘅，所以個數字我相信每一日都發生。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題其實係問，可唔可以畀個例子，就話乘客冇投訴，但係管理層就走去睇嗰個影片㗎，就監視個車長，即係最近一次係幾時呢？定係話已經解決咗嘞，呢個問題？

張子琦先生：相信有半年前嘅事㗎嘞，都未曾聽到有呢種情況發生。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二樣嘢嘞，就係呢個第 62 頁，就話安裝一個保護罩，可唔可以講下，係安裝咗幾多塊呢啲嘅保護罩，即係自從係 2018 年 6 月？因為講緊係九巴文件夾一號第 62 頁第二個措施就係安裝一啲喺車長座位附近，2018 年 6 月開始安裝保護罩嘅，安裝咗幾多個？

黎兆聰先生：相信個車隊，我諗裝咗三分一嗖㗎咋，因為好多弊處，亦都睇落好似好保護，但係衍生嗰個保護罩開關一個問題，個窿好大，瘐落去未必搵到個開關掣；第二，反光太緊要；第三，就係佢最頂層嗰個尖尖嗰個位有個瘐石，會行車嗰陣時行--瘐得唔實會乒乒嘭嘭，個車長亦都好大壓力，因為有雜聲，令到佢唔可以專心揸車。

所以我哋提議過管理層叫佢改善呢個情況，亦都我哋好多前線希望佢拆咗佢，因為喺夜晚嗰陣時，反光好嚴重㗎，嗰塊保護膜，我哋同管理層提過，但係佢話呢個係政治事件，唔可以拆呢塊板，咁我哋都好無奈。

我喺上個星期都向管理層提出呢個問題，呢塊膠係真係有啲好大嘅問題係衍生咗出嚟嘅，幾樣嘅問題，第一，就係開關問題；第二，就係反光，令到行車安全嘅問題；第三，就係佢呢個裝置係有啲瘐得唔實會發出聲響，呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係簡單嚟講，就係九巴嘅車隊有三分一就安咗，但係就唔係幾好嘅，呢啲保護罩，係咪呀？

黎兆聰先生：呢個保護罩好多問題衍生咗，我哋啲前線車長唔係唔支持，起碼有個保護膜，但係個好多弊處係反映咗畀工會同埋我哋啲理幹事聽，個弊處係有幾樣，個重點係同管理層回應過嘅，不過好似就冇乜改善過，就同我哋講就係話政治事件，所以就呢塊板唔拆得。

我哋個前線承受好大壓力，因為我今朝早嚟嗰陣時都坐嗰架車，都問個車

長，佢話嗰個員工位上面個位置個𥑮石𥑮唔實，會發出聲響，同埋會夾到手指嘅，咁都比較危險，因為有時個車長會擰左邊，去問啲乘客嘅問題，有時唔察覺會撞落塊板度，同埋嗰個開關掣都好難去開嗰度門，同埋嗰個弧拱位嘅裝置，如果車長高同埋低，都會不停咁去阻擋視線，有把刀喺自己嘅前面，阻到睇到個乘客上落嘅問題，尤其是夜間反光，啲車長話嗰塊膠膜如果有一啲對面行車線開大燈，直接會映射到嗰塊板，睇落去會反光嗦。

咁我哋有反映過，但係管理層就係話唔拆得，同埋話會出年四月或者五月會裝晒全部嘅呢啲保護裝置，唔知主席有冇睇過呢啲裝置？

主席：（經傳譯員）我見過。喺紐約、德薩斯州同埋其他地方咁多年都有裝過呢啲嘢，但係好似係冇一個簡單嘅答案嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你幾時係提出呢啲投訴？或者係車長係幾時提出呢啲投訴㗎？

黎兆聰先生：幾個月內都好多車長喺我哋工會反映，我最後接觸管理層都係上個星期接觸嗰個係我哋嘅車務總監梁生，我同佢反映過呢個問題，因為一路反映，都係嗰塊膠膜嘅反光程度同埋個開關程度，同埋呢啲裝置反而令到個車長分神，我哋有反映過，物料上改良嘅設計上，都有反映過，亦都可能佢一個開關一個裝置好實，如果譬如隻手短得滯嗰啲車長可能唔夠力去搵呢個開關掣，但係佢哋話有竅妙，就話叫我哋孿度門就可以開關，但係我睇到個問題多過幫到嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，我諗我哋都要講其他嘅問題，因為呢一點我哋都用咗好多時間㗎嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁第二個嘅問題，就係嗰啲交通標誌嘅問題，交通信號嘅問題。

你喺 289-23-5 呢一頁第十二段嗰度，有提過呢個問題，中文版就係第289-19頁。

你就提到有一個嘅建議，就係請運輸署有一啲係閃動次數嘅信號，即係話由黃燈轉去綠燈嘅時候，就有呢啲閃動次數嘅信號，等司機有所準備，避免因為突然剎車而造成危險。

你亦都係提出呢一個嘅建議幾次，我可以講呢啲嘅頁數，但係唔需要攞去嗰啲嘅文件，第一份文件就係向運輸署喺 1996 年提交嘅一份嘅信件，喺 289-31頁第四段。

運輸署嘅回應，喺 1996 年 2 月 6 號，喺 289-38 頁，運輸署嘅回應喺第二段就係話，如果加咗一個會閃亮嘅黃燈，可能就係會令到駕駛人士更加混淆。

喺 2005 年 3 月 15 號，你就再次有呢個提出，喺第 289-47 頁，英文就係289-166頁。

如果你睇 289-50 至 51 頁，係中文版，英文就係 289-170 頁。

聽完運輸署嘅回應之後，你嘅睇法係點？你係咪仍然覺得應該係有--關於堅持...

主席：（經傳譯員）其實唔係話堅持，即係要求嗰個問題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，你係咪仍然認為你哋嘅建議係合適？抑或你對於運輸署個回應係滿意？你仍然係想要求運輸署有呢一個係閃動嘅，有埋呢一個即係次數嗰個嘅信號？

張子琦先生：我對運輸署嗰個回應係不滿嘅，因為佢完全唔理解巴士要平穩剎停一架巴士需要幾多嘅時間。

現時由綠燈轉紅燈大約係三秒時間，但係當一架巴士如果行走 50 公里，要三秒時間穩定咁樣樣停定一架巴士係非常之困難，所以造成好多巴士要衝燈尾，而令社會人士都覺得巴士司機係喜歡衝燈。

但係實質上，我哋巴士司機如果喺嗰個尷尬位要剎停一架巴士嘅話，唔衝燈尾嘅話，又要平穩剎停嘅話，佢可能就係擺喺十字路口。如果佢要過埋，就變咗係一個衝燈，如果佢要喺燈位前剎停嘅話，就變咗係急剎，就會造成乘客有機會會受傷，呢啲就係搵巴士嘅困難，但係好多駕駛人士都未必明白。

私家車可以三秒剎停一架車，重型車可以急剎，啲貨物最多都係西歪東倒，冇問題，但係我哋載緊嘅係乘客。

所以我哋一再要求有倒數燈，如果佢唔裝倒數燈嘅話，綠燈轉黃燈前都要眨三至四下，畀多三秒時間我哋，作出剎車嘅準備，亦等同一啲公仔燈行人過路嘅，都會眨下，就通知啲行人即將會轉紅燈。

呢個係對成個服務嘅質素係有提高，對安全有提高，對公眾人士係有益嘅，但係運輸署一再漠視本會提出嘅訴求。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就講到嗰啲行人過路嗰啲綠公仔喺度眨，提醒嗰啲行人好快綠燈轉紅燈嘞，係咪呀？

張子琦先生：冇錯，主席，我都想需要多三至四秒時間綠燈轉黃燈前眨幾下，咁樣提示一啲搵巴士嘅司機即將轉燈，咁令到佢有足夠嘅時間穩定咁停定一架巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺世界其他嘅地方有冇咁樣嘅做法㗎，可唔可以畀啲例子我哋？

張子琦先生：我見新加坡有過，佢都係有啲綠燈箭咀眨。大陸更加多，佢全部都係直情倒數數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）係一啲數字，係咪呀？轉燈嘅時候直頭有數字喺度眨？

張子琦先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋收到運輸署嘅文件，係關乎一啲專營巴士意外嘅數字，就係唔關乎撞車嘅事件，我想你睇下運輸署嘅文件係 TD-9，就係 2018 年 4 月，喺 TD-1 第 111 頁第六段。

我哋睇到運輸署提供嘅數字，喺第六段，第五段、第六段，第五段就話：

「大概有百分之五十九至到六十五嘅所有意外，係涉及 2016（原文照錄）年至到 2017 年關乎專營巴士，都唔係撞車類型嘅意外，佢哋一般嚟講，就係譬如乘客喺巴士裏面，基於好多原因就失咗平衡。」

如果你睇下佢九巴 2018 至到 2022，喺同一份嘅文件，佢哋嘅展望嘅計劃，遠期計劃，8.2.7 段就係話：

「大部分嘅意外，有百分之五十一點五係因為乘客喺巴士上面失平衡，而呢啲嘅個案超過一半係因為係行車嘅時候，巴士剎掣。」

我想問你，從數字睇到，有超過百分之五十嘅乘客喺巴士上面嘅受傷係因為失咗平衡，所以我哋計番，即係最明顯畀出嘅理由就係突然剎車，引致有意外。你哋工會同唔同意安裝一個減速器，呢個儀器就會幫助架車就會係以某一個速度，就係減慢。譬如話去到呢個每小時 50 公里或者每小時 70 公里，你哋工會會唔會同意呢一類型嘅設備？

黎兆聰先生：我估你對車唔熟悉，車一路以來都有減速，有吹疏，我相信你哋唔熟悉車嘅機件性能，減速係有嘅，一個預期，我哋掂一掂架車，有個吹疏，有個減速器嘅，一路以來，我哋而家嘅車係好先進，一路以來都有減速。但你話要 70 突然之間剎停架車係冇可能，要預期要輕輕掂架車，吹疏，跟住架車會慢慢減速，唔係急剎，呢個減速係一路以來架車都有呢個裝置，好唔好呀？

張子琦先生：主席，我補充一下。啲乘客喺車上好多時受傷，第一，我正話已經講咗嗰個過燈位嘅問題，令到個司機可能要急剎；第二，就係而家好多人嘅揸車嗰種態度都唔係咁好，周時喺啲巴士--cut 咗去啲巴士度，巴士要被逼要急剎；第三，而家亦好多人成日手上攞住部手提電話，係冇把持好扶手，甚至佢坐喺度都有機會跌咗落地下，都仲有，咁就所以就受傷嘅機會係大咗嘅，啲問題。

林天賦先生：黃律師，我補充少少。我哋大嶼山巴士都會有嗰個叫做遲剎嗰個功能，或者叫逆剎，嗰個功能係輔助減速，已經係有咗嘅。咁我哋喺個山路裏面，都會用個叫做遲剎，即係統稱，咁係輔助佢落斜嘅，會係好穩定去停部車。

Brake 裏面有兩段，頭段係減速，第二段就係如果我哋踩 brake 嘅感覺係好實淨，brake 皮同隻碟係夾住咗㗎嘞，咁當刻係可以停車嘅，呢個係已經有㗎。

黎兆聰先生：補充，因為佢哋大嶼山有啲係單層旅遊巴，同巴士可能有啲裝置唔一樣，佢嘅簡稱嗰個係叫排氣剎車，佢嗰個一個裝置同我哋可能雙層巴士嗰個裝置又唔一樣嘅，我哋有個減速，有個吹疏，佢哋有個排氣嘅裝置，佢可以喺個手嘅

軟盤嗰度，一撻起嗰個裝置，就會排風、減速，嗰個係旅遊巴個裝置，好唔好？

主席：（經傳譯員）林生，仲有冇其他嘢想補充？

林天賦先生：得，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，如果可以的話，不如我哋而家即係做小休先喇。今朝進度如何？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋遲咗，不過我會小休之後加快番。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家會小休，等你哋喺一喺，委員會都要喺一下嘞，休息二十分鐘，唔該晒。

上午11時35分聆訊押後

上午11時55分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）各位，我想去到下一個嘅題目，就係休息嘅設施。喺你嘅文件就係提過呢一個點嘅，就係基於我哋委員會所收到嘅文件，就似乎喺早於2010年大家已經係提出呢一個問題，但係請睇一睇呢一個交通運輸策略研究，係2015年2月9號貴會畀委員會嘅，咁係文件289-76至到289-80頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一沓呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係TU文件，英文就係第289-200頁。喺呢一頁就有兩點係提出嘅，第一就係非法泊車，喺第3段講到喺一啲嘅巴士總站非法泊車，第289-78頁，同埋英文就係289-203頁，第3段。

而喺呢一份文件第二點，你要指出嘅就係第7段，就係話休息嘅設施係不足夠嘅，中文係第289-79頁，英文係289-203頁，睇唔睇到？我亦都係想你睇一睇委員會嘅一封信，就係7月23號2018年，文件289-331頁至到335頁，淨係得中文嘅啫，就係提出呢一個嘅要求，要求提供進一步資料，就係話設施不足嘅問題。

如果睇289-333頁，28至到29段，睇一睇運輸署嘅回應，講到洗手間同埋休息設施。喺你嘅回應係你有--咁多年嚟，你都話休息嘅設施係唔足夠嘅，你亦都提供咗幾份嘅文件。自從2010年，首先就係2010年6月21號，咁文件

中文就係 289-90 第 3 段，英文嘅文件係 289-221 至到 289-222 頁，呢個就係第 2、第 3 段所講嘅，就係講到公會收集咗一百三十八個巴士車站嘅情況，有大概百分之五十六點五嘅車站都冇洗手間嘅設施，平均車長往返洗手間嘅時間係如果需要嘅話，係需要大概四分鐘嘅。巴士車長事實係上要五分鐘嘅時間，部分車站更加需要十分鐘以上先至可以係夠時間去廁所。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲係 2010 年做嘅觀察，係嘛？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。我個問題係問你提出咗呢方面嘅意見，咁就係將呢個文件交畀委員會嘅，呢個問題係咪仍然一個嚴重嘅問題，即係所以你哋公會覺得係需要解決，需要處理呀？定係話情況已經改善咗？

張子琦先生：主席，係有啲改善，但係未曾完全改善，好多而家有啲總站係仍然都係未有洗手間同埋一啲休息室嘅。尤其有一啲喺屋邨入面想要求安置一個員工嘅休息室同埋洗手間係非常之困難嘅，所以我哋一再向運輸署反映，舊嘅就一定要同我哋儘快爭取番嚟，新嘅--以後逢係新設嘅巴士總站必須要有洗手間同埋員工休息室，呢個先係一個完整配套嘅巴士總站。如果冇嘅話，我哋係拒絕呢一種提供嘅服務嘅。

咁有所改善都係基於早前樂華嗰個--我哋發起一個事件，嗰個工業行動，因為就係房屋署強行咁樣要我哋吊走個休息室，莫視我哋嗰個休息員工嗰個服務嘅質素，因為有充足嘅休息時間先至可以有一個良好嘅服務。於是我哋工會係喺嗰一次嘅事件係發起一次工業行動員嘅。自此之後，有所改善，但係好多去到區議會度，啲區議員都會反對設立一個化糞池或者係休息室，咁就被諸多刁難，令到呢啲事情未曾完全去解決嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）樂華嗰次嘅事件係咪九巴嘅休息室嚟㗎？

張子琦先生：冇錯，由九巴主任回應一下。

黎兆聰先生：主席，當陣時我係負責呢個樂華事件嘅，因為我哋收到啲工友，公司就扤咗個休息室入去，跟住房屋署要求廿四小時之內搬走呢個休息室。如果唔係，我哋嗰啲工友反映就話以後都唔准擺，所以我哋第二日即刻就馬上做咗一個行動，就封咗個站半個鐘頭，亦都同啲房屋署嘅官員同埋一啲當區嘅區議員話反映過。但係唔係話今日講今日做，係反映咗好多年，係受到地區人士反對一個設施，係令到我哋啲車長周圍坐，周圍食，周圍瞓。呢啲配套冇畀到我哋，我哋係冇一個充足或者一個真正畀我哋休息嘅配套。所以經過嗰次之後，有啲問題可以解決，但係我知道新巴、城巴頗為嚴重，佢哋可能啲地方配置可能亦都冇。而家講咗十幾年，可能置富花園，我或者畀城巴嗰個主任講下。

劉善達先生：主席，我哋城巴或者新巴，置富花園講咗十幾年，但係因為佢哋嗰邊嘅屋邨嗰啲主席嗰啲就唔畀--反對我哋擺一個休息室或者廁所嗰啲咁嘅設施响度，所以到而家十幾年，我哋都仲係未擺過嗰啲設施响度，等我哋啲員工可以响度休息。

張子琦先生：主席，龍運巴士主任都有啲嘢補充。

陳廣能先生：係，或者我都講下就係龍運巴士呢一度嘅情況。咁喺我哋 E34B，元朗山水樓開出嘅呢一個路線就喺 2013 年係進行咗一個路線重組。當其時呢條路線原本就係由呢個天水圍往機場嘅，咁拆咗線之後，就由元朗直至去機場。喺拆咗線之後，咁喺元朗山水樓設立呢一個總站，就沒有設立員工休息室同埋呢個洗手間嘅設備。喺我哋多番爭取之下，就公司係同我哋講番，原來就係話受到地區嘅人士去反對。

咁變咗就係話喺整個過程之中，我哋同事喺嗰幾年就係受盡呢一個委屈，例如佢哋冇地方食飯，佢哋要喺車上面例如食一啲嘅小食。我亦都記得就係話喺 2016 年，我哋有位女同事喺巴士上面食腸粉而係被地區一啲嘅居民影相，將張相片 post 上去呢個嘅 Facebook，係進行一個嘅公審，讓我哋--令到我哋嘅女同事係非常受到呢個情緒嘅困擾，佢曾經係喊住對我哋講出呢一件事。

喺整個過程之中，我哋嘅同事平時食飯、休息係冇地方，日曬雨淋，去廁所亦都要去好遠，或者去一個比較唔係咁理想嘅設備嘅廁所，一個廁所嘅設備就係要經過一個嘅屋苑先行去入去嘅。當中，例如喺夜晚就會比較漆黑一片，咁變咗就係話佢哋係會有一個安全，即係女同事會有一個安全性嘅困擾。終於就喺 2017 年嘅 8 月先至能夠設立咗呢個休息室，其實當中呢四年其實呢個過程係非常之長遠，我哋一路以嚟都希望就話喺一條新嘅巴士線設立嘅時候，係必須要有一個巴士站車長使用設施嘅配套，而係從而令到我哋服務質素能夠係延續同埋提升。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個休息室係幾時安裝番畀你哋，係幾時嘅事呀？

陳廣能先生：如果講番 E34B，元朗山水樓呢一個休息室，係喺 2017 年嘅 8 月安裝畀我哋嘅，但係佢喺 2013 年呢條線就已經係開始行，運行緊，當中係--期間係接近四年時間，我哋車長係沒有休息室，沒有呢個嘅洗手間設備係提供畀我哋使用。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你關於新大嶼巴士 2018 年 1 月 3 號交嚟嘅文件，即係話 289-140 頁第 3 段，呢個係中文，英文就係 289-317 頁，就提及到喺新元朗中心、天水圍天慈邨嘅休息設施。咁嗰個嘅情況有冇改善呀，定係話仍然一樣呀，天慈邨？即係講緊呢個第 3 段嘅第(i)分段嗰度。

林寶強先生：應該就好似早幾個禮拜話擺咗個休息室落去，但係我未過過去，就未肯定佢擺咗落去嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以之後將個資料交番畀我哋呀？

林寶強先生：好，好，可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）林生，你係代表新大嶼山巴士，咁你可唔可以講下，有冇提供到呀？

林寶強先生：你指邊一方面呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係休息室。

林寶強先生：休息室呢個天慈邨要--我返去睇睇先，因為我係喺大嶼山，呢個喺元朗區，唔屬大嶼山區，所以我冇時間去睇過呢個位置。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你交嚟嘅文件裏面，你亦都提過另外一個例子，就係呢一個工會文件226-25頁，即係呢一個嘅頁數係24，中文係171頁，呢個就係話呢一個鯽魚涌嘅祐民街，你就話已經係經過十年嘅努力，至今一個細小嘅休息空間都未有提供，情況有冇改善到呀？

林天賦先生：唔好意思，呢個係咪我哋工會嘅文件嚟？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係九巴員工嘅文件嚟嘅。

林天賦先生：呢個唔係我哋工會下面嘅分會嘅文件。

黃女士：Yes, then I won't ask you about this.（經傳譯員）除咗觀塘樂華邨，即係呢一個係你哋提供嘅一個例子，除此之外，可唔可以畀其他嘅地點作為例子，你哋覺得巴士車長喺嗰啲地方係搵唔到一個適合嘅休息設施嘅？

黎兆聰先生：主席，舉例，九巴其實佢而家已經陸續安裝好多裝置，但係有啲裝置係受到嗰個面積同埋一個管理嘅規限，所以有待去改善呢啲設施。佢係有嘅，例如舉例，佢嗰個係單亭，個站長室嘅單亭。雙亭喇，個雙亭即係面積可能大少少，但係係唔能夠供給個車長休息嘅，呢啲例子係有嘅，但係一路係咁改善中，九巴就。

就如果我--嗰啲站頭，咁多個站頭，我相信已經差唔多陸陸續續已經有改善呢啲配套，我諗七、三之比，即係七成已經有呢啲休息室同埋呢啲化糞池廁所。可能有三成仲係要經地區或者經區議員，經工會、公司交涉先至喺度等緊呢啲配置。我哋曾經同公司溝通過，公司承諾係畀嘅，不過只係我哋明白到係真係受到地區人士阻撓，係擺唔到落去，即係淨係竹園邨一個位置，為咗一個廁所，作為籌碼，足足講咗十幾年先可以擺一個休息室，即係我舉例講一個例子畀你哋聽，好唔好呀？

陳廣能先生：就我龍運巴士嘅，咁我都補充少少。我哋龍運巴士嘅E33P就喺2016已經係全日服務，咁每一日來回班次係接近六十個班次。喺呢六十個班次，我哋嘅總站係呢個屯門兆康鐵路站南，係並沒有休息室，亦都並沒有呢個嘅廁所設施。呢條路線原本佢早年就已經係行緊車，咁喺2016年就係全日。咁我哋嘅同事，車長同事會喺呢一個嘅總站，呢個巴士總站嗰度係會食飯，會係休息，同埋

佢哋係會喺嗰個地方--例如係我哋有啲叫做我哋特別車位嗰度，我哋所謂嘅終點休息嘅，但係嗰個地方係竟然冇休息室，咁就我哋係多番爭取，得番--得到嘅結果，回覆嘅結果就係話地區同埋喺嗰個嘅運輸署方面係仲未通過。其實呢一個嘅爭取已經係到到今天已經係接近兩年㗎嘞，但係我哋仍然都仲未係見到有一啲嘅成果係睇得到，亦都未有一啲預見嘅通知係落實畀到我哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個 E33P 呢一個嘅要求係咪用書面提出㗎，即係要嗰度有個休息室？

陳廣能先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時提出呢？

陳廣能先生：工會喺 2015 年其實已經係喺我哋工會同公司嘅會議上面係提出，而公司就一路都係話佢同有關方面去申請呢一個嘅設施。咁問題就只係喺呢個嘅 2016 年區議會喺落實咗話要呢條路線全日服務屯門區嘅居民，但係我哋就話如果沒有呢一個嘅休息室，其實我哋嘅服務質素會係能夠可以提升到咩嘢層次呢咁樣，咁公司亦都係將我哋嘅意見係反映番喺區議會，反映番喺運輸署上面，咁到今天，我哋都--我都講多次，係仍然未有一啲絲毫嘅消息係畀到我哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀啲資料我哋，即係你哋書面提出要呢個休息室嘅文件，有冇？

陳廣能先生：我可以稍後提供，遲啲提供畀你哋，今天我未有帶出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你，當你有嗰份文件，請向我哋提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪話直至到而家，嗰個嘅位置仲係冇洗手間同埋休息嘅設施？

主席：（經傳譯員）佢咁樣嘅證供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。可唔可以有一啲照片畀我哋睇到嗰個位置呢？如果可能嘅話。

陳廣能先生：我都係稍後提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想去下一個問題，就係非法泊車。未講之前，黎先生，你可唔可以幫委員會喺呢一方面，九巴就係有一啲分更嘅安排嘅，係咪呀？

黎兆聰先生：分更係有嘅，三更制，早更、夜更、特別更，同埋一個 L 車嘅更份，四個嘅崗位，同埋一個通宵更。早更、夜更、特別車，一個 L 車，一個通宵車，有呢幾個崗位。

主席：（經傳譯員）分更，九巴已經係實行咗好多年㗎嘞，係咪呀？

黎兆聰先生：呢個一路以來，九龍公司 1933 以來都係有咁樣呢個安排嘅更份，呢啲

設置嘅配套，一開始已經係可能--嗰陣時可能未有通宵，可能未有特別車，但係而家呢幾十年來都係用呢種管理模式。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰啲經過修訂嘅指引就係關於譬如工作時間、食飯嘅時間等等，喺2018年2月23號就係通告咗，就係改變而家嘅制度，係咪呀？有冇呀？

黎兆聰先生：一路以來嘅制度都有嘅，行之已久嘅。你話2018年2月開始，我唔明你指出，係咪改變咗呢個制度？照我所知，呢三十幾、四十年來都嗰個制度冇轉變，係分早更、夜更、特別車、L車、通宵車，呢幾個崗位呢幾十年來都係冇轉變過。轉變係有嘅，L車可能係呢幾--我諗呢五年內係會有呢個L車。呢個L車設置就係喺中段插落去個字軌嗰度，佢係喺個站頭接更，喺個站頭收工，係唔使揸架車返廠入油嘅，呢個...

林天賦先生：主席，我聽我哋黎主任咁講，應該就係運輸署公布咗呢個新嘅工作指引之後，九巴嗰個編更嘅制度應該仲係冇改變嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，可唔可以將嗰啲新嘅指引擺出嚟呢？我心目中諗嘅，就係嗰啲嘅情況係會安排，就係一個十四個鐘嘅當更，中間係會有三小時嘅休息。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係CTB，即係城巴嘅2號文件第2頁。

黎兆聰先生：我明白主席想講乜嘢，嗰個指引喺2018年2月推出嚟，運輸署係畀時間巴士公司喺2019年嘅第二季度實行佢呢啲指引嘅，我明白你嘅意思，主席。我想再補充，嗰啲特別車同埋嗰啲L車係愛嚟榦嗰啲車長食飯，呢啲字軌，咁可能--唔知呢個補充o唔okay？

主席：（經傳譯員）我想你幫下手嘅，就係話要求提供一段不少於連續三小時嘅休息時間，即係有一啲特別更次呢一點。

黎兆聰先生：呢一點，特別車三小時休息係一路以來都有實行嘅，呢個係最基本嘅，就算係之前運輸署嘅指引，公司係有跟足嘅，特別車嘅更分必須要有三小時休息，呢個係一路以來都有行緊嘅措施嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪九巴嘅政策嚟㗎，抑或係運輸署嘅要求嚟㗎？

黎兆聰先生：呢個政策，九巴相信係暫時獨有嘅，龍運都可能一樣，我諗新巴、城巴冇呢啲嘅。我哋特別車係呢個崗位係行咗一段時間，佢嘅功能就係愛嚟榦我哋啲車長食飯，同埋行一個繁忙時間，上面一個--朝頭早一個繁忙時間，跟住畀一個break佢，連埋食飯三小時，或者係一個休息畀佢，跟住下一段佢就再去做番下一段嘅時間，呢個係特別車嗰個安排，係咁多年來都係咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，可唔可以睇下指引四？喺下面嗰度。

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度係咪有一個特別更嘅一個解釋，呢個就係要喺朝早嘅時候

嘅，係咪呀？1(b)，睇唔睇到？1(b)嗰度，黎先生，你睇唔睇到1(b)？

黎兆聰先生：我睇到。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係幾時係准許有十四小時嘅當值呢？就話要係揸十個小時嘅車，只係限於喺因應上、下午繁忙時間嘅服務需要，即係朝早同埋下晝嘅繁忙時間，呢個係咪一個新嘅規例呢？一個新嘅規定，定唔係新嘅呢？

黎兆聰先生：主席，喺2010年嘅10月修訂版嗰度，指引(b)嗰度有寫話不應超過十四小時嘅。跟住18年，我了解到就話亦都有個修訂，講緊十二小時至十四小時之間，係不應--即係呢個問題三小時休息嗰度係有修改嘅。不過我可以反映㗎，主席，我哋有個車隊涉及三千七百幾部車，其實呢啲十四小時係唔多嘅，真係唔多嘅，我諗一成都可能差唔多會有呢個問題。但係佢哋呢個崗位十四小時，佢哋係可能作息係做咗幾十年，可能有二、三十年呢啲車長係適應咗呢個崗位，佢嗰個生活作息同埋佢中間可能唔只三小時，可能有五小時或者四小時，因應嗰條路線時間去配合嘅，所以你想問呢個十四小時呢個問題係咪想問呢一點嘅，主席？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，我想問嘅係關於呢啲嘅車長如果佢哋要揸十四個小時車嘅話，佢哋落咗車嚟到去休息嗰個不少於三個小時，我想問佢哋呢啲嘅車長喺休息嘅時候有啲咩設施呢？喺邊度搵到呢啲休息設施呢？

黎兆聰先生：都要睇下個站頭設施足唔足夠，可能佢揀一啲路線會迎合番佢自己所住嘅區，等自己可以返到屋企。都有啲例外，有啲係唔係住佢自己嗰區，例如有啲九龍灣廠，佢住屯門，佢都有呢啲問題出現嘅，佢可能唯有喺休息息搵地方休息，或者搵嗰架車休息，或者返廠休息，咁呢個可能佢要自己去選擇一個休息地方。

個設置夠唔夠呢？可能七成夠，可能有三成唔夠，但係大多數嗰啲車長都係用番佢自己所近嘅路線，近自己屋企。同埋或者佢做咗咁多年嗰啲路線，可能佢習慣咗，佢唔想周圍走，佢都會揀嗰條路線，選擇喺嗰條路線，唔會離開嗰條路線。但係你話有休息室配唔配置到，迎唔迎合到佢呢？咁我相信有啲未必迎合到佢嘅，可能有時啲休息室有人飯飯，會嘈呀，咁可能會選擇一啲連鎖店或者麥當勞、大快活，搵啲地方去休息，咁呢啲我哋經常會收到呢啲個案嘅，但係你話佢足唔足夠一個休息嘅設置呢？我可以答你一半一半喇，要睇個車長適唔適合到佢，佢自己安唔安排到呢個時間自己去休息。但係我相信，佢揀得呢個崗位，佢會利用呢啲時間分配好佢自己休息，喺搵邊個地方同埋點樣去令到自己有充足嘅時間休息。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以係建議一個地點畀我哋委員會呢個禮拜去參觀一下，即係嗰度係唔夠休息嘅設施畀呢啲車長去休息嗰個不少於三個小時嘅時間嘅？

黎兆聰先生：我補充，主席，例如舊陣時，廠係冇休息室嘅，咁佢都整咗啲睡眠區。第二，就有站車嘅休息室。第三，就係佢鄰近佢自己屋企，返屋企休息。咁特別

車崗位應該有一千五百個字軌，涉及可能有千八人嗖喇，呢個特別車，即係你針對十四小時，呢啲係特別更嘅車長，我約莫講呢個數字畀你聽，主席，好唔好呀？咁特別車佢分兩段，我都啱啱重複，同埋 L 車佢都有分早 L 同夜 L 嘅，中間係冇得休息嘅，佢係直落嘅。咁 L 車都係，個功能都係一樣，都係瘐食飯。

陳廣能先生：主席，我想補充一下，就係我剛才都講咗，E33P 兆康鐵路站南呢一個嘅巴士總站係並沒有休息室。喺呢一條路線，佢哋亦都係有一個嘅同事需要係喺嗰度休息嘅。如果主席係想睇一睇呢個嘅總站，可以安排時間一齊去睇。

黎兆聰先生：唔好意思，主席...

主席：（經傳譯員）等等，黎生，你要等一等，要翻譯完先。你建議話我哋可以去睇下，就話嗰度係冇休息設施，係咪呀？

陳廣能先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個地點係咪巴士車長係會因為要返特別更，中間落場嘅時候，喺嗰度要休息不超過--係呢一個不少於三個連續小時嘅地點嚟㗎？

陳廣能先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黎生，好，到你，你可唔可以畀個例子我哋，可以去邊度去睇呢？集中番個問題，就係話我哋可以去邊度，邊個地點去睇一啲係個設施不足以讓一個返特別更嘅車長喺嗰度休息不少於三個連續小時嘅地點？

黎兆聰先生：一個月輪廠不足休息室嘅設施，月輪廠，嗰度可能有啲車長會泊嗰啲車喺嗰度中段休息嘅，喺美孚嘅。佢如果真係冇呢個休息室，佢可能會喺架車度瞓，或者搵一啲地方適合到自己喺嗰度瞓，呢個係舉例一個例子。如果我有，我或者稍後補充，好唔好呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，畀三、四個呢啲地點，等我哋去睇下。我哋想睇嘅，就係譬如話有十個車長就係要中間落場休息三個鐘，但係原來嗰度得三個位嘅啫，你知道我哋想睇啲咩嘢未呀？

陳廣能先生：都補充一下，我哋龍運巴士 A43 喺粉嶺嘅聯和墟係有設立到車長休息室，但係呢個車長休息室只能夠係容納三位嘅車長去休息。我哋喺休息嘅時間，落場嘅時間，即係俗語講落場嘅時間，我哋經常性地係有六位或以上嘅車長需要使用呢一個嘅車長休息室，咁就形成咗有不足設施嘅情況出現。

林天賦先生：主席，我想...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以再重複一次個地點？

陳廣能先生：龍運巴士 A43，粉嶺聯和墟總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

林天賦先生：我哋嘅工作人員提醒我哋，都有巴士公司代表在場，所以我希望主席你睇嗰幾個場地係真實嘅情況，唔係巴士公司安排之下嘅情況。

黎兆聰先生：我想提供多三個畀你睇睇，好唔好呀？主席。一個青衣廠，一個青衣鐵路站，一個觀塘碼頭係冇嗰啲配置畀到我哋嘅，即係嗰啲休息室。咁你睇睇呢四個，或者搵我哋公司有代表，你可以問佢，佢都掌握嘅，應該知道嘅。因為我哋工會一路有同佢溝通嘅，唔係今日講今日做嘅，一路有溝通爭取嘅。

主席：Thank you.

黎兆聰先生：Welcome.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個即係兩味更，要落場嘅，你就話即係呢一種嘅特別更，九巴一直都有咁樣嘅安排，可唔可以講下，係幾時開始你哋會有呢個特別更㗎？我想問，因為我會畀你睇一個表嘅，就係雜項文件 897 至到 898，係一個比較嘅表格嚟嘅，比較嘅表。如果睇番呢個表，呢一個嘅指引其實已經喺四次修訂過嘅，04 年、07 年、10 年，最後一次就係 2018 年嘅 2 月，咁係有關於特別更嘅安排。請你睇 898 頁，呢個其實係喺呢一個 2018 年 2 月先至引入嘅，睇番最屘嗰一欄就話係特別更，備註就話係特登為咗朝頭早同埋放工繁忙時間而定嘅，所以喺 2018 年嘅 2 月先至引入特別更。但係頭先你所講嘅答案似乎就係話呢個咁樣特別更，要分開嘅，即係拆開兩個嚟返嘅，就係一早已經有喎，你所講嘅係話有關--你提過呢個表係有關於呢一個安排嘅指引？

主席： By that you mean the guideline in relation to it?

黃女士： The guideline in relation to it.

黎兆聰先生：我想更正你嗰個講法，唔係 2018 年先有呢啲特別車嘅崗位，係呢三十年以上都有呢啲特別車嘅崗位。你講 2018 年 2 月實施呢啲措施，運輸署係有畀巴士公司於 2019 年第二個季度執行佢呢樣嘢，你要畀時間佢嘅，佢要跟你呢個制度可能要一啲時間，一啲人手，同埋呢三小時休息係一路以來都有嘅，好唔好呀？

黃女士： Yes.

張子琦先生：主席，等我補充一下，十四小時嘅工作喺運輸署嘅指引底下，就一直都有沿用嘅。咁就自從發生交通意外之後，好多人都指責十四小時駕駛係導致疲勞駕駛，但係就冇清楚劃分開一更車同埋特別車呢個區別。因為十四小時喺九巴嚟講，一向都係畀一啲特別車做嘅，中段佢有三小時休息，再加埋一小時食飯，大約四個小時休息嘅，但係就一直都唔會將十四小時擺喺一更車度做。一更車即係話中段冇休息，基本上係直落嘅。所以最新嘅指引喺 18 年呢個修訂案，就將呢個十四小時界定為係特別車，就並非一更車。

呢個「特別車」歷史悠久，主要係用於兩段嘅繁忙時間，一個係返工，一個係放工，亦因為呢兩個時間都係大多數出現喺早上6點至晚上嘅6點，所以呢個特別更車如果做晒呢兩個繁忙時間，就係會有跨幅嗰度要去到十四小時。因為佢六點鐘上完車，車完啲客去到總站，佢仲要揸番部車返廠，所以連出廠，連入廠大約係要有成十三、四個鐘頭嘅工作時間嘅。但係根據做呢啲更份嘅車長反映，佢哋認為做呢啲更份並不導致疲勞駕駛，雖然係十四小時，但係佢哋畀做一更車更加舒服，呢啲係特別更嗰啲車長嘅反映嚟嘅。

或者我哋度都有兩個做呢個特別更嘅，一個就係龍運嘅主任，你可以補充下。

主席：（經傳譯員）你一陣可以嘅，不過請你先答咗呢個問題先，即係喺呢一個嘅17年9月22號發生意外之後，運輸署就做咗一個檢討，整咗一個係工作休息用膳時間指引嘅修訂嘅，係嘛？

張子琦先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）有啲工會就建議嗰個工作嘅時間係應該限喺十二小時，係嘛？

張子琦先生：嗄，係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋工會向運輸署喺呢一個課題上面，你哋嘅立場係乜嘢呀？

張子琦先生：我哋個工會個立場係持開放態度，最主要就係要改善員工嗰個作息係擺喺首位，從而令到服務質素提高，尤其安全問題係擺喺首位嘅。

林天賦先生：主席，我哋喺見運輸及房屋局局長陳帆嗰陣時都講得比較清楚。第一，呢個十四小時係工作嘅時間上限，唔代表所有嘅司機都係要做十二小時工作，因為入面都規定咗揸車時間唔准超過十小時，呢個第一點。

第二點，就喺呢個十四小時，因為如果減到十二小時嘅話，對員工個收入會有比較大嘅影響。因為我哋有啲會員都講，如果十四小時減落嚟嘅話，每日減兩小時嘅話，佢哋嘅收入每個月會減大約5,000鈆，5,000鈆左右，即係佢佔咗家庭收入嘅一大部分。

第三個，如果要十四小時減到十二小時，即係巴士公司需要將呢啲時間畀咗其他人，其他本來工時相對短嘅員工去做呢個負擔，負起呢個駕駛任務。因為呢十四小時如果係簡單--九巴有二千個員工嘅話，佢即係每日要有四千個小時嘅工作時間，起碼要請四百人以上。要聘請一個，訓練好一個專業嘅車長，時間唔係短時間可以得到嘅，所以呢個見到就話如果呢啲工作時間喺短期入面冇可能達成嘅話，呢個變咗--工作時間應該係變咗而家嗰啲工時比較短嘅人要變咗兼負咗。

呢個所以我哋講嘅，所以整體要巴士安全唔係喺個工時嗰度著眼點，反而係休息時間更加重要，休息嘅設施更加重要，比巴士司機，巴士車長有好嘅工作條件，好嘅工作環境，咁呢個就係唔可以單純去睇，將呢個十四小時將佢醜化佢，

因為巴士公司又好，巴士車長又好，佢需要彈性。

頭先黎兆聰提到一點嘅，其實巴士嗰個車長要開特別更嘅，佢哋要申請嘅，唔係話巴士公司安排嘅，即係佢自願，佢考慮自己實際情況去申請嘅，所以呢個結合埋巴士個車長佢實際嘅處境。如果將所有嘢抽離嘅話，單純睇數字，或者單純睇呢個文件嘅話，可能對巴士行業嘅實際操作，我哋覺係有啲脫離呢個巴士行業嘅運作。

主席：（經傳譯員）你頭先提及過係見局長嘅，嗰次係咪舊年 10 月 17 號嘅會面嚟㗎？

林天賦先生：係，運輸署都有見，都有提到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。你就話係一個通知嚟嘅，通知--係工會發出通告。或者可以將呢一份文件帶出嚟，英文係 289-274 頁，或者你將呢個中文版本打出螢幕。

林天賦先生：錯咗，應該喺最近陳詞，最屘嗰一份最底嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）289-337 就係 2018 年 7 月 26 日，係咪呀？咁去到 336，289-336 頁，屘二嗰一段。英文就係 289-337-2。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家就係 10 月 17 號 2017 年，總工會關於呢一個會議，我其實就係想睇下嗰一份會議嘅通告啫。

林天賦先生：同埋 289-119。

主席：（經傳譯員）文件就係講喺 2017 年 10 月 17 號，就係總會就同五間巴士分會同局長見面，係咪呢一份文件呀？

林天賦先生：係，yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）第一點，係咪呀？「不能在短期內一刀切地下調工作指引中嘅工時上限，而應制度過渡或階段性措施嚟處理呢個問題」，即係應該要係有一啲過渡或者係階段性嘅措施嚟到去處理嘅，係咪呀？

林天賦先生：可以咁樣理解，因為陳帆局長--okay，係，啱呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家就係想問，呢個係咪工會嘅立場呢？係咪你哋咁樣嘅建議呢？

林天賦先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有啲嘅職工就係話十二個鐘頭應該係上限，但係你就話唔係喎，你覺得係應該要繼續十四個小時嘅呢一個當值，係咪呀？

林天賦先生：可以咁理解。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係正如你咁講，呢個要有好啲嘅休息設施同埋其他嘅措施，係

咪呀？呢個係咪你哋嘅立場呀？

林天賦先生：仲有休息時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）另外，喺英文個翻譯最低嗰度就話如果係打算縮減呢個嘅工作時數，就要確保係前線員工嗰個嘅薪酬唔會係大大咁受影響嘅。

林天賦先生：都講咗嗰十四小時減到十二小時，一個員工每一個月大概可能就減少 5,000 蚊左右嘅收入。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講嘅呢個立場，呢個立場，2017 年係咪咁嘅立場？即係關乎嗰個最高當值時間嘅指引，你 2015 年當運輸署問工會，話可能係更改或者修訂呢啲指引，當時你哋係咪同一個立場？

林天賦先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你係知道其實 2015 年，其實工會之間係有一啲嘅分歧，有啲就話要最多當值時間係十二小時，而你哋就係話連續當值十四時，你知唔知有咁嘅分歧嘅呢？

林天賦先生：2017 年我哋就知，係 2017 年，應該 18 年我哋先知，以前我哋比較少聽到有人咁樣講。

主席：（經傳譯員）起碼幫下我，一般嚟講，當你同運輸署或者係局長見面嘅時候，有冇呢啲嘅情況，係所有嘅工會喺同一個嘅場合會見，抑或你哋係分批同運輸署或者係局長見面嘅呢？

林天賦先生：我哋係分批見面嘅，我哋冇一齊見面。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你知唔知點解係咁嘅安排嘅呢？

林天賦先生：因為我哋同運輸署長期都係有一個不定期嘅會面，呢啲係雙方嘅共識。

第二，如果真係要反映專營巴士員工所面對嘅問題，只係得我哋一間工會有五間巴士分會，有齊巴士分會。

第三，有部分工會或者好大部分工會一開始對住我哋工會採取咗敵對，甚至係攻擊嘅態度，呢個令到大家嘅合作空間係冇嘅。

第四，喺大家討論關於專營巴士員工面對嘅問題，大家嘅觀點立場都不一致，所以上到去同官員講，一個一個講。

第五，我哋嘅每一次去到見運輸署官員嗰陣時，我哋都徵詢過我哋嘅啲幹事，或者係開專題會議去討論究竟係討論乜嘢話題。

第六，我哋嘅工會工作人員覆蓋面，即係喺所有嘅五間巴士公司入面，都有唔同嘅工作人員喺各個唔同嘅區工作，所以我哋覺得我哋掌握嘅情況會準確反映到大部分員工嘅意見。

第七，我哋工會從來冇喺即係大庭廣眾去批評其他工會，所以我哋唔希望呢啲事情繼續喺運輸署嘅會議入面發生。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以睇下《蘋果》呢一份報紙嘅報道？《蘋果日報》，就係 260...

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢，邊一份？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）工會文件 1B，中文就喺 260-257、258。至於英文就係 260-258-2。如果你睇下喺最底嗰度間住嘅，用深色字寫嘅文字，嗰度係提到運輸署現有嘅指引。但係喺呢一段嘅上一段，就係話自從一三年開始，巴職盟向運輸署要求修改指引，減工時同埋改善用膳時間，但係運輸署答覆話所有巴士公司都表示修訂指引會影響現有編更，佢哋需要額外增聘車長，長期營運開支將會增加，於是乎唔能夠係有共識嘅。

下面就寫運輸署日前表示，現時嘅指引係經諮詢專營巴士公司及工會後而制定，就佢哋認為如果而家係去要--運輸署就係用呢個理據，但係一直未正視巴士車長底薪過低，不斷加班增加外快嘅現象，因為署方認為車長薪金由巴士公司同員工商討，並同由市場調節嘅。咁就睇嚟呢，呢一度嘅報道係引述你哋嘅總工會就係其中一個原因引致個指引冇將嗰個嘅當值時間減到十二個鐘。我諗呢個未必係一個正確嘅表達，因為嗰度講所有嘅專營巴士公司都係反對呢一點嘅，呢個只不過係--即係你可唔可以同我哋確認呢個係咪你哋嘅立場呢？可唔可以講《蘋果日報》裏面所表達嘅係你哋總工會嘅立場呢，係咪呢？

林天賦先生：《蘋果日報》對於新聞報道，我哋覺得係有啲偏頗嘅。第二，講我哋工會，我哋係一套方案話畀運輸署聽嘅，唔可以咁樣抽離嚟睇，因為我要考慮巴士安全，就係淨係講工時，呢個係有欠公允嘅。第三，運輸署其實喺嗰個制訂指引嗰陣時，同我哋工會開過會嘅，有徵詢我哋意見嘅。咁佢最後嘅講法都係咩嘢呢？平衡各方，唔係淨係聽晒我哋工會一方面嘅意見，所以淨係講我哋工會提出嘅意見，運輸署全盤接受，呢個係唔準確嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。為完整，另外，《東方日報》有另外一張嘅報道。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗代表已經將佢哋嘅立場講得好清楚，我哋唔需要再去講報紙嘅報道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁好，去番你哋向委員會係 7 月 26 號 2018 年嗰個嘅文件，第 289-337-2 咁嘅文件；另外中文就係 289-336，喺工會文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係會講咩嘢嘅話題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想同佢哋確認一點，就係運輸署--喺你哋嘅文件就話運輸署

有諮詢過總工會，然後就係喺10月6號同埋17號之間係有諮詢過你哋，然後就已經係發出2018年2月嘅指引。咁即係話佢哋喺10月6號同埋17號2017年同你哋會面，但係佢哋係等到2018年2月23號公布咗新嘅指引先再同你哋總工會嚟到會面，係咪呀？呢個係咪你哋嘅立場？

林天賦先生：其實文件寫得清楚，2017年嘅10月6號見面，然之後就關於呢個修改--修訂工作指引，就我哋表達意見。然之後喺2018年嘅2月23號，佢就公布，中間就冇同我哋再次溝通，咁呢個就係運輸署同我哋工會喺處理呢件事嘅嗰個內容。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我睇到個時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。各位，我知道淨係請你哋今朝嚟嘅啫，不過而家我哋係要嘅時間要多咗喎，你願唔願意食完飯返嚟再講埋其餘嘅部分，我哋先至再聽其他工會代表嘅證供？食完飯再返嚟。

黎兆聰先生：我有個活動應承咗幾十人一個活動，我甩咗底，我要去返西貢會合番啲人，我或者搵番個九巴分會嘅代表替番我其餘嗰啲，我唔知得唔得？

林天賦先生：可以嘅，多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）張生呢？你下晝可唔可以出席呀？

張子琦先生：Yes，可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）黎生咁樣處理，好唔好呢？你願唔願意咁做呢，或者咁樣講？

黎兆聰先生：主席，我哋做工會係有一個好責任性嘅團隊，我今日兼負呢個責任，我一個船河嘅party有五十幾人，我唔參與，佢哋幾乎都要取消。作為工會係負責任嘅，一個活動，一個領導，呢啲活動就必須要去參與。如果我可以應承你，或者我逗留多一陣，你所想講嘅嘢，我儘量解答你，好唔好呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我哋都唔想話因為即係留住你，等你去唔到呢一個船河嘅活動，但係我哋會做嘅。如果我哋而家繼續做多一陣，係咪會好啲呢？黎生。

黎兆聰先生：唔好兜咁多個圈，重點講嗰啲，我相信可以解答到你。如果可能呢，半個鐘或者三個字，你所提出嘅重點，我解釋到畀你聽，我願意留低嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係有時講周邊嘅嘢就係會即係妨礙到我哋，令到我哋唔可以準時完成，兩邊都係要咁做。黃律師，繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你睇一份文件，係運輸署嘅文件嚟嘅，就係呢個18年嘅7月20號。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢文件嚟㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係回應番委員會嘅文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）處理咩嘢課題㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係有關於訓練巴士車長嘅一個作業守則嚟嘅，作業備考。或者請你睇下運輸署文件 1 號 427 頁，就係第一頁嚟嘅，有關於訓練車長嗰部分就係 435 頁可以搵到。第二格，上面就話運輸署最近向專營巴士公司--435，係運輸署文件嚟嘅，435 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度提及話運輸署最近就發出咗一個作業備考畀專營巴士公司嘅營運者嘅，有關於係訓練巴士車長，我想問...

主席：（經傳譯員）英文嚟㗎嘛，所以你需要讀出嚟，可以翻譯畀佢哋聽。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署最近發出咗作業備考畀經營者，係有關於訓練巴士車長，咁就要將唔同專營巴士公司佢哋訓練嘅安排變得一致。同時係就於巴士車長訓練系統要釐定一個係相同嘅框架，咁分時段就係 2018 年 10 月開始執行嘅。雖然咁--跟住落去嘅就係講另外一樣嘢，我想問嘅問題就係呢份嘅作業備考有冇發出畀你哋工會呀？即係等你哋去評論一下，唔會話係咪評論喇，咁有冇將呢一份嘅作業備考係畀一份你哋呀？

黎兆聰先生：你講嗰個訓練指引，我哋唔知係咩嘢嚟，應該冇收到，即係我講緊九巴吓，我冇收到呢個新指引。

張子琦先生：所有巴士都冇，五間巴士都冇，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇就於呢個嘅改變，即係培訓改變，即係會點樣監察同埋其他嘅事項，有冇諮詢過你哋呀？

黎兆聰先生：唔好意思，主席，我睇到 2018 年 10 月，而家先 7 月，會唔會有啲日子打錯咗呢？佢寫實施日期喎，我哋未收到呢個訊息，咁你打 2018 年 10 月，即係而家現在應該未有呢個通知。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，嗰份嘅實務說明已經係發出咗，不過係呢一個實施時段就係將來 10 月，但係已經發出咗實務說明。問題就係問有冇就於培訓嘅修訂，安排包括乜嘢，點樣監察，點樣去規範，有冇人去諮詢過你哋呀？

劉善達先生：城巴方面係有諮詢過嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀詳情呀？

劉善達先生：佢同我哋講過嗰個訓練個方法，即係個車長佢跟完線之後，就要去自己揸過一轉，冇問題先至畀佢行嗰條路線嘅。如果係冇訓練過，或者冇跟過嘅話，就唔准許行嗰條路線嘅。

黎兆聰先生：九巴呢度有補充。之前有啲路線可以用跟車住嘅，經工會反映咗之後，意外之後，公司係唔准跟車，要操車，一架車如果普通一個路線就六個人，如果

操過海線就三個人。不過係佢單方面修改，係冇通知過工會嘅，即係講九巴呢度，好唔好呀？

張子琦先生：大嶼山...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，等等。劉生，我想再進一步問，你頭先講黎生話有諮詢過你哋個喎，佢哋話，佢哋係指乜嘢呀？

劉善達先生：管理層。

主席：（經傳譯員）係城巴呀？

劉善達先生：城巴，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇諮詢過你哋呀？

劉善達先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，張生。

張子琦先生：冇嘅，所以呢啲措施到底係咪運輸署嘅指引，我哋係唔清楚，只不過係自從發生交通意外之後，幾間巴士公司都作出一啲修訂，就唔清楚呢啲修訂、呢啲指引係咪嚟自運輸署，佢冇同我哋清楚交代呢樣嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話交通意外，你係咪指呢一個嘅18年2月10號大埔公路嗰次嘅意外呀？

張子琦先生：冇錯，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想講另外一個課題，就係有關於嗰個車速顯示器嘅。我哋曾經聽過一啲嘅證供，就話專營巴士營運商就關注車速顯示器，話會引起車長同埋乘客之間嘅爭執，因而會令到巴士車長係受到額外嘅壓力，咁就可能會引起呢一個交通安全嘅問題，所以我就想問下，呢個咁嘅觀點，你哋工會係咪同意咁樣嘅講法㗎？

劉善達先生：係。

林天賦先生：呢個問題我哋未討論過，但係我哋覺得專營巴士車長佢會因應住每一條道路實際嘅交通限制，佢會駕駛巴士，但係乘客唔係，所以呢個可能真係會引起誤會，甚至磨擦。

黎兆聰先生：我可以補充，如果你講呢啲車速嗰個顯示器喺小巴，亦都係可能十零個人嘅磨擦。如果你話裝喺巴士嗰度，如果起哄，百幾人起哄，嗰班車唔使行㗎嘞。因為我相信我哋一個專業嘅車長，車速調控係適當嘅，係一個資深或者一個有經驗嘅駕駛者，好唔好呀？

張子琦先生：主席，我補充下，其實而家好多巴士，我哋因為係有一個提示器，佢只要一到七十公里就會響嘅。而且我哋嗰啲巴士完全係鎖死咗七十嘅，喺基本上係直路、平路都係唔會超過七十嘅，所以裝一啲嗰啲顯示器出嚟，會唔會有時或者落斜嗰十秒、八秒過少少，七十一、七十二，又會有乘客出嚟投訴，會產生一啲磨擦呢？我哋真係難以推斷會發生咩事。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講話一啲顯示就話係即係七十，如果其實嗰段道路係限速五十公里嘅話，呢個顯示器都冇乜用㗎喇，係咪呀？

張子琦先生：仲有，我哋嗰啲巴士係而家有GPS，係睇到嚟每一段路會唔會超速嘅，所以我哋絕大多數嘅車長都係唔會超速駕駛。如果唔係，佢就要返公司見，所以呢個資源扰落去係咪值得呢？我哋有個疑問，會唔會擺喺第二啲度仲好啲呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你嘅意見，我哋而家真係要停。如果係黎生你食完飯可以返嚟就即係更好。我想請大家喺兩點半再返番嚟繼續提供呢個口述證供，唔該晒。

下午1時12分聆訊押後

下午2時31分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安，黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二個我哋想問嘅問題就係關於非法泊車嘅。我哋要聽取你哋嘅證供，就係話係喺呢個總站嗰度有違例泊車嘅，咁就係令到嗰啲嘅巴士返番去總站比較難，亦都有問題嘅，咁亦都有安全嘅問題，因為違例泊車嘅原因。你哋個工會有發現到違例泊車係一個問題，你係需要同運輸署同埋警方係提出呢一個嘅違例泊車嘅問題？

張子琦先生：有嘅，主席，我哋多次向運輸署反映，喺巴士站裏面經常被外來嘅車輛喺度停泊，阻塞巴士嘅上落客，從而令到係會有機會產生嗰個安全問題。但係至今，運輸署係仍然冇想過任何方法去解決嘅。本會亦都向運輸署提出過多項建議，第一，喺巴士站裏面要畫雙黃線；第二，要喺巴士站裏面裝一啲閉路電視，可以錄低違例嘅車輛；第三，喺巴士站畫黃格，令到巴士出入方便，呢啲完全都係為咗公眾嘅利益，亦都參考咗星加坡都係咁樣做法，但係我哋本港嘅運輸署就以佢哋英國冇咁嘅例子而不作考慮。多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）關於嗰個提議就係星加坡嗰方面，係關於巴士站喺公路上面嘅巴

士站吖...

張子琦先生：係喺--主席，係喺公路上面嘅巴士站，我見到佢哋出面係有條黃線，主要巴士打燈出，後面嘅車輛就主動咁停低，讓巴士出站。咁但係香港就冇咁嘅情況出現喇，你打燈出，後面啲車只會加油嚟頂住你，令到巴士出站都好有困難，周時就係為咗咁樣樣而發生咗一啲交通意外，令到道路上更加擠塞。呢啲情況嚴重嘅地點係有伊利沙伯醫院喇、瑪嘉烈醫院喇、美景花園喇、欽州街、元州街、柯士甸道、新填地街、漆咸道南、麼地道同埋木廠街，違例--呢啲係違例泊車好嚴重嘅地點，仲有軒尼詩道、英皇道。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊喺巴士站嘅違例泊車，又或者喺巴士站附近嗰啲道路？係巴士站本身，定係附近嘅道路？

張子琦先生：係。喺巴士站入面，周時都係被一啲外來車輛佔用或者前後停咗車，中間留番個約莫有一個巴士位，但係喺呢啲情況，巴士係冇可能可以入到呢個巴士站上落嘅，係只能夠可以--只能夠 double park，咁呢個完全係令到乘客會有危險嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你會建議--咁點樣可以令到啲人就係阻嚇佢哋，就唔好喺巴士站附近之前之後嗰啲道路去泊車？有咩嘢建議？

張子琦先生：主席，根據外國嘅慣例，譬如美國，如果你係隨意喺巴士站度上落，嗰何罰款特別重嘅，香港嗰個罰款就特別輕，執法者特別鬆，亦喺巴士站裏面冇畫雙黃線，冇規定佢哋唔畀喺度泊咁樣，佢哋真係以為巴士站可以隨便上落、隨便停泊，而且如果裝閉路電視錄低佢哋，錄低啲違法嘅車輛係會有阻嚇作用，呢啲都係可以參考㗎。多謝，主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇拍到一啲嘅帶？就關於違例泊車，有冇攝錄過？

張子琦先生：有片段已經係交咗畀秘書處，而家你可以睇睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就係播緊條片嘅。我哋而家停一停先，停一停先，你首先你話畀我聽呢一個地點喺邊度嚟㗎，呢個地點喺邊度嚟㗎？

張子琦先生：呢度係北大嶼山迎東邨。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家睇到就有巴士...

張子琦先生：係喇，地下係雙黃線，完全係冇差人去管理。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係大概幾時拍㗎，呢段片？

林寶強先生：我講講，就琴日下晝拍嘅，咁而家我哋左手邊就係 37M 同 37H 嘅，咁右手邊--呢條片右手邊都係巴士站同的士站嚟嘅，咁嗰個緩衝區係好少嘅，導致啲車入唔到前面個迎東邨個停車場，我哋仲有一條片睇嘅，係阻礙巴士上落，會睇得好啲嘅。呢架巴士點解停响度？就入唔到去迴旋處㗎呢架巴士，佢

右手邊係一個停車場嚟嘅，咁啲車--喺右手邊見到啲私家車就係準備入停車場，係入唔到嘅，咁要讓一架嘅巴士出番嚟，喺個安全島逆線行車嘅呢個。

張子琦先生：呢架巴士係跨過對面嘅安全島，係逆線行車，現時係。

林寶強先生：嗰個情況係比較嚴重嘅，如果日後呢個人工島開咗之後更加多車喺附近，會導致更加擠塞嘅，呢啲位置都係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪--呢條片嗰個地點同你哋頭先第一條片嗰個地點係咪一樣㗎，還是係另外一個地點？

林寶強先生：同一樣，同一個位置，仲有幾張相睇到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

林寶強先生：呢個喺 Google Map 睇相嘅呢個係，可以喺 Google Map 嗰度睇到嘅，呢啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係左邊嘅圖片喇，就係個巴士站嚟㗎，係咪巴士站嚟㗎？

林寶強先生：係，正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以返番去前一張相？呢一張，係。嗰個灰色嗰架車，其實佢係咪巴士站裏面停，還是係喺巴士站嘅隔籬？哦，原來--我睇到喇，喺巴士站個範圍裏面㗎。

張子琦先生：冇錯，佢對面嗰架貨車都係巴士站㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪琴日拍嘅相？琴日影嘅相嚟㗎？

林寶強先生：呢個 Google 嗰啲相嚟嘅，呢張係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係 Google 嚟㗎。呢兩條片係咪你自己拍㗎，還是...

林寶強先生：係，琴日拍嘅，琴日下午拍。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係咪喺巴士裏面望出嚟咁樣拍㗎？

林寶強先生：有啲落地拍，有條片係坐住㗎私家車拍嘅，坐喺架工程車拍嘅，有一條。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實我哋睇番嗰個錄像機佢嗰個擺動嗰個角度，我哋就知道其實你係點樣拍嘅。

張子琦先生：主席，我想講嘅係呢啲情況喺香港好多處都係咁樣樣嘅情形，主要就係執法者不嚴。

林寶強先生：我補充少少吖，因為嗰個位置，迎東邨嗰邊，出邊將會填海，但係佢未完善之中就開咗呢條路，擺咗好多巴士，加上個停車場--嗰個迎東邨嘅停車場

車位不足，導致佢塞住咗個路口，私家車入唔到去，所以排隊入去嗰個停車場。另外貨車就後面--見到呢張圖嘅後面落緊貨嘅，因為入唔到停車場，導致喺外圍落貨。

張子琦先生：主席，我喺度想補充，任何理由阻塞巴士站都係唔合理、唔合法嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你就喺巴士上面就可以其實有一個向前睇嘅鏡頭，你就可以睇番或者係擺低--就攝錄咗啲影像，有啲嘅違例泊車，你覺得呢個建議點樣樣？

張子琦先生：可行嘅，主席，但係呢啲拍低咗之後，我哋嘅資方會唔會將呢啲資料會畀警方呢？第一。第二，違例者如果佢冇想到你係會畀警方，佢繼續違例，但係如果喺個巴士站度裝一條攝錄鏡頭，佢就會有阻嚇作用。多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以問一個補充嘅問題？如果我哋想清楚呢啲咁嘅情況嘅時間，咁可能車長就要可能要撳一個掣，咁然之後就係--就嗰個影--個相機就係可以知道正確係咩嘢時間呢啲事情發生，咁你覺得呢個咁嘅安排又點樣樣？

張子琦先生：可行嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係可行吖，當然，但係咁你反唔反對？你會唔會支持咁做？

張子琦先生：支持。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）再講番呢一方面嘅議題喇，我哋講番就係話巴士專線，即係巴士線嘅，咁你嘅書面嘅意見入面就係話即係巴士司機都係因為其他人違泊，咁令到佢哋工作更難喇，其中一個問題就係違泊嘅問題喇，令到啲司機都會沮喪嘅，咁所有呢啲問題都帶嚟一啲安全嘅問題，你會唔會支持呢一個講法？都有啲建議嘅，喺星加坡就譬如話係有巴士專用嘅線，你會唔會支持？

張子琦先生：主席，我係支持同埋認同嘅，但係睇番呢十零年，香港政府對巴士專線 cut 得嘅 cut，不但只唔會畀條專線佢行，仲要畀條好難行嘅路佢行，例如德士古道天橋，佢朝早6點，即係話夜晚12點至到6點，凌晨6點，佢係唔畀巴士--專營巴士行嘅，反而佢係畀一啲重型車行，係畀一啲非專營嘅巴士行，偏偏就唔畀專營巴士行，令到車上嘅乘客係要行天橋底下過，咁樣反映出運輸署處事係避重就輕，我估計應該係有人投訴太多重型車經過嗰條天橋，但係佢就選擇係專營巴士行底下，行天橋底下。多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢條天橋係咪巴士線嚟㗎？

張子琦先生：主席，呢條天橋唔係巴士線，以前係任何車輛都可以喺上面行，但係就唔使喺下面經過幾個燈位，但係而家運輸署嘅處事作風就偏偏就唔係咁樣樣處事嘅--處理嘅，係要啲巴士行一啲唔方便、唔直接嘅路面，要佢哋行橋底過，反而上面就畀重型車、畀非專利過，本末倒置，唔明白佢哋用意何在。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係集中講番--即係而家講緊巴士專用嗰啲路線喇，現有嘅巴士線喇，你嘅睇法係點？幾於政府或者運輸署佢嘅態度，對於發展巴士專用嘅線道你點睇？

張子琦先生：主席，我絕對認同、贊成係開啲巴士專線畀佢哋行，呢個係為咗公眾嘅利益，使多啲人選用交通工具，好過揸私家車出嚟，而家因為私家車太多喇，會堵塞交通，如果你巴士暢順嘅話，唔會塞車嘅話，佢哋會多啲人會選擇公共嘅交通工具嘅，希望運輸署正視呢個公眾嘅利益，唔好去扼殺巴士嘅經營，令我哋產生困難。多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題就問得好清楚，問你對於政府個睇法係有咩嘢睇法，即係係咪你意思話政府而家減晒啲巴士線，令到你哋經營唔到，定點？巴士專用線。

張子琦先生：我見唔到而家有新開嘅專營巴士路線畀巴士行，不但只係巴士路線，我喺度扯遠少少，就係現今嘅屋邨嘅巴士總站個設計都非常之有問題，令到佢哋泊位難，根本又好似有難以生存嘅空間，令到啲巴士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最屘一個問題講薪酬，我哋聽到城巴嘅營運商嘅證供就話佢哋係有薪金同埋--即係其實佢哋改革咗㗎喇，2018年3月開始有個底薪再加埋獎金嘅，咁我就想問下呢個制度，呢個建議有個弊處嘅，就似乎係話而家係冇一個獎勵嘅制度，你可唔可以代理工會確認係咁嘅情況？即係係再將個薪--3月，2018年，將個發薪嗰度...

主席：（經傳譯員）你話之前係咪講話如果安全駕駛有獎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係喇，安全駕駛有獎賞嘅。

張子琦先生：主席，講起呢個薪酬，自從1999年開始，資方不斷咁將佢哋嘅薪酬削減、福利削減，去到04年更加又大幅削減，淨係呢個99年到04年都分開三級制。喺近期，我哋要求資方要重整呢個薪酬同福利，如果唔係，對個員工個士氣打擊好大。而家我哋攞緊嘅薪酬，新入職嘅，早前都係$12,000都唔夠，後嚟我哋要求公司將嗰個安全獎、服務獎擺番落去個底薪度，先至係到$15,366，呢個薪酬係遠比運輸署界嘅行業嘅中位數為低，但係呢個車長嘅工作，負嘅責任係非常之重，佢車上嘅全部都係生命，係人。佢咁嘅薪酬偏低，係令到直接影響到聘請，甚至係佢工作嘅態度。好多人入到嚟，都係考咗個牌，操熟嗰個重型車，佢就會出去考其他重型車牌，就會出去其他運輸嘅行業度做。咁係令到成個服務嘅質素就會降低，因為成日都係新人。

仲有，佢哋嗰個薪酬太低，變咗佢哋不在乎呢份工作，帶住咁嘅心情去工作嘅話，就好容易產生交通意外。如果我講番98年之前嘅日薪，佢哋每一個車長絕大多數都係好珍惜呢份工作，因為佢哋知道佢哋出到去搵唔到呢份工，佢哋每年都有個增薪點，佢哋越做得耐，更加唔會跳槽或者離開呢個崗位，對公司有歸屬感。無奈99年之後，嗰個薪酬嘅制度大幅調低，令到呢啲車長嘅質素

顯然係下降，同時影響到公眾嘅利益。

多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話係工會要求嗰個薪酬方面個架構要調整嘅，你係幾時提出呢個要求？即係而喺18年3月嘅時候係的確已經改咗，咁你幾時提出㗎？

張子琦先生：主席，我哋呢個要求已經係有十年多㗎喇，但係一直未被認同，因為當時個環境，香港個環境或者唔係咁好，經歷過SARS、金融風暴，所以資方唔肯願意去改善。直至到呢兩、三年，資方先至肯願意逐步逐步去改善，但係係一啲嘢牙膏式嘅，所以令到好多工友都不滿意，甚至產生一啲工業嘅行動。呢啲我哋係理解嘅，所以再次敦促資方要大幅咁樣樣去改善番嗰個薪酬嘅福利，同以前嘅98年嘅日薪要睇齊，佢哋有嘅嘢，月薪都要有。咁喺而家嚟緊嘅今年度嘅加薪會議，資方而家口頭上應承我哋係大幅係加番畀我哋嗰個福利，但係嗰個薪酬仍然係未曾追得上現時嗰個中位數，因為而家我哋新入職嘅係$15,366，暫時資方只係應承加1,000蚊，加咗1,000蚊都係$16,366，遠比揸重型嘅貨車嘅司機為低。但係我哋揸緊嘅唔係重型--唔係貨車，係重型車，而家載緊乘客，我哋個薪酬唔應該低於任何嘅駕駛者，但係偏偏我哋攞嘅薪酬係非常之低，呢個係非常之不合理。所以我哋仍然係努力之中，儘量為業畀爭取更大嘅權益。多謝，主席。龍運巴士有補充。

陳廣能先生：係，sorry，或者我補充少少，係。我哋龍運巴士分會喺2018年嘅1月做咗一個統計，就係統計我哋喺2017年呢個年度我哋離職同埋入職嘅人數，我哋喺--龍運巴士喺2017年入職嘅人數係一百人，2017年呢個年度離職嘅人數係一百二十人，我哋喺1月份嘅統計就當中呢一百二十人係有--即係呢一百二十人喇，當中係有百分之六十係因為薪酬嘅問題--嘅低薪呢個問題而係離職嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄭生，可唔可以問你呢一樣嘢--陳生。關於安全獎金、其他獎金喺2018年3月係加入去個底薪嗰度，係咪有發生過咩嘢事係令到巴士嘅營運商去有呢個改變？有冇發生咩嘢事？

張子琦先生：主席，我可以好明確咁同你講，係唔關任何發生嘅事情或者某一啲特別嘅大嘅意外先至係會產生呢一個加幅嘅。因為呢個加幅喺上年嘅加薪談判，我哋上年5月，17年嘅5月已經係已經確定咗今年佢會加㗎喇，會調整，將個安全獎、服務獎擺落去個底薪度，只不過資方話佢唔希望喺加薪會議嘅時間傾呢樣嘢，等加薪會議完結咗之後，先至同我哋確實呢樣嘢嘅落實。咁加薪會議完成咗之後，我哋都追過資方「喂，你要找數喇喎」，資方都話儘快㗎喇，據聞佢哋12月董事局已經批准咗將嗰個底薪調高，將安全獎、服務獎擺落個底薪度。呢個我哋係爭取好耐，亦係我哋嗰個計劃嚟，成個將嗰個人工調升一個計劃，點解呢？我首先要將安全獎、服務獎擺咗落個底薪度，令到有$15,366，第一步。

第二步，我就爭取雙糧，雙糧係以嗰個底薪計，咁我哋先至會爭取更大嘅

成績。雙糧佢已經畀咗我哋喇又，係以嗰個$15,366，未計今年嘅加薪。咁嚟講，如果我唔將嗰個安全獎、服務獎擺落個底薪度，我只能夠攞一萬一千幾。即係換句說話，呢個雙糧我係多咗三千幾紋，呢個係我第二步。所以係與發生任何嘅事情、嘅交通意外係無關嘅。

多謝，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以2017年5月你哋已經同意咗㗎喇，咁個董事局已經之前--就喺2017年12月嘅時候同意咗呢個做法，係咪咁樣樣？

張子琦先生：冇錯嘅，主席，喺17年嘅12月已經批咗，但係公司冇即刻拎出嚟，亦都冇講畀我哋知派個聖誕禮物畀我哋，仍然係擺住唔放出嚟，佢好不恰當咁樣樣就係喺意外之後先至攞出嚟，所以畀外界誤會咗，以為係因為有宗大交通意外，先至會畀呢個福利或者調整呢個薪酬畀我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊係邊一個嘅董事局係核准呢一個嘅改變，邊一個董事局？邊間公司嘅董事局？

張子琦先生：根據我所知，主席，係九巴董事局梁乃鵬主席親自批嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇其他公司嘅董事局？

張子琦先生：主席，呢個唔清楚。

主席：（經傳譯員）林先生，呢個大嶼山巴士公司有冇作出一個咁嘅改變，就係話將安全獎金係將佢加埋入底薪嗰度？

林寶強先生：冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋畀嘅證供話畀我哋聽，就係有一個額外嘅獎金一次過嘅，咁係咪咁樣樣？

林寶強先生：係，有嘅，呢個有嘅。我哋嘅底薪係6,400紋底薪，咁每日有個津貼，就係230紋嘅，一個月開足工，返九個鐘，禮拜六、日要開工，四個禮拜六、日，加埋$16,200，比係九巴、新巴、城巴、龍運少咗錢嘅，人工係偏低嘅，大嶼山係偏低嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生，剛才黃大律師都問過--問呢個問題，因為咁樣嘅調整，其實對呢個嘅巴士嘅車長嚟講，佢哋冇任何嘅誘因或者鼓勵佢哋特別注重安全嘅，你覺得呢個調整係咪冇呢個效果？

張子琦先生：主席，唔認同嘅。薪酬--合理嘅薪酬係絕對鼓勵到一個同事對公司嘅認同、歸屬感，而唔係一個過渡式，而唔係一個騎牛搵馬，工作態度就自然不同。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你係要提出一啲嘅建議點樣去監察車長嘅表現，譬如話好似星加坡有個系統喇，佢哋係有個紅色、黃色同埋綠色嘅制度㗎，就係話睇番嗰個司機嘅情況，...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係講緊其中一間公司啫？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋睇一睇相關嘅星加坡呢間嘅公司喇，佢就係 Strait Times，海峽兩岸嘅，2017 年呢一個 6 月嘅報導嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有冇個頁碼，個頁數？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其實就唔喺我哋嘅呢一個嘅文件夾嗰度，呢間公司叫做「易塔通」，咁呢個喺文章嘅第 2 版我哋睇到喇，第 4 段喇，就係講到嗰啲嘅司機喇，咁佢哋以前喺--咁佢就將佢嗰--咁佢喺 12 月就係去到二十點喇，咁所以佢就特別喺嗰個月就係可以有一個獎金，130 鈺嘅星加坡紙嘅。咁其實有可能有遠程嘅訊息系統去監察嗰啲司機，咁亦都係根據個司機個表現就係有一個獎金㗎，咁如果我哋建議有一個咁嘅制度，咁你覺得你個工會會唔會去支持或者值得我哋去參考，或者去研究下有一個咁樣嘅獎勵計劃？

黎兆聰先生：我想補充，主席，我係九巴分會嘅代表。我想講畀主席聽，我哋呢間公司一路以來冇重視我哋呢個崗位嘅薪酬福利，直至到呢個意外，早幾日先至開始皇恩浩蕩，開始醒覺，先至畀咗十樣嘢畀我哋。我由開始喺呢間公司做咗十八年，整個過程係好唔愉快嘅，係又冇一個友善或者係一個重視呢個員工一個薪酬方案令佢對呢間公司有歸屬感，第一。

我喺呢間公司做咗十八年，頭八年都要簽約嘅，我只係投閒置散，一個好虛銜嘅工作，而誘因點解工會一路以來要爭取安全獎、服務獎要撥落個底薪？呢個係我個人堅持，我同管理層講過好多次，因為呢個安全獎、服務獎嘅基--嗰個獎金係會扣除我哋嘅，因為我哋有啲新入職嘅車長，佢哋如果經驗唔夠，佢一扣--舉例講，嗰陣時係得 1,200 鈺呢個安全獎，係會扣晒我哋嘅。所以呢個獎金係導致好多問題，工會一路以來都有爭取，不過公司就同我哋講，安全獎、服務獎呢個基數好大，一講緊係數以千計，所以直至到呢個意外發生之前，佢可能亦都想--某一啲人亦都想回應工會嘅訴求，安全獎、服務獎先至撥落個底薪。

但係我要強調，希望主席明白，唔好察覺到話冇咗安全獎、服務獎，就會令致到我哋啲車長亂咁嚟，我哋一個專業車長，相信作為一個駕駛者，佢對自己如果犯錯，係要負上刑責，但係安全獎、服務獎呢個制度恆之以久，佢已經用咗好多年，亦都好唔平等。因為我工會收納好多新人，尤其是未揸過巴士，可能頭半年至一年可能佢會唔夠經驗，賠錢畀對方，又會畀公司扣呢啲獎金，從而冇個穩定收入。工會睇到呢個方法咁多年來都存在問題，希望唔好佢令一個獎金而扣取咗我哋，係影響到我哋一個月嘅收入，哪怕今日呢個月好好彩，冇發生交通意外，可能下個月兩、三單交通意外，扣嘅錢可能扣咗成個月，可能令到佢嘅收入真係會大減。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係講緊扣減喎，講緊就係加畀你，而家就係話一個獎勵，就話喺你嗰個底薪之外，如果你係揸車揸得好，你就會係有一個額外嘅獎金，呢個就係我嘅提議，唔係話...

黎兆聰先生：哦，你呢個係講緊bonus吖嘛，九巴，冇，冇呢個制度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我唔係話你而家有冇，如果我哋話建議有一個類似咁嘅獎金嘅制度，你會唔會支持？

張子琦先生：主席，任何有獎勵嘅制度我哋都會支持，但係而家九--我哋同九巴已經傾緊一個另外一個獎勵嘅制度，就係有二十個point，每年加一個point畀佢，即係話如果佢達到公司嘅要求，佢就每年都會有錢再加畀佢，就另外嘅，就唔係一個加薪嗰個幅度，咁以前呢個係冇㗎，月薪係冇，日薪就有。咁佢口頭上已經應承咗㗎喇，可以有二十個，咁呢個係根據佢嘅表現喇、佢嘅安全駕駛喇、佢嘅出勤紀錄喇、佢嘅紀律喇，如果佢達唔到，佢嗰年就冇得升。呢個已經係一個--形式上差唔多係一個獎勵嘅制度嚟㗎喇。咁希望--當然喇，如果有其他嘅獎勵，我哋係歡迎㗎。

林寶強先生：我想補充少少，咁懲罰性係一個唔係恰當去監察司機嘅嘢，如果個司機嘅車長有乜嘢做得唔好，用個培訓制度令佢去走番一個好嘅駕駛良好嘅態度、安全嘅服務，係一個重要性㗎。如果你話畀個獎金落去係幫助佢--點講呢？即係會扣減之中，令到佢壓力仲更加大，如果你話特定咗有個獎金喺度，我要爭取呢個獎金，一有個意外喺度，令佢都冇心機去繼續去駕駛嘅。好似正如我哋大嶼山都係，安全獎，佢扣一扣，扣兩期㗎，好多時扣兩期，扣兩期就幾千蚊，已經對於個家庭生活影響嘅，係。唔該，主席。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我已經係完成咗我個提問㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席，我有一個問題，關於我哋有個保護罩㗎，今朝早有提到，似乎呢度嘅幾位就唔係都好--唔多支持呢個保護罩嘅呢個嘅睇法嘅，你唔支持係因為可能嗰個材料唔好，或者有啲聲響，或者有反光，或者你根本其實係有一個保護罩呢個咁嘅建議你都覺得唔好嘅？唔該晒。

黎兆聰先生：唔係話唔好，而係個保護罩出咗嚟，係的而且確車長反映，佢係有個感覺到獨立咗呢個駕駛呢個工作環境，但係衍生嘅問題，嗰個保護嗰個--嗰塊膠同埋衍生有啲問題，而家管理層係冇解決到，從而令到我哋駕駛分咗心同埋有衍生到有啲問題會可能嚴重咗，我哋係希望佢改善呢塊膠板。呢塊膠板係衍生--第一，我都講咗，今朝講咗喇，有反光嘅情況同埋佢最尖頭嗰個位個攝石攝得唔實會發出聲響，同埋開關一個問題，同埋我哋有啲工友質疑，就係話就算呢塊膠膜雖然係弧拱形嘅膠膜，但係要襲擊，一樣襲擊到嘅。但係車長係反映話係感覺到就有一個保護罩嘅工作環境，但係對呢塊板就不敢恭維喇。

因為反映過好多次，管理層只係話唔拆得呢塊政治板，但係我哋傾向性好

多工友都希望拆咗佢，因為呢塊板衍生好多問題。第一，就係安全問題，夜晚會反光，同埋一個高度--個車長一個高度唔--可能--而視覺上佢彎，佢睇落個視線會畀個彎度遮咗追車上嚟嘅情況係好嚴重；第二，就係呢個板會發出聲響，咁亦都係一個問題，到而家都未解決得到。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）咁你支唔支持如果管理層係用一種保護罩係唔會有任何駕駛嘅危險嘅，你會唔會支持？

黎兆聰先生：支持嘅，我哋之前有畀過啲圖，有譬如韓國，佢都有一啲完全係一個獨立嘅門，係玻璃窗，兩個可以--好細嘅，可以開關嘅，我哋畀過啲圖佢睇過嘅，有參考外國嘅圖畀佢嘅，不過我覺得佢自己諗呢個方法，半月彎嘅保護裝置，可能衍生嘅問題佢真係可能冇諗過咁細緻，衍生咁多問題出嚟，而係淨係答我哋話「呢個係政治板，唔拆得」。

主席：（經傳譯員）林生，大嶼山巴士係咪都有十四個鐘嗰種特別更？

林寶強先生：有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁司機喺返呢啲更嘅時候，有冇畀三個鐘以上嘅休息時間佢哋㗎？

林寶強先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果司機去到嗰日嗰個鐘數要休息喇，會有咩嘢設施提供畀司機喺當地--即係嗰處都休息？

林寶強先生：暫時都冇，最多喺架巴士度--有啲巴士可以畀佢哋啲㗎咋。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係冇設施嘅？

林寶強先生：暫時未有。

主席：（經傳譯員）係即係會喺邊度？係咪喺巴士總站嗰度吖，喺番個廠嗰度吖，有幾多地方大家可以去休息嘅？

林寶強先生：佢哋會喺街或者商場去啲嘅，如果近屋企就會返屋企嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你答唔答到即係有幾多巴士車長到休息嘅時間，有幾多可以返到屋企？

林寶強先生：冇知道嘅呢個，唔--有一半嘍，應該係，即係要做呢啲更嘅，一半都有嘅，約莫一半喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇返特別更？

林寶強先生：之前有，之前有，但係我都係返屋企嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。你已經估計到我跟住問你咩嘢喇。黃大律師，運輸署提供

畀我哋嘅資料就係運輸署之前提交畀立法會嘅交通事務委員會嘅一個資料文件喇，可唔可以放上去呢一個嘅螢幕嗰度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係TD1-403頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁立法會嗰個嘅資料文件？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）403頁，TD1-403頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）英文？呢個資料文件係咪英文嘅？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生（張先生？），呢份文件就喺7月25號喺立法會曾經討論過嘅，就係交通事務委員會討論過，處理兩個問題喇，其中一個--其中三個問題，一個就培訓喇，同埋安全帶喇，同埋係有啲乜--即係用科技去提高安全嘅。咁就有一個工作小組，係由運輸署成立嘅，成員就有專營巴士公司同埋有三間巴士廠，喺3月中嘅時候就開過會，咁呢份文件就係講番工作小組嘅成果。就呢三個問題有冇問過你意見？

張子琦先生：冇嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇機會睇過呢份文件，睇下佢哋提議點樣做，你有冇提過㗎？

張子琦先生：主席，我未睇過呢份文件，今日先係第一次。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生（張先生？），你頭先咁答喇，咁我就諗喇，喺我再問你問題之前，應該咁樣公道啲，應該畀你睇咗呢份文份文件先，咁然後你可以考慮下再回答番我問嘅問題。我而家建議--因為我哋仲有其他嘅工會嘅代表都好耐心等候嚟畀證供，我就建議而家先中途就請佢哋畀證供，到你表示你可以睇完喇，回答到問題喇，再請番你過番嚟，好唔好？你會唔會同？

張子琦先生：冇問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，咁而家請你離席，我哋而家就休息一陣，我哋換人，先處理職工盟嗰個代表，而家休息一陣。

下午3時25分聆訊押後

下午3時35分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鍾先生同埋其他各位，我哋多謝巴士業職工會聯盟就係接受我哋嘅邀請，今日就係嚟到我哋委員會嗰度作供嘅，我就會請黃大律師就會去提問嘅。我哋解釋一下，如果--鍾先生，或者想你哋其中一個嘅成員去作答嘅時候，就可以咁樣指出，你哋可以隨便去提交你意見。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝你鍾先生同埋咁多位今日出席嘅。我哋就已經係有你哋嘅陳述書，委員會就主要嗰個職責就係寫落去職能範圍嗰度就係提意見關於專營巴士嘅安全方面嘅，所以我嗰個問題就係同安全有關嘅，而唔係同其他嘅譬如話嗰個受聘、招職等等有關嘅問題嘅。我第一個問題就係睇一睇嗰個背景，關於你個聯盟嘅背景。鍾先生，我知道巴士業職工會聯盟就係有三個嘅成員嘅，啱唔啱㗎？

林錦標先生：啱。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先就係九巴、新世界第一巴士公司同埋成巴有限公司嘅，啱唔啱呀？

林錦標先生：係，啱。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋個聯盟而家有一千六百六十個會員嘅，啱唔啱呀？

林錦標先生：啱。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅所有嘅會員係咪全部都係巴士司機嚟㗎？

林錦標先生：唔係，有前線車長、站長、車房嘅員工，都係响前線工作嘅伙記嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，有幾多個係車長呢？

林錦標先生：超過九成。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鍾先生，你哋嘅聯盟就係有提交過兩份陳述書嘅，第一份就係2018年4月24號，就喺TU 文件夾就147至到226頁嘅，中文版本，英文版226-1 就係至 226-80 嘅。你有第二份陳述書嘅，就係就番委員會嘅一封信件，呢個補充嘅文件就係 TU-1B 260-28 就去到 260-67 嘅，喺呢個畫面上面你睇到㗎喇，英文版本就係 TU-1B 文件夾 260-68 去到 103 嘅。

鍾先生，我就想睇一睇你個陳情書裏面提出嗰啲課題，我哋逐個逐個睇，第一個嘅就係關於違泊方面嘅，違例泊車，喺 234 至 236 頁嗰度就係有關呢一方面嘅，呢個係附件二，上高係有一啲電郵，就係關於違泊嗰方面嘅，就係一啲來來回回嘅電郵，你提供畀委員會嘅，你就特別提到就南昌街嘅情況同埋其他一啲街道嘅情況，喺你哋最近嘅陳述書...

林錦標先生：律師，唔好意思，我想問一問，你係叫鍾生答定係林生答呢？因為鍾生係...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鍾先生，或者你話畀我聽邊一位你哋嘅代表係最適合去答呢一方面嘅問題，特別係違泊嗰方面，邊位最合適呢？

林錦標先生：律師，因為我係代主席嚟嘅，就因為你講鍾生就係我嘅副手嚟嘅，而家我就代表聯盟就搵劉先生解答你呢個問題。劉生。

劉啟謙先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。劉生，就附件二你提交畀委員會，呢度就係裏面係同運輸署之間嘅一啲電郵來往，係特別係投訴關於違例泊車嘅，喺第 235 頁，你就附上咗一啲相片嘅，就展示到嗰個違泊嘅問題嘅情況嘅。我哋睇到最後嗰度下低嗰度就係話運輸署就係收到呢啲電郵，你就話「我哋嘅分區嘅辦事處嘅同事就會係跟進嘅」，我個問題就係話運輸署有冇跟進到呢？同埋有冇喺南昌街呢個違泊嘅情況改善到呢？

劉啟謙先生：我哋一直由 2017 年嘅 5 月開始同運輸署就南昌街嗰個違例泊車就進行投訴，直到去到 2018 年大約係上兩個月嘅，我哋先收到運輸署最終嘅回覆，就話嗰度已經改善咗同埋加多咗一個巴士站嘅 marking 喺上面，就防止啲車輛喺上面違泊，但係其實成個過程我哋係用咗好長嘅時間同警方溝通，亦都因為呢個違泊嘅問題，喺上址係發生咗一個車長畀人襲擊嘅事件，我哋喺呢個事件之後，我哋即時去信畀運房局嘅常務秘書長黎先生，相關去信嘅喺我哋 supplementary paper 嘅附件係有附件呢封信件嘅。同時間其實我哋一直以嚟都係有追運輸署喺上址進行改善嘅工作，但係其實運輸署都係好緩慢同埋都係用一個唔想處理嘅態度去進行呢個 case 嘅處理。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。所以我哋睇一睇第一個陳述書關於違泊嘅，喺中文就係 176 頁嘅，喺英文係 226-30，括弧--括號嘅。喺呢一頁，我哋見到你嘅建議，又或者咁講，你係簡述番就住違泊嘅問題你哋做咗啲乜嘢嘅，我哋見到喺英文版本就係咁講嘅，就話你哋寫過畀運輸署嘅，「喺 2017 年 5 月嘅時候去信運輸署要求安排警員加強執法工作之外，可以嘗試透過其他可行措施去防止巴士站被違例泊車阻礙。當中建議喺上址設立二十四小時禁區、延長巴士站路面標誌，以及加設鐵欄杆去減少車輛喺上址違泊同埋防止巴士站受到其他車輛阻礙。經過多次嘅溝通之後，運輸署以附近有上、落貨嘅需要為由，最終只係安排加設欄杆，但係由於運輸署對於上址嘅問題未有正視，最終喺 2017 年 8 月喺上址巴士站發生車長被襲嘅事件，被襲嘅原因係車長正係駛過一架違例泊車嘅私家車，而畀人誤會『飛站』而被襲嘅。呢件事件正係因為巴士站畀違例泊車阻礙而引起嘅。」你就話「如果運輸署重視本聯盟嘅建議，及早安排相關嘅道路標誌設置工作，相信呢次事件係可以避免。」

你最近嘅第二份嘅書面嘅陳詞，即係第 260-89 至 90 頁，呢一個就係英文版嚟嘅，中文版就係 260-53 頁，你進一步回應係咁講嘅，就係(d)段，就話

「運輸署主要回覆係轉交所屬地區嘅運輸主任作出跟進，同時轉交警方採取相應行動。同時，就個別地區，如本聯盟所指嘅南昌街等不但作出口頭質詢，同時亦有透過同運輸署保持溝通以跟進嘅。」「就住違泊問題，本聯盟同警方會議亦都有表達關注同埋要求喺各個黑點加強執法。」跟住就話「雖然警方喺唔同嘅會議亦都有口頭承諾表示會加強執法，亦都有指違泊嘅檢控數字有所增加，但係有啲違泊嘅黑點，譬如係旺角嘅新填地街、英皇道、怡和街同埋荃灣橫龍街就未見有太大改善。」

你跟住有一個附件，就係一張黑點嘅清單，係交咗畀警方嘅，就顯示你哋曾經叫過警方去跟進各個黑點，我相信呢個就係叫做附件十四嗰度嘅，喺你封信，係2017年嘅3月26同埋27日，呢個就係喺260-462又或者係260-468-1頁。如果睇番呢封信，呢封信係寫畀運輸署長嘅，喺260-468-2頁，你呢度喺260-468-5，就關於港島區、新界同埋九龍嘅黑點嘅名單，我個問題係自此，呢兩封信之後有冇跟進過呢？

劉啟謙先生：我哋兩--呢兩封信之後，我哋喺恆常同運輸署同埋警方嘅跨部門會議裏面，每一次都有就違例泊車嘅問題反映嘅，而其實相關我哋同運輸署反映嘅內容其實係可以從我哋提交嘅會議紀錄裏面係見得到嘅，而跟進違例泊車嘅問題，我哋唔係話單一次去做，而係一個叫做可持續性嘅工作嚟嘅，即係我哋唔會可能係話就一個地點講完就唔會有任何跟進行動，而我哋同運輸署一直係跟進住每一個黑點嘅問題，或者呢啲黑點可能係自交呢個黑名單之後可能後面有增加或者有啲地方係改善嘅，但係喺我哋過去由呢個17年嘅3月直到今日我哋唔見得太多嘅地點係有改善，而呢啲嘅跟進其實都係一直以嚟係有做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你覺得要處理違泊問題，因為引起專營巴士嘅問題，你覺得應該點樣處理？

劉啟謙先生：第一，最重要係警方執法，我哋好多時遇到嘅問題係見到違例泊車係阻礙，我哋嘗試--車長會報警去處理，但係警方其實多次都係有用警區人手不足呢個理由就話佢哋處理唔到。其實喺過往我哋嘅抗議行動裏面，我哋有建議過增加交通督導員嗰個嘅數量嘅，因為其實我哋了解到有啲繁忙嘅區域，好似油尖旺區，交通督導員嗰個比例係異常地少嘅，其實警方有能力去請到交通督導員去進行呢啲交通嘅執法行動，其實我哋最認為係違例泊車係佢真係違例，而最有效嘅方法其實就係檢控呢個違例泊車，同埋運輸署係應承咗我哋會喺某一啲地區係劃番嗰個巴士站嗰個標誌，因為巴士站標誌喺法律上係有嗰個效力喺度嘅，私家車係唔可以阻礙我哋埋站。

其次，我哋亦都有就唔同嘅地點係要求佢畫雙黃線，除咗南昌街之外，我哋沙田火炭區亦都留意嗰個情況好嚴重，都有去信去要求佢去畫雙黃線嘅，我哋其實覺得現行嘅法例係有足夠嘅空間去保障我哋巴士車長係唔受違泊嘅阻礙，但係何奈我哋覺得執法係有疏忽同埋粗疏嘅地方。多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）雙黃線喺中環都周圍有，但係都阻礙唔到違例泊車喎？

劉啟謙先生：係，冇錯，因為警方執法上面同我哋講話人手唔夠，佢哋好困難去執法，其實我哋嘅角色係非常之被動嘅，其實好倚賴政府去派人去執法，但係其實咁耐以嚟，由17年去到而家，其實我哋見到嗰個執法，雖然警方話嗰個數字係有上升，但係我哋見唔到有好大嘅改善。

主席：（經傳譯員）用視像鏡頭去執法呢？即係閉路電視。

劉啟謙先生：我哋同意，我哋相信差人嘅人手始終係有限，冇可能派大量嘅警察淨係專注做違泊呢一項工作，呢一樣嘢亦都係唔合理嘅。我哋相信其實科技係有助去執法，我哋其實留意到警方其實近年都開始嘗試去用一啲科技，例如CCTV呢啲方式去執法，其實我哋係支持嘅，因為警方未必有足夠人手，但係CCTV執法的確係有嗰個阻嚇性喺度，即係between呢個懲罰，其實阻嚇性係比懲罰係更重要，你有罰佢，但係如果你阻嚇咗佢，其實比起懲罰係更加好嘅。

其實違例泊車嘅人士其實都知警方都未必會長時間喺某一個地點嗰度巡邏同埋進行檢控，換句話說，其實佢哋違例泊車個成本其實唔高嘅，但係當然引入咗閉路電視或者相類近嘅科技去執法嘅時候，佢哋變相就會知道有一個警剔性同埋阻嚇性喺度，對比起懲罰係更加有效嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺車前，即係巴士前安裝視像鏡頭去拍攝違泊嘅問題，你點睇呀？

劉啟謙先生：正如我哋補充文件嗰度亦都有提過，現時巴士嘅裏面嘅鏡頭其實有分幾種嘅，以最新型嘅巴士為例係有八個嘅鏡頭，分別係拍到車廂入面嘅位置同埋車外面嘅位置，而巴士公司亦都指出呢個鏡頭嘅片段係用作事故調查之用嘅。當然我哋明白改用呢個嘅片段去執法呢係--警方如果要取嗰個片段去執法，其實係可以嘅。亦都要留意番嗰個法例上面嘅要求同相關係咪可以咁樣做，因為有機會係牽涉亦都涉及呢個《私隱條例》，因為部分嘅鏡頭係拍到車廂裏面嘅情況。當然如果用於執法，係法例係有保障，但係呢個問題，我覺得要小心處理。但係前設係我哋係同意係用呢個方法去進行呢個執法嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係問緊你嗰個巴士入面嘅閉路電視，我係講緊影出去，向前方嘅鏡頭，係可以影到巴士嘅車長佢哋揸埋去巴士站嘅時候，如果有違泊車輛嘅時候，係可以影到，你點睇？

劉啟謙先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果巴士司機協助執法，你又點睇呢？譬如話--譬如用電子方式，佢哋可以捕捉到某一個犯法嘅情況，違泊嘅情況，佢捕捉個畫面，返到個車廠嘅時候，有人可以睇番呢個閉路電視，因為嗰度係記錄咗個時間，就可以執法，咁樣你點睇呀？

鍾松輝先生：唔好意思，我姓鍾，我想補充喺呢個問題。

黃女士：Thank you.

鍾松輝先生：因為如果你話巴士嗰個鏡頭去執法，因為架車返到廠，公司唔知㗎嘛，一定要我哋寫報告，寫報告畀公司，時段、日期，佢先去搵人去攞嗰個晶片，但係問題起碼隔兩、三日㗎喇，因為一來一回嗰啲文件，可能嗰個效果就未必咁好嘅，即係未必做得到喺呢一方面。同埋你巴士，因為你係--就算你埋站都好，因為你係行緊㗎嘛，咁你影--就算你影到架車，嗰架車究竟係行緊定係停喺度喺嗰個鏡頭嗰度係反映唔到出嚟嘅，所以我覺得係有困難，喺呢一方面。

主席：（經傳譯員）你覺得我哋作為亞洲嘅先進嘅城市，其實可唔可以安裝喺架巴士度有個鏡頭，就咁撳粒掣就可以記錄番嗰個時間，然後就等嗰個人決定--睇番嗰個人去決定到底嗰架車係咪靜止嘅呢？即係同唔同意咁樣有粒掣去記錄個時間？

鍾松輝先生：我同意嘅，但係如果嗰個技術可行嘅，我哋係同意嘅。我亦都想補充點解我哋個聯盟咁重視嗰個巴士站違例泊車呢？最主要即係話而家近呢十年、八年，即係有啲低地台嘅巴士，因為低地台巴士就係要服務嗰啲輪倚嘅乘客，如果你個巴士站違例泊車，變咗就會導致我哋埋唔到站去服務嗰啲坐輪椅嘅乘客，亦都導致到嗰個安全問題，所以我哋比較重視--點解我哋重視巴士站違泊，主要嘅原因就係隨時都有輪椅客嘅，變咗我哋埋唔到站，就會構成危險。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題係咁嘅，巴士嘅車長可唔可以被指派去幫手執法，去減輕呢個問題呢？即係話撳一粒掣，就可以捕捉到嗰個違泊嗰個情況係幾點鐘發生嘅，利用巴士車長協助執法。

劉啟謙先生：如果有呢個技術係引入到，我哋當然係非常之樂意，因為其實我哋巴士車長本身都係受違例泊車影響嘅一群，如果係有呢一個科技係可以協助到執法嘅，我哋當然係支持。其實本身巴士車長喺 230A 呢個《公共服務巴士條例》底下，其實可以賦予嘅權力係有足夠嘅權力嘅。如果要用呢個方法去執法，其實裏面又牽涉到可能法例同埋巴士公司以至運輸署嗰個睇法嘅，我覺得呢樣嘢係可以值得去畀番巴士公司同埋運輸署去考慮同研究嘅，作為車長，當然我哋--如果係有呢個科技去協助警察執法，我哋當然係支持，有粒掣撳到佢捕捉到佢嗰個動態，但係我哋相信話牽涉第一就科技嘅問題，第二就係可能其他政府部門以至巴士公司佢哋同唔同意同埋涉及嘅技術層面，我覺得係可以值得去研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個課題係就係一個聯盟係提出嘅，就用--參考新加坡嘅情況，2018 年 4 月 30 號就係 Miscellaneous 第 2 個文件夾 644 中文，係英文就係 644-2 版嘅，如果睇番建議一，新加坡嘅情況，係安裝鏡頭就係喺司機位嘅側邊，呢個 2008 年已經開始咗㗎喇。司機要做嘅嘢就係撳個掣，就將個影片交畀警方，而警方就會係畀個罰款畀嗰個違例者嘅，又要罰款或者特別嘅罰款等等，呢個係其中一個聯盟提議嘅建議，就係參考新加坡嘅做法。你會唔會支持呢個建議呢，就係咁樣去執法呢？

林錦標先生：支持嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外一個我想討論嘅問題就係特別更次，特別更次嘅問題，首先我哋睇番你嘅陳述書第 167 頁，呢個係中文版，喺英文版 226-21，你特別提到特別更，就新嘅指引就係話有特別更，佢哋需要有三個小時嘅連續嘅休息時間，你就話--第 167 頁中文版，呢個英文版 226-20，呢度就講，就唔係所有嘅巴士嘅車長都係佢哋喺屋企附近嘅，佢即使有三個鐘嘅休息時間，就好難去搵到一個適合嘅休息嘅地點，令到佢工作疲勞嗰樣嘢，亦都會肯定會影響個駕駛安全嘅，對安全嘅影響不言而喻。

喺 226-21 嗰度，英文版，係下底嗰一段，係中文版仍然都係 167 頁嘅，喺下面，你就話「九巴設有特別更嘅，而特別更嘅休息時間係無薪嘅，巴士公司以所謂嘅津貼代替薪金，此舉對特別更嘅車長係十分之不公平嘅，而運輸署對呢一方面就冇任何嘅立場或者意見，首席運輸主任更喺會面上稱運輸署冇能力監察巴士公司設立特別更。」

你嘅陳述書，我相信就係話唔同意就係一個好長嘅--有長嘅工作時間，你嘅陳述書裏面，你一直都喺度講緊就係將呢一個工作時間係由十四個小時減到十二個小時，呢個係咪你哋立場呀？

林錦標先生：呢個係我哋嘅立場嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解你會建議有一個咁樣嘅立場或者點解會有咁嘅立場呢？

林錦標先生：我搵劉生答你呢個問題。

黃女士：Thank you.

劉啟謙先生：其實第一，我哋參考咗類近普通法地區嘅工時嘅情況，我哋發現英國、歐盟、南韓同埋呢個新加坡嗰個工時都唔會話有特別更去到十四小時，其實相關嘅資料我哋已經交咗畀委員會參考，係喺我哋 supplementary paper 嘅附件九嗰度，同埋呢個附件十都有相關嘅資料交咗上嚟。當然十四個鐘其實嗰個工時講緊係好長，車長喺兩個更次之間講緊係得十個小時嘅休息，顯然大家可以試想像一下，車長落咗班，仲要來回返屋企，沖涼作息，其實實際作息嘅時間究竟有冇六至七個鐘，我哋根本睇到係唔夠。

駕駛一架巴士其實需要好大嘅專注能力，其次就係巴士司機兼顧嘅嘢係乘客、路面情況、種種都要兼顧住，其實比起駕駛一架普通嘅車係傷神嘅，顯然十四個鐘裏面，一個更次其實個休息時間係唔夠，嗰十個鐘，你睇咗其他普通法地區同埋香港相類近嘅城市，都係冇十四個鐘呢一個情況出現，對比起歐盟，甚至乎新加坡，嗰個工時其實係長嘅。餘下我哋睇下鍾生有冇補充。

鍾松輝先生：好呀，我補充少少，我哋點解會反對十四小時嘅特別更呢？第一，運輸署咁耐以嚟，嗰個巴士車長指引從來冇特別更嘅，係今次佢為咗遷就巴士公司，所以佢就同我哋講正常嘅班次就縮減到十二小時，但係佢又加咗一個所謂

特別更就十四小時，十四小時，佢仲好強調個指引講到明中段有唔少於三小時休息，但係呢唔少於三小時休息，但係佢就--即係運輸署佢就唔會負責呢三個小時究竟有冇薪酬，如果照運輸署呢個指引，唔少於三小時休息，其實一個極端嘅例子，佢可以畀六小時你休息，係咪呀？咪畀八個鐘頭人工你囉，畀六小時你休息，冇人工囉，但係你嘅時間就用咗十四小時，呢個係極端例子嚟嘅。即係意思話巴士公司就住呢個運輸署呢一個所謂車長指引，佢可以做到呢一點。

其實，第一，就係剝削緊我哋啲前線員工；第二，就更加令到嗰個車長疲勞，正如我哋個建議書有講，我哋冇時間--即係冇地方畀我哋休息。即係好似過街老鼠咁，你叫啲車長何來會可以喺嗰個所謂休息時間可以補充到體力呢？所以呢個第一點。

第二點，大家可以計一計個時間，十四小時，其實個車長得番十小時，十小時，如果佢住嘅地點稍為遠啲嘅，佢來回嗰個返工、放工時間，我哋保守估計，你去--譬如你返新界盛，個零鐘頭閒閒地，我當佢用咗兩個半鐘頭嗰個返工、放工用嘅時間，好喇，朝頭早起身佢洗面刷牙起碼要半個鐘頭，返到屋企食飯、沖涼，其實佢得五個幾鐘頭嘅咋，五個幾鐘頭，佢係咪一瞓落床即刻瞓得著呢？其實大家可以計得到究竟個車長夠唔夠時間充分去休息。所以我哋係非常之反對呢個特別更嘅班次。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，我哋有冇--城巴有冇畀我哋嘅陳述書？就話佢哋話就係以時鐘去計呢一個嘅巴士車長嘅工資，就唔係話用嗰啲獎金、津貼等等，呢個係城巴。

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）九巴喺呢方面嘅立場又係點樣樣呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）九巴嘅立場，就我所知，就因為有罷工同埋有好多人反對，佢哋就會--就諗下關於呢個特別更次嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係而家個問題就係其實佢哋會唔會用--就係用時鐘去計，即係用每小時去計還是就係減低佢哋嗰個津貼呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我要睇一睇，我要再搵啲資料先得。

主席：Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鍾先生，我哋就有另外一個協會，就巴士業職工會聯盟...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，呢個就係佢哋喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋另外一個工會話畀我哋聽--汽車交通運輸業總工會話畀我哋聽，佢哋嘅陳述書同埋口頭證供我哋就聽取咗，佢哋都係有五個分會嘅，同埋有車長嘅成員嘅，佢哋支持特別更次；第二點，其實就唔係好多人係做呢個

特別更嘅啫；而第三，如果減低咗特別更次嘅說話，就係需要聘用更多嘅車長，就會令到佢哋嘅車長嘅工資係減低咗 5,000 蚊嘅。所以佢哋就提出咗三個理由支持呢個十四小時嘅特別更嘅。你對佢哋嘅講法有咩嘢嘅--點樣睇呢？

鍾松輝先生：我嘅睇法就係咁嘅，而家我哋係講緊--探討緊巴士嘅安全問題，呢個係最重要嘅，正話我所提出如果特別更十四小時，即係普通常識，你識計數，都知道嗰個車長根本就係唔夠時間休息嘅，好容易導致呢個疲勞駕駛，呢個第一點。所以如果根據呢個安全--以安全著想，就唔應該有十四小時嘅特別更，呢個係第一點。

第二點，你話至於話因為少咗呢個特別更，假如取消個特別更，個收入又會少咗，呢個就係一個循環嚟嘅，點解會少咗收入，點解要做多幾個鐘頭去爭取多啲收入呢？主要就係因為我哋薪酬低，薪酬低，我哋先要做多幾個鐘，有啲同事要做多幾個鐘，如果你薪酬能夠以運輸業即係政府統計嗰個，即係新入職嗰啲，有個中位數畀佢，就我相信啲同事唔想做咁多嘅，如果佢薪酬係夠的話。

而家中嗰個--據我了解，如果我冇記錯，而家個中位數已經係一萬八千幾嘅，但係而家巴士公司新入職嗰啲同事都係一萬五千幾，其實我哋因為薪酬偏低，所以啲同事因為負擔重，所以先會做多幾個鐘，如果以呢個邏輯，咪返十六個鐘咪仲賺多啲囉，係咪？冇可能嘅事嚟嘅，唔可以用時間--即係唔可以話揸多啲時間就去賺取微薄嘅薪酬，係應該提高個薪酬，令到減少嗰個疲勞駕駛，呢個第一點。

第二點，正話講咗特別更嗰個中間--中段嗰個休息時間，即係用呢個所謂津貼，呢個唔係巴士公司嘅問題，呢個係運輸署嘅問題，運輸署既然提供得--出得呢一個巴士車長呢個工作指引，佢就有責任去保障我哋嘅薪酬，就唔應該將個責任就推落去勞資關係嗰度嘅。如果係咁，你運輸署就唔應該出呢個特別更，即係我覺得運輸署係非常之不負責任。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想講番之前主席問嘅一個問題，就係九巴係咪會畀一個時薪，即係斷時計嘅津貼，就譬如喺特別更過往都有畀過津貼嘅，而家請你睇番有關呢個文件冊，就係九巴嘅 KMB-1 第 111 頁，如果你睇番舊嘅每日嘅計法，就係(H)嗰項嘅，就係特別更嘅津貼，我哋可以見到喺 2018 年 3 月 1 號之前舊嘅津貼就係$21.90，新嘅就寫住話冇改變嘅。如果睇番表 2，每月嘅金額，喺 109 頁，我哋可以見到喺(E)嗰一項，就係特別更嘅津貼或者係分更嘅津貼，就係$1,951.50 嘅，無論喺 2004 年之前入職或者之後入職。喺 2018 年 3 月 1 號開始計，嗰個金額都係冇改變嘅，所以問下你，呢一個分更嘅津貼，斷時計嘅，對九巴嚟講，係咪維持不變呀，喺 2018 年 3 月 1 號之後？

林錦標先生：我搵番九巴嗰個代表答你。

黃女士：Thank you.

郭偉光先生：好簡單咁答，$21.90 嗰個係每個鐘頭嘅，但係如果正常嘅工資應該係 116 蚊一個鐘嘅，佢嗰個相距嘅工資係好誇張嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係時薪計嘅話，應該係五倍以上，如果係當人工計？

郭偉光先生：同意。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）所以喺你第 226-21 嘅意見書，呢個英文版，中文版就係 166 頁，呢個係 TU 文件冊 1A，你入面就話呢個特別更嘅津貼對於巴士車長嚟講係十分之唔公道嘅，係咪就係咁嘅原因呀？

郭偉光先生：同意。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住講番個相關嘅議題，你喺意見書就話巴士公司就要減低成本，做法就係要減低員工嘅薪酬同埋福利，我而家請你睇番第 158 頁中文版，你嘅意見書，同埋係 226-10 至 226-11 頁嘅部分，中文版 158。你提到就係巴士公司削減薪酬、削減員工福利去壓縮成本，可唔可以解釋下點樣--即係咩嘢意思呢？

林錦標先生：劉生代答。

劉啟謙先生：第一，嗰個薪酬問題正如頭先所講，特別更嗰個唔公平嘅情況，其實我哋係留意到巴士公司利用一啲長嘅工時嘅 duty 去壓縮嗰個人手嘅需求嘅；第二，就係員工福利，其實我哋見到巴士公司利用唔同嘅福利制度，分咗新制同舊制嘅員工，新制同舊制嘅員工嗰個福利其實本身係有差別嘅。縱使有部分巴士公司而家希望係改善嗰個福利，但係我哋見到其實新制同舊制嘅兩個制度員工底下，嗰個福利係有唔同嘅，尤其是新制嘅員工--新入職嘅員工有嗰個員工福利其實係比舊制員工少嘅，呢度可能請鍾生有冇補充？

鍾松輝先生：新制同舊制不論係薪酬，甚至連福利都係新制係比舊制少嘅，如果講話新制員工，而家新入職嗰啲一萬五千幾，舊制就係萬八蚊嘅，至於你話福利，例如我哋舊制就有一個月嘅年終雙糧，新制佢就都有，但係佢嗰個所謂年終獎金，佢要符合佢相關嘅條件，先有嘅。同埋不論睇醫生，我哋舊制嘅員工就每年可以有睇二十次嘅公司醫生，新制得十次嘅啫，即係諸如此類。所以新制同舊制係有個差距嘅，呢個就係睇到巴士公司喺度壓縮緊佢嘅成本，公司成日同我哋講營運困難、賺得好微薄，我唔知佢點為之微薄，我哋覺得佢賺一、兩億佢都話微薄，我唔知佢要賺幾多先為之豐厚咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。下一個問題講脫班，你第一封嘅意見書同埋補充嘅意見書都提到「鬼巴士」或者係脫班嘅問題，我而家想請你睇番意見嘅英文頁就係 226-22，就係喺 TU 文件冊，即係中文版嘅 168 頁，第二段，就講到話「脫班原因有好多嘅，譬如係欠缺車長開車、交通阻塞、車輛故障等。脫班嘅問題主要涉及人手、車輛同埋道路三個原因，前兩者係巴士公司需要正視及處理嘅，但係喺呢啲問題上，你就問運輸署有冇做個監管者嘅角色呢？『鬼巴士』實際係基於運輸署嘅定義上有灰色地帶，安排車輛行走幾個站嘅短途班次以填補因

為唔同原因而冇正常開出嘅班次，從而令脫班嘅比率下降。」可唔可以問下你呢一個脫班嘅問題，首先係咪有好多脫班呀，喺九巴嘅情況？

劉啟謙先生：九巴現時脫班嘅 target 係低於 3%，其實有主要係脫班係因為人手唔夠，大致上因為人手嘅問題，所以脫班一定係存在，當然唔係淨止九巴，新巴同埋城巴都係會因為唔同嘅原因而存在脫班呢個問題，就唔係話單獨九巴係面對呢個問題，其實每間巴士公司都係有面對緊呢一個問題嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你亦都有提到「鬼巴士」嘅呢度，可唔可以再解釋一下「鬼巴士」呀？

劉啟謙先生：現時巴士公司就每一條巴士路線係同呢個運輸署簽訂一個服務詳情表嘅，而服務詳情表係規定咗巴士行車嗰個里數、用車嘅數目同埋嗰個班次嘅，所謂嘅「鬼巴士」，其實巴士理論上應該係由總站 A 直接開到總班 B 為之一個班次，但係可能有部分我哋叫做短途班次，可能去某幾個站，中途開始載，都叫做一個計算一個班次嘅，所以「鬼巴士」可能係臨近總站前某幾站開始載，就當一個班次，咁樣出現去填補一啲係因為唔原因嘅失班嘅，畀傳媒發現之後--當然係畀《東方日報》發現之後，就冠以呢個「鬼巴士」呢個暱稱，其實實際上「鬼巴士」係鑽進咗現時運輸署對班次所定義嘅灰色地帶。

我補充一樣嘢，其實運輸署對巴士公司用車、人手以至嗰個班次，其實從每一條路線嘅服務詳情表裏面係有充分嘅掌握嘅，而呢個服務詳情表都係法例--所以巴士條例規定咗要提交嘅。呢啲文件其實喺運輸署手上係存在住嘅，所以其實運輸署對於每一間巴士公司嘅服務係有充分嘅掌握喺手嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我問呢個問題就係因為喺你嘅補充意見書入面就提到呢一個脫班係點樣帶嚟安全問題，就呢個係第 260-81，呢個英文版，中文 260-43 至 44 頁，請畀我讀出，喺 260 橫畫--即係英文版 81 頁呢一段，即係 43 頁，就係話「因為係巴士車長就喺工作時間或者駕駛時間休息不足嘅，因為巴士脫班或者專營巴士公司編排行車時間太短，無法應對路面不同車輛狀況，不同於三十分鐘嘅小休或者六十分鐘用膳，巴士公司唔會對十二分鐘嘅休息時間作出特別標示，因此車長未必可以完完全全了解十二分鐘嘅休息時間」，要睇下車輛--「行車時間往往因為路面唔同嘅情況有所增加。而編更嘅時間責任係喺巴士公司身上」，「而本聯盟未有就有關行車時間不足嘅巴士車長更分資料作出統計，但係有關詳情可參考附件八嘅資料。」可唔可以請你解釋一下點解脫班問題會令到車長喺工作或者駕駛時間休息不足呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）據我理解，就係話因為行車時間都係好短，令到巴士車長好快已經去到總站，亦都冇乜足夠時間去休息嘅，而脫班就係--個問題就係--即係意思就係話因為個班次不足嘅問題，所以安全方面最終個問題就係話嗰個行車時間本身太短，咁樣理解啱唔啱呀？

劉啟謙先生：冇錯。第一，我諗分幾個部分去答，黃律師，第一，睇番文件，其實十二分鐘休息時間講緊巴士工作指引(a)項嗰度，規定咗巴士車長每四個小時嘅駕

駛其實係有十二分鐘嘅休息時間，但係呢個十二分鐘嘅時間往往喺巴士公司安排上面係唔會畀車長知嘅，而由於嗰個行車時間不足，正如我哋提交附件八嘅更分資料裏面，其中一個更分其實係預計車長係得三分--到站同開車距離得三分鐘嘅啫，根本就冇足夠嘅時間畀車長去休息。由於香港嘅路面繁忙，車長往往可能遲咗到站，遲咗到站，又有乘客候車，佢哋自然就要繼續去行車，第一，嗰個精神就會繃緊，尤其繁忙時間，就冇咗時間休息。而行車時間上面，呢個等鍾生作答。

鍾松輝先生：有關行車時間，我哋都問過巴士公司，新巴同城巴，亦都問過運輸署，究竟巴士嗰個行車時間係如何制定嘅，原來佢哋就冇一個科學嗰個數據去制定呢個行車時間表嘅，純粹只不過係佢哋話搵架車就去試路，即係去行一次嗰啲新路線，睇下用幾多時間，呢個就係非常之唔科學嘅一個制定呢個行車時間表嘅情況。

我哋就建議畀咗運輸署聽，亦都建議咗畀新巴同城巴聽，我哋覺得制定行車時間表，第一，你要有足夠時間畀啲車長休息；第二，你要有足夠時間畀啲車長喺呢一個道路嗰度唔好超速。往往因為時間唔夠，人就好得意嘅，當你趕嘅時間，你自自然然就會揸快啲嘅，呢個係好自然嘅。

我哋覺得應該有個科學嗰個制定呢個行車時間表，例如，我舉例，你每小時究竟嗰架車每小時係行 40 公里吖平均，係咪呀？你先有個數據吖嘛，因為你市區就 50 公里，法律規定，係咪？如果你個平均嗰個時速，每小時究竟係你係制定 40 公里係啱吖，定係 30 公里啱呢，我覺得呢個第一，就係科學數據；第二點就係話嗰個巴士站嘅數量，你巴士公司每一條路線嘅巴士站，你畀幾多秒鐘啲車長去上、落客，呢個亦都需要時間嘅；第三，你畀幾多時間畀車長休息，亦都可以計算到嘅；第四，就係香港嘅馬路就不同時段都唔同嘅，即係個行車時間，因為有繁忙時間就塞啲，非繁忙時間就冇咁塞，我相信巴士公司係有能力喺呢個黑盒嗰度係攞到呢啲繁唔繁忙時間嗰個情況嘅，加埋呢個所謂塞車時間落去，去制定一個行車時間表，我覺得就起碼有個科學數據。但係我唔知道運輸署會唔會聽我哋意見。

林錦標先生：劉生有個補充。

劉啟謙先生：其實較早前嘅聽證會，程艾樂先生都有提到，巴士公司已經有黑盒 係有實時數據去記錄其實巴士行車嘅相關嘅資料嘅，即係其實巴士公司喺技術上已經係可以完全同埋充分掌握行車嘅時間，但係往往巴士公司安排嗰個行車時間緊張，因為牽涉到用車同埋用人嗰個情況，當然巴士公司希望可以用少一架車、用少一個人，而又可以做到運輸署嘅要求去服務乘客，其實往往變相就巴士車長喺每程車次之間嘅休息時間就被剝削，甚至乎因為行車時間不足，去到有大量乘客候車，而緊接下一個車程，呢啲情況其實都常見嘅。其實我哋覺得有呢啲數據，巴士公司本身手上係有足夠嘅數據去幫助佢制定嗰個時間，亦都可以防止車長--車次之間係過於繃緊嘅，但係牽涉就係因為資源、車、人手。

其次，其實我哋都有問過運輸署嘅，喺17年8月嘅會議上面，我哋都要求咗運輸署就住巴士公司安排行車時間呢啲數據上面要作出監管，但係運輸署表示其實佢哋只係會對嗰個服務詳情表作出審批嘅啫，而服務詳情表嘅內容頭先我已經閒述咗，我呢度唔再多講。

但係基於呢啲資料，其實唔可以從嗰個服務詳情表上面係去睇得出嘅，往往運輸署就做唔好把關嗰個工作，巴士公司就不停咁樣安排呢啲繃緊嘅班次，車長就會非常之辛苦，而呢啲情況，我請許生可以補充，因為許生都經常面對呢啲情況。

許漢傑先生：各位好。城巴，城巴有啲路線我講一個十幾年--操作咗十幾年嘅路線就係N8X，N8X就係通宵車，通宵行走，係由凌晨12點去到第二朝嘅06，朝頭早嘅6點，呢條路線係由柴灣嘅小西灣去到中環嘅港澳碼頭，佢畀嘅時間就係一個鐘。

我先講講我個背景，我個背景係之前我都係做通宵嘅車長，我做咗十幾年，而且我對住N8X呢條路線對咗十幾年，亦都係一樣嘢，就話呢條路線十幾年都係維持一個鐘頭一個車程，如果來回計就兩個鐘，但係一個鐘頭嘅車程裏面，我都有做過呢個N8X，但係一個鐘頭，如果實際嚟講，係做唔到，係超時嘅，係點都會超時，點解超時呢？就係N8X來回嘅站係百一個站，大概，來回計，百一個站。

如果一個車程五十幾、六十個站，一個鐘頭，市民--佢嘅行嘅道路就係行，由柴灣行柴灣道、筲箕灣道、英皇道、軒尼軒道、金鐘道、德輔道中去到港澳碼頭，呢條路線係由東區去到中區，全程係行晒所有繁忙--一啲有交通燈嘅路段，一個鐘頭，我自己做過，係好趕嘅時間，係咪真係做到，得，架車要行得快，仲要一樣嘢，係要--咁講，係要超速，先至做到一個鐘頭嘅行車車程。

而家我冇做咁耐，我絕對一個鐘頭我做唔到，而家喺N8X嘅同事因為佢做得耐，知道啲交通燈嘅操作，可以喺嗰度偷一啲時間，而令到呢個車程可以縮短，所以呢個例子係最好嘅例子。而且我作為工會代表，城巴職工會有限公司嘅代表，我喺交流會同公司講N8X呢個行車時間係絕對唔夠，係講咗--我參與工會十幾年，係講咗十幾年。變咗呢個係一個好極端嘅例子，就係咁，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊就係一個小時係永遠都唔可以實現嘅呢？係落實唔到嘅呢？

許漢傑先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果喺一個小時裏面唔能夠係完成，有咩嘢後果㗎？

許漢傑先生：嗰位同事只有繼續嗰個車程，事關點解呢？N8X一個班次係半個鐘頭一班車，所以遲咗，佢遲咗返去總站，都係要開車嘅，遲幾多都要開，除非中間發生交通意外，佢嘅時間係譬如有十五分鐘以上嘅阻延，就佢經由公司指派，

就可以喺半途做番去對站，如果唔係，如果係五、六分鐘，係冇嘅，繼續做，繼續做嗰個--另一個車程，而冇一個我哋叫做所謂中途載嘅做法。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅車程，如果你唔能夠係準時到達嘅時候，會唔會係有懲罰㗎？

許漢傑先生：冇嘅

黃女士：（經傳譯員）只係話你休息時間係縮短咗咁解啫？

許漢傑先生：係，係，點講？N8X 如果過鐘係直情冇，冇休息時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）羅教授有個問題嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我就想知道，公司點可以落實咗走四個鐘頭有十二分鐘嘅休息時間？個公司點樣可以落實呢？就肯定係譬如話頭四個鐘有十二分鐘嘅休息時間？因為呢個喺嗰個指引裏面有規定㗎喎。

劉啟謙先生：應該咁樣講，指引裏面有幾項嘢，六個鐘有半個鐘休息，同埋一個鐘頭用膳，呢兩樣嘢喺車長嗰個時間表同埋嗰個行程表裏面係明確咁樣寫住嘅，但係呢四個鐘嘅十二分鐘其實係冇清楚咁表示，有機會係巴士公司安排咗，但係可能因為車次嘅繃緊同埋交通擠塞嘅原因，嗰四個鐘頭有十二分鐘可能已經喺塞車嗰度已經令到佢冇咗，但係其實巴士車長本身係睇唔到嘅，四個鐘頭十二分鐘，可能淨係見到可能嗰程車次係特別長，可能多十零分鐘，但係佢哋係唔知道四個鐘係有十二分鐘休息嘅，但係其實(a)項呢一樣喺巴士公司編排嗰個時間表係知道佢係有呢一樣嘢，但係往往安排嗰個 trip 中間係好緊張，往往冇咗，其實車長本身都唔知道係冇咗嗰十二分鐘休息。

但係其實我哋一直都有反映，係希望可以每程車次中間係有五分鐘嘅到站嘅時候係有休息嘅，即係起碼去下廁所、停一停、啲一啲，個人都可以放一放鬆，但係現時暫時我哋見唔到巴士公司係會用一個人性化嘅方向去處理呢個問題。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）好，有一個跟進嘅問題，所以話喺文件上面，根本呢十二分鐘都冇寫到出嚟嘅，唔好講話實際有冇落實，係咪咁呀？

劉啟謙先生：落實就一定要落實嘅，因為運輸署同我哋講係有抽查嘅，而過往我哋知道的而且確係有因為(a)項冇咗嗰個十二分鐘，而運輸署有對個別巴士公司係有作出提醒嘅，但係實際上其實喺我哋交上嚟嘅附件八嘅資料裏面，其實根本睇唔到有所講嗰十二分鐘嘅。當然其實巴士公司係清楚呢十二分鐘，因為呢十二分鐘係運輸署個指引嚟嘅，但係你話白紙黑字喺巴士車長嗰度見到呢，係冇嘅，就正如而家個 mon.打出嚟，我哋見到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講番一個類似嘅題目，就係休息嘅設施，我哋可以見到喺你嘅意見書，即係 226-25，呢個係英文版，你就提到就話休息室或者係休息設施不

足嘅，中文頁數就係 171 頁，你就提出一個特別嘅問題，我而家睇緊係 226-25，英文版，你話「多年來喺休息室嘅問題上，運輸署缺乏承擔，將責任推向地政總署同埋民政事務總署身上，加上，有啲政府部門對設立休息室更加持有敵對嘅態度，例如房屋署，令到休息室嘅問題難以解決。」據你頭先講嘅例子，關於呢個一小時嘅行車時間，我喺繼續問問之前，先問你呢樣嘢，一小時嘅行車時間有冇足夠嘅設施呢？即係當你去到目的地嘅時候，就算唔計嗰個行車時間，由 A 至 B，好似你頭先提到嗰條巴士線。

許漢傑先生：係有嘅，柴灣嘅小西灣同埋中環嘅港澳碼頭係有休息設施嘅，但係總體，城巴，城巴嘅休息設施係唔足夠嘅，可能係有啲例子就係個休息室唔夠大，仲有，有啲情況係得個化廁，冇正統嘅洗手間。亦都之前有啲例子就係直情係冇洗手間，係經過我哋工會去爭取，先至由政府部門去--由運輸署帶頭，先至有一個化廁，就係咁。由劉生補充。

劉啟謙先生：黃律師，其實我哋交番嚟補充文件裏面都有一個表係講咗休息室邊啲係齊備、邊啲係唔齊備，甚至乎有啲地方係冇休息室嘅，我哋畀咗個表委員會去參考嘅，你可以望一望。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我而家會同你睇嗰份文件，我諗應該係喺附件七，你嘅意見書嘅附件七，第 260-342 至到 346，你提到一個跟進嘅進度報告，關於巴士總站嘅情況，喺 TU 文件冊嘅英文版就係 260-346-1 嘅，呢度有個表，你交畀我哋唔單只係申請進度，即係九巴嘅申請進度，城巴同埋係新巴，仲有一封信，日期係 2017 年 4 月 28 號，跟住就 6 月 28 號，你就有講到喺深水埗蘇屋嘅巴士總站嗰個問題嘅，可唔可以問下呢封信，我就留意到有啲申請已經係幾年前㗎喇，可以舉個例畀你聽，2016 年 5 月 30 號麗閣，呢個係 260-346-4 頁，「運輸署就喺 2016 年 5 月 30 號收到九巴嘅申請，並且同九巴喺 2016 年 6 月 23 號到上址進行實地視察，由於有關嘅巴士站附近行人路比較狹窄，因此運輸署工程師要求九巴修改休息室設計，九巴現時尚未向運輸署遞交修訂嘅設計。」呢個係最新近嘅進度呢？即係話係咪喺 2016 年之後其實冇進度？

劉啟謙先生：就我哋了解，其實九巴喺設置休息室嘅問題上面喺呢一、兩年係非常之積極嘅，其實表列裏面大部分嘅地方都已經加設咗休息室，縱使休息室可能未必係好大，但係起碼有一個空間可以畀車長係休息嘅。例如麗閣邨嘅進度，我哋就暫時唔清楚，但係其實表列裏面其他嘅位置，例如青衣碼頭已經係加咗休息室係使用中嘅。所以你話九巴個情況係比新巴同城巴係好嘅，起碼都儘可能都係申請可能放到一個細嘅休息室落去，甚至空間可能未必完全足夠，但係起碼有一個地方係畀車長去休息嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以舉個例子，如果我哋係要去某一啲地點實地視察嘅話，要睇下休息設施嚴重不足嘅，你會提議去邊度睇呢？

林錦標先生：我提議喺新巴嘅鰂魚涌站，即係祐民街，呢個成個就係冇一個休息室畀同事去休息嘅，呢度我哋係爭取咗有超過十年㗎喇，一路都係運輸署就話有地

區人士反對，亦都有啲地政各樣嘅話拖延，到到今時今日仲未有休息室。最新嘅消息，即係由我哋公司提供畀我嘅，兜兜轉轉用咗十年時間，嗰個休息室嘅位置由我哋提出响嗰個位置，卒之係返番嚟，要去番同一嘅位置申請，係足足用咗十年時間，係返番去我哋建議嘅--工會提出嘅建議嗰笪地方去申請，用咗十年嘅時間，到而家先話有少少眉目話會擺上去區議會，同各政府部門去諮詢，但係佢而家都唔知道佢等到幾時先有嘅。劉生就有少少嘢補充，唔該。

劉啟謙先生：其實休息室嗰個問題主要就係第一，巴士公司申請，運輸署要審批，其實個途中係牽涉咗大量嘅政府部門，要每一個政府部門批准，包括地政總署、食物環境衞生署、地政總署、警方，連埋呢個民政事務總署進行諮詢，往往一個休息室可能講緊係用上係幾年嘅時間進行呢個申請同埋呢個審批嘅，往往每個政府部門中間又有唔同嘅意見，好似鯽魚涌咁樣兜兜轉轉，其實超過咗十年嘅時間都係做唔到一個休息室出嚟。每一個政府部門都互相係有唔同嘅意見，甚至乎可能有部門覺得唔係咁妥當，就 reject 咗個申請都有。呢啲情況其實喺鯽魚涌呢個例子就係最清楚可以話到畀各位聽個情況就係咁惡劣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）巴士公司有冇做過啲咩嘢措施呢，譬如話延長休息時間，等巴士司機可以去洗手間或者去一啲休息嘅設施嗰度呢？即係有冇調整過嗰啲休息、行車時間，巴士公司有冇咁做？

林錦標先生：就呢個問題，我哋有反映過，向巴士公司反映個行車時間令到啲車長唔夠時間休息，但係公司就話會去研究，但係研究到今時，我都睇唔到佢--我哋返到站頭有冇足夠時間去廁所，基本上係因為個路面嗰個情況令到我哋啲車長返到站頭，根本就已經下一轉車就要開出嘅，我哋通常都會--司機就响情況下，都會去咗廁所先，第一件事去咗洗手間先去開車，遲就要遲，遲都要開，但係個生理一定需要嘅，所以其實我哋一路都反映嘅，但係公司方面就仲未見到佢有實質嘅行動。許生有少少嘢補充。

許漢傑先生：我想補充一樣嘢，個站頭設施，城巴，城巴有兩個例子係比較突出，第一，就係南區，個置富花園嗰個總站，由城巴開線到而家都冇一個休息室，問題係乜嘢呢？就係當地嘅業主立案法團係唔畀巴士公司設置休息室，呢個第一；我哋同運輸署--叫運輸署去同業主立案法團傾過，但係業主立案法團都係唔畀設置休息室。

第二個例子就係機場博覽館嗰個總站，機場都開咗咁多年，呢個博覽館總站係臨時嘅，臨時，咩嘢都係臨時，連個洗手間都係臨時，臨時咗十幾年，我唔明運輸署同埋其他政府部門點樣去協調呢啲站頭設施嘅嗰個建設。同埋一樣嘢就係政府部門之間係完全係冇協調去--因為我哋巴士公司要開一條線，要設置休息室、廁所，完全係冇協調。

我想講多一樣嘢，就係喺幾年前，我哋有同運輸署講，如果有笪地方要起樓，而下面運輸署係會準備有一個巴士總站，我哋會同--我哋同運輸署講咗，就係話如果有總站嘅，要預早通知我哋聯盟，話畀我哋聽呢個總站準備嘅路線

有幾多，我哋畀一啲意見畀佢嚟令到嗰個設施更加完善，但係呢個都係幾年前講緊，但係運輸署嘅回答就係話因為呢個規劃唔係佢哋嘅部門所控制，係由其他部門去--譬如政府規劃署或者係地政署咁樣，或者係康文署咁，由此可以睇到運輸署同其他政府部門真係冇一個協調嘅做法去做而令到呢啲設施能夠儘快咁設立。唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，我有一條問題問你，因為你係代表呢一個九巴員工協會嘅。有分更，好多年嚟都係有特別更分更㗎喇，係咪呀？

郭偉光先生：係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師頭先問緊你一啲問題，譬如話巴士總站，係有一啲巴士總站設施嚴重不足嘅話，你而家可唔可以今日講得出有咩嘢設施、喺邊度，等委員會可以去睇下呢？視察一下喺呢啲行特別更嘅車長佢哋係需要休息超過三個鐘嘅，但係啲設計就嚴重不足嘅，你可唔可以舉一啲地點畀我哋聽呀？

郭偉光先生：九巴方面係咁樣樣嘅，就因為特別更如果佢哋上面收車--收工嘅時候，佢哋係會將架車揸番去巴士廠嘅，由個巴士廠再--離開個巴士廠出去用膳或者係去其他地方休息嘅，大部分都係咁樣運作，而好少話喺站頭嗰度完咗上段而進行一個中段休息嘅。

如果其他有一啲更次就係話有啲特別啲嘅，就係喺個站頭度收上段，而自己離開，而之後再返番去站頭嗰度接下段嘅亦都有，呢啲咁嘅更次係個員工嘅休息嘅機會更加少，因為佢搭車去第二啲地方食飯，跟住再搭番車返番去個巴士站嗰度開下段，中間嗰個一來一回所花費嘅時間更加多嘅，所以佢哋更加缺乏休息嘅時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）我就問緊你關於嗰啲設施，如果站長就係話佢上更完咗，佢就有三個小時嘅休息時間，佢就--佢係泊咗架車喺總站，就係咪個休息設施唔夠，而佢需要去其他地方去休息呢？

郭偉光先生：冇錯，例如喺荃灣嘅荃威花園，你哋可以去睇下呢個地方嗰個設施。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪建議就係話呢個地方我哋可以睇下嗰度嘅設施，休息設施好唔足夠嘅，特別係就話嗰啲分更，佢第一更完咗嘅時候，佢去嗰度休息，嗰度休息設施係唔足夠，係咪你嘅建議可以去嗰度睇呢？

郭偉光先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）除此之外，仲有冇其他建議？

郭偉光先生：暫時冇補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我哋汽車交通運輸業總工會，其實佢哋今朝早已經嚟，佢哋就請--我哋請佢哋就睇一啲嘅文件嘅，我哋就頭先就話佢哋用一啲時間睇一啲文件，然後我哋就可以向你哋提問。而家就我哋就有一個小休嘅時間先，然後

就我哋再繼續。

下午5時04分押聆訊押後

下午5時12分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，你可唔可以提一提我就係立法會嘅資料文件？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-1文件夾第403頁，中文版416頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，你哋有冇時間係閱讀呢一個嘅立法會交通事務委員會嘅資料文件呢？

張子琦先生：主席，我哋係剛才啱啱睇過呢份報告嘅，呢份文件嘅咁樣樣。都初步我哋都畀一啲意見，認為嗰個4(a)「電子穩定控制系統」係唔建議裝嘅，因為我哋對呢套系統係有存疑，驚剎車嘅時候會突然間揦死堂軑，仲會令車輛會失控；第4項(b)控制...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前，我哋想問一問你相關嘅工作小組有冇曾經諮詢過你關於呢方面呀？

張子琦先生：主席，呢個立法會交通事務委員會係冇諮詢過我哋嘅，我哋都曾經多次要求派工會入去做一個--喺委員入面，運輸署亦冇諮詢過我哋關於呢一樣嘢，我哋只能夠用我哋嗰個工作嘅經驗嚟睇呢份報告。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你繼續講番喺呢份資料文件你想講番邊部分，同埋有咩嘢建議。你頭先講到話你懷疑呢個電子穩定控制系統嘅成效，咁其他嘅事項呢，你可以繼續講。

張子琦先生：多謝主席。4(b)，我哋喺文字上睇，係認為可行嘅，因為佢係鎖定咗70公里，不論落斜都係鎖死70公里，呢個對我哋係有幫助嘅，因為我哋好多車長行屯門公路嘅時候，因為又起又落、又起又落，好多時都會超速--都不知不覺會超速，而令到受到一啲紀律嘅處分，所以如果有咁嘅系統能夠限定咗70，落斜嘅時候都唔使驚超速，係對我哋有幫助，所以我哋認為可行嘅。

喺第6項嘅(a)「巴士監察及控制系統」，呢個我哋係唔認同嘅，因為呢個等同架巴士係畀一個控制器控制住，一到到嗰個路段係50嘅，70轉50，佢突然間會改番去50，個時間後面啲車輛會唔會預計你前面突然間冇車嘅，都唔係預計你突然間咁急速剎去到50，會唔會產生交通意外呢？呢個我哋係睇到係

有疑慮嘅，係有啲擔心會發生交通意外，所以係唔認同嘅，唔建議裝呢個嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）先打斷你一下，其中一個原因點解嗰個巴士會減速，係因為嗰個速度限制減速，即係亦都減咗，然後個巴士於是減速，點解後面個司機會覺得唔明白呢？

張子琦先生：係，係咁樣樣嘅一個駕駛習慣，如果當我哋行緊 70 嘅時間去到一個 50 嘅區域，我哋會慢慢收油，等佢減速，但係如果你呢個系統係比較急速咁樣樣減，就會令到後面啲車輛就會對一向嘅常態，「巴士唔係咁樣揸車㗎喎」，就會發生交通意外，佢會突然間會撞埋嚟，呢個係有擔心嘅我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）你點樣分辨減速會唔會係突然間發生？你點樣可以知道系統係咁呢，你喺邊度睇到呢？

張子琦先生：因為我哋如果減速，我哋會耷 brake，會有 brake 燈會通知到後面，但係你而家呢個就係有一個控制系統，有一個定位，一去到嗰度，佢就自然同你急速咁減，而又我前面係冇車嘅，後面嗰架車就會預計你唔會突然間咁快去減速減到去由 70 變速到 50，所以我哋係擔心呢樣嘢會引致到安全問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

張子琦先生：6 嘅(b)，呢個同樣我哋都係唔建議裝嘅，因為呢個碰撞嘅警報裝置及保持行車線嘅裝置，曾經有揸過呢一類型嘅車就覺得佢好煩擾，佢一遇到一啲小小嘅障礙物，就會發出響聲，尤其我哋香港都係人多車多、馬路窄，好多時如果你喺條彌敦道度，周時你附近都會出現一啲障礙物，但係呢啲實質上可能唔會對架車會受影響，但係架車就仍然都會發出響聲，嗶嗶聲，咁會令到個車長好大嘅干擾受到，所以唔建議裝。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢建議嘅就係話試行，試驗下。

張子琦先生：我畀城巴揸過呢架車嘅車長講下。

劉善達先生：主席，唔好意思。城巴就响我唔記得三年定兩年前就試過呢個系統，有個叫做類似叫做神眼系統嘅系統，就係我哋試驗嗰陣時，响高速公路係冇問題，但係一到市區，即係有少少人或者車，佢就會不停咁響，就會造成一個滋擾。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到係前員工，即係九巴前員工程艾樂嘅證供同埋鄺子憲先生嘅證供，就係話大家要留意科技喺呢段時間可能唔係咁啱用，可能喺過兩年有改進，就會啱用㗎喇，即係可能個科技本身都係有改進到嘅。

張子琦先生：主席，真係我哋而家見到揸過、駕駛過嗰啲嘅系統就係有毛病，覺得唔係咁適合，所以日後如果真係有啲系統係改善咗嘅，我哋再作考慮建議裝呢啲系統，因為的而且確我哋係一個從業員，我哋只能夠反映我哋嘅工作直接遇到嘅問題出嚟畀主席。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家問你就係反映，你之前冇人問你畀意見吖嘛？

張子琦先生：係呀，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）請繼續講其他嗰啲儀器裝置。

張子琦先生：呢個 6(c)「監察司機裝置」，呢個我哋認為係可行嘅，因為呢個係直接監察個司機有冇瞌眼瞓，我可以大膽講句，瞌眼瞓係我哋職業司機嘅天敵，佢有時真係自己瞌一瞌嗰兩、三秒就可能自己條命都冇咗，如果有一個咁嘅裝置提醒個司機「小心啲囉喎，你有啲睡意喎。」不論係對個司機、對乘客、對路面嘅交通使用者，都係一個--提供一個安全一個措施嚟嘅，所以我哋認為可行嘅呢個。不過都呢套系統，我哋都有同事揸過，希望都仍然有啲要改進嘅地方，譬如佢戴一個墨鏡，係有水銀嘅，佢就呢套系統就失效，一路長響，以為你瞌眼瞓㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

張子琦先生：好，多謝主席。至於呢個係安全帶，喺乘客座位度設置安全帶，我哋係唔建議安裝嘅。第一，因為我哋都有企位，唔係全部座位，唔係旅遊巴；第二，如果係雙層巴士上層裝咗之後，一下如果有咩嘢事發生，相信都幾混亂，譬如如果突然間發生火警，佢哋會逃生更加困難，人喺危急嘅時間佢要除條安全帶，我相信係非常之困難嘅。所以我哋就認為唔係咁可行，除咗有啲適當嘅位置，譬如係最前排嘅或者係最後座嘅中間位，一啲比較危險嗰啲安裝之外，其他我哋就唔係咁建議安裝安全帶。

去到「專營巴士車長訓練」，我哋覺得係需要加強嘅，要回復番 98 年我哋培訓一個車長出嚟，要用差唔多一個月嘅時間，仲要多啲喺路面度實質嘅操作，咁先至令到一個巴士車長佢出到嚟路面有啲信心，唔係而家成日要靠一啲車長去帶一啲新嘅車長，其實呢個我哋認為唔係可行，亦唔推薦咁做嘅。最好都係由番學校去培訓一個車長。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個學院應該邊個運作呀？

張子琦先生：多謝主席，學院都係由番學校、巴士公司同學校，同埋運輸署應該要協助嘅。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，由佢哋畀嘅證供，你仲有冇其他跟進問題？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇喇，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，多謝你哋今日留咗喺度一整日嚟畀證供，我哋感謝你哋出席，而家你哋可以離開，如果其他嘅--另外一個工會嘅其他代表而家可以過嚟，我哋而家稍休幾分鐘，你哋幾位可以離開，唔該。

下午5時28分押聆訊押後

下午5時33分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 鍾松輝先生，巴職聯會務顧問，新世界第一巴士公司職工會會長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

劉啟謙先生，巴職聯會務幹事（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

林錦標先生，巴職聯副主席，新世界第一巴士公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

許漢傑先生，巴職聯司庫，城巴有限公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

郭偉光先生，巴職聯秘書，九巴員工協會副理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

何銳昌先生，巴職聯會員，新世界第一巴士公司職工會司庫（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，多謝你哋咁有耐性，我哋就啱啱同另外嗰個職工會去傾完，我哋而家可以繼續我哋未完成嘅一啲討論。但係我明白秘書處已經同你傾過，就可能休會，就喺8月1號星期三下晝先至返嚟，所以我就會請黃律師就去討論關於立法會嘅資料文件，我哋先至休會，然後我哋剩番就8月1號星期三下晝先再討論，同唔同意呢？

林錦標先生：好嘅。

主席：Thank you.

林錦標先生：同意嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝你咁多位。呢個就係立法會交通事務委員會嘅一個討論文件嚟嘅，呢個討論文件就係由運輸署所準備嘅，就係為咗加強專營巴士安全嘅，最近係7月25號喺立法會討論咗，就係英文嚟講，就係403頁就開始，

喺中文版就 416 頁嘅。裏面討論咗幾個課題嘅，第一個課題係關於增加加設安全帶；第二個話題就係關於巴士車長嘅培訓，就係第 18 第 22 段嘅；第三個問題就係關於一啲新嘅科技嘅裝置，就喺專營巴士上面點樣可以採用一啲新科技。呢個嘅文件有冇從來交過畀你哋嘅聯盟嘅呢？有冇畀你哋係徵詢你哋嘅意見呢，呢個嘅文件？

林錦標先生：冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道呢一個文件就三個專營巴士公司都有討論，同埋運輸署都有討論嘅，就係想睇一睇就巴士嘅裝置同埋呢一個嘅巴士培訓方面嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你就繼續之前，呢一個嘅文件就係應該話係運輸署同埋三個巴士製造商同埋巴士專營公司佢哋討論之後所得出嚟嘅成果嘅，佢哋 3 月中就有討論，然後佢哋將佢哋嘅建議就係提交畀立法會，嗰個提交嘅時間就係呢一個 7 月尾嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇機會係睇過呢個文件同埋係消化呢個文件，特別喺我哋頭先小休時間嘅時候？

林錦標先生：我哋有睇過呢個文件，亦都初步了解過，就知道裏面嘅內容係講啲乜嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，首先我哋講第一個問題，關於安全裝置，第 4(a)段嘅，呢個係關於電子穩定控制系統嘅，你哋個聯盟會唔會支持去採用一個咁樣嘅系統呢？

林錦標先生：係支持嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個控制下坡時最高速度嘅車速限制減速器，你又是否支持去裝置一個咁樣嘅減速器呢？

林錦標先生：支持嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去到第 6(a)段，關於巴士監察同埋控系統，就話希望能夠盡用黑盒嘅功能，可以有實時嘅可以監察巴士嘅速度同埋有呢一個全位定位嘅系統等等咁樣。

林錦標先生：呢個係支持，而家已經係用緊㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊間公司用緊呢個系統㗎？

林錦標先生：新巴、城巴都已經係用緊呢個系統嘅。

郭偉光先生：九巴一樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）6(b)就關於碰撞警報裝置同埋保持行車線裝置。

林錦標先生：响呢個問題上，我哋係支持，但係個實質嘅數據，初初嗰陣時試驗嗰陣

時就啲伙記有個反感嘅，因為一有小小問題，佢就會響，係令到個司機個精神嗰啲嘢就有個困擾响度嘅，所以就呢個裝置就係好，但係希望有改良。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪呢一個神眼嗰個嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係--嗰個裝置叫做神眼，就由城巴去測試嘅，係咪呀？

鍾松輝先生：法官閣下，唔好意思，之前公司，新巴、城巴都曾經嘗試過嘅，測試嘅，但係就效果唔係咁好。唔好意思，據了解，公司就話會再去改良呢一個裝置，睇下遲啲改良咗之後，睇下個效果好唔好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我知係 2014 年去試驗嘅，科技已經都發展咗嘅。但係第 6(c) 段呢，「監察司機裝置」，就係去睇下車長會唔會瞌眼瞓咁樣。

鍾松輝先生：當然，呢個裝置我哋原則上係同意嘅，但係問題如果你要用呢啲裝置去監察個司機究竟係咪疲勞或者瞌眼瞓，其實本末倒置嘅我哋覺得，我哋應該係覺得就係畀多啲時間畀啲車長休息，呢個先係正式嘅做法，唔好有--個制度唔好有一個疲勞駕駛，呢個先係重要嘅。當然呢一個未嘗不可嘅，我哋覺得都。

林錦標先生：劉生有少少補充，唔該。

劉啟謙先生：其實嗰個問題就係話我哋係要預防車長因為疲勞駕駛而出意外，而唔係話搵啲嘢去監察住佢，等佢唔會瞌眼瞓，呢樣嘢其實係調番轉，我哋工會嘅角色就係希望車長喺一個安全同埋一個健康嘅環境下工作，而唔係一個長時間嘅情況下工作，跟住就疲勞駕駛而發生意外，我哋最終嘅目標係要喺意外之前提出一啲建議去防止意外發生，而唔係等意外發生咗之後先至去諗如何去改善一樣嘢。呢一樣嘢本身嗰個出發點係好，但係如果話安裝喺呢個情況下，有點兒係本末倒置，根本就係逃避咗疲勞駕駛呢一個問題，即係正如民航機機師，民航監管當局都係希望機司係嗰個休息時間係更加長，而唔係話不停咁樣去揸呢個飛機。雖然民航駕駛同巴士係兩樣唔同嘅嘢，但係其實大家嘅嗰個性質都係接載乘客，出意外嗰個後果一樣都要嚴重，咁點解我哋仲要縱容呢個長時間疲勞駕駛，跟住就搵個嘢去 monitor 住個車長唔好瞌眼瞓，會唔會真係有點兒本末倒置咗呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你係咪同意原則上同意就都可以試驗下嘅，呢個裝置？

林錦標先生：同意嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）安全帶呢，所有嘅座位都增加安全帶，你哋又覺得點樣樣呢？

林錦標先生：安全帶我哋都認同嘅，但係就應該係運輸署嘅責任，就唔係畀巴士公司嘅責任，但係運輸署完全應該由佢負責需唔需要，因為最清楚就係運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話責任即係話佢哋要畀錢，係佢哋畀費用？

林錦標先生：係講法例。

主席：（經傳譯員）明白，即係佢哋有責任去安排--即係同政府安排改變個法律，就然後去執行嘅，係要安裝之後，要乘客去戴，呢個就係要執法，你講個責任係咪呢樣嘢呀？

林錦標先生：係呀，劉生有少少補充。

劉啟謙先生：巴士上面裝安全帶係當然係保障乘客嗰個安全，呢個我諗係毋庸去爭拗嘅，但係重點係乘客如果有安全帶而唔去配帶，其實即係等如裝咗等如冇裝，其實個情況一樣，所以立例去令到乘客去戴嗰個安全帶其實係最重要嘅。而且我哋留意到小巴本身嘅情況就係喺好多年前已經係裝安全帶，都係立例要乘客去戴安全帶，而警方都有對冇安全帶嘅乘客係有檢控嘅，而個效果係理想嘅，因為乘客係記得要戴安全帶，係保障咗佢喺意外嘅時候減低佢可能嚴重受傷嘅機會。如果你話巴士裝安全帶當然係可以保障乘客，但係最重要係立例令到乘客係記得要戴番個安全帶，即使如果話唔記得戴，因為唔同嘅理由冇戴，裝咗對佢哋保障即係冇保障。

其實係有啲巴士嘅交通意外，好多年前有單喺將軍澳嘅意外，就係因為頭排--成頭排嘅乘客冇戴嗰個安全帶，而係拋出車外嘅，係有啲咁嘅情況。所以如果你話戴咗安全帶而唔纜，其實對佢個保障係等如冇保障。

主席：（經傳譯員）就所以係有啲改變，喺上層係有個金屬欄杆同埋係嗰啲危險嘅位就裝安全帶，係咪呀？

劉啟謙先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）培訓，第18段至22段提到畀巴士車長嘅培訓。

林錦標先生：許生作答。

許漢傑先生：主席，至於呢個培訓，我前兩日啱啱上完兩日嘅堂，公司城巴，城巴已經加咗個情緒管理，其他嗰啲就一路以嚟都有㗎喇，情緒管理嗰度就係公司係用一個非專業嘅人士去處理呢個課堂，喺我嘅見解嚟講，我覺得係唔夠，唔夠專業，所以就我覺得係有一個改進嘅必要嘅。劉生有嘢補充。

劉啟謙先生：其實喺我哋交番嚟補充文件嗰度，我哋參考過新加坡一個例子，新加坡喺16年10月成立咗一個專門嘅巴士培訓學院，嗰個課程係非常之全面，除咗係駕駛課程之外，亦都有一啲勞法、車隊管理系統，以至服務水準類似嘅訓練，亦都係安排咗就係車長必須要上呢啲課堂先至可以攞巴士嗰個執照嘅，其實我哋留意到喺其他地區都係有相類似嘅課程提供畀巴士車長去報讀嘅。我當然認為有啲關於情緒管理，以至係法例嘅支援係有需要嘅。呢啲課程其實應該係由專業嘅人士去提供嘅，而家起步其實已經係有點兒遲㗎喇，但係遲好過冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）許先生，你講到就話唔係一個專業人士去教呢一個課程，你認為應該係情緒管理嘅課程由係乜嘢專業人士教？

許漢傑先生：喺我嘅認知嚟講，應該係社工或者係心理學家。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

許漢傑先生：好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，或者今日都差唔多，各位，多謝你哋今日出席，亦都多謝你哋同意星期三再返嚟，我哋都期待喺星期三下晝繼續，而家就休息。

2018年7月30日

下午5時50分聆訊押後

Tuesday, 31 July 2018

(10.02 am)

REPRESENTATIVES OF KMB EMPLOYEES UNION: MR KWOK CHI SHING, MR LEE KIN KEI, IVAN, AND MR WONG KIN WAI

(Evidence given in Cantonese, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Mr Kwok, and your colleagues.

We thank you and the other representatives of the Kowloon Motor Bus Employees Union for accepting our invitation, and attending today to give evidence.

In the course of evidence, Ms Wong, Senior Counsel, counsel assisting the Committee, will ask you questions, and it is a matter for you which one of the three of you answers any particular question. But perhaps we could ask you, Mr Kwok, to defer to the others if you want the others to respond, identifying who it is you wish to respond.

But at the outset I understand that you wish to make an opening statement, and we are ready to hear that now.

Please begin with your opening statement.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR KWOK CHI SHING

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Thank you, Committee. Thank you, Chairman. I thank the two members.

We are glad that finally after a long time waiting we have the opportunity to come here to speak to you

about our voices from practitioners as well as bus captains.

I would like to say that I would ask the Committee to give us ample time to reflect our views.

I have been attending all the hearings. Most of the hearings are devoted on monitoring of bus captains as well as safety issues. I am aware of the statement. I don't expect to find the party to be blamed or to be responsible, and I do know that there will be discussions about safety, about training, I hope that you will take my views into account.

I wonder if we can ask questions of the Chairman, or the Committee. Would you allow us to ask questions?

CHAIRMAN: Well, you are here to give evidence. We are not here to give evidence. We are hear to listen, and we are more than happy to listen to what it is you have to say.

What we are trying to find out are the circumstances that obtain in the operation of the franchised bus system, in order that we can make recommendations to the Chief Executive to enhance safety.

So it is your evidence. We are not involved in the bus industry. We want to hear from you.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, yes, we are in the industry. Every day there are 4 million passengers using bus

services. This accounts for about 31 per cent of the total population using transportation. This is very important to our industry.

I understand that the time given for unions to speak is quite short. We are important stakeholders. We are important parts in the industry. We play a very vital role in safety.

There are a lot of issues we would like to cover. I have given one submission, and two supplementary submissions as per your request, covering a lot of different topics. However, these topics are only briefly touched in these submissions and supplementary statements. If we have ample time to discuss these issues, it will be conducive to the Committee reaching a conclusion. And the public would get a better understanding as well.

I found that the hearing yesterday could only cover a few simple issues without going into details: on training, and understanding of the mechanics by bus captains, the teachings or lectures, whether bus captains are conversant with the functions and mechanics as well as control of the buses they drive. I think our views are neglected.

You just ask us for a simple answer, whether to agree certain people's views, and to state our views.

I don't think that is in depth enough.

The Committee will not be able to reach a comprehensive conclusion. I don't want to repeat what other people have said. Time is precious. We just want to talk about what we are concerned with, issues that are pertinent to public safety.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt you have identified those issues in your written submissions. And that's the purpose of asking counsel to now ask you questions on the matters that you have identified.

If there are supplements that you wish to make, as the questioning goes on, then please make them. But the whole purpose of inviting you to make written submissions was to give you the opportunity to tell us what it is you wanted to say. And the purpose of this oral evidence hearing is so that we can explore the matters that occur to us as relevant.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We have some questions -- we have prepared for some topics covering black box as well as safety operation of buses, but we have not submitted the information to the Committee yet.

We have just finished compiling the information and we would like to give the same to you.

So I ask for your indulgence for us to give you the information.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why this was not submitted at an earlier stage? We have been asking you, have we not, since 28 March -- am I right, Ms Wong?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: 28 March. It is 31 July now.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We have to make preparations, we are not experts. We realise that the Committee has asked questions of the black box company. We have reviewed the information given. We think that based on the replies you have received we should give you our views, I mean us as operators of buses. Is it the case that you give us a black box and we know how to use it?

We have to show or teach our members how to handle a lot of issues, say, for example, when they have been assaulted, how they are going to deal with this situation. Also, verbal exchange after an incident has occurred.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok. I think we are going to make more progress if we begin by allowing Ms Wong to ask you questions rather than receiving a lengthy oral dissertation on matters that change, as you have just done, from black boxes, to assaults.

Let's see what Ms Wong can make by way of progress, and then we will hear from you in due course; do you understand?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, thank you. Chairman.

I hope that, well, you will allow me to make supplementary information afterwards.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Kwok, and gentlemen, for coming.

May I make a brief remark. We have received your written submissions, all three of them. The Committee's primary concern is set out in the terms of reference, and that is to make recommendation which go to the issue of safety-related matters of franchised buses.

So my questions will be focused on safety aspects rather than other areas, or employment issues.

I hope you understand, those questions will be focused on safety aspects.

May I start with your union, the composition of your union.

Mr Kwok, your union was established, if I may invite you to go to TU bundle, at page 112-9. It is only in Chinese, but I will explain the composition.

Your union was established on 14 July 2015, correct?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And as of 15 June, 2018, the membership of your union comprised of 1,400 people.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And they include full-time staff and retired bus captains who continued to stay on to work as bus captains.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, that's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And those 1,300 are all full-time staff?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your submissions raised a few areas, and I will be focusing on different areas at different times. And the first topic I would like to ask you is concerning about the facilities or the safety aspect which you mentioned with a lot of emphasis in your submission.

If I may take you to TU-1A, Chinese at page 84. English at page 90-3.

CHAIRMAN: What is the document?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is the first submission --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- dated 23 April 2018.

Page 93 in English, and page 84 in Chinese.

Under 1, you stated that:

"In order to save repair cost, KMB has, since 2015, inappropriately removed all defog heater installation causing the front window panel to have serious fogging issues under cold and wet weather ..."

And you provided photographs in annex 1, and we can

see that at page 91 in Chinese, and page 91-1 in English.

And you stated in your submission that:

"It is especially dangerous when a bus is driving at a fast speed if the bus captain cannot see the road condition clearly. It affects the safety of driving and the passengers."

Now, my first question is this: did you reflect, or did your union reflect this to the bus company, KMB?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We did.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We talked to the management of the company.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was this?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I can't recollect the time. Because there was no record. Verbally.

MS MAGGIE WONG: These photographs, can you tell us approximately when did you take those photographs?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: At the middle of last year. WhatsApp photographs taken by colleagues. And this problem has persisted for a long time, and last year it was particularly serious. Our members hoped that our union would speak out for them, and so they sent us a lot of photographs.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When you say you verbally reflected this to

the bus company, did the company reply anything on this issue?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: There was none. They tried to reject our union as far as possible. If I speak to them in the capacity of the chairman of the union, they would ask me to speak to them in my capacity as an employee, the general manager of the Kowloon Bay depot --

MS MAGGIE WONG: And did you reflect or --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, had you finished your sentence there? What about the general manager of the Kowloon Bay depot?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: He frequently stressed that I could only speak in my personal capacity out of political considerations.

CHAIRMAN: And what is the name --

MR KWOK CHI SHING: And I -- it is not convenient for me to speak in my capacity as chairman.

CHAIRMAN: What is the name of the gentleman who is the general manager of the Kowloon Bay depot?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yeung Kwok Hung, general manager of the Kowloon Bay depot.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did the bus captains reflect this to the maintenance staff of the company?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: They did. The maintenance staff had a lot of views, but they dare not speak out. Usually

I was the one who reflected these views. The maintenance staff were unhappy too, but they could not speak out because the company doesn't like that.

CHAIRMAN: What is the present position as far as these defogging devices are concerned?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: With the establishment of this Committee, we submitted a lot of documents and we were interviewed by the press. The company told the public and us that for new vehicles they would be installed with this device. When we reflected this problem, we were interviewed by independent media, and also a professor was interviewed, as I mentioned in my submission. The professor confirmed that defog heater installation is most effective, and then the reply from the Transport Department was it was not a necessary installation. Only 90 per cent of the buses were fitted with this device, that is KMB is the only exception.

KMB did not have this installation for us, hinders the safety of passengers. It did away with this installation to save maintenance cost. The bus company is of the view that there aren't too many days with this problem, and so bus captains are asked to wipe it themselves. How can they do it when they are on a highway? They can only do so when the bus stops in front of a traffic signal. So the reply is

unacceptable.

CHAIRMAN: Do new vehicles have this device fitted?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: As at today, no. All new vehicle, not fitted with this device. Because it was decided back then that it would not be installed. And new vehicles have yet to arrive, and it is promised that the device would be fitted in new vehicles. But this is very undesirable. What about the 9,900-odd buses? Some were commissioned only last year or this year. So do we have to wait until 17, 18 years?

So I think they are just trying to tell the public that they are going to do it. Even if it is not immediately, I think every year at the annual vehicle examination the TD should ask them to retrofit that device regardless of the cost. They should not wait for these 17 years to pass.

Because originally there was such a device, it was only removed by the company. It is about public safety, and --

CHAIRMAN: We have your point.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At page 90-5, in English, and at page 85 in Chinese --

CHAIRMAN: What is the point we are moving to now?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is the Transport Department's reply to

this defog device.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You stated in your first submission that:

"The Transport Department shall not approve KMB to remove defog heater which affects the safety of driving, and it is possible to adversely affect other road users. (The Union) received complaints from many bus captains and confirmed this is true. It is strongly recommended that the Transport Department directs the bus company to re-install the defog heater."

So my question is: was the Transport Department aware of the removal of the defog heater?

CHAIRMAN: Before you answer that question, you told us a moment ago that Transport Department said that this was not a necessary device. Is that the Transport Department's position?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Because independent media was concerned about this, and it saw interviews of me, and then to be fair it interviewed a professor.

CHAIRMAN: You told us about that.

Did the Transport Department make a decision that it was not necessary to install this device? That's what you told us. Is that correct?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And did you write to the Transport Department to complain about this defogging device? Did your union write to the Transport Department, complaining about this absence.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We didn't. We didn't.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may go to the next issue which relates to the gear button installation.

At page 84 of your submission, and English at page 90-3, also under section 1, you stated that:

"... the company altered the gear buttons installing for safety driving, cancelled the O/D gear button and manual retarder installations and relies only on computer-controlled singular automatic D-gear to control vehicle speed ... Under [emergency] situation it is very dangerous for there to be no saving devices for the bus captain to use."

You have shown this in your annexure at page 92, and in Chinese at page 92-1.

To complete this point, you further stated at page 90-5 that the hot weather:

"... the temperature within the bus machinery, is even higher), has affected the computer-controlled mechanism or system, and therefore immediate commands to activate the brake system cannot be made (deviated from the bus captain's judgments). Therefore the bus

captains felt that the bus has no brake system to stop the bus, and told the police that if the bus has no brake, it should be inspected (it actually cannot be detected!) because after the bus is cooled down the next day, the computer system will return to normal."

Can I ask you this. From your review, or from your union members' review, how does the removal of manual retarder installation affect bus safety?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: In that regard, I would like to defer to Mr Lee who is more familiar with it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Lee.

MR IVAN LEE: Thank you. First, let me introduce myself. Just my brief CV. I have been driving large vehicles for about 20 years, and tractor/trailer vehicles, single-decker buses, double-decker buses, automatic transmission, manual transmission, coaches, modern vehicles. Currently I am an employee of KMB. I have been driving double-decker buses for six years.

Well, when it comes to training, the instructors would only train the trainees on requirements of one of their respective bus companies. And I don't think that training on safety is sufficient.

CHAIRMAN: No. Mr Lee, you have been asked to deal with a specific question, not to make a speech.

The specific question was: how does the removal of

the manual retarder affect bus safety? Could you address that question.

MR IVAN LEE: In the system, there is a device that allows you to select. It includes a manual selection, automatic selection, and a third one is a combination of manual and automatic control.

First, the retarder. There is this function. There are four segments and a lever to control this system. You don't have to use a pedal, you don't have to use the brake system.

Mr Lai explained yesterday, said that when you stepped on the pedal, it is automatic.

And here it says that when it is affected by high temperature it is about the brake system. Well, when there is friction it generates heat and the temperature will rise. If there is a manual control that means the bus captain can control the retarder from 1 to 4, from mild control to a heavier control. This will control the gear box to secure the torque, thereby securing safe control of the brake system.

However, for single or double-decker buses, I don't see many of them with this function. Very few for double-decker buses. There are no selection buttons; only a pedal that is used to activate the retarder.

If there is a stick or a lever, as an additional

device, well, I'm sure that drivers are very familiar with it. However, when it comes to public bus training, instructors don't give trainees this kind of training. They only teach them to use the brake by applying different level of forces, what is a mild force, what is a heavier force.

So when bus captains want to stop the bus, they would just step on the pedal and use the brake pad to stop the bus.

So the system will not be fully utilised to halt the bus. You step on the pedal to activate the brake system to stop the bus. I think the force you use is about a level 3 or 4, but if you use the same level on the manual system it is rather heavy. If you can use the manual system you use level 1 or 2 force, then it is very mild and the bus will come to a steady stop.

So if there is a space of half a bus or even shorter, you can't just step on the pedal to bring the vehicle to a halt. All you can do is just watch the bus ram into the car in front of you. I do think there is inadequacy when it comes to this system on public buses, and the Transport Department is aware of that.

When it comes to vehicle examination and licensing, it covers coaches. You drive the coach in for the examination, so they are fully aware of this system.

You must know that public bus carry a lot of passengers. However, it seems that --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on. Does it come to this, that the absence of a manual retarder removes from the bus driver a choice of how to retard the vehicle, and therefore it would be better to have it? Is that what it comes to?

MR IVAN LEE: You can put it this way.

I will defer to Mr Kwok.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Let me answer. Manual retarder is very important, especially when it comes to going downhill.

The Tai Po District Council and Ms Wong said that she has heard from coach drivers saying that they drive the coach at 70km/ph to the top of the hill and then go downhill from there, it is difficult for them to slow the car down to 50km/ph.

I believe the reason is that perhaps the vehicle is rather old, so they rely only on the exhaust retarder which is not as effective. If you reach 70km/ph at the top of the hill, if there is manual retarder and you use it, three to four seconds later then the speed will be reduced to 30 to 40 without using the brake.

This is very effective to reduce speed when you are travelling downhill.

In the past, the KMB will offer once every two or three years advanced driving courses. Bus captains will

have to practise on uphill and downhill sections of Tai Po Road. It was an old model of buses, and there was -- those without air conditioning, and it came with just certain gear, say, gear 1, gear 2, and drive.

Without manual retarders we would use this system by controlling the gear instead of relying solely on the brake. Because if you use the brake and you want to reduce speed, then there is serious friction on the brake pad. There will be heat generated. I think in the most dangerous situation the braking system will be reduced in effectiveness by about 20 to 30 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, forgive me for interrupting. But your point is very simple. This is a method of reducing the speed of a vehicle, particularly going downhill, without having to use the brakes, or having to use the brakes in a harsh way. That's the point, isn't it?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. You only have to touch slightly on the brake pedal. So it is safe for everyone.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have your point.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may move on to the second submission that you made.

You make reference to --

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of that?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second submission is dated

15 June 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the Chinese is at page 112-19, in English, 112-97. It is the third submission. If I may go to --

CHAIRMAN: So it is not the 15 June one. It is 25 July.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 25 July 2018. It is page 112-97 in Chinese and --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- 112-99 in English.

There are two matters I would like to raise with you. It is the use of surveillance cameras at page 112-97 at the top.

You made the point that -- under point 3, you made the point that you support use of surveillance camera to detect illegal parking.

Do I take it from your submission that in terms of surveillance cameras you supported the idea of installation of CCTV or surveillance camera within the driver's seat?

CHAIRMAN: To monitor illegal parking or to --

MS MAGGIE WONG: To monitor, first of all, to monitor illegal parking.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Do we answer? Well, to monitor illegal parking, yes, that is feasible. I hope that it would be

installed at the front of the vehicle. That I support. Because we need to collect evidence, for everything. So that has to be done.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on. Is this kind of camera not installed in many KMB buses already?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Still half of the buses don't have it.

CHAIRMAN: But half do?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. And sometimes for some reasons the company said that footage is not captured, so there needed to be some enhancements. The effectiveness of the device should be enhanced.

CHAIRMAN: As far as the involvement of the bus captains is concerned with this issue, do you support their involvement in perhaps pressing a button which would flag the fact that this point in time is the one to examine the CCTV to find evidence of the illegal parking?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, it is a very good idea. I support that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At page 112-97, paragraph (4.1), and in English, page 112-100, you stated there that:

"It is necessary to pass the relevant regulations by legislation. Otherwise, no one will abide by the rules.

Even in the past, some employee of KMB ... requested in a report a video clip recorded by a bus camera for the purpose of complaining another driver's careless driving, which, however, was rejected by the then general manager of Kowloon Bay depot ... and if the employee really wanted to get it, he had to pay administrative fee of $5,000 (only $600 required by New World Bus and Citybus). It was obvious that the general manager was deliberately refusing the reasonable request ..."

I wanted to ask you this. What do you mean by it is necessary to pass a relevant regulation by legislation? To do what?

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I don't understand why we are getting involved in this.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes --

CHAIRMAN: Because it is perfectly simple to ask for a subpoena to require KMB to come to court to produce the video tape.

This is not relevant.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Then why would the employee be required to pay a fee in order to get the footage.

CHAIRMAN: I thought I just indicated what the proper route is. The laws of Hong Kong permit someone who is a defendant in a criminal trial to require this kind of

evidence to be produced.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then I'll move on.

In relation to the black box, you mentioned at the bottom, second last paragraph, at page 112-97, and at page 112-101, that the installation of black box has been installed for many years, but you stated that the black box functions have not been properly used.

Can you elaborate on this?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: First, the Committee asked the German contractor of the black box, there can be a lot of data inside the black box. It has been many years. The Transport Department was not insincere in requiring the installation of black box, because after the accident in 2013 in Tuen Mun, it was under pressure, and the bus company was required to install the black box. For whatever reasons, perhaps to protect itself legally, the company would not want any of the data.

At the Committee hearing -- now, the speed limit is 75, and the acceleration and deceleration mean is 2.3 plus a negative 2.3, and the gradient 44, or the tilting angle 44 degrees.

Can I supplement on this point, Chairman?

Now, the mean, well, the company has been forcing bus captains to speed. If the speed limit is 70 kilometres per hour, to prevent the bus captain from

speeding, perhaps there should be a reminder or an alert at 68. Why should it be that?

So after February and March, a staff member was disciplined for driving at 83 kilometres per hour. So the threshold for asking the bus captain to stop is a problem.

And earlier this year there was a case of a tram overturning. According to press reports, the tram company asked their drivers to drive fast, or quickly. So this threshold of 75 allows a bus to speed. Actually, it is all for buses to speed and at Tuen Mun Highway, for instance, it can reach 100 kilometres per hour. This is irresponsible. And when there is an incident the bus captain is held accountable. And he has to shoulder all legal responsibility.

Now, a bus captain only earns $10,000-odd; for the management, tens of thousands of dollars. So in fact there should be an earlier warning. And how come the speed has reached 83/85, and there is no alert? The threshold required by the company is very low.

I have heard many hearings of this Committee, and some was 1.3 and 2.3, and the tilting angle 44 degrees. By that the bus can roll over. So it is impossible that the thresholds be set at those levels.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, it is perfectly obvious, is it not, that

in setting the tilt angle at 44 degrees, all that was being done was it was being disabled? It was not intended to operate as an alert, was it, because the bus was falling over?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, if it is disabled, then it will roll over. Take motor cycles as an example, if the torque is sufficient, then the motor cycle can be upright again. But it can also roll over when it is disabled. Because there is no force to upright it again.

So for people who don't know how to drive, may think that it is correct. But when it is disabled it will roll over. When there is a torque, then it will be upright again.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwok, sorry to interrupt again.

So can I summarise, the point that the black box has not maximised its capability, is: first, speed, second, the braking system, and the third, stability control; is that it?

Can you first of all answer whether I have summarised correctly?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, the black box should store certain data, so that when there is an incident, the driving attitude of the bus captain, should there be any breaking of rules, we can rectify it as soon as

possible, and it can be of use in investigation. We have listed out all the data that should be included in the black box and the thresholds. For instance, the voltage of electronic devices and anti-slip device of the wheels, of the tyres, and also the pressure, and also the sections of the deceleration.

And the fourth is the figures of the gear, that is the gear being used, and also the revolution, the speed. And the sixth is electronic hanging system, and that is the suspension system. In the past, it was the use of steel plates for shock absorber. Now it is by means of a suspension system.

The pressure of the suspension system and the tilt angle of the vehicle, whether the pressure was sufficient, if it isn't, then the vehicle will tilt. And whether, after tilting, the figure will automatically make the vehicle upright again, and the independent gas compressor, the figure of the pump, and also the figures for, data for acceleration and deceleration.

And nine, the total weight of the vehicle. If the black box is functioning normally, all this data can be found, and it is not expensive to require such functions, it is just that the company doesn't want such data to be available. Because if such data are

available people may be able to tell that maintenance is not done properly.

And because the Transport Department hasn't asked for it the company will not do so. They don't want to be caught.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, Mr Kwok, about this black box, you earlier mentioned the driving attitude, it can detect the driving attitude of bus captains.

Does your union support the real-time monitoring of the driving behaviour of bus captains? Real-time monitoring.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: In principle it is good. We use technology to assist the bus companies, and to assist safety, but are the data correct, or accurate? There is ISO 39001, GPS, and lots of functions, but is the technology mature enough to be used in Hong Kong? As far as I know, it is not very accurate. Take satellite GPS, as an example. When we are in Mong Kok it cannot be accurate, or detected. Because there are too many high rises in Hong Kong, satellite signals are not well received.

The Committee or members of the public may say that a certain kind of technology is good, but is it mature enough? I am of the view that more experimentation should be carried out.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok. You heard the evidence from the Czech Republic of the electronics engineer about how GPS is merely one of a number of systems that allows the position of the bus to be calculated at any one time.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. That's what is said. But I think it is not possible in Hong Kong. Maybe in the rural areas, but in the urban areas I don't think it can be accurate.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, with all due respect, you are not an electronics engineer, are you? We will hear from you about buses and driving of buses, but we will listen to our engineers when it comes to that issue.

Ms Wong, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may go to the TD-1 bundle, at page 403.

It is the briefing paper of the LegCo on transport, on enhancement of safety of franchised buses in July 2018.

TD-1, page 403, and in Chinese at page 416.

May I ask your views about whether your union supports the use of some of these devices.

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to that -- do you understand, Mr Kwok, how this paper came about?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I have not heard of this paper.

CHAIRMAN: Let me explain to you the evidence that we have

received.

The Transport Department in the middle of March convened a group made up of the franchised bus operators, three bus manufacturers, and the Transport Department, and they addressed a number of issues.

One was the issue of the training of bus captains, the other was the deployment or installation of technological safety devices on bus, and the third was the issue of seat belts.

That committee met a number of times, and at the end of July, 20 July, it published recommendations which were encapsulated in this briefing paper to LegCo. Do you understand?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I understand.

CHAIRMAN: Are we to understand this as well, that at no stage was your union asked to make any representations to this working group?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: (Chinese channel playing to the floor).

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I ask in that context whether you support the use of some of this in-vehicle --

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, Chairman, what you said, the answer is yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: So no representations, never asked to make any representations? That's correct?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: They perhaps don't have much confidence of our union.

CHAIRMAN: Whether they had confidence in you or not, they didn't ask you for your help. Can you confirm that?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: That is correct. If we send them letters they won't reply to us.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and the first device I'm going to ask is the electronic stability control in 4(a). Have you heard about this device before?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, we only noticed this device after the hearing started.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Does your union support the use of this device?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, we do. We can't avoid using technology. If there are problems in its use we would reflect our views to ask for improvement, and we will continue to do that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we go to 4(b). The retarder, the speed limiting regard. It is a retarder to cap the maximum speed of the speed limiters on downhill, and it is meant to enhance the speed limiter with a retarder to slow down a bus when the speed is over70km per hour under the downhill situation. Do you support this device? Does your union support the use of this device?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I haven't looked into this device, but I would like to say that, well, for the speed to be reduced that means you do not accelerate, and you are running to neutral, and that is quite dangerous, if you are travelling on neutral gear. That's why we emphasise that there needs to be a manual system as an assistance, because you only stop the injection of fuel, and for a few seconds you may be running on neutral, and you will lose momentum, and that is dangerous, because without further injection of fuel there won't be any torque, and you can't -- well, by injecting -- allowing injection of fuel to control the vehicle. So you are running on neutral gear, you can't effectively slow the car down. When it comes to manual retarder, it is not something new.

It has always been there for heavy duty vehicles, say, for example, coaches, they are all installed with this. It is just because the Transport Department, tailor made this requirement for bus operators, because it would dispense with maintenance. They thought --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, you obviously find it difficult to accept this, but we understand your view about the manual retarder. We have got that point, and there is no need to keep repeating it.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, can we go to 6(a), the bus monitoring and control system. In brief, it is -- they rely on the use of the GPS system, or positioning technologies. And the system will --

CHAIRMAN: I think that doesn't represent the position accurately.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes --

CHAIRMAN: It says "GPS or" -- and perhaps it ought to say "and other positioning technologies".

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And other positioning technologies, and I'm reading from the document. Under 6(a), and the system will match the legal speed limit at the actual bus location. The real-time speed limit information can then be used to control the enhanced speed limiter, ie speed limiter with two speed ratings, in other words, the bus speed could be controlled or limited within the applicable speed limits depending on the road section.

So Mr Kwok, does your union support the use of this device?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, I do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about 6(b), collision alert and lane keeping device?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: In this regard, well, I think the technology is not matured enough. If they are installed, and when buses pull into bus stops one by

one, as you see the design is that they will be very close together. With this device, that means the alert will go off all the time. And for the lane keeping device, well buses are large in size. We travel in urban areas or when we pull in a bus stop, there may be some obstructions, say for example a cart, or another car parked there. So we would be straddling on two lanes. Sometimes we would be turning, and we would go into the next lane.

Very often, we can't just travel within the space of the lane, sometimes we would be going slightly over the other one.

For the Mobileye, it is only forward looking. Unless the technology evolves to the extent that it will have a 360 degrees view, I don't consider that to be suitable.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 6(c), driver monitoring device to monitor the driver --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, you were talking over the translation, so could you begin again with your question.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

What about the driver monitoring device? 6(c).

CHAIRMAN: You are talking about the drowsiness technology?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, the drowsiness technology.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Four buses of the KMB have had this

installed. Bus captains don't support it. Because the camera would be pointing to their faces all the time, and it would put pressure on them.

Another thing is that if you install this, you will have to reduce the working hours of drivers, otherwise I can tell you that 90 per cent of bus drivers, might just doze off from time to time, because they work very long hours.

So don't fool yourself by thinking that with this device installed everything would be well and good. If the company wants to penalise you --

CHAIRMAN: I don't understand this, Mr Kwok. You are saying that 90 per cent of drivers doze off -- is that what you are saying? Because of long working hours?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't it be a good idea, then, to have a camera --

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, that means they just may be close their eyes for a bit. I won't try to fool you. Because that is a fact.

We have raised this issue a lot, it is because of poor management. We have put forward an idea of taking into account where you live. Say, for example, well, you live in Tuen Mun and you work in Lai Chi Kok, and there is only one company car, so you have to wake up

really earlier --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the next one is the installation of seat belts on all buses on all seats.

Does your union support this?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: In order to reduce casualties and fatalities in accidents, yes. Well, it would be like coaches, where it is a 2-point safety belt, not 3-point safety system.

Yes, there will be inconvenience, because it will take longer for passengers to alight because some passengers might struggle a bit to take the seat belt off.

But so far, well, with so many risk factors, without proper or perfect measures we support the 2-point safety belt system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. The last topic in this paper is the training for franchised bus captain.

If you go to paragraph 18, it states that:

"The working group has agreed that the Transport Department should promulgate a practice note on training framework for franchised bus captain."

Has your union been given a copy --

CHAIRMAN: There are two steps to that. That is what is

said here. We have received a submission from the Transport Department where we have been told that the practice note has been issued.

The question for you, Mr Kwok, has your union been provided with a copy of this practice note?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: No, we have not.

CHAIRMAN: Were you consulted at all in the review of how training might be provided, monitored, and regulated?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: No. Well, we have a lot of views.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if you look at paragraph 19, it sets out the structure of the training arrangement for bus captain under the practice note, irrespective of whether they are full-time or part-time bus captain.

It includes regular training, and special purpose training. First of all, do you support this?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, we do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And paragraph 20, it provides that the regular training for the bus captains should also include the following modules with relative weightings to be covered -- set out in (a) to (e) -- including safe driving and road safety, cognition of in-vehicle device, handling of incident, customer service and knowledge of company rules, traffic regulations, occupational health and safety.

Do you have any comments on the respective weighting

of these modules?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I have some knowledge of the programme, but you have to bear in mind that if you just tell bus captains, they may not be able to grasp or understand the information. In the past, when we were trained, instructors told us the answers, so we all scored 100.

And the information would be passed on to the Transport Department, or senior management, and I think the Committee can take a look. Everyone scored 100. So it is not desirable.

In fact, the training programme should provide quantifying, quantitative figures, for instance our speed is usually 50, at most 70, and you should tell them how is it calculated.

So one kilometre is 1,000 metres, so 70 kilometres you multiply it by 1,000, it is 70,000, and you multiply it by 60, and that is the speed per minute, and then you divide by 60, and it is 19.5 metres per second. So you can quantify.

And they will understand the speed, because they have an actual figure of -- by 70km/ph that means you can travel 19.5 metres per second.

If 60km/ph, that is 16.6 metres per second, and 50 is 13 metres per second, 40 metres, 11.1 metres per second, so on and so forth.

It will be easier for them to understand if you give them figures. And you ask them to leave more room, then in Hong Kong there should be a space of three to four seconds between two vehicles.

But you have to let them understand what is meant by travelling speed. And in the past we were taught this way. When you reach the first arrow, you have to remove all fuel, and by the second arrow, well, if the phase is not changed you can add a little fuel, and go through the traffic signal.

And even if the front wheel has exceeded the line to stop, because we are buses, we have some room, we should go ahead. But nowadays they are not taught this at training.

Passengers and the public do not understand. They accuse buses of jumping the amber phase. In fact, it was taught in the past, and you have a flash lights. Sometimes you have this habit.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next topic is working hours.

Mr Kwok, in your submission, the first submission, Chinese at page 88, TU-1A, and English at page 90-7, in paragraph 5 you stated there that:

"... the reasonable maximum working hours per day

shall be 12 hours, the maximum driving time shall be 10 hours."

May I ask you your view, or your union's view about split shift, with maximum of working hours, maximum 14 working hours?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: You want me to comment on this issue?

CHAIRMAN: We want you to give us your opinion, that is the union's opinion on the split shift guidelines. 14 hours maximum duty, 10 hours maximum driving, three hours' continuous break. What is your view?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: According to the current guidelines the maximum driving hours is 11. So the committee has been talking about three hours of rest, and 10 hours of driving. It will only happen in the second quarter of next year. In 2010, the guideline was 14 hours maximum and maximum working hours 11, and there is no guideline on the minimum hours of rest in between.

And the new guideline will only be implemented in the second quarter of next year.

CHAIRMAN: That's why --

MR KWOK CHI SHING: And many of us will only have two hours or so of rest including meals, and then in the second quarter of next year there is a window.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, the second quarter of next year is when these guidelines will be fully implemented. That's the

provision, is it not?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: It is said so.

CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you these questions.

Is the guideline, with a requirement of three hours of a continuous break, implemented at all in KMB now?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: There is no hard and fast rule. It depends on the route. And for some you only have one hour of meal.

So 11 hours, driving hours, is maximised, sometimes even over that. Because there is no hard and fast rule according to TD.

CHAIRMAN: Please concentrate on the question. Has KMB begun to implement the reduced, or rather the requirement for a continuous break of three hours in special shifts where 14 hours on duty is permitted, but there is a maximum of 10 hours driving. Has it begun to implement that at all?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: No. No, they don't have enough manpower. It is 11 hours of driving. 10 hours of driving is our suggestion.

The maximum duty hours are 14 driving hours, and 11.

Then in between, 30 minutes.

Next year, in the second quarter, after continuous driving of six hours, there must be 40 minutes of rest. Right now it is only 30 minutes.

KMB has not implemented this rest of three hours in between. For some, maybe two hours or so. We have a colleague here, driving special shift duties, and he has sent e-mail to the Committee. Perhaps he has sent it to the wrong address. It was not received by the Committee. He talked to us yesterday.

And he is on monthly salary. He is just sitting next to me, and if the Committee permits, he will spend some time to tell you his views.

CHAIRMAN: Is that Mr Wong?

Yes, Mr Wong, did you drive a special shift this week?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I am on sick leave after injury at work. I have been driving there for one year.

CHAIRMAN: When did you last drive a special shift?

MR WONG KIN WAI: 26 June.

CHAIRMAN: And can you recall, if you are able to, what your day was that day? What time you left home, what time you started duty, what time you took your break, where you took your break?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I woke up at 6.15. I left home at 6.30, and I travelled to work at Mei Foo. I took two company cars. At 7.35 I clocked in.

I drove -- I started at 11.40 to Olympic, and there was one hour for a meal, and then the break in between

two hours 47-minutes. I drove again at 15.50.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Wong, we are not in a hurry. Take your time to describe this.

Where do you live?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Kwai Shing West Estate.

CHAIRMAN: And you left Kwai Shing West Estate at 6.30 that morning?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And you went to Mei Foo?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How did you travel?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Bus number 37.

CHAIRMAN: As a passenger?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And when you got to Mei Foo what did you do?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I boarded an engineering car to arrive at Stonecutters Island bus depot.

CHAIRMAN: So this is a KMB car, is it?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Car, not bus?

MR WONG KIN WAI: A coach. A coach of 60 seats.

CHAIRMAN: With fellow bus captains?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So from Mei Foo, with your fellow bus captains you went to Stonecutters Island?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you get there?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Around 7.20 am.

CHAIRMAN: And what facilities are there, at Stonecutters?

MR WONG KIN WAI: It is a KMB bus depot.

CHAIRMAN: And having arrived there, did you clock in, as you called it?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How do you clock in?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Use an Octopus card on a computer system, and then I will have a roster for the day. I have a job sheet for the day.

CHAIRMAN: You use your Octopus card, so you are electronically clocked in at 7.35 in the morning?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What happens next?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I had the licence number of the bus I was supposed to drive, I went to the car park to find it, and then I drove it to the bus terminus.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you leave Stonecutters bus depot.

MR WONG KIN WAI: 8.35.

CHAIRMAN: Between clocking in at 7.35 and leaving the bus depot at 8.35, what duties did you perform?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I left Stonecutters Island depot at 7.35, I drove to the bus terminus of Kwai Shing East Estate

and then the first departure was at 8 am.

CHAIRMAN: So you had to take the bus from the bus depot to Kwai Shing East, and what is the status of that place, is that a terminus?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes, it is a bus terminus at Kwai Shing West Estate.

CHAIRMAN: West?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And you began driving a route on that bus at around 8 o'clock that morning?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes. 8 am is the first departure.

CHAIRMAN: What was the route number?

MR WONG KIN WAI: 37.

CHAIRMAN: What is the destination, the ultimate destination that that route goes to?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Olympic MTR station.

CHAIRMAN: Carry on. Describe your day.

MR WONG KIN WAI: Since I work for the special shift on peak licence, then I would put on the C licence, that is no passenger to go to Kwai Shing West, until 9.31, all the way until 11.40, which is the last trip, driving to Olympic station, then I would finish my morning session, that would be about 12.45.

CHAIRMAN: Where were you when you finished the morning session?

MR WONG KIN WAI: The vehicle will have to be put on a stop service sign, have to drive it to Kwai Shing East Estate to leave it there.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a bus terminus?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Well, it is kind of. It is for bus captains to take their meal break, and before the next driver comes to take the bus, we can leave the bus there.

CHAIRMAN: So what time did you arrive at Kwai Shing East Estate?

MR WONG KIN WAI: About 12.45.

CHAIRMAN: So what time had you finished driving the route 37 route?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Normally it will be 12.40, driving for one hour, which is the journey time, and then I have to add one hour, which is my meal break. So normally, it will take me to eight minutes past 2, including the meal break.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you have the meal break that day?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Kwai Shing East Estate.

CHAIRMAN: And are there rest facilities there? KMB bus rest facilities?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Previously yes. Because of the Housing Authority problems they are removed. Recently I walked past, I see another facility installed. I think it was

some time last week or so.

CHAIRMAN: On 28 June, were there any rest facilities at Kwai Shing East Estate?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I don't really know.

CHAIRMAN: Well, where did you have your meal?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Shopping mall in Kwai Shing East Estate.

CHAIRMAN: What did you do with the rest of the break time?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I would take transportation to Kwai Shing West Estate to the terminus and rest at the rest facilities there.

CHAIRMAN: What transport did you take to do that?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Many modes. 47X, 37M, and 37. They are all buses.

CHAIRMAN: So you took a bus?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: As a passenger?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: A regular bus route, not a special bus driving bus captains?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I was a bus captain working for a special shift for a regular route.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. This is your meal break. And you moved from Kwai Shing East to Kwai Shing West. And you did so as a passenger; is that right?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That's right. Because there were no rest

facilities at Kwai Shing East, and there are only rest facilities for staff at Kwai Shing West.

CHAIRMAN: And you rested at Kwai Shing West?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: What are the rest facilities there? Are there seats? Are there benches?

MR WONG KIN WAI: There are three benches and some tables.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to lie down?

MR WONG KIN WAI: There are something like sofa, so I could lean back. But if you are talking about something like a bed, no.

CHAIRMAN: You are able to recline, is that it?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: When did your break come to an end?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That would be 15.55.

CHAIRMAN: So what was the length of your break that day? When did you start?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Including taking a meal, it is about two hours 47 minutes.

CHAIRMAN: When did it start?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I think my roster started, according to the schedule, is eight minutes past 2, and then until 15.55.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and then you resumed your bus driving?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: Were you on route 37 again, or another route?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Also 37.

CHAIRMAN: And for how long did you ply that route?

MR WONG KIN WAI: About one year.

CHAIRMAN: No, when did you finish driving that route that day?

MR WONG KIN WAI: 20.43. That's the time when I knocked off work. Including going to Stonecutters Island to leave the bus there.

CHAIRMAN: So you clocked out, as it were? Is that right?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: So you clocked in at 7.35, is that it?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Before 7.35. Before 7.35.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you clock in?

MR WONG KIN WAI: It was about 7.20, when I clocked in after taking the company bus to go to Stonecutters Island.

CHAIRMAN: And that day, having finished and clocked out, clocked off, did you return home straight away, or did you do other things?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I went home straight away.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us as to what time you arrived at home?

MR WONG KIN WAI: It was around 9.20.

CHAIRMAN: The following day, 29 June, were you on duty?

MR WONG KIN WAI: My last day was 26 June. Because in my

last trip to Kwai Shing West Estate there was a traffic accident.

CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon, the 26th. Were you involved in that traffic accident?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: What time was the traffic accident?

MR WONG KIN WAI: 7.20.

CHAIRMAN: What was the nature of the traffic accident?

MR WONG KIN WAI: A taxi travelling on a third lane cut across to the first lane to a smaller road, Beech Street. I was travelling on the first lane, I could not stop in time, and rammed into the taxi.

CHAIRMAN: Were you injured?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And is that when your sick leave began?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is right.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

I just want to follow up. When you are talking about the resting places, you had three chairs. Usually, how many drivers are in that location together?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I think about three or four. Because, well, they would not be there for a prolonged period of time. There would be five to six minutes of rest time, they would go in to take a seat.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: So is there enough room for all the drivers

inside the premise?

MR WONG KIN WAI: I think there was sufficient space for seven to eight people.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, we are going to take a break now. And we will resume at 12 o'clock by that clock. Thank you.

(11.43 am)

(A short break)

(12.03 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Mr Wong, you told us that you were driving that route, or rather the special shift arrangement, for a year; is that correct?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN: Can you describe, if you remember it, perhaps going backwards from that week of 26 June, how many days in a row were you driving that special shift without having a break?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Basically from Monday to Saturday I would be working continuously for five to six days.

CHAIRMAN: Well, was it five, or was it six, or could you change the pattern?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We are on a roster on the shift, so normally we would be on duty for five or six days, and then there will be one rest day.

CHAIRMAN: And were your hours of work broadly the same -- clocking in time, clocking off time?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: That is correct, it is a fixed time.

CHAIRMAN: If it be necessary, do you consent to KMB releasing to us the data they might have obtained about your work on 26 June when you clocked in, when you arrived at a bus terminus, when your break began, when you clocked off, all of the data that day, do you consent to that being provided to the Committee?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You told us about the rest facilities that were available at Kwai Shing West Estate; were there occasions when you took your rest in this split shift arrangement at other places?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Sometimes, I would, if it were too noisy, too many people going in and out, I would choose to go home.

CHAIRMAN: The question really is this. Were there other places where you took this break, other than Kwai Shing West Estate?

MR WONG KIN WAI: No. Because there was only rest facilities at Kwai Shing West Estate. When I went to work, there was still no rest facilities at Kwai Shing East Estate.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: I would like to add.

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Mr Kwok, your turn will come.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

I just want to clarify what you said earlier, Mr Wong.

You did mention about your break is about two hours and 47 minutes, right? That's including meal time. This is the break time, two hours and 47 minutes; is that correct?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is right.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: You also mentioned that if it is a bit too noisy, you will go home. If you actually have to go home, can you make a guess on actually during that two hours and 47 minutes, really, what kind of rest you can have before you carry on with your work of the day?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Well, there wasn't enough time for a rest, I just closed my eyes, rest my eyes and tried to relax, to keep my shape up.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, you wanted to say something.

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. For Kwai Shing East, it seems that a rest kiosk has been put in just a few days ago with the help of a trade union, Mr Chow Wai Hung, within a short time, the work was completed. I mentioned that the trade union intervened. We are not affiliated with any political parties. If we want something done we would go to the community to lobby. I think the main objection comes from district councillors. If there are no objections coming from the community, it would be the

problem of the government department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Wong, may I clarify a few matters.

You said that you clocked in before 7.35, and then you take the meal break at 2.08. On my calculation, it is around six hours 50 minutes before you take the meal break. So, I was trying to find out, do you have breaks or rest time during that six hours and 50 minutes?

MR WONG KIN WAI: The last driving time of mine during the morning was 11.40 for a journey time of one hour.

I could drive the bus to Kwai Shing East Estate to leave it there, and it was earlier than expected because of little traffic. So I arrived there early. My actual -- well, there was no break time at that time.

Perhaps I can give you my timetable or roster for your reference.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, yes. Because I would like to know how the rest time was arranged during that shift.

I would like to know, during that six hours and 50 minutes, how that rest time was arranged, so it would be great if we could get your timetable.

You referred to the meal break, one hour, included within the three successive hours of break; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN: I don't think it has been acknowledged that the three hour continuous break system is being implemented.

Am I right, Mr Kwok, that it is not being implemented?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: As I said, that it would be implemented in the second quarter of 2019. Well, now the company will have full flexibility. If there is 14-hour duty hours then there won't be more than 11 hours of driving. So strictly speaking, there is little rest time. It is just because of the manpower shortage. Everyone will be used to the fullest. In the past they said that it was about 6 am or 11 am, and then in the afternoon it would be 3 pm or 4 pm. That would be the arrangement.

Now, because of the manpower shortage, well, 3 pm would be late. Some of us would be asked to work on a different route.

CHAIRMAN: The question is very simple, Mr Kwok.

Thank you, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think I wanted to ask Mr Wong this question about the allowance in special shift. Is Kowloon Motor Bus paying you the reduced allowance?

CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a number, $21.90.

Is that what you get paid when you have your break in a special shift?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Could you please wait. I think the special shift allowance per day is $69.70.

CHAIRMAN: That's the total allowance, not a hourly rate?

MR WONG KIN WAI: That is the total. That is the total, $69.70 is the total.

CHAIRMAN: For how many hours of break?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Two hours and 47 minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you help me with this, about this shift allowance. If you go to KMB bundle 1, Mr Wong, this question is directed at you. If you go to KMB bundle 1, page 109. There is a table showing the allowance.

MR WONG KIN WAI: I would like to add something. The $21.90 is the calculation of a staff on a daily rate. $69.70 is the calculation for someone on a monthly salary.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have that document in front of you at page 109?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may ask you to look at the left column. "Employed after 2004", the old monthly rate. The basic salary. Are they paying you 11,810, or are they paying you 15,366? Which is applicable in your case?

MR WONG KIN WAI: 15,366.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And then you would be paid the split shift allowance of $1,951.50; is that for the whole month, the monthly rate?

MR WONG KIN WAI: Well, it depends on the number of days.

If you cannot complete 15 days, then you cannot get the full rate of allowance. So it is on a pro rata basis.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So can you tell us what allowance you would receive from (B) to (G).

CHAIRMAN: I think we are being bogged down in a minor detail here. Either way, the figures speak for themselves.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. So maybe I will move on to another topic.

Mr Kwok, I would like to raise another topic with you. It is about the issue you raised in your submission about having a priority bus lane.

And your submission in English is at page 90-7, and it should be in Chinese, page 88.

It states that:

"... where a bus has made a direction signal preparing to exit a station, other vehicles that see it must stop or let the bus exit the station. A safety distance of two seconds is used as the termination distance by which the bus must be allowed to exit the station first ... vehicles are prohibited from cutting in front of buses within 10 metres of their front to prevent the buses from suddenly having to decelerate."

In your submission you provided some examples as to the problems about cutting lanes -- and that is in the

TU bundle at pages 104 to 108 -- at the Hung Hom station.

So are you suggesting by this suggestion that you would like to have the priority bus lane system similar to what they have in Singapore?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Regarding your point about the bus that must be allowed to exit the station first, do you have any view as to how --

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the bus stop?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The bus stop.

Do you have any view --

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes, yes, correct. Bus stop.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have any view as to how it can be enforced?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Well, we use cameras, for new vehicles they have got cameras, so when the signal is issued for two seconds, if the vehicles at the back do not stop then it can be enforced.

CHAIRMAN: So that would require a camera at the rear of the vehicle?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Right now, for new vehicles, the rear mirrors on the left and the right there are cameras.

Why did I say two seconds? Because we understand that there should be a distance of two seconds, as

promoted by the government, so that there would be a safe distance, so no emergency halting of the vehicle is required.

In Singapore they draw a line, and that may lead to misunderstanding.

If I have just passed that line and reached that line and you give me a signal, then there may be some misunderstanding.

So two seconds is to quantify the distance. I propose two seconds, you may suggest three. It is just to quantify the distance. It doesn't really have to be two seconds. Because in Hong Kong space is limited and bus stops are numerous, people would not know what the line is about.

In Hong Kong, to have road markings, you have to guess at it, and you have to set up a sign, it is complicated, and the markings may be removed as time goes on. So it is best to use time as a reference. It is safer.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next topic is on training safety. You mentioned in your first submission at page 84 in Chinese, English at page 90-4 -- you raised the issue about training safety. You stated there that:

"During that time, even when road traffic was relatively simple, and I was familiar with the roads,

I also need to be trained for one month. Within that one month, majority of the time was spent in bus-driving training ..."

And you commented that the training nowadays of 18 days is insufficient.

So did I summarise it correctly, that your union's view is that the current training to newly recruited bus drivers is in sufficient?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: You are correct. You are correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is your proposed duration of training to new recruits?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: It is about the operation of the bus company. One month is about right, unless the new recruit has a bus licence. Now, for those who have to take a licence examination, one month is the minimum. In particular, the recruiting requirements are lower. And it was said at the hearing that a person with one year private car licence can then learn to drive, and after 18 days he can start driving a bus. That is very dangerous, and I think that consideration is immature.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you commented in your submission, or reply, on 25 July 2018, as to the Transport Department's role in training. If I may take you to the submission.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can just summarise the point.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The point was that you commented that

the Transport Department should take a more active role on training and supervision of bus captains courses. Is that the point you are trying to make in your later submission on 25 July?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: Yes. Yes, there should be monitoring by the Transport Department, because the training course made by the bus company would only suit its needs without other considerations. The TD should monitor.

And there should be consultation with trade unions, because we are in service, we know the qualifications for professional bus captains, they should be more open in discussing with us. That would be much better.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I have completed my questioning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Wong.

Mr Kwok, those are the questions that we have for you. You indicated at the start that there was some other material that you wanted to make available to us. And if you wish us to receive that material, please provide it in writing, and we will consider it.

Is that what you wish to do?

MR KWOK CHI SHING: We will, if we can.

Since the Committee still takes time to complete the whole consultation, and if we can make it we will submit the material as soon as possible for the Committee's

reference.

CHAIRMAN: Well, we look forward to receiving whatever it is that you choose to give us.

But for the moment, we thank for coming to give evidence. Thank you, Mr Wong, for giving us an insight into a day in a life of a bus captain working a special shift. That was most helpful to us.

But we have others from another union who are going to give evidence. So what we will do is take a short break now and invite you to withdraw from the table, and the other representatives can come forward and occupy the table.

We will take a 2-minute break. Thank you.

(12.27 pm)

(A short break)

(12.30 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES FROM STAFF RIGHTS ASSOCIATION OF KMB:
MR CHAN WING HO, MR TAN SHIN HING, MR YIU KWONG CHUN, AND MR LI KWOK WAH

(Evidence given in Cantonese, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation).

CHAIRMAN: We thank you, Mr Li, and your colleagues, representatives of the Staff Rights Association of KMB, for accepting our invitation to come and give evidence today.

I'm going to ask Ms Wong in a moment to begin asking you questions on behalf of the Committee.

Mr Li, if you wish one of your colleagues to answer any particular question, just indicate who it is, and defer to him, and then we will hear from whoever it is that you wish us to hear from, answering a particular question.

MR LI KWOK WAH: I understand.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Li. This Committee is tasked to review the safety aspects of the franchised bus operations, so my questions will be focusing on that area.

Before I ask a few questions I would like to ascertain some basic facts about your association.

Your association was established in January 2017, correct?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And there are approximately 200 members in your association as of 18 June 2018.

MR LI KWOK WAH: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And your members, 200 members, are all full-time and part-time staff of Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR LI KWOK WAH: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In what percentage?

MR LI KWOK WAH: There are about 8,600 bus captains. We have 200 members?

MS MAGGIE WONG: What percentage is full-time staff and what percentage is part-time staff?

MR LI KWOK WAH: There is only one part-time member. The others are all full-time.

CHAIRMAN: And they are all bus captains?

MR LI KWOK WAH: There are also some bus regulators, three bus regulators.

CHAIRMAN: And the rest are bus captains?

MR LI KWOK WAH: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Li, I would like to go to a specific topic on scheduled trips and loss of time.

If we could go to your submission at page 129-4 in English. You have only made one submission dated 23 April 2018. In Chinese it starts at page 117.

And the passage is at page 120.

I think in the bottom paragraph, you stated that:

"... with the continued loss of bus captains, and the need maintain the scheduled trips and avoid cancelling scheduled trips, causing bus captains' entitled rest time during work subject to the situation of lost trips and the road traffic circumstances that

day. For many bus captains who would need to drive various bus routes, in order to have more time for rest during work, will try to complete the bus routes as soon as possible depending on road traffic condition and return to the bus terminals for rest."

Can you tell us or elaborate how the need to maintain scheduled trips would affect bus captains' entitled rest time?

MR LI KWOK WAH: The bus company, say, for example, there is one hour of journey time, it would be compressed to 55 to 58 minutes. Bus captains have little rest time. If you compress journey time even by a few minutes, that means a loss of a few minutes of rest time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So can you confirm that as to whether, when trying to complete the bus routes with a less scheduled time, would that increase the likelihood of speeding by bus captains?

MR LI KWOK WAH: That is right. Because you have to catch up in order to get more rest time. Yes, buses travel at 70km/ph, in some sections where there is a speed limit of 50, we may be travelling at a higher speed, and there will be pressure, because we would need to make up for the time. As a result they will have to speed, say, for example, travelling at 70km/ph at a section of 50km/ph speed limit.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have heard about the system that there is a monitoring system of drivers, and a certain threshold was set in the black box that you cannot exceed a certain speed limit, for example 50km per hour would be set at 55km per hour. In those circumstances, if you are speeding --

CHAIRMAN: Whose evidence you are quoting there?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm quoting evidence perhaps from Citybus.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm just enquiring, is there a similar system in the KMB buses for road sections that have 50km per hour?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, for KMB there is the black box. It is a tachograph. It records the operations of the bus. You can retrieve the data. Regularly the company would check the black box, say, for example, on a certain date, a particular bus captain sped during a certain section. There is this system with the KMB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know what threshold has been set for the 50km per hour road section?

CHAIRMAN: By KMB on their tachomatic devices?

MS MAGGIE WONG: By KMB on their tachograph devices.

MR LI KWOK WAH: I don't understand your question.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard evidence -- perhaps I will explain more. We have heard evidence from another bus

operator, Citybus, that for a road section that has a fixed speed limit of 50km per hour they would set at 55km per hour within that black box. And once the bus driver exceeded 55km per hour for a continuous period of time, say, 10 consecutive seconds, it would be automatically recorded in the form of an automatic generation exception report, and certain punishment would be accorded to different bus captains for exceeding certain speed limit.

And we have that particular page there.

A speed of over 55km per hour for 10 consecutive seconds on road sections with speed limit of 50km per hour, and speed of over 75km per hour for 10 consecutive seconds on road sections with speed limit of 70km per hour.

So, as far as you know, as bus captain, do you have a similar system for bus captains in Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, there is one. Our understanding is that for KMB black boxes, they would record your speed, say, for example, if you are travelling at 78km/ph, an excess of 8 kilometres per hour, if you do not accelerate within 10 seconds, there won't be any record. But if it is over 10 seconds there would be a record. That's the same for 70km/ph, and 50km/ph. It depends on the duration. 10 seconds. If within that time you do

not accelerate it will not be recorded. Otherwise, there will be a warning letter or reduction of your bonus.

CHAIRMAN: So that I can understand that, are you saying that the vehicle can carry on at 78 kilometres an hour, as long as it doesn't accelerate to a greater speed? Or does it have to come back to 70 within the 10 seconds?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, within 10 seconds it will have to be brought back to 70km/ph.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned there will be deduction of allowance. In what circumstances --

MR LI KWOK WAH: Bonus. Bonus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So that would be bonus? In what circumstances would the bonus be reduced, and by how much?

MR LI KWOK WAH: KMB has merged the bonus into our basic salary. Before that there were two types of bonus. One for service another for safety. Each had the value of 1,178.

Now, if it is a serious incident, such as a traffic accident, then the whole month's bonus will be deducted. Usually it will be half a month's bonus should there be an incident. The same applies to good service bonus. If you receive too many complaints, half or one month of good service bonus will be deducted.

CHAIRMAN: But that's all history now, is it not? There is no bonus, there is no deduction.

MR LI KWOK WAH: That's true.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So if a bus driver speeds, or if there is a speed exception report generated, would he receive any penalty?

MR LI KWOK WAH: It depends on the number of violations -- the company will look at that -- and also the gap between two violations. If it is every month, there will be deduction. If there is one month or seven months in between then a warning letter will be issued to remind the bus captain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So under the current system, there is still a deduction regime depending on how frequent the violation is; is that what you are saying?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: From what is the deduction made?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Now, there can be no bonus to deduct. Because the bonuses are merged into our monthly salary, there can be no deduction. So every time you have one violation you receive a warning letter. Three warning letters result in dismissal.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it is not a deduction from salary --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Ms Wong. Please.

Three warning letters result in what, Mr Li?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Dismissal.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So there is not a system of deduction from the salary, but it is simply dismissal following three warning letters; is that the case?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The next topic I would like to ask is the training.

If you look at page 129-6 in English, Chinese at page 122. And you mentioned about the 18 day-training and the four-week training.

Can you tell us what is the difference in terms of the modules between the four-week training and the 18-day training provided by Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Right now KMB has this system. Those without a bus driving licence, 18 days will cover the training to get a licence, so the module is very similar to the four-week training, but much compressed.

For the 18-day course, we believe the quality of training will drop, because for new bus captains we don't know what vehicles they have driven in the past, or even if any. So they might be goods vehicles drivers, or taxi drivers in the main.

We are heavy duty buses, as a type of mass transport mode. So if training isn't sufficient, will this increase the likelihood of traffic accidents? And I'm

of the view that the training time is insufficient. I have served for 27 years. When I joined, I received four-week training. Although I already had a licence, I had to be trained for four weeks, but for KMB, if a new recruit has a licence then the training is only for seven days, to train them on the basics and also knowledge about the routes, and then he can become a professional bus captain.

There are so many traffic accidents involving buses. Many of them involve buses.

To train a bus captain, there should at least be four weeks covering the lessons and also practical training on the road. Our suggestion is for every driving instructor he can only take two trainees. In the past it was three. We want that to be changed to two, two trainees per instructor.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you.

May I take you to a document in the TD-1 bundle, at page 403. The Chinese is at page 416.

Mr Li, this is a briefing paper produced by the Transport Department in consultation with five franchised bus operators and three major bus manufacturers. And this is the product of their recommendation.

CHAIRMAN: This was a special working group set up by the

Transport Department in the middle of March, and it was required to report within three months and did so on 20 July, with this, what is now this briefing paper for the transport panel of the Legislative Council.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And this paper covers three aspects: first, the in-vehicle safety devices; second, seat belts; and third, training of bus captains.

My first question is, have the Transport Department or Kowloon Motor Bus consulted your views on any of the topics between March and June 2018?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No, this is the first time I have seen this paper. The company has not consulted my trade union.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have been informed recently that the Transport Department has recently issued a practice note to franchised bus operators in respect of the training for bus captains to align the training arrangements of different operators to be implemented from October 2018.

Have you been provided or has your union been provided with a copy of the practice note?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, before you move on.

Last week, did the Committee not ask the Transport Department to be provided with a copy of the practice note?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Have we been provided with one?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have not.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the last topic, Mr Li, I would like to ask you is this.

Amongst your 200 members -- I know some of them are not actual bus drivers, but most of them are -- how many of them are on special shifts or split shifts, to your knowledge?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Myself, is a special shift duty driver. I have not done formal statistics, but I know about 20 to 30 members who are special shift bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard evidence that the recent February 2018 guidelines are not strictly enforced or implemented in terms of the rest hours, and the three consecutive hours.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think, Ms Wong, with respect, it is a question of strictly enforced. The agreement was full implementation would not take place until the second quarter of 2019, and the issue is whether any implementation has taken place as of now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Not in KMB. No such arrangement. Many many special shift vehicles don't even provide three hours in between for meals and rest. We have collected

information, many special shift do not provide three hours. According to KMB they have three hours, but according to our survey, no, less than three hours.

CHAIRMAN: When was this survey conducted?

MR LI KWOK WAH: About two weeks ago, we have been asking our members, and many routes had less than three hours.

For some routes, like 258P, 5S, 60X, 256B, many routes do not provide three hours for meals and rest.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have copies of the survey, the results of the survey?

MR LI KWOK WAH: We have printed -- now, here are two. Because the information is in my mobile phone, and for some of the information it is not appropriate for me to pass it to you because it is a document I have taken photo of. They are company documents.

CHAIRMAN: Well, is there some material that you can provide us, redacting it as you feel appropriate so that we can see the extent of your survey and how many bus captains indicated that they were not being given a three-hour break.?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I have a dozen or so routes, and there are special duty routes, and some were given to us.

Now, there is a roster done by the company, and even then, there wasn't three hours for meal and break.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anything you can provide to us to

substantiate what you are saying?

MR LI KWOK WAH: We have printed two timetables. Chairman, if you would like to have a look I can show it to you.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. Perhaps what we will do is this. We have reached the lunch break. If you provide that to us now, we can have it copied and perhaps translated so that we can resume by asking you questions at 2.30 this afternoon on this material.

If there are other matters where you have statements to make to us, we always look for evidence to support the assertion. So if there are things that support you, please provide them to us.

But we will take the lunch adjournment now, and we will resume at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.03 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

We have a copy of the document that you wanted to hand to us, and we have a translation of part of it.

I'll ask Ms Wong to deal with the matter.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you for providing us with the document. We have extracted an enlarged the part that concerns special shifts.

We see an example of the duty hours of a bus captain currently driving a special shift for route number 258D, and we can see it starts at 6.50 and it ends at 13.43. Then restarts again at 4 pm to 8.15 pm. There was only a rest break of 2 hours and 15 minutes, instead of three hours in between.

Can you tell us when was this -- when was this happened? Or is this a recent --

CHAIRMAN: Do we not see the date on the -- if it is a roster, in the coloured photograph? Isn't that 28 April?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I can't see.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Now, this schedule, or roster was amended on 9 July, 9 July.

CHAIRMAN: Of this year?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes. This year. 9 July this year. Because the company made major changes to the schedule, so the date of commencement of the schedule is 9 July.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a photograph that we see in colour on the left-hand side, of something that the company posted?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No. That's taken from the computer screen. It is on the company's computer screen, and a picture was taken of that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, and when was that picture taken?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I'm not sure. Because it was provided by

some staff members.

CHAIRMAN: The computer screen picture seems to depict a date. 28/04/2018. Do you see that?

Top of the printout.

MR LI KWOK WAH: It is actually provided by staff members, I didn't actually read the small fonts here, up there.

So here it says 23 April 2018.

Now recently, the company has revised substantially the schedules for many routes, since 9 July, but this photo was WhatsApped to me the day before yesterday. Just to point out the problems there. So this was the photo, and that's why I used it as an example.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was this duty hours applied across the board for special shifts, or specific routes?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Well, these are individual routes, and so-called running number trips, or -- for example this is route 258D, trip number 5 is this schedule, but trip number 6 for instance would be a different schedule.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This schedule was provided by the company, Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you find more examples of this?

MR LI KWOK WAH: For instance, this one. 52X schedule 7. Or S7, in short. The early shift, 7.57, logged in, and

then the early shift finished at 12.07. But then the next shift started at 14.19, and had to go back to Po Tin to collect the vehicle. So in between there were just over two hours. So there are several more such examples.

CHAIRMAN: And the point that you are illustrating is that for maximum duties of, I think the first one is 13 hours and 25 minutes, the rest time was less than 3 hours. Considerably less than 3 hours?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Li, you told us earlier on that you are a special shift driver as well.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us, from your personal experience, a day's work? From your -- from the time you start your duty.

CHAIRMAN: When did you last drive a special shift?

MR LI KWOK WAH: 14 January, because 15 January -- because of a traffic accident I was injured and I have not started work again.

So before 14 January I was driving special shifts.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to help us with the times that you worked on that last day?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I have to look up the schedule first.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How long have you been driving --

CHAIRMAN: Well, he is looking up the schedule, Ms Wong.

MR LI KWOK WAH: On 14 January, I took a special shift in the morning. 7.30 I logged in. And for the morning shift I finished around 11 am. I had one hour for meal and in the afternoon shift I started at 16.11, and finished at 20.29 -- 21.29.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your example you have given, do you have three hours consecutive hours break?

MR LI KWOK WAH: More than that. More than three hours.

There is four hours 40 plus minutes of break in between for this particular special shift.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Prior to 14 January 2018, how long have you been working as special shift driver?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Around three years.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it the occasion that on -- it is -- was 14 January 2018 shift where you have been given over four hours break, frequent occurrence, or can you tell us how you describe four hours break.

MR LI KWOK WAH: I would just like to supplement.

For the design of every route, you know, the timing is different. For this particular route, or the route I drove on, there were six scheduled trips, or -- and there is only one day in the week, on Monday. There is just one scheduled trip with less than three hours of

break. But for all the other scheduled trips there would be at least 3.5 hours of break. But the point I'm trying to make is that for the design of other routes, with less than three hours of break, and there are such cases, and that causes fatigue to the bus captains, because they do not get enough rest in between.

For my route there is sufficient time for a break, but if all routes are designed like the route I took, then I would totally accept it.

But in other routes they don't have such a break. And we have quoted a few examples. Examples is that there are not three hours, but for my route there is enough three hours of break. So the route is different for -- given the different circumstances. And we are just quoting examples of cases where there are not more than three hours of break.

CHAIRMAN: Which route was this?

MR LI KWOK WAH: KMB has many routes. I cannot really provide all the routes, because there are several hundreds of routes of the KMB, I can't give examples of all routes.

CHAIRMAN: The route you drove on 14 January. Which route was that?

MR LI KWOK WAH: 269D.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we look at the screen capture at the moment. It referred to the route 258, (Chinese spoken) 5. What is meant by (Chinese spoken), first of all?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Now we use "S", that's called special shift. "S" stands for special shift.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This 258D, can you tell us where this route starts and where it ends?

MR LI KWOK WAH: 258D from Long Mun Oasis to Yau Tong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you mean Po Tin?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No, Po Tin in Tuen Mun to Yau Tong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know if there are as if facilities for this particular route from --

MR LI KWOK WAH: I'm not certain. But for the Po Tin staff room, it is small. We know that we have already brought this up to the Tuen Mun depot, we have asked for an expansion of the room, but that case is still under application.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You said that you have brought this up to the Tuen Mun depot. In what way? Orally or in writing?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Verbally. Verbally to the depot manager.

CHAIRMAN: Who is the depot manager?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Wan Wai Yin in Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: Is that Ms Debbie Wong?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No, Wan Wai Yin is a male.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, you have, if I understand you

correctly, worked in the Kowloon Motor Bus as bus captain for about 27 years?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know a person called Raymond Cheng, or Gary Wong? Raymond Cheng used to be --

MR LI KWOK WAH: No, I don't know them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And do you know, given your experience in Kowloon Motor Bus, do you know there is a safety quality department in Kowloon Motor Bus, some time in 2010?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes. There was. Yes, there was we call this -- I can't remember the full name. There was a department dedicated to safety issues. Safety training of bus captains. That's my understanding.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Were there meetings from time to time for this safety and quality department, with bus captains?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I have never heard they would hold meetings with bus captains. I have never heard that. I have not been invited to such meetings, if any at all.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then how do you know the existence of this safety and quality department?

MR LI KWOK WAH: When we talked to the managers of depots we heard about that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you know there was a study conducted in around that time in 2010 in relation to the identification of 29 sharp bends with certain criteria

for consideration, or implementation by bus captains. Do you know about this?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No. Never heard of it.

CHAIRMAN: I think to make the point clear, a study the purpose of which was to give advice to bus captains, how they might negotiate certain bends. But you have never heard of that?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No, no, no.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You earlier said that you have talked to the manager of depot and heard about the safety and quality department. Do you know if there are any measures suggested by this safety and quality department around the time in 2010?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I have not even heard about this department. They have not consulted us, and for our association, we have not been invited. But I don't know whether others have been invited. I'm clueless about this matter.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So what have you talked about, about this department, this safety and quality department when you were talking to the depot managers. What topic were you discussing, or talking about?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I didn't know about this department, so we didn't talk about matters related to this department,

the discussions were rather on the daily operations of the depot. No, we have not talked to the manager about safety issues.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to ask the final topic, which is on the training. Can I take you to the KMB bundle 1 at page 120. I'll just briefly explain what this is about. This is a response by the Kowloon Motor Bus to the Commissioner for Transport's letter dated 12 February 2018 regarding certain issues on recruitment and training for full-time bus captain.

This follows from the tragic incident on 10 February 2018.

I would like to ask you about the general training for full-time bus captain candidates.

Mr Li, are you also a full-time bus captain prior to the sick leave, or 14 January 2018?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may ask you, first of all, the training, before we look at this. Was all full-time bus captain candidates obliged to undergo an 18-day training for 9.5 hours a day?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would there be refresher training once you became a full-time bus captain?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, but in the past decade or so there was

no refresher training. Because previously, once every year -- once every two years there was ancillary driving training. We had to go to the Sha Tin school to receive a one-day training to have some refresher training on training attitude, enhancing our training skills, et cetera. But now, there is no longer such arrangement.

In the past 10 years, there is not this refresher training once every two years.

Now, if you are a captain, and then you are involved in some sort of an accident, then you have to go back to receive training, but if no accident happens then you don't need to have retraining again.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have route-specific training for full-time bus captain?

MR LI KWOK WAH: To my understanding, for some routes there is dedicated training. For example, cross-harbour routes, routes plying through Mong Kok, special training is required. And there is another route, 64K, going through Tai Po Road, and Fan Ling, Fan Kam Road, and Tai Lam Chung, and a three-day training is required.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So this is apart from the general training, the 18-day general training. For specific routes you have to undergo another, or extra three days training?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Correct. On the issue of training can

I defer to Mr Chan to help?

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan?

MR CHAN WING HO: Mr Chairman, at the transport panel of the LegCo held on 25 July 2018 there was a background brief paper, and on page 4 point number 15 in the Chinese version, there was this quote:

"The KMB said that whether it is the part-time or full-time bus captains, if they have not run on a route for over one month, they need extra training for driving that particular route."

So the KMB made this statement. But that has never been implemented among the bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, can you help me locate this passage? This is the LegCo briefing paper TD-1, page 403, paragraph 15.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 15.

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 15 is dealing with seat belts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe this is a separate document, Mr Chairman. It is a background paper.

CHAIRMAN: Is that prepared by the Secretariat?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, the LegCo Secretariat.

CHAIRMAN: What is the reference for that paper?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We are locating it from online.

CHAIRMAN: Is that not in the bundle?

I have certainly read the document. We are just

trying to find it.

Is this in the bundle, does it have a reference, Ms Wong?

May I ask that the document be scrolled up so we can see the context? This appears to be a report of what happened earlier. Perhaps if we go to paragraph 13/14.

So it appears to be a reference to a meeting held on 15 February, and then if we scroll down to paragraph 15, yes, we have the context now, Mr Chan.

Could you repeat your point?

MR CHAN WING HO: Mr Chairman, the point I want to make is that the KMB said that whether it be full-time or part-time drivers, if they have not driven a route for a month or more they would have to practise driving on this route again. On this particular arrangement, since I joined the company, it has never been done.

CHAIRMAN: When did you join the company?

MR CHAN WING HO: March 2015.

CHAIRMAN: This is a Secretariat paper gathering together materials to brief LegCo panel members about what has happened in the past. And this is a reference to a meeting on 15 February. Do we have the minutes of that meeting?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN: The minutes will exist, will they not, of that

meeting, so we are in a position to check the accuracy of what is the assertion by the Secretariat of what KMB are supposed to have said?

But perhaps a matter that can be looked into later.

We have your point, Mr Chan. That assertion is one that you challenge on your personal experience.

MR CHAN WING HO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If I may take you to the KMB submission. Page, volume 1, KMB-1, page 120.

CHAIRMAN: What are we being taken to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: We are taken to the response from the Kowloon Motor Bus to the Commissioner for Transport's letter dated 12 February 2018 in response to the request for investigation report, following the tragic incident on 10 February 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chan, this is KMB's response to the Commissioner's letter setting out the recruitment and training for both full-time and part-time bus captains.

I would like to ask you a few questions about full-time bus captain in terms of general training, and specific training. We can see at page 120 it sets out the full-time bus captain training and details of the

18-day training.

Over the page it states:

"A full-time bus captain candidate will have a total of at least 68 hours of on-the-wheel bus driving training (inclusive of the time for route training) under the supervision of instructors."

Can you confirm if that's the case?

CHAIRMAN: If you are unable to do so, please say -- if you simply don't know.

MR CHAN WING HO: Now for this particular response, what is mentioned there is a bit different from the training I received.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us what training did you have in your days?

MR CHAN WING HO: Let's say phase 2, four to five bus types, training on four to five bus types. Now, my own training, I was only trained on two to three bus types.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about route training? It is stated there "route training for 2 routes".

MR CHAN WING HO: Yes, I also was trained on two routes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have heard some evidence previously from Mr Li about route-specific training for full-time bus captain candidates. We see at page 122 (v), it sets out the:

"Route training for 2 routes with on-the-wheel

driving under the supervision of instructors ..."

And:

"[Bus captain] candidate must attend route training before he/she will be assigned with driving duties."

We heard there would be three days training. Do you know if there has been any change since your days, when you joined the company?

MR CHAN WING HO: Basically there has been no change.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may take you to page 123, it specified there is a route-specific training for employed bus captain both full-time and part-time, and there would be additional route familiarisation to be provided for assigning the bus captain after working three to six months, to drive another route.

Has that happened?

MR CHAN WING HO: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would that be additional training?

MR CHAN WING HO: From my personal experience, there was a department, duty dispatch department of the company.

Now, this unit would call us up, and then say for a particular route, for example 111, then at the terminus of route 111 I should ask the regulation officer for a schedule, and then I will go on that bus route for two trips, and then once I have learned that trip, the route, then I will tell the department again,

and then there may be a record, the route record here, for route 111 for me.

MS MAGGIE WONG: On page 127, we can see there are some remedial training where there are four liable incidents within one year, new bus captain within two liable incidents within first three months of work. Careless driving or failing to ensure passenger safety, and second careless driving will be termination.

It talks about remedial training for duration of one to 3 days, usually one day, subject to the recommendation of instructors.

Has that happened?

CHAIRMAN: Are you asking whether Mr Chan has had remedial training?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Has there been remedial training in those situations?

CHAIRMAN: "Have you received remedial training?" Is that the question?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR CHAN WING HO: No, I have never received remedial training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your experience with other bus captains, do you know if there are remedial training in those circumstances set out on this page?

MR CHAN WING HO: As far as I know, I have never heard

of it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Chairman, I believe I have completed my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER LO: Just a short question. Based on your experience with other special shift drivers, do you get to choose a route close to your home, or would they consider your home location in assigning a route to you?

MR CHAN WING HO: From my experience, if there is a vacancy in a particular route, then we may try to apply -- we submit a report to the scheduling division, and then there will be internal rating for bus captains and then we will see if we are assigned that route. For example, myself, I belong to the Sha Tin depot, I work in the Sha Tin district but I live in Tai Po.

MEMBER LO: So that means you don't get to choose a route. Only if there is a vacancy of that route you can apply for the same?

MR CHAN WING HO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Li, you testified that you were a bus captain driving special shifts for three years; is that correct?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And during those three years, did you drive different routes?

MR LI KWOK WAH: No. It is the same route, 269D.

That means -- because I, you know, have been assigned to that route, fixed route, sort of, and maybe because of occasional need for redeployment I will be taken away from that route, but it doesn't happen often.

CHAIRMAN: And when you took your break, the long break in the middle of that shift, where did you take it?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Home. Because where the vehicle is parked is close to my home, so I could get home.

CHAIRMAN: And where is that?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Tin Shui Wai. Because in Tin Shui Wai there is a depot. So buses could be parked there in between. So we could just leave the bus there, at the depot, and I can ride a bicycle to get home more quickly. If I walk it will take me 15 minutes to get home.

CHAIRMAN: This was Tin Shui Wai depot that you would park at during these shifts?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, the company arrange for the bus to be parked there.

CHAIRMAN: Were there facilities at Tin Shui Wai depot for people to rest if they didn't live nearby?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, there are some. But bus captains will usually take a meal there. But there is no space for taking a nap. But then you can still take a meal

there -- well, for some bus captains who live far away they can't get home and then they would rest on the bus itself. But for those who can really return home, if we have a rest break of three to four hours we would go back home and take a rest and have a meal there as well.

CHAIRMAN: So were you aware that there were work colleagues that would, as you say, take a nap in the bus because they could not get home?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, that's correct. Because they live too far away. Some of them live in Kam Tin, and, well, it can take them easily two hours to get back and forth.

So the rest break is only three hours and you spend two hours in travelling. So how can you rest? So they then might as well take a rest within the bus, and then within the rest room there is only a space for you to take a meal, and so normally the bus captains will opt to take a rest within the bus.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Is there any matter that you would like to raise with us in closing? Because we have finished the questions we have for you.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, we would like to raise some suggestions.

On -- that is on work hours. We say that for the morning shift, in the special shift, it should not be

beyond 2100. The starting hours for the morning shift should not be before 0330, because it is -- if we start too early, then when people are having breakfast we are already having lunch. For the latter shift it should not start before 1300.

For many routes the starting hours for the night shift is 11. So how can you call that a night shift? And for newly recruited bus captains, please don't assign them to special shift, because they are not yet familiar with the operation of the company.

CHAIRMAN: When you say 11 o'clock, do you mean 11 pm? 2300 hours?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I'm referring to the 11 am. I mean the night shift should start -- should not start before 11 am.

CHAIRMAN: 11 am. Thank you.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You have used terms about naming these shifts. Can you just help me at least: morning, afternoon, night. What do you call the shift?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Well, there is only morning shift and night shift for the KMB. There is no middle shift, so to speak. There is only morning shift and night shift, and then overnight shift. So this is the system in place in KMB. The association is raising this. Because if the

special shift ends after 2100, then people don't have enough time to rest. Because the road conditions are changing all the time, so if the night shift ends at 2100, and maybe because of road congestion, and traffic accidents, the shift may well go beyond 2100. So it is difficult for them to come into the morning shift the next day. So we need at least 10 hours of rest in between.

CHAIRMAN: Please take it step by step.

What are the parameters to commence work for the morning shift? What are the range of times at which you commence work in the morning shift?

MR LI KWOK WAH: What I meant was that when we start the morning shift, the first departure, usually starts at 5 am. And for some routes -- some bus captains have to report duty at 3.30 am, and that may be the last trip of the overnight shift, so that is why it starts so early.

Now, the bus captains if they start too early, well, they may not be ending at 1 or 2, so they are working for at least 11 hours. So if people get up too early, then they become tired easily.

CHAIRMAN: What range of times does the morning shift finish?

MR LI KWOK WAH: It depends on the routes. The earliest is around 12 or so, and for some other routes, 3 to 4 pm,

and then they have to report duty at 5 am. And if you are talking about long-haul buses, then it may end up at 3 to 4 pm, but for short-haul trips the ending hours may be different.

CHAIRMAN: What is the range of time during which the night shift begins?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Let's look at it this way. Well, the timing of the different routes varies. So our suggestion is that the night shift should not start before 1 pm.

So if we are talking about many departures, then the schedule may be different, some start at, say, 11, some start at 1 pm. Some start even later, so it is different for the bus captains.

So if you start at 1 pm, the bus captains don't even have breakfast, they have lunch and then they start work.

And then if the night shift starts too early, then you may have to take your meals earlier, and some night shifts end at around 1 to 2 am. So the bus captains work 12 hours, and they become fatigued easily, tired easily.

CHAIRMAN: What is the range of time when the overnight shifts begin?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Before 7.30 pm.

CHAIRMAN: And what is the range of time when the overnight shifts end?

MR LI KWOK WAH: 7.30 am in the morning. So in other words from 7.30 pm to 7.30 am.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's your point on work hours and your recommendation. Is there anything else you wish to say?

MR LI KWOK WAH: I have two issues to raise. They are about road conditions.

Well, there are skips being placed all the time along bus routes obstructing buses to get into the bus stops, and other road users as well.

So skips, is there a dedicated department to remove them, because the skips are jeopardising the safety of the road users. I don't know whether the law specifies locations where they can be placed, say for example now in Nathan Road some skips are placed and they are obstructing the traffic.

So my suggestion is that if there is a dedicated department responsible for this they should remove such skips, because we are talking about busy roads, and skips will cause traffic congestion. For bus captains, if there is traffic congestion then we may be stuck and passengers are made to wait longer.

So can skips be placed somewhere else? Can we

complain against them, and then the police will follow up?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure there is an authority or an approval that is required before you can drop a skip off the lorry onto the road. But we will ask the Transport Department about that, and perhaps the police.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any photographs that you wish to provide the Committee with, to illustrate the difficulty caused by skips in the road? Particularly if they are near bus stops, then please provide them to us.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Understand.

And there is another point on bus stops.

Earlier, we had a meeting with the Transport Department, some vehicles are parked at the bus stops, making it difficult for buses to get into the bus stops.

So our suggestion is that if there is illegally -- illegal parking around bus stops can a point deduction system be introduced to serve as a deterrent, so that vehicles other than buses will not be parked within the bus stop area? Because so many vehicles are parked at the bus stop, and buses have to double park to let passengers alight on board.

And if we go back to the bus terminus and report it to the police, the vehicles would already have gone

away.

So, can we have a point deduction system or demerit point system for vehicles parked illegally within the bus stop?

So that's our suggestion.

CHAIRMAN: On your KMB buses you have forward-pointing cameras, do you not? At least on many of the buses.

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Now, those cameras would capture vehicles parked illegally in that way, would they not?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes, that can be done. But not the majority of the buses are retrofitted with these cameras. Only 1,800 buses are retrofitted with such forward-looking cameras.

Well, instead, why don't we install some cameras on the bus stops themselves. There may be surveillance cameras installed at the bus stops to detect illegal parking. It is better to do that than using the cameras on the buses.

CHAIRMAN: Why not use what we have now? Why not use both?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Because some of the buses are not retrofitted with such cameras, especially some of the old models of the buses. And most of the old buses have not been replaced yet, or phased out yet. So 1,000 or so new models of buses are retrofitted with cameras.

CHAIRMAN: Well, those that have got cameras, would you support bus captains operating a button, perhaps, that flagged on the CCTV the time for someone to look at the CCTV film to be able to see the illegal parking? Would you support bus captains doing that?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Yes. We support it. Well, if buses can get into the bus stops then that would make it easier for the bus captains. Because we are talking about illegal parking here. And passenger safety can be enhanced if the buses really can get into the bus stops. And passengers --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Li, we understand your point. It is a point that is well made. All we are trying to do is find methods to assist you this achieving that aim.

MR LI KWOK WAH: I understand.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else?

MR LI KWOK WAH: Mr Chan would like to say something.

MR CHAN WING HO: Mr Chairman, on our bus roster schedules, we would like the Transport Department to make a guideline. Every day, for every bus captain on the same shift there should be just one main route plus a supplementary route. So one plus one. Because for many routes in the same roster, there is a range of one plus two. In other words total of three routes we may have to work on. So we would like the Transport

Department to come up with a guideline, so drivers won't mix up routes and then take the wrong route or make the wrong stops.

CHAIRMAN: So at the moment you might be asked to drive three routes, and you are suggesting it be limited to two?

MR CHAN WING HO: Yes. Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Gentlemen, thank you for attending to give your evidence. We have other representatives of other unions waiting their turn. So we are going to take a short adjournment now so there can be a swap around. Thank you for attending. We will take 2 minutes.

(3.32 pm)

(A short break)

(3.45 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES OF MONTHLY-RATED DRIVERS UNION: MR CHENG HOI YIU, MR SZETO KUEN, MR CHAN HON WA, MS YIP WAI LAM AND MR CHAN CHI FAI, MR YAN KIN MING

(Evidence given in Cantonese, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation)

CHAIRMAN: We would like to thank you, Ms Yip, and your representatives of the Monthly-rated Drivers Union for accepting our invitation to give evidence, and let me explain, if you have not observed already, how matters

will proceed. Ms Wong, who is Senior Counsel assisting the Committee, will pose questions that in part are based on the submissions that you have made, but also on other matters that have arisen.

For your part, if you wish somebody else, other than yourself, to answer questions, would you simply defer to them and tell us who it is who is going to answer the question on behalf of the union.

Is there something you wish to say at the outset?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

First, I would like to thank the SAR government for appointing this Independent Review Committee to look into franchised bus services. I would particularly like to thank the Committee members, including Mr Peter Duncan, Justice Duncan, Justice Michael Lunn, Mr Auyeung and Professor Lo, and I know you have worked very hard to look into the issue, and I would like to express my special thanks to the Committee.

We have made a submission. On the first part of our submission, engineering department, which has everything to do with safety, and a very experienced colleague in the engineering department will talk about the difficulties he faces in his daily work.

CHAIRMAN: He won't do that just now, because I'm going to

ask Ms Wong to pose questions first of all, and then if there are areas that Ms Wong has not touched on, and you wish to amplify, we'll come back to you.

So if I can invite you to be patient, we will ask Ms Wong to start first of all.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Ms Yip, and gentlemen.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, understand.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Yip, this Committee is tasked to make recommendations in relation to the safety-related measures for the operation and management of franchised buses. So my questions will only be focused on this aspect, rather than the wider aspects of employment issues.

So I hope you understand.

For your union, I believe your union was registered in the Labour Department on 28 March 2018; is that correct?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And currently, it has 150, 150, full-time staff as of 18 June 2018?

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean members who are full-time employees?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Members who are full-time employees.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you have set out in your letter in Chinese, dated 18 June 2018, at TU bundle, page 75-3 the composition of the members of your union.

And in that letter you stated that your union have earlier done a consultation and about 800 full-time employees would like to join.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I first of all ask, about the current membership of about 150 full-time employees, from which franchise buses do they come?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Most of them are from KMB. They are the bus captains. Some from New World First Bus, others from Citybus. But the latter two take up a minor portion.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And can you give us an estimate, out of 150 people, how many came from KMB.

MS YIP WAI LAM: And we asked the secretary to deal with the registration of members. And we all go to work, and we have to prepare for our submission to the Committee. So we don't have an exact proportion here. But from other companies, about five. The remaining are all KMB workers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Your submission raised a number of issues, or topics. I'll go to the training of bus

captains first.

Your submission in Chinese at page 68, in English page 72, paragraph 3, you mentioned about a trainee bus captain who passed the competency test for being a bus captain, and he became a bus captain, and later he was involved in a traffic accident, and sustained serious injuries, in less than a week after he worked as a bus captain.

Can you first of all tell us, is he a part-time or full-time bus captain?

MS YIP WAI LAM: He or she is from the same class as mine, same training class, and then we got the licence to drive the bus. Why did I raise this particular incident? At the time, well, each instructor will train one to three trainees on a bus. And based on this instructor's experience, the instructor believed that this trainee should not -- is not suited to join the trade and become a professional driver, and he advised this trainee to find some other jobs. But then this trainee came from Malaysia, and he was in dire need to find a job, so the instructor had done his best, and asked that the trainee should not be allowed to continue with the training. But then because of the acute manpower shortage, and there was heavy traffic congestion on the road, and the company, the instructor,

was under great pressure to train enough bus captains.

So under great pressure -- yesterday, I met with an experienced instructor, and he talked to me about this particular issue. He said that he was unhappy, and they set aside their own conscience, and just to fend for their living --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on -- forgive me for interrupting you. This particular trainee is someone who passed the Transport Department exam, is that right?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: When was this class when you were trained? What year is your class?

MS YIP WAI LAM: 2013. 22 April, I joined the trade.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The simple point is this, that this trainee having passed the Transport Department exam was employed as a bus captain, and he had an accident. We have that point.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Yip, have you been working for the Kowloon Motor Bus since your training in 2013, for five years? Correct? Yes?

CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to use words, because the stenographer can't write down "head is nodded".

Thank you.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Thank you. Understood. Yes. I have

worked for five years.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We got the point about the trainee. The point I wish to ask you is in your submission you mentioned that the instructor did make certain comments about the character of the trainee, but the company neglects relevant comments under the existing system.

My first question is, how did the company neglect those comments, and what comments were they?

MS YIP WAI LAM: The instructor had reflected the situation to the group leader, and the trainee was asked to go up to the rooftop to try out -- to practise training, to parking, to do some parking. So once he has done that, then we will let him continue with the training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was it your view that the training to bus captains provided by the Kowloon Motor Bus is insufficient, even though the trainee has passed the test?

MS YIP WAI LAM: We talked about bus safety all the time. I think that involves a number of factors, including the Transport Department having a role to play. And because when the exam is taken, the Transport Department may believe there would be further training by the company. So maybe the exam standard is relatively lenient. But then if an experienced instructor knows this person is not suited to driving, and he has tried his best to

reflect that, and then he is under pressure that he should train up as many bus captains as possible, and he is not really giving proper regard to safety here.

If I may add, instructors also do assessment.

Now, I recall that vividly on the day that we took the test, the exam, each instructor was rather nervous, as if he is the one taking the test. Because for the trainees, they trained, if there is a high pass rate, then it may be good for the assessment of the instructors. So that's our guess.

That's why the instructors were rather nervous too. They did mention before that it is also about their performance, assessment is one of the criteria.

CHAIRMAN: Their performance assessment is not one of the criteria for passing the Transport Department exam, is it? The Transport Department exam is completely separate.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN: They might -- from what you say, do -- make an assessment for the company. But that's a matter for the company. Transport Department determines that the person, the candidate, has passed the exam and was granted a licence.

So Ms Wong, what is the point of this?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may move on to your recommendation. One of your recommendations is that everyday driving enhancement course to be included in the training for bus captains, in paragraph 6, and focusing on accelerator and brake control, turn negotiation, and smooth driving.

Why you see a need to have this extra three days' driving enhancement course?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. Because before we take the bus driving licence exam, we need to have three years of private vehicle licence. So why do we need to strengthen training? Because buses are different from private vehicles in terms of weight. So when it comes to controlling the brake or the accelerator, it is a different kind of skill. So we need to have a better understanding of that.

And for new bus captains, in most cases, where they have involved in accident it is because of emergency braking leading to injuries of passengers or leading to car from behind crashing into the bus. So this is a more common scenario, where new bus captains are involved in accidents.

So the biggest cause is because they don't brake properly, and so passengers are injured as a result. For turning corners, buses of course are different than

private vehicle, so it needs different skills in turning corners, or manoeuvring corners, so if we have three days of additional training, it is for the instructors to assess the performance. If it is not good enough, there could be further training. It is to make sure that the trainee has completely mastered the driving skills before the trainee is allowed to drive a bus on the road and take passengers.

CHAIRMAN: Have you made this recommendation to KMB?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Never had the chance.

CHAIRMAN: In five years of employment, you never had the chance? Five years?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Employees rarely make suggestions. There is not the platform really for us, me, to share the information in such detail.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you also stated that there should be simulated traffic lights to be installed at driving school with a view to strengthening the bus captain's skill in applying the brake in response to traffic lights.

And my question is this. I understand that there would be an 18-day training for 9.5 hours a day for full-time bus captain candidate. Would that not be sufficient? Because it is based on the real life road condition.

MS YIP WAI LAM: For someone with driving experience, if someone has already got a private vehicle licence for three years, but for many young people they don't even own a private car. So they don't have road experience, and we always say road experience is the most important. Why? Because there are a lot of unforeseen situations on the road.

For an experienced bus captain this is fine. But for someone without any driving experience, then 18 days of training alone is not sufficient, definitely.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you suggest to widen the scope of training, by including emotional control, or emotional training on how to handle passengers, behaviour of passengers?

MS YIP WAI LAM: In this respect, when we joined the KMB, if I recall correctly, there was a questionnaire. There would be brief mention of your EQ, or they try to check your EQ. But would there be actual training? Well, there is also training on how we should handle emotions, yes, KMB did do that. But then the problems arose because when you are in an actual duty, and you are humiliated or shouted at by others, that means there is need for more promotion so we can do better.

The KMB has always been doing, that but all I could say, yes, in form, they have done everything, but when

we actually face the pressure, perhaps there could be some more training. It would be fine too.

Because we are always talking about starting afresh. So we need to use some special words to respond. But it is really out of touch with reality.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we move on to driving while sick?

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so -- have you experienced verbal abuse yourself from passengers?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. Verbal abuse. Even assault, physical assault.

CHAIRMAN: Did you report these incidents?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. I reported to the police at the time, but because there was not a camera on board, and then the passenger hired a lawyer, and then that passenger was acquitted.

CHAIRMAN: So you report -- this is the assault, is it? You reported an assault --

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, I did call the police.

CHAIRMAN: That led to an arrest, and it led to a charge, and it led to a trial, and it led to an acquittal; is that right, what you have just said?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And when was this?

MS YIP WAI LAM: It should be two years ago, if I recall correctly.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt you remember the date, having been assaulted on duty? Bus driver? What was the date?

MS YIP WAI LAM: I honestly don't remember. Maybe I can provide the date later.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you would be kind enough. Which court was this matter tried in?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Kwun Tong.

CHAIRMAN: And hopefully that was the only occasion when you were assaulted; is that right?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What about verbal abuse? On how many occasions have you been verbally abused by passengers?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Before the establishment of the Monthly-rated Drivers Union, it happened often. After the establishment of the union there was not a single occasion.

CHAIRMAN: And how often had it occurred before?

MS YIP WAI LAM: All the time. Every day. As long as there is some traffic congestion, or because there were not enough bus drivers, bus captains on duty, so there were fewer trips, maybe instead of 20 minutes it became 30 minutes frequency, and then passengers became really impatient and angry. And very often they would vent their frustration on us.

CHAIRMAN: Did you report these occasions of verbal abuse to

KMB?

MS YIP WAI LAM: It has actually really become part of our work, so very rarely would we report that to our supervisors. You know, other colleagues just take it as it is.

CHAIRMAN: Could you try a direct answer. Did you report it or not?

MS YIP WAI LAM: No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us on which location this assault took place?

MS YIP WAI LAM: The Cheung Sha Wan playground stop.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This assault was in the bus or around the bus station?

MS YIP WAI LAM: I was driving at the time. So I was in my driver seat, and I was assaulted.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the bus was in progress at that time?

MS YIP WAI LAM: No, it was stopped. It stopped for alight at the time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I assist, if you would look at KMB-1 bundle. It should be case 97.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a page?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 214.

Case 97, it is stated Ms Yip driving 238X, the

incident on 29 September 2016, and you injured on your right arm. Is that the incident?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

The next topic I wish to ask is driving while sick.

And you mentioned in your submission, your union submission, that a lot of drivers -- I should state correctly by citing what you have said.

You said that because of the number of hours working, the accumulative effect begins to take its toll on their body, but they are reluctant to take sick leave with the appraisal bonus in mind.

I just want to ask you this. We know that the Kowloon Motor Bus has included or merged the good service bonus and the safety bonus into the monthly salary. About this appraisal bonus point, I just want to explore.

Would this be a point that is not that relevant, because the safety bonus and the good service bonus have already been included in the salary, or merged into the salary? Is it still a valid point?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Well, those are two separate parts. You mentioned the safety bonus and the other -- the service bonus being included in the base salary right? But this assessment bonus is a different one. It is not the same

thing.

And in any case KMB has now resolved the matter. Soon this assessment will be abolished and then you won't lose these bonuses because you don't come into work.

And that money has been paid to us. So actually it is more than what they paid before, so this has been dealt with.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And Ms Yip, you earlier mentioned about a very experienced colleague in the engineering department has raised difficulties he faced in daily work.

Are they related to safety issues?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. Directly related. Definitely.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I invite your colleague to express his views on how it related to safety aspect?

CHAIRMAN: First of all, do they find a place in your written submissions?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Are we talking about problems in the engineering department?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The point is your very experienced colleague in the engineering department, the problems or difficulties he faced. Are they reflected in your submissions, or have they been written in your submission? Have they been included in your submission?

MS YIP WAI LAM: (Answer not translated).
MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that paragraph 2, about not using the original components of the original bus franchise -- of the original bus? Is that the point?
MR CHAN CHI FAI: Correct.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Please explain the problem.
CHAIRMAN: Is it not explained in writing?
MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Apart from what is written there, is there anything you wish to add?
MR CHAN CHI FAI: The shortage of components is a major problem. Well, we used not to have a shortage of components, but we don't know what happened to the procurement department. Right now we are running short of many components and what is required is lacking.

Every year there was a period where the braking component was lacking. And then for each depot they have a working capital cash flow and then the depot would try to find a factory in the next industrial building to buy some components for us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Are you describing a shortage of inventory? Is that the problem, that whereas in the past inventory was carried, but now it is not; is that it?
MR CHAN CHI FAI: In the past, we didn't have a shortage, we could make available components whenever needed. And usually we would check on the components, and we found

that if there is a problem, then we will issue an order, and then when the order gets to the store, the component will be given to us.

And for the past two years, we asked for a certain component which could not be provided to us by the stores.

And there was this incident involving the braking component that I mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "the stores", you mean the stores department of KMB?

MR CHAN CHI FAI: Correct. Yes, within the KMB.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know where the problem lies? Does it lie with KMB not carrying sufficient inventory now, or does it lie in supplier not being able to supply an order?

MR CHAN CHI FAI: We used to have a procurement department. And they press the button of a computer, and they saw that there was a lack of the component in the inventory, then they will order for them. I don't know what happened to them. And then the components got fewer and fewer, and we think that there is a problem. And when we raised the issue it is already too late. And the component that we are asking are lacking.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Ms Yip, we have heard evidence previously that the Kowloon Motor Bus has, in one of the

papers -- it was stated in one of the background brief papers, issued to the LegCo, in relation to the February 2018 incident, providing background information on safety of franchised bus operation for the panel meeting on 25 July 2018, and if we go to paragraph 15, it stated there that --

CHAIRMAN: Is this in our bundles or not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No, that's the bundle referred to by the previous --

CHAIRMAN: Can we have it added to the bundles?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. I think it is now put up on the screen.

The English reads this:

"The KMB advised that if bus captains, regardless of full-time or part-time, had not driven a route for a month or more, they would have to practise driving on that route again."

Ms Yip, and the gentlemen present perhaps, can you advise us whether this has happened, where, if a bus captain had not driven a route for a month or more, they would have to practise driving on that route again?

MS YIP WAI LAM: To be frank, if for two years we have not driven a route, a particular route, then we will have to undergo training by the instructor again. So my understanding, two years, but if you talk about one

month, retraining after one month, I have never heard of that.

MR CHENG HOI YIU: Let me supplement.

Now, if you have been driving a certain route within two years, then you can still drive that route, but for two years, if you don't -- haven't driven that route, then your record on the computer has -- will be deleted.

I have driven 496, and given another route, 47X. Now, after I have driven -- I have not driven 47X for one year, maybe all of a sudden you will be asked to drive that route again, and maybe there will be changes in the alignment of the route and the bus stop. You would still be asked to drive that route. So there is a hazard there. Because we never know what changes have happened to the route.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the computer deletes your qualification, if you like, to drive a route, if you have not driven it for two years?

MR CHENG HOI YIU: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Yip, you talked about "previously". I think it has not been translated on the screen. You said this two years, if you have not driven the route for two years you would be asked to retrain again, but previously there was not such a requirement. What do you mean by "previously"?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Well, I have never heard that you will have to be retrained after one month.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when was this requirement in place? That required bus captains --

MS YIP WAI LAM: That's been the requirement all along. From the day I joined the company, I learned that, say, if you have not driven a route for two years, after being trained on that route, that, your eligibility to drive that route will be got rid of.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Yip, do you drive special shift? Or normal shift?

MS YIP WAI LAM: I am on normal shift.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is anyone present here driving on a special shift?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Yan.

May I ask your experience in driving special shift in terms of we have heard evidence that some of the bus captains who are driving special shifts for Kowloon Motor Bus were not given three hours consecutive -- three consecutive hours of resting. Is this an experience that you have as well?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I know which route you are driving?

MR YAN KIN MING: I drive around 10 routes. And we will,

say, follow the orders, and usually on a day we will drive three routes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For how long did you take up this special shift, in KMB?

MR YAN KIN MING: Around three years.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us, did you take the morning shift or the night shift?

MR YAN KIN MING: There is only one shift in special shift, just the morning shift.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us since when, perhaps since when did you start work? For a particular day?

MR YAN KIN MING: Around 6 to 7. Am.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So 6 am to 7 pm?

MR YAN KIN MING: (Answer not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: When did you last drive a special shift? Yesterday?

MR YAN KIN MING: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Where do you live?

MR YAN KIN MING: Mong Kok.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you get up?

MR YAN KIN MING: (In English) 5 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you go then?

MR YAN KIN MING: After I get up, and I will do something, and then I will go to work.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you leave home? The actual fact,

yesterday. What time did you leave home?

MR YAN KIN MING: 6 am.

CHAIRMAN: And where did you go?

MR YAN KIN MING: The bus depot.

CHAIRMAN: Which is where?

MR YAN KIN MING: On Tsing Yi Island, the bus depot there.

CHAIRMAN: How did you get there?

MR YAN KIN MING: I will take the company bus, the first departure, and then I get to somewhere in Tsing Yi, and then change for what we call a works bus or vehicle which will take us to the bus depot.

CHAIRMAN: Which bus depot did you arrive at yesterday?

MR YAN KIN MING: Also Tsing Yi.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you clock on for work?

MR YAN KIN MING: 7.00.

CHAIRMAN: And after you clocked on, what did you do?

MR YAN KIN MING: Then I will find the bus that I have to drive on that day.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably you have to check the bus?

MR YAN KIN MING: (In English) Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: And then did you drive the bus somewhere?

MR YAN KIN MING: And then I drove the bus to the Cheung Hong bus terminus.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you leave Tsing Yi on that journey?

MR YAN KIN MING: 7.20.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you arrive at your destination?

MR YAN KIN MING: 7.30.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you begin driving the route?

MR YAN KIN MING: 7.45.

CHAIRMAN: What route were you driving?

MR YAN KIN MING: X42C.

CHAIRMAN: Where does that route take you?

MR YAN KIN MING: To Yau Tong bus terminus.

CHAIRMAN: Did you drive to and from Yau Tong in the morning?

MR YAN KIN MING: No.

CHAIRMAN: Tell us what you did do.

MR YAN KIN MING: I got to the Yau Tong bus terminus, and then I will use my private -- use the private plate. That means a bus without passengers, and then I went to Tsuen Wan, Discovery Park estate, and then I took a 40M. The bus, I drove that route.

CHAIRMAN: So you went from Yau Tong to Tsuen Wan, and then you drove a route; is that it?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What was that route?

MR YAN KIN MING: 42M.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you go?

MR YAN KIN MING: To Cheung Wang bus terminus.

CHAIRMAN: And then?

MR YAN KIN MING: I did two rounds on this route, so back and forth twice.

CHAIRMAN: Between Tsuen Wan and Cheung Wang bus terminus?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And then did you have a break?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What time was the break?

MR YAN KIN MING: Should be 12.30 or so.

CHAIRMAN: And how long was the break?

MR YAN KIN MING: To 3.20 pm.

CHAIRMAN: And where did the break begin?

MR YAN KIN MING: Well, it doesn't matter where I took the break, but rather I would be given a designated parking space, I left my bus there and then the break started counting.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you leave the bus?

MR YAN KIN MING: Tsing Yi airport station.

CHAIRMAN: What did you do in that break time? Two hours 50 minutes?

MR YAN KIN MING: Lunch and an afternoon nap.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you take the nap?

MR YAN KIN MING: At the Tsuen Wan bus terminus there is room for us to take a rest.

CHAIRMAN: What facilities are there for you to take a nap?

MR YAN KIN MING: There are four sofas, and so I could take

a short nap.

CHAIRMAN: You had a sofa?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes. Sofa.

CHAIRMAN: How many other bus captains were sharing the facilities at the time?

MR YAN KIN MING: Two.

CHAIRMAN: Once you resumed driving at 15.20, or 3.20, where did you travel to and from?

MR YAN KIN MING: It was at 3.35 that I started driving, because at 3.30 I had to get the bus and went to the bus terminus. So at 3.35 I started driving, route 41A from Cheung On bus terminus to Tsim Sha Tsui East.

CHAIRMAN: And then?

MR YAN KIN MING: Then I went back to Cheung On bus terminus.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YAN KIN MING: And then I did the same trip again. One round.

CHAIRMAN: Does that bring you to the end of your driving or not?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What time is that?

MR YAN KIN MING: 8.50 pm.

CHAIRMAN: Where were you when your driving duties came to an end?

MR YAN KIN MING: When I finished my duty, I had to take the car back to the bus depot to fill up the gas tank and then I left the car there and finished the day's work.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "car", I take it you mean the bus?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes, the bus.

CHAIRMAN: What time had you finished doing all of that, refueling the bus?

MR YAN KIN MING: 9 pm.

CHAIRMAN: What did you do after that?

MR YAN KIN MING: After that I took the works vehicle to go to the urban area and then I took another bus to go home.

CHAIRMAN: What time did you get home?

MR YAN KIN MING: 9.40 or so.

CHAIRMAN: So your day had begun at 6 am, when you left home, and it was complete at 9.40 pm; is that it?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That was yesterday?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Today is your day off, is it?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Yan, you said you were on split shift duty for three years, correct? Or special shift yes.

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you been driving those three routes for those three years, or there are different routes?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes, there are other routes as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is it a frequent occurrence that you have to drive three difference routes on the same day?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How long have you been working for Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR YAN KIN MING: I have been working for about 3.5 years at KMB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Throughout this period you have been driving special shift?

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you been involved in accidents, road accidents?

MR YAN KIN MING: So far, no.

CHAIRMAN: Well done.

MR YAN KIN MING: (In English) Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you come across any assault incidents or verbal abuse?

MR YAN KIN MING: Every day there is verbal abuse.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Assault incidents?

MR YAN KIN MING: No. No assault.

CHAIRMAN: Have you ever reported verbal abuse to the

company?

MR YAN KIN MING: No.

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR YAN KIN MING: Because the company knows, all along.

CHAIRMAN: Have steps been taken to help you deal with verbal abuse, as bus captains?

MR YAN KIN MING: You mean the company, helping?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YAN KIN MING: No. No.

CHAIRMAN: But on the buses you drive, are there now cameras that focus on the bus captain's seat area.

MR YAN KIN MING: Yes. Sometimes, yes, there is the camera, sometimes not, because every day I drive a different bus and a different route. So for the older models there are no cameras. For the new models there are cameras.

CHAIRMAN: These ones with cameras, do they not have an audio track as well, not just video?

MR YAN KIN MING: As far as I know, yes, some have audio recording, because I see some camera has a microphone.

MS YIP WAI LAM: If I may add, the judge asked what could be done to help us.

Well, actually we mentioned in our submission, we asked that bus captains be allowed to install cameras themselves. Why? Because some buses have cameras, but some don't. And if something happens, or if the police

try to obtain the video recording from the company, company will say, "No, we don't have it". We don't know why. But we want to protect our own personal safety, and actually, if a camera is installed, it sort of alerts passengers that they can be seen, and usually they are really smart, when there is a camera they will be a lot more restrained.

So we are not even asking the company to install the cameras, we are just asking the company to allow bus captains to install the cameras, so before the company installs cameras on all buses, we hope they will allow us to install cameras ourselves. And it is important that --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Ms Yip. You are racing ahead. Slow down. Like your buses.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes. Got it.

CHAIRMAN: What was the response to the company, to your request that you be allowed to install your own cameras?

MS YIP WAI LAM: If bus captains are found to have installed cameras we would be disciplined.

CHAIRMAN: Have you ever made this request in writing, to the company?

MS YIP WAI LAM: No.

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Do you think that if we tell them -- we

think if we tell them and it is going to lead to nowhere, then we won't do it. You know, there is no trust.

They won't even let us install the cameras. They would actually discipline us for installing cameras, so you would think they won't install the cameras.

CHAIRMAN: Well --

MS YIP WAI LAM: Now, if you are the senior manager of course we would be happy. If you were the senior management, we would be happy because we can reason with you.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know, and if you don't know say so, do you know why bus captains are disciplined if they install their own cameras? Has the company ever explained?

MS YIP WAI LAM: It is about privacy, they said. It is about privacy.

CHAIRMAN: Is this something they articulated in writing?

MR CHENG HOI YIU: I think at the induction training the instructors would briefly mention that they would ask us not to install the cameras, and there is a circular too, through various channels they would ask all frontline bus captains not to install captains because of privacy issues.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Also, they said, this is illegal retrofitting, that is if we install camera it would be

regarded as illegal retrofitting.

MR CHAN WING HO: Because this is not a part in the schedule of the parts, and so if it is found it is there, then it is considered illegal.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was this circular issued?

CHAIRMAN: Let's not get ahead of ourselves.

You said that they issued a circular, Mr Cheng. Can we have a copy of the circular?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Well, usually after we read the circular we won't keep it.

MR CHAN WING HO: And it is not -- it's an internal document; we can't make it public.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to have KMB giving evidence in due course. We will ask them the same questions. So why can't you provide a document to us that explains what this position is?

MS YIP WAI LAM: (Answer not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: There may be a very good reason why they don't allow you to do this, and we are just trying to find out the facts.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Say, for example, for the travelling time the company considers that confidential information too --

CHAIRMAN: Very well, we don't need to trouble you. We will ask KMB.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us approximately when this circular was issued?

MS YIP WAI LAM: A year ago.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you earlier said that if you install these cameras, you would be disciplined. Who said that? Can you tell us, identify the person who said, "If you install this we will discipline you"?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Usually, if a bus captain breached a certain code, you will be given a piece of paper, a memo, telling you why you are really summonsed to meet with the senior management. So previously, the members have sent us such memo so we know that this is the case.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be kind enough to provide us with those documents? I assume they are not KMB documents. It is a request from your members to the company.

MS YIP WAI LAM: It is a company -- it is a document issued by the company.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is the KMB issuing the notice to members -- to bus captains.

And did they spell out in the letter that "If you install cameras, we will discipline you"? Did they spell in those terms, very specific about those terms?

MS YIP WAI LAM: It is stated in the circular.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I take it that your union would support

the use of surveillance cameras to be installed for the purpose of recording verbally or orally and visually events happened in the bus?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, support.

The last topic, Ms Yip, is we have heard evidence, or the Transport Department provided us with a briefing paper, and informed us as a result of a working group study carried out in mid-March 2018 consisting of five franchised buses, and three bus manufacturers, the working group made a recommendation report which set out three areas of concern: the first is the seat belt; second is the technological device; and the third, training of bus captain.

And the Transport Department informed us that recently they have issued a practice note in relation to the training of bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So my question is: has Kowloon Motor Bus consulted your union's views in relation to the practice note?

MS YIP WAI LAM: No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you been given a copy of the practice note issued by the Transport Department?

MS YIP WAI LAM: We have never received it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I ask your view on some of the technological devices, your union's view on some of the

technological devices.

The first, it is at TD-1, page 403. If we look at 4(a), it is the electronic stability control system. Would your union support the use of this system?

MS YIP WAI LAM: On the safety devices, (a), (b), and 5 and 6, and also the other systems on the third page, after our deliberations, we think these are very good devices.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

What about seat belts to be installed on all seats in buses?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Well, it is of course a good thing to have seat belts, but there is a problem arising from this.

If the seat belts are damaged, should buses continue to operate, or do the bus captains have the responsibility to ensure that passengers have their seat belts on? And some elderly persons might need assistance in wearing their seat belt. So these are the problems that we envisage and we are worried about that. But, of course, having an extra safety device is always good. And there are so many passengers patronising bus services, we have to make sure the seat belt is not damaged and once it is damaged then passengers' safety will be jeopardised.

I think the overall direction is good. But in terms of actual implementation we see some difficulties.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you had a chance to read the section on training of bus captains, from paragraphs 18 to 22?

MS YIP WAI LAM: Yes, we have briefly read through it.

The training mentioned here -- I mean, not many details are given, but of course the more training the better. But we don't see what bus captains should pay attention in our daily work, that nothing is mentioned in that regard is regrettable.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I have completed my questioning, Mr Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: I want to follow up on the comment that Ms Yip and Mr Yan made earlier about the abuse that you are experiencing on a daily basis, and yet both of you mentioned that there was no point to report to your management.

Can I hear a bit more about the logic behind that? You refuse to report it because you don't think management is going to do anything, or whatever they do is not going to help? I just want to understand a little bit more. Thank you.

MR CHENG HOI YIU: Well, honestly, we face verbal abuse every day. It is something so common.

Why does this happen? You know, Hong Kong people are under a lot of pressure, and people are fast-paced,

and in view of the manpower shortage in the sector, because of road congestion, which is very common, and passengers may have to wait longer than they expect. So they will vent their anger on the frontline staff.

The management in all companies in the sector is well aware of the situation.

Well, for every route, for every bus captain, that happens. And the management will not do too much, because they can't solve the problem.

MR CHAN HON WA: Let me cite an example. Earlier some members have been physically -- I mean verbally abused by the passengers, and they have reflected the problem to the management. And the bus stops in the middle of the road, the passenger hurling the verbal abuse was waiting on the bus, waiting for the police's handling, and the company's handling, and the company tried to water down the matter, and asked the bus captain to continue with the trip.

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Please.

MS YIP WAI LAM: Every day we encounter this, and there is this performance management group in the company, maybe there are complaints by the passengers, and we tell the management our side of story, but the company always says, well, just be more careful, and they are not of

much actual help.

I was assaulted, and I was injured, and nobody would be able to help us. And we treat all this as part of our job.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: The police helped you, did they not? Because someone was arrested, someone was charged, someone was prosecuted.

The Department of Justice Helped you, because someone turned up to prosecute the case?

MS YIP WAI LAM: That's correct.

But for the legal section of the company, if they can render some help, that would be better.

Well, the police then were very angry too. Because going by the doctor's report, and other documents, the case seems to be established. But whenever a case gets to the court, the witnesses are not willing to come forth. So a camera will help very much.

So that's why we have been advocating for a camera on board all the time. That can also protect the passengers as well. If, say, we do anything bad then the passengers can also monitor us as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

MEMBER LO: I just have a follow-up question.

In your 18-day training session, have they trained

you about how to handle verbal abuse? Would they advise you to say nothing? Would they advise you to report? What is the procedure to handle verbal abuse during the training section?

MS YIP WAI LAM: They always say that you should use some skills, deploy some skills in your language to deal with the matter.

Now, at a time when you don't even have time to go to the toilet, and then when you get on board the bus people hurl verbal abuse against you, and they will even make comment about "Have all the bus captains died? We were made to wait so long", and so on.

So if we were able to have a longer rest time we would be better able to deal with own emotions.

The problems arise from many factors. If we do have a sufficient rest break we would have a higher EQ, we would deal with such situations better. We hope that improvement can be made gradually so that the relationship between the two parties can be improved.

The company has done that, but in actual fact, I mean, it is not very effective.

CHAIRMAN: How are bus drivers particularly selected for this kind of abuse, or do you see tram drivers, and the Star Ferry coxswains being abused in the same way? Or is it bus drivers that are particularly selected?

MS YIP WAI LAM: For tram drivers, well, usually there is not much congestion on the road for them.

And for members of the public, when they have conflicts with us, they get agitated, because the schedule is not adhered to.

So that's a problem besetting the KMB for a long time, and I don't know why there has not been a solution so far.

We set up this union, we want to safeguard passengers' safety, but we are seeing so many confrontations of conflicts with the passengers, and after discussing with the passengers we know that the main cause of the problem is lost trips.

Well, you can imagine if a passenger waits for half an hour before he can get on the bus, and he would say something like, "Have all the bus captains died or what?" And then maybe the bus captain is stuck in a traffic jam for an hour and he gets only a few minutes break, and he has to get back to work after going to the toilet, and the bus captains will not be in a good mood either. So we can't blame, put all the blame on the passengers.

As what the Chairman said, why are bus captains seeing the worst problem? Because for MTR driver there will not be any lost trips, it happens only two to three

times every year.

I can give you some preliminary figures, for every day, in every depot, some several dozen buses are not being in operation.

So the turnover, the wastage of staff is so very serious, and we are seeing more serious conflicts between the passengers and bus captains.

It has a lot to do with the bus trips, some passengers are nice, and we are under pressure.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That gives us a flavour of what we had in mind.

We do have one more union to hear evidence from, so we will thank you for attending. Thank you for your evidence, and for assisting us. If you would provide whatever documentation it is that you have undertaken to give us, we would be grateful.

We will take a two-minute adjournment now and see if we can't resume with the final union, the Part-time Drivers Union shortly. Thank you.

(5.02 pm)

(A short break)

(5.11 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES OF PART-TIME DRIVERS UNION: MR KENNETH MA, MR LEO CHA, MR GARY CHENG, MR KENNETH CHEUNG, MR JASON NG, AND MR ALEX LEUNG.

(Evidence given in Cantonese and English, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation and/or English)

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheng, and representatives of the Part-time Drivers, we thank you for accepting the Committee's invitation to give evidence to the Committee to assist us with gathering information about how buses are operated so that we are better able to make recommendations to ensure safety in the future.

Ms Wong will ask you questions in a moment, designed to draw out from the written submissions that you have made points that need amplification.

If you, Mr Cheng, wish one of the other members to answer a particular question, please defer to that member, and we will happily hear from that other person.

Ms Wong.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Thank you, before the questioning starts, can we have two minutes to express a certain view for the part-time bus drivers.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly if you wish to make an opening statement, do so.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) We do indeed.

CHAIRMAN: Bear in mind it is being translated. So if you speak at a speed that allows the simultaneous translator a reasonable chance.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR ALEX LEUNG

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I'll try to keep it slow.

Thank you for everybody's time today. After the -- well, first of all, the Part-time Bus union as we sit here, we are not a registered union under the union Ordinance. We are a group of part-time bus drivers who got together after the tragic incident on 10 February.

Shortly after that, KMB have stopped duty allocation to us, and we were very upset about this. Because the immediate reaction after the accident was the driver was a part-time bus driver, and as a result, we as a group of part-time bus drivers were under immense unjust, unfounded and untrue attacks from other trade unions, other members of the public, which has led to a suspension of duty allocation to us.

And that's why we have got together as a group.

We think the part-time bus drivers are as professional and as competent as many full-time bus drivers, if not more.

I personally have experience of 15 years as a part-time bus driver. I think we all here are very experienced and professional. We drive with pride, we

serve customers also with pride, and so we are quite upset, even until now still some sort of prejudice exists against us.

When you look at the report by KMB about the accident to the Transport Department --

CHAIRMAN: You are talking about the one that is on our website?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Yes, which I think was issued one month after the accident. When the Transport Department asked Kowloon Motor Bus if they have identified any kind of deficiency in the recruitment of drivers, the response of KMB is, "We have stopped recruitment of part-time bus drivers immediately".

This is in fact implying that part-time bus captains are inferior, and unprofessional. We are strongly denying that, and we were very, very upset by this kind of reference.

So that concludes our opening remark. And I will pass the floor to Ms Wong.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Before we proceed, it would help us if you could identify which of the various bus companies you work for? Can I invite you to just tell us? Who is KMB? (Indicating).

That's four of you are KMB.

MR LEO CHA: (In English) I am Long Win Bus.

MR KENNETH MA: I was fired by KMB because of this accident.

CHAIRMAN: So you are no longer employed.

MR KENNETH MA: (In English) Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: Because of this accident?

MR KENNETH MA: (In English) Yes, because KMB raised some criteria, for part-time bus driver. I don't accept their criteria, KMB raised -- issued, sent a letter to me. I replied them through e-mail. One copy I cc this IRC Committee.

And after that, I heard from my friend who worked in KMB, I was know that I was fired by KMB because I have not replied them.

But actually I have replied them through e-mail.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR KENNETH MA: And I now work for New World First Bus as a part-time bus driver.

CHAIRMAN: So the upshot, Long Win, one of you, you, New World First Bus, you, the other four KMB.

Thank you, Ms Wong.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Leung and gentlemen for coming.

As you know, the terms of reference for this Committee is focused on safety aspects or safety related

measures for operation and management of franchised buses. So my question will be focused on those areas. I hope you can understand.

About your union, I believe it is a Facebook group which comprised of over 600 members. Is that correct?

MR LEO CHA: (In English) Yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And I believe Mr Cheng was authorised by 100 part-time bus drivers as representative in this union to express views on behalf of them?

MR JASON NG: (In English) That is correct as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know which company, or which franchised buses these 100 part-time bus drivers work for?

MR JASON NG: (In English) All these drivers are under KMB but it is affected by the suspension of duty deployment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And may I know how long you have worked as part-time bus captains for KMB?

MR JASON NG: To whom?

MS MAGGIE WONG: For all of you.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) For KMB, I joined in 2014.

CHAIRMAN: But you have 15 years as a part-time bus captain?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I previously worked also for other bus companies.

CHAIRMAN: In Hong Kong?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) In Hong Kong, that's right.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Me as well, I started with KMB in 2014 as a part time driver. I personally have driven buses over 10 years, that included driving oversees.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Cheng?

MR GARY CHENG: (Interpreted) I worked in KMB for three years, and I worked in some other bus companies before that.

CHAIRMAN: Franchised bus companies in Hong Kong?

MR KENNETH CHEUNG: (Interpreted) Franchised and non-franchised.

CHAIRMAN: For how many years?

MR KENNETH CHEUNG: (Interpreted) I started driving buses in 2011. I served as a full-timer for three years and after that I served as a part timer.

MR GARY CHENG: (Answer not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Is there a problem with the transcription?

INTERPRETER: Sorry, the interpreter forgot to switch the button over to English.

CHAIRMAN: Could I ask Mr Gary Cheng to repeat what he said.

MR GARY CHENG: (Interpreted) My first job was with the New Lantao Bus Company as a part-time bus captain and then thereafter I worked for KMB for four years as a full-timer, and then thereafter Citybus part-time bus captain, and then I returned to KMB and have worked as a part-time bus captain for one year, so I have in total

14 years experience in driving buses.

MR LEO CHA: (In English) I've been working for KMB starting from 2016 at early 2016, and changed to Long Win Bus starting from this April.

MR KENNETH MA: (In English) I've worked for New World First Bus as part-time bus driver for about 5.5 years, and worked for KMB as part-time bus driver for about three years.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Thank you for your submission, I believe you made one submission that is dated 22 April 2018, and that could be found in TU bundle 1C, at page 293 to 294, translation 294-1 and 294-2.

There are two matters I wish to raise arising from this submission.

The first, on page 294-1 at the bottom. You stated at the bottom that:

"Since formation, our union has been emphasising that part-time (or hourly-paid) and full-time bus captains should be given the same treatment."

The "same treatment", are you referring to the pay treatment or the training treatment? In what sense are you referring here?

MR JASON NG: (In English) I am a little -- can you repeat

your question? I'm a little unsure what you are asking about.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Because at the bottom you mentioned that your union has been emphasising part-time and full-time bus captains should be given the same treatment. So "same treatment" of what?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could read out more of what is asserted.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You further stated:

"Regardless of training, supplementary training, remedial training, appointment and requirements for dismissal, the same standards should be adopted by bus companies. During recruitment by franchised bus companies, examiners and driving training instructors perform their gate-keeping role by selecting suitable candidates stringently."

So by referring to "same treatment", are you referring to the fact that you should be given the same treatment in terms of training and appointment and dismissal requirements?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Ms Wong, I don't want to blame this as a loss in translation, but I think what we were trying to say is it is part-timers and full-timers are already under the same training treatment.

And we would recommend, if possible, for all new

joiners to go through a psychiatric test, or psychology test to make sure they are able to handle the stress of driving and rogue passengers.

MR JASON NG: (In English) I would like to add on. Like what Alex is saying, is, what we are stating is that the company has been providing the same kind of training between the full-timers and the part-timers, from our standpoint we don't see any differences in there, in any kind of training.

Because from what we hear from the public there has been different opinions and voices and, you know, justice regarding the part-time drivers, which, like what we stated, we thought was unjust.

So what we are saying is any kind of training, safety measures, or whatever kind of suggestion, should have been -- sorry, should have been provided or requiring both full-timers and part-timers.

So what we are talking about here should not be focusing -- or there should not be any differentiation between full-timers and part-timers, so to speak.

CHAIRMAN: We have your point.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and about this same treatment for bus captains, I'm going to take you to a document from the KMB. It appears there is a difference in terms of training for full-time and part-time bus captain. In

short, for full-time bus captain they have to undergo an 18-day training for 9.5 hours a day.

And we can see that in KMB-1 bundle at page 120.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Ms Wong, I believe those are for drivers who only have class 1 licence before joining, whereas in our cases, we already have class 10 licence before joining KMB.

So inherently they are two different groups of people.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

That's what I'm trying to drive at. Because technically they do differentiate training between full-time and part-time bus captains.

I understand what you are trying to say, but they do have a difference in terms of training.

And may I just take you to that document, because I just want to see what you say, if certain suggestions are made.

Page 120. We can see, the three requirements for full-time bus captain candidate, and the second one also requires the full-time bus captain to pass a driving test which is a class 17. And class 17 is a public bus franchise driving licence.

So you have to go through the Transport Department to get that licence, quite apart from undergoing

an 18-day training and the driving test administered by instructors.

But for part-time bus captain, if you look at page 121, all that requires, it appears, is that a part-time bus captain with class 10 or class 17 driving licence, and then you can undergo a 2.5-day training for 9 hours a day and pass the driving test.

So it appears the prerequisite is to have a class 10 or class 17 driving licence.

But once you get that, all you need to do is to undergo a 2.5-day training for nine hours, and then a driving test.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Ma'am, if you look at it, it says "pass the driving test administered by instructors".

Now, the instructors, that is an internal exam carried by KMB. So, if you do not pass that, they will not hire us even though we have a class 17 or class 10 licence.

Now, that is very much a -- in fact, it is a higher standard than hiring a full-time driver.

I was sitting here listening to Ms Yip when she was testifying. She said 18 days was not enough. But when we pass the driving test by KMB, we are actually taking the bus on the road. It is a road test, which is even more extensive than the drive test given by the TD.

So the prerequisites, you are right, it is different. In fact, our prerequisite is higher than the full-time drivers.

So you are correct, they are different. But we are higher.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think your union is the one that suggested to have psychological assessment to be carried out by the government or third party as part of the assessment to be a bus driver, if I understand correctly. Is that your submission, or proposal?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Yes, that's right.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find that? 294-1.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Line 4, from the bottom.

Why would you make that suggestion?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I think when we made that discussion, we were referring to obviously the tragic accident on 10 February. There were news reports which said the driver had some complications with the passengers waiting at the racecourse at the time which have sort of affected his emotion. And -- well, before the conviction, I could not speculate. But it was reported that as a result --

CHAIRMAN: I think you perhaps mean before the trial.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Well, yes, thank you.

So that's why we make that suggestion, that may be

you never know, there is something in your brain that is just waiting to explode.

MR JASON NG: (In English) May I add on again? In fact, I did some study about bus accidents.

Now, if you recall in 1997 or 1998 there was a bus flipped over in Wan Chai, okay? When you looked at that case, actually, the determine of the route cause was an emotional breakdown or some psychological problem of the bus drivers that was undetectable.

CHAIRMAN: Was this a crash that occurred on an elevated --

MR JASON NG: (In English) Correct, on the flyover, yes.

MR LEO CHA: (In English) Fleming Road incident. Tonnochy Road, I'm sorry.

MR JASON NG: (In English) So anyway, that accident.

So we looked at some documents and reports, and that's what the route cause was for that particular accident, which, similarly, flipped the bus over.

So applying that case to here, that could be one of the cases or one of the reasons or that could -- having a psychological test or some kind of emotional training could help detect that.

So we don't know. Like, what Your Majesty just said or Justice just said, the trial hasn't been carried on. We don't know what was the cause, but you were asking for our suggestion, and when we looked at the past data,

that's what we got.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

And the second proposal, I believe is in your first paragraph. Your union also supported the use of or installation of video cameras by bus companies on all buses to protect safety of bus captain passengers, and other road users. And so you supported the idea of having surveillance cameras in the bus?

MR JASON NG: (In English) Yeah, we do, 100 per cent yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And may I ask another topic.

We have heard evidence from some of the franchised bus operators stating that for part-time bus captains they don't require the bus captains or rather the current regulations or current guidelines don't appear to require the part-time bus captains to declare the working hours prior to their work as part-time bus captain.

So in other words, one of their worries or concerns is that they don't know how many hours part-time bus captains have been working prior to becoming part-time bus captain.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that has been expressed as a worry or a concern of them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is not them.

CHAIRMAN: It is a matter that engages our interest.

MR JASON NG: (In English) It don't matter. I do want to answer that. Because let me ask you a question? How do you regulate a full-time driver having enough rest between shifts? You can't.

You see, when I look at it, it is like drunk driving. We expect all drunk drivers when you sit behind a wheel to be completely sober. So we expect all drivers, when they sit behind a wheel, to be completely rested, alert, when they go on a shift.

So I don't understand why we are so hung up on this topic.

CHAIRMAN: We don't require all drivers to be completely sober. We set a threshold, and it is the same thing --

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well, for bus drivers we do.

CHAIRMAN: It is the same approach for looking at part-time captains, or, for that matter, anyone else, to try and do the best one can to -- practically, to better achieve safety, and the real question is this: at the moment it appears prior to this accident in February no information was gathered as to what part-time bus captains did in their other job.

And that is the issue that engages our interest.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well, I don't know about other bus companies, but at KMB, when we report to a shift or duty, we have to sign -- or in the past, we had to sign

a document or declaration saying we are in good state to operate a bus.

Now, is there something that -- is there something you are looking for? I don't know. Now, is that enough, I don't know --

CHAIRMAN: That's a bland statement with no possibility of an audit check.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Maybe I can add on it.

Back in 2014, when I first joined KMB as a part-timer, I was required to declare my full-time jobs, and, well, external dealings, and I understand that even for Citybus and New World First Bus they required a part-time bus driver to declare annually the full-time jobs, or other jobs, the hours required, whether they are on shifts for the other --

CHAIRMAN: Citybus have introduced that as a new form, not that they did it in the past.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Well, I think they did it in the past.

CHAIRMAN: They have given us a form that which is very comprehensive --

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) There was a new form. I understand that there was an old form in which part-time drivers were required to declare their full-time jobs.

Of course they have extended the list to cover whether it is shift work, how many hours they work.

So we do -- we did have to declare, it is not something new, but I think we also we are grown up people, we take responsibility of our act, you know, if we are not fit for reporting a duty we just call in sick like the full-time bus drivers do all the time.

CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you gentlemen. You don't have to answer if you don't wish. Let me ask you one by one.

Do you have other work, and if so, is it a driving job?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Well, I do have other work.

CHAIRMAN: Is it a driving job?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I work in an office, I have multiple jobs, put it this way.

CHAIRMAN: Is any one of them a driving job?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Yes, there is one.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Ng.

MR JASON NG: (In English) No.

CHAIRMAN: No other job?

MR JASON NG: (In English) Yes other job, but not driving job.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr Cheung.

MR KENNETH CHEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I have other work, and there is a chance of me having to drive, even when

I go to work myself I drive.

CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR GARY CHENG: (Interpreted) Yes, I have other full-time work. I also have a chance to drive.

MR LEO CHA: (In English) I also have another job, and I'm a civil servant in Lands Department.

CHAIRMAN: You are driven to distraction rather than driving!

MR LEO CHA: (In English) Yes.

MR KENNETH MA: (In English) I have other full-time job but no need to drive.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's a useful snapshot for us.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: One of the changes made by the Citybus in the new form is to require part-timers to make a declaration as to the number of hours they have worked previously, or prior to becoming part-time or taking up part-time bus captain.

Would you support that idea?

MR KENNETH MA: (In English) I support that idea. The new form used by Citybus and New World First Bus is more comprehensive than in the past.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And would that be a view shared by the entire union or your Facebook members?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I think we would support

transparency, let's put it this way.

MR JASON NG: (In English) I personally would support it only if they will require the full-time driver to do the same. By that I mean if I need to declare what I've been doing outside of my driving time, wouldn't you worry about if the full-time driver went party overnight before they report to work? I would.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have seen a table that has been kindly pulled up, showing the requirements that are required to be filled in. If we can scroll it up, because you will see at the top of the form.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give me the reference in the files?

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be in CTB-571.

CHAIRMAN: CTB1?

MS MAGGIE WONG: CTB-3.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the translation can be found at page 571-1 and 571-2.

It requires part-time bus captain to sign a declaration form setting out the hours of work in a column, need to work in shift, and with a declaration showing that the information filled in is correct. Otherwise there would be disciplinary consequences.

So by that I mean it requires part-time captain nowadays to declare that.

And similar has been done for, I believe, Kowloon Motor Bus; is that the case?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a Kowloon Motor Bus form in the same terms?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Just give me the reference, if you would. There is no need to turn it up.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I want to add that this form is an annual declaration, but not every time you start a duty.

CHAIRMAN: Obviously not that.

Ms Wong, is there anything on the form that requires the information to be updated?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No.

That would be at page 128 to 129 of KMB-1 bundle. And the translation at 129-1 to 129-2.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The topic I would like to ask is, I believe Mr Kenneth Ma earlier mentioned that the Kowloon Motor Bus set up a new requirement for part-time bus captains, and it required them to -- it set up a few requirements for part-time bus captain to accept before they can continue.

If I may take you to KMB bundle 1: page 140 to 141.

And that is a submission submitted by the Kowloon Motor Bus to the Commissioner for Transport in response to the incident in February 2018.

And at the bottom it states this:

"In late March 2018 most of those 209 part-time [bus captains] have accepted our requirements. We have assigned driving duty to them after they have met the following requirements:

1. Having made a written declaration that being a part-time [bus captain] does not breach the employment contract of his/her full-time job;

2. Having made a written declaration of illness;

3. Having made a written declaration of criminal record;

4. Having passed traffic conviction record check; and

5. Having attended a full day remedial training if the [bus captain] involved has not been driving a bus for one month or more."

And it set up the latest status of the 209 part-time bus captains.

My first question may be for Mr Ma first. Are those the requirements you mentioned first that you refused to agree to, or are they different?

MR KENNETH MA: (Interpreted) I don't accept point number 1.

(In English) Written declaration that being a part-time bus captain does not breach the employment contract of his or her full-time job.

(Interpreted) I don't accept that.

The KMB had a second meeting with our union that took place in the Kowloon Bay depot, and they first raised this. In the first meeting, the KMB had never mentioned about this point.

So for myself I don't accept that.

As for second requirement, declaration of illness, during my service as part-time bus captain, every time when I try to get a bus from the depot I have to sign a declaration stating that I am fit to drive on that day.

And also we have an Octopus card which enables -- well, as long as we tap the Octopus card into the Octopus card reader at the depot, that means we have made that declaration.

Now, for item 3 and 4, these are reasonable requirements, we don't have a lot of driving points deducted, then we can drive safely.

And that has to do with safety and we think it is reasonable.

And the fifth point about driving a bus for one month or more, we have never heard that before. We have

never heard the saying that if we have not driven a bus for more than one month or more, then we have to attend this training. No, I have never heard about that before.

MR JASON NG: (In English) I know there was a little confusion for item 5. So I think there is a little confusion between route training and driving training.

Now, as far as I know, which has been a practice at KMB for a long time, is that if you have not been reporting -- or if you have not been sitting behind a wheel driving the bus for over 30 days, you are required to attend a driving training and get cleared by the instructor before you can go back on your driving duties.

Now, I think that's what point 5 is referring to. But, the wording in point 5 said if you have not been driving a route, one particular route for 30 days, then you have to retrain for that route. Now, that's something we have not heard of.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

That's what I am trying to ask you, because we have received a background paper from the LegCo. We are going to pull that up for you.

I'm sorry we don't have hard copies.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I think we are aware of the

point you are trying to make. We picked up when Ms Yip was doing her testimony.

Well, the current practice is, if you have not, as Jason has just mentioned, if you have not driven a bus for one month you have to go back to training, and then for a particular route, if you have not driven on that route for two years, then your training record of that route will be erased. That means you will have to go on training again before you can drive on that particular route.

Take an example. If I have done route 2 in 2014 and have not done it since, then I would not be able to drive on route 2 today.

MR JASON NG: (In English) On top of that, in the route training session, if there is certain deviation that it made on the route, for example a route extension, a deviation of route, you will have to be retrained, or your training record will be erased as well. So you will not be -- for example, like, if I have been doing -- if I have gone through training for route 2, and if they have -- for example, one year went by, and they have extended the route, and I have not been retrained again, then I will not be able to drive on that route again.

MS MAGGIE WONG: On this aspect, since we are on this KMB

bundle, can I take you to KMB bundle 1, page 104.

CHAIRMAN: What are we going to?

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is a report of the investigation report filed by the KMB to the Commissioner for Transport following the request by the Commissioner for Transport on 12 February 2018.

This report is dated 12 March 2018. If we may go to page 104 setting out the recommendation of Kowloon Motor Bus, and at paragraph 13 with the heading "Discontinuance of Employment of Part Time [bus captains]

Paragraph 13 states:

"KMB has discontinued the employment of all part time [bus captains] whose working hours fall below 18 hours per week. However, in order to meet the demand for bus services during peak hours, KMB has already offered the previous part-time [bus captains] the option to convert to contract hourly rated [bus captains] or to take up alternative duties in the company."

So my question is, has this happened?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Yes, it has.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in what aspect?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) For instance for the six of us sitting here, Mr Ma has not accepted this offer, I personally have opted for a 10 hours week duty, and

I think other members have opted for 18 hours -- more than 18 hours per week arrangement.

CHAIRMAN: So what KMB did was discontinue hiring bus captains who worked less than 18 hours a week, but they permitted you to sign up to 10 hours a week?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Absolutely.

I think let me -- I can understand your feeling about, because it is counterintuitive. We were working as casual drivers. They are weekends -- I usually work on weekends, usually Saturdays.

It was a time when if I am engaged, I would just call in and say I'm not working this particular weekend, but with this new arrangement, there is some kind of a pressure for us --

CHAIRMAN: You have to 10 hours a week.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) To do 10 hours a week, despite the fact that I really cannot make it most of the time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So if we go to page 141, we can see the numbers of part-time bus captains that have agreed to this arrangement in that table in the first and second row.

"Agreed to work more than 18 hours a week", that would be 78.

And "Agreed to work over 10 hours a week; declare

doing part-time [bus captain] at KMB will not breach the employment contract with their employer ..."

Being 123. So, Mr Leung, you would be in the second category.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Absolutely.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About this arrangement, do they require you to separately sign a declaration form as to how many hours you have worked, for example on that day, prior to taking up duties as part-time bus captains?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I'm not aware of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About this 10 hours a week, can you utilise it in one go, like you can drive --

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I can do five hours a day for two days, I can do one shift of 10 hours. That's not a problem. It is quite flexible.

MS MAGGIE WONG: As long as you do it within the week.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) As long as I do 10 hours.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may ask you to look at page 124 of the KMB submission. It sets out the KMB's policy on part-time bus captains in (i).

Can you look at that and confirm, or rather let us know whether it reflects the KMB's treatment of part-time bus captains before February 2018?

MR JASON NG: (In English) Ms Wong, just glancing through, as I stated earlier, I think the first two bullets, as

I told you, I think our entry requirements are higher than the full-time bus drivers, because we have to have undergone a driving test that was carried out by the instructor at KMB.

And --

CHAIRMAN: So they are not the same, they are higher?

MR JASON NG: (In English) In my opinion they are higher. And I think all six of us can comment on that as well. As far as the other bullet points below, I would have to agree to that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If one were to suggest that there be a requirement for KMB to require all part-time bus captains to fill in a declaration form declaring the number of hours they have worked before taking up duty as part-time bus captain, would your union be agreeable to this arrangement?

MR JASON NG: (In English) See, I still don't understand why we are still asking these questions. I think it is by law you cannot drive more than 14 hours a day.

Now, if you drive over that, I think that's breaching the law; am I correct?

CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of the law. It is a question of enforcing the law. And you can only enforce the law if you have knowledge of what the person

has done.

MR JASON NG: (In English) And like what Kenneth just said, when we tap card to report to duty we already declare that.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, could you repeat that.

MR JASON NG: (In English) When we report to duty with our Octopus card, that is already confirming and affirming that we are complying all the laws and we are capable and suitable of driving the bus that day.

CHAIRMAN: The issue that is outstanding is this: what if you have been driving a coach all night, and you turn up to drive in the morning. How is the bus company to know that you cannot comply with the guidelines? How is it to get that information to enforce the law that you advert to?

There may not be an immediate answer to that. But that's the question.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well --

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I would just repeat that we are fully aware of the consequences, the particular criminal consequences of fatigued driving. We are all grown up people. We are not here to -- well, there is a popular saying amongst bus drivers, you have one foot in the prison cell, and you have one foot in the mortuary. So we are fully aware of the consequences.

CHAIRMAN: Well balanced drivers?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Yes, thank you.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well, let me add on that. I gave some thoughts to that.

So you would rather us to sign a paper saying that I have not been driving for, say, nine hours, on other circumstances, on top of tapping the -- when we report to duty, tapping our card saying "We are going to drive the bus"?

So --

CHAIRMAN: Tapping your card provides no information at all about what you have been doing prior to that.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well, tapping the card means you are accepting the duty which means you are understanding the consequences that you are not -- if you are not complying to the law.

That also included -- if you say, for example, like what I said earlier, if you have consumed alcohol, by tapping the card I -- my understanding is you are implying you have not been consuming, and you are in good state on driving the bus.

CHAIRMAN: That's why for enforcing alcohol laws we have breathalysers.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Right, but you don't --

CHAIRMAN: You can get in the car, thereby declaring you are

fit to drive.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Right, but the thing is, you don't have to do a breathalyser test every time when we get behind a wheel, or you don't do that on all 3,000 drivers at KMB every day.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Chairman, I've finished my questioning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, those are the questions we have for you. If there is any closing statement that you wish to make, don't feel that you have to, but if there is anything you wish to say, we will give you the opportunity.

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) Thank you, Justice Lunn.

I think what we are trying to reiterate is there has been a very unjust perception formed about the professionalism of our part-time bus drivers. I hope today's testimony has changed that perception, and I cannot care more about the public, but I think the three gentlemen in front of me would have a much better understanding of what a typical part-time bus driver would be.

Again, I want to repeat that we take pride in driving, we enjoy driving, we like serving passengers from different areas, all walks of life, and we just

like doing this. And it will be devastating for us if we are barred from working as part-time bus drivers. That will be the most undesirable outcome for us here. And we will be very unhappy about that.

CHAIRMAN: May I ask you this.

How typical are you six gentlemen of part-time bus captains? What I have in mind is, in particular, the New Lantao Bus Company, where I think one-third of the bus drivers are part time? Are you typical of them or are they quite different from you?

MR ALEX LEUNG: (In English) I personally have never worked with New Lantao Bus Company.

It may be for Mr Cheng to give elaboration.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR GARY CHENG: (Interpreted) Actually, as part-time bus captains, maybe we all do it differently. But I think the primary reason is because there is more flexibility in the working hours. For many part-time drivers, they want to take two days off in the week. That's why they choose to become part-time drivers. Of course, at the expense of certain benefits that full-time drivers enjoy. But then they want freedom, more flexibility. So that's why some people choose to become part-time drivers. That's really the issue.

As for the New Lantao Bus Company, how come

one-third of the bus captains are on a part time basis? I think it is because it is only on weekends they have huge patronage because people will go to Lantau Island on weekends for sightseeing and that's why they need more bus drivers on weekends. So that's why there is a bigger demand for part-time drivers, probably.

So it is all about flexibility.

And, say, when I'm free then I will come and work part time. For me, anyway, it is because it fits in with my schedule, that's why I take up the part-time job.

MR LEO CHA: (Interpreted) Perhaps let me supplement in Cantonese, and I'm free to say what I want to say.

Now, before this tragic accident, for Long Win there is a serious problem of lost trips. I think between 2016 and 2017 because of the expansion of the service for the A series of routes, so that's why for North Lantao Island there is a higher lost trip rate.

So there are relatively more serious problems with some of the routes, and that's when the part-time bus drivers can come in to help remedy the situation.

Going back to the question raised by the counsel earlier, for KMB and Long Win Bus, bundle 1, page 124, it is whether KMB treats part-time bus captains equally, (i). The answer is yes. For both full-time and

part-time bus drivers they are treated equally. Every day, before we start work, we have to tap the Octopus card as a few of my colleagues mentioned already.

We have to tap our Octopus card on the reader in the regulator's office, and that is equivalent to a declaration of our health status, enough rest, that we are fit to serve as a part-time driver on the day.

That's something that the KMB has been doing all along. Anyway, since I joined KMB in 2016 and then I switched to Long Win, all along this has been the practice.

MR GARY CHENG: (Interpreted) Finally, I would like to make this suggestion to the Committee.

All along, we are talking about bus drivers. But what about passengers? Have we considered any measures that could target the behaviour of passengers? You know, Hong Kong people start complaining when they have to wait a long time, and as long as they are not happy they will make a formal complaint, they like to do that. So it is not about monitoring the speed of buses, don't worry, the bus passengers will call and complain.

So there are plenty of channels for passengers to make complaints but there is no channel for bus drivers to complain against passengers. Even if the passenger is in the wrong we can't complain against them because

there is no channel for us to do so.

CHAIRMAN: We are very much alive to this issue, which is why we have been asking so many questions about the use of CCTV with both video and audio function. And why we are interested in forward-looking CCTV on buses so that illegal parking could be picked up, not just picked up, but then enforced, the law enforced. Without being enforced, the law is meaningless.

MR JASON NG: (In English) I completely agree to that.

I think our question, or our point is, if that's the case, we actually already have the ordinance to regulate the behaviour of passengers. Has that been enforced? Has that been enforced? If so, can we put a bigger magnitude on being enforced.

Like what Ms Yip was talking about, or her colleagues, they are all have been verbally insulted. They said they get verbally insult almost on a daily basis --

CHAIRMAN: As I have said. That is why we are looking at how the law can be enforced. Because passengers do not have a God given right to abuse bus captains.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Correct, so what we saw is if we can look at MTR, actually some of the MTR staff are empowered to enforce and fine the passenger that has obsessive behaviour --

CHAIRMAN: I don't want to lengthen the proceedings, but it has been pointed out to us and is obvious really, railway stations are much easier places to enforce things. A bus captain is one man on a bus out in the open. The train driver can bring his train into a station which he has alerted there is a problem to. And people are waiting to help him. That's the big difference. That's been pointed out to us.

MR JASON NG: (In English) Well, it might have been because manpower issue, like there are supervisors that are on the road, if we can increase that number, maybe that can help relieve that, or increasing the patrol on buses? Would that be something we can consider?

CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, thank you very much, for the evidence that you have given us. It has been most informative. As you can tell, we have various factors we have to balance in making these enquiries. What we are trying to do is seek information, and you have been most helpful.

So these proceedings are adjourned, and I would like to thank the long suffering stenographers and the simultaneous interpreters for working such a long day.

We will adjourn then until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Thank you.

(6.15 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to 10.00 am on
Wednesday, 1 August 2018)

I N D E X

P A G E

REPRESENTATIVES OF KMB EMPLOYEES 1
UNION: MR KWOK CHI SHING, MR LEE KIN KEI, IVAN, AND MR WONG KIN WAI

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR KWOK CHI SHING 1

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 6

REPRESENTATIVES FROM STAFF RIGHTS 60
ASSOCIATION OF KMB: MR CHAN WING HO, MR TAN SHIN HING, MR YIU KWONG CHUN, AND MR LI KWOK WAH

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 61

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE 90

REPRESENTATIVES OF MONTHLY-RATED 100
DRIVERS UNION: MR CHENG HOI YIU, MR SZETO KUEN, MR CHAN HON WA, MS YIP WAI LAM AND MR CHAN CHI FAI, MR YAN KIN MING

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 102

REPRESENTATIVES OF PART-TIME DRIVERS 141
UNION: MR KENNETH MA, MR LEO CHA, MR GARY CHENG, MR KENNETH CHEUNG, MR JASON NG, AND MR ALEX LEUNG.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR ALEX LEUNG 142

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 144

2018 年 7 月 31 日

上午 10 時 02 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： 郭志誠先生，主席（九巴僱員工會代表）

李建基先生，幹事（九巴僱員工會代表）

黃健威先生，會員（九巴僱員工會代表）

李國華先生，發言人（九巴職員權益工會代表）

姚廣俊先生，理事長（九巴職員權益工會代表）

鄧善慶先生，總幹事（九巴職員權益工會代表）

陳詠豪先生，秘書（九巴職員權益工會代表）

葉蔚琳女士，主席（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

司徒權先生，理事（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

甄建明先生，理事（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

陳智輝先生，理事（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

鄭凱耀先生，理事（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

陳漢華先生，司庫（月薪車長大聯盟代表）

鄭啟祥先生，召集人（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

車啟冬先生，兼職車長（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

張沛棋先生，兼職車長（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

梁景裕先生，兼職車長（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

馬健德先生，兼職車長（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

吳振宇先生，兼職車長（兼職車長苦主大聯盟代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，郭生，早晨，仲有你嘅同事，我哋感謝你同九巴僱員工會代表接受我哋嘅邀請，出席今日嘅聆訊，畀證供。咁就係黃律師會代表委員會問你哋問題，你哋就決定三位之中邊一位去作答。郭生，我就邀請你，如果你想其他人回答，你就要話係想邊一位回答。開始嘅時候，我知道你係想先作一個嘅--即係講幾句說話，而家可以講。

郭志誠先生：多謝委員會，多謝主席，多謝兩位委員，我哋好高興，等咗好耐，就今次有機會上嚟講兩句說話，發表下我哋工會同埋行業車長嘅聲音，就好難得嘅。

其實我想希望委員會就畀充分嘅時間我哋反映，我哋咁多堂嗰個聽證會我都有出席，咁樣嘅意見大多數都係集中喺監管司機嗰個問題嗰度嘅，嗰個安全嘅。

我亦都有留意到主席嗰個聲明嘅，我哋唔係話要結論有一個咩嘢嘅結果，邊個需要負責，我哋只係提供嗰個安全培訓同埋其他應有嘅討論嘅。希望就委員、主席就聽到我嘅意見，就可以參考。

我哋就希望就--唔知我哋可唔可以有問題提問委員會嘅，或者主席嘅？即係會唔會畀我哋有提問嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）你今日出席就係嚟作證，咁係我哋就唔係回答，不過就係會聽你哋講嘢。我哋想做就係搵出專營巴士運作嘅情況，等我哋可以向特首作出建議，提升安全，所以我哋想聽嘅就係你哋嘅意見，因為我哋唔係從業員。

郭志誠先生：咁就係因為呢個問題，因為我哋就係在職場從業員，呢個巴士行業就每日有 400 萬嘅乘客，佔香港每天嗰個乘客比例就 31%嘅，其實都係--我哋行業都係好重要嘅。

我發覺就委員會就比我哋所屬嘅工會團體嗰個發言就比較短嘅，其實就我哋係重要嘅持份者嚟嘅，亦都係重要嘅一員嘅，亦都係喺個安全問題嗰個主要掌控者嚟嘅。其實就我哋就好多問題要講嘅，即係我有三份嗰個陳--一份陳述書，兩份--三份補充資料，委員會要求，我哋好多個項目都喺裏面嘅。喺陳述書裏面都係好簡短，即係提幾句大概性嘅，如果係得到充分討論，應該就對委員會日後嗰個結論，或者市民大眾亦都會比較清楚嘅。

係嘞，咁我哋就呢個問題，因為就我發覺琴日嗰個委員會只係問咗幾條比較簡單嘅問題，唔得深入。喺個培訓方面，嗰個車長嘅機械認識方面，嗰個教導方面，即係車長嗰個認識，能唔能夠清楚知道佢揸嗰架車嗰個性能，嗰個操控係點樣嘅，咁完全就忽略咗，忽略咗我哋呢方面嘅意見嘅。即係簡單嗰啲要求，我哋畀一個答案委員會，係贊唔贊成、認唔認同某啲人嘅觀點，或者我哋有咩嘢睇法，我係認為唔夠深入嘅，咁委員會係唔可能得出一個好嘅結論嘅。

我哋喺呢方面，希望--我就唔想重複答番人哋嗰個問題，就唔好即係--因為時間好寶貴，我哋希望儘量想講我哋關注嘅嘢，影響大眾嘅嘢。好多情況之下，就係市民或者委員會係唔清楚嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇錯，你都係指出咗呢啲嘅事項㗎嘞，喺你嘅陳述書裏面，所以我哋而家就會係你講咗嘅一啲事項，就於呢啲，我哋會問你問題，如果你想補充，你可以補充嘅。但係請你畀陳述書我哋，係畀機會你哋同我哋講一次你想講啲乜嘢，而口述證供嘅聆訊就係等我哋可以去探討一啲我哋認為有--係有關嘅事項。

郭志誠先生：今日因為我哋準備咗一個黑盒嘅問題嘅，就未--嗰啲資料或者汽車嘅操作嘅安全性問題就未呈交上委員會嘅，我哋係準備到即係臨時啱啱寫好，想喺呢度講畀大家聽嘅，希望委員會就酌情批准，因為未呈交上嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢原因係之前冇交畀我哋？因為我哋由呢個係 3 月--4 月嘅 28 號（原文照錄）喔，已經開始叫你畀資料我哋囉喎。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）即係呢一個係 3 月 28 號，今日已經係 7 月 31 號囉喎。

郭志誠先生：咁係我哋因為要準備，因為我哋唔係專家，我哋要--因為發覺就委員會裏面，即係問過黑盒公司，我哋睇番佢嗰個資料，我認為需要因應佢哋嘅答覆，而我哋再提供我哋在職嘅意見，我哋車長認識呢方面嘅機械，即係直接係操作。其實佢係咪話畀個黑盒我哋，咁我哋車長就識呢？就知呢？

咁樣即係我哋成立個會之後，好多嘢要教導啲會員嘅，譬如好似話襲擊車長，點解會唔能夠檢控，因為車長唔識搜證。同埋就喺事發之前，通常就會大家你一言我一語，變咗--其實我哋車長就根據...

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，其實如果我哋而家開始，等黃律師問你問題，可能進度會比較好，即係比起一路聽你喺度講話由黑盒到畀人--即係發生事，畀人打，可能係黃律師問你問題，個進度會更好，等佢問，跟住我哋先至有機會再聽你講，好唔好？

郭志誠先生：好嘅，多謝主席。希望結論嘅時候可以畀我補充。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒郭生、各位人士今日出席。我想簡單講幾句，我哋收到你嘅書面陳述同埋文件，即係三份都收到。委員會主要嘅要做嘅工作，其實喺嗰個工作範圍裏面都已經係寫咗㗎嘢，只要係有關於同安全--即係專營巴士營運安全有關，我嘅問題係會集中於安全呢方面，而唔係其他譬如即係僱員工作方面嘅問--嘅範圍。所以我希望你都要集中番，係回答關於安全嘅問題。

我想--我先開始問一問關於你個會嘅組成。郭生，你個會--我想請你睇番工會文件 112-9，淨係得中文嘅，不過我會解釋一下，係 112-9 呢一頁。

你個會就係喺 2015 年 7 月 14 號成立，係嘛？

郭志誠先生：係，對。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去到--直至呢一個嘅係 2018 年 6 月 15 號，你哋會員人數係有 1,400 人，係嘛？

郭志誠先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其中包括全職嘅僱員，退休咗嘅車長但係跟住續任嘅人員，佢

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

哋都係繼續做車長嘅，係嘛？

郭志誠先生：係，正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外仲--其實有1,300位都係全職車長嚟㗎，係嘛？

郭志誠先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你嘅陳述書就提及過幾方面，我都會係唔同時候集中唔同嘅問題。

第一個想問你嘅問題就係關於設施或者係安全方面嘅，就係你提過，其實你嘅文件都係好強調呢幾點嘅，或者去到工會文件1A，84頁，英文就係第90-3頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢文件話？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係工會嘅4月23號第一份嘅文件，2018年，90-3，英文嘅，而中文就係第84頁。

喺第一嗰段，你話為咗嚟到係節省維修嘅開支，自從2015年，九巴都係不合適地咁樣，係攞走晒嗰啲嘅熱風除霞裝置，令巴士喺濕凍天氣嘅情況下，車輛外溫差太大，你亦提供咗一啲照片喺第--附件一嗰度，就係第91頁，中文就係91頁，英文就係90-1。你喺個文件度話，當嗰個巴士係高速行駛，又睇唔清楚路面情況，係非常危險，就會影響咗行車安全同埋乘客嘅安全。

我第一個問題就係，你嘅工會有冇將呢一點向巴士公司反映，九巴嗰度？

郭志誠先生：有嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時？

郭志誠先生：我哋係透過同公司嗰啲管理層講過嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時？

郭志誠先生：時間就唔記得，因為冇記錄，即係口頭嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅照片，可唔可以話畀我哋聽，大概係幾時拍嘅呢，呢啲照片？

郭志誠先生：係上年年中嘅，透過嗰啲同事喺WhatsApp嗰度轉發嘅。其實呢個問題維持咗好耐㗎，因為舊年特別嚴重，咁我哋啲會員車長好期待我哋嘅工會同佢哋爭取發聲嘅，所以特別踴躍，就掟好多相畀我哋，幾間廠都係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）公司--當你口頭反映畀公司聽嘅時候，公司有冇咩嘢回應，關於呢一點？

郭志誠先生：冇回應嘅，佢哋即係儘量係想排斥我哋，即係排斥我哋工會，咁樣大多數都係嘞，即係如果我用工會主席身分同佢哋講，佢哋話唔鍾意嘅，一定要我係以僱員車長嘅身分同佢哋反映嘅，咁係當時嘅九龍灣廠總經理，楊國豪先生。

黃女士： And did you reflect or --

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你講完未㗎？嗰個九龍灣車廠嗰個總經理做咩嘢呀，佢？

郭志誠先生：即係佢經常都係強調，即係我只可以用個人身分，因為政治嘅考慮，佢--係嘞，因為政治嘅考慮，佢就--係嘞...

主席： And what is the name --

郭志誠先生：...即係唔方便我用嗰個主席身分同佢講。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢嘅名係咩嘢，嗰位先生，叫咩嘢名，嗰位總經理？

郭志誠先生：楊國豪，楊國豪，九龍灣廠總經理。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）車長有冇反映畀嗰啲維修嘅員工，公司嘅維修員工？

郭志誠先生：有嘅，咁佢哋--係嘞，其實佢哋都--維修員工都好多意見，但係唔夠膽講嘅，通常都係向我反映下。佢哋其實維修員工都好多不滿，但係就--係嘞，就冇辦法出到聲，因為公司唔鍾意。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁而家嘅情況點，關乎呢啲嘅除霞裝置，而家嘅狀況係點？

郭志誠先生：就呢個委員會成立咗之後，我哋就掟咗好多文件，亦都係有記者訪問過。佢而家就公司對外界，或者對外講係，之後嘅新車會裝番，之後嘅新車會裝番，當時我哋反映嘅時候，佢係--運輸署係唔成--即係獨立媒體訪問過嘅，亦都訪問過一位教授嘅，即係我都有提，喺文件裏面都有提過嘅。即係得呢個教授證實係熱風除霞先係最有效嘅。

當時獨立媒體訪問，運輸署嘅答覆就係話，呢一樣裝置就唔係必須嘅，現時香港嘅巴士只係九成係有裝嘅啫，即係反映淨係九巴冇喇。即係九巴就唔顧乘客同埋車長嘅安全，本身係有嘅，佢都取消，即係慳番啲維修費，佢認為咁嘅情況之下，一年裏面唔會太多日，所以佢要求車長自己抹。咁喺高速公路，點抹呢？咁喺市區停低燈位嘅時候可以抹咋嘛，咁你高速公路點抹呢？咁佢啲答覆真係好難令人接受。

主席：（經傳譯員）新車有冇呢一個裝置？

郭志誠先生：到目前為止，都係未有嘅，所有新車冇嘅，因為佢之前已經決定咗話以後都唔裝吖嘛，就之後--未嚟㗎，應該嗰啲新車未嚟嘅，就話應承咗話之後會

加裝番，但係呢個係好唔理想嘅，咁其實嗰三千九百幾部巴士點樣呢？咁咪仲--有啲都係舊年或者今年先至投入服務嘅，咁佢哋係咪需要十七年、十八年後，都仲係咁嘅情況呢？咁係咪代表咁樣敷衍咗大家「欸，我做番嘞。」咁樣？

我認為就應該--即使唔係即時，應該運輸署喺每年驗車嗰度，要求佢加裝番嘅，無論幾多錢都好，就唔能夠話呢個潛在危險，由佢喇，十幾年後先慢慢換咁樣。本身個設計係有㗎嘛，你係自己取消咗佢咋嘛。呢一個係關乎大眾嘅安全嘅，亦都係符合委員會嗰個安全嗰個要求。

主席：（經傳譯員）好嘞，我哋明嘞。黃女士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）90-5，英文嘅，中文就係 85 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家會講邊點？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係運輸署嘅回應，就係關於呢一個除霞裝置。

主席： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺你嘅第一份嘅意見書度話，運輸署就唔會批准呢一個嘅九巴去取消呢一個除霞裝置，因為會係影響公司嘅安全。咁你係咪--係收到好多嘅車長嘅反映，就係話強烈要求--運輸署要求九巴係再裝番呢啲嘅除霞裝置。

我想問，運輸署係咪知道係呢啲除霞裝置係除咗落嚟？

主席：（經傳譯員）你未答呢個問題，你正話話畀佢聽運輸署話呢個唔係一個必須嘅裝置，呢個係咪運輸署嗰個立場？

郭志誠先生：嗰個--佢因為個獨立媒體係關心呢件事，咁喺網上可以睇到，有啲訪問我嘅，跟住佢即係持平，搵一個教授訪問，同埋要求運輸署...

主席：（經傳譯員）你已經講咗嘞，我想問，運輸署有冇話表達呢一個嘅--你話畀我哋聽，運輸署話呢個裝置唔係一個必須嘅裝置，係咪呢？

郭志誠先生：係，係，係，喺報道裏面，佢係咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇寫信畀運輸署，去投訴關於呢個除塵裝置？你個工會有冇寫信畀運輸署投訴呢件事，關於冇咗呢個裝置？

郭志誠先生：冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我去下一個嘅問題嘞，關乎嗰個嘅波段裝置，第 84 頁，英文--中文，而英文版本就係 90-3 頁，都係喺第一段之下，你就話公司係改裝咗安全行車波段裝置，取消限波掣裝置，及手動減速器裝置，只係以電腦控制單一自動 D 波控制車速，喺突發危險情況下，車長係冇任何挽救裝置可用，係非常危

險。

你就喺你嘅附件喺 92 頁，呢個就係中文，跟住 92-1 就係英文，你係畀啲相我哋睇嘅。你亦都係進一步講，喺 90-5 嘅英文版本嗰度話，就話因為喺熱天嘅時候，喺巴士裏面嗰個嘅機器嘅溫度係更高，就係更加會影響呢一個嘅問題，所以就係唔能夠係即時嚟到係改變呢一個嘅狀況，就會影響咗嗰個車長嘅判斷，佢就會覺得好似冇辦法剎到掣，就話畀警方聽，就話畀警方聽，呢架巴士係冇腳掣，其實當架巴士係冷卻，第二日嗰個嘅電腦控制又會返番去正常。

從你自己嗰個嘅檢討，到底取消咗呢一個限波掣裝置係點樣影響交通安全或者巴士安全嘅呢？

郭志誠先生：呢方面我想請阿李建基先生，佢比較熟悉啲，我想請李建基先生回答呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）李生，請回答。

李建基先生：多謝主席，其實可能--首先我介紹我自己，介紹我個人嘅簡短嘅履歷。我揸咗約二十年多，嗰個大型車輛，包括馬鐵車輛、中港兩地車輛，包括單雙層嘅巴士，有波嘅及冇波嘅自動波嘅，包括比較係先進少少嘅旅遊巴我都揸過嘅。現階段嚟講，我就係九巴員工，受僱咗六年，揸咗六年巴士，公共雙層巴士揸咗六年。喺呢方面到我入職，或者喺學校嚟講，包括導師都好，佢所介紹嘅只係單一公司要求佢哋咁樣向學員培訓，整體仲有好多嘅安全嘅裝置，包括駕駛嘅技術係未夠嘅，我係覺得未夠嘅。簡單啲嚟講，睇番而家嘅附件，其實...

主席：（經傳譯員）咪住，咪住，李生，而家問你，其實係講一啲好具體嘅事，唔係叫你畀一個嘅演講嘅。而家就係話，移除咗呢個手動嘅減速器，點樣影響到巴士安全？你只係需要集中答呢方面啫。

李建基先生：喺呢個系統裏面，有一個裝置控制選擇器，包括單一嘅手動、自動，基本係有兩樣，第三樣就係包括手動、自動同一同步去運作。呢個首先我講減速器，減速器都係有呢種情況，有呢個掣喺度。咁我--喺控制呢個減速系統裏面，有四段，亦都有控制桿，係司機可以控制嘅，亦都唔使經過腳踏板呢個剎車器。琴日都有個黎主席都講，話一腳踩落去就有嘅，自動嘅。

而喺個附表度講到話，受到高溫，就係講個剎車系統，剎車系統經常受到 brake 嘅摩擦，就會受到高溫，但係如果有咗呢套手動嘅裝置，係隨司機個手同個段速去畀減速嘅力度，由一至四，輕至重，唔需要加強 brake 嘅負荷，喺呢個位置嚟講，可以帶動到波箱嘅軸心，而可以穩固佢個扭力，咁再落剎車系統，其實係好穩固嘅。但係現階段，我見唔到公共巴士，單雙層都好，唔多嘅，雙層簡直係唔會有嘅，手動控制桿，甚至乎係呢個選擇掣，選擇掣係冇嘅，就只得腳踏板去控制，開啟所謂佢哋而家嘅油壓減速器。

如果喺個呢方面，有個加強個控制桿，現階段，職業嘅旅遊巴司機喺呢一方

面係非常之熟練嘅，但係喺公共巴士裏面嘅車長，係導師都冇任何呢方面會介紹佢哋點樣採用呢套系統，只係教佢用隻腳踩個 brake，咩嘢叫輕少少，咩嘢叫重少少，喺而家咁多公共--我哋嘅專業車長裏面，係冇㗎，受到任何要收車，就一腳就到 brake 皮㗎嘞，咁呀摩擦到個 brake 碟㗎嘞，咁喺--其實個剎車系統一定有損耗，一定亦都唔會有正常可以發揮到停車或者減車嘅效果，就只有帶來每一腳 brake。而加上電腦可以 set 死咗嘅力度，可能就係三級至四級，如果手桿控制，三級、四級嘅力度係好重嘅，但係如果我由一級至四級慢慢發揮，架車係好穩固，而嗰個撳晃力、剳前剳後、減少嘅力度係冇嘅，係好穩固。所以而家好多司機遇到比較係有半架巴士位，或者再短啲，根本唔可以一腳剎停架車，就只有睇住架車向前撞嘅啫。

所以現階段，我覺得公共巴士呢套系統裏面有疏忽，運輸署係應該知道呢一點嘅，因為喺香港運輸驗車牌照部裏面，包括佢都要做埋旅遊巴，會原架係--原架巴士駛入，咁呢套嘢裏面一定有嘅，佢哋應該知嘅，冇可能一架公共巴士載咁多人，連呢個最簡單嘅系統裏面，都係隨心所願，有呀得㗎嘞，唔需要...

主席：（經傳譯員）未繼續講之前，會唔會係變成咁，即係冇一個手動嘅減速器，其實就係剝奪咗巴士車長選擇，減速嘅選擇，係咪咁嘅意思？即係冇咗自動--冇咗個手動系統，就令個巴士車長少咗選擇，喺減速方面，係嘛？

李建基先生：可以咁講，交番畀郭生講。

郭志誠先生：呢方面我回答，其實就手動減速器係好重要嘅，尤其是落斜路，我記得就係話就大埔區議會嗰個黃女士就話有--即係喺個斜--佢哋收到嗰啲旅遊巴司機所講，喺個斜路衝--70 公里嘅時候衝到上頂，再衝落去嘅時候，好難會減到車速去到 50，因為而家改咗 50 公里吖嘛。其實係點解就係，我相信佢嗰架車就可能係比較舊啲，只有一個廢氣剎車，廢氣剎車個效果就冇咁好，如果你去到上頂 70 上到頂，咁你有手動減速器，你拍落去，三至四秒之後就好快減到 50 至 40㗎嘞，咁唔使落 brake，咁會減--好有助嗰個落斜嗰個減速個安全性嘅。

其實就係我哋--即係我曾經就係--以前九巴就兩至三年就會有個叫高級駕駛，或者優質駕駛，咁我就係--嗰啲車長指明要操呢段大埔公路，大埔公路上落斜，我哋嗰陣時仲係熱狗，嗰陣時嗰啲熱狗有個限波掣，限一--限波，二波、三波，即係好似圖--附件二最左手邊嗰個，有限一波、二波、D 波咁樣。嗰陣時如果有啲車係冇手動減速器，我哋用個限波掣嘅，即係拖住個波，就即係比較穩定，唔使靠個 brake。你咁靠個 brake 係咁衝落去，你想佢減速，你係要磨住個 brake 皮㗎嘛，你磨得多，咁去到佢發熱嘅時候，去到最危急嘅時候，嗰個效果會減低，可能減低三成嘅，嗰個剎掣系統會減低三成。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，唔好意思，我要打斷你，你個--其實個要點好簡單，即係話減速，尤其係落斜嘅時候，係唔使用剎車系統，唔使係即係好大力咁剎㗎，你其實個意思都係想咁講啫，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：係嘞，少少掂一掂就得㗎嘞，係嘞，咁各方面都會好，乘客都會安全

嘅，咁樣就話...

主席：（經傳譯員）嗄，我哋知道嘞，我哋聽到嘞。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想請你睇第二份嘅陳述書，你提及過...

主席：（經傳譯員）係日期係幾多號？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二份就係 6 月 15 號，2018 年。

主席： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）中文版係 112 頁，112-19，英文係 112-97，其實係第三份嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係唔係 15 號嗰份，係呢個 7 月 25 號嗰份，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，18 年嘅 7 月 25 號嗰一份，係 112-97，呢個係中文。

主席： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）英文就係 112-99。有兩方面我想同你哋講一講，就係話首先使用監察鏡頭，就係呢一個嘅 112-97 頂部嗰度講。你提及一點--頂部，喺第三底下，你就話，你係支持使用呢一個嘅閉路電視去記錄呢啲違例泊車。從你嘅陳述書，意思係咪話，有關於呢一個係閉路電視，你係支持安裝閉路電視，即係係呢一個嘅駕駛座位嗰度？

主席：（經傳譯員）做咩嘢呀？係監察違例泊車定係？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去監察首先就係違例泊車。

郭志誠先生：係咪？監察違例泊車係可行嘅，我希望係喺車嘅前方裝嘅，我係贊成呢一點嘅，因為需要舉證，所有嘢都需要舉證，一定要做呢樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢樣我明白。

主席：（經傳譯員）未講第二樣嘢之前，呢啲咁樣嘅鏡頭，唔係已經喺九巴好多嘅車上面都已經安裝咗嘞咩，呢類型鏡頭？

郭志誠先生：仲有超過一半係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係有一半有，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：係嘞。同埋佢就有時唔知點解，公司又係影唔到，又話咩嘢，即係要加強少少，即係比較專門少少，可能係--係嘞，即係嗰個安裝要求設備嗰度個效率要提高啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）有關於巴士--牽涉巴士車長方面，如果即係牽涉到巴士車長，你

支唔支持譬如話撳個掣，咁就係顯示到係呢一段就係記錄違例泊車，咁可以愛嚟收集作為證據咁嘅做法？

郭志誠先生：非常之好，我贊成。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺112-97，第4.1段，英文版就係112-100，你就話：

> 「有需要係通過法例，如果唔係冇人會遵守規則，即使係過往，九巴有員工都係要求--有報告要求索取巴士錄影片段作為投訴其他駕駛者不小心駕駛，但係就畀當時嘅九龍灣廠總經理係拒絕。而如果員工真係好想要，佢就要畀行政費5,000元。而據知，新巴同埋城巴只需要係畀600元，好明顯係故意阻撓員工合理要求，所以本會認為必須要立法通過相關嘅財政規例先至有效。」

我想問嘅問題就係，咩嘢叫做「必須要係立法通過相關規定」，到底係想規定啲咩嘢？

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔明點解我哋會問呢一個問題。

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為我覺得好簡單，我哋只要傳召傳票要九巴提供有關片段就得喇，我覺得呢點係唔相關嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁點解員工係需要畀一個嘅費用，先攞到呢啲嘅錄影？

主席：（經傳譯員）因為呢一個就係香港嘅法例其係--容許喺一個刑事嘅訴訟裏，辯分係可以要求提出呢啲嘅證據㗎嘛。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我繼續落去問。講到嗰個黑盒，你喺屘二嗰段，喺112-97頁嗰度，屘二嗰段話，英文就係112-101頁，就係話嗰個黑盒已經係裝咗好多年，已經指定安裝多年，但係你就話，個黑盒功能冇正確使用，你可唔可以再詳細解釋呢點？

郭志誠先生：第一，嗰個委員會都問過德國黑盒承辦商，其實黑盒裏面可以有好多數據嘅，其實係已經係好多年㗎嘞，其實運輸署要求要裝呢個黑盒，就唔係話敷衍大家，因為有2003年嗰個屯門意外之後，咁受壓力而裝。佢係畀咗--要求巴士公司裝，巴士公司裝咗，咁唔知佢咩嘢原因，可能係保障自己嗰個法律嗰方面問題保障自己，咁佢乜嘢數據都唔愛嘅，乜嘢數據都唔愛。

好簡單咁就係嗰日委員會嗰度，就嗰個車速限制75，同埋嗰個加減速嗰個值就係--界限值就係2.3，同埋傾斜度係44度。就呢一點，我都想補充下，可以嗎，主席？其實嗰個界限值就過往公司成日逼車長係超速，譬如一段路係70公里，咁你如果係想個車長唔超速嘅，係有一個提示嘅，咁你嗰個值係咪應該係

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

68 或者 69 呢？「喂，超速囉喎，你收囉喎。」咁佢點解要去到 75 呢，係咪呀？之後我哋提供咗畀委員會，2 月、3 月之後，有幾樣--公司紀律員工 83 公里，訓練嗰陣時都去到 80 公里，好明顯就係嗰個界限值嗰個截油嗰度係失效，冇用，完全係冇用。

今年初或者咩嘢，好似有一單就係電車反車，咁睇報道，報紙報道就係話，電車公司係有要求車長要快嘅。所以就畀我睇到，佢呢個 75 嗰個界限值其實係可以容許巴士超速，係好贊成巴士超速。快啲喇咁樣，屯門公路，高速公路，快啲喇，人哋 80、100。咁係嘞，容許佢有限度超速嘅，咁呢個係不負責任嘅。好嘞，有事嘅時候，就叫個司機去死，去負責，負責晒所有法律責任。咁司機就萬幾紋，咁佢哋月薪係幾十萬，乜嘢責任都唔使。嗰個車長，你有--你話咗畀大家聽係 70，就會截油，會警報你㗎嘛，點解去到 70、83，佢都好似收唔到呢個警報？收唔到呢個警報嘅，咁佢嗰個界限值裏面，公司嗰個要求係非常之低。喺委員會，因為我八場、九場都有聽過，有啲去到一點幾咋，好似係，咁佢就去到 2.3，個傾斜度 44 度，44 度已經反喇，警乜鬼嘢告啫？係咪呀？咁你冇可能呢個界限值係設喺呢啲咁嘅地方裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，喺定嗰個嘅傾斜度 44 或者 43 度，就係為咗係令到佢係嗰個巴士係唔能夠再運作吖嘛，因為佢唔係為咗要去提醒佢，因為嗰架巴士就會反個囉喎？

郭志誠先生：呢一方面，即係唔可以運作，唔可以運作咪反囉。即係好似電單車咁樣，你瞓彎嘅，你嗰個動力夠嘅，扭力夠嘅，就可以企番起身；如果你嗰陣時係收嘅，或者係耷落去就反嘅，一定嘅，咁你冇咗個動力吖嘛，點帶番起架車呢？佢呢啲咁嘅帶波，係普通市民未揸過車，或者係冇--對車嘅唔夠認識嘅時候，「好似係喎，係喎。」你嗰下停，你嗰下停咪反囉，你應該係有個扭力嘅時候，咪帶番起架車囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我又再打岔，你正話就係話，嗰個黑盒係冇儘量發揮佢嘅功能，首先就係嗰個嘅速度，嗰個剎掣，同埋嗰個穩定方面嘅控制，係咪呀？我正話嘅總結合唔合適呢？

郭志誠先生：我哋可以提供嘅，其實個黑盒係應該係有咩嘢可以儲存或者記錄，令到有咩嘢事起上嚟，或者係個車長駕駛態度，或者係平時有咩嘢犯規，我哋可以及早糾正佢，或者係喺個調查方面，係有好大幫助嘅。咁我哋都列咗黑盒裏面應該有嘅數值，或者係界限值：

第一樣，就係所有電力輸出嘅電子儀器，嗰個電壓嗰個數值；

第二樣，輪軑嘅獨立防滑裝置，系統個數值，佢嗰個獨立剎車氣壓，嗰個壓力數值；

第三，就係減速器嗰個系統嗰個段數值，即係一段段，你減咗速嗰個，應該黑盒裏面有；

第四，就係電子波檔掣嗰個波檔位嗰個數值，即係當時係用緊咩波；

第五，就係嗰個轉數錶，即係轉數嗰個扭力，同埋嗰個速度嗰個數值；

第六嗰樣就係，電力懸掛系統嗰個氣壓，氣壓嗰個數值，即係個氣袋而家就係嗰個氣袋平衡嘅，以前就係鋼片嘅避震嘅，而家係氣袋，氣袋嘅，咁個數--當時嗰個數值係咩嘢嘞，咁第四個懸掛系統嗰個氣壓令到嗰個車身嗰個傾斜度，即係當時嗰個氣壓係咪夠，唔夠佢咪傾斜，即係佢嗰個能唔能夠正常發揮，嗰個回彈，即係佢傾斜咗嘅時候，嗰個數值係會自動撐番起佢嘅；

第七，就嗰個獨立壓縮氣缸，嗰個氣缸嗰個數嘞，係壓縮器叉嗰個氣泵嗰個數值；

同埋第八，嗰個剎車系統，每次使用，即係所謂嘅加減速嗰個數據；

第九，嗰個係應該有個車輛當時嗰個總重量，咁呀計算到當時嗰個情...

應該就如果黑盒正常功能，運輸署叫佢裝，應該有齊呢啲咁嘅數值，就原廠嚟已經--如果加埋落去唔會貴嘅，只係公司可能嗰個責任問題，就唔想有啲咁嘅數值存在，認為如果有，可能佢話「哦，即係你嗰個維修做得唔好嘞。」即係唔達佢嗰個數值，我相信係呢方面嘅考慮，「運輸署冇要求，我咪唔做囉，冇理由畀咁多嘢畀人捉㗎嘛。」係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）郭先生講到呢個黑盒，你早前提過嗰個嘅--可以係去偵測到嗰個駕駛態度，你哋工會係咪支持呢個實時監察車長嗰個嘅駕駛態度，實時監察？

郭志誠先生：原則上係好嘅，我哋利用科技係幫助到大家，同埋巴士公司會好安全，但係咁佢嘅數值係咪準呢？

大家都提出過，嗰個 ISO 39001，即係衛星定位，佢好多功能，係咪喺--好成熟，可以喺香港嗰度用到呢？據我所知就應該就唔太準嘅。就以現時嗰個衛星定位，我哋揸車去到旺角，佢好多已經報唔到嘞，停咗或者報錯，即係因為香港高樓大廈多，可能亦都嗰個衛星信號收到唔好。雖然大家委員會或者市民，「好呀，加咩嘢科技，加咩嘢科技。」咁但係嗰個科技係咪成熟呢？其實就我係贊同嘅，但係要多啲實驗嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，你係聽到係捷克嗰度，就係佢哋就係容許喺任何時間，嗰個巴士嘅位置可以計算得到嘅。

郭志誠先生：佢係咁講，但係我覺得喺香港應該喺市區係做唔到，郊區可以，郊區可以嘅，市區可能做唔到嗰個準確嗰個嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，你就唔係一個嘅電子工程師，而家係你都係講緊係巴士嘅駕駛者，我哋都係聽過，我哋會聽一啲電子工程師嘅睇法。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署嘅文件 403 頁，呢個係立法會嘅文件，係畀呢一個交

通事務委員會嘅，喺2018年7月，143（原文照錄）頁，中文版係416頁。

我想問下你，你哋工會同唔同意係使用某啲嘅安全裝置？

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，你明唔明白點解會有呢份文件？

郭志誠先生：我未聽過呢個文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我解釋，我哋所收到嘅資料，就係運輸署喺3月中嘅時候，就係召開一個會議，就係包括巴士嘅營運商，有三個嘅巴士製造商，同埋運輸署同埋處理一啲嘅問題。其中一個就係車長嘅訓練，另一個就係要係使用或者係裝置一啲安全嘅裝置喺巴士度，第三就係關於安全帶嘅問題。呢個委員會就開咗幾次會，喺7月尾，喺7月20號就係公布咗一啲嘅建議，就喺呢一份畀立法會文件裏面寫咗出嚟嘅。你明白嗎？

郭志誠先生：明白，明白。

主席： Are we to understand this as well, that at no stage was your union asked to make any representations to this working group?

郭志誠先生：未有傳譯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁就係喺任何時候，你同你嘅工會都係冇收到任何嘅邀請話要向佢哋去表達意見，係嘛？

黃女士： May I ask in that context whether you support the use of some of this in-vehicle --

郭志誠先生：啱嘅，係對嘅，係。

講者（不能辨別）：翻譯有啲問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係冇要求過你哋去向工作小組畀任何嘅意見，咁樣講係正確嘅？

郭志誠先生：佢哋唔知係喺邊度聽，即係好--對我哋個會就唔係咁放心，即係我哋好難...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係咪--放唔放心都好，佢都冇即係向你哋要求協助，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：完全冇嘅，係呀，寄信都未必會覆你嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先我想問嘅就係有關於一個嘅電子穩定系統，喺(a)呢一段，有冇--之前有冇聽過呢一個咁樣嘅系統？

郭志誠先生：呢次委員會聽證會我哋先會--先有留意呢樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你支唔支持使用呢一個嘅設備，即係你哋個工會支唔支持㗎？

郭志誠先生：支持嘅，科技我哋唔能夠逃避，即使用咗有咩嘢問題，我哋咪儘量反映，改善，我哋呢方面係持久咁會做多啲反映。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋請睇 4(b)，即係嗰個減速器，車速限制減速器，4(b)呢個就係話，將係--落斜嘅時候，將嗰個時速係限制咗喺某一個速度，目的就係使用減速品係超過 70 公里落斜嘅時候，就會用減速器去將個車速減慢，咁你支唔支持使用呢一個嘅設備？

郭志誠先生：我就未有好認識呢個設備，但係我想講一樣嘢，即係你減速即係截咗油，意思，截咗油即係空波，空波其實仲危險嘅，即係有一段時間空波，你截咗佢油，佢空波係咁衝嘅啫，所以我哋點解會強調一樣嘢，就係要有個手動減速器，要配合。你嗰個就咁截油，截咗油喺嗰個電腦控制嗰度，佢截咗佢油嗰段時間，有幾秒時間可能係空波，仲危險嘅，仲失去動力。截咗油又失去動力，即係架車係冇扭力，即係你帶--即係你唔能夠--有咩嘢情況之下，你唔能夠畀油帶動番佢，即係個車長控制番架車，你截咗佢油就空波，空波咪由佢衝囉，咁你 brake 耷到咪耷，耷唔到咪由佢囉。

所以就其實手動減速器或者咩嘢係唔係而家嘅嘢嚟，係不嬲都係嘢，你而家所有重型車、旅遊巴，全部都係有嘅，你係運輸署去就住巴士公司個要求，而乜嘢都唔使，唔使維修吖嘛。點解唔使維修，因為佢哋覺得巴士冇用--車長冇用，因為佢冇訓練過。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，你可能你覺得比較難接受，但係我哋明白你關於手動減速器嘅意見，我哋明白，所以唔需要再重複呢一點。

黃律師，請繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家再睇 6(a)，係巴士監察及控制系統。簡單嚟講，就係使用一個嘅係全球定位系統...

主席：（經傳譯員）但係頭先講咗話呢個係唔會真係確實即係可以講到嗰個汽車喺邊度，即係譬如話係--應該話係其他嘅定位嘅技術。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，仲有其他嘅定位技術，我只不過係睇緊文件啫。即係話可以利用呢啲定位嘅系統科技，然之後就去加埋嗰個車速限--當段嘅車速限制，然之後就可以提升到嗰個限速器嘅功能，即係話可以限制喺某一個路段，佢嗰個車速，去制訂應該限到幾時，限到咩嘢嘅速度嘅，你支唔支持使用呢一個儀器？

郭志誠先生：支持嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁 6(b)就係一個防撞嘅警--碰撞警報裝置，同埋保持行車線嘅裝置？

郭志誠先生：呢方面就係暫時就唔係好成熟。如果你裝落去，因為我哋啲巴士站，一架黐一架，就埋站嗰陣時大家都睇到，任何地方嘅巴士站，佢嘅設計嘅擺位都係一架貼一架，因為兩架同時上都係貼到好埋嘅，咁你如果有嗰個裝置嘅，就成日會響嘅。同埋你話過線，提示過線，我哋巴士好大型嘅，喺市區或者其他路段行，或者埋站嘅時候，我哋好多時或者有其他阻礙，或者有架車--紙皮車仔，或者有咩，或者有架車泊喺度，咁我哋都係騎住線嘅，咁咪成日響囉。同埋我哋一扭，扭出去，好多時都兩、三條線嘅，或者轉彎嘅時候，所以係好多時候係唔可以喺一個好完整嘅路線，嗰個火位嗰度由頭行到尾嘅，好多時會騎少少位嘅，咁係咪係咁響、係咁響呢？

即係呢方面，所謂神眼，就係佢只係向前嘅，除非就日後嗰個技術係前後左右佢都兼顧到嘅，咁就會好啲。如果而家咁樣，就係暫時唔係好適合。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住 6(c)，監察司機裝置，監察...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，頭--可唔可以再問一次？因為頭先重疊咗聲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個監察司機裝置，6(c)。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係講緊嗰個係話恰眼瞓嗰個，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個呢。

郭志誠先生：呢個而家九巴裝咗四架，喺度實驗緊，有啲車長反應就係唔贊成，佢嘅原因就係話，因為個鏡頭係對住佢嘅樣嘅，咁廿四小時，佢好大壓力，好大壓力。同埋有一樣嘢，你裝呢樣嘢嘅時候，你一定係同時係減停車長嘅工作時數，否則的話，可以話畀大家聽，九成司機都有恰眼瞓嘅情況，好短暫嘅，時間太長嘞，咁呢個係無可避免嘅。即係我哋唔好自欺欺人，裝咗就提醒你，咁即係你如果話要裝嘅，如果公司愛嚟懲罰你，即係對工--對車長係...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我唔明白你嘅意思，你就話九成嘅司機都會恰眼瞓，你頭先係咪咁講？即係因為工作時數長？

郭志誠先生：係嘞，好多時都--即係唔係話瞓著，即係恰一恰囉，即係...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係唔好喇，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：即係眼簾會垂低囉，呢個係我唔會呃大家嘅，咁你「嘩，你啲司」--即係我哋啲車長咁樣㗎？咁事實係囉。咁係嘞，即係我哋好多其他後面我哋都有提出嘅，其實係巴士公司個管理唔好嘅，即係我哋都有提出嗰個叫做居住為本，咁你而家九巴五、六間廠，佢就屯門廠喺--要你喺九龍灣返，屯門廠出嚟荔枝角廠得一班工程車嘅啫，個個都兩、三點要起身，係咪呀？咁巴士工作嗰個時數你又計佢開工嗰刻，咁呢啲時間--係嘞，即係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，唔該晒。

黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住就係關於安裝係安全帶，喺所有座椅都係安裝安全帶，你哋工會支唔支持呢樣嘢？

郭志誠先生：為咗減低意外嗰個傷亡，我哋係贊成。但係就希望就好似其他旅遊巴或者咩嘢咁，淨係喺打橫嗰度拉埋嚟，就唔係話箍住膊嗰啲，因為嗰啲有好多人唔識纜，好多乘客或者小朋友唔識纜。其實就係會有啲唔方便嘅，落車嘅時間就會慢咗，可能有啲人除唔甩，唔識除。但係為咗安全，就係目前嚟講，未有其他，因為咁多危險因素裏面，未有其他保障乘客方面，我哋係贊成嘅，所有--係嘞，落安全帶希望係用打橫方式嗰個。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後就係專營巴士車長訓練方面，請你睇第十八段，呢度話工作小組同意運輸署應該係發出一份實務守則，係關於訓練專營巴士車長嘅，你...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度其實有兩部分，呢度就話，即係我哋亦都收到運輸署嘅陳述書話畀我哋聽，實務守則已經發出。而郭生，我哋想問你嘅就係，你哋工會有冇收到一份呢啲嘅實務守則？

郭志誠先生：係冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇係問過你哋意見，關於檢視訓練車長安排，點樣去監察，同埋係點樣去規管訓練方面？

郭志誠先生：係冇嘅，其實我哋可以有好多意見。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請睇第 19 段，上面就寫咗訓練安排嗰個嘅架構，喺呢一個實務守則方面，即係佢哋係無論係全職、兼職都好，都係有一啲嘅定期訓練，同埋為特別目的而設嘅訓練。首先，你支唔支持呢樣嘢？

郭志誠先生：支持嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第 20 段，呢度就話，定期巴士車長嘅訓練應該包括呢啲單元，仲有係比呢啲嘅--同埋比重，咁係由(a)至到(e)，包括安全駕駛同道路安全、認識車內裝置設施、處理事故、顧客服務、認識公司規則、交通規例、職業安全及健康。你對於呢啲嘅係比重--單元嘅比重，有冇任何嘅意見？

郭志誠先生：其實佢呢啲課程，我可能都有--會有啲認識嘅。但係你要記住，啲車長就係，你就咁講，即係你好似讀書咁講畀佢聽，佢好多嘢係掌握唔到嘅，即係唔係好明嘅。即係過往我哋喺訓練學校裏面，就係導師講埋答案畀你剔，咁個個一百分嘅。咁交番運輸署，或者 check 番啲資料，畀高層、管理層、董事監或者係可能委員會去睇下，睇下啲數據，個個都一百分，咁呢方面就唔係好理想嘅。

其實就喺個訓練裏面，我哋啲車長就--嗰個課程裏面，其實我哋應該係用嗰啲數字量化畀佢聽，譬如嗰個距離係點計，譬如我哋車同我哋巴士係 50，最高

去到 70，咁我哋點樣計出嚟嘅，1 公里就 1,000 米，70 公里就係乘番 70，就係等於 70,000 米，再除番 60，咁就等於每分鐘係行咗幾多，再除多 60，等於每秒鐘，咁每秒鐘就係 19.5 米。咁你如果你行緊 70 嘅時候，你要停低架車嘅時候，你就量化到嘞，量化到，佢就認識「我哋去到嗰度，要行幾多。」因為佢有個量，有個數量畀佢知道，70 原來一秒鐘可以行到 19.5 米嘅；60 行到 16.6 米；50 行到 13.8 米；40 公里就每秒鐘行到 11.1 米；30 公里就佢就每秒鐘行到 8.3。因為你量化，咁佢哋容易明啲。你哋成日話兩秒距離，兩秒距離係幾多？你當時行緊幾多？佢成日話遠啲喇，遠啲喇，三秒、四秒，咁喺香港好多環境嘅時候，點會大家個距離係隔到三至四秒呢？但係你要畀佢認識到，知道車速係乜嘢，車速係乜嘢，嗰盞燈我哋應唔應該去衝佢。

其實以前係有教嘅，咁以前係點教，就係去到第一個箭咀嘅時候，我哋就收晒油；去到第二個箭咀嘅時候，如果未轉燈，我哋可以畀少少油，加啲動力過埋佢。即使去到個頭轆過咗第--嗰條停車線，因為我哋係巴士，有企位，嗰個情況之下，我哋係應該係去埋嘅。但係而家嘅訓練就冇講呢樣嘢，「總之你喺條線停喇。」咁好多時嗰啲乘客或者街外人唔明白，「巴士衝黃燈，衝黃燈。」其實以前就都有同交通部或者係訓練學校有教過嘅，我哋點樣會--即係而家又話咩嘢閃燈嗰啲，其實嗰啲閃燈都好，有時啲人你閃咗幾多秒，有啲人會博衝嘅，但係你如果有一個習慣...

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外一個問題就係工作時數，喺你嘅第一份嘅文件，中文就係第 88 頁，係工會 1A 嘅文件，而英文文件就係第 90-7 頁，中文就 88 頁。第五段，你話「車長安全合理工時應該最高都係每日十二小時，而駕駛時數最高就係十小時。」我想問下你嘅意見或者你工會嘅意見，對於呢一個係兩味更，就係話最高嗰個工作時數去到十四小時？

郭志誠先生：即係你想講呢個問題？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋想你畀我哋嘅意見，或者你公司--或者你嘅工會對於呢個兩味更嗰個指引，話最高就係工作時數十四小時，最多係揸車十小時，最起碼有三個小時嘅休息，你嘅睇法係點？

郭志誠先生：其實而家嘅指引係最高駕駛時數係十一小時嘅，如果根據呢幾日大家個委員會成日提議就話三小時休息，十四小時，係出年第二季先開始嘅，而家就喺 2010 年嗰個指引，就係十四個鐘，最高工時十一個鐘，就冇指定中段休息係要幾多時間，係冇指定。咁係出年第二季先開始實行嘅，其實而家係好多係休息...

主席： That's why --

郭志誠先生：...個零、兩個鐘頭，兩個零鐘頭，包埋食飯，咁佢--點解運輸署會就佢，咁佢而家到到出年第二季，有個空窗期嘅，有個空窗期，佢就儘量用盡...

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，唔該。第二年嘅第二季就係話呢啲嘅指引係會全面實施嘅，係咪呀？係咪咁呀？

郭志誠先生：講就係嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我就問下你，呢啲嘅指引話要起碼連續三小時嘅休息，九巴而家係有冇實行？

郭志誠先生：冇硬性規定，條條路線唔同，咁佢有啲加走直頭冇啱，畀番個鐘頭你食飯，用盡佢十一個駕駛嘅時數，有時超咗少少嘅，即係過鐘咁樣。即你而家就運輸署冇硬性規定，佢咪走呢啲罅囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）你集中呢個問--回答呢個問題，九巴有冇開始實施減低，或者係實施話要連續休息三小時，喺呢啲兩味更嘅安排，即係話當值時數係十四個小時，但係最多只可以駕駛十個小時，九巴有冇喺某啲嘅路線開始呢一個嘅安排？

郭志誠先生：目前唔會，佢而家唔夠人手，係十一鐘頭駕駛，唔係十個，十個鐘頭係我哋建議。目前嚟講，係十四--最高十四小時，就駕駛時間係十一小時，中段而家就係三十分鐘，即係日後，出年嗰個第二季就係，如果一段時間係有連續駕駛六個鐘頭，有四十分鐘，一定要有四十分鐘休息，目前就係三十分鐘嘅啫。九巴就係目前嚟講，係冇執行呢樣嘢，即係中段休息三個鐘，有啲係冇嘅，兩個幾鐘又去唔到邊度。

咁我哋呢度有個同事係特別車，佢其實係有個電郵畀過--發表過意見畀委員會，但係佢可能電郵錯咗，咁委員會收唔到，咁琴日佢同我哋講嘅。我希望如果委員會可以--佢係特別車嘅，月薪嘅，佢如果--佢喺我哋隔籬，如果委員會可以畀少少時間佢講下，等佢發揮--發表下自己特別車嘅心聲，希望委員會...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪黃先生？好呀，黃先生，你講下，你係咪揸兩味更？呢個星期有冇揸兩味更？

黃健威先生：而家係工傷嘅，唔好意思。我本人就揸咗特別更一年，其實中段嘅休息係...

主席：（經傳譯員）你最後一次揸兩味更係幾時？

黃健威先生：6 月 26 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以--你記唔記得你嗰日嗰個工作安排係點？幾多點鐘離開屋企？幾時係當更？幾時休息？喺邊度休息？

黃健威先生：6 點 15 分起身，六點半出門口，跟住返工，搭車，去到美孚之後轉兩程工程車，去到 7 點 35 分拍卡，然後開始開車。直至到上段嘅時間，係開 11:40，開落去奧運站，一個鐘頭嘅食飯，至到中段休息係兩個鐘頭四十七分鐘，下段嘅開始車時間係 15 點 55 分。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋唔趕㗎，黃先生，或者你慢慢形容。你喺邊度住？

黃健威先生：葵盛西邨。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你六點半離開葵盛西邨，嗰朝早，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）跟住你去美孚，係咪？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你搭咩車去？

黃健威先生：坐 37 號巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）係乘客，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你去到美孚，你點呀？

黃健威先生：跟住轉工程車，去昂船洲嘅九巴車廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪九巴嘅公司車？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係車--係巴士定係一架私家車？

黃健威先生：一架旅遊巴，六十座嘅旅遊巴。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有其他嘅車長一齊，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）由美孚，你同其他嘅車長去到昂船洲，係咪？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾多點去到昂船洲？

黃健威先生：大概係 7 點 20 分。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰度有啲咩嘢設施，昂船洲嗰度？

黃健威先生：係一間九巴士嘅車廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）去到嗰度之後，你係咪打卡？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）點樣打卡㗎？

黃健威先生：用八達通喺電腦嗰度拍卡，之後會有張當日嘅行車單。

主席：（經傳譯員）你用你嘅八達通就電子咁樣7點35分朝早打卡，係咪？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）跟住會點呢？跟住點呀？

黃健威先生：之後會出咗個當日需要揸嗰部車嗰個車牌出嚟，然後就要上去上面停車場嗰度搵嗰部車，然後再開去站頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾多點鐘離開昂船洲？

黃健威先生：7點35。

主席：（經傳譯員）打卡番去，7點35，跟住就8點35分離開，咁之間做咗啲咩嘢？

黃健威先生：唔係，7點35分係離開昂船洲九巴車廠，由昂船洲嘅九巴車廠揸車去葵盛西邨嘅巴士總站，開第一班車8點鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係你喺巴士總站嗰度，就要揸架車去到葵盛西。咁嗰個係咩嘢嚟，係巴士總站定係咩嘢地方？

黃健威先生：葵盛西邨係個巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）係西？

黃健威先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁跟住你就揸嗰條路線，係嗰朝早8點開始，係咪？

黃健威先生：係，8點係第一個單。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個路線係幾多號？

黃健威先生：37號。

主席：（經傳譯員）個終點站係邊度，嗰條路線？

黃健威先生：奧運鐵路站。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你繼續講畀我哋聽嗰日嘅事情吖。

黃健威先生：之後--因為係我係做特別更，繁忙時間，之後就會私牌，即係暫停載客，就再私返去葵盛西邨，開9點31分，咁就一直做到去11點40分，係最後一轉，咁開落去奧運站，就上段係完成咗，咁大概個時間係12點45分左右。

跟住...

主席：（經傳譯員）你完咗早上嗰更，你係喺邊度㗎？

黃健威先生：部車要私牌，即係暫停服務，去揸番去葵盛東邨嗰度，擺低部巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪總站嚟㗎？

黃健威先生：都可以算係總站，係畀巴士食飯，又或者係畀下一個司機去接更，可以暫時停泊嘅位置。

主席：（經傳譯員）你去到葵盛東邨係幾多點？

黃健威先生：約 12 點 45 分左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你完咗 37 號路線嘅工作，係幾多點嘅事？

黃健威先生：正常個工時應該係 12 點 40 分，係一個鐘頭嘅行車時間，但係個時間就另外再加多一個鐘係食飯嘅。咁正常個時間係應該係兩點零八分，計埋食飯時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你喺邊度--當日你喺邊度食飯？

黃健威先生：喺葵盛東邨食飯。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰度有冇休息設施㗎？即係九巴嘅巴士嘅休息設施？

黃健威先生：之前係有，但係因為房署嘅問題拆咗，咁最近就好似我行過嗰陣時，係已經裝咗一個休息室，應該係一個禮拜嘅事情嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺 6 月 28 號嘅時候，喺葵盛東邨有冇任何嘅休息設施？

黃健威先生：呢個我唔清楚。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你喺邊度食飯㗎，嗰陣時？

黃健威先生：喺葵盛東邨嘅商場嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁食完飯，食飯時間仲未完，咁你點樣過剩餘嘅時間？

黃健威先生：再坐番車去葵盛西邨個站嗰度，然後喺嗰度嘅休息室嗰度休息。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你係搭咩嘢車去嗰度？

黃健威先生：有好多架車嘅，嗰度，有 47X、37M 同 37，都係搭巴士嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你搭巴士，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係乘客，以乘客身分？

黃健威先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）一個係固定嘅路線嚟嘅，唔係話揸特別更嘅車長揸㗎？

黃健威先生：我係特別更嘅車長，固定嘅路線，因為已經係掛牌嘅車長嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢樣我明，但係而家但係講緊你食緊飯嘅時間，就搭車由係東邨去西邨，你頭先就話，你話你係搭車，以乘客嘅身分，由東邨去西邨嘅，係嘛？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯，因為東邨嗰度係冇休息室可以畀我休息，只有西邨嘅巴士總站嗰度先有員工嘅休息室。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就喺葵盛西邨休息，係嘛？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰度嘅休息設施係點樣㗎？有冇座位，有冇長凳？

黃健威先生：有三張嘅長凳，同埋有幾張檯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁可唔可以瞓低㗎？

黃健威先生：淨係好似梳化咁樣，可以挨住。如果你話要完全好似張床咁瞓低，係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但你可以挨後挨低嘅，係嘛？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁幾時係完咗你嘅休息時間？

黃健威先生：去到 15 點 55 分。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你呢一個當日嘅休息時間係幾長？幾時開始呢個休息時間？

黃健威先生：連埋食飯嘅時間，約係兩個鐘頭四十七分鐘左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾點開始㗎？

黃健威先生：個行車個時間表就應該係計埋食飯，就應該係兩點零八分開始，至到 15 點 55 分。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。跟住你就繼續做呢一個駕駛嘅工作嘞，係嘛？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪再揸 37 號車定係另外一條路線？

黃健威先生：都係37號車。

主席：（經傳譯員）你揸呢條路線係幾耐？

黃健威先生：一年。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，係嗰日，即係嗰日揸呢條路線係揸到幾多點？

黃健威先生：哦，揸到係20點43分，呢個係收工嘅時間，包埋去番昂船洲放低架巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以即係話，即係打--即係嘟卡走嘞，嘟卡離開，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘟卡入就係朝頭早嘅7點35分，係嘛？

黃健威先生：7點35分前。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁幾點嘟卡即係返工入去㗎？

黃健威先生：工程車返到昂船洲就係7點20分左右去拍卡嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）當日，即係完咗嘞，嘟卡走，你係咪直接返屋企定係有做其他嘢？

黃健威先生：直接返屋企。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講下，返到屋企係幾點？

黃健威先生：大概係九點四個字左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）之後嗰日，即係6月29號，要唔要返工？

黃健威先生：我最後係工作到6月26號，因為我當日最後嗰一轉車返去葵盛西邨嘅時候，發生咗交通意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，26號，你係咪即係都有牽涉喺呢個交通意外裏面㗎？

黃健威先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）交通意外幾多點？

黃健威先生：7點20分。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰次交通意外嘅性質係咩嘢？

黃健威先生：係有一架的士喺三線嗰度，打橫切入嚟一線，入去小路櫸樹街，而我架車因為我係喺一線直行嘅，咁收唔切，咁撞咗落架的士嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇受傷呀，你？

黃健威先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪由嗰陣時開始就放病假？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，我想跟進一下，你就講話休息嘅地方有三張凳嘅，通常就係同時間有幾多位嘅巴士司機會喺嗰度？

黃健威先生：應該有三至四位。因為每--即係佢哋其實係唔會係長時間，就可能係架巴士嚟到，有五、六分鐘咁嘅時--即係休息時間，咁入嚟坐下咁樣。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）咁夠唔夠位畀所有嘅司機，即係喺嗰個地方，夠唔夠畀位所有嘅司機同時間去休息？

黃健威先生：係足--應該係可以足夠容納到七至八個人嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該，唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生，我哋而家就會休息一陣，跟住 12 點係會繼續，即係跟番呢個鐘，唔該晒。

上午 11 時 43 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 59 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃生，你同我哋講話你駕駛呢條路線就係即係揸咗呢係一年㗎，係咪呀？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以，即係如果你記得的話呢，就係描述一下咁呢係 6 月 26 號倒數之前嗰個禮拜，咁你呢就係即係冇休息，連續駕駛呢一個嘅特別更係做咗幾多日呀？

黃健威先生：基本上我係一至六，咁係有陣時係休星期日嘅，即係連續五日到六日。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係五定係六日呀？定係你其實係可以改變呢個嘅模式㗎？

黃健威先生：係輪班輪休，所以正常係五日或者六日係放一日假。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你嘅係工作嗰個嘅時間模式，係咪大致都係一樣呢，即係話幾點嘟卡返，幾點嘟卡放？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯，係固定嘅時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果有需要，你會唔會同意九巴將佢哋有喺呢一個6月26號嘟卡返工去到巴士總站，你呢就係休息，跟住呢就係嘟卡離開，如果九巴有呢一啲嘅資料，你同唔同意我哋問九巴攞呢個資料呀？

黃健威先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同我哋講過休息設施，即係葵盛西邨嗰度嘅休息設施，有冇試過你休息嘅時候，即係喺呢個特別更休息嘅時候呢，要去第二度休息呀？

黃健威先生：有陣時會，因為太嘈嘅話係，太多人進出入，咁可能有陣時我會選擇返屋企嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題其實係問呀，有冇其他地方你係--即係除咗葵盛西邨呀，有冇其他地方你係真係有去過休息嘅呢？

黃健威先生：冇，因為淨係得葵盛西邨嗰度有休息室，咁葵盛東邨係我之前返工係仲未裝個員工休息室喺嗰度嘅。

郭志誠先生：咁呢度我想補充下呢就好--喺呢一...

主席：（經傳譯員）等等，等等，等等。等等，一陣間會到你。歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。我想澄清你頭先黃生講嘅說話，你提過話你嘅休息就係兩小時四十七分鐘，包埋食飯嘅時間，即係加埋之後就兩小時四十七分鐘，係嘛？

黃健威先生：係，冇錯。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）你亦都提及，如果太嘈，你就會返屋企，所以如果你要返屋企的話呢，可唔可以估下喺嗰兩小時四十七分鐘裏面呢，你可以即係休息到咩程度先至繼續返工呢？

黃健威先生：其實休息個時間係真係唔夠，只係瞇埋隻眼，係養神嘅方式去儘量將自己個狀態去保持到最好。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭生你想講嘢㗎，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：係，就係嘞，咁葵盛東嗰度就好似呢幾日已經裝番個休息室嘅，咁呀我哋工會協助嘅，搵過周偉雄議員協助，咁呀好短時間佢哋就完成咗，即係我哋

都有提及過，我哋工會係主動介入嘅，因為我哋工會係冇政治背景，所以呢就想促成嗰啲事情呢，我哋會親身落區遊說當地嗰啲，主要其實反對係區議員，咁如果地方冇反對呢，就係政府部門嘅問題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以呢澄清幾樣嘢呀，黃生，你話呢你就喺呢一個嘅七點三十五分之前呢嘟卡返工，跟住呢就兩點零八分就係食飯，咁即係中間有大約呢個六個鐘頭五十分鐘先至放食飯，咁所以我就想知嘞，你中段時間會唔會有啲小休，即係喺嗰六個鐘頭五十分鐘裏面，會唔會有啲小休㗎？

黃健威先生：因為我最後上段嘅開車係時間係十一點四十分，咁行車時間係一個小時，咁我一個小時，如果我係揸--因為當時個路面其實係暢通嘅，咁我係可以揸埋架車返去葵盛東邨嗰度放低架車。即係比原定個時間係早，因為個交通流量冇咁大，所以係完全暢通嘅，咁可能係提早就返去，咁但係我實質個工作係冇 break time 嘅，當時。或者係我可以提供個時間表去畀大家參考下，咁可能會大家清楚啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好呀，我哋想知道你哋嗰個嘅休息時間係點樣安排，即係喺第一更嘅時候。因為我呢想知喺嗰六個鐘頭五十分鐘裏面，係想知道點樣安排嗰啲嘅小休時間呀，所以如果你畀到時間表我哋就最好嘞。就於你提及過嘅食飯時間一個鐘頭，咁係咪包埋咗喺嗰三個鐘頭連續嘅休息時間，係嘛？

主席：（經傳譯員）佢冇承認話係呢個係有執行呢個連續三小時嘅休息時間，係咪呀郭生？冇執行到呢樣嘢，冇推行㗎，係嘛？

郭志誠先生：我都講咗係，2019 年第二季先實行嘅，而家係完全畀公司一個彈性，總之你當日十四個鐘，就唔能夠超過十一鐘頭係駕駛時間，其他就係任佢，咁呀其實係嚴格嚟講冇乜休息時間，因為佢而家因為唔夠人，佢用盡你，以前呢就係四點--三點、四點，即係我哋報告嗰度都有寫，最初嗰個時候就係上晝六點就至到十一點幾，跟住下晝三、四點先出嚟，咁樣嘅，以前嘅安排就係，咁佢而家就唔夠人嘞，咁變咗佢呢啲已經三點已經係晏㗎嘞，有啲就叫你直頭做第二條線，提早...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，郭生，問題好簡單。唔該晒，黃律師繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問黃生問題關於特別更嘅津貼呀，咁九巴係咪會畀一個減咗嘅，係咪即係$21.9 呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪如果你--即係你做呢個特別更嘅時候呢，就會有呢個每小時$21.9？

黃健威先生：麻煩你等一等。因為正確佢個特別更津貼，每一日係$69.7。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係總數，唔係每小時計？

黃健威先生：呢個係總數嚟嘅，$69.7，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係嗰個嘅休息時間有幾多個小時呀？

黃健威先生：兩個鐘頭四十七分鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師請繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以再講一講關於呢一個係更嘅津貼，九巴嘅1號文件，呢個係問黃生嘅，請你揭去九巴文件1號，呢一個嘅109頁，有一個表，個表呢就寫咗嗰個津貼嘅。

黃健威先生：主席，有少少嘢想補充，$21.9係日薪員工嘅計法，而我$69.7係月薪員工嘅計法。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你前面有冇呢份文件呀？109頁。

黃健威先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）想請你睇一睇左手邊嗰直欄，就係呢一個嘅2004年之前入職嘅底薪，係咪即係話佢哋畀你嘅係$11,810定係15,366欸呀，邊個係適用於你呢？

黃健威先生：$15,366。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁跟住你就有一個特別更津貼，就係$1,951.5，係咪成個月㗎？即係畀一啲月薪嘅車長？

黃健威先生：係要計日數嘅，咁如果係返唔足十五日嘅話，係攞唔夠嘅。簡單啲嚟講就係按比例。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以話畀我聽，由(b)一路去到(g)，你會收到幾多嘅額外津貼？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋太過細節嘞，其實睇呢啲數字，我哋都知㗎喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁或者我去另外一個嘅話題嘞。郭先生，我想同你講另外一個嘅議題，就係你喺文件度有提到嘅，就係有一條巴士專線嘅問題。第90-7頁就係英文，中文呢就係第88頁。

呢度就話，當一個嘅巴士呢係畀咗一個信息係要離站呢，咁其他嘅車輛應該係停咗佢，就畀咗巴士出咗先，咁呢就要有一個呢兩秒，鄰線嘅車輛就係畀巴士切入，咁係禁止巴士喺前方不足十米外切入前方巴士，尾巴士係需要突然間減速而令車輛乘客受傷，喺你嘅文件裏面，你係畀一啲嘅例子嘅，就係講到切線嘅問題。喺工會文件104頁去到108頁。喺紅磡站嗰個嘅問題。你係咪建議呢你希望有一個巴士優先嘅系統，好似類似星加坡嘅咁，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：係，係。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於話必須要係畀巴士駛出站先...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講係巴士站嗰度係...

郭志誠先生：係，係呀，係呀，正確，巴士站。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇咩嘢睇法係點可以執行得到呢？

郭志誠先生：頭先講咗係用一啲鏡頭，即係而家新車嗰啲側邊都有鏡頭嘅，咁我哋發出咗信號，或者兩秒，咁後面架車唔停嘅，我哋呢咁就可以執法。

主席：（經傳譯員）需要喺車嘅後面裝鏡頭，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：而家係有左右兩邊，新車嗰啲左右兩邊喺個倒後鏡後面有嗰個側鏡鏡頭嘅，影住後面，咁點解話係兩秒呢，大家都清楚兩秒距離，咁呀政府都宣傳，點解要兩秒呢，就畀佢有個安全嘅情況，即係唔使佢突然間緊急停車，咁呀如果好似新加坡嘅做法呢就畫條線呢，咁好可能就大家會有啲誤會嘞，我啱啱過咗條線，或者啱啱到嗰條線你打燈，咁呀會有個誤差喺度，咁兩秒呢大家有個量化，量化兩秒，即係我建議兩秒，你可能可以建議三秒，咁呀即係我係量化畀大家參考，唔係話兩秒就--我話兩秒就兩秒，就冇呢個問題。

香港地方小，你話同埋巴士站多，你個個巴士站畫條線，人哋都唔知係做乜，因為你煩係香港嗰啲道路交通標記呢，你要畫一條線或者係乜嘢呢，你要喺之前要戙牌嘅，同埋要刊憲嘅，每一個咁變咗係好繁複。嗰啲線行行下咁可能甩咗，咁你變咗實行起上嚟就唔係咁好，咁呀用時間嚟做，比較安全。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）另外一個嘅問題呢就係關於安全嘅訓練，喺你第一份嘅文件，中文 84 頁，英文就係 90-4。你係講到安全嘅訓練，你就話當時呢，當以前呢，嗰個嘅交通都係比較簡單，而我亦都係對於路面熟習喇，我哋都需要訓練一個月，而喺呢個月嘅訓練期，大部分嘅時間都係訓練駕駛巴士嘅，你係評論而家嘅訓練呢係十八日係唔夠㗎。我嘅摘要係咪正確呢？你工會嘅意見就係話而家對於新聘嘅巴士車長嘅訓練係唔夠㗎，係咪呀？

郭志誠先生：正確，正確嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你建議訓練要幾長呢，對於一啲新入職嘅車長？

郭志誠先生：其實就都關乎一個經營問題，咁呀一個月係適中，除非佢本身有巴士牌，如果要入嚟巴士公司考牌嘅呢，一個月係唔可以少嘅，尤其是佢而家嗰個聘請個條件愈嚟愈低，咁呀上次聽證會，運輸署就話同巴士公司研究，有一年私家車牌就可以畀佢入去巴士學習駕駛，跟住十八日咁又話畀佢出嚟營業嘞，係非常危險嘅。係即係唔成熟嘅考慮嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你呢度就係評論喇，喺你嘅回應嗰度嘅評論，係 7 月 25 號 2018 年呢就係講到運輸署嘅喺訓練嘅角色...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你就咁樣摘要個論點喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰一個論點就係話，你評論呢運輸署應該係有更積極嘅角色嘅，喺車長課程嘅訓練同埋監察方面，你喺 7 月 25 號嘅意見書係咪咁嘅意思呀？

郭志誠先生：係，係需要運輸署嘅監管嘅，因為你就咁巴士公司整個訓練課程出嚟，佢係就晒佢自己吖嘛，就晒佢自己嘅需要，咁就唔會考慮其他人，咁運輸署係應該係要有監管，咁呀最好同嗰啲工會商討下，因為我哋係在職，知道專業巴士車長係需要咩嘢條件，咁就應該開放啲大家傾下，咁呀會好好多。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，我嘅問題問完嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。郭先生，我哋今朝畀你嘅問題已經係完成嘞，咁你一開始嘅時候話你呢仲有其他嘅材料呢係想畀我哋嘅，如果你想我哋收到呢啲材料呢，就係請書面畀我哋，跟住我哋就會考慮嘅，你係咪打算向我哋提交多啲嘅材料呢？

郭志誠先生：做得到就會嘅，如果即係委員會仲有啲時間先會完善成個諮詢，咁如果我哋得到，趕到又會儘快提交，咁呀係嘞，等委員會參考下。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋希望收到呢你打算畀我哋嘅資料。目前為止呢我哋多謝你今朝呢嚟到係提供意見，亦都多謝黃先生畀我哋知道呢一個揸特別更嘅車長一日嘅日程係點樣，係對我哋好有幫助㗎。咁我哋而家仲有另外嘅一啲嘅工會嚟到係作供，咁我哋而家呢就係會短暫休息，咁請貴工會呢就係離席，咁我哋就會有其他工會代表係就座，我哋而家會係小休兩分鐘，唔該。

下午 12 時 27 分聆訊押後

下午 12 時 31 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）李生同埋你嘅同事，歡迎你哋嚟到，多謝你哋就代表九巴職員權益工會接受我哋嘅邀請，嚟到今日畀口述證供，一陣我會叫黃律師開始問你哋問題，佢哋係代表檢討委員會嘅。李生，如果你想由其中一位同事答的話呢，你就向我哋講係邊一位，咁跟住呢就可以由嗰位同事去答㗎。

李國華先生：明白。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，呢個委員會呢工作係要檢--從呢一個安全角度檢討專營巴士嘅運作，所以我會集中呢方面，喺我未問問題之前呢，我就想先確定咗一啲基本嘅資料，係有關於你嘅工會先。你嘅工會呢係喺 2017 年嘅 1 月成立㗎，係嘛？

李國華先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）大約有二百位嘅會員，即係截至到 2018 年 6 月 18 號。

李國華先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你哋嘅二百位會員呢，全部都係全職或者兼職嘅員工，受聘於九巴？

李國華先生：冇錯，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰個比例係幾多呀？即係個百分比？

李國華先生：全九巴有八千六百幾個車長，我哋有二百會員。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔係呀，我想講嘅就係話幾多個百分比係兼職，幾多個百分比係全職呀，即係你哋嘅會員嚟計？

李國華先生：我哋得一個兼職嘅會員，其他全部都係全職。

主席：（經傳譯員）全部都係巴士車長，係咪呀？

李國華先生：有站長，有三位站長。

主席：（經傳譯員）其餘都係巴士車長，係嘛？

李國華先生：冇錯，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，喺你嘅陳述書裏面呢，我就想睇一睇有關於係呢啲嘅喪失嘅時間同埋一啲訂定咗嘅班次呀，想請你睇呢 129-4 頁，你哋只係呢畀咗一份嘅陳述書我哋，日期就係 18 年嘅 4 月 23 號，咁中文版就係 117 頁。咁有關嗰段呢就喺 120 頁。

喺屘嗰段呢，你就話車長不斷流失，咁仍然要係維持同埋呢係減少脫班嘅情況，所以呢車長就係原有嘅休息時間呢，咁呢就會係因為要兼任其他路線喇，係即係喺呢個期間呢，希望有多啲休息機會呢，會視乎當時路線嘅情況呢，嘗試儘快完成該路線回到總站，爭取時間休息。可唔可以講一講，或者再解釋，或者解釋一下，點解要維持呢一個嘅係即係嗰個巴士嘅程--即係個巴士嘅規劃路線呢會影響到休息嘅時間呀？即係為咗維持班次，影響到休息時間。

李國華先生：係，巴士公司係將嗰個嘅時間表，嗰個--打個譬如，本身一條路線有一

個鐘頭時間行車嘅，咁佢縮到五十八分鐘，或者五十五分鐘畀你行車，咁嗰啲車長咪本身嘅休息時間已經少，但係如果你將嗰個班次嗰個時間更加縮短，縮短幾分鐘，咁佢哋已經係少咗幾分鐘嘅休息時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以確認一下，要完成路線，但係時間就少咗，會唔會呢引致巴士車長即係更加有機會會超速呀？

李國華先生：會嘅，因為要趕住--趕番啲時間去爭取自己嘅休息時間，咁係咪要將嗰個車速會--雖然架巴士 70 公里啫，但係喺其他路段可能會行 50，佢都可能會行 70，咁呢啲咪導致嗰個車長嗰個壓力嚟囉。佢要追番啲時間吖嘛，追唔到佢咪要喺啲路段嗰度咪要超速行駛，嗰個路段行 50 佢都可以分分鐘要行 70，或者先追得番嗰啲時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽過一個系統，一個監察嘅系統嚟㗎，係監察車長，就有啲嘅係界限係定咗喺黑盒裏面，就唔可以超過時速限制嘅，譬如可能呢就係呢一個車速限制 50 呢，就會將個界限定咗喺呢一個 55 嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）你其實係講緊邊個人嘅證供呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我引用嘅證供就係城巴嘅，我就想問嘞，會唔會有一個類似嘅系統應用喺九巴嗰度，即係一啲路段係時速限制 50，會有咁樣嘅設定呢？

李國華先生：有嘅，九巴都有個叫我哋俗稱叫「黑盒」，咁佢哋每一個行車嘅紀錄，我哋叫行車紀錄儀，記錄晒所有架巴士日常嘅運作，都可以喺個黑盒度搵得番嘅。咁公司會定期 check 呢個黑盒呢，就係話某些車長，你當時邊年邊月邊日，嗰日你行嗰個路段，你曾經超速幾多，咁九巴有呢個系統嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道係定咗咩嘢界限呀，即係有關於路段如果時速限制係 50 嘅話...

主席：（經傳譯員）係九巴喺黑盒，即係行車紀錄儀裏面定咗嗰個嘅界限。

李國華先生：我唔係好明你問乜嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽過證供，或者我解釋一下，我哋聽過另外一個--即係另外一間公司城巴嘅證供，就係話如果嗰段路段定咗時速限制係 50 公里的話，佢哋就會喺黑盒裏面定一個嘅界限，就係 55 公里，如果巴士車長超過 55 公里的話呢，即係話如果係喺一段時間，譬如話係十秒，連續十秒超過時速 55 公里的話呢，就會自動記錄呢一個嘅資料，然之後會自動發出一個特殊報告，跟住呢就會相應咁係懲罰呢一個車長，因為佢超過咗呢一個限制。

而家螢光幕會見到，咁呢就係話超過咗係時速 55 公里，連續十秒，而嗰段路段呢時速限制係 50 公里，另外如果佢哋係行車超過 75 公里，為時超過十--連續十秒，而該段路段個時速限制係 70 公里，咁你知唔知道呢，即係你--即係作為車長，喺九巴對於九巴嘅車長，有冇一個類似嘅系統呀？

李國華先生：有嘅，有嘅。因為九巴嗰個，我哋理解呢就話佢嗰個黑盒呢，就係記錄你當時嘅車速，你平均嘅你--打個譬如，係行78公里，即係架車超咗8公里，佢就睇你嗰個時間，如果你喺十秒之內，你收油呢，就係冇紀錄嘅，但係你超過十秒都唔收油呢，就係有紀錄嘅。即係50公里嗰度係一樣，70公里嗰度都係一樣，係睇你行幾多，超咗幾多公里，你有到嗰個時間先會有，用個時間去計，十秒就係你收油就係冇事嘅。如果你唔識收油呢，繼續都係咁樣行呢，就會有警告信，或者會扣獎金呀嗰啲嘢嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）等我理解下，你嘅意思係咪指即係架車係可以一路行78，只要係唔再--即係唔再加快行快啲，即係話要返--收番去，落番去呢個--喺十秒之內落番去70？

李國華先生：係，十秒之內要收油返到去70公里。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提及會扣津貼...

李國華先生：獎金，獎金。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係呢個獎金。喺咩嘢嘅情況之下會扣獎金，同埋扣幾多呀？

李國華先生：我哋而家九巴將嗰兩份獎金合成咗，叫做我哋嘅底薪，咁以前未合成嘅時候，分咗兩個獎金制度，一個就係服務獎，一個叫安全獎，咁呀每一個有一千七百幾蚊一個月嘅，咁呀我哋日薪，一千七百幾蚊一個月呢，咁佢哋呢就嚴重嘅會扣一個月，即係你有交通意外，嚴重嘅，佢就會扣你一個月，如果通常都會扣半個月㗎嘞，即係如果有問題發生嘅時候，服務獎都係一樣，你畀人投訴得多，亦都喺嗰度會畀公司扣錢嘅，都係半個月或者一個月。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰啲都係歷史嘞，係咪呀？而家再冇獎金呀，唔會再有扣獎金嘅問題嘞？

李國華先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果個車長超速，或者呢係有一個嘅報告，就係話佢超速嘞，咁佢會唔會受罰㗎？

李國華先生：睇嗰個佢犯嘅次數喇，公司會睇佢犯嘅次數，同埋嗰個相隔幾久，你個個月都有嘅，一定會扣你錢，如果咁樣我隔咗一年，或者隔咗七、八個月，你先再犯呢，就都係會出警告信提你，提番嘅啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）根據而家嘅制度，仲係會有一個嘅扣嘅機制，就係視乎你違例呢係有幾頻密，係咪咁嘅意思呀？

李國華先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁喺邊度扣呀？

李國華先生：而家冇得扣，而家嗰啲獎金喺個底薪，加埋落底薪度，九巴已經冇嗰個扣獎金嘅制度嘞，只係話每犯一次呢，就會警--就會出封信畀你，如果你收咗三封信之後呢，你就會被解僱。

黃女士： So it is not a deduction from salary --

主席：（經傳譯員）黃女士，請等等。三封警告信就係會結果係咩嘢話？

李國華先生：被解僱。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）所以而家再冇話從人工度扣錢呢一個嘅制度，反而呢就係三封警告之後就會解僱，係咪呀？

李國華先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）下一個嘅問題呢就係關於訓練嘅。如果睇下第 129-6 英文版本，中文呢就係第 122 頁。你就係講到十八日嘅訓練課程，中文係--呢一個四個星期嘅駕駛訓練，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽兩者有咩嘢分別呢，喺四個星期同埋十八日嗰個課程呢，裏面嗰個內容有咩嘢唔同嘅呢？

李國華先生：現時九巴就行緊一個叫做由冇牌嘅，就用十八日連考牌嘅一個課程，咁課程入面係基本上同四星期嘅係差唔多，但係會濃縮咗好多，咁十八日嗰度就我哋認為係話嗰個訓練嗰個質素呢會下降嘅，真係佢入嚟做新車長嗰啲呢，我哋唔知佢係以前做--揸過咩嘢車呀，或者有冇揸過車嗰啲人，因為如果就算有揸過車，都係揸貨車，或者運貨呀嗰啲，或者揸的士呀嗰啲人多嘅，咁我哋一個大型巴士，咁呀係會一個叫做集體運輸嘅工具之一，咁佢哋訓練不足嘅時候，係咪會容易有交通意外呢？

同埋佢嗰個訓練嗰個時間，真係我認為係唔夠嘞。如果我哋自己--我本身入職，我做咗二十七年，入職嗰陣時係四個星期訓練，我本身已經有牌，有巴士牌嘅，咁都要訓練四星期，但係而家佢哋有牌嗰啲，即係而家九巴請有牌嗰啲，訓練咗七日咋，即係話係訓練路線呀，同埋嗰個--嗰啲叫做上嗰啲基本嗰啲課程，就七日已經係可以出嚟做一個叫做巴士車長，專業嘅巴士車長。

咁我哋本會呢認為呢就佢而家九巴嗰個訓練嗰個，而家咁多交通意外，牽涉有巴士嘅亦都好多，我哋即係我哋認為就係話，要訓練一個車長，起碼都要有四星期嘅時間去訓練，連埋啲課程呀，連埋嗰啲操路線呀，訓練嗰個路面經驗呀。亦都而家嗰個我哋建議呢就係話，嗰個每一個師傅，駕駛導師只可以帶兩個學員，以前我哋係帶三個學員，而家我哋希望公司嗰度改到係帶兩個學員，每一個駕駛導師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，明白。去睇一睇下一份嘅文件，運輸署 1，403 頁。中文版本第 416 頁。李生，呢一份係由運輸署徵詢過五個嘅專營巴士營辦商，同埋

三間主要巴士製造商之後呢，就有呢啲嘅建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個特別嘅工作小組，由運輸署成立嘅，喺 3 月中，而呢個工作小組係要三個月內呢，有一個嘅建議出嚟，咁佢哋就喺 7 月 20 號有呢啲嘅建議，呢份文件係提交畀立法會交通事務委員會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係包括三方面，第一，就係喺車輛裏面安裝嘅安全裝置，第二呢就係安全帶喇，第三呢就係車長嘅訓練。我第一個嘅問題就係運輸署或者九巴，有冇提供或者諮詢過你哋就呢啲嘅項目嘅意見喇，喺今年 3 月至到 6 月之間有冇諮詢過你哋呢？

李國華先生：冇嘅，我係第一次見呢份文件，係冇--公司冇諮詢過工會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我哋獲告知呢，最近就係運輸署係最近係向專營巴士營辦商發出一啲嘅指引，就係關於車長嘅訓練，等到呢不同嘅巴士營辦商嘅訓練係一致嘅，就係要由 2018 年 10 月開始實施。你有冇收到，或者你嘅工會有冇收到一份呢一個指引呢？

李國華先生：冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，繼續之前呢，就係話上個星期，我哋唔係問過運輸署有冇呢一份嘅作業守則畀我哋呢，我哋而家有冇呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）未有。最後一個問題，李先生我想問你嘅，你有二百幾個會員喇，我知道有部分係--唔係車長，但係大部分都係車長，佢哋有幾多係揸呢個特別更嘅呢？你知唔知？

李國華先生：我本人就係特別更車長，我本人都係。咁我知道，即係我冇認真統計過喇，但係我識嘅都有二、三十個都係特別更嘅車長，即係喺我哋嘅會員入面，都有二、三十個都係特別更嘅車長。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我哋聽到嘅證供就係話，嗰個嘅 2018 年 2 月嘅指引呢，係冇嚴格咁樣遵守或者實施㗎，係關乎嗰個嘅休息同埋連續三小時...

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅問題係咪嚴格遵守，其實嗰個嘅協議就係話，係要等到 2019 年第二季先至全面實施㗎，所以個問題應該係問，而家有冇呢係開始實行緊呢一啲嘅安排？

李國華先生：九巴嗰度未有，未有呢啲安排，就係而家嗰啲時間表呢，就都好多車，好多特別更嘅車，連休息連食--即係中段休息食飯都唔夠三個鐘。呢啲我哋有啲數字喺度嘅，因為我哋收集咗好多資料，關於呢啲特別更唔夠三個鐘頭，即係佢九巴就話夠三個鐘頭嘅，但係我哋係用佢嘅時間去計呢，就唔夠三個鐘頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個調查幾時做㗎？

李國華先生：兩個禮拜之前，我哋已經係陸陸續續係向嗰啲會員去詢問，咁呀得出嚟嘅結果有成都好多條線，都係唔夠三個鐘頭，好多路線同埋某一條路線嘅一啲我哋叫「字軌」，即係字軌嗰度呢，譬如咁講，258D 呀，嗰架 S5 呀，有啲係 60X 呀，有啲係 265B 呀嗰啲路線好多車都--好多字軌都係唔夠三個鐘頭休息連食飯嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇嗰啲調查結果嘅文本可以畀我哋睇下？

李國華先生：我哋而家係印咗，呢個係得兩個先喇，因為我哋印--因為嗰啲資料喺我部手機度，有啲資料我又唔方便畀嘅，因為都係公司嗰個受控文件，我哋影番嚟嘅啫，所以就呢啲我哋唔會傳閱，只有我哋睇到有呢啲咁嘅--部分伙計用呢啲方式咁樣畀我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲嘅資料你可以畀我哋嘅呢？有需要嘅你可以係油黑某啲嘅資料，等我哋知道你嘅調查有幾廣泛，譬如話有幾多個車長表示佢哋係冇呢個三個鐘頭嘅休息？

李國華先生：而家手頭上都係十幾個嘅路線同埋某一個--即係十幾條路線，中間有啲特別車嘅時間，咁呀佢哋個別畀我嘅，即係駐明係話邊條路線，邊個我哋字軌車，即係就係話呢條路線係寫咗出嚟呢，係公司自己做嘅時間表係寫咗出嚟，係唔足夠三個小時連食飯連休息。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何嘅資料可以畀我哋嚟到支持你嘅講法？

李國華先生：暫時我哋係呢度呢，我哋--呢度得番兩--我哋係印咗兩個時間嘅。如果係想睇嘅，我可以呢度可以畀你望一望。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，我哋而家都係午飯嘅時間嘞，或者你而家提供畀我哋，咁我哋可以將佢印咗喇，又將佢翻譯喇，我哋下晝兩點半呢就再復會嘅時候，我哋就問你問題，係關於呢一啲資料嘅。如果仲有其他嘅事情，你係有口供嘅，或者係我哋希望有證據嚟到係去支持，如果你有嗰啲嘅證據呢，請係向我哋提供。咁我哋而家就會食飯，下晝兩點半會繼續開始，唔該晒。

下午 1 時 01 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安。我哋有一份文件係你想交畀我哋嘅，我哋已經係做咗部分

嘅翻譯，或者我請黃女士處理，黃女士，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝，多議你提供呢份文件畀我哋，我哋摘錄咗同埋加大咗某一部分就講咗啲特別更嘅，我哋睇到一個例子，就係現時車長揸特別更嘅例子嚟㗎，呢條路線就係 258D。我哋可以睇到開始就係 6 點 50 分，收 13:43；然後又再喺下晝 4 點開始到晚上 8 點 15 分收，中間個休息時間只得兩個鐘頭十五分鐘，而唔係三個鐘頭。咁你可唔可以講畀我哋聽，呢個係幾時發生嘅呢？抑或係最近嘅例子？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋睇唔睇到個日期，呢度？係咪一個更表嚟㗎，即係顏色嗰部分睇唔睇到？係咪話 4 月 28 號？嗰個有個日期。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我睇唔到。

李國華先生：呢個時間表就係 7 月 9 號更改咗嘅，就係呢個時間表嚟嘅，係 7 月 9 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）今年？

李國華先生：係，係，今年，今年嘅 7 月 9 號，因為公司嗰度就係大改，就係呢啲我哋叫做「時間表」就大改，呢個係實行嘅日期係 7 月 9 號嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度係咪一幅相嚟㗎，即係有顏色，左手邊嗰部分係咪一幅相嚟㗎？係公司貼出嚟㗎？

李國華先生：唔係，唔係，呢啲係嗰個電腦--喺電腦嗰度影出嚟嘅，即係我哋公司嗰個電腦影到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，咁係幾時影呢張相嘅呢？

李國華先生：唔清楚，因為係啲員工提供畀我㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個電腦屏幕嗰度上面似乎有顯示一個日期，係 4 月--2018 年 4 月 28 日㗎，你睇唔睇到？喺頂嗰度，喺頂部。

李國華先生：哦，咁因為呢啲都係員工提供畀我嘅呢，我冇咁細節睇上面嗰啲細字，咁呢個就應該係 2018 年 4 月 23 號嘅。咁因為我哋公司最近一次大嘅執嗰個我哋叫做「更表」，就係 7 月 9 號好多路線都重新執過一次，但係呢幅相就係前日嘅--有啲員工攞畀--WhatsApp 畀我，話有啲咁嘅問題，咁我就用咗呢個，因為有一幅相，咁我就做咗嗰個例子。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰啲當更時間係咪所有特別更都適用，定係特殊情況？

李國華先生：呢啲係個別嘅路線同埋個別嘅每一條路線，嗰個我哋叫「字軌車」嘅適用，適用呢個--即係話呢架車--打個譬喻，呢個係 258D 嘅蛇五，咁佢呢個時

間表就係咁樣，如果蛇六又唔同㗎嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個更表係公司提供㗎？即係九巴提供㗎，係咪？你可唔可以再搵多啲例子畀我哋？

李國華先生：例如呢架 52X 嘅蛇七，咁佢哋嘅--喺早更嘅--睇下先，7 點 57 分拍卡，上段就收 12:07，但係佢下段開工就係 14 點 19 分，再要返去寶田攞車，咁中段時間得兩個幾鐘頭㗎咋，即係呢啲可以--呢啲例子都仲有幾個㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你想即係解釋嗰點就係話，譬如攞番第一個例子喇，一三--兩個鐘頭，13:25，即係嗰個休息時間少過三個鐘頭，你想講係呢一點，係咪？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李先生，你話--較早時候話畀我哋聽你係特別更司機嚟嘅都係？

李國華先生：係，冇錯，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁從你個人經驗，你可唔可以講畀我哋聽你一日個工作係點嘅呢？即係由你開始--工作開始計。

主席：（經傳譯員）你上一次係幾時開特別更嘅車？

李國華先生：1 月 14 號，因為 1 月 15 號我就因為交通意外整嘅到而家都未開過工㗎，我 1 月 14 號嗰日都--之前都係返緊特別更。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以幫到我哋，就係喺你最後嗰日你返工嘅時間係點嘅呢？

李國華先生：嗰日我哋--我要搵番嗰個時間表出嚟先。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你搵吖。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你揸車揸緊幾耐時間？

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，佢搵緊個時間表。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思。

李國華先生：我 1 月 14 號嗰陣時返緊嗰架特別車就上晝，即係 7 點 30 分簽到，咁就上段收工就係 11 點鐘左右就收工㗎喇，咁跟住就有一個鐘頭食飯，咁下段就開 16:11，跟住收工就係 21:29。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺你啱啱畀我哋嘅例子，你有冇三個鐘頭連續嘅休息時間？

李國華先生：哦，超過，超過三個--因為呢架車有四個鐘頭四十幾分叫做中段休息嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺 2018 年 1 月 14 號之前，你做特別更嘅司機做咗幾耐？

李國華先生：三年左右。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2018 年 1 月 14 號嗰更，你有超過四小時休息，呢啲係咪經常發生嘅呢，抑或--或者你可以話畀我哋聽你會點樣形容呢四個鐘嘅休息？

李國華先生：我都想補充一樣嘢，就係話每一條路線嘅設計嘅時間都唔同，咁有好多--我哋就住呢條--或者我自己本身嗰條路線就有六架蛇車，咁呢六架蛇車之中，係唯一一日，星期日就有一架蛇車少過三個鐘頭休息嘅啫，其他架架一至日都有足夠嘅--起碼超過三個半鐘頭嘅。咁我重點就係話有其他路線嘅設計嗰啲時間就係話少過--低於三個小時嘅休息，即係呢啲係話製造咗嗰個車長嘅疲勞駕駛嘅，佢因為得唔到足夠嘅時間，喺中段嗰度得唔到足夠嘅時間休息吖嘛，咁我點解話唔會話自己條線唔夠，因為佢係夠嘅，係夠時間休息嘅。就如果你個--條條路線都好似--呢個設計好似我哋自--我自己本身做緊嗰條路線嘅時間，我係絕對係接受嘅，但係有啲路線係冇吖嘛。我哋好多--而家舉咗幾個例子都係唔夠三個鐘頭吖嘛。但係我哋自己本身返--我自己做緊嗰架就足夠㗎嘛，啱嘛？咁公司唔會話就條條路線--因為條條路線嘅設計嗰個環境都唔同，咁我哋唔--只係提供就話嗰啲唔夠三個鐘頭嗰啲特別車嘅問題嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊啲路線？

李國華先生：九巴有好多條路線㗎喎，我好難提供到咁多，因為有幾百條路線，咁我都冇辦法提供晒㗎嘛。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺 1 月 14 號揸嗰條路線係咩嘢路線？

李國華先生：269D。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以睇番而家呢幅圖，你睇番 258D 蛇五，「蛇」點解，首先？

李國華先生：我哋嘅用個 "S" 字嗰啲車就係叫做「特別更」，即係代表特別更嘅意意啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢個 258D，你可唔可以講畀我哋聽呢條路線喺邊度開始，邊度係終站？

李國華先生：258D 係龍門居去油塘，去油塘嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪梅田？

李國華先生：寶田，寶田，即係屯門嘅寶田去油塘。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你知唔知道呢度係咪有足夠嘅設施㗎，呢條路線？

李國華先生：我唔係好清楚，但係寶田嗰個休息室就都好細，我哋知道就係已經--我

哋係喺屯門廠嗰度反映過，叫佢加大嘅，但係而家仲係申請緊，即係加大咗休息室。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你話你有同屯門車廠提出，係用咩嘢方式？係口頭定係書面？

李國華先生：全部口頭嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）同邊個講？

李國華先生：口頭，口頭嘅，屬廠嘅經理。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰位車廠經理係邊位？

李國華先生：溫惠賢（譯音）。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪 Debbie Wong 女士？

李國華先生：唔係，呢個溫惠賢先生嚟㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李先生，如果我冇理解錯誤，你喺九巴嘅時候就係二十七年做車長㗎喇？

李國華先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你識唔識得一個人叫做鄭桂興先生同埋或者 Gary Wong 先生？鄭桂興先生...

李國華先生：唔識。

黃女士： You don't know?

李國華先生： I don't know.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你個--喺九巴嘅工作經驗嚟講，你知唔知道係有冇個安全同埋品質控制嘅部門呢，喺九巴，喺 2010 年嘅時候？

李國華先生：有嘅，2010 年應--有嘅，我哋叫做安全--全名我唔係好記得喇，因為有個部門係叫做專係搞嗰個安全嘅，即係車長嗰啲安全訓練嘅，我就理解就係咁喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢個安全品質部門係會開會㗎？亦都會同車長開會㗎，有冇㗎？

李國華先生：我未聽過會搵--即係去同車長開會喎，我未聽過，亦都冇接觸過，或者冇被邀請過開呢啲會。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你點樣知道就有呢個安全品質嘅部門？

李國華先生：都係我哋平時喺同屬廠嗰啲主任、經理開會聽過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道有一個研究，就係 2010 年咁上下進行嘅，就係關於二十九個急彎嘅，咁就係基於某一啲嘅準則就係去辨認出呢啲嘅二十九個急彎，然後就係有一啲嘅措施就係站長係應該係跟隨，你知唔知道有個咁樣嘅研究？

李國華先生：唔知嘅，係未聽過添。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋清楚少少講喇，咁呢個研究嘅目的就係希望建議車長係點樣可以係揸呢啲急彎嘅時候揸得更加好，咁但係你就冇聽過，係咪呀？

李國華先生：冇，冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你之前講過，就係話你話你曾經就同嗰啲車長經理傾過，你就聽過關於呢個安全品質嘅部門，你知唔知道呢個部門有冇建議到一啲嘅措施，大概係 2010 年喇，就係一啲嘅措施去提議嘅呢，有冇聽過？

李國華先生：連有呢個部門我哋都未--即係未聽過呢個部門，會研究呀，研究急彎，佢哋係同我--諮詢過我哋--我都--即係我哋本會就未被邀請，但係有冇人邀請其他人，我就唔係好清楚喇，即係完全有--即係呢件事我係完全--應該講係全不知情。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁關於呢個部門，其實你哋傾嘅時候個內容係啲咩嘢，講緊乜嘢㗎？即係當你同個車廠經理去傾嘅時候，咁究竟係關--圍繞呢一個部門嘅時候，你係講緊啲咩嘢話題？

李國華先生：因為我哋好--即係我哋--呢個部門我係唔知，所以我哋冇就呢個部門去圍繞--即係傾內部嘅嘢，咁我哋同屬廠經理傾嗰啲就係圍繞咗我哋車長日常運作嗰啲問題嘅啫，咁關於安全嗰啲嘢就我哋同經理呢啲傾，就係冇傾過㗎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁最後一個題目我想傾嘅就係關於培訓嘅。我哋可唔可以睇睇 KMB1，即係九巴嘅一號文件，咁就係第 120 頁㗎。我會簡單介紹下係關於乜嘢嘅，就係九巴嘅一個回應嚟嘅，咁就係運輸署之前寫封信畀佢，就係 2 月 12 號嘅--2018 年 2 月 12 號嘅一封信件，就係關於招聘同埋培訓呢啲全職車長嘅事宜嘅，咁呢個就係喺 2018 年 2 月 10 號嗰個巴士慘劇之後發生嘅事。咁我就會想問一問關於全職嘅車長佢嗰個培訓係點樣樣嘢。李先生，你係--就係你個病假之前，你都係一個全職車長嚟嘅，就係--即係 2018 年 1 月 14 號之前，係咪？

李國華先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我就想問你喇，首先就睇呢個之前我就問一問關於培訓方面，係咪所有全職嘅車長佢哋--即係如果要申請嘅--考試嘅人，咁佢哋係咪都

係要係通過一個十八個鐘嘅培訓，咁每--十八日嘅培訓，咁每一日就係 9.5 小時嘅呢？

李國華先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁之後會唔會有一啲嘅重溫培訓㗎？如果你係全職車長之後，咁你入職之後會唔會有一啲重溫培訓？

李國華先生：有嘅，不過近呢十幾年就冇喇，因為之前我哋係話每兩年就會返公司就有一個叫做輔助駕駛嘅，咁就每兩年一次嘅，就要返去沙田學校嗰度就係接受一日嘅訓練嘅，即係溫習下嗰啲即係駕駛嘅態度、提高駕駛嘅技術方面嘅。咁而家就係冇喇，即係近呢十年都冇有呢個叫做嗰個每兩年一次嘅返學校嗰啲喇，即係而家係一個叫做你本身做車長，嗰一年有交通意外，咁就先至要返去嘅啫，如果你冇任何交通意外，係唔需要返去再培訓嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係有冇針對特別嘅路線係有一啲特別嘅培訓嘅呢，喺全職車長方面？

李國華先生：以我所知就有啲路線係一定要接受訓練嘅，咁例如過海線喇、行旺角，即係彌敦--旺角一帶嘅路線都要特別去訓練嘅，咁有一條就係--例如 64K 喇，即係行大埔公路嗰啲--唔係，大埔道嗰啲，同埋粉錦公路、林村一帶喇、大帽山嗰條 51 喇，嗰啲係要特登要訓練三日嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個同十八日嘅一般嘅訓練以外㗎，係咪呀？即係係一啲特別嘅路線喇，咁你就會係需要另外三日嘅特別嘅培訓，係咪咁？

李國華先生：係，冇錯，或者關於訓練呢方面，我搵我哋陳生幫幫我手。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生。

陳詠豪先生：主席先生，我啱啱之前就喺交通事務委員會就 2018 年 7 月 25 號舉行個會議，有另一份文件嘅，佢就係一個背景資料簡介，裏面嘅中文版本第 4 頁第 15 點佢有一樣嘢就咁樣引述番嘅，「九巴表示不論全職或兼職，巴士車長若果未有行駛某路線一個月或更長嘅時間，將需要再次練習行駛該路線」。咁我想畀主席先生知道，其實呢一個嘅--即係九巴講嘅佢呢番說話，其實就從來都冇喺我哋車長度實行過嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，可唔可以就幫我手睇下，搵一搵呢一個相關嘅文件？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係 TD-1 第 403 頁第五...

主席：（經傳譯員）第 15 段係講關於安全帶㗎喎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信係另一份文件嚟㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個背景資料。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪由--係立法會秘書署準備嘅呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個編號係幾多？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋嘗試而家喺網上操緊喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪喺嗰個文件夾嗰度冇㗎？好，我哋--我其實我已經睇過，但係我哋而家嘗試想睇一睇。

陳詠豪先生：係，冇錯，係呢度喇。係，就係呢一度喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，係咪喺我哋嘅文件夾度？可唔可以將嗰個文件碌上啲，等我哋睇到嗰個上文下理係到底幾時話報告過呢件事，或者我哋可以去第 13 段、14 段嗰度。咁呢度似乎有提及喺 2 月 15 號開嘅會議，咁跟住我哋而家可以去到第 15 段。係喇，呢度就有嗰個背景喇。可唔可以請你重複你嗰個論點，頭先，陳生？

陳詠豪先生：主席先生，我想提出嘅論點就係話九巴佢話係「無論全職或者兼職巴士車長，未有行駛某路線一個月或者更長時間，將需要再次練習行駛該條路線」，而呢一樣嘢由我入職到而家，公司都未有做過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾時入職㗎？

陳詠豪先生：15 年 3 月。

主席：（經傳譯員）請等一等，唔該。呢份係秘書處嘅文件，就搜集咗各類資料，係畀立法會議員嘅背景資料嚟㗎，就係講過去發生咩嘢事，咁呢個係指喺 2 月 15 號嗰次會議講嘅，嗰次會議有冇個會議紀錄？嗰個會議紀錄--應該嗰次會係有個會議紀錄㗎，係咪？存在㗎，係咪？咁等我哋可以係去再查一查，到底秘書處呢度所講嘅係咪準確，同佢哋九巴實際講嘅係咪一樣。或者呢件事可以遲啲再睇嘅，不過我哋聽到你嗰點喇，陳生。咁即係話你係質疑--根據你個人嘅經驗，係質疑呢個講法？

陳詠豪先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，黃女士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者請你睇九巴嘅意見書第一冊，120 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係帶我哋去邊度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係去九巴畀運輸署署長，2 月 12 號，2018 年嗰封信嘅回應嚟嘅，就話要--即係運輸署要求攞個調查報告，就係因為有 2018 年 2 月 10 號嗰宗嘅巴士慘劇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）陳生，呢度就係九巴畀署長嘅回覆嚟㗎，咁就提到招聘同埋培訓全職同兼職車長嘅情況。我想問你幾個問題，關於全職車長嘅，就我講一般嗰個培訓同埋特別培訓。我哋可以喺 120 頁嗰度睇到喇，呢度列出全職車長個培訓，個細字有提到話十八日嘅培訓喇，而喺下一頁就有提到話全職車長申請人會有最少十八小時喺路面駕駛嘅培訓，就會由導師看管下去做呢個練習嘅，你可唔可以證實係咪真係有咁嘅情況？最少六十八個鐘頭駕駛訓練。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你唔可以答到就請你講，即係你如果唔知，就請你講喇，照講。

陳詠豪先生：因為呢一封嘅內容同我當年上堂就有啲出入嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以指出你接受嘅培訓係點樣？即係當時你接受嘅培訓。

陳詠豪先生：就咁講佢第--即係個 phase 2 嗰度，佢話四至五款巴士車型訓練，根據我個人實際嘅訓練，只係得兩至三款嘅巴士啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁路線訓練呢？呢度有提到話路線訓練係訓練兩條路線。

陳詠豪先生：係嘅，我都--我當時都係訓練兩條路線嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我哋有之前聽過李先生一啲嘅供述，就關於話係復修訓練，即係全職車長嗰度喇，咁喺另一頁有提到就話有兩條路線，喺導師嘅指導之下做訓練嘅，咁而巴士車長嘅應聘人，首先一定要做過呢個訓練先至可以考試嘅，咁我哋又聽過話有三日嘅培訓喇，你知唔知道自從你嗰陣時開始，有冇啲咩嘢改變過？即係由你入職到而家有冇改變？

陳詠豪先生：基本上都係冇改變。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者請你睇 123 頁。呢度提及話聘任嘅車長無論係全職、兼職，都會有路線訓練，咁另外仲會有啲路線等佢哋熟悉咗先至會編派佢哋去揸㗎，可能話過咗三至六個月之後就會揸另一條路線咁樣，有冇發生過？

陳詠豪先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁係會唔會有額外畀訓練？

陳詠豪先生：我當時個人嘅經驗就係我哋公司有個部門叫「派更部」，英文叫"duty dispatch"呢個 unit 嘅，咁佢就會打電話畀我哋，就叫我哋自己就喺站長某一條線，例如叫--即係跟 111 咁計，咁喺 111 嘅站頭裏面就問站長攞一張叫做「跟車紙」，咁然之後就自己坐一啲其他車長揸嘅巴士，揸兩轉--即係坐兩轉，咁坐咗兩轉，若果識嘅話就交番去派更部，咁就有一個 111 呢條路線嘅 record。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）127 頁，我哋可以睇到就有啲嘅修正嘅訓練，即係一年內有四

宗要負責嘅事故，如果係新車長喺頭三個月有幾宗要負責嘅事故，或者係不小心駕駛或者未能夠確保乘客安全，咁如果再有一次嘅不小心駕駛，就會終止服務。咁呢度提到話有一至三日嘅修正訓練喇，通常就係一日喇，就要由導師嚟去建議嘅，有冇發生過？

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪問陳生有冇接受過修正嘅訓練？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，有冇接受過修正訓練吖，喺咁嘅情況之下？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者應該--你個問題係咪問佢有冇接受過修正訓練吖？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳詠豪先生：我從來都冇接受過修正訓練。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就你所知，或者其他嘅車長吖，你知唔知道佢哋有冇接受過修正訓練？即係喺咁嘅情況之下，好似呢度所講嘅嗰啲情況，呢一版講嘅。

陳詠豪先生：以我所知，我就冇聽過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我相信我已經問晒啲問題喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）一個簡短嘅問題，根據你嘅經驗，即係其他特別更嘅司機，你可唔可以揀一條路線係近你屋企㗎？或者佢哋會唔會考慮你屋企喺邊度，然後先至派一條路線畀你？

陳詠豪先生：根據我嘅經驗，只可以--若果嗰條路線有一個空缺，有一個吉位，我哋可以嘗試就入一張我哋叫「簡便報告」就畀一個車務組，然之後再交畀編更組，再根據我哋車長內部嘅評分去--即係畀我哋可唔可以分配到呢一啲嘅路線，而舉例我講我自己就係隸屬於沙田廠，喺沙田區嘅工作，但係我住喺大埔嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）即係你冇得揀嘅？唔可以揀嗰啲路線？即係除非係要有空缺，即係嗰條路線有空缺，跟住你可以去申請？

陳詠豪先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）李生，你提及係你揸特別更嘅車長，三年揸咗，啱唔啱？

李國華先生：啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢三年內，你係咪揸唔同嘅路線嘅呢？

李國華先生：唔係，都係喺原本嗰條路線，即係 269D，即係我哋俗稱叫做「掛咗

牌」，就喺嗰條路線，咁偶然因為調假或者其他問題，咁可能會調走其他路線囉，就係唔多。

主席：（經傳譯員）當你休息嘅時候，即係呢個喺兩更--有分更--中間呢個長休息時間，你會喺邊度去休息？

李國華先生：屋企，因為嗰個擺車嗰度好近我屋企，所以我可以返到屋企嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係喺邊度？

李國華先生：天水圍，因為天水圍本身有個車廠，咁可以擺到--中段時間啲巴士我哋叫做俗稱「榻車」，就「榻」咗喺嗰間廠入面，咁我自己就係出入都係用架單車，咁樣可以快啲返到屋企，因為就算我行路都係十五分鐘已經返到屋企㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係天水圍車廠就喺你兩更之間，你就會泊架車喺嗰度，係咪？

李國華先生：公司安排泊喺嗰度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁天水圍車廠有冇一啲休息嘅設施嘅呢？

李國華先生：有嘅，但係就通常都係啲車長喺擺車嗰度食飯，就好似嗰啲休息或者例如可以瞓覺嗰啲地方就冇喇，只可以食飯，咁瞓覺通常都係喺架巴士度或者--即係佢哋住得遠就返唔到屋企嗰啲，同埋時間少嗰啲就喺架巴士嗰度休息，就返唔到屋企嗰啲。就我哋呢啲返到屋企，如果有三、四個鐘頭，我哋都係返屋企休息囉，同埋喺屋企食飯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道你嘅同事係會唔會--就因為佢哋返唔到屋企，咁所以佢就會喺個巴士上面就即係小休下，瞓一陣咁樣？

李國華先生：冇錯嘅，因為佢哋住得太遠喇，有啲住到錦田，嗰啲即係就算佢返去，一來一回都要兩個鐘頭嘅，咁佢返屋企做咩嘢？佢休息都係三--即係公司時間都係畀三個鐘頭你，但係你一來一回用咗兩個鐘頭囉，咁點樣休息呢？咁就索性喺架巴士度休息囉，咁你車廠入面冇休息室嘅，就只有得個食飯嘅地方，就冇休息嘅地方，咁所以啲車長通常都係選擇喺架巴士度休息囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。咁你喺最後呢個部分，你有冇啲特別嘅事項你想提出嘅呢？因為我哋都差唔多要結束㗎喇，呢個環節。

李國華先生：我哋都有啲意見想再提交嘅，因為我哋喺--即係就住嗰個工時嗰啲問題嘅。咁我哋提出就係話早更收工，即係特別更就唔可以超過 21 點，早更接更，即係就係我哋開工嗰陣時候，早更嘅開工時間就唔好少過--即係唔好喺 03：30 嘅之前。因為太早開工，嗰啲時間--即係人哋食緊早晨，我哋已經當係食緊午飯㗎喇。咁夜更我哋就唔可以早過 13 點開工，因為嗰個夜更我唔知佢收幾多點，但係你喺 13 點之前--已經有好多巴士--即係路線係夜更開工係 11 點已經開工㗎喇，咁點為之夜更？咁新入職嗰啲車長就唔好安排兩味車，因為佢哋都

未適應嗰個公司嘅運作。咁仲有兩樣嘢，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你話 11 點鐘，你係講下晚上 11 點，定係早上 11 點？

李國華先生：早上 11 點，就夜更要開工喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，早上 11 點，唔該晒。

李國華先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你呢啲嘅係點樣--呢啲咁嘅更係點樣叫呢？係早更、午更，定係晚更？

李國華先生：九巴得早、夜更㗎咋，有早更同埋夜更，冇話中更嗰啲，只有早更、夜更同埋通宵更，即係九巴而家啲更分。咁我哋會提出呢個問題，就係因為如果你啲特別更收超過 21 點，第二日就唔夠十個小時休息嘅，因為路面情況千變萬化，你如果設計一個時間表係收 21 點嘅，咁如果佢返到嚟，因為交通意外、道路擠塞，超過呢個 21 點，就第二朝就返唔到工㗎喇。即係兩更之間就係話有個十小時休息嗰個問題嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，可唔可以逐點該點講？咁早更嚟講，基本上係幾多點鐘至幾點鐘開始嘅呢？

李國華先生：我嘅意思係話早更開工嘅時間就係頭車通常都係 5 點鐘要簽到㗎喇，因為有啲路線係簽 3 點--因為有條路線--因為嗰啲調--公司要嗰架早更嘅車長要兼通宵更收工嗰個時段就要佢簽 3：30 簽到，早更，簽 3：30 要做 N 車，即係做一轉 N 車，所以提早咗嗰個出廠時間，咁就導致啲車長就因為太早開工，嗰個人嗰個精神--因為佢收工未必係收 1 點，可能係收兩點，咁係有成十一個鐘頭嘅工時，但係你太早起身，個人嘅精神會比較容易疲勞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁喺早更嚟講，其實係大概幾多點至幾點鐘會完更嘅呢？

李國華先生：個別路線嘅時間唔同㗎喎，有啲--如果最早嘅收十二點幾都有，但係有啲就會收到 3、4 點都有，同時係拍 5 點，即係拍卡係拍--即係頭車咁計，同時間拍 5 點鐘，但係佢收工時間--如果長途車嘅，可能兩轉，如果你話比較平均嘅工時，一個鐘頭一個單嗰啲就可能會收到 3、4 點。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁夜更就大概係幾多點鐘至幾點鐘開始嘅呢？

李國華先生：我哋咁樣睇喇，因為嗰個--條條路線個設計嘅時間都唔同㗎，咁如果我哋--因為我哋建議公司就話夜更唔好喺 1 點之前開工，就係咁啫，就係話因為每條路線嘅接更嘅時間都唔同，就即係話車數多嘅，接更嘅時間會拉長咗㗎，咁所以夜更 6 點鐘又開工，有啲就 1 點鐘，有啲 11 點鐘就開工，係啲車長都難適應啲囉，因為你 1 點鐘開工，我一瞓醒就早餐都未食，就已經食午飯喇，咁就開工㗎喇。咁開工嗰個--太早開工嗰段時間就--即係話你夜更太早開工，咁你用膳嘅時間又會提早咗，咁車長一收工就開始--即係有啲車收成點幾兩點

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

幾，咁就成十二個鐘頭工作嘅，咁啲車長容易疲勞，容易咩嘢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）通宵更通常係幾點鐘開始㗎？

李國華先生：七點半之前開工，通宵更。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁通宵更通常係幾點鐘至幾點鐘完嘅呢？

李國華先生：夜晚七點半，收朝頭早七點半。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。咁呢個就係關於你工時方面嗰個建議喇，咁你有冇其他嘢你想提㗎？

李國華先生：我仲有兩個問題關於嗰個道路上嘅問題嘅。咁有啲而家喺街擺啲環保斗，成日擺喺巴士嘅嗰啲路線，即係擺喺條馬路上面，阻礙巴士埋站，阻埋其他道路使用者嘅，咁其實環保斗係咪有個專門部門去吊走佢嘅呢？因為你咁樣妨礙咗嗰個路面嗰個道路使用者安全喎。咁我想提議下就係佢哋有啲--我唔清楚法例有冇規定佢哋擺邊度吖，但係而家好多道路，例如彌敦道或者咩嘢--間中都會擺啲環保斗喺度阻礙嗰個交通嘅。我想建議就係話你專門部門如果見到呢啲情況，點解唔拖走佢呢，因係你影響好--即係嗰條繁忙道路嚟㗎嘛，你擺環保斗，製造一個叫做交通擠塞。咁我哋巴士車長嘅，如果交通擠塞嘅，咁時間，用咗我哋啲時間去塞車，咁啲乘客又等耐咗，咁佢啲環保斗可唔可以擺去第二度，去咩嘢呢？係咪我哋可以投訴佢，跟住就可以由警方去處理？

主席：（經傳譯員）我相信一定係有一有關嘅部門就係需要批准嘅，喺環保斗，咁我哋就會同運輸署傾一傾，或者甚至同警方去傾一傾㗎。

李國華先生：Thank you。仲有一樣...

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你有一啲嘅相片，你就想提供畀我哋嘅，咁可以說明話即係呢啲環保斗喺街道上面造成有啲咩嘢嘅困難、問題，特別係喺巴士站附近喇，咁你可以提供呢啲相關照片畀我哋㗎。

李國華先生：明白。咁我仲有一樣係關於巴士站嘅，咁而家我哋--即係較早前我哋同運輸署開會，即係啲巴士站擺咗啲其他車輛喺度，阻礙巴士埋站，咁我哋會建議話如果--即係話喺巴士站範圍泊車，違例泊車，可唔可以引入一個扣分制度呢？即係等有啲阻嚇性啲，其他外界車輛唔可以泊入巴士站。因為而家好多外界車輛泊入巴士站，好似係合法咁泊咗入去嘅，我哋巴士埋站係需要 double park 嚟落客、上客。咁警方我哋報--返到總站再報警嘅，佢哋都走晒喇，咁我哋想話--即係話引入嗰啲叫做你泊喺巴士站入面嘅違例泊車就需要扣分，有個阻嚇作用，就係咁喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實喺九巴嘅--有啲喺--向前方嘅攝錄機嘅，係嘛？有啲巴士係有呢個裝置嘅，係嘛？

李國華先生：有嘅，有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢啲嘅攝錄機其實就可以話係影到一啲前面係非法泊車嘅影像嘅，係咪？

李國華先生：係會影到嘅，但係唔係大部分巴士都有嘛，係得一千八百幾架有咋嘛，即係向車頭前面影嗰啲係得千零架有鏡頭㗎咋。咁我建議就喺巴士--如果你係要鏡頭嘅，不如喺巴士站裝鏡頭囉。即係巴士站嗰度裝啲監控鏡頭咁樣，有冇違例泊車咪--即係好過用巴士本身嗰個 cam.去做囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係點解唔用我哋而家已經有嘅一啲裝置呢？又或者可以兩樣都用嘅。

李國華先生：因為仲有啲巴士未裝到鏡頭㗎，因為好多舊式嘅巴士冇鏡頭，因為而家仲存在啲巴士，都仲有--大部分都未淘汰，所以嗰啲未裝--唔會裝鏡頭㗎喇嘛，係嘛？而家新式嘅只有千零部係有鏡頭㗎咋。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果有嗰啲嘅攝錄機嘅巴士，咁你會唔會就同意就話如果個車長見到有一個咁嘅違例泊車喺前面，咁佢撳一個掣，咁就知道有個情況，咁就將呢一個嘅閉路電視嘅影像就傳送番去相關嘅人士，咁就大家知道可以制止呢個情況，咁你會唔會支持呢個咁樣嘅做法？

李國華先生：支持嘅，支持嘅，咁其實都係巴士埋到站嘅，咁啲巴士車長揸車比較舒服啲囉，因為你唔使同其他道路使用者--根本你嗰個違例泊車嚟㗎嘛，泊喺巴士站，係嘛？咁嗰啲客又安全，巴士又安全。如果你泊晒喺巴--啲違例泊車泊晒喺巴士站嘅，咁我哋要上客，嗰啲客要喺車與車之間去上客...

主席：（經傳譯員）李先生，我哋明白你嘅論點㗎喇，咁我哋而家希望所做嘅就係搵一啲方法去幫你可以解決你嗰個問題嘅。

李國華先生：明白。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有冇其他嘅論點你想提出㗎？

李國華先生：陳生有問題。

陳詠豪先生：主席先生，我想關於一個路線，即係而家工作個更表裏面，因為我哋希望運輸署可以做一個指引，每一日一個車長同一個更次最多就係一條主線加一條附加線，即係一加一。因為而家好多路線，即係喺同一個更表裏面需要一加二，即係 total 係做三條線嘅，我哋希望呢個情況就可以--即係運輸署可以做一個指引，就避免啲車長就混淆路線，就行錯路、停錯站。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係而家你可以係會要你哋揸三條線，你就建議話係減到兩條，係嘛？

陳詠豪先生：係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。好，多謝幾位出席嚟畀你哋嘅證供。我哋仲有其他工

會嘅代表等緊發言嘅，咁所以我哋而家休息少少時間，然後就會繼續嘅，好多謝你哋出席。

下午3時32分聆訊押後

下午3時45分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）請稍等等，請坐低，請就座，請就座。

葉蔚琳女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先我哋想多謝你葉女士同埋月薪車長大聯盟嘅代表就接受我哋嘅邀請就嚟做呢個口頭嘅陳述嘅。我就解釋下我哋嘅程序係點樣樣，首先就係黃大律師，佢就係資深大律師，佢係幫助我哋委員會嘅工作，佢哋就會問你哋嘅問題，主要都係環繞你哋個陳述書嘅，但係都會係就其他嘅方面嘅事宜去問你哋問題。喺你哋嗰方面，如果係你自己以外，希望其他嘅同事係幫你一齊答問題嘅時候，你就可以話請邊個、邊個就代表呢個聯盟去回答，咁就得㗎喇。你係咪起初，即係開始嘅時候，你會想有啲發言呢？

葉蔚琳女士：係，唔該法官大人。

主席： Very well.

葉蔚琳女士：首先感謝特區政府委派呢個專營巴士安全嘅獨立委員會，特別感謝倫明高法官先生、歐陽伯權先生、羅康錦先生以及各位隊團。因為我都得知大家喺呢段時間不斷咁樣日以繼夜，即係 7 點鐘都未收工咁去儘快去將我哋巴士嘅呢個行業嘅問題儘快去解決，特此喺度係非常感謝大家嘅。

或者我哋唔好阻大家太多嘅時間，第一個部分，我哋首先--我哋之前提交咗嘅，關於我哋安全把關嘅第一個重要嘅環素，就係話工程部，以下落嚟有一位資深嘅工程部嘅員工，佢表述下佢日常生活中喺工作上有咩嘢嘅困難嘅，我哋請...

主席：（經傳譯員）你就唔需要咁樣做，我首先會請黃大律師係問你哋問題，如果有一啲嘅問題黃大律師問，又有一啲嘢係冇涵蓋到你哋想講嘅說話，你之後你就可以補充嘅。請黃大律師。

葉蔚琳女士：知道，明白。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，我哋呢個嘅委員會就係有個責任係提議--建議有關呢個安全嘅方面嘅建議，就係特別喺呢一啲嘅專營巴士服務方面嘅安全嘅，我嘅問題主要都係集中喺安全，而唔係話聘用員工方面嘅問題，我希望你明白呢一點。

葉蔚琳女士：知道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於你嘅大聯盟，我相信就你哋喺勞工署登記嘅，2018 年 3 月 28 號登記嘅，係唔係？

葉蔚琳女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）目前就係一百五十個--2018 年 6 月嘅一百五十個嘅成員，...

主席：（經傳譯員）係全部都係全職員工嚟嘅？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係唔係？

葉蔚琳女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你哋有一封信就係中文嘅信，係 75-3 頁嗰度有一封信，係中文信嚟嘅，就冇譯到英文嘅，睇到呵？你喺封中文信係咁講嘅，2018 年 6 月 18 號嘅呢封信，就係喺 TU 文件夾 75-3 嗰個頁，就係你講到你哋嘅成員嘅組織係點樣樣，喺呢封信裏面，你個大聯盟就曾經進行過諮詢嘅，就有八百名嘅全職員工係有意加入嘅。

葉蔚琳女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就想首先問一問關於你而家目前有一百五十位嘅會員，佢哋全部都係全職員工，佢哋係嚟自邊一個嘅專營巴士公司嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：大部分都係九巴嘅車長嚟嘅，有一啲係新巴、城巴都有嘅，但係佔嘅部分比率係好少嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽一百五十個之中大概幾多個係九巴嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：因為我哋喺嗰個審核過程裏面，我哋係交由我哋嘅秘書去處理我哋嘅有關嘅會員嘅，因為其實大家都要上班同埋之前要準備委員會嘅事同埋其他嘅事項嘅時候，其實正確嘅資料，即係話幾多嘅比例就冇，但係我所知道，其他巴士公司大約有五位嘅，其餘都係我哋九巴嘅員工嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你嘅陳述書就提到好多嘅題目嘅，首先我就會講一講關於培訓--車長嘅培訓，第 68 頁，係中文嘅，係英文嘅第 72 頁第 3 段，你提到關於就有一個嘅車長嘅學員，佢就係已經考核咗，就成為車長，但係後來就係發生交通意外，嚴重受傷嘅，喺不足一星期，佢上班就係發生咗呢個意外，你可唔可以話畀我聽佢係一個兼職還是係全職嘅車長呢？

葉蔚琳女士：佢係我一個同班嘅一個同學，即係一齊入嚟經過訓練之後考一個巴士牌嘅。佢因為其實我都想順便講一講點解會帶出呢個問題出嚟呢？因為其實當時佢嘅導師，因為每一個導師都會帶一至三個學員喺一架車度訓練，其實當呢個導師見到呢個學員，以佢嘅多年經驗，認為呢個學生其實唔係好適宜去做一個專業嘅司機，曾經佢勸喻呢個同學唔好再去繼續呢個學業，不如搵過第二份工，但係當時因為呢個同學喺馬來西亞返嚟嘅，可能佢又急需搵一份工，冇辦法底下，老師都盡最大嘅努力，同咗組長講，希望用公司個--即係可以令到呢個學生即係話覺得佢唔適合，就唔好再畀佢再繼續呢個課程咁樣，但係當時因為都係同而家嘅情況差唔多，因為人手實在太短缺，每日收車實在太嚴重，為咗要交數，即係話佢哋每一個老師或者每一個上司，佢哋一路咁樣上去嘅時候都有一個壓力，就係話每日希望儘量培訓多啲學生可以交數出嚟個呢個真正可以去駕駛呢個巴士咁樣。

所以佢哋喺一層一層壓力底下，無奈就係話--我哋會見到一啲問題就係話其實佢哋有時都會--因為其實我喺琴日裏面都撞到有一個--其中嘅一個駕駛嘅老師，一個好資深，佢都有同我傾到一個問題，就係話其實佢哋有時內心都係好痛苦，同埋有時都要埋沒良心，就係我之前所講嘅，其實我哋香港人又好，每一個行業都好，佢哋為咗自己嘅生活而去埋沒自己嘅良心，明知唔得嘅，但係為咗唔想公司即係...

主席：（經傳譯員）葉女士，你繼續之前，我哋要打斷一下。呢個嘅學員，其實佢係已經係通過咗考試，係咪呢？

葉蔚琳女士：係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係邊一年佢係上呢個堂㗎？

葉蔚琳女士：2013 年呢個 4 月 22 號，我開始入嚟--入職嘅，即係喺之前十八日之前。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，唔該晒。有一個簡單嘅一點，呢個學員佢就已經係通過咗運輸署嘅考試，佢就後來就有交通意外。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，係咪即係你培訓完之後，2013 年你就正式就即刻加入咗九巴，就已經係做咗五年，係咪？

葉蔚琳女士：（沒有可聽到的回答）

主席：（經傳譯員）我希望你講出嚟，因為如果你就咁岙頭，我哋就冇辦法係做紀錄嘅，唔該晒。

葉蔚琳女士：明白，係，係做咗五年嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋講到關於學員嘅問題，喺你嘅陳述書裏面，你就話嗰個導師就關於呢一個嘅學員嘅性格有一啲嘅睇法，但係公司就喺目前嘅制度底下就

有理會到呢啲嘅評語嘅，我嘅問題就係話個公司點樣去唔理到嗰啲嘅評語，同埋呢啲嘅評語係啲咩嘢評語嚟嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：例如呢個導師佢經過同組長反映之後，組長就叫佢去天台嗰度試行泊車，即係我哋喺個訓練學校裏面，喺上面有泊車嗰個位置，就叫佢試咗，「okay 喇，咁就得喇。」咁樣就繼續畀佢即係呢個課程咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你覺得九巴提供畀車長嘅訓練係唔足夠，雖然嗰個學員佢已經係通過咗個考試喇？

葉蔚琳女士：因為最主要嘅原因，即係其實我哋成日講巴士嘅安全或者個把關，其實可能喺各方面都要去配合，包括運輸署喺幫我哋九巴考牌嘅時候，可能佢會覺得我哋仲有一段時間會訓練，可能會比較寬鬆，呢個亦都可以商榷，但係問題一樣嘢，就係話當一個有經驗嘅導師佢覺得呢個學員其實唔係好適合揸車嘅時候，佢都盡佢最大嘅能力去表達嘅時候，因為我哋會睇到就係每一層嘅壓力令到佢哋叫做寧願即係話即係多啲人，即係話有個數字喺度，幾多人入嚟做或者可以經過訓練，而忽略咗嗰個真正嘅安全嗰個把關。

因為我都想補充下，其實佢哋導師都有評核嘅，佢哋評核嗰個標準喺邊度呢？其實每一--其實因為佢哋喺評核當中，因為我哋--當時我好記得嗰個情況，就係我哋當日考試嘅時候，每個師傅都好緊張，佢哋好似自己考牌咁，因為其實點解呢？因為其實呢個佢哋訓練出嚟嗰個學生如果個合格率高嘅話，可能會令到佢哋嗰個評核會高啲，呢個都係我哋見到現場去估計，因為佢哋都好緊張話因為都要--有透露過其實都係因為對佢哋嚟講，係一個表現嘅一個標準，喺駕駛學院，佢能夠--佢帶領學生...

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋嘅表現評核就唔係通過運輸署考試嘅其中一個考慮因素嚟嘅，係咪？

葉蔚琳女士：係，係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係運輸署嘅考試係完全分開嘅，係咪？

葉蔚琳女士：係，係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係從你所講，佢哋可能會係話成為公司評核佢哋嘅情況，但係呢個係公司嘅事嚟嘅，係咪？運輸署就要決定呢一個嚟考試嘅人係咪通過到個考試，然後發個牌畀佢，所以黃大律師你想問嘅係咩嘢呢？

葉蔚琳女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以去到睇你嗰啲建議，你其中嘅建議就係話要有三日嘅加強訓練嘅課程，就係車長嗰度要做嘅，就係第 6 段有提及，呢三日嘅增強課程，就係重點教授油門、剎車控制、彎位控制同埋行車穩定性，點解你覺得需要有呢額外三日嘅駕駛增強課程呢？

葉蔚琳女士：因為其實我哋去考巴士牌之前都需要有三年嘅私家車嘅駕駛時間，先可以考牌，點解要重點喺呢一個環節裏面要加強呢？因為巴士同一般私家車嗰個重量唔同，所以導致我哋控制個油門同埋剎車系統嘅時候係需要另外一種技巧，即係要去磨合，更加去明白呢樣嘢。同埋你會知道應該有一個數字，就係其實新入職嘅車長，最多嘅交通意外嘅環節裏面，好多都係我哋俗稱「撳骰仔」，就係話緊急剎掣，令到乘客撞傷，或者令到後車會突然之間撞咗埋嚟我哋巴士度，呢個係較為多嘅呢一個情況，即係喺一個新人發生交通意外嘅比率，就係話通常最大嘅意外就係話因為剎車嗰個控制得唔好，而令到乘客受傷。

至於彎位嗰度，就係因為咁大架巴士，同我哋平時嘅私家車係有所唔同嘅技巧，都希望要加強。同埋我後尾都有補充，就係話其實除咗三日之後，再由老師去評核，如果唔 okay 嘅話，應該再 repeat 多一次一個課程，咁樣能夠確保到呢個學生真正能夠可以駕馭呢個駕駛技術嘅時候，先可以畀佢可以喺道路上行走同埋接載乘客。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個建議有冇向九巴提出過呢？

葉蔚琳女士：冇機會。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺五年受僱嘅期間，你從來都冇機會，五年裏面？

葉蔚琳女士：因為呢個範疇我哋一個職員就好少會去提議一啲問題，所以亦都冇咁嘅即係話一個門檻畀我可以去有機會真係好去細節咁去分析呢啲嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你亦都提及話應該喺駕駛學校都有模擬嘅交通燈號，就可以加強車長應用嗰個剎車嘅時候個技巧，即係因為個交通燈號，所以佢剎車，嗰方面可以多啲訓練。我嘅理解，其實已經有十八日嘅訓練，每一日係九點五小時，呢啲係全職車長嘅--即係準車長要做嘅，你覺得係咪足夠呢，呢個訓練？因為都係因應實際嘅路面情況做嘅訓練嚟嘅？

葉蔚琳女士：如果喺一個本身有一個駕駛經驗嘅，譬如--因為你三年牌，可能有啲人根本--好多年青人根本唔--即係真正自己嘅私家車都未試過擁有嘅話，佢哋根本冇一個路面經驗，我哋成日講嗰個路面經驗係我哋一個最重要嘅環素，因為點解呢？我哋好多時喺馬路要好多突發、好多問題，就係話如果對一個普通有經驗嘅車長嚟講，okay 嘅，但係如果佢係冇駕駛經驗，而佢只係單單嗰十八日嘅話，係一定唔夠嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你會唔會建議要擴大訓嘅範圍，包括埋情緒控制呢？或者係情緒嘅訓練，譬如話點樣去處理乘客、行為咁呢？

葉蔚琳女士：喺呢方面，其實我哋喺九巴我哋去入職嘅時候，我記得曾經--如果我冇記錯嘅話，係一份問卷嘅，嗰度都會略略即係話去睇下你嘅 EQ、各方面係點

嘅，但係你話實質上有冇一個實質嘅培訓呢？就都會講下點樣去用咩嘢情緒去處理呢啲嘅問題，呢個確實係九巴有做到嘅，但係當--即係我哋衍生番後邊嘅問題，就係話因為當你真係喺嗰個工作環境裏面去畀人哋辱罵嘅時候，呢啲即係話就靠我哋點樣去推廣，即係喺嗰個部分裏面做得好啲，令到嗰個問題產生出嚟。呢個九巴一向都有做嘅，但係問題就係只可以咁講，喺一個模式上係做晒嘢嘅，但係問題當你真係要去面對呢啲咁嘅壓力嘅時候，其實係可以再加一啲培訓都 okay 嘅。即係成日都講從新出發，係咪？都用--叫我哋要用魔術嘅語言去應對，但係好多時就係因為--即係其實都有啲離地，有時現實同埋...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，我哋明白你嘅論點。或者而家講...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你再講之前，你自己個人有冇畀乘客辱罵過呢？

葉蔚琳女士：辱罵又試過，打都試過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇報告番呢啲事情呀？

葉蔚琳女士：都有嘅，因為當時都有報到警嘅，但係就因為架車冇鏡頭，所以後尷嗰個客用咗律--即係請咗律師去打，後尷就嗰個客就無罪釋放。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你講係話畀人打嗰個情況，係咪呀？即係你有報告你畀乘客打？

葉蔚琳女士：有報警。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後導致有人被拘捕，跟住被檢控，跟住有審訊，跟住佢就係無罪釋放，係咪呀？你頭先講，係咪咁嘅意思呀？

葉蔚琳女士：係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾時呢？

葉蔚琳女士：應該係兩年前，如果冇記錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）肯定你都會記得個日期，因為畀--喺返工時候，因為巴士司機返工畀人打，應該都會記得個日期嘅，係咪呀？係幾時呀？

葉蔚琳女士：我唔係好記得，我或者後尷再補番畀你，好唔好？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好呀，請你事後畀番我哋。係喺邊個法庭嗰度審㗎，呢單案？

葉蔚琳女士：觀塘法庭。

主席：（經傳譯員）希望你只係有一次呢個被襲擊嘅情況，係咪？

葉蔚琳女士：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）畀辱罵，語言辱罵呢，有幾多次畀人係辱罵過呢，只係乘客辱罵你呢？

葉蔚琳女士：喺未呢一次嘅--即係我哋月薪車長成立之前，係經常性，之後可以講，一次都冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）之前係幾常發生呀？

葉蔚琳女士：時常發生，每日都會發生，只要譬如交通有啲擠塞，或者嗰日因為唔夠車長而收車，個時間本應二十分鐘一班車，變咗三十分鐘，嗰啲客就會好躁，就會變到，就會好嬲，佢哋就好多時會將嗰一啲怨氣就發泄喺我哋身上。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲被辱罵嘅情況，你有冇向九巴報告呀？

葉蔚琳女士：其實都成為我哋工作嘅一部分，我哋好少會因為咁樣而去報畀上司聽，即係我哋其他嘅同事都係自己承受。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以嘗試直接答問題呢？你有冇報告呢？

葉蔚琳女士：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以講畀我哋聽嗰次襲擊嘅事件喺邊個位置發生？

葉蔚琳女士：喺呢個長沙灣遊樂場嗰個站嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係喺巴士上面打你吖，定係喺巴士站附近呢？

葉蔚琳女士：喺當時我駕駛緊，喺駕駛嗰個巴士位嗰度被--受襲嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係巴士行緊嘅當時？

葉蔚琳女士：停緊燈。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你可唔可以睇九巴文件冊第 1 冊，應該係 97 號個案。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇頁數呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）214 頁，214 頁。

葉蔚琳女士：係呀，呢度，九...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）97 號個案，呢度就有提到葉女士揸緊 238X，就係 2016 年 9 月 29 號嘅事件，你右臂受傷，係咪講緊呢次事故呀？

葉蔚琳女士：係，係，冇錯嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）下一個題目我想講嘅，就係喺你嘅文件--陳詞裏面，你提到好

多--即係話帶病駕駛嘅問題，就話好多司機--我係複述你講㗎喇，你話因為工作時間好長，所以日積月累，漸漸令到佢哋身體健康都受到影響，但係佢哋就唔敢貿然請病假，因為佢哋要考慮到嗰個評核獎金。我就想問，我哋知道九巴將嗰個良好服務嘅獎金同埋安全獎金就合併咗入去個月薪嗰度嘅，關於話呢個評核獎金呢一點，我就想探討一下，其實呢點可能係咪都唔係咁相關呢？因為而家已經係將個安全嘅獎金同埋表現獎金都加咗入去嗰個--包括咗入去個月薪裏面，所以呢點係咪仲係成立呢？係咪仲係？

葉蔚琳女士：其實呢個係兩個部分嚟嘅，你頭先嗰個安全獎同埋嗰個--另外一個評核--即係嗰個另外嗰個服務獎同埋嗰個安全獎，擺落去底薪嗰度，係咪？之前嗰度，其實呢個係--我哋講嗰個評核係第二個部分嚟嘅，係另外一個獎金嚟嘅，係同呢個唔相關，但係呢個已經--九巴而家已經解決咗，就係話由今--將會嚟緊就係話會將呢個評核取消，就可以唔需要因為你唔返工而冇咗呢個獎金，而家喺現階段嚟講，九巴即係講好明確咁樣已經表示會取消，嗰個錢亦都出咗畀我哋，係多過之前嗰個錢添仲，呢個已經處理好咗嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，你之前講過因為一個好有經驗嘅同事喺呢個工程部方面就面對咗一啲日常嘅困難嘅，呢啲嘅問題同安全有冇關㗎？

葉蔚琳女士：一定有直接關係喇，係呀。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以請你嗰個同事係表達呢一啲嘅問題點樣同安全有關嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）其實喺你個陳述書裏面有冇提到嘅呢，呢一點？

葉蔚琳女士：即係而家意思講話去表達工程部嘅問題，係咪咁嘅意思？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你個好有經驗嘅工程部嘅同事，你話佢係面對一啲嘅問題，有冇喺你個陳述書裏面有提到嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：關於--冇提到，係，呢個佢可以解說一下嗰個問題，好簡短嘅啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪第 2 點呢？

陳智輝先生：第 2 部分？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係話冇用原廠嘅零件嘅，係咪原廠零件呢個部分就係呢？

陳智輝先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以簡單介紹下呢個問題係乜嘢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪喺陳述書有冇講？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗喺呢度寫嘅嘢之外，你有冇補充呀？

陳智輝先生：大部分都係--零件缺貨呢個問題最嚴重，就之前採購部就未有問題之前，啲零件就好少話缺貨嘅，但係唔清楚佢哋個部門發生咗咩嘢問題，到到而家呢一刻都好多零件都仲係缺貨嘅，我哋想要嗰件零件都係冇嘅，試過曾經有一段--即係每年都會有一段時間，佢就 brake 喉佢係冇貨嘅，就到冇貨，跟住每間廠就會有流動資金，個流動資金用完之後，就開始搵管理層搵錢過去隔籬工廠大廈嗰度搵啲啤喉嗰啲公司製--即係整--買啲零件返嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）你其實係咪講緊一啲零件係唔夠或者缺乏，以前就係有存貨嘅，而家就冇存貨，係咪咁嘅意思呢？

陳智輝先生：唔會有短缺，佢係--即係我哋隨時要用嗰陣時都可以搦到嚟用，我哋係正常 check 咗件零件，發現有問題，跟住就去開單，張單去到士多嗰度，跟住就畀零件我哋嘅，就近排就開始應該有一、兩年就要嗰件零件，跟住士多供應唔到畀我哋，就曾經有 brake 喉呢單嘢出現過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講嗰啲士多係你係講緊係九巴裏面嘅士多？

陳智輝先生：係，係，九巴入面嘅士多。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知個問題出喺邊？係咪因為九巴就係唔足夠嘅存貨呢？還是係個供應商佢哋唔能夠去供應呢，即係接到單之後？

陳智輝先生：之前我哋有個採購部，佢撳個電腦就開始--見到有嗰件零件開始冇喇，跟住就會提早落單，可能唔知佢嗰邊發生咗啲咩嘢問題，跟住零件開始少，跟住我哋都開始覺得有啲問題，到到提出已經太遲，因為佢一批批車咁樣返嚟，我哋要嗰件零件就冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，之前有人講過證供，就係話九巴喺其中一個文件就咁講嘅，就係一啲背景資料文件，就係向立法會發出嘅，就同呢個 2018 年 2 月嘅事件，就喺 7 月 25 號交通事務委員會嘅會議嘅背景資料文件，我哋睇番第 15 段，呢度就咁講，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪喺我哋嘅文件夾度呢？

黃女士： No, that's the bundle referred to by the previous...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以加入個文件冊嗰度呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

葉蔚琳女士：我有，我有，我有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇到。而家喺個螢幕上面見到嘅，個英文就咁講嘅，中文就係「九巴表示就係無論全職或者兼職嘅，巴士車長如果未有行駛某路線一個月或

者更長時間，就需要再次練習行駛該路線。」葉女士同埋其他幾位，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽有冇咁樣做過呢？有冇呢個安排呢？如果就係話如果巴士車長佢冇揸過某個路線一個月或者更長時間，佢就會再次就住呢個路線就要再進行練習行駛嘅？

葉蔚琳女士：坦白講，我所認知嘅嘢就係話基本上如果我哋兩年之內冇揸過呢條路線，即係譬如我未揸過，兩年都冇嘅話，就需要重新再去--而家嘅制度就係話要重新去師傅訓練，但係以往一路以來--即係我自己個人嘅認知，就係話兩年，你話一個月唔揸就要再去培訓，就應該冇聽過。

鄭凱耀先生：或者我補充一下，佢其實個制度就係你 train 咗一條線之後，你兩年內 keep 住一路有運作呢，就佢就一路都會有機會畀你做番呢條線，如果你兩年都冇做過呢條線，佢哋就所謂會--嗰個電腦會冇咗呢條線嘅 record 咁樣嘅，但係我想 for example，舉一個例子，就係我假設做咗一條 49X 嘅線，做咗一年，我如果手頭我自己個電腦有另外一條 47X 嘅線，我一路都係同一時間 train 嘅，但係我就冇做，我做咗一年 49X，之後可能一年後，佢突然有一日就會叫你去做呢個 47X 嘅，其實可能你已經係成年冇接觸過 47X 呢條線嘅，甚至乎呢條 47X 有--即係中間可能啲站、啲路線有更改，其實你係完全唔知嘅，但係佢可能就會即刻叫你去--第二日就去開工嘅，其實呢個係存在一個隱患嘅問題，根本係完全唔知道條線有甚麼更改嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講就係話就個電腦嘅系統，如果話你兩年冇揸到嘅時候，你就喺相關嘅電腦嘅紀錄會係刪除嘅，係咪咁樣呀？

鄭凱耀先生：係嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，你就講過就喺屏幕上面就冇翻譯到，如果你話冇揸一條線係兩年，你就係需要再培訓嘅，但係之前就冇一個咁嘅要求，你嘅意思話「之前」係咩嘢意思呢？

葉蔚琳女士：即係我未試過話你頭先所描述嘅，就係話如果你冇揸一個月就要再培訓，即係冇聽過呢個事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講關於兩年，呢個要求係幾時開始㗎？

葉蔚琳女士：一路以嚟都係咁嘅制度嘅，係呀，即係我入嚟到而家都係--即係話如果你兩年都冇--即係我哋之前可以「跟薦」㗎嘛，係咪？唔係淨係訓練，都係一樣嘅形式嘅，總言之你去「跟薦」或者你去訓練咗之後，而兩年，你中間冇揸過呢條路線嘅話，佢自動就會清洗咗，就等於冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）葉女士，你有冇開特別更或者普通更㗎？

葉蔚琳女士：我係一更車，普通更。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇呢度出席嘅人士，你係揸特別更嘅呢？

甄建明先生：有嘅，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）甄先生，唔該。你可唔可以講一講關於呢個特別更嗰個經驗呢？我哋聽過就係話有一啲嘅車長佢哋喺九巴底下去揸特別更嘅，佢哋就每三個小時嘅連續嘅休息時間嘅，係冇嘅，你自己嘅經驗係咪咁呢？

甄建明先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我聽你係揸邊條線㗎？

甄建明先生：其實我係揸大約十條線左右喇，但係佢每一條線都唔係淨係揸嗰條線嘅，就會俗稱我哋所謂嘅「做 order」，通常都係揸三條線嘅一日。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你揸咗呢個特別更幾耐呀，喺九巴？

甄建明先生：大約應該係三年左右喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係返早更定係晚更嘅呢？

甄建明先生：特別更就只有一個更嘅啫，就係早更。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我哋聽你幾時開始--即係幾--如果--每一日特別更係通常係幾點鐘開工㗎？

甄建明先生：通常都係六點幾至到七點幾呢個時間嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係 6 點至到 7 點--晚上 7 點？

甄建明先生：大約係呢個時間，六點...

主席：（經傳譯員）你上一次係--對上一次揸特別更係幾時呀？係咪琴日呢？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你住喺邊㗎？

甄建明先生：我住喺旺角。

主席：（經傳譯員）你通常要幾點鐘起身嘅呢？

甄建明先生：（經傳譯員）5 點鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後你去邊呀？

甄建明先生：跟住起身，即係做咗自己應該要做嘅嘢，就出門口返工。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾點鐘出門口㗎？咁琴日呢？

甄建明先生：6 點鐘，6 點鐘出門口。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會去邊㗎？

甄建明先生：我會返去巴士廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度㗎？

甄建明先生：青衣島嘅巴士廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）你通常點樣去嗰度㗎？

甄建明先生：我會搭街車，即係我哋公司嗰啲頭班車，然之後再去到青衣某一個位，再轉一架叫做工程車嘅，就會車我哋去巴士廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）你琴日就去到邊度嘅車廠呀？

甄建明先生：都係青衣廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係打卡嘅時候係幾點鐘㗎？

甄建明先生：7點鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）你打完卡之後，你就做乜嘢呀？

甄建明先生：跟住就搵番自己當日要駕駛嗰架巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪就會檢查下架車嘅呢？

甄建明先生：Yes, sir.

主席：（經傳譯員）係嘅，你然後係咪揸架車去邊度呀？

甄建明先生：然之後我揸架車去長亨巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾點鐘離開青衣呀？

甄建明先生：7點20分。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾點去到你嘅目的地呀？

甄建明先生：7點30分。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾點鐘開始揸嗰條巴士線呀？

甄建明先生：7點45分。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嗰條係咩嘢路線呀？

甄建明先生：X42號C。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰條路線會去邊㗎？

甄建明先生：去到油塘巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪就係朝早就係去油塘，然後返嚟去油塘咁呢？

甄建明先生：唔係。

主席：（經傳譯員）話畀我聽你做咗啲乜，琴日？

甄建明先生：去到油塘巴士總站之後，跟住我就應該係用私家牌，就即係一架冇裝客嘅車，就再去番荃灣嘅愉景新城就做42號M。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係由油塘，你就去荃灣，然後就揸另一條路線，係咪？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰條路線係咩嘢話？

甄建明先生：42號M。

主席：（經傳譯員）去邊呀？

甄建明先生：去長宏巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）之後呢？

甄建明先生：我做一條線係做兩轉車，即係一來一回兩次嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係荃灣同埋長宏之間，係咪？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後之後係咪休息呢？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾點呀休息？

甄建明先生：應該係十二點半嗖。

主席：（經傳譯員）個休息時間幾長呀？

甄建明先生：個休息時間去到下午3點20分。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度開始休息呀？

甄建明先生：其實佢就冇話邊度開始休息，而係佢會畀一個我指定嘅泊車地點，我就擺低部車，就當我開始休息㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你將架車擺喺邊度？

甄建明先生：青衣機鐵站。

主席：（經傳譯員）休息嗰段時間你做乜嘢呢？即係兩個鐘頭十五分鐘。

甄建明先生：Lunch 同埋一個午睡。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度午睡呀？

甄建明先生：喺長安巴士總站入面有一個休息室。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰度有啲咩嘢設施可以畀你午睡呀？

甄建明先生：嗰度有四張梳化，可以--其實可以瞓到一個短嘅午睡。

主席：（經傳譯員）有梳化，係咪呀？

甄建明先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有幾多個車長當時同你一齊共用呢個設施呢？

甄建明先生：兩位。

主席：（經傳譯員）一旦你喺 3 點 20 分開始開車，又去邊度呢？揸邊條線呢？

甄建明先生：我係 3 點 35 分開始開車，因為我 3 點 20 分係要攞番部車落去站頭嗰度嘅，我 3 點 35 分開車係做 41 號 A，就係由長安巴士總站就去尖沙咀東部嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）之後呢？

甄建明先生：之後再返轉頭，即係再去番長安巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇。

甄建明先生：然之後做多一轉同樣嘅路程。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪跟住就到你收工呢？

甄建明先生：係喇，Yes。

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾點呀？

甄建明先生：8 點 50 分，晚上嘅 8 點 50 分。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺完成你嘅工作時候喺邊度㗎，嗰陣時？

甄建明先生：我哋完成工作之後，要將架巴士揸番去巴士廠入油，然之後擺低部車，就完成當日嘅工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係指巴士，係咪呀？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你做晒呢啲係幾點鐘呀？即係你入埋油咁做晒喇。

甄建明先生：9 點鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）之後你做乜嘢呢？

甄建明先生：之後跟住就搭工程車返番出去市區，再轉車返屋企。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾點鐘返到屋企呀？

甄建明先生：九點八左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話你嗰日係 6 點鐘開始--朝早 6 點開始，你開始出門口，然後就去到 9 點 40 分晚上就完成嗰日，啱唔啱呀？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係講琴日，係咪？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）今日你休息，係咪？

甄建明先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）甄先生，你話你過去三年都係揸特別更，啱唔啱？或者分更喇叫做。

甄建明先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰三條路線係咪過去三年都係揸呢三條路線，抑或仲有其他唔同嘅路線呢？

甄建明先生：有其他唔同嘅路線嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪經常都需要揸三條唔同嘅路線呢，同一日裏面？

甄建明先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺九巴做咗幾耐呀？

甄建明先生：我喺九巴做咗三年半左右。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係喺呢段時間，你一路都係揸特別更？

甄建明先生：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇試過遇到交通意外呀？

甄建明先生：暫時冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）做得好。

甄建明先生：（經傳譯員）多謝。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇試過畀人打或者係辱罵呢？

甄建明先生：日日都有畀人辱罵。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）畀人打呢？

甄建明先生：畀人打，冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇向公司報告過有畀人辱罵？

甄建明先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解唔報告呢？

甄建明先生：因為公司根本都知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇採取啲咩嘢步驟去幫你哋面對呢啲辱罵呢，即係作為車長？

甄建明先生：你講公司，係咪？

主席：（經傳譯員）Yes. Yes.

甄建明先生：冇，冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你揸嗰架巴士有冇--即係個攝錄機係影住個巴士司機個位嘅呢？

甄建明先生：有啲有--有時有，有時冇，因為我日日都係揸唔同嘅巴士，揸唔同嘅路線，所以就有啲舊車就冇，有啲新車就有。

主席：（經傳譯員）有攝影機嗰啲係咪亦都唔係淨係影到個影像，仲有埋錄音嘅，係咪？

甄建明先生：以我所知，有啲係有錄音，因為我見到有啲係有個咪收音嘅。

葉蔚琳女士：我想補充一下，就係法官頭先話可以有咩嘢幫到我哋呢個問題，就係話其實我哋喺我哋嗰度已經提到一樣嘢，就係話因為我哋要求就係我哋本身自己車長可以自行安裝 car cam.，因為點解有咁嘅元素喺度呢？因為公司其實有好多車有啲部分有車 cam.，有啲冇，但係當我哋有事發生嘅時候，好多時或者警方向公司攞嗰個錄影嘅時候，「冇呀」咁樣，即係唔知點解冇。

但係為咗保障我哋自己人身嘅安全，亦都其實安裝鏡頭，其實令到乘客可以有一個即係話警覺性，即係話「會可能畀人睇到」，通常佢哋就會好精嘅，你有鏡頭，佢哋就會冇咁--會收斂好多，我哋所以都強烈要求，其實我哋都唔

係話希望公司去幫我哋安，而係希望可以畀我哋車長可以亦都喺未完成實施呢個全面嘅安裝即係巴士裏面每一架都有嘅嘅情況。

同埋嗰個制度完善，即係話你最少有個鏡頭，但係真係錄到出嚟，可以攞到出嚟舉證...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你等一等，葉女士，請你慢啲，慢慢，好似你揸巴士咁慢慢。

葉蔚琳女士：知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）公司對於你哋嘅要求嘅回應係點呢？即係話容許你哋自己安裝攝影機呢點--攝錄機？

葉蔚琳女士：如果發現我哋車長安裝車 cam.呢，我哋係要受到呢個即係處分。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇試過書面寫呢個要求畀公司呀？

葉蔚琳女士：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解冇呢？

葉蔚琳女士：你覺得你喺申訴或者你去講嘅時候，即係冇用，你就唔會去做，即係我哋冇咗一種信任，覺得佢連安都唔畀你安，仲要罰你嘅，你諗下你叫佢畀你安係咪都幾搞笑？如果你係九巴嘅高層，我哋咪好開心囉，即係可以有道理可以講。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知？或者如果你唔知，就請你咁講，你知唔知點解車長如果裝咗自己嘅攝錄機會畀公司處分呢？公司有冇解釋過點解呢？

葉蔚琳女士：私隱問題，佢話。你可以講。

鄭凱耀先生：係，私隱問題囉，最主要係。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係咪書面特別咁樣提到講畀你聽嘅呢？

鄭凱耀先生：其實佢喺嗰個培訓，我諗入職嗰陣時，佢導師都會略略同你有機會講過呢樣嘢，就叫你唔好裝啲 cam.呀，因為公司...

葉蔚琳女士：有出通告。

鄭凱耀先生：係喇，或者佢各種渠道都會叫所有前線車長唔好裝呢啲，因為私隱問題牽涉到。

葉蔚琳女士：同埋曾經就係話呢個係屬於非法改裝，如果我哋加車 cam.，佢會當我哋係非法改裝。

陳智輝先生：即係架車原本批 approve 嗰度冇呢件零件，你再外加落去，佢就當你非法改裝。

黃女士： When was this circular issued?

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好咁快住。你話有發過通告，係咪呀？可唔可以畀嗰份通告畀我哋呀？

葉蔚琳女士：因為要--出咗，通常我哋睇完就好少會留底。

陳智輝先生：唔係，基於係內部文件，我哋係唔可以公布出嚟，公司係有啲受控文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋就好快就會九巴畀證供，我哋都會問佢同一個問題嘅，如果係咁，點解你唔可以提供呢份文件畀我哋呢？等我哋知道嗰個情況，解釋畀我哋聽？

葉蔚琳女士：因為一般即係...

主席：（經傳譯員）可能係有好好嘅理由點解佢哋唔容許你咁做嘅，我哋只不過係想去搵出個事實啫。

葉蔚琳女士：因為我哋內部有啲文件，譬如我哋行車嘅時間，公司都視為一個機密嘅，所以本應我--因為本身我哋今次原本想將我哋行車時間嘅困難或者個時間唔夠都希望交畀法官去...

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，我哋會直接問九巴。好，黃大律師。

葉蔚琳女士：多謝。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽呢個嘅通告大概係幾時發出嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：一年前嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就話如果你自己裝置呢個攝錄機，你就會係被處分嘅，邊個咁樣講㗎？你可唔可以話畀我哋聽係邊個人去講話「如果我哋裝置呢個攝錄機，我哋就被處分㗎喇」？

葉蔚琳女士：因為通常我哋車長，公司會召見我哋或者有啲我哋違咗規嘅事情嘅時候，佢會畀一張--嗰張叫咩嘢紙？即係畀一張紙仔我哋，一張通告，即係一個便條咁樣，即係話明畀你聽因為咩嘢事咁樣而去召你上去見高層咁樣，所以喺個通裏面有時有啲會員即係之前就 send 過一啲咁嘅上嚟，所以我哋就會知道原來係咁樣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供你頭先提過嗰啲嘅文件呢？嗰啲就唔係公司嘅文件，呢個係你哋嘅...

葉蔚琳女士：公司，公司，公司發出畀我哋嘅一個文件。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，係呢一個嘅九巴公司係發畀啲車長嘅。

葉蔚琳女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋喺嗰啲信件之中，有冇講話如果你係裝置啲攝錄機，你就會受到處分，會唔會好清楚咁講明呢？

葉蔚琳女士：通告裏面有寫嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就可唔可以咁假設呢，就係話你哋嘅工會就會係贊成我哋係裝置一啲嘅監察攝錄機，可以係有影像，有聲音可以記錄喺巴士上面發生嘅事情，你哋會唔會支持呀？

葉蔚琳女士：好，支持。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後一個題目，葉女士，運輸署就畀過我哋一個嘅資料文件，就係話因為工作小組佢哋進行咗--喺 2018 年 3 月中就進行咗研究嘅，嗰啲工作小組就係有成員係包括呢五個嘅專營巴士公司同埋三個嘅巴士廠，佢哋就係有一啲建議，就係有三個範疇嘅，首先就係安全帶，第二就係關於一啲科技嘅裝置，第三就係關於車長嘅培訓。運輸署就最近話畀我哋聽佢哋最近就係有發出關於係巴士車長嘅一啲嘅指引嘅，九巴有冇諮詢到你哋嘅聯盟呢，有關於呢個嘅培訓指引呢？

葉蔚琳女士：冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋有冇畀一份你呀？就係由運輸署發出嘅實務守則，關於培訓嘅。

葉蔚琳女士：從來冇收過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問一問你就你哋聯盟就對於一啲嘅科技嘅裝置有啲咩嘢嘅意見，首先第一個就係 TD-1 第 1 號文件第 403 頁，我哋係第 4(a)段，就係關於電子穩定控制系統嘅，你哋嘅聯盟會唔會支持係使用呢一個咁樣嘅系統呢？

葉蔚琳女士：其實喺呢個車內安全裝置呢幾部分裏面，去到(a)、(b)、5、6 嗰度，以及第 3 頁嗰個(a)嗰個系統，我哋經過我哋理事嘅研究之後，都覺得呢個係非常之好嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於安全帶方面呢？喺所有嘅乘客座位，喺所有巴士上裝安全帶。

葉蔚琳女士：其實有安全帶一定係一件好事嚟嘅，但係衍生有一個問題，就係話會唔會如果安全帶損毀咗，其實巴士應唔應該繼續行車呢？或者我哋巴士司機有冇一個責任去確保每一個乘客受到安全嘅保障，去睇住佢哋有冇去處理好？或者有啲老人家佢哋需要幫助嘅時候，其實呢個衍生嘅問題我哋有少少擔心嘅。你話總括嚟講，其實安全嘅嘢有就肯定好過冇嘅，但係衍生喺一個現實裏面，每一日上落客咁多，或者我哋要確保嗰個安全就係話其實你確保每一個位，你一定要唔好損壞先得，你有一個問題嘅時候，你就會令到人哋會有危險，呢個責

任上即係其實都好多嘢慢慢上嘅，但係方向係好嘅，但係嗰個現實可以推行嘅係比較困難啲咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇機會睇過文件上面關於車長訓練嗰一部分呢？就係第 18 段至到第 22 段嘅。

葉蔚琳女士：呢度我哋都有略略係已經睇過嘅，但係就係話佢呢度係一個比較全面啲，即係話唔係好細緻知道佢想要啲究竟咩嘢培訓，其實方向都係好嘅，總言之多就梗係好過少㗎喇，但係即係話佢呢度我冇睇到佢有好實質有效地喺我哋日常生活當中遇到嘅車長嘅問題，要培訓，我哋應該係儘量去留意啲乜嘢，呢度就冇提到，所以就比較遺憾啲咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝葉女士，我已經係完成我嘅提問。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我有一個跟進嘅問題，甄先生同埋葉女士，你頭先提過就關於每一日你哋都係有遇到一啲辱罵嘅情況，你就兩個都講到就話「其實都冇用嘅，即係向呢一個管理層報告。」你可唔可以講清楚少少畀我哋聽有咩嘢邏輯呢？你唔會報告係因為你覺得管理層係唔會做嘢，還是佢哋做乜嘢嘢都冇幫助嘅，可唔可以解多少少畀我哋聽呢？唔該晒。

鄭凱耀先生：不如咁喇，因為其實好老實講，每日遇到呢啲辱罵嘅情形，我會用四字詞形容「司空見慣」，點解會咁呢？因為--點解會導致呢啲情形呢？就係因為--即係大家都知香港地生活壓力大，其實個個人都好焦急嘅，尤其是如果我哋現行呢一行行業咁缺乏人手，基本上收車或者街道繁忙、塞車啲情形已經係太常見，變咗好多乘客都有陣時佢嘅預算嘅時間達到唔到嗰陣時，佢就會將頭先即係之前都一路講緊，會將佢嘅怨氣發泄喺我哋前線嘅人員身上，所以其實根本上所有呢一行嘅行業嘅公司，我諗所有嘅管理層都好清楚嗰個情形。

基本上太多太多，你每一條線、每一個人都有呢啲情形，講真，你個個去 complain，去同管理層反映，基本上佢都唔會理你，因為佢哋都解決唔到。

陳漢華先生：有多一個小小嘅事例可以提供番，早前有啲會員就都曾經畀乘客辱罵過嘅，亦都當場向番我哋公司嘅管理組反映番個問題，部巴士就停喺當時嘅馬路上面，乘客亦都會喺巴士--即係嗰個辱罵車長嗰位乘客都會喺車上面等候警方嘅處理同埋公司嘅處理。公司嘅處理手法基本上都係大事化小，小事化無，叫個車長息事寧人，繼續行車可以喇。

葉蔚琳女士：因為點解...

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請等一等。

葉蔚琳女士：因為點解，你頭先講「你唔試過，點解你會知道冇用呢？」因為好多時我哋每一日經歷嘅嘢，同埋有好多時公司會有一個表現管理組，因為有啲客佢會投訴你，我哋就去講番事發嘅經過，可能佢企個位唔啱，即係誤會發生，通常公司都係一句「你小心啲喇，你留神啲喇。」咁樣，其實即係實質嘅幫助係

幫助唔到，你諗下我連畀人打，受傷，到最後都因為種種嘅原因，所以你會睇到就係話其實冇人幫到你，同埋我哋都已經係當咗係我哋嘅工作一部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個警察都有幫你，佢有逮捕一個人，佢哋有起訴佢等等咁樣，亦都有檢控等等，都有人幫你㗎。

葉蔚琳女士：係呀，但係就如果公司法律部門或者各方可能都會支援一下，可能個事情就會好好多，其實當時嗰啲警察都好靚，即係舉證唔到，因為其實醫生嘅報告、所有嘅嘢，但係就係因為冇嗰個實質嘅證供，因為通常香港人就係一話要去法庭，就閃晒，啲證人就唔肯去舉證。如果有個 cam.嘅話，其實即係好多嘢都可以解決到，所以點解我哋成日都講希望有 car cam.可以保障到我哋，或者亦都可以令到乘客都可以有個保障，我哋就算有咩嘢鬧咗佢或者做得唔好嘅，佢都可以就有一個反證，即係咁樣，同反監察我哋，係喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）仲有一個跟進嘅問題，就關於係嗰十八日嘅培訓，佢哋有冇訓練你點樣去處理一啲辱罵嘅呢？就佢哋會唔會話叫你唔好出聲還是係叫你報告，即係喺個培訓嘅時候有冇提到呢啲，做呢啲嘅培訓嘅呢？

葉蔚琳女士：通常佢哋好流行一句說話，就係魔術語，即係叫你運用一個語言嘅技巧，但係當你即係話每一日去行車嘅時候，連廁所都冇得去，你喺架車度其實即係講真，心情已經好難受，跟住仲要一上嚟，即係等得車耐，就問候你娘親，不由分說，又會可能會話「你啲車長係咪死晒呀？」咁樣，即係你因為其實好多嘢係配合嘅，如果可能我哋嗰個休息時間多啲，可能我哋嗰個處理嗰個情緒問題會好啲，因為其實係一路好多問題衍生出嚟，唔係話淨係話一點位嘅。即係如果我哋有足夠嘅休息時間，個精神好啲，處理嗰個 EQ 可能又會高啲，所以其實好多嘢我哋希望逐步去改善，令到大家嘅關係好啲咁樣。其實有做到嘅公司，但係實質上喺個現實裏面唔係好有成效。

主席：（經傳譯員）你覺得係咪有啲--就係巴士車長係特別係有人辱罵，還是電車或者係其他嘅交通工具嘅車長，佢哋有冇啲咁嘅情況，還是佢哋特別針對巴士嘅車長呢？

葉蔚琳女士：因為電車就基本上喺佢嗰條路嗰度就基本上好少有塞車嘅情況嘅，即係有失班嘅情況，其實我而家主要即係話市民通常同我哋產生一個磨擦或者佢哋瘟癐都係因為班次不正常，呢個問題已經纏擾咗我哋九巴係好耐，但係唔知點解解決唔到。

因為我哋就係講點解我哋--其實我哋喺嗰個出嚟呢一個--搞呢個工會就係原本就係以生命行先，即係希望能夠保障乘客嘅安全，但係其實你衍生落嚟，你會知道點解會有咁多嘅磨擦我哋同市民，我哋會經過好多大家商討嘅時候會發覺原來好多時大部分都係因為脫班，佢哋等得瘟癐，講真心，你諗下，企喺個巴士站度半個鐘頭都冇車，跟住上到去，梗係問你「喂，你啲車而家死

晒？」咁樣，咁嗰個司機又可能去到對站，佢塞咗成個幾、兩個鐘頭，佢只係得幾分鐘休息，去完廁所就要上車，你諗下當時個司機嗰個情緒嗰個處理。

其實又唔可以怪晒啲客㗎喎其實，我哋成日都講其實唔係話我哋去責怪啲乘客唔啱，而係話點解會衍生於--好似頭先法官所提問嘅好好，就係話點解淨係我哋巴士會咁，因為地鐵嘅脫班唔會好似我哋咁會冇車，只係可能一年先嗰兩、三次，我哋係每日--我可以畀一個初步嘅統計，可能之後你可以同九巴嗰度攞番個資料，係每日每一個廠基本上係有幾十部車係冇人揸，即係其實而家我哋員工嘅流失已經係去到好嚴重嘅地步，所以點解會嗰個乘客與司機嗰個磨擦會越嚟越大呢？其實好大嘅因素都係因為脫班。

其實講真心，嗰個乘客都唔係傻嘅，唔通無端端鬧你咩？都唔係咁嘅，其實佢哋都好好，但係問題就係話即係人就係有情緒，每個人都有壓力嘅時候，但係我覺得有時佢哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝葉女士，我大概知道你、明白你嘅意思，我哋仲要聽多一個工會嘅證供嘅，所以好多謝你今日出席，多謝你提嘅證供同埋你嘅協助。你頭先承諾咗會提供一啲嘅文件嘅，請你就提供，我哋就而家會小休兩分鐘，然後我哋就會聽取最後嘅呢一個嘅工會嘅證供，就係兼職車長苦主大聯盟嘅，唔該晒。

下午 5 時 02 分押聆訊押後

下午 5 時 12 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄭先生同埋兼職車長苦主大聯盟嘅代表，我哋多謝你哋接受我哋嘅邀請嚟呢度提供證供協助我哋搜集資料，知道巴士個運作係點樣樣，等我哋可以作出一啲建議，確保日後巴士嘅安全。黃大律師等一陣就會問你哋問題，目的就係根據你哋嘅陳述書裏面有一啲嘅論點可能佢需要澄清或者請你再進一步解釋，如果鄭生或者你自己或者你想你其他嘅成員答問題，請你提出話請邊一位答問題，我哋都好樂意聽佢回應嘅。好，而家請黃大律師開始。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）多謝倫明高法官，或者開始之前可唔可以畀兩分鐘我哋表達一下我哋嘅一啲嘅意見呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，當然可以，你可以作一個聲明先嘅。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）請記住我哋係有即時傳譯員嘅，所以你發言嘅速度請你都要講得合理啲，畀機構傳譯員可以跟到。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）好，多謝各位，多謝大家今日畀時間我哋，首先兼職車長苦主大聯盟，我哋唔係一個註冊嘅工會，唔係根據工會條例註冊嘅，我哋係一班嘅兼職車長，係因為 2 月 10 號嗰宗嘅慘劇之後就組織起嚟嘅，冇幾耐之後，九巴都拒絕再同我哋聯絡，我哋都係覺得唔開心，因為嗰個意外牽涉嘅司機佢話係兼職車長，而我哋作為一班嘅兼職司機，覺得就受到其他嘅工會不當、冇基礎、失實嘅攻擊，仲有其他公眾人士都係咁攻擊我哋，就懷疑我哋嗰個工作，所以點解我哋會組織起嚟。

我哋認為兼職司機同好多全職司機一樣咁專業、咁有能力，甚至可能比佢更好。我個人就有十五年嘅兼職司機嘅經驗。我哋呢度嘅都係好有經驗、好專業嘅司機，我哋係以我哋嘅職業為傲，我哋亦都係以服務乘客為傲，所以直到而家，我哋都仲係好唔開心，因為似乎對於我哋都仲係有啲嘅偏見。

我哋睇番九巴嘅報告，就係關於話呢宗意外，佢哋向運輸署發...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係講係喺我哋網頁上面嗰個報告？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係。呢個報告就喺意外發生之後一個月發表嘅。運輸署問九巴佢哋有冇覺得喺招聘司機方面有啲咩嘢不足嘅地方嘅時候，九巴個回應就係話「我哋已經停止招聘兼職司機，係立即停止。」即係話似乎佢係暗示兼職司機係不專業、能力不足，所以對於咁樣嘅講法，我哋係非常之唔高興嘅，呢個就係我哋開場想講嘅說話。而家就交番畀黃大律師。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋繼續之前，你可唔可以話畀我聽其實你哋係來自邊個嘅巴士公司，邊個係九巴㗎？就四個，四位係九巴嘅。

車啟冬先生： I am Long Win Bus.

主席：（經傳譯員）你係龍運嘅？

車啟冬先生： Yes.

馬景德先生：（經傳譯員）就因為呢個意外，我哋就被辭卻嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係因為咁嘅意外？

馬景德先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為九巴就係就於兼職嘅車長就有一啲嘅準則佢要佢哋接受嘅，但係我就唔接受佢哋嗰啲嘅標準，九巴就寄咗一封信畀我，我就用電郵係覆番佢，其中一個--我都有將副本係送交畀呢一個委員會嘅，之後就我有一個喺九巴工作嘅朋友就話畀我聽我就係被九巴辭掉咗，因為佢話畀我聽冇回覆，但係其實我就已經係通過電郵回覆咗，而家我就係新世界巴士公司嗰度就做兼職車長嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）龍運喇其中一個，你就係新世界第一巴士，另外四個就係九巴嘅，係咪？係，唔該晒。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒咁多位，多謝你哋出席。你知道我哋嘅職責，委員會都係集中係安全方面嘅事宜嘅，特別係專營巴士嘅管理同埋營運嘅安全，所以我啲問題就會集中呢啲範疇，我希望你哋能夠明白呢一點。關於你哋個聯盟，呢個係一個面書嘅團體嚟嘅，Facebook 嘅一個團體，有超過六百個嘅成員，啱唔啱呀？

車啟冬先生：（經傳譯員）係，啱。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信鄭先生就係獲一百個嘅兼職車長授權就係代表呢個嘅聯盟發言嘅，係咪？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一百個嘅兼職車長係邊幾個公司嗰度嘅車長嚟嘅呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）有幾個公司嘅--全部都係九巴嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係兼職車長，做咗幾耐呀，喺九巴？四個。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我係 2014 年加入嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你就做咗兼職司機十五年喎？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我之前係同其他公司做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺香港，係咪？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）喺香港。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我都係。我都係 2014 年就係兼職車長嚟嘅，我就自己就係揸巴士就揸咗超過十年，包括喺海外都有揸過巴士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭先生。

張沛棋先生：我响九巴做咗三年，之前都做過其他巴士公司嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪都係香港嘅專營巴士公司呢？

張沛棋先生：專營同非專營都有。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾多年呀？

張沛棋先生：前後我 12 年開始揸巴士，之後做咗三年全職，之後做咗兼職。

鄭啟祥先生：我係 04 年响大嶼山巴第一份做兼職車長，之後就响九巴嗰度做咗四年嘅全職車長，之後再响城巴嗰度做咗兼職車長，最近就一年嘅就返番九巴做兼

職車長，而...

主席： Is there a problem with the transcription?

傳譯員： Sorry, the interpreter forgot to switch the button over to English.

主席：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，請你再重複你剛才所講嘅。

鄭啟祥先生：我第一份嘅巴士工作就係响大嶼山巴士做兼職車長，之後就去咗九龍巴士嗰度做咗四年嘅全職車長，再之後就响城巴嗰度做咗兼職車長，再之後我响九巴，而家返咗嚟九巴做兼職車長做咗一年，前前後後就十四年嘅駕駛經驗。

車啟冬先生：（經傳譯員）九巴呢，2016 年開始，就係 2016 年頭，跟住就係喺今年嘅 4 月我就轉咗去龍運巴士嗰度做。

馬景德先生：（經傳譯員）就新世界，我喺嗰度做咗五年半，就係兼職嘅，我喺九巴就係兼職做咗大概三年嗖。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）多謝你哋嘅陳述書，你就係 2018 年 4 月 22 號所作出嘅陳述書，呢個係 TU 嘅第 1 號文件，就係第 293、294 頁，翻譯就係喺 294-1 同埋 2 嗰度嘅。我就想同大家討論兩個範疇嘅，就住陳述書裏面所講嘅，第一，喺 294-1 下面嗰度講，你就話自從你哋成立之後，就兼職車長同埋全職車長應該係一視同仁嘅。你講「一視同仁」嘅意思係講緊薪酬還是係培訓方面呢，你係指緊乜嘢呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以重複你嘅問題？因為我唔係太清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）因為喺最底嘅部分，你就係話你哋個聯盟就一直都強調兼職同埋全職車長應該係一視同仁，你所謂「一視同仁」係指邊啲範疇呢？

主席： Perhaps you could read out more of what is asserted.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你亦都講就話「不論喺培訓、補充訓練、提供修正訓練、錄用、要求革職嘅標準亦都係應該係一樣嘅。喺進行招聘嘅時候，專營巴士，有關考官同埋駕駛訓練嘅導師亦都係嚴格把關，挑選合適嘅考生嘅。」所以你講所謂嘅「一視同仁」係咪指喺培訓方面一視同仁，喺錄用同埋要求革職方面呀？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔想話呢個係同翻譯嘅問題有關，我哋想講嘅就係兼職同埋全職嘅車長其實已經係有相同嘅培訓，我哋就提議--建議，如果可能嘅說話，所以一啲新加入嘅車長就應該有一個心理評估嘅測試，要確保佢哋可以處理一啲壓力，喺駕駛之中嘅壓力。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我亦都想補充，正如剛才我哋同工所講，我哋公司已經一直係對於兼職同埋全職車長都係提供同樣嘅培訓，對我哋嚟講其實都冇分別，但係公眾人士就係有提出唔同嘅意見、見解，就對於兼職車長嚟講，特別係，我哋覺得係好唔公平、好唔公道。所以無論係任何嘅培訓或者係一啲安全嘅措施等等，都係應該適用於所有嘅兼職同埋全職嘅車長，所以佢哋兩者之間係唔應該有任何嘅不同嘅區別嘅或者有啲區別嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於車長，我就會睇一睇九巴嘅一個文件，就喺培訓方面，其實對於兼職或者全職車長係有啲唔同嘅，簡單嚟講，喺全職車長嚟講，佢哋係需要就接受十八日嘅培訓，每日九個半鐘，喺 KMB 第 1 號文件第 102 頁嘅。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係佢哋只係有呢個第 1 級嘅牌照或者 1 號牌照，但係對我哋嚟講，我哋已經係第 10 類牌照㗎喇已經有，所以我哋講緊係兩群唔同嘅人。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）所以係呀，我係想講呢一點。所以佢哋喺兼職同埋全職車長方面喺培訓方面真係有區別嘅，喺培訓方面係有啲區別嘅，我哋睇一睇呢個文件，我就睇下你對於我哋有一啲建議嘅睇法，我哋第 120 頁，呢度係有全職嘅車長嘅考生嘅一啲嘅要求，佢哋係需要係第 17 類嘅考試嘅測驗嘅，呢個第 17 類就係一個巴士嘅牌照嚟嘅，你係需要係通過運輸署嘅一個咁嘅測試，就同我哋喺導師嗰啲測試就唔同。

但係如果你係兼職嘅車長，如果我哋睇番 121 頁，需要嘅就係呢個兼職嘅車長係有第 10 同埋第 17 類嘅駕駛牌照，你就係兩日半嘅訓練，係每日九個鐘，你就係需要係通過個測試就得喇。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）如果你有第 10 同埋第 17 類嘅牌照，你就係兩日半嘅訓練，同埋就係通過嗰個測試嘅，就係由導師去做嘅測試。喺九巴，我哋係有一個內部嘅測試嘅，如果你通過唔到，佢哋就唔會請你，即使你有第 10 同埋第 17 類嘅牌照。

其實呢個要求係對於呢個全職嘅車長嚟講，更加高嘅，葉女士就頭先講，佢話十八日係唔夠嘅，但係我哋係通過個測試，其實我哋係一個道路上面測試嘅，呢個相對於運輸署嗰個測試個要求更加高，所以對於我哋嚟講，兼職車長個要求相對於全職車長嚟講，係更加高。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗你哋嘅聯盟就係建議話要做心理測試，由政府或者第三方去做，呢個就應該係對巴士司機評估嘅一部分，如果我理解正確嘅話，呢個係你建議書裏面嘅提議嚟嘅？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度搵到呀？294-1，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，294-1 底部，由底數上去第四行。點解你會提出呢個建

議呢？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我諗當我哋提呢個建議嘅時候，我哋指嘅係好明顯就係因為2月10號嗰宗交通意外，有一個新聞報道就話個司機同喺馬場等巴士嘅乘客有啲問題，因此就影響咗佢嘅情緒，但係喺定罪之前，當然我哋唔能夠揣測係咪真係好似報道咁嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係講應該話喺審訊之前。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係，係，啱嘅。咁所以點解我哋就提出呢個建議，就話係或者--我哋都唔知嘅，因為可能我哋自己個腦裏面有啲咩嘢隨時會爆發嘅。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充，其實我都有研究過巴士意外，喺1997年或者98年，你都或者記得有一架巴士喺灣仔嗰度翻側咗嘅，如果睇番嗰個個案，一個最主要嘅原因就係巴士司機突然間情緒崩潰定係點樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係指係上天橋嗰度？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，上緊天橋嘅時候反咗車。

車啟冬先生：（經傳譯員）喺杜老誌道。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，總之係嗰一宗意外。我哋就睇番一啲文件，一啲報道，就知道個主因，即係嗰宗意外嚟講，同今次都係個巴士反咗，所以可能--呢個就可能係其中一個理由，或者譬如做一個心理嘅測試或者做一啲嘅情緒嘅訓練都會幫到嘅，我哋唔知呀。好似頭先法官大人所講，因為嗰個審訊仲進行緊，我哋都唔知嗰個成因係乜嘢，但係如果你講話係問我哋攞建議，我哋睇番過去嘅數據，就因此提出呢個建議。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你第二個建議，我知道就係你個第一段講，就係話大聯盟亦都支持加裝攝錄機，即係巴士公司喺所有巴士都要裝攝錄機，係可以保障到車長、乘客同埋其他道路使用者嘅安全嘅。喺巴士裏面裝呢啲嘅監察攝錄機，你係咪指咁呀？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以講另一個題目，我哋聽到其他專營巴士公司嘅證供提到，就話兼職車長，根據目前嘅規例或者指引，似乎係唔需要兼職車長申報佢哋做兼職巴士嘅職務之前嗰個工作時數係幾多嘅，所以有啲就表示關注，就話佢哋唔知到底嗰個兼職車長喺離開巴士之前到底做咗幾長時間個工作

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔知道當時係佢哋表達一個關注定係擔憂定係點。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）不過唔緊要，不過我係想答呢個問題，因為等我問番你轉頭，一個全職車長，你點可以確保佢喺返更之間都係有足夠休息呢？我諗其實所有嘅司機，如果佢坐上架巴士，佢都係要確保自己係唔會係飲醉酒，即係全

部係頭腦清醒，所以我哋係咪要求所有巴士司機，當佢坐上巴士之後都已經係休息得足夠，係好警覺好強，然後先開始工作，所以我就唔明點解需要講呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋冇話要求所有巴士司機都要頭腦清醒嘅，而係要定一個規定，定一個門檻，同樣嘅事情，...

吳振宇先生： Well, for bus drivers we do.

主席：（經傳譯員）...巴士司機又好，邊個都好，同一個做法，就係話任何人喺實際可行嘅情況之下，都係要儘量確保安全，所以新政嘅問題就係話而家睇嚟，似乎喺嗰宗 2 月嘅意外之前就冇搜集到資料，就話個兼職司機喺其他嘅工作係做啲乜嘢、做咗幾耐，所以呢個都係我哋要研究嘅一點嚟嘅。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道其他巴士公司係點，但係如果講喺九巴，當我哋去返工嘅時候，過去我哋要簽一份文件嘅，或者一份申報，就話我哋狀況良好，可以操作一架巴士，你想睇嘅係咪就係咁呢，我唔知，夠唔夠我又唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個冇力嘅聲明，因為係冇辦法去查證。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）或者我可以咁補充，喺 2014 年我啱啱加入九巴做兼職司機，就要求我要申報我嘅全職工作係乜嘢、係做啲咩嘢嘅職務嘅，我知道城巴同埋新巴都係要求兼職司機要申報，每一年都要做嘅，佢哋個全職工作係乜嘢或者仲有啲咩嘢其他工作、佢哋做嘅工時係點同埋佢哋係咪返更嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）城巴以前冇咁做嘅，而家係新先有咁做。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，我諗佢哋以前都有做。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，佢哋而家先提交一份新嘅表格。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係一個新嘅表格，我知道，但係之前有一個舊嘅表格嘅，就話兼職司機就要申報佢哋嘅全職工作。當然而家佢哋再加長啲，就係問埋佢哋做幾多工時同埋係咪要返更定係點。所以我哋都係嘅，我哋都要申報嘅，所以唔係話啲咩嘢新事物嚟嘅，因為我哋都係成年人，我哋當然要負責任，為我哋嘅行為，如果我哋知道我哋嗰日唔適合係揸巴士，我哋就應該好似全職司機一樣，就係攞病假。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我逐一問你哋，各位，你哋仲有冇其他嘅工作？如果係嘅話，係咪同揸車有關呢？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係，我有其他工作嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪揸車嘅？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我喺辦公室嗰度工作，其實我有好多份工作嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中有冇邊一份係揸車㗎？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）有。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，吳生呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇其他工作？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）有其他工作，但係唔係揸車嘅工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，張先生？

張沛棋先生：有其他工作，都有機會要揸車嘅，就算平時我返工，我自己都係揸車返工。

主席： Yeah.

鄭啟祥先生：都有全職工作，都係有機會揸車。

車啟冬先生：（經傳譯員）我都有其他工作，我係公務員嘅，喺地政署，地政總署。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你更加係可能係被分心就多過話揸車。

車啟冬先生：（經傳譯員）Yes.

馬景德先生：（經傳譯員）我係都有其他工作嘅，唔需要揸車。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好喇，城巴喺佢哋新嘅表格其中一個改動，就話要求兼職司機要作一個申報，就話佢哋之前係做咗幾多個鐘頭嘅工作或者佢哋嚟返工做兼職揸車嘅時候之前係做咗幾多個鐘頭工作咁嘅，你會唔會支持咁嘅做法呀？

馬景德先生：（經傳譯員）我支持嘅。城巴同埋新巴嗰個新嘅表格就比過去就係全面好多。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪成個大聯盟都同意呢個意見呢，就係你哋嗰個 Facebook 群組係咪都同意呢？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係支持透明度嘅，或者可以咁講。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我個人會支持，但係就係佢哋亦都應該要求全職司機咁做，我講嘅意思就係話如果你要我申報我喺揸車以外嘅時間做啲乜嘢，你又擔唔擔心全職司機可能成晚喺度開派對，然後先至去返工呢？你擔唔擔心呢？我就會喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家睇到一個表格，就顯示有啲咩嘢要求，要填啲咩嘢資

料，你可以睇到呢個表格上個頂部。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀嗰個參考編號我呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係CTB資料冊第571頁。

主席： CTB-1?

黃女士：（經傳譯員）CTB第3冊。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）個翻譯就喺571-1同埋571-2，呢度就係要求兼職車長簽署一份申報表格，就講出要做幾多工時、係咪需要返更，要申報，同埋要申報佢哋填寫嘅資料係正確，否則就會有處分行動。即係話意思係而家佢哋要求兼職車長要做呢啲申報，而我相信九巴都係而家有類似嘅做法，啱唔啱呀？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇九巴嗰個表格喺呢度呢？

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係，畀個參考編號我哋得喇，唔需要擺上嚟。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）呢份表格係每一年申報一次嘅表格嚟嘅，唔係話每一次你開始揸車之前要申報嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好明顯喇。黃大律師，有冇話要求嗰啲資料幾時係要更新嘅？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。應該就係九巴資料冊第1冊128至129頁，翻譯就喺129-1同129-2嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問嘅題目，我相信馬健德先生之前有提到，就話九巴就而家加咗一個新嘅規定係畀兼職車長嘅，應該話係加咗幾個規定，要兼職車長接受，先至畀佢哋繼續做。或者請你睇KMB資料冊第1冊140至141頁，呢個係九巴交畀運輸署署長嘅文件，係回應2018年2月10號嘅事故嘅，喺底部就有咁講，就話「喺2018年3月底，大部分嘅二百零九位嘅兼職車長都接受咗我哋嘅規定，我哋喺佢哋符合咗以下嘅要求之後，我哋都有指派任何畀佢哋嘅：

第1 就話佢哋要聲稱佢哋作為兼職車長，唔會違反佢哋全職工作嘅僱傭合約；

第2 就係已經有書面申報佢哋嘅疾病；

第 3 就係有書面申報佢哋嘅刑事紀錄；

第 4 係已經通過咗無交通罪行嘅紀錄；同埋

第 5 就係參加咗全日嘅矯正培訓，即係話如果係過去亦都冇牽涉喺咩嘢事故裏面。」

或者我第一個問題可以問馬生，就係如果呢啲，頭先你係提到話就係呢啲規定你拒絕接受，抑或係講緊另一啲規定，唔係呢一拃？

馬景德先生：就住第一條，我係唔接受嘅，當初，即係話第 1 點，（經傳譯員）就係話「書面申報咗，就話我作為一個兼職車長，就唔會違反咗我全職嘅另外嘅工作嘅僱傭合約嘅」，（直接用本地話說）我係不接受九龍巴士提出呢一點嘅，佢係--九龍巴士公司係喺第二處同我哋兼職車長苦主大聯盟第二次嘅會議係喺佢哋嘅九龍灣車廠嗰度舉行嘅，當初係佢哋首先提出呢一點嘅。喺第一次會議嘅時候，九龍巴士公司從冇提出過呢一點嘅，喺以我本人嚟講，我係唔接受呢一點嘅。

至於你話第二點，declaration of illness 嘅，其實我哋--以我本人，過往喺擔任九巴兼職車長嘅時間，每一次返廠攞車，都要簽一份聲明，聲明你嗰日係適宜執行駕駛職務，而且我哋係有張八達通開機卡，亦都講到明拍卡落去嗰一個站頭或者車廠嗰個八達通機嘅 sensor 已經代表你係有同樣嘅 declaration 嘅。

就住第 3 點，冇刑事紀錄，好合理。Pass traffic conviction record check，冇問題，你自己清者自清，冇話扣我好多分嘅，好合理，呢個係涉及安全問題，我本人覺得。

跟住第 5 點，話咩嘢 one month or more，我完全未聽過呢樣嘢，甚至無喺我哋朋友或者其他咩嘢巴士迷嗰啲，從來冇人流出過講過話冇揸某一條線一個月，我冇聽過。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）就有少少混亂嘅，特別係第 5 點，呢個講關於個即係究竟係駕駛嘅訓練吖，定係路線訓練有啲混淆嘅。就我所知，呢個九巴就一直有呢個安排嘅，如果你冇揸過呢架車就係三十日或以上，你就係需要就係參加駕駛訓練，然後由導師話認可，你先至可以再揸車嘅。我覺得呢個係第 5 點所談及嘅。但係呢個第 5 點講到就係話如果你係喺呢一個嘅同一個路線冇揸車超過三十日以上，你就再需要接受訓練，呢樣嘢我哋就冇聽過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解我要問呢個點呢？因為我哋曾經--我哋睇過立法會一個嘅背景資料文件，我哋就會係喺呢度打出嚟嘅。對唔住，我哋冇嗰份文件本身。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我哋明白你所講嘅，因為葉女士佢作供嘅時候，我哋都有聽到關於呢一點。而家個目前嘅做法就係話，Jason 頭先提過，如果係你冇揸車一個月，你就要再訓練，但係如果一個嘅路線，如果你冇揸過一條路線兩年

或者以上，你喺呢一個嘅訓練嘅紀錄就會被刪除，你就會需要再培訓先至可以揸嗰條路線。譬如例子，如果我哋係已經係 2014 年我哋揸過第 2 號路線，但係我而家一直都冇揸嘅時候，我就唔可以再揸呢個第 2 號路線。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）除此之外，關於呢個路線培訓方面，譬如話路線改少少或者申延咗，或者係改咗少少嗰個嘅走線，你哋係要再培訓嘅。同埋你嗰個嘅培訓嘅紀錄都會係被刪除嘅。譬如話我已經係接受過第 2 號嘅路線培訓，就過咗一年，佢哋就將個路線係加長咗，我又冇再接受培訓，我就唔可以就再係揸呢一條線。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就呢一點，我哋係睇緊九巴呢一個文件冊，就第 1 號文件冊第 104 頁，呢個係一個報告，調查報告，就係由九巴提交畀運輸署署長嘅，之前就運輸署署長要求嘅呢個報告，就係 2018 年 2 月 12 日。呢一個報告就係 2018 年 3 月 12 號嘅，我哋去到第 104 頁，呢度就係九巴嘅建議嚟嘅。

第 13 段，就係講話兼職車長佢哋暫時停職，呢個第 13 段就其實話佢哋係已經係就停職咗所有嘅兼職嘅車長，如果佢哋每一個星期嘅工作時數係少過十八個鐘。「但係我哋為咗係滿足個需求，九巴就已經係提供畀呢一個嘅兼職嘅巴士車長，就係話可以去到一個合約，然後時薪嘅車長，同埋或者係擔當其他嘅職位嘅。」

(In English) So my question is, has this happened?

梁景裕先生： Yes, it has.

黃女士： And in what aspect?

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）馬先生就冇接受過呢個咁樣嘅方案。我自己就係話就係選擇咗每一個禮拜十個小時，而其他成員就係選擇咗每個星期工作超過十八個小時呢個方案嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）九巴就話嗰啲兼職車長佢就係每個禮拜工作少於十八個小時就係停職，但係佢哋就容許你每個禮拜做十個小時？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）其實我明白你嗰個諗法，其實好似似乎唔係好合理，其實我哋係一個可以話係散工嘅車長，我通常就係周末或者係星期六就會工作嘅，如果我係唔得嘅說話，我就會打電話就話「今個周末，我就係唔會嚟返工嘅。」但係喺新嘅安排底下，我哋就有壓力嘅，...

主席： You have to do 10 hours a week.

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）...因為我每個禮拜都要做十個鐘，如果係--有時候，我真係做唔到㗎嘛。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋去 141 頁，就我哋睇到兼職車長有幾多個人係同意呢個嘅安排，如果我哋睇番呢個表第一同埋第二行，就同意每一個禮拜多過十八個

小時就有七十八人，就係一個禮拜多過十個鐘，同埋就係申報就係做兼職嘅車長就唔會違反佢哋同僱主寫嘅呢個僱傭合約就有一百二十三人，你就係呢一度裏面，係咪呀？

梁景裕先生： Absolutely.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，佢哋係需唔需要係另外簽一個嘅申報，就係話「你係啱啱返工之前，其實你係之前做咗幾多小時」呀？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）冇，唔需要。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個每個星期十個小時呢樣嘢呢？你可唔可以一次過就係做晒十個鐘？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我可以係一日我係做五個鐘，另外一日五個鐘，或者第二時我哋係一日裏面做晒十個鐘都得。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）都總言之一個禮拜做十個鐘就 okay 喇？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇第 124 頁，就都係九巴嘅陳述書，呢度係講呢一個兼職車長嘅九巴嘅政策，喺呢個羅馬數字第(i)，你睇一睇，你可唔可以確認，又或者話畀我哋聽係咪真係九巴真係咁樣去對待--喺 2018 年 2 月之前係咁樣對待啲兼職車長嘅呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，我就咁攞一攞，正如我之前所講，第一同埋第二點，正如我頭先所講，我哋嘅入職嘅要求其實仲高過全職嘅，因為我哋係需要通過係九巴導師嘅測試嘅，...

主席： So they are not the same, they are higher?

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋唔係一樣嘅，我哋係仲高啲添，喺我認為，就真係高啲喇，我哋呢度六位成員都可以畀意見，對於之下底嗰幾點，我都會同意嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。如果我哋話建議九巴要求所有兼職車長就係填一個申報表，申報話其實佢哋兼職車長返工之前佢哋究竟已經係工作咗幾多個小時，你哋會唔會同意呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我都唔係好明點解你仍然都問呢個問題，其實喺法例上你就每一日唔能夠超過揸車十四個小時，如果你係超越十四個小時，其實就已經係犯法。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實而家唔係關於個法例嘅問題，而係話執法嘅問題，你係要知道嗰個人做咗啲咩嘢，你先至可以執法㗎。

吳振宇先生： And like what Kenneth just said, when we tap card

to report to duty we already declare that.

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以再重複呢？

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我哋開始報到嘅時候，用我哋個八達通卡去拍一拍嘅時候，其實我哋已經係話畀公司聽我哋係確認我哋係已經係遵守所有嘅法例，同埋我哋都係適合去揸車嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題係如果你係你成晚就係揸旅遊車，然後早上就去巴士公司返工，巴士公司點樣知道你係有遵守呢個實務守則，同埋你點樣可以去執法呢？可能你唔可能即時提供到答案，但係呢個就係我個問題。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我要重複，我哋係完全明白會有啲咩嘢嘅刑事責任，尤其是我哋係疲勞駕駛嘅情況底下。啲人就咁講嘅，即係嗰啲車長就一隻腳就喺個監獄度，另一隻腳就喺個殮房嘅。

主席： Well balanced drivers?

梁景裕先生： Yes, thank you.

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）你係講緊就話我係要做一個嘅表格，要寫話我之前就係冇做好長時間，我哋會拍嗰個八達通卡，就話我哋係可以揸車。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係其實你就咁拍你嘅卡，其實就冇資料話畀我哋聽你之前做過啲乜。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）我哋拍個卡就係話我哋接受呢個嘅職務，我哋亦都係接受話個講法就係如果我哋唔遵守法例，我哋係要承受後果嘅，亦都包括就係話如果話--就係頭先我講嘅例子，如果我已經飲咗酒，如果你拍咗個卡就表示就係我就係冇飲過酒，我就係可以係有好好嘅狀態去揸車嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以點解要執行醉駕嘅法例就係要你用嗰個呼吸器吖嘛去。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，但係唔係話每一次我揸車都係要用呢個呼吸器去測試，亦都唔可以話每一日要求九巴咁多千個司機都要咁做㗎嘛。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我已經完成我嘅提問，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，我哋今日想向你提嘅問題就係咁多，請問你哋需唔需要話仲有啲咩嘢想總結講一講呢？唔係一定要，但係有嘢想講，都請你可以講。

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）多謝，我哋想重申嘅，就係有啲好唔公道嘅睇法質疑兼職司機嘅專業程度，我希望今日嘅證供就可以改變到嗰個睇法。我當然係好關心公眾，但係幾位成員同埋主席今日應該係更加清楚知道兼職司機嘅工作係點。

我想重複，我哋以駕駛為傲，我哋鍾意揸車，我哋鍾意服務乘客、服務各個階層嘅人士，我哋就係鍾意做呢個工作。如果我哋被禁止做兼職司機，對我哋打擊真係好大，就會對我哋嚟講，係最唔想見到嘅結果，我哋會覺得好唔開心。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我可唔可以問你呢？六位先生，作為兼職司機嚟講，你哋算唔算係好有代表性呢？特別我諗到嘅就係話新大嶼山巴士公司，因為我知道嗰度三分一嘅司機都係兼職司機，你算唔算係同佢哋屬於係好典型嘅兼職司機抑或好唔同呢？

梁景裕先生：（經傳譯員）我個人就冇喺新大嶼山巴士公司做過，或者鄭生可以解釋一下。

鄭啟祥先生：其實做兼職車長就個個人嘅做法都有可能有好大分別，但係最主要嘅原因就係時間比較彈性，好有多兼職司機就係想一個禮拜放兩日假，就會選擇做 part-time 車長，就放棄佢有一啲福利，即係比全職車長嘅福利就少咗，但係佢哋換取到佢哋嗰啲時間自由啲，所以就會有--即係會多咗人會選擇去兼職呢個職位，其實個問題就喺呢度。

你話至於大嶼山巴士點解會有三分一車長會係兼職呢？其實佢嗰度都係--點講呢？旅遊，即係禮拜六、日嗰個人數就會多好多，佢突然之間有好多人放假，就會入去大嶼山旅遊，佢需要嘅車長就會特別多咗，變咗需要兼職車長嘅需求就會大咗。同埋都係嗰句，個彈性個問題，即係話我得閒，就我可以過嚟兼職幫下手，個原因就會係咁樣，以我所了解，就係咁。同埋我做咁耐，都係因為方便到我時間，我就可以去工作。

車啟冬先生：或者我用廣東話補充多少少，傳神啲。喺反車呢單意外之前，其實據我所知，龍運巴士嗰邊嗰個收車情況都幾嚴峻下嘅，因為自從喺--我諗大約 2016 到 17 年期間，大量 A 線嘅擴充，即係直達機場客運大樓嗰啲路線嘅擴充，變咗 E 車，即係北大嶼山對外路線嘅收車率亦都係比較高，導致到一啲嘅個別嘅更分收車情況係相對嚴重，喺呢啲情況底下，兼職車長就可以發揮到佢哋補班嘅作用。

至於返番頭先大律師問過嘅問題，喺九巴嚟到講，即係喺番 KMB 同 Long Win Bus bundle 1 124 頁所講九巴對嗰個 part-time 車長係咪一視同仁，喺呢個羅馬數字(i)以下嘅要點嗰度，其實係嘅，係一視同仁嘅，全職又好，兼職又好，一視同仁。係喇，我哋每日開工嗰陣時，將我哋個八達通卡--頭先我哋幾位同事都講過，將我哋嘅八達通卡拍喺站長室嗰部機嗰度就已經係代表我哋自行申報咗我哋嘅健康狀況、休息狀況、我哋係適合擔當當天嘅兼職車長工作。九巴一直都有做過嘅，呢一樣嘢，即係自我 2016 年開始加入九巴，跟住轉咗去龍運，一直都有。

鄭啟祥先生：最後我有少少意見想畀番委員會，就其實就講嚟講去咁耐，都係講司機嘅問題，但係有冇向乘客嗰方面，你哋有冇研究下有啲咩嘢措施可以去針對番

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

乘客嘅行為呢？因而其實你見到好多--而家香港人等車等得耐又鬧，唔滿意又投訴，投訴就最方便，其實你做咁多嘢，咩嘢車速監察，唔使嘅，佢哋識得打電話去投訴嘅，根本就係佢哋要投訴嘅渠道係好多、好多，反而司機冇得去投訴個乘客，如果係個乘客唔啱，我哋根本冇得講話個乘客唔啱，亦都冇證據，亦都冇渠道去投訴佢。我就建議，平時點解--即係好簡單一個例子，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋係好清楚呢個問題嘅，所以點解我哋先至問咁多問題就關於話嗰啲閉路電視或者係攝錄機，係咪需要有埋收音嘅功能等等嘅，我哋希望見到巴士就有閉路電視，就話啲人非法泊車都係會影得到，唔單只係影到，而且係會執法，因為如果執唔到法，就有法例都係完全冇意義嘅。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）完全同意。我諗我哋想講嘅點就係話如果係咁，根本已經係有咁嘅條例喺度可以處理乘客嘅行為，但係有冇執法呢？如果係冇嘅話，係咪應該更加大力度去執法呢？其實葉女士同佢其他同事都提到話佢哋係幾乎每一日都係受到言語辱罵嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以點解我係話過，個問題就係點樣可以執法，因為巴士乘客都冇權可以去辱罵巴士車長嘅。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）啱嘅，譬如如果我哋睇番譬如地鐵，有啲地鐵嘅職員係有權可以執法，然後--如果話乘客有啲咩嘢不當行為都可以罰款。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔想再話延長呢一個環節太多，我要指出嘅其實就係根本好顯而易見㗎喇，就係巴士就有一個巴士車長，得佢一個人喺度，而喺地鐵就有--喺個站度有好多職員可以幫手嘅，佢哋等住喺度幫佢添，所以呢個就係最大嘅分別，我就係想指出呢點，係有人指出過呢點，話畀我哋聽。

吳振宇先生：（經傳譯員）講番話人手問題，喺路上都係有啲嘅管工，即係有啲係站長或者車站長嗰啲，係咪可以加多啲呢啲人手都幫到我哋呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）好，多謝各位，好多謝你哋今日嚟向我哋作供，係提供咗好多資料畀我哋，但係你都可以睇到，我哋有好多嘅因素都需要平衡嘅。我哋嘗試想做嘅就係首先係向你哋攞到啲資料先，係今日好有用，所以今日就我要喺呢度完結，多謝各位，想特別多謝嗰啲我哋嘅謄寫員同埋即時傳譯員，今日工作咗好長時間，我哋聽日10點鐘繼續，唔該。

2018年7月31日

下午6時12分聆訊押後

Wednesday, 1 August 2018

(10.00 am)

EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:

MS DEBBY WONG

(Evidence given in Cantonese and English, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation and/or English)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Ms Wong.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Good morning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for accepting our invitation to give evidence to the committee.

You are a current employee of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company, are you not?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN: The way in which your evidence will be taken is by Ms Wong, Senior Counsel, who is counsel assisting the Committee posing questions to you. If there is anything you wish to amplify, feel free to do so.

You will be referred to documents, you can look at them on the screen, or you can ask for a hard copy, if you want to look ahead or behind where the document deals with things; do you understand?

MS DEBBY WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Ms Wong.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Ms Wong, for coming.

My questions will be focused on the resting facilities set out in your submission or reply to the letter of IRC dated 28 June 2018, and your letter of reply was sent on 4 July 2018. That can be found at FE bundle, page 199.

Ms Wong, before I start questioning on this topic, may I know how long have you worked for Kowloon Motor Bus?

MS DEBBY WONG: May I speak in Cantonese?

Yes, for 21 years. I have worked with the KMB for 21 years, and I've been involved in operations, and I have had experience in two depots: Lai Chi Kok and Tuen Mun respectively.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when did you take up the current post as operator in charge of the Kowloon Motor Bus Tuen Mun depot?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Since 1997 I work at Tuen Mun depot and then I transferred to Lai Chi Kok depot in 2016. And then I went back to Tuen Mun depot in 2018.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Your reply stated that there were 30 bus stations under Tuen Mun depot. I notice in Mr Kelvin Yeung's submission he stated there are 31 bus termini. May I just ascertain which one is correct? 30 or 31?

MS DEBBY WONG: Well, for some stations, we may not have somebody stationed there as a bus regulator, so when counting the number of bus stations, there may be a discrepancy. It should be between 30 and 31.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

And how many bus stations did you manage?

MS DEBBY WONG: Almost 10, because I'm responsible for Tin Shui Wai area. Let me, sort of count them.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time.

MS DEBBY WONG: Well, under me, at Tuen Mun depot I have got four. As the assistant manager of Tuen Mun depot, four for Tin Shui Wai area.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. I understand that Tuen Mun depot is responsible for bus operations of three districts, Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, and you are responsible for Tin Shui Wai.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that all bus stations in Tin Shui Wai?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So there are four bus stations in Tin Shui Wai?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the rest? Are they all managed by Kelvin?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Kelvin manage only on Tuen Mun

zone. Yuen Long is under another AM.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Another AM, assistant manager.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Assistant manager.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And who is that?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Amanda Hung.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Now, Ms Wong, in your submission you stated there are two types of rest kiosk. The first is type A, and the second type B.

Now, I notice type B is bigger in size. Can you tell us what is the difference -- apart from size, what is the difference between the two?

MS DEBBY WONG: Other than the size, well, in fact the internal partitioning is different. For the larger kiosk we can place more electrical appliances, like a microwave, as well as the drinks dispenser. For smaller ones, that's mainly for the bus regulator, it is more like their working station.

So the microwave and the drinking dispenser, so they are the things that we kept there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would sort of a bench so that you can sleep be provided for either type?

MS DEBBY WONG: Well, this is the working place. At a larger bus station we may be able to provide a rest room, what we call them, for bus captains to take

a rest. The size would be similar to the size of the larger kiosk. The larger kiosk is for both the regulator as well as the bus captains. The size is the same, but then the design is such that we have tables and chairs.

And then we have some offices which are concrete, say, for example, at the PTI, it already provides a concrete office. Then the space will be larger. As I've mentioned, at some locations we have more space, and we are able to provide more chairs. That's because the office is a concrete one.

CHAIRMAN: What is a PTI?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Public transport interchange.

CHAIRMAN: Are any of the four bus stations that you manage, places at which there are rest facilities?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Like Tin Shui Wai town centre there is a concrete office and we provide a rest area for bus captains and another room is for terminus supervisor.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Also in -- what I manage is Tin Yan, Tin Fu and Tin Tsz, they all have two bigger-size kiosk, one is for terminus supervisor and the other one is for bus captain.

Also what I manage, the four bus stations already

provided the rest room.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The four bus stations that you managed, are these stations providing split shifts for bus captains?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many of them provided split shifts?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I don't have the number. But at each bus station we have certain bus routes, and some is long-haul routes and some is short-haul routes, and we have a mix, bus captains, some is split shift that you mentioned, and some is one duty. That means only am shift or night shift.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So in all these bus stations, there are split shifts and are they all provided with rest facilities for all four bus stations?

CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to just the four?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, we provided the facility in my managed bus terminus, and also we have a bus depot in Tin Shui Wai, and bus captains can rest during the break inside the depot, Tin Shui Wai depot. Or they can -- if they live close to their home, they can go home, rest, and then return to work. Because we will give around three or more hours for them to rest during the break.

CHAIRMAN: Is Tin Shui Wai a town centre a depot or bus station?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We have another depot, it is Tin Shui Wai depot, it is also in Tin Shui Wai zone.

CHAIRMAN: Do you see on the screen we have a list of bus stations, which one is the depot?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Tin Shui Wai town centre is the bus station and we have another location named Tin Shui Wai depot. That is only bus parking only.

CHAIRMAN: So we don't have Tin Shui Wai depot listed here?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, that's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just to clarify, on that page, page 207, there are two Tin Shui Wai. One is Tin Shui Wai town centre, one is Tin Shui Wai railway station. So they are not the ones that are referred to by you as rest facilities?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Sorry, I missed this one. This is under my management too. Tin Shui Wai station.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So both of them?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) This is another one. The station, another bus terminus another bus station under my manage.

CHAIRMAN: You told us earlier that Tin Shui Wai town centre has a rest area; is that right?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We provide rest area there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the rest areas, are they type A or type B, or the bigger kiosk that you mentioned?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Type B.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Type B. So in all the four bus stations, are they type B?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Except Tin Shui Wai town centre, this is a concrete office, so we have concrete office for bus captain rest room.

The other is a kiosk, Tin Yan, Tin Fu, Tin Shui Wai station, they are all in kiosk B, type B.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So there would be benches provided for them, for bus captains?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, there is a chair. Not really a bench. It is a chair, and table, for them to take meal and rest.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your submission you mentioned that there is a long lapse or long lead time to have a placement, even for chemical toilets, during your management of Lai Chi Kok depot, and that is at page 198, paragraph 3D of your submission.

And you mentioned an example of Allway Garden. And can you also refer to a minute, because it appears the trade union have also reflected this to the Transport Department. I just want to ascertain if you know about this.

And that's at TU-260-192 in English. That's minutes of the meeting between the Transport Department, and Legislative Councillor and Mr Cheung Kwok Che, and representatives of the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions, and representative of franchised bus unions.

CHAIRMAN: And the date?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The date is 4 March 2015. Page 260-200.

It was under the topic of bus stop facilities, and it is stated there that:

"The unions were discontent that ... most of the bus termini did not have pre-existing fixed restrooms for employees and toilets, and requested the Transport Department to review the planning and management of bus termini. The unions were also dissatisfied with the present complicated procedure for bus companies to apply for the installation of employee rest rooms, mobile toilets and other bus stop facilities and the consultation was very time-consuming. It was suggested that the application and consultation procedure should be simplified and speed up."

It mentioned a number of locations. And one of them is "Allway Garden bus terminus (no toilets)", which is one of the examples given in your submission.

Is that the location, or is Allway Garden bus terminus the location you mentioned in your submission

at page 198?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So what is the status today? Has a toilet or rest facility been given at Allway Garden?

MS DEBBY WONG: (Interpreted) The Allway Garden terminus is uncovered and it is some way from a public toilet, and opposite Allway Garden there is a shopping centre, but the rest rooms there are always locked. We would have to borrow keys from the management office if our staff are to use their toilet.

The management office indicated that since we are not tenants they are reluctant to lend us the keys.

As I know, for the Lai Chi Kok terminus or depot, we have made submissions multiple times to the Transport Department to apply for chemical toilets. In January 2017, I submitted an application myself. It was January 2016. Again, we submitted an application to TD for a chemical toilet, and in the process TD rejected our application citing rejection from the public consultation.

It is an outdoor depot or terminus, so residents would be somewhat affected, but we considered the need for our staff to have a toilet, that's why we again applied to the Transport Department for other viable alternative locations, and in July last year we revised

our plan, and again made an application. And eventually TD approved our application last October. The reason was that our staff had no toilet they can use.

And we communicated with district councillors to convince them of the need for our staff to have a toilet. So we received an approval letter last October.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is only one of the examples. And the examples you gave based on the minutes is from March 2015, and you only managed to get the application approved in last October, which took at least two years to successfully apply for a toilet facility; is that correct?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Actually, more than two years. Before they have some e-mail with our -- my other colleague, but under my management from 2017 for the whole year we have applied again, and again.

CHAIRMAN: How long has Allway Garden been a bus station?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Over 20 years. I'm not quite remember the history, but once the bus terminus was here, the bus -- was there.

CHAIRMAN: How does it happen that a bus station is brought into use and there is not a provision for a toilet?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) So --

CHAIRMAN: How does that happen?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Our bus captain obtain need to borrow the commercial centre, their office, with the key, and they change the key if they know we borrowed, and they change the key -- change the lock again.

CHAIRMAN: No, the question is more fundamental than that. Why do you provide a bus service to a bus station if there is not a toilet there? How does it happen that that comes about?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: Why do you do it?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) So when I manage, I see the problem, so I try to communicate with the TD, Transport Department, and DC -- actually, I know the background is the DC members very unhappy of the chemical toilet placed in the public PTI.

CHAIRMAN: Then perhaps they have a choice. They either have a bus service or they have a toilet. But they -- so how is it that you provide a bus service and you allow them to oppose putting a toilet in?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) So they asked us to borrow the commercial centre's toilet. That's what the solution they think it would be.

CHAIRMAN: That's not a solution, is it?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yeah, it is true.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the second example you gave is the Lok

Wah issue in August 2017. That's at page 198. And in your submission you stated that the Lok Wah issue was only resolved in October 2017, after several lobbying with the district council.

How long have you applied for a rest kiosk in Lok Wah Estate, since when?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I read from the news it is over five years?. Sorry, this is not under my managed zone, but I read from the newspaper it is over five years we have applied. By KMB.

CHAIRMAN: Is Lok Wah in Kwun Tong?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is it a bus station?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the third example you gave is also at Tuen Mun depot, is the Yuen Long Park.

And you stated that you applied for the resting facility in 2014, and only approved in 2016.

So why did it take so long to provide, or two years to provide a resting facility?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Actually, we don't know the reason. But our procedure is submit our application to Transport Department and they will circulate our application to public, all relevant publics, like police, or DC member, and the residents, near Yuen Long

Park, they will consult them, and I remember they replied that the rejection party is police.

That's very rare from my understanding, it is not their living area, that's police. So we asked police to come out and discuss with them how can we solve this issue. Because providing the kiosk, not only our working station for terminus supervisor, also that was a resting area for our bus captains. If there is really a service providing in Yuen Long Park, we need a station, we need a rest room for them.

So we asked the police to come out to solve the issue, and try to make every party happy.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have written correspondence exchanged with the police about this matter?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes. We resubmit the application to Transport Department, and asked them to -- for another round consultation in 2015.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be able to provide us with the documentation in relation to this particular incident concerning Yuen Long Park --

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- with the Transport Department and with the police?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, I can provide that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

And may I take you to the TU bundle, as well as. This time it is in relation to -- this is a report compiled by the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions. Annex 7 of their submission dated 16 July.

And it listed out --

CHAIRMAN: Page?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 260-346-2. 260-346-2.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is a table setting out the bus terminus and the location, and the progress of the application. I would just like to ask you a few examples here to ask you whether progress has been made, or whether there has been further progress.

On that page, it is under the bus company KMB, and the location is at Tuen Mun Po Tin Estate, and it was stated there that it has been consulted for two years and no reply has yet been received.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I think that is Kelvin Yeung's submission. Po Tin.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe that's not. Because that's the document provided to us by Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions, annex 7. It is not a document by Kelvin Yeung.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But in any event, I just want you to

confirm whether that's the position.

We see in the right column, it is stated there that:

"The relevant application has to be approved by the Housing Department. [Transport Department] has already written to the Housing Department requesting KMB's application to be handled as soon as possible, it has also made follow-up call to the Housing Department to further follow up. The Housing Department replied and said it is still handling the relevant matter."

And it was in relation to the Tuen Mun Po Tin Estate.

So is that, first of all, an estate managed by you?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Or the bus station, is that managed by you?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) No, it is under Kelvin Yeung.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But you don't know about the status of this application?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Not so familiar.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what about the rest of the facilities from 260-346-2, if you look through to 260-346-6? Can you look through them and see which one of them may be applicable to you, or an estate managed by you, a bus station managed by you?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) No. All is not under my management.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

And Ms Wong, I'm going to ask you another topic.

You mentioned that you have been working for Kowloon Motor Bus for over 20 years.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know a person named Raymond Cheng?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Raymond Cheng, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: He used to work for Kowloon Motor Bus between 2010 and 2014 in the safety and service quality department.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Mm-hmm.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know that?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in his submission he mentioned that there was a study conducted during his time, following the accident in Tseung Kwan O in 2009, that there was a study about 29 sharp bends in Hong Kong, and to discuss the possible speed limit that could be applicable.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if we were to show the witness the witness statement?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. The witness statement is at page 96.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: FE bundle, page 96-4.

If you look at the section, buses can overturn

easily --

CHAIRMAN: Give Ms Wong a moment to have a look at the document.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise, yes.

Do you mind looking at the document at page 96-4?

If you look through to 96-6, so three pages.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time. There is no hurry.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, Ms Wong, we can see from this statement that Mr Raymond Cheng stated that he:

"... started the study of safe driving in the sharp turns back in 2013. The Safety and Quality Service Department invited the 4 depot managers, the representatives from Bus Captain Training School and Bus Maintenance Section of Service Department to form a study group looking deeply into all the sharp turns within [KMB] bus route network. The study collected thousands of daily bus turning data and formulated hundreds of potentially dangerous turns within the network. We then narrowed it down to top 29 corner turns that may cause serious overturning [incidents] ..."

And he named a few in Chinese characters there.

May I ask you first, did you know about the study carried out by Raymond Cheng.

MS DEBBY WONG: (Interpreted) Yes, I was aware of the 29 sharp bends. But then I was not within the group making this.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know who was in the group?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) As mentioned by Raymond, maybe it is the depot manager plus the training school instructor.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And this study group, it mentioned that -- if you look over the page at 96-6, it referred to the study group carrying out tests of these 29 turns in different road conditions, different speeds, different passengers, load conditions, and they video-recorded the whole study for future reference.

Did you know about this video-recorded study?

MS DEBBY WONG: (Interpreted) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look, if you follow on at the bottom, it mentioned there was a safety booklet.

I believe subsequently it was clarified as a small printed card, by Mr Raymond Cheng:

" ... for Bus Captains detailing each potentially dangerous turns' exact location, direction, and road nature, road condition, past record, related photos or grimes from Transport Department's document or passenger complaints ..."

Then they have made 31 is safety driving suggestions from a study of over 1,500 studies.

Did you know about this?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I know there is a safety booklet, but I'm not sure of the study.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So there is a safety booklet of these 29 turns; is that correct?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) In general. The safety booklet is in general for bus captains to be careful.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you know about the outcome of this study?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Not sure.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know if it was disseminated, passed out to bus captains?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, we will pass this safety handbook to bus captains, and we will have a very brief instruction to them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But in relation to this safety handbook to bus captain, do you know if it contains anything about these 29 sharp bends?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Sorry, I'm not very quite read the details from the booklet, so maybe I have no idea on this subject.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mmm. During your time in Kowloon Motor Bus, did you at any time discuss with the management

about conducting a study or gathering views from bus captains as to the dangerous road conditions in Hong Kong?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We will give -- I remember during Mr Cheng's -- the period I was not assistant manager, and I am one of the operations staff and we will provide some location that may have potential to have the hazard on the sharp bends. So during that time we provide some location to SSQ session to have more review on this.

CHAIRMAN: That's safety and service session, is it?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For which period?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) During Mr Cheng's -- 2010 to 2014.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about after 2014?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) After --

MS MAGGIE WONG: After 2014, did you continue to provide information about this?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, continuous.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be able to provide us with some of the documentation concerning your relaying of the concerns about locations about the topic you mentioned about the dangerous road condition that may pose risk?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Maybe I will not have the

black and white, but we will have a focus group to discuss this topic. I remember after the accident in Tseung Kwan O they have a focus group to discuss this topic.

CHAIRMAN: Were there minutes kept of these meetings? Was it documented in any way?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I'm not sure we have the document.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned a focus group, is it different from the study group?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Similar. Similar, the study group to study the sharp bend location.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But what about the membership in this focus group?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I think they all left KMB. The department -- the depot manager did mention they are all -- some is retired, some is resigned.

CHAIRMAN: So the group of people involved in studying sharp bends either retired or resigned; is that what you are saying?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Mm-hmm.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So when did they retire or resign?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) In these few years. I don't exactly remember the date.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So after they retired or resigned what happened to the focus group?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We changed to each depot to keep monitor the safety issue. Not by this section, safety -- SSQ -- the ownership shifted to each depot, operations.

CHAIRMAN: So rather than being centralised it became dispersed to each depot?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Individual. Mm-hmm.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When you mentioned each individual depot, would you discuss with the bus captains that based on their experience that certain road or bends are dangerous, and then to warn the other bus captains that they have to be careful? Would you do something like that?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We will analyse some, the accident location, bus captain experience, in the sharing group, the bus captain experience, and like this. To analyse the -- any hazard in -- on the road, and we need to maybe if that is necessary, we will discuss with training school, the instructor, how to train some bus captain to pay attention to the road.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This sharing group, is this only confined to individual depot, or would there be discussions amongst different depots?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) In -- because different location -- it depends on each depot. They will individually discuss with training school, or we have some meeting, maybe with training school we will -- we will provide to the -- any time actually, not specific, not specific in any meeting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How often you hold this sharing group?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Like what I say. It is -- if we analyse some traffic accident, so it is not time limit to them. So another is bus captains sharing experience, then if we find their location is a hazard, we will talk to the instructor, or make some notice or reminder to remind bus captain to pay attention on some hazard location. So there is no specific meeting or any time to make a promise in that meeting, or what.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You refer to making some notice, or reminder to remind bus captains to pay attention on some hazard location. Are they in writing, or orally?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Both. Mostly it is in writing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Within each individual depot?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide us with some of these notices or reminders?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I can provide to you later.

I don't it have now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

So about these individual notices, are they reactive to accidents? That's the first question. Are they reactive to accidents? The notice was issued reactive to accidents?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) For your first question, yes, sometimes it is react to the accidents. Like a reminder, for the bus captain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the second is, are they reactive to bus captains' complaints, or if I put it correctly, is it bus captains' views, initiative to inform you about certain road condition?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, if there is road condition will create some accident we will also issue some reminder for bus captain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: My question is, sorry, are they reactive -- are they study -- is it a study carried out by your company's initiative, or due to the bus captains' voicing out their views about certain road conditions? Which one is that?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) If the bus captain voice out that, we will verify the cause, or something we can protect, I mean, prevent any accident appear again, so we will find out the root cause first. If there is

really can prevent, we can do something. Like, maybe, remind them some road conditions have some -- like after the raining, the tree branches always will create some accident, we will remind them to be patient when they drive near the roadside, so we will remind something like "Be careful driving near that road section".

MS MAGGIE WONG: So that's reactive to the experience of the bus captains' views?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And not something initiated by the bus company; is that what you are saying?

CHAIRMAN: I think what you have told us is that you reacted to accidents and you also listened to what bus captains had to say?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's how you formulated these cautionary advices?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Mm-hmm. Right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Can you give us a few examples during your time perhaps in Tuen Mun, as to some of the road that you have identified as dangerous or posed risk?

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN: If you can't, just say so.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Okay. No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So you can't identify at the moment? Okay.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Concerning the last topic, it is about lost trip.

We have heard some evidence that there are a number of lost trips due to the fact that -- they are due to various reasons; sometimes due to road conditions and sometimes due to the inaccurate estimation of the journey time.

Can you confirm if that's what happened --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, can you tell us what a lost trip is?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Lost trip will be -- we have a scheduling service that we have gazette -- like gazetted trips that we promise to make a certain service level, in a certain period there is a gazetted schedule. And there is a -- if we cannot follow the scheduling of service, that trip missing was named lost trip.

CHAIRMAN: So, inability to fulfil your gazetted schedule?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Does this happen in the Tuen Mun depot that you managed?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, lost trip happened there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us the reasons why there were lost trips?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Basically we will have the crew, the sufficient of crew. Second will be the traffic condition will create -- the bus cannot arrive on time. And the third will be the bus breakdown, we don't have spare buses to replace shortly.

Fourth will be if there is an urgent -- sudden demand happened in other area, we need to redeploy some service from gazetted service to others to make the demand solved.

CHAIRMAN: To meet the demand?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes. So there is these reasons will create lost trip. Some -- actually, we are doing some -- actually, we always need to review the -- assess the scheduling of service time and time. Actually, when we create the schedule of service we need to review the -- every area, any changes, if there are changes maybe my during the off peak, the service do not need so frequent, so we will submit the application to Transport Department to reduce some schedule of service, some trips, so make use this time for bus captain for more rest time or to let them have more time to rest.

So we, on and on going, we will apply this to Transport Department and this can also reduce the trips, so we can -- may have less lost trip rates.

CHAIRMAN: Do Transport Department measure your lost trips?

Is this something you have to report?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How do you assess the journey time when you gazette all these scheduled trips?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Okay, for the first time we will use our patrol car. Maybe for the first time the timetable issued we will use our patrol car to follow the scheduled trips, scheduled routing to measure the -- estimate the journey time. After the timetable implement, maybe after certain period the environment is changed, we will analyse the previous days of regular service to summarise the journey time to average the journey time to estimate any changes after the timetable implement.

So that is how to generate the journey time.

CHAIRMAN: So if you find that the journey time in fact is taking longer than the scheduled time, what do you do about it?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We will apply to TD to make the scheduling service -- to revise the scheduling of service.

CHAIRMAN: Is that something that you do regularly?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: When did you last do that?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Actually, last month we also

submit that -- not last month, in May.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

How long typically does it take to get a response from the Transport Department?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) It will take long, because Transport Department say they will arrange a survey. Actually, not only we add the journey time, if we will, that's necessary, we also review the non-peak hour, the trip may be not that frequent, maybe reduce some trips, and the Transport Department need to make a survey, and then it will take a very long time for the process.

CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about years? How long are you talking about?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Some certain months, maybe a year, Mr Chairman, yes.

MEMBER LO: Have you used the black box information to ascertain that the trip time is actually longer?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Actually, we don't use black box for the journey time. We use -- we have a system, our -- our KMB system, which is the bus captain use their Octopus to report on the bus terminus, bus station, when they reach any bus station they will need to tap the Octopus card so that we can know that they arrive, and if there is some uncertainty, we will use its black box to see their arrival time. Actually, if

the bus arrive, bus captain reach to us report they arrive. So we will actually use our internal system, TER system. Instead of black box.

MEMBER LO: But TD does not look at that as sufficient evidence to change a timetable?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) No. I don't know how they do the analysis.

CHAIRMAN: But isn't the equipment that you have, we call it a black box, if you like, isn't it capable of doing this automatically? Or don't you know?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) You mean the black box data do it automatically?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Tell you the journey time.

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Actually, we will keep it in a database. Once we need to retrieve the data, we will recall that to see if the bus arrive on time, or something, or the speed of the bus. So not actually we rely on this to monitor journey time.

CHAIRMAN: The system you use is the fact that the bus captain uses his Octopus card on arrival at a terminus, is that it?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what are the consequences for your company if you have lost trips?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) It depends on -- "what are

your consequences"? Actually, we try to deploy sufficient crew, bus captain to make a lost trip -- minimise the lost trip. That's what -- our solution. And the other solution maybe what I mentioned, try to reduce the off-peak trips to make less bus captain to use on the road, and that's another solution.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Wong, do you know a person call Alok Jain?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Yes, our planner, ex DOD.

CHAIRMAN: What does that stand for?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Deputy operations director.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: During your time, have you been able to have a discussion or meetings with Alok Jain in relation to the safety aspects of franchised buses?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) In my understanding, I only -- the planning issue, I will discuss with him. Because he have another --

(Interpreted) He had got another sort of capacity. He was the planner, he was the head of planning.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned planning issues. What is planning issue?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Because we have a division named "Planning", we will discuss with Planning Department on some routes development, or the bus type

issue with the Planning Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In relation to the bus type issue, would you discuss black box?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Not with him.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But during your time did you have meetings with this Planning Department concerning black box?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I have finished my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

MEMBER AUYEUNG: I just want to follow up on the comment you made earlier, that when a particular spot to be defined as hazardous by yourself or a bus captain, do you also have a procedure to report it to the head office, or the training instructor?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) We will discuss with training instructor for the -- any hazard. Something like maybe a -- sharing from experience, maybe we have a terminus, we see there always have accident when bus captain turning into the bus bay, like there is a shelter, maybe a shelter erected there which will create some hazard there, we will discuss with training school how to make more training on bus captain, or do some modification on the shelter issue.

So this kind of review or something experienced from bus captain, we will do, as what I said, we will verify the final, the root cause, and then we will try to find a way out, how to solve that.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Is this communication in writing, or verbal?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Both. Both will have. Sometimes e-mail, e-mail to training school.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

The other question is during your time working in your particular responsibility, have you ever received complaints from bus captain that the resting facilities are not good enough?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) Mm-hmm, yes. We -- sometimes we will receive some bus captain request, maybe a bigger resting area, like the kiosk will be too small, they want one more, or they want more facility. Like they want distilled water, they want hot and cold water, so we will try to use our force to make them happy.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: This is just a very open question. I know you are a very experienced frontline manager.

Are there issues that you think the company can do, maybe should do, but has not done, other than the aspects we have already discussed, about safety, that

you observe over the years, that we should be aware of?

MS DEBBY WONG: (In English) I think for the safety issue, not only our company can do everything. Like what I say, some road conditions, and some -- road condition is not -- maybe, the design of the road may have some not -- not good for double-decker bus or something -- so not the company can do, it is the design of the road, or Transport Department maybe can do something on some road design.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Wong. Thank you for coming to assist us by giving evidence. But your evidence is now complete, and you can withdraw from the table. You can stay and listen to your colleague if you wish, or you are free to leave.

But we will take the evidence now from Mr Yeung.

EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:

MR KELVIN YEUNG

(Evidence given in Cantonese and English, transcription of the simultaneous interpretation and/or English)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Yeung for coming to assist us by giving evidence for accepting our invitation to do so. You have heard me explain to Ms Wong and you have seen how we proceed.

So I'll move straight away and ask Ms Wong to ask you questions.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: Good morning, Mr Chairman, and good morning, members. Could I have your permission to make some opening remarks, thank you.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to thank the Committee for inviting me to today's hearing. Just now, Ms Debby Wong spoke. Like her, I'm also an assistant manager. Others would call us zone head, in Chinese "(Chinese spoken)". I'm also responsible for the operation of Tuen Mun depot. As has been pointed out -- perhaps I should speak slower for the sake of the interpreters.

Now, for Tuen Mun depot, we are responsible for Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai. For zone heads the main duty is such that he or she will take care of the operation of the bus service including bus routes and frontline bus captains, terminus supervisors, as well as other staff members, as well as facilities at the terminus like the rest kiosk. They are within our duties.

We have to closely liaise with the frontline colleagues. Therefore, we have to know what the need, and at the same time other than dealing with the frontline colleagues regularly we have to meet with the management. We have to communicate with them, having meetings with them, telling them or relaying to them

what frontline colleagues have said, and regularly I have to talk about what happens to the individual routes, like what difficulties we have encountered.

So we have to be aware of the directions of the management.

So I can say that for zone heads, we are sort of like a bridge, a very important one, between the frontline colleagues as well as the management.

Allow me to say a few words about myself.

I have been with the KMB for almost 10 years. I started at a junior level. 10 years ago I joined the Sha Tin depot as an inspector, operations inspector. It is an outdoor sort of a duty.

My main duty was to assist the passengers as well as frontline bus captains.

If bus captains encounter any problems then we have to arrive at the scene to provide assistance. I was also responsible for the terminus facilities. So there was a lot for me to take care of.

Two years later I was promoted and I became an officer for operations. So it is an office duty. Not outdoors, but of course I have to go out to pay such visits as well.

For the first two years, as far as the safety and service quality department is concerned, I would have a

close relationship because I was responsible for safety matters.

Two years later, I was deployed to Tuen Mun, Yuen Long, Tin Shui Wai responsible for the operations, and then the company deployed me to take up a ROM project, so that's the real-time operation management.

CHAIRMAN: Very sensibly you admonished yourself that you would take this slowly, but you are not doing it. Can I ask you to slow down.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Slow down? Sure, let me slow down. Would you like me to repeat it again --

CHAIRMAN: No --

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) -- or just keep going?

CHAIRMAN: -- but do it slowly.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Two years later I was responsible for operations at Tuen Mun Tin Shui Wai. At that time the company deployed me to take up a project called ROM. I gathered from previous hearing sessions that's the real-time operation management. So for ROM and for the SSQ department, I'm experienced.

So I am -- I welcome questions from you on those two topics. This year, unfortunately, there was a very serious bus accident in February and I found that KMB has become the focus point of the media, political parties, trade unions, and even some former colleagues

of the KMB have aired different views regarding the company.

It is not just myself, but my colleagues have also found that quite a lot of the view points or the allegations were untrue. Together with the other six zone heads we believe that such untrue allegations regarding our bus captains' frontline officers, back office colleagues and the management, such untrue allegations are most unfair. Therefore, we have co-signed a letter addressed to our board of directors. We would like to tell them what we have seen, and what actually happened.

So it was a brief one, but we told the board of directors what we saw, and then we forwarded the letter to the Committee for your reference. I know that a few zone heads have had correspondence with you. Today only Debby and myself can find time to attend your hearings. What we want to do is that in the capacity of a zone head we would like to tell you what actually happens.

From my point of view, before the accident, in other words, before February, if you asked the public or residents what they feel about KMB service in recent years, they would say that service has improved, and they are doing rather well in terms of the bus service, and facilities, real-time arrival information,

et cetera. There have been improvements.

Unfortunately, after the accident in February, if you ask the residents again --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Yeung --

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for making the opening statement, but you have occupied quite a lot of time already --

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) I am nearly finished.

CHAIRMAN: You can make some closing remarks if you like, but we are going to move now to questions.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yeung, thank you for coming. You mentioned that you joined KMB 10 years ago, that would be around 2008?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) 2009.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when you became the operator in charge of the Tuen Mun depot?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Around 2013.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we can see that in your statement that the -- or rather in your opening statement, Tuen Mun depot is responsible for bus operation of Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, and you are only responsible for Tuen Mun, correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In 2013, I once managed the stations in Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai. I was

responsible for a little more than half a year, and after that, I was responsible for Tuen Mun, and I was the zone head of Tuen Mun. Until July this year -- well, after July I was rotated to Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, so I'm very familiar with Yuen Long, Tuen Mun and Tin Shui Wai.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you mentioned in your submission there are 31 bus terminus with full-day bus services under Tuen Mun depot. So currently, how many bus termini are you managing?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For Yuen Long, Tuen Mun and Tin Shui Wai there are a total of 31. Ms Wong mentioned 30, because one terminus only started operation at the end of June. So there might be a discrepancy.

For bus terminals with full day service --

CHAIRMAN: The question was very simple. How many bus stations do you manage? Don't tell us your mental process at arriving at the answer. Just give us the answer.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) But I must tell you how we ascertain the number of 31.

CHAIRMAN: No, that's not necessary, Mr Yeung. Listen to the question, and please respond directly to the question.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) There are 31 stations with

full-time service.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many terminals do you manage?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In July I was responsible for stations in Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai.

CHAIRMAN: The question was: how many stations do you manage?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) 31 terminals with full-day service.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So you manage the station together with Debby Wong for Tin Shui Wai as well, co-manage?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Correct, and Yuen Long as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But you are of the same rank as Debby Wong, is that correct, or you are of a higher rank?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I'm mainly responsible for Tuen Mun terminals, but the company wants me to look at Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai as well. But for Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, Debby and Amanda are chiefly responsible.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in your opening statement you stated that you take care of bus routes and front line of bus captains, et cetera. Do you know how many bus stations have special shifts?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Of the 31 stations, if you

don't mind, I will count them now.

From my recollection, all of them have bus captains on special shifts.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And would resting facilities be provided to all 31 bus stations or bus termini?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, there are resting facilities.

MS MAGGIE WONG: All 31?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If you need, I would like to elaborate on this. Of the 31 bus stations, there are special shifts, but the bus captains might not end their working days at the same station, so at all 31 stations there would be resting facilities for captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yeung, you mentioned there are two types of rest kiosk. We have heard that, type A and type B, and you stated that for type A, the kiosk is about the size of 17 square feet, and for type B, 50 square feet. And we heard from Debby Wong that there is a bigger kiosk. Can you tell us how much bigger in comparison with type A and type B?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For type A it can accommodate a maximum of two staff. For type B, the size is around double of type A. So in other words, if you put two type A kiosks together, they would look around the same size as one type B kiosk. However, if

you place two type A kiosks there would be a wall in between. So the space would be -- would not be able to be used some fully.

CHAIRMAN: Is this designation A and B a KMB designation?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes. These are our two standard kiosks: type A and type B.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The Transport Department has made no guidelines on provision of rest facilities; is that correct? No guidelines whatsoever.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct. As far as I know, they do not have guidelines in place. So KMB would decide what kind of facilities to install.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There is another type you mentioned. It is tailor-made kiosk, to cater special need of individual bus terminus. Can you tell us how many of these tailor-made kiosks were under your management?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Let me count.

There are two to three. But I would have to verify the exact number of tailored kiosks.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what is meant by "tailor-made"?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Sometimes the applications for certain kiosks were not approved by TD or the Housing Department. For example, the sizes might be inappropriate or they might stand in the way of other facilities such as facilities for the blind. Then we

might have to tailor special sizes to fulfil the department's requirements.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the approximate size of this tailor-made kiosk?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) The total area should be similar to a type B kiosk. If the width is too much, we might narrow it down, but then we might make the kiosk longer. So that is the situation as I know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would sleeping sofa or benches be provided in all or some of these resting facilities that you manage?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In Yuen Long, there are three locations with sleeping areas with benches for captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned three locations with sleeping areas. Can you tell us where?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Tuen Mun depot, Tuen Mun town centre, and Tuen Mun south depot: at Tuen Mun south depot there are no sleeping benches, but there is still space for captains to sleep.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many sleeping benches were there for each of these locations?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I cannot give the exact number now. But there are approximately five benches.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For each of them?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, at each location.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And that location would be shared by how many bus captains?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For all bus captains, whether or not they are on special shifts, they can use the facilities. I don't have the exact figure on hand.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you give us an estimate of the number of bus captains that would use each of these locations?

CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about any one time, or what?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Any one time.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) From what I see at the stations, most of the time the five benches would not be fully occupied by captains, so at any one time less than five captains would be using the facilities.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At what time did you go down to these locations?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Usually in the so-called middle hours, in other words from 11 am to 3 or 4 pm. When I visit in those hours, sometimes benches would be occupied by captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How frequently did you go down for these three locations?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, our duty is such that for every week I have to visit different terminus. So for the three places on a monthly basis I would go at

least one to two times. For Tuen Mun depot I would go more frequently, because my office is right at Tuen Mun depot.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And may I now go to some of the examples that you mentioned in your submission that you stated that there are difficulties in obtaining permission or in obtaining successful application for resting facilities.

It is at page 181-1 to 181-2.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Of FE bundle.

And in your statement at the bottom you mentioned three locations that require improvement, and the first one is So Kwut Wat, newly introduced on 25 June 2018, and you state there had that:

"... provision of a type A kiosk and chemical toilet is needed. (application ... is pending since 13 June 2018)."

May I first ask you, how long this So Kwut Wat bus terminus existed?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If you talk about full-day operation, it was introduced on 25 June 2018.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So this was a bus stop newly placed, instead of being there for years?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When you introduced this new bus terminus, with the Transport Department, did the Transport Department require at any stage that your company do provide resting facilities to bus captains?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) The TD didn't require the provision of such facilities for bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The Transport Department, when they approved this bus terminus, were there requirements set out in writing?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) What do you mean? You mean when we introduced the route, whether there is any written correspondence? The answer is yes. We have to formally submit papers to get a formal application, and the TD will formally sort of reply to us, saying that it is approved.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When the Transport Department approves a certain route, would they, in your experience, normally impose certain conditions?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) What do you mean by "conditions"?

MS MAGGIE WONG: For running that particular route.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, the TD would ask for the alignment and the bus stops along the route, and the journey time, the journey distance, the frequency. All such will be clearly stated in their approval letter.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In relation to this So Kwut Wat terminus, would there be special shifts for this particular bus terminus?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So because you stated there that the application was only made since 13 June 2018, so at the moment there will be no resting facility, is that correct, for that So Kwut Wat bus terminus?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct, for so Kwut Wat bus terminus we have placed a type A kiosk and a chemical toilet -- we would like to do so, but so far we have not got the approval from the TD.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many bus captains are working in that So Kwut Wat bus terminus?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If you look at the number of bus captains involved, if I remember correctly, I would say three or four of them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many of them are on special shifts?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) One.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do I take it that the type A kiosk is installed notwithstanding the fact that approval has not been given?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) This is a fact. We haven't got the approval, but we have already installed it there, because we have commissioned the route. If we

don't have it there, it means that the bus captains can not take a rest there.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the second example you gave is Po Tin Estate, in which you state there that in order to cater for more bus captains for resting, there is a need to convert type A to type B kiosk, and you applied to the Housing Authority since 24 November 2014.

Can you tell us what is the progress so far as this -- because you are applying on 24 November 2014. Is the current state still type A kiosk, or did you do similar thing as in So Kwut Wat Estate, installing type B nevertheless?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For Po Tin terminus, we used to have three type A kiosks. As I have said, well, two of them were merged together, but then the space was not put to maximum use, we reviewed the situation, we found that it wasn't adequate, so we applied to the Housing Department hoping that the two merged type A kiosks can be converted into a type B kiosk, and for the third type A kiosk it should become a type B kiosk. As of this moment, we have not got any approval from the HD, but still, we have already replaced the two type A kiosks by a type B kiosk. So the replacement has taken place. We are yet to convert one more type A kiosk into a type B kiosk.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Why do you see a need to convert type A to type B for Po Tin Estate?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We went there, we saw the bus captains were outside the kiosk eating their meal box, because there was not sufficient space within the kiosk. Bus captains have also told us that they didn't have sufficient space, therefore we believe that two type A kiosks would not be adequate.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are there special shifts for this Po Tin Estate?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many bus captains are using the two type A kiosks?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I haven't got the detailed figures as to how many bus captains doing special shifts are using the facilities. My understanding is that many of them go home to take a rest.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How many routes are running for this Po Tin Estate?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For whole-day routes there are two of them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about non-full day?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For non-full day service another two bus routes. They have morning service only.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I see the time. May we take

a break?

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr Yeung, we are going to take a break until 12 o'clock by that clock on the wall behind you.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

(11.41 am)

(A short break)

(12.00 pm)

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yeung, just to wrap this matter up, do you mind providing us with some figures about Po Tin Estate, in terms of how many bus captains are using the kiosk in the Po Tin Estate, in terms of special shifts.

And you have also stated in your submission that it normally requires a long lead time for about five years before your application for resting facilities can be approved, and you cited four examples at page 181-2; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm going on to another topic, Mr Yeung.

In your opening statement you said you are experienced in real-time monitoring, ROM device, and also the SSQ, is that correct -- SSQ department, that is safety and service quality department; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And you said that two years later, after

you were assigned to the Tuen Mun depot you were assigned to take up the project concerning ROM. Can you tell us when that was.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Regarding the ROM project, I think it was around about 2013 that I started to take part.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since 2013?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, what was that question? Because you talked over the interpretation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I am so sorry, since 2013 Mr Yeung was assigned --

CHAIRMAN: We got that one, then you asked another question which produced an affirmative answer, but we didn't hear the question.

Never mind. Move on then.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think my question is whether it is since 2013, and then Mr Yeung said "Yes".

Do you know a person by the name of Raymond Cheng?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I take you to his statement that he mentioned, something about a study that he conducted for safe driving in the sharp turns back in 2013. That's at page 96-4 of FE bundle.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you read three pages, 96-4 to 96-6.

CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MS MAGGIE WONG: There are a few questions I would like to ask.

First, at page 96-4, Mr Cheng mentioned:

"The Safety and Quality Service Department invited 4 Depot Managers, the representatives from Bus Captain Training School and bus maintenance section of Service Department to form a study group to looking deeply into all the sharp turns within [KMB] bus route network."

Are you part of this study group?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) At that time I wasn't a manager, so I wasn't on the study group. But then the then manager did ask for my opinions.

CHAIRMAN: Who was that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If you talk about depot managers, at that time it was the general manager for Tuen Mun depot, Mr Woo Kin Keung, who has already retired.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And according to this study they have narrowed it down to the top 29 corner turns that may cause serious overturning accidents. Did you know about these 29 corner turns?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And did you contribute to the narrowing down to 29 corner turns?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As far as I can recall, I think at that time there were more than that. I think they identified certain sharp bends locations as identified by Mr Raymond Cheng. I recall that there were more than 20 plus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that according to Mr Cheng he has identified more than 29 turns. How did you know that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I think from internal communication, for our driving instructors, I did have a discussion with them over such a topic. My understanding was that from our driving instructors, they said that for sharp bends, if it is 90-degrees or almost 90 degrees, they would regard it as a sharp bend. So I understand there were more than such a number of locations.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you turn over the page at 96-6, at the top it mentioned that:

"The colleagues from the Safety and Service Quality Department accompanied all the colleagues from the study group to test all the 29 turns in different road conditions, different speeds, different passenger load conditions and video-recorded the whole study for future

reference."

Did you know about this video-recorded study?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) At the time I heard that they invited driving instructors to carry out test runs at such locations. As to whether it was really done, and what extent, and how many was covered I don't know. But I did hear about such a matter, and I was also aware that they had the idea of making a video recording.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that you heard from the driving instructors. Are those driving instructors still employed by KMB?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) My understanding is they are still working with the company, I mean the driving instructors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us who?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, I don't know who actually had meetings on that day. There were dozens of driving instructors, I can't give you the names of the driving instructors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if we read on from that paragraph, it appears that this video-recorded study was carried out. Because it is stated there that important data was collected from these experiments to come up with a set of safety guidelines.

And if we follow on and read from that paragraph, he

further stated:

"From the study, we were able to produce a safety booklet ..."

He subsequently clarified as small printed cards:

" ... for Bus Captains detailing each potentially dangerous turns' exact location, direction, and road nature, road condition, past record, related photos [et cetera]."

And he suggested 31 safety driving suggestions from a study of over 1,500 studies.

Did you know about these small printed cards for bus captains?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you seen one of them?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Are they still in existence?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No longer in use.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you retrieve a copy?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I'm not sure whether we still get them in our office. Some frontline bus captains and some driving instructors have different views for such cards, so they have not formed part of our training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So why are those cards no longer in use?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As I have said, some driving

instructors and some frontline bus captains think that it is difficult to define what is a sharp bend. The definition could be wide. If you are to set a speed for each and every sharp bend, it may be beyond the capability of the KMB. Probably the rationale behind the study is to enable each bus captain know about the maximum speed to be deployed at each bend. But then for a bus captain, he will be going through different sharp bends and then for the TD, the speed limit is 50, so they believe that it is better to make a judgment on each and every occasion rather than asking the bus captain to remember the maximum speed for each and every bend.

CHAIRMAN: How did you come to know about these different views?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, the cards had been issued by the bus captains, and they did reflect their views to me. They said that if they didn't follow the suggested speed limit, in fact they did not commit any offence or speeding within the laws of Hong Kong, but then the company would not say the same.

So if an accident didn't happen, is it a risk? We didn't come to any conclusion.

At that time, we raised the point perhaps we should talk to the TD to sort of install the arrows at the

sharp bends or we can put up some warning signs.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You referred to "at that time we raised the point with the Transport Department to install the arrows at sharp bends". When was that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We suggested to the SSQ, but I do not know whether the SSQ eventually applied to the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In 2013. I do not know whether they eventually applied to the TD.

CHAIRMAN: When were the cards issued to the bus captains, as you said?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I cannot remember the exact dates, it was around 2013 or 2014.

CHAIRMAN: Is that throughout the bus captains in KMB?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, we attempted to distribute the cards but having heard the captains' comments we stopped distributing the cards.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yeung, you also mentioned that you're experienced in real-time ROM device, and can you tell us how experienced are you in knowing the functions and capabilities of black box?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Are you referring to ROM or the black box?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Both.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For ROM I was one of the staff representing operations in the design phase of this system. I was involved throughout the development of ROM.

For black box I'm not too familiar with the technologies involved. Many of our computer programmes would be supported by the black box, which would provide the necessary data.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You -- ROM is -- stands for real-time monitoring. So is your involvement limited to the provision of real-time data for passengers to know the schedule time of buses? Or is your involvement wider in terms of the safety aspect?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As far as I know, the design of ROM did not involve any safety considerations. We relied on black box data in designing the system and we wanted to make use of the data to determine our frequencies, so safety was not among the considerations.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that at that time, I don't think it has been translated -- you mentioned that at that time it was not mentioned at any of the meetings about the issue of safety, in terms of the real-time monitoring. I think you also mentioned "at the meetings".

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What meetings?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) ROM was a new project, and we started from scratch. We made use of existing black box data, so we would meet regularly and everyone would provide input on how we should design the system.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) It should be 2013, I cannot remember the exact month.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Who were present in these meetings?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We had representatives from our IT department, representatives from the operations unit of the four depots, and there was a central department known as the traffic department. They were the project managers who would coordinate these meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was the planning and development department, or were people from planning and development department present in these meetings?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No, they were not involved.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you know about Alok Jain?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I know him.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you have dealings with him during the time of 2013 to 2015?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We did have meetings on certain planning issues.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What are the certain planning issues?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For example, we planned bus routes for the coming year, they had to be submitted to TD and the district councils, so he and I took part in meetings with the TD and district councils on bus route rationalisation or other changes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard evidence from Mr Alok Jain that at that time there was an idea, to use Lai Chi Kok as the real-time operation management centre, or so-called, the operation control centre, in which the data analysis would be done company-wide. Have you heard about that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I heard about it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we also heard evidence that ultimately Lai Chi Kok office was not used in that way. It became an office instead of a real-time operation management centre; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Incorrect.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So up until now is it still being used as real-time monitoring centre?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We had a radio control section. It is still exists today.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us what is this radio control section?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In Chinese we call it the

KMB radio. It operates around the clock. When captains and other staff run into issues on the road they can call this 24-hour number, and staff would be deployed for support. The radio would have direct lines with the police, and they would exchange intelligence with the ETCC of the Transport Department, and police.

CHAIRMAN: What is ETCC?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I don't know what the full name is in English. It is something like the Emergency Transport Coordination Centre.

MS MAGGIE WONG: As you said, it sounds like a radio station for emergency situation instead of real-time monitoring using black box; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Eventually, ROM transformed into another kind of system, and this system is still in use.

But the current system is a bit different from the design of ROM back then.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned "a bit different". How different?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Back then the idea of ROM was to monitor the separation between buses, and if the system realised that a certain bus is too close to the bus in front, prompts might be given to the bus captain so that they would set off later. So if they are going

too slow, again prompts might be given, or issued to bus captains. The idea was to allow more even waiting times for passengers.

So the idea was that ROM could share some work of terminal regulators, and if the Lai Chi Kok depot was turned into a control centre, then most regulators would not be needed anymore. But now we have retained all the terminal regulators and ROM became a system of monitoring the locations and speed of buses and, if necessary, we can use this database to retrieve the past records of buses.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that this system was transformed, or rather a bit different from the original design, or idea. Why would there be a transformation of this idea?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I'm not sure about the reason for the decision made by the management, but myself and some staff from the project team felt that if we are to use the system to replace the functions of regulators, the idea was not very realistic, that's why we offered comments to the management that there would be certain risk if regulators are dismissed, but I do not know whether this was the reason for the eventual decision.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us when this transformation

took place?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) It took place in around 2014 or early 2015.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So after 2015?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, in the subsequent months.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We also heard from Mr Alok Jain that at the time when this real-time monitoring system was considered, one of the ideas was to nudge the driver to drive in a better way on the road by creating some kind of a system where they could give them feedback about how they are driving and whether they are outliers or whether they are falling within the normal pattern or whether it is good behaviour or bad behaviour.

Have you heard about that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What happened to this idea?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) It was implemented. Now on every bus there is a small device with four lights, and it would emit a low beep reminding bus captains of any improper driving behaviour.

CHAIRMAN: Any improper driving behaviour?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Right. Say, for example speeding, or sharp braking, or sudden acceleration, or if the engine has been idling, we don't want the engine

to be on and yet the bus remains stationary. So there will be a beeping sound and there will be light signals.

CHAIRMAN: So four areas?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when do you have this system of alerting drivers by using this alert system, or small device, you call it?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Sorry? If you ask for an exact date, I can't recall. But I would say that it must have been there for a few years. If you wanted information, I can go back to check it up for you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And can you tell us more about the system of black box in terms of monitoring drivers' behaviour?

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, what thresholds are set to cause this device to illuminate a light and to emit a low sound. What is the threshold for speeding?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For the details, I don't think I have got them with me. But there will be a speed, and also the number of seconds taken to accelerate or decelerate, or to brake, but I have not got the figures with me now.

CHAIRMAN: None of them?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No.

CHAIRMAN: Does what is on the screen now help you? We have received evidence that this information comes from the

black box that was on the Tai Po bus that had the accident on 10 February of this year.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That is, for the record, BM-66.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I have come across such figures. I understand that our management would tune the figures so as to see whether there was a need to enhance the warning. As to whether they are the current set of figures, I'm not sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned the management would tune the figures. Can you tell us who are those members in the management that would tune the figures?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I think the management of our engineering department, if they want to modify the system, it will be such engineers who would do it. So in my daily work I have not come across such figures.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we may go to 67, page 67 of BM bundle. Scroll it down.

In the blue section, blue paragraph, the third paragraph, this is the black box, or telematics company, in which your company has a contract to provide telematics system.

It states there:

"Regarding the real-time operations management system we are not aware about any plans by KMB to introduce such a system. Hence, we are neither aware of

any plan by KMB to interface the technograph/telematics system with the ROM system."

It appears --

CHAIRMAN: I think give Mr Yeung a chance to read this.

This is provided by Openmatics and ZF Friedrichschafen.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you finished, Mr Yeung?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Finished.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you confirm that's the position of KMB? Was this accurately recorded there?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As far as I know, yes, it is correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have KMB considered interfacing the telematics system with the ROM system in future?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I don't know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know who would know?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I think colleagues from the engineering department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we go back to black box. Can you tell us briefly how KMB would monitor the drivers' driving behaviour by using black box?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, there are two areas here. First of all, the most straightforward one is about speeding. So for us, in the operations, in the depot, as well as the TQD, they would monitor the situation by using the program. The data would be fed

from the black box, so that's about speeding.

And then, we have got alerts from the small device for driving behaviour, so we would also record the number of times that the light was emitted, so it is an area which falls within the responsibility of the TQD.

CHAIRMAN: Where do you get the information about the number of times that the light is lit and the sound is emitted?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Our IT department will send a report telling us how many times the light was activated regarding a driver. For harsh braking, when the light is activated it doesn't always mean that the driver is wrong, because if the vehicle in front has braked, then the driver has to do the same. So the department would review to see whether a particular bus captain has more times that the light is activated and we may get a plain clothes assessor to ride with the bus captain to check if there is anything wrong with the driving behaviour.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned your IT department will send a report telling you how many times the light was activated regarding a driver. How frequent would that be done?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) A report for every week or two.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So let's quote an example: if a driver had

a habit of harsh braking, and it is recorded in your data, and that report would only be given to you a week later; is that the position?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I would say yes, correct. I can't recall how many days later we get the report.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And would the driver know about his harsh braking habit instantly?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If he has harsh braking while driving, the light will be emitted and then the beeping would also be activated.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What would be the consequence of a driver who has a habit of constantly having harsh braking within that week?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As I've mentioned, therefore, both departments would work on it.

Let me focus on my department. Well, if the light comes up once, we can't, on that basis, say that there is a problem. We would identify those who are repeaters, we would call them by telephone, and give them a gentle reminder, or as I have said, we will get our inspectors to check if there is anything wrong, and then for TQD, as I have mentioned, they would also get someone who is in plain clothes to act as an assessor to be with the bus captain to assess whether their bus captain is jerky, and whether he has resorted to harsh

braking all the time so as to follow up on such bad driving behaviour.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the TQD, sorry?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Training and quality assurance department. And their responsibility is to train our bus captains and to carry out assessment about their driving skills, and if necessary, to take follow-up action, say, for example, disciplinary action, or issuing warnings. Such will be the responsibility of this department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that you would identify together with TQD those who are repeaters, and you would first call them by telephone and give them a gentle reminder.

How many of those repeaters were there? Perhaps just quote an example for this year.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I think there would be one or two every time. It may not be a repeater. If I see that in a particular report the number of times is more than other bus captains, then I will find out from the list who they are, and I will give a reminder. For others, who have had this once or two times only, we will wait for the next time to see whether they have the same again.

Take Tuen Mun as an example. If you ask for the

number, it would be a couple of them, less than 10.

CHAIRMAN: Per what?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) 900 or so for the entirety of Tuen Mun depot.

CHAIRMAN: So 900 bus captains but less than 10 would fall into this category; is that what you are saying?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For those 10, how many times did they have that harsh braking? How many times have they had this problem of harsh braking before it triggers or activates your concerns?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Usually it would be a single digit, say five times, or six times. And if we think that in this case he has relatively more such occasions, then we will take the action I referred to.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned five or six times. Within a day or within a week?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Within a week. As to the exact figure I need to verify, I'm not sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide us with the information later?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now if the person have this habit -- simply referring to those 10, what would you do? If you

noticed that he had a habit of harsh braking, what would you do apart from telephoning him? Would you talk to him and find out the reasons?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I would call him or a face-to-face interview. I may do that as well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you done that to those 10?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, either me or my colleagues would make that move.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have they improved?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Some of them did and some of them would not have a relapse of such behaviour. From my recollection, most would not repeat such behaviour. So there has been improvement in most cases.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard also from Mr Alok Jain's evidence that during one of the meetings, they explored the idea of having a scorecard system for drivers, and one of the systems that was explored is the GreenRoad.com system. And what it does is it gives an analysis of the driver's driving behaviour, and it would fall into three different categories, like red, amber and green.

CHAIRMAN: Have you heard of such a system?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since when did you hear about this system?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) The year was around 2013 or

2014. I cannot remember the exact time. It was quite a few years ago.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has this system been explored or discussed in one of your meetings with other depot managers or other management, or other members of the management?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) This was not covered in ROM meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about meetings other than ROM?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, a meeting was convened on this issue.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In 2013 and 2014?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, around that time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So who were present in the management?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I would have to check which members were present, because we have many meetings with many people in attendance, I was among the attendees.

For the others, quite a few have left KMB or retired already.

CHAIRMAN: Were records made of this meeting?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I believe there are records and there might be a brief e-mail, but I'm not sure whether I still have it in my e-mail account.

CHAIRMAN: Can you look to see if you do?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Apart of e-mails, were no minutes kept of such

meetings?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For many of our meetings we would have e-mail recaps and they would serve as minutes. I cannot really remember whether minutes were taken for this meeting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And this system was not used. Do you know why?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) This system should have been deployed. I'm not very sure about the name mentioned by Mr Alok, but from what you described, it is very similar to one of our current systems.

CHAIRMAN: What is that system?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) As I said, there would be beeps and lights emitted, and lights of three colours would be shown depending on driving behaviour. And these lights would go on when the bus captain beeped the Octopus card at the terminal, the time of the next bus would be shown, and lights of three colours would be shown to represent the performance of the captain. Green is the best, yellow, and red means something to be improved. And this system is still in use.

CHAIRMAN: So when the bus captain comes off duty and he taps his Octopus card, where is this information displayed for him?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) It would only be displayed

the first time a bus captain beeps his Octopus card in the morning. I'm not sure whether it would show the records for the previous days, but what I'm sure is that the records for the same day would not be shown. So no information is displayed during sign-off.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying the information is displayed at the time of sign-on?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, information is displayed during sign-on.

CHAIRMAN: And the information relates to what with time period?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I would have to check the period concerned. But this is not same-day information. It refers to a past period, but as for the range of that period, I have no such information on hand.

CHAIRMAN: And where is the display? Where does the bus captain see this?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) At each bus terminal there would be a computer. When a captain returns to the terminal he would have to beep his staff card to obtain such information. The computer would be located outside the kiosk at each terminal facing the bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: And the computer screen depicts what?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) One of three colours would be displayed to the captain, red, amber and green.

CHAIRMAN: What do they signify?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For the detailed definitions, I would have to look it up. Green means very good performance, in other words, the captain has performed very well. Amber means that there is room for improvement in terms of driving behaviour, and this is based on the reminding device on board I mentioned. And red means very poor performance.

As I said, the IT department would generate a list and very likely these captains would get a red light.

CHAIRMAN: Is the colour green displayed simply because no alert was signaled in the previous driving period?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, as far as I know.

CHAIRMAN: What triggers amber?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I would have to look up the exact definition on what triggers amber or red. I don't have the definitions to hand now.

CHAIRMAN: Would you do so and would you provide that information?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, it is possible.

CHAIRMAN: Is the information in hard copy?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If e-mails or minutes were available the information would be listed. So if I can locate that e-mail, I can disclose the information.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you also take a photograph of what was displayed on the screen, the kiosk that you mentioned, about this signal?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, it is possible.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, what would be the consequence if that driver has a red signal.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) It is actually a reminder. As I said, if the IT department's list shows repeaters, action would be taken, for example we would call them or the TQD would follow up with them. But as for this computer display, the nature is more of a reminder than to take certain actions against a bus captain.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you explored the idea of having that bus captain who has red signal to undertake a remedial training? Have you explored that?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes. From my computer, I cannot see the colour of the signal, because the coloured lights are reminder to the bus captains themselves.

For the report set out by IT department, if there are repeaters, with a high frequency of relapse, then the TQD would provide training.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about those with green signal? Has your company considered giving a reward for those who consistently have green signal, good driving behaviour?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) We do not reward bus captains with a green light because we would assume that good driving is expected. So, as far as I know, we are not doing any such thing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This system, does it also apply to part-time bus captains?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, as far as I know. Because the same devices would emit light and sound as reminders if necessary.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Yeung, I'm going to the next topic. It is on the surveillance cameras.

We have heard evidence from a few trade unions about assaults on bus captains, on frequent assaults on bus captains. And --

CHAIRMAN: I think if you are moving to a new topic, given the time, we will take the adjournment now.

Mr Yeung, we are going to adjourn, and we will resume our hearing at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

(1.00 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you.

Mr Yeung, before the lunch break we were on the black box. May I ask a few more questions about this black box? I think you said that about the system of having -- alerting bus captains that they have certain driving, bad driving habits like harsh braking and acceleration was in place a few years ago, but you can't remember the year; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I just refer you to a few documents from your company's submission to see if it may assist you. KMB-1, page 168.

We can see this is a submission from Kowloon Motor Bus to the Committee dated 18 May 2018. If we look at this page, it refers to what the black box will capture, including records of speeding, harsh braking, and abrupt acceleration.

If we go down and see the third bullet, it mentions that:

"Identification of the [bus captain] of a particular bus is done through our Terminus Management System ..."

This terminus management system, are you one of the personnel involved in this terminus management system?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, this is a system that I will use in my work.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we go back to page 148, this is an

action plan for implementation of the key recommendations, as of 10 April 2018. This is in response to the report on the Tai Po accident, dated 12 March 2018.

CHAIRMAN: This is a redacted version of that report?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, this is the redacted version of that report.

If we look at page 148, paragraph 10 on the right-hand side, it provides that the KMB should -- the topic is, if I read that out:

"KMB should monitor [bus captains'] performance by analysing his driving record from the black box installed on buses and improve the effectiveness and timeliness of follow-up disciplinary actions on [bus captains'] inappropriate driving behaviour and attitude."

And on the right-hand side it appears to suggest there was a system because BOP 207 function in the black box system, and:

"This checking is done on a daily basis for the driving record of the preceding 10 days. Any abnormalities will be dealt with and reported promptly to TQD, which will then commence disciplinary procedures."

So it appears this report would only be generated

after 10 days, if I summarise it correctly; is that the position?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) To my understanding, for our IT department, we will try to reduce the number of days, bring it to lower than 10 days, but I'm not sure by how many, but if I remember correctly, it would be less than 10 days.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If you look further --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, what is BOP 207?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) BOP 207 is a function within BOM, and BOM stands for bus on-board management, something like that. And for this function, it will capture the speeding records of every bus. And if a bus speeds, exceeding the speed limit of the roads, we will use the BOP 207 function to retrieve the speeding records.

CHAIRMAN: What is the threshold set to determine whether a bus is speeding?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For every location, we would identify the statutory speed limit, either it is 50km per hour or 70km per hour, so that's the two standards for buses. So if a bus goes through a certain area, then the system through the GPS location function will match this bus against the speed limit, and if there is an exceedance, then that will be shown on the report.

CHAIRMAN: What is the excess, to determine that there is speeding?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) To my understanding, there should be some allowance. Because we are afraid that the speeding measurement or the GPS may not be accurate all the time, but as to the range, I don't have the figures with me. And for me, whenever there is a record generated we will verify that this is the right location, then we will hand over the records to the TQD for follow-up action.

CHAIRMAN: And against what do you verify the record?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Say if a bus is found to be speeding, then we will check the departure record of the bus, maybe whether there would be an error in the TER system, but then if it is a correct record proving that the bus captain drives the bus, then we would look at the GPS coordinates, the X/Y coordinates, because sometimes there might be interference, and the exact location of the bus cannot be shown.

So if we identify that this is the right location, and we see that, say, the speed limit doesn't match with the actual speed, ie there is speeding, then we will confirm that this is the location where speeding takes place.

CHAIRMAN: Apart from reference to GPS coordinates of

latitude and longitude, do you have any other method of determining location?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No, to my understanding we just use X/Y coordinates of the GPS, no other method.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean latitude and longitude?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I -- well, we mainly use X and Y coordinates to confirm. I'm not aware of the longitude and latitude. I press the coordinate button and a map will show up, and the map will show the current location of the bus and then we will look at the location to see whether the bus has indeed driven through that area and the speed it is being driven at.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and if we see in that box, we can see a milestone as to the IT department. It is stated there that:

"IT [department] is in the process of enhancing the presentation of the Bus Performance Reports to facilitate monitoring speeding, harsh braking and abrupt acceleration. After the enhancement ... Operation Sections will analyse the data of preceding 8 days twice a week to provide driving records of [bus captains] with irregularities. The reports will be passed to TQD twice a week. Immediate actions will be taken to alert respective [bus captains] to deter them from committing the same faults."

This is the submission filed to the Transport Department which appears to suggest --

CHAIRMAN: This is an accident report, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Not a submission.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, this is an accident report and this is an action plan for implementation of key recommendations as of 10 April 2018. It starts at page 145.

So Mr Yeung, according to this milestone, what is improved is the generation of the report will be reduced from 10 total days, correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Answer not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, the existing system monitors speed only; is that right?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) BOP 207 function only monitors the speed.

CHAIRMAN: And the change is to monitor not only speed but also harsh braking and abrupt acceleration. So that's one of the changes.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) For BOP 207 function, that does not cover harsh braking and a sudden acceleration. It only focuses on speeding.

CHAIRMAN: So the supposed change is to monitor not only speeding, but harsh braking and abrupt acceleration. That's what is stated here, is it not?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Correct. We need to generate another kind of report which was mentioned before lunchtime, and that speeding, acceleration and braking will be reviewed. That was covered previously.

CHAIRMAN: So what is meant when it says that there will be an enhancing of presentation of the bus performance report -- presumably that's what the acronym "BOP" stands for -- to facilitate monitoring, speeding, harsh braking and abrupt acceleration. Are you saying that already exists?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I'm not sure whether the action plan on improvement has been implemented. But as of today, I'm still using BOP 207 to monitor speeding, and as I said, the IT report will be monitoring speeding, harsh braking and abrupt acceleration.

I'm not sure what I'm doing now matches with the action mentioned in this milestone.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. About this report that you talked about this morning about receiving reports about harsh braking. Since when did you start to receive these reports?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I started seeing such a report in 2017. But I don't have the exact date now. I can find it out for you if needed.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Moving on to the next topic about surveillance cameras, Mr Yeung, we have heard from a number of unions, and particularly KMB, that there were increasing assault incidents on bus captains by passengers, and one of the measures that would help the police to enforce the law is to use surveillance cameras to capture both audio and visual images -- audio recording and visual images of what happened.

And we have heard some evidence that -- or at least from your KMB submission, that currently, there are only 2,319 KMB buses, and 146 Long Win Bus buses that have these surveillance cameras. Can you tell us, to your knowledge, what about the remaining buses?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, according to the figures you mentioned, my knowledge is this. With the procurement of new buses and replacement of old buses, at the time of procurement CCTV systems are already installed on new buses. So the actual figures should be more than what you just quoted.

As for remaining buses, I understand that the company plans, by the end of this year, to -- well, I'm not sure about the exact figure, but to retrofit 600 to 700 buses with CCTVs. That's what I know about the management's plan in 2018.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And about this management's plan in 2018, does that cover all buses, all KMB buses, even though they are old models?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Judging from the figures, I don't think they are all covered. I think there will still be a minority of buses to be replaced, that will not have the CCTV installed. It doesn't cover all.

But I'm not sure whether in 2019 this will still be their plan. I'm not sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard some suggestions from some of the union members, that they wish to install some of the -- they wish to install their own surveillance camera, because some of the old model buses did not have surveillance camera. So they consider it as a measure to protect their own safety and also the passengers' behaviour, but that was a measure vetoed by the KMB.

And a circular was issued. Does that happen, to your knowledge?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) To my knowledge, yes. We don't allow bus captains to install their own surveillance cameras.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you issue a circular --

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Let me answer Chairman's question.

As far as I know, it has to do with some limitations under the PDPO as to how this video --

CHAIRMAN: What is that an acronym for?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Sorry, Personal Data Privacy Ordinance. Exactly which clause, I'm not sure, but from what I heard, this is to protect the bus captain, because previously in some cases, the KMB bus captains took some video clips and posted them onto the Internet, and subsequently we received complaints about invasion of privacy of the other persons.

So, to my understanding, the bus captains would be told that because of the requirements under the Personal Data Privacy Ordinance bus captains are not allowed to install their own cameras. That's my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your opening statement, you said that you have a very important role in the sense that you are the very important bridge between the frontline colleagues as well as the management.

Did you express or voice out this bus captains' concerns or requests to the management?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I did. Well, there were some bus captains who reflected that they preferred not to have cameras installed on board. And I once told the management that if you install many cameras on buses

some captains would like the protection, but some captains would not prefer it, because they would be put to great pressure since they would be under constant surveillance, and I did tell the management that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About these assault incidents, we see from the KMB submission that they would provide some psychological support --

CHAIRMAN: Before we leave this subject, Ms Wong began to ask you about the issue of a circular and I interrupted her. Was a circular issued telling bus captains that they could not deploy their own CCTV cameras?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In my recollection -- I mean, I don't have any recollection of ever seeing such a circular. I don't know whether I have forgotten, but I myself have not seen this circular.

CHAIRMAN: How was the information passed to the bus captains that they were not permitted to install their own CCTV cameras?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, in fact, we understand the bus captains' positions. If they wish to install their own device we understand their position. Usually we would very gently tell them that "If you install cameras, of course you are protecting yourself but you could be breaching certain laws", and I would recommend that they take down the CCTV cameras they installed

themselves, and if they are not willing to cooperate we would refer the matter to the TQD, but we won't disallow bus captains to drive simply because they are not willing to take it down.

CHAIRMAN: So it is a recommendation, and not a prohibition?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, this is my role. I give recommendations to frontline staff asking them not to do it. As for the TQD, after the case had been referred to the TQD, further action may be taken so that an explanation be given to the bus captains as to the pros and cons of installing their own cameras.

CHAIRMAN: But again, a recommendation and not a prohibition?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, that's the role I play. In front of frontline staff, that's what I do. I give recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: And TQD as you call them, do they give recommendations or do they issue prohibitions?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I'm not sure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you find that out from TQD?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No problem.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For those frontline staff who wish to have surveillance cameras installed, but didn't have one, did you pass on their message to the management that those who wish to have surveillance camera installed should

have them? So they don't have -- in that sense, the bus captains wouldn't have to violate the so-called Privacy Data Protection Ordinance? Have you voiced that out?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I did on various occasions. I would receive feedback from bus captains during formal or informal visits, bus captains would tell me and I would tell the management the wishes of bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So what is the response from the management?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) The response I got from the management is that they would like to do it as soon as possible. That is, of course, new buses would come with CCTVs; as for old bus they would also be retrofitted. At the time I was told that the management also understood the need of bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard from union members that because of these increasing assault incidents, they treat it as part of their daily lives, and your KMB submission mentions assistance, psychological assistance or support to be given to these staff.

In your view, did the bus captains make any discussions as to how this condition can be improved from the company's perspective?

Can you see from that page, I believe that's

page 149-113, which set out:

"The taskforce will engage a professional consultant to provide a comprehensive view of the current practice and make recommendations in areas including ... recruitment on [bus captains'] emotional intelligence, and stress tolerance, training, counseling and performance management."

Did you participate in this process?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) KMB engages a third party in collaboration to set up a hot line for bus captains, and it is an independently run hot line. As for paragraph 38, on page 113, I understand this is what the management is doing now.

At one of the meetings I also attended, and a university in Hong Kong, was also invited to conduct a review and make recommendations to KMB. One of the meetings involved meeting the psychologists where I would tell them the plight faced by bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And moving on to another topic, it is about lost trips.

We have heard evidence from your colleague, Ms Debby Wong, that lost trips appear to be a frequent occurrence, and it affects driving behaviour because of the inaccurate estimation of scheduled journey time. And also it would, in turn, affect the rest time period.

What is your view on this matter?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) From my perspective, lost trip is due to various reasons.

First, we may lose a trip because of shortage of bus captains, there may be traffic jam in Hong Kong, there may be emergency situations, public events, demonstrations, rallies, or special traffic arrangements, inclement weather, and vehicles breaking down on the road. All these contribute to the problem of lost trips. But we try our best not to affect the rest periods of bus captains, because we have a schedule of journey time, we have provided that to the bus captains, and about 96 per cent of these, or 90 per cent of these trips allow bus captains to have sufficient rest periods.

As for 90 per cent, well, it varies. But on the whole, of 10 trips, bus captains could have sufficient time for operating the bus for nine trips with sufficient rest time. As for the remaining one trip, it may be due to the reasons I mentioned.

But we would not deliberately shorten the journey time to make up for the lost trips.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you quote an example? And you mentioned in the morning about the Po Tin Estate having split shifts; do you recall?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And in Po Tin Estate, I've checked your KMB website, there are a number of routes, and one of them is 258D. It is a route from Po Tin Estate to Lam Tin. I believe the estimated journey time is about 1.5 hours; is that correct?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Roughly. Yes. That's the journey time. Roughly.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have heard some evidence about this particular trip, 258D, that the scheduled trip does not provide sufficient rest time, three hours rest time, for bus captain on split shifts.

Can we pull up the supplementary information that we received from the union yesterday.

We received information about this 258D (Chinese spoken) which is split shift 5, and it specified the start time as 0650 to 1343, and another period is 1600 to 2015. So the rest hours, the one in the middle, only provides 2 hours and 15 minutes, and not the three hours rest time.

And this appears to be a schedule devised by the company, KMB.

What is your answer to this?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I don't have the schedule with me now. I was involved in formulating the

timetable here. If my memory serves me right, for the first section, the end time should be 12.43 and not 13.43. We have a meal break, we give our pay -- the pay for the meal break for the bus captain. So on a normal day without congestion, the bus captain should be able to take a rest, starting 12.43, and then he will ask to drive again at 4 pm.

So it would be longer than the guideline of the TD, which will take effect in 2019.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to confirm that this is a mistake, 1343, that in fact the break starts at 1243, by reference to records?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN: Please provide that information.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Moving on to another topic.

One of the union members expressed that you can actually calculate the journey time by using black box data, rather than having someone who drove the route and without the actual scientific data.

And one of the suggestions is to get information on peak or non-peak hours and then factor in the congestion situation, then come up with a journey time estimate which is a more scientific approach.

What is your view on this?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, we are already doing

that. We have a scheduling section which is responsible for reviewing all timetables and bus captains' duties. So this department is responsible for that. My role is to provide input to them.

Now, if I receive any feedback I would tell this section, say, bus captains would tell us that there is not enough journey time, and on and off, they will use a system to review the journey time. Maybe we can use a bus to do the actual trial of the route. We don't do that frequently. We will do that when a new route is being put in operation. We don't have any historical data, so we will ask a bus to conduct a trial and then simulate the journey time.

And then when sufficient data are gathered for a route then the scheduling section will use two ways to review the journey time. One, is the departure and arrival time of the bus captains, which is recorded in the TER mentioned before, that whenever a bus captain arrives at the terminus at the regulator's room he will tap the staff card and his arrival time will be recorded, and of course the regulator will also input the departure time from that bus terminus. So, having the departure and arrival time, we will know the exact journey time.

The other method is using the GPS location function.

These two methods are valid, we believe, because they can reflect when actually the bus will arrive at the terminus.

So when will we review the journey time? Let me cite an example. Po Tin is a very good example. We talked about 258D. The other route is 260X, from Po Tin to Hung Hom railway station. And it will go through a very congested area, where the XRL is being built near Jordan, and because of the construction of the XRL there is major diversion of traffic there, and when the construction work started then the journey time for 260X was very insufficient. So in that kind of scenario, we will review the journey time and we lengthen the journey time substantially as a result.

And up to now, there is now an underpass built already, so Jordan is not so congested and we found that this journey time is excessive now, so much so that there are not enough parking spaces at the terminus for buses because they arrive too early. Also then we will review the journey time based on the actual situation.

CHAIRMAN: And you do this by seeking the approval of the Transport Department to alter the journey time; is that it? The schedule.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, if we don't -- if we don't have to alter the frequency, if we revise the

timetable, we don't need to apply from the TD.

So if the schedule is a frequency of 10 minutes, and then we have to increase the journey time, maybe we use different methods, for example redeploying buses to run this route or maybe we can add in a new bus, and based on the actual situation we will see whether that can be done.

So if, say, if that can be done, if there is talking about drastic changes in journey time, and we can't cope with it with our own existing resources maybe we have to adjust the frequency then.

So if we have to adjust the frequency then we will have to apply to the TD for doing so, and we need the TD's approval before we can adjust the frequency.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Going to another topic, we heard this morning from your colleague Ms Debby Wong about having a focus group to discuss some of the roads that may pose a dangerous risk to bus captains or to passengers. So, as far as Tuen Mun is concerned, do you have similar focus group where you would discuss with bus captains about certain road conditions that bus drivers have to pay more attention or sharp bends, or -- along that line?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes. Yes, we do that.

We have some examples of that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you provide us with some of the examples?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Say, we resort to two channels to solicit information on hazards. First is from the bus captains themselves, because they have first hand experience on potentially dangerous areas. For example in July and August there may be heavy downpour, and on some road sections maybe pot holes will appear because of the downpour. Private cars may not encounter problems, but it will be a bumpy ride for the buses, and as a result maybe the passengers will lose balance, and if bus captains tell us so, we will notify the relevant department in the first instance, and if we find that the problem is really serious we will tell the regulator who should then tell all the bus captains who will drive along that route maybe they should slow down, or they should try to divert, or what. So this is the first way that we collect information.

Second way, say, in during the rainy season, our field staff will inspect regularly the road conditions. In Tuen Mun and Yuen Long there would be a number of rural routes, and trees, after heavy downpour they may tilt, and it may be dangerous. So the trees may crash into the glass windows of the buses, and if the problem

is identified to be serious we will notify the police and we will seek the Fire Services people to cut the trees or we will approach the TD to prune the trees, if the problem is not serious.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned few staff will inspect regularly. How regular?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) In Tuen Mun depot we have a list of black spots where there will be a lot of trees actually branching out into the carriageway, so the field staff will do that, especially during the rainy season.

So the field staff will inspect all the black spots in the area once a month, and if the rain fall is really heavy, we will ask them to step up the frequency of inspections. Say, if a period is a sunshine period there might not be much of a problem with the trees, then they will really inspect the road condition.

Their duty is to continuously observe and raise safety concerns and report the same to us.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the last topic is, we have been informed recently by the Transport Department that they have issued a practice note in relation to the training of bus captains. Have you seen a copy of this practice note?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I don't know which one you

are referring to. Can you refer me to exactly which one you are talking about.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, if I may refer you to TD-1 page 403. If we go to paragraph 18 -- paragraphs 18 and 19 make reference to the practice note.

CHAIRMAN: If this helps you at all, this was something that was issued apparently in the last 10 days or so.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, we have enhanced our training several months ago. I don't know whether the paper talks about is what I know of.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In what way did you enhance some training?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Well, there are two phases of training, phase 1 and phase 2. And for phase 1, if the bus captains have only class 1 and class 2 private car licences then they will have to go through phase 1 training. They have to pass the TD's bus exam and that's phase 1. After they pass the TD test --

CHAIRMAN: Did you enhance phase 1 in the last several months? Can you answer that "yes" or "no".

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) I don't see an enhancement for phase 1.

CHAIRMAN: Did you enhance phase 2?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How did you enhance it?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) If need be -- that's the

instruction from the management. If need be, we won't allow the bus captain to complete the course. Only when the bus captain himself is confident or the mentor is confident, then we will allow him to complete the course. That means originally he may be required to train a number of days, but if there is no confidence we would extend the training before we allow the bus captain to graduate.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Chairman, I have finished my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Yeung, thank you for coming here to assist us by giving your evidence. That is now complete, and you are free to leave, but equally you are free to stay. We have other people to give evidence. Thank you.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We will take a short break while Mr Yeung leaves the desk. Two minutes.

(3.16 pm)

(A short break)

(3.21 pm)

FORMER EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:

MR RAYMOND CHENG

(Evidence given in Cantonese and English, transcription of

the simultaneous interpretation and/or English)

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheng.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for responding affirmatively to our invitation to give evidence, and thank you for waiting patiently all day whilst the other evidence was adduced, but now we come to you.

You will have seen the method by which we adduce evidence. I'm going to ask Ms Wong to start asking you questions.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes, Chairman, corporate members, you are all welcome. It is my pleasure to attend this hearing. But first of all, before the Q&A, I want to declare the interest. May I use Chinese?

CHAIRMAN: Of course you may.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) In relation to the bus accident occurred on 10 February, I have no relationship or affiliation with any persons injured or died in the bus accident.

In relation to the KMB directors, or the management, I have no affiliation or no relationship with them.

Before 2015, I had a working relationship with the managing director and the board of directors of KMB.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Cheng, for coming.

And Mr Cheng, you were the senior manager in safety and quality department --

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: -- for the period of 1 May 2010 and you retired on 12 September 2014?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: At that time, Mr Edmond Ho was the KMB managing director?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Gary Wong was your supervisor at that time.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I'm going to focus on a few areas. The first is the identification of 29 sharp bends for internal analysis that you have explained and produced documentation in your submission to the committee.

If I may invite to you look at FE bundle, page 96-4 to 96-6.

On this page, 96-4, if we go down the section "Buses can overturn easily", the second paragraph, it referred to you starting a study of safe driving in the sharp turns back in 2013. And:

"The Safety and Quality Service Department invited the 4 depot managers, the representatives from Bus

Captain Training School and Bus Maintenance Section of Service Department to form a study group looking deeply into all the sharp turns within [KMB] bus route network.

Can you tell us who the four depot managers were at the time?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Those four managers were respectively from Tuen Mun, Lai Chi Kok, Sha Tin -- and Lai Chi Kok, Sha Tin, Tuen Mun and Sha Tin depot managers. For these four depot managers, we formed a taskforce, and apart from these four depot managers, there were also representatives from bus captain training school. And the representative was in the rank of assistant manager, Richard Lee, and he was the school principal of the training school, and we also had representatives from the bus maintenance section, who was an engineer, and had already left the post, and he is called Henry So, and this study group looked into all the sharp turns involved in the bus routes in Kowloon and New Territories in particular proposed by the depot managers.

As for the study method, the criteria, first of all, were, a reduction of speed limit from 70 to 50; number 2, the curvature; and number 3, number of passengers for these bus routes, plying the sharp turns, because if these buses are usually fully loaded, the weight would

increase.

And next point, we also took into account the actual situation at the sharp turns, and then we conducted an assessment on over 1,000 sharp turns from all the data collected in Hong Kong, Kowloon, New Territories, and we narrowed them down to 29 sharp turns.

And we also used actual buses to ply these routes and you can see we also made use of cameras on board to record the situation of these buses manoeuvring the 29 sharp turns.

We conducted tests on all these 29 turns at different speeds, 20, 30, 40, 45, 50 kilometres, and we repeated the test a number of times.

We also made use of the black box you mentioned. It is BOM, the acronym. That is bus-on-board monitoring system to calculate the safe speed that buses should use in manoeuvring the turns without affecting traffic flow. We then put forward a recommendation to the senior manager.

I would like to pause here.

Any further question from you?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Cheng.

May I ask who initiated this study?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Back then, the managing director, Mr Edmond Ho instructed my then supervisor

Mr Gary Wong, and then Mr Gary Wong talked to me and my team members.

CHAIRMAN: What position did Gary Wong hold?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Head of SSQ.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did you have meetings with the colleagues you mentioned earlier on from time to time in relation to this study?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When was that?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Around end of 2013 and early 2014.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Were there minutes of these meetings?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) I believe there were. There might not be formal minutes, but there may be exchanges of e-mail, like what Mr Yeung said. We would try to confirm everything through e-mails. Because we had to put in a lot of arrangements later on, maybe we needed a bus captain to drive the route, we needed to arrange for engineers, and the instructors of training school to fix the dates to do all these.

My e-mail account was closed so I couldn't retrieve any information, but for other colleagues who were involved in the work, they might be able to retrieve the relevant e-mails.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Cheng, do you know of any persons who are currently working in KMB but were involved in this study that we can ask?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Well, it has been four years on. To my understanding, most of the colleagues left.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About this video cam of those 29 sharp bends you mentioned?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Before I retired, after I finished with the project, I handed the footage in person to the principal of the bus captain training school, Mr Richard Lee. As to the whereabouts of the footage, I don't know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Who took the footage of these 29 sharp bends? Or who drove the car so that the video cam could record these images?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) The car cam, who hand-held the camera? It was fixed on the front part, the front, or the handrail of the front seat in the upper deck, so it did not need to be hand-held, all we needed to was to turn it on, or turn it off. So this was done by myself.

As to the question of who stored the footage, it was I who stored the footage. And then I handed the footage to my then supervisor, Mr Gary Wong. We should first take a look at the footage to make sure it is done in

the correct way.

And we took many footages. And the footage was handed to the principal of the bus captain training school who edited the video, and then he handed back the footage to us. Well, some of the footage was useful, others not. And after the editing we handed the footage to the training school which stored it.

On one or two occasions, Mr Gary Wong showed it to the then MD, Mr Edmond Ho for viewing. That was just for viewing. We didn't study in depth as to say whether a particular speed was right or not. We didn't discuss this at the occasions I mentioned.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Cheng, in your paper at page 96-6, you stated that at the bottom that:

"From the study, we were able to produce a safety booklet for ..."

I think you later clarified it as small reminding cards:

" ... for Bus Captains detailing each potentially dangerous turns' exact location, direction, and road nature, road condition, past record, related photos or diagrams from Transport Department's document or passenger complaints. There were 31 safety driving suggestions from a study of over 1,500 studies."

Are those 1,500 studies the test that you have

undertaken in short-listing those 29 sharp bends?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you recall what those 29 sharp bends were? Are you able to still remember?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) It has been five years on. I forgot the majority of them.

I do remember individually some of them.

The four quoted in my paper were the ones I remember. As I said, for the 29 sharp bends, they are mostly in the rural areas. In urban areas there are so many traffic lights and there is congestion, and bus captains usually do not speed. But in rural areas when bus captains ply through highways, they may speed, or they may display incorrect driving behaviour, especially when we talk about going down from highway to the downtown area.

Well, for the four examples that I cited, it is about a highway having a speed of 70km, and then suddenly they have to reduce the speed to 50km in order to go into the downtown area. So that's where the danger lies.

For the 29 sharp bends, sorry, I don't have records on hand what these bends are.

So I try to recollect what these are so I can remember only four.

But I do remember the number is 29 in total. The sharp bends.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Cheng.

In your paper you stated this study followed on from the Tseung Kwan O bus accident in 2009. May I refer you to a LegCo paper that mentions --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, if we are leaving the four areas that Mr Cheng remembers, can you describe to us what these four areas are, the four places that you do remember?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Yes, I can. Say, for example, from Kwun Tong Road near the Choi Hung PTI, there are two highways with four lanes, and then all of a sudden there are just two lanes going to To Kwa Wan, and two lanes going to Sai Kung, and the curvature is around 230 degrees. And if a bus goes at 70km in Kwun Tong Road, and it has to go uphill through a ramp, and the ramp has a curvature of 230 degrees, and it has to make a certain turn to go to the Choi Hung roundabout, and then it can choose to go to either San Po Kong or Sai Kung.

But then this bend is only one lane, and there are no trees, this is an elevated highway. But then sometimes obstacles were left behind by lorries, and there were oil stains left over by motorbikes and cars,

and there is this film of oil which would lead to skidding. If you drive at 50km and the way ahead is smooth, if you use 50km you would not be able to negotiate the 230 degrees bend, because the road surface may be slippery, and the curvature is so big, and especially for double-deckers, it comes with a loading, and if there is acceleration, and then if you go to the apex of the bend, there will be a G force created.

The heavier the bus, the faster the bus, the greater is the G force, and as a result, the chances of a bus overturning will also increase.

CHAIRMAN: Is this an example of where a road, or a vehicle on a road is moving from a 70 kilometre an hour limit to a 50 kilometre an hour limit?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

That's one of them. What are the others?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) To my recollection it is Ma On Shan, from the Tate's Cairn Tunnel going in the direction of Ma Liu Shui, and if you pass through Ma On Shan around the housing estate Kam Ying Court, there is a left turn bend and the curvature of that bend is above 180 degrees, and again it is from 70km switching to 50km, turning left down to the Ma On Shan town centre.

This bend is similar to the one that I mentioned

from Kwun Tong Road to Choi Hung Road. From Kwun Tong Road to Choi Hung Road the bend is turning right, and then there is a sharp bend of 230 degrees down to the Choi Hung roundabout, and for Ma On Shan, from the Tate's Cairn Tunnel Highway to Ma On Shan is a left turn: the curvature and the carriageway, they were similar to the previous example.

And there is also the noise barrier, and the view of the bus captain was not that good compared to the previous example. In other words, the view was worse here in this latter example.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's the second example. Can you provide the remaining two that you can recall?

CHAIRMAN: I think all you need to do is tell us where the place is and what the curvature was, if that is the relevant fact.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) For the curvature --

CHAIRMAN: What is the place, first of all?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Okay.

(Interpreted) The first one is Tseung Kwan O/Kwong Ming Road roundabout. The second one is Cha Kwo Ling Road northbound, left turn to Lei Yue Mun Road westbound. The third one, as I described, Tate's Cairn Tunnel Highway northbound down to Shek Mun, and then to

Ma On Shan. Number 4, Kwun Tong Road westbound, and then turning to Clear Water Bay Road. I explained the last one.

Let me first explain the one about Kwong Ming Road in Tseung Kwan O.

In 2009, November, there was a bus accident involving two fatalities and numerous injuries.

The MD then already gave me a mission when I took office that I should look into this roundabout to see whether there was room for improvement. So after I assumed office, I visited the roundabout in Kwong Ming Road in Tseung Kwan O to inspect the site, and there was a highway that went to the roundabout with a left turn to Kwong Ming Road/Kwong Ming Estate, I don't actually remember the name. But the curvature of the bend, it is -- I mean, it is a roundabout, so it is 360 degrees. If you go the wrong way, you can just follow the roundabout for another round to choose the exit you want.

So for Kwong Ming Road, say if you are travelling at 50 kilometres, or below 50, there is not much problem. But when it is raining, or at night, when the sight line is poor, then you shouldn't exit the roundabout at 50 kilometres, which is the speed limit, because it would be prone to accident.

The other one is Cha Kwo Ling Road northbound, left turn to westbound of Lei Yue Mun Road. This is in Kwun Tong, off the Kwun Tong post office, there is a bend. Again, there is a highway, one takes a left turn downhill to Kwun Tong and the speed limit also drops from 70 to 50 kilometres.

This carries the same characteristic. It is single lane traffic, and as I explained just now, if you travel at 50, you could be speeding. Although the Transport Department provides signage reminding drivers that there is a bend ahead, sometimes drivers may not be very attentive all the way. But we have professional drivers, but in the lapse of moment, the driver may forget, or that he may be pressing the gas pedal in a way that he can exceed 50 kilometres and then at that junction it would be dangerous.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Cheng, I would like to invite you to look at a document following on the accident. It was a LegCo paper --

CHAIRMAN: Which accident?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The accident, the traffic accident on Tuen Mun Road in 2012.

This LegCo paper can be found at page 260-443-20.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Of TU bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Which number?

MS MAGGIE WONG: TU-1B.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 260-443-20.

It is a LegCo paper for the special meeting on 27 November 2012. It is stated as "Background brief on safety of franchised bus operation and safety of long downhill roads".

If you go to paragraph 6, it made reference to the fatal traffic accident on New Hiram's Highway in May 2008 resulting in a total of 18 fatalities and 44 injuries.

And drop a few lines, we see that:

" ... [Transport Department] had also conducted a territory-wide review of long steep downhill roads and had identified a total of 29 downhill road sections in the territory."

The list can be found in appendix 1, which is also in this bundle at page 260-443-29.

Mr Cheng, would you mind taking a look at these 29 sections or locations and see whether the four locations you mentioned can be found in this list?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) On the first page, that's 29, these road sections are in Hong Kong Island, and

then for 330, number 15, Clear Water Bay Road, Ngau Chi Wan in Kowloon. That's the one that I personally checked. But it is not the same as the one I studied. Because one is upstream, the other is downstream, and for New Territories, none. I can find none.

But I want to supplement. In 2008, I hadn't assumed office as senior manager of SSQ.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I understand, Mr Cheng.

So the exercise you conducted is a valuable one? Because you have undertaken a detailed task of looking at how many roads -- how many roads have you looked at in terms of New Territories?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) A lot. But I can't tell you how many now, because my responsibility relates to safety and driving, and I would get on board a bus for inspection at least once a month.

I mean, I would be in plain clothes, without any advance notice, I would board a bus of my company. From the very beginning, like I said, in rural areas, very often drivers would neglect safety, so I would say it is very frequent, at least once or twice a month I would take these buses from Yuen Long, I would take 968 to Tin Hau, and then in Tin Hau I would take another bus back to Tuen Mun. It is a working trip. And I would record details relating to the dangerous road sections, and

I would report back to the then supervisor, Mr Gary Wong.

Therefore, in identifying the 29 sharp turns, I provided a lot of comments which were accepted.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may invite you to look at page 96-6 of the FE bundle, your submission, in that paragraph you stated you made 31 safety driving instructions, suggestions from that study.

Do you recall what those safety driving suggestions were, or what it related to?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Most of these suggestions related to driving demeanour. Some of them related to driving speed.

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by "driving demeanour"?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) For driving demeanour I mean whether the bus captain would be very attentive in driving, or whether all of a sudden he would accelerate or brake abruptly, or make a sharp turn abruptly as mentioned by the previous witnesses. Because if the driver makes a sharp turn all of a sudden, it may affect the centre of gravity of the bus. Let me give you one example.

When negotiating a bend of 30 degrees, if the driver manoeuvres the bend, normally it may take one second or one to five seconds. However, if the driver drives at

speed such that the bend of 30 degrees is manoeuvred with just 0.1 seconds, then the bus would slide. I don't know what it is called in Chinese, but it is some kind of drifting of the tail of the bus, such that passengers seated or even standing passengers would tend to fall.

Do you get my meaning? That is to manoeuvre a bend with 0.1 seconds, it is very different from manoeuvring a bend in 1 second. That's about driving demeanour.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (In English) Welcome.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When you talked about some of them related to driving speed, when you made that suggestion, did you recommend to the bus captains for some of the sections of the road that have 70km per hour, the driver should drive below the speed limit permitted for that road section? Did you suggest that in that handbook?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) First of all, buses have now been equipped with a device limiting the speed at 70. Even if he floors the pedal, when the bus reaches 70 kilometres it won't go faster.

However, if the bus is going downhill or perhaps -- well, coming back to driving demeanour, the bus could go beyond 70 kilometres if he uses the neutral gear. And my answer is, no, because my answer is about safety

driving, and the driver must not exceed the speed limit.

So if he drives below 70 or 68 kilometres, I would appreciate that, but we also need to consider sight line and driving demeanour. Maybe the driver is in a bad mood, or he may have something on his mind, and then he drives at 25 kilometres, then I won't recommend it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And page 96-7, you mentioned small reminding cards printed and readily available to be issued to all bus captains -- all concerned routes' bus captains.

Did you participate in drafting the small reminding cards?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) No, but I can supplement.

Mr Yeung said that the cards were printed in 2013/2014. That's not correct. The card's dimension is 2 inches by 3-inches and they give a summary of the locations of the 29 sharp bends, the direction, the safe driving speed, and all these are in the card. But unfortunately, the cards were printed after I retired. And I knew from Mr Gary Wong, my then supervisor --

CHAIRMAN: Just tell us what you know yourself, not what others have told you that happened. Do you understand the difference?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) I got it.

CHAIRMAN: So did you ever see any printed cards?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No, no.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And if I may go over to page 96-6.

In answer to question 7, you stated there that:

"I was very disappointed upon hearing that SSQ study" --

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, I only want evidence to be led of what this witness knows personally.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Then I won't pursue this.

Mr Cheng, do you know a person by the name of Alok Jain?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your study, in relation to this 29 covered turns, did you have a chance to work with Mr Jain?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Interpreted) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: During the time when you were working with KMB, did you have a chance to work with Mr Alok Jain in relation to the safety aspects of franchised buses?

MR RAYMOND CHENG: (Interpreted) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I've finished my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheng, thank you very much for coming to assist us, for agreeing to give evidence, and giving us the evidence you have. We are grateful.

Your evidence is concluded, and we have more

evidence to receive, so we will take another short adjournment and then I think we are ready to receive the representatives of the Federation of Bus Industries.

So we will take a short break. Thank you.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

(4.05 pm)

(A short break)

(4.16 pm)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS: MR LEUNG KAM KEUNG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG

(Evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of the simultaneous interpretation) (continued)

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, good afternoon, apologies for the delay in reaching you. As you will have seen, we have been taking evidence from others but we are now ready to resume with your evidence.

Ms Wong.

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG (continued)

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you so much, gentlemen, for coming.

Yesterday, I have asked some questions about the resting facilities in relation to your submission dated 16 July, annex 7, in relation to Lai Kok Estate.

I understand that Mr Lau has dug up further information about the progress of this Lai Kok Estate and would like

to supplement on this.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Thank you, Chairman.

Regarding the locations in annex 7, take Lai Kok as an example as mentioned by Madam Wong, the resting lounge has been installed.

I want to supplement that regarding resting facilities, KMB has been more proactive than other bus companies. At other locations KMB has striven to install resting facilities and it is not only Lai Kok, but Tsing Yi Pier, Kowloon City Pier, and also another bus terminus in Cheung Wang, so you can see that KMB is more proactive than Citybus and New World First Bus, because for the other franchised bus companies, take Quarry Bay as an example, over the years they have failed to install the resting lounge.

This may be due to various reasons, but I can say, on the whole, KMB is more proactive.

Of course, the facilities, or the size of the lounge may not be perfect, but at least they are providing resting facilities for use by staff of KMB.

I would also like to supplement that there is one resting lounge that may be demolished soon, that is TST terminus. We received a paper from the Harbourfront Commission suggested that the bus terminus at Tsim Sha

Tsui ferry pier would be demolished. But this terminus involves a lot of bus routes. The Harbourfront Commission already discussed the topic and we also wrote to Transport Department requesting the department to explain a number of things: after demolition where will the bus routes be accommodated and also, after taking down the bus terminus, there would be no resting facility for KMB drivers. And it is also very crowded, and so far the Transport Department has not been able to answer our questions.

Because for Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier terminus the facilities are very good. If the terminus is demolished, as the proposal goes, it will turn into an ordinary bus stop without resting facilities for KMB bus captains.

I also have another paper for reference. And this is from the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a document you wish us to receive?

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have copies of it? We will have it copied.

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Here is my copy. (Handed).

CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will have it copied now.

MR LAU KAI HIM: No need to photocopy.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Lau.

In one of your annexures, annexure 18, can I summarise one of the points you made in your submission?

CHAIRMAN: What is the reference?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reference, it is annex 18 of the supplemental document filed by the union on 16 July 2018, and the document itself contains a minute, a letter dated 28 June 2007. In Chinese it is at page 260-522; in English page 260-523-22. It is a letter --

CHAIRMAN: Which bundle?

MS MAGGIE WONG: In TU bundle, I apologise.

CHAIRMAN: Which one.

MS MAGGIE WONG: 1C.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That is a letter dated 24 November 2016 from your union to the Transport Department. I'm only interested in one topic. It is paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3. In relation to this topic, your union requested, or invited the Transport Department to consider having three-party negotiation or meeting in relation to the design and facilities of newly built bus terminus.

And at 1.3 you stated that you would like the department to consider to arrange for regular meeting to

be attended by the government, bus company, and labour union. That's at page 260-523-8. Regular meetings to be attended by bus company and labour union so as to facilitate discussion on matters including the design of facilities in old and new bus terminus.

And we can see in one of the replies of the Transport Department, at page 260-523-22, that they appear to consider that this request should not be three-party, but instead they invite you to go through the bus company.

It would be at page 206-523-22, second paragraph:

"When designing a new bus terminus, in addition to referring to the usual design standards, our Department would also take into account the circumstances of the terminus, including the number of expected routes, number of passengers, direction of the flow of people, environmental limitations, operational needs of the buses, et cetera. We would also consult the relevant bus companies for their opinion on the design in concern. Therefore, if staffs have any suggestions on the design and facilities of the bus terminus, the staffs may reflect them to their company. Our department believes that the current mechanism is effective."

So the Transport Department appeared to reject your

request to have three-party negotiation. Is that the position?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I now go to another topic, on year-end attendance bonus.

May I invite you to your second submission, at page 260-94 in English, and Chinese at page 260-57.

Now, have you got the document, Mr Lau?

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I ask you this. You mentioned something here about the year-end bonus. Is that on top of the safety and good service bonus that the KMB is currently offering to bus captains?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Let me put it this way. For safety award and attendance bonus, these are incorporated into the basic salaries of bus captains. For (a), on this page, it refers to a year-end bonus, and in 2018 KMB already undertook to scrap the year-end bonus, and that double pay would be implemented. As for the year-end bonus, an assessment would be conducted and staff would be graded from 1 to 5, or not available. And then award would be -- or bonuses would be given according to the grading.

So these are two different things.

CHAIRMAN: When in 2018 did KMB agree to scrap the year-end

bonus?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Around May or June they undertook to scrap the year-end bonus system, and a double pay system would be implemented. And the actual announcement date was in June.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a copy of the announcement?

MR LAU KAI HIM: You mean a notice issued by the company? We can get a copy from KMB. If the Committee would like to have a copy I can provide a copy to the Committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, please do so.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Mr Lam would also like to supplement about the bonus system for New World First Bus.

MR LAM KAM PIU: For New World First Bus and Citybus they share the management, and for safety bonus, attendance award, since March this year they have been incorporated into the basic salaries. But I want to supplement regarding bonuses.

Many years ago we already reflected our view to the company. For the bonuses, allowances, they should be part of the salary and they should be incorporated into the basic salaries as a remuneration package. But for various reasons the company had all along rejected the idea.

But ever since the tragedy happened, the company claimed that in light of the market situation they would

include the bonuses and allowances in the remuneration. So it is just a consolation prize. It is just better than nothing. But over the years we have been striving for this. We didn't just start after the tragedy happened. Because we understand that this problem has affected staff all along, because our staff all along have been given very low basic salary.

So we have been reflecting this to the company.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Ms Wong, the New World First Bus staff union has reflected to the management, and that was in annex 17, and in 2017 our trade union has asked for the attendance bonus to be incorporated into the basic salary. We have been striving for it for a long time already. But we have lost the older minutes of meetings. But in appendix 17 it shows that they have been talking to the management all along about this.

Mr Chung would like to supplement.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: I would like to supplement.

Mr Lam talked about safety bonus, attendance bonus, et cetera, being incorporated into the basic salary and that started in November, and there were two bus tragedies, and the company told us that because of the pressure from the community and our salary is on the low side, all these allowances would be incorporated into the basic salary.

Mr Lau referred to the year-end bonus, and for us, there are the new systems and the old systems. In the old system it is in the form of a double pay without any conditions attached. So an extra month of pay will be disbursed. But for those under the new system, they have to meet with certain conditions stipulated by the company. Say, for example, if you take sick leave you will be given less. So the number of sick leave days you have in a year will be factored in. Maybe if you are complained against, your year-end bonus will also be deducted.

So for the frontline bus captains, especially the new recruits, they are not willing to stay long. They will just work for one year or half a year, and then they quit.

MR LAM KAM PIU: Mr Hui would also like to supplement.

MR HUI HOU KIT: Citybus and New World First Bus, our year-end bonus is different from the New World First Bus. We have three systems under Citybus. The first system covers the most experienced staff members, we call that double pay, and for the second batch, for myself I'm in that, we call that remuneration in a sense, and that comprises three parts.

The first is the basic salary, the other, the second is the -- your OT pay for the whole year divided by

one-third, and that is your bonus.

And the third batch is the contract bus captains.

So that means one month's basic salary for them.

And there is also a grading system.

If in one year you do not have full attendance, then your bonus will be deducted. So your basic salary will be divided by 365, say, if you are absent for one day of work, then you would get your bonus deducted by that amount, and then if it is sick leave and all that, then it would be deducted in the same manner.

And if you receive warning letters, well, if it is a final warning letter, then your bonus will also be deducted. If you receive a final warning letter, then you will only get 75 per cent of your basic salary as the bonus.

So that's how it works in Citybus.

Starting 2005, Citybus has started hiring contract bus captains. Initially, there was no year-end bonus, but we have been striving for it all along. And now that is being given.

But for new recruits, and the year-end bonus, there is one thing we object strongly against. Say, if they are on leave, and they do not have a full attendance, then their year-end bonus will be deducted. We don't think it is reasonable.

Maybe the person is taken ill or he suffers injury at work, maybe he applies for leave because of marriage or he has to attend a funeral or something like that. This is something beyond his control.

So if the pay for the colleague is being deducted for those reasons, that would be very unreasonable. That's all I wanted to say as a supplement.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we have heard about a system that was in place in Kowloon Motor Bus. Maybe Mr Kwok can assist.

We heard about the bus having a small device with four lights which would inform the driver immediately when there are four conditions, speeding, harsh braking, abrupt acceleration -- I think those are the three conditions.

CHAIRMAN: And engine idling.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Engine idling.

Mr Kwok, do you remember when these lights were put in place in buses?

CHAIRMAN: Could we bring a photograph of -- there it is. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's, for record purpose, BM-65.

CHAIRMAN: This is a document provided by Openmatics describing to us this alert system with the four LED

lights.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have been informed by one of the depot managers, Tuen Mun depot manager, that in fact there was this LED light system that would signal the driver immediately when one of these situations happened.

So my question is, do you recall when was this LED light implemented in buses in Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: 2013. 2013.

MR LAU KAI HIM: We tried that out in 2013, and that was installed.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: 2013.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

And they also talked about a system where whenever you go to work you put the Octopus card on the kiosk, there was an Octopus card where you can put on the reader, and it will automatically show whether you are a green driver, amber driver, or red driver.

Can you confirm if that was the system in place in Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How does this work? You put your Octopus card on the reader and what display do you see?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: When I go into work, and when I tap the card, then there will be this display. Usually it is a green light.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Chairman, I have something to supplement.

There are the red, amber and green lights, so that, well, based on the information collected from this box, then that shows the driver's driving behaviour, so if you have a green light then you are okay. If you have an amber light you need improvement. Red, of course, is not good, and there is also an incentive programme launched.

So if the drivers have the green light, then a reward is given to the driver. But for some time I don't see any information regarding this bonus or reward scheme. But this Octopus reader is still in operation at KMB, and the system pointed out by Ms Wong still exists.

Now, bus drivers will tap the card and then the relevant lights will come on. This system is connected to the GPS to monitor the bus driver's performance, and then information collected can then classify the bus drivers into amber, red and green drivers.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know what period of driving is reflected by this colour display, red, amber, green? To which period of driving does it relate?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Well, it is from the start of work to the end of your duty.

CHAIRMAN: So when you come on duty, you tap your card, and

this is displayed, is that right, Mr Kwok?

What does the display refer to? Yesterday's driving, the month's driving, a week's driving?

MR LAU KAI HIM: It is a kind of sustainable performance on your part, and every time when you tap the card you will be reminded on your performance as indicated by the colour. Well, we don't have a specific period, say, for assessing your performance -- well, that's a reminder on a sustainable basis. Every time when you tap your card, the relevant colour will show up to tell you your actual performance.

It doesn't cover a specific period. I wonder whether Mr Kwok has anything to supplement.

CHAIRMAN: We have been told that it does. If you don't know, please say so.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Well, as far as I can recollect, it is usually about the performance in the previous week. Yes, indeed there is a period.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Now we can see on the screen that there are these four thresholds that trigger some kind of alert. Do you know whether triggering one of the alerts, for example that the engine has been idling too long affects the colour that you have given for your record? In other words, if you left the engine idling at the bus station

do you get a red signal?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: There will be also a beeping sound, and the light will also come on.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that.

Does the fact that you left the engine running too long, and the light flashed, and you got a beeping sound as you sat waiting in the bus station, does that result in a day or two, or a week's time later, you getting a red indicator when you tap your Octopus card, or not?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: They will take the average statistics. We would not have that kind of consequence. Only if it happens one or two times. If that happens frequently then the reminder will come on.

CHAIRMAN: Have you ever been provided with details that tell you exactly how it works, or not?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: No. Well, no explanation has been given.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know what the threshold values are for triggering the audio and visual alert in the bus captain's cockpit? Do you know what the thresholds are? Speed, acceleration, deceleration?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: I have driven many different buses, and different buses have different devices that give different effect. Some are very sensitive. Some would be triggered very easily, say if you press on the gas

pedal quite hard, or when you brake hard, or when you take a turn too sharply, some devices are sensitive, some are not.

So I have the impression that this system is not very consistent among the buses.

CHAIRMAN: For example with speed, do you know what speed the alert is triggered at?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: It will beep if it goes above 70.

CHAIRMAN: So if you are in a 50 kilometre an hour speed limit and you are doing 60, it doesn't beep?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: If it is 50, well, I haven't heard any beeping sound so far.

CHAIRMAN: In the five years that this system has been working, no beep in a 50-kilometre zone?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Kwok.

MS MAGGIE WONG: About the Octopus card reader system showing the green, amber, red colour of the drivers. When was it implemented?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Five years ago -- 2013.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So the same time when you have this LED illuminating light system?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: I suppose so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

And since we are on this topic, may I ask your view

on this, Mr Lau earlier mentioned that you used to have a reward system based on the driving performance, but now it appears that the system did not exist. Is that what Mr Lau is saying?

MR LAU KAI HIM: That's right, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So what is the reward?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, because of lapse of time, I really cannot remember very clearly, but when it was first implemented, there was a poster. Some sort of a poster, which I had seen that there was this scheme reminding drivers to drive in an environmentally friendly manner in a safe manner, and if you reached the target you would get a reward.

As for the actual details, I no longer remember. But I do have the recollection that there was some sort of reward coming from data of the box, but since then I have not heard anything about the reward or its details.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Kwok, have you ever received a reward?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes? And what was the reward? Money? Fruit? Balloons? What was it?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Do you mean the red, amber, green performance related one?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: I think it related to a promotion, or star bus captain.

CHAIRMAN: So not monetary, not immediately monetary?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: No, no. Not monetary.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Kwok.

Mr Auyeung, yes.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Mr Kwok, I want to ask a question about -- as a bus captain, do you find this system helping your work?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Do you mean this LED surveillance or monitoring system? Yes.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Kwok and Mr Lau, do you remember when this reward system was first implemented? Would it be around the time when you have this red, amber, green system?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, regarding the LED system, I remember very clearly that it was in 2013. When I was at work I first got in touch with the LED system and I was told by other bus drivers that they didn't get used to the LED system because it kept beeping and the lights kept going on, and it was in 2013. But I do not remember whether the reward system was also implemented around the same time.

I only have the recollection that I saw a poster

about this incentive, if the performance was good, but I no longer remember details.

I can tell you very clearly, however, that this system was implemented in 2013 and the black box with four LED lights are still being used at the moment.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If this system was re-implemented, that there would be reward, or bonus --

CHAIRMAN: Well, what we have been told is that insofar as there is a reward, it might have been promotion, but it was not monetary.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If one were to suggest that there be a reward in the form of bonus payment, based on the colour of the system, that is if you consistently have green colour, being good driving behaviour, you would receive a bonus --

CHAIRMAN: A monetary bonus?

MS MAGGIE WONG: A monetary bonus, would you find it helpful, or useful in enhancing the safety awareness of driving?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, whenever there is an incentive or reward system, I think psychologically speaking it would be helpful. It would be positive.

But let's say if you are given a bonus if you have green colour, then it serves as an incentive for bus

captains to improve his performance. But I need to make it clear, that the awareness of safety will not be enhanced simply by having a bonus. If the driver's safety awareness isn't high, then even if there is a bonus I don't know whether certainly this will help improve the safety aspect of driving.

These are two different concepts.

Of course, if you have a bonus, it will be helpful, it will be an incentive, but about enhancing safety awareness, I don't think the black box with four LED lights would really substantially improve the safety awareness of drivers. It only serves as a reminder, and the bonus would be an incentive for them to improve their performance, but their awareness will not be enhanced simply by the black box with four LED lights and bonuses.

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Let me supplement.

As I mentioned just now, different buses have different devices that give off different responses. Some are responsive, some are not. So if this is used to assess the work performance of bus captains, I think this is substandard. I think we should assess the performance with other means.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In your experience, have you come across a driver who consistently has red signal, or red colour

in terms of this system, this Octopus card system?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: I have not seen one.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard evidence from KMB former employee that there was a small reminding card that informed bus captains about 29 sharp bends and providing some safety driving tips.

Do you recall receiving a small printed card?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, Mr Lau.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Let me supplement.

For this small card, I have not received it, I never saw it, but the company does provide information on the intranet regarding these road sections, and previously the company also reminded colleagues to read the notice about dangerous road sections on the intranet. That would remind them about the road sections and the information came with pictures and text.

As for the small card, I have not seen it myself.

As for safety information about road sections, the information is on the intranet as I can see on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "the company", you mean KMB?

MR LAU KAI HIM: That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us when did you start to have this intranet information about these road sections?

Since when?

MR LAU KAI HIM: The information, when I joined in 2013, I could already access this information. So all along, they are on the website, and about two or three years ago they were still updating and collecting data about potentially hazardous road sections, and they would update information on the intranet.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned two or three years ago they were still updating; what about now?

MR LAU KAI HIM: I don't know whether there has been any update now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I go to the next topic, on assault of bus captains.

Your union has made a lot of emphasis on this by providing us with minutes of meeting, and also in your submission. If I may take you to your submission only, that's at page 260-93 in English; Chinese is at page 260-56.

And it refers to your union:

"...always followed up with incidents where bus captains were attacked."

And you also stated that your record would not be complete because only those union members who informed you would you have support them.

"However, in the past, the Federation has always

been communicating with the Police on bus captain safety."

And you produced a Transport Department minutes of meeting on 30 June 2017 in annexure 15. That's at page 260-473 in English.

Now, is this a recent occurrence about assaults on bus captains by passengers which led to you having these meetings with the Transport Department and the police, and the Department of Justice?

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can I ask about your views on installation of surveillance cameras? We have heard evidence from different unions that most of them support the use of surveillance cameras being installed in the driver's cockpit in order to protect the bus captain as well as to record in video form and in audio recording the incident.

Does your union support this, the installation of surveillance cameras?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: We agree to the installation of CCTVs, not just to protect the bus captains but also the passengers as well. With CCTV, then the facts can be known.

MR LAU KAI HIM: I have something to supplement.

In our meetings with the police, the police have

emphasised the importance of producing evidence. In assaults on bus captains, evidence is important. If we have CCTV footage, then we will know how the incident happened. It can protect bus captains, and passengers alike. If we have footage serving as evidence of bus captains being assaulted then that will help in presenting the case in the court.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, thank you.

Related to this topic is the installation of protective --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- do any of you gentlemen have any experience of CCTV being used in this way in the courts -- taken from a bus showing an assault on a bus driver?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: No.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Hui?

MR HUI HOU KIT: Yes, I have a case.

But that happened before we had the installation of the CCTV. At that time there were human witnesses. I mean, there were people who served as witnesses telling the court that I was assaulted, I was beaten up, and there was a fine imposed on the culprit.

But then if we had footages, then we don't have to rely just on the witnesses. Because passengers are worried, and they sometimes they don't want to be

witnesses, so if we have such CCTV then it can help show that passengers actually beat up the bus captains and then there is a higher chance of a conviction. And that will help the bus captains.

MR LAU KAI HIM: I would like to supplement.

The union has been emphasising to the DoJ and the police that Hong Kong is a common law jurisdiction and the burden of proof lies with the prosecution, and if we have CCTV footages, the prosecution will be more effective.

And we have expressed our worry about bus captains being assaulted and at the court we must emphasise the seriousness of such a problem, because it will have an adverse impact on not just the bus captains, but other road users and passengers.

We don't want to interfere with the ruling of the court, but we notice that every time the penalty meted out is not deterrent enough and the message for the community seems to be that this is a sort of low court criminal offence, I mean the passengers assaulting the bus captains. I don't think bus captains should be assaulted by passengers, and under cap 230A the passengers should not be assaulting the bus captains.

And we haven't seen the DoJ emphasising to the judiciary the seriousness of the problem and, as

a result, people think that this is just something common place, and how can the law protect the safety of bus captains, if this is the case?

CHAIRMAN: You have made this submission to both the police and the Department of Justice, have you not?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Yes, in the meeting on 30 June 2017, we reflected our views, and we made two major points.

First, in the prosecution process the DoJ must tell the court the seriousness of the problem of assault on the bus captains, and the harm it does to this society. And also because the sentencing is always very light, and is not deterrent enough. And we have asked the DoJ that after the prosecution they should also actively follow up, maybe they should appeal against the sentencing. So we have mentioned all these.

We have been talking to the DoJ, we said that we are not interfering with the court's ruling, we respect such a ruling, but we think the rule of law is the foundation or the cornerstone of Hong Kong success, and this is something that the DoJ is also proud of.

But then what the DoJ does does not really bring out the seriousness of the problem, so the bus captains are not adequately protected under the law.

If some of the sentencing can be harsher, then it will be deterrent.

We also notice that in dealing with such cases the police may not know too well about the actual situation, and in some cases the police will ask the bus captains to settle the case by conciliation, and we have emphasised to the police that the power given to us under cap 203A is very big, but then many frontline police officers don't know about the content and how 203A operates.

MR HUI HOU KIT: At the hospital, my injury was examined, and the police was not notified yet, but then the witness has not come forth yet, and the police would advise me to resort to conciliation. And then, after I know that there was a witness I said to the police that I would like to have prosecution.

I have served in a trade union for over 10 years, and I have seen cases of colleagues whereby the police have advised the bus captains to conciliate, "because you don't have a witness, and even if there is a conviction, well, only a fine will be imposed. So why don't you just resort to conciliation?"

We had meeting with the police, and with the DoJ, and we emphasised that the police's role is to protect the rights of the underprivileged. The bus captains have been beaten up, so there is no reason why you should ask us to resort to conciliation.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Hui, when were you attacked? What was the date?

MR HUI HOU KIT: Over 10 years ago. When I was working as an overnight bus captain.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. We have some statistics going back three years, but -- we have particulars going back three years, but we don't have anything going back that far.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Chairman, for record purpose, the minutes of meeting, 30 June 2017 mentioned by Mr Lau and gentlemen is in TU bundle, at pages 260-474 to 477.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Related to this topic, gentlemen, is about the use of protective shield.

We have heard one union expressing that there are problems relating to the use of protective shields. May I enquire, Mr Kwok, perhaps, in relation to Kowloon Motor Bus, because I believe that's the step taken by KMB. Do you have any issues about the use of protective shield installed near the cockpit, driver's cockpit?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: There is no problem with the installation of protective shield, but the way it is installed is undesirable.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us why?

MR KWOK WAI KWONG: Well, the protective shield covers too

small an area. And the location is undesirable, and it blocks the sight line and there is also a sound, a noise.

There is a suggestion, that it should not be half a panel, but the entire panel. Even if the passengers want to beat us they can still do so. So it should go all the way from the bottom to the top.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Mr Lam and Mr Chung would like to supplement.

MR LAM KAM PIU: On the bus captains being assaulted, and the installation of protective devices, we have made a suggestion to the Transport Department. I went to the UK myself, and I took some buses in the UK. Well, Hong Kong bus models are similar to the UK's, but at the driver's cabin, in the UK buses, well, a full enclosure is being put in place made of plastic. It is like a room, so to speak. And the passengers will not be able to get in touch with the bus captains, whereas the bus captains would be able to view the roads and the external situation. I wonder whether this kind of device is suited to Hong Kong.

But we have made the suggestion to the TD for their consideration.

On the KMB's device, it is only a pilot programme, and there is still room for improvement.

Well, as users, we can make suggestions on improvement to the bus company. The engineering staff of the bus company do not know how it works. Only the users will know how well it works so we should reflect our views to the engineering staff of the company. And improvement or enhancement can then be made.

This device can help bus captains, but Citybus and New World First Bus are against the idea.

The management of these two companies said that if the bus captains do not offend the bus captains then the passengers won't beat you up.

So in other words, we are prepared to be beaten up.

So for Citybus, New World First Bus, our colleagues have seen KMB's device and we have given our feedback to our company, and they have given us a response.

CHAIRMAN: Where were you in the UK when you encountered this full protective cover? Where were you? Which place?

MR LAM KAM PIU: London. Even Birmingham.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know which bus company in London was using this device?

MR LAM KAM PIU: I really don't know which company, but I saw that a number of bus operators had this system installed.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Your union also expressed concerns about the use of 12.8 metre bus that have rear wheel steering function, and the Transport Department has replied to your union that they will review the suitability of each route and require the bus company to conduct road testing to ensure safety for driving.

And the letter of reply from Transport Department was dated 11 September 2017.

That's TU bundle, page 260-2 to 260-4.

Does your union still have concerns about the use of this particular kind of buses?

MR LAM KAM PIU: True. Because for 12.8 buses in light of the road conditions in Hong Kong, because we have narrow roads, and heavy pedestrian flow, and there is a hazard using very long buses.

As for 12.8 bus with the rear axle steering function, when manoeuvring a bend of course it would be very good for the driver. But for other vehicles they may not know that the bus comes with this rear wheel steering function, and the Transport Department would issue something to let the driver know that it has the function, but other drivers may not know. So when the rear axle steers during a bend, when another vehicle approaches very closely the back of the bus, the wheel

would actually go outside its own lane, causing danger to the vehicle next to it.

We may not have the statistics at the moment, but at certain locations such as bus termini, or different road sections, we had instances of the rear wheels grazing vehicles next to it. But, of course, we would be in a disadvantageous position, because we grazed the other vehicle, and at the moment, because of the width of the lanes in Hong Kong, we have a width of 9 feet but for buses it has a width of 8.5 feet. So the bus itself is fully occupying the whole width.

Imagine if there is another large vehicle making a turn at the same time, for the 12.8 bus, definitely the rear would graze the other vehicle, and then once you turn the vehicle, the tail of the bus would go into the next lane.

KMB used a 12.8 bus for trial, and they set up cones, to check how the 12.8 bus makes a turn, and in fact, the tail went 3 feet off its own lane.

So we told the Transport Department that when the 12.8 bus is tested, there should be union representatives attending the test, and, well, traffic cones should be set up, so that when the bus negotiates the bend of 90 degrees we could see whether the tail would touch other vehicles.

However, the Transport Department replied by saying a test had been conducted and union representatives would not be invited to another test.

We requested once again recently, that the union should be invited to give comments as well, and we proposed the location, Fleming Road flyover, turning into Hennessy Road on Hong Kong Island, because at that road junction vehicles can either turn left or right, so we can test the 12.8 bus there, because Citybus and New World First Bus both have 12.8 buses. So if two buses turn at that junction, definitely there will be an accident.

At the moment other motorists do not understand the rear axle --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lam, we do have a shortage of time. We have your point. You still have concerns that these buses are not safe in Hong Kong. We have that. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If you would not mind, can you give us the request in writing that you wrote to the Transport Department requesting for a retest for that particular section. If you can supply it to the Committee later.

Now --

MR LAU KAI HIM: Chairman. I'm sorry to say that the Federation received a phone call from a top official of

Transport Department expressing deep dissatisfaction that we passed three documents to the Committee which are minutes of meetings. But we do believe that these documents would help the work of the Committee.

So we are going to provide the minutes of meetings in the past, but for the August 2017 meetings onwards, the Transport Department would not provide minutes to us.

CHAIRMAN: Who was it that spoke to you on the telephone expressing deep dissatisfaction that you had passed documents to this Committee? Who was it?

MR LAM KAM PIU: Well, that day it was I who rang the Transport Department with a view to asking them to return documents to us, because we have been asking for meeting minutes for a long time, and they have been telling us that other departments have not forwarded documents to them, et cetera. So I just asked them to give us as soon as possible.

And the other side then told me that, "Well, we didn't provide document even if the Committee asked us. That's because we respect the privacy of the union."

And then I told -- and then I told them that if the minutes of the meeting are passed on to others we definitely would not do that.

But if this is for helping the enquiry, we

definitely will submit the minutes, and that's our position. Because the other official is in the directorate grade, I don't want to disclose his identity, I don't know whether there would be some problem. I can just say that he is a directorate grade officer.

MR LAU KAI HIM: We hope --

CHAIRMAN: When was this conversation? When?

MR LAM KAM PIU: In June, no --

CHAIRMAN: Take your time.

MR LAM KAM PIU: It was in July, mid July when I asked for documents, as we knew we were awaiting the Commission's invitation to attend the hearing.

MR LAU KAI HIM: I would like to apologise to you, Chairman, on behalf of the Federation. We tried to look for documents, but unfortunately we have not been able to submit documents to the Committee, and we are sorry, and we can't think whether there would be further minutes received by the Federation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the documents that you have supplied us.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, gentlemen. My last topic is about practice note, a recent practice note issued by

the Transport Department.

We have recently been informed that the Transport Department has issued a practice note to franchised bus operators in respect of the training for bus captains to align the training arrangements of different operators, and to lay down a common framework of the training system for their bus captains. And this is supposed to be implemented from October 2018.

This practice note was issued in the context of a working group set up as a result of the February 2018 Tai Po accident.

This working group comprised five bus operators, three bus manufacturers, and the Transport Department. And recently, they have informed us that they have issued a practice note.

So my question is, has your union been supplied with a copy of the practice note?

MR LAM KAM PIU: No.

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Excuse me.

(Interpreted) We received a reply from the Transport Department and we read the reply. As to whether the practice note -- I want to know whether it comes in the form of a booklet or otherwise? We never received any booklet. We did receive a letter from the Transport Department regarding training of bus captains, but not

other documents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Lau. We have not received it either.

So may I also ask, about this practice note. Have you ever been consulted about this practice note in terms of training of bus captains? Has Transport Department or each of the bus operators consulted your union about the topic of future training of bus captains?

MR LAU KAI HIM: First of all, we only learned about that from the Commission, that a working group had been set up by the Transport Department comprising representatives from the bus manufacturers and FB operators.

We only learned about this working group through the Commission, and in May during our meeting with the Transport Department we requested the Transport Department to allow a representative of the union to join the working group because we are related. Of course, the Transport Department did not agree. And for the practice note, from its drafting to its issuance, we had no participation. We only learned from the Commission that there is this working group. So we have never been consulted.

When we knew about the working group we were

concerned. We said that we should be consulted, but we were never consulted.

CHAIRMAN: When you made this request of the Transport Department, did you do so in writing?

MR LAU KAI HIM: In May, we had an inter-departmental meeting together with the Transport Department. That was on the next day after the TD came to the hearing here. And we had a meeting, and we asked to be included in the working group.

The Administration's response is that, well, we have certain members already, and they have not responded directly as to whether we would be included. And they have not mentioned anything about the practice note and they have not consulted us.

And as to the minutes of that meeting, we don't have the minutes, as I said.

CHAIRMAN: So the request was not made in writing, it was made at a meeting and was made orally; is that the position?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Yes. Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do you not have your own minutes of the meeting?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Our colleagues had recorded the discussion, but every time it is usually the Transport Department who drafted the minutes. We have jotted down some notes ourselves, but these are not formal meeting minutes.

But we have jotted down the salient points, and every time the TD has special staff who worked on the minutes, which would then be distributed to us.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could provide us with what notes you have got of the meeting.

MR LAU KAI HIM: Mr Chairman, I have to talk to the colleagues and try to compile something, and then supply it to the Chairman afterwards. Can that be done?

CHAIRMAN: If you would, that would help us. Thank you.

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, that will be all my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, that concludes the questions that have been asked. Are there any concluding remarks that you wish to make -- short remarks? You don't have to, but if you wish to we will listen to them.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Chairman, the union would like to emphasise this position. On the TD's guidelines on bus captain working hours, the guidelines are not law, but then they do sort of regulate or govern the bus companies' operations. And they will also directly affect our colleagues, because the stakeholders, our colleagues are affected.

Now, on this special shift, so this special shift is

still at 14 hours and driver fatigue is created. And not only that, on the three consecutive hours of rest, there is still no further guideline. I think we should get paid for that as well. And the Transport Department is being irresponsible by not specifying that. We spend 14 hours in our shift, but we don't get paid for 14 hours.

It says that a rest break of not less than three consecutive hours. That means it can be more than three hours, according to the guidelines.

Well, in accordance with the guidelines they can give six consecutive hours of rest. So that means we get paid only for eight hours.

Now, as we said, we get $21.90 per hour. I think the TD, Transport Department is very irresponsible.

(Chinese spoken) --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Mr Chung.

Ms Wong, have we not been told by Citybus that they propose paying, when they introduce the special shift, they propose paying not this allowance rate, but the normal rate for working hours?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, they do, in their submission.

CHAIRMAN: It is Kowloon Motor Bus that apparently are paying a different rate.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: I would like to supplement. I am

talking about the guidelines of the Transport Department, and not on individual bus companies' way of calculating the pay. According to the guidelines, the bus companies can choose not to pay the bus captain during the rest breaks.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chung, the Transport Department's approach and the guidelines don't address the issue of pay at all, do they? Is that your complaint, that they should address the issue of pay?

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: So the Transport Department say, "Pay is a matter between the bus companies and the bus drivers, not us." That's their approach as we understand it.

MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI: Yes, correct. The guidelines are compiled by the Transport Department. They should have the responsibility. And also franchised bus services are public services, and public interest is at stake. If you don't handle the issues properly, all people of Hong Kong would be affected.

Let me cite an example.

Back then, the government was launching anti-corruption measures, so that public interest would not be undermined. But then TD is being irresponsible, it is trying to meet with the demands of the bus companies, and it is disregarding our livelihood. And

14 hours, well, we don't have enough rest breaks for a 14-hour shift.

CHAIRMAN: We have your point now.

Mr Lau, was there something you wished to say on that point?

MR LAU KAI HIM: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: A concluding remark.

MR LAU KAI HIM: (In English) Two minutes. Two minutes, okay?

(Interpreted) Well, electricity, water supply, bus services are all public services and public interest is involved, I understand the Chief Executive appointed the three gentlemen to serve in this Committee because public interest is at stake, but then the TD is not bearing public interest in mind. It is condoning fatigued driving, it is allowing excessively low pay.

The Transport and Housing Bureau know about the accounts of the bus companies, and they are actively involved in the income and laws of the bus companies, and if they want to have a fair hike the CE in Council's approval has to be obtained.

And the TD is coming up with guidelines only on the working hours and they are not, they are disregarding the pay, and we work long hours with low pay, and we have made suggestions to the TD on pay rise based on

very good grounds, and we can only provide good service if we have enough manpower, so everything is related.

If you just focus on working hours and you don't say anything about pay, low pay, then that's no good. Because it is all related to safety.

We can only provide good service if we have enough bus captains, and if we get paid reasonably, then we would not have driver fatigue and we can drive safely.

We regard it as a responsibility. This is not a job, so to speak. But the bus companies regard it as a kind of job, and don't see it as a trade coming with great responsibility.

That's all I want to say. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your closing remarks, and thank you for abiding by your promise that it would take two minutes.

These proceedings are now adjourned, and we will resume again -- I think it is on Tuesday, when we have other evidence to receive.

Thank you, gentlemen, for attending, and we apologise for the inconvenience and having to ask you to come back. Thank you for being patient and waiting until we could reach you. But we are now adjourned.

(5.40 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to Tuesday, 7 August 2018)

I N D E X

P A G E

EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS 1
COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:
MS DEBBY WONG
EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 2
QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE 33
EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS 35
COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:
MR KELVIN YEUNG
EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 40
FORMER EMPLOYEE OF KOWLOON MOTOR BUS 103
COMPANY (1933) LIMITED:
MR RAYMOND CHENG
EXAMINATION BY MS WONG 104
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERATION OF 123
BUS INDUSTRY TRADE UNIONS:
MR LEUNG KAM KEUNG, MR CHUNG CHUNG FAI, MR LAM KAM PIU, MR LAU KAI HIM, MR HUI HON KIT, MR KWOK WAI KWONG

EXAMINATION BY MS WONG (continued) 123

[Blank Page]

2018 年 8 月 1 日

上午 10 時 01 恢復聆訊

出席人士： 黃綺玲女士，助理經理（屯門車廠）（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司僱員）

楊晉瑋先生，助理經理（屯門車廠）（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司僱員）

鄭桂興先生，（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司前僱員）（行業工會巴士業職工會聯盟）

鍾松輝先生，鍾松輝先生，巴職聯會務顧問，新世界第一巴士公司職工會會長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

劉啟謙先生，巴職聯會務幹事（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

林錦標先生，巴職聯副主席，新世界第一巴士公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

許漢傑先生，巴職聯司庫，城巴有限公司職工會理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

郭偉光先生，巴職聯秘書，九巴員工協會副理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

梁錦強先生，巴職聯組織主任，新世界第一巴士公司職工會副理事長（巴士業職工會聯盟（包括各會員工會，即九巴員工協會、新世界第一巴士公司職工會及城巴有限公司職工會）代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，早晨。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）早晨。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，係，早晨。感謝你今日就係接納我哋嘅邀請上嚟作證，你而家現時係九巴嘅現有職員，係嘛？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋就會請黃大律師，佢就係協助我哋獨立檢討委員會嘅大律師，佢會問問題。咁就係向你提問，就用咁嘅方式向你取證，咁你可以作補充，你亦都可以就係睇番我哋嗰個投影器上面打出嚟嘅文件，又或者如果想嘅話亦都可以攞番嗰個印冊本，明白嘛？

黃綺玲女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該，黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，感謝你今日出席，我今日就想係先睇係嗰個休息嘅設施。咁你曾經係回應咗我哋獨立檢討委員會嘅函件，咁嗰個日期就2018年6月28號嘅信，咁至於話你嗰個回應就喺2018年7月4號就係畀我哋，大家可以睇番呢個FE嗰個文件夾，199頁。

黃小姐，我未向你問問題之前--未就呢個題目係問問題之前，先問下係你喺九巴度係工作咗幾耐呢？

黃綺玲女士：可以，我有廿一年喺九巴工作，亦都係喺車務嗰方面嘅 operations 嗰方面，亦都係喺兩間唔同嘅車廠工作過，一間係荔枝角廠，另一間係屯門廠。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係幾時係開始係擔任現時嘅職位呢？就話係九巴屯門車廠嘅車務主管，係幾時開始呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）你問題係幾時呀？係幾時？自從 97 年我就喺屯門車廠嗰度做，咁然後就轉咗去荔枝角廠，咁就係喺2016年嘅事，然後我又返番去屯門車廠，2018年嘅事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺你個回覆嗰度就講及就係有三十個車站，呢個就屯門嘅車廠底下，有三十個係總站。我留意到就係喺楊晉瑋先生嘅陳述書嗰度，佢就提及有三十一個總站，想問下邊個先啱呢？係三十定三十一呢？

黃綺玲女士：總站我哋未必係有站長，即係有人 station 嘅，咁可能喺嗰個 counting 方面，可能 Kelvin Yeung 同我可能有少少出入，應該係都 between 30、31。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我想問下，你係負責打理幾多個車站？

黃綺玲女士：有十個如果 under，因為我係負責天水圍區，咁差唔多有--我要數下先。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，慢慢。

黃綺玲女士：如果而家 under 我屯門廠，而家喺呢個 as on assistant manager，我係有四個總站係 under 天水圍區。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。我明白喺屯門車廠嚟講呢，佢就負責三個區嘅車，屯門、元朗同埋天水圍，你就係負責天水圍？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪天水圍所有嘅總站？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）總共有四個總站，係咪呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁其他呢？係咪都係由楊生負責？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）楊生就只係負責屯門區，元朗就係喺另一位係助理經理管理嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，助理經理邊位？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）佢係 Amanda Hung。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，喺你嘅陳述書嗰度，你講過你係有兩種嘅休息室，首先第一種叫做係 A 類，第二種就叫 B 類或者 B 型。B 型我知道個大細嚟講就大啲，你可唔可以講出就除咗嗰個大細之外，兩者仲有咩嘢分別呀？

黃綺玲女士：除咗個 size 之外，其實裏面嘅間隔都有少少唔同，如果係大啲 size 嘅 kiosk，我哋係可以放多啲 electrical，譬如微波爐、雪櫃、飲水機都可以放埋喺個房裏面，如果係細嗰啲主要就係 for 我哋站長，佢哋 working station 嚟嘅，咁另外一啲嘅 kiosk 就係 for 頭先所講嘅微波爐、雪櫃，淨係 for 啲死物。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）會唔會係有個地方佢哋可以係瞓喺度呢？即係兩者...

黃綺玲女士：呢啲係工作地方，另外仲有啲--如果有啲地方個總站 bus station 比較大，我哋可以提供一個我哋叫 rest room，就 for 車長一啲嘅休息，咁佢個 size 等於我哋講嘅另外一個大啲 kiosks，其實嗰隻大啲嘅 kiosks 有 for 站長，或者係 for 車長休息，咁個 size 係一樣，但係裏面嘅設計係會有啲枱，有啲凳嘅設備。咁另外我哋仲有一啲 concrete 嘅 office，可能係個 PTI 本身係 provide 嘅 concrete 嘅 office，咁就會嗰啲地方會大啲。正如我 mention 過，亦都有啲地方點解係可以有多啲空間，或者可以多啲凳，嗰啲就係 concrete 嘅 office。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話 PTI 係咩嘢意思呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）公共運輸設備。

主席：（經傳譯員）你所打理嘅，有冇呢啲咁樣嘅地方就可以休息嘅設施呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）好似係天水圍市中心就有一個呢係石屎嘅地方，咁我哋就可以提供到係車長休息嘅地方，咁另外一個房呢就係畀嗰個係站長。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，請你講。喺天恩、天富同埋天慈，佢哋都有兩個大啲嘅房，一個就係畀站長，一個就係畀車長，同埋我所管理嘅嗰四個站，都已經係有嗰個嘅休息。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你所管理嘅四個站，我想問下呢四個站係咪有一個係安排，就係車長係要係分開嗰更嚟到做？

黃綺玲女士：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有幾多個係咁㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我冇嗰個數字，但每一個站頭我哋都有唔同嘅路線，有啲係長程車，有啲係短程。咁我哋即係會混合，咁我哋就會即係混合，咁有一啲更就係混合更，有啲就係一氣呵成，即係話只係早更或者係夜更。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好嘞，咁若果喺對方，就係車長要分開兩次嚟到做嘅話呢，佢哋係咪都係有休息嘅設施？

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪就係講嗰四個呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席： Thank you.

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋有提供，我哋有提供嗰啲設施，喺我管理嘅車站嗰度係有㗎。咁同埋喺天水圍嘅車廠，車長呢都可以喺休息嘅時間，就係喺天水圍車廠裏面休息。如果佢哋住得近自己屋企嘅話呢，亦都可以返屋企休息，然後呢係再返嚟做嘢。因為我哋係畀兩、三個鐘頭呢畀佢係喺中間休息。

主席：（經傳譯員）想問下天水圍市中心係一個車廠定抑或係車站呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋另外有一個車廠叫天水圍車廠，都係喺天水圍嗰個區。

主席：（經傳譯員）你睇番呢個螢光幕，嗰度有好多站，咁邊個喺天水圍？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）天水圍市中心就係一個係站，咁另外我哋應該仲有一個叫天水圍車廠，咁嗰個只係畀巴士停泊。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話呢度冇列出天水圍車廠。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）啱，你講得啱。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）207 嗰度，你就係講到一個天水圍市中心，一個係天水圍鐵路站。呢啲都唔係你所講嘅休息設施？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我漏咗，係呀，天水圍鐵路站都係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）兩者都係？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係另一個站，天水圍鐵路站，另一個呢都係屬於我管嘅係總站㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）你較早時候講過，天水圍市中心嗰個站都有休息嘅設施？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，嗰度呢係提供個休息設施。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲休息嘅地方，係屬於 A 類，定係 B 類，係咪嗰啲大啲嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係 B，B 型，大啲嗰個。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺嗰四個車站嚟講，係咪都係 B 型呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）除咗天水圍係市中嗰嗰呢係石屎做，咁所以有一個係石屎嘅地方。咁就係畀嗰啲車長休息。另一個就喺天富，天水圍鐵路站，佢哋都係 B 型嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁即係話亦都會有啲長凳畀佢哋，係咪呀？係畀車長？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係呀。唔係真係長凳，係椅同埋檯，讓佢哋食飯同埋休息。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺你嘅陳述度，你就提到即係如果要安裝一啲即係用化學劑嘅廁所呢，即係個需時係比較長嘅，即係當時你係管理緊荔枝角嘅巴士車廠，咁呢個就係喺第 198 頁所講嘅，喺你嘅陳述，咁你就提到荃威花園。我想你睇番呢一個會議紀錄，因為工會亦都係有向運輸署反映呢一點，咁我就係想確認你係咪知道，咁呢個就係喺 TU 嘅文件夾，或者係 192 段，咁呢一個就係張國柱當時立法會議員，同埋呢一個巴士業職工會聯盟，同埋其他工會發出嘅。

主席： And the date?

黃女士：（經傳譯員）日期係 2015 年 3 月 4 號。呢個就係第 260 頁，192 嘅編號，咁呢就係喺上面呢一個部分，咁呢個即係講緊巴士站嘅設施。咁而上面就話，工會係不滿，因為大部分嘅巴士總站都係冇一啲固定洗手間去畀員工去用，同埋佢哋係要求運輸署係去檢討巴士總站嘅安排。

咁而現有嘅程序係非常之複雜，即係如果巴士公司係想安裝呢啲員工嘅廁

所，同埋其他嘅巴士站設施，咁諮詢過程呢亦都係非常之費時，咁而建議就係申請同埋諮詢嘅過程呢，係應該簡化同埋加快，而工會亦都係要求以下嘅巴士總站係應該加快去安裝設施，咁呢就係呢度提呢一個荃威花園嘅巴士總站，呢個就係你喺198頁提到嘅荃威花園站，係咪呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁而家個情況係點呢？荃威花園嘅巴士站係咪有廁所呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：我用番中文，Allway Garden 嗰度其實係一個露天總站喇，咁嗰度其實個廁所呢係要行得好遠先至有一個政府嘅公廁，咁另外喺呢個總站嘅對面呢有個商場，係個商場有個廁所，但係鎖住嘅，咁所以長期我哋係要向嗰個管理處呢係借鎖匙先可以去到㗎我哋啲員工。咁嗰個管理處呢亦都曾經講過，因為我哋唔係租客，所以就唔想借畀我哋，所以基於呢個原因，以我所知，荔廠喺舊年亦都知道--我哋曾經申請過好幾次，已經都 submission 過畀 Transport Department 去申請啲 chemical toilet，咁亦都喺舊年，我係喺--等我睇下，2017年1月嘅時候，我亦都係入過一個 application，等我睇番先。

係2016年1月嘅時候呢，我哋亦都再次向 TD submit 嗰個 chemical toilet，咁亦都喺中間嘅過程呢，TD 亦都係 reject 咗我哋嘅 application，基於話 public 嘅 consultation 嘅 rejection，咁跟住我哋亦都再探討個位置，因為其實一個露天嘅總站，其實附近一定會有少少係影響居民，但係我哋都以一個角度，係員工都需要洗手間嘅角度去同運輸署，甚至係當區嘅議員再去申請一啲比較可以接受嘅位置，咁喺再中間嘅過程再探討，咁亦都終於喺舊年嘅7月我哋再次 revised 我哋嘅圖再去 submit，亦都最後運輸署係喺10月嘅時候批，係基於因為我哋嘅員工真係冇得用，同埋中間有個過程我哋係亦都係同嗰啲當區嘅議員，都係再同佢好多次嘅溝通，令到佢理解我哋呢個員工嘅生理需要，係要擺一個 chemical toilet，所以終--終於喺舊年嘅10月有一個 approval letter 返咗。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個只係其中一個例子，咁根據會議紀錄，你畀嘅例子只係15年3月。咁你係等到去年嘅10月先至收到呢一個申請嘅批准，咁即係話係用咗起碼兩年先可以成功申請到安裝呢個廁所，係咪呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）其實係超過兩年，咁因為再之前呢我係同其他嘅同事有其他嘅電郵來往，咁但係喺我負責嘅期間，都係整整係用咗兩年。

主席：（經傳譯員）荃威花園嘅巴士站係有幾耐歷史？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）超過二十年，我唔係好記得嗰個歷史係點。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係一有呢個總站都係已經開始有巴士路線係行駛㗎嘞？咁點解係係即係當時係有呢個總站而係冇廁所呢？

黃綺玲女士： So --

主席： How does that happen?

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅車長呢係需要係從商場嘅管理處借廁所鎖匙。因為佢知道我哋會借呢啲鎖匙，所以佢哋就換咗啲鎖。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果係冇安裝廁所呢，點解當年係可以興建呢一個總站嘅呢？點解會咁樣做嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）即係喺我負責嘅期間，我就見到呢個問題，所以我就嘗試同運輸署同埋區議會去傾嘅，咁區議員呢據我所知，佢哋係唔想喺呢一個公共交通交匯處係安裝一啲用化劑嘅廁所。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁佢哋有得揀嘅，即係究竟如果有一個廁所，點解釋會決定去興建呢個巴站呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋就即係要求我哋係去借用商場廁所，呢個就係個解決嘅方法。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就唔算係一個方法嚟㗎，係咪？

黃綺玲女士： Yeah, it is true.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你畀嘅第二個例子，就係樂華，咁就係 17 年 8 月就喺 198 頁，咁喺你嘅陳述度呢，你講到呢一個樂華嘅問題，係到咗 17 年 8 月先至係解決嘅，即係你經過同區議會周旋之後。你喺樂華邨嗰度幾時已經係申請去興建一個休息室呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）咁我睇番報導呢，係超過五年，咁但係呢個就唔係我負責嘅範圍，咁但係我根據新聞報導，就係超過五年前呢九巴已經係作出申請。

主席：（經傳譯員）樂華邨係咪喺觀塘？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪一個巴士站嚟？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你畀嘅第三個例子呢，都係喺屯門嘅車廠，就係元朗公園。咁你就指出你係 14 年係申請引入呢個休息設施，但係 16 年先去批准，咁點解要足足兩年先可以引入呢個休息嘅設施呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）其實我哋唔知道係咩嘢原因，咁但係個程序呢就係我哋向運輸署申處，然後佢哋就會向公眾呢係去分享一啲--同埋佢會同相關嘅人士，包括係警方，區議員，元朗公園附近嘅居民等等，佢哋全部都有諮詢。我記得

佢哋答覆入面講，就係警方係否決呢個申請，咁但係我就覺得好奇怪，因為唔係居反對，而係警方，咁我哋係要求警方--即係我哋希望呢同警方去傾下點樣可以解決呢個問題。因為休息室唔單止係畀呢啲站長用嘅，亦都係可以畀我哋嘅車長用，即係如果要喺元朗公園提供服務呢，我哋係要有間休息室嘅，所以我哋係要求警方去解決呢個問題，同埋希望各方都係滿意。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你同警方有冇書信來往呢，就住呢個問題？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）有。我哋係呈交咗資料畀運輸署，要求佢哋進行另一輪諮詢，就係喺 2015 年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以即係向我哋分享呢個事件嘅相關嘅書信來往呢，即係喺元朗公園。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係你哋同運輸署同警方之間嘅書信？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）可以，可以提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我就想你睇番 TU 文件冊，咁呢一份就係一份報告，就係巴職聯呈交嘅，就係 17 年 7 月 16 號。

主席： Page?

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係第 260 頁橫格 346-2。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個表呢就列出咗巴總站嘅位置，同埋申請嘅進度，咁我就想同你講講幾個例子，同埋我想知道呢個佢哋相關嘅進度係點嘅。咁喺呢一頁呢就係巴士公司係九巴，總站嘅位置呢就係屯門寶田邨。咁呢就話已經係諮詢咗呢條邨兩年，但係就冇收到回應。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）呢個應該係楊晉瑋先生呈交嘅資料嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信唔係咁樣嘅，因為呢個係巴職聯向我哋呈交嘅文件嚟嘅，喺附錄七，就並唔係楊晉瑋先生呈交嘅文件嚟。

黃綺玲女士： Okay.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁無論如何呢，我就想同你確認一下情況係咪咁樣，咁喺右面嗰一欄，就話相關嘅申請呢係必須要得到房屋署嘅批准，運輸署呢係已經去信畀房屋署係要求呢儘快處理九巴嘅申請。佢呢亦都係即係有打電話畀房屋署去跟進，而房屋署呢就回應表示呢佢哋仍然係處理緊相關嘅事項嘅。咁呢個就係即係關於屯門嘅寶田邨，首先呢個屋邨嘅範圍係咪你管轄㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）唔係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係嗰度嘅巴士站係咪你管轄㗎?

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係楊晉瑋先生負責。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你係咪唔知道呢項申請嘅進度呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，我唔知道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁其餘嘅設施呢？即係 260-346-2，咁如果你去番 260-346-6 呢，你可唔可以睇一睇究竟邊一個項目係同你有關呀？或者係即係嗰度嘅屋邨嘅巴士站係由你管理？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）冇，全部都唔係我管理嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，我就想問你另一個課題，你提過呢就話你係為九巴工作咗超過二十年嘅。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問嘞，你認唔認識一位人士叫做 Raymond Cheng？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，我識。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢呢就係以前都係九巴嘅工。2010 至 2014 年期間呢就喺九巴度工作，就係呢一個安全及服務質量部，你知唔知呀？

黃綺玲女士：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺佢鄭桂興先生嗰個陳述書嗰度呢，佢就提過呢就係曾經呢研究過，即係喺佢就職期間，就係喺將軍澳係巴士意外 09 年出咗意外之後，佢哋進行過一個研究，咁呢就係研究過二十九個係香港嘅一啲急彎，咁呢亦都呢係有討論過，究竟應該呢嗰個係時速限制應該係定係邊一度。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋係畀證人睇一睇相關嘅陳述書。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，相關嘅陳述書係 96 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊一個文件夾呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係 FE 嗰個文件夾嘅 96-4。如果你睇番嗰段就係嗰個標題就話巴士容易係翻側。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係畀少少時間佢睇睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，你介唔介意而家呢先係睇一睇呀？即係 96-4 嗰一頁嘅文字。或者係請你一路睇到去 96-6，即係總共 3 版。

主席：（經傳譯員）你慢慢，唔需要急。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，黃女士，喺呢份陳述書嗰度呢，可以見到就係鄭桂興先生呢佢呢就係話佢喺 2013 年嘅時候呢，就開始研究呢一啲係彎位嘅，咁佢就係搵咗係四個車廠經理，同埋係車長、訓練學校，同埋係維修部門嘅代表呢就成立一個研究小組，係深入咁去睇下佢哋巴士網絡嗰度所有嘅急彎，咁就有收集咗係數以千計嘅係轉彎嘅數據，咁同埋呢就係睇番係數以百計嘅可能有危險風險嘅係呢一個彎位，然後將佢係最後就係收集到頭嗰二十九個，咁就容易產生嚴重因為係翻側車輛嘅意外，咁呢有一啲中文嘅例子喺度，咁你知唔知呢？

黃綺玲女士：Sharp bend，但係我唔係一個喺個 group 裏面嘅 for make 呢樣嘢囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知邊個係嗰個成員呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）正如鄭先生所講，係呢個車廠嘅經理可能，咁同埋呢就係訓練學校嘅導師。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個研究小組，呢度提過嘅研究小組，或者你揭去跟住嗰版，或者跟住嘅第 3 版，即係 96-6 嗰度，嗰個呢就提及呢就係一個係研究小組，就進行咗測試，測試晒所有二十九個係彎位，喺不同嘅道路情況，係不同嘅車速，不同嘅係載客量嘅情況底下嘅情況，亦都將佢呢拍攝咗錄影帶嚟到作日後參考，你知唔知道係有咁樣樣係要拍咗錄影帶去研究呢？

黃綺玲女士： No.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者繼續就睇落去，去到下面嗰度，呢度提及呢就係話有一份呢係安全小冊子，我諗後嚟呢就係澄清咗，就唔係小冊子，咁係鄭桂興先生就講咗，就話係一啲細細張嘅卡仔，咁就詳細咁話咗每一個係危險彎位嘅正確嘅位置、方向、道路嘅情況、道路性質、過往嘅紀錄，以及係運輸署嘅文件或者係乘客投訴所得到嘅最新嘅相片或者係圖，咁呢就總共有三十一個就係安全駕駛嘅貼士，咁就總共做咗一千五百個研究，你知唔知㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我知道有一個安全小冊子，咁但係對於嗰個研究我就唔係太肯定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）換句話講，就係就呢二十九個彎位，就有一本安全小冊子，係咪呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，大體上係咁，咁就促請司機或者係車長係要小心。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個研究結果，你知唔知悉呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）唔太肯定。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知就即係將佢集中起嚟，咁同埋呢就係印發咗畀啲車長呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢啲安全小冊子呢係會畀嗰啲車長，我哋亦都係簡單咁樣畀咗啲指示佢哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關乎一個安全小冊子係畀車司，咁你知唔知裏面係有冇講及呢二十九個急彎呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我冇乜睇過嗰個手冊嘅細節，咁所以對於呢個課題，我唔係太清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺九巴嘅時候，我想任何時候有冇同係管方呢就係討論過要進行一項研究，又或者呢係收集車長嘅意見，就睇下佢哋對於呢一啲係香港係危險嘅道路情況嘅睇法呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我記得我當時就唔係嗰個助理經理，我當時就負責車務，咁我都有提供係話邊一啲地方可能係有潛在嘅危險，即係講到嗰啲係急彎，喺當時嚟講，我哋提供咗一啲地點，咁呢就係畀安全及服務質素部門，讓佢哋就係進一步跟進。

主席：（經傳譯員）係嗰個安全及服務呀，係唔係？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係邊段時間呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係鄭先生嘅時間，係2010至到2014年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁2014年之後又點呀？

黃綺玲女士： After --

黃女士：（經傳譯員）14年之後又點呢？你有冇繼續呢就係提供呢一方面嘅資料？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀番一啲文件我哋呢？你話你呢就係提供咗一啲地點嘅，即係你係顧慮嘅地點，就話有啲地方呢可能嗰個路面情況就係有潛在嘅風險嘅。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我未必須呢係有白紙黑字寫低咗，咁但係呢我記得就喺將軍澳意外發生之後呢，咁呢係有一個焦點小組嚟到係研究呢一個課題。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇係開會嘅時候係做咗呢個會議紀錄或者其他嘅文件？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我唔太肯定有冇咁嘅文件。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講嗰一個係焦點小組，係咪同嗰個係研究小組唔同㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）類似，類似一個小組嚟到去睇下嗰啲急彎嘅地點。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個焦點小組嘅成員又係邊個呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我諗佢哋全部都離開咗九巴，有關嘅車廠經理，有啲呢就係退咗休，有啲就已經辭咗職。

主席：（經傳譯員）有關嗰個小組，即係睇嗰啲急彎小組嘅成員呢，一係呢就已經係離職，一係呢就已經退休，你係咪咁嘅意思呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋係幾時退休或者係幾時離職嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）最近呢幾年，但我記唔清楚嗰個日期。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢退休或者辭職之後，咁嗰個焦點小組又點呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋就改變咗，就每一間車廠呢就會就係關注嗰個安全問題，但係呢就唔喺呢一個安全及服務部門。

主席：（經傳譯員）個焦點就反為就係轉向每一個車廠個別去睇，就唔係中央，就係分散咗係畀番個別車廠？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提過係個別車廠，你有冇同車長係傾下，就問下根據佢哋嘅經驗，有冇邊啲路段或者邊啲彎位呢係危險，好讓你哋可以提醒其他車長，請佢哋係要小心，有冇係做過咁嘅嘢呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會分析一啲嘅意外發生嘅位置，我哋會有一啲分享小組去分享巴士車長嘅經驗等等，咁我哋係會分析道路嘅潛在危險，咁如果有需要呢我哋係會同訓練學校嘅教師去傾，點樣可以提醒車長係去小心呢啲道路情況嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢個分享小組呢，係咪即係只係喺某啲嘅車廠度去做，定係唔同車廠之間亦都係會討論呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係視乎個別嘅車廠而定嘅，佢哋可能係個別會同訓練學校去傾。咁我哋有時係會同訓練學校去會面，其實我哋任何時候都可能會同佢哋傾，就未必須一定係要等開會先傾。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個分享小組嘅舉行頻率係幾多呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）即係正如我所講，如果我哋係要分析一啲交通意外呢，其實係冇一個特定嘅頻率嘅，咁如果係巴士車長之間分享經驗呢，如果佢哋覺得某個位置係有危險，佢哋係會同呢個教師去講，同埋亦都係會發出一啲通告去提醒車長去小心，咁就未必有一個特定嘅會議或者係時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁你提到係發出一啲通告去提醒車長去小心某一啲位置，呢啲係咪書面發出嘅通知，定係口頭？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）兩種都有嘅，咁但係多數呢都係書面通知。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪每個車廠都有？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀一啲例子我，我哋睇下即係呢一啲通告係點樣？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我而家冇帶，可以遲啲提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。至於呢啲個別嘅通知信，其實係咪就住個別嘅意外而發出嘅呢？係咪有發生咗意外先至會係發出呢啲通告呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）你第一個問題，答案係，係嘅。有時如果出現意外，我哋係會提醒車長某啲嘅事項。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二個問題呢，就係會唔會就住車長嘅投訴而發出通告呢？或者應該咁講，係咪即係必須係要有車長去即係提出某啲道路嘅情況呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）如果某啲道路情況係會產生危險，我哋係會向車長發出提醒或者通告。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我嘅問題係，係咪你哋公司自發去進行一啲研究呢，定係因為某啲嘅車長提出一啲意見，先至會去做嘢呢，係究竟邊一個描述係啱啲？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）如果車長係表達意見，我哋係會即係搵出呢個原因去避免意外再次發生，咁所以我哋係先會搵出呢一個原因，咁去睇下我哋可唔可以做一啲預防嘅措施，例如提醒佢哋道路嘅情況，譬如話落雨之後一啲樹枝呢，或者樹木可能係會引起危險，咁我就會提醒佢哋係要有耐性地駕駛，即係我哋就會提醒佢哋喺嗰個路段係要小心啲駕駛。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁換句話講，即係你會因應車長嘅意見係去作出反應嘅。

黃綺玲女士： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而唔係由巴士公司去主動進行嘅，你入咪咁嘅意思？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢所講呢就係佢係就住意外作出反應，而佢哋亦都係會聽車長嘅意見。

黃綺玲女士： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁而佢就住呢啲情況呢，就會係發出一啲嘅通知嘅。

黃綺玲女士： Mm-hmm. Right.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀啲例子我哋，即係喺你負責屯門車廠嘅時候，即係當時你係認為有邊啲嘅道路係可能引起危險嘅呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你係畀唔到例子呢，你可以講嘅。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，我講唔到。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係你而家係講唔出例子，係唔係？

黃綺玲女士： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢就另一個問題，就係脫班嘅問題。咁我哋係聽取咗一啲證供，就係出現咗一啲脫班嘅情況，就係有各種原因，包括係道路嘅情況，咁有時係因為行車時間預測係唔準確，你可唔可以確認係咪即係發生咗呢啲情況？

主席：（經傳譯員）首先你可唔可以解下咩嘢為之脫班呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）咁我哋有一個行車嘅時間表，係一啲即係刊憲咗嘅班次，係我哋承諾嘅服務嚟嘅，咁喺某啲嘅時間係有一啲刊憲嘅時間表，咁如果我哋唔能夠係去履行呢個時間表呢，咁就係會視為脫班。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話係為咗係即係履行呢個刊憲時間表，係唔係？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢個情況喺你管理嘅屯門車廠有冇出現呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係有嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講講點解係出現咗脫班呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）基本上係我哋係有足夠員工，或者唔足夠員工；第二呢就係交通情況可能會令到巴士唔能夠如常係到站；咁第三個原因呢就係可能係巴士故障，而我哋係唔可以喺短時間內係搵一啲其他巴士去替代。另外就係如果喺其他地區突然間有一個需求，我哋可能要重新去調配我哋嘅服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係去解決或者去滿足其他嘅需求？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）咁呢啲原因都係會引致脫班。其實我哋係要一直去久不久係檢討我哋嘅時間表，咁當我哋訂立呢一個服務時間表嘅時候，我哋係要檢討

每個地區睇下有冇出現變化，咁例如譬話喺非繁忙時間，即係服務需求唔高呢，我哋係會向運輸署去申請，可能去即係減少呢個班次。咁呢個時間呢就可以畀車長呢係休息下，即係畀佢哋有多啲嘅休息時間。咁所以我哋耐唔耐都會向運輸署申請。咁呢個亦都可以係減少班次，咁可能就會令到脫班率係下降。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇係去即係去檢視你有幾多脫班嘅班次，你係咪要匯報㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）要。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你點樣去評估行車時間呢？即係當你將呢一個服務時間表刊憲嘅時候？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）咁第一次呢我哋係會用一啲巡邏車，咁我哋第一次呢就會用一啲巡邏車去行一次呢一個行車路線，去估計呢個行車時間。咁當我哋訂立咗時間表之後，過咗一段時間，即係如果環境嘅情況有變，我哋係會分析一啲即係之前行車嘅日子，然後就歸納出呢一個行時間，或者計算一個平均嘅行車時間，咁我哋亦都係會預計喺訂立咗時間表之後，嗰個時間有乜嘢嘅改變，咁呢個就係我哋喺計算行車時間嘅方法。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果你發現行車時間比你預計嘅時間長呢，你會點做呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係會向運輸署申請去更新我哋嘅行車時間表。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪定期都會咁樣做？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你上一次做係幾時呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）上個月呢我哋係有遞到申請嘅，都唔係上個月，係5月。

主席：（經傳譯員）通常運輸署會幾耐覆？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）好耐嘅。運輸署就會話佢哋係要做一個調查，我哋唔單只係檢討呢個行車時間，我哋亦都係會檢討喺非繁忙時間班次可能唔需要咁頻繁，我哋可能會減少班次，咁而運輸署就會係進行一個調查，咁就需要好長時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊係咪以年計嘅呢，要幾耐呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）可能幾個月到上年計都有可能。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）你有冇用到黑盒嘅資料，去睇下究竟行車時間係咪有出入呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇用黑盒，我哋有一個系統，就係九巴嘅系統，車長就係會用八達卡去向總站匯報，即係當佢哋到咗一個巴士站嘅時候，佢哋係要

即係嘟張八達通卡，咁我哋先知道佢係到咗。即係我哋可以用黑盒係去睇呢個抵站時間，咁當長到嘅時候，我哋係要求佢哋匯報佢哋已經到站，咁我哋會用我哋內部嘅系統，叫做 TER，就唔係用黑盒嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁但係運輸署會唔會認為呢一個係足夠嘅理據，即係畀你去更改呢個時間表呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我唔知道佢哋係即係點樣分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係如果呢個所謂嘅黑盒唔係會自動去進行呢個工作嘅咩，你知唔知道呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）你意思話黑盒嘅數據可以自動做到呢樣嘢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，就話到畀你聽嗰個車程係幾長。

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋都會將佢放喺個數據嗰度，如果我哋需要呢係搵番啲資料出嚟，我哋就會將佢攞出嚟，咁去睇下巴士有冇準時到達，亦都可以睇埋呢係個車速，所以呢我哋就唔係用呢個嚟到去監察嗰個係行車時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你呢就係靠車長就係去到譬如總站呢，就嘟嗰個八達卡，係咪呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問，如果你哋有脫班，咁對你哋公司嚟講有咩嘢後果嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）有咩嘢後果，我哋嘗試呢就係調派足夠嘅車長嚟到去儘量減少嗰個係脫班情況，呢個就係我哋個解決方案，其他嘅解決方案呢就正如我所講，譬如話非繁忙時間嘅班次係減少，咁呢就係少啲車長喺路上駕駛，呢個都係解決方法之一。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，黃女士，你認唔認識一位叫做 Alok Jain 嘅人士呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋嘅係以前嘅 DOD 嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）DOD 你即係咩嘢意思呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係呢個車務總監。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你嘅時候呢，你有冇機會係同 Alok Jain 係同傾過一啲安全方面嘅事宜呢？關於專營巴士嘅安全事宜，有冇同佢係傾過呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解就係，我只係就規劃嘅事宜係同佢傾，因為--係planner嘅head，係囉，planning。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講及一啲規劃嘅事宜，呢啲係咩嘢嘅事情呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有一個部門，就係負責做計劃，我哋就係會同規劃部門呢係傾，係講及呢個路線嘅發展，亦都會講及呢就係巴士嘅係車種，亦都會同呢個規劃部門傾。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講到係巴士嘅型號，你會唔係傾到係黑盒嘅事情呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）唔係同佢講。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁喺你工作期間，你有冇係同呢個規劃部門就開會有講及黑盒嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我要問嘅係咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該，唔該晒。歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。黃女士，感謝你今日出席。我就係想跟進一下較早時候你所講嘅，你就話如果有某一個地點，你要係將佢界定為係一個潛在風險，或者係車長界定佢係有潛在風險，有冇一個程序就話要同總部係匯報番，又或者係同一個係訓練嘅導師係匯報㗎？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係會同訓練導師就係討論，即係如果冇潛在風險嘅話。譬如話講番我個經驗，譬如話當車長係入去總站，埋去條線嗰度嘅時候，可能嗰度呢就係起咗個巴士站上蓋，嗰度呢可能有潛在風險，我哋就會同係訓練學校導師係傾，就點樣可以減少嗰個風險，又或者係就嗰個巴士站上蓋就作一個修訂，將佢係改動。呢啲嘅事情呢，我哋都會係會檢討，我哋亦都會睇車長嘅經驗，正如我所講過，我哋會搵出嗰個問題嘅根由，然後就嘗試搵一個解決嘅方案。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）你哋咁樣嘅溝通，就係書面定抑或口頭嘅呢？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）兩者都有，有時係用電郵，有時電郵畀呢個訓練學校。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。仲有一個問題，你喺工作期間，以你嘅職責嚟講，我想問車長係有冇投訴過話佢哋嘅休息設施就唔夠好呀？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）係，有時我哋都會收到係車長有一啲要求，譬如話想要一個大啲嘅休息地方，譬如話係 B 型太細嘅話，佢哋想要多個，佢哋想有多啲嘅設施，譬如話蒸餾水，佢哋想有熱水、凍水，咁所以我哋就會儘量就係以我哋所能夠做嘅事情呢，係讓佢哋係滿意。

歐陽先生： Thank you.

羅先生：（經傳譯員）仲有一個係問題，我知道你係一個好有經驗嘅前線嘅經理，我想問下你，公司有啲咩嘢可以做或者係應該做，但係又冇做到呢？即係除咗我哋剛才已經係講過，呢個係指多年嚟係你留意到關乎巴士安全方面有啲咩嘢係應該做又未做？

黃綺玲女士：（經傳譯員）講到安全嘅問題，我諗唔單單係我哋公司，我哋公司自己做唔得晒所有嘅嘢，譬如話道路嘅情況。有啲道路嘅情況，譬如話道路設計，可能係不利於係雙層巴士行駛，呢啲亦都唔係巴士公司可以做，或者運輸署可以就道路嘅設計係做一啲嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，黃女士，多謝你，感謝你呢今日係上嚟作證，協助我哋，我哋而家就完成嘞，你可以呢係坐番落去下面嗰度聽你嘅同事作證，又或者你可以選擇離開㗎。我哋而家想請楊晉瑋先生上嚟係作證。楊晉瑋先生，感謝你今日接納我哋邀請，係今日上嚟作證，剛才你已經係聽到係黃女士作證，相信你係理解我哋嗰個程序，咁而家直接就係問問題。

楊晉瑋先生：係，早晨，主席同埋兩位委員，或者可以畀我做一個開場白，可唔可以呀？係，好，咁早晨喇咁多位。咁首先我好多謝委員會邀請我出席今日呢個嘅聽證會，咁其實我就同剛才 Debby Wong 一樣呢，都係我嘅 assistant manager，咁其實其他同事會叫我哋做 zone head，或者我哋中文叫做車務主管。咁我同 Debby 都係負責屯門廠嘅一啲車務運作嘅，咁屯門廠頭先剛才講過，我應該要講慢少少，係咪呀？佢個翻譯可能趕唔切，係。咁屯門廠主要負責係屯門、元朗、天水圍三區嘅車務運作，咁而 zone head 呢佢主要個工作範圍就係去管理巴士嘅營運，包括巴士路線，前線車長，站長或者其他同事，同埋一啲站頭嘅設施，例如車長嘅休息設施等等，都係由我哋 zone head 去負責。

咁我哋嘅工作呢其實就需要同前線嘅同事非常之緊密聯繫，咁所以呢我哋一定要好需要知道所有前線同事佢哋嘅實際需要。咁同時間我哋除咗前線同事之外呢，我哋亦都要定期同管理層去溝通，同佢哋開會話番畀佢哋聽，我哋見到或者前線同事話畀我哋聽佢哋有啲問題，我哋都要話番畀管理層知，咁當然亦都要定期話番畀佢聽我哋每條路線個營運情況有啲困難。咁所以無論係佢哋管理層嘅處事方針，或者佢哋方向其實我哋都要好清楚。咁所以我可以咁講，我哋 zone head 係前線同事同埋管理層中間嘅一個好重要嘅一個橋樑。

咁或者我簡單介紹一下自己，咁我喺九巴都大概做咗將近 10 年，咁我就由低做起嘅。咁我 10 年前我就先加入沙田廠，就負責做呢個車務督察，咁車務督察其實係一個外勤嘅工作，咁主要佢係去協助乘客，提供服務，或者協助前線嘅車長，當車長遇到任何問題嘅時候呢，我哋即時第一個反應就要去到現場幫佢手，咁同時間車務督察都要去管理呢啲班次，站頭啲設施等等一系列大大小小嘅事，都係車務督察去負責管理。

咁兩年之後，咁我就升咗去車務主任，咁呢個係一個 office 嘅工作嚟嘅，就唔係外勤嘅工作，咁當然都要好多時間要出去出面 site 嗰度去工作。咁我頭嗰兩年，我就同安全及服務質量部就有一個好緊密嘅聯繫，因為我係負責 safety 呢樣嘢。咁兩年，即係再兩年之後，咁我就調派咗去元朗、屯門、天水圍呢三笪地方去做一個車務運作嘅管理。

咁其後公司都委派我去負責做一個 ROM 嘅 project，咁 ROM 就應該係叫做 real-time operation management，咁我留意到...

主席：（經傳譯員）楊先生，其實你頭先講咗話要講慢啲，不過你就冇講慢到，想請你講慢啲。

楊晉瑋先生：（經傳譯員）好，我會講慢啲。你想唔想我再繼續，再重複定...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要重複，不過慢啲。

楊晉瑋先生：咁我再講番喺個兩年之後，咁我就喺屯門、元朗、天水圍負責車務運作，咁當時公司就委派咗我去做一個 ROM 呢個 project，做一個研發。咁其實之前聽證會我都有留意過，應該有講過，real time operation management 呢個 project。咁所以就住呢個 ROM 同埋安全服務質量部，咁我都有經驗，所以我都好歡迎委員會如果需要問我任何關於呢兩笪地方嘅問題，我都好樂意去提供畀你哋。

咁就住今年即係好不幸，喺今年 2 月發一個嚴重一個交通意外，咁我發覺到即係九巴都成為咗各大傳媒嘅一啲焦點。咁無論係唔同嘅政黨，唔同嘅工會，甚至乎一啲我哋嘅舊同事，佢都會對我哋公司有好多唔同嘅意見，咁我發覺其實都唔只我嘞，我其他同事都發覺。

咁其實當中係有好多失實嘅報導，咁我就同埋另外六位 zone heads，咁我哋都覺得其實呢啲失實嘅報導，對於我哋而家嘅所有同事，無論車長又好，我哋前線管理人員又好，或者我哋後勤嘅管理人員，甚麼乎我哋嘅管理層都好，呢啲失實報導都係非常之唔公平，咁所以我哋最後就聯署一封信就寫畀我哋個董事局，我哋希望將我哋見到，我哋實際做緊嘅嘢，就將呢啲嘢一五一十就話番畀個--當然好簡短，就話畀董事局聽。咁最後我哋都將呢封信，就 forward 畀委員會呢邊去做一個參考。

咁我知道之前都有同幾位 zone head 有啲來往，咁今日可能淨係得我同阿 Debby 可以抽時間嚟到呢度，咁我都希望我哋可以即係用我哋 zone head 嘅身分去話番畀大家究竟實際嘅情況係點嘅。

咁其實喺我自己個角度睇，係意外發生之前，即係 2 月之前，咁當你問好多廣大市民，或者一啲街坊呢問佢關於九巴，你覺得近呢幾年佢服務如何呀？以我所知佢哋都應該都會答話「佢嘅服務都唔錯，進步咗好多。」例如喺巴士車型、設施，或者我哋啲預報到站時間等等一系列進步，我哋都有。

咁不過好可惜，就發生咗 2 月呢單意外之外，咁可能你問番啲街坊，佢都會覺得九巴個服務好差...

主席： Mr Yeung --

楊晉瑋先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）楊先生，好多謝你即係進行一個陳述，但係你已經用咗好長時間。

楊晉瑋先生：（經傳譯員）我差唔多講完。

主席：（經傳譯員）你最後可以有一個最後嘅陳詞，咁但係而家我哋要進入一個問答嘅環節。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）楊先生，多謝你出席。你提到你 10 年前係加入九巴，咁即係大概係 2008 年。

楊晉瑋先生：2009 年，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你幾時係開始出任元朗車廠嘅車務主管？

楊晉瑋先生： Around 2013.

黃女士：根據你嘅陳述，或者你啱啱所講，屯門車廠係負責屯門、元朗、天水圍嘅車站，咁而你淨係負責屯門，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：喺 2013 年嘅時候，我就曾經管理過元朗同埋天水圍，應該大概管理咗大半年，咁之後我就負責屯門區嘅車務主管，咁其實直至到 2018 年 7 月，即係其實係上個月嘅時候，咁我哋會有啲 rotation 嘅，咁我就 rotate 番去元朗同埋天水圍，咁所以我係對屯門、元朗、天水圍三區，我都可以講話非常之熟悉嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你陳述度你講到係有三十一個巴士總站，就係即係喺屯門車廠轄下，咁你現時係管理緊幾多個屯門巴士總站？

楊晉瑋先生：如果成個屯門、元朗、天水圍呢，就總共有三十一個，咁可能頭先我聽到阿黃小姐，可能佢三十個，因為有一個新嘅巴士站，係喺 6 月尾先啟用，咁所以最後就有咗一個數字嘅出入，咁我點樣去釐定呢啲巴士站呢？我哋就會用一個--如果佢有一個 full day service 嘅路線，咁我先會叫呢個做一個真正嘅巴士總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）楊先生，個問題好簡單，你管理幾多個巴士站呀？即係你唔需要同我哋講話即係你中間個過程，點樣諗。

楊晉瑋先生：但係我需要話畀你知三十一個總站，我哋點樣去 consider 31，如果你講所有譬如淨係朝早淨係開一班...

主席：（經傳譯員）係唔需要嘅楊先生。

楊晉緯先生：Okay.

主席：（經傳譯員）你回答個問題就可以㗎嘞，你直接回答問題就可以。

楊晉瑋先生：三十一個 full day service 嘅總站。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係你管理三十一個？

楊晉瑋先生：係，我喺 7 月嘅時候，屯門、元朗、天水圍我都有負責。

主席：（經傳譯員）問題係你管理幾多個車站？

楊晉瑋先生：三十一個 full-day service 嘅總站。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係咪同黃綺玲女士一齊管理天水圍嘅車站，係唔係？

楊晉瑋先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，同埋元朗嘅車站嘅仲有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你同黃綺玲女士嘅職級係一樣，係咪？定係你係高級啲？

楊晉瑋先生：我主要係屯門，但係公司想我睇埋元朗同埋天水圍，所以三區我都會睇晒，但係個主力係 Debby 同埋 Amanda 就係元朗同天水圍。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺開場發言嘅時候，你講到你係負責啲巴士嘅路線同埋車長，你知唔知道有幾多個巴士站係有特別更？

楊晉瑋先生：喺三十一個裏面，介唔介意我數一數呀？

黃女士： Please do.

楊晉緯先生：以我嘅印象，exactly 我個 number 應該係全部都會有一啲特別更嘅車長。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪全部嘅三十一個巴士站都有休息設施？

楊晉瑋先生：係會有休息設施。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪全部三十一個站都有呀？

楊晉瑋先生：如果需要，我可以再解釋多少，咁三十一個總站可能有一啲佢係有特別更喺嗰個站度，但係佢未必係喺嗰度收工，可能佢會去第二度收工。咁我哋三十一個站裏面都會有，即係無論佢喺唔喺嗰度收工，都會有車長嘅休息設施喺嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）楊先生，你提到係兩種嘅休息，即係有 A 類同埋 B 類，咁你表

示A類休息室就大概係17平方呎，咁而B類就係50平方呎，咁我哋聽到黃綺玲女士就話有一種大啲嘅休息室嘅，咁究竟呢啲即係大啲嘅休息室，同A類同B類比係大幾多呢？

楊晉瑋先生：係，type A大概可以坐最多坐到兩個同事，同一時間，咁type B其實佢個size係大概兩倍of呢個type A嘅，即係如果你將兩個type A放埋一齊呢，你喺出面個外觀望落去呢就大概等於一個type B，咁但係當然佢因為中間有埲牆如果你擺兩個type A，咁佢會冇咁實用，咁呢個一個最大嘅分別。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個A同B類嘅呢個分類係咪由九巴去分類？

楊晉瑋先生：係，呢個我哋本身係有兩隻standard嘅size，type A或者type B。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署呢係冇制定任何嘅指引，即係就住呢一個休息嘅設施，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：係，以我所知係冇guideline嘅，係KMB自己決定擺邊隻size。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到呢有另外一種度身定做嘅休息室，係去符合某啲嘅巴士站嘅特別需要嘅，你可唔可以同我哋講，喺你管理嘅巴士站底下，有幾多個呢一啲特別製造嘅休息室呀？

楊晉瑋先生：應該大概有兩至三個，個exact number我要返去verify，究竟嗰個係咪tailor made。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）度身定做係咩嘢意思呢？

楊晉瑋先生：可能我哋同運輸署或者其他譬如房署申請嘅一啲kiosks佢哋唔批准，可能佢哋個feedback返番嚟係個size唔啱，或者會阻住其他行人，行人路或者其他嗰啲盲人設施，咁我哋就要將個size稍為改一改嚟到fulfil番有關部門嘅request嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢種即係度身定做嘅休息室，大概係幾大呢？

楊晉瑋先生：應該唔會同一個type B睇得太遠，即係如果可能係太闊嘅，即係有關部門覺得太闊，可能我哋將佢窄少少，但係我哋就會喺個長度嗰度加番啲，咁呢個係我認知嘅tailor made嘅動作。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺全部或者某啲嘅休息室入面，會唔會提供一啲可以瞓覺嘅長凳或者係梳發？

楊晉瑋先生：有三笪地方係會有一啲我哋所謂嘅叫做瞓覺嘅凳，一個sleeping area畀車長去休息用嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到有三個位置係有一個瞓覺嘅區，你可唔可同我哋講下喺

邊度呀？

楊晉瑋先生：屯門車廠，屯門市中心，同埋屯門南車廠，咁屯門南車廠就嗰啲凳就相對冇另外嗰兩筲咁--即係咁瞓覺凳，但係一個大啲嘅 area 都係喺個車廠度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）每個位置有幾多張可以瞓覺嘅凳？

楊晉瑋先生：Exact number 我呢一刻畀唔到，大概有五張咁上下。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪每個位置都有。

楊晉瑋先生：每一個 location，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁每個位置大概有幾多位車長使用呀？

楊晉瑋先生：其實所有車長，無論佢係特別更或者唔係特別更，佢都可以使用，咁實際嘅數字我而家冇掌握到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以即係同我哋講，大概即係喺每個位置有幾多位車長使用呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊同時間呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯，喺同一時間。

楊晉瑋先生：喺我落去呢啲站嘅時候，見到大部分時間佢哋係呢--即係頭先我講大概五張呢，都會有空位喺度，車長冇咁多個車長用，即係應該係少過五個車長 at any one time 喺我落去嘅時候見到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你幾時係去呢啲嘅位置？

楊晉瑋先生：最主要係一啲中段嘅時間先會有車長用，即係 around 朝早 11 點至到下晝 3 點、4 點，咁如果我呢啲時候落去，就會見到有車長用。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你落得去有幾密呀，即係呢三個地點你落得去有幾密呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋嘅職責係每個禮拜都要去唔同嘅總站，咁如果三筲地方呢，我哋 at least 每個月我都會去 1 至 2 次。如果屯門車廠就會更加多，因為我個 office 就係喺屯門車廠，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我而家係想講及一啲例子，你喺你嗰陳述書嗰度有提過。你有講過就係話喺取得批准嗰方面呢，就係有困難 181-1 同埋 181-2 嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊度呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，係 FE 嗰個文件夾嘅 181-1，181-2。喺你嘅陳述書，你睇番嗰版嘅下面嗰度，你提及三個地點就話需要就係改善。第一個地方就係掃管笏。你就話係喺 2018 年 6 月 25 號新生係加入，你提到就係話係需要

就係提供一個A型嘅休息設施，同埋一個係化學廁所，咁你就話自從2018年6月13號就已經申請，咁但係仲未批。首先想問你，掃管笏嘅巴士總站係有咗幾耐呢？

楊晉瑋先生：如果有全日嘅巴士服務就係6月25號開始正式投入服務。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）換句話講，呢個係新建議嘅巴士站，就唔係話已經存在咗多年呀？

楊晉瑋先生：冇錯，正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你引入呢個新嘅巴士總站，我想問運輸署任何時候有冇要求過你公司係要提供一啲休息嘅設施畀車長用呢？

楊晉瑋先生：運輸署冇要求我哋要擺呢個facilities畀車長。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署佢哋批准一個巴士總站嘅時候，會唔會書面係列出一啲要求？

楊晉瑋先生：你嘅意思係呢條線開辦嘅時候，有冇一啲書面嘅來往？有，我哋要正式入文件向運輸署申請呢條線，咁運輸署亦都會正式覆番畀我哋，confirm佢哋approve我哋呢條線。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當運輸署係批准某一條路線嘅時候，根據你嘅經驗，佢哋會唔會一般都係列出一啲要求？

楊晉瑋先生：你嘅意思係乜嘢conditions？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）譬如話你要提供某一條路線嘅時候。

楊晉瑋先生：有，佢會定我哋嘅路線嘅走線，即係沿途嘅車站，同埋譬如journey time，journey distance，個frequency都會列明喺佢個approval letter度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關乎呢個掃管笏嘅巴士總站，會唔會喺呢一度呢係有啲特別更嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）因為你有講過，嗰個申請就只係18年6月13號係遞入去，所以目前係咪冇休息設施喺嗰度，咁講啱唔啱呀？即係以掃管笏嘅巴士站嗰度就冇？

楊晉瑋先生：係for呢個掃管笏，我哋係有擺咗一個type A嘅kiosk，同埋一個chemical toilet，咁但係喺呢個moment我哋未收到運輸署嘅approval，係嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺掃管笏總站嗰度係有幾多車長喺嗰度工作？

楊晉瑋先生：如果用每一日嘅車長嘅人次，如果我冇記錯大概係三至四位車長。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有幾多就係做特別更嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：一位。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁講啱唔啱呢？呢個A型嘅係休息設施，係已經躉咗喺嗰度嘞，縱使你哋未攞到批准？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個係事實，我哋係未收到approval，就放咗落去，因為我哋即係條線就開咗，我哋如果唔放落去，車長就冇得休息。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你畀咗第二個例子，就係寶田邨，嗰度你就話為咗係讓更多車長可以喺嗰度休息，係有需要就係將嗰個休息設施由A型轉做B型，咁你哋就係向房屋委員會就係申請，咁就2014年11月24號就申請，咁可唔可以話畀我哋聽，就呢一個設施嚟講，而家嗰個情況係點樣樣呀？因為你14年11月24號就已經申請，我想問而家係咪仲係一個A型嘅設施，定抑或係你好似喺掃管笏嗰度係躉咗嗰個B型嘅設施喺嗰度，縱使係未有批准？

楊晉瑋先生：寶田總站，咁佢原本就係有三個type A kiosks喺度，咁正如我剛才講過，有其中兩個type A佢係黐埋一齊，咁即係佢個間格係唔夠實用，咁我哋都review過覺得佢唔足夠嘅，咁所以我哋就同房署去申請，將兩個黐埋嘅type A將佢變做一個type B，另外將第三個嘅type A亦都將佢變做type B嘅，咁係喺呢一刻都未收到房署嘅approval，咁但係我哋都將兩個type A replace with一個type B，係已經replace咗，即係而家outstanding係賸一個type A我哋未convert去做type B。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解你認為係有需要將A型係轉做B型嘅休息設施呢？即係以寶田邨呢個例子嚟講？

楊晉瑋先生：因為無論係我哋落去見到啲車長，佢哋係揸住個飯盒要喺出面嗰個kiosk出面食飯，因為入面唔夠坐，又或者其實車長本身都會同我哋去反映番佢哋唔夠坐，咁所以我哋都覺得兩個type A係唔足夠。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）寶田邨呢度又有冇人做特別更？

楊晉瑋先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有幾多位車長係用呢兩個係A型嘅休息設施呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我冇詳細數字喺手係幾多個特別更嘅車長會用，因為以我所知佢哋好多都會返屋企去休息嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）寶田邨有幾多條巴士線呀？

楊晉瑋先生：如果全日線呢，就有兩條。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）非全日線呢？

楊晉瑋先生：Not full day就有另外兩條，係淨係朝早有特別班次。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我睇到個時間，你會唔會想而家係有一個小休呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）當然。楊先生，我哋小休至到12點鐘，即係話背後嗰個鐘到12點鐘再恢復。

楊晉瑋先生：Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

下午11時41分聆訊押後

上午11時59分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席，或者係講埋呢一個課題，想問下，你可唔可以係畀啲數字我哋，關乎呢個寶田邨呢個站嘅，有幾多巴士車長就係用寶田邨呢個車站嘅設施？即係我專注就係呢個做特別更嗰啲嘅。

另外你喺陳述書亦都有提過，就話一般嚟講都需要一個好長嘅籌備時間，即係差唔多五年嘅時間，你嗰個係關於呢個休息設施嘅申請先至係批到，亦都係提過一啲例子嘅，就181-2嗰度嘅，有啲例子嘅，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我而家轉去另一個課題，楊先生。你喺開場白嗰度就講過，你對於呢個實時嘅監察係非常之有經驗，即係呢個係ROM好有經驗嘅，另外呢個SSQ都係即係話安全及服務質量部，你都係好有經驗，係咪呀？啱唔啱？

楊晉瑋先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你都有講過，兩年之後，即係話你係兩年之後，就係去--即係做咗屯門車廠之後兩年，你就係做一個特別嘅項目嘅，可唔可以講係幾時？

楊晉瑋先生：ROM呢個project，應該大概喺2013年左右開始，我有份參與嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2013年開始，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你剛才嘅問題係問咩嘢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）自從2013年開始，楊先生...

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我嗰個聽到，因為你問佢嘅時候，咁佢就話係，但係就聽唔到個問題。唔緊要，繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我問題就係話，係咪自 2013 年開始，然後楊先生就話係。你認識一位人士，佢個名叫做係鄭桂興先生？

楊晉瑋先生：認識。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇番佢嗰份嘅陳述書，佢就係有提過，就係話佢進行過一個研究，呢個研究就係講及喺急彎嗰度係安全駕駛，2013 年，咁就係想請你睇番呢個 FE 文件夾嘅 96-4，嗰度有三頁紙，96-4 一路去到 96-6，有三頁㗎，請你睇睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我諗你睇完嘞，係咪呀？呢度有幾條問題想問下你，首先就係 96-4，嗰度鄭先生有提過，呢個安全及服務質量部，呢個部門就係邀請係工廠--車廠嘅經理，以及就係巴士訓練學校嘅代表，以及係服務部嘅係巴士維修部門嘅代表就係成立呢一個研究小組，咁仔細去睇嗰啲巴士網絡裏面嘅急彎嘅位置。你有冇加入呢個小組？

楊晉瑋先生：當時我未係 Manager，所以我唔喺呢個 study group 入面，但係我當年嘅 Manager 有問我嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰位係邊位？

楊晉瑋先生：如果佢 refer Depot Manager 嘅，就應該當年我屯門廠嘅總經理，胡堅強先生，而家已經退咗休。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）根據呢度嘅研究，佢哋就係將佢收窄做係廿九個彎位，就話嗰啲地點可能引致嚴重嘅車輛翻側嘅意外，你知唔知道有呢廿九個彎位？

楊晉瑋先生：知道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇份係幫手係將嗰個彎位嘅數目，將佢收窄到係廿九個？有冇？

楊晉瑋先生：以我嘅記憶，當時應該係唔止呢啲數目嘅，可能佢係 identify 咗有

一啲 Raymond Cheng 先生覺得係一啲 sharp bends 嘅 location，都有 identify 到嘅，以我嘅印象，應該唔止呢二十幾個。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係咪話根據鄭先生，佢就係搵出係多過廿幾個嘅彎位，你點知？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個係我哋一啲 internal 嘅 communication，可能，因為我都有同當其時嘅訓練導師，即係我哋嘅教車嘅導師去討論過呢啲問題，咁當時，我--以我所知，個導師就話，其實 sharp bends 就--即係其實你逢嚟 90 度角，或者將近 90 度角，都可以 sharp bends 嘅，所以我就知道應該唔只呢啲 location 嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你揭去後面嗰版，96-6，頭頂嗰度，嗰度就話：

「安全及服務質量部嘅同事就係陪同係研究小組嘅同事就去測試嗰廿九個彎位，就係以不同嘅道路情況，不同嘅車速，不同嘅載客量嘅情況去測試，咁亦都係將佢拍咗錄影帶，列做作日後參考之用。」

你當時知唔知道係有咁樣樣係拍做錄影帶，去進行研究？

楊晉瑋先生：我當年係有聽過佢哋會邀請訓練導師去做一啲 test run，去試呢啲 location，但係最後有冇做到，或者佢做咗幾多個，我唔清楚，但係我都有聽佢哋講過有呢回事，同埋會有拍片嘅呢個想法嘅，當年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提過話你聽聞，喺訓練導師嗰度係聽聞呢啲事，我想問，有關嘅導師而家係咪仲受聘於九巴？

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，仲有喺公司做嘅，嗰啲 driving instructor 係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講係邊一位？

楊晉瑋先生：我唔清楚當日如果話同佢哋開會係邊一個，因為佢 driving instructor 都有好幾十個，我唔--exactly 邊個，或者個名，我呢一刻畀唔到你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果喺呢段跟住睇落去，睇嚟就係呢一個錄影嘅研究係的而且確有做㗎，因為跟住嗰度就講咗，係收集咗一啲好重要嘅數據，而佢哋亦都因而制訂咗一啲安全嘅指引。或者大家係--你繼續睇埋呢一段文字，嗰度繼續講就係話，從呢個研究嗰度，我哋就係得以編制咗一部係安全小冊子，後嚟佢就澄清，就話呢啲係卡仔，咁呢啲小冊子就係讓車長係知道--詳細咁知道邊度嘅彎位係會有--係存在風險，佢嘅具體嘅位置、方向、路嘅情況、性質等等。咁佢話做咗一千五百個嘅研究，咁就有三十一個就係安全駕駛嘅建議嘅，你知唔知悉係為車長係製備咗呢啲小卡？

楊晉瑋先生：知道。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇係見過？

楊晉瑋先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家係咪仲有？

楊晉瑋先生：已經冇用嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以搵番一份畀我哋睇？

楊晉瑋先生：我唔肯定 office 仲會唔會有，因為即係無論駕駛導師或者前線嘅車長都有啲意見，對於呢張卡，咁所以我哋都冇再成為我哋 training 嘅其中一 part 嚟嘅，呢個。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解呢啲卡仔唔再用？

楊晉瑋先生：因為頭先我講過，有導師或者有一啲前線嘅車長，佢哋覺得即係 sharp bends 呢個定義係好廣泛，如果每一笪地方，即係每一個 sharp bends，你要定一個車速畀佢，咁其實未必係九巴我哋可以自己做到。咁我明白可能佢背後嘅 study 可能係想畀一個 reference 畀車長們，佢哋知道每一個 sharp bends，佢哋最高速係行幾多，但係你好難叫佢哋記住每一--即係佢揸，譬如每一次巴士行過咁多 sharp bends，每一個位都唔同，而運輸署個 speed limit 係 50，所以大家都覺得應該係按番個實際情況去評估番嗰個彎佢個速度係要幾多，rather than 你叫個車長記住每個彎背後應該 maximum 係幾多。

主席：（經傳譯員）你點知佢哋有唔同嘅意見？

楊晉瑋先生：當時，因為呢張卡都有曾經出過畀啲車長嘅，咁啲車長都有同我反映過，話即係如果佢真係唔跟足呢一個 suggested 個 speed 去做，咁喺香港法例係冇超速嘅，但係佢--可能公司覺得佢唔應該揸咁快，咁係咪一個危險嘅情況呢，如果佢冇任何意外發生？咁呢個係我哋冇一個 conclusion 嘅，即係反而我哋嗰陣時都有 raise 番，會唔會係同運輸署講番即係喺一啲路譬如設立番一啲急彎嗰啲黑白嗰啲箭咀，或者其他嘅警告字眼。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當時你向運輸署表示係想即係喺呢一啲嘅急彎入面就加呢啲箭咀嘅標誌嘅？

楊晉瑋先生：應該呢個係我哋提議番畀 SSQ，咁最後 SSQ 有冇去同運輸署申請，我就唔清楚嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係幾時？

楊晉瑋先生：應該都係 2013 嘅時候，我係唔清楚有冇--最後有冇向運輸署申請嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲卡係幾時係發畀啲車長？

楊晉瑋先生：個 exact 日期我已經冇乜印象，應該 around 13、14 咁上下。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪所有嘅九巴車長都有收到呢張卡㗎？

楊晉瑋先生：係，冇錯，我哋係有嘗試將佢派，但係好快大家個 comment，所以我哋就--即係收到大家嘅意見，就冇再去派呢張卡。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）楊先生，你提到你喺呢一個實時營運管理嘅裝置都係有經驗嘅，你對黑盒嘅運作同埋功能有幾熟悉？

楊晉瑋先生：如果你嘅意思係針對 ROM 呢樣嘢定係唔關 ROM 事，淨係講黑盒？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）兩樣都係嘅。

楊晉瑋先生：如果 ROM，我當其時係其中一位代表 operation 嘅同事去畀 input，去設計呢個新系統嘅，應該由 day one 至到--去到最後期，我都有份參與 ROM 呢個研發。

至於黑盒，就你話本身個黑盒個技術，我就唔會十分清楚，但係我哋公司背後好多程式，或者好多電腦嘅 program，背後佢都會由黑盒 support 去畀呢啲 data，畀啲 data 畀嗰啲程式嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）ROM 係代表實時營運管理，咁你嘅角色係咪為乘客提供一啲實時嘅資訊，令到佢哋知道巴士到站嘅時間？定係話你係負責一個比較廣闊嘅安全嘅範疇？

楊晉瑋先生：以我嘅認知，當其時 ROM 呢個設計係冇任何安全嘅因素擺咗落去嘅，咁我哋當時就係 based on 我哋嘅黑盒有嘅 data，點樣去將呢啲 data 去設計一個程式，嚟運用呢啲 data 去有效咁樣管理我哋嘅班次，同埋點樣去調配我哋呢啲巴士嘅，當年係冇任何嘅 safety 嘅因素喺我哋個會嗰度 discuss 過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到當時係冇喺任何嘅會議度提到安全呢一個議題，即係喺呢一個實時管理方面，你亦都係有會議度提及，係咪？

楊晉瑋先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係喺咩嘢會議？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋定期--因為其實呢個 ROM 係一個新嘅 project，係由零開始嘅，即係我哋係 based on 我哋有嘅 black box 嘅 data 去做，咁所以我哋定期會有會議去--大家去畀 input 點樣去設計呢個新系統。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時開始？

楊晉瑋先生：都係應該喺 2013 年，月份我唔記得咗。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰啲會議度有邊個出席？

楊晉瑋先生：有 IT，我哋電腦部嘅代表，有我哋四個唔同車廠嘅車務組嘅代表，咁亦都有當年嘅一個中央嘅部門，我哋叫做交通部，traffic department，咁佢哋會有--即係佢哋就個角色就係一個 Project Manager 去統籌呢個會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）規劃與發展署嘅同事有冇出席呢啲會議？

楊晉瑋先生：冇參與過，planning 嘅 department 嘅同事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你識唔識程艾樂？

楊晉瑋先生：認識。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你喺 2013 至 15 年期間，有冇同佢合作？

楊晉瑋先生：有喺一啲我哋 planning 嘅 issue 上面同佢有開過會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你所謂嘅某啲嘅規劃嘅議題係包括啲咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：譬如我哋去計劃來年嘅巴士路線計劃，要提交畀運輸署或者區議會，咁佢係同運輸署同我都開過啲會嘅，係去策劃番個巴士路線嘅改善，或者提升，或者其他改動。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我哋係聽取咗程艾樂先生嘅作證，當時係有一個諗法，係想用荔枝角車廠做一個實時營運嘅管理中心嘅，或者一個所謂嘅控制中心，就會係全公司都係會分析數據，你有冇聽過？

楊晉瑋先生：有聽過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）根據程生嘅證供，最後荔枝角嘅辦公室就冇咁樣做到，佢就冇成為一個實時營運嘅管理中心，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：唔正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁到而家，佢係咪都仍然係作為一間實時營運中心？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋有一個叫做 radio control section，而家係喺當年我哋呢個位置嗰度，而家仲存在嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同我哋講下，呢一個電台控制中心係咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋中文簡稱叫呢個做電台（九巴電台），咁佢係二十四小時運作，佢係無論車長或者其他同事，喺路上面遇到有啲咩嘢問題，佢都會即時打畀呢個電話，廿四小時有人接聽，咁佢哋會分析件事，再派同事去幫手嘅。咁同時間，呢個電台，佢會同運輸署或者警察有一個聯繫，佢哋有個直線電話，同番運輸署嘅 ETCC，即係緊急協調中心，就如果有啲咩嘢事，佢哋互相會交換番一啲資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢係 ETCC？

楊晉瑋先生：英文嘅全寫，唔好意思，我冇資料喺手，應該係緊急協調中心，類似咁樣嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）根據你所講，似乎呢個電台係應付一啲緊急嘅情況，而唔係一個實時管理，即係用黑盒進行實時管理，啱唔啱？

楊晉瑋先生：其實最後個 ROM 呢樣嘢，係演變咗去另外一個系統，咁佢哋而家都有用呢個系統，但係同當年嘅 ROM 呢樣嘢係有少少出入嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你話係有少少唔同，究竟有幾唔同？

楊晉瑋先生：其實 ROM 當年係想類似參考一啲譬如鐵路，咁佢會 monitor 呢啲列車，或者即係我哋 monitor 啲巴士，佢哋嘅同--譬如同前面架車，或者同後面架車，嗰個差距有幾多，咁可能佢會--個系統如果 identify 到可能某班車行得太--即係黐得太--前面嗰架車太前--太密嘞，咁佢可能會 prompt 一啲 message 去提個車長，你個--可能喺下一個站就要停一停先，唔好開住；或者調番轉，可能佢係開得太慢，咁可能會 prompt 個 message 去畀啲資訊畀個車長，「你距離前面嗰架巴士幾遠」，咁希望喺巴士站等車嘅乘客，佢哋嗰個 waiting time 係會平均啲嘅，咁呢個係當初成個 ROM 背後嗰個原意。

其中一個範疇就係話，佢哋可以代替咗站長呢個角色，即係如果成立咗 ROM 呢個 program 之後，咁喺荔枝角車廠就做咗呢個中央控制中心，咁其實大部分站長個角色都可以唔需要嘞，因為中央處理。去到現在，我哋係冇--我哋係會 keep 番所有站長，但係只係用呢個 ROM 呢個系統，而家我哋將佢演變咗係淨係監察架車嘅 GPS 嘅 location，監察佢嘅 speed，或者如果有需要嘅話，我哋可以用呢個 data base 去 retrieve 番佢個 past record 嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到呢個系統係同原有嘅設計係有啲唔同嘅，點解係即係呢個系統嘅功能係有呢個演變？

楊晉瑋先生：最後個原因我唔肯定 management 個決定係點解，但係我自己同埋好幾位嘅當時嘅 project team，我哋都覺得，即係如果你要用呢樣嘢嚟取締晒個巴士總站嘅站長，其實係有啲--我哋覺得有啲唔 realistic 嘅，所以我哋都曾經畀過 comment 畀 management，話畀佢聽「可能會有啲風險，如果你唔用站長。」但係最後係咪因為呢個原因，有一啲改變，咁我就唔肯定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同我哋講講，呢個系統幾時出現呢個演變？

楊晉瑋先生：大概 2014 或者 15 年初咁樣囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係話喺 2015 年打後，係咪？

楊晉瑋先生：係嘞，around 嗰啲月份。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程艾樂先生表示，當考慮使用呢個實時管理系統嘅時候，其中一個目標係令到司機係駕駛得好啲，因為呢一個系統係可以畀車長--即係就可

以反映下車長係點樣去駕駛，究竟即係佢地嘅駕駛行為好唔好，係咪符合標準等等，你有冇聽過呢個講法？

楊晉瑋先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個諗法最後係發生咩嘢事？

楊晉瑋先生：其實係有做到呢樣嘢嘅，應該我哋而家每一架巴士上面，都會有個device，好細個，咁佢係有四盞燈，同埋會發出好細聲嘅一個「吆」一聲，去提示番個車長，如果佢有一啲唔好嘅駕駛行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）不當嘅駕駛行為？

楊晉瑋先生：冇錯，係譬如超速，或者佢突然間急速剎車，或者突然間acceleration，突然間加速，同埋如果佢個引擎開咗架車，個空轉，即係我哋唔想佢開咗架車，但係架車又唔郁，擺咗喺個站度，咁都會發出「吆」一聲，同埋有燈去顯示嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有四方面，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：係，正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）由幾時開始，你哋有呢一個咁嘅係系統，就係用呢啲方法去警示嗰啲車長，即係提醒佢哋，你話呢個細嘅裝置？

楊晉瑋先生：唔好意思，如果 exact 嘅日期我已經唔記得咗嘞，但係應該都有好幾年嘅時間，呢個如果需要，可以之後我去搵番資料。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個黑盒，你可唔可以講多啲畀我哋聽？點樣用佢嚟到去監察車長嘅表現？

主席：（經傳譯員）你未落去之前，我想問，你哋嗰個係限值係定喺邊度，係定個限值喺邊度，然後嗰啲燈先會係發光，同埋幾時先會作一個細聲嘅「吆吆」響？譬如話超速，咁個限值喺邊度？

楊晉瑋先生：詳細嘅數據我冇喺手，咁佢係會有個速度，同埋佢喺幾多秒鐘剎車或者加速，都會有呢樣嘢，有嗰啲 standard 喺度，但係我哋--我呢一刻冇嗰個數據掌握。

主席：（經傳譯員）一啲都冇？任何一項都冇？

楊晉瑋先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家呢度打出嚟嗰個資料會唔會幫到你手？呢個就係黑盒，就係大埔巴士，即係話今年2月10號嗰部巴士嘅資料嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係喺BM-66嗰頁。

楊晉瑋先生：我有見過呢啲數字，但係最後係--因為我知道，我哋 management 佢會 tune 呢啲數字，去睇下會唔會需要加強嗰個 warning 嘅，咁喺呢一刻，係咪用緊呢一 set 嘅數字，我唔肯定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你又提過係管理階層就係會調整嗰啲數字嘅，咁意思係指管理階層嘅邊一啲人士係會去作出呢個調整？

楊晉瑋先生：應該我哋工程部嘅 management，佢哋要去呢個系統，如果要 modify 呢個系統，一定要係佢哋去做呢樣嘢，所以喺我嘅日常工作，就冇接觸到呢啲數字嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以落去第 67 頁，喺 BM-67。或者係落去下面嗰度，喺藍色嗰個部分，藍色嘅第三段，呢一個就係 Openmatics 呢間公司，而你哋公司就係同呢個 Openmatics 就係有合約，就由佢哋提供呢個遠程測量，咁呢度就講到話，關乎呢個實時營運管理系統，我哋係唔知道九巴係有計劃係引入一個咁嘅系統，所以我哋係唔知道九巴有任何嘅計劃，去同嗰個係黑盒，或者係遠距離嘅系統就係將佢係有一個連繫嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你讓楊生一個機會去睇一睇先，呢個係 Openmatics ZF 就提供畀我哋嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭生，睇咗未？

楊晉瑋先生：（經傳譯員）睇咗嘞。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以就確認一下個情況係咁，九巴係？呢度所講嘅係咪屬實？

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，應該正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）九巴有冇諗過係將呢一個遠距離通訊嘅系統，係同呢個實時營運管理系統，喺日後將兩者係連接起嚟？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個我唔清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你會唔會知邊個人會知道呢件事？

楊晉瑋先生：應該都係 engineer 嗰面嘅同事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家我哋又想講番黑盒，可唔可以簡單咁同我哋講一講，九巴係點樣樣去監察車長嘅駕駛行為，點樣用黑盒去監察車長嘅駕駛行為？

楊晉瑋先生：其實有兩個範疇，第一個就係最 straightforward 嘅 speeding，無論我哋車務組，即係我哋而家 depot，或者係我哋嘅 TQD 嗰個 department，佢哋都會去 monitor，用我哋個 program，咁嗰個 program 背後就係喺個 black box 嗰度畀 data 佢嘅，呢個係 speeding。

另外就係頭先我講嘅嗰個駕駛提示器嗰個盒仔，咁其實背後都會 record 咗嗰個佢著燈響嗰個次數，呢個範疇就會由 TQD 去負責。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話嗰啲燈著燈嘅次數，係你邊度得到嗰啲資料？有響聲又點呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋嘅 IT 嘅部門，佢會 send 一個 report 出嚟，就去話番畀我哋聽，個車長嗰盞燈佢著過幾多次。咁當然譬如你話 harsh braking 咁計就，佢著燈又唔一定代表係佢唔啱，即係譬如如果前面有架車突然間停車，咁佢一定要剎車㗎喇，咁呢盞燈著咗，亦都未必代表個車長唔啱，所以 TQD 個部門可能佢會 review 番，會唔會係某一個車長特別多燈著，咁樣佢--或者佢會搵一啲便裝嘅一啲 assessor，去跟個車長，睇下佢個 driving behavior 有冇問題嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提及你哋嘅資訊科技部門就會出一個報告，話畀你哋聽就係盞燈著過幾多次，即係會以某一個車長嚟計。咁我想問，會幾頻密一次？

楊晉瑋先生：大概一星期會有一個 report 出嚟，一至兩星期會有個 report 出嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）不如舉個例子，如果個車長佢有咁嘅係習慣，就成日係大力剎車，咁亦都係喺呢個數據嗰度記錄低，咁呢個報告就只會係一個星期之後先畀到你嘅，係咪咁？

楊晉瑋先生：應該正確，冇錯。佢 past 幾多日我冇印象，即係佢個 report 出嚟係幾多日之前，我冇印象。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）車長會唔會知道佢自己有咁樣樣嘅係話急劇剎車嘅習慣，會唔會即時知？

楊晉瑋先生：佢個--佢如果揸車嘅時候，佢 harsh brake 嘅話，嗰盞燈係會著同埋會響嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁個後果係點，如果個車長佢有咁嘅習慣，就係時常都會急劇剎車，即係一個禮拜之內成日咁做，有咩嘢後果？

楊晉瑋先生：所以我頭先 mention 過，我哋兩個部門都會一齊做，咁我講番我自己個部門先喇，咁我哋見到，因為你好難就住話佢響咗一次燈，就代表佢有問題嘅。咁我哋會搵一啲 repeater，即係經常會有燈著嗰啲，我哋會去--打電話去同佢做個溫馨提示，或者我哋會搵番我哋嘅一啲外勤，即係頭先我講嘅車務督察，會睇下--跟下佢車，睇下呢個車長有冇問題。咁同另一邊箱，TQD 嗰面，佢哋亦都--頭先我 mention 過，佢哋會搵一啲可能便裝嘅 assessor 去跟佢，睇下佢，去評估番佢個駕駛係咪經常好剖，成日急剎，跟車太貼之類呢啲咁嘅唔好嘅 behavior。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你所講嘅 TQD 係咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：TQD 其實係我哋一個 training 同埋--training and quality assurance department，咁佢個職責係去培訓我哋車長，同埋去評估佢哋嘅駕駛技巧，或者如果需要嘅話，進一步行動，譬如去有啲紀律行動，或者一啲 warning，都會由呢個 department 去負責嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講過，你就同呢個部門 TQD 係一齊睇下有邊啲人就係經常咁做，咁就首先會打電話，就畀個溫馨提示。我想問，就有幾多人係咁樣樣經常咁做？或者你畀個例子，譬如今年嚟計，有幾多人係咁樣重複咁去做？

楊晉瑋先生：大概可能每一次係會有一個、兩個，其實我未必係 repeater 嘅，可能係我見佢嗰個 report，佢個次數係高於其他嘅車長，咁我就會搵一啲比較喺個 list 裏面好高嗰啲車長，就會去 remind 佢。咁其他可能一啲可能係一次、兩次嗰啲，可能我哋就會再睇下佢下一次會唔會再出現咁樣。咁你話個數目，以我屯門嚟計，其實就幾個咁樣，係 less than ten 咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）「少過十個」係咩嘢意思？

楊晉瑋先生：成間屯門廠大概九百幾個車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）有九百個車長，但係少於十個就屬於呢個類別，係咪咁嘅意思？

楊晉瑋先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢十個，佢哋係急劇剎車係有幾多次？佢哋係會急劇剎車幾多次，然之後先至係引發你係關注？

楊晉瑋先生：通常嗰個數字都係個位數嘅，即係可能係五次、六次咁樣，咁我哋就會覺得佢係比較多，我哋就會去做我哋頭先個行動。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講「五、六次」，係一日五、六次定抑或一個星期五、六次？

楊晉瑋先生：應該一個禮拜嘅，但係個 exact 數字我要 verify，我唔可以 sure，呢度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提供嗰啲資料畀我哋，日後？

楊晉瑋先生：可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果有個人有咁嘅習慣，即係講番嗰十個，你又會採取咩嘢行動，如果你留意到有個人成日都有呢個急劇剎車嘅習慣？除咗係打個電話畀佢，你仲會做啲咩嘢？會唔會同佢傾下，就問下佢咩嘢原因？

楊晉瑋先生：會打電話，或者面對面嘅 interview 都會有機會做嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇對呢十個人咁樣做？

楊晉瑋先生：有，一係我或者我其他嘅同事都會去做呢個動作。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋有冇改善？

楊晉瑋先生：有一啲會嘅，你下一次會見唔到佢出現，咁可能個別嗰啲，佢哋--我印象唔多會--下一次會見到佢，大部分都會有改善嘅，以我印象裏面。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）程艾樂先生嘅作供嘅時候亦都表示，喺其中一次會議之中，佢哋傾到用一個評分卡嘅制度，即係針對車長嘅，咁考慮其中一個系統，就係一個GreenRoad.com 嘅制度，就係針對駕駛嘅行為嘅。咁有三大類，包括係紅、黃同綠嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇聽過呢套系統？

楊晉瑋先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你幾時開始聽過呢一套系統？

楊晉瑋先生：年份大概應該都係 13 或者 14 咁上下，exact 我都係唔記得嘞，都好幾年前。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你哋其中一個會議上面，有冇探究或者討論過呢個系統，即係同其他嘅車廠嘅代表或者管理層？

楊晉瑋先生：你嘅意思係，ROM 嗰啲 meeting 就冇 cover 呢樣嘢嘅。

黃女士： What about meetings other than ROM?

楊晉瑋先生：有，如果專係針對呢樣嘢，有曾經有個 meeting 開過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪喺 2013 至 14 年？

楊晉瑋先生：係嘞，應該 around 嗰啲時間，真係幾年前嘅時間。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有邊個出席，即係喺管理層方面？

楊晉瑋先生：如果你話當時嘅 member，我真係要 check 番有邊個喺度，因為我哋有好多唔同嘅會，有唔同人參與。咁我當時我有份嘅，我有份開嘅，呢個會。咁其他人我--應該有好幾位都已經離開咗九巴，或者退咗休。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個會議有冇紀錄㗎？

楊晉瑋先生：應該有 record，但係 e-mail 可能會有個 brief 即係 send 番出嚟，但係我要--我唔肯定我 e-mail 仲有冇 keep 到呢啲 record。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以去檢查一下有冇呢個紀錄？

楊晉瑋先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗電郵之外，呢啲會議有冇會議紀錄？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋可能好多會都會用 e-mail 做一個 recap 嘅，咁嗰個已經 serve as 個 minute，我唔肯定--我唔記得嘞，呢個會有冇 minute take 過，我唔肯定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢套系統係冇被採用嘅，你知唔知點解？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個 system 應該有用到喎，我唔肯定係咪 Mr Alok 講嗰個名，但係頭先你嘅 description，同我哋而家有個 system 係非常之相似。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個系統係咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：佢會 based on 個車長嗰個--其實背後都係頭先我講嗰個盒，嗰個燈，同埋個發出嘅聲，嚟 based on 佢嘅駕駛表現，嚟出三種顏色嘅燈話畀佢知嘅。呢個燈係幾時會出，就係佢喺返工嘅時候，佢要喺個總站拍佢個個人八達通，個 staff card，佢個電腦就會顯示畀佢聽，畀佢睇，下一班車佢要開幾多點。咁喺嗰個螢幕度，佢會有三種顏色出嚟，去話番畀個車長聽，佢個駕駛表現係屬於綠色最好，黃色係中間，定係紅色係需要改善嘅。咁呢個 system 到到呢一刻，我都仲見到會有用緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）當車長係落班嘅時候，佢嘟佢哋張八達通，呢個資訊會喺邊度顯示出嚟？

楊晉瑋先生：佢應該只會喺佢每日返工第一轉車，即係第一次 tap 卡嘅時候，佢會話番畀佢聽，佢個--exact 嗰個 period 我唔知，佢係話番畀佢聽，係上個禮拜定係幾日前嘅 record，我唔肯定，但係唔係同日嘅 record 嚟嘅，所以主席你問嘅，佢 sign off 嘅時候，係冇 display 到畀佢。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思係咪話，即係喺簽到嘅時候，會顯示資訊，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：係，冇錯，佢 sign on 嘅時候。

主席：（經傳譯員）所顯示嘅資料係針對邊段時間？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個我要 check 番佢個 period 係 refer to 幾時，但係唔係 real time，即係唔係講緊即日話番畀佢知嘅，係對上一個 period，但係呢個 period 係幾多，就我呢一刻冇個資料喺手。

主席：（經傳譯員）資訊喺邊度顯示出嚟？即係車長會喺邊度見到呢個資訊？

楊晉瑋先生：喺每一個巴士總站都會有一部電腦，就個車長佢每一次返到個總站報到嘅時候，佢都要用自己嘅 staff card 去拍卡，去攞 information，咁嗰個電腦就會喺個巴士總站嗰個 kiosk 出面對住個車長嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）電腦嘅螢幕係會顯示啲咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：佢會用三種顏色嚟話畀個車長聽，正如我剛才講嘅紅色、黃色同埋綠色。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋分別代表啲咩嘢？

楊晉瑋先生：詳細嘅 definition，我要 check 番背後嗰個 definition，但係綠色就係佢個表現係非常之好，係個車長做得好好，佢個 performance；黃色嘅，就應該係可能佢有一啲地方可能個 behavior，driving behavior 需要更改，其實都係 based on 頭先我講嗰個提示器，喺架巴士度；咁當然紅色嘅，就會係好差嘅，咁應該紅色嘅差，就係我哋--頭先我講 IT 會 send 畀我個 report，我 gen 到出嚟嘅人，most likely 都係應該呢啲人會收到紅色嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果顯示綠色燈，係咪代表喺即係之前嗰段嘅行車期間，就冇出現一啲即係警告嘅信號，係咪？

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢情況先至出現黃色燈？

楊晉瑋先生：佢個 definition 我真係要 check 一 check，即係究竟點樣先會出到 amber 或者 red 嗰個 signal 出嚟，背後個 definition 我呢一刻冇喺手。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供呢個資料？

楊晉瑋先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個資訊係咪有一個列印嘅版本？

楊晉瑋先生：其實就係頭先主席你問我嘅，如果有 e-mail 或者 minute，就會喺嗰度 list 咗出嚟嘅，所以如果我搵得番嗰個 e-mail，我就可以 disclose 畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，麻煩你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就住螢幕上面顯示嘅資訊，你可唔可以影一啲相，即係喺呢一個休息室外面嘅顯示屏？

楊晉瑋先生：可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果有個車長係得到紅色燈，咁會有咩嘢後果？

楊晉瑋先生：其實佢係一個提示嘅性質，如果--我哋做嘅 action 其實就係頭先我講，如果 IT department 收到嗰個 file，我見到佢哋係 repeater，或者佢係特別高過其他車長，我哋就會 take 我頭先嗰個 action，打電話畀佢，或者 TQD 個部門會搵人跟佢。但係喺最前面嗰個 screen，即係頭先主席想問我攞嗰

個螢幕，其實係做一個提示嘅動作，rather than 係有一啲 action 要去against 個車長嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇探討過，係要求一啲得到紅燈嘅車長係去即係接受一啲補救性嘅培訓？

楊晉瑋先生：我印象我有試過，如果--因為我部電腦，我係唔會睇到個車長係咩嘢顏色，綠色、黃色、紅色，因為嗰個係畀車長佢自己一個 remind，reminder 畀佢，反而我係 based on 我頭先講過嗰個 IT send 嗰個 report，如果真係有一啲 repeater 係出現嘅話，而個次數係高，咁 TQD 嗰邊係要畀 training 佢嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁得到綠色燈嘅車長，又會係點？你哋公司有冇考慮過係即係畀一啲獎勵，即係畀一啲係長期都得到綠色燈，而駕駛行為良好嘅車長？

楊晉瑋先生：我諗綠色，我哋冇刻意去做一啲動作去讚賞佢哋，因為我哋 assume 應該佢揸車好係正常嘅一個表現嚟嘅，以我所知，我公司應該冇做呢樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢套系統係咪同時都適用於兼職嘅車長？

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，有，因為佢哋喺架巴士，嗰個盒仔都會提佢哋，都會響，都會著燈。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）楊先生，我就會去講另一個議--話題，就係呢啲閉路電視嘅。我哋聽取咗一啲證供，係嚟自一啲嘅工會，佢哋講到一啲襲擊車長嘅--即係經常--即係車長經常受到襲擊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你係即係講一個新嘅議題，因為時間有限，我哋而家會暫停，咁個聽證會就會喺兩點半繼續嘅，唔該晒，楊先生。

楊晉瑋先生： Thank you.

下午 12 時 58 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。楊先生，喺午餐之前，我哋就係講緊關於黑盒嘅，我可唔可以再問一問關於黑盒嘅事呢？你話就關於就有一個警示車長嘅制

度，譬如如果佢哋係有突然之間剎車等等，幾年前其實就呢個系統已經係有安裝，但係就唔記得咗係邊一年？

楊晉瑋先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家睇幾份文件，就係你公司嘅陳述書嚟嘅，睇下會唔會幫到你，就 KMB 九巴第 1 號文件，第 168 頁，呢個係九巴嘅陳述書，2018 年 5 月 18 號嘅，如果我哋睇番呢一頁，呢一度就係講到就係關於黑盒，佢可以記錄啲乜嘢，關於係超速或者急劇嘅剎車或者係突然加速。

第三點，就係話一個呢個車長，我哋點樣去識辨佢，就係透過我哋個總站管理系統嘅，呢個總站管理系統，你係咪其中一位係有參與呢個系統嘅一個人呢？

楊晉瑋先生：就呢個係一個日常我哋會用--我係會用嘅一個系統嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋返番去第 148 頁，呢個係一個行動計劃嚟嘅，就係話點樣去落實一啲 2018 年 4 月 10 號提出嘅，就係一啲主要嘅建議，呢個就係關於係 2018 年 3 月 12 號關於呢個嘅大埔嘅意外嘅一個報告，...

主席： This is a redacted version of that report?

黃女士：（經傳譯員）...呢個就已經係刪減咗啲某部分嘅。我哋睇番第 148 頁第 10 段，右邊嗰欄，呢度就講就話--個題目就係，呢個九巴就應該係監察車長嘅表現，就特別係分析喺黑盒裏面嘅佢哋嘅紀錄，同埋就睇下如果佢哋車長有一啲不恰當嘅行為，就應該係有紀律處分嘅。

喺右面，我哋就有一個叫做“BOP 207”嘅功能就喺黑盒裏面嘅，但係呢個咁嘅，就係每一日就睇番嗰個駕駛嘅紀錄，其實係睇番之前十日嘅，如果有發現有一啲異常嘅情況，就會係由呢一個嘅培訓同埋管理質素部門就會係去處理嘅，然後佢哋就會係作出處分嘅程序，基本上係咪睇番之前十日嗰個嘅紀錄呢？

楊晉瑋先生：以我嘅認知，應該我哋 IT Department 係嘗試去將十日呢個日數係減低嘅，但係我手頭上，我唔係好肯定佢減低到幾多日，應該如果我冇記錯，應該佢係少過十日嘅。

黃女士： If you look further...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前，“BOP 207”係咩嘢意思呢？

楊晉瑋先生：“BOP 207”其實係我哋一個叫做“BOM”，B-O-M，嘅一個 programme 裏面嘅其中一個 function，B-O-M 應該係 stand for bus on-board management，something like that，佢呢個 function 佢係會幫我 capture 每部巴士佢嘅超速紀錄嘅，每逢有巴士會超速，即係個路面嗰個車速限制，我哋會用呢個 BOP 207 可以 retrieve 到呢啲 speeding 嘅

record。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋嗰個界限值係乜嘢係為之超速呢？

楊晉瑋先生：每一個 location 我哋都會 identify 咗佢係個法例嗰個限制車速，一係 50 公里每小時或者係 70 公里每小時，巴士一係 50，一係 70 嘅，當個巴士行經嗰一笪地方嘅時候，呢個 system 就會透過個 GPS 個 location 去 match 番呢架巴士究竟有冇同個限制有出入，如果有嘅話，佢就會喺呢個 report 度出番嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）通常係--你通常係超咗幾多先至話有超速呢？

楊晉瑋先生：應該以我所知，係會有一個 allowance 喺嗰度，因為驚嗰個 GPS 或者個 speeding 會唔準嘅，但係嗰個差距係幾多，我哋呢一刻冇嗰個數字喺度。我哋會做嘅，即係喺我嘅角色，總之逢嚟佢有呢個 record 出咗嚟，我哋 verify 番嗰個 location 係正確呢，我哋就會交畀我哋嘅 TQD 嘅 department 去做 follow-up action。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會係點樣去核證嗰啲嘅紀錄呢？

楊晉瑋先生：首先佢個--如果有架巴士出現咗佢話佢超速，我哋就會對番佢個 departure record，究竟呢架巴士會唔會有人入錯車牌，喺頭先嗰個叫做 TER 嗰個 system 嗰度，如果啱咗嘅話，證實咗係呢個車長負責駕駛呢架巴士嘅，我哋就再睇一睇佢個 GPS coordinators，個 X、Y 嗰個 coordinate 係咪正確，因為有時可能會受到干擾，會架車可能唔能夠正確顯示佢嘅位置嘅，當我哋正確見到個位置係啱，而見到嗰個車速限制係唔 match with 嗰個實際車速，即係如果佢超咗速嘅話，我哋就會確認呢個位置超速。

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗呢一個衛星定位系統嗰個嘅 X、Y 嗰度，你有冇其他嘅方法就去確定個地點？

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，係冇嘅，我哋係用 X、Y coordinate 個 GPS。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪意思係經瑋度呀？

楊晉瑋先生：我唔知道有用其他呢兩樣嘢，我會最主要係用 X 同埋 Y 去做呢個確定嘅。即係我撳咗落去個 coordinate，佢就會彈咗一個地圖出嚟，個地圖就會顯示當時架巴士嘅位置，我哋就用呢個地圖個位置嚟確實睇下架巴士係咪真係行過嗰度、個車速係幾多。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番呢個表格，我哋睇到一個「里程碑」嘅，呢度寫住，呢一個資訊科技部就話佢哋而家做緊就係能夠改良緊巴士表現嘅報告，希望能夠更加好監察嗰個超速同埋緊劇剎車同埋突然加速嘅，但係跟住就係 改善之後，嗰個車務部就會係分析有關嘅數據，就係一個禮拜兩次，就係之前八日嘅

數據，就係話畀啲車長聽有咩嘢異常嘅情況，嗰啲報告就會係一個禮拜兩次就係畀呢一個培訓部，然後就會即時採取一個行動，希望佢哋唔會再重蹈覆轍嘅。呢個就係畀運輸署嘅一個陳述書。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪一個意外報告？呢個唔係陳述書嚟㗎喎。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。呢個係意外報告嚟嘅，呢個係一個嘅行動計劃，點樣去落實一啲相關嘅主要嘅建議，就係2018年4月10號，由145頁開始嘅，楊先生，根據呢個嘅「里程碑」呢一度，就其實個改善就係話由十日去到八日即係去做嗰個報告？

楊晉瑋先生：正確。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你...

主席：（經傳譯員）而家個系統係咪淨係監察個速度呢？

楊晉瑋先生：如果BOP 207，呢個function係淨係對車速做一個監察嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個改變就話唔係純粹就係監察嗰個速度同埋嗰個急劇剎車同埋急劇加速嘅。

楊晉瑋先生：如果你針對住BOP 207呢個function，佢係冇包括頭先你講嘅harsh braking或者係sudden acceleration呢兩樣嘢，係淨係focus on speeding。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以話佢哋個建議就係話我哋監察，就唔純粹係超速，就係同埋急劇剎車同埋突然加速，呢度係咁講嘅，係咪呀？

楊晉瑋先生：係，冇錯，即係就係要用另外一種report，就係頭先即係lunch之前講嗰個report，係會review埋speeding、acceleration同埋braking嗰兩樣嘢，呢個就係頭先喺之前cover咗嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度講就話呢度要改善嗰個嘅巴士表現報告嗰個，就希望能夠更加好監察超速、急劇剎車同埋急劇加速嘅，你係咪已經有嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我唔肯定佢而家呢個“Milestone”呢度mention嘅improvement個action plan而家implement咗未，但係as of今日，我係繼續用緊BOP 207去monitor個speeding同埋頭先剛才講嗰個IT會send畀我嘅report就係monitor speeding、harsh braking同埋個acceleration嘅，我唔肯定我而家做緊嘅嘢係咪等於“Milestone”講佢嘅action嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個報告，今朝早你提到嘅報告，就關於急劇剎車等等，你幾時開始係有收到呢啲報告嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個 report 應該我喺 2017 年嘅時候已經有見過呢個 report 嘅，已經我哋已經開始要做㗎喇，exactly 我要--如果你需要，要再搵畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該搵喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，我哋講下一個題目，就係監察攝錄機。楊先生，有好多嘅工會話畀我哋聽，特別係九巴嘅工會就越嚟越多一啲辱罵車長嘅事情，係乘客去辱罵車長嘅，其中一個可以幫警方去執法嘅方法就係用一啲監察嘅攝錄機去影低無論係聲帶或者係影像，就係知道發生緊咩嘢事，我哋又睇一啲證供話畀我哋聽起碼就係--即係最少就係九巴，而家係有二千三百一十九嘅九巴巴士、一百四十六個龍運巴士就係有呢啲嘅監察攝錄機嘅。咁可唔可以講下據你所知其餘嗰啲巴士呢？

楊晉瑋先生：Okay，剛才你講嘅數字，以我嘅認知，應該--因為隨住我哋啲新車不斷買入，啲舊車退役，所有新車買嘅時候就已經 installed with 呢個 CCTV 嘅呢個 device，所以應該而家實際嘅數字係比剛才你 mention 嘅為多嘅，至於餘下落嚟嘅車，以我所知，公司會有計劃喺今年嘅年底之前，再為應該大概--exact 個 figure 我唔肯定，但係應該大概六百零、七百架車再去幫佢拉線，再裝個 CCTV 上去嘅，呢個係我知道 Management 2018 年會做嘅一樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）2018 年管理層嗰個計劃有冇包括所有九巴呢？雖然有啲係舊車。

楊晉瑋先生：如果我就咁睇個數字，就未 cover 得晒，應該剩番好少數將會就嚟退役嘅車冇包含，即係如果我計番我哋個 bus fit 出嚟嘅話，就應該未 cover 晒。我唔肯定佢會 2019 年係咪會繼續有 plan 呢個，呢個我唔清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到有啲投訴，或者唔好講「投訴」，係有啲建議，就係工會嘅成員佢哋建議就安裝自己嘅一啲攝錄鏡頭，因為有啲舊嘅巴士型號就係冇攝錄鏡頭嘅，佢哋覺得裝咗都可以有個措施可以保障到佢哋安全同埋係即係睇番乘客嘅行為嘅，但係九巴係否決咗呢個建議嘅，亦都出咗一個通函，係咪咁呀？據你所知。

楊晉瑋先生：以我所知，係，我哋係唔容許車長去裝自己嘅攝錄系統嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係咪發咗個通函...

主席： Why not?

楊晉瑋先生：我答主席嘅問題，我知道嘅，就應該關於一啲個人私隱條例裏面可能有一啲限制公營巴士嘅點樣去應用嗰個片嘅。

主席： What is that an acronym for?

楊晉瑋先生：個人私隱條例，exact 佢係邊個 clause 講，我唔肯定嘅，但係我知道，我聽番嚟嘅，就係因為其實係保障番個車長，因為之前試過有一啲 case 係

我哋車長--即係 KMB 嘅車長佢可能影咗一啲片，跟住放咗上網，之後我哋係收到一啲投訴係關於個人私隱，係侵犯咗對方嘅。所以我哋--即係我嘅認知，就我哋都會同車長講「因為係保障番車長嘅利益，有個人私隱條例規定咗某一啲嘢，令到就唔可以畀你哋自己裝嘅。」呢個係我嘅認知。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你嘅開場發言，你就提到過話你嘅角色就好重要嘅，意思就係話你係作為一個好重要嘅橋樑嘅，係管理層同埋前線員工之間嘅橋樑，你有冇提出過巴士車長嘅關注呢，或者佢哋有咁嘅要求，有冇向管理層講呢？

楊晉瑋先生：有嘅，其實另一方面我都有收過有一啲車長佢哋嘅反應，佢哋係唔鍾意我哋裝個鏡頭喺架車上面嘅，所以呢一方面我都曾經同管理層講過話「你裝咁多喺架車上面，其實有一啲車長係覺得保障佢哋，但係有一啲車長都唔係好鐘意，好似有樣嘢去 monitor 住佢，好似好大壓力咁。」呢個我都 express 畀管理層知嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於襲擊車長嘅事件，我哋就見到九巴嘅書面...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋講第二個範圍之前，黃大律師頭先問你通函，然後我頭先打斷咗佢嘅，個通函係咪有發出過，係同巴士車長講話佢哋唔可以自己裝自己嘅監察鏡頭，有冇咁樣通函？

楊晉瑋先生：喺我印象裏面係--我冇印象見過呢一個通告嘅，唔知係咪我忘記咗，但係我冇印象見過呢個通告。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個資訊點樣畀巴士車長知道，等佢哋知道佢哋唔可自己裝閉路電視或者監察鏡頭呀？

楊晉瑋先生：即係其實我哋明白車長有--如果佢自己選擇裝上去嘅車長，我哋係明白佢個立場嘅，所以通常我哋都會用一個比較柔軟嘅方式去同佢哋講話「其實你咁樣裝，有機會--當然你保障咗自己，但係你有機會都違反咗某一啲條例嘅。」我哋就建議佢去拆番呢個 CCTV 落嚟，即係拆番佢自己裝嘅 CCTV 落嚟，如果勸咗佢唔聽嘅話，我哋都會交番畀 GQD 嗰面去跟進嘅，但係我哋係唔會話即刻要佢拆咗佢，如果唔係，就唔畀佢開車，我哋冇做呢樣嘢嘅，即係會比較柔軟啲嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係建議啫，唔係話完全禁止？

楊晉瑋先生：喺我哋嘅角色，我哋喺前線同事，我畀佢哋嘅 instruction 都係 recommendation 畀佢哋唔好咁做，至於 TQD，我哋--即係如果個車長佢唔拆，我哋 pass 畀 TQD，可能佢哋會再進一步嘅行動去解釋番畀個車長聽，其實有啲咩嘢弊處係存在住咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係都係建議，但係唔係話禁止嘅？

楊晉瑋先生：喺我個角度--喺我嘅角色，喺我前線嘅團隊嘅角色，我係做一個recommendation嘅動作。

主席：（經傳譯員）你叫TQD，培訓及質數保證部，佢哋係咪又係建議吖，定係直頭禁止吖？

楊晉瑋先生：呢個我唔清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你而家可唔可以同TQD問下？

楊晉瑋先生：冇問題。

黃女士：前線員工如果想裝監察鏡頭，但係自己冇嘅話，你有冇將佢哋嘅訊息去上--即係講畀管理層聽就有巴士車長係想裝監察鏡頭嘅時候應該幫佢裝，等佢哋--即係話車長自己本身唔需要違反呢個嘅私隱條例呢，你有冇同管理層講？

楊晉瑋先生：有，喺唔同嘅場合，都會收到車長嘅一啲意見，即係一啲formal嘅visit或者一啲informal，我落去同啲車長傾偈，佢哋都有同我反映，我都會同番管理層講番車長嘅意願嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）管理層個反應係點？

楊晉瑋先生：我收到管理層嘅回覆，就係佢哋已經儘快希望將我哋啲巴士就裝--即係新車固然之會有，舊車都會儘快裝呢個系統嘅，佢哋--當時佢應該同我講係佢哋知道、明白車長嗰個需要。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到有工會成員就話因為有越嚟越多襲擊車長嘅事件，佢哋就當係平常事，喺你嘅意見書入面就提過就會畀一啲心理輔導或者係支援畀有關員工嘅，你嘅意見，巴士車長有冇咩嘢提議，即係點樣可以改善，喺呢一部分，喺公司應該點樣改善。呢一頁我哋都見到，就應該係149頁--對唔住，113頁，就提到專責小組就搵咗個顧問去全面檢討現行嘅做法，然後就提出一啲建議，包括要評估巴士車長佢嘅情緒智商同埋係處理壓力咁樣，你有冇...

楊晉瑋先生：本身KMB係有同一間第三者嘅機構去合作，提供一條熱線去提供畀啲車長，嗰條叫做「傾心線」，係一個獨立運作嘅一個hotline嚟嘅。至於我見到而家paper 3第38段講嘅呢樣嘢，我都知道管理層係做緊呢樣嘢，佢哋當中其中一個meeting我都有出席過嘅，佢哋係委派咗或者邀請咗一間--應該香港一間大學輔導系或者心理系，個名我唔肯定，去幫佢做一個review或者睇下有啲咩嘢recommendation可以畀到九巴嘅，其中一個meeting就係同呢啲心理學家去--我會話番畀啲心理學家聽究竟而家我哋啲車長有啲咩嘢面對緊嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）繼續講另外一個問題，講巴士脫班，我哋聽到你嘅同事，即係黃綺玲女士佢畀嘅證供就話脫班係常見嘅情況，亦都會影響駕駛嘅態度，因為預定嗰個嘅行車時間唔準確，亦都會影響車長休息嘅時間，你對呢件事有咩嘢

睇法？

楊晉瑋先生：其實喺我嘅角度，lost shift 其實有好多嘅因素會導致嘅，首先就係我哋車長唔夠人，我哋會冇咗一個班次，我哋香港嘅交通可能塞車或者有啲特別事故，引致到架車開唔到，就冇咗一個班次，另外有啲可能一啲公眾活動、遊行或者一啲特別改路措施都會令到架車冇咗一個班次，當然仲有天氣或者一啲壞車嘅影響都會令 lost shift 嘅出現嘅，但係我哋喺 lost shift 嗰度，儘量我哋都唔會影響到車長嗰個 journey time 嗰個休息時間。因為其實個 journey time 我哋提供咗畀個車長，我哋嘅 schedule，journey time 係大概 90% of 佢個 trips 係可以有足夠嘅時間行車，90%呢個係一個 index，可能會高啲，可能會低啲。

咩嘢叫做 90%呢？就即係佢十個 trip 裏面可能會有九個 trip，佢都會有足夠嘅 journey time 去 operate 嗰架車，之後返嚟仲會有休息時間嘅，剩番嗰 10%，即係剩番嗰一個 trip，可能就係因為頭先我講嘅其他問題，令到可能大塞車，佢返唔到去。而喺 lost shift 嗰度，我哋係唔會刻意去減咗個車長個 journey time 係令到佢追番我哋唔見咗嘅 shift 數嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以舉個例子，你朝頭早提過寶田邨嗰個站，就有特別更次，你都記得嘅。喺寶田邨，我就睇過你嘅九巴網站，就有幾條巴士線嘅，其中一條就係 258D，係由寶田邨去藍田，我相信估計嘅行車時間係個半鐘，啱唔啱？

楊晉瑋先生：大概應該係呢個 journey time，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）亦都有證供話畀我哋聽，就關於呢個特別嘅呢個 258D 呢個路線，嗰啲我哋嘅行車時間就係--嗰啲車長如果做呢個特別更次嘅時候，佢哋就冇足夠嘅休息時間，我哋可唔可以將琴日工會嗰個陳述書嘅部分我哋可以喺個畫面嗰度睇一睇？呢個係 258D 嘅路線，「蛇」5，呢個就係分更第 5 號，呢度講就係話開車時間係 06:50，然後就 13:43，跟住就係 16:00，至到 20:15 嘅，所以嗰個休息時間就係中間嗰段，就係只係有兩個鐘十五分鐘，就而唔係三小時嘅休息時間，呢個係公司定出嚟嘅行車時間表嚟嘅，你對呢個嘅回應係點樣呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我而家就冇 schedule 喺手，但係呢條線我都有份去做個 time table，以我嘅 memory 記得，呢一個 duties 佢第一段，即係 first session 嗰個 end time 應該係 12 點 43，唔係 13 點 43 嘅，因為其實有一個鐘頭，我哋係畀個食飯--我哋畀一個 meal break 嗰個錢畀個車長，即係其實佢 12 點 43 分，如果 on normal day，冇塞車，應該喺 12 點 43 分之前，佢都已經係可以休息，下一次開車就係 4 點嘅，應該係多過三個鐘頭嗰個運輸署新嗰個 guideline，應該係 2019 年生效嗰個。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以確定下呢個係其實真係一個寫錯咗呢？其實就係 12:43，你可唔可以畀番啲紀錄我哋睇番呢？

楊晉瑋先生：可以，可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，就請你提供番相關嘅資料。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其中一個工會成員，就係用呢一個黑盒就可以知道個行車時間，計出嚟，就而唔係話有個人佢揸車，佢就話畀你聽，而唔係用一啲科學嘅數據，其中一個建議就喺繁忙同埋非繁忙時間嘅時候攞咗一啲資料，然後就加入一個因素，就係話可能塞車，然後先至係計出嗰個行車時間，呢個係比較科學嘅講法嘅--做法嘅，你點樣睇？

楊晉瑋先生：其實我哋係有做嘅，我哋本身有一個 scheduling section，佢哋專係負責去 review 所有 time table，所有車長嘅 duties 都係由呢個 department 去 review 嘅，我嘅角色就會協助畀啲 input 佢，譬如我收到啲意見，會話番畀呢個 section 聽啲車長邊度可能唔夠 journey time 或者佢哋有啲咩嘢要求。佢哋會 on and off 佢哋會用一個 system 去 review 個車長嘅 journey time 嘅。其實剛才你所講嘅，我哋用一架車或者用一架巴士去實地去試，其實呢個我哋唔係成日用，幾時會用到呢，就係可能開一條新線，因為我哋本身冇一啲 historical data 我哋可以 review 嘅，所以我哋可能真係搵一架車，用番一個巴士嘅速度去模仿一次佢嘅 journey time 出嚟。

但係當一條線係已經有一定數量嘅 data 嘅時候，我哋係會用兩種方法，應該話嗰個 schedule section 佢哋會用兩種方法去 review 個 journey time，一，就係個車長嗰個到站同埋開車時間，就係記錄咗喺嗰個 TER，頭先 mention 過嘅，每逢個車長到站嘅時候，佢就會喺嗰個站長室嗰度就拍自己個 staff card，我哋就會記錄咗佢嘅到站時間，當然個站長就會喺嗰度 input 佢個下一次嘅開車時間，從而我哋將兩邊個--一個 departure time 再加一個 arrival time，兩個減起嚟，就知道佢實際用咗幾多嘅 journey time。

另外一個所講嘅，就係用番嗰個 GPS 嗰個 location 去定，其實呢兩個，無論邊個 method 都好，其實都係--我哋都覺得係 valid 嘅，因為真係反映到架車幾時到咗站，佢會不時佢去 review 呢個 journey time，就如果我--可以畀我舉一個例子，其實寶田係一個好好嘅例子嚟嘅。頭先講過 258D，另外一條線係 260X，佢係由寶田去紅磡火車站--紅磡鐵路站嘅，佢中間係途經過一笪非常之塞車嘅地方，就係而家起緊高鐵，近住佐敦嗰個附近。因為佢起高鐵嘅關係，佢嗰度有一個大型嘅改路，令到佢開頭一開始呢個工程嘅時候，我哋 260X 係非常之唔夠行車時間，因為佢係未起高鐵突然間要改路，我哋就 review 個 journey time，跟住然後就將嗰個 journey time 係加咗好多畀呢條線嘅車長嘅。去到而家呢一刻，其實而家最新嗰度有條地下隧道--行車隊道開咗，佐敦嗰度都已經比較冇咁塞車，我哋發覺呢條線佢嘅 journey time 而家係多得滯，係多到架車返到總站係唔夠位泊車，因為啲車長佢太早返到站，所以我哋都會 review 個 journey time，可能 adjust 番，according to 佢個事實。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪需要係向運輸署去攞個批核嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：如果我哋自己可以 revise 到個 time table，係唔需要改任何嘅 frequency 嘅話，我哋係唔需要同運輸署申請嘅，即係假設佢個 schedule of service 係規定我哋十分鐘一班嘅，260X，如果因為行車時間唔夠，我哋要加一個行車時間，可能我哋會用好多種方法，譬如係 deploy from 其他巴士線去行呢條線，又或者甚至乎加一架新車，加一架新線落去，呢啲我哋會按實際情況，睇下可唔可以做到，但係唔係喇，做唔到喇，因為一個好大幅嘅一個行車時間調整，我哋冇辦法可以憑我哋現有嘅 resources 去做呢，我哋惟有就睇下可唔可以將嗰個 frequency 稍為調整，當我要調整個 frequency 嘅時候，我哋一定要向運輸署去申請嘅，要等運輸署 approve 咗，我哋先可以去調整。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家去傾第二個題目，今朝早黃綺玲女士就今朝早講，就係話有一個聚焦小組--焦點小組，就係去傾下究竟有啲邊啲路段就對於車長或者係乘客嚟講，都係比較危險嘅，如果喺屯門嚟講，你有冇啲類似嘅聚焦小組㗎？你就會同啲車長或者去傾去呢個嘅--邊一啲路段係都要特別小心或者一啲好急嘅彎等等咁樣？

楊晉瑋先生：有嘅，有呢啲例子可以提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供啲例子呢？

楊晉瑋先生：係，譬如我哋會--我哋有--通常用兩種途徑去收集呢啲 hazard 嘅，第一嘅，就係車長佢直接同我哋反映，因為佢哋係第一身，佢哋知道邊笪地方係有潛在嘅風險嘅，例如--譬如可能呢排 7 月、8 月佢落雨落得好緊要，有好多地可能嗰啲馬路會因為大雨嘅關係，會出現咗一個個嘅窿嘅。架巴士--如果私家車行，可能未必有問題，但係架巴士行，佢就會好撳，有機會乘客因為咁樣而 lost balance 嘅，車長如果話咗畀我哋知，我哋第一時間當然要通知番有關嘅政府部門；第二，就係如果我哋發覺係好嚴重，我哋會即時同站長，通知站長去話畀所有會途經嗰個路段嘅車長聽，話畀佢聽去到嘅時候可能佢要慢速，甚至乎可能佢係咪要出一條線去避開咗嗰個窿呢，呢個就係第一個我哋可以攞到嘅意見。

第二，就係我哋其他同事，我哋有一啲外勤嘅同事，佢哋其實--尤其是喺雨季，佢哋要定期去巡查個路面嘅，佢哋主要就係針對去巡--尤其是我因為屯門、元朗嗰面就比較多一啲郊區嘅線，好多啲樹嗰啲，佢一落完雨，佢會因為可能水嘅關係，會髡咗落嚟，甚至乎有少少傾斜嘅危險嘅，嗰啲情況都係我哋主動發現到，因為佢有機會撞爛個巴士嘅玻璃，所以我哋都會即時--如果真係好嚴重，我哋會報畀警察聽，可能佢哋會搵消防員去 cut 咗個樹佢，但係如果可能好輕微掂到架車嘅，我哋就會話畀運輸署聽，等佢哋安排去做一啲修剪嘅工程。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就話你哋嗰啲外勤人士就會係定期去巡查，幾定期呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋本身--我哋自己屯門廠就有一個叫做類似黑點嘅地方，即係我哋會話到邊啲地方其實有比較多嘅樹木係會伸出嚟嘅，我哋--佢係要 keep 住去做呢樣嘢嘅，尤其是喺呢個雨季嘅時候，佢大概一個月時間嘅，佢就會成個區--我哋成個區嘅所有 black spot 會巡一次嘅，我哋其實會視乎實際情況，譬如如果真係落雨大啲，我哋可能再要求佢會加密少少，但係如果嗰一排可能係冇乜雨，係陽光普照咁樣，可能樹嗰個問題又唔係咁大嘅，但係其實平時佢哋巡路面--即係佢哋日常，譬如佢由呢個站去呢個站，佢哋嘅職責都要去不斷去 observe，睇下有冇啲 safety 嘅 concern 係佢哋見到，佢哋會報囉。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後一個題目，運輸署最近話畀我哋聽佢哋就係發出咗一個實務守則，就係關於車長嘅培訓方面嘅，你自己有冇睇過呢個實務守則呢？

楊晉瑋先生：唔好意思，我唔清楚係 refer 緊邊個，有冇得可以畀我參考？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-1 第 403 頁，我哋睇第 18 段，第 19 段，呢度就咁講，就係講關於--第 18 同埋第 19 段就講到呢個實務守則嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個喺其實過去十日之內先至發出嘅啫，呢個實務守則。

楊晉瑋先生：應該我哋嘅 practice 唔係呢排發生嘅，即係而家佢 refer 緊我哋嘅 training，我哋 enhance 咗好幾個月㗎喇，以我所知，但係我唔知呢個 paper 佢 refer 緊嗰樣嘢係咪我講緊嗰樣嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你係點樣改善你哋嗰個培訓嘅呢？

楊晉瑋先生：我哋 training 裏面其實佢分開兩個 phase 嘅，一個叫做 phase 1，一個叫做 phase 2，phase 1 就係如果佢係冇任何--即係佢淨係得 1 或者 2 牌私家車咁樣，佢入嚟想做我哋嘅車長，佢就要透過 phase 1 呢個 training，就去向運輸署去考取呢個巴士嘅駕駛執照嘅，呢個就係 phase 1。當佢 pass 咗運輸署呢個駕駛考試之後，佢攞到嗰個真係個巴士駕駛執照...

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇喺過去幾個月可唔可以改善第 1 期呢？

楊晉瑋先生：Phase 1 我見唔到有 enhance 嘅動作。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 2 期呢？

楊晉瑋先生：Phase 2，有。

主席：（經傳譯員）點樣加強？

楊晉瑋先生：如果有需要嘅話，即係呢個係 management 畀我哋嘅 instruction，如果有需要嘅話，我哋係唔會畀個車長去完成呢個課程嘅，一定係等佢自己有信心或者導師對佢有信心，我哋先會畀佢完成嘅，即係換句說

話，原本可能佢係要 train 咁多日嘅，但係冇信心，我哋寧願都係希望佢再畀多啲 training 佢，先可以畀佢畢業出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我問晒喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。楊先生，多謝你嚟呢度作供協助我哋，你而家係作供完畢，你而家可以離席，但係你可以留喺度，我哋會請下一位作供，唔該。

楊晉瑋先生： Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）而家稍為休息，楊生可以離席，休息兩分鐘。

下午 3 時 16 分押聆訊押後

下午 3 時 21 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，多謝你接受我哋邀請上嚟作供，亦都多謝你耐心全日咁樣等候，因為我哋之前係聽緊第二啲證供，而家輪到你，你應該有睇到我哋個程序，我哋而家會請黃大律師開始問你問題。可以開始。

鄭桂興先生：（經傳譯員）主席、委員，我好榮幸能夠出席呢一個聆訊，首先喺開始問答之前，我要申報利益。可唔可以用中文？

主席：（經傳譯員）當然可以喇。

鄭桂興先生：本人同 2 月 10 號巴士災難十九位死難者及六十六位傷者完全沒有朋友或者親屬嘅關係，亦都同現時九巴董事總經理及管理階層沒有朋友或者親屬關係，只係同 2015 年前嘅董事總經理及管理階層有工作夥伴關係，okay。We can start。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒鄭生。唔該鄭先生今日出席。鄭先生，你係安全及服務質素部嘅經理，係咪？鄭先生，你係安全及服務質素部嘅經理，係咪呀？即係高級經理？

鄭桂興先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講緊係 2010 年嘅 5 月 1 號開始，你其實就係 2014 年 9 月退休嘅，係咪呀？

鄭桂興先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當時何達文就係九巴嗰個嘅總裁，係咪呀？

鄭桂興先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）Gary Wong當時係你上司，係咪？

鄭桂興先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家集中講幾個部分，第一，就係點樣係找出二十九個嘅急彎，係一啲內部分析嘅用途嘅，你其實喺提交畀委員會嗰個書面嘅文件入面亦都提到過，而家首先請你睇番FE文件冊嘅96-4至96-6頁，响呢一頁，即係96-4頁，如果我哋睇下嗰一段，就係話巴士好容易會翻側，即係第二段，入面提到係關於安全駕駛，你就喺2013年開始做一個研究嘅，喺急彎方面，而安全及服務質量部就邀請四個站頭嘅經理，同埋係培訓嗰度嘅代表，同埋係維修部就做一個嘅研究小組去深入研究喺巴士路線網絡入面嘅急彎，可唔可以講下嗰四個經理係咩嘢人呀當時？

鄭桂興先生：嗰四份係分別屯門廠、荔枝角廠、沙田同埋呢個荔枝角廠--荔枝角、沙田、屯門及沙田廠嘅depot manager，咁樣呢四位manager，我哋組織咗一個taskforce，除咗以上四位嘅depot manager，連同巴士訓練學校嗰個校長，佢個grade係assistant manager，名就叫做Richard Lee，咁樣再連同呢個Service Department，即係維修部，佢哋嘅工程師，咁因為工程師就係而家亦都離咗任嘅，就係呢個Henry So，咁樣我呢個小組就搜羅晒所有由四個depot提供畀我哋全香港、九龍、新界，或者集中啲講，就係九龍同埋新界各線巴士日常所經過嗰啲急彎。

點樣去define急彎呢？就係我哋嘅criteria就係，一，就係嗰個時速限制，由70轉50；二，就係個急彎個弧度；三，亦都係嗰啲經常日常經過嘅巴士線嘅載客量，因為如果佢日常都係好滿嘅，即係換句話講，個車重會加重咗；第三，就係我哋亦都係考慮到嗰個急彎嗰個實際嘅情況去作出個評估，由九龍、新界，甚至乎香港所搜集返嚟大約千幾個嗰啲急彎，我哋篩選到為二十九個，而呢二十九個，我哋制定咗嘅方針，我哋係用巴士實地去行駛。

喺嗰個test嗰個途中，我哋亦都利用嗰啲video，car cam.喇所謂，去錄影當時嗰架巴士行經嗰二十九個嘅急彎，呢二十九個我哋全數有做過嘅，係用唔同嘅速度嘅，包括由20 km、30 km、40 km、45 km、50 km去反覆來回去測試嘅。咁樣亦都利用咗頭先你哋所講嗰個black box嘅，即係我哋嘅簡術語就BOM，BOM就bus on-board monitoring system去計算番我哋行駛邊個速度係可以安全，亦都唔會影響到個交通流量嗰個速度，就做一個建議畀我哋嘅senior management。

我想喺呢度停一停，你有啲咩嘢問題想再問？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該你，鄭生。我想問邊個係帶頭發起話要做個咁嘅研究嘅呢？

鄭桂興先生：當時就係我哋嗰個 MD，Mr Edmond Ho，就轉述咗--指示我時任嘅 supervisor Mr Gary Wong，咁樣 Mr Gary Wong 就同我、同我哋個 team member 一齊去傾嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）Gary Wong 佢係咩嘢職位呀？

鄭桂興先生：佢係 Head of SSQ。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你頭先提到有一啲嘅同事，你會唔會同佢哋不時都開會係講關於呢個研究嘅呢？

鄭桂興先生：有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）幾時㗎？

鄭桂興先生：大約係 2013 年尾、2014 年初。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲會議有冇會議紀錄？

鄭桂興先生：我相信係有嘅，就我哋唔會話一個 formal 嘅 minute，而係用 exchange of e-mail，好似頭先楊生咁樣講，係有通過電郵去作實嘅，因為其後我哋要好多安排，包括安排車長，即係一個特別職務嘅車長去駕駛架巴士，要安排工程師，要安排呢個駕駛學院--駕駛訓練學校嘅導師去定出個日期去做嘅，我相信呢啲 minute 喺九巴--我嗰個 e-mail account 就 close 咗，就完全我係搵唔番，咁樣或者其他有參與呢個工作嘅同事可能會搵得番相關嘅 e-mail。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，你知唔知道佢哋而家仲喺九巴就職嘅，佢哋亦都係有參與呢個研究，我哋可以向佢哋問嘅呢？

鄭桂興先生：因為已經事隔咗四年，以我嘅認知，大部分嗰啲同事已經離咗職。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢個車上嘅攝錄機，就關於呢二十九個急彎你提到嘅呢...

鄭桂興先生：嗰啲影片係我當時退休前，我做完呢個 project，係親身交畀當時嘅巴士訓練學校嘅校長 Mr Richard Lee 嘅，而家嘅去向喺邊度呢，我答唔到你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邊個去--二十九個急彎，邊個去拍攝嗰啲嘅短片嘅呢？同埋邊個去揸嗰啲車嘅呢，致使到嗰個攝錄機可以去拍低呢啲片呢？

鄭桂興先生：首先講嗰個攝錄機嗰個--邊個 hand held 呢個攝錄機呢，係 fix 咗

喺個巴士第二層嘅頭位嗰個 barrier 嗰個 handrail 度嘅，係唔需要搽嘅，只係開關、開關，呢個工序係由我本人去做嘅。咁樣另外，你嗰個問題，黃小姐，你所講嘅問題，係呢個邊個去儲存呢？喺拍攝完，係我本人儲存，我係交番畀我時任嘅 supervisor Mr Gary Wong，因為我哋要先睇下我哋所錄影返嚟嘅片段係唔係 correct。

另外我哋將所有二十九個試過嘅急彎，其實唔止一個片嘅，係好多個片嘅，係交番畀去巴士駕駛訓練學校嘅校長，由佢做一個剪輯，然後剪輯完就交番畀我哋，因為大家都知喇，好多 footage，嗰啲 footage 有啲係有用，有啲係冇用，咁樣我哋 edit 咗，就再交畀駕駛訓練學校，駕駛訓練學校去儲存，當中我哋有一、兩個 occasion，由 Mr Gary Wong 或者我，我唔係好清楚，係交番畀時任嘅 MD Mr Edmond Ho 睇嘅，咁樣我哋都係 just for viewing 啫，冇深入再去研究下「呢個速度係唔正確㗎喎」，呢樣嘢就冇喺嗰啲 occasion 去討論。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，第 96-6，喺下面個部分，你講就喺呢個嘅研究之中，我哋就能夠係印製一個叫做「安全小冊子」，你後來就係話呢個唔係小冊子，呢個係一啲提示卡咁樣。你喺呢度就講每一個嘅危險嘅彎佢哋嘅地點、佢個方向、佢個路面同埋相關嘅相片，就係你有一千五百個嘅路段有研究過嘅提議，你就係提出咗三十一個嘅建議。呢個一千五百個所謂嘅研究，係咪就係喺你呢一千五百個研究裏面，你就搵出呢個二十九個最有問題嘅彎位呢？

鄭桂興先生：Yes。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我哋聽嗰二十九個彎位係邊二十九個？你記唔記得呢？

鄭桂興先生：已經事隔咗成年，咁樣大部分都係忘記咗，只有個別，例如我喺個 paper 寫嗰四個，我就好清楚，可以 list out 出嚟，而我頭先較早之前，就我作供就有解釋過，我哋大部分嗰啲彎位，呢二十九個彎位都係集中喺郊區，因為市區日常都好塞車、好多紅綠燈，咁樣嗰啲車長就冇機會去超速，但係喺市區之外，即係郊區，佢哋通常行嗰啲 highway，就有機會會發生呢個超速或者駕駛態度不正確嘅行為出現，尤其是由嗰個 highway 落番個市鎮，好似我以上提供嗰四個地點都係一個 highway 行緊 70 或者 80，突然間要減速去番 50，落番嗰個市中心呢，就多數個危險就會出現。

呢二十九個，對唔住，我因為冇晒紀錄，我一啲紀錄都冇喺個手度，我只係憑記憶記到四個，以及二十九個呢個急彎嘅數字，我就好清晰可以回答到你個問題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，鄭先生。你嘅陳述書就係講話呢個研究就係同呢個 2009 年將軍澳嘅巴士意外有關嘅，我就想睇一睇一個立法會嘅文件，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前。就鄭先生，你可唔可以描繪一下呢四個地方，你記

得嗰四個地方，嗰個有急彎嘅地方，你可唔可以描繪一下？

鄭桂興先生：我可以舉例，就由觀塘道近住彩虹交匯處，佢有兩條天橋係四線行車，突然間佢會 cut 做兩線，出番土瓜灣，兩線就上番西貢嗰個道路，佢個弧度係大約 230 度喽，大約 230 度喽，如果架巴士喺觀塘行緊 70 公里嘅，佢要上條 ramp，即係 uphill 上嗰個 ramp，嗰個 ramp 係一個弧度 230 嘅，佢要急轉彎，落番去呢個彩虹交匯處，然後先至可以選擇去新蒲崗或者選擇去西貢，呢個彎係單線行車嘅，咁樣嗰度係冇樹木嘅，因為佢係高架橋嚟嘅，但係個路面就經常性就有啲雜物，即係嗰啲貨車遺留咗啲雜物喺嗰個路面度，亦都包括有啲油跡。

咩嘢為之油跡呢？就係啲電單車或者私家車佢燒唔完嘅偈油會遺留咗喺個路面度，就溝成一個薄膜，呢個薄膜就會令到嗰啲車行駛時間好容易蹦呔，如果用安全嘅速度 50 去行，如果前面係好暢通無阻，你會有機會用 50 呢個限速係過唔到呢個 230 度嘅彎，因為一，佢係地面可能會有蹦，二，佢亦都個弧度咁大，尤其是雙層巴士你有個重量嘅，亦都喺個行駛個--加速嗰陣時行駛，有個 acceleration，有 acceleration 呢，去到個彎嗰個心嗰度，我哋叫“apex”，嗰個 apex 嗰個彎嘅中心，佢會產生一種離心力嘅，我哋叫做“G force”，嗰個 G force，你架車越重，你架車行得越快，個 G force 就越大，就令到你架巴士反側嘅機會亦都會大。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪講緊一個嘅例子，就話架車如果由 70 轉到去 50 嘅公里行車，就會有出現呢個情況，係咪一個咁嘅例子呢？

鄭桂興先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係其中一個例子，另外嗰啲呢？

鄭桂興先生：另外一個，以我記憶，就係喺呢個馬鞍山，就由呢個大老山隧道一路向住馬料水方向，佢去到呢個馬鞍山呢個錦英苑咁上下嘅屋邨，佢有一個左轉嘅彎嘅，佢個左轉嘅彎嘅弧度係超過 180 度，咁樣亦都係由 80 公里或者 70 公里，70 公里轉番 50 公里，佢左轉嘅彎落番去呢個馬鞍山市區，嗰個彎其實同我頭先講，喺呢個觀塘道上呢個彩虹嘅彎位，佢係大同小異，只係一個彩虹道去呢個--觀塘道去彩虹道嗰個彎就係向右急轉 230 度落番去呢個彩虹交匯處，而馬鞍山，即係大老山公路去呢個馬鞍山，佢就係左轉，咁樣佢嗰個弧度、個行車嘅路同呢個頭先以上表述係差唔多，唯一佢亦都有個隔音屏，呢個落馬鞍山嗰度佢有個隔音屏，個視線就有機會就冇好似喺觀塘道落去彩虹交匯處嗰個視野度係咁好，換句話講，係差啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。呢個係第二個例子，其餘嗰兩個可唔可以都解釋埋呀？你記得嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你要講嘅其實就係話嗰啲地點喺邊，嗰個彎度係幾多就得㗎喇，呢啲先係有關嘅即係我哋想知嘅嘢。

鄭桂興先生：嗰個彎度嘅弧度，我哋唔係用GPS...

主席：（經傳譯員）首先你講個地點先。

鄭桂興先生：Okay，okay，第一個地點就係將軍澳廣明道（原文照錄）迴旋處，第二個就係茶果嶺道北行左轉鯉魚門道西行，第三個就係我頭先描述過，就係大老山公路北行落石門就上馬鞍山方向，及第四個，觀塘道西行轉上清水灣道急彎。咁樣頭先尾嗰兩個我講咗，咁樣我首先先講一講呢個將軍澳廣明道（原文照錄）嗰個，就因為2009年11月發生一個兩死幾傷嘅車禍，時任嘅MD，就當我上任，已經畀咗一個mission我，就係話要研究下呢個迴旋處有啲乜嘢改善嘅空間。

咁樣我上咗任之後，我自己親身都去過呢個將軍澳廣明道（原文照錄）嗰個迴旋處去實地考察，佢嗰個情況亦都係一個highway，即係高速公路，經過一個迴旋處，就左轉入番呢個廣明道（原文照錄）嗰個屋邨，我忘記咗個名，而呢個彎道係一個360度嘅，佢係一個迴旋處嚟嘅，你如果行錯咗方向，你可以沿住嗰個迴旋處再行多360度再選擇你所入嗰個駛入道嘅。咁樣嗰個廣明道（原文照錄）嗰個就其實如果你喺50公里或者低過50公里去入去，係個問題唔大嘅，但係如果你喺個雨天或者夜晚黑嘅視野冇咁好，你就唔能夠用番50公里呢個限速去進入，因為會好容易產生危險。

咁樣另外一個就係茶果嶺道北行左轉鯉魚門道西行，呢個就喺觀塘嘅，觀塘郵政署對埋去嗰個彎位嘅，亦都係一個highway，左彎落番去呢個入觀塘嘅通道嘅，佢亦都係由70公里轉為50公里，咁樣佢亦都嘅特性又係呢一個單線嘅，即係單線嘅行車，好似我以上咁樣表達，如果你利用到50公里，係有機會係會超速嘅，雖然運輸署講到有晒路牌、有晒啲箭咀話前面彎路，但係有時我哋嗰啲司機未必真係全程咁專心，我哋嗰啲司機係好專業嘅，但係突然之間有一刻佢忘記咗或者踩嘅油門嘅協調嗰度唔係咁好，就有機會超過50公里，會駛入一個路口就會產生危險。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭生，而家請你睇番一份文件，係意外之後，就立法會有一份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個意外呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）屯門公路意外，2012年，呢份立法會文件就喺260-443，係而家TU文件冊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）再講多次個號碼。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係1B文件冊，260-443-20。呢份係一個2012年11月27

號交通事務委員會嘅特別會議嘅文件，呢個就係講緊話專營巴士營運嘅安全同埋係好長嘅落斜嘅路上面嘅安全嘅背景資料，如果大家睇下第 6 段嘅話，就有提到喺西沙公路 2008 年 5 月 1 號嘅致命交通意外導致十八名嘅乘客死亡、四十四人受傷。再睇落幾段，就係話運輸署亦都做咗一個全港性嘅檢討，就係睇下有乜嘢好長叫做「長命斜」呢啲落斜嘅路，總共就發現喺全港係有二十九個咁樣嘅落斜嘅路段嘅，然後喺附件 I，就見到呢一度呢啲路段嘅一個表，喺 260-443-29 頁就見到喇。鄭生，請你睇下呢二十九個地點嘅路段，睇下你提到嗰四個路段可唔可以喺呢個表度搵到？

鄭桂興先生：喺嗰個 260-443-29 嗰度，第 1 頁全部都係集中香港嘅，喺呢個 260-443-30，其中有一個就係 15，Clear Water Bay Road 牛池灣，呢個係我本人有睇過，就係同我頭先睇嗰個--我研究嗰個係唔同，大家一個係 upstream，一個係 downstream 嘅。咁樣再睇落呢個新界嗰度，係冇嘅，係冇嘅。另外我想--我補充，2008 年我仲未職呢個 Senior Manager SSQ。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我明白嘅。鄭生，即係你做嘅研究都係好寶貴，因為你就做咗一個好仔細嘅研究，呢個工作就睇下喺新界其實你係睇咗幾多道路呀？

鄭桂興先生：係好多，但係個數目係答你唔到，因為我嘅職責係喺關於安全--駕駛安全嗰度嘅，咁樣我嘅 frequency 去跟車係每個月起碼一次，我嘅跟車嘅方式就係用便裝，不預先通知嘅情況下去乘搭我哋公司嘅車輛，尤其是我 from the very beginning 我都講，喺郊區嗰個安全係好容易被我哋啲車長忽視，所以我個 frequency 係好頻密，我每個月起碼一次、兩次去搭嗰啲車，包括由元朗搭呢個 968 去到天后，喺天后再搭車搭番去屯門，咁樣其實我呢個屬於係 working trip，我會記低有關嗰啲危險嘅路段，咁樣亦都回報番畀我時任嘅 supervisor Mr Gary Wong，所以喺篩選嗰二十九個急彎，我係提供咗好多意見，亦都被接納嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。而家請你睇下 96-6，呢一頁係你嘅意見書，你呢段你就話有三十一個安全駕駛建議嘅，就係嚟自呢個研究，你記唔記得呢啲安全駕駛建議即係乜嘢？又或者係關於咩嘢，大概？

鄭桂興先生：大部分都係牽涉到呢一個駕駛態度嘅問題，亦都有部分就牽涉到行車嘅速度問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）駕駛態度咩嘢意思呀？

鄭桂興先生：駕駛態度就係嗰個車長會唔會好專心去揸車，會唔會突然之間好似以上嘅作供者所提及嘅突然加速、突然間剎車、突然之間攞軚，因為佢突然之間攞軚，有機會會影響架雙層巴士嘅 centre of gravity，如果--我舉一個例子講，一個彎，一個大約 30 度嘅彎，如果佢用一秒或者一秒以上去順住嗰個彎位去攞軚，佢所需可能一秒、一點五秒或者兩秒，但係如果嗰個車長駕駛嗰陣時佢用零點一秒過同一個 30 度嘅彎，就會令到架車就會好 sliding，我唔知中文叫咩嘢，係「西」，會甩尾，會「西」，會 sliding 咁樣出去嘅，咁樣令到

坐喺車嘅乘客或者甚至乎企喺度嘅乘客佢會失去重心。你 get 唔 get 到個意思？零點一秒轉一個彎同一秒去轉一個彎係唔同嘅，呢個係一個駕駛態度嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講到話有一啲係同駕駛速度有關，你咁樣畀建議嘅時候，有冇建議某啲路段係時速 70 公里嘅嗰啲巴士車長係應該駕駛嘅速度係低過法定許可嗰個駕駛速度呢，你有冇咁樣建議呀？

鄭桂興先生：首先，我哋而家巴士就已經 equip 咗一個 devices，就係 70 公里嘅限速，佢行到 70，佢再踩油，佢都唔會超越 70，但係如果佢嗰架車係落緊斜，或者甚至乎個駕駛態度，回歸番駕駛態度，佢 off 波咁樣行，嗰架車速就有機會超越咗 70 公里，咁樣如果你問我係咪建議啲車長行到 70 呢，我嗰個答案係 no，因為我哋係要小心安全駕駛，一定唔能夠超過嗰個法定限速，如果佢低過 70 或者 68，我係好 appreciate 嘅，但係你唔好因為個駕駛態度或者其他嘅事，行 70 公里呢，佢可能心情唔好或者有啲嘢煩擾住佢，咁樣佢行到 25，我就唔 recommend。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第 96-7，你就話有一啲嘅提示卡，就已經印製咗，就可以分發畀所有相關路線嘅車長，你有冇參與係製作呢啲嘅細小嘅提示卡嘅呢？

鄭桂興先生：冇，但係我可以補充，頭先楊生佢提供就話印製啲小卡係 2013 或者 2014，個答案係唔啱嘅，印製呢個小卡，個小卡嘅 size 就係兩吋闊、3 吋高，一張卡仔嚟嘅，係 summarise 咗嗰嗰二十九個急彎嘅道路位置、嗰個方向、個行車嗰個安全時速，就喺張卡嗰度，但係好不幸，呢張卡係我退咗休、離咗職先至去預備、去印，我亦都同我時任嘅上司 Mr Gary Wong 口中聽到，係已經準備晒，印好...

主席：（經傳譯員）好，你就不如話你自己知道啲乜嘢嘢，而唔好話人哋話畀你聽啲乜嘢嘢，你明唔明白個分別呀？即係你...

鄭桂興先生：明白，明白，understand。

主席：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇見過呢啲嘅小卡呢？

鄭桂興先生：冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）96-8，第 7 條問題，你就係話--你話「我好失望，因為我聽到安全」...

主席：（經傳譯員）就我希望就係話佢呢個證人佢自己知啲乜嘢就好喇，就唔好再問其他。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄭先生，你識唔識一個程艾樂先生？

鄭桂興先生：識。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺你嘅研究裏面，就關於呢二十九個急彎嘅研究之中，你有冇同程艾樂先生一齊合作過呢？

鄭桂興先生：冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當你喺九巴在職嘅時候，你有冇機會同程艾樂先生一齊工作呢？就住專營巴士安全嘅事宜？

鄭桂興先生：冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我已經完成我嘅提問。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄭先生，好多謝你今日就嚟協助我哋，同埋提供個證供，我哋非常之多謝你，而呢個部分已經係完成，我哋會有另外一個啲證供人，然後我哋而家暫時係小休嘅，唔該晒。

鄭桂興先生：唔該。

下午4時05分押聆訊押後

下午4時15分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安，唔好意思，我哋晏咗先開始做你呢部分，不過你都應該見到我哋頭先係聽取其他證人嘅證供，而家我哋係恢復聽你嗰方面嘅證供，黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒各位今日嚟嘅。尋日我就問咗一啲問題，關於休息設施嘅，喺你嘅意見書有提過，就係7月16號交嚟嘅，係附件七，就講麗閣邨嗰個休息設施，我知道劉先生就攞到啲新嘅資料，關於麗閣呢一個嘅休息設施，而家可以補充嘅。

劉啟謙先生：多謝主席，我哋根據番我哋附件七嘅地點，都有做過一啲 review 嘅，其實發現即係以黃律師嗰個例子麗閣邨，係已經裝咗呢個休息室㗎喇。我想喺呢度指出一點，就係九龍巴士公司喺處理休息室呢個議題上面係較新巴、城巴積極嘅，大部分嘅地方其實都有盡過佢哋嘅努力去安裝呢個休息室。不下於所講嘅麗閣邨，喺個表列裏面嘅青衣碼頭、九龍城碼頭同埋呢個長宏總站等等嘅地方，都係有裝咗休息室嘅。

我哋見到其實嗰個積極性係較新巴、城巴係好嘅，其實新巴、城巴，我哋見到多年嚟，好似鯽魚涌呢啲個案係長久以嚟都仲未裝到休息室，涉及當然好多唔同嘅因素嘅問題，但係我哋如果對比起兩間公司嚟講，九巴嗰個情況係較新巴、城巴係積極嘅。當然嗰個休息室嘅面積或者嗰個可能設備未去到最完善，但係基本，微波爐、雪櫃、飲水機呢啲基本嘅休息設施其實係有提供到畀巴士嘅員工去使用嘅。

另外我想補充多一點，就係休息室嗰個問題上，我哋有一個位置面臨緊一個清拆嘅危機，就係尖沙咀碼頭巴士總站，我哋收到海濱事務委員會園境師學會有一份文件，就話就提議就話將尖沙咀巴士碼頭嗰個總站就清拆，而嗰個總站本身牽涉嘅路線係十分之多嘅，而呢一個建議已經喺海濱事務委員會討論咗，而我哋亦都已經去信畀運輸署，要求運輸署解釋幾樣嘢嘅，嗰個總站拆咗之後邊度擺嗰個巴士；第二，就係個總站拆咗之後，員工係冇休息嘅地方嘅，而嗰個總站本身人流以至到車流量係十分之多嘅。

呢啲問題運輸署到而家係未解答到我哋，而我哋都十分之擔心，就係尖沙咀碼頭巴士總站嗰個設施其實係十分之完善嘅，如果佢被清拆的話，第一，嗰度大量路線佢哋個 propose 就係話變做普通嘅巴士站，就肯定冇足夠嘅休息地方畀員工㗎喇。我哋好擔心就係話遲啲會唔會再有其他嘅例子會係咁樣。而我手上有一份係園境師學會嘅文件可以呈畀委員會參考嘅。多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪一份你想我哋睇嘅文件呀？

劉啟謙先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇副本？

劉啟謙先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就個副本。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家我哋去影印。

許漢傑先生：唔使影印㗎喇。

劉啟謙先生：我畀咗你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒劉先生。喺你其中一份附件，附件十八，我可唔可以簡述一下你提過啲乜嘢呢？喺你嘅意見書係咁講嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先講頁數。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係附件十八，係補充文件冊，由工會提交嘅，2018年7月16號提交嘅，入面就有一封信，就係2007年6月28號嘅，中文版本就喺522，應該係260-522，英文就係260-523-22。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個文件冊？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係TU文件冊。

主席：（經傳譯員）嘅邊個？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）1(C)。呢封信日期就係2016年嘅11月嘅24號，由你嘅會寫畀運輸署嘅，我淨係有一個問題我有興趣嘅，就係第1.1至1.3段，你就邀請運輸署考慮有一個三方嘅磋商會議去傾下新建巴士總站嘅設計同埋配套問題；喺1.3段，你就話希望署方就有啲常設會議，有巴士公司同埋係工會代表，呢個就係260-513-8頁嘅，即係話有常設會議係有署方、巴士公司同埋工會嘅參與，有恆常會議去溝通、協商巴士業相關嘅事項，其中包括新、舊站頭設施嘅設計。

喺其中一個運輸署嘅回覆，260-523-22，就見到似乎佢哋考慮呢一個建議就唔應該係三方嘅，而係建議你透過巴士公司提出嘅，呢個260-523-22嘅第二段，「喺考慮新嘅巴士總站設計，喺用新嘅意見之外，運輸署亦都會考慮到嗰個情況，譬如係話有幾多條路線、人流方向、有幾多乘客同埋係巴士嘅運作需要咁樣，亦都會係諮詢有關巴士公司嘅意見，睇下佢哋對於個設計有咩關注，如果職方有任何意見嘅，對於巴士總站設計同埋設施嘅話，職方係可以向公司反映，而署方認為現行機制係有效。」

似乎運輸署係拒絕你嘅要求有三方嘅協商嘅會議，係咪咁呀？

劉啟謙先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講下另一個題目，係年終嘅勤工獎金，我想請你睇番你嘅意見書，第二份，260-94頁，呢個英文版，中文260-57頁，你睇到個文件未呀？

劉啟謙先生：（經傳譯員）睇到。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家問你呢個問題，你提到年終勤工獎，係唔係除咗安全同埋良好表現獎之外，九巴係而家提供勤工獎畀車長㗎？

劉啟謙先生：應該咁樣講，安全同埋呢一個叫安全獎金、一個勤工獎金呢啲其實已經係納入咗巴士車長嗰個底薪入面，而文件上面(a)嗰度講緊嗰個係年尾有一份獎金嘅，而呢份獎金九巴已經喺18年承諾咗取消咗呢個年終獎金嘅制度，就改以一個雙糧嘅形式向員工發放。而呢個之前所謂嘅年終獎金係要需要經過一個評核，去評定員工分呢個一、二、三、四同埋無法評級去釐訂嗰個獲取嗰個金額，其實本身係兩樣唔同嘅嘢嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）2018年九巴係幾時同意取消年終獎金嘅呢？

劉啟謙先生：大約係5月至6月期間係承諾咗取消呢個年終獎金嘅制度，改以一個雙糧嘅制度，而實際通告發出畀員工嘅日期係6月份嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇嗰個通知嘅副本呀？即係通知員工。

劉啟謙先生：副本係公司出嘅通告嚟嘅，係喇，可以問到九龍巴士公司攞到，如果委員會係想要一份嘅，我可以提供到畀委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

劉啟謙先生：另外林生佢想補充埋新巴嗰個獎金嘅情況。

林錦標先生：係，新巴同城巴因為同一個管理層，所以就個獎金，安全獎、勤工獎、服務獎就响今年嘅 3 月就已經將佢歸納咗落個底薪裏面，但係响--我再要補充一下，呢個獎金嘅嘢，我哋已經响多年前已經向公司反映嘅，就話呢啲獎金、津貼就係薪酬嘅一部分，係應該係要放落去底薪嗰度去一併去計呢個薪酬嘅，但係奈何新巴、城巴係好--一路都用種種嘅理由就拒絕咗嘅。自從發生咗一件慘劇之後，公司就係話因應個市場先去將呢啲津貼先肯擺落去，我哋對呢個遲來嘅安慰--我當佢安慰獎，即係好過冇喇，因為我哋係多年已經係去爭取㗎喇，唔係話發生事先去爭取，因為我哋係睇到呢個問題係困擾咗啲同事，因為同事個底薪一路都係咁低嘅，所以我哋係希望不斷咁向公司去反映，呢個係我哋嘅補充。其他有冇補充？

劉啟謙先生：黃律師，相關新巴職工會同資方談判提過相關資料，其實附件十七已經有一份會議紀錄詳列咗出嚟，新巴職工會其實喺 17 年已經有同資方提出話將勤工同埋安全獎金納入底薪嗰度，其實已經唔係話一段短時間去爭取，而係長時間去爭取，但係較舊嘅會議紀錄，新巴職工會已經遺失咗，暫時未提供到，但係暫時附件十七嗰份係證明咗佢哋一直以嚟係有同資方係有講呢一樣嘢嘅。

林錦標先生：鍾生有少少補充。

鍾松輝先生：主席，唔好意思，我都想喺呢個問題嗰度補充少少。今朝林生所講嘅，就每個月嗰啲甚麼勤工獎、安全獎嗰啲撥晒落去而家嘅底薪，由 3 月份開始，主要嘅原因就係基於因為大家都知，發生咗兩宗嘅巴士慘劇，公司同我哋講，就係因應嗰個社會個輿論個壓力非常之大，因為我哋底薪係偏低嘅，所以佢就將呢個所有津貼就撥落呢個底薪嗰度。

除咗呢一樣嘢，正話劉生就講緊話年尾獎金，我哋嘅年尾獎金就係有--應該新制同舊制嘅，舊制嘅就係雙糧嚟嘅，就冇任何條件，就雙糧，就係發放一個月呢個年尾雙糧。如果新制嘅同事，佢就要符合公司嘅條件，例如如果你請病假就會畀少啲嘅，根據你全年請咗幾多日病假，係因應你嘅病假、請假或者你有其他被投訴嘅，佢都會扣減你嗰個年尾獎金，所以呢樣嘢就形成對嗰啲前線嘅車長，好多新嘅車長所以就留唔得得耐，有啲做咗一年半載就走㗎喇。

林錦標先生：許生仲有一個補充，唔該。城巴嘅。

許漢傑先生：城巴同新巴有個年尾獎金有啲唔同嘅，城巴有三個制度，第一個制度就係最耐嘅員工，做得最耐嘅員工，嗰啲叫做雙糧；第二批就好似我呢批就係叫做酬金，酬金嘅包含裏面就係有三樣嘢，第一樣嘢係底薪，第二樣嘢就係個

OT，全年嘅 OT 嘅除番 12 嘅三分一，呢個係酬金，呢個係第二批。

第三批就係新，我哋叫做合約車長呢批，就係相當於而家改咗制之後，就變咗一個月嘅底薪。呢個佢哋有評級嘅，其中一個評級就係因為如果佢一年裏面個出勤嗰度會扣，會扣咗譬如係缺勤一日就扣一日，佢個底薪除三百六十五日，就扣一日嘅人工，如是者推論，就係病假好、工傷假好、事假好，佢都係咁樣扣㗎喇。仲有一個扣，就係佢如果喺日常工作有簽--有 warning，有警告信，唯一一個警告信會扣嘅就係最後警告，就會扣。點樣扣法呢？就係如果有一個最後警告佢只係收嗰個年終特別獎金嘅七五折，係底薪嘅七五折，就大致上城巴就係咁樣。

至於呢個年終特別獎金，合約方面，事關城巴由 05 年開始請合約員工，初初係冇年終獎金嘅，但係一路我哋爭取以嚟，到而家都有一個規模，但係喺呢個年終--即係新人嗰個合約個年終特別獎金呢度，我哋有一樣嘢係好反對，就係如果佢因為缺勤而導致要減呢個年終特別獎金嘅人工，我覺得喺我哋城巴職工會嚟講，係覺得唔合理。

點解唔合理呢？就係因為佢有事、佢病或者工傷或者係婚假或者係白事假，佢先至請假，呢個問--有啲呢啲假唔係佢可以控制到。我覺得如果咁樣扣合約同事呢啲人工，我覺得--喺我哋工會立場，更加係唔合理。大致補充完畢。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有聽過一個制度，係九巴嘅制度嚟嘅，或者郭先生可以幫幫手，就有一個嘅裝置係有四眼燈嘅，就會話畀嗰個司機聽，有四種嘅，譬如話你係超速，就係突然之間剎車、突然之間加速，即係有三個呢啲咁嘅情況出現，...

主席：（經傳譯員）同埋空轉嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）...引擎空轉。郭先生，你記唔記得呢個咁嘅裝置喺巴士上面幾時裝置呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以我哋去睇一睇嗰個相關嘅照片？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係 BM 文件冊第 65 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個 Openmatics 呢間公司提供嘅文件嚟嘅，佢話畀我哋聽呢個就預警系統係點樣樣，係有四眼嘅紅色燈嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一個屯門車廠嘅經理話畀我哋聽呢個就係個 LED 嘅燈嘅系統嚟嘅，就會話畀個司機聽如果呢啲其中一種嘅情況出現，佢哋個司機就會通知佢㗎喇。你記唔記得呢個 LED 系統嘅燈光系統喺九巴幾時安置喺個巴士上面嘅呢？

劉啟謙先生：2013年，2013年安裝，開始試驗。

郭偉光先生：2013年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。佢哋都講到另外一個嘅系統，就如果你就去返工嘅時候、開工嘅時候，你就喺休息室嗰度就拍你個八達通卡，就喺八達通卡嘅讀卡器嗰度就拍一下，佢就會自動就話畀你聽你係一個綠色、黃色或者係紅色嘅司機，你可唔可以確認其實喺九巴就係用緊呢一種系統呢？

郭偉光先生：係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）點樣運作嘅呢？你拍卡，其實你通常就會見到啲乜嘢嘢㗎，喺個讀卡器嗰度？

郭偉光先生：通常我開工，去到站頭拍第一下卡，就會有呢個顯示嘅，通常都綠色嘅。

劉啟謙先生：主席，我有補充，其實紅色--有紅色、黃色同綠色，就係根據呢個box所收集嘅數據去評估個車長個駕駛嘅安全情況，而綠色就會同佢哋講話佢哋嗰個駕駛係安全、環保都達標嘅，需要改善就當然係黃色，而唔理想就當然係紅色。

但係我所觀察，之前係出過一個獎勵計劃嘅，就就住呢個盒子出咗一個獎勵計劃，就係統計番車長如果做得駕駛係環保、係達標嘅話，其實係有獎勵嘅，但係呢一個獎勵我已經一段時間都見唔到有呢個獎勵嘅資料出嚟。但係呢個盒子而家係仍然喺九巴嘅巴士係有運作，而頭先黃大律師所講嗰個系統仍然係亦都係存在。

車長其實每一次用佢哋嘅八達通卡去總站報到嘅時候，個電腦螢幕都會顯示個顏色，去提示番個車長個駕駛個表現係咪理想。而我所知，呢個黑色嘅四個燈嘅盒子，其實本身係駁住一個全球衛星定位系統嘅，藉以去監察車長嗰個駕駛嘅表現，從而就得出嗰個黃色、紅色同綠色嗰個數據出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢個咁樣嘅紅、綠、黃就係指譬如你喺駕駛嘅邊一段時間嘅資料嚟嘅呢？意思即係你係駕駛嗰個日期或者係邊一段嘅期間嘅資料就係...

郭偉光先生：係由開工至到收工嘅工作表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係首先你開工嘅時候，你就拍卡，你就會係有呢啲咁嘅燈出現㗎嘛，係咪？

郭偉光先生：係，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個咁嘅展示其實係咪講緊你琴日吖，係過一個星期或者過去一個月嘅表現呢？

劉啟謙先生：其實呢個表現係一個--我認為係一個可持續性嘅表現，因為你每一次其實拍嗰個八達通卡都係會有顯示提醒番你嗰個駕駛係屬於咩嘢顏色嘅，而呢個咩嘢顏色就冇話一個好籠統咁指定一個日子去評核嘅--即係評估，我認為係一個可持續性嘅提示嚟嘅，即係每一次你拍八達通卡喺嗰度報到嘅時候，其實都會顯示嗰個顏色話畀你聽你係乜嘢嘅表現。咁樣呢個表現其實都唔會話特定一個日子或者時間畀你睇到嘅。郭生，有冇補充？

主席：（經傳譯員）有人話畀我哋聽其實係有，係有一段特定嘅日子，如果你唔知道嘅時候，你就話畀我哋聽唔知喇。

郭偉光先生：係，自己個人嘅記憶之中，就係應該係大概一個禮拜，佢提示一個禮拜之前嘅表現嘅日期嘅，有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋喺個螢幕上睇到，呢個有四個嘅條件，可能就會係有一啲嘅預警嘅情況，你知唔知道譬如話其實如果個引擎空轉得太耐，就會可能影響到你嗰個顏色嘅，譬如話你喺呢一個巴士站或者嗰個有空轉嘅情況，會唔會有一個紅色燈畀你呢，你知唔知道大致上嘅情況係點呢？

郭偉光先生：係有個聲響提示嘅，同埋有個著燈嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白嘅，我明白嘅。譬如話你引擎空轉太耐，有燈光，然後同埋有個聲響，會唔會--因為咁嘅時候，你一個星期之後，當你去拍嗰個卡嘅時候，你就會睇到一個紅色嘅燈，係會唔會咁樣發生呢？

郭偉光先生：佢係攞一個平均嘅數據嘅咋，唔會話因為一次半次而會有呢個後果嘅，即係你經常性咁樣發生，佢先至會有一個提示。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇人話畀你聽其實實際成個系統係點樣去運作嘅呢，嗰啲細節有冇人講過畀你聽？

郭偉光先生：唔知。劉生有冇補充？細節。唔知道，冇呢個解釋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道嗰啲數值係幾多，個限值，即係去到幾多就會令到佢有聲響或者會著燈，喺巴士車長嗰個駕駛室嗰度，你知唔知道譬如話係加速或者減速個限值去到幾多就會著呢？

郭偉光先生：我揸過好多唔同嘅巴士，唔同嘅車佢嗰部機嘅反應同埋出嚟嘅效果都唔同嘅，有啲係好敏感嘅，啲啲都會響嘅，例如大腳啲油，例如重少少 brake 或者掂到 brake 嘅時間嘅問題，或者係扭軚過急，佢--有啲車係特別敏感，但係有啲車就冇乜反應，呢個系統嘅效果係反應不一嘅，我嘅感覺係。

主席：（經傳譯員）舉個例，車速，你知唔知道行到咩嘢車速，嗰度個警示就會響？

郭偉光先生：超過 70 係會響嘅，70 公里係會響。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話你喺一個 50 公里嘅路段，你行緊 60，佢就唔會響，係咪

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

咁呀？

郭偉光先生：行緊50，佢唔會--我未見過佢響囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個系統裝咗五年，即係喺個 50 公里嘅限速嘅路段，佢係冇響嘅？

郭偉光先生：係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒郭生。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講番八達通卡個讀卡嘅系統，顯示番紅、黃、綠色，即係司機嗰個顏色係幾時實施㗎？

郭偉光先生：五年前，2013。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係當你有呢一個嘅 LED 嘅燈光系統嗰陣時，一齊裝嘅？

郭偉光先生：應該係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。講番呢個題目，我有一個問題問你，劉先生頭先就提到你以前有一個獎金嘅計劃，就係根據駕駛表現嘅，而家就似乎就冇呢個制度，係咪劉先生係咁嘅意思呀？

劉啟謙先生：係，冇錯，yes。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係個獎勵係點樣㗎？

劉啟謙先生：第一，由於個時間都隔咗好遠，個實際嗰個內容，我個印象已經唔清晰，但係初期推行嘅時候係有個海報--類似海報嘅東西我係見過，就話呢個係一個計劃係提示啲車長去駕駛係環保嘅--個出發點係環保嘅，同埋安全，如果達標嘅話，係會有獎勵嘅，但係就冇--實際嗰個操作同埋嗰個相關 details 嘅內容，我已經忘記咗，但係我係有印象同埋記憶係有提過係話有獎勵呢一個東西喺嗰個盒子入面嘅，但係之後我已經唔再聽見話有獎勵同埋相關嘅內容㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）郭先生，你有冇收過呢個獎？

郭偉光先生：有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個獎係乜嘢呀？係畀錢定係生果，定係咩嘢，畀汽球你？

郭偉光先生：你係講緊係咪個紅、綠、黃燈個表現嗰個？

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

郭偉光先生：應該係一個--同一個即係升級車長嗰個有啲關係。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係唔係金錢，唔係即刻話畀錢你嗰種獎金？

郭偉光先生：唔係畀錢嘅，唔係畀錢。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒郭生。歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）郭生，我想問一條問題，你作為車長，你覺得呢個制度對於工作有冇幫助？

郭偉光先生：即係你講而家監察嗰個燈嗰個制度？

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

郭偉光先生：都有。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）郭先生、劉先生，你記唔記得呢個嘅獎勵制度係幾時實施㗎？會唔會係你開始有呢個紅、黃、綠嘅制度嘅時候？

劉啟謙先生：第一，嗰個燈號裝嗰個年份，我可以好肯定係 2013 年嘅，因為喺 2013 年我工作期間係初初接觸過呢個燈號，我收到車長有反映過畀我聽話初初佢哋唔習慣呢個盒仔，個聲響好嘈同埋不停咁樣著燈，所以佢哋就係話有唔慣，所以我就好肯定當時裝呢個盒係 2013 年嘅。但係係咪隨住--伴隨住嗰個獎勵制度一齊呢，呢個我已經冇咗嗰個記憶，但係我係有印象係見過係有海報係話有一個獎勵嘅制度，如果佢做得好，係會有獎勵嘅，但係實際嗰個內容同埋獎勵啲乜嘢，我已經冇咗印象。

但係有一點我可以好清楚話到畀主席聽，呢個盒子係 2013 年開始係同我哋講話開始使用，去到而家都仍然係繼續係有用呢個黑色四盞燈嘅盒子。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果呢個系統係再實施嘅，就係話有...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋頭先聽到係咁嘅，講緊有個獎勵可能係升級個問題，但係唔係金錢嘅獎勵。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果話有人建議就話係當獎金咁樣發放，係根據司機車長嗰個顏色，如果你持續攞到綠色嘅，即係話你駕駛良好嘅話，就會有獎金，...

主席：（經傳譯員）而家講緊係獎金。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）...錢，如果咁樣建議嘅話，你覺得有冇幫助，有冇用，對於加強車長嘅安全意識，有冇用，有冇幫助？

劉啟謙先生：第一，逢係有獎勵計劃--即係有獎勵嘅嘢，其實喺心理學嚟講，都係一個正面--對車長係有正面幫助。你話會唔會--分兩樣嘢嚟講，首先，如果你話有呢個盒子，個達標綠色而有獎金嘅，車長當然嗰個表現有機會可能係因為有

獎金呢個誘因而令到佢個表現係會提升。

但係有一點我諗要講清楚，就係安全意識係唔會隨住呢個獎金而增加嘅，即使有獎金嘅誘因喺度，如果假設個車長個安全意識係唔足夠嘅，呢個獎金亦都未必有一定嘅肯定同埋幫助改善佢哋駕駛嗰個安全性嘅，但係因為係兩樣唔同嘅概念嚟嘅，一個獎勵當然我覺得一定係有正面嘅鼓勵同埋一個幫助，但係你話會唔會提升佢哋嗰個安全意識呢，其實個人認為單靠呢四盞燈係唔可能完全改變一個人駕駛嗰個安全意識嘅。呢個燈號純粹只係一個提醒同埋一個警剔畀佢哋，而呢個獎勵計劃係有助佢哋可能係會做好少少，但係個意識絕對係唔會因為呢四盞燈同埋有獎勵而提升，不外乎錢或者係其他嘅獎勵。

郭偉光先生：想補充少少，因為我頭先都講過，因為唔同嘅車嗰個設備，係會有唔同嘅反應嘅，有啲車好敏感，有啲車係冇乜反應嘅，如果用呢個嚟鑑定嗰個車長佢個工作表現係有啲粗疏嘅，我覺得應該從其他方面去評核，比較滿意啲。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）郭先生，喺你嘅經驗，有冇遇過有一個車長一路都係紅色嘅呢？即係喺個制度底下，拍八達通卡，一路都係顯示紅色呢？

郭偉光先生：我冇見過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到九巴一個前僱員嘅證供，就係話有一張好細嘅卡仔係提醒通知啲巴士車長係有二十九個急彎，然後就提供一啲安全駕駛嘅貼士，你記唔記得有冇收過呢張卡仔呀？

郭偉光先生：係冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）劉生。

劉啟謙先生：我有補充，卡仔就的確係冇，亦都唔見過有呢啲卡仔，但係其實公司係有相關路段嘅安全提醒係放咗喺公司個內聯網上面嘅，而早期公司對員工係有要求佢哋係睇嗰個安全駕駛提示，係要去番內聯網嗰度睇番，提醒佢哋有啲特定嘅路段可能有危險，要提番佢哋要小心嘅，而嗰啲資料其實包含咗有圖片同埋文字嘅解釋嘅。

如果你話卡仔--話急彎卡仔，我都冇見過，但係路線嘅安全嘅資料其實放咗喺內聯網嘅，係，而家 screen 放出嚟嘅資料就係放咗內聯網裏面，車長係可以查得到、睇得到。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話公司係講緊九巴，係咪呀？

劉啟謙先生：係，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講唔講到你幾時開始係接觸到呢啲路段嘅喺內聯網嘅資料，係幾時有㗎？

劉啟謙先生：呢啲資料喺我入職大約 13 年嘅時候開始我已經有接觸到呢啲資料，已

經係有，有，一直係有上載，同埋其實大約係兩、三年前嘅，其實都仍然係有更新去搜集番一啲有安全問題或者隱患嘅路段，去擺番喺嗰個內聯網上面進行更新嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到兩、三年前佢哋都仲係更新緊啲資料，而家呢？

劉啟謙先生：而家有冇更新，我唔清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講另外一個問題，襲擊車長，你工會就都好重視呢一個問題，就提供咗好多嘅會議紀錄，喺你嘅意見書亦都有強調嘅，而家請你先就睇番你嘅意見書，就係 260-93 頁，呢個係英文版，中文版就係 260-56 頁，就提到話你哋嘅聯盟一路都有跟進車長被襲擊事件，你就話你嘅紀錄可能唔係齊全嘅，因為只係你嘅聯盟嘅成員通知你，先至會去支援嘅，但係過去聯盟對於巴士車長安全問題，一直同警方進行溝通，然後你就提供咗一個同運輸署嘅會議紀錄，2017年嘅6月嘅，呢個就喺附件十五嗰度。

就喺英文版係 260-73 頁，呢個就係關於乘客襲擊車長嘅，因此你就同運輸署開會同埋警方開會，同埋律政司嗰面開會？

劉啟謙先生：（經傳譯員）係，對。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想問一問，你對於譬如話啲監察嘅鏡頭有啲咩嘢嘅意見呢？有啲唔同嘅工會話畀我哋聽，大部分都係同意係就喺司機位嗰度裝置嗰啲嘅監察鏡頭，就可以保護車長同埋可以錄音同埋錄影就係相關嘅事件，你哋嘅工會就會唔會支持，就係話裝置呢啲嘅監察嘅鏡頭？

鍾松輝先生：我哋係同意嘅，同意就裝嗰啲閉路電視嘅，其實就係唔單只保障車長，甚至乎保障埋乘客添，因為有呢個 CCTV，咁可以證明到嗰個事實嗰個真相。

劉啟謙先生：我有少少補充，其實喺警方嘅會議裏面，其實警方都好強調舉證嗰個重要性，好多時車長襲擊呢啲事情都好依靠嗰個舉證，當然有閉路電視嘅片段，當然就可以將個經過可以還原得一清二楚，其一就可以保障到車長，亦都係保障乘客嘅，如果有呢啲閉路電視嘅片段去佐證車長被襲嘅話，我哋相信無論喺檢控，以至去法庭表達嗰個嚴重性上面，係會更加清晰同埋全面嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。相關嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前，咁多位，你哋有冇以前試過就喺法庭上面其實就有一啲閉路電視嘅片段就係展示到車長被襲嘅情況，有冇一啲個案你自己親身有經驗㗎？

鍾松輝先生：冇。

劉啟謙先生：冇，no.

主席： Yes, Mr Hui?

許漢傑先生：我有個案嘅，不過就係未有閉路電視嗰陣，不過就係有人證，嗰陣時係有人證證明嗰個乘客打我，就個結果就係佢罰款、留案底咁樣，但係喺我嘅經驗嚟講，如果有鏡頭嘅話，我哋可以唔使依靠去搵證人，事關其他乘客係比較怕事，就唔想去做證人，如果有呢個鏡頭，係會幫到我哋去有佐證，能夠證明嗰個乘客打車長，佢檢控嘅機會我覺得係高，同埋又係對我哋車長嚟講，一個好大嘅幫助。

劉啟謙先生：我有少少補充。我哋其實聯盟一直都同律政司同埋警方強調，我哋相信香港係一個行普通法、有法治嘅地區，舉證嘅責任喺控方嗰度，如果有CCTV作為襲擊車長做檢控的話，當然嗰個效果會更加好。我哋亦都多次同警方同埋律政司表達咗我哋對車長被襲嗰個擔憂，亦都要求咗律政司喺檢控嘅過程必須要同法庭強調車長被襲嗰個嚴重性不下於車長自己本身，乘客，以至其他道路使用者身上。

我哋一直都強調就我哋冇話要干預法庭嘅判刑，但係我哋留意到好多時車長畀人襲擊之後，往往施襲者嗰個判刑係冇阻嚇性，變相帶出一個好壞嘅訊息畀社會知道其實襲擊車長係一個低成本嘅犯法嘅刑事罪行。但係我哋覺得我哋巴士車長係冇理由，亦都經常係不合理地被襲擊嘅，呢樣嘢我覺得係唔應該。

而且法例亦都--230A，《公共巴士服務條例》亦都賦予咗車長有啲職權係法例上容許，亦都係我哋擁有嘅權力嚟嘅，但係調番轉我哋經常都係被施襲嗰一個，而我哋見唔到律政司有同司法機構有強調到打車長呢件事嘅嚴重性，亦都畀社會帶出一個好錯誤嘅訊息，就係其實打車長係一個好平常嘅事，亦都唔需要負刑責，調番轉，法例又如何可以保障到我哋車長嘅安全呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪同司法機關同埋--對唔住，係律政司同埋警方方面係有反映過你哋嘅意見㗎？

劉啟謙先生：冇錯，喺2017年6月30號嘅會議上面有反映過，我哋反映左兩個重點，第一，就係律政司喺檢控嘅過程裏面必須要同法庭同埋司法機構講得到襲擊車長嗰個嘅嚴重性，同埋對社會嗰個危害嘅問題；第二，就係我亦都同律政司指出，由於呢啲判刑都係輕，同埋車長都攞唔--嗰個帶唔到嗰個阻嚇性出嚟，我哋亦都要求過律政司係話檢控完成之後，應該要積極嘅跟進工作，包括就係同法庭講要上訴覆核刑期，呢啲都係喺我哋個會議紀錄裏面有提過嘅，我哋聯盟其實一直有同律政司重申我哋唔係話要干預呢個法庭嘅判決，我亦都每一次好尊重法庭嘅判決，但係我哋相信法治係香港最成功嘅基石，亦都係一個行普通法地區，呢樣嘢係我哋引以自豪，但係最大嘅問題係律政司嗰個工作上面，我哋見到佢帶唔到嗰個罪行嘅嚴重性出嚟，變相其實車長根本嗰個喺法律上嘅保障其實唔足夠，變相。如果你話係有啲例子，係可以係帶出嗰個嚴重性，判刑係話嚴重嘅，我哋相信係有一個好大嘅阻嚇性。

同埋仲有一點，我哋留意到警察喺處理呢啲被襲嘅案件嘅時候，其實好多時都唔清楚嗰個情況，有好多時車長可能又有嘢手嘅，被誤以為呢個打鬥；亦

都有啲情況下，嗰個警方會主動勸車長「不如息事寧人，和解喇。」我哋亦都有同警方強調過，230A 賦予我哋嘅權力其實係好大，滋擾車長其實係可以將嗰個乘客係移離個車廂度，呢啲係法例賦予咗畀我哋，但係警方好多前線嘅警務人員係唔清楚 230A 個實際嗰個操作嘅情況同埋個內容。

許漢傑先生：我有嘢補充。頭先就住我親身經驗，劉生講咗個情況，就係我喺醫院驗傷嗰陣，當未有人通知警察嗰陣，有證人嗰陣，佢就同我講，警察同我講「你不如和解，唔好搞咁多嘢，和解喇。」當我知道有證人嗰陣，我就同個警察講我要告。

好多時我作為工會理事長，做咗十幾年工會，我見到好多同事遇到呢啲咁嘅情況，警察係真係有叫佢哋「你不如和解，你又冇證人，好難舉證，好難告得佢入，就算告得入，都係罰款了事，對佢冇太大嘅阻嚇性，你不如和解算喇。」但係我覺得呢個情況喺我哋同律政司開會，同警察嘅代表、刑事部門嘅代表開會嗰陣，我哋有強調呢樣嘢，就係話警察本身係要維護一個弱勢社群，一個社群嘅--好似我哋車長畀人打完，你冇可能叫我哋和解。

同埋一樣嘢，就係去到上法庭，律政署嗰邊...

主席：（經傳譯員）許先生，你被襲嗰日係邊一日呀？日期係幾時呀？

許漢傑先生：好多年--十零年前，當我仲做緊通宵車長嗰陣。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺三年前嘅數據，我哋就有--或者有啲相關嘅資料係三年前，但係如果你話咁耐之前就冇喇。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，就為咗紀錄嘅原因，2017 年 6 月 30 號嗰個會議紀錄，佢哋提到嘅，劉生提到，就喺 TU，就係 TU 260-474 至到之後嗰幾頁嘅。呢個就係跟住就係講關於呢個保護罩嗰方面。有一個工會話畀我哋聽就用保護罩其實係有啲問題嘅，我就想問一問郭先生，就特別係九巴方面，我相信呢個係九巴嘅措施嚟嘅。你喺使用保護罩方面，你覺得有冇問題呢？就喺司機位附近裝置呢個保護罩有冇問題呢，你覺得？

郭偉光先生：裝置保護罩係冇問題，但係佢而家所裝置嘅情況係唔理想嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽點解呢？

郭偉光先生：因為嗰個保護罩涵括嘅範圍太過少，同埋佢太過--嗰個位置唔理想，同埋會有個阻礙視線嘅情況，另外一樣嘢就係個聲音，都有個聲音喺度，有個嘈吵嘅聲音喺度。另外一樣嘢就係有個建議，就應該係成幅過，唔好係得一半，得一半其實保護唔到我哋嘅，佢要打我哋，一樣打到，真係嘅，應該係由上至下會比較理想啲。

劉啟謙先生：呢一個問題林生同鍾生都有補充。

林錦標先生：其實我哋都有關於呢個車長被襲同埋裝呢個防被打嘅裝置，其實我哋响

運輸署都提咗一個意見嘅，因為我本人就曾經就去過英國，睇到英國嘅巴士，就因為我哋香港嘅巴士亦都係個型號亦都係英國嘅，但係英國巴士就係司機位嗰度全部裝晒呢啲--一啲膠片嘅形式嘅，係全部封密晒嘅，即係個司機好似一間房咁嘅，就完全啲乘客係接觸唔到個車長，但係個車長亦都可以睇到出面嘅環境，同埋睇到路面嘅。但係我唔知道呢個系統--即係呢個裝置適唔適合香港，但係我哋响會議提出過建議畀運輸署同巴士公司去考慮。

就九巴呢個裝置，其實佢都係一個試驗性質，其實應該係仲有改良嘅方向嘅，視乎於我哋係用家，提出嘅意見畀番巴士公司去改善佢呢個裝置，因為你巴士公司裏面嘅工程人員係唔知道你哋嗰個情況嘅，只有個用家先知道係嗰個裝置係點樣，將個意見反映番畀佢嘅工程人員或者係反映番畀公司聽，然後去作出改良，可以做到一個良好嘅效果。

其實呢個裝置係幫到司機嘅，不過新、城巴就已經反對咗話做呢一個裝置，因為以新、城巴嘅管理層講就話「你哋司機唔好得罪啲乘客，啲乘客就唔會打你哋㗎喇。」我哋惟有--冇辦法喇，我哋準備畀人打㗎喇已經。即係我哋新、城巴同事見到九巴有咁嘅嘢，我哋都希望，亦都同公司反映，已經公司係答咗㗎喇。我呢度嘅補充就係咁多。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺英國，你話見到咁樣全面嘅一個保護罩，係喺英國喺邊度見到呀？

林錦標先生：响倫敦，甚至係伯明翰。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道邊間巴士公司呀？倫敦邊間巴士公司用呢一個裝置呢？

林錦標先生：因為我真係唔清楚佢邊間公司，但係我見過佢嗰度就有好多--幾間巴士公司全部都係裝到呢個系統嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你嘅工會亦都有表達關注，就係用 12.8 米長嘅巴士，佢個後軸有呢一個嘅轉向嘅功能，而運輸署都有回覆嘅，就話會考慮下每個路線係咪適合，同埋要求巴士公司去做路試去確保駕駛係安全嘅，呢封信就係由運輸署回覆嘅，日期係 2017 年 9 月 11 號，即係 TU 文件冊第 260-2、橫劃 4 至橫劃 6 嘅。你嘅工會係咪對於呢一種嘅巴士嘅使用係咪都係仲有關注呢？

林錦標先生：係嘅，因為 12.8 米其實响香港現行個道路方面，因為香港就路窄人多，而用到咁長嘅巴士其實佢個隱憂一定响度嘅。仲有一樣嘢，因為呢個 12.8 米尾輪轉向，當佢轉向嗰陣時，轉彎無疑司機係揸得好舒服，但係因為佢有咁長，其他車輛唔知道你架車會尾輪轉向嘅，只有司機先知有個--運輸署要巴士公司要黏一張紙話畀司機聽呢個係尾輪轉向，但係其他嘅道路使用者係唔知道呢架巴士係尾輪轉向，當佢轉向之下，同一時間有其他嘅車輛貼近咗個巴士，

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

一轉彎，巴士個尾嗰部分就會過咗對方嘅行車線而產生危險。

响情況下，因為正式話交通意外數字暫時可能影響--即係冇咁多數字，但係响一啲位置嗰度，例如一個巴士總站，有啲路面係曾經試過尾輪轉向係掃到其他車嘅，但係--梗係冇辦法喇，一定係輸就輸在我哋，因為我哋過咗對方個火位線。

仲有，而家個道路個路面嗰個闊度根本而家嘅巴士响嗰條行車線裏面，即係每側得半吋位嘅啫，佢因為個--而家係畫咗係 9 呎嘅，而巴士已經係 8 呎半吋，你可想而知我哋架車已經係佔用晒嗰條行車線㗎喇，如果有隔籬有一架大車一齊轉彎的話，一個轉左，一個轉右，同一時間一轉，我哋嗰架 12.8 米就一定掃過隔籬，冇得講嘅，因為嗰條線係咁多，嗰條行車線咁多，一轉之後，個尾就會拂到過去。

因為九巴亦都攞咗一架 12.8 米响一個安全情況下去試，哋咗雪糕筒，去試呢啲 12.8 米轉彎嘅情況，足足响嗰條行車線嗰度係過咗 3 呎位嘅，所以响情況下，我哋同運輸署講，响 12.8 米要試路嗰陣時係希望邀請埋我哋工會，我哋一齊去試，而且用哋咗一啲--即係我哋唔好用其他車輛去試，用一啲雪糕筒擺响度，等佢轉嗰個 90 度彎之下，佢會唔會係撞到其他車輛各樣，但係奈何運輸署就話「因為巴士公司去試咗，唔會叫你哋工會去再試嘅。」

我哋亦都响近期都要求再多一次，關於試路嘅問題，如果去到咁長嘅車，希望同埋工會去畀意見，我哋提出咗一個地點，我哋提咗一個地點嘅，就係响香港灣仔嘅菲林明道天橋轉呢個軒尼詩道，因為嗰個路口一個係左轉，一個係右轉，响嗰度就嚟試呢個 12.8 米，因為同一時間係城巴同新巴都有 12.8 米，如果同一時間有兩架 12.8 米一齊去嗰個彎位，一定出事嘅，因為大家都唔知道--即係响現時嚟講，其他道路使用者係唔知道我哋嗰個 12.8 米個尾輪轉向，所以我哋一路都要求運輸署...

主席：（經傳譯員）林生，我哋就唔係好夠時間，我哋明白你想講咩嘢㗎喇，即係你哋仍然都係關注呢一種長巴士喺香港使用係唔安全，我哋其實明白㗎喇，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你唔介意嘅話，可唔可以你頭先講話你書面再要求運輸署去做一個重新測試嘅嗰份文件，如果你可以提供畀我哋，就唔該你遲啲提供畀委員會喇。

劉啟謙先生：主席閣下，非常之唔好意思，我哋聯盟就收到運輸署首長級嘅官員來電，就話對於我哋畀咗--一開始畀咗三份會議紀錄委員會非常之唔高興，亦都覺得非常不滿我哋將啲會議紀錄畀會議紀錄，但係我哋覺得畀會議紀錄委員會係有助委員會嘅工作，我哋一樣將過往嘅會議紀錄提交畀委員會，但係 2017 年 8 月之後嘅會議紀錄，運輸署就話佢哋唔會再畀我哋㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個同你喺電話咁講呀？即係話好不滿你畀咗啲文件畀呢一個

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

委員會呢？係邊個咁講呀？

林錦標先生：當日係我打電話去運輸署，希望佢哋交番啲文件畀我哋嘅，因為我哋仲有--已經係追咗好耐呢啲會議嘅文件，佢一路都話仲有啲部門未交，仲有一啲其他嘢，仲未可以畀到我哋，我話「你儘快畀我哋喇。」佢就--對方其實都講咗，佢話「你哋--委員會叫我哋交，我哋都冇交到，呢啲係我哋尊重你哋工會嗰個私隱，就唔會交畀委員會。」我亦都同佢講，因為如果係畀其他人嘅，我哋係唔會畀會議紀錄，但係如果係畀--係有助調查嘅問題，我哋一定會交，呢個係我哋個立場嚟嘅。

因為我都想講，因為對方係首長級，我亦都唔想公開佢係邊個，因為我唔知會唔會係對佢個前途有問題，所以我真係唔夠膽講，因為我知道對方嗰個真係首長級。

劉啟謙先生：我哋其實好希望委員會係諒解我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢段對話係幾時講㗎？

林錦標先生：响6月嗰陣時--唔係，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你慢慢諗吖。

林錦標先生：响 7 月，今個月嘅--係响 7 月中嗰陣時我去追嘅，因為我哋亦都知道要係等緊委員會叫我哋上嚟嘅。

劉啟謙先生：我代表我哋聯盟再一次向主席你講抱歉，我哋好盡力去搵主席所要求嘅文件，但係何奈我哋真係得唔到，交唔到畀委員會參閱，我哋真係非常之抱歉同唔好意思。而之後我哋仲會有會議紀錄收到--我哋都唔敢想會唔會再有會議紀錄收到。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，你已經提供過畀我哋嘅會議紀錄。黃大律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。各位，最後我要問嘅就係呢一個嘅實務守則，即係最近運輸署發出嘅實務守則，我哋最近就知道運輸署係發出過一份實務守則，就畀專營巴士公司，係畀巴士車長培訓，就係唔同嘅公司統一嘅培訓方式嘅，同埋就有一個框架係點樣培訓巴士車長嘅，就話擬定喺 2018 年 10 月會實施，就有個工作小組，係因為喺 2018 年 2 月大埔巴士意外之後成立而提出，所以有個咁嘅框架嘅。呢一個工作小組就有五個嘅巴士公司代表、巴士廠代表同埋係運輸署嘅官員嘅，而最近佢哋就通知咗我哋已經係發出咗實務守則。

我個問題係咁嘅，有冇畀過一份呢個實務守則畀你個會呀？

林錦標先生：冇。

劉啟謙先生：Excuse me，我哋收過委員會其中運輸署嘅回覆--運輸署答回去嘅信件我哋係有睇過，但係如果你話有冇嗰個實務守則，可以--係一本吖，定係--

如果係一本的話，我哋就冇收過，我哋只係收過委員會畀我哋運輸署有關車長培訓嘅回覆嘅信件啫，其他資料我哋冇收過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該劉生，我哋都冇收過。我再問下呢一個實務守則，之前有冇諮詢過你哋所有呢個實務守則嘅內容呢，關於係培訓巴士車長嘅，譬如話運輸署或者巴士公司有冇諮詢過聯盟將來培訓巴士車長有咩嘢題目咁，有冇諮詢過？

劉啟謙先生：第一，我哋都係從委員會得知運輸署原來係成立咗一個工作小組係有巴士製造商同埋巴士公司嘅持份者，我哋都係從委員會嘅作供先得知有呢一個嘅工作小組，而我哋其實喺 5 月份有同運輸署一次會議裏面，要求過運輸署將我哋工會係加入嗰個工作小組入面，因為其實講嘅內容都同我哋工會係有關係嘅，但係運輸署當然就冇答應我哋話將我哋加入去喇。而呢份所謂實務守則其實由制定以致個內容，我哋一直都冇參與過，而所謂嘅工作小組都係從委員會嘅作供先至得知有呢一個工作小組嘅存在，其實所有佢哋嘅工作都係冇諮詢過我哋。

我哋得知之後，其實已經好緊張話「你哋唔可以話唔諮詢巴士工會㗎喎。」但係何奈佢一個諮詢、一個問題都冇同我哋講過，冇問過我哋任何意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）你向運輸署提出呢一個要求嘅時候，你係咪用書面提出㗎？

劉啟謙先生：我哋喺 5 月份有同運輸署進行一次跨部門會議嘅，就係喺運輸署嚟完聽證會嘅翌日，我哋係有同佢係開過一次會，就就住嗰個工作小組，其實我哋即時有同佢哋講話「可唔可以加埋我哋入嗰個工作小組入面呀？」其實署方嘅回應都係話「工作小組都係工作都係嗰啲成員」，就冇正面回應過會唔會加我哋入去，而實務守則其實喺會議上亦都冇任何提過話有呢一樣嘢，亦都冇諮詢過我哋，我哋係喺嗰個會議，而嗰個會議嘅會議紀錄正如頭先所講，我哋係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你唔係用書面提出嘅，你就係一個會議嗰度提出，就係用口頭提出嘅，係咪咁呢？

劉啟謙先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你自己有冇寫低啲會議紀錄㗎？

劉啟謙先生：我哋有--同事係有記錄低個內容，其實呢啲會議每一次都係由運輸署負責畀番個會議紀錄我哋，而我哋自己其實有一個手--即係 write down jot notes 嘅紀錄喺度，但係唔係一個 formal 嘅會議紀錄嚟嘅，但係有 jot 低啲重點嘅內容，而每一次其實都係運輸署會派員去記錄同埋做個會議紀錄畀番我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）你呢個會你寫低咗啲咩嘢重點，或者你都可以提供畀我哋，得唔

得呢？

劉啟謙先生：主席，我要返去同同事整理一下，可唔可以事後補番畀主席閣下睇番呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你咁做，就會對我哋有幫助嘅。

劉啟謙先生： Thank you very much. Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，主席，我嘅提問就到此為止。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，就我哋就係完結㗎喇，提問嘅部分，你有冇啲最後嘅一啲結語？如果你冇乜特別嘢講，都可以唔需要嘅。

鍾松輝先生：我哋聯盟想強調一個立場嘅，就住運輸署制定嗰啲巴士工作指引，嗰個工作指引，呢個指引當然唔係一個法例，但係就對巴士公司係有一個規範嘅，而呢一個指引亦都係對我哋啲員工亦都有直接嘅影響，因為佢嘅指引就都牽涉到我哋啲持份者、啲員工嘅，如果運輸署就住今次嗰個指引，就住嗰個特別更呢個指引，而呢個指引佢仍然係維持十四小時，繼續令到我哋啲車長疲勞駕駛不特只，佢仲係將中間嗰三個小時休息，而冇作出任何嘅指引落去，即係意思就係話應該係薪酬直落計，但係運輸署就不負責任，就唔提供呢一個指引，變相我哋時間就用咗十四小時，但係我哋就收唔到十四小時嗰個薪酬，佢個指引所講話唔少於三小時，即係意思可以多過三小時，根據指引。

如果個巴士公司--其實根據指引，佢可以畀夠六個小時你休息嘅，多過三小時吖嘛，咁就變咗我哋啲前線車長就得番八小時嘅薪酬，其他嗰啲就正如前日咁講，$21.90一個鐘，呢個我哋覺得運輸署就非常之不負責任。

其實我最想強調，因為呢個專營巴士公司係牽涉到一個公共服務嚟...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，鍾生。就黃大律師，城巴係咪講過就話有特別更，佢哋建議就唔係話純粹係一個津貼嘅呢一個嘅工資，而係話真係一個正式嘅時薪嘅？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋係真係咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）好明顯九巴就係嗰個工資就係唔同喇。

鍾松輝先生：我想補充少少嘅，而家我所講就係運輸署嗰個指引嗰個內容，就唔係個別巴士公司去提供嗰個薪酬計算方法，而因為根據嗰個指引，巴士公司係完全可以唔畀薪酬㗎，嗰個休息時間，就算新巴、城巴今日應承咗我...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個運輸署嘅指引其實就唔係話針對關於個工資個問題，係咪你建議就話呢啲指引應該都係涵蓋工資嘅呢個範疇呢？

鍾松輝先生：冇錯，我想...

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署就話「工資嗰方面其實就係巴士公司同埋呢一個司機之間嘅問題，就唔係我哋嘅責任嚟嘅。」佢哋就係咁講嘅。

鍾松輝先生：係，冇錯，我覺得指引係佢哋制定嘅，佢哋係有責任嘅。我仲想強調一樣嘢，因為專營巴士服務係屬於一個公共服務嚟嘅，係牽涉到--係影響到呢個公眾利益，因為如果你處理得唔好，係全香港嘅市民都受到影響嘅。我舉個例，當年香港政府就住公務員貪污，佢都高薪養廉，佢都有個政策令到唔可以有影響到呢個公眾利益，你運輸署制定嘅指引，但係佢就不負責任咁淨係符合巴士公司嗰個所謂要求，就唔理到我哋嗰個生計，我哋對呢個非常不滿。同埋十四小時絕對係唔夠時間休息嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋明白㗎喇。劉先生，你係咪都係就呢一點想講多少少呢？

劉啟謙先生：其實我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）係總結嘅。

劉啟謙先生：兩分鐘。其實好簡單，巴士、電同水呢啲都係公營事業，牽涉到公眾利益，當然我哋明白特首委任三位做委員會，就係因為牽涉到重大公眾利益，但係運輸署仍然都唔將呢個公眾利益放喺首位，仲縱容呢個疲勞駕駛，仲縱容唔理嗰個工資低嘅問題，其實巴士公司嘅生意嘅數目，其實政府運房局係有監察同監控，政府係全權咁介入緊專營巴士嗰個收入、支出，加價都要政府批准，都要經過交諮會、行政會議，政府早已經係完全咁樣插入咗巴士公司嘅管理入面。我哋睇唔到理由畀運輸署推搪，淨係整個指引，但係就唔理薪酬，容許我哋仍然係長工時、人工低呢個慘況。

而我哋同事亦都提過工資指引畀運輸署參考，用一個科學同埋一個實際嘅數據去釐訂個薪酬，保障巴士嘅員工。巴士業要有足夠嘅人手，先至可以提供到適切嘅服務，每一樣都係唇齒相依嘅，如果遺漏，淨係講工時，唔講嗰個人工低，其實冇用嘅，同安全呢樣嘢係完全談唔上，係掛鈎嘅呢樣嘢。有足夠嘅車長工作，先至提供到服務，車長先至會有足夠嘅薪金，就唔會長時間駕駛，唔會疲勞，唔疲勞，其實安全嘅問題就減低。

我最後想補充一樣嘢，就係我哋看待呢一個係一個責任，唔係一個工作，而家就調番轉，我覺得巴士司機就係一個工作，接載乘客啫，但係背後個責任其實好大，所以我希望主席會明白。

多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你嘅總結嘅，就多謝你，你兌現咗你嘅承諾，就係用兩分鐘就夠喇。好，我哋就暫時停止，我哋會休會，應該係下個星期二會繼續嘅，我哋就會聽取其他嘅證供，多謝咁多位今日出席，唔好意思，就你哋要再一次返嚟，多謝你哋嘅耐性，我哋而家就係休會嘅。

2018年8月1日

下午5時41分聆訊押後

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

Tuesday, 7 August 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WING BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG

(evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of simultaneous interpretation unless otherwise indicated)

CHAIRMAN: Dr Leung, gentlemen, thank you for helping the invitation of the committee to give evidence to assist us in our duties. I understand, Dr Leung, that there is an initial statement that you wish to make, so we will hear from you then, after which I will ask Mr Duncan, who is one of the counsel assisting the committee, to pose questions to you.

It may be that one or other of your colleagues is better equipped to answer questions, and I leave it to you to indicate if that's the case and to give way to that colleague. If you can nominate who it is, that would assist us. But perhaps I could invite you first of all to make your opening statement.

Opening statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

Good morning, Mr Chairman and members of the committee. May I say from the outset that we were and still are very sorry about the tragic incident that

occurred on Tai Po Road on 10 February 2018.

On 11 February 2018, I took chairman's action to form a special committee of the board of directors comprising Dr John Chan and Mr Andy Tsang as members and I as the chairman, to conduct an investigation into the incident and to come up with recommendations on bus safety.

The special committee has held a number of meetings with KMB/Long Win management, representatives of two trade unions two bus manufacturers, ADL and Volvo.

The special committee produced a report on 12 March 2018, setting forth therein a number of recommendations to enhance bus safety. This report was submitted to the Commissioner for Transport on the same date and the same has also been submitted to this committee.

On 10 April 2018, we reduced into writing our action plan to implement the recommendations set out in the report dated 12 March 2018, and yesterday we submitted to this committee an update on the action plan, stating therein actions taken by our management to execute the recommendations up to the end of July 2018.

Mr Chairman and members of the committee, my colleagues and I have come before you this morning with a humble heart and with proactive attitude. We know that we are duty-bound to offer safe bus services to our

passengers and we welcome any recommendations that would enhance bus safety. Subject to technological and financial feasibility, we would be glad to implement your recommendations.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

Examination by MR DUNCAN

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Good morning, Dr Leung, and gentlemen.

I would firstly like to echo the chairman's remarks by thanking you for your attendance today, and also for providing a very significant amount of written material to the committee for its consideration.

There are some areas where clarification or further assistance would be appreciated, and it is in that respect that I have a number of questions for you.

I appreciate that you are representing both the Kowloon Motor Bus (1933) Ltd and also Long Win Bus Company, but if it is in order and just to ease matters, I will refer generally to both entities as "the company"; it will make things easier.

If, however, at any point you wish to distinguish between the two entities, please feel free to do so.

If I could firstly raise one point, just from your

opening remarks, Dr Leung.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I am looking at the fifth paragraph of those remarks, where you referred to the production by the special committee of 12 March this year, following the tragic accident at Tai Po. It is said in your remarks that that report was submitted to the Commissioner for Transport on the same date, and that the same has also been submitted to the committee.

Are you aware that certain portions of that report were withheld from the committee?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes, the redacted portion, relating to the traffic accident, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Could you perhaps turn to the copy of the report that is in the bundles. We will find this in file KMB-1 at page 98.

You will see at that page the front --

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) What page are we on, Mr Duncan?

MR DUNCAN: I'm just taking you to the report itself.

CHAIRMAN: Page 98.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You will see the cover of the report, and then if you turn the page through to page 99, you will see a table of contents. You will see the table of contents

at page 99.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Table of contents, page 99, yes.

MR DUNCAN: The portions which are of interest to the committee, which are being withheld, are part 2, accident regulation report, and part 3, issues relating to bus captains.

Issues relating to bus captains is obviously a matter of central importance to the operation of this inquiry, and I'm simply going to make a request of you as to whether you would consider releasing to the committee both parts 2 and 3 for the committee to consider, of course within the confines of its terms of reference.

You may wish to discuss that with your colleagues, but I'm simply making that request of you and ask you to consider that, please, perhaps after the hearing today.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Specifically you are referring to part 2, accident investigation report?

MR DUNCAN: Correct.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) As well as part 3, issues relating to bus captains?

MR DUNCAN: Correct. If you look at pages 102 and 103 of the bundle, you will see that that information is being withheld.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And no doubt a position was taken on that.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: But I am asking you to reconsider that with your colleagues, not right now but during the course of these proceedings.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) In that connection, may I please ask whether this information would be submitted for the consideration of this committee or would it become public information? I have to know that.

CHAIRMAN: All information that this committee receives is on the basis that it becomes public, if the committee deem it appropriate.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Thank you, Mr Chairman, for that clarification.

I will consider your request.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Sticking with this file, KMB-1, could I ask you to go, please, to page 31.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Page 31. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Just to put this page in context, this is an extract from the initial submission made by Kowloon Motor Bus, by the company, in response to the committee's request for information.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If you just want to put it in context, if you go back to page 1 of the bundle.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Page 1?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You will see a letter from the secretariat of the committee dated 28 March 2018.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If you go through the following pages, you will see that the committee has asked for information relating to a number of specified matters.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Then if I take you to page 31, you will see at the top of the page one of the questions which was posed by the committee:

"Please identify and supply copies of:

(iv) any codes of corporate and social responsibility published by your company."

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I am interested in the first of the three components, which appears in paragraph 2 of the answer. Do you see the component described as a key component, "Safety"? Perhaps I can just read that out for the record. You have said:

"The three key components of our [corporate social

responsibility] have been listed on the corporate website:

KMB and LWB are committed to providing customers with a safe, reliable and comfortable bus service, which gives value for money. KMB and LWB continue to invest heavily in improving the safety of its bus operations by providing intensive training to its staff, strengthening performance monitoring procedures, implementing reward schemes, improving bus design and promoting passenger safety both internally and to the public."

What I want to do, Dr Leung, is, concentrating on the implementing of reward schemes --

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Maintenance?

MR DUNCAN: Reward schemes. Do you see the reference to "reward schemes"?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I want to ask you a few questions, please, with regard to what schemes currently exist relating to the safety performance of bus drivers. Do you understand that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Reward schemes, improving bus design -- okay.

Godwin, would you please answer the question.

MR DUNCAN: I haven't really asked the questions yet. I'm just indicating the matters I'm going to pursue. That's

the topic I am going to pursue with you and your colleagues.

CHAIRMAN: And mr So will be dealing with the questions?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: In that respect, can I ask you to turn to page 108 of the bundle.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) 108?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: We see at paragraph 29 on that page that on 21 February 2018, KMB and LWB announced that safety bonus and good service bonus would be incorporated into basic salary, effective from 1 March 2018. There is reference then to table 2, table 3 and table 4, which set out the pay structures before and after the salary optimisation.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And you will see the tables by turning the page, finding those at 109 and 110.

I notice that this change was announced on 21 February, which was just 11 days after the accident in Tai Po. My question is: was the occurrence of the accident a factor in the announcement of this change?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Thank you, Mr Duncan. Thank

you for your question. I'm glad I have an opportunity to make a clarification on this point. In fact, last November, when there was unfortunately a traffic accident happened in Sham Shui Po, involving casualties and injury to a number of passengers, I noticed from the newspaper report that our monthly rated bus captains at the time were earning a salary of less than $12,000 a month. It was just under $12,000. Then -- in fact, this is my initiative -- I said to myself that something had to be done about it.

So I examined the pay structure of the monthly rated bus captains, and I noticed each month that apart from the basic salary and safety bonus of $18,000, as well as --

CHAIRMAN: 1,800?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) 1,800, I beg your pardon, 1,800 -- thank you for your correction -- as well as a safety performance bonus of another 1,800, were paid.

Then I decided that we can perhaps enhance the remuneration structure. So at the board meeting in December, the board approved that the safety bonus as well as the performance bonus totalling $3,600 be incorporated into the basic salary. That's the first thing.

And the second thing, because the overtime payment

was formerly based -- was made by reference to the basic salary at the then rate of less than $12,000 per month, so, as a result of incorporating this bonus amount into the basic salary, the overtime payment would likewise be increased by reference to the new basic salary rate. That was another reason.

So, to cut a long story short, after this enhancement, the monthly rated bus captain will receive a basic salary of about $15,400 a month, and likewise the overtime payment will be increased accordingly. Thirdly, the annual bonus which was previously set at $12,000 per year would likewise be increased to the new level of over $15,000.

So that really enhanced the pay of our bus captains.

The decision was made in December with a view to implementing such new rate of pay in March, on 1 March, but unfortunately this tragic incident happened in February, so it was misinterpreted by some people that we adjusted the pay because of the traffic accident. It had nothing to do with it. It was actually decided at my own initiative at the board meeting in December, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

CHAIRMAN: Dr Leung, you referred to the Sham Shui Po accident as having occurred in November. Do you have in

mind the accident that occurred on 22 September 2017?

Mr So.

MR GODWIN SO: That accident that happened on 22 September was in Cheung Sha Wan.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) I stand corrected.

CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps you are not corrected. Was it the November accident and, in which case, what was the date?

MR GODWIN SO: There was no accident in November. Our action was in response to the accident that took place in September in Cheung Sha Wan.

MR ROGER LEE: Sham Shui Po.

CHAIRMAN: 22 September?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR ROGER LEE: I would like to add, talking about bonuses, at that time we felt that bonuses were actually a pressure on bus captains. We did not think that bonuses was a kind of incentive. Bus captains would be under a lot of pressure if they were given bonuses and it might not be appropriate. That is why the board decided that the bonuses be incorporated into basic salary.

As the chairman said just now, there will be a points system for paying salaries. I think that has been covered, and I think Mr So will tell you more about

the present situation.

MR GODWIN SO: Our company does have rewards to encourage bus captains to pay attention to bus safety. We used to have safety bonuses, and in 2016 we changed it to a kind of star bus captain reward. Within a certain period of time, if there is no accident record and if there is any compliment from passengers, then the bus captain will receive different rewards. If they are within 15 years, it would be one star. If it is 15 to 29 years, if there is another good record, they will be given another star, and then in the end they will be given a grand star.

Also, in December each year, we have an annual gathering in order to give recognition to bus captains with good safety records. This is the star bus captain scheme.

CHAIRMAN: Does this scheme still operate?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, it is still operating. It is going on.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr So. I'm going to ask you a few more questions about that reward scheme in a few moments. It's something which has been included in the information you provided us.

Just keeping with the removal of the safety bonus for a moment, Dr Leung, you told us that the announcement -- the new scheme was resolved at a board

meeting in December. Is there any reason why it wasn't announced until 12 February?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Well, it was approved by the board in December, I think 22 December, and then the management would take time to implement the new pay structure. In fact, I understand from the managing director the proposed day of implementation would be 1 March of this year.

MR DUNCAN: Prior to this change, during the time when the safety bonus existed, how was the awarding of the safety bonus determined in any particular individual case?

MR GODWIN SO: In the old safety bonus scheme, we looked at a few indicators. First, whether there was any accident that was committed by the bus captain, whether it was liable, and whether there was unsafe driving. Then there would be the safety bonus of $1,700. Then, if he performs well within half a year, the bonus which was withheld because of a poor record will then be disbursed and this is controlled by the operations department.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand from that that it was restricted to whether or not the person had been responsible for an accident?

MR GODWIN SO: The company also has plain clothes inspection and we also rely on complaints from passengers. From these channels, we will know whether the bus captain has

engaged in unsafe driving, and then the safety bonus will be used as a kind of disciplinary action, to discipline bus captains who commit unsafe driving.

MR DUNCAN: Prior to this change, when the bonus system was in place, what proportion of your drivers received the full bonus?

MR GODWIN SO: When we had the safety bonus, 90 per cent of our colleagues would get a full bonus. Those who would have the bonus deducted or delayed, they would account for less than 10 per cent.

MR DUNCAN: During the course of the committee's deliberations, and no doubt taking up some of your management time, we have learned that technology can detect such things as speeding, excessive braking, excessive acceleration, those sorts of factors. Were any of those factors taken into account when the old safety bonus was in existence?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: At that time, the safety bonus only focused on the disbursement of the bonus after an accident. The daily performance is covered by other bonuses, like the good service bonus.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Can I refer you now, please, to page 77, where these reward schemes to which you have already referred are set out. The question that the committee posed, at the top of page 77, is this,

"Remuneration packages":

"Is there any reward system for bus captains with good performance (and/or with low accident records)?"

The first of these is described as the "Safe Driving Award". Can I ask: how long has this been in place?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The safe driving award has been there for many years. It was like one or two years ago we replaced it with the star bus captain scheme.

MR DUNCAN: Does it no longer exist?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We have replaced it with the star bus captain scheme so it no longer exists.

MR ROGER LEE: Let me explain clearly. This scheme still exists but it was like a sheet of paper, it is a kind of certificate, but now we call it the star bus captain and we use gold and silver, real gold and silver to reward the bus captains, so they feel it more strongly because this can be tagged to their lapel.

MR DUNCAN: Is the safety aspect of this award restricted solely to responsibility for accidents or otherwise?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) The criteria for the award?

MR DUNCAN: The criteria, yes. Is anything taking into account apart from the fact that the driver is accident-free, so to speak?

MR GODWIN SO: In the past, yes, you are right. The award was about zero liability. In other words, the bus

captain does not have to bear any responsibility in accidents. In other words, for five consecutive years, if the bus captain did not get himself involved in any liable accidents, he would be sort of commended in the form of a certificate.

MR DUNCAN: And there is no financial reward involved in this award; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: You are correct, no bonus.

MR DUNCAN: Could I then turn to the outstanding service award. Does any component of the outstanding service award depend on safety performance?

MR GODWIN SO: Perhaps. You may want to turn to annex 9c. So, other than the bus captains, all other staff members are covered by this outstanding service award.

MR DUNCAN: You are saying it's not restricted to bus drivers? Thank you. My question, though, is in the context of a bus driver, is whether he drove safely or not a matter which is taken into account in deciding whether he should be awarded an outstanding service award?

MR GODWIN SO: Well, in the case of an outstanding service, say for example he has helped a passenger, then he will be given this award. But prior to giving him this award, we will also check whether he has a safe driving record. If he has, and if he served passengers well,

then he will get this outstanding service award.

MR ROGER LEE: In other words, this is mainly about the service, say what he has done, say how he has helped a passenger, his attitude towards passengers. Of course, it may also be related to his safety performance, but it is mainly about service, because bus captains, in the course of driving, they are very good in terms of their attitude towards the passengers. So this is about outstanding service and it covers not just bus captains but also terminus supervisors, regulators, as well as the bus stop assistants.

MR DUNCAN: So keeping with the bus driver and reflecting the fact that he might have been helpful to a passenger, that aspect of bus safety, would the fact that he had driven without any accident for which he was responsible also be taken into account?

MR GODWIN SO: Well, let me say this. For his driving behaviour, he will be given the safe driving award, so it is a matter of zero accident and depending on the duration involved. Then, for the outstanding service award, for BCs and non-BCs, if they put up a good service, they will be awarded. But prior to giving the award for bus drivers, there is a prerequisite, that is he must have a good driving record, because, after all, it is an award.

I gave an example of helping the passengers. I was sort of citing an example. I just wonder if you can go to the document annexed as annex 9c. I think it would be illustrative.

MR DUNCAN: Certainly. If we go to 9c-2. You find that at KMB-9 at page 3853. Is that what you are referring to?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Outstanding service award. Okay.

MR GODWIN SO: As I think you can see from the screen, this is to recognise staff members' contribution and outstanding performance. Nomination is by directors and department heads. So this is for everyone.

MR DUNCAN: A few moments ago, you mentioned that it would depend on a good driving record. Do you mean by "good driving record" accident-free?

MR GODWIN SO: Let me clarify. For the first one, that's the safe award, we have to check the accident record. For this one, this is about the outstanding service. When it comes to outstanding service, we will also check whether he has got a good driving record before he would be nominated to be given this award which is outstanding service award.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. My question is does "good driving record" mean no accident for which he was responsible?

MR GODWIN SO: Not all.

MR DUNCAN: What else?

MR GODWIN SO: Other than accidents, there may be complaints by passengers, and then of course internally we have got plain-clothed inspectors checking on the drivers to see if they have a good driving record.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Does this outstanding service award carry with it any financial reward?

MR GODWIN SO: No, no financial reward.

MR DUNCAN: This is simply again a certificate, is it?

MR GODWIN SO: Correct, a certificate, sort of a commendation.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now let's turn to the next one on page 77, star bus captain, about which you have already given very clearly some information this morning.

What criteria are taken into account in the award of a star to a bus captain?

MR GODWIN SO: Maybe the secretary can go to annex 9c-3.

MR DUNCAN: KMB-9/3858. Thank you.

MR GODWIN SO: Please go to another page.

Yes, this is the right one; please stop here.

Under this scheme, first of all, a good service record and a good accident record.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Page 3864.

CHAIRMAN: In which page of the bundle is this to be found,

Mr Duncan?

MR DUNCAN: The original, which is in Chinese, is at 3864.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Page 3864.

MR DUNCAN: The translation?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) In Chinese.

CHAIRMAN: 3865-1?

MR DUNCAN: 3865-7, I think.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) There's an English version on page 3865-7.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

We have that. Is there anything you want to bring to our attention there?

MR JOHN CHAN: (In English) If I may supplement, this is a scheme which was devised to recognise in particular good bus captains, and the number of awards every year was very limited; it was only two or three every year.

This was a very specially designed scheme for recognition and incentivising of good bus captain performance.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Did this contain any financial reward?

MR JOHN CHAN: (In English) No.

MR DUNCAN: Let's go to the next matter on page 77 and back to KMB-1, "Career path for [bus captains] with

outstanding performance".

If I could just ask this question. The promotion from bus captain to bus captain II, would that involve an increase in a bus captain's salary?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Likewise, from bus captain II to bus captain I, would that also result in an increase in the salary of the bus driver?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I think the details of that we can see on the earlier pages to which you referred us when looking at the bonus. I won't take you back there.

I think we can see from the bottom of page 77 the criteria which are invoked for that particular career path, so no accident or disciplinary warnings and good attendance in the past two years.

Is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Let's go then to the last of these matters, on page 78, the annual performance bonus. It is said on this page that the bonus is paid twice a year and it is linked with BC's performance. Just now is it linked with the bus captain's performance?

MR GODWIN SO: It covers a number of points. First of all,

the driving record and whether he has been disciplined, and then his attendance record. By "attendance", I mean he hasn't had any record of absent without permission, because that would affect the service stability.

So there are three main elements.

MR ROGER LEE: If I may also supplement. Just a few months ago, we made a change. We have got a 13th month salary. In the past, there was an assessment once every six months; there was an annual performance bonus. Now we have got the 13th month bonus. In other words, we haven't got this assessment.

MR DUNCAN: Are you saying the annual performance bonus does no longer exist?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Correct.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Correct. Mr Duncan, I mentioned earlier in the hearing that no only did I incorporate the safety bonus and performance into the basic salary; at the same time, at the end of the year, this annual performance bonus will become the 13th month pay to the bus captains.

In other words, formerly they were getting at most an annual bonus of $12,000 per year, payable in two instalments. Now, at the end of the year, they will be getting annual pay --

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Just like double pay.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) A 13th month pay, a double pay. They will be getting double pay by reference to the new rate of basic pay, which is now $15,400.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly that the extra month's pay is not performance-based?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) No, no. Mr Duncan, you are correct.

MR DUNCAN: So before the change which was approved by the board last year, a person could receive first of all a safety bonus, and that applied to 90 per cent of your captains, if I understood correctly before, and would also qualify for an annual performance bonus?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: What proportion of your bus captains would have received a grade 1 performance bonus each year?

MR GODWIN SO: About 90 per cent, almost 90 per cent.

MR DUNCAN: Do I understand that the annual performance bonus was done away with then by virtue of the decisions made at the December board meeting so that from 1 March this year you have the new pay structure?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Since 1 March, yes. Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: So is the situation at present then that there is no specific financial reward for a bus driver depending on his safety performance?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Well, there are other safeguards to ensure that our bus captains will drive properly and safely.

Perhaps I should mention at this stage that apart from the remuneration enhancement which became effective on 1 March, I am also proposing, with the blessing of the board, other enhancements.

For example, just now, you referred to bus captains, there are three grades of bus captain, bus captain, bus captain II and bus captain I, and I have the support of the board of directors that these three grades will soon be expanded into five grades. And also the annual increment point, it will be expanded from the current eight increments to 20 increments. So this will be, you know ...

This, for example, promotion to the next grade, as well as the award of the annual increment, will not be automatic. This will be subject to performance of the bus captains. But more importantly, I think, and I believe I'm correct in saying, that the bus captains will not be less responsible in their behaviour, because the safety bonus was done with. I think they are professional drivers and they have their own safety to safeguard, apart from the safety of the passengers.

So my principal objective is to enhance the

remuneration of the bus captains as a whole and hope that not only would I be able to recruit new bus captains but to retain the serving bus captains as well. That's my intention, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

With regard to those matters for which you have the support of the board, if you are changing the pay structure at all, is that something which as a matter of practice you would discuss with the unions before they were implemented, or would you implement it and then tell the unions?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes, I did. In fact, as you know, I met with representatives of the trade union personally a few months ago.

And apart from the remuneration incentive that was executed on 1 March, I indicated to the trade union further enhancements would be coming, and they know that. For example, they know that instead of three bus captain grades there will be five grades; instead of eight annual increments, there will be 20 increments. And there are other incentives too.

But I am always willing to listen to the views of the bus captains. Really, how should I say, I find that because, personally, my governance philosophy is people first. People always come first. Of course passengers

come first, they are very important to us, and our staff are equally important to us, and of course at the same time I have to be accountable to my shareholders as well. So I am doing my level best to enhance the remuneration of all staff, not just bus captains, other frontline staff, in the hope that we can recruit and retain quality staff members for our services.

MR ROGER LEE: I would like to add one point here. Actually, we have communicated with many other members of staff.

MR GODWIN SO: I can also say something here. We have heard these aspirations in the past. They also thought that if money is pegged to safety, they would experience pressure when they drove, and also the annual performance bonus, they also had the aspiration about this. When I met with bus captains and also when I talked to depot staff, they wanted this to be changed. So we heard them, and as the chairman said, he met unions' representatives, and so there is this change.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

I want to refer you, Dr Leung, to the evidence of one of the persons from whom the committee has heard. This was Mr Lai Siu Chung who came from the Motor Transport Workers General Union. Do you know Mr Lai?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Mr Chung, yes, I met him as

a representative of one of the trade unions, I met with him, yes.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to ask to be turned up the transcript at Day 9 at page 98.

CHAIRMAN: What is the reference in the bundles?

MR DUNCAN: It's the page on the screen now, and in the hard copy of the transcript, it will be Day 9, page 98, line 13.

CHAIRMAN: Which of the four transcript bundles is it to be found in?

MR DUNCAN: Number 4.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: If I could just explain the commencement of this dialogue, Dr Leung, at line 13, there is an entry attributed to Ms Maggie Wong, my colleague, one of the counsel for the commission, and she asked this question of Mr Lai:

"Mr Lai, we are not talking about deduction. It is addition. What I'm suggesting here is not about deduction. It is on top of your basic salary. If you drive well you would receive an extra bonus. That's the system. It's not about deduction."

And Mr Lai replies:

"Well, KMB doesn't have such a system."

And Ms Maggie Wong says:

"Not about whether you have the system. If one were to recommend such a system, would you support that?"

And what I am interested to bring to your attention is the reply of Mr Lai, which follows:

"Chairman, we support any type of reward system or incentive system. Right now we are talking to the KMB on another kind of bonus system: there would be a 20-point increment system. So in other words, if you achieve certain requirements then you will get an increment, an extra point. And that is beyond the annual salary increase. The KMB has verbally promised that there will be a 20-point system, it's calculated based on the performance, safety performance, attendance, discipline. If the bus captain does not achieve the standards then he will not get an extra point.

So that's a kind of bonus system."

Now, the 20-point system to which Mr Lai referred I think is something that you referred to in your evidence; correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: The system that you have in mind, will it depend at all on safety performance?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes. As I said earlier on too, the award of this increment, as well as promotion

to the next grade, will not be automatic, but the safety performance as well as other performance will be taken into account. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Have you yet decided how you would assess safety performance in that context?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes. We do have a quality assurance department, Mr Duncan, and they are responsible for monitoring the performance of all bus captains.

At this point in time, perhaps I can ask the head of our quality assurance department --

MR ROGER LEE: Perhaps I would like to add something here.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Wait, wait -- and he can tell you how we monitor the performance of the bus captains, and after that, Roger, you can supplement.

MR JAMES WONG: Good morning. I am James Wong; I am the head of training and quality assurance department of KMB. I am responsible for training bus captains. I also monitor their behaviour and integrity. Within my area of responsibility, we regularly monitor the behaviour of bus captains. Whether there is speeding or whether there is any unsafe driving, this is monitored by the black box.

On the other hand, if we receive complaints from passengers or even prosecution by the police, we will

know that there is undesirable behaviour on the part of the bus captain or that he has broken traffic rules. In this regard we also have plain-clothed inspection. If we get a complaint from any passenger, we will arrange for our plain-clothed driving inspector to go on board to look at the driving behaviour of the bus captain personally in order to decide whether his attitude or techniques are correct.

Just now you asked how we monitored whether there is any irregularity on the part of bus captains. We have done a lot in this regard. Our objective is to achieve safe driving. In our Bus Captain Training School, we have different kinds of driving training. Let me talk about with about basic training. There are two phases. Phase 1 is to allow the bus captain to achieve the standard to get a driving licence of the right class from the TD, Transport Department, and in phase 2 we will allow the bus captain to achieve the standards of training with KMB so he can serve passengers.

In the case of poor behaviour, we will rely on other ways to monitor.

MR ROGER LEE: As has been pointed out, there are many channels. We will have more communication with the bus captains. As to whether bus captains would regard it as a way of further monitoring before he gets a promotion,

certainly we will heed your advice. This is our initial suggestions. That's the way for the future. We are going to have more communication with the bus captains.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. The monitoring of the bus drivers is a matter I will ask further questions about later on when we come to the black box situation, but I appreciate your remarks. Thank you.

Leaving the question of awards and so forth, I want to move to a different matter, still connected with safety, by taking you to another bundle. This time, KMB-6, at 2110.

You should be looking at a copy of the Kowloon Motor Bus management structure supplied to the committee by the company.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: We will see at the top of the management structure Mr Roger Lee, who is here today. We then have a line which includes the operations director, Mr Kin Wang Leung, who is also here today. On that same line we have the general manager, corporate planning and business development, Mr So, who is also here today.

Underneath the operations director, we have the deputy operations director, Mr Patrick Pang, who is with us as well, and under the human resources director we have Mr James Wong, who has just answered one of the

questions, in the box of training and quality assurance.

I want to go from that management structure to another entry in the bundles which have been provided by you. That's at KMB-3 at page 708.

This is an extract from the annual report of the holding company, Transport International Holdings Ltd, and it's the annual report for 2011.

I want to pick up on page 708 one of the paragraphs. It's under the general heading, if we go back to a few pages, to 705, "Operational review", "Care for customers".

Then we have, on pages 706 and 707, a number of headings, and we come to 708 and an entry which is headed, "Safety Management System". If I could read the first of the paragraphs under that section:

"As stated in its corporate safety policy, KMB is firmly committed to striving for continual improvement in safety performance. Robust safety governance is the backbone of our safety management system. A rigorous safety governance framework ensures that the highest levels of safety performance and sustainable operations are achieved. Established in 2010, the safety and service quality department focuses on enhancing our safety performance and delivering high quality services."

Then there's a reference in the following paragraph, you will see, to the development and implementation of the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series 18001, and it continues.

So did there, in 2011, exist a safety and service quality department? Is that the position?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) It has been replaced by the quality and assurance department.

MR DUNCAN: Right. We will come to its replacement, but I just want to first establish that back in 2011 it was called the safety and service quality department; is that correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Can you then go, please, to page 774 of the same bundle. We are still with the 2011 report. You will see on that page "Key Corporate Executives"; do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Then if you go down the list, one of the key corporate executives is a Mr Gary Wong, head of safety and service quality department. Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If we go to the annual report for the following year, 2012 -- we can find that, I believe, at page 995

of the same bundle, and on that page, we will see again, under the heading of "Key Corporate Executives", the name of Mr Wong included as the head of safety and service quality department. Is that correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Let's move from bundle 3 to bundle 4 of KMB, and go firstly to page 1202. If you would take it from me -- at page 1202, do you see the reference again to Mr Wong as the head of the safety and service quality department?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Which year is this annual report?

MR DUNCAN: This is, if you could take it from me, the 2013 annual report.

At this point, I would like to go back to a reference that we have already seen this morning, KMB-9/3855. This is the reference of the outstanding service award.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Outstanding service award.

MR DUNCAN: Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) I see it on the screen, yes.

MR DUNCAN: The distribution includes a distribution to the head of the safety and service quality department. You will see that on the right-hand side of the distribution list --

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.
MR DUNCAN: -- about six down from the top.
DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.
MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then back to bundle 4, this time, please, at page 1410, you will see at page 1410 the key corporate executives as they are listed in the 2014 annual report.

On this occasion, there is no reference, is there, to any head of the safety and service quality department; is that correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.
MR DUNCAN: In fact, I think you have said earlier in your evidence that this department was replaced at some point; is that correct?
DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.
MR DUNCAN: The committee has received evidence -- I'm not sure whether you've seen this or not -- to the effect that the employment of Mr Gary Wong was terminated during the year of 2015. Is that correct?
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.
MR DUNCAN: Did that coincide with the safety and service quality department no longer existing?
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.
MR DUNCAN: Please continue.
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Regarding the work of this particular

department, at that time, Mr Owen, head of the operations, didn't know much about the past and the communication with the bus captains was poor. So there was a decision to enhance the work, so as to let it be taken up by the two deputy heads of operations, one of them being me, myself.

In terms of the hardware, I am very familiar with it. I've been with KMB for a long time, most of the time with the engineering department. So regarding bus hardware and engineering and safety, I can do more.

Earlier on, the department's knowledge about those parts, it wasn't adequate, and for this department, as to its earlier communication with bus captains, it was poor, and in fact bus captains were not satisfied and in fact it could have been done better. Say, for example, at a specific bend there were certain suggestions and many bus captains found them unrealistic or impractical. Say, for example, they would like to specify certain speeds for entering a bend and the speed would be recorded on a card and ask the bus captains to remember the speed. For professional bus captains, it is just not practicable and in fact it would cause confusion. This is one of the examples.

When the function was incorporated with the operations director, the function would be strengthened

within the compartment of the bus, and in terms of hardware, we have done a lot, like on-board facilities. At that time many bus captains had a lot of views about demisters, they were not happy with the demisters. We did a series of matters in order to provide a long-term solution. And there were new black box monitoring reports which were generated, and on-board stickers were also placed in a more proper manner.

With regard to CCTV, we also strengthened it. Of course, we faced a lot of difficulties with regard to the installation of CCTV. We had to communicate with the bus captains and we had to do it step by step.

In terms of hardware, there is a lot more, including how we could have facilities to help bus captains, and in the past half-year or so we had a lot of discussion with the sector and the manufacturers. We talked to bus manufacturers to see how our buses could become more safe. All in all, in terms of hardware, we enhanced it. We placed emphasis on the hardware. Anything that could be enhanced in terms of hardware would be attended to by an open mind on our part. And in terms of hardware, and especially with regard to safety, there has been a lot of enhancement in the past few years. We will continue to go in that direction.

As for operations, we have another deputy operations

director who is looking over our operations and including road safety. Bus captains face their work environment every day and safety is important, including facilities, road facilities, terminus facilities, road congestion. All these are related to safety, and rest time is also an important element.

We hope we will adopt a human approach in communicating with bus captains with regard to operations, so we can enhance bus safety.

As for monitoring, safety training and also discipline, in September 2017 we set up a new department. That is the quality assurance department. It is responsible for training bus captains, training of new bus captains, safety training, remedial training, monitoring, discipline, et cetera. Hopefully we can enhance hardware and software in the area of safety, so we can perform better. We can also see that when the department is enhanced to the level of deputy operations director, the injury rate resulting from traffic accident has been improved. We hope we can continue to work hard in this regard.

Thank you.

MR ROGER LEE: All in all, basically, we are talking about the same staff. It is just that the head is not there, and we are talking about an interdepartmental approach

to tackle safety and quality control. I think that is what Mr Leung has been doing in the past few years.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you for that.

So the safety and service quality department was, if I understand it correctly, established in 2010, and ceased to exist, at least in its former form, in 2015; would that be correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: We have seen from the 2011 annual report that that was a department which focused on enhancing the company's safety performance and, as it said in the report, delivering high-quality services.

Apart from Mr Gary Wong, how many other staff were in that safety and service quality department between 2010 and 2015?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Fewer than 10.

MR DUNCAN: Is there any person in the management structure now who carries the responsibility for the matter of safety across the company?

MR GODWIN SO: At present, the company structure is such that every department has some responsibility for safety. In September last year, we set up a department which is under the human resources department. It is called the training and quality assurance department. My colleague sitting next to me is the head of that

department. He is responsible for different matters, but he trains bus captains. And as for hardware, this is left to the engineering department, because safety has to do with the stability and the facilities of the vehicle, and then on the human side it is the driving technique.

In the training and quality assurance department, we have done a lot of enhancement with software in terms of training and staff performance. I think I can hand over to Mr Wong to introduce that to you.

MR JAMES WONG: Actually, safety should not be the responsibility of just one person in the company. Rather, everyone in the company should ensure safety, whether it is occupational safety or driving safety. In my department, I am mainly responsible for driving safety of bus captains. From the training stage, we would require them to place emphasis on safety. In terms of bus captains, first of all they must have safe driving techniques. Secondly, they must have a safe driving attitude. Then, they must have good knowledge about the company and Hong Kong's roads so that he can be safe.

First of all, I place emphasis on driving techniques, because if he doesn't have driving techniques he just cannot manoeuvre such a big bus.

From joining KMB, we have increased driving instructors from 65 to 81. The 81 driving instructors have to have certain qualification. They must have ten years of experience in driving a bus and they must have not committed any serious or liable traffic accident, and of course they must perform well because they would be responsible for teaching new bus captains.

Now that we have 81 driving instructors, we place emphasis on achieving standards for bus captains. In phase 1 of training, we make sure that they would have the qualification to get a driving licence for driving a franchised bus, that would be issued by the Transport Department, which would confirm that our school has achieved that standard. After the bus captain has got a driver's licence, he will continue with training to achieve KMB standards, meaning that he will have to understand the routes and he will have to know the roads, the road situations in Hong Kong.

Then I also mentioned driving attitude, which is also important. Very often, this will be affected by the stress that they experience and it also depends on their mental state. In order to do something about this, in May we signed an agreement with the psychology department of the Chinese University of Hong Kong in order to do a consultancy to help us to understand the

stress suffered by bus captains when they drive, so that we can enhance the psychological state of bus captains, for them to achieve a safe driving attitude. This is going on, and the psychologists of the Chinese University of Hong Kong have talked to our frontline staff and bus captains to understand their work difficulties. We hope that in the future our driving instructors will be able to train our bus captains in such a way that the psychological state of our bus captains will be enhanced.

As for knowledge, we require bus captains to know the operations of KMB so that they can drive safely.

MR ROGER LEE: I would like to add something. As I said, safety is an interdepartmental matter. Our training school has to do more with bus captains, but then we also look at the hardware. Hardware installation is an important part. In the past year, together with Mr Leung, we went to bus fairs overseas, to understand better safety installations for buses. In autumn last year, we had an exchange with Queen's University in Belfast and another organisation. We sent our staff to learn there, to understand how we can enhance driving safety. There were professors and research personnel who also came to Hong Kong, to KMB, and there will be more cooperation between us later on, in order to

research into hardware of buses, to see whether it can be done so that we can help bus captains to have more support when they drive.

This is already starting, and I believe that in future the driving school and the hardware aspects will be enhanced so that there will be better driving safety.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any specific devices that you have considered with Queen's University?

MR ROGER LEE: There are many aspects but there are mainly two aspects. First, in terms of bus operation, how we can allow it to be steered in a more smooth way. This is one aspect. Another aspect is when we purchase hardware in the market, we are procuring them from a third party, and when it is applied on board there will be some difficulty, because especially with double-deckers, we only have two to three companies supplying the devices and there is a lack of competition. We must look for technological institutes. I think Belfast has almost the only university which does research into the mechanics of double-deckers.

At this stage, maybe I can ask Mr Leung, our operations director, to explain things to you.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Let me show you a paper, that's paper 190.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is what Mr Lee has been referring to. That is that KMB together with the Queen's University in Belfast, have come to a cooperation. W-Tech is a sort of institute under the university. We have got a project. We have got an engineer, Mr Lo, just the end of last month, went to visit this university. We have a cooperation. So he is acting like a visiting researcher so as to take part in the project.

We have researchers from this university in Northern Ireland. For the guiding professors, there were two of them who came to visit KMB last month. We talked to them. They were aware of the bus operations in Hong Kong. We told them about our safety issues and we talked about ways to improve the hardware, so when we talk about the content of the cooperation, it is a holistic way to take a look to see what can be done in terms of hardware, say for example in reminding the bus captains, say for example, whether the bus captains are attentive, and we talk about the traffic conditions, the driving attitude. We want to alert the bus captains.

Then, further on, we would like to see the following. We want to know whether we can rectify certain improper behaviour of the drivers. So this would be part of the project. A lot will be covered.

Please refer to the paper itself. A lot will be covered in terms of the hardware and software. As to why we are cooperating with this university and how it is to be done, as Mr Lee has said, we are going to cover all the facilities on board the bus, so it would be comprehensive.

So in terms of bus design, I think a lot of things can be applied in the situation of Hong Kong, and then we may come up with certain standards. I think I can say that currently we haven't got any standards, quite unlike the case of private cars.

For private cars, we have got many safety facilities, but then for double decked buses we encounter a difficulty here. We do want certain facilities. We do want new technologies. We want to have them on our double-deckers. But then usually it is not easy to achieve.

I joined in 2015. Almost on a yearly basis, I went to Europe, so as to talk to the two bus manufacturers. I shared views of Mr Leung. Unlike private cars -- well, in the case of private cars, there are many facilities that cannot be available on double-deckers. It is difficult to persuade the bus manufacturers to do so. Maybe this is due to the lack of cooperation. I won't elaborate. But indeed it is difficult.

I went to Northern Ireland. I firmly believe that for the researchers in Queen's University as well as the company called Wright, I think they are really passionate about buses. I believe that KMB's cooperation with them will produce a product in which I will be confident. I think this will help KMB. It will also help the trade as a whole so we can achieve improvements. It is going to be a very meaningful initiative. I believe that KMB has a lot of expectation about this project. We have got some young engineers within KMB.

When we talk about safety, in the past we have a lot of research, say for example a solar facility based on the roof of the bus. In fact, this has helped many bus captains. During hot weather, when they return to the bus -- of course, when you park a bus during hot weather, the temperature of the bus is high, it is acting like a greenhouse; it will be up to 50 degrees under the sun. He has to switch on the engine, he has to cool down the temperature before he can start driving. It takes time; it is very hard on them. So having installed the solar panels, and in fact we have entered phase 2. We believe that after parking a bus the solar panels can reduce the temperature of the bus substantially. After his rest break or after a meal

break, it will be easier for him to switch on the engine and start again. It may be something small but we hope this will become a standard feature.

In other words, for our new buses, we hope we can ask our bus manufacturers to fit the solar panels on the roof. Hong Kong is really too hot. In the coming year, 2019, the new buses will get the solar panels on the roof. This can reduce the air temperature. We have succeeded in bringing down the temperature.

CHAIRMAN: I think we have got your point. You have made it a few times.

May I ask this, and then we are going to take a 20-minute break: may I ask that you provide to the committee a legible version of the document that we have at page 190 in the bundle, W-Tech. I think perhaps the problem is that it's coloured ink and it hasn't come through properly. If you could provide a copy we can read, then we can follow your suggestion and read the paper.

But we will take a 20-minute break now.

(11.37 am)

(A short adjournment)

(12.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Dr Leung, could I have you and your colleagues, please, at KMB-1 at page 188. You should be looking at a copy of a letter from KMB to the committee dated 23 May 2018. Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Does that refer to the matter about which evidence was given just before the break, the collaboration with a company called W-Tech?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: If I could bring your attention page 188 and the letter two-thirds of the way down:

"The purpose of the ... meeting was to discuss implementing a series of advanced driver assist systems ... in the fleets of KMB and LWB."

And it goes on to say:

"The objectives of the said collaboration with as follows", and we can see them outlined: 1, 2 and 3:

"1. To complete a technology viability assessment of pre-commercial/commercial ADAS technologies applicable to the Wrightbus Streetdeck configuration;

2. To recommend ADAS appropriate for implementation within the KMB and LWB fleets of Wrightbus vehicles on the basis of this assessment; and.

3. To deliver a roadmap for ADAS implementation to KMB and LWB."

Now could I ask this question: does the KMB fleet at the moment include a number of Wrightbus vehicles?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Currently, there is one undergoing prototyping. For the bodywork for Wrightbus, we have got many bus bodies on Volvo chassis, hundreds of them.

MR DUNCAN: Apart from the Wrightbus, who are the other manufacturers of the buses in the Kowloon Motor Bus fleet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Sorry, please repeat your question.

MR DUNCAN: Who are the vehicles in the KMB bus fleet manufactured by -- I think there's a series, a number of different manufacturers; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Other bus -- Volvo, MAN, mainly ADL and Volvo.

MR DUNCAN: So Volvo, MAN, ADL, that's Alexander Dennis; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So basically three types within the bus fleet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Now, the bus that was involved in the Tai Po accident, was that a Wrightbus?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: With Volvo chassis, with Wrightbus bus body. It's a double-decker.

MR DUNCAN: So how many of your buses have this configuration, a Volvo or a MAN or an ADL base with

a Wrightbus configuration?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I don't have the exact figure, but I would say roughly 800 to 900 of them.

MR DUNCAN: What is the total number of your fleet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Together with LWB, almost 4,300, for both KMB and LWB.

MR DUNCAN: Can you explain again what the Wrightbus prototype is, please?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The chassis and bodywork have been manufactured by Wrightbus. It's a two-axle double-decker.

MR DUNCAN: And the collaboration agreement that you have reached with W-Tech, does that anticipate that the company will be purchasing a number of Wrightbus vehicles of that nature?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR DUNCAN: What does it anticipate? On what buses would the possible ADAS system be installed?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is a research to see what will be of assistance in relation to enhancing bus safety. We want to find out what can be available and achievable on Wrightbus, and then we will take into account bus operations in Hong Kong. We also hope that the outcome, if feasible, will be applied and benefit the buses in Hong Kong, but after all this is a research. This is

too early to talk about implementation. So it is an academic research. We have deployed a colleague to Queen's University in Belfast to carry out a one-year project, which is a research, to see what would be possible, so that in future they can be applied to double-decker buses, in this particular case Wrightbus, but we are not ruling out any possibilities, and we also hope that in future such safety features will become standard safety features. We hope that all other bus manufacturers will also take part or will use such measures to enhance bus safety.

MR DUNCAN: Could you just kindly explain for the committee what is the use of, say, the Volvo chassis with the Wright-tech [sic] body, as I understand you? Could you explain that, please?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: For the chassis, we have to (unclear word) three of them, and the engine, and the transmission system and the driver's cab. For the bus body, that's on top of the chassis, including the bodywork, the flooring, the seats, the air-conditioning. So they will be regarded as the body.

For the bus body, it is by Wrightbus. For the chassis, that's by Volvo.

CHAIRMAN: Where are the two joined together, the chassis and the bus body?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It can take different ways at different points. As to the one I mentioned, I suppose it should be in the UK, at Wrightbus, manufactured by Wrightbus.

(In English) Just to clarify, a chassis can have different kinds of bus bodies.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I understand that. My question is simple: where are they put together?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) They can be put together either in the original manufacturer's facilities or they can assembled elsewhere. In the past, KMB did our own bus assembly. We also had buses assembled in China and there are buses assembled in different places.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: When you say it could be done by the original manufacturer, in this case would that be Volvo or would it be Wright Group?

MR ROGER LEE: Well, for the chassis, if it is by Volvo, and if the body is Wright, then there are two functions. First of all, the chassis can be transferred to Belfast and then the body, the bus body, would be fitted onto the chassis. It is complicated because both would undergo a lot of research. We talk about the torque, et cetera. Then in Malaysia, Wright has got a plant in Malaysia, to carry out bus assembly work. So for the Volvo chassis, and in fact we have got it for Gemilang,

Wright is for body, Volvo is for the chassis, and Wright has also researched and developed its own chassis but we have only got one, that is the one being tested. Now, a bus has got the chassis as well as the body. You need both. Before you can research into the ADAS, you must have a bus physically to do it. After we have got the ADAS, it means it can be used in any bus.

MR DUNCAN: What's the advantage of having the Wrightbus body, over just having the complete Volvo bus?

MR ROGER LEE: For Wrightbus, let me supplement. Today, their chassis cannot have three axles, because in the UK they have got many Wrightbus bodies and Wrightbus axles but they can only accommodate two, but in Hong Kong we are mainly having three axles, because this has a larger capacity and we carry a larger air-conditioner at the back, and for Hong Kong for each axle, we have this standard; the loading cannot exceed a particular limit.

So, in the case of Hong Kong and for us, KMB as well, we usually use the three axles. For Wrightbus, it has got a chassis as well as body, it's similar to ADL. ADL has both chassis as well as the body, but before Wrightbus has got three-axle buses, the only one we have got from Wrightbus is only two-axle, for Volvo, three; that is why we have got their bodywork fitted on to Volvo chassis.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you very much. Mr Duncan asked my question already. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Just going back to the management structure -- we don't need to go to the document -- Mr Wong, when you were giving your answer before, you mentioned a lot about responsibility for training, and that's clearly in the training and quality assurance department.

Who in the company carries the responsibility of monitoring not the training of the drivers but the actual performance of the drivers, in particular their safety performance? Where does the responsibility for that sit?

MR PATRICK PANG: Mr Duncan, let me answer this question. As far as the monitoring of the safety of bus captains is concerned, it is done at different levels by different colleagues. For each bus, we have got the so-called black box, we have got this tool. On a weekly basis, we have monitoring reports. We get the data.

Three main sets of data would be available. First of all, speeding; second, abrupt acceleration, sudden acceleration; third, harsh braking.

For our depots, for our management at the depots, on a weekly basis we take a look. Currently, what we can achieve is that we can look at the data collected by the black box for the preceding four days.

In fact, every day we start with the following. That is we will analyse the data, in particular speeding beyond the limits covering beyond the 50km per hour and beyond the 70km per hour limits. For sudden acceleration and abrupt braking, we have got data to tell us the case of individual bus captains. This is because we do generate exception reports, and we can find out whether the driving behaviour of certain bus captains should warrant our attention.

If we see that for a particular bus captain over a particular period of time, his driving attitude is such that it warrants our attention, then we will first of all advise the bus captain and will get our frontline staff to talk to the bus captain to find out whether there is a special reason for that. And then regarding the over-speeding, we will refer the cases of speeding to our training and quality assurance department immediately, to take follow-up action. And then for speeding, maybe Mr Wong can also supplement.

What I would like to say is that the black box data will be kept, will be reviewed and will be followed up.

MR DUNCAN: The question really was who has the responsibility. So you have talked about the depots carrying out work. What staff are at a depot?

MR PATRICK PANG: Mr Duncan, who should be responsible,

I can answer you --

CHAIRMAN: "Who is", not "should be"; "who is". And please can I ask you to speak more slowly.

MR PATRICK PANG: (In English) Okay.

(Via interpreter) The management at depot starts with our operations officers. The operations officer, in every depot or zone -- overall speaking, at KMB, we have four main depots, including the one at Lai Chi Kok, the one in Kowloon Bay, another one in Sha Tin, and the one in Tuen Mun, and of course we have Long Win Bus. At every depot, there are boundaries delineated for them. They are responsible for different zones. There is an assistant manager or manager responsible for every zone. We call them managers or assistant managers. Every manager or assistant manager has different numbers of operation officers under them. On a daily basis, when operations officers come to work, the first thing they do is to look at the black box information for the preceding four days, including speeding, sudden acceleration, and harsh braking.

Assistant managers and operations officers do this every day.

MR DUNCAN: So how many operations officers would there be at each of the four depots?

MR PATRICK PANG: Altogether, at every depot, depending on

the size of the depot, some may have six to seven operations officers, some may have three to four operations officers, and altogether there are about 37 colleagues dealing with the data analysis.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a graphic or a map that shows the zones that are applicable in each of the four depots?

MR PATRICK PANG: Chairman, can I be allowed to supply -- absolutely, yes, definitely.

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer "yes" or "no" -- thank you. Try answering "yes" or "no" to this as well.

MR PATRICK PANG: (In English) Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide a copy of such a map or plan to us, "yes" or "no"?

MR PATRICK PANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Will you do so, "yes" or "no"?

MR PATRICK PANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Now, the operations officers presumably report to the depot manager; would that be correct?

MR PATRICK PANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And who do the depot managers report to?

MR PATRICK PANG: At every depot, there will be an experienced general manager or manager who will coordinate the operation of the four depots and Long Win

Bus. These five experienced general managers or managers directly report to me.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to come back to the black box in a few moments, but there are just two other matters I want to explore with you before I do that.

Can I ask you to have in front of you, please, bundle FE-1, and could you go, please, to page 96-1 of that bundle. At that page, you should be looking at a copy of a document sent by email by the committee to a Mr Raymond Cheng. Are you looking at that? Do you see that?

Do you recognise Mr Raymond Cheng as being a former employee of the company? Is he known to you as a former employee?

MR ROGER LEE: He left when I joined the company. He left in 2014.

MR DUNCAN: Right. You will see that one of the matters that the committee has enquired into is under the heading "Employment by KMB"; do you see that?

Can you just read to yourself, please, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of that email letter from the committee to Mr Cheng.

Have you been able to read that? Thank you.

Could you then please turn to page 96-4. Have you seen this response previously, Mr Lee?

MR ROGER LEE: No.

MR DUNCAN: Could you take the time, please, just to read to yourself what appears at page 96-4, 96-5, and there's also an extract on page 96-6. Just read that to yourself, please, to familiarise yourself with it.

Thank you. Then at page 96-7, you will see a further response from Mr Cheng, where he addresses again question 1 and question 2. I wonder if you would be good enough, please, just to read those entries to yourself, at page 96-7.

Thank you. Now, on page 96-7, just under the heading "Answer to Q2", Mr Cheng refers to the matter of 29 sharp bends, and it talks about information being in an Excel format. Do you see that?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Does that information still exist within the company?

MR ROGER LEE: I joined the company in 2015. I have not seen such information. In the past few months, however, I sought an understanding with people who have worked in the company for a long time and how these 29 sharp bends came about. I can supply the record to the committee. According to the information, at that time, Mr Edmond Ho, the managing director, said that the operations director of that time should approve it

before it would be implemented. According to the records, in 2014, the proposal of the 29 sharp bends was not implemented, and in the record papers it was seen that many bus captains and frontline staff had a lot to say about the implementability, and in 2015, when I took over in early 2015, I knew nothing about that recommendation, but the present operations director, Mr Leung, or the head of the training school, can supplement.

MR DUNCAN: I don't want to labour this point. All I'm asking is whether the information in the Excel format is available, and I think you've said that you could make the record available. Are you saying that it is available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I cannot answer the question now. I can find out.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And if you are able to locate it, would you provide it to the committee?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The other records that I think Mr Lee was making reference to was the explanation for why the scheme was not implemented.

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Could you make those records available?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So there are two records. One is the Excel format with the 29 bends and whatever else went with it, and then the records that go to why it was not implemented.

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Just to supplement that, if you look down at the bottom of the page, 96-7, there is reference to small reminding cards with exact locations of sharp bends and safe speeds having been printed. Could you also enquire into the company's records as to whether a sample of the printed card is available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I haven't seen that.

MR JAMES WONG: In fact, in relation to this matter, I have looked it up. According to the information, I think at that time there was a proposal for the KMB to identify the sharp bends so that the bus captains would slow down the speed. I've got the minutes for that meeting, and as our MD has already said, at that time it would require the approval of the MD before it could be implemented.

According to the agenda of that meeting --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Wong, do these cards exist or not? Could you just answer that question directly?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) Because I want to add some more

information.

CHAIRMAN: By all means add more, but tell us directly: do they exist or not?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) I don't have.

CHAIRMAN: They don't exist, as far as you are concerned?

MR JAMES WONG: (In English) No.

CHAIRMAN: I don't want to cut you off so tell us what it is you want to tell us.

MR JAMES WONG: According to the documents, it said that it would require the approval of the OD to implement it. According to the record, at that time it was obstructed by many staff members so it was not implemented and therefore I think that this didn't go into the staff members telling them about the sharp bends.

For the sharp bends, KMB came up with safety guidelines, but it is not about those 29 sharp bends. In fact, for our website for staff members, we have provided road sections, including sharp bends and others, carrying with them the driving tips. They are available from the website for staff members. So, for an employee who has to drive a particular route, he types in the route and then, covering the starting point and the ending point, there will be things that would warrant the attention of the bus captains, including the bends. So, when he drives, he will follow the

guidelines and drive carefully.

That's all I want to supplement.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Could you go back now, please, to KMB-1 at page 30. We are back on the initial submissions to the committee, and in this particular respect you have been asked, you can see at the top of the page, to "identify and supply copies of any codes of practice established by your company"; do you see that?

Under the codes of practice, there are two standards referred to, together with the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series. Do you see those references?

The first of those is the International Organization for Standardization. Do you see that?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Would it be fair to say that there is nothing within that standard which applies directly to the matter of safety, applicable to bus captains?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Likewise, if we go to the second of the standards, the International Organization for Standardization -- ISO 14001 -- again, would there be nothing within that standard which is applicable to the

safety procedures which should be undertaken by a bus captain?

MR GODWIN SO: For ISO 14001, nothing, but ISO 9001, that's all about quality management. It does involve safety.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, but the question I'm asking is does it concern safety with regard to the manner in which a bus captain drives?

MR GODWIN SO: For this question, I would like to ask you to look at the second bullet above, "Staff Handbook". The fifth item, there is this safe driving manual for bus captains, and that involved the safety measures. Perhaps Mr Duncan would like to talk about this one.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Let me supplement. Back to ISO. For OHSAS 18001, that is the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series, we do mention safety, one of them being that for each depot, we have to set up a depot safety committee with two elements. First, maintenance, that is maintenance carried out within the depot. Then another committee is for operations.

For each depot, it has to set up a structure, and it is an occupational safety committee. The majority of the members are from the operations section, including Mr Pang. For the depot safety committee, for the part concerning operations -- now, for bus captains, at the bus termini, and for bus captains driving on the road,

for bus captains moving around in the depot, we talk about their working environment. For the depot safety committee, it also examines the traffic accidents of the depot. So it is under ISO 18001. We do have a "plan, do, check, act", and that takes care of driving safety matters. We do have it.

MR DUNCAN: What I'm asking you is whether 18001 dictates how a driver should drive. It doesn't descend to that detail, does it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I would like to say that this is not the only thing to govern the driving of bus captains. As Mr So has said, for ISO 9001, there are measures relating to the safe driving of bus captains.

What I want to say is that there are different systems, and each will have its own functions, and in different ways it can contribute to the training, with monitoring, enforcement of our bus captains. For 18001, we talked about the depot safety committee. That takes care of matters at the depot level. But then for the Bus Captain Training School and then for the human resources department, we have to look at it from the corporate perspective.

So it isn't a matter of just having a single element. We have to take a holistic view.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, I understand that. My simple question is:

there is nothing in the corporate safety manual, OHSAS 18001 which dictates how a driver is to drive safely? That's my simple question.

MR GODWIN SO: If you want to know how a bus captain should drive safely, then you should refer to what I have talked about. That is the one found at annex 1837, that is the safe driving manual for bus captains. That's from the corporate.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, the bus captain safety handbook; we are aware of that.

What I want to refer you to is miscellaneous file 2 at page 769. You should be looking at a copy of the letter apparently to the chairman of the LegCo's Panel on Transport, dated 16 June 2016. Do you have that in front of you?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And it appears to be from an organisation called the Community for Road Safety; do you see that?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is the heading of the letter, "Administration's paper on new franchise for bus network of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company Ltd -- report on the public consultation on the new franchise"; is that the heading?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Now, if you read the letter itself, you will see

it refers to the submission of a document on 18 April 2016 to the government, which you can see on the following page, 770. Is the company aware of this organisation called the Community for Road Safety?

MR GODWIN SO: I became aware of this organisation as a result of this submission. Prior to that, I didn't.

MR DUNCAN: Have you read this document then, the document which commences at page 770, "New Franchise for Bus Network of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co Ltd"? Have you already read it?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Briefly.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Can I take you, please, to page 772. Do you see a heading on that page, "Bus Safety -- Road Safety Management System"?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Could you read the contents of that section, please, to yourself.

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware of that standard, ISO 39001?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, from this submission.

MR DUNCAN: Were you not aware of this prior to reading this submission?

MR GODWIN SO: No, not before that.

MR DUNCAN: Have you read the standard since reading this submission?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Briefly.

MR DUNCAN: And do you think there is some merit in the standard as far as your company is concerned?

MR GODWIN SO: Well, let me say this. First of all, for this report or for this submission, I don't think they have carried out any site visit at our company, nor did they consult us. Then, for this standard, this is not the only safety standard. For the author writing this report, I think he also said that the bus operator should come up with a safety system so as to achieve this particular ISO standard, namely 39001.

In our company, there is a safety system. We built it on the premise of ISO 9001, and ISO 39001 is actually evolving from ISO 9001. It has covered four main pillars: plan, do, check, act. And we have also got renewed accreditation under ISO 9001. And recently we engaged a transport expert from the UK to the company to look at our operation, our maintenance, in order to conduct a health check on us, so as to enhance our internal safety standards. That is our own safety standard. It might not have to be pegged to ISO 39001. Nevertheless, it is a very high quality standard.

MR DUNCAN: When you say "recently", when was that?

MR ROGER LEE: I would like to add, I think it was in March/April this year, our board of directors hoped to

engage a overseas expert to look at our operations. Whether it is about maintenance of our fleet or duty despatch for bus captains and even training, we would like to see how we can enhance our service in this regard.

Actually, there is more than one expert. Actually, yesterday they started to work.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Well, yesterday they came to Hong Kong. They came to our depots to start working.

CHAIRMAN: And who are they?

MR ROGER LEE: I don't have the name of the company. Can I supplement it afterwards?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do so. Do none of your colleagues know the name of this consultant?

MR ROGER LEE: Actually, it was in spring this year that I went to London. I met a few consultants. Some worked at London Transport. Some worked at large bus operators in the UK. Most of them are experienced operators in the UK. The company's name is Direx Solutions Ltd. It is a consultant company. Most of the consultants have been experienced in large bus operation in the UK.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So do I understand there is an investigation underway; there is no report available as yet?

CHAIRMAN: I think you said they began yesterday.

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

(Via interpreter) Actually, a lot of information was submitted beforehand but the actual work just started. The consultant will certainly submit reports to our board after he has reviewed our operations.

MR DUNCAN: When do you expect that that report would be available?

MR ROGER LEE: Within the year.

MR DUNCAN: You mean within 2018 or within 12 months?

MR ROGER LEE: It will be in stages. The first stage is for them to do a body check, to see where we can improve. This is difficult because, first of all, he has to get to know our colleagues, so this will be done in stages. I believe there should be an initial report by the end of the year.

MR DUNCAN: Right. I'm now going to turn to the topic of the black box, which has been referred to on a number of occasions already this morning.

Can we start by picking up KMB-1 at page 50. Again, this page is part of the initial submission made by the company to the committee back in April of this year.

At page 50, the question that was asked, question number 2:

"Are electronic recording device eg tachographs/blackboxes and speed Limiters installed on

all buses? What information from these devices pertaining to monitoring the driving performance of bus captains is captured, and how is the collected information used to enhance driving safety? Are the buses equipped with forward-looking cameras that record and retain the progress of the vehicle?"

I'm particularly interested in the second sentence, "What information from these devices pertaining to monitoring the driving performance of bus captains is captured, and how is the collected information used to enhance driving safety?"

You will see the answer which has been provided to the committee, the first bullet:

"All KMB and LWB buses are equipped with black boxes and speed limiters."

Secondly:

"The black boxes capture the information of vehicle speed and vehicle location.

Operations sections of KMB and LWB monitor bus speed daily for the driving record of the preceding 10 days to monitor BCs' driving performance. Information will be passed to performance managers to commence disciplinary action within 14 working days from the time of the contravention."

Do you see that answer?

MR ROGER LEE: (Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN: Now, there are a number of matters I want to explore with you with regard to these black boxes. Let me make it clear at the outset what I'm interested in finding out on behalf of the committee. In particular, I'm interested in finding out what data these black boxes in your buses are capable of capturing, firstly; and secondly, what do they in fact capture, as opposed to what they are capable of capturing. And there's a third aspect, the use to which that data is actually put.

I just make that all clear to you so you can understand why I'm asking these questions.

I'm going to cover those matters in four areas, to try and make it simple for everybody concerned.

First of all, I'm going to ask you what requirements, if any, the Transport Department has laid down for the installation and use of black boxes. So what obligations do you have by virtue of the Transport Department requirements? That's number one.

Number two, I'm going to explore with you the data which is actually collected by the black boxes in the company's buses.

Thirdly, I'm going to cover what use is actually made of that data to provide real-time alerts to the bus

drivers as they are driving the bus.

Then, finally, I'm going to ask questions to find out what use is made of recorded black box data in order to facilitate the assessment of driving behaviour and also the monitoring of the driver as he is driving the bus.

So those are the areas, I think, that the committee will be interested in, and we will go through those one by one; okay?

MR PATRICK PANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So the first of those topics is what requirements, if any, what obligations you have under the franchise agreement, or otherwise, to the Transport Department in respect of the installation and use of these black boxes.

So can I take you in that context first of all to TD-5, and ask you to turn up, please, page 1597.

Are you looking at a note from the Transport Department?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And is it addressed to a number of bus companies, including your own? And does it carry the heading, "Installation of Electronic Data Recording Devices on New Buses"? Is that the heading?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And is that a reference to a black box, an electronic data recording device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: In reality, in November 2003, we started the installation. That was in November 2003. And before --

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Leung, be patient. Mr Duncan will ask you questions. If there's something you wish to add because his questions aren't good enough, feel free to do so.

MR DUNCAN: And does that contain the requirement, namely that buses first registered after 1 July 2004 should be installed with a black box complying with the stated technical specification? Is that the requirement?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. If you turn the page, are the requirements set out there in items number 2 and 3?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And the first of those, item 2, does that demand that, "The device should sample the following data at 1 second intervals, and store data every 30 seconds for a period of 2 weeks"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And does it refer to two aspects, first of all the operation times?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And, secondly, vehicle speed?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: In item 3, there is further reference to the software for analysing on-board or downloaded data should be capable of reporting two matters; is that right?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: First of all, with regard to an accident report, the vehicle speed profile, at a time interval which is then set out.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Then, secondly, the over-speeding report: the frequency, maximum speed attained and over-speeding duration for speeds over 70 kilometres per hour?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So was that the first requirement issued by the Transport Department with regard to the installation of black boxes and what they should be able to provide?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: We can perhaps come back to that further after the lunch break.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Gentlemen, we will take our lunch break now

and resume the hearing at 2.30 this afternoon.

2.30. Thank you.

(1.02 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, gentlemen.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Gentlemen, we had seen before lunch the requirements from the Transport Department with regard to the use of black boxes in October 2003.

The next document I'd like to take you to, to be found in KMB-1, and perhaps we can go to page 159 firstly.

This is the second submission that the company made to the committee dated 18 May. If I could take you, please, through to page 175. You will see at the top of the page a question (5), in which the matter of the franchise requirements is mentioned.

You will then see question (6), a question posed by the committee:

"Please identify those franchise requirements. Are the requirements imposed by the Transport Department? Are they expressed in writing? If so, please provide copies of those documents."

And in the company's response, there is reference to clause 7(1) of the franchise, and then an explanation which reads as follows:

"During the discussions of the new franchise, the government has requested KMB to commit to adopt a list of enhanced safety features including but not limited to on-bus electronic data processing device (also known as black box), speed limiter and surveillance cameras, as the standard provisions when acquiring new buses (please refer to extracts of the letter from [the department] dated 10 March 2017 ...). KMB has given its undertaking to TD to implement these commitments under the new franchise."

The letter from TD is referred to in an annex, which I'll ask you to turn up. That would be at KMB-9 at page 3997. It's the second-last page of the bundle.

If you look at that page, it's headed, "Provision of on-bus facilities", and it is introduced by saying, "Pursuant to clause 7 of the new franchise, KMB has committed", and there are set out under that sentence item (a), and then an item (b) on the second page.

The one which is relevant for our purposes is under (a) and under the heading, "Enhanced safety features", as referred to in the previous document.

If you just go down the list of safety features, you

will see, I think, eight of them, numbered (i) through to (viii). The third one of those refers to the electronic data processing device, ie the black box.

Is it correct that the department has not stipulated any requirement with regard to any particular use of the black box? It has simply said that that is a safety feature which the company should have? Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: So to the extent that the explanation suggested that that was an enhanced use of the black box, that would be not the correct way to read this document at page 3997; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's a bit complicated.

CHAIRMAN: It's complicated?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What's complicated?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) I try to explain.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Chinese words not interpreted) ... there's a commitment that we are going to do, but is it an enhanced feature? It's difficult to comment. But we have undertaken to do that.

MR DUNCAN: As I read it, you have undertaken to utilise the device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: And that's all?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Of course, that device would be used, as said, but we will make it as helpful as possible to the company. But is it an enhanced safety feature? We are of the view that it would be helpful for safety purpose.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan's question was: there is no stipulation by the Transport Department of any enhanced use of the device, is there?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

CHAIRMAN: Nor is there any stipulation as to any enhancement of the capabilities of the device.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I am grateful, Mr Chairman.

Apart from these two documents which we have seen, the one in 2003 and this one in 2017, has the Transport Department at any time required the company to make any particular type of use of the black box?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

MR DUNCAN: Just before I leave the document at page 175 of bundle 1, it is said in the last sentence that KMB has given its undertaking to the Transport Department to implement these conditions under the new franchise.

In what form was that undertaking given?

MR GODWIN SO: Maybe I should answer this question, because

I played an important role in the franchise renewal. It's an undertaking, according to page 3997, it was the content of a letter, it was signed by the company, representing the commitment to implement these, so that the matter, the franchise, can be granted by referring the matter to ExCo. That's a commitment on our part.

MR DUNCAN: Would you be able to provide a copy of the letter to the committee?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: This is a standard letter that is issued very close to the time when the franchise is renewed? We've seen these before.

But you're undertaking to do nothing, because there was no enhanced safety capability of the black box that had been stipulated and there was no enhancement of the use that was to be made of it. This was a puff, was it not?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's the requirement from the Transport Department, enhanced safety feature. It's the term used in the paper. We would see how we can make the best use of these features. It's not just about the wording. For example, electronic data processing device is mentioned, and they have certain specifications, and we would take the opportunity to enhance safety.

CHAIRMAN: The only specifications were dated November 2003. Nothing had changed since then.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Apart from this undertaking, we would do more. That's the minimum.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Leung, it's not a criticism of you. If the Transport Department, for their own reasons, invite you to undertake to commit to do nothing, you had agreed to it, hadn't you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I want to move on to the second of the areas I indicated I would cover with regards to the black box, and that is asking questions with regard to what data the black boxes in the KMB boxes are capable of collecting and what data they do actually collect. Do you understand that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I think you are aware that the committee have heard evidence from a Mr Kulis who is a representative of Openmatics, the company that supplied the black boxes to the company.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: You are aware of that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Have you had the opportunity of reading his evidence?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Briefly, yes.

MR DUNCAN: What about the written documentation that he provided to the committee? Have you had the opportunity of reading that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I think you are referring to the documentation provided by Openmatics' solicitors?

MR DUNCAN: Indeed, it came through the solicitors. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

In that respect, can I take you to one of the other bundles, BM-1. If you would be good enough, please, to turn up page 64 of that volume, you will see there that the law firm that the chairman obviously had in mind writing with regard to the services provided by the company referred to in that letter. Do you see that letter from the law firm?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Then if you turn to page 65, you will see the information with which the committee has been provided from page 65 right through to page 72.

The questions are in black and the answers have been provided in blue. I think that's the correct way of reading that letter.

The first matters I wish to bring to your attention are on page 65. You will see in item 1:

"In written submissions provided to the committee, dated 24 April 2018 ... KMB stated that ...

'Since 2015, KMB has taken the initiative to equip its buses with speed limiters, black boxes and surveillance cameras to monitor the driving performance of the bus captains as well as to assist in accident investigation."

If I could bring your attention, please, to the response in the next three paragraphs:

"Please note that the Openmatics portfolio does not consist of the aforementioned speed limiters and surveillance cameras. However, the black box is part of the Openmatics telematics system as explained below.

Openmatics entered into a supply contract to deliver telematics systems, dated 16th of April 2013 with Kowloon Bus Company ... and Long Win Bus Company ...

Openmatics started offering telematics services by using the first black box system called the 'Mozart box'. Later on, Openmatics replaced the Mozart Box by a successor platform black box called the 'Bach Box'. However, clients can use both systems in parallel as [Kowloon Motor Bus] does."

First of all, I will ask you to confirm that what is

said in those three paragraphs is correct.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) It is correct.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

I now want you, please, to turn to page 68 of the letter. If I could bring your attention to the second paragraph on that page which is coloured blue, and which reads this:

"What does the term 'BC' stands for?"

Then the following paragraph:

"The Openmatics telematics system installed at KMB can identify", and then four bullets:

"records of speeding; recorded every second and stored together with the related GPS data;

'malpractice' of harsh braking;

Abrupt acceleration;

The corresponding bus registration numbers with the assistance of other systems".

Are you able to confirm that that sets out what data the systems on the KMB bus are capable of identifying?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Before I go to the next page, there is one matter I would like to take up with you. If you would look down to the next entry:

"The Openmatics telematic system installed at KMB cannot identify:

Route numbers of certain buses".

But then the next paragraph is the one I am now interested in:

"The data are collected as defined by the system. Every second, the system collects the defined data and sends that data every 30 seconds -- if connected to WiFi or other cellular network or via USB -- to the defined FDP server. The information is also stored locally on the telemetry unit (black box) for 30 days. But data from the telemetry unit can be lost if it is not downloaded correctly."

If you look at the bottom of the page, the very last paragraph, there is a repetition of that entry, and it refers to the data being sent to the server every 30 seconds.

Could I then take you, please, to KMB-1 again, at page 72. This again, if I could remind you, is the response of 24 April this year of the company to the committee, the first response.

Could I bring your attention, please, to the last paragraph on that page:

"Black boxes are installed in all buses to capture the real-time information, such as speed, route, door open or close status and Global Positioning System (ie GPS), but there is a delay of about 10 seconds for

transmitting the information to bus headquarters. The data will be kept in the computer under the bus on-board monitoring system ..."

Now, there would appear, at least on the face of those two documents, to be a difference in that, according to the letter from the law firm, the data is sent every 30 seconds, whereas according to the return from the company it seems that the delay or the time at which the data is sent is every 10 seconds. Would you be able to comment on what appears to be a difference?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

(Via interpreter) Currently, the delay is 30 seconds. We hope to achieve a delay of 10 seconds, and we hope to achieve this by enhancing our servers, and technically we want to enable data to be committed to be transmitted more frequently. So currently the delay is 30 seconds.

MR DUNCAN: So what steps are you taking to achieve a 10-second delay?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We will look to enhance server technologies in order to achieve our target of 10 seconds.

MR DUNCAN: When do you expect that to happen?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We have no concrete timeline now but we are moving towards that direction.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help me at least by explaining what you mean by "enhance server technology"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The current delay is 30 seconds mainly due to server capacity, and the flow of data would increase. So this is an issue we have to solve.

CHAIRMAN: What server? Whose server?

MR GODWIN SO: I would like to add to what I just said about the difference between 10 seconds and 30 seconds and how we can reconcile the difference.

10 seconds referred to a delay when an incident is triggered, data would be sent after 10 seconds, and if the delay is 30 seconds, data would be transmitted to our headquarters every 30 seconds. So 10 seconds refers to a data delay, whereas for 30 seconds data would be sent to the headquarters every 30 seconds. So the two are referring to different procedures or processes.

CHAIRMAN: I'm asking for an explanation as to what this server is. Whose server is it? Where is it? What function does it perform?

MR GODWIN SO: The server is located in the data centre of our Kowloon Bay depot and the function is to store the data for analysis, to explain certain exceptions.

CHAIRMAN: So its capacity is not sufficient at the moment to produce a 10-second transmission; is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: (In English) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware of the fact that whether it's a 30-second gap or a 10-second gap or even a 5-second gap is a matter of choice for the user of the black box?

MR GODWIN SO: For the transmission gap of 30 seconds, that would not affect our analysis of data from the black box. As suggested in another paper, no bus route data is provided, so we would have to store this data and we would have to identify from other systems what the routes are and who the relevant bus captains are, before we can take warning or disciplinary action.

These reports are generated daily, so whether or not the transmission delay is 10 seconds or 30 seconds has no bearing on the task of analysis.

CHAIRMAN: Because there is no real-time analysis; is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: For real-time, yes, correct, we do not perform real-time analysis.

MR DUNCAN: Just if I could have an answer to my question, please.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, perhaps Prof Lo could ask a question.

MEMBER LO: I just want to clarify. There's this 10-second delay, and then you send the data 30 seconds later, so the total delay is 40 seconds, right? Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Let me correct it. At the

moment, every 30 seconds the data, for that 30 seconds, are transmitted through the internet to our server. The 10 delays are equivalent to 30, I mean in terms of meaning. So existing is 30. Our intention is to shorten it to 10. That's the situation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan, your question.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. The question I'm asking is this. Do you realise that it's a matter of choice for the user of the black box as to what the time delay should be: 30 seconds, 20 seconds, 10 seconds or 5 seconds? It is just a matter pertaining to the parameters; are you aware of that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is a decision. It depends on technical consideration, resources, and whether we feel that this is conducive to our work on how data can be transmitted to the system sooner.

MR DUNCAN: Technically, it's feasible?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It should be.

CHAIRMAN: What are the financial implications for increasing the capacity of the server to permit transmission in 10 seconds rather than 30 seconds, in broad terms?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We haven't looked into that but it would not be a small sum. We hope with the technological

advances we can achieve that goal sooner. It has to do with data volume and data traffic and data storage.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Could it be just a matter of having a much more powerful server? Could that be the solution?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not necessarily. We are looking into ways to improve or increase the speed of traffic.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Could you look, please, at page 69 of BM-1, again the same enclosure to the law firm's letter. If you look at the second portion in blue on that page, and the second paragraph:

"The telematics system installed at KMB is capable of recording deceleration and acceleration of the buses. However, the deceleration and acceleration of the buses as feature recording this on an ongoing basis is not enabled."

If I could just supplement what is said there by taking you to the oral evidence of Mr Kulis, who was a representative of Openmatics. You will find this in the transcript for Day 6, transcript volume 3, Day 6, page 146.

Can I bring your attention to line 21, please. Line 21 starts with the words "Mr Derek Chan" who is the gentleman sitting beside me, one of the counsel for the committee, and he asks this question:

"In the middle of the page, again, in blue, that is the answers from your company, it is stated that ..."

And he has referred to the same passage I just referred you to, where it is said that the deceleration and acceleration is not enabled, and the question he asks is this:

"Are you able to elaborate or explain to us what is meant by this paragraph, especially the part about recording acceleration and deceleration on an ongoing basis?"

Mr Kulis responds as follows:

"Yes, I'm also not sure if I will get the point of this sentence correctly, but I think the sentence is referring to the situation that these values, acceleration and deceleration, for the KMB we are using to raise realtime warnings, not for recording them to the data. This is my understanding of this declaration. So we have the system, the driver feedback device, which is warning the drivers in the realtime if they [are] accelerating too much or decelerating too much. For this propose we are using the values of acceleration and deceleration, we are not storing these values for the historical data. That's my understanding of this sentence declaration.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see. Okay.

So your understanding is that the acceleration and deceleration are not recorded in the black box data systems?

Is that correct, Mr Kulis?

MR KULIS: Yes, that's my understanding. Because another function of the -- our box is the record, the several data, as the black box feature. There are maybe 20 different values, but not the acceleration and deceleration."

So we will pause there. So what Mr Kulis seems to be saying is that although the KMB black box is capable of storing the data pertaining to acceleration and deceleration, that facility has not been enabled for KMB. Now, I would ask whether the company would wish to comment on that, in the light of the evidence given this morning by one of you that the deceleration and acceleration data is in fact stored and is in fact accessed in the context of monitoring driver behaviour.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's correct to say that it is not stored, data are not stored, on the black box, but the information on acceleration and deceleration will be transmitted back to our server, so it's there.

MR DUNCAN: So are you saying it's stored in the server?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Once it is stored in the server, how would the

persons in the company get access to that data, in a practical sense?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The information in the server would tell us the information on acceleration and deceleration, and then we can see whether there is any exceedance of standards or norms, extreme acceleration and extreme deceleration, leading to improper driving behaviour, as an example. We will use the information to identify the relevant bus captains so that we can review the driving behaviour by some other department in my company. That's how we use the information stored.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan's question was: how does the person access that information? What happens; what steps are taken? That was the question.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The information is in the computer. We have some computer software to deal with such information, which would mean that some reports would be generated through such software. The information is only about information of that black box in question, acceleration/deceleration, et cetera. But there is no information on the bus routes or the bus captains concerned. So we have to process the information before the reports can be generated and some other departments in my company can then take follow-up action.

CHAIRMAN: So the person requests the computer to give

information about a particular black box? Is that what you are saying?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's not that.

CHAIRMAN: Then I missed it. Try again.

MR ROGER LEE: Let me supplement. The information in relation to a black box, that is the information on acceleration and deceleration, will be transmitted to the server from the black box, and in that server we can tell the entire journey from the start to the end. We can check information on the entire journey, and also the position of the relevant stops --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting. Is this done by going to a particular black box, "We want information from this black box"? Presumably, you can tie up the black box with a bus number; is that how it's done?

MR ROGER LEE: That's correct.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) At the back end we can --

(Via interpreter) Yes, we can match the two. The number of black box, it is connected to the number of the bus. We know which bus has got this particular black box. You know the number of the black box and you know the number of the bus.

CHAIRMAN: So the operator who is searching the server is asking for data in respect of a particular black box and therefore bus; is that it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Before I ask Mr Duncan to resume, let me ask you this. Why, if the black box is capable of storing the data of deceleration and acceleration, is it not stored there as well as being transmitted to the server?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Let me explain. The black box records on a second-to-second basis the location, the speed of the time, the coordinates, and we compare the speed of this second with that of the last second. If the acceleration is over a pre-set value, it's 4km at present, if it exceeds the value of 4km, then there would be an alert for the bus captain, by a light and also by a sound alarm.

If, for this second, the alarm has been triggered, then the data of the fact that the alarm has been triggered would also be recorded. If, for a particular second, the speed compared with that of the last second is lower than a set value 7km -- it used to be 8km -- that is to say it is a very abrupt deceleration, likewise, the warning device would be lit and a beep will come off and the warning for abrupt braking would also be recorded at that moment.

So all these warnings during that second or moment would be transmitted back to our server, so we can check whether warnings were issued in that second. So the

number of reminders or warnings are stored in our server, so we know when warnings were issued to bus captains and for what reason. All this information is available in our servers.

CHAIRMAN: So does it come to this, that whereas speed is recorded on a black box every second, as is required by the Transport Department, deceleration is only recorded if it crosses the thresholds you have just identified, namely an increase in speed of 4 kilometres per second and a decrease of 7 kilometres? Is that it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I would like to supplement. I forgot to mention speeding. Likewise, if the speed exceeds a pre-set value, that second, right now our threshold is 70kph, if the speed exceeds 70kph, the device would go off, and in that second the warning given by the device would be recorded if the speed of the vehicle exceeds 70 kilometres per hour. So in case of harsh braking or sudden deceleration, if it exceeds the pre-set value, it would be recorded, and the second-by-second record would be transmitted to our servers.

CHAIRMAN: When was the speed excess set at 70 kilometres per hour?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: On 23 February, we adjusted the speed threshold to 70. It used to be 75.

CHAIRMAN: That's 2018?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Just so I understand this completely -- I want to take you back to the information that you provided the committee in your first submission and then what was provided in the second submission.

Could I take you to your first submission at page 50. I've taken you to this page and indicated that I was interested in the second sentence of the question:

"What information from these devices pertaining to monitoring the driving performance of bus captains is captured, and how is the collected information used to enhance driving safety?"

In your answer, with regard to the capturing of information, the only matter which is mentioned is vehicle speed and vehicle location. There is no mention there of acceleration or deceleration. Is there any reason for that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Vehicle speed is available second-by-second, and I explained the difference between speed at this moment and the next equates to acceleration or deceleration. That's why we do not have another device to record deceleration or acceleration,

because we can calculate this based on the difference in speed.

CHAIRMAN: This answer is not a complete answer to the fact, is it, as Mr Duncan is suggesting to you? The question is why.

This is 12 words, that was the answer, to what was an open-ended question, seeking assistance from your company.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I can only say that the black boxes capture vehicle speed.

CHAIRMAN: Amongst other things.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Among other things, yes.

CHAIRMAN: The question is why didn't you mention the other things. I'm asking you the question because you are the person answering. I don't know who made this submission but somebody wrote this and I'm asking why it's less than complete.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: There are more than 20 parameters including time, date, vehicle speed, engine, the number of revolutions per minute.

CHAIRMAN: So why are they not mentioned here?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: These are the two main data to monitor bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to move now to the third area which

I indicated I was interested in and -- we've touched on this already but -- sorry, we haven't touched on this yet. The third area is what use is made of the data being collected to provide real-time assistance to the bus captain? That's the area I'm now interested in.

I'm going to ask you, with respect, to go to page 65 of BM-1 again, the letter from the law firm. Halfway down the page, in blue, it is stated:

"The telematics system consists of the three main parts".

The first part he has referred to is the driver feedback device. There's an introduction:

"This device provides visual and acoustic feedback to the driver about four basic threshold values (engine revving, speeding, idling, and acceleration). It is placed in the driver's cabin and connected to the Openmatics on-board unit.

Driver feedback overview means the driver will be informed about the information by beeping and illuminating four LED lights if the - calibrated - thresholds will be reached."

Then you have further details of the engine, the speed, the idling and the acceleration set out on that page.

Does this accurately reflect the real-time driver

alert system which is installed in the KMB buses?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: If you would then be good enough, please, to turn the page, so I can ask questions about thresholds. At the top of page 68, the writer of this document says this:

"To our knowledge, the driver feedback system was installed in the accident vehicle."

Referring to the Tai Po accident.

"The driver feedback thresholds for the accident bus were initially defined by KMB and then calibrated by Openmatics to fit KMB's defined parameters."

Do you confirm that to be correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, it's correct.

MR DUNCAN: "According to the history, the four thresholds on the accident vehicle were defined by KMB and then calibrated by Openmatics latest at [24 July] 2017."

Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I would like to add one point. Yes, for acceleration and deceleration, for tilting angle, it says 44 here, 44 degrees. We never had any defined threshold. We did not provide any value because we could not identify any reference values and it wasn't provided to ZF.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, by KMB? By KMB? It wasn't provided by

the company?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) By KMB.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Were you aware that this threshold had been inputted into the Tai Po bus, 44 degrees?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, we are aware of that.

MR DUNCAN: Are you aware that Mr Kulis explained that that is really a default provision, which means there is no provision for a tilting parameter at all?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, I understand.

CHAIRMAN: In effect, it disabled this function? Would that be fair?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: The document continues to say:

"According to our best knowledge at the time of the accident, the thresholds were", and they are there set out; we can read them for ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, for the record, you would read them out for us, Mr Duncan.

If I can help, acceleration is set in metres per second, is it not, 1.15?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) 1.15 metres per second squared.

CHAIRMAN: Squared, yes.

Deceleration set at 2.3 metres per second squared.

Speed, set at kilometres per hour, 75; is that

correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And there is a second threshold configuration, speed in areas.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: As opposed to speed, and that is also set at 75?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) That we are not aware of.

CHAIRMAN: I should say 75 kilometres per hour. But you are not aware of the second one?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

(Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Then there's a configuration of idling values and engine values; do you see that?

CHAIRMAN: 3,000 revs per minute, isn't it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

(Via interpreter) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Were these the thresholds that existed not just in the bus which was involved in the Tai Po accident but on all Kowloon Motor Bus buses at that time?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And they will been defined by KMB and calibrated by Openmatics; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Just dealing with the two matters pertaining to speed, if I understand things correctly, if any of the particular buses exceeded a speed of 75 kilometres per hour, the driver would experience a beeping sound and also a blinking light in the cabin; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: What about the situation if the bus was travelling at, say, 60 kilometres per hour in a 50 kilometre per hour speed limit zone? Would there be any sort of alert to the captain?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Not at the moment.

MR DUNCAN: Would it be desirable that such a system existed?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, yes, absolutely.

MR DUNCAN: Could I in this respect take you to the evidence of Mr Kulis, at Day 6, volume 3, at page 150.

If I could bring your attention to line 7 on page 150, where Mr Chan has introduced the subject by saying:

"The next parameter under tilting angle is the configuration of excessive speed values.

In this screenshot we can see two parameters under that. One is speed and one is speed in areas, and [in] this case, both are set at 75 kilometres per hour.

Now, firstly, a more basic question. Just to see if

my understanding is correct. So if the bus in this case exceeds 75 kilometres per hour, the threshold would be considered crossed; is that correct?"

Then at line 17, Mr Chan asked this question:

"What is the difference between these two parameters, speed and speed in areas?"

Perhaps you would be good enough to read to yourself what follows, from line 19 right through to page 155 at line 9. Just take your time to read that through, please.

Have you been able to read that through?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If I understand that evidence correctly, Mr Kulis is suggesting two different ways whereby there may be the two different speed limits set up. Is that your own understanding?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. The first is what we can see on page 151. This is at line 2:

"... you need also to configure the areas in some other window, or enter some geo-fencing into the system."

And at line 7, Mr Chan's question:

"Obviously the bus, if you wish to take advantage of the speed in areas parameter, the system would have to

know where the bus is to trigger that parameter."

Then it concludes at line 23, in that part:

"Of course they need to configure or in cooperation with us, we need together to configure the areas, we need to define results, the rules, then the system is capable."

So the commission has heard -- I'm not sure whether you are aware of this -- that Citybus engaged that system, where they have defined, I think, 25 areas and there is provision for feedback for those 25 areas. Are you aware of that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So that's one.

The second one, in which I'm a little bit more interested, is the utilisation of the digital mapping. You can see, I think, mainly from page 154, from line 8, where Mr Chan poses this question to Mr Kulis:

"If I have a digital map that is able to show different speed limits on different roads, would I be able to use that combining with the system currently available here, to configure to set different speed thresholds depending on where the bus is on the digital map? Or is that not possible under the system?"

Mr Kulis responds:

"Definitely it is possible."

And he then proceeds to give an explanation.

Now, as I understand it, there is available in Hong Kong digital mapping of our roads; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So given what you said a few moments ago, that it would be desirable to have a system whereby speeds in excess of 50 in a 50 zone would be detected, what is your reaction to the possible implementation of either of these two possible routes suggested by Mr Kulis?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We are glad to learn about this, and, well, because of the IRC, we will be able to have access to official digital maps.

The speed limit is an important matter, in respect of different road sections. If the information is incorrect, it would have grave consequences. So we have been talking to different parties on how we may know the speed limits in different locations, different areas, so that when the vehicle reaches a certain location, we will know that it is 70kmh or 50kmh as the limit, because right now we can't tell one from the other, so we set it at 70kmh.

If we know that in that particular location the speed limit is 50kmh, then the alarm will be triggered. We have conducted a test drive, by incorporating the road speed limits into the black box, so that the road

speed limit is known by the system, and the test drive tells us that it's a possible solution.

We will explore on how this may be taken forward, and if it is tested to be feasible it will be incorporated into our fleet, so that when the speed limit, whether it's 50kmh or 70kmh, is exceeded, an alarm will be triggered. That would represent a great improvement over the current situation.

MR ROGER LEE: The map is important, because the speed limit can change from time to time. For example, if there is an accident or if there is a road excavation, the limit may be changed very quickly. So we need to have a so-called live map. We have just received the digital map and the Openmatics have helped us to incorporate that into the system. We have a vehicle fitted with this new system and we have conducted a test drive. So there will be real-time information provided to the bus captain that the limit has been exceeded.

But geo-fencing, it will take a lot more time, because that would have to do with the control over acceleration. We have one vehicle fitted out for that trial so far.

MR DUNCAN: Why did you say that "because of the IRC we would be able to have access to the digital maps"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's just my gut feeling. Maybe it's

just a coincidence.

CHAIRMAN: Where did you get the digital map from?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) From government.

CHAIRMAN: From which department of government?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Have you asked them before?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Not really.

CHAIRMAN: When did you ask them?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) I didn't ask.

CHAIRMAN: How did you come by it, then?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) I don't know. I just received a letter from them.

CHAIRMAN: So the Transport Department informed you that it was available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: When was that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) In June, the letter dated June 7.

CHAIRMAN: June 7?

MR DUNCAN: So no information from the Transport Department prior to June of this year that digital mapping was available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

CHAIRMAN: Would you be prepared to provide us with a copy of this letter?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, in which case, let's have it copied now. Somebody can come and take the letter and physically copy it. It's not marked in any way, is it? We'll just photocopy it and we can return it to you. Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

It would be fair to say, wouldn't it, that Kowloon Motor Bus vehicles put up far greater mileage on 50 kilometre per hour roads than 70 kilometre per hour roads?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I can't answer this question because I need more data.

CHAIRMAN: You can take solace from the fact that Citybus were unable to answer that question as well, but we have maps with the speed limits of the roads of Hong Kong, and we've got them coloured, so we can tell at a glance that there are many more roads that are 50 kilometre per hour roads than 70 kilometre per hour roads.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) I think it's about the roads that our buses run on.

CHAIRMAN: No, we understand that as well. We have that as well. We can put your bus routes on top. But broadly speaking, I'm sure you can answer the question: there are many more 50 kilometre per hour roads that the buses

drive down than 70 kilometre per hour roads, are there not? If you still can't answer, please feel free to say so.

MR DUNCAN: Can I help you out: do Kowloon Motor Bus vehicles regularly travel on roads which have a speed limit of 50 kilometre per hour?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes, but you know, the number of trips that you go on that journey, on that road, may be different. You may have buses very frequently running on ... So, you know, I'm an engineer. I have to get the facts before I can tell you.

CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps you ought to be a politician.

MR DUNCAN: Can I just ask this before I leave the topic: what steps prior to the formation of the committee had KMB taken to explore whether it could have an alert system on buses which exceeded the 50 kilometre per hour speed limit?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: When the speedometer reaches 50 kilometres per hour, we once prompted the captain, we would not know which route the captain was on, we once reminded the captain that he reached 50 kilometres per hour. But since we could not identify the locations of the buses, we still wanted to prompt captains that they have exceeded 50 kilometres per hour when they are in urban areas, but in some cases, some bus captains might

find these alerts unnecessary. So after pilot testing this approach for a short time, we discontinued the practice because we could not determine whether the bus was on a 50 kilometre zone or 70 kilometre zone.

CHAIRMAN: So, as I understand what you are saying, you tried a pilot test where you had an alert go off whenever you went over 50 kilometres per hour but that annoyed the bus drivers because presumably they were driving quite a lot of the time in 70 kilometre per hour areas and you gave up?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes, Correct.

CHAIRMAN: When was that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Some years back. I can't remember.

(Via interpreter) So this was not from the telematics system or the black box.

CHAIRMAN: This was from the speedometer?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) That's right, yes.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to take a short break at some stage in the afternoon because it's a long time for everybody, to stretch your legs and have a drink. If this is convenient, please say so. If you want to finish a topic, say so.

MR DUNCAN: Just one question, Chairman, if I may.

The system was purchased from Openmatics in 2013,

I think.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And it would have been at that time that the parameter of 75 kilometres per hour would have been installed into the system.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: KMB established this value and they informed Openmatics.

MR DUNCAN: So, between 2013 and the time the committee was formed, did you look into the possibility of this system capturing speeds in excess of the 50 kilometre speed limit, with the help of the GPS system? Did you investigate that at all during that period?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I am not sure, but I believe that we once discussed this issue with the manufacturer.

MR DUNCAN: Can you give us any idea as to when that was?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Not that I can recall.

CHAIRMAN: Can you recall who was involved from the company side of things?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) I can't recall.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, we will take a break now. We will take 15 minutes. Thank you.

(3.53 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.08 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Gentlemen, would you please have in front of you the transcripts bundle for Day 11, that will be bundle number 4, and I'd like you to turn up, please, page 73 of that transcript.

If I could pick it up, please, at line 14, where Ms Maggie Wong, counsel for the committee, is asking questions of Mr Kelvin Yeung. I think, gentlemen, you will recognise Mr Kelvin Yeung as being a current employee of the company. Is that correct?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So at line 14, Ms Wong poses this question:

"We have heard also from Mr Alok Jain's evidence that during one of the meetings, they explored the idea of having a score card system for drivers, and one of the systems that was explored is the GreenRoad.com system. And what it does is it gives an analysis of the driver's driving behaviour, and it would fall into three different categories, like red, amber and green."

Then if we could jump, please, to page 75, at line 8, where we have Mr Kelvin Yeung saying:

"This system should have been deployed. I'm not very sure about the name mentioned by Mr Alok, but from what you described, it is very similar to one of our current systems."

The chairman then asks:

"What is that system?"

Mr Kelvin Yeung then gives this answer:

"As I said, there would be beeps and lights emitted, and lights of three colours would be shown depending on driving behaviour. And these lights would go on when the bus captain beeped the Octopus card at the terminal, the time of the next bus would be shown, and lights of three colours would be shown to represent the performance of the captain. Green is the best, yellow, and red means something to be improved. And this system is still in use."

The chairman asked the question:

"So when the bus captain comes off duty and he taps his Octopus card, where is this information displayed for him?"

Mr Kelvin Yeung replies:

"It would only be displayed the first time a bus captain beeps his Octopus card in the morning. I'm not sure whether it would show the records for the previous days, but what I'm sure is that the records for the same day would not be shown. So no information is displayed during sign-off.

Chairman: Are you saying the information is displayed at the time of sign-on?

Mr Kelvin Yeung: Yes, information is displayed during sign-on.

Chairman: And the information relates to what time period?

Mr Kelvin Yeung: I would have to check the period concerned. But this is not same-day information. It refers to a past period, but as for the range of that period, I have no such information on hand.

Chairman: And where is the display? Where does the bus captain see this?

Mr Kelvin Yeung: At each bus terminal there would be a computer. When a captain returns to the terminal he would have to beep his staff card to obtain such information. The computer would be located outside the kiosk at each terminal facing the bus captains?

Chairman: And the computer screen depicts what?

Mr Kelvin Yeung: One of the three colours would be displayed to the captain, red, amber and green."

So having taken you through that, my question is: do you confirm that this green/Yellow/red system currently exists?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Could you describe, please, what the basis of this scheme is, how it works?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's an appraisal system of the bus

captain's performance. It gives you -- it's based on some scores. Four things are assessed under this system. First, excessive idling, that is prolonged idling; second, harsh braking; thirdly, sudden acceleration; finally, speeding.

For these four conditions, each bus captain has to engage in multiple trips per day, so these four criteria would be assessed over the week, to assess the captain's performance. For the criteria I mentioned, we have certain standards. If a captain performs well, the bus would operate more smoothly and passengers would be more comfortable and the fuel consumption of that bus would be more satisfactory and the bus would be greener. In other words, the driving experience would be equal to safe.

According to the assessed scores, the best captains would be given green, and there would also be an amber class and red class. So there are three classes. So scores would be given on a weekly basis. When bus captains report duty at termini, when they sign in, their scores for the seven days preceding the period ten days ago would be displayed. Red and amber performance classes would not be shown, but there would be reminders displayed to the captain.

For the screens at the termini, they might be

visible to other people sometimes. In other words, certain information is displayed to the captains. When a bus captain accesses our staff site, he can check his scores for the past eight weeks. So, when they report duty at the bus terminus, the screen would show their score, and as for details, the bus captain can check the information on the staff website. This way, the bus captains can know more about their driving performance and they can seek to make improvements as appropriate.

So this is the purpose of our design. It was launched in November 2015.

MR DUNCAN: So it's there for the benefit of the bus captain, primarily?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes, and for the benefit of the company and the passengers as well.

MR DUNCAN: On what data is the classification of red, amber or green based?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I have no data on hand on how the colour is classified, but most of the time it's green; there is a formula.

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Sorry, I misunderstood. I repeat --

(Via interpreter) There are four categories including excessive idling.

CHAIRMAN: There is no need to repeat the categories; you were very clear about that. Perhaps Mr Duncan's question is this. What is the threshold that is set for these four categories?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: There are two thresholds, one for excessive idling, no more than 15 minutes. No more than 15 minutes. For harsh braking, the threshold is based on the black box setting. For sudden acceleration, it follows the black box setting. For speeding, again it follows the black box setting. In other words, for speeding, the threshold is 70; for sudden acceleration, 4 kilometres per hour per second.

MR DUNCAN: It seems that the information is communicated to the driver when he signs on for the day; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: For each journey or trip, at the start and end of the journey, the captain would tap his card at the terminus. So every day the information is displayed twice to the captain. If the information is displayed all the time, the captain might feel annoyed, so twice a day the score of the captain would be displayed.

MR DUNCAN: Is he tapping on the screen with his card, is that how it works, or does he insert a card or something?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: When the card is tapped, the information is shown on the screen.

MR DUNCAN: Does the classification of red, amber or green have any impact with regard to the sorts of awards we were discussing this morning?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

(Via interpreter) No. It was only true at the beginning phase, for a short period of time. So, basically, the system serves to inform the captains of their performance so they can improve their driving techniques.

CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to help me further about the criteria that apply. You've told us about the four categories. You have given us the thresholds. What if one was to have one speeding in excess: does that stop you having a green score? Or what if it was one excessive acceleration? How does this work?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) There's a formula for that.

CHAIRMAN: Are you prepared to tell us what the formula is? Do you know what the formula is?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) There's a formula for that.

(Via interpreter) Can we share that with you later?

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. No doubt the formula is rendered into writing. Is it something that is on the staff website so that the bus captains also know what the formula is?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: On the website, bus captains can see their own performances, so only green, amber or red would be displayed, and there are four categories being displayed. So the captain would see the colour for the respective category. The actual scores would not be displayed but only the colours.

But if the bus captain is in the red, we would remind them to be gentle when they accelerate or brake, they should also minimise idling time, et cetera. So we would remind them of the respective improvements needed.

CHAIRMAN: Please provide this formula. Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Is there a circular or a document of some sort which explains to the drivers what the purpose of this scheme is and how it works?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes. We issued notices and posters.

MR DUNCAN: Would you be able to provide some samples of those as well, please?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Okay. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Have you received any feedback from the drivers or from the unions as to how they regard this particular score card system?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No formal feedbacks were given, but from communication with captains we were aware of their feedbacks. They also knew that this is not an award

scheme. This is an exercise to inform captains of their driving performances.

MR DUNCAN: What proportion of captains would consistently get a green rating?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: According to preliminary figures, most captains would receive a green rating. The percentage -- about 1 per cent of the captains would get a yellow and few captains would get a red.

MR DUNCAN: Hardly any would get a red if only 1 per cent get yellow; would that follow?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: For example, for the week of 15 to 22 July, there were nearly 90,000 records of green, or rather 69,000, 69,824 cases of green, 800-plus cases of amber, and eight cases of red. For the week before that, from 8 July to 14 July 2018, 61,010 cases of green; for amber, 768 cases; for red, two cases.

MR DUNCAN: If I could take, perhaps, a relatively extreme example: what about a driver who had been constantly speeding in a 50 kilometre speed zone but travelling less than 70 kilometres per hour, and driving into roundabouts with the bus tilted? Under this scheme, he would still command a green rating, would he not?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We do not know what the location is or whether the bus captain is in a 50 kilometre zone, so it cannot be determined. So only speed is displayed.

MR DUNCAN: So he'd end up a green?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any feedback as to whether the drivers really take any notice of this scheme?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is only one of the ways to tell how captains drive. There are four other criteria, including excessive idling, harsh braking, sudden acceleration and speeding. We can see other reports. This is just a colour classification of red, amber and green, to inform captains, but we have other reports in place to assess drivers.

So for certain captains on red, we would know about the details, and if they speed in a 50 kilometre zone we can deal with it through other reports. So the management would look at the situation.

There are officers responsible for monitoring their performance. This green/amber/red system is a straightforward system to inform the captains of their performance, just one of them.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan's question was not what notice you take about how drivers drive; it was whether they take any notice of this green/amber/red system.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Every day, when they tap their card, they have two opportunities to be informed of their performance, and they can also see their own performance

through the website. So the captain is aware of the grade that they have got.

MR ROGER LEE: It's just provided as a reminder, a gentle reminder, but it is very individual. Bus captains have individualistic driving behaviour. We are just telling them the basic information so that they at least know how they are assessed, how their performance is assessed. Of course, we can provide more information, as the next step. We can provide more detailed information in the future. We also have plain-clothed inspectors and also complaint investigation. This is something designed to give space for self-improvement by captains.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Does it function effectively, efficiently? I mean, does it work in a technical sense? Are there any problems with it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It can be better. If the data are more real-time in nature and if it can more accurately reflect the driving behaviour. As this example given suggests, if he is speeding in a 50kmh road section, the system won't be able to tell. And if there's a digital map to indicate that the driver is speeding in a road section with 50kmh as the speed limit, the scores will be very different.

At present, that's the best we can do with the current system, but if there's a better way to reflect the actual situation, we will certainly strive to make improvement along that line.

MR DUNCAN: My question was more related to accepting the current system. Does it work efficiently, in the sense the drivers know the system works and they utilise the system and if they tap their card it actually works? So in a practical sense does it work efficiently?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: I ask that because of what appears in a miscellaneous bundle, number 3, at page 899. Could you turn that up, please.

CHAIRMAN: I think it's to be found in miscellaneous bundle 2, still. At least it is in my version.

MR DUNCAN: Page 899.

You probably have not seen this document, gentlemen, so I will take you through the relevant parts in a moment, but I think Mr Lee at least will be aware that the chairman and members of the secretariat of the committee visited a number of the termini and depots last Friday, 3 August, and if I can explain, these are the notes that were drawn up after the meeting and after the visit.

The first one which is documented on page 899 is

a visit to the Sha Tin New Town Plaza terminus, and I'm interested in the last entry on that page. Perhaps I should start off with the reference under "Photos are at annex A". There's a reference during the visit the committee also talked to three bus captains and learned certain things. So there was a discussion between the committee and three of the bus captains.

Then resuming at the last dash on the page:

"The same bus captain subsequently demonstrated [to the committee] the use of the October/staff card terminal at the bus regulator's office."

Then there's a reference to what Mr Kelvin Yeung had said at the hearing; we have just been through. If I could pick it up in the second-last line of the page:

"The bus captain having tapped his Octopus staff card ... the computer screen displayed a white screen with a message in blue-coloured letters, reminding the captain to drive carefully within the rainy conditions of the day. The screen then showed the details of the next bus trip that the bus captain was assigned to drive. No colour-coded messages, boxes or screens were noted. When asked about whether [the captain saw] colour-coded messages displayed on the screen when he first reported for duty that day, the captain gave a negative response".

So we have that report. Then if I could take you to page 902, which refers to the visit to the Luen Wo Hui bus terminus, and the last entry, the captain was also asked about the colour-coded boxes or screens, and the answer was also negative. The committee observed "that when a bus captain tapped his Octopus/staff card at the bus regulator's office, the same white screen with a reminder message in blue-coloured letters, followed by details of the driving duties of the bus captain was displayed."

Then item (E), the Tuen Mun depot, page 903, the reference halfway down there, during the visit the committee also talked to a bus captain resting in the sleeping room and learned from the KMB staff present at the depot that, and it's the second bullet, that the bus captain was aware of the colour-coded messages, boxes or screens and he described it as a monitoring mechanism on whether the bus captain had practised eco-driving. He was aware that green colour generally signalled everything was fine, amber meant that a captain would need to improve, while red generally depicted problems with the bus captain.

Then finally, the Shan King bus terminus, page 904. We have reference to the committee talking to three bus captains at the terminus and learning from the bus

regulator and the bus captain that, and the third bullet down, the other two bus captains were invited to show the effect of tapping their Octopus/staff card at the bus regulator's office when reporting for duty. The same white screen with a reminder message in blue-coloured letters, followed by details of the driving duties of the bus captain was noted. No colour-coded messages, boxes or screens were noted. When one of the bus captains was asked whether there was a screen which refers to their Octopus/staff card on the day of the visit, the bus captain replied that she could not remember as she did not really care about the screen.

I appreciate of course that you weren't present and it's not fair to ask you to comment on that, but are you able to offer anything with regard to the screens apparently being tapped but then simply reminding the captain to drive carefully and showing details of the next trip, but apparently not showing the green, amber or red? Are you able to comment on that at all?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Well, there may be a reminder of the rainy conditions on that day. Yes, that's a reminder.

The amber message is not displayed every time. We don't want to give too many reminders, especially when they have to make frequent trips and they will have just

spent a little bit of time at the terminus, and then the message is not shown on that occasion. But I cannot rule out technical problems of individual terminus. We have to look into whether there is any technical hiccup, and also whether, in terms of publicity, some bus captains are not really fully aware of this three-colour message system. We may have to do more. But we still think that this is a good way to tell bus captains how they have performed.

As for how we calculate the scores and whether the scores should be fine-tuned to more accurately reflect the performance, I think we should have to work harder on that.

MR DUNCAN: Are you able to tell us when the bus drivers were last informed about the significance and purpose of the system?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I can't tell.

MR DUNCAN: I think you have indicated to the committee that you will make some documents available with regard to the formula and also the description of the scheme for the staff.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

I move now to the last of the aspects of the black box that I wanted to ask questions about. That is the

use that's made of the data captured by the black box in order to facilitate the monitoring and the assessment of the driving behaviour.

We have seen already that one of the functions of the black box is to capture the speed of the bus. I'm going to ask you, please, to look at the second submission to the committee, again, of the company, this time at page 167.

There are two reasonably long questions asked at the top of page 167. I don't believe I need to go through those, but what I would simply do is bring your attention to the second paragraph of the response. It is stated as follows:

"There is a dedicated computer programme in generating suspected speeding cases for the officers to check and verify. After examination, confirmed speeding cases will then be forwarded to performance managers of bus captain performance management section for taking further action."

If I could then ask you to turn to page 170, please. The committee has there asked, at the top of the page, the company to "provide some copy samples of the data obtained illustrating driving at inappropriate speeds and/or speeds in excess of the speed limit at particular locations", and amongst the answers, the first bullet,

the response is that:

"A sample of the data retrieved from black boxes (in the form of a report known as BOP 207) is annexed ..., which shows speeding cases (personal data withheld). It shows the date, time, bus registration number, route number, and concerned [bus captain's] information."

We will find that annex at KMB-9 at page 3993. There is a translation at page 3995-1. I have a couple of questions with regard to this report, please. If you look at the very first row, there's an entry towards the right-hand side of the document which has the duration, it says in seconds, and a maximum speed of 67.9, which I assume is kilometres per hour. Would that be correct?

MR JAMES WONG: Yes, I can read.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So is a correct reading of that that a bus was found to be travelling over 67.9 over the whole 32 seconds; under 67.9, about 67.9? What exactly is it that that chart tells you?

MR JAMES WONG: According to the table, for this bus TW5352, on 1 May 2018, 0000 hours, 00:00, and the time 20:07, at this time, for the duration of 32 seconds, the maximum speed was 67.9 kilometres per hour.

MR DUNCAN: Throughout that period it was 67.9?

MR JAMES WONG: In the duration of 32 seconds, that was the speed.

MR DUNCAN: Throughout the 32 seconds?

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

MR JAMES WONG: In the 32 seconds, the maximum speed occurred was 67.9.

CHAIRMAN: But why choose 32 seconds? Why not choose 90 seconds or 10 seconds?

MR JAMES WONG: The black box display would be updated every second. Once a vehicle reaches a particular speed, the black box would show the maximum speed of the bus within a certain duration.

CHAIRMAN: What I'm trying to understand is why 32.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is an exception report and there are certain settings. When a certain setting is exceeded, information would be displayed. In other words, for a duration of 32 seconds, the setting was exceeded, but the maximum speed was 67.9. So over this period of 32 seconds, our pre-set setting was exceeded. So apparently this is a 50 kilometre per hour zone.

If this is a 70 kilometre zone, this entry should not exist. So for a duration of 32 seconds the bus exceeded the limit for this speed zone and the maximum speed was 67.9.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: So is the duration pre-set?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No. It would depend on the duration in

which the bus exceeded the threshold. It depends on the duration within the bus trip. It is an accumulative value. It is not a continuous duration. It refers to the total duration of all the trips that day, and this shows the number of seconds in which the bus had exceeded our threshold.

MR ROGER LEE: For this example, the area is a 50 kilometre per hour zone, so for a duration of 32 seconds the bus exceeded the speed limit of 50 and within the 32 seconds the bus once reached 67.9. So, in other words, during the 32 seconds, the speed of the bus exceeded 50 but the maximum speed was 67.9.

CHAIRMAN: Am I correct in understanding that an exception report would not be generated unless you exceeded the speed limit for more than 10 seconds?

We can all do the exercise of doing down to find if there are any single digits, but this is a matter of principle. Is that a correct understanding, that an exception requires a continuous excess of speed limit of 10 seconds or more?

MR JAMES WONG: I will answer this question. In a computer programme, we will set certain thresholds, and when a bus reaches certain speed it will be displayed.

I would like to share some figures.

CHAIRMAN: Can you try answering the question? Is that

a wrong understanding? If so, just say, yes, it's wrong.

MR JAMES WONG: It's not 10 seconds.

CHAIRMAN: What is it?

MR JAMES WONG: That's why I would like to tell you about the situation for different durations --

CHAIRMAN: Why not try answering the question directly first and then give an explanation. What is the threshold?

MR JAMES WONG: Between 56 and 65 kilometres per hour an entry will show up if the duration is more than 30 seconds. This is on roads with a speed limit of 50.

And between 66 to 70 kilometres per hour, in a 50 kilometre zone, if the duration is more than 15 seconds, it will show up on the computer screen.

CHAIRMAN: Why is this information not in the thousands of pages that you have provided us in these reports? Why do we have to ask these questions in an oral hearing? It's perfectly clear what the committee were seeking when we asked these open-ended questions.

Carry on with your explanation, if you would be kind enough.

MR JAMES WONG: In 50 kilometre roads, for speeds from 76 to 79 kilometres per hour, information would be displayed if the duration lasts more than two seconds. This is for areas with a 50 kilometre speed limit.

CHAIRMAN: That's most helpful. Is there a similar pattern with speed limits of 70 kilometres per hour?

MR JAMES WONG: At 70 kilometre speed zones, if the speed is between 76 to 79kph and the duration is more than 30 seconds, the occurrence would show up on the screen.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: If it's over 80, two seconds would be the threshold.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN: Let us go back, please, to KMB-1 at 168.

In the first bullet answer that you've given the committee -- this is the second submission of the company -- you have stated that:

"By means of a computer programme, black boxes will ... capture records of speeding ... malpractice of harsh braking, and/or ... abrupt acceleration for analysis. Further information ... corresponding bus registration numbers and route numbers, can be retrieved with the assistance of other systems", which are then described. "It takes about 10 days to retrieve such data for analysis, where necessary, further disciplinary actions will be taken."

Why does it take as long as 10 days to retrieve what might be quite significant data?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's four days now. Four days is still

too long. We would like to make it faster. The data in the server will be the black box number, the bus number, the data, from second to second the location, where there is speeding, harsh braking, abrupt acceleration. These are the data, but we have to relay the data to individual bus captains. For that, we will rely on a lot of information, including TER, terminus management system.

For this TER, terminus management system, it requires the sign-on or sign-in of bus captains, when the bus captain starts the journey, the bus number, the route number, and at the end of the trip the bus captain will sign off. So the system knows when the journey starts, when it ends, and the system would capture the information of the bus captain, the information of the bus and of the journey.

For this system, TER, it captures such data on a daily basis with more than 200 termini, and all of the information would then be transmitted to the server, to our servers. There are also data on the bus on-board system. We need to provide the interface between the systems so that we can tell the bus driven by a particular bus captain, the relevant locations and the performance.

Then we need to do more processing, to know which

zones are 50kmh road sections. So we need to have the FMI, the fleet management information system, which can tell the journey, the locations, and which road sections are 50kmh and which are 70kmh. So we need to know the route, the bus captain, the data of the journey, and so on. That's why it's complicated.

So if we have a digital map and everything is stored in the black box, we can do it much more quickly, and we will be able to produce the same report in one day.

CHAIRMAN: This technology has been available for a long time, has it not?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes, I know.

CHAIRMAN: You can answer "yes" or "no" and then you can explain.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes. Yes, I know.

CHAIRMAN: If you want to explain, the obvious next question is: why haven't you done it before?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I have tried to look into the same issue. I have asked the same questions. I would say we will do whatever we can as an operator, and the resources available to us, the influence that we can exert, and we hope this will present an opportunity, this time, so that we can make things move more quickly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: At the committee's request, you have provided

the data which we see in the form of the table in respect of excessive speed. Are you able to provide a report which has reflected instances of harsh braking or excessive acceleration?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We have a weekly report on these conditions. This weekly report will look back at the past week in respect of a bus captain and how many seconds of exceedance in those three areas: harsh braking, sudden acceleration and speeding. We have a weekly report to reflect these matters.

When these weekly reports are generated, relevant departments in my company would take follow-up action. Sometimes, harsh braking and sudden acceleration are unavoidable because of road conditions, and it may not reflect a problem on the part of the bus captain because the road conditions can change suddenly, you have pedestrians crossing, suddenly there are other vehicles, and we understand the tremendous pressure faced by bus captains and sometimes they may make some undesirable or unsatisfactory moves, but we need to tell them what they have done. Sometimes, our colleagues would arrange an interview or would talk to the bus captain over the phone, and if necessary we would have to send some plain-clothed officers to do some on-spot inspection.

Otherwise, we cannot really tell whether it's

a problem of bad or poor performance.

MR JAMES WONG: Maybe I can supplement. This morning, when we talk about the black box, we said there are four lights to provide the feedback to the bus captain -- I won't repeat the details -- which will provide an instantaneous reminder to the bus captain so the performance can be rectified, and also there is the three-colour system, when the bus captain taps his Octopus card, when he signs on, all these messages are meant to remind the bus captain of the need to improve, if appropriate. And on top, there's the weekly report which would record the speeding, acceleration and deceleration data.

And the data in the past kept are not as detailed here. We only got accumulative data. There's a performance management group under my department, and they would inform the operation, the depot, not to issue warning but to remind bus captains that certain speeding episodes have been recorded, so that they would improve.

As for the harsh braking or sudden acceleration, we would send plain-clothed driving instructors to check on the bus. They will observe how the bus captain drives, so whether it's unsafe driving, as reflected by the data, and then the inspector or the instructor would report back to us so that we can take appropriate

action.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Leung, can I bring you back to the question Mr Duncan asked some minutes ago now: are you able to provide the committee with a report that evidences harsh braking or harsh acceleration? We've got one on the screen which enables us to understand, now it's been explained to us, how you look at speeding. Are you able to give us a similar document that deals with harsh braking and acceleration?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you please provide us with that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Nodded head).

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: I'm now going to ask you to look again at the transcript, please. Day 6.

CHAIRMAN: Whose evidence is this, Mr Duncan?

MR DUNCAN: This is the evidence of Mr Kulis, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: At page 161.

CHAIRMAN: Of which bundle?

MR DUNCAN: This would be bundle number 3, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I mentioned earlier on the concept of a score card for the drivers' driving behaviour, the bus captains' driving behaviour, and I just want to ask

a few questions of you in relation to this part of Mr Kulis' evidence.

If I could pick it up, please, on page 160, at line 22. Mr Chan says:

"The next item that I'm interested in, or I am going to ask questions on, is the ability or the capability of using software analysis to provide a report on acceptable or unacceptable, safe or unsafe driving behaviour."

And he asks this question:

"Does your company provide the software that is capable of assessing, based on the data collected by the black box, capable of assessing or coming up with a report of what is acceptable or unacceptable driving behaviour? Is that possible?"

And he says, "Yes, it is possible."

Mr Chan asks:

"How is that possible ... If I'm a bus operator and I come to you and say I want something that allows me to generate a report of a particular driver? How would you tell me that can be done, how can that be done?

Mr Kulis: In that case, I will introduce you to our application driver feedback, together with the portal parts, together with the software solution which we are providing, so then you can regard the parameters as we

were talking about, then, and you can get also the statistics, so then at the end of the day, or some period, you can make your own analysis, for example, which driver have most warnings, thresholds, speeding events, and so on.

This is one option.

And then we can also design the solution for you, if you are not satisfied with the driver feedback only, if you want to have more sophisticated calculations, we can log the driving data, the parameters, into the database and make the analysis relevant for you. If you are more focused on different inputs, maybe some other parameter is concerning you, we can make analysis and score it on that.

It depends how you feel the logic. If you want to calculate the bonus points and evaluate the best driver, or if you want to introduce, let's say, the negative restriction, it is just check they are better drivers, or better behaviour, and so on. There are multiple ways to achieve it.

Also depends what the drivers are open for, or the unions, it can have more solutions.

Mr Derek Chan: So it is just the software capabilities. Because the hardware itself is just the data collected by the black boxes. Is my understanding

correct? I don't need to buy new equipment? In order to come up with such a score card of a driver's behaviour?

Mr Kulis: No, you don't need new equipment. If, for example, now you are the customer, and you already have our boxes we can just talk about new possibilities and we can give you the new software and you will use the same hardware for that.

Mr Derek Chan: In your experience, how common is it around the world in commercial fleet management for the operator to use software to come up with a score card of the driver's driving behaviour? How common is it around the world?

Mr Kulis: It is -- based on my experience it is relatively common in the West European countries. On the other hand, in some other regions, they want to keep the system simple, like is the driver feedback negative. Only a simple warning, and that's it. Because still we need to consider that drivers need to understand what they are scored for. So if you introduce more complex calculation, to evaluate the score cards, we need to provide the training of the drivers, need to understand it. So it differs by the countries and regions."

Mr Chan at line 18:

"Moving on then from this driver score card --"

Mr Chairman interposes:

"Before you move on. If it is quite common in Western European countries, what thresholds do they use to monitor driver behaviour if they are scoring the driver 'good' or 'bad', or 'average'. Whatever the score card might be?

Mr Kulis: To give you the example, for example the truck companies in Germany, they are using the parameters as we have here, the basic parameters, so the speeding events, acceleration, deceleration, but on top of that they are, for example, evaluating if the driver is using the [something] for the driving, so he is saving the brakes, or they even have the analysis of the speed value shape in time, and the brake application. So if they are not using the aggressive driving style or if they are not -- how to say, if they are driving more effectively. There are multiple analyses for this.

Chairman: So the basic model would be to start with analysing speeding, acceleration and deceleration, that's the basic model?

Mr Kulis: Yes. Also the idling, if you keep the engine running, if you are standing, then you are wasting money obviously. That's the basic model. And then on top of that, maybe saving of the brakes and so on."

Now, you can see the approach that Mr Kulis is suggesting in that part of his evidence. Given that the software is clearly available, does that sort of approach have any appeal to you, rather than approaching it from, "Well, you have exceeded the speed and that's bad", so it's going to be negative, converting it to some sort of positive, from the way in which the driver is generally approaching his duties?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Their approach is the same as ours. We are doing the same thing. We would look at it from a safety perspective. We would look at the items that need to be considered. Of course, the black box would capture many data, including fuel consumption, braking patterns and other scenarios. I believe that there is an application. They are talking about -- the document mentions a transportation committee, for commercial drivers, they might be driving the same vehicle all the same, so from a commercial perspective, it can find out whether a vehicle is idling for too long and whether there would be breakdowns and they can tell whether or not the air-conditioning is switched off. So this is commercially useful.

But for bus captains, they might not drive the same bus every day, they might not be driving the whole day, and a bus would be driven by different captains, and

a captain can drive different buses on different days.

So the assessment considerations might be different from consideration from just a safety perspective. So we would assess safety aspects. So we are mainly thinking about safety.

If you include other factors, we might not be able to conduct the analysis within four days. We might need five, six or seven days or even more.

MR DUNCAN: I'm going to ask to be put up on the screen a short article which the committee has seen which appeared in the Straits Times on 16 July this year.

Have you seen this particular article before?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

MR DUNCAN: I just ask the secretariat to scroll down and I invite you to read the contents of it.

CHAIRMAN: I think the date of the article is July last year.

MR DUNCAN: Oh. I beg your pardon, yes. It was published June 29, 2017. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Have you been able to finish reading that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. You can see that it refers to something called a GreenRoad vehicle tracking system, and you may recall earlier this afternoon we saw GreenRoad.com, I think, referred to in the transcript.

Do you recall that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN: So are you familiar with this GreenRoad vehicle tracking system?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) No.

MR DUNCAN: Do you have any sort of immediate reaction to what is contained in this article? Assuming its content to be true, do you think this would be of any value for the company to consider?

CHAIRMAN: By that, are you referring to a bonus system of rewarding good driving?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is something that can be considered.

MR DUNCAN: Has it been considered to date?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Not to date.

MR DUNCAN: So your reaction is that this is worthy of consideration by the company?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Can you repeat the question?

MR DUNCAN: Is your reaction that this is something worthy of consideration by the company?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) I think I can confirm that, yes, we will consider -- we will study and consider the recommendations mentioned in this article. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) May I have a copy of this?

CHAIRMAN: Of course we can provide you with a copy.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: (In English) Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Chairman, that would be a convenient moment, if it suits the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Gentlemen, we have reached the end of our working day. The consequence is that we will adjourn shortly and I would ask you, or those of you who are available, to return to carry on giving evidence on Friday, that's Friday, 10 August, at the same venue.

Mr Leung, before we do adjourn, there is one matter I would seek your help with. You spoke of having conducted a test drive with a vehicle that had been fitted with a system to enable you to, as I understand it, differentiate between being in a 50 kilometre speed limit and a 70 kilometre speed limit, and you say that Openmatics had assisted you in incorporating devices in order to do that. That is something that the committee would like to hear more about. Is this documented in any form that you can provide to us?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) You mean the test itself?

CHAIRMAN: The various steps that you have taken, how the vehicle has been fitted up, so we can understand what it

is that you are examining.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) We will prepare that for you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and obviously somebody who can speak to it orally at the hearing. But it would help us if we could have something in advance so we can try and digest what steps you have been taking. That would help us.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (In English) Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Do you mean provide those information before Friday?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you can, whatever you have available, and then someone who can speak to it and answer our questions on Friday, because this is obviously a most interesting development.

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung has a question.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

I just want to follow up on two questions, both of them addressed to Mr Lee.

In the morning, Mr Lee, you did mention about, on the compensation side, that the leadership team decided to merge the driving bonus into the base salary, and you did mention that it puts pressure on the bus drivers, because of that bonus. Then later on, I think you mentioned that you have introduced this 20-point system

which would also generate some sort of monetary reward.

My question is, this 20-point sort of measurement, also would that generate any kind of pressure to the bus drivers? If not, why?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) I think the actual bonus, as far as the bus captain is concerned, the bonus I think is deserved. They think it's part of their pay. Let's imagine if because there is an accident, whether they are liable or not, somehow that so-called bonus would be deferred, it creates some unnecessary pressure.

If you can imagine, the bonus should be part of their salary, and every year there are increments, judging on their performance, so it doesn't feel like you take something away, so that is some kind of, if you like, assessment or benchmarking and you say, okay, you performed well this year, you deserve an increment, or something further, you are actually talking about they move to another grade. So it's not like it's completely different.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you. Then I will move on to the second issue which is on safety. I also heard comments this morning that from your leadership team's perspective, safety is the responsibility of all departments, henceforth there is no single department responsible for risk or safety.

In the past year or two, have the team run into situations in which the departments have misunderstanding, thinking that the other department are handling certain safety issue and it ended up with nobody addressing the issue at all?

MR ROGER LEE: (In English) Every Monday morning, we actually, myself and my operation directors and all the other directors, have a couple of hours, we sit down, and we talk through, no matter it's a bus hardware issue, and the bus captains, their performance, and also the facilities at the terminus and depot, we actually basically work as a team to ensure safety will not just simply apply for just the bus captain.

Presumably, Mr Leung, you ...

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: For example, there is a case where the bus captain had a conflict with a passenger, so we install the protective shield to protect the bus captain. So it's the job of not just the operations department but also the procurement, the engineering department, so everyone will have to look into this. Whether it would be possible resource-wise, it cannot be determined by one single department.

Another example is the retrofitting of CCTV. No single department can make a decision on when this can be done and how quickly this can be done is also

a matter for all the departments and whether the procurement can speed up the process. It's all teamwork.

MR ROGER LEE: You have to be responsive whatever you do, and you have to make sure that it's comprehensive. And you cannot really do anything which is not amenable to the hardware, the bus. And of course the operations department have their needs. So it must be interdepartmental in the nature of these works.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. In which case, gentlemen, we will adjourn now until 10 o'clock on Friday. Thank you.

(5.36 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Friday, 10 August 2018)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WING BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG (evidence given in Cantonese; transcription of simultaneous interpretation unless otherwise indicated) 1

Opening statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG 1

Examination by MR DUNCAN 3

[Blank Page]

2018 年 8 月 7 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），
香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

羅康錦教授，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

Peter N. Duncan（鄧樂勤）資深大律師、黃佩琪大律師及陳政龍大律師由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

梁乃鵬博士，主席（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

陳祖澤博士，副主席（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

李澤昌先生，董事總經理（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

蘇偉基先生，總經理（企業策劃及業務發展）（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

梁健宏先生，車務總監（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

彭樹雄先生，副車務總監（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

黃祥明先生，培訓及服務質素管理部主管（九龍巴士（一九三三）有限公司及龍運巴士有限公司代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士，各位先生，感謝你哋今日接納咗我哋嘅邀請，上嚟作證，協助我哋履行職責。我明白梁博士係會作一個開場白，so 梁博士，等陣間你講喇，之後我會想請係鄧樂勤大律師，佢係其中一位我哋嘅代表大律師，佢會向你提問。可能你哋其中一位同事或者係會係覺得係由佢哋答問題係會比較好啲，冇問題㗎，或者你可以先話畀我哋聽你係請邊一個同事係答某一條問題嘅，你都可以作一個開場白。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你，主席。主席，委員會嘅委員，早晨，讓我開宗明義講出我哋當時同埋而家都依然係深感遺憾，呢個係指喺 2018 年 2 月 10 號，喺大埔公路所發生嘅交通事件。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

喺2018年2月11號，作為主席，我作咗一個決定，去成立一個董事局嘅特別委員會，成員係有陳祖澤博士，同埋曾偉雄先生，我係擔任主席，去就事件進行調查，並且就巴士安全提出建議。呢一個特別嘅調查委員會係開咗數次嘅會議，會見咗九巴同埋龍運巴士嘅管理階層，亦都會見咗兩個工會嘅代表，以及係兩家巴士製造商，分別係亞歷山大丹尼士同埋富豪。調查委員會喺2018年嘅3月12號提交咗份報告，裏面羅列咗多項嘅建議，以提升巴士安全。呢份報告喺同日亦都提交咗畀運輸署署長，同一份報告亦都交咗畀你哋獨立檢討委員會。喺2018年4月10號，我哋以書面嘅形式寫低咗我哋一個行動計劃嚟到去落實2018年3月12號嗰份報告所列出嘅建議。而琴日，我哋向獨立檢討委員會更新咗我哋嘅行動計劃，裏面係列出直至2018年7月尾，管理階層所採取嘅行動，去落實呢一個建議。

主席先生同埋委員，我同我嘅同事今日嚟到席前，我哋係懷住謙卑之心同埋一個積極主動嘅態度，我哋知道我哋責無旁貸，係向乘客提供安全嘅巴士服務。任何可以提升巴士安全嘅建議，我哋都係歡迎，視乎技術上同埋財政上是否可行，我哋係會樂意去落實你哋嘅建議嘅，唔該主席先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，梁博士。係，鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。早晨，梁博士同埋各位先生，首先，我亦都係想係重複係主席所講，今日多謝你哋係出席，亦都感謝你哋係提交咗相當大量嘅書面嘅材料畀委員會，等我哋去研究同埋考慮。一啲部分我哋係需要係同你哋係澄清，又或者係希望你哋係進一步協助我哋，所以就此，我就有啲問題向你提問。我知道你係代表九龍巴士(1933)有限公司，同埋龍運巴士有限公司，或者為求係簡便起見，我會就係講「公司」，雖然就係我意思係包括咗九巴同埋龍運，咁樣就比較簡單。喺任何時候，如果你想係特別指名係兩間公司嘅其中一間嘅話，請你隨便係話清楚畀我哋聽就得嘞。或者首先，我先係就你嘅開場白嗰度係提問一句。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我睇番第五段，你嘅開場白嘅第五段，你當就提及係你哋呢一個特別調查委員會，喺2018年3月12號有一個報告，呢一個就係喺2月大埔係交通意外之後所成立。你就話就喺同日，3月12號同日提供咗嗰份報告畀運輸署署長，亦都係將同一份報告交咗畀呢一個係獨立檢討委員會。我就想問，你知唔知道嗰一個部分係有--嗰個報告嘅有某啲部分就係冇交畀係檢討委員會？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，關於係嗰個報告，關於嗰個事件，係有部分就係塗黑咗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋喺文件夾嗰度，喺 KMB-1 呢個文件夾嗰度，第98頁，我哋可以睇番你哋嘅報告。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，鄧大律師，係邊一頁？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇番嗰份報告，第98頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）第98頁。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會見到係報告嘅係封面，跟住請你揭去第 99 頁，嗰度有一個係目錄表嘅，第99頁，係目錄表。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，係，目錄表99頁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋呢個委員會係想知道嘅地方，但係嗰度就係冇提交，譬如話係第二部就係嗰個意外調查報告，第三部就係關乎車長嘅事宜。關乎車長嘅事宜，當然呢個對於我哋進行嘅調查係相當之重要，所以我想向你提出個請求喇，咁就睇下你願唔願意就係將呢兩個部分，即係第二部同埋第三部都係交畀我哋係檢討委員會去考慮，當然要符合我哋嘅職責範圍，或者你係想同你嘅同事商量一下，不過我想而家提出呢一個要求，就想請你就係今日--譬如話今日聆訊之後去考慮一下。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）講到係特別係第二部分，呢一個意外調查報告，以及...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）啱。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）...係第三部係關乎係車長嘅事？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）啱，你講得啱。或者你睇番第102頁同埋103頁呢個文件夾度。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）103，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度寫住就係資料冇係提交㗎。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就而家係想請你重新考慮，我唔係想你即時作一個決定，我係想請你就係喺我哋進行呢個研訊期間，都同同事係研究一下。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）關乎呢一點，我想問下，呢啲資料係咪會畀呢一個係檢討委員會定抑或會成為公開資料？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋呢個檢討委員會所收嘅資料，我哋嘅基礎都係話，係都會就係會交畀公眾㗎，如果認為係適當嘅話。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我會--唔該晒，我會考慮你嘅要求嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你，梁博士。我哋仲係睇緊呢一個 KMB-1 呢個

文件夾，我就想請你係揭去第31頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）第31。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）31。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）31，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我講番嗰個上文下理，呢一個就係九巴，即係你哋公司回應係委員會向你哋索取資料嘅一個部分嚟嘅。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁或者想請你睇番呢個文件夾嘅第1頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）邊頁呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第1頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你呢度見到就係秘書處就係--委員會嘅秘書處 2018 年3月28號寫嘅信。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者你一路揭去後面嗰幾頁，你見到就係委員會就係--就多項係特定嘅課題係要求索取啲資料嘅。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇第31頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）31。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺嗰頁嘅頂頭嗰度，嗰度就係睇到我哋委員會所問嘅問題，呢度就係話，請你係找出同埋就係提供以下文件嘅副本，就係你哋公司嘅係管治同埋社會責任嘅守則。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺你哋答案嘅第二段嗰度，有三個係元素㗎，你就話呢啲係三個關鍵嘅元素，分別係安全。或者我將佢讀出，作為一個紀錄。你呢度就咁講，你話三個關鍵嘅元素，即係話我哋嘅係企業社會責任有三個關鍵嘅元素，喺我哋嗰個企業嗰個網站嗰度有寫，安全。九巴同埋龍運都係話，係要向乘客提供一個安全、可靠同埋舒適嘅巴士服務，應該係物有所值嘅服務。九巴同埋龍運就係會繼續係大量投資，去改善佢嘅巴士服務嘅安全，咁方法就透過係向職員提供密集嘅訓練，係加強呢一個表現嘅監察程序，以及有一個獎勵計劃，以及係改

善嗰個巴士嘅設計，以及係提倡係推廣係巴士乘客嘅安全，呢一個係內部去做，同埋向公眾去咁樣做。

我而家想做嘅就係，梁博士，我想首先就係講嗰個獎勵計劃。

梁乃鵬先生： Maintenance?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）獎勵計劃，你呢度就係有見到嗰度寫到就係「獎勵計劃」，係咪呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想問你幾個問題，究竟目前你哋有啲咩嘢嘅計劃，係關乎係巴士司機嘅安全，你哋有啲咩嘢獎勵計劃，明唔明白我嘅問題？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我同事就係會係答呢個問題，係蘇生會問。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我仲未問問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）蘇偉基先生會負責呢條問題，係咪呀？

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢方面，我就想請你揭去 108 頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）108，108。係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第廿九段，嗰頁嘅第廿九段，嗰度就話 2018 年嘅 2 月 21 號，九巴同埋龍運就宣布安全獎金同埋良好表現獎金就會將佢併入去嗰個底薪嗰度，咁而生效日期就 2018 年嘅 3 月 1 號。呢一度就係講到第三個表同埋第四個表，就係講出咗嗰個--喺呢一個薪酬嘅優化之後，嗰個薪酬嘅結構。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你去到第 109 頁同埋 110 頁就睇到嗰個詳情㗎嘞。我就留意到，呢一個宣布係喺 2018 年 2 月 21 號係作出，當時就係意外發生之後第十一日。我嘅問題就係，呢一個意外嘅發生同呢一個改變嘅宣布，嗰個係咪一個因素嚟嘅呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你嘅問題，我好高興有一個機會係喺呢一方面作出澄清。實際上，喺去年嘅 11 月，當時喺深水埗亦都發生咗一個好不幸嘅巴士意外，有多位乘客係傷亡。我喺報章嘅報道係留意到，我哋月薪嘅巴士車長當時係賺取緊少於每月 12,000 元，即係啱啱係少過 12,000 元。其實係由我提出，我就當時同自己講，要做啲嘢，要對呢件事做啲嘢，因此我就係檢視咗月薪巴士車長嘅薪酬結構，我就留意到，每一個月除咗佢哋嘅底薪之外，同埋一萬...

主席：（經傳譯員）1,800 紋？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，對唔住，1,800 紋嘅安全獎金，係，多謝你糾正我，對唔住。另外，仲有另外一個獎金，都係 1,800 紋。咁我就決定，我哋或者可以係提升佢哋嘅薪酬結構。喺 12 月嘅董事會會議，董事會就係批准嗰個安全同埋表現嘅獎金總共係 3,600 元，就將佢哋係納入底薪裏面，呢個係第一點；

第二點，因為呢一個逾時工作嘅薪金之前嗰個基礎就係要參考底薪，當時嗰個每一個月係少過 12,000 元，但係我哋將呢一啲獎金加入咗底薪之後，呢一個逾時工作嘅薪金亦都係會增加㗎嘞，因為係以新嘅底薪去計算。呢一個就係另外一個理由，咁長話短說，咁我哋做咗呢一個提升之後，月薪巴士車長底薪大概每一個月係 15,400 元，同時佢哋逾時工作嘅補償亦都係會相應增加。

第三，每一年嗰個花紅，之前就係每年 12,000 元，而家亦都會增加㗎嘞，增加到多過 15,000 元嘅。咁樣係會增加咗巴士車長嘅收入，呢一個決定係 12 月作出，我哋係打算呢一個新嘅薪酬制度會係 3 月 1 號係實施。不過好不幸，就發生咗 2 月嘅不幸嘅事件，因此有啲人就係錯誤咁樣詮釋咗，就話係因為有交通意外，我哋先至去調整嗰個薪酬，但係其實兩者係冇關係，當時係喺 12 月，喺董事會嘅會議，由我提出去決定。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you, Dr Leung.

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士，你係講到深水埗嗰個意外，就係 11 月發生，咁你記唔記得喺 2017 年 9 月 22 號亦都係發生過一個意外？

蘇偉基先生：即係個意外其實係 9 月 22 號長沙灣嘅意外。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，對唔住，對唔住，我等你糾正我，我以為係 11 月。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實唔係㗎，你係咪講緊...

蘇偉基先生：係冇 11 月嘅意外嘅，當時個舉措係回應 9 月 22 號新巴喺長沙灣嘅意外。

梁乃鵬先生：深水埗。

主席：（經傳譯員）9 月 22 號？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

李澤昌先生：回應多少少就係，頭先講到嗰個獎金嗰樣嘢，其實我哋當其時我哋覺得獎金其實係會畀到啲車長好多嘅壓力，所以係我哋唔覺得係用獎金好似係一種即係好似利誘咁嘅感覺，所以其實車長佢本身嘅壓力應該好大，如果用一個

bonus 咁樣嘅去畀佢，我覺得係未必一個恰當，所以當其時董事會就決議將嗰啲獎金就撥咗落去個薪金嗰度。其實喺--啱啱主席都講咗，我哋未來而家嗰啲薪酬有嗰啲級數，同埋升嗰啲 point 嗰啲已經講咗。咁我諗仲有一樣嘢，就係其實我哋--我諗蘇生會講多少少而家嗰個情況。

蘇偉基先生：我哋公司亦都係有設立一啲獎項，去鼓勵車長嗰個行車嘅安全，以往我哋有啲安全獎。咁喺 2016 期間，公司就將呢個獎項就改咗，叫做一個星級車長。喺呢個計劃入面，如果車長佢喺某段時間達致一個行車安全，冇意外紀錄，或受乘客讚許，佢就可以頒授唔同嘅獎項。佢分好多嘅年期，十五年之內會係一個星，如果十五至二十九年又多一個良好紀錄，又會有另外一個星，去到最高亦都有個大星。我哋每年喺 12 月亦都有個週年嘅聚會，係表揚同埋獎勵安全良好嘅車長，咁呢個就係一個叫做星級車長嘅計劃。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個計劃而家係咪仲運作緊？

蘇偉基先生：係，生效緊，亦都每年係恆常做緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，蘇生。我想請問你多幾個問題，係關於--一陣間再問你呢啲獎勵嘅計劃，因為喺你畀我哋嘅資料裏面都有講到。不如我哋而家講番呢一個安全獎金嘅問題。梁博士，你就話畀我哋聽，新嘅計劃就係喺 12 月嘅時候，董事會嘅會議係當時決定嘅，點解要係喺 2 月 21 號先至宣布？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，咁係董事局就係 12 月決定咗，我諗好似係 12 月 22 號，然後管理層係需要時間去實施新嘅薪酬架構，實際上，董事總經理係向我告知，係建議實施嘅日期係 3 月 1 號，係今年 3 月 1 號。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁喺呢一個改變之前，當我哋仲有安全獎金嘅時候，咁呢一個安全獎金係點樣發放？喺任何一個個別嘅個案，係點樣去決定？

蘇偉基先生：喺呢個舊有嘅安全獎嘅計劃，我哋係會睇幾個指標，首先就係個車長會唔會喺有意外嘅發生，喺意外發生，究竟佢係咪需要負責，佢有冇不良嘅駕駛，咁我哋罰，有機會係半個月或者係一個月嘅安全服務獎，嗰個數係講緊一千七百幾蚊。但係如果佢喺半年行為表現良好之後，相關嘅獎金係會發放番畀嗰位車長嘅。而呢個咁嘅管理，就係由車務組去負責。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁個意思係咪即係話，係要限制於嗰個人係咪要負責嗰個意外？

蘇偉基先生：亦都公司自己本身有一啲便衣嘅巡查，或者乘客嘅投訴，我哋喺呢方面都知道車長佢有冇不良駕駛嘅行為，從而就利用呢個以前嘅安全獎係去紀律處分我哋不良駕駛嘅車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢個改變實施之前，即係仲有呢個獎金嘅時候，你哋

嘅巴士車長當中，有幾多嘅比例係可以得到全面嘅獎金？

蘇偉基先生：喺以往呢個安全獎，其實我哋有九成嘅同事係會攞足一個全額嘅，咁被扣或者褪遲咗出呢個安全獎，係少過一成嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺委員會嘅商議嘅時候，當然亦都係向你嘅管理人員係聽過一啲意見。我哋知道有一啲嘅科技可以係記錄譬如話係有超速，或者係大力剎車，或者係過度加速，呢一類咁樣嘅因素，咁呢啲嘅因素會唔會都考慮埋㗎，即係喺有呢一個舊嘅安全獎金嘅時候？

梁健宏先生：當其時嗰個安全獎金淨針對意外後嘅發放，針對意外後嘅考慮，至於佢平常嗰啲表現，就喺其他嘅獎金嗰度，就係嗰個總服務安全獎金嗰度係去處理嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該，請你而家去睇第 77 頁，係，77 頁。呢一啲嘅係你剛才講到嘅獎勵計劃。委員會當時提嘅問題就係咁講，係關於薪酬嘅制度。咁如果巴士車長係表現良好，同埋甚至係冇任何嘅意外紀錄，或者係好少嘅意外紀錄，會唔會有任何嘅獎勵？咁首先，有一個就係所謂安全駕駛獎嘅，我想請問，已經係實施咗幾耐？

梁健宏先生：呢個安全獎嘅設立都好多年㗎嘞，咁就去到大約係一、兩年前，就我哋用另外一個星級計劃去取締。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁即係而家唔存在嘞？

梁健宏先生：我哋用個星級計劃去取締嘞，而家就唔存在。

梁乃鵬先生：存在，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：存在，我諗解釋清楚，呢一個計劃仍然都係存在嘅，不過以前係用一張好簡單嘅一張紙之類嘅嘢，係一個獎狀，但係而家叫做星級計劃，其實係用一啲即係金，即係係黃金嘅金，同埋一啲銀，係真係 silver 嘅銀，咁樣去獎勵個車長，咁就令到佢個感覺會更加強烈，可以擺咗佢自己個心口裏面嗰啲嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢個獎嘅安全嘅方面，係咪限制於對於意外有冇責任呢一樣嘢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）即係個準則？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀，準則。呢啲會考慮啲咩嘢嘅事情？除咗話司機就係冇涉及意外，即係可以咁講。

蘇偉基先生：以往呢個獎項--講得啱，其實佢係淨係計 zero liability，即係話車長係唔需要負責嘅意外。咁即係變句說話，如果個車長喺連續五年，佢冇發生佢自己需要負責任嘅意外，我哋就會有個嘉許，個嘉許係一張證書嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇呢個金錢嘅獎勵㗎，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：正確，呢個係冇一個獎金。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁我而家又想講下，嗰個係良好服務獎勵，我就想問下，會唔會係有邊一部分就係好視乎佢嗰個係安全表現嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個可以大家睇睇佢有個 annex 9c-2 嗰度，咁就呢個除咗車長，其實所有員工都會係畀呢個表現獎蓋範。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你就話唔係單係限於係車長，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生： Correct.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該，咁不過我問題就問，講到車長嗰方面，巴士司機方面，佢安唔安全駕駛，係咪你哋都會考慮埋呢一點，然後先至睇下佢攞唔攞到呢個傑出服務獎㗎？

蘇偉基先生：佢係咁樣講，如果佢係一個 outstanding service，舉例如佢係幫助咗乘客，咁佢係會獲呢個獎，但係喺獲呢個獎之前，我哋都會睇睇佢嘅駕駛紀錄係咪良好，如果佢駕駛紀錄良好，而因為佢一個幫助乘客而獲獎，我哋就會頒呢個表現良好獎畀佢。

李澤昌先生：即係其實換言之係，佢主要係喺嗰個服務方面，佢做咗啲咩嘢嘢，譬如係點樣幫助啲乘客，點樣係對啲乘客嘅態度，當然有可能會係因為佢個安全係其中一分，但係主要都係講佢嗰個服務嗰方面，因為有啲車長喺嗰個整個嗰個揸車嘅過程裏面，佢係真係對啲乘客個態度係非常之好，咁呢個係一個即係outstanding 嘅 service award，其實呢個係包含除咗車長之外，有啲即係站長，有啲站務助理，有啲即係我哋嘅稽查，其實都會喺呢度裏面嘅，所以係比較係即係概括嗰個面係闊好多。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番巴士司機，你講就話可能佢對啲乘客係服務得好好，好幫到手，我就想問，會唔會都要係佢揸車安全，就冇係涉及呢一個係需要負責嘅係意外，呢一啲會唔會都考慮埋㗎？

蘇偉基先生：或者可以咁樣講，如果佢個駕駛行為，我哋係用頭先第一個講緊嗰個良好駕駛獎去獎勵，嗰個係冇意外，咁我哋就睇番個年份去獎勵。咁第二嗰個表現獎就係無論係車長或者非車長好，如果佢表現良好就會獲呢個獎。咁呢個--但係獲呢個獎之前，如果係車長都有個前設，就係佢嗰個駕駛都係有一個良好嘅紀錄，因為係一個獎項，而呢啲獎項良好表現，頭先我舉一個例子，譬如話幫助乘客，可以係一個例子。咁我想秘書可唔可以去一去 annex 9c-2 嗰份文件，我相信會係有個好清楚嘅講到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以，我哋可以去 9C-2，九巴 3853 頁。我想問你剛才係咪提及嘅就係呢一份？

梁乃鵬先生： Outstanding service award. Okay.

蘇偉基先生：咁大家都睇到，螢光幕嗰度，佢就係話去表現員工，如果佢係有貢獻，或者個表現良好，咁就會由佢嘅主管去提名，然之後我哋就會頒發呢個良好表現獎，咁呢個係 for 所有嘅同事嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇幾耐之前，你話都會視乎佢有冇良好嘅駕駛行為，你剛才係咪講呢個安全駕駛獎，即係話係冇意外嗰個？

蘇偉基先生：我要即係澄清，第一個，嗰個係安全獎，嗰個係會睇佢嗰個意外紀錄，呢一個就係睇佢嗰個表現良好，但係喺表現良好嗰度，我哋都會睇睇佢係咪一個有良好駕駛紀錄先至可以提名佢獲取呢個表現良好獎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。我就想問，良好駕駛紀錄係咪就係唔需--即係佢冇一啲需要負責嘅係交通意外嘅紀錄？

蘇偉基先生：並非所有，因為除咗意外...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊啲呀？

蘇偉基先生：顧客嘅投訴，或者我哋自己內部亦都有一啲嘅便衣巡查，都會去睇到一個車長，其實佢嗰個駕駛紀錄係咪良好嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。呢一個傑出服務獎有冇係金錢嘅獎勵㗎？

蘇偉基先生：係冇嘅，冇一個獎金包含嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪都係一張證書咁，都好似頭先講嗰樣？

蘇偉基先生：一張證書，冇錯，一張表揚。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。好，跟住落去嘞，就係呢個星級車長計劃，我諗你剛才都係畀咗少少資料我哋㗎嘞。我而家想問，喺頒呢個獎嘅時候，係畀粒星佢嘅時候，係用啲咩嘢準則？

蘇偉基先生：呢個秘書可唔可以幫我去一去呢個 annex 9c-3 嗰度？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）KMB-9，3858 頁，唔該晒。

蘇偉基先生：去一去後一頁，有一個介紹嗰個--係嘞，呢個，停喺呢頁。喺呢個計劃入面，首先就係具備良好嘅意外同埋服務紀錄。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）3864 頁，第 3864 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呢度嘅第幾頁呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢原文就中文嚟嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）第3864頁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家睇緊嗰個--想搵埋嗰個翻譯本。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係中文。

主席：（經傳譯員）3865/1？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔係，3865/7。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）3865-7嗰頁有一個英文嘅翻譯本。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，而家打咗上嚟嘞，咁樣有咩嘢特別嘅嘢係想同我哋講下？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）或者讓我補充一下，呢個計劃嗰個目的就係表揚嗰啲係良好嘅車長。其實我哋每年頒出嘅獎就係唔多嘅，係兩、三個嘅，咁就係一個特別嘅計劃，嚟到去表揚佢哋，亦都希望係鼓勵佢哋就係有個良好嘅表現嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該，呢度裏面有冇呢一個係金錢嘅獎勵㗎？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）冇㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，去番第77頁嘞，就係KMB-1嗰度，講到話係如果嗰啲車長就表現良好嘅話，佢哋嗰個係職業嘅晉升嘅階梯係點樣樣嘅。我想問一個問題，由車長升去車長二，我想問，會唔會係增加佢嘅薪酬？

蘇偉基先生：有㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）同樣，車長二升去車長一有冇？亦都係咪會係讓佢就係有加人工？

蘇偉基先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番啲細節嘞，我諗可以睇番係之前，你係話畀我哋聽嘅，係關於獎金嗰頁嗰度嘞，我諗而家唔需要去嗰度睇嘞。呢度喺77頁底下嗰度，你見到係有咩嘢準則嘅，係睇咩嘢準則，然後先至可以係一級級上去嘅，即係話係冇意外，冇呢個紀律警告，同埋過往兩年都係出勤嘅紀錄係好嘅，啱唔啱？

蘇偉基先生： 正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。好嘞，就呢個課題係最後一項，第78頁，嗰個就係週年嘅表現獎金。喺呢版嗰度佢就話，呢個就一年係出兩次嘅，咁亦都係同嗰個車長嘅表現掛鉤。我就想問，點樣同係車長嘅表現掛鉤？

蘇偉基先生：呢個包含幾方面，第一，就係嗰個駕駛紀錄有冇曾經被紀律處分，佢嘅出勤嘅紀錄，「出勤」嘅意思係講緊係不假不到，即係 absent without permission，因為你呢個影響嗰個服務嗰個穩定性嘅，咁最主要係綜合呢三大嘅指標。

李澤昌先生：呢度亦都可以有少少補充，喺啱啱我哋前嗰幾個月，呢個已經係轉咗係一個十三個月嘅雙糧，即係換言之即係話，過去每六個月係評核，然後畀呢個所謂叫做 annual performance bonus，亦都轉咗係十三個月糧，即係換言之，呢個評核嘅基制已經係冇咗嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你意思係，年度表現獎金已經唔再存在？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）正確㗎。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充，我剛才喺研訊都提過，我唔單只將安全獎金同埋係服務獎金納入底薪，同時喺年尾嘅時候，呢一個年度表現獎金就會變成第十三個月嘅糧係畀車長嘅。換句話說，之前佢哋最多都會係每年係攞到獎金就係 12,000 元嘅，就係分兩次畀。但係而家，到咗年尾嘅時候，佢哋就會攞到...

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）即係好似雙糧咁樣，攞多一個月嘅糧。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）咁就係跟番新嗰個底薪去發放嘅，而家就係 15,400 元。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁樣嘅了解啱唔啱，就係話呢一個第十三個月糧就同服務係無關嘅？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）你係正確嘅，係無關嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係舊年 12 月，董事局批准呢一個改變之前，一個人首先就會係得到一個安全嘅獎金，就係你九成嘅車長都攞到㗎喇，即係如果我之前嘅理解係正確嘅。咁佢哋亦都仍然可以係有一個年度表現獎金？

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有幾多嘅巴士車長係會得到首先呢一個每年嘅年度表現獎金？

蘇偉基先生：約莫九成，接近 90%，以往。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解啱唔啱，就係呢一個年度表現獎金而家取消咗嘞，就係因為舊年 12 月董事局嘅一個決定，就係話由今年 3 月 1 號起，你係開始新嘅薪酬架構？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁而家嘅情況係咪咁樣，就係已經冇咗具體嘅一啲金錢

上嘅獎勵，即係呢一個巴士車長就算有安全嘅駕駛紀錄，都唔會有一啲金錢上嘅獎勵？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有其他嘅保障，去確保我哋嘅巴士車長係會好正確同埋好安全咁樣駕駛。或者我都應該喺呢一個階段提及，除咗提升佢哋嘅薪酬之外，即係而家已經實施咗，係 3 月 1 號，我亦都係建議緊，希望董事局係同意係有其他方面嘅改善。譬如剛才我哋講到，巴士車長嗰度係有三個級別，就係車長、車長二、車長一。我係得到董事局嘅支持，就係呢三個級別，就將會係擴展到五個級別，同埋每年嘅增薪點亦都係會擴大，由而家八次嘅增薪點，係會增加到二十個增薪點。譬如話要晉升去下一個級別，同埋要得到--每一年嗰個增薪點其實係唔會係自動，係要視乎佢哋巴士車長嘅表現。但係更加重要嘅，我相信，我相信我咁樣講都係正確嘅，就係巴士車長喺佢哋嘅態度上，並唔會變成更加不負責任，即係話唔會因為冇咗安全駕駛獎，就會冇咁負責任，因為佢哋係專業司機嚟㗎，佢哋自己都要保障自己嘅安全，除咗乘客安全，都有自己嘅安全要保障，因此我最主要嘅目標就係要去增加、提升巴士車長總體嘅收入。我希望我唔單只可以招募新嘅巴士車長，我仲可以係挽留現職嘅巴士車長，呢一個係我嘅意向嚟㗎。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，梁博士。講到你剛才話得到董事局支持嘅事情，如果你而家係改變嗰個薪酬架構，你會唔會係好似慣常咁樣，都會同呢啲員工嘅工會去傾，抑或係就咁實施咗，先話畀佢哋聽？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會㗎，其實我自己係親自同工會嘅代表喺幾個月見過面。除咗係關於薪酬方面嘅新嘅架構喺 3 月 1 號實施咗之後，我亦都係向工會進一步係表示就話，將會有進一步嘅改善，佢哋係知道。譬如話佢哋知道與其有三個級別嘅車長，將會係有五個級別；與其有八個增薪點，將來會有二十個增薪點，同埋仲有其他嘅薪由。不過我係時時都好願意聽巴士車長嘅意見。我應該點講呢？我發現我自己個人嚟講，我嘅管治哲學就係話以人為先，首先要注意啲人，當然，乘客對我哋好重要，佢哋係首要，但係我哋嘅員工同我哋--對我哋嚟講同樣重要。同埋我都要向我嘅股東負責，所以我係盡我嘅所能去提升我所有嘅員工，唔係淨巴士車長，即係包括埋前線嘅車--其他嘅人員佢哋嘅收入，等我哋可以招募同埋挽留優質嘅員工。

李澤昌先生：呢度有點補充嘅，其實我哋都有同好多其他嘅員工即係都有溝通到，喺呢方面。

蘇偉基先生：呢度我亦都可以講一講，其實呢啲訴求喺以往公司都有聽到嘅，佢哋亦都覺得將金錢同個安全綑綁，佢哋行車嗰陣時會有個壓力，咁就年尾嗰個 annual performance bonus 係要評核，亦都係有訴求，我自己同車長接觸，或者經廠務嘅同事亦都有反映，佢哋係對呢樣嘢係希望有個改變，所以我哋係聽到員工嘅聲音，再頭先主席係接見咗工會嘅代表，係作出一個改動。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。梁博士，我而家想請你去睇番我哋見過嘅一位證

人嘅證供，佢係黎兆聰，佢係代表一個工會。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）佢係我哋工會嘅一個代表嚟嘅，我都有見過佢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以睇番第九日研訊，喺第 98 頁嗰度嗰個謄本。

主席：（經傳譯員）請問喺我哋嘅文件夾裏面嗰個編號係幾多？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家喺螢幕上面，大家係可以睇到一頁嘅紙，咁大家可以睇番第九日嘅研訊，睇第九行（原文照錄）。

主席： Which of the four transcript bundles is it to be found in?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，第四個。

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我解釋一下當時呢一個對話，喺第十三行，就係由黃律師，即係我嘅同事，係委員會嘅其中一位律師，佢就問一個問題問黎生，佢就話「我哋唔係講緊一個減扣㗎，呢一個係增加㗎，我而家意思就係話，唔係增加咗你嘅底薪，如果你駕駛良好，你會係得到另外一個獎金，呢個唔係關於減咗你嘅人工。」咁黎生就話「九巴就冇一個咁嘅制度。」咁黃律師就話「唔係話關於你有冇呢個咁嘅制度，如果有人想建議一個咁嘅制度，你會唔會支持？」

我想你留意嘅就係黎生呢一度嘅答案，佢就咁講「主席，我哋係支持任何獎勵或者激勵嘅制度，而家我哋係同九巴講緊係有另外一種獎金制度，就會係有一個二十個增薪點嘅制度。」

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係我剛才提及㗎嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個就係你提及㗎，唔該。咁意思就係，如果你係達到某啲嘅表現，你就會係得到另外一個增薪點，呢個係唔單只每一年嘅增薪，咁九巴就已經係口頭答應咗，會有一個二十個增薪點嘅，就會係講到表現、安全表現、出勤同埋係紀律。咁如果巴士車長係達唔到呢啲標準，就唔會得到呢一個額外嘅增薪點。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，頭先我係講到增薪點㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你而家心目中嗰個制度，會唔會都係要視乎安全表現㗎？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）會㗎，好似我剛才都有講過，呢一個增薪點同埋係晉升去下一個級別唔會自動，要係考慮安全表現，同埋其他方面嘅表現，係會㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你決定咗你會點樣去評估安全表現未，即係喺呢一個

制度之下？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）有㗎，我哋係有一個服務質素管理部，佢哋就係負責去監察所有巴士車長嘅表現嘅。咁喺呢一個時候，或者我可以請我哋有關嘅主管。

李澤昌先生：或者呢度可以補充少少先。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）咁佢呢一個主管就可以話畀你聽，我哋點樣去監察巴士車長嘅表現嘅，咁之後就李生可以補充。

黃祥明先生：早晨，大家好，我係 James Wong，係呢個九巴嘅培訓及訓練部質素嘅主管，咁我係負責係訓練巴士車長嘅訓練，兼且係要監管佢哋嗰個行為同埋操守。咁喺我嘅管理範圍裏面，我哋係會有不時係恒常嘅監測車長嘅行為，包括佢係喺行車上面有超速，或者係駕駛唔穩妥，呢方面我哋有黑盒嘅監管。

另外一方面，我哋係會有接到啲乘客嘅投訴，甚至無係個警察嘅控訴，從而知道呢個車長係有啲唔好嘅行為，或者係不遵守呢個交通規則嘅事件。喺呢方面，我哋係有呢個便衣嘅巡查，當我哋接到有乘客嘅投訴嘅時候，我哋係會安排我哋嘅便衣導師係上車，係親身去睇下呢個司機嘅駕駛行為，從而決定佢嗰個駕駛態度，或者個技巧是否正確。咁喺頭先問我哋點樣去監管呢個車長嘅違規，咁我哋喺呢方面都係盡咗好多嘅努力，喺度做，我哋目標都係希望能夠達到安全駕駛。

其實我哋嘅駕駛訓練學校係有好唔同嘅，好多嘅方向嘅駕駛訓練。咁喺呢個基本訓練裏面先，我哋基本訓練就係會有分兩個階段嘅訓練，第一個階段就係令佢可以達得到呢個運輸署嘅駕駛執照；而第二個駕駛訓練，第二個階段，我哋係令佢--訓練到佢可以達到我哋九巴嘅訓練目標，可以出嚟服務呢個乘客。至於佢哋有啲唔好嘅行為嘅時候，我哋係會用唔同嘅方法去監察。

李澤昌先生：正如頭先講，其實我哋有好多渠道，到其時會同個車長多啲溝通，頭先你所講嘅，究竟係咪車長覺得呢一樣嘢係咪另外一種嘅監察佢嗰個駕駛技術，從而有冇呢個所謂升職。咁我諗係--呢啲係我哋一定會聽取嘅意見，呢個都係我哋即係初步嘅提議，係向呢個方向行。咁日後，我哋應該同啲車長喺呢方面多啲溝通喇，呢啲意見最後都係一個綜合嘅意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，你講到嗰個監察巴士車長，我之後會繼續多問一啲問題，或者當我哋去到係呢個黑盒嘅時候，我哋會再問多啲呢方面嘅問題，感謝你剛才所作嘅回應。剛才就講呢個安全獎金，安全獎，嗰個就講完嘞，我而家係想落去係另一樣嘢，但係都係同安全有關嘅，我就想請你係睇另一個文件夾，今次就係想睇呢個 KMB-6，2110 頁。你而家睇緊嘅應該係九巴嘅係管理架構，係你哋公司交畀委員會嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺頂頭嗰度見到就係管理架構，上面嗰度就係李澤昌先

生，佢今日都係在席㗎；跟住就係見到就係呢個車務總監，就係梁健宏先生，佢今日亦都在席嘅；喺同一行，我哋就係有總經理，就係企業策劃同埋業務發展嘅蘇偉基先生，佢今日亦都在席嘅；喺車務總監下面，就有副車務總監，就係彭樹雄先生，今日亦都在席嘅；喺人力資源總監下面嗰度，係有黃祥明先生，佢剛才亦都答咗其中一條問題嘅，咁嗰度就係寫，嗰個部門就係培訓及服務質素管理部。

我就係想睇文件夾嘅另一頁，亦都係你哋提交嘅，呢個就係 KMB-3，708頁。呢個係嚟自週年報告，呢個就係載通國際，你哋嘅控股公司嘅週年報告嗰度係摘出嚟嘅，呢個係 2011 年嘅週年報告。708 頁裏面嘅其中一段，或者去番 705 頁嗰度，就會見到佢嗰個標題，嗰度就講及就係嗰個車務嘅檢討，呢度就講係話照顧乘客，或者照顧你哋嘅係顧客。706、707 嗰度都有多個標題，去到 708 嗰頁，嗰度有一個安全管理系統呢一個咁嘅標題。或者先睇一睇呢度嘅第一段，嗰度就話喺九巴嘅企業安全政策嗰度講咗嘞，就九巴就係好希望係喺安全表現嗰度係持續係精益求精，而呢一個係安全嘅企業文化，就係你哋嘅係重點，你哋有一個非常之嚴謹嘅安全管治框架嚟到確保，係可以達致最高嘅安全表現水平，喺 2010 年成立，安全及服務質素部就係集中就係睇如何去提升呢個安全表現，同埋提供一個高質素嘅服務。跟住就係有提及如何就係去有呢一個職業健康同埋安全管理系統，就係呢一個 18001。

我想問，喺 2011 年嘅時候，係咪當時有一個安全及服務質量部？當時嘅情況係咪咁？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）佢已經取代咗㗎嘞，係由培訓及服務質素管理部取代咗㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，不過我哋而家想講番 2011 年，當時就係叫做係安全及服務質量部，啱唔啱？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你去到同一個文件夾嘅第 775 頁，對唔住，774。我哋而家仲係睇緊呢個 2011 年嘅係報告㗎，你喺呢度你會見到就係主要嘅企業，係行政人員。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你睇番呢個名單，其中一位係關鍵係企業係行政人員，你會見到係一位 Gary Wong 先生，佢就係負責呢一個係安全及服務質量部。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我哋又睇番跟住嗰年，2012 年嘅週年報告，我相信就可以喺同一個文件夾嘅第 995 頁嗰度係見到，喺嗰一頁亦都可以見到就係話關鍵嘅係企業，行政人員，黃先生就係有個名係寫咗喺度㗎，佢就係安全及服務

質量部嘅主管，係咪呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家去九巴嘅第四個文件夾嗰度，首先去 1202 頁。1202 頁。1202 頁，喺呢度可以再見到就係黃先生個名，咁佢都係安全及服務質量部嘅主管？

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我就想問，呢個係邊一年嘅週年報告？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）2013 年，即係我話畀你聽係 2013 年嘅報告。我想睇番我哋今朝已經睇過嘅一頁嘅，係 KMB 文件夾 9 嘅 3855 頁。呢個就係講傑出服務表現獎。

梁乃鵬先生： Outstanding service award.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，睇到嗎？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，我喺螢光幕上面睇到嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度就係分發嗰個名單，就包括係安全及服務質量部嘅主管，你可以見到就係嗰個係分發畀邊一個嗰個名單嗰度，係右手邊嗰欄。

梁乃鵬先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概係數落嚟第六行喽喇。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，而家就去文件夾嘅四，今次麻煩你去睇 1410 頁，1410 頁，呢度都係關鍵嘅企業行政人員，呢個係 2014 年嘅週年報告嘅資料嚟嘅。今次就睇唔到係有提及安全及服務質量部主管，啱唔啱？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你較早時候，作證嘅時候講過嘞，就係呢一個部門就係喺某一個時候就係有其他係取代咗，係咪呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會就係聽取咗啲係證供嘅，唔知你知唔知，就關乎 Gary Wong 先生，黃嘉峰（譯音）先生，佢喺 2015 年嘅時候，佢係解僱咗，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪亦都同呢個安全服務質量部唔再存在，個時間上係一樣？

梁乃鵬先生：講喇，繼續講。

梁健宏先生：呢個部門嗰啲工作就當其時嘅車務總監，Mr Owen Eckford 就因為當其時呢個部門嘅做，對於個巴士機件係唔識嘅，對於個車長嘅溝通係做得唔好。咁有個決定，就將呢個部門嘅工作就提升畀兩位車務副總監去處理嘅，其中一位就係我本人。喺硬件嗰方面，就我好熟悉，我喺九巴做咗好多年，都係喺工程部，喺巴士嗰度，所以變咗巴士硬件，巴士嘅安全嗰方面，我可以做多啲嘢嘅。咁之前嗰個部門對於巴士嗰個認知係冇嘅，係唔足夠嘅，至於呢個部門之前同車長嘅溝通係不好嘅，亦都收到好多車長嘅不滿嘅聲音嘅，應該可以再做得好啲。例如有啲個別嘅彎位，佢提議有啲咁嘅建議，好多車長亦都覺得係不切實際嘅，呢個就其中一個例子，佢提議有啲彎位就指名一啲咁嘅轉彎嘅速度，咁個速度就記住喺張卡嗰度，咁令啲車長就記住嗰個速度，咁呢樣嘢對於一個我哋嘅專業車長，係不切實際，比較混亂啉，呢個其中一個例子。咁取消咗，或者將呢個功能併入咗車務總監之後，就會強化咗個功能。

喺車箱嗰方面，喺硬件嗰方面，我哋做咗好多嘢，車箱設備，當其時好多車長對於除霧設施或者防霞氣，英文就 demister，就好多嘅意見嘅，就不滿嘅，咁當其時亦都做咗一系列嘅東西，去令致到點樣長遠咁解決呢個問題。亦都有啲新嘅黑盒嘅監察報告，亦都可以做到出嚟，車箱入面嘅貼紙亦都更加條理，整理好。CCTV 嗰度，我哋亦都會加強去裝，當然係安裝呢個 CCTV 亦都面對好多嘅困難，亦都要同車長溝通，咁我哋呢度慢慢、慢慢咁樣做。當然個車嗰個硬件嗰度仲有好多嘢嘅，包括有啲點樣用可以幫助到車長嘅設施，我哋亦都喺呢一年、半年亦都同業界，同製造商好多嘅商討，我哋亦都同一啲學校，一啲巴士製造商，點樣樣令致到我哋巴士安全更加可以做好啲。總總而言，硬件嗰方面，就提升咗好多，我哋注重硬件嗰方面。喺硬件嗰方面，任何可以提升嘅，我哋都會保持一個開放嘅態度去考慮。喺呢一方面，硬件嗰方面，呢幾年就住安全嗰部分係提升咗好多，我哋亦都會繼續朝住呢個方向係做嘅。

至於喺營運嗰方面，亦都有副車務總監，另外一位副車務總監係去睇住營運嘅，咁就住營運嗰方面，道路嘅安全都好重要。車長每日面對嘅工作環境，喺點樣安全，多多方方面面都緊要嘅，包括設施，路面嘅設施，站頭嘅設施，路面嘅擠塞情況，呢啲都對安全係有好大嘅關連嘅。休息時間亦都係一個好重要嘅元素，我哋亦都希望人性化處理，就住營運嗰方面，同車長嘅溝通，去喺呢方面提升駕駛安全。

至於監察同埋安全培訓紀律嗰方面，我哋喺 2017 年 9 月就成立咗個新嘅部門，當其時有新嘅部門，就係質量及服務質素管理部，咁佢就負責車長嘅訓練，新車長嘅訓練，安全嘅培訓，remedial training，監察，紀律等等嘅工作，希望全面提升包括硬件、軟件，喺安全嘅範疇嗰方面嘅表現。咁亦都睇到，喺呢個部門提升到喺副車務總監層面嘅處理之後，喺交通意外受傷率都有改

善嘅，咁我哋都希望呢個工作，我哋可以繼續努力咁再做好啲，再做落去，多謝。

李澤昌先生：即係總括而言，其實就係基本上嗰啲員工都係同一班人嚟嘅，只不過可能嗰個 head 係唔喺度嘅啫，咁仲有都係主要都係講緊一個跨部門嘅方式，係處理呢個 safety 同埋 service，呢個 quality 方面，咁其實過去呢幾年，我諗阿梁生就主要講咗呢樣嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好多謝你，咁即係話，如果我理解正確，安全及服務質量部係 2010 年成立㗎，佢以呢一個方式存在，係直至 2015 年，咁樣正唔正確？

李澤昌先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇到 2011 年嘅週年報告，呢一個部門就係集中去提升公司嘅安全表現，就好似喺個報告裏面講，就希望係提供有質素、高質素嘅服務。除咗黃嘉峰先生之外，呢一個安全及服務質量部多時有幾多人手？係 2010 年至到 2015 年嘅時候？

李澤昌先生：少過十個人。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇任何一位，即係喺你而家呢個管理架構裏面，就係要負責安全呢件事？即係公司嘅安全，係邊一位，喺你而家管理架構負責？

蘇偉基先生：而家公司個架構其實基本上每一個部門當然都有佢嗰個安全個意識，亦都有佢安全個責任。咁我哋亦都喺舊年 9 月成立咗個部門，其實佢喺人事部嗰度係分拆出嚟，嗰個部門就叫做培訓及質量保證部，咁隔籬位同事就係我哋當時個--而家個主管，咁佢係負責多方面嘅，但係佢都係講緊培訓車長，硬件嗰方面，正如頭先梁生講，都係留番畀工程部去睇住嘅，因為安全係有分硬件就係架車嘅設施、穩定性；人嗰方面，就係佢駕駛嘅技術咁樣嘅。咁喺嗰個培訓及品質保證部亦都係提升咗好多喺軟件、培訓、員工表現嗰方面嘅，咁呢度我就交畀阿黃生去介紹番。

黃祥明先生：咁其實安全就並非一個公司、一個人去負責，而係我哋公司每個人都要確保自己個工作安全，包括係個職業安全，或者佢嗰個車長嘅駕駛安全。咁喺我個部門，我主要就係管理啲車長佢嘅駕駛安全，咁由佢哋受訓開始，我哋已經係開始係要佢著重呢個駕駛安全。咁我睇呢個訓練係有三--車長嘅方面，佢首先一定要駕駛技巧安全；第二，就係駕駛嘅態度安全；再而，就係佢嘅駕駛嘅認知，即係話佢對公司，或者香港嘅道路要熟悉，呢個安全。咁我首先著重就係個駕駛嘅技巧，因為如果佢冇呢個技巧，根本上佢唔能夠操控一部咁大嘅巴士。

咁由我加入呢個九巴到而家，九巴已經由六十五位導師，增加到而家有嘅八十一位嘅導師。咁呢八十一位嘅導師就佢哋要做導師嘅資格並非簡單，佢要喺十年就係有呢個駕駛巴士嘅經驗，就並無干犯一啲嚴重，需負責任嘅違規嘅駕駛

嘅意外。同時當然佢要表現良好，因為佢負責日後要教導一啲新嘅學員。咁我而家增進咗有八十一位導師之後，我哋個駕駛係著重喺個學員嗰個達標嘅訓練，咁喺佢頭嗰段嘅訓練嘅時候，我哋要確保佢係能夠有個資格，係獲得運輸署嘅發畀佢嘅一個專利巴士嘅駕駛執照，所以呢個係由運輸署嗰邊係確認我哋學校能夠做到呢個目標。喺佢獲得呢個駕駛執照之後，佢係會繼續進行我哋嗰個九巴嘅訓練，目的就係佢要認知我哋喺九巴個行駛路線，同埋點樣配合番香港嘅道路嘅運作。

頭先我講過，佢哋嘅駕駛態度亦都係一個重要嘅範疇之一，咁喺呢個駕駛嘅態度，好多時都係來自車長本身嘅壓力，或者佢哋嘅心理質素。咁由於我哋要提升佢嘅心理質素，其實喺 5 月嘅時候，我哋已經係同呢個中大嘅心理專家，已經係達成咗一個合約，有合作性，就係我哋就搵佢哋協助我哋去了解車長喺工作上面嘅壓力，從而減省佢嗰--減低嗰個受壓嘅心理質素，然後提升佢嘅心理質素，令佢能夠有個安全嘅駕駛態度。呢個計劃我哋係繼續進行緊，咁呢段期間，中大嘅心理專家已經係向我哋車長或者前線嘅同事，係探討咗佢哋工作上嘅困難，我哋希望喺呢度日後會有個好啲嘅結果，可以令到我哋嘅導師可以根據佢哋嘅方向，去訓練我哋嘅車長，而提升佢個心理質素。

至於個認知方面，我亦都係需要佢係認識我哋九巴嗰個運作，了解我哋有啲乜嘢可以幫到佢，從而提升喺駕駛方面嘅安全。

李澤昌先生：咁有啲要補充嘅，就係頭先講到係喺安全嗰個方面係跨部門，咁除咗係即係車長嗰方面，我哋嗰個駕駛學院要做多啲工作之外，仲有係一個車嘅硬件方面，喺個車個硬件嘅配置，其實都確確實實係一個即係好重要嘅一環嚟嘅。

過去嗰一年，即係我同梁生本人嗰兩年都去咗即係喺嗰啲車嘅--喺外國嗰啲巴士嘅車展，都認識多啲關於巴士嘅安全嘅配置。喺上年嘅秋天，我哋亦都同咗一啲即係喺呢個 Belfast 嘅 Queen's University 同埋一間 Wright 嘅一間 manufacturing，就作為一個--有一個交流性嘅一啲嘅行動，就我哋就派咗我哋自己嘅員工去嗰邊學習，係點樣可以做多啲，研究多啲，點樣可以幫--喺架車裏面，喺架巴士裏面，幫到駕駛嘅時候嘅安全，咁佢哋都有佢哋嘅 professor，同埋佢哋嘅 research 嘅人亦都過咗嚟九巴，亦都會--將來都會係多啲同我哋一齊喺呢方面嘅合作，就研究一下，喺個車個硬件方面，可唔可以做多啲，更加多啲嘅工作，喺呢個未來，可以幫到個車長行駛嘅時候有更加多嘅支援。呢個東西其實已經係展開緊㗎嘞，咁我相信喺未來，喺硬件方面，同埋配合埋頭先我哋嗰個駕駛學院，係可以會喺呢方面會做多啲安全嘅嗰方面嘅工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲特別嘅裝置，你係同皇后大學係講過嘅？

李澤昌先生：有好多方面嘅，主要係兩方面，第一方面就係基本上就係喺個車個運作裏面嘅時候，有啲咩嘢方式可以令到架車更加係行得順暢一啲，呢個係一方面；另外一方面就係，點樣諗一啲方法，譬如而家好多喺坊間我哋買嗰啲硬件都係喺個即係第三者嗰度買番嚟，好多時候係唔係喺個巴士裏面，係應用嘅時候有一個

難度。因為巴士本身佢係--特別係雙層巴士，係只有得兩至三間嘅公司係做，所以佢嘅競爭能力即係係非常之唔大嘅，所以我哋一定要搵一啲--即係係一啲有技術性嘅 institutes，其實 Belfast 係差唔多係唯一一間大學，係做呢個雙層巴士嘅研究，喺個機械工程裏面。佢有幾個工作做嘅，或者我呢個時候畀梁生，我哋個營運總監，車務總監解釋一下。

梁健宏先生：或者希望大家睇睇有個 paper，就 190 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

梁健宏先生：咁呢度就講到頭先李生所講嘅，我哋九巴同呢間 Queen's University，喺 Belfast 嘅，咁同呢間 Queen's University 嘅有個合作。W-Tech 就係呢間 university 同個 Wrightbus 轄下有個 technology 個 foundation 去做嘅。咁佢有個 project，咁我位同事，我哋個工程師，我哋有位盧（譯音）生，啱啱上個月月尾就去咗呢間 university，同佢哋合作，佢就 as 一個 visiting researcher 去參與呢個 project 嘅，咁呢個 project 亦都有佢北愛爾蘭呢間 university 嘅 researcher 一齊去做嘅。咁 guiding 嗰啲 professor 亦都喺上個月，有兩位嘅，亦都嚟過九巴，亦都同佢傾談過，佢亦都知道香港嘅巴士運作，佢亦都知道--我哋都介紹畀佢知我哋面對嘅情況，喺安全問題，點樣樣可以喺硬件嗰方面可以做好啲。

所以講番呢個合作嘅內容，基本上就係一個 holistic，一個整體嘅去睇一睇有咩嘢嘢，喺硬件嗰方面，無論喺提點車長，包括個車長係咪--佢嘅注意力，或者其他方面，交通狀況，當其時個駕駛態度，會唔會可以令到個車長知悉，呢樣就係一個比較 alert 佢嘅。咁亦都有啲就係更加再進一步，有啲咩嘢嘢可以架車嗰方面，雖然佢個車長，有啲咩嘢嘢可以令到--糾正番佢個可能有啲唔係幾好嘅行為，咁呢樣嘢咁就同嗰個 project 喺度再做。嗰度包括好多樣嘢嘅，有啲又睇番文件本身，就好多樣嘢，硬件、軟件都有。

但係點解同呢間公司合作，或者點樣樣參與呢個 project，正如頭先李生所描述，呢樣嘢就真係成架車內容包含嘅設備，咁佢就一個整體嘅設備，咁好多設施都可以喺設計嗰方面，可以應用到喺我哋香港嘅。當然做完咗之後，呢樣咁嘅設施，或者呢個咁嘅規格，或者定咗咁嘅標準，所謂，因為其實而家就冇標準嘅，唔係好似私家車咁，好多啲安全設施，好多私家車而家其實好多都有㗎嘞，但係唯獨是雙層巴士，我哋面對一個困難，亦都有時都希望有啲嘢設備，有啲新嘅技術，睇下我哋雙層巴士可唔可以有，但係好多時都唔係咁容易可以做到。

李澤昌先生：或者咁，我即係喺 2015 年入行，我基本上每一年都會去歐洲同嗰兩間巴士公司係有傾偈，我個人感受就係，其實即係好似梁生講，佢同私家車係好唔同，好多私家車嘅設施，其實喺雙層巴士係好難說服嗰啲巴士嘅製造商去做呢樣嘢，可能因為佢嗰個競爭性嘅問題，佢或者唔需要做定係點樣喇，我唔會詳談呢度，但係係真係有個好大嘅難度。我去過呢個北愛爾蘭，我亦都好深信 Queen's University 呢班即係研究嘅學院，同埋 Wright 呢間公司係好有呢

個做巴士嗰種心，好有 passion，我相信即係九巴同佢喺呢個合作，我好希望呢一個嘢做咗出嚟之後，我一定會係有信心㗎嘞，希望呢件嘢可以除咗幫助九巴，亦都可以幫助我哋呢個業界未來喺呢方面做得好啲，呢個係非常之有意義嘅一個舉措嚟㗎，我哋九巴真係喺呢方面係即係呢個 project 係寄予厚望。

但係與此同時，其實九巴自己本身都有一班即係年青嘅工程師，喺啱啱講到嘅 safety 方面，其實過去我哋都研究咗好多嘅嘢，例如呢個太陽能嘅東西，放喺個巴士嗰個頂嘅上邊，咁呢個其實係真係幫助到好多車長，佢喺天時熱嘅時間，係返到架車嗰度，係因為佢要--你講緊天時熱泊低架巴士嘅時間，其實架巴士嘅溫度係相當之熱，因為好似一個即係 greenhouse 咁樣，即係曬到成 50 度。咁巴士司機好多時係要著嗰個引擎，然後佢要等到架車凍到某一個溫度，佢先至可以行得，咁個時間係長，亦都係非常辛苦，亦都我哋覺得佢哋要諗多少少嘢。咁嗰個太陽能嗰個板擺咗去之後，而家已經去到一個即係第二個階段，咁我哋相信，因為泊低架車嘅時候，用個太陽板係令到嗰架車個溫度係減低咗好多，當佢去休息，或者食完飯返嚟嘅時間，佢著番架車個時間就會短咗好多，即係佢冇咁疲累。雖然呢啲少少嘅研究，其實已經我哋下一次，呢個已經係未來九巴嘅標準安置，即係話我哋新嘅巴士已經係同我哋啲生產商，希望佢擺嗰個太陽能板喺上邊，因為香港嘅天氣實在太熱，我覺得如果呢樣嘢係--呢樣嘢會嚟緊 2019 年所有嘅雙層巴士都會有個太陽能板喺上邊，係減低咗呢個溫度，會係--呢個係成功咗，係減低咗好多，我覺得呢啲咁嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）李生，我諗我哋明白你嘅，我諗我哋明白你嗰個論點，或者我係等間會小休二十分鐘。而家我首先想係請你就係畀番一份係可以睇得到嘅文件，即係呢個 190 頁，嗰個係 W-Tech，可能係原本係用顏色嚟到打印，所以就睇得唔係幾好，或者就可唔可以畀一份容易啲睇嘅文件我哋睇睇？

而家首先係休息二十分鐘，唔該。

上午 11 時 37 分聆訊押後

中午 12 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你主席先生。梁博士同埋你嘅同事，想請你睇番 KMB-1，188 頁。應該睇緊就係九巴寫畀委員會嘅一封信，日期係 2018 年 5 月 23 號，睇到嘛？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪就係剛剛我哋小休之前所提及嘅證供，就係你哋話同公司從呢個 W-Tech 嘅合作？

梁健宏先生： Correct.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想請你睇一睇第 188 頁嗰封下面三分二嗖，你呢度就話該次會議嗰個目的，就係希望係討論係咪可以喺九巴同埋龍運嘅車隊嗰度就係有一啲係高級嘅協助司機嘅系統，跟住你就有講到呢個合作有啲咩嘢嘅係目標，有三點。

第一，就係話係完一個技術可行性評估，就評估一下佢嗰個係商業應用或者商業應該之前一啲係協助司機嘅技術，而係可以跟番呢個 Wrightbus Streetdeck 框架。咁另外就係話建議一個適用高級協助駕駛，或者係車長制度嚟到喺九巴同埋龍運嗰度係去，咁係跟番呢個評估。第三，就係有一個係路線圖嚟到去落實呢一點。我想問目前九巴嘅車隊有冇呢一啲係 Wrightbus 車輛呢？

梁健宏先生：現時有一部正進行 prototype，至於車身嗰方面 Wrightbus 喺我哋嗰度有好多 bus body on Volvo chassis，就有幾百個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）除咗係 Wrightbus 之外，我想問喺九巴嘅車隊仲有啲乜嘢係巴士製造商嘅巴士呀？

梁健宏先生： Sorry, please repeat your question.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問係有啲係乜嘢嘅巴士車廠製造巴畀你哋係組成你哋嘅車隊呀？係邊啲巴士製造商？

梁健宏先生：有其他製造商，包括 ADL、Volvo 同埋 MAN，至於最主要都係 ADL 同 Volvo。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）富豪、猛獅同埋 ADL，ADL 就亞歷山大丹尼斯，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）基本上係有三類，係咪嘞？車隊裏面基本上係呢三間廠，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺大埔意外所涉及嘅巴士，係咪 Wrightbus 嘅車嚟㗎？

梁健宏先生：嗰㗎係一個 Volvo 底盤配 Wrightbus bus body 嘅 double-decker。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋嗰度有幾多部巴士就有咁樣樣嘅配置呀？富豪或者猛獅丹尼斯嘅底盤，咁而車身呢就係 Wrightbus 嘅車身呢？

梁健宏先生：確實數字我冇喺手，不過大約有接近八百、九百架。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你車隊總數係幾多呀？

梁健宏先生：我哋總共連埋龍運、九龍巴，總共接近四千三百個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以再解釋一下 Wrightbus 嘅原形 prototype 係乜嘢嘢？

梁健宏先生：嗰架一架係底盤同埋車身都係 Wrightbus 嘅製造嘅，係一架 two-axle 兩車軸嘅雙層巴士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋呢個合作嘅協議，即係你哋同 W-Tech 係達成一個合作嘅協議，我想問係咪你哋打算公司就係會買咁樣樣形式嘅 Wrightbus 嘅巴士呢？

梁健宏先生： No.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁唔係嘅話，係打算係有啲乜嘢嘅成果呢？又或者你哋係會有啲係乜嘢巴士呢係會安裝一啲高級嘅係咩嘢司機協議制度呢？

梁健宏先生：呢個係一個睇睇有咩嘢設施，將來有啲咩嘢嘢，對於幫助到巴士安全係有咩嘢嘢可以喺佢哋嘅 Wrightbus 嗰度可以做到，而呢樣嘢係因應番，考慮番香港嘅巴士運作，亦都希望將來呢個成果如果係做得到嘅話，將來香港嘅巴士都可以受惠，但係呢個只不過係一個研究，正式落實嘅呢都言之尚早。

呢個係一個係同學術嘅研究，我哋派咗位工程師同 Queen's University 喺 Belfast，就做一個 research，一年嘅 project，去睇睇有啲咩嘢嘢係可能將來係適用到喺雙曾巴士，in this particular case 就係 Wrightbus，但係亦都唔排除呢樣嘢我哋亦都好希望，將來呢樣咁嘅安全設備變成一個標準嘅安全設備，希望所有其他嘅巴士製造商都會參與或者利用呢個咁嘅提升巴士安全。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以幫我哋手解釋一下，你就話用呢個諗富豪嘅底盤，咁而嗰個係 Wright-tech（Wrightbus？）嘅車身，可唔可以解釋一下呢？

梁健宏先生：底盤就係真係即係有車軸，三個車軸，咁就引擎，有全動系統，咁就有個 driver's cab。咁至於個 bus body，就係 on top of 個 chassis，包括車身、flooring、seats、air-conditioning，呢啲就係個 bus body。嗰個 bus body 就係 by Wrightbus，而個底盤 chassis，個底盤就係 by Volvo。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁兩者喺邊一度結合呢？嗰個底盤同個車身。

梁健宏先生：可以喺唔同方法，喺唔同哋方，咁呢架如果頭先所提及到嗰架，就應該係喺英國，喺 Wrightbus 嗰度，喺 Wrightbus 製造嘅。

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）主席，如果容許嘅話，我想係澄清一下，嗰個底盤可以呢係有不同嘅車身。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我明，我個問題係喺邊度呢係結合埋一齊呢？黐埋一齊呢？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）可以喺原本個車廠嗰度，巴七製造商嗰度，又或者可以喺第二度組裝，喺過往我哋九巴有我哋自己嘅巴士組合嘅工作，我哋亦都有喺中國嗰度係組裝啲巴士，亦都有喺唔同嘅地方組裝過啲巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話可以由原廠去做，咁今次嚟講就屬於係富豪定抑或係 Wrightbus 去做呢？

李澤昌先生：其實佢嗰個底盤，如果係譬如一個 Volvo 嘅底盤，如果嗰個 body 係 Wright 嘅呢，佢有兩個可能性，一，佢就會將呢個底盤 ship 咗去北愛蘭 Belfast，佢就會將佢個殼就嵌咗，bus body 就嵌咗喺個底嗰度。咁其實呢個係一個好複雜嘅工作，因為佢個底盤同埋佢嗰個 bus body 係要做好多嘅研究，因為佢嗰扭力同埋等等嘅嘢。

亦都有啲情況，佢就喺馬來西亞，Wright 有個 plant 喺馬來西亞，就做呢個 bus assembly 嘅工作。咁即係其實 Volvo 嘅底盤亦都嵌咗喺 Gemilang 都有嘅，有幾隻牌子都有嘅。咁好嘞底盤 Volvo 係主要做底盤，咁 Wright 係一個 body 嚟，咁但係 Wright 佢本身有自己研發嘅底盤，Wright 都有自己研發嘅底盤，但係暫時我哋就只有一架，就係而家做緊測試呢架。

咁因為有一架巴士有底盤，同埋有一個 body，你先至可以研究到呢個 ADAS 呢個 system。因為你有實際架車你先可以咁做，但係呢個如果研究咗呢個 ADS system 之後，其實呢個 system 可以喺任何一架巴士都會係一個東西係用到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個好處係咩嘢呢？Wrightbus 嘅車身用佢而唔係用晒成部富豪有咩嘢好處？

李澤昌先生：我或者再補充少少，其實 Wrightbus 今日，佢嗰個底盤係做唔到三軸，因為佢喺英國好多都係 Wrightbus 嘅 body，亦都有 Wrightbus 嘅底，但係佢只能夠做到兩軸，而香港嘅巴士係三個軸為主，因為三個軸因為佢載個量比較大，同埋佢後面有一個好龐大嘅冷氣，佢就壓嘅重量好犀利。即係香港個道路有個標準，就係每一個 axle 佢盛載嘅重量係唔可以超過咁多，所以香港嘅巴士大部分我哋九巴都用一個三軸。

咁 Wrightbus 佢有 body 亦都有佢嘅底盤，呢個有啲似 ADL，ADL 就 complete 係一個 body 同底盤都係佢自己嘅嘢嚟嘅，咁唯獨是 Wrightbus 未研發到有三軸嘅時候呢，我哋而家香港唯一有嗰架試緊 Wrightbus 有個底盤嗰個係兩軸嘅，咁但係 Volvo 有就三軸，所以 Wrightbus 個 body 就嵌咗喺 Volvo 嗰個底盤上面。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我諗佢問咗我嘅問題，唔該你主席先生，鄧生已經問咗我嘅問題嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番呢個係企業架構，我哋唔需要睇番嗰個文件，黃先生你剛才係提過好多係關於訓練培訓嘅責任。當然呢一個係屬於培訓及服務質量管理部，我想問公司裏面邊一個係負責係監察，唔單單係車長嘅培訓，係睇埋車長嘅表現，特別係車長嘅安全表現呢，邊個嘅責任嚟嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：係，Mr Duncan，或者我回答呢個問題，其實喺監察嗰啲車長嗰個安全，其實我哋係分咗唔同嘅 level，或者唔同嘅同事係去處理嘅。咁其實我哋每一輛嘅巴士裏面呢，我哋都有一個俗稱所謂黑盒嘅一個工具。咁我哋係每一個禮拜我哋都係會有一個我哋所謂嘅 monitoring report，一啲嘅數據出咗嚟，咁佢主要就包括咗有三樣嘅主要數據。

第一，就係超速；第二，就係一啲突然嘅加速，sudden acceleration，同埋最後就係一啲突然嘅減速，我哋叫做 harsh braking。咁我哋車廠嘅管理人員，佢哋係會每個星期就睇番，其實而家我哋做到就係話，我哋可以睇番黑盒前四日嘅數據，咁呢一樣嘢呢，其實我哋嘅同事呢係每一日第一樣嘢做嘅呢，就係會去分析，特別係 speeding 我哋嗰個超速，咁呢個超速呢我哋係包括超速 50 公里，同埋 70 公里。

另外喺嗰個突然加速或者突然煞車嗰度，其實我哋亦都有個數據，就係可以睇得到個別車長，因為我哋會出一啲叫做 exception reports，咁我哋亦都睇到有冇啲個別車長，嗰個駕駛嗰個嘅行為係值得我哋關注，咁我哋車廠管理如果睇到有某個車長，喺某個時段嗰個駕駛態度可能覺得值得我哋關注，我哋第一時間我哋就係會勸喻呢個車長，我哋搵一啲前線嘅督導人員，亦都係會同啲車長傾偈，睇下有冇啲咩嘢特別嘅嘢。

另外就住嗰個超速，咁我哋亦都係會將一啲超速嘅案件，我哋係會即時交畀我哋嗰個 training and quality assurance department，佢哋亦都係會作出嗰個跟進，或者稍後喺超速嗰度，或者黃生可以有多啲嘅補充。咁我想講就係呢啲黑盒嘅數據，係我哋會保存，我哋會檢視，同埋我哋亦都係會跟進。

彭樹雄先生：其實個問題呢，就係邊個有責任？你就講咗嗰啲車廠就做咗啲乜嘢，咁有啲咩嘢人員喺嗰度？

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題就係邊個係，唔係邊個應該。同埋唔該你可唔可以講慢

啲。

彭樹雄先生：Okay，我哋車廠個管理層，就由邊度開始呢？就係由我哋嗰個車務主任嗰個嘅層面開始。我哋車務主任呢，我哋叫做 operations officer，咁就係每一個屬廠，同埋每一個屬區，我哋叫做 zone。整體嚟講，我哋 KMB 我哋有四個主要大嘅車廠，咁包括荔枝廠、包括九龍灣廠、包括沙田廠，同埋屯門廠。

當然仲有龍運巴士，咁呢啲每一個廠，我哋其實都係有啲 boundary，即係一啲界限嘅劃分，佢哋負責唔同嘅區域，咁每一個區域，我哋係會有一個助理經理，或者經理級嘅同事係去負責，咁我哋叫呢啲做 manger 或者係 assistant managers，咁佢每一個經理或者助理經理嘅下面，佢亦都有唔同數量嘅車務主任，operations officer。

咁我哋亦都係呢啲 operations officer 佢哋每一日返工做第一樣呢，佢就係會睇番之前諗四日嗰個黑盒嗰個嘅資料。咁剛才我講咗嘞，就包括超速，突然加速，或者係突然咁煞車。咁呢個責任亦都係我哋個車務主任，同埋啲助理經理每日都會做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有幾多位呢啲車務主任呢？喺每一個車廠嗰度有幾多位呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋總體嚟講，我哋每一個嘅廠，視乎嗰個廠嗰個嘅大細，可能有啲有六至七個嘅車務主任，亦都可能有三至四個嘅車務主任。整體嚟講，去處理呢啲數據，其實約莫有大約三十七個同事呢，係會處理呢啲嘅數據嘅分析等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇一個圖表或者一個地圖，可以畀我哋睇到每一個車廠負責嘅區分呢？

彭樹雄先生：主席，容誰我可唔可以喺會後或者喺個今日...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以答得定唔得？

彭樹雄先生：可以，絕對可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。請你儘量回答得或者唔得。

彭樹雄先生：好，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一個咁樣嘅圖或者圖表，或者地圖嘅副本畀我哋，你會唔會咁做？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）我會。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，大律師。

MR DUNCAN： Now, the operations officers presumably report to

the depot manager; would that be correct?

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢啲車廠經理又向邊個報告呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋其實每一個 depot，都會有一個資深嘅總經理，又或者經理佢係去負責統籌呢四個車廠，同埋龍運巴士嗰個嘅運作。咁而呢五個資深嘅總經理，又或者經理呢係直接向我負責。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之後我會再講番黑盒嘅問題，但係而家有兩樣嘢我都想同你探索一下，然後先講黑盒。我想請你睇一睇 FE-1 號。請你去第 96-1 嗰一頁。你而家應該係睇到一份用電郵傳送嘅文件嘅一個副本，就係畀鄭桂興先生嘅，你睇唔睇到呀？請問睇唔睇到呀？你會唔會睇到鄭桂興先生其實係九巴嘅前僱員呀？

李澤昌先生：我嚟嘅時候佢已經走咗，佢應該係 2014 年走嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，你就到本委員會曾經研訊或者調查過嘅事件，就係九巴嘅僱用嘅情況，或者你自己睇一睇第一同埋第二段，請你自己睇一睇，同埋都睇埋第三段。睇一睇就係本委員會寫畀鄭先生嘅一封電郵。

請問你睇咗未？好，唔該。咁而家想請你睇睇第 96-4 嗰一頁。你之前有冇睇過呢一回應呀？李生。

李澤昌先生：未睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者你而家用少少時間自己睇一睇。係第 96-4 嗰一頁，同埋 96-5 同埋 96-6 呢幾頁，請你而家慢慢睇一睇，等你熟習一下。

李澤昌先生： Okay.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒，喺 96-7 嗰一頁，你會見到進一步嘅回應，係鄭先生，佢再一次係回答第一同埋第二條問題，或者都請你都自己睇一睇呢一啲，就係 96-7 嗰一頁。

好，唔該，喺 96-7，即係話回答第二條問題嗰度下面呢，鄭先生就係講到廿九個急彎。佢就講到就係 Excel 呢一個形式儲存嘅一啲資料，你睇唔睇到呢？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一啲資料，仲喺唔喺九巴內部係存在呢？

彭樹雄先生：我 2015 年 join 呢間公司嘅時候，其實我係真係未見過呢啲資料嘅，但係喺呢幾個月，我亦都同啲喺度做咗好多年嘅同事，亦都了解過呢啲研究同埋呢二十九個 sharp bends 係點樣走出嚟。咁啲記錄亦都可以畀番你哋去睇

睇，據嗰個資料顯示呢，就係當其時佢哋嘅 managing director 嗰陣時 Edmond Ho 先生，就話需要當其時嗰個 operation director 要 approve 咗佢先至會執行呢樣嘢。

咁睇番啲記錄喺 2014 年嘅時候，呢一個二十九個 bend 呢個建議，係並冇執行過，亦都喺嗰啲佢哋記錄嘅文件，亦都睇到有好多車長同埋佢前線嘅員工，都有好多聲音係關於嗰個執行性方面，係咪可以做到？

我喺 2015 年初接任嘅時候，係完全係唔知道有呢一個咁嘅建議，咁或者而家嗰個 operation director 梁生或者係我哋個 head of 嗰個 training school 可以喺呢度補充。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我都唔會想講好耐嘅呢一點，我只係想問一問有關嘅 Excel 認識儲存嘅資料，係咪仲喺度，我相信你話你係會畀個記錄我哋係咪，即係有，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：我而家答唔到你，我可以去 find out。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你真係搵到，你會唔會可以交畀委員會？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）另外頭先李生所講記錄，就係講到話點解呢一個計劃係冇實施，有關呢一啲嘅記錄，可唔可以都畀我哋呢？咁即係話有兩種嘅記錄，一個就係關於廿九個急彎嗰啲嘅記錄，另外就係點解呢一個建議係冇實施嘅？好，唔該晒。

我都想補充，如果你睇一睇 96-7 呢一頁嘅底部，有一個就係講到一啲細嘅提示卡，講到就係話嗰啲急彎吧具體嘅地點，同埋係有啲乜嘢安全嘅車速，呢啲都印咗喺度，麻煩你翻查公司個記錄，睇下仲有冇呢啲卡嘅樣本？

梁健宏先生：我未見過。

黃祥明先生：其實我喺呢方面都有做過啲參考，咁睇番以前嗰個文獻，我知道係當時有提議過我哋九巴去搵一啲嘅急彎，等我哋啲車長去知道之後呢，喺嗰個地區就個車速去減慢，咁喺嗰個--我手頭上有一個當時嘅開會會議記錄，咁正如我哋個 MD 所講，係當時係需要一個 MD 去同意咗呢個執行先至可以做到，咁但係我睇番當時嗰個會議嘅議程呢，就並冇得到呢個...

主席：（經傳譯員）黃先生，我想問呢啲卡，有定冇？不如你直接回答呢個問題？

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）因為我係想補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可以係提供多啲資料，不過直接，究竟仲存在嗎？

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係照你所知，就不再存在？

黃祥明先生： No.

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係想截停你講嘢，咁你而家可以繼續補充你想補充嘅事情。

黃祥明先生：咁嗰個文獻裏面就係話係需要 OD 去同意執行呢樣嘢嘅，咁但係當時喺個記錄上面，係受到好多同事嘅意見阻擾，咁變咗係冇執行到，咁所以我相信呢份文件係當時係冇流出去畀前線嘅同事去做參考，邊啲係啲急彎嚟。

咁其實喺講急彎呢樣嘢，我哋而家九巴係做嗰個安全嘅所謂指引畀啲同事亦都有繼續做緊，就唔係當時所講呢二十九個急彎，而係我哋喺我哋嘅誒員工網站上面，就有提供我哋所有路線，如果有急彎或者有危險情況嘅時候發生，我哋一個叫駕駛貼士，咁呢個駕駛貼士係員工網站裏面可以睇得到。

咁員工係當佢要駕駛一條路線嘅時候，佢主要係上個網嗰度呢，就打入佢嗰個要行駛嘅網，嗰條路線，嗰條路線就會有個起點至到終點，就會顯示出沿路有咩嘢危險或者咩嘢要留意，甚至係急彎嘅情況。咁當呢個員工要駕駛條路線嘅時候呢，咁佢就可以依照呢個咁嘅指引呢去小心行駛有關嘅路段，咁呢個就係我嘅補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該主席先生。你而家不如幫我哋睇下呢個 KMB-1 第 30 頁。而家就講番你嘅第一次提交嘅文件，或者你睇番頂頭嗰度，就係請你睇一睇，究竟你公司係有乜嘢嘅守則，同埋就提供啲係副本，睇到嗎？

喺嗰個實務守則嗰度，呢度提及兩行嘅標準。呢個就係有職業健康及安全之外，就仲有兩項嘅標準嘅，睇到嘛？首先，就係國際標準組織，睇到嗎？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁講啱唔啱呢？喺嗰行標準嗰度，係冇一樣嘢係專門係同巴士車長安全有關。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

蘇偉基先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一樣嘞，如果你睇番下面嗰行嘅標準，國際標準組織 ISO 14001，一樣嘞，我咁講啱唔啱呢？就係嗰行標準底下，係冇一樣嘢呢係具體關乎巴士車長嘅安全要求。

蘇偉基先生：喺 ISO 14000 係冇嘅，但係喺 ISO 9000 嗰度佢係成個品質一個嘅管理，個系統呢係有牽涉到 safety。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，但係我要講嘅呢，就係話即係我頭先問，就係話係咪同車長駕駛表現嘅安全有關？

蘇偉基先生：呢個問題我哋可以睇睇上面第二個 bullet Staff Handbook 第五位嗰度呢，有個叫做車長安全駕駛手冊，咁呢個就釐定咗我哋車長需顧及嘅安全嘅措施，呢個係我想 Mr Duncan 你想指係兩樣。

梁健宏先生：我想補充一樣，就係講番我哋個 ISO，喺呢個 OHSAS 18001，即係 Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series 嗰度呢，我哋有提及到 safety 嘅，咁其中有一樣嘢就係每間廠都要成立一個 depot safety committee，咁有兩個組成份嘅每間廠。

有一個成份呢就係維修，即係喺廠內做維修保養工夫，咁亦都有另外一個 committee 就係 for 車務嘅，每間廠佢都有一個成立個結構呢，就係 operations safety committee，呢個 safety committee 嘅組成，就絶大部分都係車務營運同事嘅團隊嘅，包括彭生在內。

咁佢哋呢個 depot safety committee，如果我哋講車務嗰部分呢，亦都牽涉到呢譬如話嗰啲車長喺 bus termini，啲車長喺路面，啲車長喺廠內嗰個工作環境，而呢個 operations safety committee 亦都檢視番佢嗰間廠佢哋嗰啲交通意外嘅，咁係喺 under 呢個 ISO 18001 呢，係有一套系列係 plan、do、check、act 呢，去睇番就住駕駛安全嘅事宜嘅，我哋係有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實我問嘅就係 18001，有冇指明一個巴士車長係點樣去駕駛呢？佢冇去到咁嘅細節，係咪呢？

梁健宏先生：我想講呢套唔係淨係一樣嘢去管理車長嗰個行車嗰個方面，正如頭先我哋位同事蘇生描述，ISO 9001 亦都係有啲規範，係可以涉及到巴士車長嗰個駕駛安全嘅守則。其實我想講呢就係唔同制度，唔同嘅 system，都會有佢自己本身嘅用處，亦都喺唔同嘅方面，亦都可以 contribute，可以貢獻到點樣樣可以令到我哋巴士車長喺培訓，喺監控，喺檢討，點有一個整體性去做。

因為呢度頭先所講，18001 頭先所講 depot safety committee，喺 depot 嘅層面，但係喺其他 department 譬如喺車長培訓學校，譬如喺 human resources 嘅層面，亦都要一個成間 corporate 去睇成件事情嘅，唔係話單單一個睇一樣嘢，係整體嚟睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我明白，但我問個問題好簡單，其實就係喺嗰個 OHSAS 18001 嗰度呢，冇一樣嘢係講明話個巴士車長係如何安全駕駛，呢一個係最主簡單嘅問題。

蘇偉基先生：如果想睇一個車長如何駕駛安全，係應該參考頭先我講嗰個呢車長安全駕駛手冊，喺 annex 1A-37 嗰個，呢個係公司對車長嘅駕駛安全，駕駛手冊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，呢一個係車長安全駕駛手冊，我哋知。我而家想請你睇就係雜項嘅文件夾2，769頁。睇緊嘅呢應該係一封信，佢就係寫畀立法會交通事務委員會嘅主席，2016年6月16號嘅一封函件，睇到嗎？

蘇偉基先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇嚟嚟自己一個組織，咁就係道路安全研究小組，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰封信嗰標題，就講及係政府當局嘅文件，呢份文件就係關於九龍巴士一九三三有限公司嘅巴士網絡新專營權嘅公眾諮詢嘅報告，嗰個標題係咁咪，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你不如自己睇一睇呢封信，你就會見到佢提及係有一份文件，2016年4月18號嘅文件，咁你跟住嗰版你就會睇到。咁係770頁，就係佢哋係提交畀政府嘅一份文件。我想問，公司知唔知道有一個咁嘅組織，叫做道路安全研究小組？

蘇偉基先生：喺佢交畀呢個委員會嘅文件嗰度，我得悉有呢個機構，之前我不得悉。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你有冇睇過呢份文件呢？即係 770 頁開始嘅呢份文件，講及呢就係九龍巴士公司巴士網絡嘅新專營權？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）簡單咁睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。咁而家就想請你睇呢個 772 頁。喺嗰度見唔見到就係講及巴士安全管理系統。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以睇番嗰個內容呢？睇番呢一段個內容，請你自己睇一睇。

蘇偉基先生：可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個 ISO 39001 嘅標準，你知道嘛？

蘇偉基先生：從佢呢個 submission，我得悉。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）未睇呢份陳述書之前唔知？

蘇偉基先生：之前我唔知。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）自此之後，即係睇咗佢呢份陳述之後，有冇睇過呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）簡單咁睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你認唔認為呢個標準裏面有啲嘢係有用嘅呢？對於你公司嚟講係有用嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個我要咁樣講，首先呢份報告，我所睇到佢係冇喺公司做一個實地嘅考察，或者係對我哋有個諮詢，咁另外呢個 standard 亦都唔係安全一個唯一嘅 standard，咁呢位編配呢份報告嘅作者，亦都話希望巴士嘅承辦商係有一個安全系統達至呢個 ISO 39001 嘅。

咁公司今日自己本身其實亦都係有一個安全嘅體系，我哋亦都建基於一個 ISO 9000 嘅體系，咁呢個 ISO 39001 其實都係喺 ISO 9000 嘅基石之下演變出嚟，覆蓋住四個大嘅 pillars，就係 plan、do、check、act，咁我哋喺 ISO 9000 嗰度，亦都最近呢係獲得相關機構係有個 review 嗰個嘅 accreditation。

咁我哋覺得呢方面我哋自己點做呢？我哋最近亦都喺英國聘請咗一位交通嘅專家嚟我哋公司嗰度，係睇睇我哋嘅營運，我哋嘅車務，維修，做個 health check，從而提升番我哋自己內部嘅一個 safety standard，呢個 standard 係我哋自己，係未必需要同 ISO 39000 去掛鉤，但係都係一個高水準嘅 standard。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話最近，係幾時呀？

李澤昌先生：我想補充，我呢度補充少少，大概我諗喺今年嘅 3、4 月嘅時候，我哋個董事會就好希望我哋搵一啲即係外國嘅專家，想睇睇我哋喺嗰個 operation 喺營運方面，無論車佢嗰個維修，同埋喺嗰個車長佢嗰個點樣派更營過，甚至乎喺個 training 嗰邊，想去睇下即係喺外國有啲乜嘢嘢我哋可以將我哋呢方面嘅服務係提升，咁其實都多過一位專家，咁其實就應該喺呢一、兩個禮拜已經開，尋日其實已經彩取緊工作。

梁健宏先生：琴日已經喺香港，嚟咗㗎嘞，我哋喺我哋嘅廠嗰度呢開始工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係邊位呀？

李澤昌先生：我因為我冇佢間公司嗰個名喺度，我後補番呢個資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）好吖，唔該你。你各位同事係咪都唔知道呢個顧問嘅名？

李澤昌先生：其實我係喺今年嘅大概係春天嘅時候，就過咗去倫敦，咁就見過好幾個 consultant，係同佢見過面，咁有啲係以前喺嗰個 London Transport 做過又有，有啲係喺英國喺嗰啲大嘅 bus operator 做過都有。

咁呢啲大部分都係喺即係英國經驗嘅 operator，諗佢間公司名就叫 Direx Solution Limited，係個 consultant 嚟，但係嗰啲 consultant 呢大部分都係喺英國裏面，喺嗰啲 bus operator 係好有經驗。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係話，而家係進行緊個調查，暫時未有報告？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢哋話琴日先開始做。

李澤昌先生：佢其實係之前都有攞咗好多資料，咁但係佢真正工作，係而家先至開始工作，佢一定會即係呈交一啲報告畀我哋嘅董事會，係睇睇而家嗰個運作係點樣？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你認為嗰個報告幾時會有呢？

李澤昌先生：喺今年之內。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪即係2018年之內抑或係一年之內。

李澤昌先生：係分階段，首先係第一個階段係佢哋做一個--我哋叫做一個即係檢視一下，有邊啲地方我哋可能要有啲地方要做番好啲，咁就困難嘅，因為佢先要認識我哋啲同事等等，咁我哋係分階段去做，咁今年嘅年尾應該有一個初步嘅檢討report。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我而家呢就想講下黑盒嘅問題。今朝都提過好幾次。我哋開始嘅時候呢睇睇KMB-1嘅檔案，第50頁。咁呢一頁亦都係最初提交文件之內嘅，係由九巴向委員提交嘅初步嘅文件嚟嘅，就喺今年四月嘅時候提交嘅。

咁第50頁呢一度，我哋問嘅係第二條問題嚟嘅，就係話有冇一啲電子記錄嘅裝置嘅呢？譬如話車速記錄儀，黑盒或者係車速限制器係裝置喺所有巴士上面呢？呢一啲置裏面有啲咩嘢嘅資料係關於巴士車長嘅駕駛表現嘅監察，係會可以收錄到嘅呢？咁同埋收集到嘅資料點樣用嚟係提升駕駛嘅安全呢？巴士有冇一啲前置鏡頭嘅攝錄機，係可以睇到呢一架車輛嘅行駛嘅呢？

我自己最有興趣呢就係第二句嘅，究竟喺呢一啲裝置裏面收集到嘅資料，即係話係關於車長駕駛嘅表現，係收集到啲咩嘢資料呢，而有關嘅資料點樣用嚟去加強或者提升駕駛嘅安全呢？咁我哋大家可以睇番交畀委員會嘅答案。

第一點，所有九巴同龍運巴士，都係裝置咗黑盒同埋車速限制器嘅。第二點，黑盒就係會收集到車速同埋車輛位置呢一啲資料。九巴同龍運巴士嘅車務組，就會係每日監察車速，係睇番之前十日嗰個駕駛嘅記錄，咁樣就可以監察到巴士車長嘅駕駛表現㗎，有關嘅資料呢就係會交畀車長表現經理，咁如果係有任何違反規則嘅事情，就會喺十四日內開始呢個紀律嘅行嘅。你睇到呢個問題嘛？

李澤昌先生：(Nodded head).

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢一方面呢我有好幾條問題想問下，即係關於黑盒嘅

問題，咁一開頭我想講清楚呢，就係我有興趣嘅呢即係代表委員會去調查嘅呢，就係究竟有啲咩嘢資訊係你嗰啲巴士上面嘅黑盒呢係可以收集到嘅，呢個係第一條問題。

第二就係，實際上就收集到咩嘢資料呢？即係嗰啲黑盒係有能力收集到啲資料，但係實際上又實上又收集到啲咩嘢資。第三呢就係有關嘅資訊係點樣利用呢？咁我而家就好清楚話咗畀你聽，我係想調查呢幾樣嘢，因此你就會明白點解我會問以下嘅問題。

咁我就會就四個範疇去發問，咁大家都會比較容易啲。第一，我就會問你，有啲乜嘢嘅係運輸署已經寫出咗嘅要求，就係話黑盒嘅裝置同埋使用，運輸署有啲咩嘢嘅要求，即係話你有啲咩嘢嘅責任係去符合運輪署嘅要求？呢個係第一點。

第二，就係我會同你探索一下，實際上呢啲黑盒收集到嘅數據，即係喺你嗰啲公司嘅巴士上面，實際上呢啲黑盒係收集到啲咩嘢數據呢？咁然後我就會睇下究竟呢啲數據實際上係點樣利用呢？去提供實時嘅警示畀車長，即係當佢哋駕駛緊嘅時候，點樣去提供實時嘅警示畀佢哋呢？

到最後呢我就會問一啲問題去找出究竟呢一啲記錄咗嘅黑盒數據，係點利用嚟去便利你去評估佢哋嘅駕駛行為，同埋點樣可以呢係監察到車長實時嘅駕駛行為。咁我呢就會一條一條咁樣問呢啲問題嘅。

彭樹雄先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好嘞，首先第一個範疇，有啲乜嘢係喺呢一個專營嘅協議裏面，你有啲咩嘢嘅責任係關於使用呢啲黑盒係要向運輸署負責呢，即係運輸署有啲咩嘢要求，咁喺呢一方面，我想你睇運輸署文件夾第 5 個。我想請你去睇 1597 頁。係 1597 頁，請問你係咪睇緊由運輸署發出嘅一封短嘅信呢？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢係寫畀好幾間巴士公司，包括你哋嗰間。咁佢個題目係話喺新巴士上面呢係裝置電子數據記錄裝置。

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢度亦都係講到黑盒同埋喺巴士上嘅電子數據記錄系統。

梁健宏先生：現實上我哋呢樣呢，我哋 2003 年 11 月已經開始裝嘅，2003 年 11 月開始裝呢個 electronic data recording device。

MR DUNCAN： Right.

梁健宏先生：再之前...

主席：（經傳譯員）梁生，等一等，大律師會問你問題嘅，咁如果你有啲嘢想加，因為佢問得唔夠好，咁一陣間可以再講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢度有冇一項要求，就係話2004年7月1號之後註冊嘅巴士都應該係有一個符合有關技術規格嘅黑盒呢？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你揭下一頁，呢一啲其他嘅要求呢寫出咗，喺第二點同埋第三點嗰一啲嘅要求。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第二段嗰度，係咪就係話要求呢一個裝置，應該係每一秒呢就係收集數據，然後呢喺兩個禮拜之內每三十秒呢就係儲存有關嘅數據？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢係咪講到兩方面呢，第一即係嗰個操作嘅時間？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二，車速。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第三段，嗰度呢進一步講及就係要有一啲軟件嚟到分析呢係車上，或者係下載咗嘅數據，咁呢個亦都應該係有以下嘅功能嘅，啱唔啱呀？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先，就講及係意外報告，要睇番嗰個車輛嘅車速，咁嗰度嗰個係頻密嘅程度亦列出嘅。

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二點，就係講超速嘅報告，有幾頻密，係去到最高嘅車速，以及就係如果係過咗係70公里嘅話，究竟佢係持續咗幾耐？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問運輸署當時係咪首次去發出咁樣嘅要求，就係話要係安裝一個黑盒同埋黑盒裏面應該有啲乜嘢嘅功能？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋呢係可以係午飯之後再繼續，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，各位先生，我哋而家呢就會係休息，係午飯，我哋會喺今日下晝兩點半再繼續，兩點半，唔該晒。

下午1時02分聆訊押後

下午2時31分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）下午好，Duncan先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）响食午飯之前我哋就睇到咗運輸署嘅呢一啲要求，即係使用黑盒嘅要求，時間就係2003年嘅10月，而家我哋想睇另一份文件嘅，就係KMB-1 159頁，呢個係該公司係2018年5月交嘅第二份陳述書，我想大家睇175頁。响個頁頂大家可以見到係寫住係第--有提過話嗰個係專營權嘅一啲要求嘅，第五條問題。跟住有第六條問題，委員會提出嘅問題，「請指出專營權有啲咩嘢要求，呢啲要求係唔係運輸署施加嘅呢，係咪用書面表達嘅呢，如果係，請提供有關文件嘅副本。」

公司嘅回應，佢就提過話條文第7條，7(1)，即係話專營權合約嘅第7(1)條，跟住有一個解釋，响討論新嘅專營權嘅期間，政府要求九巴要係承諾採取一啲係加強嘅安全措施，包括但不限於响巴士上安裝啲電子嘅數據嘅處理嘅裝置，有啲人就叫做「黑盒」喇，同埋限速器同埋個監察嘅鏡頭，作為一啲標準嘅設備，當買新嘅巴士嘅時候，就將呢啲納入為標準設備，請睇2017年3月10號由運輸署發出嘅文件嘅一個係摘錄，九巴就係承諾係--向運輸署承諾，就會係响根據新嘅專營權實施有關嘅要求嘅。

咁呢個運輸署嗰個信件係一個附件嚟嘅，請大家睇一睇KMB-9呢度嘅一份附件，3997頁。呢個係嗰個文件夾裏面嘅倒數第二份文件。睇番呢頁，呢度係關於係巴士上嘅設施嗰個標題，呢個話根據新專營權合約嘅第7條，九巴應承就做某啲嘢，由(a)，跟住就(b)，第2頁就有(b)一系列，對我哋嚟講，有關就係(a)，下面寫住「加強安全嘅設備」，呢個就係之前我提及嘅文件所引述嘅有關設施，咁就睇番呢個安全嘅設施總共有八樣，第一項就係羅馬數字(i)，一路去到羅馬數字(viii)，八項。第三項就係話電子數據處理設備，即係嗰個黑盒，係咪咁講啱呢，運輸署係冇講清楚係點樣使用呢個黑盒㗎，佢只係話呢個係一個安全嘅設備嚟嘅，公司應該有呢個設備，咁樣講啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁所以根據你嗰個解釋，呢個係一個加強嘅用途，即係如果當呢個係一個加強安全，3997 頁咁樣講，就唔當一個--唔係一個加強安全嘅設備嚟嘅，係嘛？

梁健宏先生：有少少複雜嘅，呢個問題，因為...

主席：（經傳譯員）有咩嘢複雜？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我解釋下。（證人直接用本地話說）Okay，因為一個咁嘅 requirement 佢就 carry forward 嘅，佢將之前嗰啲 franchise 有啲其他啲嘢佢都加埋落去，即係變咗呢個係咪 enhance 呢，就可能同對上一次係咪有分別？呢個係一個 commitment 嚟嘅，喺一個 feature 我哋會做嘅，但係係咪 interpreted as enhance 呢，就我都比較難去 comment，但係我哋係會做呢樣事情嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據我嘅理解，你哋應承咗係用呢個咁樣嘅設備...

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咪就係咁多呢？

梁健宏先生：當然我哋會呢個 device 嘅，咁當然我哋會盡量令到佢係幫到我哋喇，咁我哋係會用嘅，但係答你個問題係咪一個 enhanced safety feature 呢，我哋係覺得係幫到 safety 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁 Duncan 先生嘅問題就係話運輸署冇要求--冇講清楚究竟係點樣嚟到呢個設備嚟到係即係所謂加強嘅用途，亦都係冇講明係要將呢個設備嘅用途係要加強嘅。

梁健宏先生： No.

主席： Nor is there any stipulation as to any enhancement of the capabilities of the device.

梁健宏先生： No.

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好多謝你，主席，幫手。除咗呢兩份文件呢，我頭先都--我哋睇咗喇，2003 年嘅一份同埋呢一份 2017 年嘅，咁除咗呢兩份，運輸署有冇响任何時間要求公司係就住呢個黑盒運用有冇話指定用--要嚟做某一種用途？特定用途嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我未--我哋睇第二份之前，我想睇番 175 頁，即係文件夾第一份，175 頁，嗰度最後一句話九巴承諾--向運輸署承諾嚟到係實施呢個-

-即係根據新嘅協議實施呢啲咁樣嘅要求嘅，咁乜嘢形式嘅呢，請問係用咩嘢形式嘅呢，呢個承諾係？

蘇偉基先生：呢個問題或者可以等我答喇，因為我喺嗰個 franchise 個 renewal 嗰度我有個扮演個重要嘅角色，咁個 undertaking 意思即係話公司佢係--頭先大家睇到第 3997 頁，其實係一封信嘅一個 content 嚟嘅，咁呢封信要係公司簽署，簽署即係代表 commit 去 implement 呢啲嘢，咁然之後佢就可以提請去行政會議去 grant 一個 franchise 畀我哋，咁所以呢個係 commitment 嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀呢封信嘅副本畀委員會？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係標準信件？係咪當你嗰個要--嗰個專營權要更新--差唔多限期就係要寫咁嘅標準信，係嘛？咁但係你冇話任何嘅所謂加強嘅用途㗎喎，你冇應承要有呢個黑盒嚟到係做所謂加強一啲用途嘅，所以只係一個虛張聲勢㗎咋，係咪呀？得個「講」㗎咋？得個「講」字嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係運輸署即係要求我哋做，“enhanced safety feature”呢個 term 係喺個 paper 度係咁寫嘅，咁我哋 read 佢，當然我哋亦都會睇番呢啲 item，我哋點樣樣可以盡量咁利用到佢，幫助嗰啲 safety 嘅，我哋唔係睇字面嘅，我哋唔係睇個 wording 點寫，譬如講頭先嗰度“electronic data processing device”，咁佢或者之前個 specification 就係嗰樣嘢，但係其實我哋都希望如果係有啲嘢係可以更加 enhance 到，我哋都會轉用其他啲幫到我哋增加嗰個安全嘅，我哋係會唔會淨係喺字面嗰度做，我哋會自己（聲音重疊）...（聽不清）

主席：（經傳譯員）唯一嗰個 2003 年嘅 11 月所講嗰啲係要求㗎，冇嘢--跟住之後冇變㗎喇喎？

梁健宏先生：我哋除咗 undertaking 呢樣嘢之外，我哋仲會再做多一啲囉，this is the--呢個係最 minimum。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係批評你，梁先生，如果運輸署要求你應承--乜都唔做，咁你都同意咗喇，係嘛？乜都唔使點做嘅，你係同意㗎，係嘛？

梁健宏：...（聽不清）

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想去第二個範圍，我就想係涵蓋嘅，呢個就關於黑盒嘅另一個範圍。即係話呢個關於個數據，呢個黑盒，即係九巴裝咗嘅黑盒究竟可以收集啲咩嘢數據呢？咁同埋實際上又收集咗咩嘢證據呢？即係可以收集同埋實際收集咗啲咩嘢數據呢？

梁健宏先生：Yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你都知道喇，委員會有聽過一啲證供，呢個叫做Kulis先生，佢哋係一間叫做Openmatics嘅公司嘅代表，即係佢係嗰個黑盒嘅供應商嘅，你知道有件咁嘅事喇？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇機會睇番佢嗰個證供？

梁健宏先生：好簡要咁睇過喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁至於佢嗰個書面嘅文件呢，佢向委員會提供嘅書面文件，有冇機會睇過？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你係指稱嗰個代--其實係嗰個律師代表佢交嘅文件？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。好喇，我想你睇另一個文件夾，BM-1，請你睇番--或者係而家請顯示番第64頁，係喇，呢份文件裏面嘅64頁。你會見到呢間律師行就係即係主席所提及--即係呢個係嗰封律師行嘅信，咁封信就係關於相關公司所提供嘅服務嘅，你見唔見到？呢個就係律師行嘅信件，你見唔見到？然後就請你揭去65頁，你就會見到提供咗畀委員會嘅資料嘅，咁就係由65頁去到72頁嘅。咁問題就係用黑色字，而答案就係用藍色字顯示嘅。

首先我想你睇嘅就係第65頁，咁喺第一個問題，就係有個書面陳述，就係喺2018年4月24號呈交咗畀委員會，咁就由2015年起，九巴就係喺佢哋嘅巴士度安裝一啲限速器喇、黑盒喇同埋一啲監察鏡頭去監察車長嘅駕駛表現，同埋協助調查意外嘅，咁我希望--我想你睇一睇之後嗰三段答案嗰部分。咁Openmatics嘅服務就並不包括上述嘅限速器同埋監察鏡頭，但係黑盒就係Openmatics嘅遠程監察系統嘅一部分嚟嘅，Openmatics就係喺13年嘅4月16號同九巴同堆龍運巴士有限公司係簽署咗一個供應嘅合約，去提供一個遠程系統嘅，咁Openmatics就開始去提供一啲遠程服務，咁而亦都係使用咗第一個叫做「莫札特盒」嘅黑盒系統。其後，Openmatics就係即係用一個--另一個叫做「巴哈盒」嘅黑盒代替咗呢個莫札特盒，咁但係客戶係仍然可以同時使用嗰兩套系統，咁而九巴都係有咁做嘅。咁而呢一個遠程系統就係有三個部分，以上所講係咪準確？係咪正確？

梁健宏先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想你睇第68頁，都係信件嘅一部分嚟嘅，請你睇下呢一頁嘅第2段，就係藍色字嘅部分。究竟呢個英文字母“BC”係代表啲咩嘢？咁而之後嗰一段就講Openmatics嘅遠程系統即係係安裝咗喺九巴嘅系統係可以顯示以下四項嘅，第一就係超速嘅紀錄喇，紀錄每一秒嘅數據同埋同相

關嘅呢一個全球定位系統嘅資料係一齊儲存嘅；咁第二就係急停去剎車嘅一個不當嘅行為；第三就係突然加速；第四，相關嘅巴士登記編號，咁就係喺即係使用其他系統配合嘅情況下都可以得出呢個資料嘅。你可唔可以確認以上就係包括咗九巴巴士嘅系統係可以即係得出嘅資料？

梁健宏先生：係嘅，可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者能夠收集嘅資料。咁我哋去下一頁之前，我就想同你去了解一個問題，咁如果你睇番下一段，喺九巴安裝嘅 Openmatics 遠程系統，係唔能夠得出某啲巴士嘅路線嘅號碼嘅，咁而之後嗰一段就話系統係會收集資料嘅，咁而每一秒政府--呢個系統係會收集一啲呢啲指明嘅資訊喇，咁而係每三十秒就係會傳遞呢啲資料嘅，如果係即係已經接連咗去呢一個 WiFi 網絡或者其他嘅資料網絡，或者係透過 USB 去傳遞去指定嘅 FTP 嘅伺服器嘅，咁而相關嘅資料亦都係有喺呢一個遠程系統度--一個本地遠程系統儲存嘅。咁而下一段亦都係有即係重複到呢一段嘅資料。咁佢就話呢個數據就係會每三十秒係傳遞去伺服器度嘅。咁我想你睇番 KMB 文件冊一嘅，第 72 頁。呢個就係今年 4 月 24 號由九巴公司交畀委員會嘅第一次回應嘅，咁我想你睇下呢一頁嘅最後嗰一段。咁佢就話所有巴士都係有安裝黑盒去收集一啲實時嘅資料，包括速度、路線、車門係咪係開定係關喇同埋一個全球定位系統，咁但係即係要將呢啲資料傳遞番去巴士嘅總公司，係會有大概十秒嘅延誤嘅，咁而呢個資料就會係喺呢一個巴士嘅監察系統，即係透過呢個系統係儲存喺電話度嘅。咁根據律師行嘅信件，就係唔一致嘅，咁而根據律師行就係每三十秒傳遞系統，但係根據九巴公司，係每十秒就會傳遞呢個資訊嘅，你可唔可以評論一下即係呢個--即係似乎--呢個差別？

梁健宏先生：Yes，thank you。現時就係三十秒，我哋亦都希望係做到十秒嘅，快啲嘅，我哋而家係做緊嘅，咁最主要點做呢？係加大個 server，加大個 server，技術上點樣樣可以令到啲數據可以早啲傳送，呢樣嘢我哋係朝住嗰個方向做，係做緊嘅，係諗住係十秒。再 repeat，existing 而家係三十秒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你係採取一啲咩嘢步驟係去達至一個十秒嘅延誤？

梁健宏先生：我哋就會研究睇下點樣樣可以加大啲 server，一啲技術問題，我哋可以做到三十秒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你預期幾時係會實行？

梁健宏先生：暫時未有一個確實嘅時間表，不過我哋亦朝住嗰個方向做，希望盡快可以收集到啲數據。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以解釋一下咩嘢為之「改善一個伺服器嘅技術」？

梁健宏先生：喺三十秒嗰度，覺得最主要係個 server 嘅容量，咁變咗--同埋嗰個

flow會快咗，會密咗㗎喇，咁呢樣點樣技術問題去解決，要處理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢嘅伺服器？邊個嘅伺服器？

蘇偉基先生：呢度我想補充番究竟頭先講十秒、三十秒，how reconcile the difference。十秒係講緊嗰個 delay，即係話發生之後，佢喺第十秒呢個data就ready to send，三十秒就係every 30 seconds interval佢就將呢啲data傳送去我哋headquarters個server嗰度。10 seconds the data delay ready to send and then every 30 seconds interval就會send去個headquarters嗰度，咁所以呢度解釋番十秒同三十秒係講緊唔同嘅嘢嚟嘅先。（經傳譯員）我需唔需要重複？

主席：（經傳譯員）我係問緊呢個係乜嘢伺服器，係屬於邊個嘅呢，佢嘅功能係乜嘢呢？

蘇偉基先生：嗰個server而家喺我哋九龍灣車廠個data centre嘅入面嘅，佢個function就係store呢啲data，然之後去做分析，去identify一啲exception。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係話現時嘅容量係唔足夠，咁所以就係有一個十秒嘅傳達嘅延誤，係咪？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你認為究竟延誤嘅時間係十秒、五秒或者三十秒就係呢一個使用黑盒上面嘅一個選擇嚟嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：講緊頭先嗰三十秒嗰個傳遞，其實對我哋去分析嗰個黑盒嘅數據係冇影響嘅，因為點解呢？我哋收咗個raw data，正如頭先另外一份paper都咁寫喇，佢未有嗰個車嘅路線嘅，咁我哋係要措起佢呢啲數據，喺其他嘅system嗰度係要搵番究竟邊條路線、邊個車長，我哋先至可以去做一啲勸喻或者紀律嘅行動嘅，咁呢啲咁嘅報告其實都係每日去generate一次，咁所以你話個數據究竟係十秒send上嚟定係三十秒send上嚟，對嗰個做exception report個process其實係冇影響嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係冇實時嘅分析，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：Real-time我哋係用另外一個alert，我哋係--正確，冇real-time analysis。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，我想澄清一下嘅，即係首先就有個十秒嘅延誤，跟住要用多三十秒去傳遞呢個資料去總部，啱唔啱？即係總共要四十秒，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我想去澄清一下嘅，現時每三十秒，資料就會係傳遞去我哋嘅伺服器嘅，經過互聯網，咁而十秒嘅延誤就個意思其實同三十秒一樣，咁現時嘅延誤就係三十秒，我哋嘅目標就係將佢縮短到十秒，而家個情況就係咁

嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我問嘅問題就係你認唔認為即係黑盒嘅使用者係可以決定嗰個延誤究竟係幾長呢，係五秒、十秒、廿秒、三十秒喇，即係你知唔知道呢個情況？

梁健宏先生：呢個係一個決定，亦都視乎技術上同埋資源上同埋係咪幫到件事情，我哋覺得係有機會幫到件事情嘅，就點樣樣可以令啲數據更加可以快脆啲去到嗰個系統嗰度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）策略上係可行嘅，係咪？

梁健宏先生：應該係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果係將嗰個伺服器嘅容量增大，等你可以十秒鐘就傳送嗰啲資料，就唔係三十秒喇，咁嗰個開支方面有咩影響？

梁健宏先生：未估量過，不過應該都--數字都唔細嘅，不過我期望科技發達，呢啲嘢就比較可以快啲達到喇，因為牽涉到嗰個 data traffic、data volume、data storage。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）會唔會其實係有個比較更加強--即係能力更加強嘅伺服器就得㗎喇？

梁健宏先生：都未必㗎，所以一路係我哋都係研究緊點樣樣可以加快呢個--嗰個流程。

歐陽先生： Okay, thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你睇第 69 頁，BM-1 69 頁，都係嗰個律師樓發出信件嘅呢個附件，你睇到第二部分，藍色嘅嗰第 2 段，同一頁，咁第 2 段，第 2 個段落，「呢個遠程嘅資料系統係响九巴安裝嘅呢個系統係可以記錄速度、減速、巴士嘅減速同埋加速，不過巴士嘅加速，即係話持續咁樣嚟到係記錄巴士加速、減速嘅呢個咁樣嘅功能係冇啟動嘅。」

可唔可以就係補充一下就係關於呢個--我嘅意思就係想請你睇下 Kulis 先生嘅口頭嘅證供，佢係代表 Openmatics 公司作供嘅，請大家睇第六日嘅謄本。謄本嘅第三冊，第六日嘅聆訊，146 頁。「好喇，我想請你睇睇第二十一行，呢度第廿一行，係一位叫做 Derek Chan 先生，佢係委員會嘅大律師，坐喺我隔籬，佢話中間嗰度--佢話嗰個文件中間個--頁個中間係你哋間公司提供嘅答案喇，佢話呢個咁樣嘅講法，頭先我已經講咗喇，加速、減速，就係呢個功能係冇啟用到嘅。我想問嘅問題，你可唔可以解釋下或者係講一講，究竟呢一段嘅意思係咩嘢意思？特別係話記錄嘅加速、減速，即係持續咁樣嘅記錄加速、減速資料呢個講法。」

Kulis 嘅回應係咁樣樣嘅「係呀，我都唔知道，我明白嗰個--佢句子講咩嘢嘅，不過我諗佢係講緊一個情況，呢啲咁嘅數據、數值，加速、減速嘅數值係畀九巴嚟講就係要嚟即係實時提出警告嘅，就唔係喺度記錄，做數據紀錄嘅，呢個係根據我嘅理解喇，即係佢哋嘅一個聲明所講嘅呢件事嘅，我嘅理解喇，所以話我--即係話有咁樣嘅系統裝咗喇，即係嗰個司機嘅回饋嘅設備就會警告嗰個司機喇，實時警告，究竟係咪加速太快、減速太快咁樣。咁所以我哋就係用緊啲加速、減速嘅數值，但係就唔儲存有關嘅數據嘅，即係呢啲係叫做歷史數據喇，呢個就係我嘅理解呢個陳述書所講嘅係咁嘅意思。」「咁陳生，我明白你嘅意思喇。咁所以你嘅理解就係話响嗰個黑盒嘅數據嘅紀錄系統就唔會係記錄加速、減速嘅數據嘅，啱唔啱？」

咁 Kulis 先生話「係㗎，我都係咁樣理解嘅，因為嗰個我哋嘅黑盒有另一個功能嘅，就係記錄功能嘅，因為呢個有唔同嘅數據嘅，可能有二十個唔同嘅數據、數值可以記錄嘅，不過就唔包括加速、減速嘅」，咁呢度就我哋等一等，停一停，睇一睇，Kulis 先生嘅意思好似係咁講喎，雖然九巴使用嘅黑盒係有能力係可以儲存加速、減速嘅數據嘅，但係你冇啟用到呢個功能嘅，即係九巴就冇啟用到呢個黑盒呢啲功能嘅，我想請公司可唔可以提供下你哋嘅意見呢？即係鑑於你哋之中其中一個人今朝都作證都話加速、減速嘅數據係其實係有儲存到嘅，亦都會係--佢話係用嚟監察司機嘅行為嘅。

梁健宏先生：係嘅，我哋冇儲存喺個黑盒度，但係呢啲所有嘅資料，加速、減速嘅資料亦都會喺我哋嘅伺服器嗰度嘅，所以啲資料都會傳送番去我哋個伺服器嗰度，係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思你話係個伺服器度儲存咗個數據？

梁健宏先生：對。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個响伺服器就措咗呢個數據之後，咁公司嗰啲人點樣佢係接觸到呢啲嘅數據嘅呢，實際上係點樣做嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：我哋喺個 server 度呢啲紀錄我哋會睇番呢啲加速、減速嘅資料，從而制定一啲--睇睇有冇啲係超過一啲標準，譬如話佢加速得太快或者減速得太快，從而衍生啲比較唔係好 proper 嘅駕駛行為，咁喺呢一度我哋可以利用呢啲咁嘅資料係搵出一啲有關嘅車長去再檢討下佢哋嗰啲行為，就交畀我哋其他部門去處理，呢啲就係用呢啲資料嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧先生問，啲人點樣可以接觸到呢，要有啲咩步驟先可以睇得到呢個資料呢，呢個就係佢頭先問嘅問題。

梁健宏先生：呢啲資料就係喺電腦嗰度嘅，咁就我哋會有啲電腦程式去處理呢啲咁嘅資料，就出咗一啲 report 出嚟，一啲報告出嚟，咁嗰度亦都因為黑盒度啲資料只係紀錄低嗰個盒嘅資料、時間、速度、加速、減速嘅情況，咁亦都冇嗰條路線嘅資料，亦都冇嗰個車長嘅資料，所以變咗我哋喺背後，喺個伺服器，喺

呢啲咁嘅數據，我哋經過一輪嘅處理，先至可以出到一啲報告出嚟，令到我哋其他部門啲同事可以去跟進。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以嗰個人要求電腦就攞到嘅資訊就係某一個黑盒嘅資訊嘅啫？

梁健宏先生：嗰度係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可唔可以再講一講？我聽唔到。

李澤昌先生：或者我補充少少，嗰個黑盒嗰啲資料嗰個速度，佢嗰個加速同埋減速呢啲資料就會傳送去嗰個 server 個攝錄器嗰度，而呢個 server 嘅攝錄器裏面，佢會好清楚知道架車由起點去到終點，佢成個車嘅車程，佢亦都可以查到呢架車程裏面佢行嘅位置，咁所以嗰個攝錄器就會有一個好精準知道佢喺邊一個位置係...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，李生，我要講一講，你係咪去某一個黑盒，先至攞到嗰個資料？即係譬如話你可以將嗰個黑盒同嗰個巴士嘅編號係聯繫起來㗎，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：Yes，At the back end we can--係呀，有配對㗎，嗰個盒嘅秎巴同我哋架巴士秎巴係有個 connection 嘅，所以知道呢個盒嘅秎巴對番邊架巴士秎巴，係有個 index 嘅，你知道個盒秎巴就知道邊個巴士秎巴。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個要求呢啲資料嘅人就係話佢係講緊某一個黑盒或者即係某一架巴士嘅資訊喇，佢要求見到嘅就，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想--我叫鄧先生繼續之前，我想問一個問題，點解個黑盒係有能力係記錄個加減速嘅數據，點解唔响嗰度措起佢，然後另外亦都係傳送番去個伺服器呢？

梁健宏先生：等我解釋吖，個黑盒就記錄低每一秒鐘地點，即係經緯度喇，嗰一秒鐘架車嘅速度。咁如果呢一秒鐘嘅速度去比較番上一秒鐘嘅速度，佢加速超過一個 pre-set value，而家就係 4 公里，4 公里，如果超過而家我哋定咗 4 公里，佢就會車速嘅提示器就會著燈，亦都會響嘅。如果佢呢一秒鐘響過嘅話，呢一秒鐘佢亦都記錄低咗呢個提示器佢響過嘅，亦都有紀錄嘅。如果佢呢一秒鐘佢嘅速度相對佢一秒鐘係細過，而家就係 7 嘅，之前就係 8 嘅，7 公里每小時，即係話佢剎車比較快喇，係急剎喇。

咁同樣地，個提示器亦都會著燈同埋「呲」聲提醒個車長嘅。而呢個急剎嘅提示亦都喺嗰一秒鐘記錄低嘅，記錄低嘅。咁嗰一秒鐘佢所有冇提示或者冇提示，呢啲咁嘅紀錄，就一秒鐘嘅紀錄都會傳送番我哋嘅伺服器嘅，所以佢嗰秒鐘有冇提示過佢，喺我哋資料就知道晒㗎喇，所以儲存喺嗰個盒嗰啲數據需唔需要幾多次，我哋嘅伺服器都有㗎喇。我哋嘅伺服器掌握晒呢個車長被提示過多少

次、因為咩嘢原因提示佢，我哋個資料喺個伺服器嗰度係有㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁換句話講，黑盒就會每秒係記錄速度喇，呢個就係運輸署要求嘅，咁但係減速率就只係會喺超越咗你嗰個即係上限嘅時候，即係每秒 4 公里或者係下降咗 7 公里先至會記錄喇？

梁健宏先生：我再補充多一點，我漏咗一樣，就係 speeding，同樣地，如果佢個速度係超過某一個我哋 pre-set 嘅 value，嗰秒鐘，而家我哋定咗就係 70，如果佢嗰秒鐘佢超過 70，個提示器就會響㗎喇，而嗰秒鐘亦都會記錄低個提示器響過佢嘅，如果係超過 70。即係換句說話講，speeding，即係 speeding sudden deceleration、harsh braking、超過嗰啲 pre-set value，都會提示個車長，亦都喺嗰秒鐘如果係有呢啲提示，會記錄低，而所有呢啲咁嘅紀錄，每秒鐘嗰啲紀錄係會傳送去我哋個電腦伺服器嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時係定下呢一個每小時 70 公里呢一個嘅數值㗎？

梁健宏先生：我哋今年 2 月 23 號就將嗰個提示嘅 value 就改做 70 嘅，之前係 75。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊 2018 年，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：對。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝，主席。咁我想你睇番你向委員會提供嘅資料嘅，咁喺你第一份嘅即係陳述入面，我想你睇番第 50 頁，你第一份嘅陳述嘅。咁之前我提過，即係我對問題嘅第二部分係有興趣嘅，即係話呢啲嘅裝置即係會收集啲乜嘢資料去監察司機嘅表現，而呢啲收集到嘅資料點樣可以改善駕駛安全，咁根據你嘅答案，你只係提到車速同埋車輛嘅位置，你冇提到加速或者減速嘅，咁點解呢？

梁健宏先生：因為我哋每一秒鐘都有個速度嘅，正如頭先解釋喇，呢一秒鐘同下一秒鐘個速度嘅分別就等如加速或者減速嘅，所以變咗我哋就唔需要另外一個計時器計佢加速或者減速，我哋就係用每一秒嘅速度去計番佢個加速係點樣樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁但係似乎即係呢個唔係一個完整嘅答案，即係唔係完整咁樣回應咗鄧律師嘅問題喎，個問題係「點解」。呢個即係只係得十二個字嘅啫，呢一句嘅答案，即係你係只係用咗呢十二個字去回應呢一個問題。

梁健宏先生：我只係可以講，個黑盒 capture 咗嗰個車嘅速度。

主席：（經傳譯員）亦都有其他嘅嘢，係咪？

梁健宏先生： Among other things，對。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題係點解你冇提到其他嘅資料呢？咁我點解問呢個問題，因為係你負責係回答呢個問題嘅，我唔知邊個係呈交呢份嘅陳述，咁我只係問點解係唔完整呢。

梁健宏先生：我哋有二十幾項數據嘅，有時間、有日期、有 vehicle speed、有引擎嘅轉數。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁點解冇喺呢度提到呢？

梁健宏先生：可能就係呢兩樣最主要嘅數據就係 for monitoring of bus captain。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家想講第三個範疇嘅，我之前亦都係表示我係有興趣呢個範疇，咁我哋之前都有提過--唔好意思，我哋係未經過呢個問題嘅，咁第三個範疇就係呢啲收集到嘅資料係會點樣使用，嚟以一個實時嘅方式可以協助車長呢，呢個就係我有興趣嘅範疇喇。係請你睇第 65 頁，就係 BM-1 嘅文件冊嘅，呢個就係律師行發出嘅信件。咁喺呢一項中間藍色嘅部分，佢就話遠程嘅通訊系統係有三個主要部分嘅，咁而第一個部分就係司機回饋裝置，咁喺個介紹度就話呢個裝置係提供一個視覺同埋聲音嘅回饋畀司機嘅，就係就著四個基本嘅門檻嘅數值，包括係引擎嘅轉數、超速、加速同埋即係閒置嘅狀態嘅，咁佢係喺呢一個司機箱嗰度同埋係接駁到去呢個 Openmatics 嘅系統，咁而車長嘅回饋系統就係表示如果即係相關嘅數值達到去門檻嘅話，咁車長就會係得到一個資訊，包括係透過呢一個「呲呲」聲同埋會有盞燈亮起嘅，咁呢個就係包括係引擎、速度、閒置嘅狀態同埋加速嘅，咁呢一頁度就顯示咗呢啲資料㗎。咁呢個情況係咪即係已經充分咁樣去即係描述咗九巴上面嘅車長嘅警告系統？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁而家就請你--我想問一啲問題嘅，就係關於呢一啲嘅界限數值嘅。咁 68 頁嘅頁頂，咁就話「根據我哋所知，司機回饋系統就係有喺意外中相關嘅車輛度安裝嘅」，係講緊大埔嘅意外，咁而司機回饋嘅限值，即係喺相關嘅意外入面嘅巴士係最初係由九巴去訂立，然後就由 Openmatics 去調校，去即係切合九巴嘅指定嘅數值嘅，你可唔可以確認？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據相關嘅歷史，咁而意外中車輛嘅四個限值就係由九巴去訂立，而後來係由 Openmatics 就喺 17 年 7 月 24 日係調整嘅，係咪正確？

梁健宏先生：想補充一點，acceleration 同 deceleration，係嘅。Tilting angle 嗰度，嗰度 44，我哋從未有任何嘅設定嘅，亦都搵唔到一個

reference 嘅設定，所以係冇提供畀 ZF 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係九巴冇提供，係嘛，你嘅意思係？

梁健宏先生：By KMB，冇提供嘅，我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁據我哋所知，呢啲限值係有即係入咗落嗰個意外嘅巴士，係嘛？即係 44 度。

梁健宏先生：我哋知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道 Kulis 先生係解釋呢個就係預設嘅安排？

梁健宏先生：明白，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係--有取消...

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢個文件就講到根據喺意外嘅期間，我哋嘅所知，當時嘅限值就係咁樣嘅，咁大家可以睇到。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁或者可唔可以讀出嚟，鄧律師？即係方便我哋記錄。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）即係加速率就係以每秒幾多米嘅，就係 1.15，每秒 1.15 米。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係每平方--秒 1.15 米嘅，咁而減速就係 2.3，速度就係 75 公里嘅，每小時，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁就係喺某啲嘅區域嘅速度，咁同樣係每小時 75 公里嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係唔知道呢一個數值。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你係唔知道第二項數值，係嘛？

梁健宏先生： No.

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁然後就係一個閒置嘅數值同埋引擎嘅數值嘅，睇唔睇到嗰個數值？

主席：（經傳譯員）3,000 轉。

梁健宏先生： Yes，yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係嗰啲有關嘅限值，唔係淨係個大埔意外個巴

士，而係所有九巴嘅巴士上都有啲咁嘅數值嘅，當時係有啲咁嘅數值嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁啲數值係由九巴制定嘅，同埋 Openmatics 就調校嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）再睇番兩件有關速度嘅事喇，如果我冇理解錯嘅，如果我理解係正確嘅話，如果任何一架巴士超過咗每小時 75 公里嘅速度，嗰個車長就會聽到啲「呲呲」聲嘅，同埋個燈會閃下嘅，即係响架車駕駛艙會發現兩樣嘢嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁如果個巴士譬如話每小時 60 公里，而當時嗰個道路嘅限速係 50 公里，有冇任何嘅提示嘅呢？即係車長會收到提示呢？

梁健宏先生：而家係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會有好啲呢，如果係咁樣嘅提頁系統？

梁健宏先生：係，absolutely。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁响呢方面我想請你睇睇 Kulis 先生嘅證供。請翻到第六日聽證會第六日，我哋嘅第三冊，頁數係 180--唔好意思，係 150。請你特別留意第七行，第 150 頁第七行。咁陳先生就係話「嗰個校好嗰個角度或者校好個數值就係超速，呢度有兩個數值嘅，一個就係速度，另一個就某啲區域嘅速度，兩個都係定咗每小時 75 公里。咁首先有個基本嘅問題，睇下我理解有冇正確，如果係超過每小時 75 公里，咁就即係已經過咗界喇，啱唔啱？」咁就話第 17 段佢話「啱嘅」，17 段話。咁佢呢兩個數值有乜分別呢？速度相對於某區嘅速度，可唔可以請你--你自己睇番第十九行，一路去到第 155 頁第九行。請你用啲時間去睇一睇呢幾行。係咪可以睇晒呢？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我冇理解錯呢個證供，Kulis 先生嘅講法有唔同嘅地方嘅，有唔同嘅--制定兩個唔同嘅限速嘅數值嘅，你嘅理解係咪一樣？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第一個我哋見到嘅 151 頁嘅呢個第二行，你要制定究竟係咩嘢區域，即係話譬如嗰個地理嘅界限或者係其他嘅資料，如果你係想某啲區域有唔同嘅速度嘅限制嘅一啲數值，咁嗰個系統要知道佢响幾時先至會觸動到呢個咁樣嘅限數值嘅，咁即係話要係制定有關嘅數字，我哋需要調校嘅，要制定究竟有啲乜嘢嘅地區、有咩嘢數值。委員會聽到喇，我唔知道你知唔知

喇，我哋所聽到嘅就係城巴係有咁樣嘅系統嘅，佢哋有制定㗎，廿五個唔同嘅區域嘅。咁喺呢廿五個區域就會提供一啲回饋畀車長嘅，你知唔知道有咁嘅事？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁第二樣我就更加有興趣嘅，就係使用呢個咁樣嘅電子嘅系統嘅--電子地圖嘅，154 頁第八行開始，咁陳先生，陳正隆（譯音）先生就向 Kulis 先生提出呢個問題「如果我有一個數碼嘅地圖可以顯示唔同嘅路段，有唔同速度嘅限制嘅，咁我可唔可以將呢個系統同而家呢個系統就合併，嚟到係制定唔同嘅所謂嘅速度嘅限值嘅，就視乎嗰架巴士响嗰個電子地圖顯示嘅咩嘢地方，定係話根據呢個系統咁樣合併做唔到嘅？」Kulis 嘅回覆就係話「肯定係可行，係可以做到嘅」，咁我哋需要做一啲嘢，想需要一啲軟件嘅。香港都已經係有電子地圖㗎喇，係嘛？你知唔知？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）頭先你講過喇，最好係有咁樣嘅系統，即係話如果你話嗰度係限度 50 公里，如果你超出 50 公里，最好就有個警示畀個車長喇，咁你對於呢個可行性，呢度有兩個可能嘅改進嘅方法，Kulis 建議有兩個方法，你有咩嘢睇法？

梁健宏先生：我哋係好高興知道可以咁樣做，亦都因為呢個 IRC，咁我哋可以得到一啲 map，政府嘅 digital map，因為呢度講緊係一個官方嘅紀錄嚟嘅。一個 road speed limit 係一個好嚴重嘅事情嚟嘅，如果嗰啲數據係唔正確，係會好危險，所以我哋而家點做呢？我哋其實喺不--同 Openmatics 商討呢件事情，點樣可以做到唔同嘅區可以知道佢嗰個速度嘅 limit，架車去到嗰度，佢知道呢個 limit 係 70 抑或係 50，而家因為我哋唔知道邊度係 70、邊度係 50，所以我哋就定咗係 70。咁利用呢個方法，架車嗰個位置，知道嗰個位置係 50 嘅話，佢超過 50 就會響佢㗎喇，呢樣嘢我哋就同 Openmatics 亦都 test drive，7 月 31 號。

我哋會有架車將個 digital map 嗰啲 road limit 嘅 condition 就畫咗喺嗰架車嗰個黑盒入面，從而令致到嗰架車去到邊個位置佢就知道嗰個地點嘅 road limit 係幾多，速度係幾多。咁我哋 7 月 31 號試過，就覺得係 positive 嘅。再進一步我哋就睇到點樣樣可以再 further implement，如果係 possible 嘅，我哋就會所有嘅車隊都會有呢樣嘢嘅措施，從而架車去到 50 嘅地方，超過 50 佢就會提示個車長，去到 70 嘅地方，超過 70，就會提示個車長。相對而家就會大大咁改善。

李澤昌先生：即係有點補充嘅，因為嗰個地圖嘅重要呢，因為其實香港每一日個道路個速度都可以改變嘅，例如有啲掘咗路、例如有交通意外，其實個即時嗰個道路嗰個速度係可以直接影響到我哋嘅車速，所以個地圖係其實一定要係一個 live 嘅地圖嚟嘅，所以咁--即係我哋係有一個突破，就係喺過去一段好短嘅時

間，嗰個地圖終於係我哋收到喇，咁 Openmatics 亦都即係擺咗喺個黑盒裏面。咁我哋其實喺第一階段就係頭先講 70、50 都好喇，而家我哋有架車係已經嘗試緊㗎喇，咁如果我哋係試到係得嘅話，就會有個即時嘅 alert，個 system 睇番嗰個車嗰個 desk board 嗰度 real-time 咁話畀個車長聽「你係超咗速度」，咁但係 geo-fencing 嗰個係需要更加長嘅時間，因為 geo-fencing 嗰個係因為係會--嗰個 black box 收到呢個訊息之後就會即係控制番嗰架車嗰個即係加油、踩 brake 嗰啲，嗰個可能要時間長啲，但係起碼第一階段嗰個 70 同 50 嗰個喇，有咗個 map，嗰度就會行得會快啲，但係而家都係一個--即係我哋試咗大概都係--一架車，試咗都係嗰幾個星期嘅啫。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解因為呢個委員會你就攞到嗰個電子地圖呢？

梁健宏先生：呢個係我自己嘅 gut feeling 啫，不過即係事情可能咁巧合喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺邊度攞到呢個地圖？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）政府。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個部門？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）之前有冇問過？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時問？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我之前冇問。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁點解會攞到？

梁健宏先生：我就收到封信。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係運輸署就話畀你聽係可以攞到咁嘅地圖？

梁健宏先生：係咁，啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時發生嘅事？

梁健宏先生：6月嘅，6月7號。

主席：（經傳譯員）個信件係寫住「6月7號」？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係6月之前係運輸署就冇表示係有呢啲數碼地圖嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一份即係呢封信嘅副本我哋？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁麻煩而家就去影印呢封信，可唔可以有人去幫手影印呢封信？即係上面冇寫到字，係嘛？咁只係影印就可以喇，跟住我哋會還番畀你嘅。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝，主席。可唔可以咁講，九巴公司喺即係一啲限速 50 嘅路段，即係嘅行駛嘅里數係比起限速 70 嘅地段嘅里數係多好多嘅？

梁健宏先生：答唔到你，can't answer you，我要去攞多啲數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁可能--其實城巴都答唔到呢個問題，可能你係可能會感到安慰喇，如果你聽到咁樣。咁香港嘅路段嘅速度限制就係有用顏色去分嘅，即係大部分嘅路都係限速 50 嘅，咁我哋就可以顯示埋你嗰啲巴士路線嘅，咁但係即係一般地講都可以答呢個問題嘅。咁喺限速 50 嘅路段嘅巴士行駛係多過制速 70 嘅巴士好多嘅，如果你仍然係答唔到，你可以話我知。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我幫一幫你吖。九巴嘅巴士係咪經常去行駛一啲路段限速 50 嘅地帶？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，但係即係嗰個有幾多程車--即係車程嘅數量可能係唔同嘅。即係我係工程師嚟嘅，所以我係想知道啲事實先去回答你。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你都可以去從政。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想問多一個問題嘅，就住呢一個範疇，咁喺成立獨立檢討委員會之前係有採取到啲咩嘢步驟，即係就住一啲超過咗時速 50 公里限制嘅巴士，究竟係做咗啲乜嘢？

梁健宏先生：我哋曾經試過呢，我哋曾經試過個咪錶去到 50 嗰陣時就 prompt 個車長，個咪錶去到 50，當其時架車係唔知道佢行緊咩嘢路段嘅，我哋曾經試過佢超過 50 就提一提佢「喂，你超過 50 喇」，但係啲車長--因為我分別唔到架車喺邊個位置，但係我哋都想提嗰啲車長，如果佢行緊市區嘅道路，就話畀佢知「喂，你超過 50 喇」，但係有啲情況就係嗰啲車未必真係--行開又 50，又 70 嘅話，變咗有啲車長就覺得就有啲 unnecessary 嘅 alert 喇。所以變咗試咗一段好短嘅時間，我哋都唔可以再做，因為其實我哋判斷唔到架車實情係喺 50 路段吖，抑或 70 路段。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係根據我嘅理解，你係想去試驗一下，即係當車速一超過 50 公里就去有一個嘅訊號，但係啲車長就覺得好煩，因為即係好多時佢哋都喺一啲限速 50 嘅區域嘅？

梁健宏先生： Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）究竟係咩嘢時候？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）都好一段日子之前喇，我唔記得實際嘅時間。（證人直接用本地話說）but 呢個就唔係 telematics 出嚟嘅，唔係個黑盒嗰度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係車速器，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋稍後就會去休息一下，因為即係已經進行咗一段好長嘅時間，咁大家可以去放鬆一下。即係你係可以嘅話，即係可以去小休嘅話，你可以話畀我知嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者可以完埋呢一個議題。呢套系統就係 13 年係向 Openmatics 去購買嘅，係咪？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁當時，即係限速 75--即係 75 車速呢一個數值有冇係輸入咗去系統度？

梁健宏先生：嗰個設定係 KMB 話畀 Openmatics 知嘅，係 KMB 定嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁喺 2013 年直至到委員會成立呢段期間，你有冇檢討過即係呢個系統有冇去即係透過呢個全球定位系統去記錄一個超速超過 50 嘅情況，你有冇即係探討過呢個情況？

梁健宏先生：（證人直接用本地話說）我唔可以肯定，但係我相信我哋曾經都會同製造商討論過呢個話題。（經傳譯員）我唔肯定嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋知係幾時？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你記唔記得即係喺公司入面係咩嘢人士係參與？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，我哋而家係會小休十五分鐘，唔該。

下午 3 時 53 分聆訊押後

下午 4 時 08 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧生，請繼續。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。各位先生，請睇番嗰個謄本嘅文件冊，係第 11 日嘅聽證會嘅謄本，請睇番 73 頁，請睇番第 14 行，佢係委員會嘅黃律師問呢個 Kelvin Yeung 楊先生，大家都知道楊先生係公司嘅現在嘅僱員，啱唔啱？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 14 行呢度，即係黃小姐，黃佩琪大律師，「我哋同 Alok Jain 收到--其中一次見面嘅時候收到嘅證供，就佢哋考慮過有個積分表嘅一個系統嚟嘅，即係計積分嘅系統嚟嘅，其中一個考慮過嘅系統就係呢個叫做 GreenRoad.com 嘅系統嘅，佢呢個作用就係會知道嗰個司機嘅駕駛嘅行為，呢個車長，有三個類別嘅，紅色、黃色、綠色。」

跟住我哋跳一跳，去 75 頁，睇番 75 頁，第 8 行，楊先生講「我唔係好清楚 Alok 先生所講嗰個名，不過應該係採用呢個制度嘅，呢個其實好似我哋現有嘅制度。」

主席問「嗰個制度係乜嘢制度呀？」楊晉瑋先生 Kelvin Yeung 就話「正如我所講，會有聲，會有燈著咗，有三隻顏色嘅燈嘅，視乎個車長嘅駕駛行為，就會著三盞燈嘅一種燈。呢啲燈就佢响嗰個車長總站，拍咗個八達通卡，就會著㗎喇，跟住個燈就會視乎嗰個係車長嘅表現嚟到著個燈，綠色最好，黃色同埋紅色即係話有啲嘢需要改善，呢個系統現在仍然响度使用嘅。」

主席就問一個問題「當嗰個車長係落班嘅時候，佢就再點一點佢嗰個八達通卡，呢個响咩嘢地方會顯示呢個資料畀佢睇呢？」楊生就話「只係話佢第一次拍個八達通卡嘅時候，朝頭早嘅時候先至會顯示呢個資料嘅，我唔知道佢會唔會顯示番前一日嗰個資料嘅燈號，但係我知道同一日嚟講，就唔會畀番個車長睇嘅，即係話佢落班嘅時候冇資料嘅。」

「你嘅意思即係上班嘅時候就係有資料嘅？」「係嘅，上班嘅時候就顯示資料嘅。」

「呢個資料係關於咩嘢時段㗎？」「我要睇番嗰個有關嘅期限嘅，不過就唔係講緊同一日嘅資料嚟嘅，係關於過去一段時間嘅，至於話呢個期限係個範圍，我就而家冇資料。」

「咁樣嗰個顯示响邊度顯示呀？嗰個巴士車長喺邊度見到㗎？」「每個巴士總站都有一個電腦嘅，個車長返到去總站，佢就要將佢嘅職員卡嚟到係拍一拍，咁先攞到呢個資料嘅，個電腦就响嗰個亭外面嘅，即係巴士總站對住巴士車長個亭外面嘅。」

「即係你意思話...」「有三種顏色，就會其中一種就會向個車長顯示出嚟，就係紅色、黃色、綠色。」

好喇，我睇番頭先個證供，我有個問題，你可唔可以證實呢個三色系統，綠色、黃色、紅色係現在都仍然响度使用㗎？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以形容一下呢個系統個基礎係點樣㗎？

梁健宏先生：呢個係一個車長駕駛嘅評估嚟，一個 score 嚟嘅，一個分數，就有四樣嘢去評估佢嘅，第一樣就係 excessive idling，即係怠速太長；第二樣嘢就係 harsh braking，即係急剎；第三樣就係 sudden acceleration，加速得太快；最後一樣就係 speeding，超速。如果就住呢四個項佢嘅表現，喺每一位車長佢一個 trip，佢每日咁多個 trip，一個禮拜嘅表現，我哋就攞呢四樣嘢去作為一個準則去評估下佢嗰個駕駛嘅表現。

當然我哋有啲準則就係頭先所講嗰幾個內容，嗰幾個類別，佢做得好嘅話，架車就會比較柔順一啲，乘客坐喺架車度會安全啲，架車嗰個 fuel consumption 亦都會環保啲，個 fuel consumption 會好啲嘅話，就即係等如環保啲，所以變咗呢樣嘢就係一個 eco-safe driving，eco-safe。

評估咗有個 score，就會分為最好嗰啲就綠色，另外就有 amber 同埋 red 嘅，即係分三個級別，呢個就係每一個禮拜嘅 score 嚟嘅，呢個 score，佢去到 termini 嗰度去 report duty，佢 sign in for duty 嗰陣時，佢就會話畀佢知佢十日前嗰七個 week 嘅--七個日，十日前之前嘅七天嗰個 week 嗰個 score，show 到佢係綠色，黃色、紅色就冇 show 出嚟嘅，不過就會 show 一啲 wording 提醒佢要注重啲乜、注重啲乜。

意思就係點解呢？其中一樣嘢因為車長喺站頭去拍嗰個卡，個 screen 唔多唔少有時有其他人會睇到，即係變咗呢樣嘢就令到個車長就知道佢係咩嘢 score，但係嗰個內容就係咁樣樣顯示。同一時間，佢如果上番去我哋嘅員工網，個車長上個員工網，佢亦都可以睇番佢過往嗰八星期佢個分數嘅。呢啲咁嘅提點亦都喺佢喺站頭、bus terminus report duty 嗰陣時，嗰個畫面亦都會話畀佢知佢嘅分數之餘，詳情佢亦都係可以上番個員工網，知道佢嘅駕駛表現，呢個係一個比較佢自己知道佢自己嘅駕駛行為，呢啲就自己去改進喇。

呢個設計個目的就係咁樣樣。我哋就係應該係 2015 年 11 月 launch 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，個系統係可以幫助到車長，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，亦都係可以幫助到乘客同埋巴士公司。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）究竟紅、黃、綠嘅呢個分類係基於乜嘢嘅資料或者數據去訂定嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：我暫時就冇呢個分類嗰個數據，不過絕大部分都係 green，嗰個 score 係有個 formula，有個程式嘅。

李澤昌先生：佢問黑盒有啲咩嘢數據。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我誤解咗個問題，我重複一次。（直接用本地話說）有四個item嘅，有四個類別嘅，excessive idling...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要重申呢一啲嘅類別㗎喇，你講得好清楚。鄧律師嘅問題就係究竟定立嘅限值係幾多，即係就住呢四個類別？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔係咁簡單嘅，（直接用本地話說）佢有兩個threshold嘅，第一個就係excessive idling就係唔好超過十五分鐘，唔好超過十五分鐘；Harsh braking就係跟番我哋黑盒嘅setting；Sudden acceleration跟番黑盒嘅setting；Speeding亦都係跟番黑盒嘅setting。即係換句說話講，speeding就係70，sudden acceleration就係4 km per hour per second。

主席：（經傳譯員）似乎呢個資料係有傳遞，即係當車長每日去簽到嘅時候就會見到呢個資料，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：佢每一日拍卡，佢每一個journey、佢每一個trip，start or end the journey佢會tap his -- tap佢個卡喺嗰個terminus嗰度嘅，每日就有兩次會話畀佢知嘅，因為你次次都話畀佢知，佢就覺得好煩擾嘅，所以變咗每日佢拍卡就會話畀佢兩次知，就話畀佢知，show到佢個score係幾多嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪即係要拍張卡定係要插張卡入部機度？

梁健宏先生：係，佢拍佢個卡，個screen就會show出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個紅、黃或者綠嘅分類會唔會影響一啲某一啲獎項呢？正如我哋今朝所講。

梁健宏先生：No，淨係喺開始launch有個promoting scheme嗰時先至有短暫試過呢樣嘢啫，otherwise就冇，純粹一個等個車長知道佢自己嗰個performance，知道佢自己嘅表現，等佢從而佢自己去改進佢嗰個駕駛技巧。

主席：（經傳譯員）關於嗰四個類別，你就同我哋講過啲限值係幾多，如果譬如話喺個速度嗰度係超過咗限值，車長係咪唔會得到呢個綠色嘅分類呢，或者如果係加速率太高，又會係點呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係有一個嘅方程式嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同我哋講下方程式係乜嘢？或者你知唔知道究竟條方程式係點樣？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係有一條方程式嘅，（直接用本地話說）之後再交畀你，可以嘛？

主席：（經傳譯員）可以嘅，即係希望係用一個書面嘅形式係分享呢個方程式嘅，會唔會係喺網站度都有呢條方程式，令到車長知道呢？

梁健宏先生：The formula，佢嗰度有--喺個 website 嗰度，佢自己先睇到佢自己嗰個 performance 嘅，淨係即係 show 到綠色、黃色同埋紅色嘅啫，佢自己睇到嘅，亦都分番嗰四類別嘅，佢自己知道嗰四類別嗰個 score 係咩嘢色嘅啫，actual score 就冇嘅，係 by colour。但係我哋有啲提示，如果佢係紅色嘅話，就提示佢要踩油門就柔順啲，踩 brake 就緩慢啲，空轉嗰陣時就少啲，會提點番佢邊一類別需要改進。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你提供呢條方程式，唔該晒。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇任何嘅通告或者係文件係去解釋畀車長知道究竟呢個計劃嘅目的係點呢，同埋點樣運作嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：有嘅，我哋有呢啲通知嘅，我哋有 poster 嘅，有...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供一啲嘅例子呢，呢啲嘅資料？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇從車長或者工會收到任何嘅意見，即係佢哋點樣去睇呢一個嘅評分制度呢？

梁健宏先生：唔係一個好 formal 嘅 feedback，亦都--但係亦都有啲同事同啲車長去溝通，都知道呢樣事情嘅，佢哋亦都知道呢個唔係一個獎賞嘅計劃嚟嘅，呢個係一個希望啲車長知道佢駕駛表現嘅方法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有幾多百分比嘅車長會長期都有一個綠色嘅評級呢？

梁健宏先生：初步數據有啲顯示絕大部分都係得到 green 嘅 rating 嘅，佔咗有大約1個 per cent 嗰就會黃色嘅，紅色就比較少。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果只有百分之一係得到黃色，係咪即係好少--即係少於百分之一係紅色呀？

梁健宏先生：For example，譬如講番最近7月15號至7月22號呢個禮拜，有接近九萬個 record 係 green 嘅--六萬九千-- 69,824 係 green 嘅，有844係 amber，red 就係8個 record。至於再之前嗰個禮拜，2018年7月8號至到2018年7月14號有61,010個紀錄係 green 嘅，amber 有768，red 係有兩個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者講一個比較極端啲嘅例子，如果有一個司機係經常都係喺一個 50 限速區度係經常超速，但係車速係低過 70，而喺一啲迴旋處就翻側咗架巴士嘅，根據呢個嘅制度，佢仍然都會得到綠色嘅評級，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：因為呢個佢唔知道佢喺咩位置嘅，所以佢就唔知道你喺 50 路段，呢個就分辨唔到嘅，呢個分辨唔到，佢淨係個速度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以就會畀一個綠色評級佢？

梁健宏先生：淨係速度，係，yes。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇收到一啲意見究竟啲車長係有冇為意有呢一個制度呢？

梁健宏先生：睇番有啲情--呢個就係只不過其中一個即係想知道佢點樣樣揸車嘅，亦都有其他呢啲佢頭先所講嗰四樣嘢，包括 excess idling、harsh braking, sudden acceleration 同埋 speeding，我哋都有其他啲 report 可以睇到嘅，呢個只不過頭先所講嗰個綠色、黃色、紅色，個車長自己知道，但係其他我哋有啲報告亦都可以睇番佢呢幾樣嘢嘅表現，我亦都知道有啲紅色嘅同事，我哋知道佢嗰個駕駛內容，我亦都知道佢哋係 50 會超速，我哋亦都會有其他嗰啲 report 可以知道，去處理呢個情況，嗰個係管理層會睇嘅，正如頭先彭生所講，佢有啲車務主任就會喺其他啲 report 去睇呢啲同事嘅表現。

而家呢個綠色、黃色、紅色只不過一個好簡單，但係亦都有啲啟發性，等啲車長知道佢個表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧生問就唔係話你點樣知道佢哋嘅駕駛表現嘅，就係佢哋有冇留意到有呢個制度？佢哋為唔為意呢？

梁健宏先生：每一日佢有兩個機會佢會睇番佢哋個 screen，佢自己嘅 performance 嘅，亦都佢可以上員工網嗰度睇到，呢樣嘢就個車長會知道嘅，車長係知道嘅。

李澤昌先生：其實呢一樣嘢係一啲幾溫馨提示嘅嘢，當然要尊重番大部分嘅車長佢自己都有佢自己嘅駕駛嗰個態度同精神，呢個唔係一個 discipline 或者係咩嘢嘅態度嚟，所以其實呢一個係亦都要尊重個車長佢本身應該係有個正確駕駛態度，呢個係最基本等佢有一個知道自己係揸成點，亦都係希望佢哋自己可以喺嗰度係得到啲改善。當然下幾步可以係話多啲資料係咪可以令到我哋可以深入咁知道佢係咪轉彎等等嘅嘢，呢個係有其他嘅方案去做，例如係有啲便衣巡查、有人投訴，呢個會再做。但係呢一樣嘢係真係係希望佢哋尊重啲車長，佢自己畀番啲空間畀佢哋自己咁解嘅啫。

主席： Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）究竟有冇效呢？或者效率好唔好呢？呢個制度有冇咩嘢問題呢？

梁健宏先生：我覺得係可以再好啲嘅，如果嗰啲數據係更加可以實時反映到個車長嗰個駕駛態度、方法，正如頭先所描述，佢行緊個 50 路段，講 speeding，如果

佢行緊 60，佢都唔會喺個分數度反映到出嚟，但係如果--正如上一次講話如果我有個 digital map，可以 indicate 到佢喺 50 路段超速嘅話，咁樣嗰個分數就可能又好唔同，呢度亦都會反映到出嚟嘅，所以而家個 score 係我哋現時個情況下可以做到嘅，但係如果係有啲更加好嘅反映到實際嘅情況，我哋就會跟進，會希望再做好啲。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我個問題就係關於--係咪究竟呢個系統有效率呢？即係巴士司機知道有個咁嘅系統，佢哋有利用到，同埋拍完卡就知道，究竟呢個系統係咪有效，係咪有效率咁樣運作緊嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我問呢個問題，因為從嗰個關於雜項事件嘅文件冊第 3 冊 899 頁嘅，可唔可以請大家揭去嗰一頁呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個雜項文件冊第 2 冊，即係我呢個版本就應該係第 2 冊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可能未睇過呢份文件嘅，各位先生，我就想向你逐部分係簡介，我諗李先生會知道委員會主席同埋秘書處嘅人員就曾經去探訪一啲車廠、總站，係 8 月 3 號，即係上個禮拜五，我解釋下，呢個就係探訪完之後做嘅一啲紀錄嘅，即係開完會，探訪完之後做嘅紀錄。

第一個係關於 899，係去沙田新城市廣場嗰個總站嘅紀錄嚟嘅，我有興趣就係最後一個記項，呢一頁嘅最後一項，個附件 A 有啲相片嘅，委員會都同三個車長傾過偈嘅，都係了解一啲事項，就即係委員會同嗰三個巴士車長傾完之後，跟住你睇最後一點，同一個巴士車長之後就示範點樣嚟使用八達通卡或者係員工卡响嗰個係稽查嗰個辦事處嗰度點用。

呢度有個備註嘅，8 月 1 號聽證會嘅時候 Kelvin Yeung，係一個九巴嘅僱員就作咗證嘅，去到跟住下面嗰行，佢就係拍咗卡，跟住嗰個電腦就有個白色嘅畫面，跟住有個藍色字體嘅訊息，就叫佢小心駕駛，因為今日就個天氣就落雨，跟住就話畀佢聽下一個巴士嘅個路程係乜嘢，冇見到任何有啲分顏色嘅訊息或者係有啲--或者一啲訊息嘅窗口、盒，我問佢究竟有冇見過嗰個分顏色嗰個訊息，佢話冇，因為佢今日第一日係報到上班嘅。

跟住 902 頁，呢個去聯和墟巴士總站嗰度嘅探訪嚟嘅紀錄嘅，最後一項，呢度呢一頁嘅最後一項，亦都係問番嗰啲巴士車長究竟有冇喺個螢幕度有啲係顏色嘅訊息呢，個回答都係冇嘅，委員會就觀察到當佢拍卡嘅時候係有個白色嘅訊息，綠色嘅字就講清楚今日佢呢個負責嘅路線嘅一啲訊息。

跟住就去到屯門嗰個總站--車廠嗰度，屯門車廠，903 頁。一半嗰頁嘅中間嗰度，探訪期間，委員會都同一個車長傾偈嘅，佢响嗰個休息室度嘅。

第二點，個巴士司機就知道係有呢個分顏色嘅訊息顯示响個螢幕嘅，當佢擺嗰個係八達通卡就會見到，佢就話呢個係一個--係咪一個綠色嘅駕駛行為嘅

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

一個監察系統嚟嘅，佢知道如果係綠色，即係話一切都可以嘅；如果係黃色，係需要改善嘅；如果係紅色，一般嚟講，即係話個巴士司機嘅駕駛係有啲問題嘅。

最後，山景嘅巴士總站，904 頁，呢度就引述委員會同三個巴士車長嘅傾偈，就知道嗰個係稽查，呢個有啲咩嘢睇法，第三點呢度，其他兩個巴士車長就即係顯示佢哋上班嘅時候就拍卡，都係見到一個白色嘅同埋有一啲係藍色嘅字嘅訊息，就講明佢嗰個巴士司機今日嘅駕駛嘅分派嘅職務，見唔到有啲有顏色嘅訊息嘅。其中一個巴士司機就話佢第一日--即係啱啱上班嘅時候就係會見到個訊息嘅，有啲就話--有另外一個就話佢唔知道，冇留意，佢就冇留意嗰個螢幕有啲咩嘢嘅訊息嘅。

我就想你畀啲意見，你可唔可以講下呢個拍完卡之後，嗰個訊息就話叫佢小心駕駛同埋下一個路程係點樣樣，就冇話咩嘢紅或者綠、黃、紅，可唔可以講一講你嘅睇法呢？

梁健宏先生：佢嗰個提示嗰日，譬如天氣係不穩定，係濕呢，就會提示嘅。Amber 嗰個，佢就唔係每次都提示嘅。點解咁呢？亦都唔想令到個車長覺得太多，尤其是有啲 trip 係好 frequent 嘅，佢嗰個埋站時間比較短，就設計到就唔會 show 嘅，亦都唔排除主席當日喺個別站頭會唔會有啲技術問題，我哋要去睇一睇，睇到咩嘢原因 show 唔到出嚟。

第二樣嘢，宣傳嗰方面，係咪啲車長唔係咁充足去了解呢個咁嘅紅、黃、綠呢樣嘢呢？我覺得我哋都要做番好少少，但係我想覺得呢個都係一個好嘅方法，等個車長知道佢自己嘅駕駛，等佢自己知道。

至於嗰個 score 係點計法、可唔可以計好啲、精準啲、準確啲反映到佢嗰個駕駛狀況或者宣傳好啲，我諗我哋真係要加培努力。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽幾時你最後一次話畀巴士車長呢個咁嘅系統有啲咩嘢重要性？

梁健宏先生：我唔知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你同委員會講，你又話有啲文件你可以畀我哋嘅，係咪呀？即係關於嗰個方程式同埋點樣計，同埋你向員工點樣係通知佢哋呢個計劃嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家就係想去講黑盒上嘅另一個範圍，我就想問一啲問題嘅，即係話呢啲黑盒嘅數據去點樣使用先至可以去協助監察車長同埋佢哋嘅駕駛表現嘅，我知道黑盒嘅其中一個用途就係收集巴士嘅車速，我係想請你睇下你呈交畀檢討委員會嘅第二份陳述，呢個就係 167 頁嘅。

呢度有兩題比較長嘅問題，就係喺呢一頁嘅上方嘅，就係 167 頁，我諗我都唔需要係逐一講，但係我希望你係想睇一睇回覆嘅第二段，就話呢個就係有一個特有嘅電腦程式去匯報一啲疑似嘅超速個案，係畀一啲主任去檢查同埋確認嘅。喺確認之後，一啲已經確認嘅超速個案就會交畀呢個巴士車長表現管理組嘅表現經理係去進一步採取行動嘅。

我而家想請你睇睇第 170 頁，委員會即係喺上方就話公司係被要求去提供一啲資料同埋樣本去說明喺咩嘢位置係會有司機係以一個不適合嘅速度去駕駛，而喺回應方面，第一段就話由黑盒收集嘅數據嘅樣本就係以一個 BOP 207 號報告嘅形式係去程交嘅，就係喺附件度夾附，就顯示咗一啲超速嘅個案，而係遮掩咗一啲個人資料，佢係顯示咗日期、時間、巴士登記編號、路線號碼同埋相關車長嘅資料。

我哋就會睇番呢一份嘅附錄，就係 KMB-9 文件夾嘅第 3995 頁，係第 3995-1 嗰度都係有一個翻譯本。我就有一啲問題就係關於呢份報告嘅，如果你睇番第一行，喺右面就有一項資料，嗰個長度就係以秒去代表，有個最高速度就係 67.9 嘅，我假設呢個係每小時幾多公里，係咪？啱唔啱呀？

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）係，我見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個正確嘅理解係咪代表當時架巴士嘅速度係喺嗰三十二秒嘅期間速度都係超過 67.9，究竟係多過 67.9 吖，大概 67.9 吖，定係低過 67.9 呢？即係究竟應該點樣解讀？

黃祥明先生：呢個圖表顯示呢架巴士 TW5352，喺呢個時間 2018 年 5 月 1 號嘅 0 時 00、十九-- 20:07 嘅呢個時間有三十二秒嘅時間係最高車速係 67.9 時速公里。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪即係喺整段嘅期間都係速度 67.9 呀？

黃祥明先生：喺呢個顯示嘅時間嘅三十二秒都係呢個時速嘅速度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係係咪整段期間都係呢個速度呀？

黃祥明先生：喺呢三十二秒裏面，佢係有延續性嘅呢三十二秒裏面係出現過最高嘅車速係 67.9。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解你係要揀呢一個三十二秒嘅期間，而唔係六十秒或者九十秒呢？

黃祥明先生：因為嗰個黑盒嗰個顯示係每秒出現嘅，當佢係一個達到一個我哋指定咗嗰個嘅車速限制嘅時候，佢就顯示出嚟，就會顯示到呢架車喺當時行咗幾耐嘅時間裏面係行幾高--最高嘅車速係幾多。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係我想了解，就係點解三十二秒？

梁健宏先生：呢個係一個 exception report 嚟嘅，呢個係一個 exception report 嚟嘅，佢有啲 setting 嘅，佢有啲 setting 嘅，佢 exceed 某一個 setting 呢，就會 show 出嚟，換句說話講，三十二秒鐘佢都 exceed 咗嗰個 setting，不過最高速就係 67.9，呢三十二秒佢都係超過我哋定嗰個速度。似乎呢個路段應該就係 50 路段，因為如果 70 路段，佢就唔應該出嚟嘅。呢個 50 路段，佢有三十二秒鐘係超過呢個路段嘅 setting，而超過呢個 setting，其中最高佢係去到 67.9。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）究竟呢一個時間呢個長度係咪預先定嘅？

梁健宏先生：Duration 就唔係 pre-set 嘅，係睇到有幾多秒鐘佢係超過嗰個速度，佢個 journey 其中有幾多秒鐘，佢措埋，accumulated，唔係 continuous 嘅，喺佢成個當日嗰個--佢當日嗰個 journey time，佢總共有幾多秒係超過--個速度係超過我哋特定嘅...

李澤昌先生：假設為例，take 呢一個秣巴，即係話嗰條路段係 50 公里嘅個時速，即係話佢三十二秒係超出咗嗰個 50，而呢三十二秒裏面，佢有一個車速係去到 67.9，即係其實呢三十二秒都係超過嗰 50，但係佢最高係去到 67.9。

主席：（經傳譯員）我咁理解啱唔啱呢，喺呢啲特殊情況嘅報告，如果巴士唔係超速超過十秒嘅話，就唔會產生呢一項嘅紀錄，啱唔啱呀？即係當然我哋大家可以搵下究竟係咪有一啲嘅時間嘅長短係少過十秒，但係呢個係原則嘅問題，究竟即係係咪要起碼係連續十秒超速先會有紀錄呢？

黃祥明先生：呢個問題可以等我回答，其實我哋喺個電腦度係 set 定咗一啲嘅指標，等架車去到某個時段，某個車速嘅時候，會顯示出嚟嘅，或者我簡單啲，將個數字話一話畀大家聽，我哋定咗係 56 至到 65 嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以答咗我問題先？我理解啱唔啱--係咪錯誤呀？

黃祥明先生：唔係十秒鐘。

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾多呢？

黃祥明先生：所以我而家就將個情況講出嚟，因為唔同車速嘅時段，我哋 set 嘅時間係唔同。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解你唔直接答個問題，跟住先解釋呢？

黃祥明先生：Okay，對唔住。

主席：（經傳譯員）究竟個限速係幾多呢？

黃祥明先生：喺 56 至到 65，我哋係超過三十秒嘅時間呢，我哋就會將--喺個電腦

就會彈出嚟，而家講緊限速 50 嘅道路。第二個我哋訂定嘅就係 66 至到 75 呢個速度，如果喺一個限速 50 公里嘅道路，超過十五秒，我哋都會喺個電腦度彈出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解呢個資料就冇喺呢幾千頁嘅資料度出現呢？點解我哋要喺一個聆訊度問先至會得出呢啲資料呢？當我哋問呢啲問題嘅時候，即係委員會想知道嘅事情係好清楚嘅。好，請你繼續解釋。

黃祥明先生：另外喺--如果喺個道路限制 50 公里嘅道路，佢係由 76 去到 79 呢，我哋訂定咗兩秒鐘就會顯示出嚟，呢個係 50 公里嘅限速嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係非常有用嘅資料。喺限速 70 嘅地段情況係咪都類似呢？

黃祥明先生：喺 70 公里嘅道路，如果佢係喺 76 至 79 公里嘅範圍裏面超過三十秒，就會亦都係出現出嚟。

梁健宏先生：如果係超過八十公里嘅話，兩秒鐘就會出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番 KMB-1 168 頁，第一點嗰度，即係嗰個圓點嘅第一項嘅答覆，呢個係你哋嘅第二份--公司嘅第二份陳述書，你就講清楚，呢度就話利用一個電腦嘅程式，黑盒就會係記錄速度同埋啲急剎車、過快咁加速同埋有其他嘅資料係需要嘅，就會响嗰個其他嘅管理嘅系統會係記錄嘅，就大概要十日，先至可以攞到呢啲咁樣嘅數據嚟分析，跟住可能有紀律行動嘅。點解啲咁重要嘅數據要十日先至可以處理到呢？

梁健宏先生：而家就四天，四天都長嘅，我哋亦都想希望再快啲。個資料純粹係--喺嗰個伺服器嗰啲資料純粹就係個盒、個秝巴，不過就即係跟個巴士秝巴，每一秒鐘嘅數據、速度、經緯度呢啲咁嘅數據，有冇超速、有冇大油、有冇急剎，呢啲數據，咁多一架車嘅數據，但係我哋點樣樣去 relate 番去到個別車長、個別路線呢，呢啲亦都係要成個好多唔同嘅系統嘅 interface 嘅，包括 TER、站務管理系統。

站務管理系統係咩嘢呢？就係每一位車長佢去站頭 sign in，即係等如主席去睇到佢拍卡，佢 sign in，就話畀佢知呢個車長 start 呢個 journey、咩嘢車牌、咩嘢路線，去到 the other end of the route，佢就會 sign off，即係變咗佢就知道佢幾時開始呢個 journey、幾時 end 呢個 journey，喺呢個系統就 capture 咗嗰個車長嗰個資料、個巴士嘅資料、路線嘅資料。

呢個 TER 呢個 system，TER，每日措埋咁多嘅資料，每一個站，我哋有二百幾個站，而呢啲咁嘅資料全部就去晒我哋個 server 嗰度，呢啲咁多嘅資料，呢啲咁嘅資料亦都同 bus on-board monitoring system，就係頭先我所講架巴士每秒鐘嗰啲資料，點樣樣可以 interface 去搵番出嚟某啲車長當日揸過咩嘢車、佢當日個駕駛狀況、經緯度，即係 location。

有咗呢啲資料，點樣樣去判斷佢係 50 路段呢？亦都要再要 process，因為亦都要 match 番 FMI，FMI 就 fleet management information system，呢個 system 有咩嘢呢？有嗰架車經過嗰個地點，知道係行邊段係 50、邊段係 70，從而知道嗰架車有車長、有路線、有佢行車嘅情況，加埋 FMI 嗰段路佢係 50 抑或 70。

所以點解呢個事情咁複雜，所以點解--即係如果頭先所講有個 digital map，我乜嘢資料已經喺個黑盒嗰度有晒嘅話，咁樣樣就更加快捷，我相信--我敢講，個 report 一日就可以有。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲咁嘅科技已經有咗好耐㗎囉嘞喎，啱唔啱呀？

梁健宏先生：Yes, I know.

主席：（經傳譯員）你可以話係定唔係嘅，跟住解釋。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，我知道有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你想解釋，好明顯，咁點解之前唔做呢？

梁健宏先生：亦都嘗試去理解呢個問題，亦都嘗試去問呢個問題，我哋儘量做喇，我哋嘅範疇以內，as an operator，我哋可以掌握到嘅資源、可以運用到嘅影響力，希望借住今次呢個機會，令到啲嘢可以行快啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會就係要求咗你提供嗰啲數據嘅，頭先我哋見過一個表裏面即係譬如超速嗰啲數據嘅，你可唔可以畀一個報告就反映，即係譬如話係剎車或者加速太過突然、太快嗰啲咁樣嘅情況嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：我哋有個 weekly report on 呢幾個狀況嘅，呢個 weekly report 就係睇番過往嗰星期個車長佢嗰個駕駛情況，有措埋有幾多秒鐘係 exceed 超過我哋嘅特定指標嘅喺三個範疇，harsh braking、sudden acceleration 同埋 speeding 嘅，我哋有個 weekly report。

呢啲 weekly report 出咗嚟之後，就會交畀我哋有關部門就跟進嘅，當然有時 harsh braking 或者 sudden acceleration 有時亦都係因應交通狀況係有時無可避免，亦都未必真係完全係車長嘅駕駛問題，睇番路面而家個狀況千變萬化，行人過馬路、其他車輛、交通狀況唔多唔少車長面對嘅壓力好大，所以有時無可避免佢都會做啲所謂唔係幾好嘅動作，但係我哋都希望知道佢所面對嘅係咩嘢情況。

收到呢啲 report，我哋啲同事亦都會跟進嘅，包括可能畀個電話佢，約見下佢，或者嚴重嘅，情況係許可嘅話，就可能要便衣去跟跟佢，睇下佢實際嗰個駕駛狀況係點樣樣，呢啲就係呢份 report 最主要嘅功能，而唔係去--因為亦都 identify 唔到佢係咪真係駕駛不良。

黃祥明先生：或者我可以補充少少，我哋今日全日講緊個黑盒，今朝我哋曾經講過佢嗰個車嘅顯示器，即係話我哋個車長喺車廂裏面有即時嘅顯示嗰四盞燈，我唔再重複喇，嗰個係即時畀個車長一個認知，等佢知道佢駕駛嘅時候有問題嘅，希望佢從而能夠即刻改善或者改好佢嘅駕駛方法。

跟住我哋亦曾經講過，拍卡有黃、綠、紅呢三種顏色嘅儀器，呢個我哋希望個車長係自我檢討，佢見到自己嘅駕駛技巧之後，就係希望佢可以自我檢討，就改進佢嗰個駕駛態度。

而家我哋講緊呢一樣嘢係我哋每個星期都會有一個嘅報告出嚟，呢個報告會包括車長嘅超速、車長嘅加速同埋急剎嘅資料，呢個資料喺呢個初步嘅時候係未好完善，唔係而家我螢光幕見到嗰個資料咁多嘢，只係見到一個累積嘅數字。

喺呢啲車長超速嘅累積數字，我哋見到嘅時候，我下面嘅一個叫做表現管制組嘅同事，即係 performance management 個 section，就會通知番廠務嘅同事，等佢哋通知呢個車長，呢個並非一個嘅懲罰，而係一個提醒，通知啲車長喺呢個階段已經知道佢有一啲超速嘅情況，等佢要小心駕駛。

另外頭先講到一啲急剎同埋突然加速呢啲咁嘅情況，我係會派一啲嘅便衣巡查，呢啲便衣係我哋嘅駕駛學校嘅一啲嘅導師，佢哋穿著便裝嘅衣服去上呢個巴士度，直接觀察呢個車長嘅駕駛情況，從而得知佢係咪真係好似電腦嘅顯示有急剎或者令到車輛嘅行動唔安全，然後向我匯報，等我哋可以採取呢個紀律嘅行動。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁先生，我想講番頭先鄧生幾分鐘前問嘅問題，你可唔可以畀一啲報告畀我哋呢個委員會呢？而家我哋螢幕見到一個報告，你可唔可以講一講嗰啲係剎車太過急、突然譬如加速，你可唔可以畀一個類似而家螢幕見到嗰個報告，就係關於嗰個加速、減速、太過突然、太快嘅？可唔可以呀？

梁健宏先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你再睇嗰個謄本嘅，係第六日嘅--聽證會第六日嘅謄本。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個嘅證供呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 Kulis 先生嘅。161 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個文件冊㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 3 份嘅。之前我提過嗰個積分卡呢個咁樣嘅講法同埋巴士車長嘅駕駛嘅表現、駕駛嘅行為，我就想問一問關於 Kulis 先生呢個證供所講嘅事嘅，我想問幾個問題，先睇第 3 行，161 頁第 3 行，我哋先要去番

159頁先嘅，唔好意思。係160，第160頁，第22行。

陳律師就話「我下一項有興趣嘅題目，就係我會問一啲問題，就係關於用一啲軟件分析去擬備一個報告，就係關於安全或者不安全嘅駕駛行為嘅。」佢就問「你間公司有冇提供軟件，就係根據黑盒收集嘅數據，就可唔可以提供一個軟件係可以製造一啲報告去顯示乜嘢係可接受或者不可接嘅駕駛行為嘅呢？係咪有可能嘅呢？」Kulis先生嘅回答就係可以嘅。

而陳律師就係問「係點樣做呢？要點樣做呢？如果我係巴士嘅營運商，而我係嚟問你『我點樣可以係製造一啲某位司機嘅報告？』你會點樣同我講呢？即係你會同我講可以點樣做呢？」而就係有一啲--「我就會向你介紹一啲我哋嘅司機嘅回饋資料同埋一啲相關嘅部分同埋連同呢個軟件，你就可以去考慮一啲相關嘅數據，而最後，你係可以得到你自己嘅分析，而你就會可以見到邊個司機會有最多嘅警告或者超速嘅情況，呢個係其中一個選項，然後我哋可以為你去設計一個方案。如果你係唔只係想要司機嘅回饋數據，咁都係睇下你究竟你嘅諗法係點，如果你想係計一啲嘅分數去決定乜嘢係--邊個係最好嘅司機或者用一啲負面嘅數據嘅分析，其實係有唔同嘅方法係可以達成呢個目標嘅，亦都係視乎司機或者工會嘅意見。」

而陳律師就話「呢個只不過係軟件嘅功能嘅啫，因為硬件就只係個黑盒嘅啫，我嘅了解係啱唔啱呢？我係咪唔需要買一啲新嘅設備，先至可以得出呢個司機嘅分數呢？」個回答就係「你唔需要新嘅設備嘅，如果你係顧客嘅話，你已經係有我哋嘅盒，我哋只需要傾下有啲咩嘢嘅可能性，我哋可以畀一個新嘅軟件你嘅。」

「究竟全球係幾咁--即係呢個情況係有幾咁普遍呢？究竟喺全球係有幾常用嘅呢，即係用呢個嘅積分制度？」Kulis先生就話「根據我嘅經驗，係喺歐洲係幾常見嘅。而喺有一啲嘅地方，佢哋想係用一個簡單啲嘅制度，即係一個負面回饋嘅制度，例如一個簡單嘅警告，就係咁多嘅啫，因為我哋要明白司機亦都係要明白呢啲分數係點樣運作，如果你係用一啲比較複雜嘅計算，你係要培訓啲司機嘅。」

而陳律師就話「好喇，咁唔再講呢一個計分呢個制度。」主席就話「喺你繼續之前，如果喺一啲西方嘅一啲歐洲國家係非常普遍嘅話，佢哋係用啲咩嘢嘅數值去評核駕駛嘅行為係好定係唔好或者係普通呢？」「係一啲德國嘅公司，佢哋用嘅數據同我哋一樣，一啲基本嘅數值，例如係一啲超速、加速、減速，而另外佢哋亦都係會睇下司機係咪會比較克制，佢哋係呢一個係踩 brake 嘅時候。佢哋亦都係有分析佢哋嘅速度嘅變化，同埋呢個剎掣嘅情況嘅。」

主席就表示「基本嘅模式就係分析呢一個速度加速、減速，係咪？」回答就係「係嘅，而喺一個怠速嘅--如果有個怠速嘅情況，即係你係嘥緊錢嘅。呢個就係個基本模型。而喺呢個之上，或者亦可能會睇下佢哋會唔會係克制地去剎掣嘅情況嘅。」

Kulis 先生就喺呢一部分嘅證供入面即係係咪顯示其實係有呢一個就軟件提供，對你有冇任何嘅吸引力呢，呢一個嘅方案？即係而唔係話你超咗速，所以--即係呢個係一個比較負面嘅做法嚟嘅，相反就係用一個比較正面嘅做法，係會比較受司機歡迎。

梁健宏先生：佢哋嘅做法其實同我哋一樣嘅，我哋都係做緊同樣事情，我哋就以安全去睇嘅，純粹以安全嘅角度，去睇番佢邊啲 item 係需要計嘅，當然而家嘅黑盒 capture 到好多唔同嘅數據，包括佢嗰個耗油量，包括佢踩 brake，包括佢其他嘅情況，我相信有啲 application，尤其是睇番嗰個內容，佢講緊一個 commercial，講緊一個 truck transportation company，一個車長或者一個司機，嗰啲商業嘅車長、商業嘅司機，佢可能揸緊一架車，固定都係嗰架車，佢可以知道嗰架車嗰個表現，喺一個商業個角度嚟睇，個 economic 嚟睇，佢知道佢有冇 idling 太耐，佢知道佢會唔會唔死火，佢知唔知道佢冇熄冷氣，呢樣嘢係有用嘅，commercially。但係作為巴士車長，佢未必每日都揸嗰架巴士，佢未必全日都揸一架巴士，嗰架巴士亦都唔係一個車長揸晒，明天佢亦都揸第二架巴士，所以喺呢個角度嚟睇，有啲嘢如果你係點樣樣去評估嗰個價值，我相信就同而家我哋講緊嗰個安全就未必聯繫得上。

所以我覺得有啲咩嘢係要安全嗰部分我哋要攞嚟睇，我哋淨係最主要係應用到安全，如果你用埋其他嘅元素去再計，唔多唔少，我未必做到四日，可能要五日、六日或者七日。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺個螢幕上，就係我會顯示一篇嘅文章，委員會亦都係睇過，係7月16號嘅今年。你之前有冇見過呢篇報道呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想請秘書處去向下去顯示呢份報道嘅，就請你睇一睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢篇報道係舊年7月嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，係2017年6月29號嘅呢篇文章係，唔該主席。請問你係咪睇完喇？

梁健宏先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你見到佢哋有一個所謂嘅綠色路嘅一個監察制度，之前我哋睇到 GreenRoad.com，就係喺個謄本度入面有提及嘅，你有冇印象呀？

梁健宏先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你對呢一個 GreenRoad 嘅道路監察系統熟唔熟悉呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔熟悉。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係你對呢篇報道嘅--即係即時嘅反應係乜嘢呢？你覺得對於你哋公司嚟講，有冇價值呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊呢個獎賞或者花紅嘅制度？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀。

梁健宏先生：可以考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）到目前為止，有冇考慮過呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）未嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁所以你嘅反應就係你哋公司可以考慮嘅，係咪？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以重複個問題呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嘅反應係咪就係呢個係你哋公司值得考慮？

梁乃鵬先生：係，我確認我哋係可以考慮，我哋係會考慮呢篇報道嘅建議嘅，我可唔可以要一份嘅副本呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）當然，我哋係可以影一份畀你嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概係咁多喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，各位，我哋今日嘅工作就到此為止，我哋係好快就會係休會。如果可以星期五返嚟嘅事，我哋就會星期五去繼續，即係 10 號，我哋喺同一個地點度繼續嘅。

梁先生，喺我哋完結之前，你之前係進行咗一個嘅測試嘅駕駛，就係比較咗 50 同埋 70 限速區嘅分別，而 Openmatics 就係有採用咗一啲裝置嘅，委員會係希望了解多一啲嘅，呢個係有冇任何嘅文件紀錄，喺呢一方面。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）你係講緊個測試？

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你係相關嘅程序係點呢，就住呢啲車輛？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係會預備呢啲資料嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）希望有人可以用口頭作供，但係最好可以事前畀一啲資料我哋，等我哋係了解一下你哋嘅程序係點。

李澤昌先生：你嘅意思係咪星期五之前提供啲資料？

主席：（經傳譯員）係嘅，如果你可以嘅話，即係儘量提供你可以提供嘅資料，同埋係提供一個可以--即係提供可以口頭作供嘅人士，因為呢一個議題係會比較有

興或者有用嘅。歐陽先生係有一個問題。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我係想跟進兩個問題嘅，兩個問題都係同李先生有關嘅，今朝李先生係提到賠償嘅問題，管理層就係決定將呢一個嘅駕駛花紅就納入埋薪金度，你提到就會為車長帶嚟壓力嘅，因為嗰個花紅。之後你提到你係引入咗呢一個 20 分嘅制度，亦都係會有包括某種嘅獎賞，就住呢一個 20 點嘅制度會唔會為車長帶嚟任何嘅壓力呢？如果會嘅話，點解呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）我諗嗰個實際嘅獎賞對車長嚟講，佢哋認為佢哋值得去攞到嘅，因為係佢哋嘅薪水一部分嚟嘅，就算有個意外，關唔關佢事都好，佢需唔需要負責都好，呢個獎金就會係押後咗先畀嘅，就會製造一啲不必要嘅壓力，你可以想像到，如果嗰個獎金係佢哋嘅薪金一部分，咁咪每一年佢哋都有加薪嘅，就係根據表現加薪嘅，佢就覺得好似你攞走佢啲嘢咁樣，佢就想有啲係評核、有啲基準，話「好喇，你值得係有咁嘅加薪嘅。」或者你係--譬如話「你可以升一個職位嘅。」咁就唔同。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想講第二件事，就關於安全嘅。我都收到今朝有啲講法，就因為安全係最重要嘅，所有部門都要處理嘅，所以冇一個特別嘅部門處理安全問題嘅，過去一年，你哋個團隊有冇發現有啲部門係有啲誤會，以為其他嘅部門處理緊安全，而係實際上冇任何一個部門係處理緊安全？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）每一個禮拜一嘅早上，我本人同埋嗰個營運部嘅董事、其他嘅董事都會有幾個小時就坐低傾嘅，會講一講啲硬件問題、巴士或者係巴士司機嘅表現同埋設施、總站、車廠嘅問題，我哋係有一個團隊工作嘅，即係我意思即係話唔係話安全淨係講緊道路嘅問題或者淨係講緊巴士司機嘅問題。或者梁生可能有嘢補充。

梁健宏先生：好似嗰個車長咁，畀--啲乘客有啲衝突咁樣樣，咁要做一樣嘢去做，包括安裝 CCTV，包括裝嗰塊 protective shield，唔係淨係一個 department 做，亦都需要 procurement 去配合，所以唔係單單一個部門，亦都係需要工程部，需要 procurement，都要 finance，去整體去睇呢件事情，夠唔夠資源、要做得幾快呢？呢啲唔係一個 single department 就可以做。譬如話就住 CCTV retrofit 或者點樣樣，唔係一個部門就可以決定幾快、做唔做，係一個成公司嘅決定，點樣做起上嚟？亦都係全公司要配合，procurement 去幫手，要儘量去啲嘢可唔可以掌握快啲到，所以呢樣嘢在在都係全個團隊。

李澤昌先生：因為做嗰樣嘢嘅時候，你要係好 responsive，同埋要 comprehensive，你基本上係唔離得開個車個硬件、嗰班工程師、維修部門佢係咪真係可以配合到，當然喺個車務部亦都有佢嗰個需求嘅，仲有當然就係有好多 incident 你係唔離得開係--唔係--即係整體性、跨部門嘅。

歐陽先生： Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你，好喇，我哋會係暫時休息，休會直至到星期五上晝10點鐘再續會。

2018年8月7日

下午5時36分聆訊押後

Friday, 10 August 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WING BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG

(simultaneous interpretation used only where indicated)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Dr Leung and gentlemen. Thank you for returning to continue to give evidence. I'll ask Mr Duncan to begin questioning.

Dr Leung, is there something you would like to say first of all?

Statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes. Good morning, Mr Chairman. May I have two minutes, please?

Mr Chairman, I refer to the request made by Mr Duncan on Tuesday for the disclosure of part 2 and part 3 of our special committee's report dated 12 March 2018.

Mr Chairman, I have had the opportunity of studying both part 2 and part 3 of the report. I am satisfied that part 3 of the report, namely issues relating to bus captains, would not in any way prejudice the investigation conducted by the police. I also feel that the report should have been submitted to this committee sooner, so that the committee will have better

understanding of our recruitment, training and performance monitoring of our bus captains.

Mr Chairman, please accept my apology that part 3 of the report has not been submitted to you sooner.

As to part 2 of the report, ie the accident investigation report, I am of the opinion that it is not appropriate to disclose the contents thereof to the public. I am also of the opinion that such report is not relevant to the terms of reference of this committee.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for drawing to my attention the GreenRoad vehicle tracking system. I have directed the management to find out more about Tower Transit, the bus operator in Singapore, with a view to visiting them in due course to learn more about the GreenRoad vehicle tracking system.

Also, I have got inspiration from this news article that perhaps I should reconsider the award of safety bonus to our good performance bus captains. It doesn't have to be a significant amount, but some sort of recognition to our bus captains would serve to promote bus safe driving.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Mr Duncan, may I invite you to make enquiries into what Dr Leung has said to us now in relation to the parts of the report that are disclosed and are not to be disclosed, in view of what is said in the last paragraph of the letter that was sent to the committee on 9 August?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, yes, we will do that.

I think, Mr Chairman, if I might say, with regard to part 3, which we find now at page 377 of the KMB-1 bundle, it would seem to me, with respect, that part 3 really is no more than an introduction to or request for the details which we have already received at annex 5.

CHAIRMAN: So we have received annex 5?

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's right, we received that earlier. So I don't think there is any particular issue which arises with regard to part 3.

Part 2, Mr Chairman, I have heard your remarks and we will consider the matter accordingly.

CHAIRMAN: Because the likelihood is that part 2 contains material of different nature. We know nothing about what it contains. Opinions and views are irrelevant to the committee, but empirical data may well be relevant. I invite you to consider that and deal with the matter in due course, whenever you feel it is appropriate.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We will do that, Mr Chairman.

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued)

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and good morning, Dr Leung and gentlemen.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Good morning.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We have since the last hearing received two letters from the company and I would like to go to the second of those letters, please, which we will find at KMB-1 at page 297.

I wish to bring your attention, please, to the bottom paragraphs on page 297, where there is reference to item (2), which concerns the matter of the 29 sharp bends which were the subject of questioning on Tuesday.

The letter states:

"In respect of item 2 [which was the item requested], the following are enclosed as appendix B".

Then from (i) through to (vi), there is reference to a number of matters.

Ultimately, at paragraph (vi), this statement is made in the letter:

"a series of emails indicating that Mr Owen Eckford, the then operations director ('OD') did not endorse this safety enhancement programme."

I wish to explore that a little with you, please. In that respect, can I take you to the same bundle at page 309. At page 309 through to page 311, you will see

item 1 as the letter identifies it, which are described as "Meeting Notes for Review on Safe Speed Limit for Identified Sharp Bends". You will see that it's dated 31 July 2014, a meeting which apparently lasted for some two and a half hours and was attended by a number of people.

We can see the details of that for ourselves, pages 309 through to 311.

Then at page 312 we see item (ii) in your letter, as identified in your letter, which is a table which sets out details of the 30 sharp bends. That runs from 312 through to page 314.

Then at page 315, item (iii) is identified in your letter, a communication plan which had been referred to in the first item, the meeting notes. One can see the details of the communication plan, running from page 315 through to 316, with what might be described as very detailed proposals with regard to the communication of the plan, as it then was.

Then at page 318, there commences a series of photographs of the relevant bends. One can see those right through to page 351.

Then at page 352, we have item (v) identified, which is said to be, according to the letter, a draft safety speed card in contemplation in September 2014. We see

that card there at page 352.

Then finally, at (vi), from pages 353 to 355 we have the series of emails described in your letter as indicating that Mr Eckford did not endorse the programme.

I just want to pause for a few moments, if I could, with regard to the contents of these emails. They start, I think, with the email which can be seen on page 354. There's an email from Gary Wong, whose name has already been mentioned in the hearing as the head of the then safety and service quality department. It is an email sent on 14 August 2014 to Mr Edmond Ho, who I understand was the managing director of the company at that point.

Is it correct that Mr Ho was then the managing director?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: He was at the time, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When did he cease to be the managing director?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Roger should say.

MR ROGER LEE: He ceased on 1 January 2015.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That's when you began your tenure?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did he then leave the company?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: No, he stayed on as a non-executive director of the board until the last AGM, last year.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Back to the email, we can see it's from Mr Wong to Mr Ho, and I won't read out the email but if you go through it quickly, you will see that it informs Mr Ho and those copied on the email with what it described as the field operational tests on safe speed limits for 30 identified sharp bends and roundabouts having been completed on 12 August.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, before you move on, might I suggest you might read out the first paragraph.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Because there are some questions that might usefully arise, given that these are public hearings and it is difficult for the public to follow things unless they are given a context.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I understand, Mr Chairman.

Let me read the first paragraph to you:

"I am pleased to inform you that field operational tests on safe speed limits for the 30 identified sharp bends and roundabouts were completed on 12 August 2014 (Tuesday). Attached please find the Excel file showing the calculation of safe speed limits carried out by EO, validation of calculated safe speed limits performed by

DI of BCTS (SSQD's staff as observer) and the result of final review jointly conducted by EO, BCTS, depots, [Long Win Bus Company] and [the service and quality department]."

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, that might be an entry for the Guinness Book of Records for acronyms, but perhaps we can explore what these acronyms mean with the representatives of KMB.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Would you gentlemen be able to help us, first of all, with the reference to -- if we go back to those copied, first of all, Evan Auyeung DMD, what would that be?

MR ROGER LEE: He was the deputy managing director.

MR PETER DUNCAN: HR, would I assume correctly that's human resources?

MR ROGER LEE: That is correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: OD?

MR ROGER LEE: Operations director.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that a position that exists today, operations director?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that Mr Leung's position?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: DOD?

MR ROGER LEE: Deputy operations director.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And SSQ?

MR ROGER LEE: Safety and service quality department.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then in the substantive part of the email, the first paragraph, "EO"?

MR ROGER LEE: Engineering officer.

MR PETER DUNCAN: "DI"?

MR ROGER LEE: Driving instructor.

MR PETER DUNCAN: "BCTS"?

MR ROGER LEE: Bus Captain Training School.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I believe we've covered the acronyms in the first paragraph.

Is there then reference to the file which has been enclosed, the Excel file, at the beginning of the second paragraph; do you see that?

Does the email continue to say this:

"With respect to the theoretical calculations and validation of safe speed limits for the 30 identified locations where the risk of bus roll-over is deemed to be high, it would be very difficult for all concerned [bus captains] to remember different speed limits due to different turning radius of roadway curves. [Bus captains] can make errors (ie lapses of memory/memory errors) no matter how well trained ..."

And it's difficult to read but I assume that's "briefed they are".

"The consequences of such human errors can be severe if the BC [bus captain] gets wrong memory and drive the bus at a speed for what's that supposed not to be. This may lead to a serious 'bus roll-over' accident and the hazard presents significantly greater risk than other types of traffic accident. The risk is 'unacceptable' and cannot be tolerated. Therefore, we recommend stronger risk controls to minimise the intolerable risk caused by the human errors.

In view of above, we simplify the variety of safe speed limits into '15 [kilometre per hour', '20 kilometres per hour' and '25 kilometres per hour'] for the 30 identified sharp bends and roundabouts so as to make it easier to understand and remember. Based on the final review shown in the attached Excel file, the recommended safe speed limits are listed as follows ..."

You will then see a paragraph which is devoted to the particular limits.

If I pick it up again at page 355:

"The management of speed through appropriate safe speed limits is an essential element of road safety. As a rule of thumb, the recommended safe speed limits are not higher than the calculated roll-over speeds within the same depot area. Take for an example, if the [bus

captain] of KBD gets wrong memory and drive [s] the bus at a speed of 20 [kilometre per hour] instead of 15 [kilometre per hour, this may not lead to a 'bus roll-over' accident as the calculated roller-over speed limit for Hiram's Highway flyover to Clear Water Bay Road (shown in road section no 20 in the attached Excel file) 24.9 [kilometre per hour]. This principle can also be applied to other depots."

If I just pause there, "KBD" there presumably would be a reference to one of the depots?

CHAIRMAN: Is that correct?

MR ROGER LEE: Kowloon Bay Depot.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then to continue:

"To conclude, action [plans] are summarised as follows:

(a) Identify the locations of sharp bends and roundabouts where the risk of bus roll-over is deemed to be high; (Completed on 6 June 2014 for the first 29 identified locations)

(b) Calculate safe speed limits for all identified sharp bends and roundabouts based on technical assessment; (Completed on 27 June 2014 for the first 29 identified locations and on 13 August 2014 for the

thirtieth location at Pui Oi Interchange (Yuen Long direction))

(c) Validate the calculated safe speed limits by test drive; (Completed on 29 July 2014 for the first 29 identified locations and on 12 August 2014 for the thirtieth location at Pui Oi Interchange (Yuen Long direction))

(d) Review the safe speed limits based on the results of calculation and test drive; (Completed on 31 July 2014 for the first 29 identified locations and on 13 August 2014 for the thirtieth location at Pui Oi Interchange (Yuen Long direction)) and

(e) Develop communication plan so as to convey safety message on safe speed limits to all relevant [bus captains] (see the attached Communication Plan) and conduct speed checks."

Then there is reference to the file and then the email continues to say this:

"It is expected that the implementation of safe speed limits can take effect in October 2014 upon completion of action items addressed in items 1 [to] 3 of the communication plan."

The email which is addressed to Mr Edmond Ho, the managing director, and copied to a number of people, asks the managing director for his approval. So the

last entry is, "For your approval please".

We then see, at page 353, a response email from Mr Ho the very next day.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, Mr Duncan, one of the matters that the committee asked for in its letter of 8 August to the companies was the Excel soft copy, if it was available.

Has that been addressed in KMB's response?

MR PETER DUNCAN: My reading of the email is that it has been addressed, but I will ask the members directly.

CHAIRMAN: Can we have a direct answer? Were you able to locate this Excel file or not? If you would like to be referred to the question, I can ask that that be brought up on the screen. It's in the annex to the letter and it's at page 234, and is item 2. The general request made in the letter itself was if you've got them, please provide, and then this is the shopping list, as it were. Item 2 is the Excel soft copy and/or any hard copies.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We have it.

CHAIRMAN: And are you going to provide it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Chairman, I understand that hard copies have been provided to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: And by that, everything that's on the Excel soft copy we now have in hard copy? Do I understand you correctly?

MR GODWIN SO: We have printed out and provided on page 312 and 313. It's the print-out of the Excel file mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So if we go back, please, to the emails, at the bottom of page 353 there's a response from Mr Edmond Ho, which is addressed to Mr Gary Wong, the sender of the earlier email, and also to Mr Owen Eckford, who was then the operations director.

Is Mr Eckford still employed by the company?

MR ROGER LEE: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When did he leave the company?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: He left at the end of 2015.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did that coincide with Mr Edmond Ho ceasing to be the managing director?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Edmond Ho had ceased to be the managing director at the end of 2014/beginning of 2015?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Was the email copied to a number of persons, many of whom had been copied to the email from Gary Wong through to Edmond Ho? Do you see the ccs on

that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If we turn the page to page 354, does the response read as follows:

"Thank you and your team for the effort in coordinating this safety enhancement programme. Your proposed actions look fine with me. For formal approval, please ask [operations director] to check and endorse.

Many thanks!"

And there is a postscript to the message:

"By copy of this email, would [operations director] please check HSSQD's documents and communication plan, and then issue formal approval as you see fit. Thanks!"

Just to be clear, what is "HSSQD"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Head of safety and service quality department.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Thank you. The next email --

CHAIRMAN: At that time, was that Mr Gary Wong?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The next email with which the committee has been provided is one sent some time later, on

6 April this year, and it's from a person called Aman Fong TQD to Louisa Leung IA. The heading is the same heading as was contained in the two emails I've previously referred to, namely "Safe Speed Limits for the 30 Identified Sharp bend and Roundabouts".

Now, what is the position of Mr Aman Fong?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: She is a manager.

MR PETER DUNCAN: A manager of what department?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: She is a manager of training quality assurance department.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. And Louisa Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Louisa Leung is head of internal audit department.

MR PETER DUNCAN: This request -- the email reads as follows:

"Dear Louisa,

[Please] note.

Regards,

Aman."

Do you see that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It would appear that Louisa is being asked to note the emails to which I have just referred. Would that be a proper interpretation?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Nodded head).

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then there is a subsequent email to which the committee has been referred 11 days later, on 17 April, from Louisa to Aman, the same heading, and this time the email reads:

"Dear Aman

It was noted that Edmond Ho asked Gary Wong to obtain [operations director's] formal approval for the exercise. Did you receive any subsequent email that suggest Owen have given formal approval to Gary on this topic?"

We have at the top of the page then another message from Aman to Louisa in response and a one-word answer, "No".

So it would appear from that that no subsequent email was received.

I'll take you back, if I could, to the construction of these events as it appears in the letter, at page 297. The author of this letter seems to have concluded that Mr Owen Eckford did not endorse this safety enhancement programme, but the committee, as I read it, has not been provided with any document which positively says that Mr Eckford did endorse it or did not endorse it or may even have failed to consider it.

Is there any further information available to the committee within the company's records which would

assist the committee in understanding what happened, particularly with regard to the actions of Mr Eckford, after the email of 15 August 2014 was sent by Mr Edmond Ho?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not that I am aware of.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company searched its records with regard to what may have happened between 15 August 2014 and 6 April 2018 which, according to the information we have been provided, is the critical period? Has the company looked for this information?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you telling us that there is no written information available?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Let me put it this way. We have an internal audit unit. We have asked our head of internal audit to look at the safety and service department's work on such bends. The internal audit's report up to this date -- well, you have seen the relevant emails -- they are the information -- the latest information we have got.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We can take a look again but as Mr Lee says, that's all we have got so far.

CHAIRMAN: On its face, this is rather strange, is it not? The managing director of the company responds to the head of the safety department, he copies it to the

operations director, and he asks that he be asked to give formal approval, and the managing director doesn't leave the company for four months, at the end of the year, and you are saying that there is nothing that evidences the operations director doing anything, either endorsing it, not endorsing it? There's nothing at all?

It's a bit puzzling, isn't it? You agree? But you will look, will you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Owen Eckford left at the end of that year, 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Not the end of that year; it's the end of the following year.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Before he left, he didn't give any indication as regards this plan. I took up the safety section's work in April as the deputy operations director in 2015.

CHAIRMAN: I understand all of that. The only matter that I'm drawing to your attention is, on its face -- there may be some explanation -- when a managing director copies into an email the operations director, who is asked to give formal approval to what has obviously been an extensive research into a safety programme, and you tell the committee that there is nothing that evidences what he did, either way, endorsing it or rejecting it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) You might have noticed

that at that time, the MD, in replying to the email, mentions that it's subject to the endorsement of a communication plan. There was a communication plan worked out by us. Many officers of our companies talked to the bus captains in different termini. It was not warmly received. They had strong views, bus captains had strong views. I believe that's one of the reasons that the OD would have taken into account. Whether this was the cause of this rejection, it was not formally recorded.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did you yourself, Mr Leung, participate in those discussions with the bus captains?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Was this before your time as operations director?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Before my participation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So in that respect you are telling the committee what your understanding is of the situation?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there anybody in the group who was there in 2014 who can speak to what happened?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not in --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of the seven of you.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Somebody else.

CHAIRMAN: Well, if it's appropriate, and if you wish, Dr Leung, for that person to speak to the matter, we will gladly receive evidence from him or her.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Kelvin.

MR PETER DUNCAN: As a matter of interest, is Mr Eckford still resident in Hong Kong, as far as you know?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR KELVIN LEUNG: (Via interpreter) Thank you, Chairman. As I replied to some other questions in the previous meeting --

CHAIRMAN: For the record, please identify yourself. We know who you are but the record doesn't.

MR KELVIN LEUNG: Kelvin Leung, assistant manager of operations.

(Via interpreter) From Tuen Mun depot.

CHAIRMAN: This is a matter that you dealt with in your evidence before, is it not?

MR KELVIN LEUNG: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I didn't get a translation of that. Would you repeat your answer?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) I'm Kelvin Yeung, assistant manager of operations at the Tuen Mun depot.

CHAIRMAN: The question that you were asked by me was: this is a matter that you dealt with in your evidence before, was it not; and your answer?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At the risk of repetition, Mr Yeung, could you assist us as to why it might have been that apparently this plan was not carried through?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) At that time, I received a document which was shown in the PowerPoint. It showed the locations of the 29 bends and the suggested speed limits. At that time, I was involved in talking to bus captains in the bus termini. As part of my day-to-day communication with them, there was --

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just to interrupt you, what was your position at that point exactly?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) I was a senior operation officer. I was responsible for the Tuen Mun depot as well. So I went to the bus termini to talk to bus captains.

The message I received from them was that it was not feasible, the plan was not feasible; they could not remember the speed limits of different bends in performing driving. That would bring a lot of pressure to them. If they remember things incorrectly they might be subject to punishment. That's what they told me.

I also relayed the message to my supervisor at that time.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Who was your supervisor?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) The general manager of Tuen Mun depot, Mr Woo Kin Keung.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is he still with the company?

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) He has retired.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It is apparent from the material that the committee received that this plan was at some point discontinued; it was not carried out. Are you able to assist the committee as to who made the decision not to continue with the plan?

CHAIRMAN: And if you don't know the answer, don't speculate.

MR KELVIN YEUNG: (Via interpreter) I do not know.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Yeung.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Leung, if I can go back to you, do I understand there is going to be a further search among the company's records --

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: -- in order to assist the committee to find out who apparently made a decision to discontinue with this plan and the reasons for that discontinuance?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: As a matter of interest, would there not be, on the company's computer, copies of all emails sent or received by Mr Eckford in the course of his work at

the company in 2014? Would you expect that information to be available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I'm not too sure.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that's another matter that you could provide an answer to when you do this search, if those that would know what your record preservation system is could provide us with that information.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Leung. I am going to move to another topic now, but I am going to go back to one matter which was dealt with on Tuesday. This relates to the speeding report that we have been provided with, which we will find in KMB-9 at page 3993.

The translation appears at page 3995-1.

I think it was Mr James Wong who assisted the committee with regard to this report on Tuesday. There are just some matters I would seek some clarification upon, if I could, Mr Wong.

During your evidence on Tuesday -- and we can see this, I will just give you the reference for everybody's benefit; it's Day 12 and the transcript reference is pages 134 to 135 -- you provided the committee with thresholds relating to the generation of this report.

So breaking it up between the 50-kilometre zones and

the 70-kilometre zones, you told us that for the 50-kilometre zones, the report will capture those buses that were travelling at three different speeds and different durations. The first speed was speeds between 56 and 65 kilometres per hour for 30 seconds; then 66 to 70 kilometres per hour for 15 seconds; and then 76 to 79 kilometres per hour for 2 seconds.

Then we had a similar sort of breakdown for the 70-kilometre zones. The report would capture those buses which were travelling at, first of all, 76 to 79 kilometres for 30 seconds; secondly, over 80 kilometres per hour for 2 seconds. They are the thresholds that you gave us.

I also understand from your evidence that the black box was at that time not capable of identifying different speed limits on different roads in generating real-time alerts to the drivers. In other words, the black box could not tell whether the speed limit on a particular road was 50 kilometres per hour or 70 kilometres per hour, so therefore the threshold for the driver to be alerted was simply set at 75 kilometres per hour, and then you also told us that that had been reduced to 70 after the accident at Tai Po.

So is my understanding correct so far?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. One of the explanations given, I think, was that this was because, at that time, in fact before 7 June 2018, the company did not possess the digital mapping which was available through the Transport Department?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

With all that in mind, and going back to this report, if the black box data does not tell you whether the bus is in a 50-kilometre zone or a 70-kilometre zone, how is it that this exception report is able to distinguish or pick out a bus which is speeding above the limit in a 50-kilometre zone?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) This is exactly why we needed time in order to make available this report. We would know the additional information, but our depot would have to use another computer program to check whether that is a 50-kilometre zone or a 70-kilometre zone, so that we could know whether the bus was in a 50-kilometre zone or 70-kilometre zone, so that we would have this report which you have now, so that I can check which bus captain, at what time, at what location, sped.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly this report has only been prepared very recently?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) This is a report formulated on 1 May 2018. It was rather recent.

CHAIRMAN: By what means is the place at which the bus is identified doing a particular speed identified?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) At present, we look at the route of the bus. We, on our own computer system, have mapped the places for every route. How can we identify the location? We will look at the time, at the material time, and also the hourly speed of the bus. That is why this takes time for our staff to use the relevant software to tackle it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How long have you been able to produce this sort of report? Since when?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We started to have this kind of black box in 2013 and we already had this kind of report; we use the same way to do it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You said that this report was produced on 1 May this year. Were these sorts of reports being produced at the time of the Tai Po accident?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This report was done on 1 May, but then this type of report, this type of exception report, had always been produced. We started to have this kind of exception report in 2013, and we could know whether the bus captain sped in 50km or 70km zones.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How long after --

CHAIRMAN: Would you just give me a moment, Mr Duncan.

MEMBER LO: Can I ask you a question?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Sure.

MEMBER LO: Now, if the bus is speeding at 67.9, you should know that it was speeding beyond 50; right?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: So in your company record, you should have a record of this segment is set a speed limit of 50; right?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MEMBER LO: So you didn't need the TD's digital map to know that you have different speed limits for different sections of your routings?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) That is what we judged according to our own knowledge. So we judged which zone was 70km or 50km. Our staff had to do this manually that this particular section was 50km or another section 70km and we had to do it every day. If there are new road sections, we will have to update our own records, and if there are new routes or if there is diversion, we will have to update the records ourselves. This is what we have to do. Even if we have these speed limits for different road sections, we will still have to verify that with the black box data so that we know

whether speeding happened in 50km or 70km zones.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Maybe I can supplement. Actually, black box data will let us know the speed of the vehicle and the locations, but we will not know whether there has been speeding. From the start to the end of the journey, the black box will record the time at any X, Y, Z location and the speed that was used, and when this comes back to the company we have a system: knowing the speed limit of a particular road section, we superimpose the black box data on that, so we will know whether there has been speeding.

But it takes a long time because we have over 400 routes and you have two directions for each route and there are many, many buses running on these routes. That is why it takes a long time.

As to your second point, the black box is two systems. The black box company can use a physical map and they can take the speed at any X, Y, Z location. This is what they can do but this was not done at that time.

Secondly, the black box companies have suggested that if there can be a digital map, a live map, like the one from TD, if it has been installed, then the time could be much shortened. I think this is what Mr Leung was trying to say.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I can recapitulate. The black box that we can see, looking at it now, tells you the latitude and longitude. I think you call that X and Y.

MR ROGER LEE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: The latitude and longitude is what it's described by a short form.

That tells you where the bus is. At that point in time, because you get every one second a report of speed, you know what the speed of the bus is. The third step you take is to work out what the speed zone or limit is for that area.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So location, speed and then speed limit, and that is done manually because you hadn't found out about digital maps.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How many people have you been employing doing this manual job when it could have been done by digital map automatically?

MR ROGER LEE: 37.

CHAIRMAN: There's your cost-cutting.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just to clarify, at the risk of some repetition: when did the company start producing these sorts of reports, that distinguished between the 50 and

the 70 kilometre per hour?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We had it since an early time. I have been told by some colleagues that we started to have this in 2007, but at that time the black box data were not as detailed, and in 2013, with this latest type of black box, we gathered more data and therefore we can conduct a more detailed analysis.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, if a bus driver exceeded a 50-kilometre speed limit on the first of the month, when would the report be compiled in order for you to conclude that? How much later?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) At present, it would take four days for the report to be produced, and Mr Wong would have received the same report, and Mr Wong would deal with it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Previously, how long did it take?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Ten days, and in the more distant past, 14 days. In 2007, it would take even longer. At that point, the data from the black box were not transmitted through the server, and the physical downloading was required, so the time taken would be even longer.

MR PETER DUNCAN: This is what the 37 people have been working on?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Maybe more, if for

downloading of data, you will have to do it on board individual vehicles, so it may involve thousands of buses and many people at the repair/maintenance section. It's a very tedious task. So more than 70 people would have been involved. More than 37 people would be involved.

MEMBER LO: Let me ask a question. So this 14 days or four days' delay would prevent basically real-time operations; right? If a driver taps in using his ID and the record is put into the black box, so this information is instantaneous, there's no need to go back 14 days or four days to match it. Isn't that a very simple solution to fix it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct, correct, (Chinese words not interpreted).

MEMBER LO: Why isn't that done?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We are moving towards the same direction so we can have the black box data transmitted by the bus captain. One of the items in our submission to the committee is on this geo-fencing element. That is we will store the information of the bus captain in the black box as well. So we have a record pertaining to the bus captain and we will know on a second-to-second basis which bus captain is driving the vehicle.

CHAIRMAN: That is not done at the moment?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: The black box does not record the fact of the Octopus card of the captain logging on to take charge of that bus?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR ROGER LEE: That's why it takes at least ten days previously.

CHAIRMAN: If you can do it briefly, how is the identity of the bus captain established? You've got the bus number, you've got the speed, you've got the location, you manually work out the speed limit. How have you been and do you at the moment establish the identity of the driver?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It's not currently done, so we need to match the black box data with the terminus records, because through the terminus records we know which bus captain drove whatever bus in respect of whatever route at the particular time. Then we match the time of the records with the black box data, because the black box does record time, and then we know at a particular time that that bus was driven by a particular bus captain.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Simply put, you have some data from the black box and you have some records from

the terminus which is a separate system. Then we have the fleet management records. The terminus records are about the bus captains, the fleet management records about the vehicle, and then we would have to match the three sets of data to make the identification. So it takes a long time.

CHAIRMAN: Is the terminus record done automatically through a computer by use of the Octopus card of the captain?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes. That's one of the inputs.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I want to move slightly onwards now to another topic, not unrelated to this. That's the topic of real-time monitoring of the bus captains.

Just so it's understood what I mean by this, can I take you back to the evidence of the gentleman from Openmatics, Mr Kulis, which we will find on Day 6 at page 158.

That would be bundle 3, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could ask you to turn to line 14 on that page, where Mr Chan, counsel for the commission, asks Mr Kulis this question:

"Now if the data is capable of being transmitted and

received at, say, 5-second intervals, does your company provide the technology either in hardware or software to facilitate real-time monitoring of the data collected by the black box?"

And his answer is, "Yes".

Just to put this in context, you have told us at the moment, I think, that the data is provided at 30-second intervals, but it can be reduced down to 5 seconds? Is that a correct understanding?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Mr Chan continues:

"So let me see if I get this right. Your company supplies the black box, it collects the data, and the system is able to transfer that data, say, every five seconds, to a defined server?

Mr Kulis: Mm-hmm.

Mr Derek Chan: So as a supervisor, I'm sitting in my office, how do I monitor the driver, real-time? Do I need additional software, or does your company already provide the software for me to do so?

Mr Kulis: There are two options, we can provide our software solution, which consists of the Openmatics portal and additional applications on the server side. That is one option, but some customers they are

preferring just to get the data, and they have their own IT systems behind. In that case we are just the data provider and we don't care about the utilisation or operating of that. Utilising that.

Mr Derek Chan: In this case, KMB, is it the case that ZF only works as, as you describe it, a data provider, or are you aware of any more advanced use by [Kowloon Motor Bus] of your company's real-time monitoring capabilities?

Mr Kulis: I think in this case [Kowloon Motor Bus] is the customer, at the current moment, they are using their own IT system to handle the data and work with the data. But, yes, it's by agreement, we can also change it if we want.

Mr Derek Chan: I see. In your experience, how common is it around the world in terms of commercial fleet management for the company to monitor the driving behaviour of its drivers real-time? How common is that?

Mr Kulis: I think this is quite a common request. Both from the safety and economic reason, the companies usually want to monitor the drivers. In some countries there is the conflict with the law regulation and protecting the driver safety, like in the West European countries, sometimes it is not so easy to introduce monitoring system, but the demand is always there."

So that's the context in which I want to explore this matter a little further with you, if I may. I want to take it further firstly by referring you to KMB-4, at page 1202. This is an extract from the 2013 annual report. We have seen one of these before.

CHAIRMAN: Of KMB?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think the holding company, first of all.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And then Kowloon Motor Bus Company and in fact a number of other subsidiaries also of the listed company.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So if we look down the list of key corporate executives in the Kowloon Motor Bus Company, you will find the name of one Alok Jain, head of planning and development department. Is that a name which is known to some of you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We can see the position that he held at that time.

Are you aware that Mr Jain has provided evidence to the committee?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In that respect, I'm going to ask you to turn up, please, bundle FE-1 at page 40. In fact, the

document I wish to show you commences at page 39 of that bundle, and it's a submission that the committee has received from Mr Jain.

Have you had the opportunity of reading this submission?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Briefly, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If you have read it just briefly, perhaps I could bring your attention, please, to page 40, paragraphs 2 and 3. Perhaps for the benefit of others than you and me, I will read those paragraphs out.

Mr Jain says in paragraph 2:

"Real-time Operational Management (ROM) System was a by-product of installation and telematics devices on board the buses, which has been ongoing by the time I joined the organisation.

a. I was involved in many meetings and discussions about the technical specifications, features, technology selection and so on in relation to ROM right after I joined the company. I was not involved in discussions related to funding, tendering and project management. I also cannot remember when exactly the decision to implement was undertaken but was aware that project implementation was in progress. The primary reasons to implement the project were --

(i) Improve safety -- through real-time alerts and feedbacks to bus captains;

(ii) Improve fuel efficiency -- through enhanced driving behaviour and performance management; and

(iii) Deliver reliable bus services -- through active management of deployment and incident/disruption management.

b. There were extensive discussions on type of vehicle and driver performance parameters that will be monitored through this ROM system including their potential benefits. As the telematics data was still available even after the scrapping of the project, there was some level of monitoring but the real value of ROM system was 'real-time' and this capability was sacrificed. This was analogous to a port mortem ..."

I will leave out that sentence.

Then item (c):

"I was not much involved in the discussions pertaining to exact cost implications of the project but through meetings and discussions, was under the impression that the project was planned to deliver a positive ROI.

3. Many, if not the most, of the bus companies in the developed world today deploy same or similar functionalities as [Kowloon Motor Bus] had envisioned in

the ROM system. Even at the time when KMB was drawing up the plans, we were drawing heavily on the experiences from Seoul, Singapore, London and Munich. Media reports or company announcements from other cities have shown clear benefits of such systems in terms of safety, fuel efficiency and driver behaviour. In New Zealand [and the source is the GreenRoad.com website] bus companies achieved 4 per cent reduction in fuel consumptions and 81 per cent reduction in speeding infringements. Tower Transit in Singapore achieved more than 7 per cent fuel savings, and halving of 'incidents' of poor driving behaviour. Accidents from collisions fell by half, while accidents caused by bus drivers plunged by 70 per cent."

So that's the information that Mr Jain provided in writing to the committee. Mr Jain has also given evidence to the committee -- I will simply give you the reference in the bundles; it's transcript bundle 8, and on this topic --

CHAIRMAN: I think it's bundle 3, is it not?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I see. It's Day 8 -- bundle 3, I beg your pardon -- and it runs for some pages, 81 to 98.

By the way, have you had the opportunity of reading that evidence, Mr Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, in Chinese.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. So I won't take you through it, but it amplifies what Mr Jain had said in this submission, which was to the effect that the company had considered a project which would involve real-time monitoring, but according to Mr Jain, that project was scrapped.

So what I would like to ask first of all is: do any of you recall discussions pertaining to the possibility of real-time monitoring?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) ROM means real-time operations management system. It's not a real-time monitoring system.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So it doesn't live up to its name?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It is an operations real-time management system. It is about bus operations management. It has nothing to do with driving safety.

MR PETER DUNCAN: First of all, was there a real-time monitoring system considered by the Kowloon Motor Bus Company at some point, referred to by Mr Jain?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This is what we have now. This is the on-board driver's alert and driver's feedback. On board buses, there is a real-time alert to bus captains.

(In English) Speeding, when he applies brakes suddenly or with sudden acceleration.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. Are you aware that the company at one stage considered the type of system that Mr Kulis referred to in his evidence?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I had knowledge that there was this intention. I knew about it and I also asked ZF that we should have real-time alert to bus captains, that there should be a two-directional communication in order to have real-time alerts sent to bus captains about their behaviour. But at that time, the starting point is not about safety but about keeping distances between vehicles. This is just really for bus operation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So you can see what Mr Kulis has referred to, and that's the concept of somebody receiving information, seeing that a driver is speeding or seeing that he's braking sharply or that he's accelerating, and then making instant communication to the driver as to his driving behaviour. That's what Mr Kulis is referring to.

Has the company had a project to consider that sort of facility?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Never?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Never.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So your understanding of what Mr Jain was

saying in his letter and his evidence, what is your understanding of what he was referring to?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I believe he was talking about our real-time operations management system.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think, in that case, I will have to refer you to some of Mr Jain's evidence explicitly.

Could I refer you, please, to Day 8, bundle 3 of the transcripts, at page 86.

Can I bring your attention, please, to line 9 of page 86.

CHAIRMAN: May I suggest that we begin at the top of the page, because this might explain the marriage between the two, the bus grouping and another use that might be made of the data.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman. So we go to line -- is Mr Chairman referring to page 85 or page 86?

CHAIRMAN: You might begin at page 85. I think that puts it into context.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

So line 2, Mr Leung, at page 85, Mr Jain says this:

"So until then, a lot of data in [Kowloon Motor Bus] was residing in silos in individual departments. They were collecting -- for example, engineering information was available in engineering, operational information

was available in the operations department, and they were all in different systems. The plan was to put this all into a single data warehouse and create a single version of truth.

Chairman: What use was to be made of the data contained in this single data warehouse?

Mr Jain: So there were three stages. The first stage was to establish the static, what is real, what is happening on ground. The second stage was to put into some level of modeling, where we could use it for planning purposes, in short term. And the third objective, eventually, was to take it into a predictive level, where we could apply statistical tools and do some forward projections.

Chairman: What use was to be made of the first step, the real-time?

Mr Jain: That was primarily for management information purposes, as well as for any investigations, reporting, so on and so forth.

Chairman: Investigations into what?

Mr Jain: For example we used to receive a lot of passenger complaints about services, we could go back and look into the data and verify that information.

Chairman: So if the complaint had been made that the bus had been driven at an excessive speed and braked

harshly, could that be investigated by analysing the data that had been put into this single data warehouse?

Mr Jain: Potentially, yes.

Chairman: That's a response to a complaint. Was there any plan to use the data proactively?

Mr Jain: So the second stage was where we went into real-time operations management system, because once we built the data models on the historic data we could translate the similar level of information and analyse on a real-time basis, and the idea was of course to monitor the whole operation on a real-time basis using what we normally call an exception management, where anything that goes beyond the threshold of normal operation you start to actively manage it.

Chairman: How was it envisaged, if it was, that this approach could address the manner in which a bus was [being] driven?

Mr Jain: For example, if any bus that was being driven beyond the parameters that were set as normal operation, then it would raise an alert, and normally the companies, or examples that I have seen around the world, they use this green, amber, red approach. So green is normal operation, anything that goes on the outlines of threshold boundaries it starts to raise the alert [is] an amber, and then of course once it crosses,

it is a red alert. So at that time some intervention is necessary.

Chairman: Was it envisaged that this alert raised by a parameter being breached could occur real-time?

Mr Jain: The intent certainly at that time was that."

Now, that's the passage that I was referring to. What sort of system do you understand Mr Jain to be referring to in that respect?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This is not in our present system.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that something which you understand to be the equivalent of the real-time monitoring system that Mr Kulis was referring to?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What's the difference?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) ROM is real-time operations management. It is about deployment of buses. This has nothing to do with driving safety of bus captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It would seem that Mr Jain understood it differently. Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I agree.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When he says that the project, as he understood, was scrapped, do you recall a project being

started but then being scrapped?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It was never scrapped. This project started in October 2014. It has never been terminated. It's ongoing.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In that context, just to be absolutely clear, what do you say "this project" is?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This is about the real-time operation management system by using the black box and the availability of real-time location information, so that we can be more efficient in bus deployment.

CHAIRMAN: In what way?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For every route, the buses at different locations, frontline people, including the regulator, the officers, will know the locations of the buses at any time. When there's traffic congestion, some of the buses might be stuck in certain location. Such information will allow us to do a better deployment, because we would know that some of the buses might not be able to return very quickly, so deployment can be arranged in a more efficient manner.

That's the core of the facility of this real-time management system which would facilitate the work of our officers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just before we take a break, if I could

return to Mr Kulis and what he was referring to in the earlier passages to which I brought your attention. That's Day 6, page 158, the same bundle 3.

Are you there, at page 158?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I brought this to your attention earlier, but at line 25, Mr Chan is asking him questions about this situation:

"So as a supervisor ... [sitting in his office monitoring the driver real-time] ..."

And implicitly in that, if he sees a problem, communicating with the driver, he says, "You need to change the manner in which you're your driving", that sort of system.

First of all, that sort of system is quite different, is it not, to what you had just been adverting to?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I don't want to confuse terms. If I could refer to that as "real-time driver monitoring". Mr Kulis has referred to the fact that this is quite commonly used in other parts of the world. Have you seen that in his evidence?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is this something which Kowloon Motor Bus

has given consideration to?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What is its position with regard to this? Because obviously Kowloon Motor Bus does not apply this system at the moment. What is the company's position?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not practical.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So you have considered it and decided against it; is that the position?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you explain to the committee why it is not practical?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It would mean a lot of pressure for bus captains, and we may not have a system that can deal with so many bus captains at the same time. We have also consulted ZF and Openmatics, and the conclusion was that it was not practicable.

CHAIRMAN: When were these consultations?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) They were some time ago.

CHAIRMAN: Try and help us a bit more than that. When?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It is not very formal discussion. We did talk to them, especially to Openmatics.

CHAIRMAN: When?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It is not by me. My

colleagues discussed the matter with them. We were aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: Who?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I can't recall now.

CHAIRMAN: Let me give you some time to recall while we take a break.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: We will take a break for 20 minutes.

(11.36 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.58 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Leung, do you have any further information for us as to who it was who spoke to Openmatics on this issue and when that was?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I asked my colleagues to try to understand the situation. It was proposed that a supervisor could use a software to monitor the performance of each bus captain. We found that it was not practical. We will not take this further. We talked to ZF about another thing. In other words, having one supervisor watching over bus captains, we think that is not practicable because we have 4,000 bus captains. We cannot have that number of supervisors to

watch over 4,000 bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: What did you talk to ZF about?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Our design with ZF was how to transmit the real-time data to our company and how our company's data can produce real-time maps of where our bus captains are at any time so that we can have more efficient real-time operations management. That is the objective of designing the ROM at that time.

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: When were these discussions?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It was in 2013. When we started to install black boxes, we were aware of how these black boxes would function.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I would like to supplement here to what the operations director has said. There are two views on how to manage the fleet real-time. One is that there would be a central management system knowing how the vehicles are doing on the roads and then a central control room can communicate with the bus captains so that the buses would be at a suitable distance from one another to ensure smooth operation.

But there is a big problem here. The real situation on the ground, unless you have very accurate information about the road conditions with a lot of CCTV monitoring the journey, because we are not a railway company, and

the communication with the bus captain would be a problem because they are already facing a lot of pressure on the road. So that's a worry.

Now we have the data, and then at the back end we have the TER system, involving the regulators, the frontline staff at the bus termini. These people know the road conditions on the ground. When the bus captain reaches the terminus, of course the staff there know to what extent there has been a delay, then maybe something has to be done to catch up. It's more people-oriented as a management approach.

Bus is different from railway. It would be difficult to have a central control system to manage 4,000 bus captains on the roads. But the data provided by Openmatics can facilitate the work of the back-end operation, but it is not about a system of managing 4,000 bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think we've got that point; you have made it about three times.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr Lee, I am sorry, but I had the impression before the break that with regard to the real-time driver monitoring system that Mr Kulis was talking about -- I had the impression from you that somebody in the

company had spoken to Openmatics about that. Are you saying that that has actually not happened?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We did discuss with Openmatics about their black box. As regards the software that would enable a supervisor to manage the fleet, that was not discussed and we will not consider doing that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So you have decided against a real-time driver monitoring system because it is not practical?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) If we have a system whereby a supervisor would be monitoring the bus captains, we are of the view that it is not practicable. If you take a look at ZF's reference to Western countries, and then also for safety or commercial reasons some of them have done this. We have had some internal discussions. It's about whether we can retrofit some vehicles to do the same, for example vehicles to transport the coins or fueled vehicles, we will consider whether those can be refitted to do the same.

But we are not talking about buses, and he was also talking about much smaller bus companies, not the bigger ones like us.

CHAIRMAN: Who is "he"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It's in the evidence,

the representative of Openmatics.

CHAIRMAN: I see. You are referring to Mr Kulis, are you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm sorry to have to go back to Mr Jain's evidence, Mr Leung, but with regard to the project that he described and in respect of which you seem to have a different understanding from Mr Jain, were you involved in that project to which he refers?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I need, I think, to take you to another part of his evidence, at Day 8, which will be in bundle 3, and this time at page 89.

Before I take you to the evidence, perhaps you could just describe to members of the committee what your involvement in this project was.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This project was considered in 2013. I was responsible for bus maintenance at that time. I participated in some of the presentations. It's because of the availability of black box as a technology to help the company to develop the bus operations. At that time, the company also engaged a consultancy firm, and some recommendations were made to KMB. I was responsible for managing people in maintenance and repair, but I was also involved in

some of the presentations and I knew about the concepts behind and how real-time information could be made use of to facilitate operations.

After I took over as operations director, I knew the relevant programme in much more detail, and in 2016, when I formally took over as head of operations, I knew that there was a real-time operation management system which was ongoing. I realised at that time that there were real-time maps to show the locations of buses which would facilitate the deployment of our fleet. It was in January 2016 when I took over as head of operations.

At the same time, I realised that the project would involve another function, that is a substitute for TER, a substitute of the function of the TER system. The TER is about the operations at the bus termini. When a bus captain arrives, he would report for duty and start the driving duty and then when he returns he also reports to the terminus and we will know the time of arrival and then the regulator can do the deployment duties based on the information collected.

One of the proposed ROM functions was to replace the TER, in that there will be a central control room to remotely deploy bus captains and assign duties to different routes and to adjust the headways, the frequency of service, and also to receive reports from

bus captains regarding breakdowns, accidents, and matters relating to passengers. Under the proposed design, it would be centrally managed.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Leung.

I want to bring to your attention, please --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan, before you pose that question -- Mr Leung, in the course of your answer, you said that the issue of the availability of black box data was considered and consultants had been engaged. What were they asked to do?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) He was asked to look into service delivery and service enhancement and to make recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: Would that include avoiding, for example, bunching up of buses? Is that what he was engaged for?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It's consultant services for operations transformation.

CHAIRMAN: But dealing with service issues like bunching up of buses?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

The portion of Mr Jain's evidence to which I wish to bring your attention, Mr Leung, is at page 89 of the

transcript, Day 8. I think you have that in front of you.

At line 14, Ms Wong, counsel for the committee, asks this question of Mr Jain:

"Is it the case that throughout the time you joined the company until the time you left, you were involved in this ROM project?

Mr Jain: I wouldn't say until the time I left, but during that period when it was being discussed as a part of implementation process, yes, I was involved in the project very actively.

Ms Wong: And I notice in (i) of that paragraph (a) you stated that the primary reasons to implement the project were to improve safety through real-time alerts and feedbacks to bus captains.

The feedbacks to bus captains, can you tell us whether it is intended to be real-time feedback or a reactive feedback to bus captains after the complaint has been received.

Mr Jain: There were two things that happened. The idea was to develop a two-way communication system between the bus itself and the operation control centre, and the bus drivers were supposed to have what we call a DDU, driver display unit, and through this DDU there are two ways to intervene with a driver. One is done at

the bus level where the bus, you can pre-programme the parameters that bus -- any time transcends, it creates an alert for the driver.

The second level of alert could be triggered by somebody sitting in the operation control centre. Let's say, for example, if a bus is running too fast, but still within the speed limit, and the on-board device does not detect any anomaly. However, at the OCC, a supervisor detects that on a particular section the bus driver, probably because of weather conditions or because of any accident or road conditions, they should be driving slower, then a supervisor can technically intervene and alert the driver or remind the driver to go slow in that section.

So there are two levels of interventions that can be done.

Chairman: On the second intervention, that is the supervisor in the OCC, how would he communicate his intervention to the driver?

Mr Jain: So we had many options being discussed at the time. We were talking about just a display system. The second was we were also talking about an audio system.

Chairman: So there were two possibilities. One was through the display system or otherwise by audio?

Mr Jain: Well, display was almost there, and audio was considered as an additional possibility.

Chairman: Was audio going to be by radio or by some other means?

Mr Jain: Primarily by radio, or even 3G communication. We had not gone that far, I think, at that time.

Ms Maggie Wong: You mentioned there were many meetings or discussions about this ROM features. Can you recall if there are minutes or documents recording what was discussed?

Mr Jain: There were a lot of presentations, if I recall, and there were e-mails post meeting summarising what was discussed, the key agenda, or key tasks to be [borne] by respective people. But as formal minutes, as we know them, I cannot recall if they were prepared."

Now, you see that evidence, Mr Leung. It would appear that Mr Jain's description of the project is totally at odds with your understanding of the project. Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any idea of any project that was being undertaken in the company with regard to the type of response to the drivers to which Mr Jain was referring?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Right now we don't have any such project going on. At present, the ROM does not have this function.

CHAIRMAN: You were asked about at that time, when Mr Alok Jain was in the company. Was there any such project going on that you are aware of, perhaps not the one you've told us about?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Jain at line 19 on page 91 has referred to "presentations". You also had referred to presentations, I think, in your evidence earlier, with regard to the same ROM project. Do those presentations still exist?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I have to find out.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would be grateful if you could look further into that, so the committee can view presentations, emails, and so on, regarding the ROM project at the time that Mr Jain was at the company. Could you have somebody explore that for us?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just before we leave this --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: In that context -- this was a matter that arose

earlier -- would you provide us with information as to the company system of the preservation of these kinds of records? Mr Duncan has already mentioned the preservation of emails, but of other records. In this case, we are talking about presentations. Could we have some information about what the company policy is? Not necessarily now but when you come back to us.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I would like to add one point. With regards to ROM, we do have the entire ROM proposal for October 2014. We have it here. It talks about what the ROM is for. Some parts are about using the central control room to replace regulators, but it was not done because I thought that it was not practical. And it was not discussed by the board of directors.

So if you are talking about the ROM, the information is here. What the ROM is, it is here. I can submit it to the IRC so you will know what the ROM is. As I was saying, ROM is real-time operations management system, which has nothing to do with driving safety.

CHAIRMAN: We understand your evidence. We also have Mr Alok Jain's evidence, and clearly he speaks about what you are talking about, but he also speaks about another allied use of the data. The data is generated for one purpose but could be used for another. That's

what we are asking about. But we will happily receive the material that you have.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Just before I leave this topic, Mr Leung -- and I'm talking about real-time driver monitoring, you understand; that's the system that Mr Kulis was referring to -- I understand your position, that you say it's just not practical. What I do want to have clearly understood is how far the company has looked into this.

You mentioned some discussions with Openmatics but with regard to other sorts of vehicles. Has the company undertaken any study at all as to how this system is engaged, for example, in Western European countries as per the evidence of Mr Kulis?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Let me answer the question. Yes, on Tuesday, we said that some colleagues went to Northern Ireland to learn about this, and talking about Openmatics and real-time systems.

In the past, when bus captains drove, they knew whether they were speeding, and today, when the speedometer points to 70 kilometres, he will be reminded. At present, Openmatics and our company are doing a study. There will be speed limits set on the map; whether it is 50km or 70km, it will be seen. In

other words, on the dashboard, there will be an audio alert if there is speeding beyond 50km or 70km.

This was started on 31 July. That is, a trial was started. And on the day before yesterday, we submitted papers to explain to you that this was being done.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. That covers speed. What about excessive braking, excessive acceleration, other aspects of the driver's behaviour that might constitute unsafe driving?

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me, are you putting your question in the context of real-time information?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, real-time driver monitoring.

CHAIRMAN: May I invite you to rephrase it with that included?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly.

Has the company taken any steps in respect of real-time driver monitoring with regard to matters other than speed, specifically matters such as harsh braking, excessive acceleration?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Today, on board the buses, sudden acceleration and harsh braking are already subjects of alert sent to bus captains. We already have it today. But in this past period, we discovered that apart from Openmatics, passengers should be alerted as

well because we have found that apart from elderly people, young people may be using their handphones and they may have accidents caused to them when there is sudden acceleration or harsh braking.

We have done a lot in order to avoid those accidents. My colleagues, say along Cheung Sha Wan Road, we have done something to distribute leaflets there to remind people that they should not concentrate on their mobile phones when they travel on buses.

As for Openmatics, we have done something as well and we are working on geo-fencing. We are testing it out on our fleet. But this is a little complicated, because the vehicle itself has a speed and then the black box would identify the location of the bus and what the speed should be, and number three, it is geo-fencing. This will feed the information back to the vehicle. This is electronic. Say, for example, the brake, the gas pedal, and how this is controlled -- well, we are going in that direction.

We can give you supplementary information but this is being done.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I think we understand that, Mr Lee, and thank you for that. But my question is specifically aimed at the system that Mr Kulis was describing, where there is active supervision within a central control

unit of a driver's speed and other aspects of his driving.

I have asked Mr Leung about that and he says, "No, it's not practical; it's been considered and we are not doing it."

My question is what investigations, if any, has the company conducted with regard to how that system is incorporated in other jurisdictions and whether, therefore, it might be suitable in Hong Kong?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Let me say something else about this issue. Technological advance is such that if we can have data to know whether a bus captain is speeding and if the information can be seen real-time and can be transmitted real-time and so we can identify the bus captains -- well, we will be able to take care of all the problems we thought we might have. So it depends on technological advance. We hope technology can help us. That is why now we have the 30-second interval. We hope it will be reduced to 10 seconds and maybe down to 2 seconds, 1 second. This is about technology. We wait for this to happen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I don't think you have answered my question, but I conclude from that that you have done very little about what I had asked about, because you believe there are better ways of achieving it through

different technology. Is that a fair summary of the situation?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) What I mean is if technology will allow us to have real-time monitoring -- you are talking about monitoring -- not real-time assist or real-time alert but real-time monitoring, that someone can be watching over the bus captains. Just now we talked about Western countries where a supervisor will be watching over a bus captain, for safety reasons, for commercial reasons. But talking about our buses, we have 4,000 of them. 90 per cent of the bus captains are competent and safe drivers. Do we have to have 3,999 people watching over 4,000 drivers? That is a technical issue.

If technology can help us, say two persons can watch over 4,000 bus captains and if every bus captain drives well, then I will be embracing that system.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So because of those matters, the matter has not been explored; is that the situation? You have simply concluded it is not practical so it would be a waste of time exploring it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We have an open mind.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm sorry but when you say you have an open mind, is it something that is on the table for your consideration, or have you concluded that it's just

not practical?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) At that time, the decision not to do it was based on the fact that it was not practicable, but later on, if there is a practicable real-time monitoring system, we will be very happy to adopt it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: But it is not something which the company is currently considering; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For the time being, we cannot see a practicable solution. If there is one, we would be very happy to adopt it immediately.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Lee, a few moments ago, mentioned the matter of passengers on the bus. I'm going to move to an aspect of passengers. That's the question of passenger behaviour on your buses.

I think you are aware that the committee has heard that it is a daily occurrence almost that your drivers will be subjected to verbal and sometimes even physical abuse. Is that a fair summary of the present unfortunate situation?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Let me respond to this question. Yes, indeed it is.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to ask you, please, to turn to bundle KMB-1 at page 203.

At this page, we will see a letter from the committee to the company, dated 20 July this year. If I could remind you that the letter seeks further information with regard to physical assaults on bus captains. In paragraphs 2 to 4, which you will see on page 204, you are requested to supply details pertaining to five particular assault cases. Do you see those references?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I can see them.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If you then turn to page 212 of the bundle, you will see the response from the company, and the number of statistics relating to assault cases which occurred between the period of January 2015 to 22 July 2018.

At page 218 -- I'm looking at the translation -- you will see particulars of the five cases to which the committee have referred in its letter. Those cases having existed -- the dates were all in the month of April of this year.

Are you at page 218?

MR PATRICK PANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Of those five cases, if we look at the "Penalty/Imprisonment" column there, we see that the first two are classified as "Not pursued by police", and we see the last referred to as "Still under

investigation".

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At items 3 and 4, we have the defendant having pleaded guilty in each case, and having been fined $3,000 and $1,000 respectively.

Are you aware that the maximum term of imprisonment, maximum term of sentence that a magistrate can award for a case of common assault is a fine of up to $100,000 and imprisonment for six months? Are you aware of that?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It would be fair to say, would it not, that in the light of those maximum sentences, these particular sentences seem to be rather light; would you agree with that?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I agree.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is this something of a problem that -- is this seen by the company as something of a problem, the lightness of these sentences?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) This is, to us, one of the problems and one of our concerns.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I wonder, please, if you could look at page 293 of the same bundle. This is a translation of a document which you will see, I think, around about page 286.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I can see that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Reading from the translation at page 293, is this a letter which is dated -- you can see the date under the signature of the Kowloon Motor Bus legal department -- 8 March 2018, under the heading, "Multiple Cases of Assault on Bus Captains"?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it addressed to the police force and in particular to the Commissioner of Police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the second paragraph of the letter read this:

"In May last year, we wrote to the Police expressing that our bus captains had been assaulted one after another. Upon considering the relevant cases, we found that certain offenders not only committed the offence of common assault but were also likely to be in violation of section 13A(1)(c) of the Public Bus Services Regulations ... no passenger or intending passenger shall wilfully do or cause to be done with respect to any part of the bus or its equipment, anything which -- (i) obstructs or interferes with the workings of the bus or cause damage: or (ii) causes injury, discomfort, annoyance or inconvenience to any other person.

As such, our company had specially sent our staff to the police station to provide evidence for the following

cases, and requested that the Hong Kong Police may prosecute the suspects in accordance with section 13A of the Regulations (the relevant statements are attached herewith for your reference) ..."

And the various cases are set out. I pick up the letter again on page 294:

"Subsequently, our company had written to the Hong Kong Police to enquire the developments of the above cases, but were told by the Hong Kong Police that the offenders involved in the cases were only prosecuted for common assault (the relevant letters exchanged with the Hong Kong Police in respect of the cases ... are attached herewith).

Recently, when our company met with the frontline bus captains, the captains have repeatedly indicated their wishes that the Hong Kong Police would strictly enforce section 13A of the Regulations to warn people who affect bus service operations, or even the offenders who attack our staff.

In this regard, we now earnestly request that the Hong Kong Police do, in future cases of assaults on bus captains, seriously consider charging the offenders under section 13A of the Regulation, in addition to the charge of common assault. Our company will definitely cooperate with the Hong Kong Police to offer our

assistance. If you have any enquiries concerning the above matters, please feel free to contact our Counsel ..."

Then at page 296 do we see the response from the police dated 17 May:

"I acknowledge receipt ...", the first paragraph, then the second paragraph:

"Regarding the follow-up action of the meeting with your company on 28 March, you are hereby notified that the division has notified the regions in writing to remind the frontline staff to be fair and professional when handling the cases of assault or harassment of bus captains, and shall understand the nature of the case and the injury of the injured to properly categorise the case and seriously consider whether Public Bus Services Regulations ... of the Laws of Hong Kong should apply."

A few questions arising from that correspondence, if I may. First of all, with regard to assaults on your drivers, have the police instituted any prosecutions since 17 May this year?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Not that I'm aware of.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So we don't know as yet whether the police have heeded the request to charge under the regulations; we have yet to find that out?

MR PATRICK PANG: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: But do I understand that to date that has not been the practice at all?

MR PATRICK PANG: Sorry, you mean prosecution under 230A?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) From the records of the company, I would say there has never been a case invoking Cap 230A for a prosecution.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you aware that the maximum penalty provided for by the regulations is a fine of $3,000 and six months' imprisonment?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I know that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So what is the point of asking the police to prosecute under a section which carries a maximum penalty less than that for common assault?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The company is of the view that in respect of cases like common assault, the investigation by the police is a difficult process. If Cap 230A is invoked in the investigation or in the prosecution, it would be relatively easier to prove the offence or the offending act.

We also hope that those who abuse or attack our bus captains, those passengers would be made known that there is this regulation, Cap 230A, in regard to passengers' behaviour, and it doesn't take physical abuse or physical contact to constitute a breach, and

the spirit behind Cap 230A is that the behaviour of passengers can sometimes go against the law.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So are you of the view that it would be easier to establish an offence under the regulations than it would to prove common assault?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I think we have to leave this question to the police, but as a public bus service provider, since we have a piece of legislation which is there to protect the bus company and our frontline colleagues, then why don't we try to use this regulation to institute prosecutions?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to ask for that regulation to be pulled up, just so that we understand exactly what it contains. The regulations are in the bundles.

CHAIRMAN: Whilst that's being done, Mr Pang, the offence is wider, is it not, under the regulation? The conduct that it catches is wider?

MR PATRICK PANG: Yes, Mr Chairman.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think we've found them, Mr Chairman, at THB-2, page 132.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So 13A(1)(c), which is the regulation you have in mind, reads:

"No passenger or intending passenger shall --

...

(c) willfully do or cause to be done with respect to any part of the bus or its equipment anything which:

(i) obstructs or interferes with the workings of the bus or causes damage; or

(ii) causes injury, discomfort, annoyance or inconvenience to any other person."

Is that the regulation you have in mind?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just going back to the question of assaults, have you at any stage asked the police to bring to the attention of the magistrates the prevalence of this behaviour of passengers?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, we did, Mr Duncan. That is why, on 28 March, Mr Leung, our head of the legal department, myself and another colleague responsible, another manager, responsible for traffic accident and investigation, we initiated to go to the police headquarters to meet with a chief superintendent and his superintendent. We discussed for an entire morning, to express what our company and other public bus operators are concerned about.

At that meeting, we gave a lot of figures to the police, because we felt that if you just looked at the figures, we would be concerned.

Allow me to use a little time. With regard to

assault on bus captains, in 2017 there were 35 cases only, but in 2018, up till 27 July, there were 41 cases already. We could see that the situation is deteriorating. That is why we hope the police could seriously conduct in-depth investigations into such cases, so as to allow our bus captains to drive in a safe environment.

CHAIRMAN: Are the figures that you gave the chief superintendent at this meeting the same figures that you've given us for those periods, 2017, 2018?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman, on 28 March, our figures were only up to the month of March but --

CHAIRMAN: We are aware of that. But in other respects, were they the then current figures that we've got?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That is correct, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Did you give them the same data, in the same format, that we've got?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I should have done so.

CHAIRMAN: And did you go back -- because we asked you to provide these figures -- as far as 2015, in the figures you gave the police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, we did.

CHAIRMAN: One looks at those figures. No one has been

imprisoned in all that time, have they?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That is correct, according to our records.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What sort of response did you receive from the police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) At that meeting, on 28 March, I could see that the police were also concerned. The chief superintendent promised at the meeting that he would issue guidelines to the frontline policemen to first allow them to seriously investigate into all alleged assaults, and he would remind his frontline staff to see whether there would be cases where Cap 230A could be applied for investigation and prosecution.

MR PETER DUNCAN: By bringing these matters to the attention of the police, what were you trying to achieve?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Our objectives are simple. We don't want our frontline bus captains to continue to be subject to excessive abuse. This is our objective.

Or, Mr Duncan, if you would allow me, Mr Chairman, to respond to your question: actually, common assault and Cap 230A -- now, why do we also want to bring in Cap 230A? Please allow me to cite an example.

CHAIRMAN: It's obvious, looking at it. It's very wide, is it not?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Chairman, can you please allow me to mention a case which is very recent? If Cap 230A was applied, our bus captains' work would be made more safe and more efficient.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Please do so.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The case happened on 29 July. I can tell you the gist of what happened. It was around 11 pm. Four male passengers who were in their 20s boarded a bus. They did not pay the full fare. At that time, the bus captain asked them to pay up the full fare, but the four men did not pay any regard to the bus captain. The bus captain continued with his driving because there were other passengers. When he was at Festival Walk and Yau Yat Chuen, where passengers disembarked, these four men also wanted to disembark, and then the bus captain asked them to pay again.

The four men paid no regard to the bus captain and they disembarked from the bus. Then the bus captain -- at that time, the engine was running but the bus captain suddenly found that the bus broke down; the engine was in an off position. The bus captain immediately alighted from the bus and he saw the four men running

away. The bus captain suspected and in fact he heard some kicks against the bus body, and the bus captain suspected that, one, the men switched off the "off engine" button near the end of the bus body, but the four men ran away, and since there were passengers on the bus, the bus captain boarded the bus again and re-started the engine and then he continued with the journey.

Then, about 15/20 minutes later, after he went to the terminus and then he went back to the traffic light at Tat Chee Avenue in Yau Yat Chuen, the bus driver stopped because of the traffic lights, and then suddenly the bus company discovered that the engine was switched off. Then, from his rear view mirror, he saw those four men again. The bus captain alighted from the bus again, and again he found that the engine button was pushed so it was switched off, and then the four men ran away; he could not apprehend them. The bus captain immediately informed our inspector on duty and reported to the police.

After the police came on the scene to understand the incident, that policeman classified the case as "dispute". The bus went back to the depot and that was it for the day.

I would like to point out that cases like this one

showed clearly, very clearly, that Cap 230A could have been contravened, but in the end, the case was just classified as "dispute".

I therefore very much hope that in protecting the personal safety of bus captains and in ensuring the provision of efficient service to the public, I really hope and I do earnestly hope that the relevant authorities can seriously consider applying Cap 230A.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you asked the police to bring to the attention of the Magistrates' Courts the prevalence of the behaviour to which your drivers seem to be subjected? Have you asked them that?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Absolutely, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have they done that? Have they stood up in court and said to the magistrate, "This is a very prevalent offence which we think requires a deterrent sentence"? Has that step been taken?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We did say this to the police, but, Mr Duncan, I hope you understand, with regard to 2017 and up to 22 July 2018, there are altogether 76 common assault cases against bus captains, but only ten of those were convicted. Six were resolved and seven were not pursued by the police. Another one, the police said they issued a verbal warning. So there

were ten convictions.

Whether the case officer of the police told the court about the seriousness of the offence or whether the magistrate meted our sentences according to the mention of seriousness of the case, I don't think I can answer that here. Perhaps you can ask the police whether they did it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you considered taking this issue up with the Secretary for Justice?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Whatever we can do to protect our bus captains, we will do. We have even considered if we can bring follow-up civil claims in these cases, and also to inform the public that such cases seriously affect bus operations and safety.

CHAIRMAN: Could you answer the question?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We haven't thought about talking to the Secretary for Justice, at this time.

CHAIRMAN: What about the Director of Public Prosecutions?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) No, not at this moment. We don't intend to do this now. We hope by talking to the police we can achieve what we want.

CHAIRMAN: In view of the time, if that's convenient, Mr Duncan --

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: -- we will take the lunch adjournment and we will

resume at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, gentlemen.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Good afternoon, Chairman.

Gentlemen, I wonder if you could have in front of you, please, bundle TD-2, at page 1.

Here we have a copy of the Public Bus Services Ordinance. If you could go through, please, to page 58 of the bundle, you will see there section 36, which is concerned with the question of by-laws. Subsection (1) of section 36 states:

"Subject to this ordinance and its franchise, a grantee may make by-laws for all or any of the following matters ..."

And we see them set out -- (a), (b), (c), (d) -- and (e) has a number of subparagraphs; and there are also subsections (2), (3) and (4) on the following page.

Of particular relevance with regard to the discussion we were having before lunch is perhaps (1)(e), in that a grantee has the power to make by-laws for the purpose "generally as to the conduct of passengers while using grantee's buses".

The question is: has KMB passed any by-laws?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has it ever considered passing by-laws?

MR GODWIN SO: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company given any consideration to whether the passing of a by-law may offer some assistance with regard to the current situation that its drivers face with regard to passenger behaviour?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) My understanding is that if we are to pass by-laws, then the company will have the responsibility to enforce the by-law. We need to consider whether the company has got the resources, the capability, to do so.

Moreover, in the case of contravention of the by-laws, when it does take place, do we have staff on site to deal with it immediately? That's our consideration.

Currently, what happens is that Cap 230A is being enforced by the police, they have the resources, they are professional and that's much better than the case of a franchised bus company.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So does the company have any intention to consider this aspect?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Not for the time being.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We have received evidence from the company

that in some buses, cameras have been installed to assist the detection and hopefully the prosecution of offenders.

Could I take you, in that context, to KMB-1 at page 82. We can see the question that was posed by the committee, as follows:

"Is there any customer services training provided to bus captains to equip them with the relevant skills to handle difficult passengers?"

The company's answer, which was contained in the first of the submissions, included the following, and I'm referring to the third bullet on that page:

"Apart from training, we have taken the following measures to assist [bus captains] in handling difficult passengers:

...

-- Surveillance cameras, including forward-looking cameras and a camera covering the driver seat, have become standard features on all new buses since 2015. Up to February 2018, surveillance cameras were installed in 2,319 KMB buses and 146 [Long Win] buses. The remaining buses will be equipped with surveillance cameras phase by phase. Surveillance cameras capture the behaviour (with audio recording) of difficult passengers. It will protect the interest of [bus

captains] in subsequent investigation by the police or legal proceedings."

So my first question is: have these cameras resulted in evidence which has yielded successful prosecutions against offenders?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: According to what I have just read out, 2,319 KMB buses have had the cameras installed. That leaves how many at the moment without cameras?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) As of now, almost 2,800 buses are equipped with the cameras. The entire fleet is 4,300.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Among the KMB buses, about 1,800 are not yet equipped, and then for Long Win, 70 to 80 buses haven't got the CCTV cameras.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have there been occasions when the drivers themselves have endeavoured to capture these unruly passengers by use of their mobile phones?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Bus captains are not allowed to use their own mobile phones while they are driving.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I suppose while they are driving it is pretty obvious why that would be, because of the effect on their safety. What about when the bus is stationary, are they permitted to use their phones in those

circumstances?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We do not allow bus captains to use their own recording devices to carry out the recording.

MR PETER DUNCAN: One of the witnesses who gave evidence from the unions to the committee -- I will simply give everyone the reference; I won't go to his evidence, but it's at Day 10, pages 128 to 130 -- was effectively complaining to the committee that bus drivers were not allowed to use their phones.

CHAIRMAN: Did he say phones or cameras?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think he mentioned cameras.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because there's a distinction, is there not, between the kind of camera that one often sees in taxis and a camera on a telephone?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I will rephrase that.

One of the union representatives, I think it was from the Monthly-rated Drivers Union, stated that some of the drivers wanted to use a camera, but there was a circular which had been issued prohibiting such use. Are you aware, first of all, of that evidence?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there a circular?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We do have it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I wonder if that can be provided to the

committee, please.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes. May I explain the reason?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) My understanding is that as far as the Commissioner of Personal Data is concerned, he has got guidelines concerning the use of cameras to collect personal data, including images. First of all, there must be a notice to tell others that they are being captured on camera. There must be an intention policy.

Moreover, if someone would like to get the information, there should be guidelines as to how to deal with that, and if it is no longer of use it has to be destroyed.

For individual bus captains, if they are to set up their own CCTV on board, I don't think they have ways to ensure that they can meet the three guidelines that I have just referred to.

As far as the company is concerned, the company can do so. Clearly, there is a notice to say that there is a CCTV on board and the bus company has the policy to retain or retrieve the images already captured.

So we won't stop at 2,400 buses as I referred to. Before the end of the year, 90 per cent of the buses

will be equipped with the CCTV facility. For the remaining 10 per cent, they are not getting it for the moment, and but then they will be retired from the fleet in the coming year, 16 to 18 years old, they will be replaced by new buses.

In other words, within the year, all the buses will be equipped with the CCTV facility.

CHAIRMAN: So the rights of privacy transcend the rights of protecting your own safety; is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We have to strike a balance.

CHAIRMAN: It's not your balance; it's a legislative balance, isn't it?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is this something on which you have taken legal advice?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I think the guidelines are clear and comprehensible. For this circular, by this circular, we do not allow the bus captains to have install their own devices, but I can't answer this question because I hadn't joined the company at that time. But surely I can ask for advice again, because there is still time before the end of the year.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has it been a matter which the company has raised with the privacy commissioner?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You had discussions with the privacy commissioner?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No, I mean I have read the guidelines and the guidelines have already set out those points.

CHAIRMAN: Have you raised with the privacy commissioner whether or not the use of cameras by bus captains, who intend to record people abusing them or physically assaulting them, would contravene the legislation.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No, I didn't.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to move to the matter now of protective shields for the drivers. In this respect, could I ask you to turn, please, to page 62 of KMB-1.

In one of its answers in its initial submission, the company said the following:

"In response to increasing number of assaults against [bus captains], we have taken the following measures ..."

And the third-to-last paragraph:

"We will install a protective shield near the driver's seat starting from June 2018."

Has that process started?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And what sort of numbers now of buses have installed the protective shield?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) 1,500.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What is the intention with regard to the remainder of the fleet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We will complete the installation by the end of the year.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want to take you to another bundle, miscellaneous number 2, at page 913.

At the right-hand-bottom corner, do we see one of the installed protective shields?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Who was responsible for designing the shield?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Our engineering section.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Who was responsible for manufacturing the shield?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It was designed by KMB itself. It is procured by KMB. We carried out the installation and we submitted it to the TD for approval, and upon their agreement they were installed in June.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When you say you procured these, you procured them from whom?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) From an overseas supplier.

MR PETER DUNCAN: From which country?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I don't have the information on hand.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Would you be able to obtain that information?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Please provide that.

Was this design based on protective shields that one finds elsewhere in the world in buses or not?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For other countries, especially those in UK, might not be suitable for us. First of all, our buses are air-conditioned, so the design cannot be a full enclosure. For our bus captains, they are not covered to their left. So the design offers protection to the bus captains on their left. You might see that there is an opening which could be -- allows the shield to be opened. That's why we designed our own shield, to offer protection to our bus captains, and hopefully they are happy with the design.

When we carried out the design, there were some teething problems during installation and we are dealing with these. In some cases, the magnets were loose, and we found out a way to carry out the installation properly. There were views that there is light reflection and we served to solve that as well.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you aware that representatives from two of the unions have indicated to the committee that they are not entirely happy with the design?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I received comments from some unions on this issue. There was dissatisfaction. I also received some views from unions that we should speed up the installation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I will simply give you the references and then I will take you through the issues which seem to have arisen. There was a representative from the Motor Transport Workers General Union who gave evidence on Day 9. If you want to see his evidence, you will find it at pages 33 to 36. Then on Day 11, there was a representative from the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions who gave evidence, and that can be found at pages 150 to 151.

CHAIRMAN: Also of Day 9?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Sorry, that's Day 11.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you read that evidence, Mr Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I should have.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I am not asking if you should have, if you have.

I will just take you to it quickly. First of all, Day 9, bundle 4, page 33.

If you commence to read to yourself from line 18 on page 33, you will see reference to the installation of a protective shield. Then, at the top of page 34, I bring your attention to this:

"It may look to be some protection, but the opening of the shield is very big, it is not easy for you to switch it on and off, and it is very reflective and then there is a magnet at the very tip, and while the bus is moving there may be noise."

There seems to be three complaints in that sentence: reflection, the magnet, and noise. Have those complaints been communicated to the company?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is anything being done about that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We dealt with most issues and we are dealing with the problem of reflection.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So reflection remains an outstanding issue; correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct, but our intention is to protect the bus captains. As for the reflections, the shield is located on the bus captain's left, and normally we feel that this would not affect the bus captains in their driving, but we are still looking to get around the issue and hopefully we can

improve upon that.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, I would like to add something. The reason for installing these protective devices in June was that, as I said before the lunch break today, in the year 2018, the number of assaults on our bus captains rose sharply, which was why our management felt that this issue should be dealt with immediately. Therefore, in terms of design, procurement and installation of the device, we made a decision within a very short period of time.

After installation, we realised there were some teething problems. For example, the magnets might be too tightly attached. And when bus captains get on or off, in an environment with a high light contrast, there might be reflections. However, some bus captains strongly welcomed our decision.

As I said, our bus captains were victims of assaults and we felt we had to address the sentiments of our bus captains. We hoped the police would make more prosecutions and we would speed up the installation of CCTVs. Apart from installing the protective shield in April, next to the driver's cabin we also put up a warning message, saying that disturbing the bus captain is a criminal matter or a criminal offence. We try to offer a safe driving environment for our bus

captains.

That said, we are still rectifying the protective shield in order to do even better. For example, for reflections, is there something we can do? On each bus, we have an arrival reminding device, and on that device we added a message that if our bus captains are disturbed, we might stop the vehicles. And with our bus captains being disturbed or possibly being disturbed, we hope to do something for our bus captains, in order to help them.

Apart from these protective devices, the arrival reminding device and the slogans, our legal department has also been very down-to-earth in offering help to assaulted bus captains. For our frontline inspectors and terminus supervisor, they are offering plenty of support to our captains. If a captain is assaulted, our inspectors would arrive on site immediately and they would accompany our bus captains to a doctor, and our legal department colleagues might take statements from our captains if necessary. So these are things we are doing.

So in terms of protecting our bus captains, I feel that our company has a responsibility, and I hope that the police would offer as much support as possible. We have a string of measures in place.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Pang, could you provide the committee with a photograph of the warning that you say is being displayed on buses, and also the warning, if it's in visual form, about the bus captain stopping the bus if there is a disturbance?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, it is certainly possible. For the reminding device, the bus captain would have a button to press. So let's say if the next stop is on Nathan Road or a certain building or park, when the captain presses the button, it would show that the bus captain is being disturbed. I would offer that photograph.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The arrival reminding device, is that something in writing or is that audio?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Both.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If you turn up, please, miscellaneous file 2, page 913, the photograph we had open before.

Are you able to see the warning device in that photograph, the warning sign?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, yes, indeed, there's the sticker we have put up: it is a criminal offence to cause nuisance to bus captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

With regard to these issues that the representatives

from the union raised, what is the current situation between the company and the unions? Are the unions supportive of what you are doing? Are they objecting to what you are doing?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, are you saying that whether they are in support of the installation of the protective shield, or are you referring to something else?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm referring in particular to the problems which they identified: the magnets, the reflection, the noise, and so forth, which you say are being addressed. What's the status of the communication between you and the unions on these matters?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) They are aware of the fact that the company is in the process of dealing with the problems. They are satisfied. But of course, in future, as to what the end product will be like, we will not just talk to the trade unions. We will also listen to the views of all the bus captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can I bring your attention, please, to page 35 of the transcript that you have in front of you. That's Day 9. There's another issue which one of the representatives raised at line 7. There was concern that the protective shield might affect the sight line of the bus captains, and that they cannot see clearly

the getting on and getting off of the passengers. Is that something which has been communicated to the company?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, let me answer your question like this. I also have a driving licence for buses. I had experience of getting on board a bus with the protective shield. For the driver's cabin, to the left-hand side we have the protective shield. For this protective shield, it is transparent. Unless we have a major contrast in terms of the lighting, the sight line would not have been affected substantially.

But of course we do appreciate individual bus captains may have concerns and therefore, in the course of it, we tried to modify the protective shield. We are working on it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you satisfied yet that the protective shield will not materially affect the sight line?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Well, I won't say it would affect substantially, but of course, in the past, there was nothing at all. Now you have got a transparent plastic panel to your left-hand side. As far as habits are concerned, maybe bus captains may find they are not yet used to it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I wonder if you can pick up now, please, file KMB-1 again, at page 83.

Perhaps just before I leave that subject of the plastic protection shields, when was consideration first given to the installation of the shields?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It was July last year, 2017. There was an increasing number of bus captains being assaulted. So we decided that we had to act on it, to help the bus captains, and in fact some bus captains did make such a suggestion. So it was last year that we started to think about it and we started to have our own designs.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, let me give you a response. From my contacts with the bus captains, I think the majority of them are happy to see that the bus company has taken a step forward. But of course, as to whether we can fine-tune the details, and with hindsight, if you put this question to me, of course we could have done better. However, at least we have taken the first step. When we have taken the first step, there will be a second step. By the second step, we are here sourcing some materials which can avoid the problem of reflection, and we will try to see if we can source another magnet.

What I want to say is that, after all, we need to make the first step forward and for the bus captains at the front line, they are aware that the company has

taken the first step.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I understand that the company, in the context of bus drivers, has to deal with something like seven different unions; is that correct?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) For the time being, we mainly communicate with two trade unions, but in fact we do communicate with every colleague via different channels.

CHAIRMAN: In the capacity of trade unions, two unions who constitute 90 per cent of your bus captains; is that right?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And when you communicate with the others, it's not in any capacity as a trade unionist; it's as an employee?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Well, we don't count the capacity. Other than the two unions I have referred to, for each bus captain, we do have a channel for them to speak up, and we will also take the initiative to listen to them. Say, for example, as Mr Pang has said, our depot officers, inspectors at the front line, and even Mr Pang himself, are regularly at the depots and at the terminus during the course of duty, and after they have knocked off will listen to them.

We have got a JCC, joint consultation committee. It holds meetings on a monthly basis. We listen to the suggestions of the bus captains as far as work is related, and if the suggestions are relevant and appropriate, they will be taken on board. This is a regular arrangement.

CHAIRMAN: The question was simply this. I'm sure you understand the question. Do you deal other than with the two main unions you have described as unions, not as bus captains but as unions?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And which unions do you deal with then, other than the two main ones?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman, in our company, we have two so-called major unions. In addition, we have also liaised with the other so-called unions. Say, for example, in this hall, we have got Mr Kwok Chi Shing, a retired bus captain. He is sitting right here in the audience. I have personally talked to Mr Kwok for more than two hours.

CHAIRMAN: If my memory is correct, you told him that you'd deal with him as a bus captain but not as an unionist. That's why I am raising the question, not you personally, the company.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) In my context, whether

somebody is a union member, that's not the main reason.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thanks, Chairman.

I think we actually have a list of the unions on a slide. I wonder if that can be brought up, please, just while we are on this topic.

We see there the names, I believe, of seven unions whose representatives have given evidence to assist the committee. Which are the two major unions?

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the two major unions that KMB deal with?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Well, you are showing the English name. I think it should be the Motor Transport Workers General Union, the KMB branch. Is it possible to show the Chinese names of the unions?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly. We will arrange for that and bring it up later on.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, perhaps Mr Chan could just deal with that orally.

MR DEREK CHAN: The Motor Transport Workers General Union, the Chinese for that is "(Chinese spoken)".

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, right, that's correct. That's one of the two.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I think it is now being displayed in Chinese characters for you.

And the other one?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It so happens that I found the submission. KMB Workers General Union.

CHAIRMAN: What is the reference page number for the submission where this is dealt with?

MR GODWIN SO: TU-1(A), page 130 to 131, and their submission is 133.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Could that page that Mr So has referred to be put up on the screen, please.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So did I understand you to say that 90 per cent of the bus drivers belong to one of the unions?

CHAIRMAN: One of the two unions?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It could be one of the two unions or one of the seven unions.

CHAIRMAN: No. My memory -- it's either in a submission or in oral testimony -- is that it was identified that KMB dealt with two unions.

I see Dr Leung nodding. If someone can find me that

reference, then we can put that up.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman. We will find that and come back.

Did I understand you to say correctly -- would it follow from what you have said that it is just about 10 per cent of the drivers who do not belong to any union?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) First of all, each captain can take part in more than one union, so the total might not equate to our total number of bus captains, at 8,600.

As for the number of members cited by each union, the information is provided by the unions themselves, but we would judge whether or not the numbers cited are reasonable. According to the numbers reported by the two unions, they make up about 90 per cent of our total number of bus captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly that those two unions that you've identified are the unions that you deal with most?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Correct, but may I add something?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) As I said, some bus captain do not belong to any union, so on the request of unions

we would discuss some matters with them. But regardless of which unions they belong to, we would listen to our staff and we would consult them actively.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, if I understand you correctly, what you are saying is that your contact with the bus drivers is sometimes directly and is sometimes through the unions?

MR GODWIN SO: Correct, but both simultaneously happen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, I had directed you towards page 83 of KMB-1.

CHAIRMAN: Are we moving to another topic?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, we are.

CHAIRMAN: Before we do that, can I ask that KMB-1, page 218-1, be put up on the screen.

You will see at paragraph 2 there was a request that -- in paragraph 3: Please provide a copy of what is called the "CCTV brief finding report".

That related to the document that is at page 218, two of the five cases in which KMB described what had happened, and it's cases 3 and 4 where there is reference to that phrase, "CCTV brief finding report".

Have you provided us with a copy of that?

Can you give me the reference?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

You may turn to page 300.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

The question I wanted to ask, arising out of this issue, is: in your experience, how good is the quality of the video and audio recordings when it comes to examining verbal or physical assaults on bus captains?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman, I can say that the quality of the CCTV recordings are adequate to identify the persons involved. So the quality is acceptable. It can also help the police roughly identify the assailant.

CHAIRMAN: And what of the audio track in capturing, for example, the verbal abuse that might lead up to the physical assault?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman, it depends on how far you are from the microphone. Usually, sound from the driver's cabin can be captured.

Chairman, I want to add that each bus is equipped with nine CCTV cameras. So the CCTVs do not just capture the driver's cabin. They can capture what happens elsewhere on the bus as well as what happens outside. We have a total of nine cameras.

CHAIRMAN: Are there occasions when you transcribe what is captured on the audio track so that you can present that to the police, or do you leave that to them to do?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) It's not just for

assault cases. For traffic accidents, et cetera, we would submit CCTV footage to the police.

CHAIRMAN: I'm asking about the audio track. Do you ever transcribe that so that the nature of the abuse can be identified, or do you just hand it over to the police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Usually, we will send the whole set of information to the police.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the CCTV?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes. We would submit both the video and audio recordings to the police.

CHAIRMAN: The second matter that is dealt with in that schedule of those five unfortunate cases on 4, 5 and 6 April -- page 218 of KMB-1 -- the second issue is the provision of information coming from the Octopus card used by the passenger.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's case 1; do you see that?

Now, case 1 was marked as not being proceeded with, "No further action", despite the fact that KMB had already provided the police with Octopus card records of the assailant.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Had the Octopus card records been provided to the police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) For this case, I think

we had submitted the records. But, Mr Chairman, I want to stress that if the Octopus card was not a personalised card, if it was non-personalised, the follow-up work might be difficult. However, if the card carries an identity --

CHAIRMAN: We understand that, because we have asked the police about the information that is obtainable.

In your letter, which I think is at page 297 of KMB-1, in the reply to this letter of request, the second paragraph, you refer to case 1 and you say this in the last sentence:

"In or around end of April 2018, we had a telephone conversation with the police concerning the Octopus card records and informed them to collect our written reply."

Were they collected? Try "yes" or "no" on that, if you can.

MR PATRICK PANG: No, they didn't come and collect.

CHAIRMAN: Did you then supply them to the police, "yes" or "no"?

MR PATRICK PANG: No, but --

CHAIRMAN: By all means explain, but what happened was the Octopus card information never reached the police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) This is an assault which happened in Tin Shui Wai. As I recall, since I was on this case personally, in early April we received a fax

from the police, requesting the Octopus card records, and on 24 April we had the letter ready, and we also had the Octopus card records ready.

Our colleagues followed the guidelines. Since the police faxed a memo to our company we had to verbally ask them to send someone to collect it themselves, or else we would not be able to identify the identity of the sender.

We made a phone call to Tin Shui Wai district of the police; we asked them to come and collect the reply. But the police never came and the letter is still with us and the Octopus records are still with us.

So that's what happened, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Since you were personally involved in this case, what was the nature of the assault?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I remember that on B1 station, it is a cross-boundary route, it involved a male bus captain, it was in Lok Ma Chau.

CHAIRMAN: What was the nature of the assault -- a punch, a bottle on the back of the head -- what was it?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Please give me some time. We have too many of these assault cases, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please take your time.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, just while that's being

looked for, Mr Chan has brought my attention to page 101 of bundle 1 --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: -- in regard to the 90 per cent representation, and he suggests that that may be the evidence to which Mr Chairman was referring, paragraph 4 on that page.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is what I had in mind.

Yes. Nature of the assault.

MR PATRICK PANG: Mr Chairman, it should be page 216.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just tell me the nature of the assault, that's all.

MR PATRICK PANG: The bus captain was pushed onto the ground and then sustained injuries to his hip and the head.

CHAIRMAN: And any medical treatment?

MR PATRICK PANG: I'm sorry, it doesn't contain any medical checkup, et cetera, et cetera, here.

(Via interpreter) It's not indicated here. I'm sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN: What I'm concerned about is that the ball has been allowed to drop between the police and KMB, involving one of your bus captains pushed to the ground and injured on his head and his hip, and the situation, you tell us, is that the information on the Octopus card is sitting in an envelope in KMB. How does this happen?

MR PATRICK PANG: Mr Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: If you are trying to protect your bus captains, how does this happen?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman, I did ask this question, when I became aware that the Octopus card records are not been collected. It was the end of last month that I became aware of it. So I'm sorry, perhaps the follow-up work should have been done better. I think that's the case, that it should have been done better.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Pang, am I correct in thinking that you were formerly a gazetted officer of the Hong Kong Police?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Is this something that both in your current job and with your former occupation you would be able to deal with so that the information does get where it should get?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Certainly, I can do that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I was asking you now, please, to turn to page 83 of KMB-1. The question that you were asked and to which you responded in your initial submission was:

"Is there any counselling service provided to bus captain [s] in need?"

The second bullet answers that question in the following way:

"A task force comprise KMB's deputy operations director, depot heads, head of training and quality assurance department, head of communications and public affairs and manager, talent acquisition of human resources department has been formed to look into enhancing the provision of emotional support for [bus captains] and frontline staff. The task force will engage a professional consultant to provide a comprehensive review of the current practice and make recommendations in areas including but not limited to recruitment, assessment on [bus captains] emotional intelligence and stress tolerance, training, counselling and performance management. It is expected that the recommendations will be implemented phase by phase to address immediate concerns."

Could I ask, firstly, when was that task force formed?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Around about the end of May of this year.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And what prompted its formation?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Duncan, this is an initiative from me,

because when I learned that our bus captains are often abused, I thought that we should seek professional advice on how to handle the situation and how to offer, in particular, counselling service to our bus captains in need of counselling.

I happened to learn from the vice-president of the Chinese University that they had previously offered consultancy service to the police some years back, during the occupation movement, and I thought that this might be useful to our bus captains who are often abused by passengers. As a result, because we are a utility company, we have to invite tender from different interested parties, and in the end the Chinese University of Hong Kong was selected. I did not take part in the selection exercise, to avoid any conflict of interest, because I happen to be the council chairman of the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

They are now working on a proposal that hopefully will assist us in the recruitment exercise and to offer emotional support to our bus captains, if in need. That's basically how it comes about, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Can I ask you please to refer to page 229 of this same bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move to that, Dr Leung, can you assist

us if you have any indication so far as to how it is that you might be assisted by this advice, professional advice, in the recruitment of bus captains?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Basically in the recruitment exercise, they will make an assessment of the emotional attributes, if I may use the word, of any candidates. So basically their advice would be in assisting us in the assessment of their emotional attributes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I ask you please to go to page 220 of bundle 1. At page 220, you will see a letter from the company to the committee, dated very recently, 6 August, and it refers to the action plan for implementation of the key recommendations.

You can see that action plan commencing from 221, and what I wish you to do, please, is to turn to page 229. At page 229, can we see reflected, first of all, on the left-hand side of the page, the position at the initial stage of this psychological support proposal? Is that correct? Does that show the initial proposal?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then, in the middle of the page, do we see the action plan with milestone dates as at 10 April?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Correct, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are we then provided, on the right-hand

side, with the current situation, which I will read out:

"The consultancy team from the psychology department of a local university was appointed on 31 May 2018. In June 2018, the team has kicked off its review of the current practice in relation to the provision of emotional support through visiting depots, BCTS and hotline centre, and meetings with deputy operations director, depot staff, zone heads, driving instructors, recruitment team and employee relations team of HR department."

"BCTS" would be?

MR ROGER LEE: Bus Captain Training School.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Continuation:

"In July 2018, the consultancy team has shared their initial observations with the task force. Both parties have worked out the general approach in delivering the project and the key activities in the coming months, namely to set up some focus groups to collect views directly from [bus captains] and frontline staff on their needs in terms of psychological support and wellbeing, to plan the training of driving instructors which was scheduled to start in September 2018, to further review the recruitment process so as to maximise its effectiveness, and to develop supporting activities

for building a balanced and healthy work life."

Are you able to provide any more information as to when the results of this enterprise are likely to bear some fruit?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) According to information from CU Hong Kong, the project is ongoing. Soon, we are going to make arrangements to let bus captains of different experiences and frontline staff members to form focus groups so that zero Hong Kong can understand the stress of frontline staff as well as the difficulties that they face. According to our plan, we are going to carry out a questionnaire/survey for all frontline staff of the company so as to find out further from them about the difficulties and then CU Hong Kong will formulate a programme so that we know how to tell bus captains ways to ease their stress, and it will start with the driving instructors of BCTS.

The instructors will soon be given courses so that they know how to relieve their work stress, so that they can in turn teach the bus captains.

So we start with the driving instructors and the instructors will teach the bus captains.

As far as timing is concerned, it is ongoing. In August, we are going to have the focus groups. In September, it is hoped we can finish the questionnaire

and then we can train the driving instructors. It will continue and we hope that by the end of the year we are able to complete the whole exercise.

The target is we want to train the trainers, that is the driving instructors. We hope they will stay with the company and they will continue to train the frontline staff members.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Chairman, perhaps I should add that my initiative goes beyond that. I am hoping we are going to set up a department consisting of professional industrial psychologists and they will form part of the set-up of the company, so that they can stand ready to offer whatever might be needed by other colleagues in the company. So there would be a new department. You know, I don't know, subject to the consultancy recommendation, there might be, say, one unit in one of the four major depots. There might be someone posted to the recruitment department. It all depends. I am working on that. It's not just an ad hoc project, no.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Doctor.

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me, Mr Duncan.

Dr Leung, when, if you have any idea, do you hope that this advice could be acted on in the recruitment process? What timescale do you have for that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I don't have a ready answer to that,

Mr Chairman, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: No, I understand.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: But I hope that it can be done as soon as possible. Basically, I want to set up this new department as soon as possible and to have in place professional psychologists working as colleagues in our company.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) I have something to add with regards to your question. I am the project manager for this project. During recruitment, we consider the fact that bus captains are a professional role, so the work nature is closely related to work attitude. So, with the help of psychologists, we hope to identify the right candidates during recruitment, and in turn they can help fulfil the roles of bus captains.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Could you go, within the same file, please, to page 185. This is an extract from the second submission by the company to the committee.

I just want to bring to your attention the third of the questions that was asked at that stage. That is:

"Please describe what part, if any, of an assessment

of the emotional intelligence and stress tolerance of a candidate played and plays in the previous and existing system for the recruitment of bus captains. In such previous recruitment and in the current system of recruitment are any enquiries directed at an assessment made of a prospective bus captain's ability to 'handle difficult passengers'? If so what was ... the nature of those enquiries and the related assessments?"

I just want you to confirm for the record that we will find the answer to that question on page 185 and 186. Is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just one aspect of that I would like to confirm, please. Page 186, the second bullet:

"A sample [bus captain] candidate interview evaluation form is annexed ..."

And you have given the annex reference. We might just take a quick look at that. We will find that at KMB-10 at page 4439.

Is that the form, at KMB-10/4439, which is currently used at the evaluation form in this context?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, but some columns are no longer applicable.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Please explain.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We can look at the next

page, 4440. You can see there is a box called "DISC Test Evaluation". This is a personality check. A professional firm would conduct some questionnaires for the candidates. The candidates can make choices. For example, the candidate can describe their own personality as outgoing or any other adjective. The candidate can tick the most applicable or the least applicable boxes that describe them.

After review in 2014, the form was deemed to be ineffective, so this field was no longer included. The rest are still in use now.

CHAIRMAN: Although it's been discontinued, can you help me at least with the acronym, "DISC"?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) "DISC" is an acronym. It refers to a form; I can provide that after the meeting.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR GODWIN SO: Can I continue?

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Even without the DISC test, there was still something to assess the EQ and tolerance of the candidates. Currently, our interviewers would interview the bus captain candidates. There would be more questions. For instance, "If you face rude passengers or difficult passengers", we would assess how the candidate would react. So we would offer

hypothetical scenarios to see how candidates would react. That way, we can assess the candidate's EQ, their attitude, whether they are polite, et cetera. So we currently use interviews as a way of assessment.

Apart from interviews, each candidate would have to undergo an on-the-wheel test. Our assessors would embark on a 30-minute trip together with the candidate on the road, and we can assess the personality of the candidates and in turn we can make a holistic assessment on whether a candidate is fit for the role of bus captain.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Having touched now on the matter of recruitment, I'm going to ask you, please, to look at page 60 of KMB-1.

Again, this is an extract from the initial submission of the company to the committee on 24 April.

The first of two questions asked on that page is this:

"What are the problems encountered in recruiting and retaining bus captains?"

If you could just read to yourself the first two paragraphs on that page. You have brought to the attention of the committee the issue of the shortage and aging problem of commercial vehicle drivers generally in

the transport industry in Hong Kong. Do you see that?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is this a matter, the shortage, that has existed for some years?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would like you to turn up, please, KMB-9, at 3840.

Has the company from time to time raised this shortage issue with the authorities in Hong Kong?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The shortage of bus captains started in 2016 and TD was aware of the situation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr So.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At page 3840 of the bundle, do you see that there is a press release with regard to the matter having reached the attention of the Legislative Council; do you see that?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it introduced by saying:

"Following is a question by the [honourable] Frankie Yick and a reply by the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung Bing Leung, in the Legislative Council today (June 29) ..."

We can see that's 2016. I won't read out the

question in full, but is it concerned with this matter of the manpower shortage?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we go down to the bottom of the page, do we see the reply from the Secretary for Transport and Housing?

Can I read the first paragraph of the answer:

"The Government is mindful of the manpower situation of the transport industry. Different transport trades have repeatedly relayed that the labour market has become tighter in recent years. Staff recruitment is not easy and there are signs that the workforce of the industry is aging. In response to the situation, the Government will formulate strategies together with the industry and will work with the trades at policy level if it is feasible and desirable. We also hope that the trades will strive to improve working environment and remuneration and help young people understand more about the trades through different platforms, thereby attracting new blood."

If I could just pause there, could I ask you this: has the government in fact formulated strategies together with the industry to address this problem?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Personally speaking, I don't think I have got any such information.

From the guidelines of the THB in the IRC bundles, it has been said that they encourage the recruitment of sufficient bus captains, but as to whether the government has got strategies, I don't think I have seen any.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could move to the next page, 3842, and the third full paragraph on that page, if I could bring that to attention, the secretary says this:

"In terms of staff qualifications, drivers of franchised and non-franchised buses, PLBs, taxis and container trucks have to hold the relevant driving licences of commercial vehicles. The law requires that an applicant of these driving licences must hold a valid licence to drive a private car or light goods vehicle for at least three years ... [Transport Department] is reviewing whether it is possible to shorten the requirement with a view to attract more new entrants. The target is to strive to complete the review within this year."

My question is: has the law been changed in that respect so that the period is shortened?

MR GODWIN SO: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has anything happened in that regard?

MR GODWIN SO: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is the company supportive of such

a change?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I think we need to carry out consultation and I want to know about the compensation. If somebody has only got one year's experience as a holder of a private car, I just doubt whether he can drive a franchised bus carrying 150 passengers. There is a safety consideration. Somebody gets a driving licence but it's not the same as having driving experience.

As to whether a year's duration is adequate, I think we need to study the matter and discuss about it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the Transport Department come to you and said, "Look, let's discuss this, see what the issues are"?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) The Transport Department did invite different franchised bus companies to discuss the matter, but no decision has been made. I think it was sometime last month. But no conclusion has been reached.

At that time, there was no clear position being stated. They merely tried to consult the different franchised bus operators.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Had they approached your company before last month on this issue?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) No, not before that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can you look now, please, at KMB-9, page 3844. I think it will be 3855 that I want you to look at. I will be working off the translation at page 3847-1.

You should be looking at a document which is headed, "2018 [to] 19 audit", "Expenditure budget".

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I believe this to be a record regarding a discussion at a meeting of the Legislative Council earlier this year on 20 April.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, but the data is on page 3847-3?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I want to take you through the questions first that were apparently asked of the government regulatory officer, who in this case seems to be the Commissioner for Labour.

The first question, reading from page 3847-1:

"Request is made to the concerning authority to inform us about the followings:

(a) Please provide the following statistics on the aging issue of drivers for public transport services and container trucks."

That's question (a), and then question (b), on the translation 3847-2:

"For job vacancy in (a), please provide the following statistics."

Then (c):

"The shortage of manpower in drivers for public transport services and container trucks has remained for a long time. Will there be any supplementary for whether the position of driver be included into the programme by the Labour Department? If yes, what's the plan? If not, what measures to help the industry in employing drivers effectively and also the relevant staffing arrangements and expenditure budget?"

If we go through the three answers, at item (a):

"From 2013 to 2017, the age distribution of drivers for franchised buses is as follows".

One will see the figures there, with in particular the age of 25 to 29-year-olds, 2013, 341; 2017, 449. At the other end of the scale, 60 to 69, in 2013, 1,167; and in 2017, 2,022 in that category. The previous category, 50 to 59, in 2017, 5,886 in that category.

Then (b):

"From 2013 to 2017, the number of job vacancies for drivers of franchised buses is as follows".

Then we can see a job vacancy in 2013 of 192, and a vacancy last year, 2017, of 366.

Then at 3847-4 we have the answer to the third question, item (c):

"Pursuant to the Transport Department, as of the end

of 2017, there were more than 370,000 holders of effective 'commercial vehicle' (note) driving licence" -- Commercial vehicles refer to private light buses, public light buses, taxis, private buses, public buses, franchised public buses, medium truck, heavy truck, articulated vehicles and special purpose vehicles -- "but only more than 90,000 commercial vehicles with the licences, therefore the key is how to attract qualified individuals to join the industry. In view of this, the government should not make a hasty consideration on the proposal of importing drivers for commercial vehicles but must take into account the livelihood of local drivers."

Now, you can see that a point which has been raised is the possibility of persons from outside Hong Kong being allowed to come in in order to alleviate the situation which appears to exist generally in the transport industry as far as drivers are concerned.

Does the company have any particular position on a proposal such as this?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No. May I explain?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Nothing to explain or ...?

MR ROGER LEE: I think so.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So you are neither for this nor against

it; is that the position?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: May I say this: this is a very political issue. I can anticipate that there would be strong objection from the trade unions in Hong Kong to introduce import of labour. In Singapore, they do it. SBS, they have drivers imported from the mainland of China, thereby solving the problem of driver shortage. They do that in Singapore. But I doubt if we can do it in Hong Kong, in view of the current political situation.

CHAIRMAN: Didn't they have a lot of trouble with striking imported labour drivers?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I think sometime -- yes, a few months ago, perhaps sometime last year, because of the differentiation of remuneration package, but I think the problem was solved eventually.

CHAIRMAN: But you identify this as a political issue?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Here in Hong Kong.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I think, in reality, there is also another point. Hong Kong is a unique city. It is quite unlike the case in Shenzhen or Shanghai or in Taipei. In those cities, they have a larger context, and in Hong Kong we have got double-decked buses and we have the right-wheel drive. So it is quite different and this is the difficulty. For the roads in Hong Kong

and for the passengers in Hong Kong, when compared with other cities and when compared with the mainland, I think we are very different.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, I propose taking a break to give everyone a little rest, and I propose taking 15 minutes. Is this a suitable moment?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Indeed it is, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. We will take a break for 15 minutes.

(4.13 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.29 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Wong, you assisted the committee in respect of the suggestion that one of the measures that might be taken to ease the manpower shortage would be to reduce the time that a person has to hold a licence before applying for a heavy duty licence from three years to one year. I think you expressed some reservations about that.

Do you have some reservations?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Just now, I said that TD approached the trades to discuss this issue.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did you agree that reducing it would be a good idea or did you express some reservations?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) We would have to look into the issue. The current requirement is that someone must hold a private vehicle licence for three years. If the requirement is shortened, we may have to consider passenger safety and driving safety. I have no personal stance on this, but our company would have to look into this before replying to the TD.

CHAIRMAN: When do you expect to reply to the Transport Department?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) This is in process. There is no fixed deadline for us to give a reply.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, when we approach this issue, I think we need to strike a balance among a number of factors.

First of all, there is no compromise on safety. If we are to reduce the requirement of three years, if you simply look at the duration or the number of years, you are losing sight of the whole picture. Can we reduce the number of years required but at the same time requiring the candidate to give us information that for two years he has been driving all the time or he has such driving skills that it is up to a particular standard, or maybe we can consider having another test so that he doesn't need three years, he can have a shorter duration, but he must pass a particular

test -- can such be considered?

Of course I know that the industry, not just KMB, suffers from driver shortage, but still the prerequisite is as follows. First, we give priority to safety, and then for the other factors we have an open attitude.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want you, please, to have in front of you the transcript bundle for Day 1, at page 66, so that will be bundle 1. Day 1 at page 66.

At page 66, line 8, you will see that I have asked a question of Mr Joseph Lai:

"Does that reflect the Government's position accurately with regard to the manpower shortage?"

And there is a response from Mr Lai, Mr Joseph Lai, who I can tell you was a representative from the Transport and Housing Bureau, permanent secretary.

If I can just bring to your attention, please, the answer which he provided to that question, and if I could pick it up at line 16:

"The other part of our position, regarding the chronic problem of shortage in commercial drivers, is that we are taking steps to try to -- a full legislative amendment, and I would be happy to elaborate on that in a moment or two -- full legislative amendment to relax the licensing requirement for commercial drivers.

So, basically, what happens is that, at present, if you want to apply for a licence, a driving licence, to be a commercial vehicle driver, you will have to have had a private ... driving licence for three years before you are eligible to make the application public ie the application for a driving licence for commercial vehicles.

Because of the chronic manpower shortage, we have proposed, and the trade as well as Legislative Council have agreed, that the three-year period could be reduced to a one-year period. So in future, all you need is to have a private car driving licence for one year before you can apply for a driving licence for a commercial vehicle. Commercial vehicles include, of course, buses, and that includes of course franchised buses.

We are drafting the amendment legislation, and we hope to be able to introduce that into the Legislative Council before the end of this year. If that is passed by the Legislative Council, that should also go some way towards relieving the private shortage problem. It may not provide a total answer, but hopefully it will provide some relief.

On our part, that's what we have been doing. But yes, having said that, we do also think that it's part of the franchised bus companies, as the franchisee, to

take all reasonable measures to ensure that they have the necessary number of drivers to provide service."

So you can see from that extract that apparently the government is firmly advocating reducing the three-year period to a one-year period and is drafting legislation accordingly.

Before I read this extract to you, was the company aware of this?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, what is clear is that -- well, first of all, I know it -- now, regarding the three years' driving experience, I think that requirement, to one extent or other, has discouraged some candidates from applying. Cutting it from three years to one year means that more people can go to the school to sit for the bus driving licence exam. Ultimately, you need to take the exam for class 17 and then you will qualify as a bus driver.

Now, if you reduce it from three years to one year, it means that more people will be going to the bus training school, but ultimately the threshold is whether you can pass the driving examination. It helps, because people, some people, do have the ability to do so. Whether it's three years or one year, it is still being discussed; we haven't got a timetable.

CHAIRMAN: Were you aware that the trade supports this

training, as Mr Lai states?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Half-half. Some in the trade of course would think about their interests, and then for the other half, fewer and fewer people are driving commercial vehicles. I think the most important threshold is whether you can pass the bus driving licence exam. For KMB, we have got two parts. The first part, you sit and pass the bus driving examination and there's a licence from the Transport Department. With this licence, basically, you can drive a bus and you can also drive vehicles like tourist coaches. So there will be more for the industry -- there would be more applicants. So I would say half-half.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, Mr Wong, when you indicated before that the government had discussed this with you, was this something which was discussed with KMB alone or was it discussed with other interested parties as well?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) With all the bus companies together.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How many meetings were held?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) I recall there was only one meeting. One.

CHAIRMAN: That was last month, as you put it?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Correct. I said it was

last month. I need to look up my schedule before I can recall the exact date.

CHAIRMAN: But you went on to say no clear position was stated.

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) We were told about what they generally have planned to do. If the number of years required is to be reduced, then there is a requirement for passenger service cost. But then such were preliminary ideas. Therefore, we have yet to get the overall picture as to what would be done.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lai was giving evidence three months ago, telling us that the trade supported it, and you say he was asking the bus companies last month about the same issue?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In February this year, the new guidelines with respect to shifts and rest times, and so forth, were issued. Has the issue of those guidelines affected the ability of the company to recruit staff for bus driving positions?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, if I am to answer your question directly -- well, maybe first of all let me say this. The Transport Department revised the guidelines this year, but then the revised

guidelines are supposed to be fully implemented in the second quarter of next year. But our initial assessment is that -- and in fact we are already carrying out some system modifications; in other words, we are upgrading the computer programs so as to tie in with the revised guidelines. Well, for the new guidelines --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Pang, this was not an open-ended question. The question was simply this: has it affected the recruitment of bus captains? You can probably answer that "yes" or "no".

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) If you only talk about recruitment, yes, it will be affected.

CHAIRMAN: That was Mr Duncan's question.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In what way has it been affected?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We have done some calculations. If we are to follow the revised guidelines, we need to recruit an extra 200 bus captains. Then, under the revised guidelines, we have the special shift, and for this special shift, in future, if we are to do away with it and if we have a strict shift, then we need another extra 1,000 bus captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I will come to the ramifications of the extra shift somewhat later, but I'm sorry I haven't made

myself clear. Since February, has the issue of the guidelines made it easier or made it harder, or has it had no effect, on the company's ability to recruit people to the position of a bus captaincy?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) This depends on how candidates respond to the new guidelines. The company did a lot in February when the guidelines were revised. I do not feel that candidates knew or cared much about these guidelines, or the new guidelines.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So I infer from that that it has had no effect; the position is much the same now as it was in January; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We did not feel that there was an effect.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, you have indicated that in order to comply with the new guidelines, you are going to have to engage something like 200 additional captains.

Since the Tai Po accident, it is true, is it not, that you have altered your policy with regard to the work of part-time captains and to the engagement of part-time captains?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the figure you have given us, the extra 200, take that into account?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The decision you have made with part-time captains, does that mean that number of 200 will actually increase?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The 200 extra bus captains to deal with the new guidelines, we were referring to full-time captains. In February, we made a change to our policy on part-time captains. The percentage of part-time captains in terms of the total captains of our captains was only 3 to 4 per cent before -- after that change in February.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm going to ask you to go to page 58 of KMB-1, please.

The question you are asked -- again, this is the first submission:

"Does your company have adequate full-time bus captains to provide proper and efficient service? Is there a need for your company to continuously employ bus captains on a part-time basis to make up for the manpower shortfall and/or to augment the core staff complement to cover special events and absences? Please also furnish the number of bus captains on different employment terms and the extent to which the current staff complement can meet your operational requirements?"

If I could go to the last bullet on the page. You

have said there that:

"[bus captains] are employed in the following types of employment based on [the] date of appointment:

-- Daily-rated [bus captains]: those who were employed before May 1999."

Forgive me for asking this, but does that mean these are bus captains whose salary is based on so much per day?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And equally, monthly-rated bus captains, they are paid by the month, a monthly amount; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: Monthly amount, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then the third group, the retired bus captains who are engaged for re-employment, they can be paid either on a monthly rate or a third way, on the basis of so much per hour; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) This depends on the employment mode. If they choose an hourly rate, they would be rostered and paid on an hourly basis. For monthly-rated BCs, they would be rostered and paid on a monthly basis.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. We can see the numbers, at least as they were at the time of the return, 24 April, on page 59. Those on a daily rate, 2,105 for KMB; those

on a monthly rate, 5,201; retired folk who are re-employed, rated on an hourly basis, 577; retired who have come back on a monthly basis, 383; and then external hourly-rated bus captains, 371.

Do I infer correctly that external hourly-rated bus captains would all be part-time?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then you have the figure of bus captain vacancies at the end: 28 February, 280.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, at that moment.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we go back then to page 58, and if I could bring to your attention the second-last bullet on that page, concerning part-time bus drivers:

"Since mid-February 2018, KMB has stopped recruiting new external hourly-rated [bus captains] who work short hours (ie below 18 hours per week)."

Is a consequence of that that KMB will still engage new part-time workers as long as they work more than 18 hours per week?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I have something to add. Part-time and full-time captains are different. With a threshold of 18 hours per week, we would have to know any employment of the bus captains prior to their work and we know whether they were engaged with other

vehicles, et cetera. So it might be hard to define part-time or full-time work by the threshold of 18 hours per week, so that's why we drew the line at 18 hours per week for part-time drivers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I do infer from that that you consider it is more likely that people who work more than 18 hours will not have another job which interferes with their driving? Is that the rationale?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes and no.

(Via interpreter) Yes, if someone works continuously more than 18 hours every week, we would ask if the bus captain has other work. If the answer is yes, we must understand the nature of such work and whether their employers allow them to drive. This is very important.

Let's assume the bus driver also drives a taxi. If he drives 18 hours at KMB, we might not know the total number of hours spent driving. We have rules in place. That is, we have to find out about the other employment of the driver or else we won't be able to understand their profile.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And what's the perceived problem with respect to a person, say, who wanted to work for you just 12 hours a week?

MR ROGER LEE: No. Simply just reject.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, but why do you have no interest in

that sort of person?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) If the applicant does not provide the information, we cannot take the reasonable step to concern -- to find out about their total number of work hours or the possible problem of fatigue. We require applicants to make several declarations. First of all, their work outside, and from our records, for the 300-odd captains, 40 per cent are clerical post workers, and the remaining 30 per cent have no other employment and about 25 per cent are engaged in other driving duties or employment. They have to assure us that their work does not contravene with the work at KMB and there is no objection from their other employers.

So we want to make sure that there will not be driving fatigue from captains engaging in two driving jobs. For those who work below 18 hours per week, it would be hard for them to provide such information. For part-time captains, even though they are part-timers, they must take their work seriously. If they have to work 18 hours per week, we have to make sure that their driving skills are sharp.

So this is one of the factors we would consider.

MR PETER DUNCAN: But the bottom line with that system, if I may observe, is the quality of the information you are getting back with regard to the other employment of the

individual. The quality of that will not necessarily depend on whether a person works for you for 12 hours or whether he works for you for 20 hours. Do you understand my point?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I do not agree.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Why do you not agree?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We know that a lot of people love driving buses of different models, that's why they become part-time captains. But do they have the right mindset? This is something I will not comment on. As I said, our company has guidelines in place, so we must apply these standards.

So, for continuous employment of someone who works 18 hours per week, we can ask them what other jobs they have outside. That's why we set the threshold at 18 hours. We feel that we would not recruit less bus captains on shorter hours, which would affect our productivity, so the threshold of 18 hours is the right trade-off between productivity, and that's why we set this threshold.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If you do not set such threshold, even if a captain has great driving skills, if the captain only works one or two hours, it would be very difficult to roster them. So this is something we must bear in mind.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, do you propose taking the representatives to the declarations?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I do ultimately, but not at this point.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We will come to those later, in a different context, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Of course.

But whilst we are on this topic -- you have given some overall statistics for the jobs -- the fact they don't have jobs, and those that have driving, 40 per cent clerical, 30 per cent no other employment, 25 per cent engaged in driving. Can you provide those statistics to the committee?

MR GODWIN SO: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: And in particular details of the other driving jobs?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, it's possible.

CHAIRMAN: For example, presumably --

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Like driving goods vehicles or chauffeurs.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I have in mind: coaches, chauffeurs, taxis, PLBs, and so on. If you could provide that, that would be helpful.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Was this change prompted by the accident at Tai Po?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, triggered by this incident. This is because at that time, in the society, there was this idea; that is, we as a bus company had been engaging part-time bus captains. We weren't talking about the skills of the part-time bus captains. The question was maybe the bus captain had started with us in the evening, we didn't know about his daytime job, whether he was very tired. At that time, we thought we could have done better, so we paused and then we fine-tuned the arrangements and then we came up with the criteria that it should be drawn at 18 hours, and we have got 300-plus bus captains, we offered them the chance to convert and the new policy has been in place since then.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Prior to the Tai Po accident, how many part-time bus captains did you have working less than 18 hours a week?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Among the 300-plus bus captains, I can't give you the exact figure, 200-plus could work for more than 18 hours. Less than 100 worked less than 18 hours.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I take you, please, to page 104 of the same bundle. This is the part 4 of the report sent

to the Transport Department following the accident at Tai Po, so it's actually earlier in time. It's dated 12 March. Part 4 is concerned with recruitment, and the first heading is, "Discontinuance of Employment of Part Time [bus captains]". What is said in this paragraph is, firstly, that:

"KMB has discontinued the employment of all part-time [bus captains] whose working hours fall below 18 hours per week."

So you will see it's slightly differently expressed from what is at page 58, in that 58 talks about stopping the recruiting of new hourly-rated BCs, whereas this mentions the discontinuance of all part-time BCs whose working hours fall below 18 hours per week.

Leaving aside how it is expressed, are you conveying the same message in each of these communications?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The two are consistent. They all talked about those working short working hours, that is less than 18 hours per week. First of all, there won't be recruitment of new candidates in this category. Second, for the one shown on the screen, for the existing employees -- now, the two are different. Just now I talked about stop recruiting new candidates, and then here we talk about the existing staff; we talk about discontinuing the employment. We weren't talking

about dismissing them because they are hourly-rated, it's just that at that time we stopped rostering them, we didn't assign jobs with them, and then we discussed with them, as mentioned in the second paragraph, that is we persuaded them to convert into contract hourly-rated. That is whether they could work longer hours. Because some of them didn't have an alternative job or their income would be affected. So at that time we said, "You have been working shorter hours, maybe you would like to take up another role, say for example being an assistant at the terminus."

So we are talking about different things. For that, we didn't want to affect their income.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I understand. Thank you very much.

What is meant by "convert to contract hourly-rated BCs"? Would they not have been contract hourly-rated before this change?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Correct. In the past, we just called them part-time BCs. Since February, for the newly recruited, they would fit the arrangement of four weeks in a row, 18 hours a week, and we talk about continuous work. So it would be confusing to use "part-time", and that's why we use the term "contract hourly-rated BC".

For this group of employees, they worked for less

than 18 hours in the past, then we talked to them. If they could take up more work, then that means they would drive for more than 18 hours. That's one way out. Another way is they could take up other posts.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Could I take you through to page 145, please. This is the first of two action plans which you have provided. This first one was provided to the Transport Department on 10 April. I am sorry, I should have referred you to page 138. You can see the letter there at 138, and the second paragraph refers to an action plan.

Do you have page 138?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. This response of 10 April -- so again, it was before the first submission to the committee -- contained the action plan and I am asking you to turn up, please, page 145.

We can see the first of the topics there, consistent with what you have told us, number 1:

"To discontinue the employment of part-time [bus captains] whose working hours fall below 18 hours per week."

The action plan:

"No more new employment of part-time [bus captains]

with working hours below 18 hours per week since 15 February 2018."

So that was done?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Secondly, number 2:

"To offer the previous part-time [bus captains] the option to convert to contract hourly-rated [bus captains] or to take up alternative duties in the company."

Then the action plan states this:

"Status of the 209 previous part-time [bus captains]:

Agreed to work [more than] 18 hours a week: 78.

Agreed to work over 10 hours a week; declare doing part-time [bus captains] at KMB will not breach the employment contract with their employer", and then a third row, "Quitted".

So if I could concentrate on the middle classification, do I read that correctly that some of the previously employed part-time bus captains are now permitted to work more than 10 hours a week but less than 18 hours a week, provided they are not breaching the employment contract with their employer?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes. Can I supplement?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It is not universally more than 18 hours?

If you have been previously employed by the company, you can work, say, for 12 hours a week, provided there is a declaration that the employment contract with other employer is not breached?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What about those who agree to work more than 18 hours a week? There is nothing in this particular box which suggests that they have to make a declaration with regard to whether or not they are breaching their employment contract. So what is the position with those who agree to work more than 18 hours a week? Do they have to make a declaration?

MR GODWIN SO: Can I one by one to explain slowly?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Please.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Someone was previously a part-time BC, now he opted to become a BC with more than 18 hours; he signed a new contract, and he is regarded as a contract hourly-rated BC. He has to disclose his outside employment. He has to disclose his outside employment. So this is the first category: agreed to work for more than 18 hours.

For the second group, they are still part-time BCs. This is because at that time there was a group of part-time BCs, they have been working for us, and all of a sudden they haven't been assigned work. They talked

to us. They have expectations of us. We have been employing them. We have stopped new employment. We know about their driving skills. So we tried to do something which is a compromise to both parties. They can continue to drive, but then, as Mr Lee has said, we don't want them to drive an hour or two. At least they should drive 10 hours. And they have to declare that doing so would not breach the employment contract of the other job, because I know that for some employment contracts part-time work would not be allowed and they shouldn't have been working for us.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, Mr So, we have received evidence from drivers in this very category, Part-time Drivers Union.

Carry on.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I have finished.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm just wondering why, in the first category, there is no reference to the requirement for a declaration.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We have omitted -- well, in fact, the 78 of them did declare, they did report to us about their alternative employment.

CHAIRMAN: So was this done in a form?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, and I can supply a copy.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So whether you work more than 10 or whether you work more than 18, you have to sign the same declaration; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) They are two different documents, but I can provide both to you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

While we are on the subject of these sorts of documents, I don't believe in the bundle we have any example of an employment contract with the bus captain. Is there a standard letter of employment that is entered into?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you also provide that, please?

MR GODWIN SO: I will.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there just one form for all bus captains or are there different forms depending on their status?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For the new recruits, one form, and then there is another one. That's for the re-employment of retired BCs. So two types.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. We would be grateful if you could make available the two types. Thank you.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, if we could go back, please, to

page 124. I have a few more questions about part-time bus drivers, bus captains.

In fact, I think if you start with page 117 in the bundle. This I think is the first letter which was written by the Transport Department to the company after the Tai Po tragedy. The letter is dated 12 February, and there are a number of -- (a), (b), (c), (d) -- questions, and the first of those questions we can see at (a). At the moment, I'm concerned with question (b):

"KMB's policy on part-time bus captains and details of these captains, including the number of part-time captains, deployment and working hours, et cetera".

If you then turn to page 124, you will pick up the question at the top of that page.

KMB's response is described to issue (b), as we can see it in (i):

"KMB's policy on part-time [bus captains]".

If you go through the bullets, there are seven of them, they basically say that part-time bus captains are treated in the same way as full-time bus captains in each instance, save for the third, which is concerned with training. So the first bullet:

"Part-time BCs have the same entry requirements as full-time BCs ..."

The second requirement:

"Part-time BCs are subject to the same assessment of instructors ..."

Then we get the third one:

"Part-time BCs receive appropriate training before passing out for duty ..."

So it's not "the same training", it is "appropriate training".

If I could just try to identify any differences which existed at least at this time, that's February 2018, between the training which was provided to full-time bus captains and the training which was provided to part-time captains respectively.

In that respect, can I take you, please, to page 120. I think the first difference -- sorry, is there a difference in the qualification and recruit requirements in that for a full-time candidate, the alternative requirement is the holder of a private car licence for at least three years, or the holder of a valid class 10 or class 17 licence, whereas for a part-time candidate, in (ii), you must have either the class 10 or the class 17? Is that the first difference?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, that's because you weren't prepared to bear the cost of training someone to be a part-time

captain if all he held was a driving licence; would that be it?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

The second matter to which I wish to bring your attention is (iii), "General training", and for full-time candidates, I refer to the bullet under (iii), he is required to "undergo an 18-day training (9.5 hours a day) (subject to extension based on assessment of the candidate's performance by instructor)."

And if we turn the page to page 121, we will see the comparable requirement for the part-time bus captain. Under (iv), he or she is required to undergo a training of 2.5 days, as compared to 18 days, of 9 hours a day. Is that the difference?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, but I mention that for the (vi), this part-time BC with class 10 or class 11 driving licence.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. There is still a difference, is there not, between the length of the training, in that the full-time bus captain has to undergo an 18-day training, whereas the part-timer has to undertake only a 2.5-day training?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, at the moment.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then a third difference, if I understand this correctly, if you look at page 121, "Phase 2", the

route training at the bottom of that box is conducted on two routes; whereas if you look at the part-time position at page 122, the route training is for one route. Is that a difference?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then a further difference, if I understand this correctly, at page 121, the full-time -- I'm looking at the bullet just above (iv):

"A full-time [bus captain] candidate will have a total of at least 68 hours of on-the-wheel bus driving training (inclusive of the time for route training) under the supervision of instructors."

And the equivalent at page 122, just under the box:

"A part-time [bus captain] candidate will have a total of at least 16 hours of on-the-wheel bus driving training (inclusive of the time for route training) under the supervision of instructors."

So is that a fourth difference?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you consider that the difference in the training between full-time captains and part-time captains is justified?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) First of all, during the time of -- that was the training situation at that time around the incident, but not the current training

situation now.

Mr Duncan just now cited a number of training requirements or factors. For training on full-time captains, for the 18 hours, each instructor would train two candidates. For part-time BCs, the training would be one-to-one. So in terms of direct guidance and education for bus captains, the time allocated would be greater. At that time, the thinking was that this could achieve the objective of enabling them to drive. So that was the situation at the time.

Meanwhile, the requirements of 18 days and 2.5 days refer to general training -- if a captain cannot fulfil the requirements within 18 days, the period might be extended, and likewise, for part-time captains, if the training cannot be completed within 2.5 days, the training would be extended.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I would like to add to that. In terms of justification, in the past, the 18 days of training was provided in two phases. With the first phase, the driver can secure a driving licence. The captain would have held a licence already, ahead of the training. So the direct comparison should be between 2.5 days and nine days.

Secondly, for full-time captains, the ratio of instructors to candidates is two to one, whereas for

part-time captains it would be one to one, and for full-time captains they would train on four to five bus types, whereas for part-time bus captains, they would be trained on two bus types. For the number of routes trained, for full-time BCs, two, and for part-time BCs, only one.

So the scope of education would be less diversified for part-time captains because they are likely to only operate one to two routes, and the training given by instructors would be on a one-to-one basis.

CHAIRMAN: So is the short answer to the question "yes"?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, it's satisfied.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do the full-time drivers and part-time drivers drive the same buses?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And leaving aside the number of routes, the number of different routes that drivers drive on, do they drive on the same routes?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It's hard to give a direct answer. We have more than 400 routes. For our new bus captains, whether or not they are full-time or part-time, at the beginning they would drive the easier routes. As to whether all captains would drive the same routes -- well, we have four depots, but at the

beginning drivers would drive the easier routes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I know you have reviewed the training provisions in recent times, and we will come to those in the morning, but can I just ask you this question. Under the new proposals -- leave aside the practice note but just your new proposals -- will the training for bus captains be the same whether they are full-time or whether they are part-time?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, thank you. If that's a convenient moment, then we have reached the end of our day, tiring no doubt as it was for everyone, not least the stenographers.

We will adjourn now and we will resume tomorrow at 10 o'clock. Thank you.

(5.30 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WING BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG (simultaneous interpretation used only where indicated) 1

Statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG 1

Examination by MR DUNCAN (continued) 4

[Blank Page]

2018年8月10日

上午10時01分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士，各位早晨，歡迎大家嚟到繼續出席我哋嘅聆訊。梁博士有咩嘢你想講一講呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席，各位早晨。我想用兩分鐘講一講。主席，我係講關於鄧樂勤先生响4月提出嘅要求，要求星期二要求一個報告，2018年3月12號。主席我有過一個機會係睇番個報告嘅第二、第三部分，我係信納第三部分嘅報告，即係話關於巴士司機嘅事項呢部分，係唔會影響呢個警方進行嘅調查，唔會受到影響。

我都覺得呢個報告應該儘快交畀呢個獨立檢討委員會，等委員會更加明白我哋點樣招聘，點樣做訓練，同埋係點樣監察巴士司機嘅表現。請你接納我嘅道歉，即係話我之前冇提交呢個報告嘅第三部分畀委員會，至於話報告嘅第二部分，即係有關意外調查嘅報告，我認為內容向公眾公告，係並不適宜。我亦都認為呢個報告係同呢個委員會嘅職權範圍，並不符合。

我亦都想多謝委員會就提醒我，呢個綠色駕駛監察系統嘅事項，我已經同管理層傾過，即係話究竟喺星加坡呢個 Tower Transit 公司，即係話响星加坡佢哋係點樣實施呢個綠色駕駛嘅監察系統。我亦都從中得到一啲啟發，上次所講呢份報導文章，或者我哋應該要重新考慮畀表現良好嘅司機係一個獎金嘅制度，應該安排，唔需要一個係好大額嘅獎金，但係都係一種對於巴士司機係一種獎勵，亦都可以係鼓勵安全駕駛同埋綠色駕駛嘅行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你梁博士。我想問一問關於嗰個報告嘅各個部分，有部分就要求公開，有部分唔公開，咁上次你嘅信件佢响 8 月 9 號呢係信件嘅最後一段，係向我哋提出一啲睇法，鄧生，你有咩嘢睇法？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）報告第三部分，我哋喺响377頁，九巴文件冊裏面377頁。我就覺得第三部分只係一個簡介，就即係要求係附件 5 嘅一啲要求資料嘅一個簡介。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我哋收到回覆？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，收到，所以冇乜特別關於第三部分事項係需要再睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係根據你嘅意見，第二部分我哋會採取跟進行動，第二部分有一啲材料係唔同性質，而家我哋都唔知道佢有咩嘢內容。意見或者係睇法，對委

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

員嚟講係無關重要，但係嗰個係有關記錄，可能對我哋嘅工作有關係。正如你所講，我哋可以稍後再跟進。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋會咁做，主席。多謝你主席，梁博士各位，早晨，上次研訊完之後，我哋收到公司嗰兩封信，我想睇第二封先。呢個係 KMB-1，297 頁。我想請大家睇睇最底 297 頁第一段，佢就提述到第二項個項目，呢個係關於嗰啲好急彎，二十九個嘅，我哋响星期二都講過。

信件就話關於第二項，即係話呢個我哋要求嘅第二項事項，佢哋就有啲附件作為信件附件 B，咁就有羅馬數 I 去到第 VI 項，就提述一啲事項。跟住去到第 VI 項羅馬數字，呢個係一個陳述書，有啲係電郵嘅紀錄，呢個 Owen Eckford，當時係營運董事，就唔贊成呢個咁樣安全改進計劃。

我想喺呢度探討一下，喺呢方面我可唔可以請你亦都同時睇一睇同一套嘅文件 309 頁。309 頁去到 311 頁，第一項就係嗰個信件提過，呢個係一個會議記錄，即係話關於係辨析出嚟嘅急彎嘅安全速度限額嘅檢討，呢個 2014 年 7 月 31 號，呢個會議總共維持兩個半鐘頭，有啲人出席咗呢個會議。我哋可以自己睇番個 309 到 311 頁就可以睇到個會議記錄嘅內容，312 就係第二項文件，正如你文件所講第二個事項。

其實呢個係一個表格嚟，表格就列出嗰三十個急彎，312 頁到 314 頁，去到 315 頁，呢個第三個事項，即係個文件所講嘅第三個事項，呢個係一個係通訊嘅計劃，睇到即係打算點樣通知各方計劃，由 315 頁開始去到 316 頁，我認為呢個係一啲好詳細提議，即係關於點樣溝通嘅，即係將當時嘅計劃點樣係通告有關嘅方面。

318 頁，呢度就見到有一啲相片，好多張相片，就係有關嗰啲彎道，彎位，一路可以去到 351 頁。352 頁就係所提出嘅信件第五項，呢個係一個係所謂係草擬本嚟嘅，係嗰個安全速度嘅一張卡，352 頁見到呢個係草擬本，安全速度嘅卡嘅草擬本；跟住第六項 353 頁到 355 頁，呢啲係一啲電郵嘅信件。

Eckford 先生，你首先喺信件講，就話佢並不贊成，並不通過呢個咁樣嘅計劃，我想你睇睇呢啲係電郵嘅內容。首先開始嘅時候，就係有一份電郵 354 頁開始，呢個係 Gary Wong，咁頭先我發出，我哋都已經知道佢係當時安全服務組別嘅主管，2014 年 8 月 14 號發出畀 Edmond Ho，何先生，當時係公司嘅董事總經理。啱唔啱呢？何生係咪當時嘅董事總經理？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢幾時就唔再做董事總經理呀？

梁乃鵬先生： Roger should say.

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）2015 年 1 月 1 號開始唔做。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你開始就你嘅任期，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢係咪離開公司呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）佢留低嘅，就作為一個董事局嘅非執行董事，我諗做咗過去八年都係咁樣，都係做呢個職位。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，睇番呢份電郵，呢個係由黃生發出嘅電郵畀何先生，我就唔係成封電郵讀出嚟，不過你可以快快咁攞一下，你就見到，佢就話畀何生，同埋有啲副本有送交到其他人。佢就講到一個係現場嘅一個測試計劃，就關於係嗰三十個急彎嘅安全速度嘅一個測試，就 8 月 12 號完成咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧生，你未講之前，可唔可以建議下，你可唔可以讀第一段出嚟？

MR DUNCAN： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為嗰度可能會引起一啲對我嚟講，有用嘅一啲問題，因為呢個係公共嘅研訊嚟嘅，因為除非佢哋有啲係背景佢哋好難明究竟發生咩嘢事？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我而家讀出第一段「能夠好高興通知你，關於安全車速，即係關於嗰三十個識別咗嘅急彎同埋迴旋處嘅現場測試，就已經喺 2014 年 8 月 12 號星期二完成咗，你可以睇番夾附喺呢一度嘅 Excel 嗰檔案呢，就可以睇到我哋嘅 EO，佢計出嚟嗰啲安全嘅車速，咁同埋訓練學校嗰啲授權嘅人員，就係點樣計出嚟，然後就係將佢核實嘅，咁之後 EO 有關嘅訓練學校、車廠、龍運巴士公司同埋安全及服務質量部，佢哋係一齊做咗一個最後嘅檢討嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師，呢度用咗好多簡寫，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢啲簡寫係咩嘢意思？請你通過九巴嘅代表，睇下呢啲簡寫係咩嘢意思？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請各位幫係我哋睇一睇呢啲簡寫係咩嘢意思，我哋睇下已經係抄寫咗喺度嘅呢啲，咩嘢叫做 DMD，呢個 Evan Auyeung？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）佢就係副董事總經理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）HR，係咪即係人力資源部？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係，啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）OD 呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）車務總監。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一個嘅位置，今日係咪都仲係存在呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪就係而家呢位梁生？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）DOD 呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）副車務總監。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）SSQ 呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）安全及服務質量部。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好嘞，嚟番個電郵個本體。第一段 EO 呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）工程主任。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）DI 呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）駕駛導師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）BCTS？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）巴士車長訓練學校。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋都處理咗第一段嘅簡寫。咁之後仲有提述到一個檔案，就係夾附喺呢一度，就係用 Excel 嘅方式寫嘅一個檔案。咁第二段開頭嗰度都有講，你睇唔睇到呀？咁呢個電郵繼續咁講，佢話關於嗰啲理論嘅計算，同埋嗰三十個已經識別出嘅地點，安全車速嘅核實。

同埋如果係好可能令到巴士有翻側嘅風險嘅話，咁同埋有時就係轉彎嘅時候，嗰個半徑係有唔同，令到車長可能會有錯誤，譬如話佢哋會記錯咗，即係無論你畀幾好嘅訓練佢，呢一度就係打咗窿，咁就係比較難睇，我相信呢個意思係話即係你對佢哋簡介咗幾多次，佢哋都可能會唔記得。

但係如果有咁樣嘅人為錯誤，嗰個結果就係會好嚴重，即係如果巴士車長係記錯咗，然後佢用嘅車速係唔應該用嘅車速，就會有大問題，就會導致嚴重嘅巴七翻側意外，係會比其他嘅交通意外造成嘅風險係更加大嘅，呢一個風險呢係不能接受，不能忍受嘅，因此我哋就認為係應該有更強嘅風險管理，去儘量減低人為錯誤造成嘅不能接受嘅風險。

因此我哋就會係將安全車速嘅不同種類將佢簡化，變成係每小時 15 公里，每小時 20 公里，每小時 25 公里，就去處理呢三十個我哋識別咗嘅急彎同埋迴旋處，咁樣就令到車長更加容易明白，同埋記得。跟番我哋夾附嘅 Excel 嗰個檔案裏面，我哋講最後檢討，我哋而家喺下面就係表列咗我哋建議嘅安全車速。

你就會睇到呢一段，就係講到唔同嘅車速限制。喺 355 嗰度佢仲會係繼續講，我哋用安全速去處理車速，係對道理安全嚟講一個好基本嘅原素，我哋係認為安全車速係一定唔可以喺同一個車廠區係高過我哋計過可能導致翻側嘅車速。有一位車長佢係記錯咗嗰個安全車速應該係 15 公里，但係佢行咗 20 公里，咁樣未必係會導致翻側。

因為我哋計過喺嗰個檔案裏面第二十段嗰度，就如果喺清水灣道，有關嘅翻側嘅車速應該係 24.9 公里先至巴士會翻側，呢一個原則亦都係會適應該於其他嘅車廠。呢一度你就係會講到有關其中一個車廠。你呢個 KBD 係咪即係話九龍灣車廠。

李澤昌先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋結論嘅時候，下低就係一啲行動嘅計劃。

第一，我哋係要搵番呢啲彎位同埋迴旋處嘅地點去睇下邊度呢有最高嘅令到巴士翻側嘅風險，呢一啲嘅做法首廿九個，就已經喺 2014 年 6 月 6 號做好咗。

第二，就去計算一下所有呢啲識別咗嘅彎位，同埋迴旋處嘅安全車速，我哋係根據技術嘅評估，咁呢個開頭嗰廿九個識別嘅地點，就已經喺 2014 年 6 月 27 號完成咗，而第三十個，就喺 2014 年 8 月 13 號完成咗，呢個就喺元朗方向嘅博愛交匯處。

(c) 應該用實際駕駛測試去核實我哋計算出嚟嘅安全車速，咁開首嗰廿九個識別嘅地點，就已經喺 2014 年 7 月 29 號完成咗，而第十三個喺元朗方向博愛交匯處嗰個，就喺 2014 年 8 月 12 號係完成咗。

(d) 就係要去檢討安全車速，個基礎就係要跟番駕駛測試嗰個計算結果，就喺廿九個識別地點就已經喺 2014 年 7 月 31 日完成，第三十個喺元朗方向博愛交匯處嗰個，就 2014 年 8 月 13 號完成咗。

(e) 就係要發展一啲溝通計劃，就可以將安全信息係傳遞出去，呢啲信息就係關於安全車速，令到佢哋可以交畀所有車長。

請大家睇下我哋夾附嘅溝通計劃，同埋我哋要去進行一啲車速嘅查核，然後跟住下一個有一個提述，就係講到嗰個檔案，個電郵就繼續講，我哋認為實施咗呢一個實施安全車速，應該可以喺 2014 年 10 可以實施，即係話處理咗溝通計劃第一至三項嗰啲行動之後，就可以實施。

個電郵就係寫畀何達文先生，當時嘅董事總經理，就係副本係交畀其他人，就係請董事總經理係批准，所以最屘就係話「請你批准」。然後喺 353 頁，就會有一封電郵係何生回應。

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前大律師，委員會其中一樣要求，就係 8 月 8 嗰封信嗰度寫到嘅，就係一個呢個 Excel 檔案嘅軟件，請問九巴嘅回應有冇處理呢一點呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我睇呢一個電郵，我就認為應該係處理咗，咁但係我就會請佢哋直接回答。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你直接回答，你搵唔搵到呢一個 Excel 嘅檔案？如果你想睇番有關嘅問題，我可以喺屏幕畀大家睇，就係一封信嘅附件嗰度，係 234 頁第二頁。呢一個係問題本身，即係話如果你有，請你提供，咁呢一個就係所謂購物表咁樣；第二點就係話希望你提供 Excel 嗰個檔案嘅軟件，...

梁健宏先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）...或者有任何嘅確都畀我哋，即係有冇一啲實體嘅覆本？

梁健宏先生： We have it.

主席：（經傳譯員）你有嘅，係唔係？你會唔會提供呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）會。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我理解，嗰啲實體嘅本，已經係交咗畀委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪所有喺軟件嗰度嘅嘢，係咪已經用實體文件提交咗呢？咁嘅理解正唔正確？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係印咗出嚟嘅，亦都係提供咗係 312 至 313 頁嗰度，係我哋將呢一個提述過嘅 Excel 檔案係印製咗出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋而家返番去嗰啲電郵嗰度。353 頁個底部，就係何達文先生嘅回應，佢係寫畀黃嘉峰（譯音）先生，就即係話頭先嗰封電郵嘅發出人，同埋 Owen Eckford，佢當時係車務總監。而家 Eckford 先生係咪仲係受聘喺九巴呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁佢幾時離開？

梁健宏先生：佢 2015 年年尾離職。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪啱啱係可以同何達文先生做完董事總經理嘅間時間係脗合嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）並不是。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）何達文先生係 2014 年尾或者係 2015 年初嘅時候，係冇再做董事總經理嘅。

梁健宏先生： Correct.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁呢一封電郵亦都係抄錄畀其他人嘅，咁同黃嘉峰先生寫嗰個電郵呢都係一樣，大家睇唔睇到嗰個抄錄嘅表嗰度嗰啲人名？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家睇 354 頁，就係咁樣回應嘅「多謝你同埋你嘅團隊係盡力去統籌咗呢一個家強安全嘅計劃，你建議嘅行動，我覺得冇問題，如果要取得正式批准，請車務總監去查核同埋係批准同支持，好多謝你。」後面係有一個加註，就係話呢一封電郵亦都係抄錄咗畀其他，「請車務總監去查核一下，安全及服務質量部主管嘅文件同埋溝通計劃，然後正式由你決定係發出正式嘅批准，多謝。」我同你查核一下，“HSSQD”係咩嘢意思？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）就係安全及服務質量部嘅主管。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。下一份嘅電郵，喺當時...

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係黃嘉峰先生？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）下一份電郵，我哋收到就係一封電郵之後發出嘅 2018 年 4 月 6 號，就係由一位叫 Aman Fong 嘅人士發出，就係培訓及服務質素管理部嘅，佢就係發出畀 Louisa Leung IA 嘅，嗰個題目就係一樣嘅，就係同之前嗰兩份電郵嘅題目係一樣。即係話有三十個辨析嘅急彎同埋迴旋處嘅安全速度限制，呢個 Aman Fong 係做咩嘢職位？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係經理嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個部門嘅經理？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係培訓同埋服務質素管理部嘅經理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）Louisa Leung？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）內部稽核嘅主管理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個電求佢咁講嘅個電郵「Louisa 請留意呢個信件」跟住就係話 Aman 發出嘅。即係話 Louisa 就收到呢個信件，就要求佢注意頭先嘅電郵，係咪啱呀？係咪咁樣解釋定係啱㗎？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁之後仲有一封電郵，我哋都曾經睇過，十一日後，4月17號發出，由Louisa畀Aman，嗰個標題一樣嘅。呢度就咁講「Aman，我哋知道何達文先生要求黃嘉峰先生要搵營運總監嘅正式嘅批准，進行有關嘅計劃嘅。」你有冇收到其他嘅電郵，就即係Owen先生係曾經就住呢個咁嘅事，畀過正式嘅批准呢？

我哋睇到有另一個Aman去Louisa有一個回應，佢就「冇」，即係似乎電郵發出之後，冇再收到其他電郵。我哋重組番呢個信件所講嘅事件，297頁。發出信件嘅人，似乎佢有個結論Owen Eckfordh先生並冇批准呢個安全改進計劃，但係委員會就冇收到任何嘅--你冇提供任何嘅文件，就話好正面咁講話，Eckford先生係冇批准呢個計劃，係佢冇批准到或者冇考慮過呢個計劃。

有冇其他嘅資訊可以提供畀委員會？即係你哋公司有冇其他記錄可以提供？協助委員會了究竟發生咗咩嘢事，即係關於呢個Eckford先生佢有啲咩嘢行動，自從2014年8月15號何達文先生發出電郵之後，佢有咩嘢行動採取過，等我哋比較Eckford先生？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道裏面嘅情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇睇番佢嘅紀錄？即係話2014年8月15號到2018年4月6號之間可能發生咩嘢事？即係呢個關鍵嘅期間，有冇咩嘢事發生，有冇睇番你哋公司紀錄？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係意思冇任何書面嘅材料可以搵到出嚟？

李澤昌先生：可唔可以咁講，我哋公司有個internal audit嘅部門，我哋就搵咗我哋個internal audit嗰個head，睇過成個嗰個呢個之前嗰個safety service部門，做過呢一個彎位嘅設計嘅嘢。我哋嗰個internal audit嗰個報告到今日為止，頭先你睇到嗰啲e-mail，應該係最接近嘅，不過我諗我哋個OD係咪可以再返去再仲有啲咩嘢補充。

梁健宏先生：我哋可以再去再睇睇，但係正如李生頭先所講，我哋而家就係我哋手頭上嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）表面睇起上嚟就比較奇怪，因為董事總經理就回應嗰個安全部門嘅電郵，佢就將呢個電郵就抄送咗嗰個營運總監，請營運總監畀一個正式嘅批准，跟住四個月之後，呢個董事總經理先至離開公司。你係咪即係話冇任何證據就話嗰個係營運總監就住呢件事做過任何事，批准，唔批准，都冇任何資料？係咪令人有啲疑惑，你同唔同意？不過你會搵㗎嘞。

梁健宏先生：Owen 佢年尾辭職，佢年尾離，2015 離開。

主席： Not the end of that year; it's the end of the following year.

梁健宏先生：2015 離開，佢離開之前呢個計劃佢亦都冇任何表示過，我 4 月呢個--（經傳譯員）喺 2015 年做咗副嘅營運總監。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我明白你講嘅，不過我想你留意，就係話就咁表面睇嚟，可能有得解釋，嗰個董事總經理將呢個電郵抄送畀營運總監，如果你需要正式嘅批准，即係呢個係一個新嘅安全嘅計劃，你話即係話冇任何證據，你話畀委員會聽佢冇做過任何嘢，即係不論係批准，唔批准定係冇資料？

梁健宏先生：你留意到當其時個 MD 覆番個 e-mail，佢喺下低嗰度亦都係話喺 subject to 一個 communicataion plan，咁當其時亦都做咗一個 communication plan，好多車務嘅同事，車務主任亦都去到各個站同車長去溝通，當其時嘅反應就係不理想嘅，啲車長係有好多嘅意見。我相信呢個係其中一個原因，當其時嘅 OD 佢會考慮嘅，至於係咪呢個佢唔批准嘅原因，就冇正式披露出嚟。

主席： Yes. Mr Duncan.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇同嗰啲係巴士司機自己有溝通呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個只係你上任前？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，我未參與呢個工作。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你即係話畀我聽，就係你個理解嘅情況？

梁健宏先生： Correct.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇任何人當時係參與 2014 年，可以同我哋講當時發生咩嘢事呀？

梁健宏先生： Not in --

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇其他人？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有其他嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士，可唔可以請有關嗰位人士，我哋可以從佢嗰度攞到啲口述嘅證供？不論係男士，邊位男士或者女士，如果喺度。

梁健宏先生： Kelvin.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想了解下，Eckford 先生而家仲喺唔喺香港呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔喺香港嘅。

楊晉瑋先生:係，多謝主席。正如我上一次個 hearing，我回覆過，當時我係有見過頭先其中一張紙嘅，裏面係有...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係記錄上係顯示究竟你係邊位？

楊晉瑋先生: （經傳譯員）我係 Kelvin Yeung（證人直接用本地話說）屯門車廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係你之前都係响呢個作過證，處理過嘅事項，啱唔啱？

楊晉瑋先生: （經傳譯員）啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）我聽唔到，可唔可以再將你嘅答覆再講多次？

楊晉瑋先生: 係，我係 Kelvin Yeung，楊晉瑋，assistant manager 助理經理，operations of Tuen Mun depot，車務組嘅，屯門廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）我頭先問你嘅問題，呢件事你係之前作供嘅時候處理過，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我可能都會重複嘅，不過請楊生你幫我哋講講點解嗰個有關嘅計劃係冇實行到？

楊晉瑋先生：喺當其時我收到一份文件，頭先喺個 PowerPoint 嗰度都見到有顯示過嘅，就係顯示當其時嗰二十九個急彎裏面嘅 locations，同埋建議嘅車速。我當其時就有份去落去同其他同事去唔同嘅車站去搵一啲車長，做我哋日常嘅溝通嘅時候，就同佢哋傾過呢樣嘢。我收到車長嘅信息，就係佢哋覺得呢張紙...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）停一停，你當時係咩嘢職位？

楊晉瑋先生：嗰陣時我係一個 senior ooperation officer，高級車務主任，係，我都係負責屯門嘅車務組。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you.

楊晉瑋先生：係嘞，咁我就喺嗰啲車站做，就同車長去做溝通，我收到車長嘅信息，就係佢哋覺得呢一張紙裏面嘅信息，係唔可行，佢哋冇辦法就住每一個彎去記住每一個彎嘅車速嚟行駛，咁樣會令到佢哋會有壓力，如果佢哋記錯嘅話，會唔會公司有一進一步嘅懲罰，呢個係當其時佢哋提出嘅一啲問題嚟嘅，我亦都有將當其時呢個情況轉達番畀我當其時嘅上級聽。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嘅上司係邊位呀？

楊晉瑋先生：係，當時嘅屯門廠嘅總經理，胡堅強先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）仲喺唔喺公司做？

楊晉瑋先生：佢已經退咗休。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）從呢個委員會收到嘅材料，就睇到你某一個階段，呢個計劃就終咗，就冇實行到，你可唔可以幫委員會了解下，邊個決定唔再實施呢個計劃？

主席：（經傳譯員）如果唔知道呢一個答案，就唔需要猜測。

楊晉瑋先生：我唔了解。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。好多謝你楊生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁生，咁個理解啱唔啱，係咪應該會喺公司嗰度再進一步搜查你哋嗰啲記錄...

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）...去協助委員去找出係邊一位決定咗唔繼續呢一個計劃，同埋唔繼續嘅理由？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我都有興趣知道，喺公司個電腦嗰度，係咪都應該有呢啲電郵嘅副本嘅呢？即係 Eckford 先生收到同埋係發出嘅電郵，喺 2014 年佢喺公司工作嘅時候，係咪佢啲電郵都有副本喺你哋嘅電腦嗰度？你認為有關嘅資料係咪應該會有嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我唔係好肯定。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢亦都係你進一步搜集嘅時候，可以為我哋找出答案，如果有人知道邊一位係負責公司嘅記錄保存嘅呢，請你都話畀我哋聽。

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你梁生，而家我去講另外一個題目，不過我就會去番一件事，就係星期二處理過嘅，就係關於超速報告，你係交過畀我哋嘅，喺 KMB-9 號，3993 頁。翻譯本喺 3995-1。

應該係黃祥明先生係協助過委員會講過呢一個報告，係星期二嘅時候。我只係想澄清一啲事情啫黃生。喺你作供嘅時候，星期二，或者我畀番個參考嘅數目你，嗰個謄本嘅頁數 134 至 135，你就畀咗一啲關於呢一個報告，就一啲嘅限額，就係一啲 50 公里嘅區同埋 70 公里嘅區。

你就話如果係揸 50 公里車速嗰啲嘅地點，你嘅報告就會係記錄到一啲巴士係行緊三種唔同嘅車速，而且係有唔同嘅時限。第一個就係 56 至 65 個公里，如果係行咗三十秒呢，就係會記錄㗎；然後 66 至 70 公里，即係每一個鐘頭就會行咗十五秒就會記錄；如果係 75 係兩秒都會記錄，跟住關於 50 公里嗰啲，如果有關嘅速度係去到 76 至 79 公里，就會多過兩秒都會係記錄到，如果係高過 80 公里就係兩秒都會係記錄到，呢一啲就係你畀我哋嗰啲限值。

由你嘅證供我亦都明白到嗰個黑盒，當時就係未能夠識別出不同道路嘅車速限制，就係未能夠實時向車長發出警示，意思就係話個黑盒係唔能夠知道某一條路嘅車速限制，唔知道係每小時 50 定係 70 公里，因此對於嗰個車長嚟講，好多時個限值就係設定喺每一個鐘頭係 75 公里，但係喺大埔嘅意外之後，就將佢變成 70 公里嘅，咁我嘅理解到而家嚟講啱唔啱？

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁其中一個解釋就係話，因為喺當時 2018 年 6 月 7 號公司係未有擁有運輸署畀嘅數碼地圖嘅。

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋記住呢一點，然後睇番呢一個報告。如果黑盒嘅數據話唔到畀你聽，巴士係喺 50 公里嘅地區定係 70 公里嘅地址，呢一啲例外報告點樣可以幫你識別出一架巴士係咪喺 50 公里嘅地區嗰度超速？

黃祥明先生：其實就係呢個正正就係原因，點解我哋需要一啲時間先至可以做到呢一個嘅報告。因為當一個初步嘅資料得悉之後，我哋喺廠嘅同事，就需要喺我哋另外一個可能叫做電腦程式，就係睇睇呢啲嘅道路，是否係 50 嘅限速道路，或者係 70 嘅限速道路，從而喺嗰度就搵出佢究竟呢一架車係喺 50 嘅超速道路行緊，定喺 70 嘅限速道行緊，我哋先至可以得到你而家手頭上呢個報告，咁我先至可以對證睇睇邊一個車長、喺邊一個時段、喺邊一度係有超速嘅行為。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁我嘅理解啱唔啱呢？就係話呢一個報告係最近先至做好？

黃祥明先生：呢一個係 2018 年 5 月 1 號嘅報告，都係近期嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係用咩嘢嘅方法去知道嗰架巴士係喺某一個地區嗰度係超速緊，用咩嘢方法知道？

梁健宏先生：而家係根據嗰條路線，架車行嗰個 route，我哋自己就將嗰架車嗰條路線就自己就喺自己嗰個電腦系統嗰度就有地點嘅。點樣 identify 個地點，就係當其時個時間同埋佢行車時速去定嘅，所以呢樣事情係真係需要啲時間，我哋同事我哋嗰個軟件去處理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一類嘅報告，你係幾時開始能夠做到出嚟？

梁健宏先生：我哋 2013 年開始有呢樣黑盒，都已經有，用呢個方法去做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係你話呢一個報告係今年 5 月先至做好，呢一類嘅報告當時大埔意外嗰陣時，係咪已經係有呢啲報告呢？

梁健宏先生：就 5 月 1 號嘅，但係呢款咁嘅 report，呢啲咁嘅 exception，我哋之前不嬲都有，我哋 2013 年都開始有呢啲咁嘅 exception report，睇到個車長係喺 56 段超或者係 76 段超速。

MR DUNCAN： How long after --

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，等一等，畀啲時間我。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我會問你一個問題。

梁健宏先生： Sure.

羅先生：（經傳譯員）如果嗰架巴士超速係 67.9，你應該知道佢應該係超速咗，過咗 50 公里，係咪呢？

梁健宏先生：係。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）喺你公司嘅記錄，你應該有一個咁樣嘅紀錄，你應該係定 50 公里呢一個時速？

梁健宏先生：係。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁你喺運輸署嗰個數碼地圖，你唔需要一定有嗰個地圖先知道你每一條線嗰啲嘅區？

梁健宏先生：嗰啲係我哋自己根據我哋自己個認知去判斷話邊段路係 50，邊段係 70 嘅。即係我哋啲同事要 manually 去喺嗰個自己個記錄嗰度，呢段路至到呢段路就 50，呢啲路去到邊度係 70，變咗呢個係一個過程，我哋每日都要去做，變咗有啲同事有啲有啲新嘅路段，我哋要 update，update 我哋自己嗰個記錄。咁有啲路段，有啲新嘅路線，或者改路，我哋要自己去 update 嘅，呢樣又係我哋要做嘅事情，就算有呢啲唔同路段嘅距離，50 好，70 好，亦都要同我哋而家嗰啲黑盒嘅數據又要擺番落去先至 compare 到佢係咪超 50 或者超 70。

李澤昌先生：或者我補充少少，其實個黑盒嘅數據就會講咗嗰架車行駛嘅速度，同埋佢嗰啲 X、Y、Z 嗰啲位置，咁就絕對唔知道嗰段路係咪超速，佢架車由開始去到終點嘅時候，個黑盒係有個時間，係呢個 X、Y、Z 嘅位置同埋佢當其時行嘅速度。

返到嚟公司嘅時候，我哋有一套系統，嗰個系統係知道 X、Y、Z 嘅位置嗰段路嗰個 speeding limit，咁然後將黑盒嗰個東西 superimpose 落去嘅時候，就睇到佢有冇超速定係唔超速，係非常長嘅時間，因為我哋有成四百幾條

線，每一條線有來回嘅方向，仲兼夾好多班，所以係一個好長時嘅時間，呢個係咁嘅情況，但係你頭先講第二就係，個黑盒本身佢有兩個系統可以做到嘅。

一個系統就係黑盒嗰間公司可以 physically 有個 map 裏面，佢喺嗰度就可以 dictate 咗個 X、Y、Z，有個速度，呢個佢哋係可以做到嘅，咁嗰陣時就未做嘅；另外一個方法，就個黑盒嘅公司呢有提議到，如果有個 digital 嘅 map，係一個 live 嘅 map，就好似你講政府個 install 咗裏面嘅話，以上講嘅情況就可以大大縮短好多，我諗呢個係梁生想講嘅嘢。

梁健宏先生：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，或者係我係重複一下，嗰個黑盒，而家睇番轉頭就會話到你聽有關嗰啲軸，即係 X 軸、Y 軸。

李澤昌先生： Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）就話到聽某一個地點喺邊度，咁樣就話到畀你聽嗰個巴士喺邊度，咁喺嗰個時候喺當時，因為你係每隔一秒都會係記錄個車速，所以你係知道巴士車速嘅，咁你做嘅第三個步驟，就係要睇下嗰一啲有關嘅地區當時嘅車速，所以就地點，然後車速，然後車速限制，然後你就要手動咁樣去做嘅，因為你當時冇數碼地圖？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係聘請咗幾多人去做呢一個手動嘅工作呢？即係其實數碼地圖都可以自動做到。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係三十七位。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲係咪慳錢嘅一個做法？係，大律師你可以繼續。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想澄清少少頭先重複嘅嘢，究竟公司係幾時開始提出呢啲報告？即係可以分到每小時同 50 同 70 公里嗰啲地區？

梁健宏先生：其實我哋好早已經有嘅，有啲同事同我講 2007 年已經開始咁做，不過當其時嗰個黑盒啲數據就冇咁詳細嘅，到 2013 年而家呢款嘅黑盒資料仲多啲，變咗就可以做得更加仔細少少。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係超出咗 50 公里，譬如話一個月嘅第一日超速，咁嗰個報告會幾時出到嚟，等你可以即係有個咁嘅結論就發生咗呢件事，要幾多日？

梁健宏先生：而家就四日就出咗個 report，同一時期黃生嗰度就會收到呢啲報告，黃生就會處理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前要幾耐？

梁健宏先生：之前就十日，再之前就十四日，再之前如果係2007年嗰陣時，可能仲耐。因為當其時嗰個電腦記錄喺個黑盒嗰度，就唔可以經 server 經 internet 去傳送嘅，係需要係 physically 去 download 嘅，所以當其時就比較時間可能仲長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢三十七個人就喺度做緊呢啲嘢？

梁健宏先生：可能仲唔只，當其時因為如果講 downloading 嗰啲 data，你每人要走去架車嗰度就 download，可能牽涉到維修組，每月月檢，我哋講緊幾千部車嘅話，就一個好 tedious 嘅工夫，肯定就遠遠多於三十七人，但係我哋都有做當其時。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）呢個十日或者十四，係咪即係要需要咁多時間？剛個車長拍卡，咁個記錄係响個黑盒度，即係唔需要再去睇番十四日前或者四日前，如果係咁樣做，係咪可以揀番呢？

梁健宏先生：正確。

羅先生： Why isn't that done?

梁健宏先生：而家我哋亦都循住呢個方向亦都係再做，就將個車長嘅資料會唔會攞咗落去個黑盒嗰度，呢度係我哋會做嘅。我哋琴日畀 IRC 嗰個報告嗰度，其中一樣 item 就講 geo-fencing 嗰度，我哋亦都加埋呢個元素落去，就係話將個車長個資料擺埋喺個黑盒資料落去，變咗每一秒嗰個資料都有埋嗰個車長嗰個記錄，咁就知嗰一秒鐘邊一個車長揸，呢樣嘢我哋就會去做。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係而家仲未做到呀？

梁健宏先生：No.

主席：（經傳譯員）而家嘅黑盒呢冇記錄，嗰個車長嘅八達通，即係佢拍卡開始揸車，係記錄唔到呢個資料嘅？

梁健宏先生：冇。

李澤昌先生：咁所以需要有十日時間處理。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以簡單啲講，你點樣知道嗰個巴士車長嘅身份？你有巴士嘅編號、有速度、有位置，你可以計出嗰個，你都知道嗰個係限速係幾多，而家你係點做，係點樣去搵出嗰個有關嘅司機嘅身份，點樣辨析？

梁健宏先生：而家就未做到，咁變咗我哋就要將嗰啲黑盒資料同我哋個站務記錄要去相併，因為我哋站務記錄就知道邊個車長喺邊個時間揸緊邊架車同埋咩嘢路線，時間同埋個車牌對番黑盒嘅資，因為黑盒資料就有時間同埋個車，咁就去對番嗰啲資料就知道邊個時間就係嗰個車長揸，所以變就係用呢個...

李澤昌先生：唔係，簡答你，其實今日佢係個黑盒有個資料，跟住佢有一個站務嘅資料，就另外一道系統，跟亦都有一個就叫做嗰個車嗰個行駛嗰個 fleet management 個資料。即係佢個站務個資料係印嘅，車嗰個行駛嗰個資料個 fleet 喺車，再加埋黑盒個資料，佢將嗰三套嘢併埋一齊先至答到法官嗰個問題，所以係真係好長嘅時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個車站紀錄，係咪用一個你拍卡就會自動記錄？

梁健宏先生：係，呢個其中一個 input。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你主席，我想向前睇睇其他另一個事項，就係嗰個實時嘅巴士監察系統，即係巴士車長嘅監察系統。可唔可以請你睇番 Openmatics，Kulis 先生嘅證供。係研訊嘅第六日，158 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，請睇第 14 頁。陳正隆（譯音）先生，即係代表委員問 Kulis 先生呢個問題。如果係可以係即係譬如話嗰啲數據，就每隔五秒鐘就可以傳送接收，佢哋公司有冇提供呢個服務，即係一係就硬件，一係軟件嚟到係協助可以實時監察嗰個黑盒嘅數據。個答覆係「可以」，我呢個係背景。你話畀我聽，而家有關嘅數據係用每隔三十秒就係傳送嘅，就唔可以減到每五秒做傳送，有冇理解錯誤？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）陳先生，睇下我有冇理解錯誤，陳生就話貴公司係提供個黑盒，黑盒就收集數據，呢個系統係可以每五秒鐘傳送資料去一個指定嘅伺服器。佢嘅答覆就「唔嗯」

作為監察人員，我响寫字樓我點樣係實時監察司機，我需唔需要額外嘅軟件，定係你間公司已經係提供咗有關軟件畀我做到呢樣嘢？Kulis 先生話有兩個方法，可以畀我哋一個軟件嘅解決方案，呢個就係我哋有個 Openmatics 嘅門站網路，同埋額外嘅一啲係軟件，但係有啲公司佢哋就淨係需要個數據，佢哋背後有其他嘅資訊系統，我哋只係一個數據嘅提供者，我哋就唔理會佢點樣利用有關嘅數據。

陳生問「响個九巴嚟講，你哋公司正係作為一個數據嘅提供者，咁你知唔知九巴有冇利用你嗰啲數據，用一啲比較先進嘅用途嚟到做實時監察？」我諗你响咁嘅情況之下，Kulis 先生話咁嘅情況之下，「九巴係個客戶，而家佢哋係用佢哋嘅資訊系統嚟到處理嗰個數據，咁當然如果有協議，我哋可以改變呢個方法。」

你覺得個世界上管理商業嘅車隊公司係點樣實時監察佢哋嘅司機嘅系統，

呢個普唔普遍？通常佢哋都普遍有咁樣嘅要求，佢哋係要去考慮到安全同埋經濟嘅原因，有關嘅公司呢通常都希望係監察司機嘅表現，有啲國家就呢個會同嗰個法律方面嘅規管嘅一啲衝突，要嚟保障佢哋安全，有啲係西歐國家，就唔容易咁樣引一啲監察系統，不過呢個需要，呢個要求就一向都有。

我就想再進一步探討，不過第一先講一講嗰個背景脈絡。首先我想你再睇番KMB-4號檔案，第1202頁。呢個係2013年年報，我哋都之前見過。

主席：（經傳譯員）係九巴㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係嗰個控股公司嘅。

主席： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然之後有九巴嘅同埋佢其他嘅附屬公司，有啲係上市公司。

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度有講過九巴嘅主要嘅人員，一個叫做Alok Jain，係嗰個規劃及發展部門嘅主管，你識唔識呢個人，呢個人當時佢嘅職？呢位Jain先生曾經向委員會提供過證供，你知唔知？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，知嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想你睇FE-1，第40頁。我想你睇番由39頁開始嘅呢份文件，委員會從程艾樂，Jain呢位先生收到嘅陳述書，你有冇機會睇東呢份陳述書？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）簡要咁睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你留意第40頁，第二段、第三段，為咗方便其他人同埋你哋各位，我就讀出嚟嘞，佢喺第二段就話「實時嘅營運管理系統，係將嗰啲黑盒裝咗上巴士之後嘅一個副產品嚟，呢個就係响我加入呢個公司嘅係一個持續嘅工作，我就涉及有好多嘅會議同埋關於嗰個技術嘅指標，個特色同埋點解選擇科技，同埋加入咗公司之後我就涉及呢方面嘅工作，我就冇涉及嗰個撥款，管理同埋招標嘅，我亦都唔記得當時係幾時係邊決定，但我知道嗰個係計劃係當時係進行緊，目的就係要改安全，希望有即時警示同埋對巴士車長嘅一啲回饋。

第二，就係改善現有嘅效率，就係希望可以改善駕駛嘅行為去咁樣做；第三，就係希望可以更積極咁樣去處理任何嘅事件或者係嗰啲有問題嘅事件，就可以提供更可靠嘅巴士服務，咁我哋可以用呢個ROM系統，就係可以處理咗呢啲事情，帶嚟好多嘅得益。我哋係廣泛咁樣係討論咗呢件事。

因為巴士信息系統嘅數據，當時仲有嘅，就算我哋冇咗呢一個計劃都仲可以有，我哋就唔可以冇咗呢一個實時監察，呢一個你可以話就係好似一個驗屍嘅

做法咁樣。然後(c)嗰度，我就冇乜參與一啲嘅討論，就係講關於話呢一個計劃實際嘅成本，不過通過開會同埋討論，我有一個印象，就係呢一個計劃係可以帶嚟一個正面嘅 ROI。

好多巴士公司，即係喺已經發展嘅世界，都係用相同或者咁上下嘅呢一啲嘅功能，就係好似九巴睇到 ROM 嘅制度裏面有嘅功能，當時九巴係制訂緊計劃，我哋其實都係大大去學習首爾、星加坡、倫敦同埋幕尼黑嘅經驗。傳媒嘅報告或者係一啲係公司嘅宣布，即係呢一啲嘅城市都話畀我哋聽，喺安全巴士司機嘅行為同埋燃料效率方面，都有好多得益。

喺紐西蘭，佢其中一個嘅網站嗰度，巴士公司係可以減低百分之四嘅燃油嘅耗用，同埋係超速係減低百分之八十一；星加坡嘅 Tower Transit，就係可以慳油百分之七，然後就係因為不良嘅駕駛行為造成嘅事件係減半。關於碰撞嘅意外，就減咗一半，而巴士司機造成嘅意外甚至係減咗七成。」

呢一個就係程艾藥先生書面畀委員會嘅一啲意見，程生亦都係喺呢一度作過供，或者我又畀番有關嘅謄本嘅頁數畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）應該係第 3 號文件。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔好意思，我講咗第 8，即係第 8 日研訊，3 號文件，係由第 81 頁至到第 98 頁。同埋梁生，你有冇睇過有關嘅作供。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有，我用中文睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我而家唔係話要詳細同你講，但係佢就係進一步闡釋程艾樂喺剛才佢嘅書面意見所講嘅嘢，講出嗰個效果就係話，公司係考慮過一個計劃，係會處理實時嘅監測，但係根據程生所講，嗰個計劃就係被取消。

首先，我想請問你哋任何一位有冇記得有一個咁樣嘅討論，就係講到話可以實時監察？

梁健宏先生：ROM 係 real-time operatons management system，呢個就唔係一個 real-time monitoring systme。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話佢個名唔係講出佢真正嘅功能？

梁健宏先生：呢個係一個車務實時嘅管理系統，係車務管理系統，係同駕駛安全係冇關嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先，九巴有冇考慮過即係以前，即係程生講嗰啲，實時嘅監系統，有冇考慮過？

梁健宏先生：呢個就係以前我哋有嘅喺車廂入面嘅 driver's alert，driver's feedback，喺個車嗰度有個 real time alert to bus captain（經傳譯員）係畀實時嘅警示畀車長，當佢係超速，大力煞車或者係突然加速。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，咁你知唔知道喺某個階段，公司係考慮過 Kulis 先生喺佢作供嘅時候講嗰一類嘅系統呢？

梁健宏先生：呢個我曾經知悉過係有咁嘅念頭嘅，亦都曾經知悉過，亦都問過 ZF 呢個 real-time 提示啲車長用一個雙向嘅通訊去提示啲車長，即時提點佢呢個車長嘅行車態度，不過當其時嘅出發點就係，唔係叫佢安全嘅，係叫佢保持嗰個行車間距，純粹係 for 車務嗰個運作。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你睇到 Kulis 先生所講嘅嘢，就係話有一個概念，就係有人收到資料知道巴士車長係超速，大力煞車，或者係突然加速，然後就係即時同車長溝通，話畀佢聽佢嘅駕駛行為係咁樣，Kulis 先生所講就係咁樣咁公司有冇一個咁樣嘅計劃，去考慮呢一種嘅設施？

梁健宏先生：冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）從來冇？

梁健宏先生：從來冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁即係你個理解關於程生所講嘅嘢，即係喺佢嗰封信頭先講嘅嘢？咁你嘅理解係乜嘢，其實阿程係講緊係啲乜嘢？

梁健宏先生：我相信佢就係話，我哋而家講緊嗰個實時車務管理系統 ROM，real-time operations management systme。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，我就要請你睇番程生其他嘅證供。我想請你第 8 日嘅研訊，第三套文件，係謄本嘅文件，第 86 頁。我想請你留意第 9 行，86 頁第 9 行。

主席：（經傳譯員）我建議我哋由呢一頁嘅開頭開始，因為程生就係解釋到兩件事嘅好處。一，就係將啲巴士組合；第二，就係點樣用嗰數據。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，主席。請問主席你係講 85 頁定係 86 頁？

主席：（經傳譯員）不如你由 85 頁開始，因為咁樣我哋知道成件事。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁生，第 85 頁第 2 行，Jain 先生就話到到嗰陣時之前，好多九巴數據都係喺個別嘅部門嗰度，咁佢哋喺度收集一啲工程嘅資料，然後車務嘅數據就喺車務嘅部門同埋係用唔同系統。嗰個計劃就係要全部將佢擺喺一個單一嘅數據庫嗰度，主席就係問「究竟會點樣用如果有一個單一嘅數據庫？」

程生就話「會三個階段，第一，就係要睇下當時靜態實際上發生緊咩嘢事；第二個階段就係要有一啲模擬，等我哋可以喺短期將佢做一個即係計劃出嚟；第三個目標就係話將佢帶到一個可預測嘅水平，等我哋可以用一啲數據或者統計嘅工具去做一啲向前嘅推算。」「咁如果係第一步驟，係咪即係話實時？」

「呢一個就係完全係愛嚟做管理信息嘅，就亦都可以做調查喇，報告。」「咩嘢叫調？調查乜嘢呀？」「譬如話我哋好多時都會收到乘客對服務嘅投訴，我哋就可以返去睇啲數據，然後去核實有關嘅資料。」

「如果個投訴已經係話呢架巴士係超速，同埋係突然大力煞車，會唔會係用數據分析，然後將佢去調查，即係如果已經有一個單嘅數據庫？」Jain 話「理論上可以。」

好嘞，呢一個就係去回應嗰個投訴，「咁你會唔會好積極咁樣自己自動咁樣用嗰啲數據？」「喺第二個階段，我哋就用呢一個實時嘅車務管理系統，當我哋有咗呢一啲嘅數據之後，我哋就將佢可以傳去一個另外一個水平，就可以分析有關呢啲實時嘅數據，我哋就可以用實時監察整個車務嘅營運，我哋呢個就叫佢做例外管理。」「即係話如果有任何嘢係超出咗一般嘅車務做嘅嘢，你而家就可以積極咁樣即時去處理佢？」

「你點係考慮到可以處埋巴士嘅駕駛態度呢？」「譬如話如果係有任何嘅巴士超出咗一般車務應該有嘅參數，我哋就可以發出一個警示，全世界就會用紅、綠、黃呢三種嘅警示，綠就係正常嘅車務，但係如果有任何嘢係超出有關嘅限值範圍，就會有一個黃嘅警示，然後再進一步就會紅嘅警示。有時就係要即時去干預。」主席就問「你會唔會認為如果係超出咗參數，就會發出警示，係咪應該即時發出？」實時發出？程生就話「嗰個目的就當然係要喺當時做。」

呢個就係嗰一段，係我想提出，照你理解程生當時喺一方面講緊嘅系統係咩嘢系統？

梁健宏先生：我哋現時嘅系統係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢照你嘅理解，係咪等於一個實時監察系統，就係 Kulis 先生所講嗰個呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個分別係咩嘢？

梁健宏先生：我哋個 ROM 係實時車務管理，係講番一啲車務調動同個車長個駕駛安全係完全冇關係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）似乎程生個理解唔一樣，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：同意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當佢話佢理解嗰個計劃係被取消，你記唔記得係曾經開始過一個計劃，然後就取消咗？

梁健宏先生：係未有取消過嘅，呢個 project 係 2014 年 10 月開始做嘅，仲未停止，仲繼續做緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個背景搞清楚先，你講嘅計劃係咩嘢計劃？

梁健宏先生：呢個就係一個實時車務管理系統，因為有呢個黑盒，有呢個巴士嘅實時地點，就可以令到車務調動更加有效率。

主席：（經傳譯員）用咩嘢方法？

梁健宏先生：每一條路線嗰啲巴士亦都知道佢喺唔同嘅地點，個前線員工包括站長、督察、車務主任，佢每一刻都知道嗰條路線嗰啲車輛嘅位置。有啲情況交通擠塞，啲車輛可能塞埋喺某一個地點，呢啲咁嘅資料，就令到我哋個車務調動更加容易掌握，知道邊啲地方可能係邊啲站啲巴士可能好耐都返唔到嚟，變咗佢喺調動巴可以更加有效率，呢個就係嗰個實時車務管理系統最核心嘅方面，可以畀到我哋嘅車務同事。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋未曾小休之前，我想再睇番 Kulis 先生嘅證供，同埋佢所提述過之前嘅段落，我引述過佢提出嘅一啲，就响第 6 日提出嘅睇法，第 158 頁都係第 3 號文件冊。搵到未？158 頁。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，搵到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前我都提過，係第 25 行，陳律師問，咁你喺咁嘅情況之下，如果作為一個即係監督人員，坐喺寫字樓，可唔可以實時監察嗰個車長？佢即係暗示就話如果有問題，可唔可以同個車長嚟到溝通？就話你要改變嗰個駕駛行為，咁呢個就係佢個問題，當然呢個系統同你頭先所啱啱講嘅係好唔同。

梁健宏先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想講呢樣嘢作為實時嘅車長嘅監察系統，以免混淆，我就話呢個係一個實時嘅車長監察系統，Kulis 先生就話呢個都好常見嘅，世界其他地方常見嘅，你見唔見到佢呢方面嘅證供？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）九巴有冇考慮過做呢樣嘢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋關於呢個咁樣嘅系統，有咩嘢立場，因為而家九巴未實施嘅，而你哋嘅立場係咩嘢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔現實嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你覺得即係決定就唔做，係咪呀？即係你哋決定就係唔採納？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）講得啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同委員會解釋點解係唔現實？

梁健宏先生：對啲車長會好大壓力，亦都未必有咁嘅系統可以處理到咁大量嘅車長同一時間，亦都曾經徵詢過 ZF Openmatics 呢個情況，覺得個結論都係不可行。

主席：（經傳譯員）你啲諮詢係幾時做？

梁健宏先生：一段時間㗎嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可幫下我哋，幾時呀？

梁健宏先生：就唔係一個好 formal 嘅討論，不過亦都有啲傾談過，尤其是喺 Openmatics 嗰部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時？

梁健宏先生：就唔係我去傾談，我啲同事同佢討論過，知道有啲咁嘅嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個做？邊個同佢哋傾？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我而家唔記得。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者畀啲時間你諗一諗，我哋而家就小休二十分鐘。

上午 11 時 36 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 58 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。梁生，你仲有冇進一步嘅資料可以畀我哋，就係話邊一位係同 Openmatics 講過呢一件事，同埋係幾時嘅事？

梁健宏先生：我問番啲同事，咁就了解番個情況就，呢個佢所提出嘅用一個 supervisor，經過一個軟件，睇住每一個車長嘅表現，其實呢個情況，我哋係覺得唔可行嘅，所以變咗喺呢一方面，我哋亦都唔會再處理嘅，其實我哋同 ZF 講嗰樣嘢就第二樣嘢嚟嘅。換句說話講，頭先嗰個一個 supervisor 睇住一個車長，呢個咁嘅做法，我哋覺得唔可行，因為我哋有成四千個車長，我哋唔可能有咁多個 supervisor 去睇住四千個車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同ZF講嘅係咩嘢？

梁健宏先生：我哋同 ZF 嘅設計就係點樣樣將嗰啲實時數據可以傳遞到畀我哋公司，咁而我哋公司嗰啲數據點樣樣可以做到一啲實時嘅地圖，啲車長喺唔同路線嘅地點，可以從而令到我哋嗰個車務嗰個實時管理係做得更加有效率嘅，呢個就係當其時我哋設計呢個 ROM 嘅目的。

李澤昌先生：或者我呢度補充少少。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時討論㗎，呢件事？

梁健宏先生：呢個應該係 2013 年我哋開始裝黑盒，當其時我哋知道有黑盒嗰個用途。

李澤昌先生：我想喺呢度補充多少少 Operation Director 頭先講嗰啲嘢，其實今日有兩個睇法，去點樣去實時去管理嗰個車隊嗰個狀況，一個睇法就係，佢嗰個所謂 real time，佢有個中央嘅控制室，然後就可以知道路面啲車點樣行法，咁從而由個中央嘅控制室就同個車長去同佢溝通，就令到嗰架車行嘅速度同前車嘅距離唔好太近或者太遠，令到個運作上會係順啲嘅。當然呢樣會有個好大嘅問題，一，實際上車長喺路面嘅真正嘅情況，喺個控制室裏面，你除非你嘅資料係非常之準確，你知道路面嘅情況，即係話好多 TV 影住之類嘅嘢，即係佢唔係一條鐵路嚟嘅；第二個問題，就係同個車長之間嘅溝通，呢個今日嚟講可能係唔理想嘅，因為個車長喺個路面嘅壓力都相當之大，所以呢個溝通嘅時間亦都係--呢個頭先梁生係憂慮嘅一點。另外，而家我哋做緊嘅，就係用咗嗰啲數據，然後我哋自己喺個 back end 嗰度，有一個叫做 TER 嘅 system，T-E-A-R（原文照錄），我諗你大家都知道，呢一個就會係同我哋喺地勤嗰啲督察，同埋喺站頭嗰個站長嗰個，係比較即係有拿捏到嗰個交通擠塞嘅情況資料。當嗰啲車長去到個巴士總站嘅時候，而個站長同埋嗰個督察係好清楚呢架車係遲咗幾多。當然，有啲情況係可能要個車長要做快少少，要追番嗰班，或者係知道情況，咁呢個我哋當其時覺得係比較人性化多少少。實際上，因為即係巴士同鐵路有少少唔同，佢個中央控制去管理四千個巴士喺路面，係有個難度，咁呢個我諗就相信頭先我哋講緊就係嗰個分歧就喺呢度，但係 Openmatics 畀嗰啲數據畀番我哋個 back end，都係做緊呢一樣嘢，不過就唔係一個中央去控制四千個車長。

梁健宏先生：多謝李生補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你都講咗三次嘞，我哋都明白嘅。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁生，我哋小休之前，我有個咁嘅印象就係話，關於呢個實時嘅司機，巴士車長嘅監察系統，呢個係 Kulis 先生嘅講法，我嘅印象就係，你話你間公司係同 Openmatics 講過呢樣嘢嘅，你其實而家係咪話，即係冇講過呢件事？

梁健宏先生：我哋有同 Openmatics 商討佢嗰個黑盒嘅，就住佢個軟件，話有個

supervisor睇住個車長去管理嗰度，嗰部分我哋係唔會考慮，亦都應該冇討論過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話你決定唔做一個實時嘅車長監察系統，因為唔實在？

梁健宏先生：我哋覺得如果係用一個 supervisor 睇住一個車長呢個方法去處理，係不可行嘅，因為你睇番 ZF 佢嗰度，佢就 refer to 喺一啲 Western country，佢 refer 番有啲個別嘅情況，因為安全嘅理由，因為商業嘅理由，咁就用呢個方式。其實我哋亦都曾經自己內部討論過，有啲--我哋自己有啲車，我哋有啲車可唔可以會裝啲呢啲咁嘅設施去監察佢，不過嗰啲車就唔係巴士，譬如係我哋運 coin box 嗰啲車，或者我哋運 fuel 嗰啲 tanker，咁呢啲車會唔會係一個 security reason 去做呢樣事情，就唔係我哋巴士，所以我覺得佢 refer 番一啲 case，就未必就係 City bus 嘅，或者我哋咁大車隊嘅 application。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係講邊「佢」？邊個係「佢」？

梁健宏先生：我講緊就係喺個 exhibit--喺個 evidence 嗰度，你哋 Openmatics 嗰個代表。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你係講緊 Kulis 先生？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我就想講番程生嘅證供。梁生，關於佢描述嗰個計劃，你似乎個理解同程生嘅理解係有啲唔同嘅，你有冇涉及佢講嗰個工作計劃？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇番佢證供嘅另一部分，係研訊第八日，係文件冊第三號，89 頁。未睇呢個佢嘅證供之前，或者想同委員會--你可唔可以同委員會講一講，你參與係點樣參與法？

梁健宏先生：呢個 project 就 2013 年，咁就當其時我就係負責 bus maintenance，咁亦都有啲參與一啲 presentation，因為有黑盒呢個工具，可以幫助到公司嘅車務嘅發展，當其時亦都有公司搵過個顧問公司，幫 KMB 喺呢一方面有啲建議嘅。當其時對於車務，我就本人就唔係好參--我最主要係維修嘅啫，但係都有參與呢啲咁嘅簡介，個 involvement 就係咁樣樣，知道嗰個 concept，車務點樣樣可以更加有效率，利用實時嘅資料。

到到我正式接任車務總監，我先至認認真真知道呢個情況，到到我知道呢個情況之後，我 2016 年接任車務總監，知道有 ROM，real time

operation management system呢個project進行中，我留意到有啲實時嘅地圖，知道架車喺條路線喺邊度，呢樣嘢就幫到我哋站長督察去點樣調配車輛，呢度係做咗嘅，當其時係2016年1月，我接任車務總監呢個職位嗰陣時。但我亦同時發覺到呢個project，原來係包含一啲另外一個功能嘅，就係代替我哋TER站務管理系統嘅功能嘅。站務管理系統就係講bus termini嘅運作，包括車長嚟到個站，佢去報到，開車，跟住到站，佢會report duty，知道架車幾時到站，車長亦都喺要接受站長個車務調動，呢個就係站務管理系統TER，當其時就係TER。頭先我講番呢個ROM其中一個功能就係代替TER，「代替」嘅意思就係佢會成立一個中央控制室，係遙控咁樣樣，remote咁樣樣去調派車長嘅工作安排，調派車輛喺唔同路線嗰個班次嘅調動，亦都遙控咁樣樣收到車長嘅報告，就住任何事情，包括壞車，包括意外，包括乘客嘅種種狀況。呢樣嘢就係嗰個設計就係中央去負責所有喺...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，梁生。我想你留意...

主席：（經傳譯員）未做呢樣之前，大律師，我想問一個問題，梁先生，你頭先答我哋嘅時候，你話當時有黑盒嘅數據係你考慮過，你又請咗顧問，咁顧問要求--你要求顧問做咩嘢？

梁健宏先生：佢負責就住service enhancement、service delivery嗰度畀啲意見嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）包唔包括防止譬如話呢啲巴士去埋同一笪地方，即係堆埋一堆咁？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係顧問係即係--係服務嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話啲巴士太集中一笪地方都包括，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師，請繼續。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）程生嘅證供，我想你睇一睇89頁，謄本嘅89頁，係第八日嘅會議嘅，第14行，黃律師代表委員會問咗一個問題，問程生，「係咪你加入公司到到你離開嘅呢段期間，你係涉及呢個ROM實時管理系統嘅計劃？」

「我唔敢講話我離開嘅時候都係參與，不過當時係討論嘅時候，即係實施嘅時候，我係就好積極咁參與有關嘅計劃嘅。」

黃小姐話「我知道有個段落就係主要要實施呢個計劃嘅原因，係要通過實時嘅警示，同埋畀巴士司機嘅提示，係改善安全。咁可唔可以--關於嗰個將訊息回饋畀巴士司機，你可唔可以話畀我聽，呢個係一個實時、回饋定係一個畀人投訴之後事後先至去向巴士公司提供個資訊？」

程生就話「個概念就係要係希望同巴士公司同埋嗰個控制中心，車務員控

制中心有一個雙向嘅溝通系統，咁巴士佢哋有一個叫做 DDU，即係話司機嗰個顯示系統嘅，咁透過呢個系統，就可以有兩個方法嚟到去干預嘅。第一，就根據預先設定嘅限值，就如果超出，就有個警示；第二個就係話，有啲人可以向控制中心嚟到係提示個車長嘅。咁我哋假設，譬如話有人坐咗响個車務控制中心，咁而家有架巴士太快，不過都仲係响嗰個車速限制嘅範圍之內，嗰個車上嘅設備就發現唔到咩問題，不過嗰個控制中心嘅控制人員發覺譬如有笪地--有某個路段，天氣，或者其他嘅意外等等，應該係慢一啲嘅，咁呢個督導人員就可以係介入，就請嗰個司機响呢個路段特別小心，咁呢個係有兩個方法嚟到--兩個水平嘅干預嘅。」

「咁响第二個層面，嗰個係控制中心個督導人員，你點樣可以係同個司機嚟到係聯絡？」

「我哋係經過好多唔同嘅選擇，我哋係講緊一個顯示系統。第二就係，我哋都講過一個係聽力方面嘅做法。」

「咁即係話有兩個可能性，一個就係用顯示系統，另外就係用一個聲音嘅系統？」

「係呀，如果已經有顯示，就另外一個可能性就係加埋嗰個聲音。」

「咁會唔會係用無線電，抑或用任何嘅方法？」

「應該係可以用無線電，或者用 3G 嘅溝通系統，當時我哋冇講到咁遠。」

黃律師就話「你就講過話有好多嘅會議，同埋好多討論係講到呢一個實時車務控制系統，你記唔記得有冇一啲會議嘅紀錄，或者係一啲文件，係記錄咗呢啲嘅討論？」

「如果我記得，係有好多嘅簡介，亦都有好多嘅電郵係做咗啲摘要，即係話我哋主要嘅議題，主要要做嘅工作咁，但係如果你話正式嘅會議紀錄，我記唔到話有冇準備過。」

你睇到呢一個證供，梁生，似乎程生描述呢一個嘅計劃，完全係同你對於呢一個計劃嘅理解係截然不同，你覺得係咪咁？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇知道任何嘅計劃，係喺公司嗰度進行緊，係關於程生講到話點樣講番畀啲巴士車長聽？

梁健宏先生：現時係我哋冇咁樣樣嘅 project 進行中，現時我哋個 ROM 就唔係做呢樣事情嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）頭先係問你喺嗰陣時，程生仲喺公司嘅時候，有冇一啲咁樣嘅計劃係你知道嘅呢？即係唔係話你講嗰個。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第 91 頁 19 行嗰度，程生就講到一啲簡介。你都有講過一啲簡介，你頭先作供嘅時候，都係講番 ROM 呢個實時車務控制系統，咁而家呢啲嘅簡介嘅資料仲喺唔喺度？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我要查一查先知。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋會好希望你進一步睇一睇，等委員會可以睇番呢一啲嘅簡介資料、電郵，係關於呢個實時車務控制系統，而係當時程生喺公司嘅時候呢一啲嘅資料，你可唔可以搵人幫我哋搵下？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，大律師，等一等。

MR DUNCAN： Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢一方面，就住先前嘅一件事，我想請你提供一啲資料，係關於保存呢一啲紀錄嘅公司嘅制度，大律師都已經講過話保存電郵，仲有就係其他嘅紀錄，譬如今次呢啲就係簡介會嘅資料，我哋可唔可以都有一啲資料就係關於你公司呢一方面嘅政策？唔係一定而家，而係你返轉頭可以畀我哋。

梁健宏先生：想補充一點，就住嗰個 ROM，我哋其實就係有一套 2014 年 10 月嘅成份 ROM 嘅 proposal 係點做，就係喺度嘅，咁呢度講番呢個 ROM 係做啲咩嘢嘅，其中有部分係關於用中央控制室去取替站長呢一方面，我就暫停冇做嘅，我覺得呢樣嘢係唔可行嘅，亦都未經過我哋公司尤其是董事會嘅討論嘅，所以如果講 ROM 呢個系統，嗰啲資料就喺度㗎嘞。ROM 係乜嘢嘢，就係呢啲嘞，我亦都可以交畀 IRC 去了解下實際係呢個 ROM 係咩嘢嘢。正如我頭先所講，“ROM”係 real time operations management system，係同駕駛安全冇關。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋理解你嘅證供，我哋都有程艾樂先生嘅證供，好明顯佢係講述一啲你有講嘅嘢，但係佢亦都講到用數據嘅另外一個輔助方法，即係嗰個數據產生係為咗一個目的，但係其實亦都可以愛嚟做第二啲嘢嘅，我哋而家就係問呢樣嘢，不過我哋好希望都睇到你而家有嘅一啲材料。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我離開呢個題目之前，梁生，我哋就係講緊實時車長監察系統，你都知，呢個就係 Kulis 先生所講嘅系統。我明白你嘅立場，咁你就話唔實際，不過我希望你好清楚--我好清楚明白就係，究竟公司係考慮咗幾多。你就話同 Openmatics 討論過，係講到其他嘅車輛，公司有冇做過任何嘅研究，係呢一個系統可以點樣用？譬如話喺西歐啲國家，即係好似 Kulis 先生提過咁，公司有冇考慮過，考慮咗幾多？

李澤昌先生：等我答你呢個問題，有，星期二已經講咗，我哋已經係有一啲同事去咗北愛爾蘭係學習緊。咁講番即係 Openmatics 嗰樣嘢，嗰個即時 real time 嗰樣嘢。過去就個車長喺嗰個行走嘅時候，佢知道佢係咪超速，今日嘅情況就係，其實當嗰個油針去到 70 公里嘅時候，咁個車長就會提示佢。而家 Openmatics 同我哋公司已經開始係做緊一個研究，就係將佢嗰個地圖係放咗一啲所謂叫做車速嘅限制，喺香港嘅地方，無論係 70 同 50 都會睇到嘅話，咁即是話，嗰個所謂 real time，喺嗰個車長嗰個 dashboard 嗰度就會響起超過 70 同埋超過 50，呢個係進行緊嘅。其實呢個亦都喺 7 月 31 號已經開始我哋啲車隊係試緊呢樣嘢，咁亦都喺尋日我哋入咗啲文件--前日入咗啲文件畀你，都解釋緊呢個係進行緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，呢個講到車速，如果大力剎車，突然加速，其他巴士車長嘅行為係會導致不安全駕駛嘅行為？

李澤昌先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你而家問嘅問題係咪都同實時嘅監察有關？

MR DUNCAN： Yes, real-time driver monitoring.

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，你可唔可以再問一次，係包括埋實時監察？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，公司有冇採取任何嘅步驟，係關於實時巴士車長嘅監察，就係除咗超速之外？具體嚟講，就係譬如話大力剎掣，剎車，突然加速。

李澤昌先生：今日其實喺嗰個 real time，喺架巴士上，個 sudden acceleration 同埋個 harsh braking 已經有提示到個車長㗎嘞，今日已經有㗎嘞，但係我哋過往呢一段時間都發覺到，其實除咗係個 Openmatics 之外，其實車長--車裏面嘅乘客都要提醒佢哋，因為我哋發覺好多車嘅乘客，除咗係老人家提醒佢之外，一啲年青人佢用手機，佢令到佢--有個 harsh braking 同埋個 sudden acceleration 令到佢喺車裏面發生意外都有。我哋都喺而家特別啲路段發覺呢一個--我哋俗語叫做因為呢樣嘢而有嘅意外，都做咗好多工作，喺--我相信有啲同事呢一段時間喺嗰啲譬如長沙灣道，我哋喺幾個月前都做咗啲工作，就派啲 leaflet 就提醒一啲人喺坐巴士嘅時候唔好掛住睇手機咁多，或者提醒啲老人家，呢個我哋繼續做。

去到嗰個 Openmatics 嗰度，我哋之後亦都有啲工作做緊嘅，就係我哋講緊嗰個 geo-fencing 嗰樣嘢，geo-fencing 嗰樣嘢，其實我哋已經開始有啲車隊係試緊呢樣嘢嘅，但係呢樣嘢係比較複雜，因為點解，其實係除咗個車佢本身有個速度，架車本身有嘅，然後個 black box 係搵到個 location，知道嗰架車個位置應該行嘅速度。咁第三樣嘢就 geo-fencing，個 geo-fencing 就駁番入去架車裏面，嗰個用電子控制嘅，例如嗰個 brake，例如嗰個油門，例如嗰個減速器，即係有個 gearbox，係點樣控制番佢呢樣嘢，呢個我哋係向呢個工作行緊。我哋可以即係畀番啲補充少少，呢個係做緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我哋明白嘅，李生，多謝你。我頭先個問題係具體講到 Kulis 先生描述嗰個制度，就係話好積極主動嘅監測，即係話喺中央控制室嗰度係講到佢嘅速度，同埋其他駕駛嘅行為，咁你就話「係冇嘅，係唔實際嘅，我哋考慮過，但係唔做。」我個問題就係，你有冇做過任何嘅調查，如果即係喺公司裏面，去睇下究竟其他嘅國家司法管轄區係點樣用呢一個系統？咁而因此可能喺香港都啱用呢？

梁健宏先生：或者我想再就住呢個問題再講多少少，科技嘅發達，科技嘅進步，如果嗰啲資料係好容易咁知道呢個車長係咪超速，如果啲資料係咪即時可以睇到嘅話，同埋嗰啲資料點樣傳送到，同埋點樣樣可以分辨到邊一位車長，我相信以前我哋覺得有問題嗰啲，都可能會解決，所以變咗，都係視乎嗰個科技嘅發展，我哋亦都希望科技係可以做到。所以點解我哋而家有 30 秒，希望去到 10 秒，或者會唔會去到兩秒、1 秒，呢樣嘢就真係科技，呢樣嘢就真係科技，我哋都期望，期望呢樣嘢可以做到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你冇答到我問題，不過由你嘅答案，我可以有一個結論，就係其實你做咗好少我問關於嘅嘢，因為你相信有其他好啲嘅方法，用其他嘅科技可以做到，咁我咁樣講係咪公道？

梁健宏先生：我意思就係話，如果嗰個科技可以令到嗰個 real time monitoring，而家你講緊 monitoring，就唔係 real time assist 或者 real time alert，而係 real time monitoring，係有人睇住個車長嘅表現。之前所講及到，西方國家有個 supervisor 睇住個 driver，安全理由，商業理由，但係如果我哋講緊我哋巴士，四千個巴士，99%個巴士都係--車長都係一個好稱職，好安全駕駛嘅車長。我哋係咪要用三千九百九十九個人睇住呢四千呢個車長呢？呢個係一個技術上嘅問題，如果科技上係可以做到，幫到我哋，可以由兩個人睇住四千個車長，而每個車長都係駕駛好嘅話，我相信我哋會極之採納。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係因為呢一啲嘅事情，咁你就冇進一步探索呢個問題嘞，係咪呢，呢個情況係咪咁？因為你個結論就係唔實際吖嘛，係唯時間？

梁健宏先生：我哋係保持開放嘅態度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你話保持開放態度，係咪即係話仲喺檯面，你仲會考慮嘅呢？抑或你已經係有一個結論就係唔實際？

梁健宏先生：當其時我哋覺得嗰個決定，或者當其時個決定冇做到，係基於不可行，如果將來有個情況，real time monitoring，係 practical 嘅話，我哋極之開心咁採納。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係就唔係公司而家考慮緊嘅嘢，咁樣講啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：暫時我見唔到有一個 practical 嘅方向畀到我哋，如果有嘅，我哋極

之樂意即時去採納。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）李生頭先講即係巴士上面乘客嘅一個嘅事項，我就想請講到嗰一啲關於乘客嘅事項嘞，呢個係講緊係乘客嘅行為，即係巴士上乘客行為。我相信你都知道，委員會聽過啲證供就話，差唔多每日你哋嘅車長都會受到人口頭上，甚至有時係肢體上嗰啲係侵襲嘅，咁樣係咪一個合理嘅一個對事情嘅簡述？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

彭樹雄先生：或者我回應呢個問題，確實係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇 KMB1 號文件冊，203 頁。呢一頁係一封信，係由委員會發畀公司嘅，日期今年嘅 7 月 20 號。我想提醒你，就係呢封信係希望攞到啲進一步嘅資料，呢個關於即係襲擊巴士車長嘅資料。第二到第四段，即係 204 頁可以睇到呢兩段，我哋要求你提供一啲詳細嘅資料，就住五個襲擊嘅事件提供資料嘅，你見到呢度有關嘅要求嘞。

彭樹雄先生：係，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。請你睇番 212 頁，係同一個文件冊，呢個係公司嘅回信，你有提供啲統計嘅資料，關於襲擊嘅個案嘅，就從 2015 年 1 月 1 號到 2018 年 7 月 22 號期間嘅一啲統計數字嘅。218 頁，我係睇緊一個翻譯本嘅，你有睇到，呢度有五宗個案嘅詳情，即係委員會就係請你就住呢五宗係提供資料嘅，全部都係今年四月發生嘅事件嘅，請你係咪揭到已經 218 頁嘞？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。呢度有五個個案，你睇番嗰個懲罰或者係入獄嘅刑期嗰度，你見到第一項第二個就係話，警方唔進一步處理，最後一個個案就仍然係調查緊。

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）三、四呢兩個個案，個被告就係認罪嘅，就罰款 3,000 鈆，另一個就罰款 1,000 鈆，即係分開就兩個被告就分別就係罰款嘅。你知唔知道最高嘅入獄嘅懲罰或者係裁判官關於襲擊，最高可以係罰幾多呢？就係 100,000 鈆嘅罰款，同埋六個月入獄嘅，你知唔知道？

彭樹雄先生：係，知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁樣可唔可以咁講，既然有咁高--呢啲咁嘅高--最高刑罰，咁呢幾個個案嘅懲罰似乎都係比較輕微，咁樣講公唔公平呢？

彭樹雄先生：我同意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢係咪一個問題？公司認唔認為係一個問題，即係話懲罰係輕微？

彭樹雄先生：呢個係我哋其中覺得一個嘅問題，亦都係我哋其中一個嘅 concern，可以咁講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你而家睇睇 293 頁，同一個文件冊，293 頁。呢個係一個文件嘅翻譯本嚟嘅，文件大概會响 286 頁嗰度睇到㗎嘞。

彭樹雄先生：係，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁而家我睇 293 頁呢個信件嘅翻譯本，呢封信你可以睇到係嗰個簽名，九巴嘅法律部門嘅簽名下面嗰度，即係 2018 年 3 月 8 號，呢度即係話係巴士車長受到多宗襲擊嘅個案。

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係寄畀警方嘅，特別係即係寄畀警務處處長嘅？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二段呢度咁講嘅，「舊年嘅 5 月，我哋寫信畀警方就係表示關注我哋個巴士車長一個接一個受到襲擊嘅。咁考慮過有關嘅個案，我覺得有啲人根本就唔淨只係襲擊嘅，而係一個係違反咗公共巴士服務規例嘅第 13A(1)(c)條，即係話乘客或者係打算搭巴士乘客就唔應該影響到巴士或者係巴士嘅設備嘅，或者影響到造成干擾或者造成損害嘅，或者係造成任何人嘅受傷，或者係唔舒服，或者係受到唔方便，或者係滋擾嘅。所以我哋請咗我哋嘅職員，就住上述個案向警方提供資料嘅，希望警方可以控告呢啲--根據有關規例嘅 13A 條，控告呢啲嫌疑犯嘅，咁我哋有關嘅陳述書證供就已經係附錄响本信件嘅。」

跟住去到 294 頁，就係繼續嗰封信喇，跟住我--「本公司就寫咗畀係香港警方就係考--查詢呢個發展嘅，我哋得到通知就係，佢哋淨係告呢啲人係--警方淨係告呢啲人係普通襲擊嘅。我哋有同--呢度亦都有啲其他同警方嘅通信嘅副本嘅，我哋就同--本公司最近同前線嘅巴士車長就見面，佢話香港警察就--佢哋希望警方會根據規例嘅第 13 條例嚴格執法，去到警告嗰啲人會影響我哋巴士車務嘅人，或者係襲擊我哋職員嘅人。我哋希望」--跟住咁寫，「我哋希望香港警方將來將呢啲襲擊嘅巴士車長會係考慮下根據規例嘅第 13A 條控告佢，即係再附加上嗰個普通襲擊嘅罪名嘅，我哋會同警方合作，嚟到係提供協助嘅。如果你有咩嘢需要查詢，請隨時係接觸我哋嘅律師。」

296 頁就係嗰個警方回信嚟嘅，係 5 月 17 號，佢即係話「收到你嘅信，關於嗰個係同你哋公司嘅見面--3 月 28 號見面之後嘅跟進行動，我哋已經係通知咗總區，嚟到提醒前線嘅人員，就係要處理嗰個係襲擊或者係滋擾巴士司機嘅個案，要係公平同埋專業處理，我哋明白到呢個情況嘅性質，我哋都知道呢個係一

個應該要考慮下係咪根據香港法例第 203A 條（原文照錄），將公共巴士服務採取行動嘅。」

關於襲擊車長，警方有冇試過，即係今年 5 月 17 號之後，有冇試過提出過檢控？

彭樹雄先生：呢個我暫時收唔到個訊息，應該就冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以我哋唔知道究竟警方係咪接受你哋嘅要求，根據個規例嚟到係檢控，我哋仲未知㗎？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）唔知嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁到目前為止，一向個做法都唔係咁，係咪呀？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）你意思根據 230A 章提出檢控，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN： Yes.

彭樹雄先生：從我公司嘅紀錄，我哋睇得到係從未有一單嘅案件係用 230A 係作出檢控嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道，規例裏面最高嘅罰則係 3,000 蚊罰款，入獄六個月？

彭樹雄先生：係，我知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以要求警方根據呢度嚟到規例控告，係有咩嘢用途呢？因為佢比起普通襲擊嘅罰則係低啲嘅。

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋公司嘅睇法，因為就住一啲嘅譬如話普通毆打等等，好多時嗰個警方指出嗰個檢控，或者個調查，相對地係困難嘅，而喺--如果喺用 230A 作出調查甚至檢控，可能相對地，去證明嗰個違法行為係會比較係容易啲。兼且，我哋亦都希望一啲毆打我哋車長，又或者“abuse”，我用個字，我哋車長--abuse 我哋車長嘅乘客亦都能夠得知到，其實係有一條嘅 230A 係監管住乘客嘅行為，有啲唔一定係話要 physically，即係要係郁手郁腳接觸到，有身體接觸，其實 230A 嘅精神就係話，一個乘客嘅態度其實都係可能會觸犯到法律嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你覺得比較容易係成立嗰個控罪，係咪呀？就唔係--即係比普通襲擊容易啲，係咪咁嘅睇法？

彭樹雄先生：當然，呢個我諗我哋都要交番畀警方去回答，不過站喺我哋一個公共巴士服務營運者，既然有一條法例係能夠我哋叫做保障到我哋巴士公司，保障到我哋前線嘅同事，點解我哋唔嘗試，試下用呢條條例去作出檢控呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我唔係好記得，請佢哋打出呢一條規例出嚟，等我哋知道實際上佢係點寫嘅，我哋或者而家顯示嗰個規例。

主席：（經傳譯員）當我哋咁樣做嘅時候，彭生，嗰個喺規例之下嗰個罪行好似係寫得闊啲，係咪？即係佢包括嗰啲行為，係比較闊啲，係咪？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）主席，係㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋搵到嘞，係 THB 第 2 號文件夾，第 132 頁，13A(1)(c)，就係你諗到嗰個規例嘅部分，佢係咁講㗎，「乘客或已成為乘客嘅人，對巴士嘅任何部分或其設備故意作出或故意安排作出任何事情，而該等事情阻礙或干擾巴士的操作，或引致損壞；或第二，導致他人受傷、不安、煩擾或不便。」你係咪就係諗緊呢一方面嘅規例？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）係，鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番嗰個襲擊嘅問題，喺任何階段，你有冇要求過警方要讓裁判官留意，乘客呢一方面嘅行為其實都頗普遍嘅？

彭樹雄先生：係有，Mr Duncan，所以點解我會喺 3 月 28 號，其實係由我同埋我哋個 head of legal，梁律師，另外同一個負責交通意外或者調查嘅經理，我哋係主動去警察總部，police headquarters，同一位總警司同埋佢嘅警司，我哋係傾咗一個上晝，係表達我哋公司，甚至乎其他公共巴士服務營運者嘅 concern，我哋嘅關心。喺會上面，我哋亦都畀咗好多嘅數字警方，因為我哋覺得，其實如果純粹睇嗰個數字，我哋會覺得係比較擔心，點解呢，容許我用少少時間，其實喺襲擊車長，2017 年只係得三十五宗，但係 2018 年直至到 7 月 22 號，已經有四十一宗。我哋睇得到個情況係越嚟越差，所以係我哋希望警方能夠可以真係確確實實，認認真真，好深入咁去調查呢一啲嘅案件，令到我哋嘅車長可以喺一個安全嘅環境裏面去工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）你剛才畀嘅數字，即係你喺嗰個會議畀嗰兩位警司嘅，係咪同你今次畀我哋嘅數字係一樣嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman，我哋 3 月 28 號嘅時候，我哋嘅數係去到 3 月嗰個數嘅啫，呢個 7 月 22 號...

主席：（經傳譯員）我當然明白，但係喺另外一方面，我哋而家有嗰啲數字？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪用同一個方式，同一個寫呢一啲日子嘅方法畀警方？

彭樹雄先生：係，應該係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇返去，因為我哋係請你畀呢啲數字我哋，你有冇喺畀警方嘅數字嗰度包括係去到 2015 呢？

彭樹雄先生：有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋--當我哋睇呢啲數字嘅時候，冇人係被監禁？

彭樹雄先生：根據我哋紀錄，係嘅，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁警方嘅反應係點？

彭樹雄先生：其實喺嗰個會面裡面，3月28號個會面裏面，其實我睇得出警方都係關注嘅，咁嗰個總警司，個Chief Superintendent，佢亦都係喺個會度，亦都承諾佢會出一啲嘅指引畀佢哋前線個車長--Sorry，對唔住，畀佢哋前線嘅警員就係去第一，係會好認真咁去調查呢啲所有嘅alleged assault，同埋佢亦都會係提點佢前線嘅同事，睇下有冇一啲嘅案件係能夠適合用230A係去調查，甚至檢控嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你請警方留意呢啲事情，其實你個目的係咩嘢呢？你想達到啲咩嘢目的？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋想達致就好簡單嘅啫，我哋唔想我哋啲前線車長係繼續受到一啲即係係--我用個字係“excessive”，一啲excessive嘅abuse，呢個就係我哋想咁樣做嘅啫。又或者Mr Duncan，如果你容許我都回應番又或者Mr Chairman個問題就係話，其實common assault同埋230A，我哋點解會想有230A呢？或者都容許我舉一個剛剛喺...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁好明顯，好明顯㗎嘞，一睇就知道嘞，因為佢好廣泛吖嘛？

彭樹雄先生：主席，你可唔可以畀我講一講啱啱有一單發生咗嘅事件，其實如果用230A，係可以令到我哋嘅車長嘅工作更加安全，更加暢順？

主席：（經傳譯員）哦，好呀，當然可以喇，唔該。

彭樹雄先生：或者我想帶大家，其實呢一單事件發生係喺7月29號，7月29號，咁我好簡單咁概括講一講就係，我哋喺夜晚差唔多11點鐘嘅時間，咁有四個二十幾歲嘅男乘客，咁佢上車，佢就係冇畀到足夠嘅車資嘅。當時個車長就曾經追問佢哋，叫佢畀足夠嘅車資，但係呢四個男子就完全冇理會個車長。咁個車長就繼續行車，因為有其他乘客。當佢去到又一城又一村落客嘅時候，呢四個男乘客就想落車，咁個車長就再一次追討。咁呢四個男乘客就完全冇理會，就落咗車嘞。

好嘞，跟住個車長就發覺，因為嗰架車當時個engine仲係應該suppose係行緊㗎嘛，但係個車長突然之間發覺架車死咗火，個engine off咗。咁個車長即刻就落車睇，就發覺呢四個男乘客就一路跑住咁走咗。好嘞，咁個車長於是乎就懷疑，同埋佢亦都聽到一啲踢我哋個車身嘅聲音㗎，有啲碰撞嘅聲音，其實我哋嘅車長就懷疑，第一，佢就係將我哋車尾有個死火掣就係熄咗，於是乎個engine就off咗。但係嗰四個男子就跟住就跑走咗嘞，好嘞，咁個巴士車長

因為有乘客喺車，佢於是乎上番車，再重新 start 過個 engine，咁繼續行車嘅。

好嘞，架車就喺大約十五、二十分鐘之後，佢就去完總站，再返番轉頭，去到又一村達之路個燈位，當時個車長係因為燈位所以停咗車嘅，但係突然之間，嗰個車長又發覺，個 engine 又熄咗，然後佢喺倒後鏡，又見番嗰四個男子，咁車長再落車睇嘅時候，就發覺個車又係熄咗個 engine。咁於是乎個車長追唔到喇，因為嗰四個男子走咗嘞。車長就即刻通知我哋當值嘅 inspector，咁我哋報咗警嘅。但係警員到場了解事件之後，當時嗰個警員就將呢件事作為一個糾紛咁樣處理，佢哋當呢個係一個 dispute case。然後巴士返番廠，咁就收工。

我想指出，其實好似呢一個咁嘅案件，其實係好明顯地，好明顯地，230A 係有可能係有人干犯咗嘅，但係結果呢個案件係作為一個糾紛咁樣處理。所以即係我都好希望就係話，喺保障我哋車長嗰個人身安全，保障我哋能夠提供一個適切嘅服務畀市民大眾，其實我真係好想懇請有關當局能夠認真考慮 230A 嘅檢控。

係，多謝 Mr Duncan。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇問過警方，去讓裁判官法庭去留意呢一類行為嘅普遍性呢？似乎你嘅巴士車長係要受到呢啲...

彭樹雄先生：有，絕對有，absolutely 有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁佢哋咁做呢？佢哋有冇喺法庭度企喺身，話畀裁判官聽「呢一個係好常見，好普遍嘅罪行，我哋認為應該判得重啲，係可以有阻嚇作用。」有冇採取咁嘅步驟？

彭樹雄先生：呢一方面，我哋係有同 police--即係有同警方係提出過嘅，但係 Mr Duncan，我都希望你明白，就住 2017 年至到 2018 年 7 月 22 號，我哋總共係有七十六宗嘅普通襲擊車長嘅案件，但係當中只有十單係被定罪嘅啫，convicted 十單；有六宗就係和解咗；有七宗警方就係唔追究㗎，not pursuable--即係或者 not pursued；另外一單警方係話佢哋畀咗口頭警告。所以到底嗰十宗定罪，有冇喺法庭度，嗰個調查嘅警員係同法庭講咗嗰個嚴重性呢？又或者個法官有冇因為呢個嚴重性，而去考慮判刑呢？咁呢個我諗我喺呢度我答唔到，或者可以問一問警方有冇咁樣做法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你打唔打算同律政司司長提出呢件事？

彭樹雄先生：其實任何嘢可以保障到我哋嘅車長嘅，我哋都會做嘅，呢個其實我哋甚至乎都考慮，會唔會可以有一啲所謂 follow up 嘅 civil claim，可以令到市民大眾知道，其實呢一樣嘢係好影響到個巴士安全，好影響到個巴士運作。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以請你回覆個答--問題呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋喺呢刻就話，Secretary for Justice，我哋就--我哋冇--喺呢個階段，我哋冇諗過。因為我哋都想其實...

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個係檢控專員呢，刑事檢控專員呢？

彭樹雄先生：冇呀，對唔住，主席，我哋冇--喺呢個階段，我哋係冇咁嘅打算，因為我哋始終都係覺得，我哋同警察嘅溝通，我哋希望都能夠真係做到我哋想做嘅嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，睇個時間...

MR DUNCAN： Certainly, Mr Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）而家我哋可以係小休食午餐，咁晏晝就係從兩點半開始嘅。

下午1時01分聆訊押後

下午2時30分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，午安。各位，希望大家就係攞出TD-2嗰個文件夾，第1頁，呢度我哋有《公共巴士服務條例》，想麻煩你睇一睇呢個第58頁，文件夾嘅第58頁，你睇下呢個第36條，嗰個係關乎呢個附例嘅，嗰度就係第(1)，喺嗰度嘅36就係話任何專營公司喺符合本條例同埋佢嘅專營權嘅規例下面，可就以下所有或任何事宜訂立呢個附例嘅，嗰度就係有(a)、(b)、(c)、(d)、(e)各項嘅，而(e)底下仲有一啲分段嘅，另外亦都係有第(2)、(3)、(4)條，跟住嗰版嗰度就見到喇。

而大家可能覺得同我哋喺午飯之前所傾嘅嘢最有關嘅應該就係(1)(e)嗰度，嗰度就係話專營公司有咁嘅權力係制定一啲附例嘅，就係關乎乘客一般嘅行為嘅，即係話如果啲乘客係搭呢啲專營公司嘅巴士，我想問九巴有冇制定過任何嘅附例呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）從來有冇考慮過話自己要制定附例呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問公司有冇考慮過制定附例可能喺某程度上可以處理到目前個情況，即係話你哋而家嘅車長係要處理乘客行為嘅問題？

蘇偉基先生：我理解，如果係成立 by-laws 嘅話，公司就係有個責任去 enforce 呢個 by-law，就要考慮公司有冇咁嘅資源、有冇咁嘅能力，同埋就係話當嗰啲違反呢個 by-laws 嘅行為，佢喺嗰個地方嘅出現，公司係咪有員工可以即時去處理得到呢？呢個係一個考慮。現有嘅情況就係 230A 就係由警方去執法，佢喺個資源同埋嗰個嘅專業程度係比一個專營巴士嘅服務商嘅為大，同埋亦都更加專業。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問下，公司有冇打算去考慮呢？

蘇偉基先生：暫時冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋就係有聽取過一啲證供，就話喺某啲巴士嗰度就係已經裝咗一啲鏡頭嚟到協助偵查嘅工作，亦都希望最後如果需要檢控一啲違例人士嘅話，就有助嘅。我就想請你睇呢個 KMB-1 嗰個文件夾嘅，就係喺第 82 頁嗰度嘅，呢度就係委員會向你哋問咗一啲問題。

當時問嘅問題就咁嘅，「就想問下，向呢個車長有冇提供過一啲顧客服務嘅訓練嚟到幫佢哋就有嗰個技巧去處理一啲麻煩嘅乘客？」

你哋提供嘅答案，其實就係喺第一份提交嘅陳述書嗰度有咁嘅答案，就包括下者嘅，我而家想睇番一個係第三點，呢度就話：

「除咗培訓之外，我哋亦都採取下列嘅措施嚟到協助車長去處理一啲難搞嘅乘客嘅」，其中就係話有一啲「監察嘅鏡頭，包括係方向向前嘅鏡頭，同埋有一個係影到車長個位嘅鏡頭，自從 2015 年開始，所有新巴士都係有一個標準嘅裝置。去到 2018 年嘅 2 月監察鏡頭就係已經係喺二千三百一十九部九巴嘅巴士同埋一百四十六部龍運巴士上面係裝咗嘅。其餘嘅巴士亦都會裝呢一啲監察嘅攝影機嘅鏡頭就係逐步咁去做嘅，呢啲監察鏡頭就可以影到嗰個行為，亦都可以有錄音，就可以影到嗰啲難搞嘅乘客，就會係喺日後警方進行調查或者係有法律訴訟或者程序嘅時候保障到車長嘅利益。」

我第一條問題就想問，呢啲嘅鏡頭或者係攝影機有冇讓你哋係有證據嚟到係促成係成功咁檢控到嗰啲違例者呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據我剛剛所讀出嘅二千三百一十九部九巴就已經有呢一啲嘅相機，呢啲攝影機，目前有幾多部係未有呢啲鏡頭嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：有二千--接近二千八百部車係有 camera，我哋成個車隊就有四千三百嗖，換句說...

蘇偉基先生：喺九巴嘅車隊大約係有一千一百部係未有裝，喺龍運，我諗大約係有七

十至八十部係未有裝呢個CCTV嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇話出現過咁嘅情況，車長自己就係嘗試去影呢一啲粗魯嘅乘客嘅行為，用佢哋自己嘅手機，有冇車長嘗試過呢？

蘇偉基先生：行車期間，車長係唔可以用自己嘅手提電話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗佢揸緊車嘅時候，好明顯呢個當然係咁嘅情況，因為會影響安全，但係巴士停低落嚟嘅時候又點呢？准唔准佢哋用手機呢，喺咁嘅情況之下？

梁健宏先生：我哋唔容許車長佢用自己嘅攝錄器材就擺喺個車廂度去攝錄嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有一位證人係工會代表，佢曾經就係作證嘅，或者我畀番大家係嗰個有關嗰個係頁碼，第10日嘅聆訊，係128至130頁嘅，講到就係佢哋嘅投訴，就係話車長就唔可以用手機嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實佢係講手機定係相機呢？

MR DUNCAN：I think he mentioned cameras.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為嗰度有分別嘅，因為好多時譬如的士，我哋見到有呢個相機，同手機嗰個相機又唔同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，等我再問過個問題。有一位工會嘅代表，我諗係月薪車長聯盟嘅，佢哋就講過，就話有啲車長就係想用相機，但係出過通告係發畀佢哋，就係禁止係咁樣用呢啲相機嘅，首先你有冇聽過呢啲咁嘅證供呀？

蘇偉基先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪出過份通告？

蘇偉基先生：有喺度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以係交畀我哋委員會睇呢？

蘇偉基先生：可以。我可否解釋原因呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以，講。

蘇偉基先生：我理解，而家私人專員喺用CCTV，佢係有個指引去收納呢啲牽涉到個人私隱嘅數據，包括影像，首先就係要有個告示話畀人聽佢係被攝錄，然之後亦都有個指引，佢係要有一個retention嘅policy，同埋如果有人去索取，佢有個指引佢點樣去處理，亦都不需要嗰陣時，係要銷毀。

如果個別車長佢自己裝佢嘅CCTV喺個車廂入面，其實佢係冇辦法係保證到佢係符合到頭先嗰三樣嘅指引嘅，而家公司其實喺呢三樣嘢係明確做到，佢喺個巴士個車廂，上車嗰陣時係有個告示我哋呢架車係有個CCTV，公司亦有政

策去處理、保留或者 retrieve 嗰啲嘅錄咗嘅攝錄。公司唔係話停咗喺今日頭先講緊二千四百架車嗰度，我哋會喺年底之前，會將我哋嘅車隊九成係裝番 CCTV，餘下嗰一乘唔裝原因，其實佢都相繼喺一年之內會係退役，因為佢亦都架車老喇，十七、八歲，畀一個新車取替咗。變咗成件事就係話喺年底之內，我哋嘅車隊係會有配置 CCTV。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪保障私隱就緊要過保障你哋嘅安全呢？

蘇偉基先生：我哋要取個平衡。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係你嗰個係平衡，呢個係講到法例上面要有一個平衡，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋係咪有徵求過法律意見呢？

蘇偉基先生：佢個指引其實係清楚、明白嘅，當時呢張嘅 circular 係唔畀車長自行裝，我唔可以答，因為係我未加入公司。但係我可以今日去再問一次，因為由而家到年底都仲有一個時間。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇同呢個私隱專員係提過呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有同呢個私隱專員傾過？

蘇偉基先生：No，I have read --佢有個指引出嚟，而個指引亦都係列咗呢幾點。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇同私隱專員係傾過就係話如果係車長用呢一啲相機，希望就係影到啲人係襲擊佢哋嘅，...

蘇偉基先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）...如果係咁樣嘅話，會唔會係違反法例，有冇問過呢？

蘇偉基先生：冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就講到係嗰個保護車長嘅嗰個保護屏或者係保護罩，我就想請你就係落去呢一個你哋第一份陳述書嘅第 62 頁，呢一份係第一份嘅陳述書，公司就講過以下嘅說話嘅，你話「鑑於就越嚟越多人襲擊呢個車長，我哋因應就係採取咗下列嘅措施」，或者你睇一睇呢一個第三至到最屘嗰段。「我哋就會裝一個保護板就係近住喺嗰個車長個位嗰度嘅，由 2018 年嘅 6 月開始咁做。」呢個過程係咪已經開始咗？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家有幾多架巴士係有裝呢一個保護罩呢？

梁健宏先生：直到目前為止，一千五百部。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）車隊餘下嘅巴士會點樣做呢，有咩計劃呢？

梁健宏先生：我哋預計年底內完成呢個裝置。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇另一個文件冊，就係雜項嘅文件冊2，第913頁，喺右下角，我哋見唔見到呢一塊嘅保護板？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個係負責設計呢一塊板嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：本公司嘅工程部，工程部。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個負責製造呢塊板嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：KMB自行設計，就去採購，亦都係試裝，亦都交過畀運輸署去檢視，佢哋覺得同意，我哋先至大量今年6月開始安裝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話你採購咗呢啲裝備，你係同邊一個買㗎？

梁健宏先生：外國嘅供應商。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係邊個國家㗎？

梁健宏先生：我而家冇資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以攞呢個資料呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你提供呢一個資料。呢個係咪根據世界其他地方巴士嘅保護板嚟設計㗎？

梁健宏先生：其他外國，尤其是英國，有部分嘅設計都未必啱我哋用嘅，因為我哋嗰啲，首先第一，我哋有冷氣，我哋唔可以係一個full enclosure嘅，變咗呢個亦都因應番我哋嗰啲車長，最主要個情況就係佢左邊係冇遮擋嘅，所以個原意設計都係喺左邊，希望有個保障畀我哋嘅車長。亦都有啲--你留意有啲位，有啲窿，其實係畀嗰度開車門嘅，所以變咗呢個protection shield純粹係我哋自己設計，希望個車長又用得開心，亦都可以做到保養--保護佢嗰個功能，希望--所以變咗係我哋設計。

當然我哋設計開始嗰陣時亦都安裝過程之中有少少teething problem，而家我哋都喺度處理中，有啲情況話個攝石嗰度係鬆嘅，我哋都搵個方法安裝得企理啲。有啲投訴或者覺得意見話係反光嘅，我哋都諗有咩嘢方法去處理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道有兩個工會嘅代表係有同委員會表示佢哋並

唔滿意呢個設計？

梁健宏先生：我收到有部分工會嘅意見，就住呢樣事情唔係幾理想，我亦都收到有啲工會嘅意見，係覺得希望我哋加快啲裝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就會畀一個資料你參考，係嚟自汽車交通運輸業總工會，係喺第9日提供咗證供嘅，你可以睇番第33至36頁，而喺第11日，係有巴士業職工會聯盟作證嘅，呢個就喺150至151頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪都係第9日㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，呢個係第11日，11日嘅。梁先生，你有冇睇過呢部分嘅證供呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）應該有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你已經睇過，我就想畀番你睇，首先第9日，文件冊4，第33頁，你可以由第18開始睇嘅，你就會見到提到一個安裝保護板嘅事宜，而係第34頁嘅頁頂，我就想你睇一睇嘅，佢就話似乎有一啲保護，但係個保護罩嗰個窿係好大嘅，而亦都係唔容易係開關嘅，同埋佢係反光，非常之反光，而喺嗰個端端嗰度就有磁石，而當巴士行駛嘅時候，可能係會產生噪音嘅，似乎喺呢一句有三項嘅不滿，首先就係反光，第二就係有磁石，第三就係有噪音嘅。有冇人向公司反映咗呢啲問題呀？

梁健宏先生：有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇做過任何嘢？

梁健宏先生：大部分我哋都處理咗，反光嘅問題，我哋亦都係在處理中。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話反光仍然係一個未解決嘅問題，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：正確，但係我哋覺得最主要嘅出發點就係希望畀個車長一個保障，反光嗰度係喺左手邊嘅，亦都係喺佢駕駛嗰個視線係左手邊，所以正常嘅行車，絕大部分時間都--我哋覺得係可以嘅，但係亦都希望睇下有咩嘢方法可以解決呢個問題，希望儘量做到最好。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我有嘢想補充少少。其實點解我哋6月會裝呢啲嘅保護嘅裝置呢？正如我喺午膳休息之前都講，因為今年2018年，我哋車長被襲擊嘅數目係急升得好犀利，所以我哋管理層覺得有需要係要即時係要處理呢個問題，所以我哋喺嗰個設計、做procurement購物、裝置，其實我哋喺好短時間裏面係去做個決定嘅，裝咗之後，我哋明白係有啲啲嘅teething problems，所謂一啲嘅問題，例如攝石可能會實得滯，又或者有--當嗰個車長進出一啲光或者暗，即係比較大對比嘅地點嘅時候，可能會有啲反光，呢個其實我哋知道嘅，但係裝咗之後，確實我有好多前線嘅車長係非常之歡迎我哋公司呢一個嘅舉措嘅。

當然，我都咁講，我哋去決定嘅時候，因為實在嗰個我哋車長畀人襲擊，我哋車長個 sentiment，我哋車長嗰個感覺、個感受，我哋覺得我哋一定要 address 嘅。當然我哋去同警方傾，我哋希望警方做多啲檢控，我哋儘快裝我哋嘅 CCTV，我哋亦都係喺 4 月除咗裝呢個保護嘅裝置之外，我哋亦都喺我哋嘅司機駕駛室嘅隔籬亦都新裝咗一個嘅標語，就係話「滋擾車長乃刑事罪行」，呢個其實亦都係一連串我哋係真係好想畀到一個安全嘅駕駛環境我哋嘅車長。

呢個當然喺個過程裏面係咪可以做得好啲呢？我哋其實而家都仲係喺度係去 rectify 緊呢一個 protective shield，譬如有啲咩嘢特別嘢，例如反光，我哋可以點樣處理呢等等。

另外，我哋亦都喺我哋每一架車，我哋有個叫做報站器嘅，我哋亦都喺個報站器度，我哋亦都加入咗一個嘅告示，大致上就係話我哋嘅車長係受到滋擾，我哋可能會停車處理。呢個亦都係幫助到我哋嘅車長去處理呢一樣畀人滋擾或者可能發生畀人滋擾嘅情況底下，我哋都希望我哋儘量可以做多少少嘢，就去幫得到我哋嘅車長。

另外，除咗呢啲保護裝置，除咗嗰個報站器，除咗嗰個標貼提醒乘客，我哋公司嘅法律部嘅同事亦都係好貼地咁樣、好 down to earth 咁係去幫助一啲我哋被襲擊嘅車長，我哋前線嘅督察、前線嘅站長亦都係畀晒所有支援我哋嘅車長，有車長被襲擊，我哋啲 inspector，我哋啲督察第一時間會到場，陪同我哋嘅車長睇醫生，法律部嘅同事會陪同個車長，有需要嘅，畀口供等等。呢個亦都係我哋會做緊嘅。

所以就住保護我哋車長方面，我覺得我哋公司係責無旁貸嘅，當然我哋都希望警方可以儘量幫多啲手，但係我哋自己本身亦都係有一連串嘅工作係做緊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）彭先生，你可唔可以向提供嗰句警告字樣嘅相片呀？即係喺車上面嗰一句嘅字句，同埋就話嗰句「如果車長受到滋擾，架車就可能會停落嚟。」可唔可以提供呢個字句？

彭樹雄先生：絕對可以，Mr Chairman，係可以嘅。主席，我想補充，嗰個報站器就係個車長佢有個 button 會撳嘅，其實嗰個就係譬如話到到某個站，如果大家有搭巴士，譬如下一個站係彌敦道幾多號或者係咩嘢大廈或者係咩嘢公園，佢撳，佢就會 show 到個車長被滋擾等等嘅。主席，我會提供嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

彭樹雄先生：多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話有個報站器嘅，嗰個就係文字表述吖，定抑或係聲音廣播呢？

講者（不能辨別）：Both.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）麻煩你打出嚟就係呢一個雜項 1，913 頁--對唔住，應該就係雜項 2 嘅文件夾 913，我哋呢張相之前係打過出嚟睇㗎喇，913 頁，喺呢度我哋睇唔睇到嗰個警告嘅字眼㗎？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，而家係喇，冇錯，呢個就係嗰個我哋嘅標貼「滋擾車長乃刑事罪行」。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。關於係工會代表提過嘅事情，我想問下，而家公司同工會方面係個情況係點樣樣呢？工會係支持你哋嘅做法定抑或係反對呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，你意思係咪話佢哋係咪支持裝呢一塊保護板定係啲乜嘢呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我係講緊佢哋話有個問題，即係話反光、有聲噪同埋嗰個攝石鬆，你就話已經處理緊，我想問下，而家你哋同工會就呢啲事情上面個溝通個情況而家係點呀？

彭樹雄先生：佢哋知道我哋公司正在係處理緊個問題，佢哋係感覺到滿意嘅，不過當然，嗰個 end product，即係將來嗰個製成品會係點樣呢？我哋其實都會再--唔係淨係同工會，我哋亦都會聽所有車長嘅聲音嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家又想請你睇一睇呢一個第 35 頁，呢一個係謄寫本或者紀錄本嘅第 35 頁，應該喺你前面，呢個係第 9 天嘅，其中一位代表就係喺第七行嗰度有提過嘅，呢度佢哋就話擔心係嗰個保護板就會妨礙咗車長嘅視線，佢哋就無法就係睇清楚上車、落車嘅乘客，呢樣嘢係咪佢哋都已經同公司講過㗎？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，或者我可以咁樣答你，因為本身我都有巴士牌嘅，本身我都試過坐上一架有保護裝置嘅巴士度嘅，因為我哋個駕駛室嘅司機位--車長位嘅左手面就係嗰個 protective shield，呢個 protective shield 其實係透明嘅，除非有一個好大好大嘅 contrast，即係光同埋暗嘅對比，否則的話，其實個視線係冇受到太大嘅影響嘅，但係當然我哋都明白個別車長嘅擔心，所以其實我哋都係喺個過程裏面就係話去睇下點樣可以 modify 到呢一個嘅 protective shield，呢個我哋係做緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家呢一個保護板係唔係大程度上係唔阻佢嘅視線呢？

彭樹雄先生：我可以講佢唔係好大嘅影響，當然，你始終喺你嘅駕駛室--以往係完全係冇遮擋嘅，但係當然，你有一塊透明嘅膠板喺你嘅左手面，當然喺個習慣上係可能會突然之間啲車長可能會有啲啲咁多唔習慣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家又想請你睇一睇呢個 KMB-1 呢一個文件夾，再睇番呢個文件夾，83 頁，或者仲係講緊呢一個係塑膠嘅保護板，幾時係第一次係諗起要裝呢一個保護板呢？

梁健宏先生：呢個就係舊年 2017 年有車長襲擊嘅事件多咗，就決定要做啲嘢去幫助車長，亦都有啲車長就提議過，係舊年我哋諗住做呢一樣嘢，自行設計。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我都想最後都有少少嘅回應，我同車長嘅接觸，其實大部分嘅車長其實都係高興公司係行前咗一步，當然呢一步會唔會可以喺嗰個細節上可以做得好啲呢？即係 with hindsight，你問番，當然我哋係可以做得好啲嘅，但係我哋始終係行緊第一步出嚟，我哋有第一步，就會有第二步，我哋第二步，而家就係 source 緊有冇一啲物料係完全係唔會有反光，又或者嗰啲 magnetic 我哋係咪可以係 source 過另外一種類型呢咁樣，我想講嘅就係我哋係都需要行出第一步嘅。亦都我哋前線嘅車長亦都知道公司係行出呢一步嘅，多謝 Mr Duncan。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我理解到，講到巴士司機方面，巴士公司係需要面對七個不同嘅工會嘅，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：我哋暫時係主要同兩個係有個溝通，但係其實每一個同事，我哋都有同佢哋有唔同嘅渠道溝通。

主席：（經傳譯員）係唔係工會就係有兩個工會，呢兩個工會就包括咗百分之九十嘅車長，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同其他人係溝通嘅時候，就唔係以工會嘅身分，就以僱員嘅身分？

蘇偉基先生：我哋唔係話睇佢有冇 capacity，我哋除咗同頭先所講嗰兩個工會，其他每一個車長，其實我哋都有一個渠道畀佢去發聲，或者我哋去主動聽取佢嘅聲音。舉例如，正如頭先彭生講，我哋車廠嘅主任、前線嘅督察或者彭生本人都定期性，喺站頭、廠嘅上班、下班、中段時間去主動去接觸佢哋，聽取佢聲音。

而我哋公司亦有一個叫做 JCC，joint consultation committee 嘅組織，係每月定開會，聽取佢哋對工作上有啲咩嘢建議，而相關嘅建議我哋亦都係合適嘅，會採納，呢一個係一個恆常嘅措施嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實個問題好簡單嘅，我諗你係明白嗰個問題嘅，除咗嗰兩大工會，你就稱佢哋為工會，除此之外，你會唔會有其他嘅組織，你都係同佢哋係打交道，唔一定係叫做工會嘅，有冇呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗嗰兩大工會之外，仲有邊啲工會你係有同佢哋傾嘅？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman，或者--其實我哋公司係除咗有兩個所謂我哋嘅主要大嘅 union，其實我哋都有同其他佢哋嘅所謂 union，我都有聯絡嘅，例如其實喺呢個 hall 裏面有一位郭志成（譯音）車長，一個退休嘅車長，坐咗喺嗰度嘅郭車長，其實我亦都親自同郭車長係傾談咗超過兩個鐘嘅，其實我係歡迎公司任...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你話唔係以呢個工會代表嚟到係同佢講，係車長身分，所以我就問你呢個問題。

彭樹雄先生：喺我嘅接觸裏面，其實係唔係工會喺我嘅接觸裏面其實唔係一個最主要或者係第一個嘅因素。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實我估我哋其實有一個工會嘅名單，不如將佢打上嚟，而家既然係講開呢個課題，可以將佢哋個名貼咗出嚟嘅。我哋見到啲名，我諗係有七個嘅工會嘅，而佢哋就係已經上嚟作證，協助呢個委員會嘅。我想問，你所講嘅兩個主要嘅大嘅工會係邊兩個呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話九巴會係同佢哋傾嘅嗰兩大工會？

MR DUNCAN：Correct.

蘇偉基先生：因為呢個係個英文譯名，我哋記得應該就係汽車工會嘅九巴分會，我想睇下會唔會有中文，我易認啲？我相信應該係第 9，有個工會...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我哋可以嘅，可以等陣間安排，就畀個中文名你。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，或者你可以口頭上講一講。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）汽車交通運輸業總工會。

蘇偉基先生：呢個係，正確，我哋係其中一個。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我諗佢哋而家都將嗰個中文名係打咗出嚟畀你睇。另一個呢？另一個係邊一個呢？

蘇偉基先生：咁啱我搵到，佢曾經 submit 嗰封信，我好肯定個名喇而家，係九龍巴士職工總會。

主席：（經傳譯員）頁碼係邊個呢？即係等我哋可以睇一睇。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）TU-1(A)，130 至到 131 頁，而佢哋嗰個陳述書就係 133 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。我哋可唔可以顯示蘇先生所講嘅嗰一頁呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）據我理解，有九成嘅司機都係屬於呢兩個工會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中一個？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可能係兩個工會其中一個或者七個工會其中一個。

主席：（經傳譯員）據我所記得，喺口頭或者係書面證供嘅時候就講過--即係佢哋講過，就佢哋會同兩個工會去交涉嘅。似乎梁先生係點頭，或者我哋之後可以睇番嗰一部分。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我哋之後會處理呢個問題。我咁樣理解正唔正確呢，只有一成嘅車長係唔屬於任何嘅工會？

蘇偉基先生：首先呢度每一個車長可以參加多一個工會，所以加埋晒個數係未必等於我哋車長嘅總人數八千六百位；第二，每一個工會講佢有幾多會員嘅人數，其實係由個工會自己去提供，當然我哋日常都會有個知悉，係咪一個合理嘅估算，我哋從頭先嗰兩個工會報告出嚟嘅數字，確實係佔我哋公司嘅車長數目大約九成。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁樣理解啱唔啱呢，你所講嗰兩個工會就係你最常接觸或者係交涉嘅工會，係咪？

蘇偉基先生：正確。但係可唔可以補充？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可以。

蘇偉基先生：正如頭先所講，有車長佢係不屬於任何工會，所以我哋一方面應工會要求同佢溝通，我哋亦都會同員工--我哋唔會理佢本身係邊個工會，我哋亦都會聽取佢意見，主動問佢嘅意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我理解冇錯，你嘅意思就係你係會同巴士司機接觸，有時係會直接同佢哋接觸，有時就會透過同佢哋接觸嘅？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）但係兩者係會同時發生嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我之前就請你睇 KMB-1 文件冊嘅第 83 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋係咪講另一個話題喇？

MR DUNCAN：Yes, we are.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋去另一個話題之前，我就想先顯示 KMB-1 文件冊第 218-1 頁嘅，喺第 2 段，你就會見到有一項要求，第 3 段就話「請提供嗰兩份閉路電視大綱調查報告嘅拷貝本」，同埋喺 218 頁有其中兩宗個案就有一個描述，呢個就係個案 3 同個案 4，就係有講到有一個閉路電視嘅扼要報告嘅，你有冇提供

過呢個資料，可唔可以畀番個頁數我參考？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。你可以睇番第 300 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。我想問嘅問題，就住呢個問題，根據你嘅經驗，閉路電視嘅錄像同埋聲音嘅質素係好唔好嘅呢？就住對車長作出言語上面或者係身體上嘅襲擊？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman，我可以講其實嗰啲 CCTV 嘅質數係足夠可以睇得到嗰啲人士嘅外貌嘅，個質素係都 okay 嘅。同埋亦都係可以幫到警方係好粗略咁認到個 assailant，即係個施襲者嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而聲音或者錄音嘅質素係點呢？例如係如果有一啲口頭上面嘅滋擾同埋身體嘅侵襲。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman，咁又要視乎佢係距離嗰個咪有幾遠，如果一般喺嗰個駕駛室嘅，其實都可以聽到嘅。同埋，主席，我都想補充，我哋架車總共係有九個嘅 CCTV 嘅，九個鏡頭，所以唔係淨係嗰個我哋嘅 bus captain 嗰個駕駛室，其實係有唔同嘅角度都係可以影到車內嘅情況嘅，與及車外嘅情況都可以影得到嘅，我哋總共有九支嘅鏡頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲情況係--即係你有冇嘗試將呢個錄音就抄錄成謄本，然後就再將呢一個謄本交畀警方呀？

彭樹雄先生：其實唔係淨係呢啲毆打嘅案件，其實一般嘅交通意外等等，我哋好多時都係會--我哋係會交個閉路電視嗰個影像等畀警方。

主席：（經傳譯員）我係問緊個錄音，你有冇試過將個錄音嘅內容係抄寫出嚟，去顯示呢一個襲擊嘅性質呢？定係你純粹就會交畀警方呀？

彭樹雄先生：我哋通常做法，我哋係一套咁樣交晒畀警方嘅，係聲音...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪指閉路電視嘅錄像呀？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，聲音，即係嗰個 video、audio 都係會交畀警方嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）第二個問題就係喺 4 月 4 號、5 號同 6 號嘅幾宗個案，就係 KMB-1 文件冊嘅第 218 頁，第二個問題就係就住乘客所用嘅八達通卡嘅問題，...

彭樹雄先生：係，Mr Chairman，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）...呢個就係個案 1，你見唔見到？個案 1 就上面寫住「冇去跟進，冇再進一步採取行動」，雖然係九巴已經向警方提供襲擊者嘅八達通紀錄。

彭樹雄先生：係，Mr Chairman。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇將相關嘅八達通紀錄交畀警方呀？

彭樹雄先生：我睇呢個案件，我哋係應該有交到出嚟嘅，我哋交咗出嚟嘅，不過 Mr Chairman，我想強調，如果呢個八達通卡佢唔係一啲 personalised 嘅，即係佢係非記名嘅，呢個如果佢係非記名嘅，其實嗰個跟進就可能會有啲困難嘅，但係如果當然佢登記咗，即係有個 identity 嘅，警方...

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白嘅，我哋明白，因為我哋有問過警方係攞到啲咩嘢資料嘅。喺你封信就應該係 KMB-1 嘅 297 頁，喺呢個回覆信入面，喺第二段你就講番個案 1，而你最後嗰句就係咁嘅，就話係「大概喺 2018 年嘅 4 月尾，我哋係同警方通過電話，就住呢個八達通紀錄同埋通知佢哋係收我哋嘅書面回覆嘅。」究竟佢哋有冇收到呢個回覆呀？或者你可以嘅話，你答有或者冇。

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）冇，佢哋冇嚟收嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇提供到呢個回應呀？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）冇，...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你解釋一下--你可以解--但係呢一個八達通嘅問題係從來都冇畀警方知道。

彭樹雄先生：呢個我哋講緊係一單喺天水圍發生嘅一單毆打案件，我記得因為我親自睇過呢一個案件，我哋 4 月初就收到警方一個 fax 傳真，就嚟就想攞呢一個嘅八達通紀錄，我哋喺 4 月 24 號，其實我哋已經準備好嗰個嘅 letter，同埋亦都係有八達通嗰個紀錄，我哋嘅同事跟番個指引，因為警方係 fax 嗰張 memo 嚟畀我哋公司，所以我哋一定要 verbally，即係口頭上叫佢搵人親自嚟攞嘅，否則的話，我哋係唔能夠證實到對方嘅身分。

我哋嘅同事係畀過電話天水圍警區，叫咗佢嚟攞，但係一路警方都冇嚟攞嘅，嗰封信仍然喺我哋公司度，嗰幾個八達通嘅紀錄仍然喺我哋公司度。Mr Chairman，嗰個詳情就係咁樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話你自己有參與呢個個案，究竟個襲擊嘅性質係乜嘢呀？

彭樹雄先生：呢個我記得係喺一個 B1 嘅車站，即係喺一個過境嗰個車嚟嘅，有個男車長嘅，我記得，喺落馬洲。

主席：（經傳譯員）襲擊嘅性質係咩嘢呀？即係係咪有人打佢塊面或者係用樽扑佢個頭等等？

彭樹雄先生：主席，或者你容許我--畀少少時我睇一睇，因為--唔好意思，因為實在太多呢啲 assault case。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，你可以慢慢睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席先生，當佢哋搵緊嗰啲資料嘅時候，剛剛就係有人話畀我聽就係文件 1 101 頁就講過話代表百分之九十嘅車長，或者呢度就可以就係睇番，可能你剛才就問我哋啲證供係喺幾時提出嚟嘅，可能喺呢度，係嗰一頁嘅第 4 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，係，我心目中都係諗緊呢一段。係，嗰個襲擊嘅性質係點呀？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman，it should be --佢係（經傳譯員）216 頁，216 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）講個性質。

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）車長就畀人推咗落地下，就受傷，臀部同埋頭部就受傷。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇需要接受治療呀？

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，呢度係冇講話係咪驗傷。（直接用本地話說）冇，喺度冇表示到，sorry，對唔住。

主席：（經傳譯員）我關注嘅就係似乎件事就不了了之嘅，九巴同警方之間，但係呢件事係涉及你嘅一位車長畀人推咗落地下，臀部、頭部受傷，你話畀我聽就係話八達通嗰啲資料，你就入咗信封，就喺九巴公司嗰度就係不了了之，點會咁發生嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Chairman...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪真係保護你啲車長㗎？點會容許呢啲事發生呢？

彭樹雄先生：其實我想講，其實我都有問過呢個問題，當我知道嗰個八達通紀錄係冇攞嘅時候，其實係上個月底，所以喺呢一方面，對唔住，係我哋可能跟進上面係咪可以做得好啲呢等等，我哋係覺得係可以做得好啲嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）彭生，我咁講啱唔啱呢？其實你以前都係香港警隊嘅成員嘅。

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你而家份工同埋你以前嘅職業，其實你係咪都應該處理到--係即係應該個紀錄去到應該收到紀錄嘅人嗰度呢？

彭樹雄先生：我絕對可以嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧樂勤律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席先生。我就係想請你睇番第 83 頁嘅，呢個係九巴文件夾 1，83 頁，委員會問，而你喺呢個初步嘅陳述書所回應嘅，就係話你哋已經係有一啲係輔導嘅服務提供畀有需要嘅車長，呢個第二點，你就咁樣樣

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

回答呢個問題嘅，即係當時問你哋有冇提供呢啲服務，你就話有一個專責小組，成員包括係副車務總監、係車廠嘅主管、係培訓及服務質素管理部門、通訊傳訊以及係人力資源部嘅成員組成一個專責小組，就係睇下點樣樣為車長同埋前線員工提供呢個情緒支援，你哋會係搵一個專業嘅顧問，幫你哋全面咁樣樣去檢討目前嘅做法，而且就係睇下有邊啲地方可以提供建議，其中包括就係招聘車長同埋就評估車長嘅情緒智商，佢哋能否就係抵禦呢一個壓力，培訓、輔導同埋表現管理嘅；你哋預期就會係逐步咁樣樣去落實呢一啲建議嚟到去處理嗰個即時嘅問題。

我想問，就係呢個專責小組係幾時成立㗎？

黃祥明先生：喺5月尾左右，今年嘅5月尾。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咩嘢事促使你哋係成立呢個專責小組呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）律師，可唔可以等我答呢？其實呢個主意係嚟自我嘅，因為當我知道我哋嘅車長經常畀人襲擊，我就覺得應該係尋求專業嘅意見，睇下我哋可以點樣去處理嗰個處境，同埋特別係就如何去搵我哋嘅車長，如果佢哋有需要嘅話，提供一個係輔導嘅服務嘅。

咁啱我就係識得中大嘅校長，佢哋之前係提供過一啲顧問嘅服務係畀警隊嘅，其實係幾年之前嘅事，就喺佔中嘅時期，佢哋有提供過咁嘅服務，我就諗下，可能對我哋嘅車長嚟講都有用嘅，因為我哋嘅車長經常都係有被乘客襲擊嘅，作為一個公共服務嘅營運商，我哋係需要招標，睇下有邊間公司或者組織係有興趣嘅，最後就係揀選咗中文大學。嗰個遴選工作我冇參與嘅，因為咁樣係要避免呢一個利益衝突嘅，因為咁啱我係認識中大嘅校長嘅。

而家佢哋係喺度制定緊一啲建議，希望可以幫到我哋手，幫我哋進行招聘嘅工作，亦都可以為我哋提供呢個情緒嘅支援，如果我哋有車長係有需要呢一方面嘅協助嘅話，所以就係咁樣樣嘅一個背景係形成嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而家想請你睇一個229頁...

主席：（經傳譯員）未落去之前，梁博士，想問一問，你知唔知道佢哋係專業嘅顧問，而家嚟講，你知唔知佢哋喺招聘工作方面喺邊度可以幫到手？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）基本上喺呢個招聘工作嗰度，佢哋會做一個評估嘅，評估一下嗰個應徵者佢喺情緒方面嘅特性，如果我可以咁樣講，換句話講，佢哋嘅建議就係讓我哋就可以評估一下嗰個車長應徵者佢嗰個係情緒個表現嘅，或者佢個能力嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家想請你睇呢個 219 頁，其實想請你揭去跟住嗰版220頁，220頁，就見到係你哋公司寫畀委員會嘅一封信，近期寫嘅，係8月

6 號嘅，呢度就講及一個行動計劃去落實一啲主要嘅建議。221 頁開始就係嗰個行動計劃。

我想請你係去 229 嗰頁嘅，229 嗰度，就係嗰版嘅左邊，就係嗰個關乎係心理支援嗰方面嘅情況，啱唔啱呀？呢個就係講及最初嗰個建議係點，係咪呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）中間嗰欄就見到係 2018 年 4 月 10 號嗰個嘅行動計劃係有啲咩嘢里程碑同埋有啲咩嘢日期呀咁？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）跟住喺右邊嗰欄，就知道目前個情況，我而家會將佢讀出嘅，係「一所本地大學嘅心理學系嘅顧問團隊就係 2018 年 5 月 31 號獲委任嘅，喺 6 月份就係開始咗係檢討目前嗰個做法，係睇下點樣樣提供呢一個情緒支援，就係透過去參觀車廠、車長訓練學校同埋一個熱線中心，同埋係同呢個副車務總監、車務嘅職員、分區嘅主管等等就見面嘅。」BCTS 係咩嘢意思？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）就係呢一個車長訓練學校嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係喺「2018 年 7 月，就話顧問團隊就係同呢一個專責小組講及佢哋初步嘅觀察，雙方就係制定咗一個係一般嘅方向，即係點樣去做嗰個項目，同埋喺嚟緊嗰幾個月會有啲咩嘢主要活動，就話會成立一啲焦點小組嚟到直接向車長同埋前線嘅員工係收集佢哋嘅睇法，睇下佢哋就喺呢個心理支援方面有咩嘢需要，同埋就係去睇一睇就點樣去培訓嗰個駕駛嘅老師，就會係 18 年嘅 9 月開始嘅，亦都再去睇一睇嗰個招聘嘅程序，嚟到係希望儘量就係奏效嘅，亦都希望就係有一啲支援嘅活動，就希望佢哋最後身心平衡同埋工作、生活都係好健康嘅。」

呢樣嘅工作，你知唔知道大概幾時會有啲成果呢？

黃祥明先生：根據中大畀我哋嘅資料同埋消息，其實我哋一定要係--呢個計劃係運作緊嘅，嚟緊我哋將會安排唔同資歷嘅車長同埋前線嘅站長同埋 inspector，就組成一啲嘅 focus group，等中大嘅同事可以了解到前線同事嘅工作壓力同埋困難。根據我哋嗰個計劃，將會做一個全公司嘅前線同事嘅問卷調查，進一步了解有關嘅困難，然之後中大就會制定一個嘅方案畀我哋，係點樣可以去教導有關嘅車長去減壓或者舒緩壓力嘅情況。

呢個亦都會由駕駛學校嘅導師開始，佢哋將會接受一啲課程，就等佢哋係點樣將呢啲咁嘅舒緩工作壓力嘅或者情緒壓力嘅工作係點樣去教導呢啲車長，從而我哋由呢個導師開始就教導呢個車長，等佢哋可以喺工作上獲得呢個舒緩。

時間就係而家其實一路行緊嘅，嚟緊嘅 8 月，我哋就會有呢個 focus group，9 月就係希望可以完成到嗰個問卷之後，就進行呢個導師嘅教導，一路做落去，我哋希望喺嚟緊嘅年尾能夠完成到成個計劃。

目標就係話我哋要訓練有啲導師，一個 train the trainer 嘅模式，等佢哋日後可以留喺九巴度繼續訓練有關嘅前線同事。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我就想補充我呢個提議其實並唔係得咁少嘅，我希望我哋可以成立一個部門，係有一啲專業嘅心理學家同埋佢哋都會成為我哋公司嘅一部分，咁樣佢哋就可以隨時支援公司其他嘅員工，所以換句話講，就會有一個新部門，呢個就要睇顧問嘅建議。可能佢哋就會建議喺四大嘅車廠度可能成立一個部門，或者可能喺全部嘅部門都有一個單位等等，但係呢個就並唔係一個臨時或者即興嘅工作嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士，你覺得幾時先至可以喺呢一個招聘入面係加入呢個嘅考慮？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我就而家畀唔到一個答案，主席。

主席：No, I understand.

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）但係我希望可以儘快做。基本上我係想成立--即係儘早成立呢一個新部門，同埋係邀請一啲專業嘅心理學家加入，成為我哋員工嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃祥明先生：主席，我有嘢補充，關於你嘅問題嘅，因為呢個 project 係由我做個 project manager，喺呢個招募嘅時候，其實我哋考慮番每個車長，當佢做一個九巴車長，都係一個專業嘅工作嚟嘅，佢哋嗰個工作嘅性質同埋嗰個佢個工作態度係好成正比，我哋所以搵心理專家嘅協助，就係希望喺佢招募嘅時候已經可以搵啲正確嘅人去協助我哋日後執行呢個車長嘅工作，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我想請你睇 185 頁，喺同一份嘅文件冊，呢個亦都係喺最初嗰份文件嘅一個--應該係第二份呈交文件嘅一部分嚟嘅，即係你哋公司呈交畀委員會。我想你睇下嘅一頁嘅第三個問題，請你形容一下喺分析一個候選人嘅情商或者係抗逆能力嘅時候，呢一個評核係扮演咗一個咩嘢角色呢，喺聘請車長嘅時候？同埋喺以往同埋現有嘅招聘系統底下，會唔會係問一啲問題，即係就住呢一個相關人士佢哋處理一啲比較哦手乘客嘅能力，呢個問題就係喺第 185 頁同埋 186 頁嘅，正唔正確呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想確認其中一點嘅，就係第 186 頁，喺第二點，一個車長面試評核表嘅樣本，就係喺呢一個附錄入面嘅，或者我哋可以睇下個附

錄，呢個就係 KMB-10 文件冊，就係第 4439 頁，呢個就係嗰份--係咪就係而家用嘅評核表格就係呢個情況？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，但係有一啲欄就已經係唔再適用。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以解釋一下？

蘇偉基先生：Okay，我哋可以睇一睇後面嗰頁嘅 4440 嗰頁，中間下低，你會睇到“medical check”上面有個 box，叫做“DISC Test Evaluation”，其實呢一個係一個 personality check，係外面一啲嘅 professional firm 就做一啲問卷，個問卷就係話畀個投考人就去選擇，譬如話一條題目就係話點樣去形容你嘅性格，你可以話你自己開朗、其他嘅形容詞，由個投考人自己去剔邊個係最合適形容你、邊個最適合不形容你。呢一個嘅表格喺 2014 年已經係檢討過，話嗰個成效係低，所以呢個係冇用到嘅，其他嗰啲其實就係現時係有用緊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即使係冇再用嗰個欄，或者你可唔可以解釋下 DISC 係代表乜嘢？

蘇偉基先生：DISC 係一個 short form，會後我畀番出嚟，佢係一張表格嚟，我可以會後畀番。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以繼續？

主席：（經傳譯員）可以。

蘇偉基先生：冇咗呢個 DISC，唔係話任何去睇下嗰個投考人嗰個 EQ、tolerance 嗰啲嘢，我哋而家嘅方式就係由我哋嘅 interviewer，我哋嘅面試官係同投考嘅車長進行一個面試，喺面試嗰度會有啲模擬嘅題目，舉例如，就係當你揸車，有啲乘客好不禮貌地、好刁難地，就睇下嗰個投考人究竟佢會點樣反應，作為一啲咁嘅假設性嘅過案，就等個投考人去睇番，「如果咁樣發生，你會點樣做？」就睇到佢嗰個人個情緒、待人係咪禮貌、個和善，用一個面試嘅形式係做一個評估嘅。

亦都除咗話做面試之外，其實每位考生亦都要係有個試車，即係話喺一架私家車嗰度由我哋嘅駕駛嘅考官同佢一齊行大約三十分鐘嘅車程，就睇到佢喺路面上遇到其他嘅道路使用者，其實已經係睇得到一個人嗰個嘅性格各方面嘅嘢，綜合，我哋就可以評估到究竟呢個嘅考生係咪適合做一個職業嘅車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我哋而家就講到招聘嘅問題，請你攞去 KMB-1 文件冊嘅第 60 頁，呢個就係你哋公司第一次呈交文件嘅一部分嘅，就係 4 月 24 號呈交畀委員會。第一個問題就係咁樣嘅，喺招聘同埋保留車長嘅時候遇到

啲咩嘢問題，或者你自己可以睇一睇頭嗰兩段嘅答案，你就向委員會表示呢一個短缺嘅問題同埋車長--或者商用車輛司機老化嘅問題嘅，喺香港整體嘅運輸業嚟講，你見唔見到呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個司機短缺嘅問題係咪已經存在咗好多年㗎喇？

蘇偉基先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇 KMB-9 文件冊，第 3840 頁嘅，Has the company from time to time raised this shortage issue with the authorities in Hong Kong?

蘇偉基先生：首先公司出現車長短缺係喺 2016 年嘅，我哋係有提出嘅，呢個我哋運輸署亦都得知我哋個車長係短缺嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）頭先就聽唔到有傳譯嘅。

蘇偉基先生：車長短缺嘅問題喺 2016 年開始，而呢個問題運輸署係知悉嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒蘇先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）文件冊嘅第 3840 頁，你見唔見到呢度有一份嘅新聞稿呀？

蘇偉基先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係關於呢件事情就去到立法會，你見唔見到呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係易志明議員嘅一個問題，就係運房局局長張炳良教授就係喺 6 月 29 號喺立法會回應嘅，呢個就係 2016 年，我就唔會將問題讀晒出嚟，但係呢個係咪同人手短缺嘅問題係相關嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢一頁嘅底部，我哋就見到運房局局長嘅回應，我就想將呢一個答案嘅第一段讀出嚟。

「政府係知道運輸業嘅人手短缺嘅人手問題嘅，唔同嘅運輸業界亦都係多次提出喺近年嘅勞工市場係越嚟越緊張，招聘員工係唔容易嘅，同埋似乎係有跡象顯示業界嘅勞動人口係老化緊，就住呢個問題，政府係將會係訂立一啲嘅策略，同業界一齊，而亦都係會喺政策上同業界去合作，如果係可行同埋係有幫助嘅。我哋希望業界係會努力改善工作嘅環境同埋待遇，同埋幫助年輕人去了解多啲呢啲行業嘅，透過唔同嘅平台，咁樣就可以吸引多啲新血加入。」

我就讀到呢一度，我想問，政府其實有冇制定過任何嘅策略即係話同運輸業係聯手去到應付呢個問題呢？

蘇偉基先生：我個人就冇收到，我喺個 IRC THB 嘅指引，佢就話鼓勵專營巴士嘅服務商係聘請足夠嘅車長，至於有冇一啲 strategies，我冇睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）落去下面嗰頁，3842，喺嗰一頁嘅第三、第四段，我想請你睇番，局長當時就咁講嘅，就講到就係「從業員資格方面，專營同埋非專營巴士、公共小巴、的士同埋貨櫃車司機，都需要持有相關嘅商用車輛駕駛執照，現時法例上面就規定呢一啲嘅駕駛執照嘅申請者必須係持有有效嘅私家車或者係輕型貨車駕駛執照最少係三年嘅，運輸署正喺度檢討係咪可以縮短呢個要求嚟到吸引更多新人去入行嘅，個目標就係爭取今年裏面完成。」

我要問嘅問題就係，我想問下，法例有冇改到呢，就呢一方面嚟講，法例有冇改呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話將嗰個要求個期間係減短，係有冇發生過咩事呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司支唔支持咁嘅改變呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個就真係要諮詢同埋佢有咩嘢 compensation，因為如果你話揸咗--獲得 private car licence 只得一年，其實有冇足夠嘅經驗可以駕駛一架專營巴士，載一百五十位嘅乘客呢？喺安全嗰度係有個考慮。當然，你話攞咗牌係咪等於佢有個駕駛經驗呢？可以未必成正比，但係你話一年嘅牌係咪呢？我相信都要討論去研究。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問下運輸署有冇搵過你哋「我哋可唔可以傾下呢件事？睇下關注啲乜嘢嘢？」咁呀？

黃祥明先生：運輸署曾經就邀請各個嘅專營巴士就係討論呢個問題，但係未有一個結果嘅，應該係上個月嘅時候就討論，但係未有呢個結果。當時佢都冇一個清晰嘅立場係點樣，只係徵詢各個專營巴士嘅意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇搵過你哋公司，喺上個月之前，有冇呀？

黃祥明先生：冇，之前係冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家想麻煩你睇睇 KMB-9 呢個文件夾，其實同一個文件夾嚟嘅，3844 頁，其實就想你睇 3855，我頭先就睇緊呢一個翻譯本，就係 3847-1，你睇緊嘅就應該嗰個標題係咁嘅，「2018 至到 19 年審計開支預算」。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我相信係一個紀錄嚟嘅，呢個應該係立法會開會嘅一個紀錄，今年較早時候嘅一個會議紀錄，係4月20號佢哋開會嘅一個紀錄。

蘇偉基先生：係。不過嗰啲資料就係喺3847-3。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。我首先想請你睇睇嗰個問題，我諗就係問政府嘅管制人員，相信就係有關嘅管制人員就係勞工署嘅，我睇3847，嗰度就係請相關當局提供以下嘅資料，第一就係話關於就係公共運輸服務同埋貨櫃車呢啲行業嘅司機嘅老化嘅問題，嗰個(a)嗰個問題。(b)就係問-- 3847-2，就係想問下嗰個空缺個情況，要求提供嗰個統計數字。(c)就係話講到係公共運輸業同埋呢個貨櫃車嘅司機短缺嘅情況已經係存在一段長時間，會唔會係勞工處就係將佢納入作為呢個輸入勞工嗰度呢？如果冇嘅話，係會有啲咩嘢措施嚟到幫業界可以有效咁樣請到司機呢，同埋相關嘅人手同埋嗰個開支嘅。

講到嗰個回覆，(a)嗰個部分，2013至到17年，專營巴士司機嗰個聯營分佈就係如下，大家可以睇到，嗰度有啲數字嘅，特別就係講到25至29歲，係2013年嘅時候341位嘅，2017年係449位；另一邊，60至69歲嘅，2013年就係1,167位，2017年嘅時候係有2,022位，就係屬於呢一個年齡組別；對上一個年齡組別係50至到59歲，2017年就係5,886位就係屬於呢個年齡組別。

跟住(b)嗰個答案，講到係嗰個職位空缺嘅，講到係專營巴士嘅司機嘅職位空缺嘅數字係咁嘅，13至到17年，2013年就係192個空缺，去年2017年空缺嘅數字係366個。

3847-4，就係有(c)項嗰個答案，根據呢個運輸署喺2017年年尾，係有超過三十七萬人就係持有呢一個有效嘅商用車輛，下面有一個註釋，嘅駕駛執照，即係話的士、私家巴士、專營巴士、小巴、掛接車同埋係貨車等等，但係只係有多於九萬部商用車輛就係有牌照嘅，所以個問題就係話點樣樣去吸引嗰啲合資格嘅個別人士就去加入嗰個行業嗰度。有鑑於此，政府唔應該倉卒咁樣去考慮係話為商用車輛就係輸入司機，係應該就係考慮埋本地司機佢個生計。

你呢度可以睇到，呢度有一個提議，就話考慮搵外來嘅人士，輸入外來嘅司機，讓佢哋嚟香港嗰度就係做嘢，就係去舒緩嗰個運輸業面對司機不足嗰個情況。我想問你哋公司就呢一方面，就一個咁嘅建議，你哋有咩嘢立場呢？

蘇偉基先生：冇，我可唔可以解釋？

主席：Yes.

蘇偉基先生：呢一...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇嘢解釋？冇嘢解釋定點？

李澤昌先生：I think so.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你一係支持，一係反對嘅，係咪？個情況係點呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）可否讓我直接咁講呢？呢個係一個高度政治性嘅問題嚟嘅，我可以預計會有強烈嘅反對嘅，即係話香港個工會一定會大力反對嘅，如果話係要輸入勞工，喺新加坡佢哋有咁做嘅，喺新加坡嘅巴士公司佢哋有來自中國大陸嘅司機，因而係可以解決人手不足嘅問題，喺新加坡佢哋有咁做，不過我懷疑喺香港係咪可行嘅，有鑑於目前嘅政治氣氛。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋有冇話係抗議、示威反對呢一個輸入司機呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我諗係因為呢一個係薪酬不同嘅問題，但係呢個問題最後解決咗嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就將佢定性為一個政治嘅問題。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）講喺香港。

李澤昌先生：其實都仲有少少輕微嘅實際上嘅，因為香港呢個城市好獨特，其實佢周邊嗰個駕駛環境好唔同，即係唔似深圳或者上海或者喺台北，佢有好大嗰一個國家，佢嗰個駕駛嘅技術好相似，即係香港係零零舍舍喺成個區，佢除咗係個雙層巴士同埋佢嗰個右軚嘅揸法係非常之唔同，變咗係有一個困難嘅一點，所以亦都係香港啲道路同埋香港嗰啲乘客都係比較係比其他嗰啲一個整個內地係好唔同，所以係有少少唔同嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，我打算而家就係小休一下，讓大家稍事休息，我就打算就係休息十五分鐘，呢個係咪一個啱嘅時候呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係嘅，主席先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家係休息十五分鐘。

下午4時13分聆訊押後

下午4時29分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。黃先生，你向委員會表示就即係你講到有一

個措施係去解決人手短缺嘅，就係將呢一個攞到牌照嘅要求由三年縮短到一年，你對呢個建議有冇保留？

黃祥明先生：剛才我講係運輸署係有搵過我哋嘅業界去討論呢個問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你同唔同意縮短嗰個持牌年數嘅建議係有用嘅呢？

黃祥明先生：呢個我諗我真係要深入探討先得，因為而家嘅要求係需要有三年嘅私家車駕駛執照，如果將佢降低嘅時候，我哋都係始終考慮佢嗰個乘客安全同埋駕駛安全，所以呢個我冇個人嘅立場，我諗係需要公司再詳細去探討，然之後去回應畀運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）你幾時係回覆運輸署㗎？

黃祥明先生：呢個商討係進行中嘅，就未有一個最終嘅確定回覆日子。

彭樹雄先生：我諗，Mr Duncan，我哋睇呢個問題嘅時候，我哋相信要平衡好多方面嘅考慮，第一，我覺得有一樣嘢唔可以妥協嘅，就係嗰個所謂 safety。到底我哋如果將三年嗰個年期去減短，如果純粹就咁講個年期，我相信我哋就唔係睇緊一個大 picture，會唔會係譬如話我哋將個年期可能會縮短，但係可能嗰個投考者佢可能要有其他提供到畀我哋資料佢原來係可能兩年佢係不停咁駕駛又或者佢本身係嗰個駕駛技術都係有一定嘅水平，咁又會唔會有一啲額外嘅測試，可以唔使三年，可以係一個短啲嘅時間，但係經過一個--我哋一個所謂合格嘅測試，會唔會可以考慮呢等等。

我哋其實喺呢一方面，當然我知道成個業界唔係淨係 KMB，都係缺車長嘅，但係問題就係我哋嘅前設就係第一，safety 係行先，然後其他嘢我哋係完全係持一個開放嘅態度係去處理嘅。多謝 Mr Duncan。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇番嗰個紀錄本，係第 1 天嗰個聆訊嘅紀錄本，66 頁，文件夾 1 號，第 1 天嘅聆訊，第 66 頁，第 66 頁第 8 行，呢度你見到，我當時有問一個問題嘅，我就問黎以德先生「究竟嗰個係咪正確咁反映政府嗰個立場，即係關乎人手短缺？」

黎先生回應嘅時候就咁講嘅，佢係黎以德先生，佢就話「我就係作為呢一個運房局嘅代表，我係上任秘書長」--或者我將佢嗰個答案係打出嚟，我想請你睇呢個第 16 行嘅。

「我哋嘅立場嘅另一個部分，即係關乎係商業司機嘅長久存在嘅短缺問題，就係我哋已經採取步驟去係有一個全面嘅立法嘅修訂，我就可以講下嘅，就係話要將商用車輛司機嘅牌照要求就係放寬，即係話基本上就咁嘅，目前如果你想攞個牌照，想攞駕駛執照係揸商業車嘅話，你就需要有一個私家車嘅執照，要擁有咗三年，然後先至可以有資格係進行申請嘅，即係話係申請就係攞個駕駛執照，揸呢個係商業車輛。

由於長期都係人手短缺，我哋就已經作出咗一個建議，而業界以及立法會亦都同意咗，就係呢一個三年期係可以將佢縮減到一年期嘅，所以喺日後你只需要係有一個係私家嘅駕駛執照一年，然後就已經可以係申請攞呢個商用車輛嘅駕駛執照，商用車輛當然就包括巴士，亦都包括埋係專營巴士嘅。

我哋而家草擬緊相關嘅法例嘅修訂，我哋希望就可以喺今年年尾之前係將佢提交畀立法會，如果立法會係通過嘅話，應該喺某程度上都可以舒緩到呢一個短缺嘅問題。未必可以全部解決個問題，但希望都可以提供一啲舒緩嘅，喺我哋嘅度，呢個就係我哋所做緊嘅工作。

不過正如我講過，亦都要講埋，我諗亦都係專營巴士公司作為一個專營權嘅獲授權者，係採取一切合理嘅步驟，去確保佢哋有所需嘅司機嘅數目去提供個服務。」

好，呢度你見到喇，睇番呢一個紀錄本，睇嚟就係政府係立意就係要將個三年期就係縮減到一年嘅，而且已經係草擬緊嘅個法例嘅修訂。我喺未將呢一段文字讀出嚟畀你聽之前，之前你哋公司知唔知悉呢件事㗎？

李澤昌先生：呢一樣嘢就好肯定清楚就係因為每一次--知道嘅，佢三年嘅個駕駛經驗係唔多唔少係減少咗一啲有機會投考做巴士司機嘅個機會，將三年去 relax 到一年嘅時間，其實變咗有多啲人可以入到個學校裏面去考呢個巴士牌。最後，最重要都係考個巴士牌，我哋所謂叫做 17 牌，就係有資格揸巴士，係嘅個先至為目標。

當然如果你將三年去到一年嘅時候，變咗佢入去個學院嘅人數就可能會多咗，變咗都係最後嘅個關卡都係考到嘅個巴士牌為基準。咁係幫到嘅，因為喺無論你三年又好，兩年都好，有啲真係有能力去做，呢個我哋係知道嘅。好似我哋頭先有個同事講緊，就係而家仲係喺度討論緊，就未有一個我哋嘅時間表。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道業界係支持呢個改變㗎？因為呢度黎秘書長係咁講嘅。

李澤昌先生：一半一半，一半一半，有啲係當然覺得有啲 trade，當然覺得某啲因素會對佢自己嘅個嘅利益嘅關係；從另外一半，有啲真係覺得而家係喺嘅個揸商業車越嚟越少人，嘅個門檻最重要都係考到巴士牌。今日我哋九日有兩個門檻嘅，一個就係頭一 part，就係令到佢入嚟個學校嘅時候就考到嘅個巴士牌，呢個巴士牌係政府運輸署批出嚟嘅，如果有咗呢個牌之後，佢基本上就已經可以揸得巴士，同埋其他嘅好似例如嘅啲旅遊巴士嘅啲咁嘅東西，對個業界係多咗，因為你入嚟嘅 applicant 係多咗。一半半囉，可以咁答你。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）黃生，你話政府係有同你哋商討過嘅，係淨係同九巴傾

叮，定抑或係同其他持份者傾？

黃祥明先生：係同所有嘅呢個巴士公司係一齊商討。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）開過幾多次會呀？

黃祥明先生：我印象中係記得只係一次啫，只係一次啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係上個月嘅，係咪呀？你講過。

黃祥明先生：冇錯，係，剛才我講過係上個月，但係日子我要 check 番我個行程表先記得番邊一日。

主席：（經傳譯員）但你頭先亦都講過就話係冇清楚嘅立場顯示嘅？

黃祥明先生：講咗一啲嘅佢哋嘅大概預算嘅做法，包括其中一樣就話要啲--如果係改低嗰個有駕駛執照嘅年份嘅時候，就要佢哋進行一啲叫做商業駕駛嘅訓練，佢英文叫做 passenger service course，但係呢啲都係好初步同我哋講，所以而家都未有一個好大嘅 picture 知道佢哋係點樣做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）當時黎先生係三個月之前作證嘅，佢當時就話業界係支持嘅，你而家就話只係上個月先同巴士公司係問呢個問題？

黃祥明先生：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺今年嘅 2 月份，有新嘅指引，呢個就關於就係佢哋嘅當值時間、休息時間，呢個新嘅指引就發咗出嚟嘅，呢啲新嘅指引，我想問有冇影響咗你哋係招募員工、招募車長嘅工作呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我如果直接答你，如果我哋係要--不過首先我想講，運輸署今年嗰個修訂本嗰個 revised guidelines 係要到到出年嘅第二季先係全面咁樣去落實嘅，但係我哋初步嘅估計，其實我哋而家開始做緊一啲嘅 system modifications，就係一啲電腦程式嘅 upgrade，就去 fit 番呢一個新嘅 guideline，我哋估計，如果呢個新嘅工時指引係完全行嘅時候...

主席：（經傳譯員）彭生，其實呢個問題唔係一個開放式嘅問題，好簡單嘅咋，有冇影響到你哋係招募車長呢？有定抑或冇？

彭樹雄先生：如果純粹講 recruitment，係會有影響。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗鄧律師要問嘅問題就係咁嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話有影響係喺邊方面受影響？

彭樹雄先生：如果--我哋計過，用呢個新指引呢，我哋要額外請多二百個車長，同埋新指引底下有一個所謂特別更，呢個特別更，

如果我哋係將來取消呢個特別更，一更過，一個straight shift，我哋更加額外要請多一千個車長。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對於嗰個特別更嗰個影響，我哋遲啲先至講。或者我頭先講得唔清楚，唔好意思。自從2月份，我想問，呢個指引係令到你容易啲吖，定抑或難啲，定抑或係冇咩嘢影響，即係對於你哋招募車長方面係難咗吖，易咗吖，定抑或冇影響呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個其實可以喺番投考人佢點樣respond呢個新嘅guideline去決定，因為公司喺2月呢個新guideline期間做咗好多嘢，呢個我哋好focus講個guideline，我就唔感覺到招聘人其實對呢啲嘅guideline有幾大嘅認識或者關注。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係據我嘅理解，即係話冇影響？

李澤昌先生：唔係好嚴重。

蘇偉基先生：暫時未反映。

李澤昌先生：唔係好嚴重。

黃祥明先生：暫時未反映。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你表示為咗符合新嘅指引，你係要請多二百名嘅車長，喺大埔意外之後，你係已經係更改咗你對兼職車長同埋聘請兼職車長嘅政策，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你就話要請多二百個車長係咪已經反映咗呢一個新嘅政策？

李澤昌先生：冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋就住兼職車長嘅決定係咪即係意味住呢個數字係會唔止係二百？

蘇偉基先生：二百個車長係需要增加去配合呢個新指引，其實講緊嗰個係全職嘅車長嚟嘅。我另外都想答一答，就係話我哋2月喺嗰個part-time嗰個嘅改變，我哋要了解到其實part-time車長2月前或者2月後對公司成個車長嗰個勞動力，佔嗰個比例其實都係講緊3至4%嘅啫。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）明白，唔該晒。我想你睇58頁，KMB-1文件冊，個問題--呢個亦都係你第一份呈交嘅文件之一，問題就係你公司有冇聘請足夠嘅全職車長去提供有效同埋有效率嘅服務呢？你公司需唔需要持續咁樣去聘請一啲

兼職嘅車長去解決呢一個人手短缺嘅問題，或者係去輔助一啲核心嘅員工去處理一啲特別嘅活動同埋處理一啲缺席嘅問題呢？請你提供唔同聘請條件嘅車長數目同埋現有嘅員工能唔能夠係符合你嘅運作需要呢？

我想你睇番呢一頁嘅最後一段嘅，你回應指車長聘請嘅招聘類別就係根據佢哋嘅招聘日期去分類嘅，而以日薪嘅車長嚟講，就係 1999 年嘅 5 月之前嘅，呢個意思係咪即係話如果以日薪去聘請--即係呢啲係咪指以日薪去計算薪金嘅車長？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而月薪車長嘅意思即係話佢哋每月去支薪嘅，正唔正確？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）每月支薪嘅，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第三類就係退咗休嘅車長，佢哋就係重新被聘請，佢哋可以係每月支薪或者係用一個第三個方法，即係用月薪嘅。

蘇偉基先生：呢個係跟佢個 employment 而定嘅，唔係話佢選擇嘅，即係如果佢係一個揀咗時薪 hourly rate 嘅，我哋就計佢每一個鐘頭去編更，就計佢每一個鐘頭嘅工資，如果佢揀係一個月薪車長嘅，我就以一個每個月嘅形式去編更，佢收嘅就係月薪嘅工資。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋睇到啲相關嘅數字，就係 4 月 24 號嘅情況嘅，就係第 59 頁，就有日薪嘅車長，2,105 名就係九巴嘅，月薪車長就係 5,201，退咗休嘅車長而係重新聘請，如果以時薪計就係 577 名，一啲退咗休而再聘請嘅車長，以月薪計就有 383 名嘅，另外就係有啲外來嘅時薪車長就係有 371 名嘅。據我嘅了解，外部嘅時薪車長全部都係兼職車長嚟㗎嘛？

蘇偉基先生：正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然後你就列出咗巴士車長空缺嘅數目，直至喺 2 月 28 號就係有 280 個空缺嘅。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，當時係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番第 58 頁，喺屘二嗰一點，呢個係關於兼職車長嘅，「自從 18 年嘅 2 月中開始，九巴已經係停止招聘新嘅外來時薪車長，如果佢哋嘅工時係短嘅（即係話每星期係少過十八小時）。」因為咁樣，九巴係會繼續去聘請兼職車長嘅，只要佢哋每星期係工作超過十八個鐘？

蘇偉基先生：Yes.

李澤昌先生：呢個有點補充，我哋覺得 part-time 同埋 full-time 呢樣嘢有一個好唔同嘅，其實十八個鐘頭每一個星期或以上其實係令到我哋好清楚可以同嗰

個員工知道佢之前如果有其他嘅工作，我哋一定要清楚知道佢嗰份咩嘢工作，兼夾佢揸車嘅時候可以知道佢之前有冇揸過其他車或者個身體嘅狀況，所以其實好難定論一個 full-time 佢工作嘅時間係咪十八定十九，有啲人嘅 full-time，其實佢每日係工作四個小時都係叫做 full-time，所以其實我哋將呢個 part-time 呢個字係清楚地用「十八個鐘頭以上」，係我哋畫咗一條線喺度嘅，每個星期。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據我嘅了解，即係話每星期工作超過十八個鐘嘅人就唔會--即係再有其他工作係影響佢哋嘅駕駛工作嘅，係咪？

李澤昌先生：Yes or no，係，我哋覺得如果佢連續性每一個星期都做十八個鐘頭，我哋就會問嗰個車長佢有冇其他嘅工作，如果有其他嘅工作嘅話，我一定要了解清楚佢嗰份工作係咩嘢工作，而佢嗰個工作嘅僱主容唔容許佢揸車，呢個係一個好重要嘅問題嚟嘅，因為有啲情況，譬如假設一個車長佢喺出面揸緊的士嘅，佢嚟到我呢度佢揸十八個鐘頭，其實我有機會唔知嘅，十八個鐘頭樓下，所以我哋係好肯定地，我哋想 draw 十八個鐘頭就--其實呢個係我哋一條例係畀自己，就我哋係一定要令嗰架車入嚟嘅時候係知道佢嗰份工作--另外嗰份工作係咩嘢工作。呢個重要嘅，因為相反，如果我哋唔知道嘅話，我哋就唔知道佢個情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果有人係淨係想幫你係工作十二個鐘，有咩嘢問題呢其實？

李澤昌先生：No. Simply just reject.

個問題係點解，個問題係點解，即係你點解會有興趣知道呢？

蘇偉基先生：如果嗰個投考人佢冇提供，其實我哋都做唔到我哋可以一個 reasonable step 證明佢嘅工時或者佢另外有招聘，有個疲勞嘅考慮。佢如果而家過十八個鐘，我哋就要佢有幾個嘅 declarations，首先就係佢喺出面有啲咩嘢職業，我知道佢做緊咩嘢職業，我哋而家個紀錄就係我嗰三百幾個車長，其實四成係文員工人，其他三成就係冇職業嘅，餘下大約 25%就係佢從事其他駕駛嘅工作。

佢亦都要向我哋講佢做九巴呢個兼職係冇抵觸同埋佢嗰個僱主係知悉，佢自己講得㗎喇，一個 in good faith 嘅 system，起碼我知得到佢唔會打緊兩份工，而做到有個駕駛疲勞，呢個我可以做到嘅嘢，我做咗，自己。如果你話佢係一個少過十八個鐘嘅，基本上佢好難提供呢啲嘢畀我嘅，亦都我哋覺得 part-time 車長雖然係 part-time，但係佢都要對佢嗰個職業係有一個著緊，seriousness，你一個禮拜你揸得十八個鐘頭，就唔係話揸兩、三個鐘頭，我都知道佢個駕駛技術唔好有生疏咁樣盛，係一個考慮嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係呢個系統嘅底線，根據我嘅了解，就係你收集返嚟嘅資料，就係關於嗰個人士嘅其他嘅工作，而你收集返嚟嘅資料就係視乎究竟

嗰個員工係幫你工作十二個鐘定係二十個鐘嘅，你明唔明我嘅問題呀？

蘇偉基先生：唔認同呢個，我。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解你唔認同呀？

蘇偉基先生：我哋睇得到好多坊間都有講好多啲人佢好喜愛揸巴士，揸唔同嘅型號，所以佢就做兼職巴士車長，但係佢有冇個 mindset 呢？呢個我唔敢去喺呢度批評。正如頭先所講，公司一定係有個 guideline，一定係有把尺嘅，我就要擺呢把尺喺度，而呢把尺我哋參考就係話今日香港連續招聘十八個鐘頭就係一個連續招聘，佢可以係我嘅員工，我可以問佢「究竟你出面有啲咩嘢職業呀？」咁樣做。我哋就係擺咗呢十八個鐘喺度，我哋亦都覺得擺咗十八個鐘嗰度，唔會因為咁樣而招聘少一啲短工時嘅車長而令到我嗰個車長個團隊個勞動力少咗，所以其實我十八個鐘以上係安全同勞動力中間一個嘅 trade-off 嚟，我就擺十八個鐘喺呢度。

李澤昌先生：或者你試下可以想像一下，如果你冇十八個鐘定咗喺度，就算佢個駕駛技術點咁好都好，一個鐘，返兩個鐘，聽日又或者唔返，下個禮拜就唔知去咗邊度，喺嗰個編更同埋喺嗰個人事安排係非常之後困難嘅，我諗呢個都係一個我哋比較都要諗一諗嘅一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，你會唔會建議講番呢一個申報嘅問題？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）遲啲會，不過而家就暫時未住。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個議題上，你係提供咗一啲整體嘅數字，就係關於呢啲工作嘅情況，譬如話四成就係做一啲文書工作，然後有三成就係冇工作，另外有兩成半就有其他嘅駕駛職務，你可唔可以提供呢啲嘅數據畀委員會呀？

蘇偉基先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）特別就係其他駕駛職務嘅資料。

蘇偉基先生：可以。

主席：For example, presumably...

蘇偉基先生：貨車或者係私人嘅司機等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我都喺心目中諗嘅，即係揸旅遊車、的士、公共小巴或者私人司機，請你畀多啲資料我哋，係會有用嘅。

蘇偉基先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有咁嘅改變係咪都係大埔嘅車禍之後促成嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：係由嗰件事而引起嘅，因為當時社會上係有個聲音，就係話作為一個巴士公司，你招聘咗 part-time 車長，大家唔係討論 part-time 車長嘅技術，而係覺得作為個巴士公司，你點知道呢個 part-time 車長佢返你份工，可能佢黃昏返工，佢朝頭早做份咩嘢工、有幾勞動，呢個係要知嘅，我哋嗰陣時亦都係醒覺到係可以再做好啲嘅，就停咗先，跟住我哋就優化佢，所以我哋就跟住就係話做一個十八小時嘅一個 criteria，當時剩咗喺度嗰三百幾，我哋亦都有一啲轉職嘅安排係畀佢哋，就變咗嗰個新嘅 policy 亦都係沿到今日都喺度做緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺大埔車禍之前，想問下，你哋當時係有幾多車長每周係工作少於十八小時？

蘇偉基先生：其實喺嗰三百幾個車長入面，之前--我 exactly 唔記得，約莫喇，二百幾個係做十八個工時以上嘅，百幾個係十八個工時以下。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇呢個 104 頁，同一個文件夾嘅第 104 頁，呢一個就係報告嘅第 4 部分，呢個係你哋交畀運輸署嘅報告，呢個係喺大埔車禍嘅報告，個日期就係 3 月 12 號嘅，第 4 部就關乎係招聘嘅。你呢度就講話喺停止係聘用呢個兼職車長，喺呢一段裏面所講嘅就係首先，你就話九巴已經不再係聘用工作時間低於每周十八小時嘅兼職車長，所以呢度嗰個表達嘅形式係少少唔同嘅，即係對照番呢個第 58 頁，58 頁就係話停止係招聘新嘅時薪計嘅車長嘅，但係你呢一度就講停止聘用佢哋係少過十八個鐘一個星期。兩者有啲唔同，其實你係咪兩者想講嘅係同一樣嘢嚟嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：係一致，兩個講法，都係話對短工時，每個禮拜返少十八個鐘嘅人，第一，係不再新招聘，唔再招聘新嘅，第 13 點，而家大家螢光幕見到嗰個，就係話現有，當時已經請落嘅，兩個唔同嘅，頭先我第一次講就係不再招聘新嘅，而家呢度提，就係喺現有嗰陣時我哋點呢？呢個“discontinued the employment”唔係講緊解僱住，因為呢班 part-time 車長佢係 hourly rate 做，我哋只不過嗰陣時係停止咗派更畀佢，然之後去同佢商討一個方法，正如第二段講，係勸誘佢轉去一個 contract hourly rate，即係話「你短工時，可唔可以做多啲，做長工時呀？」可能有啲根本佢係無職業嘅，或者可能係影響佢收入，當時我哋亦都話「你以往做開短工時，不如你就做其他嘅崗位。」舉例如，一個站務嘅助理，起碼唔好因為咁樣係影響佢個收入。所以係講緊唔同嘅嘢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，明白，唔該。轉為呢個合約嘅時薪係咩嘢意思呢？佢哋唔係呢個合約嘅時薪嘅車長，以前唔係都已經係嘅喇咩？

蘇偉基先生：冇錯，以前我哋統稱叫做“part-time BC”，喺 2 月之後，我哋就再請嗰啲就係符合連續性每周工作十八個小時，呢啲其實我哋叫做“continuous employment”，長工時。其實係咪再用個“part-time”嗰個字呢，有啲混淆，所以呢啲我哋叫做「合約時薪車長」，“contract

hourly rate BC”，呢班同事以往佢係少過十八個鐘嘅，所以正如頭先我講，我哋同佢商討，如果佢可以返多啲更分，返多啲工嘅，佢咪揸多過十八個鐘囉，呢個係一個方法。或者就係 take other 嘅 posts。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想請你睇呢個第 145 頁嘅，你哋就提交咗兩份嘅行動計劃，呢個係第一份嘅，第一份就係你提交畀運輸署，呢一個就係喺 4 月 10 號所提交嘅，其實應該請你睇呢個 138 頁先嘅，因為嗰度係有封信嘅。喺第二段嗰度就係提及一個行動計劃嘅，138 頁，睇到嘛？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。呢個就係 4 月 10 號嘅回應，亦都係第一次提交陳述書畀委員會嘅文件嘅，想請你睇番呢個 145 頁，因為之前嗰度，138 嗰度提及一個行動計劃。呢度睇到第 1 個項目，就係符合你剛才所講，就話「不再係聘用兼職車長，而佢嘅每周工作時數係低於十八小時。」呢個行動計劃就話兼職車長如果佢工時間係每周少於十八小時嘅話，自 2018 年 2 月 15 號開始就唔再有新嘅聘用，係咪呀？呢個就做咗喇？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 2 點就話「之前嘅兼職車長就佢哋係有一個選擇，將佢轉做呢個合約時薪嘅車長，又或者係喺公司裏面擔當其他嘅職責嘅。」嗰個行動計劃就咁講嘅，就話「209 位係之前嘅或者前兼職嘅車長佢而家個情況係點，第一就係話同意每周係工作超過十八小時就有 78 位；同意就係一周工作超過十小時，申報就係話喺九巴嗰度做兼職車長係不會就係違反佢哋原本僱主同佢嘅僱員合約嘅；最後一項就係離職。」

讓我就係集中睇中間嗰個類別，我咁嘅理解啱唔啱呀，就係有一啲你哋以前就係請佢做兼職車長嘅，而家畀佢哋就係做超過十個鐘，不過就少過十八個鐘嘅，只要佢哋咁樣做係唔會違反佢哋另一份工嘅僱主同佢個合約嘅，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以就唔係全部人都係超過十八個鐘，如果你之前已經公司請咗你嘅，你都仲係可以譬如話一周就係工作十二小時嘅，只要你作出咗聲明，就話你同另一個僱主嘅僱傭合約就係全部都遵守到條款，冇違反，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係願意係做多過十八個鐘呢？呢個表格呢一欄嗰度冇講話佢哋都要作一個聲明㗎嘛，冇講話要求佢哋聲明就話唔會違反另一份工嘅僱傭合約嘅，究竟個情況係點呢？嗰啲願意係做多過十八個鐘嘅情況又點呢？要唔要作一個聲明呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）或者我逐個逐個係慢慢解釋。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，好，唔該你。

蘇偉基先生：之前佢係 part-time 車長，佢揀咗轉去一個多過十八小時嘅，佢係簽過一份新嘅 contract，叫做 contract hourly rate 嘅 contract，佢係需要 disclose 佢嘅 outside employment，佢係需要 disclose outside employment，呢個就係第一個行講，“Agreed to work more than 18”個鐘頭嗰組。

第 2 嗰組就係其實佢仍然係 part-time 車長，我哋當時因應有一班 part-time 車長佢繼續喺度工作，突然間唔派更分畀佢哋，佢哋有訴求同我哋講，因為我哋已經係招聘咗佢哋，我哋冇再請新嘅，佢嘅駕駛技術我哋知嘅，佢有個紀錄喺度，我哋就做一啲大家都可以 compromise 嘅嘢，就係話佢可以繼續駕駛，但係都唔好--正如頭先李生講你返一個鐘、兩個鐘，你一個禮拜都返番十個鐘，亦都需要佢 declare 佢唔好同佢現有嘅工作嘅合約係違反嘅。因為我哋所知悉有啲嘅僱傭係唔畀你做 part-time 嘅，你如果喺我哋做 part-time，其實就唔應該嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）蘇先生，未繼續之前，其實有呢一類嘅巴士車長嘅，佢哋嘅陳述書有畀我哋，你可以繼續。

蘇偉基先生：我完㗎喇呢度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想知道第 1 類，你就冇提及就話佢哋要作一個聲明，要申報。

蘇偉基先生：呢度係寫漏咗，其實佢有做嘅，呢七十八位同事，係有報告佢喺 outside employment 嘅資料畀我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪用一張表格嘅形式？

蘇偉基先生：有，可以提供。

主席：（經傳譯員）麻煩你畀一個副本我哋睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話無論你係做多過十個鐘定抑或多過十八個鐘，你都係要簽署同一份嘅申報嘅表格去作一個聲明嘅，係咪呀？啱唔啱？

蘇偉基先生：兩份唔同嘅文件嚟嘅，我都可以分別提交。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你。我哋講緊呢一類嘅文件嘅時候，我諗我哋手頭上嘅文件夾就並冇任何嘅僱傭合約嘅樣本嘅，有冇一份標準嘅合約㗎？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有，有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以亦都係畀份我哋睇呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，我可以嘅，我會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問下係咪得一種表格畀晒所有嘅車長，定抑或係有唔同嘅呢？好視乎佢哋嘅身分呢？

蘇偉基先生：喺現有新招聘，我哋係用一款，另外一款就係話退咗休之後續聘，暫時係用緊兩款。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該，希望你都畀埋我哋睇，兩款都畀我哋，唔該晒。

蘇偉基先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋而家睇番第 124 頁，就住兼職車長，我仲有一啲問題嘅，或者由第 117 頁開始，第一點就係由運輸署--呢封信就係喺大埔意外之後，運輸署畀九巴嘅第一封信，日期係 2 月 12 號，就有幾個問題，有(a)、(b)、(c)、(d)項，而第一個問題，你就見到喺(a)嗰度，我而家就比較關心係問題(b)，就係話九巴對兼職車長嘅政策同埋呢啲車長嘅詳情，包括係兼職車長嘅數目、佢哋嘅工作嘅時數同埋調配。

而家我哋睇番 124 頁，你就會見到喺頁頂有呢個問題嘅，九巴嘅回應，就住問題(b)，你見到呢個羅馬數字(i)段，就係九巴對兼職車長嘅政策，如果你睇番下面嗰幾點，就有七點嘅總共，基本上意思就係兼職車長嘅佢對待嘅方式同全職車長係一樣嘅，除咗第三點，第三點就係講培訓嘅。

第一點就係兼職車長同埋全職車長嘅入職要求係一樣；第二點就係兼職車長接受嘅評核同全職車長係一樣嘅；而第三點，兼職車長就係會接受合適嘅培訓先至會係開始工作嘅，即係佢講到係要接受合適嘅培訓。我就嘗試去搵究竟兩者之間有咩嘢分別，呢個係講緊 2018 年 2 月嘅，就住對全職車長提供嘅培訓同埋對兼職車長提供嘅培訓。

就住呢一點，想你睇一睇第 120 頁，首先喺資歷同埋招聘條件方面，全職嘅申請人，即係一個另外嘅要求就係持有私家車牌照三年或者持有第 10 類或者第 17 類嘅駕駛執照嘅，呢個係全職嘅申請人；而兼職嘅申請人就喺第(ii)段，羅馬字(ii)段，你就係要有第 10 類或者第 17 類嘅駕駛執照嘅，呢個係咪第一個嘅分別呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）我假設就係你唔會花錢去培訓一個兼職嘅車長，係咪？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想講嘅第二個議題，就係羅馬字(iii)段，就係一般嘅培訓，全職嘅申請人就係必須接受十八日嘅培訓，每日係 9.5 小時，係有可能係延長嘅，根據駕駛導師嘅表現評核。而我哋睇番第 121 頁，我哋係見到對兼職車長嘅相應要求，就係羅馬字(iv)段嘅，呢個車長係必須接受 2.5 日嘅培訓，同全職車長嘅十八日每日九個鐘係唔同，呢個係咪有個分別呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。但係正如我提到羅馬數字(vi)段，就係呢一個兼職車長嘅申請人就係有 10 號或者 17 類嘅駕駛執照，

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係培訓嘅長度仍然係有分別，係咪呀？全職車長係必須接受十八日嘅培訓，而兼職車長只需要接受 2.5 日嘅培訓。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，當時係咁嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第三個分別，以我嘅理解，你睇番第 121 頁，第 2 階段，喺嗰一個表嘅最後嗰一個部分，就話就會喺兩條路線進行嚟講嘅訓練，但係如果你睇番 122 頁兼職車長嘅要求，路線嘅培訓只係會係就住一條路線進行培訓嘅啫，呢個係咪有個分別呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另一項嘅分別，正如我理解，就係睇番第 121 頁，我哋睇番就係羅馬字(iv)段上面嗰一個部分，「全職嘅車長申請人就會係接受起碼六十八小時嘅駕駛訓練，包括係路線訓練嘅，就會喺導師嘅指導下完成。」

而第 122 頁，兼職車長方面，喺呢一個表下面就講「兼職車長嘅申請人就會接受總共起碼十六小時嘅駕駛訓練，包括係接受路線培訓嘅時間嘅，係喺駕駛導師嘅指導之下完成嘅。」呢個係咪就係第四項分別呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就住全職車長同埋兼職車長之間培訓要求嘅分別係有原因或者係合理嘅呢？

黃祥明先生：首先剛才我哋喺度睇嗰啲就係喺之前，即係喺呢個事件發生之後，即係嗰段時間發生嘅訓練情況嚟嘅，就非係而家嘅訓練情況。剛才 Mr Duncan 都舉出咗好多唔同嘅訓練元素喺度，我想舉出多一樣，就係話如果係一個全職嘅訓練，即係十八日--所謂十八日嘅訓練裏面，當時係導師一對二嘅訓練嚟嘅，而喺呢個 part-time 嘅訓練嘅導師係一對一嘅，即係話喺個導師嘅直接監管同埋嗰個學習車長嘅駕駛亦都係時間會多咗嘅。呢個喺當時嘅安排係咁樣樣，當時亦都嘅諗法係可以達到佢哋嗰個出嚟駕駛目標，所以呢個係當時嘅情況。

同時呢個所謂十八日同埋兩日半係一個正常嘅訓練，如果一個車長喺十八日唔能夠達標，我哋係會延長佢嗰個訓練期，同樣地，一個 part-time 車長，如果佢兩日半唔能夠完成--唔能夠達標，佢亦都會延長個訓練期。

蘇偉基先生：呢度我補充，即係頭先講過 justification，因為喺以前嗰十八日係分開兩個階段，第一個階段嗰個嘅後果就係話佢可以攞到嗰個駕駛執照，喺 part-time 車長，其實招聘嗰陣時佢已經領有駕駛執照，所以如果 like-to-like 嘅比較，就應該九日同兩日半，呢個先至做一個 adjustment。

第二，正如頭先黃生講，喺個導師同嗰個學員以一比二，呢個就一比一，所以又一半；第三，正如文件所講，如果全職，佢學嘅車型，學四至五款，但係兼職學嘅車型就係兩款；再者，就係話全職學嘅路線就兩條，兼職學嘅路線就係一條。所以雖然時間係短，但係佢學嘅嘢冇咁 diversify，佢係兩個車型、一條線，因為佢做兼職，佢就係可能淨係揸嗰兩個車型，就揸嗰一條線嘅啫。亦都導師係一對一。

主席：（經傳譯員）簡單嘅答案係咪就係「係」呢，就住呢個問題？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）全職同埋兼職嘅車長係咪駕駛同一啲巴士㗎？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我哋唔考慮路線嘅數目或者唔同路線嘅數目，啲司機係咪都係揸同一啲路線嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個好難去直接答你呢個問題。我哋有四百幾條線，我哋嘅新同事，無論佢係全職車長或者兼職車長，佢開首都會揸一啲容易啲駕馭嘅線，至於你話會唔會全部都係揸同一條線呢？因為我哋起碼有四個廠，就一定唔會大家都係揸同一條線，但係大家都會開首係嘗試一啲容易嘅線。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我知道你有檢討過呢個培訓嘅安排喇最近，我哋今朝亦都傾過，但係我有一個問題想問嘅，喺呢一個新嘅建議底下，即係如果我哋唔考慮呢一個實務守則，我哋只係講呢個新嘅安排，就全職同埋兼職車長嘅訓練要求係咪一樣呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，呢個會唔會係一個適當嘅時間就係結束今日嘅聆訊呢？我諗大家都係好辛㗎喇，起碼負責記錄嘅都係喇，係咪呀？我哋而家會就係暫停，就聽朝早 10 點鐘再繼續，唔該晒。

2018 年 8 月 10 日

下午 5 時 30 分聆訊押後

1

[Blank Page]

Saturday, 11 August 2018

(10.01 am)

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WIN BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG

(simultaneous interpretation used only where indicated)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Dr Leung and gentlemen.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Good morning, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Before that, Mr Chairman, may I have a few minutes, please.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Chairman, after the hearing yesterday we submitted to the committee further documents in relation to the action plan for the speed limit on 29 bends.

If I may briefly refer to the summary of documents submitted before the committee. First of all, I have to say, Mr Chairman, you have asked a very fair and valid question as to why the proposed plan -- the proposal submitted by Mr Gary Wong was not acted upon by the management. I had to agree that I have the same doubt, you know, as to why it was not acted upon.

If I may just refer to the summary of documents submitted before the committee. On 31 July 2014, the action plan -- it says that the action plan will be submitted to operations director and managing director for endorsement.

Then on 14 August 2014, an email was sent by Mr Gary Wong to Mr Edmond Ho, stating that "For your approval, please." Then on 15 August 2014, an email was sent by Edmond Ho to Gary Wong, "Please ask the operations director for formal approval after checking and endorsement."

Then came 2 February 2015. There was an email sent by Mr Gary Wong to all the general managers of the depots, saying that "it is now the right time to reconsider the implementation of the speed limits on these identified bends."

And on 5 February, another email was sent by Gary Wong to all the general managers of depots, "I will submit them to operations director and operations and planning director for final approval."

If I may refer the chairman to exhibit 5 of this bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have that.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman. This is a circular sent by Mr Gary Wong to all the general

managers and managers of the operations department as well as other departments. It is stated in this memo:

"A meeting with [operations director] this morning regarding the above captioned subject. We have a new approach" -- and I repeat, "a new approach" -- "to manage this issue and the actions are summarised as follows:

(1) SSQD [namely his department] will prepare a safety poster 'Safety driving through sharp bends' for the month of April. Depots are required to place and display the safety posters at prominent places inside the depot areas and all [bus terminals] and [driving instructors] are required to conduct safety briefings to [bus captains] at all [bus terminals] as normal practice;

(2) SSQD will prepare an internal notice which to be issued by Traffic Department to enhance the safety awareness among [bus captains] and to remind all [bus captains] to watch a safety video by means of e-learning (same approach for bus fire handling).

(3) SSQD will liaise with [Bus Captain Training School] to post a safety video on staff website to specify the general safety guidelines/precautions when driving through sharp bends. The sharp bend 'Po Shun Road onto Tong Ming Street' will be selected as

an example for the 30 second safety video. All [bus captains] are required to log in or make use of other means to watch the safety video and their names should be captured/recorded.

(4) [Bus Captain Training School] to quote Tseung Kwan O toppled over incident as a lesson learnt for all new [bus captain] trainees and all other [bus captains] through appropriate safe driving training."

At the end of the paragraph, it is stated:

"Please note that there is no need to issue the safe speed limits cards" -- no need to issue the safe speed limits cards -- "and the speed limits will not be specified" -- will not be specified -- "in the safety video and internal notice. It is expected that we will start to take the above ... actions in April 2015. I will keep you informed of the updated progress."

Mr Chairman, I just want to point out that all the proposals set out in this memo have all been acted upon. The management has taken action to implement all these proposals.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, have any steps been taken to paginate this material? Because it's likely to be referred to, and it would help if we were to paginate it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, we will arrange for that. These pages just arrived on my desk a few moments ago.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. If somebody could perhaps start doing that, then we can write the numbers in ourselves.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly.

Dr Leung and gentlemen, good morning. Thank you for your homework overnight and thank you for that explanation this morning.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I have to apologise on behalf of the management. So much time was spent on this topic yesterday. If our management had done their job better, you know, the whole thing could have been explained clearer yesterday. Please accept my apology.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you for that gesture, Dr Leung.

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN (continued)

MR PETER DUNCAN: Dr Leung, I just have a couple of questions arising from the material we received overnight.

If you look at exhibit 1, this is the email from Gary Wong of February 2, 2015:

"Following the clearance of protest areas in December 2014, it is the right time to reconsider the implementation of speed limits for the identified sharp bends/roundabouts."

So the word "reconsider" would suggest that this matter had already been the subject of consideration.

We don't have any documentation with regard to what happened subsequent to the email of Mr Edmond Ho on 15 August 2014, which sought formal approval from the operations director, Mr Eckford.

Has the management been able to find any information as to what happened after August 2014 and before February of 2015 with regard to that request for formal approval?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: We have to look up the file. The documents submitted before the committee are all we have got, the relevant material we have got, from our file.

CHAIRMAN: We understand that, but the question is very simple: where are the records of what was being considered between 14 August 2014 and 2 February 2015? Where are they?

Mr Lee, perhaps you can help.

MR ROGER LEE: I will try to help but I joined the company in January 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: And no doubt I will go back to the office and find out a bit more.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you weren't the managing director at the time this decision was taken on 13 February 2015,

because you told us previously that this was something that had been decided when Mr Edmond Ho was the managing director. That's not the case, is it, from the documents you have provided today?

MR ROGER LEE: Can you just let me to get back to the office to find out more information?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Chairman, perhaps if I may make a point of clarification, because I raised the same question with our management.

It started with:

"Following the clearance of protest areas in December 2014 ..."

They were referring to the Occupy --

MR PETER DUNCAN: Occupy Central, yes.

If I could raise another matter, please, that we addressed yesterday. This is the matter of the exception reports that we were provided with yesterday.

I am referring to two types of reports, one relating to speeding and the other relating to harsh braking and sudden acceleration which we saw yesterday. Just so there is no misunderstanding here, can we look first of all at KMB-9 at page 3993.

You will recall that we spent some time on this document in the last couple of days. That's the first

type of report I'm referring to.

And the second type of report is that which we can find at KMB-1 at page 362.

CHAIRMAN: What kind of report is that?

MR PETER DUNCAN: This pertains to speed, and then also acceleration, and then also harsh braking.

You will recall that sort of report?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

With regard to the accident in Tai Po on 10 February this year, can I ask this question: was the bus involved or the driver of that bus identified after the incident in any of these two types of reports generated for 10 February?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) At that time, we did not identify the bus through these reports because, at that time, we looked at the specific incident and bus involved without having to wait for these reports.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So were the reports ever produced for 10 February?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) At that time, the focus was on the bus itself. I did not realise or pay attention to the occurrence of this bus in these reports.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So this type of reports had never been

produced for 10 February?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) These reports are regular reports. In other words, for buses that contravene our guidelines, they would show up on these reports. So these are regular reports.

For the Tai Po incident, it was an exceptional incident, which was why we looked at that bus specifically. I cannot recall whether the bus was covered in these reports.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you undertake a check as to whether there were such reports issued for 10 February?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes. I can check whether such reports appeared at that time.

CHAIRMAN: And having done so, will you provide them to the committee?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) If I am able to identify the records, of course I would provide them to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Had the bus been travelling in excess of 70 kilometres per hour -- had that bus been travelling -- would a report such as the two types we have seen automatically have been produced?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) First of all, for the table we see right now, the speed threshold was

75 kilometres per hour. If the bus succeeded 75kph, it should show up on this table.

As for another, shorter table, it depends on the road speed limit at that time before we ascertain whether a bus was speeding. If there was speeding, again, it would show up on the report.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If there was harsh braking or extreme acceleration, would that have automatically generated the second type of report?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If those reports were not generated at that time, would the system today allow for the production of those reports?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) If there was harsh braking or sudden acceleration, there would be such record. If there was such occurrence, it would show up on the report. So if I am able to identify that report, I will share that with the committee.

MR PETER DUNCAN: My question is a little different. If the report does not exist, can you produce a report today from what consists in the company's records, in its computers?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) I don't quite understand the question. If there was harsh braking or sudden acceleration, it should have shown up on the report

already.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I see. Thank you.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It should be possible, but since the records or figures were from half a year ago, they were already archived in other systems, so we might need to identify the data involved. So we have to study the feasibility, but I believe it's possible.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We moved, at the end of yesterday, to the matter of training. Before I resume with that, I just want to ask a few more questions about the issue of manpower shortage.

As a comment, it would seem that given the likely effect of the new guidelines, the problem of the shortage of bus drivers is going to get worse rather than better. Is that a fair comment?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I agree, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company developed any recent initiatives with regard to how the situation might be improved?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) This is a diverse issue. First of all, something must be done on recruitment, and the company also needs to promote staff morale. In terms of the recruitment of bus captains, something must

be done by way of remuneration. Our chairman mentioned some measures this Tuesday, and in terms of recruitment, in different districts and different types of roles, we hope to do something.

These days, not many staff are prepared to stay in the job for a very long time, unlike in the past, so we suggest recruiting different types of people to our company. In terms of promoting a sense of belonging for staff, we have also done a lot. We would enhance depot facilities. We are providing different services and facilities such as resting areas and hairdressing service. We have also introduced gym rooms and ping-pong tables and at bus termini a lot has been done to enhance comfort for bus captains. So we have done quite a lot.

In terms of lifestyle, we implemented recreation clubs, including football activities. Most bus captains are males, so we want to allow them to take part in various facilities or activities after work; for example, singing events. And at the instruction of the chairman, we also set up a scholarship. This way, we can do something for the children and kids of our bus captains or staff. So hopefully this can help us retain staff and attract new blood in the recruitment of bus captains. The work is certainly not easy. This is

something we would continue in light of the shortage.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, our managing director, Mr Lee, talked about our work in terms of staff retention and recruitment. So in terms of software and bus operations, I would like to share what we have done to address the crew shortage.

Mr Lee talked about hardware, including rest kiosks, et cetera, so I won't repeat what he said. Meanwhile, in terms of bus operations, we want to adopt a more people-based approach. This way, we can improve a sense of belonging for our bus captains and boost retention rates. We also took out a number of encouraging measures to facilitate the application of sick leave for bus captains, and we would also streamline our journey times or durations and hopefully we can provide for adequate journey time and resting time.

In terms of application of leave, redeployment, application for rest days, et cetera, by bus captains, we hope to be adopting a people-based approach or people-oriented approach.

And for applications for bus captains on redeployments, leave, et cetera, this is something we will deal with. In April, we conducted a questionnaire, to allow BCs to choose their preferred work arrangements. The need of each BC might be different.

Some might work eight hours while others might want to work ten hours, and we would try our best to accommodate or facilitate their request.

(Chinese words not interpreted) ... like they have been harassed and I have talked about my measures yesterday. We have also stepped up our training for frontline staff. In June, 200 operations officers and instructors at all levels have been trained for two days and altogether eight courses were arranged. During the training, what we were doing was to enhance ways to give support to frontline bus captains when they encountered difficulties.

In addition -- Mr Chairman, well, a number of points here. A bus captain may get involved in a traffic accident. A bus captain may encounter what I said yesterday, incidents of abuse. So we have enhanced the ability of our operations officers and inspectors, so that they can arrive at the scene to help BCs to deal with a traffic accident.

We tried to enhance our frontline capacity to provide appropriate assistance to the bus captains. Our company has also got dedicated people to deal with traffic accident investigation. We have also got the legal department. We have also got the Road Safety Unit from the Hong Kong Police Force to give us talks. It's

a two-hour talk, to talk about road safety.

So in June that was done and I believe that it was well received by our staff members.

So we would like to enhance the frontline management so that we are able to provide assistance to our frontline bus captains. For bus captains, they face a lot of problems on a daily basis, like the traffic is getting more and more congested, the number of vehicles on the road is not in proportion to the sort of road network. More and more vehicles are illegally parked. More and more of them are illegally parked in bus bays or at bus stops. Then, as a result of traffic congestion, as a result of illegal parking, our bus captains find that they have to get a longer journey time, and what is worse is that the journey time is such that bus trips have been lost, and in fact our bus captains are facing huge pressure.

Well, we have got verbal abuses, quarrels and sometimes physical abuses arise from such external factors.

As to illegal parking, especially illegal parking at bus stops -- I hope you would understand that there are wheelchair-bound passengers and buses have to be stopped right at the bus stop before the wheelchair passenger can make use of the specific point along the kerb to

board the bus.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan's question was not an open-ended enquiry into everything you might choose to tell us about what had been done. He was asking what initiatives have been taken.

You have told us about stepped-up training. Is there anything else you want to describe?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I just want to summarise and say that the bus captains face many difficulties and in fact we are trying to solve the problems one by one, gradually.

As to the question of retention, Mr Chairman, I hope you will understand the pressure on the bus captains has a lot to do with retention and recruitment.

CHAIRMAN: You have told us repeatedly about what the pressures are. The question is what initiatives have been taken. You have probably told us all of the ones that exist.

Mr Lee wants to say something.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Mr Pang was saying that while a bus captain is driving, even if the bus is stationary, say for example caught in traffic congestion, the bus captain suffers from a huge mental stress. Many bus captains have been complaining that it is hard for them to be trapped in a traffic jam, so it

is a difficult job.

Mr Pang is saying that we have been reminding being departments that traffic congestion is serious and the road conditions are bad. We hope that by raising this point, we are able to ease the traffic congestion and we hope that we can improve the road congestion. So such are our initiatives.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: To which government departments have those complaints been issued?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) You refer to the road conditions?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) A number of them.

Of course, first of all, the police force. Say, for example, because of illegal parking and also the loading and unloading activities blocking our access to the bus stop and we can't park right at the bus stop and we are not able to get the wheelchair passengers on board. Other passengers also find it difficult to get on board. And you recall the incident in Central on Connaught Road.

CHAIRMAN: I think you are repeating yourself.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So one is the police. What other

department?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) The other is the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Highways Department as well, because the conditions on the road may not be that satisfactory, and then the FHD, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department --

CHAIRMAN: What conditions? Road surface or ...?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Uneven road surfaces or obstacles on the road.

CHAIRMAN: Any other departments?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, FHD. The trees, especially in the rural area, after the rainy season, the branches are blocking or obstructing.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, so the trees need pruning, obstacles on the road, congestion and illegal parking, that's Police and Transport Department. Anybody else?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I think basically those are the departments. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: What's the overall response been from government? Perhaps Mr Lee can sum this up, shortly, if you can. Satisfactory or not?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Could have been quicker,

faster.

CHAIRMAN: So it has been done, has it, but it could have been done quicker?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Sometimes we have to take our own efforts to do so.

CHAIRMAN: Has the problem of illegal parking at and around bus stops and elsewhere been solved?

MR ROGER LEE: Not all of them, especially at night.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the problem of traffic congestion been resolved?

MR ROGER LEE: No.

MR PATRICK PANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, what was the answer to that?

MR ROGER LEE: No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What proportion of the company's bus drivers are women?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) 6 per cent, roughly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company have any initiatives to attract more women to this position?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We do, and we have been studying the matter. In particular, for the Tuen Mun Depot, we have been working harder on it because it is

a mainly residential area. During our recruitment exercise, of course we observe equal opportunities but still we want to attract more female candidates.

We have considered whether we can have facilities to cater for the needs of the females. Say, for example, someone may be a housewife, and if we can have nursery facilities for childcare, if we can set up such a facility within our depot, I believe it will be helpful.

But then, of course, land use is a restriction and we are not able to do that yet.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have these considerations led yet to any particular initiatives undertaken by the company to attract women?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) In addition, as far as the post or the job design is concerned, we have the so-called half-time bus captains. In other words, they work shorter hours or the number of days that they work in the week would be fewer, so as to cater for mothers who have to take care of their children.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has that resulted in any significant increase in the number of women who are employed?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, it does help with the number of applicants. As I have said, we try as much as possible to provide separate toilet facilities at our

terminus. We will try as much as possible to have different toilets for different sexes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want to ask that a slide be brought up on the screen now which summarises the profits of KMB and Long Win Bus in recent years, I think for the years 2011 to 2017. This has been gleaned from the reports in the bundles. So if I could just explain this chart, the top heading is "Profit for the years of 2011 to 2017 for [Kowloon Motor Bus]", and the references you will see across the top are all from the bundle KMB-6.

And the profits after taxation are shown across from the year 2011 up until the year 2017.

We can see from this chart that losses were made in the years 2012 and 2013. Do you see those losses recorded as 51 million and 21 million respectively?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It would be fair to say that since 2013, the profits of the company have increased quite steadily; is that a fair comment?

MR ROGER LEE: Not fair comment.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I agree, but there is a reason for that. Mr Duncan, perhaps I can explain better the financial position of the company by referring to KMB & Long Win-1 submissions, page 93, if I may have that, please.

Yes, Chairman. May I say that we have been, and still are, labouring under very difficult position to operate a franchised bus business. If I may refer to this table, yes, Mr Duncan, you rightly pointed out that in 2012 we made a loss of $51 million, and in 2013 we made a loss of $21 million.

But when you say that, we had been making steady profit from 2014 to 2017.

May I please point out one thing. Please look at the profit of 2016. We made a profit of $618 million. But if you look -- if I may draw your attention to the fuel costs. In 2012, the fuel cost was $1.46 billion. In the year 2013, the fuel cost was $1.4 billion. Then it comes down to $1.2 billion in 2014, thereby giving us a profit of $197 million.

If you look closely at the profit of 2016, we made a profit of $618 million, but if you look at our savings of the fuel costs, in that year we spent only $624 million on fuel costs.

So it tells us that while in 2016 there was a marginal increase of our revenue, our profit was not resulted from the rise in revenue but rather because of the savings from the fuel costs.

The same applies to the year 2017. The amount of profit equals to the amount of fuel costs we saved.

That is important to note.

More importantly, I would like to point out that in last year, 2017, our staff costs amounted to $3.6 billion, and this equals to roughly 60 per cent of the total operating expenses. These staffing costs will continue to rise from year to year because of the annual pay increase exercise. So you will see that, in the case of fuel costs, we have completely no control whatsoever over such expenditure. So that's why I would like to bring out to the attention of the committee that I have been doing my level best to promote the wellbeing of our staff. They are very important assets of the company. We are here to serve people; we have to keep them.

I would say that within my level best -- I will do my level best to improve the wellbeing of our staff and to care for their wellbeing, so hopefully we can recruit new bus captains and to keep our serving bus captains in the company. But on that point, I have to say that I am painfully aware of the fact that we have been running short of bus captains for a number of years, but we have got to look at the larger issue, the market situation in Hong Kong. But right now the unemployment rate of Hong Kong is 2.8 per cent. This is virtually full employment in Hong Kong. But there is nothing -- well,

you know, we talked about imported labour -- there is not too much we can do about it. But what I have been trying to do, at least I have a strategy, to improve the remuneration of our bus captains, in the hope that other commercial drivers will come over to join our company, and basically a movement of drivers from other transport sector to KMB and Long Win. That's my strategy for attracting bus captains.

I appreciate and fully recognise that it is difficult to get new bloods, new recruits, into bus captains, as explained by the management, because of the working conditions, the abuse of our bus captains by passengers, et cetera.

But I will continue to look after -- you have my assurance that I will continue to do my level best to promote the wellbeing of our staff, in the hope that the bus captain shortage problem can be addressed.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

If I could just pick up one of the matters you mentioned. You said a few moments ago that you have a strategy to improve the remuneration of the bus drivers. Are you able to disclose what that strategy is?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Basically, we are talking about the

remuneration of the bus captains. I did that, you know, at the board meeting of December last year, to incorporate the bonuses into the basic salary, and I told you at the Tuesday hearing that there will be further upgrades -- I will be expanding the grades of the monthly bus captains, and also to expand their annual increment from eight to twenty; I told that at the hearing.

But basically money, I'm talking about money, and the working conditions of our bus captains. No efforts will be spared in attracting, if I may say so, new bloods to our staff force, I would say that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We will come to the starting salary of new recruits later today, but in the light of what you have told us about price of fuel and so forth, what scope is there to increase the basic remuneration of your bus captains, in order to attract more people to this position?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Apart from -- well, let's say we want to recruit a new bus captain. After the implementation of all the initiatives that I mentioned, plus the annual increment of pay in 2018 being implemented later in the year, subject to agreement of the trade unions, I work out that a new bus captain would be earning about $23,000 per month, roughly, for 10 hours of working.

Working on a 10 hours basis, it would be about 23,000.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's 10 hours a day, six days a week?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes, six-day week, and as I say, in the hope that perhaps some commercial drivers may consider to join our company as well as new bloods might consider joining our company.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company developed any particular initiatives to attract young people to the position? We saw the statistics yesterday and saw that the number of young people is much less than the number of middle-aged people.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes, we did. I will talk about our HR initiatives. In terms of male bus captains, and as Mr Leung said, the labour productivity is limited, so in terms of remuneration -- well, many staff, including frontline staff, would not only consider salary; they would consider the working conditions, and we have enhanced the arrangement of family cards for staff, and family members of our staff can take the bus for free, and we are creating an ideal environment. As I said, the proportion of female drivers is 5 to 6 per cent, whereas in Hong Kong the proportion of males and females are comparable.

In terms of what we will do, perhaps I will defer to Mr So.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We strive to hire young drivers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I am particularly interested in the young people.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Young people.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes. In terms of recruitment channels, apart from the traditional medium of newspapers, we have been using social media in order to reach out to the younger generation.

And in terms of benefits, there is something we can do. As we said, we have recreation clubs which might be appealing to younger people. We have sports activities such as soccer, basketball, badminton, or singing activities. As Mr Pang said, in terms of rostering, we would try to cater for the young people and their lifestyle, and at depots we have introduced recreation facilities to appeal to young people.

And in terms of shuttle service to depots, we have expanded our service so that people who live far would not be discouraged from joining the company. In terms of promotion, we have been proactive and in the past half a year we have organised multiple open days and recruitment days, and we have sent outreach teams to our depots in order to reach out to younger prospects.

So this is what we have been doing.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you noticed any improvement in regard to young people?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) KMB has four depots and when we open our depots, apart from -- well, we encourage young people to bring their family members to visit the depots so that the family members of our captains can understand the working environment, and this is rather appealing.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, I have something to add to what Mr So said.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I am only interested in whether these initiatives have actually resulted in any improvement. Or is it too early to say?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I can only say that we are gradually achieving improvements. We do not want our young captains to feel that they become captains only because they are at a dead end or they have no choice. In the last nine months, some captains have been promoted to inspectors or operations officers. We hope to motivate young people to join the bus trade. This is something we want to do.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) In the past, captains were seldom promoted to inspectors or to clerical grades, but this is something we are trying to do.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Basically we are saying that we have accelerated promotion policy for the talented young men.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Is there a minimum age before you will engage a bus captain?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Can you repeat the question, please?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Is there a minimum age which applies to persons who can join your company as a bus captain? Do they have to be 20 or 25 or 30?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) So long as the applicant holds a private vehicle licence for three years, they will be considered.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Dr Leung, you touched, in one of your answers a few moments ago, on the matter of fare increases.

When was the last fare increase approved by the Administration?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) 2014.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The committee has heard of the mechanism by which fare increases are considered. Has the company applied for any fare increase since 2014?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: No, we have not. Again, to explain our position better, may I please refer to page 95 of this same file.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: We have to apply for fare increase in accordance with the formula as set out in paragraph 33(vi). There is a formula stated there: 0.5 times increase in wage index plus 0.5 times increase in Consumer Price Index minus 0.5 times productivity gain.

If the result of this formula equals to or exceeds 2 per cent, then we can apply to the government for a fare increase. That's the trigger point for it. But as in the last two years, because our profit -- also, there was another cap -- if our profit reaches the level of 9.7 per cent of our net asset value --

DR JOHN CHAN: Net average fixed assets.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: -- net average fixed assets, we can't apply for any increase. This is the case for 2016 and 2017, so we couldn't apply for any increase, according to this formula.

So unlike our big brother, MTRC, they have a formula, but the increase is automatic; they don't have to apply for it. But in our case, we have to make an application for fare increase, and more often than not we never get the rate of increase that we apply for. That's the situation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

The obvious question, Dr Leung, is this: are you

content with the current formula?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Sorry?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you happy with regard to the current formula?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Of course not. Why would I be happy? Of course not. Mr Duncan, how can I be happy with such a formula?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any particular suggestions as to what formula should be applied?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I think we have been talking to the Transport Bureau for a number of years, and so far we have achieved nothing. We just have to keep on talking with them, to convince them that it is time for a revision of the formula.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) The biggest problem with this formula is it is looking at what happened in the past, and then on that basis you apply for a fare adjustment. We talked about the staff costs as well as the fuel costs, and they are about the future costs. Say, for example, recently, the fuel prices have gone up. In the past year or two, prices have come down. So it's a matter of the time-lag and we are not able to reflect the situation.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Chairman, I missed out one important issue. The oil price is not included in this formula.

We know how much we spend on gas, but this is not included in the formula. A very significant cost factor of our operation is excluded from this formula.

CHAIRMAN: Fuel is not a part of Consumer Price Index?

DR JOHN CHAN: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you have in front of you, Dr Leung, the file THB-2, and in particular page 23.

Perhaps if I go back to the commencement of the document. It's actually at page 1. It is a document issued by the Transport and Housing Bureau and it's called, "Public Transport Strategy Study", dated June 2017.

Are you familiar with the fact that this report exists?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you go, please, to page 23 of the bundle.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you see a heading on that page, "(d) Fare adjustment arrangement"? Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And in paragraph 4.25, you will see the formula which you have included in your submission at page 95. Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I can take you over the page to page 24, and bring your attention to paragraph 4.28:

"The aforesaid existing arrangement was put in place in 2006 after consultation with the LegCo. The arrangement was subsequently fine-tuned having regard to the outcome of the review in 2009."

Then at 4.29:

"In this regard, the government has conducted a review of the FAA. The initial findings indicate that the arrangement should be kept intact, while the data could be updated on two fronts".

Then you can see those fronts there described, "(a) Productivity gain value" and then the "Passenger reward arrangement". I think you will see in the "Passenger reward arrangement" reference to the 9.7 per cent, which I think you have touched on during the course of your evidence this morning.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes, the annual fixed assets, that's right.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

Then at 4.30 we have this statement:

"The government has initiated discussion with the franchised bus companies on the initial review outcome and the details of the above two data updates. We will announce the discussion outcome and expect to implement

them in the first half of 2018 upon approval by the Chief Executive-in-Council."

Have you heard anything from the government on this matter?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Not on -- basically, I have been talking -- I have had discussion with the government, you know, on the passenger reward arrangement, and we haven't come to --

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) May I supplement?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: No, no, no. Let me finish first.

I have been, you know, talking to the government. I have had discussion with the government on this, on the passenger reward arrangement, and no definitive agreement has been reached between us.

MR PETER DUNCAN: There is reference to the fact that this matter was going to be considered by the Executive Council, and then an implementation in the first half of 2018.

Have you had any news in that respect?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: No, no implementation as of today.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If the recommendation which is described at the top of page 25 is accepted, will that ease your concerns with regard to the fare adjustment arrangement?

DR JOHN CHAN: Mr Duncan, we, as of today, have not been told of the outcome of the review and of any submission

to Executive Council. This has not happened.

If you look at what this says here, if we may go to the next page. Yes, the sentence at the end of paragraph 4.29, it says:

"The consultant recommended that the triggering threshold of 9.7 per cent should be adjusted downwards slightly ...", et cetera.

Just looking at that figure --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, where are you reading from?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: 25.

DR JOHN CHAN: 25, I think, paragraph 4.29 of the document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have it, thank you.

DR JOHN CHAN: If the triggering threshold of 9.7 is reduced, purely from a financial point of view that is bad news for KMB.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, as matters stand, from the perspective of KMB, it does not appear that there is any imminent likelihood of an improvement in the fare adjustment process? Is that a fair summary of the situation?

DR JOHN CHAN: That's right.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So the comment that Dr Leung had with regard to being the younger brother of the MTRC would remain; is that fair?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: We are the poor little cousin!

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. I now wish to return to training.

MEMBER LO: I just have a question on the cost structure. You mentioned that the fuel cost is a big part of the variation, fluctuation of your business.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MEMBER LO: Have you thought about a scheme to stabilise the variation over time, over the years, maybe with the government?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: The government will leave this matter to KMB and us only, and in fact, at one time, in previous, many -- some years ago, we discussed with the government the possibility of having a surcharge, you know, for our fares, arising from the increase, significant increase, in fuel costs. It came to nothing because the government would not agree to that.

Of course, we have considered all sorts of options for cost-saving in this aspect, but we made a conscious decision not to do any oil hedging. We find that it's not advisable to hedge against oil -- you know, the gas oil price, because we learned the unfortunate experience of Cathay in that aspect. You know, they got a substantial loss as a result of hedging.

So what we have done is to talk -- we have in fact reached an agreement with the oil supplier. That's what we are doing today. Then we have agreed that they will supply gas oil to us, for a number of years, normally

for three years. Then we agree the capped price for the gas oil.

Currently, we have a capped price of US$85 per barrel. That's what we are doing now. If the gas oil price goes up, goes beyond US$85, we are still paying $85. But, on the other hand, if the gas oil price comes down, say comes down to $40, $45, we don't have any floor on the price and we just pay the market price --

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes, the floor is US$45.

MR ROGER LEE: (Chinese words not interpreted).

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Currently, we don't have such floor.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We do not conduct hedging against oil, because oil costs are a major cost component. We agreed with the oil suppliers that the cap is US$85 per barrel, which is the crude oil cost plus a margin, and we would have a spot rate and we would add a premium on top. Of course I cannot disclose the exact figure. It's meaningless to have a floor price. Coming up, we will have a floor price of about US$45 and we have shifted the risk to the oil suppliers.

And, like the chairman said, we are trying to come up with our own way to protect ourselves against fuel costs. Fuel once made up 20 per cent of our costs, which was significant.

As for the toll charges, they are rather high. Most people do not know that KMB is paying the full toll charges, even for government tunnels.

So these are crucial cost components which we are monitoring.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Back to the question of training, gentlemen. Can I have you, please, at page 145 of KMB-1.

We are looking here at the action plan as of 10 April 2018, which was submitted to the Transport Department on that date, and at paragraph 3 on page 145 through to paragraph 7 on page 147, we see the action plan for training.

If I could pick it up at item 3, the statement is made there -- and this is the point we reached at the end of yesterday's hearing -- that henceforth "all newly recruited bus captain candidates should be subject to the same standard of training".

MR JAMES WONG: (Chinese words not interpreted).

MR PETER DUNCAN: Whether they are full-time or part-time, they will receive the same standard of training; is that correct?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Since that time, we no longer recruited part-time captains, so we applied the same standards to all.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Will there be part-time captains who perform for more than 18 hours a day -- will they be recruited in the future?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) A week?

MR PETER DUNCAN: 18 hours a week, yes.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And they will receive the same form of training as any bus captain who is proposing to work on a full-time basis?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, we can read for ourselves the contents of the new training programmes, as set out in items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

I just ask, with regard to item 7:

"The number of ... driving instructors should be increased to a total of 110."

And in the action plan, it is stated that the canned:

"The ... candidates would complete all training and necessary exams before 30 June 2018... to form a cadre of 81 [driving instructors]."

Has that been completed?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) This is already completed. We have now a cadre of 89 DIs.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would like now to refer you to another bundle, which is TD-1, at page 403.

You should be looking at a document dated July 2018, issued by the Transport and Housing Bureau and Transport Department, for discussion in the Legislative Council on 25 July. Do you have that paper in front of you?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via Interpreter) Yes, I see that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, in the portion on page 403 with regard to the background, it refers to the setting up of a working group following the accident on 10 February. Do you see that?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I see that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And we see that the scope of the work is described in paragraphs (a) and (b)? And was one of the scope of work described as the reviewing of the training arrangements adopted by the franchised bus operators?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes, that's described in paragraph (b).

MR PETER DUNCAN: At the bottom of the page, there is a footnote which describes the composition of the working group, to include the five franchised bus operators, together with the bus manufacturers and of course the representatives of the Transport Department itself.

May I ask whether any of the gentlemen present were

members of this working group?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For KMB and LWB, myself, Godwin So, Mr Leung Kin Wang, operations director, and Mr James Wong, the head of the training and quality assurance department, represented our company.

CHAIRMAN: Was there not also a subgroup dealing with technical matters?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And what was the KMB representation on the subgroup?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Technically speaking, myself and another engineer represented the company.

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) For the relevant training, I attended the meeting.

CHAIRMAN: What was the name of the other engineer who attended the safety device subgroup?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Ivan Ho.

CHAIRMAN: And, Mr Wong, were you the only representative on the training group?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I was the representative. I was the lone representative for the training subgroup.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: On page 403 --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, before we move on, Mr Duncan, would you

explore who the representatives of the Transport Department and the other franchised bus companies were?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly, Chairman.

Who on the working group represented the Transport Department?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) In the past, TD was -- the group was chaired by Rachel Kwan, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport, and after she went on retirement leave Macella Lee, the Deputy Commissioner, chaired the group.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did the Transport Department have other representatives?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, they had plenty. I cannot name each one of them. They had a senior transport officer, et cetera, and they were from a bus and railway unit as well as a road engineering unit, but I cannot remember all the names.

CHAIRMAN: Were minutes not produced of these meetings?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide them to us?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would ask you, please, to turn up one of the other bundles, CTB --

CHAIRMAN: Before we do that, can we pursue the other

franchised bus company representatives, or will they be reflected in the minutes that you are going to provide us?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, their names are present on those minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

CTB & NWFB-3, please, at page 588. Do you see a document headed, "Working group on enhancement of safety of franchised buses" dated 13 March?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it followed by a document which is described as an annex, and the heading, "Working group on enhancement of safety of franchised buses"?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If you go to page 590, do you see a heading, "Membership"?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does that assist with regard to those persons from the Transport Department who worked on the working group?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Was it the same people at each meeting?

MR GODWIN SO: Almost.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. It would appear that this document does not include the names of any of the bus manufacturer representatives.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For bus manufacturers, they attended the meeting of the technical subgroup. Here, this is about the main meeting; they did not attend.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Did members of the Transport Department attend the subgroup meetings?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes, within the subgroup, some of the Transport Department representatives and representatives from franchised bus operators, including myself, hold meetings together.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Who chaired the subgroup?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) If I remember correctly, it should be Amy Tse.

MR PETER DUNCAN: From the Transport Department?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Correct. Yes, she is responsible for training.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For the technical subgroup, a number of them were involved, David Tsang, once, and I think he retired and he was replaced by others, and at the last meeting it was chaired by Assistant Commissioner, a Mr Chan Ying Kit.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I notice on page 403 of TD-1 that the

major bus manufacturers were invited to join the technical meetings. Did they actually attend the technical subgroup meetings?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, they did.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And which of the bus manufacturers named there -- Alexander Dennis, Volvo, and Regal-MAN -- which of those were represented at the subgroup meetings?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For Alexander Dennis Ltd, it was represented by Andrew Boulton. Volvo, by Julia ...

(In English) I forgot the first name. And Jacky Chan of Volvo.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Julia for Volvo and Jacky Chan for?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Volvo.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Two for Volvo?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Two for Volvo.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And what about Regal-MAN?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Rex Wong for Regal.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are these all local representatives of those companies, or are they resident overseas?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Local resident engineers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Julia Lu, L-U.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The chairman asked whether minutes of the working group meetings were retained, were kept, and you

indicated yes and you are going to supply those.

Were there minutes of the subgroup meetings kept?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The minutes are distributed by the working group chairman and they sent the minutes to us.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do they include the minutes of the subgroup as well as the main working group?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Different meeting minutes, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When you provide the minutes, could you provide the minutes not just of the working group but also of the subgroup?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, if the hiatus suggests that you have in mind a break, that is certainly welcome.

We will take a 20-minute break, gentlemen. Thank you.

(11.36 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.58 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

We were at page 403 of TD-1, the paper which briefed members of the Legislative Council on the recommended measures to further enhance safety of franchised buses.

Could I ask this question. As the first sentence of

the document indicates, these are recommended measures. Does the company regard itself as being bound by these measures, or is the company going to regard these measures as recommendations only, as is stated in the paper?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) On page 413, which is annex A, there would be a target time frame for each recommendation, and this is for the trade's consideration. So these are technical bus features.

In terms of the training of bus captains, there are practice notes which the trade has to comply with, and in the last paragraph of the practice note there is a requirement for a monitoring and audit system to be in place for each company, and they must ensure that the practice note is complied with and the matter must be reported to the board.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So with regard to the technical matters, do I understand your answer to mean that you go through the trials and then make a determination as to what can be implemented?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) As far as engineering is concerned, a lot is ongoing. They are recommendations but from the perspective of the company, we will certainly try our best to enforce them vigorously.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Without going into the detail of the

document yet, it is apparent from this document that if many of the recommendations are adopted, this will have quite an impact on the way in which bus captains are trained and also on how bus captains carry out their duties. Do you agree with that?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We notice that neither the unions nor the bus captains were represented on the working group. What consultation has taken place with the bus captains and/or the trade unions during the period that this working group has operated?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Allow me to elaborate on this. For this working group, the Transport Department hasn't invited any trade unions. When the discussion reached the third meeting, as you know, then we got the guidelines for the training of bus captains. It was suggested that individual operators, according to our needs, should consult the trade unions.

Now, for our company, that is KMB and LWB, read the guidelines. In fact, it is a matter of setting out all the practices among all the bus operators, and then the TD grouped them together and produced the practice note. For this practice note, our company is able to meet all the requirements, and in fact this is what we have been doing, and what we are doing. Therefore, we haven't

consulted our trade unions or our staff members again. This is because they are already in place. Nothing new there, as far as KMB is concerned.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What about the technology devices which have been recommended; what consultation, if any, has taken place with the trade unions with regard to those matters?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Again, as I have said, they would defer to the bus companies to carry out the consultation. We have to look at the broad suggestions made. First of all, for newly acquired buses, there should be seat belts. As of today, 44 of our buses in the fleet are fitted with seat belts for all, and bus captains have had the experience of driving such buses. So it isn't something new.

Then, as to the second recommendation, it is said that we should have real-time speeding alerts. Well, two days ago, you know that we do have the real-time alerts. We have got it already.

The TD is saying other than the 70km per hour, we should also cover 50km per hour. I have covered that so I don't want to repeat.

Then there should be another feature to alert bus captains who are sort of falling asleep. We have got four buses on a pilot basis. It is merely a matter of

reminding them. There won't be a record and we are not going to resort to disciplinary actions. We want to ask bus captains to try them and then they can tell us whether such a device would be helpful to them.

Therefore, as far as the bus features are concerned, the first one I have covered, we have the seat belt; second, the drowsiness alert, we have got four on trial to get views from the bus captains; and then the other one, we have also got it in our company as well.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

You have mentioned the practice note, and I wonder if we could turn the practice note up. I believe it would be at 470.

CHAIRMAN: This was provided on 9 August; am I correct?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. If you look at page 463 of the bundle, you will see a letter from the Transport Department of 9 August, which was in response to a letter from the committee of 23 July.

You will see at page 471 to 473 a practice note which bears the date August of 2018. Do you see that?

So if you look at the practice note --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, which page is this, the practice note?

MR PETER DUNCAN: 471.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. But we were told, were we not, by a submission of the Transport Department, that this had

been promulgated in July?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Indeed, that was the position, Mr Chairman.

If you go to page 427, please.

CHAIRMAN: That gives us the date.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. There is a letter from the Transport Department dated 20 July, which provides an attachment, and then you will see the attachment running from page 428, and at page 435 there is reference, in the first complete box, to the fact that the TD had recently issued a practice note to franchised bus operators in respect of the training for bus captains, et cetera.

What date did the Transport Department issue the practice note to Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) 6 August.

(In English) Through a fax.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Had you received any practice note from the Transport Department prior to 6 August?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

(Via interpreter) Well, for the practice note, it's an output from the working group. On 25 July, they went to the Transport Panel of LegCo, but they didn't have that paper, as you can see. Then, on 6 August, we received a fax, telling us that it would be formally launched and we were expected to implement it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. My question is whether before 6 August the Transport Department had issued a practice note to Kowloon Motor Bus.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not a formal one.

CHAIRMAN: Were you issued an informal one?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Please ask the question again; I don't quite grasp the question.

CHAIRMAN: Well, the Transport Department are telling the committee in a written submission that they have recently issued a practice note to the franchised bus operators and they told us that on 20 July, and then, when they provide us with a practice note, it is dated August, and you tell us that you've got one that's dated 6 August. Were you given any earlier version of the practice note, one that is consistent with what the Transport Department are telling us?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I can provide what I have received, so we have attachments to a discussion paper for meetings before that.

CHAIRMAN: What was the date that you received that practice note?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) 6 August.

CHAIRMAN: Nothing prior to that, in any form?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, there's an attachment to a discussion paper of the working group's meeting.

CHAIRMAN: And what's the date of that document?

MR GODWIN SO: Mid or early July.

(Via interpreter) I can't recall the exact date.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a copy of the document?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide it to the committee?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Let's have a look at the practice note itself. TD-1/470. We will be able to read for ourselves the general content of the document, but one matter I would like to bring to your attention, please, is paragraph 4 on page 471, and the minimum requirement.

The working group, with regard to the induction course, has suggested a certain period of time for classroom training and then a certain period of time for behind-the-wheel road training, and the working group has drawn a distinction between full-time and part-time drivers.

What is the intent of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company in the light of the earlier evidence on the action plan that it's your intention in the future to treat all bus drivers in the same way whether they be full-time or

whether they be part-time?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) When this item was discussed, the other FB operators were also present. As far as training is concerned, different companies have different arrangements and needs. Therefore, in the light of the different circumstances of different operators, the TD came up with the minimum requirement. So you can see that the topic is called "minimum requirement". In other words, for some companies, they would still be engaging part-time bus captains, and I clearly stated that for KMB, we have stopped recruiting part-time bus captains, but then the TD has to take into account the other operators when they drew up the guidelines. That's why they have included this point about part-time bus captains, but it doesn't apply to KMB.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company envisage any changes in its training programme, as set out in the action plan and in the other documentation provided to the committee, as a result of this practice note?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) No, no need to change or revise. This is because we have made our suggestions and the TD came up with this in the light of our submission.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

I would like to leave training now and turn to another matter.

Could you in this respect, please, turn up KMB-1 at page 129.

The original documentation here is at page 128 to 129, and I'm working off the translation at 129-1.

This is a document headed, "Declaration". What is the purpose and what is the use of this document?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) In February or March, the company set up an investigation committee in the aftermath of the Tai Po accident, and the idea was that we had to know more about our employees, in a process known as "know our employees", and we wanted to find out whether their other employments outside might affect their work and whether our employees have significant medical history which might affect their work, and also whether they have been convicted of dangerous driving in the past and also criminal conviction records.

And during recruitment, we would look at the information submitted by the applicants when considering whether they would be hired.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, prior to the Tai Po accident, was there any form such as this required to be set out when a potential bus driver joined the company?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It wasn't that detailed but

there was still similar work. For example, in terms of dangerous driving, we would ask them to give their records. For medical history, no declaration was needed, but there would be a medical check upon induction.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Did the form enter into the position of what other employment a person was undertaking, the old form?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No, not before.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you happen to still have a copy of the old form which was in use?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, we can provide that.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Who was required to fill out this declaration?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The applicant for the post concerned.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So this form is signed upon the applicant being engaged in employment; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: On an ongoing basis, what checks does the company undertake to understand what an employee might be doing outside his working hours, both part-time employees and full-time employees?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We rely on the candidates

to make their own declarations in good faith and they would provide the information.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So there's a check when a person commences his employment. What, say, he's been working with the company for five years or so: is there any ongoing declaration such as this, or any other measure to understand what, for example, a part-time driver might be doing in other forms of employment?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Internally, we have a staff handbook, and there is a requirement that if a staff member engages in part-time work outside, it must be declared.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So it depends solely on what an employee would choose to tell you; is that the situation?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Our staff are obliged. The rules are there in the staff handbook and they must be complied with.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What measures are taken to audit and enforce the rules which are in the handbook in this respect?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) If the rules are not followed, and if we find that a staff member engages in work outside, there would be sanctions, and in the past there were cases in which bus captains were dismissed for this reason.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any checking mechanism, due diligence, as it were?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any initiatives to change this situation whereby the company undertakes some sort of checking system as to what other employment activities an employee may be involved in?

MR GODWIN SO: (Chinese words not interpreted).

MR PETER DUNCAN: We requested yesterday --

CHAIRMAN: We didn't get a translation of the answer.

MR GODWIN SO: Yes, we will consider, actively consider.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We did not receive last evening -- this is by way of a reminder -- a copy of any employment contract. Is that still to come?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, we will provide that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want to ask you to turn now, please, to page 109.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that -- are you moving away from this topic?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN: You mentioned the staff handbook, and certainly I've seen the provision you're talking about. Do you happen to know the reference for it in our bundles, or

Mr Duncan, do you happen to know, just so we can have a quick look at it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) If I can find that, I would provide the page number.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I've got the annex number but not the page number. It's annex 1a-iii-7, I think. Sorry, that would be the outdoor operations staff handbook; is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) In bundle KMB-8, page 3072, point 1.

(In English) In English version, 3042.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

This of course refers to full-time employees, does it not?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So is there a provision that applies to part-time employees?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) As we said, our bus captains who work 18 hours a week for four continuous weeks would be considered full-time employees. That's why they have to follow the requirement under 1.8.

CHAIRMAN: But prior to the Tai Po accident, when you were recruiting part-time captains, was there a requirement that they declare their employment elsewhere, if they engaged in that after they had first been employed?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What about the former employees who are now allowed to work between 10 hours and 18 hours? Are they regarded as full-time employees or are they part-time employees?

MR GODWIN SO: Full-time.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So would they be aware of this, if they read this provision? Full-time employees, et cetera, et cetera, would they regard themselves as full-time employees if they read this handbook?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) They were once our employees, after they retired they were re-engaged, and therefore they were aware of the provision 1.8.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any intention to amend 1.8 to reflect these new employment arrangements?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could take you back, please, to KMB-1 at page 109. We have here considerable detail with regard to the remuneration of bus captains, and the first thing I would bring to your attention with regard to the monthly rates is the distinction between those employed before 2004 and those employed after 2004.

Could you just amplify why there is this distinction?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) First of all, some history. In 2003, Hong Kong's economy took a hit because of SARS, and in 2003 the company did not recruit new bus captains and the bus operations declined that year. After 2004, we started hiring bus captains again. Based on the market pay level at that time, we adjusted the remuneration of new bus captains to reflect market changes.

So, for monthly-rated captains, there were two types. The first type, BCs employed before 2004, their remuneration would not change, but for those employed after 2004, based on the job market and economic environment, we paid remuneration based on market prices. So there are two types of BCs.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If we move down to item (E), the split shift duty allowance, does this reflect an allowance paid in respect of the split shifts which are now provided for in the 2018 guidelines?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) If you pause here, the 2018 guidelines are to be implemented in the first quarter of 2019. Currently, we are following the government guidelines talking about 14 hours a day, out of which 11 hours for driving duties; in other words, three hours for rest. Currently, we have got colleagues on split

duties. When somebody is assigned split duties, he will be drawing an allowance measuring $1,950-plus. In between, he has three hours' rest, and we cover that period by using this allowance.

CHAIRMAN: So currently you are following the 2010 guidelines?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you envisage having split shift duties once the new guidelines are implemented?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We will consider as to how it will be revised. Since there will be the need to consult the staff -- well, we will certainly consider, but it is difficult to tell how it would be revised. Yes, there will be.

MR PETER DUNCAN: There will be some split shifts?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And will that allowance be the same or will that change?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We will consider enhancement.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How is that calculated -- when you say $1,951.50 a month, a driver would not be on a split shift for a whole month, would he?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) No, because in the case of

a monthly-rated BC, and if he is on a split shift duty, he will be on such a duty for the whole month.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So how many days in a month would you expect a driver to work? Say, would it be 27 days out of 30 or 31?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) A rest day for every six days. So assuming that we haven't got a public holiday, then for a 30-day month he has to work 26 days.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And that would entitle him to $1,951.50 in addition?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. Would you have drivers who work split shifts for less than the whole month, say for five days or for ten days?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It's possible.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So what sort of allowance would they receive? Do they get the whole 1,951 or is there a proportion?

MR GODWIN SO: Proportion.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that based on a daily proportion or what? How is that calculated?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Depending on the number of days worked for that month and then for how many days he has been doing split shift duty and then that would be multiplied by the figure of 1,950-plus, and then that's

the amount of his split shift duty allowance.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So approximately how much per day does that amount to, approximately?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Roughly $70.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we go over to page 111, we can see at table 3 the daily-rated salary provisions, and we see the split shift duty allowance here at item (H). That is a sum of $21.90, and I notice at (H) it's provided for on an hourly basis. So if a person is on a split shift for one hour, presumably he gets paid an extra $21.90; if he is on a split shift where he has a rest time of three hours, presumably he gets $60. Is that the way it's calculated?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So there is a difference in the treatment between the monthly-rated and the daily-rated bus drivers with regard to the split shift duty allowance; is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) You have to take a holistic view. You can't just look at the split shift duty allowance. For daily-rated BCs, they have a higher basic salary. So it is right to say that there is a difference, but then you have to look at the whole picture.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In the event that the company utilises the

new guidelines and engages in split shift duties, will this allowance also be reviewed, will this be a matter of review?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I wonder if we could turn up the new guidelines, please. We find these in KMB-2 at page 61.

And in fact the previous guidelines, those currently in force, are happily on the previous page, at page 60. You can see the two together.

Currently, what is a typical shift as opposed to a split shift, currently?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) If I may talk about it briefly. There are usually two types of shifts: first of all, what we call the straight duty or the straight shift. So maybe you work for eight hours or ten hours, or it could be 12 hours. So I'm talking about the working hours.

Then we have about 23 per cent of our BCs who are on special duties, so the split duty that Mr Duncan referred to, the working hours would not exceed 14.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So with regard to the new guidelines, are you able to indicate to the committee whether there is likely to be any material change to what you have just described?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Under the new

guidelines, for straight duties, the working hours will not exceed 12, out of which the driving hours should not exceed 10 hours. There isn't any obvious difference.

But then for the split duties, I think relatively speaking the difference is greater. This is because, according to the Transport Department's guidelines, for the special duty, that is the split duty, the working hours should still be no more than 14 hours. But then, for the driving hours, the driving hours must not exceed 10 hours.

So, when compared with the current guidelines, for the current guidelines, not exceeding 11; under the revised guidelines, the driving hours would be one hour short.

Then there is another feature. Under the new guidelines, for the split duty BCs, the bus captains must have a rest break of no less than three hours and on a continuous basis.

So that's the main difference.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What are the dynamics? Are there persons who want to work the split shifts as they are at the moment, in order to earn more money, or is it a situation where the company has to order drivers to work those split shifts?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) For our company, we

would never force any colleagues to take up any special or split shift duties. All bus captains who are on such split shift duties do so on a voluntary basis.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If I may add a point. The dynamics are such that as far as KMB is concerned, we cover a large catchment area. During the morning peak hours, by 6 or 7 am in the morning, it is already the start of the morning peak and the demand is huge, and then the peak will come up again at about 6, 7 or 8. So it's like two humps for the peak periods. Someone may live in Tuen Mun. After the morning peak period, the bus captain can go home and then come back for the evening duties. So there is this geographical factor.

So some of them are like that, and that's the minority, and they do have such a need.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) All in all speaking, for BCs on split shift duties, as Mr Lee has pointed out, we need to cover the morning peak as well as the evening peak.

KMB is in a unique position because we do cover a large area, and we have got four main depots, and we have also got satellite depots. For BCs on split shift duties, well, indeed, they may go home to take a rest in the middle of their shift, for those few hours involved.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Given the remuneration rates that we have

seen, will the new guidelines, if they are adopted, with reduction in the maximum working hours and the requirement for rest times -- will they result in some of your drivers receiving less by way of remuneration?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) To answer your question, if we don't consider the remuneration -- in other words, if the remuneration package is the same, if we simply look at the driving hours -- it may be the case that some BCs may have a reduced take-home pay. But then, as Mr So has said, in fact we are actively considering measures, in particular how we are able to enhance the allowance covering the rest break, so that for BCs, especially those on split shift duties, they have more rest time but more -- they would not be suffering from a reduction in their take-home pay. The management and chairman asked us to consider this.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Duncan, the board has made a direction to the management to the effect that in respect of the split duty shift drivers, although they would be working 10 hours instead of 11 hours per day, their remuneration should not be less favourable, let me put it that way.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has that been communicated to the bus captains?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: In fact, this is stated in our action plan for the recommendation, and I think the management has

already talked to the trade unions.

Perhaps Mr Pang can elaborate on that.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, I touched base with representatives of staff unions, and the depots also convey such messages to the bus captains, that our management would actively look to optimise the remuneration package so that even with the new guidelines the take-home salaries of bus captains would not be less. So the captains are positive about this.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: May I also add that if their working hours are reduced from 11 to 10, then we may also consider whether it is necessary to have 14 hours a day, when it can be changed from 14 hours to 13 hours. Although this is permitted by the Transport Department, to have 14 working hours per day, we will review that, and our intention is to reduce the working hours from 14 to 13.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Duncan, am I correct in recalling that that is what we have been told in evidence that Citybus will be doing, that the split shift which they don't operate at the moment but which they will implement will only be a maximum of 13 hours?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I believe that is a correct recollection, Mr Chairman.

If I could just have that confirmed through the action plan, Dr Leung. If I can refer you, please, to KMB-1 at page 149. Is that reflected in item 12 on page 149?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, Mr Duncan.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: On the right-hand side.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That is what is meant by that last paragraph; is that correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Exactly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I have just been handed a note, Mr Chairman, that that evidence from Citybus appears at Day 4 of the transcript, page 75, lines 1 to 6.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Moving on, gentlemen, to page 180, please, this time of TD-1.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, before you move on -- Mr Lee, you told us about the rest pattern of bus captains working split shift hours, where they take that longer period of rest. You said that a minority of them are able to go home.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us with, in rough terms, the proportion of bus captains driving these split shifts

who begin their rest period at a bus station rather than a depot? I ask that question because the secretariat and I have visited bus stations and the Tuen Mun Bus Depot and we are aware of the difference in the facilities available.

So the question is what proportion of bus captains working special shifts commence their period of rest at a bus station.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We will come back and identify these figures. We do have such figures. They take their rest at three places: one, at home; two, at bus stations; and three, at bus depots.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Page 180 of TD-1, please. You will see at this page an extract from the forward planning programme for the years 2018 to 2022, submitted by the company to the Transport Department. If I understand correctly, this is one of the requirements of the franchise, that such a programme be provided each year to the Transport Department, and I believe this is the latest one that is available. Is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The latest forward planning programme was for 2019 to 2023, and it will be submitted on 17 August. It is ready for submission by early next

week. So this is the latest programme submitted.

CHAIRMAN: So when was this submitted, the one we are looking at?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It was submitted in June 2017.

MR PETER DUNCAN: This portion of the forward planning programme concerns the matter of bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, you are going to be submitting one on or by 17 August of this year; is that right?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you please provide the relevant chapters of that report to the committee?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If we look at bus safety -- it is referred to as clause 8 of the forward planning programme, and I wish to bring your attention, please, to paragraph 8.2, which is concerned with the analysis of bus accidents in the past two calendar years.

If I could bring your attention in particular, please, to page 181, and the "Accident rate by bus captain age". Have you made the point in that paragraph that the results show that younger bus captains are more prone to higher accident rates, mainly due to the fact that these bus captains have relatively less bus driving

experience and they are more prone to accidents in their first few months of service? Is that a point which is made on page 181?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then if you turn the page to 182, is there a similar point made in clause 8.2.4?

"The results of an analysis on accident rate by experience in terms of years of service ... are shown in figure 8.3. As mentioned above, the likelihood of an accident occurring in the first year immediately following recruitment is relatively higher."

CHAIRMAN: Is that what's stated there?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that what's stated?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are there any particular provisions made to meet what seems to be this trend with regard to what happens at the commencement of the career of a bus captain?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I do not quite get what you mean.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could give you something from my own experience. When I was a young boy and travelled regularly to school on a bus, the bus driver often had a co-bus driver with him, sitting with him, giving him tips and so forth. Is there any sort of provision like

that within the company?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes. We realise the figures you pointed out. The new bus captains are often younger, and in the initial period there would be a buddy bus captain to accompany them, to reinforce their confidence and familiarise the bus captains with the roads, and so that they know how to deal with passengers. At around the third month, there would be a workshop for bus captains so that they can share their experience as a bus captain. We hope that new bus captains would be able to familiarise themselves with the work environment and minimise occurrences of accidents, or accident rates.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How long have these buddies been operating?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, perhaps I would briefly introduce these buddy drivers or buddy inspectors and their work.

For all full-time bus captains and half-time bus captains, for example, the housewives as mentioned by Mr Duncan, they might work four hours a day and five or six days a week, they are considered half-time drivers. After the bus captains complete two phases of training at our captain training school, we would assign buddy drivers on a full-time basis for the first and second

days of work, and on the seventh and 16th day, the buddy drivers would accompany these new bus drivers in their driving duties.

For our part-time captains, again we would assign buddy drivers, but for part-time captains recruited in the past, they all held class 10 and class 17 licences, in other words licences for buses and franchised buses. So our buddy drivers would accompany them on their first day of work.

Earlier this year, we introduced a buddy inspector programme. For each new bus captain we would assign a designated inspector who would liaise with the bus captain and we also prepared cue cards, containing the contacts of our inspectors as well as the phone numbers of depot managers, assistant depot managers and operations officers.

So apart from driving skills, our buddy inspectors can provide holistic support, so you can consider them mentors. If bus captains run into any questions or doubts, they can approach the buddy inspector. That way, we hope the new bus captains can familiarise themselves in the job as soon as possible, and like Mr So said, for all our new bus captains, after they are on the job for three months, we would arrange a workshop for them, and all depot managers, driving instructors

and myself would attend the workshop to check with the bus captains to identify the difficulties they encountered in the first three months.

Then every time we would invite a very experienced bus captain to share tips as to how to cope with the daily work. So, for a new bus captain who has three months' experience, he will certainly go through such a process.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. My question was: when did these buddies first start operating?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For the concept of the buddy driver, it was conceived in the year 2013 and it has undergone enhancement all the time.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, if that's not inconvenient, we will take our luncheon adjournment now.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will adjourn now and resume at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, gentlemen.

Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Gentlemen, could I ask you please to be at page 180 of TD-1.

Before the lunch break, I had taken you through to page 182. Could you now please turn to page 183, where we have analysis by the company of accidents by nature.

If I could just ask you a few questions, please, arising from table 8.1. We have the first column, referring to "Passenger loss of balance"; percentage, 51.5 per cent.

There is another heading further down the table, "Injury to passenger inside bus". What is the distinction between those two headings?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For "passenger loss of balance", it means the passenger doesn't hold the handrail and he loses balance. And "injury to passenger inside bus" means there is an accident and the passenger is inside the bus, and the passenger is injured just sitting there, not loss of balance, and he is injured due to the accident.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How would a passenger just sitting there receive an injury? How does that happen?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Let's say there's an accident, a collision, and the passenger is sitting there inside the bus, and let's say the bus rolls over, and then the sitting passenger is injured, so that would

mean injury to passenger inside bus.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I don't want to be pernickety but we have a different percentage for a bus which rolls over, the last heading. Would it not be covered under that?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Maybe I can give you another example. A passenger can still get injured while sitting inside bus. For example, when the bus brushes against some trees or tree branches and the passenger is injured. So it's a different category from the passenger loss of balance category.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Last month, there was a case in Central, the bus was on the road and suddenly the bottom of the bus deck was hit by protruding concrete.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly that the company has set out these categories and in the case of an accident there will be a classification according to the categories which are here listed?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

The passenger loss of balance, 51.5 per cent. At 8.2.7, there is a reference to the fact that more than half of these cases were caused by bus braking in traffic. Do you have any information for the committee with regard to the other half or so of these cases as to

the cause of those accidents?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Passenger losing balance can be due to a number of reasons. One of them might be that the driver is not quite aware of the passenger situation, whether he has already been standing there properly or has taken a seat, or maybe the bus captain is not driving the bus properly. We talked about acceleration or harsh braking a few days ago, and that can be another cause. Sometimes, after alighting a bus, the passenger doesn't -- boarding the bus, rather, after boarding the bus, the passenger doesn't hold the handrail and when the driver has to take some evasive action of driving, the passenger then loses his balance.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The second item, "Head on/tail collision", 13.5 per cent --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Duncan -- when there is an incident where a passenger loses balance and becomes part of these statistics, over half of the injuries involving buses, do you investigate the data available to you as to deceleration and acceleration?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) In the case of a passenger losing balance, we would investigate into whether there is an acceleration or deceleration on the part of the bus captain. So the short answer is yes. And also the CCTV can also capture what happened on board the bus.

CHAIRMAN: Do you do the investigation -- let me ask the question neutrally. What data do you use to investigate deceleration or acceleration?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) As we have discussed, the black box will record the relevant data, and we can have access to such data on our server, and then we know whether the bus captain suddenly accelerates or brakes, decelerates the bus harshly.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have statistics that are the result of these investigations, for example the rate of deceleration or acceleration?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) We don't have formal statistics on this issue.

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) If there is a case of this nature, we would handle the irregular driving behaviour of the bus captain, but no record is kept about the analysis.

CHAIRMAN: But half of the injuries on your buses are caused by this factor alone.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I agree that records should be kept, but it's in relation to 2015/2016, we cannot provide any statistics for that period. But I will check that if in the new system, we would see if we can keep statistics about acceleration or deceleration in

respect of cases involving passengers losing balance.

CHAIRMAN: Are you doing that at the moment, 2018?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We can do it.

CHAIRMAN: But have you done it, past tense?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I don't know at this moment.

CHAIRMAN: But you can do it?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know how many passengers have been injured by loss of balance so far this year, approximately?

MR GODWIN SO: 300.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Presumably, when you investigate the circumstances in which a passenger has been injured through loss of balance, you have available the data from the black box which you can obtain on the server, but you also have the data from your various cameras on the bus?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So by a combination of the technological devices you have available, you can determine reasonably, perhaps, whether or not the braking was justified?

MR JAMES WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do you keep any statistics as to that?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) As I said, we would investigate into such cases, but the records, the data

of the investigation, are not kept.

CHAIRMAN: You don't keep a simple statistic like 445 persons injured but the braking was justified in 300 cases? Nothing as simple as that?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Well, we have the data but we don't transform such data into so-called statistics.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Maybe I can supplement here. All accidents will be looked into, and we would categorise cases into whether the bus captains should be held responsible or not, and whether the sudden braking is justified by the traffic conditions. Of course we can carry out more analysis.

CHAIRMAN: But presumably, when you do that, you must keep statistics?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I believe the data are there, but of course we can go back and do some analysis to seek further improvement.

CHAIRMAN: Well, isn't it an important tool, to monitor the behaviour of bus drivers, to know whether or not the deceleration was harsh, and from your investigation it was unnecessary?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Just leaving table 8.1 for a moment and going down

to table 8.2, we have again the same "Accidents by nature", but this time not percentages, actually the number of accidents.

Now, the chairman asked with respect to "passenger loss of balance" whether the number of passengers affected is recorded, and my understanding is that you said that so far, for 2018, the passenger loss of balance number would be 350. Is that correct?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It's 300, approximately 300. I'm speaking from memory.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Approximately 300, yes, thank you.

Is it possible for you, from your records, to go down the columns and indicate the numbers of persons affected by each of these accidents?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We are talking about the number of cases here, the data are not kept in this table.

CHAIRMAN: No. Table 8.2 simply describes the number of accidents. There might have been 1,000 passengers who lost their balance; is that what you are saying?

MR GODWIN SO: I agree. I know what you mean.

(Via interpreter) Yes, I agree, but there is no number for the passengers, but we can have the figures for 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Both of the number of accidents, 300,

approximately, and you can then also provide us with the number of passengers who lost their balance?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, I can do that.

CHAIRMAN: It might have been all of those standing up who might have lost their balance?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you please provide us with that information, for 2018?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, we will do that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can you do that for each of the columns thereunder?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I will try, but I may have difficulty, because these have to do with 2015-2016, but we can provide case numbers and also passenger numbers for 2018 with regard to loss of balance accidents.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I'm only concerned about 2018. But say -- you've got a heading there, "Bus overturn/topple", there's just one accident -- can the number of passengers injured by that be easily ascertained?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes. There is only one case. Certainly we can look up the figures.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And likewise, hit a street object or a vehicle or an animal, there are 27 accidents, is it

possible for you easily to retrieve the number of persons injured by that?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, we can do that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would be grateful if that can be supplied when you supply the records for 2018.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Just going back to get a further understanding of these charts, the second heading is "Head on/tail collision". We have another heading further down the chart, "Collision with other vehicle (rolling back/forward/reversing)". What is the distinction between those two? I notice the first one is responsible for 13.5 per cent of accidents. What is the distinction?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) For head-on/tail collision, usually we look at static objects, and if there is head-on/tail collision then we classify it as this.

The second collision column, very often it is because we changed lanes and that leads to collision between vehicles, and then we would classify it as collision with other vehicles in lane-changing.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So that's the distinction between the second heading and the third heading?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What about the heading further down, "Collision with other vehicle (rolling back/forward/reversing)"; what's the distinction with that?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Sometimes vehicles would reverse and that leads to collision, then it would be classified as this one.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Going back up, "J/O collision" at 6 per cent and 48 incidents in 2016. What is a "J/O" collision?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) This means junction, junction collision.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. And further down, "Entering R/A collision"; what does that refer to?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) It's a roundabout, entering roundabout collision.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When you supply the statistics with regard to 2018 with regard to the number of passengers affected, could you also distinguish between persons injured and fatalities?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

I wish to turn to another subject now, and that is a matter which has been referred to this morning by at

least two of you, I think, and that's the subject of illegal parking.

The committee has heard not only from you but also from previous witnesses that this is very much a safety hazard, and I think this morning one of you gentlemen assisted the committee by indicating what steps you had taken with regard to this, in particular reports to different government departments, but without any apparent improvement in the situation.

Could you look, please, at miscellaneous bundle number 2, at page 644. In fact, I think the document starts at page 643, and runs into page 644, and with a translation at 644-1, which continues on page 644-2.

You will see this is a document received by the committee from the persons from the Democratic Alliance, and if I could turn to the second page of the translation -- in fact, I think at the bottom of the first page of the translation, 644-1, we have this opinion expressed:

"To eradicate illegal parking at bus stops, it must be dealt with from its roots and by formulating suitable policies, revising the outdated laws. The problem can only be resolved by multipronged measures."

It continues to say:

"Suggestion 1: Following Singapore and installing cameras on all bus fleets. Singapore has since 2008 installed cameras on buses and the cameras are installed next to the driver's seats. When drivers discover cars parking inside the bus stop, they can press the button and record a video of 5-10 minutes. The bus companies will then hand the recording to the police, thereafter the police can review the recording and in around two weeks' time the ticket will be sent to the car owner's home. Each penalty ticket costs nearly [$800], there is additional charge of [$5,000] and imprisonment of 3 months for late payment of penalty.

For the first year, Singapore has recorded 2112 incidents of drivers driving into the bus lanes or bus stops to pick up and drop off customers. For 2014, the number of cases of driving into the bus lanes and illegal parking has already reduced to 886, it has successfully deterred most drivers not to stop at the bus stops."

Now, we have heard evidence already that the company installs a camera which is I think directed towards the driver's seat, and there is also a camera which is a forward-looking camera, described I think in the submissions as a surveillance camera.

Could I ask, first of all, presently, are either of

those cameras used to record cars which are illegally parked or vehicles which are illegally parked, at the moment?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, my short answer is no. However, if you would allow me, I can supplement.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Please.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Regarding the recorded clip being given to the police for the purpose of prosecuting against illegal parking, in October/November last year I started to do it, because I was responsible for Lai Chi Kok Depot at that time, and it was a pilot scheme that was agreed with the police, and we took that approach in order to report cars that were illegally parked at bus stops.

CHAIRMAN: So what did you do?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) What we did was, I used one trial location and that is in Tsim Sha Tsui, on Canton Road, at bus terminus 271, we used that route which travels from Lai Chi Kok Depot to Sha Tin Depot, because at that terminus there was always illegal parking, and also, at Canton Road, you call it the luxury shop street, actually there is a high traffic volume there, and at that time I was the general manager

of Lai Chi Kok Depot and I had a meeting with the police.

I myself wrote a standard statement, a statement, and then I asked my frontline inspectors that if they should see illegal parking, we should use our mobile phones to record a footage which, together with a standard pro forma -- well, we will just record the date and time. The location is already known because that is the only trial location, and we would give it to the traffic section of Kowloon West of the police for prosecution.

We found that it was very effective, because when prosecutions started I could see that on some social media there were reports of this and that if you park at bus stops, you might be prosecuted. And on Canton Road, very often there is illegal parking, we would call the police, but when the police come the cars would have gone, and then the police would go and then the cars would come back. So it was only tackling the symptoms but not the root of the problem.

Therefore, we used our own initiative. We joined hands with the police and we found that it was effective, and you can see that recently the police have also carried out two pilot schemes, and now the pilot scheme has been expanded to all five land-based police

regions, and the police is doing that now.

Therefore, Mr Duncan, my short answer is we do not use our on-board CCTV for prosecution, but in our pilot scheme, together with what the police are doing, and also we can see that there is more prosecution and fines being meted out for illegal parking at bus terminus.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Why don't you use the on-board, rolling-all-day, CCTV cameras?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Well, we can do that, but in that pilot scheme, it would be more convenient, because our inspectors would be driving a patrol vehicle to patrol the area, and if they use their mobile phones it would be more convenient.

But of course, Chairman, if -- well, in the on-board CCTV we can also do recording, we can do that.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, it would be very simple to have a button that would keep a log of the time at which someone should view the CCTV?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) You are correct, Chairman. If we can reduce illegal parking, we will certainly do that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So I take it from the scheme that you have described, this has brought some improvement to the

illegal parking problem?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) If we are talking about the terminus of 271 at Canton Road, then I would say a significant improvement has been made.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just with regard to that terminus?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Because the police have just launched the scheme, the full scheme, we have to monitor the effectiveness now.

But as of yesterday, on the whole, illegal parking has not really been improved significantly. That's not what we have seen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there any correspondence between KMB and the police with regard to the pilot scheme that you have described?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We have some emails, and also we use the so-called standard pro forma, the statement, in respect of the terminus of 271 at Canton Road. I can hand over the information to the committee.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We will do that.

CHAIRMAN: That's the emails, communication with the police, and your standard form.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) No problem.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly from your evidence that you will pursue the possibility of the system which is described as being in use in Singapore?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We do have an open mind. We agree that we should do that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Sorry, when you say you have an open mind, are you going to look into it or not?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, yes, we will follow up. We will look into that.

CHAIRMAN: You are complaining on the one hand of having a problem. This is a beyond belief simple way of solving it, is it not?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Chairman, the pilot scheme we launched for Canton Road last year was carried out when there was no precedent of basing a prosecution on just video footage. That never happened before the trial scheme.

CHAIRMAN: There are lots of prosecutions that are based on the use of video, CCTV evidence, are there not?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yesterday, Chairman, you said I had worked for the police, and I have also worked in the traffic section of the police. So in respect of illegal parking, in the past there was no prosecution based on video footage. There might be prosecution for

jumping a red light and things like that.

CHAIRMAN: That might be a limitation of the police force or the Department of Justice, but there is no barrier in law to using that evidence.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I agree. Earlier this year, I learned from the press reports that the police had started to do this based on video clipping, to prosecute illegal parking vehicles, and I'm talking about stationary vehicles, not those vehicles in motion involved in speeding or jumping red light, et cetera.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Pang, I think we should do it on our own, take our own action, and see how the police respond to our action.

I think, Mr Chairman, that's the action I'm going to direct my management to take.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Gentlemen, could you turn up, please, the transcript for Day 11.

CHAIRMAN: In which bundle do you find that?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Bundle 4.

CHAIRMAN: Whose evidence are we going to?

MR PETER DUNCAN: This is the evidence of Mr Lam Kam Piu, who is a representative of the Federation of Bus Industry Trade Unions.

If I could direct your attention to line 2 on page 153, Ms Wong has brought the witness's attention to the fact that his union had expressed concerns about the use of 12.8-metre-long buses that have a rear wheel steering function in Hong Kong.

At line 13, you will see that Mr Lam Kam Piu makes this statement:

"Because for 12.8 [metre] buses in light of the road conditions in Hong Kong, because we have narrow roads, and heavy pedestrian flow ... there is a hazard using very long buses."

At line 17, he says this:

"As for 12.8 [metre] bus[s] with the rear axle steering function, when manoeuvring a bend of course it would be very good for the driver. But for other vehicles they may not know that the bus comes with this rear wheel steering function, and the Transport Department would issue something to let the driver know that it has the function, but other drivers may not know. So when the rear axle steers during a bend, when another vehicle approaches very closely the back of the bus, the wheel would actually go outside its own lane, causing danger to the vehicle next to it."

And Mr Lam continues right through to the middle of page 155.

Could I ask this question: to what extent are 12.8-metre buses used in Hong Kong; and secondly, does the company share the concern of Mr Lam that these may pose a hazard in some of the regions of narrow streets?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) 12.8-metre buses? We have them. KMB has these buses. Most are not rear-wheel steered. There are advantages. We did try such buses. We had some concerns, so we converted them to ordinary 12.8-metre buses. They are not rear-wheel steered.

Of course, 12.8 metres means that these buses are longer, with a higher passenger capacity. We will use them for busy routes, especially long-haul routes, so that we can carry more passengers. That's helpful, to improve our services.

It's longer than the 12-metre-long buses, but we would try them out first on the routes. The routes for which we would deploy such buses would be determined after carrying out tests in conjunction with the Transport Department. The deployment will come after the trials.

So far, for KMB, we have some 200 buses, 12.8-metre-long buses.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Maybe I can supplement. What is meant by the rear-wheel steering -- most are

front-wheel steering vehicles. They have three axles. So, when the bus makes a turn into a bend or when there's a sharp bend, the outward displacement would be less serious. For the first batch, we only got one with rear-wheel steering and our colleagues don't think highly of that, so we stopped the use of this kind of buses with rear-wheel steering.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Leung, you said you had some concerns about rear-wheel steering. What were those concerns? Are they the ones Mr Lee has just told us about?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) The concerns are the bus captains' concerns. The turning circle would be smaller. But the characteristic of outswing would be different. The outswing is bigger. That is, when you negotiate a bend, you have to make some adjustment to adapt to it. If you drive a rear-wheel steering this day, and then tomorrow you drive another one which is not rear-wheel steering, you need to do some adjustment yourself. So that's the concern of bus captains.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) It's not related to safety. It's about the adaptability.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, if I understand correctly, there are no rear-wheel 12.8-metre buses now in the fleet?

CHAIRMAN: Rear-wheel steering.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Rear-wheel steering, yes.

Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: With regard to the 12.8-metre buses that do exist in the fleet, how many are there?

CHAIRMAN: I think you have told us about 200?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes, 200.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When you say you would deploy them on certain routes after contact with the Transport Department, has that already happened?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And are these buses simply used on defined routes?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any concerns about their use, given what the committee was told by the trade union representative?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have any concerns that when the vehicle goes around a bend, it might end up going outside the lane, causing a hazard to other vehicles? Is that a concern at all?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) First of all, in deciding which route would be suitable, we will talk to the Transport Department. For some routes, it would not be

appropriate to deploy such buses, and the bus captains would have to learn to drive 12.8-metre-long buses, before they really drive these buses.

So we would do it only if it is not a rear-wheel steering 12.8-metre-bus and only when the bus captain has been properly trained.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So are you aware of any particular issue with any of the unions at the present time with regard to this matter?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want you to go to another volume now, this time TU-1(A). At page 84, you will see a copy of a submission received by the committee from the KMB Employees Union. The translation of that commences at page 90-1. I am working on the translation and I wish to refer you, please, to page 90-3, which refers to the matter of facilities safety.

Do you have that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. The union has said this to the committee:

"In order to save repair cost, KMB has, since 2015, inappropriately removed all defog heater installation, causing the front window panel to have serious fogging issue under cold and wet weather (when the difference

between external and internal temperature is big) ..."

And they have referred to annex 1 which I think you will find at page 91, the original, and 90-1 as the translation.

The question I would like to ask is: is it correct that since 2015, the company has removed all defog heater installations?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) That is not correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you know what the union may be referring to here?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I believe they were talking about some demisters. We have two models. Some used heated air, and then in 2010 we changed it to using cold air ones. The bus shown in annex 1 with the plate UF 2751, it had a cold air defog installation.

I believe this bus was two years old.

Why is it that we changed from hot air to cold air defog installation? Before 2010, all the defog installations were heaters, and the heated air would use the coolant at the end of the bus and then it would be heated up, and then the hot water would travel from the end of the bus through pipes to the front of the bus, and it runs throughout entire bus for 12 metres, and a two-way pipe would measure 24 metres. The hot water would be travelling along the 24-metre hot-water pipe.

The defog heaters would use such hot water to generate hot air, so that the windscreen will not see any condensation, especially when the weather is wet and cold.

However, that installation was not reliable. Very often, the pipes might burst. If the pipes burst, the very hot water, which is of a very high temperature, and in certain cases some hot water travelled into the bus itself, and in 2010 we changed it to a cold air installation in order to resolve that problem.

But whether we use hot air or cold air defog installation, you have to turn it on for five to ten minutes before you can remove the condensation.

In 2010, we started to use cold air defog installation to replace the heaters, but the bus captains did not welcome it because it was already cold and there was cold air blowing onto the windscreen. So, by 2015, we heard those views from bus captains and we had to resolve the problem, because this might affect the driving situation of the buses, and then we found some anti-fog coating to remove the fog. This would be painted onto the windscreen. It sounded old-fashioned but it was effective. You paint it on the windscreen, there would be no condensation.

At the same time, we looked for other ways to deal

with the problem. At the same time, we researched into other demisters together with bus manufacturers. We discussed with Volvo to see whether we could find anything, and then we found two things. One, heated windscreen. There would be heated wires within the windscreen. That is very common for private cars, but if you don't ask, if the manufacturer doesn't do it for you, you cannot do it yourself. But was it immediately available? No. It was not as simple as buying it from a supermarket. This had to be particularly manufactured for buses, and we tried it on 25 buses in 2016, and the situation is still the same now.

Then, at the same time, together with ADL, another manufacturer, we researched into another thing, and that is to use electrical demisters. We would use heated wires to generate hot air to remove condensation.

Many trials were done because it involved heating elements and we had to resolve other possible problems, and in the end we resolved the problem this year, and functional electrical demisters that can be installed now.

So, at this moment, we have electrical demisters, we have heated windscreens. These are the two options for now. And the bus company has decided that these two will be installed on buses without heaters. We will

retrofit those buses with these installations. We will do this on the cold air demisters so that the entire fleet can be provided with proper demisters so the bus captains will welcome using them. And in future, we are inclined to use heated windscreens in our new buses.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Let me add something here. From this picture, we actually know -- well, actually, with regard to the coating, the anti-fog coating, there would be different problems because bus captains did not know there was this coating and they might remove it, and at the depot we had to rely on our staff to do the anti-fog coating, and the staff did not like it. Now, we have posted notices to say that some windscreens have had anti-fog coating painted on them.

And in the past, we have always been trying to research into new ways to deal with the condensation, and even in future, if we embed demisters within the windscreens, we would be the first in the whole wide world.

We have spent over a year with the manufacturers. As Mr Leung was saying, buses are very different from private cars. We have to do so much more.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can I ask you, please, to turn to KMB-1 at page 98. You will see that this is the commencement of the report which was sent to the Commissioner for

Transport on 12 March after the accident. I want to bring to your attention page 115 of the bundle.

At paragraph 46 is the question, this issue of condensation, addressed and communicated to the Transport Department. Is that where you can see that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The second sentence:

"Prior to the incident, for the sake of defogging, anti-fog coating would be applied to the windscreens of buses that were without hot air demisters. Having reviewed the mechanism, either hot air demisters or heated windscreens will be adopted, for more effective and faster dehumidification."

Does that statement recognise that before the incident, ie the accident on 10 February, the defogging provisions were not satisfactory?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can I ask you, please, to turn to the action plan, the first of the action plans, at page 151. At item 20, is the matter of condensation addressed?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. The second of the bullets indicates that the existing buses, as opposed to new buses, will be retrofitted with hot air demisters or heated windscreens by phase within the next 12 months.

So how far through this programme are you at the moment?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: As I said, we have already started some of the retrofit and we are already ordering most of the components.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How many buses will require to be retrofitted?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) A total of about 2,700.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And how many have been done already?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Probably ten, as at today.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is the union aware of this programme?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) They do.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you aware of any disagreement between the company and the reason why presently with regard to this matter?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) There is none.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I go back to the union submission, that's the KMB Employees Union submission, again at page 90-3 -- that's the translation -- in bundle TU-1(A).

In the paragraph which immediately follows that to which I referred previously, we have this information that the union has brought to the attention of the committee:

"Besides, the company altered the gear buttons installation for safety driving, cancelled the [overdrive] gear button and manual retarder installations and relies only on computer-controlled singular automatic D-gear to control vehicle speed ... Under emergent situation it is very dangerous for there to be no saving devices for the bus captains to use. For example (such as aeroplane, mass railway transit, Express Rail Link and cruises) all adopt computer navigation, but during emergency, manual operation mode is used to avoid danger. This is like all automatic-transmission private vehicles are equipped with ... [plus or minus] M gear ..."

There are references then to annexes 2 and 3 in the bundle, which one can find on pages 92, 92-1, 93, and 93-1.

The representative of the union spoke of this during the hearing, during an earlier part of this hearing. The reference is Day 10, pages 13 to 18.

Have you had the opportunity of reading his evidence?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I just ask, first of all, was there a time when there was what the document described as a manual retarder available to the captain?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) All buses are equipped with a retarder. All retarders are handled by the foot pedal in automatic mode. But for specific routes, we have manual retarders. Those running on Tai Mo Shan with long, steep slopes, they will use hand-retarders. All buses are equipped with retarders.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The written submission seems to imply that the manual retarder was cancelled. Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It's not correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Let us have a look at what was said to the committee on Day 10. Bundle 4.

At page 13, line 6, Ms Wong says this:

"If I may go to the next issue which relates to the gear button installation."

She then refers to the section that I have just read out:

"... the company altered the gear buttons installing for safety driving, cancelled the O/D gear button and manual retarder installations and relies only on computer-controlled singular automatic D-gear to control vehicle speed ..."

Then further on, on page 14, line 25, the chairman brings Mr Kwok to this question:

"The specific question was: how does the removal of the manual retarder affect bus safety? Could you

address that question."

And Mr Ivan Lee replies:

"In the system, there is a device that allows you to select. It includes a manual selection, automatic selection, and a third one is a combination of manual and automatic control."

Then at page 17, again the chairman intervenes and asks this question:

"Before you go on. Does it come to this, that the absence of a manual retarder removes from the bus driver a choice of how to retard the vehicle, and therefore it would be better to have it? Is that what it comes to?

Mr Ivan Lee: You can put it this way."

Mr Kwok at line 9:

"Let me answer. Manual retarder is very important, especially when it comes to going downhill."

Then at page 18, line 5.

"Without manual retarders we would use this system by controlling the gear instead of relying solely on the brake."

So there is no further information from the witnesses as to the cancellation -- direct evidence as to the cancellation of the manual retarder. It seems to be implicit in those replies that at some stage the manual retarder device has been cancelled. Do you know

what he getting at here, Mr Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Let me try to say this. We have not cancelled any retarder. If you may refer to appendix 2.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Of ...?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Annex 2 of the union submission.

CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) If you take a look at the gear selector -- that's not a gear selector as such. That's a gear inhibitor. To limit the gear, you can engage, for old buses, we have this gear inhibitor. In 2008, we switched to automatic gear, so there is no need to have this gear inhibitor anymore. The design of the gear inhibitor is that when you go up a slope, and the power is not sufficient, then the bus captain can choose not to go beyond number 2 gear or number 3 gear, because if you don't have the power to go up, you may have to -- the gear would go up and then down, so that would be the selection allowed for the bus captain to ensure a smoother journey. That's the gear inhibitor. That would mean they would limit the gear from going up to a certain level.

If it's pressed when it goes down a slope, it will not drop from a higher gear to a lower gear instantly.

If you press number 2 gear and you are travelling at gear number 4, you will not drop to gear number 2, as in the case of a private car. So this gear inhibitor is not for the purpose of deceleration or slowing down the speed. We are talking about a very big bus with passengers, a number of passengers. So to ensure safety we have pneumatic decelerator. It's within the gearbox. It's in the annex. It's in every bus. This pneumatic device is operated like this. It's in the brake. What it requires is to press the brake lightly, to trigger the pneumatic braking, to slow down the vehicle. It's used by exerting -- it's operated through pneumatic transmission, and you would not damage the brake, and the brake lining would not be damaged. The brake is not subject to additional loading. It's a safety device. It has been a safety device, a standard safety device, on every bus for a long time, and it cannot be dismantled by us.

In 2008, when we adopted the automatic gear, there would be no need for this inhibitor. So it's D, N, R, the three buttons, and we don't have that gear inhibitor button anymore. So that's already the smart gearbox that we have adopted since 2008. And the gearbox would be able to tell whether the journey is uphill or downhill or whether the bus captain is stepping on the

accelerator and also whether he's trying to accelerate or decelerate and to what extent, and a suitable gear would be automatically set or selected. If it's an uphill journey, the gearbox knows that and it would not allow the gear to go up a higher level, and the bus captain doesn't have to expend a lot of effort to try to reduce the gearing, and the bus captain can pay more attention to traffic conditions. That's the advantage of this smart system.

We have never dismantled any safety device on the buses, and we are here talking about standard installations or devices.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So are you aware of any issue at the moment with any of the unions with regard to the manual retarder system?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I repeat, we don't have manual retarder system now. And we haven't heard views on this subject from other unions.

MR PETER DUNCAN: There is one other matter raised by the unions with the committee which I wanted to give you the opportunity of commenting on. That is the number of routes that any one driver might be asked to travel on during the course of one shift.

The committee heard evidence from representatives of two unions who said that some drivers would be required

to drive up to three routes in a day, and this was regarded as too much of an onus on the drivers.

First of all, are some drivers required to drive on three different routes in the course of one day's work?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, yes, that happens. So yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And the union takes the view that it's too much of an onus on the drivers. What is the company's position with regard to this?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We have an internal guideline on this issue. In a day's work, a bus captain is not to be asked to drive on more than three different routes, and also our duty despatch staff know this. If individual bus captains say they may drive on three routes in a day -- well, it can happen. This is within the scope of our guidelines.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have the unions raised with you the fact that the view is that three routes is too many?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) This really depends -- well, if you are only talking about the unions, they have not really mentioned that three routes are too many. Very often, many bus captains are equipped to drive on a number of routes, but our guidelines are there to ensure that within any shift on a day, there will not be too much change, because they may have

difficult remembering the stops.

But all the routes must be despatched to drivers only when they have been trained on those routes, but we don't want them to drive on too many routes because they have to remember the stops, and to a certain extent this may be difficult for them.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Sorry, I don't quite understand your answer. I asked you whether any of the unions had complained three routes are too many, and your answer was "have not really mentioned". Either they have mentioned it or they haven't.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Individual bus captains, a minority of bus captains, mentioned that, that is a fact. So the company said that it should be three routes or fewer in any shift.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Those who have mentioned to you that three routes is too many, is that a very large majority of -- a large number of the bus drivers or is it a small number? Can you give the committee some idea of that?

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Pang has already said it was a minority, but can you give us an idea of the number you are describing?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) At this moment, I cannot give you an exact figure, but we can go back and take a look. We can look at one particular day and -- we can

look at that.

DR JOHN CHAN: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Chan.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Sorry, Chairman, to my knowledge there are not many, as far as I know. As to how we can quantify it and what is regarded as a majority or what is regarded as a minority, but to my knowledge there are not too many.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, this would be a convenient time for the afternoon break, if it suits the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

Gentlemen, as we have done on previous days, we will take an afternoon break to give everyone a rest.

15 minutes, please.

(3.49 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.04 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Gentlemen, would you be good enough, please, to turn up TD-1 at page 477.

You should be looking at a copy of a letter from the Transport Department to the franchised bus operators, dated 7 June 2018, the date of course after the

committee was set up and commenced its deliberations.

Do you see that letter?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Prior to receiving this letter which informs the receivers of the availability of digital road mapping, prior to receiving this letter dated 7 June 2018, was KMB aware of this facility?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: You mean geo-fencing?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Digital road mapping, rather.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When did you first become aware that digital road mapping was accessible?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I thought you were talking about geo-fencing. The map was only available -- well, we only knew about the map after receiving this letter, 7 June.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right --

CHAIRMAN: There are two matters here, are there not? It's a digital map but it also contains speed limit information, and that's the question: did you know that this was available before the letter of 7 June 2018?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In the second paragraph, the writer of the letter says that the speed limits managed by the

Transport Department in the geographical information system format is "already available", do you see that, "already available"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you know now when that information actually became available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We have since talked to our suppliers, and we have tried to access the information through the data set. We have to deal with the format in some way, but we are in the process of accessing the information.

CHAIRMAN: No. The question is simply this: do you know at what date the information was available? Because it's said to be "already available". Do you know now when it was available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I only learn from this letter.

CHAIRMAN: No, I appreciate that. You have been given the good news that there is a digital map of Hong Kong and it's got speed limits on it, and you can redeploy your 37 people who are involved in tracking this information.

Did you then find out when it was that this was first available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I don't quite get the question.

DR JOHN CHAN: (Via interpreter) We know that it's

available; not when we knew about this, when it was available.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) It was available for a long time.

CHAIRMAN: That's what I'm trying to find out, and that's what Mr Duncan is asking you. It's been available for quite a long time. Do you know when it was -- not "quite", it was available for a long time. Do you know when it first became available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: What did you mean when you said it was available for a long time? What's the time period?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Sorry about the confusion. I was not aware that the government is releasing this information to us freely.

CHAIRMAN: No, we understand this, but having -- as I've tried to put it -- received the good news that this digital map with speed limits is available, have you troubled to find out for how long it has been available, for how many years, for example?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I think our IT department is able to get one last year, so I know this exists.

CHAIRMAN: Are you suggesting that they didn't tell you about it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: You mean TD?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, your IT department, "I think our IT department was able to get one last year".

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: But that is not a live map. I know that --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Leung, they are very simple questions. You are being told by this letter that there is a digital map available and it has a function which allows you to know speed limits, and the question is, subsequently, have you found out how long this has been available? "How long have we been missing out on this device?" Have you troubled to find that out?

DR JOHN CHAN: Sorry, Mr Chairman.

(Via interpreter) Not when we were told by the government about it but when was it available first on the part of the government?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Sorry about this. The answer is I don't know.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) GIS, that is something in the last couple of years. The geographical information system has been around for a long time on the part of the government.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Prior to the receipt of the letter of 7 June, had the company made any enquiries of the

government to ascertain whether this digital mapping system was available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware that, for example, in London, a digital map with speed limits on has been available since at least 2008-9; are you aware of that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

If you could look, please, at KMB-1 at page 279. Perhaps we should start with page 235, just to see what this document is. You can see there your letter of 8 August, which is addressed to the committee, and addresses items 1, 3, 6 and a poster plus a circular under item 4. It's the second paragraph of the letter. Do you see that?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then if we try to find out what item 6 is, we have to go back one page to the annex to the committee's letter of 8 August. We see there, it's:

"Copies of the documentation that describe and evidence the steps taken, including the involvement of Openmatics, to enable data to be obtained in real-time to distinguish between speeding in speed limits of

50 kilometres per hour and speeding in speed limits of 70 kilometres per hour and the documents describing and evidencing the results of those tests ..."

You kindly then provided an amount of information, and that which I am interested in is at page 279, item 6.

If I could bring your attention there to paragraphs under the heading "Works undertaken":

"A number of initiatives have [been] carried out to improve the above.

Openmatics has manually defined 50 ... and 70 [kilometre per hour] zonings (please refer to annex). KMB had started a conceptual trial on 31 July 2008 by comparing the above speed limits with the actual speed. Such [speed] is to verify whether the real-time on-board speed alert would notify the bus captains upon the actual speed of the trial bus exceeds the speed limit of the road. The result of the initial trial is so far positive. Further testing will be carried out. We are prepared to introduce the government's digital map into the Openmatics black box, which will take three to four months. However, the government's digital map does not contain live information, and can only be updated every 6 months."

The question is, what deficiencies do you regard

there as being with regard to what you have identified in the last sentence, "The government's digital map does not contain live information, and can only be updated every 6 months"; what's the problem there?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) By "live information", it means if there is a road situation which may affect the speed to be used, the information should be sent to the digital map. This is what we mean by "live information". Say, for example, tonight a tunnel will be closed, and another tunnel, there would be just one tube for both directions, then the speed would have to be reduced, and within a very short time the map should tell us the new speed limit in a tunnel.

But right now the digital map is updated only every six months. In other words, if the time period is shortened, it will become more like a live situation.

CHAIRMAN: Is that accurate, that it is updated every six months, or is that what it says on the website?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We discussed this with government officials. We hope we can be given a live map. But so far, it is still only updated every six months, and they only update the permanent road speeds.

CHAIRMAN: With whom did you have this conversation?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is an email message between our staff and TD.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have that with you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, I bring it with me.

MR ROGER LEE: August 8.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide a copy of it to us?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you do it now? We can copy it -- it's not marked, is it? Thank you very much.

Can we have multiple copies.

You were answering my question when I interrupted you. With whom did you have the conversation? Perhaps, now the document has been taken away from you, you can't answer.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: It was an email to the TD engineer, my email to Mr Danny Chan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We will find out when we get it.

Prof Lo, please.

MEMBER LO: It seems to me the speed limit will not change every day. Once in a while, certain segments will change speed limit, maybe construction sites, maybe certain kinds of scenario. So it's not going to change every day; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Depending on the road conditions, because sometimes you have a temporary construction site.

MR ROGER LEE: Accident.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: So you may have some shortened.

CHAIRMAN: But these are all gazetted, are they not, government gazette?

Well, let's approach this step by step. There is a system, is there not, so that speed limits can be changed legally, and that involves the government posting gazettes, saying such and such a section of road, the speed limit which is 70 will change for the next three months and become 50? Are you familiar with that system?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN: And that system of gazettes deals with both changes for months, or some of them are even for a year, and it also deals with short-term changes?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Sometimes it deals with changes that are for a certain hours of the day for a few days or a month?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: Like tunnel or accident.

CHAIRMAN: So what I am asking you about, these are all gazetted, are you saying there is another system of changing speed limits legally that are not gazetted?

You are not saying that? So they are all gazetted.

If one looks back at the 2018 gazettes, I think you will find there are 22 gazettes that deal with this

issue. Some of them are temporary and some of them are long term.

Perhaps we had better wait for the document.

Mr Duncan, are there some other matters you can deal with?

MR PETER DUNCAN: I was simply going to ask whether the Transport Department has yet responded to your email.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The TD hasn't replied to last reply yet.

CHAIRMAN: Well, don't hold your breath.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to turn now to a number of the technology devices that have been referred to in the submissions to the committee, possible technology devices which are available and which relate to safety matters.

Could I start, please, by asking you to look at KMB-1, page 114. This is an extract from the report sent to the Transport Department on 12 March, and on this page we see part 5, "Other measures to enhance bus safety", and what I wish to bring to your attention is paragraph 43, which is under the heading of "Tilt alarm". What is contained under that heading is the following:

"A tilt alarm will be installed on every bus on the entire fleet. Upon reaching a specific inclination, the alarm will be triggered to alert the driver."

Do you see that entry?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

We heard on Tuesday -- in fact, we saw the statement of Mr Kulis that the black box that was supplied by Openmatics contained a provision for a tilt parameter. Do you remember that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And I think it was you, Mr Leung, who explained on Tuesday that the company did not provide any value for this parameter because you could not identify any particular reference values. Do you remember saying that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, I did.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can we go back to page 114, that paragraph 43. Would it be fair to say that that statement was made in reaction to what had happened to the bus involved in the Tai Po incident?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is after the incident.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Was it a reaction to it, because that bus had in fact tilted and it in fact overturned?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: This is the recommendation of the committee, so this is after the incident.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Well, this was very shortly after the incident, wasn't it?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: 12 March.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What do you mean by "the committee"?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: The special committee of the board of KMB.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If you could then go, please, to page 150.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, the context in which this statement is made at paragraph 43 is paragraph 39, under the heading, "Other measures to enhance bus safety", specifically this, the last three lines:

"The special committee has considered these issues, in consultation with KMB's bus suppliers, and made various recommendations which KMB's management will be implementing or further examining."

That's the context, is it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's the context.

(Via interpreter) With regard to the tilt alarm and the tilt angle, we would decide on the angle. Before that, we did not know how to do it. Together with ADL and Volvo, we discussed this, and their advice was that they could not give us any specific recommendation. They could not recommend any particular tilt angle. Their recommendation was that it would be difficult to decide on an angle, because if the angle was too narrow

it would not be meaningful, and the bus captains would be receiving a lot of misleading information, and if the angle is too broad, it may be dangerous and the bus captains will either steer the bus or apply the brake.

Therefore, ADL and Volvo both did not recommend a tilt angle. Rather, they proposed to deal with this with ESP or ESC, in order to deal with this matter of tilting, and in fact we could not take reference from other countries. We could not find any relevant tilt angle for reference.

CHAIRMAN: Did you raise this with Openmatics, since it is in their equipment, whether or not it is used anywhere?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We did, we did.

CHAIRMAN: What was their response?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: There isn't any relevant -- they didn't recommend anything for us.

CHAIRMAN: Did they indicate to you whether or not they knew that this alert was used by anybody?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not any double-decker that is relevant to us, no.

CHAIRMAN: By that, is it to be inferred it is used by vehicles other than double-decker vehicles? Is that what you are saying?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: They are referring to some coaches, presumably.

CHAIRMAN: So it is used on coaches; is that what Openmatics told you?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not exactly. We asked them any relevant double-decker for reference. They didn't -- they come up with a figure but that presumably is not double-decker, so we still awaiting for their confirmation but it is not double-decker.

CHAIRMAN: Was this done in writing?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, in writing.

CHAIRMAN: Are you in a position to provide us with copies of this exchange?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, I try to, yes.

CHAIRMAN: When was this done, approximately?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: One or two weeks ago.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So please provide the exchange of correspondence that addresses this issue.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Leung, having regard to what you have just said, if I can go back to page 114, the statement at paragraph 43 seems to be quite unequivocal:

"A tilt alarm will be installed on every bus of the entire fleet. Upon reaching a specific inclination, the alarm will be triggered to alert the driver."

Was that in fact the resolution of the company at this point, 12 February 2018?

CHAIRMAN: Well, it's 12 March I think when this report was

made. The accident was on 10 February.

MR PETER DUNCAN: 12 March, I beg your pardon, yes.

There's a positive statement there at paragraph 43 that the company will install a tilt alarm on every bus in the entire fleet.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) That should be in the black box, and we are talking about triggering the alarm, the one in the black box, not that we would install another alarm, another tilt alarm.

CHAIRMAN: No, that's understood, but perhaps if one stands back, this was a recommendation from the special committee. It was recommended that:

"A tilt alarm will be installed on every bus of the ... fleet. Upon reaching a specific inclination, the alarm will be triggered to alert the driver."

Now, that's 12 March. Since then, you have carried this forward, from what you have said. You have spoken to ADL and Volvo and you have spoken to Openmatics.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Right.

CHAIRMAN: So what is the result of that? Just summarise it because I think I understand what the result is.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Volvo, ADL --

CHAIRMAN: There is no need to go through the details. What is the end result?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) There is no suitable

angle. They cannot specify any particular angle.

CHAIRMAN: So is the result this, that although this is a recommendation of the special committee, it's not one that you are able to enforce or put into practice?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's correct. Thank you very much.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So if we look at the second action plan, at page 231 of the same bundle -- this is the action plan provided to the committee on 6 August -- have you summarised in writing what you have just told the chairman --

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: -- in the right-hand column on that page?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So the upshot is there will in fact be no tilt alarm; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, you mentioned in the course of those remarks the electronic stability control system.

Could you go, please, to page 114 of KMB-1. Do we see there what was contained in the report to the Transport Department on 12 March, and to put into proper context it was said that the special committee had considered the issues which had been described in consultation with the bus suppliers and it made various recommendations with KMB's management will be

implementing or further examining.

There is then reference at paragraph 41 to the electronic stability control system, and it is described as follows:

"[It is] an important safety feature available for buses. It is a mandatory safety feature on coaches in Europe. ESP reduces the risk of skidding and rolling over. Installation of ESP in Euro V and Euro VI buses is under testing and verification with the suppliers. Upon confirmation by the suppliers, ESP will be installed in the entire fleet phase by phase."

Now can I ask this question: prior to the incident, had the company considered the application of this system?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When did it first consider the application of the electronic stability programme?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) It is between 2014 and 2015. We tried to approach a German company, MAN, they had this ESP programme. In 2016 we purchased 20 buses with ESP system. We used them on the road. 21 altogether, 21 buses altogether.

CHAIRMAN: From MAN?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Double-decker.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So these had been in use for some time prior to the accident on 10 February?

MR ROGER LEE: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Had any decision been made by the company as to whether the use of this system should be extended beyond that's MAN buses?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What was that decision?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) All new buses that we are going to purchase, all Euro VI new buses will be equipped with ESP.

CHAIRMAN: But when was that decision made?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Volvo and ADL, we need some time. We have to talk to them further as to when these will be available. So those buses will be available after that happen.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Mr Chairman, if I may, this was actually reported in the updated action plan as of 1 August 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the page reference? 235, something like that?

MR PATRICK PANG: 230, should be.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

I think the context of Mr Duncan's question was this. From 2016, you had 21 buses, double-decker buses, supplied by MAN which had ESC. Had you made any

decision whether or not to go ahead with installing ESC on new buses prior to the Tai Po accident?

I see you are shaking your head, Mr Leung.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, it was still on trial. We wanted to get more data. We only had 21 buses at that time. But we found out that ESP could help us in preventing skidding and rolling over, so we wanted to speed up the programme.

CHAIRMAN: So the decision to act in the way that is set out at page 230 of KMB-1 is a consequence of, firstly, the 10 February accident and, secondly, the investigation of the special committee, and thirdly its recommendation?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you describe the current position then with regard to the retrofitting of the ESP programme? It is said on page 114 that:

"Upon confirmation by the suppliers, ESP will be installed in the entire fleet phase by phase."

Have you received any confirmation by suppliers that this is feasible?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) They are still developing their own equipment. The new buses will arrive in 2019 and these will be equipped with this system then the next step will be for the retrofitting

of the same device or system to our existing buses.

The initial response is positive; the initial indication is positive.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) For Volvo it's 18 to 24, but for ADL, we don't have a timetable for the retrofitting programme.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have ADL indicated whether it is feasible?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes. It can be done. It can be retrofitted.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So does that then cover the entire fleet by referring to --

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We are restricted to Euro V buses.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Pre Euro V vehicles, there is no electronic braking system.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So does that mean some of the fleet will not have this system?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What numbers?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Euro V or newer buses account for more than half of our fleet.

CHAIRMAN: So just under or some figure under half will not have this fitted --

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: -- when retrofitting has been complete?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: That is correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just to complete the picture on this, could we go to TD-404 again, please.

CHAIRMAN: Which bundle is that in?

MR PETER DUNCAN: TD, I beg your pardon, TD-1.

Has the working group recommended that all franchised bus operators, in paragraph 4, have committed that all new double-deck buses procured from July 2018 onwards will be incorporated with that device, the electronic stability control device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And does that contain, in paragraph (a), a description, full description, of the nature of that device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) For KMB, all new buses starting from 1 January 2019 will be fitted with this.

MR PETER DUNCAN: While we are on page 404, do you see the reference in paragraph (b) to ""Retarders for capping the maximum speed of the speed limiters on downhill ('speed limiting retarder')"? Do you see that reference?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I ask you just to keep that open,

but to refer again to the report to the Transport Department after the accident, at page 115, please.

CHAIRMAN: Of KMB-1?

MR PETER DUNCAN: KMB-1, yes.

Can you read paragraph 45 to yourself, please.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does it finish by saying this?

"A retarder is a hydraulic system that slows down the gearbox. Speed limitation systems could be offered on new buses after a period of engineering and testing."

Who supplies these sorts of devices?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: The bus manufacturer.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How long have they been available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: They will become available on our new buses for ADL in early next year.

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Duncan's question is more general than that. How long have they been available to buy or fit, purchase?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not at the moment.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Let me ask it -- I haven't made myself clear, I'm sorry -- were these devices available prior to the Tai Po accident?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: No.

MR ROGER LEE: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When did they become first available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: They will become available.

MR ROGER LEE: Maybe the first one in KMB.

CHAIRMAN: They are not available elsewhere in the world?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: For double-decker, no. I'm not sure. I'm not sure.

CHAIRMAN: By all means be cautious.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I'm not sure.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Let's go back to square one. Before the accident, were you aware of the existence of these device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: We did, we did, but not with ADL. We did go to Wrightbus, we did go to Belfast, we did go to Queen's University to talk about a lot of new features, safety features. Yes, we know this technology. We know this technology, especially on vehicles.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that this was a technology that was offered on Wrightbuses?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Not at that moment.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Actually, after the accident, we talked to ADL and Volvo in order to explore whether retarders can be fitted onto buses. At that time they spent some time to think about the possibility and we can only say this, because it was not readily available.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Presumably, before the incident, before February this year, you would have been aware of the fact that the retarder mechanism that you had to keep buses below 70 would not be effective on a downhill slope; you must have known that? Would that be correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Because that system simply works by starving the engine of fuel, doesn't it, reducing the amount of fuel?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So given that you were aware that the system did not retard a bus going in excess of 70 downhill, had you before the incident made any enquiries into whether there was available in the market any device which would offer assistance in that respect?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) There should have been but I don't know where we mentioned this.

If the buses use hand-retarders, this can be done. The speed going downhill can be limited.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's not quite the question. Had you considered with the bus manufacturers before the incident anything in the nature of what you discovered since the incident with regard to inhibiting the speed downhill?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Not that, from my memory, nothing.

DR JOHN CHAN: May I try to explain what is a slightly technical question. We had referred earlier to a system of hand-retarders on certain bus routes coming down Hiram's Highway, because it is particularly steep. In the context of Mr Duncan's question, yes, those buses and those hand-retarders had been in use for a long time before the Tai Po accident. So to that extent, yes, we knew.

But this particular type of speed retarder that we are talking about here, that's something that has occurred to us only since, after the February accident.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, I understand.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the hydraulic system?

DR JOHN CHAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can we go to the action plan, please, the first action plan, to understand the situation here. I think this can be found at page 150.

Is that the reference, "Speed limitation -- speed limitation system which will automatically activate the brakes to slow down the gearbox should be installed on new buses after a period of engineering and testing"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And the action plan as at 10 April:

"Both ADL and Volvo are studying how this system could be implemented on new bus. Feasibility will be

updated in due course."

Then if we follow this through to action plan no. 2, item 19.

CHAIRMAN: Which page?

MR PETER DUNCAN: This will be at page 232, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We are informed that:

"ADL's Euro VI new buses will come with this feature. Volvo will have this feature available in July 2019 and their Euro VI new buses delivered before this time will have the feature retrofitted."

Does that cover all the new buses that you will be acquiring in the future, just ADL and Volvo?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, all new Euro VI buses.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So are you going to be acquiring new buses apart from Euro VI buses?

MR ROGER LEE: All the new buses will be Euro VI.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And they will be restricted to ADL and Volvo, will they?

MR ROGER LEE: So far, only these two manufacturers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we go back to the working group's recommendations, are we able to see those in detail at TD-1, pages 404 and 405?

Do you see those entries?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: With regard to retrofitting, you will notice that the working group recommends that the operators and the bus manufacturers start the development of these two add-on devices for existing buses with a working target to commence the tests of the devices and trials of the retrofitting work in about 12 to 18 months. That's the second half of 2019.

Could you just confirm for us, please, what the company's intentions are with regard to retrofitting with regard to this device?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We will do it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And will you do that in accordance with the working group's recommendations?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We will do that accordingly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would now like to move to the next device referred to by the working group. This is under the heading of page 405 of "Trials of new safety technology".

If I could just introduce this by reading the introductory paragraph:

"In order to enable the [franchised bus] operators to step up their management and control of their bus fleet, and reduce the potential risks arising from human errors or effect of unsafe driving behaviour, the

[working group] considered that new safety technology which can assist the [franchised bus] operators in monitoring and controlling bus safety should be actively explored. Generally, the [franchised bus] operators have committed to further exploring sources of supply of various latest safety devices/technology and launch trials with a view to establishing the technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness of their application in [franchised buses]".

The first matter to which the working group has referred is what is described as the "bus monitoring and control system". Could I just read out, please, what this is said to contain:

"In view of the latest technological development in bus fleet management system and black box with functions on real-time fleet supervision, bus speed recording, Global Positioning System ... location recording, et cetera, the [working group] considered that it should be a medium-term goal for [franchised bus] operators to develop a comprehensive BMCS with positioning function, operational information monitoring function, and variable speed limiting function with geo-fencing technology. In brief, by making use of GPS or other positioning technologies, the system will match the legal speed limit at the actual bus location. This

real-time speed limit information can then be used to control the enhanced speed limiter (ie speed limiter with 2 speed settings). In other words, the bus speed could be controlled or limited within the applicable speed limits (50 [kilometre per hour] or 70 [kilometre per hour] depending on the road section). The system will also enable the [franchised bus] operators to monitor their bus fleet more closely and to take appropriate management action against overspeeding and other unsafe or improper driving behaviour such as heavy braking or inappropriate speed during cornering or downhill. To this end, [franchised bus] operators have agreed to proceed with developing the system and conducting trials in two phases ...:

(i) Phase 1: a BMCS with positioning function, operational information (such as vehicle speed, brake status, deceleration, et cetera) monitoring function and geo-fencing technology for fleet management will be put on trial to achieve detection of speeding and provide real-time alert to the bus captains; and

(ii) Phase 2: Subject to the successful development of the phase 1 trial, the BMCS so developed will be incorporated with additional application of enhanced speed limiter being developed by bus manufacturers so as to limit the bus speed in accordance with the

corresponding speed limit of various road sections."

If we go there to the company's action plan --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan, may I interrupt -- and this is a question for you, Mr Leung.

If you go back to page 402, where the Transport Department provided the committee with information relating to progress of the working group's meetings, you will see that in the final two lines it says that:

"... the report of the working group will be provided the soonest possible for the committee's reference."

Now, this letter is dated 19 July. You are a member of the working group. When might we expect to receive the working group's report?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I haven't received it.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. Can you help us as to when we might all expect to receive it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) The working group is still in session.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. It's obviously gone over the time that we were told by the Commissioner for Transport was to be its reporting time, when she gave evidence in May, but I'm trying to get some indication from you, as a member of the group, nothing more than that, when we might expect to receive the report.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) There are minutes of meeting, and all I've got are the minutes of meetings.

CHAIRMAN: You misunderstand me. At the end of the day, the working group is going to produce a report. When might we expect to get the report?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I have to ask the chairman of the working group.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that, but you are a member of it. Are you close to the end? Is it about to be signed off or not?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: I think it's close to the end.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Sorry, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's perfectly in order, Mr Chairman.

Is it proposed to have any more meetings of the working group, or has the working group fulfilled its function?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) According to the agenda, there have been three general meetings on training and fleet management. We have made some progress. We expect a report to be written up. And there will be a fourth meeting. The agenda will be on bus training and the monitoring mechanism of bus captain training. It will be convened in mid-September.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Let us go to the action plan, the first of the two action plans, at page 150 of KMB-1.

Is it at paragraph 16 on that page that this matter, that is to say BMCS, is reflected?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We are working towards this objective. We have talked about digital map and black box, and these are being worked out. We have a timetable. If we achieve that goal, then the next stage -- there will be a second stage. In the future, we will be able to give alerts to the bus captain instantaneously, real-time, whether it's a 50km speed limit or 70km speed limit.

But geo-fencing is more complicated. There will be information fed into the black box and the black box will identify whether there is speeding, and then the CAN system will be provided with the input so as to reduce the speed, to reduce the fuel supply. We have to be very careful because this will mean taking over the captain's driving.

We have a bus being tried for this new system but it is still on trial.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So is it at item 16 of the action plan which reflects the work to be done on the bus monitoring and control system?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. For a further update on that, can we go to the second action plan, at page 231 of KMB-1, please. Do we see on page 231 the action plan, as of 1 August 2018, and in the first paragraph, does it refer to the test drive which you mentioned a few moments ago?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So going back to the recommendations of the working group, according to the Transport Department, where is KMB exactly with regard to phase 1 and phase 2 respectively?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Phase 1 will involve giving alerts only. Only alerts would be given.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. What stage has been reached? Is phase 1 completed? Is it halfway done? What's the situation?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We are still doing the trials. We haven't reached the stage where we can have the findings.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We have to install the digital map in the black box so that we can tell between 50kmh and 70kmh, and this test drive is about finding out whether this will work, the digital map will work, this can be done in the short term.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Let me supplement. We

have manually installed information on some road sections in the black box. That is to say for certain GPS coordinates, it is subject to -- it is a 50-kmh zone, we have manually inputted the information to the black box. But if we have a live map, the entire map would be installed and then we can carry out a more comprehensive test.

CHAIRMAN: And how many road sections have you dealt with by installing that manually, the distinction between a 50-kilometre zone and a 70-kilometre zone?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) The manual input is done this way. If the section is 70kmh zone, we would manually install or input the map, and then we can actually test all buses but we are just doing this for one bus. Then, if the alarm doesn't go off when it exceeds 70kmhkmh we know whether it works.

If it works on one bus, it will work for all 4,000. This is done manually now. If we can install the digital map, of course we need to verify the format first, and if that can be done then we can comprehensively do this for both 50kmh zones and 70kmh zones.

CHAIRMAN: But the question was, in this manual trial, how many sections of road have you installed with these latitude/longitude parameters?

MR ROGER LEE: In fact all of them.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you able to provide any sort of indication to the committee as to how long it might take for these two phases to be totally trialled?
MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We have given you the indicative information.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Can you remind us where we can find that in the bundles? You have given us a bar chart, haven't you?
DR NORMAN LEUNG: 279 to 281.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Can you help us then as to what is meant by the first heading, "Incorporate speed limit into black box by Openmatics", end of November 2018?
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) This is about the government's data set.
CHAIRMAN: Digital map with speed limits?
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes, right.
CHAIRMAN: Installed by Openmatics into all black boxes?
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: All black boxes. But for the trial, it may be one or two, but ...
CHAIRMAN: This is what you hope to achieve, presumably?
MR ROGER LEE: Yes.
MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: But going through the steps, what is meant by "Validate the speed limit accuracy"?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We hope the system can operate normally. We would like to try whether, at a certain location, that it can really fulfil the requirement.

CHAIRMAN: So cross-check; is that it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Cross-check.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Chairman, sometimes it relies a lot on the GPS for positioning. Sometimes certain road sections, even if the map speed limit is accurate, the bus speed as fed into it might not be accurate, because if you only rely on GPS it may not be accurate and it needs to be adjusted.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) One of the considerations is whether the signals of the GPS are stable and accurate. That has to be adjusted.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Say, for example, on Tuen Mun highway, we have a bus speed at 70 kilometres per hour, but then if you rely on GPS for positioning, sometimes they would tell you that the bus is on Castle Peak Road and the speed limit is 50km there. Therefore, sometimes the roads can be very close and we have to adjust the positioning.

CHAIRMAN: This is a problem that occurs when one road is on

a flyover and the other road is beneath?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes, and also the parallel one.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Just going through the steps here -- so you are going to carry out an internal trial. What is meant by that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Well, it may be a test drive by our own staff, or a trial on a specific route. We need to carry out the trials to see whether the operation will meet expected results.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Because today, if the light would be activated at 70km, there will be a light on the speedometer. But later on, the 50km and 70km alert will be done by the system. So it is totally different. From the angle of the bus captain, today there will be a light, it is because today he is reminded that it exceeds 70km, but later on, whether it is 50km or 70km, we will have to rely on the system to check it against the speed limit of the road section, and bus captains have to adapt to this and we have to give them some time to tell them that this is the incentive behind the change of the system.

CHAIRMAN: You have another bar here, "Consultation with frontline staff"; I suppose that speaks for itself.

"Implementation to full fleet", by the end of

January of 2019.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Then in terms of time, if one goes to the bottom of this bar chart, you repeat the matters that you have set out earlier: carry out internal trial, consult frontline staff. Why is that repeated?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) They are different. This is phase 2, Chairman. The first one is that on the dashboard there will be two real-time indicators, telling the bus captain that he has gone beyond 50km and he will be alerted, or whether he is exceeding 70km so we alert him. But the one that is below, it is about phase 2. When the bus captain exceeds the speed limit or is driving at a high speed, then the geo-fencing system will take over the bus captain's driving, and to tell him that he has to cut the fuel supply.

We have left out 70km here. In other words, when it comes to phase 2, if the bus captain goes beyond 70km, say for example when he goes downhill, then the bus will use geo-fencing technique in order to cut the fuel supply. We will not just alert the bus captain. This is about phase 2.

CHAIRMAN: So phase 1 will be complete on this timeline by the end of January 2019?

MR ROGER LEE: We hope.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

TD/406, please. TD-1/406, please, leads on to the next device to be trialled. This is the collision alert and lane-keeping devices. It is said that:

"The collision alert system is an add-on device which will give an alert to the bus captain in the event of a possible crash. The lane-keeping device is also an add-on device to alert the bus driver when the bus starts moving away from the lane other than proper steering. Both devices are available in the market. Thus, trial of using the devices in [franchised buses] to assess their applicability and effectiveness is recommended."

We saw earlier today in the accident statistics that head-on and tail collisions, and collisions involving a changing of lane, were responsible for something like 25 per cent of bus accidents.

CHAIRMAN: Remind me, if you would, Mr Duncan, where those figures are to be found.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. That's at page 183, Mr Chairman, of the same volume, TD-1.

Had the company given any consideration to the application of these devices prior to the accident in

Tai Po in February?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes, we did.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you please describe what consideration was given and what the outcome of that consideration was.

CHAIRMAN: Before you answer that question, I'm looking at 183. Lane collision seems to be 11 per cent, does it not? Are you including some other figures?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I'm sorry, Mr Chairman. I should have broken it down. I was combining "head on/tail collision" with "collision (changing lane)", giving approximately 25 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

I'm sorry, please put the question again.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

What consideration had been given to the engagement of these sorts of devices prior to the accident in February?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Actually, in 2017, our engineering department -- well, myself and our operations director, Mr Leung, together with some young engineers in the company -- we thought of new ways to help those two things that you mentioned, and because of that, as I said, in the spring or actually in the autumn of last year we went to Northern Ireland to go to

Queen's University in Belfast, exactly to look into these two matters.

KMB in-house has a group of engineers who actually have been sent to Northern Ireland to do this, and Queen's University sent professors to Hong Kong to look at our buses.

These are two main projects. The first one is collision alert. We would like to know the distance between our bus and the vehicle in front of the bus, because we have found that direct collision on long-haul routes can be fatal, and we want to do something to see whether our bus can be a distance away from the vehicle in front, and if the braking distance is not sufficient we will have to alert the bus captain and we have been doing this internally. Now we have engaged a university in Belfast so that we can develop this together.

If you look at the W-Tech document, you will see that when there is a change of lanes, when the bus captain engages in lane changing but he doesn't do proper steering, there will also be alerts. We are researching into this now.

But today, I can only tell you that we are still doing the research. We don't even have initial conclusions or results.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I would like to add

one point. In the market, we will be watching out for third-party products. Later on, we are going to address driver monitoring device. We don't know whether the device would be applicable, but we hope so.

MR PETER DUNCAN: According to the Transport Department's account of the working group's deliberations at page 406, there are already devices available on the market. Do you see that reference?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) That's right, for (c), on drowsiness.

MR PETER DUNCAN: No, for (b).

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I know that some other bus companies are also trying this out. We will be keeping a close watch. We will try it out again. We will do that.

Talking about lane-keeping devices and the alert, I remember many years ago we tried out something, but the results were not satisfactory. But given present technology, we will be keeping watch and we will be doing further trials.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm just wondering why you are entering into this research project with the overseas university if there are in fact already devices available on the market.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, even if some products are available, you may try them out and you don't know whether they are good for your buses.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I would like to say something more here. Actually, a product may be very good for a particular place, but we drive on different roads. We have long-haul routes. We have urban routes. We have routes where there are many people and many vehicles. The situation is complex. There is no one third-party product that can be applicable to our buses. We are talking about very congested and sometimes long-haul routes. It is very difficult to find one product. We can only try them out. But at the same time we should also try to seek a way out for ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, we have reached the close of play and it's been a very long day for everyone, as always for the stenographers the longest, but that's why it's time to close.

Gentlemen, it's clear, as was obvious during the day, that you have much information to provide us. We will go through the transcript, as no doubt you will, and we will identify exactly what it is that you are to provide to us, which is most helpful. We would ask you, if you could, to make that available to us within two weeks of today, because it is clear that we will need to

have another oral session. But it is helpful to everyone if we can get the documents in good time, have them paginated. You can then digest them and so can our counsel.

So can I ask that you provide the information that you have undertaken to provide within two weeks and we will fix another hearing thereafterwards.

Thank you very much for attending. I know these have been long days but it has been helpful to the committee.

So we will adjourn now and the hearing will resume when we are able to fix a date. Thank you.

(5.32 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WIN BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG (simultaneous interpretation used only where indicated) 1

Statement by DR NORMAN LEUNG 1

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN (continued) 5

[Blank Page]

2018年8月11日

上午10時01分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士同埋各位先生，早晨。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）早晨，主席，早晨。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你主席。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，或者等我先講，可唔可以畀幾分鐘我？

主席：（經傳譯員）當然可以。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，琴日聆訊之後，我哋向委員會係提供進一步嘅文件，呢個係關乎行動計劃嘅，就關於二十九個彎位嘅時速限制。另外我講一講提交畀席前嘅提交文件總結。

或者讓我講一講，主席先生，你問咗一個問題，就係都好公道嘅同埋好切題嘅，你就問過點解王家豐先生所作嘅建議，我哋管理階層係未有係落實嘅，我一定要承認，我自己心中亦都有咁嘅疑問，就想知道點解係冇加以實施嘅。

或者我哋睇一睇嗰個提交文件嘅一覽，喺2014年嘅7月31號，嗰度就係話行動計劃就會提交畀車務總監同埋總經理，以供佢哋係通過嘅。跟住就係喺2014年嘅8月14號，當時就係王家豐先生就係寫電郵畀何文達先生，就話請你係批准嘅。跟住就係14年嘅8月15號，當時就何先生就係畀電郵就係黃生，就叫佢就係請車務總監就係去正式批准，當然事先就係查核咗同埋通過咗先。

跟住就係喺15年嘅2月2號，當時就係有一封電郵嘅，就係王家豐先生就係發出係畀所有車廠嘅總經理，嗰度就話「而家就係適當嘅時候去再考慮係落實車速限制呢項事情嘅」，即係只針對嗰啲已經係搵出嘅嗰啲急彎。

喺15年嘅2月5號，王家豐先生就發電郵畀所有車廠嘅總經理，佢就話「我會將佢呈交畀車務總監同埋另一位總監，就等佢哋作最後嘅批核嘅。」

主席先生，我想請你哋睇番呢一個證物5號，即係呢一個文件夾嘅證物5。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好，我有喇。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒主席先生。呢一份就係一個通函，就係王家豐先生就係發畀所有有關嘅部門嘅主管。喺呢一份便箋嗰度，就話「今早係同車務總監開過會，係關乎上述嘅題目嘅，我哋而家係有一個新嘅做法」，我要強調，呢度就講話係「對於點樣處理呢個事宜就有新嘅睇法，新嘅做法。嗰個行動就會係總結如下：

第(1)，就係嗰個安全服務及質量部就會預備一份安全嘅海報，一張咁嘅海報就係話駛過急彎嘅安全駕駛，就會 4 月嘅時候做，車廠就需要將呢一啲安全海報係擺放喺同埋展示喺一啲當眼嘅地方，喺車廠嘅地方同埋所有嘅總站嗰度，係駕駛訓練導師就需要向所有嘅車長就係進行呢個安全嘅提示，作為一個正常嘅做法；

第(2)，就係安全及服務質量部就會擬備一份內部通告，呢個就會由交通部就係發出嘅，就加強車長嘅安全意識，亦都提醒所有嘅車長就係要觀看一個安全嘅錄影帶，就係透過呢個電子學習嘅方法，呢個就 1 月就好似處理巴士火警一樣；

第(3)點，就係安全及服務質量部就會同車長訓練學校商討喺職員嘅網站嗰度上載一個安全嘅短片，就講明如果佢哋係駛過呢啲急彎嘅時候，一般嘅安全指引同埋預防措施係乜嘢嘅，而嗰個寶順路轉入去唐明街呢一個急彎就會被揀選作為一個例子，呢個就係三十秒鐘嘅安全短片嘅。所有嘅車長都需要登入或者用其他嘅方法嚟到觀看呢一個安全嘅短片同埋佢哋嘅名就會係記錄低，會有紀錄嘅；

第(4)點就係巴士車長訓練學校，就會引呢一個將軍澳巴士翻側意外作為一個教訓，就係要所有嘅新入職嘅車長、學員同埋其他嘅車長就係知悉嘅，就透過適當嘅安全駕駛訓練。」

跟住嗰段就話「請留意，而家係唔需要係發出嗰個安全車速限制卡嘅，而嗰個安全短片嗰度係唔會」，係唔會，「講明嗰個安全車速嘅限制嘅，嗰個內部通告都唔會咁樣嘅，預計就會喺 2015 年 4 月嗰度採取上述嘅行動。我會係適時咁樣將嗰個進展向你匯報。」

主席先生，我想講，就係所有嘅建議、所有嘅行動，即係話喺呢份文件嗰度所列出嘅行動全部都已經係做咗，管理層亦都採取咗行動嚟到去落實呢一度所有嘅建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）唔該你，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，我相信都會成日講番呢份文件，我諗要係編番個頁碼，做咗未呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋會安排㗎喇，呢幾頁就只不過係剛剛係嚟到我面前

嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我都明白嘅，會唔會係搵人幫我哋做咗呢樣工作，就等我哋自己去填番個頁碼。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，肯定可以嘅。梁博士，各位先生，早晨，多謝你哋做咗功課，琴晚做咗功課，交畀我哋，亦都感謝你剛才作嗰個解釋。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我要致歉嘅，我要代表管理層就係致歉，琴日大家花咗咁多時間，如果我哋嘅管理層早啲做好呢樣工夫嘅話，其實就一早已經係喺琴日係清楚解釋咗個事情，請接納我嘅道歉。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，梁博士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁博士，我係因應就係你哋交畀我哋嘅新嘅文件，係有啲問題要問嘅，請一請你睇番呢個 1 號證物，呢個就係王家豐喺 15 年 2 月 2 號發出嘅電郵，呢個就係話「喺 2014 年 12 月示威區嗰度清咗場之後，而家係適當嘅時候再考慮係落實嗰啲已經係搵出嘅急彎同埋迴旋處嘅車速限制。」你呢度就話再考慮，我睇呢個字眼就係意味住你呢一個課題之前已經係考慮過嘅。

我哋冇任何嘅文件係關乎究竟何先生喺呢一個 2014 年 8 月 15 號發出電郵之後究竟係有啲乜嘢事做過嘅，當時就話希望就係得到車務總監嘅批准嘅，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽究竟 14 年嘅 8 月 15 號之後一路去到 2015 年嘅 2 月之間就係做過啲咩嘢，而係希望得到佢正式嘅批准呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋要搵番有關嘅文件，我哋呈交畀委員會嘅文件就係我哋手頭上嘅所有，即係相關嘅文件就係咁多，喺我哋嘅手頭上就係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我都明白，我哋就係 14 年 8 月至到 15 年嘅 2 月 2 號之間係有啲咩嘢紀錄、有啲咩嘢文件，關乎呢件事？李生，或者你係咪會知道呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）我嘗試去幫手。我係 15 年 1 月先加入公司嘅，但係我肯定可以返去公司睇下有冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係當時 15 年 2 月 15 號落呢個決定嘅時候，當時你就係個總經理，你之前同我哋講過呢樣嘢就係喺何達文先生係總經理嘅時候就已經落咗個決定嘅，係咁樣嘅，係咪呢？根據你今日所畀嘅資料就係顯示個情況係咁嘅。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以讓我返去寫字樓再搵嗰啲資料出嚟呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該，好。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）等我係澄清一下，因為我都同管理層就問過呢個問題嘅，呢度就係話喺 2014 年 12 月係示威區清咗場之後，呢度講嘅就係佔中嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度所指嘅就係佔中。或者我亦都想問另一件事，跟進琴日所講嘅，呢個就係講到嗰啲係例外嘅報告嘅，琴日都有提過嘅，我就係講緊兩類嘅報告，一類就係關乎超速嘅，另外一類就係關於突然剎掣或者係加速，我哋琴日都睇過，我就想澄清呢一點。

首先，我哋講下KMB-9文件冊第3993頁，你應該記得我哋過去嗰幾日係講過呢一份嘅文件嘅，呢個就係我所講嘅第一類報告；而第二類報告就係喺KMB-1文件冊第362頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一類係咩嘢報告呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係同車速有關嘅，同埋亦都關乎加速同埋突然剎掣嘅問題。你應該記得呢份報告，係咪呀？

黃祥明先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就住大埔嘅意外，就係今年2月10號嘅意外，我想問一個問題，涉事嘅巴士或者嗰架巴士嘅司機喺意外之後有冇喺呢兩類嘅報告中嘅任何報告係顯示出嚟，就係喺2月產生嘅呢啲報告？

黃祥明先生：當時就並冇喺呢兩個報告裏面去留意有冇嗰單案件嘅車長或者架車嘅情況出現嘅，因為其實喺當時我哋係獨立咁去睇番嗰架車發生情況嘅事件，就無需要等呢一個報告嘅出現。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當時有冇擬備呢啲報告，喺2月10號？

黃祥明先生：由於當時係集中喺即時搵呢個報告嘅--呢架車當時嘅情況嘅報告，我冇留意，亦都唔記得有冇喺呢個報告裏面再出現嗰個車嘅情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話喺2月10號就從來都冇產生過呢啲報告，係咪呀？

黃祥明先生：呢啲報告係一個恆常性嘅報告嚟嘅，即係話所有車當佢係違反一個我哋指定嗰個指引嘅時候，就會喺呢啲報告就出現，所以呢個係恆常性嘅報告，但係當時你講大埔案件嗰單事件嘅時候，係因為佢係獨特嘅事件，我哋係獨特咁樣去睇嗰個車嘅情況，就我唔記得有冇喺呢個報告再睇番。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以承諾去檢查一下究竟有冇發出過呢啲報告呢，喺2月10號？

黃祥明先生：可以嘅，我可以再查番，睇下當時有冇呢個報告出現。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同委員會分享呢份報告呀？

黃祥明先生：如果我check到，我當然會提交畀呢個committee。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當時巴士有冇係以超過時速 70 嘅速度行駛，如果巴士以超過 70 嘅時速行駛，會唔會嗰架巴士--即係會唔會自動係產生呢兩類嘅報告呢？

黃祥明先生：首先而家喺我哋螢光幕見到呢個表，當時我哋 set 嘅車速係 75 公里，如果佢超過 75 公里，應該就會係喺呢個表嗰度出現。至於另外一個比較細嘅圖表，就要睇下當時嘅道路嘅限速係幾多，我哋先至會睇下架車有冇超速，如果有超速，同樣都會係喺嗰個報告度走出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係有急速剎車或者係急速嘅加速嘅情況，會唔會自動產生咗第二類嘅報告呀？

黃祥明先生：會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果當時係冇產生呢啲報告，現時嘅系統可唔可以產生番嗰啲報告呢？

黃祥明先生：因為呢個紀錄係當時如果佢係有一個 harsh braking 或者 excess acceleration 嘅時候，已經係記錄在案㗎喇，如果係有嘅時候，已經喺個報告裏面會出現咗，我會搵到嘅時候，我提交番畀委員會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我個問題有少少唔同嘅，如果係不存在呢個報告，你可唔可以喺今日去--即係根據你哋公司電腦系統嘅紀錄產生報告呢？

黃祥明先生：我唔係好明白個問題，因為如果佢係當時有 harsh braking 或者有 excess acceleration，就應該已經喺個報告度出現咗㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）明白，唔該晒。

梁健宏先生：應該係可以嘅，但係嗰啲數據因為都半年前，我哋所有嗰啲數據已經係擺咗喺 archive 去第二啲系統入面嘅，我哋可能要攞番當其時半年前嘅數據，所以變咗我哋要睇一睇個可行性，我相信係可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）琴日我哋最後講到培訓嘅問題，喺我繼續講呢個話題之前，我就想就住人手短缺呢個問題再問一啲問題，喺新嘅指引底下，巴士車長嘅短缺就似乎會更加係加劇，而唔係會改善嘅，咁樣講合唔合理呢？

彭樹雄先生：係，Mr Duncan，我同意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋公司最近有冇推出過一啲措施去改善呢個情況呢？

李澤昌先生：其實呢個係多方面嘅，首先一，就係喺嗰個招聘方面做啲嘢，另外一方面就係喺公司裏面點樣提高嗰個員工之間，佢嗰個對嗰間公司嘅嗰種 morale。

喺聘請車長方面，除咗喺個薪酬要做一啲工夫，主席星期二已經講咗一啲舉措。我哋亦都係好希望喺請人方面，喺唔同嘅類型、唔同嘅性質，喺唔同嘅區域，我哋都係想做啲工夫，因為而家大部分呢個世代嘅人做工作，有啲未必真係好似以前嗰種長時間咁嘅，我哋而家喺呢個情況裏面都做緊一啲工夫。我哋個人事部嗰度都有一啲建議，係請唔同類型嘅人嚟呢間公司。

至於喺嗰個公司裏面令到啲員工個歸屬感強啲，其實亦都做咗好多工作，無論喺佢哋嗰個廠嗰個 depot 裏面優化佢哋嗰個設施，令到佢喺休息同埋譬如我哋做咗一啲有啲畀佢買嘢方便啲，或者幫佢哋剪頭髮，或者有啲休息嘅地方可以有啲譬如打乒乓波、gym room 嘅嘢。亦都喺佢哋喺個站頭裏面過去呢段時間亦都做咗好多嘅工作，令到佢喺個站頭亦都舒適啲，呢個係做咗都幾多。

仲有就喺佢個生活方面，個 lifestyle 方面，我哋亦都做咗好多 recreation 嘅 club，好似係足球，令到好多--因為車長嘅數目都係比較多係男性，就希望佢哋喺工作以外都有啲活動令到好多大家啲同事可以聚埋一齊，唱歌會等等嘅嘢。

亦都我哋嘅主席吩咐我哋成立咗呢個獎學金，希望好多啲公司嗰啲員工啲家屬都可以有個機會可以幫--有啲嘢幫到佢啲細路仔可以讀大學等等，好多嘢都希望可以挽留一啲同事之餘，亦都可以希望吸引一啲新嘅人做我哋嘅車長。

呢個工作係知道唔容易，亦都知道因為個短缺嘅問題，我哋向呢個方向會繼續做。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，或者我哋個 managing director 李生都講咗我哋嗰個喺招募或者喺嗰個挽留人才方面做咗啲工夫，我想係集中講一講我哋有啲乜嘢嘅軟件，喺行動上，喺嗰個車務運作上，我哋係過去係做咗，而係去 address 呢啲 crew shortage 嘅問題。

正話李生講咗一啲嘅硬件，例如休息室等等，我就唔再補充，不過喺另一方面，我哋而家嗰個車務運作，我哋係希望儘量做到係人性化啲啲，我哋就希望係可以加強嗰啲車長嘅歸屬感，減少佢哋個離職嗰個比例、比率，亦都係做咗好多鼓勵嘅工作，就去針對有啲車長嗰個病假嘅申請。另外，我哋亦都係不時咁樣去優化我哋嗰個嘅行車時間，亦都係極力希望能夠提供一啲充足嘅行車時間同埋一啲休息嘅時間。

就住車長申請假期、調更、調假、崗位嘅調配、休息日嘅申請，我哋全部都係儘量做到人性化，我哋亦都係會接受車長，譬如話口述又或者正式入申請去做一啲調更、調假、調崗位等等。我喺 4 月亦都係做咗一個問卷，就畀啲車長去選擇一啲嘅工作嘅安排，因為每個車長，其實佢哋可能嗰個需要都係有啲唔同，有啲可能要八個鐘頭嘅工時，有啲可能佢想做十個鐘頭嘅工時等等，我哋亦都係儘量係去--我用個字就係用「儘量去遷就」或者「儘量去 facilitate」，facilitate 佢哋嘅 requests 嘅。

另外，琴日我都講咗我哋嘅車長面對好多嘅問題，有啲係客觀嘅問題，例如佢哋受到滋擾，我哋琴日都講咗，盡咗好多工夫。另外，我哋亦都係加強咗前線督導人員嘅訓練，喺 6 月我哋係同我哋有二百位嘅車務主任同埋各級嘅督察，我哋做咗一個訓練課程，係兩天嘅，總共我哋係搞咗八個 courses。喺個訓練課程裏面，其實我哋都係強化點樣可以支援到前線車長，當佢哋遇到困難嘅時候，我哋點樣去處理。

另外，我哋亦都同其他政...

主席：（經傳譯員）有啲乜嘢嘅困難？你話佢哋面對困難。

彭樹雄先生：主席，佢哋主要係幾樣嘢嘅，第一，車長可能會遇到一啲交通意外，車長可能會遇到一啲我琴日所講嘅 abusive 嘅事件。我哋就係強化咗我哋嗰啲車務主任同埋嗰啲督察點樣去現場協助車長處理交通意外，點樣可以強化到我哋前線嘅督導人員點樣能夠提供一個適切嘅幫助畀車長。

我哋公司亦都係搵咗我哋內部，我哋搵咗一啲專職交通意外調查、法律部嘅律師，甚至乎我哋都請埋香港警務處道路安全小組亦都係嚟講咗--每一次都嚟，就兩個鐘頭嘅安全駕駛、道路安全等等。我哋係 6 月舉行，就呢個我哋覺得啲同事嗰個評價，睇得到係非常之高。呢個亦都係我哋希望強化我哋嗰個嘅前線管理，從而令到我哋畀到前線車長嗰個幫助係更加多。

另外車長每日面對嘅問題其實都係好多，例如交通越嚟越擠塞，道路嘅車輛嘅數目同道路嘅增長完全唔成一個正比，違例泊車亦都多，違例泊喺巴士站裏面嘅車亦都多，因為正正呢個問題，好多時交通阻塞，好多時違例泊車令到我哋嘅車長不但只行車時間係要加長，更甚嘅就係好多時因為行車時間又或者因為咁樣脫班，其實我哋車長係面對一個好沉重嘅壓力。好多嘅言語上嘅衝突，甚至乎肢體上嘅衝突，其實正正就係因為嗰個客觀嘅因素而引致到有所發生。

交通個違泊，違例泊車，特別係巴士站，大家應該要明白我哋好多嘅輪椅客，我哋嘅巴士一定係要停正喺嗰個巴士站，嗰啲輪椅客先至能夠有一個 curb 位係可以上到車，但係正正就係因為有某啲違例嘅泊車...

主席：（經傳譯員）彭生，鄧律師就唔係一個開放式嘅問題就係讓你選擇係你想答晒你想講嘅嘢嘅。我哋想知道就係有啲咩嘢設施，你就講咗加強呢個培訓，除此之外，仲有啲咩嘢想講呢？

彭樹雄先生：其實我想總結，就係話其實我哋車長面對好多嘅困難，我哋其實係每一個困難喺度慢慢去同佢哋解決，所以其實呢個對於嗰個所謂 retention，其實，主席，我想你--希望你明白，呢個其實對於車長嗰個嘅壓力，其實同佢嗰個 retention 或者佢留任係有一個直接影響。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋明白，...

彭樹雄先生：多謝主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）...其實你重複講咗佢哋有咩壓力。我哋其實剛才問題就話你用啲咩措施，我諗你已經講咗你係現有㗎喇，李生想講，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：彭生講嗰樣嘢，譬如車長佢行車嘅時候，佢喺嗰個--佢架車唔啷呢，佢喺架車--即係等如好塞車嘅時候，對佢嗰個精神壓力係好大，好多車長而家係經常都講緊係好辛苦，因為塞車嘅關係，因為車塞車係辛苦過揸車，我諗好多人都知，所以彭生嘅意思就話我哋做嘅嘢就係好多時同啲政府--提點佢啲道路擠塞或者啲道路係嗰啲路面嘅條件好差，我哋係做緊呢啲 initiative 嘅嘢，呢個可以從而幫到個車長喺塞車嘅時間，或者嗰啲路面嗰個 condition 可以有啲改善，令到佢嗰個舒服啲，我諗呢啲都係我哋嘅 initiatives。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋係向邊一個政府部門係提出呢啲投訴呢？

李澤昌先生：你講緊係關於嗰啲路面嗰啲，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。

李澤昌先生：我諗有幾個嘅，一個就當然係警務處，因為有啲違例嘅泊車或者係啲 loading and loading 嗰啲，會擋住個巴士站，令到個巴士司機泊唔到站，就好似頭先彭生講搞個輪椅嗰個板嘅時候又搞唔到。有啲乘客就會要好辛苦咁上車，呢個我記得係上年有一件事就係喺中環干諾道發生嗰件事。另外有個情況就係當...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你重複緊你講嘅說話。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一個就係警隊，另外呢？

李澤昌先生：一個就係運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。有冇其他部門？

彭樹雄先生：我哋個別都有路政署，因為嗰啲路面嗰個 condition 可能冇咁好，另外 FEHD，食環署...

主席：（經傳譯員）你話個路面情況，係個路面...

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，路面譬如話凹陷，路面有一啲嘅障礙物。另外我哋喺雨季...

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇其他部門？

彭樹雄先生：食環署，食物環境衞生署，一啲樹喺嗰啲路，特別係郊區，雨季之後好多樹伸咗出嚟係撞到我哋啲巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰啲樹就需要係修剪、路上嘅障礙物，另外就係塞車同埋就係違

例泊車就警方？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有冇其他部門呀？

彭樹雄先生：大致上都係咁，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）整體嚟講，政府有咩嘢回應呢？或者李生就可以總結一下，就簡單咁講，係滿唔滿意呢，你哋？

李澤昌先生：可以快啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係都有做，不過你話佢哋應該係做得快啲？

李澤昌先生：有啲係靠自己去做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）違例泊車，喺巴士站違例泊車同埋其他地方違例泊車解決咗未？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）未全部解決晒，特別係夜晚。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）交通擠塞，呢個問題解決咗未呢？

李澤昌先生： No.

彭樹雄先生： No.

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你點答呀？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）冇，未呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）車長裏面有幾多個百分比係女性呢？

蘇偉基先生：大約6%嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇措施就係吸引更多嘅女性嚟到係擔任呢個崗位呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個係有嘅，我哋亦都係有啲探討，呢個特別喺我哋屯門嘅車廠，我哋會做得多啲，因為嗰度係住宅區多啲，我哋招聘嗰陣時都係會 equal opportunity，但係我哋真係想吸納多啲女性嘅車長。呢度我哋有諗過就有啲設施可以配到畀我哋女性嘅車長，舉例如，佢可能係一個 housewife 主婦，如果有一啲育兒、nursery 嘅設施，我哋可以喺個廠某啲地方撥到出去，我相信係有幫助，但係確實而家我哋用地嗰度係有個限制，我哋係未做到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅考慮有冇引致你哋就係做咗啲咩措施嚟到係吸引佢哋申請呢？

蘇偉基先生：另外我哋亦都喺嗰個崗位嗰度設計到有啲叫做半職嘅車長，意思即係話佢工時短啲或者佢每周返嘅工作天會短啲，就適合一啲需要照顧小朋友嘅母親去擔崗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁樣樣有冇令到你哋大大咁增加咗女性擔任車長呢？

蘇偉基先生：喺申請嗰度係有幫助，頭先我哋亦都講多一樣，就係話儘可能我哋喺我哋巴士總站嘅設施嗰啲嘅洗手間就係男、女廁係分開，如果我哋喺--儘可能做得到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就而家想請大家係攞張投影片出嚟，呢個就會係總結咗九巴同埋龍運巴士嗰個喺近年嚟嗰個盈利嘅，去到 2011 至到 2017 年嗰個情況嘅，呢啲就係喺你哋嘅報告嗰度就係抽出嚟嘅，或者我解釋一下呢啲圖表，首先就係 2011 年至到 2017 年九巴嘅盈利，你呢度見到係頂頭嗰度亦都有講咗佢喺邊一個文件夾嗰度攞出嚟，就係 KMB-6，喺呢個稅後嘅盈利，你呢度就可以睇到，就由 2011 年一路去到係 2017 年嘅。

喺呢個圖表嗰度大家可以睇到喺 2012 年、2013 年係有虧損嘅，嗰度見到就係五千一百萬同埋二千一百萬嘅，分別係。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁講公唔公道呢，自從 2013 年到而家，公司嘅盈利就係都穩步咁樣樣上升嘅，咁講啱唔啱呢？

李澤昌先生： Not fair comment.

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）同意，不過呢度有原因嘅，鄧律師，或者我可以解釋一下公司嘅財政狀況，我想講番九巴同埋龍運第一份嘅陳述書嘅第 93 頁，或者借用嗰份文件就可以更好咁解釋一下我哋公司嘅財務狀況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒梁博士。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，我想講就係我哋而家都仲係喺好困難嘅情況底下係營運專營巴士嘅服務嘅，我想請大家睇一睇呢個圖表，係，鄧律師，你講得啱嘅，喺 2012 年我哋有一個虧損，就係五千一百萬，喺 2013 年，我哋個虧損就係二千一百萬元嘅，當你哋話我哋之後係穩步咁樣係有呢個盈利，即係話由 2014 年至到 2017 年有咁嘅情況，不過我想指出一點嘅。

請你睇一睇 2016 年嗰個盈利嘅，我哋就係有六億一千八百萬，我請你睇睇嗰個燃油嘅成本，喺 2012 年嘅時候嗰個燃料嘅成本係十四億元嘅，喺 2013

年就係十四億，然後去到十二億，呢一個就2014年，因而讓我哋係可以有一個盈利嘅，盈利就係一億九千七百萬元。

如果你睇番2016年嘅利潤，我哋嘅利潤係6.8億，但係如果你睇番我哋喺燃油度慳到嘅開支，嗰一年我哋只係花咗6.24億喺燃油度嘅。換句話講，喺2016年，我哋嘅收入係輕微上升，但係我哋嘅利潤上升唔係因為收入增加，而係因為我哋喺燃油度慳到嘅錢係多咗。而到2017年，利潤就同我哋慳到嘅燃油成本係相等嘅，我就想指出呢一點。

我亦都想指出喺舊年，即係2017年，我哋嘅員工開支就係達到三十六億，呢個大概係等如營運開支嘅六成，員工嘅開支係會繼續上升，每年都會上升嘅，因為每年都會有一個工資調整嘅。你見到我哋完全係控制唔到呢一類嘅成本嘅，所以我就想向委員會指出我係一直係致力係促進我哋員工嘅福祉，因為佢哋對公司係非常重要，我哋係希望服務大家，所以我會竭盡所能去改善我哋員工嘅福祉，希望我哋係可以請多啲巴士車長同埋係可以挽留我哋現有嘅車長。

但係我都好明白我哋已經面對咗車長短缺多年，但係我哋要睇番香港嘅市場情況，現時香港嘅失業率係百分之二點八，幾乎係一個全民就業嘅狀態，我哋講過輸入勞工，呢方面我哋係冇嘢可以做到嘅，但係我哋嘅策略就係改善我哋巴士車長嘅薪酬，而我哋希望其他--即係揸其他商用車輛嘅司機亦都係會加入我哋嘅，我哋係希望將業界其他嘅司機吸引嚟加入九巴同埋龍運，呢個就係我哋就住車長嘅策略。

我非常明白係好難係吸引新血去成為車長，正如管理層亦都講過，關於因為呢個工作嘅環境、乘客嘅態度等等，但係我可以向你保證，我會繼續竭盡所能去提升我哋員工嘅福祉，希望我哋可以解決車長短缺嘅問題，多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝梁博士。你提到一點就係你有一個策略去改善車長嘅薪酬，你可唔可以透露一下呢個策略嘅詳情？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）基本上我哋係講緊車長嘅薪酬，喺舊年12月嘅董事局會議，我哋傾過，我哋決定就將呢一個花紅納入為呢一個底薪之中，而我哋亦都向委員會透露我哋會進一步提升車長級別嘅薪酬，我哋會將個增薪點由8個增加到20個嘅，所以我哋係講緊薪酬同埋我哋車長嘅工作環境嘅。我哋係會繼續努力去吸引新血加入我哋嘅公司。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋今日稍後會講到你哋新車長嘅起薪點嘅。你提到呢一個燃油嘅成本等等，有乜嘢計劃去提升你哋車長嘅起薪點或者係底薪去吸引多啲人入嚟呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）假設我哋要請一個新車長，當時我哋實質我啱啱提到嘅措施之後，再加上每年嘅增薪點，喺2018年稍後實施新措施，即係當工會同意之後，我預計新嘅巴士車長嘅薪金大概月薪係23,000鈲，大概23,000鈲，呢

個係講緊工時十個鐘，大概收入係$23,000。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪即係每日十個鐘，每個星期六日呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。正如我所講，我哋希望有一啲嘅商業車輛嘅司機係會考慮加入我哋公司，同時係希望可以吸引到新血，呢個就係我哋嘅策略。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋公司有冇引入任何嘅措施去吸引年輕人加入呢？我哋琴日睇到一啲數據，我哋見到年輕人嘅數目係比中年人係少好多嘅。

李澤昌先生：有嘅，有嘅，我會畀少少時間我哋嘅 HR 嗰邊傾一傾。嗰個問題係其實今日，如果你講一個男性嘅車長，佢係喺個--頭先啱啱講咗嗰個實際嗰個勞動量其實係有限，所以除咗係個人工之外，好多工作嘅人其實--就算係前線嘅員工，唔係單講個人工，亦都講嗰個環境、待遇，其實巴士公司，我哋都提升咗譬如係嗰啲家屬卡，即係佢可以坐巴士係免費或者係有一啲喺我哋巴士公司可以做到嘅--營造個環境畀佢，相反個問題就係問，即係頭先你講緊譬如嗰啲女性車長係 5 至 6%，其實香港嘅男性同女性其實嗰個量唔係相差遠嘅，嗰度係一個好大嘅市場我哋去諗。

就你講緊我哋仲有啲乜嘢嘅要諗去做嗰樣嘢，或者蘇生可以補充少少。

蘇偉基先生：唔該，我哋係致力請一啲年輕嘅車長，...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）特別係年輕人。

梁乃鵬先生： Young people.

蘇偉基先生：Young people，冇錯，首先我哋就喺招聘嘅途徑嗰度，我哋除咗傳統用報章，我哋用啲社交嘅媒體，social media，因為呢啲就先可以接觸到younger generation，我哋亦都可以喺我哋公司嘅福利嗰度考量，正如頭先所講，我哋嗰啲康樂會，我相信對一啲年青一代會吸引啲，舉例如，係有啲係體育嘅活動，踢波、籃球、羽毛球或者係唱歌呢啲。

我哋亦都喺嗰個--頭先彭生講，編更嗰度係適合佢，佢哋有佢自己日常嘅作息，亦都喺個廠嗰度設立一啲康樂嘅設施吸引一啲年輕嘅人，我哋亦都喺廠車嘅接送嗰度，我哋做得更加滲透啲，就算佢住得遠啲，亦都唔好因為有所考慮係唔走入嚟。

我哋亦都喺 promotion 嗰度儘量主動，舉例如，我哋過往嗰半年嚟亦都舉辦多次嘅招聘日、開放日，喺車廠或者喺個巴士總站嗰度有我哋外展嘅招聘員工團隊去接觸一啲稍為年青嘅，希望佢哋新入行，呢啲就係我所講嘅舉措。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你見唔見到有任何改善，就住年輕人嘅方面？

李澤昌先生：有嘅，我哋譬如啱啱想講嗰個係個車廠，我哋九巴有四個車廠，我哋開放個車廠嘅時候，就個車廠裏面除咗係有一啲車廠嘅設施，就吸引多啲年青

人，特別帶埋佢啲仔女嚟一齊參觀個車廠，等佢一家人知道如果佢爸爸或者佢媽媽做呢個職業嘅時候，嗰個環境係吸引到嘅，呢過去呢幾個月。

彭樹雄先生：另外，Mr Duncan，我想補充一個點啫，就係正話蘇生講咗，我哋為咗吸引年青啲嘅...

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我只係想知道呢啲嘅措施係咪有實際係得到任何嘅改善呢？

彭樹雄先生：我可以講係慢慢、慢慢有啲成效，特別係我哋希望我哋唔想一啲年青嘅車長覺得佢哋做車長係好似一啲所謂 dead end 嘅一種工種，我哋過去嗰九個月，我哋亦都係有好多嘅升級，包括直接由車長升督察，車長甚至升車務主任，其實我哋一路都做緊。我哋希望真係可以鼓勵到，亦都能夠真係可以 motivate 到一啲年青人加入我哋巴士嘅行列，呢個就係我哋真係好想做嘅。多謝 Mr Duncan。

李澤昌先生：過往係比較少一啲車長係升做 inspector，然後再去寫字樓，而家我哋係希望喺呢度--即係呢個 internal 個公司會做緊呢樣嘢。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）基本上我哋對於一啲有才華嘅年輕人係有一個特快嘅晉升機會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）成為你哋車長有冇一個最低嘅年齡限制？

蘇偉基先生：可唔可以重複個問題？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）要加入你哋公司做車長，有冇一個最低嘅年齡要求？會唔會係二十幾歲或者三十歲？

蘇偉基先生：只要求職人佢有三年嘅私家車嘅駕駛執照，我哋都會考慮。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。梁博士，你喺稍早之前就係講過嘅，就係講及呢個加票價。我想問，政府當局對上係幾時批准過你哋加車費嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：2014年。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）委員會有聽過有個乜嘢嘅機制係可以係增加呢個票價，或者係點樣去考慮呢個票價增加嘅申請嘅，我想問你哋公司有冇喺2014年之後申請過加價呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇嘅，或者亦都要解釋一下我哋嗰個立場嘅話，或者係想請你哋睇番呢個第95頁，同一個文件夾嘅第95頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好呀，唔該。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）第 95 頁，我哋係要申請嘅，我哋要根據一個方程式去申請加價嘅。喺第 33 段嗰度，第(vi)--唔係十六，對唔住，係第(vi)小段嗰度

列咗有一個方程式出嚟嘅，嗰度就講咗，0.5 去乘工資指數嘅改變，再加 0.5 係乘呢一個係消費物價指數嘅改變，然後就減 0.5 去乘嗰個係生產力嘅增長。如果用呢條算式計咗出嚟，而見到佢係等如或者係超過百分之二嘅話，我哋就可以向政府申請就係加價嘅。呢個就係嗰個觸發點。

不過喺過去嗰兩年，由於我哋嘅利潤，你知喇。當然另外仲有一樣嘢嘅，如果我哋嘅盈利係去到百分之九十七，呢個係以我哋嗰個資產淨值嚟到計嘅--平均資產淨值嚟到去計算嘅，如果超過嘅話，我哋亦都唔能夠申請加價嘅，所以 2016 年同埋 2017 年嘅情況就咁，我哋就不能係申請係調整票價嘅，因為就係唔可以根據呢個公式去申請加價嘅。

好唔同嗰個大哥，係地鐵，佢哋係自動可以加價，唔需要申請嘅，我哋嚟講，就唔同我哋係要申請去調整價格嘅，往往都係唔能夠加足我哋所申請嗰個幅度嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。好明顯我跟住就想問呢個問題，梁博士，你對於呢一條方程式，你滿意唔滿意呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你對呢條方程式你滿意唔滿意呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）當然，如果你問滿唔滿意，梗係唔係喇，你點可以係期望我會話係滿意呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇咩嘢提議呢？即係應該係嗰個方程式係點寫呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋同運房局已經傾咗幾年㗎喇，到而家我哋都唔成功，我哋只能夠繼續同佢哋講，希望可以說服到佢哋就係話而家係時候要去檢討同埋改變嗰個方程式。

李澤昌先生：呢個 formula 有一個最大嘅問題就係佢係睇緊過去嘅情況，然後你先至 apply 一個 fare，其實啱啱講緊人工同埋油價，其實好多都係將來嘅情況。呢個 picture 如果永遠都係好似啱啱--好似而家我哋嘅油價係升咗，但係過去嗰一年、兩年，個油價係跌嘅，其實係有少少我哋滯後嘅，即係反映唔到，可以咁講。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席先生，對唔住，我漏咗一個好重要嘅一點，呢一個油價，油價其實喺呢個方程式嗰度冇加埋落去嘅，我哋知道係譬如話用咗幾多錢係買呢個汽油，但係就呢度方程式反映唔到嘅，一個咁重要嘅元素，但係呢個方程式嗰度就係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）燃料唔係喺嗰個消費物價指數嗰度計算埋㗎？

陳祖澤先生： No.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁博士，請你睇番呢一個 THB 運房局嘅文件夾 2 號，特別係想請你睇呢個第 23 頁，THB-2 運房局 2 嘅第 23 頁，其實第 1 頁就係呢份文件嘅第一版，呢個係運房局發出嘅文件，嗰個標題就叫做「公共交通策略研究」，嗰個日期就係 2017 年嘅 6 月，你知唔知道係有份咁嘅文件？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）「公共交通策略研究」。你去睇一睇呢個第 23 頁，呢份文件嘅第 23 頁。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）你講 23？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）23，係。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你見到(d)嗰度就係話「票價調整安排」，見到嘛？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢個 4.25 段，你就會見到嗰個方程式，而實質上，你亦都係喺你個陳述書，喺第 95 頁嗰度亦都係包括咗呢啲文字嘅，不如我請你睇跟住嗰版第 24 頁，就想請你就係睇第 4.28 段，嗰度就話之前所講嘅現有嘅安排就係喺 2006 年嘅時候就係引入嘅，呢個就係同立法會諮詢過之後做嘅，就係睇過 2009 年嘅檢討之後，呢一個安排係有將佢微調嘅。

2009 年就係政府係就呢一個票價調整嘅安排就係檢討過嘅，不過就基本上係保留嘅，不過個數據喺兩方面就係要加以就係調整嘅，呢度就講咗，第一，就係嗰個生產力嘅增長同埋嗰個乘客嘅優惠或者回贈計劃。呢度就有講就話百分之九點七，我諗剛剛你亦都係提過呢一個數字嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，就係嗰個固定資產平均淨值回報。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）政府就係有同專營巴士公司就係展開過商討嘅，亦都有講過就係有嗰兩項數據嘅更新嘅，政府就佢話會就預期喺 2018 年上半年就會將嗰個討論結果公布同埋將佢落實嘅，當然首先就係要得呢個特首會同行政會議嘅批准。喺方面，有冇聽過有啲咩進展、有咩嘢消息？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我係有同政府討論過呢個乘客嘅優惠計劃嘅。

蘇偉基先生：我可以補充...

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）唔好，唔好，等我講埋先，我有同政府係傾過嘅，我有香港政府講過嗰個乘客嘅優惠或者回贈計劃嘅，但係我哋仲未係達致一個共識嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度就講話係會交由行政長官會同行政會議去考慮嘅，

同埋亦都講過話係預期2018年嘅上半年係落實嘅，呢方面有冇咩消息呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）冇，直到今日都係冇實施嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度所講及嘅建議，即係睇番第25頁頂頭嗰度嘅建議，如果係獲接納嘅話，會唔會就係釋除你嘅疑慮呢？即係關乎呢一個票價調整安排方面你嘅擔心嘅地方？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，直到今日，我哋都仲未知道嗰個檢討嘅結果，亦都唔知道佢哋係有上到去行政會議嘅，呢個應該未發生嘅，你睇到呢度所講嘅就係--或者不如咁，我哋睇番另一版，4.29段最尾嗰度就話嗰個顧問建議就係百分之九點七呢個觸發點就應該稍為向下微調嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你讀緊係邊一段呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）第25頁。

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）4.29段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我搵到喇，唔該晒。

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個百分之九點七嘅觸發點，嗰個觸發嘅水平，如果係要改嘅話，純粹從財務嘹到計，對九巴嚟講，係壞消息嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）以而家嘅情況嚟到計，亦都從九巴嘅角度，睇嚟，就係即時嚟講，就唔會係喺呢一個票價安排方面係有啲乜嘢--對你嚟講係一個改善，咁樣嘅總結啱唔啱呢？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁博士，剛才就講到地鐵就係大佬，你哋係細佬，個情況就係會繼續。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係窮親戚。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家想講番嗰個培訓。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我有一個關於成本嘅問題，你提到燃油嘅價格係會影響你哋公司嘅收入，你見到咁多年嚟個情況有冇穩定過呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）政府會係叫九巴去自己處理呢個問題嘅，喺多年前我哋係同政府去討論即係徵收一個附加費嘅可能性嘅，即係喺我哋嘅車費當中，呢個附加費就係因為燃油價格大幅上升嘅，但係最後政府就不同意，所以就冇實行到。

當然我哋考慮過好多唔同嘅方案，喺呢方面係節省成本嘅，但係我哋就決定就冇採納任何對沖嘅安排，因為我哋認為就住油價去對沖唔係一個好嘅選擇

嚟嘅。不幸地，我哋見到國泰航空嘅例子，佢哋係因為對沖而係虧損咗好多嘅。

我哋同期油嘅供應商係取得共識，佢哋係會以某一個年期，譬如話三年，向我哋供應燃油，然後我哋就同意咗呢個汽油價格嘅一個上限，我哋同意嘅上限就係每桶 85 美元嘅。如果汽油嘅價格係超過 85 美元，我哋仍然都只需要係畀 85 美元一桶嘅啫。

另一方面，如果汽油嘅價格下降到每桶 40 或者 45 美元，我哋亦都係只需要畀呢一個市價嘅啫，即係最低嘅價格係 45 美元一桶嘅，暫時我哋冇一個咁嘅最低價格。

李澤昌先生：或者我喺呢度補充，其實我哋就冇 hedge 到 oil 嘅，因為油價係佔我哋個基礎好大，主席頭先講咗，就係我哋其實係同啲油公司有一個協議，就係我哋係 cap 咗佢嗰個 gas oil，即係個 crude oil，你睇下個牌價，加多辣個十零蚊嘅就係 gas oil，咁 cap 咗 85 蚊。85 蚊以上嘅我哋就唔會再畀多過，但係以下，我哋畀緊佢嘅 spot rate，然後再加一個 premium，即係當然呢個係我哋之間一個 trading 嘅銀碼，我唔方便講，即係話喺個 floor -- 其實我哋頭嗰兩年都冇-- floor 都冇乜意思，因為 gas oil 唔會變零嘅，大概都係三十五、四十蚊嘅，我哋而家嚟緊都有一個 floor，大約係四十零蚊嘅，我哋就會 trade 緊喺嗰個之間裏面，咁係為咗保護自己。

就我哋其實就將嗰個 risk 就畀咗個油公司去做，我哋發覺呢個係--即係好似主席講，呢個係自己係諗方法去 protect 番我哋喺油 cost 係佔都差唔多--曾經佔過 20%我哋嗰個 expenses，都相當之犀利。

另外有一個都要講嘅，就係我哋嗰個 toll charge 嗰個都相當之高嘅，因為好多人都唔知道其實我哋 KMB 係照畀足過海隧道費，無論係政府嘅隧道，我哋都畀足，呢個都係相當之高嘅，所以我哋係呢幾個大嘅數據我哋係睇得都幾緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番呢個培訓嘅問題，請大家搋去 KMB-1 文件冊嘅 145 頁，我哋睇緊 2018 年 2 月 10 號嘅行動計劃，係呈交咗畀運輸署嘅當日，喺第 3 段，即係第 145 頁嘅第 3 段至到第 147 頁嘅第 7 段，我哋就見到培訓嘅行動計劃，我就想先講第 3 段，入面就講到個問題就係琴日我哋都有提過嘅，「所以所有嘅車長嘅申請人係會有同樣嘅要求嘅」...

黃祥明先生：同意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）...「無論佢哋係全職或者係兼職都好」，啱唔啱呀？

黃祥明先生：其實喺嗰個時間之後，我哋已經冇再招聘 part-time，所以全部都係用呢個準則去聘請嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）會唔會有一啲兼職車長每日係--或者每日工作--或者每

星期工作超過十八小時呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢哋係會接受相同嘅訓練，係咪呀？即係同全職車長去比較。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。就請你自己睇睇呢個新培訓計劃嘅內容，就係喺第3至6段列咗出嚟嘅，同埋第7段，就住第7段，佢就話「九巴嘅駕駛導師數目應該係增加到110名」，而根據行動計劃，呢啲申請人必須喺18年嘅6月30日前完成所有嘅培訓同埋考試，先至可以完成一個有八十一位駕駛導師嘅團隊，Has that been completed?

黃祥明先生：已經係完成咗，而家我哋已經係有八十一位嘅訓練導師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家想你睇另一份嘅文件冊，就係TD-1，第403頁。呢份文件就係今年7月由運房局發出嘅，呢個就係7月25號係呈交畀立法會嘅，你見唔見到？

黃祥明先生：有，見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺403頁就係一啲背景資料，佢係關於成立一個工作小組嘅，就係就住2月10號嘅嗰一宗意外嘅，你見唔見到呀？

黃祥明先生：係，見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你見到喺(a)同(b)段，就係描述咗嗰個覆蓋嘅範圍或者工作範圍，其中一項工作就係去檢討專營巴士營運商嘅培訓安排。

黃祥明先生：係，喺(b)項嗰度有咁寫。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺頁底就係有一個註釋就講到呢一個工作小組嘅組成嘅，就包括咗五個專營巴士營運商同埋巴士製造商同埋運輸署嘅，我想問在座各位有冇人係呢一個工作小組嘅成員？

蘇偉基先生：如果講番九巴同埋龍運巴士，係由我本人蘇偉基、我哋車務總監梁健宏同埋我哋培訓部嘅主管黃先生呢三位係代表呢兩間公司。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪仲有個--即係另一個--轄下嘅小組係處理一啲技術嘅問題？

蘇偉基先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）九巴係邊個去代表呢一個小組呢？

梁健宏先生：技術層面嗰度就係我本人同埋我另外一位工程師。

黃祥明先生：有關訓練就係由我去出席呢個會議。

主席：（經傳譯員）另外一位工程師嘅名字係乜嘢呀？即係出席個小組。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）佢叫做 Ivan Ho。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃先生，喺呢一個培訓小組，你係咪唯一嘅代表呀？

黃祥明先生：訓練係由我嘅，就喺呢個訓練方面係我一個人去出席嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第403頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺我哋繼續之前，鄧律師，你會唔會去了解一下其他嘅專營巴士公司同埋運輸署嘅代表係邊個？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係嘅，會嘅。邊個係代表運輸署出席呢？

蘇偉基先生：之前係由一個助理署長 Rachel Kwan 去做 chairperson，之後佢退休休假，就由副署長 Macella Lee 係喺嗰個 call meeting 係做 chairman。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇其他嘅代表？

蘇偉基先生：好多，當然我未可以喺而家逐一去記起佢哋嘅名字，分別係有一啲 principal transport officer、transport officer、senior transport officer，佢分別係來自--佢入面有個 floor 叫做係巴士及鐵路小組嘅，亦都有一啲係一個 road 嘅 engineering 嘅小組嘅出席，但係個別名稱我記唔到。

梁健宏先生：亦都有啲係...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲會議有冇會議紀錄㗎？

蘇偉基先生：有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向我哋提供？

蘇偉基先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就請你睇另一個文件夾，就係 CTB...

主席：（經傳譯員）首先，我哋可唔可以都得悉其他嘅專營巴士公司有派咗邊個代表定係你提供呢個會議紀錄度會顯示出嚟？

蘇偉基先生：可以，嗰度都見到佢嘅名字。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。想大家睇 CTB 同埋 NWFB-3 號文件冊嘅，喺 588 頁嗰度，你見到佢就係講及加強專營巴士安全工作小組，嗰個日期就係 18 年 3 月 13 號。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度就有個附件嘅，附件嗰個標題就係「加強專營巴士安全工作小組」。

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）去到 590 頁，見到嗰個標題就係話「成員」？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度有啲人名嘅，包括就係運輸署嘅代表，呢個幫唔幫到你呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）每次開會係咪都係同一班人呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）差唔多都係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，睇嚟呢度就係冇巴士製造商嘅代表名喺度嘅。

蘇偉基先生：喺 bus manufacturer，佢哋係出席嗰個叫做 technical subgroup 嘅 meeting，呢個係一個 main meeting，佢哋係冇出席嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。講到運輸署嘅代表，佢哋亦都有出席嗰啲下面嘅小組嘅會議嘅，係咪呀？

黃祥明先生：佢亦都喺呢個 subgroup 裏面就將呢度部分嘅運輸署同事就同其他，包括我在內嘅，專利巴士公司嘅同事係一齊開會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個下面嘅小組係邊個擔任主席呢？

黃祥明先生：如果我冇記錯，應該係 Amy Tse。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署嘅，係咪呀？

黃祥明先生：係，冇錯，佢係負責呢個 training 嗰面嘅。

梁健宏先生：Technical 個 subgroup 有幾個人都做過嘅，David Tsang 係做第一次嘅，之後亦都有佢--因為佢應該係退休，有其他佢啲代替者，包括最褸屘嗰次有個 Assistant Commissioner 陳英傑先生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺TD-1嘅403頁，嗰度就話主要嘅巴士製造商，都有邀請佢哋出席呢一個技術嘅小組嘅，有冇佢哋出席過呢啲技術小組嘅會議呢？

梁健宏先生：有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰度就有亞歷山大丹尼斯、富豪、猛獅，啲名就有喺度，邊一個有出席呢一個下面嘅工作小組嘅會議嘅？

梁健宏先生：Alexander Dennis就係Andrew Boulton，Volvo就係Julia，（經傳譯員）唔記得咗佢個姓，Jacky Chan就係都係代表富豪嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）富豪就係Julia，Jacky Chan係邊度？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）Jacky Chan都係富豪嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）猛獅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）Rex Wong係猛獅嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲係咪都係本港佢哋嘅代表呢，定抑或佢哋係主要喺海外嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係當地--我哋香港佢哋嘅工程師。Julia Lu，佢個姓英文係L-U。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才主席就問過，呢一啲工作小組係有冇會議紀錄嘅，你就話有嘅，亦都會提交嘅，至於底下工作小組--下面嘅小組個會議又有冇紀錄嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）由主席嚟到係分發畀小組嘅成員嘅，交畀我哋嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）包唔包括埋下面嘅小組嘅會議紀錄呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係有不同嘅會議紀錄嘅，係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你畀會議紀錄嘅時候，可唔可以唔係淨係畀工作小組，係底下嘅小組嘅都畀我哋，好唔好呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會你就好似係暗示而家係小休呢？我哋而家係休息二十分鐘，剛才你唔停，又冇出聲，二十分鐘。

<u>上午11時36分押聆訊押後</u>

上午11時58分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我哋頭先講到TD-1文件冊嘅403頁，呢個文件就係呈交畀立法會嘅，內容就係關於點樣改善專營巴士嘅安全。我有一個問題，正如文件第一句指出，呢啲係建議嘅措施嚟嘅，你哋公司認唔認為你哋係必須要採取呢啲措施呢，定係你哋公司係覺得呢啲只係建議嘅措施，即係正如文件所講？

蘇偉基先生：可以喺文件嘅413頁，annex A嗰度，佢每一個嘅recommendation都會係有一個time frame係畀業界去考慮，呢一個就係technical嗰方面嘅bus feature，如果係巴士車長培訓嗰個，佢有一個實務守則，業界係需要遵循，亦都喺個實務守則最屘嗰段就係加入咗公司本身係要有一個監控嘅程序，審計嘅程序，係要肯定嗰個實務守則係有遵從，亦都去番公司嘅董事會匯報。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番嗰啲技術事宜，我嘅理解啱唔啱呀，就係你哋就會做試驗，然後就作一個決定，就睇下有邊啲係可以落實嘅，係咪咁呀？

李澤昌先生：喺工程方面其實就已經好多都係進行緊㗎喇，佢係recommend，但係其實喺我哋公司角度嚟講，都係一定會係盡努力去嚴格去執行緊呢方面嘅嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔需要講嗰個文件嘅細節住嘅，不過睇份文件，你都會知道如果呢個建議全部都係落實嘅話，應該對於巴士車長嘅培訓以及巴士車長如何去履行佢嘅職責都會有好大影響嘅，同意嘛？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）同意。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋留意到工會同埋車長都冇代表喺呢一個工作小組嗰度嘅，我就想問你哋有冇諮詢呢個巴士車長，又或者有冇諮詢工會呢？即係當呢個工作小組開會嘅時候有冇咁做呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個我要講多少少，喺個working group入面，運輸署係冇邀請工會代表，喺個談-- discussion去到第三次會議，大家都知道有一個嘅guideline，就係個bus captain嘅training嘅guideline，就提議係由巴士公司自己個別按需要去同工會係有一個consultation，公司--我講緊係九巴、龍運睇到呢個guideline，其實佢係將當時所有巴士公司各自對巴士車長嘅培訓，大家就講晒然後你點樣做法，然之後運輸署就將佢融會，然之後就出咗一個實務守則。

喺呢個實務守則入面嘅嘢，公司係達到所有佢所講嘅要求，亦都係現時做緊嘅，所以我哋係冇同我哋嘅工會或員工去諮詢，原因係已經現有持之以恆執行緊，係冇新嘢嘅，對於九巴嚟講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個技術裝置嗰方面，呢度係有一啲建議係加啲咩嘢技術嘅裝置嘅，又想問下，同工會方面有冇咩諮詢呢？

蘇偉基先生：都係頭先所講，佢係交番畀公司去做個諮詢，我哋要睇番佢提議嘅幾個大點，佢第一個大點就係話全車--喺新添購置嘅車係有安全帶，今日喺九巴嘅車隊其實已經有四十四架車係全車有安全帶，有大部分嘅車長都有機會係駕駛過呢啲車輛㗎喇，好耐㗎喇，所以呢個唔係新事物。

第二樣嘢，佢嘅舉措，就係話要有一個實時嘅超速提示，咁呢樣喺早兩日嘅聽證會大家都知道，公司而家係有個實時嘅車速提示，亦都係現有㗎喇。運輸署可探討就係話除咗70咪，就要做埋50咪，我哋講咗好多，我唔重複喇。

第三個，喺嗰個 bus feature，就係話提示有睡眠嘅一個裝置，呢個公司用一個方式，就係話我哋就搵四部，用一個先導嘅形式，我哋純粹提示，我哋唔會記錄，亦都唔會因為咁而做一個紀律處分，就係希望車長真係試過，佢先至可以表達到究竟呢件裝置對佢哋有冇幫助。

所以其實喺 bus feature 嗰度，一，講咗，安全帶係現有㗎喇；提示睡眠，我哋用四部去吸納員工嘅意見；至於即時一個超速嘅提示，公司亦都係現有㗎喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。你講番嗰個實務守則，或者我哋可以係打番出嚟，我相信喺470嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係8月9號畀我哋嘅，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係。請你睇番463頁，就係呢一個文件夾嘅463頁，你會見到就係運輸署8月9號嘅函件，嗰度就係回應我哋專責委員會喺呢個7月23號發出嘅信件嘅，你喺471頁嗰度，至到473頁，嗰度就係有呢個實務守則，嗰個日期就係2018年嘅8月嘅，睇到嘛？

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，實務守則係邊度呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係471。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。我諗運輸署就話畀我哋聽呢個係7月就落實㗎喇，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，的而且確係有個情況係咁，主席。去四七--對唔住，係435頁--對唔住，應該去427頁，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個就睇到個日期，係咪呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係呀，嗰個就係運輸署嘅信嚟嘅。日期就係7月20號，嗰度亦都有個附件嘅。喺附件，你就係由428頁開始去到435頁嘅，嗰度第一個格嗰度就係話運輸署最近係發出咗一份實務守則係畀專營巴士營運商，呢個關乎係巴士車長嘅培訓等等。我想問運輸署係幾時係發出呢個實務指引畀九巴嘅？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係8月6號。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署有冇畀到嗰個守則你呢？即係喺8月6號之前有冇呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。（直接用本地話說）嗰個practice note係嗰個working group嘅output嚟嘅，佢喺7月25號上立法會個Transport Panel，佢係冇嗰個文件嘅，大家睇到。之後喺8月6號，我哋就收到一個傳真，佢就話正式係推出，要我哋執行。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）8月6號之前係咪已經向運輸署發出咗畀你哋呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔係正式嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話非正嘅，係咪之前有個非正式嘅畀你呢？

蘇偉基先生：可唔可以再問多一次？我掌握唔到個題目。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署就話畀委員會聽，書面陳述就話佢哋最近就係出咗個實務守則，佢哋就話畀我哋聽就係發畀呢一個專營巴士營運商嘅，就話係7月20號咁講嘅，所以佢哋亦都係提供咗一份文件，就日期係8月嘅，你話你哋係有一份日期係8月6號，有冇一個早啲嘅版本嘅實務守則呢？而佢哋嘅內容亦都同運輸署所講嘅係符合呢？

蘇偉基先生：我可以提供番我收到嘅乜嘢，之前嗰啲係嗰個會議嘅attachment，係一個discussion paper。

主席：（經傳譯員）你邊一日係收到嗰一個實務指引？

蘇偉基先生：8月6號。

主席：（經傳譯員）再早啲就冇？咩嘢形式都好，再早啲有冇呢？

蘇偉基先生：有，係一個attachment落嗰個-- as an attachment of呢個discussion paper of嗰個working group嘅meeting。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰份文件日期係幾時呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）8月中或者8月初。（直接用本地話說）我而家記唔到。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇文件副本？

蘇偉基先生：有。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以交畀我哋委員會呢？

蘇偉基先生：會。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該主席。好喇，我哋睇番呢個實務守則，TD-1 嘅 470 頁，我哋自己都睇到究竟嗰個內容係啲咩嘢嚟嘅，不過有一樣嘢就想問你嘅，係第 4 段，睇番 471 頁，講到嗰個最低要求，工作小組講到話入職培訓嘅時候就講咗，就話喺課堂培訓方面係有啲乜嘢嘅要求嘅，應該要幾多時間嘅，另外就係路上駕駛嘅培訓又應該有幾多時間嘅，呢度亦都係分開全職同兼職車長嗰個要求係點樣樣。

我想問，九巴--我哋係知道你哋較早時候有講過嗰個行動計劃，你就話打算所有嘅車長你都會無論佢係全職定抑或兼職都會係一視同仁，你哋係點睇呢？

黃祥明先生：喺討論呢個事項嘅時候，係其他嘅專營巴士公司都係出席嘅，每個公司因為佢個訓練方面都有唔同嘅條件或者佢哋嘅需求，所以運輸署就因應各個巴士公司嘅唔同情況，就訂定咗呢個最低嘅要求，我哋睇番呢個事項係寫「最低嘅要求」。所以有啲巴士公司佢哋係會仍然係聘請一啲嘅叫做 part-time 嘅車長，而我好清楚咁表示咗我哋九巴公司已經係停止咗聘請呢個 part-time 嘅車長，但係運輸署係需要因應其他嘅同行去制定呢個指引，所以訂定咗有埋呢個 part-time 車長嘅範疇喺裏面，但係呢個並不適用於九巴嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，公司喺自己嘅培訓嘅計劃裏面，即係你喺嗰個行動計劃已經列出你嗰個培訓計劃喇嘛，同埋喺其他交畀我哋嘅文件嗰度都有提過嘅，會唔會因而受影響要改呢？

黃祥明先生：冇嘅，我哋無需要更正或者更改，因為呢個提議係我哋九巴提出之後，佢運輸署因應而係制定。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我而家就唔再講培訓呢個話題，我就想講另一個議題嘅，請你睇 KMB-1 文件冊 129 頁嘅，原有嘅嗰份文件就係第 128 頁嘅，我就會睇番個翻譯本，就係 129-1 嗰一頁嘅，呢份就係聲明書，呢份文件嘅目標同埋作用係乜嘢呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢份 declaration 其實係喺 2、3 月，公司成立咗一個調查委員會，就著嗰個大埔意外之後嘅一個建議，個理念就係“know our employees”，我哋招聘車長，但係我哋確認要對我哋招聘嘅員工多啲認識，所以就喺幾個範疇嗰度透過呢張 declaration 去認知，第一，佢有冇喺外間係有其他嘅僱用，會唔會影響佢工作；第二，就係佢有冇一啲嚴重病歷，係會影響佢嘅工作；第三，佢有冇一啲過往違例駕駛嘅紀錄；去到第四，就係有冇一啲刑事嘅

紀錄。我哋喺做招聘嗰陣時就會睇嗰個投考人佢填嘅資料而作出一個嘅考慮係咪去招聘佢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺大埔意外之前，有冇任何嘅好似呢份咁嘅表格係要畀一啲申請人去填寫呢？

蘇偉基先生：冇咁仔細，但係相對嘅工作係有做嘅，舉例如，就係查佢嗰個違例駕駛，我哋係有做嘅，病歷，雖然唔使佢自己 declare，但係亦都係有入職前嘅驗身。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰份表格有冇包括係即係要填寫申請人有冇其他嘅工作呢？

蘇偉基先生：之前係冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇嗰份舊表格嘅版本可以提供呢？

蘇偉基先生：可以提供。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你提供。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係邊個需要填寫呢份聲明書呢？

蘇偉基先生：申請職位嗰個投考人。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢份表格係咪喺聘請申請人嘅時候需要簽署㗎？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司係持續去進行啲乜嘢嘅檢查去睇下究竟全職同埋兼職員工喺外面有啲咩嘢工作呢？

蘇偉基先生：我哋係有賴嗰個投考人佢自己做一個 declaration，佢係一個 in good faith 去填佢嘅資料。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，當有人係開始工作嘅時候，即係譬如話如果有個員工係為你工作咗五年，有冇任何持續嘅聲明要求呢，或者有冇其他嘅措施去了解譬如話一名兼職嘅車長喺外面有冇其他嘅工作呢？

蘇偉基先生：我哋自己入面有個員工嘅手冊 staff handbook，入面亦都有規定員工如果係從事外間嘅兼職，係需要申報嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你係完全依賴員工去申報啲咩嘢資料畀你，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：佢係有責任，因為嗰個員工手冊係所有好多規矩都擺晒喺度，佢係需要遵循嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋採取咗啲咩措施係去執行員工手冊入面嘅規矩呢？

蘇偉基先生：如果發覺佢冇遵從，而我哋發覺外面有兼職，我哋會有紀律處分，亦都過往我哋發覺我哋有車長係做啲咁嘅嘢，係解僱咗嘅，嗰個同事。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係有冇任何檢查或者盡職審查嘅工作呢？

蘇偉基先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇任何措施去改變呢個情況呢？換句話講，即係公司會唔會有一啲嘅檢查嘅安排去了解員工可能參與嘅其他嘅工作呢？

蘇偉基先生：會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）琴日...

主席：We didn't get a translation of the answer.

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋會主動考慮。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋冇收到任何嘅聘用合約嘅，會唔會係提供呀？

蘇偉基先生：我哋會提供。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我請你揭去第109頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先係咪完成咗呢個議題喇？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提到員工手冊，你知唔知係喺文件冊入面嘅頁數係幾多呀？鄧律師，你知唔知道係邊一頁呀？我哋就可以好快咁睇一睇。

蘇偉基先生：如果我搵到，我提供。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋有嗰個附錄嘅頁數，就係附錄 1a-iii-7 嘅應該係。呢個就係戶外車務嘅員工手冊嘅，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：喺呢個 bundle KMB-8, page 3072，第 1 點。（經傳譯員）英文版，就喺3042頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。呢個就係關乎全職嘅員工嘅，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）就住兼職員工，有冇任何安排呢？

蘇偉基先生：正如頭先所講，而家我哋嘅車長係符合每周十八小時，連續四周，係一個持續性嘅僱用，我哋當咗佢根本係一個 full-time employment，所以佢都要受呢個 1.8 嘅條款係約束。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺大埔交通意外之前，當你聘請兼職車長嘅時候，有冇一個要求係要求佢哋申報其他嘅工作，喺聘請佢哋嘅時候？

蘇偉基先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）至於你哋嘅前員工又係點呢？佢哋而家可能係可以工作十個鐘或者十八個鐘，你會當佢哋係全職員工定係兼職員工呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）全職員工。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果佢哋有睇呢個要求，佢哋知唔知道--即係佢哋會唔會當自己係全職員工，當佢哋睇呢本員工手冊嘅時候？

蘇偉基先生：佢哋係我哋曾經嘅僱員，佢哋退休之後，從事--退休再續聘，所以佢哋係得悉呢個 1.8 嘅條款。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇計劃去修改條款 1.8 呢，就住呢啲招聘安排？

蘇偉基先生：會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請睇番 KMB-1 文件冊第 109 頁，呢個就係有一啲嘅詳情，就住車長嘅薪酬，首先想你睇下呢一個月薪水平，喺 2004 年之前聘請嘅員工同埋 2004 年之後聘請嘅員工，就有一個比較，你可唔可以解釋點解兩者之間有區別？

蘇偉基先生：呢度要講啲歷史，因為喺 2003 年，大家知道香港嘅經濟唔係好，當時係有個 SARS，喺 2003 年，公司係冇招聘新嘅車長，當然當時亦都個車務係有個萎縮喺度。喺 2004 之後，我哋再請番新嘅車長，因應當時嗰個勞工市場，當時個市場嘅工資水平，我哋對新入職嘅車長係有一個嘅調節，反應番當時市場，所以同係月薪車長，我哋分咗兩組，一組就係 2004 前佢哋現有--嗰時嘅薪酬我哋唔會改變佢，但係喺 2004 之後，就因應番當時嗰個嘅就業市場經濟環境，我哋係按市場水平係畀咗個工資出嚟，所以分開兩組。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋睇番(E)項，就係呢一個分更嘅津貼，喺 2018 年嘅指引度有提到呢一個分更嘅津貼嘅。

蘇偉基先生：幾樣嘢要講一講先，2018 年嗰個 guideline，正如之前我哋講，係喺 2019 年第二季實行嘅，現時公司遵循政府嗰個嘅 guideline 就係每日十四小時，其中十一就係可以做駕駛職務，即係話有三小時係休息，公司而家係有同事係行走呢個叫做 split duty，當 assign 呢個 split duty 畀佢，佢就

會申領有個 allowance，就一千九百五十幾紋，佢中間大約係有三個小時係休息，呢三個小時，我哋用呢一個 allowance 畀佢。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，你目前就係跟番 2010 年嘅指引？

蘇偉基先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個分段更嘅派更，你新嘅指引落實之後，仲有冇呢個分段更嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：呢個會考慮，但係究竟係點樣改法呢，因為會牽涉到同員工會溝通，我哋會係考慮，但係你話怎樣，我唔可以講，會有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係仲會有分段更？

蘇偉基先生：有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰個津貼係咪一樣定抑或會改呢？

蘇偉基先生：會考慮優化。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個點樣計嘅呢？你話$1,951.50 係一個月，司機唔係話成個月都做分段更嘅，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：呢個係唔會嘅，因為我哋派更，如果嗰個係月薪車長，佢係返 split shift duty，佢會整個月都係返 split shift duty。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一個月有幾多日司機係要做嘢呢？二十七日？三十日裏面--三十一日裏面二十七？

蘇偉基先生：每六日有一個休息日，如果假設當個月係冇公共假期，佢應該係三十天嘅月份就返二十六天。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就會讓佢係收到$1,951.50，即係額外嘅？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問，分段更嘅車長，你會唔會安排佢哋就係一個月唔需要返足全個月呢？就譬如五日或者十日。

蘇偉基先生：有咁嘅機會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果係嘅話，就唔係全個月，佢哋又幾多錢嘅津貼呢？係咪千九定係點呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係按比例。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係日計嘅比例吖，定抑或點樣計算出嚟嘅呢？

蘇偉基先生：睇番佢當月返工嘅日子，然之後睇番佢喺呢段日子有幾多日係做split duty，就乘番頭先講嗰個一千九百五十幾蚊嘅數字，就得出佢當月享有嘅split shift duty嘅allowance。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概係計起上嚟，一日有幾多錢呀？

蘇偉基先生：約莫70蚊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）落去111頁，表3，日薪嘅待遇，我哋見到個分段更嗰個津貼，喺(H)嗰項，個數字就係$21.90，我見到(H)嗰度係逐個鐘頭計嘅，如果一個人就係做分段更，佢做咗一個鐘，換句話講，係咪即係會多收$21.90？佢會有三個鐘頭嘅休息嘅，即係話係有60蚊，係咪咁計？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話嗰個待遇唔同，月薪同日薪嘅待遇就不同？即係如果淨係睇呢個分段更嘅津貼，佢哋嘅待遇唔同喇？

蘇偉基先生：要睇整體，唔可以淨係睇一個split duty allowance，因為其實日薪佢哋嘅員工佢個底薪亦都係比月薪高，所以首先兩者有差異，正確，但係差異原因係要睇整體嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司會用嗰個新嘅指引，如果你亦都推行呢個分段更嘅話，我想問，呢一個津貼係咪都會去檢討呢？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋將嗰個新嘅指引嗰度打出嚟，呢個喺KMB-2嗰度會有嘅，61頁，而家目前仲係有效嘅，就係舊嘅指引，就喺前面嗰版，就係60頁嗰度就有個資料嘅，亦都可以將兩者一齊睇嘅。目前，一般正常嘅更分係點呢，即係對比起呢個分段更？

彭樹雄先生：或者我簡單啲講，其實我哋嗰個shift就我哋大致上有兩種，一種我哋叫做straight duty或者係straight shift，就返可能係八個鐘頭或者係十個鐘頭，又或者可能會係十二個鐘頭，個工時，呢個講緊工時。另外一個我哋特別嘅，我哋每日約有二十三個百分比嘅車長就係返緊一個叫做特別更，正話係Mr Duncan所講嘅split duty，就係佢嘅工時係唔會超過十四個鐘嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到新嘅指引，可唔可以同我哋講下會唔會有重大嘅改變呢，對於你剛才所提及嘅安排，有冇重大嘅改變㗎？

彭樹雄先生：如果喺新嘅指引底下，我哋一個直更，straight duty，一個working hours，工時係唔會超過十二個鐘，而當中嗰個駕駛時間係唔應該超

過十個鐘，另外有--其實分別就同而家係冇一個比較明顯嘅分別，但係反而嗰個 split duty 個分別就會相對地比較大啲，點解呢？因為運輸署嘅指引底下，呢個所謂特別更 split duty，佢嘅工時仍然係唔應該超過十四個鐘，但係佢當中嘅駕駛時間就係唔會超過十個鐘，對比番而家嘅指引，我哋係唔應該超過十一個鐘，新指引底下，嗰個駕駛時間係少咗一個鐘頭。

另外一個特色--特別嘅地方就係喺新嘅指引底下，呢個 split duty 嘅車長佢一定要有一段唔少過連續三個鐘頭嘅休息時間，一定係連續唔少過三個鐘頭嘅休息時間，呢個就係最主要嘅分別。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇人係會想做呢個特別更，即係分段更，好讓佢可以有多啲收入，定抑或唔係咁嘅，而係你要下令先至叫到啲人去做呢一個分段更或者特別更呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋公司係絕對唔會強逼啲同事係去返啲乜嘢嘅特別更分，split shift，所有返呢啲所謂特別更嘅車長係全部都係自願咁去返嘅。

李澤昌先生：補充一點，嗰個 dynamic 就其實因為九龍巴士佢 cover 嗰個地區太大，譬如假設你朝頭早繁忙嘅時間，佢凌晨六、七點鐘已經係繁忙時間，佢早上嘅繁忙係好高嘅，去到夜晚黑個繁忙就會五、六、七，七、八點又上番嚟，好似成個駱駝咁兩個峰喺度。有啲車長其實佢係長喺譬如話屯門咁嚟計，佢朝頭早揸完嗰個繁忙嘅時候，佢返到去，有一段時間，佢可以返番去自己屋企休下息先，然後再返番去晏晝嗰段繁忙時間，其實佢係有一個地理嗰個問題--嗰個因素，或者一個車長本身佢有一個--即係佢個工作環境嘅因素，呢個係比較少部分，呢個係佢哋有呢方面嘅需要，係咁樣。

彭樹雄先生：其實整體我哋有特別更嘅車長，因為正如李生講，因為我哋係要 cover 嗰兩個 peak，即係 morning peak 同埋 evening peak，正正我哋九巴嘅特色就係因為我哋--即係我哋嗰個函蓋嘅範圍實在都頗大。同埋我哋有四個主要嘅大廠，亦都我哋有啲叫做衛星廠，satellite depot，我哋好多車長做呢個特別更，佢係可以喺中段嗰幾個鐘頭，其實佢真係可以返屋企休息等等咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇番呢度，剛才亦都睇過嗰個待遇，個薪酬，我想問，新嘅指引如果係採納，亦都會減少嗰個總嘅時數，亦都有呢個休息時間嘅要求嘅，會唔會令到你哋部分嘅車長嗰個收入係會減少呢？

彭樹雄先生：我答你嘅問題，就係如果我哋唔去諗嗰個 remuneration 嗰個，或者係維持不變，確實如果純粹睇番個駕駛時數，可能有車長係真係嗰個所謂 take-home salary 係會少咗嘅。不過正話蘇生都講咗，我哋其實都係積極考慮點樣可以將嗰個--特別係嗰個休息時間嗰個 allowance 嗰個津貼點樣可以優化佢，從而令到我哋返--特別係特別更嘅車長，佢駕駛時數少咗，休息時間多咗，而希望佢嗰個所謂 take-home salary 都唔會減少嘅，呢個就係我哋管理層，主席亦都係責成咗我哋會去考慮嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，董事局係指示咗管理層就住特別更嘅司機，雖然佢哋係會每日工作十個鐘，而唔係十一個鐘，佢哋嘅薪酬唔應該係會少咗嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇同車長講過呢一個訊息呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）事實上喺我哋嘅行動計劃下嘅建議中係有提及嘅，我相信管理層係已經同工會溝通過。或者彭先生可以補充。

彭樹雄先生：好呀，主席。Mr Duncan，我其實亦都初步同啲工會嘅代表，亦都係我哋同廠嗰個嘅管理層亦都係已經將個訊息帶咗畀啲前線車長，我哋管理層係會認真咁樣去優化呢一個嘅 remuneration package，希望佢哋嗰個 take-home salary，唔會因為個新指引實行而少咗嘅，呢個我哋係完全正面，車長亦都係完全正面嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充，如果車長嘅工時係由十一個鐘減少到十個鐘，我哋亦都會考慮係咪需要--即係個要求係咪需要由十四個鐘減低到十三個鐘。雖然運輸署係容許可以每日有十四個工時，但係如果我哋嘅目標係想由每日嘅工時由十四降至到十三，我哋都會考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，如果我冇記錯，之前作供嘅時候，城巴係會咁樣做嘅，即係佢哋而家係冇特別更，但係佢哋之後係會實施，而嗰個每日嘅工時規定係十三個鐘嘅。

梁乃鵬先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我相信係正確嘅，主席。梁博士，我想你睇番 KMB-1 文件冊嘅第 149 頁，喺第 12 項，即係喺第 149 項嘅第 12 項係咪已經反映咗呢一點？

彭樹雄先生：Yes, Mr Duncan.

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）喺屘二嗰一段，喺右面嗰一欄。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪就係最後一段所講呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Yes, thank you.

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）城巴作供嘅時候，即係喺第 4 天嘅謄本入面，第 75 頁 1 至 6 行嘅。

主席：Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋而家睇第 180 頁，呢個係 TD-1 文件冊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先，李先生，你同我哋講過返特別更嘅車長嘅休息時間，佢哋嘅休息時間係會長啲嘅，你講有部分係可以返屋企，你可唔可以大概話我哋知返特別更嘅車長之中有幾多車長係喺巴士站開始佢哋嘅休息時間，而唔係喺車廠呢？因為我哋係參觀過屯門嘅車廠，我哋明白呢啲設施係有啲分別嘅，所以我哋嘅問題就係大概有幾多嘅車長會喺巴士站開始佢哋嗰個休息時間呢？

李澤昌先生：我要返去畀呢啲數據你，我有嘅，我哋有嘅。主要佢哋係三個地方休息，一個就係返屋企，一個就係喺巴士站嗰度，一部分就係喺嗰個巴士嗰個depot嗰度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）TD-1文件冊嘅第180頁，呢一頁就係喺2018年至到2022年嘅遠期計劃嘅一部分嚟嘅，呢個就係你公司呈交畀運輸署嘅，如果我冇了解錯，呢個係巴士專營權嘅其中一項要求嚟嘅，係必須要提供一個遠期計劃，就係每年要呈交畀運輸署嘅，我相信呢一份係最新嘅計劃嚟嘅，係咪？

蘇偉基先生：最新嗰份係由2019年去2023，就我哋需要喺8月17號，淨係呢個section，section 8 bus safety提交，嗰份亦都係ready to submission，我哋應該係下個禮拜初係可以ready，呢個現時submit咗最latest version。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一份，我哋而家睇緊呢份計劃係幾時呈交㗎？

蘇偉基先生：而家我哋見緊嗰份應該喺2017年嘅6月十幾。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）遠期計劃嘅呢一部分就係關乎巴士安全嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）首先，你話你會喺今年8月17號呈交一份新嘅計劃，係咪？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供嗰一份報告嘅相關章節畀委員會呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就住巴士安全，就係喺呢一個遠期計劃嘅第8章嘅，我想你睇一睇8.2段，就係分析過去兩年嘅巴士意外，我想你睇第181頁，呢個就係以巴士車長嘅年齡係分類呢一個意外率嘅，呢一段就講，結果顯示，一啲年輕嘅車長就會同一啲更加高嘅意外率有關，因為主要係呢啲車長嘅駕駛巴士嘅經驗係比較少，而佢哋喺頭嗰幾月嘅期間就會遇上更多意外嘅，呢個就係第181頁所講嘅。

然後喺第182頁亦都有一個相似嘅論點，就喺8.2.4段，「如果以服務

嘅年期去將呢個意外率去分析，結果就係顯示喺 8.3 呢個表嘅，就喺招聘後嘅第一年發生意外嘅機會係相對地高嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪呢度所講嘅係咪咁樣呀？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇任何嘅措施去針對呢一個現象呢，即係話針對頭一年服務嘅車長？

蘇偉基先生：唔係好掌握到你問乜嘢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據我嘅經驗，當我細個嘅時候，我都成日搭巴士，啲車長通常有一個副車長喺旁邊，然後就畀一啲指示或者係提示佢哋嘅，你哋公司有冇類似嘅安排呢？

蘇偉基先生：有，我哋亦都有留意到頭先你所指出嘅數字，新入職嘅車長通常都係年輕啲，我哋而家喺佢揸車開首，我哋係有一個夥伴車長係陪伴住佢，等佢可以個信心，嗰個對路面嘅實習、對乘客嘅處理係更加有信心。我哋亦都喺車長第三個月嗰係有個工作坊，同佢分享佢開首做巴士車長嘅經驗，從而希望對一啲新入職嘅車長儘快熟習嗰個工作環境，減少嗰個交通嘅意外率。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲夥伴車長呢個安排係開始咗幾耐？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，或者我簡單咁介紹呢啲所謂嗰啲叫做 buddy driver 或者 buddy inspector 嗰個嘅工作。所有全職嘅車長同埋一啲嘅我哋而家有啲叫做半職車長，就正話 Mr Duncan 所講嘅，譬如會唔會有啲家庭主婦佢每日可以做四個鐘，一個禮拜做五日或者做六日，我哋嗰啲叫做半職車長？我哋個 buddy driver 就係會喺佢完成咗我哋駕駛訓練學校嗰兩個 phases 嘅 training 之後出嚟，我哋就會全日有個夥伴車長陪住佢，係包括佢第一日、第二日嘅工作，然後就再喺第七日同埋十六日係會完全陪伴住呢個新車長嘅駕駛嘅。

另外我哋嗰啲兼職車長，我哋亦都係會有夥伴車長嘅計劃，但係大家要明白因為呢啲以往我哋所請嘅兼職車長佢哋全部係有 10 牌同埋 17 牌，即係換句話講，佢哋亦有巴士牌同埋有專利巴士牌，我哋嗰個夥伴車長係會陪佢第一日。

另外，我哋喺今年年初，我哋亦都有一個所謂夥伴督察嘅計劃，每一個新加入嘅車長，我哋會有一個指定嘅督察，就會同佢聯絡，我哋亦都做咗一啲所謂 cue card，一啲嘅 card 仔，裏面有晒我哋嗰啲督察嗰啲聯絡嘅方式，有晒所有屬廠嗰啲經理同埋嗰啲助理經理同埋車務主任嘅電話。

呢個夥伴督察就會係一個除咗駕駛技術方面，都係一個全面嘅支援嘅，好似一個 mentor 咁，係喇，你可以用一個字，就係“mentor”咁樣，個車長有

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

啲乜嘢疑難，有啲咩嘢困難，有咩嘢困惑，佢都會直接搵呢個夥伴督察，呢個就係我哋希望就係能夠可以令到個新車長儘快融入嗰個工作裏面。

另外，蘇生講咗，我哋所有新車長，當佢工作咗三個月之後，我哋會搞一個工作坊，就係會所有車廠嘅管理、駕駛導師，甚至我都會出席，同嗰啲車長傾偈，睇下佢哋有啲乜嘢--過去嗰三個月遇到啲咩嘢困難。同埋我哋每一次我哋都會請一個資深嘅車長喺度同大家分享點樣可以處理日常工作等等。呢個我哋每一個新出嚟三個月，我哋一定會做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我個問題就問呢個咁嘅計劃，即係夥伴計劃係幾時開始呢？

蘇偉基先生：Buddy driver 呢個概念喺二零一三-- 12 年已經有，但係我哋係不停去優化佢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該；

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會方便就而家開始我哋就係小休係午飯？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，我哋而家休息，就兩點半再繼續，唔該晒。

下午 1 時 01 分押聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位午安。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。各位先生，請你而家翻去 180 頁，嗰個文件冊係 TD-1。响我哋食午飯之前，我就叫你睇咗 182 頁嘅。而家或者你都係請翻到 183 頁。呢度一個分析，即係公司進行一個分析，意外嘅性質嘅分析。我呢度想就住表格 8.1 問幾個問題。

第一行呢度講係乘客失去平衡百分率就係百分之五十一點五。另一個項目响個表格中間下面嗰度，巴士內嘅乘客受傷嘅。呢個係--你有咩嘢分別？

蘇偉基先生：“Passenger loss of balance”，我哋係講緊一啲意外個乘客跌倒，或者係冇緊握扶手，而架車箱係移動緊嗰陣時嘅。“Injury to passenger inside bus”，就係因為有意外，而個意外個乘客喺個車箱本身

入面，因為外來嘅意外而導致乘客坐喺架車入面受傷，佢係坐喺度，佢唔係loss of balance，但係意外會造成佢有個損傷。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你意思就坐住响嗰度，點解會受傷嘅，點解會有咁樣嘅事？

蘇偉基先生：假設有個意外係碰擊，佢坐咗喺個車箱嗰度，假設我當番一個意外翻側，佢坐咗喺度，佢係因為一個意外而受傷，佢就係“Injury to passenger inside bus”。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度有另一個百分比嘅，嗰度係巴士翻側，最後嗰個。會唔會嗰度都已經包括咗？

黃祥明先生：或者另外一個例子可以話畀你聽，有啲乘客坐喺架車度都會有受傷，就係有時我哋啲巴士經過啲樹突咗出嚟嘅地方，棵樹打落個巴士度係啲玻璃碎，就會引致呢個乘客喺車裏面受傷，呢個同嗰個乘客喺車跌嚫嗰個受傷係兩樣嘢嚟嘅。

蘇偉基先生：亦都最近有個例子，就係上個月喺中環，架車行行下，條路突然間有個石屎撞爛咗個車底，嗰次就冇乘客受傷，但係有機會就係咁樣，呢個咪意外。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我冇解釋錯--即係話公司係定咗呢啲唔同嘅類別，如果係意外就會分類，根據呢個各種嘅分類，就係將佢定為邊一種，啱唔啱？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：Thank you. （經傳譯員）呢度就乘客失去平衡就百分之五十一點五。

8.2.7 佢話就超過一半因為係嗰個巴士向行駛中需要煞車，引致失去平衡嘅。有冇其他一半嘅嘅事件，佢哋係咩嘢原因造成？

黃祥明先生：呢個乘客喺車箱失平衡而跌嚫有好多個原因嘅，其中一個原因好可能係啲車長駕駛嘅時候，就唔係太過為意呢個乘客是否係已經企好或者進入咗呢個車箱。另外一個可能性，就係個車長本身佢嗰個操控架車嘅時候，就唔係咁妥當。即係我哋幾日前曾經討論過嘅一啲叫“acceleration”，或者佢嗰個“harsh braking”，亦都會引致呢啲情況。另外一啲情況我哋睇到有好多時啲乘客本身就係上車之後，就並冇緊握扶手，因而喺架車行駛期間，或者需要有啲車進入佢嘅路線，亦需要閃避期間，呢個乘客係會失平衡而跌倒嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度第二行，撞頭、撞尾，相撞嘅事項...

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問一樣嘢先，如果有意外，乘客就失去平衡受傷，成為呢度統計涵蓋嘅一個事件，就有一半係乘客失去平衡嘅。你有冇研究你哋嘅數據，即係話加速、減速嘅情況，你有冇研究？

黃祥明先生：喺有啲乘客跌嚟嘅案件裏面，我哋係會喺調查呢架車嘅車長操控呢架車是否有加速或者減速，所以答案係有，我哋有睇到。另外，我哋喺呢個車嘅 CCTV 亦都可以睇得到當時個車嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我再問，你用咩嘢數據嚟調查加速、減速？

黃祥明先生：我哋都討論過個黑盒係會記錄當時個車嘅情況，呢啲情況我哋喺個 server 嘅資料嗰度係能夠睇得到，亦都可以鑑別得到呢個車長當時操控架車嘅時候係咪有突然加油或者突然減速呢樣嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢統計數字，即係研究完之後，調查完之後個結果有冇統計？譬如話係減速佔幾多，加速佔幾多？

黃祥明先生：冇一個實質嘅統計數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解冇？

黃祥明先生：我哋遇有呢啲情況嘅時候，就會處理嗰個車長嘅違規，但係我哋就並冇將呢啲數字綜合做一個嘅記錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係呢度佔咗你哋--呢個因素佔咗意外成因一半喎。

蘇偉基先生：同意係要有呢個記錄，因為呢個係講緊 2015/16，而家我哋係提供唔到。但係正如頭先所講，我哋做緊新嗰個，我要睇清楚係咪有個記錄，loss of balance 有幾多，harsh braking 幾多，係 acceleration 做咗，我呢刻我答唔到。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家係咪做緊，2018 年你有冇做呢樣嘢？

蘇偉基先生：可以做番。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪做咗，過去式？

蘇偉基先生：我唔清楚呢一刻。

主席：（經傳譯員）不過係可以做到嘅？

蘇偉基先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）今年有幾多個乘客係因為失去平衡受傷，大概有幾多人？

蘇偉基先生：三百嗖。

主席：Thank you. （經傳譯員）你調查嗰個乘客因為失去平衡嘅情況，你係有一啲黑盒嘅數據，你响個伺服器有嘅，同埋你都有巴士上面嗰啲閉路電視嘅資料嘅？

黃祥明先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你將你嗰啲科技嘅設備一齊睇，你就可以有一個合理嘅推斷，究竟當時嘅煞車係咪一個合理嘅原因？

黃祥明先生：Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何嘅統計數字？

黃祥明先生：我剛才講過，我哋有調查呢樣嘢，但係我哋冇將呢個記錄做一個數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）你冇話簡單嘅統計數字，譬如話四百四十五人受傷，有三百宗個案佢煞車係合理，有冇啲咁簡單嘅統計數字？

黃祥明先生：呢啲數字係有記錄嘅，但係我冇將佢歸納做一個統計，喺呢方面嘅。

梁健宏先生：或者我嘗試補充一點，所有呢啲意外都會分析嘅，所有啲意外都分番開係咪嗰個車長係負責任嘅。如果個車長唔係負責任嘅話，佢可能真係就住當其時個交通狀況，佢需要 sudden braking 嘅。所以如果我哋睇番個車長要負責任嗰啲個案，我相信嗰度應該我哋再做多數據分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係假設當你做，你一定要有個統計嘅數據嘅。

梁健宏先生：我相信嗰啲資料喺度嘅，我哋應該返去做啲數據分析，從而睇睇有咩嘢我哋可以再做好啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係一個重要嘅監察嘅工具，即係監察你個司機、車長嘅行為，即係話係咪突然煞車？但係你調查，你又覺得冇需要咁樣睇嘅？

梁健宏先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。我哋暫時唔睇表格 8.1，睇番表格 8.2。呢度亦都係從個意外性質做分類嘅，今次就唔係百分率，而係實際有幾多宗嘅意外。

主席問過你乘客失去平衡嘅呢個類別，呢度受到影響嘅乘客數目係咪有記錄？你話 2018 年，到目前為止三百五十個乘客因為咁受傷。

蘇偉基先生：係，約莫呢個而家記到嘅數係。

MR DUNCAN：Approximately 300, yes, thank you. （經傳譯員）有冇可能睇睇呢個記錄，根據呢個一行、一行睇落去，根據呢度乘客嘅數字、受影響嘅人客數字，每一種類別嘅意外逐個睇？

蘇偉基先生：呢個係冇數據，嗰個係講緊個個案嘅宗數嚟。

主席：No. （經傳譯員）8.2.8 就只係好簡單咁樣描述咗呢一啲意外嘅性質，係咪有可能有一千個咁嘅乘客係失去...

蘇偉基先生：I agree. I know what you mean. （經傳譯員）但係呢個報告係冇個乘客嘅數喺度。如果你話2018年，我哋可以提供番乘客嘅數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係話三百個以外，同埋你都話畀我哋聽有幾多乘客係失去平衡？

蘇偉基先生：可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）有可能所有企喺度嗰啲人都失去平衡個喎，你可唔可以畀呢一個資料我哋，係2018年嘅？

蘇偉基先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以呢一度每一欄嘅數字，你都畀埋乘客嘅數字我哋？

蘇偉基先生：我嘗試，但係我相信有困難嘅。因為嗰個數據講緊2015、2016，但係喺2018年，我哋可以提供番個案同埋涉及嘅人數，係關於loss of balance嘅意外。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我都係知道你係諗緊2018。不過譬如話有一個題目，就係話呢架巴士係翻側或者係直情翻車嘅，可唔可以有乘客數字？

蘇偉基先生：呢個可以，呢個一單個案當然可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）同埋如果係撞到啲動物或者其他人廿七宗嘅，你會唔會都好容易搵到受影響嘅乘客或者係受傷嘅乘客？

蘇偉基先生：可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好多謝你，當你畀2018年嘅數字我哋嘅時候，畀埋呢啲就好嘞。

蘇偉基先生：可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

講番轉頭，睇番呢一啲表，我想理解多啲。第二個就係話追撞，另外低啲就係同其他嘅車輛碰撞，就係有向後、向前。呢兩個有咩嘢分別？第一個就係13.5個百分比，呢兩者有咩嘢分別？

黃祥明先生： Head-on/tail 嘅 collision，通常我哋係會睇一啲停定咗嘅物件係頭尾相撞，呢個我叫做head-on/tail 嘅collision。第二個collision好多時係因為一個轉線而引致有車輛嘅碰撞，我哋要斷為呢個classification，就係collision with 呢個changing lane 嘅vehicle。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係第二個標題同埋第三個標題之間嘅分別？

黃祥明先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）再低啲，「同其他車輛碰撞」嗰個括號裏面，就係話向後溜或者向前溜，或者係倒後，有咩嘢分別？

黃祥明先生：有時啲車輛嘅褪後而引致呢個碰撞，就係會喺呢個 classification 裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，上番去“J/O collision”就係百分之六，有四十八宗，呢個係咩嘢意思？

黃祥明先生：呢啲係喺啲 junction 位，路口嘅 junction 位嘅碰撞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。下低係「進入 R/A 碰撞」咩嘢意思？

黃祥明先生：呢個係一個進入迴旋處引致嘅碰撞，roundabout。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當你提供 2018 年嘅統計數字，即係關於受傷乘客嘅數字嘅時候，請問你可唔可以都幫我哋區分一下，傷同亡嘅數字？

黃祥明先生：可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我而家想講另外一個題目，今朝早都講過，我相信你有兩位人士係提過，就係關於非法泊車嘅問題。委員會唔係淨係由你哋各位，由其他嘅以前嘅證人都聽到，就係話呢個安全嘅隱患嚟。

我諗今朝早其中你哋一位都協助委員會，就話畀我哋聽你哋喺呢一方面採取咗咩嘢步驟。尤其是係向唔同嘅政府部門係舉報或者報告，就令到個情況有所改善。請問你可唔可以睇下雜項文件套第 2 號，第 644 頁。呢一度就係由 643 頁開始，一路去到 644，然後係有翻譯本，644-1，佢係繼續去到 644-2 嗰一頁。

你會睇到呢一份文件係委員會收到，係來自一個民主聯盟咁樣嘅組織。我哋睇番翻譯嘅第 2 頁嗰度，係民主陣線，應該係去番第 1 頁嘅底部嗰度，644-1 嗰度。我哋睇到係有一個意見，就係話可以喺巴士站嗰度永遠停止有非法泊車嘅時候，就話應該係有正確嘅政策，同埋係要睇下啲法律係咪已經過咗期，一定係要多管齊下咁樣去處理。

佢就話第一個建議就係跟番新加坡喺成個巴士車隊嗰度係安裝攝錄機，新加坡自從 2008 年就係喺巴士上面安裝攝錄機。呢一啲攝錄機就係裝置喺巴士司機個位側邊，當司機發現係有車停喺巴士站，佢哋就可以撳一個掣，就可以錄影五至十分鐘，巴士公司就會將有關嘅攝影帶交畀警方，警方就可以檢討，睇番嗰個錄影帶，然後大概有兩個禮拜之內就會將告票寄畀車主。每一張告票就係香港 800 元，另外如果係遲交嘅話，就會額外收 5,000 元，同埋甚至係監禁三個月。

喺第一年，新加坡就記錄咗二千一百一十二宗嘅情況，就係啲司機入咗係巴士線，或者係喺巴士站嗰度畀佢哋嘅乘客上落客嘅。2014 年，喺巴士站同埋係該巴士線裏面非法泊車，就已經係降到八八六宗，就係好成功可以阻嚇啲司機唔好再喺巴士站嗰度停車。

我哋聽到一啲證據，就係公司係裝置攝錄機，就係向住巴士個司機位，另外仲有一個攝錄機，就係有一個前置鏡頭，就好似話係一個監察嘅攝錄機嚟嘅。想請問你而家呢一啲嘅攝影機有冇其中一部係用嚟去攝錄喺巴士站嘅非法泊車嗰啲車輛，而家有冇？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我簡單嘅答案係冇嘅。不過如果你容許，我可以有啲嘅補充。

MR DUNCAN： Please.

主席：（經傳譯員）請你講，請你講。

彭樹雄先生：其實就住呢一個，我哋將個錄影片段交畀警方作出違例泊車嘅情況，我舊年嘅 10 月、11 月開始。因為我負責荔枝角廠，我有一個先導計劃同警方係大家協調咗，就係正正用呢一個方式係去檢舉一啲嘅喺巴士站裏面嘅違例泊車。

主席：（經傳譯員）你做咗啲咩嘢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋嘅做法就係我用咗一個嘅試點，就係我哋喺尖沙咀廣東道 271 巴士總站嗰條線係去沙田廠嘅，由荔枝角廠去沙田廠嘅。因為嗰個巴士總站經常係泊滿違例泊車。另外廣東道，大家俗稱嗰個「名店街」，其實嗰個車嘅流量非常之高嘅。

我當時我係荔枝角廠嘅總經理，我就同警方開會。我自己寫咗一張 standard 嘅 statement，即係一個 statement，然後就我叫我啲前線嘅督察，如果見到違例泊車，我哋就用我哋嘅手機影低嗰個嘅片段，然後我哋將呢個片段加埋一張我哋叫做“standard pro forma”，其實好簡單，我哋淨係寫日期、時間，因為地點已經係--我哋係用咗嗰個做試點。我哋就畀西九龍交通就作出檢控。

呢個做法，我哋發覺非常之有效嘅。因為我哋開始檢控嘅時候，我亦都睇到有啲社交媒體開始報導，就話「咦，泊喺巴士站原來會畀人告」咁樣。因為我哋曾經喺廣東道，我哋好多時有違泊，我哋報警。但係因為實在差人嚟到，啲車走咗，and then 差人走咗，啲車又返轉頭。呢個其實係一個治標但係唔治本嘅方法。所以我就用我哋嘅 initiative，我哋同 police 夾埋發覺係有效嘅。大家都應該睇得到，最近警方亦都做咗兩個先導計劃，而家佢將個先導計劃係擴充晒去五個陸上嘅警區，警方其實而家都係做緊呢一樣嘢。

所以 Mr Duncan，簡單答，我哋係冇用我哋嘅車上面裝嘅 CCTV 檢控，不

過我哋嘅先導計劃，加上而家警方嗰個做法，同埋最近嗰個違泊嗰個罰款喺巴士站，亦都係增加咗，呢個係我嘅答案，Mr Duncan。

主席：（經傳譯員）你點解唔用車上面嗰啲時時開著嘅閉路電視嚟用？

彭樹雄先生：其實呢個我哋都可以咁樣做，不過只不過我哋當時用嗰個先導計劃，就係好多時我哋比較方便，就係我哋啲 inspector，我哋啲督察，佢哋本身會揸住架巡邏車去巡邏嘅。如果用佢哋嘅手機，其實嗰個便捷度可能會快啲。當然，主席，呢個係我哋下一步，我哋如果車上面嗰個 CCTV，其實我哋有錄像，其實我哋都可以咁做嘅，主席，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）假設其實好簡單，你撳一個掣，然後就可以記錄咗嗰個時間，到時有人睇嘅時候都睇到。

彭樹雄先生：冇錯，主席，冇錯。如果可以令到違泊減少，我哋一定會做嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗從你所描述，呢個做法就令到個非法泊車嘅情況有改善？

彭樹雄先生：如果用番我哋廣東道 271 線嗰個巴士總站，我可以答係有好大嘅改善嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）淨係嗰個總站？

彭樹雄先生：因為警方嗰個全面先導計劃，其實啱啱先至正式開始。我哋都要一啲時間睇下到底嗰個成效係咪真係咁好，不過我可以答你，直至到琴日為止，嗰個違泊嘅情況都唔係--整體嚟講，我講，都唔係一個好大嘅改善，我哋睇唔到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）警方同埋嗰個九巴，關於呢個咁嘅試驗計劃，有冇咩嘢通訊嘅記錄？

彭樹雄先生：我有一啲嘅電子郵件，我哋亦都有一啲嘅 standard pro forma，即係我嗰個 statement，就有關於尖沙咀廣東道 271 總站，我可以畀到個委員會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你交畀我哋。

彭樹雄先生：冇問題，我哋會 provide。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個電郵，即係同警方，同埋你用嘅標準表格。

彭樹雄先生：冇問題，主席，冇問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果冇理解錯誤，你會係即係睇下可唔可以採納類似新加坡嘅制度或者做法？

彭樹雄先生：如果--我哋絕對係持開放態度，我哋絕對係同意咁樣做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話你開放態度，你係咪會研究？

彭樹雄先生：我哋會跟進，我哋會 look into it。

主席：（經傳譯員）你投訴有問題，有好簡單嘅方法嚟解決，係咪？

彭樹雄先生：主席，我想講一講，其實喺我哋呢一個舊年喺廣東道呢一個先導計劃之前，其實係冇試過淨係基於一個影像去作出交通違例嘅發出嘅定額罰款通知書嘅，呢個係以前冇試過用影像嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係有好多控告都係靠嗰啲閉路電視好多錄影嘅片段嚟到進入，啱唔啱？

彭樹雄先生：主席，容許--其實你喺琴日嘅聽證會都講咗，我都係一個喺警務處工作過，我亦都喺交通部工作過。就住違例泊車，我淨係講違例泊車，illegal parking，以往係冇用影像去做檢控。佢用影像檢控嗰啲可能係超速、衝紅燈等等，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個可能係警察或者係律政司嘅一個限制，但係法律上冇規定你唔可以用呢啲做證據。

彭樹雄先生：所以今年年初我知道從報章得悉，警務處開始就係用影像去檢控一啲 illegal parking，即係我哋俗稱，即係或者 police 俗稱，呢啲叫「死車」，即係 stationary 嘅 illegal parking，就唔同一啲嘅 moving vehicle，such as speeding、jumping red light、crossing double white line，et cetera，主席。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）彭先生，我諗我哋應該係要自己做一個我哋應該做嘅行動，睇下警方有咩嘢回應。我諗我哋會係做番我哋嘅本份。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你而家睇第十一日嗰個聆訊嘅謄本。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個文件冊？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 4 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個嘅證供？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係 Lam Kam Piu，佢係巴士員工嘅工會嘅代表嚟。

請睇 153 頁嘅證供，工會就有啲關注嘅。佢話就係關於使用呢個 12.8 米

長嘅巴士，係用後輪驅動嘅巴士，佢哋對於喺香港使用呢種巴士有啲關注嘅。見到第 13 行，呢個林錦培（原文照錄），佢話「由於香港嘅路面嘅情況，即係道路比較窄，好多行人使用呢個 12.8 米嘅巴士係會帶來一啲危險嘅」，去到第 17 行，佢話「呢個 12.8 米巴士係後輪驅動嘅。响嗰個過彎嘅時候，對個巴士嚟講當然好，但係其他嘅車可能唔知道呢個巴士係後輪嚟到驅動。即係話運輸署都係出過一啲嘅通知，就等其他司機知道嘅，但係其他司機未必知道嘅。因此會對隔籬行駛嘅車輛造成一個危險」。林先生就一路講，講到呢一頁，155 頁嘅。

我想問一個問題，12.8 米嘅巴士，香港應用得有幾廣泛？同埋巴士公司係咪同意林先生嘅睇法，就係呢啲巴士响某啲窄嘅路會造成危險？

梁健宏先生：12 米 8 嘅車，香港有嘅，絕大部分所以都係冇尾輪轉向嘅。尾輪轉向亦都有佢嘅好處，我哋舊年有一部試過，不過就有啲擔心，所以變咗嗰架車我哋都改番做普通嘅 12 米 8 嘅車，就冇尾輪轉向。

講番 12 米 8 嘅車，佢就個長度係長咗，不過就當然，嗰個乘客載客量就會多咗嘅。呢啲係一啲繁忙嘅或者載客量高嘅路線，尤其是係長程嘅路線係的而且確係幫到個服務。呢啲路線或者呢啲咁嘅 12 米 8 長嘅車，相對 12 米車係長咗，但係啲路線都係特定要試過嘅，唔係話普通一條路線。呢啲 12 米 8 嘅車可以行邊啲路線，係會同運輸署一齊試過路，知道呢架車係安全可行，我哋先至可以將呢啲 12.8 米嘅車係 deploy 落去嗰啲路線嘅。暫時目前為止，九巴接近有大約二百部呢啲咁嘅 12 米 8 車。

李澤昌先生：或者補充少少咩嘢叫尾輪轉向，其實佢因為大部分嘅巴士而家都係頭輛轉嘅。因為如果你--因為後面佢係三軸嘅關係，佢後面有一個軸都係可以一齊轉，所以個車轉彎嘅時候，或者係行一啲路比較即係急少少，轉啲急彎嘅時候，佢入啲彎就冇擺得咁犀利。當然即係香港其他好多公司都仲係有用緊，我哋第一批初初出嚟嘅時候，就係冇呢個尾輪轉向，所以我哋嚟咗試咗一架。嗰架其實試咗啲同事，啱啱就講緊都對佢有啲唔係好舒服，我哋都停用咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁生，你有啲嘅關注即係後輪嚟到係轉向。你有啲咩嘢關注，係咪頭先李生講？

梁健宏先生：我啲 concern 係車長嘅 concern，因為尾輪轉向，佢嗰個 turning circle 會細啲嘅，但係佢揸起上嚟嗰個 characteristic 就有啲唔同，個 outswing 就同普通嗰啲冇尾輪轉向嗰啲車嗰個 outswing 係大咗啲，所以變咗喺嗰個習慣個問題嗰度要適應嘅。有個問題嘅，如果你今日揸一架有尾輪轉向，而跟住你揸架冇尾輪轉向，可能適應--就要少少要適應，呢啲係有少少係車長可能會 concern 嘅。但係就對於安全嗰部分...

李澤昌先生：關於安全係冇關，係揸車嗰個適唔適應到，嗰度比較係我哋要處理。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我冇理解錯誤，你係冇後輪轉向嘅 12.8 米嘅巴士？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗已經講咗，大概二百架。

梁健宏先生：Correct.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係會即係响某啲路線就係用呢啲巴士，你會同運輸署接觸咗先。係咪已經發生咗，呢樣事？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲巴士係咪有啲指定路線度使用？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你會唔會擔心--鑑於工會同我哋講嘅嘢，你有冇任何嘢關注？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你有冇關注到啲巴士轉彎嘅時候，會唔會係出咗條線，令到對其他嘅車輛造成問題？

李澤昌先生：首先兩樣嘢先，一，嗰條路線係一定係運輸署、政府係大家同意咗條路線行得先。因為有啲路線係行唔到 12 米 8。第二樣嘢係個車長，其實九巴嘅車長揸 12 米 8，佢必先之前去咗我哋個學院嗰度係學習過揸 12 米 8 嘅車，佢先至可以揸 12 米 8 嘅。所以其實路線同埋個車長嘅訓練，兼夾如一架車尾輪轉向都冇埋嘅，其實基本上嗰三件嘢係齊備，我哋先至行緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道工會而家關於呢件事有咩嘢關注？

梁健宏先生：我哋冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇另一份文件 TU-1(A)，84 頁。你會見到呢份意見，就係委員會收到嘅。嚟自九巴僱員工會，嗰個翻譯就喺第 90-1 嗰一頁。我就係會倚賴呢一份翻譯本，我想請你睇 90-3 嗰一頁，就係講到安全嘅設施。搵唔搵到？

梁健宏先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。委員會就係聽到工會咁講「為咗減低維修嘅費用，九巴自從 2015 年開始就係不適當地係拆除咗所有啲防霧嘅熱氣裝置，令到前面嗰塊嘅玻璃就有好多霧化嘅情況，如果個天氣係凍同埋濕嘅時候，即係當外部同埋內部嘅溫差係大嘅時候」。佢哋就係講到附件 1，我諗應該喺原本嘅 91 頁同埋 91-1 頁，就係睇到個翻譯。

我想請問係咪啱嘅，自從 2015 年開始，你就拆除咗所有嘅除霧器喺巴士上面？

梁健宏先生：不正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你覺得個工會當時係講緊乜嘢？

梁健宏先生：我相信佢係講緊我哋有啲除霞器係有兩款嘅，我哋 basically。以往有啲係暖風，去到 2010 年，我哋就轉咗用啲冷風嘅。喺附件 1 嗰架車車牌 UF2751 係一個用冷風除霞器嘅裝配嘅，呢架車我相信大約係接近兩歲嘅。

點解我哋由暖風變做冷風，2010 年之前所有嗰啲巴士嘅除霞器都係用暖風，啲暖風就由我哋喺車尾個引擎嗰啲冷卻水，經過引擎加熱，啲熱水就由車尾沿住水喉接駁去到車頭嘅，嗰度長度有一架巴士咁長，係 12 米咁長，來回就有 24 米嘅。呢 24 米嘅熱水喉，啲熱水就係喺度流轉嘅。暖風除霞器就係用呢啲咁嘅熱水，就產生啲熱氣，就令致到嗰個車長嗰個駕駛螢光幕，個 windscreen 就唔會有 condensation 嘅，尤其是喺比較天氣凍同埋潮濕嘅日子。

但係呢個咁嘅裝置就唔係好可靠，好多時啲水喉可能會爆。如果爆水喉嘅話，有啲好熱嘅水，嗰啲水熱呢，就溫度相當高。亦都有啲個案，有啲熱水就真係流入到個車箱入面。去到 2010 年，我哋公司就將呢樣嘢就換咗做吹乾嘅冷風，去解決咗呢個情況。不過係無論係暖風好、冷風好，你開著咗佢都需要五至十分鐘先至可以將嗰啲 fog，嗰啲 condensation 去 remove 嘅。

呢個冷風除霞器 2010 年我哋開始代替個暖風，但係呢樣嘢，車長就唔係好歡迎，因為天時凍，仲吹啲冷風。所以變咗去到 2015 年，2015 聽到啲車長有啲咁嘅意見，就要搵啲--要解決。因為你唔多唔少都可能影響到嗰個駕駛狀況，我哋就搵到啲 anti-fog 嘅 coating，除霞膏，搽喺嗰個 windscreen 上面。似乎就好 old-fashion，不過亦都係好 effective 嘅。你搽咗上去之後，condensation 就唔會發生。

同一時期，我哋覺得都可能要搵其他方法。同一時期，我哋亦都同嗰啲巴士製造商去研究其他啲 demister。我哋同 Volvo 去傾傾，睇睇會唔會有啲東西。有兩樣嘢可以走咗出嚟，其中一樣就係 heated windscreen，個 windscreen 入面係有啲發熱線嘅，呢啲其實都好 common 喺私家車，但係喺 double-decker 其實就--即係你唔問佢，佢唔幫你做，都做唔到。但係係咪即刻有，亦都唔係咁簡單。你唔係喺超級市場就可以買到，要特登為巴士去做。我哋 2016 年就試裝咗上去，有廿五部車有 heated windscreen 嘅，至到而家。

亦同一時期，我哋亦都同 ADL，第二間巴士製造商，就同佢研究第二樣嘢，就係用 electrical 嘅 demister，同發熱線製造啲暖風去 remove 嗰啲 condensation。而呢樣嘢亦都經過一輪嘅測試，因為呢度牽涉到有啲

heating element，唔多唔少亦都要解釋嗰個甚麼可能有啲其他嘅問題。所以亦都卒之都今年亦都解決咗個問題，卒之都有個可行嘅 electrical demister 可以安裝。

所以去到呢個 moment，我哋有 electrical demister、有 heated windscreen 呢兩個 option。而公司亦都決定將呢兩樣嘢裝喺我哋嗰啲冇暖氣嘅、冇暖風嘅巴士度，冇暖風嘅 demister 嗰度，我哋會 retrofit 呢啲咁嘅 equipment 去到用冷風除霞器嘅巴士上面，從而令到希望所有嘅車隊都可以提供一個好 proper 嘅 demister，令到車長係樂於使用嘅。我哋將來嘅新車都傾向採用 heated windscreen。

李澤昌先生：呢度補充一句，其實塗呢個塗液，其實過往我哋都知道有好多即係技術性嘅問題。因為好多時啲車長佢唔知道，佢塗咗，佢用佢嘅過往嘅方法，佢抹咗，可能係甩咗。亦都係好倚賴我哋去到廠嘅時候，係靠一啲員工係塗上去。其實係喺嗰個人手方面係有啲--即係唔好聽啲，有啲囉唆。我哋而家就都已經黐咗啲告示牌話呢架車係塗咗。

但係你睇到成個過程，呢啲前面車嗰啲除霞嘅嘢，其實過往我哋係冇停過手係諗緊啲新嘅方法去做。就算你講緊今日嗰個前面 windscreen，未來我哋嘅新車安咗嗰啲，即係已經佢裏面 embed 咗嗰個 demister 係全世界嘅雙層巴士第一架，即係我哋同啲製造商都已經差唔多花咗超過一年嘅時間，即係好似梁生話喺巴士嗰度，係真係同私家車好唔同，做嘅嘢係要多。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以請你睇番 KMB-1 文件冊，第 98 頁？你會睇到呢一個係交畀運輸署嘅報告嘅第一頁，呢個係 2018 年 3 月 12 號係交畀運輸署，呢個係巴士意外之後交畀運輸署嘅報告。請大家睇第 15 頁，即係呢一個文件冊嘅 115 頁。

第 46 段就係講到話有霧氣呢個問題，你有同運輸署係報告過關於呢個霧氣嘅問題，睇唔睇到？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二行嗰度就話喺呢一個事件之前，我哋就係會有呢啲塗層係髹上去嗰個擋風玻璃嗰度，如果佢哋冇熱氣嘅除霧器，我哋檢討咗個機制之後，無論熱氣嘅除霧器，或者係加熱嘅擋風玻璃，我哋都會採納，咁樣係會更加有效，更加快咁樣除霧。

係咪即係話喺嗰個 2 月 10 號嘅巴士意外之前，嗰啲除霧嘅做法係並不令人滿意？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以請你去睇番行動計劃，即係第一個，151 頁？第二十項就係講霧氣嘅問題。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：Thank you. （經傳譯員）喺第 2 段嗰度就話現有嘅巴士，即係唔係新巴士，就會係加裝熱氣嘅除霧器或者加熱咗嘅，或者暖化咗嘅擋風玻璃。你就話喺未來十二個月係分期咁樣做，你而家係做到邊個階段？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）而家我哋係跟到個時間表，我哋已經開始咗加裝，我哋而家已經係訂咗大多數嗰啲組件。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有幾多架巴士係需要咁樣加裝？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）總共係大約二千七百個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家做咗幾多架？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）大概做咗十架，今日為止。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會知唔知道呢個計劃？

梁健宏先生：佢哋知道嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道公司同埋工會喺呢一方面有冇任何意見分歧？

梁健宏先生：冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咪講番九巴僱員工會嗰個意見書，係 90-3，呢個係一個譯本嚟嘅，嗰個文件冊係 TU-1(A)。

跟住頭先我讀過嗰段下面緊接嘅，下一段我哋得到啲咁嘅資訊，工會就向委員會提出呢個睇法嘅。「此外，公司改咗個變速器嘅按鈕，呢個係為咗安全駕駛設備嘅。佢將呢個超檔嘅掣同埋人手嘅減速嘅裝置就係取消咗，淨係靠嗰個由電腦嘅 D 波嘅控制器嚟到控制車輛嘅速度。响嗰個緊急嘅情況之下，就因為冇任何嘅安全裝置畀巴士司機用，係好危險嘅。例如好似飛機、地鐵或者係高鐵，或許係遊船，佢哋都係用電腦嚟到航行嘅。但係响緊急嘅時候，就會係用一個人手嚟到控制嘅模式，嚟到防止避免危險嘅，呢個就等如全自動波嘅私家車都係會有一個加減波嘅設備嘅。」

佢就話响有附件 2 同附件 3 嘅一啲資料嘅，你可以睇到呢一啲相片，92、92-1、93 同 93-1。

工會代表响較早前嘅研訊就第十日，佢都有講過嘅，係 13 頁到 18 頁。你有冇機會睇過佢哋陳述嘅？

梁健宏先生：係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先我問一問係咪曾經有段時間，即係文件所講嘅，即

係話人手減速嘅一個裝置，即係車長可以使用呢個裝置？

梁健宏先生：我哋所有嘅巴士都有 retarder 嘅，我哋所有嘅巴士個 retarder 都係自動波箱，有腳掣去控動嘅。唯一 hand retarder 就係我哋有特別嘅路線 which is 大帽山嗰條路線係好長、好斜，就有個特別嘅配置係需要特別嘅，係用 hand retarder 嘅。我哋所有嘅巴士都係配置 retarder 嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢哋嘅意見書就暗示似乎話有個人手嘅減速呢個掣就取消咗，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：完全不正確。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇睇佢哋响第十日向委員會講咗啲咩嘢，文件冊第 4 號，第 13 頁第六行。黃小姐就話「呢個講講嗰個係變速器嘅按鈕」，我頭先讀咗出嚟，「公司改咗嗰啲係變速嘅按鈕，就係為咗安全駕駛，就取消咗 O/D 呢個減速，同埋人手減速嘅裝置嘅，就淨係靠嗰個由電腦控制嘅自動波控制系統嚟到控制速度。」

就去到 14 頁，第廿五行，問郭生呢個問題，「就話取消咗呢個人手減速裝置，點樣會影響巴士安全？你可唔可以回應？」呢位 Ivan Lee 先生講「呢個裝置，就等你可以選擇一啲做--嘅行動嘅，可以有個自動嘅選擇--即係你可以選擇自動操控，或者係混合自動人手操控，同埋人手操控，唔同嘅方法嘅。」

去到 17 頁，主席就係問一個問題話「你未繼續之前，我想問，係咪即係呢個情況其實係冇咗呢個人手嘅減速器，就即係話巴士車長冇機會揀點樣減慢個車速，最好就有，係咪咁嘅意思？」Ivan Lee 先生話「可以咁講嘅。」郭先生喺第九行就話「等我答覆，人手減速好重要，特別你係落山嘅情況。」十八行「如果冇嗰個人手減速，我哋就係利用嗰個變速器嚟到減速，唔係淨係靠煞車掣。」證人就再講「冇咗呢個人手嘅減速器」--似乎佢哋嘅回覆就暗示某個階段，你哋即係取消咗呢個人手減速嘅裝置。你明唔明白佢究竟想講咩嘢？

梁健宏先生：或者我嘗試咁樣答，我哋係冇取消到任何 retarder 嘅。或者你睇番 appendix 2。

MR DUNCAN：Of...

梁健宏先生：Annex 2 of 僱員工會嗰個，唔好意思。

主席：Yes?

梁健宏先生：你留意番佢講緊嗰個就係“gear selector”，其實嗰個唔係 gear selector 嚟，嗰個係 gear inhibitor，嗰個就係限波掣嚟嘅。舊款車係有限波掣嘅。我哋 2008 年就轉咗用智能波箱，就唔需要限波掣。限波掣係咩嘢，限波掣嘅設計，就等你架車，尤其是你上斜路嗰陣時唔係好夠力，就唔想個車長可以揀咗唔好上三波，唔好轉上二波。因為如果你上咗某個波段，跟住唔夠

力，又會跌番落嚟，跟住又上番去，又跌番落嚟。所以當其時呢個限波掣，就令致個車長一個選擇，等架車嗰個 journey 就比較順暢啲，呢個就限波掣，佢限住個波箱，就唔好跳上去高一個波。

調番轉頭，如果呢個限波掣，佢落斜路嗰陣時佢撳，佢唔可以由一個高波即刻變做一個低波嘅。For example，如果佢行緊四波，你撳個限波掣二，佢唔會好似私家車咁轉咗落去個二波度嘅，係唔會嘅。呢個 gear inhibitor 係唔係好似大家所想像中係愛嚟減速嘅，呢個完全唔係嘅。

呢架車，呢架巴士，一個咁重型嘅巴士，尤其是載客嘅，安全個系數係點樣樣去保持，就係用減速器。每一架巴士，我哋都有油壓減速器，而呢個油壓減速器就係一個全動箱，喺個波箱入面，或者係附件嚟嘅。我哋每一架巴士已經有嘅。呢個油壓減速器係點操作，就係喺嗰個逼力掌嗰度，當佢想啟動呢個減速器，佢只要輕輕咁喺個腳掌，喺個逼力掣嗰度壓落去，就會啟動呢個減速器。個減速器其實就係一個油壓嘅減速器，佢就利用嗰啲油壓嘅 friction 去減速。但係呢個油壓減速器亦都唔會對嗰個逼力皮有損耗嘅，佢純粹係減速，令到架巴士減速，但係唔會令致到嗰個逼力系統係受 loading 嘅，呢個係安全嘅設備，係好多年已經係巴士標準嘅裝備嚟。所以我哋係完全冇--亦都係拆唔到嘅。

至於我哋去到 2018（原文照錄）年，2018（原文照錄）年智能波箱，呢個限速器就唔再需要。所以變咗你見到有啲相片，就係冇一、二咁嘅，淨係 D、N、R，就冇呢個 gear inhibitor 嘅 button。因為 2008 年嗰啲波箱已經係智能波箱，你呢啲波箱，佢亦都知道架車係上緊斜或者落緊斜，佢知道個車長佢係咪踩緊油，佢知道個車長踩油踩得幾深，或者佢踩 brake 踩得幾多，從而個波箱會自自然然就住架車喺咩嘢狀況，喺咩嘢波段，令到入到一個適合嘅波段嘅。譬如如果佢上緊斜，個波箱知道佢上緊斜，佢就唔會咁容易畀佢跳上一個高啲嘅波段。所以呢啲其實就係一個智能波箱，就唔需要車長花太多嘅 effort 去兼顧去揀邊一個波段，從而希望減輕喺駕駛嗰陣時嘅壓力，集中精神留意交通狀況，呢個係智能波箱帶嚟嘅好處。我哋從沒有拆除任何安全嘅裝置。而呢啲亦都係大部分嘅標準裝置嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道而家工會有冇呢方面--人工減速器有冇咩嘢意見、睇法？

梁健宏先生：I repeat，我哋冇 manual retarder system 嘅。我哋亦都聽唔到其他工會就住呢個課題有咩嘢任何嘅意見。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）個工會亦都向委員會提出過另一個事項，我想畀你一個機會嚟到回應嘅。即係話司機要揸嘅路線--即係話一更要揸幾條路--就一條路線嘅問題。我哋收到兩個工會嘅代表嘅證供，佢話有啲司機某一日可能需要揸三條路線，佢哋覺得對於司機嚟講負擔太大。

首先係咪有啲司機需要一日嘅工作要揸三條唔同嘅路線？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，係有嘅，係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會認為呢個對於巴士車長就太大負擔，你哋有咩嘢回應，公司有咩嘢回應？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋公司亦都係有一個內部制定嘅指引，每一位車長喺每一日嘅更分裏面，佢係唔可以揸多過三條唔同嘅路線，亦都係喺我哋嘅派更組嘅同事，佢哋係會知道呢一樣嘢嘅。所以有個別同事車長講，佢哋可能會揸三條線，係可能會發生嘅，呢個亦都係喺我哋嗰個指引嘅範圍裏面嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）工會有冇同你講過，就係佢哋話個意見，一日三條線太多？

彭樹雄先生：呢個真係好視乎--如果純粹講工會，呢個其實佢哋比較少提及三條線係多。其實好多時，我哋好多個車長，佢哋手頭上佢可以揸到嘅線路，其實都係有一定數量嘅。但係我哋呢個指引，其實就係想確保佢哋喺每一日嗰個 shift 裏面係唔會有太多唔同嘅變化。因為可能要記啲站等等，可能會有啲困難。不過呢個歸根究底，佢所有嗰啲嘅路線，佢一定要有相關嘅路線操練嘅，呢個就絕對係肯定嘅。只不過我哋唔想佢揸咁多條線，就係因為可能有啲站等等佢要記，某個程度上可能佢哋會覺得辛苦啲。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我唔係好明你個答案。我問你有冇任何嘅工會係投訴過話三條線係太多，你嘅問題就話，佢哋真係冇乜提過。即係佢真係有冇提過，係完全冇提過？

彭樹雄先生：佢哋有個別少數嘅車長有提出過，呢個係事實嚟嘅，所以我哋公司都制定喺三條線或者以下，每一個 shift。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）嗰啲同你提過話三條線太多嗰啲車長，係咪大多數，抑或係少數，你可唔可以話畀委員會聽？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗彭生頭先就已經講咗話係少數，佢係講咗少數嘅。你可唔可以畀啲數字我哋？

彭樹雄先生：我諗我即係喺呢一刻，我好難畀到個好確實嘅數字，不過我哋可以返去睇一睇，譬如我哋可以攞一日嘅 example 可以睇一睇。

主席： Thank you, Mr Duncan.

彭樹雄先生：Sorry，對唔住，主席。喺我認知裏面，其實唔係好多，即係我 personally 唔係好多。即係當然，你話點樣 quantify 或者點為之多，點為之少，其實喺我嘅認知裏面，就唔係太多嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，得，大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者而家可以小休，好唔好，主席？

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，當然。各位，就好似以前咁多日，我哋下晝都會有一個小休，等大家休息一下，十五分鐘。

下午3時49分聆訊押後

下午4時04分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。各位請你揭去TD-1，477頁。大家見到呢係運輸署發出嘅一封信，係發畀專營巴士公司嘅。日期呢係2018年6月7號，係委員會成立之後嘅，亦都開始咗討論㗎嘢。大家睇到？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺未收到呢封信之前呢，咁嗰封信呢，就通知收信人就有呢個係數碼嘅地圖嘅，喺呢封信，收到呢封信前呢，九巴知唔知道有咁樣嘅設備，有咁樣嘅方便嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）你係話地理圍欄呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我講緊係電子地圖。

梁健宏先生：知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你幾時開始知道呢個電子道路嘅地圖係可以--你可以搵到嘅，攞到嘅？

梁健宏先生：對唔住，我以為你講geo-fencing，如果你個map係accessible to openly呢就係呢封信先至知嘅，係6月7號。

MR DUNCAN： Right --

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度有兩樣嘢嘅，一係就數碼地圖喇，亦都係有講嗰個限速嘅資料呢件事嘅，咁個問題就係話，你知唔知道晌6月7號之前喇吓，收到信之前呢，知唔知道有呢兩件事㗎？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔知嘅。

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二段，發信嘅人呢，呢度就咁寫，運輸署所用呢個地理嘅資訊系統嘅係一個道路嘅限速呢，已經係有㗎嘞，佢就咁講，已經係有㗎嘞。而家呢你知唔知道，呢個資訊呢係幾時係有嘅呢，幾時可以--幾時開始你係有嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：而家就我哋同啲我哋嗰啲供應商，亦都嘗試去經過呢個佢畀我哋嘅資料呢，係攞呢啲資料嘅，喺 data set 嗰度，咁雖然嗰個 format 就要需要處理，但係係攞緊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題就係，你知唔知道呢啲資料，第一次開始係幾時有，呢度講話，封信就話已經有㗎嘞，咁而家你知唔知道係幾時開始有嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）只係從信件先知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度佢就話好消息，香港有一個係數碼地圖嘞，咁當然喇已經係有㗎喇，一段時間喇，你可唔可以睇睇呢個三--可以用呢個嚟去睇睇你嗰三十七個地點嘅資料呢，嗰三十七個人點樣安排工作呀，你幾時知道有咁樣嘅資料嘅呢？你幾時知道呢個資料係可以攞到嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：唔明。

陳祖澤先生：唔係我哋而家知唔知道呢個 system 喺政府，佢話有呢個 system，係幾時？

講者（不能辨別）：我哋幾時知嘅？

陳祖澤先生：唔係我哋幾時知，政府幾時有呢個 system。

梁健宏先生：政府有好耐已經有呢個 system㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我就想知。等鄧生--大律師問呢，即係話已經有咗一段時間㗎嘞，好長時間，咁即係話呢個資訊係幾時第一時係有嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話都好耐之前已經有㗎嘞，咁你講緊係咩嘢時間呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，嗰個有啲混亂嘞，我係唔知道政府係會免費提供呢個資訊畀我哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白，你收到呢個好消息，有數碼地圖，有速度限制嘅資料畀到你嘞，你有冇嘗試搵已經有咗幾多年喇，咁樣呢個資訊其實？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅資訊科技服務部門呢就係舊年攞過嘅，咁所以我當時都知道係有咁樣嘅資訊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪你意思話佢哋冇通知你話有呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）你係講運輸署呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，係呀，你嗰個資訊科技部門㗎，你話舊年就試過搵過一次㗎嘛。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）不過呢個唔係嗰個即時嘅地圖。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁先生，其實呢好簡單嘅個問題，當時呢通過呢封信話畀你聽有數碼地圖嘞，咁嗰個有個功能呢，等你知道嗰個係速度嘅限制係乜嘢嘅，咁我哋問嘅問題呢，之後，收到信之後，你有冇試圖搵出究竟第一次幾時開始有呢個資訊呢？即係話我哋隔咗咁耐先--幾耐先至收到呢個消息呢？

陳祖澤先生：Sorry，我哋而家政府話畀我哋聽有呢樣嘢，但係我哋知唔知佢政府有呢樣嘢有咗幾耐。

講者（不能辨別）：幾耐，係嘞，係。

講者（不能辨別）：你知唔知？唔知就唔知。

梁健宏先生：我唔知，我唔知，sorry about that，I don't know。

李澤昌先生：但係 GIS 呢樣嘢呢，係即係根本上我諗好多--已經唔係一件即係呢一、兩年間嘅事嚟嘅，呢個係一個即係係政府嘅--係一個 geographical 嘅 information system 呢，呢個係有咗一段好長嘅時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你未收到呢封信，即係話 6 月 7 號之前，你哋公司有冇詢問過政府，嚟到確--即係問一問，究竟有冇呢個數碼地圖，係咪可以攞到呢個數碼地圖，有冇問過呢？

梁健宏先生：冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道譬如話倫敦呢，數碼地圖有埋嗰個速度嘅限制嘅資料呢，自從 08 年、09 年都已經係有㗎嘞，你知唔知呢件事呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。請你睇 KMB-1 號，279 頁。我哋首先睇 235 頁，等我哋知道呢份文件係關於咩嘢嘢嘅。你可以睇到呢日子係 8 月 8 號，呢一封信呢係交畀委員會嘅。係處理第 1、3、6 項，同埋第 4 項嘅一個海報，同埋一封通函㗎，你睇唔睇到呢？係第 2 段嗰度咁寫。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁我哋呢就要睇下第 6 項係乜嘢呢，我哋就要上番去一

頁喇，睇番委員會寫嘅信呢，就係 8 月 8 號寫嘅。我哋可以睇到呢，就係一啲文件，係去描述有關嘅證供喇，同埋關於嗰啲嘅步驟，係講到 Openmatics 點樣去處理即時嘅呢一啲數據，就係話譬如每 50 公里，或者每 70 公里嗰啲咁嘅地方點樣有人超速咗，係超速咗幾多，同埋係做過啲咩嘢嘅測試㗎。

咁你呢就好好喇，就畀咗一啲嘅資料我哋嘞，咁喺呢一方面呢，我有興趣嘅呢就係 279 頁嗰度。呢一個係關於第 6 項。咁我呢想你睇一睇，做咗嘅工作嗰一度嗰幾段。就話呢係做咗好幾樣新嘅措施呢去改善以上嘅情況，Openmatics 呢就係用手動去分開咗 50 公里同埋 70 公里嘅區份㗎。九巴呢就喺 2018 年 7 月 31 號呢開始咗一個概念嘅測試，就係將上面嘅車速同實際嘅車速呢去比較㗎，咁呢一個呢就係要去核實一下呢一個即時嘅車上車速警示，係咪可以通知到巴士車長，就話佢已經係超速嘞。

咁而家嗰個開頭嘅測試嘅結果係正面㗎，我哋會再進一步做其他嘅測試，我哋係會準備引進政府嘅數碼地圖呢入去 Openmatics 嗰個黑盒嗰度，係需要三至四個月㗎。不過呢政府嗰個數碼地圖就冇包含即時嘅資訊㗎，而只係每六個月呢先至會更新一次嘅啫。

個問題呢就係，你覺得喺過去，即係最屘嗰一行嗰度呢，你認為有啲咩嘢嘅不足之處呢？你話政府嘅數碼地圖呢係冇即時嘅資訊，只係每六個月先至更新一次。

李澤昌先生：Live information 嘅意思即係話當個路面將會發生嘅情況，好快會影響到嗰個路面嗰個車速，而呢個訊息會好快傳遞到去嗰個 digital map 個 information 裏面，咁呢個就喺我嚟講，係一個 live 嘅，即係例如今晚嗰條隧道會封閉，或者另外一條隧道變做單管雙程行車嘅時候，個速度會大大減低，咁好短嘅時間呢，嗰個 map 就會知道嗰條隧道嘅 speed limit。今天呢個 digital map 呢就係每六個月會 update 一次嘅，咁即係話，換言之即係話，如果嗰個時間愈嚟愈縮短嘅話呢，咁呢就愈嚟愈接近嗰個 live 嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係咪真係準確呢，係咪真係每六個月先至更新一次，抑或係好似佢網站咁講呢？

梁健宏先生：我哋亦都同嗰啲政府官員討論過，希望佢畀個 live map 我哋，但係 so far 都仍然係--都係六個月 update 一次，同埋 update 嗰啲係永久 permanent 嘅 road speed。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係同邊個講呢啲呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有一個電郵嘅，係我哋嘅人員同運輸署。

主席： Do you have that with you?

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一個副本我哋？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家可唔可以攞到呢？未編號嘅，咁你可唔可以複印畀我哋呢？唔該。我哋印多幾份喇，唔該。你剛才答緊我問題，但係我呢就係打岔咗你嘅，就係你同邊個講呢一個對話呢？唔好意思，而家你冇嗰份文件喺手，拎咗去影印，咁你就答唔到嘞。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）其實係同運輸署嘅工程師呢，我哋通過電郵。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋一陣間睇番個文件就知。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）似乎呢其實係個限速，唔係個車速，係有時呢同一日之內呢，譬如話喺路上面有啲建造工程呀，都有可能變速㗎每一日，咁但係佢就唔係每一日去更新㗎？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係要睇番個道路情況，有時呢係有啲臨時嘅建造工程，咁有啲路係縮短咗喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁但係呢啲都係刊憲嘅道路嚟㗎嘛，係咪呀？不如我哋一步一步咁講喇，應該有一個制度㗎，等呢一啲嘅速度限制可以合法咁樣改變，呢一個呢就係政府要喺憲報嗰度刊登，就話呢一段嘅路，原本係每小時 70 公里呢，喺未來三個月呢就會改到去每小時 50 公里，你知唔知有咁樣嘅制度？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我係知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）而呢一個刊憲嘅制度呢，係處理以月計、以年計嘅改變，但係甚至係短期嘅改變都會係刊憲處理㗎，有時呢處理嘅改變呢，只不過係幾個鐘，或者係幾日。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）即係譬如話隧道有意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我而家問你呢就係，呢啲全部都係刊憲嘅，你係咪話畀我聽有另外一個嘅制度都可以合法咁樣改變道路嘅車速，而唔係通過刊憲嘅呢？我哋冇咁講，咁全部都係刊憲嘅。咁如果而家睇番轉頭，2018 年嘅憲報，你就會發覺呢應該有廿二份呢啲憲報呢係處理呢一個問題嘅，有啲係臨時嘅，有啲係長期嘅。或者我哋等一等，等下嗰份文件先。大律師你有冇其他嘅嘢想處理先？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想問呢運輸署有冇回覆你嘅電郵？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署並未回覆。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔緊要，照直講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家呢，我想講一啲關於科技嘅裝置，係有一啲意見書交畀委員會嗰度呢提起㗎，即係話而家已經有嘅，有可能用到嘅科技裝置，而係

同安全有關嘅。咁或者我呢，可以咁樣開始，請你睇一睇 KMB-1 號文件冊，114 頁。呢一個畀運輸署嘅報告嗰度係抽出嚟㗎，係 3 月 12 號㗎，喺呢一版呢，你可以睇到第 5 部分，其他提升巴士安全嘅措施，我想請你留意呢就係 43 段，就係話傾側嘅警示。跟住佢係咁講，「全個車隊每一架巴士都會裝置傾側警示，當巴士係達到一個指定嘅傾斜度，警示就會係引發，就會係向司機發出呢個警示」，你睇唔睇到？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）睇到。係，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）星期二呢我哋聽到--我哋睇到 Kulis 先生嗰個證供，嗰個黑盒呢，Openmatics 提供嗰個呢，就係包括一個條文，就係有一個傾側嘅參數㗎，你記唔記得呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁生，我諗係你呢，星期二解釋過，公司呢並冇為呢個參數呢係講出一個價值，因為呢你識別唔到任何參照嘅價值，你記唔記得你講過？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我記得，係，我講過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以睇番 114 頁，第 43 段。咁樣講公唔公道呢，就係話呢一句，係因為巴士發生嘅事，因為有大埔嘅意外，呢一個係一個反應嚟㗎，咁樣講係咪公道呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，的而且確係事件之後。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪對嗰件事嘅一種反應呢？因為實際上係有傾側，而實際上係翻車嗦。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個係委員會嘅建議嚟，係嗰件事之後。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁唔係喺件事發生之後好耐，3 月 12 號，「委員會」即係咩嘢意思呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）九巴董事局嘅特別委員會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁而家唔該去睇 150 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續之前，喺 43 段呢一度嗰句，嗰個背景係咪第 39 段呢？就係其他提升巴士安全嘅措施，最屘嗰三句係咁講嘅，「特別委員會考慮過呢啲問題，就係同九巴嘅巴士供應商係諮詢過，咁呢就係作咗一啲建議，就話九巴嘅管理層呢就會係實施，或者係進一步去考慮㗎」，呢一個係咪個背景？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。（證人直接用本地話說）哦，我哋就住呢個 tilt alarm，tilt 呢個 angle 呢去點樣樣定一個 angle，因為之前我哋唔

知道點定。咁呀同 ADL 呀，同 Volvo 亦都商討過，佢哋亦都嘅 advice 呢就亦都冇一個建議畀到我哋，佢就建議呢就係，佢哋冇一個角度嘅建議畀到我哋。佢哋嘅建議呢就係，好難定到一個 angle 呢，因為佢哋覺得，定個 angle 如果係太細嘅話，其實就冇乜意思嘅，咁呀變咗啲車長呢就收到好多啲錯誤嘅信息。

咁如果定個 angle 係接近太危險嘅話，亦都唔知道個車長點 react，唔知道個車長會踩逼力，抑或會攞軚。所以變咗 Volvo 同埋 ADL 呢都唔建議嘅，都唔建議呢個 tilt angle 嘅，反為佢哋建議呢就係會唔會 ESP 呀，或者 ESC 去處理呢個 tilt 呢個 issue。而亦都冇其他嘅 reference 可以參考，包括其他巴士公司，或者其他國家有啲咩規定，就住呢個 tilt angle 嘅 alarm，亦都搵唔到任何相關嘅作為參考。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇同 Openmatics 講過呢件事呀？因為係睇番佢哋嗰個器材㗎。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁佢哋個反應係點呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋都話呢係冇任何相關嘅嘢，佢哋冇建議任何嘅數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁佢哋有冇向你顯示話知唔知道呢一個咁樣嘅警示，係任何人用得過嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇任何關於雙層巴士，即係同我哋相關嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你意思係咪即係話，如果唔係雙層巴士，就有一啲嘅汽車係用過呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋有講過一啲好似大嘅旅遊巴嗰啲咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係話 Openmatics 話畀你聽係喺嗰啲旅遊巴，佢哋有用過呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）咁又唔係，我哋問佢有冇任何相關雙層巴士嘅嘢可以畀我哋參考，佢哋畀咗個數字，不過呢具體上呢唔係關於雙層巴士㗎，我哋仲等緊佢哋係確認一個資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪係書面嗰度咁樣講㗎？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以將呢一個對話嘅副本可以交畀我哋？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾時嘅事呀，大概？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）一、兩個禮拜前。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該提交有關嘅通訊，關於呢件事嘅通訊嘅資料畀我哋。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁生，鑑於你頭先所講嘅事呢，我想你睇114頁，第43段呢，似乎呢講得好實在嘅，即係我哋會係裝置一個係即係傾斜嘅警報嘅，係所有巴士都會裝嘅，咁呀達到某一個傾斜角度呢，嗰個警示呢就會響嘅，嚟到係提醒個司機。呢個係咪公司當時有咁樣嘅決議呢？係我講緊2018年2月12號嘅時候。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗係3月12號嘅，當呢個紀錄，做呢個紀錄嘅時候。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，係3月12號嘅。呢個係一個好正面嘅，43段呢講得好正面嘅，公司呢會喺個總--你哋車隊呢所有巴士都裝呢個警報器嘅。

梁健宏先生：呢個就應該係個黑盒嗰度嚟㗎嘞嘞，就係個意思就應該係trigger嗰個alarm，喺個黑盒嗰度trigger嘅，就唔係話要再裝一個tilt alarm嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋明白嘅。不過我哋企番後睇睇呢，呢個特別委員會嘅一個建議嚟㗎，佢建議我哋有一個--要裝一個傾側嘅警報器嘅，咁呀去到某一個傾側嘅角度呢，咁就會響喇，係提醒嗰個巴士車長，呢個係3月12號嘅。好嘞，跟住呢你就之後呢，你就同ADL呀，同埋Volvo呀，兩間公司，同埋亦都同Openmatics講呢，咁呢個有咩嘢結果呢，可唔可以畀個即係簡述我呀？我哋知道發生咩嘢事呢？

梁健宏先生：Volvo, ADL --

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要詳細，即係講個結果得㗎喇。

梁健宏先生：冇一個合適嘅angle，定唔到一個angle。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁個結果就係咁樣，雖然係特別委員會有咁嘅建議呢，咁就你係冇辦法係真係實際上施行嘅，咁樣講啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，咁係啱嘅，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番第二個個行動計劃，同一個文件冊嘅231頁。呢個係一個8月6號提交畀委員會嘅一個工作或者行動計劃，呢度有一個簡述，用書面簡述咗頭先你同主席所講嘅說話，即係喺右手邊嗰一欄，咁呀講到底就係話，即係話唔會有個傾側角度嘅警報器嘞。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）咁講係啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你响嗰個意見嗰度，即係嗰個備註呢，呢個電子嘅穩定系統，有提過嘅。請你去番KMB-1號文件冊嘅114頁。我哋見到呢度係報告，

即係向運輸署提交嘅報告，即係 3 月 12 號嘅報告嘅內容呢，咁呀呢度就配合番有關嘅背景呢，即係話特別委員會呢考慮過呢件事，呢度就描述，咁呀亦都同巴士製造公司呢就商討過，咁有個建議呢，咁嗰個巴士公司呢係會實施，或者係進一步研究嘅。

咁呢度第 41 段呢，就講到係電子嘅穩定嘅系統嘅，咁佢係咁樣描述嘅，呢個咁嘅系統係一個重要嘅巴士安全嘅裝置嚟，喺歐洲嚟講，所有旅遊巴士係一個必定要裝嘅安全設備嚟嘅，呢個係防止嗰個跣胎同埋係翻車嘅危險，喺歐盟 V 同埋歐盟 VI 巴士裝置呢個電子穩定系統呢，而家係正在測試緊，亦都會同--供應商呢亦都係喺度做緊核實嘅過程。咁呀供應商證實咗可以做呢，我哋就會响--按一個分期嘅方法，將成個車隊嘅巴士就裝呢個電子穩定系統嘅。响呢件事件發生之前呢，你哋公司有冇考慮過採納呢個咁樣嘅系統呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第一次係幾時考慮使用呢個電子穩定系統呀？

梁健宏先生：喺 14、15 年之間，我哋係嘗試搵一間廠，佢叫做 MAN，喺德國，咁就有呢個 ESP 呢個 system，咁我哋喺 16 年嘅時間，就買咗二十架 MAN 嘅車，佢就配置咗呢個 ESP 嘅 system，係已經喺個路試緊，即係用緊，咁總共二十一架。

主席：（經傳譯員）MAN 嗰度畀你嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，係雙層巴士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁响 2 月 10 號發生意外之前，都用咗一段時間㗎嘞，呢啲巴士？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇決定究竟用呢個--應該係除咗 MAN 呢個巴士之外，其他都要運用呢個系統呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）而家我哋買嘅全部嘅新車，歐 VI 嘅新車，全部都會配置呢個 ESP 嘅 system。

主席：（經傳譯員）決策係幾時做㗎，幾時決定㗎？

梁健宏先生：因為嗰啲 Volvo 同埋 ADL 呢，佢要一段時間同佢傾，佢幾時開始有，咁就我哋磋商咗一段時間，佢哋可以 supply，所以先至係有嘅。

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）我哋其實响嗰個更新嘅工作計劃，即係 8 月 1 號嗰個工作計劃，2018 年 8 月 1 號裏面有講嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講邊一頁呀？等我哋可以參考嗰一頁。

彭樹雄先生：（經傳譯員）230。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我諗呢鄧先生問嘅問題就係話，2016 年呢你有二十一架呢啲雙層巴士，係由 MAN 提供畀你嘅，有呢個電子穩定系統，咁猛獅公司，咁你可唔可以幾時決定話新巴士呢就要有呢個系統嘞，即係响嗰個大埔意外之前，你幾時決定話要咁做呢？

李澤昌先生：嗰陣時仲試緊呀，所以即係想攞多啲數據先，因為嗰陣時得二十一架。但係我哋發覺到其實個 ESP 係可以幫助到，當架車 skidding，特別係佢 rolling 嘅時間呢，我哋就即刻將個速度會加快啲想做咗佢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個決定話要咁做，即係話 230 頁呢個行動呢，你嘅決定係因為 2 月 10 同埋有個特別委員會嘅調查，有個咁樣嘅建議，所以你決定咗要咁做？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以形容一下而家嘅情況係點呢？即係話從加裝呢個電子穩定系統嘅現時嘅進展呢？即係 114 呢，你話巴士供應商證實做到嘞，咁我哋就會係分期呢加裝呢個系統落去巴士度嘅，所有巴士度嘅，你有冇收到供應商話證實係做得到嘅？

梁健宏先生：佢哋都仲係喺度發展緊佢而家嗰套設備嘅，咁新車嚟到呢就係 2019 年嘅新車就會有，咁到期時佢就會下一步就睇睇點樣樣，呢啲咁嘅設備呢係去 retrofit 落我哋嘅舊車度，初步嘅 indication 呢就係 positive，咁就個時間可能需要時間，但係嗰個 indication 係 positive。

李澤昌先生：即係正如呢度講咗喇，Volvo 係大概 18 至 24，但係 ADL 就未有一個確實嘅時間表，嗰個 retrofit。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁 ADL 有冇講過可唔可行呢？

梁健宏先生：係嘅，可以嘅佢哋覺得，係可以 retrofit。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係成個車隊都包括在內？

梁健宏先生：淨係 restricted to Euro V 嗰啲車呢，係有電子逼力系統嗰啲車先至可以。

李澤昌先生：因為歐 V 之前呢係冇電子逼力系統嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係話有啲車隊裏面有啲巴士就冇嘅？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇，係啱嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有幾多架呢？

梁健宏先生：我諗我哋歐V以上嘅，佔我哋而家係超過一半嘅車隊。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話有一半係冇個囉喎？即係重新安置，就住做完都係有一半冇嘅？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁講啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者全面起見，我哋想睇睇TD-404。

主席： Which bundle is that in?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）TD-1。工作小組有冇建議所有專營巴士公司响新嘅雙層巴士，即係話2018年開始都係會裝呢個電子穩定嘅系統，係咪要咁樣做呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺(a)嗰一段，係咪就係話可以全面咁樣描述呢一個裝置嘅性質呢？

梁健宏先生：九巴就會係2019年1月1號嗰啲新車就會有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當我哋仲睇緊404頁嘅時候呢，你喺(b)嗰一段呢，係睇到一個參照呢就係講到減速器嘅，就係話你可以限制最高嘅車速，尤其是係落坡嘅時候，就係有一個限速嘅減速器。你睇唔睇到有呢一個提述呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想請你呢記住呢一點，然後呢再去睇番交畀運輸署嗰個報告，即係意外之後，喺115頁。

主席： Of KMB-1?

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）KMB-1號文件冊。可唔可以你自己睇一睇第45段呀？

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢就係咁講，佢話呢一個咁嘅減速器呢，就係一個水壓嘅設施嚟㗎，佢就話呢，做完一啲工程同埋測試之後呢，就可以喺新巴士嗰度裝上呢一啲嘅限速系統㗎。係邊一啲人會供應呢一類嘅裝置嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係巴士製造商。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）已經有咗幾耐呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）喺新巴士嗰度就會有㗎嘞，出年呢就有㗎嘞，就係ADL嗰啲，即係亞歷山大丹尼斯車廠。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗頭先大律師所問呢就係話，究竟嗰啲供應商幾時開始有？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）而家就冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我諗我問得唔清楚，呢一啲嘅裝置，喺大埔意外之前係咪已經有嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）冇㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）佢哋係幾時首先出現嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）將會有。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）第一個呢就會喺九巴嘅巴士嗰度出現。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話世界其他各地都冇？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）對雙層巴士嚟講係冇。我唔係好肯定。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你要小心啲答，要謹慎啲。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）去番最開頭先。喺意外之前，你知唔知道有呢一類嘅裝置？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有去過皇后大學，就係貝爾法斯特嘅，我哋就唔去亞歷山大丹尼斯車廠，我哋知道有咁樣嘅科技㗎，尤其是係車上可以用到㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係咪即係話呢一個嘅裝置呢，呢一個科技呢喺 Wright 嗰啲巴士嗰度有？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）而家係冇㗎。

李澤昌先生：其實今次呢個交通意外之後呢，我地同咗呢個 ADL、Volvo 呢兩間公司呢，係同佢傾嘅時候呢，我哋都係同佢探討緊呢，呢個 retarder 呢個東西呢，係咪可以呢係喺個巴士裏面安裝，咁佢哋當其時呢，都係花咗一段時間呢，係諗下呢個嘅可行性，咁我哋只能夠係講到呢度，因為即係唔係嗰件嘢，佢係好 readily available 咁樣畀我哋嘅感覺囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺今年二月嘅意外之前呢，其實你可能都知道你有嗰個減速器嘅裝置呢，就係令到你啲巴士係 70 公里內，咁係唔會喺巴士減坡嘅時候係受到影響，係咪？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）我知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為你嗰個系統就係話會減少燃油供應落去嗰個引擎嗰度吖嘛？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）既然你係知道呢一個系統就算巴士係落坡嘅時候超過 70 公里，佢都唔會將佢減速嘅，咁喺意外之前呀，你有冇查詢過喺市場上面，有冇任何嘅裝置，喺呢一方面會向你提供到協助嘅呢？

梁健宏先生：應該有，但係我唔知道喺邊一個情況講過。我哋有啲車係用 hand-retarder 嗰啲車就有，落斜路我地會 restrict 咗嗰個車速嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係問題嚟，你有冇考慮過，即係同巴士供應商喺意外之前，即係話自從意外之後，你發現咗有嘅嘢，你喺之前有冇傾過，即係話呢係可以喺落坡嘅時候限制車速？

梁健宏先生：我記憶中係冇。

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）或者我嘗試處理呢一個有少少技術嘅問題。之前我哋係講過一個某啲要喺西貢公路落斜嗰一啲巴士嗰度，可以有一啲手動嘅減速器，咁要答大律師嘅問題呢，係有㗎。呢一啲有手動減速器嘅巴士呢，喺大埔意外之前呢，好耐都有用㗎嘞，所以呢，你咁樣講就話我哋係知道，但係講到好似呢一類咁樣嘅限速減速器呢，即係我哋而家講緊呢啲呢，只係喺個意外之後，我哋先至知道有㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，明白，我明嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你意思即係呢一個水壓嘅系統？

陳祖澤先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以睇番個第一個行動計劃，等我哋可以明白呢一個情況。我相信呢應該係 150 頁㗎。係咪講呢一度呢，就係話有一個限速嘅制度，就可以自動咁樣係可以剎車，等佢可以減低嗰個波箱嘅操作。

梁健宏先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁嗰個行動嗰度就話，喺 4 月 10 號，亞歷山大同埋富豪呢，都係喺度探索緊點樣可以喺新巴士嗰度裝置呢一啲嘅設施㗎，咁就話喺適當時間亦都更新資料。然後我哋去第二個行動計劃。第 19 項。

主席：（經傳譯員）第幾頁呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）應該係 232 頁喇，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋係收到資料呢，就係話亞歷山大丹尼斯歐盟 VI 型嘅新巴士呢，就會有呢一個裝置，富豪呢就會係 2019 年 7 月呢就會有呢一種嘅設施，而佢哋新嘅歐盟 VI 型巴士，如果喺呢一個時間之前，係交付嘅話呢，就可

以加裝呢一個設施㗎。咁樣係咪包括晒你將來會買嘅新車呢，即係從亞歷山大丹尼斯車廠同埋富豪？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係㗎，所有新嘅歐盟 VI 型車呢都會包括晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會將來買嘅車都會係歐盟 VI 型嘅呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）所有嘅新巴士呢都會係歐盟 VI 型。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪即係限制於亞歷山大丹尼斯車廠同埋富豪呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）到而家為止都只係有呢兩間嘅製造商係製造歐盟 VI 型嘅巴士。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我哋睇番工作小組嘅建議嘞。我哋可唔可以睇到啲細節呢，就係 TD-1，404 頁同埋 405 頁。你睇唔睇到呢一度寫嘅嘢呀？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到加裝呢，你就會發現呢，工作小組嘅建議就係話，就係呢兩個新裝嘅裝置呢，就都要喺現有嘅巴士嗰度去加裝㗎，咁就係話呢，你應該喺十二至十八個月之內，即係話 2019 年嘅下半年，就開始嗰啲試行嘅計劃㗎，你可唔可以同我哋確認一下公司對於呢一個加裝嘅工作，你打算點樣做呢？加裝呢一個裝置。

梁健宏先生：我哋會做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁你會唔會係根據工作小組嗰個建議咁樣去做呢？

梁健宏先生：我哋會跟進。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家呢想睇工作小組講嘅另外一個裝置。就係 405 頁，嗰度講到話一啲測試嘅，一啲新嘅安全科技嘅測試，或者呢，我而家係讀咗嗰個引旨嗰一段出嚟先，就係話令到專營巴士商可以更好咁樣管理同埋控制佢哋嘅車隊，同埋呢係防止一啲不安全嘅駕駛行為造成嘅潛在風險。工作小組呢就認為有啲新嘅安全科技呢，係可以協助專營巴士商係去監察同埋控制巴士嘅安全。呢一啲應該係積極咁樣去探索嘅，一般嚟講呢，專營巴士商呢就係願意去睇下最新嘅安全裝置，或者係科技嘅裝置，去睇下邊度有呢一啲嘅供應，同埋願意呢係去測試佢哋嘅技術可行性，同埋呢係佢哋嘅--係咪物有所值㗎。

咁第一個建議就工作小組提出嘅就係所謂巴士監察同埋控制系統。我就可以讀出呢度嘅內容，由於有最新嘅巴士管理系統嘅技術進步，技術發展呢，有黑盒喇，亦都有即時嘅監察嘅功能，包括埋係速度呀，地球位置呀，同埋嘅紀錄呀，咁嗰個工作小組覺得呢一個中期嘅目標，專營巴士公司呢，應該設立一個，發展一個全面嘅巴士監察同埋個控制系統喇，有定位系統喇，亦都有啲係營運嘅資料可以進行監察喇，同埋有唔同嘅限速，包括係地球圍欄嘅科技喇，

會使用地球定位系統，或者其他嘅定位科技，呢個系統就會係即係將嗰個實際嘅巴士所在嘅位置，同埋嗰個法定嘅速度呢結合起嚟嘅。

咁跟住呢個實時嘅資料呢，限速資料就可以用嚟控制嗰個係限--加強個限速器，即係話限速器係有兩個唔同速度嘅設定嘅，即係話巴士嘅速度呢，係可以响嗰個速--即係譬如話每小時 50 公里、70 公里嚟到進行限制嘅，就視乎路段喇。呢個系統亦都可以容許個專營巴士公司嚟到係監察佢哋嘅巴士車隊喇，更加緊密咁樣去監察喇，亦都可以就住超速就採取適當嘅管理。就住超速同埋唔安全，或者唔妥當嘅駕駛行為，譬如話大力剎車呀，或者係上山或者轉彎嘅時候速度不當呢，進行一啲適當嘅管理行動。

咁呢方面就專營巴士公司同意呢係發展咁樣嘅系統，咁就會响另外一個階段進行測試嘅。第一個階段就會有一個咁樣嘅管理系統，係有定位嘅功能嘅，亦都有車務嘅資料嘅，例如車輛嘅速度呀，嗰個係剎車嘅狀態呀，加速等等，減速等等喇，有啲咁樣嘅監察系統，同埋個地理圍欄嘅科技呢，就要嚟管理個車隊，咁我會試用，嚟到係可以察覺到有冇超速，亦都可以即時提供實--警示畀巴士車長嘅。

第二個階段呢，視乎第一個階段嘅測試係如果係成功嘅話，咁呢個新嘅系統呢，即係巴士監察管理系統呢，就會有啲額外嘅裝--應用嘅功能嘅，咁就係一個加強版嘅增加，即係改進版嘅限速嘅功能嘅，呢個會由巴士製造商發展出嚟嘅，所以可以決定嗰個巴士嘅速度呢，就會係符合番唔同路段嘅相應嘅限速嘅。咁而家我哋睇睇巴士公司嘅行動計劃。

主席：（經傳譯員）未去嗰度先前呢，我就想問梁生一個問題，請你睇番 402 頁。運輸署呢提供咗啲資料畀委員會。呢個關於嗰個工作小組工作嘅進展，佢哋嘅會議喇，你見到最後兩行，「工作小組嘅報告呢，我哋會提交--儘快提供一個副本畀委員會參考嘅。」呢個係 7 月 19 號嘅信件，咁幾時可以收到，我哋幾時可以收到工作小組嘅報告呢？

梁健宏先生：我未收到過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以幫我哋呢，我哋幾時可以收到呢，你大概可以...

梁健宏先生：Working group 仲係開緊會。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白嘅，可能亦都係過咗我哋之前即係運輸署講嘅時間嘅限度喇，佢哋喺 5 月畀證供呀，我就想你可唔可以指示一下呢，即係作為你都係工作小組嘅一個成員喇，可唔可以畀我哋講一講大概我哋幾時可以收到報告呢？

梁健宏先生：有會議紀錄嘅，嗰啲我就收到會議紀錄嘅啫，Chairman。

主席：（經傳譯員）你唔明白我嘅講法，去到尾呢，個工作小組有個報告㗎，我哋幾時，大概幾時可以攞到呢個工作小組報告？

梁健宏先生：我要問番嗰個 working group 嘅 chairman。

主席：（經傳譯員）我都明白嘅，係咪差唔多完喇，差唔多即係做晒喇，就可以最後簽字？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）差唔多做完㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪工作小組仲有其他會議要開呀？係咪已經做晒佢哋嘅工作㗎喇？

蘇偉基先生：個 working group 呢，根據頭先講嗰兩個 agenda，一個 bus fleet，一個就係 training 呢，係開咗三次嘅大會呢，係叫做有一個階段性嘅進展嘅，咁我哋都 expect 佢有個 report㗎，咁出 report 就確實係主席、副署長去處理，佢跟手就召開咗第四次嘅會議，嗰個 agenda 最主要係講 bus captain training 入面有啲乜嘢嘅 monitoring mechanism，咁就係 9 月，我冇記錯係 9 月中開嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。跟住講下嗰個工作計劃嘞。150 頁，呢個係 KMB-1 嗰個文件冊嘅。呢個係第 16 段喇呢一頁，係關於呢件事嘅就係呢一段，係 BMCS，即係巴士管理及控制系統，係咪呢？

李澤昌先生：而家我哋係有向呢個方向做緊嘅。首先我諗頭先都講咗嗰啲 digital map 同埋嗰個 black box 嗰樣嘢，咁嗰樣嘢係而家係進行緊，有個時間表，咁如果嗰樣係做得到嘅話，第一個階段就可以將車長今日佢嗰個 70 公里，而呢個 70 公里今日淨係架車本身係 set 咗出嚟。咁呀未來呢係真係可以 70 同 50 呢都係提醒個車長，係即時呢，喺個 dashboard 嗰度見到嘅。

咁第二個階段就係講緊嗰個 geo-fencing，geo-fencing 嗰個其實係比較複雜，係首先一，就由個車本身佢嗰個 CAN system，輸入個資料喺個 black box，然後 black box 分析完佢嗰個 location 係咪超速，然後就叫個 geo-fencing 嘅 system 呢，就去番落去個 CAN system，即係架車本身嗰個系統嗰度，做呢個動作，究竟係收油吖，抑或將佢嗰個速度，去番嗰個 speed limit 嘅速度吖，或者係逼力呢，呢個呢係比較要小心啲，因為我哋係 overtake 咗，我哋 takeover 咗車長嗰個行為。咁呢個我哋亦都有一架車行緊係試緊呢樣嘢，但係就仲係喺試緊嘅階段嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪第 16 段呢度所講㗎？就反映嗰個需要做嘅工作，即係話呢個巴士管理同埋控制系統。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有啲進一步嘅更新呢，我哋睇番第二個工作計劃，231 頁，都係 KMB-1 文件冊。大家睇唔睇到 231 頁，2018 年 8 月 1 號嘅情況，呢

個係一個駕駛測試，頭先我哋提過呢件事嘅。

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁褪番後喇，我哋睇番工作小組嘅建議，根據運輸署所講呢，咁九巴就住第一個階段，第二個階段，而家嘅情況係去到邊呢？

梁健宏先生：Phase 1 呢就淨係畀 alert 嘅啫，淨係畀提示嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我哋達到邊一個階段呀？做咗一半，第一階段定係第二階段？

梁健宏先生：未㗎，我哋仍然都係喺度試驗，都未曾去到一個即係有結果嘅階段。

李澤昌先生：今日呢仲係嗰個，因為要個 digital map 呢，即係裝咗喺嗰個黑盒裏面呢，先至係可以完成咗 50 同 70，但係今日我哋試緊呢一架車呢，係試緊呢一個 50 同 70 嗰個情況裏面呢，個系統係 work 唔 work 嘅啫，咁即係話其實個 digital map 嚟咗之後呢，第一個階段呢，應該喺短期內應該可以做到。

梁健宏先生：補充一點喇，我哋而家就 manually 將有啲 location 呢就擺咗喺個黑盒度，manually 即係話邊一啲 GPS location 係個 zone 係 50 公里限制嘅，我哋就係 manually 就已經 put 咗落去嗰個黑盒嗰度，即係如果有個 live map 呢，我哋就成個擺咗落去呢就到期時就可以再認認真真再去試。

主席：（經傳譯員）有幾多路段呢，你哋人手即係分辨 50 公里嘅路段，70 公里路段，要涵蓋幾多路段呢？

李澤昌先生：我哋而家用手入嗰個係咁樣嘅，我哋將我哋行嘅車嘅路段係 70，咁呢就 manually 就 digit--我哋自己 manually install 落去 70 嗰啲地方，咁其實 install 70 嗰個 map 之後呢，即係 manual 嗰個，咁呢然後我哋就--其實呢就全部車都可以試得㗎嘞，但係我試咗一部，嗰一部車試咗佢行，喺 70，佢唔響，如果佢超過 70 嘅時候，50 佢係咪響，如果超過 50 嘅時候，而家我哋試緊一部，即係如果你可以想像呢，如果一部 work 嘅時候呢，其實我哋四千幾部車都會成功嘅。

但係另外個問題就返番去，就係而家呢啲係我用手去做呢個動作，咁如果嗰個 digital map，政府佢入咗去之後呢，咁嗰件事情呢，即係當然要 verify 啲 format 喇，咁呢就應該可以係實際可以好全面性就變咗一個 50 同 70，都會係做到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題我問，頭先問呢就話，人手做呢個階段呢，你涵蓋到幾多個路段呢？即係譬如話呢啲咁樣嘅參數呀，嗰啲定位系統嘅參數。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係所有嘅路段都得嘅。

主席： Thank you.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同委員會講一講大概呢兩個階段呢，要做晒啲測試要幾耐呢？

李澤昌先生：我哋畀咗你哋嘅，呢個係一個好 indicative，plan 咗邊啲路係 70，就係做 70。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提一提醒我哋响邊度搵到呢，文件度，係咪有一個好似係條狀嘅圖表畀我哋呀？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）279 至到 281。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。你可唔可以協助下我哋呢，第一個係咩嘢意思呢，就係 Openmatics 呢將有關嘅限速呢，係擺入去黑盒裏面嘅。

梁健宏先生：呢個就係將政府嗰個 live data set，就係嗰啲 road...

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話嗰個數碼地圖係有限速嗰個？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係，啱嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係由 Openmatics 去裝置落去黑盒，係咪所有黑盒呢？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係。咁喺測試嗰陣時可能係一、兩個。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係你希望可以達到嘅，係咪？

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）睇番唔同嘅步驟，呢度話核實嗰個限速嘅準確性，咩嘢意思呀？

梁健宏先生：亦都希望嗰套系統真係正常咁去運作呢，咁就真係要試試佢係咪去到嗰個地點，係真係做到嗰個要求。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係話交叉咁樣查核？

梁健宏先生： Cross-check.

李澤昌先生：有時呢，因為其實佢係好依靠嗰個 GPS 話番你嗰個定位嘅，有陣時啲路段呢，其實就算你嗰個 map 嗰個 speed limit 係準呀，但係實際上嗰個車嗰個彈上去嗰個未必係準嘅，因為你靠 GPS，嗰個位置會未必係準，嗰度要做少少調較㗎。

梁健宏先生：其中一個要考慮嘅就係嗰個 GPS 訊號係咪穩定，同埋係咪準確，呢樣嘢都要去 validate 嘅，Chairman。

李澤昌先生：即係譬如你喺屯門公路，我哋係個巴士車速係可以去到 70，其實當佢行緊屯門公路嘅時候，因為你靠 GPS 定嘅位呢，有陣時呢，佢會係度咗你行咗青山公路，咁嗰度就會 50㗎嘞。所以我哋要係即係有一段時間，因為有好多呢

啲路，佢唔同嘅車速，但係佢好近㗎，咁所以喺嗰度要做啲工夫。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個問題就係，係咪一條路係一條天橋，或者另外一條就唔係？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋平行嗰陣時都有問題，平行嘅兩條路都會有問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家呢就再睇番呢度嘅步驟嘞，咁你就會進行內部測試喇，咩意思呢？

梁健宏先生：可能就係一個自己同事嘅 test drive，或者一個特別嘅路線嘅測驗呀，呢啲係要去試下實際嗰個運作係咪達到預期嘅效果。

李澤昌先生：因為今日呢佢 70，佢響嗰盞燈嘅時候呢，係真係喺架車，佢本身嗰個 speedometer 嗰度呢，cut 咗個 70，佢響燈嘅，未來呢佢個 70 同埋佢個 50 alert 呢，係靠呢一個系統 alert，係完全兩樣唔同嘅事嚟，所以喺個車長嘅角度，佢今日 70 響燈呢，係因為佢係一個車速裏面呢，就提醒佢一過 70 響燈，未來 70 同 50 呢，都會靠呢一個系統呢，係同佢個實際上嗰個路面嗰個 limit 去響燈，咁即係同事呢，即係車長呢，佢可能要適應呢一樣嘢，所以要一段時間，等佢知道嗰個改變咗嗰個系統嗰個背後嘅誘因囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一度仲有另外，就係話同前線人員諮詢喇，咁我哋都顧名思義嘞，咁然後就係 1 月，就係全個車隊要實施㗎，即係 2019 年 1 月。

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁關於時間嗰度呢，我哋去睇下最屘嗰一行，你又重複嘞，就係之前所講嘅嘢，就係話進行內部測試，諮詢前線人員，點解要重複呢？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）呢個同呢個唔同嘅。呢個係 phase 2，係兩樣嘢嚟嘅，主席，phase 2 嗰個呢就係，頭嗰個就係佢嘅車喺嗰個 dashboard 裏面呢，有兩個 real-time 嘅，有個 real-time 嘅指示，就話畀個車長聽，你係超過 50 嘞，嗰個 speed limit，你要提醒佢，或者超過 70，你提醒佢。

下邊嗰個就唔同嘅，下邊嗰個呢，就係第二階段嚟㗎嘞，就係話當你嗰個車長係超過某一個 speed limit，或者某一個更加高嘅速度嘅時候，就由 geo-fencing 呢個 system，係 takeover 嗰個車長嗰個行為，就即係話畀你聽叫佢收油，咁呢一個呢，我哋係先做呢，呢個第一階段我哋寫漏咗係 70 公里嗰個啫，50 嗰個未做住嘅。咁如果即係話換言之呢，即係話當第二階段呢，就話如果個車長超過 70，有陣時落斜呀，等等嘅情況呢，咁個車就會係用 geo-fencing 呢個系統呢，就幫架車去收油嘞，就唔會再依賴提醒車長咁簡單，呢個係第二階段嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁第一階段係咪即係話 2019 年 1 月就完成呀？

李澤昌先生： We hope.

主席：（經傳譯員）係，大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。請大家睇運輸署文件 1 號文件冊，406 頁。就係講到下一個要測試嘅裝置㗎，就係話呢，碰撞嘅警示同埋維持行車線嘅裝置㗎。就係話呢一個係附加裝置嚟，就係會令到巴士車長呢係得到警示，就有可能會撞車嘞，咁呢個維持行車線嘅裝置呢，都係一個附加裝置喇，就係當巴士離開佢係應該轉向嗰條線嘅時候呢，就會係警示個巴士車長㗎。

咁兩個裝置呢都係市場會有㗎，因此呢喺專營巴士嗰度去試用呢一啲嘅裝置係應該㗎，我哋係會建議㗎。今日較早嘅時候呢，我哋睇番啲意外統計數字嘅時候，追撞同埋係迎頭嘅相撞呢，同埋因為轉線而有嘅意外呢，都係有成百分之廿五㗎。即係佢哋呢係總意外嘅百分之廿五㗎，呢幾種嘅相撞。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，你可唔可以話畀我聽呢啲嘅數字喺邊度呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係第 183 頁㗎，係 TD-1，183 頁。公司有冇考慮過係去應用呢一啲咁樣嘅裝置呢？大埔嗰個意外之前，有冇考慮過應用呢啲裝置？

李澤昌先生：有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以形容一下你哋考慮過啲咩？咁考慮過之後嘅結果係點？

主席：（經傳譯員）你未答呢個問題之前呢，我睇緊第 183 頁，因為轉線而造成嘅碰撞呢係百分之十一，係咪呢？抑或你係包括咗其他嘅意外呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，主席，我應該係講嗰啲分項㗎，我呢係將迎頭相撞、追撞同埋係轉線相撞呢，加埋係百分之廿五。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。唔好意思，請你再問嗰個問題喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係嘅。公司有冇考慮過使用呢一啲嘅裝置呢？即係喺 2 月個意外之前。

李澤昌先生：其實喺 2017 年呢，就我哋個工程部，我本人同埋我哋嗰個車務總監梁生，咁就喺公司裏面呢，我哋都有一班即係年青嘅工程師，一齊諗一啲即係新嘅方法，係可以係幫到你頭先講嗰兩樣嘢，亦都正正係咁樣，我哋喺正話我之前講過喇，喺上年嘅春天呢--秋天呢，我哋就去咗呢個北愛爾蘭，就搵咗呢間大學，Queen's University 喺 Belfast，咁呀正正就係研究緊呢兩個工作。

咁呀其實我哋自己 KMB in-house 都有個即係自己嘅一班工程師呢，都會一齊同--我哋 send 咗啲工程師，去咗呢個北愛呢，都係做緊呢一樣嘢，咁亦都北愛嗰啲，北愛爾蘭 Queen's University 亦都 send 啲 professor 過嚟香港一齊睇下我哋啲車係點樣。咁呢兩樣係兩個主要大嘅工程，一個就係你頭先講嗰個，即係 collision alert 嗰樣嘢，就話前車同我哋架巴士嗰個距離，咁呀呢個我哋察覺到呢，特別係嗰啲即係長途車呢，係嗰個意外呢，嗰個

direct嘅collision呢，係可以好fatal㗎。

咁我哋係，即係我哋自己都做緊一啲嘢，係可唔可以將嗰架車，同前車距離嘅時間係去到某一個距離，而你嘅車速亦都度咗你嘅braking distance呢係遠遠低過嘅時候呢，就應該要alert嗰個車長，咁呢個我哋自己裏面呢都不停做緊呢個工作，咁但係呢又有一間，而家我哋又搵到一間學校呢，喺Belfast呢，將呢樣嘢係一齊共同去發展。咁如果你睇下呢個VTech呢份文件裏面呢，亦都有介紹到呢，當佢轉線嘅時候呢，當個車長轉行車線嘅時候，而佢冇做到佢基本嗰啲嘅動作呢，個steering點點嘅話呢，亦都有啲提示，咁呢個而家我哋係研究緊嘅，不過係今日只係講畀你聽，係喺嗰個，即係我哋嗰個研究之間，係冇一啲即係實際上一啲即係初步嘅結論呀，或者結果出嚟。

梁健宏先生：補充一點喇，市面上喺可以搵到嘅third party嘅product呢，我哋都會密切留意嘅，咁就正如稍後都會講到嗰啲driver monitoring device，咁呢啲device有時都即係係咪真係啱使呢，有時都我哋都希望係嘅，我哋都希望係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據運輸署，就講到工作小組嗰個商議嘅時候，喺406頁呢，其實市場已經有呢啲裝置㗎，你睇唔睇到呀？

李澤昌先生：(c)嗰點係喇，drowsiness嗰啲，yes。

梁健宏先生：（經傳譯員）睇到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔係呀，(b)。

梁健宏先生：我知道有啲巴士公司都試緊嘅，咁我哋都會密切留意，咁我哋亦都會去再去睇睇，再試嘅，我哋會嘅。咁其實講番呢個lane-keeping devices嗰個alert呢，我記得亦都我哋嗰個神眼（原文照錄）我哋亦都試過嘅，好多年前，咁就呢啲產品，咁就當然以前試過係效果不如理想，但係而家嘅科技我哋會繼續留意，我哋會繼續再試。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問點解你要進行呢一個研究計劃呢？仲要同一間海外嘅大學去做，因為市場已經有呢一啲嘅裝置。

梁健宏先生：Mr Duncan，即係有時有啲product available呢，有時都試咗之後係唔係合用呢，都要真係要試過嘅。

李澤昌先生：因為呢度呢，其實即係要講多啲咁多多，其實每一件product呢，佢係喺佢當地嘅地方呢，可能呢係好適用，但係因為九巴佢涉及嗰個唔同嘅路呀，長途嘅路有喇，市區嘅路有喇，人多擠迫嘅路亦都有喇，即係好複雜㗎，所以即係冇一個好零零舍舍嘅一個即係third party嘅產品呀，可以係真係即係apply咗喺我哋身上，因為正正我哋就係講緊咁多人數呀，喺啲咁擠迫嘅路呀，或者一啲長途嘅路呢，係好難係搵一個呢，只能夠去試，但係當然試嘅同時呢，我哋都要自己呢，要搵一個自己嘅出路囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）大律師，我哋差唔多去到尾嘞，咁今日都係好長嘅，用咗好多時間嘞，咁我就唔打算呢要大家再留多啲時間。各位先生，今日好明顯呢你哋要再提供好多資料畀我哋嘅，我哋會睇個謄本喇，我相信你亦都會喇，你會睇睇究竟嗰度點樣講喇，你要提供啲咩嘢資料畀我哋喇，希望提供嘅資料我哋覺得會好有用。

我想請你可唔可以兩個禮拜，即係今日開始計，兩個禮拜內請你提供資料，因為我哋都需要另一個係口頭取供嘅環節嘅，咁如果我哋可以攞到，即係及時攞到個文件喇，編咗個號碼，咁呀會有幫助嘅，我都會請大律師都係喇，同樣係咁樣。好嘞，我就想請你兩個禮拜提供你哋要提供嘅文件，跟住我會再定一個日期做一個研訊嘅。

好，多謝大家出席，我知道今日都時間好長，咁亦都係大家都幫咗委員會好多，而家我哋暫時休會，到我哋定咗日期呢，我哋會復會嘅，唔該晒。

2018年8月11日

下午5時32分聆訊押後

[Blank Page]

Wednesday, 12 September 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD AND LONG WIN BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE, MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG, MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG

(simultaneous interpretation was used where indicated)

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN (continued)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Dr Leung, gentlemen.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Good morning, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Good morning, Dr Leung and gentlemen. Could I first acknowledge receipt of a considerable amount of material from the company since the last day of the hearing. Thank you for providing the committee with that information.

At the end of Day 14, I was asking you questions about the possible engagement of collision-alert and lane-keeping devices, and through Mr Leung we were informed that the company was undertaking research with Queen's University in Belfast, that had commenced last autumn, which is now about a year ago. Also, we were informed that in the market, you will be watching out for whatever third-party products might be available.

The committee has been made aware that there are devices of that nature available under the trade name of Mobileye, and I would like to ask the company whether you are aware of those sorts of devices.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, we were.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you considered the engagement of those devices?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, we will.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you not done so as yet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) In year 2014, we did try it out with Mobileye. In 2014, we had a similar trial scheme with Mobileye, but then the result wasn't that satisfactory, but of course technology does progress and in fact we have started to liaise with them again.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If I may add to that. As of today, we have already got something from Australia, and in fact we have something similar to Mobileye device, so that when a bus captain is driving, if he is to sort of doze off, then we will alert him. So we are carrying out a trial, and in fact at the same time we have also got help from Japan. For the past two years, we are looking for something similar, so that when the signs of fatigue are detected from the driver, then we can try to do something to help them.

It is difficult because in Hong Kong, for long-haul trips and short-haul trips, especially during peak hours, the bus captain will have to move his head very frequently, so it will be difficult to be precise. He has to liaise with passengers and he has to watch out for the road conditions.

So, to tackle the problem of fatigue, it will be difficult to get a third-party product. Currently, for Queen's University from Belfast, we are now tackling a number of points. First of all, a driver, for no particular reason, tries to change lanes, we would like to alert him. We would also like to alert him if he is keeping too close to the preceding vehicle. So we are carrying out technological research.

For the Japanese product, later in the year, we will have the chance to try it again. The Australian product is being tried. Then, for Mobileye, we did try it but for the time being it is not suitable for us.

CHAIRMAN: You are conflating a number of different devices there, are you not? Mobileye 6, for example, has a forward-looking anti-collision device. It picks up the speed limits, because it reads speed limits. But you are talking about an anti-dozing device as well.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes, basically, they are two different products. For Mobileye or the two

products being experimented by us, we are trying to check the facial expression of the bus captain or his visual -- his eyes, so as to alert him, so as to wake him up. Then there is a sensor on board. Then it measures the distance between the bus and the preceding vehicle, and it is aware of the speed of the vehicle.

We have the braking distance, that is, at a particular speed, you need to have a reasonable distance from the preceding vehicle to brake in time. So, if we know that it is very close to the preceding vehicle, and if the speed is such that it is not rational, then it is about something else, so it is entirely a different product.

We are having a trial of both kinds of products.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just so that we don't get confused by any sort of conflation, can we just, for the moment, keep to the collision-alert and the lane-keeping device, and then I will ask some questions about the anti-dozing device in a moment.

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, with regard to the collision-alert and lane-keeping devices, I understood you to say a few moments ago that you have re-engaged the possibility of the Mobileye device; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We will make

reference. In particular, I understand that the other operators are also trying this out. So we will try to look at the results of their pilot schemes. On top of our work with Queen's University, we have an open attitude as to the functions, the current functions, of Mobileye, although the previous experience was that it wasn't quite suitable, but I'm sure we can look at it again.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. Have you started yet to go back to Mobileye?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Not yet.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it your intention to do so?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) For the time being, it is a matter of reading the literature. We haven't yet started any dialogue with Mobileye. This is because there are similar products in the market, and maybe they are better. So we are looking at a few other products and we are also carrying out our own research.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. Have you commenced any sort of engagement with any supplier of collision-alert and lane-keeping devices?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Indeed. An Australian company, we are now trying their Australian product. For a Japanese company, we have had direct dialogue with them, and they are developing a particular device. And

on our own, we are also having an anti-collision device. It is different from Mobileye's product and it is being carried out in Northern Ireland.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Are you prepared to provide the name of the Australian company?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What is it?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Guardian.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And are you prepared to provide the name of the Japanese company?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Denso.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Could you repeat that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Denso. It's called Denso.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Perhaps you could spell that for the committee.

DR JOHN CHAN: D-E-N-S-O.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Going back to the research with Queen's University, this, as you told us on the last occasion, started about a year ago. What is the stage that has been reached with that research?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) First of all, the professor, if I recall -- if I recall, the professor from Queen's University came to visit KMB last month and

he looked at the operation on board. We also sent one of our engineers to Northern Ireland. I think he has already started to study the matter together with them. I think soon, in a month or two, the university's researcher will also come to Hong Kong to base themselves here, so as to look at the road conditions. On my part, in the next month or two, I am going to go to Queen's University to have a look of the update.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When do you expect the research will be completed?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I think we only have a tentative timetable. Summer of next year. But of course it depends on the progress.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At this stage of the research, are you able to provide the committee with any indication as to what outcome you would expect?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I need to go back to check the progress. Of course the outcome can be shared with the committee.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. My question really is: is the research at the moment such that you are hopeful or expecting of a particular outcome?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, I think, in our documents, we have already told you about the nature of the product ADAS. I think it's in the paper, in the

documents.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are you optimistic that this research will result in an effective collision-alert and lane-keeping device? Are you optimistic or are you not optimistic?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, the most that I can say is as follows. For Queen's University, I think for their mechanical faculty, I think it is such that few other universities are interested in carrying out double-decker buses related research, so it is quite unique. Then, in the UK, they are in the UK, so it would be good for them to look at it from an European perspective.

I think we can claim ourselves to be a very large bus company. Of course, I have high expectations of them.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Let us move then from the collision-alert and lane-keeping device, and move to the anti-dozing device, if I might call it that, or the driver monitoring device, in respect of which you have already made certain remarks this morning.

In this respect, can I first take you back to one of the files, KMB-1, and ask you to go to page 115.

Now, at page 115, you will find the penultimate page of the report that the company provided to the transport authorities following the Tai Po accident.

CHAIRMAN: The investigation report?

MR PETER DUNCAN: The investigation report, that's indeed it, Mr Chairman.

At page 115, paragraph 47, you will see the heading, "Drowsiness of bus captain":

"KMB is conducting a trial with a supplier on monitoring drowsiness of bus captains while they are driving. The trial test will detect the level of alertness of a driver to give an early warning of the driver experiencing a 'microsleep'. If the trial results are satisfactory, such system will be installed in KMB buses."

If I could also just ask you to leave that open but also have in front of you one of the recommendations of the working group. We will find that at TD-1, page 406.

If I can just read into the record this recommendation of the working group:

"Driver monitoring device -- such device monitors the bus captain's behaviour on-board and alerts him/her if it detects a lack of attention or drowsiness. When the system detects potential unsafe behaviours such as 'looking aside', 'dozing', 'drowsiness' or 'bad posture', the system will give visual warning and voice alert. Such device is available in the market, and trial of using it in franchised buses to assess its

applicability and effectiveness is recommended."

Now, could I ask this: with regard to paragraph 47 of the investigation report, who was the supplier with whom this trial was being conducted? Are you able to reveal that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) The company name is Seeing Machines, and the name of the product is Guardian.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can you inform the committee with regard to the progress of that trial?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, if I may talk about the process of the trial. Towards the end of June this year, the system of Guardian was installed on four buses from different depots. This is because we have got long-haul trips for different depots, two for Sha Tin Depot, one for Tuen Mun Depot, and also one from Long Win Bus.

The initial trial results are such that it is effective, and we are able to detect, say for example, if the bus driver closes his eye longer than winking, and there is a voice alert, then the back of the seat will vibrate. I myself also tested it on two buses, one from Tuen Mun Depot, the other from Sha Tin Depot. Initially speaking, we believe that it is effective.

However, this system is such that it will scan your

five sensory organs. I know it and I have been told by the depots that since it is an Australian product, and the Australian company also shared our opinion, that is sometimes, say for example, if the bus captain tilts his head to look at passengers, then the facial detection may be lost, and then it will lead to the vibration.

We understand this point, but all in all, my understanding and the feedback of the employees are both positive. So, for this trial, we are going to extend it so as to engage more bus captains to carry on with the trial.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When do you expect the trial will be completed?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) In mid-August -- well, at the end of June, we trial tested with the first batch of bus captains and then we tested with the second batch of captains. We already prepared a questionnaire to gauge the reactions of captains, and by the end of this month we will decide whether we will conduct more tests at different depots, and then we will look to implement it by phases.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do I infer from what you have said that the likelihood is that this device will be implemented?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) According to results of

the tests so far, we find it positive.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I would like to add something. Any device that can facilitate road safety is something we will try. We will move with the times and we would certainly make a start on this.

CHAIRMAN: This device, Guardian device, is one that is used in Singapore, is it not?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Chairman, I know that it's in use in Australia, but as far as I know, it is not deployed in Singapore.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Singapore has not properly started using it.

CHAIRMAN: Well, we can look at that, because it is certainly my memory that Singapore has been using it for some years.

But also, this was the device that was recommended after the investigation into the Croydon or Sandilands tram accident, was it not? It was recommended to be installed and was installed after the investigation was concluded? Transport for London.

Well, we have the report. We can make that available to you.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Two or three years ago, we were actively looking into this issue. For trains and big coaches the device was already deployed. For train

drivers, the captains, and also truck drivers, they might doze off and in many cities the device is in common use already. So, for metro or city buses, for long-haul routes, for example airport routes, I feel that this device has a key role to play and there are benefits.

For busy areas or roads, since some captains would have to tilt their heads quite a lot to look at pedestrians and traffic lights, so we must be very careful not to cause nuisance to the captains. That's why, for the research in Northern Ireland and the work done by Denso in Japan, I think the Guardian system can be deployed in some routes. And, as we said, we should have different strategies or treatments for different routes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Why would the different routes have an impact on this?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) In busy urban roads, since the bus captains would likely move or tilt their heads quite a lot to assess the road conditions or traffic lights and there are a lot of bends, this would be very different from road sections that are straight. For example, for an airport route, the bus would often use the highway, and the bus captains are unlikely to tilt their heads quite as much. So the situation is

different from cities that deploy big trucks or buses.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I am going to move now from these anti-dozing devices to the question of seat belts.

Could I introduce this by referring you again to the investigation report -- sorry, first of all, to the recommendations of the working group. We will get this again at bundle TD-1, this time at page 407.

CHAIRMAN: These are the recommendations that were expressed in the paper made available to LegCo for discussion on 25 July of this year; is that correct?

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's correct, Mr Chairman. We see that reference on page 403.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The section on seat belts starts at the bottom of page 407, and it runs through to page 410.

If I could just bring your attention, please, to paragraph 16, which contains the recommendation and the proposed way forward. If I could quote from paragraph 16:

"Having regard to the points mentioned in paragraphs 10 to 15 above, the working group has arrived at the following recommendations with a view to giving extra protection to seated passengers:

(a) seat belts should be provided for all seats in future procurement of new bus; and

(b) subject to further assessment on the technical, operational and financial feasibility, consideration may be given to retrofitting all seats in the upper deck with seat belts on buses deployed for specific bus routes, ie long-haul routes which are operated via expressways with relatively fewer bus stops."

So we see there those recommendations, and could I also ask you in this context to look again at the investigation report which was referred to earlier this morning, this time at page 114. If I quote from paragraph 40, under the heading, "Other measures to enhance bus safety", the report states as follows:

"KMB has already requested its suppliers to install safety belts on all [buses] as a standard feature for new buses ordered after 5 March 2018. As for buses that are currently in service, where certain routes so require, safety belts will be installed on the upper deck of KMB buses phase by phase."

So, if I understand things correctly, what has been said in the investigation report is consistent with the recommendations of the working group.

Now, has the retrofitting of these seat belts yet commenced?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) To install safety belts on the upper deck, technically speaking, we would have to

consider the issue of gravity. The government and ourselves -- well, the government has consulted us for certain information and our supplier conducting a technical assessment, and the progress has been positive so far. The safety belts are relatively heavy. If they are to be installed on the upper deck, the government would have to conduct tilt tests. If this is technically feasible, it won't be an issue to install them. Whereas for the two main suppliers, Volvo and ADL, the progress has been very positive, however we would still have to wait until the tilt tests are completed.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can you give the committee some idea as to the financial implications of the retrofitting of the seat belts?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) This is not cheap, or should I say, in the beginning of this year, a special committee of our company issued clear instructions. Our buses procured in 2019 and after would be fitted with safety belts. As for the retrofitting of safety belts, where possible, especially on long-haul routes, we would install safety belts on the upper deck. We do not want to see further accidents, so cost is not our main consideration. We have not considered the financial implications yet. Retrofitting of safety belts would

cost about $200,000 per bus.

CHAIRMAN: That is on the upper deck?

MR ROGER LEE: (Nodded head).

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Nodded head).

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Approximately how many buses do you expect would be retrofitted, how many buses in your fleet?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I think nearly 3,600 long-haul buses.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm trying to do the maths.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I would like to add something. Currently, we have 4,200 to 4,300 buses. That is for KMB and Long Win Bus combined. Some buses are fully equipped with safety belts. For some others, as they will retire in the next years -- for buses that will retire in two or three years, they might not need to be retrofitted. For long-haul buses, I do not have the exact figure, but about one-third of our buses would go on long-haul routes, so that comes to about 1,000.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do I understand that the new buses will have seat belts --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Mr Duncan -- earlier, Mr Lee, you said this involved retrofitting 3,600 long-haul buses. Are you now correcting that statement and in fact it involves 1,000?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm just trying to do the mathematics.

1,000 buses at $200,000 per bus?

DR JOHN CHAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: $200 million?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is the cost of that something that has been discussed with the government?

MR ROGER LEE: No.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Dr Leung --

DR NORMAN LEUNG: May I just add. Recently I had a meeting with the government official and in fact I talked to him and requested the government whether they can offer any assistance to us in retrofitting these safety belts, and the response was quite positive, if I may put it this way.

CHAIRMAN: Can you identify with whom you had these conversations?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes, Mr Chairman. Mr Joseph Lai, permanent secretary for transport, and his deputy, Mr Kevin Choi, deputy secretary for transport.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company ever in the past approached the government with regard to some assistance, let's call it a subsidy, with regard to the need to, I'd like to say, modernise its fleet?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Never. Specifically this was the first time I talked to him about subsidy for retrofitting the seat belts.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, do I understand correctly that the new buses will have seat belts upstairs and downstairs?

MR ROGER LEE: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company given any consideration as to whether -- or does the company have any view as to whether the public will actually utilise the seat belts?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We conducted a rough assessment on how the public would see safety belts. For short-haul routes safety belts are unlikely to be used, especially on the lower deck. For long-haul routes, safety belts would be more popular.

But they are not hugely popular with passengers because it is somewhat a hassle to put them on. But, in our view, especially for long-haul routes, the trend is that safety belts would be more and more important. For passengers that want to have a nap on the bus, they can choose to put on safety belts. I hope more and more

passengers would use them in the future. At the moment, they are not very popular. But KMB should follow the trend. At the end of the day this is a safety device.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company have a view as to whether there should be any legislative backup for the use of seat belts, in other words to make it compulsory that persons utilise seat belts where they are provided?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) This is somewhat difficult because passengers can stand on buses in Hong Kong. So, by way of legislation, this is a challenge. And the second challenge is enforcement. Bus captains are often harassed these days. KMB has not set up any rules to enforce this, but we find it positive to allow passengers the choice of putting on safety belts.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm going to leave the subject of safety belts now.

Can I move to something else, which I will introduce by asking you to turn up KMB-4.

Can I ask you to turn, please, to page 1182 of the bundle, which is an extract from the annual report of the listed company, that's Transport International Holdings Ltd, for 2012. On that page, you will see the members of the board of directors, and in particular you will see the names of the independent non-executive directors.

We can see those listed as Dr Leung and Dr Chan, present this morning; Dr Eric Li Ka Cheung, Mr Gordon Siu Kwing Chue, and Prof Liu Pak Wai. We see the list of the independents.

If I could then ask you to go to KMB-5, at page 1896. This is the list of the company directors, as set out in the annual report for the year 2016. We can see by reference to the asterisk the independents, the independent non-executive directors. Again, the name list: Dr Leung, Dr Chan, Dr Eric Li, Mr Siu and Prof Liu.

I won't take you through each of the reports between 2012 and 2016, but you will, I think, confirm that there were no changes in the independents during the course of those years; is that correct?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Correct, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then if I could take you, please, to KMB-6 at page 2108. This is a list of directors for the year 2017. We can see, at that page, 2108, that the directors have changed, in that Mr Gordon Siu is no longer an independent director.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Correct, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And Mr Tsang Wai Hung has been appointed as an independent non-executive director.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Correct, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, I'm going to ask a couple of questions about the independent non-executive directors, and please understand I am asking these questions with the utmost respect to those who have served and continue to serve as independent non-executive directors.

Firstly, is it a correct observation that none of the independent non-executive directors have a background of safety matters?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Well, specifically safety matters -- well, you can say that we know -- personally, I have been involved with bus operation for a number of years. In fact, I have been a director of KMB since year 2000, so for 17 years. And of course we care about the new buses, you know, for example, we have to upgrade our buses with the latest model, with the latest, you know, technology. And very often the new buses incorporate what we call the safety features. So we spend money in upgrading our buses, say from Euro IV and then to Euro V and now to Euro VI. All this is buses with the latest technology.

In that aspect, we ensure that the best available buses are purchased by KMB and Long Win, in that aspect.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think we are all aware of the fact that new people bring new ideas to organisations.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes. Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company have any policy with regard to how often the benefit of new ideas and therefore new people as independent non-executive directors might be appointed? Is there any particular policy in that respect?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: We have a number of board committees, and different directors serve on different committees, with regard to their expertise, so to speak. That's why you will see that Mr John Chan, for example, was formerly the managing director of Kowloon Motor Bus and Long Win Bus, and that's why he has been requested to serve on the standing committee of the board, which is really the executive committee of the board, and he also serves on the nomination committee, and the remuneration committee as well; whereas Prof Liu Pak Wai, for example, is a very distinguished economist, he serves on the board to offer strategic development of our bus company, just to name them as an example, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

I want to now go back to a matter which was raised at one of the previous hearings. I think it was actually Day 13. This was the subject of real-time monitoring. You recall this issue that arose on Day 13, in particular when I raised with you, with the

representatives from KMB, the evidence that the committee had heard from a Mr Alok Jain; do you remember that issue coming up?

You will recall that Mr Jain's evidence -- I will give everybody the reference just for the record; it's Day 13 at page 41 -- but his evidence was to the effect that in 2014 -- sorry, Day 13, page 41 is a summary of his evidence, but as I put it to you, his evidence was that in 2014, the company had considered a project which had involved the real-time monitoring of driver behaviour, but this project had been scrapped.

Do you remember that was the nature of the evidence that I raised? Do you recall that? Do you recall my raising that?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. And your response -- and this was by Mr Leung -- if I understand it correctly, was that the project to which Mr Jain had been referring was a real-time operations management system, and that had nothing to do with driving safety. Do you recall that was what Mr Leung told us?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We were talking about giving a real-time alert to the bus captain, over-speeding or sudden acceleration or harsh braking.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes, and your recollection was that what

Mr Jain's project, if I could put it that way, entailed was not that; it was, rather, a real-time operations management system. Correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Again, just for the record, I will give members the appropriate references in the transcript. It's Day 13, page 41, lines 10 to 14, and then page 42 at line 23.

In the light of that apparent difference, the chairman invited you to provide to the committee some of the presentations which had been made during the course of consideration of the project to which Mr Jain had been referring. Amongst the material that the bus company has provided since the last hearing have been a number of presentations. Do you recall that those presentations have been provided?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We have provided some information to the committee, I believe.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I just want to refer to some of those presentations and raise some matters with you in this context, if I may.

First of all, could you turn up KMB-11, please. Could you go to page 4492, please.

Page 4492, you will see the cover of a particular document, "The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd,

system specifications for real-time operations management system (ROM)", and this is a document which runs from page 4492, and it goes through to page 4530, if I understand it correctly.

Now, at page 4493, we will see the table of contents in this presentation. Part II is referred to as the introduction and the scope of work.

If we then go to page 4495, we will see some of the details with regard to the introduction and the scope of work, and you have, under part II, item 1, "Introduction" -- if I could bring your attention, please, to item 1.4:

"The main functions of ROM are to assist dispatchers from operations control centres and terminus supervisors from bus termini to:

Manage bus departures and bus trips.

Handle special situations that cause disruptions to bus services."

Then this is the one which I would bring your particular attention to, 1.4.3:

"Communicate with drivers, via voice, text and sound recordings for any information or special messages that needs driver's attention and action."

So do I conclude from that that the system did envisage real-time contact between the system at the bus

headquarters and the individual drivers?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) The one that we developed subsequent to this did not have this feature.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Jain's evidence I think was that this was one of the aspects that was being considered, but it was scrapped. So was real-time communication with the drivers at least part of the consideration?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Last time, our operations director said it clearly. This function would involve a central control centre, to remind bus captains over the speed of the bus, and also the need to pause at some bus stops so as to have a proper distance between buses.

Of course, in this course of action, there could be communication with bus captains. But, as we said last time, it would not be proper to distract the bus captain while he is driving. Also, this function may take the place of the function discharged by the dispatchers or the management people at the bus termini.

So we did not think there would be the need to have real-time verbal communication with bus captains while they are on duty and it would be better to enhance the functions discharged by the personnel, management personnel, at the bus termini.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I'm not asking at the moment questions with regard to the conclusion. All I'm asking

is whether, in the project that was being considered by Mr Jain, which I understand to be part of this presentation, there was, as part of that programme, consideration as to whether there should be real-time communication with drivers with regard to their behaviour, including of course speed excesses.

So do I understand correctly from paragraph 1.4.3 that this was at least part of the project which was being considered? Leave aside the conclusions.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, it is put down here. Of course, there was such consideration. It was back in 2013/2014. At that time, the view taken was that something should be done centrally so that the real-time operation management should be more comprehensive, so that, by some means, the central controls should be able to communicate with bus captains.

But we are now actually talking about the black box and geo-fencing, and the alert would be given to bus captains on board the bus and that would cover the behaviour of the bus captain. We are at this stage now.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you. If I could just, before I leave this particular document, refer you to some other passages which also seem to refer to this real-time communication with drivers. I think you will see at page 4497 -- you see under the heading,

"Functional requirements" a heading, "Operations control centre system", and at 1.1.4:

"Allow dispatcher to draw a certain area on the map so that buses within the boundary of the drawn area are:

a. Highlighted for sending text and voice messages.

b. Used for speed calculation so that the average speed of highlighted area are displayed."

If I could also bring your attention to the next heading at page 4497, "Core system functions", that's item 1.2, and then we have a subheading, "Operations management", and at (a)(7), which you actually find on the following page, 4498, we have this entry:

"Regulation of bus departures are done automatically based on a set of rules with elements of the rules configurable. The configurable items should include but not limited to the followings".

Then item (iv) mentions "driver working guidelines". So that would cover, would it not, the driving behaviour of drivers; yes?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, the regulation here refers to the distance between the vehicles from a safety perspective.

Allow me to say the following. On any one day, we have at its peak over 3,000 buses running on the road at

any one time, and they can be found all over Hong Kong, including outlying islands, that is Lantau. If you have a central control system to control all the 3,000 buses, of course, if we want to have precise information about them, it will mean it is quite a difficult task.

But here it is quite clear this is about the safe distance from preceding or following vehicles.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could then refer you, please, to --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, could you elaborate what you mean by "the safe distance"? Is this to do with the bunching of buses?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's nothing to do with safety, is it?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, in fact, bus drivers do not know how far he is away from the preceding bus, so he will just be following his speed. For passengers, buses departed at different times, but then roads get congested and, as a result, the preceding bus and the following bus will have a longer and longer headway. It means that passengers would have to wait in such a way that he has got a bunch of buses arriving. This is quite similar to the case of train service, but then trains have to stop at platforms. Many passengers would have to board and alight, and so they would stop there for a longer time, and you can more easily control the

distance between trains. This is not the same for buses.

This is because we don't want to have the bunching together of the buses. That's not desirable. Now, of course, we have got something on mind to inform the passengers about the arrival time, so it's not safety-related.

CHAIRMAN: No, this is the efficient delivery of service, nothing to do with safety.

MR ROGER LEE: Correct. Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Finally in this document, can I just bring your attention to page 4501, and the heading, "Driver communication system", under the overall heading of "Functional requirements". At 2.1:

"A driver console will be installed on each bus. The driver console will provide the following functions:

2.1.1 Display colour graphics and text data".

Then at item (c):

"Display real-time indicators showing driving behaviour of the driver with information available from the OBD. For abnormal driving behaviour, different beep sounds shall be prompted to the driver. A global parameter shall be provided to activate or deactivate

this function."

So, at least for consideration, was there suggested a real-time system whereby abnormal driving behaviour would be detected and would be communicated to the driver?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Well, I think this is what we call the on-board driver feedback device. We are in the process of installing such a system. Previously, the design was such that it would be incorporated into the driver console, but today, in fact, we have got a separate feedback device and the real-time indicators are such that we have got lights as well as audio alerts. That's for every bus.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. I'm going to move now to another matter which came up at the last hearing -- this is on Day 14 -- when the committee heard from the representatives of the company that contrary to its earlier intention, the company had decided not to incorporate a tilt alarm in the buses.

Do you recall that evidence?

MR ROGER LEE: (Nodded head).

MR PETER DUNCAN: I will again give the committee a reference to the transcript. It's Day 14 at pages 126 to 130.

If I understand Mr Leung's evidence correctly, the

reason for that was that neither ADL nor Volvo could recommend a particular tilt angle. Is that a correct recollection?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And if the angle was too narrow, it would not be meaningful; it would mean nothing. And if, on the other hand, the angle was too broad, it would be dangerous. Is that a correct recollection of what was said?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Now, I want to refer you to something which I was alerted to only yesterday, and I'm not sure whether you had a chance to look at it, but it's a document which we can find at bundle MISC-2 at page 916.

Have you had a chance of looking at this document yet, Mr Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Not yet.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. In that case, I will perhaps take you through it very slowly.

It seems to be notes of a lecture or presentation which was given at a seminar very recently -- sorry, a long time ago -- 29 August 2008, and it is headed, "Seminar on safety aspects of double deck buses in Hong Kong", and the subheading is, "Regulatory (Safety)

Requirements of double-deck buses", and the presenter appears to be a gentleman called Mr Steven Tse, an engineer in the bus safety department of the Vehicle Safety and Standards Division of the Transport Department.

This may be too much to ask, but do any of the members from the company here this morning have any recollection of attending such a seminar?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) I don't recall.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I go straight to the page in which I am interested. It's page 936. I will simply go to that and then give you the opportunity of reading through the slides which precede it.

At that page, there is this heading, "Tilt angle", and on the left, "Regulatory requirement/directive", and then on the right, "Tilt angle (DD bus)", which I infer is double-decker bus, and the reference to "United Nations -- Economic Commission for Europe, 28 degrees"; "EC -- European Union, 28 degrees"; and "Hong Kong, 28 degrees".

Does this mean anything to you, Mr Leung?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Well, for each vehicle, in particular for double-decker buses, for them to be allowed to run on the road, they have to meet this test requirement, namely the tilt test. It is a static

test. In other words, the bus is static when it is tested for tilting. If the bus can tilt at an angle 28 and it won't topple, then it means that it can meet the test requirement, it can get the type approval, it can be registered for running on our roads. That's my understanding.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think the static test has been referred to in previous documentation provided to the committee; is that correct?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

I am going to move now to the subject of journey times and lead up to the issue of what are known as -- what are described sometimes as "lost trips". I think you know what I mean by that.

Can I start by taking you to the evidence of one of the representatives that we heard from one of the unions, I think it was the Staff Rights Association of KMB, Mr Li Kwok Wah. We will find that at the transcript for Day 10, if I could take you to that, please, at page 62.

If I could just read you a passage from Mr Li's evidence. He has been asked questions by Ms Wong for the commission at line 14, and Ms Wong asks this:

"Mr Li, I would like to go to a specific topic on

scheduled trips and loss of time."

And a few lines down:

"And the passage is at page 120."

At line 20:

"... you stated that:

'... with the continued loss of bus captains, and the need [to] maintain the scheduled trips and avoid cancelling scheduled trips, causing bus captains' entitled rest time during work subject to the situation of lost trips and the road traffic circumstances that day. For many bus captains who would need to drive various bus routes, in order to have more time for rest during work, will try to complete the bus routes as soon as possible depending on road traffic condition and return to the bus terminals for rest.'

Can you tell us or elaborate how the need to maintain scheduled trips would affect bus captains' entitled rest time?"

Mr Li's answer is:

"The bus company, say, for example, there is one hour of journey time, it would be compressed to 55 to 58 minutes. Bus captains have little rest time. If you compress journey time even by a few minutes, that means a loss of a few minutes of rest time."

Can I ask you this: if a journey does take longer

than the scheduled time, does that have a potential effect on the driver's rest time?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, my answer is it may. It may. However, in each and every terminus, we have got a terminus supervisor on duty. It is exactly because of this the supervisor will make corresponding adjustments, so that the bus captains, though affected by the traffic congestion or owing to other reasons come back late to the terminus, they would still get rest time. So we will make arrangements.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are there circumstances such that sometimes bus drivers do have to forfeit their rest time?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Sometimes, this may happen, but I just want to emphasise that for each bus captain, when he returns to the terminus, he will certainly have time. He will have a pre-scheduled rest time. But then if this is being affected owing to one reason or another, we will still give him a water break, a toilet break -- he can have a sip of water, he can go to the toilet -- before he commences the next revenue trip to take on passengers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: How does the company actually calculate the length of time that is necessary for a particular route?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We do. When we draw up the journey time for each route -- well, there are two types. First of all, we have got existing bus routes. We do have a mechanism, and it is subject to regular reviews. So once every three months we will look at each bus route. We have got 380-plus routes under KMB. So, on a quarterly basis, we have to re-examine each and every route once every three months.

Then, secondly, in the light of special traffic conditions, in the light of sudden changes of passenger volume, and in the light of the increase or decrease of express routes, and in the light of feedback from frontline bus captains, inspectors and supervisors, we also have ad hoc arrangements. We won't wait until the next quarterly review. We will carry out a review of the journey time instantly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What does the review entail?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Well, a number of elements would affect the journey time. Say, for example, changes in the traffic conditions. Say, for example, in West Kowloon, in Jordan and Nathan Road, traffic was congested because of the construction of the XRL, and so we have to make adjustments about the journey time.

Then another factor that would prolong the journey

time would be changes in the number of passengers. It will have a direct bearing on the time taken. Say, for example, more passengers boarding, more passengers alighting. In other words, you have to stop at a bus stop for a longer time. Then there may be road diversions or we have to deroute a bus service. Say, for example, the main route is the same but there are slight changes to its side routes, then we have to re-examine the journey time.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'd like to refer you, please, to the evidence of Mr Kelvin Yeung, who gave assistance to the tribunal on Day 11. He I think is a current depot manager within KMB. We find his evidence on Day 11 at page 94.

In fact if I can take you by introducing the question of him at page 93, line 19, again Ms Wong asking the question. Ms Wong asks this of Mr Kelvin Yeung:

"And moving on to another topic, it is about lost trips.

We have heard evidence from your colleague, Ms Debby Wong, that lost trips appear to be a frequent occurrence, and it affects driving behaviour because of the inaccurate estimation of scheduled journey time. And also it would, in turn, affect the rest time period.

What is your view on this matter?"

Mr Yeung responds as follows:

"From my perspective, lost trip is due to various reasons.

First, we may lose a trip because of shortage of bus captains, there may be traffic jam in Hong Kong, there may be emergency situations, public events, demonstrations, rallies, or special traffic arrangements, inclement weather, and vehicles breaking down on the road. All these contribute to the problem of lost trips. But we try our best not to affect the rest periods of bus captains, because we have a schedule of journey time, we have provided that to the bus captains, and about 96 per cent of these, or 90 per cent of these trips allow bus captains to have sufficient rest periods."

Now, a lost trip, I assume that that means there is a bus which is supposed to leave from A and arrive at B but in fact, perhaps for one or more of these reasons, it just doesn't happen.

Could you give the committee some idea as to how frequent this occurrence occurs?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The Transport Department assigns a value to all franchised bus operators. In terms of the lost trip rate, in the context of our

schedule of service, the benchmark is no more than 3 per cent of the trips.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to ask in that respect for you to look at one of the Transport Department documents. Again, we will need to go to TD-1 for this, at page 34.

At page 34, we have a document which was provided by the transport authorities to the committee for the purposes of this hearing. This document is headed, "An overview of the regulatory and monitoring regime of franchised bus[es]". You can see the purpose of the paper, at page 34: "to give an overview of the regulatory and monitoring regime under which the government regulates the operation of franchised bus services in Hong Kong."

Then there are a number of sections. The part I would like to refer to at the moment can be found on page 44, and it's paragraph (e). It's under the heading, at page 41, of "Other measures and requirements through exchange of letters and issuance of guidelines", and there are a number of paragraphs -- (a), (b), (c), (d) -- and we get to (e) on page 44. If I could read that out quickly:

"In 2015, the Transport Department put forward a revised sanction mechanism in respect of the bus lost trips made by the franchised bus operators. The

mechanism sets out the procedures and steps on the issuance of letters of different degrees of gravity (including reminding letter, advisory letter, warning letter and serious warning letter) depending on the frequency, level of lost trips incurred and rectification actions taken by the FB operators. The warning letters will make way for initiating further statutory sanctions under section 22 of the Public Bus Services Ordinance, such as financial penalty, revocation of operating right of a particular bus route or of its franchise in the event that no apparent improvement is made by the bus operator concerned without providing any reasonable explanations. See appendix K on a sample of TD's letter to FB operators on the promulgation of revised sanction mechanism."

Unfortunately, I was unable to find appendix K, but reading on:

"Since the implementation of the above mechanism in 2015, the Transport Department has been closely monitoring the lost trip situation of the franchised bus operators and sent reminding letters, advisory letters and warning letter to franchised bus operators for rectification action and making service improvement. These ... operators provided explanations to the Transport Department and took prompt actions, including

deploying more standby bus drivers to fill up the shortfall, to improve the lost trip situation. Given the actions taken by the franchised bus operators, no further penalty actions were imposed on them."

Just before I ask you a couple of questions on that, could I ask you, please, to go through to page 117 of the same bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, Mr Duncan, the missing appendix K, is that not at TD-2, page 291?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I couldn't find it.

CHAIRMAN: Don't let me divert you. It may not be directly relevant.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm happy to go to that volume, if members from the company can see that, at page 291.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Appendix K.

I think that is a general letter regarding the subject, with respect to promulgating the revised sanction mechanism. You will see that.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

What I want to do before just asking you a couple of questions on this topic is to take you through to another of the Transport Department's papers, at page 117, referred to as Transport Department paper 10,

which is headed, "Operation of franchised bus service -- route scheduling, fleet deployment and designation of speed limit", and the purpose:

"This paper gives an account of the role of the Transport Department in route scheduling, fleet deployment and designation of speed limits on roads for operation of franchised bus service."

Then if you go to page 122, you will see what's described as a sample of the schedule of service of a particular bus route. There's an example which is described as the air-conditioned Kowloon urban route no. 2.

Now, going back to the question of these possible sanctions and letters, could you give the committee some idea as to how many warning letters the company may have received, say in the last six months?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, in the past six months, the company did not receive warning letters due to lost trips, but for particular routes we received advisory letters or reminder letters.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What were the advisory or reminder letters about?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) For certain routes, for example during certain hours, for example at night, the letters would remind us that the lost trip rate was over

3 per cent, and the letter reminded us to make improvements and asked why these lost trips occurred.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Has the company received any warning letters in the last 12 months?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We did not receive any warning letters in the last 12 months.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it necessary, from time to time, given the circumstances that might give rise to lost trips, to approach the department and ask for amendments to the schedule for a particular route?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Our company often contacts the Transport Department to report the specific issues we encounter on certain routes. When the TD calculates the lost trip rate, they would calculate it based on four time periods, namely the morning peak hours, morning non-peak hours, the evening peak hours and evening non-peak hours. Based on road and traffic conditions, including congestion and illegal parking, we would often reflect to TD requesting a review of the schedule of service, et cetera.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the Transport Department often grant those review applications?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I can only say that it is very difficult. We have a lot of low utilisation routes. Very often, due to change in passenger volume,

for example due to railway developments, our service demand might drop. Very often, during the non-peak hours -- we have repeatedly made written requests as well as face-to-face requests that the TD would lower the frequency of service for non-peak hours. These applications are made based on certain guidelines, and according to the guidelines, we are entitled to certain journey reductions.

Even if we fulfil the guideline requirements, to be very honest, if we need to increase our service frequency, the TD would often want us to get it done immediately, on the request of district personnel. But if we want to reduce our service, it is very difficult.

Our manpower resources are limited, but at times we would have to invest our resources on low utilisation routes. I don't think this is a healthy development.

Very often, we communicate with TD, but progress is relatively slow.

CHAIRMAN: So, although you have reduced usage, passengers, and you ask for a reduced service to be permitted, you don't get approval? And there are various forces involved in impeding your request?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just one more question before we break. Who issues these guidelines?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) TD.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have a say in the formation of the guidelines?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) The guidelines were in place for a long time. They have proved effective. So this is about the execution of the guidelines and we agree with those guidelines.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you supply the committee with a copy of the guidelines?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I think the guidelines are already included in the bundles. I will tell you where they are during the break.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Sorry, one more question. So the problem which seems to have been identified is not in the guidelines, it is in the way in which the guidelines are applied; that would be correct?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I totally agree. The guidelines are very clear. But in terms of enforcement, I realise there is a lot of resistance, so I hope that resources can be invested on the significant or useful routes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will take a 20-minute break now,

and if you can locate the reference, we would be grateful.

20 minutes. Thank you.

(11.38 am)

(A short adjournment)

(12.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I think you were going to find a reference for us to those guidelines.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We do have it. KMB Long Win Bus bundle 2, page 73, item (IV), "Frequency reduction". Yes, it has been turned up on the screen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you very much.

Just while we are on the subject of references, Mr Chairman raised the matter of the anti-dozing device being utilised in Singapore. If a reference is needed for that, it can be found at CTB-1 at page 63.

I now wish to move on to the issue of toilet and rest facilities for bus captains. Can I commence this by taking you to the volume TD-1 at page 438, please.

To introduce this particular page, we need to go back to page 427, which is a letter from the Transport Department to the committee of 20 July 2018, where the Transport Department has provided a number of answers to

questions raised by the committee.

At 438, you will see question 28:

"Provision of toilet and rest facilities at bus termini.

Has the Transport Department issued any guidelines to franchised bus operators on provision of toilet and rest facilities at bus termini? If so, please let us have the details. If not, the underlying reasons for not doing so. Does the Transport Department assume an active role in facilitating the respective franchised bus operators to pursue with relevant departments for provision of the facilities?"

I will go through quickly the response of the department to that question:

"The Transport Department has all along encouraged the bus companies, being good employers, to provide suitable toilets and rest facilities at bus termini for their staff. When relevant departments/authorities consider and vet the applications for setting up these staff facilities, the TD has been providing appropriate coordination so as to facilitate early installation of such facilities.

There are no specific guidelines issued to the franchised bus operators on the provision of toilets and rest facilities. It is because toilets and rest

facilities are generally part of the basic facilities to be considered when new bus termini are designed. Requirements and comments from the franchised bus operators on toilets and rest facilities would be incorporated in the design of the bus termini as appropriate. At bus termini where toilets are not within reasonable walking distance, or rest facilities are not provided or insufficient, the franchised bus operators are active in applying for placement of these facilities to meet their latest operational needs. As at 31 March 2018, nearly all of the 295 bus termini over the territory are provided with toilets [within] a walking distance of 3 to 7 minutes, and about 86 per cent of the bus termini (ie 255 bus termini) over the territory are provided with rest facilities in the form of regulator's kiosk/office or rest kiosk for bus captains. It is therefore considered not necessary to issue specific guidelines to the franchised bus operators on provision of toilet and rest facilities at bus termini.

The Transport Department has been proactively liaising with the relevant departments/authorities as appropriate to resolve any difficulties encountered by the franchised bus operators in applying for the facilities, and to let the departments/authorities and

the ... operators understand the procedural requirements with a view to smoothening the application process for timely provision of the facilities. The successful case of provision of a rest kiosk at the bus terminus on Ma Wan Road outside Shan Shui House of Shui Pin Wai Estate as mentioned in TD's paper 05 'Franchised bus captain -- working conditions and environment' is one of the good examples. Each department/authority may have its own statutory power and considerations in processing the FB's application for placement of toilets and rest facilities under their jurisdiction. That said, the Transport Department will continue to facilitate the franchised bus operators if necessary to actively cater for the needs of bus captains on provisions of toilets and rest facilities, and endeavour to provide the necessary assistance to the franchised bus operators in this respect."

Then there was a second question that was asked by the committee:

"Despite repeated and longstanding requests made by franchised bus operators, the committee was informed that some bus termini are still not provided with adequate toilet and rest facilities. Please identify these bus termini and whether they are major termini serving a number of bus routes and whether any of those

routes are manned by bus captains employed by Kowloon Motor Bus working on special shift who require adequate rest facilities to take rest break no less than 3 consecutive hours. Please explain the constraints in providing such facilities, particularly the reasons for rejecting franchised bus companies' request for provision of such facilities by the relevant departments/authorities."

The answer provided by the department was as follows:

"As at 31 March 2018, nearly all of the 295 bus termini over the territory are provided with toilets with a walking distance of 3 to 7 minutes, and about 86 per cent of the bus termini (ie 255 bus termini) over the territory are provided with rest facilities in the form of regulator's kiosk/office or rest kiosk for bus captains. Among the remaining 14 per cent of the bus termini without rest facilities, the franchised bus operators have not applied for provision of rest facilities at most, if not all of the bus termini.

On the other side, the franchised bus operators may apply to relevant departments/authorities for additional/enlarged rest facilities at bus termini to meet their operational needs. A list of the bus termini with toilets and rest facilities, to our best knowledge,

that were requested by the ... operators and were rejected in the past 3 years or under processing by relevant departments/authorities is attached at annex 3 for reference. We are afraid that the Transport Department does not have the information on the duty shift records of individual bus captain on each bus route which may be subject to changes from time to time and hence the information as to whether any of those routes operating at these bus termini were manned by bus captains employed by KMB working on special shift.

As shown in annex 3, the major reasons for rejecting the franchised bus operators' request for provision of toilets and rest facilities by relevant departments/authorities are mainly because of the physical constraints at individual sites (eg the bus terminus is located on a narrow sidewalk) or because of the views expressed by the community in the neighbourhood. As the proponent of the facilities, the franchised bus operators would explore feasible solutions to overcome the physical constraints and address the concerns from the locals for setting up toilets and rest facilities at those bus termini for bus captains. The Transport Department would assist the franchised bus operators in canvassing support from the locals by conducting site visits/meetings with them to

explore feasible solutions for erection of the rest facilities in order to expedite the implementation plans as and when necessary for the benefits of bus captains and passengers."

Annex 3, we will have to go to another bundle for that. It's to be found at TD-5 at page 1723.

You will see, at 1723, there is a heading, "List of bus termini with toilets and rest facilities requested by the franchised bus operators":

"(A) List of bus termini with toilets and rest facilities requested by the franchised bus operators under processing by the Transport Department.

(B) List of bus termini with toilets and rest facilities listed by the franchised bus operators under processing by the relevant departments/authorities.

(C) List of bus termini with toilets and rest facilities rejected by the Transport Department and relevant departments/authorities in the past 3 years."

Now, I will ask some questions later with regard to some of the points that the Transport Department has sought to make. It may well be that the company would wish to respond, in any event, to some of those assertions. But before I do that, before I come back to the information provided by the department, I have some questions of my own relating to the actual facilities or

the lack of the same. Then I will come back to the Transport Department position.

My understanding is that KMB has four depots, as they are called, and then a large number of termini; would that be correct?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, if we look at KMB-1, at page 252, do we see there the company's own map of depots and zones, for the company's use, which sets out the locations, or identifies, rather, the four depots that the company has: one at Lai Chi Kok, the Kowloon Bay Depot, the Tuen Mun Depot, and a Sha Tin Depot.

Just for the avoidance of any doubt, what exactly is a depot?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Within a depot, we have two functions. First of all, every night, buses return to the depot for maintenance, refuelling and cleansing. Some maintenance and repair work is being carried out there.

Another major function is as follows. Bus captains get their duty rosters and bus captains take a rest there. Bus captains go there every morning to get their duty list. There are four. At Tuen Mun Depot, it has the specific function of carrying out annual inspection and maintenance, and then at another one, Sha Tin,

training school. At Lai Chi Kok Depot, that's the centre for dispatching to cater for special circumstances, like a typhoon. For Kowloon Bay Depot, that's our backup office.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So does each bus captain start his day by going to a depot?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Most of them are, but some of them would just report to a terminus. Most of them will go back to the depot to get his duty list for the day.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do I understand correctly -- you touched on this a couple of moments ago, I believe -- that the depots do provide toilet and resting facilities for the captains?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Certainly. Within a depot -- well, in fact the depot is larger in size -- we have got showering facilities, we have toilets. And for each depot, we have got a clinic for bus captains who are not feeling well; they will be given a quick check before deciding whether they should resume their duties. There are also rest facilities for bus captains.

The chairman reminded me that in fact we have got a barber's shop for bus captains to have a haircut.

CHAIRMAN: That's certainly true in Tuen Mun, but is that

true in all four of the depots?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) All four of them. All four of them. There is even a grocery shop so that they can buy basic groceries. The majority of the bus captains would regard the depot as a place that they have essential belongings.

MR PETER DUNCAN: May I refer you, please, to file MISC-2 at page 902. You will see this is part of the document which is headed, on page 899, as a report on KMB's bus termini and the Tuen Mun Depot, visited by the chairman and members of the IRC staff on 3 August.

There is reference at paragraph (E) on page 902 to the Tuen Mun Depot.

If I could bring to your attention, please, just the second bullet point at the bottom of page 902: on the 1st floor, there is "a recreation area with two table tennis tables, a water dispenser, a locker and a soft drink vending machine, a barber's shop; a convenience shop; a restroom with A/C, four tables, 16 chairs, a refrigerator, a microwave oven and a television; and a small dark room with couches, which permitted bus captains to sleep in a horizontal position. One bus captain was sleeping in that position".

Then on the 2nd floor:

"a clinic, male and female toilets, storage room

(uniform) and offices."

Then we're assisted by annex E, which we will find on page 912, and 913, which contain photographic images of what is being described there in those paragraphs.

So that's the position with regard to depots.

Turning to the issue of termini, how many termini does KMB have?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) 217.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can we go to KMB-1 at page 201, please.

You will see, at this page, a letter from the committee dated 19 July 2018 to the company, and in the second paragraph it asks the company to provide information as to the location and address of the bus termini, and the bus depot responsible for that bus termini, at which KMB and Long Win bus captains working a "special shift", permitted under the guidelines, commence the minimum of a three-hour break which they are required to be afforded on such a shift, and the company is asked to describe in detail the resting and staff facilities available at the terminal.

Then we can see the answer to that letter at page 205, a letter dated 26 July:

"We refer to your letter ... dated 19 July ... by which you requested us to provide details of the resting and staff facilities available at bus termini that cater

for 'special shifts'.

The details are set out in the enclosed table."

And so on. Then we see the table at pages 206, 207 and through to 211.

Before I ask some questions with regard to that schedule, this of course concerns termini which are used for the special shifts. Do I infer correctly that there are some termini which are not used for special shifts?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, Mr Duncan. Some termini might not be used by captains on special shifts.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, approximately how many of those would there be?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Perhaps I can provide a figure to reflect the situation.

As for the number of termini with bus captains resting, this is something we have to look at or find out. Perhaps I can provide the number of captains on special shifts that would take rests at depots, how many would take a rest at termini and how many of them would take a rest back home.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I probably haven't made myself clear, but this table would set out all the termini at which captains may be at when they commence their special or take their special shift and then have a rest.

MR PATRICK PANG: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I understand things correctly, there would be some termini that would fall under that category, they would not be used for resting in a special shift situation. Is that correct?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Perhaps I would put it this way. According to the timetable, some termini are not being used by bus captains on special shifts for resting. However, even if a terminus has resting facilities, operationally there might be different arrangements or deployments.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, KMB has 217 termini and at each terminus there are basic facilities. As for terminus facilities, the kiosk approved by the government is about 40 square feet in area, and these are needed by bus captains, even those not on special shifts. We do not make a distinction for those on special shifts.

I have looked at all 217 termini. We are talking about kiosks of 40 square feet. This is not a place to sleep.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Sorry, when you say you looked at all 217 termini, did they cover termini used in a special shift situation and also termini not used in a special shift situation?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So that's the total number of termini, irrespective of the special duty situation?

MR ROGER LEE: Right.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I understand your answer just a few moments ago correctly, when you're considering facilities you don't distinguish between the two?

MR ROGER LEE: Right. (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I want you to go, please, to KMB-1 at page 206.

We see, amongst other things, in this table, which of the termini rely on the use of a public toilet, as opposed to a chemical toilet, and as opposed to a KMB toilet.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Of the 217 termini, we have 50 termini with purpose-built toilets, and we have 66 termini with chemical toilets and about 100 would rely on surrounding facilities, including shopping malls. One terminus has no toilet facilities.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, given -- the number of public toilets -- if I could ask about that -- according to the Transport Department document I showed you a few moments ago, these toilets might be three to seven minutes away from the terminus. Is that a correct reflection of the situation?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I have not paid visits myself, but many of them can be reached within ten minutes' walk. Some termini rely on shopping malls, and when the shopping malls are closed the captains might have to walk further. This is possible.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company consider that to be a satisfactory state of affairs?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) In the past year, we added 26 new chemical toilets, and now there is only one terminus left. I think we are reaching a level that is acceptable. By captains one year ago, the situation might not be acceptable. For chemical toilets, since there is a lack of power supply, ventilation and other aspects might be worse than a complete toilet. But this is being improved upon and more will be done.

CHAIRMAN: When you say there is one terminus left, what do you mean exactly by that?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) That is a terminus in Yuen Long. So the situation is like what you heard a few days ago: the footpath is rather narrow, and district councillors do not find that location appropriate, so it is still under application, so we are yet to install chemical toilet in one of our termini, and that terminus is in Yuen Long, in Yuen Long Park.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, after the installation of those

27 chemical toilets, in how many instances will the company be dependent upon public toilets?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) For these 100 termini, the situation is difficult because we have to rely on public toilets. Some public toilets are located in parks. Or let me put it this way: toilets are a complicated issue, because the applications for toilets require communication with government departments and district councillors and a lot of time is needed, and there is very little within our control on what we can do.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Assuming you did have control of the situation, what would be the ideal outcome for the company?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Personally, I often visit the termini, and I want our captains and frontline staff to know that we are listening to their challenges. I think the main challenge today is not on toilets but on the rest kiosks. Last autumn, there was an incident, the rest kiosks are important to our staff. The locations and sizes of the kiosks are an important part of our work coming up for new termini in the future; more should be done in terms of facilities, and this should be our area of focus.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We will come to the rest facilities in a moment, but assuming the way was much clearer than it

appears to be at the moment, what outcome would you want with regard to the provision of toilet facilities other than not relying on public facilities?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) For our chemical toilets, very often power supply could not be connected in many of them. I once asked our engineering department to supply batteries and connect them to the toilets so that 24-hour ventilation and lighting would be possible. So this was the first step we conducted.

Next, for all venues with no power supply, we have installed solar panels on top of the chemical toilets, in order to enable lighting and ventilation for our bus captains. Within my ambit, we have done our best in terms of chemical toilets. As for facilities in shopping malls or parks, would we be allowed to install more chemical toilets? This is something we would try to do. But, as we said, there is involvement of government departments and district personnel, so there is some difficulty.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, I would like to add something. I would like to thank you for raising this issue of toilets.

The issue has bothered our captains. Sometimes, our bus captains are rejected when they want to visit toilets in shopping malls, and they might have to walk

eight or ten minutes to reach a toilet. Their rest time might be jeopardised as a result, and this issue has bothered our bus captains.

I am quite surprised that some termini have no toilets. Even we can add chemical toilets, but for new termini, I am quite surprised that they have not factored in a permanent toilet.

Let me give you some examples. For example, the West Kowloon XRL Station bus terminus. It's a sizeable bus terminus but there is no toilet. For Hung Luen Road in Hung Hom, there is a new terminus to replace the Hung Hom Pier terminus. It is a public transport interchange; again, there is no toilet, there is no rest kiosk. For the Hong Kong-Macau-Zhuhai Bridge terminus, as we see now, there will be no toilet.

So again I would like to thank you for raising this issue for these resting facilities, including toilets. They should be included, or they should include the basic facilities.

CHAIRMAN: So is the root cause of the problem a failure of the planning system? How can you have new termini set up with new routes and have no regime that requires that suitable toilets be made available?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Thank you, Chairman. I do not know whether this is a design failure. For

termini built in the past, there are permanent resting facilities, including kiosks and toilets, but surprisingly, for some new termini, there are no such facilities.

For new termini, apart from a lack of resting facilities, there are design deficiencies as well. For the West Kowloon Station and Hung Luen Road termini, after they were commissioned, the Transport Department invited the bus operators to conduct trials, but we found that the designs do not suit certain models of buses, and eventually wholesale modifications must be made at the termini before our buses can use these termini.

For older termini, they weren't designed with 12-metre-long buses in mind. This is something we understand. But for new termini, we are rather surprised.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I ask you, please, to turn up file FE-1B, and go to page 199-7. Do you see there a letter dated 21 January 2016, addressed to the Commissioner for Transport from the company, under the heading, "Application for placement of chemical toilet on/over government land at Allway Gardens bus terminus, Tsuen Wan, New Territories."

Do you see a copy of that letter?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does it constitute an application for the placement of a chemical toilet at the Allway Gardens bus terminus?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If you go through, please, to page 199-10, do you see a copy of a response from the Transport Department in April 2016?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I see it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does it say in the second paragraph:

"This department has circulated your proposal to all relevant government departments for comments and sought Tsuen Wan District Office's assistance to conduct local consultation on the subject matter. I would like to advise that strong objection from local resident's representative to the placement of the proposed chemical toilet at Allway Gardens bus terminus were received due to hygiene concern and proximity of toilet facilities nearby. The details of the reasons for objection are listed in annex A for your reference, please.

As such, we regret to inform you that the application in relation to the placement of the chemical toilet is not supported. You are advised to reconsider the need and location of chemical toilet placement and resubmit application, if necessary."

Then, at page 199-13, there is another letter from the company to the Commissioner for Transport, on this occasion saying, in the second paragraph:

"Please note that the chemical toilet has been upgraded with better design and ventilation."

Et cetera, et cetera; do you see that?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We understand that Allway Gardens has been a bus station, bus terminus, for more than 20 years.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then a further letter, which is dated 29 September 2017, at page 199-18, a resubmission of the application.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then finally, at 199-26, a letter from the Transport Department of 29 September 2017, so almost two years after the original application:

"With reference to your application for placement of one chemical toilet ... I am pleased to inform you that permission is hereby given ...", with attached 32 conditions pertaining to the installation of one chemical toilet.

Is that the situation?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I may make an observation. This seemed

to have taken a long time to achieve?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is this a unique case or does this reflect the sort of situation that often occurs with regard to applications for chemical toilet installations?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) You can see that the date is September 2016. That's after the Lok Wah incident. During that period, within a short period of time, we secured approval for 26 chemical toilets to be placed. It was a very long process. As I have said, for another 100 termini, we have to rely on nearby facilities such as parks and shopping malls. Much remains to be done. But we are talking about an application time of something couched in years.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) For this Allway Gardens example, I was also involved. Why did we put in the application in the first place? Well, as you observed, the termini has been around for many years. All the time, we had been relying on shopping malls. They allow bus captains to use it, and suddenly they said no, and our bus captains had to walk a long distance to use a toilet.

Therefore, for the first time, we submitted an application on 21 January 2016, and there was

correspondence, residents objected, the district councillor said no and the Transport Department said, "Sorry, the application is not accepted." Then, in September 2017, I went on a visit to the terminus. The I talked to the bus captains; the bus captains had strong views. Then I told my manager that we had to resubmit an application. And as Mr Lee has said, in the middle of 2017, at Lok Wah Estate, we wanted to place a kiosk there and it took years to get it approved. Then the pace quickened. As Mr Lee has said, we are talking about years in getting things done. Toilets have been a source of nuisance or trouble for bus captains for many years.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we could go back, please, to KMB-1 and the information that you provided to the commission with regard to staff facilities and toilets.

It would seem, from analysis of these references, that there are some seven termini which do not appear to have any toilet facilities at all. If I look at page 208, the third and fourth on that page, Handsome Court and Sun Tuen Mun Centre, and then at page 209, the Central (Macau Ferry), the Cheung Sha Wan -- maybe that's just one, Cheung Sha Wan; Cho Yiu; and then, second from the bottom, the Kwai Tsing Central terminus.

So how do your drivers get on at these termini?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) They went to toilets in the shopping malls.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Would that not be recorded as "public toilet"?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Some are government public toilets that can be reached within ten minutes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When you've got a number of references here to public toilets, and there's a great number -- about 100, I think you said -- some of those include shopping malls?

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So why are these blank, these seven? That implies they are not even available in shopping malls.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) It could be that they relied on toilets in shopping malls, but the shopping malls will close during certain hours and the toilets would be locked up during those hours. I would have to check and then I will come back later with an answer.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So let's move from toilets to rest facilities. In this context, can I start by referring you to the evidence of one of the union representatives that the committee heard from, on Day 9, please, at page 50.

This is the evidence of a Mr Chan Kwong Nung from Long Win Bus. He was one of the representatives from

the Motor Transport Workers General Union. He gave evidence on Day 9. I want to pick it up, if I could, at line 20 on page 50:

"Mr Chan Kwong Nung: I'm from Long Win Bus, let me supplement."

So he is supplementing a statement previously made.

"For E33P" -- which as I understand it is one of the routes -- "in 2016, the route runs around the clock, there are about 60 trips. The terminus is at Siu Hong Station South. There are no rest facilities nor toilets.

Originally, this route was already in operation, in 2016 it became a full day route. Colleagues had to eat at the bus terminus, and to rest, at special space, location, we had to rest, but there was no rest kiosk.

After repeated efforts, to have one, the result was the local community and the Transport Department had not approved it. So it has been close to two years we have been asking for a kiosk, but still, to no avail.

We have not any notification as to when that can be done.

Ms Maggie Wong: And about this E33P, was this request made in writing, about the rest kiosk?

Mr Chan Kwong Nung: Yes.

Ms Maggie Wong: When was that?

Mr Chan Kwong Nung: The trade union at our meeting with the company raised that in 2015. The company has been telling us that it is making applications with the relevant authorities, and then in 2016 the district council approved that the route should be a whole-day route to serve the residents of Tuen Mun, and we were saying that without a rest kiosk how can we improve the quality of service? Our views were relayed to the district council and the Transport Department. Even today, we have not heard anything from the parties."

Just before I ask questions about that, could I also take you back to MISC-2. This is the report of the chairman's visit. This time, at page 899.

From page 899, could you go, please, through to page 902, where the observation of the visits is as follows:

"There was no rest facility at the bus terminus.

It was noted that a bus captain driving bus route E33P could only take a nap inside the bus compartment between two bus trips as there was no rest kiosk at this open-air terminus. According to another bus captain driving the same route, there was a locker stand at the terminus, in which bottles of water were occasionally placed. An Octopus card was available for access to the toilets inside the Siu Hong Station, but it took at

least seven to eight minutes to go to the toilets in the station and return."

Then at annex D we have some photos. That's page 911. So we have photos of the terminus but no rest facility; a locker stand; and then the toilets inside the Siu Hong Station.

So you, I think, anticipate my question, which is: how could a terminus be approved and be installed without, apparently, any provision for either a toilet or a rest facility?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I think, as the chairman has said, this is a core problem. I don't have an answer for you. The latest situation is that the Transport Department has approved some facilities for this terminus. Of course, there is still work to do, in that we need to apply for power supply. This is the procedure: we need to get the approval from the government first, before we can apply for power supply, and that takes time.

So the next step for us is to do our best to get power connected to the rest facilities there.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Without going back to the Transport Department's submission, I think you will understand the tenor of what they say is that they will facilitate these sorts of applications and liaise with other

government departments.

MR ROGER LEE: That's right.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is it your experience that that is effective in any way?

MR ROGER LEE: Personally, I think some departments -- we may not need to contact some of these departments. These facilities are temporary structures, and they ask those departments which have to do with permanent structures. So they ask all those departments dealing with permanent structures.

Then the other point is about power supply. We need to get the approval before the power company would entertain an application for power supply. We have failed to make any headway about these procedures. I have asked CLP to expedite the process. You can well imagine that certain things can certainly be done much quicker.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So how long ago was it that you first made an application for a kiosk and a toilet at this particular venue?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I need to check, but it is not a short while ago, not like in terms of months. It may well be over a year. Even for power supply application, it would at least take a few months.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So it hasn't been granted as yet?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Not the power supply.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When do you expect all of the approvals will have been obtained?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Maybe after this meeting, things will gather pace, but it is not very complicated. We are talking about four to six months and nothing less than that.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) For the termini, we need a lot of time to apply for the rest facilities, and application for power supply equally takes a long time. So our colleagues would ask why they could not use the kiosks, but it's because we need to get the green light from other departments, including the DSD, Drainage Services Department, and some other formalities have to be complied with first.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have reached 1 o'clock. We will take our lunch break now. We will resume this afternoon at 2.30. Thank you.

(1.00 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, gentlemen.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Sorry, Mr Duncan, prior

to the lunch break, we talked about the facilities at the termini. Do you mind if I try to give you a reply first?

Can we go to KMB Long Win Bus bundle 1(A), page 208.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) First of all, in relation to the third as well as the fourth one, Handsome Court as well as Sun Tuen Mun Centre, we were talking about special buses. There was only service in the morning, and therefore we don't have toilets, and bus captains do not take a rest there.

In addition, if you may go to page 209, Central (Macau Ferry) -- sorry, but there is an omission here. In fact, there is a public toilet.

(Chinese words not interpreted) --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please. So that's a mistake or an omission?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Correct. Sorry for the mistake.

CHAIRMAN: That's the Shun Tak Centre, is it?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Correct. You are right, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Further down, Cheung Sha Wan, Kom Tsun Street South, we haven't got a chemical

toilet there, because we are looking at the chemical toilet at Kom Tsun Street North, so the two termini share one chemical toilet.

Then further down, second-last one, Kwai Shing Central -- I'm sorry, again, there was a slip, and in fact there is a KMB permanent toilet.

Then page 210, the last one, Yau Yat Chuen, for Yau Yat Chuen we haven't actually got a bus terminus, because route 203C goes to Tai Hang Tung. So there isn't a toilet; there isn't a rest facility for bus captains, as they don't rest there.

In addition, earlier on, some trade union representatives talked about Long Win Bus E33P, in particular Siu Hong South. Mr Duncan, you asked us when we started to apply for the facility. For Siu Hong South, it was August 2017 that we submitted our application to the TD to ask for a rest kiosk as well as chemical toilet. In July 2018, approval was given. Currently, we are now applying for power supply.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr Pang.

Can I ask you now to be at MISC-2, at page 899, which, as we saw them this morning, is the report on the visit to the bus termini, the depot, and ask you,

please, to go to the second page of the report, that's page 900.

I notice the reference in line 3 under paragraph (B), the Sha Tin Railway Station bus terminus", that this contained the new style rest kiosk with an air-conditioner, an exhaust fan, five chairs, and then the reference at the bottom of the page to the fact that "on an average day, there can be more than 10 drivers resting at the terminus at the same time."

If I read the report correctly, this seems to be a situation which is not peculiar to the Sha Tin Railway Station bus terminus. So if you look at page 901, which refers to the Luen Wo Hui bus terminus, we have in the second bullet in the first paragraph reference to a small restroom with three chairs; and then, in the second paragraph on that page, the fourth bullet:

"on the day of the visit, there were around 6 or 7 drivers resting at the terminus during peak hours".

I think if we go then to page 903 for the Shan King terminus, we have five chairs, although there is no reference on this occasion to the number of drivers who might be in that kiosk at any one time.

I think there are two points here. We heard that at the depot, there's actually a dark room with facilities which enable the bus captain to have a sleep in

a horizontal position. That doesn't seem to be the case for the kiosks at the termini. Do you believe that to be a satisfactory situation?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) This may happen. What I want to emphasise is that for the so-called kiosks, there are two sizes, one smaller, the other larger. If we would like to place a couch which is horizontal, it takes up certain space. In fact, we have been doing our best, and depending on the usage, for certain termini, bus captains may not use the facilities at that particular terminus during the three-hour break, but whenever possible and if permitted we will try to place a larger kiosk.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If I may also add to the answer. Within a depot, yes, indeed, there is something for you to lie down. For a purposely built terminus, we aren't actually talking about a chair, but then it is a lower chair that allows the employees to take a rest more comfortably. They may not be able to lie down on something like a bed, but still it is quite a comfortable facility.

As to the point you are making, the kiosk is of such a size that it is only 40 square feet, we can only accommodate five or six chairs, and we believe that there is a need. Very soon, at larger termini, we are

going to have two types of chairs, one for you to sit upright, the other for you to be more comfortable. We are already working on this at many locations.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, this morning, during the hearing, I tried to provide some figures for the committee. For us, the KMB, for bus captains doing special shifts, what I want to say is that about 9 per cent of bus captains doing special shifts, that is 134 of them, they will take their rest at the four depots. As Mr Lee has said, we do have horizontal beds. So 134 of them would have their rest breaks at the depots. For others taking their rest at the bus termini, 17 per cent of them, in other words 262 of them. Then for those who go home for the three-hour rest break, in fact they account for 74 per cent of the special shift bus captains, 1,117 of them. 74 per cent of them can go home to take their rest.

So, relatively speaking, for us in KMB, we are in a better position, because we have got differently distributed depots, and bus captains can go home within a short period of time so as to take their break.

Thank you, Mr Duncan.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If I may also add to the answer. Of course, we have given you the figures. For the rest facilities at the termini, we will continue to

work on them: better chairs, more comfortable chairs. So they are not just for special shift bus captains. Even for those doing straight duties, we will still try to improve the facilities for them.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At the larger kiosks, is there room for horizontal sleeping facilities?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I don't think they can actually lie down in a horizontal position, but then we have something like an armchair for them to recline. Of course, I'm not talking about a bed that is horizontal, but then it is like an armchair that they can sit more comfortably. Soon we are going to provide more and more chairs like this.

So we do have them, and we are working on them, and as long as their size allows, we can provide more such chairs.

CHAIRMAN: Has anyone stipulated the maximum size of a kiosk?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Every time when we apply to the TD to install the kiosk, there is a size restriction. I think we are already talking about the best size within the current framework.

CHAIRMAN: Is that an indirect answer that the Transport Department impose a limit on the size?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, indeed. Not

necessarily the TD but in fact there is.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) This is a size stipulated by the government. So we have an open attitude towards the size. It can certainly be bigger.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Well, on many occasions, we try to convert to another type of kiosk from type A.

CHAIRMAN: Which department of government stipulates a maximum size of kiosk?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The Transport Department.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) The Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: For how long has it stipulated these two sizes?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Five years.

CHAIRMAN: Really? No longer than that?

MR ROGER LEE: I'd probably say at least five years.

CHAIRMAN: And have you asked to have bigger kiosks, perhaps saying, "Look, we need somewhere for drivers to lie down to sleep?" Have you asked the Transport Department?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Usually we will ask for two 40 square foot kiosks. Usually, that's what we try to do. Usually we only get one, we are only given permission to do one. If we ask for a size which is larger than 40, I'm afraid we have never tried.

CHAIRMAN: So you don't know what the answer might be?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: But you infer from the fact that they refuse you to have two 40-foot ones, that they would refuse a 100 square foot kiosk; is that it?

MR ROGER LEE: (Nodded head).

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The armchairs you refer to, are they visible in any of the photos that are attached to the report?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) No, not shown in the photographs, but then for many bus termini we do have these kind of chairs.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The second point which arises from those descriptions that I read is the fact that you may have, say, three to five chairs, but at any one time there may be seven to eight people having a rest. Is that a satisfactory state of affairs?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Of course, there is always room for improvement. Personally speaking, I don't think this is quite satisfactory. So, as I have said, we have never stopped liaising with the government and applying to the government. So, for the rest kiosk, it isn't a problem that has been resolved; we are not satisfied with the situation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, going back to, if I could, TD-1, where we started this conversation this morning, at page 438,

where we saw the two questions of the department and their responses. If I could bring your attention to page 438, the second sentence of the first bullet:

"When relevant departments/authorities consider and vet the applications for setting up these staff facilities, the TD has been providing appropriate coordination so as to facilitate early installation of such facilities."

Is that in fact your experience of the situation?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Yes, they do play the role as a coordinator. For applications like this, there are two major departments involved. Generally speaking, the Transport Department will deal with cases other than the Housing Department or the Housing Authority. For those cases falling within the Housing Authority, the Housing Authority will be the coordinator. So we are mainly talking about two different authorities dealing with the applications.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the Transport Department's coordination result in the facilitation of early installation of the facilities, in your experience?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) As an operator, I would say that they could have done more quickly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: The second bullet, third sentence:

"Requirements and comments from the FB operators on

toilets and rest facilities would be incorporated in the design of the bus termini as appropriate."

Is that the situation, in reality?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Actually, it is very difficult for me to give you either "yes" or "no". Some would be known to us, but others, the information is not known to us. So sorry, Mr Duncan, I cannot give you a clear "yes" or "no".

MR PETER DUNCAN: Who's responsible for the design of a bus terminus?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) There are several types of termini. Some termini are on government land or government property. When they were built, the government might not have decided which bus operators would operate the routes there, and they seldom invited the operators for comment. The TD would have their own team of consultants to design the termini. So, over the years, we were never consulted on where the toilets should be installed.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So it is the Transport Department which designs each bus terminus?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If it is on their land. For termini on public transport interchanges, that might have to do with the railway company, and we are unaware of the property ownership situation, but we were never

informed.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, when the Transport Department designs a terminus on government land, do they incorporate in the design the provision for a toilet and a rest facility?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) If they call it a bus terminus, then terminus facilities should be incorporated. But from what I see now, these facilities are absent in some termini, so I cannot say or comment on their standards.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Going down to page 439, the first bullet on that page:

"The TD has been proactively liaising with the relevant departments/authorities as appropriate to resolve any difficulties encountered by the franchised bus operators in applying for the facilities ..."

Is your experience that the Transport Department has effectively resolved difficulties encountered by your company?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Mr Duncan, I would only say that it can be done better. This bullet point is actually very broad. There is no way for me to gauge what is meant by "proactively".

Or let me put it this way. The TD does not object in principle the installation of rest kiosks and

chemical toilets at the termini, but whenever there is district consultation, and it is also about whether these facilities -- or whether there is space for these facilities at the actual site. I feel that we have no major differences with the TD and I see that they have certain difficulties.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Page 440, the last sentence on that page:

"The Transport Department would assist the franchised bus operators in canvassing support from the locals by conducting site visits/meetings with them to explore feasible solutions for erection of the rest facilities in order to expedite the implementation plans as and when necessary for the benefits of bus captains and passengers."

Has the company experienced that sort of assistance?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) When we file an application, I know that the TD would communicate with the district council as relevant for the example of Allway Gardens in Tsuen Wan, the TD said that there was opposition from the residents and they asked us to apply on another site. So this is a common problem we run into.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I now want to conclude by asking you a series of clarification matters, or matters that have already been the subject of the assistance you have

given the committee.

First of all, with regard to the drivers actually coming to work to start their shifts -- now, do I understand correctly that, currently, drivers are not provided with any special transport to enable them to get to the start of their work? They have to use their own resources, their own devices, to get to work?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We do provide crew bus service. The service is provided for morning shifts and the scope is pretty wide. We do not have any depot on Hong Kong Island, but we would provide crew bus service on Hong Kong Island every morning to take captains to work at their respective depots.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right. Can you provide just a little more detail about that so the committee knows the extent of that crew bus service?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) No problem. We do have routes for our crew bus, and the timetables, et cetera, we can provide them.

For those on morning shifts, commuting is an issue, whereas for those on night shifts, the captains can often use the bus, and they can reach the depots they need.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can I ask you to go to KMB-12 at page 5010.

This is one of the documents that you supplied after the last hearing, and which provide statistics to which you referred in different context just a few moments ago.

It shows the statistics regarding what proportion of the drivers will take their midday rest respectively at the depot or at the terminus or at home. I think the earlier point that you were making was the high proportion -- I think you mentioned about 70 per cent -- who actually took their break by returning home.

MR PATRICK PANG: Mmm.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there any provision for transport assistance with regard to taking the drivers home or back from home to resume their duties?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) We have an inherent advantage, in which we have a high number of termini, so every bus captain who has completed training at our company would be deployed somewhere near where they live.

So you can see that 74 per cent of the bus captains on special shifts are within walking distance of home, and very often they would just live next to the termini, so it is easy for them to go home.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, during the hearing, on the last occasion -- if I could just give the members reference:

Day 14 at page 112 -- we were informed that drivers might be required to drive up to three routes in a day. Do you recall that evidence?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Yes, I remember.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What would be the financial implications if that was reduced to two routes a day, or would there be financial implications?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Financially, I do not see any substantial difference, but in terms of operation, there might be some impacts. For the so-called interlining or the cap of number of routes at three per day, we are not the only company with such practice.

As far as I know, all franchised bus operators in Hong Kong adopt this approach of interlining. In the last hearing, as Mr Lee said, we asked a British consultant to look at the maintenance and operation of our bus routes, and from my experience with those consultants, in other countries, sometimes more than three routes are included in the interlining.

So, to answer your question, Mr Duncan, financially there is no substantial difference, but in terms of operation, you must understand that the passenger volume might be different every day and some bus captains might be on sick leave. If we allow them to drive no more

than three routes, there would be more operational flexibility and for each bus route, there would be bus route training, or else we would not deploy the captains.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Are there any complaints from unions or drivers that driving three routes is too many?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I did not hear major complaints, but for certain drivers there might be some complaints, if they have to drive two routes a day. I think there is a need not to drive more than three routes a day and this is a common practice.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We have heard evidence with regard to what happens when a driver is required to drive on a new route. When he is required to try out a new route, does he have the assistance on board of another captain?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Captains must have received route training for all routes. If they are to drive a new route, they must receive route training at our training school.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I think we are looking at two issues here. For bus captains trained at our Bus Captain Training School, at the beginning, the driver would be accompanied by another person on board; whereas for an experienced captain picking up a new route, the captain would receive training from the training school.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When he drives that new route for the first time, does he have the assistance of another driver on board?

MR PATRICK PANG: Yes, buddy driver.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Buddy driver, yes?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It depends on the number of years of experience for the bus captain. For an experienced captain picking up a new line, that route would not be completely new for him, so he can handle it alone. For a new captain who has freshly graduated, we would assign a buddy driver who is experienced, who would give confidence to the new driver and provide the information necessary.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Dr Leung mentioned the proposal to introduce a 20-point increment instead of the current I think eight-point increment. Are you able to indicate to the committee when it is likely that this will be introduced?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) It was in effect from 1 September.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It has already been introduced?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: In fact, Mr Duncan, for your information, with effect from 1 September, if a new recruit joins KMB or Long Win as bus captain, he will be earning about

$23,000 a month, inclusive of the double pay at the end of the year. That is a substantial increase over the previous remuneration.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: You have provided us with this information in a recent submission, have you not?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: I think we are happy to make -- Godwin, will be happy to submit to this committee a comparison; all right? The remuneration package before 1 September and after 1 September. Compare the daily rate of bus captains and the monthly captains -- provide those figures to this committee, please.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We will provide it as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does it sometimes happen that a driver will fall ill during the course of his duties? Does that sometimes happen?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, it does happen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does the company have any procedures or protocols as to what should happen in that situation?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) First of all, in the recruitment of captains, according to our agreement, if a bus captain falls ill, he or she should apply for sick leave, and we have our own clinic at each depot, and

when captains are deployed, when they check in at the terminus, we would remind them that they can only work that day if they are healthy, and they are allowed to apply for sick leave otherwise.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What of the particular situation, though, that during the course of driving a route a particular driver falls ill? Is there any particular policy or protocol or procedure that is required to be undertaken?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) If a bus captain feels unwell during the course of driving a route, the captain can pull over and call our inspector. We have inspectors who make inspections, and the bus captain simply has to pull over and our inspector would arrange another bus so that the passengers can be transferred, and then we would take the bus captain to a clinic. This is our practice.

MR PETER DUNCAN: KMB-12 again, if I may, this time at page 5063. This again is some of the material that you provided the committee with since the last hearing, and it contains a description of the regular training for new bus captains, page 5063, and then the regular training for serving bus captains at page 5064.

Does the company provide any training with regard to fatigue management? And when I mention "fatigue management", what I mean, if I can try and explain

this -- recognising fatigue, knowing what to do about fatigue and knowing how better to take rest. That's what I mean about "fatigue management". Is there anything of that nature covered in the course of driver training?

MR JAMES WONG: (Via interpreter) As Mr So has said, when they join the company, we will remind them that if they are not well, they should see a doctor; they should not drive.

As for fatigue, we think this is covered by the point on not being well.

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) On fatigue management, the company has done a few things. First of all, the Transport Department has issued Guidelines on Working Hours. If we comply with the guidelines, then at least we can ensure that there is sufficient rest taken by the bus captains. We also have a chapter in the training manual that as a driver, they should manage their health properly. When they discover that they are not feeling well, they should inform the company and do not work in that particular shift that they have been deployed to work. There are also facilities at the depot -- at the terminus.

Every six hours, the bus captain has a coffee break, and there is also a water break, a layover break and

toilet break, for them to take a rest, and that's for the purpose of keeping them healthy.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So do I understand correctly from those answers that there is nothing specifically aimed at fatigue management; that these are general matters that are covered during the course of the training?

MR GODWIN SO: No.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, we have heard a lot at the last hearing that it was in early June this year that the company first learned from the Transport Department that digital road mapping was available in Hong Kong. Do you remember that evidence at the last hearing?

(People nodding)

Has the company yet started to make use of the digital road mapping?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We have talked to the black box manufacturer. We are working on it. We hope we can make good use of the map. We are doing it.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When do you expect to commence making use of the digital mapping facility?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We are doing this under a two-pronged approach. For ZF, there are two systems, one based on digital map; the other is an approach based on manual input of information and data. We are doing both. We hope that in January next year or so, we can

try to provide some information on the black box. For example, speeding, or a speed limit for that particular road section. We hope to achieve this by January next year.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At the hearing on Day 13 -- I will give everybody the reference just for the record: it's page 31 of line 12 -- the committee was informed that, at that time, that's earlier this month, or last month, in August, it took four days for the speeding report to be generated.

Then, in answer to a question from Prof Lo, Mr Leung agreed that if the driver tapped in using his ID, and that record was put in the black box, the information would be instantaneous; you wouldn't have to wait for the four days.

So what is the current situation? Do we still have to wait for the four days or is it instantaneously available?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) Still four days now, but we are working towards that particular direction.

MR PETER DUNCAN: When will you reach that direction?

MR LEUNG KIN WANG: (Via interpreter) We hope we can achieve it as soon as possible.

MR PETER DUNCAN: What does that mean, a few weeks, a month?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) We were talking about the

black box and the digital map. We can reduce it from ten to four days because of the technology. We have to merge the two sets of data, and it will take four instead of ten days.

If we can further integrate the digital map into the black box, we can certainly reduce the time taken from four days to something less. Maybe it can be reduced to one or two days. We don't know yet. But next year, the real time taken -- the time taken will be much shortened.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, gentlemen. I have, personally, no further questions, but the committee may have some questions for you.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman.

You spent a lot of time today talking about how to improve the working conditions of all the bus captains. Can you give us some description on the hiring successes of bus captains so far, using say the last month versus three months ago to six months ago? Are you having much success hiring bus captains?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) At present, on a weekly basis, we can recruit 20 to 30 new bus captains. Compared with what it was six months ago, we were only able to recruit 10 to 15 bus captains. But it has to do with the market. But, at the same time, the company has

done certain things. First of all, pay and remuneration. As our chairman has said, there was an enhancement in March, and then in August there was a pay increase. So altogether we are talking about 15 per cent increase in one year. With higher pay, we can attract more bus captains.

Secondly, we were talking about the conditions, more facilities for rest, and so on, and also in our recruitment we have stepped up our efforts. We have organised more open days and reaching out activities. We would take the initiative to reach the target of prospective bus captains so we can make up the shortage, shortfall.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) As for the target recruits, and also we have to bear in mind different local characteristics in different districts. For example, Tuen Mun is very different from Lai Chi Kok, so we will have to adopt a targeted approach. In Tuen Mun, we may want to target more women. They might not be able to work a full eight-hour day; they may only work half of that. But we know that certain hours, they will be able to work, and they don't want to have an assured working shift designated.

So we will also look into child-care service so that these bus captains can take care of their children when

they are off duty. Some of these people are in their early 50s. They may have the driving licence; they may not want to take up a full-time job.

So we will have to look at the district characteristics and the people in different districts.

Also, we have gone to different districts, including Lantau Island and Tung Chung, and we need to use some new approaches.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: A second question I may have is to follow up on the question Mr Duncan asked earlier about the design of the bus terminus.

I get the impression from your feedback that it's like you have no chance to ask for a toilet or whatever. Is the arrangement all or nothing, either you do it or you don't get the route? Is that how it works in the system?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) Not that the design of every terminus is without a rest kiosk or any toilet. Some termini would factor in this in the design, but somehow, in some of the termini, these facilities are not taken on board.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) I think Mr Auyeung was asking about our role in the design of new termini. Usually, the design of the new terminus is completed before the award of new bus routes. So they would build

the termini first before they make a decision on which operator, bus operator, should be granted the right to run the routes.

For example, in respect of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, they have been talking about offering bus service for a long time, but they haven't made a decision on who, which company, to run those routes. So they have no way to ask us about our ideas or proposals in the design. So they would complete the hardware first, before finding an operator, because when the design is done we don't know whether we will run those routes.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: You have no chance to go back and request such facilities as a toilet?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) In respect of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, we did try that, but the hardware is already completed so that's a difficult point.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

Thank you, chairman.

CHAIRMAN: You have provided the committee with redacted versions of the notes or the minutes of various minutes that were held in several different parts of the working group that was convened in March 2018 and addressed training and the use of technological devices to enhance

safety.

In response to the agenda being sent out, you sent your own shopping list of what you would like to address, and can I invite you to go to that. It's at KMB-12 at page 4939. I think the agenda had been sent out on 13 March, so this was an immediate response, and no doubt what you were doing was taking the opportunity to put down matters that you had had difficulties with, for them to be discussed. This was an opportunity for you.

Am I correct in that assumption?

MR GODWIN SO: Yes.

MR ROGER LEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What you asked them to address was, first of all, illegal parking and loading and unloading activities at bus stops; traffic congestion is perhaps a broader matter; but more specifically, bus captain assaults and traffic black spots.

Two of those matters are matters that we have received evidence on from various parties: illegal parking, particularly at bus stops, and assaults on bus captains.

The response from the Transport Department came in the letter at page 4941, dated 26 March 2018. You will see, in the second paragraph, reference is made to the

limited time span of the working group and the need to focus on submitting a review report on the outcome in three months' time. Then the response to your request:

"As for the four subjects that you have raised, we would handle them separately outside the working group."

The question I have for you is this. This is now five months later. Have these matters, illegal parking at bus stops and assaults on bus captains, been handled at all?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Perhaps I can answer this. At that time, the working group under the Transport Department focused on safety belts on buses and the training of bus drivers. After the two priority agenda items were completed, we wrote to the Transport Department, as you can see in page 4945, and we reiterated the four subjects.

Illegal parking, as we mentioned in earlier hearing, Mr Pang told you that the company took the initiative to liaise with the police in an attempt to do something about this.

As for traffic congestion, we all understand there is very little we can do.

The third one, harassment of bus captains, or bus captain assault, we understand that the Transport Department is conducting a campaign involving a number

of operators, railway operators and bus operators. This is a publicity campaign on polite passengers.

And the fourth one, traffic black spots, we have a fleet of 3,000 buses. We understand the road conditions well. Some roads are uneven or the levelling is not good, and also the marking may also affect -- may cause traffic accidents. From time to time, we write to the Transport Department. They have regional offices responsible for road safety and design, road design. We will relay the views collected from our bus captains and our frontline people.

According to this letter, the department said the matters would be dealt with outside the working group. So we subsequently wrote to the Transport Department, listing out all the 300 cases that we have gathered over the period.

CHAIRMAN: Has anything at all been achieved about illegal parking at bus stops in the five months since March? Perhaps you can answer "yes" or "no", and then go on to explain.

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) The simple answer is no. There has been no substantial improvement.

CHAIRMAN: Has anything been achieved about the issue of assaults on bus captains?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) After the last hearing,

the police communicated with us, and we once again provided detailed information about past bus captain assault cases. So the information has been passed to the police.

As I said last time, there was a case at Yau Yat Chuen, four men twice pressed the emergency button on the bus and the police took the initiative to talk to us and also the police have contacted the bus captain concerned.

CHAIRMAN: That's the total of the achievement, is it?

MR PATRICK PANG: (Via interpreter) I think in respect of illegal parking or traffic congestion, we cannot expect much to be done within such a short period of time. There's the so-called "polite passenger" campaign organised by the Transport Department to promote mutual trust and politeness, and I think this would help our bus captains in the long run.

CHAIRMAN: The other matter I would like your help on, if I can ask for it, is -- and I give you an example -- the way in which the minutes have been redacted, the minutes of the meetings of the working group.

Now, the working group has been addressing issues of training, issues of safety-related technological devices. Those are very much matters that this committee is concerned with in discharging its duties in

examining the system, regulatory system, the operation of buses, as required by the Chief Executive in the terms of reference. These are parallel, if you like, enquiries into the same issue.

Can I ask you to go to page 4926. I'm just taking this as an example. We are not dealing with a censor in wartime, blacking out material that the enemy might get hold of, are we? But when we come to the prosaic item of "Installation of seat belts for all passenger seats", page 4927, we've got half a page of black ink, and then on the next page we've got another half-page of black ink.

The more general question I would ask you is this: on what basis have these minutes been redacted? What is the logic behind it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Well, it involves the remarks made by other bus companies, so, in the absence of their consent, we have to redact the relevant parts.

CHAIRMAN: So that is the basis? You have just taken out what other people have said? You are happy to tell us what you have said but you have taken out what others said? Is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, you may say so.

CHAIRMAN: So what you have taken out is what Citybus have had to say, what the Transport Department have had to

say, is that it?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) We haven't redacted anything spoken by the Transport Department because we have asked them about it.

CHAIRMAN: So it's Citybus?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) Yes, in my version of the minutes, that's it.

CHAIRMAN: So did you ask Citybus if you could put in what it is they said at these meetings?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) I think it is better, more appropriate, for the Transport Department to do this.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer to my question is you haven't asked Citybus whether or not you can include what it is that they had to say so that we would get a full version of the minutes? You haven't even asked them?

MR GODWIN SO: (Via interpreter) After today, I will ask them. If they give us the permission, we will give you the full set.

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Sorry about that. The straight answer is that, Mr Chairman, we have not asked Citybus and New World First Bus for their consent to have the full text presented before you. Sorry about that, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Leung, but, Mr So, you will now ask Citybus. If Citybus decline, please tell us, because

then we will ask them ourselves, because we might be able to save quite a lot of ink.

One final question is this. You have told us about four depots that Kowloon Motor Bus have: Tuen Mun, Sha Tin, Lai Chi Kok and Kowloon Bay. Of those four depots, are any or all of them owned by Kowloon Motor Bus or its subsidiaries?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, among the four depots, for Sha Tin Depot and Tuen Mun Depot, they are owned by the KMB. We bought it at an auction. For Kowloon Bay Depot, it has been granted to us under private treaty grant. So we paid the premium for using it as a depot. For Lai Chi Kok Depot, it is under the arrangement of a short-term tenancy with the government.

CHAIRMAN: And, as to the meaning of "short-term", can you give us some indication?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) This is true, for the KMB Citybus and New World Bus, the government offers a site under a short-term tenancy arrangement. It depends on the duration. For Lai Chi Kok Depot, we have it renewed automatically every year. We have to pay a rent for the use of it.

CHAIRMAN: So it's an annual renewal?

MR ROGER LEE: (Nodded head).

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Mr Duncan, are there any matters arising from the questions asked by the committee?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just one matter. If I may follow up the issue of women drivers, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Previously, we were alerted or apprised of some of the issues that surround women drivers, and a few moments ago there was further information given with regard to how to approach that topic.

Has there been any appreciable increase in the number of women applying for positions in recent times?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Well, for female bus captains, it is slightly over 5 per cent as of now. Of course, it depends on the local factors. In Hong Kong, I think we have sort of half male and half female in our population. So I see a huge potential here.

Just now, to follow up on Mr Auyeung's question, we use Tuen Mun as an example, we hope that at Tuen Mun Depot, we can do something about it, and the chairman has also referred to the case in Sweden. I have also noticed that in many European countries, they are providing nurseries so that female drivers can drive. They may not be working full-time for us, but still they

can spare some time and help us out as bus captains in the short term.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you seen any fruits from your endeavours?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Indeed, there is. Personally speaking, I think in terms of stability and in terms of passenger interaction, I have a high level of hope for the women bus captains. But of course we have to get approval from the government to allow us to set up a nursery within our depot before we can move on to that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think my question was a little more specific. Has there been any increase, as yet, in the number of applications by women?

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Steady. Not really an increase.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) But many people did ask us about that.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lee, I understand that there is a concluding statement that you wish to make at the end of the evidence. Or is Dr Leung going to make it?

DR NORMAN LEUNG: Yes, Chairman and members of the committee, I just want to say that we are grateful for

your time to receive representation from us. As I said at the outset of the hearing we came before you with a humble and receiving heart. We welcome any recommendation that will safeguard bus safety for our passengers. It has been a very educating experience to us, and in particular to our management, and so with that I ask our managing director, Mr Roger Lee, to say a few words to wrap up our representation before you.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Leung.

Mr Lee?

Closing statement by MR ROGER LEE

MR ROGER LEE: (Via interpreter) Mr Chairman and members, I would like to thank everybody. We fully understand, over the past period of time, that the public in Hong Kong have high expectations in relation to bus service.

In our daily operation, there are many, many challenges, in terms of recruitment of bus captains, road congestion, and then there are many social changes, and we have seen bus captains being assaulted. So in fact it is a major challenge. But still we believe we have to discharge our duty properly. We shall continue to enhance our service.

In particular, in relation to safety, I am sure

nobody from our team would give up our efforts.

For the traffic accident in Tai Po Road in February this year, it was a huge blow to everybody in the KMB, both in the senior management as well as at the frontline. No words can describe how heart-breaking it was for us. Personally speaking, ever since, I have not been able to let it off. We won't allow the accident to happen again and we don't want this to happen again. This is one too many.

Since the accident, we come to recognise that there are inadequacies in our work. We haven't stopped in making improvements.

In the process of giving evidence, we come to realise that KMB must progress with the times. We have to do more in this regard to enhance our service. Say, for example, in terms of the use of technologies, we need to be comprehensive, and we have to aim at precision and we have to work more on our safety system, and we need to catch up with the times.

Now I turn to the bus captains. The management of bus captains, the training of bus captains, are areas that we need to improve. And in terms of our facilities -- and in fact just now we have talked about the rest facilities as well as the toilets -- well, in fact we haven't stopped making improvements in such

areas. The KMB has been serving the Hong Kong citizens for 85 years as a bus company. Indeed, it is our duty to be fully dedicated in serving the public.

Whatever that our passengers or staff need, it is our duty to meet their requirements, but at the same time it takes more than the KMB on its own to do the job. We need the support and coordination of the government departments, and then we can be effective in service enhancement.

Finally, our team as a whole are most grateful to the committee for your past work as well as your work in the future.

As our chairman has said in the opening remarks before you, with a humble heart and with the greatest sincerity, the KMB team will be open to different recommendations and suggestions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Dr Leung and Mr Lee and gentlemen, thank you for attending now for four days to assist us with your evidence. We are grateful for that, but these proceedings are now concluded. We have other evidence to take on Saturday, typhoon willing. Thank you for your attendance.

(3.43 pm) (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Saturday, 15 September 2018)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM KOWLOON MOTOR BUS CO (1933) LTD 1
AND LONG WIN BUS CO LTD: DR NORMAN
LEUNG, DR JOHN CHAN, MR ROGER LEE,
MR GODWIN SO, MR LEUNG KIN WANG,
MR PATRICK PANG, MR JAMES WONG

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN (continued) 1

Closing statement by MR ROGER LEE 112

[Blank Page]

2018 年 9 月 12 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位早晨，梁乃鵬博士早晨，各位先生早晨。鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。早晨，梁博士，早晨，各位先生。首先我想講一講就係我哋係確定係收到大量嘅材料嘅，呢個係嚟自你哋公司，就係自從上次召開聆訊之後，你哋一直都畀咗好多文件我哋嘅，亦都多謝你哋係提供咗呢啲資訊。喺第十四日結束嘅時候，我當時係問咗你哋一啲問題嘅，呢個係關於就係話一啲裝置嘅，譬如話係提醒唔好撞車同埋係保持喺行車線嗰度呢一啲裝置，當時就梁先生話畀我哋聽就係公司當時係有做過呢一個研究嘅，就係貝爾法斯特嘅 Queen 大學嘅，呢個就話係去年嘅秋天所做嘅事，即係話到而家大概有一年嘅時間。當時你哋亦都同我哋講過，就話你哋會留意市場個情況，睇下有冇一啲第三方嘅產品係可以用得著嘅。

委員會係知道市場係有咁樣嘅性質嘅產品嘅，佢個名--即係個產品個名叫做 Mobileye，我就想問下你哋公司知唔知道係有呢一類嘅裝置呢？即係叫做神眼嘅呢個 Mobileye。

梁健宏先生：我哋知悉嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問下，你哋有冇諗過係用呢一啲咁樣嘅裝置呢？

梁健宏先生：會嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪仲未開始做呀？

梁健宏先生：其實我哋 2014 年同 Mobileye 亦都試過㗎喇，2014 年我哋就同 Mobileye 亦都試過一個類似嘅計劃，試過嘅，當其時嘅成果就唔係幾理想，就當然技術會改善嘅，我亦都係開始聯絡--再聯絡佢哋嘅。

李澤昌先生：呢度都有少少可以補充，其實我哋今日其實已經採用緊一間公司，一間澳洲嘅公司就喺我哋嘅車上面都做緊一啲近乎 Mobileye，即係其實係等於車長喺行駛嘅時間，如果係有啲瞌著眼瞓咁，就會提醒佢。呢個喺我哋係喺呢個做緊個 chart 嘅，亦都同一時間，我哋亦都搵咗一間日本嘅公司，過去嗰兩年係都同--睇緊有咩嘢即係近似合適嘅嘢，喺車長行駛嘅時間有咁嘅狀況，即係我哋所謂叫“fatigue”，就希望可以幫到佢哋，過去嗰兩年其實係頭嗰年就係困難嘅，因為喺香港嘅道路上邊其實行長途嘅時間同埋行短途，特別喺繁忙嘅路段，車長佢嗰個頭嗰個轉動比較多，所以好難好精準睇到佢嘅眼，例如同啲乘客有交流或者喺轉彎嘅時候，其實係困難。

所以其實香港嘅道路係搵一個好第三者嘅一間公司去做到呢個 fatigue 呢個係困難，所以我哋亦都喺--而家喺 Belfast 喺北愛爾蘭嗰個 Queen's University，我哋都好斟酌研究嗰幾樣嘢，一，就係喺車長喺無意中轉線嘅時候而係冇一個好合理嘅理由，呢個提醒佢，或者喺同前車太近個速度去提醒佢。我覺得呢個係一個整體上嘅研究嚟嘅，當然日本嗰個牌子我哋應該喺今年或者下年年初有機會再試，澳洲嗰個牌子而家試緊。

Mobileye 我哋曾經睇過，好似梁生講，但係呢個--暫時呢個我諗係唔適合。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊好多不同類型嘅裝置㗎嘛，同埋係譬如話你話 Mobileye 6 同埋佢係咪一個係防撞--另外仲有一啲係防碰撞嘅裝置？因為佢會睇你個車速㗎嘛。另外你亦都係話有一個裝置係避免啲人係瞌眼瞓嘅。

李澤昌先生：Okay，呢個基本上有兩樣唔同嘅嘢嚟嘅，Mobileye 就係--或者係我哋試緊嗰兩隻係望住個車長佢嗰個眼神或者個面部有啲咩嘢令到佢覺得係可能係瞌著咗，就然後有一啲方法係搞醒佢。另外嗰種就係喺架車裏面有個 sensor，而呢個 sensor 係同你前車之間個距離有幾遠，而佢可以知道你當其時你架車嘅車速，因為每一架車嘅車速，佢有一個既定嘅所謂叫做“braking distance”，即係話你行緊某一個公里嘅時間，你如果喺嗰陣時急剎，你同個前車有一個合理嘅距離仲係安全嘅，如果佢量度前車嘅距離係好近，而你嘅車速去到某個階段，係基本上係即係唔係好理性嘅，呢個就係一個--即係喺另外一樣嘢，其實係整體上一套嘢嚟嘅。我哋係喺研究喺呢兩套，我哋都會做。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）希望我哋就唔會係有乜嘢混亂，我就想講下，不如先集中就係防碰撞同埋保持行車線呢一啲產品，然後之後先至再係睇嗰啲係防止瞌眼瞓嘅裝置。

梁健宏先生：可以。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講到話係避免碰撞同埋保持行車線呢啲裝置，我諗你較早時候有講過嘅，就話再睇番係咪可以搵番呢個 Mobileye 呢個裝置嘅，咁講啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：我哋會參考尤其是我知道其他啲 operator 都係試緊佢嘅，我哋都理解下對方嗰個試驗個情況如何，除咗我哋喺 Queen's University 嗰個研究之外，我哋都會保持開放嘅態度，理解下 Mobileye 而家嗰個功能係點樣樣。雖然之前嗰個經驗就未必啱用，但係我覺得都可以去睇下佢嗰個狀況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問開始咗未呢？搵番呢個 Mobileye 未呢？

李澤昌先生：未。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係咪打算咁做呀？

李澤昌先生：暫時我哋係都係喺純粹喺文件裏面睇緊佢個發展，係冇直接同Mobileye呢間公司有任何嘅對話，因為頭先都講咗其實Mobileye嘅公司佢做嘅嘢市面上都有好多係可能比佢適合我哋嘅，所以我哋係睇多幾款嘢，就亦都我哋自己亦都研究緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，想問有冇同任何嘅供應商係傾談緊就係關乎呢啲防碰撞嘅設施呢？

李澤昌先生：有，有一間澳洲公司，正正講咗我哋已經係研究緊㗎喇，用咗佢嘅產品係試驗緊，喺一間日本公司，我哋亦都有同佢哋已經有直接係有對話，係發展緊係做緊佢嗰套新嘅儀器，亦都頭先都講咗，我哋自己亦都研發緊嗰個collision，嗰個同Mobileye有少少唔同嘅嘢，亦都係啱啱講緊喺北愛爾蘭我哋亦都做緊。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。係咪可以講畀我哋聽澳洲公司嘅名？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊間呢？

梁健宏先生：嗰間就係Guardian嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）日本公司個名呢？

梁健宏先生：Denso。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以重複你個名？

梁健宏先生：日本間公司就係Denso，D-E-N-S-O，Denso。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你再串一次個名。

陳祖澤先生：D-E-N-S-O。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番呢個Queen's大學嘅研究，其實你上次都有講過㗎喇，就話大概一年之前開展嘅，我想問而家去到咩嘢階段呢？

李澤昌先生：首先，佢哋Queen's University嘅professor應該--我記得係應該上個月，上個月就佢哋亦都過咗嚟我哋九巴，就睇過我哋公司一啲我哋喺嗰個營運上嗰啲，即係喺架車裏面嗰個營運嘅情況，我哋亦都派咗我哋一個工程師去咗北愛爾蘭，喺--應該係已經開始同佢哋一齊研究緊，好快嘅將來，應該係呢一、兩個月，佢哋亦都會有啲即係做research，喺個university嘅research亦都會base喺我哋呢邊一段時間，係睇緊香港嗰個道路嘅情況，而家暫時去到呢個階段，我自己個人都會喺下一、兩個月會去一去呢個Queen's University睇下佢哋個update。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你預期幾時會做完個研究？

李澤昌先生：暫時個時間表係好 tentative，係出年嘅 summer，但係就當然係要睇嗰個進展嘅情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢個階段講到嗰個研究，可唔可以話到畀我哋聽你預期到時會有啲咩嘢嘅結果呢？

李澤昌先生：我要返去 check 一 check 佢發展到咩嘢階段，當然絕對嗰啲出嚟嗰啲結果係可以同呢個 committee 一齊分享嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但其實我個問題就問你而家做緊研究，你覺得係你都抱有希望定抑或你有啲乜嘢係預期嘅結果呢？

李澤昌先生：其實喺文件裏面，我哋應該係交咗呢一個研究，呢個 ADAS 呢個東西係咩嘢嘅東西，其實已經係文件上係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你是否樂觀呢？即係今次嘅研究係會得出一個有效嘅裝置，避免碰撞同埋保持行車線，你樂觀定唔樂觀呢？

李澤昌先生：我只可以咁講，Queen's University 佢嗰個 mechanical 嗰個部門係好少一間大學係願意做一啲同雙層巴士或者 city bus 有關係嘅研究，呢個其實都係比較係一啲好特殊嘅，亦都正正喺英國，亦都有好好嘅環境畀佢從一個歐洲嗰個角度去睇呢樣嘢，我哋作為一個全世界都算係一啲大嘅 bus operator，我當然對佢好大嘅期望。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋不如唔講呢個防止碰撞同埋保持呢個係行車線，而家就講話防止就係呢個巴士司機就係瞌眼瞓嘅，你剛才就係講咗少少呢一方面嘅情況㗎喇。喺呢方面係想請你睇番 KMB 文件夾 1，想請你睇番 115 頁，喺 115 頁嗰度，你見到呢個就係你哋公司提交畀運輸當局嘅一份報告嘅最屘嗰頁嚟嘅，就係其實--屘二嗰頁嚟嘅，其實就係大埔車禍之後你哋提交嘅調查報告，屘二嗰頁嘅，喺第 47 段，115 頁，嗰度個標題就係話車長係瞌眼瞓，你呢度就話九巴目前就進行緊一個測試嘅，就係有一個供應商就係有一啲係會監察車長嘅昏昏欲睡嘅情況，如果係揸緊車係有咁嘅情況，就會睇下佢哋就係有幾警覺，會唔會佢哋有呢個微睡眠嘅情況，如果係成績係滿意嘅話，就個系統就會安裝喺九巴嘅巴士上面嘅。

我就係想請你睇一睇工作小組其中一項嘅建議，呢一個就係 TD-1 嘅文件夾嗰度嘅，運輸署嘅文件夾 1，係 406 頁嗰度嘅。為咗紀錄起見，我就將佢讀出嚟，呢個係工作小組所提出嘅一個建議嘅，就係監察司機嘅裝置，呢一啲裝置就會係監察車上嘅車長嘅情況，就睇下佢係咪警覺嘅，如果佢就唔留意又或者譬如話佢係周圍望、瞌眼瞓、係昏昏入睡或者係姿勢唔好，個系統就會就係有啲視覺嘅警告同埋亦都會有個聲音嘅警示嘅，呢一個市場係有嘅，用佢嚟到去進行一個試驗計劃，睇下佢有冇效係運輸署嘅建議嚟嘅。

我就想問，講番呢個係調查報告嘅第 47 段，我想問，你呢度講話供應

商，究竟係邊一家嘅供應商呢？因為你進行緊呢個試驗計畫，可唔可以講呢？

梁健宏先生：個公司名就係 Seeing Machines，佢個 product 個名就叫做 Guardian。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。可唔可以話畀委員會聽就係你呢度所講嗰個測試究竟而家進展如何呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，或者我講一講我哋嗰個測試嗰個嘅進程，我哋喺今年嘅6月底，我哋就將呢一個 Guardian 嘅 system，我哋就裝咗落四架巴士裏面，其實就唔同廠嘅，因為我哋唔同廠都有啲比較長途嘅巴士線，當中包括沙田廠有兩部、屯門廠有一部、龍運巴士亦都有一部，初步嘅測試嘅結果都係有效嘅，係有效嘅，亦都係可以偵測到譬如話個車長係如果佢瞇埋眼係比較眨眼長嘅，其實嗰個 system 係會 alert 到嘅，有聲同埋喺個耳背後面會震動嘅。

我自己本身都測試過兩部巴士，一部就係屯門廠嘅，一部係沙田廠嘅，我哋初步覺得有效嘅。但係因為呢一個嘅系統佢係會掃瞄你嘅五觀嘅，亦都我都知道廠亦都同我哋講，因為呢個 product，呢個係喺澳洲嘅，澳洲其實同我哋初步嘅發現都係就係喺某啲情況底下，如果個車長，舉個例係側頭同啲乘客係去有眼神接觸嘅時候，佢嗰個 facial detection，即係嗰個就可能會有少少係 detect 唔到，佢就會有少少會震動嘅。呢個其實我哋明白嘅，但係總整嚟講，我嘅接觸我哋嘅車長，我哋啲工會嘅工友其實對呢一樣嘢都係正面嘅。我哋亦都將呢一個嘅測試就再擴展到搵多啲嘅唔同嘅車長係繼續咁測試嘅，Mr Duncan，多謝。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你認為個試驗會幾時完成呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋而家啱啱喺 8 月中--我哋由 6 月底就試咗一班嘅車長，我哋而家試緊第二班嘅車長，好 likely，好大可能我哋會喺今個月底做埋呢一輪嘅測試，我哋其實係準備咗一啲嘅問卷嘅，即係睇一睇嗰啲車長嗰個嘅反應，然後我哋喺月底，我哋會做一個決定，我哋會唔會再--除咗呢四部，我哋再訂多啲，喺唔同廠繼續咁樣測試，然後 by phases，睇下點樣可以推到出嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據你所講，呢個裝置就將會係被採用嘅，係咪？

彭樹雄先生：如果睇番而家我哋嗰個測試嘅成效，我哋覺得係 positive 嘅，正面嘅。

李澤昌先生：呢度有少少補充，其實每一件可以幫到嗰個交通路面嗰個安全，我哋一定都會去嘗試，與時並進，我諗每一件新嘅嘢都會越嚟越好，我諗我哋一定會係有啲開始嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）Guardian 呢一個裝置都係有喺新加坡採用嘅，係咪？

彭樹雄先生：主席，我知道澳洲係有用緊嘅，但係新加坡就應該就我嘅認知就應該

未。

李澤昌先生：新加坡應該係未正式開始用嘅，不過就...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可以再睇呢一點，因為根據我嘅記憶，新加坡已經係用咗呢個裝置好幾年㗎喇，呢個就係喺呢個 Sandilands 嘅電車嘅意外之後就係建議採用呢一個裝置嘅，完成嗰個調查之後，就係開始用咗呢一個裝置。

李澤昌先生：嗰個係火車，呢個唔知。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有嗰份報告嘅，都可以同你去分享。

李澤昌先生：但係有一點想講，係因為其實我哋喺兩、三年前都係好積極睇緊呢樣嘢，但係因為喺火車又好，喺啲大嘅 coach 又好，其實係用緊嘅，火車--搽火車嘅時候，有啲人係會仍然瞌眼瞓，搽大貨車亦都好多人容易瞌眼瞓，其實喺好多城市，呢啲已經係好 widely 用緊嘅，其實 metro--即係 city bus 今日面對嘅問題，就係長途嘅巴士，即係譬如去機場嗰啲，我覺得呢一套嘢係應該係--應該有一個好重要嘅功能我哋一定會係睇到佢個好處，但係喺好繁忙嘅地方，因為佢成日要睇交通燈，睇啲路面嘅行人過馬路，因為佢個頭比較郁得多，所以呢一個我哋係要好小心處理，否則嘅話，就會令到啲車長好受滋擾，所以我點解講係喺北愛爾蘭做緊個研究同埋喺日本 Denso 做緊嗰個嘢，正正就係處理緊呢一個問題。

我相信呢個 Guardian 係應該係某啲路線係用到嘅，所以我正正講就話我哋一定會喺唔同--即係唔同嘅嘢放喺唔同嘅身上去處理今日九巴嗰個問題裏面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）點解唔同嘅路線會影響到你嘅決定呢？

李澤昌先生：因為喺啲--譬如喺市區嘅繁忙嘅路段，因為個車長個頭部個郁動比較大，而佢要睇紅綠燈，睇唔同嘅路面嘅情況，特別又多彎位，佢嗰個情況係同走一條大直路好唔同，譬如假設你去機場，行一條機場嘅公路，其實佢行緊嗰 50 公里，基本上架車係一條行車線上邊，佢個頭嘅郁動基本上係冇嘅，連埋站嘅機會都好少嘅，所以有啲相似火車，有啲相似嗰啲長途嘅大嗰啲 coach，或者嗰啲貨櫃車。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家就唔再講呢啲防打瞌眼瞓嘅裝置，我而家想講下安全帶嘅，我想你睇番呢一個調查報告嘅，或者我哋先睇工作小組嘅建議，呢個就係 TD-1 文件冊，就係 407 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲就係呈交畀立法會，喺今年嘅 7 月 25 號嘅一啲建議嚟嘅，啱唔啱呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）（經傳譯員）正確嘅，主席，403 頁係有提到呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）首先就係呢一個講安全帶嘅部分，就係 407 頁嘅頁底，然後一直去到第 410 頁嘅，我想你睇下第 16 段，呢一段就係有啲建議，同埋未來嘅路向，然後第 16 段就話「根據以上第 10 至 15 段所講，工作小組就係得出以下嘅建議，目的就係去更加--即係為一啲坐低嘅乘客提供更加多嘅保護嘅：首先，所有嘅--即係以後一啲新買嘅巴士必須要喺所有座位提供安全帶；而第二點，就係之後進一步嘅技術，營運同埋財務嘅可行性研究之後，可以考慮喺上層嘅所有座位係安裝安全帶嘅，呢個就係講緊係某一啲嘅巴士路線。」

呢個就係一啲建議。我而家就請你睇番調查報告，就係今朝早前有提到嘅，呢個就喺 114 頁，第 40 段就係其他改善巴士安全嘅措施，根據報告，就話九巴已經係要求佢嘅供應商係喺所有喺 2018 年 3 月 5 號之後訂購嘅新巴士入面係所有座位都安裝安全帶嘅，而一啲現有巴士方面，如果某啲嘅路線有要求嘅話，喺九巴巴士嘅上層座位係會局部去安裝安全帶嘅。

如果我冇理解錯，根據調查報告佢所講，係同工作小組嘅建議係一致嘅，首先喺呢一啲現有巴士安裝安全帶嘅工作係咪已經開始咗？

李澤昌先生：因為其實喺上層要安置呢個安全帶最主要嘅問題就係嗰個技術性，係嗰個 gravity 嘅問題，政府已經開始同我哋係做緊一啲--問一啲資料，亦都係嗰個供應商亦都做緊呢個技術嘅研究，到今日為止，其實都仲係正面嘅，係正面嘅，因為佢最擔心就係因為嗰啲安全帶係比較重，佢擺咗喺上邊嘅時候，因為嗰啲係 retrofit 嘅關係，佢--因為佢個政府要做嗰啲叫 tilt test，將架巴士係可以嗰個重心嘅問題，其實個技術性如果係做到嘅，就應該絕對唔係一個問題，但係而家喺主要嗰兩大嘅供應商，Volvo 同埋呢個 ADL，就暫時都係好正面嘅，就當然係要 subject to 到最後係擺咗上去，做咗個 tilt test 嗰個為準。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以同委員會講一講，喺財政上如果要安裝一啲--即係喺現有巴士安裝安全帶會有啲--成本係幾多呢？

李澤昌先生：其實係一個唔平嘅一個嘅東西嚟嘅，應該可以咁講，喺今年嘅年頭，我哋公司個 special committee 已經好清楚畀咗個指引畀我哋，我哋 2019 年嘅新車係全車安裝呢個安全帶，同埋 retrofit 裏面，我哋儘量配合政府，可以嘅話，特別係長途車，我哋會喺樓上係配置安全帶，因為我哋個 special committee 清楚嘅就係話交通意外係比我哋使任何嘅費用係更加高昂，所以我哋係--暫時我哋係冇從呢個角度去睇，因為我哋就係想--唔想再見到有啲意外。

Financial 嘅 implication，我諗我哋係--暫時我哋係冇睇到呢樣，但係當然一條安全帶大概係二十萬一架巴士，喺 retrofit 嗰度，二十萬。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係講緊上層嘅，係咪？

李澤昌先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

梁健宏先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概會喺幾架現有嘅巴士度安裝安全帶呀？

梁健宏先生：我諗接近有三千部喽喇。

李澤昌先生：長途巴士喎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我係想計一計啫。

李澤昌先生：唔係，唔係，我想補充少少先，而家我哋現在有大概係四千二百部--四千二至四千三，即係話九巴再加埋龍運，其實佢裏面已經有一部分嘅巴士已經配置晒安全帶㗎喇，亦都有啲巴士係嗰個--即係隨住退役嘅關係，嚟緊呢幾年，其實我哋因為退役嘅車，如果有架新嘅車到，嗰啲未必係需要係配置安全帶，即係話兩、三年退役嗰啲，嗰啲未必需要。如果你睇長途嘅巴士，我喺呢度冇一個好準確嘅數字，大概有三分一嘅線係跑長途嘅，你即係當佢係大概一千鬆啲左右。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺新嘅巴士...

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，喺你繼續之前，李先生之前就話會喺三千六百架長途巴士度安裝安全帶，而家你係咪更正個數字應該係一千呢？

梁乃鵬先生：Yes.

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我都係想計番啱啲數啫。一千架巴士，每架二十萬？

陳祖澤先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係總共要二億嘅，係咪？

梁乃鵬先生：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇同政府傾過呢個成本嘅問題呢？

李澤昌先生：No.

主席：（經傳譯員）：梁博士。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充一下，最近我係有同政府官員見面，我同佢哋講--即係我問政府可唔可以為我哋提供任何嘅補助，即係就住呢個加裝安全帶，個反應都係頗正面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同邊個係有呢個對話？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個就係運房局常任秘書長黎以德，另外就係有呢一個運輸署嘅副署長嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋公司之前有冇聯絡過政府係要求一啲嘅資助或者係津貼呢？目的就係為咗現代--令到你哋嘅車隊更加現代化。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有同佢哋講過加裝安全帶嘅問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁理解啱唔啱呢？係新嘅巴士係會係上層同埋下層都安裝安全帶嘅，係咪？

梁乃鵬先生：Correct。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇考慮乘客會唔會真係用啲安全帶呢？

李澤昌先生：其實我哋做咗一啲有啲即係好比較係籠統嘅--即係啲大眾點樣睇呢個安全帶，喺坐短途嗰啲，其實就唔係特別多人用，特別係樓下嗰層，長途嗰啲係比較受歡迎嘅，但係都唔係話講緊一個好多人特別覺得係好接受，明白嘅，因為其實係比較係麻煩嘅。但係我哋個睇法就係呢個個趨勢係--特別係長途嘅巴士線係會越嚟越重要嘅。因為每一個人上巴士嘅時候佢有個選擇就係話如果佢想瞌一瞌嘅時間，特別係長途，佢有條安全帶係畀佢一個選擇。當然我希望呢個數字會越嚟越多，今日個數字唔係一個太過受歡迎，但係我覺得係嗰個越嚟越呢個趨勢嘅話，我哋覺得我哋作為九巴，應該係好接受嗰個改變呢樣嘢，因為最後都係講緊一個安全嘅一個裝置嚟。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）九巴有冇考慮過喺使用安全帶可能會係需要立法呢？即係換句話講，係強制乘客係使用安全帶呢？即係如果係有提供嘅話？

李澤昌先生：呢個係有個難度嘅，因為香港嘅巴士係有企位嘅，所以如果你喺有一個法例上要做呢樣嘢，一，佢企位係一個問題，第二，就係嗰個 enforcement，因為個車長亦都今日係同乘客之間亦都好多滋擾。我自己公司就冇一個特別即係係咪呢個立例去做，但係就我覺得今日嚟講，我哋一定好覺得係安置安全帶有呢個選擇畀市民大眾係一件正面嘅嘢，呢個係我哋嘅睇法。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而家我哋就唔再講呢一個安全帶嘅問題，我就想講另一個話題，我就請你攞去 KMB-4 文件冊。我就請你攞去 1182 頁，呢個就係文件冊嘅 1182 頁，呢一個就係上市公司全年報告嘅一部分，呢個就係 2012 年，呢個就係載通國際控股有限公司嘅，然後呢一頁你哋見到就係董事嘅名單，你就會見到呢個獨立非執行董事嘅名單，然後你哋就會見到梁博士同埋陳博士同埋李家祥博士嘅，同埋蕭炯柱先生，同埋廖柏偉教授嘅。

我想請你而家睇一睇 KMB-5，請睇 1896 頁，呢個係有個董事嘅名單，呢

個 2016 年年報列出嚟嘅名單，我哋可以睇到呢度有打咗粒星嗰啲名，嗰啲係獨立非執行董事嚟嘅，梁博士、陳博士、李先生、蕭先生同埋廖教授，我就唔會逐個年報睇，即係 2012 到 2016 年嘅唔同嘅年報，我諗你可以證實係冇變到嘅，即係話獨立非執行董事响嗰幾年係冇改變嘅，啱唔啱？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅，冇錯嘅，鄧生，冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家我想請你又睇到去 KMB-6 2108 頁，呢度係董事嘅名單嚟嘅，2017 年嘅名單嚟嘅，我哋睇到呢一頁 2108 頁，董事有改變喇，蕭岡柱先生就唔再係獨立非執行董事。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）講得啱嘅，係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）曾偉雄就做咗係獨立非執行董事。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想問幾個問題嘅，關於呢啲獨立非執行董事嘅委任，我希望你明白，我係非常之尊重嗰啲過去擔任過或者而家仍然擔任過獨立非執行董事嘅各位董事嘅，咁樣講啱唔啱呢？冇任何一個獨立非執行董事係有安全嘅事務方面嘅背景嘅呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）如果淨係講安全方面嘅背景，我哋--我個人就參與咗呢個巴士嘅運作好多年㗎喇，我係做咗九巴董事好多年，自從 2000 年，即係十七年，做咗十七年，當然我哋係好關心新嘅巴士，我哋知道我哋要為改善嗰個巴士，採用最新嘅型號，採用最新嘅科技，好多時候新嘅巴士係會有我哋所講嘅即係安全嘅裝置，我哋就唔會係節省我哋呢方面嘅開支，我哋不斷咁樣嚟到係改善，由歐盟 4 型、5 型，而家去到歐盟 6 型，即係話用一啲最新科技嘅新巴士，我哋就會採用嘅。我哋就要保證我哋採用嘅係可以搵到嘅最好嘅巴士，九巴、龍運，我哋都會採用呢啲新嘅巴士嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋都知道有新人士加入，就有一啲新嘅意念。

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇咩嘢政策係關於你要幾耐就要有新人委任，希望有啲新嘅諗法、新嘅意念，即係點樣委任新嘅董事呢？有冇咩嘢政策嘅呢？

梁乃鵬先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有啲係董事局嗰啲委員會嘅，唔同嘅董事就响唔同委員會嚟到係參與工作嘅，特別係我哋就住佢哋嘅專長，所以你見到陳生之前係董事總經理，係九巴嘅同埋龍運嘅，所以我哋要求佢就响呢個董事局嘅常任或者係執行嘅委員會做事嘅，佢亦都喺一個提名委員會度工作嘅，同埋嗰個係薪酬委員會，佢都係成員嚟嘅。廖柏偉教授，佢係一個係好出名嘅經濟學者嚟嘅，佢就响董事局係向董事局提供一啲關於公司嘅策略嘅發展嘅意見，呢啲我係作為一啲例子咁樣提出嚟嘅，鄧生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝你，梁博士。我想講番之前提過嘅一件事，或者之前一個第十三日嘅研訊嗰日提過嘅，有關嘅課題就係話實時監察嘅系統嘅，第十三日我哋提過呢件事嘅，當時我個具體嘅就係同你提出，同埋向九巴嘅代表提出，我哋同呢個係程艾樂先生收到一啲證供嘅，你記得程生嘅證供，或者畀一個參考編號，呢個第十三日嘅，41 頁，佢提出嘅證供就係話 2014 年--呢個其實係一個係佢證供嘅摘要嚟嘅，佢所講嘅 2014 年公司曾經考慮過一個工程嘅，呢個係話會用實時監察巴士車長嘅行為嘅，跟住呢個計劃就取消咗，你記唔記得當時我同你提過佢有咁樣嘅作供㗎，你記唔記得？你記唔記得我提過呢件事呀？

梁健宏先生：有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你當時嘅回應，梁先生回應，如果我冇理解錯，理解得正確嘅話，程生所講嗰個計劃係一個實時嘅營運嘅管理系統嘅，呢個同安全駕駛係冇關係嘅，你記唔記得？當時係梁先生話畀委員會聽嘅。

梁健宏先生：嗰度係講緊有個 real-time alert 畀嗰個車長，就住佢嗰個 speeding 或者 sudden acceleration 同埋 harsh braking。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅，你記得喇，當時即係話呢位程生所講嘅嗰個計劃係其實係一個實時嘅營運嘅管理系統嚟嘅。

梁健宏先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）為我哋嘅紀錄清楚，呢個我係講清楚，係第十三日，第 41 頁，第 10 到 14 行同埋 42 頁第 23 行，呢方面有啲分歧，好明顯，當時主席要求你提供--向委員會提供你哋有冇啲講解嘅材質，即係响考慮呢個項目、呢個計劃，即係程生所講呢個工作計劃或者工程嘅時候，有冇咩嘢講解嘅使用嘅呢？同埋係你自從上次我哋開完會之後，你就記唔記得係有冇呢啲咁樣嘅材料畀到我哋呀？

梁健宏先生：我哋係畀咗一啲資料畀個 board 嘅，我知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想就住呢啲咁樣嘅資料，就講一講嘅，同埋澄清一下嘅，如果可以嘅，請大家睇 KMB-11，請大家睇 4492，4492 呢一頁你見到嗰個封面，呢個文件嘅封面，九龍巴士公司（一九九三）有限公司係嗰個系統嘅標準，呢個係為嗰個 ROM，即係實時營運管理系統，呢份文件就由 4492 呢一頁一路可以去到 4530，如果我冇理解錯誤嘅話，响 4493，呢個係嗰個目錄，係呢個係呢份材料嘅目錄，第 II 部係簡介同埋工作嘅規模、範圍。

跟住我哋睇下 4495 有啲詳細嘅資料，就係話簡介同埋嗰個工作嘅規模或者係範圍，就第 II 部，1，簡介，我想你請睇 1.4 呢一段，主要嘅呢個係實時管理系統就係幫助嗰啲控制室嘅人嚟到係响嗰個巴士總站營運、操作嘅時候係調配嘅，調配啲巴士幾時離開同埋處理特別嘅情況同埋服務有冇受到需要終止

嘅情況點樣處理。1.4.3 就係話同司機嚟到係溝通，通過係語音、文字或者聲音嘅錄音嚟到係發布一啲畀巴士車長知道需要嘅資訊或者特別嘅訊息嘅。

呢度係咪有一個實時同車長--即係話同响你哋嘅總部同巴士車長有冇實時溝通，有冇呢個咁樣嘅部分㗎？

梁健宏先生：呢個係我哋稍後做咗 ROM，係冇呢個--冇呢樣嘢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）程先生就係話，佢話當時有考慮過呢個做法，但係之後就取消，佢話實時同車長溝通係咪當時嘅考慮要做嘅一部分呢？

李澤昌先生：或者等我講，我諗上次我哋個 Operation Director 都講得好清楚，佢呢個咁嘅功能係主要係一個中央有一個控制嘅中心，係提示個車長佢行車嘅速度，甚至乎喺一啲巴士站嘅時間佢係要停一停，隔番喺前面行車之間嘅距離，令到嗰個 management 嘅 fleet 係會嚟得比較--唔會一堆嚟，一堆走，當然呢個溝通裏面亦都可以作出咗一啲同個車長之間嘅提示。

上次都講咗，係我哋覺得喺當車長行駛嘅時間，實在令佢分心亦都係唔係一件恰當嘅事；兼夾呢個系統亦都可以係作嚟係取替咗喺巴士站頭裏面嘅站長嘅功能，呢個我哋覺得係亦都確實係有個難度嘅，最後我諗喺 2014 年嘅時候，就呢個計劃係擱置咗。所以亦都冇一個中央嘅系統同嗰個車長喺行駛嘅時間有呢個對話，就變咗採用番，update 番喺巴士站頭嘅站長個功能，會令到佢更加完善同埋妥善咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家唔係講緊嗰個結論，我係想問有冇--當程先生當時考慮--佢話佢負責埋呢方面嘅考慮個工程，係咪其中一部分就話應該有實時同巴士司機--巴士車長嘅溝通，嘅溝通嘅內容係關於佢哋嘅嗰啲行為，就包括有冇超速，我有冇理解錯誤呢？呢度 1.4.3，起碼呢度--响呢一部分係當時曾經考慮嘅一部分，先唔好講咩嘢結論。

李澤昌先生：當然呢度寫得出，我諗應該喺嗰段時間，係有咁嘅考慮嘅，當然嗰陣時做呢個 project 嘅時候，我諗應該 back date 番去 2013、2014 嘅時候，喺當其時，嗰個睇法應該係用一個比較喺中央嘅形式，令到呢個所謂叫做 real time operation 嘅 management 係全面啲，係令到車長同埋嗰個中央嗰個方法，我唔知係咪因為--或者嗰陣時嘅時候係有咁嘅睇法，但係因為而家我哋講嘅 real time 同車長已經係講緊個黑盒，講緊個 geo-fencing，嚟緊嘅，同埋係直接喺嗰個車裏面係提示佢嘅 behaviour 同埋佢速度，呢個我哋已經係去到呢個階段。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋去睇第二啲嘢之前，我想睇番呢份文件嘅其他嘅段落，似乎都係有提過同呢個同巴士車長嘅實時嘅溝通嘅，4497 頁，嗰個頂部講緊--即係嗰個標題有講功能方面嘅要求，呢個有一個係中央嘅控制系統嘅，1.1.4，容許嘅調派嘅人係嚟到係可以响嗰個地圖畫出某一個部分，可以有啲地方係可以標示嚟到係送出一啲文字或者係聲音嘅訊息嘅，亦都可以計算速度，

嗰個標示嘅地區計出嚟嘅速度可以展示出嚟，或者個平均速度可以展示出嚟。

呢度亦都有講嗰個核心嘅功能嘅，跟住就係有講呢個營運嘅管理，就係對下嘅標題嚟嘅。喺個 a(7)，即係跟住嗰一頁，4498 頁嗰度，嗰度就係話巴士離站全部都自動咁樣去調節，根據就係一啲可以改變嘅一啲規則嘅，就係應該包括但係唔限於以下各項，第 iv 項度就有提及車長嘅工作指引，我就覺得係應該包括咗嘅，係咪呀？包咗係車長嘅行為嘅，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：我睇呢個 regulation 講嘅，佢主要係想緊同行車之間個距離多過從一個安全嘅角度去睇嘅，但係我都想提點一樣嘢，其實係我哋每日同一時間喺路面，我哋講緊係接近，最高峰嘅時間係超過三千幾部車喺路面行緊，三千幾部車遍佈全香港、九龍、新界同埋離島，即係我指係大嶼山，其實如果你有一個中央嘅系統控制嗰三千多部車喺路面，當然佢有好精準嘅資料、路面嘅情況，呢個係有佢嘅難度。但係睇番呢度，佢係講緊--好清晰係講緊佢同行車之間嘅距離多過同呢個安全方面係有一啲好清晰嘅掛鈎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者等我再...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，等等。你可唔可以講講話即係安全行車距離係咪話啲車係逼埋一齊，係唔想啲車堆埋一齊定抑或係同安全有關？

李澤昌先生：Yes，yes，唔係，佢做嘅時候好多時因為啲車長佢係唔知道佢前面架車個距離有幾遠，佢就跟住個速度係咁樣行，對乘客嚟講，好多時因為佢出車嘅時間可能係唔同嘅時間出，但係因為去到某一啲擠塞嘅道路嘅時間，就前面架車同後面架車就個距離可能越嚟越拉近，對乘客嚟講，一等就會變咗就會一拃車嚟，所以如果你可以同個車長溝通，即係有啲似今日嘅火車，火車都係有呢啲咁嘅情況嘅，但係當然火車係因為埋站嘅時候多人上落，而令到架火車停咗喺站嘅時間長，你要控制後邊架車唔好行得咁快，但係巴士就好難嘅，巴士就好難，所以呢個系統係令到佢唔好有個好似你話 bunching 呢個情況，即係好 clustered，一班車嚟到，令到個客嗰個等車嘅時間就比較好啲。

但係而家我哋都有一個網上，有一個--即係做緊一個行車嘅到站嘅時間幾長都幫到個客，但係呢個同當其時個 safety 係有少少未必係完全掛鈎嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係有效咁樣樣去提供服務，就唔係同安全有關，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：Correct. Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我又想請你睇睇呢個 4501 頁，個標題就係司機溝通系統，呢個就係喺功能要求底下嘅，2.1 嗰度就係話喺每部巴士可以安裝一個巴士嘅控制板嘅，就會提供以下嘅功能嘅，2.1.1 就係話可以顯示一啲有顏色嘅圖表同埋一啲文字嘅數據嘅。嗰度係就話可以係睇一睇就係有一啲顯示一啲實時嘅標誌，就睇下嗰個司機嘅駕駛行為，如果係有不正常嘅駕駛行為就會有不

同嘅嗶嗶聲就係提示嗰個司機嘅，同埋就會有一啲嘅全面性嘅參數嚟到去啟動或者係停止呢一個功能嘅。

我想問，係咪話當時諗住有一個實時嘅系統就睇到一啲不正常嘅駕駛行為，就偵察到，就同埋就係會話番畀個車長聽「你呢啲行為係唔啱嘅」？

梁健宏先生：呢個就變咗我哋而家裝咗喺車上面嗰個 driver feedback device，而家我哋係裝咗一個嘅，之前佢個設計就係話將呢啲嘢就係喺埋嗰個 driver console 嗰度嘅，但係而家個情況實情就係我哋另外一個 feedback device，亦都將嗰啲 real time indicator 喺嗰度有啲燈、有啲聲音提示啲車長嘅，而家我哋每一架巴士都有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我而家就想講另一個課題，係上次聆訊嘅時候出現嘅，係第十四日嘅聆訊，當時委員會聽到你哋公司嘅代表所講，就係同之前嗰個打算係有所不同，就係你哋最後就係決定唔會安裝一啲係巴士傾側嘅警示系統嘅，你記唔記得有咁提過呀？不如咁，我亦都等大家睇番我哋嗰個紀錄本，係第十四日嘅聆訊，係 1620 到 1030 頁嘅，當時梁先生就話點解係有咁嘅決定呢？就係因為呢個丹尼斯同埋呢個富豪都係無法建議係應該用一個乜嘢嘅傾側角度，啱唔啱？

梁健宏先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。如果個角度太窄嘅話，就冇意思，因為都冇意義嘅，但係另一方面，如果嗰個角度太廣嘅話，就會危險喇，啱唔啱呀？我所記憶嘅啱唔啱呀？係咪咁呀？

梁健宏先生：係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。只係昨日先至有人提一提我要睇呢樣嘢嘅，我唔知道你有冇機會睇過，呢一個就係喺雜項文件夾 2 嗰度嘅一份材料嘅，係第 916 頁，我唔知你有冇機會睇過呢份文件呢？

梁健宏先生：未有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我諗就要慢慢咁樣同你一齊睇呢份文件。睇嚟，就係有個講解，又或者係一個演講嘅一啲筆記嚟嘅，當時就係好近嘅--唔係喎，其實係好耐，係 2008 年 8 月 29 號嘅一個講座，嗰個講座個標題就話香港雙層巴士安全事宜嘅講座，佢嗰個題目就係話雙層巴士嘅安全規管要求，似乎就係一位謝先生 Steven 嘅演講嚟嘅，佢就係負責巴士安全嘅工程師，就係嚟自運輸署係車輛安全及標準部嘅。

我咁問可能係問得太多，不過我唔知道在座各位先生有冇邊一位係有記憶話當時曾經係出席過呢一個講座呢？咁樣問法可能要求你哋太多，不過都想問一個問題。

梁健宏先生：我唔記得。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。我想直接去番我有興趣嘅嗰一頁，936 頁，我陣間先畀機會你去睇番之前嗰幾頁，不過喺嗰一版嗰個標題就係話傾側嘅角度，喺左手邊就話有咩嘢規管嘅要求或者有咩嘢規管嘅指示，右邊嗰欄就講呢個傾側嘅角度，「DD 巴士」我相信應該即係代表係雙層巴士咁解，呢一個簡寫。就講及呢個聯合國係歐洲經濟委員會就係 28 度，同埋歐盟 28 度，香港都係 28 度。我想問呢啲資料對你嚟講，你知唔知佢講緊乜嘢呢？

梁健宏先生：呢個係每一架車，尤其是雙層巴士佢需要喺--可以喺香港行走，就要經過測試嘅，要符合到呢個傾斜嘅測試嘅，呢個測試就係架車就係 static 嘅，係 static 嘅，架車係試傾斜嘅，當架車係可以傾斜到 28 度都唔會 topple，先至可以合格嘅，先至會出到嗰個 type approval，先至可以註冊喺路面行走嘅，我知道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話嗰個 static test，即係話嗰個靜止嘅測試，就都係之前提供嘅材料都係有包括呢點嘅，係咪呀？

梁健宏先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。我而家就想講呢個行車時間，呢個就關乎所謂脫班，即係好多時都有人咁講㗎喇，行車時間同埋脫班呢一個關係，我想首先請你睇一睇，我哋之前就係睇過係一個工會代表佢嘅證供嘅，就係李國華先生，我諗你可以喺呢個第十日嗰個紀錄本嗰度係睇到嘅，第 62 頁，或者我將李先生嘅證供嘅一部分將佢讀出嚟畀你聽，當時就係黃律師代表委員會就喺第 14 項嗰度就向佢提出個問題嘅。

當時黃小姐就咁問嘅，「李先生，我就想講及一個係比較特定嘅題目，就講及就係所編排嘅車程同埋一個係脫班。跟住就係喺第 120 頁嗰度嘅，你當時就話由於係流失咗好多車長，亦都有需要維持嗰個係行車時間表，亦都避免取消咗嗰啲定咗嘅班次，就令到就係車長本來應得嘅休息嘅時間就係受呢個脫班嘅影響嘅，好多巴士嘅車長係需要行唔同嘅路線，為咗係有更多嘅休息時間，佢哋會儘快咁完成嗰個路線嘅服務嘅，當然呢個亦都視乎係路面嘅交通情況，然後就係將車揸番去總站嗰度休息。你可唔可以同我哋講一講點樣樣去維持咗嗰個定咗嘅班次呢個咁嘅需要就影響咗車長佢應得嘅休息時間呢？」

當時李先生就咁講嘅，「巴士公司就話--譬如話就係有一個鐘頭嘅行車時間嘅話，就應該將佢壓縮到係五十五至到五十八分鐘，巴士車長就會有少少嘅休息時間嘅，如果你再將嗰個行車時間係再壓縮多幾分鐘，就會係少咗休息時間嘅幾分鐘。」

我就想問，如果有一個車程真係長過原本所編排嘅時間，會唔會係影響到車長嗰個休息時間嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我嘅答案係可能會嘅，不過正正因為我哋其實每一個總站裏面都有站長當值，所以個站長係亦都會作出一啲相應行動上嘅調整，就係去令到我哋嘅車長，就算因為交通阻塞，就算因為其他嘅關係佢係遲咗返個總站，我哋一定都係有時間畀個車長去休息嘅，我哋係會作出行動上嘅安排。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有時車長都係會唔會有咁嘅情況，就係車長係冇咗休息時間㗎？

彭樹雄先生：我哋有情況可能--我想強調，就係每一個車長佢返到嗰個總站裏面，佢係一定有時間可以有個--即係有個預先安排嘅休息，但係如果呢個休息係因為某啲嘅理由而影響到，我哋一定都會有一個所謂 water break、toilet break，佢可以飲啖水，可以去洗手間等等，然後佢先至會開始佢下一程個 revenue trip，即係嗰個下一程嗰個嘅載客嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司其實係點樣樣計算係需要幾多時間去完成嗰個車程嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：我哋係有嘅，其實喺我哋制定每一條線嘅行車時間，呢個有兩種嘅，一種就係一啲現有嘅行車線，其實我哋係有個機制，我哋係會有定期嘅檢視嘅，呢個就係第一個機制，就係我哋每三個月，每三個月，我哋係會將每一條嘅路線，舉例，我哋 KMB 有三百八十幾條線，我哋每一季每三個月一定會將個 journey time 要重新檢視嘅；第二個可以或者可能會檢視嘅就係話因應一啲特殊嘅交通環境，因應一啲特殊嘅客量嘅改變，因應一啲特別嘅路線或者特快線嘅增加、減少，同埋我哋前線嘅車長嘅反映、我哋前線督察嘅反映、我哋前線站長嘅反映，我哋都有啲 ad hoc 嘅，即係所謂--唔係話三個月，我哋唔會等三個月，我哋都會即時去檢視嗰個嘅行車時間嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你嗰個檢視會係涉及啲咩嘢呢？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋有幾個情況係會影響到個行車時間嘅，正如我講，例如一啲嘅交通嘅情況嘅改變，例如舉個例，西九龍佢喺起高鐵嘅時候，譬如佐敦、彌敦道一帶其實就擠塞咗嘅，於是乎我哋就會喺嗰個行車時間裏面係酌量去調整。又或者其實另外一個令到行車時間加長嘅理由就係其實客量嘅多少，其實呢個都會直接影響到嗰個行車嘅時間嘅，譬如話多客上車，多客落車，即係你埋站嗰個嘅時間其實相對地亦都會多咗嘅。另外有一啲另外一啲比較交通嘅改道，或者嗰條線要我哋俗稱叫做 deroute 咗，即係有啲新嘅路線，佢條主線係一樣，但係有啲支線改咗嘅，其實我哋都係會檢視嗰個行車時間嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇下楊先生嘅證供，佢就喺第十一日係作供嘅，佢就係現時嘅車站經理，九巴嘅車站經理，呢個就係第十一頁，呢個就係喺第94頁嘅，第十一日。佢嘅問題就係喺第93頁第19行嘅，就係黃佩琪大律師係問呢一個問題，佢就係問咗楊先生呢條問題，「我哋而家講另一個話頭，就係脫班，我哋係從你嘅同事 Debby Wong 就係聽取咗證供，就似乎係經常有脫班嘅情況，而佢係會影響到駕駛嘅行為嘅，因為就無法係準確地預測呢一個行車

時間，而你嘅睇法係點呢？就住呢個問題。」

楊先生嘅回應就係「對我哋嚟講，係有唔同嘅原因導致脫班嘅，首先，如果巴士車長不足亦都係會脫班，香港亦都係會塞車，可能有一啲嘅緊急情況，公眾嘅集會、活動同埋一啲特別嘅交通安排、惡劣天氣，喺路上係有車輛係故障等等，呢啲都係會引致脫班嘅，但係我哋會儘量唔影響車長嘅休息時間，因為我哋有一個嘅行車時間表，而我哋係會提供呢個表畀我哋嘅車長，而喺96%或者係90嘅車程之中，我哋嘅車--或者嘅行車之中，我哋嘅車長都會有足夠嘅休息時間嘅。」

脫班嘅定義就係有架巴士係本身應該由A去到B，但係最後就冇去到嘅。你可唔可以話畀委員會知道係有幾頻密呢，出現得，脫班嘅情況？

彭樹雄先生：其實運輸署就畀所有嘅專利巴士公司其實都有一個嘅數值，就係嗰個所謂脫班率，如果比較起整個我哋叫做schedules of service，嗰個行車時間表，嗰個benchmark就係唔應該多過3%，唔應該多過3%。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想請你睇一睇運輸署呢一份文件，呢個就係TD-1文件冊第34頁嘅，喺第34頁，呢份文件就係由運輸當局提供畀委員會，而呢份文件就係叫做專營巴士嘅整體規管同埋監管制度，喺第31頁，你就見到呢份文件嘅目的就係提供一個政府規管香港專營巴士服務嘅整體規管同埋監察架構，我就想你先睇睇第44頁嘅部分，就係(e)段嘅，呢一個標題就係第41頁其他措施同埋發出信件同埋指引，就有唔同嘅段落，有(a)至(e)，(e)段就係喺44頁嘅，我就係想讀出嚟。

「喺2015年運輸署就係提供咗一個更新咗嘅懲罰機制，就係就住專營巴士商嘅巴士脫班嘅情況嘅，呢一個機制就係包括咗係發出唔同--即係根據嚴重嘅程度發出信件，包括係一啲提示信、警告信、嚴重警告信等等，就係根據脫班嘅頻密程度同埋佢嗰個嚴重程度嘅，同埋有相關嘅解決--即係營運商所採取嘅解決措施。呢啲警告信就係可能係會引起進一步嘅法定嘅懲處，根據呢一個專營巴士服務嘅條例第22章，包括係罰款，係撤銷呢一個某條巴士線嘅營運權，同埋如果係營運商係冇改善嘅話，即係或者冇一個合理嘅解釋嘅情況，都會出現嘅。

而喺2015年引入咗呢個制度之後，運輸署就係有監察呢個專營巴士商嘅脫班情況，同埋係發出一啲嘅提示信件同埋警告信等等，等佢哋係採用修補嘅措施同埋改善服務嘅。而呢啲營運商亦都係向運輸署提供解釋同埋採取行動，包括就係調派多一啲嘅後備車長去解決呢一個短缺嘅問題同埋改善呢個脫班嘅情況嘅。而根據呢個營運商採取嘅情況，佢哋就冇進一步遭到係懲罰嘅。」

我想你睇第117頁，就係同一份文件冊。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，呢一個附錄K就係喺KMB-2文件冊嘅217頁--或者291頁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想畀大家睇下呢一個附錄 K 嘅第 291 頁，呢個就係一封一般嘅信件，呢個就係關於實施呢一個新嘅懲處機制嘅，主席，你會喺呢度見到呢封信。

我就先想問幾個問題嘅，就住呢個話題，我想你睇另外一份嘅運輸署文件，就係 117 頁，呢個就係叫做運輸署文件 10 號，呢個標題就係專營巴士服務嘅營運、安排路線、車隊嘅調配同埋設立呢一個車速限制嘅，呢份文件就係介紹運輸署喺規劃路線、調派車隊同埋制定呢一個車速嘅角色，就係就住呢個專營巴士服務嘅。

我想你睇番 122 頁，呢一份就係服務時間--即係某條巴士路線服務時間表嘅樣本，呢個例子就係有空調嘅九龍市區巴士路線 2 號，如果我哋講番呢個可能或者潛在嘅懲罰，你可唔可以話畀委員會知道九巴係喺過去嗰六個月係收到幾多封警告信呢？

蘇偉基先生：Mr Duncan，喺過往六個月，因為 lost trip，公司係冇收過 warning letter，但係個別嘅線我哋係收--另外頭先所講嘅，advisory letters，或者係 reminder letters。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅提示信係關於啲乜嘢呢？

蘇偉基先生：佢會係講述我哋某啲線喺某一個時段，假設係夜晚嘅繁忙時間，佢嗰個 lost trip rate 係大約多過 3%，就會提--我哋要係做一個檢討，改善，同埋佢亦都會問我哋究竟原因點解會出現呢個 lost trip。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）九巴喺過去十二個月有冇收過任何嘅警告信呀？

蘇偉基先生：Warning letters，過往十二個月係冇收過，公司。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）基於呢個脫班嘅情況，你哋需唔需要定時係要求運輸署改變某一啲路線嘅行車時間表呢？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋公司係不時都有聯絡番運輸署，係主要就係闡述番我哋喺嗰個特別某啲線上面遇到啲乜嘢嘅問題，因為運輸署計嗰個嘅所謂脫班率，其實佢係分開四個時段嘅，譬如話早上嘅繁忙時間、跟住就係早上嘅非繁忙時間、晚間繁忙時間同埋非繁忙時間等等嘅。就住唔同嘅路面情況，就住路面可能嗰個交通阻塞、違例泊車等等，其實我哋好多時都有同運輸署係反映，然後就話可唔可以譬如話檢視下嗰個嘅 schedule of service，即係嗰個行車嗰個時間表等等。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）運輸署通常會唔會批准呢一啲檢討嘅申請呀？

彭樹雄先生：我只可以答係好困難，我哋其實有好多我哋嗰啲叫做 low utilisation，我想解釋，因為好多時有啲客量嘅改變，例如有啲鐵路嘅發展，我哋嗰個服務可能嗰個需求係冇之前咁多嘅，好多時我哋就特別喺非繁忙

時間，我哋都係好多次、好多次都作出書面嘅同埋會議嘅要求，希望運輸署係可以酌量咁樣去某啲非繁忙時間嘅班次係作出減少嘅。

其實我哋作出呢個申請，我哋係會依據一啲嘅--我哋有啲 guidelines，有啲指引，其實我哋係跟番個指引，其實我哋係可以用一個字叫做--我哋應該 entitle 一啲嘅 journey reduction 嘅，但係就算我哋係達到呢個指引呢個係可以減班次，但係往往--即係我要好老實咁講，如果需求我哋加班次嘅，往往運輸署就想我哋即刻做嘅，因為可能地區嘅人士或者議會嘅人士，但係去減班次，呢個我哋真係遇到好大嘅困難嘅。

我哋人手嗰個餅都係咁大㗎喇，但係問題就係我哋有時真係好無奈地，我哋要將一啲嘅資源係擺咗落一啲我哋所謂 low utilisation 嘅線裏面，我覺得呢個就其實就係個發展係唔健康嘅，我覺得。我哋好多時同運輸署我哋都有溝通，但係就始終嗰個進展相對地係緩慢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，雖然你係要求一啲減少嘅服務班次，但係通常都係冇獲得批准嘅，係咪？即係有唔同嘅原因係影響到你嘅申請。

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺午飯前，我哋再問多一個問題，邊個係發出呢啲指引㗎？

彭樹雄先生：運輸署。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺議定呢個指引，你有冇一個角度嘅呢？或者你有冇參與？

蘇偉基先生：嗰個 guideline 本身都係出咗好耐，亦都持之有恆，而家係執行個 guideline，個 guideline 本身我哋係認同嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向委員會提供指引呀？

蘇偉基先生：應該喺啲 document 有，我講番喺邊頁喇，我小息嗰陣時講番畀大家聽。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。仲有一個問題嘅，即係呢個問題就係點樣去實施呢個指引呢？

彭樹雄先生：絕對同意，係個 guideline 就好清晰嘅，但係問題喺執行上始終我都明白有好多嘅阻力嘅，呢個就係我哋都希望可以真係可以將啲 resources、將啲資源用喺一啲有需要嘅路線上面，多謝 Mr Duncan。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，我哋係會小休二十分鐘，如果你可以搵出嗰個指引喺邊度，會好大幫助嘅，唔該。

上午11時38分押聆訊押後

中午12時正恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你，主席先生。唔知你哋搵到嗰個係材料未？

彭樹雄先生：有，Mr Duncan，就喺KMB Long Win Bus bundle number two，page 73，73頁，係第(IV)，“Frequency reduction”。係嘞，冇錯，就係螢光幕呢一個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋講緊嗰啲係有關嘅材料，主席亦都有講過話喺新加坡亦都有啲係防止瞌眼瞓嘅裝備，如果大家想參考嘅話，就係CTB-1，63頁，就可以搵到相關嘅材料，CTB城巴1號文件夾63頁。我而家係想講另一樣嘢，關於嗰啲洗手間，同埋就係車長嘅休息嘅設施。我開始問問題嘅時候，首先係想請你睇番呢個運輸署，TD-1，438頁。講番嗰個背景，咁先睇番427頁，呢個係一封信嚟，係運輸署發出嘅信件，係寫嚟畀我哋委員會，日期係2018年7月20號。運輸署就係回應咗委員會嘅一啲問題，提供咗啲答案。喺438頁嗰度，你會見到問題第28號，就係講及係喺巴士總站提供洗手間同埋休息嘅設施，就問運輸署有冇發出任何嘅指引畀嗰個專營巴士營運商，亦要提供巴士總站嘅洗手間同埋休息設施，如果有，係畀個詳情，如果冇嘅話，就要解釋點解。運輸署有冇積極咁樣樣去便利係有關嘅專營巴士營運者，去同有關嘅部門去跟進，好讓可以提供到咁嘅設施？

我而家好快咁講一講，係部門嗰個回應，「運輸署一直都係鼓勵巴士公司，因為佢哋要作為一個良好嘅僱主，應該係喺巴士總站嗰度為僱員提供適當嘅洗手間同埋休息設施，相關嘅部門同埋有關當局去考慮同埋批核呢一啲係申請嘅時候，即係呢啲都係員工嘅設施嚟嘅，運輸署都有提供適當嘅協調，嚟到係儘早可以安裝到。但係對於話提供呢個洗手間同埋休息設施，係冇一啲具體嘅指引發過畀營運商，因為休息嘅設施同埋係洗手間，一般都係喺設計新嘅巴士總站嘅時候，作為基本嘅設施，考慮埋㗎嘞。有關嘅營運商嘅要求，同埋嗰個意見，都會係入咗落去嗰個巴士總站設計嗰度，如果係適當嘅話。如果洗手間唔係係合理嘅步行距離之內，又或者休息設施係冇或者唔足夠，咁樣佢哋就係會好積極咁樣去申請係有呢啲設施嚟到符合佢哋嘅營運要求。

2018 年 3 月 31 號，二百九十五個巴士總站差唔多全部都有洗手間，就係步行三至七分鐘。百分之八十六，即係二百五十五個就係有休息嘅設施，就係站長室，或者站長辦公室，又或者係車長嘅休息站或者休息室。因此就係考慮過，就認為唔需要就係向呢一個營運商係提--發出一個具體嘅指引，講及呢啲總站係需要呢一啲嘅設施。我哋就係會係積極就係同有關嘅部門就去係協調，咁亦都會係讓相關嘅部門同埋當局明白，就係有關嘅程序嘅要求。咁最終目的都希望係履信嗰個申請嘅過程，希望及時可以有嗰啲設施。咁譬如話係呢個係水邊圍邨山水樓呢個馬灣道（媽橫路？）出面嗰個巴士總站嘅休息室，正如 05 號文件嗰度就係所載就係一個好好嘅例子，每一個部門同埋當局都有佢自己嘅法定嘅權力，同埋就係有佢自己嘅考量，嚟到決定批唔批佢嘅申請，嚟到有洗手間同埋休息設施。雖然係咁講，運輸署會繼續便利營運商，如果有咁嘅需要嘅話，嚟到去積極咁樣去跟進，係回應同埋係滿足車長對於洗手間同埋休息設施呢一個嘅需要，亦都會致力就係提供所需嘅援助畀營運商係跟進呢件事。」

咁跟住下面嗰度，就問題就問「縱使就係專營巴士營運商係時常同埋長久以嚟咁嘅要求，我哋就知悉有一啲總站仲係未有足夠嘅洗手間同埋休息設施，請話畀我哋聽，係邊一啲係總站，同埋係咪有一啲主--係咪一啲主要嘅大嘅站，有好多巴士線嘅？同埋佢哋有冇係一啲車長就係返特別更，而佢哋特別需要足夠嘅休息設施，嚟到去有一個不少於連續三小時嘅休息嘅時間？解釋就係有咩嘢掣肘，特別係就係點解佢哋係拒絕你哋係要求係提供咁嘅設施？即係話政府當局係有啲咩嘢理由係提咗出嚟？」

當時部門所提供嘅答案係咁，「喺 2018 嘅 3 月 31 號為止，差唔多所有全港九嘅二百九十五個巴士總站，都有洗手間，只需要行三至到七分鐘，而大概百分八十六嘅巴士總站，換句話講二百五十五個巴士總站，即係遍佈全港九，就係有休息室，咁佢嘅形式就一係站長嘅休息室，或者站長嘅辦公室，又或者係車長嘅休息室，其餘嘅百分之十四嘅巴士總站，佢冇休息設施，專營巴士嘅營運商就冇申請到提供休息設施，係要設立喺嗰度。大部分係咁，就算唔係全部都係，另一方面就係，營運商就係可以向有關嘅部門或者當局就係申請額外或者係擴大嗰個休息嘅設施，係符合佢哋喺總站嘅營運要求。咁照我哋所知，係有一個名單，就係巴士總站係有洗手間同埋休息設施，咁就係營運商要求，就但係喺過去嗰三年，就係被拒，或者係仲係部門或者當局係處理緊。咁我哋相信就係冇嗰個係個別車長佢嗰個當更嘅紀錄，因為係逐條逐條線嚟講，就好難，因為佢哋時不時有改變。至於話佢哋有冇係要返特別更，就唔知。

咁喺附件 3 所顯示，主要嚟講，點解會拒絕佢哋嘅要求，話設立洗手間同埋休息室，部門同埋當局主要拒絕嘅原因都係因為地理上面嘅掣肘，譬如話係個巴士總站喺一個好窄嘅行人路側邊，又或者係當區係社區人士就係有意見。至於話係嗰個營運商，佢哋係提出申請想有呢啲設施，佢哋係可以係搵出一啲可行嘅解決辦法嚟到去克服呢一啲實際嘅困難。咁運輸署就會協助巴士公司，就係取得當地人士嘅支持，譬如話進行一啲實地嘅視察，又或者係同當區嘅人士就係去開會，去搵下有啲咩嘢可行嘅解決方法，嚟到去係設立呢啲設施，亦都希望可以加

快落實呢一啲規劃。即係話如果咁嘅需要，而且亦都為咗車長同埋乘客嘅便利，同埋嘅好處。」

附件 3，附件 3，我哋就要去另一個文件夾，咁就係 TD-5，運輸署 5 號文件夾，頁碼就係 1723 頁。1723 頁，嗰度就係個標題就話，係有個清單就巴士總站係有休息設施同埋係洗手間，就係巴士公司申請，但係運輸署仲處理緊。咁就係運輸署仲處理緊佢哋嘅申請；咁而(B)嗰度就係話，營運商係要求係有呢啲係洗手間同埋休息設施，但係由其他嘅相關嘅部門同埋係當局係處理緊佢嘅申請，嗰個就(B)嘞；(C)嗰個標題就係話，係有一個清單，巴士總站就係運輸署已經同埋其他嘅部門喺過去嗰三年拒絕咗佢哋申請，係安呢個洗手間同埋休息設施嘅個案。

我稍後會問你一啲問題，呢個就係關乎運輸署係所作出嘅解釋，咁或者巴士公司你哋都想作一個回應。不過我未講嗰度之前，我又想睇番一啲問題，我就係想睇下究竟係呢方面嗰個問題喺邊一度。我嘅理解就咁嘅，九巴有四個車廠，你哋係咁樣叫，係有四個車廠，咁另外亦都有好多嘅巴士總站，係咪？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇番呢個九巴士文件夾 1，喺 252 頁，你睇到嘛？就係你哋公司自己嘅車廠同埋分區嘅地圖。你呢度就係將嗰四個車廠，同埋啲分區，係標示咗出嚟，你有荔枝角廠，有九龍灣車廠，屯門車廠，同埋係沙田車廠。為免生疑問，其實所謂「車廠」，即係咩嘢意思？

李澤昌先生：佢嗰個車廠裏面，主要有兩個大嘅功能，一個就係嗰啲車每晚返到去，做一啲維修、入油、清潔嘅工作，咁佢有一啲維修喺嗰度；另外一個功能，另外一個大嘅功能就係，啲車長佢嗰個--嗰啲派更嘅時間表，同埋啲車長好多時候喺嗰度休息，每朝返到去，係攞佢嗰個更紙嘅嗰個功能。咁有啲其他嘅，四個唔同車廠，有四個唔同嘅另外功能，喺屯門廠，就會做嗰個每年嘅年檢大維修；喺沙田廠嗰個，就係我哋訓練車長嗰間學校；喺荔廠，就係我哋嗰個即係中心，係調配嗰啲車輛，例如打風落雨，特別嘅情況；喺九龍灣廠，就會係我哋嘅 backup office，大部分都會喺個九龍灣廠。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咪車長每朝返工都係先去車廠？

李澤昌先生：絕大部分都會係，有啲就會去個站頭嗰度去攞車，不過好大部分都去個 depot 嗰度係攞佢嗰個當天嗰個派更嗰張紙。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我咁嘅理解啱唔啱？你其實係較早時候有提過下，我嘅理解啱唔啱，車廠係有洗手間同埋有休息嘅設施畀車長用？

李澤昌先生：絕對會有，佢個 depot 裏面，亦都係一個相當大嘅一個車廠嚟嘅，咁佢裏面係有一啲沖涼嘅設施，有一啲呢個洗手間，有呢個甚至乎每一個 depot 都有一個 clinic，係會係畀啲車長如果唔舒服，喺嗰度驗一驗，先至係咪決定

返唔返去--返唔返工。咁仲有一啲休息嘅地方，等啲車長喺嗰度休息一下。主席提一提，嗰度係甚至乎有間剪頭髮，係畀啲車長係剪頭髮。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺屯門肯定就啱，係咪所--四間都係？

李澤昌先生：四間都有，四間都有，四間都有，佢甚至乎有個 grocery shop，係畀佢買啲一般基本嘅雜貨，都喺嗰度，咁其實基本上大部分嘅車長都會當嗰個係佢一個即係地方，佢哋係有個歸宿嘅地方。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇睇呢一個雜項文件夾 2，902 頁。899 頁嗰度就係講及就係，九巴嘅係巴士總站同埋屯門車廠，就係主席同埋委員喺 2018 年 8 月 3 號去參觀嘅一個報告。咁其實就喺 902 頁嗰度，(E)嗰個係標題底下，就係見到係關乎屯門車廠。我就想請你睇一睇，第二點，902 頁底下嗰度，就話「一字樓，一字樓嗰度有一個康樂地方，咁就有兩張乒乓波檯，有呢個飲水機，有係儲物櫃，同埋一個係汽水販賣機，有理髮店，有便利店，有一個係休息室，就有冷氣嘅，四張檯，十六張凳，有雪櫃，係微波爐同埋電視機，同埋一個細嘅黑房，就係有啲係休息嘅凳，就係讓車長可以躺下，即係瞓平咁樣喺度休息。咁而當時就係有一位車長就係用咁嘅姿勢喺度瞓緊。」跟住下面嗰度，「二字樓就係有一個診所，有男廁、女廁，係一個制服嘅儲存室，同埋係辦公室。」嗰啲相就喺呢個附件 E 嗰度係包括咗喺度，912 頁嗰度就有嗰啲相，913 頁亦都係有嗰啲照片，就係反映番剛才文字所講嘅情況。呢個就係車廠嗰個情況，我哋而家就講番呢個車站嘅情況，九巴有幾多個車站？

李澤昌先生：二百一十七個。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）二百一十七個。我哋而家睇下 KMB-1 文件冊，201 頁。咁呢一頁就係委員會喺 18 年 7 月 19 號發畀九巴，咁第二段就提到要求公司係提供一個巴士車站嘅位置同埋地址，同埋係由邊一個車廠係負責嗰個車站，而係有九巴同埋龍運嘅車長就係返特別更，就係根據呢一個巴士車長工作休息及用膳時間指引，就係喺 18 年 2 月係更新，就係開始就係有一個最少三小時嘅休息。咁呢封信就係--嘅回覆就係 205 頁，就係 7 月 26 日嘅，咁就講到「我哋就回應你喺 18 年 7 月 19 號嘅信件，咁你係要求我哋提供車站，照顧呢啲特別更車長所提供嘅休息同埋員工設施。咁就喺下表就係有詳情。」咁跟住我哋就見到個表，就係 206 頁、207 頁，一直去到 211 頁。咁就住呢個表，我問問題之前，呢個表就係列咗一啲有特別更嘅車站，咁我咁樣理解啱唔啱？某一啲嘅車站係冇特別更，即係係特別更都冇使用嘅，啱唔啱？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，Mr Duncan，有個別嘅車站就未必會有啲特別更嘅車長嘅使用。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大概有幾多個咁樣嘅車站？

彭樹雄先生：或者我可以--不如我用一個數字可以--即係咁樣容易表達啲出嚟，因為邊個站有，或者有幾多站有特別更嘅車長喺度休息，我哋都要睇一睇，但係或

者容許我畀一個數就係話，我哋啲特別更嘅車長，譬如話有幾多會係喺嗰個 depot 休息，有幾多個特別更嘅車長係會喺個站頭，即係 bus termini 休息，又或者有幾多個佢哋係可以返屋企去休息嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我可能頭先講得唔係太清楚，呢個表就係列出咗一啲車長開始特別更，然後休息嘅時候，可能會喺呢啲車站度。

彭樹雄先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁如果我理解啱嘅話，某啲車站係唔會被車長使用嚟休息㗎嘛，即係返緊休息--返特別更嘅車長？

彭樹雄先生：我或者可以咁--係，我或者可以咁樣答，因為我哋如果跟番嗰個時間表，timetable，確實就某啲站頭，佢哋係冇一啲嘅特別更車長嘅休息，但係有可能喺行動上，譬如話嗰個站頭就算有一啲嘅 resting facilities 咁計，佢可能未必--因為嗰個行動上，即係個車務上嘅調配，佢可能會有唔同嘅，呢度。

李澤昌先生：我可唔可以咁樣補充，Mr Duncan？其實我哋九巴有二百一十七個站頭，或者佢哋講嗰個 bus termini，其實每一站頭都基本上有一啲好--我哋講緊啲基本嘅設施，而家你講緊嗰--呢一個站頭嘅設施，其實佢即係最大，而家政府批一個 kiosk，佢哋講緊係大概係 40 呎，40 平方呎咁大㗎咋。即係就算係咪特別更，或者係一般嘅車長嘅休息嘅設施，都係需要，而家我哋係冇刻意話邊一個係特別更先，因為其實如果我哋--我就睇過嗰二百一十七個站頭，其實每一個二百一十七個站頭裏面，佢嗰個設施係基本上我哋講緊係一個 40 呎嘅一個--平方呎嘅一個東西嚟㗎咋，即係唔係一個可以瞓覺嘅地方。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你話你睇晒二百一十七個車站，佢哋包唔包括一啲即係返特別更車長所用嘅車長--即係係咪包括晒呢啲車長用同埋冇用嘅車站？

李澤昌先生：有，有可能係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁即係話呢一個係車站嘅總數，就無論係有冇特別更車長用，係咪？

李澤昌先生：冇錯，冇錯，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁如果我冇理解錯，你啱啱就話當你即係考慮呢啲設施嘅時候，你就唔會特別係分係畀一啲特別更或者唔係特別更嘅車長用嘅？

李澤昌先生：冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想你睇番 KMB-1 文件冊嘅 205 頁，或者係應該係 206 頁。咁呢個表我哋就會見到，邊個車站就係要即係依靠呢一個公廁，而唔係一個化學廁所，或者係用一個九巴廁所。

李澤昌先生：其實今日二百一十七個站裏面，我哋叫做即係 purposely-built 有一個 toilet 喺度，係五十個；而佢有化廁嘅地方，係有六十六個；咁跟住有一百個左右，係倚賴周邊嘅設施畀個車長，例如係一啲即係 shopping mall，或者啲商場嗰啲咁嘅地方，咁今日仲有一個係冇洗手間嘅設施。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁關於呢個公廁嘅問題，根據運輸署文件，即係我頭先畀你睇嘅文件，呢啲廁所可能要即係行四至七分鐘先至去到，即係喺車站行四至七分鐘，咁樣講啱唔啱？

李澤昌先生：我冇親身行過，但係就有住大部分係可以去--係大概十分鐘之內左右，因為有啲係好倚賴個商場，咁有時商場佢係閂咗，咁佢可能會行得更遠，呢個係有呢個情況發生。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）九巴認為呢個情況理唔理想？

李澤昌先生：我哋喺過去一年裏面，我哋係添置咗個化廁係二十六個，二十六個，而家係剩番一個，咁基本上，已經去到一個我覺得係慢慢啲員工覺得係接受到嘅水平。一年前你問我呢個問題，可能係我接受唔到。但係仲有一樣嘢，我哋需要係要處理，就係因為化廁其實佢點都係缺乏咗一啲電嘅關係，所以好多時喺個通風同埋嗰啲即係等等其他嘅設施，係冇一個完整一個廁所咁好，所以呢個係--我哋仲係改善之中，咁我相信會越嚟越--即係喺呢個方面會做多啲工夫。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話「剩番一個車站」，係咩嘢意思？

李澤昌先生：嗰個喺元朗，咁因為嗰個即係同近期你聽到，前嗰幾日個差唔多個情況，因為佢嗰個--本身嗰個路，行人路係比較窄，咁亦都係當區嗰啲區議員亦都係覺得嗰個位置同埋嗰個環境唔係咁適合，咁呢個仲係喺個申請之中，而家係仲有一個我係仲未可以即係處理到嗰個化廁，喺元朗，exactly 嘅位置係元朗公園。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺安裝咗呢二十七個化廁之後，即係仲有即係幾多--仲有啲咩嘢情況，你哋係要靠公廁？

李澤昌先生：呢個比較--呢一百個站頭係困難，因為佢係倚賴個 public toilet，咁有啲 public toilet 係其實係譬如係周邊係一啲公園嘅設施，係因為申--應該咁講，洗手間係複雜，因為洗手間係佢申請嘅過程，係要同好多啲區議員，唔單只政府部門，個時間係好長，所以係--我哋係即係掌握唔到呢方面即係可以做得啲咩嘢囉。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係假設你可以控制到呢個情況，即係對公司嚟講，理想嘅情況係點樣嘅？

李澤昌先生：我自己個人就係經常都落站頭，係同啲車長，前線員工，係畀佢感覺我哋係多啲聽佢嗰個困難，其實今日佢個困難都未係個洗手間，其實佢個困難係嗰個休息室，因為休息室，我諗上年嘅秋天，大家都記得呢個樂華事件，其實休息

室係員工嘅一個幾重要嘅問題嚟，因為個休息室嗰個位置同埋佢嗰個大細係呢個需要我嚟緊嘅重要嘅工作，特別係未來香港--未來政府起嗰啲新嘅站，喺嗰個設施裏面，應該要做多少少，呢個先至係我哋覺得應該要做多啲嘅工作。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）一陣間我哋會講呢個休息室嘅問題，即係就住呢個提供廁所嘅問題，即係呢個理想嘅情況會係點？

李澤昌先生：我自己--Okay，我哋自己做咗啲咩嘢，今日啱啱我想講就係，我哋啲洗手間、化廁，其實佢係好多地方係申請唔到電，我哋大部分嘅化廁今日，我曾經係叫我哋啲工程部提供一啲電池，然後托個電池去嗰度，畀佢哋廿四小時有燈，同埋廿四小時有抽氣嘅設施。咁呢個第一步我試完，而家第二步，我哋差唔多係全部冇電到嘅地方，我哋係安置咗個太陽能嘅板，喺嗰個化廁上高，而提供啲電畀我哋啲車長可以有燈同埋有抽氣扇。我哋--即係喺我自己嘅範圍裏面，我諗我哋喺嗰個化廁嘅工作，已經我覺得係儘量去做㗎嘞。咁你話當然，即係你話係咪喺其他商場或者公園嘅設施嗰度，佢即係可以再畀多啲機會我哋係裝多啲化廁，我哋願意去做，但係即係正如頭先講，有好多地區同埋其他嘅部門，即係我真係確實係有個難度。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，其實我想少少嘅補充，即係我好多謝 Mr Duncan 你提出呢個洗手間嘅問題，其實呢個洗手間嘅問題，其實都係--都幾困擾我哋前線啲車長，因為往往個洗手間嘅問題，令到我哋啲車長去到商場，可能佢哋即係所謂食閉門羹，畀人趕番出嚟。正正因為冇洗手間，佢哋可能真係要來回--淨係來回個步程都可能要八分鐘、十分鐘，佢哋嗰個休息時間相對地係因為咁樣而係有所減少，呢個係其實都幾困擾我哋啲車長。同埋我亦都有啲驚奇就係，一啲現有嘅總站，你冇一個永久嘅洗手間，我覺得即係呢個當然我哋可以逐步做，我哋公司譬如話我哋會加自己嘅化廁等等，但係一啲啱啱起好嘅新嘅巴士總站，我覺得都頗為詫異就係，佢完全冇 factor in 到一啲 permanent 嘅洗手間喺裏面。我舉幾個例，例如西九龍高鐵巴士總站，一個係好有規模嘅巴士總站，但係完全係冇洗手間嘅安排；紅磡嘅紅鸞道，啱啱使用，佢係要嚟取代嗰個紅磡碼頭，亦都係一個好大嘅 PTI，我哋所謂 public transport interchange，亦都係冇一個洗手間嘅設備，冇站長室，冇休息室；港珠澳大橋，我哋初步睇，亦都係冇一個洗手間嘅設備。咁呢個其實正正多謝 Mr Duncan，我哋覺得係咪應該呢啲 resting facilities，包括 toilet 等等，係咪應該喺包含咗一啲基本嘅設施裏面？嗄。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁問題嘅根本係咪即係係規劃上嘅問題，點解會有一啲新嘅路線同埋新嘅設施，但係就冇一個制度去確保呢啲設施入面係有合適嘅廁所？

彭樹雄先生：多謝主席，我唔知道呢個係咪一個 design failure，但係有一啲以往即係建造嘅巴士總站係有一個 permanent 嘅 resting facility，有洗手間，有站長室，但係就好奇怪，就係--正正就係有啲新落成嗰啲，就完全係冇呢一樣嘢。同埋除咗--呢個新落成嘅巴士總站，除咗 resting facilities，其實喺個設計上，其實都有問題。正正我講，紅鸞道、西九高鐵站，呢兩個站喺

落成咗之後，Transport Department 就邀請我哋巴士公司落去試路，但係先發覺，原來佢個 design，佢個設計根本係對某啲嘅車種係唔適合，結果呢兩個站係需要做一啲好大型嘅 modifications，先至可以令到我哋嗰啲巴士係轉得到，又或者係能夠出到嗰個出口。因為佢--即係嗰個--我相信一啲舊式嘅巴士總站設計，當時係諗唔到會有十二米車，十二米八㗎，呢個我哋可以諒解。但係一啲新嘅巴士站，呢個我哋覺得係比較驚奇，嗯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而家請你搋去 FE-1B 嘅文件冊，199-7 頁。你見唔見到呢度有封信，2016 年 1 月 21 號，呢個係寫畀運輸署署長，公司發出，有關於就係話擺一個化學廁响政府土地，一個荃灣嘅--新界荃灣嘅巴士總站，見唔見到？

彭樹雄先生：見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個算唔算係一個申請擺一個化學廁嘅，呢個就係荃灣嗰個呢個地方？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你睇 199-10，呢度就係响 4 月，運輸署--2016 年 4 月，運輸署一封回信嚟。

彭樹雄先生：係，見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）响第二段，「部門將你個建議畀有關嘅政府部門，係發--睇下佢哋有咩嘢意見，亦都要求荃灣民政處就喺當地係諮詢啲人。我想同你講，當地居民嘅代表係有強烈反對，擺呢個响個荃威花園嘅巴士總站擺化學廁，因為佢哋關心衞生，同埋仲要附近亦都有洗手間，咁詳細嘅反對原因就係擺咗响附件 A，請你參考。咁我哋好遺憾話畀你聽，你申請擺個化學廁呢個建議，係我哋唔能夠支持，我哋想請你重新考慮下，係咪需要响呢個地方擺個化學廁，再重新提交申請嘅，如果需要嘅話。」

咁跟住 199-13，係另一封信，係公司發去畀運輸署署長，今次第二段，「請你--請留意化學廁已經係有更好嘅設計，同埋通風嘅等等一啲情況。」見唔見到？

彭樹雄先生：見到，有。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大家知道荃威花園即係已經有二十年係做巴士總站。

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁另一封信，日期 2017 年 9 月 29 號，係頁數 199-18，係即係重新申請嘅。

彭樹雄先生：係，見到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁 199-26，係 2017 年 12 月 29，即係話第一次申請之後，差唔多兩年之後發生嘅事嚟，「關於你嘅申請化學廁，我好高興話畀你聽，我哋而家批准等等，咁我哋夾附咗」--有三十二個條件，即係關於呢個化學廁，你要遵守呢啲條件？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我睇嚟嘅，似乎用咗好多時間嚟到申請喎？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

彭樹雄先生： Yes，係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係咪一個好獨特嘅個案，定係呢個反映一般嘅經常發生嘅情況？即係話你申請擺化學廁，係咪經常都係咁嘅？

李澤昌先生：我可以咁樣講，你睇--你留意到嗰個日子係 2017 年 12 月，呢個就係樂華事件之後嘅事嚟。我頭先都講過，其實呢個化廁，我哋喺呢段時間，係有二十六個係好短時間去得到呢個 approval，係一個非常之漫長，你頭先--我哋頭先都講咗，你話仲有一百個係要倚賴周邊嘅設施，好似話公園同埋商場，我哋仲有好多工作做，但係真係係基本上申請一個化廁，係講緊係用年作為一個單位去計算，係真係有個難度。

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，其實呢個--你 quote 呢個例子，呢個荃威花園，其實我都有參與。我哋第一次申請，點解我哋--首先我哋點解會申請，正如阿 Mr Duncan 講咗，呢個站其實係好多年㗎嘞，一路我哋都係用喺個總站對面一個商場嘅洗手間，佢哋係畀我哋啲車長用。但係唔知點解，佢突然之間就話「我唔會再畀你哋車長用嘞。」咁於是乎我哋嘅車長就要行好遠。咁我哋就喺 2016 年 1 月 21 號，就第一次申請，咁一路就係來來往往，咁就基於居民嘅拒絕，區議員嘅反對，咁運輸署就同我哋講就對唔住，佢就唔會申請。咁直至到我 2017 年 9 月，我落去呢一個站頭度去 visit，即係同啲車長傾偈，咁啲車長個反應非常之大，咁於是乎我就同我哋個經理講就話「唔得嘞，我哋一定要再寫信去畀運輸署。」咁正如李生講，因為大家都記得 2017 年年中，樂華邨，我哋想等一個休息室，搞咗好多好多年。咁 eventually，結果我哋就成功爭取咗。咁之後就都睇得到，嗰個步伐係快咗，但係都同阿李生咁講，我哋係用年做單位，申請一個化廁，呢個我哋其實都話，我都想強調，對於我哋前線車長，前線同事，洗手間呢個問題係真係好困擾，呢個係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請我哋大家睇番 KMB-1，同埋你提供嘅資訊、資料，係你提供畀委員會嘅資料，就係關於員工嘅設施、廁所等。根據呢啲分析，有七個總站似乎完全冇廁所，冇呢啲設施。如果大家睇 208 頁，第三、第四個記項，新屯門中心同埋另一個喺屯門嘅，係跟住 209，港澳碼頭、長沙灣，咁呢度有個係長沙灣、葵盛中、祖堯，呢啲總站，咁佢啲巴士車長點應付？

李澤昌先生：佢哋去嗰啲商場嘅洗手間度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）算唔算係公廁？

李澤昌先生：佢有啲係，有啲 public toilet 係嗰啲政府嗰啲嚟，但係佢周邊喺十分鐘之內，佢哋去得到㗎嘞。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度你講嘅公廁，你話有一百個，大部分有都包括係商場？

李澤昌先生： Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁有啲點解空白㗎，呢七個係完全冇任何嘢寫低？係咪即係話就算係商場嘅廁所都冇？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我再去睇一睇，有個可能性就係，佢係倚賴一啲商場嘅洗手間，但係因為商場洗手間佢係有時間限制，即係佢商場閂門，嗰個洗手間就會鎖，咁呢個我可以再睇一睇，我再--或者我稍後回覆 Mr Duncan。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁先暫時唔睇廁所，睇番休息設施。响咁樣嘅情況，我想睇番工會嘅提供嘅證供，我哋聽到佢哋嘅喺第九日嘅--第九日嘅時候，聽到佢哋嘅一啲證供。第九日，第 50 頁，呢個係陳先生，龍運嘅，陳廣龍（陳廣能？），佢係其中一個巴士總工會嘅代表嚟，佢响第九日作證。

我想就去番--睇番第 50 頁嘅第 20 行，佢就話--陳生就話「我係龍運嘅，我想補充一句。」即係佢話之前講過，而家就補充，佢話「响 E33P 呢條線」--我相信係路--我相信--我理解呢個係路線，「2016 年，咁就係廿四小時咁樣營運，呢條線，咁就大概就有六十程，有六十程，咁個巴士總站喺兆康南站，嗰度係冇休息室，亦都冇廁所。原本，佢已經有一條線㗎嘞，去到 2016 年，變咗全日線，咁我哋就要响嗰個巴士總站嗰度食飯，同埋喺特別嘅地方就係休息，不過就冇休息室。咁我哋不斷嘗試過之後，最後有一個，咁當地同埋運輸署就唔批准，咁而家呢個--我哋呢個亭就停咗，關咗兩年，咁我哋一路都要求有個休息亭，不過始終都做唔到，亦都未收過通知話幾時可以提供到。」

咁黃小姐問「咁關於呢 E33P，你幾時申請要求有咁樣嘅休息亭，係咪用書面？」

佢話「我哋响 2015 年同公司見面嘅時候提出，即係工會同佢見面，咁公司話畀我哋聽，佢一路就向唔同嘅當局申請，不過 2016 年，區議會就話應該係呢條全日線嘅嚟到係服務屯門居民，我話我哋如果冇一個休息室，我哋點能夠佢改善個服務嘅質素？我哋嘅意見就轉達咗畀區議會同埋運輸署，就算係到到今日，到今日為止，都未再收到佢哋有咩嘢回應。」

咁我未問我呢個問題之前，我想你去番雜項 2，呢個係嗰個主席去探訪嘅紀錄嚟，899 頁。由 899 頁，一路去到 902 頁，咁呢度觀察--即係探訪者嘅觀察

所得就係咁樣，「嗰個巴士總站就係冇休息室，咁嗰啲駕駛 E33P 嘅車長只能夠响兩程之間，就係响個巴士車箱裏面休息，因為嗰度冇--呢個係個露天嘅總站，冇休息室，根據另一個車長講，同一路線嘅，嗰度有一個係儲物櫃嘅地方，咁可以擺水，咁另外兆康站係你可以用八達通去到裏面嘅廁所，不過要去，就要來往要起碼七、八分鐘。」咁有啲相片，911 頁，即係呢個係總站，我哋就有個擺儲物櫃嘅，就冇廁所，咁廁所就响兆康站裏面。咁你都可以估到我想問乜嘢，點解個總站--咁你批准設立總站，但係冇提供廁所或者係休息嘅設施？

李澤昌先生：我諗頭先主席都講咗，呢個係一個好核心嘅一個問題嚟，即係呢個我答你唔到，但係就而家呢個最新嘅情況，就其實運輸署就已經係批咗佢呢個站頭嗰個設施，咁當然批咗之後，仲有一個工作要做，就係申請電。咁因為佢嗰個程序上，就係要申請咗，有咗個政府嘅 approval，然後先至可以申請電，咁申請電都要一段時間，所以係我哋而家跟住嘅工作就係努力咁樣申請嗰條電線，駁到呢個休息嘅設施。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就唔想--我哋如果唔返番去嗰個運輸署嗰啲申請文件嗰度，你明白佢哋嘅講法就係話，佢哋會協助方便你同其他嘅政府部門溝通。

李澤昌先生：係，冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪就係你嘅經驗？就係咁--有冇效？

李澤昌先生：我自己個人覺得有啲部門，有啲係可能係真係未必需要，因為呢一個所謂休息室嘅設施，其實呢一個都幾係一個 temperate，一個好臨時式嘅一個建築物，咁佢有啲部門，佢問嗰啲部門其實同一啲即係永久性嘅建築物，係接近乎係一模一樣，咁呢一個過程係我覺得有啲比較長。另外一樣嘢就係，嗰啲申請電，咁因為佢個制度係通常我哋係批咗之後，然後啲電嘅公司先至有批文，先至可以接受你個申請嗰條電線入嚟，咁嗰度亦都有啲程序上，我哋都冇辦法可以即係有個突破，咁所以而家就算等到申請咗之後，我係問緊中電可唔可以加快申請條電，咁即係我可以--你可以想像到，其實係有啲嘢係可以做得快啲嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾耐之前，你申請呢個咁嘅地方有個係亭同埋嗰個廁所，係幾時申請？

李澤昌先生：我要即係返去 check check，但係唔係一個短時間，即係唔係用月嚟計，可能已經遠遠超過一年㗎嘞。就算申請電，都要一段即係起碼要好幾個月，最快都要。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就未批准㗎，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：電未。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你覺得幾時可以攞晒啲批准？

李澤昌先生：可能開完呢個會就會快啲，但係即係我相信係，如果唔係好複雜，都要

講緊係四至六個月，係冇得少。

彭樹雄先生：其實 Mr Duncan，我哋有好多嘅--其實有好多嘅站頭，我哋用咗好多時間去申請嗰個休息室，但係好多時，個休息室擺咗喺度，我哋申請電，真係一個--都係一個好漫長。同埋我哋最慘就係，啲同事就會講「喂，你都--休息室都擺咗喺度，點解唔用得？」咁，但係查實就係，因為真係要等埋其他政府部門，有啲甚至乎要睇埋渠務署等等，即係好多好多即係有啲要經過嘅程序。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，而家已經 1 點鐘，我諗我哋而家係食午飯，咁今日下晝兩點半繼續，唔該晒。

下午 12 時 59 分聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位午安。係，鄧樂勤大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該你，主席。

彭樹雄先生：喺我哋嘅 lunch break 之前，就我哋會 check 一啲嗰啲站頭嗰啲設施，或者介唔介意我匯報番先？我哋去--麻煩你去番 KMB Long Win Bus bundle 1(A)，就係 Long Win Bus & KMB bundle 1(A)208 頁。

主席：Yes.

彭樹雄先生：首先我第三個同埋第四個站，一個叫做 Handsome Court 同埋新屯門中心。因為我哋嗰啲車係特別車嚟，即係淨係朝頭早有服務，所以嗰度係冇一個洗手間嘅設定，同埋啲車長唔會喺嗰度休息嘅。

另外就去到 209 頁，嗰個 Central (Macau Ferry)，對唔住，呢度我哋有少少遺漏，其實嗰度係有 public toilet 嘅，有公共洗手間嘅。然後落去...

主席：（經傳譯員）麻煩你等一等。搞錯咗，就唔係話遺漏？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，冇錯，對唔住，我哋係有啲粗疏㗎，呢度...

主席：（經傳譯員）信德中心，係咪呀？

彭樹雄先生：係，冇錯，係，冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

彭樹雄先生：好，另外落去，就有個長沙灣，Cheung Sha Wan，有個甘泉街South，甘泉街南，嗰度我哋係冇一個化廁嘅，個原因就係我哋用對上嗰個總站，甘泉街北嗰個嘅化廁，即係兩個站係share一個化廁嘅。

好嘞，然後落去屘二嗰個，葵盛中。咁嗰度，對唔住，呢度又係我哋有啲粗疏，其實係有一個嘅KMB嘅toilet嘅，嗰個係permanent，嗰個係永久嘅toilet嚟。

然後去到第210，最褸屘嗰個又一邨。其實又一邨我哋係冇巴士總站嘅，因為我哋嗰條203C嗰條線，就係去大坑東嘅，不過係經又一邨，所以嗰度係冇一個洗手間嘅設備，因為亦都冇車長喺嗰度休息嘅。

好嘞，另外就睇番亦都先前有工會嘅代表講，就係龍運巴士嗰個E33P嗰個兆康南。正話Mr Duncan你就問我哋係幾時開始申請，嗰個兆康南站，我哋係2017年嘅8月係入紙同運輸署申請站長室、休息室同埋化廁嘅。而運輸署喺2018年嘅7月，2018年嘅7月係已經批咗嗰個嘅approval，我哋而家就係喺度申請緊電力嘅供應嘅。

多謝，Mr Duncan。多謝主席。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你，彭先生。而家想請你睇呢一個雜項文件夾2，899頁。今朝睇過嘅，呢個係一個報告，就係報告番委員就係去巴士總站同埋車廠參觀。

請你睇呢個報告嘅第2頁，即係第900頁。喺第三行，即係(B)嗰度嘅第三行，沙田火車站巴士總站，嗰度嘅第三行就咁講，就話有新型嘅休息設施，有冷氣嘅，有空調嘅，有抽氣扇、有五張椅。然後喺底下嗰度，就話平均嚟講，一日就會有多過十位司機喺嗰個巴士總站同一時間係休息嘅。

如果我理解得正確嘅話，似乎係咪就話呢個情況都唔係淨係沙田鐵路站嘅巴士總站唯一係有咁嘅情況？因為你睇番901頁嗰度，就係講及聯和墟巴士總站喺第2點嗰度，第1大段嘅第2點嗰度就提及一個細嘅休息室，裏面有三張椅。

然後喺嗰一版嘅第2段，第4個大點嗰度，就話喺探訪嗰日，大概有六、七名司機喺總站嗰度休息，當時就係繁忙時間。

落到去903頁，就係山景巴士總站，有五張椅，但係今次就冇提及話究竟係任何時間，同一時間裏面，總共會有幾多位司機喺度休息。呢度有兩點，我哋聽到喺車廠嗰度，車廠有個係所謂暗啲話「黑房」，就係有設施係讓車長可以攤平咁樣瞓喺度。但係如果喺巴士總站嚟講，嗰啲休息室就冇同樣嘅情況

喎，你覺唔覺得咁樣係理想嘅呢？

彭樹雄先生：呢個係會發生嘅。我想強調其實我哋 呢啲所謂 Kiosks，休息室，我哋 有兩種唔同嘅 size 嘅，一種係細啲，一種係比較大啲。我哋 好多時因為嗰張--如果要真係擺一張 horizontal 嘅椅喺度，其實佢佔用嗰個嘅空間都有--即係會有一定嘅空間係會佔用到。其實我哋 都儘量就係話視乎嗰個使用個 usage，因為有一啲嘅總站，其實車長未必會喺中段休息會使用--即係嗰三個鐘頭未必一定會使用嗰個站頭嘅設施嘅，但係儘量如果我哋 可以，我哋 都會申請，如果容許的話，我哋 都會擺個比較大啲嘅 kiosk 喺度。

李澤昌先生：呢度有少少補充嘅，其實喺嗰個車廠裏面，有啲真係好似瞓低喺度嗰啲咁樣。但係而家我哋 有啲係本身係 purposely built 嘅 terminus，其實佢有啲就唔係一張凳嚟嘅，佢有張比較低少少可以坐得舒服啲嘅凳，畀嗰啲員工休息。咁個數量就係我今日手上冇嗰啲巴士總站，嗰啲係真係畀嗰啲員工，雖然唔係坐低，可以橫--好似張床咁瞓，但係嗰啲都好舒服。而家你所講嗰啲，因為佢本身嗰個 kiosk 嘅 size 係正正係得嗰 40 平方呎，咁就其實係擺得五、六張凳。我哋係確確實實覺得係有呢個需要，嚟緊我哋係好希望喺好多站頭裏面，都比較大嗰啲站係有兩個形式嘅凳，一種就係坐直嗰啲凳，另外一種係坐低，比較舒服少少嗰種。而家我哋 都已經係好多係做緊呢樣嘢。

彭樹雄先生：係，Mr Duncan，今朝早喺個聽證會度，我都想提供一啲數字或者畀呢個 Committee 參考嘅。我哋 九巴嗰啲特別更嘅車長，其實我想講就係我哋有大約九個 per cent 嘅特別更嘅車長，即是一百三十四位嘅特別更車長，佢係會喺嗰四個廠裏面休息嘅，即係換句話，正話李生講嗰啲，我哋 會有一啲 horizontal 嘅床等等，呢一百三十四位同事就會喺廠休息嘅。

另外喺各個站頭休息嘅，就佔咗十七個 per cent，就係二百六十二位。而返屋企呢三個鐘頭或者以上嘅休息，其實佔嘅總數係所有特別更嘅車長係七十四個 per cent，係一千一百一十七位同事，七十四個 per cent 嘅同事係佢哋可以返到屋企休息嘅。

正正我哋 KMB 相對地比較好嘅，就係因為我哋車廠嘅分佈比較多，同埋亦都可以真係就到一啲車長，佢哋係可以係短時間裏面係能夠返到屋企休息。多謝你，Mr Duncan。

李澤昌先生：即係但係嚟緊個將來，我想補充，即係當然呢啲係一個數字，但係即係嗰個 terminus 休息嗰個設施，我諗我哋都會再做緊啲工夫。我諗嗰啲凳，同埋可以坐得舒服嗰啲，其實唔係淨係畀一啲特別更，我諗有一啲一般嘅值更嘅同事，我諗我哋都要喺嗰度會做啲嘢喺度。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）大啲嘅休息室，我想問有冇個房係畀佢哋可以瞓平呢？

彭樹雄先生：佢就唔可以係完全 horizontal，但係好似一啲 armchair，安樂椅咁呢，佢係可以係躺臥到嘅，但係就唔係--完全唔係--即係都係當然，唔係一張

床咁，係 horizontal，但係都係一張安樂椅咁斜斜地，咁可以休息到。其實我哋開始越嚟越我哋會擺得多啲呢種嘅椅嘅。其實係有，做緊㗎，不過我哋會繼續--即係如果可以--喺個面積上面容許，其實我哋可以擺得更加多添。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇人規定過嗰個休息室嘅大細？

彭樹雄先生：我哋每一次呢啲 kiosk 去畀運輸署申請，其實有個 size 嘅限制嘅，呢個已經係最好嘅 size，即係喺而家嘅規架底下，呢個已經係最好嘅一個 size。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個咪間接咁講，就係運輸署係限制咗個大細？

彭樹雄先生：有呀，有㗎，我諗唔一定係運輸署嘅。因為有啲地方...

李澤昌先生：係有嘅，係有嘅。

彭樹雄先生：係有嘅，係，但係個...

李澤昌先生：呢個 size 係政府 stipulate 咗，所以其實我哋係呢個 size 係絕對開放，係絕對希望可以係大啲嘅。

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋都好--係申請即係由 A 亭會轉個大--我哋都有咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個政府部門係規定咗呢個休息室嘅大細？

彭樹雄先生：運輸署。

李澤昌先生：運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢規定咗嗰個呢兩種尺寸已經實施咗幾耐？

李澤昌先生：五年。

主席：（經傳譯員）真係？唔係仲多過五年咩？

李澤昌先生：（經傳譯員）我會話起碼五年囉。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇係申請過大啲嘅休息室？譬如話話畀佢哋聽，就係話我哋想佢哋瞓低，躺平咁瞓，有冇咁問過？

李澤昌先生：我哋通常咁做，我哋係申請兩個 40 呎嘅，呢個我哋通常都會咁做，咁得到嘅通常都係一個返嚟。如果你話即係可以係申請大嘅，大過 40 嘅，我哋應該係未試過嘅，未試過。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你冇試過，亦都未必知個答案？

李澤昌先生：啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你就推論，就係你想擺兩個 40，即係話如果要 100，應該

佢哋唔會批准，你係咪咁樣推論？

李澤昌先生：(Nodded head)

主席：（經傳譯員）律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你講嘅嗰啲好似安樂椅嘅椅，我想問下報告裏面有冇相？

李澤昌先生：呢度冇影到，但係我哋有好多我哋啲總站嗰啲呢，係有呢一種凳嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 2 點亦都係源至剛才我讀出嚟嘅嗰啲描述，你有時就話有三至到五張椅，但係同一時間就可能有七至八個人就係喺嗰度休息緊，咁嘅情況滿唔滿意？

李澤昌先生：當然即係永遠都可以做好啲嘅，我個人覺得唔係好滿意，所以我頭先都講咗，我哋會係未停過係繼續同政府係再繼續申請，所以休息室嗰個問題，我哋係仲未解決嘅，所以我哋係未滿意嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好嘞，而家讓我講番運輸署嘅文件夾，即係今朝早我哋展開呢一段對話嘅時候，就已經係睇緊運輸署嘅文件，就係運輸署嘅 1 號文件夾，438 頁。嗰度睇到有兩條問題嘅，就問運輸署兩條問題，佢哋亦都答咗嘅。咁想請你睇番 438 頁。第 1 點嘅第二句，就係相關嘅部門或者當局考慮同埋係審核嗰個申請，睇下畀唔畀你哋有呢啲員工設施嘅時候，運輸署一直都有提供適當嘅協調工作嚟到係便利係早日可以安裝到咁嘅設施。

我想問，你哋嘅經驗係咪都係咁樣樣？

李澤昌先生：佢係做一個協調嘅工作，但係申請呢啲嘢，其實佢係有兩個最大嘅部門嘅。運輸署佢通常係處理一啲係 Housing Department 或者 Housing Authority 以外嗰啲，嗰啲係佢哋去處理。但係喺一啲 Housing Authority 嗰啲範圍裏面，就會由番 Housing Authority 去做 coordinate。所以係基本上係兩個唔同嘅單位去處理。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）想問下，運輸署嘅協調工作有冇令到你哋早日係得到批准去造嗰啲設施，即係從你嘅經驗嚟計？

李澤昌先生：即係如果作為一個--即係我哋一個營運者，我覺得佢可以快啲囉。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第二個要點，第三句「專營巴士營運商佢哋嘅要求同埋意見，即係關乎洗手間同埋休息設施都會係喺適當嘅時候，加入咗巴士總站嘅設計嗰度。」

喺實際嘅經驗嚟講，係咪真係咁？

彭樹雄先生：其實我好難答 yes 或者 no，因為有啲可能我哋會知悉嘅，但係有啲我

哋冇知悉。所以我對唔住，Mr Duncan，我真係畀唔到一個好 yes or no 嘅答案畀你。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）邊個負責設計呢啲巴士站？

彭樹雄先生：運輸署。

李澤昌先生：我覺得有幾種嘅巴士總站嘅，有啲巴士總站係應該屬於政府嘅地，或者政府嘅產業，佢去做。咁喺做嘅時候，其實佢都未必決定咗係邊一間公司入嚟行嗰條巴士線，其實就確實佢就好少係搵咗邊一間公司畀意見。佢哋運輸署亦都係有一班專業嘅團隊，或者佢有佢自己嘅顧問係設計個巴士站。所以我就喺我過去咁多年，我就應該就未有人諮詢過我哋嗰啲洗手間喺邊度，呢啲問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）換句話講係運輸署設計每一個巴士總站，係咪呀？

李澤昌先生：如果係佢哋嘅地方，但係當然譬如好似係--即係我頭先想講嗰啲 bus transport interchange，即係可能同鐵路嗰啲有關係，我諗當然個業權，呢個我唔係好清楚。但係我哋本身就真係冇喺嗰個諮詢裏面係有知會。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當運輸署設計巴士總站嘅時候，即係如果係喺政府土地上面嘅巴士總站，佢哋喺設計入面，有冇包括埋廁所同埋休息設施？

李澤昌先生：即係我覺得係應該如果佢叫呢個叫做“bus terminus”，佢係應該有一啲 terminus 嘅設施喺裏面，但係就我眼見，而家暫時有啲係真係冇，我答唔到佢哋本身嗰個標準係點樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）439 頁，第 1 點，「運輸署係有積極咁樣同相關嘅部門同埋單位，就係聯絡去解決任何專營巴士公司喺申請設施嘅時候遇到嘅困難。」

根據你嘅經驗，運輸署有冇有效咁樣解決你公司所遇到嘅問題？

彭樹雄先生：Mr Duncan，我嘅答案，我只可以話可以做得好啲嘅。即係因為佢呢一個 bullet，其實好 broad，即係我完全唔能夠 gauge 到到底即係佢所謂“proactively”嗰個程度係去到邊度。

李澤昌先生：即係或者我咁樣講，其實運輸署係冇原則上係反對個站頭個設施係有呢啲咁嘅休息室，或者廁所、化廁嘅東西。但係因為即係每一次去到做啲地方上嗰啲咁嘅諮詢，或者喺個土地上有冇足夠嘅地方令到佢可唔可以擺到嚟嘢，佢係真係面對咗好多呢啲咁嘅疑難。當然，處理呢啲嘢其實唔係咁容易，我好明白，但係就我哋感覺到，我哋同運輸署係冇一個好大嘅分歧，但係亦都睇到佢哋有一個難度喺呢方面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 440 頁最後嗰一句，「運輸署就會協助專營巴士公司去得到當地或者當區嘅支持，就會透過做一啲實地嘅考察，或者係同佢哋會面去搵出一啲可行嘅方案，咁呢去加快呢一個實施嘅方案，就可以幫助到車長同埋乘客。」

你公司有冇即係得到咁樣嘅協助？

彭樹雄先生：呢個我可以答呢，就係當我哋入咗一個申請嘅時候，我都知運輸署係會聯繫當區嗰啲區議員等等。如果真係有反對，大家都睇到，好似正話荃灣荃威花園嗰個個案，運輸署嘅回覆最褸屘嗰段就係話「當區居民反對，你哋巴士公司搵過個位置再申請喇。」咁樣。呢個就係我哋好多時都會遇到呢一個咁嘅問題嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）最後我就想問一啲問題去澄清一啲嘅事宜嘅，即係之前你都已經向委員會講過呢啲議題。首先呢啲車長，即係返工，開始上班嘅時候，即係以我所知，即係而家冇提供任何嘅交通工具畀啲車長去佢哋返工嘅地方，係咪呀？佢哋要用自己嘅方法去到返工嘅地點，係咪？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋公司係有提供到一啲我哋所謂嗰啲叫“crew bus”，我哋嗰啲廠車。我哋嘅廠車就係早更，其實就基本上個涵蓋面都幾廣泛，甚至乎，雖然我哋冇廠喺香港島，我哋香港島都會有朝頭早嘅 crew bus 廠車係接送啲同事返番去個屬廠度開工嘅、工作嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供多啲嘅詳情？咁樣委員會就會知道呢一個員工巴士服務係點嘅。

彭樹雄先生：冇問題，其實我哋有嗰啲 Crew bus 嗰啲嘅路線，幾多點鐘開等等，我哋都可以提供到嘅。早更，因為早更嗰個交通嗰個問題，有啲同事返夜更，咁又點呢？其實同事--因為我哋嗰啲同事係可以自己搭巴士等等，佢哋好多時都係用番我哋當日中午嗰啲巴士嘅服務，亦都係可以返到去個站頭度攞車工作嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你揈去 KMB-12 文件冊嘅第 5010 頁，呢份就係你喺上次聆訊之後提供嘅，將份文件。呢度就係一啲數據，就係你啱啱有提到呢啲數字嘅。呢啲數據就係關於有幾多嘅車長會喺車廠、車站或者屋企，即係佢喺下午度休息嘅。你提到大概係七成嘅車長係會返屋企休息嘅，即係喺佢哋落更嘅時候。

會唔會有任何協助幫呢啲車長返屋企，或者係由屋企返嚟去恢復工作？

彭樹雄先生：其實我哋有個叫做先天性嘅優勢，就係我哋屬廠比較多。我哋如果個車長佢加入我哋嘅公司完成受訓，基本上佢哋係會派番去佢住嗰個地方嘅附近嘅。所以正正就咁樣，你睇得到所以好多同事，74 個 per cent 嘅特別更嘅車長，其實佢哋根本就係 walking distance，可以返屋企，有啲甚至乎住喺個巴士總站樓上嘅屋邨等等，所以佢哋其實就係好容易地就可以返到屋企。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺上次嘅聆訊嘅時候，即係第十四日，就係喺 112 頁，我哋知道車長一日可能會係揸三條路線嘅巴士嘅，你記唔記得？

彭樹雄先生：係，我記得係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係如果係每日揸嘅路線係減少到兩條嘅話，即係喺財

政上會有咩嘢後果？

彭樹雄先生：我諗財務上，我唔覺得會係一個好大嘅分別，不過可能即係反而個車務運作上可能會有啲影響。因為其實我哋所謂呢啲 interlining，或者每日唔揸多過三條線，其實我想講就唔係淨係我哋嗰間公司係會有呢一個做法。

其實我嘅理解，我哋香港所有嗰啲專利巴士嘅 bus operator，其實都係有呢一種 interlining 嘅方法，甚至乎李生喺上一次嘅聽證會都講咗，我哋啱啱搵咗英國一間嘅顧問公司嚟睇我哋嗰個巴士嘅運作，包括維修，包括嗰個車務。其實我同嗰啲 consultant 嘅接觸，overseas 嘅國家，即係外國，其實嗰個 interlining，有啲甚至乎比我哋多過三條線添，即係佢哋都係一個幾普遍嘅一個做法嚟嘅。

咁所以答番你嘅問題，Mr Duncan，financially 我諗嗰個差別唔會太大，但係可能嗰個運作上，因為你要明白每一日嗰個客量，又或者我上一次都講咗，可能有啲同事攞病假、攞咗假，可能即係嗰個調配上，嗰個彈性，如果我哋容許佢唔多過三條線，其實嗰個運作上會暢順啲。同埋我都強調，佢哋每一條線，佢一定要有個路線訓練嘅，冇路線訓練，我哋絕對唔會派車佢揸嗰條線嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係車長同埋其他嘅工會有冇向你投訴過要揸三條線係太多？

彭樹雄先生：我大部分我認知嘅，其實我冇聽到啲好大嘅聲音，當然可能個別有啲--即係可能嗰日佢要揸兩條線，佢可能會有啲聲音，但係整體嚟講，我覺得係okay。同埋佢哋亦都明白到嗰個運作上，唔揸多三條線，其實係有個咁嘅需要，同埋即係基本上呢個都係一個幾普遍嘅一個運作嘅做法嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到即係如果一個車長係要揸一條新嘅路線嘅時候會發生咩嘢事，如果一個車長需要揸一條新嘅路線，會唔會有另外一位車長喺車上面協助佢？

彭樹雄先生：所有車長，佢所有揸嘅路線一定要有嗰個路線訓練嘅。如果佢要係揸一條新嘅線，佢一定要經過駕駛訓練學校，即係我哋 KMB 駕駛訓練學校裏面嘅路線訓練，先至會揸嗰一條線嘅。

李澤昌先生：我諗呢個問題有兩個，第一個就係如果啱啱出嚟，喺我哋嘅駕駛學院出嚟，佢初初接觸嗰盤軚嘅時間，佢側邊會有一個人陪住佢一段時間嘅。另外你講嗰個，就話如果佢係一個有經驗嘅車長，然後再學一個新線嘅話，嗰個新線係一定要經過嗰個駕駛學院教佢，咁係咁樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當佢第一次揸呢條新線嘅時候，係咪有另外一位嘅車長喺車上面協助佢？

彭樹雄先生：Yes, buddy driver.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係夥伴車長，係咪呀？

蘇偉基先生：睇睇嗰個車長佢入職幾耐，如果佢係一個好資深嘅車長，佢再學咗一條新嘅路線，其實呢啲路線對佢嚟講唔係算新嘅，咁就佢就可以駕馭得到。但係如果一個新嘅車長，我哋喺佢出去學 until 一段短時間，我哋係有一啲 buddy driver，一啲資深嘅車長，就喺佢嗰個駕駛艙側近嗰度，畀到佢一啲信心，同埋有啲需要，有啲支援佢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）梁博士就提到，即係引入一個二十個增薪點嘅制度去代替現有嘅八點增薪點嘅。你可唔可以話畀委員會知道，即係呢一個建議幾時會實行？

蘇偉基先生：喺 9 月 1 號開始實行。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係已經係實施咗，係咪呀？

彭樹雄先生：係。

梁乃鵬博士：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師，由 9 月 1 號開始，如果即係有新車長加入九巴或者龍運，佢嘅薪金就會係月薪--即係佢每個月大概係會賺 2 萬 3000 蚊，係包括年中嘅雙糧嘅，所以比起之前嘅薪酬係大幅上升嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺最新呈交嘅文件都係有分享過呢個資訊嘅，係咪？

梁乃鵬博士：我哋好樂意係向委員會係呈交一個比較圖，即係喺 9 月 1 號之前嘅薪酬同埋 9 月 1 號之後嘅薪酬嘅，我哋可以比較一個每日嘅薪酬，或者日薪車長同埋月薪車長嘅薪酬。

蘇偉基先生：我哋會儘快提供番。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇發生過呢，即係車長喺執行職務嘅時候就病咗，會唔會發生？

蘇偉基先生：會有機會㗎。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司有冇任何嘅程序或者指引，即係如果發生呢個情況嘅時候會點做？

蘇偉基先生：首先喺招聘車長嗰陣時，我哋嗰個招聘書提醒，如果車長係身體不適嗰陣時係應該申請告假。我哋亦都喺每個廠嗰度係有自己嘅 clinic 係可以畀佢睇醫生，亦都喺派更嗰陣時，佢喺嗰個站頭拍卡，亦都會係提醒佢，「你係要當日嗰個身體良好，你先至可以揸車。」佢就可以係申請病假。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果即係車長揸緊某條路線嘅時候病咗，有啲咩嘢嘅程序或者政策係會執行？

彭樹雄先生：如果有車長喺駕駛途中，佢感到唔舒服，其實車長會知道--佢係可以點，佢停低架車，然後畀電話我哋當值嘅 inspector。因為我哋有啲督察，佢哋係會做嗰個所謂巡邏嘅，佢哋會揸車巡邏嘅。佢哋只要擺低架車，然後我哋督察就會安排另外一架車，就等嗰啲客過咗另外一架車，然後我哋會車個車長去睇醫生，呢個係一向都係咁樣做緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）KMB-12 文件冊，5063 頁嘅。呢個就係你喺上次嘅聆訊之後向委員會提供嘅文件，呢度就係描述咗新車長接受嘅訓練，就係 5063 頁。另外就係現有車長嘅訓練，就係喺 5064 頁。

公司就住駕駛疲勞，有冇提供任何嘅訓練？我所謂講話即係點樣處理疲勞，我或者解釋下。我哋指即係佢哋點樣辨識，即係知道係有疲勞--唔係，知道點樣防止，或者點樣休息，所謂嘅管理疲勞狀況，有冇呢啲咁樣嘅訓練？即係你哋車長訓練有冇呢？

黃祥明先生：我相信頭先蘇生講咗喇，啲車長入職嘅時候，我哋都會提醒佢哋，如果係有唔舒服，就需要睇醫生，直情唔好繼續揸車。Mr Duncan，你剛才講嘅 fatigue，我哋當佢係一種唔舒服嘅時候，佢都應該係跟番我哋呢個守則去做。

蘇偉基先生：基於一個疲倦嘅管理嗰度，有幾方面公司係做咗東西。第一，就當然運輸署佢有個指引，對於車長嗰個工時。咁符合呢個指引，就起碼都有一個足夠嘅休息。第二，就係喺車長嗰個安全手冊嗰度，亦都有個章節係提醒佢哋作為一個專業車長，佢係要管理佢自己嘅健康。當佢發覺係身體不適嗰陣時，佢係應該唔好去做嗰個更次，更加通知公司去停止。呢點，我哋係有提佢。

再者就係話，頭先我哋講咗好多站頭嘅設施。我哋都希望佢而家就係話每六個小時，就會有個 coffee break。每一個車與車之間，亦都頭先講咗有個叫 layover 嘅 break，等佢有個 water break 或者有個 toilet break，等佢可以啱一啱，去管理番佢自己嗰個嘅身體同埋疲倦。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）根據呢個回覆，我理解啱唔啱呢，即係冇話特別提過話管理疲勞嘅，即係呢啲一般性嘅訓練內容，就唔係特別提過疲勞管理嘅，啱唔啱？

李澤昌先生：冇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）上次聽證嘅時候，聽咗好多人講，今年六月初公司第一次從個運輸署知道係有個電子數碼嘅地圖，香港有咁嘅地圖。記唔記得上次聽證係曾經提過？

梁健宏先生：係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）公司已經係咪開始運用咗呢個電子數碼嘅地圖？

梁健宏先生：我哋同黑盒製造商喺呢一方面係做緊工夫，係希望可以用到嗰張 map，亦都係做緊嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你預期幾時真係可以運用到呢個電子數碼嘅地圖？

李澤昌先生：我哋雙線做緊嘅，我哋同 ZF 之前同你哋 嘅 committee 都傾過，就係佢有兩個系統，一個就用 digital map，另外一個就係用即係人手咁樣放一啲資料入去。佢哋 兩樣嘢都一齊做緊嘅，我哋期望就希望下年嘅 1 月左右，應該就可以將呢一套系統可以嘗試喺即時喺嗰架車個 dashboard 嗰度可以睇到佢嗰個超速同實際上路面個速度，就反映番喺嗰個顯示屏嗰度。我哋 期望係下年嘅 1 月。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第十三日我哋聽證嘅時候，呢個係關於記錄嘅，31 頁第十二行，當時上一個月，8 月，嗰陣時都要四日先至可以編制到嗰個超速嘅報告。

跟住回答羅教授嘅問題，佢話司機就用佢嗰個證件嚟到拍卡，跟住就你就唔使等四日，呢個就可以即刻知道嘅。而家個情況係點，而家仲使唔使等四日，定係可以即刻知道？

梁健宏先生：而家都仲係四日嘅，但係循住嗰個方向，我哋係努力緊，希望縮短個日子。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）幾時你能夠答到嗰個方向嘅目標？

梁健宏先生：我希望可以儘快。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）咁係咩嘢意思？

李澤昌先生：其實頭先講緊嗰個黑盒同埋嗰個 digital map，呢樣嘢係幫到點解由十日變四日。因為十日變四日，因為佢個 black box 個 information，我哋自己嗰啲資料嵌埋一齊，就由十日變咗四日。而嗰個黑盒，即係個 ZF 嗰個東西，再加埋 digital map 係可以成功做到嘅話，相信呢四日嘅時間一定會縮短，但係縮短幾多，可能係一至兩日，我哋唔知。但係如果你咁樣睇，我哋應該嚟緊下年嘅一月，嗰個 real time 同埋嗰個縮短嘅時間係同一時發生嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就冇其他嘅問題，唔知委員會嘅成員有冇嘢想問？

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你，主席。我哋用咗今日好多時間，就講緊點樣能夠改善車長嘅工作環境。你可唔可以描述一下你請司機嘅成功率，譬如上個月同六個月之前比較，係咪容易咗，就成功率係高咗？

蘇偉基先生：唔該委員。而家嘅情況，我哋大約每個禮拜係請到有二十五至三十個嘅新嘅車長，比對我諗半年前，三個月都係短嘅時間，當時係請緊十至十五個嘅。

呢個當然係市場供應一個考慮，我哋自己公司喺期間亦都做咗幾樣嘢。

第一樣嘢就係嗰個薪酬嗰樣，正如頭先主席講，我哋係喺今年 3 月一次嘅優化，跟住喺啱啱 8 月嗰陣時，亦都係做咗今年嘅加薪，接近其實全年都有十五個 per cent 嘅增幅。呢個人工高咗，就多啲人吸引咗。

第二就係嗰啲嘅 condition，頭先我哋講即係多啲嘅休息設施，...（說話含糊）

第三就係我哋喺招聘嗰度，亦都係即係加大力度，我哋做多咗一啲招聘日、開放日，我哋更加係--英文用“reaching out”，主動去接觸我哋嘅群眾，即係一啲 target 嘅 driver，就從而去追番嗰個車長嘅短缺。

李澤昌先生：仲有一點想補充嘅，就係請人嗰個類別，同埋每一個區，因為你知道我哋有四個唔同嘅廠。每一個區，佢嗰個人嗰個類型係好唔同嘅，譬如喺屯門區同喺荔枝角廠區，或者九龍灣區係好唔同。

我哋可能會用一個對症下藥嘅方法，譬如屯門區，佢會係多啲比較女性，佢有一啲時間可能未必足夠做到八或者十個鐘頭每日，可能做到嘅時間係一半，但係最低限度可以知道佢邊個時間好穩定去返工，邊個時間好肯定係會放工，呢度呢，我哋朝住呢啲方向去做啲工夫。你可能會喺個站嗰個 depot 裏面做啲設施，呢個我哋都係同緊政府係傾緊可唔可以做一啲托兒嘅服務之類，係令到佢可以--即係做完嗰幾個鐘頭，可以湊番啲細路仔。

咁有啲地方，譬如有某一啲工種佢係退休嘅時候，就係五十零歲頭，佢未必係想工作一段好長嘅時候，佢同樣地，佢希望有份工作，佢可能又有車牌嘅。我哋都向呢個方向做緊，即係變咗而家去招聘，唔只與時並進，係同個地區性都要扣上關係。因為我哋涉及嗰個區域比較大，譬如你甚至乎去到大嶼山、東涌都有，咁變咗即係嗰個類型係要有啲新嘅環...（說話含糊）

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）呢個同鄧大律師頭先問嘅有關嘅，就係嗰個總站嘅設計。我得到嘅印象，你嘅回覆，我得到嘅印象，即係話你冇機會係要求有個廁所嘅，你哋 係冇辦法，定係--如果唔係咁做，嗰啲路線就唔提供到？

彭樹雄先生：我諗答呢條問題，其實我諗要好搞清楚，就係其實唔係每一個巴士站都係會喺個設計上冇個洗手間，或者冇站長室。其實有好多站，佢係 factor in 咗呢一樣嘢，但係只不過就係話 somehow 喺某啲嘅站嘅設施裏面，呢一樣嘢就冇包含咗落去。

李澤昌先生：我諗歐陽先生嘅意思係話，即係佢設計新站嘅時候，我哋個角色喺邊度。我可以講畀你聽，佢設計新站，佢通常係先過係批咗條線畀邊個做，所以佢通常佢係設計完個站，如果假設呢個新嘅巴士站，佢然後先至再決定畀邊一間公司入去行呢條線。舉個為例，港珠澳大橋，佢會有一個巴士站喺嗰度。呢個巴士站佢做嘅設計已經講緊好多年前嘅事嚟嘅，但係佢開條標畀邊一間公司入嚟行呢

條線係之後嘅事嚟嘅，所以前後嘅問題，佢都唔知搵邊間公司入去同佢傾個巴士站嘅設計。如果你叫我入去同佢傾個巴士設計嘅時候，我就問「你條路線係咪畀我行先？」咁，即係變咗有個前後嘅問題。所以佢有少少係佢做咗個硬件，然後佢先至落標係搵一個 operator 入嚟做嗰條線。咁所以呢度有少少好似你話，我哋個角色未必喺佢設計時間，佢搵得我哋入去，因為我都未必知道我有機會行呢條巴士線。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）即係話你冇辦法之後要求佢啲額外設施嘅？

李澤昌先生：喺港珠澳大橋，我哋嘗試做咗嘅，但係好多嘢已經係--即係個硬件已經喺度，咁變咗係有啲困難。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提供咗畀委員會唔同嘅會議嘅會議記錄，即係工作小組 3 月--同埋啲訓練、使用科技嗰個記錄係有部分遮蓋咗嘅。响回應嗰個議程，你就有另一個你嘅所謂購物清單，KMB-12，4939 頁。即係話 3 月 13 號就寄咗個議程出去，呢度即刻有個回應，你就利用呢個機會，就寫低或者你哋遇到嘅困難，希望討論嘅。因為呢個有個機會畀你哋可以討論，啱唔啱？

蘇偉基先生：Yes.

李澤昌先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）你要求佢哋睇嘅，就係非法泊車，响巴士站非法上落客貨嘅活動，交通阻塞，呢個比較闊嘅問題。比較具體就係襲擊你哋嗰啲車長，同埋交通黑點。其中呢兩件事，我哋從唔同各個團體收過啲證供，巴士站非法泊車同埋襲擊車長嘅問題。

運輸署嘅回應，4941 頁嘅一封信，2018 年 3 月 26 號嘅一封信，你見到第 2 段咁講嘅，佢就係講緊嗰個工作小組嘅時間有限，同埋要將嗰個報告要三個月內交，同埋有埋嗰個結果，同埋建議。至於話你嗰四個課題，我哋會响個工作小組以外另行處理。

我所以問你嘅問題，就係而家都五個月嘞，呢個問題，巴士站非法泊車、襲擊嗰個巴士車長，有冇處理過？

蘇偉基先生：呢個我可以答一答先，佢頭先講咗三個月，佢就當時個 working group 喺運輸署嘅領導下，focus 就係一啲 bus 嘅 safety belt，同埋一個 bus driver 嘅 training。喺完結咗呢兩個 priority 嘅 agenda，我再去信去運輸署，你會見到喺第 4945 頁嗰度係再次重提呢四件事。

喺第一點，illegal parking。其實正如早幾時嘅會議，彭生都有講，公司都主動地係同警方做一啲嘢，希望喺度做到啲工夫。

第二樣，traffic congestion，我諗大家都理解，真係可以做到嘅嘢真

係不多嘅。

第三樣嘢就係話呢個騷擾車長，我得悉運輸署佢係做緊一個運動，就幾間公交具公司，包括埋巴士公司、鐵路公司，就係宣傳一個叫做乘客禮貌嘅運動，就係開咗兩次嘅會議，我都有啲進展嘅。

第四樣，就係 traffic black spots，咁了解到公司其實三千幾車，任何時間喺個路面嗰度，其實我哋係好熟習個路面嘅，有啲路可能佢嗰個 levelling 唔平，會影響交通意外。或者劃線，會影響交通意外。我哋呢啲其實係久不久就會去信畀運輸署，佢有一個叫做 regional office，運輸署除咗監管我哋之外，個 regional office 仲係睇埋嗰個道路嘅 design 同埋安全。我哋會同佢反映呢啲我哋嘅車長會反映畀我哋聽，我哋前線嘅員工反映畀我哋聽，就會講畀佢聽。

因為佢封信同我哋講，就係話喺呢個 working group 以外處理，所以我都有去信咗運輸署，詳列咗我哋曾經係接近三百個呢啲咁嘅個案去畀佢研究。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢實際上係處理到--即係嗰五個月，處理到巴士站非法泊車？可唔可以就咁答話有處理到，定係冇？

彭樹雄先生：我簡單答你就係 no，即係冇一個好大嘅進展。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何進展，即係佢哋話滋擾、襲擊車長嗰啲，有冇咩嘢處理到？

彭樹雄先生：喺上一次嘅聽證會之後，其實警方亦都主動再聯絡咗我哋，我哋亦都係提交咗過去嗰啲我哋車長被襲擊嗰啲案件，嗰個詳細資料亦都係已經畀咗蒼方。例如我喺上一次嘅聽證會講，我哋有架車喺又一邨就畀四個男子係兩次撳熄我哋嗰個 emergency button，其實聽證會之後，警方亦都主動聯絡咗我哋，亦都係同我哋個車長接觸咗嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個進展就係咁多，係咪呀？

彭樹雄先生：我諗有啲嘢係譬如話違例泊車、交通阻塞，即係好難話係喺咁短時間裏面有一個好大嘅成效。例如正話蘇生講咗，我哋亦都知運輸署會做一個禮貌乘客運動，就希望可以教育啲乘客點樣可以大家互相尊重，我希望呢個長遠係真係幫到整個業界，幫到我哋啲車長。

主席：（經傳譯員）另一件事我想你幫幫手嘅，我畀個例子你，如果係遮蓋咗嘅會議記錄，即係工作小組嘅。工作小組一路都係處理緊訓練，關於安全嘅技術嘅裝置，科技裝置，呢個都係我哋委員會需要關注嘅。我哋要睇嘅嗰個係規管巴士營運嘅制度，呢個係我哋嗰個職權範圍，即係特首畀我哋嘅職權範圍，呢個可以話係--我哋似乎大家同時都係睇緊差唔多嘅課題。

我想你睇番 4926 頁嘅，即係呢個作為一個例子嚟嘅。我哋唔係話好似喺

打仗嘅時候，就係要將啲重要消息或者點樣樣遮蓋咗，就避免敵人得知嗰個情報。呢度我想講，就係話呢度提及嘅，就係為所有嘅乘客座位安裝安全帶，4927頁，半版紙都係塗黑咗，跟住嗰版又係有半版紙都塗黑咗。

我要問一個比較一般嘅廣泛嘅問題，就係話係根據乜嘢準則去將呢一啲部分係塗黑咗、遮蓋咗，究竟背後嘅邏輯係乜？

蘇偉基先生：呢個其實係牽涉到其他嘅巴士公司嘅發言，所以我哋就未有佢同意下，我哋就遮咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話總之係人哋講嘅嘢，你就係塗黑咗佢，你哋自己講嘅說話，你就係唔介意話畀我哋聽，嗰個情況係咪咁？

蘇偉基先生：可以係咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你攞走咗嗰啲就係運輸署所講嘅嘢，或者係城巴、新巴...

蘇偉基先生：Transport Department係冇扠尸，因為我有問過佢。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係主要係呢個城巴？

蘇偉基先生：Citybus係刪去咗，喺我版本嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇問下城巴係咪可以將佢哋講嘅說話扒上去？

蘇偉基先生：我覺得運輸署做呢個角色恰當啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）你回應，就係你冇問過城巴，係咪呀？即係冇問過佢哋，係咪你可以將佢哋所講嘅嘢都係包括在內？如果包括咗，就讓我哋嗰個會議記錄比較全面。

蘇偉基先生：我會後問佢，如果佢準許我，全set交畀委員會。

梁乃鵬博士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，其實主席先生，直接回答，我哋係冇問過城巴或者新巴。我哋冇問佢哋攞同意去將嗰個整份嘅會議記錄交畀你哋睇，對唔住。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該你，梁博士。你而家就會去問下呢個新巴，如果新巴拒絕，話畀我哋聽，我哋咪自己直接問佢哋，因為咁樣都可以慳番墨水。

梁乃鵬博士：唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）最後有一個問題係咁嘅，你哋有問我講過係有四個車廠，九巴有四個車廠，屯門、沙田、荔枝角同埋九龍灣。喺呢四個車廠嗰度，我想問有冇邊一個或者全部都係你哋九巴所擁有，或者你哋嘅附屬公司所擁有？

李澤昌先生：其實喺呢四個車廠裏面，九巴有沙田廠同埋屯門廠係owned by九巴，嗰陣時auction site買番嚟嘅。九龍灣廠係under一個private treaty grant，基本上係畀咗地價係作為一個車廠嘅用途。荔枝角廠係一個

short-term tenancy嘅arrangement with政府嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講話短期，有幾短期？

李澤昌先生：基本上而家包括即係城巴、新巴同九巴都有好多嘅，就係政府係畀筲地方出嚟，係用一個短期租約，佢裏面其實係視乎你個年限幾長、幾短。荔枝角廠今日係每一年automatically續，要交租。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係每年都續期？

李澤昌先生：(Nodded head)

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。鄧大律師，我哋問咗之後，你有冇嘢想跟進？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果得嘅話，我想跟進一下，係講一講女司機，係如果畀嘅話。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，你問。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）之前我哋都有講過係女車長呢件事，之前你哋亦都有進一步嘅資料畀我哋，就話點樣樣去招聘女車長。我想問下，喺女車長嘅數目嗰方面，或者申請人方面個數目，最近有冇大增？

李澤昌先生：而家嗰個女性嘅車長係已經微微超過五個per cent，當然係好視乎個地區性。當然即係喺香港，其實男同女嗰個比例，其實基本上係差唔多一半、一半，我覺得呢個係一個好大嘅空間，所以頭先同歐陽先生講，我哋好想用屯門係一個例子，希望喺嗰個屯門嘅廠裏面可以做啲工夫，亦都Mr Chairman之前都有講過，喺瑞典，我都留意過係有好多歐洲嘅地方都做緊一啲呢啲咁嘅提供nurseries嘅東西，係令到有啲女性嘅車長可以騰空一啲時間，未必係一個全職，但係都有個穩定性嘅時候係一定幫到車長短缺嗰個情況。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）有冇成果，你哋呢方面嘅努力有冇成果？

李澤昌先生：有嘅，因為我自己個人覺得女性車長可能希望喺嗰個穩定性，同埋對客方面，呢個都係公司嚟緊一個方向嚟，我對呢個係寄於厚望。當然係要政府批咗我哋嗰個廠可以做呢個nurseries嘅工作先。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗我問嘅問題比較具體嘅，有冇增加到嗰個申請者嘅數目，即係女性嚟申請？

李澤昌先生：平穩，冇特別向上，冇特別向上。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該。

李澤昌先生：但係好多人問過我。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。唔該晒你，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）李先生，我明白你係想作一個總結嘅發言，喺作證完畢之後，係咪呀，定抑或係梁博士會講？

梁乃鵬博士：（經傳譯員）係，主席先生，主席同埋委員，我係想講㗎。我哋非常感謝你哋畀時間我哋係作證，正如我一開頭嘅時候所講，我哋嚟到你哋嘅席前，我哋以一個謙虛嘅心同埋一個開放嘅態度，我哋係歡迎你哋所提出嘅建議，如果能夠係加強乘客嘅安全。今次呢個經驗，對我哋嚟講係非常有啟發，特別係對我哋嘅管理階層，所以我就會請我哋嘅董事總經理，李澤昌先生就係發言，係總結我哋今日到嚟嘅作證。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你，李先生。

李澤昌先生：首先喺度即係多謝大家，我哋好深深明白到，其實睇到呢段時間，真係香港嘅市民對呢個巴士嘅服務同安全係一個好大、好大嘅期望。亦都雖然你睇到，喺營運方面係有好多、好多嘅挑戰，例如請車長、路面嘅擠塞，呢個社會有好多啲情況發生喺譬如打車長等等嘅嘢，係一個非常大挑戰。我哋都覺得我哋一定係做好我自己嘅工作，係繼續提高、提升我哋嘅服務，特別喺安全方面，我好肯定我哋呢班同事係一定唔會放棄，做得差。

今年 2 月呢個交通意外，大埔公路呢個交通意外，其實對我哋公司上上下下嘅員工嗰個打擊係非常之大，即係甚至乎可以講，唔可以用說話去形容。我哋絕對覺得--即係我個人由嗰日開始到而家，都對呢件事都冇辦法可以忘記呢個日子。我哋絕對係唔會容許，亦都唔會畀呢個意外係會再發生。因為一次已經其實係太過足夠。我哋喺呢個意外之後，我哋真係好承認到自己有好多地方係做得唔足夠，我哋係未停過係喺呢方面改善。

喺呢個聽證會裏面，呢件過程，我哋已經深深感覺到九巴一定要與時並進，要喺呢方面做多啲工夫去提升我哋嘅服務。例如喺我哋個科技方面係要做得全面，同埋係真係喺個準確性，同埋嗰個安全嘅系統係要真係與時並進，做得要更加好。

至於喺車長方面，我哋喺嗰個 management 控制，喺個管理同埋喺嗰個培訓方面係要做得更加要好，喺佢個設施，啱啱頭先講咗休息室同埋佢嗰啲洗手間嘅服務，其實我哋係未停過。

九巴其實喺香港已經服務咗超過八十五年嘅一間巴士公司，根本上我哋係絕對係應該要盡心盡力繼續服務呢個社會。如果我哋嘅員工、我哋嘅乘客要嘅嘢，我哋一定會盡力去做好佢。不過呢度有一點要提及，其實九巴好難係一間公司單方面可以做到，我好希望唔可以缺少各界同埋政府嘅部門嘅支持同配合，先至令到呢啲方面可以有效咁樣去提升個服務。

最後我哋成個團體好感激呢個委員會過去呢段日子，同埋佢未來嘅工作。正如我哋九巴嘅主席喺聽證會之前講過，我哋九巴嘅團隊一定以一個謙虛、誠懇，同埋一個開放嘅態度接受唔同嘅意見，同埋建議，多謝大家。

主席：（經傳譯員）梁博士、李先生，同埋各位先生，感謝你哋係出席咗四日嘅聆訊係提供證供協助我哋，我哋亦都感謝你哋。今日嘅聆訊到此為止，我哋喺星期六就會聽其他嘅證供，希望唔受颱風影響。今日多謝你哋出席。

2018年9月12日

下午3時43分聆訊押後

Saturday, 15 September 2018

(10.01 am)

EXPERT EVIDENCE OF PROF JOHN STANLEY

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Prof Stanley, and welcome to Hong Kong.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for assistance you have already given this committee with the two reports that you provided us with, and thank you for agreeing to come and give us oral evidence so that we can explore the ambit of your report, in particular, of course, its relevance to Hong Kong, with questions which are going to be posed to you, at least in the first place, by counsel Mr Derek Chan, and I ask him to begin that questioning.

Mr Chan.

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Good morning, Mr Stanley. Can I start by asking you a few matters by way of background and start by asking questions about your own background by going firstly to your curriculum vitae which is at page 107 of our expert bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: We see in your CV that you started your career in 1969, and in 1980 to 1999 you were the

principal of John Stanley & Associates Pte Ltd.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you tell us a bit about the work that your company did during that period?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan. We did a lot of consulting/advisory work in particular to governments at the federal level in Australia, but also at the state level, in particular in the transport space, for example the National Road strategy, the Victorian government's contribution to projects like that. We have undertaken reviews of ports in Tazmania for the Tazmanian government, work also for a range of local authorities, local councils, about their road systems, not too much work to that point about public transport. Until about the early 1990s, I was primarily in the road space in terms of transport. So I worked for the federal government earlier on in that road area and did a lot of consulting work around road economics in particular.

MR DEREK CHAN: And in 1991 to 1999, you were the deputy chairman of the National Road Transport Commission, and in 1999 to 2008, you were the executive director of the Bus Association Victoria.

Can you tell us a bit about what you did there?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The National Road Transport Commission was set up in 1991 as one of the primary

initiatives in the microeconomic reform in programme in Australia to try and improve the productivity, safety and environmental performance of road transport in Australia. Those responsibilities are in fact state government responsibilities, so that the states got together with the federal government to set up this commission to propose nationally consistent laws for everything essentially that happened on top of the road system. So that was things like mass limits, it was things like driving hour regulations and loading regulations and law as well. Fatigue was an important part of that, fatigue management.

Then the Bus Association, I had several roles there. I was obviously, in a formal sense, to represent my members, of whom there were 500, who held together at that time contracts with the state government to a worth of around about A$900 million a year. So I was the primary person responsible for negotiating their contracts with the state government.

As part of that process -- and this is a point I made in the submissions -- the bus industry receives considerable subsidy from the state government in Victoria, so a lot of the work I did as executive director was on trying to identify the value of public transport in general, but buses in particular, to the

Victorian community. So that involved work, for example, on trying to look at the role that buses play in social inclusion, and in fact I work very closely with my wife, Prof Janet Stanley, who is here today also, in that area; congestion reduction, the roles that buses can play there; the roles that buses can play in terms of improved environmental outcomes. These are really important positions to develop, in the policy sense, when you are going to government, looking for so much support.

We also had a range of businesses that we did in the association, and for example one of those businesses operated at arm's length is Road Safety Inspections, which is the largest bus tester in Victoria, bus testing since about the 1980s has in fact been a privatised industry in Victoria. The association actually took over the state government's previous vehicle inspection and testing business, and so we were the biggest bus tester and, in fact, remain so today.

CHAIRMAN: Who are the members of the bus association?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, they are essentially operators, Chairman, so they are route bus operators in Melbourne and regional Victoria, as they are school bus operators. In fact, the largest number of them, primarily because they tend to have only a small number of vehicles each,

are school bus operators, but they are also charter and tour operators. So we cover the whole range of those market areas. The largest contract values are far and away, though, in the route service area.

CHAIRMAN: How many such members are there?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There were at the time over 500. The number has come down a bit since I left them, because there's a fair bit of consolidation going on among some of the businesses.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us an idea of the size of the staff of the association?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: The staff -- the association had 50 staff when I finished my time, and that included, for example, about 10 or 12 staff in the vehicle inspection company. We had a range of people employed at the time also as ticket inspectors, so we had our own ticket inspectors; the state government provided us money to employ ticket inspectors to work on buses. We had a little marketing group as well and a group who looked after member servicing, so they spent a lot of time talking to members and looking at contract issues they may have had with the government or with the Public Transport Victoria, which is the government's responsible organisation for programme delivery.

CHAIRMAN: And who in Victoria are the beneficiaries of the

fares received by the bus companies?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: The fares are collected by government, go to government.

CHAIRMAN: So this was ticket inspection on behalf of government as the recipient of the revenue?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, you mentioned, during your role in the National Road Transport Commission, you were involved in driving hour regulations.

Did those driving hour regulations relate to heavy vehicles?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They did. The ambit of responsibility of the National Road Transport Commission was vehicles of 4.5 tonnes and above, so it was essentially heavy vehicles, and the freight side of the business, trucks if you like, was much more dominant than bus. So the truck agenda tended to dominate the work of the commission.

But in the process, the bus agenda got very much linked to it, and one of the major issues in Australia at that time was the distance between the major capital cities, Melbourne and Sydney, Sydney and Brisbane, required, if a truck was going to do it in one sitting, fairly long driving hours. So the issue of what is

an acceptable length of drive and what kind of rest provisions are needed for trucks became really important in that process. But buses got vacuumed up in it at the same time.

CHAIRMAN: Was this commission a federal commission?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It was a national commission, so it was established under federal legislation, but, if you like, the people we were responsible reporting to were the federal minister and all the state ministers.

So, Chairman, in my eight years on that board, I had 45 different ministers that I reported to.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, in 2008 you became an adjunct professor and a Bus Industry Confederation senior research fellow in sustainable land transport, Institute of Transport and Logistic Studies, the University of Sydney.

Did that post involve touchings in public transport or bus-related topics?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It involved -- I taught the final unit in the masters programme in transport management. The institute is one of the top-rated transport institutes in the world, and we run a number of master's programmes, and at that time I taught the final subject that everybody had to do, and then taught transport

policy as well, and the transport policy involved a lot of bus policy work.

MR DEREK CHAN: And, in 2012 to 2016, you were a member of the Ministerial Advisory Council advising Victoria's planning ministers in two governments on long-term Melbourne metropolitan planning strategy. I assume that involved transport planning as well?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Not as much as it should have. The main focus in that work was in fact on land use planning. The intention -- and in fact this is mentioned also in the first report I did -- we had a 2010 Transport Integration Act in Victoria that requires government to produce an integrated land use transport plan. Six of us were appointed by the planning minister to form a ministerial advisory council and advise him on what Victoria's long-term land use plan should be, and that included some work on transport strategy. I have to say I tried to write a transport strategy in that, but it was taken out three times, so for some reason the government did not want to include a transport strategy within the long-term land use planning strategy. There was a change in government in the middle of that period, and the new government appointed us again to continue doing our work.

MR DEREK CHAN: You list out a number of directorships at

the bottom of page 107.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you please tell us which one of these directorships are relevant to transport or bus policies?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The work -- when I was Commissioner of the Victorian State Services Authority, the government of Victoria gave me that appointment to look at the governance arrangements in land transport between roads and public transport. So I produced a report for the government, recommending new governance arrangements between public transport and the road authority at that time.

Metlink was the public transport marketing body for Victoria's tram, train and bus systems, at the time that I was in that role there. So we produced system-level marketing campaigns to promote, if you like, the brand of public transport, and the individual operators did their own campaigns as well.

At that same time, I was on the board of the public transport ombudsman representing bus, where complaints from dissatisfied customers, if they are not adequately dealt with by the operators, get sent to the ombudsman. So there was a role there as well. And --

MR DEREK CHAN: Excuse me, how long were you in that role as public transport ombudsman?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm guessing a bit, but I think about four years.

MR DEREK CHAN: Between which years, approximately?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Between about 2000 -- sorry, 2008 it would have finished, so 2004 to 2008.

MR DEREK CHAN: Sorry, I interrupted you; please continue.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's okay. I'm currently on the board of Road Safety Inspections, which as I indicated earlier is a bus testing company which is run at arm's length from the Bus Association to conduct the annual inspection that all heavy vehicles, or buses in particular, have to go through. We do about 5,000 of those inspections a year, which is around about 75 per cent of the relevant bus fleet in Australia.

CHAIRMAN: Is that in respect of the mechanical side of buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It is, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: How long have you been a board member of that company?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That would be about seven years.

MR DEREK CHAN: Seven years counting from today, counting back from today?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just going to page 108, where you list out across several pages a number of reports, articles,

journals, books or book chapters, in which you have written or contributed towards. I don't intend to go through all of them, because there are quite a few, but can you perhaps point out a few as examples that relate to bus policies?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Sure. If you look -- there are mainly two or three particular topic areas. The first one is a number of papers there are around, for example, the value of public transport. So the book that Prof Janet Stanley and I wrote with Prof Hanson came out about a year or two ago, which is called "How Great Cities Happen", which is "2017 books", that includes quite a lot in it about public transport and the role that public transport can play.

The issue of -- the next paper that appears under that, "Getting the Prices Right", which is here, also includes work on public transport policy.

If you scroll down further, you will see reports for 2017, "Moving People: Solutions for Policy Thinkers -- Improved public transport services supporting city productivity growth". We have done quite a lot of research on what role does public transport play in enabling a city to be productive. So there are a number of papers through here in that particular topic.

The journal articles: 2016, Stanley J and Levinson,

"Workshop 3 report: Sustainable funding sources" -- this is a report of a workshop from a conference that was held about three years ago, a conference series called the Thredbo conference series which is held every second year internationally, and the main topic of that conference is competition and regulation in public transport. I'm a member of a group of about eight who chair workshops as part of that conference series. So that particular workshop, and in fact another one that I've just published an article that will be available in the next couple of weeks, looks at what are the benefits of public transport and how can you turn those benefits into monetary flows to help fund services. So there are quite a few services in that particular space.

Two underneath that, you will see, "Moving People: Solutions for Policy Thinkers -- National Guidelines: Bus services procurement and bus service contracts". That is a paper that explores in some depth the sorts of issues involved in deciding on bus contracting regimes. It talks about questions, for example, of competitive tendering versus negotiation, which one of the issues I referred to in the report. It looks at things like contract length, KPIs that you might see in contracts as well.

The next one, "Equity in Transport", focuses very

much on the role that public transport plays in social inclusion in contributing to a fairer society.

If we continue going on down, the next one, "Reports", 2015, at the top of the page, "Moving People: Solutions for Policy Thinkers -- Connecting Neighbourhoods". One of the ideas that we came up in the land use strategy work for Melbourne was trying to shape the city in such a way that everybody could live within 20 minutes' access to most of the things you need for a good life by walking, cycling or public transport. We are a very car-dependent city. This was is about to try to reshape the land use in the city to enable public transport to play a bigger role.

The next paper talks about the role of public transport, in particular in promoting better development densities in middle suburbs of Australian cities. The report after that looks at governance arrangements which includes how you integrate transport and land use in the government sense.

In 2014, my book called, "Introduction to Transport Policy", has quite an extensive discussion of public transport issues in that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps can I summarise in this way: many of the articles concern issues of policy?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Particularly policy, but policy has been

my main focus, and strategic planning to help implement that policy.

MR DEREK CHAN: Having regard to your background, the various posts that you have had, the articles that you have written and the research that you have done, how would you describe your area of expertise?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: In terms of the subject matter of this particular hearing --

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: -- I think the expertise I would most bring to this question is issues of public transport governance and policy in a context of governance for integrated urban planning and transport planning, so it's really positioning public transport in a wider setting.

Then, when you think about bus, it's really governance and institutional arrangements with respect to bus service delivery and planning for that delivery and policy arrangements that are going to make it happen to enable bus, if you like, to best achieve the goals that government has for society. That's really the level I tend to operate, rather than vehicle operations. It's really the role that these modes play in terms of delivering value for society and how can you set up your governance arrangements, your institutional

arrangements, to maximise that value.

MR DEREK CHAN: And I think you have fairly stated in your second report, at the start of it -- perhaps I will just give the reference to the committee. That's page 56 of the expert bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I'm looking at page 56, about the third full paragraph down, so that's just past the middle of the page.

Professor, you have fairly accepted there that you are not an expert in bus operation, but have expertise in matters to do with the institutional --

CHAIRMAN: Would you read out what you are referring to?

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm sorry, I'm reading from --

CHAIRMAN: Just read out the relevant part.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. You say, at this part of your report, that you are not an expert in bus operation but have expertise in matters to do with the institutional environment within which bus operates and how this can impact performance.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Professor. Unless you've got anything to add to the background employment, I will next introduce the background of the brief, which you

had been provided with, in writing these two reports.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: For that purpose, can I please take you to the expert bundle at page 4 where -- it's on the screen -- at the second full paragraph of page 4, you set out the task with which you have been provided in writing these two reports.

In the first bullet point, you were asked to describe the operations and management of the bus system in Melbourne together with the regulatory and governance arrangements, in particular with regard to the monitoring of bus safety. So that's the first task, and I believe that's covered by your first report which has been included in the expert bundle.

In the second bullet point, you were asked:

"Having been provided with such information about the franchised bus services of Hong Kong, if so required, to summarise the system and, having regard to the bus system in Melbourne, give an opinion of the adequacy of the regulatory and monitoring systems in Hong Kong, making recommendations as to any changes to those systems, as in your opinion, are warranted to enhance the safety of the franchised bus system in Hong Kong".

I believe that's included in your second report,

which has also been is included in this bundle.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I start then with some simple practical comparisons between the bus system in Melbourne and the bus system in Hong Kong. Can I perhaps start with page 5 of that same report, in the same expert bundle.

The first point of difference is the population of Melbourne and Hong Kong. I can see that you state in the first paragraph of page 5 that Melbourne has a population of 4.8 million in 2017, and in the second paragraph you say that Melbourne is a relatively low-density city.

Do I understand that to mean there's a metropolitan area and a large suburban area?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: We would call the whole lot a metropolitan area. The function of the outer parts is very suburban, yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And in terms of annual bus trips in Melbourne, we can pick that up at the fourth full paragraph of that page, that's towards the bottom of the page, where you say this:

"Victorian government budget papers ... indicate that Melbourne's trains currently have around 240 million passenger boardings annually, trams 205 million and buses 120 million, giving a total ...

metropolitan public transport task of about 565 million annual boardings."

So the bus takes up about 21 per cent of public transport trips annually.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: I think, just to put that figure by way of contrast to the Hong Kong context, we have about 1.4 billion annual bus trips.?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: About one month. Melbourne is about one month of Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we get the 1.4 billion figure from, Mr Chan?

MR DEREK CHAN: That's from the aggregate figures provided by the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: In which submission?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I will come back to the committee with a reference for that figure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps a quick reference to that would be at page 58 of the expert bundle, which is the first part of your second report.

It may be convenient, Professor, to have the expert bundle in front of you, because I will be going to it repeatedly, basically nonstop throughout the day.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I have a very good helper here.

MR DEREK CHAN: At page 58 of the bundle, which is the start of your second report, in the middle of the first paragraph, you say:

"The Hong Kong Public Transport Strategy Study -- July 2017 ... describes the role performed by each public transport mode within the public transport system and the passenger tasks involved. It notes that the public transport system caters for 12 million passenger trips daily, of which franchised bus services carry just over 4 million ..."

And that's per day.

Mr Chairman, I will give the committee another reference a bit later, but 4 million times daily for a year would be about 1.4 billion trips annually.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, roughly how many buses are operating in Melbourne?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: About 1,700 as part of the route service.

CHAIRMAN: How is the term "route service" defined?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: These are contracted services that provide regular, scheduled -- daily, essentially -- service that's determined by the state government and laid down in the operator's contract.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So it would not include school buses, coaches --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It doesn't include coaches and it doesn't include dedicated school buses, but schoolchildren often travel on the route services.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Just by way of general comparison, can I then talk about the contractual framework under which the Melbourne buses operate, to contrast that with Hong Kong. For that, can I please take you to page 7 of the expert bundle. The third full paragraph of the page, which is close to the bottom, you say there:

"Current route bus services in Melbourne are a mix of competitively tendered services (about a third of the network) and negotiated services, the former being the previously government-provided services and the latter those started by private operators (including extensions/additions to those services)."?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct, Mr Chan. There's also, in the services that are competitively tendered, an element which is called the SmartBus system, which is a system of a couple of circumferential services that provide long-distance trunk services around the middle suburbs of Melbourne. So they are also part of the tendered regime, but they are a small part of it.

MR DEREK CHAN: Right. So I take it a third of the

contracts are competitively tendered and two-thirds of the contracts are negotiated services?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, it's not contracts. There's actually one contract that's competitively tendered. That's about a third of the task.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps you can give us a very general description of how that competitive tender process works.?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, sure. I have to say, as an introduction to this, that I was not part of that competitive tendering process, so I don't know the contract in detail. The roles that I've had in contract negotiation in detail have been the negotiated contracts, which are the two-thirds rather than the one-third.

However, the general process, as you ask for, is that the government would invite people to express interest in submitting a tender for a service, and the government would nominate what it was looking for in terms of those services, the kinds of routes that are going to be involved, the frequency, if you like. It would lay down the timetable and invite operators to put in a price that they would require in terms of, if I use the word, subsidy, to provide those services. So then it becomes a case of the operators who are bidding,

bidding, if you like, the lowest price to government.

Now, government may also take things other than price into account. It might take what it thinks is the operator's capacity to provide a good service into account as well. But that's essentially a bid to run a series of services across a spatial area. So they are essentially area-based services, apart from those couple of circumferential trunk route services that I talked about.

CHAIRMAN: Apart from the routes, presumably the government would stipulate the schedule that it wishes the service to be provided?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chairman. Frequency, the headways, and so on, and start/finish times, yes.

And then government gets the fare revenue and the government assumes profit risk but --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on to that detail, perhaps I could ask this: how many routes are tendered on how many different occasions?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Only one tender, and that's for a large number of routes together. So it's in fact a franchise area, if you like, a contract area, and all the routes that are in that area. So it's a fairly large chunk of Melbourne, given it's one-third of the routes in total. I wouldn't know the absolute number of routes involved,

it could be a couple of hundred or more. But it's essentially area-based.

CHAIRMAN: And over what period of time is the franchise, if one uses that term, awarded?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, they are mostly seven years. The negotiated contracts have been ten; they come back to seven under the new contracts that are starting in about --

CHAIRMAN: So the government offers one contract. Does it receive multiple bids and then accept multiple bus operators, or does it --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Just a single operator, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Single?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MEMBER LO: What is the difference between negotiated and tendered? Who negotiates with whom and how?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The negotiated contracts essentially relate to services that were started by the private sector, often 50, 60, 70 years ago, and for a long time ran out of the fare box, as yours still do, but in around about 1970 that ceased, and there was a requirement for service subsidies to come in at that time.

There has been negotiation, though, between the operator, at the start of those services, and government

to continue providing those services throughout the process. Now, government at one stage tried to take on the operators who have those negotiated contracts and put their services out to competitive tender. That ended up in the Australian Federal Court and the operators actually won, probably more to do with an issue of legal detail than much else.

But negotiation is still the way those contracts are dealt with, but each time they are dealt with, the contract is silent about what will happen at the end of the contract period. So the next lot of contracts that have just started now are seven-year contracts, they are silent. Then what happens at the end of that seven-year period, the industry could confidently believe they would sit down for another negotiation. The government probably wouldn't agree with that.

MEMBER LO: So the negotiation would involve changing the operator at the end or not?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No. It essentially involves determining a price to provide those services, and agreeing on, for example, key performance indicators that will lead to incentive and penalty clauses that will be in those contracts. Also things like driver training is a provision of those contracts as well.

CHAIRMAN: When you say the essential factor being

negotiated is price, that is the price that the government will pay the bus company to run the service, the subsidy?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, correct. Essentially, it's the total cost of the service. The government actually pays the total cost to the operator --

CHAIRMAN: Because the government keeps the revenue in the fare box?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct. So there's a process that's gone through which actually involves benchmarking, quite detailed benchmarking, of operator costs across all the operators, to try and identify, if you like, whether there are outliers in some particular areas, whether particular operators are low-cost or very high-cost. That leads to a discussion about what would be a reasonable band for those costs to fall within, and operators sometimes have their remuneration reduced because they look like they are too expensive relative to their peers.

CHAIRMAN: Are there occasions when agreement is not reached with the incumbent operator and the service then is offered to other operators or not?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm not aware of any such instances so far, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: And this is a system that has been developed

since the 1970s?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Well, there's been a subsidy since the 1970s. The focus on the negotiated contracts, probably 30 or 40 years. I'm not aware of the history of the 1970/early 1980s period, but it's certainly been going since the early 1980s, the way I've described it to you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: In terms of the competitive tendering contractor, who is the current bus operator in Melbourne that won the competitive tendering?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It will come to me. Just give me -- Transdev, which is a French company.

CHAIRMAN: Could you spell that for me?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: T-R-A-N-S-D-E-V.

MR DEREK CHAN: And how long has that operator been operating the competitive tender part of the system, bus system?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They have -- they have held it once. So the contract was held by another company before that, called Ventura.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you spell that as well?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: V-E-N-T-U-R-A, was the previous holder of the competitive contract, then Transdev won the tender the last time that came around, and I think that comes up again in the next 12 or 18 months.

MR DEREK CHAN: So the competitive tendering process actually resulted in a change in the operator?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed.

CHAIRMAN: You describe Transdev as being a French company.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do they operate bus services elsewhere in the world?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, a huge number in France, Chairman, and they also I think operate services in other parts of Australia as well.

MR DEREK CHAN: We have talked about one change in operator. Have there been many changes -- talking about the competitive tendering part -- in the operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There have. If I can just go back. In about 1998, I think Melbourne was the first city in the world to privatise its train service. In fact we put the train, tram and the competitive one-third of bus routes that I've talked about before -- they all got put out for tender at the same time. There were two tenders let for train, two for tram, and one for bus. One British company called National Express, one of the train contracts, one of the tram contracts and the bus contract, they surrendered that contract within about three years, so that contract changed at that time, and the holder of the other train and tram contract then got

full train and tram service at that time.

So we have had two changes in the operators.

CHAIRMAN: So who got the bus contract in 1998?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That was National Express. They won that contract in 1998.

CHAIRMAN: Was that a seven-year contract?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I don't remember, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Was Ventura the successor?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I would need to come back to you on that, what time they took on that contract.

CHAIRMAN: So you have identified for us three different contractors for the bus tender.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Transdev, Ventura and National Express?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Might there be a fourth?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There might be something between National Express and Ventura, which probably was other operators taking over those services after National Express fell through until it could be reconstituted for a tender. But I will come back to you on that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you could.

Am I understanding you correctly to say that National Express services didn't run the length of the contract; they fell out prematurely, is that the point?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, indeed. I think --

CHAIRMAN: Then someone took over?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, correct. I think there was a feeling that -- and we will probably come to this later, Mr Chan -- one of the challenges of competitive tendering is that sometimes it encourages operators to go in too low with their bid, perhaps hoping they can encourage government to negotiate the price upwards later on. In the case of the National Express rail one -- one of my papers I wrote earlier on was about this situation -- they did have one upward negotiation in their remuneration with government, but only one, and that's when they decided that they weren't going to continue.

CHAIRMAN: But all events -- as far as the bus contract was concerned, there was no successful negotiation that resulted in National Express staying on?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No.

CHAIRMAN: They pulled out of the contract?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, in relation to the reference for the 4 million bus trips per day in Hong Kong, which works out to about 1.4 billion bus trips per year.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: That would be at THB-2 at page 103.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: That's a figure as of December 2017.

Professor, that's the competitive tendering side of it.

Can I then move briefly to the negotiated contract.

CHAIRMAN: Before we leave the competitive tendering side of it, what are the key features of the competitive tendering contract?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think it's to do with incentive and penalty clauses, but as I said, Chairman, I wasn't part of that negotiation process, so I can't express an opinion on the detail of what those incentive and penalty clauses are.

CHAIRMAN: Are these documents not made public?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They tend to be heavily redacted when they are.

MR DEREK CHAN: So you can't say, or can you, whether those penalty and incentive clauses are related to safety performance or not?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I would expect that they aren't. I think it's pretty unusual to have incentive and penalty clauses that relate to safety. That's unfortunate, but they aren't in an Australian setting, to the best of my knowledge, in the operator, certainly

not in Victoria, clauses that relate safety as one of the incentive/penalty components.

MR DEREK CHAN: So I assume it would relate to performance indicators more than specific --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They very much seem to relate to operational performance, things like on-time running, service cancellations, they tend to be where most of the public transport systems around the world put their focus, sometimes also on customer satisfaction survey results, what customers think of the services. They tend to be the elements you see in those incentive and penalty clauses.

MR DEREK CHAN: Sorry, I think I might have interrupted you. You were responding to the question from the chairman about the key terms of the competitive tendering contract.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I'm saying that the main focus is -- I think otherwise, on most of the elements, the contracts are not vastly different between competitive tendering and negotiation. I think it's really just a matter of how that right to operate is provided. A lot of the detail of the contracts is fairly similar between the two.

CHAIRMAN: And the negotiated contracts are lengthy compared with the franchise agreements of Hong Kong? I think you

have made that point.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They are unbelievably long, Chairman. My recollection is that I think the Hong Kong franchise agreements are 31 or 32 pages. The comparable Melbourne negotiated contract is 160 pages, plus a bunch of schedules as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you. Professor, I think you have talked a lot about negotiated contracts, but perhaps I can just go through a couple of things, perhaps by way of summary.

You have mentioned that the negotiated contracts would be quite similar to the competitive tender contract.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I just confirm that under these negotiated contracts, it's also the government who collects the fares?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: And the operator is basically paid to run the service?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct. The contracts are what we call gross-cost-plus contracts, so they are gross cost contracts, but they do have incentive and penalty clauses as well. So the operator gets paid an agreed

amount to run the service, but then there's an at-risk component that's tied up in those incentive and penalty clauses, which is not huge but, relative to the margins on the contract, it's enough to make you focus on achievement.

CHAIRMAN: Can you estimate, if you can, the percentage of the variable?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chairman. There are essentially two main components that are operative in this space at the moment. The first one is a patronage incentive, and in a sense that's only got upside. So if an operator grows patronage faster than a benchmarked rate, then they are entitled to a patronage incentive.

Then there's an operational performance regime which covers, as I said before, things like on-time running, service cancellations. You put those sorts of things together, you are talking about 2 or 3 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: That's the benefit side of it?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's the kind of swinging margin.

CHAIRMAN: So benefit and penalty?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. So you could go up by that or down by about that. So it's not huge, but contracts like this probably have margins of around about 10 per cent on them.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Approximately how many operators would there be under this negotiated contract system?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There are 15 contracts and 12 operators. When I was negotiating the contracts, about ten or so years ago, there were a lot more; there were about 26 then. So there's been consolidation in the last decade.

CHAIRMAN: How has consolidation occurred?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It's essentially occurred through operators buying out other operators. So one of the companies that I talk about a little bit in this paper is a company called ComfortDelGro Cabcharge, CDC, who operate also in Singapore, for example, and I think in London as well. They have bought a substantial share of the market. Ventura, whose name I mentioned before, have absorbed another very large company in Melbourne as well. Some of the smaller companies have been taken over by slightly larger ones. So we have seen about half of the operators disappear in the last decade, and I expect we will see some continuing contraction.

MR DEREK CHAN: From a policy perspective, can you attribute a purpose or reason to the expectation that there will be market contraction amongst the number of operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I think that it does create benefits to particular companies in terms of cost base. Some getting a little bit larger can help you with your

cost base, some of these operators have been quite small and some of the larger ones are keen on buying market share, they are really after a substantial share of the market where they can give them a chance to grow their business further.

MR DEREK CHAN: When you talk about creating benefits, do I understand that to be benefits in economies of scale?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. There's also a part of it, Chairman, that -- these are family companies, and sometimes the next generation don't want to continue on in the business. We had an interesting example a few years ago where the Grenda Corporation, who are one of the two or three largest bus operators in Melbourne, a couple of generations in the family, the next generation decided they didn't want to continue in the business, so they sold the business, and in fact in that sale process they gave one-third of the revenue to their staff, which was an amazingly generous thing to do.

CHAIRMAN: So, as an overview, 1,700 franchised buses in Melbourne, the pie is divided up one-third to the current successful operator, Transdev?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Transdev.

CHAIRMAN: Then the other two-thirds are divided up by 12 operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So what is the largest number of buses that any one operator operates?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There would be about 500.

CHAIRMAN: About 500?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRMAN: Would that be Transdev?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Transdev would probably have 500, and I suspect that Ventura would have sort of around 300 or 400 as well. CDC would have a large number, around about 400. I can get those numbers back to you.

CHAIRMAN: So if the tendered process takes up 500, that leaves 1,200 to be divided by the 12 operators, and from what you are saying, two of them occupy most of those bus --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: In fact, three of them would account for a very large proportion of that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Professor, can you give us some idea about the size of the smaller one, how many buses a small operator would have?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm thinking around 30 to 40, but there would only be one or two.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: 30 to 40 buses only?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the Melbourne context, what happens to the infrastructure -- the buses, the depots, the repair facilities -- when one contractor moves on to the next contractor as a result of the competitive tendering process?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Sure. The contract specifies how those assets need to be handled in the process, and in fact that also applies for the negotiated contracts. So holding the depots in particular puts you in a very powerful position as a bus operator. It's very hard to build a new depot, particularly in highly built-up areas.

But one of the ways -- government is concerned about this, because government wants the opportunity to make sure there is some competition in the process, and it's hard to get competition if you've got a negotiated contract. But given that the operators, with the negotiated contracts, have a little bit of concern about whether their services might at some point be put out to tender, they have agreed with government to a process whereby their assets -- and the same thing applies for the competitively tendered ones -- are made available to a successor operator on particular terms.

MR DEREK CHAN: Basically, the old operator sells the infrastructure to the new operator?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Including the buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So the depots, the bus stations, the buses themselves?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So that's what would have happened with National Express and Ventura and the other one?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct. The three. They just change the logo on the buses.

MR DEREK CHAN: In general terms -- and my question covers both the competitive tendering part and the negotiated contract part -- does the fare revenue that the government receives cover the cost of running the bus routes?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It covers probably in the order of 20 per cent plus. So it's around about a dollar in five or a little bit better than that.

Now, if fare concessions were added, that government requires the operators to give fare concessions to certain sorts of customers, and if the government compensated the operators specifically for that, it might get up to 30 per cent, but fare box recovery, as it is, off the top, sort of just low 20s or 20 per cent.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, in that context, the bus operations are

heavily subsidised by the government?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They are. In fact, one of the reasons why, when I was running the association, we put a lot of effort into defining or trying to measure the value that the community got from those services. In fact, in the paper that I wrote with my colleague, Prof Hensher, I estimated that the value of Melbourne's route bus services to the Melbourne society, Melbourne community, is about ten times the financial cost recovery rate.

The main benefits are particularly social inclusion. In other words, if you didn't have those buses, particularly in the outer suburbs -- and Melbourne has very extensive low-density outer suburbs that are growing very fast -- if you didn't have those bus services, a lot of those people would not be able to participate in the range of activities that our society makes available. We have estimated that alone is worth more than the cost of the bus services. And the bus services are also a very significant contributor to congestion reduction. Those two benefits in particular are more than double the cost of the subsidy.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's an economic justification to giving subsidy to those services?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Precisely, Mr Chan, yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Would it be fair to say that this subsidy

part would be a big point of difference between Hong Kong and Melbourne, in the sense that in Hong Kong, the operators keep the fares and they run the profit risk of patronage?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They are a huge difference. I guess the corollary of that is probably Melbourne knows what the societal worth of its bus services is, but Hong Kong doesn't, because we have done the exercise, because we have needed to do to say what it is that we are doing for society that should make it worthwhile for government to think about paying so much money. I would think, if there's a really useful exercise to be done in Hong Kong, it's trying to define more precisely and measure the value to the Hong Kong society of the bus services that are provided.

CHAIRMAN: But Hong Kong operates a "use pay" system that works?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It does indeed, Chairman, but there are also other people who benefit from the services and other people who incur costs.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: For example, the subject of the inquiry is safety, and safety is a major externality of transport operations. So, if you have an interest in externalities, as I do, then trying to understand the

benefits and the costs that are associated with providing bus services, and if you had, for example, half the people who are travelling on the franchised buses every day getting in cars instead, you would have much poorer safety outcomes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So those sorts of things, I think, need to be understood.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Hong Kong model work simply because of the number of people who use our buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I would have said yes, Chairman, and the density that supports that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, can I move on to a related topic, but the focus a little bit different, and under this topic I want to discuss with you the advantages and disadvantages between competitive tendering and negotiated contracts. So I want to assess not necessarily which is better --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Sure.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- but the good and bad of each system, if I can use that term.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I start that topic by taking you to

page 20 of the expert bundle, which will be your first report.

Excuse me, Mr Chairman, that may be a wrong reference.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Take your time.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm sorry, Mr Chairman, it ought to be at page 20 of your second report, which is at page 73 of the expert bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: On page 73, the topic that you are discussing there is the franchises and the method of allocating the rights for service provision.

If I can draw your attention to the second paragraph from the bottom, starting with the word "However" -- I will just read it out:

"However, Melbourne also tendered about one-third of its route bus services, which adds an element of performance pressure to the whole route bus system, both tendered and negotiated. The tendering element has the effect of creating a lingering concern among incumbent operators with negotiated contracts that their services are not guaranteed: there is always a risk that their services might be tendered if they do not perform. The absence of tendering in Hong Kong for the last two decades suggests that this risk is likely to be lower in

Hong Kong than in Melbourne."

So that's the where you deal with the advantage of competitive tendering.

Can I also, in the same vein, take you to a second reference.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, you identify this as a risk, but it's a risk that is not eventuated: no incumbent negotiated contract operator has lost its contract.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I think there are two ways of looking at this, Chair. One is the risk in terms of the pressure on the costs of providing the service. The real point of competitive tendering is to sharpen the pencil in terms of what the costs are for running services, and the people who've -- the jurisdictions around the world that have gone into competitive tendering, it's almost always where you have had a government providing the service, not a private company, and the government has decided that it can't afford the cost, subsidy, if you like, to continue those services, and so it's said, "Let's see if we can get this done more cheaply by going out to tender." And the international evidence I think is that competitive tendering, if you are putting a private operator in to replace a public operator, tends to give you savings between 10 and 50 per cent.

Now, if you've got a private operator who's already operating, and operating commercially in a viable way, the rights to operate are very valuable. The government has essentially given that operator a free run in terms of a market area on which they can earn a return by providing a good service. It may well be, if they tendered, that somebody would pay the government some money to actually have the right to run that service.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: This is pretty unusual, Hong Kong. There aren't many places where you could mount that argument, but I think it's the case here. Because your services are so successful, in that commercial sense, at the end of the day, it's the government that has given the operator the right to run a service and make a profit, and it's a possibility that if that was a contested service, the price would be lower and an operator might pay the government some money to provide the service.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The second reference to the issue of performance pressure arising from tendering is at page 87 of the expert bundle. The relevant paragraph is at the top of that page. I will just read it out:

"Melbourne's route bus operators seem likely to be

under relatively greater performance pressure than Hong Kong's franchised bus operators because of: (1) the ever-present threat of competitive tendering in Melbourne, in the event of unsatisfactory operator performance; (2) the inclusion of specific (albeit small) incentive/penalty provisions in contract remuneration arrangements; and, most importantly from a safety perspective, (3) the existence of safety duties ..."

I'm going to explore with you the second and third part a bit later, but the first part refers to the benefits from the existence of competitive tendering in Melbourne.

To some extent, you have explained bits of it already, but can I test with you the concept of competitive tendering and how that fits within the Hong Kong environment where the bus operators collect the fares and assumes the profit risk from the provision of route bus services. I think you have already started on that topic during your previous answer to the chairman.

I understand there are a number of options available, but perhaps I can get you to explain some of those options. So you have talked already about -- because the route bus operator collects the profit from

patronage, and that's valuable, so you have talked about the possibility of a contractor or bidder actually paying the government a sum for the right to operate this franchised area or franchised bus routes.

What about the option of no bidding price, so the government opens up the right to run a certain franchise area? What would be the bidding be based upon then, if there's no price?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm not sure if I'm understanding you precisely, but let me answer what I think you are asking. If the government is going to do that, it would say, "Okay, in area X we are going to get rid of all existing franchises for that and we are going to invite anybody who wants to provide a service to put in a bid to provide a service for that area."

Now, the bid might be to provide a particular timetable, as we talked about before, Chairman, where the government might specify fully what it wants the services to look like, and then it invites an operator to bid for that service. Now, you would expect those bids would be pretty low, you know, in the sense of it's not going to cost the government a lot of money, in that sense. But the real issue is, I think, can the government make some money out of it; will an operator be prepared to accept a lower return, for example, than

he might be getting at the moment, and transfer some of that margin back to the government, to hold the right to run that service?

I think, in the evidence you have received from London, they talk about quite low margins on the services there because of the competitive tendering process, and I think the way London do it, they have relatively small contracts, they have short contracts, and they have performance pressure coming through that, and that pushes the returns down. So an operator might say, "I'm prepared to put in a bid, I'm not going to drop my margin", so they would put in a particular price. Another operator might think, "I'm prepared to pay the government some money for this contract because I think I can make money out of it and so can the government."

I think it's hard to know how that would go, but -- and let me be clear, I'm not saying Hong Kong should competitively tender. I wouldn't say that at all. But if you wanted to hypothetically think how might you do, then what I would do is I would pick a number of routes and I would actually choose some routes and I would deal with them. I would put some routes out to competitive tender. Now, it would be a fairly messy process in terms of assets and buses that need to get dealt, I mean

how you deal with the equity that's invested in those sorts of assets; it could be a very difficult thing to do, but presumably in principle you could do it, for a price. Then it's up to how big you want that area and how many routes you want to think about putting out for bidding.

CHAIRMAN: You referred to the London contracts as being "short". As I understand it, the system in London is the tender is for a five-year contract --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: -- with a two-year extension possibility, but that after seven years, it's re-tendered.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The seven years is the same as Melbourne; is that right?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Ours isn't a five plus two, it's seven.

CHAIRMAN: I follow that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They are also smaller contracts. They tend to be route-based contracts, I think, in London.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, as I understand it, that is the case.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, if I understand your answer correctly, there can be a number of possibilities, obviously. One is a bidder proposing to pay the government a sum for the operation, for the right to operate an area or a number of routes. The second possibility is the

bidder offering to share part of the margins with the government, as part of the bid.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's what you call a bidding price.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: I suppose a third possibility exists that there is no bidding price and the competition is based entirely on an assessment of the quality of the service expected to be provided. Would that sort of tendering be logical or not?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely. I mean, normally the criteria that are taken into account in competitive tendering -- price is one, obviously, but quality of service is very important, and often you will find jurisdictions don't offer the contract to the lowest bidder; they put more emphasis on quality of service in that process.

So quality of service would certainly be a very high priority in terms of determining what qualities you would want the operator to bring to providing that service.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, another way in which it might be negotiated is the prospective new operator might say, "I can do these routes for 10 per cent less than the fares that the incumbent is doing it"?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly, lower fares.

CHAIRMAN: There would be no payment to government, "but we are providing better value to the public"?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely. That's the kind of degree of freedom is what happens to fares.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's the advantages of competitive bidding --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- generally. Are there any perceived advantages that competitive tendering brings about that relate more specifically to the safe operation of buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think the risks are the other way with competitive tendering, that you might find situations where operators go in low with their bids and find out, "Gee, we are not making the margins we thought we were going to make; we will see where we can cut some corners." That might lead, for example, to deferred maintenance, which is a risk in this situation.

One of the things I mentioned in my first report was that Road Safety Inspections, the bus testing company that I'm a director of, was concerned about the condition of the number of the buses that were providing Melbourne's competitively tendered service. We drew that to the attention of the regulator. The reason we did that is that we operate under chain of

responsibility legislation in Melbourne for our bus services, and as a bus tester, if we know that an operator's buses are not up to standard, then we would be seen, we believe, as part of the chain of responsibility if something untoward was to happen as a function of one of those vehicles.

So I think that's a risk, and how would you deal with that? I think you have to deal with that by specifying quality criteria into your bidding document that says what your expectations are about fleet condition, for example, and how the maintenance is undertaken.

MEMBER LO: In the tendering process, competitive bid, if it were to make safety an explicit item, how would you pull it into the tendering process? So, if safety becomes an explicit item that somebody can bid for, what would that be?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think you would be nominating things like the condition of the vehicles, the maintenance schedules that need to be done. You would be setting limits on defects that operators would need to come up to, and then they would be in default under the contract if they didn't actually achieve those outcomes. So I'm not essentially -- I'm not a lawyer, but I think that's how you would deal with it. You would actually be

setting benchmark targets for performance that the operator needs to meet, and if those targets aren't met, then you would go through a cure regime.

MEMBER LO: Is it common to put accident rate as part of the bidding?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Part of the bidding criteria?

MEMBER LO: I don't know. If you were to use safety explicitly as a measure, do people use accident rate as a --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: If you were to --

MEMBER LO: If you don't keep your promise you pay a fine or something?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm not aware of too many people who actually have incentives or penalties that relate explicitly to safety provisions, but if you were to do that, then accident rate would be a really good place to start, but you would need to take that a fair bit further, I think.

CHAIRMAN: Is that not a provision in Singapore, a penalty if the accident rate reaches a certain level?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think it is, Chairman, but I don't know enough about it.

CHAIRMAN: It's quite a high level, is my recollection, higher than is experienced in Hong Kong.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, as a possible downside risk to competitive tendering, you have mentioned in your answer something about deferring costs. Let me try to flesh that out a little bit more.

You gave an example of maintenance costs.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Deferred maintenance, yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is that a consequence of the contract length being only a specified period of time, so as long as you keep up your performance within that period, you don't care what happens after, or is that a wrong way of looking at it?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No. I think -- again as I said earlier on, I'm not aware of the full detail of the competitively tendered contract, but the usual practice for government in this would be to put some requirements in the contract about the condition of the vehicles at the end of the contract period, so that you would avoid that problem.

MR DEREK CHAN: But in terms of the general concept of deferring costs as a downside risk of competitive tendering -- I think you mentioned the operator going in low -- what do you mean by deferring costs? If I understand correctly, I go in low, I operate with low cost, I cut corners here and there because of the length of the contract, I don't look at the long term, I look

at the short term -- is that the idea you are trying to express or am I getting it wrong?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I think, during the process, if you are in that position you have a serious discussion with the government about whether they might be prepared to help you out a little bit in terms of giving you a higher rate of remuneration. I mean, that's a thing that happens. You will find operators do that. They actually go to government and try to renegotiate their contract if they feel they have gone in too low.

In the particular Melbourne case, as I say, we identified a real problem that we believe was an example of that situation. That's been dealt with and the operator's fleet is now in a much better condition. I don't know whether there was any payment from government or not in that process.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps -- I'm sorry for going back on this issue, but I just want to make it absolutely clear I'm understanding it properly. I've heard a lot about advantages commercially for a competitive tender, but are there any advantages that relate specifically to safety that arise out of competitive tendering?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I can't think of any, Mr Chan, but others may be able to.

CHAIRMAN: You point to the fact that there is a risk.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think there's a risk.

CHAIRMAN: The operator finds that he's underbid and so he doesn't replace the tyres every 50,000 kilometres; he says they will last 60,000 --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They will go a bit further, yes, exactly.

CHAIRMAN: -- so that's a risk to safety?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's the risk, I think.

MR DEREK CHAN: I note that one-third of the Melbourne routes are competitively tendered. Have you seen how that introduction of competitive tendering -- has that brought about any benefits in terms of the safe operation of the buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I don't think there's any evidence of that. I think, if you look at the transport ombudsman's report about complaints against bus operators, you will find that the company that holds the contract for the competitively tendered service tends to rate relatively high in terms of complaints from customers to the transport ombudsman, and I gave you the other example of the maintenance problem that we identified as well.

CHAIRMAN: Which of the competitive tendered companies was that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: The current holder, Transdev.

CHAIRMAN: Transdev?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Mmm.

CHAIRMAN: I know from London that they have had experiences where a maintenance problem is in fact brought about by a lack of strategic planning, where all the fitters and engineers retired at the same time and they were unable to recruit. Was the Melbourne problem of that kind of origin or was it perceived to be a cost-cutting problem?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, I think it's really more to do with bus -- we've got an incredibly high population growth in Melbourne at the moment. It's growing about 2.5 per cent per annum. So the buses are being worked much harder, and I think it's partly to do with that, that the buses are doing more kilometres, they are being kept a bit longer so they are getting a bit older. That's I think probably what's been going on there.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, can I then move on to look at the pros and cons of a negotiated contract concept. Can I start first by taking you to your second report, that is the expert bundle at page 86. I am interested in the bottom paragraph of that page.

Can I just read that passage out. You say at the bottom of page 86:

"Route bus operators need to feel a certain amount of performance pressure when they are essentially

operating under a renewable negotiated franchise/contract regime. The author supports the negotiated approach to allocating the rights for route service provision, provided this includes mechanisms to ensure that operators are under pressure to perform across a range of outcome areas. This needs opportunities for a bonus for good performance but penalties for poor performance and a plausible risk of loss of franchise in the event of particularly poor performance public definitions of which should be embedded in the franchise agreement."

Can I first start with a general question: why do you support the negotiated approach over a competitive tendering approach?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. We have done a lot of work on this in Melbourne, and I think the major benefit is that what you can do with a negotiated contract, if you determine that you want to do this, is develop a really strong relationship between the operators and the government, in terms of how best to develop the system as a whole. Our experience would be that there are limited skills in government, and limited skills in the operators, in terms of things like system design and how to actually get the best out of your public transport. And if there's an opportunity to get government, the government

experts in this space, and the industry working together, you get a situation of one plus one equals three.

That's really what we've tried to do, through -- I've written about this in some of my papers -- developing what we call a trusting relationship between the government and the operator, but not to the point of what some people call regulatory capture, where the operators try to capture the regulator. That's completely anathema to what I'm talking about. But we are talking about really trusting partnerships between the two, so there's really strong and open collaboration, and that means that the contract or the franchise can vary through the period of the contract. It's an evolving thing. It's a live document. It's not set in stone at the start, as competitive tender documents tend to be, but you recognise going into it that you are trying to improve the value of the service all the way through that period, on the basis of a trusting partnership between those players who are in it.

I think we were able to do that in Melbourne at the time when I was running the Bus Association, where we achieved a very substantial increase in patronage and service delivery because of the nature of the

relationship we put in place with the government, that hadn't been done for 30 or 40 years before that.

So I think there is evidence from our experience that if you seek to develop a trusting partnership between government and the authority, without regulatory capture, but a partnership that holds accountability is really important -- so the operator's got to perform; he is not being given a licence just to receive money -- then you can get really good outcomes. That's why performance pressure is important to guard against this risk, if you like, of regulatory capture under a negotiated arrangement.

CHAIRMAN: Could you expand on what you describe as "regulatory capture"?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Certainly, Chairman. This is the thing we have talked about a little bit before, if you like, where the operator might go into a tender, bid too low, works very hard on the government to try and become their best friends, and then seeks to ratchet up the price of the contract later on.

People would often criticise negotiated contracts for just that point, that they say that the operators have captured the government, and negotiation just lets them continue on in what could be said is a rent-seeking behaviour. So we are really strong on the importance of

performance pressure to mitigate that risk, because it is a risk.

CHAIRMAN: And another way it might manifest itself would be where the bus operator is able to resist any suggestions made by the government about how to improve, for example, safety devices on the bus.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: Never actually doing what is discussed, never coming up with an actual change.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: If you have captured the regulator, you can do that.

CHAIRMAN: That's the risk.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It's a risk. That's why you need performance pressure, and the performance pressure needs to be seen for what it is, as genuine performance pressure.

CHAIRMAN: Could you give some examples of what you regard as performance pressure? In what areas?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. In particular, the safety performance pressure. We approach that very much in Melbourne through seeing -- and I think this may be one of the things that we are pretty unique in -- we see safety as a shared responsibility. All the parties in what we call the chain of responsibility that can impact bus safety have safety duties, and that requirement sits

underneath our accreditation system and it sits underneath our negotiated contracting arrangements.

So all of our operators are highly aware that they are liable to be put in a position where they might find themselves in court, if safety circumstances turn out to be such that they can be shown to not have taken due care and done all that is, so far as is reasonably practicable, to reduce safety risks.

That's a really important element of performance pressure, that chain of responsibility provision. I would say the lower-level performance pressure, not as significant as that, is to do with incentives and penalties that we talked about before, things like on-time running, and so on, but also, as Prof Lo talks about, whether you can have some incentives as well with respect to safety.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because on-time running is a service incentive for penalty, but safety, as Prof Lo has mentioned, might be measured in accident rates?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN: What other ways can one measure safety?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think accident rate is a really good starting point, and if you look at some of the reporting that has been done I think in the safety plans of the five-year forward plans, there's information on

fatalities, collisions, non-collisions -- "slips, trips and falls" types of involvement involvements as well -- and in my view, if you are going to go down the path of developing safety as an incentive or penalty provision, I would drill down into where are the safety problems. So you wouldn't use accident involvement rate in total; you would look at the fatality rate, you would look at "slips, trips and falls". And you would form a view, I think, on what is the relative importance of those two things.

I think one operator I saw, for example, had an increase in the "slips, trips and falls" type accidents, but a drop in fatalities. So, if you add them up together, and say one incident is an incident, you are missing that nuance. So I would be trying to decompose it a bit and look at the major areas of safety concern and make sure that there are KPIs, if you like, or incentive/penalty clauses that relate to those. That means you are going to really end up with a bundle, I think, of measures. I don't know how many elements are in that bundle. That's something that needs to be settled by negotiation between government operators with advice, for example, from committees such as your own, about what the components are.

But I would start with what are the main sources of

safety problems and start to target those.

CHAIRMAN: I think London have identified 42 components of some measure of approaching safety in that way.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That sounds too many for me.

MR DEREK CHAN: You focused on performance pressure. Can I just put this to you, to see what observations or comments you have.

In a situation in Hong Kong where the bus service is in one sense also competing with other modes of transportation for patronage -- for example the rail, public light buses, taxis -- do you think that type of competition also creates the type of performance pressure that you are envisaging?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It creates an element of performance pressure, but I don't think it's anywhere near as strong as the performance pressure that you get, for example, under competitive tendering, because the consequences of poor performance are much more severe under competitive tendering than they are under the context that you describe.

So, for example, you might lose some passengers if you are not competing well against MTR, for example. But that's different to losing your business. I don't see the need for performance pressure to necessarily go as far as losing your business, you know, probably as

commonly as it does under competitive tendering, but that needs to be a plausible proposition.

I think, for performance pressure, there needs to be a plausible threat that if your performance is so bad, then your negotiated franchise/contract finishes.

I guess the other thing I would say, Chairman, is that the fare adjustment mechanism that exists under your franchise agreement here provides a little bit of slack in the sense there's a formula for adjusting the fares, changes in operating costs and revenue, for example, are one of those things, but the need to provide the bus operator with a reasonable rate of return is one element to be taken into account in fare adjustment.

So plausibly somebody who's losing the sort of business that you talked about in competition could make an argument against a clause like that.

CHAIRMAN: We have received evidence from the bus operators -- and I think it's fair to categorise it in this way -- that they are not very happy with this fare adjustment mechanism, and they have reached the extent in which they don't even make applications because they anticipate them being rejected.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think it's really important that a franchise or a contract has a clear and unambiguous

means of adjusting fares. In our case, it's not so much fares as the return to the operator that gets subjected to the same sort of formula. So you would look at what's happening to wages, you would look at what's happening to fuel costs, you would look at what's happening to other elements of costs in the cost structure, and we would take those into account in changing the remuneration or the subsidy level, if you like, that the operator receives from government; whereas here it gets built into the fare-setting process as the medium that you use to achieve the same outcome.

CHAIRMAN: Having said what I did about the bus operators' views as a fare mechanism adjustment, I ought to add that they have overcome their misgivings by both making applications which are being considered by government at the moment.

Mr Chan, if that's a convenient moment.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, I was actually going to move on to the next topic, so that's very convenient.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Stanley, we are going to take a break now, to give all of us a break, for 20 minutes, and resume after that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you, Chairman.

(11.35 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.56 am)

CHAIRMAN: Professor, before we resume, might I just mention two matters. One is, as you know, we have simultaneous interpretation being performed for us. So, for the benefit of those that are listening to the interpretation, might I invite you to slow down in your answers, perhaps even making pauses, so that they can follow up with you.

The other is that perhaps you could speak more closely to the microphone which enables all of us to hear you better. It's no doubt adjustable. You will find whatever is a comfortable distance.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

We had been talking about incentivising safety just before the break. I am going to focus more specifically on that topic now.

Before the break, you have talked a little bit about what possible indicators to focus on if you want a safety-related incentive. Can I just ask a general question: how do you envisage this working in an environment where the bus operator already assumes the risk of profit from the bus operation, so they themselves depend on patronage? Do you envisage this

sort of incentive being a direct cash payment or a cash deduction, a fine of some sort? Is that what's being envisaged, or is that something different?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, that's exactly what I envisage, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: So you would have targets or benchmarks, so to speak, and if you don't make them, there will be a penalty clause, and if you go over them, there will be a bonus payment as such?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, and I would imagine you would set that up in bands, so you might fall short by a little bit, or fall short by a big bit, or you might accomplish the target by a small amount or by a large amount, and that the level of the incentive or penalty would reflect those thresholds, if you like.

I would just make a few comments which -- I talked before the break about, for example, fatalities, "slips, trips and falls", and so on, being some of the sorts of things you might take into account. In terms of developing KPIs or performance indicators, there's a number of criteria that you would expect them to meet. They need to be specific. You've clearly got to be able to measure them. They ought to be achievable. They clearly need to be relevant. The data, and so on, needs to be available on a timely basis. And all of those

KPIs need to be something that the operator can affect. There's no point having a KPI if the operator is not able to, by their performance, influence the outcomes of them. So they are really important.

But I also go back to the point I said before about we see safety as a shared responsibility, and I think it would be a real shame if those KPIs focused excessively on the bus captains and not enough on other people who are also, I believe, part of the chain of responsibility for bus safety. So you would look at particular sorts of safety performance indicators, which might be things like fatalities and "slips, trips and falls", and so on. But you would also try and see if there's a way in those indicators to target a range of people who can affect safety outcomes, not just the bus captains. Bus captains often tend to be the kind of target for a lot of this sort of work and that's probably a bit unfair.

MR DEREK CHAN: By your previous answer, do you have in mind actually a bonus system from the government that not only extends to the operator but employees of the operator or --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think that would be a matter for the companies to work out, how they think they are going to get the best result in terms of the objectives that they've got. But I had initially envisaged that this

would be a bonus or a penalty at the company level, and then the company would make a judgment about whether it would like to reward, for example, particular people who have contributed to that outcome.

MR DEREK CHAN: We have talked about at a general conceptual level. Can I take you to a specific example that we have come across during the inquiry -- there are a number of examples but I will just pick one of them.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just to illustrate how the concept may or may not work, and ask for your observations on that example.

Can I first take you to the TD-1 bundle at page 192. Just so you know what this document is, it is a KMB forward planning programme, and this particular page is one page of the section on bus safety for 2018 to 2022.

So this document, at page 192, would have been submitted by KMB to the Transport Department in around mid-2017.

So, at paragraph 8.8.1 of this document:

"KMB proposes to use the 3-year average of 2014 to 2016 actual accident involvement rate of 2.71 (defined as the number of buses involved in accidents per million kilometres operated) as a target for the purpose of this five-year plan period. It represents a 6 per cent

reduction from the accident rate in 2014, the highest record among 2014 to 2016."

So here we have the setting of a target or benchmark, so to speak.

So this is the target that KMB set for themselves as one possible safety indicator. This is in 2017.

If I can fast-forward one year and see what happens in mid-2018, and for that can I invite you to go to TD-5, page 1729.

Sorry, can I just go back a page, to 1728, just to give the document some context. So, at 1728, you see a letter from the Transport Department dated 21 May 2018, and it's from the Transport Department to KMB. The first paragraph of the letter says:

"This is to provide you with a set of guidelines and requirements covering the following aspects for your compliance in preparation of the five-year forward planning programme (2019 to 2023) ..."

So we are one year on, and we are on the topic of the same forward planning programme.

Over the page, on 1729, you will see the Transport Department's comments on bus safety. In the first paragraph, the Transport Department says:

"We note that there was an increase in the number of KMB buses involved in accident per million

vehicle-kilometres from 2.74 in 2016 to 3.04 in 2017, which was at a high level."

In the next paragraph, I will just read the last sentence:

"Also, the actual accident involvement rate, which is 3.04 in 2017, was higher than the proposed target accident involvement rate in your FPP" -- that's the one we saw earlier" -- which was 2.71."

And you can see in the table below that the accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres has been increasing, 2015, 2016 and 2017.

The paragraph below the table also notes that:

"In terms of number of traffic accidents/number of cases involving KMB buses as shown in the table below, it has also shown an increasing trend from 362 in 2015 to 423 in 2017."

From the passages I have just read, we see that KMB did not meet the accident target rate that it set for itself. You can also see an increasing trend in KMB's accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres.

In this context, where KMB has failed to meet the target it set for itself, do you see your suggested incentive/penalty system operating in a situation like this?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, but I wouldn't apply it the way

it's been applied here.

If you look through the rows in the table that's headed, "Number of KMB buses involved in traffic accidents", you will see the number of fatalities has gone from 11 to 5 to 3; the number of serious injuries has gone from 122 to 110 to 11; and the number of slight injuries has gone from 737 to 787 to 889.

Now, to quote an accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres that treats each of those rows as equally weighted is, to me, an error if you are trying to develop a performance indicator.

I would say fatalities are far and away more important than serious injuries, which are a lot more important than slight injuries. So you need a weight to apply to reflect the significance of those types of accidents, if you are going to come up with a KPI, if you like, that measures accident safety performance.

And accident rates per million vehicle-kilometres are a very blunt and, I believe, a misleading measure.

MR DEREK CHAN: You would need a more nuanced indicator or set of indicators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely. You need a set of more nuanced indicators. These should form part of it, but it should be the components, not the total.

And the components need to be weighted in some way

to reflect -- I mean, as an economist, I would use the cost of those different sorts of accidents, which we regularly measure in Australia and I'm sure you do here in Hong Kong: you have a value for a typical fatal accident, you have a value for a typical serious injury accident, and you have a value for a typical slight injury accident. I would use those weights to come up with a weighted, if you like, accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres.

Have in mind also, though, there would be other things you would want to include as well.

MR DEREK CHAN: If you go on to the next page, 1730, at the bottom, section 3, the Transport Department proposes a safety-related plan, or KMB proposes a safety-related plan. I will just read the first paragraph under that heading:

"With a view to lower accident involvement rate of buses and further enhance the safety of bus services provided to the passengers, your company is required to propose respective plans/proposals", and there are a number of them.

If you go over the page to 1731, the Transport Department required KMB to propose a target accident rate for the coming FPP, and proposed target reduction of accident involvement rate.

Again, your opinion would be that these targets are too blunt, even as a target?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely, Mr Chan. They need to be more nuanced than that.

I would have thought targets like that ought to be the outcome of a negotiation between the Transport Department and the operator, rather than something that the operator is going to propose to the department. I think this is the sort of thing that really should be the subject of a discussion where both parties can put their cards on the table and come up with a feasible programme.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, I notice from your report that the Melbourne bus contracts do not specify safety performance as being subject to incentive and penalty provisions under contract.

Can I first take you to the reference and then ask for your opinion on that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I take you to page 26 of the expert bundle. That should be in your first report.

Are you on page 26?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I read the second full paragraph, paragraph 3.4:

"Under the ten-year metropolitan route bus service contracts that expire in mid-2018, incentive/penalty provisions relate to patronage growth ... and on-time running/service cancellations. The contracts that will replace those contracts generally retain this focus. Safety is not a KPI [key performance indicator] under the contracts and safety performance is not subject to incentive/penalty provisions under the contracts but poor safety performance could result in the safety director removing an operator's accreditation, which would mean loss of contract. The new contracts are understood to provide for a passenger experience regime, which is about the operator's performance with respect to number, response and resolution of passenger complaints that fall within the operator's control. Relevant KPIs are yet to be developed but the focus is wider than safety."

Now, my question is a very simple one. If the incentivising safety concept is important, why is it not being incorporated in the Melbourne contracts?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. Mr Chan, the reason for that is that we rely very strongly, in our Melbourne contracts, on the legislative base of safety duties and chain of responsibility to achieve safety outcomes. So that essentially makes all the parties who are able to

influence safety outcomes responsible for and accountable for their performance in that regard.

I personally believe that is the primary reason why our services are held in a high regard from the safety point of view. The Transport Safety Director, who I've met many times during the preparation of the submissions to your hearing, is firmly of the view that Melbourne's route bus services are safe, and I believe that the fundamental reason that that's the case is that people can be held to account for their performance in the event that it's not safe.

So we've really got a very strong underpinning of the contract regime by safety duties and chain of responsibility in the law.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just to give a very general understanding of the concept that you just raised -- so you have legal duties in Victoria to promote safety insofar as reasonably practicable, but perhaps the peculiar feature of that is that that duty is not just on the bus operator but also on the employees that come under the bus operator?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan. The Bus Safety Act, which is the relevant legislation in Victoria, legislates safety duties. The primary safety duty, if I can read the line from the legislation, is an obligation to

eliminate or minimise potential harm or risk by doing all that is reasonably practicable to ensure safety.

Then, if you take an example, it talks about:

"An operator of a bus must, so far as is reasonably practicable, ensure the safety of the bus service."

Now, the legislation then designates safety duties that apply to a range of people, and it mentions --

CHAIRMAN: Just pause there, if you would, Professor.

Do we have this available so it can be displayed on the screen?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, we have. It would be in, probably, the professor's first report.

CHAIRMAN: But is it not in an annex to -- or one of the documents to which reference is made in the report? Are those documents available? Do we have the Bus Safety Act?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps the professor can assist on that, but not as far as I can see from the references attached to the --

CHAIRMAN: I must say, I have downloaded this myself and I have it in my own bundle. Is this not available for all of us?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, we can perhaps make it available.

CHAIRMAN: But is it not already available on the screen? Is there a reference number -- I have three volumes of

references to Prof Stanley's report on my right-hand side -- is it one of those?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Pages 22 and 23 of my first report contain most of the relevant bits of the legislation.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, the references annexed to the professor's report contain articles and publications that describe the chain of responsibility, but not the Act itself.

CHAIRMAN: Then we need the Act.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can make that available over our next adjournment. Then we can come back to that issue.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. But, at all events, we have an excerpt from it at page 23?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, we have.

CHAIRMAN: You were about to go on, Professor, to describe upon whom these duties are imposed.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you, Chairman. The legislation actually talks about, if I use your language, bus captains. It talks about schedulers. It talks about service procurers, maintenance staff, and so on.

There is a concept in the legislation called bus safety workers, and these safety duties apply to bus safety workers as well as to particular designated people such as drivers or bus captains.

So there is an extensive range of parties who can

affect safety, and the two -- or a fundamental principle on which the legislation sits is the principle of shared responsibility which I talk about at the bottom of page 22 of the report.

CHAIRMAN: Does this duty extend to the public?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It's not designated as such, no.

CHAIRMAN: I thought I had seen that in the legislation.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I've missed that, if that's the case.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you are more familiar with it than I am. I was a bit taken aback, if my memory is correct.

But, at all events, a chain of people who have duties?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Who can affect safety outcomes. It's really, I think, to remind people that this isn't just the bus drivers. You know, there are a lot of people who can affect safety outcomes, and they all need to be held accountable for their performance.

CHAIRMAN: So how are they held accountable; by being taken to court?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That can happen. The provisions essentially have monetary fines that I --

CHAIRMAN: And there are different levels depending on whether it's the company, the scheduler, the bus captain, and so on?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: With the highest level reserved for the upper echelons of the company?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct, and in the new national law that's about to come into play on 1 October -- which, in a sense, sets the background for the Victorian law -- they have introduced a category of "reckless behaviour" as well, which can lead to prison as a possible consequence.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's in the National Heavy Vehicle Law update, but that will get reflected through shortly into, if you like, the penalties that can apply under this legislation. At the moment, they are mainly monetary penalties.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, we've now got the Act. Which section tells us about who's got the public duty?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Clause 15 was where I was talking -- so the duty of an operator, for example:

"An operator of a bus service must, so far as is reasonably practicable, ensure the safety of the bus service."

Then, if you go down to clause 16, it has similar language for a procurer.

CHAIRMAN: What is a procurer?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: A procurer is somebody who buys a bus

service, and there's a really interesting discussion going on at the moment in Victoria about whether the public transport authority, which buys and determines the schedules, is a procurer and might in fact be one of the chain of responsibility.

CHAIRMAN: Why would it not be?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That would be my view, Chairman.

So this continues, going down, in that way.

Then, in section 14 of the Act, it talks --

CHAIRMAN: Can we just scroll down the list for the moment, if we may. So we were going to 17. 17 is a bus safety worker.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: 17 is a bus safety worker. Now, the "bus safety worker" is defined up in the definitions at the front part of the legislation.

CHAIRMAN: What does that encompass, broadly?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I suggest it would be better to look at that than to rely on me to remember it, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Very sensible. Can we go to the definitions section, which is normally section 1.

"Definitions", section 3. Yes, "bus safety work". Is there "bus safety worker"? There we are.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So a bus safety worker means:

"... a person who has carried out, is carrying out or is about to carry out, bus safety work", which is

defined in the previous point, "including a person who is --

(a) employed or engaged by a bus operator to carry out bus safety work;

(b) engaged by any other persons to carry out bus safety work;

(c) a trainee;

(d) a volunteer".

So this is quite broad, and, Chairman, this is where we as bus testers in road safety inspection -- that's why we were concerned, because we do testing of vehicles, and we saw that this provision could pick us up.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Can we go to "bus safety work", the previous definition.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It means:

"... an activity that may affect the safety of bus services including --

(a) driving a bus or activities associated with driving a bus;

(b) designing, constructing, supplying, repairing, modifying, maintaining, monitoring, examining or testing a bus ..."

CHAIRMAN: That's the section that applies to you.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's us.

"... (c) designing, constructing, supplying, installing, repairing, modifying, maintaining, monitoring, examining or testing equipment in or on a bus;

(d) setting or altering a schedule or timetable for a bus service;

(e) a prescribed activity"; I'm not sure what that means.

But this is pretty comprehensive, and it's really important, I think, to understand that the managers in the bus companies know this. They are very conscious of it. And, for example, in discussions about bus driver working hours, this is really front of mind in terms of what they will accept. So, for example, our bus drivers or bus captains on average would work 44 to 46 hours a week. They can, under the regulations, work more than that. They don't, because the operators are concerned about the safety implications of so doing.

In fact, the CEO of one of the larger operators, when he took on that role in 2008, had an average of about 48 hours, and he brought that down to within the 44 to 46 range over the subsequent four or five years. And most of the Melbourne operators are running at around about 45, in round terms, hours' driving a week.

CHAIRMAN: What are the maximum permitted hours of driving

per week?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They could do 72, Chairman, which we wouldn't think very favourably on.

CHAIRMAN: And is it your evidence that it is, because regard is had to this safety duty, one of the reasons that these hours have been reduced?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The operators are very conscious of the scheduling requirements, and, for example, one operator builds 35 minutes' I think slack into a five and a quarter hour shift to allow for traffic congestion affecting their run times because they don't want to go beyond the five and a quarter hours which, under our regulation, is the maximum you can drive without having a break.

And if you talk to them, they have absolutely front of mind that this is the potential safety consequences and implications for them if, for example, somebody was killed by a driver driving an excessive amount of time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: And the point that you were making, going into this chain of responsibility topic, was that because you have this underlying layer of legal obligations and duties, that explains why you don't need to specifically incentivise safety in the bus contract itself?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, in Hong Kong, where we don't have that sort of underlying legislative regime of duties and obligations on safety, would you say that it makes it more important to incentivise or focus on safety in other ways?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think it's a good way to increase the focus on safety, but not nearly as powerful or compelling as the safety duties and chain of responsibility provisions that we have. But I would also say that if you were to use safety penalties and incentives then, to go back to a point I made earlier, try and ensure that those incentives and penalties encompass a number of parties who are able to affect safety outcomes. In a sense, it's a de facto way of trying to do chain of responsibility.

CHAIRMAN: Could you give us some context for the Bus Safety Act? Is this the Act that brought into Victoria safety duties of this kind?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The way the law works, Chairman, is that -- essentially, it is driven by the national law that I was involved in when I was at the National Road Transport Commission. We now have a National Road Transport Commission, and Heavy Vehicle National Law is set through that national process and it gets applied at

the state level.

Now, not all states have a Bus Safety Act like this. Victoria and New South Wales, which are the two biggest states that have gone the furthest in this regard, and in fact the Bus Safety Act here got a bit ahead of the national legislation by introducing this idea of "so far as is reasonably practicable". The national legislation until I think 1 October this year is still based on "all reasonable effort" type of concepts. But this Victorian Act has had "so far as is reasonably practicable" as its basis since 2009, and the national law is picking that up on 1 October. So, in a sense, the national law is catching up a little bit to what the Bus Safety Act is saying.

CHAIRMAN: But how many years in the making has this process involved?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Probably about three or four. It happened when I was CEO of the Bus Association. The law was in 2009 and I had that role from 1999 to 2008. So, you know, the legislation and putting the industry's views on the development of legislation was something that I was involved in through that time.

And I think I said in my first paper that partly because the industry receives a substantial amount of financial support from government, we wanted to be seen

as very proactive in terms of safety, that we are good corporate citizens. So, in a sense, we were very proactive or keen to see safety legislation of this kind to which we thought we could confidently say we would comply.

CHAIRMAN: That, of course, is not the factual circumstance of Hong Kong.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed. I would say that if you look at simple indicators like fatality rates per million vehicle-kilometres, Hong Kong and London are not as good as Melbourne, and one possible reason for that is the fact that we've got this legislation. Another possible reason is our bus operating circumstances are probably a bit easier than they are in Hong Kong, in a physical sense, and London too.

MR DEREK CHAN: Correct me if I am wrong, but I suppose one factor in play here is that because you have a heavily subsidised system, and a cost-plus-profit contract structure, any increased costs that relate to safety can in that sense be passed on to the government?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely. But it also means that the government then looks very closely at any potential additions to cost that may be from a safety perspective.

An example would be we've had concerns for a number of years, but more particularly in the last three or

four years, with abuse and assault of bus drivers, and so installing security screens, closed-circuit television, and so on, to deal with problems like that have become a basis for sharing. So the operators are in fact meeting part of the cost of that and the government is meeting part of the cost of that.

So it's a negotiated outcome.

MEMBER LO: In proposing and enhancing this Bus Safety Act, who are the possible resistance and opposition against it? Who might be that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Who would be against it?

MEMBER LO: Yes. I mean, is it a straightforward thing or --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I can't think of anybody. The people who might be opposed to it, you would think, would be bus operators, because it really makes them accountable, but our bus operators in Melbourne are very much behind this legislation and the accreditation system, that is one of the key elements to implement it, because they know, or they believe, that it improves the safety outcomes that they can achieve.

So, for example, it makes them a better place for someone to go and work because they think their drivers are more likely to be safer than in a system that doesn't have this same level of focus.

So I don't see anybody really opposed to this, because the most likely candidate is one of the strongest components for having it.

MEMBER LO: Yes, but it is imposing duties and obligations and liabilities upon them, and they welcome it?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They think they can perform to an extent where they can meet their obligations to a satisfactory level. In that event, they see that it can enhance their standing as an industry that is a responsible industry. So it has really been approached as an industry, and I think that's one of the benefits that we have in Melbourne from having a very strong operator association, that we can speak as an industry rather than as individual operators.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, there is an economic advantage to enhanced safety, because accidents cost money.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed.

CHAIRMAN: That's a benefit to the bus operators.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, Chair.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the same context, the committee has received, in the form of a written report, some opposing views to the concept of incentivising safety. Can I invite your observations on that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I do that firstly by going to the expert

bundle, page 153.

Just to give this report some context, it is a report prepared by Mr Mike Weston, who is a passenger transport consult, and he specialises in the London bus system.

The page is at page 153 at the bottom right-hand corner, and the passage that I'm interested in is under the heading, "Incentivisation of safety improvements". I will just read that paragraph:

"As referred to in section 6.1 one of the recommendations from the Greater London Assembly Transport Committee was 'Revise its senior staff bonus scheme to introduce a direct link between bus safety and performance-related payments'. Also, within the body of the report, there is a recommendation that 'TfL's [that's Transport for London's] contracts with bus operators do not incentivise safety and should be revised'. During discussions with the London bus operators it was clear that operators do not support the direct incentivisation of safety within the route agreement. Operators were concerned that direct financial incentivisation might drive the wrong behaviours, especially at lower levels within the company, including potentially encouraging underreporting. Also, operators felt that linking

safety performance to financial payments could lead to a reluctance to collaborate with other operators on safety-related issues as it now had a competitive and commercial benefit. Overall options to incentivise safety within the bus contracts were not seen as a positive move."

So he's identified two possible risks. First, the underreporting of issues, and secondly, reduces collaboration between bus operators.

Do you have any observations or comments to make in respect of these two potential risks identified by Mr Weston?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. Look, I acknowledge that there is a risk that you could incentivise underreporting, but I think that's a case of trying to design monitoring systems and compliance assurance systems that make sure that doesn't happen.

For example, in our setting, the Transport Safety Director is the system auditor. He is an independent person, organisation, with a statutory brief to accredit operators and to ensure that they are complying with the provisions of that accreditation regime, and they include things like reporting.

So I think, if you are going to design incentives and penalties, you need to make sure that you do guard

against that risk. Now, that may be hard to do, but that's something you've got to "suck it and see", I think, try to find a system that deals with that risk.

As I say, our existence of a Transport Safety Director as the system umpire or auditor I think is a way that you can help to do that.

The issue of reluctant --

MR DEREK CHAN: Before you go to the next issue, can I just flesh out that first issue, underreporting?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Sure.

MR DEREK CHAN: Your evidence is that the risk of underreporting can be met with putting in place a reliable system that ensures that the data is accurately collected and recorded? Am I understanding your evidence properly?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. That would be where I would be looking for the solution and, you know, that is something that you would need to work through and see that you can achieve that outcome. But the intention would be to use that sort of process to try and deal with that problem.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, to some extent, provide some automation in the data collection and remove the human element?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That, but also maybe trying to link up databases because incidents or accidents come you

through various sorts of channels. Those --

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I am puzzling as to how one could under-report accidents, because so many different parties would be involved; it wouldn't just be -- it would be the bus driver, it would be the passenger, it might be the police, it would be ambulance. How do you under-report that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Just thinking out loud, Chairman, we have a problem in Melbourne sometimes of children throwing rocks at buses on a freeway as the bus goes underneath. If you were the operator and you were on an incentive that's based on involvements of potentially accident-type incidents, you might decide, "We will ignore that, we won't report that", whereas in fact if it had broken the window, hit the driver, you could have killed X people.

CHAIRMAN: That would be a system where your fault doesn't come into the equation. This is someone else's criminal act and you might be penalised that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It is.

CHAIRMAN: There must be ways of getting around that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think, when we were talking about the criteria for indicators, it needs to be something that you've got control over.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So I think you've nailed that one well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I think, if my memory is correct, the 42 components of the London assessment contain the fact of the bus driver being abused. How on earth that should redound to the detriment of the bus company is difficult to understand.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It is important information to have, but it's not something that you would want to be judging a safety penalty on.

I think this needs some really creative thinking, Mr Chan. This is not easy. But, you know, if you are looking at it as an alternative to safety duties and chain of responsibility, then I think the challenge needs to be tackled to make sure you don't encourage underreporting.

If I could deal with the second issue.

MR DEREK CHAN: Sorry, I interrupted you there. Please continue to deal with the second issue.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think, in a competitive tendering situation, if you are an operator who has good safety processes, you would think the inclination would be that you would use that to back your pitch, and you probably would not share information with other operators.

So I'm not quite sure about this. A reluctance to

collaborate, I think that's more to do with the problem of competitive tendering than it is to do with the challenge of safety KPIs. I think one of the things we've found is that in a competitive tendering environment, there's a general reluctance of operators to collaborate because they don't want to give away their competitive advantage, and if safety was one of your competitive advantages, then you would keep that to yourself.

So I don't really get that solution. I think one of the other points that was made by the London report -- and I think it's a really important point to make -- is the need for greater collaboration between the operators, and between the operators and government, on safety matters. That's something that I had a recommendation of in my second report too.

CHAIRMAN: Whilst there might be a risk of lack of collaboration between operators directly -- if, for example, in the London system you have Transport for London as the government side of things -- the fact that one operator, for example, because he's using Mobileye 6, has reduced the front and rear shunts in accidents, that would be something that the bus authority would pick up and be able to say, "We've had some striking results from operator A", and they would

disseminate that information to the other bus operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: You would hope so, Chairman. You would hope so. In fact, in a situation where you've got incentives and penalties, they can all put in the same technologies and all get a benefit from it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So I find that point a bit hard to understand, the second point.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's the incentive to the operator side.

Can I see if I can test the possibility of the further benefit of incentivising safety. So would a safety performance-related penalty/bonus system also have the potential to motivate the government to monitor safety-related performance indicators more closely, because there is now an additional focus and financial consequence that relates specifically to safety?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: You would expect that that would be one of the consequences of this process, particularly if, as I said earlier, there's quite a task to be gone through first in actually devising what those incentives and penalties are going to look like.

So the authority, the Transport Department, if you like, has to involve itself in a pretty deep and

meaningful conversation with the franchised bus operators in the development of those KPIs, which brings up questions of how you would do that monitoring in the process, and that's likely to therefore vest in a much more rigorous process of monitoring and assessment.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Professor. I am going to move on now to a different topic, and that is the topic of accreditation.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).

MR DEREK CHAN: In the general sense, I understand from your report that bus operator accreditation forms a central part of bus safety in Melbourne. Basically, a bus operator cannot operate unless it is first accredited, and there is a possibility of that accreditation being taken away.

Can I go to two places in your report where you talk about that, to start off the topic.

The first page I would invite you to go to is page 9 of your first report. So that's expert bundle page 9.

Again, I introduce the topic by reading out the first three full paragraphs of page 9:

"Bus operator accreditation, as a programme, was intended to ensure that a person could provide a safe, efficient and effective bus service. It started with three elements:

1. A transport management course for bus and coach operators run by Monash University, the scope of which depended on the type of service an operator wanted to provide. One senior representative of each contracted route service operator needed to complete the course, which included four units, one of which was 'safety risk management for bus operators', but also included units on the legal/regulatory framework, financial management and business development.

2. Management information systems.

3. Maintenance management systems.

As discussed in section 3.3 below, these three elements remain as key regulatory requirements for accredited route bus operators. The safety focus of accreditation more broadly has been substantially enhanced over the decade or so since inception, to focus increasingly on building what can be best described as a safety risk management culture, as discussed in section 3.3.

The bus operator accreditation system forms a major focus of this report because the author sees it as potentially the single most significant point of difference between the Melbourne safety regime and that in Hong Kong. As elaborated above, the institutional setting of Victorian route bus operation was

particularly receptive to the development of this safety agenda at the time of its inception."

So, as I understand it, the accreditation system focuses on the general running of the bus operation, of which safety forms part?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, I see a reference to the importance of management information systems and maintenance management systems in this accreditation programme. On those two topics, can I invite you to go to page 25 of this report, which refers back to those systems.

At the bottom full paragraph of page 25, I will just read the first half of the bottom paragraph:

"BusVic has played a very active role in establishing the implementing bus operator accreditation in Victoria. For example, it has contributed substantially to course content in the Monash University training programme that accredited operators must complete. Importantly, it has developed template responses to the requirements for management information systems (MIS) and maintenance management systems (MMS), based on ISO 39001, which should enable its members to develop and implement safety risk management systems that meet the requirements of the accreditation regime, provided they are diligently applied."

Now, I see the link between the accreditation system and ISO 39001, to which I will come back. But, firstly, can you describe generally what you see as the major advantages for bus operator accreditation that relate specifically to safety?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Bus operator accreditation in Melbourne is very much about safety. Essentially, that's the fundamental rationale that sits behind the operation of the accreditation system. It's really about ensuring that the operator can provide a safe service, and it's no surprise then that the accreditation is provided by the Transport Safety Director. So the Transport Safety Director is the person who has to say, "Yes, this person can be an accredited operator", which then means they are eligible to have a contract with the government.

And the maintenance management system and the management information system, the scope of those two systems is in fact determined by the Transport Safety Director. So, under the relevant legislation -- and I think I may have referred to the clauses somewhere in my submission -- the Transport Safety Director tells the operators what they need to -- what he's expecting to see or they are expecting to see, in terms of their maintenance management systems and management information systems.

I've referred in my evidence to some of the documents. For example, this is "Maintenance Management Systems: For Accredited Bus Operators"; "Management Information Systems: For Accredited Bus Operators"; "Managing the Risks to Bus Safety" -- these are publications by the Transport Safety Director which are intended, firstly, to leave operators in no doubt as to what is expected of them if they are to become accredited, but it also helps them through the process of meeting those requirements. And then the Bus Association, as I have referred in the bit that you've got highlighted on the screen, has actually developed template responses for its members to go through and customise, to meet the expectations of those maintenance management systems and management information systems.

The larger operators do a lot of particular tailoring of that to their own circumstances, but for some of the smaller operators those templates may get them almost all the way there.

MR DEREK CHAN: Please correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding is that the accreditation system, insofar as the safety aspects are concerned, focuses a lot on the risk management, and the setting up and running of systems to ensure safety.

Now, what I'm interested in is the comparison of

that focus to ISO 39001. We've already seen a reference to 39001 in this paragraph. Can I also take you to your second report at page 78 of the expert bundle. I'm looking at the paragraph in about the middle of the page, just above the heading "Bus Captain Training". Again, I will just read it out and ask you questions on it:

"Final Transport Department" -- and I think that's a reference to the Transport Department in Hong Kong -- "Road Traffic Management System, pointing out that this has been adopted by some fleet management companies and logistics companies but is not commonly adopted by the Transport Authority. It is noted in the first report on the current project that Victoria's operator accreditation system mirrors ISO 39001, and all route bus operators must achieve accreditation, but does not involve formal certification under that standard."

Now, my question is this. In the Hong Kong context where we do not have an accreditation system and we do not yet have competitive tendering, would requiring bus operators to achieve ISO 39001 have the same type of benefits on safety that can arise under the Melbourne accreditation system?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: You would expect that that would take you a fair distance in that direction. I think the

difference that you would also need to think about is the role of the Transport Safety Director, what mechanism you use, if you like, to assure compliance, as it particularly applies to bus operations in Hong Kong. So you would have the accreditation authority that does the ISO accreditation or certification, if you like, being sure that its expectations were met.

We don't have that, but we've got something like that, but we do also, though, have this Transport Safety Director who, in a sense, is the guardian of the system. So I would be looking to say, if you are going to do that, I think it's a really good idea.

I would think about, then, is there a role as well for somebody like the Transport Safety Director as an independent and accountable guardian, if you like, of system safety.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. In Melbourne that guardian of system safety, ensuring that the operator has the appropriate risk management systems in place, would be the Transport Safety Director?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: In an ISO 39001 context, that task would fall on the accreditation company to perform the annual audits?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that they can have the certification?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I'm about to move on to the next topic of a standing committee on bus safety. Would that be a convenient moment?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

Professor, we will adjourn now for our lunch break, and we will resume again at 2.30 this afternoon.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you, Chairman.

(12.57 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Prof Stanley, I am about to move on to the next topic. That is the standing committee on bus safety, and also the Transport Safety Director. I'm going to deal with these together.

You have already talked about, this morning, the role of the Transport Safety Director in enforcing the chain of responsibility and duties arising under the ordinance. So I will be focusing on this different aspect, if I may.

I am going to look at these two recommendations in

the context of being able to promote a more proactive approach to safety and issues, rather than a reactive approach.

Can I start first by going to places in your report where you talk about these two recommendations. Can I start first with going to page 100 of the expert bundle, where you set out your main recommendations in bold, in about the middle of the page.

The second bullet point there talks about your recommendation for "the creation of the independent position of Transport Safety Director, whose role is to be responsible for administering matters related to safety duties, ensuring compliance and enforcement".

So that is the context in which you are recommending a Transport Safety Director, in the context of the recommendation about setting out duties and chain of responsibility and that sort of thing.

But what I am also interested in is an observation that you made at the bottom of page 99, so the previous page of the expert bundle. At the bottom of page 99, you say:

"The independence of the Transport Safety Director both elevates safety as a desirable policy outcome and provides an independent source of accountability and transparency on safety processes and outcomes that

exceed what is likely to result if ... bus safety was left solely to the public transport regulatory agency and/or a governmental department to manage. The Transport Safety Director's audit processes and industry engagement has led the agency to the conclusion that Melbourne's route bus services and practices are safe and that the safety focus should be on developing a proactive and forward-looking safety ... management culture, as distinct from practices that react to safety concerns after they happen."

So that's the context of the safety director. In the same vein, can I then take you to the passage in your report where you talk about the standing committee on bus safety as another recommendation of yours. For that, can I please take you to --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, could you help us understand a bit more about the independent Transport Safety Director?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: What support services does he have? Who is he? Where does he come from?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: He was a position created by the Transport Integration Act, which is a 2010 act of the Victorian Parliament, that essentially reorganised a lot of the institutional arrangements for delivery and

planning of transport in Victoria. So it created an organisation, essentially, to be the peak policy body, and then it created two agencies in terms of where public transport is going that in fact are responsible, if you like, for various elements of system planning.

The first one is Public Transport Victoria, who are essentially the contract administrator and the system planner. But it also created the independent position of Transport Safety Director and Transport Safety Victoria, because it wanted to put a significant focus on safety improvement in the transport space, and it felt that to do that, creating a separate entity with a statutory duty to perform that role, was probably the strongest way to do it.

An alternative, for example, might be to just make that another responsibility of the public transport agency, but I think the feeling at the time was that safety is sufficiently important to benefit from an independent, more arm's length approach, and so that was the reason, I think, that it was done in that way.

CHAIRMAN: What support does he have to discharge his duties?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: He has his own organisation with a staff, I don't know the actual number, but they have research staff; they have staff who do field audits, for

example.

I'm guessing -- I'm simply guessing -- their staff numbers are probably around about 30 or 40, but I'll come back to you with an answer on that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

What qualifications does he have, the occupant at the moment?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: He is an expert in safety risk management, I think in aviation was his experience background. So, essentially, because the focus has been on safety risk management, I think the feeling was that he would be a good person to come into that space and apply those lessons, if you like, that he had been learning and applying in the aviation field into the land transport area.

CHAIRMAN: And land transport encompasses buses, trains, trams?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, but he's also -- he's the director of bus safety as well.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So does the government still have any role to play in mandating safety behaviour, or is that all down to the Transport Safety Director?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

MR DEREK CHAN: Does the government still have a role to

play in ensuring bus safety, or is that all left to the Transport Safety Director?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, the government's role is essentially in setting the policy framework and attaching the priority to safety, and then it's the safety director's role to in fact implement and deliver on that policy objective for government.

I included, I think it was in my second report, a diagram that compared the structure of arrangements, at page 71, in Hong Kong and Melbourne. I split that up into three categories, which we often use to talk about institutional design: strategic or policy level, tactical or system design level, and the operational level. And in terms of the way that Hong Kong's organised and the way Melbourne's organised, you have your Transport and Housing Bureau at the policy level; we have an organisation called Transport for Victoria. At the operational level, you have franchised bus operators and we have contracted bus operators. Then in the middle, you have the Transport Department; we have Public Transport Victoria but we also have Transport Safety Victoria, and probably in terms of institutions, that's perhaps the biggest gap or the biggest difference between the two sets of arrangements.

MR DEREK CHAN: Along the same vein --

CHAIRMAN: If you will excuse me, I have a nose bleed so I'm going to adjourn for a short while. Excuse me.

(2.39 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(2.50 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Apologies for the interruption, but I think normal services have been restored.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Professor, just before the break, you were comparing the institutional structure in Melbourne and contrasting that with Hong Kong, and the observation being that Hong Kong does not have a dedicated safety department or body.

Along that same vein, at page 70 of the report, which is the previous page from this chart, in the third full paragraph you made some observations about the Hong Kong system, and in the last sentence you make the remark that:

"However, the absence of an independent safety regulator in Hong Kong seems likely to lessen the relative focus on safety matters."

Is that the point that you were making before, about the benefits of having such an independent regulator?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Turning, if I may, then to the recommendation on the standing committee, which is at page 94 of the expert report. At the bottom of page 94, at point 6, you recommend establishing "a standing committee on bus safety", and you suggest "meeting at least twice yearly to review and evaluate the latest technology that may impact on bus safety, particularly for route bus operation, and advise government on desirable safety inclusions in the franchised bus fleet and other bus systems. The newly formed Working Group on Enhancement of Franchised Bus Safety could form the basis for this committee but membership should be broadened to include other bus operators."

Again, do I understand it correctly that both these approaches -- a standing committee on bus safety and a transport director -- would assist in promoting a proactive approach to bus safety issues?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Mr Chan, I believe that's the case, yes. The standing committee is really about trying to ensure there is an ongoing dialogue between the respective parties who have an influence in this bus safety area, such as the bus manufacturers, the after-market equipment providers, the government, the universities that have a role in this place as well. It is really about trying to have a mechanism for collaboration which

I also noted was an important point made by Mr Weston about the London arrangements. We have those kinds of arrangements at the national level in particular in Australia as part of the process, going through the National Heavy Vehicle Law, and it's working out in relation to bus. That's been a good way of "open door" all the way through and making sure there is knowledge throughout the field about what is possible.

I noticed in some of the evidence that was submitted, oral evidence to this committee, one of the smaller operators, franchised bus operator, commenting that perhaps he or she didn't have the information about some of the technologies that they might have liked to have had. This is really about trying to make sure that everybody's got access to a lot of the better information on a reasonably prompt basis so that you're actually ahead of the game rather than responding once an accident's happened.

CHAIRMAN: So this is to be proactive rather than reactive?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chair --

CHAIRMAN: Which is perhaps what this working group is, reacting?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I think if you get a major catastrophe of the kind you had here in February, you can expect some kind of reaction.

CHAIRMAN: Reaction is better than no action.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed.

CHAIRMAN: And best of all is proaction.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's really where I'm seeing this going, that you use that as a basis to grow into a more proactive approach, which could emerge from the working group, but in my view it needs to have a wider membership. I note that the working group started with a relatively narrow range of issues that it was going to look at, and that, I think, again is perfectly understandable, in view of the reaction to the February situation, for example.

But, going forward, at least to stand back from that and say what are the most significant areas that we can make enhancements, and I've talked here particularly about technology, because I also think that you need to focus much more on the working/driving/fatigue question and dealing with that as well, so this is particularly focused on bus safety, on the technology side.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "include other bus operators", all of the franchised bus operators are members of the working group.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. I'm thinking about the smaller bus operators as well, not just the big ones.

CHAIRMAN: Not the franchised bus operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Well, they would be franchised, but not the big ones, the one who run the minibuses and so on.

CHAIRMAN: I see. We use the term "franchised buses" to describe the six franchises and the five franchised bus operators. They were all representatives on this standing committee. But certainly minibus organisations were no part of it. Do you have in mind including them?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I do, Chair. They are a significant part of your market. My recollection is it's 1.5 or 2 per cent, in terms of millions of passengers per day, compared to 4 million with the franchised bus operations. So they are significant in the marketplace, and I think they also need to be a part of this process, because if someone is going to catch a bus, any bus, it seems to me they have the right to expect the same level of safety, no matter who is providing that service.

CHAIRMAN: But, as you will perhaps be aware, we impose different safety features on minibuses compared with our franchised buses.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. That doesn't mean that the conversation about what is the best technology that's available for those different categories of vehicle is not a conversation that should be had. That would be the point I'm making, that the floor needs to be lifted across the board if you are going to have these

conversations, not just at the big end of town.

CHAIRMAN: The working group does not include any representatives of unions. Do you have any suggestions or views on that, for the proposed standing committee?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Prima facie, I would be in favour of that. That would be certainly part of the way we would approach this in Australia.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: Is the standing committee advisory, or does it have any statutory power to enforce implementation?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Prof Lo, no. I see this as being an advisory committee to government, in particular to the responsible minister, but it wouldn't have powers of those kinds.

But ideally, it's findings, it's deliberations, any research that it supports would all be made public.

MEMBER LO: So what difference does it make if, let's say, our Transport Department has a division or a branch called transport safety, versus what you have in Victoria, where it's a separate, parallel agency or body? What difference does it make?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They are different roles. The Transport Safety Director, his role is essentially to do with implementation of particular legislation. This standing committee idea is about trying to improve knowledge and

awareness and understanding across the industry of the sorts of technologies that are available, so that they are in people's minds, when they are going through vehicle purchase decisions, for example. You know, this is about awareness raising, collaboration, trying to develop a stronger industry level understanding, as distinct from implementing an administrative mechanism to ensure that legislation is meeting its purposes.

MEMBER LO: I guess my question is why you want a separate transport safety as a separate entity, rather than part of public transport?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Public transport, or in your case the Transport Department, have multiple purposes that they try to achieve, and safety is one of those but it is only one. It's the question of the priority that you put on safety, whether you are happy to see it dealt with at that level, where it might get put down at a lower level of priority than operating commercially, for example. I'm not saying that's happening. But I'm simply saying that if an authority has multiple objectives, then it gets involved in doing trade-offs that may mean that safety suffers.

If you think safety is a serious issue, then the best chance of elevating it in a priority sense for treatment, I think, is to give it a separate entity,

responsible for looking after its administration.

CHAIRMAN: Separate and independent?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Especially independent, Chair.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just now, Professor, you talked about the scope of the working group as well. Perhaps I can put that in context by going to actually the document that shows what the scope of the working group is.

Can I refer you to KMB-12, page 4867. Here, we have the document which tells us the scope of work of the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses. In the first paragraph, it says that the working group was set up after a traffic accident involving --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could put this document in context.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. This document is an annexure to the minutes of the first meeting of this particular working group, and the first page of the document is at page 4859, and it's the notes of first meeting of the group.

CHAIRMAN: Was the starting point not an agenda, which was issued on 12 March?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I would like you to be familiar with the chronology of what was involved in the setting up of this group, the speed at which it met, and the speed at which it made decisions, because I would like your views

on that, in the context of the benefits of proactive as opposed to reactive decisions.

We were given the agenda at an early stage by one of the bus operators, and gradually we have managed to obtain the minutes, now unredacted, are they not?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, the minutes are now unredacted.

Ms Wong has drawn my attention to the Citybus bundle at page 588.

CHAIRMAN: Is that CTB-1, 1A, or B?

MR DEREK CHAN: CTB-3.

CHAIRMAN: Just put it on the screen, if you would.

MR DEREK CHAN: Page 588.

What we see on the screen is the agenda for the first meeting of the working group to be held on 13 March 2018, and part of the agenda was the discussion of the scope of works --

CHAIRMAN: Does this document have a date other than the one at the top, 13 March?

MR DEREK CHAN: This document itself does not have a date.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. My memory was incorrect then. So 13 March is when the agenda comes into being, but that also is the first meeting, and that's what you were taking us to at 4867, is it not?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, 4867 is a document that defines the scope of the working group.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps for purposes of the transcript you could read out passages that are relevant to the questions you are going to ask from this "scope of work" document.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The first paragraph of this document says:

"After a traffic accident involving a bus of Kowloon Motor Bus Co Ltd took place on Tai Po Road on 10 February 2018, a working group is proposed to be set up to review and study measures to further enhance bus safety."

So, Professor, the first point to note is that the working group is reactive to a serious accident happening. And the scope of the working group includes -- the first item is about enhancing training arrangements; the second item is about seat belts; and the third item is to explore technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, applicability and other issues relating to installation of on-vehicle safety devices.

Professor, in the context of a proactive approach, would you expect these issues to be discussed in advance, or rather as a reaction to an accident happening?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: These are the sorts of things that would come up as a matter of course on the agenda of a proactive set of circumstances. But given the situation

at the time and the concerns around, you can understand these sorts of issues being put on the agenda straightaway, recognising that it is reactive, but you can't do much else in that circumstance, but going forward, you would want to have this stuff on the agenda on an ongoing basis so that you are ahead of the problems.

MR DEREK CHAN: In a committee that is adopting a proactive approach, would you expect the scope of the committee to cover other aspects of bus safety, in addition to the three mentioned here?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Certainly. I think I have suggested in my report that you have a technology-oriented committee, but another one also focusing on training, which is the first point there. But I think the technology committee could really write its own agenda in terms of what are the forward-looking initiatives we are going to see and should anticipate and plan for that will be most effective in terms of improving bus safety.

Now, there are a range of measures that are listed here. The European process that they are going through at the moment to look at their next set of mandatory requirements has other elements as well that it's including. I would imagine that your proactive, forward-looking committee would be all over that sort of

European agenda and assessing its relevance to Hong Kong going forward, for example.

There were some notes at the back of my first report on some of the elements in that ongoing European agenda. I just wrote them as notes for your information. But they are the kinds of issues, for example, the kinds of technologies, that you would expect a forward-looking committee would be looking at and saying, "Have these got a role in Hong Kong now? Will they have a role in Hong Kong in three years' time?", with all the key players being at the table.

CHAIRMAN: So you would expect such a proactive committee to be examining what others are doing in other jurisdictions?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: And you mention the European Union as an example, but we also know, because we have a report from Mr Weston, that that has been underway in London as well, for Transport for London?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed. Transport for London have a lot of investigations for themselves. Their Standard Bus, I think they call it, looks a really good initiative to me. But at the end of the day, London/Hong Kong/Europe/Australia, we all tend to get caught up in the UNECE standards.

CHAIRMAN: Transport for London are going to promulgate a bus safety standard, which I think is the term they use for it.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, which is a really good initiative too.

CHAIRMAN: So you would expect such a committee to be proactive, ongoing, monitoring what is happening in other jurisdictions?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chair, and looking in particular at the kinds of safety problems that Hong Kong is facing, and saying, "Which of these technologies are going to be most useful here in the time frame that they might be available?" And are there any areas of research that need to be done for problems that we've got that maybe nobody else has got to the same extent, because your operating environment is pretty challenging in some places.

CHAIRMAN: Would you expect such a committee to not only monitor remotely, as it were, what is happening in other jurisdictions, but to have exchanges of personnel so that such developments are discussed in person between the people involved, in Hong Kong and the EU, Australia, Singapore, London?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Certainly, and I think a lot of the original equipment manufacturers, for example, would be

falling over themselves with delight at the opportunity to participate in a process like this, if you think about the Volvos, the Scanias, and so on; they have got a lot to contribute to this process and I'm sure would be delighted at the opportunity to be involved in an ongoing basis with that sort of deliberation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Moving on, if I may, Professor, to the next topic I want to cover with you, and that's the issue of seat belts. We saw from the working group agenda just now that installation of seat belts or retrofitting seat belts was a major item on their agenda. Can I start with this question: are seat belts required to be installed --

CHAIRMAN: Just pause for a moment. The reference to seat belts at 4867 is not in either the context of retrofitting or fitting on new buses. It's general, is it not?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: "The installation of seat belts on all seats".

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, the discussion started with installation of seat belts on all seats, and I will show you in a moment the documents that show the progression of the discussion to a point where the retrofitting issue arises.

So can I just start with a general question, that is are seat belts required to be installed on urban buses in Australia?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is there a reason for that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: The belief is that the mass of the vehicle itself is normally going to provide sufficient occupant protection in the event of an accident, such that seat belts are not going to add much more on top of that. There is also a challenge with existing vehicles of retrofitting and the cost of so doing.

The way that we would approach this sort of question in Australia -- and I don't know whether you might do exactly the same thing -- is we have a process called a regulatory impact statement, and if we were looking, for example, to require seat belts to be mandatory on route buses, that would probably need to go through the process of a regulatory impact statement that would look at the cost of various ways of going about undertaking that work, and then do an assessment of the probabilities of various sorts of incident types being reduced, putting a dollar value on that, and coming up with a view as the basis of that assessment. That's the normal way we do this kind of assessment.

CHAIRMAN: And who does the regulatory impact statement?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It would be done by the relevant government department. A lot of these sorts of things would happen at a national level in Australia, so they would be done by the National Transport Commission which is the successor body to the National Road Transport Commission that I was deputy chairman of for nine years. We did multiple regulatory impact statements into various aspects of vehicle requirements.

CHAIRMAN: Has such a study been done on the impact of seat belts being installed on buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm not sure if there's been a formal one done at national level, but I know it's been looked at many times at state level in terms of seat belts. Probably the main pressure in Victoria that we get for installation of seat belts is actually on school buses in country areas, where the vehicles tend to be operating at higher speed, you have younger children sitting in the seats. But again that's not been mandatory at all; it's not a requirement.

The only requirement for seat belts on our buses is for coaches that are travelling interstate, usually at high speed.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. As I understand it, that is the distinction drawn in the United Kingdom. Seat belts have to be provided on coaches, and the issue is speed.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.
MR DEREK CHAN: Just so that I understand the context of that, when you talk about high speeds, interstate travel, what speed do coaches travel at?
PROF JOHN STANLEY: These would be travelling at 100 kilometres per hour, most of the time.
MR DEREK CHAN: So that I understand the comparison being drawn, are double-decker buses common in Victoria?
PROF JOHN STANLEY: We don't have double-decker buses providing route service, but we do have a double-decker bus that runs from the Melbourne CBD to the airport in Melbourne and -- my wife and I were just discussing during the lunch break -- we think that has seat belts. In fact, Janet told me that I continually tell her to put it on, so that suggests that they do.
MR DEREK CHAN: At what speed does the bus travel?
PROF JOHN STANLEY: It's mostly on a freeway so it would be travelling at 100 kilometres per hour.
MR DEREK CHAN: What I am going to do now, Professor, if I may, is just to take you to the stage at which the working group has reached in terms of the considerations that it has on seat belts and retrofitting seat belts. Then I'm going to go back to take you to some discussions leading up to that and ask for your views and observations on some of the matters raised, if I

may.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can start at the end, so we know where the end-game is. Can I take you to TD-1, page 403.

Just so you know what the document is: it is a document drafted by the Transport Department for discussion by the Legislative Council Panel on Transport. That discussion was to take place on 25 July 2018.

So this, as it were, is a summary of what the working group has arrived at in terms of recommendations and considerations.

CHAIRMAN: I think the letter on the previous page is useful in explaining what it is.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Perhaps --

CHAIRMAN: You could go to that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Perhaps I can read that out. That's a letter from the Transport Department to this committee, and the Transport Department says in the body of the letter:

"As you are aware from our previous submissions, the Transport Department has set up in mid-March a Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses which comprises members from all franchised bus operators and major bus manufacturers to consider and study possible

measures to further enhance bus safety. Whilst the report of the working group is being compiled, the findings and recommendations of the working group will be reported to the Legislative Council Panel on Transport at its meeting on 25 July 2018."

So that's the context in which this paper was prepared. If I can go directly to the passage on seat belts, which is at page 407, that's where the section on seat belts starts, and if I may go straight to paragraph 11, over the page, the Transport Department notes that:

"As confirmed with the bus manufacturers, it is technically feasible to supply all new buses with seat belts for all passenger seats conforming to relevant international standards. In this regard, all FB operators have agreed that all passenger seats of all new buses ordered from July 2018 onwards will be installed with seat belts."

So that's in respect of new buses.

Paragraph 12 talks about retrofitting. I won't trouble you with the details about that. The long and short of it is that retrofitting seat belts on lower decks was considered to be impractical or not feasible.

At paragraph 13:

"However, it should be more feasible to retrofit

seat belts on all passenger seats of the upper deck only in some vehicle models of the existing double-deck fleet. If all passenger seats on the upper deck are retrofitted with seat belts, it is expected that the weight of the bus will be increased by 300 to 400kg and consequently the passenger-carrying capacity may need to be reduced by 7 to 8 passengers."

So that's the consideration that has been reached at this stage, just the upper deck.

Paragraph 14, the last sentence on that page:

"Some bus operators have expressed concerns that the retrofitting of seat belts would not only incur significant financial implication, but also considerable time and manpower resources, not to mention the need to redeploy or procure additional buses to maintain the existing bus service level during the whole process."

Now, the "incur significant implication" part, there's a footnote 5 to it, and if you look at the bottom of the page, footnote 5:

"With the absence of detailed study on the technical details for retrofitting seat belts on all seats in the upper deck, a rough estimate on the costs of retrofitting a bus is about HK$200,000 (excluding manpower and overhead costs)."

So that's what we are looking at.

Paragraph 15 talks about overseas experience and practices, and it's similar to what you have told us about Melbourne.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would be kind enough to read that out, because this is relevant.

MR DEREK CHAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman.

Paragraph 15 talks about overseas experience a practices:

"The working group has reviewed the prevailing overseas practices or requirements on the installation and wearing of seat belts on buses. Currently, for inter-cities or cross-boundary routes, some overseas jurisdictions (eg United States, United Kingdom and Netherlands) have mandated the provision of seat belts for all passenger seats, while others (eg United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Australia (Victoria)) have imposed mandatory requirement of wearing seat belts. Nevertheless, for buses serving urban routes buses or buses allowed to carry standing passengers, none of the overseas jurisdictions that the working group has reviewed thus far have statutory requirements for the provision of seat belts on passenger seats. According to the transport authorities of those jurisdictions, the urban buses are typically used for short journeys, in terms of both time and distance, and undertaken at

moderate speeds on urban routes. Thus, no seat belt requirement at passenger seats on these urban buses has been imposed. A summary of the findings is at the annex B."

Paragraph 16:

"Having regard to the points mentioned in [the paragraphs above], the working group has arrived at the following recommendations with a view to giving extra protection to seated passengers:

(a) seat belts should be provided for all seats in future procurement of new buses; and

(b) subject to further assessment on the technical, operational and financial feasibility, consideration may be given to retrofitting all seats in the upper deck with seat belts on buses deployed for specific bus routes, ie long-haul routes which are operated via expressways with relatively fewer bus stops."

That's the Transport Department's summary of the position that it has reached, so the recommendation is, in terms of retrofitting, upper deck and long-haul routes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, as qualified.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, as qualified.

CHAIRMAN: Long-haul routes which are operated on expressways.

MR DEREK CHAN: Expressways, yes.

We've got examples at footnote 6 as to what those expressways are expected to be, and in footnote 7, according to the franchised bus operators, this would apply to around 2,000 buses currently being deployed on those routes.

What I want to do is then go to some examples -- not all of them, just certain examples -- of the concerns or observations made by the bus operators during discussions, and then I'm also going to refer you to one passage in Mr Weston's report that talks about the same thing, and then I'm going to ask you for your observations on this topic.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So if I may refer you to some of the minutes of the discussions of the working group. The first one that I want to take you to is at KMB-12 at page 4869-1.

What you should be looking at, Professor, is the first page of the notes of 1st meeting held on 13 March 2018, and you can see the parties present at that meeting on the first and second pages. On the issue --

CHAIRMAN: Do we have unredacted versions of this document?

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, 4869-1 ought to be unredacted in my copy, and it's also unredacted on the screen copy.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I must have had the wrong page.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm sorry, Chairman, 4869-1.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can take you directly to the seat belt passage, which is firstly at page 13.

CHAIRMAN: I think it's important perhaps to help Prof Stanley with this: there was a division, was there not, in the way in which the working group addressed these issues? So the working group met generally; there was then a technical group which dealt with safety devices; and then there was a group that dealt with training, a subgroup, I think that's called.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And what we're looking at is the main group meetings. I will be taking you to two parts in the main group meetings, so we see the observations made by some of the bus operators. I will also be taking you to a minute of the subgroup, which includes bus manufacturers, so you can see what the bus manufacturers were saying on the same issue.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Okay.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may take you to page 4869-6, starting at paragraph 13, which is a section on the installation of seat belts.

I'm still on KMB-12, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I was looking for the version, as with most

of the documents in this inquiry, I work on an unpaginated version because they are given to me the night before, and then I come into this hearing and I have a paginated version which has none of my notes on it. So I'm going to try and work from both.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I'm looking at paragraph 13 the 1st meeting note. That is the section on the installation of seat belts.

In paragraph 13, it introduced:

"At present, all exposed seats on franchised buses have been installed with seat belts. Taking the technical feasibility into account, the Transport Department proposed to install seat belts on all seats for new buses and retrofit seat belts on all seats on the existing buses."

At paragraph 16:

"Citybus/New World First Bus queried the practicability of installation of seat belts on all seats to enhance passenger safety because it would be difficult for the bus captains to ensure passengers on buses wearing seat belts. Besides, Citybus/New World First Bus also raised concerns on the need of wearing seat belts by standees who could not be provided with seat belts. The Transport Department advised that there

were requests for a comprehensive review on seat belts installation on bus after the traffic accidents. It had been more than a decade since the last review on the installation of seat belts on buses. The objective of the prevailing discussion should focus on the technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, applicability and other issues relating to installation of seat belts on all seats other than exposed seats."

So the two issues identified by Citybus here are the enforcement issue and also those standing wouldn't have the benefit of seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, if that's what you are going to do, there is a statement in the notes of this meeting that the TD, as they are called, the Transport Department, advised that "there were requests for a comprehensive review on seat belt installation on bus after the traffic accident". Do we have any information as to that?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I will have to get back to you on that, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I was wrong to call it "accident" singular. It says "accidents". That begs the question: from whom were these requests made, to whom were they made, when were they made, and in respect of which traffic accident?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. It certainly calls for that to be considered. Perhaps I can come back to you, Mr Chairman, on that.

CHAIRMAN: Well, good luck.

MR DEREK CHAN: Anyway, that's the observations from Citybus.

If I can take you then to a 3rd meeting. The notes of the 3rd meeting are at page 4908-1, and the 3rd meeting was held on 21 June 2018. Again, I am focusing firstly on the main group meetings.

I want to focus your attention at paragraph 25 of that meeting note, at page 4908-7.

CHAIRMAN: This is now 21 June?

MR DEREK CHAN: That's correct, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: You see, Professor, at paragraph 26, that the discussion about retrofitting has focused on the upper deck, for the reasons that we've already covered, about it being impractical to fit it on the lower deck.

At paragraph 26 -- I will just read it out:

"As for existing buses, the meeting noted that retrofitting seat belts on all passenger seats of the upper deck of some existing double-deck bus models should be feasible. Kowloon Motor Bus/Long Win advised that they would retrofit seat belts on all passenger

seats of the upper deck or deploy buses with seat belts on all passenger seats on routes which serve long-haul passengers or are operated on expressways with limited boarding or alighting activities at the enroute stops."

At paragraph 27:

"In the light of [that] initiative, the meeting had discussed and come to the views that having regard to the technical feasibility in retrofitting seat belts on existing buses, operation of franchised buses in Hong Kong which were mostly deployed on urban routes with standing passengers; and the costs and downtime incurred to retrofit seat belts on all existing buses, as well as overseas experiences, that there were insufficient justifications to make it a mandatory requirement for all buses to be fitted with seat belts on all passenger seats. Nevertheless, members reckoned that in the case of exposed seats and in bus compartment with no standees allowed, seat belts might give extra protection to seated passengers to prevent passengers from falling out from those seats."

Just to give you some context, the upper deck of buses in Hong Kong would have no standing room on them; standing room only applies to the lower deck.

In paragraph 28:

"In this regard, Citibank/New World First Bus was

requested to consider retrofitting seat belts on all passenger seats on the upper deck for the buses operating selected bus routes for long-haul passengers or operating on expressways with limited boarding and alighting activities along the routes. Citybus/New World First Bus indicated that it would be difficult for their companies to allocate their buses to solely operate specific routes as their buses would serve a number of routes in a day under their existing operations. In addition, Citybus/New World First Bus observed that very few passengers would make use of seat belts, it would not be financially feasible to retrofit existing buses with seat belts on all passenger seats."

So two points to note there. One is the narrowing down of the retrofitting target to upper deck and expressways/long-hauls. Secondly, you have observations about financial viability and doubts about whether it is actually useful.

CHAIRMAN: To give Prof Stanley the context, we have received oral evidence from Citybus, have we not, and they have spoken in strident terms about their views about the deployment of seat belts on buses?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, they have.

CHAIRMAN: Are you going to take the professor to that transcript, or are you in a position to summarise it?

It's 8 May, I think.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I will ask Ms Wong to locate that part of the transcript.

In the meantime, perhaps I can take you to Mr Weston's report, so we can complete the picture about the various observations and views that this committee has received on this issue.

Mr Weston's report, the relevant passage is at page 134 of the bundle.

At page 134 of Mr Weston's report, the relevant part on seat belts starts in the middle of that page. Again, I will just read it out:

"Currently bus driver or passenger seat belts are not a legal requirement in the UK on scheduled bus services.

In terms of passenger seat belt the Department for Transport guidance note makes the following statement:

'General requirements. Since 1 October 2001, seat belts have been required to be installed in each forward and rearward facing seat in all new buses. The use of an approved and properly fitted restraint system can help prevent death or serious injury, not only by restraining the occupant from forward motion but also by preventing their ejection from the vehicle, particularly in accidents where the vehicle rolls over.

The only exemption from this requirement is for buses that are designed for urban use with standing passengers. An exemption is permitted for these vehicles because they are typically used for short journeys, in both time and distance, undertaken at moderate speeds on urban routes. Although we are aware that vehicles equipped with seat belts are used by some operators for urban fare paying services, ultimately, it is for the operator to choose the type of vehicle used to provide a service'.

At present no London operators fit passenger or driver seatbelts on buses contracted to TfL. Historically First Group did fit driver seat belts but sold out their London operations to Tower Transit and Metroline ... in June 2013."

I think we have also located the passage from the Citybus transcript. Can I just turn that up?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The transcript bundle, Day 3, page 6.

CHAIRMAN: How does that translate in the Augustinian calendar, rather than the North Korean calendar? What is Day 3?

MR DEREK CHAN: Tuesday, 29 May 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: At line 15, Mr Samuel Cheng for Citybus

says -- the question was:

"... has the Commissioner required any specific safety features to be installed on any of your bus?"

That's the question.

Mr Cheng then says:

"Let me cite two examples. The Transport Department did ask the bus operators -- allow me to use English to talk about this term -- in relation to exposed seats, seat belts must be fixed.

In addition, a small number of our buses had a straight and long flight of steps, so the Transport Department asked us to fix an additional handrail."

I'm sorry, Mr Chairman, I think the more appropriate reference to be the evidence of the following day, the following hearing day. That is Wednesday, 30 May 2018., at page 58.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: At line 19, Mr Duncan, that is counsel for the committee, focused the witness's attention to "Feasibility of installation of seat belts on (a) all seats and (b) all seats on the upper deck on new buses".

CHAIRMAN: To what was Mr Duncan referring?

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Duncan is quoting a statement made in the Citybus forward planning programme, and if I could just read it out:

"'It is feasible to install seat belts on all seats or on all seats on the upper deck. However, our observation shows that very few people wear the seat belts currently available at the exposed seats. Without any legislation to mandate the wearing of passenger seat belts on a franchised bus and the enforcement authority to strictly enforce the legislation, installing seat belts on all seats will be a waste of resources because vast majority of passengers will not wear seat belts even though they are provided.'

That was a statement that you made in the latest forward planning programme for Citybus."

Mr Duncan then draws his attention to another passage in the Transport Department about the seat belt issue. At page 60, Mr Chairman raised specifically this issue of retrofitting and whether it's a waste of resources. At page 60, line 17, this is a question from the chairman:

"Before you embark on retrofitting, might I ask this question. In your earlier answers, you said that it was a waste of resources to fit seat belts because the vast majority of passengers simply wouldn't wear them, so that it required enforcement. Given that you have now indicated that you have agreed to incorporate them, what view do you have about whether or not this is a waste of

resources if there isn't enforcement?"

Mr Cheng has this to say:

"If it is not mandated by law, then it is impossible to enforce the law. Currently, there is no requirement that when you are on a bus you have to put on your seat belt. Even if it is mandated by law, in the absence of law enforcement, I'm afraid it is also a waste of resources. We maintain the same view."

Chairman: Have you raised this view with the Transport Department?

Mr Cheng: We did. Our colleagues did raise it with the TD."

So you've seen actually Citybus raising that observation in the minutes that we've just read of the working group.

Before I ask you for your observation on that issue, I can also inform you that the expressways on which the buses operate, speed limits can go up to 80, but the speed limiter is fixed at 70. So that's the speed at which the franchised bus can go on expressways.

CHAIRMAN: Well, the expressway to the airport is 110, is it not?

MR DEREK CHAN: The airport is 110, but the franchised bus limiter will still be the same, at 70.

CHAIRMAN: The legal speed limit for a franchised bus is

70 kilometres per hour?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, also. So that's the speed at which buses would travel along the expressways.

With all that information in mind, what is your observation or comment on the installation of seat belts, firstly on all the seats, and secondly focusing on the upper deck, where there is no standing passengers.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you. This really takes me back to an answer I gave maybe half an hour ago about the notion of a regulatory impact statement. I think there are two levels to this particular question. The first level is: is it technically feasible to fit seat belts in certain kinds of positions on buses, for example on the upper deck of new buses, on retrofitting for older buses. That's a technical question of feasibility.

The second level then is: if it is technically feasible, what is the cost/benefit ratio of doing that installation? In other words, what will it cost? That is the probability of particular kinds of accidents being reduced if those seat belts are installed? Will people wear them, is one of the questions that needs to be addressed in that setting?

I don't have a view in any particular circumstances whether it is a good idea or not. What I would say is

that that's exactly the kind of problem that you should submit to a regulatory impact statement. There will be information around on the probabilities of accidents, these different varieties. You can put monetary values on the probability of those sorts of accidents being reduced. You probably can form a view too on the probability of wearing seat belts, which would affect the effectiveness of the wearing thereof.

So I think this is an exercise that needs a serious piece of cost/benefit analysis done on it. Now, government may decide it wants to make a policy decision to install seat belts where it is technically feasible. That's fine. As a matter of course, the way I would approach this, though, is to say you need to go through that cost/benefit analysis first, and I think that's what should be done in this situation.

So, rather than taking it on the basis that people think it's going to be this or going to be that, the kinds of concerns that have been raised by the various parties are really genuine and legitimate concerns and they affect the values of the potential installation, but until you have actually done that proper cost/benefit analysis, it's just speculation.

If I had a gut feel, it's going to be that probably it's not going to be worthwhile, with extensive seat

belt fitting, but that would be no more than a gut feel, and ideally this needs to go through a proper evaluation.

CHAIRMAN: Because a gut feel is not good enough; you should do a cost/benefit analysis?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: And in doing that, you would look at the various components that you have described?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly. In principle, it's a pretty straightforward cost/benefit analysis. Getting some of the values or the probabilities you need will need a bit of serious research, but the process and the sorts of things you need to look for are very much encapsulated by a lot of the responses that you have read out in the various submissions.

CHAIRMAN: What parties ought to be involved in a proper and effective cost/benefit analysis on this issue? Who would you go to? What information would you want from them?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Firstly, you've obviously got to talk to the equipment suppliers, the bus manufacturers, to get a solid view of what's technically feasible with new and older vehicles. That includes with the seat manufacturers as well. You probably need to be talking also to people who do customer survey work on the

vehicle, to get a sense of what are the sorts of factors that would be influencing the probability of these seat belts being worn. In that case, you might want to go and look at vehicles where it is currently mandated, to see if the seat belts are being worn in those situations or not. For example, in Australia, you would have a look at the coaches and see whether people are actually wearing their seat belts there, and if they are what are the sorts of reasons that they are; have they been responding to some sort of market awareness campaign? What is it that's actually encouraged them to go through that process?

It's unlikely to be the fact that an inspector will get on the bus and fine them if they don't do it. It's more likely to be because they have thought about the consequences of not doing it.

So I think that's the sort of process that you need to go through there. There are a range of technical --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, if I might interrupt -- so in Hong Kong, we've got seat belts on vulnerable seats, as they are called, the top seats on the upper deck, for example, at the front. So it would be simple enough to survey whether or not people are actually prepared to use them.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN: Even though this has been identified as a dangerous or vulnerable place on a bus; are they actually using them?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely, Chair, and I have to say that my wife and I wore ours yesterday in the front seat coming from Victoria, which was the first place in the world to make seat belt-wearing compulsory.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in understanding that that was a journey coming to and from Stanley?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: That's no doubt a good reason to wear a seat belt.

You were going on to describe the people from whom one would seek assistance and the kind of information you would want from them to do this cost/benefit analysis.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you. On the cost side, we have talked about the vehicle suppliers, the manufacturers of the vehicles. When it gets to the question of retrofitting, you would need to talk to people who do that sort of work on buses, who actually -- I mean, we have vehicle body builders in Melbourne who I would go to, if I was doing this particular type of study in Melbourne, to get an opinion from them. It's probably going to be technically feasible to retrofit, it's just

going to be very expensive. I think they are the sorts of things you would need to look at. So it would require a fairly major rebuild of the bottom part.

But then it's a case of what are the benefits, so then you need to look at what are the sorts of accidents that are happening in the vehicle, and, for example, is this happening to people who are standing; is it happening to people who are sitting; what is the probability that exposure to those sorts of accidents will be reduced in the event that seat belt-wearing is required, and what do you need to do to encourage that seat belt-wearing?

If I was doing that kind of exercise, I would probably be talking to psychologists about how you would get through the message about wearing seat belts, about getting people to take this seriously. The point you make, Chair, about looking at what happens in those seats that are currently required to do it in Hong Kong, very important in terms of forming a view on the probabilities that will happen. I would be talking to whoever are the custodians of the values or the costs of different sorts of accidents. So, in other words, what is the cost of a fatal accident in Hong Kong, what is the cost of a serious injury accident, what is the cost of a minor injury accident, those sorts of things,

because they will be the sorts of unit values you need to apply to the reductions in the probability of an accident of a particular kind taking place.

CHAIRMAN: In finding out what is happening in accidents, how it is that people are injured, where they are injured, why they are injured, no doubt you would wish to consult the police, perhaps; the bus companies?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: You would certainly do both of those things, Chair. Also, if I was doing that kind of exercise in Australia, I would talk to Monash University Accident Research Centre, where they specialise in that kind of analysis. So certainly the police, and I think some of the data that I saw, I think it was from the Transport Department, on fatal accidents here in Hong Kong, looked good data, and I suspect there's a lot more available behind that than what I read in some of the summaries. But certainly those sources of information are really important.

But also, if there are university knowledge hubs that focus on safety in vehicles, then they would be an important inclusion in an exercise like this.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: As a matter of interest, Professor, in Melbourne, when you've talked about urban bus routes with standing capacities, excluding the route to the

airport, at what speeds do the buses operate? Do you have a 70km zone in your urban areas?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: We have a 60km general speed limit, but on freeways it is 100 kilometres per hour. One of the major transport corridors that the competitively tendered service runs on is on the eastern freeway in Melbourne, which has a bus lane, and that bus lane would operate at up to 100 kilometres per hour. You know, in part of the day, at the peak time, it wouldn't be able to operate at that speed all its length, but because it is a bus lane, they can operate at 100 kilometres per hour for a good part of the day.

No most of the network, the average speed is about 22 kilometres per hour. If you look at the timetable and the sort of implied speeds built into the timetable, they average about 22 kilometres per hour, which means the bus probably gets up to 60 for a short part, between stops.

MR DEREK CHAN: Let's just make sure I'm not mistaken. So some of the urban buses where there are no seat belts can travel up to 100 kilometres per hour?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Correct, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now that we have discussed the costs involved of retrofitting, it may be a good point to then move on to my next topic, which is the case for subsidy,

which is a topic mentioned --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, might I raise with you the issue of speed limit. What is the minimum speed limit that's enforced -- I'm phrasing that badly. You say 60 kilometres per hour is the general speed limit. Are there lower speed limits?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: There are, Chair. There are down to 40 kilometres per hour, for example, past schools. There are areas where 50 kilometres per hour is common. There is also a push from a number of municipal authorities or local councils to try and reduce speed limits to 30 kilometres per hour, particularly on local streets.

CHAIRMAN: And how widespread is that amongst those communities?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Not very, Chair. It's in a few inner metropolitan municipalities where there are a lot of cyclists.

CHAIRMAN: But that hasn't resulted in those kind of reductions?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, Chair. 60 is the most common. There's a bit of 50 and then there's 100 on expressways.

CHAIRMAN: And 40 past schools?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: 40 past schools. Between certain hours, in the morning, but I think it's between 8.30 and about

9.30; in the afternoon --

CHAIRMAN: So that's a variable speed limit?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. It would be 40 past the school, that school opening and closing time, and then probably revert to 60 in most cases.

CHAIRMAN: Is that signalled by an electronic sign as it is in London --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- telling you that the speed limit now is different for this stretch of road as you go past the school?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, there would be a red circle sign with a 40 lit in it.

CHAIRMAN: Has any study been done in Melbourne in respect of the link between speeds of vehicles and the damage done to people in collisions or on buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Funny you should ask that, Chair. There was an article that appeared in The Melbourne Age. It's not about buses per se but it's about speed and the risk of pedestrian death, and it shows how that probability or the risk of pedestrian death increases dramatically beyond about 40 kilometres per hour. This is based on reserve that was undertaken by the Monash University Accident Research Centre. I'm happy to leave this little piece of paper with your committee.

CHAIRMAN: Monash Accident Research Centre?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Monash University Accident Research Centre.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your offer, which we will gladly take up. This is a matter you no doubt know about is being looked at in London, Transport for London, where they have correlated the risk of fatal injury to various levels of speed.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You will have noted the significant drop in the risk of fatalities if the vehicle is doing, for example, 20 miles an hour rather than 30 miles an hour.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, but the really big jump in Melbourne at least happens beyond about -- getting towards 40 kilometres per hour, so you have a relatively flat curve up to there, then it climbs very steeply, with a much higher probability of pedestrian death.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. When you say "pedestrian deaths", so that's deaths outside a vehicle?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, walking in front of.

CHAIRMAN: Or being driven into.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Can I then move on to the topic of subsidy.

I think, in your report, you do look at the possibility of subsidy, and your recommendation that the Transport and Housing Bureau in Hong Kong should be looking at it from the angle of societal benefits that a bus operation brings, and I think you have explained a bit of that this morning to us as well.

Can I first take you to page 92 of your report, where you deal with that issue, and can I just read the second full paragraph out:

"Hong Kong's public transport system would generate large societal external benefits each year, some of which may be captured by the PT provider through land value increase, where the PT operator is a land owner. This would apply to rail more than bus. Franchised bus services will certainly produce more value to society than operators can collect in fares, particularly through easing road congestion levels, increasing social inclusion and improving road safety outcomes. If fares need to increase to find money for staffing needs, then there will be some loss of these societal benefits. This loss may be sufficient to justify government providing some financial support to operators, such as would enable them to retain/attract sufficient bus captains. Franchised bus operations can still operate commercially but on the basis that government is now

remunerating the operator a sum for the societal benefits that their service provides, benefits that the operator is not able to capture through the fare box."

I think that's consistent with what you have been telling us this morning.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the next paragraph, you suggest:

"The Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department should assess in economic terms the societal benefits of Hong Kong's franchised bus services, to enable them to evaluate the case for some financial support to those services, should such an issue be raised. It is noted that the matter of possible subsidy in respect of added remuneration was raised by counsel in discussion on the first day of committee hearings ... The safety consequences of bus captain working/driving/rest provisions are a classic example of where this public policy trade-off may need to be faced, given difficulties of attracting bus drivers and particularly if this was to be compounded, in future, by working hours greater than 12 per day being ruled out or limited more than at present. The author is not arguing for a 12-hour limit, Melbourne experience suggesting that 12-14 hours can be safe, provided the institutional setting has a strict focus on safety. However, without

such a strict safety regime, there should be some nervousness about working days exceeding 12 hours."

So here you are tying the case for subsidy to the issue already experienced here about the hiring of bus captains. In the same vein, can I take you also to Mr Weston's report, who says also much the same thing. Can I invite you to go to page 152 of the expert bundle. I am focusing on the first two paragraphs under paragraph 8.3. If I can just pick this up in the middle of the first paragraph, where Mr Weston noted that there is no public subsidy in Hong Kong, and he remarks in the middle of the paragraph:

This is an exceptional achievement; however, the question must be asked whether the emphasis on operating a commercial network without public subsidy is sustainable and potentially drives either the wrong behaviours or lack [of] focus on certain aspects of the operation. Also does this overly restrict the investment the franchised operators can make in the network especially in terms of developing and introducing new technology and initiatives."

He then goes on to say:

"Consideration could be given as to whether certain safety initiatives, such as the uptake of new ... technology and bus driver training targeted specially at

safety might need to be funded by the Transport Department as direct grants outside of the franchise agreements with specific outcomes linked to these grants. Providing funding outside of the franchise agreements is also justified especially if the benefits accrue to the wider society."

Just two points, if I may pick up from those two passages. The second part, Mr Weston links the provision of subsidy to technology and training, whereas you pick up the hiring. Is there any difference conceptually to the cases that you are both making for subsidy?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: None at all, Mr Chan. I think the key point that we are both really making here is that public transport in general and franchised buses in particular, through their operation, generate external benefits to the wider society, and those benefits have a value to the community beyond just what's involved in the commercial returns that are available to the operator who's providing the service. And if there are -- and I think it's really important to understand the value of those external benefits. I think Hong Kong to me should be having a look at what is the societal value of its public transport services. I think the numbers are going to be very big.

Then, when you've got that sort of background, you can look at particular policy initiatives, such as initiatives in technology, initiatives with training, to test whether they do have external benefits that flow from them, and whether the changes in the safety environment that you're going to generate, for example, either through technology or through training or through remuneration, if that's a link there too, is going to be such as justifies the government putting some money in to support that. In other words, the external benefits are bigger than the costs involved, but they don't accrue to the operator.

I think that's the key, really. The key concept of an externality is it's accruing to the wider society and it's not able to be captured through the fare box, or land value in some cases.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the first paragraph that I read out in Mr Weston's report, he refers to a concern that if you don't have public subsidy, it may potentially drive wrong behaviours or a lack of focus, or restriction on the investment into new technologies and initiatives.

Would you share that concern or do you have any additional comments on that?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, absolutely. I think the kind of argument in, if you like, welfare economic terms, is

that if you ignore the external benefits that are available, then the level of service provision will be not enough; that you should in fact, in terms of trying to maximise the benefits to society, provide a larger volume of service than will flow from solely a commercial operator making a decision on commercial criteria.

I mentioned earlier on in the day the Thredbo conference that's held every two years, discussing competition and regulation in public transport, which is a forum that involves academics, operators in public transport, and governments. I chair the workshop strand in that and have done for probably the past ten years, that looks at trying to value public transport services. So there's an active conversation happening there in the academic/public transport operation/government area, through that forum, and it would be terrific if the Hong Kong Transport Department and interested academics from Hong Kong could participate in that forum, which is, as I say, every two years, the next one being in Singapore next year.

CHAIRMAN: Which other jurisdictions send representatives to this conference?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Chair, I think at the last one there were 22 different countries present. Around about

a third of the participants would be academics; a number of public transport operators participate. I notice when we were reading previously you talked about Tower Transit in London -- Neil Smith, the principal of that business, is a regular in this forum; South Africa, South America are strong participants; a lot of European countries participate in the venue; Australia is well represented as well, new Zealand -- 22 countries -- and senior-level representation from government, from the universities, and also from operators.

CHAIRMAN: I take it, if the next one is in Singapore, Singapore is also a participant?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Is that government and bus operators?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: The Land Transport Authority will be hosting the next event. I suspect that some of the operators might be sponsors.

CHAIRMAN: When is that to be held?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think it's September next year. Maybe August. I will send you that information.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Does it publish information that is available publicly?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It does, Chair. In fact that's really the most important part of the whole process. It's all

published, and so --

CHAIRMAN: Is it available on the internet?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: A lot of it is. Some of it gets actually published as journal papers, which means it's not available on the internet necessarily but you can get copies of those papers. Sometimes it appears as books. But publication is the essence of the process.

In fact, it's an unusual conference in the sense that it takes you -- it extends over four days, three days of which is based on a workshop format in which participants choose one topic only and spend three days working through that topic, and that topic might be, for example, how do we get more competition into public transport operation, and they would spend three days discussing that with colleagues. The workshop I chair spends three days talking about what are the benefits of public transport and how can we value them and can we convert them into cash flows to help pay for services.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Chair, my wife points out the next conference is Sunday, 25 to Friday, 30 August 2019.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, may I then move on to the next topic, which is working hour guidelines.

CHAIRMAN: You were dealing with the topic of subsidies,

where government might play a role in addressing the issues that Mr Weston has identified. This is an issue that's been raised, has it not, by the bus operators in respect of the cost of implementing the decision, if that's what it is, to install seat belts on franchised buses?

MR DEREK CHAN: Seat belts. We have heard evidence from Kowloon Motor Bus, Dr Leung, I think it was, who said that he had one discussion with a government official.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps if you can turn up that reference in the transcript. It is also dealt with, is it not -- and I'm working from my unpaginated bundle -- but the sub-working group on vehicle safety devices, 12 June 2018, paragraph 8. Perhaps we could draw that to Prof Stanley's attention.

You have already been told, Prof Stanley, of the anxiety being expressed by Citybus of being involved in an operation of installing seat belts at their cost on buses where it is their experience that the passengers won't use them and government won't mandate it and won't even enforce it. It's a futility, I think is what they're saying, the whole exercise.

Perhaps if we could go to paragraph 8 of those minutes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Can I start first then by going to the

second meeting notes of the sub-working group.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: It starts at KMB-12, page 4932-1. That's the first page of the meeting note.

CHAIRMAN: What's the date of this meeting?

MR DEREK CHAN: 12 June 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The relevant passage that Mr Chairman referred to is at 4932-3, paragraph 8.

Perhaps I can just read that out:

"Citybus ... mentioned that the exposed seats on the existing buses were already fitted with 3 point seat belts. From their day-to-day operation experience, most passengers sitting on exposed seats did not wear seat belts. The retrofitting work with huge cost would be a waste of money if nobody uses them. It was agreed that promotion and education to passengers should be conducted to promote the use of seat belts. Citybus said that they had about 1,100 bus registered in or after 2013 which might be feasible [for] retrofitting seat belts to the upper deck. The estimated cost of retrofit would be in the magnitude of about HK$240 million which is almost impossible for the company to afford. Citybus requested the government to provide funding or subsidy to such retrofit projects if

that is really required. Therefore they have no plan to retrofit seat belts on their own. It was agreed that the issue of financial implication would be brought up in the working group for discussion."

Just to complete the picture in respect of the other two companies, at paragraph 9:

"Kowloon Motor Bus ... emphasised that they supported the seat belt installations for all new buses", and in a phase-by-phase approach.

At the end of that paragraph:

"New Lantao Bus objected to such installation due to low utilisation rate and huge cost. New Lantao Bus had no plan to retrofit seat belts."

That's the position in respect of the three providers.

CHAIRMAN: So KMB might consider to retrofit seat belts; is that the point being made there?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: They were prepared to fit them on new buses but they would only consider retrofitting them on existing buses.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. We also saw in a previous meeting note that we went through that it was KMB who came up with the initiative or proposal about retrofitting upper deck and on specific routes that are long-haul or go on

expressways.

Perhaps just to complete the picture about the evidence from Dr Leung in the last hearing, can I refer the committee to the transcript for 12 September 2018. That should be at transcript bundle 6. The relevant part of it is at page 18, line 14. Again, maybe I will read out Dr Leung's evidence:

"May I just add. Recently I had a meeting with the government official and in fact I talked to him and requested the government whether they can offer any assistance to us in retrofitting these safety belts, and the response was quite positive, if I may put it this way."

And the person was Mr Joseph Lai, permanent secretary for transport, and his deputy, Mr Kevin Choi.

CHAIRMAN: Now, this is ground that we have covered, in a sense, already, but it is actually a real issue in Hong Kong. So that we understand what you are saying, this is what calls for an analytical cost/benefit analysis. You say, on the one hand, government can make a decision, "As a matter of policy, that's what we are going to do", but even when government makes policy decisions, surely it has regard to cost/benefit analysis?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: You would hope so, Chair, but the

evidence is that's probably not always the case. But in a situation like this, you would hope that government would go through the process of doing that cost/benefit analysis and identifying the benefits, and if those benefits look substantial, they are very much externalities. These aren't benefits that are going to be captured for the operator. So they are a case for looking at subsidy as a means of helping this process to happen.

CHAIRMAN: There might be benefits for the operator. If accidents are prevented so the passenger doesn't get injured when the bus brakes or hits something, that's a benefit for the operator.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It is, that's true.

CHAIRMAN: They don't have damages to pay.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: That's true. The larger component of these will be externalities that are not able to be captured by the operator. So you would make the argument for a sharing on the basis of the cost between the government and the operator.

CHAIRMAN: But when government is disposing of taxpayers' money, it behooves government to have regard to what the benefit and the cost is, does it not?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Absolutely, to do the quantification and to work through the exercise we were talking about

an hour or so ago.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I have three more topics. One is the issue of guidelines, the second being transparency of safety data, and the third, bus captain training. I suspect I will need about 20 minutes or half an hour to finish that. Does Mr Chairman want a break now or do you want me to head straight through?

CHAIRMAN: I am conscious that you have been on your feet and the professor has been in the hot chair, as it were. Shall we take ten minutes?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I'm happy to go either way.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes then.

(4.21 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.38 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and Professor.

If I may then go directly to the issue of working hour guidelines. I think the biggest point you make there is the difference between Melbourne and Hong Kong, in the sense that in Melbourne, working hour guidelines are embedded within legislation, whereas in Hong Kong, we have them in the form of just guidelines.

Can I take you to the relevant passage in your expert report on that issue, and that is at page 91 of your expert report. I'm looking at the middle paragraph of page 91, and if I may read it out:

"Two notable differences between Hong Kong and Melbourne with respect to working/rest hours are that (1) the Melbourne (Victorian) requirements on work/driving/rest are set out in a regulation (the National Heavy Vehicles (Fatigue Management) National Regulations 2013), with (2) a safety duties/chain of responsibility link, whereas in Hong Kong they are the subject matter of a Guidelines document" -- and you can take reference to that -- "without specific legislative reference to safety duties or chain of responsibility. The Hong Kong Public Bus Services Ordinance (Cap 230) provides for regulations of working/driving/rest hours but this has not been taken up."

Pausing there, Mr Chairman, the reference to that is section 35J of the Ordinance, and the page number, without going to it, if I may --

CHAIRMAN: You are going to go into it?

MR DEREK CHAN: I don't propose to go to it.

CHAIRMAN: I'm familiar with the provision.

MR DEREK CHAN: The page reference is TD-2, page 56.

Professor, you go on to say in your report that:

"This difference in mode of establishing working/rest hour requirements between the two jurisdictions seems likely to mean that there will be a stricter focus by operators on compliance in Melbourne, since the consequences of non-compliance involve a breach of the law, which could have legal consequences for a number of people in the business, and others (possibly also including the government service procurer), because of chain of responsibility."

The last part is a reference to the Bus Safety Act that we already looked at this morning. And one of your key recommendations is for our guidelines to be embedded within some sort of regulation.

Mr Chairman, the reference for that is page 94 of the expert report, which I won't go to. It's simply a one-line reference to that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I see that. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, it may be obvious, but can I still ask you to elaborate on the advantages of incorporating the working hour guidelines into regulation and giving it the force of law.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you, Mr Chan. In the Melbourne situation, and I think I have included in my first report some examples of the potential consequences of not complying -- this was at page 27 of my first report,

which is ...

CHAIRMAN: I think the numbers marry up.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So it will be page 27 also. They are just some examples of the penalties that are there for some of the problems that might occur for a breach.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It's from that page that I got the feel of how it is that the higher up the chain you are, the more the penalty is.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The consequences have potential monetary amounts involved with them for a range of parties, as I think I also indicated earlier today, and the new revisions of the national law that are coming in on 1 October, potential for imprisonment as well for reckless behaviour and substantially increased penalties at the top of end of this scale.

So this is taken very seriously because it has that sort of embedding. I think maybe the police have criticised the application of this possibility to date, saying they don't think enough heavy penalties have been imposed. This is primarily in trucking rather than in the bus area. These provisions are mostly in infringements coming up in terms of trucking. But certainly the provisions are there, and from the conversations that I have with our bus operators, they are very conscious of these provisions and the

consequences for themselves, as management, but also for other potential players in that chain of responsibility.

Chair, I would also make the I think important point that our regulation is embedded in something that's called "fatigue management regulation". So it's Heavy Vehicles (Fatigue Management) National Regulations, as distinct from the Hong Kong approach which is guidelines that refer to working.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So it's quite a different focus, and I think that's quite important. We have been on a fatigue focus for quite some time.

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting. May I ask that somebody enquire why we are now being visited by a bright flashing red light? Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I ask the question in this way: can you, Professor, see any downside in making the working hour guidelines a matter of legal requirement under statute?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I also ask you to consider the Transport Department's explanation for not putting the working hour guidelines into regulation, and the evidence from the Transport Department I will ask you to have a look at is on the first day of the evidence, which is on 7 May 2018, so it's the first set of transcripts in the

first transcripts bundle, and can I please refer you to page 121, starting at line 4.

CHAIRMAN: Who is giving evidence?

MR DEREK CHAN: This would be Ms Mable Chan, the Commissioner for Transport.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I go forward a page just to give some context, Mr Duncan, in the middle of the page at line 13, page 120, says:

"Ms Chan, you were present this morning, I think, when I asked representatives from the bureau as to why these guidelines with regard to working hours are simply guidelines, as opposed to regulations, given that the ordinance expressly stipulates that this topic can be the subject of regulation.

Are you able to assist the committee as to the reason why this has not been a regulation or has not even achieved the status of a direction or a requirement?"

The response or the explanation of Ms Mable Chan, the Commissioner for Transport, was this:

"Because I was present at this morning's session and the context in which this issue was raised was on whether or not it should be better implemented or enforced under the law or as a franchise requirement.

First perhaps I can express my view from an operational and monitoring point of view. As I see it, the history of the working hours guidelines is long and it is an ongoing process. As revealed from the few times that the guidelines are revised, the beauty of the requirements as set out in the guidelines is that it could be reviewed and revised in a more timely basis as compared to if it is stipulated as the ordinance or in the regulation; though I must admit that as and when necessary, we should not spare ourselves from the effort in reviewing the legislation or taking it through the Legislative Council.

The fact remains that, being guidelines, it can be more flexible and it can be sort of enhanced in the light of the prevailing circumstances. Franchised bus service is a very labour-intensive service. There are also highly prescriptive requirements on the service levels of franchised bus. So I think from the government perspective, we are trying to strike a balance in ensuring the delivery of bus service according to franchise requirement on the one hand and the enhancement of the working environment of bus captains on the other."

So there is the explanation from the Transport Department, for convenience, if I could sum it up in

that way.

CHAIRMAN: Reviewed and revised in a more timely way, and more flexible.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Just remind me, prior to the February 2018 revision, when was the last revision of the guidelines?

MR DEREK CHAN: 2010.

CHAIRMAN: So eight years?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And prior to that, 2010?

MR DEREK CHAN: 2004.

CHAIRMAN: So six years?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, and I think the evidence previously was that the 2018 amendment kicked off because of the September 2017 accident.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That was when a review of the guidelines was commenced, in consequence of that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, in reaction to that accident.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So six and eight years?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Timely? A more timely way?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can just give the reference to that table of amendments. It's at MISC-1, page 897, just for the reference of the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's helpful. This details the way

that the guidelines have been changed.

MR DEREK CHAN: Exactly. 2004, 2007, 2010, 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Professor, do you have any observation --

CHAIRMAN: Before you ask the more general question, we have seen that there are penalties available for infractions. Given the work that you have done over the years with buses in Victoria, how often are people prosecuted, presumably, for this kind of infraction?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Very rare, Chair, and not in fact in relation to route bus operation. It's much more likely to occur in the longer distance running.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I can understand the different demands there.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But very rare in buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, in route buses, yes.

CHAIRMAN: In route buses?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. And if I might comment on that issue of convenience. It seems to me that you have to decide whether the guidelines or a regulation are about convenience to the authority or whether they are about outcomes to the public, and coming as a consequence of compliance with whatever it is you are putting in those guidelines. So my personal view would be it is more

important to put weight on -- emphasis on compliance than it is on administrative convenience.

CHAIRMAN: Is the fact that prosecutions are very rare for infractions of this working hours legislation for route buses because there is a high level of compliance?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I believe so, Chair, yes. In fact the scheduling and rostering processes that the operators use have very much the provisions of the regulation sitting behind them, and they build a little bit of margin for error in there, so that they don't bump up against the boundaries that are created with respect to the lengths of time before they need to take a break.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The figures of compliance with working hour guidelines in Hong Kong, have you looked at them?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think my recollection was 96 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That accords with mine, 97, perhaps, something like that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. My concern there would be that there's 4 per cent non-compliance, and why is that, what is the consequence of that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Professor.

Can I move on then to the next topic, which I hope

is more straightforward. That is the transparency of the safety data.

You make that point at page 69 of your expert report. At the first bullet point of page 69 you say:

"There are solid arguments favouring publication of the bus safety chapter of the five year forward planning programmes, because of the wider societal costs of accidents."

I think you were referring to a number of analytical statistics that relate to safety issues.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes, Mr Chan. I thought that the discussion in some of those bus safety chapters was really informative, and it is the sort of information that I believe, in the public interest, should be more widely available.

I'm referring, for example, to the kinds of analysis that was presented on the driving our links and how that affected accident performance, I think it was.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, and non-links, as I think it was established, between the number of hours you drive, the age of the drivers, that sort of comparison?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly, Chair. Accident rate by years of service, accident rate by hours on duty before the accident. I mean, I think this is really good analysis, and it shouldn't be stuck in documents that are only

available to a few select people. It's really important information in the public interest, in my view, and it shows that there's some really good research being done, trying to come to grips with the challenges that are being faced in the safety sense and it would give people confidence in what the industry is trying to do.

CHAIRMAN: The committee obviously agrees with you, because initially we were denied access to this material, and by a series of steps over several months we have managed to obtain a great deal of this material by people being willing to give it to us, perhaps recognising that it is data of relevance.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, and it is data that can inform you on areas that are unique to focus the effort.

I drew attention in fact to a little jump in the kind of six to eight-hour period after the start of shift in which the accident rate seemed to go up a little bit, and I didn't see that actually commented on in the paper in which the evidence was presented, but it just shows that the sort of analysis and the data presentation can lead you into asking questions that might be able to help better safety outcomes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, there is one matter -- I mention it now so that perhaps Ms Wong can find it -- you raised or you drew attention to the fact that the Transport

Department, in the letter it wrote requiring KMB to address why there had been an increase in accident rates -- we now have the KMB forward planning report. Presumably, that gives us an explanation. The latest report was given to us during August 2018, again at our request, when one of the members of the KMB representatives told us that they were going to provide it to the Transport Department, my memory is, on 18 August.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The latest version has made it into our bundles. I will ask Ms Wong to marry it up with what the Transport Department asked for.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I'm inviting you to do: what was the explanation for why the rate had gone up? You don't have to do it immediately. Carry on with your list.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Mr Weston also makes a similar point, on the transparency of this sort of data. Can I quickly take you to that at page 153 of the expert bundle, and if I can just read you --

CHAIRMAN: Can you give me the paragraph number, because I'm working from the set that I've marked up.

MR DEREK CHAN: That would be page 39 of the internal pagination of Mr Weston's report.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I've got that open.

MR DEREK CHAN: Paragraph 84, under the heading, "Safety

data transparency/performance". If I can read it out:

"It is clear from London's experience that greater transparency of data in relation to the safety performance of the bus network not only leads to greater stakeholder and public scrutiny [but] it also leads to a sharper focus from both the transport authority and its contracted bus operators on the safety agenda. An open approach to incident data leads to accountability.

Consideration should be given to what safety data in relation to the Hong Kong franchised bus network could be placed into the public domain."

Professor, do you agree with that or do you have any other observations in that regard?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I agree fully with that, Mr Chan. My view generally on the Greater London authority and Transport for London is they are almost without peer in terms of availability of data and information, in a global sense, and they don't try and hide things, they try and put it out there, and warts and all are prepared to confront the sorts of challenges that that shows.

I think that really leads to a lot of confidence in that process, so I'm very supportive.

CHAIRMAN: In fact this material is available on the internet and they publish it every quarter.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: They do, yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Chairman. Can I then move on to the last topic in my notes, and that is bus captain training.

In page 78 of the expert bundle, which should be the second report, you have a section on bus captain training. I think the point here is that the driver training requirement is specifically required under the Melbourne contracts.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).

MR DEREK CHAN: And in Hong Kong, recently, the Transport Department has recently promulgated a practice note in respect of this training guideline, so I won't take you to the details of that.

But there is one matter arising out of the captain training that I would like to ask you about, and that is on fatigue management training, which you expressly mention at page 90 of your report. At page 90, can I perhaps read from the second full paragraph, where you deal with your recommendation that fatigue management training should be part of our training programme. You say in here that:

"Working for 13-14 hours in Melbourne or Hong Kong puts a major focus on the question of how drivers use their remaining hours, whether they are getting

sufficient rest/sleep to avoid fatigue and on the importance of including fatigue management training in driver training programmes. Within the various bus captain training materials included in the annexes to the Transport Department submission at pages 1448 and following, and also in the briefing paper to the Legislative Council Panel on Transport on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses ... the author did not see any mention of training in fatigue management. This is an important part of bus driver training in Melbourne, including attention to related matters such as diet and exercise. The training also extends to supervisors, to try to ensure that they do not roster drivers who may be fatigued. More broadly, the idea of the Transport Department developing a practice note on the training framework for franchised bus captains is a good idea, as outlined in the paper to the Legislative Council Panel. This will help to ensure that all operators are aware of desired standards and have a means of conveying these standards to their bus captains. The training framework that is developed needs to include a specific component on fatigue management, which could form part of an occupational health and safety module and should extend to supervisors."

Professor, can you elaborate on what would be

involved in this type of fatigue management training?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. The operators in Melbourne, when they're training new drivers or when they're running retraining programmes, refresher programmes, fatigue management is an important component in that programme.

It is interesting, in our national legislation, that is then adopted into Victorian law under an Act called the Heavy Vehicle National Law Application Act, which I talk about on pages 33 and 34 of the first report, that legislation lists a whole bunch of signs of fatigue. That's how seriously fatigue is taken in this area in Victoria.

So if you go to page 34, you will see -- this is a quote from the legislation that embeds the national law in Victorian law -- it talks about:

"Signs of fatigue means that a person was or will be fatigued when driving a fatigue-related heavy vehicle on a road (whether the sign manifests itself before, during or after the driver drove the vehicle)."

Then it gives a range of a dozen or so examples of signs of fatigue. Those sorts of signs then would be incorporated into that training programme, but a lot of our operators will introduce dietitians, for example, exercise people into their driver training courses, with sitting on your backside for 10 or 11 hours a day

driving a bus is probably not great health-promoting exercise. So those sorts of things form a really important part of driver training, because of the nexus between understanding what causes fatigue and the risks of safety associated therewith.

MR DEREK CHAN: I think your overall recommendation is that this sort of training should form part of the practice note that the Transport Department issued.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It is, Mr Chairman, I think the practice note is a really good idea in terms of raising the bar on a common base level of training. But I think it is important that fatigue forms part of that. In terms of application, I think I commented that the guidelines, if they are adhered to as they stand at the moment, if anything, marginally tighter than the comparable provisions in Melbourne. The main difference in fact is in terms of how they are applied in practice, where I talked earlier today on about 44/45 hours being our norm, but I understand that it's a much bigger number than that in Hong Kong, based on some of the evidence that I've seen presented to the committee before.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, very significantly more than that.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes. So that would make the issue of fatigue management even more important here.

CHAIRMAN: And that's missing from the practice note?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: (Nodded head).
CHAIRMAN: Sorry, a nod doesn't go on the transcript. Do you agree?
PROF JOHN STANLEY: I haven't seen the practice note yet.
CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can put it up, since we are on training.
PROF JOHN STANLEY: Apologies. I have read that, Chair.
CHAIRMAN: Do we have a reference for that in the bundles?
MR DEREK CHAN: TD-1, page 470, is currently being shown on the screen. The contents of the practice note are at page 471.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR DEREK CHAN: Across the page at 472 as well, and I think the point simply is that there is no reference to any fatigue management training.
CHAIRMAN: There is no specific reference to it, is there?
PROF JOHN STANLEY: Chair, my suggestion was that it could be picked up under the occupational health and safety component of item (e), which is only 5 to 10 per cent, I think you would need to beef that up if you were going to do it that way, but it is part of occupational health and safety but it needs a specific focus.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, those are the questions that I have arising from the professor's report. It remains

for me to follow up on two matters that Mr Chairman raised with me during the course of the questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The first relates to the requests that the Transport Department received --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- in respect of the seat belt installation.

I think Mr Chairman remembers the passage but I will just give the chairman the page reference for that. That was mentioned during the 1st meeting of the working group which was held on 13 March 2018, and the page reference for that in our bundles is KMB-12/4869-1, at paragraph 16. I see it up on the screen now.

At paragraph 16, Citybus was querying the practicality and raising the concern that standees could not be provided with seat belts. Then the passage goes on to record:

"TD advised that there were requests for a comprehensive review on seat belts installation on bus after the traffic accidents."

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. Let me read that again.

"... comprehensive review on seat belts installation on bus after the traffic accidents."

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Mr Chairman, the date of this meeting was 13 March 2018, and there was actually a relevant

discussion on this in the LegCo Panel for Transport on 15 February 2018, and with the assistance of the very helpful staff of the secretariat and Ms Wong, we have actually located the relevant LegCo meeting minutes that discuss this.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: I think that is now being shown on the screen.

On the first page, we can see that it is the minutes of a special meeting of the Panel on Transport in LegCo, held on Thursday, 15 February 2018.

Can I direct Mr Chairman's attention to page 19.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I just go back a page to 18, at the bottom of page 18, at paragraph 78, Mr Chairman can see the context in which this happened. So:

"Mr Chan Hak Kan moved the following motion which was seconded."

At page 19, you can see the motion being proposed:

"This panel expresses deep sorrow and regret at the occurrence of a serious traffic accident on Tai Po Road on 10 February resulting in 19 fatalities and 66 injuries and, in order to prevent the recurrence of such a tragedy, this panel urges the administration to:

1. Request franchised bus companies to review the

staffing establishment of bus captains, provide reasonable working hours, rest time, meal breaks and remuneration packages for bus captains, and provide on a compulsory basis regular training on a safe driving attitude for full-time and part-time bus captains to ensure that bus captains are equipped with the qualities of a good driver."

So, Mr Chairman, that forms part of the working group.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: "2. Apply anti-skid surface dressing, erect additional deceleration warning signs and install speed enforcement cameras on the subject road section immediately, and review the 'high-risk' road sections across the territory and expeditiously enhance the relevant safety measures to safeguard the safety of road users."

Thirdly --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please. So, in context, the reference to "the subject road section" is to the Tai Po Road, the scene of the accident?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, according to the date of the panel meeting, that must be the case.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And:

"3. Explore ways to further strengthen the safety installations on buses, including enhancing the protection for high-risk seats, retrofitting seat belts on more seats and making it compulsory in phases for passengers to wear seat belts ..."

It goes on to talk about other devices. So that's the context in which the seat belt request had been made by the LegCo Panel.

Over the page at paragraph 79, you can see that the motion was carried.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: I hope that answers at least part of Mr Chairman's concern. We will probably raise it with the Transport Department again.

CHAIRMAN: We will do, because they haven't told us what it was, but this appears a logical explanation.

MR DEREK CHAN: Possibly, yes.

CHAIRMAN: But this refers to one accident. They refer in the plural to "accidents".

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. We have in the bundle documents dating back to 2003 and 2006 in which this issue had been raised, but perhaps it is more properly an issue that we can take up with the Transport Department when they come back.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it's a matter -- you are referring

to discussions, papers --

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- where the Transport Department have considered whether or not to require seat belts to be provided on buses, but dismissed it.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, which also --

CHAIRMAN: I think it might help if you were to tell Prof Stanley about that, and perhaps you can also tell us which jurisdictions they looked at when they decided it wasn't a good idea.

This is a matter that was considered 15 years ago, was it not?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I think the point -- I'm not going to go to the document but I think the point is they have consistently looked at it and consistently decided that it wasn't going to be very useful, having regard to the experience in overseas jurisdictions.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps you can turn up a couple of those in that journey towards the conversion on the road to Damascus, which happened in April this year.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I refer the committee to bundle SEC-1. Page 274 is where one paper starts.

CHAIRMAN: Whoever makes these lever-arch files has failed to make one that doesn't break whenever it is transferred to the auditorium.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Does Mr Chairman have the document at page 274?

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I do.

MR DEREK CHAN: The date of this document is January 2007. You can find the reference to the date at page 280.

CHAIRMAN: And what is it?

MR DEREK CHAN: It is a briefing paper prepared by the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: "Environment, Transport and Works Bureau", of the Transport Department?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. And the purpose would be for a LegCo Panel on Transport meeting. It's a progress report on measures to enhance safety of the franchised bus operation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, you can see at page 274, paragraph 3, the immediate reference to retrofitting seat belts on franchised buses. And the reference to overseas data, we can find that at paragraph 4 on page 275:

"We have collected information from other countries on the requirements of fitting and fastening of seat belts on buses. So far, we have not found any country that have legal requirements for the provision of seat belts on passenger seats of buses designed for urban use

and are allowed to carry standing passengers. According to the transport authorities of these countries, the benefit of imposing a seat belt requirement in their buses is uncertain. A summary of the findings is at annex I."

And annex I can be found at page 281.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's January 2007.

CHAIRMAN: So the jurisdictions concerned are the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, the state of Victoria in Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands and Singapore?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. And we have seen references to those similar countries in the 2018 briefing paper to the LegCo Panel on Transport as well, which we have already looked at today.

CHAIRMAN: This paper appears to be a response -- I'm looking at page 274 -- to an earlier discussion in the LegCo Panel on Transport in 2006.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. That can be found just before this document. The 2006 document starts at page 266.

CHAIRMAN: Was it couched in a similar way to the note that we just looked at in February or March of this year, a request that there be a comprehensive review; is that the same language?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, very much the same language.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can read that out, at 266.

MR DEREK CHAN: 266 is the start of the document.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The relevant part the document, which is the one dated October 2016, is at paragraph 19.

If I can just read a little bit at the end of paragraph 18.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Because it has the phrase "traffic accidents", which Mr Chairman picked up on, in the minutes. I'm reading from the bottom half of paragraph 18 on page 271:

"In the light of recent traffic accidents, TD has been reviewing with the franchised bus operators on retrofitting of seat belts on the existing buses, taking into account of the technical difficulties such as the structural strength of the seats, adequate anchorage points and design of the bus, et cetera."

So we have the same process repeating itself.

Paragraph 19:

"We have conducted a research on overseas practices regarding the fitting and wearing of seat belts in buses. A summary of the corresponding seat belt requirements is at annex."

Again, the same reference to no overseas jurisdiction having this requirement.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you. So that's 2006, 2007.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, and we can't find anything between 2007 and 2018, when the issue raised its head again at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The second issue that Mr Chairman raised with me is the request --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps having taken Prof Stanley through this material -- this obviously is a matter for the Transport Department to help us with -- on its face, it looks as though this review has been conducted in the past and it's been decided by reference to other jurisdictions, including Victoria, that it's not necessary for Hong Kong.

Is there any general reason -- you perhaps wouldn't know any specific reason in Hong Kong -- but any general reason that you can see for this I called it the conversion on the road to Damascus moment?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I think the findings from places like Australia -- and we were involved in some of these exercises when I was with the National Road Transport Commission back in the 1990s -- the major benefit from buses in terms of collision comes from the mass of the

vehicle, not from seat belts, and the question then becomes what marginal value on top of that does a seat belt generate for you?

Certainly, at the time this paper was written, that would very much have been the result of cost/benefit analyses, if you had done them on this circumstance.

Why might it be different now in Hong Kong? I think it probably goes to the question of people seated upstairs -- is there a possibility that the probability of an accident is much higher in that circumstance? I don't know the answer to that. But that's what I would be looking for. Is there a higher risk, for example, of injury associated with travelling in the upper deck of a double-decker bus than there might be on a single-level platform vehicle like we have in Melbourne that might justify the use of seat belts upstairs, so to speak? I don't think downstairs would be much different to our buses.

CHAIRMAN: But, to come back to the way you have analysed things, one would need empirical data to make this judgment, what is the accident data, how many people are thrown out of the bus, how many buses fall over --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Exactly, Chair. It's exactly the kind of analysis that should be done to resolve these kinds of questions.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Mr Chan, you were moving to your last point, I think.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, and I think Mr Chairman raised with me that in the 2018 letter from the Transport Department --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- they noted increase in certain things and asked KMB to --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, increased accident rate, broadly speaking.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can go quickly to that document. TD-5, page 1729, just to see the context of it again.

CHAIRMAN: So this is the letter from the Transport Department in advance of the annual update of the five-year forward planning, spelling out what it is that they want the company, KMB, to address, and stipulating the increased accident rate, using that term broadly.

MR DEREK CHAN: That's correct. The request is at the bottom of page 1729. Again, if I can just read it out:

"Your company is required to:

(a) conduct an analysis on the traffic accidents involving KMB in 2017, in conjunction with the situation in 2015 and 2016 ... The analysis should include the trend, the nature and causes of the accidents, as well as the reasons for the increases."

The answer we can find at KMB-12, starting at

page 5011. That's the start of the most up-to-date bus safety section.

Can I just remark, Mr Chairman, that there is no one easy place where you can find the reasons for the increase. What we see is --

CHAIRMAN: It's not addressed specifically; is that what you mean?

MR DEREK CHAN: Not directly. It's a similar format in that they analyse the accidents by route, by bus type, by hours and all that. But there are a couple of passages which Mr Chairman may find relevant.

For example, at 5025, the analysis here is "Accidents by type", and at 8.2.6.7, which is over the page at 5026, you can see:

"Driving attitude of other road users is one of the key in preventing accidents not blameworthy to bus captains."

So that seems to attribute part of it to driving attitudes of other people.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I see your point.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then, in a similar vein --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please. So, "It's not our fault; it's other drivers", is that what it comes to?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. We also see other references in a similar vein, for example at 5028, which is

paragraph 8.2.7.5. Again, if I could just read it out:

"Illegal parking at bus stops is one of the cause of improper stopping of buses, by which road users' safety will be jeopardised as passengers have to board and alight on the roadway instead of using the bus stop. [They] increased the chance of traffic accidents. Buses and other vehicles overtaking illegally parked vehicles pose safety concerns for boarding and alighting passengers, as well as other road users."

So again other contributory factors are highlighted.

Perhaps just one reference for Mr Chairman and the committee's reference. At 5031, again we find something similar. At 5031, again we have an analysis of "Accidents by district", and at paragraph 8.2.9.3, which is at the bottom of that page, you see KMB saying:

"Traffic congestion is one of the causes of the high percentage of accidents noted in the busy districts. The company recommends that proactive measures should be taken to resolve the congestion problem. We will discuss with the government."

And over the page, they talk about bus priority as a possible counter to that problem. So, again, it talks about other contributory factors to the accident rate.

CHAIRMAN: Not entirely clear how traffic congestion causes accidents. It may cause drivers to drive badly and

gives them more vehicles to hit. Is that perhaps what is meant?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps other vehicles hitting them is probably what they are trying to say.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I hope that assists the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

You haven't seen this data before, have you, Professor?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: No, Chair, but in terms of traffic congestion being associated with accidents, I think there are a number of studies that show one of the correlations between accidents is with traffic volume.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: So the higher the volume you have, the more accidents you are going to have, and congestion is an example of that.

CHAIRMAN: There are more targets to hit, aren't there?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, and closer together, so your chances --

CHAIRMAN: The more you have to be aware, if you've got people on the inside, outside, front. So to that extent traffic congestion has a correlation to accident increase; is that the point?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that.

I suppose the first point, driver attitude of other drivers, speaks for itself. If other drivers are the ones causing the accidents, then that's why there are more accidents.

Is there no figure that breaks down their assessment, KMB's assessment, of who was responsible for the accidents?

I think in Hong Kong what we have learnt is, at least with KMB, that this kind of assessment of the accidents, I think I am right in saying, began with the insurance department, and of course they attribute culpability as, "Is this one we are liable for; is this one where we are not?" I think this has been the approach.

MR DEREK CHAN: At page 5020 we have a section on "Accidents by cause", and the table is an analysis of the accidents caused by bus captains' blameworthy factors.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Chairman, the most frequent one in that table is traffic congestion, "Failing to keep safe distance from front vehicle".

CHAIRMAN: Yes. You can do that when there is no congestion, though, can't you?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: It's a bit harder.

CHAIRMAN: I have looked at a Mobileye 6 collision, in fact of course being an advert for the product collision was avoided, but there is not much traffic around and the danger is still there.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed.

MR DEREK CHAN: Unless there is anything else I can assist the committee with --

CHAIRMAN: No. Thank you for that endeavour.

MEMBER LO: I just have two questions. Thank you for all the information.

One question regarding the -- given all the context in Melbourne, perhaps we can learn something in Hong Kong. Who are the main drivers of new initiatives, technologies or otherwise, that would have an implication for bus safety? Are they operators, government committee, or who are the people driving?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I would say that comes from two sources. One is from the vehicle manufacturers, companies like Volvo, Scania, Mercedes. I think they are very conscious of trying to get an edge in the safety space at the moment, and really looking for that.

The other then is particular operators, and I quote the example in my report of ComfortDelGro, who is a Singaporean operator who operates in Melbourne, who have installed the Mobileye technology, Chair, you just

mentioned on their buses in Melbourne and in Singapore, and they are really consciously looking out for ways in which they can improve safety and their attitude is very much, "If it's not good enough for our own family, then it's not good enough for our business". So they judge safety decisions on that basis.

So it's both. It's the operator sometimes, more for retrofitting or after-market solutions. But it's the manufacturers in terms of what's embedded in new vehicles.

MEMBER LO: Even though there's no explicit safety-related KPIs in their system, they do it voluntarily?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But presumably in that calculation -- and this is a matter I suggested earlier on -- there is a cost to bus operators having accidents, is there not? The bus is out of operation, they may be left out of pocket from the damages, never mind the loss of use of the vehicle, and so on?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Certainly. In terms of fitting of after-market equipment, that's certainly true. I think it's about the safety of their customers, but it's also about business costs and part of the same process, and I think one of the benefits of that technology like the Mobileye technology is it's -- I think the cost in

Melbourne is something like A$1,500 per vehicle to install that equipment, and you would think that's a pretty good investment in terms of --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because that would easily be exceeded by the cost of an accident, and damages you have to pay for the person injured --

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed.

CHAIRMAN: -- damages to the vehicle, loss of the use of the vehicle.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Indeed, and my view is you will see that being built into the new vehicle, it's starting to already, because it is such a sensible thing to do.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MEMBER LO: The other question I have is given a public entity like Transport Safety Victoria, how would we ensure that it will perform its best and it's not just another bureaucracy that looks at numbers? Are there targets given to them to achieve, or is there any incentive or motivation for them to do their best?

PROF JOHN STANLEY: I don't know whether there are any targets that have been set to them. I will have a look at that and come back to you on that, Professor. But rest assured that because they are regulating bus operators, the bus operators will be doing all they can to make sure that the Transport Safety Director is

performing the task in a vigilant way and not becoming just another bureaucracy.

So I think there's accountability in the sense to the customer, and the customer will be doing all that they can do to make sure that the authority is genuinely serving the role that it's supposed to be serving.

At the moment, there is a very good relationship between the Transport Safety Director and the operators, because I think they both understand that their interest is in trying to build a stronger safety risk management culture and that they can do that better together. But as for specific KPIs on the organisation, I will speak to the director when I get back to Melbourne, provided the storm lets us out, and come back to you on that one.

MEMBER LO: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, is there anything arising from those questions?

MR DEREK CHAN: Not from me, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: In which case, Professor, although we have gone slightly over time, the estimate has been rather accurate as to the time we required.

It remains for us to thank you very much for the assistance you have given us, in particular in this oral session where, having had the benefit of your report, we have been able to establish what, to our mind, are the

matters that are particularly relevant, having regard to the evidence that we have received, to Hong Kong, and that's been of considerable assistance, and we look forward to receiving whatever else it is that you might feel is appropriate for us to receive.

With those words, we thank you for your assistance and wish you a safe travel home.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Chair and members.

CHAIRMAN: Whenever that might be.

PROF JOHN STANLEY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(5.38 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

INDEX

PAGE

EXPERT EVIDENCE OF PROF JOHN STANLEY 1

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN 1

[Blank Page]

2018 年 9 月 15 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

羅康錦教授，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

陳政龍大律師及黃佩琪大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

Professor John Stanley，悉尼大學商學院運輸及物流研究學院客席教授（委員會委任的專家）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，Stanley 教授，歡迎你嚟香港，多謝你向委員會提供協助，交咗兩份報告畀我哋，亦都多謝你同意嚟呢度做口述證供，等我哋可以探討你報告嘅內容，特別當然就係同香港相關嘅，我哋會向你提問題，由我哋嘅律師陳律師向你提問嘅，請佢而家開始，就係陳政龍律師。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，唔該主席，早晨，主席。首先，可唔可以講一講你嘅背景呢？就係你個人嘅背景，就去你嗰個嘅履歷嗰度，喺我哋嘅專家證人文件夾嘅第 107 頁。我哋睇到喺你嘅履歷嗰度，你係 1969 年開始你嘅事業，喺 1980 至 1999 年，你就係 Principal John Stanley and Associates Pty Ltd 嘅主事人，請問你可唔可以講一下你公司當時係做啲咩嘢工作？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋係做一啲顧問嘅服務嘅，就特別係畀政府嘅，喺聯邦政府同埋喺州政府嘅層面都有做，主要就係講話運輸嘅，譬如話域多利州政府關於嗰個載重嘅規定等，我哋都提意見嘅，同埋港口亦都係塔斯曼尼亞州政府，我哋都做咗啲關於港口嘅諮詢工作，同埋向當地嘅議會，亦都會係畀啲意見係關於話道路系統係點嘅，唔係話做咁多關於公共運輸嘅，直至去到 1990 年代，當時就係講話運輸嗰方面嘅道路空間嘅問題，嗰陣時就做好多嘅諮詢工作係關於道路經濟學嘅，特別係呢方面嘅工作。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺 1991 至 99 年，你就係國家道路運輸委員會嘅副主席，而 1999 至 2008 年就係維多利亞巴士協會嘅執行董事，請你可唔可以介--講一講你喺嗰度做啲咩嘢工作，執行總監？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我哋係 1991 年成立呢個國家道路交通委員會，就主要係想改革澳洲嘅道路運輸嘅安全同埋各個方面，嗰啲職責主要就係州政府嘅職責嚟嘅，即係話係州政府同埋聯邦政府共同成立呢個委員會，就可

以喺全國施行一啲一致嘅法例，就除咗係本州自己嘅道路系統之外，就定一啲譬如話嗰個汽車嘅重量嘅限制，嗰個載重嘅規定等等，都係即係話做管理方面，呢個係重要嘅一環嚟嘅。

同埋亦都我要代表我哋嘅業界嘅代表，就我哋個成員就有五百人，就要講話佢哋同州政府嗰啲合約，當時嗰個價值每年係有九億澳元嘅，我就係主要負責同--即係要同州政府去商討佢哋嘅合約嘅，而喺我嘅報告裏面都有提到，巴士業喺澳洲嚟講，係接受州政府嘅大量嘅資助嘅，我作為執行總監，主要就係要整體咁樣評估運輸嗰個價值，同埋亦都係牽涉一啲工作，就話睇下喺巴士喺社會融合方面扮演咩嘢嘅角色嘅，我太太其實都係做呢方面嘅工作，咁又睇下點樣可以減少擠塞同埋巴士喺改善環境方面又可以扮演咩嘢角色等等嘅，呢個都係話喺要制定政策嗰方面，就要確保係一致。

我哋亦都係協助啲商業公司，譬如其中一位嘅巴士營辦商就係做道路安全嘅檢查，即係喺維多利亞嗰度譬如係檢測嗰啲巴士嗰啲等等同埋類似其他嘅活動，其實我哋亦都係已經係本來由政府做嘅巴士檢測嘅工作嘅，而家係由我哋嚟做。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個巴士協會有啲咩嘢成員呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢哋就係嗰啲定線巴士嘅服務營辦商，咁就維多利亞喇，亦都有學校巴士嘅營辦商，其實大部分都係嗰啲嘅，因為通常如果巴士--即係學校嘅承辦商通常都係得好少量巴士，所以嗰個數目係比較多嘅、大嘅。但係當然如果講話合約價值大嘅，就係定線巴士服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）總共有幾多個成員呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）就有五百名成員，我走之後，就係降咗少少，因為有啲嘅業務佢哋整合咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講一講協會有幾多職員呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋有五十個職員，當我離職嘅時候，就包括例如話十至十二名職員就係嗰間做檢驗車輛嘅公司，我哋亦都有自己嘅稽查主任，就負責係僱用稽查喺巴士上面工作。同埋我哋亦都有一組係服務成員嘅，即係佢哋會花好多時間同成員傾偈，即係處理佢哋嘅事或者係幫佢哋聯絡政府等等，就係因為佢哋負責係提供呢啲服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係巴士公司收到車資，邊個係得益嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係畀政府嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話做稽查工作係代表政府做，因為政府係最終接收嗰啲車資嘅人，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，你提到話喺你做國家道路運輸委員會嘅時候，你就係講到話係駕駛一啲--你會負責處理一啲駕駛規例，我相信係駕駛時數，係咪呀？包唔包括埋重型車輛呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）國家道路運輸委員會處理嘅車輛就係 4.5 公噸以上嘅車輛嘅，可能係一啲嘅貨車，其實貨車嘅數量係比巴士多好多嘅，所以通常委員會主要處理都係關於貨車嘅問題，但係亦都可能同巴士有啲關連，當時澳洲最大嘅問題就係各個主要嘅大城市，譬如係悉尼、墨爾本，如果啲貨車要一次咁去，佢嗰個其實揸個距離係好長嘅，所以我哋就要睇下應該係點樣為之安全嘅駕駛距離等等，所以呢個過程好重要，但係同時都會一併就睇埋巴士嘅情況嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個委員會係聯邦委員會嚟㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係一個國家委員會，全國委員會，其實係根據聯邦法例成立嘅，我哋要負責嘅就係聯邦嘅部長同埋所有州嘅部長，即係話所有四十五個部長，我哋要向佢報告嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，喺 2008 年你做咗客席教授，亦都係巴士業聯盟嘅高級研究人員，又喺悉尼大學嗰度，即係呢個係悉尼大學嘅工作嚟嘅，咁又會做一啲研究生嘅教學同埋研究工作？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我係負責一個運輸管理嘅碩士學位課程嘅，我哋其實有都當時有唔同嘅呢類嘅碩士課程，我就係教其中一科，就係關於運輸政策，亦都係牽涉關於到巴士政策嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）2012 至 16 年，你就係部長諮詢議會就係向維多利亞嘅規劃部長，即係兩個政府，就係向佢哋提供意見係關於墨爾本都會規劃策略問題？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）其實主要更多嗰個係講話土地用途嘅規劃，喺第一份報告我都有提及嘅。我哋有二十--當時就係有一啲嘅運輸規劃嘅，需要整合嘅，有一個--所以有一個部長嘅諮詢委員會，就向佢提供意見話維多利亞長遠嗰個土地規劃應該係點樣做，亦都包括一啲嘅運輸策略嘅，我係嘗試想制定一份嘅運輸策略，但係當時唔知咩理由，政府就唔想包括--即係喺呢個長遠嘅土地規劃裏面包括埋呢個運輸策略，喺新嘅政府又再次委任我哋而家係繼續做呢個工作嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你就列出喺 107 頁呢度第一部你列出你有一啲嘅董事嘅工作，可唔可以講一講邊一啲嘅--呢啲工作係同運輸或者係巴士政策有關㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我係維多利亞嘅國家服務委員會嗰陣時候，佢哋就叫我哋睇番道路同埋公共運輸政策之間嗰個關係，我就做咗一份報告，就建議有一個新嘅管治嘅安排，就係關於道路同埋公共運輸嘅。而另外仲有一個機構，Metlink 就係關於係公共運輸嘅推廣嘅，我哋就係一啲系統層面做一啲推

廣工作，由個別嘅營辦商就會做自己嘅推廣運動，當時我亦都係公共運輸申訴專員嘅辦事處嗰度嘅，就話如果有啲乘客佢哋覺得有啲咩嘢投訴係關於啲承辦商嘅，就會去到呢個申訴專員嗰度。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你做呢個工作，即係喺申訴專員方面嘅工作做咗幾耐？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我要估一估，但係我諗係大概四年喽。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）大概喺邊段時間呀？大概喺邊段時間，邊幾年呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）應該係 199--2004 至 2008 年，應該係，而家我就係道路安全檢查嘅委員會嗰度嘅，就係同嗰個巴士協會係保持一個距離，可以咁講，就係佢哋就係每年為所有嘅重型車輛同埋巴士做檢驗嘅，每一年都會佔咗維多利亞整個巴士數量百分七十五都係我哋檢驗嘅。

主席：Is that in respect of the mechanical side of buses?

MR JOHN STANLEY：It is, Chairman.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你做咗呢間公司嗰個董事協會成員做咗幾耐？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大概七年。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）七年即係由今日數番轉頭七年，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，再落下一頁 108 頁，你就列出你有好幾頁嘅一啲報告、文獻或者係書本嘅章節等等，係你寫嘅，我就冇打算全部去睇，因為好多。你可唔可以特別指一指出一啲例子，就係同巴士政策有關嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）當然，可以。主要有兩、三個課題嘅，第一，就有寫過一啲文章，就係關於公共運輸嘅價值，就係 2017 年，呢本書就係“How Great Cities Happen”嗰度，就係講話公共運輸可以扮演啲咩嘢角色，跟住喺知道--下一個文章，跟住下面呢份就話嗰個價格要定得啱，即係使用道路嘅代價要定得啱。然後亦都有一份 2017 嘅報告，就係話點樣係令人可以流動到，即係要做制定政策者要考慮嗰啲解決方案，呢個有“Moving People: Solutions for Policy Thinkers”。

又有睇下公共運輸點樣可以令到一個城市生產力能夠好呢，佢個扮演角色係點，亦都係有提及。然後 2016 年，Stanley J and Levinson 嗰份文獻就係話可持續嘅資助嘅形式，因為當時三年前有一個嘅會議係每兩年開一次嘅，係國際嘅，當次就係講話公共運輸嘅競爭同埋規管嘅，我係其中負責主持一個工作坊嘅，喺嗰次嘅國際會議裏面，所以呢度我亦都係有發表一份文章。就睇公共運輸嘅好處喺邊度，同埋可以點樣去資助呢啲服務，所以喺嗰度係特別有提。

再落去兩張，就係話令人流動呢？即係點可以令到啲人可以流動嗰方面，決策者要考慮嘅解決方案等等。同埋比較深入咁探討就係巴士嗰個合約嘅制度係點樣處理，譬如話係公開投標吖，定係通過商討去定個合約，亦都係睇話有啲乜嘢嘅主要嘅表現、指標要定呀咁樣，即係關於巴士服務。同埋又話公共運輸喺社會融合同埋推動更公平社會方面扮演嘅角色。

再落，有份 2015 年嘅報告，亦都係繼續話即係點樣令人流動，決策者要考慮嘅方案等等。就係講話墨爾本佢想定一個策略令到所有人都可以嚟佢哋最需要常去嘅地方都只係二十分鐘嘅，可以係行路、踩單車或者係用公共交通嘅方式等等，就令到公共運輸可以--呢個文章就講話點樣可以公共運輸扮演一個大啲角色。

下一份文件就係講話公共運輸嘅角色係點樣可以推動發展密度做得更加好，特別係喺澳洲城市嘅一啲中部嘅市郊地方。就係亦都講埋嗰個--睇埋嗰個嘅管治嘅安排，就係點樣係從政府角度睇，點樣係運用個土地等等嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者我可以咁樣總結，你好多嘅文章都係講政策嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）特別係講政策，因為政策主要係我嘅關注嘅地方，同埋策略規劃，點樣可以去執行嗰個政策嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）睇番你嘅背景，你所寫過嘅文章，你所做嘅研究，你點樣會形容你嘅專才係乜嘢呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）講到話今次嗰個委員會要睇嗰個課題，我諗我可以畀嘅專才，就係關於話公共運輸政策同埋管治，就係講到城市嘅規劃，當然亦都牽涉到運輸，譬如你講話巴士，其實就係話嗰個管治同埋架構上嘅安排就可以令我哋提供到巴士服務，同埋有啲嘅政策嘅安排令到真係可以提供呢啲服務，可以話係令到巴士能夠最好咁樣達到政府所定嘅目標，係為公眾利益、社會利益嘅，所以我主要就喺呢方面。你話講到運作，就係點樣可以去設立嗰個架構等等嚟做到呢樣嘢。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺你第二個報告都係寫得好清楚，喺一開始嘅時候，或者我想講一講，係第 56 頁嘅，係專家文件，主席，我睇緊第 56 頁，大概中段嗰度。教授，你嗰度就講話喺巴士嘅營運方面你唔係專家，但係你嘅專才就係喺嗰個架構方面，不如你係讀...

主席：（經傳譯員）你指邊一段？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我係讀緊...

主席：（經傳譯員）讀佢出嚟，即係將相關嗰一段讀出嚟。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你喺呢度就話你唔係巴士營運方面嘅專家，但係你有一啲關於嗰個嘅架構嗰個環境，就係關乎巴士點樣運作同埋點樣能夠影響嗰個表現，呢

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

方面你係有專才嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）唔該你，教授。除非你喺你嘅背景方面仲有啲咩嘢補充，如果唔係，我就進去下一步。就係你所收到嘅要寫呢兩個報告嗰個指引嘅背景，我想請你睇第 4 頁，專家嘅文件第 4 頁，喺第二段，第 4 頁，第二段，你就係睇到你寫呢兩份嘅報告係要個範圍係乜嘢，喺第二點嗰度話我哋邀請你去描述墨爾本嗰個嘅巴士服務嗰個嘅制度同埋管治嗰個嘅安排，特別就係喺去監察巴士安全呢方面，呢個係你第一份報告個範圍嘅，喺我哋嘅專家文件夾裏面有嘅，喺第二點嗰度，我哋請你--我哋已經畀咗關於香港專營巴士服務嘅文件你，如果係需要嘅話，就係同我哋嚟到去總結一下嗰個制度。

考慮到墨爾本嗰個巴士制度，就係畀啲意見，我哋香港嗰個嘅規管同埋監察制度係咪足夠呢？亦都畀我哋一啲建議，係有邊啲需要改善，你認為係可以係必須要做到去改善香港專營巴士服務嘅安全嘅，呢個係你第二份專家報告嗰個嘅內容？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我就首先係想做一啲比較實務嘅簡單嘅比較，就係墨爾本同埋香港嗰個巴士制度嘅比較，想由第 5 頁開始，係同一項嘅專家嘅報告，第 5 頁，第一樣，大家嗰個不同就係墨爾本同埋香港嘅人口嘅不同，喺第一段，第 5 頁，你就話墨爾本嘅人口係有四百八十萬，喺 2017 年嘅時候，喺第二段，墨爾本係一個相對低密度嘅城市。我嘅理解係咪正確呢？呢個係咪一個都會區抑或大嘅市郊區呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋會係叫佢做一個都會區嘅。另外其他嗰個亦都係有近郊嘅地區。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）講到乘搭巴士嘅次數，我哋睇到最低嗰度，你話域多利政府嘅預算顯示而家墨爾本嘅火車就每年有二億四千嘅人次，電車就二億零五百嘅人次，巴士一億二千萬嘅人次，即係話喺墨爾本公共運輸係每一年都係有五億六千五百萬嘅人次，而巴士係佔百分之二十一次嘅乘客次嘅，係咪？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我就係想用呢個數字同香港方面對比下，香港每年有十四億...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢度十四億喺邊度得番嚟㗎？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係由運輸署畀我哋嘅總數字嗰度搵出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊一份嘅文件呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）稍後我會畀番呢一個參考畀委員會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該你。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）咁個參考，係，58 頁，即係你第二份報告書嘅第一部分，或者你攞住嗰個嘅專家文件夾係會好嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，非常之好。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，第 58 頁就係你第二份報告嘅開頭，喺第一段嘅中部分嘅，就係話「香港嘅 2017 年嘅公共運輸研究就係睇下香港嗰個嘅交通--總括交通運輸嗰個情況，而嗰個嘅專營巴士每一日係有四百萬嘅人次嘅，呢個就係每一日嘅人次，每一年係有一千二百萬嘅，呢個就係四--每一日係四百萬」，將佢乘咗出嚟，成年就係大概十四億嘅人次。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，墨爾本大概有幾多架巴士喺度營運呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大概一千七百架嘅，就係有路線嘅服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）點樣界定咩嘢叫路線服務？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢啲係合約嘅服務，係有定班嘅，每一日嘅就係由州政府決定，而且係寫咗喺營運嗰個嘅合約度。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）咁會唔會包埋，譬如校巴或者係旅遊巴。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係唔包旅遊巴，又唔包係一啲特定嘅校巴，但係好多嘅學童都會搭呢啲嘅路線服務嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，而家一個一般嘅比較，可唔可以睇下嗰個合約嘅架構，即係墨爾本巴士服務嗰個合約框架同我哋香港係點樣比較。想請你撥去專家文件夾嘅第 7 頁，第三段就係好近尾㗎喇，你嗰度話「而家墨爾本嘅路線巴士服務其實係有一啲係有啲競爭性嘅投標服務嘅，亦都有一啲係經恰商而有嘅服務，有一啲--前者就係政府所提供嘅服務，後者就係開始由一啲私人嘅營辦商，包括呢啲服務嘅延伸或者係增加。」

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，陳生，亦都喺呢一個服務裏面，有一啲係叫做係有競爭性嘅投標，我哋叫佢做智慧巴士系統，係長途嘅服務，就喺我哋墨爾本一啲市郊嘅地方，佢哋亦都係成個投標嘅機制嘅一部分，但係係佔好少部分。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，大部分--有三分一嘅合約就係經過有競爭性嘅投標，而三分二就係經過恰商之下就有合約。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔係，唔係合約嚟嘅，佢哋其實係一份合約，唔係幾份合約，都係經過有競爭性嘅投標，大概係佔三分一嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以好概括咁樣係描述下呢一個有競爭性嘅投標係點樣運作㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）做一個嘅引子，我就唔係呢一個有競爭性嘅投標，我冇參與嘅，我就唔知道嗰啲合約嘅細節，我喺合約協議方面個角色就係--我就知道嗰啲經洽商嘅合約係點嘅，就係佔咗三分二，唔係三分一。但係嗰個一般嘅程序，如果你問我，就係會政府會請人嚟到表達佢嘅興趣係咪想係投一個服務，而政府就係會指出佢希望呢啲服務裏面有啲咩嘢呢？係有啲咩嘢嘅路線、嗰個嘅班次，如果你咁講，亦都會將嗰個嘅時間表列出，就請一啲營運商就係畀一個價格，佢哋係要求幾多呢，亦都可以話係要補貼去提供呢啲嘅服務，就係嗰啲嘅營辦商去投標，如果你鍾意用呢個字，最低嘅價格去畀政府嘅。

佢亦都--政府可以除咗價格之外，會將呢啲嘅事項係考慮在內嘅，呢個就係營辦商有冇能力提供好個服務同埋係能唔能夠喺一個相當廣闊地方提供種種嘅服務，其實係以一個地區為主嘅服務，除咗就係話我正話講過嘅嗰個一筆嘅或者係比較整體嘅路線服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗呢啲路線之外，係咪話政府係可以定嗰個嘅班次㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，應該係嗰個嘅班次，即係幾耐一班等等、幾時開始、幾時結束服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋未去講呢啲細節嘅時候，我想問有幾多嘅路線係畀嚟投標嘅呢？同埋係幾多次呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）其實只係有一次投標，就包括好多嘅路線嘅，好似係呢一個嘅專營區咁樣，一個嘅合約地區，包括所有呢個合約區裏面所有嘅路線，所以都係相當多嘅，可能三分一嘅路線，我就唔知道總共有幾多個路線，但係可能都有好幾百嘅。呢個就係以地區為本嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）通常一次嘅專營期係幾長呀？如果可以用呢個字嘅話。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）通常都係七年嘅，嗰啲洽商嘅合約就可以去到有係七、八個合約--就係可以係有七個嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）政府就係提供一個合約，會唔會係接受多個嘅投標，亦都接受多個嘅巴士營運商一齊運作？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔會嘅，只係有一個單一嘅營運商嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）一個，單一？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個經洽談嘅合約同埋嗰個投標嘅有咩嘢唔同㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）嗰啲要經過洽商嘅合約就係五十、六十年係私人嘅營辦商已經開始咗有㗎喇，佢而家都係仲有嘅，大概係1970年就停咗，當時有一個嘅服務嘅改變，一路有一啲嘅洽商，就係由服務開始同埋政府去繼續係成個過程裏面提供服務嘅，佢某個階段，政府就係想接收咗呢啲洽商嘅服務，而將佢哋去有競爭嘅投標，結果就係去到澳洲嘅聯邦法庭，最後營辦商係勝訴嘅，即係關乎嗰啲嘅法律細節，但係而家仍然喺度談判之中。但每一次佢哋處理就係每一次嗰個合約都冇講到合約圓滿之後係點樣做嘅，下一組嘅合約就係啱啱開始咗，都係七年期嘅，佢哋亦都冇講過七年期滿之後會點嘅，業界就係好有信心佢哋可以繼續再有另外一次嘅談判，政府又可能亦都唔同意嘅。

羅先生：嗰啲嘅洽商會唔會係換咗嗰個營辦商？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔會嘅，其實呢個係關乎決定嗰個價格、點樣嚟提供呢啲服務，譬如話係大家要同意一啲主要嘅服務指標同埋有啲咩嘢誘因，又有咩嘢懲罰嘅條款喺呢啲合約裏面，亦都有關於車長嘅訓練咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會話嗰啲主要喺度恰商嗰個因素只係嗰個價格嘅啫，就係話政府要畀幾多錢呢間公司去提供呢個服務，呢個所謂補貼？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢個就係成個合約嗰個嘅價格，政府就係畀所有嘅錢畀晒呢一個嘅營辦商...

主席：（經傳譯員）因為政府就係--即係嗰啲車資嘅收入可以保留，係咪？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢個就係呢一個點樣嚟到定出個基準，有啲好詳盡嘅基準，嗰個營辦商嘅成本，亦都試下睇下喺某啲嘅地方，係咪有啲嘅營辦商係特別係成本高或者特別低，佢哋就去討論下乜嘢叫做合理嘅幅度嚟到去計算呢個成本，因為有時嗰個營運商係會減嘅，因為減低呢個薪酬，因為可能佢哋嘅成本相對其他嘅同業係太高嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇試過係同一個做緊嘅營辦商達唔到協議，就要將嗰個合約畀另外一個營辦商呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就唔知道有咁嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個制度係咪自從1970年代已經開始？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）自從1970年代已經係呢個補貼，嗰個焦點就係嗰啲經洽商而出嘅合約，大概有三、四十年㗎喇，我就唔係好知道1970年代或者1980年代嘅早期嘅歷史，不過應該自從1980年開始都係咁，好似我正話去向你描述咁樣嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）關於嗰個競爭嘅投標，而家墨爾本嗰個嘅巴士營辦商係得到呢一個嘅合約，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）等我諗下先，諗下，應該係法國嘅公司，係叫做...

主席：（經傳譯員）點樣串呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）T-R-A-N-S-D-E-V。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢個營辦商係經營呢一個競爭性投標得到嘅合約已經幾耐㗎喇？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢哋做過一次咁樣嘅投標，之前由另外一間公司係贏取嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就係可唔可以串出嚟嗰間咩嘢公司？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）V-E-N-T-U-R-A，就係之前喺競爭性投標嗰度中標嗰間公司，跟住 Transdev 就中咗標，我諗就喺嚟緊十二個月又會有另外一次嘅投標㗎喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就係其實一個競爭性嘅投標程序就令到係個營辦商換咗？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就話 Transdev 係一間法國公司，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋喺世界其他地方有冇提供巴士服務？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好似大部分都係法國嘅，我諗喺澳洲其他地方佢哋都有提供巴士服務嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，而家講番嗰個競爭性投標嗰度，本身專營商有冇轉過手？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）去番 1998 年，墨爾本市係世界上首個城市去私有化個火車服務，我哋嘅火車、電車，同埋有三分之一嘅競爭性投標路線同時間係公開投標，本身係有兩個標做火車，兩個標做電車，一個做巴士，一個英國公司叫做 National Express 係其中一個重要火車中標經營商，其中一個三年內就交回嗰個合約。而另一個火車同電車嘅中標者，本身就攞晒--同時間營運火車同電車。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺 1998 年係邊個中標呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）應該係 National Express，佢哋係嗰年中標嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪七年合約呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔記得喇，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）Ventura 係咪嗰個繼承營運商呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我要再查番佢哋幾時去接手嗰個合約。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你辨認咗巴士方面有三個唔同嘅營運者？

MR JOHN STANLEY：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）Transdev、Ventura 同 National Express？

MR JOHN STANLEY：Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇第四個呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）可能 National Express 同 Ventura 之間可能中間有另外一個經營者，可能係其他經營，National Express 交換牌照之後，喺未重新投標前可能有其他營運商臨時接手嘅，我會之後答覆你嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我有冇理解錯誤，就係 National Express 佢嘅服務冇法履行佢成個合約期？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）然之後有其他人接手？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。我喺之後會講番其中一個競爭性中標嘅制度就係佢哋鼓勵--就係個入標價就太低，就係希望佢哋--希望政府之後可以同佢哋再協商個價格。喺個 National Express 嘅情況，嗰個--我哋之前嘅文件講過就話 National Express 佢哋同政府商量過，至今方面就係淨係得一個，同埋佢哋決定唔會再繼續。

主席：（經傳譯員）有關於個巴士嗰方面，就係個 National Express 本身就冇成功協商到，令到 National Express 留低？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係咪終止合約？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）有關嗰個香港每日四百萬人次，大約每年十四億嘅巴士人次，呢個係嗰個運房局，第 103 頁，係 2017 年 12 月嘅數字，教授，呢個就係嗰個競爭性投標制度，而家睇番嗰個...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者喺離開呢部分之前，呢個競爭性中標嘅特點係乜嘢？競標制度嘅特點係乜嘢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主要係嗰個鼓勵同埋罰則條款。主席，我本身冇參與過協商過程，所以我無法評論嗰啲罰則同埋獎勵條款。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲係咪公眾文件呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）當佢公開嘅時候，大部分都係刪走嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）所以你冇辦法講番譬如嗰啲鼓勵同埋懲罰條款會唔會同安全又係有關呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我唔可以講話係咪同安全直接，主要係有個澳洲背景，就係話冇喺維省，就話有啲條款係直接係關於巴士安全嘅有關罰則同埋獎勵條款方面。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲係主要係表現指標？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主要係關於營運嘅個表現，譬如話準時、取消班次，呢啲係主要世界上嘅交通系統嘅重點，有陣時會擺一啲嘅乘客滿意度調查，譬如話乘客嘅意見，呢啲係通常係鼓勵同埋懲罰條款方面常見嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我可能我唔覺意去中斷你，你係回答番主席有關於嗰個競標制度嘅主要特點喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）個主要重點，大部分嘅合作元素，其實兩--協商同埋競標個制度大部分都一樣，主要係嗰啲佢哋啲條款都比較相似。

主席：（經傳譯員）而嗰個協商合約相比喺嗰啲香港嘅專營巴士協議係比較詳盡嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢哋係無法置信咁長嘅，我嘅記憶嚟講，香港嘅專營巴士協議大約有三十一、三十二頁嘅，相比墨爾本嘅協商協議大約係一百六十頁，仲有其他嘅附表呀咁樣。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，你講番嗰啲協議合約，想探討下，不如少少總結，你睇番嗰啲協商合約都同嗰啲競標制同合約都好相似嘅，可唔可以肯定就話嗰啲協商合約，政府亦都係會負責收取車資呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而個營運商係畀錢去營運呢啲服務？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢啲合約主要係嗰啲成本就附加，本身係有啲所謂鼓勵同埋罰則條款喺度，所以營運商根據議定嘅款項去營運呢個服務，然之後仲有呢啲鼓勵同埋罰則條款本身個金額唔係咁大，但係主要係嗰個分別就會令到你會有動力去達標。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以估計嗰個變數方面個百分比？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主要係有兩個元素，第一個就住嗰個乘客人數鼓勵，如果個人數係比個指標率高過，就會係有獲得個獎勵，然之後就有個營運表現制度，譬如話準時、班次取消等等，你擺呢啲嘅因素一齊，就要係大約百分之二至三--百分比二至三。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係個獎勵喇？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，即係有獎有罰，可以上落百分之二至三，唔係好多，但係呢啲合約本身個盈貿率大約有百分之十左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）大約喺呢啲協商制度度入面有幾多個營運者呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約有十五個合約，十二個營運者，我擬定合約嗰時，十年前就會多好多營運商嘅，以前有二十六，所以係過去十年係有啲行業整合嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋點樣整合嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主要係佢哋營運商互相收購，其中一間我提及嘅公司，有一間叫做 CDC ComfortDelGro 係本身喺新加坡都有營運嘅，好似倫敦都有，佢哋收購市場份額，Ventura，之前提及喇，本身亦都收購咗一間比較大嘅營運商，而有啲小型嘅營運商亦都係畀比佢大嘅公司收購，所以大約一半嘅營運商係過去十年畀人收購咗，我哋都會繼續睇到個營運商數目會持續減少。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）响個政策角度睇，你睇唔睇到係有咩嘢原因就話會令到個營運商個數目會減少呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）本身對某啲公司嚟講，成本方面係會有益處嘅，如果擴大規模，就會個控制成本有幫助，有啲營運商比較細，有啲大型，本身佢嘅購買市場份額，等佢哋可以再擴展業務。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）當你講番創造利益，就係話主要係個規模效益呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）一部分都係歸因於--呢啲如果係家族企業，譬如話下一代唔想繼承，有個幾有趣嘅例子，一個叫 Grenda Corporation，本身喺墨爾本一間比較大嘅公司，本身係都係幾代人做㗎喇，亦都下一代決定就話唔想繼續營運，所以就將佢賣咗，喺個出售過程，佢哋將三分之一嘅營運收入畀佢哋嘅職員，呢樣係非常之慷慨嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）總括嚟講，一千七百架專營巴士本身係由三分之一畀個目前成功嘅營運商，其他嘅就係...

MR JOHN STANLEY：Transdev.

主席：Then the other two-thirds are divided up by 12 operators?

MR JOHN STANLEY：Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話最大一間嘅營運商本身係營運幾多間巴士呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約五百架左右。

主席：（經傳譯員）Transdev？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）可能大約五百嗖，我懷疑 Ventura 都大約有三、四百架嗖，CDC 本身大約都有四百架左右。我可以之後回覆番個數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果個投標過程大約五百，本身有一千二百架就有其他營運商瓜分，但係兩間大約係佔大部分路線。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約三間嚟講，都佔一個好大比例。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）教授，可唔可以話畀我聽一間細嘅營運商本身會有幾多架巴士嗖呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約三、四十架。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）三、四十架巴士？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）然之後有啲淨係得一、兩架--係一、兩個營運商。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）講番墨爾本，譬如話嗰個基建、車廠同埋嗰個維修設施，如果將嗰個營運商轉換嘅時候，喺個競標制度轉換嘅時候點做呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）個合約會指明就話呢啲資產係點樣會處理嘅，而亦都安排亦都係嗰個協商合約方面，本身擁有車廠本身係畀一個有利位置，因為係喺特別市區係好難起一個新車廠。而家政府亦都比較關注，因為有機會就話有確保競爭，如果你協商合約方面就比較難啲有競爭，由於嗰啲協商合約嘅營運商比較關注就話佢哋嘅服務--路線會畀咗出嚟投標，所以佢哋同政府講，就話佢哋嘅資產同埋對於競標制嘅人，就會根據某啲條款，係會畀嗰個成功中標者，基本上就會將呢啲設施就賣畀嗰個新中標嘅營運商。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）包括巴士？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）巴士站、車廠、巴士本身？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以就 Ventura 同埋 National Express 嘅情況係咪咁樣？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋就淨係轉換巴士上面嘅標誌。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）一般而言，我嘅問題係同時關於競標同埋協商合約方面。譬如嗰啲車，政府所收嘅車資可唔可以收回營運巴士成本呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約係百分之二十幾，主要一欽收番兩毫幾子或者再好少少。政府要求營運商畀啲車價優惠，而如果根據番啲特定津貼嚟講，就會百分之三十幾，但係如果一般車資嚟講，大約二十至三十左右。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺咁背景下，政府係個津貼巴士營運商都幾大？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主要係當我個營運嗰個行業，就會啲力度就話去衡量番社會嘅得益，而我哋嘅同事係估計就話巴士路線對於墨爾本社區嘅利益大約係嗰個所收回成本嘅十多倍，主要係嗰個社會共融，如果你冇一啲近郊區嘅巴士服務，因為呢啲區增長好快，冇呢啲服務嘅話，好多人就冇辦法去參與社會提供嘅一系列嘅活動，我諗淨係呢樣嘢就主要係抵銷番呢啲嘅成本，而巴士亦都係對減少擠塞係好有幫助，呢兩樣嘢絕對係比起津貼嘅效益嘅兩倍。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係嗰個經濟嘅理據去提供補貼？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，正正係咁。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以咁講，呢個補貼部分就係香港同墨爾本嘅分別就係香港就係營運商收車資同埋佢哋負責嗰個財務風險？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）墨爾本本身知道個社會效益，因為我哋之前係做過一啲計算，就因為我哋計番對社會嘅效益同埋值唔值得係政府去畀咁多錢，呢個係一個可以--香港嚟講，都應該係有用嘅，去量化對香港社會嘅價值，有關於個巴士服務。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港嗰個用者自付制度係有效嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，係嘅，但係亦都係有其他人去受益，譬如話嗰個安全，呢個安全係一個巴士營運嘅一個重大嘅外部因素，所以對我哋嚟講，外部因素都幾緊要去了解嗰個成本同埋個效益，譬如話有一半人去坐專營巴士而轉去坐私家車，本身個安全結果會比較差，所以呢啲係需要去明白嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港模式有效係咪如果個人數呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我會話係，同埋個密度係支持到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。陳律師。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，教授，跟住我哋去講一個相關嘅課題，但係個焦點就會有啲唔同，喺呢個課題下面，我想同你討論嘅就係競標同埋協商合約兩者個優

劣，我唔係話邊一樣係好啲，而係想講每一--探討下每一種方式嗰個優劣。我可唔可以開始就係請你睇一睇專家文件夾嘅 20 頁？即係你第一份報告。主席，唔好意思，講錯咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，慢慢喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，應該係你第二份報告嘅 20 頁，即是專家文件夾嘅 73 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺第 73 頁，你呢度講嘅題目就係專營權同埋係用咩嘢方法去分配服務提供嘅權利，請你睇由尾數上去屘二嗰段，就係開始第一個字係“However”，我會讀出嚟，「但係墨爾本亦都將大概三分之一嘅定線巴士服務用招標方式判出去，就會令到喺表現方面增加咗個壓力嘅元素，對成個定線巴士系統都係，而呢個投標嘅元素就會造成一個效果，就係令到現有嘅營辦商喺--都一直有一個擔心，就話佢哋嗰個協商嘅合約唔係得到保證嘅，所以亦都有個風險可能將來佢哋嗰條線嘅服務係會用投標方式判出去嘅，即係如果佢哋表現得唔好嘅話。而喺香港就冇一個競標嘅制度，即係過去二十年都冇，就顯示喺呢方面個風險，香港可能就係低過墨爾本。」然後請你睇...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你繼續之前，你就覺得呢個係一個風險，就即係話現有嘅服務承辦商從來都未試過喺協商合約嘅時候係冇咗份合約嘅，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我諗就有兩方面去睇呢個問題嘅，一方面就要睇嗰個風險同嗰個壓力，即係提供服務嗰個成本嗰度，而真正係競標嘅話，就會令到人會警覺啲，即係要睇下佢嗰個營運個成本係點樣。喺全世界嘅好多地方佢哋都係用競標個方式嘅，就但係好多時候都係由政府提供個服務，就唔係私人公司，而政府決定佢可能係負擔唔到嗰個成本補貼，跟住就要繼續服務，咁就點做，咁睇喇。而我哋如果用競標，通常由一個私人營辦商代表咗公營營辦商，可能嗰個成本就會節省百分之十五至二十嘅。

如果係私人營辦商係一路都係有效咁樣經營緊、提供緊一啲服務，因為營辦權係有值錢嘅，政府基本上就係畀營辦商--畀佢哋自由點樣去營辦，但係佢哋可以賺到一個合理利潤，提供一個好嘅服務，但係如果係競標嘅話，即係有人畀錢政府，可以攞到呢個營辦權。

香港就比較唔尋常，就因為唔係好多地方就可以用呢一個論據嘅，因為呢度嘅服務真係做得咁成功，完全係商業營辦嘅，即係話政府就畀咗個權畀營辦商去經營，咁都係一個可行嘅方法嘅，就嗰個費用會低啲，而營辦商可能亦都會畀啲錢政府去提供個服務咁樣，都可以係咁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第二個我哋想睇嘅，就關於話係表現壓力嗰度，就係第 87

頁，即係用競標形式就會有表現壓力，第87頁，相關嗰段就係第一段，嗰頁嘅第一段，就係話「墨爾本嘅定線巴士營辦商，睇嚟係有可能會承擔比較大嘅表現嘅壓力，就係相對於香港嘅專營巴士營辦商，原因就係第(1)，就喺墨爾本經常都存在呢個可以有競標嘅威脅，即係如果佢表現唔理想就會出現；第(2)，就會包括一啲具體嘅獎勵或者罰則條款喺合約裏面；而最重要，從一個安全角度睇，第(3)點，就係有存在安全嘅職責等等。」

或者我先講番第一部分，就係因為有競標喺墨爾本佢個好處係乜嘢，首先講呢點，某程度上，你都解釋咗一部分，或者我可唔可以再問一問你？關於呢個競投或者競標嘅概念，喺香港環境點樣可以用到呢？即係因為香港就係巴士營辦商就收嗰個車費嘅收入嘅，你其實頭先已經開始講咗嘅，之前嘅答案裏面都開始講呢一部分㗎喇，即係頭先你係答主席嘅問題，我知道係有唔同嘅方案可以考慮嘅，你可唔可以解釋下各個方案呢？

因為定線巴士營辦商佢就從乘客嘅車資嗰度就收到佢嘅收入，呢個係個價值好大，你又提到有個可能性就係由承辦商畀錢政府攞得呢個營辦權去提供譬如巴士服務喺一個專營地方咁樣，香港就冇一個競標，但係政府係可以考慮係咁樣做就開放畀人去競投嗰個營辦權，如果係咁競投嘅話，而家因為冇一個價格定咗喺度，點樣用咩嘢基礎去做呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我未必完全明白你想問乜嘢，但係等我嘗試答。如果政府係咁做，就會話「好喇，而家喺 X 呢個區將現有嘅專營巴士權全部整走，我哋就會邀請邊個想提供服務就嚟入一個標，就話要喺呢個區度提供服務。」而呢個競投可能係講話有一個時間表，即係個班次時間表，政府就可能亦都具體講明話佢哋希望個服務係點樣嘅，然後邀請公司嚟去競投，可能會預計嗰個競標價係會好低，因為政府喺呢方面係唔需要話花啲乜嘢錢，政府係咪最終可以賺到錢呢？譬如可能就係睇佢哋嗰個回報率，然後將其中一部分嘅利潤係交番畀政府，等佢哋可以擁有呢個經營權。

譬如話喺倫敦咁樣，佢哋講緊嗰個利潤--個利率都係好低嘅，即係個回報率好低嘅，而喺倫敦，佢哋嘅做法，佢哋嗰啲合約都係規模細啲，年期短啲，因此就將佢嗰個回報率係撳低咗，所以可能個營辦商就會話「好喇，我而家就係要投標，不過我都唔會降低我個利潤。」而另外一個競投嘅人就可能話「我係會準備--我係願意畀番啲錢政府嘅，即係從呢個合約，因為我就可以賺到錢。」所以政府都會畀佢賺啲錢。所以好難知道話最終嗰個結果係點。

我要講得好清楚一點，我唔係話香港都應該用競投或者競標呢個制度，但係用個假設嘅情況話我哋可以做啲咩嘢呢？畀我呢，我就揀幾條路線，然後就處理，就話呢啲路線我就拎出嚟畀人競投，就會令到個過程都會簡單啲，容易嘅，就係譬如你要點樣處理已經係投放咗嘅資產、投資啲資產等等點樣處理當然係困難，但係原則上其實係做得到嘅，即係畀錢之嘛，就可以買到嗰啲資產，然後嗰個區幾大，又當中有幾多條路線你攞出嚟競投，就係咁考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講話倫敦嗰啲合約個年期好短嘅，我知道倫敦佢哋個招標個合約期係五年，...

MR JOHN STANLEY：Correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）...而有可能延展兩年，但係七年之後就要重新招標㗎喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）即係同墨爾本一樣，係咪呀？如果你講七年就。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，墨爾本都係五加二--倫敦係五加二。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我知道。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）而且佢哋嗰啲合約規模係細啲嘅，我都知道倫敦個情況係咁，就係以路線為本嚟定嗰啲合約嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我知道當然亦都可以有其他嘅可能性，一個方法就係競投人就建議向政府畀某一個數目金額，就等佢可以營辦咁多條路線喺某個區咁樣，而另外一個可能性就係競投人係提出同政府分享嗰個利潤。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而我諗仲有可能有第三個可能性，就係唔係用競投價，而係完全去評估佢哋可能將會提供個服務嘅性質係點樣樣，如果咁樣去競投，係咪都合邏輯呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係一般去考慮，即係做競標呢個方式吖，抑或考慮--價格當然係其中一個因素，但係質素係非常重要嘅，而好多時候你會發現好多地方佢哋唔會將個合約畀最低投標價嗰個人，而佢哋睇番個服務，所以服務質素肯定係一個好高嘅要考慮嘅因素嚟嘅，一個重要嘅考慮因素嚟嘅，就係話要睇番嗰個競投人佢能夠提供啲咩嘢服務，呢一點係重要。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能亦都有其他嘅方法，即係個準新營辦商，佢就會話「我比現任嗰個--而家嗰個承辦商，我會將嗰個票價降低百分之十。」從政府嘅角度考慮，就當然會令到公眾得益，咁都可以係一個方法，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，絕對可以係嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，講番嗰個好處，即係競標呢個方式嘅好處，一般嚟講，競標一般可以提供啲咩嘢嘅優勢，即係譬如話係改善到巴士服務嘅安全呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗競標，你哋可能會見到一種情況，佢嗰個競投價係低嘅，然後可能賺唔到錢，可能佢哋個承辦商就話「如果係咁，睇下邊度可以慳到錢。」譬如話係遲啲先做維修、保養，呢個係一個例子。

我喺第一份報告都有提到其中一樣，就係道路安全嘅檢驗，當時都係關注到話有啲巴士嗰個狀況好唔好咁呢個問題，所以我哋當時就話喺競標嘅方式就有呢個問題，當時我哋係向規管當局提出咗呢個問題，個原因就係如果用責任鍊呢個方式，喺墨爾本個法例係咁定嘅，作為檢驗巴士嘅人，我哋就知道如果佢嗰啲營辦商嘅巴士唔合標準，就我哋相信就要喺呢個責任鍊嗰度去處理，如果唔係，就會出問題。

所以我覺得係會有風險嘅，就係你點樣處理，就係話你可能喺做嗰個招標文件嘅時候就好明確訂明嗰個質素嘅準則係點樣樣，同埋要講明嗰個譬如巴士車隊個狀況要維持喺邊度。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋係特別明確講出安全係一個考素，應該喺個招標過程裏面加落去呢？即係要講明要安全呢個因素，點樣寫落去等啲人競投嘅時候考慮呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗要講明話嗰個車嘅狀況係點、維修保養係點樣做同埋營辦商需要保持到咩嘢狀況，咁可能喺合約裏面都要講明如果佢哋達唔到嗰啲成效嘅時候就要點樣處理，我唔係律師，肯定你寫合約，你就會講到定到一啲嘅基準嘅表現嘅指數，而呢啲基準表現目標達得到，就冇問題，如果達唔到，就要處理。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）你話喺競投嗰個準則嗰度點樣呢？即係如果我哋好明確講明話安全係一個因素，會唔會用意外率呢？即係話如果你做唔到，你要罰款咁樣呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就唔知道有人會有啲獎勵或者係罰則係特別同安全有關嘅，如果真係咁做，我就會覺得意外率都係一個好嘅起點嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）新加坡有冇一啲規定，就話如果個意外率達到某一個水平，就會有個罰則咁樣呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：I think it is, Chairman, but I don't know enough about it.

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我知道嗰個意外率係定得好高嘅，高過香港現有嘅意外率嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：Okay.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺競標，你提到話可能有一個壞處，就係個成本嗰方面嘅問題或者係要遲啲計算，你又提到話保養嘅成本，會唔會係同嗰個合約年期有關呢？譬如話只限定一段時間，只要你保持到你嘅表現，喺嗰段時間就得喇，之後發生咩嘢事你就唔理㗎喇，如果咁講，係咪錯呢？抑或係調番轉呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）正如我之前講過，我唔知道嗰啲競標合約嗰個全

部細節係點嘅，但係通常做法，政府就會喺個合約定一啲規定，就話去到個合約完嘅時候嗰啲汽車應該保持喺乜嘢嘅狀態嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個一般個概念，即係話要延遲支付一啲成本，就會係競標嘅一個弊端嚟嘅，你其實指話延遲成本係咩嘢意思呢？即係我理解，就係話因為我要保持成本低，我就係呢度慳、嗰度慳咁樣，你想講嘅係咪係想講呢個觀點呢？所以因此佢哋延遲支付某啲成本？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗就係你同政府當然會進行一連串嘅協商，睇下政府會唔會係有啲情況幫到你一啲，譬如話畀多啲錢你去營辦咁樣，有啲承辦商佢哋會咁做嘅，佢哋會嘗試去同政府重新再商討佢哋嘅合約嘅，如果佢哋發覺佢哋個利潤太低嘅話，譬如喺墨爾本，我哋就睇到真係有一個問題存在，所以嗰個情況最後就處理咗㗎喇，而家營辦商佢嗰個車隊嘅狀好咗好多，但係我唔知道嗰次政府係咪有畀到幫助佢哋或者畀咗錢佢哋。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我要講番返去呢個問題，因為我要確保我係好清楚明白你講乜嘢嘢。即係從商業嘅競標就有弊端，但係又有好處，係同安全相關嘅，係會因為競標係會提供咗呢個好處？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就諗唔到，陳生，或者係有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就係指出話有風險？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我覺得係有風險嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你就覺得競標，譬如話--譬如每咁多公里，佢唔換嗰啲車呔，就係因為想慳錢，呢個就係個風險，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，就係呢個風險，類似呢啲。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我知道三分一嘅墨爾本嘅定線巴士服務都係競標嘅，你覺得自從引入咗競標之後，對於巴士安全運作有冇帶嚟好處呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就唔認為有咩嘢證據，如果你睇番運輸申訴專員嘅報告，就係講話針對嗰啲巴士營辦商，你就會睇到嗰啲競投嘅服務，佢哋通常即係話如果呢方面服務，佢哋去到申訴員嗰個投訴都係屬於排得比較高嗰啲公司嚟嘅，就主要係保養問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）有啲邊啲嘅競投嘅營辦商？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）就係現有嗰個，Transdev。

主席：Transdev？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我知道倫敦佢哋一啲嘅可能就係因為冇策略性嘅規劃，就令到佢

啲保養有問題，好多嘅工程師同一時間係退休嘅，佢哋又請唔到人，墨爾本嗰個問題係咪都係因為咁嘅原因呢，抑或係同想節省成本嘅問題？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗應該係因為墨爾本而家都係有一個好快速嘅人口增長，就係差唔多每年係百分之二點五，嗰啲巴士就要運作得頻繁啲，我諗呢個係其中嘅原因佢哋要行多啲嘅里數，又要每日喺路上係用長咗，又老化，我諗呢個就係墨爾本嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，教授，我可唔可以去睇下一個協商嘅合約有咩利弊，首先，想請你睇你第二份嘅報告書，第 86 頁，喺嗰一頁嘅最底嗰一段，我讀呢一段出嚟，你就話，86 頁下面，「定線巴士營辦商係需要感覺到某啲嘅表現方面嘅壓力嘅，如果佢哋係一個可以係唔續約嘅，協商出嚟嘅專營權嘅話，作者就係支持呢一個協商嘅方式嚟到去批呢一個定線服務嘅營辦權利，但係呢一個嘅制度必須要確保呢一個營辦商係有一啲嘅壓力，要喺一啲嘅可以量度嘅嗰啲嘅表現方面係表現得好嘅，就有機會如果佢做得好，就有獎勵，如果佢做得唔好，就有刑罰嘅，就係可能引致佢係會甚至損失咗呢個專營權嘅，呢啲就係要全部擺晒落去嗰個嘅專營合約裏面。」點解你覺得呢一個比起競投方式更加好呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我自己喺呢方面喺墨爾本做咗好多工夫，我覺得一個協商嘅合約主要嘅好處，就係話你要決定如果你真係想用呢個方法，你就要喺政府同埋營辦商之間有一個好牢固嘅關係，就係話到底呢一個制度點樣可以發展得最好嘅，我哋就覺得政府方面係佢技巧方面有限，營辦商方面亦都係，嗰個嘅制度嘅設計同埋點樣能夠最好咁樣得到你公共運輸嗰個嘅利益，就有一個機會畀政府喺呢方面嘅專家同埋業界就一齊努力，就希望一加一係大過二嘅結果，呢個我哋而家就係試緊咁樣做，喺呢方面我寫咗好多嘅文章，就係話政府同埋營辦商要有一個互相信任嘅關係，就唔係講到話--即係唔係話規管方面係做唔到，而係要嗰間公司--唔係話嗰間公司好似係控制咗個營辦商，而係兩方面係有一個互相嘅信任嘅協作，嗰個嘅合約或者營辦商就係可以喺期內有所變更嘅，係一路喺度更新緊嘅，係一份活嘅文件，就唔係話係已經係鐵板一塊，開始係點就唔能夠改變嘅。就一路嗰個營辦期一路運作，就可以改善呢個服務嘅，就係基於大家有一個相互嘅信任。

點解墨爾本佢哋做得到呢？因為我亦都係去經營呢個巴士協會嘅，我哋喺呢一個乘客量同埋服務表現方面都有好大嘅改善，就係基於我哋同政府有呢一個嘅關係，以前三、四十年都係做唔到嘅，從我哋嘅經驗，我哋睇到如果你--政府同埋相關嘅機構有呢一個嘅互相信任嘅關係，呢一個制度亦都係需要雙方都係負責嘅，咁嗰個營辦商就可以有好嘅表現。如果佢唔係話畀個牌照佢賺錢就算嘅，佢係要有好嘅表現，點解？就係話要有一啲表現方面嘅壓力係擺喺呢個人身上嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以解釋乜嘢叫做規管方面嘅即係一個嘅--大家困咗喺呢一個嘅局裏面？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）即係話有時可能嗰個嘅標係太低，政府就覺得好難，如果佢哋大家唔太過親近嘅時候，就可能嗰方面又會想嗰個合約價格係升高嘅，好多時候大家就會批評協商嘅合約就係話好似而家嗰個營辦商就已經係俘虜咗政府㗎喇，政府冇辦法，惟有畀佢繼續嚟到去做。我哋其實就係要有一個壓力，要佢有好嘅表現嚟到處理呢個風險，因為其實有個風險嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話可能係巴士營辦商就係可能抗拒政府有一啲嘅建議話叫佢哋點樣改善，係咪咁呀？譬如話加一啲巴士上一啲安全嘅裝置。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係有講，但係就唔做，就係冇一個實質嘅改變，係唔係呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）如果真係嗰個營辦商俘虜咗嗰個嘅規管者，就可能會咁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個風險。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）所以點解你要有一個喺表現方面有壓力嘅，就係係一個真正嘅壓力。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一啲舉例例子，點樣叫做表現方面畀啲壓力佢呀？喺邊方面呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）特別係安全表現嘅壓力，我哋喺墨爾本就係覺得安全係一個共同承擔嘅責任，呢個係好獨特嘅，所有相關嘅各方都係有一個嘅責任鍊，呢個都可以影響巴士嘅安全，佢哋都安全嘅責任。呢一個就需要我哋喺我哋嘅認證制度之下有一個洽商嘅合約安排，所有嘅營辦商都相當知道佢哋如果做得唔好，佢可能係會被告上法庭嘅，如果證明佢哋冇盡佢哋嘅力嚟到去盡佢嘅責任保障安全，就會咁喇。所以呢個係一個非常之重要嘅表現壓力，呢個就係責任鍊方面。我哋覺得如果有一個太過低程度嘅表現壓力，呢個就係關乎賞罰，我哋都講過喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話喺佢哋可唔可以營辦係有一個服務嘅有獎賞，而係安全方面，可唔可以用呢一個意外率嚟到量度？

MR JOHN STANLEY：Absolutely.

主席：（經傳譯員）有咩嘢其他方法去量度呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）意外率係一個好嘅起點，如果你睇下一啲嘅報告，我哋喺安全計劃同埋呢一個五年嘅計劃，你就提供一啲資料關於傷亡率、撞車、非撞車，譬如話係蹦倒、絆倒、跌倒等等呢啲嘅意外。如果你係發現一

啲安全--你將安全變做一個可能係有懲罰嘅條件，我哋就會去處理嗰個安全嘅問題，如果你唔去將嗰個意外率嚟到一齊嚟去睇，你就咁睇嗰個傷亡率，你就會睇埋譬如話蹦嘥、嘰嘥、跌倒呀咁，我覺得呢兩點都係重要嘅。

我覺得有一個嘅營辦商就係見到越嚟越多係蹦嘥、嘰倒同埋跌嘥呢一類嘅意外，呢一方面處理咗，就減低咗嗰個傷亡，如果你將佢哋全部加起上嚟，一件事件就係一個事件，你就睇唔到嗰個整體嘅情況，如果你將佢哋分析下，睇下一啲安全嘅大嘅範疇，就係確保有一啲主要服務指標，你就可以有一條嘅條款，可能係賞罰嘅條款，即係話你就係會有一系列嘅設施喇。

我唔知道呢一個一籃子嘅設施有幾多個元素，但係係要喺大家洽商，即係政府同埋營辦商或者係委員會洽商之後嗰個結果嘅，我覺得呢個就係主要呢個安全嘅問題同埋你要去處理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗喺倫敦，佢哋有四十二個元素係關於安全嘅問題。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就覺得好多。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你正話就係重點講咗表現方面嘅壓力，我就想問下你，喺香港呢個情況，巴士服務其實都係同其他公共交通模式去競爭嘅，譬如話火車、小巴、的士等等，你覺得呢一類型嘅競爭會唔會都喺營辦商方面有壓力，要佢表現得更好嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係有嘅，都有一個程度嘅，但係就唔夠我哋正話講到競投所造成嘅要佢表現得好嗰啲嘅壓力，因為嗰個嘅後果係比較嚴重嘅，喺競投嘅情況之下，佢哋係例如話你如果競爭得唔好，你就可能少咗啲乘客，你同呢一個地鐵方面，但係呢個唔同，係完全冇咗你成檔生意嘅，我諗我哋係需要嗰個壓力係去到一個地步，如果你表現得唔好，你可能冇得做生意，冇得做嘅，呢個就係競投一般嘅情況。亦都要有一個好可能嘅一個情況，就係話呢個好可能嘅威脅，就係如果你表現好差，你會成個嘅合約或者專營權係冇咗嘅。

我諗另外一點，就係票價嗰個調整機制亦都喺你嘅專營合約裏面係容許有呢方面可能係畀佢哋表現得冇咁好，因為有一條方程式嚟到去調整價格，改變咗營運嘅開支同埋收入就係其中一樣嘢我哋畀呢個巴士營辦商係有一個合理嘅回報率，呢一個喺票價調整方面係考慮埋嘅。我哋要畀佢睇到好可能，真係好可能你如果係做得唔好，你冇咗呢個專營權嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就係聽到一啲嘅證供，嚟自巴士營運商，佢哋話咁樣嚟到係分類係唔公道嘅，佢哋對於呢個嘅價格調整機制唔係好開心，佢哋就話佢哋有時去到一個地步，都費事申請加價，因為通常都係被拒絕㗎喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗一個合約或者專營權係要寫得好清晰，冇含糊嘅地方，關乎票價嘅調整，我哋呢一度就唔係睇個票價，反而係營辦商嗰個

嘅回報，我哋都係有類似嘅方程式嘅。我哋會睇下譬如工資、燃油價格、其他嘅營運成本嗰啲嘅元素係點呢，我哋會將呢啲全部考慮在案，嚟到去計算我哋嘅補貼水平，即係話營辦商同政府收到幾多，佢就會將佢擺晒落去嗰個價格嘅釐訂嗰個情況裏面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你即係話巴士營辦商就係認為價格調整機制就係令到佢哋唔係幾開心，佢哋就唔提出申請嘅。我諗而家都係一個合適嘅時間我哋係有一個小休，我哋會休息二十分鐘，一陣間會再返嚟嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔該。

上午11時35分押聆訊押後

上午11時56分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）教授，喺我哋繼續之前，有兩樣嘢嚟講，我哋同時間提供即時傳譯，為咗方便聆聽傳譯嘅人，我希望你喺回答嘅時候可以放慢少少，同埋適當時候停頓，可以令到佢哋可以追到你。同埋你或者可以或者會對準啲個咪去回答，我哋大家都會收聽得清楚啲。希望你搵到一個合適嘅距離去回答。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋之前提及到將安全列為獎勵嘅一部分，我想特別針對呢個題目嘅，喺小息之前，你有提及到有啲咩嘢指標可以去聚焦嘅，即係作為獎勵嘅一部分，想問一個一般性問題，喺有個環境，譬如話個營運者已經本身係靠個乘客人數去獲利，你預計話呢啲嘅獎勵會唔會成為一個係直接嘅獎金或者係扣錢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢個就係我係正正會預計到。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）本身係會有啲指標，係咪？如果你唔設定嘅話，就會係有個罰則條款，如果你符合嘅話，就會有一個額外獎金？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗係會設定一個範圍，如果你稍為唔符合或者你超過少少或者你係可以達標或者超過幾多，呢啲獎罰本身係會有個最高低範圍。喺我小息前講過，譬如話嗰啲死亡、滑倒、絆倒、跌倒呢啲亦都會考慮到。

去建立嗰啲表現指標，本身係有啲要求去符合，本身你要係具體，可量度同埋可以達到，同埋明顯要有關，同埋嗰啲數據本身係要及時供應到，呢啲嘅主

要即效指標，主要係要營運商係可以去同佢嘅表現去--係影響個結果。

我哋認為安全係一個共同責任，我認為如果呢啲嘅主要即效指標傾斜於個責任喺個車長方面，而唔去涉及其他人還是本身係做個巴士安全責任鍊嘅一部分，特別係嗰啲有關呢啲巴士安全嘅指標，譬如話死亡、滑倒、絆倒、跌倒個案。

亦都睇番呢啲嘅指標本身可唔可以針對可以影響呢啲指標嘅一批人，因為呢啲係牽涉到只係車長，就唔係咁公平。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）根據你之前嘅答案，你諗緊係咪一個獎金制度？即係譬如話政府設定嘅，唔係淨係畀營辦商，可能營辦商嘅僱員都可以有呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗呢個就要公司自己去決定，即係佢點樣做到最--得到最好嘅效果，我就會覺得可能係有一個獎金制度或者一個罰則嘅制度，係公司層面嘅，由佢哋去判斷，到底佢哋想獎勵邊個，特別係嗰啲都一齊努力導致嗰個成果做得到嘅人。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）譬如我哋講過呢個概念層面，可唔可以講一個具體嘅例子？即係頭先講咗概念層面，而家可唔可以講個具體嘅例子？其實有好多例子，但係我淨係攞一個，等我哋嚟睇下到底呢個概念係咪行得通，然後就請你就住呢個例子畀啲評論，首先可唔可以請你睇 TD-1 文件夾 192 頁？

等你知道呢份係咩嘢文件，呢份就係九巴嘅遠期規劃嘅文件，呢度有一節就係特別講巴士安全嘅，就係 2018 至 2002 年嘅，呢份文件 192 頁就係九巴交畀運輸署嘅，就係大概 2017 年中左右，8.8.1 段，九巴建議用三年嘅平均數字，係 2014 至 16 年嘅實際牽涉交通率，就係 2.71 呢個數，個定義就係話每一百萬營運里數嘅牽涉喺交通意外嘅巴士數目，就比起 2014 年個意外率其實就係減低咗百分之六嘅，喺 2014 至 2016 就係最高嗰個紀錄嚟嘅，就用呢個目標做五年計劃期嘅目標，即係話佢定咗個基準喺呢度喇，可以咁講。呢個就係九巴自己定嘅目標，就係其中一個可以用嘅安全指標。

然後我哋往前去，2017 年去到 2018 年，你就可以睇 TD-5 文件夾 1729 頁，唔好意思，可唔可以返番一頁先，1728 頁，等我哋知道呢份係咩嘢文件，1728 頁，你就睇到有一封信，係運輸署，日期 2018 年 5 月 21 號，係由運輸署畀九巴嘅。

第一段，「呢封信就講話係提供你一套嘅指引同埋規定，就係涵蓋下面嘅部分，就係要你喺五年嘅規劃計劃裏面就遵循嘅，所以你準備嘅時候就要睇喇。」

好喇，即係一年前，即係講緊同一個，就係話佢嗰個未來五年嘅規劃工作。然後去番 1729 頁，你睇到運輸署嘅評論，關於巴士安全嘅，第一段，運輸署就話「我哋備悉喺九巴每百萬行車里牽涉交通意外嘅巴士數目就 2016 年嘅 2.74

就增加到2017年嘅3.04，係屬於一個高水平。」

第二段，我淨係讀最後嗰一行，「仲有，實際嘅牽涉交通意外率就係2017年3.04，就係比喺你2018至2022年規劃計劃裏面所建議嘅2.71呢個水平係高嘅。」

就呢度就睇到，每百萬行車公里牽涉意外嘅巴士數目，嗰個2016、17嗰啲數字你睇到晒，15都有。

然後喺呢一個表下一段就話「如果講到話牽涉到九巴巴士嘅交通意外數目，喺2015年362宗增加到2017年嘅423宗，就有一個上升嘅趨勢。」

喺我頭先讀嗰段，我哋睇到九巴並冇達到意外率嘅目標，呢個目標係佢自己定嘅，你可以睇到九巴嘅意外率，即係按每百萬行車公里計，係達唔到，係高咗嘅，即係話九巴自己達唔到佢自己設定嘅目標。

你覺得如果個獎罰嘅機制喺咁嘅情況，點樣做呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就唔會好似喺呢度咁樣嚟應用嘅，如果你睇番嗰個表，題目就係話九巴巴士牽涉喺交通意外個數目，你會睇到嗰個致命意外由11降到5，再降到3；嚴重受傷就由122降到110，再降到11；而輕微受傷就由737升到787，再升到889；如果你淨係講話每百萬行車公里嘅意外率，就即係話將所有唔同程度嘅受傷都有平等嘅對待，咁係一個錯誤嚟嘅。當然致命意外嘅考慮係最重要，跟住嚴重受傷都係重要，然後輕微受傷可能又冇咁重要，所以係應該要反映到各種唔同意外所造成嘅傷亡程度嘅。即係話就係有一個主要表現指標，咁先至可以係量度到嗰個安全表現，如果淨係按每一百萬行車里數嚟計嗰個意外率，咁可能會誤導嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）即係你意思應該仲有另一套嘅數字？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，你要有一整套嘅指標，呢一度就會係嗰套指標嘅一部分，但係應該係其中一個元素，唔係佢嘅全部。係應該有其他指標能夠反映到，如果我係作為經濟學家，我就會反映嗰個交通意外嘅總體成本，譬如某一種嘅意外，譬如話嚴重受傷，輕微受傷或者致命意外，佢嗰個成本係點樣，就變咗有個加權嘅因素加咗落去，就先至可以睇到每百萬行車里數嗰個意外率點樣比較。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，如果睇下一頁1730頁，底部，第(3)節，運輸署建議--或者應該係話九巴就建議相關嘅計劃，為咗要減低巴士牽涉喺交通意外嘅比率同埋進一步加強巴士服務嘅安全，照顧到乘客，我哋要求你間公司要建議以下嘅計劃嘅。然後我哋去睇1731頁，運輸署要求九巴提出一個建議，係個目標意外率，即係喺下一期嘅長遠巴士服務計劃嗰度要提及，就係呢個都係講話巴士牽涉喺意外個比率嘅。你就頭先都提到話呢個意外率就唔足夠嘅，太粗疏？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，佢哋應該係要再仔細啲，我會覺得咁樣個

目標應該係佢哋協商個結果嚟嘅，就即係話運輸署同埋營辦商之間去協商到嘅結果，唔係應該由營辦商向運輸署建議。以呢一啲嘅課題其實應該係雙方都去協商嘅題目嚟嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，喺你個報告度，我睇到墨爾本即係訂價加呢個合約模式就冇具體講明嗰個安全指標同埋有啲咩嘢獎罰嘅，或者我首先我講緊邊一頁，然後就請你評論，請你睇第 26 頁，就係專家文件夾嘅第 26 頁，即係你嘅第一份報告。你而家係咪揭到去第 26 頁呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：Yes.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以讀出第二段？即係 3.4 之下嘅第二段，「根據十年嘅都會區定線巴士服務合約就會喺 2018 年中到期，獎罰條款就係同乘客人數增長有關，亦都係同係咪能夠按時提供服務或者取消班次有關，而呢個合約就會取代之前嘅合約，就一般都係包括埋呢個焦點。但係安全就唔係一個主要嘅表現指標嚟嘅，根據合約，所以安全表現亦都冇獎罰嘅條款規定，如果係安全表現惡劣，就可能只係會導致安全總監就係取消有關營辦商個認證，就即係話佢會冇咗份合約。而喺新嘅合約，據理解，就會提供一個乘客體驗嘅機制喺度，就係話係要根據營辦商嗰個表現，睇下相關嘅乘客投訴嘅數目、佢嘅回應同埋解決嘅方法，就會成為一個考慮嘅指標。」

你提到話安全係咁重要，所以點解唔會加咗入去墨爾本嗰啲合約裏面呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，原因就係我哋好大程度係倚賴墨爾本嘅法例，就關於佢哋嘅安全責任同埋義務，就導致佢哋可以達到安全嘅要求，即係話要所有有關能夠影響到安全嘅人士都要負上責任，我個人猜測呢個就係主要嘅理由點解我哋嗰個服務係咁受到讚賞，就係因為安全嘅考慮，而運輸安全署長，我都自己見過好多次，佢喺--我喺準備你今次嘅聆訊嘅時候，我就係見過佢好多次，佢都係深信墨爾本嘅定線巴士服務安全就係因為我哋最基本理由就係要所有相關人士都要負責，所以就係喺法例裏面有關於安全嘅規定，亦都有係責任鍊嘅規定。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你頭先所講嗰個概念，嗰個一般理解就即係話喺維省係有法律上嘅責任，要確保安全，係咪呀？呢個責任嘅特點就係唔係淨係巴士營辦商，而係就算喺營辦商下面嘅僱員都要付上責任，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋有巴士安全法，就係維省嘅法例，就係就住安全責任立法嘅。即係話喺根據法例，有關有時有責任要儘可能去減少或者係消除會威脅到安全嘅因素，確保安全，譬如一個例子，就係話巴士營辦商要喺儘量合理可行嘅情況之下確保巴士服務嘅安全，而法例亦都訂明嗰個安全責任係適用於一連串嘅人嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有關呢個文本，可唔可以喺個畫面度打出嚟呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢個應該係教授第一份報告嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係喺個附件或者另一份文件嗰度？即係佢提及呢份文件，嗰份文件有冇呢？有冇就係巴士安全法，即係有冇呢份文件？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者教授可以喺呢度幫一幫手，就我所知，我就喺附夾嘅文件嗰度冇見到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我自己就有下載到，喺我自己嗰沓文件就有嘅，係咪其他人唔係都有㗎？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，或者可以畀所有人。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話係咪喺個螢幕上係咪有呢已經？有冇一個參考編號呀？就住 Stanley 教授嘅報告就有三個文件夾嘅參考編號嘅，係咪喺呢度？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係有 22、23 頁，我第一份報告就有提到部分相關嘅法例，嗰個文本喺嗰度有。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，個參考編號就係教授報告裏面嗰啲文件，即係佢提過啲文件，但係就冇嗰個法例本身。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋需要嗰份法例本身。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者下一次研訊，我哋會提供，然之後再返嚟講嗰個部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺 23 頁就有一個摘錄。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）教授，你正想繼續講話邊啲人就有呢啲責任。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。嗰個法例其實提及嘅，就係話用你哋講法，就係巴士車長、嗰啲編更嘅人員、採購服務嘅人士、維修保養嘅職員等等，即係喺個法例裏面嘅概念就係呢啲叫做巴士安全工作人員，佢哋就有安全嘅責任，而指定嘅人員就會包括例如係車長，牽涉嘅人係好多類嘅，佢哋就可能影響到個安全嘅情況嘅，所以嗰個根本嘅原則就係話共同嘅責任呢個概念，喺 22 頁報告底部嗰度有解釋。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個責任會唔會延展到去公眾人士？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我覺得好似喺法例嗰度睇過喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）如果係嘅話，我諗可能我睇漏咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我肯定你係比我熟悉嘅，我睇到，因為我當時就記得就係覺

得好怪喇，即係講到話嗰個責任鍊有邊啲人似乎有提。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）就話邊個會影響到個安全嘅成效嘅。我諗值得提醒人--即係主要係想提醒人唔係淨係巴士司機嘅，仲有其他人都要負責嘅，因此佢哋需要承擔責任。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋點樣承擔責任呀？係會係法庭告佢哋？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，係可以㗎，因為有關嘅條文就有一啲嘅罰款嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話如果係公層面，就可以係編更人員、巴士車長，而最高層嘅就係公司嘅高層，係咪？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇。而新嗰個全國法律好快就會喺 10 月 1 號生效嘅，嗰度就係定出維省法律嘅背景，就係講話有啲咩嘢行為可能會引致有啲咩嘢後果嘅，甚至係監禁嘅，呢個就係更新咗嗰個全國法例，係根據呢個法例，而家嗰個罰則主要就係罰款嚟嘅，但係將來就會改。

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，想講嗰條法例，邊一部分係講話公眾嘅責任㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）第 15 條嗰度就係講緊營辦商嗰個責任，譬如話巴士營辦商一定要喺儘可能嘅情況之下確保嗰個巴士服務係安全嘅。第 16 條亦都係類似咁講，一個採購商...

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個叫做採購人？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）即係嗰啲購買巴士服務嘅採購人。而呢度都係喺維省嘅一個好有趣嘅辯論係講緊嘅，就係講到係公眾嘅運輸當局就係購買同埋決定呢啲嘅服務班次就有一個採購人，可能係其中服務鍊一員嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解唔係呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得，就主席，呢個應該係嘅。咁繼續，就係去到第 14 條，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以睇一睇，第 14 條一路去到第 17 條，第 17 條就有一個「巴士安全工作者」，係咩嘢嚟嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）個定義就係喺法例嘅前部係定咗嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊啲係嗰啲巴士安全工人呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗最好都係睇番嗰個定義。

主席：（經傳譯員）好合理。可唔可以睇番釋義嗰部，應該係第 1 條，第 3 條，「定義」喺第 3 條，法例第 3 條，喺呢度，啱唔啱？「巴士安全工作」，係喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）巴士安全工作者就係一個人係將會或者已經係做緊一啲巴士安全嘅工作，包括一個人係由巴士營辦人係聘用嚟到係做一啲巴士安全嘅工作，或者有其他人所聘用嚟到去做巴士安全工作，係一個受訓嘅人士或者一個自願工作者，所以嗰個定義都好闊嘅，可能係巴士嘅測試，一啲嘅監察。其實我哋就係負責驗車嘅，所以呢條條款都可以包埋我哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）去番上面「巴士安全工作」嗰度。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）指「一個活動可能影響到巴士服務嘅安全，包括駕駛巴士，或者係同一啲駕駛巴士相關嘅活動、設計、建造、供應、維修、改裝、驗車」或者係--等等。呢啲嘅喺巴士上面嘅設備，或者係去定出或者係改變巴士服務時間表個班次，或者一個指定嘅服務，呢個係範圍好廣闊。

即係話巴士公司嘅經理佢哋係知道嘅，佢哋都係好認識呢一點嘅，譬如話曾經有討論到巴士司機嗰個嘅工作時間，其實就係佢哋係點樣可以接受。譬如舉例，我哋嘅巴士司機或者係車長平均一個星期工作四十四至四十六小時，喺法例之下佢哋可以工作長啲嘅，但係佢哋唔會，因為營辦商都係關心到咁樣做對安全嘅影響。

其實做一間大嘅營辦商嘅總裁，當佢喺上任嘅時候，2008 年就係將當時嗰個嘅平均工作時數，四十八降到去四十四至到四十六，喺後來嗰四、五年之間做得到嘅，而大部分嘅墨爾本承辦商都係大概一周就係定四十五駕駛小時嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）最高可以容許嘅，每個星期駕駛幾多小時呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢哋可以去到七十二嘅，我哋覺得就唔係幾好。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅證供就係話因為關乎到安全嘅職責，所以佢哋認為應該駕駛小時係下降？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。營辦商都係非常之明白嗰個編更嗰個要求嘅，譬如話有一個嘅承辦商就係喺一個五又四分一小時嘅更裏面係畀多咗三十五分鐘，因為就都會計可能有交通阻塞，就會影響行車時間，佢哋就唔想佢超過五又四分一嘅小時，根據我哋嘅法例，因為呢個係你最高冇休息之下連續揸車嘅時數，如果同佢哋講，佢哋一定最關心嘅就係可能導致對於安全嘅影響、一啲嘅後果，如果有一個人因為揸車時間太長，會唔會係會撞死另外一個人呢咁。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，講到責任鍊呢個問題，你當然下面係有好一層嘅法律責任同義務，就解釋點解你係唔需要特別嚟到話係有啲乜嘢嚟到去獎勵、鼓勵佢哋係注重安全嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺香港，我哋就冇呢啲嘅法例嚟到--喺法律方面係冇要求到確

保安全嘅責任嘅，你覺得係咪更加重要應該係喺其他嘅方面嚟到去獎賞安全呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得呢個係一個好嘅方法嘅，but 就應該唔夠好似我哋咁有一個責任鍊同埋有一啲嘅法例規定安全方面係咁有效嘅。我就覺得如果你係想用一啲賞懲嘅制度嚟到促進安全，就會去番我正話所講，要確保呢啲嘅賞罰都係會適用喺好幾方面嘅，凡係有機會影響安全表現嘅人應該都要受制，呢個就係其實想建立一個嘅責任鍊。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽喺嗰個法例方面係點樣嚟到令到維省係有安全嗰個嘅職責？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，嗰個法例嘅做法，就係主席，全國嗰個嘅法律就係我自己係有份參與嘅，就係嗰個嘅國家道路安全委員會，我哋而家有一個國家道路安全委員會，亦都有一啲重型車輛嘅全國法律，就係會喺省嗰個嘅層面係實行嘅。

唔係所有嘅省都有一個巴士安全法好似我哋咁嘅，維省同埋新南威爾斯，呢兩個最大嘅省就係喺呢一方面就係行得最前嘅，喺 10 月 1 號今年就會係開始㗎喇。我諗喺儘可能嘅情況之下，自從 2009 年呢個國家嘅法律已經係會開始嘅，我哋 10 月 1 號會開始，我覺得而家嗰個全國嘅法律已經係追上咗我正話所講嘅巴士安全法呢一方面嘅水平。

主席：（經傳譯員）用咗幾多年先至可以達到呢個嘅程度呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我諗就都要三、四年。當我係呢一個巴士協會嗰個總裁，2009 年有呢個法例，當時我 1999 年至 2008 年係擔任呢個角色，呢一個嘅法例同埋係將嗰個業界嘅意見就擺埋落去去發展呢一個嘅法例，就係我自己當時有份參與嘅。

喺我第一份嘅文件，我就話主要或者係部分原因係業界接受政府好大程度嘅財政資助，我哋亦都係想更加係主動咁樣喺安全方面令到佢哋成為好嘅企業公民，我哋係好主動嘅，亦都希望呢一類型嘅安全法例係可以係繼續，亦都希望佢哋係符合嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港就情況唔係咁喇。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。但係如果你睇下啲好簡單嘅指標，譬如每百萬行車公里嘅意外率，我哋香港同埋倫敦都冇墨爾本咁好，其中一個原因可能係因為我哋有呢一條嘅法例；另外一方面，亦都可能係個經營嘅環境，喺香港同埋倫敦係--佢哋係好過香港同埋倫敦嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢度係有另外一個因素，如果我講錯咗，你可以更正。就係你哋有一個係好大嘅補貼，另外係成本增加亦都係可以增加佢哋嘅利潤嘅，任何嘅成本增加都可以轉嫁畀政府嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，你講得啱。不過亦都--即係話政府係可以好緊密咁樣監察任何可能係增加成本嘅一啲事情，呢一個可以從一個安全嘅角度去睇嘅，譬如話喺過去三、四年，我哋都係有一啲人係譬如襲擊或者係辱罵司機嘅，喺呢一方面就引致我哋就加咗一啲安全嘅罩，亦都有一啲嘅閉路電視，去處理呢個問題，政府同埋呢一個承辦商都係大家作負擔咗部分嘅成本嘅，呢個都洽商出嚟嘅結果。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）去建議同埋改善呢一個呢一個巴士--增強呢個巴士安全法會有啲咩嘢人係抗拒嘅呢？有啲咩嘢反對呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）即係邊個會反對呢啲嘅法例呀？

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就諗唔到有咩嘢人會反對嘅，可能巴士營辦商或者會反對，因為喺呢個法例之下佢哋就要問責。但係我哋嘅墨爾本嘅巴士營辦商就好支持呢個法例，佢哋亦都係支持認證嘅，呢個認證制度。我諗一啲主要嘅因素就係佢去實行咗呢啲嘅要求之後，佢哋知道或者佢哋相信就可以改善到佢哋嘅安全表現，譬如話佢令到墨爾本成為一個大家去工作、出行都係更加好嘅地方，因為巴士司機駕駛係會更加嘅安全，我睇唔到有咩嘢人會反對嘅，因為嗰啲最可能反對嘅人可能係佢哋都係會有好處嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）但係嗰啲變咗要係有多啲嘅責任同埋義務嘅人，佢哋會歡迎咁嘅制度咩？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）因為佢哋諗佢哋可以嘅表現只要達到呢啲嘅責任，佢哋就係好滿意㗎喇，所以佢哋可以加強佢哋喺業界嗰個嘅地位，就亦都畀人哋睇到佢哋係一個負責任嘅業界，所以其中一個好處就係我哋有一個非常之強嘅業界協會，我哋可以係代表業界嚟發聲，唔係個別嘅營辦商發聲。

主席：（經傳譯員）當然呢度亦都係有一個經濟嘅利益，因為加強咗安全之後，因為意外都係會引致有金錢損失嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個對於巴士營辦商都有好處嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢一方面，我哋就係收到一份嘅報告，就係話有人反對係用獎勵嘅制度嚟到去促進安全嘅，可唔可以請你喺呢一方面表達下意見？

MR JOHN STANLEY：Mm-hmm.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就去專家報告嘅第 153 頁，呢個就係 Mike Weston 先生嚟到做嘅一份報告，佢就係一個交通乘客嘅顧問，佢就係個專長就係倫敦

嘅巴士制度。153 頁嘅最底嗰度，我想講嘅就係用獎勵嘅形式去改善安全，呢一段嗰個大題目，8.5。

我讀一讀，「喺 6.1 段其中一個大倫敦嗰個嘅運輸委員會就係有一個建議，就係去『改善佢高級員工嗰個獎賞制度，就係有一個嘅直接嘅連繫，就係巴士安全同埋表現有關嘅付款。』喺嗰個嘅報告書裏面就有建議，就係『而家嘅巴士營辦商就係冇用錢嚟到去獎勵安全，呢個應該係要修改嘅。』咁同呢一個倫敦嘅巴士營辦商傾過之後，好明顯營辦商係唔支持直接用錢嚟到去獎勵安全嘅，即係喺嗰個合約裏面，承辦商就覺得直接咁樣用金錢嚟到去獎賞就會係引致一啲錯誤嘅行為，特別喺比較低層嘅--公司嘅低層，包括就係會鼓勵佢哋係唔匯報或者係唔舉報一啲嘅意外嘅，就覺得如果將兩者相連，就會令到佢哋唔願意同其他嘅營辦商喺安全嘅問題上面係嚟到合作，因為呢個係會有一個喺競爭喺商業方面嘅利益考慮嘅，咁即係話如果用錢嚟到去獎勵安全，佢哋覺得唔係一個積極嘅行為。」

佢就話有兩個可能嘅風險，第一，就係變咗有關嘅事就係會唔舉報，有一個趨向；另外就係會減少咗巴士營辦商之間嗰個合作，你呢一方面又有咩嘢嘅睇法呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我都承認呢個係有一個風險嘅，如果你可能係會鼓勵人哋有事唔報嘅，但係我諗亦都係可能佢哋會設計一個嘅監察制度同埋合規嘅保證嘅制度，確保唔會咁樣發生，例如喺我哋呢一度，運輸安全署署長就係嗰個成個制度嘅批核者，佢係一個嘅獨立人士或者係機構，佢會有一個嘅法定嘅指引，要佢係幫承辦商認證，亦都確保佢哋符合呢一個認證規度裏面嘅條款，包括係有事係需要匯報嘅。

如果你設計一啲賞罰嘅制度，你要確保你係預防到呢個風險，可能係好難做到嘅，但係我哋都係要去試下嘅，咁去試下呢個制度，去睇下可唔可以處理到呢個風險，我哋有呢一個咁樣嘅署長就係好似我哋呢個制度嘅一個裁判或者係批核人咁樣。而家話唔願意...

陳先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，你未講下一個事項嘅時候，我哋想再講多啲第一個事項，就係遇事不報。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你嘅證供就係話遇事不報或者係傾向唔報嘅呢一個風險就可以有一個--你點樣處理呢？就係有一個可靠嘅制度去確保呢啲嘅數據係能夠係準確咁樣係收集得到同埋記錄得到，我理解啱唔啱？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我哋就要睇下有咩嘢方法，你要睇下可唔可以達到呢一點，而我哋可以用一啲嘅程序去處理呢個問題嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）某個程度嚟講，係咪話喺呢個數據收集方面係儘量機械化同埋

減少人嘅參與呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢個亦都可以將一啲嘅數據庫同事件同埋意外嚟到連貫起嚟，可以係有唔同嘅渠道嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我就係諗緊點解可以話係唔報呢啲意外呢？因為有好多方係涉及㗎嘛，譬如話司機、乘客、警方等等，甚至乎係呢一個救護車嘅，你點可以話大家聯合唔報嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你諗下譬如有一啲細路仔向一架巴士掟石，掟啲石頭，如果你係嗰個嘅營辦商，你會喺一個有賞罰為基本嘅制度，即係關於意外方面嘅事項，你就會諗「我哋就唔好理呢件事，我哋唔去匯報。」其實佢已經掟爛咗窗或者係傷咗，甚至係令到嗰個司機死亡，或者係可能係令到某啲嘅人死亡。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅制度就係你嗰個嘅錯誤係唔擺落去個方程式嗰度，有一啲嘅人係可能有--呢個可能係刑事嘅行為，你可以懲罰佢。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係有辦法去處理嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係講緊一啲嘅準則，我哋係要點樣控制。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你講到呢點啱喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我記得啱呢，有四十二個元素喺倫敦嗰個評估裏面，就係話嗰啲嘅巴士比欺凌或者係凌辱嘅，點解將佢--點解話唔會報畀巴士公司聽或者點解係會嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢個係好重要嗰個嘅訊息，如果你唔去做呢啲，你就會畀人哋係喺安全方面係有一個罰款嘅。我哋要有一啲嘅創意思巧，呢個係唔容易嘅，但係如果你睇下其他嘅安全制度方面其他嘅方法，有一個責任鍊嘅問題，就係有冇一個係遇事不報嘅問題。

陳先生：Sorry, I interrupted you there. Please continue to deal with the second issue.

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）譬如話喺一個競投制度入面，有個營運商本身有個好嘅安全步驟，你會認為就係話佢會有傾向就係話支持你所講嘅，而係唔會去分享呢啲資訊畀其他營運商。呢啲我唔認同，我諗譬如話呢啲係同個競投制度有關，而唔係同呢個安全指標有關。喺個競投制度下面，呢啲營運商一般都唔想合作，因為就唔想畀人知道佢嘅競爭優勢。而如果安全就係一個佢哋嘅競

爭優勢，就更加唔想同人哋分享。

要解決問題嘅方法，倫敦嘅報告，我認為有一項好重要嘅，其中一個要點就係需要唔同營運商更大合作，同埋政府同埋營運商更多合作喺個安全事宜方面，喺我嘅報告第二部分方面亦都係有提到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）雖然就係話營運商之間可能冇咩嘢直接合作，譬如話倫敦方面係有嗰個 Transport for London 就從個官方嗰方面，譬如話有個營運商，譬如話嗰個神眼系統，本身係去減少咗個追撞嘅意外，呢啲係個監管當局會留意到，我哋營運商 A 有個好好嘅結果，然之後就會將呢啲嘅資訊畀其他營運商？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋希望係咁，主席，譬如話情況就係有獎有罰嘅情況，都要可以安裝呢啲科技，然之後從中得益嘅。我哋就唔係話好明個第二點。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）講番個營運商嘅獎勵方面，講到譬如話睇番有冇獎勵安全措施嘅延伸利益，如果嗰個安全表現係有關嘅獎勵制度，會唔會係有潛質可以去鼓勵政府去留意番嗰個安全有關嘅係即效指標？因為而家係有一個額外嘅焦點同埋個財政後果。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你認為會係作為一個步驟嘅後果，首先就係已經係需要去決定嗰啲獎勵同罰則係點樣，所以嗰個運輸部門本身係需要去深入去同啲專營巴士營運商去討論去建立呢啲嘅即效指標，就延伸到個問題，就係話你點樣去過程上監察，同埋需要有一個更強力嘅監察同埋評估制度個步驟。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，而家我哋去另外一個範圍，就係個認證呢方面，一般嚟講，喺你嘅報告入面，巴士營運商認證係墨爾本巴士嘅中央重要部分，基本上如果佢未認證嘅話，就唔可以去營運嘅，而家係可能就係話呢啲認證就可能要改變。

而家我哋係去睇番文件夾方面，第 9 頁，你嘅報告第 9 頁，第一部分嘅第 9 頁，我首先會提及番嗰三段，「巴士營運商認證，作為一個制度去確保就話某個人係可以提供一個安全有效率嘅巴士服務，就有三個元素，係畀巴士同埋旅遊巴、營運者嘅運輸管理課程，由 Monash 大學舉辦嘅，個範圍主要係譬如話嗰個營運商提供嘅服務同埋一個每個合約嘅定線服務，高級員工就需要去完成個課程，就有四個單元嘅，其中一個就係巴士營運商安全風險管理，其中包括課題就係規管同法律架構、財政管理同埋商務擴展，另外一個就係管理資訊系統，第三個就係維修管理系統。

喺 3.3 部分提及，呢三個元素係獲認證，巴士營運商嘅主要規管元素，而個安全嘅重點係主要係過去十年係大大加強，主要集中喺去建立認為係一個安全風險管理文化。

而呢個巴士營運認證系統主要係個報告嘅主要焦點，因為作者認為主要比起

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

墨爾本同埋香港之間係一個最重要嘅單一分別，喺上文提及，維多利亞嘅定線巴士運作個機制係一個特別對呢啲嘅安全議題發展特別重視嘅，所以就睇番呢啲嘅一般營運。」我就對於嗰個管理資訊系統同埋維修管理系統嘅重視。

而家我哋去第 25 頁，去提及呢兩個嘅系統，最後嗰段，我就讀番上半段，「BusVic 係好積極咁樣去建立維省嘅巴士營運商認證制度，例如佢--個課程內容係提供咗畀 Monarsh 大學方面，就係嗰啲認證--營運商一定要去完成嘅，最緊要就係佢有一啲嘅範文回應佢關於管理資訊系統同埋維修管理系統嘅要求，係根據 ISO 39001 嘅，因佢令到佢嘅會員能夠建立同埋執行安全風險管理系統去符合認證制度嘅要求，只要佢係盡力去應用。」

我見到嗰個認證系統同埋 ISO 39001 嘅聯繫，之後我會再提及番。首先，你可唔可以總括嚟講，你可唔可以形容嗰啲巴士營運商認證系統嘅主要好處，特別係關於巴士安全呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢個營運商認證主要係關於安全，主要就係佢哋就係個認證系統嘅背後根本理據，就係確保就係營運商佢提供安全嘅服務，同埋就唔會有--所以意外就係呢啲認證係由嗰個運輸交通總監提供嘅，所以佢就「係，嗰個人就話係呢個人係可以係成為一個認證合格營運商。」所以就可以合資格去同政府建立合約。

而呢個維修嘅管理系統同埋嗰個管理資訊系統，呢兩個系統嘅範圍本身係由嗰個運輸署安全總監去決定。睇番嗰啲相關法例嘅條款，我本身啲文件都有提及到嘅，本身呢個運輸安全總監本身係會話畀個營運商佢哋要做啲乜嘢同埋佢對佢哋嘅期望係乜嘢，同埋佢要睇到啲乜嘢，譬如話喺佢哋嘅管理同埋維修系統方面，同埋個管理資訊系統方面，譬如話我睇番我文件入面所提及嘅，譬如話呢啲嘅管理資訊系統，呢啲譬如係佢巴士安全嘅管理方面，呢啲係由運輸安全總監去出版嘅，就係令到佢哋嗰啲營運商確認，就係話佢哋有咩嘢期望，同埋如果佢哋認證咗之後，就係佢哋去引導佢完成個認證過程。

而之後個巴士行業協會，我哋之前擺喺個螢幕上，就基本上係會建立一啲範本回應畀佢哋會員去睇，同埋去定制，令到佢哋符合佢哋嘅維修管理系統同埋管理資訊系統，就係呢啲比較大嘅營運商，佢哋會度身訂度一啲，根據佢哋嘅營運情況，但係如果細嘅營運商，佢哋就基本上都會夠用嘅呢啲範文。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）如果我錯，你指正我，就係話呢啲嘅認證系統，就關於安全方面，主要係集中於嗰個風險管理方面同埋設立同埋去營運呢個系統去確保安全。其實點解我會去比較番嗰個譬如係 ISO 39001，可以睇番 39001 喺呢一段，我睇番你第二個報告，第 78 頁，喺中間嗰段，喺巴士車長訓練對上嗰段，我會讀一讀，然之後再問一問。

「最後運輸部」--呢個係運輸局--「運輸署去參照番 ISO 39001 道路安全管理系統指出，就係話呢啲係有啲嘅車隊管理公司同埋物流公司，但係唔係畀個運輸監督採納。亦都係留意到，就係話維省嘅營運商管理系統亦都係參照

番 ISO 39001，然後所有嘅定線巴士營運商需要獲得認證，然之後但係就冇話要去，根據呢個個標準，然之後獲得呢個證書。」

喺香港，我哋就冇呢個認證系統，同埋亦都係冇一個競標系統，例如我哋要--如果我哋要求巴士營運商去達到 ISO 39001 會唔會好似墨爾本咁樣達到相同嘅安全利益呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你會期望就係話應該會令你去相當嘅改進，我認為就係話--要諗就係話嗰個交通安全嘅總監嘅角色、你要咩嘢機制，同埋你想嘅話，去確保合規，特別係應用香港嘅巴士營運，所以你會有嗰個認證當局就會做嗰個 ISO 認證，同埋頒發證書，如果你鍾意嘅話，去確保就係話個符合期望。

我哋冇呢啲咁嘅嘢，但係我哋有啲類似嘅嘢，但係如果我哋做嘅話，就會有一個運輸安全總監，就會去作為成個制度嘅監察者。我哋如果睇番就係話，做係一個好嘅提議。我會諗就係話如果有個角色，譬如話好似問責同作為一個獨立同埋一個問責嘅守護者去確保個系統有效。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺維省，嗰個系統安全嘅守護者去確保個營運者係有合適嘅風險管理系統就係嗰個運輸安全總監？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺個 ISO 39001 嘅背景之下，呢個責任就係由嗰個認證公司去處理，去進行一個年度檢查--審查？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋而家係會得到嗰個證書？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，而家我想去另一個題目，就係巴士安全嘅常設委員會。而家會唔會係一個合適嘅時間呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）而家會進行午膳，而家我哋會兩點半先返嚟繼續。

下午 12 時 57 分押聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）下午好。係，陳律師。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。Stanley 教授，我就會開始去下一個題目，就係巴士安全常務委員會同埋運輸安全總監嘅問題，我會兩樣一齊處理。你今朝早都有提及運輸安全總監嘅角色就係點樣可以負責執行嗰個責任鍊嘅，我就會而家集中講各個方面。

首先，我哋睇番呢兩個建議，就係話可以變咗促進更加積極嘅做法去達致巴士安全，就唔係話比較被動咁做。或者首先，睇番你個報告有提及呢兩項建議嘅，首先，去到第 100 頁，就係專家文件夾嘅 100 頁，呢度你就列出你嘅主要嘅建議，大概喺頁嘅中間，第二點，嗰度第二點，你建議「設立一個獨立嘅運輸安全總監，佢嘅工作就係負責管理同安全責任，確保遵守同埋執行嘅事宜嘅」。即係話你建議設立一個運輸安全總監，就係確保安全責任鍊得以落實。

你亦都有講一點觀察，就係 99 頁底部嗰度，喺 99 頁底部，你就話「運輸安全總監，如果係獨立嘅話，就既可以提升安全，將佢成為一個係可取嘅政策成果，同埋亦都係提供一個獨立嘅問責嘅機制，亦都係有透明度去處理安全嘅程序同埋成效，就會超越一個政府部門或者係公共運輸管理機構所能夠做到嘅，而運輸安全總監佢嗰個審查嘅程序，同埋佢可以接觸到業界，就令到佢哋都達成一個結論，就係話譬如墨爾本咁樣，佢個定線巴士服務嘅做法係安全，咁就係可以達致到呢一點。」

呢個就係運輸安全總監可以做到嘅嘢，根據同一點，我哋又可以睇埋你另外一個建議，就係關於話巴士安全常務委員會，...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者喺你繼續之前，可唔可以幫我哋再認識多啲，就係運輸安全總監佢會得到啲咩嘢嘅支援服務，佢係咩嘢人？佢應該喺邊度嚟㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）喺墨爾本，就係 2010 年有一條嘅公共運輸整合法，喺嗰度出嚟就有呢個職位嘅，主要就係重組番嗰個架構嘅安排，可以喺維省嗰度就係提供到運輸服務同埋做規劃嘅，呢個法例亦都係設立咗一個機構，主要就係一個政策機構嚟嘅，佢之下面就成立咗兩個處理機構，就係處理公共運輸，同時亦都有一個獨立嘅職位就係運輸安全總監，即係維省嘅，因為佢哋想特別聚焦睇改善運輸空間嘅安全，要做到呢一點，就需要成立一個獨立嘅組織，所以呢一個方法就係最有力可以做到嘅方法嚟嘅，同時佢亦都有其他--即係變咗佢係喺譬如好似其他嘅方案以外嘅一個選擇嘅，譬如好似一個係公共運輸局咁樣，而且佢有獨立地位，亦都係會令到佢有空間可以去做到佢嘅工作。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢有啲咩嘢支援呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢自己有一個機構，有職員嘅，我唔知道有幾多職員，但係有做研究嘅，亦都有做實地審查嘅，我純粹係估嘅啫，應該佢哋嘅職員人數大概係三、四十人，但係我之後可以畀番個答案你嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。佢有啲咩嘢資歷呢？即係而家現任嗰位？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢係安全風險管理嘅專家嚟嘅，佢嘅背景同埋經驗就係咁，主要就係因為個焦點係放喺安全管理嗰方面，所以佢就會係一個好適合嘅人選去做呢個工作，就可以應用佢喺--佢原本係喺航空界嗰方面做安全管理嘅，但係亦都可以將佢呢方面嘅經驗同知識應用喺呢度，即係陸路交通嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）陸路交通係咪包括巴士、電車同埋火車？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，但係佢亦都係巴士安全嘅總監嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）政府呢方面有冇咩嘢角色嘅呢？即係話係要要求嗰個安全行為，抑或係由呢個總監負責？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以重複你個問題？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就話政府有冇啲咩嘢角色扮演嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）政府主要就係定立呢個政策，制定嗰個政策框架，就係關於處理安全嘅，然後就由安全總監去執行有關嘅政府嘅政策。

我喺我嘅--我諗係我第二份報告裏面，就我有加一幅圖，就顯示到嗰個架構嘅，應該係第 71 頁，就係喺香港同埋墨爾本，我將佢分為三類，因為好多時候，我哋講話架構設計都係咁樣睇呢三類，就第一，就係嗰個政策層面--即係或者策略層面，第二個就係執行層面，第三就係營運嗰個層面。

喺香港同墨爾本，如果喺執行層面，香港就有運輸署，澳洲就有一個公共運輸署，然後去到--而喺最頂，即係策略層面，就係香港就係運房局，墨爾本就係有維多利亞運輸局。中間嗰層，跟住最底嗰層營運嘅層面，香港就係專營巴士營辦商，墨爾本就係合約巴士營辦商。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我流鼻血，要暫停一陣。

下午 2 時 39 分押聆訊押後

下午 2 時 50 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，唔好意思。不過我哋而家就可以係恢復正常喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好，教授，未小休之前，你就係比較緊香港同埋墨爾本嗰個嘅架構嘅，你嘅觀察就係香港冇一個嘅特定安全部門，即係冇一個專責嘅安全部門，同一個話題，喺第 70 頁，即係喺呢一個圖表嘅前一頁，喺第三段，你就係做咗一啲觀察嘅，就香港嗰個嘅制度，喺最後一句，你就話「但係因為冇一個獨立嘅安全規管機構喺香港，就似乎就係相對嚟講，係減低咗大家對於安全問題嗰個嘅注重嘅。」呢個係咪你嘅觀察呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而家講到呢個常務委員會嘅建議，就係第 94 頁，專家報告嘅 94 頁，喺 94 頁最底嗰度，第 6 點，你就建設成立一個常務委員會，係關於巴士安全嘅，就起碼一年要開會兩次嚟到去覆檢同埋去評估最新嘅關於巴士安全嘅技術，特別就係定線嘅巴士營運，就建議政府一啲應該採用嘅安全需求嘅，關於巴士嘅車隊同埋其他巴士系統，新成立嘅加強專營巴士安全嘅專責小組就可以成為呢個基礎，但係裏面嘅成員可以係擴闊啲去包括埋其他嘅巴士經營者嘅。

我明白呢兩個嘅做法，即係要建立一個常務委員會同埋呢一個嘅運輸總監就係會係令到我哋更加主動積極咁樣去處理巴士安全嘅事？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我相信喺咁嘅情況，係嘅，呢一個常務委員會就係去確保有一個恆常嘅對話，就係有關嘅方面都可以係對巴士安全有一個影響嘅，都可以繼續係討論，譬如話巴士嘅製造廠、售後嗰個嘅零件供應、政府、大學等等都有一個角色，呢個就係要建立一個協作嘅架構，我就覺得呢個好重要嘅，我哋就係倫敦嘅 Mr Weston 先生所講嘅。

我哋喺墨爾本有呢一個國家層面嘅安排，就係有呢一個國家嘅重型車輛法，亦都可以適用於巴士，呢一個係一個好好嘅、開放嘅做法去確保成個嘅業內都係知道可以有咩嘢可能性嘅，我都係注意到有一啲嘅證供話，特別係口頭嘅證供，就係有一啲細啲嘅營運商，專營嘅巴士營運商就話佢冇咁樣嘅資訊，即係關於有啲咩嘢最新嘅技術可以改善安全，我覺得呢個就係確保到每一個人都可以得到好啲嘅資訊，喺一個好快速，即係相當迅速嘅時間得到呢啲資訊，就唔好要等到有意外發生先至回應嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係應該係要主動，而唔係被動形式？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係可能呢個工作小組係咪就係一個只係因為有嘢而要去應對？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅，要咁大型嘅災難，好似 2 月咁，你就知道有咁樣嘅反應。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係有反應都好過冇反應吖。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）最好就係可以係積極主動咁。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我覺得要持續咁樣有一個積極主動嘅做法，由呢個工作小組，我覺得需要擴闊佢嘅成員，我見到工作小組就初初處理嘅事項個範圍係比較窄嘅，我覺得呢個都係可以理解嘅。因為喺呢個 2 月嗰個事件嗰個嘅回應，但係向前望，我諗我哋可以褪後一步話邊啲係最重要嘅關鍵嘅位置，就係要去改善。我哋特別講到係技術，因為我哋要喺多啲關注無論係營運、工作、揸車、疲勞呢個問題，特別係巴士安全，係點樣用技術嚟到去處理。

主席：（經傳譯員）當你話其他嘅巴士營運者，係咪話所有嘅巴士營運者都係呢一個工作小組嘅成員？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我諗唔係淨係嗰啲大嘅經營者，係細嘅經營者。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係佢哋會唔會係專營巴士營運商？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，但係唔只淨係嗰啲大嘅營運商，細嘅都要包埋。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋香港有六個嘅專營權，有五個嘅專營經營商，佢哋全部都係有代表坐喺呢個常務委員會嘅，但係有一啲嘅細啲嘅機構或者係小巴嘅機構好似係冇包括，你係咪應該加埋佢哋？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得係，譬如百分之零點一至到二嘅，都係佢哋佔咗呢個市場佔有率嘅，因為你有幾百萬嘅乘客嘅，每一日，比起呢一個專營嘅巴士經營商，我覺得佢哋喺嗰個市場都係有一定嘅位置，所以佢哋應--即係譬如如果佢哋想去搭巴士，佢哋都應該係有權利係表達佢哋對於安全水平嗰個期望嘅，無論係邊個提供服務都好。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能你都知道，我哋對於小巴要求嘅安全水準係同專營巴士有唔同嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，但係都唔代表我哋唔可以用最好嘅技術嚟到畀不同類型嘅車種，等大家有個持續一個對話，我就覺得應該成個業界裏面都有呢啲嘅對話，唔係淨係嗰啲大嘅經營商先至係參與其中嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係而家呢個工作小組就冇包埋嗰啲工會嘅，你覺得我哋係咪應該要加埋落去呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）表面上嚟睇，我覺得我係支持嘅，當然我哋喺澳

洲係都有咁樣嘅方向嚟到去處理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）呢個常務委員會，你覺得係咪應該係諮詢性質呢？應唔應該有咩嘢法定嘅效力呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得應該係對於政府係諮詢性質係好喇，特別係嗰個嘅負責嘅--問責局長，但係就冇咩嘢法定嘅權力，不過最好佢嘅研究、佢嘅討論、佢嘅一啲嘅結論都係可以公開嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）如果話我哋嘅運輸署有一個嘅部門，可以叫做運輸安全，同你哋維省嗰個係分開嘅或者一個平衡嘅，兩者有咩嘢分別呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）佢哋嘅角色係唔同嘅，呢個運輸安全總監，佢嘅角色主要就係要去實施一條特定嘅法例，而常務委員會就係去改善有關嘅知識、意識，係等業內裏面更加知道有不同嘅科技就可以應用，等佢哋大家都係喺買車嘅時候可以去考慮，譬如，呢個都係提高意識、協作同埋係喺業界係提高佢哋嘅認知，呢個就唔同話係去實行一個行政嘅架構去確保呢一個嘅法律係達到佢嘅目的嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我諗我問題就係問你點解要一個獨立嘅運輸安全嘅總監，而唔係公共運輸嘅一部分？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）公共運輸喺你呢度就係運輸署，就係有多重嘅目的嘅，佢哋要有好多嘅目標要達到，安全係其中之一，但係唔係唯一，所以而家個問題就係優次嘅問題，可能佢未必會將安全擺喺最高嗰個嘅次序，例如話--我唔係話而家個情況係咁，但係我只係話如果我哋有一個嘅總監或者一個機構係要有多種嘅目的嘅話，佢就會有時有啲取捨，可能令到安全係有所犧牲，如果你覺得安全係一個好重要嘅問題，最好就係將佢提高到去一個非常之高嘅優先處理嘅位置，就係有一個獨立嘅機構嚟到係負責任嘅，係獨立，而且係--...

主席：（經傳譯員）真係要獨立嘅，分開嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，特別重要係要獨立嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）正話，教授你就講到嗰個工作小組嗰個嘅範疇，或者我而家就係想睇一睇嗰份嘅文件，係講到嗰個工作小組嘅範疇嘅，我想請你睇九巴文件 12 第 4867 頁，呢份嘅文件就話畀我哋聽呢個工作小組嘅工作範疇，佢係要係改善專營巴士嘅安全，呢一段就話呢個工作小組係喺一宗交通意外之後...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你講番呢一份文件嗰個背景。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢份嘅文件係一個附件嚟嘅，係佢哋呢一個工作小組第一次會議嘅會議紀錄嘅附件，第一頁就係喺 4859，呢個就係佢工作小組嘅第一次會議嘅會議紀錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係應該講一講個議程咩？個議程係咪第一次會係 3 月 12 號。

陳先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為我想你知道啲事情發生嘅時序。呢個工作小組佢就係好快咁樣就係開咗會，好快咁做咗一啲嘅建議，呢個就係一個採取主動嘅做法定係被動嘅做法嗰個嘅分別，同埋係主動嘅做法嗰個好處。

喺好早期，我哋就其中一個巴士營運商畀咗一個議程我哋，我哋而家就係睇到佢哋嗰個冇經刪減嘅會議紀錄。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）黃女士係向我提出城巴文件 588 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）城巴 1、1A 定 1B 呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）城巴 3，城巴 11--係第 588 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）擺佢上網。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋而家喺屏幕上見到第一次會議嘅議程，呢個工作小組係第一個會議，2018 年 3 月 13 號舉行嘅，而部分嘅議程就係去討論呢個工作小組嗰個嘅範疇同埋委員...

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗 3 月 13 號嗰度，呢一份文件有冇日子㗎？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）呢份文件冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）3 月 13 號就係嗰個嘅議程，亦都係佢哋第一次嘅會議，跟住就會帶到我哋去第 4867 頁，係咪呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，4867 頁嗰個文件，就係工作小組嗰個範疇。

主席：（經傳譯員）為我哋謄本嘅緣故，或者你去讀出嗰啲同你嘅問題相關嘅段落，好唔好？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第一段就話「喺 2018 年 2 月 10 號大埔道涉及一宗九巴公司嘅交通意外之後，就建議成立一個工作小組去檢討同埋研究一啲嘅措施去進一步改善、加強巴士嘅安全。」呢一個工作小組嘅範圍或者工作範疇就係要回應一啲嘅意外嘅，呢一個工作小組嘅範疇，第一，就係要去檢討同埋加強訓練嘅安排，第二，就係研究安全帶嘅問題，第三，就係去探討一啲技術嘅可能性，成本效益，是否可以應用嘅，同埋其他嘅事項，就係包括喺呢個車上面安裝一啲安全嘅裝置。

如果你話係一個主動嘅做法嚟講，你會預期呢啲嘅事項應該係意外之前吖，抑或係之後嚟到去發生嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅嘢係應該係理所當然喺議程上面出現，就

係回應當時嘅情況嘅，但係當時嗰個嘅回應同埋種種嘅關注，你可以明白呢啲嘅事項係會即刻擺喺議程上面嘅，因為佢係要回應當時發生嘅事，但係喺呢一次嘅事，即係單一嘅會議就係唔能夠做得太多，應該係要持續嘅。你會想呢啲嘅事項係持續擺喺議程上面，嚟到係可以係預防某啲嘅問題嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）如果喺一個會議係用一個積極嘅做法，你會唔會期望委員會嘅工作範圍要包埋呢啲嘅嘢嘅呢？巴士安全同埋嗰啲三項提到嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，我覺得我已經建議--喺我報告嘅建議有一個以技術為本嘅委員會，另外一個就係要專注訓練嘅，呢個就係呢度第一點。我認為技術委員會就其實可以係有佢自己嘅議程，就係到底向前望要有啲咩嘢嘅措施我哋應該要預期同埋要計劃下點樣係最好嘅方法去改善巴士安全，當然亦都係有一系列嘅措施喺呢度列咗出嚟，歐洲嗰個嘅過程就係佢哋係而家係睇緊下一輪應該有啲咩嘢強制性嘅要求，同埋要包括啲乜嘢嘅項目，我覺得如果你係要積極、主動、向前望嘅委員會，應該係要處理晒，加埋呢個歐洲方面嘅議程，去評估一下佢對香港係咪適用。

亦都喺我第一個報告，我都係有提到其中一啲嘅項目係關於而家喺歐洲進行緊嘅討論，我就寫低晒作為資料畀你參考，亦都有其他嘅項目，例如一啲嘅技術，你期望一個委員會係可以話「呢啲喺香港係咪有冇角色嘅呢？喺嚟緊三年有冇角色嘅呢？」就同所有嘅持份者嚟到傾嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會期望一個積極、主動嘅委員會就會係喺其他嘅司法管轄區會做緊啲咩嘢呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係會咁做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話譬如歐洲嗰方面，我哋知道嘅，就係有一個嘅報告，係 Weston 先生都係做緊，喺倫敦，係咪都係倫敦㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀。倫敦嘅運輸署就係自己做咗好多嘅調查嘅，佢哋嘅「標準巴士」，我諗佢哋咁樣叫喇。我覺得我睇嚟幾好嘅。最後，香港、澳洲、歐洲都係應該要追番上 UNECE 呢一個標準嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸似乎就係想制定，公布一啲嘅巴士安全水平，就同佢哋而家用緊嘅係相似。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，呢個係一個好好嘅措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會期望一個咁嘅委員會係積極嘅、持續嘅，一路監察其他地方發生緊咩嘢事？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主席，係嘅，特別要睇下其他嘅地方係要面對咩嘢嘅安全問題，香港就應該問呢啲嘅設施係咪喺香港都用得到、係咪可以適用、要做啲咩嘢嘅研究去處理我哋而家嘅問題，因為你哋呢個環境比起其他地

方都係好有挑戰性嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會期望一個咁嘅委員會唔單只係遠程咁樣去監察其他地方發生緊咩嘢事，而係同佢哋喺人事方面都有一啲嘅交流，睇下佢哋有啲咩嘢新嘅發展，即係香港、歐洲同埋澳洲、新加坡同倫敦咁呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為有好多嘅原材料嘅製造商，例如都係會好高興有機會參與成個過程嘅，譬如話富豪、Scania，呢啲車種，佢哋都喺呢一方面可以有好多嘅貢獻，我諗佢哋都好開心有呢個機會係參與嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋去下一個題目，就係嗰個安全帶嘅問題，我睇番嗰個工作小組嘅議程，就係個加裝安全帶係一個重要嘅議程嚟嘅，可唔可以用呢個題目開始呢...

主席：（經傳譯員）停一停先，就關於安全帶嘅參考，喺 4867 嗰面就唔係關於嗰個加裝或者係新巴士上面，呢個係比較一般性嘅問題，呢個係關於喺所有座位安裝安全帶嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我一陣間就會就睇番喺所有嘅座位安裝安全帶同埋睇番嗰個相關文件，睇番嗰個文件嗰個討論嘅進展。所以我想開始一般性問題，就係澳洲都市巴士嗰邊係咪規定咗安裝安全帶呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢原因呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）就係覺得嗰個巴士嘅重量本身係會有畀乘客有足夠嘅保護，喺意外發生嘅時候，而安全帶所帶嚟嘅額外保障未必太多，同埋喺加裝亦都係會有啲困難，同埋個成本會關注。

可能我哋對澳洲呢個問題，就係我唔知你哋會唔會做，就係我哋會有個過程，叫做規管影響陳述書，如果我哋譬如話想探討就話要求巴士強制性安裝安全帶，佢哋就會可能要去有一個過程就係整一個規管影響陳述書，然之後去探討譬如話呢啲嘅相關成本同埋去評估嗰個唔同意外嘅可能性同埋可以減少幾多機率同埋睇番一個量化一個價值。呢啲係我哋通常都會做㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）通常會邊個進行草擬呢個規管影響陳述書呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）通常會由嗰個相關政府部門做嘅，好多嘢嘅話，澳洲全國做嘅，佢哋會通常由嗰個國家運輸委員會，呢個本身係繼承嗰個國家道路運輸委員會，我係喺嗰度做咗九年嘅副主席嘅。我哋亦都係做咗好幾次嘅呢啲嘅陳述書，關於唔同嘅車輛規定。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一個關於巴士嘅規管影響研究呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我唔知道全國有冇正式做過，但係我知道喺省嗰方面都做過好幾次嘅，所以維省個主要壓力就係我哋係校巴安裝安全帶，喺嗰啲鄉郊地方，因為嗰啲車通常都會個車速比較快，然之後你有啲好細嘅小朋友坐喺個位嗰度，但係呢個唔係強制嘅，呢個唔係一個規定嘅，唯一嘅要求就係我哋過州，嗰啲嘅旅遊巴係要安裝安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）我嘅理解就係呢個就係英國方面係有分別嘅，就係旅遊巴係要安裝安全帶，個問題係個速度嘅問題喇？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）所以我個理解嘅話，個背景就係話你講緊係個高車速，過州行程，同埋嗰啲旅遊車咩嘢速度呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大約會係每小時100公里，大部分時間。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我明白就係話個比較就係維省本身有冇雙層巴士呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋本身係冇雙層巴士提供個定線服務，但係我哋有定線巴士由墨爾本市中心去機場，我同我妻子剛剛係都午膳時間討論到，就認為就話應該係有安全帶嘅，後來 Janet 話畀我聽就係我成日叫佢戴安全帶，就應該就係佢係有安全帶嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）佢哋呢啲巴士係咩嘢速度呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）通常公路嘅話，大約係每小時100公里。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，我而家想做嘅就係去睇番有關係安裝安全帶討論嘅進展，然之後就去睇番個討論點樣，同埋問你關於嗰方面嘅意見同埋一啲嘅觀察。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）如果我睇番最後，睇番 TD-1 第403頁，畀你睇番呢份文件，呢個係由運輸署草擬嘅文件，作為畀立法會運輸事務委員會喺2018年7月25日討論文件。呢個係嗰個工作小組嘅有關於建議嘅總結。

主席：（經傳譯員）我認為嗰封信之前嗰頁嘅話，係對於解釋比較有用。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我諗我會讀番佢，呢個係由運輸署寫畀呢個委員會嘅，而信入面亦都提到，就話「喺我哋之前嘅陳述書提到運輸署喺3月中嘅時候係建立咗一個有關改善專營巴士安全嘅工作小組，主要係由所有專營權營運商嘅成員組成，同埋主要嘅巴士製造商去考慮同埋去探討係咪可以改善巴士安全嘅可行措施，雖然呢個工作組係進行緊，而佢嘅推薦同埋佢嘅結果要係响2018年7月25號向立法會匯報。」

有關係文件嗰度，就係睇番相關段落，譬如 407 頁，呢個就係關於安全帶嘅段落，而家直接去到 11 段，個運輸署留意到就係「同嗰個製造商確認就係所有新嘅巴士係可以安裝安全帶去符合國際水準，喺呢方面嚟講，所有新嘅新巴士自 2018 年 7 月就會安裝安全帶。」呢啲係新嘅巴士。

而第 12 段就講番喺現有巴士加裝，我唔會再講詳細。簡單嚟講，就係加裝安全帶喺下層係認為係不實際或者不可行嘅。

第 13 段就講番，就係話「喺某啲嘅型號嘅上層巴士，現有雙層巴士係可行去加裝嘅。如果上層嘅所有乘客座位都加安全帶，其實就話個增加嘅重量會大約係 300 至 400 kg，然之後嗰個容納人數就會減少七至八個。」

第 14 段，就係最尾一段，就係話「有啲巴士營運商就關注到喺舊巴士加裝安全帶唔單只會有重大財政影響，亦都可能會利用好多時間同埋人力資源，唔單只就係需要去重新調動或者去購買額外巴士去維持現有巴士服務，喺成個過程入面。」

而家睇番最後一段，附註 5，喺譬如話喺嗰個--如果--「由於冇一個關於去加裝安全帶嘅詳細報告，喺上層，主要係一個好粗略嘅估計，就係話每加裝安全帶喺一架巴士大約係二十萬左右，就唔計呢個人力同埋嗰啲雜項開支。」

第 15 段講番呢啲海外經驗同埋做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）不如你讀開嗰一段，因為呢個係相關嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第 15 段，講番海外做法同埋個經驗，「嗰個工作小組亦都係檢視番目前嘅海外做法同埋規定有關於巴士安裝同埋穿戴安全帶，喺跨城同埋跨界巴士，譬如有啲海外管轄區，譬如美國、英國同埋荷蘭係規定所有乘客座位需要安裝安全帶，譬如話有啲國家，喺英國、荷蘭同埋澳洲維省係有呢個強制規定要穿戴安全帶，然而有啲市區路線嘅巴士，同埋巴士佢有企位嘅話，冇一個海外管轄區，工作小組睇過嘅，就係有關法例規定乘客座位需要提供安全帶，有關呢啲司法管轄區嘅交通當局，呢啲市區巴士通常係比較係短程嘅，無論係個時間同埋個里程，同埋個速度亦都唔係咁快，所以佢哋唔會強加於呢啲路線加安全帶規定嘅，而係附錄 B 嘅方面都係有個建議嘅總結。」

而去第 16 段，「參照番 10 至 15 段，然之後工作小組有關於畀乘客更多保障，佢有以下建議，就係所有新巴士購買時候應該提供安全帶；同埋視乎有關於技術、營運同埋財政可能性，可能會考慮就有關舊巴士方面，就會有啲雙層巴士入面嘅上層所有座位，只要係特定嘅巴士路線，就譬如話行快速公路嘅長途路線，本身就唔係咁多停站嘅。」

呢個就係運輸署嘅建議總結，所以個建議就係話如果舊嘅巴士加裝安全帶就主要就係長程路線。

主席：（經傳譯員）主要係有啲要求，主要就係行快捷公路嘅長途路線。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而我哋亦都有啲附註 6 講明就話呢啲係咩嘢嘅快速道路。附錄 7 主要係講，就話目前嗰啲專營巴士營運商大約涉及二千架目前調動嘅巴士。

而家我會舉啲例子，去提及番巴士營運商佢嘅關注同埋觀察，然之後我就會叫你去睇番 Weston 先生報告入面其中一段，然之後佢亦都講番同樣嘅嘢，然之後就問番你對關於嗰個題目嘅觀察。

而家就睇番嗰個工作小組討論嘅紀錄，而家就我想睇一睇番就係 KMB-12 第 4869-1 頁，而我想你睇番嗰個會議紀錄嘅筆記部分，你睇番個出席者。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有冇一個冇刪節嘅版本㗎，呢個文件？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，4869-1 本身係冇刪節，同埋擺喺個螢幕上亦都係冇刪節嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我似乎唔係喺同一頁。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，係 4869-1。而家我哋直接去到安全帶嗰個段落，係第 13 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）可以幫一幫教授，個工作小組係咪呢方面係咪有少少嘅分歧？所以佢哋有一個技術小組去講一啲安全裝備同埋細分有一個小組係講個培訓嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：Yes.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而家我睇番個小組嘅會議，所以睇番呢啲巴士營運商嘅觀察，同埋想睇番佢轄下嘅小組嘅紀錄，本身係有製造商參與嘅，所以可以喺呢度直接睇番製造商對呢方面嘅睇法。而家我哋睇番 4869-6，由第 13 段起係關於安全帶安裝嘅，我而家仍然喺 KMB-12。

主席：（經傳譯員）我一路睇緊個版本，又同其他嘅文件一樣，因為我本身係一個冇編號嘅版本，因為佢哋之前咁樣畀我，然之後我嚟到呢個研訊，然之後我有呢個有編號嘅版本--頁數嘅版本，然之後我完全係冇我所做嘅筆記，所以而家我而家想兩個版本同時都去睇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我而家就睇番第一次會議嘅筆記第 13 段，呢個係關於安裝安全帶嘅，「而家目前所有專營巴士嘅暴露座位都已經係安裝安全帶，考慮到嗰啲技術嘅可行性，運輸署建議就喺所有新巴士同埋喺目前嘅巴士入面喺所有座位安裝安全帶。」

第 16 段，「城巴同埋新巴第一巴士質疑話有關於喺所有座位安裝安全帶嘅可行性去增加顧客安全，因為係好難地由個車長去確保所有乘客穿戴安全帶，同時巴士公司亦都係關注到企位，企喺巴士入面穿戴安全帶嘅需要，因為佢哋本身畀唔到安全帶畀佢哋，運輸署建議就係話喺交通意外之後有要求就會進行呢個全面嘅檢討嘅呢方面，而上次檢討之後已經係過咗十年，而呢啲嘅目標就喺目前嘅討論係應該集中喺嗰個技術可行性、成本效益、應用性同埋其他相關

問題，係關於所有座位安裝安全帶方面嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）好，呢個會議紀要嗰度就有一份陳述書嘅，就係話運輸署就提到就話，係有要求--即係喺嗰次交通意外之後，就做一個全面檢討講安裝安全帶嘅，呢方面有冇咩嘢資料呀，而家？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者我要之後話番畀你聽，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）我話「一宗交通意外」就錯，應該係眾數，係「多宗交通意外」。就係因為呢度就引出一個問題，係邊個提出要求，幾時提出要求同埋講緊係邊幾宗嘅交通意外？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，或者我肯定係需要去考慮嘅呢點，或者我之後再話番畀你聽。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，祝你好運。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，呢個就係城巴嘅觀察。跟住我就請你睇第三次會議嘅會議紀要，4908-1，就喺 2018 年 6 月 21 號開嘅會，呢個亦都係工作小組嘅大會會議，唔係分組，我想請你睇第 25 段，即係呢個會議紀要 25 段，4908-7。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家就係去到 6 月 21 號，係咪呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）教授，你可以睇番第 26 段，就有討論到加裝安全帶，都係集中講上層嘅，因為原因頭先我哋都講咗喇，就話如果要下層安裝安全帶就不切實際，所以呢度 26 段就提到話「有關於現有嘅巴士會議嘅得悉係喺某啲現有嘅雙層巴士型號，喺上層所有乘客座位加裝安全帶都係可行嘅，而城巴、龍運就提出就話佢哋就會喺上層所有嘅巴士乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅，然後呢啲巴士就用喺啲長途會上高速公路嘅巴士嗰度，即係話意思中間上落嘅站係少嘅相對。」

「之後，會議之後，就話考慮所有嘅技術可行性」，即係下一段，即係 27 段，就提到話「而家就係大部分佢哋嘅巴士都係用喺市區路線嘅，就有乘客站立嘅，如果話要強制規定所有嘅巴士乘客座位都要安裝安全帶，就唔係切實可行嘅，而且有啲係外露嘅車位，譬如話有啲車廂又唔畀企位嘅，本身嗰個安全帶先至會畀到額外保障畀坐咗喺度嘅乘客嘅。」

喺香港，而家就喺樓上係唔准企嘅，就喺樓下先至可以企嘅。即係巴士裏面，「呢方面城巴同埋新世界第一巴士就話要佢哋考慮喺啲長途巴士上面，就上層所有嘅乘客座位加裝安全帶，城巴同埋新世界第一巴就話如果佢哋有啲巴士只限於用特定嘅路線，根據現時佢哋嘅操作模式就有困難嘅，而且城巴同埋新一巴士就話好少乘客--佢哋留意好少乘客係有用安全帶嘅，所以喺財政上未

必係可行嘅，即係要加裝啲安全帶。」

所以呢度有兩點，第一，就係將嗰個加裝安全帶嘅範圍縮窄到會行長途高速公路巴士嘅上層，第二，有提出一點，就關於嗰個財政上係咪可行，同埋係咪有用。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者要講畀教授聽，我哋已經聽晒所有城巴嘅證供，係咪呀？佢哋對於話喺巴士裝安全帶，佢哋亦都係表達咗好清晰、強烈嘅立場。

陳先生：Yes, they have.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可以請教授睇番相關嗰個謄本，公聽會謄本，就係 5 月，等佢睇番。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，或者我哋而家可以搵番出嚟，但係等緊嘅時候，就可以睇番 Weston 先生個報告嘅，因為佢都有提及呢一點嘅，Weston 先生嘅報告就喺 134 頁，即係個文件夾 134 頁嗰度，134 頁係 Weston 先生嘅報告，相關部分講安全帶嘅就係嗰頁嘅中間。

「目前巴士司機或者乘客安全帶喺英國唔係一個法律規定嚟嘅，有關於安全帶嗰度，佢哋嘅運輸署嘅指引就提到話：

『自從 2001 年 10 月 1 號向前或者向後嘅所有新嘅巴士嘅座位，即係新巴士裏面都要安裝安全帶嘅，就有助防止死亡或者嚴重嘅傷害，唔單只話因為個乘客可能會向前，而係架巴士如果係翻側嘅時候亦都係有幫助嘅。

唯一可以豁免嘅就係如果巴士係有企位嘅，容許豁免就係因為呢啲巴士主要係用嚟短途，而且喺時間上同埋行個距離嗰度，同埋考慮到佢嗰個喺市區路線，佢個速度唔會太快，所以先至可以容許豁免，但係我哋都明白首先就要營辦商決定揀選邊啲巴士嚟要安裝呢啲安全帶。』

目前倫敦嘅營辦商係有裝到安全帶嘅，但係有一間公司傳統上，以前一間 First Group 就係有裝到安全帶，但係之後佢哋賣咗佢哋嘅倫敦嘅業務畀 Tower Transit and Metroline，呢個就係 13 年 6 月。」

而家又或者睇番城巴嗰度，搵到喇，我哋搵到嗰個謄本，謄本紀錄第 3 日。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 3 日係咩嘢，我唔知你講緊，用緊咩嘢日曆，係北韓日曆定咩嘢日曆呢？第 3 日係指乜嘢呢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係星期二，2018 年 5 月 29 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第 15 行，鄭生係城巴嘅代表，問題就係「運輸署署長有冇要

求喺你巴士上面安裝任何具體嘅安全設備？」佢鄭生回答，佢就話「等我講兩個例子，運輸署就有要求巴士營運商就係喺一啲外露嘅巴士就要裝安全帶嘅，另外，我哋有少數嘅巴士因為嗰個樓梯係比較直同長，所以運輸署都要求我哋加裝額外嘅扶手，即係嗰啲冇遮擋嘅座位。」

唔好意思，主席，更加合適嘅參考紀錄應該喺下一日嘅證供，即係 5 月 30 號 2018 年，係星期三嚟嘅，第 58 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第 19 行，Duncan 先生就係委員會嘅律師，佢就想證人睇一點，就係關於話「喺所有座位；同埋(b)，喺所有新巴士上層所有座位安裝安全帶嘅可行性」。

主席：（經傳譯員）Duncan 先生提緊嘅係乜嘢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）佢係引述一份聲明，就係城巴嘅遠期計劃裏面嘅聲明嚟嘅，或者我可以講番，就話「可以喺上層所有座位都安裝安全帶嘅，不過我哋嘅觀察顯示而家如果已經有--即係嗰啲譬如冇遮擋嘅座位而家其實已經有安全帶，因為法律冇規定一定要戴安全帶，所以好少人係會戴安全帶，而規管當局亦都冇執行，所以要加裝安全帶其實即係浪費資源嘅，因為絕大部分嘅乘客都唔會戴安全帶嘅，就算你提供咗都好。」呢個就係 Duncan 先生喺佢哋講到城巴嗰個遠期計劃時候就有作出一個咁嘅陳述。

然後 Duncan 先生就請城巴嘅代表睇另一段文字，就係運輸署提到關於安全帶嘅問題嘅，然後喺第 60 頁，主席，就特別問到加裝安全帶嘅問題到底係咪真係浪費資源，第 60 頁 17 行就係主席問嘅問題，就話「你之前答就話要加裝安全帶都係浪費資源，因為絕大部分嘅乘客都唔會纜嘅，就因為唔係一個要求執行嘅，你既然有咁提及，如果唔係法例規定，你係咪覺得佢哋浪費資源呢？」

鄭先生亦都有問，「因為而家法例冇咁規定，你話巴士唔規定一定要纜安全帶嘅，就算真係法例有咁規定，但係如果冇人去執法，我都擔心會係浪費資源嘅，所以我哋係維持原來嘅睇法。」

主席就問「你有冇同運輸署提出呢個觀點？」鄭生就話「我哋有，我哋同事係有同運輸署提過嘅。」所以係城巴就有表達咁樣嘅睇法，同佢哋喺工作小組嘅會議紀要所提嘅係一樣嘅。

好喇，喺我問你對呢件事嗰個觀察之前，我亦都想講畀你聽我哋嘅巴士所行嘅高速公路係點嘅，個時速限制可以去到 80，但係巴士係有個時速限制係定喺 70 公里嘅啫，所以喺高速公路，巴士最多都係行 70 公里。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係去機場嗰個高速公路嗰個時速限制係 110 公里？

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，但係喺巴士上面嗰個時速限制亦都係限咗喺 70 公里嘅。

主席：The legal speed limit for a franchised bus is 70 kilometres per hour?

陳先生：（經傳譯員）所以巴士喺高速公路所行駛嘅速度都係咁。好喇，你聽晒所有呢啲資料之後，你有咩嘢觀察或者評論，即係對於安裝安全帶呢點？首先，係咪所有座位都安裝？第二，係咪淨係集中睇上層，巴士上層？上層就冇企位嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好，多謝。或者咁係講番返去半個鐘頭時候我畀一個答案，就話嗰個規管嘅問題，其實呢度，個規管嘅影響呢度係有兩個方面，第一，就係技術上係咪可行，係咪可以喺巴士嘅某啲地方安裝安全帶？例如話新巴士嘅上層，或者係所有現有巴士都係加裝呢？第一個問題，首先就係技術上係咪可行？第二，就係如果係技術上可行，嗰個成本效益嘅比率係點樣呢？即係裝咗呢啲安全帶，會係點呢？即係意思安裝安全帶要幾多錢，然後減少意外嘅程度又會係點樣？同埋裝咗安全帶，啲人會唔會纜呢？又係要考慮。

喺任何具體情況，我都冇咩嘢意見話纜安全帶係好定唔好，但係我諗就係應該要做一個規管影響嘅陳述，就會睇下嗰個或然率，譬如話唔同嘅種類嘅意外嘅影響係點呢？你亦都可以畀一個金額佢，就話以金額嚟計算，可以減少幾多意外，同埋亦都睇下如果纜咗安全帶係咪可以減少傷害嗰個或然率亦都可以計算，因此就需要先做埋嗰個成本效益嘅分析，政府先至可以能做到一個政策決定，到底係咪需要裝安全帶，係咪可行，係咪值得。

所以我對呢個問題嘅睇法就係首先要做一個成本效益嘅分析，就唔係淨係話啲人覺得會咁或者又係咁樣，唔係咁，而係既然有人提出一啲關注，即係唔同方面都提出關注，呢啲亦都係真實，係合情合理嘅關注，因此就要睇下係咪真係需要安裝，但係直至你做好個成本效益分析之前，所有呢啲睇法都只能夠當成係揣測。

如果你問我嘅直覺，可能就係唔值得嘅，即係要大規模咁樣去加裝就唔值得，但係呢個係一個直覺嚟嘅，肯定係需要做一個全面嘅評估先得。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，就正正因為憑正覺唔夠好，所以就要全面做一個成本效益嘅分析？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後先至可以--咁做嘅時候，就要睇番各個唔同嘅元素，係咪呀？你頭先提到嗰啲。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，正正係咁。原則上，做一個成本效益分析係好直截了當嘅啫，就可以攞到一啲或然率或者計到個價值係點樣，睇下呢個

過程係咪值得嘅。同埋你喺呢個過程就會一定睇到各種嘅因素，係頭先即係你提到嗰啲各人嘅睇法，就可以去從咁嘅角度去分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）應該有邊啲人係參與做一個成本效益嘅分析呢？你會嗌啲咩嘢人做呢？你會想佢哋畀到啲咩嘢資料你呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好明顯，首先你要同嗰啲提供設備嘅人，即係嗰啲製造商，佢哋就會可以畀到啲好實際嘅資料同埋意見畀你，話技術上咩嘢可行、咩嘢唔可行，新嘅車、舊啲車款可行定唔可行；咁又包括埋就係做安全帶嘅製造商；可能你亦都會想問下其他做一啲譬如話顧客嘅調查，就係話有啲咩嘢因素會影佢哋係咪纜安全帶，如果係纜安全帶，係咪大部分情況都會咁做呢？

譬如話喺澳洲，你會睇番嗰啲巴士，旅遊巴，睇下啲人係咪會纜安全帶，如果佢哋係有纜嘅，到底佢哋因為咩嘢理由、點解會纜安全帶呢？係咪因為佢哋有啲市場嘅認知嘅運動，所以佢哋之後就會咁做呢？所以嗰個過程係點，係乜嘢鼓勵到佢哋會咁做呢？可能唔係因為話巴士上面有稽查，所以佢哋就會罰佢哋，佢唔纜安全帶。

所以你就要睇下有咩嘢原因，呢個過程...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，我想打個岔嘅，喺香港，我哋喺一啲冇遮擋嘅位置係有安全帶，譬如話喺上層嘅最前排，要做一個嘅調查，就咁係咪可以好簡單咁睇到大家會唔會用安全帶呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）絕對係。

主席：（經傳譯員）雖然呢個已經係認為一個危險嘅位置，喺巴士度，但係佢哋係咪真係用緊嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，絕對係，主席，我覺得我哋喺話我太太同埋我自己都琴日係有戴安全帶嘅，我哋嚟自呢一個維省，我哋係即係話第一次去見到一個地方係話必須要戴安全帶嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話據我所知，你係去赤柱，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以呢個係一個好嘅理由嚟到去戴安全帶嘅。你正話又去形容到底邊啲人我哋係應該向佢求助同埋邊啲嘅資料係想問佢哋攞嘅，去做呢一個分析嘅時候？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，就係嗰啲喺成本方面，我哋係講緊車輛、供應商同埋製造商嘅，去到事後安裝，我諗我哋要問下嗰啲事後安裝嘅人員，即係譬如我哋喺悉尼，喺墨爾本就有一啲係車輛--車身嘅安裝嘅人，我哋就會特別做呢樣嘅工作嘅，我就會問佢，就係睇下有冇辦法係事後安裝㗎？係咪好

貴㗎？我諗呢啲你都要全部要考慮嘅。

亦都會要求一個相當大嘅改裝嘅，喺個底部，如果真係咁，有啲咩嘢嘅好處呢？你需唔需要睇下有啲咩嘢類型嘅意外呢？同埋係咪嗰啲企喺度嘅人受傷，定係坐喺度嘅人受傷呢？到底喺呢啲意外嘅時候，如果真係坐喺呢啲冇遮擋嘅位置嘅人戴咗安全帶，係咪就會減少咗意外呢？同埋要做啲乜嘢去鼓勵大家戴安全帶？

如果我係做呢一類嘅工作，我會同啲心理學家傾下，點樣係將嗰個訊息係傳遞到畀人，即係知道戴安全帶係重要嘅。呢一點你就要睇下喺坐呢啲位置嘅人佢哋做啲咩嘢呢而家，喺香港？我覺得要睇下嗰個或然率，我哋應該同所有嘅呢一方面嘅持份者同埋香港不同嘅意外帶嚟嘅成本，即係話一個致命嘅意外喺香港嘅成本係幾多？一個有嚴重受傷嘅意外嘅成本又幾多？一個輕微受傷嘅意外又有咩嘢成本呢？睇下呢啲個代價係乜嘢，然後就係睇下減少咗意外嘅或然率嗰個好處係咩嘢喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）去搵意外發生嘅時候詳情係點、啲人係點樣受傷、喺邊度受傷、點解佢哋有受傷，我相信你係會想諮詢警方或者係巴士公司？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）一定會，如果我喺澳洲係做呢啲嘅工作，我會係同呢一個大學嗰個嘅意外研究中心，佢哋就係專做呢一類嘅分析嘅，當然要問埋警方，佢哋會有一啲資料嘅，喺香港，就問埋運輸署，因為致命嘅意外都係有相當之好嘅數據，我諗仲有，去睇呢啲嘅資料嘅撮要應該都有好多嘢可以睇得到嘅。資訊嘅來源亦都係好緊要，如果係有大學嘅知識樞紐，即係一啲中心，大學嘅研究中心，係專門做車輛安全嘅，我諗佢哋都係應該要參與嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我想問下，教授，喺墨爾本，當你講到市區嘅巴士路線如果係有企位嘅話，佢哋嘅車速係幾多，我哋唔好計佢去機場嗰個嘅車速，會唔會係有 70 公里呢一個限制㗎？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我哋一般個時速限制係 60 公里，但係喺一啲高速公路係可以去到時速 100 公里嘅，一個主要嘅運輸嘅走廊就係有競投嘅服務嘅，呢個喺我哋東面嘅走廊，係墨爾本，嗰度有一條嘅巴士線，佢啲巴士可以去到 100 公里嘅個時速，喺一日嘅某啲嘅時間，但係如果喺呢一個交通嘅高峰期就唔可以嘅，但係呢條係一條巴士線，佢哋可以喺一日裏面大部分時間行到 100 公里，喺其他嘅網絡，平均嘅時速 22 公里，如果你睇下嗰個嘅時間表，佢哋嘅時速限制平均係 22 公里嘅，有啲可能喺一個短嘅路段可以去到 60 公里。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我想澄清一下，即係喺有啲嘅市區巴士係冇安全帶，都可以行到 100 公里嘅，時速？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，可以嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋已經講咗事後安裝安全帶嗰個嘅成本，或者我哋而家可以去下一個題目，就係補貼嗰個問題嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講呢一點之前，我想同你講一講時速限制呢一方面，車速，嗰個最低嘅時速，或者我講清楚啲，嗰個一般嘅嗰個嘅時速限制，就係 60 公里，咁有冇一個下限嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）有嘅，可以係 40，例如經過學校就係咁，另外就係一般嚟講，係 50 公里，當然有一啲嘅市政府或者係地區議會就係想係略為提高，或者甚至係減到係時速 30 公里嘅，特別喺一啲當區嘅街道。

主席：（經傳譯員）有幾常見嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔係太多嘅，喺一啲嘅大都會區嘅內面，內街，就譬如有好多係踩單車人士就有呢啲要求。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係就冇去到咁低，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇，一般嚟講係限速 50 公里，喺高速公路係 100。

主席：（經傳譯員）經過學校就係 40？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，喺朝早某啲嘅時段，不過應該係朝早八點半至到九點半，係下晝嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係嗰個嘅時速限制係有變嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為學校朝早返學同埋放學嘅時候，就跟住去番 60 嘅，之後。

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會有一個電子嘅標示，好似係訊號，好似係倫敦咁樣，就會話畀人聽「而家呢度經過學校，你嗰個嘅時速限制有變嘅」？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）有嘅，會有一個圓圈，話裏面寫住“40”嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺墨爾本，關於呢一個車速同埋一啲係巴士喺撞車嘅時候對於人嗰個傷亡有冇一個連繫嘅呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你問呢一點好有趣，呢一個係有一份嘅文章，係喺 Melbourne Age 呢一份報紙上面，呢個就唔係真係我講於巴士，but 係講車速同埋呢一個行人死亡嗰個風險，就係講緊點樣路人嗰個死亡嗰個或然率係會大大咁升高嘅，如果係超過咗 40 嘅話，呢個係基於 40 公里嘅，呢個係基於呢一個大學做嗰個研究嘅，如果你鍾意，我會畀嗰份文件你睇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個大學嘅意外研究中心？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，係喺一個嘅意外研究中心。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你，我哋都好樂意要睇到嘅。呢個我諗你亦都係睇到，喺倫敦，佢哋嘅倫敦運輸就係將不同嘅時速同嗰個致命傷亡嗰個風險係有一個連繫嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：You will have noted the significant drop in the risk of fatalities if the vehicle is doing, for example, 20 miles an hour rather than 30 miles an hour.

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你會睇到喺墨爾本，由 20 去到 30 係比較平嘅，但係去到 40 嘅時候係大幅咁樣增加，所以嗰個嘅風險去到 40 之後係大幅咁樣攀升嘅，就即係多咗呢個機會係行人會係死亡嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話係行人死亡，即係佢哋喺車外面嘅，唔喺車上嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，佢哋譬如喺車前行過。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係畀架車撞到呀咁。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而家我想講一講補貼呢個問題，喺呢個報告，你有睇過係提供補貼呢個可能性嘅，你嘅建議就係香港嘅房運局從呢一個社會嘅利益去睇一睇，為巴士公司提供補貼呢個問題嘅。想請你睇下你自己嘅報告嘅第 92 頁，就係關於呢一點嘅，我想讀第二段：

「香港嘅公共運輸系統就係每一年有好大嘅社會對外嘅效益嘅，有啲就係譬如嗰個嘅承辦者就係會有土地嘅增值，如果嗰個嘅營運者係一個地主，亦都係適用於鐵路嘅，多過係巴士嘅。專營嘅巴士服務就係對於社會係提供多啲嘅利益，就佢哋提供嘅利益係多過佢哋所收到嘅車資嘅，特別係減少道路擠塞，係增加一啲社會共融同埋改善呢個道路安全嘅表現。如果係需要用收費嚟到係譬如請人，呢個社會效益係會降低，呢一個嘅損失係足夠係有理據叫政府為呢啲嘅營運商提供一啲嘅財政資助嘅。」

下一段，就係「房運局同埋運輸署就係應該要評估喺經濟方面，香港嘅專營巴士帶嚟嘅社會效益，去確保佢哋去評估係咪有理由為呢啲嘅服務提供一啲嘅財政支援，即係如果呢件事係提出嘅話。我哋亦都睇到有關嘅資助一定要係睇下第一日呢一個委員會律師方面嗰個嘅意見。呢個對於安全嘅影響就係更加好嘅，我哋就話將每一個嘅車長如果每日要揸車超過十二小時呢樣嘢係完全排除嘅，我哋而家唔係話將十二個鐘頭就係一個限制，其實墨爾本嘅經驗，就係話十二至十四個鐘都可以安全嘅，但係必須要有一啲制度性嘅安排，就係要著重呢個安全嘅，如果真係有一個嚴格嘅安全嘅規管嘅話。如果冇咁樣嘅安排，要

司機揸過十二個鐘一小時就係令人擔心㗎喇。」

我想請你睇下 Weston 先生嗰個嘅報告，都係講緊類似嘅事情嘅，掟去 152 頁，專家報告，頭一、二段，就係喺 8.3 之下嘅，喺大概中間--第一段中間開始讀起，Weston 先生就話香港係冇呢一個補貼嘅，喺中間就話：

「佢話呢個係一個非常之難得嘅成就，但係呢條問題就要問嘅到底係營運一個商業嘅網絡而冇公眾補貼係咪可持續嘅，同埋長遠嚟講，係咪會引致一啲錯誤嘅行為或者對於營運嘅某啲方面，就係失咗焦嘅。呢個過分咁樣限制呢個營運商嗰個嘅投資，就會令到呢一個嘅網絡就冇咩嘢發展，就唔能夠發展一啲新嘅科技同埋措施嘅。」

「其實有一啲新嘅安全措施，譬如使用新嘅安全呢一個嘅一啲嘅技術同埋巴士訓練係可以改善安全嘅。從佢哋呢個營運權之外，提供一啲支援其實係有幫助嘅，而且對公眾嘅利益嚟講，係有好處嘅。」

我想講下呢兩段嘅，Weston 先生就係講到提供一啲嘅資助，就係要嚟做科技嘅應用同埋訓練嘅。你覺得你哋兩個人係咪有一啲唔相同嘅睇法呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得我哋睇法係冇分歧嘅，而家重點就係話我哋大家都係話公共交通一般嚟講同埋專營巴士，特別嚟講，喺佢哋營運嘅時候，其實對於社會整體係有一啲嘅界外利益嘅，而呢啲嘅利益對社會係有價值嘅，而嗰個價值係超過嗰個營運商所得到嘅商業回報嘅，我覺得呢點好重要，我哋要明白呢啲界外利益嗰個價值。香港，我覺得需要睇下呢一方面，佢即係公共運輸服務嘅一啲社會嘅價值，我覺得嗰個嘅利益都係相當龐大嘅。

如果我哋睇番呢個咁嘅背景，你應該睇下會唔會有一啲嘅政策措施，例如係鼓勵用科技、訓練去測試下佢哋係咪有一啲嘅界外利益，咁樣就如果係嘅話，亦都可唔可以係改善到呢個安全嘅環境，我哋可以透過使用技術同埋訓練或者透過一啲嘅錢，如果中間真係有關係嘅，都係有理據政府係用一啲錢資助呢啲項目嘅。換句話講，如果嗰個界外利益係高過所涉及嘅成本，佢哋唔應該係由營運商去出資嘅。

我覺得呢個就係重點，重點就係要睇下係對於整體社會嚟講，嗰個界外利益係咪話單單係靠呢個車費嘅收入或者佢哋發展土地嗰度係收番嚟嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺第一段，就 Weston 先生嘅報告就話，佢就係關注如果你唔提供一啲公眾嘅補貼，有可能就係會引致一啲錯誤嘅行為，或者大家就係唔會重點睇下有咩嘢技術、有啲咩嘢措施可以改善安全嘅，呢個係咪都係你嘅關注呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我覺得呢度嗰個嘅論據就係一啲嘅福利、經濟嚟講，即係如果你完全係漠視個界外利益，嗰個服務本身嘅提供係唔夠嘅，你應該睇下，你要儘量增加對社會嗰個效益，提供多啲嘅服務，就唔好單單係從一

個商業嘅營運角度去考慮嘅。

我早前係提過嘅，喺每兩年有一個嘅大會，就係講到公共運輸嘅競爭同埋規管嘅，就係有一個嘅論壇係有好多學者同埋營運者嚟到去參與嘅，政府又有參與，我自己就係主持呢個論壇，就講到我哋過去十年喺呢方面所做過嘅嘢，亦都睇下公共運輸服務帶嚟嘅價值。當時係學界公共運輸營運者、政府都有一個非常好嘅對話，喺呢個論壇，我覺得如果香港嘅運輸署同埋有興趣相關嘅學者都能夠參與呢個兩年一次嘅論壇應該係非常之好嘅，下一次就會係出年喺新加坡舉行。

主席：（經傳譯員）有邊個司法管轄區同埋代表參與個會議嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗上一次嚟講，有二十二個唔同國家，但係有三分之一嘅與會者係學者嚟嘅，有一部分就公共運輸營運商參與，我留意到個文章，之前你提及到就係話嗰個 Tower Transit in London，而 Neil Smith 嗰個東主係經常參與呢個會議嘅，喺南非、南美亦都係好積極咁參與，有好多嘅歐洲國家都有參與，而澳洲亦都係會有好多代表團同埋紐西蘭，二十二個國家--政府、大學同埋營運商嘅高層代表亦都係有出席嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我亦都睇到就係下一個嚟講，會喺新加坡度舉行，新加坡本身亦都會有參與？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而政府同埋巴士營運商？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）新加坡嘅陸地運輸局本身會係主持呢個會議嘅，我認為有啲嘅營運商本身會係贊助人。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時舉行呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我認為係下年9月嘅，或者8月，我會補充呢啲資料畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝。有冇啲公開嘅--有冇會出版一啲資料畀公眾參閱呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）有嘅，最緊要就係成個過程嚟講，係會公開嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）網上有冇呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好多都有嘅，有啲最新就係嗰啲學術期刊嘅文章，所以就唔係話互聯網好容易搵到，但係你可以攞到呢啲文章嘅副本，有時佢哋係以書籍形式出版，但係而且出版就係成個過程嘅最重要嘅部分，呢個係一個好唔尋常嘅會議，就係話佢喺四日間，三日就會有一個工坊嘅形式，然之後與會者就揀單一嘅題目，然之後用三日時間去探討，而個題目可以係譬如點

樣可以喺公共運輸運作嗰度有更多嘅競爭，或者而且用三日嘅時間同同行去討論，呢啲嘅我主持嘅工作坊，譬如話用三日睇番公眾運輸嘅益處，同埋我哋點樣去評價同埋可以令到佢成為現金流去支付呢啲嘅服務嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）主席，我嘅太太指出，就話下次嘅會議係星期日，8月25號，去到星期五。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）而家我哋去另一個範圍，就係去草擬呢啲嘅指引。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家講番補貼，或者政府或者係有角色去解決Weston先生所指出嘅問題，呢個之前都係提及過，就係由巴士營運商有關於呢啲去實施呢啲決定嘅成本，就係話係有關喺專營巴士安裝安全帶。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係安全帶，我哋聽到九巴嘅作供，係梁乃鵬博士，我認為就話佢曾經同一個政府官員討論過一次嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以睇番相關會議嗰個對話紀錄嘅相關段落，就睇下--唔係，就我而家睇番嗰個係冇頁數嘅嗰沓文件，嗰個有關於車輛安全裝置一個轄下小組喺2018年6月12號第8段，我想特別針對嗰段畀教授睇一睇。教授，你之前亦都係知道，就係話你對於城巴，由於關於譬如話關於安裝安全帶要自負成本，然之後有啲關注，然之後佢哋嘅經驗就係話佢哋嘅乘客本身唔會用佢哋，然之後政府係唔會強制去執行，呢啲係冇用嘅。大約係佢哋嘅大意係咁講。或者我睇番第8段。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇番嗰個會議嘅紀要，KMB-12，第4932-1，呢個係會議紀要嘅第一頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢日期呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）2018年6月12號。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就相關嘅段落，梁乃鵬博士講番嘅就係4932-3，第8段，或者我就咁讀，「城巴講過就係話現有嘅巴士嘅暴露嘅座位本身有三點式嘅安全帶，由佢哋嘅日常營運經驗，大部分坐喺嗰啲位嘅乘客都唔戴安全帶，而呢啲嘅加設安全帶係成本好高，同埋如果冇人用嘅話就會啲錢。同意就係話向乘客嘅教育同埋推廣係應該係進行去推廣用安全帶，而城巴就話佢哋大約2013年之後有一千一百架巴士可能係安裝上層座位安全帶係可行嘅，而預計個成本係二億四千萬，係公司係負擔唔到，城巴要求政府去提供資金或者補貼畀呢啲加裝安全帶嘅項目，如果係規定嘅話。所以目前佢哋係唔會自資去加裝安全帶，同意就係話呢個財政嘅問題會係喺工作小組入面討論嘅。」

「而睇番九巴嗰面，佢哋強調就係話佢哋支持喺新巴士安裝安全帶，而視乎

係嗰個技術細節同埋嗰個巴士製造商嘅加裝計劃書，佢哋考慮就係話係以分期數嚟去安裝特定路線嘅安全帶，因為嗰啲路線就啲乘客傾向會用佢哋嘅。而新大嶼山巴士係反對，因為低使用率同埋高成本，佢係目前冇計劃去加裝安全帶。」

主席：（經傳譯員）基本上佢係預備喺新巴士安裝，同埋喺現行路線巴士裏面都會考慮安裝。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）睇番之前嘅會議紀要，就係九巴就係有呢個提議，就係話喺安裝上層座位嘅安全帶同埋喺啲特定嘅長途路線或者係行公路線。

提供一個完整嘅圖畫，就話梁博士嘅作供，喺上次嘅聆訊入面，我睇番嗰個聆訊紀錄，喺 2018 年 9 月 12 日，呢個係第 18 頁，第 14 行。

主席：（經傳譯員）等少少，等佢喺個螢光幕上面顯示。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）第 14 行，「我都想補充嘅，最近我同政府官員會晤，而我同佢講，就係話要求政府睇下佢哋可唔可以關於喺安裝安全帶嗰面可唔可以提供援助，而個答案係正面嘅，如果我可以咁講嘅話。」

「你可唔可以講下你同邊個討論過？」

「係運輸署常秘 Mr Joseph Lai 同埋佢嘅副手 Mr Kevin Choi 先生，運輸署副秘書長。」

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲係我哋本身係討論過嘅範圍，但係佢本身喺香港係一個實質嘅問題，所以我哋明白你嘅意思就係要求去進行一個成本效益分析，你一方面講到話政府係可以作一個政策決定，所以我哋就會係咁做，但係當政府作呢個政策決定嘅時候，佢通常都要去進行呢個--參照呢個成本效益分析？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）你希望會咁做喇，主席，證據就係唔一定成日經常咁做，譬如話喺呢個情況嚟講，你會希望政府會進行成個步驟，呢個成本效益同埋辨悉嗰個效益，如果呢啲效益本身係明顯，呢啲係好大嘅界外因素，但係呢啲嘅效益本身係唔會由個營運商去獲取嘅，所以絕對係有理據去探討下用津貼嚟去促成呢個過程。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個可能係對於營運商有利，但係如果能夠避免意外，令到乘客唔會受傷，當個巴士撞到唔知--作故障嘅時候，呢啲係對個營運商亦都係相應都係有利嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，呢啲係啱嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係佢哋唔使咩賠償喎。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，大部分嚟講，亦都係呢啲界外嘅利益唔係由營運商去獲取嘅，所以你而家就建議就係話個成本係由個營運商同埋政府分

擔。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，但係如果政府係使用納稅人公錢嘅時候，政府係咪需要去睇番嗰個利益--界外效益同埋成本呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅，如果係去進行呢個承辦，我哋會--佢嗰個過程都係之前一個鐘頭前講過。

主席：（經傳譯員）係嘅。陳生。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我而家有三個題目未講，主要係個指引嘅問題，第二個就係安全數據透明度，同埋嗰個巴士車長嘅培訓，我預大約多二十分鐘至半個鐘頭去做完嘅，你想唔想休息一下，然之後之後返嚟繼續？

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家明白就係話你都企咗好耐，同埋教授亦都作供好耐。

下午 4 時 21 分押聆訊押後

下午 4 時 38 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，陳律師。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。教授，或者我就直接去講嗰個工作時數指引，我諗你提嘅最重要嗰點就係話墨爾本同香港嘅分別，喺墨爾本，工作時數指引就係喺入咗法例裏面嘅，而香港我哋就純粹只係一個指引。

或者可唔可以請你睇你個專家報告嘅相關段落呢？就係 91 頁，你嘅專家報告 91 頁，我睇緊中間嗰段，91 頁，或者我讀出嚟：

「香港同墨爾本兩個主要嘅分別，就係指話同工作時數或者休息時數有關嘅就係第(1)，墨爾本（維省）嘅規定對於工作／駕駛同埋休息時間嘅規定就係寫咗入去規例嗰度嘅，就係全國重型車輛（疲勞管理）全國規例 2013；而第(2)點就係有關嗰個安全責任同埋責任鍊都係有提及嘅，而香港就純粹只係一個指引文件，就冇任何具體法律嘅支持嘅，《香港公營巴士服務條例》香港法例第 230 章就規定要調節工作／駕駛同埋休息時數，但係有關呢點就係冇特別有要求點做。」

或者而家我可以講下...

主席：（經傳譯員）你係再詳細講？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你唔需要講...

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，我好熟悉嗰個條文，所以唔需要特別睇㗎喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就係畀番嗰個頁數畀你，就係 TD-2 第 56 頁。教授，你喺你報告裏面提到話呢度即係話「點樣去確立工作時數同埋休息時數個規定，兩個管轄區就有唔同嘅地方，似乎喺墨爾本要守規就係重要，因為如果唔遵守，就會違反法例，就會有法律上嘅後果嘅，即係對嗰啲有關公司嘅人士，（甚至包括埋採購服務嘅政府人員都有），因為佢哋係有一個責任鍊嘅制度。」

最後另外提到就係話巴士安全法，今朝都睇過，你其中一個主要嘅建議，就係話將我哋嘅指引變成某啲嘅規例，呢度就係專家報告第 94 頁有提及嘅，我唔會特別揭過去，因為只係有一項提到嘅啫。

好，教授，可能都係好明顯嘅，但係可唔可以請你都詳細再解釋一下，將工作時數指引擺咗入去規例嗰度，等佢有法律效力嘅個好處係點呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。喺墨爾本個情況，或者我喺第一份報告其實都有畀咗啲例子，就話如果唔遵守，嗰個後果係點，就係我嘅第一份報告嘅 27 頁，可能--應該係 27 頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗嗰度第一份報告嗰個頁數係一樣嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，第 27 頁嗰度就畀咗啲例子，就話會有啲咩罰則，即係如果違反咗，會點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，呢一頁我都睇到喇，就睇到嗰個罰款會係點樣樣嘅，即係上面。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，所以嗰個後果就可能會導致罰款，就係有好多方面嘅人士嘅，今朝早我都提過㗎喇。而最新會喺 10 月 1 號修訂嘅全國法例亦都有講話大幅咁增加嗰個罰則嘅，即係喺呢個表嗰度，同埋處理埋嗰啲魯莽行為，甚至可能會有監禁嘅，所以係好認真對待呢個問題嘅。

我知道警方嗰方面都批評話呢個政策到目前嗰個應用個情況係點樣，佢哋就話冇足夠嘅刑罰，特別係講到話貨車就多過講巴士嘅。而呢啲條文主要都係講話貨車違反嘅時候情況係點嘅，但係肯定嗰啲條文係喺度嘅，而喺我同巴士營運商嘅傾談當中，佢哋亦都係好清楚知道有呢啲嘅條款同埋對佢哋可能會有啲咩嘢後果嘅。

我亦都要講一點，我覺得好重要嘅，就係我哋啲規例亦都有一啲係關於疲勞管理嘅，都係入咗法例裏面嘅，即係重型車輛（疲勞管理）規例，就同香港個做法唔同，香港就係亦都係講指引嘅啫，所以大家個焦點好唔同，而我覺得呢點好重要。我哋一路都已經喺疲勞管理有好一段時間㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者唔好介紹我打斷一下先，而家係咪有人問--即係有冇問點解

而家有盞紅燈喺度眨緊嘅呢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以問一個問題？咁樣問呢，就係教授，如果你覺得要將呢個工作時數變咗一個法定嘅指引，有冇啲咩嘢弊端呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）亦都請你可唔可以考慮一下運輸署點解佢唔將工作時數指引變為規例嗰個考慮，就係運輸署曾經就此作供，就係喺第 1 日嘅聽證會嗰度嘅，2018 年 5 月 7 號，即係第一套嘅會議紀錄，請你可唔可以睇 121 頁，第四行？

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個作供㗎？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係運輸署署長陳女士。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者我哋再睇番呢一頁，就變咗可以等你知道多啲背景，喺第 13 頁嗰度，Duncan 律師就話「陳女士，今朝早你喺度嘅，我相信，當時我問運房局嘅代表點解呢啲有關工作時數嘅指引純粹只係指引，又唔係規例，因為個條例本身都明確訂明呢一個課題可以係規管嘅課題嚟嘅，你可唔可以協助委員會解釋點解到而家都仲唔係規例，或者都唔係一個行政嘅指引或者一個規定呢？」

然後運輸署署長佢答就話「因為今朝早我都喺度，同埋呢個問題提出嘅時候嗰個背景係點，就係話到底係咪可以根據--喺法例之後，作為一個專營巴士營辦商嘅要求咁樣係會更加好能夠執行呢，就唔係講話執法。

其實我哋睇番工作時數指引呢個歷史係好悠長，而且呢個係一個持續嘅過程嚟嘅，我哋都過去有幾次係修訂嗰個指引，而指引裏面所提嘅規定，咁樣做法嘅好處就係可以適時咁樣去檢討同埋修訂，就唔係如果佢係作為法例或者係規例，就冇咁靈活，但係當如果有需要嘅時候，我哋都應該要盡力睇下係咪可以將佢做法例去檢討。

如果就係指引，即係意思就係能夠靈活啲，同埋可以因應當時情況就改善或者加強，呢啲喺服務層面其實都係相當明確嘅指引--嘅規定嚟嘅，呢度就係講話係巴士服務要取得一個平衡，提供巴士服務，一方面就係專營權嘅要求，另一方面就係有其--即係對於車長嗰個工作環境要提升，兩者嘅平衡。」

呢個就係運輸署嘅解釋就係話係方便，即係我或者可以咁樣去歸納。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係更加適時咁樣去檢討同修訂同埋更具靈活性。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者提醒我一下，喺 2018 年 2 月修訂之前，對上一次指引修訂係幾時呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）2010 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係八年喇？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）再之前呢？2010 年之前嘅修訂又係幾時呢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）2004 年。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係六年？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係。我諗之前嘅作供就 2018 嘅修訂就正係因為 2017 年 9 月嘅意外，所以先至有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁就即係話當時就開始咗檢討嗰個修訂？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，就因應嗰次意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係六年同八年係咪適時呢？

陳先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪更適時嘅方法呢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）或者我哋睇番嗰個修訂嗰個表格，就係 MISC-1 第 897 頁，係畀委員會參考。

主席：（經傳譯員）係有用嘅，因為呢度就解釋嗰個指引係幾時改過嚟。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）04 年、07 年、10 年、18 年。

主席：Yes.

陳先生：Professor, do you have any observation...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未問一啲一般性嘅問題之前，我哋睇到係會有一啲嘅罰則嘅，即係過去，你喺維省做咗好多年呢一方面嘅工夫，我想問有幾多人--幾常見係會檢控一啲違反嘅人呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好少有，主席，其實就係好少係關乎呢個定線巴士營運，都係比較係常見喺嗰啲長途嘅運作。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係嗰度係有唔同嘅需求？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係巴士係好少？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，定線巴士係好少。我就亦都係想評論一下講方唔方便嘅問題，我覺得你要去決定到底嗰啲嘅指引抑或係規例係對於當局係咪方便，同埋對於公眾嗰個嘅結果，會唔會係結果對於合規方面會唔會係好啲，我個人覺得應該係要更加著重嗰個遵守嗰個規則多過嗰個行政嘅方便。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪話如果係違反嘅時候，呢一方面嘅檢控係好少嘅呢，即係關於定線巴士嗰個嘅工作時數嗰個法例？因為佢哋合規嘅程度係高啲。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我相信係，主席，其實佢哋喺定班次同埋係編更嘅程序都係好少係需要法例嘅，佢哋係都有一啲嘅走盞位，佢哋就唔需要咁近--即係唔會話去到砸界，令到佢哋--確保佢哋有一啲嘅時間，等佢哋係有小休嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。講到話香港工作時數指引嗰個合規情況，你有冇睇過呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）大概係九成。

主席：（經傳譯員）我記得好似係百分之九十七。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我就知道係大概有百分之四就唔合規嘅、點解同埋嗰個嘅結果係點。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我想去下一個嘅題目，希望係比較直接啲，就係嗰啲安全數據嘅透明度。你喺 69 頁嗰度講，喺 69 頁第一點，你話「有一啲好堅實嘅論據就係支持將巴士安全嗰啲嘅--即係喺嗰個遠期計劃嗰啲關於巴士安全嗰一章就係要公布嘅，因為呢個係--如果有意外嘅時候，對社會都係造成一定嘅代價嘅。」冇錯，你係咪講緊一啲嘅分析數據呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，我覺得而家喺呢一個巴士安全嗰啲嘅篇章裏面講嘅嘢係好有資訊價值嘅，好多嘅資訊，我相信都係符合公眾利益，如果係廣為嚟到係公布嘅話，譬如話嗰啲嘅分析，就關於點解會有意外同埋意外嗰個表現等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係嗰啲嘅關連，同埋嗰啲嘅--譬如話一日揸幾多個鐘頭、司機嘅年齡呢一類嘅比較。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇錯，譬如話服務咗幾多年嗰啲嘅意外率、揸咗幾多個鐘頭嘅意外率，我覺得呢啲係一啲好嘅分析，就唔應該只係畀好少撮人嚟到去睇嘅，呢啲資料係如果係畀公眾知道，係符合公眾利益嘅，就可以有啲好好嘅研究可以嚟做，大家就可以係更加好咁樣係處理交通意識呢一方面嘅挑戰，令到業界同埋公眾都係做得更好。

主席：（經傳譯員）委員會好明顯係同意你嘅睇法嘅，因為我哋最初想攞得好多嘅材料，最初都係唔肯畀我哋嘅，我哋而家就係都採取咗好多嘅步驟，就攞到，而家佢哋肯畀我哋，因為呢啲嘅資料都係相關嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個數據可以話畀你聽係一啲你需要關注嘅、聚焦嘅項目。我覺得由呢一個六至到八個小時呢一個一更呢一點嗰個意外率都係好重要嘅，我就睇唔到一定要睇到呢啲嘅資料，有一啲嘅分析，我先至可以覺得有好啲嘅安全表現嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有一點嘅，我就係提一點，要黃女士可以幫我哋搵嘅，你就話你注意到運輸署喺一封信就話--即係佢寫畀九巴，即係去問點解係會有意外率嘅增加，我哋而家就有九巴嗰個遠期報告，而家我諗我哋有個解釋喇，就係最新嘅報告，喺 2018 年 8 月畀我哋，喺我哋要求之下先係提供嘅，就係九巴其中一個成員嘅代表就話畀我哋聽佢哋就係會提供畀運輸署嘅，據我所記得係 8 月 18 號。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，最新嗰個版本就係擺咗落我哋嘅文件夾度，我就想請黃女士係幫我哋係同運輸署係攞嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家想你咁做：個解釋係乜嘢呢？點解個意外率係上升呢？你繼續吖。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係。Weston 先生都係講到類同嘅一點，就係講到呢啲數據係咪應該要更加透明，我好想請你哋去睇下第 153 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）第幾段呀？因為我嗰個係標示版本嚟嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係 Weston 先生佢自己嗰度嘅第 39 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）我有。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）根據--84 段，就係安全數據嗰個嘅問題，「好明顯喺倫敦嘅經驗，就係話有關嘅數據，公開啲，就係同巴士網絡嘅安全表現係有關嘅，亦都令到持份者同埋公眾係可以睇得到，更加聚焦到運輸當局同埋佢嘅巴士營運商喺安全方面嗰個計劃嘅，應該係一個更加開放嘅態度去面對有關嘅數據嘅。我哋應該去睇下安全嘅數據喺香港嗰個嘅營運專營巴士網絡應該係公開嘅。」你同唔同意呢一啲嘅觀察？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我完全同意嘅，我都認為喺倫敦當局佢哋差唔多係冇呢一個嘅--同業睇唔到之間嗰個數據同埋資訊嘅，佢哋就亦都係冇嘗試係去隱瞞，佢哋會將佢擺喺呢度，所有嘢，好嘅、壞嘅都擺晒喺度，就等佢哋可以處理到有關嘅挑戰。我覺得係令到成個過程令人更有信心，所以我好支持嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員） 呢個其實喺網上係搵到佢哋每一季都公布呢啲數據？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以去講到我今日最後嘅一個題目，就係車長嘅訓練？78 頁，你嘅文件 78 頁，係第二份報告，你有一段係講車長訓練，呢度就係話司機嘅訓練嘅要求，你哋喺墨爾本嗰啲嘅合約係寫埋嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）（沒有可聽到的回答）

陳先生：（經傳譯員）喺香港，運輸署最近就係公布咗佢哋嘅作業守則，我就唔會講呢一個守則嘅詳情，但係喺車長訓練方面有一點我想問你嘅，就係疲勞嘅管理或者係訓練，就喺你嘅文件 90 頁係有提到嘅，90 頁，第二段開始，你嘅建議就係話疲勞管理呢一方面嘅訓練，你就話：

「喺墨爾本做十三至十四個鐘就會令--或者喺香港，就會係令大家係要問到底嗰啲司機點樣用剩低一日嘅時間呢？佢哋有冇足夠嘅睡眠或者休息去避免疲勞呢？同埋喺佢哋嘅訓練裏面點樣係加埋疲勞嘅管理呢？喺運輸署嘅 1448 頁，佢哋有一啲嘅附件嘅，就係關乎車長嘅訓練同埋後來畀立法會、交通事務委員會嘅一啲嘅文件，嗰度冇提到係疲勞管理嘅訓練。呢一個喺墨爾本司機訓練嘅重要一環嚟嘅，包括就係要司機注意呢個飲食同埋做運動嘅。呢啲訓練亦都係包埋嗰一啲嘅督察人員、督導人員，去確保佢哋唔會編更嘅時候唔會編一啲可能會疲倦嘅司機係去當更嘅。而呢一個嘅訓練，運輸署亦都有一個作業嘅守則，就係講到呢一個專營巴士嗰個嘅訓練框架係一個好嘅建議嚟嘅，呢個亦都喺畀立法會嘅文件係包咗落去。呢個確保所有嘅營運者知道乜嘢叫做良好嘅標準同埋能夠將呢啲嘅標準令到司機係認識得到嘅。」

你可唔可以講下乜嘢係叫做疲勞管理嘅訓練呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，喺墨爾本有關嘅方面佢哋訓練新嘅司機嘅時候，或者係佢哋做一啲再培訓計劃嘅時候，疲勞管理都係一個好重要嘅一環嘅。

有好趣，喺我哋嘅國家法例裏面，係亦都有採納咗喺維省嘅法例裏面有一條嘅法令，就係重型汽車國家法應用法令，我喺第 33 同 34 頁都係有講嘅。佢裏面講到好多疲勞嘅徵狀，呢個就係話我哋維省對於疲勞呢一方面係好重視嘅。

如果你睇 34 頁，你就睇到我哋引述咗法例，嗰度係將國家法例擺咗落去維省嘅法律嗰度，佢就講到「一啲疲勞嘅徵狀，即係話一個人揸完一個重型車輛之後，可能會係疲倦嘅（呢啲徵狀係會點呢？係之前、揸車嘅時間同埋揸完車之後嗰啲徵狀都係有嘅）。」

呢個可能就係會將嗰個訓練嘅內容係包埋呢啲。好多嘅營辦商會係話譬如有一啲嘅營養師，亦都係會教佢哋點樣做下運動，或者每日就係坐--因為你坐十至十一個鐘一日嚟到揸車，就係喺司機訓練方面係好重要嘅，因為我哋都係要令佢哋去明白乜嘢係引致疲勞同埋帶嚟嘅相關嘅安全風險。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）你整體嘅建議就係呢一啲嘅訓練係應該成為呢一個運輸署嘅作業守則一部分。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係嘅，我覺得係呢啲作業守則係一個非常之好嘅做法，可以係提高嗰個大家對於一般基本訓練嗰個嘅水平，我覺得亦都要加埋疲勞呢一點喺佢訓練裏面嘅，喺應用方面，我諗我都係對於呢啲指引係畀咗我嘅意見，我覺得呢啲仍然係適用嘅。你哋呢一方面係畀我哋墨爾本係緊一啲，我諗個重點就係應用方面係點，我哋而家講緊嗰個嘅一般嘅規範就係四十四至四十五個鐘，但係我覺得係喺香港可能嗰個時數係更高，根據我自己所睇嘅一啲證供有咁嘅結論。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，好多時係高過呢個時間嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）所以我哋要睇下疲勞管理喺呢度係更加重要嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個喺嗰個作業嘅守則裏面係冇嘅？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）（沒有可聽到的回答）

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，你咁樣岈頭，我哋嘅謄本寫唔到嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係喇，我就冇喺呢個作業守則嗰度見到呢一點嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋就應該要係記住呢一點，因為我哋而家係--我哋搵番嗰啲作業守則出嚟，因為而家係講緊訓練。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我睇過㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有冇一個嘅參考編號呀？喺我哋嘅文件度有冇一個編號？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）TD-1 470頁，嗰個嘅內容就係喺471。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）472 頁，其實主要就係話佢哋冇提到任何管理疲勞方面嘅訓練。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇特定嘅指引，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，我建議就係可以係睇下職業健康同埋安全嗰一環，係(e)嗰一度，因而呢個其實--呢度可能要加強，因為呢個係同職業健康同埋安全有關嘅，但係係要有一個--要特別係集中呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席，從教授嘅兩份報告，我係咁多問題。而家仲有兩個嘅事項，就係今日喺發問期間主席提到嘅，首先就係運輸署所收到嘅嗰個嘅關於安

全帶安裝嗰個嘅問題。我記得嗰一個嘅篇章，但係我就想畀你嗰個嘅頁數，呢個係喺嗰個工作小組第一次會議，2018 年 3 月 1 號開始講嘅，嗰個嘅頁嘅編碼就係 KMB-12 4869-1，喺第 16 段，我而家將佢攞咗出嚟，喺呢一度係城巴同埋新一巴就係嚟到去質疑為所有嘅座位安裝安全帶係咪實際可行嘅，因為要車長去確保乘客都係戴安全帶都係好難嘅，兩間巴士公司亦都係提出一個嘅關注，就係話企喺嗰啲人點樣戴安全帶呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）等一陣，等我讀出嚟，呢度就係話「全面嘅檢討喺巴士嘅安裝番安全帶。」

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，嗰個會議嘅日期係 2018 年 3 月 13 號，呢個係立法會交通事務委員會一個會議，嗰個會議就係關於 2018 年 2 月 15 號，亦都得到秘書處同埋黃女士嘅幫手，我哋而家搵到嗰個相關嘅立法會會議文件，我哋可以討論喇。呢度第一頁，我哋睇到係一個立法會交通事務委員會，2018 年 2 月 15 號一個特別會議嘅會議紀錄。

主席，想請你睇下第 19 頁，第 18 頁底，第 78 段就係嗰個--主席，而家你要睇番嗰個背景，陳克勤就有以下嘅動議，第 19 頁，就係睇番個動議嘅內容，就係「本事務委員會深表遺憾，對於喺 2 月 10 號嘅大埔路嚴重車禍，大約有十九人死亡、六十六個受傷人士，為咗避免同類事情再發生，委員會要求政府當局於及後專營巴士公司檢討巴士車長嘅編制同埋提供合理工時、休息時間、午膳時間同埋薪酬，同埋係強制定期訓練，就係訓練呢個安全駕駛態度畀全職同埋半職車長去確保就係話車長本身係能夠有良好駕駛特質。」

第 2，「製造一個防滑馬路表面同埋設立警告路牌同埋安裝車速鏡頭喺上述路段，立即進行同埋睇番嗰啲高危路段，同埋加快加強措施去確保道路安全使用者嘅安全。」

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該等一等。個背景就係--你嗰個相關嘅路段就係大埔路？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，因為係之後舉行嘅會議，所以就應該係指係嗰個路段。

第 3，「就係探討去加強巴士嘅安全裝置嘅方法，譬如去加強高危座位嘅保障，譬如話喺更多座位加裝安全帶同埋分階段強制乘客穿戴安全帶。」譬如話喺車長座位安裝外部鏡頭同埋就提及其他嘅裝置，呢啲就係成個作出安全帶要求嘅背景，由事務委員會作出嘅。而就睇番第 79 段就係嗰個動議係獲得通過嘅。

我希望都至少可以回答主席部分嘅問題，咁會同運輸署--因為都同運輸署再提及。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋會做，因為佢哋冇同我哋講係咩嘢嚟嘅，呢個似乎係一個合理嘅解釋。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）都可能係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係參照番一宗嘅交通意外，佢哋用個眾數。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我哋喺嗰個文件夾第2003年至6，當呢個問題係提及過，但係譬如話呢啲係可能係運輸署上嚟作證嘅時候，可以再提及嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗你係講番嗰個討論同埋嗰啲文件，譬如話運輸署嚟講，去考慮要唔要求巴士提供安全帶，但係就唔贊成嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你話畀教授聽會有用，同埋你可以話畀我聽有邊個司法管轄區檢視過，但係認為呢個唔係一個好嘅提議呢？呢個問題喺十五年前已經係檢視過。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我認為個重點就係我唔會話搵番嗰份文件，但係我諗個重點就係話佢哋睇番--多次睇過同埋決定就話唔會話太有用，主要係根據番嗰個海外司法區嘅經驗。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以你譬如話睇番就係話有啲轉去大馬士革轉營，睇番佢今年4月發生咩嘢事喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我想要求委員會去睇番SEC-1嘅文件夾，係274頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）等一陣。編理文件嘅人似乎唔為意就係話呢啲夾似乎有少少損壞。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）睇番274頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家我到咗，我有嘅。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）個日期係2007年1月，你睇一睇番嗰個第280頁有個日期，呢個係一個運輸署所預備嘅文件，係個工務部，呢個係一個畀交通事務委員會嘅進度報告，係有關於改善專營巴士嘅安全嘅措施，睇番第3段，你可以睇番有關喺現有專營巴士加裝安全帶嘅提述，而有關海外數據，第4段，第275頁，就係：

「我哋從其他國家收集有關要求安裝同埋配戴安全帶喺巴士方面，目前或者我哋未有搵到一個國家有關於法定規定要求提供安全帶作為都市用途同埋可以畀企位嘅乘客用嘅，而佢哋係--一啲交通當局佢哋認為嗰個規定配戴安全帶嘅利益係不確定嘅，而嗰個研究結果嘅撮寫嚟講，可見附錄I。」

呢個係281頁，呢個就係2007年1月。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以譬如話呢啲以上嘅司法管轄區，譬如就係美國、加拿大、英國、澳洲嘅維多利亞省、紐西蘭、荷蘭同埋新加坡？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，所以亦都喺2018年畀交通事務委員會嘅文件方面亦都係

有提及上述嘅國家司法管轄區，所以我哋今日亦都係睇到。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個文件而家睇番，就係回應喺--274 年嘅文件，係回應番喺 2006 年立法會交通事務委員會嘅早前嘅討論。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個你可以搵文件之前，2006 年嘅文件就喺 266 頁有。

主席：（經傳譯員）本身係咪好似今年 2 月、3 月咁，係咪都可以同樣--差唔多嘅寫法，就要求話要求全面檢討？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，都好似嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可以睇番 266 頁。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）就係個文件嘅開始，而相關嘅部分就係 2016 年 10 月，就有關個段落就係第 19 段，我想讀少少出嚟，因為你睇番就係字眼，個「交通意外」呢個字眼，主席亦都係留意到，就睇番第 271 頁第 18 段，「因應於最近嘅交通意外，運輸署亦都係同專營巴士營運商檢討有關於喺現有巴士安裝安全帶，考慮到譬如技術難度，譬如話佢哋座位嘅結構力量同埋固定點同埋巴士嘅設計。」

所以亦都係有個同樣嘅步驟再重複一次。「然之後亦都係研究過海外有關於安裝同埋配戴安全--喺巴士安裝安全帶嘅做法。」而暫時嚟講，係唔見到有國家係有啲咁嘅規定。

主席：Yes. Thank you. So that's 2006, 2007.

陳先生：（經傳譯員）睇番我哋係搵唔到 2007 年至到 2018 年當呢個議題再度浮現。主席同我提及嘅第二個問題，...

主席：（經傳譯員）因為頭先我哋畀教授睇過以上嘅文件，呢啲係由運輸署去協助，表面嚟講，呢個過去都有去檢討，同埋去參考過其他司法管轄區，譬如澳洲維省就話香港係唔需要，有冇啲一般性原因或者啲香港嘅特定元素或者係一般嘅原因而去改變個意願呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）關於澳洲嘅情況，當然係 90 年代，對於能夠保障個防撞衝擊係個體積，主要係額外嘅--巴士嘅額外利益--額外效益，而呢個文件草擬嘅時候，主要係進行--喺呢個情況係進行成本效益分析，點解香港嘅情況會唔同，我相信有啲人喺上層意外嘅發生機率可能會較高，我本身冇答案，但係可能我去探討，譬如話受傷嘅機率，坐上層會唔會高啲呢？相比於單層巴士，譬如係墨爾本有嘅，令到有理據係支持喺上層安裝安全帶。我唔認為我哋下層嘅座位嚟講，同我哋嘅巴士會好大分別。

主席：（經傳譯員）睇番你點樣去分析，我哋係咪需要客觀數據去作出判斷，有幾多人掟出巴士，有幾多會翻車，...

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）呢啲係本身應該去做嘅分析，去回答呢啲問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝。陳大律師，你會去到最後個範疇喇。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）主席之前同我提及，喺 2018 年嘅信，由運輸署嘅書信，就話留意到有啲嘢就係上升咗...

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話個意外率係上升。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）講係 TD-5 1729。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係由運輸署嘅信函，就喺個五年遠期計劃嘅更新之前，就要求九巴去回應一啲問題，如果我哋係嗰個意外涉及率嗰方面。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個要求係喺個 1729 頁嘅底部，「貴公司係要求進行 2017 年有關九巴嘅交通意外，睇番 2015 同 2016 年嘅情況，喺附錄 E，應該係計入嗰個趨勢、本質同埋個原因同埋搵出個原因。」而家係我哋去第 5011 頁，呢個係最新嘅巴士安全部分，本身唔係好容易搵到呢啲意外上升嘅原因。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪冇針對回應呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇直接回應。呢個主要係佢哋根據路線、巴士型號、工時等，本身有相當幾段，主席或者會覺得有相關嘅，譬如 5025，呢個係根據意外嘅種類，8.2.6.7，「其他道路使用者嘅駕駛態度係預防，唔係由巴士車長引起嘅車禍嘅主要原因」，主要係其他道路使用者嘅駕駛態度，似乎係可以歸因呢樣嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）我睇到。

陳先生：Then, in a similar vein...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該等一陣。就唔係佢哋嘅--唔係巴士司機嘅錯，係其他人嘅錯。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）睇番類似嘅段落，譬如 5028，就係 8.2.7.5，畀我讀一讀，就係「喺巴士站嘅非法泊車係令到巴士唔正確靠站嘅原因，然之後會危害道路使用者嘅安全，因為乘客需要喺馬路上落客，而唔係利用巴士站，而令到意外嘅機會增加。而巴士同埋其他車輛非法--要爬嗰啲非法嘅泊車嘅頭令到一個安全--對於乘客係有一個安全隱患，同埋亦都對其他道路使用者嚟講。」同樣地，呢啲其他嘅引述亦都係有提及嘅。

仲有一項資料係畀委員會同主席參考嘅，係 5031，又搵到類似嘅，5031，我哋有一個分析，就係跟分區去分析嗰啲意外嘅，喺 8.2.9.3 段，即係嗰頁嘅底部，你睇到九巴話「交通擠塞係喺繁忙地區導致高意外率嘅一個原因，公司就建議採取積極措施解決交通擠塞嘅問題，我哋會同政府討論。」

然後跟住就講話係巴士優先嘅，作為一個措施，可以處理呢個問題，然後亦都有提及其他導致高意外率嘅因素。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係好清晰睇到點解係交通擠塞會導致交通意外，係咪因為令到司機揸得差啲，所以好易撞到其他車呢？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）我諗佢哋就可能真係嘗試咁講。主席，我希望咁樣係幫到委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）你之前係冇睇過呢啲數據，係咪呀？教授。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，就係講話交通擠塞同意外有關係，其實都有好多嘅研究都顯示交通流量係會同交通意外有一個正比嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話更加多目標可以撞到，係咪咁解？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你要更加要小心知道兩邊都可能有人、有車，係咪咁解呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，係從嗰個角度睇，交通流量同交通意外率係有個關係嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該教授。我諗第一點，就話其他司機嘅態度，都好清楚，就係嗰啲司機造成意外，係咪冇一啲數字細分，就話譬如話九巴有冇評估過到底邊啲人負責，即係係要對個交通意外負責任嘅呢？我諗喺香港，我哋所知道，起碼係九巴嗰方面，呢一類咁樣嘅交通意外評估，我諗我咁講應該就啱嘅，就由係保險公司開始嘅，佢哋就嘗試想將個責任推畀其他人，係咪咁呀？

陳先生：（經傳譯員）係 5020 就有按成因劃分嗰啲意外嘅，將佢分類，就係譬如話係巴士車長造成，同埋或者唔係嘅理由，第一部分就係因為巴士車長造成嘅意外，呢度有細分。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）喺嗰個表，最常見嘅就係交通擠塞，就即係話冇保持安全距離，同前車。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，其實如果冇交通擠塞，反而就可以做到喎，係咪？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）難啲喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我就睇到相撞形嘅意外，就算冇咩嘢交通--即係唔係好多車，都其實有危險嘅，係咪呀？仍然都係咁嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，多謝你。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）除非仲有咩嘢協助委員會喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇㗎喇，多謝你。想多謝你畀所有嘅資料，教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）有一個問題，喺墨爾本，我哋睇到咁多資料，或者香港都可以學習一下。有啲新嘅措施要提出，邊個會推動嘅呢？無論係新技術又好，咩嘢都好，係承辦商吖，政府吖，委員會吖，定係邊個會通常推動呢啲改變？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）有兩方面嘅，一個就係汽車製造商，譬如好似富豪、斯堪尼亞等等，或者平治，佢哋都係好想喺個市場上佔有優勢，所以特別係著重安全，另外一樣，就係個別嘅承辦商，我喺我報告都提過一啲例子，譬如話新加坡嗰間 CDC，佢哋就喺墨爾本運作，但係佢哋就有安裝呢啲新嘅儀器同埋設備，因為佢哋新加坡都有咁做，佢哋都係經常去睇下仲有啲咩嘢方法可以改善安全，所以佢哋嘅態度係好好嘅。佢哋就覺得如果佢哋自己屋企人坐都唔安全，肯定就唔足夠，就畀乘客都唔得嘅，所以有時就係承辦商佢哋自己會提出嘅，可能係加裝或者睇下市場上有啲咩嘢解決方案。所以就係--當然亦都睇下新嘅車輛可以加啲咩嘢。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）即係就算冇明確嘅同安全有關嘅主要表現指標，佢哋都係會咁做，係咪呀？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋會自願做，冇錯，係。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）假設喺計算對嗰個巴士營運個成本相對於交通意外係點樣，因為其實有交通意外，根本佢哋架車會損毀咗，佢哋都要自己攞錢出嚟去整，所以都係一個成本嘅考慮，係咪？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係呀，肯定係，所以加裝一啲其他嘅--事後加裝一啲設備，都係肯定係有用，可能對乘客會安全啲，對於佢哋個業務成本都係可能有好處嘅。譬如話神眼咁呢個技術，要裝就大概係 1,500 澳元，每一架車，都係好嘅投資嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，因為如果一旦發生意外，譬如話你要賠償受傷嘅人，然後架車又損毀咗，用唔到，計起嚟，個成本可能都係值嘅。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）係，因為就的確係有呢啲考慮嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）好似維省嘅運輸安全局，有呢啲咁嘅機構，點樣可以確保佢唔係另外一個嘅政府架構，即係一個官僚架構咁呢？有冇即係咩嘢指標畀佢哋，或者有啲咩嘢方法鼓勵佢哋會盡力係做到最好呢？

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）我唔知道有冇定啲目標畀佢哋嘅，我要返去睇一睇，然後話番畀你聽，但係你可以放心，因為佢哋係負責規管巴士營辦商，巴士營辦商會盡佢哋嘅能力去做嘅，要確保運輸安全總監嘅要求做得到，唔會只係變成另一個嘅官僚機構，呢方面可能主要係睇個顧客，因為顧客會確保有關

當局係真正做到佢嘅功能，目前運輸安全總監同埋承辦商之間嘅關係係非常好，因為佢哋都明白如果佢哋可以有一個更--建立到更強嘅安全風險管理嘅文化係對雙方都好嘅。我或者返去墨爾本之後，如果嗰個颱風畀到我哋走，我就可以畀番啲資料你。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有冇乜嘢呀？陳律師。

陳先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，教授，我知道我哋今日超時咗少少，但係我哋喺計算需要時間嗰度都幾準確嘅，不過我哋喺呢度就要多謝你畀咗咁多協助畀我哋，特別有你嘅報告可以幫到我哋去確立，喺我哋心目中有啲咩嘢問題特別相關，同埋可能係考--我哋喺香港亦都已經係聽過啲證供，都係好有用嘅，我哋就期待如果你覺得仲有啲乜嘢係適合要畀我哋嘅，我哋都期待可以收到嘅。好多謝你協助委員會，祝你返屋企嘅旅途愉快，無論幾時都好。

MR JOHN STANLEY：（經傳譯員）好，多謝，非常多謝。

2018 月 9 月 15 日

下午 5 時 38 分押聆訊押後

[Blank Page]

Monday, 24 September 2018

(10.00 am)

EVIDENCE FROM THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE: MS CHAN YI PING, MR STEPHEN BAKER, MS YAU SIN MAN, MR LEE TAI WAI, MR CHEUNG TIN LOK (simultaneous interpretation was used where indicated)

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, and good morning, Chief Superintendent Yau. Thank you for attending and we thank your colleagues for attending to help us.

The way in which the proceedings will unfold you are no doubt familiar with. We have counsel, and leading counsel Ms Wong will be asking questions today. The questions in the first place will be directed towards you, but if one of your colleagues is better able to assist us, by all means defer to that colleague and we will happily take information/evidence from that person or any one of the other colleagues you wish to depute to perform that role.

If you have any difficulties with understanding questions, please state so and we'll see if we can't make sure it's elaborated.

Ms Wong.

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman, Ms Yau, and ladies and gentlemen, for coming. I will be asking questions

on behalf of the committee.

I believe the police have provided in total eight responses, letters of reply to the committee's enquiries, providing different answers to different aspects, and they are all found in the miscellaneous bundle.

I will be first of all directing my questions on a number of topics. The first topic is in relation to the statistics of accidents.

Ms Yau, I believe that the police have developed a database on all traffic accidents; is that correct?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) May I answer in Chinese?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MS YAU SIN MAN: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. I need to pause a bit so that it can be translated.

And this database, can you tell us whether it is based on the investigation reports compiled by the police from time to time?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I will ask my colleague.

We have a database on traffic accidents. The information is collected from the police regions. We would also state the causes of accidents in that database.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, in compiling these statistics, what

information would you use in compiling this data?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) You mean what information would be collected by us?

I will ask my colleague to explain in detail the information that we will collect.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: In general terms, the information would include the type of vehicle, the number of casualties, the type and nature of the casualties, whether it was a serious injury, slight injury or a fatality, and also a list of driver contributory factors, things which, according to the investigating officer, contributed to the cause of the accident.

These are compiled pretty much in a tick-box kind of way and submitted electronically to the Road Safety Unit, and then shared with the Transport Department, to enable the Road Safety Unit and the Transport Department to analyse the causation factors of traffic accidents, in order to design and adjust their road safety strategy.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a template, therefore, for this method of providing the data?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, my Lord.

CHAIRMAN: And do you have a copy of the template?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I do.

CHAIRMAN: Would you be able to provide us with it?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you do that now?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We will have it copied, please. (Handed).

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Baker, in this data form, in finding out what is happening in these accidents, you would wish to find out, first of all, how people are injured, where they are injured, and why they are injured; is that correct, in summarising the data to be collected?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The information mainly concerns the causation factors of the accident rather than the type of injury. Classification of the type of injury is more limited to whether it was a serious injury, that is defined by the amount of time the person spent in hospital, or if it was a slight injury, or if it was a fatality.

CHAIRMAN: Is that the same definition that one finds in the back page of the traffic report that the police publish?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I haven't seen that document recently, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Let me provide you with a copy of it.

Can you give this to the chief superintendent.

It has an explanatory note on the back page. For the chief superintendent, please. Just give it to the

chief superintendent. (Handed).

There is a list of terms defined there. It's on the back page.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's correct, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: So that method of definition is one that's employed in the template?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It's not in the template, sir, but it's how we classify them.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We will have that copied now, if we may. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

When this information has been compiled, would other departments or in particular the Audit Commission conduct an independent audit of the information collected by the police and the Transport Department -- is that correct?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not aware of the Audit Commission being involved in the road safety process.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can help you. We have an Audit Commission paper --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- where the Audit Commissioner is looking at different things, but it also looked at administration of road safety. This is March 2013.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. May I take you to the SEC bundle,

page 467. I believe that's bundle 2.

Mr Baker, this is an Audit Commission report dated 28 March 2013, prepared by the Transport and Housing Bureau, Transport Department, Hong Kong Police Force, and Information Services Department, relating to the administration of road safety measures.

We can see this report was tabled before LegCo later, on 5 April 2013, as part of the report on the results of value for money audits.

If I take you to the SEC bundle, the same bundle, page 543, paragraph 5.3, we can see at paragraph 5.2 it states:

"The police is responsible for investigating traffic accidents."

And you have a database, if we look at line 4:

"The police requires its investigation officers to keep their investigation findings and results in individual physical files and input accident data into a computerised case management database (known as the traffic operations and management system -- TOMS) within 48 hours of the accidents. The data may be amended ..."

And 5.3 states:

"The police's TOMS is linked with the TD's [Transport Department's] database (known as the transport information system -- TIS ...) for the

electronic transfer of traffic accident data. The Transport Department uses the traffic accident data in the TIS to identify locations of accident block spots and accident trends for in-depth investigation and analysis. The data also serve as an important source of information for formulation of road safety strategies, publicity/education programme and ongoing review of road safety legislation among other road safety initiatives."

It coincides with what you have told us earlier that the information will be shared with the Transport Department for devising road safety strategies. And one of the issues raised in this report is --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go any further, if it helps you, Chief Superintendent, this material is available in paper form so that you can have a look at other pages, rather than the ones you are being referred to, if that helps you.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Just ask for it and it will be provided to you.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: If I could take a look at it.

CHAIRMAN: Can we do that? Can we provide SEC -- I think this covers two volumes, does it not, SEC-1 and SEC-2?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, SEC-2.

CHAIRMAN: But it begins in bundle 1, am I right, 467?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, 467.

CHAIRMAN: Take a moment to familiarise yourself with it, so

you have an idea of what it is you are being asked about.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Thank you, sir.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This report is compiled by the Audit Commission, the purpose of which is to audit the data to ensure or to check whether the information relayed by the police and the Transport Department are accurate.

According to this report, it suggested that there appear to be inaccuracies in the road traffic accident data. We can see that at page 476, paragraphs 10 to 11.

First of all, we see "Accuracy of traffic accident data", the heading. It stated "Traffic accident locations" and also "Traffic accident contributory factors". In the "Traffic accident locations", if we look in line 4:

"The traffic accident location is identified using a grid reference system. Due to inaccurate input of grid references, the Transport Department has to spend extra time and resources to rectify the problem ... In Audit's view, prompt and effective measures should be taken to ensure that the grid references for traffic accident locations are correctly input in the first place ..."

And it identifies relevant paragraphs in the report which I am going to take you to in a moment.

The second matter, Mr Baker, as you have earlier mentioned, is the traffic accident contributory factors. It also mentioned that during a sample check -- that's in line 4 of paragraph 11:

"In a sample check of the accident contributory factors input for 50 traffic accident cases, Audit found that 13 per cent of the input factors were inaccurate and there was no record of supervisory check for the 50 cases. There is a need to tighten management control in this regard ..."

So it appears the data compiled in both aspects -- that's the location and the contributory factors -- appears to be inaccurate. I understand this report was made in 2013. First of all, may I ask a general question: were you aware of the problems identified in this report about the inaccuracy of the traffic accident data?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I was aware of this report when it was written. Since that time, I have worked in other police formations and so I haven't been able to follow what measures were taken in consequence of this report. But I recall at the time that the report was being prepared that the main problem was a discrepancy between the location of where the police said the accident occurred and where the accident was recorded in the TIS system,

and I recall that what the police believed was the cause of the problem was the TIS system was relying on a mapping system prepared by the Highways Department or used by the Highways Department which referred to grid blocks or grid zones, which didn't necessarily coincide with the police description of the location.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. In fact, you are correct, Mr Baker, and that problem has been identified in the report itself.

If I could take you briefly to what was stated. That is at page 505. If we start at 544, paragraph 5.5, it stated there:

"Inaccurate grid references could adversely affect the accuracy of the accident black spot list compiled by the Transport Department in the following two ways:

(a) a non-accident prone site would be wrongly listed as a traffic accident black spot if the same grid reference was used for accidents occurring on different locations of a road; and

(b) a location with frequent accidents would be omitted from the accident black spot list ..."

And in paragraph 5.6:

"In the 2006 review, Audit found that the police incorrectly input the same grid reference for 20 accidents occurring on different locations of

a highway."

If you go over the page, at page 545, paragraph 5.8, you can see "TD's checking", Transport Department's checking:

"To minimise the risks of inaccurate grid references mentioned in paragraph 5.5, the Transport Department has since 2008 carried out selective checks on grid references input by the police. Notwithstanding the launch of the map-based TIS, the TD still identified inconsistencies between the grid references and the description of the locations input by the police."

And we can see in paragraph 5.9, it noted that in April 2010, in a meeting of April 2010, the Transport Department informed the police that about 40 per cent of the input grid references were found to be inconsistent with the descriptions of the accident locations.

At the time of the review, that's 5.10:

"... Audit found that the problem of inaccurate grid references still [existed]."

If you look at line 5, it stated:

"... the grid references of 7,314 (ie 26 per cent of 27,755) cases were inaccurate."

And if we look at 5.11, the Transport Department --

CHAIRMAN: I think this is a matter that concerns us less or interests us less than the issue of the inaccuracy of

the attribution of contributory factors.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could deal with this more shortly.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: There were recommendations about how to fix this problem, and the real question is: has this been done?

Perhaps we can go to the recommendations, first of all, at 5.14.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

If you go to 5.14, page 548, it suggested to enhance the system by incorporating a validation check control in the TOMS/TIS so that police investigation officers would be alerted to any out-of-the-range error at the time of data input.

And the police agreed with the audit recommendations, as we can see at paragraph 5.15.

So my question is: has that situation been improved since this Audit Commission report in 2013?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would like to put my answers in the context that I was aware of the audit report in 2012, and that I have been away from traffic policing for some time, until 2017. Also, I was unaware that I would be questioned about the audit report and so I haven't been able to make enquiries to answer your questions before the hearing.

I can say that, as I recall, from 2012 and 2013, measures were implemented in terms of supervision of data input, and I can say that since this report was written, the TOMS system has been replaced by what we call the case management information system, which is a more modern facility for the police to input data on all kinds of police enquiries, including traffic enquiries.

And it is my understanding that this what we call the CMIS, case management information system, is linked to the Transport Department TIS system, but I am unable to say at the moment in what way the system has been enhanced in terms of the recording of the location of traffic accidents.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you, Chief Superintendent. We of course understand and accept the caveats that you enter. We will be receiving evidence in due course again from the Transport Department, and perhaps the question we could ask you now is simply this: are you aware of any ongoing problems about location inaccuracy?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Turning to the second matter, the traffic accident contributory factors, which is trickier than the first one because it requires input, actual data

input, by police officers into the system, as to the causes of the accidents.

If we look at the report, at paragraph 5.17 at page 549, 5.17 states:

"The TD [Transport Department] relies on the traffic accident contributory factors input by the police into the TIS for identifying problems of road environment, road users and driving behaviour, and [also to formulate] strategies to tackle specific types of accidents."

And during the 1998 review, the Audit's sample check revealed an error rate of 25 per cent, and in the 2006 review, the error rate was 13 per cent.

During the audit examination, at 5.20:

"... Audit examined 50 traffic accident investigation case files ... and the related 280 accident contributory factors input to the TIS. Audit found that 37 (13 per cent) of the input factors in 34 cases were inaccurate ..."

And they identify two accidents, and in summary they discovered that some of the cases where "mechanical defects" were input as the accident contributory factor when in fact it was not.

First of all, were you aware of this problem in relation to the compilation of this particular aspect,

in terms of accident data?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I was not. I was not aware of the significant problem with the input of contributory factors.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, as a way of trying to understand how this might occur, if after an accident a driver was to tell the policeman, perhaps having been cautioned, "My brakes didn't work", would that then perhaps be entered as "mechanical failure"?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: And if the system wasn't rigorous enough to correct that later, when the vehicle examiner said, "There was no problem with the brakes -- there might have been other issues but there was no problem with the brakes", would that result in that error being carried forward?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The error could be corrected, sir.

CHAIRMAN: It ought to be corrected but it might explain why it remains in the system?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is a possibility, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And Audit at that time suggested a number of recommendations in the report. The recommendations can be found at 5.22 at page 551.

To sum up, it required the police to tighten management control in terms of input into the system, by

reminding supervisory staff to critically check the accuracy against the records kept in the case files; and also to maintain records of their supervisory checks in relevant case files for management review.

As far as you are aware, has that been done or have the recommendations been carried out?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The recommendations were carried out.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And, as far as you know, were you aware of any inaccurate compilation of data in relation to the accident contributory factors, as of to date?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: As far as I am aware, the data is input as accurately as possible.

CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps you can only answer that generally rather than saying "any", but generally, are you satisfied that the system better presents accurate data now?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If I may take you to another document. The purpose of this exercise -- perhaps Mr Baker and Ms Yau -- the purpose of this exercise is to ascertain the accuracy of the traffic accident data, as you are no doubt aware, because this information is relevant to the Transport Department in devising road safety strategy or improvement measures. So the accuracy of the data is of

importance.

One of the aspects that we heard about from one of the experts, who testified last week, is we need certain procedures to consider whether there should be an impact study in Hong Kong. So you basically look at the number of victims you have, and then look at the cost of installation of these devices and look at the cost of serious injury in your jurisdiction.

So we need to have some objective data to see if there is a legitimate approach to examine safety, and to that extent, what information we have in Hong Kong to compile that data -- so that you know what direction I am going.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, in that context, might I indicate this. This cost/benefit analysis, how you might approach, for example, installing safety devices on vehicles, is one that they apparently use in Australia, but it obviously has as its core accurate data. We are particularly interested in that in the context of seat belts, seat belts in franchised buses. So that is an aspect that we will be coming back to later.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, now that we have what I think I call the template of factors that are listed as contributory factors, perhaps at some stage you could detail them.

Obviously you might need first to read them, but it would be helpful if we were to go to that at some stage.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. I may come back to it later, after the break.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: To that end, in particular on seat belts -- I am coming to this topic -- first of all, I wish to identify some of the statistics that we have from the Transport Department and also from the forward planning programme that was forward by the franchised bus operators in relation to non-collision-type accidents. May I --

CHAIRMAN: Again, forgive me for interrupting, that is another area where, in the course of our hearings, we have gathered together information to be found in documents that are otherwise confidential, that went between the franchised bus operators and the Transport Department, in which they were asked to analyse the causes of accidents on a whole range of different parameters.

Have you had an opportunity to look at that material? It is on our website, but if you haven't, that's another area where we are going.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I looked at some material over the weekend, sir, which I believe is what you are referring

to.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So, for example, in the context of seat belts, a regular pattern of accidents in buses appears to be, and are described as, loss of balance. The figure seems to be maintained at around 50 per cent of the injuries involved in and around buses.

Another aspect of the statistics is persons injured on a bus separate from loss of balance. So that is something we will come to in due course.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Mr Baker, first of all, may I ask some general questions. We have been provided, as Mr Chairman mentioned, the forward planning programme of these franchised bus operators, which straddles five years and it will be renewed on a yearly basis as to what the safety features would be, and conducts an analysis of accident trends and statistics.

Would the police be provided with a copy of this forward planning programme from the Transport Department?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We have not been, and I wasn't aware that we would be. We hadn't any expectation to receive it.

CHAIRMAN: No, as I indicated earlier, we have been given to understand that this material was confidential, and it is with some difficulty, over some months, that we have

obtained the documentation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I take you to some of the documents as examples. It would be at TD-1, page 180. At page 180 is the extract of the forward planning programme for 2018 to 2022 submission by Kowloon Motor Bus.

If we look at paragraph 8.2.7, we can see the KMB, the bus company, had identified or done an analysis of the accident nature for the years of 2015 to 2016, and we can see in particular, table 8.1, the passenger loss of balance as 51.5 per cent, and at paragraph 8.2.7, stating that:

"The majority of the accidents ... were due to passengers losing balance while on the bus. More than half of these cases were caused by the bus braking in traffic."

It also named other accidents.

This report, this chapter, contained a number of statistics, and this is just one of them. First of all, my general question is: would this sort of information assist the police in terms of compilation of data and analysis of accident data, if you were given a copy of this from the franchised bus operators? Would it assist your department carrying out the duties?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: My first impression is that a lot of this information is covered in our casualty causation factors

already.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Casualty causation factors?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Our accident causation factors already, and without spending more time to study this information I wouldn't be able to comment further.

CHAIRMAN: But, if you had this information, you would have the consolation of knowing that your own figures matched those of people who are expert in running this particular aspect of transportation?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We would, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Because, as you know, one of the recommendations in the Audit Commission report is to critically check the accuracy of the data input to the system. So, with this information, you could actually cross-check or double-check the data you have compiled to ensure it is accurate; would you agree with that suggestion?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It would be a useful reference, yes, but actually, I think we would value the assessment of our officers, to a great extent, although it would be useful.

MS MAGGIE WONG: For the purpose of verification and double-checking?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: As a cross-reference, yes, but how would we verify it? We would verify it by looking at what our

officers found out in their enquiry, because their enquiries would be rather thorough.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, in compiling your data, we can see, as an example of that, the passenger loss of balance here is 51.5 per cent, and if I may take you to the letter compiled by the Transport Department as to the statistics back in 2013, first of all. It is the letter dated 16 May 2013. That would be in SEC-2, page 566.

This is a letter from the Transport Department to the LegCo, and if we look at page 567, at paragraph (c), it identifies the number of road accidents for franchised buses. It stated that 58 per cent were non-collision --

CHAIRMAN: Before you get into detail, perhaps you could, for the record, and for Chief Superintendent Baker, establish the context of this letter.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a response to the Audit Commissioner's report?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. This is a response to the issues raised in the LegCo, when considering chapter 2 of the Director of Audit's report in administration of road safety measures that we have looked at earlier, containing recommendations, and the inaccuracies. And the Transport Department provides certain statistics

based on the information compiled.

If we look at paragraph (a), it set out the 120 road casualties in 2012, 15 involved traffic accidents happened on expressways, and in paragraph (b):

"Not many major cities in overseas countries publish statistics on accident involvement rates separately for public transport."

And they could only obtain relevant figures for some major cities in the United Kingdom.

If we go over the page, at paragraph (c), it summarised that:

"For franchised buses, because of the large number of passengers carried and the presence of standing passengers, a significant proportion of accidents involves injury of passengers even [when] there is no collision. This type of accidents typically involves passengers losing balance inside the bus compartment due to various reasons, such as not holding the handrail tightly or falling down when boarding or alighting. These are classified as non-collision type accidents. Of the [2,000-odd] franchised buses ... 5 per cent were non-collision type accidents."

So, more or less, the figure matches the KMB figure provided in their forward planning programme. We can see more up-to-date statistics in the Transport

Department paper, but you need not go through that. The new percentage that they have compiled is about 59 to 65 per cent of all accidents involving franchised buses during 2012 to 2017 are non-collision type accidents.

CHAIRMAN: When you say "accidents", are you describing injuries?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The reference is at TD-1, page 111, paragraph 5.

Now, the question I would be asking is: in compiling your data, would you differentiate accidents or injuries caused to passengers while they are seated, or whether they are standees in the bus compartments?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: As far as I recall, we don't have a differentiation whether the victim was standing or sitting.

CHAIRMAN: Is that because your approach is global, as it were, rather than specific towards buses? Your template, for example --

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: -- is not designed for that peculiarity?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is correct, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Your template works for all vehicles?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: At some stage, sooner rather than later, I think it would be useful to get to the template, because that probably gives us the direction in which the police approach the attribution of causative factors in accidents and injuries.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe we can go to your template, to establish a few matters first.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps in the first place, Chief Superintendent, you could describe what the document is, and where it comes from.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: This is a list of driver contributory factors, and the code on the left enables our officers to input onto the computer system what the contributory factor was.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There are two boxes there. The bottom box seems to be a summary of the major accidents caused by different driver contributory factors, based on the number of accidents in descending order. Is that correct? The bottom box is a summary extracting the major causes of contributory factors in descending order?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I'm sorry, I haven't prepared for these questions.

CHAIRMAN: Let's take it step by step. The list at the top clearly provides an omnibus approach to factors that

might have been relevant to driver contributory factors, and there are, it appears, 62 of them. Do I understand this correctly? Never mind what happens on the right-hand side of the page. These are the pre-determined factors that may have been part of an accident contribution?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's correct, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And, if we look at the bottom box, the driver contributory factor, let's quote an example. We see "Driving inattentively", that is 189 cases for the first eight months in 2018; is that correct? That's code number 56.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And we can see, in descending order, the next one is number 60, "Failing to ensure the safety of passenger", and we can see the number of cases here are 97, based on the statistics in the first eight months of 2018.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the third major factor is "Driving too close to vehicle in front".

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The fourth one is "Careless lane changing".

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The fifth one is "To avoid collision or

otherwise: swerving/stopping suddenly".

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the sixth one is "Improper or illegal turn".

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: As we can see, I think there are a total of I think ten -- I haven't calculated it but there are around ten-odd contributory factors that have been extracted here.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But the table doesn't identify the injuries caused to the passenger. For example, in passenger-losing-balance cases, where would we see this data? It appears this table doesn't contain that sort of information.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right. For our statistical purposes, we only categorise injuries into those three categories, and we don't further categorise them. We would have to look at the case file to obtain further information about the injury.

CHAIRMAN: So your three categories are fatal accidents, serious accidents and slight accidents, and the explanatory notes on the back of the 2017 police report on traffic accidents -- "Traffic Report", I think it's called -- defines what those terms mean?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is right, sir, yes.
CHAIRMAN: And, in a sense, this is an arbitrary drawing of lines when one comes to serious and slight accidents? You've got to draw the line somewhere?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: There is nothing magic about being in a hospital for 12 hours, rather than 15 or 20, or three days?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is right, sir.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Is there another template for injuries that you have identified, the three categories of injuries suffered by passengers on buses, franchised buses?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not aware of another template.
MS MAGGIE WONG: Then how do you calculate the number of cases where passengers lose balance on buses?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would have to look into that. I haven't got that information with me.
CHAIRMAN: Is it possible that this is a detail that you don't get involved in?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is, sir, yes.
CHAIRMAN: Professor.
MEMBER LO: I just want to understand who actually put down the contributory factors; by the officer at the scene, or determined afterwards? So who determines what factors contributed to the accident?
MR STEPHEN BAKER: The officer who investigated the traffic

accident. Once he had been to the scene, he would go back to his office later and input the contributory factors onto the computer system. And the data would be compiled by the Road Safety Unit in the Traffic Branch, and analysed.

MEMBER LO: But there may be multiple parties. For example, if the bus company investigated the accident afterwards, would those factors be flowed back into the accident record; for example, losing balance?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No. It's all based on police enquiries.

MEMBER LO: What about TD? Who will maintain a record, as the ultimate eventual authority, to say, "This is the record"? Is it TD, is it police, is it -- how do you flow information into it?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: All of the data is input by the police based on their assessment, and transferred to TD, where it is kept and analysed.

MEMBER LO: So the information would not go from TD back to police records?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We have access to the TD's information, and we share the information regularly.

CHAIRMAN: But the Transport Department is using your information?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir.

CHAIRMAN: And you don't have access to the franchised bus

accident statistics or their designation of contributory factors?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We do not, sir, yes.

MEMBER LO: So there could be inconsistencies among the records kept by the bus company and the police and TD?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: There could be, but I would suggest that we would rely on our assessment of what happened, because the accident has been investigated by a police officer who has interviewed witnesses, and I don't know how the bus companies make their assessment of what happened.

CHAIRMAN: The Transport Department would be at the apex of the triangle, as it were; they get information through this forward planning programme, certainly we know about that now, and they get information from you. They have two sources of information but you only have one.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just a matter of logistics: if the Transport Department discovered there are certain inaccuracies in the information compiled by the police, based on the data provided by the franchised bus operators, do you know what they would do about it? Would they consult you first?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am aware that when the Transport Department think there is a discrepancy in the

information, they will consult with us about it. I am not aware of all of the circumstances by which they would believe there is a discrepancy.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to give us any example to illustrate that process?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: On a regular basis, our Road Safety Unit does receive referrals of cases for which the Transport Department would like us to review the data that we have provided. But I don't know on what basis they think there is a discrepancy, whether it is from the bus company or for any other reason.

CHAIRMAN: And, in your review of the data that you provided, what steps would be taken?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We would contact the investigating formation to double-check that the information they have input to the computer system is correct, ie that it matches the information they have produced on their investigation file.

CHAIRMAN: At what stage in the investigation of the accident is the data inputted by these codes into the computer? How far into the investigation before that happens?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: At a very early stage, within hours.

CHAIRMAN: And, in the process of a review, which by its nature must happen much later, what other material is

available that might be looked at to determine whether or not the initial assessment was accurate?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The initial assessment is made almost as soon as the officer goes back to his office. Further enquiries might find that the data needs updating. The example you gave of the driver saying the brakes didn't work and yet, after examination, it is found that there is nothing wrong with the brakes, is a good one. And it takes time to find witnesses and to make analysis of the facts that have been gathered at the scene.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

So do I understand it correctly that it is the officer who is involved in the case who inputs the data in the first place?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And who will be conducting the double-checking or critical checking?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Normally, it would be the sergeant, and there are different levels of supervision involved in the handling of case enquiries.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and the sergeant will be the sergeant in charge of that division of the officer in charge of the case?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Directly in charge of that officer.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We will move on to the topic of seat belts. The reason we have spent quite a bit of time on statistics is because it is related to this issue of seat belts.

One of the things we have heard during the evidence is that you can't give seat belts to people who are standing, or standees; you can only --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me again for interrupting.

Is the failure to use a seat belt one of the driver contributory template factors?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is not a contributory factor to the cause of an accident.

CHAIRMAN: No, but it is to the injury.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. I would have to look further, sir, to answer that question.

CHAIRMAN: So this is limited to driver contributory factors of the accident?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Not the consequences of the accident?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: These driver contributory factors, these factors, for how long have they been revised or since when they have been revised or updated?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I don't know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you mind checking and provide us with the information in due course. Would your department consider compiling a separate template for consequences of accidents that cause particular types of injuries?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, what are you inviting the chief superintendent to do?

MS MAGGIE WONG: For example, to have certain statistics compiled in relation to, like, passenger losing balance, like statistics similarly conducted by the franchised bus operators, or to expand the list here, to identify which are the ones which caused the passenger losing balance in that particular category, given it accounts for the major proportion of the accidents.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would like to spend some time to investigate further how -- we already record such details. I'm sorry that I haven't brought such information to the hearing.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Maybe I will go back to the seat belts issue, because it is relevant to the seat belt issue, as to -- we have the statistics which account for about 59 to 65 per cent for non-collision-type accidents due to passenger losing balance.

So, going back to my issue --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, may I ask this general question: as an investigative tool, particularly having

regard to this issue on buses, it is a narrow issue from your point of view, I understand that -- buses, passengers being injured by loss of balance -- how often, if you are aware, would the police have recourse to the black boxes, telematics devices, on the bus, to, for example, examine excessive braking, excessive acceleration or excessive inclination?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The police would have access to any exhibit when they were investigating an arrestable offence, and that would include causing death by dangerous driving, careless driving, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. That's the general provision. But the question really is more specific: how often actually do the police examine this material? For example, one can readily see why you might examine it when you have a fatal accident, but when you have an old lady who falls over because she lost her balance on the bus and breaks her leg, is that something that would be looked at or not? In the general it could be, but is it in fact?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would have to consult my colleagues, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Following on that question, will there be a general protocol in terms of investigation into

traffic accidents that, as a matter of routine procedures, you have to obtain black-box or telematics data from the relevant franchised bus companies?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not aware that it is done routinely, and I would need to consult with my colleagues to find out how often it is done.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And, in that regard, CCTV footages, installed on buses?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am afraid it is not a level that I have worked at, and I would have to consult with my colleagues.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So may I take you to a working group. If we start, in terms of this topic on seat belt, may I start the process by inviting you to look at a paper in relation to the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses, which had been set up after the Tai Po accident in February 2018.

That would be TD Paper 8, at TD-1, page 94.

Maybe I will give this in context. This working group was set up arising from the Tai Po accident in February 2018, with the representatives of all five franchised bus companies, and bus manufacturers, as well as the Transport Department, in mid-March 2018, to review the technical feasibility and desirability of installing new safety devices or applying new technology

on the safety devices to franchised buses, to enhance protection to passengers.

Were you aware of the existence of this working group?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Or, within the police, do you know who would -- so far as you are concerned, you do not know, but what about people within the police department; do you know who would be responsible for --

CHAIRMAN: I think it might help the chief superintendent if you were to describe the limited number of parties to this working group, if you were to take him to that information.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Mr Baker, if you look at paragraph 4, we can see the number of people involved, and footnote 1, the people involved would be the franchised bus companies, namely the Kowloon Motor Bus, Long Win Bus, Citybus, New World Bus and New Lantao Bus.

If we go up to paragraph 4 --

CHAIRMAN: I think we can start at the top of the page.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, at the top of the page.

CHAIRMAN: "... the TD set up a working group with representatives of all franchised bus companies ..."

"FB" is the acronym used for franchised bus

companies, and they are listed as a footnote.

... and bus manufacturers in mid-March 2018 [that's 13 March] to review the technical feasibility and desirability of installing some new safety devices or applying new technology on the safety devices of franchised buses for enhancing protection to bus passengers."

Yes. Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. So the police is not one of the members consulted or one of the members of this working group. But, in that regard, I wish to ask you something about the installation of seat belts, and invite your comments on this.

We see, in this paper, at paragraph 5, we saw the issue of installation of seat belts as one of the matters discussed in this working group.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would read this paragraph out, to set the context for the chief superintendent.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If we read paragraph 5:

"In the light of an accident in July 2006 in which a KMB bus collided with another vehicle resulting in a passenger on the upper deck of the bus being thrown out of the bus and another similar accident in December 2007 in which a bus of Citybus ... collided with another bus of New World First Bus ... in Tseung Kwan O

resulting in three passengers on board the CTB's bus being thrown out of the bus, the TD recommended and the FB operators agreed that safety seat belts should be retrofitted at the four front seats on the upper deck of all post-1997 licensed buses to prevent passengers from falling out from the upper deck front seats. At present, the seat belts for all the exposed seats have become a standard feature of all franchised buses."

It was in this context that the working group was considering whether to implement the installation of seat belts to all seats on franchised buses.

If I may take you to a few minutes of the meeting in relation to this working group. This working group is divided also into subgroups, which I am going to take you to some of the meetings.

The reason I am asking you this --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- Chief Superintendent, or any of your colleagues, are any of you aware of whether or not at this stage, when -- I think this is something like 2008, in consequence of the 2006 and 2007 bus accidents -- seat belts were fitted in vulnerable seats, exposed seats -- I think the best example is the front of the bus on the road to Stanley, where they put a bar across the front of the bus and they put seat belts on the front seats. There are other vulnerable seats where

people have nothing in front of them where there are seat belts.

The question that I would pose generally is: are any of you aware of whether or not the police were consulted when these recommendations were being formulated? Maybe you don't, but if you are, please share your experience with us.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not aware of that, sir.

CHAIRMAN: None of your colleagues?

Well, Chief Superintendent, perhaps you could make enquiries as to whether or not the police were consulted. This was the subject of debate in LegCo, and one would have expected, in something like this, given the police involvement in their investigation of accidents, that the input of the police would have been sought.

Do you have the references of the other material that would help the chief superintendent narrow this down?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

May I take you to, first of all, the end result of this working group, and then I will work backwards to the minutes of the meeting.

If I may take you to TD-1, page 403 to 426. This was a LegCo paper submitted by the Transport Department

in July 2018 for discussion on 25 July 2018, basically summarising the recommendations of the working group.

If we could go to page 407, at the bottom, it starts with --

CHAIRMAN: I think, to give the chief superintendent a context, let's go to the first page. This is a paper prepared by the Transport Department, Transport and Housing Bureau, for discussion at a meeting on 25 July of this year of the Transport Panel of the Legislative Council; is that right?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, Chairman.

If we go to paragraph 10 at page 407, we can see some of the recommendations set out there, and setting out the position.

CHAIRMAN: Before we get there, perhaps we could start at page 403. This is the background.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would be kind enough to read out paragraph 2.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

Mr Baker, paragraph 2 reads as follows:

"Following a fatal traffic accident involving a franchised bus of the Kowloon Motor Bus ... at Tai Po Road on 10 February 2018, the Transport Department ... set up in mid-March 2018 a Working Group

on the Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses ..., which comprises members from all FB operators and the major bus manufacturers, to consider and study possible measures to further enhance bus safety. The scope of work of the working group covers the following major areas:

(a) to explore the technical feasibility, applicability and cost-effectiveness of, and any other issues relating to the installation of in-vehicle safety devices/technologies and seat belts on all seats of franchised buses; and

(b) to review the training arrangements adopted by the FB operators."

Over the page:

"So far, the working group has held three meetings since ... 2018; the technical group under the working group has also met five times. The findings and recommendations of the working group are set out in the ensuing paragraphs."

Amongst other matters, on in-vehicle safety devices, which starts at paragraph 4, may I invite you to go to page 407, in relation to installation of seat belts on passenger seats. Paragraph 10 sums up the position:

"At present, all the exposed seats on franchised buses are installed with seat belts to prevent

passengers from falling out from the seats.

11. As confirmed with the bus manufacturers, it is technically feasible to supply all new buses with seat belts for all passenger seats conforming to ... international standards. In this regard, all FB operators have agreed that all passenger seats of all new buses ordered from July 2018 onwards will be installed with seat belts."

In relation to paragraph 12, it talks about the retrofitting of seat belts on all passenger seats of existing buses, and if we drop a few lines to line 6:

"In practice, retrofitting seat belts on passenger seats, in particular those on the lower deck, will involve substantial modification and reinforcement of the bus chassis, including reinforcement of the structure of the franchised buses, addition of support mountings, replacement of all seats by those with seat belts, as well as passing the pull tests of the seat belts and seats to confirm their compliance with the international standards ... Considering the above, the bus manufacturers have advised that it is technically impracticable, if not infeasible, to retrofit seat belts on all passenger seats of both upper and lower decks.

13. However, it should be more feasible to retrofit seat belts on all passenger seats of the upper deck only

in some vehicle models of the existing double-deck fleet."

At paragraph 14:

"... the working group considers that time and manpower resources are critical. The bus manufacturers do not have the required labour and workshop facilities ... to conduct the retrofit work."

If we look through, ultimately, at the bottom:

"Some bus operators have expressed concerns that the retrofitting of seat belts would not only incur significant financial implication, but also considerable time and manpower resources, not to mention the need to re-deploy or procure additional buses to maintain the existing bus service level during the whole process."

If we look at paragraph 16, the working group has arrived at the following recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get to the recommendations, perhaps we could go through such review as appears to have been taken of overseas practices.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. If we continue to look at paragraph 15:

"The working group has reviewed the prevailing overseas practices or requirements on the installation and wearing of seat belts on buses. Currently, for inter-cities or cross-[border] routes, some overseas

jurisdictions (for example United States, United Kingdom and Netherlands) have mandated the provision of seat belts for all passenger seats, while others (for example UK, Netherlands, and Australia (Victoria)) have imposed mandatory requirement of wearing seat belts. Nevertheless, for buses serving urban routes buses or buses allowed to carry standing passengers, none of the overseas jurisdictions that the working group has reviewed thus far have statutory requirements for the provision of seat belts on passenger seats. According to the transport authorities of those jurisdictions, the urban buses are typically used for short journeys, in terms of both time and distance, and undertaken at moderate speeds on urban routes. Thus, no seat belt requirement at passenger seats on these urban [routes] has been imposed."

It also contained a summary of the findings at annex B, but --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could turn to that. That's at page 415.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You will see the range of countries that are encompassed in this statement, that in none of these jurisdictions are seat belts required for urban bus routes or where buses carry standing passengers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, Mr Baker, before I go to the recommendations, the findings from the overseas practices seem to suggest there is no point of having seat belts installed where there are standing passengers, because you can't give seat belts to standing passengers, and those are the people that are prone to injuries when there is a sudden braking or sudden stopping, in those type of injuries. That's the first point.

The second point is, in terms of urban routes, where the travel speed is generally within acceptable range, so it appears it is not as dangerous as highways, expressways or cross-border routes where generally you have a higher speed limit, to the tune of 70km per hour or above.

What is your comment in relation to the usefulness or effectiveness of seat belts on urban buses that run urban routes?

CHAIRMAN: I think, before the chief superintendent is invited to respond to such a general question, there is a third factor that is identified in paragraph 15, and it is this. It is not only that typically, as one would expect, in an urban bus route, the speeds are more moderate, but also these involve short journeys, both in terms of time and distance. That of course is a factor

that's relevant to the time in which a passenger has to put a seat belt on and his assessment of whether or not it is worth doing.

You have been invited to indicate whether or not you have any view. Do you have any view?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I do, sir. From a police and road safety perspective, the police believe that seat belts save lives. If we are to look at the Transport Department web page, it states that wearing a seat belt can reduce the chance of death or serious injury by about a half, and it also says that seat belts are very effective at reducing the effects of traffic accidents occurring at quite low speeds.

Now, speaking purely from a road safety perspective, we would encourage the use of seat belts as widely as possible.

I would also like to observe that public light buses are fitted with seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: We have received evidence that suggests that they are to be categorised differently from franchised buses. Broadly speaking, the difference suggested is those that wish to go racing to their destination get on a PLB; those who are more content to arrive alive go on a franchised bus.

Are you aware of the circumstances in which seat

belts were mandated for PLBs?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No, sir.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I go on, in relation to this PLB situation, I think that was a topic covered in the Audit Commission report, review, in that paper, as to the situation of seat belts worn by PLB passengers.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get involved in that detail, in view of your answer -- a statement that is clearly generally accepted worldwide -- that seat belts save lives, nevertheless, in the safety-conscious jurisdictions listed in annex B, the United Kingdom, Netherlands, Australia in the state of Victoria, New Zealand, Canada, Singapore, none of them have found it appropriate to require them to be installed on urban buses.

With that as a background, what view, if any, do you have about not only their provision on franchised buses, mandated provision -- what view do you have about the requirement, if it was decided to have one, that they be worn, and then the issue that arises of enforceability?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I think that passengers should have an option to enable them to travel as safely as possible, that if seat belts are not fitted then that option is denied, and that as to the enforcement aspect, it can be seen from personal experience that most people don't use seat belts on public light buses, and we can

expect the same thing on franchised buses, for the reasons that have been discussed: convenience, short journeys, things like that.

So enforcement will be an issue, and I don't think the police would be able to regularly enforce such regulations, if they existed. But at the moment they do not for franchised buses.

CHAIRMAN: But they do for PLBs.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: They do, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And what is the ease with which that is enforced or the difficulty?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is difficult to enforce, and it is not enforced regularly. I would say it is enforced occasionally, when officers decide to take enforcement as a road safety issue. There is always more than one aspect to road safety -- publicity -- but it is also coupled with enforcement from time to time.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in -- forgive me, you were going to carry on.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I was going to add that we hope that people won't obey the law only because they feel they might be prosecuted for it, for not following the law. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It took a long time to persuade people when they had a choice that they should wear seat belts in cars.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir. But going back to my earlier comment, in our view, it is better if people have the option to improve their own road safety, as a matter of choice.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Just a quick question on the seat belt. Using the experience you have on the PLB, how successful has the police force been on enforcement?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I don't have enforcement figures, but, like I say, I would hope that people would follow the law because it was good for them rather than because they would be prosecuted if they didn't.

CHAIRMAN: But, as you said earlier, most people don't wear them on PLBs, enforcement is difficult, and one can see why, and you would expect that same trend to obtain with buses?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Maybe just to wrap this up before we break -- in general, you make a general statement that seat belts save lives. I am asking from the perspective of cost/benefit analysis. Does the police have any empirical data or analysis as to the accuracy of the statement that you made, in the context of urban buses with standees?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I don't understand that question.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Whether they have conducted analysis on standing passengers, of the number of standing passengers that are injured as a result of accidents due to lack of seat belts, or have you conducted any analysis in terms of comparisons of passengers losing balance, in percentage, as to whether they are attributable to the lack of seat belts?

CHAIRMAN: By its nature, a standee cannot be provided with a seat belt.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

So, in that regard, would you have statistics or figures?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We do not.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I see the time.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the real question would be this, the more useful one: do you have any statistics about people who are injured while seated on a bus, not wearing a seat belt? The bus company figures suggest that that number of passengers is very low, 1 per cent of the injuries, something like that, 1 to 2 per cent. Do the police have any such figures?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I am not aware of any statistics, but I can search later, if you would wish me to.

CHAIRMAN: This would perhaps be most obvious, and I think unfortunately recently there has been an accident like

this, where somebody sitting in a vulnerable seat is projected out of that seat and impacts on something hard and either a serious or I think in this case a fatal injury incurs, so that would give rise to an opportunity for someone, if there was a template that said, "Seat belt not worn but would likely have been beneficial", in the general way that seat belts are. So perhaps you could see if there has been any attempt at analysing that.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I will do, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Baker. If I may go through the recommendations before we break.

In paragraph 16 of the TD Paper at page 409, the working group arrived at the following recommendations:

"(a) seat belts should be provided for all seats in future procurement of new buses; and.

(b) subject to further assessment on the technical, operational and financial feasibility, consideration may be given to retrofitting all seats in the upper deck with seat belts on buses deployed for specific bus routes, ie long-haul routes which are operated via expressways with relatively fewer bus stops."

But the Transport Department will require the

franchised bus operators to explore in more details in conjunction with the bus manufacturers on this aspect.

So the suggestion or recommendation is for all new buses that would be fitted with seats, but for existing buses, they would only be retrofitted subject to financial considerations, and even so, it would only be supplied to limited seats on the upper deck -- sorry, upper deck, with seat belts on specific bus routes, like long-haul routes with fewer stops, and on highways.

Do you have any comments in relation to the recommendations?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I think the recommendations are positive, but like I said, from the point of view of road safety, we would encourage the use of seat belts as widely as possible, although the recommendations are a step in the right direction.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong. Is that a convenient moment?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to take a morning break for 20 minutes now, and we will resume in 20 minutes' time.

(11.33 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.53 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just to wrap up the seat belt issue, may I take you to one statement made by the Hong Kong Police in your submission to the committee dated 7 May 2018. That's in the miscellaneous bundle, page 124-1.

If we go over to page 124-2, at the top of the paragraph, if you look at the three lines in paragraph 3:

"The absence of seat belts in most franchised buses and standing passengers may also contribute to passengers sustaining injury and therefore causing a reportable accident."

Can I just confirm, this is a generalised statement rather than based on statistics, based on your answers before the break; is that correct?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, it is.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Moving on to another topic, on illegal parking. We have heard evidence from some of the franchised bus operators that in relation to the enforcement actions taken against illegal parking, especially at bus stops, appears to be ineffective.

Can I take you to some of the evidence. That's Mr William Chung of New World First Bus. That's in the TSCP bundle, page 731.

CHAIRMAN: What day was this evidence?

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be Day 4.

CHAIRMAN: Day 4 in the Augustinian calendar?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What day of the month was this?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 30 May 2018. It is in TSCP-2A bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

If you look at the top of the page, Mr William Chung's evidence -- have you got that, Mr Baker?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: (Nodded head).

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr William Chung said:

"In many bus stops, there is illegal parking, and these vehicles are getting in the way of the buses, in a way that they cannot pull up close to the kerb for loading and unloading."

If we scroll down to line 16, when Mr Duncan asked, "In what way?", Mr William Chung said:

"For instance, illegal parking would reduce the width of the road when the buses drive past. Because of the large size of the bus, it's likely to get into problem, and if the passengers cannot get on and off on the kerbside, there is a likelihood of them being hit by vehicles or they may fall over."

In terms of the effectiveness of the enforcement, Mr Duncan asked at line 23:

"... has the company endeavoured to overcome this problem?", and Mr William Chung said:

"We notified the Transport Department about the black spots of illegal parking. We hope that these sections, they will have 24-hour restricted zone. We also notified the police to do enforcement work.

Mr Duncan: Has that eradicated the problem?

Mr William Chung: It doesn't help much."

And the chairman also raised this question:

"Did it result in any action?"

Mr William Chung: The police would take action, but as soon as the police back is turned, then the illegal parking problem would recur. Say, for instance, in Causeway Bay, Yee Wo Street, near SOGO, outside SOGO, in fact, this is a problem that occurs very often."

We also have evidence from trade unions; they complain that it took a very long time to communicate with the police in relation to the illegal parking problem.

May I ask, first of all, is illegal parking a problem that the police was aware of throughout the years --

CHAIRMAN: Specifically illegal parking in and around bus stops or --

MS MAGGIE WONG: In and around bus stops.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, it is a problem the police have been aware of. In fact, in 2017 we issued 4,510 prosecutions against people who parked their vehicles or stopped their vehicles in a bus stop.

I'm sorry, can you elaborate your question again, please.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a fixed penalty ticket?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. It's what we call a Pol. 570, which is a fixed penalty ticket.

CHAIRMAN: What does that cost the miscreant; $320, in 2017?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: $450.

CHAIRMAN: Now.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But then?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Also then.

So, yes, we are aware of illegal parking problems and the difficulties caused by persons who stop their vehicles in unauthorised places.

CHAIRMAN: Do any difficulties arise with enforcement because of the level of the penalty?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I believe the penalty hasn't been increased for many years, and so it has less of a deterrent effect than it used to have.

CHAIRMAN: As I remember it -- correct me if I am wrong -- the submission that the police made was that in order to

keep up with inflation, the then $320 ticket should be $800 or thereabouts. Is my memory more or less correct?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the resulting penalty that was agreed upon by government was $450?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's correct, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the complaints -- we have heard complaints from the trade unions. I'm going to refer you to some extracts. But the main complaint is -- they complained the police have failed to enforce the law in relation to the illegal parking near bus stops, and that has been a recurring problem.

They also raised questions about the lack of manpower that the police put in tackling or taking enforcement action against illegal parking.

They also stated that, since 2017, although the police figures suggest they have stepped up enforcement, they don't see any significant improvement.

In relation to this aspect, about failing to enforce the law, what do you say or what is your response to that suggestion?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Well, we enforce the law to the best of our ability. Taking enforcement action at bus stops, whilst it is important, may not be the greatest of our

priorities at any particular time. For example, the public are complaining about vehicle obstruction and illegal parking at many places, including places where it causes traffic jams, whilst we have increased our enforcement against illegal parking and vehicle obstruction related offences, from the top of my head, by about 40 per cent in the last year.

I would also say that approximately 30 per cent of the calls received by frontline officers are related to vehicle obstruction or illegal parking. So the police have made, and are making, their best efforts against illegal parking and vehicle obstruction.

If Ms Yau could add a point as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do, Chief Superintendent.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Apart from stepping up law enforcement, we also do something in terms of public education. In 2018, in our police call programme, we particularly raised the issue of illegal parking at bus stops, to alert the public.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

We have seen from the recent news reports that the police, since 1 August this year, have launched a six-month crack-down on vehicles in congested black spots, and they include problems brought on by loading

and unloading goods in restricted zones, private cars halting in areas meant for stop by buses, minibuses and taxis, illegal entries into box junctions and inappropriate U turns.

It is stated that in order to step up the measures, these five offences now carry a fine of $400, while picking up or setting down passengers in restricted areas carries a max penalty of $560.

May I ask this question. About the selection of these black spots, on what basis did the police choose these black spots?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The police have the ability, through their case management information system, to identify the locations where the greatest number of traffic complaints are received. That's one factor.

Another factor is complaints made directly to the police station made by members of the public, either by telephone or by letter. And so, at a local level, it is possible for frontline commanders to identify the congestion black spots, and to share that information with their regional command and with the headquarters command.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, following your answers, would some of these complaints come from trade unions or franchised bus operators?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We have a mechanism for liaison with trade unions and with the franchised bus companies, but I would say that the greater part if not almost the whole part is based on the statistics of complaint from the public, with additional input from the bus companies and the unions.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The news report mentioned about the trial -- it is a trial run -- it will roll out cameras with a city-wide two-month pilot, in Kowloon East and New Territories North, between December last year and January, and it stated that the initial scheme had been satisfactory, with $540 fixed penalty tickets.

About the installation of cameras, where would you normally install these cameras?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The pilot scheme that you have referred to, which was conducted in December last year and January this year, involved the use of officers using a Handycam rather than a fixed-site camera.

CHAIRMAN: Isn't that an expensive way of enforcing traffic infractions, manpower?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We began the trial in an effort to reduce the amount of manpower that was used to enforce these kinds of offences. The trial focused on moving-traffic offences which caused vehicle obstruction, for example, setting down passengers or goods in restricted zones.

Normally, to enforce this kind of offence, take this kind of enforcement action, the officer would have to intercept the vehicle at the scene or, as is what very often happens, the vehicle drives away then officers would mount a pre-planned snap-check or roadblock nearby, or an officer on a motorcycle would follow the vehicle and stop the vehicle. Therefore, because of this requirement, this necessity, more manpower would be required for this kind of operation.

The aim of the pilot and the subsequent trial is to enable two officers, one using the video camera, the other making notes of what he saw, to take enforcement action without intercepting the vehicle, and therefore the manpower requirement for the interception, either by following the vehicle on a motorcycle or by arranging a roadblock nearby, is done away with.

So it was an attempt to increase the efficiency of the enforcement.

CHAIRMAN: Has thought been given to just using cameras, taking the man on his motorbike out of it, the camera captures the infraction, it has the number plate, it has the location, it has the length of time that the vehicle has been breaking the law; you then track the registered owner from the number on the car?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's what the trial is doing, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Without men being involved is what I'm suggesting.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I see.

CHAIRMAN: Automatic cameras.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is something that we are looking at in the longer term.

CHAIRMAN: That is something that is used widely in London, is it not?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And it's used elsewhere -- Singapore?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, it is, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Why are we not using it here?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would say that was a policy issue, sir, that is now being addressed.

CHAIRMAN: Is it a question of funding being made available?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I don't think it's a matter of funding, but it is a matter of policy support.

CHAIRMAN: Can I come back to my first question which is this: using policemen, the man himself, the police officer, to enforce traffic violations, is expensive, is it not, compared with technology?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It is, sir, yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has thought been given to installing cameras or CCTV on the bus stop or location near the bus stop?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Perhaps I could ask Ms Yau to answer these questions.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Chief Superintendent.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The use of CCTV at bus stops, for the purpose of law enforcement, is being tried out in a pilot. This is something from the Development Bureau and the Transport and Housing Bureau. This is under the Energising Kowloon East Office of the Development Bureau. They have a conceptual pilot. In Kowloon East, some fixed cameras are installed there. In the first phase, the cameras would target moving offences, vehicles in motion. The second phase would be on illegal parking cases.

This is ongoing. In August, we issued the tenders. In the coming 24 months, we would look into how this might take the place of enforcement by officers. If it proves to be a mature technology, then the police will further consider how the findings can be adopted by the police to take the place of enforcement by officers physically.

CHAIRMAN: This is a mature technology. It is used widely in major cities. There is nothing immature about it.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Currently, we are trying to get the computer to use video analytics to take the image of a vehicle and how it constitutes illegal

parking.

I would also like to add that in relation to laws against illegal parking, we are required to give the fixed penalty ticket to the driver or attach it to the screen, windscreen, of the vehicle, there and then. If we use electronic ticketing or use CCTV image and then issue a ticket, under current legislation, we are unable to do it.

CHAIRMAN: You can't issue the ticket to the registered driver by using a camera to identify the number plate and then match it with the registered driver's particulars?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) If it is, for illegal parking, that cannot be done. However, with regard to driving offences, yes, that can be done.

CHAIRMAN: What is required for illegal parking; that a ticket be put on the car itself?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, the front of the car, or give it to the driver.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that needs to change, doesn't it, in order to catch up with technology that's been available for ten years?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We are aware that the THB has started work in legislative amendments.

CHAIRMAN: It's a lot easier to amend legislation by

deleting things.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. About this conceptual scheme, can you tell us when did you have this idea with the Development Bureau, in developing this technology? When was that?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In April 2017, the police, under Energising Kowloon East Office, was invited to give comment. Our view was to tell the contractor as to what constitutes a traffic offence.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have minutes of the meeting in relation to the development of the scheme with the Development Bureau?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) There may be some material, but I have to go back to find it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you be happy to provide us if you can find it?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In relation to this point, I understand that the police have been using automatic number plate recognition system, that is ANPR, since 2015; is that correct?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I can't recall the year, but yes, we have been using it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I think it is stated in one of the LegCo papers, a recent LegCo paper, placed before the

Legislative Council Panel on Security, Law Enforcement Against Moving Traffic Offences, in April 2018.

It is a paper compiled by the Transport and Housing Bureau, Security Bureau and Hong Kong Police Force. The heading is, "Legislative Council Panel on Security, Law Enforcement Against Moving Traffic Offences".

CHAIRMAN: Is there a reference in the bundle to this material?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No, Mr Chairman. This is newly added this morning.

We can see at paragraph 2, "Background":

"The police have been fulfilling their duties to safeguard the safety of the public through different means. One of the police's operational priorities is to ensure road safety and reduce traffic accidents."

Then, jumping a few lines:

"The police have been adopting a multipronged approach to promote road safety, combat moving traffic offences, and launch publicity activities and educate the public and drivers to comply with road [safety] regulations."

If we go to paragraph 7, it is in this context that there were suggestions about law enforcement action against the moving traffic offences. We can see the use of technology -- it is stated there:

"At present, there are 195 red light cameras and 24 speed enforcement cameras operating at 130 camera housing locations across the territory. Evidence collected from the cameras allows the police to subsequently identify the concerned vehicles and initiate prosecution without the need to intercept an offending vehicle, thereby effectively improving road safety. The police have been using the automatic number plate recognition ... system since 2015. The system enables traffic enforcement officers to detect relevant traffic contraventions, including those involving expired vehicle licences, registered vehicle owners driving while disqualified or having traffic arrest warrants."

May I ask about this automatic number plate recognition system. It appears this is a system also originating from London or England; is that correct?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Could I help with this part of the question --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, thank you.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: -- the ANPR part.

A trial was conducted on the use of automatic number plate recognition, beginning in 2013, and it was conducted on a very limited basis. It involved a roadside-mounted camera, which was linked to data

provided by the Transport Department concerning vehicles that were registered to persons who had an outstanding traffic arrest warrant. This enabled the officers using the equipment to identify such vehicles, and the vehicle would then be intercepted either at a roadblock or by following the offender's vehicle on a motorcycle, in order that prosecution action would be taken.

So it was used in that very limited context, as a trial.

Steps are now being taken to widen the use of automatic number plate recognition, and to widen the number of offences that can be linked to the database which is provided by the Transport Department.

We are in the process of identifying equipment which can be placed inside police vehicles, selected police vehicles, which can patrol on the highways, and surface such vehicles linked to persons wanted for criminal offences, vehicles that are wanted, vehicles that are registered to persons who have an outstanding traffic warrant.

That is the limited context in which ANPR has been used and is intended to be used. So it is a little bit -- the context of paragraph 7 doesn't give an accurate picture of what is going on.

CHAIRMAN: So it is limited to trying to detect people who

are already wanted?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir.

CHAIRMAN: It is not aimed at detecting people who commit moving offences generally?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why not the latter?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: There is another system which is used in police vehicles, which can record using video people committing traffic offences on the roads. But these systems all involve police officers operating them. They are not automated systems, which are envisaged at some time in the future, as Ms Yau has said, using video analytics, and so on and so forth.

CHAIRMAN: What about the use of the equivalent of what they use in London at yellow-box junctions?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That is also linked to video analytics.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Which is something we don't have yet, sir.

CHAIRMAN: But they have had it in London for ten years.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I know, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: In fact, they have been so successful that millions of pounds were raised in the penalties people had to pay.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. The installation of such equipment

in Hong Kong is not simply a police matter. It involves other government departments and policy-level decisions.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it obviously has data privacy connotations as well.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: It does, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Balanced against breaking the law.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir.

MS YAU SIN MAN: May I supplement a bit on the yellow-box junction involvement?

(Via interpreter) In September 2015, the THB started a study on yellow box enforcement camera system, and in April 2016, because of lack of financial backing, the study came to a stop.

CHAIRMAN: Who was providing the money?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The THB could not come up with funding support.

CHAIRMAN: This is a matter dealt with in Chief Superintendent Cadman's letter of August 2018, is it not?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Could we have that on the screen? I don't have the paginated bundle.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be 124-538 of the miscellaneous bundle.

CHAIRMAN: The page number again?

MS MAGGIE WONG: The letter starts at page 124-538.

And the paragraph Ms Yau mentioned is in paragraph 4 at page 124-539.

Maybe I will read that for the record.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you would.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In paragraph 4, you stated there:

"In respect of the yellow-box junction enforcement, in September 2015 THB convened a study with police to explore whether the yellow box enforcement camera system is technically, financially and legally feasible in Hong Kong. Since then, Hong Kong Police had tried to identify suitable products that could fit the context of Hong Kong. However, in April 2016 the study came to a halt as there was no funding support to engage a consultancy study. That said, the matter is now being actively considered, along with other types of enforcement cameras in the aforementioned interdepartmental forum."

Now, Ms Yau, it stated there that the matter is now being actively considered. What triggered a halt to an active consideration of the matter?

CHAIRMAN: They ran out of money, I think we are being told, or rather money was not forthcoming. I don't think anyone has accused this government of running out of money. It's the use of the money that's the issue, is

it not?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In the THB, together with the police and the Transport Department, there are regular meetings, and we have presented many general plans on how to use technology to enforce the traffic laws, including yellow-box junction enforcement.

CHAIRMAN: When was the scheme revived or at least consideration of reviving the scheme revived?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In February 2018, we had some meetings on e-enforcement. The issue of e-enforcement was brought up for discussion.

CHAIRMAN: E-enforcement is your shorthand for electronic enforcement of traffic violations?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Correct.

CHAIRMAN: You detect the malefactor, you identify him through the number plate to the registered owner, and you send him an e-ticket; is that it?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Simply put, that's it.

CHAIRMAN: And for how long have we been pursuing trying to do this?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) If we are talking about e-tickets, we started to raise this possibility in 2012. The meetings that we are now having are to tie in with the Smart City initiative of the government. We hope that in traffic law enforcement that more technology

should be adopted.

CHAIRMAN: So we have taken six years and we are no further along the road; is that it?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We are actively doing something about it.

CHAIRMAN: Smart City, you say?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The general traffic law enforcement will be considered in the context of the general direction adopted by the SAR government.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Ms Yau, you mentioned that in February 2018, you had some meetings on e-enforcement. What triggered this meeting to consider the issues of electronic enforcement?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) It is mainly because of the Smart City initiative formulated by the government, and that's why we had some meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was this after the Tai Po accident on 10 February 2018?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So you are saying it was before, the meeting was held before?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, we had the meeting with the THB, but it is not because of the accident.

CHAIRMAN: That's a separate question. The question is was

it before or after. Whether it was on account of is another matter.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The meeting was prepared before February.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, you stated in that paragraph that it involved interdepartmental forum about these enforcement cameras. What are the departments concerned?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The THB, the police and the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I understand correctly that this yellow-box junction enforcement is now revived as a discussion in tackling the illegal parking problem?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) This is just a part of it. In the meeting, we talk about generally the adoption of technology to take the place of manpower in traffic law enforcement.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the ANPR system? Has that been discussed as one of the systems that could be utilised to tackle illegal parking problem?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Not particularly mentioned. ANPR was not particularly mentioned.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have heard some recommendations from the trade unions, bus companies, and some of the LegCo papers, making some recommendations as to how to tackle

this illegal parking problem.

In summary, there are five recommendations. May I ask you about each one of them? The first is we have seen, in one of the answers given by William Chung of New World Citybus, that there be a 24-hour restriction zone. What is your view on this or what is the police department's view on this?

CHAIRMAN: 24-hour restriction zone of what, where, for what purpose?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 24-hour restriction zone in relation to year the bus stop, to tackle -- to identify the cars that have illegally parked near the bus station. That's what I understood William Chung's evidence to be.

CHAIRMAN: That, in addition to the bus stop, there should be a zone before and after --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- the bus stop, where parking was prohibited, 24 hours a day?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you to the secretariat who have pulled up the screen the suggestions at the top:

"We hope that [these black spots] of illegal parking these sections, they will have 24-hour restricted zone. We also notify the police to do enforcement work."

So it is in that context that I raise this recommendation. So what is your view on this?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We believe that 24-hour restricted zones can be helpful, but the setting of restricted zone is under the ambit of the Transport Department. We need their collaboration.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It mentioned here that they notified the police to do this enforcement work. Do you have any recollection that this 24-hour restricted zone has been raised with the police by franchised bus operators?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) It is not very clearly raised in writing, according to my recollection. I may have to check when I go back.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have any recollection of this matter ever being raised in your meetings with the Transport Department?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In our meetings with representatives of the Transport Department and franchised bus operators, they did mention illegal parking causing obstruction to bus operation, yes, it was raised.

When we received the message from them, we also disseminated the same to different police regions and formations so that they could take necessary action.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second suggestion they made is signage

at bus stop, putting signage at bus stop, that that section where the bus stop is is not allowed to have any illegal parking.

We have seen some photographs in one of the documents provided by Kowloon Motor Bus. That's at bundle 12A, page 5174. It's actually from 5173 to 5174. We can see, in Chinese characters, "Illegal parking strictly prohibited" in the green box, we see in the photo.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I have never seen this sign previously. Actually, all signs on the road have to be approved by the Transport Department. I don't know whether this is something prepared by the bus operator or it has been approved by the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Leaving aside the permission question, can you tell us whether that sort of signage posted at bus stops would assist the enforcement or would assist public's awareness of combatting the problem of illegal parking?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, such signs of course can be good reminders, but are they good enough to prevent illegal parking? I don't know how effective they are going to be.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any problem with ignorance, people not

understanding that you can't park your car in the middle of a bus stop? Is that a problem or not?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I know the public know that they cannot park their cars at any bus stop. But they may think it is okay to stop for a short while. So we need to do some public education.

CHAIRMAN: So the real issue is that they take a chance about breaking the law?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: And that's where enforcement is required, so the chance becomes too expensive?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Certainly.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, the third recommendation they made is having double yellow lines around the bus stop area.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean the approach and the exit from the bus stop?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, correct, the approach and exit.

How do you find that suggestion?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) This is just the same as the previous recommendation. We believe it is useful. No parking zone, it is good for preventing illegal parking. But I think the Transport Department has to do something about the road signs.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has that been raised with the Transport Department, as far as you know?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) But there is no record in the Traffic Branch Headquarters that this was raised, but the regions also have their own traffic formations and they would liaise with the local Transport Department officers on road signs, signage, and yellow lines. They have discussions separately.

CHAIRMAN: Is it currently the practice to have double yellow lines in the approach to a bus stop and the exit from a bus stop or not?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Usually, you find that.

CHAIRMAN: So the issue really is one of enforcement, because, again, everyone knows what a double yellow line is?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's right.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The fourth suggestion we have explored is by deployment of technology such as CCTV and the video cameras as you have mentioned earlier on.

The fifth recommendation is a suggestion that we may consider the practice in Singapore of having cameras installed next to the driver's seat, and all the driver needs to do is to press the button whenever he saw there is illegal parking.

CHAIRMAN: At a bus stop?

MS MAGGIE WONG: At a bus stop.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, pray in aid the use of people who

are inconvenienced by this illegal parking, get them to help.

And your question, Ms Wong?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is, first of all, what do you think about this suggestion? Because they are the complainants and they have cameras already installed on the buses; all they need to do is press a button and pass the footage to the Transport Department. And the suggestion is to simply invite them to assist in the enforcement of the law. How do you find that suggestion?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) There are two parts. If it is moving traffic offences, if we have footage from bus companies, and if we get the assistance of bus drivers in the investigation, we can fine the driver, we can fine the owner of the vehicle, to enforce the law.

However, if it is a parking offence, illegal parking, then, as I said, there are some legal restrictions; we need to issue the ticket there and then.

So it depends on the nature of the offence.

CHAIRMAN: Could you help me with the reference to the legislation which provides, as I understand your evidence, that a non-moving infraction, a parking offence, requires the ticket to be either affixed to the

windscreen or given to the driver? What is that legislative provision?

Perhaps one of your colleagues can look it up and come back to it later.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes. It's Cap 237. I am trying to find the provision.

CHAIRMAN: What's the name of the ordinance?

MS YAU SIN MAN: Fixed Penalty (Traffic Contraventions) Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

As I say, we can come back to this later.

MS YAU SIN MAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But it clearly is an impediment to the efficient enforcement of law.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Chinese words not interpreted).

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Ms Yau, we are moving on to another topic. It is on assaults on bus captains.

We have heard evidence again on the enforcement of assaults on bus captains by the police. There have been complaints that the police did not appear to have given these cases a high priority. We have been provided with a list of assaults by the Kowloon Motor Bus for the period of 1 January 2015 to 22 July 2018.

If we can pull up on the screen KMB-1, page 212. This is a letter from KMB, setting out the statistics of

the alleged assaults on bus captains reported to KMB from 1 January 2015 to "to date", that is 26 July 2018; and also details of five specific alleged assaults.

One of the issues they raised is -- if we can look at the table, there are 41 cases, and out of these 41 incidents we can see very few resulted in any prosecution or meaningful result. Only two cases we can see at items 162 and 164, at page 216. And most of these cases we see are settled or with verbal warning or not pursued by the police.

Can I ask your view on this matter: first of all, their comments that the police seemed to not give priority to these sorts of cases, when it touches on assaults on bus captains?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I would ask my colleague from the Traffic Branch Headquarters as well as those from the Crime Wing to answer.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) In relation to the 180 cases submitted by KMB -- well, after we received the information, we liaised with KMB to ask for information.

Out of 188 cases, we have successfully found the facts of the case as well as the result of 182 cases. Out of the 182 cases, 131 of them are assault on bus captains by passengers when the bus captains were working. 99 cases were successfully detected. Out of

the 99 cases, 83 cases resulted in prosecution and the cases were brought to court. 47 of them did not result in prosecution.

CHAIRMAN: There would be no further action?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I agree, right, no further action.

CHAIRMAN: And, of the 83 prosecutions, how many convictions resulted?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Of the 83 prosecution cases, 73[sic] of them resulted in convictions.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have statistics of pleas of guilty and pleas of not guilty, constituting that figure of 73?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) For the 75 convicted cases, there are different penalties.

CHAIRMAN: No. The question was: how many pleaded guilty, and how many were found guilty?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We don't have the numbers.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Have you completed your answer, Mr Lee?

MR LEE TAI WAI: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Apart from the increase of assault incidents --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Ms Wong -- do you have this information available in written form? Just as KMB

provided us with their analysis, the 188 figure, do you have a table in which you analysed it, from which you appear to be reading?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes, we have the information in writing.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide that to us in due course?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Perhaps I stopped you prematurely. You wanted to tell us about the penalties. How did you analyse the penalties?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Of the 75 conviction cases, 15 of them were imprisonment or a suspended sentence.

CHAIRMAN: How many were actual imprisonment as opposed to suspended imprisonment?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I don't have the information in this regard.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) And in relation to bound over, 22 cases; social service order, 16 cases; fine, 18 cases.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have the range of fines, maximum, minimum?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) No. And there are four cases of the probation order.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have the offences for which these persons were convicted?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Of all the cases I have mentioned, there are four types: wounding ...

CHAIRMAN: You are speaking now to the convictions, or generally?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Generally.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, wounding ...

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The second one is AOABH, assault occasioning actual bodily harm. The third one is common assault. The fourth one is fighting in a public place.

CHAIRMAN: Is wounding confined to section 19 offences?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Section 17 and section 19.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just on this last topic, fighting in public place, we have heard from some of the representations of the trade unions that they raise objection to this offence being made against the bus driver as well, in terms of fighting in public place, and they made two reasons. One is they are the drivers who are supposed to enforce the law based on Cap 230A, in terms of the enforcement of safety, or bus safety. And the second is the legislation or the enforcement should protect the

bus driver against assaults.

What do you say about those two complaints in relation to the charge of fighting in public place?

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, you say that the charge wouldn't have been brought unless it was appropriate. Would that be the answer?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) In relation to complaints made by bus captains about assault, every case is different. There are different factors. Under Cap 230A, bus captains have certain power to deal with misbehaving or law-breaking passengers. So bus captains are protected by laws, in relation to those cases under common assault or AOABH.

MR CHEUNG TIN LOK: (Via interpreter) Maybe I should supplement. The counsel asked whether, in some cases, the bus company may be of the view that the police have dealt with bus captain assault cases in a way different from what they would expect or we do not attach importance to such cases.

I want to say that is irrespective of the status, nationality, profession of the parties concerned, every case is dealt with in an equal manner.

Our colleague has referred to the information that we can provide in relation to the 188 cases referred to by the KMB. We have been able to tell you the number of

detected cases, the number of prosecutions and the number of convictions. Compared with cases of similar nature, the relevant prosecutions and convictions are relatively higher.

So we do not think that in the case of assault on bus captain cases, the police have tried to downplay the importance. I have to stress again that in handling cases of assaulting bus captains, we have adopted a very even-handed and serious attitude.

In the investigation, we deal with the cases in an even-handed manner, and if there is sufficient evidence to support a prosecution, we would proceed with prosecution, but that would depend on the case in question. If necessary, we also seek advice from the Department of Justice.

The counsel has particularly referred to the offence of fighting in a public place. What I want to say is that when we receive a report and our officer would come to the scene to investigate, we will have to classify the case according to the findings of the investigation. Of course, the parties concerned might insist on their side of the story, but the police would certainly make an assessment and come to a conclusion on the charges to be laid on one or both parties. It could be that we would only prosecute one of them, but if the evidence

shows that fighting actually took place, then we would lay the appropriate charge against the relevant party.

It is not just a decision made by the police --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for cutting you off, Superintendent Cheung. So my original suggestion was that if they are charged, it is appropriate to do so?

MR CHEUNG TIN LOK: (Chinese words not interpreted).

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Very well. We have now gone past 1 o'clock so we will take a lunch break now and resume again this afternoon at 2.30. Thank you.

(1.06 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Good afternoon.

Ms Yau, before the break, you were looking for a section in Cap 237 in relation to the issue that the fixed penalty ticket has to be served personally on the driver or fixed on the vehicle.

Have you been able to locate the section?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, we have located it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that section 15?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, subsection 15(2).

MS MAGGIE WONG: For the purposes of reading into the

record, may I read that out. I think I should read subsection (1) as well.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MS MAGGIE WONG: "If a police officer has reasonable cause to believe that a contravention is being or has been committed, he may give the registered owner of the vehicle concerned or, where section 3(2) applies, the driver liable an opportunity to discharge his liability in respect of that contravention by payment of a fixed penalty.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1) notice in the prescribed form shall be delivered personally to the person in charge of the vehicle or fixed on the vehicle:

Provided that the operation of this section or section 16 shall not be affected by a failure to comply with this subsection."

Ms Yau, is that the section you refer to that requires personal service?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Indeed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But it appears from the proviso or the "provided" part that a failure to comply with this subsection would not be affected in terms of the contravention of section 15(1).

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, I note that.

In relation to 15, we have consulted the advice of

the DoJ, but I haven't got the advice with me now. The advice was saying that the notice has to be fixed to the vehicle or served to the driver.

CHAIRMAN: If that advice was correct, for argument's sake, the legislative amendment would be simply to delete section 15(2), would it not?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: As I recall from the draft drafting instruction, my Lord, it's not to delete it. It is to add the facility to enable remote ticketing.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but deleting it would have the same effect, then service would be at large.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I bow to your ...

CHAIRMAN: But, either way, the point really is this: this can be solved very quickly, either with a blue pencil, which is how words are struck out, or with a red one, inserting them?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We shall reflect your comments, sir.

CHAIRMAN: What we are encumbered with is legislation that is 35 years old, 30-plus years old.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: That's right, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Computers have come a long way, technology has come a long way, since then. This legislation wasn't written for the technology that obtains now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, earlier on you mentioned before the break that there are, out of 188 cases provided by

Kowloon Motor Bus, 47 cases in which there were no prosecutions.

Can you let us know what is the common factor which led to this non-prosecution?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) There were 47 cases where prosecution could not be pursued. For 22 cases, we could not identify or locate the suspect or the assaulter. For 16 cases, the victims did not pursue the cases, so the cases ended. For the other six cases, insufficient evidence -- ineptitude, insufficient evidence, and the cases were closed after advice by DoJ. Another case is still under investigation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, the real question I would like to ask is -- we have heard evidence from the Kowloon Motor Bus that they prefer to use Cap 230A --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on from that -- these cases where you couldn't identify the assailant, how useful or otherwise is the fact that people pay to be on buses with an Octopus card which contains, perhaps, personal details? How useful is that in identifying an assailant?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) In trying to find the assailant -- now, for those who paid by means of Octopus card, that of course would be useful. But very often Octopus card users might not be using a personalised

card and therefore there won't be sufficient evidence to identify the persons. But if everyone is using personalised card, it will help us to identify the assailant.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Following on this Octopus card issue, I believe that there are two cases in particular that the Kowloon Motor Bus raised complaint that the police did not proactively collect information in relation to Octopus card records.

May I take you to a few documents on this issue. First of all, can you refer to KMB-1A, page 297. If we read -- I shall put this in context. There are two cases -- and I apologise for that -- if we go, first of all, to page 218 in the same bundle, 1A, there are five cases mentioned there. Have you got that?

It's case number 3 and case number 4. If we look at page 218-1, paragraph 2, it stated there -- it was a letter from the IRC to the Kowloon Motor Bus, dated 27 July 2018, in which enquiries were made that:

"... in respect of cases 3 and 4, reference was made to the preparation of a 'CCTV brief finding report' and that in respect of case 1, reference was made to the provision to the police of 'Octopus card records of the assailant'."

Then we asked for the provision of copies of the CCTV and Octopus card records. It was in this context that the Kowloon Motor Bus replied on 9 August 2018, at page 297. If you look under the heading, "Reply to your 27 July 2018 letter", paragraph 2, it stated there that:

"In respect of cases 3 and 4 referred to in the said letter, the CCTV brief finding reports prepared by the accident investigation and prevention team of our legal department are enclosed ... Please note that, as the respective defendants pleaded guilty, the CCTV videos/records were not used in the legal proceedings.

In respect of case 1 referred to in the said letter, by a letter dated 16 April ... the police requested us to provide the Octopus card records of the assailant and his ... companions who were the last three passengers on board the relevant bus at the material time. In or around end of April 2018, we had a telephone conversation with the police concerning the Octopus card records and informed them to collect our written reply."

During the oral evidence of Mr Patrick Pang, he said that the police never came to collect this Octopus card report.

If we also look at your reply in the miscellaneous bundle at page 124-537-1, I will just read out what you stated there.

Mr Lee, have you got that? Not yet.

MR LEE TAI WAI: Okay.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This is a reply from you to the committee, dated 7 August 2018. You stated there, in paragraph 3:

"For case 1 ... according to the record of Tin Shui Wai police division, it is confirmed that the police had not received any Octopus card records of the assailant from KMB despite a request was made to them to provide such information."

You identify the information that can be obtained from the use of an Octopus card, including the date and time of the transaction, the machine being used for the card, the transaction cost and the personal particulars of the card owner in the case of a personalised Octopus card was used.

Now, the complaint of the KMB is that they have the document in hand but the police did not come to collect it, and the document was hanging around in their office.

What is your answer to that?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we ought to go to the former chief superintendent, now Mr Pang's evidence.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Because the ball appeared to have been dropped between the two sides, and he undertook to pick the ball up.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may invite you to look at transcript Day 13, 10 August 2018, pages 108 to 109 of the transcript, transcript bundle 5.

If you look at page 108 first, at line 6, the question from the chairman was this:

"We understand that, because we have asked the police about the information that is obtainable.

In your letter, which I think is at page 297 of KMB-1, in the reply to this letter of request, the second paragraph, you refer to case 1 and you say this ...:

'In or around end of April 2018, we had a telephone conversation with the police concerning the Octopus card records and informed them to collect our written reply.'.

Were they collected? Try 'yes' or 'no' on that, if you can."

Then Mr Patrick Pang said:

"No, they didn't come and collect."

And if we go to page 109, still Mr Pang's evidence at line 9:

"We made a phone call to Tin Shui Wai district of the police; we asked them to come and collect the reply. But the police never came and the letter is still with us and the Octopus records are still with us."

So that's what happened. That's the evidence of Mr Patrick Pang --

CHAIRMAN: I think it culminated with Mr Pang agreeing that that was a silly state of affairs and that he would do something about it.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) With regard to the Tin Shui Wai case, we consulted the Tin Shui Wai division. According to their record, the information they gave us was that they did ask from the KMB the relevant information about Octopus, but then they sent the letter but they never got a written reply from KMB, and they did not say that they received any phone call telling them to go and collect the information.

This is what we got from the Tin Shui Wai division.

CHAIRMAN: This is a matter that we must pursue with Mr Pang and KMB.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Because it is a truly lamentable state of affairs that people involved who both have a mutual interest in an allegation being investigated and, if appropriate, a prosecution being mounted, have somehow managed not to achieve that, when the evidence apparently is available.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, you earlier mentioned that these cases, these 188 cases of KMB, there were four types of

charges, and in none of those charges do they relate to Cap 230A, and the evidence of KMB and the trade union is all spoken with one voice, and they stated that it may be easier to invoke Cap 230A with regard to passengers' behaviour, because it doesn't involve physical abuse or physical contact to constitute a breach, and in that regard it is easier to prosecute.

What is your view on this matter?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Let me try to answer the question first. Generally speaking, contraventions under Cap 230A always happen, and very often an incident may so develop that there is physical contact and then the police would arrive on the scene.

The most ideal situation is that before an incident deteriorates, the police can intervene and then we can put a stop to the incident or we can use an easier method to handle it, say, for example, to use any offences under Cap 230A. But very often, when the police arrive on the scene, there would be injuries and there would be physical contact already.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I mean, in fairness to you, I should show you a few documents in which I believe Ms Yau has replied to KMB on this issue, as to whether you would consider using Cap 230A in future.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps before you get to that we could have the

relevant part of Cap 230A on the screen, so we can be reminded about the ambit of that offence.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That would be at THB-2, page 132.

If we look at regulation 13A, and in particular regulation (1)(c), it stated there that -- it governed the general conduct of passengers and intending passengers, and if we roll up regulation 13, which provides that there is a power to remove passengers, and then regulation 13A(1) is the offence creating provision, that:

"No passenger or intending passenger shall:

(a) wilfully obstruct, impede or distract the driver of the bus or any authorised person;

(b) wilfully obstruct the driver's view of the road or any traffic;

(c) wilfully do or cause to be done with respect to any part of the bus or its equipment, anything which:

(i) obstructs or interferes with the workings of the bus or causes damage; or

(ii) causes injury, discomfort, annoyance or inconvenience to any other person ..."

And it will be an offence.

And regulation 25 provides that:

"Any person who without reasonable excuse contravenes any requirement ... under regulation 3(4) or

any of the provisions ... commits an offence."

And regulation 25(3) provides:

"Any person who without reasonable excuse contravenes ... section 13A ... commits an offence and is liable to a fine of $3,000 and to imprisonment for 6 months."

So the members of the trade union and the KMB consider this provision is effective in combatting physical assaults on bus captains by passengers. You don't need to prove actual assault in that regard; they consider it is easier to prosecute.

What is your response on that? I am coming to the point of referring you to some correspondence in which I believe Ms Yau did reply on this issue.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) With regard to invoking Cap 230A -- well, I agree we can prevent incidents from deteriorating, say, that would deteriorate into a fight where people would be injured, therefore we have always appealed to bus drivers to keep calm when there are passengers who contravene the law, and they should report to the police as soon as possible so the police can come on the scene and handle the situation, instead of disputing with the passenger and then enter into physical contact with the passenger. That is not ideal.

Therefore, Cap 230A is effective. If bus drivers

can keep calm and call the police to arrive on the scene, I am sure there will be fewer attack cases as a result.

But we have to look at each case and then we will look for the most appropriate offence for prosecution. If there is actual physical contact and if there is assault, I would think that we should go for the most appropriate offences in order to take our prosecution.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. So maybe to complete the picture, if Ms Yau can refer to KMB-1A, at page 286 in Chinese and 293 in English. It is a letter from KMB dated 8 March 2018.

The date has not been translated, Mr Chairman, in the English version, but it is dated 8 March 2018.

At page 293, the KMB stated there:

"In May last year, we wrote to the police expressing that our bus captains had been assaulted one after another. Upon considering the relevant cases, we found that certain offenders not only committed the offence of common assault but were ... likely to be in violation of section 13A(1)(c) ..."

And then he quoted the section.

"As such, our company had specifically sent our staff to the police station to provide evidence for the following cases, and requested that the Hong Kong Police

may prosecute the suspects in accordance with section 13A ..."

And they mention six cases there. Then, over the page, at 294, at the bottom:

"In this regard, we now earnestly request that the Hong Kong Police do, in future cases of assaults on bus captains, seriously consider charging the offenders under section 13A ... in addition to the charge of common assault. Our company will definitely cooperate with the Hong Kong Police to offer our assistance."

In this respect, Ms Yau replied on 17 May 2018, at page 296. The Chinese version is at page 288. You stated there, Ms Yau that:

"[Following] the follow-up action of the meeting with your company on 28 March, you are hereby notified that the division has notified the regions in writing to remind the frontline staff to be fair and professional when handling the cases of assault or harassment ... and shall understand the nature of the case and the injury of the injured to properly categorise the case and seriously consider whether Public Bus Services Regulations Cap 230A ... should apply."

So my question is this: has Cap 230A, regulation 13A, ever been invoked or used by the police to prosecute?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We looked up the records of the past few years. In 2016, we invoked 230A to issue penalty tickets to a bus passenger, just one case.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has that been used after your reply given to the KMB? Has that been used?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We looked at the records again. We did not use it this year.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Any reason why it was so rarely used?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I believe it would depend on the cases and the evidence on site, and also the facts of the case.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There is just one more matter. According to Mr Patrick Pang's evidence, Mr Patrick Pang of KMB, he stated there was a meeting on 28 March, in which the head of the legal department, himself and another colleague attended or met with the chief superintendent and his superintendent, and during that meeting the chief superintendent promised at the meeting that he would issue guidelines to the frontline policemen, to first allow them to seriously investigate into all alleged assaults, and he would remind his frontline staff to see whether there would be cases where Cap 230A could be applied for investigation and prosecution.

Has that been done?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes. On 10 May 2018,

Traffic Branch Headquarters issued an internal notice for all frontline staff, in dealing with cases of alleged assault against bus captains.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can we have a copy of this internal notice?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe we will have that through the secretariat.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a copy of it here today?

MS YAU SIN MAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Perhaps somebody would be kind enough to come forward and take the document. We will have it copied now.

May I have a look at it first. (Handed). Thank you.

Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just one last matter on this topic. There is this evidence from Mr Patrick Pang, stating -- when he was asked about this question, "Why would you use Cap 230A when you can proceed with the charge of common assault? What advantage do you see of using Cap 230A?", to which I believe KMB replied at Day 13, page 73. That would be 10 August 2018. Page 73, line 12.

Mr Peter Duncan SC, counsel for the committee, asked:

"So what is the point of asking the police to

prosecute under a section which carries a maximum penalty less than that for common assault?

Mr Patrick Pang: The company is of the view that in respect of cases like common assault, the investigation by the police is a difficult process. If Cap 230A is invoked in the investigation or in the prosecution, it would be relatively easier to prove the offence or the offending act.

We also hope that those who abuse or attack our bus captains, those passengers would be made known that there is this regulation, Cap 230A, in regard to passengers' behaviour, and it doesn't take physical abuse or physical contact to constitute a breach ..."

So, in that regard, they have highlighted the advantages of using this provision, and I believe your evidence also confirms you would consider using it, even though at the moment it is still rarely used. Is that the position?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I would like to say that for prosecution, we do not just go for the easy way out. It all depends on the evidence of the case. If there is sufficient evidence to show that there has been physical assault, even though Cap 230A A can be invoked, we would go for more serious offences, to show the significance police attach to physical assault of bus captains.

So we will not just go for 230A simply because it is easier to prove it. It all depends on evidence.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I would like to ask a more general question: how do you ensure that passenger assault cases are dealt with expeditiously?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We deal with all cases immediately. Timing-wise, it depends on when evidence can be given by the witness. We will ask the witness concerned to give statement or evidence at once. If further investigation such as medical reports are required, or statements from other witnesses are required, we would do that immediately.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Moving on to another topic, on Working Group on Review of Speed Limits.

Before I engage on this working group, I would like to explain a little bit as to why it was set up. It arose on the Tai Po Road accident, and there was this meeting of the Tai Po District Council, minutes dated 12 February 2018, and there was discussion as to --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on any further, I don't think it is the evidence that we have received that the Working Group on Speed Limits arose from the Tai Po accident. It existed already, did it not? I'm asking you, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I believe it should be it

existed -- I stand to be corrected.

CHAIRMAN: So there is a pre-existing Working Group on Speed Limits on which Transport Department and the police have representatives?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And, in this particular case, the section of road involved in the Tai Po Road was referred to this working group, with recommendations from the Transport Department; is my summary of the evidence accurate?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe Ms Yau can explain about this Working Group on Review of Speed Limits. In terms of membership, what does it comprise of?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I defer to my colleague, Mr Lee Tai Wai.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Regarding the Transport Department's Working Group on Speed Limits Review, representatives include those from the TD and two NGOs are the Motor Association of Hong Kong and Senior Drivers Association of Hong Kong, and also representatives from the police.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us what is the police involvement in this Transport Department's working group?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We have a representative from the Traffic Branch Headquarters to attend regular meetings of the working group to review the sections' speed limit on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN: Who convenes the meeting?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Assistant Commissioner of the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: So it is a Transport Department-driven committee?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do they provide the secretarial side of it?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes. They are responsible for all secretarial services, and the meeting place is also at the headquarters of the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: And presumably, in that role, they generate the agenda?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Agreed.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us how the working group functioned, in terms of does it involve considering objective facts and assessment in deciding whether suggestions for changing speed limits of certain roads should be entertained?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The TD has a regular mechanism for reviewing the speed limits of road

sections to ensure that the speed limit can ensure road safety and smooth traffic.

In reviewing speed limits, the priority is to ensure safety of users. There are a few factors to be considered in deciding whether the speed limit should be raised or lowered or kept the same. First, traffic accidents of the section involved, and the second factor is the usual speed of vehicles using that section. The third factor is the characteristics and circumstances of the road, the gradient, the sightline, the junctions, and also the situation with pedestrians.

So, based on the factors I just mentioned, TD and colleagues will come up with recommendations, as to whether the speed limit should be raised, lowered or kept the same.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that the Transport Department has a regular mechanism for reviewing speed limits. Can you tell us what is the regular mechanism; how regular?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) My understanding is the working group meets on a quarterly basis, to review different road sections. The choice of road sections is for the TD to decide. So the working group will decide the road sections to be included.

I believe the mechanism would target road sections which have had frequent or serious traffic accidents.

Such road sections will mostly be reviewed by the working group.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned that the mechanism would target road sections which have had frequent or serious traffic accidents. So, in that sense, it is reactive to accidents happening in that road section; is that correct?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) This is one of the considerations. There are other factors at play. For instance, complaint from members of the public or views of the district councils.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So am I correct to say it is not -- as far as you know, it is not a proactive exercise, meaning the Transport Department or the police would proactively look for dangerous road sections that need to consider reviewing speed limits; is that the position?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I dare not say whether it is a proactive review or not. But I believe the review mechanism is effective.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, going back to the specific example --

CHAIRMAN: Can you help the committee as to how long this Working Group on Speed Limits has been in place?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) According to records, it meets on a quarterly basis, and the first meeting, according to records, was held in 2000.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know in what circumstances it was constituted?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I have no record to check.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, in relation to the specific Tai Po Road section, may I refer you to a few documents. The purpose of this is to show that in relation to the Tai Po Road concerned, there have been complaints from the district council, from residents, from schools, that that particular road section is prone to accidents and there are lots of speeding occurred, and there has been correspondence written by the Tai Po District Council to the Hong Kong Police, requesting for assistance.

CHAIRMAN: Before you get involved in that detail, can I ask this general question: have any of the five police representatives here today been a member of this working group Working Group on Speed Limits?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No, sir.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The regular members are such that one of the police representatives is the superintendent in charge of traffic control, and he has just been deployed elsewhere and I am acting in that position now.

CHAIRMAN: So the direct answer to the question is that none

of the five representatives have acted in that role, until you acted as a deputy to whoever you have replaced; is that it?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I agree.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, Mr Lee, since you're acting as deputy, have you attended any of these working group meetings on the review of speed limits?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I attended one or two meetings, but it was two or three years ago.

With regard to the Tai Po incident review, I never attended any meetings.

CHAIRMAN: On the occasions that you have attended the working group meetings, typically, if there is such a thing, on how many sections of roads were the speed limits reviewed?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) On the occasions when I attended the meetings, about three sites and six directions would be identified, because we will look at both directions of any road sections. Therefore, there will be six road sections to be reviewed at every meeting.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Why six road sections?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) As I said, usually three sites or spots would be identified, and then we would

look at both directions of every site. Therefore, six road sections.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And who selects those three road sections?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the basis of those road sections would be on the factors you mentioned earlier on?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you have any say in the selection of the road sections?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We would give some advice, we would say whether we agree or disagree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about if you have received complaints about a certain road section? Can you suggest that this section be reviewed?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Certainly. We can make the proposal to the Transport Department that we have received a complaint with regard to speed review. But usually, members of the public or district councils and other departments would know that speed limit on roads would be under the jurisdiction of the Transport Department. Only the Transport Department has the power to state and review speed limits on roads.

CHAIRMAN: And if a district councillor didn't know that, that's what he would be told?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We would reflect the situation to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: But if the matter was raised by a district councillor, I'm anticipating some documents you are going to be taken to. If the district councillor chose to raise it with the police, he would be told, "That's not our job, that's the Transport Department's job'; is that it?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I believe our district staff, if they would receive views from district councillors they would certainly reflect the views to the Transport Department staff in that district, for that would be forwarded to the working group for handling.

CHAIRMAN: Well, we will see what happened.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, may I first of all --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that -- you have told us about the factors that come into play in reviewing speed limits, the incidence of traffic accidents, the usual speed of road users then generally the characteristics of the road, topography, and so on.

Are these reflected in a written document?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) These would appear in the report, and also there would be some filmlets on car patrol. In other words, they would use a car to patrol

the road section and demonstrate or introduce the characteristics of that road section, and also the road situation.

CHAIRMAN: More particularly, are there thresholds, parameters, that are set, for example, for the increase in the incidence of traffic accidents, that triggers a review?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I am not sure but I believe this would be one of the considerations.

CHAIRMAN: But nothing that you are aware of that is a formula?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I don't think there is a formula.

CHAIRMAN: For example, a 50 per cent increase in road traffic accidents on that road section in the last year; nothing like that?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) No. There is no formula. I cannot recall any formula.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Please.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Just to follow up on this working group. When you guys meet, do you guys make a distinction between heavy vehicle versus regular vehicles?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Normally, we don't, because speed limit would apply to all types of

vehicles, except buses or light buses, for which the speed is already limited.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If I may first of all chronologically -- because I am going to take you chronologically to the events that happened up until the Tai Po accident and the final report.

The first is the letter dated 5 June 2017. It is in bundle DC-2B. It's a complaint to the police by the Tai Po District Council. It's at DC-2B, page 840-70, in Chinese, and English at 840-74.

We can see the translation, that it was addressed to the central traffic camera investigation unit, Traffic Branch Headquarters, Hong Kong Police Force, dated 5 June 2017, and it is from the Tai Po District Councillor, Ms Chan Siu Kuen, and the title was, "Request to install 'speed camera' between Deerhill Bay and Tai Po Mei", and the first paragraph set out:

"This office has received requests for assistance from the residents in the vicinity of Tai Po Road because there are often speeding and unlawful motor racing on Tai Po Road, especially during overnight hours and on holidays, when a large group of suspectedly modified racing vehicles drive in high speed on Tai Po Road. It is suspected that unlawful motor racing

is being conducted and massive noise is generated ... which causes nuisances to residents. In case a traffic accident happens, the vehicle may collide into residents and cause severe casualty as well as endanger the safety of other road users. Thus the installation of a 'speed camera' is requested."

Then at the end, it stated:

"... I hope that your office would accede to the residents' request and install as soon as possible a 'speed camera' on Tai Po Road near the location between Deerhill Bay and Tai Po Mei ..."

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a map that would show us that location?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. It's the section between Deerhill Bay and Tai Po Mei. That's around the areas in the middle. If you can see number -- around the area in the middle.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We certainly see Tai Po Mei, and this of course is in the immediate vicinity of the bus accident on 10 February.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the partly obscured words "... hill Bay", is that Deerhill Bay?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Correct, Mr Chairman.

Upon receiving this, the Hong Kong Police Force replied on 16 June 2017, and if I may take you to 840-71

in Chinese, and 840-73 in English.

This letter, we can see it was addressed by Andrew Lam Chi Hang, for the Commissioner of Police, to the office of Chan Siu Kuen, district councillor of Tai Po, dated 16 June 2017, and it was copied to a Mr Chiu Kang Bor, Paul, Traffic Control Division, Technical Services Branch of the Transport Department, as well as the senior superintendent of police and district commander, Tai Po.

The letter stated:

"The locations for installation of fixed speed monitoring cameras are mainly determined by the Transport Department. After installation, the police is responsible for taking enforcement action. This office understands that the Transport Department ... has no plans to install fixed speed monitoring cameras in the captioned road section. At the same time, the police will continue to closely monitor the traffic situation of the road section concerned."

Now, we can see that the Transport Department refused the request to install speed camera, and the police reply appears to suggest there is nothing they can do about it, and their role is simply enforcement.

CHAIRMAN: On what basis do you say that the Transport Department had refused to install a speed camera?

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's the sentence:

"This office understands that the Transport Department currently has no plans to install fixed speed monitoring cameras in the captioned road section."

CHAIRMAN: Well, we all can see what that says.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I ask a general question first: if you received a request from a Tai Po District Councillor in relation to installing speed cameras or questions raised about speeding in a certain road section, would that complaint be placed as one of the items in the working group on review of speed limits?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I don't think so. This is just a request to install a speed camera on a road section. It has nothing to do with a review of speed limits.

CHAIRMAN: I think the point is this. If you, the police, have an opportunity to raise matters that ought to be considered on the agenda, is this something you would have put forward, for the Transport Department to decide whether or not to list it on the agenda of the meeting of the Working Group on Speed Limits?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I think the police and the Transport Department can have an exchange at many committees. With regard to the installation of speed cameras, this will not be considered at the Working

Group on Review of Speed Limits.

MS MAGGIE WONG: But what about if there is a specific complaint by a district councillor to change the speed limit or reduce the speed limit; would that reach the working group?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) If it is about the speed limit of a road section, it would reach the working group.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. May I take you to a letter dated 24 July 2015 by Tai Po District Councillor Madam Chan Siu Kuen but this time to the Transport Department. The Chinese is at 840 --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, Superintendent Lee, your point made earlier was that if the police received a request like this, it would be referred to the Transport Department, and that's made good, is it not, by the way in which this letter was copied to the Transport Department? I'm looking at 840-73.

So it has been sent to the Transport Department. That's the point you were making?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes, I agree, but the letter was cced to the Transport Department, but for installation of speed monitoring cameras. It was to the relevant division for installation of cameras. I believe the letter would not have gone to the agenda

of the Working Group on Speed Limit Review.

CHAIRMAN: That's an entirely separate point. Your point that you liaise with the Transport Department is made out by this letter, because this request for a camera was notified in your letter, the police letter, back to the district councillor.

Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I go to that specific complaint letter, can I take you to the minutes of meeting of the Tai Po District Council, minutes of the second meeting on 13 March 2015; Chinese at page 840-81, English at 840-91.

You can see the persons in attendance include a named officer at the bottom as "Head, Traffic Wing (Tai Po police district)/Hong Kong Police Force", and there were other departments concerned, like the Transport Department, Tai Po District Tenancy Housing Department and District Office, but a representative of the police force was present.

If we go to 840-92, at paragraph 79, there was a specific request from Japanese International School to reduce the speed limit of Tai Po Road section at Tai Po Kau). And at paragraph 79:

"The chairman [referred to] the receipt of a letter from the Japanese International School which requested

to reduce the speed limit of the road section in front of their school from 70km/hour to 50km/hour. They also invited the transport division to visit the Japanese International School to discuss with their students the traffic problems in their vicinity. The chairman requested the Transport Department to first respond to the request for lowering the speed limit."

Then paragraph 80:

"Mr Wong Kwok Leung responded that the Japanese International School suggested that the speed limit of the road section in front of the [school] be reduced from 70km/hour to 50km/hour in view of a traffic accident on the section of Tai Po Road in front of the Japanese International School in 2014 in which a member of the public was killed. The Transport Department and police were examining the cause of that traffic accident, which might not necessarily be related to the speed limit of that road section, including issues of the motorists' driving attitude and problem ... The TD would examine whether the present speed limit of that road section was appropriate. Furthermore, the TD had sent an interim reply to the Japanese International School after the Chinese New Year and would provide a detailed reply ..."

Now, this was a specific request, Mr Lee --

CHAIRMAN: Again, could we see the location on a map, please.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be between 21 and 22. You can see the Japanese International School.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps we could zoom out to give the overall context.

So beyond the site of the accident as one drives from Sha Tin to Tai Po; is that correct?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: This was a specific request by a school, where representatives of the police were present and they raised complaints about this issue and requested for reduction of speed limits.

Would this request be normally placed before the Working Group on Review of Speed Limits?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) According to our minutes of the meeting, I believe the police representative present was a sergeant of the Traffic Wing of Tai Po district.

According to the minutes, the district council requested the TD to review the speed limit of the road section. I believe the message received would have been put back to the working group for inclusion to its agenda or to further decide whether there should be

a review of the speed limit for that section.

CHAIRMAN: And that would have been communicated by the police representatives to the working group; is that what you are saying?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Well, from what I could see here, in the main it was the TD representative who answered questions of the district councillor. So I believe the police would not have repeatedly conveyed the message to the TD.

CHAIRMAN: No, not the TD, the working group is the question. Would the police have taken it upon themselves to communicate this to the working group? For consideration of putting it on the agenda, perhaps.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I don't believe so, because it was the TD's representative who was responsible for answering questions on that day.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I go on on this topic, if someone made a complaint on a particular road section, would the police be required to compile certain statistics in relation to that particular road section, to see if the complaint is a valid one?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) When the police receive a similar complaint, it will be conveyed to the TD for follow-up. We will not compile any statistics or carry out an investigation.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I understand the evidence correctly as even though you have a representative of the police present in this meeting, and there were complaints by a school, and there was a particular incident where someone got killed in that road section, which is serious and fatal, the police would not take up any further investigation, unless it was asked by the Transport Department? Is that the position?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Well, at that meeting, according to the minutes, the police will investigate the causes of the accident, and for that particular meeting the district council put a question to the TD, to request for a speed limit review. I did not see anything to require the police to take any appropriate action to reflect that view.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do you know if the Transport Department asked for statistics of the road accidents for that particular section of the road at that time?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) In this morning's evidence, we said that statistics of traffic accidents were shared between the TD and the police, so the TD has got such statistics.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, four months after these minutes --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, before you go on, the question was then, 2017. There has been a complaint -- 2015 -- there has

been a complaint about a fatality in 2014. Did the Transport Department ask for road accident statistics then, 2015? Not in 2018. 2015. Do you understand the difference?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I understand the difference. In the main, the TD will not ask us for statistics involving traffic accidents, because we can share our system and they have all the information we have.

CHAIRMAN: So they can get the information on a shared information system, they don't need to ask you; is that it?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And, four months after the minutes of the meeting, there was another follow-up letter by the Tai Po District Councillor, dated 24 July 2015. That's in DC-2B bundle, at 840-78, in Chinese; and English at 840-88.

If we drop to the second paragraph -- the letter is dated 24 July 2015 from Mr Chan Siu Kuen, and it is stated there in paragraph 2 -- first of all, paragraph 1, the second line, that they:

"... have received request for assistance from the residents in the vicinity of Tai Po Road. This is

because owing to the absence of speed limit traffic signs around the bend of Savannah Garden, traffic accidents happened frequently.

To ensure the safety of road users, your department is now requested to expeditiously install the '50 km' speed limit signs at the above location to remind motorists to pay attention to driving at safe speed for prevention of unnecessary incidents."

Now, this is the follow-up letter, following on from the minutes of the meeting in March 2015. In normal circumstances, would this letter reach the Working Group on Review of Speed Limits?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I believe the purpose of the letter was mainly to request for signs to be installed. It was not about a request to review the speed limit. So I believe the letter would not have reached the working group.

CHAIRMAN: What was the speed limit at that place, at that time?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I don't have such information.

CHAIRMAN: Do we, Ms Wong?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is 70km/hour.

And we have evidence from Mr Chan that it is not simply a letter. There are telephone conversations on

this matter, requesting for reduction of speed limit to 50km/hour. So this is just a follow-up letter, following up on the conversations with the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a transcript reference for that so that we can help Superintendent Lee understand the evidence?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Chairman, I need to look for that, because I just remembered this off the top of my head.

CHAIRMAN: I am familiar with that myself.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I have a moment?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, take your time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, that would be on Day 4, page 9.

CHAIRMAN: And the date?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Sorry, Day 6, page 9.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of page 6?

MS MAGGIE WONG: 14 July.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: On that page, it stated at line 18 -- Mr Chan Siu Kuen stated there:

"At that time, the Transport Department" -- this is in reference to the matter that we discussed earlier on.

"At that time, the Transport Department did not give me a direct reply. However, I have spoken to them on

the phone. They said that if the speed is to be reduced to 50 they would have to consult residents as well as owners corporations. And in 2014, near the Japanese International School there was a traffic accident at the signal junction, as a result a person was injured, and the Transport Department replied to me. He said for the speed to be reduced to 50 the TD would have to conduct a study, and after the accident they have appealed to the public to abide by road traffic regulations. They said that from the perspective of the TD, for the speed to be reduced to 50, they would have to do a lot of consultation and to liaise with the police.

I have been waiting. And I have been in contact with them. Well, Mr Wong of the Transport Department has been transferred out. And regrettably we had the traffic accident at Tai Po Mei. And I approached the police, because the TD could not help us. I asked the police to install speed cameras and I have been following that up."

Now, Mr Lee, that's the evidence given by Mr Chan, that it is not simply letters but there are follow-up telephone conversations and repeated requests, and there seems to be inaction.

Can you tell us why would that be the situation in this particular case?

CHAIRMAN: The context of this, to remind ourselves, is a letter from a district councillor to the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, correct, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: It may be that you don't know why the Transport Department didn't do anything.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The letter was the communication between the TD and the person who wrote the letter, so we should not comment on it, and we don't have any record on these matters.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So am I correct to say that the role of the police in the working group is more or less like a rubber stamp, with no particular active role in requesting the Transport Department to do anything?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) The police participation in the working group is absolutely not as a rubber stamp. We studied all the reports. We would also consult our colleagues in that particular district, and we would also consult our frontline staff, if a particular view is proposed, as to what they think about it, and then at the meeting we will reflect the police's view to the working group.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps approaching the matter the other way around, to what extent, if at all, do the police have a proactive role in putting forward suggestions? For

example, "We are concerned about the speed limit on this stretch of road and we think it should be reviewed"? Do the police do that?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I believe we must have done that, especially at road sections where there have been heavy or serious traffic accidents or, where there have been a lot of traffic accidents, the division concerned, according to the investigation records, would put different views to the TD, including a review of speed limits. Usually, this would be handled by the five land-based traffic divisions of the police, investigation would have been done, and then they would reflect their views to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to provide us with any examples illustrating that proactive role -- correspondence?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Well, generally speaking, exchanges at the district level usually are not recorded by us.

CHAIRMAN: Well, they must be recorded somewhere.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) I believe so.

CHAIRMAN: That's what we are asking for. Can you give us some examples illustrating the police having a proactive role, "There have been too many accidents in this area. For our part, we the police, who have to go there and scrape people up off the road, think it's time we

reduced the speed limit."? Are there any illustrations where the police have done that, so we can follow it?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We can go back to try to get some records. We will consult our colleagues.

CHAIRMAN: That's what we are asking for, illustrations demonstrating a proactive role.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Just as an example, if you receive a number of complaints, I believe there would be a number of road sections which citizens or other district councils would complain about, and if there are more than three road sections which require discussion, how do you select those three road sections, if there are more complaints than three road sections?

CHAIRMAN: That rather presupposes there is some kind of arbitrary limit.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a limit on the number of road sections you can discuss at one of these meetings?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Well, it depends on the nature of complaints, because there can be many different kinds of traffic complaints. If the residents complain to the police, our district staff or traffic headquarters staff will process them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We move on to the chronology, this time it is after the accident. There was this meeting of the

Tai Po District Council dated 12 February 2018. We can see that in bundle DC-2, page 285.

The minutes actually start at page 782 in English. At paragraph 5, I believe a representative of the police was present, that was Mr Chau Chung Mun, superintendent of police, investigation and support division, Traffic New Territories North, Hong Kong Police Force. And at paragraph 5, Mr Chau, apart from the road accident on 10 February 2018, he referred to the cases that the police detected in 2017, in terms of traffic violations.

If we see in the middle, it is stated there that:

"In 2017, the police had made 4 arrests, [including] 2 drunk drivers, 1 case of dangerous driving and 1 case of drug-related crime. The police had issued a total of 32 fixed penalty tickets at the road section in 2017 for speeding and traffic violations. A total of 29 traffic accidents had occurred in the Chek Nai Ping to Wong Yee Au section on Tai Po Road, out of which 2 were more serious. Although there were no speed enforcement cameras installed at the above mentioned road section, the police would carry out operations to detect speeding from time to time by placing detection equipment at a few designated spots along the road section. The Hong Kong Police Force would complete the investigation ..."

Now, Mr Chau mentioned that 29 traffic accidents occurred in this road section.

CHAIRMAN: Again, could we have a look on the map to show us the section?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. That's Chek Nai Ping to Wong Yee Au section.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Where is Chek Nai Ping? Ah, yes. Thank you. And Wong Yee Au? Yes. Thank you very much.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Lee, my question is: there were 29 road traffic accidents, 30 offences of speeding and 32 fixed penalty tickets for speeding and traffic violations for that section of the road in 2017. Would you consider these statistics warranted the attention of the police in bringing this particular road section up for discussion at the working group?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) It depends on the causes of these 29 traffic accidents. You need to know the causes before you can decide whether to take it to the working group, whether they were all related to speeding.

I believe this should be left to the traffic division of that district to decide whether this should be reviewed by the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, can you tell us, in all the working group sessions you have attended, would these kinds of

statistics be provided to the working group, traffic accident statistics?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) They would review traffic accident figures. They would do comparisons to the average accident rate.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned in your evidence earlier on, before the break, that the working group would review three road sections with six directions. And in the meetings you have attended, have you come across a particular road section in which the speed limit was reduced?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) In my impression, yes, but it was not because of traffic accidents, but because there was a major infrastructure nearby, and therefore there was a reduction.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was there an incident where the speed limit was reduced because of the road accidents on the particular road section?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) Since I only attended two to three meetings, I cannot say for sure, but I didn't see that in those two or three meetings that I attended, that the speed limit was reviewed and reduced as a result of traffic accidents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I take you to the last document in this chain. It's the information paper by Transport

Department to Tai Po District Council, dated 9 April 2018.

We can see that in TD-5, page 1617-1. This is a translation. The Chinese document is at page 1611.

I will give a description of this document. It is a paper prepared by the Transport Department, dated 9 April 2018, headed, "Traffic management measures on Tai Po Road (Tsun King Road, Sha Tin to Yung Yi Road, Tai Po)", and if we look at, first of all, the purpose of this paper, it says:

"The Tai Po District Council ... held a special meeting on 12 February ... to discuss the serious bus accident happened on 10 February 2018 early evening. The Transport Department ... has undertaken to review the speed limit and traffic management measures of the relevant road section. In view of the concerns of the local community and the Tai Po District Council about the progress of the implementation of improvement measures, this paper briefs members on the progress of TD in reviewing the speed limit of the relevant road section of Tai Po Road and ... follow-up improvement measures."

We can see, in this paper, that the Transport Department in paragraph 2 has reviewed the speed limit of the road section, and in paragraph 3 it stated:

"TD has established regular mechanism to review the speed limit of the road with a view to ... road safety and maintaining smooth traffic."

We can see over the page, at 1617-2, it stated there that:

"... protection of road users' safety is of prime consideration. In deciding whether the speed limit should be reduced, relaxed or maintained, [three] factors will be taken into consideration:

(a) traffic accident records of the subject road section;

(b) speeds of vehicles travelling on that road section; and

(c) road environment and features such as gradient, sightline of motorists, road intersections, pedestrian traffic, et cetera.

4. ... TD has comprehensively reviewed the traffic accident records of the subject road section ... [in the past two months]."

And then it suggested that, if we see section (c):

"Section between Chek Nai Ping and Yung Yi Road [which we have seen earlier on] ...

The traffic accident rate of the relevant road section was on a rising trend and above the overall average traffic accident rate in Hong Kong in the past

year. The detected vehicular speeds in recent months were lower than those of the past and generally below the current speed limit ..."

And apart from other matters mentioned there:

"In light of the aforementioned new circumstances, the speed limit of the relevant road section has scope for downward adjustment. The speed limit of 70km/hour is recommended to be lowered to 50km/hour for further enhancing road safety."

If we jump to paragraph 6:

"Separately, TD and the Hong Kong Police Force ... have started preparing for installation of a new batch of fixed speed enforcement cameras for stepping up the deterrence and enforcement against speeding motorists. The subject road section of the accident ... has already been included in the list of road sections for consideration of installation. TD is currently seeking resources and aims to firm up the installation of a fixed speed enforcement camera at the section near Chek Nai Ping of Tai Po Road ... before the end of this year."

Now, within two months of the Tai Po accident, the TD is said to have comprehensively reviewed the traffic accident reports and suggested the reduction of the speed limit to 50km/hour.

I have two questions. The first is, as far as your department is concerned, have these statistics been provided to the Transport Department before the accident?

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, could you particularise that question?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Was the traffic accident records of the subject road section provided to the Transport Department prior to the Tai Po Road accident on 10 February 2018?

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) As far as I know, no.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do you know if this subject road section has ever been placed before the Working Group on Review of Speed Limit prior to the Tai Po accident on 10 February 2018?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) As far as I know, no.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I am going to move on to another topic -- unless you have some questions on this matter.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just give me a moment, please.

There were recommendations made on 9 April for the installation of a speed camera for this stretch of road. Do we have a map? Does the map show us where the speed camera is proposed to go?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I believe the evidence is that

the speed camera has not been considered until the end of 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Was there any recommendation as to where it would go or not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. It's at 1617-5.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Could we see that on a map?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. We can see that at the right-bottom box, with the red asterisk.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is stated there, "Initially recommended location for installing fixed speed enforcement camera".

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can you help us as to what steps have been taken, first of all, to obtain speed cameras -- apparently, there was a budget issue, we saw from that 9 April paper -- so that there is one available to be placed here? Can anyone help us with that?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) For the fixed speed enforcement camera, it is mainly under the portfolio of the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department. In around July 2017, the Transport and Housing Bureau started a new round of public consultation on the installation of such cameras, on the choice of locations and the type of camera to be installed. The exercise started in mid-2017, and subsequent to the Tai Po Road accident, the Transport

Department, together with our CTCIU, central traffic camera investigation unit, under the Traffic Branch Headquarters of the police, the TD, together with CTCIU, started to see how cameras should be installed and designed for the site of the Tai Po Road accident.

CHAIRMAN: But the accident was six months ago. Where are we now?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I understand that the Transport Department has obtained funding and the camera will be installed there as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: When?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I don't know the actual date, but as far as I know they have confirmed the location and they have got money to do it.

CHAIRMAN: But, from what you are saying, this is a responsibility of the Transport Department and not the police?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That is correct.

CHAIRMAN: So they provide you with information about how they are proceeding; is that it?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's correct. The camera to be installed at Tai Po Road, as I said, was part of the plan started in mid-2017 to install new cameras.

CHAIRMAN: But presumably not at this particular location;

there was a general review about installing new cameras? Is that what you are saying?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: And am I right in recollecting evidence that was given earlier, by Chief Superintendent Baker, I think, that there are 24 fixed speed cameras in Hong Kong?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's true. Right now we have 24 such cameras installed at 130 locations. They are in operation.

(In English) 130 housings.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure I follow that. How do you install 24 cameras, fixed cameras, in 130 locations?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) So, from time to time, the cameras are placed at different housings --

CHAIRMAN: They are moved around? They are not fixed at one place?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) They are not.

CHAIRMAN: At any given time they are fixed in one place and then they are moved around?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's true. The Transport and Housing Bureau, when it sought funding from the LegCo, provided a certain ratio.

CHAIRMAN: Are there about 4,000 kilometres of roads in Hong Kong?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The latest discussion is

such that there should be a camera placed at each housing. I think that is our main focus of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN: My question was more specific: are there about 4,000 kilometres of roads in Hong Kong?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: 24 cameras?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that not one of the lowest ratios of cameras to length of roads in civilised jurisdictions?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, I got your point, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, are we sitting today until 5.30?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: In which case we will take a short afternoon break. Is this a convenient moment?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: We will take a break now for 15 minutes. Thank you.

(4.13 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.28 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Before I move on to a new topic, may I wrap this up by inviting you to go to the SEC bundle at

page 1360.

This is a LegCo paper -- sorry, minutes of special meeting held on 15 February 2018, Panel on Transport. I invite you to go to page 1360, in which three motions were passed at the Legislative Council. I won't read all of them out but only read one of the paragraphs which may relate to the question I am going to ask.

That's motion number 2. The panel urges the administration to:

"apply anti-skid surface dressing, erect additional deceleration warning signs and install speed enforcement cameras on the subject road section immediately, and review the 'high-risk' road sections across the territory and expeditiously enhance the relevant safety measures to safeguard the safety of road users ..."

Now, this motion was passed by the Legislative Council, and in relation to this matter which I ask this: has the police formed a separate department to carry out the task of reviewing the high-risk road sections across the territory?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I would like to say that we have never seen this document before. In relation to the road section concerned and the measures mentioned, the only thing we were involved was the speed enforcement cameras, and as I said the discussion

started last year, and after the accident at Tai Po Road, we understand that the Transport Department is going to install a camera there.

As regards other measures, we have not set up any committee to see to them.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Did the Transport Department consult you to provide them with certain traffic accident data in relation to particular road sections that have high risk across the territory?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We have never received any special request from the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I understand that the police has kept a database for black spots, or spots that are prone to traffic accidents. Is that correct?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We do have a list of traffic accident black spots, which is -- these locations are classified by the Transport Department. The criteria for a location to be classified as a black spot is six cases with pedestrian injury within a 12-month period, nine cases with any injury within a 12-month period, or two fatal cases within five years. And this list is updated every three months.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is the list made available to the public?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I honestly don't know the answer to that question.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt you can find out and inform us.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. You mentioned that it would be classified as a black spot if two fatal cases within five years. Once you made that classification as black spot, what measures or what safety measures would be recommended in terms of this particular road section?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: From a policing point of view, our responsibility would mainly rest through enforcement, but with all our departments working together, they could also look at road engineering road engineering, publicity and other measures to reduce the potential for accidents to happen at that location.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would the bus companies be informed of these black spots?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I would have to make further enquiries to find that out.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us as to whether or not you provide the Transport Department with your list of black spots?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Actually, the list is prepared by the Transport Department, sir.

CHAIRMAN: So dissemination of it is a matter for them?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It's their document.

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Right, sir.

MEMBER LO: Actually, it is published on the TD website.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps someone could look at that, whether or not it's available on the Transport Department's website.

MS MAGGIE WONG: May I move on to another topic, on Road Safety Council. If I may take you to a document in the SEC bundle, page 481.

CHAIRMAN: Which volume of SEC is this?

MS MAGGIE WONG: That should be bundle SEC-1.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Page 481. It is a footnote contained in the Audit Commission report that we have seen earlier this morning. If we scroll down to note 1, it provides a description of the Road Safety Council, and it contains the composition or membership within the Road Safety Council. We can see it:

"... is chaired by the Deputy Commissioner of Police (operations) with members drawn from seven government bureaux and departments (including the Transport and Housing Bureau, the Transport Department, the Information Services Department) and six non-governmental organisations (including the transport associations). It is supported by two committees, the Road Safety Campaign Committee and Road Safety Research

Committee."

So my first question is -- it is stated there that the Road Safety Councils is chaired by the Deputy Commissioner of Police (Operations). Does it hold regular meetings with respect to traffic statistics for reducing traffic-related injuries?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. It meets quarterly, at which the traffic accident trends are discussed, and the trend is mainly represented in the form of statistics.

CHAIRMAN: Have any of the officers here present today served as a representative of the police force on the council?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, sir. I have appeared at two meetings, the last two meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What role would the police play in the Road Safety Council?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The police play the role of secretariat, to coordinate the meetings, and they also have representatives on some of the subcommittees, for example, the Road Safety Campaign Committee.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What would be discussed normally in the Road Safety Council, apart from accident statistics?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: At the last two meetings, I can say that the meeting mainly focused on the road safety trend. It has also discussed items, for example, including

driverless vehicles, topical subjects such as that.

CHAIRMAN: Does it publish papers?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Are its minutes available publicly?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No, sir.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would the meeting make recommendations to the seven government departments as to how to enhance safety features on the road, in particular bus safety?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Such matters were not discussed in the last two meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can it make suggestions, if they see a problem in relation to particular aspect in relation to bus safety, can it make suggestion to Transport Department or different bureaux mentioned there?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: I believe so, because the different government departments are represented there, and the overall aim of the Road Safety Council is to reduce traffic accidents.

MS MAGGIE WONG: It is stated there that there are two subcommittees, the Road Safety Campaign Committee and the Road Safety Research Committee. May I ask, first of all, what's the membership of the Road Safety Campaign Committee?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The Road Safety Campaign Committee is chaired by one of the civilian members of the Road

Safety Council, and it consists of --

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean non-government?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Non-government, sir, yes. Also sitting on that subcommittee are representatives from the road safety team in the Hong Kong Police, some people from the private sector who are skilled at publicity.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would they meet regularly?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. They meet every quarter, I believe.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would they have any minutes of meeting for this subcommittee?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: We are checking.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. Would the topic of attack on bus captains be one of the topics that would be discussed in the Road Safety Campaign Committee?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No. It hasn't been discussed in that way. It mainly focuses on how to convey road safety messages to different groups within society. For example, elderly people or young people. Things like that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. And in terms of the Road Safety Research Committee, what is the membership?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Perhaps Ms Yau could answer that part.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) The chairman of the Research Committee is the Deputy Commissioner of the Transport Department. Members include the police, the

Highways Department, Transport Department, engineers from different units of the Transport Department, persons in charge, and in this committee, from time to time, there might be consultancy studies. Consultants would be there to give presentations. They are commissioned by the Transport Department to carry out studies, and they would give presentations at meetings. Also, there would be university lecturers and also transport experts who are on the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Transport experts who hold what positions elsewhere?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) According to what I know, they are university lecturers, but I am not sure of their research interests.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Do they meet regularly?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, we do. We have quarterly meetings.

CHAIRMAN: Are you a representative on this committee?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN: Currently?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How long have you been a representative?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Starting from April 2017, when I took up this position, I started to be on the committee. But I did not attend the last two meetings

because I was otherwise officially engaged and I was represented by other colleagues.

CHAIRMAN: But no doubt you were kept informed as to what had been discussed.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What topics were discussed?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) From what I remember -- well, this may not be all the topics. For example, we talked about child seat belts on vehicles, and also extending the green phase for pedestrians of traffic lights, so elderly people can have longer time to cross the road. And also walkability, encouraging pedestrians to walk more. This is what I can recall to have been discussed at the committees. Actually, they are research reports.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about technological --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- are these research reports available publicly?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I'm not sure about that.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would there be minutes of meeting?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, there are.

CHAIRMAN: Although you only joined the committee in April 2017, although that's now the best part of 18 months ago, no doubt you had access to records going back in time earlier than that?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN: And, in order to prepare yourself for the job, no doubt you had to read that material to see what this committee was all about?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, with regard to previous reports, I did not really look at them.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Because the term is "Road Safety Research Committee", would they discuss anything about the reduction of speed limits of certain busy roads, like in Central, Des Voeux Road? Would they raise those sorts of matters?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) From what I recall, I don't think that was mentioned. That is about a reduction of speed limits.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about bus safety in a general sense?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) No. I need to go back and look at the research reports again before I can remember, but that is what I think I can recall now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. May I just ask a general question: in what way you see Cap 230 could be modified or strengthened to enhance bus safety based on your law enforcement experience?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, I think all regulations or ordinances would have been established

with a particular intent. Cap 230A targets passenger conduct on buses, and also it is to regulate the operation of franchised buses. Since the police are here to enforce the law, I would think that I would emphasise how we can enforce the law better.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Since we are on the topic of enforcement of the law, I am going actually to the last topic.

I believe in one of the replies, you have provided the committee with 51 fatal cases.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on to that detail, there are some matters I would like to pursue.

We have, fortunately, representatives in you, Chief Superintendent Baker, on the Road Safety Campaign Committee, and in you, Chief Superintendent Yau, the police representative on the Road Safety Research Committee. I would like to pose this question to you both.

Who is it, if it is anybody, in Hong Kong government, that drives the safety of road transport? Where does the impetus come from? Who directs others? Who establishes policy?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I believe, in terms of overall transport matters, the Transport and Housing Bureau provides the steer for making policies, and the Transport Department is an executive organisation. In

terms of traffic laws and road design, this would be executed by the Transport Department.

The role of the police, according to the law, is that we are empowered by the law, so we do enforcement work as dutifully as we can.

Talking about enforcement, as we said, sometimes there would be nothing that we could do. Say, for example, I mentioned illegal parking. With what powers we are given by the law, we will do as much as we can. And in terms of revision to the law or road design, road improvements, the police also have a duty to give advice to the Transport Department. Hopefully, we can improve road safety. Hopefully, traffic can be smooth, and every road user can be protected.

CHAIRMAN: So who is it that comes up with ideas about what it is we should be pursuing? We have been discussing today, for example, seat belts on franchised buses. There are other issues about other safety devices that can be used on vehicles to make them safer. Who is it that comes up with these ideas?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I believe different quarters will provide views. On a daily basis, we enforce the law, and we can draw from overseas experience, we think. And within the Transport Department, they also do research, and in the end, it

would be up to the policy bureau to give policy support; say in terms of technology, funding, legal matters, we need the backing of the Transport and Housing Bureau, so the police and the TD can do a better job on a daily basis.

CHAIRMAN: You describe the role of the bureau as giving "steer".

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What steer has the bureau given in respect of enhancing safety on franchised buses?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I believe, within the TD, there is already a working group that is tasked to look at the operation of franchised buses, including the licensing system, and how road safety can be ensured. Hopefully, this is what the working group of the TD will do, that it will put forward more views for the enforcement departments to enforce the law and also for the policy bureau to make more or better policies to protect the public.

CHAIRMAN: Which working group are you describing?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) This morning, I heard that there was this working group. Please give me a moment.

CHAIRMAN: If you are describing the Working Group on the Enhancement of Safety, that was a working group

established on 13 March of this year. Is that the one you have in mind?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) That's the one.

CHAIRMAN: Prior to that, what was the steer being given by the bureau, about enhancing safety?

It may be a bit unfair to ask you, but it seems, from the way you have described things, that you are in the position of receiving the benefit of steer which you then have to enforce. The intermediary, the Transport Department, has come up with the implementation of the steer.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) From what I know, at the Transport Department, there is a unit on buses and railways which will watch over services provided by franchised buses and railway companies, and there is not much involvement from the police. It is hoped that the Transport Department can do more through this unit.

CHAIRMAN: Is anybody actually driving safety for franchised buses?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: For franchised buses, sir, I can't say that -- it's not within my knowledge that anyone is specifically for franchised buses. I think the Road Safety Council is a useful forum where ideas are exchanged, where all the different government departments with responsibilities for transport and

traffic are represented. And that forum does give steer to road safety policies. But I'm not aware of a committee that is specifically focusing on franchised buses.

CHAIRMAN: Let me come to you again, Chief Superintendent Yau. You are on this committee that does research, the Road Safety Research Committee. Are you aware of any research done by that committee into the benefits of using seat belts on franchised buses, as opposed to the difficulties of getting people to use them?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) From what I remember, we haven't talked about seat belts on franchised buses. I can remember that we discussed child restraint devices, that is seat belts for children.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you for your help.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

Following on that, who would suggest the topics to be discussed at the Road Safety Research Committee?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Usually, it would be for the Transport Department to provide consultancy papers. We read them before meetings and discuss them at meetings.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has any member raised a topic to be discussed in the Road Safety Research Committee?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I am not clear who to

suggest items for discussion. We are informed by the secretariat of the Transport Department.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it is predominantly driven by the Transport Department?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes, as far as I know.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Going on to the last topic, Ms Yau, that's in relation to some of the documents you have provided to the committee on 7 May 2018, in relation to 51 fatal traffic accidents, and your reference is at 124-1 to 124-2 of the miscellaneous bundle.

Now, my question is focused on asking you some of the examples that you provided here as to the use of black-box data in --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, this is not just 51 fatal accidents. It's 51 fatalities occurring on or around a bus, is it not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. 51 fatal accidents in relation to a franchised bus.

If I may refer to the question first. The question you can see is at page 124. The specific matter which you are tasked to look at is paragraph (2):

"Please provide the details of all fatal and/or serious accidents, as defined in the traffic reports, in the period 2012 to February 2014 inclusive, involving [specifically] franchised public buses, including:

(i) a brief description of the accident and the resulting fatalities and/or injuries;

(ii) a brief description of any consequential prosecution, verdicts, reasons for verdict ..."

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, on behalf of the committee, might we thank Chief Superintendent Cadman, who is not here, and those assisting him, for providing this information. We are conscious that this must have involved a lot of effort to gather together this material and we are very grateful. It was done during a short period of time.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, and we are grateful for the provision of documentation. And the 51 fatal accidents involving franchised bus is listed at page 124-4, the dates and the case numbers.

It sets out, basically, 30 cases of which 28 cases have been convicted and two acquitted, and that's set out at paragraph 4 of your letter. And 15 case summaries were provided where the driver was not prosecuted and no further action. And three cases with three brief facts only, and case not yet concluded, and two initial reports, are under active investigation, and one case with only case result.

The purpose of taking you to these 51 cases is I wanted to show some example to see the use of

black-box data or tachograph data, or the use of braking, deceleration and speed reports, and the use of this in the legal proceedings.

If I may first take you to a few examples. It's at page 124-5. That's a case in 2012, 5 September 2012, involving dangerous driving causing death.

If we can scroll to page 124-7, the background of this case relates to a fatal traffic accident at To Kwa Wan Road, and paragraph 2, involving a KMB double-decker bus, where an elderly woman was killed when she was walking across the road from a safety island to the other side of the road.

We can see at 124-8 that the police, apart from photos, they obtained the driving data from KMB, and also the data would reveal the speed when the bus pulled out from the bus stop, at a particular time, and the acceleration of the bus, the time when the defendant accelerated the bus, and when the bus captain applied the brake and how many times.

We have seen a number of examples; this is just one of them. Is this sort of information frequently used in legal proceedings?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In investigating serious traffic accidents, those that involve fatalities in particular, we will try our very best to get all

relevant records, including those captured by CCTV and also the black box.

Now, the installation of black box is not statutory, but if it is available we will always get it from the bus.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about non-fatal accidents?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) For accidents without fatalities, but that are serious, if there is a black box available, we will make use of it.

CHAIRMAN: Franchised buses have been required since 1 July 2004 to have a tachograph, black box, or rather vehicles made after that date. I think the reality is every franchised bus in Hong Kong's got a black box.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Not all franchised buses have got such. For public light buses, yes, they are all fitted with one, but not for all franchised buses.

CHAIRMAN: Could we have the requirement put on the screen? I think we also have statistics coming from the bus companies, telling us how they have retrofitted these things.

But you are saying that the police encounter franchised buses that don't have black boxes? Because that is a surprise.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Whilst we are looking for this document, may I ask this question: have you encountered

difficulties in obtaining this black-box data in any non-fatal accidents?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Where there is really such a black box, we have no difficulty obtaining the data.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That's TD-5, page 1597.

We will see a letter from the Transport Department, dated 17 October 2003, setting out the minimum requirement for electronic data recording devices being installed, and we can see the specific minimum requirements for electronic data recording device at page 1598.

We can see, at paragraph 1:

"The purpose of the electronic data recording device is to provide tools for the bus company to monitor and manage the on-road speed- and safety-related behaviour of its buses, and indirectly to encourage better driving behaviour."

And the device set out there includes the provision of data at one-second interval, install data every 30 seconds for a period of two weeks, which includes the operation time and vehicle speed -- start time, rolling time, idle time, finish time.

We will also see in some of the representations given by the KMB and Citybus that they have upgraded the

black-box data to include more data, and we can see in the TD Paper 8 -- I believe it's TD-1, page 87, and we can see in this --

CHAIRMAN: This is the paper that the Transport Department provided to the committee at the beginning of these proceedings, and I think what your attention is being drawn to is the last sentence in paragraph (c).

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: "Currently, all franchised buses are equipped with black boxes ..."

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, "and speed limiters".

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps just digressing, we are conscious of the fact that we are concentrating on buses and you have a much wider portfolio. But the question really is this: how much use do you make of the data on black boxes for the purposes of prosecuting?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) As I said, for fatal and serious traffic accidents, we will make use of data from the black box. In police investigation, if the records are there, it won't be difficult for us to obtain the data. Colleagues of the traffic accident investigation unit would take into account all evidence and make prosecutions.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you tell us whether there is any difficulty as to why this sort of information was not

used in less serious cases, other than fatal accidents?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, all facts of the case are different. For less serious traffic accidents, if just a trip or minor injury, it is not a serious traffic accident, and the investigation direction would be different. So, in investigation of each and every case, depending on the facts of the case, we will see whether it is necessary to obtain such data regardless of whether it is serious or not.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In all these cases, do you know whether this evidence, in terms of black-box data and speed reports, or acceleration reports/deceleration reports, has ever been challenged in court?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I don't have such information with me now.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Insofar as the 51 cases --

CHAIRMAN: Just allow the translation, if you would.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, could you make enquiries as to that and provide us with an answer?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would you find it useful -- I understand that the public light bus has a specific provision in the ordinance itself governing the admissibility of this

type of electronic data recording device evidence.

CHAIRMAN: Could we bring that up on the screen?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: This is a provision to make it easier to prosecute by using the black-box data.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have any references for the ordinance?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, we are locating the document. But may I make the point first and -- or may we have a few seconds?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course. Is there a separate ordinance that deals with this?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, that's the road safety ...

CHAIRMAN: Cap 374?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Cap 374.

CHAIRMAN: And it's therefore a separate part of the general Road Traffic Ordinance?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, no doubt someone can look for that while we move on.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. In general terms, there is a specific provision, following amendment of the ordinance itself, to cater for admissibility of evidence for electronic data recording device in public light buses, which makes the prosecution adducing evidence much easier.

So my question is: would the police welcome an amendment similar to the statutory provisions applicable to public light buses, in admitting this evidence in relation to black-box data?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, subject to finding the appropriate statutory provision, I have completed my questioning.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Can I please add something?

Just now, we talked about the 51 fatal cases. Since we did not have time to prepare the documents, actually there was one, which is number 19, that was about the PLB. It was not about a franchised bus. Therefore, there should be 50 fatal accidents.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So no franchised bus involved?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) There was not.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I believe that should be Cap 374A, the Road Traffic (Public Service Vehicles) Regulations.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, these are the specifications for the device, but then there is an evidential provision, is there not? Perhaps section 25. No.

Perhaps scroll through section 24, please. Yes. Go through the section. Yes.

Well, no doubt it can be located in due course, but there is an evidential provision.

Can any of the police representatives present assist us as to what use, if any, is made of this evidential provision in relation to PLBs; how many prosecutions involve reliance on the fact that the speed of the vehicle can be established by the black box?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) From what we understand, right now we do not have accurate figures at hand as to the invocation of such data from EDRD, but I can recall one case in which the device was challenged by the defence at court, and both sides supplied experts to debate the legality and accuracy of the device. And the conclusion was that the court accepted the EDRD, and also the case was successfully prosecuted.

CHAIRMAN: There is another aspect of the different legislation for PLBs which is relevant to one of our considerations, and that is whether or not franchised buses ought to have speed display units that one sees on a PLB, telling the passengers what the speed of the vehicle is.

The question that arises from that is this. Have any difficulties arisen with conflicts between passengers and PLB drivers as a result of the fact that the passengers can see, for example, that the PLB driver

is breaking the speed limit all the journey, and they remonstrate? Any difficulties with that?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) We haven't met with such difficulty. I believe, if passengers can see the speed of the vehicle, it can more effectively ensure traffic safety.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I have located the relevant provision.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. But before you move on to that -- have there been any incidents when, for example, members of the public travelling on a PLB take a photograph of the speed display unit and produce that in relation to their complaint? Are you aware of that?

MR LEE TAI WAI: (Via interpreter) We don't have such information here.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms Wong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, that would be in section 67A of the Road Traffic Ordinance itself.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If we look to subsection (6), this is a section in relation to EDRD, electronic data recording device, and it is a section on power to retrieve electronic data, and if we look at subsection (6), it is stated there:

"In any criminal proceedings, a document purporting

to be a record of the data retrieved under subsection (5)(b) is admissible as evidence of the matters appearing from the record without further proof."

And (5)(b) is, as we can see, the data stored in the fitted EDRD to be retrieved by a vehicle examiner or any person authorised by the Commissioner of Police, and that's the provision in relation to public light buses.

CHAIRMAN: And I think, Chief Superintendent Yau, you agreed that you would welcome such a provision in respect of franchised buses?

MS YAU SIN MAN: Yes, I agree.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Mr Chairman, I have completed my questioning in this regard.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Just one or two matters remaining.

QUESTIONING BY COMMITTEE

We know that in relation to the availability of black-box data, there is now available, it seems, on many buses, CCTV film of the events, in particular forward-looking cameras that allow you to see what has happened, and perhaps cameras that actually record the instruments in the cab of the driver.

Is film obtained from such cameras used in prosecutions? I have in mind one of the 50, as it now is, fatal accidents, the one at Lei Yue Mun where a bus

toppled over, and I think there, rather than using black-box material, they were using CCTV film which showed the speed.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) In the police's investigation of accidents, we can also use the film captured by CCTV on vehicles, but we need witnesses to supply the evidence. The images and oral evidence have to be combined, and this can be used for prosecution.

CHAIRMAN: Just dealing with the CCTV, this is commonly used in prosecutions for all kinds of things, is it not: bank robberies, and so on, murders?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Indeed, this is used in many criminal prosecutions.

CHAIRMAN: Right. So what are the witnesses that you need in relation to the camera itself?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I think we need the author of the film say who installed the CCTV and did anyone tamper with the images of the CCTV film.

CHAIRMAN: So section 22 of the Evidence Ordinance? It's a computer, isn't it, the CCTV?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, not necessarily a computer. It may be a chip, or it may be an audio tape.

CHAIRMAN: So you need someone to say it was installed, it was working properly and no one has interfered with it?

So it's a technician you need, not a witness to the event?

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) Well, then it depends on how advanced the camcorder is. Sometimes the vehicle owner can be that person or sometimes you need a technician.

CHAIRMAN: We are ourselves concerned with franchised buses, and they don't even allow their bus captains to put their own cameras on board, so these are cameras installed by the bus companies, maintained by the bus companies, and we have seen where they are located and we have seen the devices -- there are actually black boxes on which this data is recorded.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I believe franchised bus companies must have their devices monitored. I don't think the bus captains can remove them, because apart from data with regard to the driving, in fact the bus companies may need the information for management.

Therefore, the CCTV of the franchised buses of course is managed by the bus companies. We understand that.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, and the bus companies have IT departments, so it is simplicity itself, is it not, to establish the installation, the lack of interference, therefore the validity of the CCTV film?

You ask the KMB to give you a witness statement saying that everything was working, that proves it. Therefore, this is readily available material.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I don't know how much time they need to have it prepared, and I hope, in an investigation, I want them to be able to provide it as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Chairman. I want to come back to this Road Safety Council, and maybe the two chief superintendents can help me.

In your involvement with the two committees, are you able of any recommendation that has ever been made to the TDB by this council regarding safety issues?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: There were not any new initiatives proposed at the two meetings that I attended.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Or even looking back at minutes, are you aware of any recommendations made by this council to the TDB or the TDB turned it down for whatever reason?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: No, I'm not aware. I read through the minutes of the last probably year, but I'm not aware of any proposals being rejected in such a way.

Thank you.

Ms Yau, the same question.

MS YAU SIN MAN: (Via interpreter) I think I will have to

see what research studies have been done in the past few years that might have mentioned safety measures. I have to check first.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Lo?

MEMBER LO: I have two questions. The first one is does the TD regularly study the accident statistics on a regular basis to figure out what can be improved, or is that part of TD's job to do so?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes, the TD go through the traffic accident statistics and present their findings at the Road Safety Council.

MEMBER LO: So the police does not do that?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: The police do it in order to target our enforcement, and also to help in designing publicity material and the targeted audience for publicity material.

MEMBER LO: So is it fair to say that the role of the police is really enforcement, accident investigation, and maintaining the database, that would be basically the major functions?

MR STEPHEN BAKER: Yes. I mean, the overall safety strategy is the three Es: engagement, engineering and enforcement. And the police have the major part of the enforcement, obviously, and some of the engagement. But

engineering is more of a TD and Highways area. Yes.

MEMBER LO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, are there any questions arising from the questions of the committee?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: In which case, it remains for the committee to thank you for your assistance over this long day, and to invite you to provide the material that we have identified that you are going to seek to help us with. We will do the best we can to put that together as a list and we will send that to you as soon as we can, with references to the transcript so that you will be able to follow what it is that you were asked to provide.

In those circumstances, our evidence is finished today, and we will resume our hearing on Thursday. Thank you.

(5.34 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 9.00 am on Thursday, 27 September 2018)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE: MS CHAN YI PING, MR STEPHEN BAKER, MS YAU SIN MAN, MR LEE TAI WAI, MR CHEUNG TIN LOK (simultaneous interpretation was used where indicated) 1

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG 1

QUESTIONING BY COMMITTEE 170

2018 年 9 月 24 日

上午 10 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

羅康錦教授，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

陳政龍大律師及黃佩琪大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

邱倩雯女士，署理總警司（交通總部）（香港警務處代表）

白令嘉先生，署理總警司（交通總部）（香港警務處代表）

張天樂先生，警司（刑事總部）（香港警務處代表）

陳依萍女士，警司（行動）（新界北總區刑事總部）（香港警務處代表）

李大偉先生，署理警司（交通管理），（香港警務處代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）各位早晨，早晨，邱總警司。好，多謝你同埋你嘅同事今日出席呢個聽證會，我相信你都知道聽證會嘅程序係點樣，我哋有黃女士，我哋今日嘅代表大律師，就會係引導大家作證，問問題。問題當然係向你提出，邱女士，不過如果你嘅同事係可以提供協助，請你隨便叫個同事，或者其他邊位同事，一位或多位同事可以提供資訊幫我哋，可以咁樣做嘅。你明唔明白？如果你聽問題有問題，你可以提出，睇下我哋可唔可以闡述一下。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，多謝你，邱女士。我會代表委員會提出一啲問題問你嘅。我相信警察就已經總共有八次回應咗委員會一啲嘅問題，响唔同嘅範圍回答咗唔同嘅問題。呢個全部都係我哋响嗰個所謂 Miscellaneous，雜項嗰個文件冊裏面擺晒好。

首先我會問嘅問題係就住幾個課題提出問題，首先第一個就係意外嘅統計數字。邱女士，我相信警方係有一個所有交通意外嘅數據庫，啱唔啱？

邱倩雯女士：我可以用中文答，係咪？

黃女士：Yes, please.

邱倩雯女士：啱嘅，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我要等一等，等個翻譯做完。呢個數據庫，你可唔可以話畀我聽係基於調查報告，即係警察不時進行嘅調查報告所制訂？

邱倩雯女士：我問一問我同事。我哋係有一個資料庫，係關於交通意外嘅資料庫。我哋都係由我哋嘅警區嗰度收集資料返嚟，我哋會寫埋嗰個交通意外嘅原因。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）响制定統計數字，你用咩野資料嚟到係制定呢個數據？

邱倩雯女士：你嘅意思係我哋會收集啲乜嘢嘅資料，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

邱倩雯女士：我或者請我嘅同事去詳細咁樣解釋我哋係會收集啲乜嘢資料，好嘛？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講有關嘅訊息，就係包括資料就係一個車輛嘅類別，係咪有乘客，究竟嗰啲受傷嘅數字、性質，同埋如果係有嚴重受傷，究竟係死亡、輕傷，如果嗰個司機係有錯嘅或者佢係其中一個原因，我哋就會睇睇係根據調查人員所講，邊個人係有份造成呢個嘅成因嘅。

我哋係會用電腦嚟到收集有關嘅資料。呢個就好似响個格仔剔一剔咁做嘅，如果係用電子嘅方法就提交畀道路安全嘅小組嘅，跟住就會畀運輸署。咁等到運輸安全小組同埋運輸署係可以分析嗰個交通意外嘅成因，以便去到設計或者改進嗰個安全策略。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一個所謂範本，即係表格嘅範本嚟到交呢個報告？

白令嘉先生：Yes, my Lord.

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇一個範本嘅副本？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅，係可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以而家畀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想要一個副本。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。白令嘉先生，响咁樣嘅數據表格，你响關於呢個意外嘅成因，你會想知道究竟啲人係點樣受傷，响邊度受傷，或者係咩嘢原因係受傷，啱唔啱，咁樣嚟到係概述你收集嘅資料？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個資料主要係關於意外嘅成因，就唔係嗰個受傷嘅分類。受傷嘅分類淨係話佢係咪嚴重受傷嘅，呢個係視乎嗰個人响醫院係住咗幾耐，定係一個輕傷，定係還是係死亡個案。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個定義係咪响呢個你哋發表嘅交通報告嘅背頁嘅定義？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我最近冇睇過呢份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）我畀份你睇睇，請你畀總警司睇一睇。嗰度有一個備註嘅，就咁畀總警司睇一睇。呢度有幾個詞語嘅定義係响背面嗰度。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係啱嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個定義都係你嗰個標準表格嘅所用？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）其實喺個表格冇咁寫出嚟，不過的確係咁樣用嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我可唔可以攞番我嗰份文件？唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。當你係編製咗呢個資料嘅時候，其他部門或者審計署係咪會唔會審計警方同埋運輸署收嘅數據，咁講啱唔啱？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道審計署點解會參加道路安全...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋幫下你，我哋有份係審計署嘅一份文件，審計署就睇咗一系列嘅事項，亦都睇咗交通安全嘅行政事宜嘅，嗰個係2013年3月。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你睇睇呢個文件，SEC-2號嘅文件冊。白先生，呢個係一個2013年3月28號審計署出嘅報告。呢份文件其實係房屋署、運輸署、香港警方同埋新聞處，就係話關於呢個題目，道路安全嘅行政事宜。呢份文件2013年4月5號交咗畀立法會嘅，呢個係一個衡工量值嘅審計工作嘅一部分嚟嘅。

我想你睇SEC，同一份文件，543頁。我哋可以見到5.2段係咁樣講嘅，「警方係負責調查交通意外」，你有個數據庫，我哋睇一睇第四行，「警方要求調查嘅警務人員要保存番佢哋嗰個調查結果，同埋用一個實體嘅文件，亦都將嗰個意外數據就係攞咗喺一個電腦系統，呢一個TOMS，或者係交通營運管理系統，咁係意外四十八小時內要輸入。嗰個數據係可以修改。

警方呢個TOMS嘅數據庫係運輸署嘅數據庫，佢哋叫做運輸資訊系統，TIS嘅，係利用電子嚟到輸送嗰個交通意外嘅數據嘅。運輸署就係利用呢個TIS嘅意外數據，嚟到去搵出意外嘅黑點，同埋有冇咩嘢意外嘅趨勢，以便進行深入調查同分析嘅。有關數據亦都係一個制定交通安全策略重要嘅資料來源，亦都係可以愛嚟制定安全教育措施，或者係持續檢討交通條例，同埋其他道路安全措施嘅一個資料來源嚟嘅。」

你頭先話畀我聽嗰個有關嘅資料係會同運輸署共用分享，即係以便制定嗰個道路安全嘅策略。今次呢份報告...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未再講之前，我想幫一幫手，白令嘉先生，呢份文件其實我哋有文件响度，可以睇番有關嗰份文件。

白令嘉先生：Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）你如果需要嗰份文件，我哋可以搵人畀你嘅，就係你提出得㗎嘞。可唔可以畀嗰份文件佢？我諗呢個係 S--其實兩冊嘅，SEC-1 同埋 SEC-2。但係開始嘅時候係1？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係份文件最前嗰部分，喺 SEC-1。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，你或者用啲時間睇睇呢份文件，等你知道我哋問嘅問題係關於咩嘢事嘅。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係審計署編訂嘅，佢其實係要嚟審計有關數據，確保警方同埋運輸署使用嘅數據係咪準確嘅。根據我哋睇緊呢份報告，佢係話似乎有啲地方係唔準確嘅，即係話道路安全嘅數據有啲係唔準確嘅。

我哋可以睇476頁，第10段、第11段。首先我哋見到呢度個標題，就係「交通意外數據嘅準確性」，第一就係嗰個位置，跟住嗰個引致交通意外嘅因素。關於交通意外地點嗰段，第四行，「交通意外嘅地點係利用一個叫做座標嘅參考系統嘅。由於輸入座標嘅參考數據唔準確，運輸署係用額外嘅時間同埋資訊嚟到去改善呢個問題，或者糾正個問題。審計署覺得應該係即刻採取有效措施嚟到確保嗰個有關道路座標位置嘅數據要準確輸入，首先第一。」

另一個就係嗰個「引致交通意外嘅因素」嘅。亦都有講有一個係抽樣檢查嘅，第四行，「有一次進行抽樣調查有關引致交通因素嘅調查，我哋就睇到五十宗嘅交通意外。審計署發覺百分之十三輸入有關嘅因素係唔準確，嗰五十宗都冇一個上級嚟到去檢查、複查有關記錄，所以需要喺呢方面加強管理嘅。」

似乎就喺呢兩方面，即係話地點同埋引致意外嘅原因，似乎係不準確。以我所理解，呢一份報告就係2013年時候做。首先問一個比較概括嘅問題，你知唔知道喺報告裏面指出有關於交通意外資料嗰個不準確性？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）當報告寫嘅時候，我係知道。由嗰陣時開始，我就喺其他嘅總區工作，所以就冇再跟進究竟採取咗咩嘢嘅續後措施。喺當時做呢份報告嘅時候，以我所知，嗰個主要嘅問題就係來自位置，即係警察話意外發生嘅位置同喺呢個交通資訊系統裏面記錄低嘅交通意外位置有差異。而我記得警方相信呢一個問題嘅原因，就係交通資訊系統使用嘅地圖系統就係採納番路政署使用嗰個嘅系統，使用就係一啲嘅格網座標。呢個未必一定同警方對於位置嘅描述係一致嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）白令嘉先生，其實呢個問題喺報告裏面都有指出。我想請你睇一睇喺報告裏面所講嘅係乜嘢，就係呢一個嘅544頁嘅5.5段開始。544頁，5.5段。呢度就話「格網座標不準確會對運輸署所制定嘅交通意外黑點準確度有一個不良嘅影響，就係有兩個原因，因為就係話如果同一個格網座標用喺唔同嘅交通意外位置嘅話，就會搞錯咗嗰個黑點嘅位置。同埋就有時可能一啲經

常有交通意外嘅地方可能就會遺漏咗。跟住就話喺2006年嘅覆核裏面，審計署就發現警方就係將一個二十個嘅交通意外嘅地點，就係用同一個座標。警方就係話佢哋因為好多時有啲新路，就未必有咁樣嘅座標。」

跟住第5.8段，545頁，就係「運輸署嘅檢查」。佢就話「為咗減低呢個座標嘅不準確度，運輸署喺2008年開始就因應警方輸入嘅一啲座標，就揀咗幾個去檢查，但係仍然運輸署係搵到警方嘅描述同埋格網座標係有出入嘅。」

所以呢一個5.9段可以睇到「喺呢個2010年4月開會嘅時候，運輸署同警方講話，大約係輸入嘅座標有四成係用意外地點描述有出入。」跟住睇5.10段，審計署就發現到，仍然係有呢個唔準確嘅格網座標，就搵到呢一個七千三百一十四個，即係有兩成六嘅格網座標係唔準確。跟住睇番5.11段，運輸署...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個其實係可能對我哋嚟講就冇咁有關，即係一啲意外嘅成因。或者可以縮短咁講，有冇任何嘅建議去改善呢個問題？其實真正嘅問題就係話有冇做到，可以先睇一睇個建議，就係呢一個5.14段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番5.14段，其實就係548頁。呢度就係建議喺呢個交通資訊系統或者交通行動及管理系統裏面，就可以加一個嘅查核，令到調查嘅人員係一發現出現問題嘅時候，就可以即刻知道。跟住5.15段，警方就話同意呢個建議。

想問自從審計署報告2013年之後，有冇任何嘅改善？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我就想套番落去當時嘅情況回答，我知道2012年嘅時候有呢份審計署報告，之後我係調離開咗交通部，去到2013年先返番去。而且我都唔知道係要問我一啲審計署嘅問題，所以我唔知道要先問一問呢方面嘅資料，先返嚟今日嚟答你。但係以我所記得，2013年嘅時候係有採取一啲措施，就係監察輸入資料。自呢一份報告寫咗之後，交通行動及管理系統其實都已經由另外一個比較新嘅系統，一個個案管理資訊係司取代咗。呢一個較新嘅系統有一啲新嘅設備，等警方可以將唔同嘅資料輸入去嘅，包括埋有關於交通嘅一啲調查。

以我所知道，呢個個案管理資訊系統CMIS，其實就係同運輸署嘅交通資訊系統有聯繫，不過我而家講唔到呢個系統喺咩嘢方面有改善。譬如話係咪喺交通意外地點嘅記錄方面會有任何改善。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我哋都明白你都有去過唔同嘅部門。我哋之後亦都會聽取運輸署嘅證供，但係而家問你就係話，喺位置嘅錯誤方面，你知唔知道有問題出現？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知，我唔肯定。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講番第二個範圍，就係意外嘅成因。呢個比較難嘅，因為

呢個就有關於警方輸入有關交通意外成因嘅資料。我哋睇番 5.17，就係 549 頁，「運輸署就使用警方輸入嘅交通意外成因入去佢哋自己嘅交通資訊系統去搵出呢個環境、駕駛者同埋道路使用者佢哋嗰個嘅問題，同埋嘗試去搵出呢一個嘅改善建議。1998 年做咗一個覆核，當時審計署就發現到其實有個錯誤率，就係呢一個 25%，但係喺 06 年再做一次覆核嘅時候，就係 13%。」

我哋睇番 5.20 段，就發現係五十宗嘅個案都係有問題嘅，牽涉就係二百八十宗嘅意外。審計署發現到就係呢個 13%，即係三十七宗，即係全部三十四宗，呢個三十七宗裏面就係唔準確嘅。佢哋就發現到其中兩宗嘅意外，就發現當時警方就係話有呢一個機件故障，但係事實上唔係。

首先你知唔知道有個咁樣嘅問題，即係呢一方面有關於交通意外嗰個資料輸入係出現咗問題，你知唔知？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔知，我唔知道資料輸入有關於交通意外成因有咁大嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實我哋就想搵出究竟點解會出現咗咁嘅問題，譬如話發生意外之後，牽涉嘅人士就可能同警方講話「我嗰個制動系統就係壞咗」，會唔會警方就因此寫咗落去，就係話呢個係成因。但係之後驗過架車，就發現其實嗰個煞車系統係冇問題，所以就出現咗係有咁嘅問題。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個其實應該改番嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，但係冇改到，就留番喺個系統入面，呢個資料。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）有咁嘅可能。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）當時審計署作出一系列建議，喺 551 頁嘅 5.22 段可以搵到。簡單嚟講係要求警方加強管理嘅控制，提醒監察人員要小心檢查個案記錄裏面同輸入嘅資料係咪一致，亦都需要作出有關嘅檢查，作覆核。以你所知，有冇做到--即係話呢啲嘅建議係咪真係有執行？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係有執行到建議。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）以你所知，你知唔知道有冇任何輸入資料錯誤，即係到目前為止仲有冇呢一啲關於意外成因嘅資料錯誤輸入？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）以我所知，資料輸入係儘量準確。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實你都係一般嚟講，而唔可以話答「有」、「冇」。一般嚟講，你係咪滿意而家嘅做法，嗰個嘅系統都係反映到實際嘅情況？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。請你睇另外一份文件，我哋咁樣做，白先生同埋陳女士

（邱女士？）就係要搵出交通意外資料嗰個準確性。因為呢方面嘅資料對於運輸署做交通安全政策或者改善措施係好重要，所以資料準確性係重要嘅。我哋聽到其中一個專家嘅講法，就佢上個禮拜作證嘅，佢就話我哋需要有啲程序，即係話香港係咪要做一個影響評估。我哋睇番譬如話幾多受害人，亦都睇番個安全個措施，睇番我哋本區裏面受傷嘅人帶嚟嘅費用成本，所以你覺唔覺得呢個係一個比較合理處理安全嘅一個角度？同埋你睇下香港係咪應該制定有關嘅數據？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個所謂嘅利益成本嘅分析，無論你用咩嘢方法，譬如話你可能想响車輛度裝一啲安全嘅設施，呢個咁樣嘅做法，呢個咁嘅分析帶來新嘅措施，就係响澳洲有做嘅。當然需要嘅數據係要準確，我哋特別想睇嘅，就係專營巴士係咪要裝安全帶，呢個問題我哋會事後再探討嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，我諗我想睇一睇嗰個意外成因嘅一個標準一覽表，或者某個階段，或者你可以詳細講一講，我哋再睇一睇裏面嘅內容。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我可唔可以之後再係處理呢個問題？

主席：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我其實都就嚟想講到安全帶嘅問題，我哋想知一啲統計數字，我想睇一睇運輸署嘅一啲數據，同埋專營巴士佢哋有個管理系統裏面講過啲即係非撞車嘅意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我再打擾你。呢個我哋响個聽證會，我哋係收集到一啲機密資料，呢啲可能係專營巴士公司同埋運輸署之間嘅一啲溝通。佢哋得到嗰個要求，就係要嗰啲公司研究一啲意外成因。有冇機會睇睇有關嘅資料，或者响我哋嗰個網頁睇番個資料？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）其實我週末有睇過某一部分嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係講緊作為安全帶，巴士成因係咪有好多都係關於失去平衡嘅原因引致？個數字似乎就話受傷個案，巴士或者巴士裏面有 50%，可能有一啲意外嘅數字係除咗失去平衡，係仲有另一組數字。呢啲我哋會之後再睇睇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）白令嘉先生，頭先我提過有個叫做遠期嘅計劃，即係話巴士公司有個遠期計劃嘅，佢哋會睇睇五年嘅情況，佢哋就會每年睇一睇嗰個意外趨勢數字。呢方面，警方會唔會收到呢個咁嘅遠期嘅計劃，即係運輸署一個遠期計劃嘅文件或者內容？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋未收過，我都唔知道。我諗都冇預期佢哋會畀我哋嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我知道--我哋之前得到嘅講法，就係話係一個機密資料嚟嘅，我哋都用咗幾個月，經過一啲困難先攞到嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想你睇睇TD-1，180頁，呢個係2018至2022，九巴提交畀運輸署嘅遠期計劃。九巴就做咗一個分析，意外性質嘅分析。佢係講緊2015至16年嘅意外嘅，我哋見到呢個表，8.1，乘客失去平衡係佔咗51.5%；8.2.7就話大部分嘅意外係由於乘客喺巴士上面失去平衡，超過一半嘅個案係由於個巴士响行緊嘅時候就煞車嘅。呢度亦都有講其他意外嘅成因。

呢份報告有唔少嘅統計數字，呢個只係其中一部分。我第一個問題就話，呢啲咁樣嘅資料，可唔可以幫到警方？你哋制定數據分析意外嘅時候，對你哋有冇幫助？佢哋當時有畀呢個文件畀你，即係專營巴士公司畀一份咁嘅報告你，會唔會可以幫到警方執行你哋嘅職務？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我第一個印象就係呢啲資料，其實响我哋個意外成因裏面包含在內。我冇法子進一步評論，因為我冇時間睇呢份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你係有咁樣做，你就發覺你哋嘅數據同呢一方面嘅運輸專家所制定或者分析嘅資料都好一致嘅。

白令嘉先生：We would, sir, yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度其中一個審計署嘅建議，就係話即係要特別係睇睇輸入數據係咪準確嘅，呢個係用一個要確保--你確唔確保應該有個叫做查核或者雙重查核，同唔同意？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個會有用嘅，我諗呢個對於我哋嘅同事進行審核或者係雙重審核。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係作為參考？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係有用嘅，我哋可以對照一下，我哋同事响嗰個調查嘅時候，都好徹底嘅調查搵到嘅資料可以進行一個對照。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）响編製你哋嘅數據，有一個例子，就譬如話乘客失去佔51.5%。我或者想你睇一睇運輸署畀我哋嘅文件，佢係講緊2013年嘅統計數字。2013年5月16號，SEC-2，566頁。呢個文件係由運輸署寫畀立法會，响567頁，(c)呢一段，佢呢度就列出專營巴士嘅意外，就話...

主席：（經傳譯員）未繼續講詳細情況，可唔可以幫助白令嘉先生講講個信件嘅背景？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係回應審計署嘅，寫信畀番立法會。佢哋當時考慮審計署報告嘅第二張，即係道路安全措施嘅管理系統，就頭先講過係輸入嘅資料唔準確嘅問題。運輸署根據佢哋嘅資料提供咗一啲統計數字。

(a)就話「2016 年响一百二十宗交通死亡意外裏面，有十五宗係屬於公路嘅。」佢就話「唔係好多海外嘅大城市都係會分別為公路交通提供一啲意外嘅統計數字，佢哋只能夠搵到一啲英國嘅主要城市嘅有關數字。」去到(c)嗰段，佢就有一個係摘要，就話「專營巴士嚟講，由於佢哋所載嘅乘客數量好大，同埋係乘客係會企响度，有站立乘客嘅。就會見到，就算冇撞車，好多時候都會令到乘客受傷嘅。因為乘客可以車箱裏面種種原因，譬如話冇緊握扶手，就失去平衡，或者佢上車、落車失去平衡。呢啲係屬於佢哋所叫嘅非撞車型嘅意外。如果係專營巴士，58%係所謂非撞車類別嘅意外嚟嘅。」

呢個同佢哋遠期計劃裏面提供嘅統計數字係咪相符？我哋其實有一份運輸署比較新嘅數字，不過我哋唔需要睇嗰啲嘅暫時。佢而家講緊個百分率係 59%至 65%，即係 2012 至 2017 年涉及專營巴士嘅意外係屬於一啲非撞車嘅意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊非撞車引致嘅受傷個案？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。我哋個參考編號就 TD-1，111 頁，第 5 段。我想問下响你制定你哋嘅數據，你會唔會分開乘客坐低受傷，定係乘客係企位，即係站立响巴士裏面？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）照我記得，我哋冇咁樣分開嘅，即係話嗰個受害嘅乘客係企响度定坐响度。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為你哋嘅工作方法，就住整體嚟講，你哋標準嘅範本就唔係設計作為分開有咩嘢特別情況，即係嗰個標準範本文件係乜嘢車都啱用嘅？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋睇睇呢個文件係有用嘅，因為會等我哋知道警方係點樣睇嗰個意外同埋受傷嘅成因，點樣進行一個歸類嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋睇睇你嗰份標準嘅範本文件，或者先確立某啲事實先。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先總警司，你可唔可以同我哋講講呢份文件係點嚟，係咩嘢嚟？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢度即係話係由於司機引致嘅交通意外成因嘅一覽表，响嗰個左邊有個編號嘅，呢度係畀我哋嘅同事可以輸入去個電腦系統嘅，即係話呢個意外係咩嘢成因。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度有兩個表格--唔好意思，其實有兩格，第一格似乎底嗰格就係一個摘要，就係唔同嘅來自司機嘅成因，一啲大嘅意外。底部嗰一大個表格，就係將一啲主要嘅成因列咗出嚟，就係由多一路係少咁樣列出。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我冇諗過你會問呢啲問題，冇準備。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋逐步問，頂部嗰個清單好清楚顯示咗，就係話一個係全部都適用嘅。不過呢啲全部都係因為司機而引致嘅意外，總共有六十二種，係嘛？即係唔好講右手邊做咩嘢，唔好理佢，淨係講番可能引致意外嘅原因，係嘛？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番下面個表格，就係司機引致嘅意外原因。第一就係唔專心駕駛，就有一百八十九宗。講緊嘅係 2018 年首八個月，係嘛？呢個編碼係 56 號。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住一路落去，下一個就係 60 號，冇確保乘客安全，可以見到就係九十七宗，係 2018 年首八個月嘅數字。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第三個主要成因，就係與前車距離太近。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第四個就係不小心轉線。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第五個要係為免碰撞，同埋突然間扭軚或者停。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟住嗰個就係不適當或者非法轉彎。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可以見到總共係有--我冇計過，不過大約有十零個成因係抽咗出嚟。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個表冇搵出引致乘客受傷--譬如話失去平衡，我哋可以喺邊度搵到呢類嘅資料？因為呢個表冇呢類資料。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。我哋做統計只係會將傷勢分類，唔會再進一步分類。我哋就係要睇番嗰個案件報告先至知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋個分類關於受傷，就係話死亡、嚴重同埋係輕傷。而喺 2017 年嗰個嘅交通報告釋義嗰度，就係有解釋到呢啲嘅名詞點解。其實以我睇，即係話輕傷、嚴重受傷，其實都係你哋自己定嘅啫，因為你都係要區分究

竟咩嘢係嚴重，乜嘢係輕傷，冇話一個好特別嘅界定方法。

白令嘉先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為譬如話留院十二個鐘、十五個鐘、三日，你都分得到㗎喇？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講過就係話有三類嘅傷勢，有冇再分你係關於專營巴士？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道有啲咁嘅範本。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有關於喺巴士上面，乘客失去平衡，你點計番嗰個數字出嚟？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我要再搵一搵，我而家手頭冇呢啲資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲其實係根本唔關你哋事嘅資料嚟？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）係由到場嘅警員定係之後嘅人士先至去決定究竟因咩嘢原因發生意外？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）就係調查意外嘅警務人員，佢會去到現場睇番，跟住返去就會將嗰個成因係輸入番電腦入面。呢啲嘅資料就會由交通部嘅交通安住小組負責。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）即係話有唔同嘅人士，譬如話有呢個巴士公司，佢就可能調查過，佢哋嘅資料會唔會返番去你度，譬如話乘客失去平衡？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔會，淨係我哋嘅警方調查。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署呢？邊個係最後保留話呢個先至係正式嘅成因，係你哋定運輸署，定係咩嘢人？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）警方輸入嘅資料都係基於我哋做嘅調查，跟住就會輸入電腦，跟住交畀運輸署佢哋去分析。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）即係話呢啲資料就唔會由運輸署再返番去你度嘅？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以入去運輸署嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係運輸署就會用你哋嘅資料，但係你哋就冇專營巴士公司意外成因呢方面嘅資料，你冇㗎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）即係話其實喺巴士公司、警方同埋運輸署保存嘅資料可能有出入？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）有咁嘅可能，不過我就想講，我哋係會睇番自己嘅評估去決定究竟個成因係乜嘢。因為意外係由警務人員調查過，亦都係會見過一啲嘅傷者。但係關於專營巴士公司方面，我唔知道佢哋點做。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署就喺呢個三角嘅頂部，佢哋會透過遠期計劃--我哋而家知道呢個遠期計劃係乜嘢，同埋係從你嗰度會取得資料，即係話佢哋會有兩個源頭，但係你哋只係得一個資料來源？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果運輸署發現有錯誤、有出入，即係警方輸入嘅資料，對番專營巴士公司發現警方輸入嘅資料有錯誤嘅話，你知唔知佢哋會點做，會唔會先問下你哋先？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我知道運輸署如果佢哋覺得資料有出入的話，會同我哋講一講。我唔知所有嘅情況會點，即係因乜嘢嘅原因，佢哋會認為有出入。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀個例子去顯示嗰個程序究竟係點？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）定期，我哋交通安全小組有時會收到運輸署交嚟嘅個案，要求我哋覆核番提供咗嘅資料，但係就唔知道佢哋基於乜嘢嚟就話有出入嘅，係咪因為巴士公司畀嘅資料或者咩嘢嘅原因。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺你哋覆核提供嘅資料裏面，你哋會採取咩嘢步驟？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會聯絡番處理呢一次調查嘅總區，咁去再 check 番一次佢哋輸入電腦嘅資料係咪準確，即係話係咪同佢哋呢個調查檔案裏面所寫嘅資料係一致。

主席：（經傳譯員）調查意外嘅時候，喺邊一個階段會將呢啲編碼輸入去電腦入面，係邊個階段？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係好早期，意外發生之後幾個鐘頭就輸入。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺覆核嘅過程中，應該都會係較後嘅時間。當時會有啲乜嘢嘅材料畀你哋去睇番，去確認最初初個評估係咪準確？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）初步評估其實就係警務人員返番寫字樓之後就會做，之後有可能會作進一步調查發現到可能係需要更新，譬如話可能驗咗車之後，就發現原來煞車系統係正常嘅，唔係好似司機所講係壞咗。所以我哋需要時間，就係再向證人嗰方面搵出資料，同埋分析一啲事實，先至可以係作出呢個決定嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係負責調查嘅人員負責輸入資料，係嘛？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邊個會複查？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）通常係警長，仲有好多唔同程度，唔同層次嘅監察嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係負責嗰一個分區嘅警長？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，其實就係嗰個調查人員嘅上司。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）而家講安全帶，我哋頭先講咁多統計數字係因為同安全帶係有關嘅。我哋其中一個聆訊裏面聽到嘅資料，就係企喺度嘅人係戴唔到安全帶，...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我再打扠。冇用安全帶係會唔會出現喺你哋嗰個司機引致意外嘅範本裏面？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係意外引致嘅成因。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係會引致受傷。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我要再進一步睇番先至可以回答你問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個範本只係限於因為司機引致嘅意外原因，唔係話之後嘅後果？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個司機引致嘅原因，呢啲嘅因素係佢哋對上一次更新係幾時？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔知。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以搵下，跟住適當時候畀番資料我哋？你哋部門會唔會考慮搜集資料有關於一啲嘅交通意外之後發生嘅事，即係有關於唔同嘅傷勢？

主席：（經傳譯員）你其實想要警司做乜嘢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）譬如例如好似話乘客失去平衡，好似專營巴士公司做嘅統計，或者將呢度嘅清單擴大，即係搵出就係話邊一個原因引致乘客失去平衡，同埋搵番嗰個比例。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我都要時間先至可以搵出究竟點樣去調查，因為呢個係牽涉進一步嘅資料。唔好意思，我而家冇呢啲資料，係冇帶嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我講番安全帶，因為係同安全帶有關。因為我哋發現到，

咁係呢個非撞車嘅意外裏面，59%至到 65%都係乘客失去平衡...

主席：（經傳譯員）未問呢個之前，我就想問一個一般嘅問題。作為一個調查嘅工具，即係有關於巴士上面嘅巴士意外，呢個比較窄嘅範圍。乘客因為失去平衡受傷，你哋其實知唔知道--即係睇下你知唔知道，警方會唔會睇番黑盒去調查，搵下譬如司機係咪突然耷車，突然加速、減速咁？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋亦都可以睇到任何證物或者係調查任何證物嘅，譬如話如果係調查嗰啲可拘捕罪行、危險駕駛、不小心駕駛等等，我哋都可以接觸到啲證物嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白呢個係一個比較普遍嘅問題，我其實問題實際上警方真係會睇番頭先我講嗰啲設備？當然有人死亡嘅個案，肯定你係會睇。如果佢話有個女乘客失去平衡，就跌斷咗條腳，你會唔會睇嗰個黑盒？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講可能會，不過我要先問一問我啲同事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我跟進呢個問題，係咪有個一般嘅標準做法，喺調查交通意外嘅時候係一個恆常嘅做法，你要搵嗰個黑盒，或者佢哋遙距記錄嘅系統，即係你會同嗰個專營巴士公司攞番呢樣嘢嚟睇，係咪一般嘅做法？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔知呢個係咪一個常規嘅做法，我需要先問一問我同事先知道究竟有幾常用呢個方法。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢方面，如果閉路電視有錄影，巴士上面如果有閉路電視有影到嘢，會唔會睇？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個似乎就唔係我呢個層面，就曾經工作上接觸過，我要問一問同事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇一睇一個工作小組，即係關於安全帶嘅，工作小組嘅工作。先睇睇個有關文件，呢個工作小組就關於專營巴士增強安全嘅一個工作小組，呢個係 2018 年 2 月大埔巴士意外之後成立嘅。呢個係 TD，即係運輸署，TD-1，94 頁。

先講講個背景，呢個係因為 2018 年 2 月大埔巴士意外，然後成立嘅工作小組。所以五間專營公司都有代表响度嘅，亦都有包括製造商同埋運輸署嘅代表。响 2018 年 3 月中，就要睇睇究竟係咪適合或者採用啲新科技，安裝一啲新嘅安全設施嚟到去保障巴士公司。

你係咪知道呢一個咁嘅工作小組？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔知嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）警方方面，你就唔知道有咁嘅工作小組。警方裏面有冇人知，你知唔知有冇邊個人負責...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我可以幫幫總警司，你可唔可以描述一下呢個工作小組係有啲乜嘢人參與，有邊方面參與？或者睇睇有關嘅文件。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）總警司，請你睇第4段，嗰個備註1所涉及嘅各方面，就係話專營巴士公司，即係話九巴、龍運巴士、城巴、新世界第一巴士同埋新大嶼山巴士。去番第4...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者呢度睇睇嗰頁嘅最頂嗰度，「運輸署成立咗一個工作小組，所以專營巴士」--"FB"即係專營巴士，呢度用咗個簡寫。跟住嗰裏面就有個備註1，同埋巴士嘅製造商，成立嘅日期就係2018年3月中，其實係3月13號嚟到係複檢究竟係咪適合，或者技術上係咪可行，或者採用啲新嘅科技嚟到增加對巴士乘客嘅保障。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）警方就冇代表喺呢個工作小組，冇代表參與。呢方面我想問一問你，其實我想問下關於安裝安全帶嘅事，請你發表一個意見嘅。喺呢份文件第5段，呢度有提過一件事，就係話安裝安全帶，呢個係工作小組嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者可唔可以讀晒成段，畀總警司知道個背景？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，我哋讀番第5段。

「由於2006年7月，九巴就同另一架車撞車嘅意外，引致上層巴士乘客就係被拋出咗架車。2007年12月有另一個類似嘅意外，城巴就同新巴嘅巴士喺將軍澳相撞，有三個車上嘅乘客被拋出，即係話城巴嘅三個乘客就係拋出巴士之外嘅。運輸署就建議同埋個巴士公司同意，就話上層最前嗰四個座位就要再裝番安全帶，所有1997年之後攞到牌照嘅巴士都要有呢個安全帶，嚟到防止上層嘅巴士被拋出車外。同埋所有嗰啲即係冇保護、暴露嘅座位都要有安全帶嘅。呢個工作小組就係研究究竟係咪所有專營巴士嘅所有座位都要安裝安全帶。」

我想睇睇關於呢個工作小組嘅會議記錄嘅某幾段，呢度佢哋亦都有唔同嘅工作小組之下，仲有啲分組嘅，我想你睇一睇。

主席：（經傳譯員）未繼續之前，總警司或者你嘅同事，你哋有冇人知道，其實我哋講緊2008年，有因為2006、2007年呢兩宗巴士意外，佢就裝咗--嗰啲容易暴露，冇安全嘅座位，即係話就响前面嘅座位安裝安全帶，同埋有一個好似護欄嘅一個橫柵嘅，冇遮擋嘅座椅就安裝咗--上層冇遮擋嘅座椅安裝安全帶。當時佢哋制定呢啲咁樣嘅措施，有冇諮詢過警方？可能冇，你唔知，不過如果知嘅，請你將你嘅經驗同我哋分享。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道有件咁嘅事。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅同事？總警司，你可唔可以問一問，究竟當時有冇問過警方嘅意見？呢個係立法會研究過嘅一個課題嚟嘅。我哋預期由於呢件事嘅性質，同埋警方應該會有個參與，可能都會唔會問過警方嘅意見？應該係會問，係咪

呀？

你有冇其他嗰啲參考嘅文件編號嚟到幫警方？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先我哋睇睇嗰個工作小組佢哋最後得到嘅成果，然之後我哋之後睇番嗰個會議記錄。請你睇403至到427頁，呢個運輸署喺2018年7月交畀立法會，為佢哋7月25號進行討論提供嘅文件，呢個就一個摘要列出工作小組嘅建議。大家可以睇407頁底嗰度...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者令到總警司知道嗰個背景，我先睇第1頁。呢個文件係由運輸署、運房局提供嘅文件，係方便佢哋喺今年7月25號立法會運輸事務委員會進行討論嘅呢份文件嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）睇番407頁個底嗰度，呢度有啲建議，佢就列出...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋先睇403頁，嗰度有啲背景嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者請你睇第2段出嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，白先生，第2段係咁講嘅，「由於喺2018年2月10號大埔道，九巴發生過致命意外嘅。運輸署就喺2018年3月中成立一個促進專營巴士安全嘅工作小組，成員來自所有專營巴士營運公司，同埋主要嘅巴士嘅製造商，嚟到考慮有冇可能採取進一步嘅措施嚟到增加巴士安全嘅。工作小組嘅工作範圍包括以下範圍：一，探討技術上是否可行，係咪可以適合，同埋是否合符成本利益嚟到係喺巴士上安裝一啲車內嘅安全設施，或者係採納啲科技，同埋為所有嘅座位提供安全帶是否可行，同埋訓練方面係點進行檢討。」

佢就話「當時工作小組自從2018年3月係舉行咗三次--技術組亦都有五次會議。有關嘅結論同埋建議就係喺下面嗰幾段列出嚟。嗰個車內安全設施或者採納科技就喺第4段，去建議採納或者安裝某啲設備。」跟住請你睇407，呢個係特別講到乘客座位安裝安全帶。第10段就係列出佢哋當時嘅睇法，即係話所有冇遮擋嘅巴士座位都應該係安裝安全帶，防止佢哋跌出座位嘅。

佢就話「所以新巴士，只要係新巴士都可以安全啲符合國際標準嘅安全帶。所有專營巴士營運商都同意自從2018年7月開始，佢哋所訂購嘅新巴士都會安裝乘客嘅安全帶嘅。」第12段，呢個係講緊喺一啲冇安全帶嘅巴士度，就安裝番巴士嘅安全帶。第六行，睇一睇番實際上，裝番安全帶，特別係嗰啲下座，就會係需要喺巴士嘅底架就進行一啲改動，或者增強，亦都需要將佢嘅結構係加強，嚟到加一啲支架或者係要換晒所有座位，先至可以符合國際標準，關於嗰啲係巴士安全帶嘅拉力等安全保障。

所以營連商覺得技術上唔係好實際，就算唔係話完全做唔到都係唔係好實際嚟到將所有上層同下層嘅座位重新裝番安全帶嘅。第13段，「但係如果就係所

有上層，喺某一啲嘅汽車種類裏面都會加裝安全帶嘅話，就會更加可行。」喺 14 段繼續講，「工作小組就係考慮到時間同埋人手都好重要，巴士製造商就係冇呢個所需嘅設備同埋人手去加裝。」再睇番下面有一啲嘅巴士營運者表示關注，就係話加裝安全帶唔單只會引致大量嘅成本增加，同埋需要時間、人手，亦都需要去再買更多嘅巴士，同埋將佢調配，先至可以維持到現有嘅服務水平。跟住第 16 段「建議係小組嘅」...

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，可唔可以講呢啲覆核有冇係就於外國嘅做法睇過？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番 15 段，「工作小組就話佢哋有睇過外國嘅做法，即係有關於喺巴士上面要求安裝同埋要求乘客配戴安全帶。喺一啲城製同埋跨境嘅服務裏面，有啲地方譬如英國、美國同埋荷蘭，就係所有嘅乘客位都一定要提供安全帶。但係一啲其他即係英國、荷蘭同埋澳洲嘅維多利亞，就話一定要配戴安全帶。但係喺城市裏面嘅一啲嘅巴士，就係容許企位。

所以工作小組就係覆核過有關於要求乘客一定要配戴安全帶。睇番呢一啲外國地方嗰個運輸當局，其實呢啲城市嘅巴士路線都係比較短，路程同埋時間都係比較短嘅。」跟住睇番...

主席：（經傳譯員）係 415 頁，附件 B，你可以見到唔同嘅國家，冇一個國家要求城市內嘅巴士或者容許企位嘅巴士種類係要求乘客配戴安全帶嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）未講建議之前，我就想睇番覆核外國做法，佢哋嘅結論就係話如果可以乘客企的話，硬性規定配戴安全帶係冇用嘅。因為突然煞車、停車，就會引致企喺度嘅乘客受傷。而且一啲市內巴士，一般嚟講路程都係比較短，車速可以接受，所以就唔及跨境、高速公路咁危險。因為跨境同埋高速公路就可能揸車速度會超過每小時 75 公里。

所以想請你講一下，市內巴士用安全帶有冇用？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者未叫佢答一個咁一般嘅問題之前，就想講下第三個成因，係第 15 段有提到嘅，就係話即係唔似人哋預期話市內巴士車速比較慢，而且距離時間都比較短，呢個都係有關。因為即係乘客上咗車仲要戴安全帶，喺咁短嘅路程，係咪真係有咁樣嘅價值？係咪真係值得做？你有冇任何意見？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅。從警方同埋交通安全角度嚟講，警方相信安全帶可以救到你一命。睇番運輸署嘅網頁，就話配戴安全帶可以減低死亡或者嚴重受傷機會一半。安全帶減低--即係喺車速比較慢嘅情況之下，發生意外都好有效嘅。

如果喺道路安全角度嚟睇，我哋會鼓勵儘量使用安全帶。我哋亦都想講小巴都有安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋聽咗證供，就係話其實小巴係同專營巴士係唔同類型。一般嚟講，即係如果想快啲去到終點嘅，就會係坐小巴嘅。冇乜所謂嘅，想到站嘅

時候都仲生存嘅，就會搭專營巴士嘅。你知唔知道因為乜嘢原因，所以硬性要求小巴要戴安全帶？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）唔知。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我未講另外一樣嘢之前，即係有關於呢一個小巴嘅情況，其實喺文件裏面，審計署都有講過小巴乘客戴安全帶嘅事。

主席：（經傳譯員）未講之前，頭先你就係話全世界都承認安全帶可以拯救生命。但係喺附件 B 裏面，英國、澳洲、加拿大、新加坡、荷蘭，佢哋好似仲安全，但係都唔認為市內巴士係需要加裝安全帶。

喺咁嘅背景底下，對於專營巴士強制要提供安全帶，如果真係強制要加裝安全帶，對於話強制乘客配戴安全帶，同埋一個執法方面，你有冇任何嘅意見？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我覺得乘客應該係要有選擇，當然呢個選擇都係要確保乘客係儘量安全。如果冇加裝安全帶，當然就連選擇都冇。有關於執法方面，個人經驗嚟睇，大部分人都唔會戴安全帶，即係佢哋坐小巴嘅時候。可以預計專營巴士情況都會係一樣，即係都係原因一樣，因為唔方便，同埋車程比較短。

所以執法係一個問題，我認為警方係好難定期可以真係有效率咁執到法，目前冇咁樣嘅要求嘅，對於專營巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係小巴有。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，小巴有。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係對於小巴執法方面，容唔容易？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）都難㗎，其實係久唔久先會執法，而唔係定期，係要當警務人員覺得要因為交通安全執法嘅時候，先至會執法。其實對於交通安全有幾個方面嘅，宣傳同埋不時執法。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你係咪繼續？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充，我希望公眾人士唔會因為怕犯法先至遵守法律。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實都要好長嘅時間先說服到乘客喺私家車上面配戴安全帶。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，正如我之前所講，以我哋嘅角度嚟睇，其實乘客有選擇，等佢哋改善交通安全係好重要嘅，呢個係一個個人選擇嚟。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想好快問一問，有關於安全帶。即係有關於小巴嘅情況，你覺得專營巴士上面執法會幾成功？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我冇有關嘅資料，不過我希望公眾人士係知道係對佢哋有

利，所以守法，而唔係話因為怕畀人告，所以守法。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係正如你先前所講，好多人小巴上面都唔戴安全帶而執法係困難嘅。我哋都明白嘅，你係咪認為巴士都會有咁嘅情況？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想先講一講再小休，一般嚟講，你都有提過安全帶係可以保命。我就想講番有關於呢個成本效益分析方面，警方有冇做過任何實證嘅分析，就係話城市內巴士有企位嗰個嘅準確性？

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔明你問咩嘢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇做過分析，就係話巴士有企位，乘客係咪因為冇安全帶而受傷，你有冇做過任何分析比較即係嗰五十幾個百分點，乘客因為失去平衡而受傷，係咪因為冇安全帶？

主席：（經傳譯員）企喺度嘅人係戴唔到安全帶，因為都冇提供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，喺呢方面，你有冇任何統計數字？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我而家都知道咩嘢時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實真正嘅問題，一個比較有用嘅問題，你有冇任何統計數字，就係巴士坐位嘅乘客冇戴安全帶因而受傷有冇統計？因為根據巴士公司所講，就話嗰個數字係非常之低，得1%或者2%，你有冇咁樣嘅資料？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知有咁樣嘅統計，不過我可以再搵下。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係好明顯，如果係坐喺一啲冇遮擋嘅位，被拋出車外，跟住就撞到硬物，就引致死亡或者嚴重受傷，呢個其實亦都可以喺你哋嘅範本裏面，就話有安全帶對佢哋有利但係冇戴到，你哋有冇考慮過，從呢個方面去分析？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會咁做。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，白令嘉先生。

我而家想睇一睇建議，喺第16段，即係運輸署嘅文件409頁。工作小組得出以下嘅建議，(a)就係所有新買嘅巴士所有座位都要提供安全帶；(b)取決於一啲技術、運作，同埋財務可行性嘅評估，就係話上層座位某啲特定嘅路線，即係一啲長途嘅路線係要行高速公路比較少巴士站，就一定要有。

但係運輸署就要求巴士營運商就喺呢一方面同巴士製造商再進一步研究一下係咪技術上可行，即係所有新嘅巴士就會有安全帶。但係現有巴士只會係喺考

慮過財務可行性之後先至會加裝，而且只係喺某一啲嘅座位上層，某啲路線，譬如長途路線比較少啲巴士站嘅，或者會駛經高速公路嘅，先至會加裝安全帶。對於呢一個建議，你有冇任何意見？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個建議係正面嘅，我正所講從安全角度睇，我哋希望儘量廣泛就使用安全帶。呢個建議係一個正確方向行嘅一步。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃小姐，呢個時候方唔方便？

黃女士：Yes. Thank you.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋今日朝頭早而家小休二十分鐘，二十分鐘後我哋重新開會。

上午 11 時 33 分聆訊押後

上午 11 時 53 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，請繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）講番關於安全帶，想請你睇一睇警方寫畀委員會，日期係 18 年 5 月 7 號嘅嗰封信，喺雜項文件裏面，124-1。我哋睇番就係一橫二嗰頁，頂部，就係第三段嘅屘三，就話「大部分嘅」--124-2 頂部，第三段嘅屘三行，見唔見到？呢度就話「大部分專營巴士冇安全帶，同埋站立乘客亦都可能引致乘客受傷，同埋就係--所以係構成一個要通報嘅議案。」咁想睇番，係你小休之前嗰個嘅答--正如你小休之前所講，安全帶好重要？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁講番另外一個範圍，係非法泊車。我哋聽到有啲專營巴士公司就話，就於非法泊車執法，尤其喺巴士站，執法係冇力嘅，咁我就想請你睇番一位鍾先生，William，佢係新巴嘅，文件頁數係 731 頁，TSCP 呢份文件夾。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一日？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係第四日。

主席： Day 4 in the Augustinian calendar?

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係邊一個月？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁就係呢一個嘅18年5月，係喺TSCP文件夾2A。

主席： Thank you.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請你睇番頂部，係一位鍾生，William Chung 佢作證嘅部分，搵到未？

白令嘉先生： (Nodded head).

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢位鍾生就話「喺好多巴士站係有非法泊車，呢啲車係阻住巴士，即係話巴士唔可以泊--行到接近呢一個嘅行人路邊先至可以上落客。」

第十六行，當時呢一個嘅鄧樂勤律師問「係邊方面？」鍾生就話「如果有非法泊車，令到巴士經過嘅時候，嗰個道路嘅係寬度會減少，因為巴士比較龐大，所以就可能會有問題。如果乘客係唔可以喺行人路邊上落嘅話，就會引致到佢哋可能會畀車撞，或者跌倒。」喺執法方面係咪有效，喺二十三行，喺二十三行裏面就講「公司有冇嘗試去解決問題？」鍾生就話「我哋通知運輸署有關於非法泊車黑點，希望喺呢啲路段裏面會有廿四小時嘅禁止區，亦都通知咗警方要佢哋執法。」律師就話「有冇解決問題？」鍾生話「冇乜。」主席亦都講「之後有冇任何行動？」鍾生話「警方會採取行動，咁但係警方一轉背，又出現非法泊車。譬如話喺怡和街，銅鑼灣近住崇光嗰度，呢一個問題成日出現。」

我哋亦都聽到公會講，話用咗好長嘅時間先至可以同警方溝通關於非法泊車嘅問題。所以首先我想問，非法泊車，警方係咪一直知道呢個問題？

主席：（經傳譯員）尤其就係巴士站嘅非法泊車？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，警方係知道有咁嘅問題。喺2017年，我哋總共就進行過四千五百一十次嘅檢控，我哋係告嗰啲喺嗰啲巴士站停車或者泊車嘅人。係，或者可唔可以請你再講講你嘅問題？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲係咪定額罰款嘅？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋個呢個所謂編號570嘅罰款行動。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾多錢，罰，320欠，2017年？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）$450。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家$450？

白令嘉先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）當時呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）當時都好似係。所以我哋知道係有咁樣嘅非法泊車嘅問題，同埋咁呢個問題引起嗰啲人要响其他地方非法停車。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何因為增加罰款而加強個檢控？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）個罰款好多年都冇改，咁呢個當然就比起以前嗰個阻嚇性係低咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）警方嘅睇法就話，要追上通脹，320 鈪嘅罰款應該係增加到 800 鈪左右，當時係咁講，我有冇記錯？

白令嘉先生： It is, sir, yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）當時政府所同意就係罰款係 450 鈪？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃小姐。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋聽到工會嘅人士係投訴，我想你請睇一啲嗰個紀錄嘅摘要，佢哋投訴話警方冇有力咁去執法，針對响巴士公司非法泊車嘅車輛執法，咁呢個係一個持續嘅問題。佢有提過，警方唔夠人手，或者係調派做執法嘅，針對呢啲非法泊車車輛嘅人手係不足。佢哋亦都有講，自從 2017 年，雖然警方嘅數字就顯示佢哋執法係加強咗力度，佢就見唔到一啲顯著嘅改善，關於呢一個即係話未能夠--即係或者執法不力嘅呢個問題，你有咩嘢回應，對於呢啲咁嘅睇法？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋盡力係執法，呢個係我哋會做。採取執法行動，即係响巴士站執法當然係重要，但係未必係等於我哋當時任何一段時間嘅最高優先次序，譬如話公眾可能投訴，好多地方非法泊車，引致阻塞，引起交通嘅問題塞住咗，咁我哋當然係會增加我哋針對非法泊車嘅執法行動，或者係車輛引致阻塞嘅罪行，我記得舊年我哋就增加咗大概係百分之四十，根據我而家記得。咁前線嘅人員收到嗰啲投訴，就大部--有百分之三十係同嗰啲車輛引起阻塞，或者係非法泊車有關嘅，所以我覺得警方係已經盡力嚟到係採取行動，針對引起阻塞或者係非法泊車嘅罪行。或者我想請邱女士都可以補充幾句。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，請你講，邱女士。

邱倩雯女士：除咗喺加強執法方面，咁其實我哋喺嗰個公眾教育嗰度，我哋都做咗啲嘢。喺 2018 年，我哋亦都喺警訊節目嗰度，特別提到就係關於係喺巴士站非法停泊嘅問題，咁希望公眾係有留意到呢個事情。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋見到最近一啲新聞報告，警方今年自從 8 月 1 號進行咗開始咗個六個月嘅執法行動，特別係針對嗰啲交通阻塞嘅黑點，咁呢個亦

都包括响受限制區域嘅上落客、上落貨，咁私家車就係响巴士站或者小巴站或者的士站上落客，或者係非法進入嗰個黃格，或者係唔適當地進行調頭轉彎。咁為咗加強執法，呢五種嘅罪行而家係會涉及罰款係 400 鈆，如果喺禁區上落乘客，就個罰款就係 560 鈆。我想問，關於呢個--呢啲黑點，警察係點樣揀呢啲黑點嘅？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）警方係透過我哋個個案管理系統，係有能力辨識究竟邊笪地方係有引致好多嘅交通方面嘅投訴，咁呢個係一個因素我哋可以睇嘅；另一個因素就係，直接向警署--公眾直接向警署投訴，一係打電話，一係寫信收到嘅投訴。所以响當區，嗰個指揮官係的確係有辦法知道，邊笪地方係擠塞黑點，咁亦都可以同總區嘅管理指揮嘅單位係分享有關資訊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁根據你個講法，呢啲投訴有冇部分係從嗰個工會或者係專營巴士公司度提出？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有個安排，嚟到同佢哋嗰啲工會同埋專營巴士公司嚟到聯絡，就算唔係全部，都有大部分都係基於--我係講緊係公眾嘅投訴，公眾向警方提出嘅投訴，同埋有部分--再加埋有部分就係巴士公司提出，亦都有啲工會提出嘅投訴。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你當時講呢個運動，執法行動係會試驗性質，咁跟住之後九龍東、新界北亦都有一個試驗計劃，從舊年 12 月到今年 1 月就進行嘅，咁佢話初步嚟講，似乎就效果你哋滿意嘅，咁有五百四十張嗰啲罰款單係發咗出嚟。一般嚟講，你哋會响邊度裝呢啲咁嘅鏡頭？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個試驗計劃，舊年 12 月、今年 1 月進行嘅，咁我哋就會叫我哋警方嘅同事就用一個手提嘅鏡頭嚟到執法，就唔係固定鏡頭。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個方法嚟到執法，執行呢個交通法例，係咪貴㗎？係咪好貴，或者人力需要好多？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋希望減少呢方面依賴人力嘅即係情況，响試驗計劃，主要話嗰啲行車，即係車輛嘅罪行，譬如話禁區上落客，一般嚟講，要執法呢一類嘅罪行，要針對呢啲罪行執法，嗰個警務人員係要截停架車，當場截停架車，或者亦都有啲情況個車駛走咗，所以我哋就要根據一個--或者之前要整定一個路障，或者有人係要揸車跟住架車，跟住截停架車，因為有呢樣咁嘅要求，我哋需要多啲人手，做咁樣嘅執法行動係需要更多人手。呢個咁樣嘅試驗計劃就係容許我哋警務人員就用一個錄影嘅設備，另外一方面就去寫低個筆記，佢見到啲咩嘢，嚟到採取執法行動，又唔需要截停架車。咁所以截停車輛嘅人手，即係一係就警務人員，一係就坐電單車截停佢，或者係用路障，就冇再需要做。所以其實我哋想增加嗰個執法行動嘅效率。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇諗過淨係用鏡頭嚟到錄低，咁就唔需要嗰個人--警方人員嚟到係即係揸電單車追佢，譬如話你可以影到佢嗰個車牌，咁你就請--叫嗰個車

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

主嚟到係--你就搵到個登記車主？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋試驗緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）我意思即係唔需要人做呢樣嘢。

白令嘉先生： I see.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔需要錄影嘅，自動嘅。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個喺我哋長遠啲會再諗。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實倫敦係廣泛使用緊，係咪呀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）其他地方都係喎，新加坡，係咪？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁點解香港唔用？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我會話呢個係一個政策問題，而家我哋係處理緊呢個政策問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）關唔關撥款嘅問題？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我諗同撥款冇關係，呢個係關於個政策嘅支持。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以講番第一個問題？用警察，即係個人，警務人員嚟到係執法，即係違反--即係針對交通事項執法，係咪好貴？係，係，係，需要費用好高？係，即係相對於科技？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇諗過裝一啲閉路電視，或者一啲鏡頭响嗰個巴士站，或者附近裝鏡頭？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我想請邱女士答呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，總警司，邱女士。

邱倩雯女士：利用 CCTC 喺嗰個巴士站做嗰個執法係有--而家係有一個嘅試驗計劃，但係呢個係政府嘅 Development Bureau，呢個係發展局同埋運房局嘅一個計劃嚟。而家就係由發展局嘅起動九龍東，Energising KE Office，咁樣就啟動一個試驗計劃，proof of concept 嘅 trial，咁樣就係喺九龍東嘅地方，就係會 install 一啲嘅固定嘅攝影機，咁第一個嘅計劃就係影一啲即係行車嘅一啲嘅交通嘅範例；第二個個部分就會係嗰個試驗計劃就會係用喺一啲嘅停車，

即係違例泊車嘅交通違例嗰度，咁呢個計劃而家係進行緊。其實啱啱正正今年嘅 8 月份，就會係出個投標，咁希望喺未來嘅大概二十四個月裏面，會睇下點樣利用呢個科技，可以喺呢個交通執法嗰度代替人手，咁樣當呢個技術係成熟嘅話，呢個就會應用喺運房局嘅策動之下，就會係睇下喺而家警方係點樣可以利用到呢啲試驗計劃嘅成果，而做到代替人手去做呢個交通執法。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係成熟嘅技術，亦都廣泛喺大城市應用，冇一啲唔成熟嘅地方㗎。

邱倩雯女士：而家係校緊個電腦，點樣利用一個叫做 video analytic 嘅技術去影一部車，點樣為之停泊喺一個地方，而造成一個係違例停泊嘅即係一個 offence。另外我想補充就係，而家喺違例停泊嗰個法例上面，我哋係必須要係當時當地將嗰個告票交畀司機，或者係擺喺嗰個即係車頭嘅玻璃嗰度。如果係離開咗，即係如果係用一個類似電子告票咁樣，或者係一個閉路電視影到嘅影像，然後發告票，喺現時嘅法例，係唔可以做到。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係唔可以將--用呢一個嘅係相機影咗嗰個車牌，然之後將個告票寄去地址？

邱倩雯女士：如果係違例告票--違例停泊，係唔可以，但係 for 一啲行車嘅交通嘅犯法係可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁非法泊車要點，就係擺喺架車嗰度，將個告票？

邱倩雯女士：可以擺喺車頭嗰度，或者係畀司機。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁要改變個囉喎，唔係咩？要追上技術嘅改善吖嘛。

邱倩雯女士：我哋知道運房局已經喺呢個修改法例嗰度，已經開始做緊啲嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）改例法要刪除係容易好多個喎。黃律師，請繼續。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個概念計劃，可唔可以講係幾時有呢個意念，即係係運房局去發展呢個技術，係幾時嘅事？係發展局。

邱倩雯女士：警方係喺 2017 年嘅 4 月，就由發展局嗰邊起動九龍東嗰個辦公室，就係邀請警察去參與，就畀意見。主要我哋嘅意見就係講畀個承辦商，個合約商知道，點為之犯咗一個交通嘅法例。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇嗰次會面嘅會議紀錄，即係有關於發展呢個計劃，同發展局一齊做？

邱倩雯女士：我哋應該可能會有啲材料，但我要返去睇一睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果搵到，會唔會樂意提供？

邱倩雯女士：可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有關於呢一點，以我理解，警方一直用自動車牌認證嘅系統，由 2015 年開始已經使用呢個 ANPR 呢個系統？

邱倩雯女士：我唔係好記得個年份，但係我哋而家係有用緊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺立法會文件裏面，最近嘅一份有講，係保安事務委員會，有關於係呢一個 18 年 4 月，有關於呢一個嘅行車罪行執法，咁係保安局、警方同埋運房局，咁就係喺保安事務委員會裏面傾過，有關於行車罪行嘅執法。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇號碼㗎？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇呀，呢個係新加嘅，今朝早加嘅，主席。我哋可以見到喺第二段，「背景」嗰度，「警方係一直有執行佢哋嘅工作，就係確保道路安全，其中一個就係要確保道路安全，同埋減少交通意外，呢個係佢哋嘅行動首先任務嚟㗎，咁佢哋亦都採取多方面嘅工作，去促進交通安全，同埋打擊一啲嘅行車罪行，同埋仲有宣傳、教育，要公眾同埋駕駛者遵守法例。」

跟住第七段，就係有關於係執法，行車罪行嘅執法使用技術，呢度話「目前就係有一百九十五個紅燈嘅攝影機，另外有二十四個快相機，咁就喺一個嘅係一百三十個嘅位置裏面嘅，可以令到警方收集證據，亦知道係邊架嘅汽車涉事，同埋唔需要截停架車，都可以拘控嗰個--都可以就係控告有關嘅人士。咁 2015 年開始已經使用呢一個嘅自動車牌識別系統㗎喇，咁可以幫助到警方執法，包括埋汽車行車證過期，咁同埋係冇駕駛執照情況底下行車等等。」

咁有關呢個自動車牌識別系統，似乎呢個系統係來自倫敦嘅，係嘛？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）或者可以我幫手答。

黃女士： Yes, thank you.

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）喺使用自動識別車牌系統方面，係有做過--喺 2013 年嘅時候，進行試行，咁係嗰個範圍有限，係喺路邊安裝一架攝影機，就同運輸署嘅資料聯繫，資料就係有關於一啲同交通罪行有關嘅拘捕令。跟住就會喺路邊路障截停佢，或者用電單車跟住呢架車，去拘控呢個涉事嘅人士，所以係喺有限範圍下試行。而家我哋採取咗措施，擴大自動車牌識別系統嘅使用範圍，亦都擴大可以聯繫到數據庫嘅一啲罪行。我哋目前搵緊一啲設備，可以擺喺警車入面，喺公路巡邏，可以聯繫一啲犯罪人士、被通緝車輛，咁如果架車係登記係一啲未執行嘅拘捕交通罪行拘捕令嘅汽車，亦都可以利用佢搵到。呢個系統，我哋想用嘅範圍就係呢啲。第七段裏面所講，係冇確實咁講到實際情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話係只限於已經係被通緝嘅人士？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係用嚟捉一啲犯咗行車嘅罪行嘅人？

白令嘉先生： That's right, sir.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇原因點解唔係咁樣用？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）其實仲有另外一個系統，係警車使用嘅，可以記錄低，利用錄影記錄低喺馬路上面犯交通罪行嘅人士，不過都係需要警務人員去操作，唔係自動系統嚟。正如邱女士所講，我哋將來係希望可以用呢一個數據分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁使用好似倫敦裏面嗰啲黃格裏面嘅系統？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）呢個都係同數據分析有關。

主席： Yes.

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋目前冇呢啲技術。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係倫敦嗰個已經十年前個囉喎？

白令嘉先生： I know, sir, yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋好成功，成功到係因為啲人犯法，嗰個罰款數額係去到幾百萬英鎊喺。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，但係如果安裝呢啲設備，唔係淨係警方嘅事宜，其實就係政策方面嘅事宜嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁當然仲有呢一個私人嘅問題。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係權衡即係犯法呢一方面嘅考慮喎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

邱倩雯女士：（經傳譯員）或者我再補充下黃格犯罪？（證人直接用本地話說）喺 2015 年 9 月，運房局亦都係開始去研究喺嗰個黃格仔嗰個 yellow box 嘅 enforcement camera system，但係去到 2016 年嘅 4 月，因為冇呢個財務嘅支持，所以嗰個研究計劃亦都停止咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個負責係支付？

邱倩雯女士：運房局嗰度係提出唔到有一個 funding support，嗰個財務嘅支持。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係總警司喺呢一個 18 年 8 月嗰封信裏，Cadman 先生已經提到㗎嘞，係？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以喺個螢幕上面打番出嚟？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係雜項文件裏面第124-538頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）再畀一次個頁數。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就係124-538。頭先邱女士提及嗰段就係第四段，就係124-539頁。或者我讀出嚟，以作紀錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第四段，你就話「有關於係黃格執法，喺2015年9月嘅時候，運房局就係同警方開始研究，睇下可唔可以係技術上、財務上同埋法律上可行，去用呢個黃格執法攝影系統。自此之後，警方就係嘗試搵一個適合嘅產品，可以適用喺香港。但喺2016年4月嘅時候，呢個研究就終止咗嘞，因為係冇錢做顧問研究。雖然如此，但係嗰件事就係同其他一啲執法嘅攝影機，其實喺部門之間係有傾過。」呢度就話，呢件事其實都係積極考慮。有乜嘢係令到係終止？

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋知道，係冇財務支持吖嘛。其實冇人話政府冇錢，其實係啲錢用喺邊度先至係問題？

邱倩雯女士：而家喺運房局嗰度，亦都同警方同埋運輸署，我哋有定期嘅會議，咁我哋亦都將整體上面嘅用科技點樣去執行呢個交通嘅犯法，我哋都係即係將好多嘅計劃都喺嗰度提出，咁亦都包括咗就係黃格嘅路口嘅執法。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時會考慮重新進行計劃？

邱倩雯女士：我哋由2018年2月開始，我哋都有會議，我哋整體上面講，我哋叫e-enforcement，電子執法嗰個議題擺上去，大家去傾。

主席：（經傳譯員）電子執法，你嘅意思係話用電子方法嚟到係執行交通法例，係咪呀？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）你搵到啲方法，或者係點樣即係知道嗰個車牌，搵到個車主，就畀個電子告票，係咪咁嘅意思？

邱倩雯女士：簡單嚟講，可以係咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋要想咁做，考慮咗幾耐？

邱倩雯女士：如果講電子告票，其實由2012年已經開始提出㗎嘞。相信係而家我哋嘅會議亦都係集中配合政府一個智慧城市嘅一個概念，所以我哋喺交通執法嗰度，我哋都希望儘量用多啲科技。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話用咗六年，而家都好似冇乜再進一步進展？

邱倩雯女士：而家係好主動積極咁樣做緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）智慧城市，係咪呀，你頭先講？

邱倩雯女士：我係講整體性，喺交通執法方面，我哋係配合政府嘅方向。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邱女士，頭先你講2018年2月，你有啲會議，關於個電子執法嘅討論，係咩嘢引發要咁樣開會，考慮用電子嚟到進行執法嘅工作？

邱倩雯女士：主要都係即係政府整體上面嗰個智慧城市嘅概念，所以我哋會有會議。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪大埔，即係2018年2月10號大埔意外之後發生？

邱倩雯女士：唔係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係之前囉喎，即係個會係响意外之前開？

邱倩雯女士：我哋同運房局嘅會議唔係因為大埔嗰個意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係另外一樣嘢嚟，另一個問題係之前定之後，即係係咪因為呢件事發生就係問同之前之後唔同嘅。

邱倩雯女士：我相信會議嗰個籌備係早過2月份。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你响嗰段，呢個涉及一個跨部門嘅一個場合，嗰個部門係有啲咩嘢部門？

邱倩雯女士：我哋有運房局、警方同埋運輸署。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咁我理解有冇錯，呢個關於黃格嘅執法呢個措施已經係重新展開，因為你要處理個非法泊車？

邱倩雯女士：呢個就係其中一個部分，喺會議裏面，我哋整體上面都係即係針對一啲可以用科技代替人手嘅一啲交通違例。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個自動車牌識別系統有冇討論？即係話呢個系統可以嚟到處理非法泊車嘅事項，有冇討論？

邱倩雯女士：我哋冇特別係提到ANPR。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋見到有啲--聽過一啲建議，工會提出，巴士公司提出嘅，一啲立法會嗰啲文件都有啲建議就話點樣處理呢個非法泊車嘅情況。簡單嚟講，有五個建議，我想逐個問一問你，第一，我哋見過頭先鍾先生，William Chung先生，即係新巴嘅，佢嘅答覆講，就可以設立一啲廿四小時禁區，你對於呢個嘅睇法，或者警方對呢個睇法係有咩嘢意見？

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

主席：（經傳譯員）廿四小時禁區，邊度設立禁區？係咩嘢--目的係咩嘢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋講嘅廿四小時禁區就話即係巴士站附近設立，嚟到係搵--即係可以睇到邊啲車喺嗰度非法泊車，响巴士站附近泊車，呢個就係其中一個建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話除咗有巴士站，即係之前之後都應該係有禁區，係咪呀，就？

黃女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）就唔准泊車，全日都唔准，係咪咁嘅意思？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度睇--我哋而家响個螢幕度顯示出當時嘅講法，佢話「我哋希望呢啲咁嘅路段係會係二十四小時禁區嚟嘅，我哋都通知咗警方就做執法工作。」就响咁嘅背景，咁佢有個咁嘅建議，你哋嘅睇法係點？

邱倩雯女士：我哋相信，二十四小時嘅限制區係有幫助，但係需要去將嗰個區域嗰個地段劃做一個限制區，就一定要係運輸署嗰個工作範疇，同埋佢嗰個配合。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度有提過，佢哋都叫警方嚟到執法，有冇--你哋有冇任何紀錄？記唔記得佢哋有冇向警方提過，話設立廿四小時--即係專營巴士公司有冇向你哋提過，設立呢啲全日禁區？

邱倩雯女士：呢個喺我印象中，就冇好明確咁樣係書面提出過，咁樣可能要返去再睇睇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你有冇記唔記得，呢個問題有冇同運輸署開會嘅時候，有人提過呢個課題出嚟？

邱倩雯女士：喺我哋同運輸署同埋一啲巴士公司代表嘅會議裏面，佢哋係有提出過一啲非法泊車，令到即係阻礙咗巴士司機嘅運作，有提出過嘅。我哋收到呢啲嘅訊息之後，我哋亦都有將呢啲訊息發放去唔同嘅警區，有關嘅警區，等佢哋可以去繼續佢哋嘅執法嘅行動。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第二個建議，就係話巴士站嗰個路牌，或者嗰個標示，即係話標出嚟個巴士站係咁樣嘅，喺呢度唔准泊車，非法泊車嘅，我哋見過啲相片嘅，其中一份係由九巴提出嘅文件，係有啲相片嘅，呢個係 12A，5174 頁，5173 頁、5174 頁，你可以見到有啲中文寫出嚟嘅字「嚴禁泊車」，响裏面嗰張相係講。

邱倩雯女士：係，我之前冇睇過，冇見過呢啲咁樣嘅即係標誌喺度，道路標誌。事實

上，所有擺喺路邊嘅道路標誌都係需要運輸署去批准，咁我唔知道呢一個係即係巴士公司自己擺喺度，定係已經得到運輸署嘅批准。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）先唔好講嗰個得到批准個問題，你可唔可以話畀我聽，呢啲咁嘅牌，標示，擺响巴士站，可唔可以幫到你哋執法，或者可唔可以幫到公眾或者大家係處理非法泊車嘅問題，係咪有幫助嘅？

邱倩雯女士：我相信呢啲道路標誌有個提示性喺度，但係你話佢係咪真係可以禁止到有司機係停泊喺嗰度，我唔知道個成效會係點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪有啲人唔知㗎？或者係唔明白，佢哋唔可以响嗰個巴士站中間泊車，呢個認知度係咪一個問題嚟㗎？定係唔係一個問題？

邱倩雯女士：我相信市民係知道巴士站係唔可以泊車，但係即係可能佢哋會覺得停一停係冇所謂，呢個所以係其實需要多啲教育。

主席：（經傳譯員）個實際問題就係話，佢哋即係取巧，撞一撞運氣，咁所以需要執法？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）等到佢哋覺得咁做係成本太高？

邱倩雯女士：贊成。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第三個建議，就有啲畫雙黃線，响個巴士站範圍畫雙黃線。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係入嚟入口、出口？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢入嚟嗰部分，出口嗰部分，出去嗰部分都係畫埋黃線，呢個建議係你哋覺得點？

邱倩雯女士：呢個同之前嗰個意見都一樣，就係我哋相信係有用，即係禁止停車係有用，但係喺道路嘅設計同埋嗰個道路嘅標記，呢個都需要係運輸署嗰度去處理。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇同運輸署提過，據你所知道，有冇同運輸署提過呢個做法？

邱倩雯女士：由交通總部，我哋個聯絡，我哋就冇紀錄係話有特別提出過，但係我哋嘅每一個總區，我哋有自己嘅交通單位，交通單位同運輸署都會就住佢本地，即係 local，佢嗰啲嘅道路標記，同埋道路畫線，佢哋會有多啲嘅商討。

主席：（經傳譯員）目前嘅做法，係咪喺進入巴士站同埋離開嗰個位有雙黃線，係咪目前嘅做法？

邱倩雯女士：通常都有。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以係關於執法，因為每人--個個人都知雙黃線咩意思？

邱倩雯女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第四個建議，就係使用技術，譬如話閉路電視、錄影，之前你都提過。第五個建議，就係考慮新加坡模式，即係話喺司機隔籬位安裝攝影機，司機只需要喺見到有非法泊車情況撳個掣。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度，喺巴士站？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）換言之，係希望嗰啲受阻礙嘅人士可以幫助到，呢個係咪咁？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先想問，你對於呢個建議有咩嘢意見？因為嗰啲投訴人嚟，佢哋車上都已經有攝影機，只係需要撳個掣，然之後將影片交畀運輸署，個建議就係話，請佢哋幫助執法。對於呢個講法，你有咩嘢意見？

邱倩雯女士：分開兩個部分，如果係一啲行車嘅交通違例，我哋係可以--即係如果係有巴士公司嘅一啲嘅影片，亦都佢哋嘅司機係協助調查嘅話，我哋係可以搵番車主，搵番司機出嚟，進行呢個執法嘅。但係如果係一個泊車停泊嘅違例嘅話，咁呢個就頭先有提過，就係喺法例上面嘅限制，我哋係需要當時當地畀告票，咁所以要睇下嗰個違例嘅性質係乜嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）想請你講一講，喺呢個法例，以你所講話，咁係一個泊車嘅罪行，架車就係一係擺喺個擋風玻璃，一係畀喺司機，你可唔可以話番畀我聽，係邊一條條例？或者你同事可以搵一搵。

邱倩雯女士：我有個法例就係 Cap 237，Cap 237，我而家睇緊係邊一行。

主席：（經傳譯員）叫咩嘢名，呢條條例？

邱倩雯女士：（經傳譯員）定額罰款，違反交通條例--違反交通罪行條例。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。正如我所講，可以之後搵番畀我哋。

邱倩雯女士： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個妨礙咗有效執法。

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邱女士，我哋而家講就係，就係關於呢個車長，襲擊車長。我哋聽到一啲嘅證供就係話，係有關於襲擊車長執法方面，就係投訴警方，話警方就冇將呢啲嘅案件列為優先，咁我哋有個清單，就係列出咗一啲毆打車長嘅事件，係九巴嘅，咁就係呢一個開始嘅時候，就係 2015 年嘅 1 月至到 2018 年嘅 7 月 2 號，KMB-1，212 頁。呢封信就來自九巴，列出咗係聲稱襲擊巴士車長嘅，就係呢一個 2015 年 1 月至到今日，即係至到 2018 年 7 月 26 號，就係話有五宗。佢哋提出其中一個事項，可以睇番個表，有四十一宗，喺呢四十一宗入

面，可以見到係好少最後係控告嘅啫，就係 162 同埋 164 號，喺 216 頁可以見到。大部分嘅個案都係和解或者口頭警告，或者冇再係追究。我想問一問呢一方面，話警方似乎冇將呢啲個案列為優先處理，即係關於襲擊車長嘅個案？

邱倩雯女士：我會請我交通總部嘅同事，同埋一陣間都會有刑事部嘅同事去作答。

李大偉先生：係，針對九巴向委員會提供嗰一百八十八單案件，我哋收到之後，亦都聯絡咗九巴攞取呢啲資料。我哋成功咁喺一百八十八單裏面嘅案件裏面，可以搵到一百八十二單嗰個案情，同埋個結果。喺呢一百八十二單案件裏面，總共就係有分類到一百三十一單係巴士司機喺工作期間，喺巴士上面畀乘客毆打，其中九十九單係我哋破案，喺九十九單破案裏面，即係我哋有拘捕到人士，係有八十三單係檢控上法庭，而四十七單係冇被檢控。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係冇再進一步行動嘞？

李大偉先生：同意，冇任何進一步行動。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺八十三宗嘅控告裏面，有幾多單係定罪？

李大偉先生：喺嗰八十三單檢控案件裏面，七十三單係成功檢控。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇數字，譬如話係認罪、唔認罪嘅案件，即係最後係七十三宗係被定罪？

李大偉先生：七十五單成功檢控--成功定罪嘅案件裏面，就有唔同嘅法庭嘅判罰嘅，刑罰嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，我問嘅問題係有幾多宗係認罪，有幾多宗係審訊之後被定罪？

李大偉先生：我哋冇呢啲咁嘅數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你答完未，李生？

李大偉先生： Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗襲擊數字上升...

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，等等，呢啲嘅資料有冇係白紙黑字嘅？九巴有冇呢個分析，即係話一百八十八宗跟住點點點，咁你似乎都係讀啲數字出嚟，有冇資料？

李大偉先生：我哋有呢方面嘅資料嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提供呢一個書面嘅資料畀我哋？

李大偉先生：可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。或者我打斷咗你，你想講話關於呢個懲罰方面，你係點樣分析？

李大偉先生：喺七十五單成功定罪嘅案件裏面，有十五宗分別係判入獄或者緩刑嘅判罰。

主席：（經傳譯員）有幾多宗就係真係入獄，而唔係緩刑？

李大偉先生：冇方--冇呢面嘅--呢方面就冇呢個數字嘞。

主席： Thank you.

李大偉先生：另外簽保守行為，即係 bound over，有二十二宗；另外就係社會服務令，十六宗；罰款係十八宗。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇罰款範圍，數字範圍，最高罰款，最低？

李大偉先生：冇。另外四宗就係受教導，教導所--感化令，sorry。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你係有冇佢哋嗰個罪行？

李大偉先生：頭先我講嗰所有案件係主要係包含四種嘅個案，第一種係傷人，wounding...

主席：（經傳譯員）而家講緊嘅係關於一般定係定咗罪？

李大偉先生：概括，總共嘅。

主席： Yes, wounding...

李大偉先生：第二個控罪就係毆打，引致身體受傷；第三個控罪係普通毆打；而第四個就係公眾地方打交。

主席：（經傳譯員）傷人係咪第十九條嘅罪行？

李大偉先生：Section 17 同埋 19 都有。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）最後呢個嘞，公眾地方毆打，我哋聽過一啲工會嘅人講，話佢哋反對用呢一條，因為會係控告埋巴士車長，話佢哋公眾地方毆打，有兩個原因，一，因為佢哋係巴--佢哋就係呢一個巴士車長嚟㗎喇，佢哋要根據 230A 章係要確保安全；另外第二個就係，法例係要保護被打嘅人士吖嘛。對於呢一個投訴，即係話公眾地方毆打，你有咩意見？

主席：（經傳譯員）你可能講，如果唔係適當，你唔會咁樣告喇，我諗佢會咁樣答，係咪呀？

李大偉先生：因應巴士司機投訴畀乘客毆打嘅案件，係有唔同--好多時候都有唔同，每一宗案件都有唔同嘅案情同埋因素，咁巴士司機係有佢--喺法例 230A，係有法定權力，係佢嘅權力去點樣去處理一啲違規嘅乘客。咁如果係巴士司機毆打，就會係另外一種--就另外會係畀其他罪行會所保護嘅，即係頭先我所講嘅傷人，毆打之類嘅案件。

張天樂先生：方唔方便作啲補充，而家呢個時間？嗄，作少少補充，頭先大律師提到就係話，會唔會有啲案件裏面，即係巴士公司佢有個意見，就係警方就住巴士司機被毆打，受襲嘅案件，警方會唔會係有啲不同嘅處理方法，或者係對巴士司機受襲嘅案件，含有任何不重視嘅情況出現呢？喺呢度重申，就係我哋警方係處理每一宗案件，係不論受害人嘅身分、國籍、背景、職業等等，我哋都會係予以一視同仁咁樣去處理。係就住剛才交通總部嘅同事，佢講話關於九龍巴士公司，佢提供過一百八十八宗案件裏面，佢哋能夠搵到嘅數字，我哋比較過嗰個檢控，破案率等等，破案率、檢控率、定罪率等等，係相比較整體同類案件嘅破案率、檢控率、定罪率，嗰一百八十幾宗嘅案件嘅相關數字，係比相同嘅案件類別嘅整體數字，都係要高嘅，呢個係一個即係我哋搵到出嚟嘅一個數字嘅比較。所以喺個整體情況裏面，我哋見唔到有任何喺巴士司機受襲嘅案件裏面，係即係警方係有輕描淡寫嘅情況出現，所以呢個必須要重申就係，再重複一次，我哋警方係處理巴士司機受襲嘅案件，係採取一個一視同仁嘅一個態度，同埋認真去處理，處理--即係喺個調查過程係作出一個一視同仁嘅態度，如果個調查搵到出嚟嘅證據係充分，我哋會予以檢控。

咁檢控嗰個係採用邊一個條例，邊一個控罪去檢控，就要視乎嗰個案情。如果我哋有需要嘅話，當然係會向律政師索取--尋求法律意見。剛才大律師提到話喺公眾地方打交呢一個咁嘅情況係點樣去理解，我哋接報--即係警方接報去到場調查之後，我哋會因應唔同案件個案情，係決定嗰個案件嘅性質係屬於邊一樣。當然喺接報嘅時候，可能即係會各執一詞，即係雙方--即係牽涉--涉案嘅雙方會各執一詞，但係當我哋警方係經過詳盡嘅調查之後，我哋會係作一個評估，有一個結論，係決定係控以邊一方面，邊一個控罪，有機會係只係控告其中一方相關嘅控罪，如果係案情係的確係證實係顯示雙方都有打交嘅情況出現，咁我哋亦都會係控於適合嘅罪名。咁呢個亦都唔係單單係警方嘅決定嚟，亦都係一個案件上到法庭，有法庭嘅檢控官，檢控主任去做一個...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我截斷你，我原本嘅建議，如果係有咁樣嘅--即係如果係咁樣控告，即係話咁嘅控告嘅罪名當然係你哋覺得係適當喇？

李大偉先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家過咗1點嘞，我哋而家就係午休，我哋兩點半再復會。

下午1時06分聆訊押後

下午2時30分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）各位，午安。黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邱女士，我哋未休會之前，就係睇緊法例第237章嘅，就係講到嗰個定額罰款嗰方面，告票嗰度，就係畀呢一個車輛同埋司機嘅。Have you been able to locate the section?

邱倩雯女士：我哋搵到喇。

黃女士：係咪第15?

邱倩雯女士：係section 15嘅第(2)段。

黃女士：Subsection (2)?

邱倩雯女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就讀佢出嚟係以資紀錄，我應該都讀埋係第(1)款嘅，如果呢一個嘅警務人員有合理嘅理由相信就係已經係有觸犯咗有關條例，佢可以就係向呢一個車輛嘅司機或者係向嗰個嘅司機，就係要佢嚟到去遵守佢有關呢一個違例嘅責任，呢個就係要畀一個定額罰款。

為咗第(1)款，呢一個嘅通知應該係一個定明嘅格式，就係要係面交係呢一個掌管呢一個車輛嘅嗰個人士，但係就係要唔喺影響第16條或者係呢一條嗰個嘅情況之下，即係唔會影響佢不能夠履行呢一條條款嗰個嘅要求。

呢個係咪關於要面交嘅嗰個條款呀？

邱倩雯女士：啱，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）但係從呢一個嘅但書嗰度睇到，如果係唔能夠符合呢一條，就唔可以違反第15(1)條嘅。

邱倩雯女士：係，我睇到。我哋曾經就過就第15項，我哋都徵詢過律政司意見嘅，但係嗰個意見我而家唔喺手上面，但係基本上個意思都係話需要係畀嗰個當時當地嗰個司機，或者係我哋需要擺喺個車嗰度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果呢一--即係為講而講喇，如果嗰個嘅法律指示係合適，咁就應該係刪除第15條第(2)款，係咪呀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我從嗰個嘅草擬嗰個指示，就似乎唔係話係刪除，而係就

係去話畀我哋係--即係搖距咁發呢個嘅告票。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係其實同刪除呢一條一樣喇，嗰個結果？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係一係就係好簡單咁樣攞支藍筆係劃咗呢度，又或者係要用一支紅筆係加啲新嘅條款。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會反映你嗰個評論嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就係有一個嘅法例，就係三十五年咁--超過三十年咁久㗎喇，係咪呀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家無論係電腦或者科技都係進步咗好多，呢個法例寫嘅時候唔係為咗今日嘅科技而寫嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李先生，喺休息之前，你就係提到，喺一百八十八個個案之中，呢個就係九巴提畀你，有四十七宗嘅個案係冇檢控嘅，你可唔可以畀我哋睇下一般係乜嘢原因係令到冇檢控嘅呢？

李大偉先生：就住嗰四十七宗不能夠檢控個個案，有二十二宗係未能夠搵到嗰個受疑人嘅，即係話係施襲者，另外十六宗就係受害人最終就係不追究個事件嘅，所以就案件就終結咗，六宗係不夠證據，另外兩宗不夠證據係經過諮詢律政司意見而係就完結嘅，另外一宗就係案件調查之中。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李先生，其實我想問你嗰個問題，基於九巴嗰個證供，佢話佢哋係比較喜歡用第 230A 章嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）未去講呢一度之前，講到嗰啲搵唔到行兇者嗰啲個案，如果大家畀錢搭巴士，如果係用八達通嘅話，有冇幫助呢？因為呢啲可能會係包咗嗰啲個人資料嘅，呢一啲會唔會幫到你搵到行兇者呢？

李大偉先生：喺尋找施襲者，如果係用透過八達通嘅，係一定有幫助嘅，對警察嘅調查，但係由於好多時候使用八達通卡者未必係一個私人登記嘅八達通卡，所以警方未能夠就跟進到佢嘅身分，當然如果係個個都用個人登記嘅八達通，係會幫助到警方調查去搵到呢啲咁嘅施襲者嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好，跟進話用八達通呢個問題，我諗係有兩宗嘅個案，九巴公司係提出投訴，就係話警方係冇積極咁樣去收集嗰啲個人資料，即係用八達通卡嗰啲，我想你睇睇一啲嘅文件，可唔可以睇下九巴 1A，297 頁？

我哋講番個背景，有兩宗嘅個案，唔好意思，睇一睇 218 頁先，同一沓文

件，218，1A 嗰個文件夾，第 218 頁，嗰度有提到五宗個案，搵唔搵到？3 同埋 4 號，個案 3 同埋 4，我哋睇下 218-1 嗰一頁，第 2 段，呢度就係話，呢度係被悉到，呢一封信係我哋委員會畀呢一個九巴嘅，係 6 月 27 號嘅，嗰個嘅回應就係話關乎第 3 同埋第 4 宗嘅個案，係提到有一個閉路電視嘅報告嘅，就係話喺第 1 個案裏面就係話到係警方方面有呢一個行兇者嗰個嘅八達通卡嗰個紀錄嘅，我哋就要求有呢一個閉路電視同埋八達通卡嗰個紀錄嘅印本，喺呢一度就係話九巴就喺 2018 年 8 月 9 號就係回覆呢一封信。

喺第 297 頁，你睇下嗰個大題目就係話回覆 2018 年 7 月 27 號嗰封信，第二段度話「關於第 3、第 4 宗嘅個案，嗰個嘅閉路電視嘅由我哋法律部門嗰個嘅意外調查同埋預防組畀嘅報告就係喺附件 A，就話呢一個嘅兩個被告人係認罪，所以係冇用到閉路電視嘅紀錄嘅。」

然後，「關於第 1 宗案件，就喺 2018 年 4 月 16 號，警方係要求我哋提供八達通卡嘅紀錄同埋邊個陪同佢一齊，因為佢哋當時係有最後三個嘅乘客就係喺當時上車嘅。喺 2018 年 4 月尾嘅，我哋就同警方有一個電話嘅對話，就係關於八達通嘅資料，就話畀佢哋聽係要攞我哋嘅書面回應嘅。」

Patrick Pang 先生口頭作供嘅時候，佢就話警方冇去攞嗰個八達通嘅資料或者係報告，我哋睇下你呢度嘅回應。喺嗰個雜項文件第 124-537-1 呢一頁嗰度，124-537-1 呢一頁嗰度，537，我讀出嚟，李生，你搵唔搵到嗰份文件呀？

李大偉先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

黃女士：（經傳譯員）仲未。呢個係你畀委員會嘅一封嘅回信，係 2018 年 8 月 7 號嘅，喺第 3 段，你咁樣寫，「關於第 1 宗嘅個案，就係天水圍嘅警區嗰度，警方係冇收到任何嘅從九巴嘅嗰個疑犯或者係行兇者嗰個八達通資料。」

你亦都話呢啲嘅資料係可以喺嗰個八達通可以搵到嗰個交易嘅時間、日期、用邊一個嘅器材、嗰個交易嘅幾多錢同埋嗰個八達通卡主嗰個嘅個人資料，而家就話--九巴就話佢哋有呢啲資料，但係警方就冇去攞，於是乎呢份文件仲喺九巴嘅寫字樓度，你嘅回應係乜嘢呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋應該去番前呢一個警司彭先生嗰個嘅資料，因為我哋似乎而家兩面就係喺度推卸緊，佢就彭生就似乎就接咗手。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請你睇一睇我哋第 13 日嗰個嘅研訊謄本，2018 年 8 月 10 號，係 108 去到 109 謄本嘅，就喺謄本 5 嗰度，108 至 109 頁，你睇咗 108 頁先，第六行，主席係咁問嘅，「我哋知道，因為我哋問咗警方係有啲乜嘢可以攞到嘅資料，喺你封信嗰度，我諗應該係喺 KMB-1 第 297 頁，就係話去回應呢一封信嘅時候，喺二段，你就係講到第 1 個個案，你係咁講嘅，你話『大概喺 2018 年 4 月咁上下，我哋就係同警方講過電話，就住關於八達通呢啲紀錄嘅，就向佢哋講就話可以收到我哋嘅書面回覆嘅。』佢哋收唔收到呢？係

咪可以答有或者冇呢？」然後彭生就話冇，佢哋冇嚟到攞嘅。

然之後我哋去睇 109 頁，都仍然係彭生畀緊證供，第九行，「我哋打電話去天水圍警區，我哋問佢，叫佢哋攞呢一個回覆，但係警方冇嚟過，封信依然喺我哋度，嗰啲八達通嗰啲卡依然喺我哋度，就係咁樣發生咗喇，主席。」呢個係 Patrick Pang 先生嘅證供，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗到最後彭生就話咁樣嘅做法係好愚蠢嘅，應該係做啲嘢。

黃女士：Yes.

李大偉先生：就住呢個天水圍個案件，我哋都諮詢過天水圍分區嘅，根據佢哋嘅紀錄，佢畀我哋嘅資料，就係佢哋係有向呢個九巴係索取呢個相關案件嘅八達通資料，而發信之後一路都收唔到 KMB 書面嘅答覆，亦都冇話收到任何電話通知有關於可以去攞呢啲咁嘅資料嘅，我哋喺天水圍方面就可以攞到咁嘅資料啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一件事我哋一定要跟進，我哋要同彭生同九巴跟進，因為咁樣發生真係令人覺得好惋惜嘅，大家其實對呢件事都有一個興趣嘅，因為就係話究竟係咪會調查咗一個指控，甚至係咪可以提出檢控呢咁，但係有人唔知做咗啲乜嘢，就做唔到，但係好明顯嗰啲證據係喺度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，你先前提到呢個一百八十八宗九巴嘅案件係有四種唔同嘅檢控嘅罪行嘅，冇一次係同 230A 章有關嘅，九巴嘅證供同埋個工會嘅證供全部都係同一個意見嘅，佢哋就係話其實你動用 230A 章係更加容易嘅，如果你係講到乘客嘅行為，因為係唔需要有真係身體方面嘅接觸或者係襲擊嘅，咁都已經係可以違例，係應該容易檢控啲嘅，你個意見點呀？

李大偉先生：或者我嘗試答下先，一般嚟講，普通嘅 230A 嘅違規，即係乘客唔守規矩，係經常會發生，好多時候嗰個事件已經發展到可能已經係肢體衝突，直至到警察到場㗎喇，當然係最理想嘅方法就係喺件事件未發展到咁差嘅時候，就警察開始介入就可以平息咗佢，或者係用比較容易嘅方法處理，譬如話可唔可以考慮到 230A 嘅控罪，但係好多時候警察去到現場，好多時候已經係去到一個階段，已經係可能肢體發生衝突又或者有人受傷嘅情況。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）對你比較公道，或者我畀幾份文件你睇睇，我諗邱小姐係回覆過九巴嘅，佢係回覆過九巴關於呢件事，就係話究竟你係咪有考慮過將來都係用 230A 章，...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者未講呢一點之前，我哋可唔可以睇一睇 230A 章有相關嘅部分，等我哋睇一睇呢一個罪行嗰個範圍。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）應該喺 THB-2 第 132 頁，即係運房局嗰啲文件，我哋睇下第 13A 規例，尤其是係(1)(c)嗰一條，佢係咁寫嘅，就係講到乘客同埋將會乘搭巴士人士嘅一般行為，我哋可以睇下第 13 條嗰個規例，就係咁寫嘅，即係話嗰個巴士嘅車長可以係驅逐呢一位乘客嘅，而 13A 就係講到有關嘅罪行嘅，就係

話任何嘅乘客或者將會搭巴士嘅乘客係唔可以蓄意去阻礙或者係妨礙其他嘅人或者係呢一個巴士嘅車長或者係蓄意阻礙巴士車長嘅視線嘅，同埋係唔可以蓄意或者係令到巴士任何嘅器材係會受到破壞或者係令到其他人係會受傷或者覺得唔舒服或者覺得煩厭或者唔方便嘅，呢個係會造成罪行嘅。

第 25 條嘅規例就係寫明任何人如果冇合理嘅辯解係違反第 3 條規例，即係第 3 條第(4)款或者以下規例嘅任何嘅條文，都係會犯法嘅。

第 25 條第(3)款就係話任何人冇合理辯解，如果係違反 13A，係會犯法，係可以被罰 3,000 元或者係入獄六個月嘅。

工會同埋九巴嘅人士就認為呢一個嘅條文已經係好有效可以去對付乘客對巴士車長嘅人身嘅攻擊嘅，即係你唔需要真係證明到係有襲擊，因為佢哋認為有呢一條係更加容易檢控嘅。你點樣回應呀？同埋我一陣間都會請你睇一啲書信來往嘅，係邱小姐都畀過答覆嘅。

李大偉先生：至於用 230A 個控罪，係同意嘅，係可以喺每個事件裏面防止啲事件再惡劣下去，即係演變得更加差，譬如話變成打交或者係受傷咁樣嘅，所以我哋一路都呼籲啲巴士司機一定要冷靜處理呢啲咁嘅違規乘客，儘快報警，由警察儘快去到現場處理，而唔係用自己去同人口角，跟住肢體衝突係最唔理想嘅處理方法，所以 230A 係有佢嘅作用嘅，如果係巴士車長可以喺保持冷靜，儘快通知警察去現場處理，我相信就一定係將啲受襲嘅事件可以降低。

就住每宗案件，都要針對最適當嘅控罪，警方先會檢控嘅，相對如果係實質係一啲肢體衝突、係毆打嘅案件，警方一定會用番頭先我上晝所講嘅嗰四條控罪，最適合嘅控罪採取檢控行動嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好嘅。我哋講番成個故事，或者邱女士，請你去睇九巴 1A 沓文件，中文 286 頁，英文 283 頁，呢一封信係九巴 2018 年 3 月 8 號寫。，主席，喺英文版嗰度，個日子係冇寫出嚟嘅，但係係 2018 年 3 月 8 號出嘅。呢封信，喺 293 頁，九巴就係咁樣寫嘅，就話「舊年 5 月，我哋寫信畀警方表達話我哋嘅車長一而再被襲擊嘅，我哋考慮過有關嘅個案之後，我哋發現有一啲嘅違例者不單只係犯咗普通襲擊，有可能甚至係違反咗公共巴士服務規例 13A(1)(c)嘅，因此我哋公司實際上已經係派咗同事去警察局嗰度係為呢一啲嘅個案提供證供，希望警方可以係根據規例嘅 13A 提出檢控嘅。」佢哋係提到六個個案。

喺 294 頁嘅底部，佢話「喺呢一方面，我哋而家係熱切祈求警方喺將來如果仲有襲擊車長嘅情況」，係請佢哋慎重考慮使用規例第 13A，即係除咗係告普通襲擊之外，都係用埋 13A 嘅，「我哋嘅公司肯定會同警方合作，提供協助。」

喺呢一方面，邱女士就係回覆過嘅，2018 年 5 月 17 號，喺 296 頁，中文版 288 頁，你喺呢一度咁寫嘅，邱女士，你就係話「同你公司開過會之後，

即係 3 月 28 號，我哋而家通知你我哋嘅分區亦都係通知咗總區嗰度，係用書面嘅，去提醒前線嘅人員喺處理巴士車長被騷擾或者係襲擊嘅時候，係要公平同埋專業嘅，同埋要明白嗰個個案嘅性質，然後適當咁將佢分類嘅，然後去考慮一下係咪公共巴士服務規例，即係 230A 章係可以適用。」

我個問題係 230A 章第 13A 條從來有冇援引過係警方攞嚟去檢控嘅呢？

邱倩雯女士：我哋曾經睇番呢幾年嘅紀錄，喺 2016 年我哋都有用過 230A 去控告--發過告票畀巴士嘅乘客嘅，一共有一宗。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你回覆咗之後，有冇再用過呢？

邱倩雯女士：我哋再睇過紀錄，今年冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解呢？點解用得咁少呢？

邱倩雯女士：呢個我相信就係睇下究竟喺事件裏面究竟係嗰個證據--現場嘅證據有啲乜嘢嘅案情。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）仲有一件事，就係根據 Patrick Pang 先生，即係九巴嘅 Patrick Pang 嘅證據，佢就話 3 月 28 號開過會嘅，佢自己同埋係法律部嘅主管同埋另外一個同事，就係同總警司開會嘅，喺嗰一個會，總警司就係答應咗，喺即係個會度答應，就話佢會發出一啲指引畀前線嘅警員去到首先，就要佢哋所有指稱係有襲擊嘅個案，都要係認真咁樣調查，佢亦都會提醒佢嘅前線同事，睇下會唔會有一啲個案係適合援引 230A 章做調查同埋檢控嘅，有冇咁做呢？

邱倩雯女士：嗰個有嘅，我哋喺 2018 年嘅 5 月 10 號，係由警察嘅交通總部係發出咗一個內部嘅通告畀前線嘅同事去留意巴士嘅司機係受襲嘅事件嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以睇下呢一張內部嘅通告呀？

邱倩雯女士：可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者就係透過呢度嘅秘書處，可以畀呢一個我哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）你今日會唔會有嗰張通告㗎？

邱倩雯女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）如果有嘅，請搵同事去攞佢去影印，或者畀我睇一睇先，我可唔可以睇下佢呢？唔該。等一等。唔該。唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅題目仲有最後一樣嘢嘅，就係 Patrick Pang 先生嘅口頭證供就係話「當我哋問佢呢一個問題話點解佢係如果可以用普通襲擊嘅話，點解要援引 230A 章呢？有咩嘢好處呢？」我相信九巴係咁樣回覆呢個問題嘅，喺第 13 日，嗰個嘅研訊嘅謄本第 73 頁，呢個就係 2018 年 8 月 10 號第

12 行，呢一個鄧樂勤資深大律師就係問，「如果嗰個嘅最高刑罰係會低過呢一個 230A 章嗰個罰則，咁有咩嘢意思呢？」鄧資深大律師就係話「其實如果要普通襲擊，警方嗰個調查過程係好複雜嘅，如果用 230A 章，就係比較容易去證實呢一個罪行已經觸犯咗，我哋希望嗰啲襲擊車長嘅乘客佢知道其實係有 230A 章呢個係關於乘客嘅行為，而且係唔需要有真係肢體嘅接觸，都可以係觸犯呢個罪行嘅。」

你就係強調話用呢一條嘅條例係有好處嘅，我相信你嘅證供亦都話強調雖然而家係好少援引呢一章，你都會考慮援引嘅，係咪？

邱倩雯女士：我想提出就係檢控嘅工作唔係取易不取難，而係真係睇下嗰個案情係嗰個證據去到邊度，如果個證據已經係可以顯示到有肢體嘅受襲嘅話，縱使 Cap. 230A 係可以同樣控告嘅話，我哋相信我哋一定會係去一啲較嚴重嘅罪行，去顯示，更加巴士司機受襲係令到警方係重視嘅，就唔係話因為 230A 比較容易去證明，而我哋就去 230A，所以一切都係睇證據。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想問一個一般嘅問題，你點樣去確保乘客襲擊嘅個案係好快速咁樣得到處理？

邱倩雯女士：我哋對每一單嘅案件都係即時去處理，咁樣時間性上面亦都係睇下證人幾時可以畀到證據，我哋嘅調查隊會係立刻、即刻咁樣要求證人去畀到口供，咁樣如果有係需要到較後嘅調查，例如係需要攞醫生報告或者係其他嘅證人可以畀到口供，呢個我哋都係即時會做嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去另外一個題目，嗰個嘅係去檢討車速嘅工作小組，我未去講到呢個工作小組嘅時候，我就想解釋一下點解會成立咗一個咁嘅工作小組，呢個係完全源於大埔公路嗰個嘅意外嘅，有一次係大埔嘅區議會有一個嘅會議，嗰個嘅議程就係記錄 2018 年 2 月 12 號嗰個嘅會議，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續落去之前，我哋就冇話過呢一個嘅工作小組係因為大埔嘅意外先至引起，其實一早呢個工作小組已經存在嘅，係咪呀？黃律師？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，係，主席，應--我相信--如果我講錯，請你係更正。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係佢呢一個工作小組，關於檢討車速嘅，就係運輸署同埋警方都係有代表，係一直存在嘅。喺呢一個嘅個案，所涉及嘅大埔道嗰個交通意外，就係運輸署嗰個建議係要包埋呢段落路去嘅，係咪呀？我咁樣嚟到去總結我哋聽到嘅證供正唔正確？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係正確嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者邱女士向我哋去解釋下呢一個檢討車速嘅工作小組有啲咩嘢成員嘅？

邱倩雯女士：我讓我同事李大偉去回答。

李大偉先生：有關個運輸署嘅檢討車速工作小組，成員包括運輸署嘅同事，另外有兩個非政府組織、一個就係香港汽車會、一個就係香港高級駕駛人員協會同埋警方嘅代表，係作為參與嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽警方响呢個由運輸署成立嘅工作小組佢有咩嘢角色嘅？

李大偉先生：警方嘅代表就係喺我哋嘅交通總部派出一個代表係定期參與佢裏面嗰個會議，主要係檢討議程上面所檢討嘅路段嘅速度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一個召開呢一個會議㗎？

李大偉先生：運輸署助理署長。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係由運輸署策動嘅小組。

李大偉先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係咪提供埋秘書處支援？

李大偉先生：佢哋會提供秘書處，佢哋負責所有秘書處嘅服務，而開會嘅地方都係運輸署總部裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話喺咁嘅角色之下，佢哋定議程嘅？

李大偉先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢個工作小組點樣運作嘅呢？會唔會係考慮埋一啲嘅客觀嘅事實，同埋評估，當佢考慮到去更改某啲路段嘅車速限制嘅時候。

李大偉先生：運輸署係有恆常嘅機制檢討道路速度限制嘅，確保定立嘅速度限制能夠保障道路安全同埋交通暢順嘅。喺檢討嘅路段嘅時速限制嘅時候，儘量都會保障道路使用者個安全為首要嘅。

檢討嘅時候會考慮有幾大因素嘅，無論係調低、放寬或者保持原狀個速度限制嘅，第一個考慮就係路段發生意外嘅紀錄；第二個考慮因素就係車輛嘅常用速度；第三個考慮因素就係道路環境同埋特徵，就包括路面嘅斜度、視線、路口同埋行人情況等等。

根據上述頭先我講嘅因素，運輸署同同事就會作出佢嘅建議，究竟係嗰段道路應該係調低吖，調高吖，或者保持現行嘅速度嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到運輸署有一個嘅恆常機制去檢討一啲嘅車速，你可唔可

以話畀我哋聽呢一個嘅定期機制有幾定期嘅呢？

李大偉先生：據我理解，呢個檢討小組一般嚟講，係以每一季度就開一次會，檢討唔同嘅道路嘅，道路嘅選擇就係屬於運輸署範疇，究竟應該係檢討邊一段道路，就純粹係關於運輸署個工作小組決定嘅。我相信就係特別針對一啲可能--個機制就係特別一啲發生過嚴重交通意外又或者經常發生交通意外嘅地方，佢哋係會比較容易喺呢個會議嗰陣討論關於車速嘅限制方面。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到嗰個機制，就係會針對一啲嘅路段，可能係一啲頻密或者係嚴重嘅交通意外嘅路段，咁即係話係一個回應有發生咗嘅意外嘅機制，係咪呀？

李大偉先生：呢個係其中一個考慮嘅因素，其實仲有其他因素，就係可能係市民投訴，或者係區議會嘅反映咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁講啱唔啱呢？根據你所知，唔係一個主動嘅機制嚟嘅，即係唔係話運輸署或者係警方會係主動出擊，睇下邊啲危險嘅路段係需要考慮嗰個車速要去調整，係咪呀？

李大偉先生：我唔敢講係咪一個主--即係佢唔係一個主動嘅檢討，不過呢個檢討嘅機制係--我覺得係有效。

黃女士：Now, going back to the specific example...

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以幫下我哋，呢個工作小組已經成立咗幾耐呢？

李大偉先生：根據紀錄，一般嚟講，係會三個月，季度性開一次會嘅。

邱倩雯女士：第一次。

黃女士：Since when？

李大偉先生：而第一次嘅會議，根據紀錄，係喺 2000 年第一次。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道喺咩嘢嘅情況之下佢係成立㗎？

李大偉先生：呢個我哋冇紀錄可以查到。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於呢一個大埔路嘅交通意外，可唔可以請你睇幾份嘅文件，嗰個目的係想顯示大埔路段，即係關於乎呢一段嘅大埔路段，其實區議會、居民、學校都係有投訴話呢一段嘅路係好容易有交通意外，亦都有好多超速嘅情況，呢度有一啲嘅書信往來，係嚟自大埔區議會寫畀警方，要求佢哋協助嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）未去講到細節之前，我想請問一個一般性嘅問題，呢五位警方嘅

代表，請問有冇任何一位係參加過呢一個車速嘅檢討委員會嘅呢？

李大偉先生：嗰個常任個會員係其中一個警察代表就係交通總部嘅警司，交通管理嘅警司，其實嗰個啱啱就係調任咗，調離咗崗位，而家我就署任緊嗰個角色。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話直接去答呢一個問題就係今日喺呢一度嗰五位警方人士係冇積極咁係參與過呢一個委員會嘅工件？直至到你係代替咗之後。

李大偉先生：同意。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，自從你署任之後，你有冇參與過呢一個工作會議嘅會議呢？即係呢一個工作小組。

李大偉先生：我曾經出席過一至兩次，不過係相信係兩、三次年前嘅事嚟。而家，就住呢個大埔道呢個檢討，就我冇出席過。

主席：（經傳譯員）當你參與呢一個工作小組會議嘅時候，即係參與過嗰啲，通常會係一次會議檢討幾多個路段？

李大偉先生：喺我出席嘅兩、三次會議裏面，每一次嘅會議大致上係會搵出三個地點、六個方向，即係每一個地點通常都係有來回線嘅，所以每一次會檢討六個唔同嘅路段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解係六個路段呀？

李大偉先生：頭先我講每--通常會搵三個地點，而每個地點都係有來回線，所以有六個路段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係邊個去選擇嗰三個路段呢？

李大偉先生：運輸署同事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）點解係咁樣選呢三個路段呢？係咪就係根據你剛才講嗰啲因素呢？

李大偉先生：冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於去選擇呢啲路段，你有冇任何嘅意見嘅呢？

李大偉先生：我哋會畀意見嘅，我哋會畀同唔同意佢嘅建議。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你係收到啲投訴，係關於某一個路段嘅，你可唔可以建議話去檢討嗰個路段？

李大偉先生：當然可以提出嘅，可以提出，向運輸署同事，我哋有收到投訴係關於速度嘅要求，但係一般嚟講，但係市民或者係好多區議會、其他部門都好清楚到

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

路面上面嘅速度限制係歸於運輸署嘅範疇去檢討，同埋去定制，只係佢哋有權去檢討嗰個道路嘅速度限制。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果一個區議員係唔知道，你係咪會咁樣話畀佢聽？

李大偉先生：我哋會將呢件嘢反映畀運輸署嘅同事聽。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係如果係一個區議會係提出嘅，一陣間我哋都預計會畀啲文件你睇，如果係一個區議員係向警方提出，你係咪會話畀佢聽「呢件事唔係我哋做嘅，係運輸署嘅工作。」係咪咁呢？

李大偉先生：我相信區嘅同事收到呢啲每個唔同區議會嘅議員嘅反映，佢都一定會反映番畀佢當區嘅運輸署同事，由運輸署同事反映番上去呢個檢討工作小組裏面處理。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，我哋一陣間睇下發生咩嘢事。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，...

主席：（經傳譯員）等一等，唔該。你就同我哋講過一啲因素，就係話影響車速檢討嘅，即係話多唔多交通意外、嗰啲車輛駕駛者一般駕駛嘅速度或者係嗰啲條路嘅特徵等等，呢啲有冇喺任何書面嗰度可以睇到㗎？

李大偉先生：係會喺報告，除咗報告之外，佢哋係會播巡邏影片嘅，即係會有一架車直頭係去巡邏，去示範嗰條路，即係介紹嗰條路嘅特徵同埋嗰個車輛--道路情況嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）比較具體咁講，有冇一啲嘅參數或者臨界點係話講到要有幾多嘅交通意外先至可以引發一個檢討呢？

李大偉先生：我唔肯定，但係我相信都會係其中一個考慮因素。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你所知道就唔會係有一個方程式？

李大偉先生：冇呢條方程式。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如如果話係意外增加咗百分之五十，喺過去一年多咗百分之五十嘅意外。

李大偉先生：冇一個方程式可以講到。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。請繼續。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想補充一下，關於呢一個工作小組，當你哋開會嘅時候，你哋會唔會係分開重型車輛同埋係普通車輛㗎？

李大偉先生：一般嚟講，都唔會嘅，因為車速普遍嚟講係針對所有唔同種類嘅車輛，除咗一啲巴士或者係小巴已經係--本身已經係呢個車輛可以行咁多車速嘅啫。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先我跟番個時序，因為我都會同你講番嗰啲事情，根據時間咁樣去發生，一路喺大埔嗰件事一路去到最後個報告，首先，2017年6月5號一封信，喺DC-2(B)嗰一沓文件，係一個投訴，係大埔區議會寫畀警方嘅，DC-2(B)，840-70就係中文，如果英文，就係840-74。

我哋係睇到呢個翻譯嘅，佢係寫畀交通部總部嘅，2017年6月5號，係寫畀中央交通攝錄調查小組嘅，佢係寫畀一位張笑權先生嘅，個題目就係話希望大埔尾同埋一個屋苑之間，請你哋係安裝超速嘅攝錄機嘅，就係話呢一個係發現好多時候喺大埔道好多人喺度鬥車、賽車咁樣，尤其是係放假同埋半夜嘅時候，佢哋發現有一大組嘅，經過改裝嘅車係高速咁樣喺大埔道行駛嘅，佢哋發現有可能係有不合法嘅賽車情況，同埋係令到居民係受到好大嘅嘈雜滋擾嘅。

喺咁嘅情況，如果有交通意外，就會係會撞到啲居民同埋係會造成嚴重嘅人身嘅傷害嘅，因此係希望你哋安裝呢個超速嘅攝錄機，呢個就係喺大埔尾同埋鹿茵山莊之間嗰一段大埔道，希望可以安裝呢啲嘅超速攝錄機嘅。

呢一個就係大埔區議會寫嚟畀警方嘅一個投訴嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋有冇一個地圖可以顯示到個地點呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有嘅。就係喺大埔尾同埋鹿茵山莊之間，呢一度就係大概嗰個路段，喺中間呢一度，喺中間嗰個部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋肯定睇到大埔尾，呢個當然就係喺2月10號巴士意外嗰個路段嘅附近喇？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一度有啲字係睇唔真嘅，淨係睇到“Hill Bay”，係咪即係等如“Deerhill Bay”？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）正確嘅，主席。收到呢個投訴之後，香港警方喺2017年6月16號就係回覆咗嘅，請大家睇一睇中文840-71頁，英文就係840-73頁，我哋睇到呢一封信就係警方代表Andrew Lam Chi Hang就係寫畀區議員Chan Siu Kuen嘅，2017年6月16號，佢亦都係副本抄錄畀Paul Chiu Kang Bor，就係運輸署嘅，亦都係抄錄畀大埔嘅指揮官同埋負責交通嘅高級人員嘅。

呢一度就係講到話你哋要求係喺鹿茵山莊同埋大埔尾之間安裝攝錄機，你就話係「主要由運輸署負責嘅，安裝之後，警方就可以執法嘅，我哋就係明白運輸署而家係冇計劃喺呢一個你講嘅路段係安裝固定嘅超速嘅攝錄機，但係同時，警方係會緊密咁監察呢一個路段嘅交通情況嘅。」

呢一度就話運輸署係拒絕呢個要求係安裝超速嘅攝錄機，警方嘅回覆就似乎就話你都冇咩嘢可以做，因為你哋嘅角色只係執法，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你點解咁樣講呢，就話運輸署係拒絕去安裝呢啲攝錄機呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）因為有一句嘅，就係話「我哋係理解運輸署現時係冇計劃去安裝固定嘅超速攝錄機嘅，喺呢一個有關嘅路段」。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋要睇下佢係咪真係咁講。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想請問一個一般性嘅問題先，如果你收到大埔區議員一個要求，係講到話要裝置超速嘅攝錄機或者係某一個路段做啲乜嘢嘅，呢一個投設會唔會交畀車速嘅檢討工作小組去講呢？

李大偉先生：我相信係唔會嘅，呢個純粹係一個要求喺道路上面安裝呢個偵測器嘅啫，同檢討道路速度限制係兩回事嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗佢嘅重點就係話如果你警方有一個機會喺工作小組嗰度提出一啲議程嘅，呢一樣嘢你亦都會唔會係向運輸署去提出，然後睇下佢哋會唔會擺喺呢一個工作小組嘅議程上面呢？

邱倩雯女士：我相信就係我哋警方同個 TD--同運輸署我哋有好多唔同嘅委員會嘅傾談嘅，嘅商討嘅，其中關於要設立呢啲偵速嘅攝影機就唔會喺嗰個速度限制嗰個委員會嗰度傾嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）但係如果有一個具體嘅投訴係區議員提出嘅，就係話要佢哋修改或者係減低一個車速，會唔會終於都去到工作小組呢？

邱倩雯女士：如果係關於速度--個路段嘅速度限制，就會係去番頭先嗰個工作小組嗰度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，就想請你睇 2015 年 7 月 24 號一封信，係由一個嘅大埔區嘅區議員係 Chan Siu Kuen 女士，但係呢個係寫畀運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）咪住，李先生，你早前就係話警方如果係接收到一個咁樣嘅要求，就係會轉介畀運輸署，呢一封信其實都係已經抄送咗畀運輸署，嗰個嘅日子--嗰個係 840-73 嗰一封嘅信係咪已經係畀咗運輸署？

李大偉先生：係，冇錯，同意，但係我唔清--我相信佢係--呢封信係副件係去咗運輸署有關於處理一啲安裝一啲新嘅偵速器攝影機嘅運輸署部門，就唔係話佢哋會--呢封信唔會去咗--我相信唔會去到嗰個速度檢討小組嗰個會議上面。據我所知，運輸署係會有一...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係另外一點嚟嘅，你就話你會同運輸署方面嘅連繫就係嚟自呢封信，因為呢一封信，你--警方嗰封信係有係畀區議會㗎嘛，亦都係謄本抄送咗畀呢一個運輸署㗎嘛？係，黃女士。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我未去到講番呢一封投訴信之前，我想去睇一睇大埔區議會嘅會議紀錄，喺第二次嘅會議，2015年3月13號，中文文件840-81頁，而英文就係840-91頁。呢一度出席嗰度，喺最底嗰度，就係大埔警區嘅交通部嘅主管，另外亦都有大埔區嘅或者係房署嘅大埔當區嘅負責人或者係代表，亦都有警方嘅代表喺呢個會議度嘅。

去番840-92頁嗰度，喺79段，嗰度係有一個特定嘅要求，係日本學校，嗰度係要求喺大埔坳嗰度嘅路段嘅車速係要係限制嘅，喺79段嗰度就主席就係表示收到日本國際學校嘅呢一封信，要求將呢一個嘅學校前面嘅路段嘅車速就係由每小時70公里就減到50嘅，佢亦都係邀請呢個委員會去到呢一間嘅國際學校同佢哋學生去討論下佢哋附近嘅交通。主席係要求運輸署首先就係去回覆話要求降低車速上限呢一個嘅請求。

第80段，Wong Kwok Leung先生回應日本國際學校建議將呢一個學校前面嗰個路段嘅車速限制由70減到去50，因為係喺2014年喺呢一段大埔路嘅路段，喺學校前面係有一個交通意外，有一位公眾人士係死亡嘅，運輸署同埋警方就係研究緊呢一個交通意外嘅成因，未必一定係關乎呢一個路段嘅車速限制，可能係包括埋駕駛嘅態度同埋到底嗰個行人嘅視線係咪被遮住咗。運輸署亦都會係睇下現時呢一條路段嘅車速限制係咪合適，另外，運輸署就係會向學校畀一個臨時嘅回覆，係農曆年之後，之後就會畀一個更加詳細嘅回覆嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀我哋睇下嗰個地圖？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度，21同埋22之間，香港日本人學校。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋將佢再放番闊啲，睇到成個嘅情況，即係由意外嗰個地點，由沙田一路揸車去大埔，沿路嘅，係咪呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）啱。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個係一個特定嘅要求，係由一間學校提出嘅，警方係有代表出席呢個會議，當時係有投訴嘅，對呢個問題，亦都係要求將個車速上限降低。通常呢啲會唔會係畀嗰個工作小組嚟到去討論㗎？

李大偉先生：根據會議紀錄，我相信出席嗰個警察嘅同事就係屬於大埔區交通組嘅警長嚟嘅，我睇番個會議紀錄就係睇到係區議會要求運輸署去檢討當段嘅速度嘅，我相信運輸署收到呢個訊息之後，應該係會將佢帶番去運輸署畀個工作小組去考慮將佢擺落去個議程上面，或者係進一步去檢視下呢段路應唔應該去做個檢討嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話係會由警方代表，將個訊息傳遞畀工作小組，係咪呀？

李大偉先生：由於嗰次會議我睇到主要都係運輸署同事喺個會議上面解答區議會所--

呢個問題，我相信運輸署--警方係唔會再重複番轉達番區議會嘅意見畀番運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係嗰個運輸署，而家係講緊嗰個工作小組，警方會唔會自己係將呢一個訊息係畀工作小組？因為叫佢哋考慮喺議程度講呢樣？

李大偉先生：我相信唔會，因為當日係由運輸署同事負責解答呢個問題。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我未繼續之前，如果有人對於某個路段有投訴，警方係需唔需要係制定關乎嗰個路段嘅統計數字，睇下呢個投訴係咪有利呢？

李大偉先生：警方如果收到類似上述嘅投訴，係轉介畀運輸署同事處理嘅，我哋係唔會做任何呢啲統計或者係去做調查。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁樣理解你嘅口供啱唔啱呢？雖然你有警方嘅代表出席嗰個會議，當時亦都有一間學校去投訴，亦都有一個嘅事件喺嗰個路段係有人死亡，即係嚴重嘅死亡事件，但係警方都唔會係進一步嘅調查，除非運輸署要求佢咁做，係咪？係咪咁樣嘅立場呀你哋？

李大偉先生：我相信喺嗰次會議上面警方係會調查交通--喺會議紀錄上面，警方係會調查交通意外個成因同埋調查嘅，而運輸署係個問題嗰個--今次佢就住嗰個會議，我睇到係區議會向運輸署提問，同埋要求有關於該段路段應該係去檢討嗰個速度限制，我睇唔到兩個有咩嘢關係，關於警方話我哋冇做任何適當行動去轉達呢個意見。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道運輸署有冇要求呢一個路段嘅交通意外嘅統計數字呢？

李大偉先生：頭先喺上晝嘅證供裏面，其實運輸署同我哋警方嘅意外數字係互通嘅，佢係有我哋啲意外數字。

黃女士：Now, four months after these minutes of...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，個問題就係喺 2017 年有一個投訴--2015 年有一個投訴，就係關於 2014 年嘅傷亡數字，運輸署當時會唔會係即係問--2015 年嘅時候問一啲嘅數字，一啲嘅--唔係 2018 年，係 2015 年嘅時候，你明唔明白嗰個嘅分別？

李大偉先生：我明白，嗰個最主要就係運輸署係唔會問我哋攞交通意外嘅資料嘅，因為本身我哋嘅系統係互通，佢係有晒我哋所有相關嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係佢哋可以自己喺一個共用嘅訊息嘅系統去攞，佢哋唔需要問你嘅，係咪呀？

李大偉先生：係，同意，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰個會議紀錄之後四個月，就有一封嘅跟進嘅信件，就係大埔區議員2015年7月24號嘅個日期，喺DC-2(B) 840-78頁，呢個係中文，英文就係840-88頁，如果我哋睇下第二段，呢封信就係2015年7月24號Chan Siu Kuen女士喺第二段嗰度話--第一段先，第二行，佢哋係從大埔道附近嘅居民收到一啲求助嘅請求，呢個係因為喺呢一個屋苑嘅轉角位嗰度係冇一個交通嘅時速限制嘅標誌，所以好多時候都係有交通意外，去確保道路使用者嘅安全，我哋希望你個部門儘快咁樣喺呢度裝一個嘅標誌，就係話車速嘅限制係50，就係去提醒駕駛者係去呢度揸車係以一個安全嘅時速，就避免不必要嘅意外，呢個就喺呢一個翡翠花園附近嘅。

喺通常嘅情況，呢一啲咁嘅信會唔會係去到呢個工作小組手上嘅呢？

李大偉先生：我相信呢封信主要都係講話要求加裝一啲交通標誌，就唔係有關於要求檢討個速度限制，我相信呢封信係唔會去到個工作小組度。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰度當時嘅車速係幾多，限制係幾多？

李大偉先生：我冇呢方面嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，我哋有冇呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係時速係70，我哋從陳先生嘅證供，就唔係淨係得封信嘅，其實係有電話嘅通話，要求係降低呢度嘅車速限制去到50嘅，呢個只係一封跟進嘅信嘅，係嗰個同運輸署通完電話之後。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇嗰個謄本嘅頁數，等我哋可以去理解下嗰啲嘅證供？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可以，我要搵一搵，因為我都係臨時諗到呢一點，啱啱記得呢一點

主席：（經傳譯員）我自己都係熟悉嘅，呢一點。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）請畀少少時間我。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇問題，慢慢。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，係第4日，第9頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）日子呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）第4日，唔好意思，應該係第6頁--第6日第9頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰日係幾多號呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）7月14號。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢一頁第 18 行，陳笑權先生喺嗰陣時應該係關於頭先我哋傾嘅嗰件事，佢話「當時運輸署冇直接回覆畀我，不過我同佢哋講過電話，佢哋就話如果個速度係減到 50，佢哋就會係要諮詢居民同埋啲業主法團，喺 2014 年喺香港日本人學校附近就喺嗰個路口係有一個交通意外，有人受傷嘅，運輸署就向我回應，就話如果嗰個速度係減到 50，運輸署係要進行研究嘅，而喺嗰個意外之後，佢哋就係向居民呼籲就係要遵守交通嘅規則嘅。就話如果真係要去減到 50，佢哋係要做好多嘅諮詢，同埋亦都要同警方去聯絡嘅。我就一路等，我一路都同佢哋聯絡，運輸署嘅王生就調走咗，好遺憾，我哋就喺大埔尾嗰度有呢個交通意外，我就再接觸警方，因為運輸署幫唔到我哋，我請警方就係安裝超速攝錄機，而我一路都有跟進。」

李生，呢個係陳生畀嘅證供嚟嘅，就唔係淨係信，佢亦都係有跟進，同你哋講電話，同埋佢係不斷重複佢嘅要求，似乎係咁樣一路做緊，請問點解喺呢一個個案個情況係咁？

主席：（經傳譯員）個背景就係我哋自己提醒番自己，就係有一位區議員寫咗信畀運輸署。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係正確嘅，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）有可能你唔知點解運輸署冇做過嘢？

李大偉先生：我相信呢封信純粹係運輸署同埋寫信嗰個人士嘅溝通，我哋冇得喺呢度畀任何意見，亦都冇任何紀錄關於呢啲咁嘅事件。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我咁樣講正唔正確呢？喺工作小組裏面，警方嘅角色可以話好似一個橡皮圖章咁樣，係冇任何積極嘅角色嘅？你唔會要求運輸署做任何嘢嘅？

李大偉先生：警方嘅參與喺個工作小組絕對唔係一個橡皮圖章嚟嘅，我哋會審視晒所有佢哋嘅報告，我亦都會諮詢番地區嘅--喺嗰個地點嘅總區交通嘅同事嘅意見，有關於運輸署工作小組提出嘅建議，我哋會諮詢番我哋前線同事佢嗰段路段如果係嗰個建議，係有咩嘢睇法，從而我哋喺個會上就反映我哋警方嘅意見畀個工作小組知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋用另外一個方法去問一問呢個問題，就係話究竟去到咩嘢嘅程度，警方可以話係有一個積極嘅角色去提出一啲建議，譬如話我哋係關心呢一個路段嘅車速，我哋認為應該檢討，你會唔會咁做？

李大偉先生：我相信一定會有嘅，特別係喺一啲嚴重交通意外發生或者經常發生交通意外嘅地方，每個總區嘅交通都係會根據調查之後嘅結果，係會向運輸署提供唔同嘅意見嘅，包括就係速度檢討嘅議題，呢個工作一般嚟講都係交畀番五個陸上嘅交通--警方嘅交通部嘅同事，喺佢哋調查之後，由交通部向運輸署嘅區-

-即係運輸署嘅適當部門反映番每個區嘅需要嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一啲例子我哋？即係我哋說明你一個積極嘅角色，或者係一啲書信。

李大偉先生：手頭上我--因為一般嚟講，呢啲地區嘅來往，即係由總區同埋運輸署嘅地區嘅同事，我哋一般我哋係冇記錄嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁一定喺某啲地方有紀錄㗎？

李大偉先生：我相信會有，但係要諮詢...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就係想請你畀呢啲我哋，可唔可以畀啲例子我哋，說明話畀我哋聽警方如果喺某個地方係有一啲意外嘅，「我哋呢個警方亦都係會有一個積極嘅角色就會去同人哋講，就話可能都要係減低嗰個速度。」有冇一啲例子？

李大偉先生：我哋可以返去諮詢下，我哋會攞番呢個紀錄嘅，我哋會返去諮詢下啲同事。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家就係想咁樣，即係有一啲嘅說明，有一啲嘅證據可以顯示出警方都有一個積極嘅角色。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者畀個例子你，如果你收到一定數目嘅投訴，因為我相信其他嘅區議會或者係居民都可能會投訴嘅，如果有多過三個路段係需要討論嘅，你點樣去選擇呢？三個嚟去討論呢，即係如果有人投訴嘅路段係多過三個。

主席：（經傳譯員）你好似講到係--啲人為嘅一啲限制咁樣，係咪每一個會你有一啲咁樣嘅限制？

李大偉先生：要視乎佢哋投訴嗰啲係咩嘢性質，交通投訴有好多唔同嘅性質嘅，處理投訴都係會由--市民都會係去--如果向警方投訴嘅話，區嘅同事或者係總區交通嘅同事都會相應處理嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋而家繼續睇嗰個時序，而家就係喺意外之後，大埔區議會 2018 年 2 月 12 號開過會嘅，我哋可以睇 DC-2 嗰一沓文件 785 頁，其實英文版本嘅會議紀錄係 782 頁就開始，喺第 5 段，我相信警方嘅代表係參加咗呢一個會議，就係 Chau Chung Mun，就係一位警司嚟嘅，係屬於新界北嘅交通警區嘅。

喺第 5 段嗰度，呢位 Chau 先生就話除咗 2018 年 2 月 10 日嗰一次嘅意外之外，佢係講到另外一啲嘅個案，係警方 2017 年嘅時候偵破嘅，係關於交通違例事件。

請大家睇呢一段嘅中間部分。佢話「2017 年警方拘捕咗四個人，包括兩個飲醉酒嘅司機，一個就係危險駕駛，一個就係同毒品有關嘅罪行嘅，警方總共

發出咗三十二張定額罰款嘅票，就係喺 2017 年喺呢一個路段嗰度，就係因為有人超速，同埋係有其他嘅交通違例事件嘅，總共係有二十九個交通意外，就係喺赤泥坪同黃宜坳呢一段嘅，就喺大埔道嗰度，有其中兩個係比較嚴重嘅，雖然嗰一度當時係冇超速嘅攝錄機，警方都係會採取行動，不時係用一啲嘅偵察嘅器材都喺呢一個路段嗰度係偵察車速嘅，警方亦都係會完成有關嘅調查程序嘅。」呢位鄒先生係提及到曾經有二十九次嘅交通意外喺呢一個路段嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）不如我哋又睇番個地圖，睇番有關嘅路段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）赤泥坪至黃宜坳，...

主席：（經傳譯員）赤泥坪喺邊度呀？好，見到喇，唔該。黃宜坳呢？好，唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）李生，我個問題係咁嘅，有二十九個交通意外，三十個係關於超速，三十二個就係關於發出咗定額罰款嘅告票嘅，喺 2017 年嘅時候，你認為有咁樣嘅統計數字係咪應該令到警方有足夠嘅理由去將呢一個特別嘅路段應該喺工作小組嗰度提出嚟討論呢？

李大偉先生：要視乎呢二十九宗交通意外嗰個交通意外嘅成因係乜嘢，先可以決定應唔應該係咪--因為係咪二十九宗裏面有幾多單係關於車速嘅問題而引致交通意外，亦都係一個考慮因素，就呢個當有--我諗要留番畀當區嘅總區交通決定需唔需要將佢提交畀運輸署去檢討。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就參加過幾次工作小組嘅會議，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢一類嘅統計數字係咪都會交畀個工作小組㗎？即係交通意外嘅數字。

李大偉先生：佢哋會檢討個交通意外數字嘅，整理嚟講，每一年對比其他路段交通意外嘅平均率--發生意外率嚟作出比較嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）之前，你作供嘅時候，即係喺早上嘅時候，你就話工作小組就係會每一次睇三個路段六個方向，你參加過嘅會議裏面，你有冇見過某一個嘅路段最後係減速嘅呢？

李大偉先生：喺我印象之中係有嘅，係有嘅，不過就唔係因為交通意外，係因為附近嘅大型基建嘅工程問題而作出嘅調動嘅啫。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇試過一次事件係減低嗰個車速，就係因為喺某一個路段係有交通意外呢？

李大偉先生：由於我出席過只不過係兩至三次，我唔敢肯定，喺我兩、三次裏面應該就係冇，應該就冇試過因為交通意外而需要檢討決定就係建議去減低個速度嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我而家可唔可以請你睇呢一連串文件嘅最後一份文件，就係一份資料文件，由警方寫畀大埔區議會嘅，就係 2018 年 4 月 9 號，TD 第 5 號文件夾 1617 頁，呢個係翻譯嚟嘅，中文嘅文件就係喺 1611 頁。

我首先描述一下呢一份文件先，呢一份文件係運輸署 2018 年 4 月 9 號寫嘅，佢嘅題目就係話大埔道駿景路沙田至雍宜路嘅交通管理措施，嗰個文件嘅目的就係話大埔區議會喺 2018 年 2 月 12 號開咗一個特別嘅會議去討論 2018 年 2 月 10 號傍晚嘅一宗嚴重巴士意外，運輸署就承諾去檢討呢一個路段嘅車速限制同埋交通管理措施，因為當區嘅關注，仲有區議會嘅關注就係到底呢啲改善措施實施嘅進度如何，呢一份文件就係想話畀議員聽呢一個運輸署去檢討呢一個路段嘅車速限制同埋其他嘅跟進改善措施嘅進度。

第 2 段就係話呢一個路段嘅車速限制係檢討咗。第 3 段就係話運輸署成立咗一個恆常嘅機制去檢討呢一個路段嘅車速限制去確保係交通安全同埋安全暢順嘅。

跟住第 2 頁，1617-2 就係話喺去檢討呢一個路段嘅車速限制嘅時候，有三個嘅因素係要考慮嘅，首先，呢一個路段嘅交通意外紀錄，第二，行呢一個路段嘅車輛嘅車速，另外就係個道路嘅環境，一啲特徵，譬如佢嘅斜度、駕駛者嘅視線、有冇路口、行人嘅交通等等。

「喺過去嘅兩個月，運輸署就係全面咁檢討過呢一個路段係舊年嗰個嘅意外紀錄，亦都係去評估過一啲嘅情況嘅，喺赤泥坪同埋雍宜路呢一個路段，我哋正話睇到呢一度嘅交通意外率係有上升嘅趨勢，亦都係比香港去年嘅整體嘅平均意外率係高嘅，而呢一度過去嗰幾個月，呢一度去偵測到佢哋車輛嘅速度就係比過去同埋一般係低過 70 公里嘅。另外亦都有好多大型嘅發展喺附近嘅，而家其實係有需要將呢度嘅車速下調嘅，我哋建議係將嗰個每公里 70 嗰個嘅時速係降低到 50，嚟到去改善道路嗰個安全嘅。」

另外，我哋而家睇第 6 段，「運輸署同埋警方亦都開始係著手喺呢度安裝新一批嘅偵速嘅攝影機就係加強嗰個阻嚇同埋執法，等啲人係唔好係超速嘅。而家運輸署就係搵緊資源，就希望係喺呢一個赤泥坪大埔道附近嗰一段路，喺今年年尾之前就裝咗呢啲嘅車速偵察攝錄機嘅。」

喺兩個月裏面，呢一個意外兩個月裏面，運輸署就已經係檢討咗--佢話佢係全面咁檢討咗呢啲嘅交通意外報告，就建議將呢度嘅車速限制係下調到 50 嘅。

我而家有兩個問題，第一，係以你部門嚟講，有關嘅數字有冇係之前有冇提供過畀運輸署嘅呢？喺意外之前。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，你可唔可以係講得具體啲，呢個問題？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度嘅路段嘅交通意外數字有冇喺大埔道呢一個嘅即係 2018 年 2 月 10 號之前係向運輸署提供過呢？

主席：Thank you.

李大偉先生：印象之中，我冇喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢一個嘅路段有冇曾經係畀呢一個工作小組討論過嘅呢？即係喺 2018 年 2 月 10 號嗰個交通意外之前，有冇討論過呢？

李大偉先生：據我紀錄嚟講，我就見唔到喇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）陳生，我就想去講另外一個嘅題目，除非主席係關於呢個項目係有問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，唔該，畀少少時間我。4 月 9 號嗰個嘅建議就係話安裝一啲嘅車速嘅偵察攝影機嘅，有冇嗰個地圖呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）據我所知，係應該係 2018 年尾嗰先至係安裝到呢啲攝錄機嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊度呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係 1617 頁第 5。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰幅圖喺邊度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）右手面，右下角嗰度話初步建議固定偵察車速攝影機位置，初步建議固定偵察車速攝影機嘅位置。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。可唔可以幫下我哋，就係採取咗咩嘢步驟去裝呢啲嘅攝影機？首先，就要嗰個預算，即係有錢，根據 4 月 19 號嗰個文件，到底係有冇錢係喺呢度安裝呢？幫唔幫到我哋呢？

邱倩雯女士：我可以講一講嗰個固定嘅偵速攝影機，呢個都係主要由運房局同埋運輸署嘅工作範圍，喺其實 2017 年嘅大概 7 月嗰，其實運房局嗰度已經展開另一個階段嘅衝紅燈嘅攝錄機同埋個偵速嘅攝錄機嗰個諮詢，喺就嗰個地地點嘅選擇咁樣，同埋邊一類型嘅攝影機，事實上喺 2017 年嘅年中已經係做緊，喺大埔嘅巴士意外之後，亦都運輸署已經係同我哋嘅攝影機嘅檢控組，我哋係叫 CTCIU，係 Central Traffic Camera Investigation Unit，係喺警察嘅交通總部嘅，咁樣都已經同我哋 CTCIU 呢一個嘅單位就係去睇下點樣去落實呢一個喺大埔交通意外嗰度嗰個地點嗰度嗰個偵速機嗰個設計咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰個嘅意外係六個月前㗎囉喎，我哋而家有咩嘢進展呀？

邱倩雯女士：我知道就係而家運輸署已經攞咗有錢喺度，就會儘快咁樣喺嗰度設立偵速嘅攝錄機。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時呀？

邱倩雯女士：我唔知道實際嗰個日期，但係以我所知，係佢哋已經落實咗嗰個地點同埋已經有錢可以做。

主席：（經傳譯員）根據你講，呢個係運輸署嘅責任，唔係警方嘅責任，係咪呀？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋提供咗資料畀你，話佢哋諗住點樣做？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，冇錯。同埋呢一個喺大埔嘅攝錄機亦都係喺整體上面，我頭先講話係 2017 年嗰個新一期嘅紅燈、快相嘅偵測機嗰個計劃裏面嘅其中一部分。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係就唔係當時話係特定喺呢個地點，當時只不過係話去檢討下喺邊度裝啲新嘅 camera？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我嘅記憶啱唔啱呢？就係之前就好似係白令嘉先生就係話有二十四個--香港有二十四個嘅固定偵緝嘅車速攝影機。

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，yes，而家係有二十四部嘅偵速機喺一百三十個唔同嘅地點嗰度係運行緊嘅，（經傳譯員）一百三十個地點。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係幾明，點解喺一百三十個地點，點解係可以裝到二十四個嘅攝影機？

邱倩雯女士：呢個係不定期咁樣就將呢啲嘅偵速機就擺喺唔同嘅地點嗰度，希望係可以係加...

主席：（經傳譯員）即係周圍搬嘅？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋唔係固定喺一個地點嘅？

邱倩雯女士：唔係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係佢哋某一段時間擺定喺一度，但係都會搬來搬去嘅？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，呢個亦都係喺運房局喺同立會攞錢嘅時候，有一個比例喺度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港有成四十萬公里嘅道路。

邱倩雯女士：我可以講而家最新嘅商談，咁樣係希望就將每一個地點，即係每一個 housing 都可以擺一個攝錄機喺度，呢個亦都係而家主要商討嘅重點。

主席：（經傳譯員）我嘅問題係更加具體，香港係咪有大概 4,000 公里嘅道路？

邱倩雯女士：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係就得二十四個嘅攝影機？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺一啲明文嘅司法管轄區，係咪都係咁樣嘅比例㗎？係咪最低呀我哋？

邱倩雯女士：我明白主席所說嘅話。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃大律師，我哋今日係咪去到五點半㗎？

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，我哋就有一個小休，而家係咪一個合適嘅時間？

黃女士：Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家小休十五分鐘，唔該。

下午 4 時 13 分聆訊押後

下午 4 時 28 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，請開始。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我開一個新嘅題目之前，或者我請大家睇一睇 SEC 嗰一沓係 1360 段，呢一個就係 2018 年 2 月 15 號一個特別會議嘅會議紀錄，我想你睇一睇 1360 頁，嗰度係有三個動議係通過咗嘅，係當時喺立法會嗰度，我唔會全部都讀晒出嚟嘅，我只會讀其中一段係有可能有關嘅，即係佢會同我一陣間問嘅問題係相關嘅，呢個係第二個嘅動議。就係請佢哋係「安裝一啲防滑嘅路面同埋係有一啲嘅額外嘅係減速警示牌，放置呢個偵速攝影機，並檢視全港高危路段及儘快提升相關安全設施，以保證道路使用者安全」...

呢一個動議係由立法會通過嘅，關於呢一點，我想問警方有冇成立一個獨立嘅部門去處理全港高危路段嘅安全問題呢？

邱倩雯女士：我可以答就係喺呢份文件，我哋之前就冇見過，咁樣喺呢個第二段嗰度所講嘅建議，主要我哋有涉及嘅就係嗰個偵速嘅攝錄機，頭先亦都有提過，喺偵速攝錄機嘅時候，我哋嗰個研究或者我哋嘅討論其實由舊年已經開始，而大埔公路呢個意外之後，我哋亦都知道運輸署嗰度已經係做緊一啲--會將會喺嗰度起一個攝錄機，至於其他嗰啲方面，我哋冇任何嘅 set up--即係成立乜嘢委員會咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署就諮詢你哋，希望你哋提供某啲路段嘅某啲嘅交通意外

嘅數字，有冇呢？

邱倩雯女士：我哋冇收到運輸署嘅特別要求。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我就知道警方係有一個數據庫，係關乎一啲交通意外嘅黑點，係咪呀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係有一張係交通意外黑點嘅清單，呢啲嘅地點係由運輸署嚟到係劃分嘅，呢一個地點點樣成為一個黑點呢？嗰啲嘅準則就係如果有喺一個十二個月期內有六宗涉及行人嘅意外，同埋喺一個十二個月期內有九宗係有任何嘅受傷或者喺五年裏面有兩宗有死亡嘅個案，呢個就係每三個月就係會更新一次嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰張清單係公眾知唔知㗎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）老實講，我就唔知道個答案，呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）相信你可以去查一查，然後話番畀我哋聽。

白令嘉先生：Yes, Sir.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到一個嘅地點就會劃分為黑點，如果喺五年裏面有兩宗涉及死亡嘅事件，一旦一筲地方被列為黑點，會有啲乜嘢嘅安全措施會建議喺呢一個嘅路段度實施呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）從警方嗰個嘅角度，我哋嘅責任主要就係執法，我哋咁多個部門嚟到合作，可能係一個道路工程方面，亦都可能係宣傳，亦都係目的就係要減低呢一度再發生意外嘅可能。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）巴士公司會唔會都係獲告知呢啲嘅黑點呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我要查下先至知道。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以幫到我哋運輸署係咪會有--你會唔會將呢個名單交畀運輸署？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）其實係運輸署制定呢個交通黑點嘅名單。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以應該嗰個係咪要發布個消息應該係佢哋做嘅，係咪呀？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋嘅文件？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋嘅文件。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）其實就喺運輸署個網站上面有公布嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者搵人去睇一睇運輸署嗰個嘅網站，睇下係咪有。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我想去另外一個嘅題目，就係交通安全委員會，我就係想睇SEC嘅文件第481頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）SEC嘅乜嘢？邊一沓嘅文件？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）應該係SEC-1，481，就係我哋今朝見過嘅一個核數署嗰個嘅報告，呢度就係講到道路安全議會，佢嘅成員我哋見到係副警務處處長（行動）做主席嘅，另外有七個嘅政府署或者係局或者係部門嚟到代表嘅，呢個運房局、運輸署、呢個新聞署同有六個非常政府機構，包括埋一啲嘅運輸委員會，另外有兩個委員會就係呢一個道路安全宣傳委員會同埋呢一個嘅研究委員會嘅。

呢度就係話道路安全議會係由副警務處處長（行動）嚟到去做主席，佢係咪有定期會議嘅呢，關於一啲嘅交通數字，以減低同交通相關嘅傷亡呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，佢係每季開一次會嘅，就係會睇下一啲交通意外嘅趨勢，而嗰啲趨勢就係睇嗰啲數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想問今日在座嘅代表有冇邊一個係喺呢一個嘅議會嘅一個成員？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）有，我係喺過去嗰兩次嘅會議，我都去出席嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）警方喺呢一個道路安全議會扮演咩嘢角色㗎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）警方就係做呢一個秘書處，統籌會議，亦都喺嗰啲部分嘅小組委員會上面係有代表，譬如話嗰個道路安全運動委員會。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個道路安全議會一般討論啲乜嘢㗎？除咗交通意外嘅數字之外。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）喺上兩次嘅會議，我可以話嗰個嘅會議主要係集中喺道路安全嘅趨勢，亦都有討論到一啲譬如話無人嘅駕駛嘅車輛，呢啲咁樣嘅專題嘅項目。

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會係有一啲嘅文件係會公布嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢嘅會議紀錄會唔會公開嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）嗰啲會議會唔會係提出建議畀嗰七個嘅政府部門點樣去改善道

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

路嘅安全，特別係關乎巴士安全方面，有冇嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）喺上兩次嘅會議係冇討論過呢啲嘅項目。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個議會如果見到佢有一啲關於巴士安全嘅某方面，佢哋可唔可以向運輸署或者不同嘅呢度所提過嘅局係作出建議嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我相信可以嘅。因為不同嘅政府部門都有代表喺呢一個議會裏面，而呢一個議會嘅整體目標就係減低交通意外嘅數字。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢度講到有兩個嘅委員會嘅，有道路安全運動委員會、道路安全研究委員會，可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢個道路安全運動委員會係有咩嘢成員㗎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）道路安全運動委員會嘅主席就係道路安全議會嘅其中一個非官方嘅成員。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思即係唔係嚟自政府嘅成員？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。喺呢一個委員會亦都係有香港--我哋即係警方方面嗰個道路安全組，另外就係呢一個私人界別裏面喺公共關係方面嘅一啲專家。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋係會唔會定期開會嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）會，佢哋我相信每季開一次會嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋會唔會--呢個委員會有冇會議紀錄嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我而家喺度查緊。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。會唔會道路安全運動委員會會唔會討論話對於巴士司機方面嘅襲擊？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，佢主要討論係點樣將道路道路安全嘅訊息嚟到去帶到畀唔同組別嘅人士，譬如話老人家、後生仔咁樣。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於道路安全研究委員會有咩嘢成員㗎？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）或者由邱小姐可以幫手。

邱倩雯女士：The chairman of the--我講番中文。嗰個 research committee 嗰個主席就係 Deputy Commissioner of TD。另外嘅委員有警方，有路政署，有 TD 本身佢唔同單位嘅工程師，即係唔同單位嘅主管，亦都喺個委員會裏面會係間中會有一啲嘅 consultancy，會係做一啲解說咁樣，通常都係由運輸署去請佢哋去做一啲研究，喺嗰個會裏面就會係有一啲嘅講解。亦都個委員會會有譬如係大學嘅講師，有關於交通事務嘅專家會喺個委員會裏面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）交通嘅專家，佢哋本身係一啲咩嘢職位嚟㗎？做啲咩嘢？

邱倩雯女士：以我所知，係有一啲嘅大學講師，但係佢哋主要嘅交通範疇喺邊度，我就唔太清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋係咪都係定期開會嘅呢？

邱倩雯女士：會嘅，我哋每三個月，每季我哋會開一次會。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪參與呢個委員會嘅？

邱倩雯女士：冇錯，我係。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家？

邱倩雯女士：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你已經代表咗警方幾耐？

邱倩雯女士：我由舊年嘅 2017 年 4 月開始，當我到任喺交通總部呢一個崗位嘅時候，我就開始有參與呢個會議，但係對上兩次我就冇去到，因為有其他公務，就有其他同事代去嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你一路都知道係傾咗啲乜嘢，係咪？肯定。

邱倩雯女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係你傾過啲乜嘢？

邱倩雯女士：以我所記得嘅，就未必係全部，例如有一啲細路仔嘅安全帶，喺車裏面，細路仔嘅安全帶，亦都有提過就係延長交通燈號綠公仔讓行人可以有長啲嘅過路時間，例如畀老人家嘅長啲嘅過路時間，有一個--我哋而家講嘅walkability，即係行人--多啲行人去行路，即係呢個係我印象所及嘅其中幾個嘅研究報告。

黃女士：What about technological

主席：（經傳譯員）等一等先。呢一啲嘅研究係咪公開可以攞到嘅？

邱倩雯女士：呢個我唔係太清楚。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你開會有冇會議紀錄？

邱倩雯女士：有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你只不過係 2017 年 4 月先參與呢個委員會，當然而家都差唔多十八個月，好肯定你係可以睇到以前嘅紀錄嘅，係咪？

邱倩雯女士：可以搵到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）肯定如果你想做得好呢個工作，你係要睇番以前嗰啲嘅物料、資料。

邱倩雯女士：對於再之前嘅報告我就冇特別去睇過。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）因為呢一個委員會叫做道路安全研究委員會，佢哋有冇傾過喺啲路段嗰度或者喺啲繁忙嘅道路，譬如話喺德輔道中嗰啲，會唔會將佢減速，有冇傾過呢啲問題呢？

邱倩雯女士：以我印象中，就冇特別提過，即係關於減低速度，冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，巴士安全有冇傾過呢？

邱倩雯女士：冇，我要返去再睇下一啲研究報告先記得，但係而家即時諗起就冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我想請問一個一般性問題，230 章，你覺得可以點樣將佢修改或者係加強去加強巴士嘅安全呢？因為你有呢啲執法經驗，你認為可以點樣做呢？

邱倩雯女士：我諗每個法例嘅成立都有一個立法原意喺度，Cap. 230A 主要都係針對就係喺巴士上面嘅乘客嘅行為同埋整個專營巴士嗰個運作嘅一啲規管，在於警方係需要執法，我諗就係可唔可以讓我哋比較順利執法，係我比較著重嗰個重點。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋既然係講緊執法，我而家就會去最後一個題目，我相信其中一個你提供嘅回覆，你就話有五十一宗致命意外，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未講呢啲細節之前，有一啲嘢我都想跟進，我哋好幸運，白令嘉先生你就係參加道路安全運動委員會，同埋邱女士你係警方嘅代表就喺道路安全研究委員會嗰度，我就想請問兩位一個問題，如果有人嘅話，係邊一個，即係香港嚟講，係香港政府裏面邊一位係主導道路交通嘅安全嘅呢？即係嗰個動力係來自邊一位呢？邊個係去指令其他人嘅呢？邊個設置嗰啲措施或者政策嘅呢？

邱倩雯女士：我相信喺整體嘅交通嘅事務嚟講，香港政府運房局都係有個帶頭嘅 policy 嘅角色喺度，政策嘅角色喺度，至於運輸署就係一個行政嘅組織，喺交通條例上面，或者喺交通嘅設計，道路嘅設計，都係需要 TD 去執行嘅。警方嘅角色就係根據法例賦予我哋嘅權力，我哋可以點樣盡忠職守咁樣去做好我哋嗰個檢控嘅工作。對於有一啲檢控，我哋頭先都有提過有少少束手無策，就例如係我講嘅違例泊車，咁樣我哋會儘量會喺現行嘅法例畀到我哋嘅權力裏面，我哋都會儘量做。

另外，喺法例嘅譬如修改或者喺道路嘅設計、道路嘅改善，咁樣我哋都會係--警方都係義不容辭咁樣希望可以提供到意見畀運輸署，從而希望可以改善

到道路嘅安全，希望交通係暢順，希望係道路亦都每一個使用者都係受到保障。

主席：（經傳譯員）究竟係邊一位係提出一啲意見出嚟，就話我哋跟進啲乜嘢呀？我哋今日都傾過專利巴士上面嘅安全帶嘅問題或者有其他喺車輛上面可以有嘅安全設施呀咁，究竟係邊啲人提出呢啲意見呢？

邱倩雯女士：我諗幾方面都會係有唔同嘅意見喺裏面，喺警方日常執法，其實我哋都會預見到有一啲海外嘅經驗，係可以畀我哋用得到嘅，亦都喺 TD 裏面嘅 research，佢哋嘅研究工作，佢哋亦都會睇到，可能最終都係需要決策局運房局嗰個支持，無論係喺嗰個科技上面、喺金錢上面、喺法例上面，都希望係可以得到運房局嗰個最大嘅支持，咁樣喺 TD 同埋喺警方都希望可以喺日常嘅工作做得更加好。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就描述過呢一個運房局係要帶頭咁嘅作用，點樣帶頭法呢？運房局關於改善專利巴士嘅安全，佢提供過啲乜嘢嘅帶頭作用呢？

邱倩雯女士：我相信而家喺運輸署裏面已經有一個工作小組係著意咁樣睇專營巴士嗰個運作，無論喺佢哋嗰個發牌嘅制度同埋佢哋點樣可以係保障到道路安全，呢個希望就係運輸署嗰個工作小組可以提出更加多嘅意見畀我哋譬如執法部門可以去執法，或者喺嗰個政策部門嗰度可以係有更加完善嘅政策去保障各位市民。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個工作小組呀？

邱倩雯女士：今朝聽到係有個工作小組，稍等。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果你講緊話加強專利巴士安全嘅工作小組，佢係今年 3 月 13 號成立嘅，...

邱倩雯女士：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）...你係咪講緊呢個？

邱倩雯女士：係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個小組之前，運房局又提供過啲乜嘢嘅帶頭作用呢？係加強安全方面嘅。可能對你咁樣問係唔係好公道，但係好似你頭先描述你嘅認識嘅時候，你就係話嗰個運房局就係會畀一啲帶頭嘅作用，然後你就會執法，然後運輸署就係要去實施有關嘅政策。

邱倩雯女士：以我所知，喺運輸署嗰度亦都有一個關於巴士同埋鐵路嘅一個單位去處理有關專營巴士同埋鐵路嘅服務嘅，咁樣呢個警方唔係太多嘅 involvement 喺裏面，但係期望就係 TD 可以藉住嗰一個嘅單位可以做多一啲嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇任何人真係帶頭去改善專利巴士嘅安全嘅呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）主席，關於專利巴士，其實我係唔知道有任何一位人士係特別係負責專利巴士，其實道路安全議會係一個好好嘅平台讓我哋同埋唔同嘅有關交通運輸嘅部門可以一齊係交換意見，呢一個平台肯係可以為道路安全嘅政策起一個帶頭作用，但係我就唔知道有冇其他係咪話有一個委員會係特別處理專利巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）邱女士，我想再問你，你就係參與道路安全研究委員會嘅，你知唔知道有冇一個呢啲委員會做嘅研究係講到話專利巴士如果用安全帶有咩嘢好處嘅？即係當然有啲人未必想用喇。

邱倩雯女士：以我嘅記憶，就冇喺專利巴士講--即係冇講過專利巴士嗰個安全帶問題，只係有記得就係小朋友嗰個叫 child restraining device 嗰度有提過，小朋友用嘅安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）跟進呢一點，邊個負責建議議題畀呢一個道路安全研究委員會商討嘅呢？

邱倩雯女士：通常都係由 TD 去畀一啲 consultant's paper，我哋喺開會之前，我哋會睇，睇完之後，我哋就開會去傾。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以有委員係去提議任何嘅項目，喺道路安全委員會度傾？

邱倩雯女士：我唔太清楚係由邊度會提出啲題目，咁樣我哋都係由運輸署個秘書處嗰度通知。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係話其實都係以運輸署所推動？

邱倩雯女士：係，以我所知，係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）邱女士，去到最後一個嘅題目，就係關於 2018 年 5 月 7 號你提供畀委員會嘅一啲文件，就係關於五十一個係有死亡嘅致命嘅意外，就喺 124-1 頁，就喺嗰個雜項文件夾嗰度，係第 124-1 至到 124-2 嗰個嘅文件，我就係想問你係某啲嘅問題，係關於用黑盒裏面嘅資料...

主席：（經傳譯員）未落之前，呢個其實唔係淨係五十一宗致命意外，其實喺巴士上面或者附近嘅？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）五十一項係致命嘅意外係涉及專營巴士嘅呢啲嘅意外。124 頁，呢度就係講第 2 段，請你係提供一啲細節，係關於係致命意外嘅，就係喺呢一個嘅 2012 年至到 2014 年 2 月，特別係包括呢一個致命意外方面，同埋係有啲乜嘢嘅後來嘅檢控，有冇一啲去搵下佢成因等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，我代表委員會，我就要多謝 Cadman 總警司，其

實係佢--佢今日唔喺度，但係佢向我哋提供呢啲資料，佢都係花咗好多工夫嚟到去製備--喺咁短嘅時間裏面幫我哋製備呢啲嘅資料嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋都係好多謝你向我哋提供呢啲嘅文件嘅，有五十一宗嘅致命交通意外係涉及專營巴士，係第 124-2 頁，呢度係有嗰啲嘅數字--嗰個嘅個案嘅編號同埋嗰啲嘅日期，有三十宗，有二十八宗係定罪，有兩宗係無罪釋放嘅，係文件嘅第 4 段寫嘅；亦都提供咗係十五宗嘅個案嘅撮要，冇檢控到呢一個司機，冇進一步嘅行動；有三宗只係有簡單嘅案情，有一宗仲未完結嘅，有兩個嘅初步報告同埋一宗就淨係係有呢一個嘅案件嘅結果。

我哋其實就係想講下你用呢啲黑盒或者係啲行車紀錄儀嗰啲嘅數據係點樣用㗎？譬如佢哋減速或者係超速，喺一啲嘅法律訴訟程序裏面係點樣用㗎？舉一啲例子，124-5 頁，呢個就係 2012 年 9 月 5 號，就係一個危險駕駛引致死亡嘅個案。我哋落去 124-7 頁，呢一個嘅背景就係一宗嘅致命交通意外，喺土瓜灣道，第 2 段就係一架雙層巴士，係九巴嘅，有一個嘅老婆婆就係死亡，佢喺嗰個安全島過馬路嘅時候發生嘅。

喺 124-8 頁嗰度，除咗相片之外，警方都係從九巴攞咗嗰啲嘅行車紀錄數據，就顯示當嗰個嘅巴士係離開車站嘅時候個車速、佢嗰個嘅加速嘅情況同埋當個車長係剎咗幾多次掣、踩咗幾多次嘅剎掣。

呢度有好多嘅例子，呢個係其中一個。我想問呢啲嘅資料係咪好常喺一啲法律程序裏面使用嘅呢？

邱倩雯女士：喺調查一啲嚴重嘅交通意外，尤其是係有死亡嘅調查裏面，我哋都會係盡所有嘅辦法，攞齊所有嘅交通紀錄，包括埋巴士上面嘅 CCTV、巴士上面嘅行車紀錄。咁樣不過要提到一樣嘢，就係巴士個行車紀錄儀喺而家唔係法定必須要做嘅嘢嚟嘅，如果佢架巴士有嘅話，我哋一定會攞嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一啲非致命意外，又點呀？

邱倩雯女士：喺其他如果係冇死者嘅個案，係一啲嚴重嘅交通意外裏面，如果有個行車紀錄儀，我哋都會攞取愛嚟做證據。

主席：（經傳譯員）專營巴士自從 2014 年 7 月 1 號已經係要裝呢個黑盒㗎囉喎，唔係，抑或係話嗰個日子之後所造嘅巴士，所有嘅專營巴士其實個事實就係已經係有呢一個行車紀錄儀㗎喇。

邱倩雯女士：而家喺專利巴士唔係每一架巴士都有嘅，以我哋所知，係小巴、PLB 就有，但係專利巴士就未係每一部都有。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以將嗰個嘅要求，有咁樣嘅要求擺上去屏幕嗰度畀我哋睇呢？我諗我哋係巴士公司畀我哋有咁嘅數據，話佢哋已經事後安裝晒呢啲，你而家係咪話警方係有遇到一啲專利巴士係冇裝呢個黑盒嘅呢？因為咁就有啲詫異。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋而家搵呢份文件，不如答咗呢個問題先，你有冇遇過一啲咩嘢困難，想喺一啲非致命嘅意外度想搵黑盒嘅資料？

邱倩雯女士：我相信如果係佢本身已經有嗰個資料喺度，我哋係冇困難去攞取呢啲資料嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-5 1597 頁，呢個係運輸署一封嘅信件，2003 年 10 月 17 號嘅，就講到電子數據紀錄儀器最基本嘅要求，我哋睇到最起碼嘅要求就係有電子數據紀錄儀，呢個係喺 1598 頁，我哋第 1 段。電子數據紀錄儀嘅目的就係畀巴士公司有一個工具去監察同埋管理路上嘅車速同埋安全，即係佢嗰個巴士嗰個呢方面嘅行為，同埋係間接咁樣係鼓勵到良好嘅駕駛習慣，呢一個嘅儀器應該係提供以下嘅數據嘅，每一秒同埋嗰個記--所能夠儲存嘅數據係喺一個嘅兩星期嘅期內每三十秒佢嗰個嘅運作時間開車、嗰個嘅轉動時間、係完成嘅時間等等。九巴同埋城巴亦都有一啲嘅講解話佢哋而家係更新咗黑盒嘅數字，係可以裏面係包含多啲嘅數據。

喺運輸署文件 8，我相信係 TD-1 第 87 頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係運輸署提供畀委員會，喺我哋一開始研訊嘅時候提供嘅文件，我諗我哋要去睇(c)段最後一句，就話「而家所有嘅專營巴士都已經係有黑盒同埋呢一個車速限制器嘅」。

黃女士：Yes, "and speed limiters".

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋岔開咗一啲，我哋而家嗰個嘅重點係講巴士，當然你嗰個範疇係闊啲，我係想問你，你有幾常使用黑盒裏面嘅數據嚟到做檢控呢？

邱倩雯女士：而家喺--我頭先講過而家喺有--牽涉有死亡同埋一啲嚴重嘅交通意外，都會用到黑盒裏面嘅資料嘅，咁樣呢個亦都係喺警方調查裏面都--如果有嗰個紀錄，我哋都唔會係好困難咁樣攞到，我相信喺我哋嘅交通意外調查組嘅同事都會係將所有嘅證據一併去考慮，然後作出檢控。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）可唔可以話畀我哋聽有冇困難，就話點解呢啲嘅數據係除咗喺一啲致命或者係嚴重嘅意外之外，喺一啲輕微嘅意外你唔用？

邱倩雯女士：我諗就係即係每一個案情都會有唔同，如果即係講話一啲冇咁嚴重嘅交通意外，可能就係好普通嘅跌嘅、整嘅，咁樣呢個可能係唔牽涉係一個交通嘅--即係嚴重交通意外需要所調查嘅方向，呢個我諗我哋都會再作檢討，喺每一宗嘅交通意外調查裏面，睇下係咪--都根據案情不論係嚴重或者唔嚴重我哋都需要攞呢個證據。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺所有嘅個案，你知唔知道嗰啲黑盒數據係咪都係報告咗，譬如嗰啲加速、減速，係咪所有嘅喺法庭裏面，有冇人質疑過呢？

邱倩雯女士：我手頭冇呢一個分析嘅資料喺度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺嗰五十一宗...

主席：（經傳譯員）畀時間傳譯員譯咗先。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未繼續之前，你可唔可以係幫我哋去查詢下，然後畀番個答案我哋？

邱倩雯女士：可以。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我知道小巴喺嗰個有關嘅法例係有講到呢啲電子資料紀錄儀嘅，係咪可以接納成為呈堂證供。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以將佢擺上去個網度呢？

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪有一條嘅條款，就係令到用黑盒嘅數據做檢控係容易啲嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）請問可唔可以話畀我哋聽嗰個參考嘅編號？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋搵緊有關嘅文件，或者我講咗個要點先，或者我哋需要幾秒嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，冇問題。係咪有另外一條條例嘅呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係關於道路安全嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪374章呀？

黃女士：Cap. 374.

主席：（經傳譯員）道路交通，因此就係同呢一個一般性嘅《道路交通條例》係有關，係咪？

黃女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）好肯定我哋有人會幫我哋搵，我哋不如繼續，好唔好呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，有一個具體嘅條文，係我哋修訂咗個條例之後，就係講到邊啲嘅證據可以係法庭接納嘅，即係譬如話係公共小巴上面嘅電子紀錄系統，咁就令到控方更加容易係舉證嘅。我個問題就係警方會唔會歡迎類似嘅一種修訂呢？即係好似公共小巴有嘅條文，你會唔會歡迎呢？令到專營巴士嘅黑盒資料都可以係接納呢？

邱倩雯女士：我同意嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，視乎我哋搵唔搵到嗰個具體嘅條文，我嘅提問已經完結喇。

主席：Very well.

邱倩雯女士：我想有少少補充，唔好意思。

黃女士：Thank you.

邱倩雯女士：頭先講嗰五十一宗嘅 fatal cases，因為喺預備嘅時間比較可能倉卒咗一啲，其實有一單係 number 19，嗰一單就係牽涉係 PLB 嘅，就唔係專利巴士，所以嗰個數字係有五十宗，一共係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。即係嗰度係冇專利巴士牽涉在內？

邱倩雯女士：係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我相信應該係 374A 章，《道路交通公共服務車輛規例》...

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，呢啲就係嗰個儀器嘅規格，但係都應該有一條條文係關於舉證，係咪？可能係第 25 條喎，有冇呢？或者我哋睇一睇 24 條，唔該，係，我哋成條睇一睇。或者我哋遲啲再將佢搵出嚟，肯定有一條係關於舉證嘅。今日喺呢度嘅警方代表可唔可以協助我哋，有冇試過動用過呢一個關於公共小巴嘅舉證條文呢？即係話當你檢控嘅時候，你係可以用黑盒嘅資料嚟去確定當時嘅車速㗎？

李大偉先生：有關--據我哋了解，我哋手頭冇準確數字有關於幾多單案件引用呢個嘅數字，但係我印象之中係有一單案件曾經呢個裝置曾經喺法庭畀辯方去爭議嘅，亦都大家係會請咗互相嘅專家去爭論呢個個合法性同埋準確性嘅，結論就係法庭接納咗呢個 EDRD 嘅作用同埋佢嘅指定安裝人，而成功檢控個個案嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有另外一個方面嘅，即係關於公共小巴，仲有其他嘅條例都係同我哋今日考慮嘅事件係相關嘅，就係話專營巴士係咪都應該有呢一啲嘅速度顯示器，就係好似公共小巴咁樣，讓乘客都知道個車速？我要問嘅問題就係有冇一啲嘅困難或者衝突，係公共小巴嘅司機同埋乘客因為都睇到嗰個車速，就令到譬如話公共小巴嘅司機就係冇符合呢個車速，因為乘客睇到，咁就造成困難，有冇試過呢？

邱倩雯女士：冇呢個難度，我相信就係如果乘客都可以睇到嗰個車速嘅話，呢個亦都係可以更加有效地保障到嗰個交通安全。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我已經搵到有關嗰個條文。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒你。你講之前，有冇試過喺公共小巴嘅乘客就係影相，將嗰個車速顯示器係影相，然後就係提出一個投訴嘅，你知唔知道有咁嘅事呢？

李大偉先生：我哋冇呢方面嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，係喺 67A 條，喺番嗰個主體條例，《道路交通條例》本身嗰度，67A 條，我哋可以睇第(6)款，應該係關於電子數據嘅紀錄系統嘅，呢一度就係講到話可以撿取有關嘅數據嘅權力嘅，第(6)款就話喺任何刑事程序當中，如果有一份文件就話係根據第(5)款(b)條撿取到嘅數據紀錄，佢就會係被法庭接納作為證據，就唔需要再進一步去舉證嘅。(5)(b)，你可以睇到就係話喺嗰個裝置咗嘅電子紀錄系統裏面嘅數據，而呢一個安裝嘅人就係由運輸署署長--對唔住，係警務處處長係授權佢做呢一個安裝嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邱女士，我諗你會同意，你都會係歡迎一個咁樣嘅條文，係用喺呢個專營巴士？

邱倩雯女士：（經傳譯員）係，我同意。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我係完成咗我喺呢方面嘅提問。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。仲有一、兩件事係要處理嘅。我哋知道除咗黑盒數據係有或者冇之外，而家其實喺好多巴士上面都有閉路電視，佢哋係可以攝錄咗好多事件嘅，尤其是一啲係前置嘅鏡頭，就可以讓你睇到係發生咩嘢事，亦都有一啲嘅攝錄機亦都係可以影到巴士嗰個車長個位嘅，呢一啲攝錄機裏面嘅紀錄係咪都用過嚟做檢控呢？我就記得五十宗嘅致命意外裏面，喺鯉魚門嗰度有一架巴士係翻側嘅，佢哋與其用嗰個黑盒嘅數據，佢係用番閉路電視裏面影到嘅嘢係去顯示個車速嘅。

邱倩雯女士：喺警方嘅意外調查裏面，我哋都可以係用到車裏面嗰個行車嗰個攝錄裏面嘅片段嘅，但係嗰個片段亦都係需要有證人去提供呢一個證據，咁樣結合咗嗰個影像同埋口供嘅話，呢個係可以用喺檢控裏面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，淨係講番閉路電視，係咪而家好多時都會用到嘅呢？就算你打劫銀行等等，都會係用到閉路電視嘅。

邱倩雯女士：有，而家喺好多嘅刑事檢控嗰度都有用到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你頭先講話要證人，關於嗰個攝錄機仲要需要咩嘢證人？

邱倩雯女士：我諗最主要我哋需要嗰個 author，個原作者，邊一個譬如係 install 嗰個相機，嗰個相機裏面嗰個影像有冇人去騷擾過、干擾過，呢啲資料需要...

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話係《證據條例》裏面第 22 條，應該係有一個電腦嘅，係咪？

邱倩雯女士：未必係電腦，可能係一個 chip，一個錄影帶，錄影嘅 chip。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話你需要有人就係話係咪冇人干擾過佢，...

邱倩雯女士：冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）...即係你需要一個技術員，而唔係一個證人？

邱倩雯女士：呢個視乎嗰個 cam. recorder 係有幾先進，有一啲係可能比較容易啲，自己車主可以做嘅，有啲可能係需要到譬如一啲 technician，一啲有技術嘅人做。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係講緊專營巴士，其實巴士車長都唔可以自己擺自己嘅攝錄機喺度，其實所有呢啲嘅攝錄機都係巴士公司安裝同埋維修嘅，我哋知道佢哋係安裝喺邊度，我哋亦都見到係有黑盒嘅數據嘅。

邱倩雯女士：我相信專利巴士公司嗰個行車紀錄儀係一定有一啲監管喺嗰度，就唔係個司機自己可以係攞到出嚟，咁樣，因為呢個除咗係一啲行車嘅紀錄嘅數據之外，亦都對於巴士公司嘅管理可能佢喺嗰度一啲資料佢係需要嘅，所以喺專利巴士嗰個 CCTV 係由巴士公司去管理，呢個係理解嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）當然，巴士公司亦都有佢哋嘅資訊科技部門，好簡單，就係要有安裝，唔可以有干擾，就可以確保到嗰啲嘅影片嘅有效性，係咪？你問九巴嗰啲人畀你一個嘅證供，話所有嘢都係運作良好，就證明到佢喇。

邱倩雯女士：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就成為一啲好有價值嘅資料嚟㗎喇？

邱倩雯女士：我唔知道佢哋需要幾多時間可以預備到，但係都喺一個調查裏面，我都希望佢哋係儘快可以配合。

主席：（經傳譯員）歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我就而家想講番道路安全議會，希望兩位警司幫到我。你哋都係有參與過呢兩個委員會，你就知唔知道有冇任何嘅建議係畀房運局嘅呢？由呢一個議會，係關於安全嘅問題。

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）喺我所參與嘅兩次會，冇一啲新嘅建議。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）睇番下嗰啲嘅會議紀錄，你知唔知呢個議會有冇向房運局提過啲咩嘢建議或者係畀房運局就係推翻或者係拒絕接受？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔知道，我睇過過去嗰兩年嘅會議紀錄，但係我就睇唔到話係有啲咩嘢嘅建議係被拒絕或者係唔接受。

歐陽先生：Thank you. Ms Yau, same thing?

邱倩雯女士：喺研究嘅委員會裏面，我諗我都需要再睇睇佢有啲乜嘢嘅研究報告喺過

往幾年係可能有提及過一啲安全措施，我返去要睇睇。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）羅教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我就有兩個嘅問題，第一個就係運輸署會唔會定期咁樣研究下嗰啲意外嘅數字，睇下有啲咩嘢可以改善呢？係咪運輸署嘅工作之一呢？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係，運輸署係會睇下交通意外嘅數字，然後喺呢個議會嗰度係提供一啲嘅結論嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）警方會唔會咁做？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）警方就會咁做就係希望係針對我哋嘅執法同埋去制定一啲宣傳嘅資料去到特定嘅受眾，要嚟做宣傳。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁樣講公唔公道呢？警方嘅角色係執法、調查意外同埋去管理呢一個數據庫，呢個就係警方嘅基本角色，係咪？

白令嘉先生：（經傳譯員）係。道路安全嗰個策略嗰個整體係有三方面嘅，就係要有參與，有工程方面同埋係執法，警方個主要嘅角色就係執法，同埋部分係要去令到公眾係參與，而喺工程方面，係多啲由運輸署同埋路政署嚟到去做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，黃大律師，委員問過嘅問題，你有冇進一步嘅追問？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，委員會就想多謝幾位代表今日出席咗好長嘅聆訊，我哋亦都希望你提供我哋所要求嘅資料，我哋就係希望儘快係將佢哋成為一個清單，係畀你哋知道，亦都畀埋有關嘅研訊謄本畀你，就希望你就係可以跟進嘅。我哋今日嘅取供嘅程序就完成，我哋就會喺星期四再繼續，多謝。

2018年9月24日

下午5時34分聆訊押後

Thursday, 27 September 2018

(9.00 am)

EXPERT EVIDENCE OF MR MIKE WESTON

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Mr Weston.

MR MIKE WESTON: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for travelling from London to Hong Kong to assist us with our inquiry.

As you no doubt know, we are assisted by counsel who will pose questions to you, although there may be questions that we, the committee, wish to pose to you. If any of our questions are less than clear, by all means indicate that that is the case and we will see what we can do to make sure that the question is accurate.

I will ask Mr Duncan then to begin the evidence.

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Weston, good morning.

MR MIKE WESTON: Good morning.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would like to echo the chairman's remarks and thank you for the assistance that you have rendered to the committee, and in particular for furnishing the committee with a written report.

Could I ask you to turn up that report, please, which will be found in bundle EXP-1 at page 115.

There are a number of topics that I wish to explore with you, but before doing so I'm going to ask you a few questions about your background and your experience, and then also the context in which you have provided your report.

So with regard, first of all, to your own experience, can I direct you, please, to page 118 of the bundle, and the section headed "Context", and the second paragraph:

"This report has been prepared by [yourself] an independent consultant with over 30 years' experience within the bus industry including senior roles at Transport for London most recently as director of buses."

Then there is reference to a career resume at appendix A.

I think if we would go to appendix A -- you will find that at page 157, where we have the benefit of "Personal profile", "Recent career history", and "Other professional interests".

If I could just direct your attention to the section headed, "Director of buses, Transport for London", and under that part of the page, going back to 1999 to 2003, "Head of bus infrastructure, London Buses". Can you tell us a bit about what that involved?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. As head of bus infrastructure, which I was appointed to in 1999, prior to that I had been heavily involved in evaluation of bus route tenders. But in 1999 I was appointed head of bus infrastructure and had a range of responsibilities but was primarily responsible for the provision of all the bus infrastructure for the bus network; that's bus stops, bus shelters, bus stations, some of the bus garages which TfL owned but that wasn't the majority. So responsible both for the provision of the infrastructure but also for the day-to-day operation of that infrastructure.

That role also included an oversight of the engineering and bus specifications for the bus operators, so buses were included in that definition of infrastructure in that role.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Were you concerned with the safety of buses at all in that role?

MR MIKE WESTON: No, not directly. Clearly, I was responsible for the safety of the infrastructure. So, for example, the safe operation of bus stations, and monitoring of that locally. It was the role head of bus operations in 2003 where I became responsible for the safety of the London bus network, and then subsequently in 2004 as operations director.

So clearly, as head of bus infrastructure, there was clearly a role in terms of safety, as you would expect, but in terms of overall safety responsibility for the bus network, that was assumed in 2003.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And that's when you took up the position of head of bus operations?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then operations director -- you have touched on that already -- could I just ask where that position sat within the management hierarchy of Transport for London?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So at the time there were three directors, actually, reporting in on the bus side of the Transport for London business. I was the operations director. There was a performance director who was responsible for the performance of the bus contracts. And then there was a finance director who also had other responsibilities for other parts of the organisation. We reported into a managing director who, as well as being responsible for London Buses, was responsible for other modes within TfL, and he reported into the Commissioner for Transport for London.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then, in 2013, you were appointed director of buses. How did that position relate to your previous position as operations director?

MR MIKE WESTON: In 2013, the decision was taken to combine the roles of performance director and operations director into one role. So, effectively, this new role of director of buses became responsible for the bus network, reporting into the managing director. As I said, the managing director had other responsibilities for the surface transport operation within London, so really the director of buses was responsible day to day for the provision of the bus network, the management of the contractors, and as it says there in the evidence, the budget of about 2 billion pounds per annum for the procurement of the bus network.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You have referred in the second paragraph there to the fact that included responsibility for the provision of a "safe network"?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. As I previously said, probably the head of bus operations was when I first became responsible for the safety team that was allocated to London Buses. Operations director took forward that role, but clearly, as director of buses, as the senior manager responsible for the bus network, I also assumed responsibility for the safe operation of that network.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You left that organisation, as I understand it, in 2016, September.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Since then, you have been working as an independent consultant. Can you tell us just a little bit in your own words what that work has entailed?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. It is probably worth just saying that I took the opportunity to leave the organisation in 2016 as part of a sort of planned restructuring, and I volunteered to leave after 31 years.

As an independent consultant, I now focus on the bus industry, and there are two main areas of my focus. One is the environmental management of bus fleets, and that's an area where I gained quite a lot of experience in previous roles at Transport for London, but also franchising and tendering of bus services and network design, and I have been providing some support to a number of transport authorities within Europe on those subjects.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I now ask you to go back, please, to page 118 of your report, and just focus on the context in which you have provided this report.

I think if I could just read out quickly some excerpts from this, so we all understand the context. The first paragraph:

"This report has been commissioned by [the committee] ... to seek further understanding on the

organisation and structure of the London bus franchising system and to ascertain best practice which could potentially be used in Hong Kong to further improve the existing franchising model. The committee have already had sight of Transport for London's document titled 'London's bus contracting and tendering process' dated August 2015."

Then if we jump a couple of paragraphs down:

"In commissioning the report, the IRC have asked for the following:

(i) A description of the regulatory and governance arrangements together with the operations and management of franchised buses in London, having regard to bus safety.

(ii) A summary of the regime obtaining in Hong Kong in respect of franchised buses.

(iii) So that, having regards to the differences in the two regimes at (i) and (ii), you are asked to express opinions as to the adequacy of the regime obtaining in Hong Kong and make recommendations, as are warranted in your opinion, to enhance the safety of the franchised system in Hong Kong."

Then the final paragraph:

"Sections 2 to 5 of the report give an overview of London's public transport system, explains the structure

of the UK bus industry and the history of London's bus contracting regime and describes the current bus contracting regime and how contractor performance is monitored and managed. Section 6 gives an overview of safety management within London's bus industry and section 7 describes the various initiatives currently being delivered by Transport for London and the contracted bus operators under the bus safety programme. The report concludes in section 8 with the author's observations and opinions of how the approaches adopted in London could be used to improve the Hong Kong regime."

So there we have the context in which your report has been written.

You have referred, in that section, to some differences in the two regimes, between London and Hong Kong, and in order that we all understand what those differences are, I would just like to refer to a few of those before I explore some of these topics with you.

The first, if we go to page 120 of your report, you will see the number of passenger journeys in London, at 2.2 billion, I think that's in a year. So that's the approximate number of passenger journeys.

In Hong Kong -- I will simply give everybody the

reference rather than taking you to the document -- but at THB-2, page 103, we can work out that the equivalent number of passenger journeys in Hong Kong is 1.4 billion. So that's the comparison with regard to numbers of passenger journeys.

The second comparison I would like to bring to your attention is the proportion of the populations within the two areas which use public transport.

Perhaps we will go to the bundle on this occasion; I'm not sure whether you have seen this. If you look at THB-2, page 2, footnote 2 on that page -- this is from a public transport strategy study conducted by the Transport and Housing Bureau in June of last year, and if you look at the footnote at the bottom of that page:

"According to a study conducted by the Land Transport Authority of Singapore in November 2014, the public transport usage rate in Hong Kong was the highest among 27 major cities."

And you can see from item 2 that the ratio in Hong Kong is as high as 90 per cent, and the comparator in London is 30 per cent. The 90 per cent you will see in paragraph 1.4 on that page:

"Public transport services are closely related to the daily life of the public. Every day, over 12 million passenger trips are made through different

public transport services in Hong Kong. This accounts for over 90 per cent of the total passenger trips each day, which is the highest in the world."

So I just bring your attention also to that statistic.

The third matter perhaps which is worthy of mention is the percentage of bus use as a percentage of the overall public transport journeys undertaken. You have referred to this yourself at page 120. I have a reference to 56 per cent in my notes. Perhaps I will have to check that.

In Hong Kong, if we are on THB-2 at page 103, we will see that franchised buses, at item 2, account for 31.1 per cent, whereas heavy rail, which you can read as the MTR, is at 38.9 per cent. So there is a greater quantity in favour of the heavy rail system.

CHAIRMAN: Obviously that's the figure for Hong Kong, and that accords with my own memory, but what are you suggesting is the figure of the percentage of the use of franchised buses in London as a proportion of public transport in London?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, I have --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr Weston can help.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have that percentage at your fingertips, Mr Weston?

MR MIKE WESTON: I can't -- no doubt somebody has a calculator on the screen but it's over 50 per cent, because obviously 2.2 billion out of just under 4 billion is more than 50 per cent, so it's 50-odd -- 56 per cent it comes up as, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So that's the 2.2 billion over 3.9 million on that page?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think that's where I got the 56 per cent from.

MR MIKE WESTON: Mr Chairman, those two tables aren't entirely comparable, because for example, I noticed on the Hong Kong figures you have ferries included, where in London there are some river commuter services included, so they're not -- but the magnitude of the figures is correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. The fourth difference is the number of buses on respective networks. You have referred to this at page 126 of the report, where we see a reference of the bus fleet in 2018 consisting of 9,200 buses.

I can give you the equivalent in Hong Kong -- I can simply give members the reference to the page -- it's THB-1 at page 30, paragraph 7. The equivalent number in

Hong Kong is approximately 6,000.

Moving on to another difference, and this is the kilometres travelled annually by buses in the two territories. We can see, for London, this figure at page 120, just under the chart:

"During the period 2017/2018 the bus network operated 490 million kilometres ..."

Now, the equivalent figure for Hong Kong -- I will ask the assistant to turn up the bundle at THB-1, page 30, at paragraph 7. By multiplication, we get a figure almost the same as London, 500 million kilometres:

"About 6,000 franchised buses operate on the road every day. On average, franchised buses run over 1.4 million kilometres every day."

Now, there is an interesting result of those figures, and that is the number of kilometres travelled by each bus in each territory per year. So, in London, if we divide 490 million kilometres by number of buses, that's 9,200, we get 53,260 kilometres per bus per year. In Hong Kong, if we divide the 500 million by the 6,000 buses, then we get a figure of something like 83,333 kilometres per bus per year.

Moving away from those statistics with regard to road use, and looking at the periods of contracts under

which the bus operators work -- in London, you have set out for us the fact that London bus contracts typically run for an initial period of 5 years with the potential for a two-year extension.

We can see that on page 129, in the very last paragraph on that page.

In Hong Kong, by comparison -- and I will simply give the committee the reference again: it's TD-1 at page 73, paragraph 4; and TD-1, page 74, paragraph 8 -- we have a franchise period of ten years, and that can be extended on application by five years or two years, depending on when the application for the extension is made.

Just one question for you, if I may, Mr Weston, with regard to the London franchise -- London contracting operation. It's five years, with the opportunity of an extension for two. Can a bus operator normally expect to get that same route back again at the end of the seven-year period, or are the chances of renewal of that route effectively not automatically in his favour.

MR MIKE WESTON: No. If the route runs for either five or seven years, it will then go back out to competitive tender. Clearly, the incumbent often has an advantage because perhaps the reason that they were successful with the route the first time was because they had

a garage or a depot nearer to the route than their competitors. But, when it goes back out to tender, clearly they will bid for it and so will other operators, and it often depends on the state of the market at the time. If another operator has recently lost some routes, they may decide to be more competitive on this route to try to win this route from the incumbent.

I haven't got the exact percentages, but I think it's about two-thirds -- about 70 per cent of routes stay with the incumbent upon re-tendering; 30 per cent move between operators at the point of re-tendering.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

Then another matter I would like to raise with you is the number of bus operators working on the London network. You have referred to this at page 126 of the report, where we see a reference to domination by six large bus groups, and then several smaller companies making up the remaining 5.6 per cent of the network.

Now, as you know, in Hong Kong, the franchised bus operators consist of three groups, and I think it's fair to say that the public in Hong Kong are quite aware of the difference between, say, Kowloon Motor Bus on the one hand and Citybus on the other.

With the number of bus networks in London, is the

difference between the different bus companies something which is noticed or appreciated by the public? Does that have any effect on public use?

MR MIKE WESTON: Some members of the public will realise that their local bus is run by a particular operator, but the big difference between Hong Kong and London in this respect is that all the buses in London are painted red and have the Transport for London, London Buses, logo on the side. They also have the bus company logo on the side, but to most members of the public, it is a red bus, it is run by Transport for London as far as they are concerned, and if you asked most people in London who is responsible for the buses, they would say the Mayor of London is responsible, and people -- I'm sure a lot of members of the public realise there are different companies, but I think they very strongly understand that actually those companies are working for the transport authority, because the ticketing is provided by the transport authority, they pay the transport authority for their fares. So there is a strong recognition that there is a coordination by the transport authority in London.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So the average Joe Public would see a bus as being a bus of Transport for London rather than a bus of, say, Stagecoach?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Although the name of the individual bus operator is located on the bus itself, on the exterior, is it not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct. So as well as the London Buses, Transport for London logo on the side of the vehicle, the operator's logo is also displayed on the side. But as I said, the buses are all red, so to most members of the public they will appear the same.

CHAIRMAN: At an earlier stage, were different liveries not used by different bus companies?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, in the early days of tendering from the mid-1980s through to probably the early 1990s, the private operators at the time, who were competing against the in-house London Transport-owned bus company, which was still publicly owned, were allowed to use buses in their own liveries, and there were probably two main reasons for this at the time. One was to show to the public that things were changing, that things were improving, and one of the ways of doing that was showing that there were new operators coming into the market, so having buses in different liveries was a good way of illustrating that. And the second reason at the time was really to show to the trade unions that things were changing and that the system was moving from a publicly

owned and publicly employed operation to a private operation. So there were probably two main reasons.

Eventually the decision -- and I think it was probably in the early/mid-1990s -- was taken that actually the marketing benefit of having a common livery was far stronger than those other messages that were probably by that point already accepted by the public.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I would like to move now, please, to another quite significant difference between London and Hong Kong, and that is the difference in the contractual framework which exists and which permits the bus operators to undertake their work.

As you appreciate, in Hong Kong, there are negotiated contracts by the form of a franchise under which the bus operators operate, whereas, as is evident from your report, in London you have what might be described, and I think has been described, as a route-based competitive tendering system.

I would just like to ask you some questions -- bring to your attention, first of all, some matters, and then ask you some questions about the system which operates in London in this respect.

Could I ask you to go to page 124. If I take you through the first few paragraphs of 3.3, I think we will get a very good idea of the system operating in London.

You say:

"It is useful to understand the contract regime pertaining to London to understand how safety management, by both TfL and the bus operators, fits into this regime. The competitive tendering of individual bus routes with the whole network being controlled, regulated and planned by the Transport Authority (Transport for London) is currently unique to London due to government policy dating back to 1985.

Route tendering was introduced in 1985 with the overall structure of awarding 5-year contracts, with operators receiving 2-year extensions if they meet certain performance criteria, having remained unchanged over this period.

Gross cost contracts are used by TfL with the operators being paid for each mile operated with additional bonuses and deductions based on the reliability of the service. Passenger revenue is retained by TfL so in practice any enhancements to the contract, including safety or other improvements to buses, are funded by Transport for London not the bus operator."

Then you have taken us through, again, some of the history behind the evolution of the system.

If I could bring your attention then to the last of

those paragraphs, "1994":

"Remaining routes placed onto negotiated contracts with privatisation of the public owned companies. All bus operation privately owned but controlled and managed through the tendering process by London Transport."

So the first question I've got is: do negotiated contracts exist at all now in London, or is everything done by way of competitive tendering?

MR MIKE WESTON: No, they don't. Perhaps I can clarify the 1994 position. So, as it says in the report, by 1993 50 per cent of the bus routes had been competitively tendered. Some of those had been successfully won by private operators; some of them had been won by London Transport in-house bus companies that were still publicly owned. Because of a desire by the government at the time to privatise the bus companies that were still publicly owned and put them into the private sector, it was necessary to put the remaining bus routes, which at that point had basically received a block subsidy internally from London Transport to operate them -- it was necessary to put them onto some sort of contract. So the decision was taken to put each of these remaining routes that hadn't been subject to competitive tendering onto a negotiated contract, where the contract price was negotiated.

But the important thing that this probably fails to explain is that those negotiated contracts had a fixed life, so that the companies or the management that were buying these bus companies from London Transport had a portfolio of competitively won contracts but also a portfolio of negotiated contracts, but they knew the end date of each of those contracts. So they knew that in five years' time or four and a half years' time, that route would be subject to competitive tendering.

So it was a way, really, of sort of accelerating putting everything onto a route contract for privatisation, but with a clear view that those contracts would be re-tendered after a certain timescale, and they subsequently were all re-tendered and probably -- I'm just trying to think -- about five years later, they had all been then subject to the first round of competitive tendering.

CHAIRMAN: So by 1998/1999, all routes were operated on a tendered basis?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, roughly. Those dates are roughly about right, yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

If we go back to the second paragraph on page 125, there are references in the second line to "additional bonuses and deductions" to the gross cost contracts

"based on the reliability of the service".

I think if you go through to page 131, we get further detail as to these bonuses and deductions, at paragraph 4.3.3; is that correct?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct. So the quality incentive contract was or is a gross cost contract but with additional incentives for reliability and performance.

MR PETER DUNCAN: We can see the matters which are taken into account with regard to the incentives or disincentives, and there is reference to EWT, excess wait time. There is a quality of service indicator. And you say, at the end of the first paragraph:

"These payments could range between plus 15/minus 10 per cent and were aimed at increasing operators' focus on reliability of the service in addition to quantity (ie mileage operated) which had been the focus of the gross cost contracts."

Does the element of safety have any relevance in the context of these bonuses or deductions?

MR MIKE WESTON: No, these bonuses are -- the potential bonuses of plus 15 per cent of the contract price or minus 10 per cent are purely related to the reliability of the service, as measured either by excess wait time, which is the measure for high-frequency services, or by

on-time performance, which is the measure for lower frequency performance.

So these payments only relate to the reliability of the service provided by the operators.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I take you back now to 127.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that -- and in context, is the fact that a bonus of up to 15 per cent can be gained by good performance and a deduction of 10 per cent from the contract agreement important to bus operators, from a financial point of view?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, from a financial point of view -- I mean, the ability to get plus 15 per cent -- to get 15 per cent is very, very difficult; the service has to be running almost perfectly. To get minus 10 per cent, again, is probably quite unusual because a service would have to be very poor. So probably the average payments range perhaps between 5 and 8 per cent of the contract price for an operator's portfolio of routes added together over the course of a year. That's significant and that roughly equates to the average return that a lot of the bus companies in London are making. So in many ways an operator achieving their reliability targets effectively is their profit on the contracts. So it is an important element and it is an important incentive to the operators to achieve those payments.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could you give us an idea of what the maximum contract price would be for -- I assume it would be the longest route or the most complicated route?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. For a bus route of -- some of the bigger bus routes in London will have about 60 vehicles on them, and the contract price could be up to 20 million pounds a year, so quite a significant contract, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the basis of the contract is the bus operator says, "I will do this route for 20 million pounds", and Transport for London will pay them 20 million pounds, plus or minus the bonus or the deduction?

MR MIKE WESTON: Well, there are two payment regimes. There's the contract price which is then divided by the annual scheduled mileage to get a contract price per mile, and an operator is then paid that rate per mile for every mile that they operate. So effectively they lose the contract rate per mile for mileage that they fail to operate due to reasons within their control. So, for example, if they have no driver to run the journey or they have no bus because of mechanical failure, they would lose the rate per mile from the contract price.

But it is fair to say those deductions are relatively small. Probably, for mechanical loss

mileage, it's about 0.3 per cent; for staff, it is probably a very similar figure. So fairly small deductions for mileage not operated.

For mileage that is not operated due to reasons beyond their control -- so this is traffic delays, or diversions due to planned or unplanned events -- they are not deducted. That is considered not to be within their control so they are not deducted. Then separately, as we have said, there are these incentive payments or deductions for the reliability.

So the contract price relates to the quantity on a rate-per-mile basis, and then there is a relationship with these additional payments for reliability of the service.

CHAIRMAN: So, to crystallise that in a short example -- could you do that for us?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I will use simple figures to illustrate. So a contract price of 1,000 pounds and an operator is supposed to run 100 miles, the contract rate per mile will be 10 pounds per mile. For every mile they don't operate, they would lose 10 pounds per mile. These are very simple figures to illustrate the point.

But clearly, if the service was better than the excess wait time minimum standard within the contract,

they could earn some bonuses up to 15 per cent of that contract price. But, as I said earlier, plus 15 per cent is very, very difficult to achieve. The average is probably nearer 8 to 10 per cent for a very reliable service.

CHAIRMAN: So, in order to avoid deductions for mileage lost that is your fault, it is important to have a maintenance regime for your buses and to have adequate staff numbers? Would that be a simple way of looking at it?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, Chairman, that's correct. So making sure you've got enough drivers every day to run the service, and that's why most depots will have some spare drivers because it is a way of protecting the mileage if some drivers don't show up for work, perhaps due to sickness. And then making sure you have adequate buses each day that are ready for service, so that's around adequate maintenance regimes but also adequate spare vehicles to provide cover when other vehicles are being maintained.

But it is fair to say that the maturity of the tendering system in London is such that the amount of mileage that operators lose due to staff and mechanical reasons is relatively small. It is pretty low, because there's a maturity in managing those aspects of the

service.

CHAIRMAN: That's because of experience; bus operators know the margins that they need to have of staff and vehicles not to fall into that problem?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

MEMBER LO: To operate the system, do you have to gather information about the arrival time of every bus at every bus stop?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So the excess wait time calculation and the on-time performance calculations historically were done by surveys, sample surveys, with inspectors standing on the roads noting down -- these are Transport for London-employed inspectors -- when buses went past that location, and that data was then used to calculate the excess wait time.

It might be worth just briefly explaining what the excess wait time is. The way that Transport for London measure the reliability of high-frequency services is through the statistic called excess wait time. So, for a ten-minute frequency bus service, the assumption is that passengers will arrive randomly at the bus stop. They won't use a timetable, they will just arrive at the bus stop. So, if the ten-minute service is running perfectly, on average you should wait five minutes, because you may have just arrived and missed the bus, so

you wait nearly ten minutes; you may arrive five minutes and wait five minutes, or you may arrive and literally the bus arrives, but on average you should wait five minutes.

So the excess wait time is how long you wait over that ideal wait time, and for a route the minimum standard may be one minute or may be 1.2 minutes' excess wait time. So that's how the calculation is used.

Historically, as I said, it was done by manual data collection. Now it is calculated automatically through the vehicle location system. So historically it was a sample; now it is effectively 100 per cent statistic based on all buses on that route.

MEMBER LO: A follow-up question. You said for factors out of their control, like congestion, would not be deducted, so how do they factor in congestion in their calculation?

MR MIKE WESTON: Sorry?

MEMBER LO: You mentioned about for factors outside their control, like detour, congestion, those factors will not cause any reduction or deduction in payment scheme, but how do they factor in congestion effect in this kind of calculation?

MR MIKE WESTON: Okay. So, for congestion, an operator, when they are submitting their tender bid, would be

expected to put in a timetable or a schedule. So Transport for London will specify the frequency of the service required and will specify the route of the service. But the operator has to turn that into an operating schedule and determine how many buses they need to run that route reliably. And an operator is expected to design a schedule to cope with the average congestion on the majority of days.

In extreme circumstances -- I'm trying to think of an example -- so an unplanned demonstration in Central London, a terrorist attack in Central London, for example, where there is a lot of disruption and major chaos and congestion, Transport for London will then void those days from the calculation. So, in extreme examples where the congestion is very, very bad and it is clear that the operator couldn't predict that and also couldn't manage the service in those circumstances, those days would be void from the calculation.

CHAIRMAN: So would that apply to, for example, a burst water main, the Dartford Tunnel having a vehicle on fire and being closed?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. What tends to happen for more localised incidents is that individual routes could be void for those days, not necessarily -- I think for -- I was managing the bus network on the day of the 7 July

2005 attacks on the Underground and bus network, clearly all the data for that day and subsequent days was void because it clearly wasn't the right thing to do, to try to monitor and penalise the operators.

But individual routes could be void due to a local issue, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, going back to page 127, if we could, Mr Weston. You set out at paragraph 4.1 the contract responsibilities, and if I could try and reduce this to very simple terms by summarising four points -- if you can just confirm this is the case or, if not, please tell me -- first of all, Transport for London will invite tenders for a particular route. Secondly, a tender will put in a contract price for operating that route. Thirdly, Transport for London will keep all the fare revenue and thus assume the profits and the losses associated with the patronage on that route. Then, fourthly, Transport for London will simply pay the contract price to the operator with the bonuses and deductions you have just described.

Is that a very quick, very simple thumbnail summary?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, I think that's a good summary.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, on the routes which are made available for tender, who decides on the routes and what

factors are taken into account in determining a new route or discard of an old route?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So the route planning is done by Transport for London, and it is done under what are called the service planning guidelines which are some high-level guidelines which set the sort of aspirations for running bus services in London, and within those guidelines, for example, there is an aspiration that nobody is more than 400 metres from a bus stop in London. It's not totally achieved, it's almost achieved but not totally. And there will be various other guidelines about trying to provide a comprehensive service seven days a week, from a certain time in the morning to a certain time in the evening. So there are some guidelines that set the aspiration.

So all the route planning is done by Transport for London and they will determine which services should be enhanced, which services should be reduced. Some of that will be based on loadings and how busy routes are. Some of it will be based on working with colleagues in other parts of the organisation to determine changes likely to happen.

So at the moment, for example, there is a new railway line opening next year now, called the Elizabeth Line, which goes across Central London. Clearly, that

will bring a lot of extra capacity to the Underground network, and as a result a lot of the bus routes in Central London will lose patronage and therefore they will be changed when the line opens. Some of them will be withdrawn and some will be reduced, to make sure that there is an efficient operation in terms of the services provided.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does this involve consultation with the bus operators, or is this done exclusively within Transport for London?

MR MIKE WESTON: There will be some dialogue with bus operators, but essentially it is a sort of central planning process. There is a duty on Transport for London to consult with the local authorities in London and stakeholders, including members of the public, so Transport for London have to consult before service changes are made.

So there will be some dialogue with the operators but I wouldn't necessarily -- I wouldn't describe it as consultation.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You mentioned just a few moments ago that there was an as aspirational approach -- persons living within a certain area should have access to a bus service. Assuming that route is unprofitable, would the route nevertheless continue, to enable that aspiration?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So the decision on each individual service change is done on a cost/benefit analysis. So there is a subsidy for the London bus network, and if you take that subsidy, for every pound you spend, you will be looking to maximise the passenger benefits. So every service change will go through a small cost/benefit calculation to make sure it is getting some passenger benefits to make sure it is worthwhile investing that pound of money.

But it's worth saying there is subsidy into the bus network and ultimately, Transport for London, under the direction of the mayor, in theory, could operate the service without subsidy, through a combination of running less unprofitable services and/or charging more to passengers to use the service. So the amount of subsidy that is put into the network is very much a political decision by the mayor, who sets the strategy for the organisation.

CHAIRMAN: So it could be user pay or it could be subsidised, as it is?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. As it says in my report, one of the key things that the mayor determines is passenger fares. So the decision to change passenger fares rests with the mayor, not with Transport for London. So, clearly, that has an impact on the financial performance of the bus

network.

The current mayor, who was elected in 2016, in his manifesto made a commitment not to increase fares on the Underground or buses for four years of his initial term, and that clearly has big benefits to the travelling public in terms of value for money but obviously has implications on Transport for London in terms of fares income over the next four years.

CHAIRMAN: Where does the money come from?

MR MIKE WESTON: So the mayor has to find it from other sources, so, for example, from the Council Tax, the business rates; encourage -- well, part of it has been encouraging Transport for London to become more efficient as an organisation, through trying to reduce its costs. So a whole combination of ways of trying to balance the books.

CHAIRMAN: What proportion of the costs of running the buses does the total amount of fares represent?

MR MIKE WESTON: I'm trying to see if we've got any figures in here. At the moment, it is -- about a third of the cost of the operation is subsidy, so it's about 600.

I'm just looking at my notes for the figure.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, sorry, in the financial year 2016/17, 70 per cent of the cost of the network was covered by

passenger revenue. So the other 30 per cent was subsidy, which was 626 million. But that's varied over the years, and I think my report makes reference that in 1997/98, the network broke even, and the passenger revenue covered the cost of operation.

But we are stressing that those decisions are very -- are political decisions. They are decisions of the mayor about how he or she wants financially the bus network to operate.

CHAIRMAN: So if fares are frozen for four years, one could expect the 70 per cent covered by fares to drop to perhaps 60 per cent or some lower figure?

MR MIKE WESTON: Potentially, unless the service volume is reduced, which the current business plan assumes it will be slightly.

CHAIRMAN: Right. Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think you have referred to the financial performance and the subsidy aspects that the chairman has been asking you about, at pages 120 and 121 of your report. Do you see there reference to the financial performance?

MR MIKE WESTON: Mmm.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think, at the bottom of page 120, the last sentence, you have referred to one of the points you've just made:

"By financial year 1997/98 the network broke even with passenger revenue covering operating costs."

Then you have referred to the impact of elected mayors from 2000, at the top of page 121, and the figures, with the cost recovery of 70 per cent, apparent from the first paragraph on page 121.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. Correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, for 2016/17, the amount of the subsidy seems to be something like 626 million pounds.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So that's over 600 billion in Hong Kong dollar terms.

The chairman asked you who meets that subsidy. Is it simply the ratepayers of London, or how is that actually met?

MR MIKE WESTON: Historically, it was a combination of the ratepayers of London, both domestic, private ratepayers, but also businesses, but until this year it is also an element of government subsidy, so national subsidy. But from next year -- the government about three years ago gave notice to Transport for London that they would no longer be getting any revenue subsidy, ie subsidy to cover operating costs; they would only give the organisation capital grants, capital grants aimed at improving the infrastructure, so, for example, building

new Underground lines, enhancing stations, for example.

So the last two or three years, Transport for London has seen its revenue grant from central government go to zero, so it has had to make up that shortfall from a combination of local funding from the 32 London boroughs and business rates and domestic rates, but also by some aggressive cost-cutting, in trying to cut overheads and reduce the costs of operating the business. So it's been quite a challenging time.

At the same time, the mayor made a decision to freeze fares for four years. I refer in the next paragraph to the fact that contract prices go up with inflation. So, for the next four years, the contract prices will go up with inflation, but the fares revenue will effectively be frozen. So that's again a big financial challenge for the organisation.

CHAIRMAN: What was the size of the central government subvention at the time the government indicated it would cease to provide it over a period of three years?

MR MIKE WESTON: It was around about 600 million, I think, at the time they decided they were going to reduce it to zero, and they took the decision to reduce it to zero over about a three or four-year period.

CHAIRMAN: So 600 million pounds reduced to nothing over --

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. It's quite a significant reduction.

That was a grant to the whole organisation, not just to the bus parts of the business, but the whole of Transport for London.

CHAIRMAN: Are -- or were, perhaps -- subsidies of this kind provided for transport systems outside the metropolis, London?

MR MIKE WESTON: For the railways, yes. For buses, no. So, outside of London, bus services are deregulated, so that any operator, or anybody that is approved to operate buses, can operate, can register to operate, whatever bus services they like commercially. So, in the big cities, Manchester, Birmingham, for example, any operator can commercially operate whatever service they feel they want to, and the local authority or the transport authority can then buy in the bits of service that they feel are perhaps missing.

So, for example, if an operator operates a service commercially Monday to Saturday, the transport authority can then buy in a Sunday service, if it's not being provided commercially, and probably 90 per cent plus of the bus services are provided commercially, with the local authorities and transport authorities providing the top-up of what's not being operated commercially, although the government last year passed legislation to allow transport authorities outside of London to

consider franchising bus services, to look at introducing franchising systems, and at the moment Manchester are looking at potentially moving from a deregulated environment to a franchise-type system.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I ask you to go back now to page 127, where you have dealt with the contract structure, and leading on to page 128, under the heading 4.2, "Contract life cycle".

If I understand this correctly, the operator would be bound by two agreements, first of all the framework agreement, which, according to the second arrow, sets out the general contractual requirements for operating bus services for Transport for London; and then, third from the bottom, a route agreement also which is issued, which details the specific route requirements, including minimum performance standards.

Have you made available examples of those in your supporting documents?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, there is a reference, web link, to the route agreement, that includes an example of -- sorry, the framework agreement, and the framework agreement includes an example of the route agreement.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Yes, I see that's referred to at page 189. Yes, thank you.

MR MIKE WESTON: So the route agreement is a fairly big document, 160 to 200 pages, but each operator only signs up to the framework agreement once, and then every time they win a bus route they get a route agreement, which is the more specific information in relation to that route.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, at page 129, in the second paragraph --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move away from this -- we have had an account from Prof Stanley about the system that obtains in Melbourne, which involves an accreditation system. In what way, if at all, does the system in London, with a framework agreement, then prequalified operators -- in what way does that compare or can one contrast it with Melbourne and accreditation?

MR MIKE WESTON: The prequalification system is effectively assessing the suitability of a business to become an approved supplier for bus services. And it is trying to -- it is looking for an established operator that has an operator's licence from a government agency, and it is not the decision point at which a business wins a contract.

So the hurdles to become an approved supplier are relatively low. You have to be an established operator, you have to have an operator's licence, and you have to

have some experience of running buses. But it is set relatively low because Transport for London, as well as trying to encourage big companies and big businesses to come in as approved suppliers, also see a place for some very small companies. So there are some very small companies who may operate 10 or 15 buses on school bus contracts, for example.

So the prequalification process is a relatively open process, to encourage people to participate in the tendering process, and it is the tendering process that then decides the suitability of an operator to win a particular contract.

So I certainly wouldn't describe it as an accreditation process. It is making sure that a potential operator has got the basic components in place to run buses in London.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Professor.

MEMBER LO: Does it include whether they have a depot? Is that a qualification criteria?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. The requirement to have a depot -- as an approved supplier, you wouldn't have to have a depot. It is clearly a barrier to entry to the market, because getting a depot is a challenge, and where you locate it would be a challenge, and obviously one of the

challenges for TfL is that for a new operator, they might award them a route with perhaps 20 vehicles' worth of work, but your depot might be 150 capacity, so you have to be confident you can win more work over time to fill that depot up. But, as an approved supplier, you don't have to have a depot in London. Logically, because you are already an operator, you will have a depot somewhere, but it could be somewhere else in the UK. It could be somewhere else in Europe. It could be somewhere else in the world, in theory.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At page 129, you have addressed the question of the evaluation of an operator's bid, which you describe in the first line:

"... an assessment of all aspects of their current performance including safety."

If I may continue to quote:

"This approach allows Transport for London to reflect an operator's current performance into the tender evaluation process thus acting as a strong incentive for operators to constantly improve their performance. In terms of safety performance, along with performance on all other aspects of the route agreement this will feed into the tender evaluation process and could result in either operating contracts not being renewed or an operator failing to win a new contract.

However, safety is not currently scored as part of the technical evaluation but treated as a 'red line' in terms of the award of new contracts. An example given by Transport for London was a contractor in 2015 who due to concerns about maintenance standards, which were visible due to high mechanical lost mileage and poor engineering quality monitoring results, was not awarded new contracts whilst they addressed the area of concern."

You have given one example there of the red line having been crossed, but could you give the committee some idea as to how one does cross the red line in this context?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. It is fair to say that the red line is -- there is no definition of the red line in terms of what is and isn't acceptable.

One of the big advantages of the route level tendering system over perhaps an area-based franchising system, such as for example in Singapore, is that the ability of the authority to adjust the size of a company through route awards is very, very flexible. The challenge with a big area franchise is that if performance in certain aspects of the contract isn't up to standard, it is a very big decision to terminate that contract. You may have a contract for 400 or 450 buses.

A very, very big decision and potentially very disruptive to the transport network and members of the public.

The benefit of the London system is that you can send some very clear messages to the operator by not awarding them some contracts for a period of time. It doesn't have a devastating effect on their business but sends a very strong message that they've got to improve their performance.

So I think the purpose for this red line is not defined in black and white. It's not a clear definition. It's just a very strong check, in terms of the tender valuation. You are looking at the commercial aspects of somebody's tender bid, you are looking at their current performance in relation to quality of service, volume of service on their other contracts, looking at all the other monitoring data, to come up with a score for their performance, and then separately there is a look at their safety indicators to see whether there are any areas of concern.

The example given there was it was pretty clear that this company was struggling with maintenance, mainly due to a high retirement rate of engineers. They were losing a lot of engineers who had been with the company for a large number of years, and they had failed to

really anticipate that and recruit and train new people. So they were struggling to maintain their vehicles. That became visible in terms of a lot of mechanical breakdowns on the road, and poor engineering -- the quality monitoring that TfL undertook, the results were showing issues.

So, it was then that, because of that concern, the view was taken that that needed to improve. The operator was given a warning to improve their performance, and in the intervening period they were not awarded any new contracts. So probably over that period they may have lost four or five contracts that they would have otherwise won. Then, once that performance is returned to an acceptable standard, they were then able to win contracts again.

But it is worth stressing that red line is not defined; it's a judgment by the evaluation team and board of directors who will ultimately award those contracts. So they will have that discussion when they make that contract award.

CHAIRMAN: But in the example that you have given, the breakdowns, the high mechanical lost mileage and poor engineering, those are factors that would have shown up in quality performance monitoring, would they not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. They will show up both in the lost

mileage returns, because of the number of breakdowns on the road will start to increase, so the operator would be getting deductions for lost mileage, but they will also show up through the independent assessments that Transport for London undertake.

CHAIRMAN: I am just wondering where the two meet, the safety side of things and the breakdown of buses and therefore you are not meeting your requirements. Had this reached the stage where the wheels were coming off the bus and they were crashing into people?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. I think the first visual sign of sort of poorer maintenance tends to be mechanical breakdown, so vehicles breaking down because of perhaps gearbox failure or engine failure. I think it is fair to say that operators would always make sure that those sort of safety-related engineering things are done correctly because they realise -- because the other aspect is, as well as TfL's sanction of not awarding contracts, the government agency, who have a national role, do their own monitoring of engineering standards of bus companies across the whole of the UK, and they can ultimately call the operator to a public inquiry, and the traffic commissioner can restrict the number of vehicles that they can operate.

So there is another sanction that the government

level can apply to a bus company.

CHAIRMAN: So was this perhaps, really, a potential safety issue? Your buses are breaking down so often that it means you are not maintaining them properly and therefore potentially there is a safety issue?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think if both the operator and Transport for London hadn't recognised the urgency of the issue, it could potentially become a safety issue. I don't think it did. I think it potentially could have become a safety issue.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You did mention a couple of moments ago in one of your answers safety indicators in this context. Does Transport for London keep a list of particular safety indicators, or is this looked at from a more generic point of view?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, there's a whole host of safety indicators, and at the moment, with the operators, they have come up with a safety performance index which is about 41 indicators, which they are going to turn into a safety score for each operator, to try to bring all the various monitoring together, to give a clear indication of safety performance.

So there are a whole host of safety indicators, from engineering, mechanical lost mileage, the engineering

quality monitoring scores, driver quality monitoring scores, a whole host of things that could, if they start to look out of kilter with other operators, would be an indication that something is not right. It might not necessarily be safety-related but it tends to indicate that something is not going right in the company.

CHAIRMAN: Are these safety performance indicators publicly available yet, or are these matters to be announced soon?

MR MIKE WESTON: Not yet. They will be, yes. I think the intention is that the safety performance indicators will be made public but they haven't been as of yet. I think they will be announced shortly.

CHAIRMAN: So, at the moment -- or rather prior to, perhaps, the trial of these safety performance indicators, how was safety measured, if it was measured?

MR MIKE WESTON: There was a lot -- a lot of the monitoring -- there was a lot of trend analysis around collisions, falls on buses, all the measures -- all the statistics and data that was being gathered around safety and incidents was being -- there was a lot of trend analysis and a lot of comparison of performance between individual operators.

So, for example, TfL produced a lot of graphs showing the trends in falls on buses, in pedestrian

conflict incidents, and those were broken -- those trends were shown both at a network level but also at an operator level, and operators, through one of the forums that was held with all the operators, would share that data, and were happy that other operators saw each other's data, so they were able to compare their performance with their peer group.

So a lot of the data was monitored and then shared amongst the operators.

CHAIRMAN: Is this data available on the internet?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So the data of all -- TfL, with regards to bus data, bus safety, currently publish two lots of data. They publish every quarter an Excel spreadsheet of all incidents that have occurred on the bus network, all safety-related incidents, so slips, trips and falls on buses, incidents with other vehicles, incidents with pedestrians, incidents with cyclists. So that's produced quarterly as an Excel spreadsheet.

CHAIRMAN: But is that done globally or is that done operator by operator?

MR MIKE WESTON: Well, it's a spreadsheet of all incidents, but on the front end of the spreadsheet, anybody, including members of the public, are able to interrogate that by operator or by route. So there is a front dashboard where you can filter the spreadsheet by

operator, by borough, which part of London, or by individual bus route. So it allows the public to interrogate that data on that basis.

Then, in addition --

CHAIRMAN: But it's not presented, for example, Abellio have a lot more trips, slips and falls than Stagecoach; it's not presented in that way?

MR MIKE WESTON: No, not at the moment, no. A member of the public or some other organisation could do that analysis themselves and come to that conclusion, but it is not presented in that way.

Then, in addition, every quarter, there is a performance dashboard for the safety performance of the bus network, at a network level, so it's showing the trends compared with previous quarters on various things like slips, trips and falls, accidents, and showing the trends with previous quarters. Again, that at the moment is done at a network level, not at an operator level.

CHAIRMAN: And the network level produces figures for fatalities and serious injuries as well?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, so for any incident on the bus network.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: With regard to that data, what is the

actual source of the data? Who provides the data into the system?

MR MIKE WESTON: There are two -- the main source of the data is the bus operators inputting into a central database, which is called the incident reporting system. So all operators have a requirement to enter all their incidents onto this central database, and that's the main source of the information, and there's audits undertaken by Transport for London to ensure that operators are correctly populating that database.

In addition, that data is cross-referenced with the police data for serious incidents. So the police, if they attend an incident, will have their own database. It's about to change its name but it's currently called STATS19 data. So TfL will cross-reference to make sure that all incidents will be picked up. But clearly, the police data is only the serious incidents they attend or incidents that are reported to them.

So, for example, trips and falls on the bus that aren't related to a road traffic incident wouldn't necessarily be picked up by the police. But the main source of that data is individual bus operators entering data onto a central database.

CHAIRMAN: Is the police data available publicly?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's also published quarterly. Yes,

that's also published quarterly.

CHAIRMAN: Under a website for the Metropolitan Police?

MR MIKE WESTON: It might even be a national website, because I think it's actually national data.

CHAIRMAN: From which data can London be extracted or not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, from STATS19 you can extract it, yes, by the whole of London, by London boroughs, by certain specified geographical parts of London, and I think by vehicle type.

CHAIRMAN: So certainly, for example, you say the police data encompasses serious incidents, so one could compare all fatalities in or around buses from the police data and the Transport for London database?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I mean, those figures should correlate. There should be no reason why they should be any different, clearly. The minor injuries may not -- because there may be some minor injuries where the police have attended, but there might be some minor injuries where the police didn't attend. So the minor injuries might not but certainly the serious and fatalities should actually correlate with each other.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: In this context, could I ask you to turn to page 150 of your report. At paragraph 7.8, is there a paragraph on Transport for London's safety performance

indicator, as part of the bus safety programme? Do you see that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is that the safety performance indicator which Mr Chairman referred to but which has not yet been published?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. This is a proposal which TfL are working on, and one of the bus operators explained to us in August what would be involved in this basket. So, basically, it is 41 measures that are brought together into a safety performance score, and these measures may be weighted in different ways. So the measures may be "killed or seriously injured" figures, they may be "slips, trips and falls", various other monitoring results from engineering monitoring to driver monitoring, and they are all brought together.

The idea is they are brought together into a benchmark score of 80 for each operator, and the aim then is to monitor an operator's trend against that baseline of 80, and they are weighted in such a way that -- it is weighted so that the whole basket -- the trend is not just -- if you are unfortunate in having a fatal incident, which may not even be down to the bus company's fault, that doesn't send the score completely off the scale. So it's about trying to monitor trends

within the company and not to use it as comparing your performance with your peer group, because I think the concern then is that if you're the best, you think you don't need to necessarily do anything else to improve, but I think there is a recognition that everyone can be better and be safer. So the idea is your safety performance indicator is benchmarked at 80, and then along with TfL you monitor your performance against that baseline of 80 and you try and improve on it and improve that score.

I think the intention is that will be announced publicly, the content of it will be announced publicly in due course, but it hasn't been as of yet.

CHAIRMAN: When you say, "This was explained to us", you are referring, are you not, to a meeting that you and I had with managing directors and other officers of RATP --

MR MIKE WESTON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: -- at the end of August?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. They showed us the table of all the indicators, I think.

CHAIRMAN: And this was explained to us by Mr Jon Pike who was the head of safety and risks?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: But as you say, we are looking forward to having this made available, if it is made available, in the

middle of next month?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think it is going to be made available as part of their intended announcement of their bus safety standard in the middle of October.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Will this be likely to have any effect on the red-line approach to safety which is currently the manner in which safety is taken into account in assessing an operator who applies for either a renewal of a route or a new route?

MR MIKE WESTON: Well -- I mean, it is difficult to predict how it will be used, but certainly, if your first quarter or first period, you are benchmarked at 80, and your score starts to get progressively worse, I would expect that to start ringing alarm bells and potentially being a red line.

So it will be a strong indicator that your safety performance has deteriorated, because this is such a wide basket of measures that, you know, any significant deterioration would show up in this score. So you would expect that to really start to ring the alarm bells and be an area of concern.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now moving to another topic --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so -- why, if you have any view on this, has it proved necessary to have such a wide measure, encompassing 41 indicators, to determine

a benchmark for safety?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think, as it says in the report, the methodology has been adopted from the rail industry, and my understanding of it is that you are trying to come up with a score that's not so sensitive to individual incidents, because ultimately, if you are a large bus operator, operating maybe 2,000 buses, you will unfortunately have some incidents involved in running those buses. So the idea is to come up with a group of measures that are then weighted and brought together to create a score.

If that score starts to move either way, you have clearly done quite a lot to shift or to improve, or not -- or allowed some to get worse -- a lot of those individual indicators. So it is trying to provide a more robust measure than just looking at one specific area.

So, for example, if you took the view that your prime measure would be the number of traffic collisions that a bus company has, it's a measure, but it could be perhaps an unfair measure because it could be that on certain routes there's been some circumstances on the road that have led to more collisions beyond the operator's control. It may not be a robust overview of an operator's safety performance, and this is trying to

take a wider basket of measures into account to give a broader indication of their safety performance.

CHAIRMAN: And what is the ambit of this wider basket?

MR MIKE WESTON: Sorry, what is the --

CHAIRMAN: Ambit. One can readily understand why you look at collisions. You might look at what are described as "trips, slips and falls". You might look at infractions of road traffic law, speeding, harsh braking. But what other factors come into play?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think included in these measures will be things like the driver quality monitoring results, so how well drivers are monitoring. I think they are also going to include public correspondence around safe driving. It's just trying to get a very broad basket of measures that the overall score then becomes a sort of good, high-level indicator of an operator's broader performance in terms of safety.

CHAIRMAN: By public correspondence, you mean complaints?

MR MIKE WESTON: It could be complaints, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: One of the topics, Mr Weston, which was raised at the hearing when Prof Stanley was assisting the committee was the possible engagement in Hong Kong of a competitive bidding system, but where the bus operator of course collects the fare revenue and assumes

the profit risk himself.

I want to ask you a little bit about this, but perhaps just to put this in context can I take you to the transcript of Prof Stanley's evidence where these possibilities were identified. We will get that from the transcript at Day 16, page 45.

CHAIRMAN: What was the date of that?

MR PETER DUNCAN: That was 15 September, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you had the opportunity of reading this evidence?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. In that case, I can take you through it quite quickly, I think.

Perhaps I can start at page 45, at line 10, where counsel for the committee says this:

"I'm going to explore with you the second and third part a bit later, but the first part refers to the benefits from the existence of competitive tendering in Melbourne.

To some extent, you have explained bits of it already, but can I test with you the concept of competitive tendering and how that fits within the Hong Kong environment where the bus operators collect the fares and assumes the profit risk from the provision of

route bus services."

Then, going down to line 22:

"I understand there are a number of options available, but perhaps I can get you to explain some of those options."

Then I think we can leave quite a bit out, because all I want to do is to identify what those possibilities appear to be from the evidence of Prof Stanley. I can jump down, I think, to the bottom of page 48. At line 21, Mr Derek Chan -- he is the counsel for the committee:

"So, if I understand your answer correctly, there can be a number of possibilities ... One is a bidder proposing to pay the government a sum for the operation, for the right to operate an area or a number of routes. The second possibility is the bidder offering to share part of the margins with the government, as part of the bid."

Then, at line 6:

"... a third possibility exists that there is no bidding price and the competition is based entirely on an assessment of the quality of the service expected to be provided."

Then, at line 22, the chairman offers I think a fourth alternative:

"Presumably, another way in which it might be negotiated is the prospective new operator might say, 'I can do these routes for 10 per cent less than the fares that the incumbent is doing it'?

Answer: Exactly, lower fares.

Chairman: There would be no payment to government, 'but we are providing better value to the public'?

Answer: Absolutely. That's the kind of degree of freedom is what happens to fares.

Mr Chan: So that's the advantages of competitive bidding --"

So, bearing in mind those four possibilities, I would like then to take you to your report, at page 131, at paragraph 4.3.2, and the first paragraph, which seems to describe a situation which is not dissimilar to Hong Kong, at least as far as sharing the revenue is concerned. So it's "Net cost contracts":

"During the period 1995 to 2000 the organisation adopted a net cost contract regime with bus operators retaining the revenue for each route and taking the revenue risk. Operators would bid for contracts based on forecast revenue and either bid for a subsidy from London Transport for unprofitable routes or offered to pay London Transport a share of the surplus on profitable routes."

If I could just continue with the second paragraph:

"Net cost contract only operated for a short period of time partly due to the heavy administrative burden it placed on London Transport in allocating revenue (the majority of which came from prepaid tickets) across over 700 routes. Also, it became clear that operators in practice had very little influence over the actual route revenue as route planning, setting frequencies and fares was still controlled and managed by London Transport."

Now, let's assume, just for the sake of the discussion, that the first of the two problems in the second paragraph could be overcome, so we don't have that administrative burden. Leaving that out of the situation, is this net cost contract approach something that you would suggest for consideration in Hong Kong, or would you not think that it is workable?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think it becomes easier if you were looking at area franchises, where an operator was running and operating all the routes within a certain part of Hong Kong, or even in a certain part of London. The difficulty in London was one operator could be operating one route down a corridor and there could be four or five other routes operated by another operator, or a number of operators. Hence, the ability to actually influence your own route revenue is very, very

small.

So I think the real issue is, there is nothing wrong with net cost contracts; it's a model that is used for a number of the railway contracts, operating contracts, in the UK. There is nothing wrong with the model. You just have to ensure that the operator has some influence over the revenue and has the ability to change the revenue, either through some control of fares, either through the ability to change the level of service, or the ability to perhaps market or promote the service.

And in London Transport's case, all these levers, as I call them, were with the authority, not with the operator. So, essentially, an operator had very little influence over what the actual revenue would be, because even if they ran a very good, reliable service, if they were operating in a corridor with three or four other operators, and a lot of those buses were still going to the same common destination, passengers would just get on the first bus that comes along. They won't choose operator A over operator B.

So I think the real answer to the question is it can work -- it can probably work better where an operator has an area franchise, so manages all the routes in a certain part of the city, but also you've got to make sure the operator has the ability to control a number of

aspects of the service, because if all those controls are kept by the transport authority then it probably doesn't really work.

Hopefully that answers the question.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Incidentally -- I don't think I have asked you this before -- but how many routes are there altogether in London?

MR MIKE WESTON: There's about 700, and they vary from individual routes that just do a school journey. There are actually -- all the bus routes in London, even if they run school bus routes, are still open to members of the public, but there are some journeys at school time specifically to take children to specific schools that run dedicated routes but members of the public can use them.

So some routes might be individual school buses, one bus per route, up to some of the bigger routes, there may be 60 to 70 buses, but overall there's about 700 bus routes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Another matter, if I may, that arose from Prof Stanley's evidence -- if we can go back to that, Day 16, at page 50. It follows on from the evidence to which I have just referred. At page 50, line 9, Mr Chan then asks this question:

"Are there any perceived advantages that competitive

tendering brings about that relate more specifically to the safe operation of buses?"

We can see then the answer of Prof Stanley which really runs from page 50 right through to page 56, at line 16. Have you had the opportunity of reading this part of Prof Stanley's evidence?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, I have.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think it's fair to say, if I may now be permitted to try to summarise his evidence, that there are no advantages relating specifically to safety out of competitive tendering. In fact, he thinks that the risk might be the other way.

Is that how you read his evidence?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I mean, that's how I would read it. I wouldn't disagree with the high-level view that there are no advantages to safety of competitive tendering, but I would say there are also no disadvantages, and it then depends on the model of competitive tendering that's adopted.

So, in London, the route level tendering process, whilst the tendering process itself doesn't bring any specific advantages in terms of safety, the tendering evaluation process itself is an opportunity for the authority to look at safety before making a decision and, as we talked about earlier, the example of a bus

company whose mechanical engineering standards were not as good as they should have been, it gives the transport authority the ability to then alter its recommendation, taking safety into account.

So the tendering process and competition process itself may not directly influence safety, but the presence of the tendering process, certainly in London's case, allows the authority to take safety into account when awarding contracts and renewing contracts.

CHAIRMAN: That is, the example you have given, taking safety into account where there is a negative side to a particular bus operator -- for example, failed maintenance programme. How, in this system, could the willingness of a company to be involved in innovation, with the use of technology, to be taken? In other words, a positive side of safety. This company is deploying forward-looking cameras on all its buses to pick up safe distances to travel -- how could that be picked up in this process of competitive tendering?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think the challenge is that clearly, if the authority have set some minimum standards in terms of safety, in terms of equipment, CCTV, on buses and forward CCTV cameras is an example in London, then all operators tendering for those routes have to meet those common standards.

So, if the authority set the standard, then it is a given and all operators have to meet those standards to be awarded the contract. I think the challenge of a competitive tendering process is that ultimately you have a commercial evaluation, you have a technical evaluation, and it is very difficult for a relatively small piece of innovation within a tender -- so, for example, an operator deciding they are going to use a new telematics system that might improve driver performance -- that clearly will help their technical score, but ultimately, to a degree, the overall technical score and commercial score will still dominate the decision.

So it is probably quite difficult to let individual bits of innovation influence the overall decision of contract award. That's the challenge and that's probably why London will see a move towards more common standards, safety standards, for all operators, in terms of things like the bus safety standard.

So it probably -- the tendering process, because clearly cost is always going to be an important element, maybe discourages additional innovation over and above what the operator has -- sorry, over and above what the transport authority has deemed necessary, unless the operator believes there is a strong business case in

their own right for some of this innovation.

So, if they believe some of the technology or some innovation will actually reduce accidents enough to save them money, then they may do it off their own initiative. But I think small bits of innovation are very difficult to take into account in an evaluation process of this nature.

CHAIRMAN: So this would lead to a regulator or central authority-led imposition of minimum standards, rather than bus operators volunteering improvements in safety standards?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think that's probably the way it would end up going, and I think if you look at what Transport for London are doing with the bus safety standard, that's basically -- my assessment of that is the authority is saying, "There is lots of technology out there. We can either leave it to individual operators to innovate and adopt which ones they think are appropriate, or we could set a standard that everybody has to adopt, and if everybody has to adopt it, everybody has to cost that into their tender bids." So it keeps the playing field level, keeps the competition fair.

CHAIRMAN: So, in such circumstances, competitive tendering would be neutral to enhance safety?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and maybe that is the right conclusion, that safety should be a given and the standards should be -- you know, certain standards should be achieved by all operators bidding for routes, and where you are looking for innovation is in other aspects of the way in which they provide the service. You want competition to affect the efficiency of their organisation, their overheads, how they run the routes, and that's where you want the impact of competition to give value for money back to the public sector.

CHAIRMAN: So performance rather than safety; that's where competition comes in?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a parallel between that kind of scenario and the airline industry, where standards are mandated by the authorities rather than individual airlines equipping their aeroplanes with better equipment, as it were, for safety?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I'm not an expert on the aviation industry, but the impression you get of the industry is that safety is not seen as a competitive advantage by an airline over another airline. They treat it as a given that they all have to achieve a safety standard, and maybe that's the sort of approach that Transport for London are trying to achieve, so there's a safety

standard that's the given and it's not seen as a competitive advantage for one operator over another operator.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Have you seen such a movement in any of the cities in Europe towards that approach?

MR MIKE WESTON: In terms of safety?

MR PETER DUNCAN: In terms of a uniform standard for all buses being imposed by bodies such as Transport for London, rather than leaving it to the individual bus operators to decide what innovations they will introduce.

MR MIKE WESTON: No. I think from my knowledge, certainly in Europe, Transport for London, with their bus safety standard, are leading the way. It's fair to say that most operators in Europe, most of the big operator in Europe, will be trying some new technology to improve safety, but I think, from my knowledge, TfL are the first big transport authority to try to bring all of this together and try to come up with a common standard for all of their bus fleets.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Another matter you raised, in the context of competitive tendering, with particular reference to Hong Kong, is depot ownership and depot availability.

Can I bring your attention to page 151 of your

report. Right at the end of that page, you have introduced the topic by saying:

"The availability of bus depots is often seen as a barrier to competition."

We can see the content of the paragraph for ourselves, and it ends up by saying:

"Any future competitive tendering of bus services in Hong Kong would require a clear strategy around depot ownership and availability."

Would you like to expand on that for us and just amplify the point you were making there, Mr Weston?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. If you look at the London competitive situation, the biggest challenge for a new operator coming into the market is depot availability. That's the combination of finding a suitable site where you can build a depot but also the economics of -- if you want to come into the market and you decide to build a depot for 150 vehicles, the first route you win might be 25 vehicles, but to make that depot economic to run you have to be able to fill it up with contracts, otherwise it won't be economic.

So, even in London, the main barrier to entry is probably the availability of a depot site, and it's not impossible but it is a barrier. That's with a route-level tendering system. The challenge, if you

were going down the road of an area-based franchising or bigger franchises, is that investment in new depot facilities would be enormous, and it would act as a big barrier to competition. The model adopted in Singapore for their tendering is that the authority have provided both the depot and the vehicles, so effectively the operators are bidding to run the contracts or run the franchise but with the vehicles and depot provided by the Land Transport Authority in Singapore. So that's quite a different model.

So I think the point here is that unless -- if there was going to be some competitive tendering of bus services in Hong Kong, there would need to be a clear strategy around the barriers to entry into the market, and as I see, the biggest barrier to entry is probably depot ownership, and unless there is a clear strategy around depot ownership then the likelihood is that the competition would be very weak and it would be probably only the incumbent competing for some of the services.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Is there any sharing of depots in London amongst the operators?

MR MIKE WESTON: The majority of bus depots in London are owned by the bus operators. Probably, of the 85, I think about 75, at least 75, are owned by the bus operators. About ten are owned by Transport for London,

for various historical reasons. Some of them were vacant at the time of privatisation of the bus companies in the mid-1990s, but due to the expansion of the bus network, since 2000 these depots have been reopened and then leased to the bus companies to use for their contracts. Of those, two of those depots are shared. So there is one in east London that's shared between Hackney Community Transport and Arriva, and there is one in north London that's also shared. It's fairly unusual, it takes both operators working closely together to make that work, but not impossible. So there are two depots that are actually shared. They will have separate parts of the depot for parking but they are using the same sort of entrance and the same sort of generic facilities.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, in Singapore, have they provided depots for individual operators or are they also on a shared basis?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. The first two contracts in Singapore are new, purpose-built depots, but it is on the back of an expanding bus network in Singapore. So they have expanded the network into new areas and then built a depot to serve those areas. So a slightly different approach. But, if they carried on tendering, at some point they would probably have to think about a strategy

around the existing depots and how they were brought into the competitive tendering process.

CHAIRMAN: So the barrier that depots pose to competition would be less dealing with new routes in developing parts of -- for example, in Hong Kong, developing parts of Hong Kong, a new town, we would have perhaps rural land which is now being made urban and that would be your opportunity for the authorities to secure depots?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and my understanding is that's what's happened in Singapore. It's been new services from new depots. So it's been easier to achieve. But, clearly, if there were bus services into a new part of Hong Kong and there was a requirement for a new depot anyway, in theory that could be provided by the Transport Department as opposed to individual operators.

Depots is probably the biggest barrier that exists to bringing in new competition.

CHAIRMAN: In London, has there been consolidation, where perhaps a company outside of the UK has come into the market and acquired smaller bus companies and thereby acquired depots and entered the market in that way?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The last big operator or the last operator to enter the market was an Australian company that had been trying to enter the market for a number of years, but had found this barrier of depot availability,

and also not just availability of the depot but where across London do you decide to put your depot to compete was the barrier. So, in the end, they acquired some of the depots of a bus company called First Group who were selling up their London business and they entered the market on the back of acquisition as opposed to starting from scratch.

CHAIRMAN: I'm looking at page 126 of your report, where we have a list of the ultimate groups of the bus operators. Is the Australian company you are describing ComfortDelGro Corporation?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. The Australian company is under "Other", because they run about 3 or 4 per cent of the network. It's called Tower Transit.

CHAIRMAN: Ah, yes. They operate in Singapore, don't they?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, Tower Transit operate in Singapore and so do ComfortDelGro. ComfortDelGro is a Singaporean company. Go-Ahead also operates in Singapore.

CHAIRMAN: For example, a company like RATP Development -- is that a French company?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. There are two parts to RATP. RATP is the publicly owned transport operator in Paris, so they operate all the buses and the Metro in Paris. But RATP Development is their commercial arm that bids for overseas contracts. So I think, for example, they just

won one of the contracts for the Riyadh Metro, for example, to operate the Riyadh Metro. And as it says there, they run about 11 per cent of the London bus network.

CHAIRMAN: Which metro were you describing?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think it's Riyadh they just won.

CHAIRMAN: Riyadh, in Saudi Arabia?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But did not RATP Development take over several smaller London bus companies, historic bus companies?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, RATP also bought out a company called Quality Line, and they bought out part of another French transport company operating in London called Transdev. So they sort of evolved a little bit over the last few years. There has certainly been a lot of consolidation of the smaller bus companies selling out to these six big groups over the last few years.

CHAIRMAN: And how many of these companies have overseas, overseas from the United Kingdom, ownership? We have RATP, French.

MR MIKE WESTON: Running down the list fairly quickly, Abellio is the Dutch railways; Arriva is owned by Deutsche Bahn, the German railways; ComfortDelGro is a Singapore-based company; Go-Ahead is a UK PLC, public limited company in the UK; RATP, as I said already, is

the French, Paris public transport operator; and Stagecoach is again a UK public company. So effectively three of them are overseas state-owned companies and one is a private company. So quite a mix.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr Auyeung?

MEMBER AUYEUNG: When one company buys the other, is it part of the condition that they take over the drivers?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The framework agreement requires that if any bus company in London wants to buy another bus company, they need to seek agreement of Transport for London and seek agreement and novation of the contracts from one bus company to another. So ultimately TfL could object to a takeover of one company by another, and probably would if it led to -- if one of the big six companies there listed was trying to take over another one of the big six, TfL may object on competition grounds, and also the competition authorities in the UK may take a view that they want to intervene and review the competitiveness of the market.

So they have to seek the agreement of TfL.

Also in the UK, if they were buying the company, then they are assuming the assets and obligations of that company anyway, but there is also legislation in Europe, in UK and Europe, called the transfer of

undertakings, the transfer of undertakings of employment.

So effectively, if one operator wins a contract from another, the operator that's lost the contract can insist that the drivers move to the other company, and the drivers have the right to move if they want to. So they have to move with the contract, or they can move with the contract. Sometimes an operator will take the view that he wants to keep the drivers because he may be short of drivers anyway, so he might decide to keep the drivers, and often drivers will want to stay with the company where they are because the depot is probably closer to where they live, as opposed to where the new company might be based. But ultimately drivers have the right to transfer with contracts between companies.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And to do so on their existing terms of employment?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's what the legislation says, that they have to transfer on existing terms and conditions. A company may subsequently decide to negotiate to change those terms and conditions, but at the point of transfer they have to stay on the existing terms and conditions.

CHAIRMAN: Was this not one of the -- declared as an achievement of the mayor in the recent year or two?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The current mayor has done a number of things around drivers' terms and conditions. It's slightly different in the sense that the legislation requires you to move with -- if the contract moves and you want to move, you can opt to move to the new contractor, but they have to take you on your existing terms and conditions.

What the mayor has separately done, he has insisted that if a driver applies for a job with another bus company, perhaps because they are moving house and it is more convenient to go and work for Go-Ahead as opposed to Abellio, and they are successful in the job -- at the moment, if you opted to move by applying for a job, you start on the starter wage rate. What the mayor has agreed with the operators or told the operators they must do is if I'm a driver and I've got 15 years of experience in driving, and I apply to move from Abellio to Go-Ahead because it is more convenient for where I now live, I must be paid the rate that a 15-year service driver at Go-Ahead would be paid. So I haven't got to go back to the start of the promotional ladder in terms of driver seniority.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR MIKE WESTON: That's trying to make it fairer for drivers to transfer for sort of personal reasons.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, are you minded to take a break?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It would be a convenient moment, if you are.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is. We think alike. We are going to break up our morning. I'm conscious that it's been more than two hours that you've been testifying. We'll take a 20-minute break now and resume at 11.30. Thank you.

(11.10 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.30 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr Weston, can I ask you to turn, please, to page 153 of your report. In section 8.6, you deal with the matter of the contractual relationship between the transport authority and the bus operators.

One of the points you make there appears in the first paragraph, the second sentence:

"Whilst the contractual structure is different in Hong Kong the high-level contractual model adopted in Hong Kong does not necessarily need to change to achieve improvement in terms of the contractual monitoring,

performance management and collaboration between franchised operators and the Transport Department."

A second point you have made, if I can refer you to the following page, 154, in the second paragraph, is what you described as an over-dependency on the statutory regulations applied to all vehicles.

You follow this up, in the last paragraph, by saying:

"In terms of experience from London, compliance with the statutory requirements relating to both vehicles and drivers is very much expected and it is the initiatives, projects and collaborative working beyond these that have and will make the real-world differences to safety."

You then refer to:

"The collaboration between the London bus operators and Transport for London and their willingness to innovate and try new technologies and approaches has, and as part of the bus safety programme, will deliver real results in terms of incident and injury reduction. [So] The Transport Department should consider how they can improve the collaborative working with the franchised bus operators."

So some sentiments there with regard to collaboration.

The question I wish to ask you is: given that the Transport Department here is the regulator in this area, is there a danger of this close collaboration developing into something too cosy between the regulator and the bus operators?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think the two can sit side by side quite happily, and I think the reason why I have made those points in my report is, firstly, when I was at the TfL and was director of buses, I think I rarely referred to the framework agreement or the route agreement in any discussions with operators around performance or around issues, and I think that typified the nature of the relationship.

I think, when the chair and I met with some of the London operators in August, I don't think any of them mentioned the contract. The contract wasn't seen as an issue, wasn't seen as a barrier. I suppose I have also made that point because I feel that if an organisation -- and it would apply equally to TfL -- wanted to make significant changes to a certain aspect of the operation, and safety is the one we are clearly interested in today, then doing it via the contract potentially becomes a very long process to actually agree how you will change the contract and what you will change in the contract.

I think if TfL had tried to introduce their bus safety standard and some of the other safety initiatives via changes to the contract, it would have taken a lot longer to deliver and it would have been a far slower process.

So I think there is an issue around the speed of delivering things, and you can deliver some things quicker through collaboration. I'm sure then at some point some of those things will get incorporated into the contract, into the framework agreement, at the appropriate point in time.

So I think that's one of the reasons there's a speed at which some of these things can be done if they are not totally locked into the franchise agreement or the contract.

I am also a strong believer that if -- it is important that there is a franchise agreement, there's a contract in place, or a framework agreement, that is clearly important in case of some dispute around the contract, but I am a strong believer that certain things can be taken forward more quickly and more effectively through collaboration, and that came out very, very clearly in the discussions in August with operators and with Transport for London, that collaboration, working together, was making quite significant progress in this

safety field and in terms of the safety agenda.

I think that's why I have emphasised on collaboration.

There was a comment about the statutory requirements and meeting those. In terms of the UK requirements, there is just, in terms of vehicle maintenance standards and in terms of operators' requirements to meet the statutory requirements, there isn't a big issue. Most operators comfortably achieve those in London. So relying on those as your mechanism for improving won't really drive forward improvement.

CHAIRMAN: What are the aspects of collaboration that exist in London between Transport for London and the franchised bus operators that you would point to as evidencing the success that is to be achieved by collaboration?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think there's a number. The first one that's referred to in the report is the mechanism of the Bus Operator Forum, which is the forum of the managing directors of the bus companies and senior managers from the Transport for London buses department, who come together regularly to discuss issues of common interest, and safety is clearly one of those.

CHAIRMAN: Where do we find this in the report?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It's at page 136, Chairman.

MR MIKE WESTON: So the Bus Operator Forum, where operators would come together on an eight-weekly cycle, to meet with Transport for London managers, to discuss issues of common interest, and there are various subgroups below that that meet, again, to discuss issues of common interest but also to share best practice. And there is a safety subgroup --

CHAIRMAN: Before we get into the subgroup -- who are the people that meet at the Bus Operator Forum?

MR MIKE WESTON: It will be the managing directors of the individual bus companies, and the director level and senior managers of Transport for London, who will come together to that forum.

CHAIRMAN: Where is that meeting held?

MR MIKE WESTON: That's held at TfL's offices, usually on about an eight-weekly cycle.

It's probably got three objectives. One is to share good practice. It's a forum where operators can raise concerns, generic concerns they have, that they feel this forum can discuss. So they wouldn't necessarily raise specific issues that they have to do with their contract; it's more generic concerns.

CHAIRMAN: Could you give some examples?

MR MIKE WESTON: I'm trying to think of an example. It might be around enforcement of bus stops, for example,

parking at bus stops, where it's a generic issue for all operators. So it's a good forum to discuss what TfL can do to try to support enforcement at bus stops, for instance. It's those sorts of generic issues.

So it wouldn't be a forum where an operator would raise specific issues they've got with their contract or with their route agreements. It would be more --

CHAIRMAN: Taking that as an example, how would action be taken as a result? Who would do what?

MR MIKE WESTON: So TfL is then best placed to escalate those issues to either local authorities, who will be responsible for enforcement on certain highways, their own operational staff who may be able to contribute to enforcement, or the police, depending on the type of road.

So, again, TfL is often very better placed to escalate these things to other organisations who can help.

So those are the common issues. And then it is a good opportunity where TfL can use, through early engagement on some of the issues that they are thinking about, for example, sharing what the business plan might look like for the next five years for the organisation, which therefore could impact on the volume of work that's available to the operators, giving them advance

notice of schemes that may be coming in, so big planning schemes for Central London, for example, changes to the bus networks, so using it as a forum to share what the organisation is planning to do.

CHAIRMAN: And, for example, things like the Elizabeth Line, the consequences of that, would that be something that would be raised?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. When I was at TfL, I can recall there being a couple of presentations by the bus planning department on the impact that line would have on the bus network in terms of how routes might change. So it's a good forum for sharing those sorts of issues.

CHAIRMAN: You mentioned subgroups. Can you describe them for us?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. There are a number of subgroups. The most pertinent ones in terms of safety are the safety subgroup and the engineering subgroup. So the safety subgroup is attended, again, by all the bus companies, sometimes at a managing director or director level, sometimes by the bus companies' head of safety. That's where again common issues around safety would be discussed.

The forum is also used as a place for operators to share lessons learnt from incidents, road traffic incidents. One of the things that I know the

organisation was very conscious about, certainly when I was there, and still is, is that if one operator has an incident and does a very in-depth investigation and gets down to the root causes, it's clearly important that the other operators share the benefit and the wisdom of that investigation. It might not be totally applicable to them, but there might be some things that are applicable to them, but I think it would be remiss if the operators and TfL didn't share those lessons learnt and that good practice amongst each other.

So the forum is also used to share the outcome of investigations.

CHAIRMAN: For example, just by memory, there was an incident involving a bus driver who got out of his cab and hadn't put the handbrake on, and what that particular bus operator did to ensure that couldn't happen again.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The incident you refer to, Chair, was where a driver had a problem with a wheelchair ramp and it wouldn't go back in correctly, so the vehicle therefore couldn't move. He called out an engineer. The engineer went to try and fix it but because the driver hadn't put the handbrake on, when he fixed it, the vehicle started to move, and unfortunately the engineer was killed in that incident. So that led the

company to install a warning system whereby, when the driver leaves the cab, it warns him or her to make sure the handbrake has been deployed.

It is likely that TfL's bus safety standard would include that type of system as standard across the network, and it may even be more of an interlock.

But again it is a good example of where it's important that those sorts of lessons are shared across the contracted bus operators, and that operators don't see it as information that they should keep to themselves, that they are willing to share it, and they are willing to share with other operators those sorts of lessons learnt.

Then the engineering subgroup is generally made up of the engineering directors that will share issues around maintenance of vehicles. So often operators will have similar types of vehicles from the same manufacturers, so again there is an opportunity to share some of the lessons learnt for new vehicles coming into the fleet for issues they have had around maintenance, et cetera. So again another forum for collaboration and sharing good practice.

CHAIRMAN: And how often would the subgroups meet?

MR MIKE WESTON: On a similar cycle to the main group.

I mean, you could achieve this in a number of ways, but

I think the underlying message here I think is that the bus operators in London are more than happy to collaborate and work together on issues that aren't necessarily of competitive advantage. And safety is one they see actually it's the greater good of everybody to improve safety, hence their willingness to work together and to collaborate.

CHAIRMAN: Apart from the representatives of the bus companies, and on the other hand Transport for London, do any of these meetings involve the attendance of bus drivers or trade union members?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. There's two separate lines of communication with the trade unions. One, TfL hold a meeting with -- I mean, London predominantly has one trade union --

CHAIRMAN: That's Unite?

MR MIKE WESTON: Unite, who probably represent 95-plus per cent of bus drivers, so in that sense consulting or liaising with a trade union from TfL's point of view is relatively easy, because there is only one trade union to liaise with.

So TfL have some regular meetings with the trade union to discuss things of generic interest. For example, they would meet with the trade union probably to share some of their thoughts on the bus safety

standard, for example. But it is left down to the individual bus companies to deal with their local trade union representative in terms of local issues and local terms and conditions.

So there is a sort of two-tier approach to dealing with trade unions, with the official discussions and negotiations taking place at company level, not by TfL.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

When was the forum established?

MR MIKE WESTON: That's a good question. At least 15 years ago, very established. I chaired it probably for six or seven years. But a good 15 years, a very established process, and maybe the fact that it's stood the test of time perhaps gives it some credibility in terms of its usefulness, otherwise I'm sure it wouldn't still be -- the forum and the subgroups still wouldn't be there, if they weren't deemed to be useful.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Was it formed as a reaction to a particular event, or was it a proactive move, just to improve standards generally?

MR MIKE WESTON: If I recall, it was proactive, and I think it was probably at some point post the privatisation of the publicly owned companies, when it was felt there was a need to bring everybody together to discuss these

sorts of common issues.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I wonder if I could refer you to Prof Stanley's report, page 94.

There's a paragraph 5.3, "Conclusions on other matters", where he says in this part of his report:

"In light of this discussion, the main areas that the author proposes that Hong Kong should consider in terms of possibly improving working/driving/rest provisions for, and technology used in, route pus operation are to", and there's a number there, but he refers to an item 6:

"establish a standing committee on bus safety, meeting at least twice yearly to review and evaluate the latest technology that may impact on bus safety, particularly for route bus operation, and advise government on desirable safety inclusions in the FB fleet and other bus systems. The newly formed working group on enhancement of franchised bus safety could form the basis for this committee but membership should be broadened to include other bus operators."

The question I've got for you is: is there a body or a group of any sort in London which effectively meets the objectives of Prof Stanley's standing committee, something which reviews and evaluates the latest technology with regard to what safety inclusions in the

buses are desirable? Is there any equivalent body in London for this?

MR MIKE WESTON: Well, the structure in London, it appears to be that TfL are leading the development of those standards and reviewing those technologies, but then liaising with the operators, either through workshops or through the Bus Operator Forum structure.

So I would say that the Bus Operator Forum and the safety subgroup are the nearest to that committee, but then it depends whether Prof Stanley was suggesting that committee should be broader than the bus operators and the Transport Department, whether it should have broader membership than that.

So I think the equivalent would be the Bus Operator Forum, in London's case.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Right, and if I understand your answer correctly, initially any developments that might be available with regard to technology would be something which TfL itself would identify and then ensure that it's discussed during the course of the forum meetings?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. Or operators have identified them and brought them up through the Bus Operator Forum structure. In all fairness, often the operators will identify some of this technology before TfL does, but the structure and the lines of communication are there

for all these ideas to flow both ways between the authority and bus operators.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, I would ask you to go to another page of Prof Stanley's report, this time at --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do, just let me pursue this.

So, for example, the Guardian drowsiness machine, that might be something that a particular bus operator had raised at a safety group meeting, and then it became something that Transport for London implemented a trial of the device; is that what you are describing?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The technology you describe there -- which was the Seeing Machines, I think it was called, wasn't it, where the cameras identify when drivers potentially were falling asleep -- the trial of that came about because TfL introduced something called the safety innovation fund and they went out to all the operators, saying, "We would like to fund a number of trials of new technology and make sure that we monitor those trials properly, make sure we get some good data on how successful they are", and so they asked for operators to put in bids for some of this funding, and that was an example of one of the trials that came about, on the back of this safety innovation fund, which I think at the time, the first round was 500,000 pounds, so half a million pounds of funding was put into these

various trials.

CHAIRMAN: And this, as I recall it, was July 2017, and people were asked to bid and then awards were made in November 2017?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Then the trials rolled out?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, the trials rolled out, and then the output and the monitoring and the results of those trials are fed into or are feeding into the bus safety standard.

CHAIRMAN: And that's what will be reported on in the middle of October, the success or otherwise of these various trials?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think it's on 16 October TfL are planning an event for bus operators and suppliers, not only to announce the first phase of their bus safety standard but also to feed back to all the operators the results of the various technology trials that have taken place.

CHAIRMAN: So the role of Transport for London was to come up with the money to fund -- one part of the role was to come up with the money to fund the trial of safety devices?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, but I think also to help the operators come up with the methodology for monitoring the trials.

There are two aspects, in my view, to a trial of new technology. It is easy to engage a supplier to fit technology to your bus. What's important is you've got some robust monitoring in place, that you clearly assess the benefits and understand whether it's actually delivering results, because that helps justify the future investment in that technology. And in the past I think things have been trialled where the monitoring hasn't perhaps been as robust as it should be, hence it is very difficult to determine whether or not that piece of technology is successful.

CHAIRMAN: So who in Transport for London would have given that assistance to the successful bus operators in their bids to get money to do trials?

MR MIKE WESTON: What Transport for London did in early 2015 is set up a dedicated team to focus on the bus safety programme, and it included somebody who was seconded from the road safety team of TfL, and the aim was so they would focus, and that team is still focusing, on improving bus safety and delivering the bus safety programme.

So there is a dedicated team of two or three people whose job is purely focused on this agenda and driving bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: But, more specifically, how would they have

assisted in ensuring that the monitoring was done properly?

MR MIKE WESTON: Oh, okay, sorry. So it's a combination of they would have helped the operators develop the monitoring framework, but they have also used an external consultancy called TRL to undertake some of the monitoring on behalf of TfL and the operators.

CHAIRMAN: TRL is Transport Research?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, it historically stood for Transport Research Laboratory which was actually a government-owned transport research centre focusing on accidents and crashworthiness of vehicles but was privatised a number of years ago. So it's effectively a consultancy but specialising in road transport matters and technical assessment of road transport matters.

CHAIRMAN: That is how the bus operators were assisted in monitoring the trials?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. Some of them. Some of them, they may have monitored themselves, but TRL have been involved in trying to understand the costs and benefits of these various technologies.

CHAIRMAN: TRL was involved in the test of the intelligent speed assistance or assessment trial, was it not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, they were, in 2000 --

CHAIRMAN: June 2015?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and then early 2016.

CHAIRMAN: Reported at the end of 2016?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have that report in our bundle?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. It's in SEC-3, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I beg your pardon, it's in MISC-3.

I believe it starts at page 1002 of that bundle.

CHAIRMAN: So we see from this report, do we not, at page 1003, that the report had been amended and issued in November 2016? But I think it's apparent from the report that the initial testing had begun in June 2015.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So my understanding is that in June/July 2015, the "before" data for the two selected bus routes was collected.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR MIKE WESTON: And TfL selected two routes, one that went through Central London and then one that went from inner London to outer London. So they selected two quite different bus routes, the route 19 and the 486, and the "before" data was collected in July 2015. I think it took a number of months then for the technology to settle down and to be properly calibrated. There were some teething issues during 2015.

So the "after" data for route 19 was collected in

September 2015, and for route 486 in January 2016.

CHAIRMAN: And one of the two bus companies involved, was that Go-Ahead?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, the 486 is Go-Ahead.

CHAIRMAN: And Mr John Trayner is the managing director of Go-Ahead?

MR MIKE WESTON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Who we met in London?

MR MIKE WESTON: We did.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us then to understand, just briefly, what role Transport for London and TRL had played in ensuring that this trial was monitored and assessed properly?

MR MIKE WESTON: So effectively TfL commissioned this trial of intelligent speed adaptation, and just to clarify, effectively what this technology does is it uses the digital speed map that's available for London, and each of the vehicles fitted with equipment talk to the digital speed map, and therefore restricts the driver's ability to accelerate beyond the speed limit. So it controls the driver's speed at the speed limit. So it doesn't take away any of his or her braking ability, but at the point at which the speed limit is reached, it stops the driver accelerating any further.

So this technology was funded on these two routes by

Transport for London, but they commissioned TRL to do the monitoring, and the reason for that is that whilst I think the bus companies quite rightly could get a feel for how successful it was from driver feedback and from their own observations, it does take quite a lot of detailed monitoring to get some robust before and after data to show the real impact on the average speed of buses and the actual number of buses exceeding the speed limit before and after.

So I think there was a recognition, and this is a good example, of some new technology where it is important that you have some robust monitoring in place, ideally before it is installed but definitely after it is installed, to make sure you understand the changes and therefore understand what the benefits are.

So that's at TfL. TRL's role was the monitoring of these two bus routes, both before and after the fitment of the ISA kit.

CHAIRMAN: And to produce this very comprehensive report?

MR MIKE WESTON: And to produce the report, yes.

CHAIRMAN: This technology, intelligent speed assistance, was a technology that had been around for many years, had it not? Perhaps not implemented -- perhaps this was the time when it was ready to be implemented -- but the concept had been around for many years?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think the concept has been around. It's clearly dependent on the digital speed map existing and being kept up to date. The concept of the technology had been around but I think this was the first time it had been trialled on buses. I think about three or four years before this trial, it was fitted to one of TfL's cars, and I had the opportunity to drive the car to see how it performed, and at the speed limit, you weren't able to accelerate beyond.

So this was the sort of first full-scale trial of the technology on buses in London.

CHAIRMAN: This was technology that had been written about in the EU, had it not? Had there not been papers extolling its virtues and inviting people to experiment with it?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think there was some reference to that during our discussions in London, but I'm not totally familiar with those papers.

CHAIRMAN: So the process of doing this trial, had it involved the use of the equipment on a car, first of all, three or four years earlier; then the funding of the equipment to be installed on these two bus routes, and then the funding of the consultancy --

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- TRL to do the monitoring and the report?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: The project had been underway, therefore, for some years?
MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, but I don't think the funding was -- I don't think the availability of funding was the issue. If I recall, the issue was the technology becoming mature enough to be successfully fitted to a vehicle that was in passenger service. So I think that was what TfL were waiting for, as opposed to the funding wasn't the reason that it wasn't being trialled.
CHAIRMAN: Is it known what the funding cost Transport for London?
MR MIKE WESTON: I don't have those figures but I would suggest that actually, probably, in reality, the monitoring was probably more expensive than the actual equipment for the number of buses fitted.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR MIKE WESTON: I would suspect the monitoring would be the bigger cost involved. But in the context of the bus network, it would have been relatively -- well, it would have been very small sums of money.
CHAIRMAN: But this is an example of the authority, in this case Transport for London, funding the trial, the bus operator agreeing to participate in the trial?
MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. And hopefully a good example of the

level of monitoring and assessment that you need to go into when looking at new technology. Hopefully the report gives you a feel for the sort of depth of analysis that's needed to make sure that you are investing your money in the right types of technology.

CHAIRMAN: And a rigorous monitoring and then analysis in the report itself?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, rigorous analysis, but also independent analysis, which is quite valuable as well. So commissioning somebody to independent monitor is of value as well. And TRL have also been engaged in the assessments of all the other technologies that are being considered as part of the new bus safety standard in London.

CHAIRMAN: By that, do you mean the various devices, the drowsiness device, the forward-looking device, the one that picks up the pedestrians about to cross the road?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: TRL have been involved in the monitoring side of that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Monitoring and understanding the cost/benefits of those different technologies.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

If I could ask you some supplementary questions on

that topic, Mr Weston. First of all, with regard to when intelligent speed adaptation design was first considered by Transport for London.

If you would be good enough to look at that volume, MISC-3, at page 939, please.

Do we see there a report, dated as long ago as December 2009, on the topic of intelligent speed adaptation design?

MR MIKE WESTON: Mmm.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think, if you look through to page 943, we see the commencement of the executive summary:

"This report outlines results from a project commissioned by TfL to further explore drivers' attitudes towards intelligent speed adaptation ... and specially to understand drivers' response to the design of the user interface."

So there was a study as long ago as 2009.

If I can take you then to 945, the introduction to the paper refers, in the first paragraph, if I may quote:

"ISA software development began in France in the 1980s and has been trialled and evaluated in a number of different markets since, proving effective at reducing driver speed and incidents on the road. In May 2009 Transport for London commenced a trial of one of the

latest ISA systems in an attempt to reduce speed and road accidents in the capital."

If I could stop there. It would seem that this particular trial was not restricted, as you referred to before, to buses, or did not extend to buses; it was vehicles, it looks like, in general?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct, because TfL also have some generic road safety responsibilities as an organisation, because the strategic road network in London is TfL -- TfL owns and is TfL's responsibility. So, within TfL, there is a road safety unit, responsible for road safety generally. So these trials that this report is referring to, which is the ones -- I wasn't involved in but I recall because this would have been the cars that were fitted -- this wasn't specifically buses, this was vehicles generally, looking at the appropriateness of ISA for vehicles generally.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And if we look at the penultimate paragraph on the "Introduction" page:

"To date a year-long project has already been undertaken by TfL to understand and explore the London drivers' attitudes, motivations and barriers to ISA."

Then if we go through to page 960, in the context of cost/benefit analysis, do we see set out at page 960 a list of the perceived benefits and barriers to the

introduce of ISA?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could then take you, please, through to page 1004 of the same bundle. You will see the contents page of the TRL client contract report, published in November 2016.

I would just like to dwell upon some of the content of the report, the details of which we can see by reading the report, but in the context of the rigorous analysis, as Mr Chairman referred to it, as far as cost and benefits are concerned.

If we go through the contents, there's eight headings:

"1. Is ISA an effective method of speed compliance?

2. Is ISA an efficient method ...?

3. What is the impact of ISA vehicles on the behaviour of surrounding traffic speeds?

4. What is the impact of ISA vehicles on the behaviour of surrounding vehicle actions?

5. ... benefits and disbenefits of ISA for Transport for London."

Then you can see those headings and details set out at 5.2 to 5.13 in detail, and then item 6, the benefits and disbenefits of ISA for the bus operator; and then 7, the benefits and disbenefits of ISA for the bus driver;

and then 8, the benefits and disbenefits of ISA for the bus passenger.

So those are the various matters which TRL have explored and the details of which we can find in the report itself, in the report that was submitted to Transport for London.

I think, at page 1011, we can see the reference to 2015 for the trial that the chairman referred to. I think it's in the last paragraph on that page:

"Subsequently, in 2015 TfL carried out a trial of ISA on London buses using an intervening ISA system by Zeta Automotive Ltd."

I think that's the trial that's been referred to before; is that correct?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. That's the sort of -- yes, I think that was a very small-scale trial before these two routes were trialled on a slightly bigger basis, on a larger basis.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I now take you back, please, to Prof Stanley's report, this time at page 70. Have you had the opportunity of reading this page of his report?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, I have.

MR PETER DUNCAN: On this page, Prof Stanley is bringing to our attention the fact that one of the notable differences between the arrangements between Melbourne

and Hong Kong is that Melbourne has a separate -- I am quoting from the paragraph underneath the italicised part:

"... Melbourne ... has a separate independent safety regulator operating at the tactical level. Transport Safety Victoria was first established under the state's Transport Integration Act 2010, as discussed in section 3.3.1 of the first report under this brief, a role that has no equivalent independent safety entity in Hong Kong. The Transport Department monitors safety performance of franchised bus operators and is involved in promoting safety initiatives. However, the absence of an independent safety regulator in Hong Kong seems likely to lessen the relative focus on safety matters."

So, to summarise that, it would appear that in Melbourne, the safety aspect of the operation is taken away from the regulator and put in the hands of an independent regulator aimed at the safety aspects.

We can see more detail of this by going to page 99 of the same report. If I could read from the second-last paragraph on that page:

"Operator support is available from BusVic, the industry association, if desired, across all three areas. For example, BusVic has developed templates ... which are available to its members, these templates

having been developed in collaboration with the Transport Safety Director. The Transport Safety Director has a strong focus on the development and improvement of safety culture in a bus business and safety risk management, working with operators and the industry to improve practice. Guidance material is available, such as Guidance -- Safety Culture, September 2016 ... and the director has indicated his willingness to share materials and ideas with Hong Kong, if desired.

The independence of the Transport Safety Director both elevates safety as a desirable policy outcome and provides an independent source of accountability and transparency on safety processes and outcomes that exceed what is likely to result if ... bus safety was left solely to the public transport regulatory agency and/or a governmental department to manage. The Transport Safety Director's audit processes and industry engagement has led the agency to the conclusion that Melbourne's route bus services and practices are safe and that the safety focus should be on developing a proactive and forward-looking safety risk management culture, as distinct from practices that react to safety concerns after they happen."

Then, going down the page, in bold:

"The major recommendation from the study is that the

committee should give consideration to, within the legislative framework, recommending", and it's the second bullet:

"the creation of the independent position of Transport Safety Director, whose role is to be responsible for administering matters related to safety duties, ensuring compliance and enforcement."

Now, we can see the role of that body in Victoria and the recommendation. I suppose one of the questions that might be asked is whether we actually need another bureaucracy, as it would be, to carry out this role. Do you have any views on that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think it does depends very much on the sort of local structures and circumstances that already exist in Melbourne or Hong Kong or London.

But I would suggest that if you look at some of the progress that TfL are currently making with the bus operators around safety, and the bus safety standard and the bus safety programme, and the relative speed in which that's being delivered, I would just -- I'm not adverse to the idea of a separate safety regulator in some way, and it is something that already exists in the UK rail industry, as is referred to in my report, and it is something that TfL are thinking of trying to encourage for the UK tram industry, in terms of setting

standards and good practice.

But my fear would be that if it was suggested to establish this in London, for example, the potential is that whilst that's being established you get a period of inertia, with not much particularly happening. So I would be fearful in London, if the suggestion was made, that you may end up with a period of the current activity and current progress that's been made slows down whilst this regulator is established. So that would be my concern.

But no particularly strong views, just a little bit of a concern that it perhaps stifles progress in the short term, and maybe progress can be made quicker through collaboration and the current structures and the current players working together more closely.

CHAIRMAN: If I understand your evidence correctly, you are satisfied that appropriate progress is being made by virtue of collaboration between the franchised bus operators and Transport for London, in the various ways you have described?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, but the caveat on that comment is that that's within the tendering and competitive structure that London currently has. So whether that model transfers easily to other jurisdictions is a matter of debate, I suppose.

So, you know, it seems, from the evidence that I have seen over the last few years and the evidence that we have gathered for this report, it seems that quite significant progress is being made around the safety agenda for buses in London, but that's being made within the current structure that they have in London. So taking that model exactly and trying to put it into another region may not necessarily deliver results in exactly the same way. But the evidence from London is it certainly seems to be delivering some quite significant results and making some quite rapid progress around the use of technology and setting standards.

CHAIRMAN: What view do you take on what I understand to be Transport for London's claim that they are setting global standards?

MR MIKE WESTON: From my knowledge, it is the only transport authority that seems to be trying to set a bus safety standard for its bus fleet, and so it will set the scene, and it will certainly have a knock-on effect into other parts of the UK and possibly places such as Hong Kong and Singapore, mainly because the main bus manufacturers into London also supply the rest of the UK, and also the key suppliers into Hong Kong and Singapore. So you can see how there's going to be some obvious transition of some of this best practice to

other vehicles that they build for other parts of the world. So there is clearly some good crossover by those manufacturers who I'm sure will be keen to sell some of this technology into other regions.

CHAIRMAN: One example of that would be, for example, changes to the design of the front of buses. As I understand it, changes that would modify the box shape of the front of the bus, putting in curves, so that rather than being knocked down and put under the wheels of a bus, the person who has impact with the front of a bus would be knocked sideways; do I understand that change correctly?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So one of the initiatives that is likely to be included in the bus safety standard, when it is announced next month, is a sort of -- I call it softening of the front-end design of a bus. So it's not physical softening, but it's using more curves, looking at the rake of a windscreen, looking at having the spindles for the wipers at the top of the windscreen, not at the bottom, because if they are at the bottom they then become a point of impact for pedestrians if they are hit by the bus and potential injury.

So I suppose it is trying to make the front end of the design of the bus more forgiving. If a pedestrian is hit by a car at a certain speed, at a relatively low

speed generally they will be thrown off the bonnet onto the pavement, onto the road, but at the same speed with a bus, you are more likely to be more seriously injured because of the design of the bus.

So it's trying to make the front end of a bus more forgiving in an accident with a pedestrian. In my mind, the likelihood is that is more of a design cost as opposed to an actual manufacturing cost, and the logic would be if that design is proved to be beneficial in London, why wouldn't the likes of Alexander Dennis and Wrights, who supply to the rest of the UK and to Hong Kong, adopt that for buses that they sold into their other markets. It would be a pretty obvious thing to do. So I think that's a good example of where we might see some good practice and best practice move across into other markets relatively quickly.

CHAIRMAN: Just to come back to your observations as far as this is concerned. The model works in London, that has regard to the structure that obtains in London, and the issue of a progressive, proactive transport authority achieving the same success is going to depend on the local structures in Hong Kong?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and I think the question is which model will deliver these benefits quickest, using the current structures that are in place and trying to build

on those or establishing a separate regulator that in the short term possibly will slow the progress down.

So it's trying to, I suppose, learn from the relative speed in which London has made some progress over the last couple of years and trying to see how that sort of good practice could be implemented sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Chairman.

So I think, between you and Prof Stanley, you have provided the committee with various options to improve this aspect. One might be something equivalent to the Bus Operator Forum. Another might be a standing committee which Prof Stanley suggested, although there doesn't seem to be a standing committee in Victoria. Then a third option might be this independent regulator, the transport safety regulator. So they all seem to be matters for the committee's consideration. Would you agree with that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and perhaps the difference between the Bus Operator Forum structure and the standing committee is perhaps fairly small and may be one of semantics and description more than anything. They may be the same thing in practice.

I suppose the question out of that is whether that

committee would benefit from other third parties being involved, such as obviously the police or other authorities being involved in the debate.

MR PETER DUNCAN: You have no doubt heard of ISO, ISO 39001 in particular. Does that standard have any sort of role in the bus system in London?

MR MIKE WESTON: I'm not sure. I know that certainly Go-Ahead have got an ISO standard for their engineering practices, but whether it's the same number or a different one, I don't know. So there are some bus companies in London that have ISO accreditation for certain aspects of their operation, but it is not a requirement of Transport for London to have any particular ISO accreditation. But I certainly know Go-Ahead do for their engineering practices, but whether it's the same number or not, I'm not sure.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Could I take you to page 146 of your report, where you deal in detail with the bus safety programme, and introduced on page 146 in this way:

"In February 2016 Transport for London, partly in response to increased public and stakeholder pressure, launched its bus safety programme the core elements of which can be summarised as follows".

We can see the "Core elements" in the left-hand column, and we can see the "Recent additions" on the

right.

We may have touched on this earlier, just a few moments ago, but one of the questions I was interested in asking you was how long this bus safety programme was in the making?

MR MIKE WESTON: Not very long, and partly the reason I know is because I was still at TfL in February 2016 and was responsible for launching the bus safety programme.

The background to it is not that safety wasn't a priority and it's not that safety wasn't being progressed and taken forward and the Bus Operator Forum for safety existed and a lot of these things were happening anyway.

There was increased public pressure around the safety of buses, and that was partly driven by increased transparency from TfL in terms of publishing safety data, but it was also led by a number of stakeholders, including some members of the public that had been involved in serious bus accidents, that led to a lot of pressure on the organisation to move the safety agenda forward. So the bus safety programme was trying to pull together various aspects of work that were currently happening into a coordinated programme, where previously there had been lots of initiatives but it wasn't being seen as a coordinated programme. And February 2016 was

when that was launched, to try to progress this agenda in a more coordinated way.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So how many people would have participated in the design of the programme?

MR MIKE WESTON: Probably two or three people. Very small team. It would have been signed off internally at a higher level, but it would have been brought together by two or three people within the buses safety team.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And the programme, would you describe it as a reactive step, a proactive step, or a mixture of both?

MR MIKE WESTON: It wasn't reactive to a specific incident. I think it was an evolution of a number of things that were already happening, but probably a useful refocus on the agenda.

So, you know, I think it's clear in my mind that the bus operators and TfL have always taken safety seriously, for a number of years, but this was a useful point to try and refocus and rejuvenate the agenda and give it a little bit more direction. That was the purpose of this.

But it wasn't triggered specifically by a specific event, but there was increasing public pressure. There had been an increasing number of incidents with cyclists, because the number of cyclists in London was

rising quite dramatically. There had been some serious bus accidents as well in Oxford Street. So a number of things were bubbling under that were putting more pressure on TfL to move this agenda forward.

But I should stress that a lot of this work was already happening but probably not in such a coordinated way.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could bring your attention to page 148. There's particular reference within the programme to the bus safety standard. That's introduced in the first paragraph, if I may quote:

"A core output of the bus safety programme is the development of a new bus safety standard. TfL have been working in collaboration since 2016 with road safety consultant TRL, Loughborough University, the bus operators and manufacturers to assess and then recommend features which should be incorporated into future bus design to help drive safety improvements."

Then in the second paragraph:

"Several potential technologies including intelligent speed assistance, autonomous braking, runaway bus prevention, pedal confusion prevention, acoustic and visual conspicuity, mirror design and frontal crash protection are being considered as part of this programme with both the costs and benefits of each

being thoroughly assessed to ensure that the causality [I think that's casualty] reduction is maximised in return for the financial investment made."

Then we see a reference to intelligent speed assistance, and then the plan to announce the first phase of its bus safety standard on 16 October 2018, to which the chairman has referred, and the three introductory phases.

If I could pick it up after that:

"Although it is currently envisaged the standard will apply to new buses (around 700 per annum) consideration is also being given to the potential for retrofitting to existing buses possibly as part of their midlife refurbishment which takes place around 7 years. It is worth noting that TfL have adopted a rigorous approach to the assessment of each potential option using cost/benefit analysis to target the interventions which will give the greatest return for each pound spent in terms of injury/accident reduction.

It is not anticipated that seat belts will form part of the new bus safety standard."

When you say, "It is not anticipated", is that as a result of the rigorous cost/benefit analysis which has been applied to this particular topic?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think, during the discussions with TfL

staff about the bus safety standard, it was pretty clear that they have discounted seat belts as one of the options to be rigorously assessed fairly quickly. The view has clearly been taken that they don't want to pursue seat belts, I suspect because they know what the cost is and they feel that there are greater benefits from some of the other options that are listed above on that page.

I don't want to use the word they were "dismissive" of seat belts -- that sounds a little bit flippant because I don't think they were dismissive -- but it clearly is not featuring in their thinking in terms of the new bus safety standard. That was pretty clear from the discussions we held with TfL in August, that seat belts were not being considered.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan's question was whether or not it had been dismissed, rejected, or not considered as a result of a rigorous analysis. The contrary is the impression that we anticipate to be confirmed in the future: it hadn't even been considered?

MR MIKE WESTON: The impression we had -- we were given the impression that it hasn't been considered.

CHAIRMAN: Not looked at?

MR MIKE WESTON: Not looked at.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If we look at page 134, have you set out,

it appears in blue on that page, a quotation from the Department for Transport guidance note, which states the current situation with regard to seat belts on buses? Is that the Department for Transport guidance note?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The blue is a direct copy of their guidance.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I'm going to ask you -- I will take you through that, because we want to examine the situation in Hong Kong, as it has evolved and as it is currently recommended. So it is important, I think, that we understand this.

"General requirements since 1 October 2001, seat belts have been required to be installed in each forward and rearward facing seat in all new buses. The use of an approved and properly fitted restraint system can help prevent death or serious injury, not only by restraining the occupant from forward motion but also by preventing their ejection from the vehicle, particularly in accidents where the vehicle rolls over.

The only exemption from this requirement is for buses that are designed for urban use with standing passengers. An exemption is permitted for these vehicles because they are typically used for short journeys, in both time and distance, undertaken at moderate speeds on urban routes. Although we are aware

that vehicles equipped with seat belts are used by some operators for urban fare-paying services, ultimately, it is for the operator to choose the type of vehicle used to provide a service."

So that's the Department for Transport guidance note.

CHAIRMAN: Just for the record, this comes from a statement made by the Department for Transport issued in May 2010, does it not, headed "Seat belts on urban buses"?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, that's correct.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I think that note, Mr Chairman, to which you referred, is now in the bundles.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Can you give us a reference for that?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It's being shown up now on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: But do you have a page reference for future purposes?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It's in MISC-3, Mr Chairman, at page 1274.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Now, with regard to the position in Hong Kong with regard to seat belts on buses, I'm going to take you through some, if I can call it that -- I was going to say the history, but various considerations of this matter, and then will ask you a couple of questions at the end with regard to your opinion on certain matters.

We can start, I think, at SEC-3 at page 1310. This is a paper issued by the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, as it then existed, in 2006. You will see that from page 1316. It is a submission to the Legislative Council Panel on Transport, with the heading, "Safety of franchised bus operations".

At 1315, you will see the topic, "Seat belt on franchised bus[es]".

Paragraph 18:

"Under Road Traffic (Safety Equipment) Regulations ... it is a mandatory requirement to provide seat belt for the driver ... As regards the passenger seats, about 34 per cent of franchised buses have been equipped with seat belt[s] at exposed seats. These seat belts had been installed by the bus manufacturers as standard equipment when the buses were purchased. All franchised bus operators have committed that new buses to be purchased by them will have seat belts installed at the exposed seats. In the light of recent traffic accidents, Transport Department has been reviewing with the franchised bus operators on retrofitting of seat belts on the existing buses, taking into account of the technical difficulties such as the structural strength of the seats, adequate anchorage points and design of the bus ...

19. We have conducted a research on overseas practices regarding the fitting and wearing of seat belts in buses. A summary of the corresponding seat belt requirements is at [the annex]. It can be seen that no overseas country requires fitting of seat belts in passenger seats of buses designed for urban use or for carrying standing passengers."

Then at 20:

"In view of the above, we consider that it is not appropriate to introduce mandatory requirements for installation and wearing of passenger seat belts for franchised buses."

So that is the situation as per the Transport Department's recommendation in 2006.

If we can move from that to SEC-3 at page 1323. This is a paper headed for the information of the Legislative Council Panel on Transport, so the same panel, and the heading this time, "Progress on measures to enhance safety of franchised bus operation".

At page 1329, we can see this is issued in January 2007.

If we look at page 1323, we have the subheading, "Retrofitting seat belt on franchised bus[es]", and if we look through paragraph 3, some reports on the progress of retrofitting.

I can pick it up, I think, at paragraph 4:

"We have collected information from other countries on the requirements of fitting and fastening of seat belts on buses. So far, we are not found any country that have legal requirements for the provision of seat belts on passenger seats of buses designed for urban use and are allowed to carry standing passengers. According to the transport authorities of these countries, the benefit of imposing a seat belt requirement in their buses is uncertain."

And there's a summary at the annex.

So I think it's fair to say that between 2016 and 2017, there was no change in the view of the department; there was the same recommendation on each occasion.

The next report I would like to commend to you is to be found at TD-1/94. So Transport Department volume 1 at page 94.

The heading on this page is, "TD_Paper_08", "Application of new devices or technology on franchised buses", and if you go through to page 107 --

CHAIRMAN: This is a submission made by the Transport Department in April of this year?

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's correct, Mr Chairman, thank you.

So we have jumped from 2007 now, Mr Weston, through to 2018, and this is not a submission made to the

Legislative Council. It is actually one of the documents submitted by the department to the committee, assisting the committee in its work.

If I could bring your attention first to page 94, you will see, at paragraph 4:

"Arising from the serious traffic accident involving a franchised bus of the Kowloon Motor Bus on Tai Po Road resulting in the death of a number of passengers in February 2018, the Transport Department set up a working group with representatives from all franchised bus companies and bus manufacturers in mid-March 2018 to review the technical feasibility and desirability of installing some new safety devices or applying new technology on the safety devices of franchised buses for enhancing protection to bus passengers. The outcome of the discussion and recommendations of the working group are set out in the ensuing [passages]."

You will see then from that what had prompted the setting up of this working group was the accident in Tai Po.

Paragraph 7 of the report, under the heading, "Installation of seat belts for all passenger seats" -- perhaps I should start with paragraph 5:

"In the light of an accident in July 2006 in which a KMB bus collided with another vehicle resulting in

a passenger on the upper deck of the bus being thrown out of the bus and another similar accident in December 2007 ... the TD recommended and the franchised bus operators agreed that safety seat belts should be retrofitted on the four front seats on the upper deck of all the post-1997 licensed buses to prevent passengers from falling out from the upper deck front seats. At present, the seat belts for all the exposed seats have become a standard feature of all franchised buses."

Then paragraph 7:

"As regards the installation of seat belts for all passenger seats on franchised buses, the three double-decked bus manufacturers ... have confirmed that it is technically feasible, upon the request of the franchised bus operators, to supply all new buses with seat belts for all passenger seats which comply with the aforesaid international standards. Correspondingly, all franchised bus operators indicate that they agree to incorporate this requirement for procurement of new buses.

8. As for retrofitting of seats on all passenger seats of existing buses, the bus manufacturers have concerns that the floor structure (especially on the lower deck) of the franchised bus is not designed for seat belt installations for compliance with the

international standards. To fulfil the requirements, reinforcement of the existing floor structure and replacement of all the existing passenger seats with new passenger seats are required. Subject to detailed assessment, the bus manufacturers have initially confirmed that it may be technically feasible to retrofit safety seat belts on all passenger seats of upper deck of the existing buses which are manufactured in certain specified years. They would also make further study on such feasibility and advise the recommended models or batches of buses used by the franchised bus operators that are suitable for installation of seat belts. Based on the Transport Department's understanding, the retrofitting work will involve substantial modifications, including reinforcement of the structure of a franchised bus, replacement of all seats with seat belts, as well as conducting pull tests of the seat belts and seats to confirm their compliance with the international standards, et cetera. The retrofitting and testing work for each franchised bus will take considerable time to complete and hence will affect the bus availability rate for bus operation during the process. The franchised bus operators will further study the proposal."

So that was the situation at April 2018, this year,

as reported to the committee.

It's getting on for 1 o'clock so I will leave the following developments until after the break.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

Mr Weston, we are going to take our lunch break now.

Can I ask, Mr Duncan, what progress we have made and what estimate, if any, you have of how much longer your questioning would last, given that we acknowledge that certainly my interruptions may delay you?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I will do my best to anticipate the extent of Mr Chairman's so-called interruptions. I think we have made good progress. I think we will finish this by 3.30; if not by 3.30, before 4 o'clock, this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that indication.

In which case, we will adjourn then until 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Weston, good afternoon.

MR MIKE WESTON: Good afternoon.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Prior to the luncheon break, I had taken you to a document dated April 2018, that was Transport Department Paper No. 8.

I am now going to ask you to look at another document. Here, we are going to go back a little bit in time, to March 2018. We will find this in KMB-12 at page 4869-1. At this page, you will see the commencement of a document which is headed, "Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses", "Notes of 1st meeting held on 13 March 2018 at 3.00 pm at ..." and it gives the place and it gives the people attending the meeting.

If you go to page 4869-6, you will see the section on "Installation of seat belts", and it's that information which has been summarised in a different form and provided to the committee in the document I showed you just before lunch, TD_08, so I won't ask you to dwell on that any further.

What I would like to do is to take you to 4869-9, which confirms the scope of work for the working group. So this is the scope of work that the working group set for itself, and we can see that set out in full on page 4869-9.

With regard to items (2) and (3), there is --

perhaps I will read them out quickly. Item (2):

"To examine the technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, applicability and any other issues relating to installation of seat belts on all seats other than exposed seats;

(3) To explore the technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, applicability and any other issues relating to the installation of on-vehicle safety device, including but not limiting to the following --

(a) Speed display unit for passengers;

(b) Active/passive roll stability control;

(c) Electronic stability control;

(d) Speed control aided by GPS;

(e) Speed limiter to cap maximum speed within 70 kilometres per hour;

(f) Collision prevention and lane-keeping device; and

(g) Monitoring device on captain's condition eg dozing, drowsiness."

What I would like to ask you is this. You told us this morning, in fact, in your evidence and I think it appears in your report, that with regard to safety measures, there will, at least in London, be a rigorous examination of the cost on the one hand and the effect on the other, before any measure is introduced.

So what I am interested in is your opinion as to whether the period of three months that you will see on page 4869-11, "A report on the outcome and recommendations of the review is expected to be submitted to the Commissioner for Transport in 3 months' time", whether you would consider that period to be sufficiently adequate to undertake a rigorous cost and effect analysis of all those matters set out in the scope of work.

What is your opinion on that?

MR MIKE WESTON: On the face of evidence from London, I suppose I would cite two examples. First, the ISA study that we talked about this morning, and the time that study took to gain both pre and post data, and also the time it has taken so far for TfL to deliver its bus safety programme, which started -- work started in early 2016 and has already delivered some elements, but the main focus of that, the bus safety standard, phase 1 won't be announced until next month and will start to be implemented on vehicles from 2019.

Now, you could ask the question, has TfL taken too long to consider and deliver these suggestions, as opposed to being able to do it a lot quicker? I would suggest that to gather bus data from trials, you either need to have a small number of trial buses in service

for a reasonably long period of time, or a very, very large numbers of buses in service for a shorter period of time, to collect robust data.

So in theory, yes, you could undertake trials and assessments in three months, but in my view, to collect robust data on the benefits of those trials, you would have to do a large number of vehicles. I can't remember quite how many vehicles were involved in the ISA scheme but you would have to make sure you had a big enough sample to get some robust data.

So three months does seem remarkably quick, although I'm sure in London some people would say the time TfL have taken could have been quicker. So maybe there is a balance there between the two.

CHAIRMAN: As far as ISA is concerned in London, there were two bus routes, but presumably, in order to sustain the service on two bus routes, that would involve many, many buses?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I can't remember the exact number, but I think the 19, for example -- the route 19 is quite a big route, probably 30 or 40 buses. But I don't think all the buses were installed with the ISA equipment. It was just a smaller sample that were installed and monitored.

So three months does -- if you use TfL as

a comparator and you assume that TfL hasn't been dragging its heels, this three months does seem a very quick turnaround of an assessment of all these technologies and all these options.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm now going to take you through to April.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, although this initial 13 March agenda suggested that a report would be expected to be submitted to the Commissioner for Transport in three months' time, in fact six months have gone past and no final report at least has been submitted that we're aware of. Just to give you that context.

MR MIKE WESTON: Which perhaps suggests that the three months was ambitious in the first place.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, there is one other matter. Just let me flag it. There was a LegCo meeting when issues germane to this working group were discussed, I think on 15 February. Is that something you are going to go to at some stage? Three motions were passed.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I can take the committee to that.

CHAIRMAN: At some stage, because it gives context as to why it is that the Transport Department was considering the matters that they did consider in the working group.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman. I would like to

go to that now, to try to keep track of the dates in a reasonably chronological order.

We can actually find that, I think, at SEC-3, at page 1342.

At this page, Mr Weston, you will see minutes of the meeting of the Legislative Council's Panel on Transport of 15 February. So it is before the first meeting of the working group which we have just seen was held in March.

If we go to page 1359 -- just give me a moment, please.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Take your time.

One of the passages I had in mind is at paragraph 3 on 1360, one of the motions, which gives a shopping list of matters that the LegCo Panel urges the administration to explore.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I think the precursor to that can actually be found on page 1356.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: There is a discussion on measures to enhance bus safety, and paragraph 59:

"The deputy chairman [of the meeting] suggested that, to minimise the number of casualties in case of bus accident, all franchised bus operators should consider retrofitting seat belts to all seats in buses

by phases. Mr Luk Chung Hung recalled that there had been times all seats of certain bus models of Long Win Bus Company were retrofitted with seat belt. He asked why there was no such kind of buses at the moment.

Commissioner for Transport advised that all exposed seats of new buses purchased after 2003 had been installed with seat belts. After a serious bus accident in 2007, franchised bus companies had acceded to TD's request for retrofitting seat belts to the exposed seats and front-row seats on the upper decks for buses designed after 1997. Transport Department would, together with KMB and other franchised bus operators, actively study measures to enhance safety, including the technical feasibility of retrofitting seat belt to all seats. Managing director for KMB supplemented that KMB held an open mind on any suggestion to improve bus safety and would discuss the above suggestion with the Transport Department. In reply to Mr Luk, Commissioner for Transport said that Long Win had once proactively installed seat belts to all seats but no longer provided them having regard to the low usage.

Ms Claudia Mo noted the view of some transport experts that seat belt might not help reduce the number of casualties for such kind of serious bus accident. She was also concerned that, in case all seats were

retrofitted with seat belt, whether there would be difficulties to require all passengers to wear the seat belts. She enquired about the timetable of considering the suggestion of retrofitting all seats with seat belts and whether a consultation would be conducted in this regard.

Commissioner for Transport said that the administration kept an open mind on the suggestion of retrofitting seat belt to all seats in franchised buses. However, apart from technical feasibility, passengers' acceptability should also be taken into account when considering the suggestion of retrofitting seat belt[s] to all seats. It would study the investigation report to be submitted by KMB in one month's time and would examine the suggestion having regard to relevant considerations."

Then I think, Mr Chairman, the motions commence at page 1359, at paragraph 77:

"The chairman advised that he had received three motions respectively ... He considered that the proposed motions were directly related to the agenda item under discussion. Members agreed that the motions be proceeded with ..."

And the motion was moved by Mr Chan Hak Kan and seconded, and the translation appears at 1360, and

paragraph 3 reads:

"explore ways to further strengthen the safety installations on buses, including enhancing the protection for high-risk seats, retrofitting seat belts on more seats and making it compulsory in phases for passengers to wear seat belts, installing an external camera at the bus captain's seat, modifying the speed limiters on buses to ensure safe driving on high-risk road sections, and installing an auxiliary system for automatic emergency braking, so as to reduce the risk of injuries among passengers in an accident."

So you can see the motions of the Legislative Council which preceded the first meeting of the working group, and reference there to seat belts and some of the pros and cons.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, if it is in order, I will then take you further, please, into the chronology by asking you to turn up minutes of the second meeting of the working group, which we will find at KMB-12/4887-1.

CHAIRMAN: This is 23 April 2018?

MR PETER DUNCAN: This is the meeting, indeed, on 23 April 2018. These are the notes.

The relevant section I think you will find, Mr Weston, on page 4887-5.

So:

"After checking with the bus manufacturers on the feasibility for installation of seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses, all franchised bus operators advised that it was technically feasible to install seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses to be procured. KMB/Long Win supplemented that it would cost about an additional of 5,000 pounds for each double-decker to install seat belts for all passenger seats. All bus operators agreed to incorporate this requirement in their new single-decked buses and double-decked buses to be procured.

For new buses which had been procured but not yet delivered, KMB said they would request the bus manufacturers to install seat belts for all passenger seats if it would be feasible to include such requirement. KMB/Long Win advised that 145 new buses to be delivered before September 2018 could be able to install with seat belts for all passenger seats. Citybus and New Lantao Bus would advise Transport Department by end of April 2018 if the bus manufacturer could install seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses being manufacture[d].

For existing buses, Citybus and Kowloon Motor Bus advised that the technical feasibility for installation

of the seat belts on all passenger seats at upper deck was still uncertain. Even if it proved to be technical[ly] feasible, the subject still needed further deliberation taking into consideration the financial implications and impacts on bus operation (ie the availability of bus) due to the time required for the substantial modification of buses. Transport Department encouraged all franchised bus operators to continue to study the technical feasibility of retrofitting seat belts on all passenger seats on each bus model before reaching the final decision."

So that's the position after the second meeting, and then the third meeting we can see, which was held on 23 June -- so we've had March, April, and now we have June -- is at KMB-12/4908-1.

The relevant part of these notes with regard to seat belts appear at page 4908-7. At 25:

"The meeting noted that it was technically feasible to supply all new buses with seat belts for all passenger seats conforming to relevant international standards and all franchised bus operators committed that all new franchised buses would be incorporated with seat belts on all passenger seats."

And we have seen that the additional cost of that is going to be about 5,000 pounds per bus.

Then at 26:

"As for existing buses, the meeting noted that retrofitting seat belts on all passenger seats of the upper deck of some existing double-deck bus models should be feasible. Kowloon Motor Bus advised that they would retrofit seat belts on all passenger seats of the upper deck or deploy buses with seat belts on all passenger seats on routes which serve long-haul passengers or are operated on expressways with limited boarding or alighting activities at the en route stops.

[Post-meeting note: KMB advised that there would be about 400 new buses with seat belts on all passenger seats by mid-2019. KMB would deploy these buses to the required routes. Retrofitting seat belts to existing buses would depend on the actual situation/requirement at that moment.]

27. In the light of KMB's initiative, the meeting had discussed and come to the views that having regard to the technical feasibility in retrofitting seat belts on existing buses; operation of franchised buses in Hong Kong which were mostly deployed on urban routes with standing passengers; and the costs and downtime incurred to retrofit seat belts on all existing buses, as well as overseas experiences, that there were insufficient justifications to make it a mandatory

requirement for all buses to be fitted with seat belts on all passenger seats. Nevertheless, members reckoned that as in the case of exposed seats and in bus compartment with no standees allowed, seat belts might give extra protection to seated passengers to prevent passengers from falling out from these seats.

28. In this regard, Citybus was requested to consider retrofitting seat belts on all passenger seats on the upper deck for the buses operating selected bus routes for long-haul passengers or operating on expressways with limited boarding and alighting activities along the routes. Citybus indicated that it would be difficult for their companies to allocate their buses to solely operate specific routes as their buses would serve a number of routes in a day under their existing operations. In addition, Citybus observed that very few passengers would make use of seat belts, it would not be financially viable to retrofit existing buses with seat belts on all passenger seats. Citybus requested the government to fund the retrofit of seat belts to existing buses if that was what the government wanted."

And the section concludes, in paragraph 31:

"... the Transport Department requested all franchised bus operators to estimate the number of

long-haul bus routes operating via expressway with relatively fewer bus stops and the corresponding number of buses involved, and provide the information to the Transport Department for reference the soonest possible."

If we can then move from what you can see in that meeting to another document, this time at page 4938-1. You will see the notes of what is described as the 3rd meeting, held on 27 June this year, of the sub-working group on in-vehicle safety devices for franchised buses. So this is six days later, in the sub-working group.

If we go to page 4938-5, at paragraph 15 we see the heading, "Installation of seat belts for all passenger seats":

"Transport Department informed the meeting of their view to retrofit seat belts for bus routes serving long-haul passengers, or operating on expressways with limited boarding or alighting activities at the en route stops where passengers tend to use them. Transport Department had already requested franchised bus operators to provide return on the number of buses involved in these service natures. New World/Citybus emphasised that they did not [agree] to such retrofit work unless it would be funded by the government. New World also mentioned that it would take 3-4 skilled

labour one week to retrofit a bus (eg one man-month). Taking into account the labour cost and material cost, it was estimated that the retrofit cost for one bus would be around $240,000."

Then the final paper, I think, which I then need to show you, is a paper which the Transport Department provided by way of an update to the LegCo's Transport Panel the following month, that's July of this year. We will find that in TD-1 at page 403.

At page 403, we can see the heading, "For discussion on 25 July 2018". It's to the Legislative Council Panel on Transport, "Enhancement of safety of franchised buses", and if you go through to page 412, you will see that it's a paper which has been provided by the Transport and Housing Bureau and Transport Department in July.

The purpose of the paper is set out on page 403, and the background is set out, referring to the working group and its scope of work. There are various sections in that paper. The one of relevance to seat belts, I think I can take you directly to paragraph 16 which is on page 409:

"Having regard to the points mentioned in paragraphs 10 to 15 above ..."

And it's in that section where the detailed

matters -- I think which we have already gone through in the previous notes.

"... the working group has arrived at the following recommendations with a view to giving extra protection to seated passengers:

(a) seat belts should be provided for all seats in future procurement of new buses; and

(b) subject to further assessment on the technical, operational and financial feasibility, consideration may be given to retrofitting all seats in the upper deck with seat belts on buses deployed for specific bus routes, ie long-haul routes which are operated via expressways with relatively fewer bus stops.

The Transport Department will require the franchised bus operators to explore in more details in conjunction with the bus manufacturers to ascertain the technical feasibility of retrofitting seat belts on the upper deck of different bus models, the operational and capacity considerations in developing the timetable for the retrofitting works and how such considerations may be addressed, as well as the financial implications, in order to decide whether and, if so, how all passenger seats on the upper deck of existing double-deck buses deployed for long-haul routes mentioned in paragraph 16(b) can be retrofitted with seat belts. In

the meantime, the Transport Department will work with the franchised bus operators to promote the use of seat belts if they are available (at exposed seats or on new buses)."

I think, in addition to those papers, I should also, before asking you a couple of questions, refer you to just some aspects of the evidence that the committee has heard. First of all, evidence from Citybus, who gave evidence at an early stage of the inquiry. We will find this at Day 4 of the transcript at page 102.

CHAIRMAN: Which transcript bundle is this to be located in?

MR PETER DUNCAN: It will be in 2A, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. To give this context, this is 30 May 2018.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That's right. That's before some of the matters we have just seen.

The part I wish to bring your attention to is at page 102. Perhaps I should go to the question, which you will find at page 101, at line 15, where I am examining Mr Samuel Cheng, who is a representative of Citybus:

"Can you point to anything specific which you would regard as beyond your financial capabilities at the moment, but which, if it could be could funded, would add materially to the matter of safety? Is there any

specific matter?

Mr Samuel Cheng: I cannot give any examples which will substantially enhance the safety. Rather, there are certain things which the public would think that, when done, the safety would be enhanced.

I can give examples. Say, for example, this morning, you explored the idea of retrofitting safety seat belts for the upper deck. This morning, Mr Li talked about the cost. It will be 15,000 to 20,000 pounds per bus, and we have got 1,100 buses falling into this category. If they all have to be retrofitted with safety belts on the upper deck, the total cost, as we have given, will be HK$180 million to HK$240 million."

That's Citybus.

Then if I could take you to Kowloon Motor Bus, more recently, Day 15 --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps before we leave that, there is an observation that is relevant to the cost side of it, and that's the usage side of it. That's at the bottom of page 102. Perhaps you would draw Mr Weston's attention to that. Line 19 -- or line 16, perhaps.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I leave out the next couple of paragraphs, Mr Weston, and pick it up at line 16:

"This morning, we have said that currently there are

certain exposed seats on board and they have been fitted with seat belts, but then in fact I ride on the buses many times. I seldom see passengers occupying such seats put on the seat belts. In future, if you ask our company to spend $100 million to $200 million, or more than $200 million to work on this, while we query very much the effectiveness, of course, if the administration would like to impose such a requirement, that is to retrofit the seat belts, then I very much hope that the government will provide a subsidy so that we can install the seat belts.

So this is one of the examples. Thank you.

Chairman: So your point really is this: if the government thinks that it's worthwhile doing because it gives passengers who might want to put a seat belt on the opportunity to do so, but it's your experience that if they don't do so, then it's up to government to fund this, rather than impose it on your own? Is that the point?

Answer: If the government sees the need for seat belts, in order for the passengers to put on the seat belts if they want to, if that's the case then I hope the government would fund the exercise because if we fund it, it would be a waste of resources."

I think if you go to page 58 --

CHAIRMAN: Of this transcript on Day 4?

MR PETER DUNCAN: The transcript, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: -- there is a similar sentiment from Mr Cheng at an earlier stage, at line 24 on page 58. Yes, I had just referred to an extract from the forward planning programme for Citybus, where Mr Cheng's evidence is to this effect. I quote from line 25:

"It is feasible to install seat belts on all seats or on all seats on the upper deck. However, our observation shows that very few people wear the seat belts currently available at the exposed seats. Without any legislation to mandate the wearing of passenger seat belts on a franchised bus and the enforcement authority to strictly enforce the legislation, installing seat belts on all [buses] will be a waste of resources because vast majority of passengers will not wear seat belts even though they are provided."

So, then, moving from Citybus to Kowloon Motor Bus. Their evidence was given more recently, Day 15 on 13 September. That's in bundle 6 of the transcripts, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Day 15, page 18. At line 20, I have asked a question about new buses having seat belts:

"Do I understand that the new buses will have seat belts --"

Perhaps I need to go back a little further. At page 15, line 24, Mr Roger Lee -- he is from Kowloon Motor Bus -- is talking about the feasibility, first, of installing safety belts on the upper deck for retrofit:

"To install safety belts on the upper deck, technically speaking, we would have to consider the issue of gravity. The government and ourselves -- well, the government has consulted us for certain information and our supplier conducting a technical assessment, and the progress has been positive so far. The safety belts are relatively heavy. If they are to be installed on the upper deck, the government would have to conduct tilt tests. If this is technically feasible, it won't be an issue to install them. Whereas for the two main suppliers, Volvo and ADL, the progress has been very positive, however we would still have to wait until the tilt tests are completed.

Question: Can you give the committee some idea as to the financial implications of the retrofitting of the seat belts?

Answer: This is not cheap, or should I say, in the beginning of this year, a special committee of our company issued clear instructions. Our buses procured

in 2019 and after would be fitted with safety belts. As for the retrofitting of safety belts, where possible, especially on long-haul routes, we would install safety belts on the upper deck. We do not want to see further accidents, so cost is not our main consideration. We have not considered the financial implications yet. Retrofitting of safety belts would cost about $200,000 per bus.

Chairman: That is on the upper deck?

...

Question: ... Approximately how many buses do you expect would be retrofitted, how many buses in your fleet?

Mr Leung Kin Wang [another representative]: I think nearly 3,600 long-haul buses."

Then there is an intervention at line 22 -- sorry, Mr Roger Lee at line 11:

"I would like to add something. Currently, we have 4,200 to 4,300 buses. That is for KMB and Long Win Bus combined. Some buses are fully equipped with safety belts. For some others, as they will retire in the next years -- for buses that will retire in two or three years, they might not need to be retrofitted. For long-haul buses, I do not have the exact figure, but about one-third of our buses would go on long-haul

routes, so that comes to about 1,000."

Then the chairman at line 22:

"Before you move on ... earlier, Mr Lee, you said this involved retrofitting 3,600 long-haul buses. Are you now correcting that statement and in fact it involves 1,000?

Answer: Yes."

At line 5:

"I'm just trying to do the mathematics. 1,000 buses at $200,000 per bus?

Mr John Chan: Yes.

Question: $200 million?

Dr Norman Leung: Yes.

Question: Is the cost of that something that has been discussed with the government?

Mr Roger Lee: No."

Finally, as regards material data I need to bring to your attention, we have the evidence from the Hong Kong Police Force representatives.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on to that, there is something in the transcript that you have just read out, at page 16, line 17:

"... in the beginning of this year, a special committee of our company issued clear instructions. Our buses procured in 2019 and after would be fitted with

safety belts. As for the retrofitting of safety belts, where possible, especially on long-haul routes, we would install safety belts on the upper deck."

I think, to give that context, it would be relevant to refer to the report to the Commissioner for Transport by KMB on the bus accident on the Tai Po Road which is to be found at KMB-1A at page 98, and to paragraphs 39 and 40.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do you have that in front of you, Mr Weston?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: KMB-1A/98.

CHAIRMAN: Just to give you the context, Mr Weston, this was a report that the Commissioner for Transport required KMB to give in a period of a month. I think it was delivered on 12 March.

This precedes the very first day, which was the following day, when the working group met, and its agenda was provided to those who attended.

Perhaps I could invite you, Mr Duncan, to read this out, so we have it in the transcript, informing us as to the position taken by KMB in advance of any working group.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

If you go back to page 98 of this bundle, Mr Weston,

you will see this is issued on 12 March. At paragraph 39 the bus company say, in their report to the Commissioner for Transport:

"In the aftermath of the incident, a number of comments and suggests have been raised by members of the Legislative Council, the media and members of the public on measures which should be considered with a view to enhancing the safety of public bus operations and of bus passengers. The special committee has considered these issues, in consultation with KMB's bus suppliers, and made various recommendations which KMB's management will be implementing or further examining.

40. KMB has already requested its suppliers to install safety belts on all seats as a standard feature for new buses ordered after 5 March 2018. As for buses that are currently in service, where certain routes so require, safety belts will be installed on the upper deck of KMB buses phase by phase."

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could then finally take you to the evidence from the police. This is Day 17 of the hearing. That was held on Monday, 24 September. That will be in transcript bundle 7, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: If I could bring your attention, please,

to page 50. The exchange is between the chairman and Mr Auyeung, with Mr Stephen Baker, who is a representative of the police force.

CHAIRMAN: Chief Superintendent Baker.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you.

I think probably I need to pick it up at page 49, where the chairman has indicated that the provision of seat belts is required for public light buses, and the chairman at line 8:

"But they do for PLBs.

Answer: They do, sir, yes.

Chairman: And what is the ease with which that is enforced or the difficulty?

Answer: It is difficult to enforce, and it is not enforced regularly. I would say it is enforced occasionally, when officers decide to take enforcement as a road safety issue. There is always more than one aspect to road safety -- publicity -- but it is also coupled with enforcement from time to time.

...

I was going to add that we hope that people won't obey the law only because they feel they might be prosecuted for it, for not following the law. Yes.

Chairman: It took a long time to persuade people when they had a choice that they should wear seat belts

in cars.

Answer: Yes, sir. But going back to my earlier comment, in our view, it is better if people have the option to improve their own road safety, as a matter of choice.

Then Mr Auyeung raises this question:

"Just a quick question on the seat belt. Using the experience you have on the PLB, how successful has the police force been on enforcement?

Answer: I don't have enforcement figures, but, like I say, I would hope that people would follow the law because it was good for them rather than because they would be prosecuted if they didn't.

Chairman: But, as you said earlier, most people don't wear them on public light buses, enforcement is difficult, and one can see why, and you would expect that same trend to obtain with buses?

Answer: I would, sir, yes."

So there is a lot of information there I have asked you to digest, Mr Weston, but you can see what appears to be looming here. First of all, not just looming, but apparently decided that with regard to new buses, henceforth it is proposed that all buses be fitted with seat belts for each seat, irrespective of whether that bus is plying an urban route, presumably a very crowded

route where there is provision for standing passengers. That's the first issue, and we have heard that the additional cost to the bus companies for that facility would be something like 5,000 pounds per bus. So that's one aspect.

The second aspect is the retrofitting of the upper deck seats, where it is technically possible for buses which are plying on specific routes, exemplified by expressways, at a total cost, if we take the two major franchisees, of something like $400 million.

So what I think the committee would appreciate would be your reaction to these two matters, first of all the provision for seat belts on each and every new bus, at that not insignificant cost, and then secondly the provision of a retrofitting on those buses which ply the expressways and those specific routes.

Would you be able to assist the committee with your views on those?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I will give some sort of general observations. I think, on first sight, it seems, from the evidence this afternoon, that the decision to install seat belts has been more led by technical feasibility than assessment of the benefits. So there has clearly been a very in-depth technical assessment about whether it's possible. There has clearly been

some work around the costs. What seems to be missing is whether there is any real benefit.

I could conclude from the evidence this afternoon that the decision to adopt seat belts in Hong Kong by the franchised bus operators has been as quick a decision as TfL's decision to dismiss seat belts. We spoke earlier this morning about TfL's dismissal of seat belts as an option, and maybe this has been as quick the other way.

I think it is clear that seat belts clearly have a benefit in an accident, whether it is a car or any other vehicle, it's clearly a benefit, but it must be worn, and we have talked -- or there is evidence around the enforcement issue and the ability to enforce the use of the seat belt.

The other issue that hasn't been mentioned and I haven't seen in any of the evidence but I would also be worried about is the ability to maintain these seat belts in working order. At the end of the day, you will buy a new bus with seat belts, and it is clearly important then that if the Transport Department and the franchised bus operators are going to encourage passengers to use these seat belts, it's clearly critical that they are maintained in working order, and that in itself is potentially a massive financial

obligation and a massive time obligation. So there is an issue around maintenance, into continuous maintenance.

I think in my mind the bit that is missing in a lot of this assessment is really the cost/benefit, and really considering the cost of seat belts, and certainly the retrofitting is a huge cost. Even in new buses, the 5,000 pounds is still a fairly significant cost compared with the overall cost of the vehicle.

The key question is what are the benefits of that investment in terms of seat belts, in terms of reducing injuries, compared with how that money could be spent on other safety measures across the network. I think one of the worries is that, you know, the commitment by people like KMB to invest such huge sums of money is credible, it's good, should be welcomed, but the danger is some other technology is waiting to be installed that then can't afford to be installed because the money has been spent on seat belts.

So I think there's a whole piece of work missing here about, for every dollar that's invested in bus safety, are there bigger benefits to be obtained by intelligent speed adaptation/assistance, autonomous braking, front-end design, can that money be spent more wisely on other things? And I think the worry is once

the money has been spent on this, it's been spent.

Ultimately, from my understanding of the system in Hong Kong, this money can only come from three places. It can either come from the existing profits of the franchised bus operators -- although I have read some evidence that suggests that's not great -- it can come from the passengers in terms of increased fares, or it can come from the government; it's got to come from one of those three sources.

So there's a question about can that money be spent in a better way and get stronger results? If we added up all those figures, it's a significant amount of money, and I would question whether it could be spent on other forms of technology that would get better results.

However, I think just drawing on a bit of a difference between London and Hong Kong which I think is significant -- the decision -- TfL appear to be saying they are not really considering seat belts, but London is a very flat environment. There are very, very few roads where buses can run above 40 or 50 miles an hour. Buses generally don't go on expressways or motorways in London, so most buses are what you would term urban in London, where clearly in Hong Kong you have some quite challenging topography and you have some fast roads. So in my mind, I think I would be looking

at how you deal with those high-risk routes as opposed to a blanket one-size-fits-all in terms of solution.

So I think there could be some routes which are strong candidates for seat belts but it probably needs to be perhaps more selective as opposed to a blanket approach.

As I say, I think I would be interested in asking questions around what is the ongoing maintenance commitment going to be, in ensuring these seat belts are in working order.

CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to move closer to the microphone.

MR MIKE WESTON: In ensuring these seat belts are in working order and are maintained properly, because that's quite rightly, if there is a strong campaign to encourage their use, the public then have a right that those seat belts are working when they get on a franchised bus.

CHAIRMAN: Are you able to give us any idea of the cost of maintenance of seat belts? I am right, am I not, in thinking that they are required to be installed and worn on coaches, in the United Kingdom?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I suspect the challenge in London, if they were on service buses, would be -- the challenge in terms of maintenance would probably be in terms of vandalism and -- well, vandalism of the strap or of people putting things into the holder. So I suspect the

challenge --

CHAIRMAN: Fortunately, in Hong Kong, that's very unlikely to be the problem. Are there any --

MR MIKE WESTON: Which is less of an issue.

CHAIRMAN: -- technical factors about maintenance that might be the problem here?

MR MIKE WESTON: I don't know. But I would be surprised if there wasn't some regular maintenance requirement of seat belts. On coaches in the UK, clearly, probably vandalism is less of an issue or potential vandalism is less of an issue.

Maybe if I can just refer to some interesting TfL data in my submission, which I think was appendix D of my submission, which --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment.

Mr Duncan, can you give us a page number for that? Appendix D.

MR MIKE WESTON: It was the presentation by TfL to myself and the chairman.

MR PETER DUNCAN: 160, we believe, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR MIKE WESTON: There is an early slide of that presentation that --

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a page number for us so we can --

MR MIKE WESTON: I don't. That one there, yes. Backwards,

sorry. Yes, that's it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR MIKE WESTON: This is data for 2017, showing slips, trips and falls on buses: 3,074 in the year 2017. I think it helpfully illustrates that the majority of injuries to passengers on board were those standing, while the vehicle is in motion, while they are boarding or alighting, while they are climbing or going up or down stairs. 13 per cent is seated passengers. So there are about 400 incidents of the 3,000 down to seated passengers, which suggests that perhaps the focus needs to be on -- as much as those, also needs to be on those standing and moving around the bus whilst it's in service.

I think that just hopefully illustrates the sort of breakdown of the injuries in London by what the passenger is doing on the bus at the time.

CHAIRMAN: In the statistics that we have in the forward planning programme, Mr Duncan, KMB, for example, 2018 to 2022, distinguish between people who lose their balance, which is how we describe "slips, trips and falls", from people who are injured in their seat. My memory is that in that year -- though I think, looking at the figures for 2015 and 2016, two years -- 51.5 per cent were standing, or "lost balance" is the way it's put, and

only 1 per cent were injured in their seats, which suggests perhaps a lower rate of injury for seated passengers.

MR PETER DUNCAN: That does accord with my recollection, Mr Chairman, but I will ask my assistant to try and turn up the FPP reference to that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

One of the other issues that will arise if one was addressing this as a topic -- as required by the LegCo members in this panel, please have a look at seat belts, as you have seen -- would presumably be, first of all, what damage happens if you are not wearing a seat belt, and from the figures I have just quoted, the main damage appears to be people standing up or moving down staircases, moving around the bus, as opposed to people seated at seats, which seems to be small.

The other issue would be the usage of existing seat belts on a bus, and would it not be sensible to have some kind of survey to get empirical data about the actual usage, rather than the managing director of Citybus, who did tell us that he was a passenger on buses frequently, say, "Nobody wears them"? Would it not be sensible to have empirical data?

MR MIKE WESTON: It would be very easy to do, I would have thought, from perhaps CCTV observations and sampling of

a certain number of journeys. It would be probably quite an easy thing to come up with, a current usage rate.

But I would hope that if a decision to fit the seat belts carries forward, there would be a strong campaign, a publicity/marketing campaign, to encourage their use, because at the end of the day, once the decision has been taken to make that investment, let's hope that at least the effort is then put in to maximise the benefit from that investment.

But, as the data from TfL shows, it probably supports the case in Hong Kong that that's not the biggest issue in terms of passengers on board a vehicle.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps another factor would be to conduct a survey asking people if, because the authority thought and the bus company thought it would be a safe thing to do, to install seat belts, "Would you be prepared to use them? What's your willingness to use them?"

Such a survey was conducted back in 2007, I think. Perhaps Mr Duncan can find that reference. 2,200 people were called up by telephone is my memory.

MR MIKE WESTON: I suspect, Chair, that there is a danger with that question, in how it's asked, that people will give the answer that they are expected to give.

CHAIRMAN: The opposite of the question asked at the

referendum about Brexit.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. "Of course I would wear the seat belt", but their actions in practice may be different.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR MIKE WESTON: That's the challenge with one of those sorts of questions.

CHAIRMAN: I understand, but I assume it was done professionally, since the Transport Department quoted the statistic.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. But again, it goes back -- I'm not sitting here saying that the seat belts are necessarily a bad idea. My question is can that amount of money which has been quoted this afternoon be spent in a more cost-effective -- in a more beneficial way and result in greater benefits in terms of injuries to passengers and other road users. That's the question.

CHAIRMAN: Your concern is that if the money is spent and the pot is emptied, then money that might have been more usefully, more beneficially, spent on other aspects of safety will not actually be available to be spent?

MR MIKE WESTON: Exactly, and where we currently are, the operators have made a financial commitment for future years and could that financial commitment get greater benefits somewhere else?

CHAIRMAN: Just let me explain. We are going to take

a short adjournment, and the reason for that is that Prof Lo has a commitment elsewhere that he must keep, but we are going to continue with our hearing and Prof Lo will have available not only the transcript of the proceedings but also the audio tape. But it is necessary now for us to take a short adjournment while Prof Lo is able to leave.

So we will take two or three minutes. Thank you.

(3.40 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(3.44 pm)

(In the absence of Prof Lo)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Duncan.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I am actually going to leave the topic of seat belts now, Mr Weston.

CHAIRMAN: Were you able to turn up the figures that I had in mind?

MR PETER DUNCAN: Not precisely, Mr Chairman, no, I'm afraid. Once we do locate what we think is being referred to, we will bring that to the committee's attention.

CHAIRMAN: I think they are on the screen.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I'm not sure that gives the

distinction that Mr Chairman was referring to. It's certainly got the loss of balance of 54 per cent.

CHAIRMAN: There we are: loss of balance, 54 per cent; injury to passenger inside bus, that's 3 per cent.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And that I understand to mean the seated passenger, because that's the distinction between someone who has loss of balance.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Yes. I understand.

CHAIRMAN: To all events, it's a very marked difference in the small number of people injured while seated, although for obvious reasons there must have been a basis for installing seat belts on exposed seats. So the seat belts on the upper deck, at the front, I think came about because people were projected out of the bus. So at some stage a rail was put there, I think earlier, and then seat belts.

Then there are obvious places seated in the lower deck where there is no obstacle immediately in front of you, so if you are seated with another seat in front of you, you haven't got very far to go, and that seems to have been the rationale to that limited use.

MR PETER DUNCAN: I will just give you the reference to that page, Mr Chairman, which is now being shown. It's KMB-12, page 5115.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: So, subject to any other comments or questions, Mr Weston, I'm going to move away from seat belts and actually move to the final topic that I've got that I wish to explore with you.

That arises from page 149 of your report. I beg your pardon, it's page 146 initially. It's the issue of fatigue management, which we can see on page 146, in the introduction to the bus safety programme, was a recent addition to the bus safety programme. I would like just to ask you a few matters about this.

At page 149, at paragraph 7.6, you say in the last paragraph:

"It is also clear that there has ... been a shift towards 'behavioural safety' such as fatigue management."

Could you give the committee the benefit of your information with regard to that shift, and what is constituted by "behavioural safety"?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think the shift is that traditionally safety management has been around risk assessments, accident investigation, and often coming up with physical changes to either bus design or to suggested changes to road layout or changes to working practices.

One of the things that's certainly come out as part of the bus safety programme -- and it came out very strongly when the chairman and myself were meeting the London operators in August -- is that operators are now trying to dig further down into what the root causes of incidents may have been, and as part of that looking at the sort of behavioural impact of drivers.

An example in terms of fatigue management may be if a driver has an accident, traditionally the driver would have been interviewed, and the questions very much would have around what happened at the time of the accident, what were the factors, was the driver a contributory factor in the accident, very much focused on the incident itself.

What a lot of the operators are starting to do -- and we saw examples -- is starting to look beyond the accident and the incident itself, starting to talk to drivers about what was happening perhaps half an hour before, had they had any conflicts with passengers that may have acted as -- may have not been a direct impact on the accident but it was a distraction with them, if they had had an argument with a passenger maybe half an hour before; talking to drivers about their lifestyle. What one operator noticed, from some analysis they had done, is that often a lot of their

longer-serving drivers who had a very good safety records were far more conscientious about turning up for work early, giving themselves plenty of time to check their bus before they went into service, perhaps go to the toilet before they go into service, perhaps have a cup of tea before they go into service. So often these drivers were more conscientious about turning up on time, and in some interviews they had done -- and also more conscientious about making sure they went to bed at the right time the night before.

So operators appear to be broadening out their thinking about how they look at safety from investigating the incident itself and the factors around that incident, to a broader looking at driver behaviour and the impact that may have on fatigue. There are examples in bus companies whereby every night bus driver has a regular interview around their shift patterns and anything that might impact on their ability to drive at night.

So it's a sort of shift away, in simple terms, from investigating incidents, to try to look at driver behaviour more broadly.

CHAIRMAN: In that context, as I recall, questions asked about why you want to be a night-time driver: is it because you are delivering children to school and

picking them up during the day, so that in fact you are not actually getting a proper, sustained rest; you are looking after family and doing a full-time job?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and there were concerns expressed by some bus companies that one of the reasons they do regularly interview night bus drivers is to make sure that their work-life balance is right, and obviously a lot of pressure in big cities like London where drivers may have to share family responsibilities with their partners, to take children to school, then get home, then perhaps have three or four hours' rest before picking them up and then going to drive at night. So companies are very conscious of making sure that they understood more about a driver's ability to do the types of shift they were being asked to do, which I think is a new approach than has traditionally been the case.

MR PETER DUNCAN: To what extent is fatigue management made part of the training of bus drivers?

MR MIKE WESTON: Probably not as much as -- probably not that much, historically, and I think there are opportunities for a lot of this work to actually up the sort of interaction around the whole issue of fatigue management.

I personally don't think it's around bus drivers' hours. I think perhaps -- the danger is that the amount

that bus drivers drive could be again another quick reaction to a problem, a bit like seat belts. I don't really think that's the issue. I think the drivers' hours and regulations in the UK are pretty well established. There is no suggestion that they allow excessive driving hours. It's about making sure drivers take enough rest between their shifts and they are not doing other jobs, although most London bus operators weren't overly worried about secondary employment, but a lot of them did have processes in place to check that drivers weren't undertaking secondary employment.

But I think this whole issue of fatigue management, and also supporting drivers in getting enough rest and living the right lifestyle to do the job, is just becoming more of a focus.

CHAIRMAN: Bus companies in London have access to the register, if that's the right name, of drivers who are allowed to drive minicabs and Uber, and so on; is that correct?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So TfL, Transport for London, is the licensing authority for taxis and private-hire drivers and vehicles, and so they are able to share that database with the bus operators, so the bus operators can satisfy themselves that some drivers aren't also driving for minicab companies as a way of boosting their

income, because I think most bus companies see, quite rightly, that bus driving is a primary job and if you are full time it should be your only job, because you should be resting the rest of your time.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in recalling that some bus companies have some kind of limited checking of that information, surveillance of some kind?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I think most of the checking tends to be reactive, reactive to incidents or to information that's received. So very few companies do blanket checking of whether the drivers are doing other things, but it will be in response to certain incidents, like, for example, if a driver is off sick, sometimes they get information to suggest the driver is working somewhere else, and they will then follow that up with their own internal investigation.

But, in summary, I think we are just seeing a shift from investigations very, very focused on the incident itself to try and look at the root causes, and trying to dig down more into what some of the root causes of accidents may be. Where traditionally and historically there's probably been very much a culture of -- were we as the bus company blameworthy or not blameworthy, and that's almost been the point where the investigation has ended, "Our driver wasn't blameworthy, it was the third

party, there's a financial claim against the third party, that's investigation finished."

I slightly exaggerate to make the point, but I think what's happening now is there is more work going into identifying the root causes, and some of those root causes may only be small contributory factors but from that you can learn things that allow you to improve the safety culture and the safety practices.

CHAIRMAN: Where is the initiative coming from in this gradual change of approach to fatigue management?

MR MIKE WESTON: It's coming from the renewed focus of Transport for London to improved safety, and I think the operators see that as a joint responsibility. I don't think the bus operators in London have ever been dismissive of safety management, and it's a constant journey that in reality you will never finish because you can always become safer and safer. In our discussions in London in August, I think it was the managing director of Go-Ahead London was saying that when he joined as a apprentice probably 35 to 40 years ago, the biggest risk was people slipping over in garages because they were covered in diesel oil. That risk was eliminated years ago. So it's just a case of bus companies having to become more and more sophisticated to reduce the risk even further in

operational areas.

So I think it's a constant process but everybody is becoming more focused and more sophisticated.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Does Transport for London govern the training of bus drivers or is that left entirely to the bus operators?

MR MIKE WESTON: There are two key aspects to training. There's the driving test itself, which is a Department for Transport national requirement. So, to get a public service vehicle driving licence, you have to undergo a driving test which is undertaken by either the government agency, the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency, or a lot of bus companies will have dedicated examiners, so they will have their own examiners who can self-test but obviously are overseen to maintain standards.

Once you have your driving licence, every bus driver in the UK, and it applies -- it's European legislation -- has to do five days of accredited training every five years. Most bus companies will have a day's accredited training each year, and that is to maintain a bus driver's certificate of professional competence.

So those requirements apply to all bus and coach drivers across the whole of the UK, not just to London.

What London then does, it requires certain training courses to be undertaken, and the main one is an accredited qualification, accredited by an organisation called City and Guilds, which is called Professional Bus Driving in London, and it is a course that drivers must complete within one year of becoming a London bus driver, and they must complete that accredited training.

In addition, TfL has also developed some training that's been part of the five days of accredited training. So I refer in my report to one called In The Zone, which was a half-day training course that we developed, which was then delivered by bus company trainers to all bus drivers, and it was effectively a training course that used videos to show how drivers manage and assess risk, and basically it was a series of videos that took a bus driver through a typical morning and showed you different outcomes depending on how they had assessed risks during that half-hour prior to an accident and various incidents that took place. It was trying to illustrate that your behaviour and your risk assessment as you are driving can dramatically affect the outcome. So that was a half-day's training.

Then, more recently, they have undertaken something called Hello London which is a two-day training that all

25,000 bus drivers in London have been through, and this was centrally organised and delivered by Transport for London. This was about trying to enhance customer experience and customer satisfaction, because one of the key areas where Transport for London and the bus operators were being criticised was around driver interaction with customers and the customer satisfaction with bus drivers.

So it was very much aimed at trying to improve the interaction and the customer service drivers gave to passengers.

CHAIRMAN: What was this course called?

MR MIKE WESTON: It was called Hello London, and it was delivered to a group of 100 drivers at a time, and it took two years to complete all 25,000 bus drivers. It was delivered by a small team of actors using interactive training. So they would play out a scenario and they would get drivers to comment on how they may have handled that differently.

It didn't specifically have a direct link to safety, but fair to say that because it was trying to get drivers to interact with passengers more positively and to manage difficult situations with passengers -- I mean, one of the views is that if drivers can become less stressed and agitated by the way in which they deal

with passengers, then hopefully they are less distracted when they are driving the vehicle after that incident or that interaction. So there is a link to safety because I think it was trying to help drivers deal with difficult situations and to defuse situations from becoming more difficult.

CHAIRMAN: So this would include the abusive/aggressive bus passenger?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and one of the scenarios in the training is how you deal with that type of passenger, and the way to deal with it is not to necessarily react, and certainly not to get out of your cab and talk to the person. It's to try and pull back from it and hopefully, in most cases, that passenger will then board the bus and move on. And that becomes a distraction. That becomes a distraction to your focus on driving, so ...

CHAIRMAN: This was a course provided -- structured by Transport for London?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, structured by Transport for London, accredited with the accreditation agency, so it counted towards bus drivers' CPC, certificate of professional competence training, and in this case delivered centrally by Transport for London contractors. So it was a big commitment. But it was also trying to

achieve -- one of the other criticisms from passengers often is inconsistency between drivers, and it was trying to achieve more consistency in how drivers deal with situations and how drivers deal with passengers.

As part of the bus safety programme there is the intention to have another safety-related course, centrally delivered and centrally accredited, as part of the bus safety programme, I think sometime in 2019.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, the course was structured so that actors acted out a particular script, and the group of drivers were asked to respond to it? Is that how it was done?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. There were various scenes, and the first scene of day one was a driver coming into the garage. He asked to swap his shift in a week's time because he's got a family commitment. The supervisor is very dismissive of his request. He then has an argument with the supervisor, then gets on the bus, then drives the bus, and then a passenger gets on, but because he's in a bad mood a fairly minor situation becomes a bigger issue with a passenger.

So, initially, interestingly, a lot of the drivers sit there -- so when the actors say to the drivers, "Would you have dealt with that differently?", initially the reaction often is, "No, the supervisor was wrong,

they should have been more friendly or more helpful and the passenger could have been nicer or more polite", and then slowly they bring the drivers around to say, "I suppose if we had done this differently and that differently, maybe the outcome would have changed", and then the actors re-act that scene, taking on board those suggestions. It's trying to show that, yes, it might be somebody else's fault but you can change the outcome and you can influence what happens, and it is quite interesting to observe, to see how drivers come around to a different way of thinking, because their initial reaction often is that everybody else is at fault, "There's nothing I could have done better", but that changes.

CHAIRMAN: Is the, as it were, syllabus of this course available in written form?

MR MIKE WESTON: It should be. We can certainly find out. It's been accredited by independent accreditation agency for the CPC, but I would be very surprised if Transport for London weren't willing to share it with the committee anyway.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we might invite you to make those enquiries.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Just as a template of the kind of issues.

Obviously local characteristics would present a different script, but it might be that the formula might be similar, or at least consideration could be given to it.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I will make the request.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Do we see some details with regard to the In The Zone training and the Hello London initiative on pages 144 and 145 of your report?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Just going back to the question of fatigue management, can I bring your attention to page 146 and the last paragraph on that page, when I think, during the course of your preparation for your report, you had discussions with London bus operators and witnessed a demonstration of a driving fatigue monitoring system called Seeing Machines, and you've given details of that in that paragraph.

Has this actually been implemented by the bus operators yet, or is this something which is still under trial?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. This is one of the trials that has -- it's been trialled by a bus operator, in this case it was RATP, and as part of -- and it's being assessed by TfL to consider whether it should feature in their bus safety standard. So I think, as part of the safety

innovation fund, there were two trials of fatigue management. There was the Seeing Machines and there was another system that whilst it detected when drivers' eyes were starting to close and it vibrated their seat and it alerted the control room, it didn't video the incident, so it was very difficult then to retrospectively talk to the driver about what was happening because it wasn't capturing a video of the situation. With this system, it actually keeps the videos and captures the video of the driver, so it's far easier to engage and have a discussion with the driver.

The intention of the discussion is to move the discussion into fatigue management, "The video suggests you were starting to nod off and go to sleep; is there any reason why that might be the case?" It might prompt a discussion about some medical condition that perhaps a driver hasn't declared. It's a useful way to create a dialogue with the driver about their lifestyle.

So, from the various things trialled, this seemed to be one of the stronger systems in terms of monitoring driver fatigue.

CHAIRMAN: And this facility had a real-time function as well, did it not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So that the image that was captured was sent to

a control room, I think in the United States?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the controller in the United States would then contact the control room in the bus company, who communicated a real-time alert to the driver?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. Clearly, if the driver had at that point fallen asleep, then that sequence of events wouldn't stop any subsequent accident, but the idea is that somebody in the central control room verifies that it is a fatigue incident and then prompts the bus company to speak to the driver as soon as possible to either ask them if there is any issues and certainly interview them when they return to the garage, to assess what the causes might have been.

As it says on the bottom of that page, the operator has observed a 25 per cent reduction in incidents since May on that one route, so quite a significant result and quite a significant benefit.

MR PETER DUNCAN: At present, are there any fatigue monitoring systems in place in London buses?

MR MIKE WESTON: Only the trials. Only the trials. But we will --

CHAIRMAN: But they are available or used, are they not, on the Croydon tram?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. They were fitted to -- I think it was

the same system, if I recall, Seeing Machines, was fitted to the Croydon trams following an incident, a serious accident, last year, I think it was, or the year before, and a lot of long-distance coaches have similar systems. I think National Express have a similar system for driver fatigue, partly because probably driving on an expressway, motorway, at a constant speed, there is more chance of fatigue. So it's become the norm in that industry, but it will be interesting to see whether TfL, once they have gone through their cost/benefits analysis, these various options, decide this is one that should feature in their basket of proposals for their bus safety standard.

CHAIRMAN: The Croydon tram accident happened at the very early morning, did it not, around 5 o'clock in the morning or something like that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, very early. It was a change of speed limit, so the speed limit going down from I think 50 miles per hour to 30 or something like that, and the driver not observing the speed limit on a fairly tight curve on the system.

CHAIRMAN: So the issue really is whether or not there might be a difference between coach drivers on long, boring motorways, tram drivers in the early hours of the morning going down a track, compared with a bus driver

having to stop every 300 or 400 yards, you wouldn't expect him to be going to sleep; is that the distinction?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think that's the distinction, but then there are times of the day, even for a London bus driver, where early in the morning, it's not as busy, you might not be stopping at many stops, nighttime drivers, in certain directions it can be a lot quieter. So there are situations -- you would naturally assume there is so much going on on a London road or even here in Hong Kong that you wouldn't have time to nod off, but I think there are times when you can be -- it can be a lot quieter and maybe those situations could occur.

CHAIRMAN: But the RATP driver was driving an urban bus route, was he not, and demonstrably going to sleep?

MR MIKE WESTON: He was. We saw the video.

But I think what the report at this point is trying to do is say there is a whole host of technologies and solutions out there, but they need to be properly assessed, and the judgment needs to be made about which ones will offer the best benefit, because ultimately it would perhaps be naive to assume that you could adopt all these technologies on every bus. It's clearly not going to be financially feasible. So it's a case of making sure there is a proper assessment to select the

ones that offer the maximum benefit in terms of reducing both passenger injuries but also injuries to third parties, pedestrians, cyclists, et cetera. That's what I think from my review of TfL's bus safety programme they are trying to achieve. They are trying to really go through quite a thorough cost/benefit analysis, to make sure that the money they've got or the money they need to find is spent in the best possible way.

CHAIRMAN: You have read Prof Stanley's report and you will be aware that that is the analysis, even down to the cost of life, that they undergo in Australia, before they determine whether or not it is worth this device which has these benefits, but there aren't very many people who will help and therefore perhaps it's not worth it; cost/benefit analysis to determine all these things.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, and the Department for Transport in the UK publish those figures for cost of life, cost of major injury, so you can build those costs, because those are the wider costs/benefits to society. So clearly the cost of saving a fatality is a cost to lots of people; it's a saving to the NHS or the hospital services. So, yes, it's capturing those costs and those wider benefits.

CHAIRMAN: And, at the end of the day, you choose the device

that delivers most for the cost and delivers most benefit for the cost.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. The logic would be, if you've tested ten different systems and you understand the cost/benefit, you can rank them in order of cost/benefit and ultimately you can go down that list as far as you can afford in terms of the funding you have available. I think that's ultimately what the bus safety programme in London will do.

CHAIRMAN: And, as you say, the money comes either from profits, government, or fares?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. It's got to come from one of those three. It's got to either come from -- in London's case, it's either got to come from fares revenue, from the transport authority or from reduced profits of the bus companies.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, that really completes the matters that I was going to explore with Mr Weston.

CHAIRMAN: There is one other matter that looms large in the Transport for London approach, and that is speed limits, which we see no consideration of in what is being undergone in Hong Kong at the moment. Perhaps you could set us the scene.

And if you, Mr Duncan, can locate any material that goes to this issue, perhaps in the material relating to

London.

As I understand it, there is a digital map of London roads and speed limits, is there not?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And 20 miles an hour limits are in green, and the map is green, is it not, now?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. There's been a trend across the 32 London boroughs to implement more and more 20 mile per hour zones across large residential areas. So 20 miles per hour equates to about 32 kilometres per hour. So we are seeing more and more roads becoming 20 mile per hour speed limited. Most other roads will be 30 or 40, and perhaps a few 50. But in terms of bus routes in London, very few bus routes would operate on roads with a higher than 50 mile per hour speed limit. The majority will be less than that.

I think one of the challenges is around appropriate speed. The speed limit -- you could argue that for a large bus, a speed limit of 30 miles per hour may be the limit. It may not be the appropriate speed for that piece of road at that particular time. So it's trying to educate drivers to be aware of appropriate speed limits -- sorry, appropriate speed as opposed to just the speed limit.

CHAIRMAN: The appropriate speed for the section of road on

which the vehicle is being driven?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, which could -- the appropriate speed could vary by time of day, depending on --

CHAIRMAN: And does, in London, when schools are encountered alongside the roads, the speed limit changes for the time that the school comes out? Or perhaps there are signs telling you what the speed limit is, reminding you?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, I think there might be reminders of speed limits, and there are often by schools warning signs that activate during the school periods but not actually change the speed limits.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Given that in Hong Kong, as you are aware, we have parts of Hong Kong that are urbanly dense, with many pedestrians on the sidewalk immediately adjacent to where traffic is moving, buses are plying. With that scenario, in London, are there now limits of 20 miles an hour in streets that match that description?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. Some of the major Central London roads now have 20 mile per hour limits. So it's not just residential roads; it is some of the sort of -- I think, in the text on the screen at the moment, it talks about March 2015 trials, including Clapham High Street, which is a major thoroughfare.

CHAIRMAN: The ISA test on those two routes that you described earlier involved traversing 20 mile an hour zones, did it not, even back then in 2015-16?

MR MIKE WESTON: It did, and the results of that trial was that it was having -- the ISA trial on buses, 20 mile per hour zones was having a greater impact on other vehicle average speeds. So you tended to find that when the limit was 30, the average speed of other vehicles went down a lot less than when the limit was 20. So it was tending -- the slower bus was tending to slow other traffic down more as well, in greater proportion than it was on a 30 mile per hour road.

CHAIRMAN: I think it was described as a platoon or a convoy?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. One of the worries, when that trial was done, was if you start to flow the following traffic down, does some of the following traffic then start to take risks in terms of trying to overtake the bus, trying to nip past it at bus stops in dangerous situations, but from my reading of the report, there was no evidence of that. There was no evidence that it made other traffic behave any differently.

So, in practice, there was -- certainly in 20 mile per hour zones, restricting buses to 20 miles per hour could be a good way of helping enforce the speed limit

on other vehicles, because it would force other vehicles to slow down.

CHAIRMAN: And the risk assessment that relates to the likelihood of serious injury or fatalities related to speed of buses shows that it falls significantly, does it not, as one goes down the speed limits, 40 miles an hour, 30 miles an hour, 20 miles an hour?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, I can't remember the exact ratios but clearly, the chances of being killed if you are hit by a bus at 25 or 30 miles an hour is significantly greater than if it's at 10 or 18 miles an hour. That would be the same for other vehicles, but with buses, as I think we've said this morning, the front of a bus is less forgiving perhaps than a car, if it's involved in an incident with a pedestrian or a cyclist.

CHAIRMAN: And the mass of the bus is quite different.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: One question. What's the feedback from the bus captains in terms of dealing with multiple speed limits? Are they expressing concerns of having to deal with too many speed limits?

MR MIKE WESTON: I'm not aware of anything, and partly because a lot of these 20 mile per hour limits have gone into wide areas on a blanket basis, so it's not as if the speed limit is constantly changing. The chairman

and myself saw some technology system called Mobileye that actually reminds the driver of the speed limit as it picks up speed limit signs painted on the road or on signage and then reminds him in his or her cab that that's the speed limit.

CHAIRMAN: So the camera reads the speed limit sign and then reproduces it on a dial in front of the driver?

MR MIKE WESTON: A dial, to act as a reminder. It could be that the driver didn't notice that speed limit sign because he was looking the other way at that point.

The map on the screen now is the one that the chairman was referring to in terms of --

CHAIRMAN: And I'm right in remembering that green was the 20 mile --

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So you see a lot of inner London is 20 miles per hour, apart from a few major corridor through that area, and I suspect that will change -- that map will continue to get greener and greener.

CHAIRMAN: Have the statistics showed any positive change, correlation to serious injuries and fatalities as a result of lower speeds, or not, or not yet?

MR MIKE WESTON: Not yet, although I think if I recall the last quarter for TfL, they quoted to us that they had had no fatalities in the quarter.

CHAIRMAN: I think that's the first quarter of 2018?

MR MIKE WESTON: Which is the first time for a long time that they had had a quarter with no fatalities. So --

CHAIRMAN: The second quarter proved the dangers of being complacent because they had six fatalities.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, but I think the average running rate is still lower than the previous year. It takes a long time to build those proper, robust trends, I think.

CHAIRMAN: Has there been any impact on the time that journeys take, or is London so congested it makes no difference?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think there's been bigger factors affecting the time the journeys take as opposed to the speed limit, because there has been -- certainly in Central London, there's been a lot of roadworks connected with the introduction of cycle lanes and cycle superhighways, and a lot of construction work has had a real impact on average bus speeds, and that's slowed the bus network down certainly in Central London, more so than the 20 mile per hour limit.

I think there's a lot of those corridors where even today, if drivers could go 20 miles per hour, they would be quite happy.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking that the average speed of traffic is 9.2 miles per hour?

MR MIKE WESTON: 9.2 in Central London, so the average is

very low.

CHAIRMAN: Is that an aspect of road safety enhancement, franchised bus enhancement safety, that Hong Kong should look at, speed limits?

MR MIKE WESTON: I think the answer to that question is somebody should probably first understand what the average speed is and what the range of speeds are. I think, in London, just to clarify, these 20 mile per hour speed limits apply to all vehicles, not just buses. So they apply to all road vehicles.

First, I would suggest there is a case of understanding what the average speeds are on certain sections of road to understand the extent of the problem. I would suggest that probably greater benefits would come from reducing -- if there was a desire to reduce the average speed of all vehicles on a section of road as opposed to just buses, I think just to differentiate it between buses and other vehicles would probably be very difficult and quite challenging and I suspect the benefits would be greater from actually reducing the speed of all vehicles on sections of road.

But I think it's probably a case of first understanding what the issue is and what the problem is.

CHAIRMAN: And, like these other issues that we have discussed today, this is a matter where one needs to

obtain information first of all, as you have just described, average speeds, and so on, and then ultimately apply a cost/benefit analysis, the cost of, if traffic is going to move slower, and then the benefit?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, because the logic is, if you do slow all the bus routes down because you don't go as fast, then to run the same frequency you potentially need more buses and more drivers, so there's a cost to that, and it's back to the earlier point, is that more beneficial than fitting other safety features to the buses? It's trying to take an overview of all the options that are available and making an informed choice of all those, as opposed to perhaps picking certain things off one at a time. I think, if you do the latter approach, there is a danger you make some of the wrong decisions.

CHAIRMAN: For how long has this reduced speed limit of 20 miles an hour, as opposed to the normal 30 miles an hour speed limit in urban areas -- for how long has that been available as an option for local authorities?

MR MIKE WESTON: I don't know exactly but I would say between about five and ten years, and it's available to all local authorities across the UK, not just London. But I would say about five to ten years. It's relatively new.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think we have on the screen "January 2013" -- I think this is some kind of a publication by the circular, by the Department for Transport --

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- telling local authorities what they can do, and the circumstances in which it would be appropriate.

MR MIKE WESTON: But initially, my personal recollection, it was intended to be very selective on selected pieces of road, in response to maybe the presence of a school or some other incident, and now we are starting to see more local authorities effectively doing wider blanket 20 mile per hour zones as opposed to individual pieces of road. So we are seeing -- and that's probably because people are starting to learn that actually the impact of it on journey times is pretty marginal, but the safety benefits potentially are great --

CHAIRMAN: You mentioned that it can be now found on major London roads. You gave Clapham High Street as one. What of inner London, Regent Street, Oxford Street, roads like that?

MR MIKE WESTON: I'm not sure. I'm fairly confident that the road outside the TfL offices in Southwark is a 20 mile per hour zone, which is Blackfriars Road -- I think that's 20, for example. So it is on quite a few major roads but I'm not sure about Oxford Street.

In Oxford Street, I think if you were able to go 20 miles per hour you would be doing very well; it's a very congested road.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Duncan, is there anything arising from the topic that I --

MR PETER DUNCAN: Can I just give you a few references for matters that have come up recently.

First of all, Department for Transport setting local speed limits, you will find that at SEC-3 at page 1003. There was the earlier sheet from the "Safe London streets: our approach" document, October 2015, headed "Travelling too fast", and the statement that "A 1 mile per hour reduction in speed could reduce the frequency of collisions by around 6 per cent in urban areas", that can be found at MISC-3 at 987.

Then Mr Chairman also referred to --

CHAIRMAN: And that document is entitled "Reduction in speed", is it?

MR PETER DUNCAN: The overall document is called, "Safe London streets: our approach".

CHAIRMAN: Is this a Transport for London publication?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, it is. The major heading on page 986 is "Our priorities", and then the first priority is "Travelling too fast".

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Then you had referred earlier to a preliminary passenger survey in May 2007 to gauge the views of bus passengers on the wearing of seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR PETER DUNCAN: And that involving some 2,000 respondents. You will find that at SEC-1, page 295.

CHAIRMAN: Could we just put that on the screen so that Mr Weston can see what I was referring to.

MR PETER DUNCAN: It's paragraph 7.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. As you say, Mr Weston, it depends on what the question was.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for those.

Are there any other matters, Mr Duncan?

MR PETER DUNCAN: No, Mr Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Weston, are there any final matters that you would like to draw to our attention?

MR MIKE WESTON: No. I think the only thing that we hadn't talked about was incentivisation of contracts, financial incentivisation.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.

MR MIKE WESTON: I think that was the only other area that I'm surprised you hadn't raised.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for raising that. The issue, broadly speaking, is this. Is incentivising safety indicators

likely to be neutral, positive or negative to enhancing safety of buses? So rewards to companies for performing well in safety-related indicators, is that likely to enhance safety of buses?

MR MIKE WESTON: In my report, I make the observation that some concerns -- and there were concerns expressed by the bus operators, interestingly, as well, whether direct financial incentives potentially drive the wrong behaviours in a bus company and potentially reduce information-sharing and collaboration with their peer group.

But I think, stepping back slightly from that, I think I would suggest that -- firstly, I think operators in London have always taken safety seriously anyway, so I think the question is what behaviours are you trying to change from a financial incentive, and I think where it becomes difficult is when you start paying a financial incentive for improvements in safety performance, but an operator is still having accidents, because effectively you then end up with a slightly perverse situation that, yes, your safety performance has improved this year compared with last year, but this year you perhaps still had three fatalities and 80 serious injuries and here is your financial bonus for this year. It seems rather a strange link to make.

Now, clearly the other way of doing it is you just have pure deductions for safety performance. Now, the danger with that is if an operator feels they can't influence that safety performance quick enough, then they will just build those deductions into their original contract price to mitigate the impact.

So I think there is a whole host of concerns around directly linking financial incentives to the bus contracts. I think that's supported by TfL in their document about the bus route tendering process dated 2015, where they explain why they don't think the financial incentive would be right.

I think, on the other hand, there could be potential for other sorts of incentives. The obvious one in my mind is does the eligibility for the two-year extension at the end of the first five years -- does that eligibility -- at the moment, it's only related to reliability -- could it be related to some trend in safety performance over the previous five years, for example? So there could be some other ways of incentivising operators as not directly financial. I think I have some big reservations about making financial incentives to do with safety because I think it just feels like the wrong approach, because you are either still paying people bonuses who are still having

accidents or you are making deductions that they just build into their contract.

But maybe there are some other ways and the one that springs to mind is you are only eligible for a two-year extension if your safety performance in years 3 and 4 of the original contract have showed some positive trends, for example. That could be quite a strong incentive to operators. So it's not directly linked to financial reward.

CHAIRMAN: You use the word "incentives" but you have in mind deductions as well?

MR MIKE WESTON: It could be.

CHAIRMAN: So, to deal with the situation you posit, of giving somebody an incentive/reward for having only killed three people this year rather than six last year as being a strange way of doing it, the other way of doing that would be a deduction: "If you kill anybody, we deduct"?

MR MIKE WESTON: It could be. I think, again, you've got to make sure that over a reasonable period of time an operator has some chance of influencing that trend. Otherwise, if I am bidding for a contract for five years and I don't believe I can significantly change that trend over the period of five years, I will build that deduction or the cost of that deduction into my original

contract price, because it's a cost I know I will probably pick up during that five-year period.

So I think an incentive has got to drive a behaviour but it has also got to be realistically achievable, which is perhaps why, if I was asked by TfL to think what I would do, I would maybe think they are coming up with a safety performance indicator, this score for each operator, you possibly could link an improved trend in that score to the contract extension. That could be a way of incentivising operators.

CHAIRMAN: As things stand, the primary driving force for the extension is whether or not, am I correct in thinking, the reliability performance is being delivered?

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. So, if an operator meets the minimum performance standard or the extension criteria which is slightly better than the minimum performance, as I understand it, they would be eligible for an extension.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR MIKE WESTON: The other incentive that already exists -- and again we talked about it this morning -- is that ultimately, because there is a rolling programme of route tendering, ultimately the incentive to perform well from a safety perspective is constantly there

because if you don't, it is very easy for Transport for London to stop awarding you contracts for a period of time, and we discussed the example this morning of where that had occurred.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that.

Are there any other matters you wanted to raise?

MR MIKE WESTON: No, Chair.

CHAIRMAN: In which case --

MR PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, may I be permitted to raise just one matter arising from that?

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR PETER DUNCAN: There has been some discussion during the course of the hearing as to incentivisation of the drivers by the bus companies for safety performance. Do you have any views on that?

MR MIKE WESTON: Again, I think it has to be meaningful, and it has to be well within the driver's control, and again, during our discussions in August, there was one company that used to have a direct driver incentive, but had consolidated it into their base pay at some point because they felt it had outgrown its usefulness and it wasn't really having any impact.

I think it could, but the measures need to be very meaningful to drivers, and also need to be designed in such a way that if a driver is involved in an incident,

it then doesn't become a disincentive, "Because I've lost my bonus for the year." So again it's trying to calibrate it correctly.

But I think, during the discussions with operators, there seemed to be bit of a move away from directly incentivising drivers in terms of safety.

CHAIRMAN: One operator had a system, did they not, where the bus driver got some relatively small reward, perhaps 50 pounds, I think it was, but his name went forward into a hat and after nine months, all the drivers who had won the driver of the month award were in the draw, and the winner of the draw got a car, a new car?

MR MIKE WESTON: A new car. That was funded by the telematics company. Actually, that was quite an interesting incentive because basically each four-weekly period in the garage, a list of the best-performing drivers was put up in the garage and I think it was a 50 pounds shopping voucher that those drivers got. But it's quite a natural thing amongst bus drivers in London, I'm sure it is in Hong Kong, that everyone wants to be considered to be a good driver, so actually having your name on the good drivers list was an incentive almost in itself, and you could argue it almost didn't need to be incentivised. People wanted to be considered to be a good driver. And the car was

relatively small cost in terms of the 2,500 bus drivers that company employed.

CHAIRMAN: But it was an illustration of an incentive directly related to a driver.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes, but wasn't, Chair, a direct incentive into their pay packet or into their wages. It was away from their normal pay and terms and conditions.

MR PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. That was all.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Weston, may we close by inviting you to communicate with us with some addendum to your report, after Transport for London have delivered their bus safety standard, whatever it is they deliver, on 16 October.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That will be of great assistance to us, and any material that you are able to obtain to assist us.

MR MIKE WESTON: Yes. I will also see whether we can obtain the syllabus for the Hello London bus driver training campaign.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

On that note, it remains for the committee to thank you, as Mr Duncan said at the outset, for your report, and for fleshing that out and answering our enquiries in this oral session today. It's been most useful to be able to draw on your experience of so many years working

with buses. It's certainly an assistance to our understanding of the considerations that are relevant to what we might recommend in Hong Kong.

On that note, may we wish you a safe return journey. Thank you.

MR MIKE WESTON: Thank you, Chair.

(4.50 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Thursday, 4 October 2018)

INDEX

PAGE

EXPERT EVIDENCE OF MR MIKE WESTON 1

Examination by MR PETER DUNCAN 1

[Blank Page]

2018 年 9 月 27 日

上午 9 時正恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

羅康錦教授，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

Peter N. Duncan（鄧樂勤）資深大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

Mr Mike Weston，獨立的客運交通顧問

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，Weston 先生，係好多謝你就係由倫敦嚟到香港協助我哋嘅聽證會。你可能都知道我哋就係有律師係協助我哋，佢就會係問你啲問題，我哋委員會亦都會係向你提問嘅，如果啲問題問得唔清楚嘅說話，你就話畀我哋聽，我哋就會確保我哋嘅提問係好準確，我哋就請鄧樂勤資深大律師開始。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。Weston 先生，早晨。我就會--主席頭先所講，多謝你係協助我哋嘅委員會嘅工作，特別係提供畀委員會就有一個書面嘅報告，我哋就係想睇一睇，話請你返去去呢一個嘅報告，就係專家嘅呢個文件夾第 115 頁，就係第一份嘅，就有幾個課題，我就希望同你一齊探討嘅，但係開始之前，我就係想會問一問你嘅問題，係關於你自己嘅背景同埋經驗嘅，同埋就係話你寫個報告嘅時候你自己嗰個身處嗰個身分係點樣樣。

首先，你自己嗰個嘅經驗，我就請你翻開第 118 頁，呢度就係講個背景嘅，第二段就係你話你自己就準備咗呢一個報告，你係一個獨立嘅顧問，就有超過三十年嘅經驗，喺呢個巴士行業裏面，包括就係喺呢一個倫敦運輸局裏面嘅高層人士，同埋就最近就係呢一個巴士總監嘅。

同埋你就跟住就喺附件 A 裏面就有你嘅履歷，所以請我哋去到附件 A，喺第 157 頁。我哋睇到有你自己嘅個人嘅簡歷、最近嘅工作經驗同埋其他嘅專業方面嘅事宜。我哋睇一睇係關於巴士部總監倫敦運輸局，喺呢一段裏面，就 1999 就係 2003 就係講緊呢個巴士基建嘅主管同埋巴士營運主管，你可唔可以話畀我聽？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）巴士基建嘅主管 1999 年我就開始做，之前其實我就主要就係去評估一啲巴士嘅招標，1999 年我就係作為一個巴士基建主管嘅，我係負責一系列嘅事宜，就包括提供呢個巴士基建、巴士站、巴士上蓋同埋巴士站等等，同埋一啲倫敦運輸局嘅其他嘅設施，我哋就係要提供個基建同埋就

係平日嗰個營運，亦都係包括我哋會監管，特別係呢一個工程部同埋工程同埋巴士嘅標準，呢啲一切都係包喺呢一個巴士基建個定義之內。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個亦都冇涵蓋巴士安全嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，冇直接關係嘅，我亦都係負責基建嘅安全，譬如話係巴士站係安全，同埋監察相關嘅事宜，喺2003年我係巴士營運嘅主管，當時我就係負責呢個倫敦巴士網絡嘅安全，去到04年。喺作為巴士基建主管，我都有喺安全都係有一定嘅責任嘅，但係係巴士整體嘅網絡嘅營運嘅安全，我就係2003年先至開始做嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當其時你就係話係巴士營運部嘅主管嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然後營運總監，你頭先就講過，喺成個管理層之中，呢一個喺倫敦運輸局，究竟呢個營運總監個位置係點呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）當其時就一共係三個總監嘅，就係負責就係倫敦運輸局嘅，我自己就係營運總監。就係譬如話巴士合約方面同埋另外一個財務嘅總監，佢就係負責財務嗰方面。我哋就係係向董事總經理去負責嘅，亦都係除咗係倫敦巴士之外，其實都喺倫敦運輸局之外，其他嘅交通運輸其實亦都係有負責嘅，我哋都係向呢一個運輸部主管--運輸部部長負責。

MR DUNCAN：Then, in 2013, you were appointed director of buses. How did that position relate to your previous position as operations director?

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢一個2013年嘅時候，我哋就決定就係將兩個總監就合併咗，就變成一個巴士部總監，佢亦都係負責呢個巴士嘅網絡，亦都係向呢個董事總經理去負責，當然佢亦都有其他嘅責任，包括係其他嘅服務。巴士部總監都係每日嘅呢一個巴士嘅網絡嘅營運係需要負責，同埋係相關嘅合約嘅事宜，每一年嗰個去購買呢個巴士網絡大概係20億嘅英磅嘅，個財政。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你喺第二段你就講過，你亦都係話負責就係提供一個安全嘅網絡嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。正如我頭先所講，我作為巴士部總監，我起初嗰時就係都會負責呢個安全團隊嘅，但係巴士部總監就係一個更加高層嘅職位，我就負責就係確保成個嘅巴士嘅網絡係安全營運嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係2016年離開個機構，9月嘅，之後你就係作為一個嘅獨立顧問去工作，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢一個獨立顧問嘅工作係乜嘢呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我就2016年離開，三十一年喺嗰度服務之後，我就作為一個獨立顧問喇後來，我就主要都係巴士業嘅工作，主要係有兩點，一

個就係關於環保管理，特別係巴士車隊嗰方面，因為其實喺呢方面我都係經驗係好豐富嘅，喺倫敦運輸局做咗咁多年。另外就係巴士嗰個網絡嘅設計同埋呢個專營服務，我哋喺歐洲嘅運輸局當局，我都有同佢哋合作嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。我就請你返番去第 118 頁，就係你個報告裏面嘅。我哋就睇番你係寫呢一個嘅報告嘅背景，我好快咁讀一讀，就喺呢一頁裏面嘅一啲嘅段落，第 1 點就係話呢個係我哋嘅委員會請你寫嘅報告，希望就更加了解就係呢一個倫敦巴士個專營服務系統同埋就係睇下有啲咩嘢良好嘅作法係可以令到香港可以繼續改善我哋嘅做法。我哋其實委員會就已經係睇過呢一個倫敦運輸局喺 2015 年 8 月嘅時候嘅報告，叫做倫敦巴士合約及呢一個嘅招標過程嘅。

然後繼續睇落去，你就有講到，呢度個報告就係有關於呢個規管同埋呢個管治嗰方面，特別係倫敦巴士喺營運同埋管理方面，同埋係我哋亦都係要求就睇下--你睇下香港個專營巴士嗰方面嘅情況。同埋睇番(i)同(ii)之間嘅分別，你就係畀咗啲意見。就睇下香港嘅制度其實係咪是否足夠同埋良好同埋係提供建議，就可以改善香港專營服務同埋安全方面。

最後屘嗰段就係就「報告第 2 至第 5 段就係睇番倫敦嘅公共運輸服務，亦都解釋咗英國巴士業嘅歷史同埋結構，同埋就係睇下嗰個巴士嘅合約制度係點樣做同埋點樣監察。第 6 段就係講到嗰個安全管理。而第 7 個部分就係講到就係而家目前嗰個巴士安全計劃底下嗰個合約巴士營運商係點樣做。第 8 個部分就係講到作者對於呢一個嘅倫敦巴士嘅服務嘅觀察同埋相關嘅服務點樣可以幫助改善香港嘅制度。」

你就講到就兩個嘅制度係有啲嘅分別嘅，即係倫敦同埋香港嘅制度，就係令我哋明白有點樣唔同呢，或者我哋睇一睇，我以下所講，然後我哋再進一步去探討，第 120 頁，你嘅報告第 120 頁，我哋睇到就係呢個乘客嘅人次，喺倫敦，22 億嘅，呢個係 22 億人次嘅，喺巴士方面，喺香港，我就話畀你聽大概係幾多，就唔睇嗰個文件，呢個運房局，THB 第 2 個文件夾 103，就喺香港嘅乘客人次就係 14 億人次，所以呢個就係同呢個人次方面嘅比較。

第二個嘅比較，我想特別提一提就係兩個地方嘅人口，有幾多比例係用公交嘅，我唔肯定你有冇睇過，我哋睇 THB-2 文件冊第 2 頁，喺嗰個註腳，呢個係公交策略，就係由運房局進行嘅，係舊年 6 月進行嘅個研究，我哋睇番嗰個嘅註腳，喺頁裏面。喺新加坡嘅相關嘅機構，運輸局，2014 年 11 月做嘅研究，就係香港使用公交嘅比例喺二十七個城市係最高嘅。

喺第 2 點，喺香港嚟講，就係睇到係百分之九十嘅，係相比倫敦就係百分之三十嘅啫，喺第 1.4 段你睇到呢個百分之九十嘅數字，呢個講公交就係同香港市民嘅日常生活息息相關，每一日就係有一千二萬嘅人次，呢個等如就係呢一個百分之九十嘅，喺世界嚟講，係首屈一指嘅。我就希望特別係提出呢一點。

第三點我特別想提到嘅，就係話啲巴士嘅比例，就巴士嘅比例相對於成個公交個使用嘅比例，你就自己都有講到嘅，喺呢一點上面，喺第 120 頁，我就睇到係百分之五十六嘅，喺我個筆記係咁寫，但係我就要再搞清楚。

喺香港，我哋就喺 THB-2 個文件夾第 103 頁，我哋睇到香港嘅情況，呢一個專營巴士第 2 項，就係佔百分之三十一點一嘅，係重鐵，重型鐵路，就係講緊港鐵，就係百分之三十八點九，所以喺重鐵方面，個佔嘅比例係較高嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好明顯，呢個就係香港嘅數字嚟嘅，對於我嚟講，我都記得係咁樣嘅，你所講嘅就係話喺專營巴士喺倫敦嗰個佔嘅公交個使用率嘅比例其實就係點樣呢？或者 Weston 先生可以講一講。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者 Weston 先生，你而家有冇呢方面嘅資料呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我而家要係自己係計一計嘅，因為我哋講 22 億人次，就係 40 億嘅總數，所以應該係超過百分之五十，可能百分之五十六嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係喺呢一頁裏面？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。其實呢兩個表格都係可以去比較嘅，喺倫敦其實都有啲呢一個河上面嘅交通工具嘅，所以有少少就未必係完全直接比較得到。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第四個不同之處就係巴士嘅數目，第 126 頁你有提到個數字，你嗰個巴隊嘅數字，2018 年係有九千二百架巴士嘅，喺香港係幾多呢？THB-1 號文件冊，第 30 頁嘅第 7 段，喺香港嚟講，就係大概六千部巴士。

另外一個我哋唔同嘅地方，就係我哋每一年巴士嗰個行嘅里數，喺倫敦，喺第 120 頁，我哋睇到呢個數字，喺呢個表格嘅下底，2017 至 2018 年，就呢個講到係 4 億 9 千萬嘅公里嘅，係呢個巴士網絡方面。

喺香港嘅相應嘅數字，我請佢哋睇一睇 THB-1 號文件冊第 30 頁第 7 段嘅，我哋乘一乘，我哋得出嘅數字同倫敦係差唔多嘅，就係 5 億公里嘅，有六千架專營巴士每日，而平均嚟講，專營巴士每日係行走超過 140 萬公里嘅。

呢啲數字係好有趣，每架巴士、每個地方、每年嘅行車公里就有一啲數字，如果係倫敦嘅話，如果將 4 億 9 千萬除九千二百架巴士，我哋就會得出大概 53,000 公里，每架巴士每年行走嘅距離。而香港嘅話，如果將 5 億公里除以六千架巴士，大概就係 83,300 公里嘅每架巴士每年行走。

我哋而家講下一啲數字以外嘅事情，我哋睇下巴士公司嘅合約，喺倫敦，你就講到倫敦嘅巴士合約期一般係五年，然後係可以續期兩年嘅，呢個就係 129 頁最後一段係有提到嘅。喺香港嚟講，我就想大家睇下 TD-1 文件冊第 73 頁第 4 段同埋 TD-1 文件冊第 74 頁嘅第 8 段，我哋嘅專營合約期就係十年，可

以透過申請，再延期五年或者兩年嘅，視乎係幾時作出呢一個續期嘅申請。

Weston 先生，我就想問一個問題，就係關於倫敦嘅專營巴士服務同埋合約嘅，就五年合約期，然後可以續期兩年，巴士公司一般嚟講，係咪都即係喺七年之後可以繼續經營一樣嘅路線呢，定係未必係一定會自動畀番嗰條--即係一樣嘅路線佢呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）五年再過兩年之後，就會再有一個投標或者招標嘅過程，當初間巴士公司可以攞到一條路線，可能因為佢哋有個車廠或者其他原因，但係招標之後，佢哋就要同其他嘅經營商係去競爭，亦都係要視乎當時市場嘅情況，一啲其他嘅公司可能會--即係以前可能失去咗一啲路線，佢哋可能想去爭番返嚟，我就冇嗰個啲數字响手，但係就係大概有七成嘅巴士公司會攞番相同嘅路線嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）而我就想同你講另一個問題，就係喺倫敦嘅交通網絡經營嘅巴士公司，就想你睇第 126 頁，就係報告嘅 126 頁，呢度就講到呢個市場由六個主要嘅巴士集團係壟斷嘅，而餘下嘅百分之五點六就係由其他比較細嘅公司去營運嘅。

正如你所知，喺香港，專營巴士商包括有三個集團嘅，可以咁講，香港市民係知道九巴同城巴之間嘅分別嘅。喺倫敦嘅巴士網絡嚟講，市民知唔知道唔同巴士公司之間嘅分別呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有一啲市民會知道佢哋嘅巴士可能係由某個營運商去經營，喺呢方面，香港同倫敦係好唔同，因為倫敦所有嘅巴士都係紅色嘅，同埋亦都係有呢一個倫敦運輸局巴士嘅標誌，亦都係有巴士公司嘅標誌，但係對市民嚟講，佢哋見到嘅巴士全部都係紅色同埋都係由倫敦運輸局去營運嘅，如果你問倫敦嘅市民究竟邊個負責係經營呢，佢可能會話係倫敦運輸局，而有一啲市民可能知道係由唔同嘅公司去營運，但係佢哋而家知道呢一個即係所有嘅公司都係為運輸當局服務嘅，因為佢哋嘅車費亦都係畀呢個交通當局嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以一般市民都會覺得架巴士係由倫敦運輸局營運，而唔係由一間公司譬如話捷達集團營運嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：Yes, that's correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲巴士公司嘅標誌都會印咗喺個巴士嘅車身，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，亦都係會有倫敦運輸局嘅標誌，但係正如我所講，呢啲巴士全部都係紅色嘅，所以對大部分市民嚟講，佢哋似乎都係一樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）以前唔同嘅巴士公司係咪有唔同嘅車身嘅顏色或者圖案呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺80年代中去到90年代初，當時嘅私人營運商就係同倫敦運輸局自己嘅公司去競爭，當時佢哋可以有自己嘅車身圖案，當時主要嘅兩個原因就係第一，話畀市民知啲服務係改善緊，其中一個方法就係畀一啲新嘅營運商係有唔同嘅車身設計；而第二個原因就係話畀工會知道啲事情係改變緊或者改善緊，服務係由公營係走向私營，所以呢兩個就係主要嘅原因。喺90年代初，以一個市場推廣嘅角度，有一個統一嘅車身顏色係有利嘅，而當時市民亦都係接受咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我而家想講另一個主要嘅分別，喺倫敦同香港之間嘅分別，呢個就係合約制度嘅分別，呢個就係就住巴士公司嘅合約制度。喺香港專營服務嘅合約係可以商議嘅，根據你嘅報告，喺倫敦，你就係有一個以路線為本嘅競價招標制度，我就想問一啲問題，就係關於倫敦嘅制度，我想請你睇下第124頁，第3.3段嘅頭嗰幾段，我哋就可以睇到倫敦嗰個系統或者制度係點運作嘅，你就話「我哋係應該了解倫敦嘅合約制度，先可以了解倫敦運輸局同埋巴士公司嘅安全管理係點樣可以融合喺呢個制度入面嘅。而一啲個別巴士路線嘅競價投標制度就係由運輸當局，亦即係倫敦運輸局係管理同埋係控制嘅，呢個就係由1985年開始嘅一項倫敦嘅政策嚟嘅。

1985年就開始就就住巴士路線進行招標，而整體就會係批出一啲五年嘅合約，而巴士公司如果係符合某啲嘅表現嘅目標，係可以有兩年嘅續期，而一啲成本合約就係由倫敦運輸局就係用呢一類嘅合約。

根據行車嘅里數，巴士公司係可以有一啲嘅獎賞或者係扣減，就係就住佢哋服務嘅可以靠程度嘅，而倫敦運輸局係會保留一啲乘客嘅或者客務嘅收入，就如果需要係改善一啲巴士服務或者安全，就係會由倫敦運輸局，而唔係巴士公司去支付嘅。」呢個就係一啲巴士服務嘅演變。

我想你睇下最後一段嘅，就係「1994年-其餘嘅巴士路線都係已經納入咗一啲協議嘅合約，而公營嘅公司亦都係已經私有化，而所有嘅巴士服務都係由私人運作，而係由倫敦運輸局進行招標同埋管理嘅。」

而家喺倫敦係咪有一啲協商嘅合約，定係所有服務都係經呢一個競價嘅招標完成呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅。我想澄清一下94年嘅情況，根據報告，喺到93年，網絡嘅五成路線已經係經呢一個競價嘅招標係批出，而有四成就係批咗畀私人公司，因為當時政府係希望將公營嘅巴士公司私有化，然後將佢納入私人市場，所以係必須將餘下嘅巴士路線--即係當時係倫敦運輸局係提供資助，而當時係要將佢哋納入某一啲嘅合約，而一啲餘下嘅路線就必須要納入一啲協議嘅合約，但係報告冇講嘅，就係呢一啲嘅合約係有時限嘅，所以呢啲巴士公司佢哋可能係有一啲合約係贏番嚟，亦都有一啲係經協議得番嚟嘅，但係佢哋亦都知道四年半或者五年之後嗰條巴士路線就要進行一個競價嘅招標，所以當時嘅目標就係私有化，而嗰啲合約經過某個年份或者期限之後都係要進行

招標嘅。大概五年之後，所有嘅合約都係要進行第一輪嘅招標。

主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，98 或者 99 年所有嘅路線都係以一個招標嘅形式營運，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，大概係咁。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。我哋睇番 125 頁嘅第二段，第二行就講到係有一啲額外嘅獎賞或者係扣減，就係根據巴士服務嘅可靠性嘅，如果你睇番第 131 頁，呢度就係有多啲嘅詳情，即係呢一啲嘅獎賞同埋扣減係點樣運作嘅。喺 4.3.3 段就係講到，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢個就係同表現掛鈎嘅合約，係根據呢一個可靠性嘅表現，就係有一啲嘅獎賞嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢度就係睇到考慮到一啲嘅獎賞，就係講到呢一個額外嘅等候時間，呢個就係其中一項服務指標嚟嘅，你提到，喺第一段尾就係「呢一啲嘅獎賞或者係扣減可能係介乎正百分之十五或者係負百分之十，目標就係鼓勵巴士公司係去更加著重服務嘅可靠性嘅。」就住呢啲獎賞或者扣減嚟講，有冇考慮到安全呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，呢一啲嘅獎賞就係合約價格嘅百分之正十五或者係負百分之十，呢個就係同可靠程度係掛鈎，包括就係呢一個額外嘅等候時間同埋巴士係咪準時等等。所以呢一啲嘅獎賞只係同巴士公司嘅可靠程度有關嘅，佢哋嘅服務。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇第 127 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先，巴士公司如果表現好，係可以得到高達百分之十五嘅獎賞，相反，可能係會扣百分之十，呢一點對巴士公司係--即係喺財務角度，對佢哋重唔重要呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，喺一個財務角度，即係好難可以攞足百分之十五嘅，因為佢哋嘅服務係幾乎要完美，相反--即係同樣，扣百分之十亦都係好少見嘅，所以通常嗰個獎賞都係百分之五至八，即係合約價格嘅百分之五至八，以一個全年嚟講，嗰個銀碼都係唔細嘅。即係好多嘅倫敦巴士公司佢係可以透過呢個獎賞得到多啲嘅收益嘅，所以呢個制度好有效地可以鼓勵到巴士公司。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以同我哋講一講最高嗰個嘅合約價格係幾多呢？我相信對於嗰啲長嘅路線咁講。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）對於巴士路線，一啲長啲嘅巴士路線，就有成六十輛巴士嘅，根據合約價格去到就一年係 2 千萬鎊，個成本都幾高嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個合約就係承辦商就會係花 2 千萬鎊，而呢個倫敦運輸局就會支

付呢個費用，就唔計嗰啲獎金，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實呢個支付嘅制度嗰個合約價格就會係分開嗰個里數同埋就住嗰個里數就會支付呢個咁嘅費用，其實就佢哋如果係唔能夠運作呢啲嘅里數，佢哋就得唔到嗰個嘅支付嘅費用，譬如話佢哋冇嗰啲司機或者係冇一啲巴士或者有機件故障咁樣，做唔到呢啲里數，佢哋就喺嗰個合約價格嗰度損失咗呢啲嘅費用㗎喇，但係嗰個扣減就唔係咁高嘅，百分之三點四嘅，機件故意嘅問題，其實嗰個扣減--對於里數扣減唔係咁高嘅。

由於一啲佢哋不能控制嘅理由，做唔到嗰啲里數，譬如話係交通阻塞、改道或者係一啲計劃、冇計劃嘅事項咁樣，嗰度佢哋都係喺佢哋嘅可控嘅範圍，其實呢啲咁嘅獎金其實就係獎勵佢哋嘅服務嘅可靠性嘅，個合約嘅費用就係根據嗰個數量同埋質量，同埋亦都係根據佢哋嗰個係咪可靠，嚟到去畀額外嘅獎金嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者清晰啲，畀個例子，可唔可以畀啲例子我哋呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）或者我用一啲簡單嘅數字嚟到去講，一個合約成本，1,000 鎊咁樣，佢哋應該就係有 100 里嘅路程嘅，佢哋就如果做唔到，就係會損失 10 鎊一里咁樣，好簡單嘅例子就係咁樣，咁顯然如果嗰啲服務係好過呢一個過長嘅等候時間嘅情況，佢哋可以就係得到呢個去到百分之十五嘅獎勵嘅，正如我所講，百分之十五呢個獎勵其實都好難做得到嘅，通常就係百分之八嘅，對於嗰個服務可靠性。

主席：（經傳譯員）要避免扣減損失嗰個里數，最緊要嘅就係巴士有一個良好嘅維修、保養同埋有足夠嘅人數，係咪？係咪好簡單咁嘅觀點？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，你確保要每日係有足夠嘅車長，所以就係好多廠房都有一啲後備嘅車長喺度嘅，有一啲車長都可能返唔到工、病咗咁樣，佢哋就有足夠嘅車長，亦都係有足夠嘅車嚟到去調配，亦都需要有一個足夠嘅保養嘅計劃，足夠嘅車輛等佢哋可以係維持到個服務嘅。

但係公平咁講，倫敦嗰度嘅招標制度就好成熟㗎喇，由於人手或者機件問題係損失嗰啲里數嘅情況，嗰個情況都唔係咁高嘅，因為佢哋喺管理嗰方面都係幾成熟㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係因為經驗，係咪呀？喺巴士運作嗰方面，佢哋係知道需要有一定嘅額外嘅剩餘嘅能力咁樣，所以就唔會造成呢啲問題，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）喺運作嘅制度嘅時候，喺每一個巴士到站嘅時間嗰度，係咪都要規管？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，佢哋就係計嗰個嘅到站嘅時間，通常就會係

有一啲嘅調查，有一啲嘅站長就會喺路上面就記錄晒--呢啲係倫敦運輸局嘅自己嘅視察人員，佢哋就會係記錄晒有關嘅資料，個數據就用嚟計算嗰個超--即係過長嘅候車時間嘅，呢個係解釋咗嗰個過長嘅輪候時間係點樣，咁其實佢哋係量度嗰啲高班次嘅一啲嘅服務，佢哋就會計嗰個嘅過長嘅時間，譬如話十分鐘一班嘅車咁樣，佢一定就--乘客就會係不斷咁嚟到嗰個巴士站，佢哋有一個時間表，如果嗰個十分鐘嗰個班次係冇問題嘅話，佢哋可能會等五至十分鐘，佢哋可能嚟到係走咗架巴士，係等十分鐘就會有架巴士嚟㗎喇，咁可能就係有啲就等五分鐘，有啲可能係一嚟就有巴士，通常就係等五分鐘嘅，其實嗰個即係過長嘅候車時間就用呢個方法嚟到計算出嚟嘅，某一啲嘅路線嗰個標準嘅標準就係一分鐘、一點五分鐘嘅過長嘅候車時間咁樣。

過去都係人手咁嚟到積累嗰啲數據，而家基本上都係自動咁樣係透過呢個系統嚟到去計出嚟㗎喇，其實我哋嘅數據就係根據個巴士嚟到去計嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）好，跟進呢個問題，你話就係有幾個因素，交通嘅擠塞，呢個唔會扣減嘅，嗰個係點樣計嗰個交通擠塞嗰個因素呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：Sorry?

羅先生：（經傳譯員）你提到有四個因素係佢哋控制唔到嘅，譬如話係一啲交通擠塞，呢啲因素就唔會係導致有費用嘅扣減嘅，其實喺呢度計數嘅時候，點樣計嗰個交通擠塞㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）對於交通擠塞，當佢哋係入標嘅時候，佢哋預計就會係有個時間表，有個行車嘅時間表，運輸局就會係考慮佢哋嗰個服務係點樣，同埋係訂定嗰個嘅路線，承辦商就需要就制定一套嘅運作嘅時間表，決定有幾多巴士係調配出嚟咁樣，佢哋就需要設計一個嘅時間表嚟到應付一般嘅日子嘅擠塞情況嘅。

喺極端嘅情況，我而家諗緊一個例子畀大家參考，譬如話喺倫敦中部有示威、有恐襲咁樣，就亦都會中斷咗好多嘅巴士嘅服務嘅，運輸局就會係避免喺呢啲日子，喺計算嘅時候就唔計呢啲日子落去嘅，呢啲係極端嘅例子，係好清楚營運商就唔可以預計呢啲咁嘅情況，亦都唔可以喺呢啲情況底下運作佢哋嘅服務嘅，所以我哋就唔計呢啲日子落去嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個譬如話係爆水管，喺 Dartford 隧道嗰度係有車著火又唔計，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，有一啲地方嘅情況，佢哋就會避咗呢啲嘅日子，我相信我係--當時 2005 年 7 月就係喺巴士受襲嘅時候，我當時都係管理呢啲巴士嘅，佢哋都係唔計呢啲咁嘅日子嘅，因為其實都唔應該係咁樣嚟到去計呢啲日子，計埋落去嘅，嚟到去懲罰嗰啲營辦商嘅。某一啲嘅路線可以扣番出嚟唔計嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，睇番 127 頁，Weston 先生，請你睇 127 頁，4.1 嗰度就有講到嗰個合約嘅責任，或者好簡單咁樣係濃縮一下，總括四點出嚟，你確定咗就係話即係唔係咁樣嘅，你就話番畀我知，首先，就運輸局就會係招標，對於某路線就進行招標，跟住就佢哋就會--入標者就會訂定嗰個合約價格，對於嗰啲路線，第三，運輸局就會係保留所有嘅票價嘅收，咁就睇嗰個乘客嘅量嚟到去支付個費用，然後運輸局就會係支付嗰個合約嘅價格畀嗰個營辦商嘅，根據你正話所講嘅情況嚟到去做喇。好簡單講，係咪總括咗個情況呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，呢個總括得非常之清晰嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，喺招標嘅路線，其實係邊個決定嗰啲路線㗎？同埋有啲咩因素係需要考慮嚟到決定一條新嘅路線或者係取消一啲舊嘅路線呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係路線規劃嗰方面其實就係倫敦運輸局做嘅，佢哋係有一個服務計劃嘅指引，係高層次嘅一啲指引，呢個就係照顧到嗰個巴士嘅訴求咁樣，其實冇人係--喺巴士站嘅提供方面，冇人會超過係 400 公里咁遠嘅。

當然有其他嘅指引喺度，但係要提供一啲全面嘅服務，一個星期有七日有呢啲嘅巴士服務，就係早上、夜晚都有咁樣，其實都係包括晒所有對巴士服務嘅訴求，呢個係運輸局做嘅，佢哋就會決定究竟提供邊啲嘅服務、減少邊啲嘅服務，有啲就係根據嗰個量，乘客量，有啲就係根據就係同其他嘅機構一齊磋商，睇下需唔需要作出調整呀咁樣。

譬如話有新嘅鐵路路線係明年通車喇咁樣，就係呢個伊利沙伯線，即係嗰個橫貫嗰條嘅鐵路，就會有好多嘅容量，有啲巴士嘅路線喺倫敦中部就會係損失咗乘客，佢哋就會係喺線鐵開通嘅時候就會調節，有啲會加，有啲會減，確保就係會有一個有效嘅運作嚟到提供嗰個服務嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢方面係咪包括同巴士營運商大家磋商呢，還是就淨係呢一個運輸局自己作出呢個決定嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）當時同巴士公司的確係有對話嘅，亦都係一個中央--唔係單係中央規定，運輸局就會係磋商地區嘅當局，同埋有關嘅持份者、公眾人士咁樣，運輸局的確係需要啲諮詢，然後先至係作出任何嘅更改嘅。我哋會有同巴士公司有對話，就可以話係一啲磋商、一啲諮詢咁樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）剛才你提到就話係有一啲嘅訴求，照顧一啲訴求，一般人就喺居住嘅地點都應該係有巴士服務提供畀佢哋嘅咁樣，假定某一個路線係無利可圖嘅，咁會唔會係都繼續落去係照顧有關嘅意願呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，其實要決定一啲服務嘅改變，咁就根據呢

個成本效益嘅角度嚟到睇嘅，我哋就睇嗰個巴士嘅網絡，如果你睇嗰個補貼，你每花一鎊，就都需要係提供最大嘅乘客嘅利益，任何嘅改變都係要睇嗰個成本效益嗰方面嘅角度嚟到去睇，等乘客係有一定嘅利益，睇下係咪能夠係每一鎊都使得物有所值嘅。

當然嗰個巴士路線嘅網絡係有補貼嘅，我哋倫敦運輸局喺市長嘅指示底下，係可以冇補貼底下嚟到提供服務嘅，就係營辦少啲利潤低嘅路線，或者係收費係收得高啲咁樣。其實喺呢個網絡入面係有一定嘅補貼，呢個係一個市長本身嘅政治嘅決定嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可以係用者自付嘅，係咪呀？即係可以係補貼，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，响我報告當中有講其中一個重點，市長決定乘客嘅票價，就始終都係睇嗰個市長係咪改變嗰個嘅票價，呢方面對巴士個網絡嘅財政係有一定嘅影響，目前嘅市長佢就 16 年係當選嘅，喺佢嘅政綱入面作出咗一個承諾，就話係四年唔會加票價嘅。呢個好清楚就係對公眾人士、對乘客就係有一定嘅優惠，但係對呢一個運輸局未來四年嗰個財政有一定嘅影響。

主席：（經傳譯員）錢喺邊度嚟呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）市長就係需要從其他嘅渠道係攞呢啲財政，譬如話係嗰個嘅稅收，佢哋會鼓勵呢個運輸局就更加提高嗰個效率，嚟到去減低個成本，所以有不同嘅五花八門嘅方法嚟到去減低個成本嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實比例上喺營運巴士--即係喺嗰個票價方面係佔咗個百分比係幾多呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我睇下個數字有冇先。而家就係三分一嘅成本就係有補貼嘅，我睇番嗰個嘅數字，個筆記先。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，得。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）2016 年，七成嘅成本係乘客嘅收入嚟到去--嗰度嚟嘅，三成就係其他，呢個就係 2 千 600 萬，呢個每年個數字都唔同嘅，我報告當中，有講到 97/98 就係收支平衡嘅，嗰個票價係可以照顧到嗰個嘅運作。但係始終呢個係一個政治嘅決定，係市長嗰個嘅決定，就係佢其實喺財政運作上係點樣處理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）票價係凍結四年，七成就本來話係票價可以照顧到，而家可能係跌到六成或者更低，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）除非嗰個乘客量係減低，估計可能會減低少少嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗你提到嗰個財政表現同埋有關嘅補貼，主席剛才都

提到呢個問題，喺 120 頁、121 頁嗰度，你睇到其實有講到嗰個財政嘅表現嘅，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：Mmm.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）120 頁最底嗰度，最後嗰句你就提到就 1997、98 年嘅時候，個網絡其實就係收支平衡，票價係可以支付到嗰個營運嘅費用，跟住你就講到市長喺 2000 年之後嘅做法，就係話 121 頁最頂嗰部分，同埋就係七成嘅收回成本，就喺第一段嗰度，喺 121 頁嗰度係有咁講嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，2016 年、2017 年，補貼嗰個數量，睇嚟就係 6 億 2 千 600 萬鎊嘅，就係 60 億港幣咁計喇。主席剛才問到你，就係你嗰個補貼嘅金額喺邊度嚟，係咪就係佢哋嘅嘅稅嗰方面呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）無論係商業機構或者係個人嘅畀稅嘅人士，佢哋都會係負擔，當然亦都有政府國家嘅補貼嘅，但係從明年開始，就事實上，三年之前政府就係話畀運輸局聽，其實就唔會再畀補貼佢哋，所以就只會係會畀營運者就資本嘅投入，就佢哋譬如話好似興建新嘅地下鐵路或者係改善站頭嘅設施等等。

所以運輸局喺過去兩、三年，就係從呢一個國家嘅運輸部就係冇任何嘅補貼嘅，所以佢哋就要自己搵辦法，同埋就要去比較雷厲風行睇下點樣節省成本，令到成個營運嘅情況係可以改善，呢個係好大嘅挑戰。同時間，市長亦都係決定就係三至四年之內都唔會有一個--呢一個嘅津貼都係凍結嘅，所以其實會係因為喺嚟緊四年係呢一個合約價格就會隨住通賬增加，但係喺其他方面就係冇增加嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）中央政府個補貼嘅大概係幾多呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）當佢哋講話嚟緊三年成個補貼會凍嘅時候，大概係 6 億鎊嘅，佢哋決定就係三至四年就係減到零嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係 6 億鎊就去到零嘅，...

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個其實都係一個好大嘅削減嚟，係呀，呢個係講緊津貼成個運輸局，就唔係單單係講巴士嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢方面嘅津貼喺倫敦之外，其實有冇㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺鐵路嚟講，有，巴士就冇。就喺倫敦之外嘅地方，巴士服務其實就已經係放寬咗規管，已經唔規管㗎喇，所以任何人佢哋係被獲准係可以經營巴士呢，佢哋都係用商業去營運巴士，譬如好似係曼徹斯特、伯明翰等等，任何嘅營運商都係可以用商業原則去營運個巴士，當地嘅規管嘅機構就可能就譬如話係提供一啲缺乏嘅服務嘅。譬如話佢哋商業嚟講，佢

啲就會係禮拜一至到禮拜六就先至係營運，而政府當局就可以購買佢哋服務就係星期日去運作嘅。其實百分之九十嘅巴士服務其實係以商業形式嚟去運作嘅，而剩番嗰百分之十就係由當局政府去購買嚟提供服務。

喺倫敦以外嘅地方其實都有考慮緊會唔會有一啲嘅專營巴士服務，而家就探討緊，曼徹斯特特別就係諗緊就係從一個唔規管嘅環境就係去做到一個專營服務嘅方面。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇番第 127 頁，呢度就係講到關於個合約個架構，去到 128 頁，4.2 就係講緊合約嘅週期，就有兩個嘅協議嘅，一個就係個框架協議，跟住根據第二個箭咀，就係講到一般嘅合約嘅要求，就特別係巴士營運商應該點樣遵守。另外就係一個路線嘅協議，裏面詳列咗係一啲特別嘅路線嘅要求，特別係一啲最低表現標準等等。你有冇喺你嘅資料之中提供一啲相關嘅例子呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有。有關於路線協議嗰方面嘅，有個例子，對唔住，應該係框架協議嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我睇到嘅，第 189 頁嘅，係咪呀？係，冇錯。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）個路線協議就有一百六十頁嘍，每一個營運商都係要簽訂嘅，如果每一次佢哋去營辦一條路線，佢哋都係要簽呢個路線協議，裏面有好詳細嘅資料點樣營辦。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 129 頁第二段，...

主席：（經傳譯員）喺離開呢個題目之前，我哋睇一睇我哋 Stanley 教授有提過墨爾本嘅系統，裏面就關於一啲嘅認證嘅制度嘅，倫敦嘅制度有呢一個框架協議，有預審制度，呢個同墨爾本嘅情況係點樣對比呢，就關於認證嗰方面嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個預審制度就係實際上係審視呢個嘅公司就可唔可以成為一個嘅巴士服務供應商，我哋會睇番佢哋有冇政府機構嘅一個牌照，呢個唔係話呢個公司一定係會贏到呢個合約嘅，其實嗰個門踭唔係太高嘅，你係有一個公司成立咗，你有啲經驗係提供巴士服務，嗰個門踭係比較低嘅，因為倫敦運輸局希望能夠鼓勵各類一啲細嘅公司都可以成為個供應商，當然除咗有啲大嘅公司，譬如話其實佢哋可能係有啲細嘅公司佢哋係有--個車隊係十至十五部巴士嘅，佢哋都能夠可以係認可，希望能夠鼓勵更多嘅人就係可以參加招標個過程，然後我哋就可以決定究竟邊一間公司係能夠可以贏某一個嘅合約。

我唔會講呢個係一個認證嘅過程嚟嘅，我哋只係想希望有可能有潛力嘅公司佢哋係有基本嘅制度係可以提供巴士服務嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。係，好。係，教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）會唔會包括佢哋係有一個車廠呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。你係唔需要有個車廠嘅，因為其實如果係咁，就會成為一個佢哋進入市場嘅障礙添，因為要設置一個車廠係一個好大嘅挑戰，譬如擺喺邊度。倫敦運輸局其實可能就會畀一間公司佢只係有二十部巴士，但係一個車廠好多時候都係需要一百五十部車先至能夠營運得成功嘅，所以你係唔需要有個車廠。但係如果你係一個嘅營運商，你就應該係有一個嘅車廠去支持你嘅，可能英國，或者呢個車廠係喺另外一個地方嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好，我哋睇番第 129 頁，你就提到關於評審嗰方面，關於個標書嘅評審，你就提到就會係佢哋嘅唔同範疇嘅表現，包括係安全表現，「呢個咁嘅方法就係可以讓到呢個運輸局就係睇清楚佢哋嘅表現情況，亦都讓到營運商佢有個誘因就係不停咁改善佢哋嘅服務。喺安全方面，亦都好似其他方面嘅表現一樣，都會係我哋考慮嘅，亦都會令到我哋係考慮究竟會唔會續約或者畀批新約佢。但係安全就唔係成為呢一個技術評審嘅一部分，但係成為一個『紅線』，其中一個例子就喺 2015 年，就有一個嘅合約商，因為佢哋嘅維修嘅呢個嘅標準唔達標，所以致使到佢哋失去咗好多嘅里數，因為嗰個器械嘅原因嘅問題，所以佢哋就冇一個新嘅合約畀佢哋。」

你提到一個嘅紅線嘅問題，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽你點樣會超越咗嗰條嘅紅線呢？咩嘢為之超越嗰條紅線呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）紅線我哋就冇一個定義嘅，就話乜嘢接受到或者乜嘢唔接受到。喺呢一個路線為本嘅招標嘅好處，相對於譬如話新加坡嘅專營嘅制度嘅好處就係話讓我哋運輸局就可以透過呢一個路線招標令到呢間公司就係個大細隨時可以有彈性增大或者係減細嘅。其實如果我哋係要終止合約，尤其是譬如話啲四百或者或者四百五十部巴士嘅，係一個好大嘅決定，對於我哋嚟講，成個巴士嘅服務係一個好大嘅影響，同埋好明顯我哋就可以對於呢一個營運商，我哋--唔好嘅營運商呢，我哋就係唔批新嘅合約畀佢，就對佢哋嚟講，係一個好強嘅訊息，就係佢哋做得唔好。

所以呢條所謂嘅紅線就冇清楚去界定嘅，或者定義係點樣，就我哋就希望就話我哋喺招標嘅評審之中，我哋就會睇下清楚佢哋嘅服務質素同埋其他方面嘅表現，就係會畀分，同埋睇番啲安全嘅指標，睇下有冇問題。

呢度我舉咗個例子，呢度好清楚呢間公司喺維修方面係做得唔好嘅，因為有好多嘅工程師都已經退休，佢哋好多做咗好多年嘅工程師都退咗休，佢哋就冇預計到呢度咁嘅情況，亦都冇做一啲嘅措施去培訓適合嘅維修人員；後來就有好多嘅機械嘅故障同埋有個好差嘅呢個工程質素嘅監測。所以因為咁樣嘅問題，我哋就決定佢哋係需要改善，喺呢段時間，我哋就冇批新合約畀佢哋，喺呢段咁嘅時間，佢哋可能其實就失去咗四至五個合約，可能佢哋之前可能會可以贏到嘅，之後佢哋就喺佢改善咗之後先至可以再入標。

所謂嘅呢一個紅線就係由我哋董事局同埋我哋嘅評審小組去決定嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就頭先提嗰個例子，關於個器械故障同埋就失去咗好多嘅里數同埋好差嘅工程嘅質素，其實呢啲喺你哋去表現監察嘅時候，你哋都已經睇到㗎喇，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實就佢失去咗好多嘅里數，同埋好多嘅喺路上機械故障嘅情況，所以佢哋就會扣減佢哋嗰筆款項嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我亦都係諗緊其實呢兩樣嘢同呢一個安全有咩嘢關係，係咪去到一個情況就係話嗰啲轆直情甩咗落嚟，然後係撞嚟人呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇，冇，冇，唔係咁。第一個嘅警示其實係就好--就係通常都係機械故障嘅，即係講緊如果佢哋嗰個維修情況係好差。營運商好多時候都會確保安全都係好緊要嘅，因為倫敦運輸局會懲罰佢哋，就係唔會批新嘅合約畀佢哋，一啲國家嘅機構亦都係會做一啲監察安全嗰方面，如果有問題嘅時候，佢哋可能有公開聽證會等等，政府亦都會係有懲處嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實呢個會唔會係一個潛在嘅安全嘅風險呢？因為呢個巴士成日都死火，佢因為佢維修不善，所以都會係一個可能嘅安全嘅危機嚟㗎喎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）無論係運輸局或者營運商都會明白呢個都係一個問題嚟嘅，可能會真係會成為一個安全嘅危機，但係最後屘都冇喺真係喺安全方面出咗咩嘢問題，但係冇錯，係可能係一個安全危機嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你就頭先講到就話呢一個有安全指標嘅，運輸局有冇一系列嘅一個清單嘅安全指標嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，係有一系列嘅安全指標嘅，目前營運商佢哋自己都有一啲安全表現嘅呢一個表現嘅指數，就四十一個嘅，我哋就會將呢啲所有嘢就考慮喺一齊嘅時候，就睇番嗰個安全表現係點樣，實在譬如喺呢一個嘅工程或者係機械方面，或者係呢個司機嘅安全等等，都係有一啲嘅安全嘅指標，我哋都會特別嘅監察。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅安全指標係咪公眾人士可以參閱嘅呢，又或者係會不久將來會係公布呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）未目前為止其實都冇公開嘅，但係好快我哋就會公開呢啲安全指標。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺目前嚟講，或者係試行呢啲嘅安全指標嘅落實之前，其實而家有一啲咩嘢嘅安全嘅措施嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有，有好多嘅監察，有好多分析趨勢等等，我哋會收集好多嘅數據同埋做好多嘅趨勢分析，有好多嘅比較、分析，就係譬如話個別嘅營運商會比較，運輸局會做好多嘅圖表，就睇下唔同嘅情況，譬如話同

行人嗰個意外有咩嘢情況，呢啲嘅趨勢就會係我哋分析係一個網內嘅分析，亦都會係個別嘅營運商嚟分析嘅。而一啲巴士公司就會同其他嘅巴士公司係分享呢個數據，而佢哋之間都可以睇到大家之間嘅數據嘅，所以佢哋係可以比較佢哋嘅表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲數據喺網上係咪可以攞到嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸局係有發布兩類嘅數據，首先就係巴士網絡上面嘅任何意外，譬如話有人喺巴士上面跌低，即係蹦低等等，每年--每一季都會係發布呢啲數據嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係全部嘅公司都會發布嘅呢，定係由個別去發布呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就係有一份嘅圖表就係所有市民都可以睇到嘅，就係有一個嘅一覽表，你可以睇下倫敦唔同嘅郡或者唔同嘅巴士公司嘅表現，所以市民係可以係查詢呢啲資料嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以就唔會話跟公司，譬如話 Abellio 公司就有多啲嘅人係哦到或者蹦低？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）暫時唔係咁樣嘅。市民或者其他嘅機構可以自己去根據呢啲數據分析，而每一季都會有一個表現嘅一覽表嘅，即係就住巴士網絡嘅安全性，所以就睇到同上一季相比嘅表現。目前嚟講，就係一個網絡嘅層面去做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個巴士網絡嘅數據包唔包傷亡數字呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，係包括任何喺巴士網絡上發生嘅事件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個數據嘅來源究竟喺邊度呢？邊個提供呢啲數據嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）數據嘅主要來源就係巴士公司，佢哋就要將數據入一個中央嘅資料庫，即係一個報告嘅系統--匯報系統，而巴士公司亦要將佢哋嘅事故嘅數據係輸入呢一個系統，倫敦運輸局就會進行審核去確保啲巴士公司係正確咁樣去輸入呢啲資料嘅。而呢啲數據亦都係會同警方嘅數據係交叉去檢查，如果係一啲嚴重意外或者嚴重事故。而家就叫做 STATS19，就嚟會改名㗎喇，而倫敦運輸局就會互相去檢查，去確保呢啲資料係正確。

譬如話喺巴士上有人絆倒或者蹦低，警方係未必會統計嘅，但係呢個數據主要嘅來源就係個別嘅巴士公司，佢哋會將資料輸入一個中央資料庫。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲資料係咪公開㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，係會每季發布嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）倫敦警方嘅網站有冇呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）可能係一個全國嘅網站上面睇得到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）倫敦嘅數據係可唔可以睇得到呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）你可以睇成個倫敦嘅數據，倫敦個別嘅郡或者係某啲嘅巴士公司或者甚至係車種嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話警方嘅數據係會包括嚴重嘅事故，係咪包括所有嘅傷亡或者係死亡數字呢？而倫敦運輸局嘅資料庫係咪都會有？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢啲嘅數據應該係腳合嘅，至於一啲輕微嘅受傷，因為可能警方係會有處理某啲呢啲輕微嘅受傷，所以輕微受傷嘅數字未必係腳合，但係一啲嚴重嘅傷亡應該係腳合嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）請你撳去第 150 頁，你報告嘅第 150 頁，第 7.8 段，呢段就係關於倫敦運輸局嘅安全表現指標，呢個就係巴士安全計劃嘅一部分嚟嘅，你見唔見到？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，見到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個就係咪主席所講嘅未經發布嘅安全表現指標呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個就係其中一間巴士公司嘅建議，佢哋就喺 8 月嘅時候向我哋簡介咗㗎喇，就有四十一項嘅建議，就得出一個安全表現嘅分數，有一啲嘅元素，包括係可能乘客嘰倒或者跌低嘅數字，傷亡數字，司機嘅監察等等，呢啲就會得出一個標準，一個分數，個基準就係 80 分，然後就會係根據呢一個基準再去幫呢個巴士公司評分嘅。

如果你係遇上呢一個傷亡，有時未必係因為巴士公司嘅錯嘅，未必影響佢哋分數，所以有一個加權嘅系數，我哋嘅目標就係所有巴士公司都可以做得更加好、更加安全，所以我哋定咗一個安全表現嘅基準就係 80 分，然後你就會根據呢一個基線就儘量去改善你嘅分數同埋表現，所以呢個我哋計劃係會公布呢一個計劃嘅，但係暫時仲未。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話已經係向我哋解釋過，你係咪講緊我同你同埋一啲董事總經理，即係喺 8 月嘅會面？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，佢哋係有睇過嗰啲表嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係 Jon Pike 先生向我哋講過，佢就係安全及風險主管嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係下個月中係會有嘅，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯。我諗佢哋喺 10 月中公布佢哋嘅安全計劃嘅時候，就會公布嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個對於嗰個處理安全嘅嗰個紅線嘅做法係會唔會有影響或者分別呢？而家就會有一個紅線嘅制度去決定會唔會同一間巴士公司續約或者畀新嘅路線佢。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）好難去形容會點樣去用嘅，如果你嘅分數係越嚟越差嘅話，我諗可能都會係--即係算係一條紅線嚟，即係可能反映你嘅表現係惡化緊。因為我哋係會睇好多嘅因素，如果喺任何一方面差咗，都會係反映喺個分數度嘅，所以如果你嘅分數係低咗，可能會係一個問題嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解係需要包括四十一個因素咁多呢？即係喺你計呢一個安全表現嘅分數嘅時候。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）正如報告所講，我哋係從呢一個鐵路業就係借鏡，即係得出呢一個制度嘅。我哋嘅原則就係個分數唔應該係受個別嘅事件影響，因為如果你一間大嘅巴士公司，有二千架巴士，你係會遇上一啲嘅事故嘅，所以我哋嘅設計就係得出一籃子嘅措施或者係因素去得出一個分數嘅。如果呢個分數上升或者下降，可能你嘅表現係大幅度地改善咗或者係惡化，呢個就係比起淨係睇某一個因素係好嘅。

例如如果你主要係睇一間巴士公司遇上嘅撞車嘅意外，可能係唔公平嘅，因為可能喺某啲嘅路線有啲路面嘅情況係會導致撞車，並不代表成間巴士公司嘅整體表現嘅，所以我哋係要考慮一籃子嘅因素，先去評核佢哋嘅安全表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一個一籃子因素嘅範圍係點呢？當然如果你睇呢個碰撞嘅數字，係大家都會明白，你睇到如果有乘客跌低、蹦倒等等，或者違反交通規例、超速、急速剎車等等，仲會考慮啲咩嘢其他因素呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我哋會包括呢一個司機質素監管或者係監察，呢個亦都係同公眾對安全駕駛嘅期望係有關，所以我哋係想包括一系列嘅因素，先至得出一個分數去反映呢個巴士公司嘅整體表現嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你講緊公眾嘅回響，係咪講緊投訴呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，包括投訴。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）Weston 先生，喺 Stanley 教授喺向委員會--即係協助委員會時候講，香港就係有一個競爭性嘅投標制度，而巴士公司就會係自己係

收呢啲車資，但係佢哋亦都係要承擔風險嘅，我就想你睇睇呢一個嘅 Stanley 教授嘅作供嘅謄本，呢個就係第 16 日嘅謄本，第 45 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）日期係幾時呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）9 月 15 號嘅。你之前有冇睇過呢份證供呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）所以我就會好快咁樣帶你睇一睇呢份文件。我會由第 45 頁開始，第 10 行，委員會嘅大律師就講到呢一點嘅，「第一部分就係講呢一個喺墨爾本有呢個競爭性投標制度嘅好處，你都已經有提過呢一個議題㗎喇，所以我想同你講下呢個競爭性嘅投標制度，同埋呢個點樣係應用喺香港嘅情況。巴士公司就會自己收呢一個巴士嘅車資，而佢哋就自己承擔營運巴士路線嘅風險。」

第 22 行，就話「我明白係有唔同嘅選項，但係我就想請你解釋下呢一啲嘅選項。」我諗之後有一啲部分可以略過，因為我諗你都知道嗰啲嘅選項或者情景係乜嘢，就住 Stanley 教授所講。我就想跳去第 48 頁嘅頁底，第 21 行。

陳政龍大律師就講到「如果我冇理解錯，係可以有唔同嘅情景嘅，第一，就係一個投標商就係建議係支付政府一個營運嘅金額去換取經營某一個區域或者某啲路線嘅經營權，佢就會係同政府分享某啲嘅利潤。」

第 6 行就講到「第三個情景就係冇一個競投嘅價格，而呢個投標嘅競爭係完全係視乎服務質素嘅評核。」

第 22 行就主席話「另一個方法就係呢一個新嘅巴士公司就可能會建議佢可以--我收嘅車費比現有嘅巴士公司係可以低一成嘅，即係呢個情景底下，就唔會畀錢政府，但係巴士公司就可以幫到乘客。」陳大律師就話「呢啲就係競爭性投標制度嘅好處。」

所以呢個就係有四個嘅情景，我就想睇番你嗰份報告第 131 頁嘅，第 4.3.2 段，第一段就係形容一個同香港相似嘅制度，就住呢個盈利分享，就講到呢一個淨價嘅合約。

「喺 1995 年至 2000 年，機構就係採納咗一個淨價嘅合約制度，而巴士公司就會係保留路線嘅車資收入，然後就係承擔呢個相關嘅風險，巴士公司就會係競投一啲合約，就住呢個預期嘅收入，佢會係競投一個倫敦交通局嘅資助，就住一啲比較冇咁賺錢嘅路線，或者喺一啲賺錢嘅路線就係同倫敦運輸局係分享收益嘅。

呢個淨價合約就只係運作咗一段短嘅時間，因為就倫敦運輸局佢嘅行政嘅負擔係非常之大嘅，因為佢係要分配超過七百條巴士路線嘅利潤或者收入。而

實際嚟講巴士公司係好難影響實際嘅路線車資收入嘅，因為路線嘅規劃、班次同埋車資嘅釐訂仍然係由倫敦運輸局去控制同埋管理嘅。」

我哋假定喺第二段嗰度所講嘅兩個問題都係可以克服得到咁講喇，即係個行政嘅負擔，嗰個情況就係呢一個淨成本合約嘅做法，你覺得香港係咪可以參考呢，還是係唔可以考慮呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）如果你係睇個專營權嗰度，嗰個營辦者就係喺香港某一啲部分就係營辦所有嘅路線，就好似倫敦嘅情況咁樣，就容易啲嘅。倫敦個問題就係營運者可以係有幾條線係有不同嘅營運者或者係若干營運者嚟到去做，因此對嗰個收入係有一定嘅影響嘅。所以實際嘅問題就係喺呢個淨成本合約係有乜問題嘅。

就睇下嗰個英國嘅合約，呢個係冇問題嘅，但係要確保就係嗰啲營運者係對嗰個收入有一定嘅影響，同埋係有能力係改變嗰個嘅收入，譬如話可以控制嗰個嘅票價或者係可以係將嗰個服務水平係改變，或者係有能力係可以係推廣或者係推銷佢哋嘅服務呀咁樣。

喺倫敦運輸局嘅情況，所有呢啲咁嘅工具就係掌握喺嗰個當局當中，就唔喺個營運者手中嘅，所以營運者其實對嗰個實際嗰個票價收入有好少嘅影響嘅，即使佢哋服務嘅質量都好好，佢哋喺嗰個走廊上面有三、四間嘅營運商，佢哋係有同樣嘅路線都好，乘客都係會有車嚟就搭㗎喇，佢哋唔會揀邊間巴士公司嚟搭嘅。

所以答你條問題，就係係可行嘅，可能就係如果營運者係有一個專營權係可以處理自己嘅路線，可以喺自己嘅範圍入面係有一定嘅控制權，就好有用嘅。呢個確保嗰個營運者係可以控制到若干嘅範疇，然後先至可行嘅，因為喺倫敦嗰度當局控制咗好多嘅情況，睇嚟就唔係話咁可行。我希望答到你嘅問題。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。其實我以前都冇問過呢個問題，其實就係有幾多條路線，倫敦總有幾多條路線？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有七百，就視乎係個別嘅路線，有啲就係學校嘅路線，倫敦嘅巴士路線加埋呢啲巴士路線，其實公眾人士都可以坐嘅，但係有一啲嘅路線喺返學嘅時間就淨係畀學生嚟到去搭一啲專門嘅路線嚟嘅。有一啲路線可能係個別嘅巴士線--校巴線，有啲就可能係長啲嘅路線，就係六百、七百輛巴士都有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。另一個問題就係 Stanley 教授證供當中有提到嘅。或者係返番去第 16 日嘅聆訊，第 50 頁嗰度，呢個就係喺正話我提嗰段嘅之後嘅啫，第 50 頁，第 9 行，陳律師就問，「係咪有一定嘅優點呢，即係喺嗰個競爭性嘅投標嗰度，而具體上就係同呢一個巴士安全運作係相關嘅？」我哋睇到就係教授嘅回覆就係第 50 頁一路係答到去 56 頁嘅，第 16 行嗰度，你有

有機會睇過Stanley教授呢方面嘅證供？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係有嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我諗公道咁講，或者係可以總括一下咁講，其實喺具體上對安全同呢一個競爭性嘅投標係冇一定嘅影響嘅，其實你睇呢個證供係咪咁樣睇呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實我嘅睇法都係咁樣嘅，我唔會唔同意嗰個睇法，就話係即係競爭性投標對安全係唔會話冇影響，但係亦都唔會話有一定嘅優點。其實喺倫敦嗰度嗰個路線嘅投標，嗰個投標過程本身就並冇具體咁樣係對安全帶嚟一啲嘅優點，但係嗰個投標嗰個評估，其實等當局就可以就係睇埋嗰個安全嘅角度。

剛才我哋都講過，就有啲公司佢哋係有一啲機件--即係嗰個基建工程嘅水平就唔係話咁好，等運輸當局就係可以係有能力係更改佢哋嘅建議，特別係照顧個安全嘅問題，所以嗰個招標嘅程序或者嘅競爭性嘅招標未必係同安全有直接嘅關係，但係嗰個招標嗰個目的，特別喺倫敦嗰個情況就容許有關當局係可以係考慮埋嗰個安全角度，然後先至批嗰個合約或者係續嗰個合約嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個其實你係畀過呢啲嘅例子，考慮到嗰個嘅安全，就有一啲巴士公司佢哋喺呢方面唔係咁好嘅，喺嗰個保養嘅計劃入面係做得唔足咁樣，其實喺呢個制度入面，點樣--一間公司係咪願意進行呢個技術上嘅一啲創新，呢個對安全亦都係有一定嘅影響嘅，其實公司可唔可以係有一啲嘅前置嘅一啲嘅鏡頭咁樣，等佢哋可以睇到嗰個巴士同車輛嘅距離咁樣。喺呢一方面，呢個過程，競爭性投標方面係咪有一定嘅影響呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我相信嗰個挑戰顯然，就係如果當局係訂定一啲最低嘅安全標準，譬如話一啲設備、閉路電視、即係巴士上面前、後嘅閉路電視，倫敦都有嘅，所有嘅營運者如果佢哋係要入標嘅話，都要符合呢個標準。如果當局係訂定呢啲標準，所有嘅營運者都係需要符合呢啲標準，然後先至可以得到個合約嘅

對於呢啲競爭性投標方面嘅程序，個挑戰性就係最終始終我哋係有一個商業嘅評估嘅，有個技術上嘅評估，有時就好難就話對一啲即係喺標書入面啲少量嘅創新、科技創新，譬如話有一啲嘅通話嘅系統就可以改善到嗰個表現，因為未必得嘅有時。呢個會幫到佢哋嗰個技術上嘅得分，但係最終某程度上，整體嗰個商業上面嘅分數就會係佔咗主要嘅一個嘅決定嘅，呢個對於嗰個合約方面--喺呢方面又未必係有咁大嘅影響，所以個挑戰就喺呢度。所以喺倫敦就係用一啲一般嘅安全嘅標準，即係一般嘅巴士安全嘅標準咁樣。

嗰個招標嘅程序始終係有一個重要嘅元素，我哋唔會話唔鼓勵嗰個技術上嘅創新，即係佢哋可以係超越到呢個當局所要求嘅，當然如果佢哋覺得佢哋有一定嘅業務上可行嘅話，有一啲嘅技術上嘅創新，就可以減低嗰個嘅意外，亦

都可以節省佢哋嘅成本，佢哋亦都係好樂意咁嚟到去採納嘅，但係你少少嘅技術創新對嗰個評估方面又未必有大影響嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰啲規管當局其實就可以係訂定一啲最低嘅標準，就唔係話嗰啲巴士公司係主動咁樣嚟到去改善個安全，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我諗呢個就可能係最終係要咁樣走㗎喇，嗰條路，喺呢個倫敦運輸局講到呢個巴士安全嘅水準咁樣。我嘅評估就係當局就會話其實有好多嘅技術創新喺度，我哋要睇嗰啲巴士公司點樣去進行創新，同埋係採納佢哋認為合適嘅科技，就唔係話訂定一啲標準等各方面係採納，否則，亦都係需要加埋呢個成本入去，咁樣先至係會公平嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個情況底下，呢啲競爭性嘅投標其實喺提升嗰個安全方面係中性，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，可能係咁樣，呢個可能係一個正確嘅結論，安全基本係必定㗎喇，其實所有嘅營運者都係需要符合一定嘅標準，佢哋喺其他方面可以係睇一啲技術嘅創新嚟到去改善嗰個服務，亦都係希望提升佢哋嘅效率，亦都係會增加佢哋嘅成本，其實對公眾人士嚟講係咪物有所值係一個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）個表現，即係始終競爭係要提升表現，就唔係話安全？

MR MIKE WESTON：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）其實呢個情況同航空公司係咪可以類比嘅呢？當局訂定咗一定嘅標準，就唔係個別航空公司就係裝某啲嘅設備咁樣嚟到去提升安全。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺航空方面我都唔係一啲專家，但係我嘅印象就係你對呢個航空公司嘅印象，其實安全就喺航空公司嚟講，就唔係話一個乜嘢嘅特別嘅優點，而係一啲係一啲既定一定要做嘅嘢嚟㗎喇，咁可能呢個做法喺倫敦運輸局都係要咁樣做嘅，安全嘅標準係必定嘅，就唔係話有一個競爭嘅優點，等呢啲公司可以大家互相競爭嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）其實喺歐洲有冇城市係朝住呢個方向嚟到去走嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就安全嗰方面？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）即係一致嘅標準，所有巴士必須係當局訂定一定嘅標準，即係話喺倫敦運輸局係有一定嘅安全標準，就唔係話等公司嚟到去自己去決定點樣創新嚟到去點樣提升安全。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我所照我嘅所知，倫敦運輸局嗰個安全標準係佔領先嘅地位嘅，其他歐洲嘅地方佢哋都係用一啲嘅科技嚟到提升安全，但係照我所知，倫敦運輸局其實就係有一定嘅一致嘅標準，所有公司係遵守。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）另一點你提嘅就係喺呢個競爭性投標嗰方面，就係就住香港，睇關於嗰個廠房嘅擁有權同埋係有冇廠房嘅問題，我想你睇係你報告嘅 151 頁，最底嗰度，你就話「巴士車廠好多時就係對競爭嚟講係構成一個障礙嘅」，你睇到「喺將來，競爭性嘅投標嗰方面的確係需要有一定嘅清楚策略就係關於廠房嘅擁有權同埋有冇廠房提供嘅問題。」可唔可以同我哋係引申一下呢方面嘅講法呢？Weston 先生。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，如果你睇倫敦嗰個情況，最大嘅挑戰，如果你係新嘅營運者入嚟嘅話，始終都係有冇廠房嘅問題，呢個係始終係搵一個合適嘅地點嚟到起廠房同埋嗰個--如果你想係打入一個市場嘅話，你需要起一啲嘅廠房畀百五部車咁樣，咁你係需要係要令到嗰個廠房係喺經濟上可行先得嘅，等佢可以係攞到合約。

即使喺倫敦嚟講，嗰個要打入個市場都係嗰個廠房嘅問題，係咪有冇廠房，唔係話冇可能嘅，但係呢個係一個障礙。另外喺嗰個路線投標嗰方面，如果你係要用一個專營權嗰方面嘅做法，喺投資新廠房嘅設施其實就係好重要嘅，呢個對競爭嚟講亦都構成一個障礙嘅。

喺新加坡嗰個嘅模式，佢哋當局就會提供嗰個廠房同埋有關嘅車輛嘅，基本上個營運者喺入標嘅時候就係要營運呢個嘅專營權，而廠房、車就係呢個新加坡嘅土地運輸局提供，呢個模式亦都係完全不同嘅。

不過問題就係除非有一啲嘅競爭性嘅投標，即係香港嚟講，我哋始終都係需要係有一定嘅策略，嚟到處理呢一個嗰個嘅障礙，始終呢個畢竟都係嗰個廠房嘅問題，我哋喺呢度需要有一定嘅清楚嘅策略，好可能嗰個競爭可能會好弱㗎喇，而現有嘅巴士公司可能會係贏到個合約嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）可唔可以喺倫敦係大家分享嗰啲廠房嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，大多數嘅倫敦嘅廠房都係巴士公司擁有嘅，大約七十五間就係巴士公司公司所擁有嘅，十間就係運輸局所擁有嘅，其他即係種種原因，有啲就喺私有化嘅時候都係空置緊嘅，由於係 2000 年一路擴展，嗰啲廠房一路都係有用嘅，巴士公司就喺佢哋合約上面就係用呢啲嘅廠房，有兩間嘅呢啲廠房就係--即係倫敦東部其實就係 Hackney 同埋 Arriva 兩間公司，即係大家係分享嘅，呢個係比較少有嘅，佢哋都係大家互相合作，令到佢哋可行嘅，呢個做法都唔係話唔可行嘅，兩間廠房而家係大家係分享，有啲嘅車廠就用嚟泊車，佢哋係用當中嘅設施嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）新加坡佢哋就提供呢啲車廠畀呢啲營運商，佢哋係咪都係分享呢啲嘅廠房㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）新加坡有兩份嘅合約，就係有啲新設嘅車廠，佢哋亦都係--即係喺新加坡亦都係擴展呢啲嘅車廠嘅，佢哋嘅網絡亦都係擴展咗，亦都有新嘅車廠，佢哋嘅做法係同其他地方係有所不同嘅，如果佢哋係繼

續呢啲嘅招標嘅工作，佢哋可能係需要考慮而家嘅車廠嘅安排，睇下點樣可以將佢係喺呢個程序入面係納入埋入面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個嘅障礙就係車廠，如果係講緊新嘅路線嘅時候，呢個障礙係咪會細啲呢？譬如喺香港，就我哋要發展一個新市鎮，我哋係需要有一啲嘅農村嘅地帶，我哋會將佢擺一啲城市嘅設施，所以就比較容易啲政府當局係可以起車廠嘅，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。我所知，其實就係新加坡係有個新嘅服務嘅時候就有新嘅車廠建立。如果譬如喺香港有新嘅服去新嘅地方嘅時候，係如果係理論上就係應該由運輸署去起呢個車廠，而唔係話個別嘅公司嘅。車廠其實就係喺競爭方面係一個最大嘅障礙嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦嚟講，係咪有一啲嘅整合嘅情況呢？譬如話喺倫敦以外嘅公司佢入地倫敦，佢就係收購咗一啲細少少嘅巴士公司，然後亦都係收購咗一啲嘅車廠，就藉以進入個市場，係咪咁？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。最後一個入嚟市場嘅時候就係一間澳洲嘅公司，佢哋嘗試好努力係好多年係進入個市場，但係嗰個車廠嘅障礙其實都係好大。唔單只係咁，喺倫敦，你亦都係將係--車廠亦都係要有競爭力嘅地點嗰度，所以佢哋就去--First Group 呢間公司就買一啲車廠，然之後就進入呢個市場，就由收購開始進入市場。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋係睇 126 頁嘅，你嘅報告，你就係列出咗巴士營運商嘅名稱，嗰個澳洲公司係咪 ComfortDelGro 呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：No. The Australian company is under "Other", because they run about...

主席：（經傳譯員）佢係咩嘢邊間公司話？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）佢唔係呢度嚟嘅，佢大概係佔市場係百分之三至四，Tower Transit。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪都係喺新加坡嗰度係營運嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，佢亦都係喺新加坡嗰度叫做易塔通嘅呢間公司，都係新加坡有營運嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如好似 RATP Development 呢間公司，呢個係咪一個法國公司？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。佢有兩個部分嘅，RATP 就係公交嘅公司，喺巴黎嚟嘅，就係營運巴士同埋地鐵嘅，喺巴黎。RATP Development 係一個就佢哋嘅另外一間公司就係投資海外嘅業務嘅，佢哋係有成功投標咗一個叫做 Riyadh Metro，係呢一個倫敦嘅中心地點嘅一個巴士嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊間話？Riyadh Metro？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）RATP Development 係咪收購咗倫敦幾間比較古老嘅、細嘅巴士公司呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，RATP 亦都係收購咗一間叫 Quality Line 嘅公司，亦都係收購咗另外一間呢個法國公司，佢喺倫敦有業務嘅，喺過去幾年，佢哋收購咗幾間公司，亦都係有好多細嘅巴士公司係有整合，亦都係將畀呢啲大嘅公司去吞併嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有幾多間公司其實係倫敦以外嘅公司，RATP 呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）Abellio 就係荷蘭公司，Arriva 係呢一個德國嘅鐵路公司，ComfortDelGro 就係新加坡公司，新加坡基地嘅公司，Go-Ahead Group PLC 係英國嘅一間有限公司，RATP Development 正如我頭先所講，係法國喺巴黎嘅一個公交公司，Stagecoach 係亦都一個英國公司嚟嘅，所以係三間係外國公司公共公司，一個就係私人公司嚟嘅，所以其實都個組合都係唔同嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）如果佢哋係要去收購一間公司，其實佢哋係咪要繼續聘請嗰啲司機呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯嘅，嗰個框架協議就係如果有收購嘅情況，佢哋係要--首先佢就係要得到運輸局同意同埋佢呢個運輸局其實係可以有權反對收購嘅呢啲嘅行動嘅。如果呢個六個裏面嘅其中一個大嘅公司就想係收購另外一間大嘅公司，倫敦運輸局可能就會反對，因為唔想個競爭係減少。佢哋亦都會係喺第二啲情況係會介入嘅，因為佢哋想睇下成個競爭嘅情況會唔會可以保留到。無論如何，佢哋係需要得到倫敦運輸局嘅同意。

喺英國，如果你要收購一個公司，嗰間公司嘅資產亦都係有相對嘅責任你係要去履行嘅，咁嘅情況係喺英國同埋歐洲其實都係情況嘅，你係要將嗰啲嘅員工同時間去移交嘅。如果一間公司如果係冇--贏到一個合約嘅時候，呢間公司嘅員工係有權係去到另外一間新公司嘅公司嗰度做。一間新嘅公司可能係決定係需要繼續聘請原有原有嘅員工，因為其實佢哋亦都缺乏員工，但係可能員工亦都可以決定去繼續留喺原有嘅公司嗰度嘅，可能個車廠已經係關閉咗等等咁樣樣。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪都係原有個僱用條件都係要保留？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，法例係咁規定嘅，佢哋係要保留原有嘅聘用條件嘅。呢間公司後來之後可能係同員工磋商，就係改變嗰個聘用條件，但

係喺呢個轉移嗰刻，嗰個聘用條件應該係保留嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪市長嘅成就嚟嘅，佢所做嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實而家嘅市長其實已經做咗好多工作，譬如話係立法嗰方面，如果個合約係改變咗，你就係要遵守番原用嘅一直嘅合約條件，但係呢個而家嘅市長就係容許嗰啲員工係選擇過唔過去新公司嘅，個市長就講「如果我係一個嘅司機，我已經有十五年經驗，然後我喺申請由 Abellio 去 Go-Ahead，因為 Go-Ahead 就近我住嘅地方，我仍然就係應該係享有十五年工作經驗嘅巴士司機嘅待遇，所以我就唔需要從頭開始，即係話我嗰個經驗會繼續係保留嘅。」對於咁樣嘅情況，如果啲司機係要調去另一間公司，就比較公平一啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你係咪會唔會想小休呢？而家係一個幾合適嘅時間。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋會係有個小休。已經係作咗供兩個小時，然後我哋而家會小休二十分鐘，我哋會係十一點半之前再返嚟嘅，十一點半會再返番嚟。

上午 11 時 10 分押聆訊押後

上午 11 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。Weston 先生，請你撥去第 153 頁嘅，你報告嘅其中一頁，第 8.6 段，你就提到運輸當局同埋巴士營運商之間嘅合約關係，喺第一段第二句，你就提到「雖然合約結構喺香港係唔同嘅，香港所採用嘅呢一個高層次嘅合約模式係未必需要改變先至可以改善合約監管、表現管理同埋運輸署同埋專營巴士商之間嘅合作。」

另外我想你睇睇第 154 頁第二句，你就形容係過度依賴法定嘅規例，就係適用於所有嘅車輛嘅，然後最後一段，你講到「喺倫敦嘅情況係車輛同埋司機都係需要遵從呢個法定嘅要求嘅，而呢啲相關嘅措施、項目同埋合作，即係超越呢啲法規嘅呢啲合作同埋項目就會令到實際嘅安全得到改善嘅。」

然後你提到「倫敦巴士公司同埋倫敦運輸局之間嘅合作，佢哋係願意創新同埋試一啲新嘅技術同埋方法，同埋作為呢一個巴士安全計劃嘅一部分，呢啲

係會帶嚟一啲良好嘅結果，即係喺呢一個減少意外同埋受傷方面嘅，而運輸署係應該考慮佢哋點樣可以改善同專營巴士商之間嘅合作關係。」呢度就係提到一啲關於合作嘅觀點。

運輸署喺呢一方面係監管者嚟嘅，如果密切合作嘅話，會唔會引致監管者同埋巴士之間嘅嗰個關係係太過係親近呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我諗兩者係可以併存嘅，我喺報告度咁樣寫嘅原因係因為我喺倫敦運輸局擔任巴士服務總監嘅時候，我哋好少係講呢一個--即係我哋同巴士公司傾嘅時候好少講呢個框架協議嘅或者呢個路線協議，呢個就係我哋當局同埋巴士公司之間嘅關係。

我喺 8 月就係同一啲巴士公司嘅代表見面，我諗我哋冇提到合約，合約並唔係一個問題嚟嘅或者一個阻礙，我當時亦都係有咁樣講，因為我知道倫敦運輸局亦都係想致力去改善營運安全嘅，如果係要透過合約去著手，可能係需要好長嘅時間。如果倫敦運輸局係要引入一啲安全嘅標準，即係透過合約嚟講，就要好耐先可以睇到成果，呢個過程亦都係會係好慢嘅。

我諗如果係想快啲係做到嘢，合作係一個好嘅方法嚟嘅，我諗到咗某個時候，呢一啲元素可能係會納入成為合約嘅一部分。所以呢個可以獲得結果或者成果嘅速度係一個考慮嘅因素嚟嘅。

我亦都深信有合約係重要嘅，如果我哋有任何嘅爭議，但係我係相信有一啲事情透過合作，係更加快可以得到成果嘅，呢個喺 8 月同運輸局同埋巴士公司傾嘅時候都好清楚地帶出呢一點。喺呢方面，即係喺安全方面亦都取得好大嘅進展。所以我就強調合作呢一點。

至於法定嘅要求或者英國嘅要求，包括係一啲車輛嘅維修、車隊嘅管理等等，呢啲並冇大問題，大部分嘅巴士公司都係可以係符合呢啲要求。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個合作嘅機制係點嘅呢？即係喺倫敦運輸局同埋專營巴士商之間嘅合作係點嘅呢？你就指出合作可以帶嚟成功嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）報告所提到嘅第一點就係呢一個巴士公司會議嘅成果，即係嚟自巴士公司高層同埋倫敦運輸局嘅高層係去定期見面去傾下一啲討論點嘅，包括係安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個喺報告邊一部分呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 136 頁嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個巴士營運商高峰會，喺呢個高峰會入面，每個星期巴士公司嘅代表會同倫敦運輸局嘅代表係會面，然後去傾一啲共同關注嘅問題，而轄下嘅安全小組亦都係會鼓勵啲營運商去分享佢哋嘅最佳做法，...

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢一個巴士營運商嘅峰會有咩嘢人出席呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就會係個別巴士公司董事總經理同埋倫敦運輸局嘅總監或者係以上級別嘅代表嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個峰會喺邊度進行㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就會係喺倫敦運輸局嘅辦公室，就係為期係八星期嘅為一個週期。有三大嘅目標，第一，就係分享一啲良好嘅做法，喺呢一個高峰會入面，巴士公司就可以提出佢哋嘅有咩嘢擔憂同埋佢哋想傾嘅議題嘅，佢哋未必係會傾一啲好個別嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以舉啲例子畀我哋聽？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我諗緊就係一啲例子，譬如話關於嗰啲巴士站嘅執行嘅措施，呢個論壇其實等運輸局係支援一啲巴士站嘅設置咁樣，仲有其他一般性嘅問題都係會討論嘅，而呢啲巴士公司係會提出佢哋嘅合約入面嘅事項，...

主席：（經傳譯員）用呢個例子咁嚟講，究竟討論完之後會採取咩嘢行動呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）運輸局其實就係最有能力係提升呢啲事項畀有關嘅當局，咁佢哋就喺--譬如話喺公路係可以執行呢啲嘅措施，佢哋有人力，有警方呀咁樣，其實視乎嗰個路段係點樣，運輸局其實就係可以有能力係引進其他嘅機構係一齊參與嘅，呢啲係一般嘅事項。

呢個亦都係一個好好嘅機會等倫敦運輸局係接觸有關嘅機構係講不同嘅問題，譬如話一啲嘅未來五年之後嗰個--即係未來五年嗰個嘅業務計劃係點樣，對嗰個營運者係有一定嘅影響，同埋有一啲計劃係等巴士公司係預先係知道嘅，譬如改變嗰個嘅巴士嘅網絡。呢個論壇其實就可以係大家分享嗰個嘅工作係點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話喺呢個伊利沙伯線，呢方面會唔會係會提出呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，我喺運輸局做嘅時候，亦都係有一啲講解，一啲巴士嘅規劃嘅當局係解釋一下呢條新嘅橫貫嘅伊利沙伯線對巴士嘅路線有咩嘢路線呢咁，呢個係一個好好嘅論壇，等大家可以分享不同嘅事項嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你提到一啲小組，可唔可以同我哋講一講咩嘢嘅小組呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有幾個小組喺度嘅，主要就係安全方面嘅事項嘅小組，有工程嘅小組，安全小組其實就係所有巴士公司都有參與嘅，有陣時嗰啲董事經理或者係一啲總監或者係喺安全方面嘅負責人係會有參與嘅。亦都係大家討論一啲安全嘅問題，個論壇亦都係等巴士公司可以大家分享一啲嘅汲取嘅--交通事故所汲取嘅教訓。

我知道巴士公司其實就係好關注呢方面嘅問題嘅，如果一間公司係有一啲嘅事故，係做過深入嘅調查，係查出嗰個實際嘅底因，其他嘅巴士營運者亦都

係可以從呢個調查當中嘅結果係得出一啲嘅經驗，可能未必係完全適用嘅，有時都係會適用嘅。如果營運者同埋運輸局唔分享呢啲咁樣嘅結果，就係未必咁好嘅，所以呢個論壇其實就會係分享嗰個調查嘅結果。

主席：（經傳譯員）譬如話係有一啲事件就係巴士司機就冇係拉手掣嘅，釀成一啲嘅後果，呢啲喺呢個論壇就可以分享，確保唔會有類似事件發生，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，主席你都提到呢個事故，就係有個車長就係處理嗰個嘅輪椅嘅斜度，佢就係嗌咗工程師嚟，工程師就係處理嗰個問題，但係司機就係處理當中冇拉手掣，車就郁，最終個工程師就係冇咗命添嘅。其實就我哋會有一個嘅警告，就話巴士車長離開佢座位嘅時候，就要確保係一定要拉咗手掣先可以離開嘅咁，其實呢個運輸局嗰個嘅安全標準亦都會包括呢方面嘅環節嘅，就有一個鎖咁樣。

但係呢個係一個好好嘅例子，就係呢類咁樣嘅教訓其實大家巴士公司、巴士營運者係可以分享嘅。就有啲公司就係可能有一啲嘅資料同大家就係互相分享，大家可以汲取一個教訓嘅。

而工程嗰個小組就係有一啲工程嘅總監就係參與，佢哋係分享一啲嘅維修、保養方面嘅事項，好多時營運者都係會面對類似嘅巴士嘅車種，佢哋有一個好好嘅機會等佢哋係有新嘅車加入車隊嘅時候，佢哋可以分開啲保養、維修嘅一啲經驗，呢啲嘅論壇就大家互相合作、互相係分享一啲最好嘅做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋係幾耐開一次會㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）同嗰個主要嘅論壇個時間差唔多，其實有最主要嘅一個訊息就係巴士嘅巴士營運者其實係好樂意大家互相合作嚟到處理一啲非競爭性嘅一啲問題，譬如話係安全，為咗整體嘅大局嚟到去分享一啲嘅經驗咁樣，所以呢度大家互相係會合作嘅，喺呢方面。

主席：（經傳譯員）除咗巴士公司嘅代表同埋運輸局之外，呢啲咁樣嘅論壇、會議會唔會係有巴士車長嘅參與或者係工會嘅參與呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）唔會嘅，其實係有--亦係兩方面嘅溝通嘅渠道嚟嘅，倫敦運輸局--即係倫敦就係有一個嘅工會就代表九成五嘅巴士車長嘅，所以我哋係會同工會諮詢、溝通，呢個比較容易，因為只係有一個嘅工會係進行溝通咁樣。

運輸局都係同工會的確有定期嘅會議嘅，嚟到討論一啲一般嘅關注嘅事項。譬如話佢哋係會分享一啲巴士安全標準嘅一啲嘅諗法，呢個就視乎巴士公司睇下點樣處理佢哋嘅當地嘅工會，所以呢個係有兩層嘅做法嘅，喺處理工會嗰方面。我哋有一個正式嘅討論磋商嘅公司層面嘅渠道，就唔係呢一個倫敦運輸局嘅渠道。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個論壇幾時成立㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個問得好好，起碼十五年前成立嘅。我做主席都有五、六年，就有不同嘅程序嘅，呢個亦都係經得起時間嘅考驗，亦都係好有用，係好有信譽，否則嘅話，嗰個論壇同埋小組亦都唔會係繼續存在嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪某一個事件之後成立呢，還是係你哋主動嚟到去成立嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）如果記得嘅話，應該係主動成立嘅，我相信應該係喺私有化之後，當時就有個睇法，就話應該大家聚埋一齊嚟到去討論呢啲共同關注嘅事項咁樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者我想請你睇 Stanley 教授嗰份嘅報告，就係 94 頁，94 頁 5.3 段，就話其他事項嘅結論咁樣，佢提到就話「鑑於有關嘅討論，作者建議香港考慮嘅主要事項，嚟到去改善工作、駕駛或者係休息嘅規定，同埋係使用技術」，佢就特別提到第 6 項嘅，「成立一個巴士安全嘅常設委員會，起碼一年開兩次會嚟到去檢討評估最新嘅科技，係對巴士安全有影響嘅，特別係對一啲巴士路線嘅運作，同埋建議政府係睇下喺啲專營巴士方面點樣可以加入呢啲嘅安全嘅措施。最新嘅工作小組改善呢一個安全，就可以就係作為一個基礎，個成員可以係擴大到去加入巴士嘅營運者。」咁樣。

個問題就係倫敦有冇一啲嘅組織，一啲嘅小組，其實佢哋係符合到教授所講嘅一啲嘅常設委員會嘅要求呢？譬如話呢個常設委員會可以檢討個最新嘅科技，可以將呢啲安全嘅措施係納入去個車隊入面，倫敦有冇類似嘅機構喺度嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）倫敦嘅架構就係運輸局其實就係主導呢啲嘅安全標準嘅，佢哋就會睇嗰啲最新嘅科技，同埋跟住同巴士公司大家磋商，透過論壇，透過呢啲工作坊，咁嚟到去同佢哋磋商嘅，可以話巴士營運者嘅論壇同埋小組就可以係話類似嘅措施，教授所講嘅常設委員會係可能係闊過呢一方面嘅，嗰個成員嘅組合可能係會闊啲，但係個相應嘅機構應該係我哋倫敦嘅一啲營運者嘅論壇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）照我理解，如果我明白你嘅答案嘅話，任何嘅喺科技方面嘅發展，主要就係倫敦運輸局係做主導嘅，然後就喺嗰個論壇喺會議上面大家討論，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，所有呢啲嘅營運者都係可以提出呢啲嘅建議嘅，喺論壇上面提出嘅。好多時嗰啲營運者都係會搵出呢啲咁樣嘅科技--新嘅科技，然後大家係喺論壇提出，大家可以溝通呀咁樣，其實就兩者喺當局同巴士公司之間係有互動嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想你睇教授嘅另一份嘅報告，...

主席：（經傳譯員）等一陣間，律師，我就想跟一跟呢方面嘅問題。舉個例，譬如話

一啲防止瞌眼瞓嘅一啲嘅工具，佢哋可能喺呢啲安全嘅論壇上面提出。倫敦嘅運輸局係可以係試行呢啲嘅做法，係咪呢？係咪可以咁樣做呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，你所講嘅一啲科技，我哋叫做 Seeing Machines，即係一啲就係有一啲嘅鏡頭就睇下個車長會唔會係瞌眼瞓咁樣，有呢啲咁樣嘅試驗，就係運輸局就覺得需要試行呢啲咁樣嘅做法，而巴士公司就話亦都係想係提供經費嚟到去試下呢啲科技係做成點，同埋啲監察嗰個嘅試驗，佢就係請呢啲巴士公司就提供部分嘅經費，就其實就我哋有一個嘅安全嘅創新基金，第一輪就係 50 萬鎊，之後就係有一啲嘅試辦。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺 2017 年 7 月，就佢哋係入標，就係 17 年尾就係批咗個標，然後就係進行嗰個試行嘅計劃？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇。跟住就有監察同埋有關嘅試驗嘅結果就係加咗入去嗰個嘅安全標準入面。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個 10 月係有匯報嘅，個成功與否就會係 10 月匯報？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，10 月 16 號就會有匯報，運輸局係會有一個嘅事項等供應商同埋巴士公司就宣布佢哋嗰個安全標準嘅水準，唔單只係咁，仲有就係將營運者嗰個嘅結果--試行嘅結果係將佢入納入去嗰個計劃入面。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸局就係會出錢，係提供經費，即係其中一個角色就係試行呢啲安全嘅設施安全嘅設備，係咪呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，同埋就係幫營運者係制定一啲嘅方法嚟到去監察嗰個嘅進度嘅，喺試行呢啲新嘅科技嗰方面就可以請--好容易請供應商就安裝呢啲設備，但係最緊要就係我哋要監察嗰個嘅進度，睇下係咪有效益嘅同埋係取得一定嘅成效，而先至係證明係物有所值嘅。喺過去亦都係有一啲嘅試行，但係就冇監察，咁好難就確定到有關嘅科技係咪成功嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦運輸局嗰度，邊個單位係協助呢啲巴士公司係取得經費嚟到去做試驗？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸局喺 2015 年所做嘅就係成立一個專責嘅隊伍係集中睇呢個巴士安全嘅計劃，呢個係有運輸局嗰個道路安全小組嗰度調咗一啲人手過嚟，等佢哋係改善專門改善巴士嘅安全同埋係推行呢一個嘅巴士安全計劃嘅，所以當時係有一隊嘅專門隊伍，係有兩、三人係專門係負責處理呢一方面嘅工作嘅，同埋係促進呢個巴士安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）具體嚟講，佢哋點樣係提供協助同埋確保係有關嘅監察係做得妥當呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，其實做幾樣嘢嘅，佢哋就會幫巴士公司係

制定呢一個嘅架構，同埋亦都有一啲外部嘅一啲顧問，我哋叫 TRL，就做呢一啲嘅監察嘅工作，就等...

主席：（經傳譯員）TRL 係咩嘢意思呀？運輸嘅研究，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，運輸研究嘅實驗室，佢哋係做一啲嘅運輸嘅研究，特別係睇嗰啲意外或者係一啲撞車嘅情況，後來就幾年前就將佢係私有化咗，可以話係一個顧問公司，專門就係處理呢啲交通運輸技術上嘅分析、評估嘅工作嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）巴士公司就係得到呢啲協助，然後進行呢啲試驗，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，其實運輸局就係睇呢啲不同嘅科技嗰個優點。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲實驗所就係亦都提供協助，係咪呀？喺呢個研究方面？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）2015年...

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）當時2015年--16年初都係咁樣做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）16年就遞交報告，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個報告係喺文件夾入面有冇㗎？鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係有嘅，喺 SEC-1--SEC-3。唔好意思，應該喺 MISC-3嘅，MISC-3嘅，應該係1002頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺呢個報告睇到1003頁，係2016年11月係有發表同埋修改嘅，好清楚喺呢個報告講，就係2015年6月就開始去試驗嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，喺2015年6月、7月嘅時候，呢兩個嘅--呢個特別嘅巴士路線，我哋就收集一啲數據，然後嗰個研究實驗室，就會睇番倫敦中心區同埋倫敦以外，就係19號同埋294號，然後係喺2015年6月嘅時候就做一啲嘅數據收集，因為需要啲時間等嗰啲嘅科技慢慢係可以係應用到出嚟，同埋有啲校正嘅工作，所以喺2015年會有啲少少嘅問題，喺2015年9月就係收集咗19號路線嘅數據，而係2016年我哋收集咗486號路線嘅數據嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊間公司係 Go-Ahead 公司係有參與嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）486嗰個路線嘅試驗。

主席：（經傳譯員）John Trayner 就當其時係董事總經理，喺 Go-Ahead，我喺倫敦，我有見過佢，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以幫我哋去明白倫敦運輸局同埋 TRL，即係你哋嘅研究室，其實佢哋係扮演嘅咩嘢角色呢，特別喺監察呢一個嘅計劃之中？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）運輸局就係委託就係做呢一個智能車速輔助系統嘅科技同埋做相關嘅試驗計劃，同埋係搞清楚究竟呢個科技係做乜嘢嘢，就係關於呢個數碼地圖，然後呢個巴士佢又裝置呢個系統嘅時候，就會令到呢個成個車速可以係限制嘅，換句話嚟講，就係會令到司機係唔會超速，亦都令到佢個剎車嗰個功能係可以停止嘅，亦都唔可以加速嘅，如果已經達到咗個最高上限。

呢個係倫敦運輸局資助嘅計劃，亦都係請我哋嘅研究中心去監察，呢個巴士公司亦都可以從佢哋自己嘅觀察同埋巴士車長嘅回應，知道究竟有成功，我哋亦都喺之前同埋之後收集數據，睇下有幾有效，同埋有幾多嘅巴士喺呢個試驗計劃仍然都超速。

所以呢個係一個好好嘅例子，就話啲新科技係應用，亦都係一個好好嘅例子，我哋係需要有一個有效嘅監察制度，無論係推行計劃之前或者係推行計劃嘅期間，我哋都係需要去好好監察，呢個都係一個挑戰，令到我哋知道實際有咩嘢好處。運輸研究室其實都係喺呢一個科技應用之前同埋之後去監察相關嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）亦都係佢哋係去製備呢一個嘅非常之完備嘅報告嘅，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）關於呢個科技，關於智能車速輔助系統或者科技，呢個科技其實就已經係存在咗好多年，係咪呢？或者係冇落實到，喺起初嘅時候可能冇落實到，但係相關嘅概念其實就已經存在咗好耐？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。其實就一直都有呢個意念㗎喇，其實都係要睇番我哋有冇呢個數碼速度地圖嘅，但係其實今次係第一次就喺巴士嗰度應用。喺呢個試驗計劃三或者四年之前，亦都係有喺運輸局上面有裝置嘅，我亦都係有試過呢個嘅自己揸呢架車，但係其實有呢個裝置之後，我哋就好--個司機如果超速，就好難加油嘅，但係今次第一次係全面係科技喺倫敦裏面有一個試驗計劃。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個科技係咪其實喺呢個歐盟其實都有出現過，其實有啲嘅文件，有啲嘅--都有講話有啲人係嘗試去試驗？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係呀，其實喺倫敦我哋會面嘅時候，我哋都有傾過呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會首先係其實三、四年前其實就係呢個科技係應用喺一架車

上面嘅，我哋然後係有資金就係將呢個科技應用喺呢兩嘅巴士上面，同埋亦都後來我哋亦都出資係畀呢一個 TRL，即係呢個運輸研究中心就係去監察嘅，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）但係個科技其實已經係存在咗一段時間嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。關於個--其實個資金，有冇資金其實唔係個問題，其實係反而個關鍵就係個科技係咪已經成熟，喺呢一個客運交通方面，我哋一定係等緊嗰個科技成熟，其實我哋都一直都係有個資金嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）大概嗰個資金係幾多？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我真係冇個數字。我會話其實個監察仲貴過嗰個裝置本身嘅，我懷疑其實嗰個監察其實仲貴過嗰個裝置，其實對於成個網絡嚟講，其實個裝置個費用可能唔係咁貴。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係呢個係一個嘅例子，就係話倫敦運輸局就係出資係畀呢一啲試驗計劃，而相關嘅營運商就同意參與嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個係一個幾好嘅例子，就係話我哋係需要有一定程度嘅評估同埋監察一啲新科技，先至有用嘅，然後我哋係需要深入嘅分析，我哋先至知道我哋係咪投資喺啱嘅科技裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先係監察，然後分析，同埋制定--去寫報告嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實呢個運輸研究中心，其實佢哋都係好獨立嘅，所以呢個獨立呢樣嘢都係好緊要，我哋係需要有一個獨立嘅研究中心幫我哋做監察同埋分析嘅，TRL--對唔住，我成日都搞錯咗，混淆咗 TFL 同埋 TRL，但係 TRL 同運輸研究中心亦都係有參與呢一個嘅最新嘅關於呢個安全標準制定嗰方面嘅，特別係喺呢個科技上面。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思係有唔同嘅裝置，譬如話向前嘅鏡頭，又或者有啲嘅鏡頭知道有個行人喺附近等等？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呢啲方面嘅監察？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）同埋睇下佢嗰個成本效益係點樣，佢哋都有參與嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我會有個補充嘅問題嘅，關於呢個課題嘅。首先智能車速輔助或者調節系統其實係幾時倫敦運輸局開始去考慮嘅呢？你睇

番 MISC 第 3 號文件冊，第 939 頁，我哋睇唔睇到？呢個係一個報告，2009 年 12 月㗎喇，好耐之前，就係關於智能車速調節設計嘅。

去睇番第 943 頁，我哋睇到呢個係個倫敦運輸局委託嘅一個嘅研究，就係睇下司機對於呢個嘅科技嘅一啲嘅反應，同埋特別係呢一個用者個界面嗰方面究竟有啲咩嘢反應，呢度係一個研究，係 2009 年做嘅研究。

然後我哋去睇第 945 頁，呢個引言部分，呢度有講到第一段，就係呢個講「呢個智能車速嘅系統呢一個嘅軟件就係 1980 年喺法國已經開始開發㗎喇，亦都係喺唔同嘅市場係試過，亦都係能夠減低車速係有效嘅，喺 2009 年 5 月呢一個運輸局就係開展最新嘅試驗計劃，就係希望能夠減低個速度同埋減少呢個首都嘅路上嘅意外嘅。」

我喺度停一停，似乎喺呢個嘅試驗計劃唔係單單係限於就係巴士上面去使用，其他嘅車輛都係喺呢一個嘅試驗計劃裏面涵蓋嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。運輸局亦都係負責一般嘅道路安全嘅，因為其實都有好多嘅道路網絡喺倫敦，我哋有一個道路安全嘅分布係特別係負責呢方面，道路安全嘅，所以呢一個嘅就係呢度所指嘅，我都有參與其中嘅。所以呢度唔係淨係講巴士嘅，就係其他嘅車輛都係涵蓋，亦都係一般嘅道路安全嘅事項都涵蓋。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺引言最後一個嘅段，呢個第一年嘅計劃就係運輸局就已經開始咗，亦都想明白去睇下倫敦巴士司機佢嘅態度、佢哋有啲咩嘢誘因同埋佢哋有啲咩嘢障礙佢哋去實行呢個嘅科技，我哋睇番第 960 頁，我哋睇番個成本效益分析，喺第 960 頁，我哋睇到一系列嘅，就有一啲嘅認為可以達到嘅好處同埋啲障礙，就係話智能車速調節係科技嘅應用就係乜嘢係好處、乜嘢係障礙，呢度列咗出嚟？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然後我哋去睇番 1004 頁，都係同一個文件冊嘅，如果你睇到，喺呢個呢一頁裏面，2016 年 11 月係發表嘅報告，係 TRL 發表嘅，我哋係--嗰啲細節我哋自己可以睇，但係我想係特別講幾點，主席就係話一定係要有一個好仔細嘅分析，特別係成本效益分析嗰度先至得嘅。

如果我哋睇番嗰個內容，一共有八個標題嘅，第 1 個就係呢一個嘅科技係咪一個有效嘅科技去減低個速度--限制速度？第 2，呢個係咪一個有效益嘅方法呢？第 3，就係話有呢個科技嘅車輛對於周圍嘅環境有乜嘢影響？第 4，就係對於其他嘅附近嘅車輛嘅行為有咩嘢影響？第 5，就係好處同唔好處，特別對呢一個倫敦運輸局嚟講，有咩嘢好處、唔好處？

第 5.2 至到 5.13 就係有講清楚嗰啲嘅好處，第 6 項就係對於巴士營運商嚟講，ISA 係有咩嘢好處定咩嘢唔好處？第 7 題，對於巴士車長嚟講，ISA 有

咩嘢好處同唔好處？第 8 條，對於巴士乘客嚟講，呢個科技係有帶嚟咩嘢好處同埋唔好處呢？

呢個就係 TRL 係探討嘅事項，所有嘅詳情都係喺報告裏面可以睇得到，呢個報告就係提交畀倫敦運輸局嘅後來。

第 1011 頁，我哋睇到 2015 年就試驗計劃開始，主席啱啱提到，我相信應該係喺呢一個嘅係最後一段，係 2015 年就運輸局就係喺倫敦巴士就嘗試去試驗智能車速輔助系統，就用咗一個呢個 Zeta Automative Ltd.嗰個相關嘅系統嘅。

呢個就係我哋頭先提到嗰個試驗計劃，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個啱啱呢兩條路線去試驗之前，其實之前嗰個試驗係一個規模非常細嘅試驗嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋而家去 Stanley 教授嘅報告第 70 頁，你有冇睇過呢個報告嘅呢一頁？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有，有，我睇過。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺呢版裏面，Stanley 教授就讓我哋--希望我哋留意到其實墨爾本同香港一個最主要嘅唔同，墨爾本係--我而家就節錄呢一個，喺呢一個斜字下面嗰段，就係「墨爾本就有一個獨立嘅規管者，安全監管者，喺呢一個營運嘅層面，維多利亞呢一個相關嘅安全部門就係 2010 年開始成立嘅，就喺 3.3.1 段嗰度。呢個喺佢哋做--佢做嘅角色同香港--香港就冇相類似嘅角色或者機構，佢哋就係監察專營巴士營運系統佢哋嘅--營運者佢哋嘅安全表現，亦都係推進安全嘅計劃嘅，但係喺香港就冇一個咁樣嘅獨立嘅安全嘅規管者，就令到我哋對於安全嘅關注就冇咁大。」

似乎喺墨爾本，監管者就冇監管呢一個行車安全，而相反就係--即係呢個工作就係交咗畀一個負責安全嘅獨立管理者，詳情我哋可以睇第 99 頁，就係同一份報告嚟嘅，我就想讀出屘二嗰一段，「Bus Victoria 就係一個業界嘅組織去提供支援，即係可以提供三個部分嘅支援嘅，例如 BusVic 就係提供一啲嘅範本就畀佢哋嘅會員，而呢啲範本就係同交通安全總監共同係建立嘅，而總監就係著重呢一個發展巴士業務嘅一個安全文化，同埋風險管理，而佢哋亦都係同一啲業界同埋營運商係去改善做法嘅。係有一啲指引嘅文件，包括係呢一份叫 Guidance - Safety Culture 2016 年 9 月嘅文件，而總監亦都表示佢係願意同香港分享佢哋嘅資料同埋一啲理念嘅，如果有需要嘅話。

就呢一個總監嘅獨立性就係提升咗安全，亦都係可以提供咗一個獨立問責嘅來源，亦都係提供一啲安全步驟嘅一個透明度嘅。而總結嚟講，墨爾本嘅巴士服務係安全嘅，而應該係主動去建立一個安全嘅文化同埋安全管理嘅制度，而唔係一個被動式嘅回應。」

然之後喺呢一頁嘅下面就講到「呢一個研究得出嘅主要建議，就係委員會應該係改善或者應該係喺呢一個立法嘅框架下面考慮以下嘅，就係引入一啲可以執行嘅安全指引」，同埋「建立一個獨立嘅交通安全總監職位，要求所有嘅專營巴士公司商就係必須要得到總監嘅認證，先至可以攞到呢一個牌照嘅，同埋將呢一個要求延伸到所有嘅商業車服務。」

呢一個就係墨爾本嘅情況，我哋嘅問題就係我哋需唔需要建立一個咁嘅職位呢，喺我哋嘅編制底下？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個就好視乎本地嘅情況，無論係香港或者倫敦都好。如果你睇番倫敦運輸局同巴士公司所建立嘅一啲安全項目，或者一個關於車速方面嘅事，我並不反對一個獨立嘅安全總監嘅，因為喺英國已經係有咁樣做㗎喇。而倫敦運輸局亦都係希望英國嘅電車業都係跟住做嘅，即係就住安全方面。

但係我擔心如果喺倫敦成立呢一個職位嘅話，可能係會受到一啲阻力嘅，所以我比較擔心如果喺倫敦實施嘅話，可能喺成立呢一個監管者嘅過程之中，呢一個發展安全嘅進度可能會係受到影響，呢個只係我一個小小嘅擔憂，可能會係影響短期嘅進展，所以透過合作--即係透過而家有嘅機構互相合作，可能係會更加快得到成果嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我冇理解錯，你認為係透過專營巴士公司同埋倫敦運輸局嘅合作，係可以得到令人滿意嘅成果，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，係嘅，不過倫敦本身有一個具競爭性嘅投標制度，究竟呢一個模式可唔可以喺其他嘅地區度使用就係另一個問題。根據我過去嗰幾年所見，同埋呢份報告，即係倫敦巴士喺安全方面係有好大嘅改善，呢個就係--即係個背景就係佢哋用一個現有嘅架構嘅。

如果喺另一個地區，未必可以得出同樣嘅結果，但係喺倫敦嚟講，好明顯係取得好好嘅進展，同埋喺使用科技同埋制定標準方面亦都有好大嘅進展。

主席：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸局係表示佢哋係定緊一啲世界級嘅標準，你係點睇呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）據我所知，佢哋係唯一一個為佢哋巴士車隊定立標準嘅一個監管當局，一定係會影響英國其他地方嘅機構，亦都可能係會影響到香港同埋新加坡嘅，因為製造倫敦巴士嘅供應商亦都有製造英國其他巴士，亦都係有供應巴士畀香港同新加坡嘅。所以呢啲嘅最佳做法可能係會伸延去世界其他嘅地方，所以係會有一個正面嘅影響嘅，因為呢啲製造商可能佢會想將佢哋嘅技術應用喺其他嘅地區。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中一個例子就係巴士車頭嘅設計，係咪？佢哋係會改善一個車頭，即係一個四方形嘅設計，個改善咗之後，如果畀個巴士車頭撞到，一個途人可能係會向側面係飛，而唔係向前面嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）而下個月就會有一個新嘅設計，就係叫做將個車頭所謂令佢軟化一啲，我哋係會改變呢一個擋風玻璃，而呢一個水撥嗰個鉸就會喺上面，而唔係喺下面，因為如果喺下面嘅話，就如果撞到人嘅話，可能會令到人受傷嘅，嗰個鉸。而改善咗設計之後，如果有途人係畀架車撞到，即係係以低速去碰撞，佢可能會係被撞上呢一個行人路嘅，但係如果係以同樣車速畀一架巴士撞到，可能佢哋係會嚴重受傷嘅，所以我哋係想令到巴士車頭嘅設計係好啲，如果出現碰撞嘅情況。

呢個設計嘅費用係比呢個製造費係低好多嘅，呢一個亞歷山大丹尼斯公司冇理由就唔喺佢哋賣去其他國家嘅巴士度採用同樣嘅設計嘅，佢哋好有機會會咁樣做嘅，所以我哋可能會見到一啲良好嘅做法係延伸到去其他嘅市場。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋講番你嘅觀察，呢個模式喺倫敦係可行嘅，呢個就係喺倫敦嘅架構底下係可行嘅，係有一個進步同埋主動嘅運輸當局，如果要喺香港取得成功，都係視乎香港嘅架構係點嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅。我諗個問題就係邊一個模式可以最快取得成果，即係根據現有嘅架構，但係喺短期嚟講，如果我哋要定立一個--建立一個新嘅監管者，可能會影響短期嘅成果。過去幾年，即係運輸局亦都係有睇到呢個問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧大律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。你同 Stanley 教授，你係向委員會提供咗唔同嘅選項，點樣可以改善呢個做法，第一，就係呢一個巴士公司嘅峰會；第二，就係一個委務委員會，就係 Stanley 教授有提議過嘅，雖然喺維多利亞省就冇一個咁樣嘅架構；第三，就係一個獨立嘅交通監管者。呢啲都係供委員會參考嘅，你同唔同意？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，呢個巴士營運商峰會同埋常務委員會之間嘅個分別可能只係文字上嘅分別啫，可能係同一件事嚟嘅，喺實際嚟講。我諗另一個問題就係呢個委員會如果有一啲第三方參與，譬如話係警方，會唔會佢哋--即係可以幫助到佢哋嘅工作呢。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你應該係會聽過 ISO 標準，就係特別係 ISO 39001，呢一項嘅標準對倫敦嘅整個巴士系統係有冇影響呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺呢個工程嘅標準係會符合呢個 ISO 嘅標準嘅，但係我唔知係咪同一個號碼或者有另外一個編號嘅。倫敦有一啲巴士公司係有 ISO 認證嘅，喺佢哋業務嘅某啲方面。但係倫敦運輸局就係冇要求任何巴士公司係要有 ISO 認證，但係我相信佢哋嘅喺工程方面係得到一啲 ISO 認證，但係我唔知道嗰啲標準係咪一樣。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇第 146 頁，係你報告嘅一部分，你就詳細提到

呢個巴士安全計劃，第146頁就講，「喺2016年嘅2月，倫敦運輸局為咗回應公眾同埋持份者嘅施壓，佢就開展咗一個巴士安全計劃，而主要嘅元素就係以下嘅」，我哋見到呢一個核心嘅元素就係喺左面嗰一欄，而右面嗰一欄就係一啲最近新加嘅元素，我哋頭先都講到呢個問題，我亦都問過你究竟呢一個巴士安全計劃係籌備咗幾耐呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）唔係好耐嘅啫。點解我會知道呢？因為我16年2月我仍然係即係喺倫敦運輸局嘅一部分，我係有份係開展呢個計劃嘅，個背景就係安全並唔係一個首要嘅考慮，而巴士營運商嘅峰會亦都冇係著重呢個安全。

當時公眾施加嘅壓力係越嚟越大，其中一個原因就係倫敦運輸局就喺發布呢個交數據嘅時候係更加高透明度，而有一啲嘅持份者，包括係公眾，佢係涉及喺一啲嚴重嘅巴士意外嘅，所以呢個機構係受到好大嘅壓力要改善安全。所以呢個巴士安全計劃就係希望係納入唔同嘅元素。

以前可能有一啲嘅措施，但係就並冇一個整合嘅計劃，所以喺2016年2月就開展咗呢項計劃，令到我哋可以更加有系統咁樣推展呢啲工作嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）當時有幾多人係負責設計呢個計劃嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）大概兩至三個人，只係一個好細嘅團隊嘅啫。係由喺呢個巴士安全小組入面兩至三個人係設計嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個計劃係包括一啲主動吖，還是一啲被動嘅措施？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個計劃並唔係係為咗回應某一個嘅事件或者意外，其實純粹係一個自然嘅進展，個目標就係去重新係聚焦喺呢個安全嘅。我好清楚巴士公司同埋倫敦運輸局一直都係好著重安全嘅，呢個計劃係純粹係令到呢一個問題更加聚焦，令到工作更加有方向，但係呢個計劃並唔係由某一個事件引起嘅，但係係為咗回應一個公眾嘅訴求，包括係踩單車嘅人，因為係越嚟越多人喺倫敦踩單車，亦都係佢哋涉及一啲嚴重嘅交通意外，所以市民係期望運輸局係拓展佢哋嘅工作，但係之前其實好多工作已經做緊，只不過就唔係喺一個好整合嘅方式去進行。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我想你睇下第148頁嘅，呢度特別係講到一個巴士安全嘅標準，第一段有介紹過，「巴士安全計劃嘅一個主要嘅成果就係發展一個新嘅巴士安全標準，喺2016年開始，倫敦運輸局已經係同呢一個道路安全顧問TRL Loughborough University、一啲巴士公司同埋發展商係去評核同埋建議一啲未來巴士設計應該有嘅一啲設計特點去改善安全嘅。」

而第二段就講到「有幾項嘅潛在嘅科技，包括係智能車速輔助、一啲自動剎掣、一啲巴士嘅固定裝置、一個防止誤踏油門、一個鏡面嘅設計同埋巴士車頭嘅防撞保護等等，亦都係有考慮到各項嘅成本同埋好處，同埋亦都係想喺財

務投資同埋係減低意外方面取得一個平衡嘅，亦都有提到一個智能嘅車速輔助系統。」

跟住就係巴士安全標準嘅第一階段，就係喺18年10月16號宣布嘅，正話都講過，就話有三個嘅階段，「儘管而家預計個標準就適用於新嘅巴士（就一年大概有七百部），對於現時嘅巴士車隊都係會加裝呢啲設備嘅，作為一個中期翻新嘅計劃嚟到去加裝，大概需要就係七年嗰就加裝㗎喇。運輸局其實就係採取一個好嚴謹嘅態度嚟到睇不同嘅選項嘅，佢哋就會用成本嘅效益嘅分析嚟到去睇每一個嘅選項，確保就係每一鎊使出嚟都係物有所值，同埋可以係減低嗰個傷亡嘅數字。」

巴士嘅安全帶就冇預計就係喺呢一個安全標準嘅一部分咁樣，你就話「冇預計有安全帶」，其實呢個係咪經過一個好嚴謹嘅成本效益嘅分析，然後先至係作出呢個結論嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我諗喺同呢個運輸局傾呢個巴士安全嘅時候，好顯然佢哋冇係諗到呢一個安全帶係作為一個嘅安全嘅措施，佢哋嘅睇法就係佢哋知道個成本係點樣，同埋就相對於其他嘅選項嗰個嘅效益係點樣，我唔會話佢哋覺得係冇用，但係顯然喺佢哋嘅諗法入面就冇諗到呢一個安全帶係作為一個安全嘅標準咁樣，呢個當時就係8月嘅時候，當時冇考慮到呢個安全帶嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師嘅問題就係話係咪冇考慮到係--係咪經過嚴謹嘅考慮，然後先至唔採納呢一個嘅做法呢？係咪將來都唔會咁樣考慮呢個做法呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅印象就係佢哋唔會考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔會睇？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）唔會睇。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）如果你睇134頁，你喺你藍色嗰部分就係引述呢個運輸署嗰個嘅指引，講到目前嘅安全帶，即係巴士安全帶嗰個嘅情況咁樣嘅，呢個係咪運輸署嘅指引？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，藍色就係直接係轉載呢一個嘅指引嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我會帶你睇一睇呢一方面，我哋會睇香港嗰個情況，即係而家嘅建議係點樣，「一般嘅規定，係2001年10月1號以嚟，每一個向前或者向後嘅座位都係需要有呢啲嘅安全帶裝置嘅，用一個批准同埋係妥善安裝嘅安全帶就可以防止死亡同埋嚴重受傷嘅，唔單只就可以係將個乘客綁住喺度，同時亦都係防止啲乘客彈出嚟，特別係反車嘅情況。

唯一嘅例外就係某一啲嘅車可能係市區用嘅，係有企位嘅乘客嘅，對於短途嘅情況，就係有呢啲咁樣嘅豁免，喺時間又短，距離亦都短嘅，速度亦都唔快嘅，儘管我哋知道對於安全帶安裝方面，嗰個營運者係可以選擇邊類嘅車種

係安裝安全帶嚟到提供呢啲服務。」呢個就係運輸署嘅指引嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）為咗記錄，運輸署就係 2010 年 5 月嘅時候亦都係有一啲嘅文獻就係講到巴士安全帶嘅情況嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係喇，主席亦都提供呢方面，亦都文件夾亦都有嘅。而家喺螢光幕上面都有打出嚟㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇編號㗎？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）MISC-3 嘅，1274 頁。講到香港嘅情況，係巴士安全帶嗰方面，我想你係--我啱啱想講就話歷史，或者係對呢個問題嘅不同嘅考慮因素，我跟住就想請你表達下啲個人嘅意見。

首先我就想睇一睇 SEC-3 1310 頁，呢一份文件係環境運輸局所發出嘅，呢個係 2006 年嘅時候係寫嘅呢份文件，份文件就係畀立法會嘅運輸事務委員會，係講到呢一個專營巴士嘅安全嘅問題嘅，喺 1315 頁嗰度，你可以睇到個標題，就係專營巴士嘅安全帶。

第 18 段，「根據道路交通安全設備規例，司機係硬性規定係需要提供安全帶，其實就係百分之三十四冇遮擋嘅座位都係有安全帶嘅，而呢個所有嘅專營巴士嘅經營者都係需要承擔新巴士係要喺啲冇遮擋嘅座位嗰度就係安裝安全帶嘅。鑑於最近嘅交通意外，運輸署同專營巴士經營者就係檢討個情況，睇下現時巴士車隊入面係加裝安全帶，佢哋就會考慮嗰個技術問題，譬如話係座位係咪結構上係強而有力同埋係咪有一啲嘅鞏固點。

同時亦都係有研究做過海外嘅做法，有啲就睇嚟，就冇一啲嘅海外國家就係規定安裝安全帶就係喺一啲市區使用或者係有企位嘅巴士上面係安裝嘅。

由於上述，我哋認為要引進強制規定安裝同埋係配戴安全帶，即係專營巴士上面，呢個係唔合適嘅。」

目前就住運輸署嗰方面個情況就係咁樣，嘅立場，當時就係 2006 年嘅。

或者我哋想睇 SEC-3，1323 頁，呢份文件就係立法會運輸事務委員會嘅，同一個事務委員會，個標題就係講到提升專營巴士運作安全嘅措施嘅進度。

1329 頁，我哋睇到呢個係 2007 年所發表嘅一份文件，當時係 1 月。

我哋睇 1323 頁，有個副標題就係喺專營巴士上面加裝安全帶，第 3 段，呢度就匯報番有關加裝安全帶嗰個嘅情況。

或者請大家睇第 4 段，「我哋從其他國家係關於加裝安全帶嘅情況，到目前為止，我哋搵唔到一啲國家佢哋係有一啲法律嘅規定就係話喺市區使用嘅巴士同埋係有企位嘅巴士上面就安裝或者使用一啲安全帶嘅。」

「所以專營巴士佢哋係同意係完成個改裝工程喺上層嗰度係安裝一啲強化玻璃嘅擋風玻璃」咁樣，但係呢個就係 2008 年--即係 2007 年，當時就係對於嗰個加裝安全帶係冇任何嘅轉變嘅。

另一個事項係我想提嘅就係 TD-1 94，運輸署嘅第 1 沓文件嘅第 94 頁，個標題就係 TD 文件 08，係喺專營巴士上面應用新嘅裝置同埋科技嘅，你或者睇 107 頁...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係運輸署今年 4 月提交嘅文件，係咪？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係嘅，主席。我哋由 07 年而家係去 2018 年，Weston 先生，呢個唔係交畀立法會嘅文件，呢份文件其實係運輸署提交畀委員會，協助委員會嚟到去進行佢嘅工作嘅。

或者我想請你注意第 94 頁，你睇到就係第 4 段，「跟進番牽涉專營巴士嘅嚴重嘅意外，即係九巴大埔嘅事件，牽涉到若干人死亡嘅，呢個就係 18 年 2 月，跟住就係成立咗一個委員會就亦都係有牽涉專營巴士公司同埋巴士製造商，喺 2018 年 3 月中就檢討安裝一啲新嘅安全裝置或者係應用一啲新嘅安全技術嗰個嘅技術可行性嚟嚟到去提升巴士乘客嘅安全保障嘅。有關嘅討論嘅結果同埋係工作小組嘅建議，係已經開列咗喺下面嘅段落當中。」

你睇到就係成立呢一個工作小組嘅原因就係因為大埔嗰度發生交通意外，巴士嘅意外，第 7 段，報告嘅第 7 段，嗰度有講，就係對於所有乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅，第 5 段先，「鑑於 06 年 7 月嘅意外，當時九巴就同一輛車輛係相撞，就喺雙層巴士上層嗰度有乘客被拋出」，「運輸署就建議，而巴士公司係同意就係應該喺四個上層嘅前面座椅嗰度係加裝安全帶嘅嘅，呢啲就係 97 年之後發牌嘅巴士就防止巴士乘客就係跌出嚟嘅，目前，淨係一啲冇遮擋嘅座椅先至係需要加裝安全帶，呢個係標準嘅做法。」

第 7 段，「至於話對於所有座椅安裝安全帶，三間嘅雙層巴士製造商就確定技術係可行嘅，如果係經營者係要求嘅話，佢哋可以喺新嘅巴士對所有座椅係安裝安全帶，係符合上述所講嘅國際標準嘅；同樣，所有專營巴士嘅經營者指出就話佢哋同意係將呢一個嘅要求係納入去喺採購新巴士嘅安排當中。」

「至於話現行巴士加裝安全帶，製造商表達關注就話喺地面嘅結構就冇咁樣嘅設計就未必能夠安裝起嚟，符合國際嘅標準，係要符合呢個規定，係加固呢一個嘅地台嘅結構同埋係取代或者更換而家嘅巴士座椅。製造商亦都確定就係技術上係可以喺所有嘅上層嘅座椅係加裝安全帶，而佢係一定係某個年份製造先至得嘅，佢哋就會係就住呢個可行性做出研究嘅，同埋就係對於呢啲專營公司嘅巴士睇下係咪適合安裝呢啲安全帶。根據運輸署嘅了解，加裝安全帶係牽涉到重大嘅改裝，包括呢個專營巴士嗰個嘅結構同埋係更換所有嘅座椅，同埋係進行一啲拉力嘅測試，嚟到確定係咪符合國際標準等等。加裝安全帶同埋測試嘅工作係需要好長嘅時間嚟到去完成嘅，因此亦都影響巴士嗰個嘅出車率同埋有關嘅運作嘅。專營巴士公司經營者係會進一步研究有關嘅建議嘅。」

呢個就係 2018 年 4 月嘅情況，呢個就係運輸署提供畀委員會嘅報告。而家係已經 1 點鐘，或者可能就喺午膳時間我就會繼續。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，Weston 先生，我哋而家就會係午膳，所以我請鄧律師，你會唔會話畀我哋聽你需要再多幾多時間呢？我哋知道其實我就自己都問咗好多問題，所以亦都令到成個時間長咗。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。你亦都冇打擾到我哋嘅，我哋其實個進展都相當良好嘅。我相信就三點半應該可以完，如果唔得嘅時候，就起碼都係 4 點之前可以完。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係午膳，兩點半先至再返嚟。唔該晒。

下午 1 時 01 分押聆訊押後

下午 2 時 30 分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安。係，鄧律師，唔該。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。Weston 先生，午安。喺午膳之前，我就睇過一份文件，2018 年 4 月嘅文件，係一個運輸署嘅文件，文件編號係 8 號，而家就請你睇另外一份文件，就係返番去時序再較早之前嘅事件，係 2018 年 3 月，係 KMB-12 號文件冊，4869-1。

喺呢頁上面，你睇到呢個嘅標題就係「專營巴士安全改善工作小組」，呢個係 2018 年 3 月 13 號嘅會議嘅記錄，係 3 點鐘舉行，而跟住就有一啲出席者嘅名單。去到 4869-6，呢度就係講裝置安全帶，呢度嘅資料就係有另外一個方法係去總結，然後係提供畀委員會，啱啱喺呢個 TD-08 嘅文件嗰度有展示出嚟嘅，喺食飯之前。我而家想做嘅就係就請你去到第 4869-9，就呢度講到佢個職責或者工作範圍，就係呢個工作小組嘅工作範圍。

呢個佢哋嘅工作範圍，工作小組自行制定佢嘅工作範圍，呢度係羅列咗出嚟，4869，就至到去橫劃第 9，第(2)同埋第(3)項，或者我讀出嚟，就第(2)項就係話「去檢視個技術可行性呢一個嘅成本效益，同埋適用性同埋其他嘅方面，就係話關於除咗係呢個會暴露嘅座位之外，係其他巴士所有座位都裝置安全帶嘅，呢個講緊就係話技術可行性、成本效益同埋適用性就同埋係裝置呢啲咁樣嘅裝置嘅安全設施，譬如話係呢個車速顯示器，同埋呢一個嘅電子穩定控制，就係全球定位系統呢一個速度限制同埋呢一個速度限制器，就係每小時 70

公里，同埋防撞同埋呢一個保持行車線嘅裝置，同埋就係監察呢個巴士車長嘅情況，包括究竟佢有冇係瞌眼瞓。」咁樣。

你今朝早就話畀我哋聽，喺你嘅證供裏面，亦都喺你個報告亦都有提到嘅，就係話關於安全嘅措施，譬如係喺倫敦巴士嚟講，其實一方面你好謹慎去睇嗰個成本，但係另一方面亦都好睇嗰個效益，就喺引入啲措施之前會咁樣去做。

所以我就想問下你嘅意見，就係話三個月，4869-11 嘅，呢度講嘅就係話喺檢討之後，就係會有一個啲建議，就係三個月之內去提交嘅。你覺得三個月係夠定唔夠呢？就去好小心、好謹慎睇嗰個成本同埋個效益，就頭先我哋睇到喺個工作範圍之中，有一系列嘅安全裝置，你覺得夠唔夠？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦嗰個情況，首先就係關於我哋喺今朝早講嗰個智能車速輔助系統，我哋之前同埋之後我哋都要收集數據，呢個係一個嘅經驗，同埋就係話我哋用咗幾多時間就係倫敦運輸局就係做嗰個巴士安全嘅計劃，2016 年開始嘅，但係我哋下一個月先至係 2018 年先至講第一期點樣做，2019 年先至落實嘅。所以你可以話倫敦運輸局用咗太多時間去考慮、去討論呢啲咁嘅建議嘅，就其實我哋可以做快啲嘅。

但係試驗計劃裏面嘅數據，你係需要有一少部分嘅巴士就係用好長時間去試，又或者好多巴士用比較少嘅時間去試，先至有足夠嘅數據。當然，理論上你可以喺三個月之內係做個試驗計劃，但係如果我哋真係需要好謹慎去睇呢啲嘅數據嘅時候，你就係要做--就係多啲時間，或者你需要更加嘅樣本嘅巴士先至做得到，所以三個月好似係太少，喺倫敦嚟講，嗰啲人，當然有人會講話倫敦運輸局係可能要做快啲都未定，但係我哋亦都要平衡嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）關於呢個智能車速輔助系統喺倫敦就係有兩個路線係試驗嘅，係咪牽涉到都有好多部嘅巴士呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我其實就唔係好記得，19 號其實都係條大線嚟嘅，可能係三十、四十，但係 486 就應該係少啲嘅。三個月如果你假設對我哋嚟講，如果我哋真係冇去延誤嘅說話，其實真係太過快，太短喇時間，即係要去試咁多、咁多唔同嘅選項。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。而家我就想去睇一睇 4 月。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺做呢個之前，呢個係 3 月 13 號嘅議程，就係講話呢個嘅報告會係喺三個月之內提交畀運輸署署長，但係其實已經係過咗六個月，最終嘅報告都仲未提交嘅，就畀你知道。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我覺得就三個月就太過有野心喇，如果咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師，或者有另外一件事我都想提一提嘅，喺立法會係有個會議嘅，就係同呢個工作小組有關，係 2 月 15 號，你會唔會喺某個階段，你都會

講一講呢一點呢？因為佢哋就通過咗三個動議嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，我係...

主席：（經傳譯員）因為可能你都要提一提，因為會話到畀我哋聽個背景點解運輸署係要考慮佢哋喺工作小組裏面要考慮嘅事項。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想希望按住時序去睇啲事件嘅，喺 SEC-3 嘅文件冊嗰度會見到嘅，第 1342 頁，喺呢一頁上面，Weston 先生你見到就係喺立法會嘅運輸事務委員會佢哋嘅會議，就係 2018 年 2 月 15 號嘅會議嘅會議記錄，就係工作小組第一次會議之前，嗰個會議就係喺 3 月舉行嘅，我哋頭先睇到。1359 頁--請畀少少時間我。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，你慢慢。其中有一段就係第 3 段嚟，第 3 段，1360 頁嘅，其中一個動議裏面就係話裏面列出咗呢一個委員會--立法局委員會就係促請政府係去考慮同埋探討一系列嘅措施。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺第 1356 頁，我哋就會睇到究竟呢個動議係點樣嚟㗎喇。有討論到就話有啲咩嘢措施可以加強巴士安全，係第 59 頁講，就係「副主席就係建議係減低巴士意外裏面嘅傷亡數字，所有嘅專營巴士公司就應該係考慮係喺所有嘅巴士上面嘅座位係加裝安全帶，可以分期咁樣做，陸頌雄先生就係話佢話喺龍運巴士公司嘅時候，其實係所有嘅巴士係有好多--全部都有安全帶，但係點解而家冇呢咁樣。

呢個運輸署署長就係話喺呢個新嘅巴士--喺 2003 年購置嘅巴士係一啲冇遮擋嘅位置嘅時候都有安全帶，但係 2007 年一個嘅意外之後，巴士公司就係已經同意咗運輸署嘅要求，就係話冇遮擋嘅位置同埋喺上層嘅前面都應該係有安全帶嘅，呢個運輸署同埋其他嘅巴士公司，包括九巴，都會係會係積極考慮去睇下可唔可以加裝所有嘅座位都有安全帶，呢個董事總經理九巴就話佢對呢個持開放態度，佢亦都會同運輸署去傾呢樣嘢。運輸署答陸仲雄先生嘅問題嘅時候，就係話佢哋曾經龍運就係所有巴士裏面嘅座位都有安全帶，但係因為太少嗰個用--使用率太低，所以佢哋就冇喇，而家。

毛議員--毛孟靜議員就係話其實有一啲嘅專家就話即使有呢個安全帶，亦都未必可以減低傷亡數字嘅，佢亦都好關注如果即使所有座位都有呢一個嘅安全帶，有冇困難就係要求所有嘅乘客都係去戴上呢；佢亦都就係會問下會唔會係做一個公眾諮詢。運輸署署長就話政府當局係喺呢方面係持開放態度嘅，但係除咗話呢一個技術嘅可行性，究竟乘客是否接受呢樣嘢都係應該要考慮嘅，佢會係喺一個月之後，呢個九巴就會係提交一個調查報告，佢亦都會係睇番個調查報告，然後先至去決定或者考慮使唔使去裝置一個安全帶。」

喺 1359 頁，喺第 77 頁，「個主席就係話佢亦都係收到三個嘅動議，佢認為呢啲嘅動議同嗰個議程係有關嘅，而委員都係同意處理呢啲動議嘅。」

陳克勤先生就係動議人，呢個動議。喺 1360 頁就係有英文嘅翻譯嘅，呢個第 3 段就講，就係「探討有啲咩嘢方法，點可以改善巴士嘅安全，包括就係一啲高風險嘅座位亦都係增加個保護裝置，係喺更多嘅座位上面係加裝安全帶，同埋係分期係強制乘客應該係戴安全帶，同埋係喺巴士司機嘅外面係裝置一個嘅外置嘅攝錄機，同埋係改裝呢一個限速器，去確保喺一個高風險嘅道路上面有係安全嘅行車嘅。」

所以你睇到立法會嘅呢一個動議就喺工作小組嘅第一次會議之前就舉行嘅，所以都係有提到一啲譬如話係裝置安全帶嘅一啲好處同埋難處嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：Yes.

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）然後我就想跟住時序，我哋就睇番工作小組第二次會議嘅會議記錄，呢個係 KMB-12 4887-1。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係 2018 年 4 月 23？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，呢個係 2018 年 4 月 23 號嘅會議，呢啲係個會議記錄，相關嘅部分就喺 4887-5 頁，就去睇我哋呢啲嘅「巴士嘅營運者佢哋就同呢一個製造商睇下有冇辦法、有冇可行性可唔可以係喺座位上面係安裝安全帶，佢哋就會呢個都係可以，係有啲新嘅巴士去購買嘅時候就係可以裝置安全帶嘅，九巴同埋龍運就話會差唔多係每一架雙層巴士就係要 5,000 英鎊嘅，如果要咁做，所有嘅巴士營運商就都同意喺新購買嘅單層同埋雙層巴士都會係安裝安全帶嘅。

至於啲已經採購但係仲未送運嘅新巴士，九巴、龍運表示佢哋係會要求呢個生產商係喺所有嘅乘客座位度安裝安全帶嘅，如果係可行嘅話，而九巴、龍運就話喺 18 年 9 月之前送抵嘅一百四十五架新巴士都可以係喺所有嘅座位度安裝安全帶嘅。九巴同埋新大嶼山巴士就通知咗運輸署就係喺 18 年 4 月嗰陣時，如果係供應商係可以--即係佢哋係可以喺所有嘅乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅。

至於現有嘅巴士，九巴、龍運同埋城巴、新巴就表示呢一個喺所有乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅技術可行性評估仍然係未明朗嘅，即使技術上係可行，呢個問題仍然係要進一步考慮，因為要考慮到相關嘅財務安排同埋對巴士營運嘅影響，因為就要係相當嘅時間係去改裝啲巴士。運輸署就鼓勵所有巴士公司去繼續探討喺所有乘客座位加裝安全帶嘅技術可行性，應該喺每個巴士型號都去探討，然後先作出決定嘅。」

呢個就係第二次會面之後嘅結論，即係第二次同埋第三次嘅會議之後得出嘅結果，呢個就係 6 月 21 號，即係有 3 月、4 月同埋係 6 月。

喺 KMB-12 文件冊 4908-1 頁嘅，同安全帶有關嘅部分就係喺 4908-7 頁嘅，喺第 25 段，就話喺「會議上同意係可以喺所有新嘅巴士嘅乘客座位係安裝安全帶嘅，係可以符合相關嘅國際標準，而所有嘅巴士公司就承諾所有新嘅專

營巴士都係會喺全部嘅乘客座位度安裝安全帶嘅。」而額外嘅支出將會係每架巴士大概 5,000 鎊。

第 26 段，「至於現有嘅巴士，喺會議上係提到，喺某啲現有雙層巴士型號上層嘅所有乘客座位加裝安全帶係可行嘅，而九巴、龍運就表示佢哋會喺巴士嘅上層所有座位加裝安全帶，而喺呢啲係某啲長途嘅巴士或者喺一啲某啲行走高速公路嘅路線嘅。

而九巴、龍運就話到咗 2019 年中就會大概有四百新巴士會係所有嘅乘客座位度安裝安全帶嘅。九巴、龍運就會將呢啲巴士調配去上述嘅路線。喺現有嘅巴士加裝安全帶就要視乎實際嘅情況或者要求。

就住九巴、龍運嘅措施，喺會議上係同意喺現有嘅巴士加裝安全帶嘅，而係相關即係喺現有巴士安裝安全帶嘅成本同埋所需嘅時間，根據海外嘅經驗，就冇足夠嘅證據支持佢成為一個強制嘅--所有巴士嘅強制要求。但係委員同意至於一啲冇保護嘅座位同埋一啲冇企位嘅車廂係需要嘅。

喺呢方面，城巴、新巴就被要求去考慮喺某啲長途巴士路線嘅上層所有座位加裝安全帶或者喺一啲喺高速公路行走嘅某啲路線，城巴、新巴表示會好難調配佢哋嘅巴士只係行走某一啲嘅路線，因為佢哋嘅巴士每日都會係調派去唔同嘅路線嘅。同時城巴、新巴亦都係表示好少乘客會係用安全帶，所以喺現有嘅巴士度加裝安全帶喺財務上係不可行嘅。城巴、新巴要求政府去支付加裝安全帶嘅費用，如果政府係咁樣要求嘅話。」

而個結論，喺第 31 段，就係話「運輸署係要求所有嘅專營巴士營運商去估計一啲行走巴士停站比較少、高速公路嘅長途巴士路線同埋相關嘅巴士數目，並將呢一個資料係儘早交畀運輸署參考。」

我哋而家就睇另外一份文件，就係 4938-1，呢啲就係第三次會議嘅記錄，就係喺今年 6 月 27 號進行嘅，呢個就係一個專營巴士車內安全裝置嘅工作小組，換句話講，呢個就係六日之後所進行嘅一個會議。

我哋睇 4938-5 頁，第 15 段，嗰個標題就係喺所有嘅乘客座位安裝安全帶。「運輸署通知會議就係同佢哋就係喺長途巴士路線安裝安全帶嘅睇法，或者就係一啲喺高速公路行走而上落係比較少嘅路線，運輸署已經係要求專營巴士商係去提供參與呢啲服務路線嘅巴士數目。新巴、城巴強調佢哋唔同意呢一項嘅加裝工作，除非係由政府係畀錢嘅，咁亦都係睇到係需要三至四名技術嘅勞工，要用一個星期先可以為一架巴士加裝安全帶嘅，如果考慮到呢一個人手嘅支出同埋物料嘅支出，加裝一架巴士加裝安全帶嘅成本會大概係 24 萬嘅。」

而最後一份文件，我都想帶你睇一睇嘅，呢份就係運輸署交畀立法會交通事務委員會喺今年 7 月提供嘅更新文件，呢一個就係 TD-1 文件冊 403 頁嘅。喺 403 頁，呢個標題你見到就係 2018 年 7 月 25 號討論嘅事項，就係畀立法會交通事務委員會嘅，標題就係改善專營巴士嘅安全。我哋睇第 412 頁，你見到

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

呢份就係由運房局、運輸署提供嘅文件就係喺今年7月嘅。

文件嘅目標就係寫咗喺403頁，而喺背景底下就講到呢一個工作小組同埋工作範圍，喺呢份文件有一啲部分就係講到安全帶嘅，我想你睇下第16段，就係409頁嘅，「就住以上10至15段所提到嘅要點」，嗰啲部分就講到一啲嘅詳情，即係我哋已經提到㗎喇。

「工作小組就得出以下嘅建議，目標就係為呢啲坐低嘅乘客提供更加多嘅保護，首先喺未來採購新嘅巴士應該喺所有座位都提供安全帶；而

(b)就係喺進行進一步嘅技術營運同埋財務評估之後，係可以考慮喺某一啲嘅巴士路線嘅上層嘅座位提供安全帶嘅。換句話講，即係行走一啲巴士停站比較少、高速公路嘅長途路線。

運輸署係會要求專營巴士商去進一步同巴士製造商去探討喺唔同巴士型號嘅上層加裝安全帶嘅技術可行性，同埋亦都係要考慮到呢一個營運同埋容量同埋係要決定一個加裝工程嘅時間表，同埋呢個財務嘅可行性，然後先至去決定究竟會唔會喺16(b)段所講嘅長途巴士路線嘅上層可唔可以加裝安全帶嘅。同時，運輸署會同專營巴士商去宣傳乘客使用安全帶，如果係有安裝嘅話（換句話講，就係一啲冇保護嘅座位，即係新嘅巴士上面冇保護嘅座位）。」

我就會問幾個問題嘅，我就會講番委員會已經聽取咗嘅證供嘅某啲部分嘅，首先就係城巴嘅證供，即係喺早前嘅聆訊佢哋係有作供嘅，呢個就係第4日嘅謄本嘅，第102頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一份文件冊㗎，你講緊？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）2A文件冊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個背景就係18年5月30號。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢個就係之前我哋聽取嘅證供嚟嘅。我想你睇102頁，我想你睇番第101頁第15行，我就喺度問緊城巴嘅Samuel Cheng先生，我就問到呢一個財務嘅安排，就係「如果係可以支付呢個部分嘅話，會對安全有咩幫助呢？」

鄭先生就話「我唔可以舉到任何可以改善安全嘅例子，但係有一啲事情可能公眾會覺得係可以改善到安全嘅，其中一樣嘢就係喺上層加裝安全帶。今朝李先生就講到成本，就會係每架巴士15,000至到20,000金鎊嘅，我哋係有一千一百架呢一類嘅巴士，如果佢哋全部都要喺上層加裝安全帶嘅話，總成本將會係1億8千萬至到2億4千萬港幣。」呢個就係城巴嘅情況。

我想你睇番九巴嘅部分，就係喺第15日，...

主席：（經傳譯員）首先想講下呢一個成本嘅問題，呢個就係102頁頁底嗰度，想Weston先生睇睇嘅，第19行，或者第16行。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第16行就講話「今朝我哋講到喺車上有一啲嘅冇保護嘅座位，佢哋已經係裝咗安全帶，我就成日搭呢啲巴士嘅，但係我就好少見到乘客--即係呢啲座位嘅乘客會戴安全帶，以後如果你要我哋公司去使1億或者兩億或者甚至超過兩億做呢件事情嘅話，我哋就好懷疑究竟係有冇用，即係如果政府係有呢個要求嘅話，如果係真係要加裝安全帶，我希望政府係會提供資助畀我哋係去安裝安全帶嘅。呢個就係其中一個例子，唔該晒。」

主席就話「你嘅意思就係如果政府係認為係需要咁做，因為乘客可能係想戴安全帶，但係根據你嘅經驗，如果佢哋唔咁做嘅話，應該係由政府去出錢，而唔係由你哋自己畀錢嘅？」

鄭先生話「如果政府認為係有需要乘客去戴安全帶，我希望政府係會資助呢一個安裝嘅工作，如果唔係，就--即係如果要我哋自己畀錢，就會係好浪費資源。」

睇番第58頁，...

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪呢個謄本，第4日？

MR DUNCAN：The transcript, yes.（經傳譯員）鄭先生早前都係有類似嘅睇法嘅，喺第58頁嘅24行，我就講緊一個城巴遠期計劃其中一部分嘅，第25行，我就話「係喺上層嘅所有座位安裝安全帶係可行嘅，但係根據我哋嘅觀察，而家好少人係會喺呢個未經保護嘅座位嗰度戴安全帶嘅，如果係冇立法係要求專營巴士嘅乘客安裝安全帶嘅話，而加上由執法單位去嚴格執行嘅話，喺所有座位安裝安全帶只會係浪費資源，因為多數嘅乘客都唔會戴嘅，即使係有提供嘅話。」

好喇，講完城巴，而家講九巴同埋近期啲嘅聆訊，第15日，9月13號嘅，第6份嘅資料夾，第15日，18頁，第20行嗰度，我就問過一個問題嘅，係關於新嘅巴士裝安全帶，我相信佢哋有安全帶嘅，或者睇番前少少，第15頁，24行，李生，Roger Lee就係九巴嘅，佢提到就係上層裝安全帶嘅可行性，「喺上層裝安全帶，技術上我哋係需要考慮到嗰個地心吸力嘅問題，政府諮詢過我哋同埋有關嘅供應商關於嗰個可行性--技術上可行性同埋個進度嘅。安全帶比較重嘅，如果你係要喺上層安裝，政府係需要考慮到嗰個傾側嘅測試，如果係技術可行，就唔會係一個問題，但係兩個供應商富豪同ADL嗰個進度就係喺正面嘅。」

跟住佢就係講到嗰個財政上嘅影響，就係喺呢個加裝安全帶。

「價錢唔平嘅，即係喺今年初嘅時候，就有個特別委員會就發出一個清楚指示，我哋嘅巴士19年買嘅同埋之後嘅就有安全帶，至於話加裝安全帶，如果可行嘅話，特別係啲長途嘅路線，我哋係會喺上層加裝安全帶，我哋唔希望係進一步有意外嘅，所以個成本唔係我哋主要考慮，有關安全帶就需要一加巴士就係需要20萬嘅，係上層咁計。」

「有幾多架巴士係會加裝呢？喺呢個車隊入面有幾多架呢？」

梁生（另一位代表）就話「我相信係三千六百部長途嘅巴士。」

跟住就第 22 段嗰度，李生，Roger Lee 就話佢要補充，「目前我哋有係四千二、四千三架巴士，呢個係九巴、龍運加埋，有啲巴士就係有安全帶，但係其他佢哋係明年將來嘅年份就會退役㗎喇，呢啲巴士係會兩、三年退役，佢哋就唔會加裝嘅。對於長途線嘅巴士，我唔知道個實際個數字，但係三分一就會係長途嘅。」

主席喺 22 行嗰度就話「李生，你講過就話加裝三千六部嘅長途巴士，你係咪更改你嘅聲明，就話係一千呢？」佢就話「係嘅。」

第 5 行，就話「我就係嘗試就計一計數，一千部巴士 ，20 萬，每部巴士 20 萬？」「係。」

「個數字就係 2 億元嘅？」梁博士就話「係嘅。」

「呢一點就需要同政府傾嘅？」個答案就係「唔會。」

好喇，最後，我想你留意一下嘅，就係我哋係聽取過警方嘅證供，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋講呢度之前，或者喺嗰個謄錄本嗰度，你正話提到第 16 頁嗰度，第 17 行，「喺今年年初就係我哋公司成立咗個委員會，就係特別委員會發出指示，我哋嘅巴士 19 年或者之後採購嘅係會有安全帶嘅，至於話安全帶嘅加裝，如果可行嘅話，特別係長途線，我哋係會喺上層嗰度係安裝安全帶嘅。」

我諗清楚啲嘅，就係呢個係提到九巴係就住大埔道交通意外佢提交嘅報告，呢個就係 KMB-1A 第 98 頁，同埋第 39 段、第 40 段。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你睇到嘛，Weston 先生？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，睇到嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）KMB-1A，98。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就講番個背景，係運輸署長係規定九巴喺一個月之內提交嘅一份報告，喺 3 月 12 號提交嘅，呢份報告就係喺工作小組開會之前嘅，就正話都有講過邊個出席咁樣。或者我想請 Duncan 大律師同我哋讀一讀，等我哋知道九巴喺呢個工作小組之前嗰個立場係點樣嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者睇番 98 頁，文件夾嘅第 98 頁，Weston 先生，你睇到呢個就係 3 月 12 號，39 段，巴士公司就話喺報告當中係咁講嘅，呢個係畀運輸署長嘅，「事件之後，就立法會議員提出咗不同嘅意見同埋建議，傳媒、公眾人士都提到應該採取咩嘢措施嚟到去提升公共巴士運作嘅安全，特別

巴士乘客嘅安全，特別委員會考慮過呢啲事項，諮詢過九巴嘅巴士供應商，同埋作出若干嘅建議，而九巴嘅管理層係會執行同埋係進一步探討嘅。」

第 40 段，「九巴已經要求咗供應商係喺所有嘅座位安裝安全帶，呢個新訂嘅巴士，喺 18 年 3 月 5 號之後就會係既定嘅安排嚟㗎喇。至於而家現行嘅巴士，如果有啲路線係需要嘅話，係可以喺上層分階段咁嚟到去安裝呢啲安全帶嘅，呢個係九巴嘅巴士。」

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）好喇，最後就想請你睇一睇警方所畀嘅證供，呢個就係第 17 日嘅作供，日期就係 18 年 9 月 24 號星期一嘅，第 7 號嘅文件夾。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）或者想請你睇一睇第 50 頁，當時就係主席同歐陽先生係同 Stephen Baker 先生係對話嘅，Baker 先生就係警隊嘅代表，佢係總警司嚟嘅，或者睇番第 49 頁先，主席就提到安全帶嘅問題，即係小巴，公共小巴就有安全帶嘅。

主席就話「係咪小巴有？」Baker 先生話「係嘅。」

「其實喺執法嗰度有冇困難？係咪好容易嘅呢？」Baker 先生就話「好難執行嘅，因為呢個都唔係定期咁執行嘅，呢個係有時咁樣執行，警務人員就決定要執法，就係因為道路安全嘅問題，呢個係唔單只係一個環節嘅問題，即係需要宣傳，需要經常嘅宣傳嘅。我希望啲人就唔會話因為驚住檢控，然後先至係守法。」

主席話「呢個係需要好長嘅時間先至說服到啲人係坐車係戴安全帶。」佢就話「我哋認為如果啲人有得選擇，咁就更加好嘅，即係去改善佢哋嘅道路安全作為一個選擇，一個選項。」

歐陽先生就提咗一個問題，就話「安全帶嗰方面，根據小巴嘅經驗，警方喺執法方面係咪好成功呢？」Baker 先生話「我冇嗰啲執法嘅數字，但係我希望市民係會守法，因為係對佢哋好嘅，即係而唔係進行檢控咁樣。」

「但係正如剛才所講，大多數嘅人就唔會喺小巴嗰度係纜安全帶，執法係好困難嘅，我哋可以睇到點解你預計喺巴士嗰度亦都有同樣嘅趨勢嘅？」Baker 先生話「係嘅。」

好喇，有好多資料係提供咗畀你消化嘅，Weston 先生，但係你可以睇到呢度嘅情況就係肯定就係有個決定就係話至於話新嘅巴士以後--有個建議就話以後新採購嘅巴士就係會有安全帶嘅，每個座椅都係會有安全帶嘅，不管嗰輛巴士係行走呢個市區路線，咁係好擠逼㗎喇，我相信應該，亦都係有一啲企位嘅乘客。我哋聽到巴士公司嗰個額外嘅成本，就會係差唔多一架巴士就係

5,000鎊嘅，呢個係其中一方面。

第二方面就係喺上層嗰度嘅座椅加裝安全帶，技術上係可行嘅，對於行某啲路線嘅巴士，即係行一啲譬如話高速公路嘅路線嘅巴士，如果你替兩間專營巴士公司嚟講，嗰個成本就差唔多係4億。

我相信委員會明白嘅就係你對呢兩方面其實都可能有你嘅意見，即係新購置嘅巴士係要安裝安全帶，呢個唔會話好大嘅開支。第二，就係加裝安全帶嘅問題，喺行走一啲高速公司、特別路線嘅巴士加裝安全帶，我好希望係聽下你嘅意見。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，或者我畀一啲一般嘅觀察先，我相信初步睇嚟，從今日嘅證供聽到就係安裝安全帶就係技術上係可行嘅，亦都係有佢嘅優點嘅，即係有做過研究係咪可行，成本就係另一個問題，係咪有實際嘅優點呢？

從我嘅聽到嘅證供，就係話喺香港專利巴士經營者加裝安全帶，呢個佢哋接納呢個安排嘅速度好似呢個運輸局拒絕呢個安排係咁快咁樣，一樣咁快。我相信安全帶的確有佢嘅優點嘅，喺交通意外嘅時候，汽車又好，咩嘢車都好，的確係佢嘅幫助嘅。

我哋都係聽過一啲執法嘅問題，係咪有能力去到執法嘅問題，另一個問題提到嘅，就係喺證供嗰度係未必有提，就係係咪能夠令到呢啲安全帶係成日都係運作良好呢咁，最緊要就係你有啲安全帶，如果運輸署同埋專營經營者係要啲人係纜安全帶，就確保佢哋係用得到先得嘅，呢個亦都可能係一個好大嘅財政負擔嘅。喺保養嗰方面亦都係一個問題，經常要保養住呢啲安全帶。

我認為喺好多評估嗰度冇睇到嘅就係嗰個成本效益嘅問題，安全帶嗰個成本，加裝安全帶亦都係一個好大嘅成本負擔嚟嘅，喺啲新巴士，5,000鎊，亦都係有一個成本喺度㗎嘛。主要嘅問題就係投資呢啲錢落去，個效益係點樣，安全帶喺減少交通意外傷亡嘅時候相對於嗰個--嘅價錢相對於嗰啲錢擺喺其他嘅措施嗰方面係點樣比較呢？其中一個擔憂嘅地方就係九巴投資龐大嘅金錢，呢個當然係值得歡迎，但係始終個危險就係有其他嘅高科技嘅措施係可以安裝嘅，亦都係同樣可以係投資喺嗰度嘅。

呢點，每一鈪使落去，愛嚟提升安全係咪可以係取得更加好嘅效益呢？譬如話嗰個車頭嘅設計、自動減速、自動剎車等等嗰啲咁嘅措施，嗰啲錢係咪花得更加有成本效益呢？

啲錢一係就係嚟自現時專營巴士嗰個嘅利潤；我聽到一啲嘅證供就係都唔係好高嘅，一係就嚟自嗰個乘客，個票價會高啲；一係來自政府。始終都係呢三個來源係得到經費嘅，始終問題就係點樣使呢啲錢，點樣可以使得物有所值嘅，點樣可以取得更加好嘅成效。如果你加埋呢啲咁嘅數字，嗰個錢都唔係少嘅。

其實我就要問，係咪可以係花喺其他嘅形式嘅科技以取得更加好嘅成效呢咁？但係相對於倫敦、香港嘅比較，最重要嘅就係運輸局佢哋就唔係好贊成呢個安全帶，倫敦就係好平坦嘅地方，唔係話好多車就係每小時四、五十里咁行，大多數嘅巴士係喺倫敦就係同香港係唔同嘅，香港其實嗰個地勢就係好有挑戰性嘅，亦都係有唔同嘅。

所以我就會睇下其實特別係一啲高風險嘅路線點樣去處理，我哋可能就唔係話一刀切去做一啲嘢，可能係有啲唔同嘅方案。有一啲嘅路線其實可能真係需要安全帶嘅，但係我認為你哋應該選擇得比較好啲，而唔係一刀切嘅去做。

正如我所講，我就會問一個問題，就係話究竟保養方面究竟有需要幾多嘅承擔呢等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以埋啲個咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就去確保呢個安全帶其實係保養得好，亦都係有一個好嘅功能繼續，使到佢哋可以繼續被使用嘅。當嗰啲乘客去到架專營巴士嘅時候，其實真係嗰啲安全帶真係情況係好嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽嗰個保養費係幾多呢？而家喺啲--譬如係喺英國，譬如旅遊車會唔會有㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦嚟講，譬如話佢哋係一啲服務型嘅巴士嗰度，嗰個保養嘅挑戰就可能有啲人刻意破壞，就或者有啲人就係喺個安全帶嗰度就塞住嗰啲窿呀咁樣樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港嚟講，都係唔會係一個問題嚟嘅。喺呢一個保養會唔會係有啲嘅技術層面都會係一個問題嚟嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我唔係好清楚，就我相信就應該一定係會有一啲定期嘅保養嘅工作要做嘅，喺英國嘅一啲嘅旅遊車嚟講，其實即係刻意破壞呢樣嘢就唔係話真係個問題好嚴重嘅。或者我亦都係喺我個報告裏面講，就係附件 D 裏面，...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你稍等一下，鄧律師，你可唔可以畀我哋嘅頁碼呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）就係由運輸局係提交畀我同埋主席嘅，係第 160 頁嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有一個幻燈片呢度就係有講到...

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇嘅頁數呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯喇，就係呢個喇，呢個。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）就係佢，呢一頁，2017 年嘅數字，就係話喺巴士

上面有啲人係跌嚟，就係 3,074 嘅數字，係 2017 年嘅數字。呢個就係睇到大部分喺巴士上面嘅乘客受傷就係因為佢哋企喺度或者佢係上緊車、落緊車或者佢哋係上緊樓梯、落緊樓梯，就大概係百分之十三嘅，就喺三千宗之中，大概係四百宗係呢一類型嘅。所以其實我所認為我哋焦點應該就係睇下嗰啲企喺度嘅乘客，呢個係說明喺倫敦嗰個受傷嘅情況嘅分類，就係有啲人企喺度咁樣樣，同埋啲乘客喺乜嘢狀況底下喺架巴士上面係受傷嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺遠期計劃裏面嘅一啲數字，鄧律師，2018 至到 2022 年就有講到有啲人就係佢哋係失咗平衡，佢哋跌嚟，亦都有啲數字就係嗰啲人坐喺度就係受傷嘅。2015 至 2016 年兩年，百分之五十一點五就係嗰啲企喺度嘅乘客嚟嘅，或者佢哋係失去重心、失去平衡，只係有百分之一嘅人就係佢哋坐緊嘅時候係受傷嘅，呢個似乎就係話就係坐喺度嘅乘客佢哋受傷嘅百分比係比較低嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個，主席，呢個好似似乎係我記憶所及嘅情況，可唔可以請我助手係將嗰個計劃再搵出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）另外一個問題係就呢個立法會議員就要求我哋審視下安全帶呢個問題，首先如果你唔配戴安全帶，你有咩嘢嘅受傷，可能似乎啲人就係話啲人喺架巴士行嚟行去、上樓梯或落樓梯，而唔係真係坐喺個座位受傷嘅，所以坐喺度嘅人受傷嘅比率係比較少。

另外就係話，其實而家我哋睇下而家巴士嘅人去使安全帶嘅情況係點樣，係咪應該做一個調查，呢一個城巴嘅董事總經理話畀我聽其實都冇人去戴嘅，其實會唔會我哋其實搜集一啲客觀嘅資料會好㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係好嘅，如果譬如話我哋係用一啲閉路電視去睇清楚究竟個使用率有幾多咁樣會係好。但係我認為你話要係裝安全帶嘅時候，你亦都係有一個宣傳運動去鼓勵啲人去配戴安全帶，如果你真係決定去投資去裝安全帶嘅說話，起碼都能夠將呢一個好處係攞到最大嘅。但係我哋嘅運輸局嘅數據顯示其實就呢個真係一個--係車上乘客嘅問題，呢方面唔係最大嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）另外一個因素可能就係話係進行一個調查，就問下啲人因為呢一個巴士公司或者管理當局認為係安裝安全帶係安全啲嘅，佢哋願唔願意使用呢？2007 年嘅時候，其實可能都--如果係，我冇記錯嘅時候，就係都做過咁嘅調查嘅，佢哋就訪問咗，用電話訪問咗二千二百個人嘅。鄧大律師，可唔可以證實下呢一點呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實你點樣去問嘅時候，都會影響嗰啲人點樣去答嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，係呀，譬如好似我哋話係脫鈎，咁都係有一個嘅全民投票去問呢啲問題都係有啲問題嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其實你問問題係一件事，但係實際上啲人點做係另外一件事嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我認為如果係好專業咁去做，又會係好嘅。運輸署其實都畀過呢啲相類似嘅數據畀我哋。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我就唔係咁講話其實安全帶就唔好嘅、係唔需要嘅，但係因為你要投資咁多錢，今日下晝我哋都講過有幾多錢，係咪啲錢係咪用得其所一啲呢可以？係咪真係有呢一個嘅成本效益等等，亦都會係帶嚟更多--好多嘅好處。

主席：（經傳譯員）你就話如果我哋要花咁多錢嘅時候，呢筆錢就可能係用其--投資喺其他嘅安全裝置會好啲嘅，而家可能冇使緊嗰方面嘅錢。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）個營運商可能就係嚟緊要使一筆錢嘅，嚟緊呢幾年，但係其實呢筆錢係用緊其他用途更加物有所值嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）等我解釋下，就我哋而家會小休，因為盧教授佢有其他嘅事情，佢一定要去嘅，但係我哋仍然都係要繼續嘅。我諗我哋而家要小休直至盧教授佢可以離開嘅。唔該晒。

下午 3 時 40 分押聆訊押後

下午 3 時 44 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

Peter N. Duncan（鄧樂勤）資深大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

Mr Mike Weston，獨立的客運交通顧問

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我就而家唔再講安全帶喇，Weston 先生。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋頭先講嗰啲數字，有冇搵到出嚟呢？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）對唔住，冇。如果我哋真係搵到嘅，我哋就會提交畀委

員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）我認為佢已經喺個螢幕上面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）但係呢度就冇講到主席你講過嗰啲嘅唔同類型嘅，就係百分之五十四就係失去重心，但係就係個巴士個乘客受傷係百分之三

主席：（經傳譯員）我相信呢個就係講緊坐喺度嘅乘客，因為我哋前面係講話失去重心吖嘛，呢啲就係嗰啲坐喺度嘅乘客喇。所以其實嗰個數字相距係好大，因為佢哋係坐喺度嘅時候，相對係少人係受傷嘅，好明顯個原因--所以就我哋喺冇遮擋嘅座位嘅時候，我哋要裝置安全帶，我哋應該有原因嘅。

喺下層有啲座位前面就係冇一啲嘅阻擋，所以即使你要拋開去外面，亦都唔會拋好遠，所以亦都唔需要下底個下層嗰度裝安全帶嘅，似乎咁樣就係個原因。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，我就會話畀你聽個頁碼 KMB-12 第 5115 頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）睇下仲有冇其他嘅意見或者問題，如果冇，我就唔再講安全帶，我就嚟到我最一個課題希望能夠同你探討嘅。呢個係你個報告嘅第 149 頁，嗰度提到，唔好意思，係應該係 146 頁嘅，係關於疲勞管理嗰方面嘅，喺 146 頁，呢個係巴士安全計劃嘅引言嗰度，呢個係講個係最近增加咗嘅項目就係疲勞管理方面，我就想係就呢方面問你幾條問題。

喺第 149 頁，7.6 段，你就話，最後一段你咁講嘅，「好清楚就係而家我哋嘅關注係越嚟越係關於行為安全嗰方面，特別係疲勞管理。」你可唔可以話畀委員會聽點解會有一個咁樣嘅改變呢？你所謂嘅「行為安全」係咩嘢意思呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）傳統嚟講，我哋就係講緊係安全管理或者係風險管理、調查意外同埋譬如話喺巴士嘅設計方面係有咩嘢改變、道路設計方面有咩嘢改變，同埋我哋嘅運作方面有咩嘢改變等等，呢個都會係呢一個巴士安全計劃裏面嘅部分嚟嘅。

我哋之前主席同我同倫敦巴士公司喺 8 月會面嘅時候，呢度都有提到，但係而家我哋就想掘深一啲，就係睇番嗰個根源嘅問題，特別係個司機嘅行為有啲咩嘢影響。

喺疲勞管理嘅其中一個例子就係如果有一個司機係涉及一個意外，以前即係傳統上就會問個司機發生咩嘢事，睇下嗰個司機即係喺嗰個意外嘅角色係乜嘢，即係我哋以前係會著重個意外本身，但係而家好多嘅巴士公司就開始唔單只睇嗰個意外本身，佢哋係開始同車長講喺意外之前半個鐘發生咩嘢事，即係有冇一啲同乘客嘅互動可能係會令到佢哋分心，例如啲公司亦都係會啲車司傾

佢哋個生活方式係點。

佢哋好多即係一啲好有經驗嘅車長，佢哋好多時都會係預早去返工，令到佢哋可以有充足嘅時間檢查佢哋嘅巴士先係去開車嘅，呢啲司機就會比較係準時去返工，而佢哋亦都係會比較清醒嘅，而呢啲巴士公司係會--即係佢哋唔單只係調查事件本身，佢亦都係會睇呢個同事件有關嘅一啲元素或者環境，佢亦都係會睇下疲勞嘅可能嘅因素，有一啲嘅巴士公司係會經常係訪問佢哋嘅夜更司機，睇佢哋嘅嗰個編更嘅情況等等。所以嗰個演變就係由睇個事件本身去到係訪問個司機本身嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你問啲司機點解佢會想開夜班車，佢哋會唔會係因為日頭想去接佢哋嘅小朋友，會唔會令到佢哋休息不足呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）有一啲巴士公司係表示一啲擔憂，點解佢哋經常係同一啲夜更司機傾偈呢？因為佢哋想去確保佢哋嘅工作同埋佢哋生活取得平衡嘅。因為有一啲嘅司機可能要同佢哋嘅另一半分擔呢個家庭嘅責任嘅，譬如話佢哋接完啲小朋友之後，可能會即係要休息三、四個鐘，先至去開車嘅，所以啲巴士公司就想了解多啲司機能唔能夠係履行佢哋嘅職務，所以呢一個相比起傳統嘅做法，係一個比較新嘅做法嚟嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）喺車長培訓方面，有幾多係融入咗呢一個疲勞管理呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）以前一直都唔算係好多嘅，我自己覺得就未必係關車長嗰個工作時間事嘅，即係可能同安全帶一樣，可能有啲人會覺得個車長嗰個工作量係有關係，但係我覺得並唔係一個問題，英國係對工時係有管制嘅，就冇跡象顯示呢啲司機係要超時去工作，佢哋喺更同更之間亦都有充足嘅休息，大部分嘅倫敦嘅巴士公司都唔係好擔心啲車長另外有工作嘅，有一啲公司會去睇下佢哋有冇其他嘅工作。佢哋亦都係會幫助車長，令到佢哋有足夠嘅休息同埋有一個健康嘅生活嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）倫敦嘅巴士公司係可以睇到--即係揸巴士或者 Uber 車嘅司機嘅一個名冊，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸局係的士嘅發牌機構同埋一啲私人預約車嘅，佢可以將呢一個資料庫同巴士公司分享，巴士公司就知道有一啲車長就會係--都係會開的士嘅，有一啲公司就覺得啲司機應該只係開巴士嘅啫，其餘時間應該要休息嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果我冇記錯，有一啲嘅巴士公司係會有限度地去檢查呢一個資料嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）大部分呢啲檢查都係比較被動式嘅，就係就住一啲收到嘅資料，比較少公司就係全面檢查個司機會做緊啲咩嘢工作嘅。如果有車長病咗，如果佢哋認為呢個司機可能係去咗做其他工作，佢哋可能會調查

嘅。但係我哋嘅方向係由調查個事件本身去到搵一啲比較深層嘅原因，即係有咩嘢原因會引致到事件或者意外嘅。

傳統上，我哋通常都係睇究竟巴士公司有冇錯，或者睇下啲司機係有冇錯，定係會唔會向第三者進行索償，即係當然我係誇大少少咁講，但係而家會比較多係去搵出呢個問題嘅根源嘅，有一啲原因就並唔係一個完全嘅原因，但係你可以睇到呢一個係有建立咗一個安全嘅文化。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個針對疲勞管理嘅文化嘅轉變，即係由邊個發起嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個就係因為倫敦運輸局係重新係重視呢個安全，呢個係一個聯合嘅責任嚟嘅，我諗巴士公司都係有責任，呢個係一個無終止嘅過程嚟嘅，喺今年 8 月，我哋會面嘅時候，倫敦運輸局嘅代表表示四十或者五十年前，最大嘅車廂--就係啲人蹋低，因為就好多汽油喺個車上入面嘅，呢個就係好多年前，所以巴士公司係會越嚟越注意去減低呢個風險嘅，所以呢個過程係持續嘅，但係會越嚟越著重安全。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）倫敦運輸局有冇負責監督車長嘅培訓，定係交由巴士公司處理呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）培訓係可以分兩方面講嘅，首先呢一個駕駛考試就係一個全國交通部嘅要求，如果你要攞一個公共車輛嘅駕駛執照，你就要考一個駕駛試，就由一個汽車局進行考核，或者呢啲巴士公司亦都可以自己係進行考核嘅。

你攞到呢一個車牌之後，英國嘅司機每五年就要接受五日嘅認證培訓，多數嘅公司都會每年進行一日呢一個培訓，去維持司機嘅專業駕駛證書嘅，呢個係全英國嘅巴士同埋旅遊巴司機都要做嘅，唔單只係倫敦嘅司機。司機係要接受一啲嘅訓練課程，而主要嘅課程，一個由 City and Guilds 認證嘅考核，呢個係一個專業巴士駕駛嘅課程，呢一個課程就係要喺你成為倫敦巴士司機一年內係完成嘅。而倫敦運輸局亦都發展咗一啲嘅培訓，呢個就係五日嘅認證課程嘅一部分嚟。

另外，我哋發展咗一個半日嘅培訓，就係由巴士公司提供畀所有嘅司機嘅，呢個培訓課程之中就有用一啲影片去話畀司機知道點樣可以去處理一啲嘅危機，啲司機就會見到喺意外之前係可以點樣去處理，然後就會--就去我哋會講解「你嗰個駕駛表現點樣會影響到呢一個結果嘅」，呢個係一個半個鐘嘅培訓。

然後就有一個兩日嘅培訓，就係畀成個倫敦二萬五千個司機嘅，呢一個就係由倫敦運輸局安排嘅。呢個就係為咗改善顧客嘅滿意程度。因為好多人就批評倫敦運輸局同埋巴士公司就係就住巴士司機同埋乘客之間嘅互動嘅，所以呢個培訓就係想改善司機同埋乘客之間嘅互動嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個培訓叫咩嘢名？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）叫做 Hello London 嘅，就係每次就係培訓一百個司機嘅，就要用兩年嘅時間去培訓二萬五千個司機，就會由一個角色扮演嘅小隊去進行，佢哋就會進行一啲角色嘅扮演，然之後就叫啲司機係去評論一下佢哋自己就會點樣處理呢啲情景嘅。

就呢個培訓就同安全冇直接有關，但係可以話就係鼓勵啲司機係去用一個正面嘅態度同顧客互動、乘客互動同埋去處理一啲比較困難嘅情景嘅，同埋令到佢哋喺同乘客互動嘅時候就冇咁大壓力，同埋可以平靜一啲。所以喺呢個方面都係同安全有關嘅，因為佢係會幫助一啲司機處理一啲比較難纏嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以呢個就係包括同一啲比較惡嘅乘客係去互動，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，因為有時你係出嚟同個乘客理論未必係最好嘅，你可能要係冷靜一啲，因為咁樣就可能會引開咗你嘅注意力。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪由倫敦運輸局設計㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，就係由認證機構提供認證嘅。呢一個就係持續專業進修嘅一部分，喺呢個情況下，就係由倫敦運輸局係去統籌嘅，所以呢個係一項承諾嚟嘅，其中一個目標就係回應一啲乘客嘅投訴，就住呢啲司機，同埋令到司機處理乘客嘅方式更加一致嘅。呢個亦都係根據呢個巴士安全計劃底下，另外一個有同安全有關嘅課程，就係中央去統籌，同埋亦都係有認證嘅，呢個就大概係2019年開始。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺呢個課程嘅設計底下，有一啲嘅演員進行一啲角色嘅扮演，然後啲巴士司機就要回應，係咪咁樣做？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯，就係有唔同嘅情景，第一日就係司機入到個車廠，佢就要求下一個星期就調更，然後佢嘅上司就冇理佢，然後司機就同呢一個上司係去理論，跟住之後佢開車，因為佢心情唔好，就因為一啲小事就同乘客爭拗等等。當演員問個司機佢會點樣處理，佢哋都好多都會話呢個佢哋嘅上司係唔啱嘅，佢哋啲乘客應該都要係有禮貌啲，跟住就講，如果司機處理嘅乘客唔同，可能個結果係唔同，然後啲演員就會係再係處理呢一個情景，所以就顯示其實你係可以改變呢個結果嘅，所以睇呢啲司機唔同嘅諗嘢嘅方法都係幾有趣嘅，因為佢哋一開始都覺得佢哋都係會咁做嘅，但係係會改變嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個課程嘅大綱有冇一個文字寫低嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個課程係由獨立嘅認證機構係認證嘅。倫敦運輸局係可以係向委員會分享嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係可能係一個範本，本地嘅情況未必一樣嘅，但係嗰個方程式可能係相似嘅，可能係值得參考嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我會要求佢哋提供。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我哋睇過呢一個半日嘅培訓同埋呢個 Hello London 嘅培訓，就係第 144 同 145 頁，就係你報告嘅一部分。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）講番呢個疲勞管理嘅問題，我想你睇第 146 頁同埋呢一版嘅最後嗰段，喺你準備呢份報告嘅時候，你其實就係同呢一個倫敦嘅巴士公司傾過嘅，就係有一個監察呢個疲勞嘅一個系統，就英文叫“Seeing Machines”，喺呢段，你亦都係畀過一啲嘅詳情嘅。呢個系統巴士公司係咪行緊，還是就而家都仲係試辦緊？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個試行，係巴士營辦商 RATP 係試行嘅，運輸局就會係評估，睇下係唔係將來喺嗰個巴士安全標準嗰度係納入喺裏面嘅，呢個係嗰個安全嘅創新基金嘅一部分，係關於嗰個疲勞嘅監察，我哋就會係測察巴士車長係咪眼係會瞌埋，如果係嘅話，就嗰張座椅就會震嘅，如果合埋眼就會係通知嗰個嘅上司，我哋喺嗰度有一啲嘅錄像嘅，係影住嗰個嘅車長，亦都可以就係同呢一個車長大家傾，喺嗰個傾談嘅時候就會講到嗰個疲勞嘅處理咁樣。就佢哋瞌眼瞓，跟住就瞌埋眼就瞓咗著咁嘅情況。

佢討論嘅時候就會睇下係咪有一啲--有冇一啲嘅醫療嘅問題，亦都係同個車長大家進行對話，傾下佢哋嘅生活方式咁樣。從嗰個試驗嚟睇，喺監察嗰個疲勞駕駛嗰方面呢個係有效嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個亦都係一個即時一個嘅功能，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個影像就會係捕捉咗，然後嗰個主管人士就會係知道嘅，喺美國嗰度，個主管人員就會係--控制室就會係即時咁樣係提醒嗰個司機嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，如果車長喺當時係瞌著咗嘅話，有關嗰個程序就唔會係導致任何意外發生，喺嗰個控制室嗰度如果係認為有疲勞駕駛嘅情況，就會係知會巴士公司，同車長就大家進行對話，就睇下有冇一啲特別嘅問題，喺佢返車廠嘅時候就要睇下嗰個原因係點解。喺呢一版嗰度最後一段就講到，就話係自從 5 月之後，就喺呢條路線嗰個意外率嘅數目係減低咗百分之二十五嘅，都係有好大嘅裨益嘅呢方面。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）目前有冇一啲嘅疲勞駕駛嘅監察系統，喺倫敦嘅巴士入面有冇？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）淨係嗰個試行，淨係個試行嘅做法，...

主席：（經傳譯員）但係都係有用嘅，係咪呀？係咪即係喺呢個 Croydon 嘅電車嗰

度有用㗎？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，嗰個同嗰個 Croydon 嘅電車喺意外之後，嗰個系統一樣嘅，應該係舊年或者前年嘅時候，有好多長線--長途嘅巴士亦都有類似嘅系統，我相信就係亦都有好多好類似嘅系統係監察疲勞駕駛嘅，特別係喺駕駛一啲長途車嘅時候，疲勞就會係更加容易發生嘅。我哋其實係好想知道呢個運輸局睇過成本效益之後係咪覺得應該將佢納入埋喺呢個交通安全標準入面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）Croydon 嘅電車事件就喺早上發生嘅，係咪呀？朝頭早 5 點發生嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，當時好早，嗰個速限就由 50 里去到 30 里嘅，嗰個司機就當時就喺嗰個好窄嘅彎位嗰度冇留意到嗰個速限咁樣咁出事嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題就係究竟揸巴士喺呢啲長途嘅車長同呢個電車喺呢啲彎位嗰度，即係三百、幾百嘅公里嘅里數嗰度係咪有差別呢，係咪有分別呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係有分別嘅，喺倫敦嘅巴士車長喺大清早嘅時候喺繁忙嘅時候亦都唔會話停咁多站嘅，夜晚就嗰條路比較靜，所以好多時你會假定就係喺倫敦嘅道路上面就有好多情況發生，香港瞌著嘅機會就唔高嘅，倫敦嗰度就比較靜，就好多情況係--好多時有咁嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）RATP 佢哋當時係揸緊一條市區路線㗎喎，係咪呀？即係佢哋都瞌著咗？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，我哋睇過呢啲咁嘅錄像嘅。我認為個報告要做嘅就係指出有一啲技術係可以係用嘅，就需要作出評估，就睇下邊一樣係有最好嘅效益，因為最終嚟講，如果我哋係採納晒所有呢啲嘅科技，就係--如果採納得晒所有嘅科技，咁比較天真嘅想法，因為財政上都係好龐大嘅，所以我哋要選擇一啲係有最大嘅效益，係可以減少呢個乘客嘅傷亡或者係對第三者嘅傷亡，路人或者係騎單車嘅人士咁樣。呢一個運輸局嘅安全計劃其實就係會做一個好全面嘅成本效益嘅研究，希望嗰啲錢係用得最好嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你睇過 Stanley 教授嘅報告，嗰度當時有分析過一啲生命嘅代價咁樣，澳洲嗰度佢係有研究過嘅，就睇下係咪值得係花錢用喺某一啲嘅裝置嗰度，就嗰個成本效益嗰個嘅研究嚟到去作出決定咁樣。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，英國嘅運輸署就會係睇到嗰個生命嘅代價，因為畢竟呢個就係比較廣泛嘅對社會嘅代價嚟嘅，譬如話係減低嗰個傷亡，其實對呢個醫療嗰方面亦都係有好大嘅節省嘅，所以呢個有廣泛嘅一啲嘅效益喺度。

主席：（經傳譯員）最終嚟講，有關嗰個設備其實就應該係達到最高嘅效益㗎喇，係

咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，嗰個邏輯就係如果你係測試十種唔同嘅裝置，亦都係要睇嗰個成本效益，你可以係排優次，睇下嗰個嘅最高嘅效益，一路睇，睇落去嗰個清單上面，睇下你嗰個可以負擔得幾多，個經費有幾多咁樣，始終嗰個倫敦嘅巴士安全計劃就係咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為嗰個錢係嚟自利潤、票價或者係政府，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，即係始終都係呢三方面嘅財政來源，喺倫敦嗰度，喺票價嗰度或者係當局或者係嗰個利潤，巴士公司嘅利潤。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，基本上我要探討嘅範圍都七七八八喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有一個問題就都係好--呢個倫敦運輸局嗰度，我哋睇得好清楚就係嗰個嘅速限嘅問題，睇嚟，香港呢度就係我哋都可以睇一睇嘅，鄧律師，可唔可以同我哋睇下有冇一啲材料係關於呢方面嘅情況，亦都係同呢個倫敦係相關嘅呢？照我理解，就係有一啲電子地圖或者係同埋有一啲嘅速限嘅，喺倫敦嗰度。20 里係綠色嘅，個地圖就係綠色顯示嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係喇，其實有個趨勢就係三十二個倫敦嘅區佢哋都係推行呢個每小時 20 里嘅一個速限嘅，係好多住宅區佢哋有咁樣嘅安排，即係 20 里，即係 32 公里。有好多嘅道路而家漸漸都係 20 里嘅速限㗎喇，其他嘅道路就係 30、40 或者 50 每小時嘅速限，喺倫敦嘅巴士就好少就巴士會去到時速係 50 里嘅。

我相信其中一個挑戰就係要選擇一個合適嘅速度，個速限你可以話對於一啲大型嘅巴士，30 里其實都係嗰個限制，即係極限㗎喇，某啲道路我哋係要教育車長係要注意嗰個合適嘅速限--即係合適嘅速度，咁嚟到去即係要佢遵守嗰個速限嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）某啲即係嗰啲道路，即係有車行嘅道路，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）不同時間亦都可能有不同嘅速限嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦，如果有學校嘅話，嗰個速限係咪亦都會減低呢？即係學校放學嘅時候，亦都係會即係個速限會降低呢，或者係有一啲嘅牌寫明個速限呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係會提醒佢哋嗰個速限嘅，學校亦都有一啲警告牌，喺學校返學、放學嘅時候，佢哋就係可以改變個速限嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）香港，照你所知，香港有部分嘅地方就係好人煙稠密嘅，喺行人路上面有好多嘅行人，而馬路上面亦都係有好多嘅車輛，巴士係經常喺隔籬係行駛，以呢個咁嘅情景嚟講，倫敦係咪都係限喺 20 里呢？即係類似咁嘅道路係咪都係每小時 20 里呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，一啲主要嘅倫敦嘅道路的確就係 20 里，每小時係 20 里嘅車速，有啲就係住宅嘅道路，其實就係有一啲就係 15 里，有一啲道路就係一啲主要嘅道路亦都係有咁樣嘅安排。

主席：（經傳譯員）你正話所講嘅嗰個速限，即係嗰個 30 里嗰啲嘅道路就係會去到 15、16 里，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個速限嗰個嘅試驗，即係呢啲 20 里嘅道路，呢個係對其他車輛有一定嘅影響嘅，當個速限係 30，一般嘅平均速度就係會去到 20，巴士就會好慢，巴士甚至係會令到嗰個交通嘅流量係會減慢嘅，即係比起 30 里嗰度。

主席：I think it was described as a platoon or a convoy?

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）其中我哋關注嘅，就係當我哋進行試驗嘅時候就會係減慢嗰個車速，有啲車就可能會係冒啲險就爬頭咁樣，亦都會係導致一啲危險嘅景象嘅，喺我報告當中所講，暫時都冇咁樣嘅證據，有可能就係令到個交通就係個駕車人士個行為係有不同嘅。喺實際上，喺 20 里嘅地區，我哋將巴士下限到 20 里，令到我哋係--幫我哋係--即係令到其他車輛係減慢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）風險評估係牽涉到有冇可能就係造成一啲嚴重嘅傷亡，即係有啲巴士嗰個--如果將 40、30、20，一路減低，就會係減低嗰個嘅風險嘅？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我唔記得個比例係點樣，其實如果你係一架巴士行緊 25 或者 20 里，相對於 20 里嗰個被撞到嗰個傷亡嘅程度係有咩嘢唔同，我就唔係好記得，正如我哋今朝所講，巴士嘅車頭其實就係牽涉到撞到乘客、撞到單車，其實都係好嚴重嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）我想跟進一個問題，車長佢哋嘅反應係點樣呢？就係有不同嘅速限咁樣，佢哋有冇表達過關注呢？佢哋處理不同嘅速限咁樣。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我唔知道有咁嘅情況，除咗話嗰啲 20 里嘅道路，佢哋係一致咁嚟到去執行，呢個就唔係話嗰啲速限不斷咁改變，其實係有一啲嘅裝置，譬如 Mobileye 呢啲咁嘅裝置係可以提醒個車長嗰個速限係點樣嘅，又佢係感應到嗰個速限嘅標誌嘅，喺司機位嗰度就會知道嗰個速限係點樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個鏡頭就係會睇到嗰個速限，然後就會同司機就係表達一個訊息？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）提醒個訊息係點樣嘅，當然車長就未必留意到嗰個嘅標誌，但係個機器就可以係睇到嘅，喺面前嗰個嘅地圖就可以睇到，譬如主席都講過，就不同嘅顏色，...

主席：（經傳譯員）綠色就係呢個 20 里？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺倫敦好多地方，即係中部嘅地方其實都好多係

呢啲 20 里嘅速限嘅，我相信呢個係會嗰個地圖就可能會越嚟越綠㗎喇變咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺數字上，睇唔睇到一啲正面嘅轉變呢，即係相對於嗰個嚴重嘅傷亡意外，喺減低咗呢個速限之後，有冇一啲嘅關係呢，還是冇呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）暫時都未睇到。上一季佢哋係話嗰一季係冇一啲嘅死亡數字嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係第一季，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）呢個係好耐以嚟，第一季係完全冇死亡數字嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）第二季就--呢個可能會係有自滿嘅情況，係有六宗嘅死亡意外。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）但係始終都係低過以前嘅數字，呢個係需要時間嘅，即係先睇到個趨勢係點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一啲嘅影響，對於嗰個車程有幾長還是咁擠塞都冇乜大分別呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我相信就係有一個因素影響嗰個嘅車程嘅，因為特別喺倫敦中部有好多嘅道路工程，係有一啲嘅單車徑、單車路亦都有一啲工程嘅進行，亦都影響到嗰個車速咁樣，亦都係令到個巴士嘅速度，喺倫敦中部係會減慢咗嘅，呢個影響比嗰個 20 里嘅車速限制影響就更加大嘅。呢啲司機就對於 20 里都係冇問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）就喺呢一個大概係九--平均嘅速度就係每小時係 9.2 里嘅，係咪呀？喺倫敦。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個會唔會就係話我哋香港要改善我哋嘅道路交通同安全，其實呢個係我哋應該係特別留意嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我哋係需要明白平均嘅車速係點樣樣，同埋大致上嗰個幅度係幾多，喺倫敦嚟講，呢個 20 里就係適用於所有嘅車輛，唔係單單係巴士嘅，所以我哋首先要明白喺某一啲嘅道路個平均嘅車速係點樣樣先，我相信希望能夠就所有嘅車輛都平均減速，就唔係淨係巴士減速，就會有更大嘅裨益。我相信所有嘅道路同埋所有車輛一齊減速就會係個裨益會更加大，但係首先我哋要明白究竟個問題個根源喺邊度先嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋今日就傾到其他嘅課題，就同樣我哋係首先要搜集一啲數據，譬如話個平均車速係點樣樣，跟住就係去就做一個成本效益分析，如果個車速係減慢，究竟會係成本係點樣樣，個效益係點樣樣？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，個邏輯就係咁，如果你就係要所有嘅巴士減速，你唔係--如果你係要維持所有嘅班次不變嘅時候，你就需要更多嘅巴士、更多嘅司機。返番去我哋頭先講嘅一點，究竟咁樣做呢，還是再裝置更多嘅安全裝置更加有效呢？我哋應該係有所有嘅數據，然後先至做選擇。如果你就咁純粹單一去做一個選擇可能會做錯選擇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個 20 里嘅減速，市區，已經係行咗幾耐呢？係對於當地嘅政府機關嚟講？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我就唔係好知道，我會話係五至十年，就係已經係喺英國各地佢哋呢一個嘅當地政府都係有呢個選擇，唔係淨係倫敦，但係已經係五至十年喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家我哋睇番呢個文件係 2013 年 1 月嘅，呢個係一個通告，係運輸部嘅，就話畀本地政府講佢哋可以做啲乜嘢嘢同埋係點樣為之適合嘅車速。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）據我自己嚟講，如果我記得冇錯嘅時候，其實嗰啲本地政府都可能好選擇性去做呢樣嘢嘅，譬如話係有學校喺附近等等，但係而家我哋越嚟越多嘅當地政府就係會喺某一啲嘅地段就有個 20 里嘅車速限制，當然我哋啲人係睇到其實對於嗰個車程時間嘅影響，其實唔係好大，但係就有好大嘅裨益，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你話係而家喺主要倫敦嘅道路都係有嘅？其他嘅道路，譬如 Oxford Street、Clapham High Street 等等？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我就唔係好肯定，喺呢一個 Blackfriars Road 其實應該都係 20 里嘅，其實都係啲主要嘅道路都係 20 里嘅。如果喺 Oxford Road，你都係可以做到 20 里，其實已經係個交通好暢通㗎喇，因為其實基本上係好擠塞嘅嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）鄧律師。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）我就想畀你幾個參考嘅文件嘅，首先運輸部就係制定速限嗰樣嘢，SEC-3 1003 頁嘅，就係呢一個 2015 年嗰份文件，就係個標題係話行得太快，就如果你係減速一里，就可以喺市區嗰度減低咗撞車就百分之六嘅，然後另外一頁就係 MISC-3 987 頁嘅，主席...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個文件叫做咩嘢名？係「減速」，係咪嘅意思呀？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）呢個係安全倫敦街道，我哋嘅方法，我哋嘅方案，呢個係喺 986 頁就話我哋嘅優先次序，第一個首要嘅次序就係話要係解決一個行得太快嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）得，唔該晒。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）你亦都睇到 2007 年 5 月嗰個一個調查，就係講緊乘客嘅調查，有二千個嘅被訪者，呢個係 SEC-1 第 295 頁可以睇得到。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以擺上去屏幕嗰度，Weston 先生都可以睇得到我之前所提及嘅嗰個調查。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）第 7 段。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，就係喇，Weston 先生，就係其實都係視乎嗰個問題點問法嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝晒，唔該晒。鄧律師，仲有冇其他嘅事項？

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）冇，主席，多謝，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）Weston 先生，你有冇最後有一啲嘅嘢你係想我哋特別留意嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇，唯一一樣我哋冇提到嘅，就係話點樣去鼓勵或者一個合約嗰方面，呢個就我都覺得好奇怪點解你冇提嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個咁樣嘅，關於呢個課題，其實係去做一啲鼓勵嘅措施或者係安全指標係對於改善安全會有作用或者冇作用還是係有一個負面嘅作用呢？譬如話我哋去獎勵一啲公司，如果佢哋個安全表現係好好嘅，特別喺安全指標嗰方面，咁樣會唔會真係可以改善巴士安全呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）喺我個報告裏面，我就有個觀察，就係話呢個巴士公司就有啲關注，就呢個--其實反而會唔會有一個直接嘅財務嘅獎勵，就會令到佢哋唔願意分享資訊等等，但係無論如何，我都想提一提。

倫敦嘅營運者其實向來都好重視安全，所以個問題就係話你有一個財務上獎勵，金錢嘅獎勵，你係想改變一啲嘅咩嘢行為呢？你開始係畀緊啲現金嘅獎賞或者一啲嘅財務嘅獎賞，但係呢一個嘅營運者仍然都係有意外，個問題就係話可能你今年嗰個安全表現相比於舊年就係改善咗，但係你仍然都係有三個人就係死亡，或者係八十個人受傷，但係你仍然都係有個獎金，所以其實嗰個情況就變得好奇怪。

另外一個方法去做就係話你係純粹係扣減，按住個安全嘅表現嚟扣減你個合約價格，但係就係嗰啲嘅營運者，如果佢哋認為佢哋喺安全嗰度表現得唔係好好嘅時候，佢哋係入標嘅時候，佢哋就會將呢樣嘢擺埋落去喇。所以話關於財務嘅一啲獎勵，都係好嘅。喺倫敦運輸局 2015 年嘅文件之中，佢哋都有提到呢一點，佢哋都解釋過就係財務嘅獎金或者鼓勵其實都係好嘅。

另外，其實其他嘅獎勵都可以嘅，可以考慮嘅，譬如我諗到就係話係喺頭

五年個合約期完咗之後，你之後嗰兩年嘅續約就係有個優勢嘅，我哋而家就係話個服務嘅可靠性我哋主要嘅考慮，但係會唔會我哋就係話之前嗰五年佢個安全嘅表現都可以考慮埋喺裏面呢？亦都另外一個方法就唔係話一定財務上嘅獎勵，我對於呢一個嘅安全表現有財務獎勵，我有好大保留，因為你可能--其實佢仍然有意外嘅時候，你仍然係畀緊佢哋嘅獎金，然後或者佢哋係會入標嘅時候將佢計埋個成本落去。

當然可能仲有其他嘅方法嘅，譬如話你係喺頭嗰第三同埋第四年嘅時候，你嗰個安全表現係好嘅時候，你就可以有資格可以續約多兩年嘅，呢個就亦都會係一個幾好嘅鼓勵，就唔係一個財務嘅鼓勵嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你用呢一個「鼓勵」呢個字，但係你就係獎金咁，但係你就仍然就你又諗緊呢一個扣減喎？譬如你可唔可以話你獎勵啲人其實今年係有三個人死亡，但係舊年有六個人嘅，所以你就有獎勵，但係另一個方法，你就係可以係扣減嘅，你嗰個畀佢哋嘅錢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，我哋要睇一個合理長嘅時間，而相關嘅營運商佢哋就有啲方法真係可以改變個情況，改變個趨勢，係如果我係得五年去營運嘅時候，我係冇辦法喺五年之內作出改變嘅時候，我就會將呢一條成本就打埋落我嗰個入標價嗰度。

所以我認為所謂嘅獎勵真係可以令到嗰啲人個行為有改變，亦都係可以達到嘅，如果唔係咁，如果--倫敦運輸局應該點樣做呢？咁就會係有一個安全嘅指標，然之後我會畀分，然之後將呢個畀分就係去同佢能唔能夠係兩年續約去掛鈎，呢個就亦都可能會係一個方法去鼓勵到相關嘅營運者嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家目前嚟講，係話可唔可以續約就係關於佢哋嘅服務係咪可靠嘅，係咪呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係，主要嘅考慮係咁，係嘅，如果個營運商係能夠滿足到最低表現嘅要求或者係做得好少少，佢哋就合資格係可以係續約嘅。另外一個獎勵嘅方法就係話，我哋今朝早都有提過，因為我哋常常都會再招標嘅，如果喺--所以呢一個安全表現我哋一直都係考慮嘅，如果你冇個好嘅安全表現嘅時候，我哋運輸局就唔會再係批新嘅約畀你。今朝早我哋亦都係傾咗好耐喇呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇其他嘅事項你想提出嘅呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋都會想睇一睇，我哋有提到點樣可以獎勵啲巴士司機，就係由巴士公司去獎勵佢哋，特別係佢哋係喺安全係表現得好，你喺呢方面有冇乜嘢嘅意見呢？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）我認為係要有意義，亦都係嗰個司機係可以控制

範圍之內先至可以做。有一間公司有一個直接嘅司機獎勵計劃，後來佢就係將佢納入咗佢嘅底薪嗰度，因為都覺得唔係好有用，冇乜影響，我覺得係可以做嘅，但係要考慮嘅就係話對於司機嚟講係有意思嘅。同埋設計到一個地步，就係司機可以參與嘅，而唔會話「因為我做得唔好，我就係冇咗個獎金。」唔會係一個反效果。同營運商嘅討論，似乎佢哋都唔係好想喺安全方面特別去獎勵司機嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有一個營辦商就係話有一個司機就係有被獎勵係 50 鎊嘅，同埋佢後來就係 9 月之後，佢個名就係擺落個抽獎嗰度，佢就係抽到架車嘅，係咪咁呀？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）係嘅，一架新車，呢個就係因為同一個遠程訊息系統有關嘅，亦都係一個好好嘅一個獎勵嚟嘅，佢就係攞到 50 鎊嘅。喺倫敦嘅巴士司機，好似香港都係，佢哋都想成為一個好嘅司機，有一個呢一個嘅好司機名單其實都係好好嘅，啲人就會係有希望得到鼓勵係可以成為榜上有名嘅。對於嗰架車嚟講，其實嗰個價錢都唔係好高嘅啫，我哋講緊係有二千五百個巴士司機嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個亦都係一個獎勵司機嘅一個例子，係咪？

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）但係呢個唔係話係獎勵佢係用佢嘅加薪或者係其他嘅獎金去獎勵佢嘅。

MR DUNCAN：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席，呢個係咁多喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）Weston 先生，我哋就結束喇，希望你能夠係就住你個報告，倫敦運輸局佢哋係公布咗呢個係 12 月 16 號公布咗架巴士安全標準之後，你可唔可以提交畀我哋呢？對我哋嚟講，係好大幫助嘅，又或者有其他嘅材料，你覺得係對我哋有幫助，都請你提交嘅。

MR MIKE WESTON：（經傳譯員）好，我就會睇一睇可唔可以睇到嗰個嘅教程 Hello London 嘅課程嗰個畀大家嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好多謝你，唔該晒你哋有呢啲嘅報告提交畀我哋，同埋係嚟到作證嘅。今日呢一個嘅聽證會都係非常之有用嘅。你嘅經驗，喺巴士業務嘅經驗係非常之寶貴嘅，亦都令到我哋明白我哋對香港可以得出啲咩嘢嘅建議。希望你一路順風嘅，唔該晒。

2018 月 9 月 27 日

下午 4 時 50 分押聆訊押後

Thursday, 4 October 2018

(10.01 am)

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS AMY TSE, MR PATRICK WONG, MR YK CHAN, MR WILLIAM SHUM, MR TONY YAU

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Ms Chan, and good morning to your colleagues.

Thank you for accepting our invitation to give further evidence to the committee, to assist us in our enquiries.

At the outset, I would like to make a few observations about what happened yesterday. Yesterday, at 5 o'clock, we received a bundle of documents from the Transport Department. One of them is what appears to be the final version of the report of the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses, but we received new documents dealing with the implementation of a road safety audit and a study on low speed limit zones. We received other material in relation to facilities, the arrangements that are made, for bus captains at bus stations.

Now, service of documents at 5 o'clock on the day before a hearing obviously causes difficulties to counsel who are assisting the inquiry, because certainly so far as speed limits are concerned, low speed limits,

20 miles an hour or its equivalent in kilometres, is an area where there is a wealth of material to which you will, in due course, be referred, to assist us. But of course that material isn't available now. It has to be found. It has to be put into our bundles. It has to be scanned so that it can be put on the screens, and so on.

May I simply ask this question: why is it that the documents were served on us at 5 o'clock yesterday?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, if I may? On behalf of the department, I would just like to send apologies to the committee for the late delivery of the papers. Actually, we have followed through the oral hearings since May, when I last attended the hearing at the committee, and we actually followed through carefully and we noted a number of important areas that the committee have expressed keen interest. Amongst those, we are actually giving thought to a number of important initiatives that we have to secure internal clearance and also we are securing additional dedicated resources to implement those initiatives.

So we would love to send those material across to the committee to facilitate your consideration and deliberation at an earlier juncture. Obviously, due to a number of pressing urgent commitments, so we would not be able to do that earlier. So I would send my deep

apology for that. But hopefully, that will also serve as a reference material for the committee. We are not expecting the committee to take that into account in a very detailed way in hearing our further evidence to that, but in any event, we would just like to keep the committee posted of some of the developments within the government and within the department, and actually in parallel we are seeking dedicated resources to push forward a number of those initiatives. So we think that it may help to give the committee an idea of what we are thinking and what we are planning to do.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that, and thank you for your confirmation that you are following the evidence that we are receiving, and from what I understand you to be saying that you are proactively responding to it, as is obvious from the topics that you have looked at. That is to be welcomed. That is the journey that we are all embarked on and we are pleased to learn that.

But let me give you an example. Apparently, in August of this year, a department of the Transport Department which goes by the initials VSSD issued a new requirement, basic minimum requirement, for electronic data recording device. That is August, the document is dated. Why are we not told about it until October? And

this is a topic we have been raising with various witnesses. Why is it that we are all operating from a requirement promulgated in November 2003, but in fact it's been superseded? Why was this not drawn to our attention?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, that August update is actually a development arising from the deliberation of the Working Group on Enhancement of Bus Safety. The working group has actually gone through a number of rounds of discussions with the various parties involved, and that transpired to some of the updates.

With hindsight, we should have done that, on that particular update, on that document, and informed the committee on that occasion, but we actually have incorporated that as part of the whole working group report.

Let me just add a personal remark to that. It is actually our pledge in previous hearings and in previous submissions that we would like to complete the working group first-stage study within six months. Due to the various urgent commitments cropping up, especially in the midst of the super typhoon, we have not been able to schedule the last working group meeting with our bus operators in early September. Our original target is to finish it by then. So the last meeting had to be

rescheduled to mid-September, and we actually made some fine-tunes to the working group report and made sure that everybody is well aware of the recommendations and the findings of the working group report.

We sent the working group report to the committee at 5.00 last evening, it's actually subsequent to our --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting. Well, that's an improvement, because in the past we've been getting documents during the night, so at least we got it at 5 o'clock and we are grateful for that.

MS MABLE CHAN: We certainly want to improve and we strive for the best, and my deep apology to the chairman for causing you difficulty and inconvenience, but we would like to keep you posted of any of our initiatives in a timely manner. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: The problem is not for the committee. The problem is for our counsel, because it is their job to assist us by testing the evidence that you advance, and in order to do so, they have to draw your attention to relevant documents that perhaps you have not provided but they are nevertheless relevant, and they can't do that in the time that they have been allowed. But thank you for what you have had to say.

Before I invite counsel to begin questioning, is there any statement that you wish to make at the outset?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I know time is precious, and if you allow I would just like to make brief remarks, just to highlight a few things in response to the interest areas that the committee has indicated and expressed over the last few months.

CHAIRMAN: Please do so.

Opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

Chairman and members of the committee, my team and I are pleased to appear today before the committee today to give further oral evidence in support of the committee's work.

Since our last attendance at the hearings in May, we know that the committee has invited other parties to provide oral evidence and have closely followed through the submissions made by various parties.

As the mission of the Transport Department tells, we strive to provide the world's best transport system which is safe, reliable, efficient, environmentally friendly, and satisfying to both users and operators. Safety is of utmost importance to the transport operation, including the provision of franchised bus services. To this end, we have been trying our very best to monitor franchised bus operations in accordance with the law and having regard to the franchise

requirements.

Since May, we have provided supplementary information for reference of the committee at the committee's request and suggestion. Today, we stand ready to answer any questions or issues to be raised by the committee.

I just wish to highlight a few things to address a number of aspects on which we think the committee has expressed keen interest.

First of all, we have been taking some proactive action in enhancing road safety and developing our road safety management system. To ensure continuous improvement of the system, the department reviews it with reference to overseas practices and experience from time to time. Apart from preparing in late 2017 for embarking on a consultancy study on the review of potential roadside safety hazards in the Hong Kong road network in May this year, following a recent review in May, we have identified a further area of improvement to strengthen the performance evaluation and auditing of the system by introducing a road safety audit mechanism within the Transport Department.

We have proposed to set up a dedicated team to implement road safety audit to all new roads, to enhance road safety in a proactive, comprehensive and systematic

manner, and are securing dedicated manpower resources in this regard.

I wish to add that late last week, we have just got information from the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau that we would be able to get a few spare hands approved for implementing this road safety audit, and it is on that basis that we can confirm that we will implement this audit mechanism within the department in the coming months.

Secondly, the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses has completed its first six-month study and come up with a number of recommendations to further enhance bus safety, including the feasibility of installation of in-vehicle safety devices and equipment and review of training for bus captains.

Chairman, this is not the end, but rather a beginning. The working group will continue its work and will meet on a regular basis so as to monitor the progress of follow-up actions and review the practice note on training framework for bus captains to achieve the best possible industry standard practices.

Meanwhile, I would like to report that the Transport Department is actively taking forward the recommendations of the working group, including the various development and tests, trials and feasibility

studies, with the FB operators and bus manufacturers.

One of the initiatives that the working group has been pushing for is the development of a prototype of the bus monitoring and control system, BMCS in short, for franchised buses. This embraces the black box, GPS, geo-fencing, two-stage speed limiter with mapping against the statutory speed limits.

As a first step, in particular Citybus and New World First Bus have embarked on the phase 1 trial of the BMCS on their whole fleet since 18 September this year, whereby real-time audio alerts will be provided to the bus captains when the vehicle speed exceeds the corresponding legal speed limit.

Apart from overseeing such trials by franchised bus operators, the Transport Department sees the need to push it from ourselves by engaging a service provider to carry out an independent trial on vehicles, to evaluate the applicability and effectiveness of using geo-fencing technology to control vehicle speed, which is one of the vital parts of the BMCS.

We will review the outcome of the trials and will have further discussions with bus operators with a view to developing a clear roadmap for enhancing the franchised bus monitoring through implementation of the BMCS.

Meanwhile, we are also in the process of securing manpower resources to have a dedicated team to oversee transport technology, which will help speed up the process of such trials and initiatives.

Thirdly, we are equally concerned with the welfare of the bus captains and assisting in every possible way in facilitating the provision of ancillary facilities at the bus termini. Since December 2017, the Transport Department has set up a task force with representatives of relevant government departments and franchised bus operators, to monitor the provision or upgrading of the public transport ancillary facilities at public transport interchanges, bus stops and termini, and will continue to work closely with the relevant approving authorities through regular meetings, with a view to speeding up the processing of the applications.

Looking ahead, we will explore in consultation with relevant government bureaus and departments to pursue along the approach of providing such ancillary facilities at new public transport interchanges and bus termini at government cost, while the franchised bus operators will pay the rent and recurrent costs for using these facilities.

In this regard, we will have to pursue this and take it further with the relevant bureaus and departments

overseeing the management of such facilities and also regarding the funding arrangements.

With the latest review of the guidelines of bus captains' working hours, rest times and meal breaks in early 2018, franchised bus operators have started to implement the latest guidelines by phases since the second quarter of 2018, targeting for full compliance by the second quarter of 2019, subject to the recruitment of sufficient bus captains to fill up the shortfall arising from the shortening of duty hours and driving hours of bus captains.

Bus operators have been trying hard to recruit new bus captains and retain the existing bus captains, including improvement in the remuneration packages. This will inevitably have an impact on the franchised bus operators' accounts. A number of developments are happening on this front and I would like to report that by now the government has just received fare increase applications for all of the bus operators, and we will take every effort to process these applications in a timely manner and go through the due process, including consultation with the various approving authorities within the government.

Finally, Chairman and members of the committee, it has always been my intention to personally attend before

the committee during the whole hearing today. Regrettably, due to an urgent commitment to attend a special meeting of the Legislative Council House Committee later this afternoon to discuss the aftermath issues arising from the super typhoon which cannot be rescheduled, I will have to apologise for not joining you throughout the hearing today, but please rest assured that my team members appearing today will continue to offer the best support to the committee for the rest of the hearing, and if necessary for the hearing on Saturday I will be able to join the rest of my team to help the committee for your work.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Chan, and thank you for your explanation which we were informed of in advance about your unavailability this afternoon. Of course we understand that, and I hope that the commencement of proceedings today hasn't given you a bad start to that whole day.

But I would ask counsel now to start asking questions. Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Ms Chan, for those opening remarks. I will be kicking off the questions today on

a number of copies topics, and Ms Maggie Wong, senior counsel, will carry on questioning on other topics, possibly later today or on Saturday, so it will be mostly me today.

Ms Chan, can I start off with the first topic, and that is on the issue of competitive tendering in Hong Kong, and by competitive tendering I am referring to both competitive tendering of franchises as a whole or individual bus routes.

Just to give you some context to my questioning, the committee has heard evidence from two overseas experts, Mr Weston and Prof Stanley, on the operating environment of urban buses in London and Melbourne respectively. Have you had an opportunity to go through that evidence?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: In that case, rather than taking you in detail through the report, perhaps I will just summarise the position so that the questions I am about to ask will have some proper context.

Firstly, the situation in London is that all urban bus routes are open for competitive tender, with contract lengths of five years plus a possible extension of two years, after which the route will be open to competitive tendering again. So that's the situation in London. The market is dominated by six large bus

groups, comprising of around 94 per cent of the bus network.

Mr Chairman, just for the reference, on record, that's the expert bundle, page 126, in Mr Weston's report.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm familiar with the table.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's London.

In Melbourne -- again, since you have been through the evidence, I will just summarise it instead of going to the report -- about two-thirds of the bus network in Melbourne are subject to negotiated contracts, and there are about 15 contracts with 12 operators.

Again, just as a matter of reference, that's Day 16 of the evidence, page 34, line 3.

Secondly, about one-third of the bus network in Melbourne is provided for by way of a single contract across a defined spatial area that is subject to competitive tendering. The contract length would be seven years.

Again, the reference, if I may just put it on record, is Day 16 of the evidence, pages 22 to 27.

So that's the position in London and Melbourne.

Now, in Hong Kong, before I ask questions on that, can I just take you to an annual report of Transport International Holdings, which is the parent company to

KMB. I'm taking you to the 2015 annual report at KMB-5, page 1523.

CHAIRMAN: For which year?

MR DEREK CHAN: 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Do you have that, Ms Chan?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: You are looking at page 32 of the annual report for 2015, which is page 1523 of our bundle. Can I just draw your attention to the column at the right-hand side of the page, at the first paragraph of that column. I will just read it out into the record:

"In 2015, two competitive tendering exercises for new bus routes were finalised by the HKSAR Government, and KMB was awarded both tenders. As a result of the first tender, routes 290 and 290A were introduced in March 2015 to operate between Tseung Kwan O and Tsuen Wan. The call for tenders for the route package for Anderson Road Development Area was made in mid-2015 and KMB was notified that it had been award the tender in November 2015. Services on the routes will commence in phases from the first quarter of 2016 in line with the population intake."

So there is a reference to some competitive tendering of routes in Hong Kong. So, in the context of

all of this, I have a number of questions for you. The first one is: what is the scale of competitive tendering that exists in Hong Kong at the moment?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the ready figure in quantifiable terms, but as this statement in the KMB report pointed out, there have been a number of occasions whereby, should there be a new town development, a new social transport need emerging, or there is any particular circumstances whereby a package of routes would involve profit-making or non-profit-making, then the Transport Department will venture out to proceed with competitive tendering.

Let me quote a recent example. It is the high speed rail station in West Kowloon. We have introduced three routes, one from Admiralty to West Kowloon, the other one is from Kwun Tong to West Kowloon, and the last one is from Sheung Shui to West Kowloon. We have actually discussed the needs and designed the routing, and then we have packaged the tender exercise in a way to facilitate competitive bidding, while striving for a sustainable financial operation of the routes involved.

The outcome is that -- colleagues perhaps may supplement on that -- one route is awarded to Citybus Ltd --

CHAIRMAN: I was at that bus station yesterday.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. One route is awarded to Citybus Ltd and two routes are awarded to KMB.

For the reference of the committee, in the last two routes awarded to KMB, our internal guesstimate is that one of the routes would not be profit-making, and it is through this competitive tendering strategy that we would like to invite competition, although the spatial area of the new routes may be perceived to be well served or well covered by KMB, that doesn't stop us from venturing out to proceed with competitive tendering to attract competition while achieving sustainable financial operation of the routes involved.

Let me also quote another example. It's the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge new routes. We also proceed with a competitive tendering whereby we have awarded at least one route to the New Lantao Bus Co Ltd, and the route actually straddles service areas which is currently also served by the major bus companies like KMB.

My point is just to answer senior counsel's question that under our current franchise model, we will also proceed with competitive, route-by-route, tendering exercise.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: After the hearing, or later on if possible, can you give us some actual numbers of the proportion of routes that are now subject to competitive tendering and also the contract details --

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- of those competitively tendered contracts?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, if that's what you are going to do -- the competitive tendering what you've described, has that been of the open public competitive tendering nature, or restricted to certain participants?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I would ask my colleagues to supplement on that detail.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MS MABLE CHAN: Amy Tse.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Tse.

MS AMY TSE: The operator selection exercise is restricted to the local market, namely the Citybus, the New World First Bus, the Long Win, KMB and New Lantao.

CHAIRMAN: So restricted to those operators that currently hold one or more franchises; is that the case?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, in the local service market.

MS MABLE CHAN: Local franchised bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: Five bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Were these tenders in that restricted market -- were they promulgated publicly so it was known by an interested member of the public that this exercise was going on?

MS AMY TSE: Before we conduct the operator selection exercise, when we plan the routing, we will consult the district councils involved on the routings and the details.

CHAIRMAN: Did you inform the district councils that you proposed to embark upon a tendering exercise restricted to these five bus companies?

MS AMY TSE: We will inform them that we will select the operators and based on the routings and the details and any comments they can provide.

CHAIRMAN: So you were consulting them about routes, not about how you were going to tender? Is that the position?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So, if an interested member of the public wanted to find out about, for example, West Kowloon -- we've built this new bus station, next to the Express Rail station -- who's going to be running the buses, how would he have found that out, in advance of it actually

happening, in other words? If he had turned up, like me, yesterday, he would have seen a Citybus going to Admiralty, and he would have seen KMB buses going elsewhere, but how would he have known in advance?

MS AMY TSE: We will just inform the district council and conduct the consultation with the district council.

CHAIRMAN: So this is reflected in correspondence, is it?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is it reflected in the minutes of the councils?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So perhaps you could provide us with that correspondence, and if you've got the minutes, can you provide us with the minutes?

MS AMY TSE: Yes. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Prof Lo.

MEMBER LO: I just want to find out more about the tendering process. Does it involve the safety record of the company when you award a route contract, or what is being considered? What are the major factors? Is the fare being considered? What are the factors that award one route to one company and not to the other?

MS AMY TSE: Fare is one of our criteria to assess. The other is the accident rate that we would also compare.

MEMBER LO: So how exactly do you compare the accident rate

of two companies? Do you have parameters or do you have factors you look at in a very explicit manner, so people can actually know in a very transparent manner?

MS AMY TSE: It will be assessed based on the existing parameters, like the number of accidents involvement rate, as we are now using -- in the vehicle-kilometre that we are now using as a parameter.

CHAIRMAN: These are statistics that one has seen in the forward planning bus safety sections of the companies; is that what you are describing?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, and the number of accident rates in the past three years.

CHAIRMAN: But do you give any weighting for different kinds of accidents, for example an accident kills ten people or an accident where an old lady falls over in a bus? Do you weight them?

MS AMY TSE: We will count all the types of accidents.

CHAIRMAN: But do you give different weightings for them? Do you understand my point?

MS AMY TSE: No, we do not give the weighting to different types of accident. We take it as a whole.

CHAIRMAN: So it's a raw figure?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The number of accidents per millions of kilometres or whatever statistic you use; is that it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, if I may --

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- I would ask Amy or Patrick to elaborate a little bit, that there are a number of factors that they will consider in a restricted tender exercise. So, in response to the member's question about safety, Amy has quoted the indicator that we have used and made reference to in the forward planning exercise. Apart from the safety factor, there are a number of other factors regarding performance and service standards that they will also consider.

I would suggest we will provide, after the hearing, the factors considered in the marking scheme --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: -- for the complete reference for the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much. If you could provide that before we have our hearing on Saturday, then we would be in a position to ask questions that might arise. Can that be done?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, sure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you.

Ms Chan, on the issue of the safety performance

indicator, it is a matter I will come to in a moment, but before I move on, may I just pick up on a question Prof Lo asked, about whether fares is a criterion. Can I just understand -- so in the tender exercise, the bidder will put in a proposed fare for the route; is that correct? So it's not set by the government?

MR PATRICK WONG: No.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, was there an answer to that?

MR PATRICK WONG: Actually, because it's competitive tendering, the bus company will put forth their proposed fares, which we have -- the fare scale governs the maximum fare per distance. Each company has their own fare scale. So whenever they submit a bid for the particular route under tender, they would put forth their proposed fare, which may be below the ceiling fare level under the scale I have just mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: How is the ceiling fare made known to the bus company?

MR PATRICK WONG: It's been gazetted and basically published.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a fare per kilometre and how is it articulated?

MR PATRICK WONG: Basically, they set different kilometres with different fares. In other words, the longer distance, they can charge higher fares. Also, it

depends on different service types they provide. For example, some recreational routes which can be operated on Sunday and public holidays, they can be allowed to charge higher fares, and overnight services, they can be allowed to charge higher fares, and so on and so forth.

CHAIRMAN: And this is gazetted?

MR PATRICK WONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide us with a copy of the current version?

MR PATRICK WONG: Yes, sure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Would these fares still be subject to the fare adjustment mechanism for the normal franchise agreements, or are they separately considered? So, once they have bid for the route, according to the contract price, and they want to increase it later on, is it done under the same mechanism?

MR PATRICK WONG: Yes, once they offer and we accept the tender, the fare will be charged in accordance with that fare, and if they want to raise that fare they are subject to the fare increase mechanism, as you have just mentioned.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I understand correctly, from a policy perspective, this competitive tendering exercise would be restricted to new towns, or new developments, when

a package of routes becomes available.

Are there any plans, that the government may or may not have, to expand the scope of competitive tendering, and if so to what extent?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will answer that question.

It is always the government's objective to promote competition and to improve service standards. As a forward-looking perspective, there are a number of new development areas or districts like in the New Territories or even in the urban Kowloon, like the Kai Tak development. So, while we are venturing into competitive routing in such new town developments or new area developments, should there be any routes that straddle across these new areas to the existing built-up area, like between Kwun Tong and also the Kai Tak East development, then we also will try out the approach of competitive routing, route-by-route, tendering approach.

Looking ahead, under the current franchise model, it will not preclude us from doing more in this regard. I also wish to add that from the past experience, should a franchised bus operator fail in the service standards or compliance with the franchise requirements, like in the 1990s there has been occasions that we actually suspend the operation of certain routes or certain package of routes, like in the case of the China Motor

Bus, and then we take out those routes or package of routes for competitive tendering, to invite new operators to operate those routes. So there is always the opportunity for us to do more and to use this as a vehicle to salvage the service performance of existing operators.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: When was the last open, public, competitive tender in Hong Kong for bus routes? Open public.

MS AMY TSE: It was at 1998, when we first tendered the routes for the airport service.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS AMY TSE: Sorry, to China Motor Bus, in 1998.

CHAIRMAN: So such competitive tendering as there has been since has all been restricted competitive tendering?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Are there any plans, or at least plans under consideration, to subject the old routes currently under the franchise agreements -- subject those routes to competitive tendering, in an open manner, not just restricted to Hong Kong incumbents?

MS MABLE CHAN: At the present moment, we do not have immediate plan, but we would not rule out such opportunity because we always keep in view the service

performance of the various franchised operators in terms of various bus routes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may then move on to the next topic, which is the use of, firstly, safety indicators or safety performance indicators. I will also ask questions about the virtues or non-virtues of using incentives or penalty clauses in contracts linked to such a safety performance indicator.

If I may take it step by step, firstly, by looking at the concept of a safety performance indicator. I would like to start by looking firstly at what is currently used by the Transport Department, and then later on ask for your comments on the evidence that this committee has received in terms of possible improvements in this area.

Before I go to the details, can I start off by asking you to clarify one aspect of the full report of the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses. That may or may not have relevance to this topic, I'm not sure, so I want to ask you to clarify that.

That report has made it into bundle TD-5.

Mr Chairman, I don't have the page references. If I may just use the paragraph numbers of the report at this stage.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Ms Chan, do you have the report in front of you?

MS MABLE CHAN: Just a minute.

MR DEREK CHAN: Please take your time.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I am ready.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, just for the record, the first page of the report is at page 1757 of TD --

CHAIRMAN: As normal, I am working on the document that was provided overnight, so I don't have page numbers, as is normal.

MR DEREK CHAN: So am I. Perhaps I can just put the page numbers in for the record of the transcript, so that when we come back to it later on, we have a page reference there.

The first reference is TD-5, page 1757, and I wish to refer you to paragraph 4.26, which is page 1798 in the bundle.

Just to give some context to this paragraph, this paragraph is contained in a section on training, so at first blush it may not be relevant to the topic of safety performance indicators. So I may just invite you to clarify.

If I can just read out 4.26 first:

"The working group considers that in order to ensure that adequate and appropriate trainings are provided to

bus captains, all franchised bus operators should also enhance their internal monitoring and audit mechanism for the training of bus captains, including developing key performance indicators, monitoring the implementation and their effectiveness, and formulating appropriate remedial follow-up actions."

And the rest of the paragraph talks about reporting to management.

Can I just ask you to explain what you mean by development key performance indicators; what is it a reference to?

MS MABLE CHAN: This key performance indicator is regarding the training of the bus captains and it is not directly relevant to the safety performance indicator as you may have mentioned at the outset. For the committee's background, in the past, the franchised bus operators have volunteered to set an indicator for their training, say the number of bus captains to be trained in the past three years.

MR DEREK CHAN: I see.

MS MABLE CHAN: This is just a starting point, but with the promulgation of the practice note on the training framework of bus captains, one of the issues and observations that we have found is that by just relying on one single indicator of the number of bus captains to

be trained in the past three years, it does not suffice to achieve the training requirement of bus captains.

The proposal of developing key performance indicators will cover the performance of the bus operators, in providing training of in-service bus captains for refresher course, remedial course, and also for those that are necessary to rectify the driving misbehaviour of those bus captains committing traffic offences. And, on the other hand, we have also observed that while the bus operators have mentioned that they will provide behind-the-wheel training for the in-service bus captains, this may not be actually provided for the in-service bus captains to the extent that we expect. Say, for example, some of the behind-the-wheel training will actually involve that particular bus captain watching behind another bus captain behind the wheel, so he's just observing from behind. So this does not fulfil the expectations of behind-the-wheel training.

So we are expecting the franchised bus operators to develop key performance indicators along these fronts, so that it is easier and more efficient for the bus operators to achieve an internal monitoring and audit mechanism.

We are also expecting them to provide regular

reports. If I remember correctly, it's half-yearly, at least half-yearly, to their management boards. On the other hand, they should also provide exceptional reports to the management boards on their training indicators and the effectiveness of their training. In parallel, these reports should be provided to the Transport Department for our regular monitoring and also for us to review with them in our regular meetings with them, with their senior management.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: For my purposes, just to make it clear, these performance indicators do not relate to driving behaviour as a result of the training?

MS MABLE CHAN: In a way, it is a training target.

MR DEREK CHAN: Training target. Thank you for that clarification.

If I may then move on to looking firstly at how safety indicators are presently, currently, being used by the Transport Department.

Can I do that by first taking you to the bus safety section of KMB's forward planning programme for 2018 to 2022. The page reference for that is TD-1, page 180.

Just to remind you of the context, this would be a document prepared by KMB and submitted to the Transport Department around mid-2017, which relates to

the next five years, 2018 to 2022.

If I can take you immediately to page 192 of this document. Under paragraph 8.8.1, under the heading "Proposed Target and Other Measures", the paragraph states as follows:

"KMB proposes to use the 3-year average of 2014 to 2016 actual accident involvement rate of 2.71 (defined as the number of buses involved in accidents per million kilometres operated) as a target for the purpose of this five-year plan period. It represents a 6 per cent reduction from the accident rate in 2014, the highest record among 2014 to 2016."

So the point that I wish to draw to your attention, before I move on to the next document, is that the target that KMB set for themselves is 2.71.

Can we then move forward a year to see what happened in 2017, so the next document that I wish to take you to will be the next forward planning programme for 2019 to 2023, and the page reference for that is TD-5, page 1728.

Do you have that before you, Ms Chan?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Page 1728, first of all, is a letter from the Transport Department to KMB, dated 21 May 2018, basically providing KMB with a list of what needs to be

included in the next forward planning programme. So that's the context.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, please.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then over the page, at 1729 to 1731 is your letter to KMB as to what needs to be included in the next FPP.

If I may just read the first two paragraphs of page 1729, under the heading of "Bus Safety":

"We note that there was an increase in the number of KMB buses involved in accident per million vehicle-kilometres from 2.74 in 2016 to 3.04 in 2017, which was at a high level.

The table below which summarises the number of KMB buses involved in the traffic accidents by severity of accident from 2015 to 2017 reveals that there was a decrease in the number of fatal accidents from 11 cases in 2015 to 3 cases in 2017. However, the number of slight traffic accident has shown an increasing trend from 737 in 2015 to 866 in 2017. Also, the actual accident involvement rate, which is 3.04 in 2017, was higher than the proposed target accident ... rate in your FPP (2018 to 2022), which was 2.71."

So KMB did not meet a target that it set for itself. And we can see in the table below the two paragraphs I just read the number of KMB buses involved in traffic

accidents as a rate per million vehicle-kilometres had been increasing from 2015 to 2016 to 2017, the rate being 2.62, 2.74 to 3.04.

The second table below on that page also shows an increasing number of traffic accidents involving KMB buses throughout the same three years.

So it would appear from this analysis -- and please correct me if I am wrong -- that the two safety indicators that the Transport Department focused on here are, firstly, accident rates per million vehicle-kilometres, and secondly, the number, the absolute number, of traffic accidents involving KMB buses.

Would that be a fair summary?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then we can skip forward to page 1731, which is the last page of that letter. Under subparagraph (4), the heading is "Target for target accident rate", and can I just read it out. The Transport Department says:

"Your company is required to

a. propose target accident rate for the coming FPP to pursue continuous improvement to the safety of your operation

b. propose target reduction of accident involvement

rate per million kilometre yearly for the coming five years."

Again, the focus is on the accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres. Can I explore with you the utility of using this accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres rate as a safety performance indicator.

Firstly, would you agree with me this rate covers both accidents where the bus driver is at fault and also accidents where the bus driver is not at fault? Would that be correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is a general indicator of counting the number of accidents. So the number of accidents may cover some of the accidents involving driver's fault or may not. The causes of the accidents may be multiple and the investigation of the accidents and also the determination of the causes of whether the driver is a contributing factor will be subject to the judicial proceedings.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So the short answer is "yes"?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And, therefore, this rate includes factors to which the bus driver or bus operator cannot control; would you agree with that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: With that in mind, can I refer you to the evidence of Prof Stanley on this point, and can I invite your observations or comment on that.

Can I firstly take you to the transcript of Day 16, which is 15 September 2018, which should be in transcript bundle 7, page 67.

I would like to pick it up at page 67, line 16. Just to give you some context to the answer, I was asking questions of Prof Stanley about using a benchmark safety performance indicator as a trigger to a penalty or incentive clause. But can I just pick it up on line 16, where Prof Stanley talks about what he would expect to be included in a safety performance indicator. I will just read it out for the record, at line 16:

"I would just make a few comments which -- I talked before the break about, for example, fatalities, 'slips, trips and falls', and so on, being some of the sorts of things you might take into account. In terms of developing KPIs [that's short for key performance indicators] or performance indicators, there's a number of criteria that you would expect them to meet. They need to be specific. You've clearly got to be able to measure them. They ought to be achievable. They clearly need to be relevant. The data, and so on, needs

to be available on a timely basis. And all of those KPIs need to be something that the operator can affect. There's no point having a KPI if the operator is not able to, by their performance, influence the outcomes of them. So they are really important."

In the same vein, can I also take you to page 93 of the same day's evidence, and can I pick it up at line 22 of page 93. Again, just to give you some context, looking at the exchange above, the discussion was about whether the indicator includes something that the operator has or has not control over. At line 22, Prof John Stanley says this:

"I think, when we were talking about the criteria for indicators, it needs to be something that you've got control over."

So, given that we have just looked at the accident rate per vehicle-kilometres, which includes pretty big weighting of accidents to which the bus operator has no control over because the bus driver is not at fault, what observations do you have in terms of Prof Stanley's suggestion of what a performance indicator ought to include, something that the bus operator does have control over? Do you have any observations in that regard?

MS MABLE CHAN: Firstly, in terms of key performance

indicator, I think it serves the purpose of having -- of serving as a management tool or indicator for both the regulator, ie the Transport Department, and the franchise operators, to review their performance in the aspect of safety at the outset.

As I answered your question a minute ago, in terms of road transport or land transport, there could be a number of contributing factors leading to accidents. While following this KPI in terms of the number of accidents in absolute terms and also the number of accidents per million km, we are also in the process of the forward-planning exercise, digging into the analysis of the nature of accidents, in terms of the bus type, bus model, the type of accidents, be it collision or non-collision, and also the age of the drivers involved, the routes of those accidents involved. Merely relying on the KPI will just help us as a very high-level tool to evaluate the overall safety performance of a franchised bus operator, but that would not suffice. We are actually asking the franchised bus operators to cover in their safety chapter, as we have provided in May for the committee's reference, that they actually have to break down those accidents by the various categories that I have just mentioned.

In fact, my Bus and Railway Branch and also the Road

Safety and Standards Division have joined hands in analysing the trend of the accidents according to the various categories as I mentioned, in order to evaluate in more detailed terms the safety performance of the franchised bus operators.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, if I may -- obviously, if you want to expand, please let me know -- but my question is more focused on the indicator. Obviously, the evaluation, as you have mentioned, it is important to dig deep into different causes and all that --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting, Mr Chan, but I think this matter can be put very simply. You don't agree with Prof Stanley that a KPI must be something that a bus operator can influence the outcome? You don't agree with that?

MS MABLE CHAN: To answer your question, I would not agree, because a KPI, in terms of a management tool --

CHAIRMAN: That answers my question. Let Mr Chan pursue his question.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

You mentioned analysis and the different causes and breakdowns and all that. From my reading of the documents, there is no targets at all set for the bus company in respect of individual categories of analysis.

The only target that I can see is this accident per million vehicle-kilometres.

So, in terms of using something as a target, do you agree that you should be using something that the bus company has control over?

MS MABLE CHAN: If we are operating in a vacuum, and in taking a purist approach, it would be good if we can have some KPI that a company can have full control. But, as I have answered the chairman's question, I do not totally agree that a KPI will have to be fully controlled by a company, because it is an indicator, to start with, and it serves as a basis for us to evaluate its performance. Because the accidents are complex and could be contributed by various factors, it is by our detailed analysis of the various types of accidents and the nature of accidents involved that we can start to dig deep into the various other related performance indicators.

If I may, you have mentioned about the training targets. In the working group discussions, the safety is our utmost concern, and while the company may not have full control of the number of accidents involving their buses in a particular year, as far as the bus type, the bus safety and the bus captains are concerned, there are a number of ways that they can help to bring

down the number of accidents in absolute terms and also the number of accidents involved per million kilometres.

It is actually on this front that we have come up with the practice note, and then to expect them to develop key performance indicators on training, and also with the update of the specifications of the black box, and also with the installation of the CCTV, all these devices will help the company to investigate whether or not a driver is particularly involved or cause fault to that accident or there are other contributing factors.

So we will take all this into account in evaluating whether the company has tried its best in providing a safe bus, as also to equip the driver with a safe driving behaviour and attitude.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, when you are weighting these various different incidents and analysis that you are talking about, different aspects, different causes, you investigate through CCTV and all that, so the weighting will be done in your head?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps it would be helpful if I quote an example of how we would deal with this. Say in the case of KMB, we have pointed out that its accident rate has actually exceeded its pledged target. We have asked them to provide further analysis in terms of the nature and category of the accidents. Our initial observation

has found that the number of non-collision accidents have actually increased relatively over the last year, and the installation of the black-box device and also the CCTV would actually help the company to advise us of whether or not there is something wrong with a particular bus model or whether there is something wrong with a particular bus captain's driving behaviour, that has led to the increase in non-collision accidents involving the falling of passengers or losing of passengers' balance within a bus.

There are a number of routes, say, for example, that we may observe there are higher occurrence of such kind of accidents. We actually go deep down to that level of detail to investigate and to ask the companies to come up with focused measures. If the chairman and members may remember correctly, when we last presented the safety chapters, you can see that the companies have presented quite standard paragraphs on the improvement measures to enhance safety, but I think since the last submission of the FPP we have actually, with the comparison of the analysis of the accident trend, gone deep into the accident analysis and asked them to provide focused measures to address the various occurrence of accidents by bus routes, by the bus type, and also by the type of the accidents. This will help

us with the reference of the KPI, as a start, for us to evaluate in a more comprehensive and holistic manner the safety performance of franchised bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: Where is this request of the bus companies that they perform a more detailed analysis?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have written to the various bus operators, setting out our requirements. One of the examples is just illustrated in the bundle, our letter to the KMB. We can certainly provide other letter samples for the committee's reference. And following the issuance of those letters the various franchised bus operators are in the process of finalising the coming forward planning programme, in particular the safety chapter. So the process is developing and is evolving.

The whole FPP exercise will end by the end of this year, by which we will submit the finalised FPP, including the route planning exercise, as well as other chapters, in particular the safety chapters, to the bureau for the agreement -- in accordance with the law.

CHAIRMAN: This is delayed compared with previous years, is it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: Is this not a delay compared with the normal timetable for the forwarding of the forward-planning exercise?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think it is more or less in line, but obviously --

CHAIRMAN: So it will be the end of the year before the bus companies have given you this safety chapter in their forward-planning exercise?

MS MABLE CHAN: To be correct, the franchised bus operators have submitted a draft of the FPP, including the safety chapter, by the deadline --

CHAIRMAN: The deadline being?

MS MABLE CHAN: End of June, and it is supposed to be around the end of September/early October that we will come back to them with comments, and hopefully we will reach some sort of agreement on the contents of the chapter, and then it will take us from early October to the end of this year for us to submit to the bureau and for clearance of the FPP.

CHAIRMAN: Is there not some statutory requirements about this timetable?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is a statutory requirement, correct.

CHAIRMAN: Can you remind me where this is to be found? The dates you have mentioned, as I recall, it was the end of June and certainly September.

MS MABLE CHAN: End of September, yes.

While me colleagues are searching through the bundles, you are correct, there are two dates mentioned

in the ordinance. They have to submit by the end of June, and then we are supposed to reach agreement with them by the end of September --

CHAIRMAN: Otherwise, you can go for an arbitration via the Secretary for Transport and Housing; is that right?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, and the process beyond September and taking us to the end of December is the internal process for us to seek the clearance from the Secretary for Transport and Housing, when we will submit all the details of the route planning exercise.

CHAIRMAN: Which is why I asked the question. Are you not past 1 September or the end of September? Have you reached agreement with the bus companies?

MS MABLE CHAN: The date of end of September has passed. In this particular year, because of a number of questions we have posed to the operator, we are expecting them to provide supplementary beefing-up sections to the safety chapter, and that is why by now they are still finalising the additional pieces of information to the safety chapter.

CHAIRMAN: So you haven't reached agreement this year yet?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

Chairman, the reference to the statutory provision is clause 12A of the Public Bus Services Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. When do you expect to reach agreement

this year?

MS MABLE CHAN: We hope to agree with them as early as possible.

CHAIRMAN: Obviously, but do you have any expectation when that might be achieved?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps a piece of information: we have recently met with Citybus Ltd and New World First Bus on the FPP, and we are also arranging a meeting with the KMB and Long Win on the FPP. So a lot of work is underway for us to reach an agreement as early as possible.

CHAIRMAN: You've said that twice now. Are you unable to put a date on it? If you are, just say so.

MS MABLE CHAN: I cannot mention a date at this juncture, but it is my objective to reach an agreement as early as possible, because we also have to finalise the routes for the next year, for the planning purpose and for early dissemination to the public of information.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, again just for the record, section 12A, the section Ms Chan referred to, is contained in THB-2, page 109.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: An earlier question by the chairman is about your request to the bus operators to provide further

breakdown of the causes. I think one example of that would be at TD-5, page 1729 to 1730, which is the document we have just been looking at.

At page 1728, the letter dated May 2018, and then at the bottom of page 1729 you require the KMB to conduct an analysis of traffic accidents, and over the page you ask them to analyse the traffic accidents related to non-driver factors.

So is that the sort of request to bus companies that you were referring to in your evidence?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. And actually over the page on 1730 there is also a long list of the analysis that we are expecting the company to conduct and provide.

CHAIRMAN: At page 1729, the bottom of that page, "Your company is required to (a)", and then the last sentence:

"The analysis shall include the trend, the nature and causes of the accident, as well as the reasons for the increases."

So you are requiring them to give you causes?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that developed further on the next page, 1730?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can point out where that theme is developed. Just read it out, when you find it.

MS MABLE CHAN: Okay.

So we are expecting the company to provide further analysis on the identification of the causes of the accidents and whether there are any common factors in the accidents as identified. This will provide a basis for them to tell us what specific proposals or the improvement measures and programmes that they will provide. Say in the case of non-collision accidents involving falling passengers, the location of the passengers, are they along the stairs or are they on the lower deck or the upper deck.

CHAIRMAN: Where is that spelt out in this letter?

MS MABLE CHAN: I am just giving an example of --

CHAIRMAN: Before you give an example, can you read from the text anything that supports what you are saying? We've got this phrase "You are required to give us an analysis of the nature and causes of the accident", that's page 1729.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: All I'm asking you is: is that developed further on the next page?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is further developed on the next page, down the page of 1730 we have mentioned the safety-related plans, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: So with a view to lower the accident

involvement rate of buses and to further enhance the safety of buses provided to passengers, we are expecting them to propose the respective specific plans and proposals: to enhance the existing monitoring system or introduce new monitoring system on the safe driving of buses; to enhance the awareness of the company's employees on the consequences of the monitoring system, what sort of disciplinary action and penalties that may have; and also to develop action plan for automation of monitoring of bus captain driving behaviour through the data captured in black boxes of similar devices; as well as to propose publicity plans and programmes in the next two years to enhance passenger safety.

And also, over the page, to 1731, we also expect them to provide programmes in the next two years to enhance bus captain training for part-time and full-time bus captains respectively -- this is also related to the working group recommendation on the training framework. And to provide a programme of surveys to assess the utilisation rate of seat belts on buses which are installed with 3-point seat belt on all seats as suggested in the 2018-2022 FPP submitted to the Transport Department.

On this latter point, we are also picking up some of the initiatives they mention in the previous FPP and we

are expecting the company to follow through with assessment and survey to evaluate the effectiveness and utilisation, so that they can provide us more detailed data and information for us to monitor the effectiveness.

CHAIRMAN: Just coming back to page 1730, at the top, three or four lines down, "Analysis on traffic accident related to non-driver factors", and then there is a lot of detail about that.

There is no requirement that I can see where there is to be an analysis of driver-related factors, if a driver braked too harshly because he was going too fast as he approached the bus stop. Where is the requirement to give you that analysis?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, in the case of the KMB, here we do not specify to that extent and ask them to provide detailed analysis as to what kind of behaviour of the driver has caused the traffic accidents. But can I quote the example in the Citybus, whereby they are upgrading the black-box specifications and the installation. They are actually keeping a log of the events caused by the driver and those will be the cases whereby is there any very speedy acceleration or speedy deceleration.

CHAIRMAN: 50 per cent of all accidents that are

non-collision are loss of balance, are they not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And it's obvious beyond imagination that that must be related to braking, accelerating or swerving, for one reason or another. But then the information that you need to help you with that comes as to the cause of the accident, and that's why I'm asking you why you don't ask for details of what caused the accident. The answer might be the bus driver was driving inattentively, and what then was the cause of the accident? Because he had to brake too hard.

MS MABLE CHAN: In this current letter that we sent to the KMB, we haven't gone down to that level of detail.

CHAIRMAN: Have you done so for Citybus?

MS MABLE CHAN: Can I check for that, because in the updated minimum requirements for the black box, we actually have specified them to illustrate the events where there is an over-speedy acceleration or deceleration. Can I ask my deputy commissioner to update the committee on that, about the acceleration of the G force of that, so that to facilitate the company to identify whether there are any sudden braking or over-braking, harsh braking, by the driver?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

You are addressing the August 2018 basic minimum

requirements for electronic data recording device, are you?

MR YK CHAN: That was a minimum requirement, but what I am talking about is --

CHAIRMAN: Let's start with the minimum and then you can go on to what is the maximum, what you are hoping they will do. What's the minimum first of all? And what we are looking for is data about acceleration or braking.

MR YK CHAN: May I have a minute?

CHAIRMAN: It's appendix 2, if that helps you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just for the record, Mr Chairman, that's appendix 2 to the working group report, and the page reference is 1807 of TD-5.

CHAIRMAN: Not on the bundle I've got. There are no page numbers.

MR YK CHAN: Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: The basic minimum requirement for the electronic data recording device, which we commonly refer to as black box.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: For this update, we have sort of updated with new additions or requirements.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. What we are looking for is acceleration and braking. Which one is that?

MR YK CHAN: Item 4(a):

"Accident report -- vehicle speed profile at time interval of 1 second for the 3 minutes period preceding detection of 0.4G deceleration."

This is a requirement that the equipment should be able to record that sort of acceleration or deceleration --

CHAIRMAN: This is deceleration. It used to be 0.2, didn't it?

MR YK CHAN: No. 0.4 has been in this since first inception already.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Why is 0.4 deceleration chosen? Is that when you hit the wall? Is that what 0.4 means?

MR YK CHAN: No. Actually, 0.4 is a figure that we adopted some time ago. It was actually based on a study.

CHAIRMAN: What does it represent?

MR YK CHAN: It represents the force, when you step on the brake, the sort of gravitational force that you may experience as a normal person.

CHAIRMAN: I understand --

MR YK CHAN: To put simply, 0.4 -- normally, we are talking about gravitational force is 9.81 metres per second per second. Now, 0.4 is a fraction of that. Now, on a bus --

CHAIRMAN: What does this actually mean for a real driver?

Braking where smoke is coming off the wheels; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Give us a real example; what does it mean?

MR YK CHAN: No, the definition of this one is actually -- what it demonstrates is a deceleration force of 3.92 metres per second, which would be experienced by a passenger sitting on a seat would fall off the seat. So this is sort of a braking force that is large enough or deceleration force large enough to cause a passenger who normally sits on a seat and fall off. So this is a requirement specified in this equipment.

CHAIRMAN: So a passenger seated but without a seat belt would fall off a seat at this level of deceleration?

MR YK CHAN: Fall off the seat -- well, now, to put it more technically, there was no dislodgement of passenger from the seat in more than 95 per cent of the sample cases. So this is a probability of 95 per cent of the passengers would probably fall off the seat without a seat belt, if a retardation force of 0.4G is applied on the bus suddenly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So what that then triggers is if you have a deceleration of that kind, you must provide speed for the previous three minutes, but that's it, is it?

MR YK CHAN: This is purely when you apply -- this is

an instant moment, but we also need records of what happens in the previous three seconds.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR YK CHAN: Three minutes, sorry.

CHAIRMAN: At item 2 there is a reference to brakes at (c), is there not, "Activation of brake"? So the machine must always report when the brake has been applied?

MR YK CHAN: Well, the machine should be able to -- item 2 refers to it should be capable of recording those data at every second interval.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: And store data every 30 seconds for a period of two weeks.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: So all those (a) to (f), this black box should be able to keep those information intact.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that explanation. That's the minimum. But what is it that you say that you are expecting the bus companies to do above the minimum?

MR YK CHAN: Well, actually, the system that we saw from -- understand from -- actually, we saw how it works from Citybus and New World First Bus -- it actually can record all those information.

CHAIRMAN: Can record what?

MR YK CHAN: Speed.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: Let me refer to this -- it actually, obviously can record the operating time.

CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to a document?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, the document, the minimum specification we just talked about, in paragraph 2. Vehicle speed; activation of the brake, that can be seen on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: Actually, whenever the bus pulls into the stop and opens the rear door, that can be shown on the screen. Obviously the GPS coordination actually can --

CHAIRMAN: It's coordinates, is it not?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, the position of that bus, and whether a bell has been pushed. All those information are able to be provided by the bus company.

CHAIRMAN: But this is the minimum. I'm asking about what it is you expect them to provide, because the black box does a lot more than this, does it not?

MR YK CHAN: I think black box is a common term for an equipment, telematics system installed on buses and obviously they can provide various functions, but as far as bus operation and fleet management is concerned, the parameters specified are the parameters we are looking for, particularly when you are talking about whether a vehicle is actually speeding, whether the driver is

driving in a proper manner, whether he's applying hard brakes or not, whether the driver actually is servicing the passengers in the correct manner, whether someone might complain about the bus driver did not stop. So we can actually see from the system that the driver actually pulled into the stop and also, in response to the bell, pushed bell, and see what happens, and also let the passenger get off the buses with the doors open. All this information is related to operation of the bus services, and this is really the key information that we are looking for.

Also, the bus companies are actually developing their monitoring indicators as to how should this information be recorded and also how they analyse it later.

CHAIRMAN: All this information is recorded. The question is getting them to analyse it and use it.

MR YK CHAN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: The buses are awash with CCTV cameras. They've got these telematics devices that store all this information.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But the question is: is it being used, and is it being used to enhance safety?

On that note, we will take our morning break.

20 minutes.

MR YK CHAN: Okay.

(11.35 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.55 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Just before the break, on the point about whether we have asked the FB operators to provide the causes of --

CHAIRMAN: May I invite you to be closer to the microphone.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry. Before the break, you asked us to provide some evidence to see whether we have asked the FB operators to analyse the causes of those non-collision accidents, in particular the loss-of-balance accidents.

May I refer you to our letter to KMB in the bundle.

CHAIRMAN: The 21 May letter?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, 21 May.

CHAIRMAN: That's TD-5 at page 1728.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

On page 8 of our letter.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, page 1729.

MS MABLE CHAN: May I refer to the last item, "Analysis of

traffic accidents involving KMB", and we asked them to conduct an analysis on the traffic accidents involving KMB in 2017, in conjunction with the situation in 2015 and 2016, presented in annex E(i).

May I refer to the annex E(i)?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Where do we find that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, Chairman, perhaps the annex is not included in the bundle, but I can certainly submit --

CHAIRMAN: What's included in the bundle is what we've been given either by KMB or by the Transport Department. But if you've got annex E(i), we can have it copied now.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Should I --

CHAIRMAN: If someone can come forward and take the annex from you and then we will have it copied.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, Chairman, about that. (Handed).

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could come back to that in a moment.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, are there other questions you could ask in the meantime?

MR DEREK CHAN: I could perhaps follow up on one factual matter arising out of the exchange between Mr Chairman and Mr Chan of the Transport Department about the black-box requirements, in the meantime.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps, Mr Chan, I can take you to the new,

2018, black box minimum requirements which we had been looking at before the break, which is at appendix 2 of the working group's report.

Do you have that in front of you, Mr Chan?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. May I -- sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Let Mr Chan get to his question and then you may.

MR YK CHAN: I just want to make one point. Before the break, I answered to Chairman that the requirement under paragraph (a), the 0.4G, has it ever changed --

CHAIRMAN: I think you will find that's where Mr Chan is taking you.

MR YK CHAN: But after I double-checked with the 2003 version, it's actually been changed from 0.2 to 0.4.

CHAIRMAN: So it's been doubled, the deceleration threshold, 0.2 to 0.4?

MR YK CHAN: That's right. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And 0.4 is 95 per cent of people falling off their bus seats.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, the chance of 95 per cent --

CHAIRMAN: What's 0.2? How many fall off their bus seats at that level?

MR YK CHAN: 0.4 was actually a threshold taken a long time ago, and at that time -- let me explain --

CHAIRMAN: No, can you help me with -- perhaps you don't know the answer -- how many people fall off their bus

seats if the braking is 0.2?

MR YK CHAN: I don't have the answer. I cannot answer.

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer this question: why was it changed from 0.2 to 0.4?

MR YK CHAN: The reason is that in 2006, when we discussed with the operators on this minimum specification, actually when we have meeting with them and assessing the performance of the requirement, it was come out that because the 0.2 really is a very, very, very light deceleration force which will come up very, very frequently and doesn't provide any meaningful indication for monitoring purpose, and at that time we have discussed with the operators and agreed at meetings that the 0.2G version was changed to 0.4, but unfortunately, at that time, the number hadn't been changed in the specification, so this time we take the opportunity to update it. That's why.

CHAIRMAN: 12 years later? It took 12 years to update it?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. I think this is an overlook that we should have done earlier.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have minutes of this meeting of 2006 where this matter was discussed?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, I think we have notes of meeting too.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide them to the committee?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Now, Mr Chan, you were cut off. Perhaps, for the record, you can give us the reference to the 2003 minimum requirements.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. That's at TD-5, page 1598.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could have that on the screen.

Yes. There it is. 3(a).

This reference that you made to 95 per cent of people falling off the seat at 0.4G deceleration, is that a study that someone has conducted?

MR YK CHAN: From our search, it was a study conducted by the US department of transportation in 1977.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the details of that? Do you have that paper?

MR YK CHAN: We can provide it later.

MR DEREK CHAN: Does the study that you refer to include the probabilities of standing passengers losing their balance at 0.2 versus 0.4G?

MR YK CHAN: Unfortunately, there is no reference made to the standing passengers, because for sitting passenger you have a proper seat and people will sit in a prescribed, defined area, but for people standing, that is another matter, because how people stand is really -- there's not much control and also there's no set form of standing. So, from that, we don't have any

sort of equivalent deceleration force applied make reference to standing passengers.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we can readily infer by using common sense that they would all be on the floor, wouldn't they, if not through the front of the bus?

MR YK CHAN: Yes and no. Because it really depends on how people stand, and we actually specify in the buses there are lots of devices to facilitate standing passengers, holding bars and grips, and if people are doing the right thing when standing then I think the chance of falling down may not be as severe. But of course we understand people, they come on the bus carrying their packages and walk around when the bus is moving, then that's another matter.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: I have just been handed a document which --

CHAIRMAN: I think this is the document that you wish to speak to -- we now have it -- headed annex E(i).

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman. This is the annex E(i) attached to the letter to the KMB as well as other franchised bus operators. In this table, we are asking them to categorise and analyse the contributing factors of traffic accidents involving bus captains. We have provided in this table for the handy reference a comparison of the number of bus captains involved in

those traffic accidents in three years, and we have divided the factors as listed in the table.

So, in the second item, "Factors related to bus captains".

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: And the second item -- because this is a partial description of the nature of the accidents, we have input here as stopping or starting negligently as an example, and following this description, in our letter to the various bus operators, the bus operators are elaborating in their safety chapter the various factors relating to these kinds of accidents.

And in terms of stopping and starting negligently, we notice in their safety chapter, which is being finalised for our consideration, that in the case of KMB, they are actually subdividing the accident counts by the incidence of accelerating, of bus braking in traffic, bus braking when stopping for passengers, when pulling off or leaving bus stop. So there are individual categorisation of number of accident counts in terms of the bus braking under various circumstances.

So while the bus braking is not specifically mentioned in this table, because this is a starting reference for them, and we expect them to provide the detailed accounts of the accident situations, they are

providing in their safety chapter on the causes, whether or not hard braking is applied during the traffic or whether they are pulling off from the bus stop, et cetera.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Can you just help me, at least: where has this data come from?

MS MABLE CHAN: The data has been compiled with reference to the past accident statistics described in the previous bus safety chapters of the various bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: So is this collation of data an exercise done by the Transport Department? This table in front of us, this one page.

MS MABLE CHAN: Maybe Tony, our chief engineer, can help us on that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR TONY YAU: Chairman, yes, this data we collected from the police traffic accident system.

CHAIRMAN: From the police?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But it is the Transport Department that have produced this document?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And what are these police statistics called?

MR TONY YAU: The name is case investigation --

CHAIRMAN: Speak closer to the microphone, if you would.
MR TONY YAU: Because they have changed to a new system with a new name.
The system is named case management incident system.
CHAIRMAN: CMIS I think is the acronym they use.
MR TONY YAU: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Because we had evidence from the police.
MR TONY YAU: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And you have access to their data bank, do you not?
MR TONY YAU: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Have you read the transcript of the evidence that the police gave us not so long ago?
MR TONY YAU: No. We only can access the data --
MS MABLE CHAN: The transcript, police transcript.
MR TONY YAU: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Then you know that the police told us that they had a template of I think 60 factors that was given to the police constable who's investigating the accident, and he ticks one or more of these boxes and then inputs it into the computer; that's how this data is obtained. Then apparently it is reviewed by someone higher up.
So that's where this information is coming from, the police?
MR TONY YAU: That's another table, those factors shown on

the screen is the factors that the police referred to. That mean when they input the traffic data, they will choose the factors that contribute to the accident.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may move back to, at a more conceptual level, the use of a safety performance indicator, which we had been discussing before the break.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, let me ask this of Ms Chan, if I may: this letter that you wrote to the Kowloon Motor Bus Company -- I'm looking at page 1729 now, where we find annex E(i) -- there is no indication in the text of the letter as to where this data comes from, is there?

MS MABLE CHAN: No, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why you wouldn't tell KMB where the data comes from?

MS MABLE CHAN: If I may explain. Because it's quite a common practice for us to refer to the police database on the number of accidents and also the categorisation of the causes of the accidents, because apart from the police, TD do not categorise the number or the nature of the accidents.

So, actually, this traffic accident data compiled in 2015, 2016 and 2017, as attached to the letter, there is actually a subsequent briefing for the FB operators on

our expectations. So we just have a briefing and there is no sort of written records. So, on that briefing, we are explaining to them the details of the data that we are expecting. So we do not have a record of the discussion but obviously it is quite a common knowledge of the bus operators that we are referring to that accident database as administered by the police and have access by the TD.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, returning, if I may, to the issue of the safety performance indicator. I seem to understand from your evidence that you disagree with the use of a safety performance indicator. Just to make sure that I'm correct in understanding, I'm just going to put to you two short passages in Prof Stanley's evidence, just to make sure there is no ambiguity in what we are talking about.

Can I take you to the transcript of Day 16, which is 15 September 2018, at page 61 of the transcript. Can I start with the question at page 61, line 21, where the chairman asks:

"What other ways can one measure safety?"

And Prof Stanley says this:

"I think accident rate is a really good starting point, and if you look at some of the reporting that has

been done I think in the safety plans of the five-year forward plans, there's information on fatalities, collisions, non-collisions -- 'slips, trips and falls' types of involvement involvements as well -- and in my view, if you are going to go down the path of developing safety as an incentive or penalty provision, I would drill down into where are the safety problems. So you wouldn't use accident involvement rate in total; you would look at the fatality rate, you would look at 'slips, trips and falls'. And you would form a view, I think, on what is the relative importance of those two things.

I think one operator I saw, for example, had an increase in the 'slips, trips and falls' type accidents, but a drop in fatalities. So, if you add them up together, and say one incident is an incident, you are missing that nuance. So I would be trying to decompose it a bit and look at the major areas of safety concern and make sure that there are KPIs, if you like, or incentive/penalty clauses that relate to those. That means you are going to really end up with a bundle, I think, of measures. I don't know how many elements are in that bundle. That's something that needs to be settled by negotiation between government operators with advice, for example, from committees such as your own,

about what the components are.

But I would start with what are the main sources of safety problems and start to target those."

On that same subject, can I take you to page 72 in the same transcript, at line 18. Prof Stanley is saying that:

"... accident rates per million vehicle-kilometres are a very blunt and, I believe, a misleading measure."

The question that I was asking:

"You would need a more nuanced indicator or set of indicators?

Prof John Stanley: Absolutely. You need a set of more nuanced indicators. These should form part of it, but it should be the components, not the total.

And the components need to be weighted in some way to reflect -- I mean, as an economist, I would use the cost of those different sorts of accidents, which we regularly measure in Australia and I'm sure you do here in Hong Kong: you have a value for a typical fatal accident, you have a value for a typical serious injury accident, and you have a value for a typical slight injury accident. I would use those weights to come up with a weighted, if you like, accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres.

Have in mind also, though, there would be other

things you would want to include as well."

So do I understand it correctly, from your evidence this morning, that you would disagree with this approach to measure safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would like to elaborate a little bit more on my stance and observation.

First of all, when being asked before the break whether or not I agree with Prof Stanley's point that the KPI simply cannot be a useful factor in measuring the safety performance, my answer is I do not agree because, similarly, I think that there should be a reference point and a starting point, and for the management --

CHAIRMAN: Well, you disagreed earlier that a KPI that is outside the control of the bus company is not relevant. I think that was the issue; it's a KPI that's outside control. That was Prof Stanley's point.

MS MABLE CHAN: My point is noting the KPI on the safety factor in terms of number of accidents, while that to a certain extent may not be controlled by the company at all, we still think that this KPI is useful in measuring the service performance.

On the other hand, as I mentioned, because an accident could be contributed by a number of factors, if we go down to a very specific indicator, say for

example the number of accidents involving a bus captain who apply harsh braking in certain circumstances, if we do not go deep to investigate the contextual circumstances of that occasion, this kind of indicator, again, may not be primarily contributed by the driver alone.

As I have already seen a number of occasions, as revealed from the CCTV by one or two of the bus operators, when the black box tracks an event log whereby the bus captain has applied harsh braking, without the investigation of the other data collected as revealed from the CCTV, we do not know that perhaps it may involve an outside factor which cannot be controlled by the driver or the company as well. It could be the driver has to make a hard choice in whether or not he has to apply harsh braking in order to prevent colliding with another vehicle or a passenger, that he has applied harsh braking, and it also leads to losing balance of a passenger on board a compartment.

My point is just to illustrate that it is difficult for us to come up with a simple, specific indicator alone, to measure the safety performance of the company. Prof Stanley's suggestion of, say, coming up with a weighted accident rate could be an area that we can consider and further discuss and explore, but still we

need to have a reference point and we need to have a starting point. In having a safety performance indicator like the number of accidents or the number of accidents involving the bus travelling distance, we can have a trendal comparison or analysis, year on year. As illustrated in KMB's case, we can see that there is an increase in the number of accidents rate in 2017 as compared to 2016 and also exceeding the target rate. These are targets or pledges set by the companies themselves. So that also can serve the purpose in evaluating whether they have made their very best in reducing the number of accidents year on year and whether they are complying with the pledge that they have volunteered and offered to us.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: What about Prof Stanley's opinion that using that measure is too blunt and may be misleading; do you agree with that?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think I have tried to answer that question.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Ms Chan.

Then if I may take you to how London is doing it at the moment.

What I'm going to do, Ms Chan, is first take you to a passage in Mr Weston's report on the London approach.

I'm going to take you then to a short passage in his evidence that relates to what I'll be reading from the expert report, and then I will be going to a document from Transport for London on the same issue. So, with that information in mind, I will be asking for your observations on London's approach.

Firstly, Mr Weston's report. Can I take you to the expert bundle at page 150, at paragraph 7.8 of Mr Weston's report. Can I just first read it out into the record. Under the heading "TfL safety performance indicator", Mr Weston says this:

"As part of the bus safety programme TfL [Transport for London] have developed a safety performance indicator (SPI) based on an approach already used within the rail industry. The SPI monitors a basket of measures including incident data and outputs from the observational measures giving an operator an overall score which is benchmarked at 80. Their individual future performance is then measured against the benchmark to track for either deterioration or improvement. The system is not designed to compare bus companies between each other but to track the trend of an individual company."

So that's what Mr Weston says in his report. I'm going to take you then --

CHAIRMAN: I think it's important to emphasise the point that this safety performance indicator is being developed for use in the bus safety programme, and it's the bus safety programme that will be announced on 16 October. So this is a new system.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I understand that, because we have exchanges with the Transport for London commissioner as well.

CHAIRMAN: Can you speak closer to the microphone, please.

MS MABLE CHAN: I also noticed their new initiative and we have exchanged with Transport for London and obviously we are also striving to see if there is an effective measurement of the safety performance of the bus and rail industry.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can quickly take you to Mr Weston's evidence on this same paragraph of the report. That's at evidence at Day 18, 27 September 2018, at page 52.

Can I take you to the end of page 51 first. At line 23, you will see a question from Mr Duncan.

CHAIRMAN: We don't see anything on our individual screens yet.

Yes, thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: At line 23, you see Mr Duncan taking

Mr Weston to paragraph 7.8 of the report, which we've just read. Can I then skip to page 52, line 4.

Mr Duncan asks this question:

"Is that the safety performance indicator which Mr Chairman referred to but which has not yet been published?

Mr Weston: Yes. This is a proposal which TfL are working on, and one of the bus operators explained to us in August what would be involved in this basket. So, basically, it is 41 measures that are brought together into a safety performance score, and these measures may be weighted in different ways. So the measures may be 'killed or seriously injured' figures, they may be 'slips, trips and falls', various other monitoring results from engineering monitoring to driver monitoring, and they are all brought together.

The idea is that they are brought together into a benchmark score of 80 for each operator, and the aim then is to monitor an operator's trend against that baseline of 80, and they are weighted in such a way that -- it is weighted so that the whole basket -- the trend is not just -- if you are unfortunate in having a fatal incident, which may not even be down to the bus company's fault, that doesn't send the score completely off the scale. So it's about trying to monitor trends

within the company and not to use it as comparing your performance with your peer group, because I think the concern then is that if you're the best, you think you don't need to necessarily do anything else to improve, but I think there is a recognition that everyone can be better and be safer. So the idea is your safety performance indicator is benchmarked at 80, and then along with TfL you monitor your performance against that baseline of 80 and you try and improve on it and improve that score.

I think the intention is that will be announced publicly, the content of it will be announced publicly in due course, but it hasn't been as of yet."

Lastly, can I refer you to a document published by the Transport for London on this very same issue. Can I take you to bundle MISC-3, page 1194. Perhaps I could start at 1189, which is the first page of the document.

Ms Chan, the document I am taking you to is an update on the bus safety programme published by Transport for London, in response to London's Assembly Transport Committee report.

CHAIRMAN: This is November 2017?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's correct, Mr Chairman. I'm just trying to find the date.

Anyway, Ms Chan, can I just take you to page 1194,

which is headed, "Contract and performance management". The introduction says:

"We use a range of data as part of the assessment of an operator's ability to provide a safe service. As part of the bus safety programme we are considering methods to improve this process and to increase the emphasis on safety in the award and management of contracts.

Progress

Having considered a range of methods to best monitor operator safety, we are developing an operator safety performance index (SPI). The SPI is based on the same principle as the consumer price index, that is, a composite measure, using basket of indicators to generate a single performance index. The operator SPI builds on the success of the TfL bus network-wide SPI which was introduced in 2017 to better monitor safety performance across 81 safety-related indicators. The operator SPI will include 41 indicators, a mix of incident-generated data and behavioural observations, covering: staff and customer safety, network safety, risk management, driving standards and engineering. Each operator's performance will be tracked against their own baseline, to encourage continuous improvement."

So, Ms Chan, my question for you is this --

CHAIRMAN: Are you going to go to the document entitled, "Driven to distraction", the Greater London Assembly's earlier document dealing with this issue?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, I was going to deal with it in the context of giving incentives, because that's what --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because this is a response to what the Greater London Assembly had had to say.

By all means do it whenever you like, but I think that's the context. This is Transport for London's response to what was in effect an attack on their approach.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can come back to that, because it is a document I will go to shortly after.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan --

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- I'm not suggesting we need to copy 41 factors that London uses. My question is more on a conceptual level, about the idea of coming up with a basket of measures to form an overall safety performance indicator, with which we can monitor and measure the progress that a bus operator makes, and to encourage them to improve as against that measure.

What is your observation about that type of approach?

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman, and senior counsel, for drawing reference to the initiative of Transport for London. Actually, we also take note of their recent initiative, which is actually November 2017. We have actually arranged our officers to visit Transport for London, which has been planned some time ago, to learn more about their road safety and public transport safety programme and plans.

I think the gist of the initiative is to -- the conceptual rationale is to take into account a basket of factors in evaluating the safety performance of bus operators. We think that there should be a performance indicator, at least a performance indicator for us to evaluate the safety of the bus company. That said, we also think that if we can move towards the direction of embracing a number of key relevant factors, and come up with a simple index or indicator, that could be an area that we can further explore and study and examine.

Meanwhile, with the working group recommendations to push for a comprehensive and holistic bus fleet monitoring and control management system, what we are pushing for is to ask the bus companies to install all the relevant devices and to provide real-time monitoring

of the drivers' attitude and behaviour, to keep track of the key events, say like braking, harsh braking or acceleration, in the black-box log, coupled with our expectations of the bus operators to follow the training framework. All these could be a number of factors that we can take into account in further developing a more sophisticated performance indicator on safety.

So this is something that we also have interest in, and with all the other recommendations and developments on the real-time automatic surveillance of a bus operation and drivers' behaviour and attitude, I think we will have firmer ground for us to explore and discuss this with the bus operators, in order to find a pragmatic way and yet a more sophisticated way to measure the bus operators' safety performance. This is certainly an area that we will have keen interest to examine and study.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: When do you expect to be able to identify the relevant factors and come up with a simple index of performance?

MS MABLE CHAN: I cannot commit at this juncture, but being the head of the department and with our initiative to visit Transport for London on the whole rationale and issues involved in this sort of SPI, we would certainly

hope to come up with some preliminary thinking and analysis, say within a year, Chairman.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Is this something that you have discussed with the franchised bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: We haven't yet reached that stage, but obviously, with the development of key performance indicators on training, and with the real-time monitoring with the black-box functions and all the other driver-assisted device, I think now we are in the process of following up all these in our working group forum. As I mentioned in my opening statement, with the learning of the various experiences and views and suggestions through this Independent Review Committee, both the operators and the TD find the working group as a very useful forum. We will continue our work on that front and that will be an appropriate forum to bring the parties together to pursue all these meaningful initiatives to enhance measurement of safety performance of franchised bus operators. We will take it forward in that forum, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: You have used the word "forum" several times there. Do you have in mind the recommendation that Mr Weston made that this working group should become a standing committee, a Bus Operator Forum is the term

used in London; is that what you have in mind?

MS MABLE CHAN: I also noticed that reference in the expert evidence about a forum, operators' forum. So while we call it a working group, it is similar in terms of its nature and in terms of its scope of work.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: No, the specific question is this: do you have in mind making this permanent, not a working group working on a particular project, but a permanent group that would meet regularly, in future?

MS MABLE CHAN: It will be a permanent group which will meet regularly.

CHAIRMAN: And it would be similar, therefore, to the Bus Operator Forum which exists in London?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Which is what Mr Weston has recommended we adopt in Hong Kong. So you are accepting his recommendation? You are doing it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, so the first side of the equation is coming up with some combined, sophisticated safety performance indicator. The second part of this same equation is the concept of incentivising or having penalties imposed in, say, a franchise agreement, for meeting or not meeting targets for this safety

performance indicator. That's the concept I want to explore with you.

For that, can I take you directly to the London Assembly Transport Committee, the "Driven to distraction" document that Mr Chairman was talking about. The document is at MISC-3, page 1134, and the document, as you can see, is dated July 2017.

The concept that I'm focusing on is incentivising safety, or penalising it, for not meeting certain targets.

Can I take you to page 1151 of the report. Perhaps I should start on 1150, to give it some context.

Under the heading "Setting safety targets", if I can pick it up under paragraph 2.2:

"Injury and collision targets could be used to provide TfL and operators with clear incentives to improve London's bus safety record. They have a clear role in improving performance for many private and public services. As we explore in this chapter, performance targets have helped TfL drive up the reliability of the bus network in recent years. We believe that a similar approach could also be applied to bus safety by directly linking safety performance to profits for all bus operators working in London, and to the pay of senior TfL management."

Now 2.3:

"TfL has told us that it intends to introduce bus safety targets, but there is no indication that they would be linked to financial incentives. In November 2016, TfL's Safety, Sustainability and Human Resources Panel was asked to agree a bus customer major injury target for 2007/18. TfL also told us in February that it would aim to set bus safety targets by the end of the year. We are waiting for TfL to publish these targets, but we think that they need to be linked to financial incentives if they are to be effective."

So it's the second part that I am focusing on.

If you go over the page, at page 1151, can I pick it up at 2.6:

"TfL has previously explained its decision not to set safety targets for the operators by stating that:

'[Safety] is not directly related to payments/deductions due to the importance of avoiding the suggestion that safety of operation is in any way a negotiable trade off against cost.'

While we understand TfL's argument, we fundamentally disagree with it. Operators will behave in line with the incentives (particularly the financial ones) that are set by TfL -- their shareholders would expect nothing less. By not factoring safety into the payment

structure of contracts, TfL is failing to direct operators to provide the safe service we think London needs. As the case study below illustrates, financial payments have been successfully linked to safety in transport contracts in other countries."

The box itself talks about the Spanish example which I will skip for the moment. If I could pick it up again at 2.7:

"If TfL wants to take positive steps to reduce injury and collision rates, it must introduce meaningful incentives for operators to make their services safer. Londoners agree with us: of the 1,662 Londoners we surveyed, 88 per cent thought it was important that TfL incentivised safety as well as punctuality."

So, Ms Chan, from a conceptual level, can I ask for your observations or comments on this concept of incentivising safety and penalising not meeting targets.

MS MABLE CHAN: First of all, I think this is not an easy topic. It involves correlation of the safety performance to the financial payment or financial penalty to the operator. I think this suggestion or this idea raised in the London circumstances whereby we know that in London, they implement a sort of MOM model, a management and operation model, for their bus services. Whether or not the safety performance can be

related to a financial subsidy or payment to the operator or a financial penalty to the operator will involve a lot of discussion and debate in the context of Hong Kong whereby we actually operate bus services under a franchise model.

So, conceptually, we are operating under a different model. This is the first point I wish to make.

Secondly, under our current regime, we have a statutory provision whereby if a franchised bus operator fails in providing a proper and efficient service, then we can make a case to the Executive Council as to whether or not we can impose a financial penalty.

So I think, in the Hong Kong context, should we in the future come up with a more sophisticated safety performance index or so, it may provide a more effective and meaningful reference or basis for us to make our cases to the Executive Council as to penalise in terms of financial terms on a bus operator for failing to fulfil its target in terms of safety performance.

On the other hand, whether or not we can sort of use this and translate into a financial payment to the operator, I think it is a different game. We know that this one is currently discussed and explored in London. Obviously, we will learn a bit more directly from Transport for London on this, but at this juncture

I will not take this lightly. So we will keep an open mind and KIV the developments and obviously we will take into account the experience in London as well as in other jurisdictions. We will not rule out the possibility for us to deliberate and explore this internally, but my point is whether or not we can take it forward, we have to take into account a number of other factors and in a very careful and prudent manner.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Unless you have any further observations on this issue about benchmarking, indicators, and incentivising issue, I will be moving on to my next topic.

CHAIRMAN: Just to understand what the Greater London Assembly were saying here, at 2.6 on page 1151, there's a reference to what TfL had said, "safety is not directly related to payments/deductions". Now, that phrase "payments and deductions" is clearly a reference to their system, which we don't have, of incentivising better performance of service provision, and penalising a failure to deliver performance service.

What the Greater London Authority appear to be saying is that if you can do it for performance, then you can do it for safety. But your point is this, that our model of Hong Kong is different, we don't have

a system of bonuses or deductions, so all that perhaps we would be left with would be a system of penalties, if you fail to meet a safety performance indicator.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's what they have in Singapore, is it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Chairman, actually, the penalty provision is now currently in the law, so we can refer to that clause, and with the development of more sophisticated and balanced performance safety indicators, one area that we can further develop and take forward in our forum with the bus operators is how that can translate into a more systematic and formalised system of imposing penalty.

Of course, in the past, there are accounts that we have imposed both statutory fines or penalty by referring to this clause. We have. But how it can relate systematically to a sophisticated performance indicator, including safety, is something that we can seriously take forward in our working group with the bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: When was such a penalty last imposed?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have the data with my folder, but perhaps I need to find time and supplement it to the committee in a moment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because it was my memory that when this

issue was dealt with on 7 May, we were told that it had never been used.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Am I correct in remembering that, Mr Chan?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that accords with my memory, but I need to dig up the reference to be sure.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

But you are telling us it has been used?

MS MABLE CHAN: Let us double-check on that, and the date. Let us double-check on that and then we will supply the information later in this hearing.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

Mr Chan, do we have the provision that obtains in Singapore? My memory is that it is a financial penalty, I think S$100,000, if an accident rate is exceeded, a specific accident rate.

MR DEREK CHAN: I have an idea of where that may be, but perhaps we can deal with that reference over the break.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr Auyeung?

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Ms Chan, is it true that such penalty system does exist within the public transport system in Hong Kong, for example within the MTR system?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, you are correct.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, based on the current records I have, there is an account of us imposing a penalty in 1996, but we will further check as to the basis upon which we have imposed that fine.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt that was on China Motor Bus.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman, you are correct.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, just to follow up on the reference to the evidence on 7 May, the issue was raised with the Secretary for Transport and Housing Bureau, Mr Joseph Lai. That is page 8 of the transcript for 7 May 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps we could have that on the screen.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm looking at the transcript for 7 May 2018, at page 32, line 19.

CHAIRMAN: Just wait until we can all share it.

MR DEREK CHAN: Chairman asked this question:

"Before you move on, Mr Duncan -- by that do you mean no financial penalty has ever been invoked?

Mr Joseph Lai: Chairman, by that I mean the question of safety issue leading to an attempted use of this particular section concerning financial penalty has never been invoked thus far, so it's not tested."

Then Mr Duncan goes on to ask:

"So do we understand correctly from that answer that

no financial penalty has ever been imposed for any of the reasons set out in that section, section 22?

Mr Joseph Lai: Chairman, not to my recollection or understanding. I would be more than happy to come back with a written confirmation of that, but certainly not in recent times."

CHAIRMAN: That's a matter that you can come back to.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, Mr Joseph Lai's statement is correct, because he was answering in respect of safety. The recollection is there has not been any fine imposed on previous occasions. The incident that I mentioned regarding China Motor Bus in 1996 is regarding the lost trips of that franchised bus operator and we imposed a fine of 8,000 on China Motor Bus in -- the incident was in 1995 and we imposed the fine in 1996.

CHAIRMAN: But I think there was a second part to the answer -- I'm only looking at the screen. We can see at the top of the screens:

"... no financial penalty has ever been imposed for any of the reasons set out in that section, section 22?"

And that also got a negative answer, to his understanding. So that's now been qualified, has it? Does section 22 deal with a range of matters for which a penalty can be applied?

MS MABLE CHAN: Proper and efficient service, and safety is

one of the factors that we consider in whether or not a franchised bus operator is providing a proper and efficient service.

CHAIRMAN: So, insofar as that suggests it has never been applied for any of the reasons, that's now qualified; it had been imposed for lost trips occurring in 1994 but the penalty was imposed in 1996?

MS MABLE CHAN: 1995 lost trips, and the fine was imposed in 1996.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I am about to move to the next substantive topic of the approach to bus safety taken by the Transport Department. I was going to kick it off with a general question. Perhaps I can ask that --

CHAIRMAN: We are not going to have the commissioner this afternoon, so perhaps it's a good opportunity to ask the general question.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

Ms Chan, the general question I'm going to kick off this topic with is this. In the context of the Hong Kong system, who is responsible for driving bus safety or driving improvements to bus safety? Who provides the impetus for new safety measures to be implemented?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would say, in terms of public transport, and in particular bus safety, the Transport Department will no doubt be the party to be responsible to monitor and enhance the safety of bus operation, and we will make our effort to drive public transport safety.

MR DEREK CHAN: With that in mind, I was about to look at some examples of how the Transport Department has dealt with enhancements to bus safety throughout the years, before making some observations on that.

Perhaps I can start that process after the lunch break, if that's convenient to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can just ask one or two more questions at this stage, so the commissioner can reply.

Who in the Transport Department has responsibility for driving issues of bus safety? Which person or persons?

MS MABLE CHAN: Within the department, it will be a joint effort of our Bus and Railway Branch and also the Road Safety and Standards Division. The assistant commissioner for Bus and Railway Branch is Mr Patrick Wong, and in the Road Safety and Standards Division, it's the chief engineer Mr Tony Yau who is also present today, Mr Tony Yau.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: So both parties, both units, are responsible

for joining hand in hand to push and drive for public transport safety.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Do I take it from that answer there is no team within the Transport Department that's dedicated solely to bus safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: There is not a single team, but the Bus and Railway Branch oversees all policy and operational matters related to franchised buses, and the Road Safety and Standards Division will also provide impetus and input to enhance road safety, including public bus safety.

So, apart from these two major divisions, we have the Vehicle Safety and Standards Division, which is responsible for monitoring and regulating on the hardware, ie the maintenance and the standards of buses. And the assistant commissioner is Mr Reg Chan, who is also acting as deputy commissioner of the Transport Department. They oversee in general the vehicle standards and safety of vehicles, including franchised buses.

CHAIRMAN: There was a second part to the question, which was: who is responsible for new innovations? Technological safety devices, let's try that.

MS MABLE CHAN: This is a very interesting subject,

Chairman. Actually we learned a lot throughout this IRC process. Over the past year or so, the Vehicle Safety and Standards Division, headed by Mr YK Chan, has been overseeing the new technology advancements in vehicle standards and maintenance. While there is no dedicated team or extra manpower resources, their division is driving for new technological advancements, and under the working group we have a technical group chaired by Mr YK Chan. That is the main forum for us to drive and push the various in-vehicle safety devices and automated real-time systems and features, including black box, GPS.

May I also add that we see the need and the importance of having a dedicated team, as in the case of London and in other jurisdictions, of enhancing transport technology research capability within the department. We are actually securing and bidding necessary manpower resources involving engineers, transport officers and electrical and mechanical engineers, to set up a dedicated transport technology team within the department.

We have not been able to say a bit more for the committee's reference because this one is actually undergoing an internal resource bidding process, but I would just like to give an idea for the committee's

reference.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: The technical group that Mr YK Chan heads in the working group, that is something that followed, obviously, the setting up of the working group, and that was 13 March 2018. The technical group presumably happened second, later.

MS MABLE CHAN: That is correct, Chairman. The idea of having a working group actually arose from our attendance at the Tai Po District Council and the Legislative Council Panel on Transport immediately following the tragic accident in February. On those two occasions --

CHAIRMAN: I think you are referring to 12 February and 15 February respectively.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, of February, Chairman, you are correct.

There are a lot of different ideas and suggestions flagged up on those two occasions. Coming out from those two meetings, my team and I considered that we have to take a proactive approach and a more systematic approach to take heed of all these suggestions and ideas and advice, and we have to try and push for ourselves, and we subsequently informed the Transport Advisory Committee, on 27 February, about our suggestion of forming a working group, with the proposed terms of

reference to cover three areas.

First is on on-board vehicle-safety devices and equipment technology. The second aspect is on the feasibility and effectiveness of the installation of seat belts. The third is on enhancing the training for bus captains.

So we formalised this idea in late February, after the tragic accident, and this did lead us to formally establish the working group in mid-March.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: You said earlier that you had decided, following the meeting with the district council in Tai Po of 12 February, and the 15 February LegCo meeting and motions that you were going to be proactive, but in fact you are being reactive to events that have already happened, are you not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, if I may, I think that there is a lot more proactiveness that we can adopt. Of course, this idea of forming a working group is reacting to the tragic bus accident. I think we have taken a forward-looking and proactive approach by not just waiting for the various advisory committees and parties to make request and for us to respond. Rather, we should set our agenda by forming that working group, and it was on that basis that we have, at the start of the

working group meetings, come up with a number of possible ideas and initiatives, to set the agenda and go through it one by one with the bus operators and the manufacturers.

So I think, in that sense, we are taking a more systematic and forward-looking approach to set the agenda for ourselves, rather than waiting for the bus operators or the bus manufacturers to tell them what they can or will do.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: We've gone over time. We will take the lunch break now. We thank you for your attendance this morning. We hope you have a good afternoon. We look forward to seeing you on Saturday.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman, sure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your assistance.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now until 2.30.

(1.05 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, before I resume my questioning, can I just report back on a reference that Mr Chairman asked for, in terms of the Singapore penalty provision.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: One reference to that is expert bundle page 229, at paragraphs 3.19 and 3.20.

CHAIRMAN: Can we have that on the screen.

What is the document that we are looking at?

MR DEREK CHAN: The document itself is an appendix to a Transport Department document. The relevant paragraph starts at paragraph 3, which looks at the Singapore situation.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, tell me again, if you would, what the document is. Is there not an original document from Singapore which spells out this?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Just to answer the chairman's question earlier and then going to the source document itself, the document that I took Mr Chairman to is annexed to a letter to the Singapore authority --

CHAIRMAN: Ah, yes, thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- asking them, "Look, this is the materials that the committee has received" and asking for the assistance of the Singapore Land Transport Authority.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The document that I took Mr Chairman to is an annexure to the letter sent to the Singapore authority, to seek their assistance.

The letter itself is at page 198 of the same bundle.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We don't need to be delayed by this.

MR DEREK CHAN: In any event --

CHAIRMAN: Is there no reference to a penalty being enforced or available in relation to the accident rate per million kilometres?

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I will come back to you on that, Mr Chairman, with a more specific reference, instead of just handing up references that have provided to me in the moment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps I can just review the references first myself.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Very well. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, Mr Chan, I understand you will be taking over the main answering of the questions.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Before the lunch break, questions were directed at Ms Chan in relation to the approach taken by the Transport Department on bus safety, and Ms Chan was questioned on the general question about who was responsible for taking this forward.

My next series of questions will be in relation to a number of historical events, and I'll be going through them quite quickly, just to see the Transport Department's handling of issues about bus safety

historically. I'm just going to go through them. If you recollect them, that's fine. If you want a reference to the raw documentation, please let me know.

Firstly, in July 2003, a bus fell down a slope from Tuen Mun Road, resulting in 21 fatalities and a number of people injured. Arising from that Tuen Mun incident, there is now put in place hazard speed limiters that limit the maximum speed of the bus. So these speed limiters were required to be installed after the Tuen Mun accident, and this has now become a standard feature for franchised buses. Is that correct?

MR YK CHAN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Where is the requirement first time for speed limiters?

MR YK CHAN: After the incident, we have looked into the possible ways of putting this right and then we discuss with the operators, and then after that we impose the new requirement to incorporate in buses the speed limiter, limiting those buses to 70kph.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's why it happened. Where do we find it? Was it a letter, a requirement in the franchise; where is it?

MR YK CHAN: We should have incorporated in the specification, the minimum spec of the buses, but

of course before that, I believe there should be a series of discussions with the bus company and then perhaps there's a an exchange of documents, but at the moment we are checking.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It's a very simple question: what document do we look for to find it; yes?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. We can provide.

MR DEREK CHAN: A second safety measure arising from that same accident was the requirement for the franchised buses to have black boxes. We have been through that requirement this morning. It's in a letter dated October 2003. But do you recall that black-box requirement also arising out of the Tuen Mun accident?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat the reference for the promulgation of that document?

MR DEREK CHAN: TD-5, page 1597, being the letter; 1598 being the requirement itself.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then, in July 2006 and December 2007, there were two incidents of franchised bus collisions that resulted in passengers being thrown out of franchised buses.

The bus safety measures that were implemented as a result of those incidents were, firstly, a horizontal

guardrail being required to be installed on the upper deck windscreen; and, secondly, safety belts were required to be installed on the four upper deck front seats.

Firstly, do you recollect those two safety measures being implemented --

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- as a result of those incidents?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Both these features are again now standard features for franchised buses?

MR YK CHAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any reference to where this was promulgated? If not, come back to it.

MR DEREK CHAN: It's all in the list of franchised bus requirements which is annexed to the franchise agreement. I will come back to Mr Chairman on the reference to that list.

CHAIRMAN: When was this first required? Again, if you don't have detail, come back later.

MR YK CHAN: We will come back on the exact date.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, in 2016, there were three bus accidents which caused the breaking of glass on the exit doors of buses, which caused injury to passengers. Arising from those incidents, an additional guard bar

was installed on the exit door. Do you recall that safety feature being implemented as a result of those incidents?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, this has become a standard feature for all franchised buses?

MR YK CHAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Again, when was that required, first of all?

MR YK CHAN: That's required after the accident, but I can tell that all the -- after that, the buses have been retrofitted with such a guard bar, and they all completed in June 2017.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: On 22 September 2017, there was a fatal bus accident which occurred in Sham Shui Po that resulted in three fatalities and a number of passengers injured.

As a result of that accident, it led the Transport Department to conduct a review of the Guidelines on Bus Captain Working Hours, Rest Times, and Meal Breaks, which resulted in a new improved set of guidelines in February. Is that a correct summary?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then, in March 2018, following the Tai Po accident in February 2018, a Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses was set up.

I'm going to go to the chronology of the setting up of this working group in a moment, but can I first ask you this question.

We have just been through what appear to be a number of fairly useful safety features that have been implemented throughout the years as a result of bus accidents. Is there any reason why those safety measures were put in place only after the accidents had occurred and were not proactively put in place before the accidents occurred? Is there a reason for that?

MR YK CHAN: What I can say is when we -- we require the bus companies to provide a proper and efficient service, and provision of properly equipped buses to serve passengers is one of them, and all along we have been monitoring the performance of bus companies, of course including the equipment, the vehicles they use.

Now, of course, normally, when the services are being provided without any major incidents, then of course we will presume that they are actually operating properly, and actually this is a system instilled in our organisation that we take note or actually monitor continuously the operation of these buses, and if ever, in any circumstances, we discover there is any major fault of these buses or the way they provide the service, then the Transport Department would

proactively follow up the cases.

Hence, I would say that those accidents are unfortunate events that we don't want to see, but the Transport Department actually is proactively continuously monitoring what's happening to the operation of buses, and if we ever discover any incidents that have a major cause or to a specific type of accident, then we will sort of discuss with bus operators to provide and implement the necessary measures and equipment to ensure that those accidents won't happen again. This is the way I believe is a responsible way to ensure the safe operation of buses in Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: Can you point to some safety feature that was imposed, a requirement, without there having been an accident before that might have been connected to the safety feature?

MR YK CHAN: Apart from that, apart from monitoring the operation of bus services in Hong Kong, we also take note of what's happening in other parts of the world. One example I can quote is actually recently, some years back, we actually discovered or take note of there's some fire happened, occurred on buses --

CHAIRMAN: Fire in the engine compartment? Is that what you have in mind?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. When it's in operation, the fire actually broke out in a bus, but of course those cases maybe come from engine or other purpose, or other situations.

Arising from that, we actually -- our Vehicle Safety and Standards Division to carry out a research on what can we do, what can be done, to sort, of prevent that, and arising from that we require the bus companies to put in place the fire suppression system on all these buses and it has now become a standard feature in our bus specification.

CHAIRMAN: So this was again in response to there being some fires and then you did some research and then you put in place a requirement for fire suppression.

MR YK CHAN: You can say that.

CHAIRMAN: Do I understand you correctly?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What I was asking you for is an example where you imposed a safety requirement without it being connected to an event that had occurred earlier. If you want to think about it and come back later, do so.

MR YK CHAN: I cannot think of any major sort of standard features or improvement with the buses, but I believe, actually, our Vehicle Safety and Standards Division does discuss, we have regular meetings with bus companies on vehicle repairs and maintenance aspects regularly.

There may be small things that happen. We can find out, for example, there are new features and faults commonly found in buses during our inspection. Those things that we notice, if we take note of that, then we can discuss with bus companies and require them to take particular note and pay attention for remedial action.

I think one of the examples is sometimes when we do the inspection and discover some leakage of oil from a particular part, or whether there's any rusting on the chassis, and for those things, probably it won't cause accidents as such, but this is a small thing that can accumulate to a certain stage that may cause some sort of vehicle breakdowns and inconvenience to bus passengers.

Those small things, although it looks they are not very significant, but we do discuss with bus companies, and one thing, if we discover such minor faults in the buses, we not only discuss with that particular company, we also put this across to other bus companies to take note, because they do operate similar types of vehicle.

I think this is the way that we continuously monitor -- we do an inspection, monitor, and find out what's happening to those buses and if any fault we require the bus company to take action.

For major incidents like the ones you mentioned,

of course, after our investigation, if we can identify any sort of ways, technically feasible ways, to address that, then we sort of follow through.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: I will then next go on to look at the setting up and the process of the Working Group on Enhancement of Bus Safety, and I will deal with the events in a chronological manner.

If I may first start off with the minutes of the LegCo Panel On Transport, please, the LegCo Panel on Transport meeting that took place on 15 February --

CHAIRMAN: If you are going to deal with this chronologically, doesn't the district council meeting on 12 February come first?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, it does, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: That I think is a meeting that the commissioner attended.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The document for that is in the DC-2 bundle, page 782.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: As you can see from the first page of the translation of the document, at page 782, this meeting of the Tai Po District Council took place on 12 February 2018.

Over the page, at 783, you can see that Ms Mable

Chan, Commissioner for Transport, was present in the meeting.

As you can see from page 784, the topic of discussion was the accident on Tai Po Road. I won't go through the minutes in detail. Suffice for me to summarise it in this way: a lot of views were expressed by different members of the district council, which Ms Chan, the Commissioner for Transport, explained this morning she took into account. So that's the first event.

CHAIRMAN: I think it's worth going to paragraph 8, where Ms Chan is speaking. One sees that perhaps one of the first steps that was being taken:

"The Transport Department had asked KMB to submit a report for the ... accident as soon as possible and KMB had also promised that they would submit [a report] within one month."

Then there is an indication that it had been announced that this committee would be set up. There is an indication in the last three or four lines that the commissioner was aware of concerns expressed by the Tai Po District Council about road safety in the Tai Po district and the relevant road section in the past, and this would be followed up closely.

There is another reference, as I recall, from the

commissioner later on. Are you able to take us to that, Mr Chan? Yes, paragraph 34.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, at page 798 of the bundle, Mr Chairman.

So, again, perhaps just summarising the four points that the Commissioner for Transport raised in this meeting, the first one being driving tests for bus captains and the vehicle examination issue. The second point is a review of the safety and speed limits; thirdly, locations of bus stations; and fourthly, that KMB will set up an investigation committee.

So these were the matters addressed by Ms Chan at this meeting.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is worth noting what is in (ii):

"The Transport Department will review the safety and speed limits of the roads in Hong Kong from time to time."

That's a general statement, no doubt.

"Although the site of the current accident is not a traffic black spot, the department will consider appropriate accident-improvement measures in consideration of the number and nature of past accidents, road design, site environment, and the impact on the drivers."

That of course is what happened.

Then, as I think you said, the final reference is,

in (iv), in anticipation of the KMB accident report.

I think that gives a context to the next date which, as you were saying earlier, is 15 February, and it's the LegCo meeting.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. That document is at bundle SEC-3, page 1342.

Mr Chan, do you have the document in front of you?

MR YK CHAN: I am looking at the screen.

MR DEREK CHAN: At page 1342, you can see this is a set of minutes of the special meeting held by the Panel on Transport on 15 February 2018, and over the page, at page 1343, towards the bottom of the page, you can see Ms Mable Chan attended as the Commissioner for Transport.

Again, I won't take you through the discussions, but can I go straight to the motion that was passed as a result of this meeting, at page 1360. The motions record that the panel urges the administration to, firstly:

"1. request franchised bus companies to review the staffing establishment of bus captains, provide reasonable working hours, rest time, meal breaks and remuneration packages for bus captains, and provide on a compulsory basis regular training on a safe driving attitude for full-time and part-time bus captains to

ensure that bus captains are equipped with the qualities of a good driver".

So the first motion concerns the guidelines, the working hour guidelines, and training. The second motion states as follows:

"2. apply anti-skid surface dressing, erect additional declaration warning signs and install speed enforcement cameras on the subject road section immediately, and review the 'high-risk' road sections across the territory and expeditiously enhance the relevant safety measures to safeguard the safety of road users ...

3. explore ways to further strengthen the safety installations on buses, including enhancing the protection for high-risk seats, retrofitting seat belts on more seats and making it compulsory in phases for passengers to wear seat belts, installing an external camera at the bus captain's seat, modifying the speed limiters on buses to ensure safe driving on high-risk road sections, and installing an auxiliary system for automatic emergency braking, so as to reduce the risk of injuries among passengers in an accident."

So the third motion concerns the installation of in-vehicle safety devices or measures, as well as the issue of seat belts.

Now, next in the chronology is the submission of KMB's investigation report on the Tai Po accident to the Transport Department on 23 March 2018.

Mr Chairman, the reference to that is KMB-1, page 98.

I won't go to this document yet. I just note that it was handed in on this date and I will come back to it a bit later.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, what happened after the submission of the KMB investigation report is the first meeting of the working group, which was held on 13 March 2018.

Before I get to the minutes, I want to first go to the agenda, which is at CTB-3, page 588.

I simply ask you to note from this agenda that the main issue on the agenda appears to be "Discussion on the scope of works and membership of the working group". There is no date on the agenda. Do you recall whether this agenda was issued before KMB submitted its investigation report or afterwards?

MR YK CHAN: The meeting -- you mean the working group on 13 March?

MR DEREK CHAN: No, the meeting was on the 13th. Presumably the agenda would have been sent out before the meeting. The KMB investigation report was given to the Transport

Department on the 12th, so would this agenda have been set before the 12th?

MR YK CHAN: I think we have to come back to check on the exact date --

CHAIRMAN: Presumably -- forgive me for interrupting -- it was sent out under cover of a letter. Would that not be what one would expect?

MS AMY LEE: It is an email.

MR YK CHAN: We cannot confirm whether it's a letter or by means of an email.

CHAIRMAN: But either way, there is a record of it?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, that's right.

CHAIRMAN: That's what you are suggesting, is it? You can check and provide it?

MR YK CHAN: Now, if I --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- when were the franchised bus operators first contacted at all about participating in a working group? When did that happen?

MR YK CHAN: I cannot tell the exact date but presumably the bus company would be advised in advance that there would be a working group.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, they were asked, "Would you be prepared to take part in a working group?"

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You can't recall when that was?

MR YK CHAN: I can't recall the exact date.

CHAIRMAN: Do you recall who did it? Did you do it?

MR YK CHAN: Not me personally, no.

CHAIRMAN: Not you. Did any representatives of the Transport Department now present make that contact?

MR YK CHAN: Probably not one of our representatives here today.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR YK CHAN: Somebody in the office.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, very well, in which case can you try to help us with some emails, correspondence, which helps us understand the time frame in which this was set up?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I then move on to the actual minutes of the first meeting, and this is KMB-12, page 4869-1.

Mr Chan, can I just confirm with you that you have the right document in front of you. It should be KMB-12, page 4869-1 on the bottom right-hand corner.

That should be the first page of the notes of the first meeting of the working group.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I confirm that you have the notes of the first meeting of the working group held on 13 March 2018 in front of you?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So you can see the attendees at that meeting on the first page.

Can I take you to the second page, 4869-2. In the opening remarks by the convenor, who is Ms Rachel Kwan, Assistant Commissioner for Transport, can I pick it up six lines down from the top, where the convenor says that:

"... the purpose of the WG meeting was to review and study measures with a view to further enhancing bus safety."

My first question is this. Is there any reason why a working group of this type, which gets together everybody -- well, not everybody -- gets together the franchised bus operators and the Transport Department for the purposes of studying measures to enhance bus safety -- is there any reason why such a working group had not been set up prior to the Tai Po accident?

MR YK CHAN: I would say that this is a working group that was specifically set up in the wake of this particular incident. In the normal time, the other time, when the Transport Department do have other regular meetings set up to follow up with all aspects of the operations of the bus companies.

So, for this particular group, I think we have

a specific target or specific purpose for investigation, that's why we set up this working group, and it involved all the franchised bus companies and the relevant sections or divisions of the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Who attended these other regular meetings?

MR YK CHAN: Well, we have different sort of regular meetings in the Transport Department and the bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you do. Was there any -- let's call it a forum -- was there any forum at which the very senior people in the bus operators attended together?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. We have regular forums with senior management of the bus companies. TD, the Transport Department's representative, may typically be the assistant commissioner of the Bus and Railway Division, and this meeting -- and the counterparts from the bus companies, they normally would be the operational directors.

CHAIRMAN: Not the managing directors?

MR YK CHAN: Not the managing director.

CHAIRMAN: Because that's the signal difference, is it not, between the working group and whatever else might have happened before? You've got the top of the companies there?

MR YK CHAN: If there are very important and specific items

that have to be discussed and which have to be decided by the many top management level, then probably there will be meetings.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide us with the minutes of such a meeting, where the managing directors were present of the various franchised bus operators where safety was being discussed?

MR PATRICK WONG: Yes, sure.

Mr Chairman, may I supplement what Mr Chan said? Basically, we had different regular meetings on -- sometimes they're regular and sometimes ad hoc basis, and as you can see from the working group members, what Mr Chan mentioned about the manager or the operation directors, for example, KMB's Mr Godwin So is also attending another regular meetings, we are partners on various issues and Mr William Chung of Citybus and New World First Bus as well.

So, basically, we are partners and we had different meetings on various issues as mentioned by Mr Chan. Also on services, maybe included some regular meeting on safety and other --

CHAIRMAN: It's a very specific question. It's safety. And it's very specific. Managing directors -- Roger Lee, when was he last present at such a meeting together with Mr Cheng the managing director of Citybus, together with

the senior people at the Transport Department? That's the question.

Were there any such meetings: safety, top of the companies, top of the Transport Department?

MR YK CHAN: Mr Chairman, the regular meeting with the Bus and Railway Branch, meeting with their counterparts at the bus operations, the representative from those companies, like Godwin So and William Chung, et cetera, they are really the people that have been authorised by the company to make top-level decisions on all matters on operations. That is the regular forum that we have, to discuss with them all aspects of the bus operation, including safety. And the decision made at those meetings or items discussed at those meetings, they actually will be honoured if agreed by these companies. So probably there's not specific meetings that we have to actually meet the managing director.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is "no"? The short answer to the question is "no"? The explanation is what you've told us first?

MR YK CHAN: Normally, no.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, at paragraph 2 of the minutes, there is a note that:

"The members had no objection to the membership and

the scope of work of the working group."

And there's a reference to an annex. The annex we can find at page 4869-9. The first item of the scope of work for this working group is to review the training arrangements. This is a matter that was covered by the motion passed by the LegCo Panel on Transport on 15 February 2018 that we just looked at a moment ago.

The second item for this working group is:

"To examine the technical feasibility, cost effectiveness, applicability and any other issues relating to the installation of seat belts on all seats other than exposed seats."

Now, again, the issue of seat belts was something mentioned in the motion passed by the LegCo Panel on Transport that we looked at moments ago.

Thirdly, the scope of work for the working group included the exploration of:

"... the technical feasibility, cost effectiveness, applicability and any other issues relating to the installation of on-vehicle safety devices ..."

Again, that is also something mentioned by the motion of LegCo Panel on Transport.

My question is --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, item (a), the speed display unit for passengers, was that mentioned in either the

debate or the motions?

MR DEREK CHAN: Not that specific unit. It was more a general reference.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. But were the other items all mentioned or not?

MR DEREK CHAN: The speed limiter cap is certainly mentioned. The other specific matters were not addressed --

CHAIRMAN: It's a matter that can be checked simply by reference to the minutes of the LegCo meeting and the motions. So perhaps you can come back to us on that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman.

My question for you, Mr Chan, is whether the definition of this scope of works for the working group was driven very much by the motion passed by the LegCo Panel on Transport; is that a fair observation?

MR YK CHAN: Well, I disagree to that. As you know, the scope of work as given in this minute, they go into quite detail, and also, as you can take note that in particular at item (3), there are a number of subitems included, specific devices that we are going to look at.

Actually, before this working group, we have done a lot of preparatory work, to look into what sort of thing we can do to improve or to help the bus captains on buses and what sort of device that can possibly be

useful for installation.

Of course, those are the research we have done and then incorporate in the scope of work for further investigation and discussion with the operators.

Some of the ideas may have been raised or suggested by the public or by LegCo members, or by others. But, in this world of putting safety equipment on buses, there is nothing -- there really are a number of things that you can do. If you are talking about seat belts, of course everybody will readily recognise that seat belts might help and this is a legitimate item to be investigated.

Whether training for bus captains, of course this is an accident that might arise from inadequate training of bus captains, and thus legitimately an item which we should investigate in the working group report.

All in all, before this working group report, we actually did some research and prepared for the items to be discussed. I think this is a responsible way to do it. Otherwise, if we just go to a meeting that allow the operators to make wild suggestions or even not responding to specific measures -- our view was, actually, in conducting this working group, we have done our research first and then prepared the items to be discussed, so that we have a more focused discussion

during this working group meeting, in the hope that we can achieve something meaningful and useful out of this working group.

CHAIRMAN: When was this research done about safety devices?

MR YK CHAN: We actually did a large part of our research in a compact time, about February.

CHAIRMAN: So it was done after the Tai Po accident?

MR YK CHAN: You may say so.

CHAIRMAN: Well, do you say so?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I compare the list of safety devices here with the list of safety devices mentioned in the KMB investigation report, which was available the day prior to this meeting.

For that, can I ask you to keep 4869-9 open, and at the same time go to KMB-1, page 114. KMB-1, page 114, is part 5 of the KMB investigation report that was submitted by KMB to the Transport Department on 12 March 2018.

Under this section, KMB was considering "Other measures to enhance bus safety".

In terms of safety devices, you can see, at paragraph 41, KMB mentioned the electronic stability programme, or also called electronic stability control.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If you compare that against the scope of works document, at 4869-9, that's item 3(c).

Then, at paragraph 42 of the KMB investigation report, page 114, you can see a reference to geo-fencing, and that's a reference to speed control aided by GPS.

CHAIRMAN: Do you agree that the two mean the same thing?

MR YK CHAN: I would say so.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm sorry, Mr Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR DEREK CHAN: And speed control aided by GPS is item 3(d) in the list of safety devices to be considered by the working group.

Over the page, at paragraph 45, KMB raised the issue of speed limitation. So sort of a speed retardation system that does more than just cutting fuel when the bus goes past a certain speed limit. That is also mentioned as one of the devices to be considered by the working group at paragraph 3(e).

At paragraph 47 of the KMB investigation report, there is consideration being given to a device to monitor the drowsiness of bus captains, and that is also a device to be considered by the working group at paragraph 3(g) of the scope of works document.

My general question is this: why do we see a substantial overlap between the devices that KMB said they are considering and the devices that are to be considered in the scope of works for the working group? Had there been prior coordination or discussion between the Transport Department and KMB on safety devices that can be considered and what should be put on the agenda?

MR YK CHAN: Okay. Let me try to answer this question.

Previously, I mentioned that before the working group meeting, the Transport Department has been carrying out some research on the sort of equipment that may help to improve equipment we fit on vehicles, to improve or to help the drivers, and also improve the safety standards, safety of vehicles.

In the course of doing that research, apart from our research we actually talked to the manufacturers. This is a logical way to do it because when you try to find out --

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on with your long answer, can you answer the specific question: had there been prior discussions between the Transport Department and KMB about what should be on the agenda; "yes" or "no", or "I don't know"?

MR YK CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: No? Now, by all means, carry on.

MR YK CHAN: I just want to try to set the scene what has been done. When we do our research, apart from our own normal context, we also approach the vehicle manufacturer of those buses. So mainly it's the three main manufacturers of buses in Hong Kong, ADL, Volvo and MAN, and we discuss with them and try to find out what can possibly be done to be fitted on those buses to improve the safety of vehicles.

I think for improving the safety of buses, there are only a number of things you can do. There is nothing new. But we can find out and bus companies can find out. I don't know whether they have discussed with the manufacturer to do the same thing as well, but for us, we do that independently in February.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, if you don't mind, can I summarise it in this way: what you are saying is that you did your own independent research, KMB might have done their own independent research, you don't know, but it's a coincidence, a proper one, that you come up with a similar list of safety devices; is that the case?

CHAIRMAN: Because there are only a limited number of safety devices that are relevant; isn't that your evidence?

MR YK CHAN: That is right. And you can also notice that what KMB proposed, not all of their proposals are in our list, so obviously they are doing their own research and

think there is something that should be investigated.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Still on the scope of works issue, can I take you back to the minutes itself at paragraph 3. That's at page 4869-2, paragraph 3.

Paragraph 3 says this:

"As regards the proposed scope of work, KMB/Long Win further suggested including four other aspects advise assault on bus captain, illegal parking at bus stops, traffic congestion, aggravating bus captains' driving fatigue and pressure as well as bus stop arrangements in the scope of work."

Paragraph 4 contains the Transport Department's response to that suggestion.

Can I pick it up over the page, around six lines down from the bottom. The minutes recorded this:

"Given the 3-month limited time span of the working group, it was agreed at the meeting that the working group should focus on the proposed scope of work set out at annex ..."

And it goes on to record what that scope of works is.

Am I correct to interpret it as saying that, at this stage, the intended limited time span of the working group meant that additional bus safety related matters

proposed by KMB should not be discussed in order to focus on the proposed scope of works of the working group? Is that a correct interpretation?

MR YK CHAN: At that time, as I just mentioned, the intention was to complete the working group and investigation and also come up with the recommendation in a really tight time, in about three months. That's why, at that moment, we sort of want to focus on those critical items.

Now, all other items, we are not saying that they are not relevant.

CHAIRMAN: But the answer to the question is "yes".

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The question was, was KMB's shopping list rejected because of the short time span? And the answer is "yes; is that right? Do I understand your evidence?

MR YK CHAN: That's right, that's right.

We also mentioned to the bus companies that those items can be discussed at other forums; it's not necessary to be covered in this working group.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Now, at this stage, what was the rationale behind the intended limited life span of a working group of this nature? At that stage, why was it not a permanent group; why was it intended to be only three months? What was the thinking behind it?

MR YK CHAN: The thinking behind it at that time was we tried to find out and develop measures as quickly as possible, and three months' time at that time was considered appropriate, in order to cover the scope that we have defined at that time.

CHAIRMAN: What was the urgency in finding out and developing measures as quickly as possible? What was the urgency?

MR YK CHAN: I suppose the urgency was that a serious bus accident had occurred, and the Transport Department would like to work with the bus companies to develop remedial measures as quickly as possible, so as to minimise or even eradicate the occurrence of such incidents in future. But of course those items cannot be implemented in one day but we try to complete it as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: And presumably -- and say so if it wasn't -- this was also a reaction to the fact that there had been considerable concern expressed in LegCo, in the district council and publicly about the incident, the 10 February accident. Was that a factor in the urgency?

MR YK CHAN: I would say this is a contributing factor to that.

CHAIRMAN: There was a need to be seen to be doing something; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, it may be convenient here again to note the reference on the transcript on the scope of work discussion between KMB and the Transport Department. There's a series of correspondence on this very topic, which starts at KMB-12, page 4939. I don't intend to go to that detail at this stage, but again the reference is there.

CHAIRMAN: Just give me a moment because I want to understand what you are talking about.

This is correspondence about the KMB shopping list, as I've called it?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, and then the Transport Department's response. So there are four rounds of communication, if I may put it that way, starting at 4939.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, can I then take you back to the minutes of the first meeting, and can I take you, please, to paragraph 16, which is page 4869-6.

Mr Chan, I am going to come back -- this paragraph 16 is on the issue of seat belts. I am going to come back to you on seat belts as a separate topic later on. But, at this point in the chronology, can I just ask you this question which arises from

paragraph 16.

At paragraph 16 -- I will just read it into the record:

"CTB/NWFB queried the practicability of installation of seat belts on all seats to enhance passengers safety because it would be difficult for the bus captains to ensure passengers on buses wearing seat belts. Besides, CTB/NWFB also raised the concerns on the need of wearing seat belt by standees who could not be provided with seat belts. TD advised that there were requests for a comprehensive review on seat belts installation on bus after the traffic accidents."

Now, Mr Chan, what "requests" is referred to in this paragraph here? We know, in the LegCo Panel on Transport, in the motions passed there was a reference to seat belts, which is a month before this meeting. Does the "requests" there refer to the requests made by the LegCo Panel on Transport in its motion, or does it refer to some other requests?

MR YK CHAN: I think what you mentioned, the LegCo session, the request for seat belts, to review the seat belt arrangement, is one --

CHAIRMAN: Could you speak into the microphone more directly. Thank you.

MR YK CHAN: Yes. I believe that what you mentioned about

the LegCo members' request for review on seat belts is one source of information, but of course we cannot specifically mention which one, which occasions that the requests were made, but from our meeting of the press and also from other sources, we do note that seat belts is an item that we are expected to look into.

CHAIRMAN: Are you moving on?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: There is a reference here, in the plural, to "traffic accidents". Now, Tai Po was one accident. To what other accident was this referring?

MR YK CHAN: I think it really mentions that particular accident.

CHAIRMAN: So plural is a mistake? It should be "the traffic accident"?

MR YK CHAN: I think that was a general statement, referring traffic accidents. There's not particular mention of other accidents, but the Tai Po accident is the one that brings up this issue for review.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The next matter in the chronology that I want to deal with is the issue of a digital speed map. What I'm referring to is a digital map with speed limits incorporated into the map itself.

The first document I want to take you to in this

respect is at TD-1, page 366.

What you should have before you, Mr Chan, is an email. Can I first take you to the bottom email on page 366. It is an email from the committee's secretariat to the Transport Department, one Mr Tony KT Yau.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of the email?

MR DEREK CHAN: The date of the email is 1 June 2018. You can pick that up at the bottom of page 366.

The email itself is over the page at page 367. You can see from the second paragraph from the top:

"It was noted from the hearing that CTB and NWFB had set their black box system to automatically generate over-speeding report for drivers driving above 70 km/h generally, as well as for drivers driving above 50 km/h on 25 road sections selected by the companies for enhanced monitoring ... A question was posed to CTB and NWFB on whether the bus company management had any information on the percentage (in terms of length) of roads travelled by CTB's and NWFB's buses and with a statutory speed limit of 50 km/h that were covered by the abovementioned 25 road sections. In response, CTB and NWFB replied that they did not have the figure (as they said that they did not have a full set of digital data detailing the speed limit of all roads in Hong

Kong) but agreed to share with the committee a digital map depicting all roads that their buses operate on.

It is in connection to the above that I am writing to seek your assistance in providing the committee with digital maps showing the statutory speed limits of roads in Hong Kong, so that the committee may compare those maps with the ones to be provided by CTB and NWFB."

Now, (i) and (ii) set out the detail of that request, but that request was made on 1 June 2018.

What then happened on this topic is a letter was then sent to the bus companies by the Transport Department, on 7 June 2018, just a few days after this email.

Can I firstly take you to the document, at TD-1, page 477. Do you have before you the letter from the Transport Department to the bus operators dated 7 June 2018?

Mr Chan, do you have that before you?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: In this letter, in the second paragraph, the Transport Department says:

"I am pleased to inform you that the dataset of speed limits under the road networks managed by TD in the geographical information system format is already available to download from data.gov.hk [website] of the

HKSAR government."

In the third paragraph, you inform the bus operators that:

"You may utilise these GIS data packages to explore the technical feasibility on speed control by GPS or geo-fencing with your bus manufacturers or other appropriate parties to conduct relevant trials."

Now, my question is this. Is there any reason why the Transport Department wrote to the bus companies, drawing their attention specifically to the availability of a speed limit digital map, in the context of GPS speed control, only after this committee has enquired into its availability? Is there any connection between the two?

MR YK CHAN: Well, the date of the letter was sent on the 7th to the operators.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: We sent this letter because Citybus said -- I believe they are not aware of the city map data is already available.

CHAIRMAN: That was apparent from what had been stated in the letter from the committee, was it not, that it was obvious they didn't know about the availability of this digital map?

MR YK CHAN: I presume Citybus did not know.

CHAIRMAN: No.

MR YK CHAN: That's why we sent a letter to them to advise the datas are actually available.

CHAIRMAN: So there is a connection between the fact that it came out in the inquiry, this letter, perhaps, to the Transport Department, telling you that, although it was already available on the transcript, and that's why there was a response saying, "If you don't know about its availability, here it is, it's available"; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: I think there's a connection.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you. Perfectly sensible, if I might say so.

MR DEREK CHAN: Then, moving on from that, Mr Chan -- there were various meetings held in March, April and then June. I will come back to some of the details of the matters discussed in the meetings on the issue of seat belts, but at this stage can I then go forward in the chronology to 25 July 2018. That date is relevant because we have a meeting by the LegCo Panel on Transport, and a briefing note was prepared by the Transport Department in advance of that meeting or for the purpose of that meeting.

That document is at TD-1, page 403.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's the briefing paper prepared for the panel meeting.

Now, Mr Chan, I had originally prepared a number of questions to ask you on the basis of this briefing paper, but those issues have now been superseded by the report, the full report, of the working group that the department provided to the committee yesterday afternoon, so I will pick up the matters that I want to ask you from the full working group report.

The report -- Mr Chairman, my copy is unpaginated, but again, for the transcript's record --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- the report of the working group is at TD-5, page 1757.

CHAIRMAN: Which paragraph number are you going to?

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm going firstly to the summary at section 5 of the report.

Mr Chan, I'm going directly first to the summary of recommendations at chapter 5 --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have it.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- which is internal pagination page 41.

Mr Chan, at paragraph 5.3, it deals with the proposed installation of in-vehicle safety devices, and 5.3 says:

"All new double-deck buses procured from July 2018

onwards will be incorporated with:

(a) electronic stability control system, and

(b) speed limiting retarder."

At 5.4, it is noted that for existing buses, the franchised bus operators will be working on retrofitting these two items on to the buses.

So that deals with one category which is devices which will be installed.

At 5.5, this deals with devices that will be trialled to see whether they are worth installing, and under that category we have the BMCS, which is the bus monitoring control system, the collision-alert and lane-keeping devices, and the driver-monitoring device. So these are the devices that are to be trialled.

My question is this: is there any reason why these numerous enhancements to bus safety were considered only after the Tai Po accident and not before that?

MR YK CHAN: I would say that these improvement measures or new equipment is an outcome of our discussion with the bus operators and the vehicle manufacturers to prove that they might be useful, actually useful, for improving the safety of buses, and that comes out, the recommendation like this.

CHAIRMAN: But the question is, why weren't you having these discussions with the bus manufacturers prior to the

Tai Po accident? That's really the question.

MR YK CHAN: Well, perhaps, as I mentioned before, this Tai Po accident actually entails a series of questions on whether something more can be done to improve the safety of operation of buses, and arising from that I would say that this is the outcome of the discussions, and this is the way we have been moving forward.

CHAIRMAN: I think it comes to this, does it not: because of what had been said in LegCo, the district council, publicly, the press, that was the impetus that got you looking into these areas; is that fair?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Now, can I focus on the BMCS for the moment, which is the bus monitoring control system. Is it a fair summary to say the bus monitoring control system consideration arises as a result of the technological advancements of the black box or telematics systems that's available to be installed on franchised buses? Would that be a fair observation?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. Black box is sort of a major item that is embedded in this sort of system.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. It is the black box that enables the BMCS to be further advanced?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: We have already looked at the pre-existing requirements that the Transport Department imposed on the franchised buses this morning, in a document dated 2003. In that regard -- to some extent we have already covered this this morning, but there are a few matters I want to ask you about, at paragraph 2.22.

We've already been through this morning that annex 2 contains the updated black-box requirement. At 2.22, the report says:

"Moreover, the working group notes that the TD has recently reviewed and updated the 'Basic minimum requirements for electronic data recording device' which was first issued in 2003."

So my question is when was this reviewed and what prompted the review?

MR YK CHAN: Well, it is a review of the function, the capability of the telematics that are now available -- for the telematics now currently used by the bus companies, and then the review give us the results that there are some other functions that actually the telematics is capable of recording or taking signals and it would be useful in enhancing the BMCS. That's why I would say that the revision of the basic minimum requirement for the electronic data recording device is arising from this review.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, is arising from this review, the committee?

MR YK CHAN: This review.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Still on the issue of the BMCS, can I take you to paragraph 5.14.

At 5.14 of the report, it says this:

"Moreover, the Transport Department is keen to see the development and trials on BMCS which enables franchised bus operators to adopt a more holistic approach in both enhancing bus safety and management and control of bus fleet. Apart from overseeing trials by franchised bus operators, the Transport Department plans to engage a service provider to carry out an independent trial on vehicles to evaluate the applicability and effectiveness of using geo-fencing technology to control vehicle speed, which is one of the vital parts of the BMCS. Looking ahead, the TD would review the findings as revealed in the trials and would have further discussions with franchised bus operators with a view to developing a clear roadmap for uplifting the franchised bus monitoring through implementation of the BMCS."

Now, I've got a couple of questions on this proposed engagement of a service provider to carry out independent trials. What progress has currently been

made on this front, engaging an independent service provider to conduct trials independently by the TD?

MR YK CHAN: We are actually applying for resources, funding, to fund this independent trial.

MR DEREK CHAN: So does that mean that there's not yet an identification of who may be providing this service?

MR YK CHAN: Not yet.

CHAIRMAN: This term, "service provider", what does that actually mean? Independent consultant? What is it?

MR YK CHAN: Well, this is a party who can provide this sort of service to the Transport Department to carry out this trial. May I put it more specific?

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR YK CHAN: We are looking to engage the Hong Kong Productivity Council to carry out this sort of trial for us. But this is not yet fixed because we are still waiting for funding.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you can help me. Why is it that you think that they have the expertise to deal with this?

MR YK CHAN: We have actually tried to source a suitable party to assist Transport Department to do an independent research on this geo-fencing technology. This is because we want to try to be more proactive, to do more research in this regard, and also we have some more independent information to verify the bus

operators' claim on their development, whether they are genuine or not.

In the search of these parties, we find that the Hong Kong Productivity Council, they do have an automotive parts and accessory system and R&D centre. We have discussed with them and we believe that they have the sort of capability to carry out this sort of research.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So I take it from your answers that you do not yet have a defined scope for the engagement, or have you got something?

MR YK CHAN: We are working on the detailed project brief, on the scope of the project, but basically what we want to do is -- we will try to do this trial in two phases. The first one is to test out this geo-fencing technology, to see what can be done to improve the accuracy of this positioning system and whether it is working properly, and we also intend to try in other types of vehicle, to see whether it works.

In the second phase, subject to a successful trial in the first phase, then we will talk to the bus companies, whether we can adopt this technology to try on their buses as well. So we will have our independent trial and the bus company also engage their own supplier

to do more or less the same thing. But this is something that we try to cross-reference and see whether we are actually doing the right thing or they are doing the right thing.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, the first part of the test is to test the accuracy of the GPS system? Is that what you said?

MR YK CHAN: Well, the first part is -- I think, out of this whole geo-fencing technology, one aspect is, the most difficult, is the application of this GPS positioning in Hong Kong environment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: And there are a lot of feedbacks that they are not very accurate and that's why they have to apply geo-fencing technology to actually map out -- sort of map out these road networks and then try to provide a more accurate reading on the route itself. This is something that has to be tried out.

Also, I understand that the service provider working for Citybus and also KMB is also working on that sort of technology and has produced some quite good results, but we want to try to -- we really want to have an independent trial to sort of verify and then understand more about this technology.

CHAIRMAN: And this technology is, first of all, GPS, Global Positioning System?

MR YK CHAN: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRMAN: And its implementation in a geo-fencing system; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm sorry, do you want to say something, Mr Chan?

MR YK CHAN: No, that's all.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, there is nothing in this report that talks about a similar proposed appointment of an independent consultant or a separate independent Transport Department trials for the other devices that are being tried. They are the collision-alert and lane-keeping devices and the driver monitoring devices.

Now, are there any plans by the Transport Department to conduct their own independent trials or consultancy work, and if not, why not?

MR YK CHAN: We would like to do more, but the reality is we do need resources to do it. As the commissioner this morning also mentioned, we are actually applying for resources to set up an IT -- technology group, to carry out that sort of studies and researches. With the resources we have at the moment, and like this trial we are also applying for funding to do it, if we have sufficient resources, we certainly would like to go into

that sort of -- more researches.

In fact, in this project, independent trial, the second part is really we will go into sort of using the technology to map out -- match out the speed limit of the vehicles and then we also want to carry out trial on whether we can apply the speed limiters, to restrict the speed on our road sections. But this is really subject to the first successful trial in the first phase and then we will go into the second phase.

CHAIRMAN: And by "speed limiters" you mean active retarders?

MR YK CHAN: That's right.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, so we have been through the way the Transport Department has dealt with various enhancements to bus safety. Now I want to contrast that by looking at the London approach.

CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to another topic, we are going to take a mid-afternoon break, not least of all to give Mr Chan a rest, but also yourself. If that's convenient, we will take 20 minutes now.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: A 20-minute break.

(4.02 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.22 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I think I owe the committee a reference in terms of the Singapore penalty situation.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The document that we have that describes the franchised bus services in Singapore is at SEC-2, page 822. That's the first page of the document.

So, Mr Chairman, the document itself is an information note from the research office of the Legislative Council Secretariat, and the part relevant to us for our question is at paragraph 3.19 at page 834. At 3.19, there is a reference to "Quality of Service Standards", defined as "QoS", and the end of the paragraph says:

"Currently, the QoS standards comprise the following two categories:

(a) Operating performance standards which measure minimum daily or monthly operational deliverables, either at the bus network or route levels. They cover the aspects of bus reliability, loading and safety ..."

So that's where safety comes in.

At 3.20, the paragraph sets out consequences of non-compliance with the QoS standards and the scale of the fines.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Turning over the page, at 835, we have a table of the quality of service standards, grouped under different headings.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman will note that under the heading "Reliability", the third item is a bus breakdown rate, which is set at less than 1.5 per cent monthly, and under the heading "Safety" it would appear that the Singapore Land Transport Authority also uses only the accident rate of all bus services of less than 0.75 per 100,000 bus kilometres per month.

CHAIRMAN: And as we would express that, 7.5 per million kilometres?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. And again, page 837 --

CHAIRMAN: A high figure compared with our accident rate for our buses in Hong Kong?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, purely on an accident rate basis.

CHAIRMAN: But nevertheless a penalty to be visited on the franchised bus operator if that event occurs?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Am I right in recalling that we have asked those assisting us in the Land Transport Authority in Singapore whether or not this penalty has ever been used?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The committee has written letters to

the Land Transport Authority, setting out a number of matters which arose from this research, information note.

CHAIRMAN: And that's one of the questions: has this penalty provision ever been invoked?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, before the break, I was going to contrast the Hong Kong approach to the London approach. So, firstly, can I deal with the topic of what they have referred to as intelligent speed assistance, which is similar to our geo-fencing speed limitation concept.

For that, can I first take you to a document --

CHAIRMAN: Do you agree with that proposition, that ISA is similar to geo-fencing?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I first take you to a document at bundle MISC-3, page 939.

Mr Chan, what you have before you should be the first page of a report published by Transport for London titled, "Intelligent speed adaption design", dated December 2009.

Can I go to the introduction to this report to give context to what was happening in December 2009, and for that can I go to page 945.

So what is being looked at now are the introduction part -- I will just read out the first two paragraphs:

"ISA [that's intelligent speed assistance] software development began in France in the 1980s and has been trialled and evaluated in a number of different markets since, proving effective at reducing driver speed and incidents on the road. In May 2009 TfL commenced a trial of one of the latest ISA systems in an attempt to reduce speed and road accidents in the capital. Prior to this trial TfL developed one of the most comprehensive digital speed maps of any city.

The three types of ISA modes currently available are Advisory, Voluntary and Mandatory ISA. The Advisory ISA displays the speed limit to the driver via a digital map and GPS system in the vehicle, and is currently an add-on unit, similar to a satnav device. Voluntary ISA goes a step further, linking the speed limit information with the vehicle engine management electronics, and can limit the vehicle's performance once the speed limit has been reached. Under the Voluntary system the equipment can be switched off if the driver wishes so that the device does not affect acceleration. The Mandatory ISA differs in that the equipment cannot be switched off (except in case of emergency). TfL is sponsoring a trial of Advisory and Voluntary ISA within London."

And can I take you to the second-to-last paragraph from the bottom:

"To date a year long project has already been undertaken by TfL to understand and explore the London drivers' attitude, motivations and barriers to ISA."

Again, my reference to this document is to set the scene and give a date as to when the Transport for London has been looking at this ISA system.

The second document that I want to take you to, on the same subject, is a report from the Transport Research Laboratory dated November 2016 on the same issue. In the same bundle, can I take you forward to page 1002.

Mr Chan, I hope you have before you a report by TRL, the Transport Research Laboratory, in London, on intelligent speed assistance on London Buses, and it says, "A trial on two London bus routes".

Over the page on 1003, you can pick up the report date near the top of the page, which is November 2016. Again, can I pick up the context of this report from the introduction, which is at page 1011 of the report.

Starting at the middle part of the page, under the heading, "What is ISA?", the first paragraph describes what intelligent speed assistance is -- it's similar to what we've looked at so I'm not going to read it out --

and the second paragraph, which I will read out, says this:

"In the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, TfL made a commitment to run a trial of ISA Technology on a small number of vehicles in the bus fleet to understand the potential role of this technology in promoting adherence to speed limits across the road network and its impact on reducing KSI casualties. Subsequently, in 2015 TfL carried out a trial of ISA on London buses using an intervening ISA system by Zeta Automotive Ltd. Such a system is the focus of the study."

So, Mr Chan, I just want to pick up the dates from this report, because the report is dated November 2016, but the trials took place in 2015.

Again, can I take you quickly to page 1105, which is an appendix to the same report. It's a report on a trial, and the report is dated October 2015. Again, just picking up dates of various things happening in this context.

Over the page, at 1106, it gives us a little bit more information about the trials in the first bullet point:

"TfL are running a trial of intelligent speed assistance technology on 48 London Buses. The technology brings together internal information on the

vehicle speed with external information on the speed limit, and actively controls the speed of the vehicle to stay within the speed limit."

The second bullet point says this:

"ISA has been trialled across Europe and research in Sweden shows a positive impact of the technology both in terms of improving road safety and acceptance from drivers."

Just to complete the picture, 1120, we can pick up the date of the second trial, which is January 2016, at page 1120 of the report. There's a report on the phase 2 trial.

So the documents show that the ISA had been under consideration by Transport for London as early as 2009, with trials conducted in 2015 and 2016.

My question is this: was the Transport Department aware of TfL's extensive analysis into intelligent speed assistance prior to the Tai Po accident?

MR YK CHAN: We are not aware of this.

MR DEREK CHAN: Leaving this topic of intelligent speed assistance, I'm going to move to look at how London approach their bus safety programme.

Can I pick that up firstly from Mr Weston's report, which is at expert bundle page 148.

CHAIRMAN: Internal pagination?

MR DEREK CHAN: Internal pagination, page 34.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: And I'm looking at paragraph 7.5 which is headed, "Bus safety standard".

Mr Chan, I'm just going to read the first two paragraphs under the heading, paragraph 7.5, which provides the context in which Transport for London was looking into setting up the bus safety standard:

"A core output of the bus safety programme is the development of a ... bus safety standard. TfL have been working in collaboration since 2016 with road safety consultant TRL, Loughborough University, the bus operators and manufacturers to assess and then recommend features which should be incorporated into future bus design to help drive safety improvements. The primary objective of the bus safety standard is casualty reduction especially those killed and seriously injured.

Several potential technologies including intelligent speed assistance, autonomous braking, runaway bus prevention, pedal confusion prevention, acoustic and visual conspicuity, mirror design and frontal crash protection are being considered as part of this programme with both the costs and benefits of each being thoroughly assessed to ensure that the casualty reduction is maximised in return for the financial

investment made."

Now, the committee has heard evidence that this process of developing a bus safety standard began in February 2016, and still has not been completed as of today.

CHAIRMAN: That is Mr Weston's evidence?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, and the reference to that, Mr Chairman, is at Day 18, which is 27 September 2018, page 115, line 7, which gives us the date for that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: As Mr Chairman mentioned this morning, the bus safety standard is expected to be announced in mid-October 2018. So it's more than a two-year process, in that sense.

CHAIRMAN: I think what we've been told is that it is intended to be rolled out in phases, and the first phase will be announced in October.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Actually, if I can just read on, if you look at page 148, the same page that we are looking at, just a bit further down, just under the middle of the page, it says here:

"TfL are planning to announce the first phase of its bus safety standard on 16 October 2018 and it is currently envisaged that they will have three introductory phases:

-- phase 1 ...

-- phase 2 ...

-- phase 3 ..."

And you've got the dates there.

Having looked at the Hong Kong approach and having looked at the London approach, what would be your response to a suggestion that the Transport Department's previous approach to enhancement of bus safety appears to be more reactive to accidents having occurred rather than proactively and systematically seeking out additional measures to enhance bus safety before accidents occurred?

MR YK CHAN: I cannot comment on the background, how this bus safety programme comes from. We don't know what institute the authority --

CHAIRMAN: You are not being asked to comment on that.

MR YK CHAN: I know. I understand. But what I'm saying is I don't know whether the bus safety standard is more or less equivalent to what we have already, something that we have the recommended minimum specification requirement for new franchised buses.

In these specifications, it includes all the features a franchised bus should have, in terms of providing services or facilitating passengers using the buses, and obviously a large part in it does cover

safety and new safety measures to be incorporated.

Again, this standard, this time we have reviewed it and also amended it, in August this year, and we will continue to do so, to include the new standards, to be incorporated in here.

The bus safety standard mentioned to be revealed or to be unveiled in London comprises a lot of phases and certainly I would suppose it's a very comprehensive and very complicated programme. Certainly, the Transport Department will look into that and see what we can learn from this. As the commissioner said, we will send somebody to the UK later, and certainly this is one aspect that we can further look into.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, can I then move on to seek your observations on some of the recommendations that the committee has heard that may improve the consideration, proactiveness of the considerations being given to the enhancement of bus safety, and I would like to invite your observations on them.

Firstly, the committee has heard various terms being given to this, but one term is a Bus Operator Forum. That's from Mr Weston. Prof Stanley talks about a standing committee on bus safety, the main aim being putting together various interested parties and collaborate on bus safety issues on a regular basis.

To some extent, Ms Chan has accepted that recommendation this morning, by referring to the extension or turning the Working Group on Enhancement of Bus Safety into a permanent group. So I want to ask --

CHAIRMAN: She accepted in terms that she was accepting the recommendation of Mr Weston.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. In that sense, can I ask some further questions about this working group intended to be made permanent.

Can I first pick it up from the working group's final report at paragraph 5.13. Again, just for the reference of the transcript, this is TD-5, page 1803, internal pagination page 43.

Mr Chan, I hope you are looking at paragraph 5.13, which is under the heading, "TD's proposed actions". The first part of 5.13 talks about the steps that TD proposes to take in respect of the devices proposed.

Can I pick it up at the last sentence, the last line of internal pagination page 44, which says this:

"The TD will continue to keep track of the latest development of other devices and technologies with a view to further enhancing bus safety. Taking a proactive approach, the TD will continue to convene working group meetings to monitor the progress of trials closely on a regular basis, and provide a platform for

the Transport Department and the franchised buses operators to exchange views on the latest bus technology advancement and the applicability of new safety devices and technologies on franchised buses."

This is a reference to what Ms Chan said this morning about extending the life of the working group. Is that correct?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is there any document which sets out the details of what is now a permanent working group? For example, is there a document setting out any expanded scope of work, any set regular meeting intervals, any document which tells us how this working group has changed from an interim group to a permanent group?

MR YK CHAN: Nothing in writing at the moment, but certainly during our discussions with the bus operators, we will discuss this -- we have sort of mentioned about -- because all those initiatives mentioned in the working group will take some time for implementation, and also, as we mentioned, we will also look into the new initiatives where possible. So the working group will carry on, but now, as discussed this morning, this working group is going to be changed to become a permanent forum, but nothing in writing yet.

CHAIRMAN: Have you secured the agreement of the franchised

bus operators to continue to be members of this permanent forum?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's been done orally?

MR YK CHAN: We mentioned in the last working group.

MS AMY LEE: Last working group meeting.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?

MR YK CHAN: We have thrown this idea out at the last working group meeting and they did not express any objection to it.

CHAIRMAN: What was the date of that meeting?

MR YK CHAN: 21 September.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's referred to at paragraph 1.5 of the full report.

Can you give me a page reference in the paginated version, Mr Chan?

MR DEREK CHAN: TD-5, page 1763.

The reference to there being a meeting is at the second line of paragraph 1.5.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, in the working --

CHAIRMAN: So it was mentioned at that meeting?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, the four dates mentioned for the working group, it was the last one, 21 September.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. The committee has been provided with the unredacted full notes or draft notes of these other

meetings. That is other than 21 September and 29 August 2018.

Would you please provide those to the committee?

MR YK CHAN: As I understand it, the notes of the last meeting are still being prepared and to be commented by the operators, so we will --

CHAIRMAN: Right. Well, no doubt it's in draft form, it's ten days ago or more, so there must be a draft. Prepare a draft and we will accept it on that basis.

MR YK CHAN: Yes. We will discuss with the operator.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, we found that when we ask everybody, they agree to do it for themselves and defer in respect of others, so eventually we got some redacted notes and then Citybus must have said, "Yes, we don't mind the committee having them", and we got the full version. We would like to get to the end result, straight away if we can.

MR YK CHAN: Yes. We will certainly look into this. The only worry is because the notes are in draft format and have not been seen by the members, so I don't know whether it will be the final version.

CHAIRMAN: Just give them the draft notes now and get them to comment. If there are reservations, then by all means make them.

MR YK CHAN: We will consider it.

CHAIRMAN: That's the best you can do, "We will consider it"? All right.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just on this working group, can I just ask one further question about the scope or the intended scope of this working group going forward.

From the passage at paragraph 5.13 of the working group report that I just read out, it appears from the wording that the scope of works of the working group is intended to be restricted to discussions on technological enhancements on safety device of franchised buses. Would that be a fair observation of the intended scope of this working group going forward?

MR YK CHAN: It would be fair to say that the scope of the working group has been defined beforehand, and it is a common understanding of the members of the working group that we will restrict our discussion to those items.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. As we have established when I went through the chronology in respect of this working group, that scope of work was agreed with a time frame of three months for the life of the working group in mind.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The new intention is for this working group to be permanent.

MR YK CHAN: Right.

MR DEREK CHAN: So my question is: is it intended that the scope of works of this transformed working group is still going to be restricted --

MR YK CHAN: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- to only technical considerations, or is it intended to consider other aspects of bus safety that may relate to safe practices or bus-related road safety issues, for example?

MR YK CHAN: Well, with the change of the scope, the working group into a permanent forum, I would expect the scope of the new forum will cover much more than the original scope and if there's any need to extend to other issues related to safe operation of buses, I think we will include it. We are open-minded about this.

CHAIRMAN: So you would expect, or you anticipate, the scope of this permanent working group/forum to encompass all issues of safety/safe operation of buses? Is that it?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN: Please do. Prof Lo.

MEMBER LO: What about membership of the working group, like for example police or Road Safety Council people, who would be relevant to look at bus safety?

MR YK CHAN: Well, the membership -- since we will be transforming this working group into a more permanent forum, the membership, we can consider whether it should be extended to other relevant members, whether government or non-government. But at the moment, I think we will have to discuss and see how this group is going to work, in terms of membership and the scope as well.

CHAIRMAN: When do you expect these matters to be resolved, that is to say the scope identified and the membership to be identified?

MR YK CHAN: I would say we will do it as quickly as possible. There's a million things going on, and we certainly hope we can take forward this new initiative as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: By the end of the year? You are identifying scope and you are identifying members. Those are the two matters.

MR YK CHAN: Perhaps we can take this target for achievement.

CHAIRMAN: You will consider that as a possible target?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Potential?

MR YK CHAN: Bearing in mind -- may I supplement -- because as I mentioned before we are trying to get more support,

resources, to take forward this initiative, and certainly this is a factor that we have to consider.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: The next recommendation that has been suggested to the committee which may have an effect of encouraging a proactive approach is what has been termed as a safety innovation fund in London.

Can I first take you to the evidence of what that fund is, and then I will ask for your observations on that. Firstly, can I take you to the expert bundle at page 146.

Mr Chairman, that's --

CHAIRMAN: Mr Weston's report?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Weston's report, internal pagination page 32.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: I am interested in the paragraph under the heading, paragraph 7.3, "Safety innovation fund".

Again, I will just read it out:

"During November 2017 TfL announced as part of the safety innovation fund the award of 500,000 pounds to six bus operators to develop new ideas that will improve safety across London's bus network. Abellio, CT Plus, Go-Ahead, RATP, Tower Transit and Metro line were all awarded funding for their ideas for safety devices and

to improve workplace behaviour. These trials form part of the data collection process which has fed into the development of the bus safety standard."

Mr Weston then goes on to describe the actual devices being trialled, so I won't go through that.

Can I then go to a passage at page 152 which contains Mr Weston's recommendations.

Mr Chairman, that's page 38, internal pagination page 38.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: A related recommendation that Mr Weston gives, under the heading "Network financial performance" -- can I pick it up at the second full paragraph of that page:

"Consideration could be given as to whether certain safety initiatives, such as the uptake of new safety technology and bus driver training targeted specially at safety might need to be funded by the Transport Department as direct grants outside of the franchise agreements with specific outcomes linked to these grants. Providing funding outside of the franchise agreements is also justified especially if the benefits accrue to the wider society."

Having that context in mind, what observations does the Transport Department have in terms of establishing

some sort of fund that provides funding for trialling and developing or coming up with new ideas or new measures to enhance bus safety?

MR YK CHAN: As you may know, in Hong Kong the operating situation is very different to that of the UK. I believe the bus services in the UK are tendered out and actually the government is providing funding to run those services, while in Hong Kong the bus companies actually should be responsible to run the network or bus routes on their own, under commercial principles.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, under what?

MR YK CHAN: Commercially viable -- commercial principles.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR YK CHAN: So these are private companies, and the bus companies should be responsible to pay for all the outlays for operating the bus services and we believe that the operation, the equipment and buses are being provided by the bus companies and they should normally continue to do so. So the UK situation is very different from Hong Kong.

But about new initiatives, whether it should be subsidised by the government can be a topic that can be discussed. In actual fact, even nowadays in Hong Kong, we actually sort of are subsidising the bus companies to put up the display units on one-for-one arrangement. So

this is not an item that cannot be touched. We are open-minded about this. But do they establish funding solely for a particular purpose? That I think will have profound implications and real cost implications to other public transport modes as well.

But for individual items, certainly we are open-minded about it and it should be discussed, if the bus companies see there is a need to do so.

CHAIRMAN: What is this display unit that you subsidise?

MR YK CHAN: Currently?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR YK CHAN: Currently, the government is providing subsidised funding for installation of real-time display units on the bus shelters or bus stops, and also the seatings at those bus stops on a one-for-one arrangement. That means if the bus company provides one, the government will subsidise for another one. So this is the arrangement that has been implemented. So we do provide assistance to take forward initiatives that are beneficial to the general travelling public.

CHAIRMAN: This real-time display unit tells the member of the public the estimated time of the arrival of the next bus?

MR YK CHAN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that government does a one-for-one

subsidy?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The bus company provides one, the government does another?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And what about bus shelters, bus seats, seats at bus shelters?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, seats at the bus shelters, installed at the bus shelters.

CHAIRMAN: A one-for-one arrangement?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

MR PATRICK WONG: Seats no. All subsidised by government.

MR YK CHAN: Sorry, seats --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, what's the position with seats?

MR PATRICK WONG: For seats, basically we subsidise the provision of the seats installed at the bus shelters, for the bus shelters basically built by the bus operators themselves, and for the ETA, we call it the display unit, just mentioned by Mr Chan, it's being subsidised on a matching basis one by one.

CHAIRMAN: So you pay for the member of the public to sit down at the bus stop to watch one in two of the displays that you have paid for; the other is paid for by the bus company? Is that it?

MR PATRICK WONG: Actually, I think for seats, basically we

have a lot of requests and feedback from especially elderly and those people in need, they prefer to have seats. So we want to -- actually, it's the government policy under the public address -- policy address, that it subsidises the bus company to expedite the provision, to make more numbers available for those who are in need.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Who pays for the bus shelter, the structure?

MR YK CHAN: The bus company.

CHAIRMAN: Right. Thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Another recommendation that has been suggested to the committee by Prof Stanley is the establishment of an independent safety regulator.

Again, you have read Prof Stanley's report. I'll just give the context to the question. In Australia --

CHAIRMAN: I think it would help to be taken to his recommendations, so we can understand it.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

Can I take you to two parts of Prof Stanley's report. The first one is at expert bundle page 70.

Mr Chairman, this is a reference to Prof Stanley's second report.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Internal pagination page 70.

Mr Chan, can I just draw your attention to page 70. The page is headed up, "Governance", "Main agencies and roles", and in the middle italicised passage Prof Stanley quotes something from the Transport and Housing Bureau on the system in Hong Kong. Can I pick it up in the paragraph under the italicised passage:

"THB thus performs the strategic or policy role, the TD undertakes the tactical role and franchised bus operators provide the operational or delivery role. This parallels the Melbourne arrangement, where Transport for Victoria undertakes the strategic role and the Public Transport Development Authority has responsibility for the tactical level. As shown in figure 3.1 [which is the figure over the page], however, a notable difference between arrangements in the two jurisdictions is that Melbourne also has a separate independent safety regulator operating at the tactical level. Transport Safety Victoria was first established under the State's Transport Integration Act 2010, as discussed in section 3.3.1 of the first report under this brief, a role that has no equivalent independent safety entity in Hong Kong. The Transport Department monitors safety performance of FB operators and is involved in promoting safety initiatives. However, the

absence of an independent safety regulator in Hong Kong seems likely to lessen the relative focus on safety matters."

So that's the first part that I wish to draw your attention to.

The second part, if I may ask you to turn to page 99 of the same bundle.

Mr Chairman, that's internal pagination page 46.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I pick it up at the middle of the page, so I'm going to read the paragraph under the numbers 1, 2 and 3. Prof Stanley says this:

"Operator support is available from BusVic, the industry association, if desired, across all three areas. For example, BusVic has developed templates for MISs and MMSs which are available to its members, these templates having been developed in collaboration with the Transport Safety Director. The Transport Safety Director has a strong focus on the development and improvement of safety culture in a bus business and safety risk management, working with operators and the industry to improve practice. Guidance material is available, such as Guidance -- Safety Culture, September 2016 ... and the director has indicated his willingness to share materials and ideas with Hong Kong, if desired.

The independence of the Transport Safety Director both elevates safety as a desirable policy outcome and provides an independent source of accountability and transparency on safety processes and outcomes that exceed what is likely to result if (route) bus safety was left solely to the public transport regulatory agency and/or a governmental department to manage."

So, in that context, what is the Transport Department's observation as to this idea of setting up an independently accountable safety regulator that focuses on safety issues?

MR YK CHAN: Well, I don't know the scale of operations -- is it in Australia, Melbourne? -- under this Victoria, and as I understand the bus operations in Victoria, they are sort of quite de-centralised to quite a number of operators, and obviously the scope of monitoring is much larger.

CHAIRMAN: This is a report really about Melbourne rather than the state of Victoria, which obviously is huge.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, but it's talking about BusVic. I'm not sure whether it's talking about the whole of Victoria or it really only concentrates on Melbourne.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I follow your point.

MR YK CHAN: But even if it is talking about Melbourne, as I understand, Melbourne bus operations, the bus

operation in Melbourne is very different from Hong Kong. In Melbourne, I think they are talking about quite a number of operators, in quite a large number, and --

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think we can help you with that.

MR DEREK CHAN: In terms of negotiated services, which is about two-thirds of the routes, there are 15 contracts and 12 operators, and in terms of one-third of the route which is subject to competitive tendering, there is one contractor, but that is subject to change or may change every seven years.

MR YK CHAN: So talking about less than 20 operators?

CHAIRMAN: 13.

MR YK CHAN: 13. So obviously you are looking at quite a number of operators across the spectrum, and the regulators of these operators have to manage quite a number of these operators.

But for Hong Kong, we are looking at -- well, we have six franchisees, and roughly into three core groups: KMB/Long Win, New World First Bus/Citybus, NLB.

CHAIRMAN: Long Win.

MR YK CHAN: Long Win and KMB.

MR DEREK CHAN: New Lantao is the other one.

MR YK CHAN: Yes, NLB, New Lantao Bus. So we are managing basically three large groups, six franchisees.

Under this regime, I would say it is much easier,

because we don't have to manage such a large number of operators, and quite easy -- if you talk about maintenance of safety standards, that will be a much smaller task, as I see it.

CHAIRMAN: In Hong Kong?

MR YK CHAN: In Hong Kong.

Also, as already mentioned previously by the commissioner, in the Transport Department we do have specific professional branches and groups to look into safety. We have the Road Safety and Standards Division, the Vehicle Safety and Standards Division, and also Bus and Railway Branch, all these are actually exercising very tight control on the monitoring of these operators.

As far as I can see now, we are doing -- well, I think the way we are working is very efficient, very efficient in the sense that with one department and dealing with only three big groups, and what we want to achieve sort of in raising the safety standards of these operators is not a tremendous task, like in Melbourne you have to convince probably 13 or 14 operators to achieve a common goal.

In particular, when you talk about turning a working group into a permanent forum now, it actually is creating a much more focused core group. I would say this forum will take on the duty, I would say very

similar to what is being proposed, as an independent audit sort of set-up, like the one in Melbourne.

So, in the Hong Kong context, I think the need for establishing a separate entity to oversee the operation over the Transport Department and the operators is not absolutely necessary.

CHAIRMAN: But what's independent about a forum that is comprised of the Transport Department and the bus operators? They are not independent of each other, are they? They are not independent.

MR YK CHAN: I would say, yes, they are not independent, between those two parties, but I think we can further look into the membership of this group and see whether it is possible to bring in independent opinions into the group, to provide independent opinions on the operations and running of this group.

CHAIRMAN: Who do you have in mind?

MR YK CHAN: I don't have anybody yet, but we certainly will look into this.

MEMBER LO: I was talking about the Road Safety Council people.

MR YK CHAN: We certainly would welcome.

CHAIRMAN: You would regard them as being independent, if they were members of this permanent working group forum, that would give an element of independence; do you

agree?

MR YK CHAN: Yes, yes, members from the Road Safety Council are actually quite independent members.

CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: I hear the comment about this forum, that you will be -- sort of you are having permanent meetings, including many stakeholders, but one of the comments I would make is that this forum would discuss more than just safety, because you would discuss many other things.

What about within the Transport Department having a particular unit just responsible for safety? Is it a possibility?

MR YK CHAN: At the moment, we have a unit called Road Safety and Standards Division. This unit actually looks into the safety aspects of all modes of transport. Certainly franchised bus is one of them.

But I see that this unit alone cannot achieve specifically what we want to achieve for enhancing the safety of buses, because it involves more than roads; it also involves vehicles and the sort of operations.

So, in actual fact, within the Transport Department internally we can certainly form a group comprising the experts from all these divisions, to specifically look into franchised bus safety. I think this is workable.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: We heard from the commissioner this morning that there are about four units responsible for safety jointly. But how often do those units meet? Do they meet regularly, like monthly, to discuss safety issues?

MR YK CHAN: At the moment, there is no set regular meeting between these units, but certainly, particularly in the backdrop of we are going to sort of create a new forum to take forward the bus safety issues, and obviously all these units will be sort of involved, and perhaps under this forum we will sort of have to internally arrange regular meetings to discuss and take forward initiatives, bring to the Transport Department's notice.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Thank you.

MEMBER LO: May I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN: Please, Professor.

MEMBER LO: I try to explore a little bit more about the Road Safety Council. So how does that work with the TD and the police? Is that sort of like an independent body to look after safety? Has it served an independent role already? I'm trying to understand the working relationship between Road Safety Council, the TD, the police, and also a Road Safety Research Committee which is part of the Road Safety Council -- how would these four entities work together to promote or to look at safety?

MR YK CHAN: On this question, may I invite Mr Yau to talk about it?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

MR TONY YAU: Thank you, Chairman. The Road Safety Council combines a representative from different departments or bureaus, and also from outside official members, such as motorist associations, Institute of Logistics and Transport, Hong Kong Medical Association and Hong Kong Road Safety Association, IT fields and insurance.

So the Road Safety Council is an independent body, and under the Road Safety Council we have two subcommittees. The first one is the Road Safety Research Committee -- Prof Lo, you are one of our members -- and the second one is the Road Safety Campaign Committee. The Road Safety Research Committee, that means if we have some new initiative under the road safety, no matter if the initiative it related to vehicle safety, road safety or other new issues, it would be discussed in the Road Safety Research Committee.

In the Road Safety Research Committee, we have academics from different universities, and also some members from other relevant road safety associations.

For the Road Safety Campaign Committee, it mainly focuses on publicity and education. Under Road Safety

Council, we have a quarterly meeting for each council and each subcommittee. In the Road Safety Council, the TD will report the quarterly accident record to the council members, and the accident record will include bus accident record. So members of the council will offer their comments on the bus safety performance.

CHAIRMAN: And whose statistics are these for franchised bus accident records?

MR TONY YAU: Similar to other accident records, we retrieve the data from the police system and then do our analysis --

CHAIRMAN: So it's based on the police primary data, is it?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And you collate and analyse that?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Who does that?

MR TONY YAU: My office, TD, Transport Department, and we report to the council members the safety performance, the trends, or any observations.

CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to speak into the microphone more closely.

Yes, so based on police records which your Transport Department collate and analyse?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. Then we report the safety performance to the council members, report any observation we identify,

any trend of accidents or any common contributory factors noted in our analysis.

Because the Road Safety Council consists of members from our bureau, the police and other external bodies, so if they have any comments or suggestions, any initiative to enhance or any policy to enhance bus safety, they will be discussed in the Road Safety Council, and the members under the council would follow up on the ideas raised in the council.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Road Safety Council make recommendations specifically relevant to enhancing franchised bus safety?

MR TONY YAU: In recent few years, they do not have any particular recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: Has it ever made a recommendation about enhancing franchised bus safety?

MR TONY YAU: I think, because the recommendation may involve legislation, enforcement as well as publicity, although to my memory there's no specific comment or suggestions about the legislation, but on the enforcement as well as the publicity there are some suggestions to enhance the bus safety.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide us with some examples of that, where a recommendation has been made?

MR TONY YAU: For example, I remember that we identified the

trend of accidents, for example, the passenger lost balance, and then the publicity we propose in the Road Safety Council is focused on alerting passengers to hold the handrail firmly. That's one example.

CHAIRMAN: I had more in mind recommendations relating to perhaps the design of buses, the safety devices, seat belts. Has the council ever made those kinds of recommendations?

MR TONY YAU: No. I think why there's no recommendation from the Road Safety Council is, over the past few years, the overall accident numbers remained stable for the franchised bus.

CHAIRMAN: Isn't that all the more reason to make recommendations, if the accident rate is not dropping? Isn't that a reason to make recommendations? That seems to be the driving force in London, to get the accident rate down. They have a goal. I think they call it zero, goal zero or some phrase like that. So, if the accident rates are not dropping, why aren't recommendations being made?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. We have also the target in the Road Safety Council -- we are also discussing any plan to lower the accident rate. But we are not talking about lowering the accident rate for franchised bus. We are talking about lowering the accident rate of the whole --

all the transport.

CHAIRMAN: Is the reality that this council makes no recommendations that are directly relevant to franchised bus safety, apart from holding onto the handrail?

MR TONY YAU: As I mentioned, this is one of the examples of publicity. The Road Safety Council has recommended enhanced publicity, and also, for enforcement, the Road Safety Council also recommend the police to do enforcement.

CHAIRMAN: Enforcement of what?

MR TONY YAU: Such as illegal parking at bus stops, because it will affect the operation of the bus as well as --

CHAIRMAN: Yes. When was that recommendation made?

MR TONY YAU: I have to check the records.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide that information to us? Because that is a subject that has been a constant refrain of bus companies, in particular KMB, and of the trade unions, the drivers, that there is an ongoing problem, not solved, not really addressed. I think they might say the police are not really interested.

MR TONY YAU: Because each year the police, in the Road Safety Council, they will consult on their STEP programme, the selective traffic enforcement programme, and, in the STEP, there's selective enforcement about the illegal parking.

CHAIRMAN: Please provide documents that show this recommendation that the police enforce the law about illegal stopping at bus stops.

MR TONY YAU: I will check. I am not sure whether it is particular for bus stops or in general the illegal parking.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?

MR TONY YAU: I have to check the record, to check if the illegal parking is focused on bus stops or any location on road carriageway that affects road safety.

CHAIRMAN: Well, any recommendation of either of those areas, please provide us a copy of the document.

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I was about to move on to the topic of seat belts, but I see the time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's obviously an appropriate moment. But, Mr Chan, if there's something you wish to say, please do so.

MR YK CHAN: Thank you, Chairman. Talking about the enforcement of illegal parking at bus stops, I believe it is not the mainstream work of the Road Safety Council. Actually, this is a subject, as you have rightly pointed out, that the unions and the bus companies mention; this is a common problem.

For this, the Transport Department actually is taking active action, has been taking active action, to push -- not push -- to request the police to take enforcement action, and we do receive specific requests from bus companies and then we refer them to them, and also we follow up whether they have done it or not.

So it would be fair to say that operational problem like this will be sort of more or less undertaken by the Transport Department rather than by the Road Safety Council.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We've encountered your efforts in that respect. We've been provided with correspondence, and so on. We've heard from the police about it as well.

MR YK CHAN: We can find out some sample of it.

CHAIRMAN: All that I was trying to do was to find out what it is that the Road Safety Council does that is relevant to enhancing safety on franchised buses.

But we have reached the end of our day. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your assistance today. There are quite a number of documents that we will be asking you to provide before we sit on Saturday, but we are now going to adjourn until Saturday.

What time are we sitting on Saturday?

MR DEREK CHAN: I understand we are starting at 10 o'clock, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: So we will adjourn then until 10 o'clock on Saturday. Thank you very much.

(5.31 pm)

(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Saturday, 6 October 2018)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE 1
CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS AMY TSE, MR PATRICK WONG, MR YK CHAN, MR WILLIAM SHUM, MR TONY YAU

Opening statement by MS MABLE CHAN 6

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN 12

[Blank Page]

2018 年 10 月 4 日

上午 10 時 01 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

羅康錦教授，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

陳政龍大律師及黃佩琪大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

陳美寶女士，運輸署署長（運輸署代表）

陳英傑先生，副署長／公共運輸事務及管理（署理）（運輸署代表）

黃志光先生，助理署長／巴士及鐵路（運輸署代表）

謝善怡女士，首席運輸主任／巴士及鐵路 1（運輸署代表）

邱國鼎先生，總工程師／道路安全及標準研究（運輸署代表）

岑毅安先生，總機電工程師／車輛安全及標準（運輸署代表）

李美鳳女士，總運輸主任／特別職務（運輸署代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨，陳女士同埋你嘅同事，多謝你接受我哋邀請嚟進一步向委員會作供，協助我哋嘅調查工作，嘅研訊工作。或者一開始，我想先講幾點嘅觀察，就係琴日發生咩嘢事，琴日 5 點鐘--下晝 5 點鐘，我哋收到一沓文件，係運輸署畀我哋，其中一份似乎就係工作小組嘅最後嘅報告，呢個就係檢討巴士安全嘅工作小組嗰個工作報告嚟嘅，同埋亦都有幾份文件，一份係講嗰個時速限，就係一個關於道路安全嘅審核同埋低時速限制區嘅研究，另外就係關於巴士車長嘅輔助設施嘅，即係喺巴士總站嗰度。

咁晏 5 點鐘先畀到文件我哋，當然就好難協助到我哋嘅研訊，特別係講到話係低時速限制區，譬如話時速 20 公里等等，呢啲肯定係相關嘅材料，當然我哋係需要一陣你會提到嚟協助我哋嘅，但係嗰份文件係咁遲先至畀到我哋，因為我哋又要將佢掃瞄，加咗入我哋嗰個文件夾度等等，都係要好多工。

所以我就想問一個問題，點解要琴日下晝 5 點鐘先交呢啲文件畀我哋呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，容許我回答，代表運輸署，我哋首先向委員會致歉，因為我哋咁遲交呢啲文件。其實我哋一路自從 5 月我哋出席咗第一次嘅聽

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

證會之後，一路都有做跟進工作，我哋好小心咁跟進，我哋亦都察悉到委員會就住幾個重要方面都表達咗興趣，我哋其實都有考慮幾個重要嘅措施，但係我哋需要首先內部通過到，亦都要爭取到額外嘅資源去實施嗰啲額外嘅設施，所以我哋就希望可以交到呢啲資料畀委員會，係儘早畀到你哋，等你哋考慮。但好明顯，因為同時我哋亦都有好多其他緊急而重要嘅工作，所以冇辦法更早咁提交呢啲資料，我係誠心致歉。

但係我亦都希望呢啲嘅資料可以作為參考資料畀委員會嘅，我哋唔係話預期委員會要好仔細咁嚟考慮呢啲資料，即係喺我哋進一步作供嘅時候，只不過我哋係想向委員會報告政府內部同埋部門內部嘅一啲最新嘅發展，其實我哋正在爭取專項嘅資源，可以落實當中嘅幾項措施，我哋只不過係希望畀多啲資料委員會，等你知道我哋而家諗緊啲乜嘢同埋打算做啲乜嘢嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，多謝你，多謝你證實話你都係有跟進，亦都有一路係留意我哋所收到嘅證供，同時你亦都係去回應，好明顯從你睇到嗰啲嘅課題，我哋都好高興睇到你係咁做嘅，只不過係呢個過程我哋大家都係一齊行，所以都希望可以從中學習。

但係我可以畀一個例子你，譬如係今年8月，運輸署就用咗呢個叫VSSD，就係話有一個電子嘅數據記錄儀嚟嘅，呢份係8月嘅情況嚟嘅，點解要等到10月先話畀我哋聽呢？呢份文件，個日期就8月嘅，其實呢件事我哋一路都係有唔同證人都有提出，而有關嘅要求其實係2003年11月已經係定咗㗎喇，點解之後又係冇再用呢？點解唔早啲講畀我哋聽？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，8月嗰次嘅更新其實就係因為加強專營巴士安全工作小組嘅工作而做出嚟嘅，佢哋考慮到嘅，佢哋亦都係有好多輪嘅討論，亦有牽涉唔同嘅人士，之後就有呢個更新，睇番轉頭，我哋其實應該係喺更新咗文件之後，立即通知委員會，但係我哋其實係將呢部分納入咗工作小組嘅整體報告裏面嘅。

或者我都可以再補充一個個人意見，就係喺之前嘅作供同埋我哋都係知道，係要喺六個月內首先完成工作小組嘅第一期嘅工作，做咗份報告，但係同時亦都係出現咗一啲緊急嘅工作，特別係因為嗰個超強颱風，所以最後一次嘅工作小組嘅會議就要9月初先至可以同相關嘅巴士營運商開到會，但係因為9月初開唔到會，所以就要改期到9月中，然後之後我哋要再修訂一下嗰個報告，亦都要確保所有人都知道相關嘅建議，呢個工作小組報告就琴日5點鐘交畀委員會，其實係因為...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，容許我打斷一下，咁都係改善咗㗎喇，其實過去我哋都試過半夜收到文件，起碼今次係5點鐘，我哋都已經好多謝你喇。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋肯定係希望改善，我哋會盡力去做，我亦都係再誠心向主席同委員會致歉，為你哋造成不便。我哋亦都係會儘量適時咁樣向大家報告最新嘅發展。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係淨係我哋嘅委員會嘅，就算律師都係，因為佢要係事先睇到個資料，先至可以幫助到我哋去提問嘅，但係呢啲係相關嘅文件，雖然你冇之前畀到，但係其實係相關嘅，但係你就畀唔到足夠時間佢哋去睇。不過點都好，多謝你。或者喺我請律師開始提問之前，我想問下你想唔想一開始作一個評論？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我知道時間好寶貴，主席，如果你容許嘅話，我只係想好快咁講一講幾點，就係委員會顯示關注嘅範疇，係過去幾個月你哋提出嘅，我想好快咁講一講。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你開始。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。我同我嘅同事好高興今日可以再次出席委員會嘅聽證會係作進一步證供協助委員會工作。

喺我哋上一次 5 月出席聽證會之後，我哋知道委員會係邀請唔同人士提供口述證供，亦都係有唔同人士提供咗好多嘅文件嘅，我哋作為運輸署，我哋亦都係會盡力為香港提供最好嘅運輸系統，安全、可靠、有效率、環保，而且亦都係照顧到用家同埋營運商嘅；安全就係我哋嘅運輸系統最重要嘅一環，所以喺呢方面，我哋一路致力去監察巴士營運商嘅表現，係要確保佢哋符合法律，亦都遵守所有嘅安全要求。

喺 5 月之後，我哋都提交咗補充資料畀委員會參考，呢個係因應委員會要求嘅，今日係樂意回答任何委員會提出嘅問題，我只係想特別係提及幾點，就我哋相信係委員會過去表達關注嘅。

一直以嚟，我哋都係積極採取行動，加強道路安全同埋改善我哋嘅道路安全管理系統嘅，我哋為咗要確保系統不斷改善，運輸署係會參考外國嘅經驗同埋做法嘅，不時都會咁做。喺 2017 年底，我哋亦都係開展咗一個顧問研究，就睇下喺香港路邊嘅危險嘅因素，我哋係亦都有確認咗有好幾方面可以再加強嗰個改善嘅工作，係加強我哋嗰個表現評估，同埋有個制度係做道路安全審核嘅。

我哋亦都有建議係成立一個特別嘅隊伍係實施道路安全審核，即係所有新嘅道路都會咁做，同埋積極、全面同有系統咁樣加強道路安全，我哋已經係取得有關所需嘅人力資源。

我哋亦都想補充，喺上星期，財經事務局嗰度亦都通知我哋，話已經批准咗畀我哋有額外嘅人手，可以實施道路安全審核嘅工作嘅，所以我哋就會喺部門裏面喺未來嘅幾個月會開始實施呢個系統。

第二方面，講到話係專營巴士服務安全加強嗰方面，我哋就完成咗一個六個月嘅研究，即係呢個工作小組做嘅工作，就要提出一啲建議，可以加強巴士嘅安全，包括埋喺巴士裏面安裝一啲嘅安全設施同埋係有關於巴士車長嘅培訓

亦都會檢視。

主席，呢個唔係終結，而係開始，我哋會繼續做我哋嘅工作，工作小組會繼續做佢嘅工作，就會定期開會，就係去監察有關嘅跟進工作嘅進度，同埋會檢視業內嘅一啲嘅做法，希望可以提出最佳嘅業內嘅安全做法。

另外我亦都係想報告運輸署已經積極執行工作小組提出嘅建議，包括各項嘅發展、測試、試行同埋可行性嘅研究等等，都做咗，亦都係同巴士營運商同埋巴士製造商合作一齊去做嘅，其中一個就係要做一個原型，係巴士監察管理系統 BMCS，就係裏面會有黑盒，會有全球定位系統，有地標圍欄同埋兩階段嘅時速限制等等，等佢哋可以符合嗰個法定嘅時速嘅。

作為第一步，城巴同埋新巴就已經係開始咗試用嘅工作，喺全個車隊自從今年9月18號就開始試行，就會有實時嘅響號嘅警報，等巴士車長可以知道佢哋超速。

運輸署亦都覺得我哋需要去推動有關嘅工作，我哋就已經係聘用咗一個服務營辦商就係進行獨立嘅測試去睇下有啲咩嘢方法可以控制車速，呢個就係 BMCS 嘅一個重要部分嚟嘅。我哋就會係檢視嗰個測試嘅結果，然後亦都會同巴士營運商一齊確定一個更好嘅路線圖，更清楚，點樣去加強專營巴士嘅監測，就可以用呢個 BMCS 嚟做得到嘅。

另外，我哋亦都會睇外國嘅一啲嘅最新嘅科技，希望我哋有一個專責小組會做，就睇下點可以加快有關嘅測試。

第三，我哋亦都係非常關注巴士車長嘅福利，係希望係每一方面都能夠協助到佢哋係提供更多嘅輔助設施喺總站嗰度嘅，自從 2017 年 12 月中，運輸署就成立咗一個專責小組，係有各個相關政府部門同埋專營巴士營辦商嘅代表參與嘅，就去監察喺公共交通交匯處嗰度嘅設施點樣可以係加強。我哋會繼續密切同各方一齊合作，尤其是係一啲負責審批嘅部門，等我哋可以係儘快去處理相關嘅申請。

往前睇，我哋就會考慮同相關嘅政府部門同埋政策局，諮詢佢哋，睇下點樣可以用政府嘅資源去提供一啲輔助設施喺公共交通交匯處同埋巴士總站，等營辦商可以畀租金就可以用到呢啲嘅設施嘅，喺呢方面，我哋會同相關嘅政策局同埋部門就一齊工作，就會睇下點樣可以管理到相關嘅設施同埋處理有關嘅撥款問題。

有關於巴士車長嘅休息時間、用膳時間等等，我哋之前已經做過一次嘅檢討，而家已經係逐步咁樣去落實最新嘅指引嘅，即係由 2018 年初就開始咁做。而喺 2018 年第二季，最新嘅指引已經係逐階段落實，亦都因為要聘用足夠嘅巴士車長嗰度可能係出現短缺，所以又要睇下點樣，如果僱用到車長之後，就縮短佢哋嘅工作時間、駕駛時間等等嘅。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

而巴士營運商亦都努力去招聘新嘅巴士車長同埋可以係保留現有嘅巴士車長，佢哋已經係改善咗有關嘅服務條件等等嘅。所以喺呢方面有好幾樣事情都係做緊嘅，我就想報告政府啱啱收到所有嘅專營巴士承辦商提交嘅增加車資嘅申請，我哋就會適時咁樣去處理呢啲嘅申請，亦都會做番相關嘅工作，包括係諮詢各個有關政府嘅審批部門等等。

最後我一直都希望可以喺全部嘅聽證會裏面親自出席嘅，但係因為今日需要特別臨時係出席立法會今日下午嘅內務委員會嘅特別會議，係處理因為超颱風引出嘅一啲問題，所以我首先要道歉，我今日係冇辦法全日出席呢個聽證會，但係請你放心，我嘅同事，今日出席嘅同事會繼續盡力協助委員會嘅。如有需要，星期六再舉行聽證會嘅話，我同我嘅同事就可以出席協助各位嘅工作嘅，多謝。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你，陳女士，多謝你解釋。我哋係事前知道話你今日下晝係唔能夠出席聽證會，我哋當然明白嘅，希望今日可以一早就開始做呢個聽證會，令你今日都係一開始得唔好嘅，不過無論如何，而家我可以請律師向你提問。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，多謝你，陳女士，你頭先嘅開場發言，而今日就由我就住幾個方面提出問題，先開始，然後遲啲黃律師就會就住其他可能今日晏啲嘅時候或者禮拜六就會問其他嘅問題嘅，所以今日主要係由我提問先。

陳女士，一開始我係想講下就係競爭性投標呢一個嘅問題，投標即係包括就係專營巴士成個嘅服務或者係個別嘅巴士線嘅，委員會聽到嘅證供就係有兩個海外嘅專家，就係 Weston 教授同埋 Stanley 教授，就係講到倫敦同埋墨爾本佢哋嘅市區巴士嗰個營運，你有冇機會睇過嗰啲證供呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇過㗎喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，與其係要你詳細咁睇嗰啲嘅報告，不如我就撮要講一講，然後我就係會問相關嘅問題，首先倫敦嘅情況就係所有嘅市區巴士都係可以畀人競投嘅，嗰個合約期係五年，亦都可以係續期兩年嘅，之後嗰啲嘅路線又會再次攞出嚟係投標，呢個就係倫敦嘅情況。嗰個嘅市場就係由六大間嘅巴士公司嚟到係去佔咗最大嘅市場佔有率，大概百分之九十四嘅。主席，呢個就係喺 Weston 先生嗰個專家文件㗎第 126 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪即係你話專家定係嗰個嘅證物？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係專家嗰㗎嘅文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我知道。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係倫敦，至於墨爾本，因為你都睇過證供，我就會係撮要，就唔會逐頁去睇。

墨爾本嗰個嘅巴士嘅網絡有三分二就係大家去洽商出嚟嘅合約，而大概有十五份合約，十二個嘅營運商，呢個就係第16日嘅證供，第34頁第3行。另外有三分一嘅墨爾本嘅巴士網絡就係由一個單一嘅合約，就係一個特定嘅區域行走嘅，呢一度係要競投嘅，個合約期係七年。為咗紀錄，我就想講係我哋第16日作供嘅第22頁去到27頁。呢個就係倫敦同埋墨爾本嘅狀況。

香港，我未問香港嘅情況，就我想你睇一睇呢一個九巴嗰個母公司交通運輸國際集團佢嗰個嘅周年報告，我而家就想你睇2015年嘅年報，係KMB-5嗰一沓嘅文件，頁數就係...

主席：（經傳譯員）邊一年話？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）2015年嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）頁數就係1523頁，呢個就係呢個載通嘅年報，搵唔搵到呀，陳女士？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）搵到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）第32頁，年報2015年，就喺我哋文件第1523頁，我想你睇右手面嗰一欄，第一段，我讀出嚟，「喺2015年有兩次嘅投標嘅，一啲新嘅巴士線，就係特區政府就係落實咗，而九巴就係兩次都係中標嘅，第一次嘅投標就係關乎路線290、290A，就喺2015年3月開始咗係行走將軍澳同埋荃灣嘅，安達臣路發展區就喺2015年嘅年中就係招標，而九巴就係獲通知，喺2015年11月就係得到通知話『我哋中標嘅』。而呢一啲路線嘅服務係會分階段開始，喺2016年嘅第一季開始，就係同佢哋人口嘅遷入係配合嘅。」呢個就係關於香港某啲嘅路線嘅投標安排。

我哋睇番晒正話所講嘅，我有幾個問題，第一，香港嗰個嘅--而家嘅投標嗰個嘅規模有幾大呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我就冇一啲量化嘅數字係即刻講得到，但係正如正話九巴嘅年報都係指出係喺好多情況，如果係有咗新嘅發展區嘅話，如果有一個新嘅交通需求又，或者有任何嘅情況我哋需要有一組嘅路線，係包括埋有啲係可能有利可圖嘅，有啲就係未必能夠係有利潤嘅，運輸署就會係攞出嚟投標嘅。

舉個例，最近就係西九嗰個高鐵站，我哋就有三條新線，一個就係金鐘去到西九龍，第二個就係觀塘去到西九，第三，就係上水去西九。我哋討論過嗰個需求，跟住就設計咗一個路線，然後我哋喺呢一個投標係有一組嘅路線，一方面係可以有競爭性嘅投標，另外一樣就希望嗰個嘅運作係財政上係可以維持得到嘅。個結果就係有一條路線就係畀咗城巴。

主席：（經傳譯員）我琴日都去咗嗰個站。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）哦。有一條嘅路線就係批咗畀城巴，另外有兩條就係畀咗九巴，畀委員會嘅參考就係喺嗰兩條嘅路線係畀咗九巴，我哋內部估計其中有一條係唔能夠有利潤嘅，就係我哋就係呢個投標嘅策略就係我哋想引入競爭，而有一啲嘅新嘅路線可能佢嘅服務範圍就可能已經覺得係已經係有九巴係服務緊嘅，但係我哋都仍然係繼續係攞出嚟投標，去鼓勵競爭，亦都係希望呢啲路線嘅營運係喺財政上係可持續嘅。

我亦都係想舉另外一個嘅例子，就係港珠澳大橋嘅新路線，我哋做咗一個投標，我哋起碼有一條路線就係畀咗新大嶼山巴士公司嘅，而其實呢條路線其實亦都可能同一啲九巴嘅主要路線係有重疊嘅地方，我想指出就係我哋而家嗰個嘅專營嘅模式，我哋係會有鼓勵競爭，同埋逐條路線嘅一個投標嘅工作。唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家或者係今日之後，可唔可以畀我哋有一啲實際嘅數目，有幾大部分嘅路線而家係用競投嘅方式，同埋嗰啲嘅合約嘅詳情呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）未繼續之前，我就想問，呢啲所謂有競爭性嘅投標係一啲係公開嘅投標抑或係有限制性嘅投標呢，即係只係某啲嘅人可以參與嘅--某啲嘅公司可以參與？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我請我嘅同事係補充。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係 Amy Tse。

主席：（經傳譯員）謝善怡女士。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）好喇，而家嗰啲嘅篩選營運商嗰個工作，我哋係限制喺本地市場嘅，即係話城巴、新一巴、龍運、九巴同埋新大嶼山巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係畀只係限於而家有一或者兩個嘅專營權嗰啲巴士，係咪呀？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係，即係本地嘅市場。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係本地嘅專營巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）五間公司？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅喺一個有限制嘅投標係咪都係向公眾嚟到係公開嘅呢？因為我想知道公眾知唔知道而家係就某啲嘅路線有投標嘅呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋未開始去篩選或者選擇營辦商之前，我哋首先就係規劃咗條路線，我哋會諮詢區議會，話畀佢聽嗰個定線同埋呢啲嘅細節。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇話畀區議會聽話你打算淨係限制畀呢五間嘅巴士公司去競投嘅呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會話畀區議會聽我哋定線嗰個嘅細節同埋佢哋提供嘅一啲嘅評語或者意見嚟到去揀選營辦商。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你會關於路線就係諮詢佢哋，但係點樣投標，你哋就唔會問佢，係咪呀？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果有公眾有一個新嘅公司，就係想--或者公眾有一個相關嘅人士，佢哋想知道譬如話西九，關於呢個新嘅巴士站點樣起同埋喺嗰個嘅高鐵站隔籬、邊個會係營運呢啲巴士，佢哋點樣去查到呢啲嘅資料呢？預先點樣呢？如果佢琴日嚟到，佢就見到一架城巴去金鐘，又見到九巴，周圍都係有，佢會唔會事先可以知道嘅呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會話畀區議會聽，然後就諮詢區議會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪喺一啲信件裏面書信往來係反映得到？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喺區議會嗰個嘅會議紀錄度係睇到嘅？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀我哋睇下你哋嘅書信往來同埋有關嘅會議紀錄？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）呢個考慮呢啲嘅路線或者係批出呢啲路線嘅時候，你會唔會考慮嗰啲嘅安全嘅表現呢，嗰個嘅往績呢？即係你哋去批出呢條路線畀呢間公司嘅時候係有咩嘢嘅考慮因素呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）車資係一個嘅準則，另外，嗰個意外率亦都係我哋比較嘅一個準則。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）你點樣去比較兩間公司嘅意外率呢？係咪有一啲嘅參數抑或你有一啲嘅因素去可以睇下兩間公司，咁可以係好透明咁樣係睇得到嘅呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係會基於現有嘅參數，譬如話涉及意外嘅數字，佢嗰個嘅比率，我哋係用緊係每車行車公里嘅，呢個係一個參數。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅統計數字係咪嗰間公司嘅關於呢一個安全方面嘅規劃嗰部分係咪睇得到㗎？遠期嘅計劃係咪睇到㗎？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係，同埋喺過去三年每一年嗰個嘅意外率。

主席：（經傳譯員）不同類型嘅意外會唔會有不同嘅比重㗎？譬如話有一個意外就係令有十個人死亡，話有另外一個意外，就係有個老太太喺巴士度跌嘅，你會唔會有不同嘅加權㗎？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋會數晒所有類型嘅意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係會唔會有不同嘅加權㗎？你明唔明我嘅意思呀？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，不同類型嘅意外，我哋唔會將佢加權嘅，就係攞晒總數。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話係一個嘅原始嘅數據，係咪？

謝善怡女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話每一百萬行車公里嗰個嘅意外數字，或者你其他所有嘅數字，係咪咁呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，...

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）...我會叫謝女士或者係黃生幫我補充嘅，佢哋會解釋一下我哋嘅一啲限制性嘅投標點樣做嘅，關於講到安全嘅問題，謝女士亦都係有一啲嘅指標話我哋用過嘅，喺遠期規劃嗰度係作為參考。除咗呢一個安全嘅因素，仲有其他嘅因素，關於就係佢哋嘅表現、服務水準，佢哋都會考慮嘅，呢個嘅研訊之後，我哋可以畀嗰個評分表大家睇，...

主席：（經傳譯員）好吖。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）...就係畀委員會嚟到參考。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，唔該。我希望我哋喺星期六嘅研訊之前係得得到，我哋就可以問問題，可唔可以呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。陳生。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。講到呢啲嘅安全表現嘅指標，我哋一陣間都會講嘅，但係未講嗰樣嘢之前，我可唔可以係去番正話羅教授問嘅，到底車資就係一個考慮嘅因素，喺呢啲投標裏面，係咪由嗰個嘅競投人自己提議一個嘅--某條路線嘅車資嘅，抑或唔係由政府去定㗎？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢？個答案係咩嘢話？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）係其實呢個係一個競爭性嘅投標，所以巴士公司就會建議佢哋嘅車資，就我哋亦都會有一個車資嘅級表，就係話每一個嘅路程最高可以收到幾多車資，每間公司都可以定佢哋嘅車資嘅，佢哋喺提交標書嘅時候，佢哋亦都要提出--係根據我哋呢一個嘅車資水平嗰個嘅表就係上限提出一啲嘅建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）最高係幾多呢？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）係已經係賣咗憲報，大家都知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪每公里幾多錢，係點樣計㗎？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）其實係不同嘅公里亦都有不同嘅車資嘅，譬如話車程越長，佢哋可以係收貴啲，亦都視乎不同類型嘅服務嘅，如果係一啲康樂性嘅路線，佢係星期日或者係公眾假期先行走，佢哋亦都可以係貴啲，又或者係一啲嘅晚間服務、通宵服務，佢哋都可以嘅貴啲嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪已經係賣咗憲報㗎？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以畀我哋一份而家嗰個版本？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果呢啲嘅車資係可唔可以用而家嗰個嘅車資調整機制嚟到係去調整㗎？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋接受咗嗰一個--如果我哋批出咗嘅話，佢哋就要根據呢一個車資嚟到去收費，如果佢哋想加價，佢哋就要根據車資調整機制嚟到係去調整嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）從一個政策嘅角度嚟睇，呢一個嘅競投或者係投標嘅工作會唔會只係限於一啲新市鎮或者係一啲新嘅發展或者有一啲新嘅路線組合先至會做嘅呢？政府有冇咩嘢計劃去擴闊呢一個投標嘅範圍？如果係嘅話，諗住去到咩嘢程度呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者等我答，政府嗰個目標一向都係想係促進呢個競爭嚟到去改善服務水平嘅。如果向前看嚟睇，其實有一啲新嘅發展區，譬如喺新界或者喺九龍嘅市區，譬如係啟德嘅發展區都會有一啲新嘅需求嘅。當我哋喺呢啲新嘅市鎮或者新嘅發展係想有一啲具競爭性嘅路線嘅，我哋就會諗下應唔應該係重疊一啲而家係舊嘅區，譬如觀塘或者啟德東嘅呢啲已發展區嘅一啲路

線，要唔要嗰度有重疊嘅。

我哋都會試下逐條線、逐條線咁樣嚟睇--嚟到去投標嘅，向前睇，我哋喺呢一個現有嘅專營模式，我哋亦都覺得冇乜嘢係令我哋--冇嘢--我哋係可以喺呢一方面做多啲嘅。我亦都可以話根據經驗，如果有一間嘅專營巴士營運商喺佢哋服務水平方面係唔符呢一個專營權嘅要求，好似喺1990年代，我哋係試過係某啲嘅路線係唔畀佢再營運嘅，或者係某啲嘅路線組合，就好似中巴咁，我哋就攞走咗嗰啲嘅路線或者係一啲路線嘅組合嚟到出嚟投標，畀一啲新嘅營辦商嚟到去運作嘅，所以其實我哋成日有機會都係會係再進一步係用呢個作為一個工具嚟到去改善嗰個服務水平嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）上一次喺香港嘅巴士路線公開嘅競爭性招標係幾時呢？即係對上一次嘅公開招標。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係1998年嘅，當時我哋就第一次就就住呢啲機場嘅巴士路線進行招標，就係中巴公司，就係1998年嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）當時嘅競爭性招標係咪有限度咁進行嘅呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇計劃係就住現有嘅專營協議嘅現有路線係會唔會進行競爭性招標呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）暫時我哋係冇計劃咁做嘅，但係我哋唔會排除咁樣做，因為我哋一直都係有監察唔同專營巴士公司唔同路線嘅表現嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我就想講另一個議題，就係首先用一啲安全或者安全表現指標，我就會問一啲問題，就係會講下使用一啲獎勵--即係喺合約入面使用獎勵或者懲罰嘅好處同埋壞處嘅，即係就住呢啲安全表現指標。

首先，我就想去睇下安全表現指標呢一個概念，首先，我就想問一下運輸署現行嘅做法，同埋跟住我就會問你嘅意見嘅，就係點樣可以改善呢一個方面，喺我講啲細節之前，我就想請你澄清呢一個加強專營巴士安全工作小組報告上面有一點我就想你澄清嘅。

呢個就係TD-5文件冊，我就冇嗰個頁數，我就可能會講嗰個報告嘅頁數或者嗰個段數嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。陳女士，你有冇呢份報告响手呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）請等等。係，我睇到喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）報告嘅第一頁就係1757頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢份文件係啱啱先至有啫，所以我就冇嗰個頁數嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我可以加番呢個頁數，令到我哋嘅謄本度都可以記錄到。

第一，我想先睇TD-5文件冊嘅1757頁，我想你睇下4.26段嘅，呢個係1798頁，首先，我想講下呢一段嘅背景嘅，呢一段就係講培訓，即係喺培訓底下嘅，驟眼睇，可能同安全表現指標呢一個議題冇直接嘅關係，我有一點想你澄清嘅，我就想先讀出4.26段。

「工作小組認為如果係要向車長提供足夠同埋相關嘅培訓，所有嘅專營巴士公司係應該改善佢哋培訓巴士車長嘅內部監管同埋核證機制，包括係開發一啲主要嘅服務指標，監察佢哋嘅實行同埋有效性同埋係制定一啲合適同埋有效嘅跟進行動，並且向管理層匯報。」

我想你解釋一下發展一啲主要嘅表現指標係咩嘢意思呢？同埋係有咩嘢關係呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲嘅主要表現指標就係同車長嘅培訓有關，而且同你所講嘅安全表現指標係冇直接關係嘅。以往專營巴士公司係主動制定咗一啲培訓嘅指標，例如係過去三年培訓車長嘅數目，呢個只係起點嚟嘅啫，我哋係有提倡呢一個專營巴士車長訓練綱領嘅實務守則，我哋發現如果我哋只係依賴一個單一嘅表現指標，例如係過去三年訓練嘅車長數目，係不足夠嘅。

就發展一啲主要嘅表現指標係可以監察到巴士公司嘅表現，即係就住現有車長嘅培訓同埋一啲嘅溫習課程、一啲跟進課程，呢啲就可以有效係矯正一啲犯下駕駛錯誤車長嘅表現或者係行為嘅。而巴士公司表示佢就會係為現有嘅車長提供實地嘅駕駛訓練，但係呢一類嘅培訓就並唔能夠滿足我哋嘅需要嘅，例如有啲呢啲嘅駕駛訓練--即係有陣時呢啲訓練只係由一個車長去喺監察或者睇住另一個車長去駕駛，呢一個就同我哋預期嘅要求係唔同嘅。

而我哋係希望專營巴士公司係可以做多一啲，佢哋就可以更加有效地進行內部嘅監核，我哋亦都期望巴士公司係定期提供報告，應該係起碼每半年係向佢哋嘅管理層或者董事局係提供報告嘅，佢哋亦都要提供一啲特別事故嘅報告，向佢哋嘅管理層，就住佢哋嘅培訓、培訓嘅有效性，亦都係要提供嘅。而呢啲報告亦都係要提供畀運輸署，令到我哋可以定期去監察，同埋喺我哋同佢哋嘅管理層會面嘅時候，亦都可以定期檢討嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）有一點想澄清嘅，呢一啲嘅表現指標同駕駛行為，即係因為培訓所引起嘅駕駛行為係冇關？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個係一個培訓嘅項目之一。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你澄清。而家我就想睇睇現時運輸署點樣用呢啲安全表現指標嘅，首先，我想你睇睇九巴嘅遠期計劃，就係2018至22年，頁數就

係 TD-1 文件冊嘅第 180 頁，我想提一提呢個背景，呢份文件就係由九巴準備，就係呈交咗畀運輸署，就係喺 2017 年中嘅，呢個就係關於未來嗰五年嘅計劃，即係 18 至 22 年嘅。

我想你睇睇第 192 頁，喺 8.8.1 段，呢個標題就係建議嘅目標同埋其他嘅措施，呢一段就係咁講嘅，「九巴係建議係用 2014 至 16 年嘅三年平均實際意外率，就係 2.71，（呢個定義就係每 100 萬行車公里涉及意外巴士嘅數目），呢個就作為五年遠期計劃嘅目標，呢個就亦都係等同係即係比起 2014 年嘅意外率係減低咗百分之六，呢個亦都係 14 至 16 年嘅最高紀錄。」

我就想向你指出，九巴自行制定嘅目標就係 2.71，然後我哋就睇一睇下一年，即係 2017 年係發生咗咩嘢事，下一份我想你睇嘅文件，就係下一份嘅五年遠期計劃，就係 2019 至 23 年，頁數就係 TD-5 文件冊嘅 1728 頁。你睇唔睇到呢份文件，陳女士？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）第 1728 頁，呢封係運輸署向九巴發出嘅信件，就係 18 年嘅 5 月 21 號，就向九巴提供咗一個清單，就係講咗下一份遠期計劃需要包括嘅項目，背景就係咁樣。

至於喺 1729 至 1731 頁就係你向九巴發出嘅信件，就係提出喺下一份嘅遠期計劃要包括嘅項目，我就想讀出頭嗰兩段，呢個標題就係「巴士安全」嘅。

就話「我哋發現喺涉及意外嘅九巴巴士數目，即係喺每百萬行車公里計，就由 2016 年嘅 2.73 上升到 2017 年嘅 3.04，呢一個係一個高嘅數字嚟嘅。

以下呢一個表就總結咗 2015 至 17 年涉及交通意外嘅九巴巴士數目，就係以意外嘅嚴重程度去分類。就結果顯示致命意外嘅數目就由 15 年嘅 11 宗下降到 17 年嘅 3 宗，而輕微交通意外嘅就有輕微上升嘅趨勢，就係由 15 年嘅 737 宗上升到 17 年嘅 866 宗，而實際嘅意外率就係喺 2017 年係 3.04 嘅，呢個就係比喺 2018 年至 22 年遠期計劃嘅目標意外率為高嘅，而呢個當時預期嘅意外率係 2.71。」

換句話講，九巴就達成唔到佢自己定下嘅目標，而下面呢個表，你就會見到呢個就係涉及交通意外嘅九巴巴士數目，就係以每百萬公里計嘅，呢個趨勢係上升緊嘅，由 15 去到 16 至 17 年，呢個意外率分別係 2.62、2.74 同埋 3.04。

下面第二個表亦都係顯示咗涉及九巴巴士交通意外數目，呢三年內亦都係有上升嘅趨勢嘅。

根據呢度嘅分析，似乎運輸署所著重嘅兩項安全指標，第一，就係每百萬行車公里嘅意外率；第二，就係交通意外嘅數目，就係涉及九巴巴士嘅意外數目嘅。我咁講，啱唔啱呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，啱嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以跳去1731頁，就係呢封信嘅最屘嘅部分，喺第(4)分段，個標題就係「目標意外率」呢一個目標，運輸署就話「你哋公司係必須要喺嚟緊嘅遠期計劃係指出一個目標嘅意外率，同埋係包括一個改善安全嘅建議」，第二項，就係「喺嚟緊嘅五年就係提出一個每百萬行車公里減低意外率下降嘅目標。」

我就想同你探討一下點解使用呢一個每百萬行車公里嘅意外率作為一個安全嘅指標，首先，呢一個意外率係包括咗因為巴士車長犯錯引起嘅意外同埋不涉及巴士車長嘅意外，啱唔啱呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個一般性嘅指標，係去統計意外嘅數目嘅，呢啲意外可能係包括一啲涉及巴士車長犯錯嘅意外，但係有時就同車長無關嘅。呢個就視乎意外嘅調查同埋意外嘅成因，睇下車長係咪其中一個成因。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以簡單嚟講，個答案就「係」嘅，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）換句話講，呢個意外率係包括咗一啲巴士公司或者車長都控制唔到嘅元素，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想你睇下Stanley教授嘅證供嘅，我就想你評論一下，首先，我就想你睇睇第16日嘅謄本，就係9月15號，就係喺第7號文件夾第67頁，我就想講67頁嘅第16行，我就想講番一啲背景畀你聽，當時我就問Stanley教授一啲問題，我就問緊一啲--用一啲標準嘅安全表現指標就作為制定一個獎賞或者懲罰嘅方法，我想講番第16行，Stanley教授就講佢認為安全表現指標應該包括啲咩嘢，我就想讀出嚟，第16行。

「我就有一啲意見嘅，喺休息之前，我講到一啲意外，譬如話一啲致命嘅意外，嘰倒、跌嚫等等，呢啲係你可以考慮嘅元素嘅，至於制定一啲主要嘅服務或者主要嘅表現指標，你係應該符合一啲嘅元素，佢哋一定係要有針對性，你係可以量度得到，亦都係可以實行得到，亦都係要相關嘅，而相關嘅數據應該係要定期或者及時去提供，而呢一啲嘅指標就係要係呢啲巴士公司係影響得到嘅，如果巴士公司係唔能夠係影響呢啲指標嘅話，就係冇意思嘅。」

我亦都想你睇下第93頁，就係同一日嘅謄本嚟嘅，第22行，第93頁嘅，我亦都想講番一啲背景畀你聽，當時就係講緊呢啲指標究竟巴士公司係控唔控制得到嘅，喺第22行，Stanley教授就話「我認為如果我哋講呢個指標嘅範圍，咁必須係一啲你控制得到嘅事項。」

我哋就啱啱講緊每百萬行車公里嘅意外率，好大部分嘅意外都係巴士車長

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

控制唔到，即係話啲車長係冇犯錯嘅。你就住 Stanley 教授嘅意見，你認為呢啲指標係應該包括啲咩嘢呢？即係巴士公司係能夠控制到，你有咩嘢意見呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）首先，講到話主要表現指標，目的就係作為一個管理工具或者係一個指標，就係畀規管當局，即係運輸署同埋專營巴士營運商，都可以檢視佢哋就住安全嗰方面嘅表現嘅，喺我頭先啱啱答你之前一個問題嘅時候，講到道路安全或者係陸路交通安全都係有好多因素導致意外發生嘅，我哋睇呢個主要表現指標，即係話係實際交通意外嘅數字同埋每 100 萬公里嘅涉及交通意外率，其實都係喺呢方面，我哋都做緊--就係講係一個遠期計劃嘅工作，就係去嘗試去探討分析意外嘅性質，牽涉一啲巴士嘅種類、巴士嘅型號、意外嘅種類、到底係碰撞抑或係冇碰撞，同埋所牽涉巴士司機嗰個年紀同埋嗰啲巴士路線等等。

純粹如果只係--我哋係純粹係倚賴呢啲嘅主要表現指標幫我哋去定一啲高層次嘅工具去評估整體安全表現，即係指專營巴士營運商，但係唔係足夠嘅，我哋都實際有要求話專營巴士營運商喺佢哋有關於安全嗰個章節裏面，即係今年 8 月畀委員會嘅時候，都有提到佢哋要將呢啲意外將佢細分做唔同嘅種類，之前我有提及。

而事實上，我哋部門嘅巴士及鐵路部都同埋道路安全及標準處都有聯手去分析巴士意外嘅趨勢，即係各種嘅分類，同埋係更加仔細咁去評估專營巴士營運商嘅安全表現。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，如果你想再擴大啲講，請你話畀我聽，但係我個問題就係話就係呢個評估嘅指標...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者畀我打斷一下，陳律師。其實可以好簡單咁問呢個問題，你就唔同意 Stanley 教授所講，就話主要表現指標必須係巴士營運商可以影響嘅結果嘅一個指標，係咪？你唔同意，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我唔同意，因為作為主要表現指標，就係一個管理工具，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你已經係答咗個問題，已經係答咗個問題。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席。你提到話係要分析唔同嘅意外成因，但係其實喺有關文件裏面冇定一啲指標畀巴士公司就話按唔同分類嗰個分析嚟去睇嘅，唯一一個指標就係呢個每百萬公里意外涉及率，如果你話用某一啲嘢嚟做一個指標，你同唔同意就係應該用一啲巴士公司可以控制到嘅因素嚟做指標？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）如果我哋純粹喺理論層面咁講，當然可以有啲主要表現指標係巴士公司完全控制到就最好，但係喺我頭先答主席問題嘅時候，我唔係完全同意話主要表現指標係應該要由公司全面可以控制到嘅，因為呢個一開始只

不過係一個指標，就作為一個基礎，等我哋去評估佢哋嘅表現，因為意外嘅成因係好複雜嘅，可以係有好多唔同嘅因素導致，所以我哋係要詳細分析各類嘅意外、佢嘅性質同埋種類，然後等我哋可以作好深層次咁去分析一下相關嘅表現指標。

你頭先提及話培訓嘅指標，喺工作小組嘅討論裏面，安全係我哋最關心嘅問題，巴士公司未必能夠全面控制到牽涉到佢哋巴士嘅意外宗數，即係每一年，但係講到話巴士安全同埋巴士車長嗰方面，其實係有唔同嘅方法佢哋可以做到係將意外嘅整體數字係減低嘅，或者以百萬公里計嘅意外率都可以減低，所以喺呢一方面，我哋就制定咗實務守則，就預期巴士公司能夠制定一啲嘅就住培訓嘅主要表現指標。

至於話黑盒嗰個規格同埋加裝閉路電視呢啲嘅做法，所有呢啲儀器都可以幫到巴士公司去調查到底有關嘅巴士車長係咪牽涉到造成嗰宗嘅交通意外嘅。

所以我哋會考慮晒所有嘅因素去評估到底巴士公司係咪已經盡咗力去提供安全嘅巴士服務，同埋亦都可以令到佢哋嘅巴士車長有安全嘅駕駛行為同埋態度。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你喺計算唔同嘅事故、分析嗰個比重嘅時候，你頭先提及係喺你個腦裏面做呢啲比重？譬如裝閉路電視等等。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者可唔可以一個具體例子我哋點樣做，譬如話九巴，佢嘅意外率其實係超出咗佢哋自己提出嘅目標，我就要求佢哋進一步分析有關意外嘅性質同埋種類，我哋嘅觀察發現冇涉及碰撞嘅意外個數字係增加咗嘅，即係相對於前一年，而裝設黑盒同埋閉路電視其實可以幫到公司話到畀我哋聽到底係咪有一種嘅巴士型號有啲咩嘢問題又或者係有一個巴士車長嗰個駕駛行為係有問題，因此導致係冇涉及碰撞嘅意外宗數增加，即係話包括係乘客跌倒或者乘客喺車上面企唔穩。亦都有一啲嘅路線，譬如我哋發現係呢類咁嘅意外係會多啲嘅，所以我哋就係會仔細咁去調查，就要求公司提出一啲特定嘅措施去處理。

或者上一次我哋提交有關安全章節嘅時候，你都會睇到各間公司都係提交咗一啲牽涉到標準嘅段落，係話佢哋落實咗啲乜嘢加強安全嘅措施，但係自從上一次提交遠期計劃之後，我哋都係實際會去分析意外嘅趨勢同埋係深入咁分析相關嘅意外，要求佢哋提供一啲特定嘅措施去處理唔同類型，就住按巴士路線嗰啲嘅意外率、巴士嘅型號等等咁樣，等我哋可以更加全面、整體咁樣去評估專營巴士營運商嘅安全表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）你話要求呢啲公司做更詳細嘅分析，喺邊度有寫？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋係寫咗畀唔同嘅巴士營運商就係提出呢啲要求，其中一個例子就係喺畀九巴嘅信件嘅，喺一份文件夾裏面有㗎喇，我哋當然可以提交有關嘅信件嘅範本畀你哋參考嘅。而喺發出呢啲信件之後，有各個專營巴士

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

營運商都已經喺度制定下一個嘅遠期計劃，就會特別係處理呢個安全嘅章節嘅，呢個過程係不斷會係演變嘅。整個遠期計劃就今年年尾會完成，我哋就會提交嗰啲計劃畀政策局，就會根據法例去做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪比起之前係遲咗呀？即係比起一般嗰個時間表，即係提交呢個遠期計劃，今年係咪遲咗？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我覺得係差唔多係跟番過往嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）即係喺年尾之前，巴士公司就會係提交佢哋遠期計劃裏面嗰個安全章節？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）專營巴士營運商其實已經提交咗遠期計劃嘅草擬本，包括埋安全章節，係按嗰個--喺個限期之前交咗㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）限期係幾時呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）6月中--6月尾，6月尾。應該係9月尾或者10月初，我哋要畀番我哋嘅意見佢哋，然後希望之後我哋可以就住有關章節嘅內容達成協議，就可能會係年底或者明年初就交畀運房局係批准嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個時間表係咪有一個法定規定㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係有法定規定嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提一提我喺邊度可以搵到個法定要求呀？即係你提嗰啲日期，因為如果我冇記錯，應該係6月中同埋係9月嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）9月尾。我同事搵緊嗰沓文件夾，但係你講得啱嘅，係有兩個日期喺條例有提及嘅，佢哋係要喺6月尾提交，然後我哋就應該係要9月尾同佢達成協議...

主席：（經傳譯員）否則嘅話，可能--可以就去到運房局局長嗰度做審裁，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，係一路去到9月嗰度嗰個過程就係內部過程嚟嘅，就係要取得運房局局長嘅同意，我哋會提交所有路線嘅詳細計劃等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以我就個問題就係問你係咪已經過咗9月尾，你係咪已經同巴士公司達成協議呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）9月尾個日期已經過咗，喺今年，特別呢一年係因為有一系列嘅問題我哋向營辦商提出咗，所以我哋就預期佢哋就住嗰個安全章節就要提供一啲補充--即係要再補充一啲資料，再加強，所以而家佢哋係就住呢一個章節係制定最後嘅內容。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係今年你哋仲未達成協議，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，未達成嘅。主席，有關嗰個法定條文，就係第12A條，《公共巴士服務條例》第12A條。

主席：（經傳譯員）今年你哋預計幾時可以達成協議？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋希望儘早同佢哋達成協議。

主席：（經傳譯員）好明顯喇，但係有冇話一個大概幾時做得到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者可以提供個資料畀你哋，我哋最近同城巴同埋新巴都係就住佢哋遠期計劃開過會，我哋亦都係同九巴安排緊，同埋龍運安排緊會議係處理佢哋嘅遠期計劃，所以我哋係做緊各項工作，係儘可能儘早同佢哋達成協議。

主席：（經傳譯員）你講咗兩次喇，你係冇辦法畀到個日期，係咪？如果係真係咁，你就講，照講。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺現階段，我唔可以提一個日期，但係我嘅目標就係希望儘早去達成協議，因為我哋亦都需要定到明年嗰個最後嗰啲巴士路線，亦都係而且要將有關資料發放畀公眾嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，為咗做紀錄，就係12A條，即係頭先陳女士所提嗰點就係喺THB-2文件夾109頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，講番較早之前主席嘅問題，你就係話你要求巴士營運商進一步提供細分資料關於嗰啲嘅意外成因嘅，喺TD-5文件夾1729至1730頁其實就係頭先我哋啱啱睇嗰份文件，係TD-5文件夾1729頁。

1728頁嗰封信件就係2018年5月嘅日期，然後嗰度底部，即係1729頁底部，你就要求九巴就住巴士意外就係做分析，然後下一頁，一個佢哋分析同非巴士司機相關因素嘅交通意外做分析，呢個係咪你嘅頭先提及嘅，頭先？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，而喺1730頁其實都係有一個好長嘅清單，就話我哋要求公司去做嘅分析嘅，要佢哋提供呢啲資料嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺1729頁底部，「要求你哋公司(a)」，然後第二，就係「分析有關意外嘅性質同埋成因，同埋解釋點解意外宗數增加嘅理由。」呢個係你要求佢哋做嘅，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）然後下一頁1730又進一步再要求，你可唔可以指出喺邊度就話繼續係有呢啲要求呢？如果搵到嘅，讀出嚟，唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋就係希望公司提出進一步嘅分析，就係呢一個意外嘅成因，同埋佢哋有冇一啲相同嘅因素，想佢哋話畀我哋聽佢哋有啲咩嘢具有嘅建議嚟到去改善嘅，譬如話非碰撞式嘅意外，就係啲乘客跌嘅，到底佢哋喺邊度跌倒嘅呢？喺上層定係下層吖，定係喺樓梯呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊度寫出嚟呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我而家係舉個例...

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你未舉例之前，可唔可以讀出嗰個文本係支持你而家講嘅嘢呢？我哋有呢一句「你係要畀我哋一個分析係關乎意外嘅趨勢、成因同埋類型」，呢個就係喺 1729，下一頁嗰度係...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺下一頁就係我哋繼續講落去，1730，我哋提到同安全相關嘅計劃，主席。我哋就話目標要去減低涉及巴士嘅意外，同埋係加強向乘客提供巴士服務個安全，你哋公司係要畀我哋有關嘅計劃或者建議去改善現時嘅監察制度或者係要新嘅監察制度係關乎巴士嘅安全同埋增加你哋公司員工嗰個意識，就係呢啲監察制度嗰個結果同埋會有啲乜嘢嘅紀律行動或者係懲罰嘅，亦都要發展一個嘅計劃書，就係自動咁樣嚟到去監察到車長嘅駕駛行為，就係透過喺黑盒裏面或者類似嘅儀器裏面嘅一啲嘅資料，另外就係要有一啲嘅宣傳計劃嚟到係去喺嚟緊兩年加強乘客嘅安全。

下一頁，1731 頁，我哋亦都希望佢哋喺嚟緊嘅兩年提供一啲嘅計劃去加強車長嘅訓練，無論係兼職或者係全職嘅，亦都係希望佢哋--個工作小組嘅建議就係關於訓練嗰個嘅框架，另外就係畀我哋一啲嘅計劃，嚟到去調查嗰個用三點安全帶呢一個嘅有幾頻密嘅。我哋亦都要求佢哋係做一啲嘅調查或者係評估，去評估呢啲嘅安全帶嗰個嘅使用狀況、有效程度等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，去番 1730 頁，喺頭嗰四行，就係要去分析一啲唔關乎嗰個車長嘅造成意外嗰個嘅因素，喺過去嗰五年，呢度有冇做過分析？有冇一啲係同車長相關嘅分析呢？譬如話佢哋車速太快，就嚟要去入站嘅時候，就係突然嚟到去剎掣，有冇呢一類型咁樣嘅分析？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，喺九巴方面，呢一度我哋冇講到呢個程度話要佢詳細咁樣去分析車長嘅乜嘢駕駛行為係引致交通意外。但係我可唔可以舉個例呢？喺城巴方面，佢哋係更新緊黑盒嗰個嘅規格嘅，佢哋將司機嘅一啲事件記錄低，即係譬如係有冇太過快嘅快速或者係減速。

主席：（經傳譯員）有一半嘅意外都係非碰撞式嘅，都係因為乘客失咗平衡，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我覺得毫無疑問，呢一個一定係佢哋係太快嘅突然間剎掣或者係加速或者係搖擺嘅或者係扭軚嘅，呢一方面，我就係想問你呢啲都係同意外嘅

成因有關，我就問你點解係冇問到一啲關於呢啲意外嘅問題？有時就係啲司機揸車嘅時候就唔留心，有時佢就係剎掣剎得太急。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢一封信，我哋畀九巴嘅時候，我哋冇去到咁細緻嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你城巴有冇呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我查一查喇。不過喺我哋最新嘅、起碼嘅，關於黑盒規格嘅要求，我哋就係規定佢要--如果係有一啲係過急嘅剎掣或者係踩油嘅時候，係要喺黑盒裏面係記錄到呢啲嘅事件嘅。或者我請我嘅助理署長話畀委員會聽喺呢一個嘅踩油嘅時候，佢哋公司係咪能夠搵得到係有突然剎掣或者係剎得太急或者係剎得太多嘅、太過份。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。你就喺 2018 年 8 月嘅時候關於係最基本嘅要求，話嗰個電子數據紀錄儀，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪講緊最起碼嘅要求？

主席：（經傳譯員）講緊最起碼嘅要求先，然後再講到你期望達到最高嘅水準--水平，可以做到乜嘢呢？關於踩油同埋係剎掣嘅嗰啲數據。係咪喺附件 2 呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）為紀錄嘅原因，應該係工作小組嗰個嘅報告，係附件 2 嗰個嘅編碼係 1807，係 TD-5。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係唔喺我呢一沓文件度喎，冇編碼嘅--冇頁碼嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個電子數據紀錄儀嘅最起碼要求，我哋就平時叫佢做黑盒，呢個更新，我哋係對於嗰個嘅新嘅版本或者新嘅要求係有一啲更新嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我知道，到底如果我哋係關於係加速或者係剎掣方面喺邊度呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）其實係 4(a)，「意外報告，就係當時嘅車速，係要去記錄到每秒鐘嘅時段，係要持續三分鐘，就喺呢個 0.4G 減速嘅呢啲嘅事件之前。」呢個就係話呢一個嘅儀器要起碼記錄到呢一類型嘅加速或者減速...

主席：（經傳譯員）但係呢個係減速，應該以前係 0.2 嘅，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，係 0.4，自從一開始用，就已經係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解係 0.4，減速 0.4 呢？係咪咁樣就係--咩嘢叫 0.4 呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）0.4 係一個數字係我哋以前喺一個研究之後採納嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢意思呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）就係話嗰個嘅力度，當你一踩落去嗰個剎車掣嘅時候，嗰個嘅地心吸力嘅，你會一個正常人所感受到嘅力。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明，...

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）擺喺 0.4，其實就係講緊嗰個係每秒鐘 9.81 米，即係 0.4...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁咩嘢意思呀？係咪對於一個嘅司機嚟講，咩嘢意思呢？係咪話當喺嗰架車轆都有煙出嘅時候嚟到剎掣？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，唔係。

主席：（經傳譯員）畀一個嘅例子我。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話有一個嘅乘客坐喺車度，佢如果喺咁嘅減速，佢會係蹋出嚟㗎喇，呢個就係一般一個剎掣力係大到咁樣嘅地步，就係能夠令一個坐喺椅上面嘅乘客就係跌落嚟嘅，呢一個係需要喺儀器裏面記錄得到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係係一個冇纜安全帶嘅乘客會係跌落嚟？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）會跌出個座位--就更加技術性咁講，就係九成五嘅乘客如果喺咁--如果冇戴安全帶，喺咁樣嘅減速力度，0.4 嘅話，就係會突然之間係跌出座位嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。呢個就係話如果有咁樣類型嘅減速，你一定要係提供喺之前嗰三分鐘嗰個嘅車速，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個嗰一刻嘅時間，但係我哋亦都需要知道喺呢一個事件發生之前嗰三秒--唔係，對唔住，係三分鐘嗰個係發生咩嘢事。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 2 項就係指到嗰度有提到剎車掣嘅，喺(c)嗰度，係咪呀？就係嗰個嘅儀器一定要係記錄到幾時係踩過剎車掣？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，呢個應該係第 2，就係話可以記錄到每一秒時段嗰個嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）即係可以記錄到喺兩個星期嘅時段裏面係每三十秒嘅資料嗰啲數據可以喺嗰度，即係話呢個黑盒應該係可以係保持到呢啲資料完整。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，多謝你解釋，呢個就係最起碼嘅要求，但係你就話希望巴士公司係做高過你哋嘅最低要求嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋嗰個制度希望就係話城巴同埋新一巴都係可以記錄所有呢啲嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嘢資料？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）車速嘅資料。係可以係去記錄到嗰個嘅運作時間。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

主席：（經傳譯員）你係講緊邊一份文件呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢一份文件，係最低嘅起碼嘅要求，喺第2段，就係個車速、幾時剎車，呢個係可以喺螢幕上面睇得到。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話嗰個巴士係去到車站嘅時候就開咗呢一個車尾嘅門，呢啲全部喺嗰個屏幕上都係可以嘅。呢個係咪全球定位系統嗰個嘅協調...

主席：（經傳譯員）係有座標，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）即係話巴士嗰個位置、到底有冇人撳過鐘，呢啲資料全部都係由巴士公司提供嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係最起碼嘅要求，我就係問你，你希望嗰啲黑盒係做得更多，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）其實黑盒係一個一般嘅即係講呢啲儀器嘅名嚟嘅啫，其實係呢一個嘅安裝喺巴士上面就係佢哋可以做唔同嘅功能嘅，喺巴士營運同埋車隊管理方面，嗰啲嘅參數就係如果你係講緊一架巴士係咪真係超速、嗰個車長駕駛係唔係合適、佢係踩呢個剎車掣係咪踩得太急、佢係咪用一個合適嘅態度嚟到去服務乘客、有冇人係會投訴，我哋都喺呢個嘅系統裏面係--譬如話嗰個司機係咪停喺嗰個車站度，有人撳鐘，佢就會係停車，呢啲全部都係可以睇得到嘅。而公司亦都係發展緊一啲嘅監察指標，睇下呢啲資訊應該點樣去記錄、佢哋點樣嚟到去分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）所有嘅資料都係記錄嘅，嗰個問題就係佢哋要分析同埋使用，巴士亦都係有呢個嘅閉路電視嚟到去睇住佢哋，嗰個問題就係係咪用緊，係咪用佢嚟到去增加呢個安全？

喺呢個時候，我哋就休息二十分鐘。

上午11時35分聆訊押後

上午11時55分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳先生。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，喺休息之前，就講到我哋有冇要求專營巴士公司...

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以對正個咪講嘢？唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺休息之前，你就要求我哋去提供一啲嘅證據去睇下我哋有冇要求專營巴士公司有冇去睇下某一啲嘅意外，包括係跌低或者係蹦低，我想講番5月21號嗰封信嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係TD-5嘅1728頁。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，唔該晒。係我哋封信嘅第8頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）就係1729頁嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我想講最後個項目，就係「分析涉及九巴嘅交通意外」，我哋要求佢哋分析喺2017年涉及九巴嘅交通意外，同埋亦都分析15同埋16年嘅情況，就係喺附錄E(i)嘅，我想睇番附錄E(i)。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺邊一頁呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，主席，文件冊入面就冇呢個附錄，附錄...

主席：（經傳譯員）文件冊入面有嘅嘢就係由九巴或者係運輸署提供嘅。如果你有附錄E(i)，可唔可以畀一份我哋呢，而家？

陳美寶女士：Yes. Should I...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者有人可以係從你手中攞一份呢個附錄，然後畀一份我哋呢。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你可以一陣間再講呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師，你有冇其他問題想問呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我就想跟進其中一點，就係運輸署陳先生同埋主席之間嘅對話，即係關於呢個黑盒嘅要求。主席，我想你睇一睇2018年最新嘅黑盒嘅要求，就係休息之前我哋講到嘅，就係工作小組報告，你有冇呢份文件，主席？

陳英傑先生：Yes. May I -- sorry.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者畀陳大律師問埋佢嘅問題先。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我就先講一點嘅，喺休息之前，我就回應主席，就講到4(a)段，就係0.4G嘅減速率有冇改變過...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗陳大律師就係想同你講呢一點。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個就係2003年嘅版本，就係由0.2去到0.4嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話呢一個減速嗰個上限就係由0.2就去到0.4，係咪？

陳英傑先生：That's right. Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）喺0.4嘅減速率之下，百分之九十五嘅乘客都會喺個座位度跌出嚟。

陳英傑先生：Yes, the chance of 95 per cent...

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係0.2G嘅減速率又點呢？有幾多人會跌出嚟呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個嘅上限就係好耐之前採用㗎喇，...

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係0.2G嘅減速率底下，有幾多乘客會跌出嚟，你答唔答到呢？

陳英傑先生：I don't have the answer. I cannot answer.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你可唔可以答呢個問題呢，點解由0.2G轉咗去0.4G呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）喺2006年，我哋同巴士公司討論呢一個規格嘅時候，當我哋會面嘅時候，我哋評估咗呢項嘅要求，我哋發現0.2G只係好輕微嘅減速，係會經常出現嘅，亦都係對於監察嚟講，冇意義嘅，當時我哋同巴士公司會面，亦都同意咗就將0.2G轉去0.4G，不幸地，當時--即係喺呢個規格入面就冇更新呢個相關嘅數字嘅，所以今次我哋就更新咗呢個數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係過咗十二年之後先做，係咪呀？即係用成十二年先去更新呢個數字？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我諗呢個工作應該係會早啲做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇2006年呢一個會議嘅紀錄呢？

陳英傑先生：Yes, I think we have notes of meeting too.

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向委員會提供呀？

陳英傑先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。陳律師，頭先打斷咗你，或者你可唔可以講番2003嗰個最低要求嗰個文件紀錄？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就係TD-5文件夾1598頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係擺上螢幕喇。係喇，呢度有喇，3(a)。你頭先提及百分之九十五嘅人坐喺位都會跌咗落嚟，即係話如果係用0.4G嘅減速衝力嘅話，呢個係咪有人做過一個研究㗎？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）從我哋嘅搜尋，就喺1997年嘅時候，運輸署做一個研究發現嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇有關嘅文件？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以遲啲畀你。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你所講嘅研究包唔包括埋如果企喺度嘅乘客會企唔穩呢？即係嗰個數字係幾--呢度有冇呢？即係關於0.2同0.4G。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）有關於站立嘅乘客，恐怕就冇提及嘅，因為坐喺度嘅乘客，佢係有個正式嘅位坐喺度，就可以容易啲去界定，但係企喺度嘅乘客，係另一回事嚟嘅，因為啲人點樣企法我哋就唔可以控制到嘅，亦都冇話既定用咩嘢方法企嘅，所以我哋就冇相關嘅減速衝力嘅，係針對站立嘅乘客嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以用常識，你哋都係應該--佢哋應該都會跌晒落地，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）可以係，可以唔係，因為好視乎佢哋點樣企法，喺巴士裏面，我哋其實有訂明話巴士有啲咩嘢設施可以幫到嗰啲站立嘅乘客，譬如佢係扶住一條柱--一支杆等等，如果佢哋企得好穩陣，未必係咁大機會會跌落地嘅，但係當然有啲人佢上咗巴士，可能手拎住啲嘢，然後巴士行嗰陣時候行嚟行去咁又另一回事喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）啱啱我收到一份文件，就係你頭先想提嗰份文件，陳女士，就係附錄E(i)，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席。呢個就係附件E(i)，就係我哋夾附畀九巴同埋其他專營巴士公司嘅信件嗰度嘅，喺呢度，我哋就想佢哋分類，將導致巴士意外嘅原因嘅分類，呢度就係比較有幾多巴士車長係牽涉喺嗰三年期嘅交通意外裏面嘅，我哋就將佢因素就拆開嚟，就列咗喺呢個表度。

喺第二項就係同巴士車長有關嘅因素，同埋因為呢啲係講話唔同意外嗰個性質，呢度有個描述嘅，就係講話譬如一開始嘅時候，佢係大意咁樣開車等等，例如作為一個例子，然後我哋同巴士公司傾過之後，巴士公司就喺佢哋嘅--而家會喺嗰個安全章節嗰度就會詳細講述每一類呢啲意外嘅成因。

譬如如果話講到話巴士車長大意咁停車或者開車，呢啲嘅安全因素都會喺個安全章節嗰度最後訂明嘅，而譬如好似九巴，就會將佢交通意外數字分類，就話譬如話喺停車畀乘客上落車或者係離開巴士站嘅時候嗰啲嘅情況，所以就將嗰啲交通意外就分咗咁多個細類，就喺唔同情況嘅時候所發生嘅。

如果特別講話係踩剎車掣呢一點，就冇特別具體咁提及嘅，因為呢個係一個可以話係一個起始嘅一個參考水平嚟嘅，但係我哋預計佢哋喺佢嗰個安全章節就會好詳細咁講出各個意外嘅成因係咪話佢突然間剎車或者係喺巴士站開車出嚟嘅時候等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲數據係嚟自邊度㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢啲數據就係根據過往嘅交通意外統計數字，就喺之前嘅各間巴士公司嗰個安全章節裏面有提及嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話呢個就係由運輸署將嗰啲數據組合起上嚟，係咪？即係呢個表只係得一頁嘅之嘛。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我哋嘅總工程師邱生可以幫一幫手。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋呢啲數據係從警方嘅交通意外調查組嗰度攞番嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係警方呀？但係呢份文件係運輸署提供嘅，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，係佢哋運輸署做出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲警察嘅統計數字叫做乜嘢㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）個名稱係...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你可唔可以近啲個咪講嘢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）因為佢哋而家轉緊一個新嘅系統，所以有個新嘅名，嗰個系統就係「事故個案管理系統」。

主席：（經傳譯員）CMIS，係咪呀？即係佢哋用個縮寫，CMIS。

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）因為我哋聽過警方作供嘅。你哋係可以用到佢哋個數據庫嘅，係咪？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇睇過警方唔係幾耐之前向我哋作供嗰個證供謄本呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇，我哋只係可以接觸呢啲數據。

陳美寶女士：The transcript, police transcript.

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有，有，有睇過。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪--你都知道警方話過畀你聽佢哋有個範本嘅，係有六十個成因，即係話警員如果佢調查交通意外嘅時候，就有呢個範本，有六十個成因，佢哋就剔每一個成因，然後就將啲資料輸入去電腦，然後就會有高層啲嘅人就會檢視呢啲嘅資料，所以嗰個資料係咁嚟嘅，即係由警方嗰度。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，其實佢哋有個表，而家顯示嗰啲因素都係其實警方所

提及嘅因素嚟嘅，即是喺佢哋將呢啲嘅數據輸入去電腦嘅時候，佢哋就會揀係邊啲因素導致個交通意外嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我返番去轉頭，講一個比較概念性嘅問題，就係話係安全表現指標，因為喺小休之前我哋都有傾緊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者係喺你咁做之前，可唔可以先問一問陳女士，呢封信係你寫畀九巴嘅，我睇嘅係 1729 頁，喺嗰度，我哋就搵到附件 E(i)，嗰度信件其實冇提及呢啲數據嘅來源嘅，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢特別理由點解你唔話畀九巴聽呢啲數據係邊度嚟嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我解釋一下，因為我哋一般個做法都係用警方關於譬如交通意外數字嘅數據庫同埋佢哋嘅分析等等，因為其實只係有警方會話將啲意外分類，我哋運輸署冇嘅，所以呢啲關於 2015、16、17 年所制定嘅交通意外嘅數據都係咁樣嚟嘅。

其實我哋之後都會係會向巴士公司做一個講解嘅，就會講我哋要求佢哋做啲乜，如果喺做嗰個簡介會嘅時候，我哋就向佢解釋我哋預計--希望佢哋提交嗰啲數據要有幾細緻，我哋就冇嗰個討論嘅紀錄，但係好明顯呢個都係巴士公司一般都知道，就係話我哋其實係用警方所管理嘅數據庫，而運輸署係有權用嘅，純粹係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我返番去講安全表現指標嘅問題，從你哋嘅證供，似乎你係唔同意用一個安全表現指標，為咗確保我嘅理解正確，我就想請你睇 Stanley 教授嘅供詞裏面有兩段，等我哋好清晰知道我哋大家講緊乜嘢，唔會有含糊或者混淆。

好，而家睇番第 16 日聽證會嘅證供謄本，即係 2018 年 9 月 15 號，61 頁，謄本 61 頁，61 頁，第 21 行，我由嗰個問題開始。

主席問「仲有乜嘢其他方法我哋可以量度安全呢？」而 Stanley 教授就話「我覺得意外率係一個好嘅起點，如果你睇番喺嗰五年遠期計劃裏面嘅安全計劃裏面提及嘅一啲嘅數據，譬如話係碰撞式，有導致死亡嘅意外，冇碰撞嘅意外，滑到、絆倒、跌倒嘅意外等等，你可以沿住呢個去再制定一啲關於安全嘅鼓勵措施或者係罰則。如果你唔用嗰個整體嗰個意外牽涉率，你睇嗰個死亡率同埋睇下滑到、絆倒、跌倒嘅意外等等，你就可以形成一種睇法。我就覺得呢個係相對係重要嘅。

就如果佢哋加埋晒所有呢啲，話一宗事故都係一宗事故，你其實就睇唔到

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

嗰啲細節嘅，所以我就會將佢再拆分一啲嚟睇，就睇下啲主要安全關注嘅地方。同埋確保主要表現指標係同呢啲相關嘅，而你鼓勵或者罰則都係同呢啲有關嘅。我唔知道嗰沓裏面係有幾多嘅元素，我諗就需要由政府同埋營辦商去討論、去協商。

又我哋或者可以睇番乜嘢係主要影響安全問題嘅因素，然後由嗰度做一個起點。」

然後就請你睇第 72 頁，係同一份謄本，18 行，Stanley 教授就話「每 100 萬行車公里意外率，就我覺得係一個誤導，而且係太過粗疏嘅一個指標嚟嘅。」

跟住我就問「你係咪需要一個更加細緻嘅指標或者一組嘅指標？」Stanley 教授話「絕對係需要嘅，你需要一套好細緻嘅指標，呢啲都係成個指標嘅一部分，能夠反映到，由於作為一個經濟學家，我就會話嗰啲唔同意外嘅一個成本係乜嘢，就可以咁樣去量度，我相信肯定你哋香港都會咁樣去量度嘅。譬如話係典型嘅導致死亡嘅意外係有一個數值，其他輕微啲嘅意外又有一個數值，就可以當佢係一個加權咁樣嚟睇嘅。當然仲有其他嘅因素可能你都想包括埋係其中。」

所以從你今朝早作供，你就話你係唔同意用呢個方法嚟去量度安全，啱唔啱？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可唔可以再詳細啲解釋我哋嘅立場或者觀察？喺小休之前，你就問過我係咪同意 Stanley 教授嗰個講法，就話主要表現指標就唔可以係唯一個指標去量度安全，我就話唔同意，我就話只不過係需要有一個起點，一個參考點。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，其實早啲時候，你係唔同意就話主要表現指標如果係巴士公司唔可以控制嘅，就唔相關嘅，我諗我哋講嘅呢個問題，就係主要表現指標係咪控制得到，呢個就係 Stanley 教授嘅睇法。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗講到話安全因素，譬如講話有幾多宗意外，喺某程度上，就唔係話巴士公司完全可以控制到嘅，但係我哋覺得用一個咁嘅指標仍然都係可以幫到我哋去量度個安全表現嘅。而另一方面，我提到話一宗意外可能係好多因素造成嘅，如果我哋用一啲好具體嘅指標，例如話牽涉到巴士車長嘅意外宗數，可能係因為佢大力剎車，即係某啲情形之下，如果淨係咁樣睇，又再深入啲去調查當時係咩嘢情況嘅話，呢一類咁嘅指標就未必可以係完全顯示到佢係完全由巴士司機造成嘅意外嘅。

譬如可能話巴士公司去睇番嗰啲閉路電視嘅錄影帶，又有個黑盒有紀錄，就睇到巴士司機急劇剎車咁樣，可能都仲要睇埋譬如話閉路電視有啲其他嘅數據，就顯示可能係牽涉一啲外在嘅因素，係巴士司機或者係巴士公司冇辦法控制嘅，可能巴士司機係要作一個艱難嘅決策，到底係咪要大力剎車，避免同其

他車相撞，或者係撞到一個路人咁樣，而當--因為佢大力剎車可能都導致啲乘客企唔穩等等。所以好難話我哋做到一個好簡單單一嘅一個指標去量度巴士公司嘅安全表現嘅。

Stanley 教授建議話用一個加權嘅意外率，可能喺呢一方面，我哋可以進一步去探討同討論，但係我哋需要有一個起點，一個參考點嘅。而講到話有幾多宗交通意外，幾多交通意外牽涉到巴士嘅行車里數嘅話，其實變咗我哋可以有一個比較嘅基礎，係按年咁去做比較，而我哋亦都可以--譬如話從咁，我哋可以睇到係咪話個意外率增加，即係 2017 年相對於 2016 年係增加咗，而且亦都係超越咗佢哋嗰個目標意外率嘅，呢個目標就係由巴士公司自己定嘅。咁亦都能夠達到我哋嘅希望做到，就係我哋有啲咩嘢方法可以按年咁去減低嗰個意外率或者宗數，呢個就係佢哋可以提供嘅資料嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）Stanley 教授嘅建議就係話用呢一個嘅方法係太過粗疏，可能有誤導性嘅，你有咩嘢睇法？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我已經答咗呢個問題㗎喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。好，而家就睇一睇倫敦點樣做，倫敦而家嘅狀況。陳女士，就想請你睇一段 Weston 先生講到倫敦嗰個做法嘅報告書，我就會喺佢嘅口供嗰度攞一小段嘅文字嚟讀出嚟，就喺佢嘅專家嘅報告，仲有就係講到倫敦方面嘅證供，我會讀咗出嚟先，然後請你係畀下你嘅睇法嘅。

首先，Weston 先生嘅報告就係專家文件 150 頁，7.8 段，Weston 先生嘅報告，我讀喇，喺「TFL 安全表現指標」，Weston 先生就話「係作為佢哋倫敦運輸嗰個嘅巴士安全計劃，佢哋有一個安全表現指標，嗰個做法就係基於鐵路業嗰個嘅做法嘅，佢哋就係會監察一籃子嘅措施，包括一啲意外嘅數據同埋一啲可以觀察出嚟嘅措施嘅一啲嘅表現，佢嗰個整體嘅數字就係 80 嘅，將來嘅表現就係根據呢一個嘅基準 80 嚟到去比較，就係睇下到底有改善抑或係惡化嘅，呢個制度唔係要去比較巴士與巴士公司之間，反而係睇一間個別公司嗰個嘅趨勢。」Weston 先生嘅報告就係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個重要嘅就係話要去強調安全表現指標係要嚟發展用喺一個嘅巴士安全計劃嗰度，而呢一個巴士安全計劃就係會喺 10 月 16 號嘅時候公布，呢個係一個新嘅制度？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我明白嘅，我哋同倫敦嘅運輸署都係有一啲聯絡。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以對住個咪講大聲啲？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，我哋同倫敦嗰個嘅運輸嘅局係有一啲嘅聯絡。我哋就係想睇下有冇一個有效嘅量度就係關於巴士同埋鐵路業嗰個安全表現。唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而家想請你睇下 Weston 先生喺同一個報告嘅睇法，就係喺 2018 年呢一個嘅係 9 月 27 號，第 18 日嘅研訊講嘅。喺 51 頁尾嗰度，第

23行，你睇到鄧先生係一個嘅文件嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家仲未睇到。得喇，睇到喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就係鄧大律師就係問Weston先生，佢話「可唔可以去睇你報告150頁？」我就想去第52頁第4行，鄧先生就問「係咪有一個安全表現指標已經係--即係有指稱過，但係未公布嘅？」

「係呀，就話呢個就係一個嘅建議，呢一個倫敦運輸局係做緊嘅，巴士營運商係向我哋8月嘅時候解釋過，就係牽涉埋落去嘅有四十一個嘅措施，係呢一個嘅安全表現分數嗰度就可以有不同嘅加權，可以包埋係一啲死亡或者嚴重受傷嘅數字，可能係滑倒、絆倒或者係跌倒呀咁樣嘅。

佢哋目標就係要去監察一個營辦商嗰個嘅趨勢，就係根據呢個80呢一個嘅基準，佢係經過加權，加權落去成個籃子嘅指標裏面。就係話唔單只話有一宗致命意外咁簡單，就係話呢個可能唔關嗰個巴士公司嘅事嘅，呢個就唔會令到佢個分數大大咁降低嘅，我哋係想監察呢間公司入面嘅趨勢，就唔係要佢嚟去同其他嘅公司去比較。我覺得咁樣做未必係幫到佢改善嘅，只不過係一個認可，就話你而家呢間公司係做得好咗、安全咗。如果譬如嗰個基準係80，你就係基於呢個80嘅標準嚟到去改善嘅。嗰個目標就係喺適時就係會向公眾公布，不過而家仲未嘅。」

最後，請你睇下倫敦係交通局佢哋嗰個公布嘅一份嘅文件，係關於同一個事項嘅，請你睇雜項文件3第1194頁，或者由1189頁開始講，係呢一份文件嘅第一頁。

陳女士，嗰份嘅文件就係呢一個巴士安全計劃嘅最新情況，呢個就係呢個倫敦嘅交通局係應佢哋嗰個嘅有關嘅委員會要求係提交嘅一個報告。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係2017年11月？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。想搵番個日子。無論如何，陳女士，請你睇1194頁，個標題就係合約同埋呢一個嘅表現管理。

喺引言嗰度話「我哋用一系列嘅數據去評估一個營辦商係咪能夠提供一個安全嘅服務嘅，作為巴士安全計劃嘅一部分，我哋考慮緊一啲方法去改善呢個程序同埋係更加可以係著重獎勵安全同埋係合約嘅管理嘅。

我哋考慮過一系列嘅方法之後，我哋而家決定有一個營辦商安全表現指標，呢個叫SPI，係基於呢一個消費物價指數嘅同一個原則，喺一個嘅綜合嘅措施，係有一籃子嘅指標嚟到係得到一個單一嘅表現指數。呢個係因為我哋喺2017年係引入咗呢一個巴士網絡嘅安全表現指標，都係好成功，會有八十一個相關嘅指標，而呢一個指數係四十一個指標，係包括一啲係意外衍生嘅數據同埋一啲行為方面嘅觀察，包括係員工同埋呢個顧客安全、網絡安全、呢個風險管理、駕駛嘅水平、工程嘅情況等等。每一個營辦商嗰個表現都係會根據佢自

己嗰個嘅表現嘅指標做一個追蹤，嚟到去鼓勵持續嘅改善。」

陳小姐，我嘅問題就係...

主席：（經傳譯員）你而家係咪會去講“Driven to distraction”，呢個係大倫敦議會佢哋嗰一份嘅文件？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，我會一陣間係講一講話「提供誘因」呢一點嘅，咁...

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，呢個係回應呢一個大倫敦議會佢哋呢一方面嘅要求嘅。你可以用你嘅方法去做，但係我覺得嗰個就係背景，呢個係倫敦嘅運輸局嗰個嘅回應，亦都係有人對佢呢個做法有一啲嘅批評嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我一陣間會講番呢一度，因為呢一份文件我好快就會講到㗎喇。陳女士，我唔係話我哋要照抄呢四十一個倫敦用嘅因素，我係更加概念性嚟講，我哋會唔會都係想有一籃子嘅措施，畀我哋一個整體嘅安全表現指標，我哋可以一路監察，亦都係去量度巴士營辦商嗰個嘅進展嘅，亦都鼓勵佢哋係根據呢啲嘅措施一路去改善嘅，你有啲咩嘢嘅評論？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席同埋陳生係去向我哋提出倫敦運輸局嗰個嘅措施嘅，其實我哋都知道佢哋呢啲最新嘅發展，其實係2017年11月㗎喇，我哋已經安排咗我哋嘅職員去探訪佢哋嘅部門，其實之前已經係計劃咗，去認識多啲佢哋關於道路安全同埋公共交通安全計劃嘅一啲計劃。

我諗佢哋嘅措施簡單嚟講就係要有一個好概念性嘅做法，就係去考慮到一籃子嘅因素去評估巴士營辦商個安全表現，我覺得應該係有一個嘅表現指標嘅，起碼有一個指標等我哋去評估呢間巴士公司係咪安全。話雖如此，我覺得我哋應該要向住呢個方向發展，我哋要有好幾個相關嘅因素，然後要有一個單一嘅指數或者指標，呢一個範疇我哋可以再探究、研究嘅。

工作小組嘅建議就係話想有一個全面嘅巴士車隊嘅監察同埋管控計劃，我哋而家係想叫巴士公司係安裝晒所有相關嘅儀器，而提供實時嘅監察去睇住車長嗰個嘅駕駛態度，係睇住佢一啲主要嘅事宜，好似話剎車、係咪急劇嘅剎車、加速同埋嗰個黑盒嗰個紀錄。另外我哋亦都係期望巴士營辦商係跟住嗰個嘅訓練框架，呢啲係一系列嘅因素我哋會考慮，嚟到去發展一個更加精確嘅表現指標，嚟到關於巴士嘅安全嘅。

呢啲我哋都係有興趣係會繼續，仲有其他嘅建議同埋一啲嘅發展，就係關於巴士嘅用儀器嚟到實時監察巴士嘅運作，同埋車長嗰個嘅態度，我諗呢個係畀我哋更堅實嘅基礎嚟到去繼續探究，就同巴士公司方面去研究，我覺得呢個都係實務嘅，呢個係一個更加係進深嘅一個方法，我諗我哋都係好想喺呢方面研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你估大概要幾時先至可以搵到相關嘅因素，有一個單一嘅或者係簡單嘅表現指數呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢個時候，我講唔實，但係我係運輸署署長，我哋亦都係諗住去拜訪倫敦嘅運輸局，我哋會同佢哋討論下成個安全表現指標嗰個嘅理念，我諗大概嚟講，應該一年內，我哋會有一啲初步嘅諗法嘅，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪已經同專營嘅巴士營運者係傾過嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我未嘅，但係話去發展一啲嘅主要表現指標，喺訓練方面嘅，同埋係實時嘅黑盒嘅監察功能同埋其他係協助到車長嘅一啲儀器，我已經係跟進緊㗎喇，同我哋嘅工作小組。喺我開場白嗰度話我哋根據經驗，同埋喺呢一個嘅檢討小組裏面嘅一啲建議，運輸署都覺得工作小組係一個好有用嘅一個制度，我哋會繼續用嗰個機制將所有相關嘅各方就係坐埋一齊，我哋就會睇下點樣用一啲係有用嘅措施嚟到去改善安全表現呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）你用咗「場合」呢個字幾次，你係咪即係聽到或者個心係咪諗住 Weston 先生就話呢個工作小組應該係一個常設嘅委員會，一個嘅巴士營運嘅機制，係咪咁呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我都係睇到專家嘅證供係有用“forum”，即係營辦商嘅“forum”呢個字，我會叫佢係一個工作小組，其實佢嗰個嘅性質同埋嘅工作範疇都係差唔多嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個更加具體嘅問題，你而家心裏面係咪諗住將呢個成為一個永久嘅委員會或者機制，就唔係一個工作小組嘅，係會有定期會議，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個永久嘅小組，會定期咁開會。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係有啲似倫敦而家嘅巴士營辦商大會咁，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）類似喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）Weston 先生亦都係建議我哋喺香港採納嘅，你係咪接受佢呢個建議呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。多謝主席。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，呢一方面就係要有一啲合併嘅，比較係精準嘅安全表現指標，而另外一方面就係話要用一啲嘅誘因或者係賞罰嚟到擺落你嗰個嘅營辦協議嗰度，即係佢哋能唔能夠達標就係可以有賞罰嘅，呢一點我想同你係探討一下。我想請你睇倫敦議會交通委員會嘅一份文件，呢個主席正話係講到嘅就係雜項文件 3，係第 1134 頁，大家睇到，個日期係 2017 年 7 月嘅，我而家想集中睇嗰個概念就係話唔達到某啲嘅目標嘅時候就係有一啲賞或者罰嘅，係 1151 頁，呢一份報告書--唔好，由 1150 頁開始，等我哋知道個背景。

呢度會係「制定安全目標」，第 2.2 段，「受傷同埋一啲嘅碰撞目標係可以要嚟作為一啲嘅指標去改善倫敦嘅巴士安全紀錄嘅，呢個有好清晰嘅角色，係好多--無論係公營或者係私營嘅服務都係可以改善佢哋嘅表現。我哋相信可以用一個類似嘅方式嚟到係將安全表現係同呢啲巴士營辦商嗰個利潤連結起嚟，就係亦都係直接影響佢哋高層管理員嗰個嘅薪酬嘅。」

喺 2.3 段，「倫敦運輸局就係向我哋表示佢係有意引入一啲巴士安全嘅目標，但係就冇計劃--冇跡象顯示佢哋係呢啲係會同一啲金錢嘅獎勵係拉上關係嘅。喺 16 年 11 月，倫敦運輸局嘅安全可持續性同埋人力資源小組就係被要求係去決定 2017/18 年嘅巴士乘客主要嘅受傷數字嘅目標，而倫敦運輸局亦都同我哋講喺 2 月有同我哋作出一個匯報嘅。」

我想講 2.6 段，「之前倫敦運輸局係解釋點解冇向巴士公司定立一啲安全嘅目標，佢就表示『安全就冇直接同一啲金錢或者一啲扣減係相關，因為佢哋係唔想有帶出一個訊息就係營運嘅安全就係一個可以協商嘅一個代價嚟嘅。』

我哋明白倫敦運輸局嘅睇法，但係我哋就並唔同意嘅，營運公司係會根據一啲獎賞係去行事，特別一啲財務上嘅獎賞，而佢哋嘅股東亦都係有相同嘅期望嘅。如果唔將安全納入一啲合約嘅支付架構，就倫敦運輸局就唔能夠鼓勵營運商係去承諾一啲安全嘅表現。」

喺 2.7 段就講到「如果倫敦運輸局係想減少呢一個意外或者受傷同埋碰撞率，佢必須要向呢一個巴士公司引入一啲有意義嘅獎賞，令到佢哋提供更加安全嘅服務。而倫敦嘅市民亦都係同意我哋嘅做法嘅，我哋訪問嘅一千六百名倫敦市民之中，百分之八十八同意倫敦運輸局係必須要就住呢一啲安全同埋及時嘅表現係提供一啲獎賞嘅。」

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）首先我認為呢個唔係一個簡單嘅議題嚟嘅，因為呢個就係涉及就將呢一個安全嘅表現同埋巴士公司嘅財務誘因係去掛鈎。喺倫敦嘅情況下，我哋知道倫敦就引入咗一個叫"MOM"嘅模式，就住佢哋嘅巴士公司。

至於安全表現可唔可以比巴士公司嘅獎賞或者係懲罰有關呢？呢個係喺香港係有好大嘅討論空間，亦都係涉及究竟巴士公司係咪以一個專營權嘅方式去經營，我哋首先要睇下我哋係咪用緊同一個模式；第二，喺我哋現有嘅機制下，我哋係有一個法定嘅框架，如果專營巴士公司無法係提供適當同埋有效率嘅服務，我哋係可以向行政長官係提出係對佢哋進行財務上嘅懲處嘅。

喺香港嘅情況之下，如果我哋日後係引入一個更加複雜嘅安全表現指標，就可以令到我哋更加有效咁樣向行政會議係提出係懲處一啲無法去滿足安全要求嘅巴士經營商。

究竟我哋可唔可以將呢樣嘢轉化為針對巴士公司嘅金錢嘅懲處，呢個係另一個問題，呢個問題之前喺倫敦係有探討過嘅，倫敦運輸局可能會對我哋有一啲啟示，但係喺現階段，我哋係會保持開放嘅態度。我哋會考慮倫敦同埋其他

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

司法管轄區嘅經驗，但係我哋唔會排除係去內部探討呢個問題，但係個問題我哋會唔會實行，我哋就會考慮好多其他嘅因素，我哋係要小心謹慎去考慮。唔該主席。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）除非你有其他嘅觀察想提出，呢一個獎勵嘅機制，我就會係講下一個議題。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者畀佢答一答，你係咪有嘢想講？

陳美寶女士：No.

主席：（經傳譯員）至於倫敦議會所講，喺第1151頁嘅第2.6段就講到倫敦運輸局講咗啲咩嘢，「安全就冇直接就同一啲款項或者扣減掛鈎」，呢個就係講緊佢哋嘅制度，佢哋就係會獎勵一啲好嘅服務，而如果啲巴士無法係提供滿意嘅服務，佢哋係會受到懲罰嘅。而倫敦當局嘅做法就係呢個制度可以延伸到去安全表現嘅，但係喺香港嘅制度係唔同，我哋冇一個獎賞或者扣減嘅制度。我哋只有一個懲罰嘅制度，如果你唔可以滿足一個安全表現指標，就會懲罰。

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）新加坡都係一樣，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，主席。我哋法律入面係有懲處嘅條文，我哋就會引用嗰啲條文，然後係去發展一啲比較平衡嘅安全表現指標，根據我哋同巴士公司之間嘅峰會，我哋其中一項就提到我哋喺懲處方面點樣有一個更加高透明度嘅制度，以往我哋係有一啲法定嘅罰款，根據呢個條文，究竟我哋點樣將佢哋同安全表現指標掛鈎，呢個就係喺我哋同巴士公司參與嘅工作小組都可以做嘅嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）上一次進行懲處係幾時呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我有呢個資訊喺我個文件夾入面，但係暫時就畀唔到一個答案委員會。

主席：（經傳譯員）就講到一個5月7號嘅文件就話從來冇用過，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我有冇記錯，陳大律師？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）根據我嘅記憶係咁嘅，但係我要搵番個相關嘅資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你而家同我哋講係有用到，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋要再去確認一下嗰個日子，我哋會確認一下，然後會稍後再提供呢個資料嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師，我哋有冇新加坡嗰面嘅資料呢？如果根據我個記憶，就係有個金錢上嘅懲處，就係十萬元新加坡元嘅，即係如果係超過咗某個嘅意外率。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我哋喺一陣間下晝返嚟去處理呢一個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，可以嘅。歐陽先生。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）香港嘅公共交通系統係有一個懲處嘅制度，例如係港鐵嘅制度，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅。主席，根據我哋有嘅紀錄，係有記錄我哋係喺96年係進行過懲處嘅，但係我哋會再去確認一下我哋嗰個當時個原因係咩嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）應該係針對中巴嘅懲處，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我想講番 5 月 7 號嘅證供，就係向運房局提供--即係向呢一個黎以德先生常務秘書長嘅，就係今年 5 月 7 號嘅謄本，或者我哋可以顯示出嚟，第19項嘅。呢個就係5月7號嘅謄本，第8頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，慢慢。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，應該係第32頁，第19行。

主席：（經傳譯員）稍等。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席問咗呢個問題，「鄧大律師，喺你繼續之前，你嘅意思係咪從冇施加過財務嘅懲罰呢？」而黎以德先生就話「主席，就我講嘅就係因為安全而令到我哋要引用呢個條文，即係財務懲處嘅條文。」「就從來冇係因為--即係啟用 22 條嘅懲處嘅？」而黎先生就話「主席，我就記憶中就冇嘅，我就見唔到要引用呢一個嘅條文。」

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，黎以德先生嘅證供係正確嘅，因為佢係回應緊安全方面嘅問題，而佢嘅印象中，就以前係冇施加過罰款嘅，而我所提到嘅情況，即係就住中巴喺 96 年嘅情況，就係同嗰間嘅專營巴士公司嘅脫班有關嘅，我哋係向中巴施加咗 8,000 蚊嘅罰款，呢個事件就係喺 1995 年，我哋喺 96 年係施加罰款嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我就問題嘅第二部分--答案第二部分，上面都有講到「係冇引用過 22 條而去施加任何嘅罰款？」而答案就係「冇錯嘅，以我嘅記憶或者係了解。」第22條係咪同罰款有關？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）就係一個合適同埋有效率嘅服務，而安全就係其中一項我

1 哋考慮嘅因素之一。

2 主席：（經傳譯員）換句話講，就從來冇係--即係94年出現咗脫班？

3 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）95年都出現咗脫班，而喺96年就係施加咗罰款嘅。

4 主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。陳大律師。

5 陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就準備講下一個嘅議題，就係運輸署對安全嘅做
6 法，...

7 主席：（經傳譯員）我哋下晝署長就唔會喺度嘅，或者可能一啲一般性嘅問題可能而
8 家問咗先會好啲。

9 陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我想問嘅一般性嘅問題就係以香港嘅制度嚟講，邊
10 個係負責推廣或者係改善巴士安全？邊個係負責係去發動去實施一啲新嘅安全
11 措施呢？

12 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺公共交通嚟講，特別係巴士安全，當然運輸署係負責嘅
13 單位，佢哋係負責係監察同埋改善巴士安全，而我哋亦都係會努力係改善公共
14 交通嘅安全。

15 陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想睇一睇一啲嘅例子，就係睇下運輸署一直以來點樣去
16 改善巴士嘅安全嘅，或者我哋喺午飯後就開始進行呢個過程。

17 主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以問多一、兩個問題，畀運輸署署長係作答嘅。運輸
18 署係邊一位係負責係推廣巴士安全呢，係邊啲人士負責呢？

19 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺運輸署之內，就係一個我哋係一個共同嘅努力，呢個我
20 哋有一個巴士及鐵路科，我哋亦都係有一個道路安全同埋標準部嘅，我哋助理
21 署長同埋負責呢一個鐵路部就係黃先生，或者黃志光先生，呢兩個單位都會係
22 共同係推廣公共交通安全嘅，唔該，同埋我哋同埋亦都係有邱國鼎先生嘅。

23 陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）換句話講，就係喺運輸署入面冇一個單一嘅單位係負責巴
24 士安全？

25 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇一個單一嘅單位，但係巴士及鐵路科就係負責係睇
26 所有嘅政策同埋營運嘅事宜嘅，就住專營巴士。而道路安全及標準研究部亦都
27 係有份係去推廣同埋係改善道路安全嘅，包括係公共巴士安全。

28 除咗呢兩個主要單位之外，我哋亦都有一個車輛標準及安全部，就係負責
29 監管同埋監督呢一個硬件方面問題，包括係維修同埋巴士嘅標準，而助理署長
30 陳先生亦都係運輸署嘅副署長，佢哋係負責監管整體嘅車輛安全同埋標準，包
31 括係專營巴士嘅。

32 主席：（經傳譯員）問題嘅第二部分就係邊個係負責一啲創新嘅事宜，包括係安全嘅

裝置呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好有趣嘅問題，喺過去嗰一年左右，車輛安全及標準部，即係陳英傑先生所帶領，佢係負責去睇一啲喺車輛保養同埋安全方面嘅一啲新技術，我哋冇一個特定嘅單位同埋一啲額外嘅人手，呢個部門係負責推廣一啲新嘅技術，而喺工作小組底下，我哋亦都有個技術小組，亦都係由陳英傑先生係去主持，呢個就係一個主要嘅平台畀我哋係去推廣一啲唔同嘅安全裝置同埋一啲自動化嘅實時系統，包括係黑盒、全球定位系統等等。

我亦都想補充，我哋見到有一個獨立隊伍嘅重要性同埋需要嘅，即係正如我哋喺倫敦同埋其他嘅地方嘅例子度睇到，係去改善呢一個公共交通嘅研究能力。我哋亦都係爭取一啲人力嘅資源，包括一啲工程師、運輸主任同埋一啲機電嘅工程師，同埋我哋目標係去喺部門之內係創立一個交通嘅科技隊伍。呢個我哋就係一個內部爭取資源嘅過程嘅，我就想畀委員會參考。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳英傑先生嗰個嘅技術小組，佢一路做緊工作，但係好明顯一路就係負責係成立嗰個工作小組，就係2018年3月13號，之後先至成立嗰個技術組，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，正確嘅，主席。我哋成立呢個工作小組個意念就係來自我哋參加大埔區議會會議嘅時候提出嘅，因為喺個 2 月嘅意外之後，就出席呢個會議嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你講緊2月，2018年2月，係咪呀？嘅12同15號。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，正確，主席。就話由好多--當時提出好多嘅睇法，建議，好多諗法，就係嗰兩次嘅會議度提出嚟嘅，而喺嗰兩次會議之後，我同我嘅團隊就認為我哋需要主動同埋更有系統咁樣去處理所有呢啲嘅建議，所以我哋要自己努力去推動有關工作，之後我哋就通知咗交通諮詢委員會，就喺 2 月27 號嘅時候通知佢哋，就話我哋係建議成立一個工作小組，嗰個職權範圍，建議就包括三個部分。

第一，就係巴士上嘅安全裝置，第二，就係安裝安全帶嘅可行性，第三就係加強巴士車長嘅培訓。所以我哋喺 2 月底嘅時候就係制定呢啲嘅建議，就係因為喺嗰次交通意外之後，因此就令我哋正式 3 月中嘅時候成立咗呢個工作小組。唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）你較早時候講話你決定跟進大埔區議會 2 月 12 同 15 號嘅建議同埋立法會相關嘅會議同提出嘅動議等等，你話會採取行動，但係其實你根本係回應緊已經發生咗嘅事件嘅，雖然你話你係主動，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗我哋可以做嘅主動措施仲有好多，至於話成立工作小組呢個嘅諗法係回應嗰次嘅巴士意外慘劇，但係我哋亦都採取咗前瞻同埋主動嘅做法，唔係等各個相關嘅諮詢委員會或者相關人士提出，我哋先至回

應，相反，我哋應該定出嗰個日程就係成立呢個工作小組，所以係喺咁嘅基礎，喺工作小組一開始開會嘅時候，我就已經係提出咗各個可能考慮嘅措施，然後定咗嗰個會議議程，然後就同巴士公司同埋巴士製造商逐個咁樣去傾呢啲建議，所以我哋係採取一個比較有系統同埋前瞻性嘅做法，為我哋自己定咗個議程，唔係等巴士公司或者係巴士製造商話畀我哋聽「你哋可以做到啲乜嘢。」唔該主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋超時喇，我哋而家就係午膳時間。多謝你哋今朝早出席我哋嘅聽證會，希望星期六可以再見到你，陳女士。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）好多謝你嘅協助。好，而家我哋就休會到兩點半。

下午1時05分聆訊押後

下午2時30分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，喺我繼續提問之前，我可唔可以報告一下，頭先主席你問到有個參考編號㗎，就係關於星加坡嗰個罰則嘅條文，其中一個參考就係專家文件夾229頁，係第3.19同埋3.20段。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇擺上螢幕嗰度？我哋睇緊嗰份係咩嘢文件？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）文件本身就係一份運輸署文件嘅附錄嚟㗎，相關嘅段落就喺第3段開始，就係睇星加坡嘅情況㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔好意思，你可唔可以再講一次畀我聽呢份係咩嘢文件？係咪星加坡原本嘅文件嚟㗎，即係原來源自星加坡？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，或者就係答你較早嘅問題喇，然後就講番個文件本身喇，我呢度請主席睇嘅文件就係一封信寫畀星加坡嘅管理當局，就問佢哋話呢份文件就係我哋委員會收到嘅，咁就問番，所以星加坡嗰個陸路交通嘅管理局喇，咁就有封信就係發咗畀星加坡嘅有關規管當局，就係請佢哋協助嘅，咁而嗰封信本身就喺第198頁，即係同一套文件夾裏面。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我諗我哋唔需要喺呢度花時間。好喇。有冇提及話嗰啲罰則

點樣執行？係針對譬如話每一百萬行車公里意外率嘅呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我之後再返嚟畀番啲具體嘅參考資料，咁我自己都要搵番嗰個有關編號出嚟先。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該你。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我知道陳生今日晏晝係由你主要回答問題喇，喺午膳之前我哋就向陳女士提問，就話運輸署喺巴士安全方面所採取嘅做法，咁我哋問咗陳女士一啲一般性嘅問題，就話邊個係負責推動巴士安全嘅，而我跟住落嚟嘅一連串問題充係講番啲過往嘅事件嘅，主要充睇下運輸署過往係點樣處理巴士安全嘅問題，咁我會逐項去講，咁如果你記得嘅話，咁就最好喇，但係如果譬如你想問番有關嗰個原文件嘅參考編號，請你話畀我知。好，第一，2003年7月，有一架巴士喺屯門公路跌咗落去個山坡，導致二十一人死亡，亦都有相當人數受傷，因為屯門公路嘅事故，而家就有啲被動式嘅時速限制器就限制咗巴士行駛嘅時速，咁呢啲時速限制器就喺屯門意外之後係規定巴士公司要安裝，而家已經成為所有專營巴士嘅標書裝置嚟㗎，啱唔啱？

陳英傑先生：係。

主席：（經傳譯員）第一次規定限速器係幾時？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係嗰次事故之後，我哋就睇番有啲咩嘢嘅方法可以糾正個問題，咁我哋就同巴士公司傾過之後，咁我哋就施工咗一個新嘅規定，就係話巴士要安裝時速限速器就係限制個時速係每小時70公里。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，但係點解發生？係邊度搵到嗰封信或者嗰個專營權嘅規定係點？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋應該係將佢納入咗個規格裏面嘅，咁但係即係巴士嘅最低規格，但係之前係--我相信係我哋同巴士公司有一連串嘅討論嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實係一個好簡單嘅問題啫，就係想搵嗰份文件，咁請你搵出嚟。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）好，我哋會提供嘅。而家聽唔聽到？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）第二項嘅安全措施亦都係因為同一宗交通意外而引申出嚟嘅，就係規定專營巴士公司安裝黑盒，今朝早我哋都已經睇過呢個規定喇，就係2003年10月嘅一封信嚟嘅，咁你記唔記得呢個黑盒嘅規定亦都係因為屯門公路嘅意外而出現嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你可唔可以重複嗰份頒布文件嘅參考編號？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係 TD-5 號文件夾，1957 頁就係嗰封信喇，1958 頁就係嗰個附錄嘅文件--嗰封知件嘅附錄，即係個規定本身。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）然後 2006，7 月同埋 2007 年 12 月又有兩宗專營巴士相撞嘅事故，導致有乘客由專營巴士嗰度拋咗出去，最後因為呢啲事故而施加嘅巴士安全措施，第一就係要喺上層巴士嘅玻璃窗安裝個打橫嘅欄杆；第二就係喺上層前面四個位要安裝安全帶，咁你記唔記得有呢啲嘅安全措施就因為嗰兩次事故而提出嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，記得。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁而同樣喇，而家呢啲設施已經係專營巴士嘅標書設施喇？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁有冇一個參考編號幾時頒布呢個規定？如果冇嘅話，或者遲啲畀番喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）全部都係喺專營巴士嘅規定清單嗰度嘅，或者遲啲我畀番嗰個參考編號你，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）第一次規定係幾時？同樣喇，如果你而家冇呢個細節，或者遲啲畀番我哋。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會之前畀番個具體日期畀你。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁然後喺 2016 年就有三宗嘅巴士意外，喺嗰個巴士門嗰度就爛咗玻璃，咁就導致有人受傷嘅，乘客受傷嘅，咁因為呢啲事故喇，咁又額外加裝咗一條防護杆喺嗰個巴士門嗰度，咁就係因為呢啲事故就安裝咗呢個新嘅安全設施...

主席：（經傳譯員）同樣喇，而家亦都變成係專營巴士嘅標準設備嚟嘅，又係喇，第一次規定係幾時？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係喺個意外之後㗎，我可以講嘅就係話自此之後，所有嘅巴士都係加裝咗呢啲嘅防護欄杆，咁就全部喺 2007 年 6 月嘅時候完成加裝嘅，2017 年 6 月完成加裝。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）2017 年 12 月 22 日，有宗導致死亡嘅巴士交通意外，就喺深水埗，就有三人死亡，亦都有乘客受傷，咁亦因為呢次嘅交通意外，運輸署就檢討咗巴士車長嘅有關於佢哋工時、午膳同埋休息時間嘅指引嘅，咁亦都實施咗，啱唔啱，係因為嗰次嘅事故？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）啱。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）然後喺2018年3月，因為2018年2月大埔嘅交通意外之後，咁就成立咗加強專營巴士安全工作小組，等一陣我會再講番成立呢個工作小組嗰個時序喇，不過或者我首先問你，就係我哋頭先已經係睇過喇，睇嚟似乎都係相當有用嘅一連串嘅安全設施，咁多年嚟一路都施加咗喇，咁有冇咩嘢理由，點解喺意外發生之後先至實施呢啲安全措施，唔係喺意外發生之前已經咁做，有冇咩嘢原因係咁樣？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋要求巴士公司提供有效率嘅服務，咁亦都要提供裝置妥善嘅巴士嚟服務市民，我哋一路都監督住巴士公司嘅表現，當然包括埋佢哋用嘅設備、用嘅巴士等等，咁當然喇，一般如果提供服務，又冇咩嘢大事發生嘅話，咁我哋當然就會假設巴士公司嘅營運妥善。咁喺我哋個機構裏面有一個制度，等我哋可以持續監督住巴士嘅運作，咁如果有任何嘅情況發現係巴士有啲咩嘢--巴士公司提供服務有啲咩嘢大嘅問題，咁運輸署就會主動跟進嘅。我必須講，嗰啲意外事故係好不幸嘅事故，我哋唔想見到發生，咁但係運輸署係一路持續密切咁監督住巴士運作嘅，咁如果我哋發現有任何巴士事故，或者有啲特別具體類型嘅意外同巴士有關，我哋都會同巴士公司傾，係咪可以再施加啲咩嘢嘅設施或者係裝一啲咩嘢裝置，避免呢啲意外再發生，咁我相信咁係一個負責任嘅態度，確保巴士服務係安全㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以指出一啲嘅安全施設係喺冇發生意外嘅時候就已經提出要做嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）除咗話監督巴士嘅服務之外，我哋都會睇下世界各地發生緊咩嘢事嘅，係有幾年前我哋其實就發現或者留意到有啲巴士發生火警。

主席：（經傳譯員）係個巴士引擎著火？你係咪咁嘅意思？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，即係喺巴士行駛嘅時候，喺巴士上面著火，咁但係可能係因為其他原因，即係有其他情況㗎，咁總之係因為咁樣，我哋嘅車輛安全嘅標準部做咗啲研究，睇下我哋可以做啲咩嘢防止呢啲情況出現，咁喺嗰次嘅檢討之後，我哋就要求巴士公司喺所有巴士都要有滅火嘅設備，咁而家已經係巴士嘅一個標準裝置嚟㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係呢個同樣亦都係因為有發生過一啲火警，然後你做咗啲研究，然後你就係有個規定，就要做滅火設備，我個理解正唔正確？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我問你一個例子，就係話你係喺--有冇施加過任何嘅安全措施，係唔係同之前任何嘅事故相關㗎，如果要諗一諗，咁你可以遲啲先至話番畀我聽，你可以咁樣做嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我就冇諗過啲乜嘢重大嘅--即係啲特別重大嘅例子喇，咁

但係我哋嘅車輛安全及標準部係會同巴士公司定期開會，係講及巴士嘅維護、保養同埋安全設備等等嘅。咁可能亦都係有啲比較細微嘅事故發生，譬如話喺我哋檢驗巴士嘅時候，可能發現有啲嘅小問題，咁如果我哋留意到，我哋會同巴士公司傾，又要求佢哋要注意或者採取啲補救行動，有啲例子就係譬如有時我哋檢驗巴士嘅時候，發現漏油，喺巴士嘅某一部分漏油，又或者喺個車底盤嗰度就生銹，咁呢啲情況都唔會話引起意外嘅，咁但係呢啲小毛病積累落去就可能最後會導致車輛發生故障，對乘客造成不便。咁雖然呢啲情況唔係好嚴重，但係我哋都會同巴士傾嘅，咁如果我哋發現有呢啲咁比較巴士上面細微嘅瑕疵，咁我哋唔單只淨係同相關嗰一間巴士公司傾，我哋亦都會話埋畀其他巴士公司聽，等佢哋都知道，因為佢哋都係用緊類似嘅巴士型號嘅，咁所以我哋係會做檢驗，然後就監督住情況，睇下啲巴士上有啲咩嘢嘅毛病或者瑕疵，我哋就會要求巴士公司採取行動。如果係啲重大嘅事故，好似之前提及嗰啲，當然喇，喺我哋做調查之後，我哋發現有任何嘅方法，技術上可行，可以處理到呢啲問題嘅，我哋就一定會跟進到底嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，跟住我哋睇成立加強專營巴士安排工作小組嘅過程，我就會跟時序咁樣去處理。或者首先就睇番立法會運輸事務委員會嘅會議紀錄，喺今年2月15號開始嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係由時序開始，咁係咪首先應該睇2月12號區議會嘅會議開始先？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為嗰次會議就係運輸署署長有出席嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，嗰份文件就係DC2號文件夾，782頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁你睇到喇，喺呢一份文件翻辯嘅第1頁係782頁，呢個係大埔區議會2月12號2018年開會嘅會議紀錄。783頁，陳女士，即係運輸署署長係有出席呢個會嘅。784頁你都睇到，討論嘅話題就係大埔道發生嘅交通意外，我就唔會詳細睇呢一份嘅會議紀錄喇，咁我就撮要嚟講，區議員都係表達咗唔同嘅意見，而運輸署嘅署長今朝都係同我哋講過㗎喇，佢都係有考慮到表達過嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，睇下第8段，陳女士係喺呢度發言嘅，佢話第一步會做嘅就係運輸署叫咗九巴去提交一份交通意外嘅報告書，儘快，而九巴亦都係答應喺一個月內提交呢份報告。咁當時就係已經公布咗我哋呢個委員會係會成立嘅，表示咗。咁最後嗰四行就話署長亦都係知道大埔區議會有一個共識，就係關於大埔區同埋相關路段佢哋以前都係表達過關注嘅，佢話就會同幾個部門緊密咁樣合作。我記得運輸署署長仲係稍後係有提過呢啲類似嘅論點，咁你記唔記得喺邊？喺第34段。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）798 頁。呢度就想撮要下，就係運輸署長喺呢個會裏面講咗咩嘢呢，第一，首先就係嗰個嘅車長要考駕駛嘅試喇，咁另外就係運輸署會係檢討香港道路嘅安全同埋車速限制喇，咁就係話會成立一個小組，呢個就係陳女士喺當時所提到嘅各點。

主席：（經傳譯員）值得注意嘅就係喺羅馬數字第 ii 段嗰度就係話運輸署就係會不時咁樣檢討香港道路嘅安全同埋時速限制，呢個都係一個比較一般嘅講法喇，咁雖然話嗰個發生意外嘅嗰個地段唔係一個交通意外嘅黑點，部門都係會考慮一啲改善嘅措施，因為考慮到過往嗰啲意外嘅性質同埋數目喇，嗰個道路設計、環境同埋對於車長嘅影響，咁當然後來就係一如佢講咁發生咗喇，咁我諗你最後一點就係講緊下一個日子喇，就係立法會開會嗰日。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，喺 SEC-3，1342 頁。陳生，你有冇嗰份文件？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我而家係望住個螢幕㗎。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）134--1340 頁，係立法會交通事務委員會特別會議，日子係 2018 年 2 月 15 號。下一頁，1343 頁，喺最底嗰度近紙尾嗰度，就係睇到運輸署署長陳女士有出席嘅。咁我唔會話同你一路講嗰個嘅會議討論，咁不如我哋直接就去到 1360，就係佢哋嗰日通過嘅一啲動議。嗰個動議就係話委員會懇請政府--速請政府，係要求專營巴士嚟到係檢討佢哋車長嗰個嘅編制喇，佢哋工作時數、休息時間、食飯時間等等，咁亦都係要強制咁樣喺定期咁有一啲嘅訓練，咁呢個就係包括兼職同埋係全職嘅司機佢哋嘅駕駛態度等等。咁第一個嘅議程就係一啲工作嘅指引同埋訓練。

第二個嘅動議就話用一啲防滑嘅路面喇，鋪設防滑嘅物料喇，係要有多啲嘅警示牌同埋係有一啲即係規管呢個車速嘅一啲偵測嘅攝錄機等等。第三就係要睇下有咩嘢嘅方法係進一步加強巴士嘅安全裝置，包括係對一啲高危嘅座位係多啲安裝番呢個安全帶，同埋係分階段強制乘客要纜安全帶，咁就要喺一啲巴士--喺車長外面嘅位係裝一啲嘅攝錄機，仲要改裝一啲嘅限速器，就確保喺啲高危嘅路段就係會小心啲嚟到去駕駛，咁就減少喺意外嘅時候乘客嘅傷亡。咁第三個嘅動議就係關於安全，喺車內一啲安全裝置嘅安裝或者措施同埋關於安全帶嘅問題。

咁按時序，下一件事就係九巴就大埔呢一個意外向運輸署提交呢一個調查報告，呢個係 2018 年 3 月 23 號嘅事。呢個就係九巴一嘅文件第 98 頁，我就而家唔會係進入呢份文件度討論，不過我就知道係嗰一日嚟到係提交咗報告，我稍後會講番佢嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇問題。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）講到城巴講嗰個報告，咁就係工作小組嘅一次會議喇，就係 2018 年 3 月 13 號第一次嘅會議。好喇，我未講嗰個會議紀錄之前，想講下嗰個會議議程就喺 CTB-3 第 588 頁。我就想請你係備悉呢一個嘅議程，喺議程

嗰個主要嘅項目就係去討論呢個工作小組個工作範圍同埋成員。呢一個嘅議程係冇日子嘅，咁你記唔記得呢個議程係幾時發出？係九巴交咗報告書之前定之後嘅事？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）你講呢個會議？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個會議係3月13號，咁估計應該個議程喺會議之前係提交。咁九巴嗰個嘅調查報告就喺3月12號交畀立法會嗰個嘅事務委員會。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁我諗我要去查一查先知道確實嗰個日子。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我就打一打岔，應該係有一封信咁樣附隨呢一個嘅議程？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋唔記得到底用係電郵或者係用信嚟到係寄出。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁無論如何，都係有紀錄㗎，係咪可以？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係有㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你可以幫我哋去查一查，再話番畀我哋聽。我哋未繼續之前，我想知道專營巴士公司係你哋幾時去接觸佢，係關於要佢哋參與呢個工作小組嘅呢，你哋幾時去接觸佢哋嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我而家就講唔到確切嘅日期，不過應該係會預先通知咗呢啲公司會有一個工作小組。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，咁估計你就會問佢哋「你打唔打算參加呢個工作小組」？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你唔記得幾時？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我唔記得嗰個確實嘅日子。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你記唔記得係邊個邀請佢哋，係咪你？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係我自己個人去同佢哋講。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係你，咁有冇運輸署任何嘅代表而家喺度嘅，在座嘅係去負責聯絡巴士公司嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）應該唔係今日在座嘅代表喇，不過係辦事處嘅其他職員。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，咁你可唔可以幫我哋去查下有冇一啲嘅電郵或者係書信嘅往來，等我哋知道呢個工作小組係幾時嚟到去成立？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁我哋去第一次會議嘅紀錄，就係 KMB-12，嗰個

頁數就係 469-1--係 4869-1。陳生，可唔可以同你確認你而家係搵到嗰一份文件，係 KMB-12，4869-1，4969-1。係應該會議紀錄嘅第 1 頁。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）搵到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我可唔可以確認你係有呢個工作小組 2018 年 3 月 13 號第一次會議嘅會議紀錄喺你面前？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你睇下出席嘅人吖，第 1 頁。第 2 頁，4869-2，喺開場白嗰段係關女士，佢係就係助理運輸署署長，佢就係呢一個工作小組嘅召集人。由頭數落去第六行，召集人就話工作小組嘅會議目標就係去研究、去複檢一啲嘅措施可以係進一步加強巴士安全嘅。我想問，呢啲工作會議--或者呢個工作小組係所有人又或者起碼係巴士公司同埋運輸署喺埋一齊就去研究巴士安全嘅，有冇咩嘢理由，點解咁樣類型嘅工作小組唔係喺大埔嗰次嘅意外之前就成立？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）因為呢個工作小組就係因為嗰個嘅事件之後特別而成立嘅，喺正常或者平時，運輸署係有其他嘅定期會議同埋其他嘅機制去跟進巴士公司各方面嘅營運嘅，咁呢一個工作小組係有一個特定嘅目標，有一個特定嘅目的就係調查嘅，咁所以我哋成立咗呢個工作小組喇。咁所有嘅專營巴士公司同埋運輸署相關嘅組別都係有介入。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁邊一個會出席嗰啲其他嘅定期會議？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署有好多其他嘅定期會議同專營巴士公司開嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）一定係有喇，或者叫做一啲嘅場合會唔會有啲專營巴士公司好高層嘅管理人員係一齊出席嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅，我哋定期都會同巴士公司嘅高層管理人員有一啲嘅會面嘅機會嘅。運輸署嘅代表應該就係助理署署長，佢係負責巴士同埋鐵路嘅營運嘅，而呢個會議佢哋嘅對口單位就係巴士公司喇，佢哋就係嗰啲嘅營運總監。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係嗰個管理...

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係嗰個管理嘅總監。

主席：（經傳譯員）因為其實係有一啲嘅分別嘅，因為呢個工作小組同埋以前嘅--唔係由公司最高級嘅人嚟到去參與嘅咩？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）佢有啲好重要同埋好特定嘅項目係要討論嘅，咁係要由嗰啲非常之高層嘅管理人員做決定嘅，咁應該係有啲咁嘅會議。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁可唔可以畀我哋類似呢啲會議嘅紀錄，就係話佢哋嘅總監係會有出席嘅？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）係，我補充喇，有時呢啲會議係定期，有啲就係就一啲特定嘅事嚟成立嘅，咁你睇到呢一個嘅工作小組嘅成員喇，陳先生就係提到蘇先生喇，咁仲有一個，佢係嚟自九巴㗎喇，仲有鍾先生，佢就係新一巴嘅，咁我哋其實係夥伴嘅形式，我哋有不同嘅會議，討論不同嘅事項，好似陳生咁講，咁有時我哋有啲定期嘅會議係講安全嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我個問題係非常之有針對性嘅，就係關於安全嘅，咁嗰個嘅營運總監李先生，佢幾時係試過同你哋開過會？呢個就係城巴嗰個嘅總監，咁佢有冇同你哋開過會？幾時？有冇咁樣類似嘅會議係講到安全嘅，係由呢啲公司最高層嘅人嚟到去出席嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）主席，即係巴士及鐵路部嘅常規會議，即係同嗰啲巴士公司代表，即係好似蘇先生或者鍾先生等等，佢哋就係由佢哋公司授權係去做一啲營運嘅決定嘅，咁呢個就係我哋定期嘅會議去討論所有關於車務，包括係安全嘅事宜嘅，咁而嗰啲會議所作嘅決定都係會即係由佢哋相關嘅公司係去授權或者係同意嘅，所以就冇一啲特別嘅就係會涉及佢哋嘅董事總經理嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁所以個問題係咪即係唔會，即係根據你同我哋所講？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，通常都唔會嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺會議紀錄嘅第2段就講到委員冇反對成員嘅組成同埋工作小組嘅工作範圍，咁就係提到附錄嘅，咁而附錄就係喺4869-6頁或者-9頁嘅。咁工作範圍嘅第一項就係來檢討培訓嘅安排，呢個就係立法會喺4月15號交通事務委員會所通過嘅動議嘅內容。咁而工作小組嘅第二項工作範圍就係去檢討喺所有嘅座位安裝安全帶嘅技術可行性、成本效益同埋其他嘅事宜嘅，咁而該項動議，即係立法局交通事務委員會所通過嘅動議亦都有提到安裝安全帶嘅。第三就係探討安裝車上安全裝置嘅技術可行性、成本效益同埋其他嘅事宜，咁呢個亦都係立法會嗰項動議入面提到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）首先喺a項就係乘客嘅車速顯示儀，咁呢個係咪動議入面提到嘅呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇特別提到呢一個裝置嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁其他嘅項目係咪都有提到？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁車速限制器嗰個車速上限係有提到嘅，冇提到其他嘅事項...

主席：（經傳譯員）睇番立法會會議紀錄嗰項動議係咪就可以睇到，係咪可以向我哋確認？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，可以嘅。我嘅問題就係呢個係咪--即係呢個工作小組嘅工作範圍就係受呢一個嘅立法會嗰項動議所影響，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我唔同意。呢個會議紀錄入面嘅工作範圍係相當詳細嘅，咁喺第三項你見到係有好多分項，係有非常之針對性咁樣提出我哋會睇嘅裝置嘅，咁喺成立呢個工作小組之前，我哋已經做咗好多準備工作去探討我哋可以做啲乜嘢係去幫助到巴士車長同埋可以安裝啲乜嘢有用嘅裝置。咁我哋即係研究咗嘅結果就係加咗入去呢一個工作範圍入面嘅。其中一啲項目可能係由公眾建議或者係由立法會議員去建議，或者係其他人士建議嘅。咁但係就住喺巴士安裝安全裝置，即係如果你講安全帶嘅話，當然大家都知道安全帶係會有幫助，咁所以包括埋佢都合理嘅。咁至於車展嘅培訓方面，即係如果巴士車長嘅培訓不足係可能會引致意外，咁當然我哋喺工作小組係應該探討嘅，咁所以我哋係即係做咗一啲研究係決定去即係傾啲乜嘢嘅，咁我諗呢個係一個負責任嘅做法。如果我哋淨係開會就有啲巴士公司係提出乜嘢都可以，而我哋唔講一啲特別嘅措施嘅話，即係我哋喺未開始工作小組工作之前，我哋已經做咗功課，咁樣我哋喺日後嘅會議就可以更加集中討論，咁我哋希望係可以做到一啲嘢嘅，透過呢個工作小組。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係關於呢啲安全裝置嘅研究係咩嘢時候做嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁大部分嘅研究都係大概係2月嘅時候做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話喺大埔意外之後做嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）你可以咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）你會唔會咁講？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想比較一下呢一啲安全裝置同埋調查報告入面所講嘅安全裝置，咁呢個報告係即係喺前一日就係公布嘅，咁我想你睇下 KMB-1 文件冊嘅 114 頁，同埋同時間繼續睇 4609 頁嘅。KMB-1 文件冊 114 頁，114 頁，係，KMB-1 文件冊 114 頁。咁呢個係九巴調查報告嘅第五部分，咁呢個就係喺18 年 3 月 12 號呈交畀運輸署嘅，咁而喺九巴就提到一啲其他改善巴士安全嘅措施。喺安全裝置方面，你見到第 41 頁九巴就有提到呢個電子穩定程底，或者可以叫做電子穩定控制系統。咁如果你同呢一個工作小組工作範圍比較，即係喺 4869-9 頁就係 c 項嘅，咁喺第 42 段，喺九巴嘅調查報告第 42 段，喺 114 頁，咁就講到地理圍欄，咁就對應由全球定位系統輔助嘅車速控制。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同唔同意兩者係講緊同一樣嘢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我可以咁講嘅。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）另外就係車速限制，就係由全球定位系統輔助，咁呢一個就係喺呢一個安全裝置嗰個清單嘅d項嘅。咁喺下一頁嘅45段，九巴就提到限制車速呢個問題，咁就有一個減速嘅系統，咁唔單只淨係隔斷呢個燃油嘅，咁呢個亦都係喺工作小組喺3e段提到嘅。咁喺47段，九巴嘅研究報告就講到話係即係監察車長瞌眼瞓嘅情況，咁而工作小組同樣係喺第3g段係有提到呢一個安全裝置嘅，即係喺呢個工作範圍嘅文件之中。咁我有一個即係一般性嘅問題，咁我哋見到九巴考慮嘅措施同埋工作小組工作範圍入面嘅安全裝置係非常脗合嘅，之前運輸署同埋九巴有冇係傾過即係考慮安裝啲咩嘢安全裝置，同埋即係會喺個議程上面包括啲乜嘢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我嘗試答呢個問題，早前我就提到喺工作小組會議之前，運輸署係做咗一啲研究，就係關於可以喺車上安裝咩嘢裝置去幫助啲司機同埋改變車輛嘅安全嘅，咁喺進行嗰啲研究嘅時候，同時我哋亦都有同巴士嘅製造商對話，咁呢個係一個合理嘅做法嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你答一個好長嘅答案之前，你可唔可以先回答呢個問題，運輸署之前同九巴有冇傾到究竟喺個議程上面應該寫啲咩嘢？有定係冇，或者你唔知道？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，請你繼續。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我就想講一講即係個背景，我哋進行研究嘅時候，我哋係有接觸一啲巴士嘅製造商，咁主要係三大嘅巴士製造商喇，就係我哋有同佢傾過即係包括係ADL、Volvo同埋MAN呢五間公司，我哋有同佢傾過點樣可以改善啲巴士嘅安全，咁就喺改善巴士安全方面，其實做嘅嘢係有限，即係冇咩嘢係新嘅，我哋知道喇，巴士公司亦都知道，我唔知佢哋有冇同啲巴士製造商係傾過去做一啲一樣嘅事情，咁但係對我嚟講，我哋喺2月就有做...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳先生，總括可唔可以咁講呢，你做咗--即係你自己一個獨立嘅研究，你唔知九巴有冇做獨立研究喇，咁但係就即係咁啱，咁巧合你哋得出嘅安全裝置嗰個清單都係一樣嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）因為相關嘅安全裝置嘅數目都係有限嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，咁而九巴--即係九巴建議嘅事項唔係所有都有喺我哋個清單上面，咁所以即係佢哋認為係--即係有啲嘢佢哋認為應該做嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁我想你睇番會議紀錄嘅第3段，就係4869-2頁第3段嘅。第3段就話就住呢個建議嘅工作範圍，九巴龍運進一步就建議係包括四個其他方面嘅，即係就住襲擊車長--包括襲擊車長、巴士站違泊，塞車令到即係巴士車長嘅疲勞加劇同埋壓力，同埋巴士站嘅安排嘅。咁第4段就有運輸署嘅回應，咁我想講下一頁最屘第六行，咁會議紀錄就話因為工作小組嘅時限只

有三個月，咁會員同意工作小組應該係著重討論附錄入面嘅建議工作範圍，咁而附錄就有提到呢個工作範圍係乜嘢。咁可唔可以咁樣理解，當時工作小組有限嘅工作時間就即係反映喺工作小組嘅工作範圍唔應該傾九巴提出嘅改善安全建議喇，可唔可以咁樣去理解？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）當時嗰個目標係完成工作小組嘅工作同埋調查，同埋得出一啲嘅建議，咁所以時間只有三個月係非常之緊張嘅，所以當時我哋係想著重處理呢一啲重要嘅事項。咁我哋嘅意思就唔係話其他事項係無關。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁但係你個答案就係「係」，係咪？即係但係九巴嘅--你話九巴嘅建議係唔會考慮，因為時間緊絀，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。我哋亦都提到--即係向巴士公司提，即係呢啲問題可以喺其他嘅會議或者峰會上面去傾，唔一定要喺呢個工作小組度傾嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁喺當時，呢個工作小組嘅時限--即係點解會有一個有限嘅工作時限？咁當時點解--即係決定呢個工作小組只係一個三個月嘅工作小組，而唔係一個常規嘅小組，當時嘅諗法係點？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）當時我哋係想儘快得出一啲嘅建議，咁所以三個月係合適嘅呢個長度，就去完成我哋訂立嘅工作範圍。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解要儘快去得出一啲嘅措施？點解咁有逼切性？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我諗個原因就係有一個嚴重嘅巴士意外喇，咁而運輸署就係希望同巴士公司合作去制訂--即係儘快制訂一啲補救措施，目的就係去避免日後有同樣嘅意外發生嘅，咁當然呢一啲嘅項目唔能夠係即時去實行，但係我哋係儘量係儘快去完成嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁換句話講，當時就係回應--因為區議會、立法會等等，或者係公眾都係對呢一個事件係有好大嘅關注嘅，即係呢一個 2 月 10 號嘅意外，所以係咪因為咁，好有逼切性？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我會話呢個係其中一項原因。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你想畀人哋知道你係做緊一啲嘢，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢個謄本入面有講到呢一個工作範圍嘅，咁呢個就係 KMB-12 文件夾 4939 頁開始嘅，咁但係我就唔會詳細講，咁但係個頁數就喺呢度。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你畀少少時間我，因為我想知道你講緊乜嘢嘅。呢封信函就係

經九巴嗰個「購物清單」喇，我會咁叫佢喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，佢哋有四輪嘅溝通嘅，同運輸署，就係由4939頁開始。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳生，我想你而家睇番第一次會議嘅會議紀錄，請你睇第16段，4869-6頁。陳生，呢度第16段講嘅就係安全帶嘅問題，或者我遲啲先至再獨立講安全帶呢個問題，但係而家即係純粹係從時序嘅角度睇，呢個問題就係第16段嗰度引申出嚟嘅，第16段我或者讀出嚟喇，就係「巴士同埋城巴質疑所有座位都安裝安全帶嘅實際可行性，即係用呢一個嚟加強乘客嘅安全，因為其實要巴士車長確保所有乘客都上咗車真係有戴安全帶都有困難嘅，而且新巴同城巴都提出個關注，就係話如果企喺度嘅人，係咪又係需要安排安全帶呢？咁運輸署就話係全面檢討過，有呢啲咁嘅提出，就係因為喺交通意外之後，全面檢討過喺巴士安裝安全帶嘅問題嘅。」咁喺呢一段嗰度提及話有啲要求係唔只乜嘢嘢？我哋知道喺立法會嘅運輸署事務委員會會議上通過咗啲動議，就係話要喺巴士安裝安全帶，咁呢個就係呢次會議之前一個月提出嘅動議嚟嘅，咁所以呢啲嘅要求係指立法會交通事務委員會提出嗰啲要求吖，定係其他要求？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我諗你所提及嘅即係立法會要求話安裝安全帶...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你可唔可以直接對住個咪講？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我相信立法會議員提及話安裝安全帶呢個其中一個要求喇，咁但係我哋就好難好具體咁講話係喺邊一次會議就提出呢啲嘅要求，因為我哋有同新聞界，同其他人都有見過，咁我哋都有留意係有提過安全帶呢樣，就要求我哋要去研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你繼續。呢合有個提及，就係話大埔嘅交通意外喇，咁仲有話有其他嘅交通意外嘅，咁指嘅係邊啲其他嘅交通意外？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我諗其實主要都係講嗰一宗嘅交通意外。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以呢度用咗交通意外眾數係錯㗎，係嘛？係指嗰個交通意外？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我相信係指一般嘅講法，就係提及交通意外，冇話特別講邊一宗交通意外，但係大埔交通意外只係其中一個帶出呢個問題嘅意外嚟嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）下一個事項，或者喺個時序裏面下一個事項我想講就係發表一個電子地圖，即係意思電子地圖上面有時速限制加咗落去，喺呢方面第一份我想請你睇嘅文件就係TD-1號文件冊366頁。喺你面前，陳生，應該係睇

到一封電郵，請你先睇電郵嘅底部 366 頁嗰度喇，呢封電郵係委員會秘書署寫畀運輸署 Tony KT。

主席：（經傳譯員）個電郵日期係幾號？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）2018年6月1號，喺366頁底部會見到嘅。咁呢封電郵其實個內容就喺 367 頁嗰度出現嘅。由上數落去第 2 段，就從個聽證會嗰度知悉，城巴同新巴已經係裝住黑盒嘅系統，係會自動做呢個超速嘅報告嘅，即係話如果司機駕駛個時速係超過咗 70 公里嘅話，咁而至於話嗰啲巴士公司管理層會唔會有資料知道話譬如喺嗰個駕駛路段幾多嘅百分比，即係新巴同城巴嘅巴士係嗰個法定嘅時速係 50 公里嘅，咁而係又係以上提及嗰二十五個路段有包含嘅，咁喺回應嘅時候，新巴同城巴就話佢哋冇呢個數字，因為佢哋話佢哋冇全套嘅電子數據係顯示晒香港所有路段嘅時速--所有道路嘅時速限制嘅，咁但係就同意交畀委員會一份嘅電子地圖係顯示佢哋喺邊啲道路上面佢哋嘅巴士有運作嘅。

咁喺呢一方面，我就想請你協助委員會提供一啲電子地圖係顯示香港所有道路嗰個法定時速限制嘅，咁等我哋委員會可以比較呢啲嘅地圖，即係呢啲地圖新巴同城巴將會提供畀我哋㗎，咁呢個就係 2018 年 6 月 1 號嘅電郵。咁跟住運輸署就寫咗信畀各間巴士公司，就喺 6 月 7 號，即係出咗電郵之後幾日喇，咁呢度就係 TD-1 號文件冊，4077 頁--或者係 477 頁。請問你而家睇唔睇到運輸署寫畀巴士公司--各間巴士公司嘅信件，日期係 2018 年 6 月 7 號，陳生，你面前睇唔睇到呢封信？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，睇到。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢封信嗰度第 2 段，運輸署就話「我好高興通知你有關於時速限制嘅數據，即係運輸署所管理嘅道路系統--嘅網絡裏面，咁已經係可以喺 data.gov.hk 呢個網頁嗰度下載嘅」。咁然後第 3 段你就話畀啲巴士公司聽「你哋可以利用呢啲嘅數據，即係地理資訊系統嘅數據，GIS 嘅數據嚟去探討點樣可以控制時速，用全球定位方式或者係地標圍欄方式，咁你可以同你哋嘅巴士製造商去討論呢個問題，然後進行有關嘅測試」。有冇咩特別原因點解運輸署會寫信畀巴士公司，特別請佢哋留意話有關於一個時速限制嘅電子地圖，其實係已經有嘅，咁你係要等到我哋委員會問有冇呢啲資料嘅時候，你先至寫信畀巴士公司，兩者之間有冇關運嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）嗰封信嘅日期係 6 月 7 號寫畀巴士公司，各間，我哋出呢封信，因為城巴話--我諗佢哋係--我相信佢哋係唔知道呢啲嘅地圖數據係已經存在嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個喺委員會寫嘅信裏面已經有提及喇，咁係咪冇乜可能佢哋唔知道？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我假設城巴係唔知道，所以點解我哋寫信畀佢哋，提醒佢

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

啲有關嘅數據其實已經存在。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係話係因為喺研訊裏面提到，咁跟住就運輸署就再寫信話畀佢啲聽有呢個數據，雖然其實呢個資料喺我啲個聽證會謄本已經有㗎喇，係咪咁解？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我相信係有咁嘅關連嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該，我覺得咁亦都係完全合理。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，咁我啲繼續，陳生。喺3月、4月、6月都開過好幾次會--一連串嘅會議喇，咁我一陣就會再返嚟講話嗰個安全帶嘅問題，咁但係喺呢個階段，我想繼續跟住個時序去到2018年7月25號嗰個日期相關嘅，因為我啲有一個會議，係立法會交通事務委員會嘅會議，咁而運輸署喺開嗰次會之前準備咗一份文件嘅，呢份文件就喺TD-1號文件冊，403頁。呢份係簡介文件，為嗰個交通事務委員會嘅會議準備嘅。咁我有幾個問題就住呢份文件想問你嘅，咁但係嗰啲問題就已經--原本係準備問你，但係而家因為工作小組已經出咗報告喇，所以就唔需要問喇，琴日下晝你就交咗呢份報告畀我啲喇，咁所以我就會從嗰個工作小組報告裏面去提出呢啲問題嚟問你。主席，我嗰份報告就未有編頁碼嘅，咁但係為咗紀錄，咁呢個就係TD-5號文件冊，1757頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一段，你想講？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）首先我講嗰個撮要喇，第5節，撮要第5節文件，即係個報告嘅。主席，我首先想請你睇嗰個建議嘅撮要，就係第五章。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，我啲有喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）佢嗰份報告本身嘅頁數就係41頁。陳生，喺5.3段，處理嘅問題就係建議喺車內安裝嘅安全裝置，就話由2018年7月2號採購嘅新雙層巴士都需要裝有嗰個電子穩定控制系統，同埋第二就係時速限制器--車速限制減速器，咁就即係話專營巴士公司就要首先就係處理啲新巴士，由現有巴士就係咪安裝嘅問題喇。然後5.5段就係處理一啲會試用嘅一啲安全裝置，睇下又係咪要安裝，咁呢度我啲睇到就係嗰個BMCS喇，即係巴士監控嘅系統喇，同埋就係一啲碰撞警報、換線裝置等等喇，咁呢度又--我想問下喇，點解所有呢度咁多加強巴士安全嘅措施都係喺大埔意外之後先至考慮，唔喺之前考慮？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲新嘅改善措施或者新裝置都係喺我啲同專營巴士公司同埋巴士製造商傾過之後，覺得佢啲係有用，可以改善巴士安全，因此先至提出呢啲建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係個問題係點解呢啲討論即係你唔會喺話大埔意外之前已經同巴士製造商有呢啲討論？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）或者好似我之前都有提到喇，大埔嘅意外其實就牽涉到一連串嘅問題，就話我哋仲可以做啲乜嘢去加強巴士運作嘅安全，咁呢個就係嗰個討論嘅結果，咁所以我哋就係朝呢個方向去。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個問題，我諗其實就係譬如話喺立法會、區議會、媒體、公眾都係有提話--係因為有呢啲情況先至即你令到你會去睇呢啲事項，咁講係咪公道？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）可唔可以特別聚焦睇呢個 BMCS，即係巴士監控系統，巴士監控系統。呢個考慮就係因為科技進步，即係黑盒嗰個科技進步先至會考慮嘅，咁係咪一個公道嘅觀察？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，黑盒可以話係一個主要嘅元素喺呢個監控系統裏面嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，就係因為有黑盒，先至可以令到巴士監控嘅系統可以再有新嘅進步嘅措施？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁運輸署就要求專營巴士公司就今朝嗰份文件--即係睇到2003 年嗰份文件就要求你哋做一啲嘅設施，咁而喺今朝我哋亦都有提及㗎喇，咁就喺嗰個報告 2.2 段，我而家想問一問你嘅。唔好意思，係 2.22 段。我哋今朝都講過呢一樣嘅，就係附件二就係已經更新咗個對黑盒嘅要求，唔係你喇，係嗰個報告書咁講，2.2 話「再者，工作小組就係備悉運輸署最近係檢討過同埋係更新咗電子數據紀錄儀嘅基本要求，咁最初係 2003 年頒布」。咁我想知道嗰個嘅--上一次係幾時檢討呢一個嘅最低要求，同埋點解有咁樣嘅檢討？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係檢討嗰啲嘅電子數據紀錄儀裏面嘅--巴士裏面所用嘅佢哋嘅功能喇，嗰個嘅容量喇，咁呢一個嘅檢討就令我哋知道嗰啲黑盒係可以記錄或者係可以幫助我哋加強呢個巴士監控嘅系統，咁我哋就話呢個對於電子紀錄儀嘅--數據紀錄儀嘅基本要求更新咗。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，呢個係因為咩嘢？因為呢一個檢討--因為呢一個委員會？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，呢個檢討。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）仍然講緊呢個巴士監控系統，請你去睇 5.14 段。5.14 段即係報告書裏面就話「再者，運輸署係好希望睇到巴士監控系統嗰個嘅發展同埋試用，因為佢係能夠令到專營巴士公司採納一個更全面嘅方法嚟到去改善巴士安全同埋車隊嘅管理同埋控制嘅。咁除咗呢啲巴士公司喺海外嘅試行之

外，運輸署都係打算請一個嘅服務提供者去做一個獨立嘅試行，喺車輛上面嚟到去評估一下用呢個地理圍欄嘅科技係咪用得到同埋係咪有效，例如去控制車速，咁呢個就係呢一個系統一個非常重要嘅一點。向前望，運輸署係會喺呢啲嘅試行計劃裏面去檢討嗰啲嘅結果喇，咁就進一步同專營巴士公司去商討，係希望發展一個好清晰嘅路線圖，去加強專營巴士嘅監控嘅，咁就係透過呢一個系統」。好喇，我有幾個問題嘅，關於呢個建議，話請一個嘅服務提供者去做一啲獨立嘅測試或者試行計劃，咁我想問喺呢方面聘用獨立服務提供者方面有咩嘢進展？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋而家係申請緊資源，即係錢喇，嚟到去做呢個獨立嘅試行計劃㗎。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁即係話而家都仲未係話搵到邊一個嘅服務提供者嚟到做呢一件事嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）未嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個「服務提供者」其實咩嘢意思？點解㗎，呢個字？係咪一個獨立嘅顧問，定係咩嘢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個可以向運輸署提供呢個服務，幫我哋做試行計劃嘅一方喇，我再講得具體啲，我哋想聘用香港嘅生產力促進局去幫我哋做呢一個嘅試行計劃嘅，咁但係呢個仲未落實嘅，因為我哋都仲係等緊要有資金先做到。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你幫一幫手，點解你覺得佢哋有咁樣嘅專材去做呢一件事？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係試過去搵不同嘅機構去幫運輸署去做一個獨立嘅研究嘅，關於地理圍欄嘅科技，因為我哋想係更加積極主動，做多啲嘅研究嘅，喺呢方面。另外，我哋想有一啲獨立嘅數據去確認，到底巴士公司方面聲稱話佢哋或者佢哋呢一方面嘅發展係真抑或假嘅，咁喺呢一個去搵合適機構嘅過程，我哋就發覺香港生產力促進局就係有呢啲嘅車輛嘅部件喇，有有關嘅系統係喺佢哋嗰個科研中心，我哋同佢哋傾過，咁我哋相信佢有咁樣嘅能力去做呢一個研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁從你嘅答案就顯示你仲未有一個嘅確定嘅範圍嘅，係嘛，呢一個--或者你已經係有一啲複稿？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋而家做緊一個嘅項目嘅概要，即係關乎呢一個項目嘅範疇，但係我哋係想分兩階段嘅，首先要試下地理圍欄技術係有咩嘢辦法令到佢嗰個定位能力係更加精準。另外，我哋亦都係想喺其他車輛入面試行下，睇下佢係咪行得通。咁另外我哋如果係有做咗一啲成功嘅試行計劃，我哋就會同巴士公司嗰度傾下，睇下佢可唔可以將呢個技術攏擺喺佢哋嘅巴士上面試下，咁我哋有自己嘅獨立試行計劃，巴士亦都有自己嘅供應商去做一啲差唔多嘅

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

嘢，不過我哋希望可以互相參照，睇下我哋或者佢哋係咪做緊一啲正確嘅事。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，嗰個測試嘅第一部分係測咩嘢？係咪測嗰一個嘅全球定位系統係咪準確？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢啲叫做地理圍欄技術，今日最困難嗰方面就喺香港呢個環境用全球定位系統呢一個應用嘅，咁有好多嘅回應就話佢哋唔係幾準確㗎，咁所以佢哋係要應用地理圍欄技術去提供一個路線方面、道路網絡方面一個更加準確嘅數據，呢個係要試過先得嘅。據我所知，幫九巴同埋城巴做嘅服務提供者都係做緊一啲類似嘅技術，咁結果都係唔錯，但係我哋想有一個獨立嘅測試去核實同埋對呢個技術了解多啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個技術就係首先一個全球定位系統，咁然後就係用呢個地理圍欄技術，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳生，你係咪有嘢想講？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳生，呢度報告書裏面係冇提到一個話類似係聘用一個獨立或者係外聘一個顧問嚟到去試行其他呢度建議嘅一啲器材，咁呢個就係碰撞警報裝置同埋保持行車線裝置等等嘅，我想問，運輸署會唔會都係就其他嘅儀器聘用自己獨立嘅服務提供者或者顧問去試行？如果唔會嘅話，點解？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋都想做多啲嘅，但係現實就係需要有資源先做得到。好似我哋今朝署長咁講喇，我哋而家係想搵一啲資源去成立一個嘅資訊科技組嚟到去做呢一類型嘅研究嘅，暫時我哋所有嘅資源，好似呢一個咁樣嘅項目，我哋都要去申請撥款嘅，如果我哋有足夠嘅資源，我哋當然係想做多啲嘅研究喇。其實喺呢個項目，即係呢個嘅獨立試行項目第二階段我哋就會用呢一個嘅技術去睇下車輛嗰個嘅車速限制，咁就會試行下可唔可以喺一啲嘅路段上面係施加呢一個嘅車速限制器嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係講嗰啲車速限制器係咪即係車速限制減速器？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳生，我哋都講完咗運輸署點樣處理呢啲種種提高安全嘅儀器喇，我而家就另一方面想講下倫敦嗰個嘅做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）既然你都要開另一個題目，我哋都係要小休㗎喇，亦都畀陳生休息一陣喇，咁或者我哋而家休息二十分鐘，二十分鐘。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔該。

下午4時02分聆訊押後

下午4時22分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，咁我有提到新加坡嘅罰則，請等一等。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）文件係形容咗新加坡嘅專營巴士服務，就喺SEC-3文件冊嘅第822頁，呢個就係文件嘅第1頁。唔好意思，應該係SEC-2文件夾嘅822頁。主席，呢一份文件係立法會秘書處研究部嘅資料文件，咁相關嘅部分就係3.19段，就係喺834頁。3.19段，有提到服務質素標準，咁呢一段最後就講到，暫時，即係目前呢一個服務質素嘅標準就包括以下兩類，(a)係營運表現標準，就係量度每日嘅最低或者每月嘅營運嘅標準，咁就包括就係巴士嘅可靠程度、負載同埋安全；咁而3.20段就提出如果唔符合呢啲標準嘅相關嘅罪則。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁835頁就有一個表，就係服務質素標準，就係有唔同嘅標題。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，咁你會見到，喺可靠性呢一個標題底下，第三項，就係巴士故障率，咁個目標就係每個月少於百分之一點五。咁似乎新加坡嘅交通局都係用呢一個巴士服務意外率即係低於某一個數目，即係話每百萬行車公里七點五。

主席： And as we would express that, 7.5 per million kilometres?

陳政龍先生： Yes. And again, page 837 --

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢個係比香港嘅巴士意外率係高嘅？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，純粹係睇嗰個巴士意外率嘅啫。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個就講到對專營巴士嘅罰則？

陳政龍先生： Yes, that's correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋已經問過新加坡嘅陸路交通當局，就我哋有問過佢哋有冇即係畀過呢啲嘅罰款，係咪？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋係問過新加坡嘅交通當局一啲嘅問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係咪即係從來未施加過呢一啲嘅懲罰？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳先生，喺休息之前，我就希望比較一下香港同埋倫敦嘅做法。首先，我想講一講佢哋所謂嘅智能車速調節系統，即係同我哋嗰個地理圍欄嘅概念係相似嘅，咁我想先你睇下呢一份文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）你同唔同意呢個講法，智能車速調節系統係同地理圍欄係相似嘅，你同唔同意？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想你睇下一份文件，就係 MISC-3 文件冊嘅 939 頁。陳生，你面前睇到嘅應該就係一份報告嘅第 1 頁，係倫敦運輸局所發表，個題目就係智能車速調節設計，日期就係 2009 年 12 月。可唔可以首先睇下呢個報告嗰個引言？咁就可以畀大家有個背景係咩嘢情況，或者去 945 頁。呢度引言--我讀出頭嗰兩段。「ISA 軟件設計嘅制訂就喺 80 年代喺法國開始，咁就自此喺唔同嘅市場都有評估，證實係有效可以減少--減低車速，同埋喺道路上嘅事故。喺 2009 年 5 月，倫敦運輸交通局就開始一個測試，就用最新嘅嗰套智能系統，就希望可以減低車速同埋道路交通嘅意外。咁喺呢個測試之前，倫敦運輸局已經係制訂咗一套全面嘅電子車速限制地圖，即係係所有城市都有㗎，咁總共有三種唔同嘅智能系統嘅模式，而家係有個叫勸喻式，一個係自願式，一個係硬性規定，就強制式。咁如果係勸喻式，就即係顯示嗰個速度限--車速限制畀司機，就通過呢個電子地圖，等司機可以睇到；而自願，就再進一步就係會將呢個車速嘅限制嘅資料，同嗰個汽車嘅引擎管理電子系統係連結喺上嚟，咁喺呢個自願系統之下，如果熄咗呢個設備嘅時候，司機係可能咁選擇咁樣做，咁就變咗嗰個裝置就唔會影響嗰個加速。」咁另外再睇下落幾段就係「到目前為止，佢已經做咗一年嘅呢個計劃，即係倫敦嗰面，咁佢等佢哋可以認識，同埋探討到倫敦司機嗰個駕駛態度，同埋要做呢個系統，有啲咩嘢嘅可能嘅障礙等等。」咁即係話，倫敦交通局就一路睇緊呢套嘅智能系統，智能車速調節系統喇，即係 ISA。

咁第二份文件我想你睇嘅，都係講同一個課題，就係運輸及研究實驗所嘅一份報告，日期就係 2016 年 11 月，喺同一個文件冊裏面，我想你睇 1002

頁。陳生，你面前應該睇到嘅就係 TRL，即係倫敦運輸研究實驗所嘅一份報告，就係話喺倫敦巴士上面，裝咗呢個智能車速輔助系統。咁你睇到嗰個報告個日期，喺上面就係 2016 年 11 月。咁又係嘞，我哋講講呢份報告嘅引言嗰度相關內容，1011 頁。喺中間嗰部分嗰頁，就話嘞，ISA 係咩嘢，咁第一段就描述呢一個智能系統係咩嘢，就同我之前讀出嗰個係好近似。由第二段就係咁講，就話「為呢個即係呢個行人輔助--行人安全行動計劃，我哋管理局就係承諾就會做一個試驗計劃，喺少量嘅巴士上面做，睇下佢呢個係--個科技係點樣應用。咁之後喺 2015 年，倫敦運輸局就係進行咗一個智能系統嘅測試，就喺倫敦巴士上面做，咁就係一間公司 Zeta Automotive 所提供嘅系統嚟。」咁呢個報告日期就係 2016 年 11 月，而嗰個測試就喺 2015 年進行。

而家去 1105 頁，咁都係就係嗰份報告嘅附錄嚟。呢份報告就係講到嗰個試驗計劃，咁日期就係 2015 年 10 月，咁就解釋咗當中發生嘅事。咁 1106 就畀多少少資料我哋嘞，就係話「管理局就做呢個智能車速輔助科技，咁就係主要係喺--即係睇下嗰個--即係外在嘅就係關於嗰個車輛嘅速度，同埋內在嘅資料同埋外在資料就係嗰個車速限制，咁呢度就係已經喺歐洲同埋其他地方有使用，證明都可以改善道路安全，而司機亦都接受。」咁或者係 1120 頁，我哋睇到第二次做試驗嘅日期，就係 2016 年 1 月，就係 1120 頁，同一份報告，就係第二階段嘅試驗。所以呢度就顯示，呢個 ISA 系統就係倫敦嘅運輸局就有考慮，咁佢哋喺 2009 年就已經考慮，然後 15 年、16 年都做個試驗。咁呢個主要就喺--即係倫敦嗰方面就係就住呢個智能車速調節系統係做過大量嘅分析，係咪呢啲情況都係喺個大埔意外之前出現嘅呢，即係做嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋係唔知道㗎。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，我哋而家唔好講呢個 ISA，我哋講番倫敦係有個計劃加強巴士安全。首先，Weston 先生嘅報告裏面，就係專家文件冊 148 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰份文件本身嘅頁碼係幾多？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）34。

主席： Thank you.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我睇緊嘅係 7.5 段，就係巴士安全標準。陳生，我會讀出頭嗰兩段，即係 7.5 嗰度，因為呢個提供咗嗰個背景就係話倫敦嗰方面係點樣定嗰個巴士安全標準。「巴士安全計劃第一個關鍵嘅成果就係要制訂一個新嘅巴士安全標準，運輸局一路都--自從 2016 年就同道路安全顧問 TRL，一間 Loughborough 嘅大學，同埋巴士營運商同埋製造商，一齊去評估同埋提出一啲建議，建議一啲設施就可以加入去未來嘅巴士設計裏面，咁主要目標就係減少傷亡，特別係嚴重嘅傷亡同埋死亡。咁有幾個可能又可以考慮嘅技術，包括就係智能車速調節系統，自動剎車系統，同埋好多其他嘅設施。咁就係所有每一項設施嗰個成本效益都係全面咁樣去評估，確保我哋一方面可以儘量減少傷亡，但係同時亦都係喺我--就住我哋所做嘅財務投資嗰度，得到最高嘅回報，從傷亡減

少嘅角度嚟睇。」咁呢個就係2016年開始嘅工作，到而家都未完成。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係Weston先生嘅報告，係咪呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，而呢度就有個參考嘅資料，就係喺第18日嘅聽證會，即係2018年9月27號，第115頁，第7行，即係謄本嗰度。

主席： Thank you.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好似主席今朝都提到，巴士安全標準，我哋預期應該係喺2018年10月中嘅時候公布，咁即係話呢個過程係超過兩年。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗係原本係想逐--分階段咁推出，第一階段就應該喺10月公布。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，我可以繼續睇落去，如果去到148頁，即係同一個報告，再落啲，同一頁，喺中間嗰度，就話「我哋倫敦運輸局計劃第一階段嘅巴士安全標準就會喺2018年10月16號公布，咁佢哋預計就會三個嘅開始嘅--三個嘅階段，就係第一、第二、第三階段去引入。」咁我哋睇番香港嘅--喺香港嘅做法，亦都睇到倫敦嘅做法，咁你對於一個建議，就話運輸署之前嘅加強巴士安全嘅做法，似乎更多係回應意外，即係喺意外發生之後先至回應，而唔係主動積極咁，同埋有系統咁樣去睇下仲有啲咩額外措施可以加強巴士安全，就避免發生意外？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我就唔可以評論嗰個背景，就話倫敦嗰個巴士安全計劃係點樣出嚟，我哋唔知道有啲乜嘢...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋冇叫你評論嗰點喎。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我明白，我明白。但係我想講嘅就係，我唔知道巴士安全標準係咪同我哋已經有嘅標準係一樣，因為我哋都有啲最低規格要求，係要求專營巴士公司做得到。咁呢啲嘅規格，包括所有嘅設施，即係話專營巴士必須要具備嘅，呢個講就係話要提供服務畀乘客，可以方便利用到巴士服務，咁而好大部分都係講安全，同埋新嘅安全設施係要加入嘅。呢啲嘅標準，今次我哋又再檢視，亦都有修訂，就係今年8月嘅時候做。我哋會繼續咁做，去包括一啲新嘅標準。巴士安全標準喺倫敦嗰度話係會引進或者檢視㗎喇，咁佢哋有好多個階段，咁我會相信佢哋應該係好全面，亦都好複雜嘅一個計劃嚟。運輸署肯定會睇下從中可以學習到啲乜嘢嘢，又正如署長講，遲啲我哋會派人去英國㗎，肯定呢個係其中一方面我哋會睇嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳生，咁我可唔可以繼續請你睇下委員會聽過嘅一啲建議，你嘅睇法係點嘅？就係話點樣可以積極主動咁去加強巴士安全嘅一啲建議。首先，委員會聽到有好多嘅名詞提及，其中一個就係巴士營運商論壇，呢個係Weston先生講嘅，而Stanley教授就提到話有一個常設委員會係處理巴士安全，咁當中就包括咗各個相關嘅人士，或者係各方都有參與佢哋定期開會，合作

處理巴士安全嘅事宜。咁喺某程序上，陳女士今朝早都接納咗呢個建議，咁佢話嗰個工作小組係會繼--永久存在。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢話接納，佢係--佢就係話佢接納咗係 Weston 先生呢個建議㗎。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁好，從呢方面睇，咁可以問呢個係可唔可以進一步問題，係咪準備將呢個工作小組變咗係常設呢？或者先講工作小組最後報告，5.13段。係TD-5號文件冊，1803頁，佢內部嗰個頁數就係43。陳生，請你睇5.13段，就係話運輸署嘅建議行動。咁佢第一部分就講話，你哋會採取啲咩嘢步驟係回應嗰啲建議，或者最後一句我想睇，第四十--即係佢本身43頁嘅最後一行，就話「運輸署會繼續留意最新嘅裝置同埋科技嘅發展，目的就係想進一步加強巴士安全，咁運輸署會採取主動積極嘅做法，繼續召集工作小組會議，係密切咁樣監測住試驗嘅進度，會定期咁做，而且會提供個平台畀運輸署，同埋專營巴士公司交換意見，睇下最新嘅巴士科技發展，同埋係有啲咩嘢新嘅安全裝置同埋技術可以應用喺專營巴士上面。」咁呢個其實就係同今朝早陳女士提及話會延長呢個工作小組嘅壽命嗰點嘞，啱唔啱呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）有冇任何文件，係列出而家已經係一個常設工作小組嘅細節嘅呢？例如有冇一份文件，就話佢嗰個工作範圍，擴大咗係點樣樣？有冇話佢定期開會，同埋有冇文件可以話畀我哋聽，呢個工作小組已經由一個臨時嘅工作小組變咗一個常設嘅工作小組？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）喺現階段，冇任何文字嘅紀錄嘅，咁但係肯定，喺我哋同巴士公司傾嘅時候，我哋會傾呢一點，我哋都略為--之前略為提過喇。因為工作小組提出咗好多建議，咁所以係需要時間先可以落實。而正如我哋提過，我哋都會睇下一啲新--即係儘可能仲有冇啲新嘅措施嘅，咁所以工作小組係會繼續工作。但係好似今朝早都有提到，呢個工作小組會成為一個常設嘅會議，但係暫時冇喺文件上面有寫低。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪已經取得專營巴士公司同意，繼續做呢個常設嘅基制嘅成員呢？

陳英傑先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪已經口頭上做咗？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋喺上一次工作小組會議已經有提到㗎嘞。

李女士： Last working group meeting.

主席： I'm sorry?

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）即係上一次嘅工作小組會議，我哋有提出呢個睇法，諗

法。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰次會議係幾時，日期？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁嗰次會議，佢哋係冇反對。嗰次會議日期，係 9 月 21 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗄，喺呢個報告嘅 1.5 段有提及嘅。可唔可以畀個頁數我，陳生？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）TD-5 號文件冊，1763 頁。咁嗰度提及話有個會議，喺 1.5 段第 2 行有提及。

陳英傑先生： Yes, in the working --

主席：（經傳譯員）咁喺嗰次會議嗰度有提及，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，就係最後，即係嗰個四個工作小組會議嘅最後一個，就係 9 月 21 號。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，嗰個委員會已經收到一整套所有嗰啲會議紀錄嘅正式版本，或者係草擬版本，係完全冇刪減嘅，咁但係就係 9 月 21 號同 8 月 29 號嘅好似仲未有，咁你可唔可以提供畀我哋？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）上一次會議嘅會議紀錄都仲準備緊，咁又需要巴士公司評論先。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，咁就算係草擬本都可以畀我哋先吖，一定係有個草擬本喇，係咪呀？咁一係個草擬本，就用個草擬本提交畀我哋喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋同巴士公司商量吖。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋問佢哋嘅時候，佢哋都係同意，但係又話要問下其他啲人，咁最後我哋得到係一啲刪減過嘅會議紀錄，跟住就城巴就話「係呀，我哋唔介意畀委員會㗎。」咁我哋要嗰個嘅成個完整版本。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋會睇下，唯一憂慮嘅就係，嗰啲草稿係未畀其他委員睇過，咁所以我唔知道嗰個最終嘅版本係咩嘢。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁而家就畀佢哋睇嗰啲草稿喇，咁叫佢哋評論喇，如果係有啲咩嘢嘅保留，咁就改喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋會考慮佢㗎。

主席：（經傳譯員）我覺得呢個係--就係咁喇，你會考慮，好吖。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）關於呢個工作小組，我想再問多個問題，就係佢呢個工作小組再發展落去，嗰個範圍你諗住係點嘞。咁我哋而家啱啱就讀咗 5.13 段報告

書，咁從字裏行間就睇嚟，呢一個工作小組嘅工作範圍係會限喺討論一啲科技嘅發展，就係關於點樣改善專營巴士嘅安全，我咁樣講公唔公道？呢個就係工作小組未來嗰個嘅工作範圍？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，其實工作小組嗰個工作範圍一早已經係界定咗，而委員會嘅成員嘅共識都係，我哋嘅討論就會限喺--局限喺呢啲嘅範圍裏面。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，咁我哋一開始嘅時候，都係按住時序講，呢個工作小組點樣成立㗎喇，咁當時就係話呢個工作小組嘅壽命係三個月嘅啫。

陳英傑先生： Yes.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）但係而家嗰個打算將工作小組變成常設。

陳英傑先生： Right.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁所以我想問，呢一個經過轉型嘅工作小組，係會唔會仍然工作嘅範圍係咁有限呢？

陳英傑先生： No.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）會唔會淨係講呢個技術嘅考慮呢？會唔會考慮巴士安全嘅其他方面，譬如話係巴士有關嘅道路安全嘅事宜，一啲安全嘅做事方法呀咁？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁範圍改變咗之後，嗰個工作小組就會成為一個常設嘅基制，我諗。咁我估計佢呢個新嘅基制嘅範疇就會比較原本嗰個範疇闊啲㗎喇，咁我諗係可以處理巴士安全其他嘅事項，我喺呢方面係保留開放嘅態度。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係你預期，呢一個常設嘅工作小組或者係基制就係會個範疇係包括多所有關於巴士嘅安全，或者安全運作嘅事宜，係咪呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁我可唔可以問一個問題呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）隨便。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）咁關於工作小組嘅成員又係點嘅呢？舉例，警方或者係道路安全議會，會唔會都係成為佢嘅一員？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）因為關於嗰個成員，因為我哋會改變呢個工作小組，成為一個常設嘅基制，咁嗰個成員我哋要考慮應唔應該係包埋其他嘅人士，咁包括官方或者非官方。但係喺呢個時候，我哋要討論下先，咁睇下呢一個嘅工作--呢個小組或者佢嘅範疇係點樣運作，包括埋佢嘅成員同埋佢嘅範疇。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你預期呢啲嘅問題幾時可以落實到呢？幾時先至可以定出工作

小組嘅範圍，同埋佢嘅成員係邊個？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我只可以話我哋希望儘快，因為有千百萬樣嘢都係發生緊，我哋當然希望就係儘快將新嘅措施係實施。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以喺呢個年尾之前呀？你而家係到底係搵緊工作小組嘅範疇定係成員？呢個兩樣嘢嚟嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋希望如果年尾做得到就係我哋嘅目標喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你覺得係一個可能達得到嘅目標？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席： Potential?

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，我哋都要留意番，我哋而家係想攞一啲資源多啲嘅支援，多啲嘅資源，嚟到去實施有關嘅措施，咁呢點我哋要考慮在內。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）下一個嘅建議係向委員會提過嘅，就係可以鼓勵一個比較積極主動嘅做法，就係喺倫敦，佢哋有個安全創新基金，可以睇你--睇下關乎呢個基金嘅證供，咁睇下你自己有乜嘢觀察嘞。係專家文件夾 146 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係 Weston 先生嘅報告？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，Weston 先生嘅報告，自己嘅頁數就係 32。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）咁喺 7.3 段，安全創新基金。我再讀出嚟喇，「喺 2017 年 11 月嘅時候，倫敦運輸局就係宣布佢安全創新基金嗰部分，就係會係提供 500,000 英鎊畀六間巴士公司，去發展新啲嘅概念，嚟到改善倫敦嘅巴士網絡嘅安全，咁呢六間公司全部都係就佢哋嘅安全嘅設備，同埋改善工作嘅行為，員工嘅表現，係得到呢啲基金嘅支助。咁亦都係佢哋做嘅試行計劃又係一個資料搜集嘅過程，亦都係後來係擺咗入去發展呢個巴士安全標準。」好，而家我想去另外一段，係 152 頁，就係 Weston 先生嘅建議。主席，呢個係 38 頁，呢個報告書嘅 38 頁。

主席： Thank you.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個相關嘅建議，Weston 先生提出嘅，就係喺網絡財務表現嗰度，係成段我想讀出嚟嘞。「我哋應該要考慮某啲嘅安全措施，例如話係引用新嘅安全技術，同埋車長嘅訓練，目標就係要加強安全，係應該由運輸署以直接資助嘅形式，喺專營協議以外，係提供畀巴士公司，就要達到一啲指定嘅成效。咁喺專營協議以外提供一啲資金，係有理據嘅，因為佢可以係令成個嘅社會

受益。」咁我想問，運輸署對於成立一個基金有咩睇法？個基金係要嚟資助，要嚟發展，試用一啲新嘅措施，新嘅器材，嚟改善巴士安全嘅，你哋嘅睇法係咩呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）大家都可能知道，香港嘅經營環境同英國係好唔同。我相信英國嘅巴士服務係由政府畀錢，然後就係外判畀公司。而香港就唔同，我哋就係用一個嘅商業...

主席：（經傳譯員）咩話？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）商業嘅原則就係畀巴士公司嚟到經營呢啲嘅網絡。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩話？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係要商業上可行嘅商業原則。

主席： Thank you.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁所以呢啲私人公司，即係巴士公司就要負責營運巴士嘅所有成本，所有開支，咁我哋相信嗰啲嘅器材、巴士，都係由巴士公司去提供，咁佢哋應該繼續係用呢個模式，英國嘅情況同香港好唔同。關於一啲新嘅措施應唔應該由政府補貼都係可以討論嘅，呢個問題。事實上，即使今時今日，香港我哋都係有補貼畀巴士公司，去做呢啲嘅顯示器嘅，係即係一對一咁樣嘅安排。咁即係話，呢一個嘅建議都唔係話不能夠去考慮嘅，我哋都係持開放嘅態度。但係話如果單單成立一個基金，有一個特定嘅目標，我相信就會對成個嘅公共巴--公共運輸系統有一啲成本方面嘅影響，咁但係對一啲個別嘅項目，我哋都係持開放嘅態度，可以係討論嘅，如果巴士公司認為有需要嘅話。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個你哋補貼緊嘅顯示系統係咩嚟嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）而家？

主席： Yes.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）而家政府係補貼緊畀巴士公司，去安裝一啲實時嘅顯示系統，喺巴士站，或者係巴士站嗰度顯示，咁另外喺呢啲巴士站嘅座位，即係用一個一對一咁樣嘅安排，巴士公司負責起--負責一個項目，我哋政府就係補貼另外一個項目，咁呢個係配對，咁呢一個安排已經係實施緊，我哋係都係提供咗一啲協助，嚟到係推行一啲對整體運輸大眾有益嘅呢啲措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個實時嘅顯示系統，就係等搭車嘅人知道大概下一班車幾時到？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係嘞。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁你就話政府係一個一對一嘅配對？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁巴士就係公司提供一個，政府就提供另一個？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁嗰啲--係嘞，巴士站，巴士座位，巴士站嘅座位又點呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，係巴士站嗰啲座位。

主席：（經傳譯員）亦都係一對一嘅？

陳英傑先生： Yes.

黃志光先生： Seats no. All subsidised by government.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，係座位...

主席：（經傳譯員）乜嗰啲座位嘅情況係點呀？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）即係我哋就係話喺巴士站上蓋下面，如果佢哋係要裝呢啲座位，就係由巴士公司佢哋自己起嘅。咁至於嗰啲嘅預計巴士到達時間，我哋就叫嗰啲顯示系統，咁就係一個配對，一對一嘅安排。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係你係畀錢畀啲乘客，就睇下嗰啲嘅顯示器，睇下巴士幾時到，你哋就出資興建一個，咁巴士公司就一個？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，咁關於嗰啲座位，我哋就係特別喺老人家同埋一啲有需要嘅人士，都係好多嘅要求，希望喺巴士站提供座位嘅。咁政府其實喺施政報告都係話呢個政策，我哋會補貼巴士公司係儘快提供座位，咁等有需要嘅人係可以有多啲嘅位嚟坐。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁邊個畀錢起呢個巴士站嘅上蓋？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）巴士公司。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）另外一個建議，Weston 先生--Stanley 教授亦都係向委員會建議，就係話要有一個嘅獨立嘅安全嘅規管機構。咁你都讀過--睇過 Stanley 教授嘅報告喇，咁我就講講個背景先。喺澳洲...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗畀我哋去睇下 Stanley 教授嘅建議，咁就等我哋大家理解下。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，咁我就帶大家睇 Stanley 教授嘅報告書嘅兩部分，第一個就係專家文件夾，第 70 頁。咁呢個就係 Stanley 教授嘅第二份報告。

主席： Thank you.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）佢自己報告嘅頁碼係70。主席，請大家睇睇第70頁。佢嗰個嘅大題目係管治，跟住就係主要嘅機構，同埋角色。咁呢一度就係香港嗰個嘅房運局喺4月24號嘅一個意見嘞。就係房運局就係負責嗰個嘅策略嘅角色，咁運輸署就係實際提供服務㗎，咁呢個就係同物業局嘅安排係類似。「維多利亞運輸局就係有一個策略嘅角色，而佢哋嘅公共運輸發展局就係負責去執行。咁但係兩者有一個好明顯嘅差別，就係墨爾本有一個獨立嘅安全規管當局，就係喺策略性嘅層面嚟到運作嘅。咁呢個維多利亞嘅運輸，交通嘅安全就係喺佢哋2010年嘅法案嗰度成立㗎。咁但係喺香港，我哋就冇一個對等嘅當局，運輸署就係去監察專營巴士公司嘅安全表現，而都係負責促進一啲安全嘅措施，但係香港冇一個獨立嘅安全規管當局，咁似乎就係減低咗大家對安全問題嘅關注嘞。」呢個就係第一部分我想大家留意嘅。第二部分，請大家揭去第99頁，同一沓嘅文件。主席，呢個文件本身嘅--報告嘅本身頁數係46頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）大概係中間嗰度，我就會係讀一、二、三段下面嗰一段，教授就話「呢個維多利亞巴士公司係會有營運方面嘅支援，呢個係業界嘅委員會。咁譬如話佢哋係會為MIS、MMS係發展一啲嘅範本，咁就所有嘅成員都係用得到嘅。而呢一個運輸安全總監係非常--佢嘅焦點、重點就係發展同埋改善呢一個巴士業界嘅安全文化，同埋呢個安全風險管理，亦都係同公司同埋業界去改善佢哋嗰個做法。咁佢哋有一啲指引嘅文件，呢一個運輸安全總監係獨立，就係令到一個--有一個好好嘅政策，就亦都可以有一個獨立嘅問責同埋透明嘅，呢一個嘅安全過程。咁就巴士安全就係完全係由呢一個公共交通規管當局嚟到去負責㗎。」咁喺呢方面嚟講，運輸署嗰個有咩嘢嘅觀察，對於話去成立一個係獨立嘅交通安全，或者係運輸安全嘅監察當局，你有咩嘢睇法？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知喺澳洲即係墨爾本嗰個業務嘅規模，呢個係維多利亞省嘅，咁即係據我了解喇，維多利亞省嘅巴士營運就係唔係中央化嘅，咁而監管嘅規模係大好多。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就係講緊墨爾本，而唔係整個維多利亞省嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁但係佢講緊一個巴士監管機構，即係我唔知佢係講成個維多利亞省吖定係淨係墨爾本。

主席： Yes. I follow your point.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）就算淨係講墨爾本，即係據我所知，墨爾本嘅巴士業務同香港好唔同嘅，喺墨爾本係有唔同嘅經營公司喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋可以幫下你。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）至於話協商嘅服務，就佔路線嘅三分二，就有十五份合

約，十二間公司，咁而有三分一嘅路線都係有呢個競爭性嘅競投嘅。咁但係每七年，係可能係會轉變嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁講緊係咪少過二十間？

主席：（經傳譯員）十三間嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）所以你講緊係即係好多唔同嘅巴士營運商，咁而呢啲營運商嘅監管機構係需要即係管理唔同嘅公司嘅，咁但係喺香港嚟講，我哋有六間嘅專營巴士公司，咁主要有三個集團，咁龍運、新巴、城巴。

主席： Long Win.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）九巴、龍運。

陳政龍先生： New Lantao is the other one.

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）新巴同埋城巴，同埋新大嶼山嘅巴士。咁基本上我哋係管理緊三間集團底下嘅六間專營巴士公司。我可以咁講，咁樣係容易好多，因為我唔使管理好多唔同嘅公司，如果講緊維持呢啲安全嘅標準，係會相對容易嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺香港？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，喺香港嘅。正如即係署長所講，運輸署係有獨特--即係特定嘅即係專業嘅分支，咁我哋有道路安全部、車輛標準及安全部，同埋一個巴士及鐵路科嘅。咁我哋係好嚴謹咁樣去控制同埋管理呢一啲巴士公司嘅，即係我哋係做得唔錯嘅，因為我哋嘅工作係非常之有效率，因為我哋一個部門只需要同三大集團係交涉。咁至於提升啲巴士公司嘅質素，或者安全標準，就同墨爾本唔同，喺墨爾本，係你係要即係說服十幾間公司，先至可以達到你嘅目標。咁至於即係將呢個工作小組變成一個常規嘅會議，係令到我哋可以有一個即係集中嘅核心小組，咁呢個會議嘅目標嘅功能，同一個獨立嘅審核機構係好相似，即係同墨爾本個機構好相似嘅。咁而香港嘅情況嚟講，成立一個獨立嘅監管機構，去即係監管運輸署同埋巴士公司並不必要嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個會議係包括運輸署同埋巴士公司喇，咁有咩嘢獨立性？佢哋--即係呢個唔係一個獨立嘅會議嚟嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，唔係獨立嘅，因為即係有兩方，咁但係我哋可以睇下個成員嘅組成，咁然後我哋會睇下可唔可以引入一啲獨立嘅意見，咁可以為車務提供獨立嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）你心目中有咩嘢人選？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋暫時冇其他人，但係我哋係一定會去探討呢個問題嘅。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我哋講緊係道路安全議會嘅委員喇，成員喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋好歡迎佢哋。

主席：（經傳譯員）你認為佢哋係獨立，即係如果佢哋成為呢一個工作小組嘅成員，咁係咪就有一個獨立性响度？你同唔同意？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，道路安全議會嘅成員都係頗為獨立嘅。

主席： Please, Mr Auyeung.

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）咁呢一個--就住呢個工會，就會喺唔同嘅持份者之間，會有即係定期會議喇，咁呢一個會議唔單只係會講安全嘅，你會講其他嘅事宜。咁運輸署會唔會有一個即係單位，專門係負責安全，咁樣可唔可行呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）目前，我哋有一個道路安全及標準研究科，咁呢個單位就係處理所有公眾--公共交通嘅安全，包括係專營巴士。咁但係呢一個分支並唔可以達致我哋提升巴士安全嘅目標，因為唔單只係涉及道路，亦都涉及車輛同埋營運。所以實際嚟講，喺運輸署入面，我哋即係可以成立一個小組，係包括呢啲唔同嘅分支嘅專家，去特別去睇專營巴士嘅安全，我認為咁樣係可行嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）咁今朝，署長就表示係有四個單位係共同負責巴士安全嘅，咁但係呢啲嘅分支係咪有定期會議？會唔會係每月都會會面？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）目前就冇即係一啲定期嘅會議，即係喺呢啲唔同嘅單位，咁就住即係成立一個新嘅會議去處理巴士安全嘅事宜，當然呢啲單位都會參與喇，咁而喺呢個會議入面，我哋內部即係都要安排一啲會議，係去討論同埋去實施一啲嘅措施嘅。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

羅先生： May I ask a question?

主席：（經傳譯員）羅教授。

羅先生：（經傳譯員）我想探討一下呢一個道路安全議會嘅，佢同運輸署同埋警方之間點樣合作？佢係咪一個獨立嘅機構，去處理安全問題？佢係咪已經有一個獨立嘅地位？我想知道道路安全議會、運輸署同埋警方之間嘅合作關係，同埋呢一個道路安全嘅研究委員會嘅，咁呢四個單位係點樣去合作處理安全問題？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）咁喺呢個問題，我想請邱先生去講一講嘅。

主席： Yes, please.

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔該，主席。道路安全議會係包括唔同部門嘅同埋局嘅代表，同埋亦都有啲非官守成員，例如係一啲即係車輛總會、醫委會、香港道路安全協會、一啲保險界嘅代表等等。咁所以道路安全議會係一個獨立嘅機構嚟，咁

喺道路安全議會底下，有兩個委員會，第一，就係道路安全嘅研究委員會，咁羅教授係其中一名嘅委員；咁另外就係道路安全嘅宣傳委員會，咁就如果我即係喺呢個研究委員會嗰度，如果我哋有一啲新嘅措施，無論佢哋係關於車輛安全、道路安全，或者其他嘅問題，都會喺呢一個道路安全嘅研究委員會度傾嘅。咁而道路安全嘅研究委員會下，我哋係有唔同大學嘅學者，亦都有一啲來自即係相關即係組織嘅成員嘅，咁而道路安全嘅宣傳委員會，主要係負責公眾教育同埋宣傳。咁喺道路安全議會底下，我哋係每季都會有--即係同委員會會面，咁而喺道路安全議會下，即係亦都係運輸署每一季會即係檢討一個意外嘅紀錄，咁而呢啲嘅意外紀錄會包括巴士嘅意外，咁樣委員會嘅委員就可以提供意見嘅，即係就住巴士安全表現。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁呢啲專營巴士意外嘅數據係喺邊度？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）即係同其他嘅意外紀錄一樣，我哋係會即係依賴警方嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁即係主要係靠警方嘅數據？

邱國鼎先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）然後你就會整理同埋分析，係咪？

邱國鼎先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）邊個做㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅同事，即係運輸署嘅同事，咁我哋就會向委員匯報呢個安全表現，趨勢等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向--對正個咪講嘢？你就會睇警方嘅紀錄，運輸署就會加以整理同埋分析嘅？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，然後我哋就會將呢個安全表現匯報畀安全議會嘅委員，我哋就會講下我哋嘅觀察、趨勢，同埋一啲共同嘅--共通嘅成因等等。因為道路安全議會就係包括唔同嘅局、警方同埋第三方嘅代表，如果佢哋有任何意見，或者建議，即係就住政策，或者係改善嘅巴士安全嘅措施，咁就會喺道路安全議會度傾嘅，咁而議會嘅委員就會進一步跟進嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）道路安全議會會唔會就住改善專營巴士安全，係作出一啲建議？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）喺近年嚟講，佢哋就冇即係提供建議。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋有冇曾經提供過一啲改善專營巴士安全嘅建議？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）因為建議可能涉及立法同埋執法，同埋宣傳，咁據我即係所知，就冇特別講關於立法嘅意見，但係就係有一啲建議就係關於執法同埋宣

傳，咁目的就係改善巴士安全。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀啲例子我哋，即係曾經即係作出過嘅建議？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）例如我哋係分析咗意外嘅成因，例如係乘客失去平衡，咁而我哋係即係向道路安全議會作出嘅建議，就係主要係即係提醒乘客就係緊握扶手，咁呢個係其中一個例子。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係有冇任何其他嘅建議，係關於巴士嘅設計、安全裝置、安全帶，即係議會有冇即係作出過呢啲嘅建議？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇，我諗個原因就係喺過去幾年，整體嘅意外數字都係維持穩定嘅，即係就住專營巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁如果係咁，唔係應該更加即係作出一啲建議咩？即係意外數字係冇下降到喎，咁樣唔係應該更加係需要即係作出一啲建議？咁倫敦嘅情況，佢哋係有一個零意外嘅目標嘅，咁目標就係即係令到意外減少，咁佢哋就有個咁嘅零意外目標嘅。咁佢哋嘅意外率係下降緊，而佢哋亦都係有一啲嘅建議。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋亦都係有一啲即係目標，即係去--我哋亦都係有一啲即係建議就係減低呢一個意外率，就係所有交通工具意外率，唔單只係專營巴士。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁實際上，道路安全議會係咪冇即係就住專營巴士作出任何即係針對性嘅建議，即係除咗緊握扶手之外？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）正如我所講，呢個係一個即係宣傳措施嘅例子。咁道路安全議會就係有即係提供一啲建議去加強宣傳同埋執法，即係而喺執法方面，道路安全議會亦都係有一啲建議嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）邊方面嘅執法？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）例如係違泊等等，因為即係喺啲巴士站嘅違泊情況，因為就會影響巴士嘅營運。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時作出呢啲建議㗎，係？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我要即係睇番啲紀錄先。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以向我哋提供呢個資料？因為呢個就係即係一直以嚟，巴士公司，特別係九巴工會同埋車長即係嘅一個持續嘅問題嚟嘅，而係冇解決到，咁可能佢會覺得即係警方係冇咩興趣去處理。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）咁每年，道路安全議會即係都會係即係徵詢嗰一個嘅--一個重點交通執法項目，咁喺呢個項目底下，係有包括呢個違泊問題嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁請你畀一啲文件我哋，顯示警方係有就住巴士站違泊嘅情況執

法嘅。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我會去睇番啲紀錄。咁我唔肯定呢個係即係特別係喺巴士站嘅執法，定係一個一般嘅執法。

主席： I'm sorry?

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我就要睇下啲紀錄，睇下呢一個即係針對違泊行動係喺即係針對巴士站吖定係喺即係一般--即係其他地方。

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗任何嘅情況都--即係如果有文件，都可以畀我哋嘅。

邱國鼎先生： Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）陳大律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我想講下呢一個安全帶嘅問題，咁但係我見個時間就可能差唔多。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係可能唔係好適合而家講嘞。咁但係陳大律師，如果即係有嘢你想講，就請你而家講。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）喺巴士站違泊嘅執法問題，呢個就唔係道路安全議會嘅主要工作。咁正如你所講，但係呢一個就係工會同埋巴士公司指出嘅一個問題，運輸署係已經係有主動去做咗一啲嘢，係去要求警方係進行執法，我哋係有收到巴士公司嘅求助，咁我哋就會即係將呢啲個案轉介，咁然後我哋就會跟進下，睇下究竟佢哋有冇做到。咁可以咁講喇，呢啲嘅營運問題，主要係由運輸署處理，而唔係道路安全議會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋係有即係睇到你呢方面嘅工作，我哋睇到相關嘅書信，而警方亦都係有提到嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以即係舉一啲例子。

主席：（經傳譯員）我淨係想知道，道路安全議會有邊方面嘅工作就係同提升專營巴士嘅安全有關，咁但係我哋今日嘅時間就到嘞，咁多謝各位嘅今日嘅協助。咁我哋要求咗你提供即係一啲嘅文件，即係喺星期六之前，咁我哋而家就會即係休會，直至星期六繼續嘅。星期六我哋會幾點開始？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係朝早九點半嘅--9點嘅--10點嘅，應該係。朝早10點，唔好意思。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁我哋星期六嘅朝早10點繼續，多謝各位。

2018年10月4日

下午5時31分聆訊押後

Saturday, 6 October 2018

(10.01 am)

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS AMY TSE, MR PATRICK WONG, MR YK CHAN, MR WILLIAM SHUM, MR TONY YAU

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

MR DEREK CHAN: Good morning.

MS MABLE CHAN: Good morning, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for attending on a Saturday to help us take this evidence.

At the outset, let me explain the absence of Prof Lo. Prof Lo has duties at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology today, because they are hosting an Asian Deans' Forum of Engineers, and he is unable to attend, but rather than dislocate our hearing, what we are going to do is this. We will continue, and of course, and because we have a live transcript, we are able to -- and this is what we are going to do -- we are going to have this emailed to him during the course of the day at different stages so that he can review it to see if there are questions that he wants to pose and he can do that through me.

At the end of the day, of course, he will have available the corrected transcript, and we have an audio record as well, so he will be able to review everything

that has been discussed and, if there are any matters arising subsequently, then those are matters that we may find it necessary to pose in written questions.

But that explains, I hope, Prof Lo's absence.

I'm going to ask Mr Chan now to recommence the questioning.

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN (continued)

MR DEREK CHAN: Good morning, Ms Chan, and to your colleagues as well.

Thank you for providing to the committee yesterday some additional materials on matters arising from the hearing on Thursday. I would like to follow up on one matter arising from the new material provided. That is the material concerning the black box deceleration threshold.

Firstly, can I take this step by step -- can I firstly remind ourselves what the threshold is currently, and for that can I take you to appendix 2 to the report of the Working Group on Enhancement of Safety of Franchised Buses. The page reference is TD-5, page 1807.

Ms Chan, do you have appendix 2 in front of you?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: This was canvassed with your colleague Mr Chan during Thursday afternoon's session. Attention

was drawn to paragraph 4 of this new black box requirement, which says that the software for analysing on-board or downloaded data should be capable of reporting the following:

(a) Accident report -- vehicle speed profile at time interval of 1 second for the 3 minutes period preceding detection of a 0.4G deceleration."

There was a discussion on Thursday afternoon about the change from 0.2G in the 2003 requirement to 0.4G, which is what we see here now. There was a discussion on Thursday afternoon when this was changed and some of the additional materials that were provided to us yesterday evening relate to this change. May I just go through that change, and I also want to ask questions about the rationale for this selection of the 0.4G threshold, which we discussed Thursday afternoon, and the new materials throw some light on that selection. So I'm going to go through those two issues as I go through the documents.

If I can take it again in stages, firstly, I will go through the process of the change in I think 2005 to 2006 and 2007. For that, can I refer you to the new materials that came in last night. I'm going to go to a document headed "Annex C1".

Mr Chairman, I know we are probably both working on

unpaginated version.

CHAIRMAN: I have annex C1 in front of me.

MR DEREK CHAN: For the purposes of the transcript, the bundle reference now is TD-5, page 1853.

Ms Chan, I hope you have before you minutes of meeting of the Transport Department and CTB liaison meeting which took place on 19 May 2005.

There were a number of representatives present from the Transport Department. I take it from the names that appear there that none of the colleagues present today attended this meeting; would that be correct?

MR YK CHAN: Correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can go over the page, under the heading "Black box", paragraph 25 refers to the issue of retrofitting. At paragraph 26:

"Citybus mentioned that during the last Transport Department/franchised bus companies joint meeting, 2 suggested changes of the black box requirements were discussed:

-- The accident log of the black box should be triggered by 0.4G deceleration instead of 0.2G;

-- The accident log record should be 3 minutes with 30 second after and 2 minutes 30 second before."

And at paragraph 27:

"The Transport Department advised that they had no

objection to the suggested changes and would like to gather more feedback from operators."

So it would appear from this minute that 0.4G was something that was selected by Citybus; would that be a correct reading?

MR YK CHAN: Can you hear?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, we can.

MR YK CHAN: I understand that the subject was discussed in 2005. Possibly, it was arising from a request from Citybus, to see whether the triggering point should be varied because of the 0.2G deceleration.

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is "yes"?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It's Citybus' idea. Try to use "yes" or "no" if you can -- by all means explain afterwards. But the answer is "yes"?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: If you go to the next document, annex C2, you have an email more than a year later, on 19 September 2006, attaching the proposed requirements for the black box to be installed. And over the page, we see a draft requirement and in a table in the middle of the page we can see 0.4G being referred to in item 2 and item 4. So that's the position as at September

2006.

Can I then move on to the next --

CHAIRMAN: Just for the purposes of the record, because things have been redacted, who was the sender of this information and to whom was it sent? Perhaps, Mr Chan, you can deal with that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Chairman.

It appears from the first page of annex C2 that the email was sent by a Mr Walter Foo of the Transport Department; is that a correct reading of the document?

MR YK CHAN: May I invite Chief Engineer Shum to reply to this question?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: The email is sent by Mr Walter Foo who is one of the engineers of the Transport Department at that moment.

MR DEREK CHAN: And it looks like, from what is left unredacted from the recipients of the email, that the email was sent to the franchised bus operators; would that be a correct reading of the email?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes. All the recipients are the staff in various franchise operators, even those which are fully redacted.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, my apologies. I didn't notice that the letters on the left were not translated in

English, so, for the purposes of the record, the first line is the sender.

CHAIRMAN: I can work that out myself, but it's important that it's in the record because otherwise, when one reads this later, it needs more explanation.

MR DEREK CHAN: Certainly, Mr Chairman.

The next document is annex C3, which takes us to 28 March 2007. I hope you have before you the minutes of the 28th joint meeting between the Transport Department and franchised bus companies.

On the first page, you can see that those present from the Transport Department and also representatives of the franchised bus companies were also present, with their names redacted on the version that we have.

Can I then take you over the page to paragraph 5, which is the only passage on the black box. Under the heading, "black box data box data recording device", it is recorded that:

"The Transport Department advised that the functional requirements and specification of the electronic data recording device had been finalised and all bus operators would be updated in due course."

So that was the position as at March 2007.

Then the next document, annex C4, is an email dated 5 October 2007, which attaches the black box

specification. Again, can you just confirm that the email was sent by a Mr Steven Tse and he is a colleague of yours in the Transport Department?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And the recipients, can you tell us who they are? Because I only see a reference to KMB and Citybus.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: All the distribution, even in the redacted parts, are the staff of all the franchised bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: Why have they been redacted?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Because the email contains the names of the staff. That's why we redacted those, the name of the staff of the franchise operators.

CHAIRMAN: Why do you do that? What's so offensive about someone's name being there? Is this compliance with data protection? Is it really?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I think, when the staff redacted in the preparation of the response yesterday, I think they may not have the time to seek the consent of the relevant staff. We can certainly --

CHAIRMAN: So the answer is "yes"?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: This is because you are concerned about data protection?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's an extraordinary spanner to throw in the works of perfectly ordinary correspondence, is it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: We are working on a more prudent basis. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not criticising you. It may be the unintended effects of this legislation.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I then go to the second page of annex C4, which contains what I understand to be the finalised black box requirement, after what appears to be two years of discussions. Would that be a correct understanding?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So that's the process by which the black box requirement was changed.

Next, I want to go into the rationale of using --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that -- why did this change, if that's what it was, not find its way into the document that was issued -- a document of the type that was issued in August 2018? Why was there a 12-year delay before it found its way into that format?

MR YK CHAN: Chairman, on Thursday I mentioned already that the process of discussion and eventual change of this deceleration force took place between 2005-2007, and I think at that time the staff of the Transport Department actually recognised that the change -- the

new deceleration attributes have been taken on board, but --

CHAIRMAN: No. Please answer the question: why was there a delay of 12 years before it was put into the format that we now have, August 2018? That is the question, nothing else.

MR YK CHAN: I would say that the staff of the Transport Department at the time did not take the trouble or omitted to change these parameters in the specification.

CHAIRMAN: So it ought to have been done but it wasn't; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: In hindsight, we believe we should have done it earlier.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I want to now move to the rationale of using 0.4G as the threshold. We discussed this on Thursday afternoon. I'm going to start by reminding you of the evidence given on Thursday and then go to the new materials to seek your observations or comments on them.

Can I first take you to the transcript of Thursday's hearing, which is Day 19, 4 October 2018, starting firstly at page 54.

Just to give context to the passage I will be

reading, at page 53 there were discussions about why 0.4G deceleration was chosen, and can I pick it up at page 54, line 4, where Mr Chairman asked the question:

"Give us a real example; what does it mean?"

Mr Chan said this:

"No, the definition of this one is actually -- what it demonstrates is a deceleration force of 3.92 metres per second, which would be experienced by a passenger sitting on a seat would fall off the seat. So this is sort of a braking force that is large enough or deceleration force large enough to cause a passenger who normally sits on a seat and fall off. So this is a requirement specified in this equipment.

Chairman: So a passenger seated but without a seat belt would fall off a seat at this level of deceleration?

Mr Chan: Fall off the seat -- well, now, to put it more technically, there was no dislodgement of passenger from the seat in more than 95 per cent of the sample cases. So this is a probability of 95 per cent of the passengers would probably fall off the seat without a seat belt, if a retardation force of 0.4G is applied on the bus suddenly."

So that's the first part I want to take you to.

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on, which is it, no dislodgement

of 95 per cent, or a possibility that 95 per cent would fall off? They are contradictory, aren't they?

MR YK CHAN: I think I would clarify this point. It is the probability of -- 95 per cent of the probability of passengers would not be dislodged from the seat.

CHAIRMAN: Would not?

MR YK CHAN: Would not.

MR DEREK CHAN: That figure of 95 per cent is something I am going to take up with you in the article that you provided to us.

CHAIRMAN: So 95 per cent of passengers seated but without a seat belt would not be dislodged from their seat by 0.4G deceleration?

MR YK CHAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Still on the same issue, can I move forward a little bit in the transcript to page 61, and pick it up at line 3. The question from Mr Chairman was this:

"Can you answer this question: why was it changed from 0.2 to 0.4?

Mr Chan: The reason is that in 2006, when we discussed with the operators on this minimum specification, actually when we have meeting with them and assessing the performance of the requirement, it was come out that because the 0.2 really is a very, very,

very light deceleration force which will come up very, very frequently and doesn't provide any meaningful indication for monitoring purpose, and at that time we have discussed with the operators and agreed at meetings that the 0.2G version was changed to 0.4, but unfortunately, at that time, the number hadn't been changed in the specification, so this time we take the opportunity to update it."

So there's a reference there -- the point that I want to take from that is the operators are saying, "Look, 0.2 is too low; you get a lot of hits coming up."

Page 62, I'm going to read it from line 8, it's the question from Mr Chairman:

"This reference that you made to 95 per cent of people fall off the seat at 0.4G deceleration, is that a study that someone has conducted?

Mr Chan: From our search, it was a study conducted by the US Department of Transportation in 1977.

Chairman: Can you give us the details of that? Do you have that paper?

Mr Chan: We can provide it later."

Just pausing here, that has now been provided by the Transport Department at annex D of the materials provided to us yesterday evening. I'm going to go to that next, but can I just finish off reading the rest of

the transcript, because it's relevant to the point that I wish to take you to in the discussion paper. I will pick it up again at line 16, where my question was:

"Does the study that you refer to include the probabilities of standing passengers losing their balance at 0.2 versus 0.4G?

Mr Chan: Unfortunately, there is no reference made to the standing passengers, because for sitting passenger you have a proper seat and people will sit in a prescribed, defined area, but for people standing, that is another matter, because how people stand is really -- there's not much control and also there's no set form of standing. So, from that, we don't have any sort of equivalent deceleration force applied make reference to standing passengers.

Chairman: Yes, but we can readily infer by using common sense that they would all be on the floor, wouldn't they, if not through the front of the bus?

Mr Chan: Yes and no. Because it really depends on how people stand, and we actually specify in the buses there are lots of devices to facilitate standing passengers, holding bars and grips, and if people are doing the right thing when standing then I think the chance of falling down may not be as severe. But of course we understand people, they come on the bus

carrying their packages and walk around when the bus is moving, then that's another matter."

The point I wish to pick up when I go to the study is the 0.4G and 95 per cent issue and secondly, whether there is any scientific data for standing passengers.

For that, can I take you to annex D of the materials provided yesterday.

Excuse me, Mr Chairman, I will just get the page reference.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: For the record, it's TD-5, page 1862.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I will be working off the internal pagination.

CHAIRMAN: As always, so am I.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chan, can I first take you to the introduction to this paper, at page 9 of 28 in the top right-hand corner.

CHAIRMAN: Can you supply a paginated number for that, for future use?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The bundle pagination is page 1870, in bundle TD-5.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can just read the first two paragraphs of this introduction:

"Very little experimental research has been performed on the effects of deceleration on seated users of ground transportation. Of this limited research, only two previous studies have used live human subjects. In studies aimed at developing specifications for street railways (trolley cars), Hirshfield accelerated standing subjects at constant jerk rates of between 1 and 10 g per second. Participating subjects ranged from 11 to 78 years, 39 (87) to 107 g (235 pounds), and 132 (4 feet 4 inches) to 193 centimetres (6 feet 4 inches) in height. In the study, the foot movement accompanying loss of balance resulted in the opening of a sensor switch. Loss of balance occurred at 0.16 g for both forward-facing, unsupported males wearing low-heeled shoes and forward-facing, unsupported females in high heels. Loss of balance occurred at 0.23 g for subjects holding an overhead strap, and at 0.27 g for subjects holding a vertical stanchion.

The second study, by Browning, also measured only standees. Ninety subjects ranging from 15 to 65 years participated. Subjects could face either forward or backward and use a handrail if they so desired. Observer ratings of movement indicated that subjects reacted equally to acceleration (facing forward) or deceleration (facing backward). Ratings of 'slight

relative movement' occurred at 0.055 g for unsupported subjects and at 0.115 g for subjects holding the handrail. Safe emergency deceleration in excess of 0.2 g were postulated for seated subjects."

So it would appear from this that there were studies done even before 1977 on the effects of acceleration or deceleration on standing passengers. Would that be a fair observation, Mr Chan?

MR YK CHAN: Well, this is a short introduction provided in the report in giving a summary of what the author would observe, for which we don't have full access to the details of those studies. So, yes, as quoted in the paper, there were studies --

CHAIRMAN: But this is an academic paper.

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And of course there is a list of references, and if we go to page 19 of 20, or 27 of 28, we see the Hirshfield paper, do we not, item 1, "Disturbing Effects of Horizontal Acceleration. Electrical Railway Presidents' Conference Committee, September 1932".

MR YK CHAN: Yes, there were previous studies.

CHAIRMAN: And we have the Browning report. The Browning report is October 1972, and it comes from the "Royal Aircraft Establishment, Technical Report, Farnborough" in the United Kingdom. So both reports are identified.

The provenance of the statistics is clear.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: At this stage, I'm going to go further to another part of the discussion paper, but at this stage can I ask this question. Were these papers or studies considered by the Transport Department when they agreed to use 0.4G acceleration as the threshold?

MR YK CHAN: As far as I understand, these papers were not considered at the time when we considered to change the threshold.

CHAIRMAN: So are you saying that no regard was had to the effects of different levels of deceleration on standees, but regard was had only to seated persons? Is that what you are saying?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Why?

MR YK CHAN: The parameter adopted in this specification is the specification for the bus operators to develop their black box. At that time, we believed the sitting passengers -- the black box should be able to measure deceleration that affects passengers who are seated in the buses and those who are most secure.

CHAIRMAN: But why not consider the standees, who are going to be affected by lower levels of deceleration?

MR YK CHAN: Well, the passengers sitting on the seat, from

observation, would be more difficult -- well, since they are seated in confined, proper seating, it would be more difficult for them to dislodge, and if we can use the black box to measure the deceleration, which is -- we suppose it is the higher forces that enable to dislodge passengers from the seats, and this is the more serious incidents that we would like to look at.

CHAIRMAN: So what are you saying, that standees being thrown to the floor is less serious?

MR YK CHAN: Not at all, but I would invite Mr Shum to supplement further technical points.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, probably a good idea.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: One of the considerations is that for the seated passengers we seldom ask them to hold the handrail tightly, and we had a series of publicity advising standing passengers to hold the handrail or the other parts firmly when they are standing inside the bus. That is one of the considerations we believe to be taken into account when considering revising the deceleration rate from 0.2G to 0.4G.

CHAIRMAN: To be fair to you, you weren't involved in this decision, were you, in 2005-2007; is that right?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: No -- yeah, I am not involved in the discussion at that moment.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any more information than we have

here as to why this change was made, to help you answer these rather obvious questions?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: No, sorry. We don't have that.

CHAIRMAN: So you are doing the best you can to produce ex post facto rationalisation for the change; is that it?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just to round up this point, can I take you to another passage at page 26 of 28 of the same document. That's TD-5, page 1887.

Again, I will just read from the first and second paragraphs:

"The goals of this study were both to provide data to understand the influence of various parameters on seated passengers during emergency stops, and to obtain initial estimates of the emergency decelerations to be specified for transit systems.

These data indicate that seated passengers can safely experience deceleration levels about twice those reported for standees. A conservative estimate of the emergency deceleration to be specified in the design of transit systems at which 84 per cent of the occupants of an untilted forward-facing standard transit seat will remain securely in the seat is 0.47 g. To insure

retention of 84 per cent of the occupants of a side-facing seat, the best estimate is 0.41 g. And, for a seat tilted back 5 degrees (facing forward), the best estimate is 0.52 g."

Mr Chan, there's a reference to 84 per cent of the occupants in an untilted forward-facing seat. What I can't find is a reference to 95 per cent. It may be that I have missed something. Can you perhaps direct me to the part where the 95 per cent comes from?

MR YK CHAN: I will invite Mr Shum to reply to this question.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: In the "Discussion" section, the 0.41 deceleration rate is referring to the side-facing, and for what we are referring to, can I bring you to page 11 of this paper.

CHAIRMAN: Are you taking the numbers from the top or the bottom? Because there's a difference.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: That's the page with three graphs.

CHAIRMAN: But there are two sets of numbers. One appears at the top, and it says, for example, "26 of 28", but when you look at the bottom, it says "18". So which numbers are you taking?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: The page number is --

MS MABLE CHAN: The bottom.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So page 11.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes. Here is the top-most graph. In this top-most graph, there is the wording "95 per cent retention". Yes, this one.

MR DEREK CHAN: Is that the one at 0.42G?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes, referring to 0.42G. You can also notice in the X axis, there is an item, a figure, 0.4G. Yes, this one.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, if I understand the graph correctly, at 0.4G, 95 per cent of the seated passengers would not be dislodged; is that correct?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It's more than 95 per cent, isn't it, on the graph?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So what is it? 98, something like that?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: We can't have an estimate. That's why we quote more than 95 per cent of the sampled case would not be dislodged under the 0.4G deceleration.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: In the "Discussion" passage that I just read out previously, there was also a reference to the data indicating that seated passengers can safely experience deceleration levels about twice those reported for standees.

So it would appear, on the face of this study, in

the passages I just read out, including the passages read out in the introduction part -- it would appear that standing passengers holding onto fixed supports, such as overhead straps or vertical bars, would lose their balance at deceleration values of 0.23G or 0.27G. Do you agree with this observation on what appears in the "Introduction" part of this paper?

CHAIRMAN: Those are the results of the Hirshfield study, 1932.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, on the face of the figures put forward in this study, it would appear that the selection of a deceleration threshold of 0.4G would adequately look after the interests of the sitting passengers but not the interests of the standing passengers. Do you have any observations to this suggestion?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So does the Transport Department consider that more careful and scientific analysis ought to be conducted on whether the 0.4G threshold sufficiently protects the safety of standing passengers?

MR YK CHAN: Yes. I think we can do more to study, to find out how the various deceleration force could have an effect on various types of passengers such as those standing and sitting.

CHAIRMAN: The papers that we've been looking at were 1977, 1972 and 1932. Have you looked for papers more recently than that, academic technical research into this issue, in the last 50 years?

MR YK CHAN: That's what we have been trying to do and --

CHAIRMAN: You've tried to do that?

MR YK CHAN: We have tried.

CHAIRMAN: With what success?

MR YK CHAN: Not much success. This is the paper that we can find out.

CHAIRMAN: Again, you were somebody not involved at the time that this was discussed; is that right?

MR YK CHAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So when was this attempt made to look for more recent studies?

MR YK CHAN: In the last couple of weeks.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help us as to where you were looking? Who did you contact?

MR YK CHAN: We have our engineers to do the internet search and also dig out from our files and documents to see whether there actually was any material reference that we can make in regard to the study of this subject. So far, our searches on the internet and also other sources have not been very successful.

CHAIRMAN: So internet searches, your own records, and what

else?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: That's the only two ways.

CHAIRMAN: Have you contacted the excellent local universities, their departments of engineering, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, that is Prof Lo's university?

MR WILLIAM SHUM: In the past few weeks, we haven't done that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I will move on to the next topic, of seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, I rather assumed that you will be dealing with this, so I will be addressing you, but if you feel other colleagues are more suited to answer, please indicate.

Can I first pick up the seat belt topic from the working group's full report, because the issue of seat belts was dealt with extensively in that report. Again, for the purposes of the record, the full report begins at TD-5, page 1757, and I would invite that attention be drawn to section 3 of that report, which deals with the issue of seat belts.

I would like to start this topic by first looking at the position in other jurisdictions, firstly, and

secondly, what the Transport Department's historical position on this issue is. So, in respect of the overseas jurisdictions, can I first take you to paragraph 3.11 of this full report.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a paginated number for this page?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Chairman, the internal pagination is page 28, the bundle reference is TD-5, page 1788.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, I will just read out paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12. At 3.11, the report says this:

"Noting the divergent views of franchised bus operators, the working group has reviewed the prevailing overseas practices or requirements on the installation and wearing of seat belts on buses. Currently, for inter-city or cross-boundary routes, some overseas jurisdictions (for example United States, United Kingdom and Netherlands) have mandated the provision of seat belts for all passenger seats, while others (for example United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Australia (Victoria)) have imposed mandatory requirement of wearing seat belts. Nevertheless, for the urban buses or buses allowed to carry standing passengers, none of the overseas jurisdictions that have been reviewed thus far have statutory requirements for the provision of seat belts on passenger seats. According to the transport

authorities of those jurisdictions, the urban buses are typically used for short journeys, in terms of both time and distance, and undertaken at moderate speeds on urban routes. Thus, no seat belt requirement for passenger seats on these urban buses has been imposed. A summary of the findings is at the appendix IV."

And appendix IV is page 1809 in the bundle.

Mr Chairman, I think page 1809 simply sets out what had been described in the paragraph that I just read already.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have it in front of me.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, for urban buses with standing passengers, there is no seat belt requirement in those jurisdictions reviewed.

Just one minor matter of clarification. When was this review conducted in the context of this working group report? Would it be in the course of 2018 or before that?

MS MABLE CHAN: The review is conducted in 2018, in preparation and in the process of the discussion of the working group report.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you. I ask that because a similar review was conducted in 2005-2007. Before I go to that, perhaps I will just round off this part by reading paragraph 3.12 of the report as well. Paragraph 3.12

says this:

"The above review findings were also echoed by the three bus manufacturers who advised that seat belts were not required for buses travelling in cities in other countries, and that in Europe, seat belts are only required for inter-city coach without standing passengers and passengers on city bus tend not to wear seat belt due to its short travelling time. They also opined that the retrofitting of seat belt in franchised buses of Hong Kong could not protect standing passengers."

3.12, as I understand it, is a reference to the observations of the bus manufacturers that were expressed during the subgroup meetings of the working group that involved the bus manufacturers; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, with the 2018 review in mind, can I then move back in time to a similar review conducted in 2005-2007. With that, can I stay on the working group report and go to paragraph 3.2 to introduce that historical review, because it's referred to in the report. Paragraph 3.2, internal pagination page 23, bundle reference page 1783, says this:

"The TD has made it a requirement to install seat

belts on selected seats in the light of accidents involving franchised buses in 2006 and 2007. The Transport Department recommended that the franchised bus operators agreed in 2007 that seat belts should be retrofitted at the four front seats on the upper deck of all the post-1997 licensed buses to prevent passengers from falling out from the upper deck front seats. We have taken the opportunity in the 2012, 2015 and 2017 franchise negotiation exercises to make it a franchise requirement for bus companies to install seat belts at all exposed seats."

So that's a summary of the review undertaken in 2006-2007. Again, can I go to one of those historical documents in 2006 to illustrate the review undertaken back then. For that, can I refer you to the bundle SEC-1, page 266.

At page 266, I hope you have before you a paper prepared by the Transport Department for the Legislative Council Panel On Transport, "Safety of Franchised Bus Operations". You can see the date of the paper at page 272, which is October 2006.

Can I draw your attention directly to paragraph 19 at page 271, which appears in the section titled, "Seat belt on Franchised Bus".

Can I read directly paragraphs 19 and 20 for the

point of the overseas jurisdiction review conducted back in that time. Paragraph 19:

"We have conducted a research on overseas practices regarding the fitting and wearing of seat belts in buses. A summary of the corresponding seat belt requirements is at annex."

The annex is at page 273, but I will read on first:

"It can be seen that no overseas country requires fitting of seat belts in passenger seats of buses designed for urban use or for carrying standing passengers. Studies conducted in Australia and Canada indicated that the additional safety benefit of installing seat belt on all seats in a bus might not be as great as envisaged and that it is very difficult to ensure that all passengers will use seat belts.

In view of the above, we consider that it is not appropriate to introduce mandatory requirements for installation and wearing of passenger seat belts for franchised buses. However, we will continue to work with the franchised bus operators to identify measures for better protection of passenger safety."

So is it fair to say that the overseas jurisdictions that the Transport Department have considered have not changed their stance between 2006 and 2018 in respect of not requiring seat belts to be installed on urban buses

with standing passengers?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I would say that in the two rounds of review, the overseas experiences and practices as revealed from the review show that the overseas jurisdictions' stance towards the installation of seat belts remains largely the same.

CHAIRMAN: There is reference in paragraph 19 to studies conducted in Australia and Canada indicating that the "additional safety benefit of installing seat belt on all seats in a bus might not be as great as envisaged", and then the second issue, "and that it is very difficult to ensure that all passengers will use seat belts".

Can you give us references to these two studies, or perhaps there are more, Australia and Canada?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have the details of the references of the studies with me now, but we can certainly provide the reference afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do any of your representatives know to what studies this is a reference? I know the Australians, particularly New South Wales, have examined seat belts on a number of occasions.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And this is consistent with what they have had to

say.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: No one can help us? But you can in due course?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have those materials and the references, but offhand we are not in a position to quote the specific references.

CHAIRMAN: No, but you will provide them in due course?

MS MABLE CHAN: I will provide that, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, with that historical context in mind --

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, Chairman, my colleague Mr Tony Yau would like to add on the comparison of the stances of the overseas jurisdictions. Perhaps I will invite him to point out an observation in regard to the US.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Please do.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

MR TONY YAU: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Chan, you are right that for urban buses, the requirements are more or less the same between 2006 and 2018 reviews. But if you consider, except for urban bus, that means for some inter-city buses, there is a change in United States legislation. In November 2013, the US passed a new legislation, requiring seat belts for each passenger sitting position in all new buses, except urban buses or school buses.

CHAIRMAN: It's urban buses that we are talking about.

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We know, for example, that coaches in the United Kingdom, say going between Birmingham and London, they are required to provide seat belts, but buses in both of those cities are not. So it's the urban buses we are interested in.

MR TONY YAU: Yes, but those inter-city buses are more or less the same like our long-haul buses, that means from Hong Kong Island to NT, those buses are required to travel on several expressways, the high-speed expressways.

CHAIRMAN: And are there any speed limits at which those buses can travel in the United States? Because there is a difference between travelling at 70 kilometres per hour and being able to do 110 kilometres per hour, is there not?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a difference? Are they allowed to do high speeds?

MR TONY YAU: I think there is also a requirement for the bus running at high speeds in those jurisdictions.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. One can see the obvious difference. It is no doubt the logic, the rationale, applied to coaches -- coaches going down English motorways do so at

considerable speed, not at 70 kilometres per hour.

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, with that historical context in mind, can I then consider the current position adopted in the working group report.

Before I go to the details, I understand that the position is slightly different in respect of new buses and in respect of retrofitting existing buses, so I will deal with those two situations in turn.

Going firstly to the position with new buses, can I please take you to paragraph 3.4 of the report, which is internal pagination page 24, and bundle reference page 1784. Can I just read paragraph 3.4 first:

"As regards the installation of seat belts for all passenger seats on franchised buses, all three double-deck bus manufacturers (that is ADL, Volvo and MAN) have confirmed that it is technically feasible to supply new buses with seat belts for all passenger seats which comply with the aforesaid international standards if such installation is made as a procurement requirement. In light of this, the working group recommends that seat belts should be provided for all seats in future procurement of new buses. All franchised bus operators have agreed that all new buses

ordered from July 2018 onwards should be installed with seat belts."

So that's the position for new buses.

Before I ask the next question, I want to draw attention to another piece of information that may or may not be relevant to the next question that I am about to ask. That is the cost of installing seat belts on all seats on new buses. For that, can I take you to -- it would be good if you have the working group report open in front of you while we go to this other reference -- KMB-12, page 4887-5.

Perhaps I can go to 4887-1 first, just to give that document some context.

Ms Chan, at page 4887-1, you should have before you the notes of the second meeting of the working group, held on 23 April 2018.

Can I draw your attention to paragraph 16 of those minutes, which is at page 4887-5, and again I will just read out paragraph 16:

"After checking with the bus manufacturers on the feasibility for installation of seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses, all franchised bus operators advised that it was technically feasible to install seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses to be procured. KMB/Long Win supplemented that it would

cost about an additional of 5,000 pounds for each double-decker to install seat belts for all passenger seats. All bus operators agreed to incorporate this requirement in their new single-decked buses and double-decked buses to be procured."

The reference to 5,000 pounds' extra cost per bus to install seat belts on all seats referred to in the minutes, did that turn out to be a correct estimate, with the information you have now, compared to April 2018?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is the information that we are aware.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So it's correct, an extra 5,000 pounds?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: With that information in mind, my question is this: what has changed since 2006-2007 that led to the Transport Department making this recommendation for new buses? Has the analysis on the benefit of seat belts on urban buses with standing passengers changed during that time?

MS MABLE CHAN: In our working group discussion, the seat belt is one of the key areas that we have looked into. Before preparing for the working group discussion, the Transport Department has undertaken to conduct a further review of the overseas experiences. As I just answered

to the senior counsel's question, it appears to us that the overseas jurisdictions' stance towards the installation of seat belts for urban buses remains generally the same.

That said, we have taken this issue very seriously. There has been a number of discussions raised in the Legislative Council Panel on Transport, so we have to look into this subject very carefully. We consider it from different aspects. First, it's from a road safety and public transport safety aspect. Secondly, we also look into the technical feasibility of installation of seat belts for new buses and on existing buses. Thirdly, we also look into the cost and financial implications of doing this extra installation of seat belts for all passenger seats.

On the public transport safety point of view, we have actually taken this seat belt issue to the Road Safety Council for discussion and for seeking their advice. On this aspect, I will later invite Mr Tony Yau to supplement on that, on our position regarding the safety and protection that we think the installation of seat belts would provide to the passengers on board our urban buses in Hong Kong.

On the technical feasibility --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, when did you refer this

matter to the Road Safety Council?

MR TONY YAU: In April, Road Safety Research Committee, subcommittee, we discuss.

CHAIRMAN: In April of this year?

MR TONY YAU: Sorry, it should be July, July's meeting.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, by a paper or an email?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, paper.

MR TONY YAU: It's a meeting, it's a subcommittee meeting. We discussed by paper.

MS MABLE CHAN: A paper was submitted.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide a copy of that as well?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What date in July was this meeting?

MR TONY YAU: May I check my diary?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Take your time.

MR TONY YAU: 17 July.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Ms Chan, I think you were --

CHAIRMAN: I interrupted you, Ms Chan.

MS MABLE CHAN: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN: You were dealing with the first aspect, that's for road safety.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, on road safety and public transport safety, we have consulted the Road Safety Council, the

relevant committee, and presented a paper. But on this score, I would also ask Mr Tony Yau to elaborate a little bit more in a minute.

I would like to just cover the other two aspects. On the technical feasibility, in the working group discussions with the presence of the bus operators and the bus manufacturers, we have actually tackled the issue on two fronts. First is on the new buses. As revealed from the meeting notes, we have looked into the feasibility of whether or not seat belts can be installed for all passenger seats for the new buses to be procured, and we got confirmation from the bus manufacturers that this is technically feasible, and we also have the bus operators present at the meeting confirming that they would be prepared to take this into account for the procurement of the new buses in the future.

On the costing and the financial implications, for the new buses, the additional 5,000 pounds for each double-decker bus amounts to about 1.5 per cent of the total cost of a new double-decker bus. At the meeting, the bus operators considered that it is technically feasible and also operationally feasible for them to procure new buses with the installation of the seat belts on board for, for the new buses.

I think the next question will be on those existing buses.

We also go through the different bus models.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, for retrofitting, I'm going to take that as a separate topic, if I may, which I will be expanding on that, and then I will be asking for your views on a number of issues relating to retrofitting, if you don't mind.

MS MABLE CHAN: Sure. That's okay.

Should I invite Mr Tony Yau to say --

CHAIRMAN: I think it's more efficient if we allow counsel to explore the matters that he thinks are relevant for us. If matters are not a raised that you feel you want to raise, by all means do so, but can we proceed by a questioning method first.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, you have helpfully referred to three considerations. What appears to me -- and I may not be correct but it appears to me that there doesn't seem to be an attempt to carry out an analysis on the benefits, an objective, scientific analysis on the benefits that seat belts on all passenger seats may bring. Is that a fair observation?

MS MABLE CHAN: I beg your pardon?

CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing the issue of cost/benefit analysis, or only benefit?

MR DEREK CHAN: We have the cost here of 5,000 pounds.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. The question appears to be: you don't to have conducted a cost/benefit analysis. That's the proposition being put to you.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would not agree.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, just a side point --

CHAIRMAN: Before we move on -- what analysis did you do then, if you don't agree with that proposition?

MS MABLE CHAN: First, we have looked into the cost of the installation of seat belts on all passenger seats for new buses. On the other hand, we have also discussed and looked into the benefits of providing seat belts for all passenger seats for new buses.

CHAIRMAN: And what was the result of that analysis?

MS MABLE CHAN: We considered that the provision of seat belts for all passenger seats will render additional protection for the passengers on board the new buses, and on that I would invite Mr Tony Yau to just supplement on this aspect.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR TONY YAU: If we are required to do any cost/benefit analysis, we have to base on like-to-like comparison.

What we are concerned with is the safety belt is a protective measure. What others previously proposed, those in-vehicle devices, such as collision alert,

electronic stability control, speed limiter and retarders, they are all preventive measures. They are trying, via transport technology, to prevent accidents occur. But for seat belts, it's a protective measure. That means, after all, the accident still happens and the seat belt is the general measure that can protect the passengers.

So if we need to compare or do a cost/benefit analysis, we have to find other device that has the same protective performance or is in the same category as the seat belt. I am not seeing any similar things that can provide similar benefit to bus passengers and have the same protective measure during the accidents.

And considering the cost, during the working group we discussed with the bus operators, the cost is about 5,000 pounds per vehicle. We are talking about each new bus is over HK$3 million cost. That means the additional cost is only about --

CHAIRMAN: We've been told it's about 1.5 per cent of the cost of a new bus.

MR TONY YAU: Yes. So comparatively the cost is quite low, and the protective benefit is quite good, very significant.

CHAIRMAN: What are the incidence of passengers being injured while they are seated on buses at seats where

there are no seat belts? Did you look at that?

MR TONY YAU: There is some analysis but it is for private cars, the seat belt can reduce the severity of the accident.

CHAIRMAN: Cars are quite different from buses. Did you look at the incidence, the number, of passengers being injured or killed whilst seated at bus seats that are not equipped with seat belts? Did you look at that?

MR TONY YAU: There are no specific study on public transport --

CHAIRMAN: So is the answer no?

MR TONY YAU: (Shook head).

CHAIRMAN: But why not?

MR TONY YAU: We also discussed, as I mentioned before, in the Road Safety Research Committee, and I looked at -- we have mentioned it in the working group report, 5.10.

CHAIRMAN: The question is simple: why didn't you look at the number of people that are being injured or killed while seated at bus seats where there are no seat belts, as an indication of what the cost of the problem is?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, may I add?

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MS MABLE CHAN: We need to acknowledge that based on colleagues' evidence, we have not made any quantifiable analysis into the causes of the accidents whereby any

passengers without a seat belt will be more seriously hit. But I would like to point out the historical perspective --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, "why not" is the question; why haven't you done a quantifiable analysis?

MS MABLE CHAN: We have not done so and I do not have a ready answer, but I would like to point out --

CHAIRMAN: Let me try to help: are there statistics available? Have these records been kept? Have they been collated?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I don't think there are specific statistics collected or collated in this regard.

CHAIRMAN: None by the police?

MS MABLE CHAN: We cannot answer on behalf of the police.

CHAIRMAN: Well, you have access to their accident data bank, do you not? I'm not asking you to answer on behalf of them. Do they have any category of statistics that helps you with this?

MR TONY YAU: Chairman, in our road traffic accident statistics we issue to the public each year, we have those figures.

CHAIRMAN: But you have figures presumably that include cars. I'm asking about buses.

MR TONY YAU: We have buses.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. What have you got?

Perhaps you would like to consider this. I don't want to be unfair to you. If you need a bit of time to collate the information, do so, and we will come back to it later.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, since reference to the police data has been made, I am asking those assisting me to find the reference for the police letter that they sent to us very recently, that does have some data on seated passengers being injured.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it does. Yes, you have reminded me.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is this material on our internet, on our website?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, it is. I'm just getting it.

It may not answer the point fully.

CHAIRMAN: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: But at least it would be of some relevance.

May I please draw your attention to MISC-1C, page 124-561.

Mr Chairman, it's a letter from the police to this committee, dated 3 October 2018, in case you have that document somewhere else.

Ms Chan, I hope you have before you this letter from the police to the committee dated 3 October 2018. At paragraph 3, the police notes:

"Traffic Branch Headquarters could not find any record of any consultation from the Transport Department regarding the recommendation to install seat belts on buses in 2007."

And the rest of the paragraph talks about the meeting of the Road Safety Council.

Over the page, at paragraph 4, the police says this:

"The police have been keeping statistics on the number of passengers who were injured while seated on a bus and not wearing a seat belt. The figures were tabled as below."

We can see statistics were kept by the police in 2015, 2016 and 2017 of what appears to be passengers who were injured wearing or not wearing seat belts.

Has this sort of data been considered by the Transport Department when making the recommendation that seat belts should be installed on all new buses, when considering the benefit analysis?

CHAIRMAN: Or is this the first time you have seen this data?

MR TONY YAU: No, no, we are aware of those data.

CHAIRMAN: So you have seen it?

MR TONY YAU: Not exactly. They are usually in different presentations. But the figures, the source, we have seen.

CHAIRMAN: Did you consider it when making your analysis?

MR TONY YAU: Because currently those casualties, maybe the passengers are not -- no seat belt is provided to them, and for our proposals to provide seat belt, did it really concern with the security?

CHAIRMAN: No. The question is very simple: did you consider this data or not? Don't tell us what else you considered, but did you consider it or not in your analysis?

MR TONY YAU: We have not considered --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. "Yes" and no" are very simple words. Is there something more you wish to say about what you did consider?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, may I add that to be fair to my colleague, he is the road safety expert in the department. He has been participating in the Road Safety Council and the relevant subcommittee meetings. He has close liaison with the police. I think, in their experience and based on their past research and work, they have gathered and have access to the police figures. It's true that they have not considered the figures as tabulated in this form. So I think it's true for them to say that they have not considered such statistics in this presentation, but as Tony would just like to present and explain to this committee and

honourable chairman, it is their expert and professional analysis that provision of seat belts will provide additional protection to a passenger when seated on a bus.

That's all I would like to supplement. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We had a chief superintendent of police giving evidence here, and he reminded us of that well-worn phrase, "Seat belts save lives". That's not in dispute.

The issue is what is problem, what is the extent of the problem on buses what is the cost of fixing it, and that's all we are trying to find out.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Yau, did you perform any analysis, make any paper on this point, that can help us understand what you say you did, and if so can you provide it to us?

MR TONY YAU: So that's why, in our working group report, 5.3 and 5.4 ...

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer my question first: did you produce a paper addressing this cost/benefit analysis?

MR TONY YAU: No. I want to mention --

CHAIRMAN: Can you just answer the question: did you do so or not?

MR TONY YAU: We are going to request in the working group

report that those --

CHAIRMAN: No, Mr Yau. Please answer my question. I will give you all the time you want to give whatever other explanations you want to give. Did you prepare a paper that addresses this issue? Take your time to think about it. It's a simple question.

MR TONY YAU: No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, what else do you want to say?

MR TONY YAU: As mentioned in paragraph 5.4 of the working group report, that's why, for existing buses, that means the retrofitting of seat belts of existing buses, the working group recommends that TD, the franchised bus operators and the bus manufacturers to continue to work closely.

CHAIRMAN: Very well. That's what you wanted to tell us. We now know what you wanted to tell us.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, Ms Chan, my next question is this. It may be unfair in the sense that it asks you to explain what may or may not have been done by your predecessors, but my question is this. If the Transport Department considers that seat belts are so good, then why wasn't such requirement imposed in the 2006-2007 review?

MS MABLE CHAN: I cannot answer on behalf of my predecessors

of the review at that time and the position taken at that time, but in the course of the working group discussion, the Transport Department's point of view is that the seat belt would render additional protection to passengers, but whether or not it can achieve the effect that we would like to would depend very much on whether the passenger will use the seat belt, in the first place, and whether or not they are seated.

We know the constraints that may affect the effectiveness of the seat belt, but notwithstanding that we think that for new buses, the installation of seat belts is cost-effective, but it will render additional protection, while the additional cost is not significant. But I will address the retrofitting of existing buses in a later stage.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Before I move on to retrofitting, perhaps I can just make one side point.

In KMB's investigation report on the Tai Po accident, which was made available to the Transport Department on 12 March, so before the first meeting of the working group, KMB already indicated voluntarily that it would install seat belts on all passenger seats.

Can I just give a page reference -- I think you

remember that.

CHAIRMAN: Can we have that reference, please. And can we have it on the screen.

MR DEREK CHAN: KMB-1, page 114, paragraph 40.

Mr Chairman, 114 is part of the KMB investigation report on the Tai Po accident dated 12 March 2018.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We get that from page 98, which gives us the front page.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

If I can just read out paragraph 40, headed "Safety belts", which is in part 5 of the investigation report, titled "Other measures to enhance bus safety". If I may just read out paragraph 40:

"KMB has already requested its suppliers to install safety belts on all seats as a standard feature for new buses ordered after 5 March 2018. As for buses that are currently in service, where certain routes so require, safety belts will be installed on the upper deck of KMB buses phase by phase."

Now, it would thus appear that even before the first meeting of the working group, KMB themselves have already taken the step to install seat belts on all passenger seats.

CHAIRMAN: On all new buses.

MR DEREK CHAN: On all new buses. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

So my question is this. Given this position of KMB, to what extent did this position play a part in your working group's recommendation that seat belts should be installed in all passenger seats for the other franchised bus operators as well?

MS MABLE CHAN: First of all, I would like to say that the receipt of the KMB's report to me on 12 March was later than our email to inform the various bus operators on 6 March regarding the measures that we would like to study to enhance the franchised bus safety.

We have provided the committee with our email on --

CHAIRMAN: This is not in dispute. On 15 February, the LegCo discussion focused, to some degree, on seat belts.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So it's not surprising that you have put this on your agenda. There is no dispute about that.

MS MABLE CHAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: The question being asked is this. The fact that KMB have come to this decision before the working group ever met, did that play a part in you requiring that other -- or proposing that all franchised bus operators install seat belts on new buses? That's the question: did it play a part or not?

MS MABLE CHAN: We take note of the plan of KMB to request the suppliers to install safety seat belts on all seats

for their new buses. We take note of that.

But in the working group discussion on the installation of seat belt issue, we take our due diligence to look into the technical feasibility, the financial implication and the road safety perspective of this --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me interrupting, but to crystallise it, you took note of the feasibility, the cost, and the benefit -- the road safety perspective, you call it -- but that means the benefit to passengers?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I was going to move to the issue of retrofitting seat belts.

CHAIRMAN: Very well, but before we leave this topic -- can you help the committee as to this: what proportion of the franchised buses in Hong Kong does the KMB Group, if I can call it that, operate?

MS MABLE CHAN: You means in terms of the number of buses?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, buses. 4,000, from my memory?

MS MABLE CHAN: 4,000 out of 5,900.

CHAIRMAN: Well, let's call it 6,000. So two-thirds of the buses. The company running two-thirds of the buses has decided to introduce seat belts on new buses, leaving the consideration about what to do with the other

one-third, and you say of that, "We took note of that"; is that it? That's your evidence?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will take a 20-minute break now.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

(11.32 am)

(A short adjournment)

(11.53 am)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, if I may then move on to the issue of retrofitting.

Again, I am going to start by looking at the passages in the working group report that deals with the issue of retrofitting. I'm going to read more passages than before because I recognise that the issue of retrofitting is more complicated.

So I think, to do justice to the analysis carried out in the report, I ought to read a few paragraphs in full. Can I first take you to paragraph 3.8 of the working group report, internal pagination page 26, bundle reference TD-5, page 1786.

Mr Chairman, there appears to be something wrong with the screen. Ah, there we are.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Has that been resolved?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, do you have paragraph 3.8 in front of you?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm going to read out 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10, and pausing towards the end of 3.10 to make a few remarks, but I will start reading first. 3.8 is contained in a section, "Retrofitting of seat belts on existing franchised buses", and the issue now is retrofitting on the upper deck. 3.8 says this:

"Even though it would be technically feasible to retrofit seat belts on all passenger seats on the upper deck, there are other implications. First, it is expected that the weight of the bus will increase by 300 to 400kg and the passenger carrying capacity will probably be reduced by 7 to 8 passengers as a result of the modification. Moreover, the retrofitting and testing work for each franchised bus will take considerable time to complete and hence will affect the bus availability rate for bus operation during the process. Subject to the manpower available for the retrofitting works ADL and Volvo have estimated that the retrofitting would take about one week, requiring 3 to 4 skilled labour, per bus. However, since bus manufacturers have indicated that they could not provide the manpower and workshop

for the retrofitting work, the franchised bus operators would need to carry out the work by engaging contractors or utilise their own manpower and workshop. The availability of skilled workers and workshop facilities are critical factors in determining the time required for the retrofitting and testing work. Based on a very rough estimate, it would take about 6 to 12 years to complete the full retrofitting for about 3,300 buses.

3.9. In the light of the above, some bus operators have expressed concerns that the retrofitting of seat belts would not only incur significant financial implications, but also considerable time and manpower resources, not to mention the need to re-deploy or procure additional buses to maintain the existing bus service level during the whole process."

Pausing here, the reference to "significant financial implications" has a footnote 10 next to it, and at the bottom of the page, footnote 10 says this:

"In the absence of a detailed study on the technical details for retrofitting seat belts on all seats in the upper deck, a rough estimate on the costs of retrofitting a bus is about HK$200,000 (excluding manpower and overhead costs)."

So, pausing here, it would appear from this that on the cost side of the analysis, you are looking at

something like HK$600 million in order to carry out the retrofitting over six to twelve years. Is that a correct rough way of looking at it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Correct, in terms of a rough estimate.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may then continue reading from --

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so, what is meant by "excluding manpower and overhead costs"? What costs are they?

MR YK CHAN: Mr Chairman, may I answer this question? The cost quoted in the footnote only comprises the quote provided by the manufacturers on the equipment and fittings. In completing the whole retrofitting work, additional costs will be involved, including labour and other overheads, which is not included in this amount, at that time.

CHAIRMAN: So the manpower costs of the engineers who retrofit these devices is not included; is that it?

MR YK CHAN: It's not included because at that time there was no estimate about it.

CHAIRMAN: And what about the overhead costs? Is that something to do with the fact that the bus is out of action for a week?

MR YK CHAN: Another overhead might be workshop rental, things like that.

CHAIRMAN: I see. But what about the fact that the bus is out of action; is that costed into this?

MR YK CHAN: That's not factored into this at all.

CHAIRMAN: So that's an extra cost that's not yet calculated?

MR YK CHAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: So the 600 million global figure is plus, plus, plus; is that correct?

MR YK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may continue reading paragraph 3.10:

"In this regard, all franchised bus operators opine that, from their day-to-day observation, those passengers sitting on exposed seats do not normally wear seat belts. Seen in this light, the retrofitting works appeared not to be cost-effective."

Pausing here, I will ask you to note that this is something that I want to follow up with after we have read all the passages.

"On the other hand, they consider that public education should be conducted to promote the use of seat belts on buses. Amongst the five franchised bus operators, KMB and Long Win emphasise that they support the seat belt installation for new buses. Subject to the proposal from bus manufacturers, KMB and Long Win would retrofit seat belts on upper deck passenger seats or deploy buses with seat belts at all passenger seats

on routes which serve long-haul passengers or are operated on expressways with limited boarding or alighting activities at the en route stops. The remaining three franchised bus operators (that is Citybus, New World First Bus and New Lantao Bus) do not support the retrofitting works due to the expected low utilisation rate and huge retrofitting cost, and request for government subsidy should the proposed retrofitting be taken forward."

Now, again, just pausing here, there are references in this paragraph to franchised bus operators opining that passengers sitting on exposed seats do not normally wear seat belts and an expected low utilisation rate.

Am I correct that these sentiments were expressed during the working group meetings by the franchised bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, just to give this issue more context, this committee has heard evidence from the police, and Chief Superintendent Baker, on behalf of the police, indicated an expectation that most people would use seat belts.

Mr Chairman, the reference to that evidence, if I can just give it, on the transcript, is Day 17, 24 September 2018, page 48, line 20, and also at

page 50, line 13.

I understand there is an option of just retrofitting seat belts on the upper deck and only on the routes that involve using expressways, and that's covered in 3.13, so I will read that as well before I start questioning.

3.13, under the heading "Conclusion and actions ahead":

"Having regard to the operation of franchised buses in Hong Kong which involves mostly urban buses with standing passengers, the technical feasibility of, and the costs and time required for, retrofitting seat belts on existing buses, the working group considers that there are insufficient grounds to make it a mandatory requirement for all buses to be fitted with seat belts on all passenger seats."

Just pausing here, I'm wondering if it's a typo or an issue with the language, because I understand that the working group recommends seat belts to be fitted on all passenger seats in new buses, so should this sentence read, "There are insufficient grounds to make it a mandatory requirement for all buses to be retrofitted with seat belts"?

MS MABLE CHAN: I can clarify on that. First, for new buses, the working group's recommendation is that all the new buses to be procured would be installed with

seat belts for all passenger seats.

The working group considers that there are insufficient grounds to make it mandatory or I should emphasise that to make it a statutory requirement for all the buses, including both new or existing buses, to be fitted with seat belts on all passenger seats. When we make this statement, we are mindful of the various issues involved, which is still yet to be further examined and assessed, in particular the technical feasibility, the cost and time required for retrofitting seat belts on existing buses.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: So a distinction here is drawn between a franchise requirement and a statutory requirement? Is that a correct understanding?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is the first distinction, and the other distinction is that the franchise requirement is for all new buses, but we do not make a franchise requirement for all buses.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thanks for that clarification. If I may read on in that paragraph:

"Nevertheless, the working group recognises that as in the case of exposed seats and in bus compartment with no standees allowed, seat belts may offer extra protection to seated passengers. Hence, the working

group recommends, and all franchised bus operators have agreed, that the feasibility of retrofitting of existing buses for installation of seat belts has to be further examined. Subject to further assessment on the technical, operational and financial feasibility, consideration should be given to retrofitting all seats in the upper deck with seat belts on those buses deployed for specific bus routes, that is those long-haul routes which are operated via expressways with relatively fewer bus stops."

Now, at footnote 11, the working group report gives examples of what expressways are being referred to, and at footnote 12, the number of buses required for retrofitting appears to be reduced to 2,000.

Am I correct to interpret this as saying, under this option, again on a global rough estimate, we are looking at something like HK$400 million, plus, plus, plus --

MS MABLE CHAN: Correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: Going back, if I may, to the general statements that I have read out before about retrofitting works appear to be not cost-effective -- now, when you are talking about cost-effectiveness, is that expressed in relative terms to the benefits that retrofitting might bring to passengers?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Given Mr Chairman has indicated that the Transport Department has not made any quantifiable analysis on the benefits of seat belts, how is the cost-effectiveness measured, assessed?

MS MABLE CHAN: The statement that the retrofitting of seat belts on existing buses appears not to be cost-effective was made on the following considerations.

First, we notice that amongst the existing buses, not all bus models would be technically feasible for retrofitting of seat belts.

Secondly, for those models which are technically feasible for installation of seat belts, the installation of seat belts for seats on the lower deck would have implication on the structure and the operation aspects of the buses.

Thirdly, we also notice about the operational implications in terms of time and in terms of the labour arrangement, manpower and workshop arrangement, for the retrofitting work, which may have an implication and impact on the availability of the buses for the various bus operators to deploy.

Taking all this into account, the working group have carefully considered this and discussed with the bus operators, and as the senior counsel has also mentioned, in paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14, it is on this basis that we

consider, and the bus operators agree, that the feasibility of retrofitting the existing buses for installation of seat belts has to be further examined.

So, to answer your question, the statement that it appears not to be cost-effective hasn't undergone a quantifiable and robust cost/benefit analysis in that term, but we have required, and the FB operators have agreed, that the operational and financial feasibility have to be, amongst other things, further assessed before we consider whether or not the seat belts can be installed with -- the seats on the upper deck can be installed with seat belts and, if so, whether they could be applicable to those long-haul routes which are operated via expressway with relatively fewer bus stops on which there may be a higher chance for the passengers, because they are not getting on and off that frequently, so it would be on that basis that the promotion of the use of seat belts would stand a higher chance.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: By that you mean that the utilisation rate would be higher?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: Noting in your answer that more assessment is required, can I take you to an approach to this

cost/benefit analysis suggested by Prof Stanley and Mr Weston, and then after I have read out the evidence I will invite your observations on whether this approach ought to be adopted.

If I may first take you to the transcript of Prof Stanley's evidence. That's at Day 16, 15 September 2018, page 124.

Perhaps I can take it from page 123, just to give it some context. At page 123, line 20, you can see the topic is on the installation of seat belts on all seats, and at page 124, line 1, I was asking this question:

"So can I just start with a general question, that is are seat belts required to be installed on urban buses in Australia?

Prof John Stanley: No.

Mr Derek Chan: Is there a reason for that?

Prof John Stanley: The belief is that the mass of the vehicle itself is normally going to provide sufficient occupant protection in the event of an accident, such that seat belts are not going to add much more on top of that. There is also a challenge with existing vehicles of retrofitting and the cost of so doing.

The way that we would approach this sort of question in Australia -- and I don't know whether you might do

exactly the same thing -- is we have a process called a regulatory impact statement, and if we were looking, for example, to require seat belts to be mandatory on route buses, that would probably need to go through the process of a regulatory impact statement that would look at the cost of various ways of going about undertaking that work, and then do an assessment of the probabilities of various sorts of incident types being reduced, putting a dollar value on that, and coming up with a view as the basis of that assessment. That's the normal way we do this kind of assessment.

Chairman: And who does the regulatory impact statement?

Prof John Stanley: It would be done by the relevant government department. A lot of these sorts of things would happen at a national level in Australia, so they would be done by the National Transport Commission which is the successor body to the National Road Transport Commission that I was deputy chairman of for nine years. We did multiple regulatory impact statements into various aspects of vehicle requirements."

So that's one passage.

Another passage that I would like to read out in the same day's evidence is at page 144. At 144, line 4, my question was this:

"With all that information in mind, what is your observation or comment on the installation of seat belts, firstly on all the seats, and secondly focusing on the upper deck, where there is no standing passengers?

Prof John Stanley: Thank you. This really takes me back to an answer I gave maybe half an hour ago about the notion of a regulatory impact statement. I think there are two levels to this particular question. The first level is: is it technically feasible to fit seat belts in certain kinds of positions on buses, for example on the upper deck of new buses, on retrofitting for older buses. That's a technical question of feasibility.

The second level then is: if it is technically feasible, what is the cost/benefit ratio of doing that installation? In other words, what will it cost? That is the probability of particular kinds of accidents being reduced if those seat belts are installed? Will people wear them, is one of the questions that needs to be addressed in that setting?

I don't have a view in any particular circumstances whether it is a good idea or not. What I would say is that that's exactly the kind of problem that you should submit to a regulatory impact statement. There will be

information around on the probabilities of accidents, these different varieties. You can put monetary values on the probability of those sorts of accidents being reduced. You probably can form a view too on the probability of wearing seat belts, which would affect the effectiveness of the wearing thereof.

So I think this is an exercise that needs a serious piece of cost/benefit analysis done on it. Now, government may decide it wants to make a policy decision to install seat belts where it is technically feasible. That's fine. As a matter of course, the way I would approach this, though, is to say you need to go through this cost/benefit analysis first, and I think that's what should be done in this situation.

So, rather than taking it on the basis that people think it's going to be this or going to be that, the kinds of concerns that have been raised by the various parties are really genuine and legitimate concerns and they affect the values of the potential installation, but until you have actually done that proper cost/benefit analysis, it's just speculation.

If I had a gut feel, it's going to be that probably it's not going to be worthwhile, with extensive seat belt fitting, but that would be no more than a gut feel, and ideally this needs to go through a proper

evaluation.

Chairman: Because a gut feel is not good enough; you should do a cost/benefit analysis?

Prof Stanley: Exactly ..."

I will pick it up at line 9 again:

"Prof John Stanley: Exactly. In principle, it's a pretty straightforward cost/benefit analysis. Getting some of the values or the probabilities you need will need a bit of serious research, but the process and the sorts of things you need to look for are very much encapsulated by a lot of the responses that you have read out in the various submissions."

Then the rest of it talks about where you could get that type of information in Australia, which I won't read out.

Another passage that I want to go to, along the same lines, is at page 149, line 4. Again, I'm picking it up in the middle of Prof Stanley's answer which focuses more on the benefits side. Line 4:

"But then it's a case of what are the benefits, so then you need to look at what are the sorts of accidents that are happening in the vehicle, and, for example, is this happening to people who are standing; is it happening to people who are sitting; what is the probability that exposure to those sorts of accidents

will be reduced in the event that seat belt-wearing is required, and what do you need to do to encourage that seat belt-wearing?

If I was doing that kind of exercise, I would probably be talking to psychologists about how you would get through the message about wearing seat belts, about getting people to take this seriously. The point you make, Chair, about looking at what happens in those seats that are currently required to do it in Hong Kong, very important in terms of forming a view on the probabilities that will happen. I would be talking to whoever are the custodians of the values or the costs of different sorts of accidents. So, in other words, what is the cost of a fatal accident in Hong Kong, what is the cost of a serious injury accident, what is the cost of a minor injury accident, those sorts of things, because they will be the sorts of unit values you need to apply to the reductions in the probability of an accident of a particular kind taking place."

So that's Prof Stanley's view on how a cost/benefit analysis can be carried out.

I'm going to take you also to a short passage in Mr Weston's report about the London approach, and then I am going to ask for your observations. Can I take you to Mr Weston's report. The report starts at expert

bundle page 115, and the short passage that I want to refer you to is at page 148 of that bundle, internal pagination page 34.

Ms Chan, as you can see, page 148, the topic being discussed is the bus safety standard, and the context concerns what safety devices to include as part of the bus safety standard. I will just read the third paragraph from the bottom, the paragraph starting with, "Although it is currently envisaged". I will just read out that paragraph first:

"Although it is currently envisaged that the standard will apply to new buses (around 700 per annum) consideration is also being given to the potential for retrofitting to existing buses possibly as part of their midlife refurbishment which takes place around 7 years."

Now, Ms Chan, it's not talking about seat belts here. The next part is what I want to focus on:

"It is worth noting that TfL have adopted a rigorous approach to the assessment of each potential option using cost/benefit analysis to target the interventions which will give the greatest return for each pound spent in terms of injury/accident reduction."

CHAIRMAN: I think, to put that into context, it would be useful to refer to the second paragraph under the heading "Bus safety standard", where the various

technologies that have been examined are stipulated.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman. Perhaps I can read that for the record as well.

So the second paragraph under the heading "Bus safety standard" says this:

"Several potential technologies including intelligent speed assistance, autonomous braking, runaway bus prevention, pedal confusion prevention, acoustic and visual conspicuity, mirror design and frontal crash protection are being considered as part of this programme with both the costs and benefits of each being thoroughly assessed to ensure that the casualty reduction is maximised in return for the financial investment made."

So it would appear from the two experts' evidence that a similar rigorous cost/benefit analysis is undertaken in both jurisdictions. What I would like is the Transport Department's observations in respect of such an approach to the issue of retrofitting seat belts on franchised buses.

MS MABLE CHAN: Referring to the first expert submission, I notice that the reference that a regulatory impact assessment is considered necessary to consider any mandatory requirement for the installation of seat belts, and in this second submission or evidence from

Transport for London, Mr Weston, it mentions about cost/benefit analysis.

From the Transport Department's perspective, I would say that I agree that for any installation of in-vehicle device to improve bus safety standard, we would need to go through a robust and careful assessment. While we may not be referring to the similar terminology as in the case of the two expert submissions, ie the regulatory impact assessment or the cost/benefit analysis, the working group's observation and consideration of requiring further study on the feasibility and operational considerations and the financial implications of the retrofitting of seat belts also embraces the need to look at this issue in a more systematic and holistic manner.

As the chairman pointed out a little bit earlier, in paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14 in the working group report, we may not have mentioned about comparing this cost or implications with the benefit. As a forward-looking approach, when we take this forward, I agree that we would have to look into these operational and technical and financial considerations and compare them with the benefits.

Given the retrofitting of the existing buses for seat belts appears to be not cost-effective at the

present moment, and it involves a number of considerations, obviously, should there be any decision to make it a mandatory or statutory requirement for all existing buses to be installed with seat belts, in particular on the upper deck, we would have to look into seriously on how much marginal benefit we can achieve as compared with the cost and the technical considerations.

So, in short, to answer your question, I agree with the expert advice that if we want to go forward with a mandatory requirement, we have to go through some cost/benefit analysis or impact assessment.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: What about the suggestion from Prof Stanley and to some extent in Mr Weston's report about some scientifically-based quantifiable analysis on the benefits that can be achieved by the installation of seat belts? Do you agree with that observation and the need to do that in our present case?

MS MABLE CHAN: I agree, though I think a lot of work would need to be done in that perspective, because so far the buses, the franchised buses, in Hong Kong, we do not have such installation. So it is difficult to gather the data in this sense. But still, we can go further, to do some overseas research, and also we can do further analysis based on the accident figures in other types of

vehicles. But still the constraint would be those vehicles are not double-decker. On the other hand, we think it is also worth to further consider, because the protection and the choice that can be provided to the passengers would also merit our consideration of whether the provision of seat belts on the upper deck passengers is worth further consideration and examination.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, if I may, I was going to move into the topic of bus accident data.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but before you do that, there are some questions that I'd like to ask.

Have you obtained any data of the utilisation rate of the seat belts that are currently installed in franchised buses?

MS MABLE CHAN: No. No, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Sorry, I don't have the answer.

CHAIRMAN: Is that something that you intend obtaining in the future?

MS MABLE CHAN: That's something I would intend to do. I just wish to add that we also notice the view expressed by the bus operators at the working group that they are inclined to think that the utilisation rate of seat belts is low. I wish to add that while noting that statement, we don't think, if it is true, that the

current low or relatively low utilisation rate of seat belts should not be a key factor to stop us from exploring or examination or assessment of the installation of seat belts on existing buses, because I think this is something that both government and also the bus operators should do more in passenger education.

CHAIRMAN: We have received evidence from Mr Samuel Cheng, the managing director of Citybus, of his personal experience as somebody who travels a lot on buses that seat belts are not used. Do you accept that that is a fair assessment, not not used by anybody, but the very low rate of use?

MS MABLE CHAN: I notice his statement, although I do not receive similar statement by other bus operators' operations staff.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: But do you accept what he's observed? He says he goes on buses all the time.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I would just accept his statement, although I would like to add I also travel on buses all the time.

CHAIRMAN: Do you notice people wearing seat belts?

MS MABLE CHAN: I'm the one using the seat belt.

CHAIRMAN: Apart from you?

MS MABLE CHAN: I notice a number of people actually like to

sit on the exposed seats, like the front seats on the upper deck. On my personal experience, I have seen people using the seat belt.

CHAIRMAN: Would it not be simplicity itself to ask the bus operators to use their CCTV cameras to capture the use of seat belts? For example, those upper deck seats at the front.

MS MABLE CHAN: I think that would be a good idea, because the installation of CCTV on buses, the rate, I mean the number of buses installed with CCTV, have already reached some 80 per cent, and CCTV are installed on the upper deck, and I think this is actually a good idea that we can consider.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any intentions as to whether or not you would seek to have the use of seat belts made mandatory on buses where they are fitted?

MS MABLE CHAN: Should we consider this as a way forward, then this is exactly the point that I would like to make and agree with the expert observation that we have to go through a robust impact assessment before making it a statutory or mandatory requirement.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Have you considered the difficulties that lie in the way of making the use of seat belts mandatory on a bus, a double-decked bus, with only one bus driver, no

conductor? How is it to be enforced; have you considered that?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would not underestimate the issues or difficulties involved in an actual operation context, in particular the enforcement. We will certainly take that into account when we consider the operational aspect of examining the installation of seat belts on all buses.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: What about education? Is there any way TD can educate the public more on encouraging them to use seat belts?

MS MABLE CHAN: This is certainly an area that we can do more. We are actually working diligently on a passenger education campaign. There are a number of themes, regarding their attitude and their responsibility when on-boarding public transport modes. The issue of seat belt and the use of seat belt wherever it is available is certainly an area that we would promote further.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: In that context, would a mandatory requirement, leaving aside the issue of enforceability -- would a mandatory requirement to wear seat belts where available assist in the public education, drawing on the experience in public light

buses?

MS MABLE CHAN: In a way, it may help, but on the other hand I think that the enforceability and the impact -- because it will have to be enforced, and implemented by the bus operators. So we would certainly need to take that into account seriously when we move towards any step of making this as a mandatory requirement.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you just remind me, for my benefit -- I think we have received evidence on this, but instead of me digging around for the reference -- is the wearing of seat belts on public light buses a mandatory requirement under statute?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It is, is it not, and has been for quite a few years?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. 2005? I don't have the exact date. We can check.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We have that information. We have received evidence about this.

But perhaps this is the real point. When Chief Superintendent Baker was telling us that the expectation would be of a low utilisation of seat belts on franchised buses, he did so having already observed that there was a low utilisation on PLBs, and he also said that there were real difficulties in enforcement, and in

fact enforcement only happened in bursts when particular policemen decided to enforce it, but generally it was an unenforced law.

MS MABLE CHAN: If I may add that -- I noticed his statement, but I think it is always a chicken and egg issue. I think, if we have to consider any safety installation or device, to make it mandatory, we need to -- when we take this to the Legislative Council, it is an established practice for the administration to submit our assessment, including any impact assessment, to the Legislative Council for passing anything into the law. We have to support that with figures and with anecdotal evidence, with statistics. Whether or not it could be enforceable is also one of the issues that always our Legislative Councillors will raise when we put something into the law. But once it is agreed and passed in the law, I think it will be up to operational departments, like TD, and also the enforcement agency to make our best effort to ensure a law, the legislative requirement, is implemented to its fullest possible.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Earlier on you said, as I recall, that if the utilisation of installed seat belts on buses was to be made mandatory, it would have to be enforced by the bus operators.

MS MABLE CHAN: I think, in the outset, when a bus passenger gets onto the bus, no doubt a bus captain on a bus would be the first point of contact to have first-hand information and knowledge about the utilisation of passengers.

If something is written into the law, and it is always the law enforcement agency's responsibility. Should they receive any complaint or should they see this on the roadside, it will be in their prerogative to ensure that something in the law is enforced.

CHAIRMAN: The reason I raise that with you is because we had evidence from a bus company who said they couldn't possibly do that, there's one bus driver and 135 people on the bus, and there are two decks to the bus.

MR DEREK CHAN: Chairman, we appreciate and acknowledge the difficulties and the pressure on the bus captain. So I think, should we go along that path to make it mandatory, of course we have to be true to ourselves, to make sure something written in law is enforceable, and we would have to think of ways to help or equip our bus operators to help ensure that the seat belt, if available, can be utilised.

The usage of CCTV or the promotion campaign, all these will be considered in ensuring this, but I think at this present stage we will not take this lightly and

we are not anywhere near the stage of making the wearing of seat belts a mandatory requirement. That is why we are taking a very prudent approach here.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may move on to the next topic, which is bus accident data.

Can I deal firstly with the present situation, as it currently is. We have looked at the "Bus safety" sections of the forward planning programmes, which I will refer to as FPPs, of the bus operators on numerous occasions, so I'm not going to go back to them, but they contain a lot of data and analysis on bus accidents.

We have also heard from the police that the police do not have access to the data contained in the "Bus safety" sections of the FPPs.

Mr Chairman, the reference to that evidence is Day 17, 24 September 2018, page 19. I'm not going to go to it; I'm just giving you the reference for the transcript.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's Chief Superintendent Baker, isn't it?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's correct.

So, Ms Chan, my question is this. Prior to such data being made available to the public through the provision of it to this committee, had this data and analysis been made available to the public?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I will start off and then I will ask my colleagues to supplement.

Based on my knowledge and recollection, we have asked the franchised bus operators to make further disclosure of their accident data on an annual basis.

CHAIRMAN: When was that request made?

MS MABLE CHAN: I'm afraid that we have to provide the year in which this has been included as a franchise requirement. Based on my colleague's cursory knowledge, it has been for quite some years.

CHAIRMAN: It's a franchise requirement, is it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Franchise requirement.

MR DEREK CHAN: It's a franchise requirement to provide it to the Transport Department. My question is more towards disclosure of it to the public.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Let me elaborate a little bit.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Or, actually, perhaps it may be useful if I can provide a copy -- it's already there. On the screen is the New World First Bus Fuller Disclosure, 2017.

So, go down the page, at the bottom of the page, and go down. 13, I think. I think this is not the example I would like to refer to. Perhaps I can supply you with the page of the Citybus Fuller Disclosure, 2017 -- I can provide this page to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We have that in our bundles.

Where are they, Mr Chan?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, we do. I'm looking for it now.

CHAIRMAN: Just give us a moment.

MR DEREK CHAN: The document is contained in TD-3, page 906.

Ms Chan, is that the document you were trying to locate?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And what page, perhaps, if you've got the original, the internal pagination?

MS MABLE CHAN: There is no page on that.

MR DEREK CHAN: The page number is in the top-left and top-right-hand corner.

MS MABLE CHAN: Paginated page 909.

CHAIRMAN: 909? Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: The point I would like to make is the bus operator, they provide the accident data in their fuller disclosure report which is disclosed to the public. Of course, I would need to point out that the description and the outline of the accident data may not

go down into the further deeper level, which, as circumstances require, we may ask them to provide further analysis into more detail on specific causes of accidents. But this is the sort of accident data required to be provided in their fuller disclosure to the public.

CHAIRMAN: You're referring to paragraph 13?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, item 13.

CHAIRMAN: Have you had a look at the Transport for London's accident data on the internet?

MS MABLE CHAN: I have. It's more --

CHAIRMAN: You have seen how broad that is, how it's produced every quarter?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I understand that.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why we couldn't do that in Hong Kong?

MS MABLE CHAN: As we shared with the chairman, the previous FPP that we presented to the committee in May, on a personal account, I think there are a lot of areas that we can elaborate and enhance, and actually, in the process of FPP in the coming 2019-2023, we have also produced to the committee the letter that we have written to the FB operators that the areas that we would like them to further elaborate and analyse. With that as the basis, there is certainly scope for us to request

the bus operators to disclose in an even greater extent of the accident data for the public's information.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason why the "Bus safety" chapter with the accident data that we've seen in these forward planning programmes could not be made public, all of it? Is there any reason?

MS MABLE CHAN: Obviously, we haven't gone through that detailed discussion with the bus operators, as to whether or not that safety chapter can be disclosed in full. I just wish to point out that --

CHAIRMAN: Well, can you think of any reason that it couldn't be disclosed? There's nothing commercially sensitive about it, is there?

MS MABLE CHAN: In general, there may not be any immediate commercial sensitivity that I can think of in that "Bus safety" chapter.

CHAIRMAN: By all means take time to think of it, because I can't think of a single thing that would be commercially sensitive so that it might not be something that ought to be revealed.

MS MABLE CHAN: I just want to highlight one point.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Because when we asked the franchised bus operators to provide further information for the purpose of the FPP, not for the purpose of the fuller

disclosure, we have ventured into the area of asking the bus operators to diagnose the accident causes, say by bus route, down to bus route, or into very specific reference to certain bus routes. So I'm not saying that may be commercially sensitive, but I think we have to be conscious that should that "Bus safety" chapter be made as a fuller disclosure to the public -- I mean, the commercial sensitivity angle would have to be taken into account.

CHAIRMAN: Can you think of any commercial angle? I'm inviting you to do so. What is there that could possibly be commercially sensitive in a chapter about bus safety?

MS MABLE CHAN: I'm just thinking of it in a theoretical way, Chairman, first of all. Because the bus company is also required to advise and elaborate on their plans and proposals to enhance bus safety and measures to be taken, so the bus operator may put in some dollar sign on to some specific measure on to that programme, and also the timeline for implementing that specific proposal in the coming five years or so, as part of their investment of the company in the forward-planning exercise for the coming five years.

CHAIRMAN: In the "Bus safety" chapter?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask Mr Chan to take us to that -- in due course, Mr Chan -- so you can explore this issue. The question is, is there anything that could possibly be properly commercially sensitive in this data? Please come back to that later, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I will perhaps deal with that particular point after lunch.

CHAIRMAN: Whilst we are on this topic, is there any reason why this data, in the forward planning programme "Bus safety" chapter, could not be disclosed to the police? They said they would be delighted or happy to receive it. Is there any reason why the police couldn't get it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, on this front, I do not see there is any particular difficulty in providing this data for sharing with our close partner, ie the police.

CHAIRMAN: So can I take that --

MS MABLE CHAN: This is something that we can consider.

CHAIRMAN: You are only going to consider it? You can't say yes, they can have it?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think the best I can say is that we will consider that.

CHAIRMAN: You are open to discussing it, are you?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, just focusing on what is available to

the public --

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps, if I may -- because the safety chapter has been compiled and provided to TD in the context of the forward planning programme, so apart from providing detailed information and analysis, the primary objective is to let the bus operator inform and advise the government and administration of their forward-planning exercise, their investments, their plans, and all that. That's why I need to take a bit of caution here that I would not at this point commit the government on any specific disclosure of a particular chapter; although, as I answered the chairman's question, that the sharing of that "Bus safety" chapter with the police is something that is worth us considering.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I am right, am I not, Mr Chan, in recalling that Mr Weston recommended that this data be made public?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, I was going to go to that --

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps after lunch you can come back with that reference.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I was going to go to the recommendations a bit later.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, just focusing on what the current

situation is and then looking at what could be the situation a bit later -- in the hearing on Thursday, the Transport Department provided, during the hearing itself, a document entitled, "Contributory factors of traffic accidents" with a reference "Annex E" on the top right-hand corner.

I understand that that document has not yet made its way into the bundle.

Ms Chan, do you have a copy of that document? It's on the screen but do you have a hard copy of that document before you? A copy is being made available to you now. (Handed).

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: I'll just give the context of this document. This document was provided as part of a letter that the Transport Department sent to KMB --

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: -- on 21 May 2018, asking KMB to provide accident analysis in a similar format.

Just for the transcript, the page reference of that letter from the Transport Department to KMB is at TD-5, page 1728.

My question, actually, is quite simple. Has a table like this been made available to the public on a systematic and regular basis, going into this level of

detail?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR DEREK CHAN: To be fair, I understand that the Transport Department does publish road accident statistics on its website annually.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: And part of the information does relate to franchised buses. My question is more whether the disclosure goes to this level of detail.

MS MABLE CHAN: No, not to that detail.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, Ms Chan, before going to the recommendations and what could be the position, I just want to establish the passing of accident data from the franchised bus operators to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on to that -- just looking at annex E, given that we've been told about the considerable number of accidents that involve people losing balance on buses, which are the categories of driving behaviour that contribute to that, looking at this schedule?

I ask that question because when I look at "Stopping/starting negligently", whatever that means, but let's assume stopping with harsh braking and starting with excessive acceleration, that seems to be a very small number of incidents. So what is it that

contributes to losing balance?

MR YK CHAN: Mr Chairman, making reference to this list, I would go through probably one by one.

CHAIRMAN: Take your time for a moment. Take what you say is the big one, and then go down in scale.

MR YK CHAN: I would say stopping and starting negligently.

CHAIRMAN: But why are there so few, if that's --

MR YK CHAN: This is only one of the factors. Possibly to avoid collision, probably the driver's action is to try to stop -- press hard on the brake to avoid collision, that may cause the unbalance of the passenger on board.

"Overtaking/lane changing negligently", yes, certainly, that may cause passenger imbalance in there.

"Driving too fast" -- it may, but if you only drive constantly too fast that may --

CHAIRMAN: It's completely irrelevant, isn't it, driving too fast? It's the change of speed that makes a difference --

MR YK CHAN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: -- or swerving.

MR YK CHAN: No, so probably it is not a major factor to that.

U-turning, it depends on the rate --

CHAIRMAN: You don't see too many buses doing U-turns, do you?

MR YK CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR YK CHAN: But usually our routes will be tried out on the first hand, but when they really need to U-turn, then we should ask them to exercise caution. But U-turning may be one factor, because it involves turning direction with different speed, so it may cause imbalance.

Further down: "Failing to observe traffic signals/traffic signs", it may not be.

CHAIRMAN: Well, just tell us the ones that are, not the ones that are not.

MR YK CHAN: "Driving inattentively" may be one. "Lost control of vehicle" may be one.

CHAIRMAN: These figures don't really help us, do they?

MR YK CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Because if one was to start with this question, "We've got a problem with people losing balance on buses; what's causing it?", where do we find that information from?

MR YK CHAN: Perhaps we may do more analysis. I think we do have the consequence of the accidents, like whether, say, a passenger on board has lost balance and got injured.

CHAIRMAN: Let's just take that as an example.

MR YK CHAN: Based on that, I think we can do more analysis

on the cause.

CHAIRMAN: When that happens, somebody is injured on a bus because they have lost balance, they are thrown into some hard object on the bus and they are injured, does the bus operator perform an analysis of the circumstances? And there would be easy ways to do that: CCTV, to show whether or not he was braking because of a child running across the road, a car changing lanes. And then one could see if that wasn't the case, you might see that he had gone past the bus stop and was braking hard so he could stop near the bus stop. Is that kind of analysis done?

MR YK CHAN: I understand bus companies do carry out such investigations.

CHAIRMAN: Do they give you the results, the data, to show what has caused it?

MR YK CHAN: We do not receive those information for each and every accident, but for specific incidents or accidents, we ask for more detailed information of the investigation, they will provide us with the reasoning.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not asking whether or not you get data for each and every accident, but surely this information could be collated and they could say, "We have 200 people injured on the buses where the bus drivers are at fault, and these are the conditions that have caused it:

accelerating too fast, decelerating harshly."

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I will try to help while my colleagues are finding some specific evidence on that. I recall that in past years, say in 2006 or 2007, in their analysis of the accidents of passengers losing balance of certain bus companies, then colleagues have noted a rise in the trend and also the number of accounts, and they have asked the companies to investigate. One of the causes then was the lack of adequate handrails along the staircase and also on the lower deck. It was arising from the analysis then that we have required the bus companies to install additional devices in the bus compartment, to help to address this particular factor of, say, passengers rolling over down the stairs onto the lower deck.

CHAIRMAN: In what years was this data required and provided?

MS MABLE CHAN: My colleagues are checking. I think we have reported that in one of our previous submissions.

CHAIRMAN: There's no need to hurry because we have reached lunchtime. Maybe you can deal with that after lunch.

MS MABLE CHAN: I can quote the reference, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We will take our lunch break now and resume at 2.30 this afternoon. Thank you.

(1.03 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.31 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, I think before the lunch break both Ms Chan and myself owed the committee a couple of references.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I take them one by one, in turn.

The first reference that the committee was interested in was in relation to Mr Weston and Prof Stanley's views about making the "Bus safety" section of the forward planning programmes public.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The first reference for that can be found in the report of Prof Stanley, which is at expert bundle, page 67, internal pagination page 14 of the second report.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Again, if I can just read it out:

"The forward planning programme documents are understood to be confidential documents, as between the relevant franchised bus operators and the Transport Department. The author believes that the data and

analysis they contain is an important part of the process of an operator demonstrating their capacity to operate a proper and efficient service. The fatalities associated with these services are largely pedestrian fatalities, making them a significant societal or external cost of service operation. It is argued in section 4 of this report that franchised/contracted route bus operators need to be subject to performance pressure to help ensure they provide a proper and efficient service. Being publicly accountable for their safety performance would help to sustain performance pressure. There are solid arguments favouring publication of the "Bus safety" chapter of the FPPs, because of the wider societal costs of accidents."

Prof Stanley expands on this in his evidence, so I will take the committee to that as well. Can I refer the committee to the evidence of Prof Stanley on Day 16, 15 September 2018, at page 178.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I can pick it up at line 3. That is where I am asking the question, and I am asking Prof Stanley this:

"You make that point at page 69 of your expert report. At the bull bullet point of page 69 you say:

'There are solid arguments favouring publication of

the "Bus safety" chapter of the five year forward planning programmes, because of the wider societal costs of accidents.'

I think you were referring to a number of analytical statistics that relate to safety issues.

Prof John Stanley: Yes, Mr Chan. I thought that the discussion in some of those "Bus safety" chapters was really informative, and it is the sort of information that I believe, in the public interest, should be more widely available.

I'm referring, for example, to the kinds of analysis that was presented on the driving our links and how that affects accident performance, I think it was.

Chairman: Yes, and non-links, as I think it was established, between the number of hours you drive, the age of the drivers, that sort of comparison?

Prof John Stanley: Exactly, Chair. Accident rate by years of service, accident rate by hours of duty before the accident. I mean, I think this is really good analysis, and it shouldn't be stuck in documents that are only available to a few select people. It's really important information in the public interest, in my view, and it shows that there's some really good research being done, trying to come to grips with the challenges that are being faced in the safety sense and

it would give people confidence in what the industry is trying to do."

Can I then pick it up over the next page, at page 180, where Prof Stanley deals with Mr Weston's opinions on the same topic, so I can probably deal with both together.

Picking it up at line 16, where I ask this question:

"Yes. Mr Weston also makes a similar point, on the transparency of this sort of data. Can I quickly take you to that at page 153 of the expert bundle, and if I can just read you --" and can I drop to line 25:

"Paragraph 84, under the heading, 'Safety data transparency/performance'. If I can read it out."

Mr Chairman, what follows is an extract from Mr Weston's evidence so I will read that as well so I can deal with both Mr Weston and Prof Stanley at the same time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Reading from line 2 on page 181:

"'It is clear from London's experience that greater transparency of data necessarily the safety performance of the bus network not only leads to greater stakeholder and public scrutiny [but] it also leads to a sharper focus from both the transport authority and its contracted bus operators on the safety agenda. An open

approach to incident data leads to accountability.

Consideration should be given to what safety data in relation to the Hong Kong franchised bus network could be placed into the public domain.'

Professor, do you agree with that or do you have any other observations in that regard?

Prof John Stanley: I agree fully with that, Mr Chan. My view generally on the Greater London Authority and Transport for London is they are almost without peer in terms of availability of data and information, in a global sense, and they don't try [to] hide things, they try [to] put it out there, and warts and all are prepared to confront the sorts of challenges that that shows.

I think that really leads to a lot of confidence in that process, so I'm very supportive."

So those are the views of both Mr Weston and Prof Stanley.

CHAIRMAN: Can you provide the reference for Mr Weston's evidence? What day and page was that?

MR DEREK CHAN: The quote that I was reading out is actually a reference to Mr Weston's report.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Where is it?

MR DEREK CHAN: Expert bundle, page 153, which is internal pagination page 39 of Mr Weston's report, under the

heading, "Safety data transparency/performance", paragraph 8.4.

CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Hopefully, that deals with the first issue.

The second and third issues deal with the contents of --

CHAIRMAN: This may be an opportunity for you, Ms Chan, to respond about the issue -- if it's not yet the right opportunity say so -- of whether or not there is anything in this safety chapter accident data information that might be commercially sensitive.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I have been looking through past FPP safety chapter. It appears to me that there may not be a significant part of the information that may directly relate to the commercial sensitivity of the companies involved. I would like to add that open data policy and approach is something that Hong Kong government and Transport Department is also advocating. So more transparency, greater transparency of data, in particular on safety that is of concern to members of the public, is an approach and a direction that I think TD would actively pursue and discuss with the bus operators.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And when do you expect to be in a position to

make a determination about this issue?

MS MABLE CHAN: As mentioned in the past hearing, our working group will continue its work. It will be one of the topics on the agenda to explore.

In parallel, we are also working with the bus operators to improve and elaborate the various analysis in the safety chapter of the FPP reports. We will also raise this issue with the bus operators in the coming months.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Do you expect to be able to decide this by the end of the year?

MS MABLE CHAN: I may not be able to commit at this point in time, but we will try our best.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, as you will note from the evidence that I have just read out, there's a reference to the data being available in London being without peer. Prof Stanley said the view generally on the Greater London Authority and Transport for London is that they are almost without peer in terms of availability of data and information.

The London approach is something that I will come back to in a moment, and in terms of how we can learn

from that, and whether their approach is commendable here, but before I do so, perhaps I can deal with one more issue arising from the "Bus safety" chapter that arose during the evidence before lunch, and that is the issue about the cause of accidents in the "Bus safety" section of the reports, a particular example being raised is the issue of people losing their balance and what causes people to lose their balance.

Mr Chairman, this is actually covered, at least from what I can find, in two of the years of the "Bus safety" section, so perhaps I can take them in turn.

The first in time is the "Bus safety" chapter in KMB's forward planning programme for 2017 to 2021. That can be found at KMB-12, page 5320.

Ms Chan, I hope you have before you, at page 5320, the five-year plan for KMB, 2017 to 2021. Such a plan would be made available to the Transport Department around the middle to third quarter of 2016; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: Just on the issue of loss of balance and the cause of it, as an example, can I take you to page 5324.

CHAIRMAN: Just pausing there -- this plan has to be forwarded to the Transport Department by 30 June, has it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the Transport Department, together with the company, are to resolve whatever problems there might be by 30 September?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, you are correct.

MR DEREK CHAN: So if we can go to 5324, the paragraph that I'm interested in is 8.2.7, but as you can see the context of it is under -- it's contained within the section, "Accidents by nature", and it's one paragraph within a series of analysis, but this paragraph has particular relevance to the example that was being discussed in the evidence before lunch, so I will just read it out, 8.2.7:

"The majority of the accidents (52.4 per cent) were due to passengers losing balance while on the bus. More than half of these cases were caused by the bus braking in traffic. Accidents with injuries sustained as a result of different kinds of collisions accounted for 36.5 per cent while accidents with injury to pedestrians accounting for 4.3 per cent of all the accidents."

So, in this context, the bus operators have tried to articulate the cause of the majority of the accidents arising from passengers losing their balance. Is this something that you were referring to or trying to refer to in the evidence before lunch?

MS MABLE CHAN: The statement I have made regarding the observation of the accidents relating to passengers losing balance, that I am referring to, and the subsequent analysis and the action to be taken is relating to passengers losing balance.

The thing that I would like to refer to before lunch is that as an ongoing exercise, passengers losing balance has been an ongoing issue of concern to us, and in the 2013 franchise renewal exercise, whereby there is agreement on the franchise and also the exchange of the commitment letter, that we have required the company, as a result of our discussion with them and analysis of the accidents by nature, in particular of passengers losing balance, one of the measures that we have required the bus companies to do is to install and improve the handrailing along the staircase, double railing along the staircase, as one of the issues tackling particular incidents with passengers losing balance along the staircase.

So this is an ongoing issue of concern to us. The 2016 FPP has also highlighted the majority of the accidents relate to passengers losing balance while on the bus. So I think this is something that the bus companies and also the TD have always been concerned about, and we continue to take efforts to see what can

be further done.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, I want to follow up with you the Transport Department's monitoring of harsh braking situations, since you have mentioned that it's a cause for concern to the department.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do so, perhaps those who are not on their feet might assist you by finding the reference in the franchise renewal to a requirement that a handrail be fitted to the staircase.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: We can also refer to the --

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It doesn't have to be done immediately; at some suitable time.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Before I go to the harsh braking issue, Mr Chairman, I have referred to the 2017-2021 FPP. Perhaps I will just give you the reference to the same or similar paragraph in the 2018-2022 FPP.

CHAIRMAN: Of KMB?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, of KMB. The page reference is TD-1, page 180, that's where the report starts, and page 183 is where you find a similar paragraph.

At paragraph 8.2.7 --

CHAIRMAN: It's a replica with a slightly different figure

from the previous year.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The majority of the accidents is 51.5 here, as opposed to 52.4:

"... due to passengers losing balance while on the bus. More than half of these cases were caused by the bus braking in traffic."

That's the same observation as the year before.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, I see you are looking for something.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I am actually trying to identify the reference, as an example of the enhanced safety feature of double handrailing at staircase in our letter to the KMB --

CHAIRMAN: Feel free to come back to that at a suitable opportunity. Don't be distracted. I'm sure somebody next to you can help you.

Mr Chan, in the analysis that we have seen of this kind of accident data, is there not an analysis somewhere about the liability for accidents? In other words, 100 accidents but only -- I think this is the figure -- 75 per cent caused by others, 25 per cent by our bus captains?

MR DEREK CHAN: That analysis -- yes, it's in the "Bus safety" chapter for 2019-2022, which is the one that was handed in in August 2018, where they actually split the driver contributory causes.

CHAIRMAN: Whilst we are dealing with this topic, could we have a look at that? What is the reference to that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, the paragraph 8.2.10 on page 5325 refers to the statement that you recall.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MS MABLE CHAN: "The breakdown of liability in the two-year period is shown in table 8.3 below. For 79 per cent of the cases, the bus captains were not blameworthy. The pending cases ... are those pending for police action ..."

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, the bundle reference? Is that KMB-12?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's the following page.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: So we are still in the 2017 FPP.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It may be it's repeated elsewhere, but in this document liability is assessed at 25 per cent for bus captain.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I think Mr Chairman will recall the evidence, in terms of the 2018 FPP, the Transport Department issued a letter in May 2018, annexing that table that we have just seen on Thursday and today,

which --

CHAIRMAN: Annex E?

MR DEREK CHAN: Exactly, which separates factors caused by bus captains, and factors not caused by bus captains, and the request made to KMB to further break down accidents in that sort of category, which actually led to an even more detailed analysis in the 2018 "Bus safety" section that relates to 2019-2023. So that's where we get a lot of analysis in the next "Bus safety" chapter, even more detailed, that splits it into driver contributory factors and non-driver contributory factors.

CHAIRMAN: Where is the 2019 five-year plan?

MR DEREK CHAN: It's in the same bundle, KMB-12, at page 5011. That is where it starts.

For example --

CHAIRMAN: Give me a moment.

MR DEREK CHAN: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: For example, at page 5016, we see a similar heading, "Accidents by nature", and again you see the breakdown. But at page 5020 there is a new chart, "Accidents by cause", and it's broken into bus captains' blameworthy factors and -- the "Accidents by nature" part, there's no breakdown of bus captains blameworthy

or not blameworthy, and then at 8.2.3, there is that breakdown of bus captain blameworthy factors which we don't find in previous FPPs.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Ms Chan, can I ask you this. We are looking now at the data that the bus company KMB have been compiling. Do you know how it is that they compile this data; how do they determine liability or non-liability?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I'm afraid I do not have the ready answer.

CHAIRMAN: Has there been no correspondence when these kinds of figures were asked to be produced, "How is it that you are producing them?" Not that you're aware of? Nobody asked them?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is as part of the process that colleagues will discuss with them and get the analysis. I have to be careful, at this juncture, not to give you any conclusive or misleading answer.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly don't give us misleading answers. But somebody must know how this data is tested. Somebody at the Transport Department surely tests the data. How are you doing it?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on our knowledge, because regarding accidents involving bus captains, the liability, very often the accidents will have to be determined and

investigated through the police proceedings. Then they will identify which is relating to the drivers' fault and which accidents are not. Based on that information, bus companies will also differentiate those accidents by the specific type of causes relating to the bus captain's behaviour.

CHAIRMAN: If the bus captain is being prosecuted that would be a very easy way to say, "That's our liability", but I'm asking you: is that not something that you asked them, "How are you reaching these figures"?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not have a ready answer because the colleagues involved in the discussion with KMB are not the persons involved on this table. If you can allow us, we can perhaps supplement with an example to illustrate how we test the data with the bus company.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Auyeung.

MEMBER AUYEUNG: Maybe the other way to ask the question is the Transport Department gives those categories to fill in? So are these classifications identified by the Transport Department?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, based on my knowledge and the advice from our colleagues, this information is compiled by the company themselves.

CHAIRMAN: So the categories are their categories, not yours?

MS MABLE CHAN: Not our category.

CHAIRMAN: Frankly, looking at these figures, it's very difficult to understand how it is that 25 per cent of all accidents are caused by passengers losing balance, with those figures. Has nobody troubled to ask them what this all means?

Anyhow, perhaps you could provide us with an explanation for what action, if any, has been taken by the Transport Department, and if possible illustrate it with correspondence, indicating the enquiries that were made and the responses that were given -- if they were made orally, then it can be dealt with by identifying the conversations, the dates, the persons -- so that we can have an evidential basis for understanding this data.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, can I follow up with you the concern that the Transport Department has on the issue of harsh braking.

At the moment, how does the Transport Department monitor harsh braking behaviour of bus captains, if at all?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, I'm just confirming my understanding with my colleagues.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course. Please take your time.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, based on our previous submissions to the committee, the Transport Department has been asking the franchised bus operators to submit information on the number of random checks and how they monitor the black box administration of the franchised buses. So our monitoring is based on the information provided by them.

In the past few months, we have, in the course of the working group discussion, discussed with the franchised bus operators on enhancing the black box features and functions, and based on the updated minimum requirements on the black box, we are asking the franchised bus operators to provide further information on the event logs of the black box data as captured in their regular monitoring.

So we will continue to monitor in particular regarding the specific misbehaviour of the bus captains, including harsh braking or braking suddenly.

CHAIRMAN: What is the further information on the event logs that you have asked for?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, the event logs, as logged by the black box, will include vehicle speed, harsh acceleration, harsh deceleration. So different companies may have slightly different thresholds for the event logs and also for issuing real-time alerts to the

bus companies. So this is the area that we are working with the bus companies on allowing the event logs to be provided to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: The updated minimum requirements came in in August, did they not?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, there is -- yeah.

CHAIRMAN: So, presumably, this request for further information about event logs was made after that?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, corresponding --

CHAIRMAN: When was it made?

Was it made in correspondence?

MS MABLE CHAN: It is not made in correspondence, but we have met the Citybus -- I'm sorry, can I repeat again?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Colleagues, further to the issue and update of the basic minimum requirements of the black box, have first met with Citybus company on 26 September regarding the new requirements on the event logs and the submission of the data. We haven't done that with KMB but we are in the process of doing so.

CHAIRMAN: And were the Transport Department representatives any of the people who are present here today?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Amy, Amy Tse.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Ms Tse can help us as to what this new information was.

MS AMY TSE: We understand that KMB has been setting some thresholds for speed limit and harsh acceleration and harsh deceleration. So we welcome this initiative, so we discuss with Citybus, New World First Bus and NLB, to see if they could also generate this type of threshold as a way to monitor their bus drivers' driving performance.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: What are the thresholds that you understand that KMB have now set for speed limit, harsh acceleration, I think that's probably described as sudden acceleration, and harsh deceleration. What are the those thresholds?

MS AMY TSE: For KMB and Long Win, the harsh acceleration threshold is vehicle accelerates at a speed of over 4 kilometres per second, and for harsh deceleration, vehicle decelerates at a speed of over 7 kilometres per second.

CHAIRMAN: And speed?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, the speed.

CHAIRMAN: What about the speed?

MS AMY TSE: For speed it's vehicle speed over 70 kilometres per hour or above. For Citybus, we understand they are also using the latest technology to define the road sections with speed limits of 50 kilometres per hour and

with the aid of the digital maps --

CHAIRMAN: This is not the latest technology, is it? This is technology that's existed for years?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, I understand.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the way to put it is that the use that is now made of long-existing technology.

MS AMY TSE: Yes, it's their use of the technology.

And for other road sections with a speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour in the black box.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: And what was the result of your requests of Citybus?

MS AMY TSE: For Citybus and New World First Bus, they replied that they are willing to study, but they have a concern of what type of threshold to set for the deceleration and the acceleration, because the accident may be a bit complex, so they need to discuss with the unions to see whether a specific threshold could be set.

For NLB --

CHAIRMAN: Just before you move on -- sorry to interrupt -- but specific thresholds have been delineated by KMB. Are you suggesting that they were concerned about the thresholds that KMB had set?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, we share KMB's threshold setting information with Citybus and New World First Bus, and

they are willing to study it.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that. You said they were concerned about the thresholds that had been set, so are you saying they were questioning the thresholds that KMB had imposed?

MS AMY TSE: They need to study it before they make a decision.

CHAIRMAN: That was because they were concerned about the level of the thresholds; do I understand you?

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, can I add a word on that?

CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MS MABLE CHAN: In my recent exchange with Citybus, I wish to add to what Ms Tse has added, by expressing that they need to study and see if that threshold can be implemented in the Citybus case, the Citybus management is considering how it could be operated and then to consider the follow-up actions, if any, by non-compliance by the bus captains. So they are considering the operational issues regarding the applicability of the threshold.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: You mentioned that KMB already has a threshold system in place, and I think Ms Tse mentioned -- I'll just focus on harsh braking because

it's easier if I focus on an example.

Does the Transport Department know whether the monitoring done by KMB of harsh braking allows them to focus on harsh braking on an incident-by-incident basis, or what does the Transport Department know about that?

MS MABLE CHAN: What we know is that they have set the threshold, and for monitoring, because of the black box availability, of the black box function, the black box can actually generate exceptional reports of non-compliance or exceedance of the threshold. So we know that the bus operator is using this function to help them to monitor as well.

CHAIRMAN: So, as you understand it, KMB can use the black box to generate exceptional reports of harsh braking?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. The same also applies to Citybus and New World. They would also use the black box function to generate exception reports.

MR DEREK CHAN: It's your understanding, and I'm simply asking for the Transport Department's understanding, of these exception reports, do they identify individual instances of harsh braking?

MS MABLE CHAN: I cannot speak on behalf of the franchised bus operators but the black box function and technology and the generation of the exception reports will help them to monitor to a great extent how the bus captains

apply braking, either acceleration or deceleration. So I think they will have to take that into account in an actual operational context, to see if the exception report with the threshold can actually help them to monitor in a very effective way.

MR DEREK CHAN: So am I understanding you correctly that insofar as this aspect, in terms of what generates an exception report, the Transport Department leaves it to the judgment of the franchise operator; would that be a fair way of doing it?

MS MABLE CHAN: At the present moment, I think the process is ongoing, but we would certainly be very interested and we consider that it is also necessary and effective to know the threshold and how they generate the exception report, so that it can help us to focus on investigating the causes of the accidents, leading to passengers losing balance, because this is an ongoing issue of concern, and the hard braking has been identified as one of the key factors contributing. So with the black box function and the generation of the exception reports, we would very much like to pursue and look into this further in our working group.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may then move away from the issue of harsh braking and back into the more general topic of bus accident data.

We know from the evidence that the Transport Department shares a database with the police, that is the case management information system, and the Transport Department would obtain data and do its own analysis from that database. So that's one part of the information that's available to the Transport Department.

What I want to focus on is the other part of the information, which is the accident data from the franchised bus operators.

We know from the "Bus safety" section of the FPPs, the bus operators make available its own data along with its own analysis to the Transport Department once a year. So, leaving that aside, and excluding major incidents where the Transport Department would obviously require the bus companies to submit an investigation report as we have seen in the Tai Po accident, would there be any other systematic and regular reporting of bus accident data by the bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: I am checking some of my notes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. So leaving aside the "Bus safety" chapter and leaving aside major incidents.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would invite Ms Tse to reply on that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Tse.

MS AMY TSE: So each month we obtain the information from

the police, and we will analyse the data from the police, and if we find that the accident rate has been increasing or some abnormal situation, we will write to or we will discuss with the operators and find out the situation or any rectification or any things that have to be done.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I perhaps illustrate what I'm asking with a very simple example. Say an incident involving an old lady losing her balance in the bus, she injures herself slightly, I imagine not reported to the police, but the bus operator was aware of the incident and keeps its own records.

Would the Transport Department know about this incident, or would it simply form part of the accident data submitted under the "Bus safety" section?

MR PATRICK WONG: Mr Chairman, may I take this question? As explained by Ms Tse, what we did was for the incidents, we rely on the police cases which have been investigated. For those mentioned by the SC, at the moment we do not receive that sort of information, because it happens basically every day. So the answer is "no".

MR DEREK CHAN: I'm going to go on to the London approach on something like this in a moment, but before I do that,

can I establish one more fact about what the Transport Department does with the two sets of data.

When you have the bus safety data from the bus operators annually under the "Bus safety" chapter, does the Transport Department do any crossmatching between the two data sets that it receives, one from the police and one from the bus operators? Does the Transport Department do any crossmatching exercise?

MS MABLE CHAN: Based on my knowledge, with the involvement of Mr Tony Yau's road safety division and also the Bus and Railway Branch, I can confirm that in our preparation for the forward-planning exercise, we did look at the data submitted by the company and also we looked into the police data. We may not compare it one by one, but we will look at it on a trendal analysis, and if there is any obvious discrepancy then it is certainly the areas that we will question and ask for further analysis.

I can also mention that because the government has also representative on the management boards of the bus operators, on the board discussion they will also at times submit some information on the accident data. We will also look at that, and in preparation of our discussion at the management boards, our colleagues will also look at those regular accident data and then we

will also compare with the database that we have access to. Should there be any discrepancy or differences, we will also point it out in the management board.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So you don't specifically cross-check?

MS MABLE CHAN: We don't specifically cross-check but we will also look into and see whether there is any area of discrepancy and difference.

CHAIRMAN: Can you help me, at least, as to what it is that you mean by your colleagues on the management boards giving you accident data, if that's what you were saying?

MS MABLE CHAN: I am one of the directors on the management board. In preparation for the management board discussion, in looking at the accident data or the safety report submitted by the company to the board, colleagues will also have access to the data provided by the company and then we will compare it with the database that we have, and should there be any case that differs, then we will make that remark and point it out at the management board and ask them that they would have to make sure that their data should align with the police data available.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to understand: what role do these

government directors on the management of the companies' boards perform? Are you suggesting that they are a channel, separate channel, for information to the Transport Department?

MS MABLE CHAN: I would not say that it is a separate channel to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Well, what are you saying?

MS MABLE CHAN: I just would like to mention some forum at which there may be also availability of this accident data, and a government director being present on the management board would also have the opportunity to make our comments and observations on the information provided by the company.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: If I may, Ms Chan, then take you to the London approach. I am going to take you to a few documents so that we have a more complete picture on the evidence that we have on how Transport for London approaches the issue of data transparency.

Can I start first by going to Mr Weston's report at page 141 of the expert bundle.

Mr Chairman, internal pagination page 27 of Mr Weston's report.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The expert bundle, page 141.

Ms Chan, maybe I can just read bits of this out and then ask you to comment on some of them. I will be pausing and asking you to comment on individual paragraphs.

Firstly, under paragraph 6.2, Mr Weston says this:

"As part of bus operators' contractual requirements, they are required to submit comprehensive data relating to incident and accidents which have occurred across the network. This data is submitted through IRIS (incident reporting information system) although in the case of serious [accidents] these will be reported and monitored in real time through TfL's central control room who will work with other agencies to manage the [immediate] response to the incident.

TfL also publish STATS19 data which is the national data set of road traffic collisions involving death or personal injury. This data is compiled by the police and is published on a quarterly basis."

Pausing here, Transport for London appears to be working on a similar concept as the Transport Department here, in the sense that they have two data sets, one from the bus operators and one from the police, and it would be the data set from the bus operators which I am most interested in, in comparing what, if anything, Hong Kong can do to improve on this front.

If I can drop down to the second paragraph from the bottom of the same page:

"Every quarter TfL publish Excel spreadsheets listing all reported incidents which occurred across the network and include the following information for each incident -- route, date, operator, location in terms of London borough, injury result (treated at scene, taken to hospital), details of the injured party whether passenger, third party, their gender and, if known, their age.

TfL also publish, on a quarterly basis a bus safety dashboard which provides a narrative of the published data and trend analysis with previous quarters."

Over the page:

"This openness, and the associated increased scrutiny from stakeholders, encourages accountability from both TfL and its contracted bus operators for safety performance and encourages continuous improvement."

Just pausing here and going back to the issue of the Excel spreadsheet listing all reported incidents which occur across the bus network -- do you have any observations as to the utility of publishing data down to this level of detail?

CHAIRMAN: Before you ask that question, this is an appendix

to Mr Weston's report, is it not?

MR DEREK CHAN: It is a web link.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it's -- I'm asking you this question, really. I have a file that has printed out the data you are describing. Is that material in our bundle?

MR DEREK CHAN: I see that the secretariat has pulled up the table on the screen. My understanding is we have separately downloaded the data from the internet, but not having incorporated it into the bundles in paginated form.

CHAIRMAN: So you can illustrate it from what's on the screen?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It says "Q1, 2018".

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Perhaps I can just describe for the record what's being shown on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: It is one data set that has been downloaded from Transport for London's website, and in the page on the screen that you can see, it is in relation to the accidents that occurred in January 2018, and on the spreadsheet we can see each incident, the route, the operator, the borough, the injury result description, victim's sex, adult/child, victim casualty category, et cetera, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any information that goes off to the right-hand side, as I am looking at it? Yes, so there is.

So let's categorise, as we are looking at it -- are you able to see this?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What we call "loss of balance", they call "slip, trip and fall".

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And we can see the frequency with which they have that problem as well.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, my question was: do you see any utility in the context of Hong Kong for setting up a kind of reporting system and making public information to this level of detail?

MS MABLE CHAN: Perhaps I may make a few preliminary observations. The information set out on the screen, on the details of the incidents, as mentioned in Transport for London's evidence, is down to the very detail of the individual incident. I think, in the Hong Kong context, we are not yet in that position, to track down to every incident to that level of detail. At the present moment, we will have an established system to keep track of fatal accidents regarding the route involved, the operator, the victim involved and the driver involved.

I personally think that while we will advocate open data and transparency, so as to enhance the accountability of both the regulatory authority and the transport operators, the publication or disclosure on every incident with that detail may not -- while it may help to enhance transparency and accountability, it may also go far beyond the level of detail that the public, members of the public, may be interested to know.

I wish to point out also --

CHAIRMAN: But isn't that a matter for the public? If they are not interested in it they wouldn't bother reading it, but they can't read it if it's not available.

MS MABLE CHAN: And also, very often, the incident, once happened, there could be a lot of subsequent developments, regarding the situations of the passengers involved and the pedestrians involved. So I think, once we have to consider disclosure on an incident basis, the timely updating and ensuring the factual accuracy of the information in this format will also have to be considered, because we have to make sure that the public that has access to this kind of information can have correct knowledge of what happened in those particular incidents.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt that's what they do in London. Are you suggesting we're not capable of doing this in Hong Kong?

MS MABLE CHAN: No. That's why the third point I would like to make, as I mentioned the day before, we are also hoping to learn more from Transport for London and the Road Safety and Standards Division colleagues have arranged a visit to Transport for London in February 2019. This is one of the areas that we would like to learn more about the preparation, the issues and also the resources that are required and how they discuss and liaise with the various bus operators, and also to have to verify the data with the police department, so as to see how this kind of information in this format will actually help to enhance transport data accountability and transparency while not causing any complications in the disclosure process.

CHAIRMAN: What are the complications when looking at this bland information: the date of an accident, the route of the bus, the bus operator, the garage from which it came, the place at which it happened, the nature of the injury, male/female, adult/child, type of injury, and whether or not it's a passenger or presumably somebody else, a driver?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. Mr Chairman, I think the information here, tabulated in this form, will serve to provide members of the public a simple and factual account of the incident.

The point I would like to add is when we consider whether or not we would disclose or provide the information in this format, we will also have to consider how this information will have to be further updated or elaborated, once it is promulgated.

CHAIRMAN: What update do you need to make from this? A female is not going to become male. Adult is not going to become a child. The accident is not going to happen in another place. What's the update?

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, because in particular I notice that there is a column showing the injury description.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: My point is while this table will present a factual account of the injury description at the juncture or immediately, we, from the administration's point of view, also need to consider whether or not there would need to be further updates on the injury description and whether there is any development on that, because I think once the public get this information, there may be also further follow-up questions from the members of the public on what follow-up action has been done and are there any further developments.

So this is something that we would need to discuss further with Transport for London, on how to feed back

to this kind of information disclosure, if there is.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. May I ask that we have a paper copy of this page, so that we can follow for our records what it is we've been looking at, and could that be distributed to everybody.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Chan, you mentioned a moment ago Hong Kong, we, are not in a position to look at this on an incident-by-incident basis. But that's because the operators at the moment are not required to report on an incident-by-incident basis; is that correct?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: If we look at London's reporting obligations -- and perhaps I can ask you the practicalities of setting up that sort of system or the utility as well, and for that can I please take you to bundle MISC-3, page 1189, which is a publication from Transport for London, titled, "Update on bus safety programme".

Ms Chan, the passage that I'm going to take you to --

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment while I take a note.

Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: I wish to take you to page 1191.

CHAIRMAN: This is the November 2017 response of Transport

for London; am I right?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Chairman. And within the report there is a description of what the system currently is and what they hope can be done to improve the system. So I will be asking Ms Chan on both those aspects.

Ms Chan, at page 1191, the heading is "Bus collision data analysis". I'm not going to read out the "Introduction" paragraph. I want to focus on the paragraphs under the heading "Progress", because the publication starts off that part on a description of what their current system is, and I first want to ask you questions about that.

If I can just read it out first:

"We currently have two main data sets for bus collision data: IRIS and STATS19."

Again, we have established from Mr Weston's report that STATS19 is a reference to the police data.

I will continue reading:

"IRIS is used by bus operators under contract with TfL for reporting incidents relating to their operational activities. This includes collisions, but also slips, trips and fall and other safety incidents such as assault. Operators are required to report serious incidents within 48 hours, and all incidents within seven days. The system serves as the complete

and reliable single source of information on all incidents involving or affecting London's buses."

Now, just pausing here, comparing that to Hong Kong, we also have access to the police data, so in that sense it looks at least the same, but would you agree that the Transport Department in Hong Kong is disadvantaged in the sense that it does not have a similar data set on every incident from the bus operators?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, I would agree that under the current franchise regime, there is no such requirement on the specific report of specific incidents to the Transport Department.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. For the future, do you think it would be useful to require the franchised bus operators to have a similar reporting obligation? Because it seems to me, from a practical perspective, all it requires is the setting up of a computer system.

MS MABLE CHAN: I think this is certainly an area that is worth pursuing, and also, with the automatic data transmission, I think there can be ways to make this data compilation and transmission more efficient and more effective.

MR DEREK CHAN: And instead of receiving different data sets from different bus operators, you can have one common system that all franchised bus operators use to report

incidents; would that be helpful?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think it would always be helpful and wise to have a common set of template for data report and for data compilation, so that it can equip relevant parties to do data analysis and further investigation and for recommendation of any further follow-up actions.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Chan, before you move on, reference is made at this London update on bus safety programme to this being a requirement under the contract that the bus operators in London have with TfL.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of where that provision is in the contract?

MR DEREK CHAN: No. I have tried to make some effort to look for that, and at the moment this is the only paragraph I can find where the reporting obligation is set out in some detail. I can perhaps attempt to look for it after the hearing.

CHAIRMAN: No doubt that's a matter we could raise with Mr Weston.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Because it's presumably a simple contractual provision that requires bus operators to report incidents, including collisions, slips, trips, falls and other safety instances.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So it would be useful to know what it is, how they couch it.

If I could ask you, Ms Chan: this would be very simple, to say to the franchised bus operators, "This is what we want you to report. You can design your own template. We want the date, we want the place, we want to know adult/child, female" -- because age is clearly relevant to trips, slips and falls, as they call it, and London reports, as we do, that it's older people who suffer more, sometimes even sadly fatally, from those kinds of accidents. But this would be very easy to request of the bus operators, would it not?

MS MABLE CHAN: I think it is something that we can actively pursue, Chairman.

MR DEREK CHAN: The other advantage which I am getting on to, when I read on in this publication, is if you have an event incident-by-incident report from the operators, if the matter was reported to the police, you would also have the same data from the police database, which would allow you to conduct a matching exercise to see the quality of the information recording process that the franchised bus operators adopt. Would you agree with that suggestion?

MS MABLE CHAN: That will help in data matching and in

identifying of any discrepancy or exceptions. I think it boils down to the question of how to set the template and to identify major headings for the data template, and then we can get the various bus operators to come up with a similar set of categorisation and also incidents reporting.

So this is something that I think we can take the matter further and discuss with the bus operators.

CHAIRMAN: Presumably, the bus companies themselves require their bus captains to make reports of this nature?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Are you aware of the nature of the information the bus companies require?

MS MABLE CHAN: Because, as we have asked them to provide the data and the analysis by causes of incidents in the "Safety" chapter, it's actually collated based on their raw data and the accounts of the incidents. So we consider that it is not difficult for the bus operators, for the bus company, to capture these data in a more systematic way and report it to the Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: But do you know, for example, what KMB require their bus drivers to report when there is an incident, an accident? Do you know?

MS MABLE CHAN: I do not know to the level of detail.

Perhaps -- Ms Tse would like to add.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS AMY TSE: Thank you, Chairman.

We understand that bus operators will require the bus captains to report any incident that happens, say within the bus, if there is injury, then they should report to the police.

CHAIRMAN: So, if there's an injury, the bus captain should report it to the police?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: So the police reports ought to match 100 per cent to the bus captain's, if the systems work?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is this reflected in writing? Is it part of a handbook, for example? I think the bus companies have got quite useful bus captain handbooks. Have you seen this requirement? If you haven't, say so.

MS AMY TSE: We don't have the information in hand. We may have to check with the bus operators, whether they have put it in the handbook.

CHAIRMAN: We've got bus captain handbooks in our bundles, do we not?

Mr Chan, perhaps someone can look for that and we might be able to turn it up now; well, in due course.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Perhaps I can round up this issue or

this topic by looking at what remains for London to do.

Ms Chan, are you still on page 1191 of the MISC-3 bundle that we were just looking at?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: I had read out the first paragraph under "Progress", which describes what the system in London presently is.

The next paragraph under that -- I won't read it out -- describes the police data, so it refers to STATS19 being the old police system, and also refers to COPA which is an updated police system so I'm not going to refer to that.

Over the page, at 1192, under the heading "Future works", this is what Transport for London is aiming for:

"Work is being done to improve the compatibility of IRIS, STATS19 and COPA. A complex matching exercise is continuing to ensure better consistency and reliability of each data set. We are also developing a software system to improve the efficiency and accuracy of collecting IRIS data by enabling it to be automatically updated from bus operators' own various databases."

My question is this, Ms Chan: in terms of looking into the future, should this type of synergy between different data sets be something that Hong Kong should be aiming for in terms of its bus accidents, data

collection and reporting process?

MS MABLE CHAN: Certainly, I think this will be an area that we would hope we can achieve, especially with the improved consistency and reliability of different data sets.

At the present moment, the various bus operators, they keep track of the data, while we have asked them to try to categorise the accident data in terms of the nature and the contributory factors, the description may not be exactly the same as what the police department has done.

I think a common and consistent data set with more frequent updates, say in an automatic way, I think will certainly help the relevant parties to have better articulation and also diagnosis of the issues of concern and then the corresponding follow-up actions.

Also, I would like to add that the expert evidence/submission in this regard actually demonstrates the complexity involved in accidents, in the contributory factors to the accidents, very often the accidents can be contributed by various factors, and the diagnosis of the accidents very often would have to come after thorough investigation by the police and also judicial proceedings.

But, in any event, it will not stop us from trying

to get the first-hand information and categorisation of the incident data from the various bus companies.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, that completes the topics that I have to cover, but before I sit down can I come back to you on this operations handbook, staff handbook, because those assisting me have very helpfully given me the reference already, and I think I can provide an answer to the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can I refer the committee to bundle KMB-8A, page 3086. It's showing up on the screen at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: What is being shown on the screen is the first page of the document from Kowloon Motor Bus, headed, "Outdoor operations staff handbook", and the bottom of the page states that the last update is January 2018.

The relevant part dealing with the procedures when encountering a traffic accident can be found at page 3123 of the bundle.

Volume 8A, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Page 3123.

Under part nine, the handbook says this:

"If a staff member is involved in a traffic accident

while driving company vehicle, he/she should fill in and submit the 'traffic Accident Report' with letter of authorisation within 72 hours of the accident (hospitalised staff should submit the report as soon as possible after discharged from hospital). Please pay attention to the followings", and there's some detail about the description of the report.

After the items 1, 2, 3 and 4, it says:

"The completed 'Traffic accident report' should be submitted to the designated duty dispatch sections of respective depot and countersigned by staff members who collect the report. Any staff members who fail to submit the report on time will have to bear the consequences and will be disqualified from receiving the 'bus captain good services bonus'. Moreover, the company also considers taking disciplinary action against the staff member for non-compliance."

Mr Chairman, I won't read on, but I think the point to take from this is there is no express obligation or direction to the staff to report the matter to the police, although there is a reference to providing a statement made to the police to the legal department, at the third bullet point from the bottom.

CHAIRMAN: Does this handbook contain the traffic accident report?

MR DEREK CHAN: Not in the version that we have in the bundle.

CHAIRMAN: In that case, may I ask that we make a request of KMB to provide us with whatever this document is so that we can see the detail that is required in this report. That would help the Transport Department know what information should be available in KMB.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. Mr Chairman, on that note, if I may hand over the questioning to Ms Wong.

CHAIRMAN: Not just yet, Mr Chan.

I'd like you to pursue, if you would, the issue of harsh braking and the information that we've received from KMB as to what they do with these reports, and then to take us to one of their so-called four-minute accumulated total, so we can see how they gather the data.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

For that purpose, Ms Chan, I think it would be useful for you to have two documents together. Can I first ask you to have before you KMB-12, page 4848. Also, can I ask for the secretariat's assistance in providing the page reference for a recent submission from KMB dated 3 October 2018, which I have in an unpaginated form.

CHAIRMAN: Then you have the same version as I have. We can

work from that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I'm trying to give a reference so that Ms Chan can also have a copy of that before her.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: KMB-1, page 571.

Again, just to clarify, what I wish to have before you, Ms Chan, is firstly KMB-12, page 4848, which is a harsh braking exception report provided to us by KMB; and also KMB-1, page 571, which is a submission from KMB which describes how that harsh braking exception report had been generated. So that's why I want these two documents side by side.

Page 4848 is a Chinese version of the harsh braking report.

Mr Chairman, the English translation is at page 4851. Perhaps I can use the translated version for convenience.

Just reading the table for the moment, Ms Chan, you see that the table heading, "BC performance from 6 February to 12 Feb", so about a week, and the harsh braking -- in the heading -- is said to have accumulated more than four minutes.

If you look at the fourth column from the left, the "harsh brake accumulated" is described as "deceleration more than 8 kilometres per hour". So this is what the

table looks like.

With that table in mind, can I ask you to look at KMB's description of how this harsh braking report is generated.

For that, can I ask you to look at the submission from KMB at paragraph 3(B), firstly, page 572.

CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, the document that we've been looking at on page 4848, is this a document that's come to us from Kowloon Motor Bus?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: And it comes from their records?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It's not a document that is sent to the Transport Department?

MR DEREK CHAN: Not as far as I understand, because this is the exception report that KMB generates for themselves.

CHAIRMAN: Let's ask: the document at 4848, is that sent to the Transport Department, that kind of document, or not?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So this is a KMB internal record.

MR DEREK CHAN: Under paragraph 3(B), page 572, KMB sets out, The criteria for generating weekly bus captain performance reports are as follows". So the first bit deals with speeding; the second bit deals with sudden acceleration; the third bit, over the page, deals with

harsh braking. If I can just read that out, under the heading "Harsh braking":

"BC's name will be shown in the BC performance reports when the accumulated duration of harsh braking (that is for any particular second, the decrease in speed compared with the speed of the preceding second exceeds 7 kilometres per hour) ..."

And if you look at footnote 3 at the bottom:

"The threshold was set at 8 km/hr per second prior to 1 August 2018."

That's why we see the reference to 8 kilometres per hour in the table.

Continuing reading from the top:

"... recorded by the black boxes of all buses driven by that BC during a particular week is more than 4 minutes."

At paragraph 6, KMB says this:

"The causes of BCs' sudden acceleration and harsh braking vary, for example, they might do so due to actual traffic conditions at such particular time. Accordingly, KMB and Long Win's approach is to monitor the bus captains' driving behaviour first instead of taking immediate investigation and follow-up actions. KMB and LWB thus do not have the practice of generating detailed incident-based reports for sudden acceleration

and harsh braking. Further, the number of entries would be numerous if such detailed reports were generated. For example, an aggregation of 60 minutes (that is 3,600 seconds) of sudden acceleration by one BC would create at least 3,600 entries in the report while an aggregate of 4 minutes (that is 240 seconds) of harsh braking by one BC would create at least 240 entries. Given the massive volume of data involved, the information technology department of KMB and LWB has made their best effort in conducting manual analysis of the relevant data to generate irregular detailed reports (with the adoption of BC performance report standard) in response to the requests of IRC as explained below."

So, Ms Chan, just to give you some context, KMB also provided other data pursuant to this manual effort for the purposes of the committee, so I'm not going to go into that more.

CHAIRMAN: I'd like you to go to that, because one sees what four minutes of accumulated braking actually means. This is done over one week, 240 seconds, and as one can imagine and as you will see, you don't do harsh braking for 20 seconds in a row, because you would be stationary after several seconds. So we get a measure of how often this harsh braking is happening.

Mr Chan, perhaps you can go to the first of the

pages. It's annex 1(b)(1) -- it's page 1 of 16.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I think that's already on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Perhaps we could have this printed out for the benefit of the Transport Department. Is this in hard-copy form that would be available to them in a file that is with them?

MR DEREK CHAN: I certainly looked at it as a soft copy on my computer because it was quite long. I didn't cause that to be printed out.

CHAIRMAN: I have a hard copy here myself, so presumably hard copies have been produced.

There's a lot of pages on sudden acceleration and there are fewer pages on harsh braking.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The report on harsh braking begins at page 5578 of KMB-12.

Ms Chan, I hope you have before you a document -- there's a heading on the top left-hand corner of the page which says "Annex 1(b)(i) harsh braking report for selected BCs".

Ms Chan, just to give you some context, according to the KMB submissions, this is not a document that is regularly generated by KMB themselves. It's a document that they generated at the request of the committee, to look at the individual instances of harsh braking that make up a four-minute entry which then appears in their

regular exception report.

Ms Chan, what you can see is that this set of records at the bottom comprises of 18 pages and you will be looking at the first page, at 5578. All these records relates to an employee number 3965, and if you look across the page you can see a number of information about the route, the time, the date, and the speed deceleration.

CHAIRMAN: Have we been given any explanation for some of these abbreviations, for example "ba_value"?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. The explanation is actually at the written submission we have just been looking at, at KMB-1.

CHAIRMAN: So what is "ba_value"? I think we can do it by deductive logic.

MR DEREK CHAN: The ba_value, according to KMB, and this is in footnote 4 of the submission we have been looking at, the item "ba_value" refers to brake deceleration value which is calculated by comparing the speed of a particular time with the speed of the preceding second. So that is the speed difference.

CHAIRMAN: So the speed at 06:05:45 was 5.8 kilometres per hour, and that had come about because the vehicle had been braked by 9.5 kilometres per hour from the previous second; is that it?

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, that's correct, Mr Chairman.

Ms Chan, from 5578 to 5586, you can see the entries generated for employee 3965. Then, on that page, you can see the employee number then changes to 63287.

CHAIRMAN: Do we know what the accumulated total of this particular driver's harsh braking was?

MR DEREK CHAN: According to KMB submission, at paragraph 7(b) that we have just been looking at -- I will read it out:

"The detailed record of harsh braking for BC with employee number 3965 (401 entries entailing 6.68 minutes of harsh braking) ..."

So that's for 3965.

"... and BC with employee number 63287 (395 entries totalling 6.58 minutes of harsh braking) ..."

Ms Chan, I think you can see 63287 from page 5586 down to 5595, comprising, as I said, 395 entries.

So, Ms Chan, from the perspective of the Transport Department, do you have any observations about the practice of KMB of basically not generating an exception report for a bus captain for harsh braking until this bus captain accumulates something like hundreds of times of crossing the harsh braking threshold within any particular week? Do you have any observations about that?

CHAIRMAN: It might be you want to reflect on that, and we are going to take a break soon, and give you a chance to think about the question.

But perhaps next we might move to what it is that is provided to the Transport Department about harsh braking.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. I have that document. I had that document a moment ago. Give me a moment, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course.

MR DEREK CHAN: In terms of what is given to the Transport Department, I think Ms Tse mentioned this a moment ago. Can I take you to TD-4, page 1020. This document at the top says, "Monthly report on monitoring measures relating to bus safety", and I think this is a document that Ms Tse referred to earlier about requiring bus operators to submit a form of random checks that they take -- or checks that they do take on the black box data.

If I can take you down to one-third of the way up from the bottom, under the heading, "Checking black box data box data for monitoring of driving behaviours of bus captains", the second box under that heading, under the item, "No. of ad hoc checks on black box data conducted"; second column:

"No. of mal-practice cases found (as at end month)

Please provide breakdown of cases by nature [of]:

- speeding.

- braking suddenly.

- others (please specify)."

And for this example braking suddenly is reported as eight times, and verbal warning is 13 times. So, when the Transport Department gets a document like this, and it is reported that there is eight "braking suddenly" cases, it appears to suggest, how does the Transport Department interpret this data?

So does the Transport Department interpret it as eight individual instances of harsh braking, or what?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps now would be the time to take the break, and you can reflect on the question whilst we have a break. Let's take 15 minutes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

(4.16 pm)

(A short adjournment)

(4.31 pm)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: So, Ms Chan, before the break I asked you two questions.

Firstly, from the perspective of the Transport Department, do you have any observations as to KMB's practice of basically not generating an exception report

on harsh braking until an individual bus captain has accumulated what is hundreds of occasions of crossing the harsh braking threshold within a particular week? That was the first question.

The second question was in respect of the monthly report, at TD-4, page 1020. So, when the Transport Department receives the report and sees on one of the entries, "braking suddenly", what appears to be eight cases, how does the Transport Department interpret that data?

Perhaps Ms Chan can deal with those in turn.

MS MABLE CHAN: I will address the first question and then I will invite my colleague Mr Patrick Wong to respond to the second.

On the first question, I think with the availability of the black box function to generate exception report, and with the focus of issue of concern on harsh braking, I think we expect the company to take a very serious approach to how to make use of this function and their data to help them to closely monitor the driving behaviour of bus captains.

No doubt, the data generated by the black box alone may not necessarily lead to any conclusion that the bus captain drives the bus in a negligent manner. Still, it provides some objective data for the bus company to

investigate further. We expect that with, say, the availability of installation of CCTV, and with also the plain-clothed inspectors on board the buses, all these are helping, equipping the bus company to take into account any other relevant observations on the bus driver's behaviour. But no doubt this black box data is very essentially and first-hand information and a basis for them to identify any misbehaviour or malpractice of the bus captain.

I will invite Mr Patrick Wong to address on the second question, regarding the information that we ask the bus companies to provide regarding the black box data.

MR PATRICK WONG: Mr Chairman, basically the template shown on the screen has been --

MR DEREK CHAN: Which is page 1020 of TD-4.

MR PATRICK WONG: Yes. It's been designed by the Transport Department and shared with -- actually, we requested the franchised bus companies to provide such information since January this year.

For the case you mentioned about the braking suddenly, we gather that -- because on the left column, it shows 400, but we are not sure actually, for designing this template, we just ask the franchised bus companies to provide the information about the number of

malpractice cases found. So, under the "braking suddenly", we cannot confirm whether it's actually based from the acceleration or deceleration black box data on this, but maybe we gather that the bus company would do some more investigation, maybe interview with the bus captain, before coming up whether it is established as a malpractice. That's what we understand.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, can you help me -- what does the figure that you pointed out -- what does 400 mean?

MR PATRICK WONG: Number of checks, ad hoc checks.

CHAIRMAN: So ad hoc as opposed to routine; is that it? The box above it, "Routine".

MS AMY TSE: Chairman, the ad hoc checks by bus company is normally based on the complaints, not the routine one but the extra one that they did. The routine one would be 8552 for the KMB case, as shown.

CHAIRMAN: But that doesn't address braking, that's only speeding, which is the point really. They check speeding, not harsh braking.

MS AMY TSE: For speeding, because they have a report generated from the black box, but for the ad hoc checkings, normally they act on the complaint, and because the braking, they might need to investigate based on the CCTV, before they just simply use the data

to say that it is the negligence of the bus drivers. They need more different investigation before they could classify it as a malpractice of bus captains.

CHAIRMAN: So what it comes down to is this: there is an exception report generated for speeding?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, there is report generated for speeding.

CHAIRMAN: But there is no exception report generated for harsh braking?

MS AMY TSE: To our understanding, they can set the threshold, but at the moment they may not generate the report because they need more investigation.

CHAIRMAN: Let's just deal with the facts. The explanation can be another matter. There is no exception report generated for harsh braking?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, to my understanding.

CHAIRMAN: The ad hoc report comes about because there had been a complaint and they go and investigate it as a result of the complaint.

MS AMY TSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But the fact is the data is available, as we have seen in all these pages of data, to monitor/understand the volume of harsh braking that's occurring; correct?

MS AMY TSE: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Now, one of the factors that is obvious is that the threshold they are setting, which used to be for

braking more than 8 kilometres, now reduced apparently to 7 kilometres per hour change per second, is in the range of 0.2G thereabouts, is it not? They are not monitoring this at 0.4G, are they?

MS MABLE CHAN: No.

MR WILLIAM SHUM: Yes, for the 7km/hour/second, is approximately equal to 0.2G.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That is relevant to problems caused to people standing in a bus.

Yes, Mr Chan.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, that completes my questioning, so with your permission I will hand over the questioning to Ms Wong.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much for your help.

MR DEREK CHAN: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Just give me a moment, Ms Wong, to dispose of some of these files.

MR DEREK CHAN: Mr Chairman, Ms Wong didn't let me sit down.

CHAIRMAN: I think she was probably encouraged by me.

MR DEREK CHAN: The reason is because Ms Wong has very helpfully dug up the traffic accident report that we had been looking at, in terms of what the bus drivers are instructed to do when they encounter an accident.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: There is actually a better reference than

the one I took you to earlier.

So perhaps I can invite Mr Chairman firstly to look at bundle KMB-10A, page 4190-1.

Just for the purposes of the record, the Chinese of the document starts at 4161; English translation, 4190-1.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: The document that you should have before you is headed, "Quality guide on how to handle bus traffic accidents", and it's a document from KMB.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: Perhaps just starting at the last point, which is the actual traffic accident report.

Mr Chairman will find that at appendix II of this document which is at page 4190-31.

And I think at 4190-29 is the English translation of that document.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a legible, or more legible, version of the one at 4190-31? That looks as though it's a scanned version.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes. There's not in this file. Perhaps we can liaise with KMB afterwards to get that.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: But what is interesting is if I can draw the committee's attention to 4190-38, which appears to be

a standard form letter of consent, seeking the passenger's consent for not to file a report with the police, even though he sustained injuries.

So it does not appear to be a matter of course that incidents would definitely be reported to the police.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you for that.

MR DEREK CHAN: Ms Wong has very helpfully found a more legible copy of the traffic accident report, at bundle KMB-10B, page 4397.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you, Ms Wong.

So what appears to be missing from this form compared with the information that is on the Transport for London website, details of incidents resulting in a fatality or injuries, which required hospital attendance and treated on scene." What is missing is any reference to the nature of injuries, is it not? But there is a reference to a fatal, admitted, discharge -- presumably that's a reference to hospitals.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, under the heading "Particulars of casualties", there appear to be boxes that can be ticked.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR DEREK CHAN: "Not verified", "left scene", "discharged", "admitted", "fatal". I think what appears to be missing is a characterisation that is perhaps more useful for

analytical purposes later on as to whether it's a "slips, trips and falls" accident, whether it's a loss of balance case, those kind of categories.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Ms Chan, that would be something that, if you were to design a template and require franchised bus operators to give you this kind of information so that you had a better database, then you could design whatever it is you wanted them to tell you.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes. I will, yes, because this is very important, and how we can sort of describe it and set in the template, to enable accurate data reporting, is something that we will have to look into. Yes, we will.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR DEREK CHAN: Yes, Mr Chairman. May I once again attempt to hand over hand over the microphone to Ms Wong.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Ms Wong.

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and thank you, Ms Chan, and ladies and gentlemen.

I will be asking a few topics. The first topic is on the Working Group on Speed Limit Review, and its functions and its interrelationship with the Road Safety Audit that you mention in your new annex and how it

works in practice.

With that remark, may I first of all ask you -- we know from the evidence that the Transport Department's Working Group on Speed Limit Review includes representatives from the Transport Department and two NGOs, which are the Motorist Association of Hong Kong and Senior Drivers Association of Hong Kong.

CHAIRMAN: I think that might be a translation that is supposed to capture advanced motorists; am I right?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

And also representatives from the police. Is that correct?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We also heard evidence that the person who convenes the meeting is the assistant commissioner of the Transport Department; is that also correct?

MR TONY YAU: Correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The Transport Department also provides the secretarial side of it. May I ask first of all, the function of the working group -- would the working group consider based on objective facts and assessment of accident data in determining whether there should be suggestions for changing speed limits of certain road sections?

CHAIRMAN: Before you answer that question -- is this

committee described in our papers somewhere, in our bundles?

MR TONY YAU: I think in our paper 10. TD-1, page --

MS MAGGIE WONG: 120. TD-1, pages 120 to 121.

MR TONY YAU: 120, yes.

CHAIRMAN: But is it a working group or is it a committee?

MR TONY YAU: It's a working group.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR TONY YAU: The main purpose of the speed limit review working group is to advise on TD's review of speed limits and advise on TD's practice on setting speed limit.

The members offer comments on the speed limit review, based on the major four factors. The first one is the accident history of the concerned road sections. The second one is the geometric environment of the road sections. That means the road's environment conditions. And the third one is the number of changes in speed limit, the existing speed limit and the connecting road speed limit. The fourth one is the actual vehicular speed, that means the speed measured on site.

CHAIRMAN: That's the 85th centile?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I understand that the working group also meet on a quarterly basis, and may I ask -- we have

heard evidence that the choice of the road sections is for the Transport Department to decide; is that correct?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, correct.

MS MAGGIE WONG: If there is a situation where you receive complaints from the district council about certain road sections that need to review speed limit, how would that reach the Working Group on Speed Limit Review?

MR TONY YAU: Usually, when there is a request from district councils, they will approach our regional district engineer, and our regional district engineer will base on those criteria of a speed limit review and see if any significant change.

Also, the main three points they have to consider is whether there is a change of accident and change of road environment. If there is a public request, they will consider whether they will prepare the speed limit report and submit to the working group for discussion.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned one of the things is whether there is a change of accident. What do you mean?

MR TONY YAU: As I mentioned, to consider the speed limit review, one of the criteria is the accident history. We usually will calculate the average year -- the year accident rate. So, if the district engineer noticed that there are significant increase of accident, they may consider to do a speed limit review.

CHAIRMAN: How is "accident" defined?

MR TONY YAU: It is the personal injury accident rate of the road section concerned, as compared with the figure of the whole territory.

That means the concerned road section's accident history compared with territory-wide, to see if the accident rate of the concerned road is particularly higher than the average one.

CHAIRMAN: So it doesn't get into the statistics unless there is a personal injury?

MR TONY YAU: Only consider the personal injury accident.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, so you could write the car off and get out and walk away and it doesn't go in the statistics; is that it?

MR TONY YAU: It's based on the record from the police.

CHAIRMAN: It requires an injury before it gets in the figures?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned the accident rate, and that it only requires -- it only qualifies as an accident rate if there is a personal injury. What happens -- maybe you quote an example -- in this scenario it is Tai Po Road -- which particular district would you compare the statistics before it reaches the working

group?

MR TONY YAU: Usually, we will compare with the territory-wide average values.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In the Tai Po Road section, which district would that be?

MR TONY YAU: For Tai Po Road, we would consider -- we would select the concerned sections of Tai Po Road, and then we sum up the accidents and we calculate the accident rate for that concerned section of road, and then compare it with the territory-wide figures.

MS MAGGIE WONG: There's one situation --

CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting again -- accident rate per what?

MR TONY YAU: Accidents per million vehicular kilometres.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned accidents per million vehicular kilometres, but it doesn't state accidents that necessitate personal injuries. So, in that sense, it is qualified by the Transport Department as accident for injuries per million vehicular kilometres; is that the position?

MR TONY YAU: We only count the personal injury as accident, as traffic accident.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Why?

MR TONY YAU: Because we base on the police figures. We only retrieve -- we only can assess the accident, the traffic accident, involving personal injuries. I know that from police, there are quite some accidents that maybe the motorist vehicle hit some street furniture and they left, and those figures, they did not have a quite -- cannot record all that incident because the concerned motorist maybe disappeared after those accidents that do not involve any personal injury.

CHAIRMAN: But there clearly was an accident. It might, for example, be a bend where cars go off regularly, but it's only an accident if somebody is injured?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, but because required by the regulations, only accidents involving personal injury need to be reported to the police. So maybe for those that do not involve personal injury, they do not need to report to the police, so we do not have very true figures of that kind of accident.

CHAIRMAN: I understand what you're talking about, the requirement in law to report if there's an accident involving injury. But if the car is broken at the side of the road, the driver might have run away, but there clearly has been an accident -- tyre marks all over the road, lamppost knocked down -- and that doesn't count?

MR TONY YAU: It doesn't count in this exercise of speed

limit review.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Now, on this accident rate, can I ask another scenario. It's if that particular section of the road has a lot of speeding, and the police issue a lot of fixed penalty tickets for speeding, and I understand that some of the accidents would be shared with the Transport Department in terms of accident data, but would that sort of fixed penalty tickets data be shared with the Transport Department?

MR TONY YAU: You mean that maybe --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Speeding.

MR TONY YAU: Yes, speeding, the police issue tickets for speeding and actually there are quite a number of vehicles are speeding, but it did not reflect in the accident rate.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes.

MR TONY YAU: That's the reason why we might consider the accident rate. If in that case that many -- or maybe most of the vehicles are speeding, but the accident rate is still low, there may be a problem of the speed limit set. So, under the current situation, they have to conduct a speed limit review. Maybe the speed limit imposed on the road is too slow, from traffic engineer's viewpoint. That's why most of the cars are speeding but

the accident rate is very low.

CHAIRMAN: I think part of the question was, "Do the police provide you with their data as to the fixed penalty speeding tickets issued on the section of road as a matter of course?" Do they do that?

MR TONY YAU: No, not for the speed limit review exercise.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Can you give us a ballpark figure -- because you talked about the accident rate being screened by the engineer of the particular region, and compared to the particular district, can you give us a ballpark figure as to what figure it reached would it warrant the investigation or review or consideration by the Working Group on Speed Limit Review?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. Maybe I can give you some figures. The territory-wide accident rate, I mean it's territory-wide, not particular district accident rate, we annually issue the road traffic accident statistics. For example, the accident rate for territory-wide in 2017, accident rate per million vehicle-kilometres is 1.15. That means, for a particular section of road, if the district engineer finds that after the calculation, the accident rate is higher than 1.15, they will consider to conduct a speed limit review.

CHAIRMAN: Is this material in our bundles? What's the name of this document where this is contained?

MR TONY YAU: I would like to add, in addition to the accident rate, even there's no observation from accident rate or other factors, they would conduct a regular review of the road section, a regular review of the speed limit of the concerned road section.

CHAIRMAN: Where is this figure, territory-wide accident rate per million vehicular kilometres 2017 -- what document is it in?

MR TONY YAU: It is in the booklet the Transport Department issue every year. The name is "Road Traffic Accident Statistics". It is available on our Transport Department homepage.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Wong, is that in our material?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No. I haven't seen that. Maybe we can be provided with that.

CHAIRMAN: This is available on the internet?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can see if we can locate it now. What page is it at?

MR TONY YAU: Page 9.

Yes, on this page, the 1.15 accident rate.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Could we have a copy of that printed, please, and distributed.

MS MAGGIE WONG: According to this table, it doesn't specify the territory.

CHAIRMAN: Is that term perhaps found elsewhere in these statistics?

MR TONY YAU: Because this table summarises the whole Hong Kong figures.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but is that spelt out somewhere else?

MR TONY YAU: Maybe you can refer to figure 2.13.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Do we have to go to the bottom to get a total?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: "All roads", that's the figure?

MR TONY YAU: "All roads", yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: On that table, "All roads", does that mean all roads within that territory, or all roads within the selected roads mentioned there?

MR TONY YAU: All roads within the territory.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So, when you mentioned earlier in the evidence about the engineer would look at the accident rate based on territory-wide, would this table assist?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. Territory-wide is actually the "All roads" accident rate figure.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So you would look at the 0.13 figure and not the 1.15 figure; is that the position?

MR TONY YAU: 1.15 should be on the bottom.

CHAIRMAN: 1.15 is the territory-wide accident rate, but the

Tai Po Road rate is 0.13, is it not? You look at the two figures, don't you, how the particular section of road compares with the territory-wide ...

MR TONY YAU: In the speed limit review report, the engineer has to select a concerned section of road, and then use that section of road, to retrieve all the accident occurred over the past one year, and then calculate the accident rate.

CHAIRMAN: By that, are you suggesting that the reference "Tai Po Road Sha Tin" is a broader area of the road than the section of the road that the engineer would select; is that what you mean?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, because the exact boundary may be different.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So the Tai Po Road from beginning to end might have quite a number of different sections; is that it?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And this figure is the summation of all of those different sections?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, I think so.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Now, you mentioned earlier in the evidence that even without this accident rate, the Transport Department would regularly review the limits or the road sections or the speed limit of the road

sections. On what basis would it conduct that exercise?

MR TONY YAU: It mentions in our submission, the latest submissions, the paper.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that TD Paper 10?

MR TONY YAU: No, the submission that we submit on Wednesday, on 3 October.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be TD-5?

MR TONY YAU: That's the table.

MS MAGGIE WONG: That would be TD-5, page 1817. Is that the paper?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You stated there, at page 1819, paragraphs 12 and 13, that "As mentioned" -- if I could read that into record:

"As mentioned in TD Paper 10 ... speed limit reviews taking into consideration a number of factors, including accident rate, actual vehicular travelling speed, road geometry and environment of the road section, will be carried out regularly and discussed in the standing Working Group on Speed Limit Review."

Then at 13 you stated there:

"A review of speed limits on all roads will be carried out at regular intervals, and the frequency for such reviews will make reference to their road types ..."

And you specify that there are three road types: trunk roads, the frequency will be 36 months; primary distributor roads, 48 months; and rural roads, 60 months. That would be equivalent to five years.

Can you explain or elaborate what is meant by "trunk roads"?

MR TONY YAU: Trunk road is the major, usually with higher standard, including the expressways, and usually it's linking inter-district or inter-region. That means the trunk road may be linking different districts or from regions, say Kowloon to the New Territories.

We also have a definition of that. This is under our transport planning design manual, we have a definition of trunk road; do you want me to --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Can you either read it out or give us a copy.

MR TONY YAU: I will read it out. The trunk roads -- there are two different types of trunk roads, the first one is rural trunk road. Rural trunk roads is:

"... Roads connecting the main centres of populations. High-capacity roads with no frontage access or development, pedestrian segregated, widely spaced grade-separated junctions, and 24-hour stopping restrictions."

For the urban trunk roads, they are:

"... roads connecting the main centres of populations. High capacity roads, with no frontage access or development, segregation of pedestrians, widely spaced grade-separated junctions, and 24-hour stopping restrictions."

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What about the primary distributor roads?

MR TONY YAU: Primary distributor, under the same design manual, it means:

"... roads forming the major network of the urban area. Roads having high capacity junctions, though may be at-grade, segregated pedestrian facilities wherever possible and frontage access limited if not entirely restricted, and 24-hour stopping restrictions."

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it's not limited to urban roads; it could include New Territories, roads in New Territories, as long as it fits the description?

MR TONY YAU: Maybe the new towns. New towns, the nature is similar to the urban areas.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. Sorry, I should have asked earlier about this trunk road. Trunk road, would that be mostly urban roads or does it also cover roads in New Territories?

MR TONY YAU: Both, cover urban and rural.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And what about rural roads?

MR TONY YAU: Rural roads are:

"... roads connecting the smaller centres of populations or popular recreation areas with major road networks. Frontage access should be limited wherever possible and junction design whilst not necessarily grade separated should be of a high capacity standard."

MS MAGGIE WONG: I see, in your footnote 1, you mentioned that:

"For most roads, if the speed limit accords with the design speed set for their existing road types and road characteristics, changing the speed limit will not be required ..."

On this section first, the existing road types is the three road types that you mentioned; is that the position?

MR TONY YAU: Do you mean Tai Po Road?

MS MAGGIE WONG: No, generally, this statement, "existing road types", does this "existing road types" mean the road types that you mention in paragraph 13, ie the trunk roads, primary distributor roads and rural roads?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, "existing road types" covers all the different roads.

In this footnote, there's a new term, the design speed. That means, for an engineer, when they design a road, they have an intention on what the design speed

for that road. For example, if a road is designed for 50 kilometres per hour, I think no matter whatever change of the road environment, the surrounding area, or accidents, even though you review several times, the speed limit will remain 50 but will not have any chance to increase to 70 because that is the design speed, it is the road constraint, the site constraint that limits the speed limit.

CHAIRMAN: What about decreasing it, if you have hots of accidents?

MR TONY YAU: Under the current speed limit structures, our lowest speed limit usually is 50.

CHAIRMAN: You don't consider any other lower speed limit?

MR TONY YAU: We've mentioned that in the paper.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to come to that as a separate topic.

MS MAGGIE WONG: The second part is:

"... changing speed limit will not be required unless there has been demand on it or the accident rate on the concerned road is above the territory-wide average."

There are two provisos here. The first is there has been demand of it.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, where are you reading from?

MS MAGGIE WONG: From footnote 1, Mr Chairman, I apologise, page 1819.

"There has been demand on it"; what do you mean?

MR TONY YAU: That's echo what I just mentioned before, there are two ways to trigger the speed limit review. The first one is the regular review. Regular review, which follows the road types, and the frequency of review, that means the table mentioned under paragraph 13. And the second way to trigger the speed limit review will be triggered by public demand or accident rate, and accident rate, I have just explained how to compare with the territory-wide average.

CHAIRMAN: So public demand might be district councillors communicating to you complaints made by residents; would that be it?

MR TONY YAU: The members of the public.

CHAIRMAN: Through the district council?

MR TONY YAU: Maybe.

CHAIRMAN: We've seen that in the Tai Po Road itself. That clearly is a public demand, is it not? Or don't you regard that as a public demand?

MR TONY YAU: When we receive a demand from DC members, we will consider a review.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned, "When we receive a demand from DC members, we would consider a review." The "we", who are you referring to?

MR TONY YAU: Usually, the DC members will approach our district traffic engineers.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it will be screened by the district traffic engineer first, to see if it reached the accident rate before it reached the working group; is that the position?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. They would consider also -- accident rate is one of their considerations. They will also consider whether there is a significant change in the environment around their district.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. What do you mean by "significant change in the environment"?

MR TONY YAU: For example, with some new developments, property that will affect the traffic mix or increase the traffic flows.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is there a mechanism where if the distinct council or district councillor, the public, disagrees with the consideration given by the traffic engineer that the road should be reviewed, what can the public do in those circumstances, apart from going repeatedly to the to traffic engineer? Is there a review mechanism where it could reach the Working Group on Speed Limit Review?

MR TONY YAU: Because, based on our current practice whether to conduct a speed limit review or -- the speed limit

review itself is quite technical. So it really depends on the traffic engineer to conduct a speed limit review and find out the most suitable speed limit for that concerned road section.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In terms of the current practice, this traffic engineer, if the accident rate doesn't meet the criteria, would the traffic engineer, having received a number of complaints, or the district council is dissatisfied with the complaints and requests the engineer to review it, would the engineer as a protocol go and visit that particular site in question?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So it's a protocol?

MR TONY YAU: Usually, the traffic engineer will have a site visit with the concerned DC members, and see if -- even though there may not be sufficient reason to trigger the speed limit review, they may see on site what kinds of traffic improvement measure can be done.

CHAIRMAN: By that, do you mean perhaps improving signage, or chevrons, that sort of thing?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. Sometimes it improves the -- usually it is the pedestrian crossing facility. They may find the speed limit is too high, and they have difficulty crossing the road.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Still on that page, can I proceed to ask you about that paragraph below the table:

"Over the past five years, speed limits of 143 road sections have been reviewed and discussed in the Working Group on Speed Limit Review."

These 143 road sections, is there a breakdown of which road type it was?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, I have a record.

MR DEREK CHAN: Can you give us the figure?

MR TONY YAU: I will check whether I have the information available.

I have a table showing all the road types of each 143 road sections, but do not have a summary or an example of primary distributor or --

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. First of all, can you give us an average of the road sections that would be reviewed on a yearly basis?

MR TONY YAU: Average is at least 24 road sections, each year.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Is that number a fixed number or can it be changed subject to circumstances?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, it's the minimum number, at least we have to review 24.

MS MAGGIE WONG: How do you select the 24 road sections?

MR TONY YAU: It's based on the regional engineer's

considerations.

MS MAGGIE WONG: And the regional engineer considerations will be based on the three criteria you mentioned earlier?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, and also the public demand, accident rate.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Would this information be made public, these 143 road sections, or the 24 road sections that are going to be reviewed; would this information be made public so that the public knows the working group would review these 24 sections and give their comments before the working group convenes?

MR TONY YAU: No. But if there are any changes in the speed limit finally recommended in the working group, we usually will consult the district council.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mention also in that paragraph that out of the 143 road sections reviewed, seven road sections have been recommended for speed limit changes.

Can you tell us, first of all, these seven road sections, which type it is, or which road types they are?

MR TONY YAU: For that seven road sections, two roads are primary distributors, one road is a district distributor, and two roads are sliproads of expressway, and one is a rural -- two primary distributors, one

district distributor, two sliproads of expressway, one rural, and one local distributor.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Second, the speed limit, you stated there that there had been changes. What is the change?

MR TONY YAU: Five road sections, the speed limit is decreased, and two road sections, the speed limit is increased.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So which are the road sections where the speed limit is decreased?

MR TONY YAU: You mean the name of the road section?

CHAIRMAN: Do you mean the name or the type of road?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I mean first of all the road type, and if you would also be able to assist on the specific road sections, and the year.

MR TONY YAU: Maybe, from the time chronology -- in 2015, for the five road types that the speed limit decreased, there is one primary distributor, one district distributor, one rural, one local distributor, and one sliproad of expressway. Those five road types have a decrease of their speed limit.

For the two road sections have an increase of the speed limit, one is primary distributor and another one is sliproad of expressway.

MS MAGGIE WONG: I see the time, Mr Chairman, but I would like to explore this. I would be grateful if you would

provide more information about this 2015 in relation to these five roads types where the speed limit is decreased, and the specific sections which we are concerned with and the reasons why they are decreased in terms of speed limit, and the relevant minutes of the meeting of the working group.

CHAIRMAN: Before the witness answers the question, may I enquire what is the relevance of this line of questioning?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Mr Chairman, I wish to know on what basis, first of all, would it reach the working group in terms of specific road sections; and the second is what considerations have been given in the working group and what weight has been given in the working group as to the complaints made by the district council.

Maybe, if they could address these two matters without minutes, I'm happy with that.

CHAIRMAN: Ultimately, what is the purpose of finding out this information?

MS MAGGIE WONG: It's whether we could improve the working group system or the protocol in terms of reviewing of road limits, when it comes to complaints from district council, without simply using the accident rate per territory-wide coverage, because it appears artificial.

CHAIRMAN: You have in mind the benchmark being what

happened on this Tai Po Road section that we are concerned with?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, specifically.

CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Can you provide information as to that?

MS MABLE CHAN: We will try to dig out those minutes to facilitate.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS MAGGIE WONG: In terms of -- before I go on with this paper, can I ask a few questions, going back to this Working Group on Speed Limit. May I ask a few questions as to why it is set up in the first place. We have information that this working group -- or rather you provided information that this Working Group on Speed Limit Review has been formed in 2000. Can you tell us why this Working Group on Speed Limit Review has been formed in 2000?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. The working group was formed in 2000. In that year, I remember there's a LegCo paper, stating why we set the Working Group on Speed Limit, because at that time there is quite public enquiries or comments that the then road section, the speed limit were usually set too low and the police will invoke enforcement for those road sections. So there's quite a strong request from public, in particular the motorists' association,

that we have to review the speed limit with a view to seeing if any particular roads, any concerned road, the speed limit can be increased.

CHAIRMAN: Who was it that suggested forming a working group to deal with the public concerns?

MR TONY YAU: The Transport Department.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is that set out in the paper, the LegCo paper?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We have the LegCo paper pulled up on the screen and we will distribute copies now.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a bundle reference or not?

MS MAGGIE WONG: I apologise, Mr Chairman, it is not in our bundle yet, but we picked it up from the LegCo documents. It is a document prepared by the Transport Bureau, dated 24 January 2000.

Is that the paper that you -- or the LegCo paper you refer to in your evidence?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Thank you. If I may, for the purposes of the record, it is a LegCo paper headed or entitled, "Speed limit in Hong Kong", and this paper was presented by the Transport Bureau in relation to three aspects: the structure of speed limit categorisation and the criteria of setting speed limits on roads in Hong Kong;

second, the review of speed limits in Hong Kong; and the relationship between traffic accidents and speed limit.

We can see in paragraph 3 there is this speed limit categorisation. In terms of low band, which is 50km per hour for urban or new town built-up areas; middle band, 70 to 80 for areas outside urban or new town built-up areas; and high band, for 100km per hour for high standard expressways.

If we go over the page --

CHAIRMAN: Before you move on -- for how long has Hong Kong adopted that approach of these three bands, perhaps earlier expressed in miles per hour, but for how long have we had that approach?

MR TONY YAU: I think around the same time that the paper is issued.

CHAIRMAN: This came into being in 2000?

MR TONY YAU: Yes, but before 2000, in Hong Kong, the speed limit of roads also generally can be classified in those three bands, but in that paper, in that LegCo paper, we clearly specified that Hong Kong have those three speed limits.

CHAIRMAN: What is the status of this structure, the three-band structure?

MR TONY YAU: It's still valid --

CHAIRMAN: No. What is its status? This is an approach

adopted by the Transport Department. Is it a law?

MR TONY YAU: No.

CHAIRMAN: So what is it?

MR TONY YAU: It's our current approach.

CHAIRMAN: Transport Department's approach?

MR TONY YAU: Administration's approach.

CHAIRMAN: The government's approach?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: The Transport and Housing Bureau's policy approach?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that expressed in any other document?

MR TONY YAU: I'm not aware of that, apart from this paper, there is any paper about the speed limits structures.

MS MABLE CHAN: Chairman, perhaps, if I may.

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MS MABLE CHAN: I would think that to put it in a more accurate context, it's the government approach as set out in the Transport Department's transport, planning and design manual. I may not say it to that far as a policy approach.

CHAIRMAN: Transport, planning and design manual?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms Wong, we are already over time. I'm leaving it

to you to choose a moment when a topic is finished.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe just to end this topic.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the date of this manual that you refer to?

MR TONY YAU: You mean the transport planning manual?

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes, the transport planning --

CHAIRMAN: Presumably you update it from time to time.

MR TONY YAU: Yes, we have submitted this copy to the secretary of the committee.

CHAIRMAN: When was it born, this manual? Does it go back to the 1960s? 1950s?

MR TONY YAU: Please wait. I need to check. It's based on -- I remember it's based on some similar UK manual at the time, and we drafted one to suit Hong Kong road conditions.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I have looked at a copy from the Hong Kong University, so I think it has its origins in the 1960s, doesn't it, UK in the 1960s?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. That's the first edition.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Has this speed limit structure in the transport manual ever been reviewed or updated?

MR TONY YAU: Yes. The concerned structure we will regularly update.

MS MAGGIE WONG: You mentioned "regularly update". On what criteria would you update it?

MR TONY YAU: We will check if there are any changes, say, to overseas practice that triggers our update in light of overseas matters.

MS MAGGIE WONG: We will touch upon this overseas practice maybe in the next session, but if I could go back to this LegCo paper, just to finish off this document before we break. It's in paragraph 6 of this LegCo paper. It talks about the review of speed limit in 1999, and:

"... the administration commissioned the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) in the UK, an independent leading transport research establishment in the world, to carry out a study on the speed limits in Hong Kong."

It also specified some of the findings in the paragraph that follows.

So my question is this. Apart from this 1999 commissioning of the Transport Research Laboratory in the UK, has there been other commissioning of the Transport Research Laboratory in recent years?

MR TONY YAU: No.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So that's the only one that has ever been done?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is this document available publicly, this consultancy report?

MR TONY YAU: I don't think so. It may be a kind of internal consultancy report.

CHAIRMAN: Right. Is it a document you can provide to us?

MR TONY YAU: Yes.

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, Chairman, certainly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If you could provide it, we'd be grateful.

MS MAGGIE WONG: So do I take it that apart from 1999, there has not been a consultancy study or a big study on the overseas practice in terms of speed limit structure in Hong Kong since 1999?

MR TONY YAU: No, there's not a particular consultancy study on speed limit review, but as we mentioned in our paper of low speed limit zones, we are aware that many of the European cities implement some lower speed limit, say 20 miles per hour, it's similar to 30 kilometres per hour. We are studying whether such measures would be suitable in Hong Kong.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Yes. I understand. That would be perhaps a new job for the Road Safety Audit team; is that the position?

MR TONY YAU: No. This is different. The low speed limit study is related to the road designs, whether it's a

suitable traffic calming measure to make the vehicles drive at such low speed limit.

MS MABLE CHAN: So, to put it shortly, irrespective of whether or not the Road Safety Audit team is in place, this low speed limit zone, we have already started some pilot scheme and study.

CHAIRMAN: There's a lot of material available, isn't there?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes.

MS MAGGIE WONG: When did you start this low speed limit zone study?

MR TONY YAU: We start the study under the walkability study, and the walkability study commenced in December 2017.

CHAIRMAN: What is the walkability study?

MR TONY YAU: Walkability study, to review our current standard and design to see if any particular measure or innovative measure can enhance the pedestrian environment so that encourage the road user to walk more.

CHAIRMAN: In the way that they have developed it in London?

MR TONY YAU: London is one of our reference in this study.

MS MABLE CHAN: This is quite relevant, Chairman, because I notice, in the discussion with the expert about the reference to certain road sections in London, that is exactly one of the reference points for us in taking

forward the walkability study.

While the study focuses or branches out from improving the pedestrian environment, it actually touches upon how to improve the road and also pedestrian pathway, in order to ensure the safety and also to enhance the ambience of the environment, and it touches upon the study of whether low speed limit zones in some of the road sections is worth considering.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. The two go together, don't they?

MS MABLE CHAN: Yes, the two go together.

I would just like to add that in Hong Kong, we are actually focusing on a few road sections in the urban districts, in particular like Hong Kong Island.

MS MAGGIE WONG: What is the membership of this walkability study or low speed limit zone study? What is the membership?

MR TONY YAU: We appoint a consultant to do that.

CHAIRMAN: And who are they?

MR TONY YAU: Mott MacDonald.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, could you repeat that?

MR TONY YAU: Mott MacDonald consultant.

MS MAGGIE WONG: Maybe that is an appropriate time to stop, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure it is.

We will adjourn our proceedings. I ought to say

this, for the record, that as I indicated at an earlier stage in the day, we have been providing Prof Lo with a running transcript, and in the course of the day he's come back to us with questions, but obviously these proceedings will have to be adjourned, and so, at the resumed hearing, he can pose those questions. It might well be that we are dealing with other topics and we will have to go back to them, and it's better that he should have the opportunity to put them himself. But he has come back to us during the day.

So what we will do is adjourn now and we will resume at a date that is mutually convenient to you, Ms Chan, and your representatives, and counsel. We will have to investigate diaries as to when that date is. But we will confirm in due course when we will resume these hearings.

MS MABLE CHAN: Thank you very much, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: So we are now adjourned to a future date. Thank you.

(5.48 pm)

(The hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)

INDEX

PAGE

EVIDENCE FROM THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT: MS MABLE 1
CHAN, MS AMY LEE, MS AMY TSE, MR PATRICK WONG, MR YK CHAN, MR WILLIAM SHUM, MR TONY YAU

Examination by MR DEREK CHAN (continued) 2

Examination by MS MAGGIE WONG 160

2018 年 10 月 6 日

上午 10 時 01 分恢復聆訊

出席人士： Hon Mr Justice Michael Lunn（倫明高），香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會主席

歐陽伯權先生，香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會委員

陳政龍大律師及黃佩琪大律師，由高露雲律師行委聘，代表香港專營巴士服務獨立檢討委員會

陳美寶女士，運輸署署長（運輸署代表）

陳英傑先生，副署長／公共運輸事務及管理（署理）（運輸署代表）

黃志光先生，助理署長／巴士及鐵路（運輸署代表）

謝善怡女士，首席運輸主任／巴士及鐵路 1（運輸署代表）

邱國鼎先生，總工程師／道路安全及標準研究（運輸署代表）

岑毅安先生，總機電工程師／車輛安全及標準（運輸署代表）

李美鳳女士，總運輸主任／特別職務（運輸署代表）

主席：（經傳譯員）早晨。唔該晒星期六出席呢個聽證會協助委員會去取證嘅。我一開始要解番羅教授嘅情況，羅教授今日喺科技大學係有工作在身嘅，因為佢哋係有一個論壇就係關於亞洲嘅工程學系嘅，佢今日嚟唔到。我哋個做法就會咁嘅，我哋會繼續，因為我哋有現場嘅謄本，我哋嘅做法就會係喺今日唔同階段將呢一個現場嘅謄錄版本去電郵畀佢，可以係透過我--如果佢有需要，可以問一啲問題，而到今日最後嘅時候，就會有一個更正版本嘅謄本同埋錄音版本，等教授可以知悉番我哋討論過嘅事項，如果之後仲有需要嘅話，亦都可以以書面嘅方式去再提問嘅。我先解釋番羅教授今日係嚟唔到嘅。而家我會邀請陳律師係繼續嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，署長早晨，多謝你哋尋日向委員會提交咗一啲嘅文件，就係星期四嘅聆訊之後，一啲跟進嘅文件，我想跟進番一件事嘅，就係根據新提供嘅文件，關於黑盒減速嘅嗰個數據嘅，我想首先問你嗰個限額係幾多？而可唔可以請你睇番呢個專營巴士加強安全嘅小組嘅一個報告？嗰個報告就係第 1807 頁，陳女士，而家有冇附件 2 呢？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係陳先生喺星期四下晝聽證會嘅時候就提交出嚟

嘅，而家就講番喺文件嘅第 4 段，關於黑盒嘅要求，就話用嚟--嗰個軟件係應該可以提交報告，關於以下嘅事項嘅，就係呢一個嘅喺偵察到減速 0.4G 嘅時候嘅一個三分鐘嘅時間呢個車輛嘅速度嘅情況，我哋就星期四下晝問過，喺 2003 年嗰個要求係 0.2G 嘅，而家見到個要求係 0.4G 嘅減速嘅。星期四下晝就有討論過點解會改咗，同埋喺尋日傍晚就提交咗啲文件，關於呢一個嘅更改嘅，我想問下呢樣嘢。我亦都想問下背後改嘅理據嘅，即係點解會選擇個界限值係 0.4G，呢樣嘢亦都係討論過嘅。想同你傾下關於呢兩個問題嘅。

我逐步講，首先會講番呢一個改動，喺 04、05、06、07 年，嗰個改動，我而家就先請你睇番尋晚提交嘅一啲文件，而家先請你睇附件 C1，我哋而家--主席，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我都睇到 C1㗎喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，呢度係未有頁碼嘅，呢個應該係運輸署第 5 號嘅文件冊嘅 1853 頁。

陳女士，而家你應該見到係運輸署同埋城巴一個聯絡嘅會議，呢個 2005 年 5 月 19 號嘅會議紀錄，有啲代表嘅，係運輸署代表出席，我睇番啲名應該係你今日在場嘅同事當時都冇出席呢一個嘅會議嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想而家請你睇第 25 段，即係話黑盒，黑盒就講--即係安裝個黑盒，到 26 段嘅時候，就提過話喺上一次嘅專營巴士同運輸署嘅聯合會議入面就建議黑盒嘅要求就有兩項嘅更改，就商量過嘅，第一，就係呢一個黑盒嘅意外紀錄，應該係由 0.2G 改做 0.4G 嘅減值；另外就係呢一個嘅意外紀錄應該係喺之後--即係三十秒之後記錄三分鐘同埋三十秒之前記錄兩分鐘嘅。而運輸署就話冇反對以上嘅更改，亦都想知道營運商有咩嘢意見嘅。

睇番呢個會議紀錄，似乎 0.4G 減速就係城巴選擇嘅，咁樣睇，你同唔同意？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）聽到嘛？聽到嘛？

主席：（經傳譯員）聽到喇。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我明白呢個題目 2005 年討論過，好可能係據城巴要求，去睇下呢個數值係咪應該要更改，因為 0.2G 嘅本來係。

主席：（經傳譯員）答案即係「係」喇？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）城巴提議嘅。你儘量係答「係」或者「唔係」，即係簡單嚟講，個答案係「係」喇？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋睇跟住嘅一封電郵，係 annex C，即係附件C2，係一年之後㗎喇，就係2006年9月19號，個附件就係話安裝黑盒要嘅要求，之後嗰頁，我哋見到呢個黑盒嘅要求草擬本，喺呢頁中間，我哋見到喺呢個表嘅第2、第4都出現0.4G嘅，即係話去到2006年9月個情況就係咁喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）為咗記錄起見，因為有啲部分係有遮蓋嘅，我想問下係邊個，寄件者同埋收件者係咩嘢人？陳先生，或者你可以處理。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。主席，如果睇番附件 C2 第一頁，電郵就係一個運輸署叫做 Walter Foo 嘅人士發出嘅，啱唔啱呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我可以邀請岑毅安先生，即係話我哋總機電工程師回答嘅。

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）呢個電郵係--冇錯，係 Walter Foo 先生，佢當時就係運輸署嘅一個機電工程師，發出嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而睇番冇遮蓋嗰啲部分，喺電郵收件者嗰一欄似乎係電郵發畀嗰啲嘅專營巴士公司嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。呢啲係唔同嘅專營巴士公司嘅唔同嘅職員...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，主席，我冇留意到，其實封信喺左手面係冇翻譯到出嚟嘅。應該咁樣講，第一欄就係寄件者。

主席：（經傳譯員）得㗎喇，喺紀錄上面就可以㗎喇，我自己可以理解。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）下一份文件就係2007年3月28號，喺附件C3，你而家面前見到就係一個會議紀錄，係運輸署同埋專營巴士公司嘅第二十八次聯合會議。第一頁你可以見到運輸署代表同埋巴士公司嘅代表，但係人名嗰度就係遮蓋嘅，我哋有嘅版本，我而家想請你睇第 5 頁，關於黑盒嘅，黑盒數據記錄儀器，呢個係個標題，呢度記錄就係話根據運輸署，就係話呢個電子數據記錄儀器嘅要求同埋規格係已經細節落實，所有巴士營運商係喺稍後就會收到最新嘅通知，呢個情況就係2007年3月嘅。

下一份文件係附件C4，2007年10月5號，呢度就有一個附件關於黑盒要求，可唔可以確認呢一個係叫做一個 Steven Tse 嘅人士發出，係運輸署你嘅同事嚟嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）收件人，可唔可以講下係咩嘢人呢？我哋只係見到有九

巴，有城巴。

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）喺遮蓋嘅部分嘅收件者其實係所有專營巴士公司嘅職員。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解需要遮蓋呢？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）因為電郵入面提到嗰啲職員嘅名，我哋就遮蓋番嗰啲職員嘅名。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解要咁做呢？點解呢個職員嘅名喺度嘅話，係會侵犯到佢呢？係咪同個人資料私隱有關呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗喺準備呢一個回應，我啲同事遮蓋嘅時候就冇去問番有關職員嘅同意嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）個答案即係「係」喇？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）係因為你係關注呢一個嘅個人資料保障喇？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）好奇怪，一個咁普通嘅書信來往，點解需要加呢個枝節呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋只不過係謹慎啲去行事。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係批評你，可能係呢個法例本身引發咁嘅現象。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我而家揭去附件 C4，第二頁，似乎係傾咗兩年之後，就係嗰啲最終個黑盒嘅要求嘅細節就敲定喇？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）黑盒要求改變嗰個--有更改嗰個過程就係咁喇，我跟住想問下你...

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺繼續問之前，點解如果係有呢一個改變，喺2018年8月發出嘅有關嘅文件入面係冇反映出嚟呢？點解延遲咗十二年先至用咁樣嘅格式呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我尋日都提過，討論過程同埋呢一個減速值嘅更改就喺2005年、2007年之間討論嘅，運輸署嘅職員當時就認為新嘅減速值...

主席：（經傳譯員）請你回答番個問題，點解延遲咗十二年先至用咁樣嘅格式呢？即係我哋而家2018年見到嘅格式呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我會話運輸署嘅職員當時--或者為免麻煩，或者佢哋遺漏

咗去將呢一個規格嘅啲參數改變。

主席：（經傳譯員）而家事後係咪應該咁做呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）如果而家事後睇番，應該嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，陳先生，我而家想講下用 0.4G 作為界限值嘅理據，我哋喺星期四下晝都討論過，我而家可以提醒番你星期四嘅證供係點樣，然後再睇番一啲新嘅文件，聽下你對呢啲文件有咩嘢意見。

而家先睇番星期四嘅謄本，2018 年 10 月 4 號第 19 日嘅聽證會，第 54 頁，我而家解釋一下我讀緊啲乜嘢先，第 53 頁嘅時候，就傾緊點解選擇呢個 0.4 嘅減速值嘅，而家喺 54 頁第 4 行，繼續講。

主席問咗條問題「畀一個實際嘅例子，咩嘢意思呢？」陳先生就話「唔係，呢一個嘅定義就係顯示呢一個減速嘅力度就係每秒 3.92 米，即係話有乘客坐喺座位嘅話，會係跌出座位嘅，而呢一個嘅剎車嘅力度就會令到--或者減速嘅力度係會令到一個乘客係由座位度跌出嚟嘅，呢個係要求嚟嘅。」

主席跟住話「即係話如果唔戴安全帶嘅話，一個坐喺度嘅乘客就會係因為咁樣嘅減速嘅程度去跌出座位？」而陳先生回答「跌出座位呢，其實技術層面講就係喺百分之九十五嘅樣本嘅情況，就會令到乘客係跌離座位嘅，即係話有個百分之九十五嘅可能性，如果冇戴安全帶嘅話，呢一個乘客會跌出嚟，如果係有 0.4G 嘅減速值嘅話。」

主席：（經傳譯員）喺繼續講之前，呢度話有百分之九十五嘅情況，乘客喺座位度跌出嚟，或者話百分之九十五嘅可能性，係咪有呢兩句說話有矛盾？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我講--我要更正番，呢度係話有百分之九十五嘅可能性個乘客係唔會跌出架車。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）再講百分之九十五呢個數我陣間會同你再討論嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係百分之九十五坐喺度嘅乘客冇戴安全帶，如果係有個 0.4G 嘅減速值嘅話，都唔會跌出個座位嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）正確嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係同一個課題，我哋去睇一睇謄本第 61 頁，第 3 行，主席就問「你可唔可以回答呢條問題？點解係由 0.2 轉到去 0.4？」陳先生就講話「就係話喺 2006 年當我哋係同呢一個經營商去講最低規格嘅時候，當我哋見佢哋同埋去做評估佢哋嘅表現嘅時候，我哋就發現 0.2 就係一個好輕微嘅減速

嘅動力，其實成日都會發生嘅，對我哋嚟講，如果要監察嘅說話，就唔係好有意思。喺嗰陣時候，我哋就同呢一個營運商亦都係同意咗，就話0.2G就應該係更改到去0.4，但係不幸，喺嗰個規格之中就冇改到嘅，所以今次我哋就利用呢個機會就去更改佢。」

我喺度想問嘅就係話營運商就話0.2係太多，因為經常都會發生嘅，喺第62頁，我哋就係由第6行開始睇--唔好意思，應該係第8行，呢個亦都係主席問嘅問題，呢個就係話係「係百分之九十五嘅人就喺0.4G嘅減速嘅時候就會跌落張凳嗰度，呢個係咪有人係曾經做過研究嘅呢？」陳生就話「我哋嘅資料，就係喺美國嘅運輸署嘅時候1977年曾經做過一個咁樣嘅研究。」

主席就話「你可唔可以畀我哋一啲細節呢？你有冇呢個文件呢？」陳先生就話「我哋係可以提供畀你。」

而家就運輸署已經係提供咗呢個文件，就喺附件D嗰度嘅，琴晚就提交畀我哋，遲少少我就會係再睇呢個文件。我而家就再讀埋呢一個其他嘅謄本嘅部分先，因為都好有關嘅。

喺第16行，我嘅問題就係話「呢個嘅調查研究，你講嘅就係話有冇提到係0.2同埋0.4G嘅限值嘅時候，企喺度嘅客人佢哋會唔會跌呢？」陳先生就話「唔好意思，就係冇關於企喺度嘅乘客嘅，因為坐喺度嘅客人佢哋係坐喺個座位度，佢哋都會喺特定嘅位置嗰度係坐低，但係如果啲人企喺度嘅時候，嘅情況就好唔同，因為啲人點樣企其實我哋係控制唔到，亦都係冇任何規格啲人係點樣企法嘅，所以因此我哋就係冇關於有呢啲嘅--關於企嘅乘客嘅呢啲嘅數據喇。」

主席就話「其實如果係一般嘅常識嚟講，佢哋都會係跌咗喇？」陳先生就話「就睇下佢哋究竟係點樣企嘅，我哋喺巴士裏面其實都講清楚其實如果一啲人企喺度，佢哋係可以拎住啲扶手，如果佢哋係做姿勢係正確嘅時候，可能佢哋跌低嘅機會就唔係好大，但係如果有啲人佢哋有行李上嚟或者佢哋郁嘅時候，可能個情況就好唔同喇。」

所以我就會特別想講一講關於個研究嗰度就係呢一點，就係0.4G同埋百分之九十五嘅問題，同埋就有冇一啲嘅科學嘅數據，就係特別係一啲企喺度嘅乘客佢哋嘅情況係點。我可唔可以請大家睇下附件D，就係琴日提供嘅嗰份文件。主席，唔好意思，我就睇一睇嗰個頁碼係幾多。呢個係TD-5嘅1862頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就或者我睇一睇我哋自己本來本身嗰個頁碼。陳生，我哋可唔可以首先睇一睇佢個引言？係呢一個嘅28頁嘅第9頁嘅，喺右上角。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以話畀我聽頁碼呢，如果喺個文件夾之中？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就係1870嘅，就係TD-5嘅文件冊嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以係第一、二段去講一講，「其實係關於減速嘅度其實就喺呢方面嘅研究就好少嘅，特別就係一啲坐喺度嘅乘客嘅，就喺呢啲嘅研究之中，其實就係只係有兩個研究就係同一啲人有關嘅，特別係喺呢啲嘅研究就係譬如話係鐵路嘅度，Hirshfield就係發現就係1同埋10g每一秒就會係有一啲郁動嘅，然後喺107g（235磅）、132（4呎4吋）去到193厘米（即是6呎4吋）嘅高度嘅時候，就會係個情況係咁。如果有啲人係失去咗平衡嘅時候，喺0.16嘅g嘅呢個限值嘅時候，嗰啲坐--佢哋係向前，啲男士佢哋係著低踭鞋同埋女士係高踭鞋嘅時候，佢哋會失去平衡。而對於佢哋拎住一啲嘢嘅時候，佢係0.23g嘅時候，就會係失去平衡。

第二個調查係Browning嘅，佢哋就係講企嘅乘客，有15至60歲嘅人，九十個人係參與，如果佢哋係向前同埋向後，而佢哋係揸住個扶手嘅時候，我哋發現就係如果加速嘅時候，同埋減速嘅時候就會係對於佢哋有啲影響嘅，喺0.055g嘅呢個動力嘅時候，如果佢哋係冇嘢扶住嘅時候，佢哋就會輕微有郁動，而佢捉住呢一個嘅扶手嘅時候，喺0.115g呢個嘅限值嘅時候，佢哋就會有動，而坐喺度嘅人，0.2g嘅時候，佢哋就係會有影響嘅。」

呢個就係同呢一個企喺度嘅乘客對於呢一個加速嘅時候就有啲影響嘅，呢個係咪一個好--係一個正確嘅觀察嚟嘅呢，陳先生？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個簡單嘅簡短嘅引言，就係呢個報告裏面，就係嗰個作者嘅觀察，我哋對於呢啲研究，我哋冇嗰個細節，喺文件裏面講，呢個就係有個研究，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個學術嘅文件研究嚟嘅，如果你去到第19頁嘅時候，我哋都睇到有其他嘅文件或者研究，就係話橫向嘅加速嘅時候，有啲咩嘢嘅影響嘅，呢個係Browning嘅研究，1972年，就係一個嘅技術嘅研究嚟嘅，係英國嘅，嗰啲數據係非常之清楚，個問題亦都係好清楚嘅，睇得。陳先生。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢一個階段，我就想問一問呢個問題，呢啲嘅研究或者文件，運輸署當佢去同意係用0.4嘅減速值嘅時候，作為一個界限值嘅時候，有冇參考過呢啲文件呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）就我所知，呢個文件，當我哋係改變嗰個界限值嘅時候，我哋冇考慮到嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪意思，你就係話意思就係話唔同嘅減速嘅程度係對於企嘅乘客個影響你冇考慮到，你純粹係考慮坐喺度嘅乘客呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。點解呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係嗰個我哋定嗰個界限，就係為巴士營運商去開發黑盒嘅用途嘅，喺當其時我哋覺得嗰個黑盒應該係可以量度到當減速嘅時候對於坐喺度嘅乘客有咩嘢影響，佢哋係個影響係點樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解你冇考慮到企喺度嘅乘客呀？佢哋受一啲減速，即使唔係好快嘅時候，佢哋都會影響得好緊要嘅。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）因為嗰啲嘅坐喺度嘅乘客，佢哋就坐喺度，對佢哋嚟講，佢哋要郁動係比較難嘅，所以我哋就用黑盒去量度嗰個減速個程度，佢個減速要大啲，先至啲人會係跌出嚟嘅，所以呢個就亦都會個情況係比較嚴重。

主席：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思話企喺度嘅乘客，如果佢哋跌低嘅時候，個情況冇咁嘅嚴重？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅，或者我想請岑先生佢去補充嘅。

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）其中一個我哋考慮就係話嗰啲坐喺度嘅乘客，我哋好少叫佢話「你係捉緊個扶手」嘅，但係企喺度嘅乘客，我做好多嘅宣傳活動，就叫佢哋--勸籲佢哋企喺度嘅乘客捉緊個扶手或者係捉緊一啲其他嘅部分，當佢哋企喺個巴士上面，所以呢個其中一個考慮因素，當我哋去更改個減速嘅 G 值嘅時候，由 0.2 更改到去 0.4G 嘅時候。

主席：（經傳譯員）我要好公平嘅，你咁講，你當其時 2005 年、07 年嘅時候，你都冇參與嗰個決定嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，我真係冇參與嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇多一啲嘅資料可以提供畀我哋呢？點解會作出呢個更改，就幫助你去回答呢啲，聽落去都係好明顯嘅問題？

岑毅安先生：No, sorry. We don't have that.

主席：（經傳譯員）你已經盡你所能去回答呢個問題，就係提供一啲點解要做更改嘅理由，你已經盡你嘅所能，係咪？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，或者我總結下呢一點，第 28 頁裏面嘅第 26 版，就係同一個嘅文件嘅，呢個係 TD-5 1887 頁嘅，我哋就第一、第二段去讀，「呢個研究嘅目的就係提供數據，就係睇下唔同嘅限值對於坐喺度嘅乘客喺突然剎車嘅時候有啲咩嘢影響，同埋就睇下呢一個嘅突然減速嘅時候有啲咩嘢影響，呢啲嘅數據就係表示，話畀我哋聽呢一個佢哋嘅坐喺度嘅乘客，當佢有一個減

速嘅時候，佢哋個經驗比嗰啲企喺度嘅乘客有兩倍咁多，呢個百分之八十四嘅喺一個座位上面嘅乘客佢向前嘅時候，當佢嗰個減速值係0.4g嘅時候，佢哋就可以安然坐喺個位嘅。要確保喺呢個打橫嘅位嘅時候，百分之八十四嘅乘客喺0.41g嘅限值，同埋呢一個嘅傾側5度嘅時候，嗰個限值應該係最好係0.52g嘅。」

呢度有講過，就係百分之八十四乘客就坐喺呢一個嘅向前嘅座位嘅時候嘅情況，百分之九十五呢個就冇講到嘅，喺呢一度提到，或者我係漏咗啲嘢嘅，你可唔可以話畀我聽你百分之九十五個數字係點樣嚟嘅呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我請岑先生去回答。

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）喺我哋去同巴士公司傾嘅時候，0.4G嘅減速值嘅時候，就係講嗰啲打橫排嗰啲座位嘅，我哋去睇一睇呢個文件嘅第11頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係睇緊上高定係下底嗰個嘅頁碼呢？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係有三個圖表嘅嗰個。

主席：（經傳譯員）有唔同嘅頁碼嘅，呢個就係第11，下底就係1872等等，你睇緊邊個頁碼？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）下底嗰個。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，下底嗰個頁碼，第11頁。

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係睇第一--最上嗰個圖表，喺呢個圖表之中，呢度寫百分之九十五嘅保留值，就係呢個喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪0.42G嗰個減速值嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，0.42G減速值。你睇X軸，呢度寫住有一啲嘅數據，係0.4G嘅，寫住。係，冇錯，就係呢個喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果我咁樣去理解圖表，啱唔啱呢？就係0.4G嚟計，百分之九十五嘅坐喺度嘅乘客就唔會跌出嚟嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實如果你睇呢，其實係多過百分之九十五講喎，係咪呀？

岑毅安先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）還是百分之九十八定係點呢？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）我哋就唔能夠去正確講，所以我哋就話係多於百分之九十五嘅，就多於百分之九十五嘅乘客就係唔會跌出嚟嘅，就係當係0.42嘅減速值嘅時候。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就頭先我讀出嚟嗰段亦都係講到嗰啲數據就會係坐喺度嘅乘客就係感受到嗰個減速係兩倍嘅個感覺強過一啲企喺度嘅乘客，因此喺呢一個嘅研究，我就頭先讀出嗰段，就包括喺引言部分嗰啲嘅文字，就話企喺度嘅乘客，如果佢係有緊握嘅扶手等等，佢哋會失去平衡，就會係 0.3G 同埋 0.27G 嘅時候，就係會失去平衡嘅，似乎喺引言嗰度係咁講嘅，你會唔會同意呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係 Hirshfield 1932 嗰個嘅研究嘅結果嚟嘅？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺呢個調查之中個數據，似乎就係話--我哋去 0.4G 嘅減速 G 值其實就已經係可以足以係去照顧好嗰啲坐喺度嘅乘客，但係嗰啲企喺度嘅乘客，佢哋嘅情況就冇被照顧，而我呢個咁嘅講法，你有啲咩觀察或者同唔同意？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署會唔會諗就係話更加小心同埋更加科學嘅研究，去做一啲咁嘅研究，去睇清楚 0.4G 嘅呢個值係咪真係可以保障到個乘客嘅--或者企喺度乘客嘅安全呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，我覺得我哋可以做多啲嘢，做多啲研究去找出唔同嘅減速值點樣去影響唔同嘅乘客，譬如話企嘅或者係坐嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋睇咗嘅文件係 1977、1972 同埋 1932 年做嘅，你有冇睇過一啲近期啲嘅學術或者係技術方面嘅研究呢？譬如喺過去五十年有冇呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋都係嘗試咁樣做...

主席：（經傳譯員）你有嘗試咁樣做？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）有。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇成功呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）唔係好成功，我哋能夠搵到嘅文件都係呢一啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）當然，你係冇當時參與呢一啲討論，係咪？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，正確。

主席：（經傳譯員）究竟係幾時嘗試去搵一啲比較近期嘅研究呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）喺過去幾個星期。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以協助我哋，話畀我哋聽你喺邊度搵？你接觸過邊個？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅工程師喺網上尋找同埋睇番自己嘅檔案或者文件，去睇下究竟有冇任何嘅材料我哋係可以搵到關於研究呢一個題目嘅，到而家，我哋網上嘅搜尋同埋其他嘅資源，我哋都係冇乜成功。

主席：（經傳譯員）好喇，即係網上搜尋同埋你自己嘅檔案，仲有冇其他呢？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）就係呢兩個方法。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇接觸過本地非常之傑出嘅大學，譬如話佢哋嘅工程學系或者係港大、科大，甚至其他嘅大學呢？

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）喺過去幾個星期，我哋冇咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我而家打算開始另外一個題目，就係關於安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我假設會係你去處理問題，所以我係會向你發問，但係如果你認為其他嘅同事應該回答，你可以請佢哋回答。

首先，我而家想講關於安全帶，係睇番工作小組嘅報告嘅，因為喺嗰個報告裏面係詳細咁樣處理咗安全帶嘅問題，為咗個紀錄，嗰個報告係喺 TD-5 嗰沓文件 1757 頁開始嘅，我請大家睇第 3 部分，呢一部分係處理安全帶嘅問題嘅。首先，我係請大家睇一睇其他司法管轄區嘅情況，然後睇下運輸署以前嘅立場係點樣樣嘅，關於其他司法管轄區，我想大家睇 3.11 段，喺呢一個全面報告嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋自己畀一個頁碼佢呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅，主席，我哋內部嘅頁碼係第 28 頁，我哋聽證文件嘅頁碼就係 TD-5 號文件 1788 頁。法官閣下，我而家就會讀出 3.11 同埋 3.12 段嘅。

3.11，個報告係咁講嘅，「我哋考慮到專營巴士公司方面不同嘅意見，工作小組就係檢討咗而家海外嘅做法同埋佢哋嘅要求嘅，即係關於喺巴士上面安裝安全帶嘅問題，如果係城際或者係跨境嘅一啲路線，譬如話美國、英國同埋荷蘭，佢哋就係硬性規定所有嘅座位都要有安全帶，但係其他人。譬如英國、荷蘭同埋喺澳洲嘅維多利亞省，就係話一定係要戴安全帶添嘅。但係如果係市內或者係有企位嘅巴士，任何嘅海外司法管轄區，即係我哋檢討過嗰啲，冇一個係法定規定一定要喺個座位嗰度配備安全帶嘅。根據呢一啲司法管轄區嘅運輸當局，市內嘅巴士好多時都係用嚟畀人搭一個短嘅時間，無論係時間或者係距離都係嘅。同埋好多時喺市內嗰個速度都係唔會好快嘅，因此對於呢啲市內巴士就唔會有安全帶嘅要求嘅，有關嘅數據就係喺附件 IV 嗰度。」

喺附件 IV，就喺 1809 頁嘅，即係我哋嗰啲會議文件 1809 頁。陳女士，1809 頁就只不過係詳細講出我剛才讀出嗰個段落所描述嘅嘢。主席話佢係搵到嘅。即係話如果係喺市內嘅巴士，就佢哋檢討過嘅司法管轄區就並冇法定要求要有安全帶，我只不過係想有一個細微嘅點想你澄清一下，呢一個檢討係幾時做嘅呢？即係就呢一個工作小組嘅報告嚟講，係咪喺 2018 年呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個檢討係 2018 年做嘅，係當我哋準備同埋當呢個工作小組係佢自己討論嘅時候。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）唔該晒，我咁樣問係因為有一個類似嘅檢討，係 2005 同埋 2007 年有做過嘅，但係我講嗰樣之前，我而家又想讀埋 3.12 段出嚟嘅。

3.12 段係咁講嘅，「以上嘅檢討結果，就嗰三個巴士製造商都係同意嘅，佢哋嘅意見就係話如果喺其他嘅國家，譬如喺城市內嘅巴士都係唔需要有安全帶嘅。喺歐洲，如果係城際嘅大巴士，而且係冇企位嘅話，先至係需要呢一啲嘅安全帶嘅，佢哋就認為喺香港就算加裝安全帶，都唔會保障到企位嘅乘客。」大家可以睇到 3.12 其實就係嗰啲巴士製造商，佢哋喺小組討論嘅時候佢哋發表嘅意見嚟嘅，我咁樣講啱唔啱呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，正確。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺 2018 年做咗呢個檢討之後，我而家就想回顧一下一個類似嘅檢討，就係 2005 至 2007 年做嘅，好喇，我哋而家留住呢個工作小組個報告，我哋去 3.2 段嗰度係向大家介紹一下呢個以前做過嘅類似嘅檢討，3.2 段，內部頁碼第 23 頁，我哋嘅聽證會文件頁碼 1783 頁。

3.2 段係咁講嘅，「運輸署就係規定，喺 2006 年、2007 年嘅時候因為有專營巴士係牽涉喺意外嗰度，因此喺某啲嘅座位就規定要有呢一啲嘅安全帶，而喺 2007 年，專營巴士公司都係同意喺上層最前嗰四個位係要安裝安全帶，即係話所有 1997 年之後發牌嘅巴士都要咁樣樣，以防止佢哋係跌出座位嘅，喺 2012、2015、2017 年我哋喺傾呢一個續牌嘅時候，我哋都利用嗰個機會，就係規定所有巴士公司就係話呢一啲冇任何遮擋嘅座位都要安裝安全帶嘅。」呢一個就係因為 06、07 年嘅時候有一啲意外發生。

好喇，我而家講番其中一份歷史性嘅文件，就講下當時做嘅一個檢討嘅，而家請大家睇一睇 SEC-1 嗰一沓文件，第 266 頁，喺 266 頁，我希望大家都睇到呢一份文件，係運輸署準備嘅，係畀立法會運輸事務委員會開會嘅時候用嘅，你可以喺 272 頁睇到嗰個日子就係 2006 年 10 月寫嘅，請大家直接睇 271 頁第 19 段，呢一度嘅大題目就係話公營巴士上嘅安全帶，我而家直接係讀出第 19 段同埋第 20 段，係講到海外嘅司法管轄區點樣處理安全帶嘅問題。

第 19 段，「我哋係做咗一個研究去睇下海外點樣去處理巴士安全帶嘅問題，有關嘅要求就會喺個附件嗰度有一個摘要嘅。」呢一個附件喺 273 頁，不過我繼續讀咗先。「我哋可以睇到冇任何一個外國嘅國家係要求喺市內嘅巴

士，即係城市內嘅巴士，就算係有企位嘅乘客，係要求佢哋安裝安全帶嘅。喺澳洲同埋加拿大做嘅研究就係發現如果喺所有嘅座位嗰度安裝安全帶，其實額外嘅安全利益都唔係咁多嘅，因為我哋都好難想像所有嘅乘客都會願意扣上安全帶。

因此我哋認為並不適當去硬性規定所有專營巴士都要安裝同埋係強逼乘客配戴安全帶嘅。但係我哋會繼續同專營巴士公司一齊工作去搵多啲措施確保乘客安全。」

我咁樣講公唔公道呢？就係海外司法管轄區，就係話運輸署考慮過嗰啲，係冇改變佢哋嘅立場嘅，2006 年至到今年 2018 年，關於話唔去規定喺市內嘅巴士，就算有企位，乘客都要安裝安全帶。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅，我認為喺我哋兩輪嘅檢討之中，海外嘅做法同埋經驗，好似我哋嘅檢討都顯示出對於安全帶嘅配備，佢哋嘅立場大致上係冇改變。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺第 19 頁，就係講到澳洲同加拿大嘅研究，就話就算喺所有嘅巴士座位安裝安全帶，其實額外嘅安全利益都唔係大到好似我哋想像咁嘅，然後跟住就話好難想像所有嘅乘客都可以確保佢哋用呢一個安全帶，你可唔可以畀澳洲同埋加拿大呢一啲嘅研究嘅參考嘅資料畀我哋呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我而家就冇嗰啲詳細嘅資料，但係我哋可以畀番有關嘅參考資料畀大家嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋呢一度嘅代表，有冇邊位知道呢一啲嘅研究係乜嘢研究呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我知道喺新南威爾斯州澳洲嗰度係有做過一啲研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係我想知佢哋點樣講，你喺適當時候畀番啲參考資料我哋。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有嘅，我哋有有關嘅參考資料，不過而家我哋好難引述嗰個參考嘅資料畀大家。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你會向我哋提供？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）會嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋睇咗呢一個歷史背景之後...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，主席，我嘅同事邱生想講一講海外司法管轄區嘅比較，我想邀請佢向大家講出佢嘅觀察。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。陳律師，你係講得啱嘅，喺市內巴士個要求喺 2006 年同 2018 年間係冇大改變嘅，不過除咗市內巴士之外，如果你講係城際

巴士，喺美國嘅法例係有改變，喺2013年11月，美國係通過咗新嘅法例，就係規定所有新嘅巴士都要有安全帶，即係除咗校巴同埋市內巴士之外。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋知道喺英國，喺伯明翰至到倫敦之間嗰啲嘅大旅遊巴係需要有安全帶嘅，因此我哋而家想講嘅唔係城際巴士，係市內巴士。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，我意思就係話如果城際巴士就好似我哋嗰啲比較長線嘅巴士，即係譬如話由港島去到新界，佢哋係要用高速公路嘅話咁樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一啲巴士，如果你講番美國嗰啲，佢哋有冇一個車速限制呢？因為如果車速係70公里同110公里，咁就爭好遠㗎嘩？

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會個規定係唔同呢？佢哋可唔可以係以高速行駛呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我相信係有規定嘅，喺嗰啲嘅司法管轄區，如果佢哋高速行駛，應該有規定。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喇，我都覺得係有分別，所以嗰個邏輯就係會適用於呢啲大嘅旅遊巴，因為佢哋事實上都係高速行駛嘅，並不是每小時行70公里。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好喇，我哋而家有咗呢個歷史背景之後，而家我想考慮一下工作小組報告裏面講到嘅現時嘅立場。我未講到個細節之前，我明白個立場，對於新巴士同埋加裝安全帶喺現有巴士係有些少唔同嘅，我係會逐一講呢一個唔同嘅狀況。

首先，講新巴士嘅立場，請大家睇報告第3.4段，內部頁碼24，聽證會文件頁碼1784。首先，我讀出3.4段，「關於喺公營巴士上面所有嘅座位安裝安全帶，所有三個嘅巴士製造商，即係亞歷山大丹尼斯、富豪同埋合德猛獅，就話技術上係完全可能嘅，甚至係合乎國際嘅標準，即係如果你認為呢個係採購嘅要求，我哋係可以咁樣安裝嘅。鑑於呢一個咁嘅講法，工作小組嘅建議就係喺採購新巴士嘅時候，所有嘅座位都應該有安全帶嘅，所有嘅專營巴士嘅公司都同意，就話從2018年7月起，佢哋訂購嘅巴士全部座位都應該有安全帶。」呢個就係新巴士嘅情況。

我問下一個問題之前，我想大家留意另外一項資料，可能同下一個問題有關或者無關嘅，就係關於嗰個成本，喺所有座位安裝安全帶，如果係新巴士嚟講，個成本係幾多，我想請大家留住呢個工作小組嘅報告，然後我哋睇另外一份文件，係KMB第12沓文件，4887-5嗰一頁，或者我去4887-1嗰一頁先，等大家知道嗰個背景。

陳女士，喺呢一頁，你應該係面前見到㗎喇，呢個係第二次工作小組會議嘅筆記，日期係2018年4月23號嘅，而家請你睇番第16段，呢個會議紀錄，呢個係4887-5頁，等我讀出第16段。

「同巴士廠商係查問過，對於新嘅巴士座位安裝安全帶嘅可能性之後，所有巴士公司都話技術上係可以喺採購嘅新巴士嘅所有乘客座位度安裝安全帶嘅，而九巴龍運亦都係補充，每一架嘅雙層巴士係要額外 5,000 鎊嘅成本係為所有乘客座位安裝安全帶，所有巴士公司都同意喺佢哋嘅新嘅單層同埋雙層採購嘅巴士係實施呢個新嘅要求嘅。呢度提到有額外成本，就係每一架巴士 5,000 鎊去安裝乘客嘅安全帶，呢個係會議紀錄入面提到嘅。」

呢個係咪一個正確嘅估算呢？根據你而家有嘅資料。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）睇番喺 2018 年 4 月，呢個係據我哋所知嘅資料。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）即係啱囉喎，額外每一架巴士成本係 5,000 鎊？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你有呢個資料，我個問題係喺 06、07 年之後有咩嘢更改呢，令到運輸署有呢一個建議，為新嘅巴士裝安全帶？對於喺市內巴士安裝安全帶，係咪個益處有改變呢，喺呢段時間？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺我哋工作小組嘅討論入面，安全帶係其中一個好主要我哋討論過嘅題目，喺準備工作小組嘅討論之前，運輸署係有進一步檢討過海外嘅做法。頭先回答番大律師嘅問題，似乎海外對於市內巴士乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅立場大致一樣，呢一點我哋係好認真看待嘅，喺立法會嘅交通事務委員會都提過數個建議，我哋需要好小心咁樣考慮呢一個課題。

我哋由唔同嘅角度考慮，首先係道路交通同埋公共交通安全；第二，我哋亦都考慮到技術可行性，對於新採購巴士同埋現有巴士安裝乘客嘅安全帶；第三，我哋亦都考慮如果額外加裝所有乘客座位嘅安全帶嘅話，額外嘅成本，對於安全角度，我哋其實係有向道路安全議會提出呢啲議題，去討論攞佢哋嘅意見。

接住落嚟，喺呢個題目，我可以請邱國鼎先生補充一下我哋對於安全同保障嘅立場，即係話如果喺我哋市內巴士喺香港乘客座位加裝安全帶嘅影響，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續講之前，你可唔可以話你幾時向道路安全議會提出呢個議題㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）4 月，喺道路安全研究小組曾經討論過呢個題目。

主席：（經傳譯員）今年 4 月？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，係 7 月，係 7 月嗰個會。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪以文件或者電郵方式呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係一個會議，一個小組會議嚟嘅，就有文件，有討論文件

嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有提交文件畀議會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提供文件副本畀我哋？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係7月邊一日呀，個會議？

邱國鼎先生：May I check my diary?

主席：（經傳譯員）你慢慢喇。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）7月17號。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。陳律師。陳女士，我打斷咗你，我哋講緊你第一個嘅關注，即係話...

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，道路安全同埋公共交通安全，我哋就有諮詢過道路安全議會有關嘅小組，亦都提交咗文件，第二，呢一方面，我都會請邱國鼎先生隨後補充。但係我而家先講埋另外兩方面，喺技術可行性方面，工作小組嘅會議，亦都得到巴士廠商同埋巴士公司嘅參與。

我哋係處理兩個問題，第一，就係新嘅巴士，你可以睇番會議紀錄，我哋係有討論過，新採購嘅巴士，乘客座位都安裝安全帶呢個可行性，廠商嘅回覆係話技術上係可行嘅。專營巴士公司嘅代表喺會議上亦都係話--都確認佢哋係可以就住新採購巴士喺將來係實施呢一個建議嘅。

對於成本同埋財政影響方面，對於新嘅巴士，每一架雙層巴士額外嘅成本5,000 鎊，即係等如總成本嘅百分之一點五，即係話購置一架雙層巴士嘅總成本嘅百分之一點五。喺會議嘅時候，巴士公司亦都係話係喺技術上、操作上都係可行嘅，如果喺新採購嘅巴士所有乘客座位安裝安全帶。

下一條問題就係話現有巴士加裝安全帶，我哋參考過唔同巴士嘅模型...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺加裝嗰個問題，我稍後會另一個題目先至再詳細討論，而家先講番幾個問題。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我而家係咪請邱國鼎先生去補充先呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋如果畀大律師去問晒所有有關嘅問題，先會更加有效率嘅，如果仲有啲事項遺漏嘅話，你可以提出，不過請佢繼續問先。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我而家繼續問番嗰三個考慮，如果我錯，請你更正我，不過似乎係冇做過一個客觀嘅、科學嘅分析，係如果所有乘客座位都加裝安全帶嘅話係有咩好處，咁樣講公唔公道？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我唔明。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪講緊成本效益嘅分析吖，定點？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋有呢個成本就係5,000鎊...

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，你個問題似乎係--你話「你似乎冇做過任何成本效益嘅分析」，佢係咁樣問嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔同意。

陳政龍先生：Again, just a side point...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋繼續講之前，你做過乜嘢分析呀，如果你唔同意佢講法？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）首先，我哋有考慮成本，如果新巴士所有乘客座位安裝安全帶嘅成本，我哋有考慮；第二，亦都有考慮效益。

主席：（經傳譯員）你個分析結果係點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋結論係如果係所有乘客座位都裝安全帶嘅話，就會為喺車上嘅乘客提供額外嘅保障，呢一方面可以請邱國鼎先生係補充嘅。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）如果我哋要做成本效益分析嘅話，我哋要對等比較嘅，我哋關注嘅係安全帶係一個保護裝置，之前我哋提過喺車廂內嘅其他嘅譬如係限速器或者係穩定控制系統，所有呢啲都係一啲防禦嘅措施嚟嘅，就係用技術去防止意外嘅發生，但係安全帶係一個保護裝置，因為畢竟都係會發生意外，而安全帶就係一啲安全措施可以保障乘客，如果我哋做一啲成本效益分析嘅時候，我哋要搵一啲類似嘅同等嘅有咁樣嘅保護功能嘅儀器去同安全帶去比較，而我冇見到有任何一種保護裝置可以對乘客，特別喺發生意外嘅時候提供一樣嘅保障。

而喺工作小組，我哋亦都有同巴士公司討論，額外嘅費用就係每一部巴士5,000鎊，而每一架雙層巴士就係超過300萬。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋知道㗎喇，即係話係總成本嘅百分之一點五。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）喺比較總成本嚟講，係比較低嘅，但係呢一個帶嚟嘅保護，呢個得益係好高嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇啲情況係有車上嘅座位乘客因為冇安全帶而受傷呢？你有冇研究過呢一樣嘢呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有啲研究嘅，係私家車，安全帶可以減低意外嘅嚴重性。

主席：（經傳譯員）私家車同巴士好唔同，你有冇考慮過--有冇研究過有啲事件有乘客係喺車上坐喺個座位度因為冇安裝安全帶而受傷或者係甚至死亡呢，你有冇

研究過呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇一個特定嘅研究。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係答案就係你冇喇？

邱國鼎先生：（沒有可聽到的回答）

主席：（經傳譯員）點解冇呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋亦都有討論過，正如我頭先提過，就係喺道路研究小組嗰度傾過，呢個係喺工作小組報告嘅 5.10 段嗰度。

主席：（經傳譯員）個問題好簡單，點解你冇去研究過喺巴士上座位嘅乘客冇安全帶而導致到有受傷或者死亡嘅事件去顯示番個問題喺邊呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）請容許我補充，主席。我哋要承認番，根據職員嘅證供，我哋係冇做過任何可以量化嘅研究，考慮到意外嘅成因嘅，去研究一下係唔係冇帶安全帶嘅乘客個傷勢會重啲，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你喺繼續講之前，我而家問你嘅問題，點解冇做咁嘅研究，或者係可以量化嘅分析呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋冇咁樣做，我而家都答唔到你，但係我想指出...

主席：（經傳譯員）等我協助你，有冇咁嘅統計數據？有冇紀錄？有冇整理過呢啲資料？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗喺呢方面冇收集過或者整理過統計數據嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）警方冇？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋唔可以代表警方回答。

主席：（經傳譯員）你接觸佢哋嘅交通意外數據庫嘅，你唔係叫你幫佢答，有冇任何數據係協助到你嘅？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）主席，喺我哋嘅路上交通意外數據，我哋每年係的確有啲數字嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有啲數字係包括私家車，但係我問嘅係巴士。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋巴士方面都有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有啲咩嘢數字呢？或者你可以考慮下呢點，我就唔想對你唔公平，如果你需要啲時間去整理下啲資料，我哋可以稍後再返番呢一點嘅。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，因為提到警方嘅數據，我問緊我嘅助手搵番最近警方發畀我哋嘅函件，有啲資料關於係巴士座位乘客受傷嘅數據嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你都提醒咗我，呢啲資料喺我哋嘅網站有冇呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅，未必可以完全回答到呢個問題嘅，但係都有啲關係嘅，而家想請你睇番雜項1C嘅，頁數係124-561，主席，呢個係10月3號2018年警方發畀我哋委員會嘅函件。陳女士，你而家面前都應該有呢一封信件，係警方係喺2018年10月3號寫畀委員會嘅，第3段，警方知悉佢哋嘅總部係搵唔到任何運輸署根據喺2007年呢個建議喺巴士上安裝安全帶嘅任何諮詢嘅，呢一段就講到同道路安全議會嘅會議，之後嗰頁。

第4段，警方係咁講嘅，警方就係有一啲統計數字，關於係喺巴士上嘅座位乘客冇戴安全帶受傷嘅，跟住就係2015年、2016年、17年警方有啲數據提供，似乎就係一啲乘客係有帶同冇帶安全帶而受傷嘅數字嘅。

運輸署有冇考慮到呢一啲數據呢，當時你係提議話喺新嘅巴士係有安全帶，你去考慮個益處嘅時候，有冇睇過呢啲數據呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）還是你第一次去睇到呢啲嘅數據呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，唔係嘅，我哋都係知道呢啲嘅數據。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，你以前見過㗎喇，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）其實佢哋嗰個格式可能唔同嘅，但係嗰個來源，其實我哋都知嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）當時你去做分析嘅時候，有冇考慮呢啲數據？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）而家嗰啲傷亡嘅情況，因為有啲--而家我哋就冇安全帶吖嘛，我哋嘅建議就係話要提供安全帶，我哋比較關注...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，唔係，唔係，個問題好簡單嘅啫，你有冇考慮過呢啲嘅數據呢？你可以話畀我聽你仲考慮過其他嘢，但係有冇考慮過呢啲數據？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）是或者否其實好簡單嘅啫，如果你想補充嘅時候，你可以話畀我聽你考慮過其他嘢都得。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋要好公道嘅，對啲同事，佢喺我哋嘅運輸署其實係道路安全嘅專家，佢有參加道路安全議會嘅會議，佢亦都係有同警方去聯繫，基於佢哋以前嘅研究，佢哋係攞到警方嘅資料同埋數據嘅，冇錯，如果有咁樣嘅數字，點樣嘅方法係去表達呢啲數字嘅時候，佢哋就冇考慮過，但係邱先生可能想解釋嘅就係話佢哋嘅專業嘅分析就會話畀佢聽有安全帶就會係對於

坐喺度嘅乘客提供額外嘅保障嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋之前有警司係嚟作供嘅，佢話畀我哋聽，提醒我哋有如果呢一個嘅乘客佢係戴安全帶戴得好嘅說話，佢就可以個生命得到保障，呢個嘅問題就係大家唔爭論嘅，個問題就係話--個問題--而家個問題喺邊度，同埋究竟嗰個成本係點樣樣。邱先生，其實你有冇做到啲分析同埋有冇一啲文件去令我哋明白你究竟係做過啲咩嘢分析，你可唔可以提供呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）喺我哋嘅工作小組嘅報告第5.3、5.4段嗰度，我哋有提到...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以首先回答我個問題，其實你有冇係做過一個文件就係有呢一個成本效益分析呢？

邱國鼎先生：No. I want to mention...

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以就咁答問題？有冇咁做？

邱國鼎先生：We are going to request in the working group report that those...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，邱先生，唔該你答我嘅問題。你需要幾多時間都得，你係需要點樣解釋都得，我會畀時間你，但係回答我問題，喺呢一個課題上面，你有冇去撰寫過一個文件？或者呢個係一個好簡單嘅問題，你用--你可以花啲時間去諗一諗。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，你係想講啲乜嘢嘢呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）第5.4段，呢個工作小組嘅報告就話「所以喺現有嘅巴士，如果我哋要加裝安全帶，個工作小組就建議運輸署、專營巴士公司同埋巴士廠就係大家緊密繼續聯繫同埋去工作嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）係，呢個係咪你想話畀我哋聽嘅？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，陳生，繼續。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我下一條問題就係咁嘅，可能唔係咁公道嘅，咁樣問你，就係請你解釋就係你上一手做過或者冇做過啲乜嘢，但係無論如何，個問題就係話運輸署--如果個安全帶係咁好，點解喺2006、07年做個檢討嘅時候，冇加入咁樣嘅要求呢、規定呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我就唔可以係代我嘅上一手嘅人去回答，但係喺我哋工作小組嘅討論嘅當中，運輸署嘅睇法就係安全帶就會提供畀乘客一個多一層嘅保

障，但係可唔可以達到我哋希望達到嘅成果呢？亦都係視乎嗰個乘客會唔會使用或者配戴呢啲安全帶，同埋佢哋係咪真係坐喺度嘅乘客。

我哋知道有限制嘅，對於呢一個安全帶有冇效，但係即使係咁，我哋認為係新巴士嚟講，如果我哋要配有安全帶，其實都幾有成本效益，亦都會係提供額外嘅保障，而嗰個額外嘅成本亦都唔係咁大嘅。係關於現有巴士我哋再加裝，遲少少我就會講多啲。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。陳生。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺加裝之前，我就係都想提一點嘅，喺九巴關於大埔嘅意外嘅調查報告嘅時候，2018 年 3 月 12 號提交畀運輸署，九巴就係講，就話--自願咁講，就係話佢會係安裝--喺所有嘅座位之中安裝安全帶，...

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以睇一睇嗰個頁數呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）KMB-1 第 114 頁第 40 段嘅，主席，114 頁嘅，就係九巴，係大埔公路嘅意外嘅其中一個嘅部分嚟嘅，係 3 月 12 號嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我哋睇到喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我讀一讀出嚟，第 40 段嘅，就係「安全帶」係標題，係呢個調查報告嘅第 5 部分，就係「其他措施可以改善巴士安全」嘅，好，我哋讀出第 40 段嘅。

「九巴就已經係要求呢個嘅供應商就係喺新巴士喺 2018 年 3 月 5 號採購嘅巴士之中就係都係有安全帶嘅，係一個標準嘅一個設施嚟嘅，而家現有嘅巴士嚟講，如果係有一啲特定嘅路線係需要嘅時候，就喺上層嘅巴士上層嘅座位之中就會係逐步咁安裝安全帶嘅。」

所以喺工作小組第一個會議之前，九巴自己就已經係採取行動係去裝置安全帶喺所有嘅所有座位之中，...

主席：（經傳譯員）係所有新巴士。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，主席，係，唔該晒。我個問題就係九巴而家個情況就係咁，九巴呢個咁樣嘅決定其實有冇影響到工作小組個建議，就係話係建議其他嘅專營巴士公司都係要喺所有嘅座位度安裝安全帶呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）首先，我會想講九巴提供嘅報告，2018 年 3 月 12 號收到嘅，係遲過我哋發出電郵，就係 3 月 6 號就係畀所有嘅巴士營運商，就係話畀佢哋聽其實我哋會研究乜嘢嘅措施去改善巴士安全嘅，我哋提供畀委員會其實已經係提供咗相關嘅電郵嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）冇錯，我哋喺呢點係冇爭議，喺 2 月 15 號立法會有討論過呢個問題，佢哋都有傾過關於呢個安全帶嘅，所以其實你嘅議程裏面，你擺上一個

咁嘅議程就係唔奇怪，冇問題嘅，呢個冇爭議，個問題就係話九巴其實喺工作小組開會之前佢哋作出咁樣嘅決定，呢個有冇影響到你哋工作小組嘅建議，就係話提議其他嘅專營巴士公司，其他或者係所有嘅專營巴士公司都喺新嘅巴士嗰度係有安全帶，有冇影響嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道九巴有呢一個咁嘅計劃，就話係需要供應商喺新嘅巴士有安全帶，但係喺工作小組我哋去討論嘅時候，討論關於安全帶嘅時候，我哋係盡力希望睇下其實嗰個技術可行性、財務方面係點樣樣，同埋道路安全嗰個方面係點樣樣。

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我真係要打斷一下，或者我講得清楚少少，你係睇番嗰個嘅可行性，技術嘅可行性，同埋係呢一個關於呢一個對於道路安全同埋乘客嗰個益處嘅，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，陳先生。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就而家係去到關於加裝安全帶方面，...

主席：（經傳譯員）好，我哋喺做呢樣嘢之前，其實你可唔可以幫一幫委員會，喺呢一方面，專營巴士或者係九巴其實係大概佔嘅比例係幾多呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）你嘅意思係巴士嘅數目，係咪呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）係，巴士嘅數目，佔幾多？大概係四千，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）大概係三分之二，即係六千部之中，四千部係九巴嘅。呢間公司其實係三分二，擁有香港嘅巴士車隊，佢就係決定喺新巴士裏面係裝置安全帶，其餘三分之一，你就話被悉到呢個九巴嘅決定嘅，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，或者我哋而家小休二十分鐘。

上午11時32分聆訊押後

上午11時54分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，而家我想講加裝安全帶嘅問題，我首先係講番工作小組有關嘅段落，我係會讀多啲段落出嚟嘅，因為我發現加裝呢個問題係比較複雜嘅，為咗對工作小組嘅分析公道，我係會係全部讀幾段出嚟，首先請大家睇 3.8 段，係工作小組報告，內部頁碼 26，聽證會號碼係 TD-5 文件 1786 頁，主席，似乎嗰個屏幕有少少問題--而家有喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）解決咗未呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，解決咗。陳女士，你睇唔睇到 3.8 段呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我而家係會將佢讀出嚟，亦都會讀出 3.9、3.10，然而就會停一停，到時我會係講幾句嘅，不過首先我讀咗先。

3.8，佢嘅部分就係話喺現有專營巴士上加裝安全帶呢一部分嘅，佢就係咁講，而家個問題就係講加裝上層嘅安全帶嘅，3.8 係咁講嘅「就算係喺上層所有乘客座位加裝安全帶係技術上可行都好，都有其他嘅影響嘅，首先，我哋認為巴士嘅重量係會增加 300 至 400 公斤，而載客嘅容量可能會減少七至八位乘客，因為係要將佢改裝；仲有加裝同埋測試嘅工作，喺每一架專營巴士嚟講，都要需要好多嘅時間，因此亦都會係影響喺呢一個程序當中巴士嘅操作同埋巴士可用率嘅。同埋睇下仲有冇呢一啲嘅人力，ADL 同富豪就話係需要一個星期，每一架巴士一個星期，仲要三至四個有技能嘅技工嘅，但係因為巴士廠就話佢哋冇咁樣嘅地方係可以做呢啲加裝嘅工作，公營巴士嘅公司就要自己用自己嘅工場嘅地方同埋自己請承辦商去做，因此有冇咁樣有技能技工同埋工場有冇地方就會係一啲好重要嘅考慮。基於一個比較粗略嘅估計，係可能需要六至十二年嘅時間，將全部三千三百架巴士加裝上層安全帶嘅。」

3.9 段，「因此有一啲嘅巴士營辦商就係表達咗一啲關注，就話加裝安全帶唔單只係令到佢哋喺財務上有負擔，甚至喺時間同埋人力方面都係好可觀嘅，仲要就係可能要重新調配或者係購置新嘅、額外嘅巴士令到喺整個程序當中都有足夠嘅巴士服務嘅。」

好喇，講到呢一度，我停一停，喺註腳 10 嗰度就係講到有關嘅財務負擔嘅，佢就係咁講，「我哋未詳細去研究呢一啲技術上嘅細節之中，我哋係假設一架巴士如果係要做呢個加裝就要 20 萬港元嘅，仲未計人力同埋係一啲間接嘅費用嘅。」因此講到成本嗰方面，喺個分析嘅時候，你係睇緊成香港六億元嘅，咁樣先可以係六年到十二年做晒所有嘅加裝，我咁樣講係咪正確呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正確，粗略嘅估計係咁。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者而家我繼續去讀，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你再讀之前，咩嘢意思就係話人力同埋間接費用係唔包括呢？咩嘢意思呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我答呢個問題，喺呢一個註腳嗰度講嘅成本就只係包括巴士製造商喺器材同埋嗰個加裝嘅安全帶嗰度佢哋報價，其他嘅費用或者係人力仲未包括在內嘅，因此我哋係咁講。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話譬如話要有啲工程師，佢哋係要加裝呢一啲嘅安全帶，即係話工程師嘅費用未加落去？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。因為當時係未能夠係估計嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）咩嘢叫做間接嘅費用？係咪即係話譬如話架巴士可能成個禮拜唔用得呀咁？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）有可能係包括你要租個工場嘅地方。

主席：（經傳譯員）仲有架巴士喺嗰個禮拜係唔用得㗎嘛？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）係呀，都未計算喺呢一度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個就係額外嘅成本嚟㗎喇？

陳英傑先生：That's correct.

主席：（經傳譯員）所以呢一個總體嘅數字話6億，其實仲有其他嘅成本係未包括在內嘅？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）跟住第3.10段，「喺呢一方面，所有嘅巴士公司都係話由佢哋每日嘅觀察，坐喺冇遮閉嘅座位嘅乘客通常都唔會戴安全帶嘅，如果係咁嘅情況嘅話，似乎加裝安全帶就唔係符合成本效益喇。」喺呢一度停一停，我想跟進一點。

「另一方面，佢哋覺得應該加強公眾教育去鼓勵喺巴士上配戴安全帶，喺五個專營巴士公司嚟講，九巴同龍運強調佢哋就住新嘅巴士係支持安裝安全帶嘅，亦都要睇下巴士廠商嘅建議，九巴、龍運就會喺上層嘅座位加裝安全帶，又或者係如果有一啲係行公路嘅路線，長途嘅路線，係中段站好少嘅話，亦都可以喺所有嘅乘客座位加裝安全帶，其餘嘅三間巴士公司，即係城巴、新巴、大嶼山巴士公司就唔支持加裝呢一個建議嘅，係因為使用率好低喇預期，同埋係加裝嘅費用高昂，要求政府如果係要加裝呢個建議實施嘅話，係提供津貼嘅。」

停一停，睇番呢一段，係講到巴士公司嘅意見，佢哋話喺冇遮閉嘅座位嘅乘客嗰度，其實一般都唔戴安全帶，佢哋預期個使用率係好低嘅，係咪喺工作小

組嗰時開會都同巴士公司討論呢一點呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）委員會聽過警方嘅證據，而警方嘅代表，即係總警司Baker 佢都係話預期大部分嘅人都會用安全帶嘅。主席，就住呢一個證據、證供，可以講番係喺謄本嗰度嘅第17日嘅聽證會，9月24號2018年，第48頁20行同埋第50頁13行，據我理解，仲有一個做法，就話只係上層安裝安全帶，同埋只係喺長途車，行公路嘅路線，冇乜站先至安裝安全帶。

呢一個就喺3.13嗰段有提到嘅，「結論同埋未來嘅工作」，呢度係咁講嘅，「考慮到喺香港嘅專營巴士嘅營運狀況都係喺市內巴士，亦都係有企位，同埋喺現有嘅巴士加裝安全帶嘅技術可行性、費用同埋所需時間，工作小組認為係理據不足去令到所有嘅巴士係強制安裝座位嘅安全帶。」

我停一停，我唔知道係咪有打錯字吖，定話係語言嘅問題，因為我理解工作小組係有就住新巴士建議所有座位安裝安全帶嘅，呢度就話所有巴士，如果係要強制安裝安全帶嘅話，就理據不足，係咪有啲搞錯呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我可以澄清一下嘅，首先，對於新嘅購置嘅巴士，工作小組嘅建議就係所有新嘅巴士都係所有乘客座位都安裝安全帶嘅，工作小組嘅建議就認為如果係話全部巴士，我哋有一個法定要求或者強制要求要所有巴士，包括新購置巴士同埋現有嘅巴士都係所有乘客座位要加裝安全帶嘅話，就理據不足嘅。我哋咁樣講嘅時候，我哋係明白好多問題，嗰啲問題仲需要仔細考慮去評估嘅，譬如話係安全帶。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢度有個分別，就係話呢個係一個專營巴士嘅協議嘅要求，同埋法定嘅要求，啱唔啱？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個第一個分別，另外就係話所有巴士吖，定係所有新嘅巴士。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）多謝你嘅澄清，我再繼續讀呢一段，「然而工作小組亦都承認喺冇遮閉座位同埋係巴士車廂係冇企位嘅情況底下，安全帶係會為坐低嘅乘客提供額外保障，所以工作小組亦都建議，而所有公司亦都同意現有巴士加裝安全帶呢個可行性係要進一步考慮嘅。視乎技術性、操作上同埋財政上嘅可行性嘅評估，當局應該考慮喺有啲巴士係指派行某一啲嘅路線，譬如話係長途巴士，係行公路，比較少中途站嘅，上層嘅所有座位都應該加裝安全帶。」

睇下個附註，佢就畀咗啲公路嘅例子，呢個係第11號--第12號嘅附註，就係話根據巴士公司，似乎牽涉嘅巴士嘅數目會減低，就大概係二千。

咁樣講啱唔啱呢？呢一個數字都係一個粗略估算嚟嘅，啱唔啱呀？就即係4億港元，稍為超過4億港元。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）講番轉頭，我頭先讀過嘅段落，即係話如果加裝安全帶似乎唔符合成本效益，當大家講到符合成本效益嘅時候，係咪相比加裝安全帶為乘客嚟嘅益處而言呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士都有提過，因為運輸署冇就呢一方面，即係安全帶嘅效益做一個成本效益研究，你點樣去評估成本效益呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對於現有巴士加裝安全帶似乎唔符合成本效益，呢句說話就係有以下考慮嘅，首先，我哋留意到唔係所有現有巴士嘅型號都係適合加裝安全帶嘅；第二，有啲巴士型號適合加裝安全帶嘅技術上，但係喺下層都加裝安全帶嘅話，就會對於巴士嘅結構同埋運作有影響；第三，我哋亦都留意到運作上嘅影響，譬如話時間、所需嘅人手，如果話係要喺工場嗰度加裝嘅話，呢樣嘢亦都會影響專營巴士可以調配嘅巴士嘅數目嘅。考慮到呢啲情況，工作小組係仔細考慮過，亦都有同巴士公司商討嘅，正如資深大律師亦都提到喺 3.13 段、3.14 段，係基於咁嘅原因，而巴士公司亦都同意現有巴士加裝安全帶呢件事係要進一步去研究嘅。

所以回答番你嘅問題，呢句說話話似乎唔符合成本效益係冇經過一啲可以量化同埋穩健嘅成本效益分析，但係我哋有要求巴士公司要進一步評估操作上同埋財務上嘅可行性，我哋先會進一步考慮到底喺上層可唔可以加裝安全帶，如果係嘅話，對於係行走公路嘅長途巴士路線，中途比較少巴士站嘅，會唔會係有比高嘅機會咁樣做呢，因為乘客係冇咁頻密要上車、落車嘅，而係根據咁嘅基礎，係有較大機會使用安全帶嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係嗰個使用率會高啲，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯，主席。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你都提過話需要更多嘅評估，Stanley 教授同埋 Weston 教授都有一啲建議嘅，我讀咗佢哋嘅證供之後，再邀請你去回應一下，你覺得呢個方法係咪可行。而家請你睇番 Stanley 教授嘅證供嘅謄本，就係 2018 年 9 月 15 號，第 124 頁，或者由 123 頁開始講起，畀大家一啲背景資料，第 123 頁第 20 行，你可以見到個題目就係「所有座位加裝安全帶」。

124 頁第 1 行，我就問呢個問題嘅，「喺澳洲市內巴士係咪有要求加裝安全帶嘅呢？」「冇。」

我個問題就話「係咪有原因嘅呢？」Stanley 教授就話「一般嚟講，呢架車輛本身嘅重量，就會提供足夠嘅保障，而安全帶就唔會提供更多嘅保障，而且現有嘅車輛加裝安全帶亦都係一個挑戰，成本亦都會增加。

我唔知你明唔明，有一樣嘢就叫做係一個條例帶嚟嘅影響嘅一個陳述嘅，譬如話如果係喺巴士路線，現有嘅，係強制安裝安全帶嘅話，似乎就要去做一個條例實施嘅影響嘅研究，去睇下咁樣做牽涉嘅成本，同埋亦都要睇下唔同嘅事故嘅情況嘅唔同嘅機率係咪會減低。然後再計下佢嗰個成本，然後去作為一個評估嘅基礎嘅。我哋平時就會咁樣做嘅。」

而主席跟住就問，「呢個嘅條例影響係咩嘢意思呢？」「通常就會由政府部門做嘅，喺澳洲就有係國家嘅層面會做好多嘢，譬如係話佢國家嘅交通局，就係我亦都做咗副主席九年嘅，我哋係有做過唔同嘅車輛研究嘅，唔同方面嘅條例影響嘅說明嘅。」

呢個係其中一段，另外一段都係教授嘅證供，就係第144頁，144頁第4行，我問題係話「考慮到嗰啲資料，你對於呢個意見，即係話喺所有座位安裝安全帶，或者第二，淨係喺上層冇企位嘅乘客去安裝安全帶，你嘅觀察係點呢？」

教授就回答話「多謝，呢個係令我要返番去半個鐘頭前提到嘅嗰個答案嘅，我覺得係有兩個層面嘅，第一，就係話喺巴士嘅某啲位置，譬如話係新巴士嘅上層係技術上係可以安裝安全帶或者係舊嘅巴士去加裝。

第二個層面，就係話如果係技術上可行嘅話，呢一個成本效益比率係幾多呢？即係意思話成本要花幾多，同埋如果安裝咗安全帶之後，嗰啲意外嘅種類發生嘅機率係咪會減低呢？人哋會唔會戴安全帶呢？呢啲問題都係需要回答嘅。

我會講話呢啲問題就係你要係喺條例實施嘅影響嘅評估入面去做嘅，有唔同呢啲種類呢啲意外發生嘅機率個資料係點樣呢，你亦都可以係就住呢啲意外機率減低去睇下用金錢去量化計算，然後你亦都可以對於配戴安全帶嘅機率有個意見，亦都會影響戴安全帶嘅有效性嘅。

政府喺決定如果係技術可行嘅話，作為一個政策嘅決定去安裝安全帶都可以嘅，而咁樣做，你要去先做一個嘅成本效益分析，我覺得喺呢個情況應該咁樣做嘅，所以我覺得個基礎唔可以係話就咁憑人嘅意見認為應該咁做、應該點樣做。

我哋要考慮好多一啲真實而係有基礎嘅一啲關注，同埋會影響係咪去安裝安全帶，但係你要做一個恰當嘅成本效益分析先，如果唔係，所有都係猜測嘅。

我自己就覺得人哋可能覺得係應該要安裝安全帶，不過呢個冇恰當嘅評估嘅話，只係一個意見嚟嘅。」

「即係話就咁一個嘅感受係唔夠嘅，你要做一個嘅成本效益分析？」

「冇錯。」

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

「而咁樣做嘅話，你會睇啲乜嘢情況呢？」

「理論上，原則上，就會係非常簡單嘅成本效益分析，而要考慮個機率嘅價值嘅話，你要做一啲比較嚴肅啲嘅研究，你要睇番你喺唔同嘅收到嘅陳述書入面已經係提到過嘅。」

跟住落嚟嘅證供就問關於澳洲嘅好多嘅資料，我就唔會讀出嚟。另外一段我想講嘅都係同一點嘅，就係喺第149頁第4行，Stanley教授個答案中間，呢一段開始，第4行係講效益嘅。

「但係呢個情況就要問係有乜嘢效益，你要睇下呢架車係會發生乜嘢類型嘅意外，譬如係咪喺企位嘅乘客定座位嘅乘客會有意外，而如果要求戴安全帶嘅話，呢一類型嘅意外機率係咪會減低幾多，而你要做啲乜嘢去鼓勵大家戴安全帶呢？

如果係咁樣做嘅話，我就可能係要同心理學家講下你點樣去叫人戴安全帶、點樣令到人哋去認真處理，我覺得喺香港，而家都係應該要咁樣做嘅，係好重要嘅就係去考慮到底會發生嘅機率係幾多，我會同--即係話我會考慮發生呢啲意外之後嗰個成本係幾多，即係話如果香港有致命意外嘅話，牽涉嘅費用係幾多、個成本係幾多、嚴重受傷嘅意外係幾多，因為你要將呢一啲嘅價值去將佢轉換去應用喺係某一種嘅意外發生嘅機率減低咗嘅話，個價值係幾多。」即係解釋咗就點樣去做一個成本效益分析嘅。

就我就會睇一睇 Weston 先生喺倫敦嘅情況，然後我就會問一問你點樣睇佢哋嘅意見。好，我哋而家去睇番去 Weston 先生嘅報告，係呢個專家嘅文件冊115頁，我就想睇一段簡短嘅一段，就係呢一個嘅文件夾嘅第148頁，喺文件裏面就係第34頁嚟嘅。

陳小姐，第148頁，呢個就係「巴士安全標準」嘅，呢個背景就係關於應該係裝置一啲乜嘢嘅安全裝置，我就會讀下面數上嚟第三段。

呢度講話「雖然話呢個新嘅標準就會喺新嘅巴士適用，每一年就有七百部嘅，我哋亦都係諗緊其實可唔可以喺而家嘅巴士裏面加裝，特別就係而家係中期嘅時段，就大概係會係需要七年時間去完成嘅。我哋特別要留意就係倫敦運輸局就係採取一個非常嚴謹嘅措施就去睇番每一個嘅可能性，就用一個成本效益分析嘅，就會係希望能夠達到就係話每一鎊我哋使咗嘅錢就能夠達成最大嘅傷亡同埋意外減低嘅效益嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係巴士安全嘅標準，我哋睇緊唔同嘅巴士嘅科技嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者我亦都係為紀錄起見，我都係睇一睇第二段，就係「巴士安全標準」。

「有唔同嘅科技我哋睇緊嘅，包括智慧車速輔助、自動剎車同埋呢一個聲控同埋影像嘅分析等等，其實都係我哋睇緊嘅，我哋都係設計去睇呢一啲嘅唔同

嘅選項，就確保我哋係投資咗幾多錢，我哋應該係能夠攞盡嗰個益處同埋利益嘅。」

因此呢兩個嘅專家嘅報告話畀我哋聽其實佢哋都有做--喺兩個唔同嘅司法管轄區都做一啲好嚴謹嘅成本效益分析嘅，我希望運輸署特別去睇一睇呢一個咁樣嘅方法，就特別喺專營巴士裏面加裝安全帶，會唔會係做同類嘅嘢呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）第一位專家嘅供詞，佢就講到個規管影響研究，就佢認為係需要嘅，如果我哋係要強制係要加裝或者安裝安全帶嘅時候，就需要嘅，喺呢一個 Weston 先生，倫敦，佢就講到係成本效益分析，運輸署嘅睇法就係我哋同意喺車上面係安裝一啲嘅裝置去改善巴士安全標準，我哋係需要有一個嚴謹同埋小心嘅評估，或者我哋所用嘅字眼係同佢哋唔相同嘅，同嗰個專家，譬如話規管影響研究或者成本效益分析，可能我哋用嘅字眼唔同，但係工作小組嘅觀察同埋佢考慮就係話我哋都係需要進一步去探討個可行性同埋嗰個運作上嘅影響、財務嘅承擔等等，係就住--即係話就住加裝或者安裝安全帶。換句話嚟講，我哋都係睇緊用一個更有系統嘅方法，更全面嘅方法去睇呢一個嘅課題。

主席較早前都提出，喺第 3.13、3.14 段，喺呢個工作小組嘅報告裏面，我哋可能冇講過話就係將成本同埋效益嚟作一個對比，但係我哋都係前瞻嘅，前瞻嘅，當我哋再去推進呢個項嘅時候，我同意我哋係需要睇番喺操作技術同埋財務方面嘅承擔同埋睇番我哋嗰個嘅效益係點。

我哋而家喺現有嘅巴士加裝安全帶似乎唔係咁符合成本效益，我哋亦都考慮過幾個因素，所以其實係咪應該成為一個強制或者法定嘅規定，抑或要求特別係喺目前現有巴士上層加裝安全帶，我哋真係要去認真去睇下究竟我哋係有乜嘢額外嘅成本或者額外嘅效益，特別係我哋亦都係睇番成本同埋個技術嘅可行性。

專家提過，如果我哋係需要有個強制嘅要求嘅時候，我哋需要係進行一啲成本效益分析或者係做一啲影響嘅研究。唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）又或者 Stanley 教授或者 Weston 先生嘅報告都有提到，就話有啲科學嘅、量化嘅一啲嘅效益，如果我哋真係要加裝安全帶，我哋需唔需要做呢啲嘢呢？你同唔同意呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我同意嘅。我哋需要做好多嘅工作嘅。專營巴士喺香港，我哋暫時都未有呢啲嘅裝置，所以其實喺呢方面，我哋都係好難收集數據，但係我哋都可以係研究海外嘅經驗，作進一步嘅分析，特別係基於嗰啲意外嘅數據、其他嘅車輛嘅意外數據，但係我哋要考慮到佢哋唔係雙層嘅車輛。我哋需要為乘客提供保護，我哋亦都要考慮呢一點，去決定究竟我哋要唔要求或者係需唔需要進一步考慮喺上層去加裝安全帶嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就想去另外一個嘅課題，就係關於巴士意外數

據。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺做呢個之前，我又自己都有幾個問題想問一問嘅，你有冇去搜集一啲數據，就係關於安全帶，如果有嗰啲安全帶，佢哋嘅使用率係點樣呢？即係講緊喺專營巴士嘅安全帶。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇，主席，冇。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解冇呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我冇答案。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇打算將來會收集呢啲數據？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會咁樣做嘅。我想補充，就係我哋亦都留意到係巴士營運商喺工作小組嘅時候，佢哋亦都畀過一啲意見，佢哋傾向於認為就係嗰個使用率都係好低嘅，我哋知道有咁嘅意見，而家個使用率係相對較低嘅，但係呢個唔係一個我哋應該關鍵去考慮嘅因素，當我哋去考慮就應唔應該喺現有巴士裏面加裝安全帶，因為我哋認為無論係政府或者係巴士公司，應該係做多啲乘客教育嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋 Mr Samuel Cheng 先生，城巴嘅董事總經理，佢喺作供嘅時候，佢就話佢係--佢自己都成日搭巴士，但係安全帶係啲人係唔多用嘅，你覺得呢個係咪一個公道嘅講法呢？就係冇人用或者係一個使用率係好低。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我有知道佢嘅證供係咁嘅，但係其他嘅巴士公司或者佢哋嘅員工，佢哋個個講法係唔一樣嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢話佢成日都搭巴士嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我係接受佢嘅證供，但係我自己都成日搭巴士嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你有冇發現啲人係就會配戴安全帶呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我自己會戴嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）其他呢，其他人呢？你自己之外。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）其實其他有啲人鍾意喺啲冇遮擋嘅座位嗰度坐，譬如話上層嘅頭一排，我自己個人嘅經驗，我就見到啲人係有用--有配戴安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實如果我哋叫巴士公司用閉路電視睇下啲人有冇用安全帶，其實會唔會好簡單？譬如特別係呢一個上層嘅乘客。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個好嘅建議嚟嘅。如果我哋安裝閉路電視，其實而家已經有百分之八十嘅巴士就有閉路電視，有啲就喺上層安裝嘅，我覺得你呢個建議係好嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你計唔計劃會強制--如果有啲人--有啲巴士已經安裝咗安全帶，強制啲乘客一定要配戴呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個正正係我想係提出嘅一點，我係同意專家嘅觀察，我哋係需要有一個嚴謹嘅規管影響研究，先至決定係咪應該係強制啲人一定係要配戴安全帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇考慮過如果係要強制乘客配戴安全帶係會有咩嘢困難呢？我哋上高冇其他嘅人手，只係有個車長喺度，會唔會真係有困難呢？如果有個強制嘅要求。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔會低估嗰個困難嘅，特別係實際喺營運嘅當中，特別係話點樣去執法，我哋肯定會考慮呢一點嘅，如果我哋特別去係審視喺所有巴士裏面安裝安全帶嘅時候。唔該晒。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）關於教育嗰方面呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）歐陽先生，係。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）呢一個運輸署有冇方法點樣去更加去教育乘客同埋鼓勵佢哋去做安全帶？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）其實呢個我哋可以做得更多嘅，我哋希望有個乘客嘅宣傳運動，亦都係會有唔同嘅主題，關於佢哋嘅態度、佢哋嘅責任，特別佢哋喺公交嘅時候、坐車嘅時候佢哋應該點樣做，關於安全帶點樣使用，如果真係有安全帶嘅時候，佢哋應該使用。呢個肯定我哋係需要做多啲宣傳嘅。唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果係一個強制嘅要求，如果真係有已經安裝咗安全帶，強制要求佢哋配戴，呢個會唔會成為你哋嘅工作其中一個部分呢？你曾經喺呢個小巴做過嘅，你可唔可以睇下啲經驗係點？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係有幫助嘅，但係嗰個執法同埋個影響都要考慮嘅。我哋係要執法嘅，同埋個巴士公司係應該去落實嘅，如果真係要成為呢個強制規定嘅時候，我哋係要考慮呢啲。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋之前又睇過一啲嘅證供，我就唔哋，你可唔可以話畀我聽其實喺香港嘅法例嚟講，喺小巴裏面強制啲乘客去戴安全帶係咪有強制嘅規定㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅，係嘅。我哋可以係去搵番啲資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實我哋都有呢啲資料，我哋都聽過一啲證供嘅。總警司 Baker 先生，你就話畀我哋聽其實你都--如果專營巴士要--即係你即係個使用率係非常之低，喺公共小巴裏面嘅使用率都係好低，其實喺執法嚟，都係好難嘅，可能係分--即係某一個時期特別去執法咁樣。

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我想補充，我知道佢嗰個證供嘅，其實呢個永遠都係一個雞同雞蛋嘅問題，如果我哋要考慮任何嘅安全裝置，我哋係令到佢係一個強制性嘅措施，如果我哋係要將呢個建議提交立法會嘅時候，政府一直嘅做法就係會係將我哋嘅影響嘅評估嘅資料都係提交畀立法會嘅，喺立法之前，我哋好多時候都係需要提交一啲嘅數字、數據去支持我哋嘅建議。

另外一點，我哋嘅立法會議員都會問，就係究竟執法係咪可行呢？但係一旦立法，就係運輸署或者其他嘅執法部門就會盡我哋嘅努力去確保嗰啲立法嘅、嗰啲法例嘅規定係真係可以盡力去落實嘅。唔該晒。

主席：（經傳譯員）你之前講過，如果我冇記錯，如果配戴係要一個強制嘅規定，可能係需要巴士公司去執法，係咪去落實佢呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）開始嘅時候，巴士車長就會係乘客嘅第一個嘅接觸點，就係話畀巴士乘客聽相關嘅資料，如果已經係立法喇，永遠都係嗰啲執法機構嘅責任去執法嘅，如果佢哋係收到投訴又或者佢哋係知道有違法嘅情況，佢哋嘅責任係去執法嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解我提出呢一點呢？因為巴士公司嘅證供話畀我哋聽，其實佢哋真係做唔到，只係有一個巴士司機，有好多嘅乘客喺巴士上面，亦都係巴士有兩層。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我哋知道，亦都明白巴士車長嘅困難同埋佢嘅壓力，如果我哋真係要強制咁樣做，我哋要確保個法例寫到一個地步，其實呢個條例係可以執行到嘅。同樣，我哋可能亦都係要令到巴士嘅營運者就係確保嗰啲安全帶就係會被乘客去配戴嘅。閉路電視同埋宣傳計劃都可以考慮嘅，但係喺呢一個階段，我哋唔會掉以輕心，其實而家我哋都未係話可以好快令到呢一個係強制性嘅，所以我哋係好謹慎進行。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，我而家講下一個嘅課題，就係巴士意外嘅數據。首先，我要處理一下現時嘅狀況先嘅，我哋睇咗嗰啲係所謂 FPP，即係前瞻性策劃嘅計劃嘅關於巴士安全嗰啲嘅部分，我唔會再講，但係嗰度係有好多關於巴士意外嘅數據喺嗰個部分嘅，我亦都聽到警方嘅證供，就係話警方係並不能接觸到巴士安全報告裏面嘅一啲數據嘅。主席，警方嘅證供就係第 17 日，第 19 頁嘅，我唔會真係要詳細讀出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係總警司 Baker 嘅證供。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我個問題係咁嘅，喺公眾得到呢一啲數據之前，即係話你未將呢一啲數據交畀委員會，因此公眾得到呢啲數據之前，請問呢一啲嘅分析數據有冇向大眾公布過呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會答先，然後我會請我嘅同事補充嘅。基於我自己嘅知

識同埋記憶，我哋係有叫專營巴士公司進一步披露佢哋嘅意外嘅數據，我哋就係請佢哋每年咁樣做。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係幾時作出呢個要求呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）等我哋查核一下先。可能我哋只能夠講嗰一個年份，我哋係將佢作為一個續牌嘅要求。根據我嘅同事所講，就已經好多年㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係呢一個係續牌嘅要求嚟嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你意思係將嗰個數據交畀運輸署？但係我頭先個問題係講話要向公眾披露有關嘅數據喎。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我詳細講一下，或者--有喇，係咪呀？而家喺屏幕上面係有新巴 2017 年話佢更全面披露嘅一份文件，或者我哋睇關於個頁底嗰個部分，再繼續向下，第 13 項。呢個唔係我真係想舉嘅例子，或者我遲啲再畀城巴 2017 更全面披露嘅一份文件畀大家，我遲啲畀一個頁碼大家。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實喺我哋嗰啲聆訊文件裏面有嘅，喺邊度呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）畀少少時間我哋搵一搵。文件喺 TD-3 第 906 頁，陳女士，你係咪想搵呢份文件？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一頁呢？如果你有原本嗰份文件嗰個內部嘅頁碼係幾多呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）喺左上同左右都有一啲嘅文件嘅編頁嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）但係喺底部我哋係睇到 909 呢一頁。我想講嘅就係巴士營辦商喺佢哋更全面披露呢一種嘅報告裏面就係會將意外嘅數據公布畀公眾嘅，但係我都要指出嗰啲數據嘅描述未必係可以去到比較深嘅層次嘅，因為如果個情況係需要嘅話，我哋係會請佢哋更加詳細咁樣去分析，講出個意外嘅原因，但係呢一啲咁樣嘅就係意外嘅數據，就係我哋要求佢哋喺全面披露報告裏面公布畀公眾嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係咪睇緊第 13 段呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，第 13 項。

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇網上睇倫敦方面嗰個意外數據嘅報告呀？

陳美寶女士：I have. It's more...

主席：（經傳譯員）你有冇見到佢哋其實每季都提供一啲粗略嘅數字，香港點解唔可以咁做呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，之前嗰啲前瞻性嘅策劃報告，即係我哋喺 5 月嘅時候提交畀委員會嗰啲，我個人認為有好多嘅範疇其實都可以改善嘅，即係喺 2019 同埋 2023 年嘅時候，我哋再做呢一啲遠期計劃嘅時候，就好似我哋提議過，會請佢哋係進一步做多啲分析嘅，肯定我哋係可以進一步要求巴士營辦商以更詳細嘅方式將意外嘅數據係公布畀公眾人士嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇咩嘢嘅原因係我哋喺呢啲遠期計劃裏面睇到嘅意外數據點解唔可以全面披露畀公眾呢？有冇咩嘢理由嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好明顯，我哋仲未同巴士營辦商詳細去傾，就係話呢一類咁樣嘅安全數據可唔可以全面披露，我只係想指出...

主席：（經傳譯員）你諗唔諗到啲咩嘢原因呀？點解唔可以全面披露？呢啲唔係商業性嘅敏感資料嚟嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，唔會話有即時嘅商業敏感性，...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔緊要，你要多啲時間諗，你可以諗嘅，但係我自己就覺得好簡單啫，應該唔會有咩嘢商業嘅敏感性而因此係唔可以向公眾披露。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我只係想強調一點，當我哋請專營巴士營辦商提供多啲嘅資料去做遠期計劃，而唔係因為要全面披露嘅理由，我哋仲未係去叫巴士營辦商去分析每一條巴士路線嘅意外原因嘅，即係我哋冇具體咁樣要求。我唔係話呢樣嘢會有商業敏感性，但係我哋都要明白如果呢一個巴士安全嘅章節都要變成全面披露嘅資料嘅話，我哋都要由商業敏感性呢一個角度去考慮佢。

主席：（經傳譯員）你又諗到啲乜嘢嘅商業敏感性嘅角度呢？我而家就邀請你咁做，有啲乜嘢係會有商業敏感性嘅呢？呢個只係講巴士安全嘅章節啫。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我只係理論上咁樣去思考一下啫而家，主席，因為巴士公司都需要詳細講出一啲嘅計劃去加強巴士安全同埋佢哋會採取咩嘢措施，巴士嘅營辦商有可能對於某啲具體嘅措施係講明需要用幾多錢同埋會講實施某一個具體措施，喺未來五年嗰個時間性嘅，即係亦都會講到佢哋成間公司喺呢一方面要做幾多投資嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係巴士安全嗰個章節？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁，或者陳律師，一陣間你可以帶我哋去睇嗰個章節，去睇下係咪有咁嘅情況。我一般嘅問題就係話究竟係咪真係喺呢一啲數據裏面有任何嘅商業敏感性？我就要問呢個問題。陳律師，請你一陣間返嚟處理呢個問題。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好呀，我喺食晏之後會處理呢一點。

主席：（經傳譯員）當我哋講緊呢一個題目嘅時候，我想問下有冇咩嘢嘅理由，點解呢一個巴士安全嘅章節亦都唔可以披露畀警方呢？因為警方就話如果收到，佢哋會好高興，點解連警方都收唔到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我就睇唔到有咩嘢嘅困難嘅，如果要提供呢一啲數據同警方分享嘅話，應該冇咩嘢困難嘅，呢樣嘢我哋係可以考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你只可以考慮，你唔可以話一定得呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗喺而家我哋可以講嘅只係話考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你係可以同佢哋討論，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我想講，因為呢一個巴士安全嘅章節係以遠期計劃嘅其中一部分交畀運輸署嘅，除咗係畀好多詳細嘅分析之外，其實有一個目標就係要讓巴士營辦商話畀政府聽佢哋喺遠期計劃裏面有啲乜嘢嘅投資、佢哋嘅策劃等，所以喺呢一方面，我要小心啲，我喺呢一方面，我唔能夠為政府承諾任何一個章節會有咩嘢具體嘅披露嘅，好似我剛才回答主席，呢一個巴士安全嘅章節如果要同警方去分享，我哋只能夠話我哋可以考慮。

主席：（經傳譯員）我咁樣講啱唔啱呢？陳律師，我記得 Weston 先生就建議，就話有關嘅數據要向公眾披露。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅，啱嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者喺食晏之後，你亦都可以返嚟講番呢一點。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，之後我哋會講有關嘅建議嘅。好，而家我哋再集中睇一睇現時嘅情況，然後睇下將來嘅情況可以係點樣。喺星期四嘅聆訊當中，運輸署喺聆訊當中提供咗一份文件，就係話交通意外嘅成因嘅，就係喺右手面上角就寫住“E”嘅附件嘅。

照我所知，呢一份文件仲未納入我哋嘅聆訊文件冊當中嘅。主席，而家都喺屏幕上面，請問你有冇自己一份呢，主席？而家向大家派發一個副本嘅。

我講一講個背景先，呢一份文件係一封信裏面嘅一部分，就係運輸署畀九巴嘅一封信件，係 2018 年 5 月 21 號嘅，就係請九巴提出佢哋對意外嘅分析嘅，為咗謄本嘅利益，呢一個嘅謄本嘅頁碼就係 TD-5 1728 頁。我個問題好簡單，咁樣嘅一個表有冇向公眾披露過呢，係好有系統、好定期咁樣，以一個咁樣嘅表列嘅公眾公布過呢一啲嘅資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我要對你公道嘅，我知道運輸署係有發布--即係喺網上，每年發布道路交通意外嘅一啲資料，個資料亦都包括專營巴士嘅，我只不過係想問下有冇好似咁詳細咁樣公布呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，冇咁詳細咁樣公布。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我哋未講個建議同埋將來嘅情況可以點之前，首先，我想確立一下呢一啲意外嘅數字，由專營巴士營辦商交畀運輸署...

主席：（經傳譯員）你未講呢一點之前，我想睇番E附件呢一度，我哋聽到有好多嘅意外，其實都係關乎到啲人係喺巴士上面失去平衡嘅，呢一度有啲乜嘢係巴士車長嘅駕駛態度係同呢一度有關--呢一樣嘢有關嘅呢？請你睇一睇呢個表。

我咁樣問係因為當我睇到話係好疏忽咁樣開動或者係剎車，同埋係好重咁樣剎車或者係突然間好快咁加速，似乎嗰啲事件嘅數字係好細嘅，究竟係有啲乜嘢嘅原因係令到巴士乘客失去平衡呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）主席，講番呢一個表，我想逐一項咁樣講，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你等一等。你講咗啲比較重要嘅先，然後由最重講到最唔重要。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我會覺得係停車或者開動架車係疏忽嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解得咁少事件呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我相信佢哋有可能係防止碰撞，個車長可能會好快咁樣剎車嘅，即係可能係要防止同其他嘅車輛碰撞，就會令到乘客係失去平衡嘅；同埋係好疏忽咁樣爬頭、轉線，亦都會令到乘客失去平衡；開得太快，有可能，但係如果佢係一路都係揸得太快...

主席：（經傳譯員）咁就冇問題喎，其實個問題就係佢係要改變個速度先至會令人失去平衡，或者係突然間扭軚。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）所以呢個揸得太快應該唔係嘅。如果係掉頭，...

主席：（經傳譯員）巴士都唔需要掉頭，係咪呀？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯嘅，唔係好多時巴士需要掉頭。但係一般嚟講，我哋嘅路線係會畀我哋測試過嘅，但係如果佢哋真係需要掉頭嘅話，我哋係會請佢哋小心謹慎嘅。但係掉頭有可能嘅，因為佢轉嘅方向，一路轉嘅時候有唔同嘅車速，就會令到乘客失去平衡。再睇落去，「冇留意交通訊號／交通燈」，應該唔會嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）不如你話有關係嗰啲，好唔好？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）「不專注駕駛」應該可能會係，「不能控制車輛」可能係，「巴士車長突然間生病」...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢一啲咁嘅數字唔係好幫到我哋嘅。等我哋再問過呢個問題，因為而家就話巴士乘客會失去平衡，我就想知道係有啲咩理由，喺邊度可以搵到呢啲資料？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）或者我哋可以做多啲分析，我諗我哋係有意外一啲後果嘅，譬如車上有冇乘客失平衡受傷。

主席：（經傳譯員）用呢個做例子。

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋可以根據呢個情況，做多啲分析。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果有人係喺車上失平衡，受傷，可能撞到車上嘅硬物受傷，巴士公司會唔會分析番意外成因呢？呢個係最易嘅方法嚟嘅，係咪因為有小朋友突然過馬路要急剎吖，定係架車突然轉線吖，會唔會去睇下係咪咁嘅情況呢？或者佢個巴士站係要埋站嘅時候佢係急劇剎掣咁樣，有冇做咁樣嘅分析呢？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我理解巴士公司有調查。

主席：（經傳譯員）調查之後嘅數據會唔會畀結果你睇，睇下意外成因？

陳英傑先生：（經傳譯員）我哋冇收到呢個資料，唔係每一宗意外都有，但係一啲特定嘅事故或者意外，我哋有要求佢哋調查更多詳情嘅話，佢哋係會提交嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我唔係問緊你有冇數據，但係你都可以整理資料，譬如話喺巴士上，我哋有二百個乘客受傷係因為司機嘅問題嘅，譬如話係加速太快或者係急劇減速。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我嘗試協助，呢一方面我同事而家搵番有關嘅資料先，我就記得過去，譬如 2006、07 年，喺佢哋嘅分析，喺意外當中，任何巴士公司，即係分析乘客失衡嘅時候受傷，亦都有係睇下有幾多宗咁嘅事故，要求佢哋調查嘅，其中一件事--其中一個原因就係話喺樓梯嗰度缺乏扶手，同埋喺下層缺乏扶手，係因為做完呢個分析之後，我哋就要求巴士公司加裝車廂嘅儀器去處理呢個因素，即係話有乘客喺上層由巴士樓梯碌落嚟，碌咗去下層。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊一年份呀？你要求呢一個數據，嚟提供數據。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我同事而家喺度搵緊。應該係我哋之前一份意見書，提交咗㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔使趕，因為而家已經午膳時間，或者喺午飯之後繼續，而家午飯休息，下晝兩點半繼續，唔該。

<u>下午 1 時 03 分聆訊押後</u>

下午2時32分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）午安。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，午飯時間，陳女士同我係要幫委員會查番一啲資料嘅，我而家逐樣講番，第一個參考嘅資料委員會有興趣知嘅就係 Weston 先生同埋 Stanley 教授喺呢個巴士遠期計劃入面關於增加巴士安全嘅管理嘅事項嘅意見。

而家先睇番 Stanley 教授嘅意見，喺專家文件冊嘅第 67 頁，即係喺第二份報告入面嘅第 67 頁。等我讀出嚟。

「呢一個遠期計劃嘅文件就係保密文件嚟嘅，係巴士公司同埋運輸署之間嘅保密文件，作者相信入面嘅數據同埋分析係作為營運商工作一個重要嘅部分去顯示佢哋係有能力提供恰當有效嘅服務，而同呢啲服務有關嘅主要傷亡都係行人嘅，令到佢哋嘅社會或者係外在成本係增加嘅。喺呢份報告嘅第 4 段就係話呢啲嘅營運商要確保佢哋提供恰當有效嘅服務，就喺表現方面會受到壓力嘅。而佢哋安全表現係要公開嘅話，可以令到佢哋持續地受到呢一種表現嘅壓力。亦都有一啲嘅說法，認為喺呢個遠期計劃入面嘅巴士安全嘅章節係應該公開嘅，係考慮到呢啲意外嘅更廣泛嘅社會嘅成本。」

另一方面，Stanley 教授嘅證供就係喺 9 月 15 號 2018 年第 178 頁嘅，佢有嚟到委員會度作證。

主席：（經傳譯員）繼續。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）可以睇番第 3 行，第 3 行就我問咗一個問題，我問 Stanley 教授「你喺你嘅專家報告第 69 頁提出一個論點，第 69 頁嘅第一點就係話『有啲有力嘅論點就係對於五年遠期計劃巴士安全嘅章節係應該發布嘅，係因為意外比較廣泛嘅社會成本。』」

跟住 Stanley 教授就話「係嘅，陳先生，我覺得係關於巴士安全章節嘅某啲部分嘅討論係好有資料性嘅，呢啲為咗公眾起見，係應該畀公眾參考，譬如舉個例，喺駕駛嘅分析同埋點樣影響意外表現，我諗係有關連，呢個關連係重要嘅。」

「係，我覺得應該係有啲比較，譬如係話你駕駛嘅時數、司機嘅年齡喇咁？」

「冇錯，係譬如係入職年期同埋喺意外之前嘅駕駛嘅鐘數同埋意外率，我覺得應該而家係只係畀少數人知道，我就覺得喺公眾嘅利益起見係好重要嘅，係令到大家可以做一啲好好嘅研究，就可以知道喺安全嗰方面大家面對咩挑

戰，亦都係令大眾有信心業界係嘗試去解決問題嘅。」

然後到180頁嘅時候，Stanley教授喺同一個題目，就係回應番Weston先生嘅專家嘅意見，我而家可以請大家睇下第180頁第16行，我就咁樣問嘅，「係，Weston先生都講咗一個類似嘅講法嘅，即係話呢啲數據要有透明度，我可唔可以而家請你睇下專家文件冊嘅153頁，我就可以讀畀你聽」。

然後第25行，「84段，標題係安全數據嘅透明度同埋表現，然後我就讀出嚟。」

主席，跟住就係講番Weston先生嘅證供嘅部分，然後亦都可以再處理Stanley教授點樣回應嘅，由第2段，第181頁開始。

「由倫敦嘅經驗，好清楚關於巴士網絡安全表現嘅數據要有更高嘅透明度係會令到持份者同埋公眾更加能夠去監察，亦都可以畀運輸當局同埋外判嘅巴士營運商係更加聚焦喺安全嘅問題，其中一個公開事件嘅數據係會帶嚟問責性嘅，應該考慮到喺香港嘅專營巴士網絡安全數據方面應該係公開。教授，你同唔同意或者你喺呢一方面有咩嘢觀察？」

Stanley教授就話「我完全同意嘅，陳律師，對於係倫敦當局同埋運輸局，就係一般嚟講，我個意見就係佢哋係獲得大量嘅數據同埋資料，而佢哋整體嚟講，係唔會隱瞞任何嘢嘅，佢哋就咁將佢係公開，而且就顯示係有啲乜嘢挑戰，我亦都覺得好有信心嘅，對於呢一個做法，我好支持嘅。」呢個就係Stanley教授嘅意見。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以提供番Weston先生佢嘅證供，即係喺邊一日嘅證供，同第幾頁呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我讀出嚟嘅就係Weston先生嗰份報告。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喺邊度？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）專家文件冊第153頁，即係話嗰份報告嘅第39頁，標題係「安全數據透明度及表現」，呢個係第8.4段。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，多謝你協助。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個希望處理到第一個問題。第二、第三個問題...

主席：（經傳譯員）或者畀個機會陳先生你可以回應番--如果你覺得而家仲未係時候，你就出聲，但係呢個機會可以畀你回應下喺呢一個巴士安全嘅章節，就話呢一個--就提出話呢啲資料應該係喺商業上都係有敏感度。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我睇過以前嘅遠期計劃嘅安全嘅章節，我就覺得似乎冇一個好重要嘅資料係可能牽涉公司一啲嘅商業敏感資料嘅。我就想補充，開放數據嘅政策或者個方法，香港政府同埋運輸署都係倡議嘅，我同意係要數據有更

高透明度，尤其係同安全有關，牽涉公眾，而家嘅方向或者我哋做法就係運輸署會同巴士公司繼續商量。

主席：（經傳譯員）你覺得幾時先可以就呢一個議題有啲決定呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）正如我之前喺聆訊嗰度講過我哋嘅小組會繼續係探索呢個議題嘅，同一時間，我哋都同專營巴士公司商量，睇下呢一個遠期計劃嘅巴士安全章節入面嘅細節，呢個問題我哋都會同巴士公司喺未來幾個月傾嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以喺今年年底前有個決定呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我呢個階段唔可以承諾，我哋會盡力嘅，唔該晒主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我頭先讀咗啲證供出嚟，提到喺倫敦，數據係公開嘅，正如 Stanley 教授講，就係話喺倫敦嘅交通當局都係話佢哋喺公開數據方面差唔多係同儕之間首屈一指嘅，而倫敦呢個方法，我就陣間會再講下嘅，睇下我哋點樣可以從倫敦嗰度學習或者應唔應該採取佢哋嘅方法。

但係關於巴士安全章節，我仲有一個問題要講嘅，呢個係喺午飯前，我哋嘅證供嗰度係引出嘅一個問題，就係喺報告巴士安全章節嘅講及意外原因，譬如話係乘客失去平衡，同埋係佢哋失平衡嘅原因。

主席，喺我搵到嘅就係起碼有兩年嘅報告入面嘅巴士安全嘅章節都有提到嘅，我而家可以逐一講下。第一，係九巴嘅巴士安全章節，即係話喺九巴 2017 年至 2021 章嘅五年遠期計劃嘅巴士安全章節，呢個係文件冊嘅 5320 頁。

陳女士，喺你面 5320 頁就係一個九巴 2017 年至 2021 嘅五年遠期計劃，通常喺 2016 年嘅年中或者第三季就會提交畀運輸署嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）關於乘客失去平衡同埋原因，我舉呢個例子，而家請你睇下...

主席：（經傳譯員）請等等。呢個計劃係咪 6 月 30 號前要交畀運輸署呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署就要同公司解決當中任何嘅問題，要喺 9 月 30 號前完成嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果睇番 5324，我想睇嘅係 8.2.7，呢個係講緊意外嘅性質，跟住就係有一連串嘅分析，就係呢一段就尤其同我哋講嘅例子有關嘅，即係我

哋午飯之前你證供提到嘅。

8.2.7段就係話「係百分之五十二點四，即係話意外嘅大部分都係因為乘客喺車廂內失去平衡，呢啲個案超過一半係因為交通情況巴士剎掣導致嘅，而因為有意外導致受傷嘅係因為唔同嘅情況嘅碰撞，就百分之三十六點五，而係對行人造成傷害嘅意外就係所有意外中嘅百分之四點三。」

即係話巴士公司嘗試解釋導致到乘客失去平衡嘅意外嘅大部分嘅成因，呢個係咪就係你喺午飯之前提及呢一點嗰時想講有關嘅證供呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）關於同喺意外時乘客失去平衡，我嘅觀察同埋其後嘅分析，會採取咩嘢行動，即係話都係關於乘客失去平衡喇，我想喺午飯前講番嘅，就係話作為一個恆常嘅工作，可以話我哋一直都有關注乘客喺車廂內失去平衡嘅。

喺2013年嘅專營巴士專營權續期嘅時候，亦都有一個嘅交換承諾嘅信件，喺我哋同巴士公司傾完同埋係意外嘅性質，包括係乘客失去平衡嘅問題，之後我哋有要求巴士公司喺樓梯嗰度係要加裝雙排嘅扶手嘅，呢個係針對特定嘅事件，即係話有乘客喺上層樓梯碌落嚟，呢個我哋係特別關注嘅。

2016年遠期計劃亦都有指出意外大部分同乘客喺巴士車廂失去平衡有關嘅，即係話呢樣嘢運輸署同九巴一直都好關注嘅，我哋亦都有致力睇下點樣解決。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我想同你跟進一點，運輸署係點樣監察急剎嘅問題，你都會呢個係你關注...

主席：（經傳譯員）你問之前，或者你坐喺旁邊嘅助手都可以搵番喺專營權續期嘅時候增加呢一個雙排扶手嘅要求。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，可以嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你唔需要立即搵嘅，你可以而家同事由佢哋做。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我講急剎之前，我提到2017年至2021年嘅五年遠期計劃，我講番類似一段，喺2018年至2022年嘅遠期計劃入面都有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係都係九巴？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。TD-1 180，呢個就係個報告開始嗰頁，然後183頁你就會搵到類似嘅段落，第8.2.7段...

主席：（經傳譯員）其實啲數字唔同，但係嗰個用字都係一樣。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）大部分嘅意外，百分之五十一點五，之前就係百分之五十二點

四，「多過一半就係因為有巴士剎車嘅問題嘅。」

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該，唔該晒。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，你而家喺度搵緊啲嘢，係咪呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我就嘗試就睇下個文件，就係關於喺樓梯嘅雙層扶手，我哋係寫封信畀九巴...

主席：（經傳譯員）可能我哋遲少少，有機會先至再睇，我哋或者而家唔好分心做呢樣嘢，我相信你隔籬嗰個可以幫到你嘅。

陳大律師，我哋就頭先睇到個分析，呢個嘅意外數據，有冇睇到喺邊度講到關於嗰個意外嘅責任係點樣？我認為，一百宗之中就係百分之五十就係啲乘客有關，而百分之二十五就係同我哋巴士車長有關。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係睇巴士安全章節有關，就係2019-2020年，就係2018年8月提交嘅報告嚟嘅，我哋就係將佢嗰個百分比寫咗出嚟嘅。

主席：Whilst we are dealing with this topic, could we have a look at that? What is the reference to that?

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）第5325頁嘅第8.2.10段，就係正正係講，就係「呢個係兩年之間究竟邊個負責任，百分之七十九其實嗰啲巴士車長都唔需要負責嘅，其他大概百分之一就係等緊警方去進一步行動嘅。」

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係邊一個文件冊㗎，係咪KMB-12文件冊呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，下一頁嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我哋仍然係2017年嗰個報告--2017年嘅遠期計劃。

主席：（經傳譯員）可能喺其他地方都有重複到，但係呢度講到就係巴士車長係要為百分之二十五嘅意外負責嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，你講緊就係2018個遠期計劃，運輸署就係2018年5月就寫封信，就裏面有附件就有--我哋睇到就係頭先個表，就係...

主席：（經傳譯員）附件E嘅？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。就係講緊有啲乜嘢因素係因為個車長，有啲乜嘢唔係，然後我哋就請呢個九巴再細分啲數字，之後又有一個更詳盡嘅分析，就係喺2018年嘅巴士嘅安全個章節嗰度，係就係由2019至到2023年，我哋就有更加詳細嘅資料嘅，就有一啲關於巴士車長有關、巴士車長冇關。

主席：Where is the 2019 five-year plan?

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係同一個文件冊，係第 5011 頁嘅，2019 年嘅五年計劃嘅，講緊。譬如呢度有個例子...

主席：（經傳譯員）對唔住，等一等。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）譬如好似喺 5016 頁，我哋睇到相同嘅標題，係「意外嘅性質」，我哋見到個仔細嘅分析，5020，我哋有另外新嘅圖表，就係話意外嘅原因，就關於係有巴士車長有關嘅原因或者因素，呢個巴士嘅性質嗰度，其實我哋就冇細分話究竟巴士車長使唔使負責嘅，但係呢一個嘅 8.2.3 嘅圖表嗰度我哋睇到有幾多係巴士車長要負責嘅，但係 2019 年之前嗰啲報告，我哋就冇一個咁樣嘅細分。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。陳女士，我可唔可以問你，我哋而家就睇緊啲九巴嘅數據，你知唔知佢哋點樣去收集同埋分析呢啲數據？佢哋點樣去決定邊個係需要負責或者邊個唔需要負責呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，對唔住，我諗我就冇答案。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋有冇書信來往呢？你就叫佢哋提交啲數據，你有冇問佢「究竟你哋點樣去整合呢啲數據嘅呢？」你係咪你唔知，冇人問，定係點樣呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）呢個係成個過程嘅一個部分，我哋同事會同佢哋討論，然後我哋就會攞到呢啲嘅分析資料，喺呢一刻，我就唔想畀一啲誤導性嘅答案畀你。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係有啲人一定知道其實呢啲數據係咪真，或者去嘗試去測試下啲數據呀咁樣，運輸署一定有人咁做㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）就我哋所知，關於係意外同車長有關嘅，嗰個負責任嗰樣嘢，好多時候嗰啲意外就係由警方去調查，佢哋就會話畀我哋聽究竟邊一啲意外係同巴士車長嘅缺失有關、有邊啲唔係。根據我哋嘅資料，巴士公司亦都會係將佢細分，就係嗰啲意外個原因係乜嘢嘢，就係會唔會有啲係同巴士車長嘅行為係點。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果個巴士車長佢係被起訴嘅時候，佢當然係負責，但係我話問你，就係話你有冇問佢哋點樣去整合同埋搜集呢啲數據、點樣去釐訂係呢啲數據呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我真係冇呢啲嘅答案，因為同九巴傾嘅同事其實佢就冇喺度，或者其實我哋可以補充係話畀你聽究竟我哋點樣去測試呢啲嘅數字嘅，同九巴。

歐陽先生：（經傳譯員）或者另外一個嘅方法去問，就係話係咪運輸署畀呢啲嘅不同嘅項目畀佢哋係填嗰啲數字，係咪由運輸署釐訂一啲唔同嘅分目嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，就我所知，我亦都問過同事，呢啲資料就係由公司自己編製嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲分項係佢哋嘅分項嚟嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，唔係我哋嘅分項嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好坦白，你睇番呢啲數字，其實我哋就唔係好明，點解譬如話所有嘅數字之中，百分之二十五就係話因為一啲嘅乘客佢失去平衡咁樣，有冇人就話問下佢點解、呢啲係咩嘢數字嚟嘅呢？

或者你之後可以話畀我哋聽，解釋畀我聽運輸署採取啲咩嘢行動、有咩嘢角色就係去睇呢啲數字嘅？或者你同佢有書信來往，或者你係問佢問題，佢哋係有回答，係咪口頭問佢哋問題，或者佢係咩嘢日子、邊個去問等等，所以我哋知道就係有好嘅證據去話畀我哋聽我哋點樣去理解呢啲數字，可唔可以呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，可以。唔該晒主席。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，我同你跟進一個問題，運輸署關於急劇剎車呢樣嘢係咪好關注，喺而家，你哋係點樣去監察呢個車長佢係急劇剎車㗎？如果你真係有監察嘅說話。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，等我--我而家同同事嘗試確定緊。根據我哋以前提交嘅證供，運輸署就係叫緊一啲嘅專營巴士公司係提交佢哋點樣去監察黑盒嘅數據，所以我哋嘅監察係基本上係基於佢哋提供畀我哋嘅資料，喺過去數個月，喺工作小組嘅討論嘅過程當中，我哋同專營巴士公司講過就係點樣可以改善黑盒嘅功能同埋功用，我哋亦都係更新咗一個最低嘅要求，就係關於黑盒嗰方面，我哋叫專營巴士公司就提供進一步嘅資料，就係關於黑盒喺日常之中嗰一啲嘅數據提供更加多，我哋就會特別監察到就譬如巴士車長佢哋嘅行為不當，譬如話佢哋急剎、突然之間停車等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）你仲要求咩嘢額外嘅資料呢，係關於個紀錄嗰方面？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，嗰個事件紀錄嗰方面就係黑盒嗰方面，關於個車速，突然之間加速，突然之間減速，唔同嘅公司其實有唔同嘅界限值嘅，就係講緊喺事件紀錄方面，或者就係實時係發出警告畀間公司咁樣。呢個我哋同巴士公司一直係做緊呢方面嘅工作，就希望能夠就佢哋嗰個事件紀錄能夠提供得更好。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個最新嘅最低要求係8月先生效嘅，係咪？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）所以話呢個希望事件紀錄被提供更多嘅資料，呢個嘅要求其實就係之後先至提出嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）幾時提出㗎，呢個要求？係咪喺書信嘅來往之中提出要求嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋就係同城巴會面。我再從--嚟過。就關於我哋就同城巴就係 9 月 26 號見面嘅，就特別係關於呢個事件紀錄最新嘅要求，我哋就同九巴仲未見，但係我哋就同佢哋而家安排緊。

主席：（經傳譯員）運輸署嘅代表或者今日出席嘅人士其實有冇同佢哋傾嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者 Amy Tse，謝善怡女士。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲最近嘅資料係啲咩嘢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道九巴就係釐訂緊一啲嘅車速嘅界限值同埋急劇加速同埋急劇減速嘅。我哋歡迎佢哋做呢一啲咁樣嘅計劃，我哋亦都係同呢一個城巴、北大嶼山巴士公司同埋新巴就睇下可唔可以就係釐訂一啲類似嘅界限值，就可以監察司機嘅行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）九巴而家佢哋最新嗰個界限值，譬如話急剎、急劇加速、急劇減速等等，嗰個界限值而家最新係點樣？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）九巴同龍運急劇加速嘅界限值每秒鐘係超過 4 個公里，減速，每一秒係超過 7 個公里嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而嗰個車速呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係，車速。如果佢哋係每個小時 70 公里，佢哋就係超速。我哋明白到佢哋採用緊啲最新嘅科技係睇緊一啲嘅道路係計過係有 50 公里嘅車速嘅...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係最新嘅科技，其實呢個科技已經係有好多年㗎喇。或者你應該咁講，你就係用緊一啲以前一直已經存在嘅科技。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係，其他嘅道路如果係有 70 公里嘅車速嘅時候，佢哋都會睇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你哋提出個要求之後，城巴點樣回應呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）城巴、新巴佢哋嘅回答就係佢哋願意去睇一睇，但係佢哋就好關注就應該係點樣設一個點樣嘅界限值，特別係減速或者係加速嗰方面，因為意外好多時候都好複雜嘅，所以佢哋係需要同工會去傾一傾應唔應該係釐訂某個特定嘅界限值嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）請你唔好繼續住，我想打岔一下。其實九巴已經定咗具體界限值，你而家係咪話佢哋係關心到九巴嗰個係嘅限值呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋知道九巴嘅資料之後，已經係畀咗新巴同城巴，佢哋就話願意去研究嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明白，但係你話佢哋係關注到九巴已經定咗個限值，你意思係咪話佢哋質疑九巴定咗具體限值呢？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）佢哋話需要研究一下，然後先至決定。

主席：（經傳譯員）係因為佢哋係有啲關注嗰個限值，係咪？我嘅理解啱唔啱？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）啱嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我可唔可以繼續補充呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）可以。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我最近同城巴交談嘅時候--我都想補充一下謝小姐所講嘅，佢哋表達過話要研究一下，去睇下可唔可以喺城巴嗰度都實施同一個限值，城巴嘅管理層係考慮緊點樣去操作同埋去考慮使唔使採取一啲巴士車長不守規嘅時候嘅跟進行動，所以佢哋係考慮緊呢一個限值喺適用性方面嗰個操作方面嘅事情。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）你就提過九巴已經定咗呢啲限值，已經有喇，謝女士亦都講過係急剎車嘅時候嘅情況，運輸署知唔知道九巴去監察呢一個大力剎車嘅情況係咪就可以令到佢哋可以每一個意外都可以集中睇下係咪有急剎車嘅情形呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋所知嘅，就係佢哋定咗個限值去做監察嘅，因為黑盒嘅功能已經係可以產生呢一啲係超出限值或者係不合規嘅呢啲嘅報告，我哋知道九巴就可以用呢一個咁嘅功能幫助佢哋做呢個監察㗎喇。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話照你理解，九巴就可以黑盒去產生一啲例外報告出嚟，如果有急剎車嘅情況？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，新巴、城巴亦都可以用呢一啲黑盒嘅功能去印出一啲例外報告。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我想問下，係咪你嘅理解，就係我問緊運輸署嘅理解，呢一類嘅例外報告係咪都可以講出任何一個大力剎車嘅事情呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔可以代表專營巴士公司去答，但係黑盒嘅功能同埋佢嘅科技同埋呢一啲嘅例外報告，的而且確到好大程度上可以幫佢哋監察個巴士車長點樣剎車、點樣加速、減速，佢哋喺實際操作嘅時候都要考慮呢一點，去睇下個例外報告同埋有關嘅限值係咪可以好有效呢，幫助佢哋做監察。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我咁樣理解啱唔啱呢？就係講番呢一啲例外報告，運輸署其實就係留番畀專營巴士公司自己去判斷，係咪呢？咁樣係咪公道呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗而家嗰個程序仲係繼續緊嘅，但係我哋當然係好有興趣，我哋亦都覺得係有需要，同埋都係一個有效嘅方法，等我哋知道如果有咗呢啲例外報告之後係咪可以幫助我哋調查意外嘅原因，而係牽涉到乘客失衡嘅，我哋想知道係咪呢一個係其中一個促成意外嘅成因，因此黑盒同埋例外報告都係我哋想喺工作小組嗰度進一步跟進嘅事嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者而家唔再講呢個大力剎車嘅問題，而家去番一個比較一般性嘅題目，就係關於巴士嘅意外數據。我哋聽到證供就話運輸署係同警方係分享呢個個案管理嘅系統嘅，然後運輸署就從呢一個資料庫嗰度攞啲資料去做自己嘅分析，因此運輸署其中一個資料嘅來源就係呢一個系統。

我想集中嘅就係講另外嗰方面嘅資料，就係專營巴士公司嘅意外數據，我哋知道由呢個巴士安全嗰個部分，即係遠期計劃裏面，巴士公司就會係提供自己嘅數據同埋分析，然後每年交畀運輸署。

好，而家將呢件事擺埋一邊先，亦都排除一啲比較大嘅事件，當然，有大嘅事件嘅時候，運輸署就要求巴士公司提供調查報告，就好似喺大埔嗰個意外咁樣。我就想問下，有冇其他嘅有制度性嘅定期嘅報告係巴士公司交畀你係講關於啲意外嘅事情嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我而家查一查我嘅筆記先。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係喇，我唔係講遠期計劃裏面嗰個巴士安全章節同埋比較大嘅事故，係其他嘅。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我請謝女士回答呢個問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀，謝女士。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）每一個月，我哋會得到警方嘅資料，然後我哋會分析由警方得到嘅數據，如果我哋發現意外率係有所增加或者有任何不尋常嘅情況，我哋會同巴士公司傾，睇下個情況係點，同埋有乜嘢要改正或者佢哋需要做啲咩嘢呀咁。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我說明一下我想問嘅問題，我而家用一個例子，譬如話有一個事件，有一位老婦喺巴士上失去平衡，佢自己係受咗輕傷，但係就冇報警嘅，不過巴士公司知道呢件事，佢自己做咗紀錄，運輸署咁會唔會知道呢件事？抑或就只會係成為巴士安全部分嘅其中一個數字呢？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）主席，請問我可唔可以答呢個問題呢？好似謝女士所解釋，我哋基本上係倚賴警方嘅事件數字嘅，好似大狀頭先提嗰啲咁嘅例子，現時嚟講，我哋係唔會收到呢啲嘅資料嘅，因為基本上日日都會發生，所以個答案係冇嘅，係唔知嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，我講番喺倫敦方面係點樣做，不過之前我仲想確立另

外一個事實嘅，就係運輸署點樣處理呢兩組嘅數據，當你收到巴士公司每年畀你嘅巴士安全數據，即係喺呢一個巴士安全章節嗰度寫嗰啲，運輸署會唔會去做核對嘅呢？兩套嘅資料，即係由警方收到一套，巴士公司嗰度又收到一套，你兩者之間會唔會做一啲比對或者核對嘅呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）邱先生，佢有呢一個道路安全嘅工作，同埋另外一位同事，基於我嘅所知，當做呢一個遠期計劃嘅時候，當我哋睇巴士公司嘅資料，我哋亦都會睇埋警方畀我哋嘅資料，我哋未必會逐項去比對，但係我哋會睇趨勢分析，如果兩者之間有好明顯嘅差別，我哋係會提出問題同埋要求進一步嘅分析。

我都可以提及，就係政府係有派代表坐喺巴士公司嘅管理局嗰度嘅，喺管理局有關討論嘅時候，都會提供一啲意外數字，我哋會睇咗嗰啲數字先，我哋嘅同事亦都會係睇呢一啲定期嘅意外數據，同埋係比對我哋有嘅數據庫，如果有一啲好明顯嘅差別，我哋都會喺嗰個董事局嗰度係會提出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係唔會好具體咁做核對嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我哋唔會，但係我哋會睇下有冇邊一度係好明顯嘅差別或者落差嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以協助我，當你話你哋喺董事局嗰啲嘅同事就係話會畀啲數據你嘅，你頭先係咁講？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）喺公司嘅董事局係會有運輸署嘅代表，喺睇嗰啲意外嘅數字同埋公司向董事局提交嘅巴士安全報告嘅時候，我哋嘅同事就會攞到有關嘅資料，我哋就會將佢同我哋數據庫裏面嘅資料核對嘅，如果係發覺係有唔同，我哋都可以喺董事局嗰度係講出嚟嘅。我哋就會話畀佢哋聽佢哋嘅數據應該係同警方嘅數據一致嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我而家想嘗試明白一下政府代表喺呢啲公司嘅董事局嘅角色係乜嘢，你而家係咪話佢哋係另外一個渠道讓運輸署攞到資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我唔會話係另外一個渠道。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係咩嘢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我只係想提及話有一啲嘅平台我哋都可能攞到呢啲意外嘅數據嘅，政府係有董事坐喺呢啲公司嘅董事局嗰度，就令到我哋可以評論或者係講出我哋對於公司提交資料嘅一啲觀察。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，而家我想講下倫敦嗰個做法，我會讓你睇幾份文件，然後我哋就可以好全面咁睇一睇倫敦嘅運輸局佢哋係點樣做呢一啲數據點樣係有透明度嘅。

首先，我睇番 Weston 先生嘅報告，就係專家文件冊第 141 頁，內部嘅頁碼就係 Weston 先生報告第 27 頁，專家文件冊第 141 頁。陳女士，或者我讀某啲部分出嚟，然後請你提出一啲意見，我會不時讀完一段就停一停，請你畀意見嘅。

第一，開始就係 6.2 段，佢話「喺巴士公司合約嘅要求當中，巴士公司係要提供全面嘅數據，係關於事件同埋意外嘅，係成個網絡裏面嘅，呢一啲係通過事件報告資料系統提交嘅，如果有嚴重嘅事件就會係實時報告同埋係監察，就係通過有關嘅中央控制室，然後我哋係會即時同嗰個有關嘅機構發出一啲即時嘅回應嘅。

倫敦嘅運輸局亦都係會提供全國嘅一啲數據就係關於車輛嘅碰撞，如果係造成傷亡，就會咁樣做嘅。每一個季度都會有警方嘅報告。」

似乎倫敦同香港都係有兩套嘅資料，一就係來自巴士公司，一就係來自警察嘅，來自巴士公司嗰啲嘅資料就係我最有興趣嘅地方，我哋就想睇下香港同倫敦比較之後，香港點樣可以改善嘅。

而家我想睇下屘二嗰一段，同一頁，「每一季，倫敦嘅運輸局就會係用一啲大嘅表係表列出所有報告咗嘅事件嘅，就係成個網絡都係咁，然後每一個事件所有嘅資料，就係個路線、日期、邊個係營運商、嗰個地點、有冇人受傷、係咪當場處理咗抑或係入院、如果受傷嘅人究竟係乘客，抑或係第三者、佢哋嘅性別，同埋我哋知道佢哋嘅年紀。

佢亦都係每一季度就會去比較之前嗰個季度同埋做一啲趨勢嘅分析嘅。呢一度就話咁樣可以鼓勵透明度同埋係可以鼓勵佢哋繼續係改善嘅。」

好喇，而家停一停，講番呢一個大嘅表，就係成個巴士嘅服務網絡都係會包括晒嘅，我想知道你知唔知道有冇用咁樣嘅形式，用咁具體嘅形式係畀呢一個數據呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）其實呢一個係 Weston 先生報告嘅一個附件嚟嘅，係咪呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個連結嚟嘅，網上嘅連結。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，我而家就係問緊你--因為我有一個檔案就係印出咗你而家描述緊嘅數據，究竟係咪喺我哋嘅文件冊裏面嘅呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我睇到秘書處已經將有關嘅表打咗喺屏幕上面，我嘅理解就係我哋係由網上下載咗有關嘅資料，但係仲未包括有頁碼嘅文件冊裏面嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你而家我哋睇番呢一個屏幕，係咪呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我描述一下，等我哋喺個紀錄嗰度都可以講出究竟屏幕上係顯示出啲乜嘢嘅。

係一份數據集，係喺倫敦交通局嗰個網頁嗰度下載嘅，你喺呢一頁會見到喺1月發生嘅意外，呢個係2018年1月，喺個試算表你可以見到每一件事件路線、營運商、所屬嘅區分、傷勢、受害人嘅性別、年紀、係屬於乘客定係邊一類型。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺右邊，我而家睇緊畫面嗰度再過啲仲有冇資料㗎？睇到喇。我哋見到嘅分類係咪你都見到呀？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋叫做失去平衡，佢哋就係叫做蹣倒、絆倒或者係跌倒嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，喺香港嘅情況，用咁樣嘅匯報嘅方式將資料公開去到咁仔細，你覺得應唔應用到喺香港？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）或者我可以初步畀一啲觀察，螢幕上顯示嘅事故嘅詳情，關於倫敦嘅運輸當局，呢個係睇到每一件事件嘅仔細嘅詳情，但係喺香港嘅情況，我哋就冇辦法去追蹤去到每一件事件，去到咁仔細喇。我哋而家嘅做法就係有一個系統記錄有致命嘅意外係行咩嘢路線、受害人嘅資料、司機嘅資料，我自己覺得我哋係倡議公開數據同埋透明性，令到規管當局同埋交通營運商問責性更高，但係每一件事件去到咁仔細去公開嘅話，未必--即係可能係可以加強透明度、問責性，但係亦都可能超越公眾可能有興趣知道詳情嘅層面，...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢都係由公眾決定，佢哋冇興趣都好，佢可以睇咗之後冇興趣，但係佢而家直頭係冇辦法睇到。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）好多時候一有意外發生嘅時候，係有好多事後嘅發展嘅，牽涉乘客，亦都牽涉行人，所以我哋要考慮就住各宗事故嘅披露嘅時候，我哋亦都要確保呢一個格式嘅資料入面係咪準確、係咪最新嘅資料，因為我哋要確保如果公眾攞到呢啲資料嘅話，佢哋都係要有正確嘅認知嘅事件。

主席：（經傳譯員）佢哋喺倫敦都係咁做，你係咪意思我哋喺香港就冇能力做到呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔係嘅，所以第三點我想提到嘅就係我之前嗰日都提到我哋都係希望參考倫敦嘅交通當局，而我同事其實已經安排咗一個嘅訪問嘅，係倫敦交通當局，喺2019年2月嘅時候去，就係正好畀機會我哋去學習準備呢啲嘅問題、需要嘅資源、佢哋點樣同唔同巴士公司商量，仲要同警方核對資料，睇下喺呢個格式咁樣嘅資料點樣可以加強喺交通上嘅數據透明度，而同時唔會因為披露資料期間會有啲複雜嘅問題。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋睇到呢一個咁實事求是嘅資料，就睇番巴士公司、路線、廠房喺邊、傷勢、傷者嘅性別、年紀、意外嘅事故類別、受害人係乜嘢人、係乘客定司機、行人。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗喺呢一個表格入面嘅資料係可以用一個好簡單、好客

Transcript by Epiq Hong Kong, Limited

觀嘅方法去向公眾交代呢個事件嘅原因同埋詳情，個問題係我哋用咁樣嘅格式提供資料嘅時候，仲要考慮呢一啲資料係點樣可以喺發布之後再更新。

主席：（經傳譯員）你由呢度要點樣更新呀？係咪即係個受害人由女變男、成人變番小童？個意外其實喺第二度發生？所謂更新係咩嘢意思呀？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我留意到，主席，有一行就係話受傷嘅描述嘅，呢個表可能係形容番喺意外發生嗰一刻或者意外發生之後佢哋立即得到嘅資料，我哋作為當局都要考慮下要唔要進一步更新番個傷勢嘅描述，喺呢一方面有冇進展嘅，因為可能公眾都有進一步追問有咩嘢跟進行動，有冇進一步發展，呢啲係我哋要同倫敦當局再進一步傾去實施披露資料。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該，我想呢一頁有副本喺手，等我哋可以睇下入面嘅內容，希望全部人都有副本。陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，頭先提到喺香港我哋就唔適宜係逐件事件咁樣去睇，係因為而家呢一刻冇要求巴士公司就每宗事故匯報嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）如果你睇下倫敦嘅匯報要求，問下可唔可以成立咁嘅系統、點樣應用，我而家請你睇雜項 3 嘅文件冊，1189 頁，係倫敦嘅交通局一個叫做巴士安全計劃嘅最新情況嘅文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）你等一等，我做一做筆記先。呢個係 2017 年 11 月嘅，回應番呢一個交通當局嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯，呢度就描述番個最新嘅情況同埋要點樣去改善個系統，我就呢兩方面問番陳女士嘅。陳女士，喺 1191 頁，標題係「巴士碰撞數據分析」，簡介嗰段我唔讀喇，我想讀跟住嗰段，標題係「進度」，因為呢個文件一開頭就形容佢哋而家嘅系統係點，我都要問一個問題先嘅。

佢係咁講，「我哋而家對於巴士撞擊嘅數據係有兩組主要嘅數據集，係 IRIS 同埋 STATS19。」而 Weston 先生嘅報告就提到 IRIS 係警方嘅數據嚟嘅。

我繼續讀，「IRIS 係由巴士公司使用嘅，關於佢哋嘅營運活動嘅事件嘅匯報，包括撞擊，亦都包括係滑倒、絆倒或者跌倒，同埋一啲嘅安全事故，包括襲擊嘅。而巴士公司要喺四十八小時之內匯報嚴重事件，所有嘅事件就要喺七日之內匯報嘅，呢一個系統係完整、可靠、單一嘅資料來源，呢啲資料就係所有嘅影響或者係涉及倫敦巴士嘅事故。」

我停一停先，相比香港嘅情況，我哋亦都可以接觸到警方數據，睇落去係好似，但係你同唔同意香港嘅運輸署有一方面係輸蝕咗嘅，因為由巴士公司入面係冇能夠提交到啲數據集，關於巴士意外嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我同意，喺而家嘅巴士專營權營運制度入面係冇要求就住特定嘅事件需要特定嘅匯報嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）將來你覺得咁樣有冇作用呢？如果要求巴士公司有一個類似嘅匯報嘅制度，因為似乎喺實際嘅角度嚟講，要做嘅只不過係成立一個電腦嘅系統？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗呢個當然係一個可以跟進嘅範圍，再加埋自動數據傳輸，我相信係有辦法令到呢個數據嘅紀錄或者係整理係更加有效率嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）即係話可以唔使由唔同巴士公司收到唔同嘅數據組，而係有一個單一嘅系統要佢哋匯報？可唔可能呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我覺得關於匯報數據、採集數據方面，我哋一直都可以做一個單一嘅系統，等我哋可以分析好啲數據再提交報告建議進一步嘅行動嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師，喺你繼續之前，而家提到巴士安全計劃嘅最新情況，喺合約入面有冇標明巴士公司向倫敦交通當局有咩嘢責任呢？有冇咁嘅條文呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我唔知道，我而家唯一搵到嘅就係呢一段，入面有講係一啲嘅匯報嘅責任嘅詳情，我可以係嘗試再搵下。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個我哋亦都可以問下 Weston 先生嘅意見。可能係好簡單有一條嘅合約嘅條款，就係話有啲事故嘅話，包括係碰撞、有人滑倒、絆倒、跌倒，都係需要由巴士公司向當局匯報嘅，咁樣係好有幫助。

陳女士，我想問一問你，咁樣同專營巴士公司嘅制度好相近嘅，我哋想有咁嘅範本、有日期、時間、受害人嘅特色，譬如話係佢年紀、性別，因為當然佢個年紀亦都係同譬如話有冇跌倒有關，同埋有陣時受害人因為某啲特質，佢可能係個傷勢較重，甚至係死亡嘅，可唔可以係要求巴士公司提交呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我諗我哋可以好積極跟進嘅，主席。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我繼續讀嘅時候睇到另外一個問題，如果你係由巴士公司逐宗事故去匯報嘅話，如果係向警方匯報嘅話，你都有一樣嘅數據㗎，喺嗰個數據庫入面，就可以令你可以對照一下，睇下專營巴士公司喺記錄資料嘅時候佢嘅方法妥唔妥當？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）咁樣對於核對數據同埋去找出有乜嘢錯漏、差異係有用嘅，所以我哋應該有個範本，一啲主要嘅標題，然後我哋可以由唔同嘅巴士公司去決定類似或者係一樣嘅分類，然後匯報事故，我諗呢一方面我哋可以進一步考慮嘅，同巴士公司商量。

主席：（經傳譯員）巴士公司都會要求車長去匯報呢啲嘅事件㗎？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道巴士公司要求咩嘢資料吖？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）因為我哋要求佢哋提供數據同埋資料，係喺嗰個巴士安全嘅章節嗰度提供，呢個亦都係根據佢哋嘅原數據同埋佢哋畀嘅證據去再整理嘅，巴士公司係用一個更加系統性嘅方法去收集數據、匯報畀運輸署係唔難嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係你知唔知道譬如話有件事故發生或者意外發生嘅時候，公司要求車長匯報乜嘢資料呢？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我冇呢個詳情，或者可以由謝女士補充。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。我哋知道巴士公司要求車長匯報喺車上發生嘅，譬如話意外有受傷嘅話，就要係匯報畀--就報畀警方聽嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話如果有受傷嘅話，巴士車長係要匯報畀警方聽？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果系統係有效嘅話，警方嗰啲數據同巴士公司應該係百分百脗合？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢樣嘢係咪書面反映番呢？有冇一個手冊--巴士公司應該有啲幾有用嘅巴士車長手冊畀佢哋嘅，你有冇見過？你冇見過，你可以話冇見過。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）而家我哋冇資料，我哋要問下巴士公司先。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅文件冊係咪有車長嘅證供呀？或者可以睇下，而家可以答到我哋嘅--或者稍後答喇。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我可以總結呢一個問題，就係睇下倫敦點樣做，陳女士，你仲係咪喺 1191 頁呀？我哋頭先睇緊嗰一頁。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我讀咗「進度」嘅第一段，形容番喺倫敦嘅系統而家點樣做嘅。我繼續想讀第二段，講警方數據嘅，STATS19 就係警方舊嘅系統，仲有 COPA，係一個警方更新咗嘅系統，我就唔繼續講呢方面。到 1192 頁，後面嗰頁，未來嘅工作嘅標題，呢個就係佢哋交通當局要做啲乜嘢。

「要花啲工夫去改進喺 IRIS、STATS19 同 COPA 嘅相容性，我哋係會繼續做嗰個複雜嘅核對嘅工作去確保每一個數據組嘅可靠性同埋相容性嘅。我哋亦都做緊一個嘅--開發緊一個軟件系統，可以係改善 IRIS 嘅數據收集嘅效率同埋係準確性嘅，因為係會由巴士公司自己嘅數據嗰度自動更新嘅。」

未來路向，陳女士，你覺得唔同嘅數據組能夠協同嘅話，係咪香港應該做嘅呢？即係我講緊嘅係喺收集數據同埋匯報嘅工作。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）肯定係嘅，呢個係一個範疇我哋希望能夠做多啲，特別係希望能夠唔同嘅數據更加可靠同埋更加一致，目前嚟講，唔同嘅巴士營運商佢哋有自己嘅數據庫，我哋希望佢哋能夠將佢哋嗰啲意外分類，譬如就住嗰個性質或者係成因嚟分，但係嗰啲佢哋嘅形容詞可能同警方嗰啲形容詞可能唔一樣，因此我覺得應該有一個致嘅數據庫或者數據集，亦都係更新得更加頻密，就肯定會幫唔同嘅各方明白個情況，同埋去分析大家關注嘅事宜，同埋去採取適當嘅跟進行動。

我亦都想補充，專家嘅證供同埋佢哋供詞，喺呢方面嘅供詞係話畀我哋聽其實喺意外嚟講，嗰啲成因好複雜嘅，通常有多於一個嘅成因，嗰個分析個意外好多時候都係要係詳盡由警方調查之後先至可以搵得到同埋可能經過相當嘅程序先至可以確定。但係無論如何，我哋都會係搜集第一手嘅資料同埋希望能夠係向唔同嘅巴士公司攞到一啲唔同嘅數據。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我就已經完成咗我要探討嘅課題，但係完之前，我哋就講關於一個營運嘅手冊嗰方面，其實我同事已經畀咗我，我而家畀個答案你--畀委員會，提供啲資料畀委員會。

KMB-8(A)，第 3086 頁，而家已經喺個螢幕度打咗出嚟，呢個係第一頁嚟嘅，呢個係九巴嘅文件，就係戶外營運同事或者員工嘅手冊，呢個就係講 2018 年 1 月最後更新嘅。相關同程序有關嘅部分就特別喺意外嘅時候，3123 頁嗰度可以睇到，第 8(A)，第 3123 頁，喺第 9 個部分。

呢個手冊就講，「如果有一個員工就係有交通意外，尚當佢係揸緊公司嘅車嘅時候，佢就應該係填咗呢一個『交通意外報告』同埋一個授權書，就係喺意外七十二小時之內，如果嗰個同事要住院嘅時候，佢出院之後，就儘快做。」呢個跟住就係話要係留意啲咩嘢，跟住就有幾項。

1、2、3、4 之後，呢度就講，就話「呢個填好咗嘅『交通意外報告』就應該係去提交畀相關嘅車廠嘅有關嘅部門，亦都係畀嗰啲接受個報告嗰個人去簽署嘅。如果佢哋就冇咁做嘅時候，佢哋就話係唔會收到呢一個嘅『好服務獎賞』，亦都可能因為佢哋冇遵從相關嘅規矩，公司可能會採取呢一個紀律行動嘅。」

呢度講到--冇清楚講清楚就係話畀員工聽係一定要去報警嘅，雖然呢度就話可能就係要提供一份嘅口供或者係呢一個嘅報告畀警方，呢個係第三段所講嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅手冊有冇有包含呢一個交通意外嘅報告呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）冇，冇喺我哋嘅文件冊度嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果係咁嘅時候，我哋就要求九巴就係提供呢個相關嘅文件，致使到我哋知道究竟呢個報告嗰個需要個詳情係幾仔細，致使到運輸署可以知道呢個九巴其實係手頭上有啲咩資料。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，就我哋請黃律師繼續去發問嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我希望你能夠係再傾一傾關於急剎車嗰個問題，同埋九巴就係話畀我哋聽究竟呢啲嘅報告佢哋點樣處理，同埋就係關於呢個四分鐘嘅一個規定係點樣樣。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）好，我哋睇兩份文件，會比較幫到我哋嘅。首先我哋睇一睇 KMB-12 第 4848 頁，我希望請秘書處幫一幫，就話畀我哋聽嗰個頁數，一個最近嘅文件，2018 年 10 月 3 號九巴提交嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你係同我嗰個版本一樣嘅，係咪呀？如果係咁嘅時候，我可以就睇呢一個版本。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我希望有個頁碼，陳女士知道究竟係講緊邊一頁。KMB 第 1 號文件冊第 571 頁。

我澄清一點，陳女士，希望係睇到，第一，KMB-12 第 4848 頁，呢個係急剎嘅一個報告，就係由九巴提交畀我哋嘅，另外 KMB 第 1 號文件冊第 571 頁，就亦都係九巴提交嘅意見書--陳述書，佢就講到呢個嘅急剎報告係點樣編製，所以我就希望呢兩份文件就一齊併排我哋睇。

4848 頁，呢個係一個中文嘅報告，個英文嘅翻譯就喺 4851 頁，又或者我哋用嗰個英文嘅翻譯本，就等大家方便啲，睇起上嚟。我而家就係睇下呢個圖表，陳女士，你睇到嗰個標題就係 2018 年 2 月 6 號到 2 月 12 號嗰個急剎嘅情況，就係總次數係--或者個總時數係多過四分鐘嘅，你睇番左邊第四個，就係話急剎嘅次數，就係減速係每小時係高於 8 個公里嘅。呢個表就係咁。

然後我哋睇一睇嗰個形容係點樣樣，呢個咁嘅報告係應該點樣係編製出嚟，我哋睇一睇嗰個文件，我哋睇一睇就九巴呢個提交呢一份文件，第 3 段，3(B)，第 572 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）第 4848 頁，呢個嘅文件係咪九巴提交㗎？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）係佢哋嘅紀錄當中嘅？

陳政龍先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個唔係提交畀運輸署嘅一個文件，係咪？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）就我所知，就冇嘅，呢個嘅係九巴...

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個4848有冇提交畀運輸署嘅？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，冇嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好，呢個係佢哋自己內部紀錄嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）第3(B)段係第572頁，佢哋就講就話呢一個車長嘅每周嘅表現點樣去做，呢個就係包括佢哋超速或者急剎等等，我就讀出嚟。

「呢度個車長個名就會喺佢哋嘅車長嘅表現報告嗰度寫出嚟嘅，當嗰個急剎嘅總時數或者累計時數就係--呢個嗰個減速嘅情況係相對於之前嗰一秒嘅減速係超過7公里」，佢哋就會寫出嚟。

而我哋睇番嗰個註釋，第3嗰度就係話「就2018年8月1號之前，其實佢之前嗰個嘅準則就係每秒係8個公里嘅。」

好，我哋繼續。呢個就係由「黑盒所記錄嘅，就係如果個累計嘅時數喺之前嗰個禮拜係多過四分鐘，就係會記錄。」

第6段，就係話「呢個嘅嗰個原因，急剎都會係好多原因嘅，譬如因為可能實際嘅交通嘅情況，喺某段時間係需要佢哋咁做。九巴同埋龍運嘅方法就係話去監察佢哋嗰個車長嘅情況同埋嗰個行為，而唔係即刻採取行動嘅，九巴同埋龍運巴士就唔會係有一啲好仔細嘅報告就係講急劇嘅剎車同埋加速嘅。如果做得好多次嘅時候，就會係有報告，譬如話如果係佢嗰個累計時嘅時數係多過六十分鐘，佢就會係喺個報告嗰度，而另外佢係嗰個時數係多過四分鐘嘅時候，佢哋就會有二百四十個提到嘅。因為個數據嘅數量好大，所以嗰個技術部門就會盡佢哋嘅最大能力去編製一啲報告，如果係有異常情況出現嘅時候，就會去編製呢啲報告。」

陳女士，我就想畀啲背景你，九巴除咗呢個嘅守則之外，亦都畀咗好多其他嘅數據我哋，但係我哋就唔會講得好仔細。

主席：（經傳譯員）就一個累計呢個剎車係超過四分鐘係咩嘢意思，其實係講緊係一個星期其實係講緊二百四十秒嘅，但係你就唔會話做得好頻密嘅，所以我哋就知道嗰個急剎嘅情況係幾咁頻密。

我哋去睇番第一頁，附件1(b)(1)，第1頁。或者我哋睇一睇呢個文件，我哋讓運輸署了解得更加好，呢個係咪喺紙張上面㗎？其實係咪喺個檔案裏面可以提供畀佢哋呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係我嘅檔案，其實喺我個電腦裏面，其實都幾長嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）就我相信有一啲紙張嘅版本嘅，係咪？係急劇加速其實就係好多頁嘅，但係急剎就比較少啲頁數。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）急剎嗰個報告就係5578頁開始嘅，係KMB第12號嘅或

者係九巴12號嘅文件冊嗰度。

陳女士，我希望你呢度睇到一份文件，嗰個標題係左上角寫咗，就係附件1(b)(i)，就係急剎報告，就係特別針對幾位特別嘅車長嘅。就九巴嘅文件，一般嚟講，就其實就唔係話九巴會係定期去編製嘅，就係因為我哋委員會要求，佢哋就編製，我哋就想睇番呢個急剎嘅個別嘅事件，就講緊係四分鐘嘅急剎嘅累計時數，然後就會喺個報告裏面出現，呢啲咁嘅情況。

所以，陳女士，呢度就係睇到呢個一共係有十八頁，你就我哋而家睇第5578頁嘅第一頁，呢啲嘅紀錄就係個員工嘅紀錄，員工編號3965嘅呢位員工嘅，你睇番呢一頁，其實好多嘅資料，關於佢哋嘅路線、時間、日期、車速、減速等等。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢啲咁嘅簡寫其實佢哋有冇解㗎，"ba value"咁？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）相關嘅解釋其實就喺我哋頭先嘅KMB第1號文件冊。

主席：（經傳譯員）"ba value"係乜嘢呀？我哋可以推想出嚟嘅。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）九巴就講，喺註釋第4號嘅時候，我哋頭先睇過講直情"ba value"就係呢個制動器嘅加速嘅值，就係同呢一秒同之前嗰秒去比較嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係嗰個車速就係每個小時5.8嘅公里，個ba value就係9.5嘅，所以相對於之前嗰一秒其實就係嗰個加速個值就係咁樣，係咪咁呀？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係。陳女士，由5578頁去到5586頁，你可以睇到3965號員工嗰啲記項，然後你亦都可以睇到有關嘅員工嘅編號就變咗63287。

主席：（經傳譯員）我想請問嗰一位特別嘅車長，佢大力剎車嘅累計分鐘係幾多呢？

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）根據7(b)嗰個文件，我都讀番出嚟先。

「3965號車長嘅累計就係6.68分鐘，就有401個記項嘅」，「63287號車長就係395個記項，總共係6.58分鐘大力剎車」。

陳女士，我諗你亦都睇到63287係由5586頁開始去到5595頁嘅，總共係有395個記項嘅。陳女士，從運輸署嘅角度睇嚟，你對於九巴呢一個做法有咩嘢觀察呢？基本上就喺車長大力剎車方面都冇一個例外嘅報告，直至到呢個車長係累積咗幾百次超越咗大力剎車嗰個門檻，即係喺某一個星期裏面，佢先至有呢啲報告，你有咩嘢觀察呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者你都想用啲時間諗一諗，我哋好快會有一個小休，就令到你可以有時間諗下呢個問題。我亦都想問，佢哋交啲咩嘢報告畀運輸署嘅呢？如果有大力剎車嗰啲嘅事故。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）我有有關嘅文件嘅，或者畀少少時間我搵出嚟。

主席：（經傳譯員）好呀。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）講到話有啲乜嘢係交畀運輸署，我諗陳女士都有講到嘅，就係TD-4 1020頁，呢一份文件最頂嗰度就係講到關於巴士安全監察措施嘅每月報告，陳女士剛才都講過，就係話公司係要提交一啲嘅表格，係講到關於黑盒嘅數據，佢哋嗰啲突擊嘅檢查嘅。

我哋睇下最屘嗰度嗰三分一，就係話查核黑盒嘅數據以監察巴士車長嘅駕駛行為，可以睇到就係話有幾多次突擊嘅檢查，就係喺月尾嗰度有幾多次咁樣嘅個案呢，譬如話個性質係超速、突然剎車嗰啲咁樣，我哋睇到突然間剎車係有八次嘅，口頭嘅警告係有十三次嘅。

當運輸署收到呢一類咁樣嘅文件，就係話有八次係突然剎車嘅，呢度似乎係咁寫，運輸署會點樣去詮釋呢一個數據嘅呢？運輸署嘅詮釋會唔會認為係有八次唔同嘅事件呢？即係話分開有八次突然間剎車抑或係點呢？

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋而家休息一陣，等你去考慮下呢一個問題，即係當我哋小休嘅時候。我哋而家小休十五分鐘。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）多謝主席。

下午4時15分聆訊押後

下午4時32分恢復聆訊

出席人士如前。

主席：（經傳譯員）陳律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）陳女士，喺小休之前問咗你兩個問題嘅，第一，運輸署嘅角度嚟講，你對於九巴嘅做法有咩嘢觀察？即係關於用力剎車係唔會每一次做一個報告，只係如果有一個巴士司機係某一個禮拜係累積咗幾百次咁嘅情況先會有個報告；第二，關於每個月嘅報告，即係TD文件冊第4號1020頁，當運輸署收到報告，見到其中有一個嘅記項就係有八次嘅突然嘅急速剎車，係點樣處理呢個數據呢？或者陳女士可唔可以回答呢兩個問題？

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）我會答第一個問題，同埋我邀請我嘅同事回應第二個問題。

第一個問題就係有黑盒嘅功能去顯示一啲嘅事件嘅報告，就係睇下用力剎車嘅情況，我哋預期巴士公司係認真看待點樣使用呢一個功能同埋啲數據去密切

監察巴士司機嘅表現。

而黑盒嘅數據，單憑數據就未必可以係有一個嘅結論司機係疏忽駕駛，但係可以係作為一個理據，巴士公司可以進一步調查。如果有閉路電視監察嘅系統同埋喺車上有便裝嘅調查員嘅話，係可以進一步去睇下觀察一下巴士司機嘅表現，但係毫無疑問黑盒嘅數據係好重要，亦都提供一啲資料作為根據畀佢哋去睇下巴士車長有乜嘢不當嘅行為。

我而家請黃志光先生回應番關於黑盒嘅數據係要求巴士公司提供咩嘢資料。

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）主席，基本上螢幕上顯示嘅...

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）即係1020頁，係運輸署嘅文件冊第4冊。

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係由運輸署決定，我哋要求巴士公司提交有關嘅數據，由今年1月已經開始。

你提到突然剎車嘅問題，左手邊個欄目顯示“400”，我哋只係要求巴士公司提供佢哋搵到嘅不當嘅行為有幾多個個案，至於突然剎車，我哋唔可以確認係唔係根據黑盒嘅突然加速或者剎車嘅數據，或者巴士公司可能會進一步調查一下，可能係同巴士車長會面咗，跟住先有呢個數據嘅，我哋呢個就係收到嘅就係咁。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以協助下我呢？你提到呢個數目字“400”係咩嘢意思？

黃志光先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係即場嘅臨時嘅一個檢查。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係相比起一個例行檢查，係咪呀？上面嗰一格就係寫住「例行嘅檢查」。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）巴士公司突擊檢查就唔係例行檢查，通常因為有投訴，而突然間作出嘅，而例行檢查就係上面8552。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係嗰度冇講剎車嘅，淨係講緊超速啫，即係佢哋係有檢查超速，但係冇突然剎車。

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）超速呢個就係根據黑盒嘅數據產生出嚟嘅報告，但係對於突擊檢查就係因為有人投訴，而剎車好多時候要調查埋譬如話閉路電視嘅數據，而唔可以淨係用黑盒嘅數據去指稱司機疏忽嘅，佢哋要進一步調查先可以將佢定性為係唔係不當行為。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係話超速方面就會產生一啲嘅例外報告嘅？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）超速就係咁嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係如果係剎掣嘅就冇喇？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）我哋嘅理解，佢哋可以設定一個界限值嘅，就係而家就唔會話去即刻產生一個報告，因為佢哋需要進一步調查。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋處理一下個事實先，即係話急剎係唔會因為咁產生報告嘅？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）據我哋理解，就係啱嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）而突擊檢查嘅報告係因為有投訴，佢哋係就住個投訴去調查所得嘅？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係其實我哋見過有咁多頁嘅數據，即係話係已經有現成嘅數據，去監察理解到底急剎呢個情況係有幾嚴重？

謝善怡女士：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）其中一個因素係要急劇剎掣嘅，譬如由 8 公里而家減到去 7 公里，講緊每秒嘅改變就係 0.2G 嘅，佢哋唔係監察 0.4G 嘅，啱唔啱呀？

陳美寶女士：No.

岑毅安先生：（經傳譯員）正確嘅，喺時速 7 公里每秒嘅轉變就係等如 0.2G 嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）當然對於喺巴士站立嘅乘客就會有問題喇。係嘅，陳大律師。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，我已經完成提問喇。我而家請黃大律師繼續。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。黃大律師，畀少少時間我去處理一下呢度啲文件先。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，黃大律師就請我唔好坐低住。

主席：（經傳譯員）或者佢可能得到我嘅鼓勵。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）原因係咁嘅，因為黃大律師就幫忙我就搵到啲報告，就睇番話巴士司機收到咩嘢指示，如果遇到巴士有意外嘅時候。或者我可以先邀請主席睇番文件冊 10(A)，4190-1 頁，係 4161 頁嘅，呢個中文版，英文譯本就係 4190-1 頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）係。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）而家喺你面前有嘅文件就係話如何處理交通意外嘅指引，係九巴嘅。我哋可以睇下最後一點，關於交通意外報告，主席，你睇番附件 II，即係 4190-31 頁，你可以見到嘅，交通意外報告表。4190-29 頁就應該係佢英文譯本。

主席：（經傳譯員）有冇一個更加清晰可以閱讀㗎？因為呢個睇落，係一個掃瞄嘅版本。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）或者我哋之後可以同九巴聯絡攞番嘅。

有趣嘅地方，就係我想邀請委員會留意 4190-38，呢個就似乎係一個標準嘅一個表格，係尋求乘客嘅同意唔好去警方嗰度作出投訴，即使有受傷。即係似乎唔係話理所必然一定係有事件，就會去向警方舉報嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）黃大律師亦都好幫手，搵到一個係交通意外報告表，一個更加容易閱讀，清晰嘅，呢個係喺 4397 頁嘅，九巴嘅文件冊 10(B)。

主席：（經傳譯員）似乎喺呢個報告表缺乏嘅資料，相比起喺倫敦嘅交通局個網站嘅，就係意外嘅傷亡或者意外嘅結果，係咪需要當場接受治理定留院，但係呢度係冇提到受傷嘅性質嘅，定話係有啲譬如話死亡、留醫、出院呀咁樣。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）係，喺呢一個傷亡者資料嗰度係有啲空格可以剔嘅，有「死亡」、「留醫」、「出院」、「離開現場」、「未能確定」，似乎冇嘅部分就係分類，呢個可能係其後分析嘅時候更加有用，睇下係咪一個滑倒、絆倒或者跌倒定係一個失去平衡嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實可以設計一個範本要求巴士公司向你提供一啲資料，等你可以改善你嘅數據庫，因為你可以要求佢哋提交咩嘢資料。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係，係好重要嘅，同埋我哋點樣可以喺個範本入面形容，喺個報告入面反映，呢一個當然我哋係會考慮嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

陳政龍先生：（經傳譯員）主席，或者我而家嘗試再一次將個時間交畀黃大律師。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席，唔該晒陳女士。

各位，我會問幾個範圍嘅問題嘅，第一個範圍就係呢一個嘅車速檢討嘅小組委員會佢嘅功能同你喺新嘅文件附件入面提到道路安全有咩嘢關係同埋個關係係乜嘢。首先我想講，我哋由啲證供入面聽到運輸署有同你哋傾關於車速限制嘅就包括係運輸署嘅代表，就有兩個非政府組織，就係香港車輛組織...

主席：（經傳譯員）我諗係應該有一個翻譯就係關於係高級嘅司機？

黃女士：Yes.（經傳譯員）同埋就係警方嘅代表，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋亦都聽到證供就係話會議召集人就係運輸署嘅助理署長嘅？

邱國鼎先生：Correct.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）運輸署亦都係提供秘書處嘅服務嘅，而個工作小組，我想問一問，就係嗰個功能係乜嘢嘢--工作小組會唔會考慮基於一啲客觀嘅事實同埋評審，就係睇下嗰啲意外嘅數字，就去決定係會唔會建議某一啲嘅道路應該係更改個時速限制？

主席：（經傳譯員）問呢個問題之前，呢個嘅工作小組嘅委員會喺我哋嘅文件冊之中有冇提到㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）喺10號文件，TD-1，...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-1嘅第120頁至到121頁。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係工作小組還是係一個委員會？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係一個工作小組。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個速度限制檢討工作小組主要嘅目的就係提供意見畀運輸署要唔要檢討速度限制同埋點樣做，嗰啲委員亦都會係提供意見，佢哋基於四個主要嘅因素，第一個就係將嗰個相關道路嗰個意外嘅紀錄或者歷史；同埋嗰個路面嘅情況；第三，就係話呢一條道路同佢相近連接嘅道路嗰個嘅速度限制有冇分別或者改變；第四，就係話汽車嗰個速度，就係話我哋實際嗰個車速。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係講緊第八十五個嘅分位？

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我知道工作小組就每季係會開會嘅，我哋有證供話畀我哋聽就運輸署佢決定究竟係邊一條路去睇嘅，係咪㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果你有一個情況，就係話你接到投訴話係區議會提交嘅投訴，就係話有某一啲嘅道路需要係檢討個車速限制，呢個咁嘅意見就點樣可以交到畀個工作小組嗰度睇呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）如果區議會有意見或者建議，佢哋會搵我哋嘅區域嘅工程師，嗰啲工程師就根據我頭先講嘅準則，就睇下需唔需要建議車速嘅限制會改變，主要考慮三點嘅，個交通嘅事故意外有冇改變同埋嗰個道路嘅環境有冇改變，如果有需要嘅時候，佢哋就會係編製一個報告，然後提交畀工作小組去考慮。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就提過就話有冇意外有冇咩嘢改變，咩嘢意思呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）其中一個嘅準則就係嗰個意外嘅歷史，我哋通常就會計算每一年嗰個意外率，如果嗰個區域嘅工程師發現嗰個意外嘅數目突然之間增加咗，佢哋就會做一個嘅速度限制嘅檢討。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋點樣去定義乜嘢叫做意外呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係嗰個個人受傷率，相比於成個香港嗰個受傷率，即係話相關嗰個道路嗰個率就係同全港嘅受傷率係比較會唔會佢哋係特別高。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果有人係受傷嘅，你就會去搜集一啲數據？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯，係。

主席：（經傳譯員）如果一啲人離開咗、走咗，我哋就唔會嗰啲數字可以反映出嚟嘅？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）就我哋會睇番個紀錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）其實你首先要有人受傷，然後你先至係搜集嗰啲數據，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係呀。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到意外率，如果佢係要計算落意外率，就要有人受傷，如果--或者你係舉一個例子，如果譬如話喺一個咁嘅情況，大埔道，你就會將佢嘅數據就會同另外邊個區比較，然後先至將意見提交畀工作小組？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋就會睇番全香港嘅數字。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）如果喺大埔道嚟講，佢就係屬於邊個區㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋就會睇番大埔道嘅某一個嘅路段，然後我哋就睇番嗰個意外個數目，然後就計算出意外率，然後將佢同全港嘅意外率去作比較。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我要打岔一下。意外率係每乜嘢嘅意思呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係每百萬行車公里嘅意外率。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你又提到每百萬行車公里嘅意外率，你又冇提到就話呢啲意外率一定係要有人受傷先至計入去，係咪運輸署其實就將佢改一改，就其實就係話有人受傷嘅意外率，每百萬行車公里？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋真係會淨係睇有人受傷，我哋先至係叫嗰啲做係交通意外嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。

主席：（經傳譯員）點解呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）因為我哋就會睇番警方嘅數字，我哋只係睇到有人受傷嘅意外嘅數字嘅啫，我知道譬如有一啲嘅意外，有一啲嘅車佢就係撞到嗰啲路邊嘅情況，但係佢哋就離開咗嗰啲車，所以佢哋就唔應該--佢哋唔會係呢啲所有嘅意外都係有紀錄嘅，因為好多時候嗰個司機，其實佢就離開嘅即刻，當中亦都係冇人受傷。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係好明顯呢個都係意外㗎，或者係有一個彎位，其實嗰啲車成日都會撞到嘅。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）咁係根據我哋嘅規例，就係只係有人受傷嘅意外先至係需要係向警方報告嘅，如果其他意外，佢哋就唔需要報警嘅，所以因此我哋就冇呢方面嘅意外嘅數字。

主席：（經傳譯員）我明你講乜，呢個係法律就話有人受傷嘅意外先至係要報警，但係如果架車係壞咗，可能嗰個司機係走咗嘅，但係好明顯其實係有意外嘅，譬如話有嗰個燈柱撞低咗等等。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）對唔住，我哋喺計算嗰個速度限制嘅時候，我哋就唔計呢一類嘅意外嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我又想問一問呢一個關於意外率嗰度，我就譬如話有好多人喺呢一段嘅車速嗰度，喺呢個道路嗰度超速，警方就發出咗好多張罰款通知書，我哋又知道有某一啲嘅意外嘅資料就會同呢一個嘅運輸署一齊去分享嘅，但係關於呢個定額罰款通知嘅呢啲資料會唔會係交畀運輸署去知悉㗎？我哋講緊超速

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋警方就發出呢個告票咁樣，或者係，呢個喺意外率裏面係冇反映出嚟。所以點解我哋考慮意外率嘅，淨係意外率，或者大部分嘅車都係有超速嘅，意外率仍然都係好細，所以其實個車速可能有問題嘅，就可能嗰個車速有時候會係太慢，所以咁多車都會係超速，而同時間個意外率仍然都係好低嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）嗰個問題其實係警方有冇提供佢哋嘅數據，就係講關於就係佢哋關於超速發出嘅定額罰款通知書，關於某一個道路？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇，冇，冇，就係關於我哋檢討車速限制嗰方面嗰個工作嚟講，佢哋冇畀一啲呢啲資料我哋。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀一個大概嘅數字畀我哋？你講到就係關於呢個意外率就係由當區嘅工程師去睇嘅，而將佢係同當區嚟再去比較嘅，你可唔可以

大概嘅數字畀到我哋？個數字去到乜嘢位，然後你先至會去睇--工作小組會去睇一睇呢一個嘅路段需唔需要檢討個速度限制呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我可以畀啲數字你，喺全港嚟講，意外率，全港，就唔係一個特別嘅區域，每年我哋都會發布呢個意外率嘅數字嘅，全港意外率，2017 年每百萬行車公里 1.15，意思就係話如果呢個道路嘅路段個工程師發現其實呢個意外率係高於 1.15，佢哋就會諗下要唔要檢討嗰個速度限制。

主席：（經傳譯員）你呢啲嘅資料有冇喺我哋嘅文件冊嗰度有㗎，喺邊一張文件呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）除咗意外率之外--或者我哋冇嗰個意外率睇到，佢哋都會係定期去檢討某一個路段嘅車速限制嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋喺邊度去睇到呢個嘅數字，就係講緊 2017 年每百萬行車公里嘅意外率？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋運輸署每一年都會係有一個小冊子，係講緊道路交通意外嘅，喺運輸署嘅網頁都有嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）黃律師，係咪喺我哋嘅文件冊當中？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）冇，我冇見過。我哋可能遲少少會提供。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喺網上可以睇到嘅？

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）或者我哋睇一睇，睇下可唔可以搵得出嚟。係第幾頁呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）第 9 頁嘅。係，冇錯，就係呢一頁，我哋睇落少少，1.15，見到呢度。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋可唔可以打印呢一份出嚟，然後我哋分發畀大家？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）就根據呢個圖表，呢度冇講話係全港㗎喎。

主席：（經傳譯員）會唔會喺呢啲數字嘅其他嘅部分可以睇到呢一個嘅形容呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個嘅圖表就係講全香港嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係會唔會好清楚喺邊一度講明呢個係一個全港嘅數字？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋睇 2.13，圖表 2.13。

主席：（經傳譯員）我哋係咪去到...

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）我睇到喇，「所有道路」？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，冇錯。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該晒。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺呢一個圖表就係「所有道路」係咩嘢意思呢？係咪等如係呢啲嘅被選擇嘅道路嘅所有嘅道路還是...

邱國鼎先生：係全港所有道路。

黃佩琪女士：（經傳譯員）你之前嘅作供，就係話就嗰個工程師就會睇一睇嗰個意外率--全港嘅意外率，呢個圖表係咪其實可以幫到佢㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，就全港嗰個就係話全港所有道路。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就會睇番你0.13嗰度，而唔睇1.15？

邱國鼎先生：1.15 should be on the bottom.

主席：（經傳譯員）1.15就係全港嘅意外率，而大埔道就係0.13，個意外率，係咪咁呀？你睇呢兩個數字，係咪？就係某一個路段同全港嗰個點樣比較？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係喺呢個速度限制檢討個報告之中，嗰個工程師就會揀某一段嘅道路，然後我哋就去睇，睇番過去一年所有嘅意外數字，然後我哋就計出嗰個意外率。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係大埔道沙田其實係講緊係一個大少少嘅範圍，而唔係淨係嗰個工程師選嘅好細嘅路段？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）嗰個界限其實就係可能有唔同嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）大埔道就可能有唔同嘅路段嘅，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個就呢個數字等如係所有呢啲嘅唔同嘅路段嘅總和嘅平均，係咪？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你剛才嘅口供就提到就算冇呢個意外率，運輸署都會定期檢討不同路段嘅車速限制，你咁樣做嘅時候，個基礎係乜嘢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）喺我哋嘅文件裏面，我哋都係提交過。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪第10號文件呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，係我哋星期二提交嘅文件--唔係，應該係星期三，總言之係10月3號。係一個表嚟嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）TD-5，喺TD-5第1817頁，係咪呢一份呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺嗰度，係1819頁，第12同埋第13段，或者我讀，因為咁就可以寫落去個紀錄嗰度，「我哋睇番TD嘅運輸署嘅文件，呢一啲嘅檢討會睇唔同嘅因素嘅，譬如意外率、實際嗰啲車嘅速度、嗰個道路嘅幾何環境，呢啲就會係定期做嘅，亦都會喺工作小組嗰度傾。同埋所有道路嘅車速檢討都會係定期咁樣做嘅，而有關嗰個頻率就會睇番唔同種類嘅道路。」

你就話道路可以分為三種嘅，主要幹道，就係每三十六個月，主要嘅道路，四十八個月，或者係鄉村嘅道路就係六十個月，即係五年嘅。你可唔可以話畀我哋聽咩嘢叫「主幹道路」呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）即係嗰啲最主要嘅路，亦都係最高標準，包括高速公路，通常係會將唔同嘅區域或者區係連結埋一齊嘅道路，譬如話由九龍去到新界，我哋喺呢一方面係有定義嘅，我哋係有定義嘅，即係對於主幹道，...

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你一係讀出嚟，一係畀個副本我哋。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）主幹路係有兩種嘅，第一，就係鄉村主幹道，呢啲就係將嗰啲人口中心係會連結埋一齊嘅，甚至係有唔同高度嘅入口或者出口嘅；如果係喺城市方面嘅主幹道，就會係「將唔同嘅人口中心連結埋一齊，佢係會將行人係分開同埋係有唔同嘅高度或者係層次嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）好。另外嗰啲區域或者係幹路，又係啲咩嘢嚟？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）區域幹路就係話將市區嘅道路組成一個主要網絡嘅，佢哋亦都係有好高嘅容量，同埋進入呢啲道路係有限制嘅，同埋係有二十四小時不准停車嘅一啲限制嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係話唔單只係指市區嘅道路，亦都包括新界嘅道路？總言之係符合呢個定義，就包括？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）或者係新市鎮，因為新市鎮嘅性質同市區都好相近。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔好意思，我亦都要講番主幹道嗰度，係咪大概都一定係市區嘅呢？抑或都包括埋新界呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）兩樣都包括嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）鄉村嘅道路又點呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）鄉村嘅道路係會將比較細嘅人口中心連結埋一齊，或者係將嗰啲康樂嘅地方同主要道路網絡連結埋一齊，佢會係有一啲嘅--個容量未必係好高嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺嗰個註腳 1 嗰度，你就話喺大部分嘅道路，如果個時速係符合嗰個道路嘅特徵同埋佢嘅設計嘅容量，就唔會需要改變佢嘅時速嘅，所謂現行嘅道路種類係咪就係呢三類呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）你講緊大埔道？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔係，一般嚟講，你有個講法，就話現行嘅道路種類，係咪就係你 13 段所講嘅道路種類呢？係咪就係主幹道、主要幹路同埋鄉村道路呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）其實而家現行嘅道路種類係包括晒所有嘅道路嘅。當一個工程師設計一條道路嘅時候，佢要自己打算嗰個設計嘅時速係幾多嘅，如果一條路係要設計成每小時 50 公里做時速限制嘅，個道路環境或者周圍嘅環境有咩嘢改變都好，就算你檢討幾多次都好，嗰個時速都會係維持喺 50，都唔會有機會去到 70，因為嗰個原本設計嗰個時速就係 50，係考慮到有關嗰個周圍嘅限制嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係如果有好多意外，會唔會考慮將佢減低呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）根據我哋而家嘅時速嘅系統，最低都係 50 公里。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係你唔會考慮再低啲嘅時速？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋喺個文件都有提過。

主席：（經傳譯員）係，係，我哋之後可以分開再講呢一點。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）其實仲有第二部分嘅，改變時速係唔會需要嘅，除非係有一個咁嘅要求，或者除非嗰個路段嘅意外率係高過全港意外率，呢度有兩個但書，第一，就係話有要求...

主席：（經傳譯員）你而家讀緊邊度？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）註腳 1，主席，對唔住，1819 頁。即係話有要求，咩嘢意思呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個就係回應我頭先所講嘅，就係話有兩個方法係可以引發一個檢討嘅，第一，就係定期嗰個，即係我哋 13 段所講嗰啲定期嘅檢討；第二，要引發時速檢討，就係公眾人士要求或者係意外率。意外率我頭先已經解釋咗，係同全港嗰個平均去比較。

主席：（經傳譯員）公眾嘅要求就有可能係話居民有投訴，因此區議會就向你反映，係咪呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）公眾人士。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪要通過個區議會呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有可能。

主席：（經傳譯員）但係喺大埔道好明顯已經有公眾要求，係咪？你覺唔覺得嗰個就係公眾要求呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）當我哋收到區議會議員嘅要求，我哋係會考慮嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你就話當你收到區議員嘅要求嘅時候，你就話「我哋」，「我哋」係邊個呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）一般嚟講，區議會嘅會員就會係接觸我哋區嘅工程師。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係話會係由區嘅交通工程師去審議，睇下佢會唔會係達到一個意外率，然後先至會交到去工作小組，係咪呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。意外率係其中一個考慮，佢哋亦都會考慮個環境係咪有重大嘅改變。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）咩嘢叫做「環境有重大改變」？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）譬如話有啲新嘅發展，譬如房地產嘅發展，係會影響嗰啲唔同車輛嘅種類或者係加咗交通流量呀咁。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有冇一個機制係公眾人士或者區議員係同交通工程師嘅考慮嘅意見係不一致嘅，如果係咁，公眾人士可以點做呢？除咗不斷咁同嗰個交通工程師講，有冇一個檢討嘅機制讓呢件事可以去到車速檢討工作小組嗰度呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）根據我哋慣常嘅做法，車速檢討其實係好技術性，我哋真係要倚賴交通工程師去做咗車速檢討，然後提議有關嘅路段應有嘅車速限制。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於你講呢個現行嘅做法，呢一個交通嘅工程師，如果個意外率未達到有關嘅準則，雖然佢收到唔同嘅投訴，而區議員又唔滿意嗰啲投訴，就要求個工程師再檢討，個交通工程師會唔會就因此去做一個當地嘅視察？係咪一個慣常做法呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係一般嚟講，交通工程師都會同有關嘅區議員一齊去實地視察，可能就算未有足夠嘅理由去引發一個時速檢討，佢都可以實地睇下可唔可以有啲交通嘅改善嘅措施。

主席：（經傳譯員）你意思係咩嘢呀？係咪即係話嗰啲指示牌或者喺地面畫一啲箭咀咁樣？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有時如果有行人過路嘅措施，佢哋就會覺得個車速太高，行人過路比較難，就可以做啲嘢嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）喺同一頁，我想問你關於呢一個表下面嗰一段嘅，喺過去五年，我哋檢討過一百四十三個路段嘅時速限制，亦都喺工作小組嗰度傾過嘅，

關於一百四十三個路段，有冇將佢哋分類，係屬於邊類嘅道路呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有嘅，我有個紀錄喺度。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你可唔可以畀啲數字我哋呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我而家睇一睇我係咪手上有資料先。我有一個表係列明呢一百四十三個路段屬於咩嘢嘅道路嘅種類，但係我就冇一個總數話係邊一類有幾多個路段嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）首先，你可唔可以畀一個平均數字我哋，每一年係檢討幾多個路段呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）平均嚟講，最少係二十四個路段，每一年。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係咪一個固定嘅數字嚟㗎，抑或可以就唔同嘅情況改變？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢個係最細嘅數字，即係最少要檢討二十四個路段。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你點樣選擇呢二十四個路段呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係基於區域交通工程師嘅考慮。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）區域嘅工程師考慮就會基於你頭先講嘅三個準則？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）仲有就係公眾要求同埋意外率。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有關嘅資料會唔會公布嘅呢？即係關於呢個一百四十三路段又好，二十四路段又好。呢啲咁嘅資料會唔會公布嘅呢？等公眾知道工作小組就會檢討呢二十四個路段，然後向工作小組提供意見，咁佢先開會呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔會嘅，但係最後工作小組建議改變個時速嘅話，我哋就會去諮詢區議會。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一段你都有話喺呢一百四十三個路段之中，有七個工作小組就係建議改變個時速限制嘅，首先，你可唔可以話畀我哋聽呢七個路段係屬於啲咩嘢嘅道路種類呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）呢七個路段，有兩個係主要幹路，一個就係區嘅幹路，有兩個係高速公路嘅連接路，而一個就係鄉村道路，即係話兩個係主要幹路、兩個就係區嘅幹路、一個就係鄉村道路。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）關於時速，你就話有改變過，點樣改變法呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）有五個路段就係減咗速，有兩個路段係加咗嗰個時速限制。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）有邊啲嘅路段係減咗速嘅呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）你意思係要路段嗰個名呀？

主席：（經傳譯員）你講種類定係個名呀？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我意思首先就係個種類，如果你都可以，甚至講埋啲咩路段就好喇，同埋邊一年。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）好，我用時序嚟講，2013 年，關於減咗速嘅路段，一個係主要幹路，一個區嘅幹路，一係本地--當地嘅幹路，一個就係鄉村道路，一個就係高速公路嘅連接路，就有呢五個路段就係減咗時速限制。另外有兩個路段就係增加咗時速限制，一條就係主要幹路，另外一條就係高速公路嘅連接路。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我留意到時間，主席，但係我都想再探索一下。如果你可以提供多啲資料，關於 2015 年呢五種道路種類車速限制係降低咗，同埋我哋關注嘅某啲路段，同埋點解會減咗個車速限制嘅，同埋嗰啲嘅工作小組有關嘅會議紀錄。

主席：（經傳譯員）證人回答問題之前，我要問下你問呢啲嘅問題有咩關連呢？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，係嘅，我想知道有咩理據去傾某啲路段，工作小組；第二，就係工作小組考慮咗咩，同埋喺工作小組考慮區議會投訴嘅時候，畀幾多比重去考慮。如果唔需要睇番會議紀錄都回答到呢兩個問題嘅話，我都好接受嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）最終，你要知道呢個資料有咩作用？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）去睇下我哋可唔可以改善工作小組嘅工作，又或者係喺檢討道路嘅車速限制嘅慣常做法係點，如果有收到投訴嘅時候，而唔係淨係睇嗰個嘅意外率嘅，喺全港，因為似乎係人工做出嚟嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）你知唔知道呢一個大埔公路段嘅基準係幾多？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）好。畀時間你搵番嗰啲會議紀錄出嚟。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你答番頭先嘅問題之前，我再問下其他問題，講番呢一個道路速度限制檢討嘅工作小組，我想問下點解起初會成立呢個工作小組呢？我哋有啲資料--或者其實你提供呢啲資料嘅，就係話喺 2000 年嘅時候成立呢個工作小組嘅，係檢討車速嘅，可唔可以解釋下點解 2000 年會成立呢個小組呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）工作小組係喺 2000 年成立，當年，我記得有立法會文件解釋係點解成立呢個工作小組檢討車速限制，因為當時有好多公眾查詢或者意見，就係話某啲嘅路段嗰個車速限制太低，而警方喺嗰啲路段又會執法，所以係公眾嘅一個要求--幾強烈嘅要求，我哋應該去檢討一下道路嘅車速限制，去

睇下有冇邊一啲路段嗰個車速限制可以提高。

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個建議成立工作小組去處理公眾關注呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）運輸署。

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。係咪喺立法會文件都有指出㗎？

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）我哋有立法會文件而家喺畫面度見到嘅，我哋亦都會派發文件。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺文件冊入面有冇？

黃女士：（經傳譯員）對唔住，主席，暫時而家未加入去我哋文件冊，呢個係喺立法會嗰啲文件嗰度搵出嚟嘅，呢個係運房局係2000年嘅1月24號準備嘅文件。你頭先講嗰個係咪就係呢份嘅立法會文件，你頭先嘅證供？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）唔該。而家為咗紀錄起見，我而家要講出呢一個標題係「香港車速限制」，係喺立法會嗰度交通事務委員會，由運房局提供嘅，呢一個文件就會講三件事嘅，就係車速限制分類嘅結構，同埋係點樣喺香港道路上設置道路車速限制、點樣檢討車速限制同埋交通意外同埋車速限制嘅關係。

到咗第3段，佢係講緊話譬如係低速嘅，就係喺市區或者係新市鎮嘅密集人口地區就係時速50公里，而中階嘅就係喺市區以外或者係新市鎮嘅密集人口地區就係時速70或者80嘅，...

主席：（經傳譯員）你繼續講之前，香港用呢一個方法有三個階級嘅，係已經用咗幾耐？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我諗係呢個文件發出嘅時間差唔多。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係2000年？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，但係喺2000年之前，喺香港道路嘅車速限制一般都係分做呢三級嘅，喺呢個文件交畀立法會嘅，我哋就清楚指明香港係有三級嘅車速限制，呢一個結構，即係話有三個級別嘅，而家係咩狀態？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）仍然有效，...

主席：（經傳譯員）唔係，我問佢個地位係點樣嘅？係咪運輸署採納嘅方式？係咪條法例？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔係。

主席：（經傳譯員）咁係咩嘢呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係我哋而家嘅做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係運輸署做法？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係行政嘅做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）即係政府嘅做法？

邱國鼎先生：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）即係運房局嘅政策嘅做法？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）喺其他文件有冇提及㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）除咗呢份文件，我就唔知道仲有咩嘢文件係關於車速限制嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）主席，我諗更加準確咁講，就係政府嘅做法係喺運輸署嘅運輸設計計劃手冊嗰度，我就唔可以將佢講話一定係政策嘅做法。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係交通設計規劃手冊？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

主席：（經傳譯員）唔該。我哋已經過時㗎喇，我而家係等你黃大律師去選擇幾時完成，或者你講完某一個部分之後。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你講過呢個手冊嘅日期係幾時㗎？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）你講係嗰個交通設計及規劃手冊？

黃女士：Yes, the transport planning...

主席：（經傳譯員）你應該話不時有更新嘅。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋亦都有交一份畀秘書處嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）係幾時開始有呢個手冊？係咪50年代、60年代？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我要去查核一下，但係據我理解，係根據英國一啲類似嘅手冊係制定嘅，再睇番香港嘅情況。

主席：（經傳譯員）係呀，我都睇過香港大學嘅一份副本，我諗係好似 60 年代寫㗎喇，係喺英國。

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）可能係第一版，冇錯。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個車速限制嘅結構，喺手冊入面寫嘅從來有冇更新過或者檢討過？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係，有關嘅章節我哋都係不時會更新嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你提到定期更新係有咩嘢條件你就去更新呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）如果有任何更改，譬如話海外嘅做法，我哋都會係跟番去更新嘅。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者喺下一節我哋再講詳細啲，但係我而家講番呢份立法會文件，去快啲講埋呢份嘅文件，然後我哋可以休息。我哋講到係呢份文件嘅第6段，佢提到喺1999年個車速限制有檢討過，「喺英國就有一個嘅獨立嘅交通研究嘅院所，亦都係喺全球領先地位嘅，叫TRL，就做過一個研究，關於香港嘅車速限制嘅。」而跟住嗰一段就係講佢嗰個結果。

我想問嘅就係除咗1999年開始去請英國嘅呢一個嘅交通研究實驗所去做一個研究之外，喺近年有冇請過呢一間機構做研究呢？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）即係呢個係唯一一個做過嘅？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）係。

主席：（經傳譯員）呢個係咪公開嘅文件嚟㗎，呢份顧問報告？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）應該唔係，可能係內部嘅顧問報告。

主席：（經傳譯員）可唔可以提交呢個報告畀我哋？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）可以。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）可以，主席。

主席：（經傳譯員）多謝你提供呢個文件。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）除咗1999年之外，就冇一個主要嘅研究或者顧問研究係睇番喺外國嘅做法，去比較香港嘅車速限制嘅結構？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）冇嘅，對檢討車速限制冇一個特別嘅顧問報告，但係我哋喺文件都提到過啲低速嘅地區，喺歐洲一啲嘅城市係用啲較低嘅車速限制嘅，譬如係時速20英里，即係等如30公里，我哋都有研究過呢啲嘅措施喺香港是否合適。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）係，明白。可能係道路安全嘅審核小組嘅新嘅任務喇？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）唔係，呢樣嘢唔同嘅，呢個研究其實係同道路設計，睇下

用咁樣嘅措施係咪適合司機喺道路上用咁樣嘅低速去行駛。

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）即係話呢個道路安全審核小組無論係有冇喺度，我哋都已經係開咗一個嘅試驗計劃同埋研究㗎喇，關於個低速嘅地帶。

主席：（經傳譯員）係咪有好多有關嘅資料㗎？

陳美寶女士：Yes.

黃女士：（經傳譯員）你幾時開始做一個低速區嘅研究？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋喺做易行城市嘅時候嘅研究開始嘅，呢個研究就係2017年12月開始做嘅。

主席：（經傳譯員）易行研究係咩嘢意思呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）即係檢討我哋現有嘅標準同埋設計，睇下有冇一啲措施或者係有創意嘅措施可以改善行人嘅步行環境去鼓勵用家多啲行路。

主席：（經傳譯員）係喺倫敦發展起嚟嘅，係咪呀？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）倫敦係我哋其中一個參考嘅地方。主席，呢個都幾有關係嘅，我都留意到喺同專家嘅討論期間講到一啲路段係喺倫敦，呢個就係我哋參照嘅地方，去做一個易行嘅研究嘅時候，去改善行人嘅步行環境嘅時候，其實亦都係睇下點樣可以改善道路同埋行人路去提高道路安全同埋改善環境嘅氣氛嘅。亦都係某啲路段係提及到嗰啲嘅車速限制都係應該係考慮嘅。

主席：Yes. The two go together, don't they?

陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）係呀，兩樣有關嘅。我都想提到我哋喺香港係聚焦喺市區某啲嘅路段，尤其係香港島。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）呢一個嘅易行或者係低車速區嘅研究係有咩嘢委員？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）我哋委任顧問做嘅？

主席：（經傳譯員）係邊個？

邱國鼎先生：（經傳譯員）Mott MacDonald，Mott MacDonald顧問公司。

黃女士：（經傳譯員）或者喺呢個時間暫停，主席，都合適？

主席：（經傳譯員）係。我哋而家就會暫停，不過我要講，喺今日較早嘅時候我都提過，我哋會將而家一路打嘅謄本都會交畀羅教授，睇下佢最尾有冇問題，但係今日都係要暫停，呢個聆訊再恢復嘅時候，佢可能會問一啲嘅問題。我哋可能而家係講緊某個題目嘅，佢會去問番其他啲題目，但係佢會有機會咁樣做嘅。

而家我哋會暫停，然後再另定各方都方便嘅日期，即係律師同埋陳女士同埋

1 你啲同事，佢哋去搵一個日期，下一次再恢復聆訊。

2 陳美寶女士：（經傳譯員）唔該晒主席。

3 主席：（經傳譯員）我哋而家押後去另外一日繼續聆訊。

4

5 2018年10月6日

6 下午5時48分聆訊押後