

B

B

C

2016年2月23日

C

D

上午10時04分恢復聆訊

D

E

出席人士：石永泰資深大律師、許偉強大律師及鄭欣琪大律師，為外聘律師，代表食水含鉛超標調查委員會

E

F

王鳴峰資深大律師、陳樂信大律師及羅頌明大律師，由律政司延聘，代表水務署署長

F

G

G

H

李柱銘資深大律師及吳思諾大律師，由何謝韋、李偉業律師事務所延聘，代表啟晴邨及葵聯二邨公屋居民代表 Lee Pui Yi、Chong So Nga 及 Lui Hui Ping

H

I

I

J

何沛謙資深大律師及殷志明大律師，由羅夏信律師事務所延聘，代表香港房屋委員會

J

K

李頌然大律師，由顧增海律師行延聘，代表有利建築有限公司、明合有限公司及伍克明

K

L

許佐賓大律師，由的近律師行延聘，代表保華建築營造有限公司

L

M

M

N

孖士打律師行陳宇文律師，代表中國建築工程（香港）有限公司及瑞安承建有限公司

N

O

O

P

主席：係，Mr Ho。

P

Q

何先生：早晨。

Q

R

水務署第四證人：黃仲良（水務署副署長）宣誓繼續作供
何先生繼續盤問

R

S

S

T

問：早晨，副署長。

T

U

答：早晨。

U

V

問：我今朝想同你先睇一睇嗰個 WW046 嗰個表格先，好唔好？

V

B

B

C

答：係。

C

D

問：請你打開 B15.1，37621 頁，唔該。呢個表格就--呢個表格因為--對唔住，你有未？

D

E

答：睇到，睇到。

E

F

問：係。呢個表格當然就唔係淨係新落成嘅大廈所用，即係譬如呢個表格係包含譬如好似係要改動，或者係甚至乎係移除某一啲嘅 inside service 而用嘅，係咪？

F

G

G

H

答：同意。

H

I

問：所以個表格本身就即係我睇落就好似比較概括啲，即係話佢有要求就係--即係你譬如可以 delete 一啲 part 嘅，譬如話係“pipe and fittings installed”，然後跟住畫一畫，就“intended to be installed”咁樣嘅意思，係咪呀？

I

J

J

K

答：見到有咁嘅。

K

L

問：係嘞，嗰個用意都係話即係如果你係新落成大廈，咁當然就係即係--對唔係，唔係新落成，即係如果係新 project，咁就唔係講 install，因為...

L

M

M

N

答：Intended to be installed，嘎。

N

O

問：...呢個 Part I 就係都未開工之前，咁所以就如果係講緊新嘅 project，就應該係“intended to be installed”咁樣？

O

P

答：Intended to be installed，係，啱，啱，係。

P

Q

問：係，唔。我想知道--我想睇一睇呢一個表格，琴日都同你睇過啲 notes，你揭去 37627。

Q

R

答：Sorry，喺...

R

S

問：37627，啲 notes 嗰度。

S

T

答：37627。Okay，得。

T

U

問：唔噃。呢個 notes，就第 2 段，就提醒啲即係簽--即係如果有需

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

要簽呢個表格嗰啲人士，佢就咁講嘅，“Provided that all pipes and fittings intended to be installed are approved by the Water Authority, Parts I and II of this Form shall be submitted to notify the Water Authority of the details and commencement date of plumbing works. If any of the pipes and fittings used/to be used have not yet been approved by the Water Authority, prior approval must be obtained”。

基本上，就係話「哦，你哋」--我想明白，係咪你哋即係話，「哦，如果我哋曾經之前係已經批核過嘅某啲嘅 pipes and fittings，咁你就可以簽落去。」即係引用喺你嗰個 Annex 1 嗰度？

答：個 annex， annex。

問：但係如果有一啲係我哋以前係未--水務署係未批核過嘅，就唔該你事先申請咁樣？

答：先攞個 approval 先。

問：係嘞，事先攞個 approval 先，係咪？

答：係，係。

問：個用意都係咁樣？

答：係。

問：係，咁就睇番--主要我都係想睇番第 7 點嗰度。

答：唔。

問：你琴日講就係呢一個 1987 年之後，就引用埋所有 pipes 都要加埋入去呢個 annex 裏面，係咪？

答：係，啱，係，係，係。

問：唔。我睇到第 7 嗰度，一開始講，就係 pipes intended to be used 就要 reported in the Annex？

答：啱。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：然後，跟住 fittings，就只係幾種 need to be reported，fittings 就係 draw-off taps、stop valves、gate valves、ball valves、combination fittings 就係咁，呢幾種係需要 report 嘅咁樣，係咪？

答：係，啱。

問：再睇落去嗰個列--即係列出嗰啲 BS 嗰啲項目，頭大半部都係講啲 pipes？

答：唔。

問：如果講到係 fittings，就係嗰幾個 valves，喺下面嗰五行，係咪呀？

答：係。

問：唔。呢個 form 嗰個--仲有一個，第(ii)點嗰個“Categories of compliance of fittings”，你見到喇？

答：見到。

問：就係我哋琴日講番嗰個四個 categories，就係嗰四個 categories，係咪呀？係嘞，其他又可以已經係審批過，approve 咗嘅，嗰四個 categories？

答：係，嘍。

問：所以即係就咁睇，基本上，呢個成個 annex 你哋去處理，擺乜嘢落去個 annex 嗰度，個重點都係話呢啲 pipes、呢啲 fittings、呢啲部件，就需要係有個比較詳盡嘅列明，咁就係有個--即係睇下係咪邊個 category 係曾經審批過，或者係如果未審批過，你就應該要先嚟畀我去批准先，咁就先用咁樣？

答：嘍，嘍。

問：唔。就唔係特別喺呢一個表格裏面係講物料，即係譬如好似焊料，呢一類咁樣嘅物料嘅應用方面嘅，...

答：即係我琴日都講過，...

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：...同意，係咪呀？

答：...其實因為即係你用喺一個 plumbing works 裏面，講緊嘅物料係好多，咁我哋一路--即係我都講--琴日講過嗰個歷史發展，一路我哋都睇到譬如嗰啲嘢有問題嘅，咁我哋即係嗰個風險大啲，咁我哋就叫大家一路報喺個 annex 度。咁同埋仲有一樣嘢，我都即係話其實仲有另一個 purpose 嘅，就係話即係當你其實好多 fittings，即係水龍頭，如果你睇番我哋個 list，個 approved list 係講緊可能以千計、以萬計嘅，如果即係有預先報咗，如果啲同事譬如落到去見到有個牌子嘅 fitting，其實有一定嘅困難去知道佢究竟係咪一個 approve 嘅，所以預先 approve 咗係好嘅，咁可以即係大家對番。

問：係。就係因為將嗰個集中點擠咗喺嗰啲 pipes，擠咗喺嗰啲 valves 嗰度，就變咗去填寫呢啲表格嘅人嘅時候，係有可能唔為意其他以外，如果係譬如好似用嘅焊料會有一個風險嘅時候，嗰個風險係乜，或者點解要注意其他以外嘅物料使用嘅風險？

答：呢個我唔同意，因為即係基本上，我即係琴日都講過，即係你去做一個工程，即係其實係好多嘅 specification、BS govern 緊，咁而去去做一件嘢，根據合約，就要做到合約要求嗰個--即係我成日都講有一個叫 partial 嘅要求。

問：唔㗎。

答：咁所以佢--任何一個人去做工程嘅時候，即係除咗有一啲報咗喺 annex 裏面嘅，事實上，喺個合約裏面有要求，法例上都有要求，呢樣嘢根據 BS，咁佢哋係有個責任，或者亦都要知道嘅，如果所有做工程嘅人都明白，即係我做每一件嘢，其實都要 comply with BS，或者個 specifications 嘅。

問：唔㗎，唔㗎。

答：所以我唔認為所謂話咩嘢風險唔風險，因為喺我認知裏面，construction 就即係要 comply with specification，係一個好基本嘅要求嚟嘅其實。

問：係。即係你都話喺地盤可能要處理嘅物件、物料、工序都相當繁複，咁大家都明白。就係個問題，就係當你哋將嗰個要求係擺咗喺即係呢啲 pipes 同埋某一啲 valves 嘅部件嘅時候，你就話「欸，咁多，我都有辦法 check 得晒個啲，水務署。」但係你就話要求，「喂，

B

B

C

唔該你喺其他嘅人士，就嚟 check 晒佢。」

C

D

答：其實...

D

E

問：即係係唔係嗰個問題個癥結，就係水務署當你將嗰個焦點集中咗喺呢度嘅時候，有冇即係諗下，其實可能需要提--即係直情係擺一個項目係關於呢一類咁樣嘅物料處理，好似 solder 咁樣？

E

F

F

G

答：即係其實我就唔係好同意話你報咗落 annex，就係個所謂焦點所在嘅其實，即係...

G

H

H

I

主席：你大聲少少，對住個咪講。

I

J

J

K

答：係，sorry，唔好意思，係。即係我嘅睇法就係話，即係呢個係水務署嘅要求，即係 LP 或者 AP 要報嘅物料嘅 list 嚟嘅。

K

L

問：唔。

L

M

答：但係唔代表話，「欸，你得嚟嘞，淨係跟呢啲就 okay，其他嘢就唔使跟。」我諗完全冇咁嘅 intention 想做呢啲--我講呢樣嘢。

M

N

問：唔係，我都唔係咁嘅意思提問你。

N

O

答：係，唔。

O

P

問：我嘅意思就係話，如果你覺得某一啲物料--嗰個物料係需要去著眼嘅，大家應該要聚焦嘅，嗰個物料係咪應該要擺喺呢度？

P

Q

答：即係我諗...

Q

R

問：等大家個注意力都會去埋嗰個物料嗰度？

R

S

答：即係我成日都講，即係冇所謂聚焦與唔聚焦，即係一個建造工程 comply with specification，基本要求。即係我難想像話我做一件工程，呢一啲我聚焦，於是乎我就會 comply with specs；呢部分我就唔聚焦，於是乎做乜都唔緊要，或者唔會太緊張去 com 唔 comply。我相信做 construction，唔可能係用咁嘅形式去做。

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

問：咁你擺呢十幾、廿項嘅 BS 喺度做乜嘢？你都係想啲人--你擺得喺度，呢啲嘢起碼我都要 make sure 我用啲 pipes，用啲 valves 係同呢一個 BS 係配合，係啱合。

D

D

E

E

答：我諗起碼...

F

F

G

G

主席：同埋你到最後，你到最後你啲啲同事落去做 final check 嗰陣時，佢哋都係揸住個 annex 1 去 check 㗎嘛？你話㗎嘛。

H

H

答：WA 係揸住個 annex 去 check，但係我相信如果嗰個 AP 佢嗰個 project，under 個 project ...

I

I

主席：唔係，唔好講個...

J

J

答：唔係，即係我...

K

K

主席：唔好講啲啲大原則住先，...

L

L

答：係，okay。

M

M

主席：...大原則就係你咩嘢嘢都要 comply，呢啲我哋全部都接受，係咪？而家人哋個問題係好 specific，即係你...

N

N

答：即係我--嘅。

O

O

主席：...擺呢啲咁嘅項目喺呢度，個目的係乜嘢嘢先？大原則我哋完全接受，基本上，你所有嘅嘢都要話 British Standards，所有嘅嘢你都要跟番個 specification，呢啲冇人會同你拗嘅。

P

P

Q

Q

答：Okay。

R

R

主席：個問題就係你擺呢啲嘢喺呢度，當然你講過，你有--佢有佢個 historical reasons，historical reasons 因為漏水，係咪？

S

S

答：唔。

T

T

主席：但係漏水，過咗幾十年之後，係唔係仲係一個漏水嘅 issue，咁呢個另外一樣嘢㗎嘛？

U

U

答：唔，唔。

V

V

B

B

C

主席：係咪？

C

D

答：Okay。即係其實其中仲有一個好大，我頭先講咗，你報咗喺呢個 list 裏面，其實我哋去 check 物料嘅時候，可以 facilitate 我嘅同事落到去 check 嗰個--即係 according to 個 list 嘅，即係嗰個情況就係咁樣做嘢。

D

E

E

F

F

G

問：如果--我唔知係咪--即係我仲唔係好明，你哋對於個食水--可能籠統啲講，食水污染嗰個風險評估喺幾時係真係有多少少嘅注重？

G

H

H

答：我諗我哋一路都非常注重呢個食水安全。

I

I

問：如果你話睇番八十年代，最主要其實都係睇係咪漏水，而家可能去到都係有講嗰個食水節約嗰個問題，咁即係漏水當然係唔理想。咁但係幾時開始你覺得呢一個物料監控，或者呢啲咁樣嘅 pipes、fittings 嘅申請程序係加入咗個食水安全嗰一個咁樣嘅目標嚟度？

J

J

K

K

答：我諗--即係其實我琴日都講過一樣嘢，即係喺個食水安全嚟度，其實我哋一路睇番都係我哋非常之著緊，所以 that's why 我哋有個 material control，我記得 Prof Fawell 都認同呢個係一個最好嘅方法。

L

L

M

M

問：Material control 你個表格上面咪呢一啲 annex 1 嘅 control？

N

N

答：所以--我諗其實--我哋成日話，其實你要即係闊啲去睇呢件嘢，即係我哋 on one hand，其實呢個係一個 construction contract，不過我唔想再重複嗰樣嘢。

O

O

P

P

Q

Q

主席：你要大聲啲，我都係聽唔到。

R

R

S

S

答：Okay。即係我唔想再重複，因為我都講咗即係嗰個情況，即係我哋 rely on 兩個 aspect 嘅，第一，即係我哋有我哋嘅 inspection，有個 file inspection；on the other hand，其實我哋都點解當日我哋要搵 AP 落去要負責番呢樣嘢，就係因為呢個其實都係--因為佢有一個 continue supervision，即係好大程度上，呢個係非

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

常之重要去 ensure 啲 material 係 comply with 個要求。

C

D

問：我係想問...

D

E

答：即係屬於...

E

F

問：...貴署，水務署做--即係喺呢一個物料嘅選用、監控嗰方面，除咗話你擺咗落去叫個 AP，「唔該，你喺地盤度負責幫我睇下。」

F

G

答：唔。

G

H

問：除咗呢一樣嘢，你幾時由一個處理--重點處理唔好漏水，而至到引申到到去話「我而家都其實應該係睇埋嗰個食水安全呢一個角度」嘅呢，...

H

I

答：即係...

I

J

問：...由八十年代到而家？

J

K

答：Okay。我諗八十年代開始已經係咁樣做，如果你記得我琴日講過一樣嘢，就係話今日你啲 fittings、pipes，你如果要擺到 approval，你係要擺去 laboratory test，如果你要 test，係要 test for 啲 elemental，即係嗰個基本佢嘅含各種成分，呢個就係正正一個 material control 嘅 ensure works safety。that's why 我哋咁緊張話，即係我哋要搵一個 authorized person 去 certify 一啲物料係 comply with 個要求，即係你就可以睇到，其實我哋對嗰個 material control 嗰個重視，即係如果佢係，我唔需要搵個 AP 去 certify 一啲咁嘅嘢。

K

L

L

M

M

N

N

O

O

P

P

Q

主席：我諗呢度其實你講緊兩個唔同嘅層面，第一個層面，就係你講緊--啱啱講緊啲 test，其實就係要你啲隻 fittings，或者啲隻配件係可以上到你哋水務署個 list，呢個係第一個 criteria，因為如果你上唔到你個 list，根本係唔需要考慮實際上可唔可以喺地盤用。其實你講嚟講去，都係講緊我叫做入閘嘅條件，第一。其實就有講到實際上去到地盤嘅時候係點樣做嘅，你係講緊一個人入閘嗰度佢有 testing 啫。實際上，subsequently，個 AP 或者個 LP 到後喺個地盤嗰度用嘅時候，講緊嘅有冇測試，係完全係兩回事，兩碼子嘅嘢嚟嘅。

Q

R

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：我想補充一下，即係其實測試係其中--即係嗰個其實 more on the QC，我自己覺得。

主席：唔係，嗰個測試，你講緊係入閘條件嘅測試？

答：唔係，另一方面，即係 on--我想講，嗰個 specification、British Standards 係一個好重要嘅嘢，去 ensure the quality of the material。

主席：唔係，呢個係--呢一樣嘢--係，呢啲大題目又係唔使講嘅。

答：所以喺呢個--okay。所以喺 site 度，當你是一件物料，你 comply with 嗰個 specification，其實你已經 ensure 咗個 material control。

主席：唔係，我明，呢啲嘢我哋完全明。我哋個問題就係你呢一個咁樣樣 comply with BS，你喺入閘嘅時候，你已經要交晒上去畀人哋，呢一個--呢一度嗰個--呢度我哋完全冇異議。

答：唔。

主席：不過 subsequently，去到落到去地盤，一個 specific project 嘅時候，你再要個 LP，再要個 AP 去簽，就唔係簽你入閘嘅條件，就係簽...

答：係所有嘅嘢。

主席：...當時喺嗰度用嘅嘢，啱唔啱先？

答：係嘞，係所有嘅嘢，即係無論係 annex 定唔係 annex。

主席：係咪？所以我哋唔好成日將--我明白點解你哋要講，因為其實喺後面嗰一步，基本上係冇測試，啱唔啱？

答：唔。

主席：即係係去到地盤，individual project 嚟講，去到嗰一個 stage，其實係完全冇任何嘅測試嘅？

答：嘎，嘎，唔需要，因為，嘎，okay。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

主席：好嘞，咁而家佢另外一個問題，就係話你哋幾時由呢個最初嘅所謂我哋嗰啲叫做 functional 嘅 test 去到後面，你哋 shift 咗去做一個叫做即係 safe water qualities 嘅呢一個咁嘅 conceptual...

答：係嘞，嘎。

主席：...咁樣嘅 assurance 呢，...

答：即係我...

主席：...係咪咁嘅意思？係囉。

答：Okay。即係 that's why 我就解釋番話，其實當你件嘢即係 comply with British Standards 嘅時候，其實已經係 ensure 到個 water quality。

問：即係你講得好聽啲...

主席：即係講嚟講去都係講第一個，講嚟講去都係講第一個。不如我咁問你。

答：好呀。

主席：你呢個咁嘅二零--你呢個 list，我睇落去就全部都係 pipes 同埋 valves 嘅啫？

答：係，fittings，係。

主席：係呢兩樣嘢嘅啫，係咪先？

答：啱，啱，唔。

主席：不如我問下你，你去到 2004 年，我哋尋日都睇過，咁你有啲 colleagues 又話 express，有啲 concern on 呢啲咁樣嘅 solders。咁請問你哋有冇諗過將佢擺咗落去呢一度？點解唔擺落去，如果你係咁注重 water qualities 嘅話？

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：2004年嗰個我即係琴日講過，我亦都要搵同事再睇番嗰個資料。即係但係我都想講番一樣嘢，即係擺與唔擺 on 呢個 list，其實你始終--我哋其實都好清...

主席：唔係，我絕對明白你嘅意思，...

答：Okay。

問：...就係話我其實多此一舉，...

答：你睇 specs 都有。

主席：...我其實多此一舉嘅啫，擺落去呢度，其實應該全部...

答：唔係，都唔可以話多此一舉嘅，但係唔--我成日覺得唔可以 take it 話你唔擺落去，於是乎大家就唔使太緊張跟唔跟，我就唔...

主席：唔係，我哋從來都有咁講過，從來...

答：即係我見到 specs 有晒呢啲要求喺度。

主席：唔係，從來冇人咁講過，不過我哋成日都好 queries，就係點解你要特登擺落去，因為你--因為我哋用啲 common sense 去諗嘢，我哋唔會做啲多餘嘅嘢，做咁多多餘嘅嘢嚟做乜，啱唔啱先？你做一樣嘢，梗係有一個 purpose，咁你話「哦，我做呢樣嘢係多餘嘅。」咁得，你可以咁答。

答：或者我想再補充，頭先如果你記得我講過一樣嘢，你報咗落 46，仲有一個好嘅作用，就係當我同事落去檢測地盤啲物料嘅時候，你有個水龍頭，有個 brand name，如果我有一張 46，我其實好難知佢係咪一個 approve 嘅，因為我可能個 list 裏面有上千上萬隻 approve 嘅水龍頭。但係如果你講焊料，其實 serve 唔到呢個 purpose 個嘢，即係你就算報畀我聽，你今日用“Fry”，寫咗落去，到我哋同事落到地盤，我都唔知你係咪“Fry”嚟嘅，其實。

主席：你即係咁又講唔通嘢，署長，老老實實。

答：係，係。

主席：你啲 copper pipe--你個 copper pipe 九萬幾隻牌子個嘢？

B

B

C

答：但係佢有講清楚個牌子畀我哋聽，喺個 46。

C

D

主席：咁你同樣一樣可以嘅啫，如果你講 solder 嘅話？

D

E

答：唔係，即係嗰啲喺地盤...

E

F

主席：唔係，你 logically 係完全唔通個啲？

F

G

答：唔係，我想講就係你喺地盤會睇到嗰隻嘢，即係你可以睇得番佢 copper pipe 用邊隻，個水龍頭用邊隻。

G

H

H

I

問：即係其實如果即係當時係有諗得比較周詳一啲，亦都有個注意力係擺喺譬如冇啲 WHO 嘅 guideline、paper 嗰啲，如果個風險當時係比較意識得清晰啲，署長，會唔會覺得呢個 solder 呢一個問題，其實應該喺呢啲物料嘅審批程序裏面，喺水務署嘅角度都應該睇到出嚟？

I

J

J

K

答：如--即係我會咁講，如果當其時意識到即係有呢個風險，即係有人違規，即係有人喺 specification 都唔 comply with 咁嘅風險，我都同意其實可能要睇緊呢樣嘢嘅，正如我哋今日已經做咗呢個 step。即係當我哋 aware 到原來即係 despite 有 contract，有等等各樣嘢，即係我琴日講，即係 LP、main con、AP 都 fail 咗之後，原來有咁嘅風險喺度嘅。That's why 今日我哋去做嘅時候，我哋都 on site 會做一啲 lead check、攞水辦等等。即係如果意識到呢個有人即係違規嘅風險，我同意嘅，應該係要咁做。

K

L

L

M

M

N

N

O

問：我就係想同你提番呢一樣嘢，因為我而家睇你最新呢一份 WWO46 嗰個格式，你睇你 C21, 19087。呢份係你--當然係個呢件事係已經曝咗光之後嘅最新版本。

O

P

P

Q

答：係。

Q

R

問：喺第--嗰個中間個 "PURPOSE OF SUBMISSION" 嗰一段裏面嘅第三行，呢個中間嗰度--第三行中間嗰度，"pipes and fittings to be installed and any materials to be used for the construction" 等等，呢一個加上嗰個 "any materials to be used"，以前個表格係冇呢一樣嘢，係而家加上去，咁呢個咪就係一個--我相信係因為經一事長一智，亦都係一個風險嘅評估之後，覺得其實從一個監察水質嘅角度嚟睇，呢一個 materials to be used 都係一個緊要嘅環節嚟個啲，所以我一定要寫番呢個？

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

D 答：你都係啱，如果有記得，我哋總化驗師都有講過，即係風險其中一個
E 好特別嘅，點樣評估，就係 due to occurrence of 一啲 event，
D 你會知道嗰個風險。即係今日，即係我哋即係經過呢個鉛水事件之
E 後，實在 recognise 到有啲即係違規唔守 specification 嗰個風
F 險，that's why，即係我哋都要喺嗰方面做一啲 improvement on
F 嗰個 material control。

F

F

G 問：唔。當然嗰個問題就係即係如果呢一個問題係早意識到，或者水務署
G 將個表格係有更改，亦都通知業界點解要做呢件事，咁可能即係對於
H 成件事個...

H

H

I 答：呢個...

I

I

J 問：...演變就可能會好唔同，對唔對？

J

J

K 答：Sorry，即係呢個同嗰個風險評估嗰個原則有少少--即係風險一定係
K due to 你一啲 event，一路發生，你有 recognise，你提高啲嘛。
L 即係當你有呢啲咁嘅事件發生嘅時候，其實你未必意識到個風險係咪
L 咁高，我想講番呢個 point 啫。

L

L

M 問：唔。

M

M

N

N

O 主席：我又唔--當然我唔否定你講嘅嘢，不過有陣時呢啲風險唔需要一定
O 喺本地發生先至學習到個啲，你可以睇下人哋地方㗎嘛？

O

O

P 答：即係你一定係有啲嘢 occur 㗎，令你知，呢個同意，係。

P

P

Q 主席：係。同埋其實你睇番過去，當然你舊嗰個就淨係 functional 去
Q control，但係你睇番過去，如果我哋用番譬如好似咁講，你 1938
R 年 ban 㗎用鉛，其實鉛有害呢一樣嘢，其實對水務署嚟講係完全唔係
R 一個新嘅事物㗎個啲？

R

R

S 答：唔，同意，同意，係，同意。

S

S

T 主席：係囉，啱唔啱？

T

T

U 答：啱，啱。

U

U

V 主席：咁所以其實即係雖然可能係事發好耐，但係完全未必係新，甚至有

V

V

B

B

C

機會，我唔知吖，雖然我諗呢個機會都唔係咁高。

C

D

答：唔。

D

E

主席：可能一九三幾年到而家，可能仲有啲樓，...

E

F

答：用緊鉛。

F

G

主席：...我唔敢講，有機會係仲係用緊鉛嘅嘅水管，當然可能會係一個好細嘅數目，係咪？

G

H

答：嘎。

H

I

主席：所以即係你 from 一個 water qualities 嘅 perspective 去睇，鉛喺水裏面呢一個問題，即係香港唔係話完全冇過呢一樣事發生，係有，而引致到 ban 咗添。

I

J

答：你意思係 1938 年 ban 咗嘅？

J

K

主席：係嘞，係囉。

K

L

答：Okay，啱。

L

M

主席：啱唔啱？

M

N

答：唔係，所以我想提少少，或者補充少少我嘅睇法。即係就其實如果我哋講風險，一定係兩部分嘅，一個 probability，一個 consequence。鉛對健康有影響，一定係即係我哋 recognise 嘅 consequence，但係個 probability 就真係好睇一啲 event of occurrence，我哋先知道究竟即係呢個風險係有幾高--即係個 probability 有幾高。

N

O

O

P

P

Q

主席：我梗係明。

Q

R

答：然之後，你嗰個相應嗰個措施就應對嘅。

R

S

主席：我絕對明。係咪譬如你哋而家成日都測住啲 radiological aspect，係咪？

S

T

答：唔。

T

U

主席：你驚大亞灣有啲咩嘢事，係咪影響啲水質，咁但係實際上呢啲從來

U

V

V

B

B

C

都有發生過，啱唔啱？

C

D

答：所以呢個其實亦都有一個 risk 嗰個 assessment，before 大亞灣之前，其實係未必會做呢啲嘢，...

D

E

主席：啱呀，我同意。

E

F

答：...即係當你有一啲嘢令你 recognise 到個風險增加嘅時候，你咪去做個囉。

F

G

G

H

黎先生：咁就睇番轉頭，事實上亦都唔係話冇試過係有人用一啲含鉛嘅焊料嘅事出現個啲，...

H

I

I

J

答：你指係 overseas。

J

K

黎先生：...如果你睇落去，譬如話嗰個潔具會 98 年去出一張 circular，梗係有事發生過，人哋先出張 circular。

K

L

答：我唔敢肯定。

L

M

黎先生：就算你 04 年嗰陣時，你哋自己水務署啲人同 VTC 啲人開會，講嗰陣時都話係叫人哋小心呢樣嘢，梗係有事發生過，唔會無揸揸搵出嚟講嘅，係咪呀？

M

N

N

O

答：呢個我答你唔到，因為我有乜資料。

O

P

主席：唔係，當我哋講有事嘅時候，唔係話有啲乜嘢...

P

Q

答：乜嘢發生咗。

Q

R

主席：唔係好大，但係...

R

S

S

T

黎先生：唔係話你見到好大件事，但係起碼你啲水務署嘅同事係知道有啲咁嘅情形出現，係咪？

T

U

答：Okay，嘎，嘎。

U

V

V

B

B

C

黎先生：即係你唔可以話係一件好大型嘅事，係有件大事發--大事得好緊要，好似而家今次件事咁大件事，先至為一件事嘅，係咪呀？你係一個專業部門嚟㗎嘛，...

C

D

D

E

答：我同意嘅，即係...

E

F

黎先生：...係咪？

F

G

答：...你最緊要睇嗰件事，即係嗰個--即係我成日都係講兩個 aspect，consequence and probability 應該係。

G

H

黎先生：咁你即係事實上係當時你啲同事係有--察覺到有啲咁嘅問題，只不過係你哋能唔能夠以啲嘅嘢嚟睇到嗰個問題嗰個嚴重性喺邊度，有冇做一啲嘅工夫咁解嘅啫？

H

I

I

J

答：呢個我諗係要--真係要搵番--我哋要 gather 番個 backup information，或者我啲同事可以再講講。

J

K

黎先生：你哋--我就真係鼓勵你真係要返去搵搵嘞，即係呢一樣嘢。

K

L

答：係喇，係喇，okay。

L

M

黎先生：即係如果唔係嗰陣時--你肯唔肯話你唔知嗰陣時，我就係唔係 convince 到，咁真係你咪都唔知，睇落去唔係個啲，無論個...

M

N

答：Okay。

N

O

黎先生：...個行或者你哋，事實上都係知道鉛--焊料--有鉛嘅焊料係對於呢個水喉係有影響，係咪呀？

O

P

P

Q

答：我都係咁講，即係或者我哋返去 gather 番啲 information，...

Q

R

黎先生：唔，嘎。

R

R

答：...等即係我啲同大家講。

R

S

S

T

主席：係。唔係，我哋當講你嘅時候，係講緊你水務署 as a whole。

T

U

答：明白，明白。

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

D

黎先生：我哋唔係講你個人。

D

E

答：我知。

E

F

F

G

主席：因為我哋每個人都唔識--識唔晒所有嘅嘢㗎嘛。

G

H

答：嘎，嘎。

H

I

主席：即係當你水務署嘅人去到 VTC 開會話我哋有 concern，咁嗰個人就係水務署，嗰個人我哋唔理佢咩嘢身分，啱唔啱？

I

J

答：同意，同意。

J

K

主席：係囉。

K

L

問：我都仲即係可能我去 Part IV 驗水嗰度之前，我仲想問即係少少即係關於個 Part I，多少少。

L

M

答：唔。

M

N

問：你就話即係因為我有個字叫做“not tested”--sorry，“not listed”，Material--“Pipes and fittings not listed”咁樣，...

N

O

O

P

答：唔，okay。

P

Q

問：...即係諗住 AP 就包晒佢咁，係咪呀？

Q

R

答：係，有咁嘅，係，啱，啱。

R

S

問：即係你個想法就係咁樣？

S

T

答：係，係。

T

U

問：因為我寫埋個“not listed”，咁你就包晒佢，係咪呀？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係。

C

D

問：唔。即係我想知道第一，AP 當時喺入 Part I 嘅時候，係未--個工程都未進行㗎嘛？

D

E

答：啱。

E

F

問：即係個水務工程未進行，係咪？

F

G

答：唔，唔，同意。

G

H

問：佢只可以話「我嚟上咗啲料畀」--即係主承建商上咗啲料畀 developer, developer 睇過想即係將來會用嘅料係合乎呢啲 BS 咩嘢嘅標準，咁就填落去嗰個 Part I 嗰度？

H

I

答：嘅 annex 度。

I

J

問：跟住簽咗個 Part I, 係咪？

J

K

答：Okay, okay, 係。

K

L

問：咁喺呢一個步驟裏面，其實呢個唔係對於你哋嚟講話控制用料嗰樣嘢，唔係一個--對你哋嚟講一個 assurance 嚟嘅，係咪？

L

M

答：呢個一定係 assurance, 因為嗰個...

M

N

問：點解？

N

O

答：...因為 AP 能夠簽咗名, certify 話即係我 listed, 我 not listed, 都會跟晒水務條例, 即係佢已經可以講話 assure 咗我哋將來佢喺呢個建造裏面, 佢會睇住單嘢, 佢 ensure 所有嘅我哋 Waterworks 嘅 requirement which 其實應該係 translate 咗 into 佢嘅 contract 度, 就會 comply with 我哋。咁其實冇嘅, 我諗佢係應該可以做到呢樣嘢, 因為佢係有一個嘅 supervision 嘅 system, 去睇番住呢件嘢。

O

P

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

嘅物件，你用乜嘢。

C

D

答：唔。

D

E

問：AP 就即係好明顯就會填一個“Fry 99”喇，因為嗰個已經係上咗料審批咗。咁填嗰個步驟，話畀你聽我--即係諗住--其實 LP 話畀我聽會用呢隻“Fry” 99，呢個本身都唔係一個 assurance，係咪？

E

F

F

G

答：其實...

G

H

問：我 certify 呢隻嘢將會係--將會用？

H

I

答：我諗大家即係又係有啲 difference，我覺得即係如果一個 AP 喺呢度簽咗名，certify 話呢啲嘢 listed/not listed 係 intended to be used，其實佢係--基本上，如果畀我做，我都係基於一個，第一，我 contract 個 specification 係 comply with Waterworks Regulations。

I

J

J

K

問：唔。

K

L

答：第二，我有一個 supervision system 去 ensure 將來嗰個整個 construction 可以 comply with specs 嘅，and then 我覺得我就可以 certify 到呢樣嘢。

L

M

M

N

問：咁樣，唔。即係你嘅理念，就係總之我即係叫得你簽，你簽咗呢，我就會係靠晒你？

N

O

答：我諗簽個名係一個非常之謹慎嘅嘢嚟㗎嘛，應該。

O

P

問：明白，明白，唔。咁我一陣間睇下你個 Part V 簽名嘅時候，你又有謹慎。

P

Q

Q

R

答：Okay，好。

R

S

問：即係--好。Part IV，我想同你講講驗水。

S

T

答：好。

T

U

問：驗水我最簡單直接，就請你睇你哋部門張生嗰個證人口供。

U

V

答：張生？

V

B

B

C

問：我想張業駒先生。

C

D

答：Okay。

D

E

問：嗰份證人口供喺 19.5，佢就有個好好嘅 summary，喺 Annex 2，13802 頁。

E

F

答：係，睇到。

F

G

問：13802 頁。

G

H

答：係，睇到。

H

I

問：呢度就你見到佢係有個“Summary of Water sampling and tests involving WSD”。

I

J

答：唔，睇到。

J

K

問：唔。就去第一中間嗰個 box，第 2 嗰度，“newly constructed inside service”。

K

L

答：唔。

L

M

問：就“*For newly constructed inside service*”，喺 2012 之前，就 take 水辦係驗八個 parameters，就係 near construct--connection point。

M

N

N

O

答：唔喎。

O

P

問：2012 至 15，就係“*samples were taken for testing near connection point (8 parameters) as a prerequisite for effecting water supply; after effecting water supply, water samples were taken from inside service within building*”，似乎嗰個 inside service 係即係喺嗰度擺嚟測試嘅話，就係 2012 之後先至有呢件事嘅？

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

答：係，喎。

S

T

問：唔。咁 2015，(c) 嗰度，就係“*(after discovery of the excess lead in water incident in 2015) water samples have been taken for testing both near connection point and from*

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

the inside service”，見到嘞？

答：見到。

問：唔，呢個就嗰個演變嘅過程。我想知道你喺 2012 之前，其實你話淨係喺 connection point 嚟 take 嗰啲 water samples 去驗，呢一個係一個 conscious 嘅決定嚟嘅，係咪？

答：噏，...

問：我決定唔喺 inside service，而只係喺個 connection point 嗰度去 take samples？

答：呢個--其實如果你睇番呢份嘢，都係真係一個演變，before 2012 年之前，其實我哋知道所有啲 housing contract、developer 嘅 contract，其實佢哋都會要求，即係當個 inside service 做好之後，佢哋自己會洗一次嘅。

問：噏。

答：當其時我哋--當然佢哋會洗佢哋嘅 system，which 我相信即係我一路都講，AP 即係對佢業主嘅責任，都係想 deliver 一個 properly constructed，係 suitable 個 used 嘅 system。咁我哋當其時亦都要 ensure，就係話當你做一個 system 嘅時候，你個 system 係 clean enough，唔好去 contaminate 咗嗰個 public 嗰個 system，因為呢個其實影響好大，因為對附近嘅居民係一個好大嘅影響嚟嘅。咁嗰陣時即係我哋都係睇番呢樣嘢，我哋覺得最緊要 whereas inside 嘅，我哋知道其實即係嗰啲--即係嗰個 AP 等等，佢會 ensure 裏面係乾淨嘅。

And then 去到 2012 年，即係大家知道添馬發生咗一單 LD 嘅事件之後，我哋又更進一步，即係就係話 okay，即係雖然我知你裏面會洗，但係其實我哋當陣時喺 2012 年再出多個 guideline，再提醒，直頭係畀好 detail，即係教佢點洗，洗完之後，仲有一樣嘢去提佢嘅，就係話「你洗完，你點知自己係洗得乾淨，the best way 就係擺個水辦擺去驗一驗，究竟掂唔掂，如果驗咗出嚟唔得，你咪再洗囉」咁樣。咁即係一路一路都有提醒嘅。

問：唔，明。

答：再去到 2015 年，今次事件之後，我哋又要再行前多一步，就係話「我

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

都係要你攞個水辦去驗完畀我睇到啲嘢 okay, 包括重金屬, 然後, 我哋先畀 water supply 你。」咁你睇到個演變過程, 其實就係話如果即係個 AP 佢做得到佢哋本身可以做到嘅嘢, 風險不高, 我哋都盡量就係話即係其實即係各施其職, 大家可以做到你個部分嘅嘢。

問：噏, ...

答：And then 即係如果我哋一路睇個風險, 係一路--即係將個個要求一路提高。

問：你 2012 之前, 你頭先講個點解有即係叫--喺呢度要 take--connection point 就 take 呢啲水辦, 你就講話當時即係要睇下佢洗得乾唔乾淨, cleansing and disinfection, 係咪呀?

答：應該咁講, 其實個個係去 safeguard 個 public 個個 system 嘅, 但係以...

問：即係唔好有...

答：...地面, 你個 develop--新嘅 development 唔好令到周圍啲...

問：Contaminate... (聽不清) source?

答：...其他啲啲即係附近嘅居民受影響, 呢個非常之重要嘅。

問：係, 明白。但係主要都係喺個個 cleansing、disinfection...

答：啱, 嘎, 嘎。

問：...個個角度去睇嘅, 即係你唔好有一啲污染...

答：污糟。

問：...番之前?

答：係嘞, microbial, 你成日講個個生物個個風險。

問：生物風險?

答：係。

問：咁物料風險呢?

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：物料風險，好似 Prof Fawell 早前我諗都有講過，即係物料風險一路以嚟，嗰個就係個 material control，即係喺嗰個...

問：即係我想知道 2012 年之前，你哋嗰個 philosophy，對於物料風險個監控，喺呢個 checking of samples 裏面，根本唔係你個 consideration，係咪咁講？

答：即係我諗陳健民先生，或者甚至 Prof Fawell 都講過好多次，即係根據世衛嗰個標準，即係嗰個 guideline，the best way 去 control 嗰個重金屬等等，就係一個 material control，that's during construction 嘅時候，你要 ensure 嗰個啱嘅物料用咗落去，呢個最好嘅。

問：唔。

答：但係嗰個 microbial 個風險，亦都根據世衛，因為你 microbial 風箏，你有帶 during construction 去控制，not until 你洗乾淨咗，你先知呢個風險 eliminate 咗。

問：即係如果你係咁講，即係其實你亦都記得 Prof Fawell 也好，或者其他有啲 papers 亦都講，如果你純粹係睇嗰個 prevention，我相信你個 philosophy，就話「哦，prevention 係好緊要，咁所以我哋有呢啲 AP、LP 乜嘢」咁樣。

答：係，啱。

問：咁就跟住到到 verification 就可以唔需要咁著跡，樣樣嘢都去 check。但係有個大前提，就係個 prevention system 係要 effective 先。

答：即係...

問：即係呢個 Prof Fawell 都有咁樣講過，即係你...

答：絕對同意，即係如果我哋認為，即係如果即係我哋--...（聽不清），一路都係我哋希望個 AP which 一個--我成日話係一個專業人士嚟嘅，佢會負責成個 building project。即係 everything 嘅，not only 即係 plumbing，風、火、水、電，structural safety 等等，呢個人我哋 rely 咗 on 佢，佢要 ensure 嗰樣嘢係 okay。Prof Fawell 我記得佢喺作供嘅時候都講咗，除非我哋有咁勁嘅 foresight 去睇到話喺呢啲咁嘅 barrier 之後，都仲 fail 嘅，咁

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

我哋就需要 put in 呢啲咁嘅 system。

問：我想同你講，如果你要有一個你 rely on 係有個 prevention 嘅 mechanism 喺度，但係如果你要 rely on 呢個 prevention，其實去話你自己唔需要再喺個 verification 嗰度做咁多嘢，呢個喺個 prevention 係唔係一個 effective 嘅 prevention，你自己都要有一個評估，...

答：即係...

問：... 你自己擺落去個評估就係要你做個 passive identification，做 risk management 做 control points，咁然後你先話呢個都可以係一個 good enough prevention 嘅 mechanism，所以...

主席：第4點未講，verification of control 呢樣嘢緊要嘅。

何先生：我而家就係即係 go to 嗰個 sample 嗰度。

主席：係呀，係呀。

答：即係...

問：即係呢一套嘅--如果你話「我想 rely on 呢一套咁嘅理念嚟 justify 我個 position，個監管嗰個 position。」呢一套嘢唔可以淨係話「你咪 prevention 囉。」你要睇嘅嘢就係 prevention 係唔係 effective，咁你就要有所有呢一啲咁樣嘅風險嘅評估同管理咗，真係你覺得安心，我就可以減輕最後嗰個 verification。

主席：唔係，唔係咁嘅意思。Prevention 其實係一個 control measure，係咪？Verification of control measures 嗰個先至係重要，你個 prevention 究竟 work 唔 work，你就要有另外一啲嘢去 verify 佢 work 唔 work 嘅。

何先生：明白，明白。

B

B

C

主席：所以...

C

D

D

E

問：咁所以加埋第四個 element 上去。咁你作出一個咁樣嘅評估之後，你就可以話「啊，我可以安心跟世衛裏面啲 papers 有啲所講，就話 prevention 嚟緊希望去到最後要--到最後測到有問題，已經 too late 喇，too close。」

E

F

F

G

G

H

主席：係嘞。你明唔明？即係 Prof Fawell 話「啊，啱，因為你 chemical monitoring，第一，好貴；第二，唔係好 practicable，對於好多人嚟講，所以呢一個 material use 嗰度，monitoring 嗰一度係重要嘅。」我哋冇人有異議嘅，基本上。好嘞，咁個問題就係嗰個 material monitoring 就係個 control measures，跟住個問題就係咁嘞，你點樣樣去 verify 呢一啲 control--呢啲所謂 multi-barrier method etc，呢個 prevention 其中一個係 work 咁樣咋嘛？

H

I

I

J

J

K

K

L

L

M

答：即係如果我哋咁講緊你所謂 verification，我相信當世衛提出呢個咁嘅建議嘅時候，我相信佢係做咗一個幾詳細嘅研究，然後，make 一個 recommendation 畀大家，就話你喺嗰個 material control 嗰度做好啲，instead of 話你去到最後，佢唔--我印象中，世衛...

M

N

N

O

主席：世衛，我諗我睇世衛嗰個 drinking 嗰個 guideline 可能多過你哋。

O

P

答：Okay。

P

Q

主席：人哋成日都叫你哋 adapt 去你個 local situation、local circumstance，從來都有話過畀你哋聽，「你一定要跟我呢樣嘢，我教晒你點樣樣做。」冇咁講過嘅，永遠都係因時制宜，你嗰個地區因為 social、geographical 好多樣嘢，economical，咁多 factors 喺度，所以你一定係要 revise 你自己嘅 own mechanisms 嘅，佢只不過係畀咗個 framework 你去跟嘅啫。

Q

R

R

S

S

T

答：呢個同意嘅。

T

U

主席：咪係囉。

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：That' why 我哋咪--其實香港個 system 唔曳個喎，應該係--我諗我哋香港建造業嗰個整個 system 係做得唔錯嘅，其實如果你睇番啲 private sector，其實都做得相當之好，我諗公營其實都好嘅即係。所以 even 因為有個咁嘅 system，我哋 put in 咁嘅 multi-barrier，其實係做得我覺得係一個相當唔錯嘅 system，that's why 我覺得用一個咁嘅物料控制係一個 proper 嘅做法嚟個喎。

問：唔噃，好。咁頭先主席提出嗰個 verification，喺你嗰個 prevention 嘅層面嚟睇，verification 其中一個項目，呢個我想知道你嗰個 Part IV，人哋要入紙話「我完工嘞。」直至到你 Part V 抽咗抽咗水辦出嚟，Part V，呢個唔係正正喺個 verification，咪喺呢一個步驟裏面係可以做得到個囉？

答：我諗即係要 practically 去諗呢件事，因為即係我哋其實都--我諗陳健民先生講咗好多，我就唔係咁專喺呢度。你喺個客做完去擺水辦驗嘅時候，其實即係以世衛嗰個 guideline，應該係主要去睇 microbial risk，如果你話要全...

主席：再講多次，對唔住。

答：Microbial，microbial。

主席：唔係，唔係，你再講多次，再講多次。

答：即係當你個客做完件嘢要去擺水辦嘅時候，我諗我哋都係要 focus on 嗰個 microbial risk，which is in line with 嗰個世衛嘅標準。

主席：其實又唔係喎，老老實實。

答：如果你 on 其他嗰啲，其實都幾對嗰個 compliance 係都幾犀利，個 cost，如果你話「哦，其實如果你再 go forward，即係可能要好多隻 heavy metal 你要驗等等。」咁呢個係即係一個幾大嘅 compliance cost 嚟個喎，即係我諗要 strive balance。

主席：唔係，應該咁講，我同意你部分嘅講法，不過我又唔同意你講到嗰

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

個--因為你最初你驗--你最初驗水，你驗嘅八個 parameters，其實嘅八個 parameters，你話係咪真係唔係...

答：Microbial。

主席：...microbiological emphasis 其實又唔係，老老實實唔係...

答：邊個唔...

主席：...特別係--唔係 microbiological emphasis，雖然你嗰度係有驗 E. coli，有驗 heterotropic...

答：Plate count.

何先生：Plate count.

主席：...plate count，...

答：Coliform。

主席：...同埋有驗 total coliform。但係呢啲全部根據 Prof Fawell 講，都只不過係一個--呢啲全部都係 general indicators of...

答：係 of 嗰個。

主席：...water quality 嘅嘢，其實佢唔係話特別好 specific 係話要驗邊一隻。咁因為基本上，過去啲 water crisis--啲 water whatever 有啲 health outbreak，好多時都係因為啲 microbiological pathogens 令到佢引起。咁所以呢啲擺咗喺度，其實係愛嚟 test 個 general quality，即係同 pH、colour、conductivity 一樣，諸如此類，係咪？Residual chlorine 諸如此類，呢啲其實基本上就係好大路嘅嘢嚟嘅，係咪？

答：唔。但係呢個好似都係世衛啲 parameter 嚟嘅，我以--我--其中三隻菌嘅一個。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

主席：呢個有--應該咁講，世衛有講，亦都有講到究竟--譬如好簡單，你
驗 conductivities，其實係驗咩嘢嘅啫，...

答：Con...

主席：...其實係驗--可能係驗緊啲 raw water 入嚟嗰陣時個 general
qualities。

答：其實 conductivity，我哋最驚就係鹹淡水摺咗啫。

主席：吓？

答：鹹淡水。

主席：即係成個你嗰八個 parameters，其實即係我可以話畀你聽，其實
唔係話 particular emphasis on microbial
contamination，其實係 general quality，係一個好概括嘅嘢，
因為 Prof Fawell 講「我哋除咗 E. coli 之後--之外，我哋而家
考慮多 Enterococci 諸如此類。」咁呢個都係一個好 general 嘅
嘢。

答：係。

主席：所以你唔可以話因為咁樣樣，所以我哋係 particular pay
emphasis on 啲 microbiology，其實只不過係一個 general
qualities 嚟嘅。

答：主席，我因為真係唔係好專呢瓣嘢，所以唔能夠即係再 further
elaborate on 呢樣嘢。

主席：得，唔緊要。

問：即係我都想返番去嗰個即係抽樣去驗你背後嗰個監管你...

主席：唔係，即係返番轉頭，即係返番去嗰八個 parameters，驗水嗰八
個 parameters，即係個意思就即係話其實係冇好 specific 係針對
係 material use 嘅，所以嗰個 verification of control

B

B

C

C

D

D

E

E

F

F

G

G

H

H

I

I

J

J

K

K

L

L

M

M

N

N

O

O

P

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

measures, verification of 嗰個 materail use, 其實呢八個 parameters 係一啲都 test 唔到出嚟嘅, 即係其實基本上係冇。啱, 即係同意你講, 如果你要 control lead, 如果你就--嘅話, 你就應該要喺 material 嗰度著手, 咁得, 呢樣嘢我哋即係去到 stage 3, 我哋都接受係啱嘅。

答: Okay。

主席: 但係個問題去到 stage 4 嘅時候, 你作為一個即係 water quality 嘅 guardians 嚟講, 你就冇咗呢一個 measure 去 verify 第三個 stage 嘅嘢, 而你嗰八個 parameters 係做唔到呢一樣嘢嘅。

答: 我--可能我唔係呢個--呢方面嘅專家, 所以我好難再即係 further 講到呢個 point。

主席: Okay。

問: Okay。咁冇辦法再同你研究呢個問題。

答: 即係--sorry。

問: 不過, 呢個問題另外一個題--一個細啲嘅題目, 就係話你喺--你 2012 年之前講話係抽水辨, 係喺個 connection point 附近去抽, 即係話你喺 2012 年之前已經係決定咗唔去研究 inside service 裏面嗰個水質?

主席: Up to 2012 年, 你哋都有做--冇呢個...

何先生: Up to 2012 年, 係。

問: 呢個係 conscious 話「我喺個 connection point 度抽, 所以我就唔會下游喺 inside service 裏面個問題」, ...

答: 我頭先講過, 即係唔係...

B

B

C

問：...係咪咁樣？即係個理念係咪咁樣？

C

D

答：即係其實我--即係始終係一個 construction project，我哋知道--即係我頭先講，就知道你裏面，其實你哋自己係會做好你哋自己個 system。我哋都相信個 AP 係 ensure 想 deliver 一個 plumbing system 係 suitable for use for 佢哋嘅 client，我哋將來嘅 attendant。That's why 我哋當其時個 focus 就擺咗喺 make sure 個 public 嗰個 water system 唔受污染，即係一路發展...

D

E

E

F

F

G

問：呢個係...

G

H

答：即係我哋--如果即係我成日都話，你有個 system 喺裏面，你有個 supervision system，有個好好嘅系統去 ensure 嗰件嘢 deliver，咁你做得到嘅，我唔係好需要成日插隻手入去，一定要管住你啲嘢；但係你做唔到嘅，我哋就要去管，好似而家咁，我哋越管越多，...

H

I

I

J

J

K

問：我...

K

L

答：...就係想 ensure 你哋係 properly 做好你個工作。

L

M

問：我聽到你講嘅，我聽到你呢一個...

M

N

答：即係我想畀番一樣...

N

O

問：...--呢個理念就係正正就係話你係 "yes" to my question，就係話「我當時係覺得唔需要去睇 inside service 嘞，我覺得喺個 connection point 好 okay，因為我會...」

O

P

答：因為你哋會做到你嘅嘢，你會做到你嘅嘢。

P

Q

問：「...--LP 又幫我簽，AP 又幫我簽」咁樣，係咪？

Q

R

答：AP 又會幫你做嘢。

R

S

問：即係呢個就係你個...

S

T

答：我哋個...

T

U

問：...成個覺得你哋個角色嗰個理念係咁樣，係咪？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係。

C

D

問：我想你睇一個文件嘅，呢個係 2009 年嘅文件，想你睇 C4，係 3579 頁。有一個我相信係你哋內部嘅 working group，“Divisional Meeting of Customer Services Division - Working Group for Action Items”，呢個 2009 年嘅文件，3579 頁，見到嘛？

D

E

E

F

答：3579，係。

F

G

問：係，唔該。

G

H

答：睇到。

H

I

問：我唔知 bottom half of 嗰啲 people present 嗰度，“C L WONG”係咪閣下？嗰度 I/CS(A)L。

I

J

答：嗰個唔係我，唔係我嚟。

J

K

問：唔係，你有參與呢個...

K

L

答：我唔係 inspector 嚟，嗰陣時。

L

M

問：哦，對唔住。你有參與呢個...

M

N

答：冇，冇，冇，呢個“C L WONG”唔係我嚟嘅。

N

O

問：唔係你嚟？

O

P

答：唔係我嚟。

P

Q

問：唔係，唔好理點樣都好。我睇番呢--我哋睇番呢個文件，我想你去呢個會議紀錄，3582。

Q

R

答：3582，係。

R

S

問：2.7 底下有個“Issue No. 3”嘅。

S

T

答：唔。

T

U

問：呢度就係“Taking water samples for New Building Project”，就講話喺 2004 年嘅時候，“TSU endorse -- with CE's endorsement had clarified the doubts in Circular

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

Letter 6/2002 that water samples would be required for only underground fresh water mains underneath roads.]

D

D

嗰個“doubts”嗰度，係咪曾經--會唔會係話有人提過話「喂，使唔使喺 beyond 個 connection point 可能都要 take 一啲 samples？」

E

E

F

F

答：呢個答你唔到，因為我...

G

G

問：你答我...

H

H

答：...唔知嗰陣時講個“doubts”係啲咩嘢嚟。

I

I

問：“Doubts in Circular 6/2002”？

J

J

答：我唔知個背景，...

K

K

問：唔可以...

L

L

問：你睇一睇嗰個 present--people present 嗰個 list 裏面，有冇邊位同事我哋將會上嚟畀證供，我可以問到呢樣？

M

M

答：K K 劉、梁永泰（譯音）...（聽不清），應該冇啲。

N

N

問：冇呀？

O

O

答：嘎，嘎。

P

P

問：哦，okay。咁可能冇得再跟進。嗰個 list 嘅列表裏面，而家有冇係在職嘅？

Q

Q

答：在職，有，有，有，有，有人在職。

R

R

問：有，唔。我想知道，而家你哋二零--睇番我哋頭先講個 take samples 嗰個，張生嗰個口供紙嘅，喺第 13802 頁。

S

S

答：Sorry，係...

T

T

問：而家你--13802。

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：B--係咪 B bundle？

問：B22--C19.5。

答：C19.5，sorry，喺幾多？13...

問：C19.5 13802 頁。

答：一三八--okay，okay。

問：13802 頁。

答：睇到。

問：唔。我想知道你由 2012 前嘅 practice，去到 2012 至到 15 中間嘅改變，就似乎加入咗呢個 inside service 嘅...

答：Guideline 畀佢，即係其實做咗兩樣嘢。

問：即係加咗 inside service 落去？

答：即係叫--即係畀咗一啲 guideline 佢哋，教佢哋--即係其實我--佢--我哋出咗張 circular，如果你睇下，有留意係 2/2012。咁畀咗 guideline 佢哋，教佢哋即係點樣洗裏面，然後仲提醒佢哋，洗完之後，記住擺啲水辨去 check 一 check，究竟啲嘢係咪洗得乾淨，如果唔係，就繼續洗番乾淨咁樣。

問：我想提出嘅，就係你就算改個 practice，加咗 inside service，你用一個提議嘅形式去加入去，係唔係其實都有一個一定程度，你哋評估過個 inside service 應該要擺啲乜嘢 measures 入去，去睇下個 inside service？唔好就係咁睇 connection point，如果我睇埋 inside service，係咪做過一個咁上下嘅評估？

答：呢個咁詳細，我就唔係太清晰，或者可能稍後我另外一啲同事，林正文先生可能會畀到啲詳細啲嘅資料你。

問：因為我睇你 2012 年嗰張 circular，2 號 of 2012 年，你喺 15.1，B--對唔住，B15.1 嘅 37558。

答：三七五--係，睇到。

B

B

C

問：37558。

C

D

答：係，睇到。

D

E

問：我想你睇 37560。

E

F

答：唔。

F

G

問：37560 就一開宗明義，“Under the provision of Waterworks Regulation 7, a consumer or the agent shall be responsible for keeping an inside service clean.”

G

H

似乎一開宗明義就已經係講話，呢張 circular 其實係講緊 inside service，係咪？

H

I

答：係。

I

J

問：你睇到第 (A) (I)，大 (A) 項嘅 (I)，“Newly Installed Underground Fresh Water Mains”咁，見到嘛？

J

K

答：見到，係。

K

L

問：去隔離個，後一版，37561 頁。

L

M

答：37561，係咪？

M

N

問：係。你見到個大題目 (II)，(A) (I) 就係講 underground fresh water；第 (II) 就係話 “Newly Installed Fresh Water Inside Service other than Those covered in (A) (I) above”，所以一定係喺 2012 年嘅時候，將個注意力係擺咗喺不單只個大渠 mains。你個--你個個集中都會係講埋 inside service？

N

O

答：即係頭先講咗個發展係咁樣樣，即係...

O

P

問：唔係，我想知道背後係唔係當時覺得應該要睇埋個 inside service？

P

S

答：我嘅理解係因為嗰個添馬嗰個事件之後，即係就個--想再提番啲人，「你個 inside service 要即係 properly 洗好佢，and then 即係我頭先講過嗰啲，你要...」

S

T

U

V

U

V

B

B

C

問：添馬事件，即係...

C

D

答：係，添馬事件之後...

D

E

問：...Legionnaires' disease 嗰個？

E

F

答：係，係。

F

G

問：我想睇多啲。你跟呢一個大嘅 heading, inside service 大嘅 heading, 我想你再揭多一版，去到 37562。

G

H

答：37562，係，睇到。

H

I

問：吓？

I

J

答：唔。

J

K

問：你見到中間有個“Methods Using Disinfectants other than Chlorine”，見到嘛？

K

L

答：係，係，見到。

L

M

問：呢個都仲係 under 你嗰個 inside service 嗰個 heading 嘅。

M

N

答：係。

N

O

問：喺頭嗰段，中間嗰度，你見到右手邊最--“After successful disinfection, the inside service shall be immediately drained and thoroughly flushed with potable water.”

O

P

答：係。

P

Q

問：跟住下一段，個(3)嗰度，我係想你特別留意嘅。

Q

R

就“After disinfection”，咁你就話“arrange with either the Water Authority or an accredited laboratory to collect samples at representative sampling point(s) as agreed by the Water Authority for bacteriological and chemical analysis.”

R

S

S

T

T

U

我想知道你呢個--或者我讀埋佢先，我問你。

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

跟住最後嗰行，“If the results are satisfactory, the fresh water inside service can be put into operation. If not, the above disinfection and testing procedures shall be carried out again.”

當你哋集中去睇 inside--去考慮個 inside service，點樣去處理個 inside service 嘅時候，呢度係講話 bacteriological 同埋 chemical analysis。

答：Chemical in a sense，佢係講緊嗰個 residual chlorine。

問：residual chlorine？

答：嘎，係個八個 parameter 嘅其中一個。

問：但係當時你哋都有著眼去睇話，其實 chemical analysis 可能會幫--即係會可能係包其他嘢個嗎？

答：我諗嗰陣時--我就唔係好--正如我唔係專家，當其時亦都係--個 philosophy 都係話，個 material control，即係去控制嗰樣嘢，如果攞水辨嘅，主要係 microbial risk。呢度嗰個“chemical”，我相信係講緊嗰個 residual chlorine 嗰個情況。

問：明白。所以到到呢個 point，你都覺得--即係其實你哋就算睇 inside service，你哋都唔覺得係應該要再睇下會唔會有個 leaded solder 嘅風險咁樣嘅？呢個都仲未係睇你哋嗰個 horizon 裏面嘅？

答：即係我諗都係--嗰個 philosophy 都仲係話，即係 the best chemical 嗰啲係用一個物料管制嗰個方法，microbial risk 係 take water sample 去處理。

問：唔係，我提出嗰個問題就係呢個當時唔喺你個 horizon 裏面，即係你睇嘅嘢都唔會諗呢一方面嘅嘢？

答：因為覺得喺 material control 處理咗個問題。

問：處理咗就係交咗畀其他人去幫你看--幫你把關？

答：唔可以咁講嘅，system 係--我哋擺個 system 入去，要求大家跟呢啲嘢做，係嘞。

B

B

C

問：好，唔，明白。而家 2015，當然我睇番張生第最--第 3 點，2015，就擺咗八--十二個 parameters。

C

D

D

答：係嘞。

E

E

問：就包咗四個重金屬喺度，係咪？

F

F

答：係嘞，係，啱。

G

G

問：唔噃。呢個係即係現時嚟講，你覺得係一個有效嘅即係處理呢個重金屬風險嘅做法，係咪？

H

H

答：我諗一路即係正如我講，你一路睇睇個風險個情況點樣，你其實 control measure 去應對番呢個咁嘅 risk。

I

I

問：呢個就係嗰個 verification 個步驟...

J

J

答：即係我哋去到今日睇到嗰個風險，即係有人有違規嘅風險，that's why 我哋再編訂一個咁嘅 control measure 去睇。我諗呢個唔算係 verification，我個 concept 啱唔啱？即係呢個 verification 就係我哋 control measure，呢個呢其實係一個 control measure，我覺得就係。

K

K

L

L

M

M

問：呢個係 control measure？

N

N

答：Control measure 去 tackle 嗰個違規個 risk 喺度。

O

O

問：唔，唔。即係呢個步驟冇嘢話--即係現時你--我相信你行咗嚟嘞，呢個步驟？

P

P

答：行咗，行咗，行咗。

Q

Q

問：行咗。即係喺實際嘅 implementation，實際執行嘅角度嚟講，呢個完全冇問題，係咪？

R

R

答：我有...

S

S

問：即係只不過而家 2015 年之後，呢件事發生咗，就擠多個咁樣嘅作--嘅步驟喺度，之前就大家冇為意呢樣嘢，就有擠，冇咁樣做法？

T

T

答：你--即係正如我頭先講，因為有咁嘅風險 arisen 喺度，要等個

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

control measure 去 tackle 呢個違規風險，我哋所以做咗一個咁樣...

問：實際上驗十二個 parameters，喺入咗 form Part IV 之後，驗十二個 parameters，然後先至出個 Part V，係冇喺個執行有任何問題？

答：我唔係好明，點為之執行上有問題？

問：即係唔係有啲 practical 嘅 consideration，令到你而家即係咁樣嘅做法係做唔到，或者係難以執行，或者係...

答：做就做得到嘅，好 obviously...

問：...resources 嘅問題，各樣嘅嘢...

答：業界嘅 compliance cost 係上升咗好多嘅，即係無可否認，因為你其實驗多咗好多辨，要驗埋呢隻重金屬，個 compliance cost 係一定上升咗嘅。

問：係。

主席：業界個 compliance cost 係會多咗好多，...

答：我--即係好多就呢個好難講嘅，多咗喇吓，我可以咁講。

主席：多咗啲喇？

答：係，多咗。

問：即係好多定啲，當然係相對嘅啫，...

答：相對嘅啫，係。

問：...你一個 building project 講起嘅 compliance cost 嘅增加，同個 building project 個根本係...

答：但係個 compliance cost 正如--即係你睇下由邊個承擔嘅啫，如

B

B

C

果由個 licensed plumber 承擔開，對佢嚟講咪多；你話由個 main contractor 承擔咪少囉，可能。

C

D

D

問：即係我想知道，喺執行上，呢個 2015 而家係執行得到嘅？

E

E

答：即係我講咗，係執行到嘅，不過 compliance cost 上升。

F

F

問：只不過係...

G

G

答：個 compliance cost 上升。

H

H

問：...2015 年之前就唔係咁樣做法？

I

I

答：因為睇唔到嗰個風險，即係未知有呢個違規風險。

J

J

問：唔，明，明白嘅。

K

K

主席：加咗四項，咪最多加多 1000 釐。

L

L

何先生：因為我相信嗰個相對嘅，我就唔係好認同呢個增加咗好多。

M

M

N

N

主席：李教授話 180 釐一個 sample，好似係。

O

O

答：一隻金屬定係四隻？一隻？

P

P

主席：係呀，四隻囉，係。

Q

Q

答：即係--四隻，180？

R

R

主席：四隻 sample，你咪當佢 1000 釐--800 釐。你原本嗰八隻係要做，係咪？咁只不過係多咗 800 釐。

S

S

答：但係可能而家仲做多兩隻，sample 都攤多咗。

T

T

主席：咁呢個另外一件事，係咪？

U

U

答：係。

V

V

B

B

C

C

D

問：好嘞，LP、AP 就簽咗個 Part IV，Part IV--我淨係講 AP 先，AP 根本簽都係講嗰啲範圍啫？

D

E

答：喺舊嗰張 form 係咁，即係 confirm 嗰個...（聽不清）

E

F

問：就即係如果你係作一個--又返番轉頭，對唔住，嗰個風險評估個問題，就你哋都唔係特別喺呢個 Part IV--用呢個 Part IV 嚟要求個 AP 去承擔一個物料監控嗰個角色嘅？

F

G

G

H

答：我諗 AP 佢再 certify 番個物料嗰個情況，就應該喺呢度最後一張 form 132 嗰陣時...

H

I

問：就唔係呢個 Part IV？

I

J

答：係，喺 132 嗰陣時，...

J

K

問：我一陣間會同你討論嗰 part。

K

L

答：...我哋有要求個 AP 再簽一次，就 confirm 番啲嘢係跟咗個水務嘅要求去做咗咁樣樣。

L

M

問：嗰個係 132。我而家講緊 Part IV，46。

M

N

答：132，嗰張嘢非常重要，因為係畀水--嗰張 certificate 牽涉同佢入伙紙係好直接關係嘅。

N

O

問：我一陣間同你討論嗰個 132，好唔好？

O

P

答：好呀，好。

P

Q

問：我講番個 Part IV。

Q

R

答：Okay。

R

S

問：就我想知道，即係 Part IV 就其實 AP 個角色就唔係講緊個物料監控？

S

T

答：以前嗰張 form 係，即係而家新，我哋就...

T

U

問：而家新嘅就...

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：...即係要求大啲。

C

D

問：...即係你加咗好多嘢上去，係咪？

D

E

答：係，啱，啱。

E

F

問：明白。跟住你就簽 Part V，即係如果驗過嗰啲 sample 係標準係 okay，就簽 Part V，跟住就供水，跟住 connect，供水？

F

G

答：係，係。

G

H

問：係咪？

H

I

答：Sorry，聽唔到，唔好意思。

I

J

問：你驗過啲 samples okay，就我相信亦都有對過嗰啲物料...

J

K

答：Sorry，我想睇番張 46，Part V。

K

L

問：Part V，好呀。

L

M

答：Page 幾？嗰呢度其實。

M

N

問：喺 B15.1，37625。

N

O

答：B15.1，37625，okay。

O

P

問：Part IV 喺前個版。

P

Q

答：係，係，睇緊，睇到。

Q

R

問：我同你講就係 37625 Part V 嗰度，就你哋做咗一啲 inspection，話對過個 annex，用嘅料係同個 annex 符合，或者有更改嘅，同個更改咗嘅 annex 符合，然後跟住就簽嗰個 Part V，係咪？

R

S

答：係嘞，嘎。

S

T

問：唔。呢個 Part V 你自己都話，即係“detailed in Part IV are first(last?) inspected”幾時，又“Pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, no irregularities were found and the plumbing detailed in Part IV is approved.”

T

U

U

V

V

即係你自己喺呢張 form 嗰度，你係話“Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations no irregularities were found.” 其實呢一個就咁睇字面，你哋自己作出咗一個 Waterworks Ordinance 同埋 Regulations 嘅最後把關。

答：如果你睇呢個 term，叫“irregularity”，即係你亦都明白，我哋嗰個即係到最後嗰個 final inspection，因為我諗如果你知道喺一個 development 裏面，講緊嗰個 plumbing works 係--我諗如果部件，我諗真係講緊成千上萬，water chain--supply chain 都講緊幾千條咁樣。當然當其時係 base on 一個所謂 spot-check 之類，and then 我哋有個說法就話有 irregularity found 嘅啫，即係基本上你睇過一啲嘢，冇發現咁樣樣。我諗呢個係一個 Waterworks Regulation--即係講我哋作為一個 regulator 去睇番嗰啲嘢，最後一個 inspection，冇 irregularity，於是乎我哋話「Okay, approve」咁樣。

問：即係如果你只係驗一件，嗰件係對嘅，咁你都會自然話“no irregularities were found”，係咪--即係你--總之你--我想知道你嗰個背後--你頭先所講個背後，係咪就係話「總之我睇過嗰啲，嗰啲我冇覺得有問題，咁我就會填呢個 no irregularities were found？」

答：當然，即係如果你有留意成份 form 嘅設計，我--即係兩 part，第一--我琴日講咗，即係個 final inspection 我哋做一轉；另外，我哋都要啲 AP、LP 都證明啲嘢係話會跟我哋 Waterworks Regulations 嚟做。Base on 呢兩樣嘢，我哋 approve 佢。

問：所以即係咁耐我哋嘅討論裏面，你整個呢一個 46 嘅設計，就係話「哦，我係淨係 AP 同 LP 嚟承擔咗嗰個物料嘅控制嘅責任。」所以喺水務署，你就覺得你可以係即係好抽離？

答：其實你睇番--即係我哋可以探討仲有冇 alternative factor 或者 more effective to 呢一個咁嘅安排。In fact，我哋--如果唔介意，主席畀我講一講。

即係 after 呢個事件之後，其實我哋都有同業界討論過一個情況嘅，就係話可唔可能我哋去做一啲 interact inspect--其實唔係 interact，係 surprise inspection，想做一啲咁嘅嘢。大家都冇問過--其中一樣嘢好重要要做嘅，就係嗰個業界，嗰個 plumber 一定要通知我哋佢幾時開工，喺邊度有嘢做，我哋先可以做到

surprise inspection。如果唔係，全香港咁多地盤，我哋走入去，其實未必有嘢做緊嘅。

但係到如果佢真係譬如通知我哋，佢哋就認為，第一，嗰個其實呢個 general 都好多 paper work 嘅，即係佢通知，同埋其實係有一定困難。因為佢可能兩個禮拜前通知我，「我禮拜後喺邊度開工，做乜嘢嘢。」但係你知道地盤成日都變緊嘅，that's why 當我哋同個業界討論呢個問題嗰陣時，其實佢嘅建議就話「喂，不如你加強啲嗰個 -- 喺 on site 地盤嗰個 in -- 嗰個 supervision and inspection，更加有效喇。」

如果你有睇番 HKIA -- HKIE，甚至我哋 -- 我自己做開 task force 嘅，我哋都建議其實最有效嘅方法，可能係 group in 個 building services engineer，或者 building services inspector 去睇番呢樣嘢。即係呢個應該係最有效率，或者最 effective 去 ensure 啲嘢係 properly constructed。

問：你...

答：所以我想講番，即係我成日想話，我哋而家 currently 個 system 係咁樣樣，and then 我哋要問一個問題，有冇好啲嘅 alternative 咁樣，咁呢個永遠都可以探討嘅，我覺得。但係我頭先話，其實我哋都探討過其中一個 alternative，就以業界傾過呢個問題，大家個得出嚟初步嘅睇法，就係話可唔可能即係喺地盤嘅 supervision 加強啲，由 BSE、BSI 去睇。

問：你始終嗰個 philosophy 就係唔同啲嘢嘅專業嘅範疇，你哋去睇晒佢，水務署嗰個角色就我覺得，聽你嘅講法都比較含糊嘅。

答：其實唔係含糊嘅，即係水務署作為一個 regulator，我諗我兩個工作可 -- 要做，第一，我自己要做啲乜嘢嘢，我哋只可以做一啲咩嘢；another thing，作為一個 regulator 係我可唔可以 put in 一個 system which 我 -- I can rely on，去令到我條例啲嘢可以做得到呢咁。所以我諗...

問：你話要...

答：...作為 regulator，你話如果完全所有嘢自己做，去 ensure 晒所有嘢嘢 comply with，呢個對個社會嚟講未必係最好嘅，因為未必係最 cost effective，因為我哋 -- anyway，我哋都係用緊一個

B

B

C

public resources', ...

C

D

問：我...

D

E

答：...所以我認為--即係呢個我自己睇法。

E

F

問：係。

F

G

答：你其實我要做 strike a good balance between，有邊啲嘢由我自己做，有邊啲嘢我 put in system。我想講話，其實我哋而家可以有個 system 去 rely on AP，呢一班全部都係專業人士嚟嘅，and 佢哋係 take care of 個成個 construction project 嘅，...

G

H

H

I

問：我想講番...

I

J

答：...即係其實幾--我認為係好 robust，sorry。

J

K

問：好，好。我聽到你講，你頭先講嗰個就係話，你 put in 一個 system 你可以 rely on，呢個正正就 back to question，你要 rely on 個 system，你一定要有作出一個好全面嘅風險評估，你先覺得呢個 system 係 robust enough 畀你去 rely on。咁我--我哋啲啲--我唔再返轉頭又講嗰啲 philosophy、風險評估嗰啲咁嘅嘢，好唔好？

K

L

L

M

M

N

答：Okay，okay。

N

O

問：我想亦都睇下你呢個 philosophy 話搵個 AP 去 take 咗呢個最終--即係你嗰個所謂即係最把--最重要、最把關嗰個 target，你知 AP--其實 AP 都有好多種唔同 AP 㗎嘛？

O

P

P

Q

答：你意思係可能係唔同嘅專業界別？

Q

R

問：喺個地盤，佢有好多專業界別，好多唔同 background 嘅 training，...

R

S

答：三個喇，三個...

S

T

問：...AP 唔係淨係一定講緊建築師？

T

U

答：Sorry，聽唔到。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：唔係一定係淨係建築師？

C

D

答：可以係測量師，可以係工程師。

D

E

問：係，可以係工程師，可以係 structural engineer，我哋以前就可以仲係 geotechnical engineer，佢都可以做 AP。

E

F

答：我知道 engineer 可以做，surveyor 可以做，architect 可以做。

F

G

問：Surveyor 可以做，係嘞，唔係一定係...

G

H

答：Architect。

H

I

問：...architect。即使 architect 都未必即係完全一定有--但可能有啲水喉嘅知識，但係因為佢唔處理水喉，佢唔係真係落手落腳去處理水喉，所以佢個知識嘅水喉都有一定局限？

I

J

答：我相信 architect...

J

K

問：即使 architect。

K

L

答：...佢哋會--即係其實 architect 做緊嗰樣嘢，亦都好類似我哋做緊嘅嘢。當你嘅 knowledge 或者去唔到嗰度，其實佢需要做嘅，正如琴日 HKIA 嗰個建議，你咪 put in a system，你去 engage 一啲 qualified 嘅人有咁嘅 knowledge 去做。即係我哋唔可以 expect 一個 authorized person 係識晒成個地盤全部嘅各樣嘅嘢。

L

M

M

N

N

O

O

P

問：我想就係睇下你呢一個背後個理念嗰個可靠性。

P

Q

答：我相信 authorized person 成個概念都係 base on 一個咁嘅--因為佢作為一個地盤嘅 coordinator...

Q

R

問：點解你要搵個 AP 去幫你承擔呢個責任呢？

R

S

答：但係佢係成個地盤--琴日主席都講咗，第一，佢最高，佢係負責整個 development 嗰個負責人，佢要 ensure 其實...

S

T

問：譬如佢係一個 surveyor，或者譬如佢係一個 structural engineer，佢畫--簽咗圖，擠咗入去，始終可能係個地盤嗰個--做一個 periodical supervision，可能係個 architect 嗰度，未

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

必係一個 AP 本身嘅個個？

C

D

答：即係佢咪 entrust 畀呢班人幫佢做，其實佢好多--我相信個 AP 有可能地盤每一個細節佢都知嘅，或者都有去 on site inspection...

D

E

E

F

問：你記得我琴日同你睇 HKIA 嗰個--有個 box，你上面最大個個 coordinator 就係個 architect，...

F

G

答：AP (Authorized Person)。

G

H

問：...最左手邊嗰個咪 AP，然後跟住有啲 structural engineer，有啲 geotechnical engineer，見唔見到--記唔記得？記唔記得？A4。

H

I

I

J

答：A4。

J

K

問：A4 喺 2977。

K

L

答：係，睇到。

L

M

問：見唔見到？

M

N

問：即係你個 coordinator 佢就話 architect，喺上面，然後左手邊嗰度咪 AP，然後中間有 RSE、有 RGE 咁樣，見到喇？

N

O

答：係，見到，見到。

O

P

問：所以你如果話，因為你係個地盤最終你要負責任，但係 AP 唔係一定係呢一個人個角色？

P

Q

答：Sorry，唔係好明。

Q

R

問：唔係一定係嗰個 architect 個角色，AP 可能佢係嗰個 surveyor 佢係真係簽咗圖入去，佢作為一個 AP 簽圖嗰個角色。你將個責任擺喺個 AP 背後嗰個理念，有冇考慮過呢一啲咁樣嘅問題，抑或你一開始就 assume 個 AP 就係個 architect，所以你將個責任擺落個 AP 嗰度？

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：唔係，唔係，唔係，我有咁 assume 過 AP 係個 architect。AP 我一早講話 can be 即係幾個 discipline 都可以嘅，即係只不過 AP 係整個 development 嗰個負責任嘅人，佢要 ensure 個 development...

問：係個 architect？

答：唔係一定 architect 嚟嘅，AP。

問：咁咪所以囉，個地盤--我哋頭先睇嗰個表，似乎個 suggestion 就係話，個 coordinator 最--個 lead 個--個 head coordinator 就係個 architect 唔係一定係個 AP？

答：但係當你去到個 construction stage，個 authorized person 係 can be 三個 discipline 嚟嘛。我唔係好 get 到你唔...

問：除非嗰個我 misread 咗呢一個 chart 個用意，2977 嗰度。即係你話我相--我明白你嗰個講法，就係我理解--即係我想理解呢個講法，就係話「我想搵個真係喺地盤負責嘅人，所以就我將嗰個責任就擺喺佢，...」

答：畀--係，啱，啱。

問：「...我就要就 rely on 佢喇」咁？

答：係。

問：但係我想同你講，就係話你--好，你睇呢個 chart，如果我有理解錯，地盤嗰個 coordinator 就叫做個 architect，個建築師？

答：我覺得未必一定個嗰，係咪呀？

問：我唔...

答：我唔--我覺得佢呢度講緊個 architect 係一個 consultant 去 deliver 個 project 個咋嘞。

問：個 AP 個責任...

答：即係可能佢即使...

B

B

C

問：...就係主要係對 BO 嘅，即係 Building Authority 嘅，...

C

D

答：係喇，啱。

D

E

問：...就係 ensure 佢入則去攞批文，或者係最後攞 OP，係符合 BO 底下嘅要求，呢個就係個 AP 個責任？

E

F

答：係囉，即係所以佢咪要 ensure 成個 development 係 deliver in complies with 即係各個要求咁樣樣。

F

G

問：所以佢係...

G

H

答：所以佢係好大責任係...

H

I

問：...可能係 surveyor，可能係 structural，可能係各樣。

I

J

答：係，啱，啱，係，啱，啱，啱，啱。

J

K

問：但係即係我第一，我同你提出嘅，就係呢個可能唔係一個 architect，...

K

L

答：同意。

L

M

問：...可能係一個 architect，...

M

N

答：係。

N

O

問：...喺地盤要睇呢啲 coordination 啲啲可能係要 architect？

O

P

答：要係個 architect 睇...

P

Q

問：可能係個 architect？

Q

R

答：喺地盤睇可能係個 architect，可能係 building services engineer，可能係 building services inspector，any...

R

S

問：好。我想睇下你將呢個責任擺落去個 AP 嗰度，係唔係一個適合嘅做法。

S

T

答：唔。

T

U

問：你睇番嗰個你個--我想同你而家去嗰啲 132 嗰啲文件。

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：Sorry，係。

C

D

問：132 嗰啲文件。

D

E

答：132，好呀。

E

F

問：係，132 嗰啲文件。

F

G

主席：或者我哋 take 一個二十分鐘嘅 break 先，好唔好？

G

H

H

I

上午 11 時 30 分聆訊押後

I

J

上午 11 時 54 分恢復聆訊

J

K

出席人士如前。

K

L

L

M

水務署第四證人：黃仲良（水務署副署長）宣誓繼續作供

M

N

主席：你仲要問幾耐，Mr Ho？

N

O

何先生：我估問多三個字嘍，得唔得？

O

P

主席：Okay，得，十五分鐘。

P

Q

何先生：即係我希望可以快啲--我其實問埋 132 嗰啲 form 就會完。

Q

R

主席：就完㗎嘞，好呀。

R

S

何先生：或者我唔重複一啲即係理念嗰啲各樣...

S

T

主席：唔使嘞，我哋知道你想表達嘅嘢係咩嘢，基本上。

T

U

何先生：唔該。

U

V

V

B

B

C

何先生繼續盤問

C

D

問：我想請你睇 B15.1, 37630, 呢張就係嗰個 WWO132 嗰張 form 15.1, 37630。

D

E

答：37636, 呢張唔係, 你係想睇一三--Okay, 得, 得, 得。

E

F

問：37630。

F

G

答：睇到, 睇到。

G

H

問：係。就我想首先同你講呢個有分兩部分, 呢個有 Part I、Part II, 係, 見到?

H

I

答：係, 係。

I

J

問：你見到個抬頭, 就係叫做 "APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE REGARDING WATER SUPPLY AVAILABILITY/CONNECTION", 然後跟住佢講到明呢張 form 嘅個用意, 就係針對呢個 Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments...) Regulations 咁樣。

J

K

K

L

L

M

呢個就係 AP 要最後擺入伙紙必須要擺到嘅即係一個--要交一個 certificate 上去, 就係根據呢一個 Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments...) Regulations, 係咪?

M

N

N

O

答：係, 啱, 係呀, 係呀。即係我哋要出一張 certificate 畀佢, 話已經 connect 咗個 water supply 畀佢, 佢然後就擺呢張嘢去申請個 occupation permit 咁樣。

O

P

問：Occupation permit, 唔。

P

Q

答：係。

Q

R

問：嗰個步驟就其實即係 AP 有好多步驟 under 個 Buildings Ordinance 要做, 嗰個係其中一個步驟?

R

S

答：我相信係。

S

T

問：我想睇下你個--呢度個 Part I 有幾樣嘢要睇嘅, 即係第一, 就係譬如個 proposed development estimated daily demand 係幾多 litres 嘅水, 就要再分細啲, 就 residential、commercial、

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

industrial 咁樣，見到嘛？

C

D

答：見到。

D

E

問：因為我想睇下你同唔同意，就係呢一啲係因為喺嗰個 sanitary fitments 嗰個條例底下，如果你係 residential 嘅，你幾多人住，你幾多個廁所，或者係浴室，係有一個好嚴謹嘅規定，所以你要睇下有幾多個 number of flats, anticipated population 咁樣？

E

F

F

G

答：我諗主要原因，如果你睇番 I 嗰個 heading，就係“Availability of Water Supply”咁嘅，即係當你要知道可唔可以畀到水佢嘅時候，我最緊要知道你要幾多水先喇。

G

H

H

I

問：係，嗰個就因為你作--你係用作住宅用途，或者係商業用途，或者係工業用途係有完全唔同嘅要求？

I

J

答：因為嗰個 demand 係完全唔同㗎嘛，即係譬如你工業...

J

K

問：即係話同意我，係咪？

K

L

答：我相信係啱，...

L

M

問：同意？

M

N

答：...即係我想話畀你聽，即係呢度呢啲咁嘅 information collect，係想知道你個 water demand 係幾多。

N

O

問：因為喺嗰個 building administration，即係 Buildings Ordinance 個角度底下，最緊要你睇到，你譬如呢一啲咁樣嘅 sanitary fitments，你譬如幾多人住，係唔係有幾多個廁所，你如果嗰個係一個公眾嘅場所，譬如好似一個 commercial building，或者一個 industrial building，嗰個佢關注嘅地方係喺嗰個條例底下所需要知道話你有幾多嘅水嘅供應？

O

P

P

Q

Q

R

答：條例底下，你嘅意思係 building...

R

S

問：Sanitary fitments。

S

T

答：我覺得如果站在純粹水務署嘅角度嚟睇，其實我最終--最重要係知道你嗰個 water demand 係幾多嘅啫。即係變咗...

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：但係呢張 form--填呢張 form 係畀--最終係要畀建築署去擺--去建築...

答：因為如果--sorry。

問：...--Building Authority。

答：因為如果你講 Part I，我覺得成個 centre on 都係你要幾多水，水務署畀唔畀到水，呢個即係一定係同嗰個你個 demand 幾大，我喺當區我啲水管能夠 provide 幾多 supply，呢個係最基本要睇到嘅嘢。

問：佢要佢--因為個 AP 要擺呢個 certificate under 呢一個條例，AP 要係根據嗰個 building 嗰個 (Sanitary Fitments) Regulations，我可唔可以請你睇一睇個 sanitary fitments 嗰個 Regulations？

答：係，係第幾度？

問：你有冇你嗰個--我唔知有冇入到個文件夾裏面。或者我畀一個 spare copy。

答：好。

問：呢個個條例底下，你見到--有冇睇到 Regulation 4？

答：Regulation 4。

問：Regulation 4，嗰度有好詳細嘅列明，如果你呢個係一個 residential building，你個 water closet fitments 係有啲咩嘢要求。你睇啲 table 1、table 2，如果你係一至八個人住，或者多過八個人住，或者係甚至乎你如果係 number of female person 又點，number of male person 又點，嗰個 water fitments closet 嘅要求就有一個好清晰嘅界定嘅。

答：但係呢個其實唔能夠直接計到嗰個 water demand，我應為。

問：唔係，從一個 building administration 去 BO 度擺，最後嗰日，我知，...

答：但係呢張 form 係...

B

B

C

問：...呢個就係佢嗰個要求。

C

D

答：但係呢張 form 係 WW0132，係水務署嘅 form 嚟㗎嘛。

D

E

問：呢個係等到你哋去 issue 嗰個 1005 嗰張 form，等佢交咗 1005 去㗎嘛？

E

F

答：係囉。

F

G

問：你而家 design 呢張 form，你個 heading 都係叫做“Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments...) Regulations”㗎嘛？

G

H

H

I

答：因為你需要我出一張證明 connect 咗 water supply...

I

J

問：我需要你出證明，係因為我要去攞，要符合呢一個 sanitary fitments 嗰個條例嘅要求，去攞我個 OP 㗎嘛？

J

K

答：係囉，即係我設計張 form，Part I，我就想知--你問我有冇水㗎嘛，其實如果我--你即係撇開，乜都唔使諗住，最簡單一樣嘢，我點知我自己畀唔畀到水你，最簡單就係你話畀我聽你用幾多水先喇，係咪呀？

K

L

L

M

問：我明，我明。

M

N

答：如果--所以成個 Part I，我又唔覺得我哋真係要 make reference to 呢個 Buildings Ordinance。

N

O

O

P

問：呢個唔係你要 make reference to 嗰個問題，我係話畀你聽，我--當個 AP 填呢一張嘢，我想要一張你嘅 certificate，等我去攞水，等我去攞 OP，我個專注點就係我要符合晒呢一個 sanitary fitments 條例底下，...

P

Q

Q

R

答：但係呢個我...

R

S

問：...關於幾多人、幾多個 flat，如果係 commercial 有幾多 urinals，啲去水、sanitary 嗰個問題，我要符合晒呢一樣嘢。

S

T

答：呢個因為個 AP 相對於個 Buildings Ordinance 個 requirement，佢需要符合晒呢咋嘢。但係你有幾多個去水，幾多個 urinals 嗰啲，唔係我哋個 focus，我哋個 focus 係 water supply。我仲想講呢

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

個，其實 Part I 都未去到話要 issue 一張 certificate 畀佢去擺去 OP，Part I 純粹--可能 Part I 同 Part II 基本上 talking about 相對幾年，你 Part I，你係問緊我有冇水畀你，於是乎你畀啲資料我，我然後 confirm 畀你，畀到定畀唔到咁嘛。

D

D

E

E

問：明白。

F

F

答：所以我覺得唔係直接同個 Buildings Ordinance 掛鉤。

G

G

問：Part II 就係...

H

H

答：係，就證明...

I

I

問：...我哋申請嘅時候，你就要喺 under 個 sanitary fitments，你可唔可以畀到嗰張 certificate 畀我喇？

J

J

答：其實我都唔覺得 Part II 需要睇嗰個 Buildings Ordinance，因為 Part II 即係我哋需要嘅係 issue 一張 certificate，話畀你聽，我已經畀到 water supply 你。

K

K

L

L

問：個 Part II 去申請，係唔係就係申請你嗰張 1005？

M

M

答：係呀，你申請嗰張 1005。

N

N

問：就係申請你張 1005 咁嘛？

O

O

答：就係申請 1005。

P

P

問：我想去睇下你張 1005，去 37802 頁。

Q

Q

答：三七...

R

R

問：37802。

S

S

答：37802。

T

T

問：37801 同 37802。

U

U

答：係。

問：呢個我 take 個 for example 係啟晴，有兩個 stage。第一，就係喺 37801 嗰個係 domestic 嗰個 stage，Block 1 to 6；第二個

V

V

B

B

C

stage 就係 commercial，喺 37802 嗰度，Stage 2，啟晴。

C

D

答：係，睇到。

D

E

問：呢張要--你要求個 AP 要畀你填個 Part II of WWO132，就係要求你去畀呢個 certificate，等個 AP 可以去申請...

E

F

答：其實你睇到咪我哋...

F

G

問：...嗰個人伙紙？

G

H

答：你見到呢張 certificate 係我哋直接 issue 畀 Buildings Department，即係你 confirm 我哋要求你 confirm 嘅嘢，我哋咪 issue 一張 certificate 畀 Buildings Department。

H

I

問：呢張紙開宗明義都係講 Building (Administration) Regulation 25A，就係...

I

K

答：因為佢需要我--佢需要一張咁嘅 certificate。

K

L

問：Exactly。嗰個 25A，我哋而家睇番--或者我一陣間先講個 25A。你就睇下中間呢兩張要求你 issue 嘅 certificate，你所謂嘅「水紙」，裏面係“paragraph (2) of regulation 10A of (Sanitary Fitments) Regulations”。

L

M

M

N

答：Sorry，你 refer 緊邊份嘢，sorry？

N

O

問：你睇下嗰張水紙嘅第一同埋第二段。

O

P

答：Okay，睇到。

P

Q

問：係講你 issue 咗一張紙，嗰張嘢係根據呢個 regulation 10A of (Sanitary Fitments) Regulations 出嘅，10A 嘅 paragraph (2) 同埋 10A 嘅 paragraph (1) 而出嘅，見到嘛？

Q

R

R

S

答：見到。

S

T

問：所以你出呢張水紙，你都係針對就呢個 (Sanitary Fitments) Regulations 去出嘅嘛，呢張水紙？

T

U

答：我唔係律師，我睇到個字眼就“for the purposes of”，即係我出

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

呢張嘢，證明畀個 connection water supply 畀咗你，就 for the purposes of 10A，即係畀你--話畀你聽，我已經有 connection water supply 畀你，咁你咪可以去申請擺 OP 囉。

D

D

E

E

問：係囉。所以我填嗰張 132...

F

F

答：所以唔係呢--唔係根據佢 issue 呢個 connection，係 for the purposes of 咁嘛。

G

G

問：明白，我亦都係想講 for the purposes of。

H

H

答：Okay，好呀。

I

I

問：因為我申請個 132，我就係 for the purposes of 呢個 sanitary fitments 個 regulations 底下嘅要求，去擺張水--去擺張 OP，係咪？

J

J

答：同意。

K

K

問：所以成個針對點都係話，點樣可以喺呢個程序底下去 facilitate，或者去 enable 個 AP 去申請，去提供一張 certificate，係 under 呢個 sanitary fitments？

L

L

M

M

答：我唔同意係 facilitate 或者 enable。

N

N

問：唔同意？

O

O

答：我覺得係水務監督要證明我供咗水畀你，於是乎水務監督有個要求，要你...

P

P

問：你證明要供咗水畀我，係因為 for the purposes of 呢一啲 sanitary fitments 嘅要求？

Q

Q

R

R

答：唔係，因為 for the purposes of 畀呢張 certificate，等你可以去申請擺個 OP。

S

S

問：即係--我相信呢個我可以喺陳詞嘅時候再講嘅，因為呢個--即係大家可以睇條例嗰個要求係乜嘢。

T

T

答：Okay，好呀。

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：我或者好白咁同你講，根本呢個唔係講緊食水安全。

答：呢個我覺得如果唔係，我點解要你 confirm 一啲 compliance with 嗰堆嘢呢？

主席：講咩嘢話？

答：即係我睇張 132 嗰度，我係有一個要求，就係話個 AP 要 confirm，即係話嗰啲即係物料等等係 comply with Waterworks provisions and requirement 咁嘅樣，我好清晰有咁嘅要求。

問：如...

答：即係 before 我出一張水紙畀你之前，或者 before 我 confirm connection water supply 畀你之前，等你可以擺 OP 之前，我係有咁嘅要求要你 confirm。

問：其實即係你睇番，如果真係有睇下嗰個 sanitary fitments 嗰個 regulations 同埋 Buildings Regulations，佢底下有一大炸關於嗰啲 plumbs、system 各樣嘢。所有嗰啲話講到呢啲 bathing、去水系統嗰啲 fitments，係就住嗰個 sanitary 嗰個角度去睇，同你個食水安全嘅關係...

答：但係其實--即係我或者表達我自己意見，或者我哋大家睇法唔同。呢一張 form 係一張 WWO form 嚟嘅，係水務署自己嘅 form 嚟嘅，水務署 group in 一個 requirement，想你要做呢樣嘢。我一定係講緊一啲同我水務監督有關係嘅嘢，即係正如我記得主席都講過，去水嗰啲又唔關我哋事，我有理由想話你要 confirm 你 compliance，如果一啲同我完全冇關係嘅嘢，我唔需要嗰啲嘢。

問：你自己嗰個 Waterworks Ordinance 有一個 part 係講 pipes and fittings 嘅，應該 schedule--sorry，係，Waterworks Regulations Part V and Part VI，Part V and Part VI--唔係，sorry，對唔住。呢個係--啱嘞，係 schedule 2 嘅 Part V 同 Part VI of Waterworks Regulations。你有冇？

答：睇到，係。

B

B

C

C

問：係咪呀？Part V，喺 schedule 2 底下嘅 Part V，同埋 Part VI，你見到你喺 Waterworks Regulations 底下，都有嗰啲 flushing apparatus 講 flushing system 又點，internal diameters 又點呀，...

D

D

E

E

答：因為呢啲同嗰個用水係...

F

F

問：...bath, lavatory, basins, sinks 又點呀咁樣，見到嘛？

G

G

答：見到。

H

H

問：係。

I

I

答：唔。

J

J

問：呢啲都係--即係我相信係喺你嘅角度呢就係呢啲係同嗰個用水，或者唔可以等佢嘅水...

K

K

答：嘎，類似。

L

L

問：...嘅角度嚟睇喇，係咪？

M

M

答：係，啱。

N

N

問：咁就我唔知你答唔答到，就係喺 Buildings Regulations 底下，就係從一個 sanitary, make sure 有--佢駁咗水，所以就變咗可以衛生，即係你沖廁所，係有水去沖廁所嘅，你有咁多個 bathroom 去喺一個 residential premises，係足夠應用嘅，你喺--譬如講喺公眾地方嘅 commercial premises，或者 industrial，或者係 recreational premises，嗰個係有相應嘅設施，從一個 sanitary 嘅角度去睇嘅？

O

O

P

P

Q

Q

答：所以邏輯上完全--我有熟讀--唔係，冇讀過添喇，譬如 regulation 喇，即係 Buildings Regulations，但係我覺得邏輯上完全冇問題嘅。即係當你想擺張 OP，你要確保你下面嘅 sanitary 係 work 嘅，掂嘅，你需要有 water supply, that's why 你需要去問水務監督畀個 water supply 你。

R

R

S

S

T

T

問：唔。

U

U

答：你亦都需要水務監督 confirm 係我已經 connect 咗 water supply

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

畀你，咁你先可以擺到 OP，如果唔係即係 BD 就覺得你後面嗰揪嘢可能 work 唔到嘅，因為你有水。到水務監督想畀水你嘅時候，水務監督就要求你確保你做嗰個 plumbing system 係 okay 嘅，然後我先可以 confirm 畀水你，所以我覺得係一個 series of action 係好合理嘅，即係我要你確保到你啲嘢做掂晒，我就畀水你，出張 cert 畀你，你就搵住張 cert，或者我哋 BD，就確保到你下面嗰揪嘢都 work 嘅，於是乎你咪擺去 OP 囉。

問：所以成揪嘢嚟講，每人睇嘅角度都有啲唔同，每人需要用--根據一個 process 去申請一張 certificate 嗰個角度都有啲唔同，但係歸根究底，如果我哋係講緊要 maintain 個 standard of water quality，你一定係要有你適合嘅表格也好，一個 circular 也好，或者係有啲 point 你去做 monitoring 也好，你唔可以就咁將你嗰個責任 willy-nilly，就話「哦，你簽張嘢畀我喇，咁我就 rely on 你，簽咗你--我就當已經確保晒所有嘅嘢合乎標準。」

答：唔係，如果咁我哋又 go back 番晒一大揪之前嘅 discussion 嚟嘞，我諗。

問：或者我唔喺度同你糾纏，因為如果唔係我即係 go through 嗰啲 regulations 係會少少複雜嘅。

答：Okay。

問：咁我如果留待我個 final submission 先講，你唔會覺得你有啲嘢我有畀機會你解釋咁？

答：唔會。

問：Okay。

何先生：主席先生，我就...

主席：唔該。Mr Lee。

李柱銘先生盤問

B

B

C

問：我想叫你睇一睇你哋個 website 係講自己嘅功能咁樣。一份中文，一份係英文。兩份都要嘅，唔該。首先我用--想你睇睇中文本先。

C

D

D

答：好。

E

E

問：一開頭就係話以下是水務署的主要工作及職務。

F

F

答：係。

G

G

問：好清楚，你見過未㗎，呢啲嘢？

H

H

答：我哋個網頁㗎嘅。

I

I

問：係，咁即係你負責，係咪？

J

J

答：即係睇下你講負責到即係幾細，咁我當然有 oversee 番啲工作嘅。

K

K

問：係，同埋我一陣問你啲題目，如果你自己係唔--覺得唔適當係由你答，就唔該你話畀我聽係邊個，...

L

L

答：好呀，好呀。

M

M

問：...等我哋唔需要...

N

N

答：Okay，好呀，okay，好。

O

O

問：如果有啲嘢你係根本係應該知道，或者唔記得咗，啲下資料呢，你話出嚟得㗎嘞。

P

P

答：Okay，得，好，唔該。

Q

Q

問：因為我唔介意你打電話返去查都得嘅，好嘛？

R

R

答：Okay，好，好。

S

S

問：咁底下就講一、二、三、四、五，五個主要嘅工作同埋職務。

T

T

答：唔。

U

U

問：第一個，就係策劃有關水源發展同埋供水系統事宜，咁啲細節我唔問。

V

V

答：Okay。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：第二，就「設計及興建水務設施」，呢啲都係大嘅，即係唔係入房啲啲，所以我唔問。

答：唔。

問：第三，就「供水及分配系統的操作及維修保養事宜」，呢度我讀一讀，「本署監察存水和引水道、入水口、水塘、抽水站、濾水廠、配水庫、幹管及分配喉管的運作和保養，以確保每一客戶能得到穩定的供水。」

答：係。

問：即係每一戶人用水，你都擔保係廿四小時服務嘅？

答：係。

問：唔。第一--跟住呢個重要，「食水水質控制」，本署檢查同埋控制供水嘅水質，並定期從原水、淨化水、客戶水龍頭嘅抽樣，抽取樣本，進行化學、細菌學、湖沼學、生物學同埋輻射學化驗。

答：唔。

問：即係你係負責去化驗，啲啲客戶嘅水龍頭嗰度，睇下啲水質合唔合乎標準，係咪？

答：我哋有咁做嘅，即係如果我有記錯，可能陳健民先生都有講過嘅，其實我哋每年就會去客戶水龍頭擺一萬六千對，即係 pair of 即係 water sample 嘅，咁主要嗰陣時就係處理嗰個最高風險，就係嗰個 so-called microbial risk，即係嗰個細菌污糟嗰樣嘢，我哋每年都會去到個客戶嘅水龍頭會擺到咁多水辦。

問：但係你所謂客戶水龍頭，係直至到最近為止呢，你就去商場嘅，係咪？

答：係，因為...

問：關於公屋嚟講。

答：...都面對一個問題嘅，其實 access into 即係個別住戶嘅單位，係有啲困難嘅，即係有啲--你知有啲住戶又未必想你入去咁樣，咁我哋以往都係主要去一啲我哋所謂 accessible 一啲嘅位置去擺。

問：其實你有冇嘗試過譬如搵啲大廈管理處啲啲，搵佢哋幫手，你就自己

B

B

C

一個人拍門未必得，可能亦都冇人嚟度添，係咪？

C

D

答：其實...

D

E

問：你哋試過未？

E

F

答：...大廈管理處我哋都有做嘅，就入--即係你話幫手，反而就係入大廈管理處嗰個--譬如佢有陣時大廈管理處裏面有洗手間嗰啲，我哋會入去佢嗰度擺水辦做。

F

G

G

問：即係你有上去樓上做嘅？

H

H

答：我即係正如頭先，可能你都話，我唔係百--知道咁 detail，但係我嘅理解，即係我哋水質科學部嘅同事畀我嘅資料，就係話其實係有一定難度嘅，因為未必即係大家咁想畀你咁拍門入去。

I

I

J

問：好嘞，咁...

J

K

答：至於有冇真係真真正正拍過，人哋唔畀嗰個，我或者嚟呢度答你唔到。

K

L

問：但係事發之後，即係舊年7月以後，...

L

M

答：係。

M

N

問：...咁你哋就去好多嘅公屋嗰度，又上去上面，係咪？

N

答：嗰個我哋就--我哋幫房署做嗰個水辦化驗工作。

O

O

問：係嘞，咁咩嘢人帶你上去做嘅呢？

P

P

答：要房屋經理--唔係，sorry，房屋署嗰啲管理處嗰啲同事帶我哋上去擺水辦。

Q

Q

問：係嘞，所以有房屋署啲人帶你上去就有問題喇？

R

R

答：我諗都要--仲要嗰啲住戶同意嘅，...

S

S

問：梗係喇。

T

T

答：...即係有啲都唔畀你入去擺。

U

U

問：呢個唔畀，咪隔離嗰個囉，係咪？

V

V

B

B

C

答：可以咁講。

C

D

問：老實講，你為佢自己嘅食水安全，我諗佢哋唔會話個個都話畀個閉門羹你食㗎嘛？

D

E

答：係，即係喺嗰次...

E

F

問：係咪呀？

F

G

答：...我哋驗水嘅經驗，就咁大部分都畀我哋入，...

G

H

問：係囉，係囉，係囉。

H

I

答：...即係如果唔係做唔到。

I

J

問：好嘞，跟住嗰個，就「提供客戶服務及執行水務設施條例」，我想你睇下英文版，呢個。

J

K

答：唔。

K

L

問：睇下英文版，就去到最收靚嗰度，就“To provide customer services and to enforce the Waterworks Ordinance”。

L

M

答：唔。

M

N

問：咁同中文版就脗合嘅。

N

O

答：唔。

O

P

問：好嘞，咁跟住去番中文版，睇內容嘞。本署負責有關《水務設施條例》及規例的行政工作，並會審查新建或者改建屋內嘅水喉嘅申請，視察有關嘅工程，一路咁落。

P

Q

答：唔。

Q

R

R

S

問：但係睇番英文版，就話“The department is responsible for the administration and enforcement”，有呢兩個字嘅，“and enforcement of the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations”你再睇番中文版，係唔見咗 enforcement 嗰度嘅。

S

T

T

U

答：負責有關水務條例行政工作，唔，係，可能有翻譯上...

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：但係其實你唔係話唔關你事吓嘛，執行嗰度？執行嗰度要...

C

D

答：執行關事，關事。

D

E

問：...--對我哋而家嘅研究好重要，...

E

F

答：關事嘅。

F

G

問：...突然間唔見咗，唔係故意嘅？

G

H

答：呢個我要返去叫佢哋睇番清楚，改番佢，因為執行係需要，...

H

I

問：我相信唔係故意...

I

J

問：我相信唔係故意，因為你睇番嗰個 heading 嗰度，係有講執行。

J

K

答：係嘞，係嘞，執行係重要，要，要，要，要。

K

L

問：Okay。其實呢啲咁嘅，呢一類呢啲文件啲啲，即係係咪你自己--當然唔會你自己做㗎？

L

M

答：唔會。

M

N

問：但係你即係--我哋講即係負責嘅政府就要點樣搵個人出嚟負責，...

N

O

答：係。

O

P

問：...咁搵你都有乜錯㗎喇？

P

Q

答：我都應該要負責嘅。

Q

R

問：好。我想問問，你個 Water Authority 同你哋個 Water Supplies Department，係咪其實你哋就有個 executive arm，咁啱唔啱？即係 Water Authority，你哋就 executive arm？

R

S

答：其實因為我諗未至於好似房委同房署咁樣樣嘅關係嘅，我哋個 Water Authority 其實就 Director of Water Supplies。

S

T

問：係喇。

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：即係佢就係--Water Supplies Department，佢又係 Director of Water Supplies，都係咁樣樣，我唔敢肯定咁算唔算係一個 executive arm of--Water Authority 其實係一個人嚟㗎喇，基本上就。

問：但係佢搵人做嘢嘅時候，佢點都搵人幫佢手㗎？

答：因為佢又係 Director of Water Supplies。

問：咁個 Water Authority 本身有冇人係屬於 Water Authority，係真係幫佢出手出腳做嘢嘅呢？

答：其實成個 Water Supplies Department 即係有--即係如果有某些嘅工作係 for Water Authority 做，就去幫 Water Authority 做囉。

問：係喇。

答：嘎，嘎，嘎。

問：咁即係逢係--即係你有頂頭上司，佢搵人做嘢就係你哋成班人幫佢做㗎喇？

答：係，啱，啱，啱。

問：即係唔同話舊時港督，而家特首，咁佢有自己一個秘書處㗎嘛，冇啲咁嘅嘢嘞？

答：冇，冇，冇，冇。

問：Okay，okay。即係其實所以 Professor Fawell 同埋我哋大家都即係 interchangeable 嘅，有時都唔分得邊個打邊個。

答：係，啱，啱，啱。

問：咁同埋我聽你口供裏面，你好多時都提及 Professor Fawell 嘅，...

答：係。

問：...因為你覺得佢係專家，係咪？

答：佢一定專家，我相信。

B

B

C

問：因為好多時人哋問你，你話「Professor Fawell 都係咁講喇。」
咁即係搵佢嚟托住，係咪？但係有啲嘢你又好似唔跟佢個喎，我遲一步要問。Okay。就而家有啲本子，我諗你見過㗎嘞吓。

C

D

D

E

答：見過。

E

F

問：係 A1，21 同埋 22。呢個本子唔需要向你介紹，係咪？

F

G

答：唔使，唔使。

G

H

問：你睇佢最收靚嗰度，就係係 2015 年 8 月嘅，啱唔啱？

H

I

答：二零...

I

J

問：最收靚，最底下。

J

K

答：呢本嘢出嘅時候係 2015 年 8 月，啱，啱，啱，啱。

K

L

問：你睇埋嗰度，字就細咗啲。最收靚嗰版。

L

M

答：最收靚嗰版？

M

N

問：即係呢度，喺個 cover 度。

N

答：喺最靚嗰度，okay，可能有咗呢張，睇唔到，應該係呢度。佢有咗最後嗰版。

O

問：佢有咗最後嗰版？

O

P

答：有，有，有。

P

Q

問：你信我講，我...

Q

R

答：睇到。

R

S

問：哦，喺第一版。

S

T

答：睇到，係。

T

U

問：Okay。咁嗰個--呢個刊物呢就係香港特別行政區政府新聞處設計嘅。

U

V

答：係。

V

B

B

C

問：就由政府物流服務署印嘅。

C

D

答：係。

D

E

問：好明顯你哋係有參與嘅，係咪？

E

F

答：有，有，有，有。

F

G

問：好大參與添，係咪？

G

H

答：唔知點 define 為之大與細，係有參與嘅。

H

I

問：因為我睇裏面，我諗醫務署都有嘅？

I

J

答：係。

J

K

問：你哋水務署嘅？

K

L

答：係。

L

M

問：咁可能房屋署都有嘅，可能？

M

答：我唔係好肯定，但係水務署嘅參與係有嘅，...

N

問：係嘞，係嘞。

N

O

答：...我都幾肯定。

O

P

問：譬如你睇下個題目，本書一開頭就係，「香港的食水供應，減低食水含鉛」，即係好特別嘅，直情講明含鉛嘅，因為呢個問題喺7月度爆咗出嚟咁嘛？

P

Q

答：係，啱。

Q

R

問：咁變咗揭開嚟第一版，裏面嘅第一版。

R

S

答：唔。

S

T

問：我唔會讀晒啲字嘅，我讀頭讀尾嘅啫。

T

U

答：Sorry，唔好意思。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：第一版。本港嘅食水供應。

C

D

答：係，睇到。

D

E

問：係喇，就呢度「水務署致力為香港市民提供 24 小時嘅不間斷嘅優質食水」，啱唔啱？

E

F

答：係。

F

G

問：咁跟住去到厠廁嗰度，咁就呢句好長，好長呢句。中間嗰度，「食水通過」--得唔得？中間嗰度。

G

H

答：係。

H

I

問：「食水通過就包括抽水站」乜嘢乜嘢，咁然後呢就去到最收厠，跟住係厠三嗰行，「然後經樓宇內部供水系統，包括地下缸、天台水箱、喉管等送到用戶的水龍頭。」

I

J

答：唔。

J

L

問：即係由始至終，去到開水喉嗰度喇，啱唔啱？

L

M

答：係，啱。

M

N

問：你同唔同意其實講到優質食水，第二行呢度，同埋 24 小時嘅呢，就即係你哋嘅部門，係你哋負責將呢啲水，優質嘅食水係不停咁送到去個用戶嘅水龍頭，啱唔啱？

N

O

答：我哋--啱，其實啱，我哋一定係將個優質食水送到去個用戶嗰個邊界度，and then 我哋就喺法例上又好，我哋有一啲宣傳又好，甚至我哋即係可能好多 put in 一啲 system，就希望喺嗰啲客戶裏面，因為即係等於喺--你入我屋企，你要我屋企--你出到門口可能好乾淨，入到我屋企要我乾淨，我都有個責任，雖然可能我哋 put in 好多 system，希望嗰個客戶能夠 properly maintain 佢嘅系統。

O

P

P

Q

問：唔係，我知道，呢啲係負責嘅問題，我遲一步問你。

Q

T

答：嘍。

T

U

問：但係呢度係咁寫㗎嘛？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係，係，即係我哋--呢個一定係我哋嘅目標嚟嘅，我哋希望去到個客戶個水龍頭個水質都係 okay 嘅。

C

D

D

問：如果你呢個目標其實亦係你個責任喇？

E

E

答：我...

F

F

問：譬如冇水喉，咁邊個負責？譬如我開水，冇水咁點呢？

G

G

答：咁一定我責任，因為冇水吖嘛。

H

H

問：係囉，咁如果我開啲水喉，原來邇邊嘅，咁邊個負責？

I

I

答：要睇睇究竟個情況係 due to 乜嘢囉，即係如果係譬如佢個大廈食水缸污糟之類，咁我哋通常有收到咩嘢 complaint，即係話譬如個水污糟，咁我哋會派啲同事出去即刻睇嘅。

J

J

問：係嘞。

K

K

答：咁睇睇佢究竟嗰個污糟嘅情況係 due to 我哋嘅 system，定係佢嘅，如果發覺係佢哋裏面嘅呢，咁我哋就會出番個 notice 畀番嗰個大廈管理處又好，就叫佢哋快啲清潔番嗰個 system，去確保啲水質乾淨。

L

L

M

M

問：Okay。譬如好多用戶佢一開水喉冇水，有啲就即時打畀佢大廈管理處。

N

N

答：但係好多即時打畀水務署。

O

O

問：因為你個電話擺喺度吖嘛，係咪？咁即係兩度都喺，你唔可以話佢錯㗎？

P

P

答：唔錯，唔錯。

Q

Q

問：咁你都派人去同佢...

R

R

答：我哋會睇嘅。

S

S

問：係囉，okay。第二版。

T

T

答：Okay。

U

U

問：呢度重要嘞，頭先你想講㗎嘞。供水系統嘅保養同埋維修，你先有個圖，呢個圖好清楚嘅。

V

V

B

B

C

答：係。

C

D

問：政府土地係綠色嘅。

D

E

答：唔。

E

F

問：咁政府嘅水管，啲大水管就去到嗰個兩個箭咀嗰度，嗰度係駁水位，係咪？

F

G

答：係。

G

H

問：係咪接駁位，我哋...

H

I

答：唔。

I

J

問：...--connection point?

J

答：Connection point，係。

K

K

問：咁黃色嗰啲就即係入咗人哋嘅私人物業裏面，...

L

L

答：嘎，我哋嗰度叫...

M

M

問：...可能係公屋嚟嘅？

N

N

答：...communal，嗰啲就係。

O

O

問：Communal。然後，就經過水喉、水喉、水喉，咁就去到個水龍頭？

P

P

答：就去--係嘞，後面嗰個就入咗個單位裏面嗰啲。

Q

Q

問：係嘞，係嘞，係嘞，咁你分得清楚嘅。你底下就係水務設施，綠色底下，係咪？

R

R

答：唔。

S

S

問：跟住就公共--公用供水系統，跟住就內部供水系統，你要分開啲顏色。

T

T

答：係。

U

U

問：Okay。好嘞，一開頭，從水務署嘅主要管道駁接--接駁到呢個樓宇地界接駁點為止嘅水管，由水務署負責維修。

V

V

B

B

C

答：係。

C

D

問：即係喺街度嗰啲，如果爆水喉，全部要你負責嘅？

D

E

答：係我哋，係喇。

E

F

問：Okay。跟住從樓宇地界接駁至樓宇內部嘅公用配水管，由代理人，一般就係物業管理公司或者業主委員會負責維修。呢個即係黃色嗰啲？

F

G

答：係嘞，啱，啱。

G

H

問：好嘞，咁所有單位/屋內嘅喉管嘅維修同埋更換就由業主負責，... 呢啲就係去到粉紅色嗰度？

H

I

答：係嘞，啱，啱。

I

J

問：Okay，而家講保養同維修，冇話水質嘞？

J

K

答：其實兩樣係好有直接關係嘅，即係如果...

K

L

問：唔係，呢本書係咁講個嘞？

L

M

答：吓？

M

N

問：呢本書仔係咁講嘅，係咪？

N

O

答：唔係，你話水質同個保養維修，其實個關係好大的嘅，因為你如果 properly maintain 個 system，其實你可以 ensure 到個 water quality 嘅。

O

P

問：唔。問題就係--當然就係邊個--去到最收靚邊個負責，所以我明白嘅，你話嗰啲持份者，大家都要出嚟嘅。

P

Q

答：係，啱。

Q

R

問：咁而家嗰啲 water safety plan 嗰啲，即係水嘅...

R

S

答：水安全計劃。

S

T

問：...--水安全計劃都係有呢個構思嘅？

T

U

答：啱嘅，即係你--又講番 Fawell，佢都建議話譬如去到--譬如好似黃

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

色部分，黃色部分去到紅色部分係咪應該整個 water safety plan，咁佢都話持份者其實係要做呢個 plan，即係當然佢都有建議話 Water Authority 係咪應該 take the lead，或者 provide 一啲 guideline，就畀啲持份者去 develop 佢哋嘅 safety plan 嘅，咁呢個其實我哋即係都開始諗緊呢樣嘢。

問：開始諗緊咋？

答：以往係有 water safety plan in building 嘅，呢個係--不過或者即係我都想話，其實世界各地都唔係咁多有個 water safety plan in building，因為 water safety plan in building 呢，你如果有留意 Fawell 嘅說法，其實係要個 stakeholder 做嘅，要個 stakeholder 做嘅，即係譬如如果喺呢度可能...

問：Stakeholders，有個"s"嘅，所有。

答：因為我哋譬如水務監督不能代佢去做嘅。

問：唔。

答：因為入到去裏面，佢裏面好多風險等等，係佢清楚過我哋嘅，譬如好簡單佢幾耐做一次 inspection，佢有幾多人去睇住個 system 啲啲。當然，呢個咁嘅方向係我覺得值得探討嘅，即係大家將來係咪應該做一個 water safety plan for 裏面，咁我哋可能鼓勵多啲發展商，甚至可能房署去做嘅。

問：你而家仲話可能，仲係探討咋嘞？

答：唔係，因為我想講一個 point，當然大發展商去做一個 water safety plan 相對容易嘅，因為你始終都係需要有一啲專業人士幫佢做，但係你亦都要諗番，如果去到一啲譬如小業主啲啲，你如果要 impose 一個 requirement 畀佢，佢可能都有一定嘅即係負擔喺度去做呢樣嘢。

所以容許我講多嘢少少，即係所以其實如果過往嚟講，我哋就係--基本上係畀一啲 guideline，即係話我哋譬如有啲 maintenance 嘅 guideline，畀啲講座，甚至我哋有推出個大廈優質食水計劃，都係 to some extent 係--我唔敢講係等於個 water safety plan，因為我覺得係一部分，係都去 tackle 個個 microbial 個個風險，因為呢個其實一般嚟講，我哋睇到啲 system，呢個風險係最

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

大概，所以即係我哋一路做緊嘅，以往都係 through 公眾教育、大廈優質食水計劃等等去推動，即係大家好妥善維修自己嘅 system，去確保個水質。

你話之後係咪可以諗 water safety plan for 呢啲咁嘅，要啲裏面譬如啲業主、管理處去做，我覺得可以探討嘅呢樣嘢。

問：可以探討，即係唔係一定做個嗎？

答：其實我哋推動呢個嘢係可以做，我覺得唔係話好難，但係你要--如果每一個人都要做嘅呢，就要小心考慮番個個...

問：我幾時話每一個人都要做啫？

答：Okay。

問：唔係，你覺得呢樣嘢係咪應該做先？

答：對個食水水質個個即係進一步 improve 個 system 去確保水質係一個好嘅，因為正如我哋水務署自己都做咗 water safety plan for 我哋自己，即係確保咗我哋成個供水系統個食水安全嘅。咁你話去到個客個度做，呢樣係值得諗嘅，我覺得。

問：你話自己個個，你即係去到 connection point 個個就做咗嘞，不鏟--本來有嘞？

答：我哋自己去到 connection point 已經做咗。

問：即係為自己而做嘅？

答：其實為大家，唔係為自己，即係為咗全香港市民。

問：當然，去到最收畀就梗係全香港市民喇。

答：係呀，因為如果我哋啲水唔安全，即係無論你後面幾乾淨都有用。

問：啱。咁但係你即係等自己警惕下嘅，係咪？你去到...

答：唔係警惕，係 ensure safety。

問：係喇，即係一定要做到個個標準。其實你哋有冇--譬如講係鉛嚟講，你話去到呢個接駁點，你哋嘅水質應該係點樣？鉛嚟講，個含鉛量應

B

B

C

該係低成點？

C

D

答：我有特別去搜集過數據睇過呢樣嘢，即係總之...

D

E

問：冇一個準則㗎？

E

F

答：唔係，符合世衛標準 10 個 microgram per litre，我哋要 comply...

F

G

問：咁就好高個囉嗰，如果去到嗰度？

G

H

答：10 個 microgram per litre 係--我知大家都好多討論喺呢度，其實如果你睇番全世界，即係我都明話，即係譬如你喺美國、英國，佢哋有 lead pipe，佢哋平時...

H

I

問：唔係，唔係，我唔想嗰時候。

I

J

答：Okay，好，好。

J

K

問：可能你哋根本誤解咗世衛呢個所謂 10 個 microgram，呢個我遲啲會同你講。

K

L

答：Okay。

L

M

問：但係我當佢係呢個先。

M

N

答：好。

N

O

問：咁你唔係話畀我聽你個目的就係--目標都係咁多啫，係咪？即係求其唔好超過，你就 happy，咁樣唔係，係咪呀？

O

P

答：我個目標係 comply，comply，comply，即係目標係 comply。

P

Q

問：係。

Q

R

答：唔係話想去到 10，我哋唔係咁嘅目標。

R

S

問：咁應該 0 吖嘛，應該--理論上應該 0 最好，啱唔啱？少少都有...

S

T

答：但係 practically 做唔到。

T

U

問：做唔到一件事，即係應該係 0，因為鉛就唔應--我哋唔應該飲落去，

U

V

V

B

B

C

或者食咗落個肚度，唔啱嘅，係咪？因為會累積，有啲毒㗎嘛，...

C

D

答：唔。

D

E

問：...係咪？即係最好就應該做到 0, 0 含鉛嘅水就最好，啱唔啱？理論上就係咁樣。

E

F

答：理論上係咁，但係...

F

G

問：你有理由故意擠啲鉛落去，啱唔啱先？

G

H

答：我唔會，我唔會 impose 啲鉛。

H

I

問：Chlorine 就可能擠啲落去，係咪呀？

I

J

答：Sorry, chlorine 會擠，...

J

問：Chlorine 會擠啲落去。

K

K

答：...chlorine 會擠。

L

L

問：係嘞。所以理論上應該係 0，但係做唔到，咁你幾多你至認為--去到個 connection point，我而家講吓，去到幾多你至認為唔得？你都係 10 咩，而家？

M

M

N

答：10，係，而家我哋用個 10 個度做標準。

N

O

問：真係？

O

P

答：而家係用 10 去做標準。

P

Q

問：係咪因為陳健民嘅意見？

Q

R

主席：唔係，我聽唔到你頭先個問題。

R

S

李柱銘先生：係咪因為陳健民...

S

T

主席：唔係，之前嗰個問題係咩嘢話？

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：你話係咪即係求其你哋啲水去到 connecting point 嗰度，含鉛嘅分量如果係唔超過 10 個 microgram per litre，你就 happy 嘞？

答：唔係，我哋應該咁講，我哋 aim at 嗰個--即係我哋而家嗰個標準定喺個所謂 compliance 嗰個標準，就係跟世衛，或者即係呢個好多討論喇，係 10 個 microgram per litre 嘅，呢個係我哋嗰個即係標準嚟嘅，即係個 compliance 要 comply 到呢樣嘢。

問：你嘅意思係咪即係話如果超過 10，就...

答：唔得喇，我哋。

問：...啲部門一定要唔得嘞，...

答：唔得。

問：...要叫佢快啲搞掂佢，係咪？

答：要處理。

問：如果唔超過 10 就 okay？即係去到個 connection point。

答：即係 comply 到就 okay。

問：當 okay 㗎嘞？

答：所有我諗啲水質標準都係咁樣，我哋最緊要 comply with。

問：Okay，即係去到 connection point，唔好超過 10 個 microgram per litre，啱嘛？

答：呢個就係個標準喇，個標準。

問：咁 9.99 okay 嘅？

答：理論上係喇。

問：Okay。

答：理論上唔應該係個嗰？因為你呢啲人咗去裏面，再加少少就已經過 10 個囉嗰，係咪先？

B

B

C

C

D

主席：你唔可以--你咁樣樣拗落去，永遠拗唔完個喎，係咪？當佢話「我同意 9.99 唔係幾好」，跟住你又話 9.98，咁拗落去。

D

E

李柱銘先生：Okay, okay。為食飯起見，我都會快啲。

E

F

主席：唔係，唔係食唔食飯嘅問題，食唔食飯唔重要嘅，最緊要係...

F

G

李柱銘先生：對我重要。

G

H

主席：對你重要。你想--exactly 究竟想問黃副署長係話，我哋係咪應該 set 一個更低嘅...

H

I

李柱銘先生：係呀。

I

J

主席：唔係，應該咁講，世衛標準還世衛標準，其實我哋香港應該有我哋香港自己嘅標準，而我哋香港嘅標準，因應我哋自己個目前嘅情況，應該係可以做到遠低於 10，甚至呢係低過 5 都得嘅。

J

K

K

L

L

M

問：同唔同意？

M

N

答：我--我諗即係呢段時間喺 hearing 都聽到好多咁嘅意見。

N

O

問：係喇。

O

P

答：呢個我覺得我哋一定會探討番嘅，即係 given--即係我哋當然要睇番--因為其實 even 喺 health base 呢個 argument 度，都好似唔係好一致嘅意見，我真係聽到--我有問過啲同事，佢哋有啲人講畀我聽話喺澳洲，take 10 係一個 health base 嘅。我哋上一次如果有機會睇個 health protection，蘇格蘭嗰份嘢，佢 devise 個 10 都係一個 health base，咁我亦都聽到 Fawell 話呢個唔係 health base，咁我諗我哋要詳細研究下。

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

S

T

主席：蘇格蘭就一定唔係。

T

U

答：唔係，Okay，唔緊要，我覺得呢個我哋會研究嘅。

U

V

V

B

B

C

主席：係。

C

D

答：即係會研究嘅。

D

E

E

F

問：但係呢度可以即係斟酌嘅，不過我就而家話聲畀你聽，...

F

G

答：好呀。

G

H

問：...其實 Prof Fawell 講得好清楚，佢話而家唔係 health base 㗎嘞。

H

I

答：Okay。

I

J

問：同埋佢話，而家呢個只係每一個國、每一個地方都好，應該係低過，起碼你個目的要愈低愈好嘅，你同唔同意？佢係咁講嘅。

J

K

答：愈低愈好，係。不過，你亦都睇番，即係環顧全世界，even 有啲譬如好似紐西蘭、澳洲，其實佢有 lead pipe problem 嘅，新加坡都有嘅，...

K

L

L

M

問：你唔好睇人㗎，...

M

N

答：...但係佢哋 report 都係 10 嘅。

N

O

問：...你睇你自己先，咁 Prof Fawell 又話...

O

P

答：唔係，同意嘅，所以我 that's why 我要研究囉，我咪話。

P

Q

問：所以 Prof Fawell 又話香港啲水質其實好好嘅，...

Q

R

問：...因為去到 connection point 嗰度係好好嘅。

R

S

答：唔。

S

T

問：咁 Prof Lee 係驗，有時驗埋個水喉--水龍頭嗰度驗，有好多嘅 sample 驗都係 0.000 嘅鉛，即係 detect 唔到嘅。

T

U

答：唔。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：你明--睇下有冇--你跟住呢啲證供，一路都有睇住㗎？

C

D

答：去到咁 detail，我就冇跟到咁 detail。

D

E

問：Okay。所以其實佢哋兩個都覺得香港嘅水質係非常好嘅。

E

F

答：唔，多謝先喇。

F

G

問：係喇，即係讚一讚你先。咁問題即係所以就有理由你個 requirement 就跟 10 嘅，所以你明我意思嘛？

G

H

答：唔係，個標準啫，即係等於 passing mark 係 50 分，咁我可以擺 100 分嘅。

H

I

問：係囉，係囉。即係個人靚都係咋嘛，你話 50 個 per cent，有啲人話唔夠個啲，...

I

J

答：Okay。

J

K

問：...係咪呀？Okay，你而家你睇睇第 4 版。

K

L

答：唔。

L

M

問：咁就上面，就「食水水質符合世界標準」，左面、右面都畀一百分嘅，睇唔睇到？

M

N

答：唔，唔。

N

O

問：Okay。跟住「食水水質符合世界標準」，呢度就話水務署所供應嘅食水水質完全符合世衛水質標準，你嘅意思即係少過 10，係咪咁解？

O

P

答：係，一定係，如果唔係...

P

Q

問：Okay。跟住「2007 年，水務署根據世衛訂定嘅水質準則推行水安全計劃，進一步保障供應給用戶的水質安全」，咁即係你 2007 年已經做咗一個水安全計劃個囉嗎？

Q

R

答：係。

R

S

T

問：呢個就其實去到 connection point 個囉嗎，...

T

U

答：係。

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：...係咪呀？但係你就話根據世衛訂定嘅水質準則，咁跟住進一步保障供水給用戶嘅水質安全，咁我睇番第 1 版嗰度，水--你就去到水龍頭個嗰，應該你去到--你話佢優質食水，第 1 版，24 小時，咁就送到用戶嘅水龍頭，𨳊𨳊嗰句，咁人哋一望落去...

答：水--係，送到去水龍頭。

問：咁人哋一望番落去，就以為你呢個水安全計劃，就去到水龍頭個囉嗰，係咪？

答：事實上係去到 connection point，我哋做緊嗰樣其實。

問：係嘞，但係你咁樣講到，人哋一望落去，唔知係 connection point 㗎嘛，...

答：Okay。

問：...係咪呀？

答：唔，唔。

問：我唔係話你有意，但係即係有誤導個嗰，一望落去...

答：或者唔係咁清晰，其實因為如果我哋做咗個 water safety plan，即係一定係保障到嗰個--全香港市民嗰個食水安全嘅，呢個必然嘅，因為最緊要--最重要，我諗你亦都同意，就係我哋啲水...

問：唔係，可以同佢哋講，你若果去到 connection point 都已經唔好嘅呢，咁就一開水喉嗰啲一定唔好喇？

答：係喇，係喇，係喇。

問：但係你就算出面好好，唔等於開水喉嗰啲就好好㗎嘛，因為...

答：所以 that's why 後面都需要即係要做番啲嘢。

問：係喇，係喇。

黎先生：黃生，可唔可以近啲嗰個咪，...

B

B

C

答：Sorry，唔好意思，唔好意思，okay。

C

D

黎先生：...你望咗嗰面有陣時，好難聽，聽得好辛苦。

D

E

答：Okay，好。

E

F

F

G

問：咁樣跟住嗰段，「本港現行嘅水質檢查制度全面同埋嚴格，整個食水供應同埋水務設施各個環節都實施完善嘅水質監控」，「方法是從水務署監管嘅供水系統不同部分定期抽樣進行物理學」，就包括酸鹽（鹼？）嗰啲、pH，一路落化學，包括鉛，咁樣一路落，咁就同埋各方面嘅檢測咁樣--檢視。我想問一問你先，其實呢本--你做呢個本子嘅目的係咩嘢嘢呢？

G

H

H

I

I

J

答：因為...

J

K

問：因為7月就爆出事件，舊年。8月已經出呢個本子。

K

L

答：唔。

L

M

問：係咪其中一個目的就係安撫人心，等啲人唔使咁驚呢？

M

N

答：其實我相信即係好多時，即係當其時出呢件嘢嘅時候，好多市民對即係鉛喺食水裏面嗰個情形係點樣樣，導致啲乜嘢嗰啲，係唔係好清楚嘅，咁我覺--我哋覺得即係畀一啲咁嘅資訊市民係一件好事嚟嘅，即係等佢哋了解下係乜嘢，甚至如果你睇番後面，亦都有啲措施，建議啲市民可以做啲乜嘢嘢去避免呢樣嘢。

N

O

O

P

問：咁所以個目的有冇其中一樣就係先話畀市民聽，唔使驚，起碼啲水去到 connection point 係正嘅？

P

Q

答：呢個我諗係喇，即係都--我唔敢講係咪一定嘅目的，呢個資訊係畀佢哋知道即係啲水都 okay 嘅，咁樣去到...

Q

R

R

S

問：即係其中一個目的就等佢哋安心，係咪呀？唔使咁驚？

S

T

答：係喇，即係我呢個一定係想話畀佢聽，起碼我哋水務署供到嘅水，去到 connection point 係安全嘅，係符合世衛標準。

T

U

問：但係你又冇特別提 connection point 個嘢，話係去到嗰度安全個

U

V

V

B

B

C

喎，係咪呀？你有特別咁分開個喎？

C

D

答：即係我唔知，如果你係成份 read as a whole，我唔知可唔可以畀到呢個信息，就係話其實我哋嘅供水一路去到--即係前面都有講過，即係我哋負責到我哋 waterworks 去到 connection point，and then 即係入到裏面嘅時候，就即係可能啲管理處會負責，跟住就再去個個...

D

E

E

F

F

G

問：所以我頭先問你第 1 版、第 2 版、第 3 版就係咁喇嘛，你負責維修就好清楚嘅，...

G

H

答：唔，唔，唔。

H

I

問：...係咪？

I

J

答：唔。

J

K

問：咁擔保啲水嘅優質就有好清楚咁講嘅，係咪？

K

L

答：嘎。

L

M

問：呢個水優質計劃亦--水安全計劃亦有講話去到 connection point 嘅，呢啲事實嚟㗎嘛？

M

N

答：係，係。

N

O

問：Okay。咁跟住我唔會讀晒嘅。

O

P

答：唔。

P

Q

問：去到第 5 版上面個度，就話「食水進入樓宇**內部**...」呢個特別黑色，「...供水系統後，有機會因為種種原因受到污染，主要嘅污染源頭來自日久失修嘅內部供水系統」，其實對呢次含鉛，唔關日久失修喎，係咪？

Q

R

R

S

答：應該唔關事。

S

T

問：而係後面個嘅，「包括喉管老化或生鏽」，都唔係？

T

U

答：都唔關事，係。

U

V

問：而係不當嘅焊接嘅喉管？

V

B

B

C

答：係嘞，呢個。

C

D

問：呢度至係嘞，...

D

E

答：嘎，呢度，嘎，嘎。

E

F

問：...係咪呀？咁就水箱老舊都唔關事嘅，一路都唔關事嘅？

F

G

答：唔。

G

H

問：好嘞，「另外，食水亦會被一些建造、裝修或更換供水系統時安裝嘅不合規則」，其實都唔關事，...

H

I

答：不合格可能一個原因。

I

J

問：...對呢個事件其實唔關事嘅？

J

K

答：即係如果今次，而家睇番就係個焊接物。

K

L

問：係喇。都...

L

M

主席：都有少少啲嘢部件咁嘅？

M

N

答：但係啲個影響就應該唔係最大。

N

O

P

問：你提下都好嘅，我其實都想問你，你話啲嘢--即係啲嘢水龍頭啲嘢，裏面都係--因為係銅嘅？

P

Q

答：銅，裏面有鉛，嘎。

Q

R

問：係有鉛嘅，譬如水龍頭都會嘅？

R

S

答：有。

S

T

問：我就想問你，譬如你去個水龍頭啲度，攞啲水辦出嚟，flush 咗先，你當 flush 咗都好，咁譬如個結果係 10 個 microgram，啱啱 10 個 microgram per litre 咁樣。

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：唔。

C

D

問：你哋會唔會知道呢 10 個 kilogram--microgram，10 個 microgram，sorry，per litre 嘅 lead，嘅鉛，有幾多係焊料？有幾多就係嗰啲配件呢？

D

E

E

F

答：即係我嗰陣時有做過 task force 嗰個 investigation，但係當日主要都係 base on 一個 static，即係就佢有嘗試過分嗰個 proportion，但係你話 during 一個水管係流動嘅時候，我哋就真係有研究過。

F

G

G

H

問：其實應該測到嘅，係咪？得唔得？

H

I

答：我諗流動--我估，即係呢個 which 我都其實好 interest to know，就係話都唔知--可能要搵 Professor Lee 嗰個 CP--CFD 嘅即係 model 嚟真係做一次好詳細研究，究竟即係各個樣嘢點樣 contribute to，因為你如果流動嘅時候，sorry，好唔同嘅，即係我相信。

I

J

J

K

K

L

問：我知道。咁仲有流動嘅時候，譬如佢個水喉裏面啲--喉管裏面有啲--又有陣時啲污糟嘢積聚喺度㗎嘛？

L

M

答：係呀，即係仲有好多呢啲 factor 影響緊囉。

M

N

問：又含鉛㗎嘛，有啲可能？

N

O

答：即係如果我哋以往，即係我哋 task force 做嗰個結果就係話，即係其實可能如果你有啲含鉛嘅焊接物，亦都會 at the end 影響到有啲 so-called deposits...

O

P

P

Q

問：係嘞。

Q

R

答：...--即係 lead deposits，呢啲 lead deposits 可能又會影響番個水質嘅。

R

S

問：係嘞。

S

T

答：咁所以其實係一個幾複雜嘅，所以你話要知道嗰個 proportion during 一個真係流動嘅情況，我相信可能要再詳細啲研究下先可以知道。

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：即係到今日為止，你哋都唔知個答案？

C

D

答：我而家我唔知。

D

E

E

F

主席：Static 嘅水就知？

F

G

答：Static 就可以 base on 我哋幾個 chain 做咗嘅，有個...

G

H

問：係嘞，你就就擺去浸咩？

H

I

答：哦，嗰個 static，24 小時 static，唔郁嘅啲水。

I

J

問：我知。咁所以呢個其實應該做個啲，係咪？

J

K

答：我覺得可以研究，...

K

L

問：即係等我哋知道...

L

M

答：...可以研究。

M

N

問：係嘞，等人哋知道淨係你啲水龍頭嗰啲有--最高可以高到幾多，人哋
要想知道，就算你根據英國嘅標準，係咪？咁都想知道有幾多嘅。

N

O

答：呢個可以研究下嘅，我哋。

O

P

P

Q

主席：呢個好複雜。

Q

R

答：係，複雜㗎，其實。

R

S

李柱銘先生：係複雜，係複雜。

S

T

主席：係。

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：唔容易，我覺得...

C

D

問：我知道唔容易。

D

E

答：...唔容易。

E

F

問：所以我唔會做㗎嘛。

F

G

答：我都難嘅，如果對我嚟講。

G

H

主席：因為你唔係淨係講緊個 tap，你仲有好多 round，...

H

I

答：係呀，係呀，成條 chain。

I

J

主席：...仲有好多嘢，所以...

J

K

答：應該係複雜嘅，難嘅應該。

K

L

主席：呢個就真係可以好貴嘞，我諗如果要做嘅話。

L

M

答：係呀，嘎。

M

N

問：咁你有冇諗過，你都話可能搵 Prof Lee，係咪？

N

O

答：唔係，我話 Prof Lee 嗰個 CFD 個 model 係一個可能可以用嘅 model，去...

O

P

問：我唔係話佢好貴。

P

Q

答：唔係，唔係，唔係，即係其中一個要諗，因為 dynamic 嗰個情況唔容易。

Q

R

問：即係到而家為止係有呢啲資料？

R

T

答：冇，冇，冇。

T

U

問：Okay。所以到而家為止，你哋嘅目的就係最緊要搞掂嗰啲焊料，含鉛嘅焊料入咗水，係咪呢？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：最緊要搞掂，都應該係嘅，如果--嘎，嘎，嘎。

C

D

問：係咪呀？

D

E

答：係。

E

F

問：就喺嗰度嚟針對喇。因為你哋已經講咗喇嘛，鉛從何處來，第5版，咁就跟住又講禁用焊--唔係，譬如第一--鉛從何處來，第5版，一、二、三，第4段。

F

G

G

H

答：唔。

H

I

問：銅管只含低於0.1嘅雜質，包括鉛，即係鉛可能低定少--仲更加少，係咪？此外，本港於八十年代起禁用含鉛焊接物料接駁樓宇內的供水銅管。然而，由低含鉛量嘅銅合金製造嘅裝置，包括閥門呢啲，仍然係符合英國同埋其他認可標準嘅。咁就食水為何含鉛，咁呢度就講，因此大廈或個別住戶--住所嘅一啲喉管同埋裝置可能含有少量鉛，特別就係由銅合金製造嘅裝置，例如閥門，講番頭先嗰度。咁就根據外國經驗，食水含鉛嘅過程通常就係錯誤，或者違法使用不合規格嘅喉管和裝置。其實到香港事發之前，你哋都睇到其他嘅例子，Scotland嗰啲你睇到，都知道㗎喇？

I

J

J

K

K

L

L

M

答：我就唔知，嗰陣時。

M

N

問：你個人唔知？

N

O

答：我唔知，係。

O

P

問：但你個部門應該知嘅，係咪？

P

Q

答：呢個真係要好似頭先話齋，我要返去 gather 下啲資料。

Q

R

問：好呀，你返去問問，對我嚟講，你隨時打電話都得嘅，okay？咁同埋如果咁樣，即係我哋唔可以做事--即係你哋個部門唔可以話事發我至知，咁唔掂咩嘛，同唔同意？

R

S

答：其實...

S

T

問：我哋唔可以採取呢個態度個嗎？

T

U

答：其實我哋都有一個 radar，即係我哋有啲同事去睇番，只不過即係

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

as far as...

問：個 radar 唔 work 囉。

答：At 呢個 moment，我唔知 further collect 嗰啲資料係點，即係當其時我哋嗰個 radar 係即係搜集唔到呢個信息囉，即係。

問：完全搜集唔到？

答：根據--我哋遲啲我哋有位周世威先生都會有個 statement 講呢樣嘢，當其時可以聽。

問：即係佢就--即係如果知，就應該佢知，佢負責嘅？

答：唔係，佢有個 statement 會講番即係當日我哋其實係點樣去 R&D。

問：唔係，我想你個部門有冇人負責，譬如 Scotland 出事，或者 Ireland 出事，咁你嘅部門有冇人負責睇呢啲嘢，同埋匯報番畀你聽呢？

答：因為我哋唔會話淨係睇 Scotland 睇咁嘅，其實全世界㗎嘛，應該。

問：你睇 CNN，BBC 都得喇，...

答：嘎，嘎，嘎。

問：...係咪呀？

答：即係我哋係 through 可能有啲 general，或者我成日都講，最重要其實 through 幾個最重要嘅權威嘅組織，世衛、BSI 等等，去搜集資訊，當然我哋啲同事亦都會去搜集一啲資訊咁樣樣。但係你話係咪咁可以已經概括晒全世界發生嘅事，咁我相信就應該做唔到嘅。

問：細嘅嘢呢，如果一個城市--一座樓宇，梗係唔使理，但係爆到全國性嘅呢，唔使等世衛㗎喇？

答：Scotland 都唔係全國性嘅，我嘅理解，都係一個 city 或者一個鎮，我唔記得講緊幾多，呢個。

問：我而家想問你嘅好簡單，你個部門有冇人，如果有，係邊個？係專係要處理呢啲問題嘅，如果事發，或者世衛有啲咩嘢出，即係佢應該向你報告嘅起碼。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：遲啲周世威個 statement...

問：係咪佢先？係咪佢先？

答：佢嘅 statement 會詳細講番，佢會解釋番其實我哋部門唔係話一...

問：唔得，我唔可以問佢，呢個要問你，要高級啲嘅，即係邊個負責嘅？

答：應該係好多同事負責，即係呢個責任...

問：譬如？

答：散開，譬如我 water science，陳健民先生佢哋嗰隊 water science 嘅 chemist，咁佢哋都會--即係有時對佢哋工作需要，或者佢哋會睇番嗰個即係國際上有冇特別嘅事故發生，值得留意咁樣，都有做呢樣嘢嘅。即係我可能都可以舉番個例子，就係有一段時間，李律師，你知唔知？你有冇聽過？即係喺澳洲都死過人嗰個，咁嗰個我哋知嘅，於是我們跟住要去驗番呢個 CNG 嗰啲咁嘢，我哋有 in response to 一啲我哋知道嘢嘢，我哋會處理番嗰個。

主席：唔係，佢--我諗李大律師嘅意思就係，你哋 department，你哋個部門一定要有一個 coordinator 係去負責嘅。即係你唔可以話--當然喇，因為水質科學，咁佢可能佢睇嘢嘢，佢咪純粹睇水質科學。譬如好簡單，佢鉛對佢嚟講，佢可能淨係睇嗰個 analytical method，又或者佢淨係睇嗰個--我唔知喇，好多，係咪？

答：唔。

主席：或者佢淨係有興趣知道究竟而家由 10 去到 8，或者去到 5，咁我哋要點樣做。但係你嗰個 customer service，即係你另外一 part 嘅人，佢可能對 water science 完全冇興趣，我都唔 care 究竟你而家水務署嗰啲儀器可唔可以 detect 到 8，或者 detect 到更低，我淨係有興趣知道如果要用 lead solder 嘅話，lead solder 我要點樣去監管，或者佢個 grading 係應該點樣，咁你話佢嘅注意力就喺嗰度。另外，一啲人又可能有另外一啲注意力，啱唔啱先？總之個問題就係你有冇一個 central 嘅 unit 係去 coordinate 晒呢啲所有，一定要有一個人係知道，佢要識，佢唔需要識好多嘢，不過樣樣佢都要識少少，知道，咁個 significant 喺邊一度。然後，即係李先生嘅意思譬如就係咁樣樣，譬如好簡單，你一個醫生，個個

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

都係識一啲啲嘍咋嘛，啱唔啱先？係咪？你唔會識晒啲嘛？

答：唔，唔，唔。

主席：咁有一隻藥出左嚟，可能淨係對呢一個--呢一部分有影響嘅，咁但係到最後你個衛生署或者醫管局，你要有一個人知道晒呢隻藥原來係有問題嘅，藥係用喺呢啲人嘅身上就有問題嘅，用喺啲人身上就有問題嘅，用喺細路就得，用喺大肚婆就唔得，咁你要有人知啲嘛，你唔可以冇人知啲嘛，每一個醫生可能佢哋嘅範疇都唔同咩嘛，係咪？咁你要有一個人知啲嘛。

如果陳健民，咁佢可能成日都匿埋喺個 lab 嗰度做佢要做嘅嘢，係咪？你有個 AD 負責 customer service，佢係最有興趣，譬如咁講櫃檯嘅嘢，係咪？咁大家做大家嘅嘢，就有一個人 click 到，譬如好簡單，蘇格蘭咁樣樣，係咪？你明呵？你睇 general，我同你睇 general 都係水淋鴨背嘍咋嘛，你擺個 law general 出嚟睇，係咪？有陣時都係揭下個 headings，都唔關我事，擱埋一邊囉，係咪先？

答：唔。

主席：即係你做一個咁大嘅部門，in charge of 一樣咁重要嘅嘢，可能你就要有一個 central unit，你個 technical support，其實係 customer service 嘅可能，佢咪 focus on customer service 囉。

答：唔，唔。

主席：係咪呀？你明我意思，佢有一個可能係好 interested in British Standard，佢--你有喇，我見到你哋有人做 amendment 嘍，係咪？

答：唔，唔，唔。

主席：British Standard amendment，咁做完之後，就擺落去個 library 嗰度就收工個囉嗰。

答：唔。

主席：係囉，咁即係個 significant 係做咩嘢呢，點解又好似又有乜人知，即係--即係發生喺你部門嘅身上，同樣亦都發生喺房署嘅身上，有人知道要改，亦都有人改左，不過原來到最後，即係房署一樣咋嘛，佢去到最後，即係佢啲 building services 知道要加個

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

specification, 知道有呢啲咁樣樣嘅嘢, 跟住佢寫完之後交上去畀佢個 chief, 佢個 chief 話「我咪寫咗落去囉, 執行唔關我事嘞, 我唔知個嘞。」跟住嗰份嘢又上咗去呢一個--佢哋嗰個 development board 嗰個 management meeting 嗰度, 嗰度話通過, 原來--你睇番佢哋都知, 原來成個部門都冇人知道, 聽佢哋講就話個 rationale 係咁嘅, 冇人知, 咁同樣都可以應用喺你水務署嘅身上, 係咪? 你某一部分嘅同事知道呢樣嘢, 而家李大律師就話「好, 係, 得, 冇問題, 如果你哋過去係咁樣樣。」咁但係你點樣樣可以確保你以後唔係咁樣樣呢?

答: 唔。

問: 有冇人或者一個部門負責呢?

主席: 係嘞。係咪?

答: 其實我哋係有個 research and development unit 嘅, ...

問: 係呀, 我想問 R&D, 係。

答: ...不過其實嗰個 R&D 呢真係都係喺嗰個 division 都有各自負責一啲範疇嘅, ...

主席: 係, 即係...

答: ...我聽到主席嘅意見嘅, 咁呢個我返去我再探索下呢個情況。

問: 因為你要兩個時段嘅, 一個就係事發之前, 咁譬如呢啲已經發生, 全世界呢度發生, 嗰度發生㗎喇嘛, 咁你 R&D 裏面, 如果都完全唔知嘅就好杰個囉嘞, 你明嘛? 而家事發之後梗係知, 咁事發之後有邊個人一定要負責, 將來有啲咩嘢嘢就你一定要負責嘅。

B

B

C

答：唔。

C

D

問：如果你有呢，個個都可以知，可以唔知咁就弊㗎嘞。

D

E

答：呢個我哋會即係詳細睇睇個情況係點樣樣。

E

F

問：我覺得要做㗎。

F

G

答：Okay。

G

H

李柱銘先生：係咪適當嘅時候？

H

I

主席：食飯緊要。係，我哋食飯先，兩點半繼續。

I

J

J

K

下午 1 時 01 分聆訊押後

K

L

下午 2 時 33 分恢復聆訊

L

M

出席人士如前。

M

N

李柱銘先生：主席。

N

O

O

P

水務署第四證人：黃仲良（水務署副署長）宣誓繼續作供

P

Q

李柱銘先生繼續盤問

Q

R

問：黃生，我哋繼續問呢個本子問題。我想你睇第 7 頁，唔該。

R

S

答：睇到。

S

T

問：就喺上面嗰度，「共同處理食水含鉛問題」，「減低食水中含鉛嘅水平，需要政府、發展商、建築承建商、認可人士、持牌水喉匠、水喉工人、水喉和裝備供應商、業主、物業管理公司和用戶等所有持份者共同努力」，包括水喉工人啲，係咪呀？

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：唔。

C

D

問：點解呢？嗰啲工人都參加埋？

D

E

答：我諗主要都係大家都要盡量避免用咗一啲含鉛嘅焊接物等等嗰啲嘢，我諗大家都留心下呢樣嘢咁樣樣。

E

F

問：就我唔係批評，因為你最緊要落手落腳嗰個都知道自己焊緊嗰啲水喉嘅時候有咩嘢要小心嘅，係咪？

F

G

G

答：唔，唔，唔。

H

H

問：所以呢度就如果睇落去，就即係所有有關嘅人，包括埋用者都要包埋落去嘅，係咪？

I

I

答：呢段嘢唔係--即係我有直接參與個 drafting 嗰度，不過我諗嗰個概念都係話盡量各持份者，其實大家都留心呢樣嘢，咁一定會係好啲㗎喇嗰個。

J

J

K

K

問：唔係咁簡單，佢話「需要」咁嘛，而家開頭，係咪呀？

L

L

答：係。

M

M

問：「需要」，去到尾，就所有持份者共同努力，即係需要所有人都共同努力，正確㗎嗎，唔係咩？你唔同意咩？

N

N

答：我 okay，我有問題咁講，即係我想講番呢段嘢，我有份參與個 drafting，佢 exactly 當其時想點，但係你話共同努力，呢個我同意嘅。

O

O

P

P

問：唔係，你反而唔同意，我至批評你，你同意就有事。

Q

Q

答：Okay, okay, okay。

R

R

問：係所有人至...

S

S

答：大家一齊。

T

T

問：...嗰個效果至好㗎嘛，譬如你個個人都識，係嗰個水喉工人唔識，佢就出事喇可以，係咪？

U

U

答：咁都有咁--其實已經好好多㗎喇，如果大家譬如你嗰啲發展商、承建

V

V

A

A

B

B

C

C

商，起碼你畀啲啲焊料佢嗰陣時唔係有含鉛嘅，咁咪唔會出事囉，即係你越多人留心呢樣嘢，個 barrier 越多，咁應該呢個越好嘅。

D

D

問：好呀，既然你咁講，你係咪話水喉工人可以唔加入去呢？

E

E

答：我又唔係咁嘅意思，其實我諗個睇法都係話呢個各持份者大家一齊努力，越多 barrier 一定係越好嘅，我個睇法就。

F

F

G

G

問：呢個就係涉及--頭先我哋睇過嗰個，就係嗰個水安全計劃，你同唔同意水安全計劃都應該將所有有關人士，水喉工人就可以擺個 question mark 喺度，擺個問號喺度，其他所有人都應該喺度嘅，唔知啱唔啱呢？

H

H

I

I

答：水安全計劃嗰個概念有少少唔係話啲 stakeholder 嗰樣嘢嘅，more 係去--當然 stakeholder 都影響，以我嘅認知，就係話當你講一個水安全計劃嘅時候，係想睇一睇個系統裏面，個系統裏面有咩嘢地方有機會有 hazard 嘅，and then 就 assess 個 risk，and 做一啲 control measure 去盡量將個 risk 減低咁樣嘅，即係 more 係喺個 system 本身去睇番件事。

J

J

K

K

L

L

問：我覺得可能就呢度你係錯嘅，因為照我睇世衛嗰個目的，就係想所有有關嘅人士，包括用家，都要大家一齊共同努力，其實呢度寫係啱嘅。

M

M

N

N

答：唔係，冇問題嘅，呢個我諗你頭先講緊係嗰個 Water Safety Plan，我記得我都有機會睇過嗰本 Water Safety in Building，係世衛嘅刊物嚟嘅，佢裏面都有提到每個持份者其實都有一啲可以做嘅嘢去--即係你話頭，共同努力去達致整個水安全嗰個情況嘅。

O

O

P

P

問：因為你要用家都要識嘅，譬如出事嘅時候佢要知道點樣處理，或者最好就大家防範有啲某些問題出現，係咪？

Q

Q

答：防範於未然，係，係，係。

R

R

問：所以係應該--所以持份者係應該包括所有呢啲？

S

S

答：係，持份者，我同意嘅。

T

T

問：但係問題就係持份者個定義，你係咪覺得有啲問題呢？呢個定義係咪廣泛得滯呢？頭先我所講...

U

U

答：我又唔覺得，唔覺得，我覺得即係都係我...

V

V

B

B

C

問：你話個系統咩？你頭先講系統咩？

C

D

答：唔係，我另外一樣嘢，講緊，即係我話 Water Safety Plan 嗰個諗緊應該係講緊個 supply system，即係呢個 system 裏面有咩嘢地方有機會出 hazard，然後去評估個風險，control measure，即係同個 stakeholder 可能唔係咁直接可以 connect 埋一齊，雖然 stakeholder 一定有個 part to play 嘅，正如我頭先講，喺世衛嗰個刊物裏面，Water Safety in Building 佢都有講過各個持份者其實都有啲責任或者可以做一啲嘢，去為咗食水安全，達致呢個目的咁樣樣。

D

E

E

F

F

G

G

H

問：我又不如咁問你，既然頭先你第四版已經講咗個水安全計劃㗎喇？

H

I

答：唔，唔。

I

J

問：咁你水安全計劃就去到嗰個 connection point 嗰度，係咪？

J

K

答：係，唔。

K

L

問：但係你應該係要做第二個，起碼要做第二個水安全計劃，就係入到屋水龍頭嗰度嘅，其實你哋有㗎喇嘛而家，而家有㗎喇嘛？

L

M

答：水安全計劃入到水龍頭裏面？

M

N

問：係呀。

N

O

答：我哋暫時個 Safety Plan 就去唔到嗰度嘅。

O

P

問：未去到咩？

P

Q

答：未去到，未去到，即係呢個...

Q

R

主席：你睇下你又唔係完全啱得晒嘅，副署長，其實有嘅，因為你哋有一個 Water Safety Plan general 㗎嘛，最大嗰個。

R

S

S

T

答：Okay，我哋有嗰個 target 話我哋一定去到個 consumer tap，from source to tap。

T

U

主席：唔係個 target 嘅，唔係，你哋 individually，當然你哋每一個

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

treatment work, 每一個 pumping stations 嗰啲有你哋嘅 WSP, 但係你知道你哋 Consumer Branch -- Consumer Services Branch 都有 WSP。

答：Consumer Branch 即係如果喺個 Water Safety Plan 裏面係有一部分就擺咗喺個 annex 度，如果你--即係喺我哋最 general 個 plan 裏面。

主席：係囉，你個 annex 嗰度咁嘛，你嗰啲係--你嗰啲都係...

答：係，不過我仲諗緊一個--如果真正一個 Water Safety Plan for the building, 其實就正如我今朝咁講，我諗 Fawell 都同意，就話其實係可能要由個持份者，譬如嗰個管業處等等去 develop 嘅嗰個 Water Safety Plan, 因為佢哋最清晰，喺嗰個 in building 裏面嗰個 system。

主席：啱。

答：咁樣樣囉即係。

主席：你睇下你嗰個 WSP 究竟係 at 咩嘢 stage, 其實你都睇過世衛嗰啲 Water Safety Plan, for buildings 㗎嘛，有好多唔同嘅 roles and responsibilities of 啲 stakeholders 㗎嘛，係咪？

答：係，係。

主席：你睇下你究竟你想去到幾早 involve 嗰啲人，但係實際上你哋水務署 -- 應該咁講，theoretically, 理論上係有嘅，for buildings, 係咪？因為你哋個 Consumer Branch 係有寫㗎嘛，喺你個 general 嗰度，不過你話究竟有幾深入同埋究竟係一個純粹係響應世衛 WHO Guidelines 2004 年你哋自己寫出嚟嘅，咁就另外一回事，究竟有幾 practical 就係另外一回事。

答：但係我都想補充話如果--即係我哋而家諗緊要做嗰樣嘢，就真真正正係一個 Water Safety Plan, 由 stakeholder 或者管業處理之類去 develop 一個 plan for 個 building, 我哋諗緊再行多--即係而家想諗緊嗰一步。

主席：係囉，咁你咪...

答：Okay。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

主席：因為你知道 Prof Fawell 個 criticism of 你哋嗰啲 Water Safety Plan，基本上就係 top down 同埋淨係得啲 skeleton 嘅之嘛，冇 meat，冇 substance，佢話，唔係我話嘅。

答：但係其實我哋有幾個 tier 嘅 plan 嘅。

主席：唔係，佢睇晒嚟喇，佢話你哋嗰啲係有 skeleton，但係佢話一個 Water Safety Plan 唔應該係只不過係得一個 document 或者一個 piece of paper 嘅，應該有好多嘢嘅，有--我唔知喇，exactly 究竟--因為佢話如果--佢話佢去 Northern Ireland，同 northern Ireland go through 佢哋嘅 WSP，都要用咗六個月嘅時間。

答：做嗰個 plan。

主席：做佢哋個 plan，係呀。

答：我哋我諗都做咗好長時間，我哋都。

主席：佢都話你哋唔夠，就係話你哋唔夠。

答：Okay。

主席：你哋可能用咗好多時間，不過佢就話 to 佢嚟講，只不過係有個 skeletons，即係有個大綱，但係去到嗰啲 meat，去到啲 substance 嘅時候，佢都仲係覺得係 lacking 嘅，exactly 究竟點樣樣，我相信就唔會係我哋而家喺呢一度可以討論，你想 involve 有幾多，即係你話如果你真係想做嘅，你咪可能真係要詳細同任何一位呢方面係權威嘅人士坐喺度慢慢傾。

答：Okay。

主席：我唔知喇，係咪？可能最初你哋水務署引進 WSP 嘅時候，都可能已經有喺外國叫人嚟，或者我唔知你哋究竟當時係點樣樣做。

答：根據陳健民先生，就有搵過澳洲有個都喺世衛裏面嘅人，都溝通過，亦都借過佢哋嗰啲嘢嚟睇咁樣嚟做。

主席：係喇，唔係，澳洲其實做得好好嘅，我見過佢哋澳洲嗰啲嘢，不過我見到你哋--我曾經好 specifically 問過 Prof Fawell 嘅，我話畀佢聽我睇過你哋嘅 WSP 嘅，我問佢，因為佢喺佢嗰個報告裏面有

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

咁講，所以我先至問佢點解--佢喺庭上高有咁講，於是我就先問佢「點解你話嗰啲係 skeleton？」咁嘛。

答：我唔係好記得，anyway，我嘅理解我哋做個 safety plan 其實都有人話我哋做得好嘅，其實都。

主席：實做得到㗎。

答：唔係，做得好，話我哋做得好。

問：邊個話你哋做得好？陳健民？

答：我唔係好記得，係有人都--如果需要嘅，我可以搵番啲資料出嚟，再畀番...

問：即係外國嘅專家，你嘅意思？

答：我唔敢肯定，但係如果你有留意番，我記得署長好似都有提及過呢個 point 嘅，即係我哋做嘅 safety plan 其實係有人都認同我哋做得好。

問：但係而家亦有人話你哋做得唔好。

答：我要睇一睇 Fawell 嗰個 comment。

主席：佢唔係話佢做得唔好。

答：我要睇一睇 Fawell 嗰個 comment。

問：都未做，其實就。

主席：未做。

問：未做。

B

B

C

主席：要做詳盡啲，我諗係。

C

D

答：係，係，或者稍後我睇下可唔可以搵番啲資料出嚟，好唔好呀？

D

E

E

F

問：好呀。其實我嘅理解就係做呢個咁嘅水安全計劃，其實就要一定係頭先呢一段咁樣，你將所有嘅持份者拉埋一齊搞，第一樣就係搵呢啲人，你同唔同意？即係搵晒呢啲人先開始做。

F

G

G

H

答：我唔係呢個專家，即係做 water safety plan，我哋陳健民先生就專啲，我唔係好能夠 comment 到 on 呢樣嘢。

H

I

問：好，或者我咁問你，而家你個部門裏面邊個係處理呢個問題？

I

J

答：總化驗師，總化驗師。

J

K

問：但係陳健民先生已經係退休咗喇喇喎。

K

L

答：有人而家又做咗總化驗師喇喇嘛。

L

M

問：我唔知邊個吖嘛，係邊個？

M

N

答：郭有定先生。

N

O

問：吓？

O

P

答：郭有定先生。

P

Q

問：郭有靖？

Q

R

答：定。

R

S

問：定。

S

T

答：姓郭，郭有定。

T

U

問：好定個「定」？

U

V

答：好定個「定」，係。

V

問：郭有定先生，okay。

B

B

C

C

D

主席：我諗 Mr Lee，呢一方面其實就應該 go along，如果 go along Prof Fawell 嗰個 water quality manager，嗰一個人可能先至係呢一個 key position 嘅人，唔單只係 water safety plan，仲要係要 update 埋全世界，人哋講畀佢聽嗰啲，呢個就係個 key man，如果你要一個人做 central co-ordination 嘅話。

D

E

E

F

F

G

G

H

問：你同唔同意？

H

I

答：琴日我答許律師嗰陣時我都講咗，其實呢個 water quality manager 呢個方向，我哋覺得值得探討嘅，可以睇，可以睇嘅，即係我...

I

J

問：唔係，我希望你做。

J

K

答：唔係，我部門裏面未正式詳細討論呢個問題，我認為呢個方向或者呢個諗法係值得去...

K

L

問：你預備交界邊個嚟睇呢？邊個處理？

L

M

答：我諗我哋部門...

M

N

問：定係你自己處理？

N

O

答：可能都係我自己處理都唔定，即係我哋部門會詳細討論呢樣嘢。

O

P

問：因為點解？我哋而家大家亦知道，應該要搵一個人扯頭纜㗎嘛，...

P

Q

問：...你逢係搵一班人，要搵個人扯頭纜至得㗎嘛，你願唔願意做呢個工作？

Q

R

R

S

答：冇問題，如果要我做，我可以。

S

T

問：即係冇人扯頭纜做唔到嘅，你明我意思嘛？

T

U

答：明。

U

V

問：你而家就講到好，你講到做入間屋添，啲水入到每一座大廈裏面添，

V

B

B

C

係咪？水安全計劃。

C

D

答：係，如果--係，呢個可以去...

D

E

問：呢個就去到好犀利㗎喇，去到每一間屋都有㗎喇。

E

F

答：好犀利㗎喇，係喇，你講得啱。

F

G

問：係呀，但係而家啲公屋都未有，房署你都未拉埋佢哋坐埋一齊，而家我哋係講呢度之嘛，你房署啲人坐住喺度等你哋，你又唔去搵埋佢一齊？

G

H

答：唔。

H

I

問：可能你又等房署搵埋你哋一齊，係咪？

I

J

答：唔需要等佢哋。

J

K

問：大家都係政府部門㗎喇嘛。

K

L

答：Okay。

L

M

問：係囉，你哋有個跨部門嘅會議㗎喇嘛，係咪呀？

M

N

答：我哋其實同房署有定期嘅會議嘅，可以呢個係一個其中一個 item，我哋可以討論。

N

O

問：係囉，okay。跟住第7版去到中間嗰度，「因應2015年7月發生公共屋邨食水含鉛量超標事件，為減低新落成樓宇內部供水系統受重金屬污染嘅風險，水務署已於」，已於，「7月13日要求：新落成樓宇在申請供水時，如使用燒焊方法接駁喉管，必須呈交焊接物料無鉛證明書」，而家做咗㗎囉嗎？

O

P

P

Q

Q

R

答：係。

R

S

問：吓？

S

T

答：唔。

T

U

問：要求佢哋咁做㗎囉嗎？

U

V

答：係，係，係。

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：有冇啲咁嘅 form 畀我哋睇㗎？即係點樣咩嘢叫做--要佢哋證明係...

答：佢提交一張 certificate 證明佢用嗰隻焊料係無鉛嘅，就...

問：係 form 乜嘢呢個？Form 咩嘢？

答：唔使 form，佢哋只要有個 supplier 或者咩嘢證明譬如佢係 FRY 嘅呢隻嘢係無鉛焊料，有一張證明書 certificate 入嚟就 okay，唔需要--唔係，冇特定嘅 form 要做呢樣嘢。

問：我哋可以去邊度搵到呢一張咁嘅嘢？

答：由嗰個 LP 或者佢哋 AP provide 畀我哋。

問：即係你哋部門...

答：我哋有一個 specify 嘅 form 畀佢話填啲咩嘢嘅，而係佢...

問：Standard form 都有㗎？

答：唔使，佢畀張 certificate 我哋 okay㗎喇。

問：但係而家我哋成日睇來睇去你嗰幾張 form 都係 standard form 㗎㗎嘛。

答：但係如果你 certificate，因為呢個咁嘅 certificate 係全世界可能好多嘅供應商㗎嘛，佢哋個個國家可能有自己一啲 certificate form 㗎嘛，咁咪會--我哋都有理由特定話張 certificate 一定要咩嘢樣。

問：我就知道好少政府部門會唔使 standard form。

答：哦，okay，但係呢張係 certificate 㗎嘅。

問：即係有咁嘅嘢嘅？唔係，如果聽日，你可唔可以帶張畀我哋睇呀？

答：我可以問一問我啲同事，睇下可唔可以攞到一張，即係佢哋大家都會...

問：係囉，因為我都未曾聽過呢啲咁嘅嘢，但係呢度就有。

B

B

C

答：Okay。

C

D

問：Okay？

D

E

答：係。

E

F

問：跟住第二點，就係7月13號要求嘅，新落成樓宇內部供水系統在最後驗收嘅食水樣本就係測試時，測試中就加入呢四個新嘅項目，呢幾個金屬？

F

G

G

答：唔。

H

H

問：Okay，我就唔讀，有幾個字我唔識讀，okay。呢度做咗，大家都知道喇。

I

I

答：係。

J

J

問：跟住就食水供應嘅國際標準，呢度你就話世衛定出嘅飲用水水質標準作為基礎，方便已發展同埋發展中嘅國家就各地不同情況制訂當地嘅標準，以保障公眾健康。此標準並非國際單一嘅標準，你就覺得係保障公眾健康而設嘅，係咪？

K

K

L

L

答：係。

M

M

問：即係叫做 health-based 㗎囉嗎，health-based？

N

N

答：In general 都係 health-based，不過正如我今朝講，喺 in respect of lead 嗰個 PGV 究竟係 health-based，就有一個好--就都有一啲討論，喺呢個 hearing 嗰度。

O

O

P

P

問：唔係討論㗎喇，Prof Fawell 就好清楚，佢話以前就係，而家唔係喇，你同唔同意而家已經唔係 health-based 嘅？即係鉛㗎講。

Q

Q

答：正如我今朝講，我哋都要詳細研究番，因為事實上我嘅總化驗師陳健民先生同我講過，就話譬如喺澳洲佢哋 take it 10 係一個 health-based，不過我諗--即係有啲地方去 take it as 一個 health-based，我哋都知道 Fawell 講話唔係一個 health-based，所以我諗我要詳細啲睇一睇啲嗰啲 scale...

R

R

S

S

T

T

問：因為佢係世衛其中一個權威人士㗎喇嘛，係咪呀？

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係，即係...

C

D

問：陳健民先生唔係咁嘛。

D

E

E

F

主席：你唔可以咁講嘅，我哋睇下啲背後嘅道理嘅啫。

F

G

答：係。

G

H

問：而家最嘍就係咁，陳健民先生就退休咗，係咪你哋而家成個部門都仲係跟番佢呢條線係採取佢嗰個立場，係咪呢仲係？

H

I

I

J

答：唔係，正如我今朝咁講，given 有--今朝我哋都聽到有幾種嘅意見，我哋咪真係詳細啲研究下究竟呢個 10 呢個標準，你話頭係咪仲可以再提升定點樣樣，我覺得...

J

K

K

問：唔係提升，減呀。

L

L

答：Okay，即係去研究呢樣嘢。

M

M

問：Okay，好喇，呢個我唔問喇。即係而家呢個世衛呢個標準係唔係從健康嗰面嘅，你就唔同意嘅，我哋就話已經唔係，你就話覺得仲係嘅，係咪？

N

N

O

答：唔係，世衛好多嘅標準都係一個 health-based 嘅，我頭先講話...

O

P

問：唔係，鉛呀，我而家講鉛啫。

P

Q

答：鉛就正如頭先講，有意見認為係，有啲意見認為唔係，我諗要再想研究下。

Q

R

問：Okay，你自己有冇睇法嘅呢，喺呢個問題上？

R

S

答：我諗我唔係呢方面嘅專家。

S

T

問：即係冇喇？

T

U

答：我即係覺得要睇多啲資料，然後--或者我哋都要真係問下啲專家--其他專家嘅意見。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：本來我以為你哋有專家上嚟，後來又冇--嗰啲意見書又冇到，人唔切，冇人到。

C

D

D

答：Okay，係，係，係，其實仲--即係除咗喺度，我諗將來，甚至可以再去搵一啲國際專家，再問一問佢哋嘅意見嘅，呢個唔難嘅。

E

E

F

問：睇到去第9版。

F

G

答：Okay。

G

H

問：第9版上面嗰啲，你話現時重金屬嘅國際標準，咁就咁寫，鉛就10，香港，大家都知道我哋唔同意，我哋唔同意呢個係 health-based 嘅，你就話仲係 health-based，okay。跟住去到呢個呢個表底下有句細細個字嘅，每公升10微克份量大約等於40個標準泳池總水量嘅一滴水。睇咗落去，好多人就話「嘩，咁使乜驚啫？我食我」...

H

I

I

J

答：我唔係咁嘅意思，即係可能畀大家有個 idea 究竟一個 microgram 等如幾多啫，我諗而家你睇番啲標準，10個 microgram 以上係已經超咗標準，我覺得唔係話佢想講話其實冇事，...

J

K

K

L

問：唔係，因為我...

L

M

答：...只不過大家要明白呢個係講緊真係好微量嘅嘢。

M

N

問：我就驚，驚呢啲咁嘅嘢啲資料，啲市民睇咗落去，「嘩，我使乜理咩？」咁。

N

O

答：我諗唔係。

O

P

問：你話得咁，即是一滴嗶，四十個標準泳池嗶，我幾時至飲完嗰啲水，都就一滴咋。

P

Q

答：唔係，我諗嗰個濃度嘅意思啫。

Q

R

問：唔係，其實你需唔需要呢啲，我就問你？

R

S

答：我諗畀大家...

S

T

問：因為我驚你誤導咗市民話唔使驚。

T

U

答：Okay，唔係，即係其實最主要畀大家有個 idea 咩嘢叫 microgram

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

嗜，microgram...

問：對普通人 microgram 唔緊要㗎，佢知道食落去對身體有冇害嘅之嘛，最緊要係，係咪呀？飲咗落去。

答：唔。

問：Okay，好喇。第 10 版，預防措施，呢度好深㗎，呢啲字，好大個字㗎，係重要嘅。「2015 年 7 月初，有公共屋邨嘅食水樣本含鉛量被驗出超出世衛標準和有水喉駁位被發現有使用含鉛嘅焊接物料，政府對事件高度重視，由政務司司長領導嘅跨部門會議於 7 月 11 啟動，並作出重要後繼工作和相關措施的決定。發展局成立專責小組調查成因」，房委會又有，呢度一路咁落去，我唔讀晒佢喇。所以呢度停一停，所以政府係非常關注呢件事，係咪？

答：係，係。

問：由政務司司長親自嚟籌組一個跨部門嘅會議，係咪？

答：係。

問：包括三局、三署，係咪呀？

答：唔。

問：房屋、水、醫務署，即係三度嘅。

答：係，應該有呢啲部門參與。

問：我想問一問，你哋開會有冇會議紀錄？即係呢啲跨部門。

答：我印象中冇，我印象中冇。

問：冇嘅？

答：係。

問：你有份開㗎嘛？

答：因為我係嗰個 task group 嘅 chairman，即係呢個就係話水務署成 -- 發展局咪成立咗個專責小組，因為我係 chairman，所以我通常都要去報一報個進度，我個工作。

B

B

C

問：因為佢呢個跨部門嘅會議，照我睇，就係第一次會議就係 7 月 11 號嘅，啱唔啱？

C

D

答：呢度係咁講。

D

E

問：你呢個 Task Force 第一個會就係 7 月 17 號，即係六日後嘅已經，好快嘅。

E

F

答：係，係，係，啱。

F

G

問：所以你一開始 Task Force，你就所以就以後啲跨部門嘅會議你都有去喇喇？

G

H

答：唔可以咁講。

H

I

問：唔係咩？

I

J

答：應該係有陣時有去，有陣時冇去。

J

K

問：即係需要你匯報就去？

K

L

答：係，需要匯報就去。

L

M

問：唔需要就你頂頭上司去？

M

N

答：係，係，係。

N

O

問：Okay, all right。

O

P

主席：等一陣先。返番去 826，唔該。826 其實我有一個 concern，因為而家 Mr Lee 講起，就係左手邊第二段。

P

Q

答：826，左手邊第二段。

Q

R

主席：「根據世衛標準，每個項目嘅準則值係代表一個體重 60 公斤嘅人喺 70 年裏面每天飲用 2 公升呢個濃度嘅食水而唔會引致對健康產生明顯影響。」呢個我可以而家話畀你聽一定係錯嘅。

R

T

答：唔係，小心啲，因為佢呢度講緊啲個係個準則值，即係 guideline value。

T

U

V

V

B

B

C

主席：錯。

C

D

答：錯？因為我諗 Fawell 講緊個 lead 嗰個就係 PGV, provisional guideline value。

D

E

主席：你一定要返去睇清楚世衛個 guideline 講乜先得㗎。

E

F

答：Okay。

F

G

主席：係一定錯，呢個係--唔係每一個項目嘅準則都係用呢一個去計嘅。

G

H

H

I

問：鉛就唔係。

I

J

答：鉛已經係 PG --係，㗎，鉛，咁唔肯定。

J

K

K

主席：Chemical aspect 就係好多時候用呢個 TGI -- T...

L

L

答：PTWI？

M

M

主席：唔係。

N

N

答：又唔係。

O

O

主席：TDI, tolerable daily intake, tolerable daily intake TDI 就係一個 60 公斤嘅人每日飲兩升嘅水飲七十年，佢計出嚟嗰個就係一個正常嘅 guideline values 嚟嘅，喺好多好多 chemical aspects 裏面都係用咁樣樣去計嘅，但係去到某一啲嘅重金屬，某一啲嘅 chemicals, 就完全唔係咁樣樣去計嘅。

P

P

Q

Q

R

R

鉛，我話畀你知鉛點解唔係，我聽 Prof Fawell, 睇完佢啲 report, 睇埋世衛嘅文件，鉛首先就唔係用一個 60 公斤嘅人去計嘅，㗎唔㗎呀？

S

S

答：㗎。

T

T

主席：係用一個 BB, infants 去計嘅。

U

U

答：B 仔，係，係

V

V

B

B

C

主席：嗰度計出嚟唔係用 TDI 計嘅。

C

D

答：用 TD --係 weekly intake。

D

E

主席：係用 PDWI 去計嘅-- PTWI 去計係因為佢係 provisional -- provisional tolerable weekly intake，細路仔係永遠唔會去到七十歲嘅，所以一定係用當時佢個--所以佢係用 provisional tolerable weekly intake 去計嘅，啱唔啱呀？

E

F

F

G

答：Okay。

G

H

主席：而計咗出嚟嗰個數就係話 25 個 microgram per kg，呢個係 per week，跟住如果你將佢 divided by 7，於是就變咗 3.5 個 microgram per day，明唔明呀？

H

I

I

J

答：明。

J

K

主席：跟住就再用--於是佢哋又--呢個就去到 2011 年，就呢個最初嘅時候就係 10 個 microgram 就係一個 GV，就係一個 guideline values，跟住去到唔知 2004、2008 whatever，就於是就又--唔係 2004，2004 至 2008 嘅時候，...

K

L

L

M

答：應該去到二零...

M

N

主席：...睇番以前定嗰個都依然係話係 guideline value，不過就引--唔係，應該咁講，最初就係引用呢一個...

N

O

答：PTWI 去計。

O

P

主席：...所謂嘅 TDI 去計，後...

P

Q

答：初頭係 TDI。

Q

R

主席：最初係 TDI 去計，...

R

S

答：跟住就 PTWI。

S

T

主席：...後來就改做 BB 就...

T

U

答：PTWI。

U

V

主席：...PTWI 去計。

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：褻瀆就因為 revoke 咗。

主席：就有一個 threshold 出嚟，就定咗嗰個就係做 threshold，去到 2011 年就話連嗰個 threshold 都有，呢個 PTWI 已經 no longer 係一個我哋認為可以接受嘅 value，所以就連嗰個都有埋，所以就話 base on 因為 treatment performance 同埋 analytical achievability，純粹係基於呢兩個原因，所以我哋先至訂立呢一個 provisional guideline values，所以你呢一段呢度講，每個項目嘅準則係代表一個體重 60 公斤嘅人喺七十年呢度係--我可以話畀你聽一定係錯嘅。

答：即係唔一定 apply to 所謂 guideline value 嘅，有啲 guidance value 唔應該...

主席：有好多 parameters 係唔係用呢一個方法去計嘅。

答：...係 base on 呢樣嘢。

主席：嗰個世衛標準裏面話畀你哋聽有啲乜嘢情況之下，我哋係定佢係做 provisional value、guidance values，同埋我哋定佢係 provisional guidance values 係有幾個情況之下我哋定佢做 provisional guidance values 嘅，呢一個 treatment performance 係其中之一個，analytical achievability 係另外一個，另外仲有兩個嘅，如果我有記錯嘅話，有其他嘅原因係定佢做 provisional 嘅，所以呢度就咁睇落去，我可以話畀你聽--第二啲我唔敢講，不過呢一句，我就覺得係一定錯㗎喇。

問：希望你返去睇清楚，好唔好？

答：Okay，我同我啲化驗師，問一問佢哋。

主席：係呀，因為你--個問題係咁，因為你講咗呢個係大前提出嚟，跟住你就講其他國家又點樣樣，跟住你就講跟住隔離嗰度你就世衛、又歐盟、美國，跟住你就再講埋一滴水，四十個標準泳池，其實你呢個一路咁樣樣引申落嚟，我唔敢--即係第一段我就覺得係--我頭先講嗰個，我都差唔多幾肯定你一定係錯㗎喇，跟住落嚟嗰啲就其實某程度上就變咗一路都係好有程度上就有少少唔係好準確，我唔會話你

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

misleading, 不過唔準確。

答：Okay。

李柱銘先生：唔該。

問：咁樣我返番轉頭，而家第十版嗰度，就呢個跨部門會議，我想問一問你，我哋就知道--或者我畀啲文件你睇一睇，係 AC1 tab 16 page 334，呢個文件就係跨部門會議跟進啟晴邨食水水質事件嘅，返番轉頭嗰頁，你睇下佢個時間就係 2015 年 7 月 11 日星期六，okay，夜晚 8 點 14 分嘅，呢個就話「政務司司長林鄭月娥今日（七月十一日）上午就召開跨部門會議，討論房屋署啟晴邨食水含鉛事件的跟進工作，並作出重要後繼工作」同埋相關措施嘅決定。參與會議嘅包括運輸及房屋局、發展局、食物衛生局、房屋署、水務署同埋衛生署，三局三署就係咁解，係咪？

答：唔。

問：跟住就下午佢哋就出嚟開會--開記者會，跟住就運輸同埋房屋局局長張炳良教授喺記者會上表示政府高度重視今次事件，特別係承做嘅持牌水喉匠懷疑違規嘅問題，就以及如何儘快處理事件，控制風險呢度，係咪？

答：（沒有可聽到的回答）

問：呢度就 7 月 11 號就開始第一個跨部門嘅會議，跟住另外一個文件，就係 AC1 17，即係跟住個文件，page 336，跟住個文件就係啱喇。嗰個頭先就係 7 月 11 號嘅，呢個就去到 10 月 8 日，你睇到喇嘛？

答：睇到。

問：即係幾個月啱喇。咩嘢「以下係政務司司長林鄭月娥今日（十月八日）出席立法會內務委員會特別會議討論食水含鉛事件的開場發言」，佢就第一段唔讀，「多謝」。第二段，「由七月十日發現啟晴邨食水含鉛量超標，到現在已經 3 個月，由我主持的跨部門高層會議，至今舉行了 17 次會議，統籌部門合作，盡速推出跟進措施。正如我在上次會議所說，在處理今次事件上，我們一直本着三大原則，即『公開透

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

明』、『以人為本』和『全面徹查』。」跟住嗰啲唔需要讀。

即係佢頭三個月，由7月11號開始，三個月嘅就已經開咗十七次會，你知唔知到到而家開咗幾多次？

答：我唔知，我有--我唔知。

問：唔知，大概呢？頭頭就好密嘅，好明顯好密嘅，係咪後來就--係咪成立咗呢個調查委員會就有咁密？

答：我唔係好--即係冇乜特別記憶，因為我--正如我頭先講，我主席主要都係去報告番嗰個專家小組個工作個進展，我又唔係每一次都出席嘅，所以我唔能夠講得咁清楚。

問：Okay，我就知道其實嗰啲--係咪所有重要嘅議題都交上去傾嘍？即係對鉛水呢個問題。

答：因為其實我主要去都係講我個專責小組嗰啲工作進度，其他議題我有特別好留意。

問：不如我好簡單、好清晰咁問你。

答：好呀，好呀。

問：譬如關於抽水辦去驗，係抽嗰啲 first draw 嘢，即係隔夜水嘢，定係沖咗水喉兩分鐘，然後至攞去驗，呢啲問題有冇啲呢個高層次嘅跨部門會議度傾過嘅呢？

答：我出席嗰啲會，我有印象傾過呢啲嘢，我出席嗰啲會，不過...

問：你覺唔覺得呢樣係個重要性係令到應該提出嚟嘅呢？

答：我覺得呢個係一個幾專業--即係你問我嘅意見，一個幾專業嘅嘢嚟嘅，似乎陳健民先生就啲呢方面嘅知識係最豐富，佢...

問：佢係一個好堅持嘅人嚟嘅，即係可以好硬頸嘅人，講得唔好聽就，你覺唔覺？

答：我諗佢有佢嘅專業原則，因為佢係一個--你都知道佢係一個 chemist 嚟嘅，係一個科學家嚟嘅，佢對佢自己嗰個認識，佢個 knowledge，佢亦都有佢自己嘅睇法，咁樣樣。

B

B

C

問：係咪即係你哋都跟住佢嘅睇法呢？

C

D

答：如果以我哋個團隊嚟講，佢係喺呢方面應該係有佢嘅專業嘅知識，同埋如果你有留意，佢都有講佢負責喺水務署，甚至話同呢個 water sampling 嘅工作都有三十幾年嘅經驗，佢應該係一個--即係團隊裏面一個對呢方面，我咁講，都係可能最有認識嘅人。

D

E

E

F

問：即係你...

F

G

G

H

主席：或者調番轉頭問一問先，嗰陣時有冇問過政府化驗所擺一啲佢哋嘅專業嘅意見？

H

I

答：我唔知，我答唔到呢個問題。

I

J

主席：得，好。

J

K

K

L

問：所以又係返番嚟呢度，你唔知，邊個知？又係陳健民嘅咋喎，佢又已經 retire 咗，呢位咩嘢咩嘢定先生...

L

M

答：郭有定，郭有定。

M

N

問：佢知唔知呢？

N

O

答：你講佢知唔知啲乜嘢？

O

P

問：就呢啲嘢，而家問緊呢啲嘢。

P

Q

答：如果你而家再去問佢...

Q

R

問：即係抽水辦係應該...

R

S

答：...關於抽水辦點樣擺法，我相信佢都有認識嘅，佢有認識嘅。

S

T

問：唔係，我希望你返去直頭問清楚，因為而家我哋一路咁樣研訊一路咁樣聽落去，一路叫你哋啲人嚟㗎嘛...

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

主席：唔係，陳健民承認咗係佢 make 嘅個 decision，係呀，佢...

C

D

李柱銘先生：唔係，我想知道佢而家離開咗之後，咁又點呢？定係佢仲有個影響力喺度，定係點呢？

D

E

主席：哦，呢啲我又覺得唔需要追問落去嘅。

E

F

李柱銘先生：Okay，好。

F

G

主席：實有人繼承佢個位㗎喇。

G

H

H

I

問：我想問你第一次開會，你哋嗰個 Task Force 嗰度，係 C19.6，C19.6 tab 132 page 13896，就你哋嘅第一次 Task Force 嘅會嚟，應該係。一開頭嗰度，個日子就係舊年，7月15日，係咪？7月17號。

I

J

J

答：17，係。

K

K

問：6點，“Present”嗰度，你就應該 CL --呢個 CL Wong 就係你喇？

L

L

答：係，係我，呢個。

M

M

問：另外 CL Wong 係邊個嚟？

N

N

答：我哋啲幫辦嚟嘅。

O

O

問：幫辦。呢個就係 Deputy Director of Water Supplies 係你喇？

P

P

答：唔。

Q

Q

問：陳健民喺底下嘅，睇到嘅，係咪？

R

R

答：唔，唔。

S

S

問：我哋不如睇一睇跟住嗰頁，揭一揭，去到最底下嗰度，“4.0 Item 3 - Proposed physical sampling work”，4.2 嗰度，“The meeting analysed the testing results of the water samples previously collected at Kai Ching and Kwai Luen Estates. It is noted that the water samples collected at sump tanks and rook tanks do not contain lead. As such, it is reasonable to conclude that plumbing system

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

D

D

upstream of the roof tanks is not contaminated by lead.”。呢度嘅意思即係話你哋啲水入到去個公屋裏面，上到上面天台嗰個...

E

E

答：天台缸。

F

F

問：...--天台嗰個缸都有事嘅？

G

G

答：係。

H

H

I

I

問：Okay，然後，“4.3 Water samples and pipes and fittings along the whole water supply chain (including joints and water taps) are to be taken from the following locations for testing of lead content”，(a)、(b)、(c)，就喺邊度擺喇，okay。

J

J

K

K

L

L

M

M

N

N

“4.4 Members expressed that the procedures to collect water samples would affect the testing results of lead content. Flushing tests (sampling with different flushing time) and Stagnation tests (sampling with different stagnation time) are to be conducted at different time intervals so as to address the controversy over the procedures of taking water samples.”

O

O

呢度就好清楚，已經你哋係知道有唔同嘅睇法嘅，有爭拗嘅，controversy，有爭拗嘅。

P

P

答：因為，呢度都有講咗話你用唔同嘅方法可能得出嚟有唔同嘅結果。

Q

Q

問：係喇，所以亦可以調番轉頭講，即係話如果你想有咩嘢嘅結果，你可以用咩嘢方法嚟喎，如果你想有呢一個結果，你就用某一個方法就令到有呢個結果都得嚟喎？

R

R

答：唔可以咁講，唔可以咁講。

S

S

問：唔得咩？

T

T

U

U

答：其實你應該係話，即係明白到係唔同嘅抽水方法有唔同嘅結果，that's why 你要選擇一個合你嘅個採樣嘅方法。

V

V

B

B

C

問：好喇，我相信你而家明嚟喇，呢樣嘢，拗撬點喺邊度，你知嚟喇？

C

D

答：明，明。

D

E

問：如果你想知道嗰啲水有冇含鉛、有冇超標，你係用 flushing 嗰啲 sample 㗎，定係 stagnation 嘅 sample？

E

F

答：如果你 compare with 嗰個世衛標準，咪用個 flush sample，我諗陳健民先生...

F

G

G

H

問：我唔係講 compare with 世衛標準，我話如果你想 test --我而家呢個水喉，我想開出嚟，睇下啲水裏面係咪含鉛超標，含鉛超標，你係咪要 flush 佢呢？Flush 佢就梗係啲鉛冇晒喇。

H

I

答：唔可以咁講。

I

J

問：點解唔可以咁講？

J

K

答：Flush 㗎，亦都有好多 sample 係 fail 㗎，其實而家係好多 flushed sample 都係超標。

K

L

L

M

問：你嘅意思即係如果我而家想 test 我個水龍頭，我而家廚房裏面，我開嚟預備飲嘅，咁開呢啲水，我想驗有幾多鉛，你話要 flush 嘅，一定要 flush 嘅，係咪呀？

M

N

答：唔係，我諗陳健民先生解釋過我哋...

N

O

問：你唔好講佢，我講你啫，如果你同意佢講咁就得喇，佢講嗰啲就係你講嚟喇？

O

P

答：我基本上都同意佢個睇法嘅。

P

Q

Q

R

主席：乜嘢話？

R

S

答：我都同意佢嘅睇法嘅，如果睇番嗰個水質 against -- compare with 世衛標準。

S

T

T

U

問：黃生，到而家你都同意？你成日聽埋你個頂爺 Prof Fawell 咁樣講

U

V

V

B

B

C

咗咁多，講完又講呢樣嘢，你仲同意陳健民？

C

D

答：我諗佢都好詳細解釋番佢個...

D

E

問：Prof Fawell 都好詳細解釋。

E

F

答：係，各有--其實 Fawell 都有講番佢話--我諗--係喇。

F

G

主席：我覺得咁問就有意思嘅，係咪？

G

H

李柱銘先生：唔係，即係而家...

H

I

I

J

問：好喇，你仍舊覺得陳健民啱，係咪呀？

J

K

答：佢有好詳細解釋番，佢有佢道理喎度。

K

L

問：唔係，你覺得佢啱唔啱先？你覺得佢梗係--兩個都好詳細解釋，咁點啫？

L

M

答：即係佢個 sampling，係 for 個 purpose 係合理嘅，我覺得。

M

N

問：Okay。

N

O

O

P

主席：乜嘢話？

P

Q

答：即係 for 個 purpose，即係話佢陳健民當日話佢攞個水辦係希望 compare against 世衛標準，that's why 佢攞個 flushed sample，我覺得佢呢個咁嘅說法，我覺得合理。

Q

R

R

S

S

T

問：但係我個問題唔係佢個，我問題話而家我想試下呢個水喉開出嚟啲水，我而家攞去飲或者攞嚟煮飯用，究竟含鉛有冇超標，對我或者啲 BB 有冇危險，咁都要 flush？陳健民話要 flush，你係咪同意吖？

T

U

答：我認為佢咁講都有個理據喎度。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：你同唔同意先？

C

D

答：我都傾向同意佢嘅睇法嘅。

D

E

問：Okay，你呢個睇法代唔代表政府嘅睇法？

E

F

F

G

主席：佢係政府咩嘛，佢就係政府嘅。

G

H

李柱銘先生：係喇，佢仲有高過佢㗎嘛。

H

I

主席：唔係，署長--我唔記得咗署長個答案係咩嘢，佢係副署長，佢係政府㗎喇。

I

J

問：咁代表政府㗎喇嘅，我而家當你，係咪呀？

J

K

答：如果係咁講，都係喇。

K

L

L

M

主席：你梗係要--有陣時冇得避㗎喇，係呀，坐得呢啲位就要--坐咁嘅位就要接咁嘅招㗎喇，係呀。

M

N

N

O

問：Okay，但係呢啲咁嘅問題，就係喇，有冇擺出嚟傾過？首先 Task Force 佢哋有冇擺出嚟傾過？

O

P

P

Q

答：Task Force 有--正如呢度有講，大家都明白有唔同嘅 sampling protocol，對你個當然--對你個 result 可能會有影響，但係我哋-- that's why 我哋就想睇下其實--當時嘅 Task Force 就唔係話想 derive 個 sampling protocol 出嚟嘅，反而就想睇一睇個 stagnation 同埋一個 flushing 對個 lead content in water 嘅影響係幾多嘅，譬如我 stagnant 喺一個 system 裏面一段時間，其實個 lead content 會點上升法呢，當 flush 咗之後，又有咩嘢影響，嗰時大家反而係 more interest 想做到一套咁嘅嘢出嚟嘅。

Q

R

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：呢一樣咁嘅問題有冇擺到去--你話唔記得，定唔知，係咪呀？跨部門會議，有冇，呢啲咁嘅問題有冇喺嗰度討論過？

答：我有印象有。

問：你有印象，你可能錯過，可能有嘅，係咪？因為你未曾去晒咩。

答：其他啲我真係 comment 唔到。

問：但係如果--譬如你有冇林鄭政務司司長有冇問你？

答：冇，冇問我。

問：張炳良局長有冇問你呀？

答：冇問我。

問：有人問呢啲嘢嘅？

答：有人問我，係，冇問過呢啲。

問：Okay，好喇，你睇完 Prof Fawell 同埋 Prof Lee 啲專家報告，佢第一個報告好早期已經出嘅，嗰個 preliminary 嗰個，你知道嘛，跟住而家又出晒報告，畀埋證供添，呢啲嘢有冇去到呢個跨部門嗰度反映番出去呢？

答：我有再--即係 Prof Fawell 同埋 Prof Lee 出咗 report 之後，我有 attend 過一個咁嘅會，應該。

問：有冇書面交上去報告番？

答：冇，我哋冇做過呢樣嘢。

問：你唔覺得呢樣嘢好重要嘅咩？

答：重要，可能佢哋都有機會睇到，即係各個局都有機會睇到嗰個報告。

問：哦，即係可能有機會睇到，咁你就算喇，你覺得冇責任係報告上去？

答：因為呢個報告係大家都可以睇到㗎嘛。

問：即係又有傾過，照你所記得？

B

B

C

答：我哋 within 我哋部門當然有傾，我哋睇咗報告，我哋自己有傾，我有同其他部門有傾過喇應該，我應該有同佢哋傾過。

C

D

D

問：Task Force 裏面有冇傾呀？

E

E

答：Task Force 已經完咗喇，因為個工作，...

F

F

問：完咗，okay。

G

G

答：...所以冇再...

H

H

問：你哋部門係邊啲人？

I

I

答：你講-- sorry，邊啲人傾過？

J

J

問：你哋部門有得傾咩？

K

K

答：咁好多人都有份傾，即係啲化驗師...

L

L

問：署長呢？

M

M

答：署長有，我哋呀，咁大家都有傾嘅。

N

N

問：幾多人嘍？

O

O

答：好難咁數，因為好睇個個 item，因為佢哋...

P

P

問：呢個 item，呢個 item。

Q

Q

答：唔係，因為喺兩個專家報告裏面其實都有好多唔同方面嘅，有啲--譬如好似講 CPD 啲啲，我哋又可能搵一啲相關嘅同事會傾傾佢哋有冇 knowledge on 呢啲咁樣樣，所以我諗大家會有就呢啲報告，都會有討論嘅。

R

R

問：有冇唔同意見嘅，定係全部都同意陳健民個睇法？

S

S

答：我覺得大家 in general 都同意陳健民嘅睇法嘍，應該。

T

T

問：即係大家都唔接受 Prof Fawell 嘅講法？

U

U

答：其實 Prof Fawell，我記得，如果我有記錯，佢亦都講咗有一個 universal method 係可以真係 test 得到一個平均啲個飲水個水

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

質，Fawell，我記得佢有一句好--佢話 first flush 唔代表性，不過你 flushed 都唔代表性咁樣，就有一個 universal method 去做呢樣嘢，佢有咁嘅睇法。

問：你記唔記得佢嗰個 preliminary report 點樣講？好清楚啫，一定要 first draw 啫。

答：但係佢到佢最近入嗰個 report，佢真係 make 咗個咁嘅 statement，佢有咁嘅睇法。

問：佢上嚟呢度畀口供，有冇聽過？你有冇聽到？

答：我睇佢個 report 裏面有咁寫。

問：唔係，上嚟畀口供嘅時候，你有冇跟住？

答：我有跟晒佢成個嗰個畀口供嘅時間，所以我唔可以...

問：我覺得你哋就喺嗰度抽一句出嚟，咁就當係支持你哋個睇法。

答：我唔覺得係咁，你睇番佢個報告，我諗 Fawell 都有講番...

問：你唔係淨係睇嗰一句嘅，你睇佢成個報告，睇埋個 preliminary report，睇埋佢上...

石先生：主席，我諗又有少少好似同 Ms Ada Fung 嘅歷史重演咁樣，我諗個 departmental stance，好坦白咁樣講一句，都相對地清楚，同埋平心而論，可能水務署佢哋會話「我哋而家其實兩位專家報告講乜，佢哋喺盤問嘅時候講乜，委員會自然到最終佢會有自己嘅裁決，王大律師嘅團隊自然」--唔喺度，王大律師，水務署嘅團隊可能佢哋都要返去抽絲剝繭地作出一個 official 嘅陳詞，我亦都可以理解，一位證人喺證人台嗰度，可能佢話「我要 stick my neck out in the witness box，代表晒全署，我哋都要開下會，睇下我哋嘅取態係點嘢。」呢個我哋其實係可以理解嘅。

所以其實如果李大狀係打算話專家咁勁，水務署係不合理地拒絕去硬頸，佢唔肯接受，佢大可以陳詞嘅時候講，但係我相信再問多十次，個 departmental stance 喺證人台度都係差唔多嘅咋。

B

B

C

主席：我都相信係，唔會。

C

D

D

E

問：好喇，我問你十次，你都係咁嘅答案㗎喇，係咪呀？

E

F

答：我諗都清楚講咗喇。

F

G

問：Okay，我本來想話問你第十一次嘅。

G

H

答：Okay。

H

I

問：Okay，你睇 13967，又係 C19.6，C19.6。

I

J

答：Okay，13967，係咪呀？

J

K

問：係，即係頭先都 third meeting 嘅。13967。

K

L

答：Okay。

L

M

問：或者我睇番 13963，呢度特別有個 paper 嘅，就係 TF Paper No. 3/02，“Task Force to Investigation Cause of Excessive Lead Content in Drinking Water”，呢度就係 review of interim finding，個 objective 1，“To study the leaching rate of lead in the Kai Ching Estate by carrying out a Stagnation Test and a Flushing Test.”，兩度都做嘅，係咪？

M

N

答：係。

N

O

O

P

問：“Methodology”，第 2 段，“A vacant flat is selected in the Kai Ching Estate for the investigation.”，然後就係“A Stagnation Test is conducted by firstly flushing thoroughly the water supply system from a tap in the flat for at least 2 plumbing system volumes or 15 hours. Samples will be taken from the kitchen tap at hour 0 and then at 4, 8, 12, 24, 48 hours”，250...

P

Q

答：each mL 呀應該，mL，millilitre。

Q

R

問：即係四分一個 litre？

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係，係。

C

D

問：Okay, "for lead analysis. Care should be taken not to disturb the water column during the whole Stagnation Test period."，跟住，"A Flushing Test will immediately be carried out after the Stagnation Test such that the water being tested has already been stagnant for 48 hours. Samples (250 mL each) will be taken at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 and 30 minutes after flushing for lead testing."

D

E

E

F

F

G

G

H

跟住就做咗個 result，我就想你搵到去 13967，呢個上面個櫃就係 Stagnation Test，okay，底下個個就係 Flushing Test，Flushing Test 都因為其實就停咗一陣嘅，然後至開始 flush 嘍嘛，當佢係 0 minute，即係 after stagnation，即刻開，...

H

I

I

J

答：係，四十八個鐘，開。

J

K

K

L

問：...你可以話 first draw 咁上下個 effect，即係 first draw 一樣，係咪？

L

M

答：係喇。

M

N

問：個 result，你睇番個 result，去到右邊第層二個 column，就 34.2 個 micrograms per litre...

N

O

答：七，七。

O

P

問：點七嘅 micrograms per litre，係咪？

P

Q

答：係。

Q

R

問：好高嘍嗎。

R

S

答：Okay，係。

S

T

問：即係如果係呢個 stagnation 嘅--即係 stagnation 嘍喇，first draw 嘅 result，一個 minute 跌到去 6，6 就係你哋個部門就覺得合格，係咪？

T

U

答：呢個啱標準。

U

V

V

B

B

C

C

問：兩分鐘再跌到 3.1，三分鐘-- sorry，三分鐘就 2.6，即係都係減，不過唔係減咗幾多嘅啫，四分鐘 2.5，五分鐘就 2.3，十分鐘就 2.0，三十分鐘 1.6，即係最 drop 得緊要就係頭一個分鐘。

D

D

E

E

答：喺，係。

F

F

問：其實一分鐘已經達標，係咪呀？

G

G

答：唔，唔。

H

H

問：零至一分鐘已經達標，即係六十秒已經達樣，係咪？

I

I

問：你睇番，揭番轉頭，13965。

J

J

答：139 --係。

K

K

問：你有個圖表喺度，個段數就係 3.2 段，“Flushing Test The water had been stagnant for 48 hours before the FT”，Flushing Test，“Individual test results for FT are shown in Annex A”，睇到跌得好快嘅，就 35 個度咁樣一跌跌到落嚟，係咪？

L

L

M

M

N

N

答：唔。

O

O

問：跌到落嚟 5 多少少，跟住 6，咁就已經係一分鐘，跟住第二分鐘、第三分鐘、第四分鐘、第五分鐘，係咪？睇到㗎？

P

P

答：係。

Q

Q

問：所以跟住你個 diagram 底下就話，“3.2.1 1 minute flushing was sufficient to bring down the lead content of 34.7 µg/L to comply with the WHO GV of 10 µg/L for lead.”，一分鐘就搞掂，由 34.7 跌到落去 6。所以好清楚你哋會睇到你哋嗰個 Task Force committee 啲 members 都睇到，如果將隔咗夜嘅水或者隔咗好耐嘅水，你沖一分鐘，就嗰啲鉛差唔多沖走晒㗎喇，差唔多。

R

R

S

S

T

T

答：有效地 reduce，我哋咁講。

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：唔係，非常有效地 reduce，係咪？

答：係。

問：你睇番 34.7 變咗 6，係咪？

答：唔。

問：由非常超標到到合乎標準，你哋嘅睇法就合乎標準，係咪？

答：係。

問：如果係一沖沖咗去，咁你啡一分鐘，擺去驗就一定唔超標㗎囉喎，咁高佢都唔超標㗎囉喎，係咪？

答：又可以咁講，因為事實上即係喺嗰個幫房署做嗰個 sampling 裏面，即係個 water test programme 裏面，你唔可以話一定 flush 咗就一定唔超標，亦都有超標嘅情況，我諗即係--其實我估係 complicate 嘅呢個，我諗就算 Prof Lee 都 recognise 到呢個問題嘅，佢話--即係都唔係話咁 straight forward，有陣時點解個 second draw 又高啲咁啲。

問：所以喺當你今次開會嘅時候，即係第三次會，即係 8 月 3 號，8 月 3 號，如果你睇番 13952，你睇到個日子，第三個會，8 月 3 號已經清楚地知道如果你擺係水辦嘅時候，沖完之後，個結果會係點，好清楚㗎喇，啱唔啱呀？

答：其實應該睇到兩樣嘢，第一，如果你擺一個 stagnant 咗好耐嘅水辦，佢一定高得好緊要，因為如果佢喺個 system 裏面耐，第二...

問：唔係，可能啫，可能高到好緊要啫，未必一定，有啲冇嘅。

答：第二，就係佢 flush 咗之後係會將佢 bring down 嘅，睇到兩個 observation。

問：Flush 咗之後就一定將佢 bring down，一定㗎喇。

答：我諗 in general 都會，除非有啲 second draw 啲啲又出現啲古靈--其實有啲時候，唔係一定係咁嘅。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

主席：唔係嘅，其實唔係嘅，你一定要小心睇 Prof Fawell 嗰個報告，佢嗰個所謂 second draw 係 T 20，T 加 20 second 之嘛，T 加...

答：即係你講 Prof Lee 嗰個？

主席：Prof Lee 嗰個，T 加 20，...

答：T 加 20。

主席：...甚至係最多去到 T 加 40，即係講緊--其實嚟嚟去去，講嚟講去都係講半分鐘之內，係咪？

答：半分鐘，係，係。

主席：所以如果你一沖沖兩分鐘，就絕對唔會有--一定係差唔多已經沖晒咁滯㗎喇。

問：同唔同意呀？

主席：就算你 Prof Lee 嗰啲，佢啲話可能會有一個遲嚟嘅...

答：係，delay 嘅。

主席：...問題，但係遲嚟嘅問題都係去到 T 20 嘅啫，T 加 20 second 之嘛，係咪？

答：T 20、T 40，好似都見到，係，okay。

主席：所以最 odd 嗰啲--老老實實，最 odd 嗰啲都係 T 加 60 之嘛，一分鐘之嘛，如果你話「我一開水沖」--因為你哋嗰陣時個指引係兩至五分鐘，我當你最 minimum 嗰個兩分鐘，其實都差唔多已經沖走晒所有嘢。

答：但係其實又真係有 result 係...

主席：啱，個問題即係話畀你聽乜嘢嘢呢？個問題就係話如果你沖咗兩分鐘之後，你都仲搵到咁多鉛喺你嘅水裏面嘅話，你嗰個 first 係超得好緊要，你明唔明呀？

B

B

C

答：即係所以--唔係...

C

D

主席：你明我意思嘛？

D

E

答：我明，我明你意思，我明你意思，我明你意思。

E

F

主席：係呀，係超得好緊要，...

F

G

答：我明你意思。

G

H

主席：...先至會去到嗰一度。

H

I

問：同意咁嘛？

I

J

答：呢個係我哋個 stagnation and flushing test 得到出嚟嗰個結果嚟。

J

K

K

L

主席：即係就一定唔會係頭啖水冇事，頭啖水係一定冇事。

L

M

M

N

問：同唔同意呀？

N

O

答：可以咁嘅 observation。

O

P

問：當然，有啲屋嘅，譬如佢真係完全冇問題嘅，根本嗰啲都唔係用嗰啲咁嘅焊料嘅，係咪？甚至冇用焊料嘅，李教授做啲 0.000 都有，都有好多嘅，呢啲係完全冇事嘅，你 flush 唔 flush 都有事嘅，但係如果有事嘅，就算好大件事嘅，你沖一分至兩分鐘，差唔多乜都有晒㗎喇，如果仲有超標嘅，就好大件事㗎喇，同唔同意？你睇到啲 result 㗎？

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

答：有咁嘅 observation，你睇個 stagnation、flushing test 嗰個結果就係咁樣樣。

S

T

問：係喇，係喇，我而家問你邏輯啫，係咪呀？

T

U

答：係。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：如果沖完兩分鐘都超標，就真係好大件事，同意咩嘛？

C

D

答：我都係話 base on 個 stagnation、flushing test，係 observe 到呢啲嘢。

D

E

問：就算沖咗兩分鐘，沖咗兩分鐘仍然有 6，仍然有 6 都唔係咁簡單嘅，係咪？

E

F

F

G

答：所以--不過我諗我唔想再咁...

G

H

主席：不過呢度我哋唔需要重複。

H

I

答：係喇，因為陳健民先生都講過...

I

J

J

K

主席：因為你問黃先生都唔會有啲咩嘢唔同嘅答案喇喇。

K

L

李柱銘先生：Okay，okay。

L

M

M

N

問：但係你又明㗎嗰，你明白㗎，喺你哋個立場，即係你咩嘢屋邨就叫做 affected 受影響，一啲就 unaffected 不受影響，其實個分歧就可能一個水辦就嘅咋嗰。

N

O

O

答：一個水辦有事。

P

P

問：如果有一個水辦超標，已經係受影響㗎喇嗰，係咪呀？

Q

Q

答：係，係，啱。

R

R

問：即係成個樓宇可能十幾個水辦，一個你已經可以話畀個 benefit of the doubt 佢。

S

S

答：係，就成條邨添嗰，唔係一棟樓，成條邨。

T

T

問：係喇，成條，隱隱陣陣，就係咁樣。所以如果你 flush 咗之後，然後發現佢合乎標準，咁就 unaffected，係咪呀？

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：係，啱，因為--我又再重複番啲討論，陳健民先生講過，我哋攞水辦係想反映番佢日常飲用水個水質係咪同世衛標準比較。

問：因為就係陳健民先生，我哋已經有充分時間去盤問佢㗎喇。

答：係，okay。

問：你有聽到我哋點樣盤問佢，係咪？

答：有聽過，有聽過。

問：我睇番而家呢個第十版。

答：Okay。

問：都係喺番呢個第十版，A1 22，tab 22。

答：Sorry，唔好意思。

問：A1 tab 22。

答：Okay，係。

問：你講完第十版，上面就講咗有個跨部門會議，而跟住就食水處理，呢度就話「如整晚沒有用水，翌日早上從各個水龍頭取水飲用或煮食前，應先行放水 1 至 2 分鐘，為節」，呢度，好明顯呢個 8 月出嘅，其實可能你已經知道頭先驗個水辦嘅結果㗎喇？

答：其實兩方面，我唔係好記得係咪因為知道，因為實在呢一啲咁嘅 advice 喺外國都有嘅，即係美國、英國都有啲咁嘅 advice。

問：所以你哋覺得如果沖一分至兩分鐘就好隱陣，就算攞嚟飲都得嘅？

答：即係有一個--外國都有咁樣嘅建議，做個 flushing advice，其實係可以幫助你避免嗰個食水裏面有過高嘅含鉛量，係一個有效嘅方法。

問：頭先我畀個例子你睇，即係你哋自己啲紀錄，一分鐘已經好勁喇減得。

答：係，係。

問：已經夠㗎喇，但係你仲穩陣啲，兩分鐘添，「1 至 2 分鐘」。

B

B

C

C

答：呢個我諗同個流量都有啲關係嘅，即係唔係話一句講晒，一定係三十秒、一分鐘定...

D

D

問：即係穩陣啲，兩分鐘。

E

E

答：Okay，係，係，係。

F

F

問：1 都 okay 㗎喇，你話「1 至」吓嘛，「1 至 2 分鐘」。

G

G

答：係，係，係。

H

H

問：好喇，但係就節約用水，就應利用啲啲容器就將放出嚟嘅水儲存，就作非飲用嘅用途，Prof Fawell 都話，佢話最緊要要清晰，對啲居民嚟講，你等佢清晰嘅，一致嘅訊息畀佢，就唔好搵亂，因為一方面你就叫佢啡啲啲水佢，安全啲，但係你又想佢慳水，又叫佢擺個盆嚟載番，好煩㗎嘛，你知喇。

I

I

J

J

答：其實呢個應該係--如果你擺嚟飲用或者煮食，如果你洗面就唔使放一至兩分鐘嘅。

K

K

L

L

問：唔係，廚房啲啲就唔係擺嚟洗面㗎嘛。

M

M

答：Okay，洗嘢囉，洗嘢都唔怕嘅其實。

N

N

問：洗嘢，但係有時你知道有啲人一開-- Prof Fawell，佢話佢自己都係咁嘅人，一朝頭早跔起身，就走入去，就一開個水喉就擺嚟煲水嘅，跟住就飲㗎喇，成日都係飲啲啲水㗎喇，係有呢啲咁嘅人㗎嘛，Prof Fawell 自己都係一個咁嘅人，你明吓嘛？所以你話「你『啡』咗就有問題㗎喇。」跟住佢都話佢都知道，係，可以儲起佢，佢話儲--其實啡一分鐘、兩分鐘好耐㗎，我而家每朝早都啡一陣，但係我有睇住個錶，我知道我忍唔到一分鐘㗎。所以係咁開水喉、開水喉，係咁睇晒啲水一分鐘，如果嗰度儲水又冇用嘅，嗰度又唔喺度洗嘢嘅，你明唔明呀？個個人唔同㗎嘛，即係我淨係想洗面，想剃鬚，想嘅口，咁你儲埋啲水冇用㗎。

O

O

P

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

S

答：如果你洗面、剃鬚就唔使啡佢兩分鐘嘅，一...

T

T

問：唔係㗎，我嘅口我都穩陣啲㗎。

U

U

答：我諗唔使驚到咁。

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：我驚佢原來三十幾，咁點搞？

答：唔。

問：Okay，所以好多人，而家變咗有啲個訊息又要慳水，又要啡水，畀人嘅感覺，你明嘛？

答：其實我諗呢個 message 盡量想你其實係可以儲起啲水去擺嚟做其他嘅用途嘅。

問：可以，係呀，但係真係好煩㗎嘛，okay，得喇，你又想慳水，all right。呢度又幾得意嘅，第十二版，第十二版就講「檢驗食水供應系統」，佢話市民可委託認可嘅化驗所抽取嘅水樣本同埋化驗有關認可化驗所嘅資料就畀咗出嚟嘅。跟住第 9 就話「如經驗測後發現食水含鉛量不符合世衛標準，市民應即時參照」世衛防護中心嘅健康作出行動，詳情參閱網頁。

跟住 10，「市民亦應與屋邨」或者「大廈管理處、業主或業主委員會商討，聘請相關專業人士，包括持牌水喉匠、屋宇裝備工程師或建築測量師等，檢查內部供水系統，查出含鉛量超標」，即係差唔多叫啲市民“do it yourself”嘅，係咪？「你自己搞掂佢」都得嘅？

答：如果佢哋對自己嘅供水系統有呢個擔心或者懷疑，就可以自己做個檢查。

問：跟住 11 就仲更加喇，如果你要些微嘅修改，就唔使，就可以冇--跟住第十三版第二行，所有與食水接觸的物品，就包括水管咩嘢呢，亦須合乎相關嘅英國標準規格，話畀市民聽，市民真係一頭霧水，係咪呀？

答：唔。

問：「有關持牌水喉匠」又點樣，又畀啲資料佢，你又唔係唔畀，你畀資料佢，不過普通嘅市民嚟講，真係一頭霧水㗎喎。

答：你意思係一頭...

問：唔知做乜嘢好。

答：如果有需要，咪搵個 licensed plumber 幫佢去做一啲檢查啲啲咁

B

B

C

嘅嘢。

C

D

問：係囉，但係-- okay，所以我而家仍然講番一點，就係如果你有個水安全嘅計劃喺度，就好囉，等佢哋知道發生咩嘢事，知道大家點樣做，同唔同意？如果有一個咁嘅計劃。

D

E

E

F

答：我唔係好 sure 水安全計劃係咪咁嘅用途，我唔係好肯定，因為我都唔係做水安全計劃嘅專家。

F

G

問：Okay，好。我有一度好--我問你好短嘅，問幾個題目，因為好多人問過你㗎喇，我好簡單問，我呢度希望唔使問你條文添。

G

H

H

答：好。

I

I

問：就係嗰個 form WWO46 嘅 form，同埋 WWO132 嗰啲，我簡單問，我希望唔需要...

J

J

答：好，好，得，好。

K

K

問：我理解你嘅講法，就即係話你哋負責嘅嘢就係定一個標準，定落一個標準，你係 regulator 嚟嘅，呢個係你嘅 role 嚟嘅，你定立一個 standard，咁就 British Standard，跟住就搵 AP、LP 嗰啲佢哋搞掂，你意思其實就係咁，簡單啲講？

L

L

M

M

答：即係希望佢哋睇住嗰個 construction，用料等等係符合個標準咁去做嘢。

N

N

O

問：係喇，係喇，所以你就覺得既然已經呢幾個 form 係寫得咁清楚，係咪呀？你有理由唔相信佢哋會唔跟住做㗎？

P

P

答：2015年7月之前，我哋真係--佢哋冇理由唔跟嘅，不過而家我哋知有咁嘅風險，於是乎我哋有啲 control measure。

Q

Q

R

問：係喇，係喇，okay，okay，係喇，係喇。但係我想問你，你哋其實都係要有啲監管嘅責任㗎嘞，會唔會呀？譬如我頭先畀嗰個--你哋嗰個 website 嗰度，係咪？

R

S

S

答：係。

T

T

問：你要執行㗎嘛？

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：唔。

C

D

問：即係嗰個條例喺度，你哋要執行㗎嘛？

D

E

答：唔。

E

F

問：唔係淨係 administration㗎嘛？

F

G

答：喎。

G

H

問：中文本、英文本，你記得，係咪呀？

H

I

答：係，係，係。

I

J

問：2015年7月之前，有冇任何 AP 或者 LP 係因為鉛水含--啲水由含鉛過分而被罰？

J

K

主席：之前定咩嘢話？

K

L

李柱銘先生：之前。

L

M

M

N

答：之前應該冇。

N

O

問：冇咩？

O

P

答：應該冇，係。

P

Q

問：2015年7月之前。

Q

R

答：之前冇，冇。

R

S

問：完全冇罰過 AP 或者 LP，因為鉛水問題？

S

T

答：因為鉛水或者食水含鉛，冇，冇，冇。

T

U

問：因為你都唔知。

U

V

答：係，因為--冇錯。

V

B

B

C

問：所以你知唔知道，譬如喺--你話知唔知得嚟喇，你知唔知喺法律上可唔可以罰佢哋？如果佢哋...

C

D

D

答：如果佢違反咗條例，咪可以罰囉。

E

E

問：你覺得係可以罰嘅？

F

F

答：可以。

G

G

問：點樣罰法？你嘅理解。

H

H

答：如果佢 contravene 個水務條例，第一，個 LP 自己，我哋對佢可以進行紀律處分。

I

I

問：紀律處分？

J

J

答：係，係，另外我嘅理解，喺條例裏面，佢用咗一啲違反水務條例，應該可以都告佢嘅，不過呢個詳細我真係唔係好熟讀嗰個法例。

K

K

問：唔緊要，唔緊要，你覺得係刑事--可以用刑事嚟告佢？你覺得？

L

L

答：去到咁，我唔係好識答你。

M

M

問：Okay, okay。所以就未曾試過嘅，個問題就係咁，當你係將呢個責任可謂，交界 AP 同 LP，就淨係用兩個 form 呢個方法，用兩個 form 嘅咋，46 同 132。

N

N

O

O

答：係，係，佢要 certification，我哋要求佢喺上面 certify 啲嘢。

P

P

問：當佢知道咁多年你個部門都有採取任何嘅行動，咁多年都有採取任何行動，佢哋又覺得有問題嚟囉嗎。

Q

Q

答：照計--我或者唔係好同一諗法，我都係成日咁講，authorised person 其實係一啲專業人士嚟嘅，我諗我哋作為專業人士，有理由話從來冇拉過，於是乎我哋就有乜所謂咁樣樣。

R

R

S

S

問：唔係，...

T

T

U

U

主席：你要對住個咪講，我哋聽唔到你講乜。

V

V

B

B

C

答：Okay，唔好意思，即係我意思 authorised person 係一個專業人士嚟嘅，我哋做一個 certification 嘅時候，我唔覺得應該係話因為從來都拉你唔到，於是乎你又唔使好認真咁去做個 certification，呢個我覺得唔係咁樣樣。

C

D

D

E

E

F

問：你覺得佢哋應該，因為佢有責任？

F

G

答：因為佢哋有專業操守，係咪呀？

G

H

問：係呀，咁即係就應該做嘅嘢，佢應該做足嘅？

H

I

答：係。

I

J

問：如果佢做唔足，咁就有法子喇？

J

K

答：而家我哋知道原來呢個制度本身有個有違規嘅風險，that's why 我哋而家真係要再多一啲嘢去處理呢個風險。

K

L

問：而家你知道用含鉛嘅焊物引致而家呢個問題，你就話如果 AP 唔識，佢可以問個 building services engineer，係咪呀？

L

M

答：Service engineer，係。

M

N

問：中文點叫呀？

N

O

答：樓宇屋--屋宇設備...

O

P

問：工程師。

P

Q

答：...工程師，係。

Q

R

主席：屋宇裝備工程師。

R

S

答：屋宇裝備，係咪？嗰個準確啲。

S

T

T

U

問：佢哋實識㗎喇？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：識，點會唔識？

C

D

問：唔係，唔係點會唔識，譬如 AP 你都話識㗎？你都以為識㗎？

D

E

答：我成日就話你睇番 Hong Kong IA、Hong Kong IE，都有咁嘅建議話其實應該搵 building services engineer 去睇番住呢樣嘢，所以我諗大家我哋做工程師都認為其實呢個 discipline 嘅人應該係識嘅。

E

F

F

G

問：但係個 form 又有話要佢哋參與，完全冇提㗎嗎？

G

H

答：因為一路以嚟，我今朝講過，個 AP 做一個 certification 嘅時候，佢一定係佢 base on 一個 system，有人話畀佢聽件嘢做妥，然後佢先可以做呢個 certification，係咪呀？

H

I

I

J

問：因為我冇法子唔問你一個，你睇一睇個文件，呢個係 B4.6。

J

K

答：B4...

K

L

問：B4.6，tab 94，係 7365，7365，今日問過㗎喇，何資深大律師問過你，葵聯嘅個 form，7365，你睇咗喇嘛？

L

M

答：睇到。

M

N

問：“To”嗰個其實就係 LP 嚟嘅，係咪？呢個明顯係畀 LP 嘅，...

N

O

答：Sorry，你...

O

P

問：而家呢個睇緊係 part v 嚟嘅。

P

Q

答：Part v 嗰個水務署同事嚟嘅。

Q

R

問：“To”嗰個，呢個係喇？

R

S

答：應該係 licensed plumber，我相信。

S

T

問：係喇，跟住佢就葵涌，講嗰個樓宇喺邊度，跟住佢就話“Plumbing detailed in Part IV are last inspected on”一個 14 年 4 月 15 號，right？

T

U

答：唔，唔。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：即係畀人睇到你哋嗰度有個 inspection，係咪？

C

D

答：唔。

D

E

問：跟住，“Pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, no irregularities were found and the plumbing detailed in Part IV is approved.”，呢度呢句好重要，兩部分，首先就第一句，頭先講咗，就已經有個 inspection，喺 14 年，okay，跟住“Pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations”，根據有關嘅法例，睇唔到有咩嘢唔妥，即係話喺嗰日係視察嗰日就睇唔到有咩嘢唔妥，所以就批准，你呢度就唔係話「pursuant to 你個 certification 話冇事，所以我畀你。」你明我意思嘛？

E

F

F

G

G

H

H

I

I

答：我明你意思，不過佢喺 part I 已經 certify 過話佢會根據我哋呢一個水務條例去做嘢，如果喺 part I。

J

J

K

問：唔係，我覺得有一...

K

L

答：唔係，呢個係冇寫嘅，同意。

L

M

問：你同意咩嘛？

M

N

答：同意，同意，同意。

N

O

問：同埋呢個係畀嗰個水喉匠嘅之嘛？

O

P

答：係。

P

Q

問：咁你使乜講咁多嘢啫，咁一批就得㗎喇，係咪呀？

Q

R

答：唔。

R

問：你咪話“It is approved.”，咁咪得囉，使乜講我又幾時 inspect 過，幾時咩嘢啫？如果你交界上頭睇，我就明白，你交界水喉匠之嘛。

S

答：Okay。

S

T

問：Okay，呢度我想--你知唔知道如果係嗰個 AP 係屬於 Housing 嗰面嘅，即係佢哋 in-house 嘅，佢哋自己裏面嘅則師好，咩嘢好，做 AP，咁受唔受嗰個 Building Ordinance 嚟管束㗎，你知唔知？

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：Building Ordinance？

C

D

問：係，係。

D

E

答：我理解，唔受嘅，我理解，唔受嘅。

E

F

問：唔受嘅，係喇。所以就如果係呢啲咁嘅嘢就郁唔到個 AP 㗎㗎。

F

G

答：郁唔到個 AP 呀？

G

H

主席：郁唔到？

H

I

I

J

問：都唔受...

J

K

答：佢係一個專業人士㗎㗎，佢簽個名落去，我諗佢都有個責任嘍度嘅。

K

L

問：但係因為佢係個 Building Ordinance 出面，佢唔受約束㗎㗎？

L

M

答：但係你...

M

N

問：房署嘅樓，係咪？

N

O

答：但 anyway 我哋都唔係用緊 Building Ordinance 去處理呢個個情況，其實我哋要求個 AP certify 一樣嘢，如果喺 private sector 嗰個正正式式嘅 AP，如果喺 Housing 嗰個可能就唔係一個正式嘅 AP。

O

P

P

Q

問：Okay，如果你係覺得自己已經盡咗責，你話「我已經做咗咁多嘢，我信佢。」因為你嗰個證人口供，係第三個 statement 就好清楚嘅，呢個係 C21 172。

Q

R

R

答：係咪呢個？係咪呢個？

S

S

T

問：第 9 段，呢度就講--一開頭就講 form 46，就講 AP，跟住落三、四行就 WW0132，咁又講喇。跟住就去到呢一段嘅第七行、第八行，就話 "As such, one would reasonably expect the AP to confirm with the LP and other relevant stakeholders (e.g. the main contractor or plumbing sub-contractor)

T

U

U

V

V

on whether there are further documents or developments relating to the factual basis of the matters which the AP is to certify. One would also reasonably expect the LP and other relevant stakeholders (all of whom are directly or indirectly engaged by the developer to construct the inside service for the developer's premises) to readily provide the AP with relevant information to enable the AP to make the relevant certifications. In light of the above, it is reasonable to expect that there should be adequate communication between the AP and the LP and other relevant stakeholders including the provision of relevant drawings and changes of the pipes and fittings installed."

有一度、兩度、三度都係話“reasonably expect”呢啲字或者“reasonable to expect”，跟住第10。

“Similarly, the AP may obtain information from the LP and/or the contractors regarding any subsequent changes to materials”，呢度講 form 46 嗰啲，“It is reasonable to expect that the LP and/or the contractors would provide such information to the AP in order to facilitate the process.”。

如果你話「我已經交咗畀佢，佢冇理由唔照住做㗎。」如果 AP 佢搵咗個 LP，佢又覺得個 LP 冇理由呢佢，即係一度同一度嘅之嘛，你明我意思嘛？你就話自己係 reasonably believe，個 AP 又可以 reasonably to believe 個 LP，你明我意思嘛？邏輯上。

答：我諗呢個最重要係咪合理地去相信，即係...

問：點解你合理，佢唔合理呢？

答：我當然我覺得我哋合理地去相信呢個 AP，given 佢係一個--我成日講話係一個專業人士，佢亦都要負責番成個 development 嗰度。

問：AP 見到個水喉匠同埋有啲好大工程㗎嘛，有啲，好有錢都得㗎嘛，水喉匠。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

答：水喉匠好有錢，okay。

問：唔係，有啲公司好有錢，西裝筆挺都得㗎。

答：Okay。

問：即係佢又可以信個水喉匠嘅之嘛，你明我意思嘛？

答：我諗大家--最緊要你認為嗰個係咪合理嘅相信，亦都支持你嗰個 certification，我諗最重要呢個。

問：老實講，事情就發生咗，你而家睇番轉頭，當然你話事後孔明，係咪？你諗番下，你覺得你個部門要唔要負責呢？咁耐都完全冇醒覺嘅？

答：我今朝都講過，即係話其實作為一個 regulator，我哋 on one hand 我哋自己有啲工作做，譬如 final inspection，on the other hand，我哋亦都 put in 一個 system，希望透過一個 system 有效地去令到啲人可以跟到嗰個 regulation 做嘢，呢個我哋一路嗰個 philosophy 係咁樣樣。你話有冇 better alternative，我覺得真係要考究下，大家研究下有冇 better alternative 去...

問：而家都諗唔到有冇 better alternative？

答：而家我哋其實喺最後而家 put in 咗一啲 control measures，including 話我哋驗水辦，到我哋收貨嗰陣時做一啲 checking on the material 嗰啲，before that 我哋當其時真係察覺唔到嗰個風險，that's why 我哋嗰陣時係 put in 一個咁嘅 system，plus 一個自己嘅 final inspection 咁做嘢。

問：唔係，到而家，事發咗之後，就返番轉頭，有冇覺得做得唔妥嘅地方？睇番轉頭喇而家。

答：我覺得...

問：都有？

答：其實都--我自己睇，都係一個合理嘅 system，合理嘅做法。

問：哦，合理嘅 system，即係唔係你哋個部門錯，社會錯？

答：我唔可以咁講嘅，我覺得你 put in 一個 reasonable system。

B

B

C

問：咁邊個錯？

C

D

答：咁邊個錯啫？個 system 係你搞出嚟㗎嘛。

D

E

問：我諗呢個調查將來會...

E

F

答：唔係，你自己都應該撫心自問，係咪呀？

F

G

問：我講咗即係話我覺得合理地 put in 一個 system 去希望啲嘢能夠依據嗰個 regulation 去...

G

H

答：而出咗事㗎，出咗好大件事㗎，你自己冇諗番下個部門冇冇啲做錯咗嘅地方嘅咩？到而家都未諗到？

H

I

問：唔係，你話我哋當日察覺唔到嗰個風險，今日我哋察覺咗，我哋於是乎...

I

J

答：唔係你哋察覺嘅，係有啲社團發覺到呢個，係咪呀？

J

K

問：我察覺個風險，即係佢哋發覺到件事，我哋察覺咗呢個風險，於是乎我哋即時都擺入一啲 control measure 去 tackle 呢件事。

K

L

答：咁有冇錯吖？即係你嗰個機制有冇問題？

L

M

問：你問我，我就話當日個 system，我都覺得係合理地擺個咁嘅 system 喺度，with 一個 recognition of higher risk，我覺得係我哋應該要再擺番一啲 control measure 去控制番呢個風險。

M

N

答：即係嗰陣時冇錯嘅？

N

O

問：我唔係好想用冇冇...

O

P

Q

Q

R

主席：佢答咗你，佢話合理嘅制度。

R

S

李柱銘先生：合理。

S

T

問：或者我用第二個方法問一問你，你睇下 32 段...

T

U

主席：你用第二個方法問番同一樣嘢？

U

V

V

李柱銘先生：唔係，唔係，我相信主席你會明白嘅。

問：係 32 段，都係你個口供，18778，或者你睇一睇，攞一攞 31 段，有喇嘛，31 段？你話“within the above control mechanism involving multiple stakeholders”，呢度就講開，睇啲啲原料嘅，睇啲啲 pipes 啲啲嘢嘅，你話“WA’s role is regulatory and its inspection of plumbing installations is generally guided by a risk-based approach.”，即係你知道呢個 context 係咩嘢得喇，而家睇落去，32。

“WA considers that the current inspection of the finished plumbing works is pitched at the right level taking into account the multi-layered control mechanism.”，因為啲啲學會就話要 independent building service section。

你而家講喇，“To have an independent building service section within WSD on top of the existing control mechanism is not an effective way of administering public resources. Setting up an independent building service section will mean deploying public resources to duplicate the efforts of various stakeholders.”

好喇，跟住就去到最收靚嗰兩個字，呢一版，“The considerable resource implication is hardly justified.”。33 段，...

陳樂信先生：In fairness, Mr Chairman, could Mr Lee just read the sentence he skipped?

李柱銘先生：Okay. Sure. I go back to read the first...

陳樂信先生：“This independent building service”

問：“To have an independent building service section within

WSD on top of the existing control mechanism is not an effective way of administering public resources. Setting up an independent building service section will mean deploying public resources to duplicate the efforts of various stakeholders. This independent building service section of WSD will have to be substantial in size given that WA's regulatory remit is territory wide. The considerable resource implication is hardly justified."

跟住你就話--你即係其實就覺得關於你係睇住嗰啲水喉嗰啲係咪跟 British Standard 嗰啲嘢，你認為你而家呢個制度已經夠啱喇，係咪？

答：唔。

問：係咪呀？

答：即係一個合理嘅做法。

問：我問番你，同樣，你對呢個水質睇下含鉛--即係呢啲咁嘅做法係咪都係你覺得已經足夠呢？

答：其實嗰個...

問：呢度只係講--你講啲材料，嗰度係講個水質。

答：其實材料同水質係有關係嘅，大家我諗一定都同意呢樣嘢嘅，我都係成日講話如果你材料 okay 嘅，做啱標準嘅，其實個水質 okay 嘅，所以我 put in 一個 system 去希望大家能夠--或者令大家跟個要求做個物料，其實就等如已經可以令個水質 okay。

問：咁所以就兩樣嘢你都覺得 okay 喇喇？

答：合理...

問：物料同水質。

答：你合理地擺入一個咁嘅 system。

問：即係而家呢個 current inspection of 呢啲嘢，物料同埋水質都

B

B

C

okay 嘅？

C

D

答：個 system itself，我哋呢度講緊係嗰個 inspection，finish plumbing。

D

E

問：呢度就物料，但係水質你話一樣㗎喇都係，係咪？

E

F

答：其實係--係喇，有關係嘅，兩件嘢。

F

G

問：藤嗰瓜，瓜嗰藤咁樣？

G

H

答：係，正如我講，如果你個 water supply chain 嘅物料係 comply with standard 嘅，其實 okay 嘅嗰個水質。

H

I

問：所以你而家呢個 current inspection 都係 pitch at the right level 㗎喇？

I

J

答：The finish plumbing，我諗我哋講緊呢個 finish plumbing works。

J

K

問：都一樣㗎喇？

K

L

答：係，係，係。

L

M

問：都啱嘅，適當，係咪？

M

N

答：因為上面有個前設喇當然，即係有其他嘅人幫手睇住嗰個建造嗰個情況。

N

O

問：因為你個邏輯，就係如果你用啲材料用得啱，就有理由唔合標㗎嘛？

O

P

答：係。

P

Q

問：啲水質冇理由唔合標㗎嘛？

Q

R

答：唔。

R

S

問：如果你啲材料啱，睇住晒，個個都用咗你個合理期待，原來果然是真的，咁咪冇事囉，啲水質應該 okay，所以而家你覺得就算你睇住個水質嘅呢樣嘢都 okay 㗎喇，係咪？

S

T

答：唔。

T

U

V

V

問：Okay，你跟住你就講 33 段，你話“*It should be noted that the current arrangement is in line with the role of a regulator as identified by the Construction Industry Review Committee Report*”。

底下有個 footnote 嘅，2001 嘅，right，咁就 issued in 2001，呢度就係話“*Chief Executive decided to appoint an independent committee to carry out a comprehensive review of the construction industry. The Construction Industry Review Committee was set up in the light of various incidents involving non-complying construction building works which revealed some inherent weaknesses in the construction industry.*”

你而家就 quote 咗佢，你就話“*...Given resource constraints, all regulators face the same challenge of how best to target their enforcement action. We recommend that our regulators should explore with the industry, whenever appropriate, ways for industry participants to assume a greater responsibility over their behaviour through a degree of self-regulation. The regulator will continue to police the system, but with greater emphasis on those particularly at risk and with appropriately raised stakes for those who attempt to abuse the regulator's trust...*”

你呢度就即係話你哋咁樣做法，其實呢個 report 都係同意你哋咁做法，係咪咁呀？

答：唔可以話佢同意呢個，其實早我哋嘅意思...

問：即係 support 你，即係同你...

答：我哋話當日 2001 年有個咁嘅 report，有個咁嘅睇法，我哋其實同 --而家我哋而家嗰個上述嗰個安排其實都 in line with 一個咁嘅 --呢個報告個睇法。

問：即係大家個 thinking 一致嘅？

答：係，可以咁講。

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
VA
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：Great minds think alike。

答：我唔敢講我哋係咪 great mind。

問：Okay，不如我哋睇一睇佢哋個 report，好唔好？

答：我哋個-- sorry。

問：我哋 extract 嚟嘅啫，因為相當大本。呢度就有封信嘅，係 Construction Industry Review Committee，係 2001 年 1 月 18 號，咁就寫畀嗰陣時嘅特首嘅，董建華先生嘅，就係個 Henry Tang，唐英年，the Chairman of the Construction Industry Review Committee，睇到封信喇嘛？

答：唔，睇到。

問：Okay，因為佢跟住就夾呢個 report 上去，所以我...

答：係。

問：嗰封信我略為讀一讀，第一版唔需要，第二版，“In order to achieve the envisaged results, radical improvements are called for in the way construction projects are delivered, the way risks are shared, the way industry participants interact with one another and the ethical standards within the industry. We have attempted in this report to set strategic directions for a change programme that encompasses all sectors of the industry. However, our efforts represent but the initial steps of a major reform process for the construction industry. The successful transformation of the industry will hinge critically on strong leadership and commitment from both the Government and industry in implementing the change programme.

As a major client of local construction, the Government has an overriding interest in ensuring that the construction industry delivers better value.”

去到呢封信最收靚嗰句，“A reformed construction industry that strives for excellence will provide firm

support to our efforts in making Hong Kong a world class city.”，好 positive 嘅，係咪？

答：唔。

問：好喇，睇一睇個 report，我哋淨係畀--你睇下第 39 版，internal pagination，39 版，就 4.15，呢個就係“Clear accountability”，佢就強調 accountability，“The satisfactory delivery of a project depends on the commitment of all stakeholders to perform to the best of their abilities in full alignment with the objectives of the project. We look to all members of the project team (including client organisations, designers, engineers, contractors, subcontractors, site supervisors, workers and others) to take a responsible attitude to their work and to perform their duties to a high standard. To facilitate the development of a performance-oriented culture in the construction industry, we need to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved in the project delivery process and the expected standards of their performance. At the same time, we need to put in place a fair system of sanctions so that when things go wrong, the responsible parties are brought to account. Regulators, clients, professional institutions and industry bodies can all assist in establishing a clear accountability structure in the industry.”

呢度講得好清楚，佢驚 something go wrong，所以話你一定要有一個好嘅 system，有好嘅 sanctions，係咪？嚟制裁佢哋至得嘅，如果邊個百厭仔，要罰嘅，okay。

跟住，“Consistent with our philosophy that the construction industry should be motivated to strive for excellence through market forces as far as possible, we take the view that construction legislation should be kept to a minimum that is necessary for the protection of worker safety or other wider public

interest. Where regulations are necessary, they should clearly and fairly set out the responsibilities of the concerned parties and put in place appropriate sanctions proportional to the seriousness of the offence. Taking site safety as an example, we note that under the existing regulatory framework, the main contractor is held liable for safety offences committed on his site. Given the prevalence of subcontracting in local construction, this approach means that where the offence is actually committed by a subcontractor, the sanction fails to target the party that is at fault", "This should be rectified in order to bring the full force of the regulation to bear on those who abuse the system."

呢度就話有時罰錯人，根本唔關個 main contractor，個 subcontractor，但係啲 law 就罰咗個 main contractor，就唔罰個 subcontractor。

跟住呢段重要，因為呢個 paragraph 就 cite 咗你頭先啲嘢嘅，你呀，4.17，"Legislation will lose its sting without effective enforcement."，即係話如果你就算有法律都好，如果 enforcement 唔好，冇用㗎，你話某個人犯咗罪，要坐監，根本都冇人去拉人、冇人去查。呢句就係你嗰個 quote 冇咗㗎，你嗰個 paragraph，突然間呢句唔見咗，冇 quote 嘅，你知唔知呀？

答：（沒有可聽到的回答）

問：你頭先嗰段，我讀咗畀你聽，你再睇番，你嗰個口供，你嗰個 witness statement，係 18779 版 33 段，你個 quotation，一開波，你就 "Given resource constraints"，係咪？

答：唔，唔。

問：你如果睇番 4.17，都有 "Given resource constraints"，不過就第一句冇咗之，"Legislation will lose its sting without effective enforcement."，所以而家就係--你呢件事就係咁喇，你就話佢 in line with 你，其實唔係嘅，佢話如果你就算有法律都好，嗰條刺，嗰條針可以冇用嘅，如果你係有 effective enforcement，你哋而家個問題就係咁，你話「我有喇，我咪靠晒

A 响 AP，靠晒响 LP。」但係你有 effective enforcement，個問
B 題就喺晒呢度。
C

D 答：我諗佢呢段嘢個首尾都呼應嘅，去到最後，即係話 greater emphasis
E on 嗰個--即係個 stakes for those who attempt to abuse
F 個 regulator trust，我諗即係兩...

G 問：但係最緊要第一句，“Legislation will lose its sting
H without effective enforcement.”，呢句就 summarise 我哋
I 而家呢個 problem，可以話畀你聽，即係你好多嘢都係，你話得，係
J 咪？响水其實唔曳㗎㗎，你去到街嗰度都好㗎㗎，入到去裏面就麻
K 煩，因為你話又要 BS 㗎，咁就好喇，如果所有嗰响水喉嗰响嘢跟足
L BS 嘅，都有丁咁多嘅可能，有丁咁多鉛會走到响水度，不過好少，雖
M 然你計唔到出嚟，但係就應該好少嘅啫，但係响嘢喺邊度嚟呢？就係
N 嗰响焊料嗰度含鉛，喺嗰度喇嘛。

O 如果嗰度合乎 BS 嘅，或者跟你哋嘅條件，又應該冇鉛㗎，唔應
P 該有鉛㗎㗎，咁咪全部應該冇事㗎。就算你幾好都好，你有咗嗰個
Q effective enforcement 冇用㗎㗎。

R 答：唔係，所以--即係我諗--不過可能又重複番個說法，當然我哋有一個
S final inspection 會做一响嘢去睇番嗰個，如果我哋見到個
T system，即係我哋嘅 inspection cover 到嗰响咁嘅嘢，如果見
U 到嗰响嘢有問題，其實我哋都會對佢有處分嘅，有响扣分嘅。

V 問：你都唔查，冇一個人畀人罰，你頭先答咗我，冇一個人被罰。

答：唔係，你頭先講個鉛嗰個問題。

問：呢個都係呀。

答：但係如果 in respect of 其他响嘢，我哋可能有罰分，有扣分...

問：唔係，鉛嘅問題冇一個人罰分吓嘛。

答：係，因為嗰陣時未察覺呢個風險。

問：你未發覺，因為你唔去查，頭先你今朝就講，你話本來去查，本來想
去 surprise visit，後來同業界傾完，佢話唔使...

答：唔係，呢個係 after 個 incident，我哋曾經去諗...

B

B

C

問：哦，after incident 添。

C

D

答：...--再諗可唔可以--因為我今朝都講過，其實我哋作為一個 regulator，我哋做咗兩部分嘢嘢，一就係自己去做嗰個 final inspection、interim inspection，the other hand 就係我哋擺呢個 system，希望由 AP、LP 去 ensure 呢件事，你話而家再 on top 再擺一啲其他嘢 system 去 check 呢樣嘢，我哋要研究究竟你係咪--我成日都話你最緊要有一個 effective 嘢 means 去做到呢樣嘢。

D

E

E

F

F

G

G

H

問：而家問題係你嘢部門，我而家好沉重咁話畀你聽係失職，喺呢個問題上，係嚴重失職。

H

I

答：我諗咁對我啲同事實在未必係一個好 fair 嘢 comment。

I

J

問：我話畀你聽點解，因為根本你咁多嘢喺度，你就淨係得個信字，又有理由信嘍嗎，你成日話好有理由信、有理由信、有理由信，你都查都唔去查，一次都有去查，你又係 regulator，你 regulator 淨係 set 一個 standard 嘢啫，咁有咩嘢用呢？譬如一個足球隊，我 set 一個 standard，個個人仲係爭波都要擺到嘅，冇用嘢，你 set 一個 standard，咁又點啫，擺唔擺到個波呢？

J

K

K

L

L

M

答：唔係，我頭先講過，我哋都 put in 個 system，即係你話我係交波...

M

N

問：好喇，你有冇用過--採取過乜嘢行動，而去話畀自己聽「我呢個 system 係行得通，一路行都通，佢哋個個遵守。」你有冇做過任何嘢嘗試過搵出嚟，根本有冇人遵守你啲嘢先？有冇做過任何嘢？

N

O

O

P

答：其實你咁...

P

Q

問：唔係，有定冇啫？好簡單嘢提問。

Q

R

答：Sorry，聽唔到。

R

S

問：有定冇？有冇做過任何嘢...

S

T

答：其實我哋一路睇番--其實我哋都有做 final inspection，我都有睇番佢哋做...

T

U

問：File inspection？

U

V

V

B

B

C

答：係，都睇番佢哋做嘅工作。

C

D

問：淨係睇文字嘅工作？

D

E

答：唔係，我哋都有 on site 去睇番嘅，都有睇番 in general，佢哋都係做我哋嘅要求。

E

F

問：你有冇去過睇過人哋焊緊嘅時候，埋去睇過下？

F

G

答：因為我哋做 final inspection 嗰陣時，佢已經焊完㗎喇，我哋去...

G

H

問：咁咪係囉，未焊完之前有冇去睇下呢？

H

I

答：呢個就係我哋今朝講嗰個問題，你係咪能夠好有效地去做一個咁嘅 surprise inspection，呢個要諗一諗嘅，因為...

I

J

問：唔係諗諗，如果你想做，一定做到㗎。

J

K

答：唔係，你仲要講個 effectiveness 同埋 cost effectiveness，係咪呀？即係唔係話我...

K

L

問：所以你應該答我，我因為問咗你，我話你個部門有冇做過任何行動係嘗試尋真相，睇下佢哋係咪真係跟住晒嘅？乖乖地嘅。

L

M

答：我都係咁講，喺 final inspection，to some extent，我都係睇咗佢哋有個 finished product in general 係咪同我哋想要嘅嘢係夾嘅，呢個係睇到嘅。至於你頭先講到話燒焊嗰個，因為個...

M

N

問：好喇，係咪合乎 British Standard，應該搵到㗎？

N

O

答：嗰個制度就係話當你一件喉料想用喺個 plumbing system 嗰度，其實 beforehand 佢哋 test 咗，to British Standard，然後我哋先 approve 佢用一啲...

O

P

問：邊個話畀你聽合乎 British Standard？人哋話畀你聽之嘛。

P

Q

答：Laboratory，laboratory，laboratory，即係有啲 accredited laboratory 佢驗咗，咪...

Q

R

問：你擺過啲樣去畀佢驗，你擺去驗嘅？

R

S

答：即係個 supplier 要將佢嗰個--要畀個 sample 個 accredited...

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

問：唔係，個 supplier 擺個 sample，嗰個 sample 一定係合標準，如果唔係，擺去驗咩嘢嚟做咩嘢啫？佢唔會擺個唔合標準嘅擺去驗㗎嘛。

答：我諗呢個如果你講番喺世界，譬如喺英國，佢哋都係用一個咁嘅 system 嘅咋喎，即係個 supplier 擺個 sample 搵去一個 laboratory 驗咗，to British Standard，然後先 approve 呢件嘢可以用喺個 system...

問：譬如你起咗樓，你走去--起完喇，你去一個樓宇度，一度地方啫，就搵條水喉出嚟驗一驗得唔得呀？

答：呢個真係要--我哋除非真係有呢個懷疑，因為你其實好 destructive，你要走去鋸咗人哋啲水管，拆咗人哋啲嘢，我哋而家嘅做法係有懷疑先咁做，當然鉛水事件之後...

問：你完全冇懷疑過咩嘛，到嗰陣時為止都完全冇懷疑過。

答：因為我哋基本上係睇個 approved list，佢係 approve 咗啲料--嗰啲譬如龍頭、水管，我哋 base on 嗰個 approved list 咁。

問：所以我話畀你聽我唔係亂咁話你哋部門失職嘅，人哋後知後覺，你而家後知，仲仍然不覺，好多嘢而家都仲係諗可以考慮、可以考慮，都唔做，到而家為止都唔肯承認可能錯誤，係咪？譬如驗水辦，點解唔驗多個啫？主席成為話行多步得唔得啫你哋驗完 flushing，點解唔可以驗 stagnation 呢？驗多個咩，係咪呀？

答：你...

問：許大律話你等個市民安心，驗多一次，唔肯，你係後知，仲唔肯認，仲唔肯覺嗰度慘呀。

答：就住嗰個驗水辦，我琴日都解釋過我個睇法。

問：你解釋過，我唔問你，不過我而家話畀你聽，你有理由唔做多--唔行多一步嘅。

答：呢個你個睇法，我有我嘅睇法。

問：梗係我嘅睇法，你話唔同意咪得囉，你唔同意咩嘛？

B

B

C

答：我唔同意你嘅睇法。

C

D

問：點解唔同意呢？

D

E

答：我頭先解釋咗。

E

F

F

G

主席：咁就唔係好公平啫，李大律師。

G

H

李柱銘先生：又即係琴日嗰啲，你今日--okay, okay。

H

I

問：你而家話驗嗰啲水喉合唔合乎 BS 嗰度，你擺咗幾多條管去驗，拆開嚟驗？三條？

I

J

J

K

K

主席：你講邊個時候？

L

L

李柱銘先生：事發咗之後。

M

M

N

問：事發咗之後。

N

O

答：我哋而家基本上做，因為針對嗰個焊接物...

O

P

問：我問你幾多條之嘛。

P

Q

答：唔係，我而家其實唔係驗喉，反而係驗個焊。

Q

R

問：驗焊，okay。

R

答：有驗焊。

S

S

問：擺咗幾多驗，拆開嚟驗？

T

答：唔使拆，而家我哋用嗰個叫做 quick lead check，就直頭係 on site 有落去，睇番嗰個 joint 入...

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：喺出面已經驗到喇嘛？

C

D

答：係，我哋喺個 joint 度有一啲 swab，睇番佢有冇變色嚟睇番個 lead check。

D

E

問：而家都仲用緊？而家都用緊？

E

F

答：而家做緊，係，而家做緊。

F

G

問：驗邊啲樓，你而家用緊呢啲？

G

H

答：所有新入伙，即係新落成嘅 plumbing system 我哋都會做。

H

I

問：哦，新啲啲就做？

I

J

答：係。

J

K

問：嗰啲舊啲啲你會唔會再驗多次呢？因為你話 unaffected 唔等如就話 unaffected，你 unaffected，你做咗個抽樣去驗，你抽咗譬如一座樓宇，可能十個、八個，有時少好多嘍喎，咁驗唔到就有嘍囉喎，同埋你 flush 喎，全部 flush 嘍喎，flush 兩分鐘喎，係咪？又同埋死都唔肯驗 first draw，到而家都仲係。你如果行多一步，去試一試，唔好 first draw -- 要 first draw，試試，唔會咗好多時間、好多錢嘍啫，係咪呀？

K

L

L

M

M

N

答：（沒有可聽到的回答）

N

O

問：咁就證明佢真係--起碼都證明佢，等人哋安心，點解唔可以行呢步呢？

O

P

答：唔係，頭先我解釋咗，我琴日都講過我嘅睇法，關於兩個，無論係一個 independent sampling by Prof Lee and 我哋嘅做法，都 confirm 咗...

P

Q

Q

R

問：你對 Prof Lee 好唔 fair，Prof Lee 係因為佢嘅時間同埋錢嘅問題，佢做嘅 sample 唔夠你哋多嘅，你知㗎。

R

S

答：但係個結...

S

T

問：你仲話你自己 sample 多過佢，你自己都講喇。

T

U

答：但係嗰個結果 match，大家。

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：係，結果 match，結果分分鐘可以錯㗎嘛，你都唔係好多，佢就更加少，係咁㗎嘛，佢都驗到出嚟，有㗎㗎。

C

D

D

E

答：唔係，大家佢--如果你有睇下 Prof Lee 佢個 conclusion，係咪呀？

E

F

問：係呀。

F

G

答：佢話佢都 affected、unaffected 都 largely confirm 咗嗰個 finding，同我哋嘅 finding 係吻合。

G

H

H

I

主席：Largely，你要睇個“largely”嗰個字，佢唔係話 exactly 一樣，係咪？佢係講 largely...

I

J

答：但係我哋覺得有一個咁獨立嘅睇法。

J

K

主席：一個好 broad 嘅 approach，就 largely confirm 嘅，同意嘅，係咪？

K

L

L

答：唔。

M

M

主席：不過個問題當你去到 individual 嘅 housing estates 嗰陣時候可能會有落差，譬如好似--我其實到而家我都唔係好明葵涌邨，老老實實，雖然你有解釋過有少少話有啲咩嘢 environmental contaminations，有個咩嘢抽風扇好多塵諸如此類，不過你成條邨，即係整個嚟睇，就睇落去，似乎就真係好似超標㗎㗎。

N

N

O

O

答：唔係，我哋即係大家唔同睇法，我哋睇番就 Prof Lee 有做佢嘅嘢，我哋有做嘅嘢，大家嘅結果係吻合嘅。

P

P

Q

Q

主席：唔係，我明。

R

R

答：或者我都唔想再好...

S

S

主席：唔好糾纏落去。

T

T

答：...再係糾纏喺呢個 point 度。

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

主席：唔係，你個問題係即係話佢哋固步自封，係咪？

C

D

李柱銘先生：係呀。

D

E

主席：固步自封，...

E

F

李柱銘先生：同埋...

F

G

主席：...不思進取。

G

H

李柱銘先生：係，行多步都唔肯。

H

I

主席：係囉，即係一樣囉。

I

J

李柱銘先生：我鍾意你嗰個「行多步都唔肯」。

J

K

主席：佢唔同意，答咗喇。

K

L

問：唔同意，今次我唔問你點解，okay。其實如果用李教授嗰個做法，如果用你哋嘅思維，你哋嘅思維就係求其去嗰啲 estate 度擺啲辦嚟試，求其有一個辦超過 10，你就認為成個屋邨都應該係受影響嘅，你哋係咁做，係咪？

L

M

M

N

答：第一，就唔係求其嘅，擺辦嘅時候，應該當其時擺辦係 systematic 嘅，因為佢通常係以每一條 down-feed，你明我意思？其實可能佢天台缸落嚟，好多條 down-feed 嘅，即係好多條，每一條 down-feed 嗰個佢供應嗰個 zone 最低、最遠嗰個單位擺水辦嘅咁樣，除非嗰個擺唔到，就去之後一個，所以係有個系統去擺嘅。

N

O

O

P

P

Q

問：即係唔係 random 嘅？

Q

R

答：唔係 random 嘅，即係 systematic，希望擺到最遠。

R

S

問：但係去到個屋邨裏面，用邊層樓--邊座樓，邊棟樓係咪 random 嘅呢？

S

T

答：唔係，唔係，唔係，棟棟樓都擺。

T

U

問：棟棟樓都擺？

U

V

答：係。

V

B

B

C

問：如果你求其攞到一個 sample 係超過 10 呢...

C

D

答：如果有一個水辦超過 10，就 declare 嗰條 estate...

D

E

問：你知唔知道其實 Prof Lee 係驗到--因為佢就唔同你個計法，佢就唔同你個計法。

E

F

答：佢有佢嘅計算方法，啱。

F

G

問：如果佢攞啲水辦用你嘅方法計，已經又唔同咗，你知唔知？

G

H

答：用我個...

H

I

問：係呀，即係求其有一個，有一個 sample 過咗 10，就已經當成個...

I

J

答：但係佢因為攞個--佢就攞一個即係可以講話全日最高或者攞最高位嗰個嚟計。

J

K

問：係，係，佢攞 first draw，係，係。

K

L

答：所以佢亦都--我覺得佢都合理嘅，因為你有理由--即係佢哋都 recognise 話你有理由攞最高嗰個就當係呢條邨 daily 飲--就算你話我真係一起身就掙個水煲埋去煲水，其實你由最高嗰點落到一分鐘後，可能已經跌咗一段，即係變咗嗰個水質都唔係話最高嗰點嚟嘅。

L

M

M

N

問：應該就差唔多冇--一分鐘應該真係冇晒咁滯嘅，應該就。

N

O

答：唔係，所以就算你話你朝頭早起身去煲一煲水，你可能--普通水煲講緊 1 litre，普通細啲啲 1 litre，可能你成個煲掙入去啲啲 4 個 litre，by the time 你攞到後期啲啲可能已經係好低，所以你 average...

O

P

P

Q

問：唔係，後期都--前頭啲啲入埋個煲度㗎嘛。

Q

R

答：Okay，或者我唔 go into detail。

R

S

S

T

主席：唔係，你攞咗嗰個煲度，...

T

U

U

V

V

B

B

C

問：咁咪係囉。

C

D

D

E

主席：...你個問題就係你 lead 係 accumulative 㗎嘛。

E

F

答：明，不過我意思你唔能夠以-- Prof Lee 有佢個諗法，即係你見佢其實係 take 20、40、60、80，and then 去計一個平均嘅，我覺得佢都背後佢有個諗法㗎度，佢點解用咁嘅方法去計算。

F

G

G

H

H

問：但係如果用 Prof Lee 嗰啲，因為佢用 first draw，因為 first draw 係超標嘅，譬如 20，你唔接受嘅，係咪？

I

I

J

答：（沒有可聽到的回答）

J

K

問：如果驗到個佢任何一個公屋嘅屋邨，好喇，用你嗰個係最低嗰層樓，最靱靱最遠嗰個，用 first draw，一樣驗到係 20，唔係 10，你點處理？

K

L

L

答：唔係，呢個其實我哋即係...

M

M

問：你唔接受，你唔要，係咪？因為係 first draw。

N

N

答：唔係，我哋唔會擺 first draw 添，因為唔具代表性，基本上我哋嘅 sampling protocol 就唔係咁㗎嘛，Prof Lee 有佢嘅 sampling protocol，然後佢用佢嘅方法去計算番佢點為之 class 1、2、3。

O

O

P

問：唔係，請你答個問題，如果有個人係搵一個 government laboratory 嘅人陪埋佢抽水出嚟，first draw 嘅，係 20 嘅，呢度 20，你話「唔緊要，我唔理你，你呢個唔會當做有影響。」係咪咁樣嘅答案？

P

Q

Q

答：我哋認為咁擺唔具代表性。

R

R

問：你會去擺過一個，不過今次就啡咗兩分鐘先，係咪咁？

S

S

答：即係用我哋個方法，個 sampling protocol 係咁。

T

T

問：然後就話「欸，嚟，冇事吖，跌到 6 嘞」。

U

U

答：因為我哋係想睇番--不過又 go into --又重複番。

V

V

B

B

C

C

D

主席：係呀，返番轉頭啲唔好講，係，係。

D

E

答：係喇，係喇，唔好，嘎。

E

F

F

G

李柱銘先生：呢個時候係咪適當呢？我哋早啲咁多。因為我啱啱要預備第二個 topic。

G

H

主席：唔係，你仲有幾多嘢要問？

H

I

李柱銘先生：我就想短啲嘅，畀啲時間，我會盡量減啲。

I

J

主席：哦，但係聽日仲有幾耐？

J

K

李柱銘先生：我諗--我希望個半鐘頭嘍。

K

L

主席：嘩，仲有個半鐘？

L

M

李柱銘先生：係好多嘢，不過我想 cut 啲。

M

N

主席：哦，okay。聽朝 10 點，我哋聽朝 10 點。

N

O

2016年2月23日

O

P

下午 4 時 26 分聆訊押後

P

Q

Q

R

R

S

S

T

T

U

U

V

V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C Tuesday, 23 February 2016 C

D (10.04 am) D

E (Transcript of simultaneous interpretation E

F except where otherwise specified) F

G MR WONG CHUNG LEUNG (on former affirmation) G

H Cross-examination by MR HO (continued) H

I CHAIRMAN: (In English) Yes, Mr Ho. I

J MR HO: Good morning. J

K A. Good morning. K

L Q. Today, I would like to take you through the form WWO46. L

M B15.1, page 37621, please. M

N For this form -- N

O A. Sorry, yes, I see it here. O

P Q. Of course, this form isn't just for newly completed P

Q buildings. It would also cover things like alteration Q

R or the dismantling of inside service or removing of R

S an inside service. S

T So it appears to me to be rather general. You can T

U delete certain parts; say, for example, "(in English) U

V pipes and fittings installed", and then "(in English) V

intended to be installed" after the slash.

A. Yes, I see it.

Q. So the purpose is that for newly completed buildings --

sorry, I mean for a new project, of course it isn't

a matter of installation, because part I is for the

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C stage 3 commencement, so it's a matter of "intended to install"?

D A. Correct. D

E Q. If I may take you through this form -- we refer to the notes, so please go to page 37627. E

F A. Sorry? F

G Q. 37627, the notes. G

H For the notes, paragraph 2, it is a reminder, for anybody having to sign this form: H

I "(In English) Provided that all pipes and fittings intended to be installed are approved by the Water Authority, parts I and II of this form shall be submitted to notify the Water Authority of the details and commencement date of plumbing works. If any of the pipes and fittings used/to be used have not yet been approved ..., prior approval must be obtained ..."

J

K

L

M

N So, in other words, does it mean for pipes and fittings already approved in the past, then you can sign this form and have it included in annex 1; however, for those that haven't been approved by the Water Supplies Department, prior approval should be obtained?

O

P

Q

R A. Yes, prior approval should be obtained. R

S Q. So that's the intention. S

T Basically, I would like to take you to point 7. T

U Yesterday, you told us that post-1987, all pipes have to U

V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C be added to this annex. Now, for paragraph 7, it starts C
with the following:

D "(In English) All pipes used/intended to be used are D
E required to be reported in the annex." E

F For fittings, only just a few items need to be F
G reported: (in English) draw-off taps, stop valves, gate G
H valves, ball valves and combination fittings. So only H
such items have to be reported? H

I A. Correct. I

J Q. If we go further down the list, we have BS items. The J
K first part is about the fittings, and then further down K
L we get the valves, five lines further down, "(in L
M English) Categories of compliance of fittings". M

N So yesterday we referred to the four categories, and N
O then we have the Kitemark. So those four categories O
P have already been approved? P

Q A. Correct. Q

R Q. So, on the face of it, for this annex, as to what is to R
S be included in the annex, the focus is on the following S
T point: that is, the pipes and fittings have to be T
U itemised in a detailed way. So you have to check which U
V category has already been approved. If it hasn't, then V
prior approval should be obtained, before it can be
used.

So this form isn't about materials like the

soldering materials. It isn't about the use of such materials.

A. Well, in a public works project, we talk about many materials to be used. When we spot that there have been problems then if the risk is high, then we have to ask it to be reported in the annex.

There is also one other purpose. For the fittings, like the water taps, if you look at the list, we have an approved list. We are talking about thousands or tens of thousands of such fittings. If there isn't any prior reporting, it will be difficult for us to see whether it is fine, if there hasn't been any prior approval, when we are on the site.

Q. In other words, you would like to shift the focus to the pipes and the valves, so that when you fill out the form, the person involved may not be aware of the risk pertaining to, say, things like solder materials; they may not know about the nature of the risk?

A. I cannot agree with you. As I said yesterday, when you carry out a project, there are many specifications and BSs involved. You need to meet the contractual requirements. It is a parcel of requirements. Any person involved in a project, you need to look at the contractual obligations as well as the legal requirements. That person is duty-bound to know about

it, so he has to follow the BS requirements as well as the specifications.

So I cannot agree with you concerning your point about the risk. My understanding is that in a construction project you have to meet the specifications.

Q. You are saying that on the site there are many materials and many procedures that you have to take care of. It is quite complicated. The question is, you have requirements concerning the components, the pipes, et cetera. Now, you are saying that there are so many, the WSD cannot check all of them. Now, you are saying that other people should also check them. When the WSD places the focus on this, have you ever considered that perhaps you need to have a category concerning such materials like the soldering materials?

A. I cannot agree that that's the focus.

CHAIRMAN: Please speak up. Please speak into the microphone.

A. My view is that this is the WSD's requirement of the LP. That is to come up with a list of materials. But then the point is not that you only need to follow this and no others. That's not our intention, and neither is that my intention.

MR HO: My question is, if you think that certain materials

have to be emphasised, and it should require the focus of everybody, then that material shouldn't have been included here, so that everybody should pay attention to that material?

A. As I have always said, it isn't a matter of whether you should focus attention on it or not. In a project, it is a matter of compliance with the specifications. You can't say that for a particular project, "I need to focus on it, I need to meet the requirements for others. That's not a focus; I don't need to make efforts to comply with it." I don't think that's the attitude of doing a project.

Q. So what's the purpose of putting these fittings in the annex? They are there because you want to make sure, at least make sure, that these BSs are complied with?

CHAIRMAN: At the end of the day, when your colleagues go to do the final check, they would have with them the annex, as you have said?

A. Yes, they would have the annex.

CHAIRMAN: But the project under the AP -- let's not talk about the broad principles. The broad principles would mean that everything must be complied with. We understand. But we are very specific here.

You put these items in the annex. What's the purpose of putting them in the annex? We accept the

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C broad principle that everything must comply with the C
D specifications or British Standards. No one would argue D
E with you over that. E

F The question is you have some listed here. You have F
G mentioned some historical reasons, past water leakage G
H incidents, but after decades are there still problems H
I related to leakage only? I

J A. When you report these in the list, then that would J
K facilitate the checking by our colleague, and they can K
L countercheck what they see with the list. L

M MR HO: I still don't quite understand about your assessment M
N of risk of contaminated water. The emphasis you give to N
O the issues -- O

P A. We have always attached importance to this. P
Q Q. In the 1980s, the main concern was water leakage, and Q
R now we want to save water, and of course leakage is R
S never desirable. But when did you begin to think that S
T regulation of the use of pipes and fittings would be for T
U the purpose of safety of drinking water? U

V A. As I said yesterday, we always emphasised the importance V
of safety, and Prof Fawell also agreed that this is V
important. V

Q. Is it because of this that you find these fittings in R
the annex? R

A. We have to adopt a wider perspective. S

T
U
V

CHAIRMAN: You have to speak up. I still cannot hear you.

A. I don't want to repeat what I have said. We rely on two aspects. We have our inspection. On the other hand, why do we want the AP to be responsible for this? Because it has continuous responsibility to ensure the materials will comply with the relevant requirements.

MR HO: So, on the part of the WSD, as far as the selection of materials is concerned, you have a supervisory role. Apart from trying to ask someone else to do it for you, you have a responsibility. When did this become a point of emphasis? When did you switch from looking into water leakage to safety? The 1980s?

A. We started to look into the incident in the 1980s. Today, laboratory tests would be required for materials to be used, and we would look into the components and the fittings. That's why we are very concerned that there should be certification from the authorised person. We attach importance to the use of materials, otherwise we wouldn't ask the AP to certify this.

CHAIRMAN: Actually, we are talking about two different levels. You were talking about the tests, for fittings or components to be listed in your departmental approval list. Because if the fitting is not in the list, then there's no way that it can be considered for use on the site. So it's the so-called threshold condition, to

fulfil the threshold; it doesn't really look at what's the practice to be followed on the site.

The AP or the LP will, as a matter of actual practice, not test something --

A. That's two different levels. I think the test is more about quality control.

CHAIRMAN: It's about the threshold of being listed.

A. I also just want to say that specifications of British Standards would ensure quality. That's very important.

CHAIRMAN: We don't have to talk about these big topics.

A. On the site, when you use some materials, and you comply with the specifications, then that will mean they are safe.

CHAIRMAN: Well, compliance with BS, it's already done at the threshold level, when you list the fittings. But we are talking about subsequently, on the site, when the LP or the AP is required to certify certain things. It's not about meeting the criteria for the list.

I understand why you are trying to say this, because when it comes to individual projects, at that stage, you have carried out no tests.

A. But there's no need.

CHAIRMAN: Then there's the question, when did you start to introduce this so-called functional test, and then you changed the focus of your attention to this conceptual

notion of safety?

A. When you comply -- when a material complies with the BS,
it would ensure water quality.

CHAIRMAN: All right. You are still on the first level.

MR HO: Maybe I should rephrase my question.

CHAIRMAN: For this list, all of them are just pipes and
valves and nothing else. In 2004, yesterday some
colleagues expressed concerns about solders. Did you
consider putting the solders into this list, since you
were so concerned about water quality?

A. I have to ask my colleague to find out the relevant
records for the 2004 situation.

CHAIRMAN: I know. You may think that this is superfluous,
to list it in the annex.

A. I don't think you can say that since it's not in the
list, people should not be too concerned about it.

That's not what we are saying. That's all the
requirements in relation to the specifications.

CHAIRMAN: We didn't say that, but we are curious why, among
all these things, you have to list these in the annex,
because we won't do anything that is redundant or
superfluous. We do things for a purpose.

A. Reporting this in form 46 also serves an important
purpose. When my colleague goes to the site to check,
and if you have a tap with a certain brand name, I won't

be able to check without the list, because there are thousands of approved taps.

But if we are talking about soldering material, the same purpose cannot be served. Today you use FRY, you enter the record as FRY; when my colleague goes to the site for an inspection, he would not know whether it was FRY that you used.

CHAIRMAN: There are thousands of brands of copper pipes.

A. But they would tell us which brand or brands that they would use.

CHAIRMAN: The same can be applied to solder. Then it's not very logical.

A. On the site, you can see the copper pipes, the taps, and you can tell which pipes or taps have been used.

MR HO: If you thought through very carefully at that time, and if you put due emphasis on the WHO Guidelines and other documentation and literature, if you were keenly aware of the risk, then, Director, you should have covered solder in the WSD's approval process.

A. If we were aware that someone would breach the rules, I would have agreed that regulation should be tightened up. That is what we have done now. The LP, the main contractor and the AP may have all failed their duties, and then there would be the risk. So today we would do some tests and take samples.

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C I agree that if we were aware of the risk, we should C
have done more.

D Q. For the latest version of WWO46, please look at C21, D
E page 19087. Of course, that's the latest version, after E
F the incident was exposed. F

G In the middle part, "(in English) Purpose of G
H submission", line 3: H

I "(In English) ... pipes and fittings to be installed I
J and any materials to be used for the construction ..."
K The words "(in English) any materials to be used" K
L cannot be found in the previous version of the form. L
M Now you have learned a lesson, and I believe it's also M
N the product of a risk assessment. N
O So from the angle of monitoring water quality, O
P materials to be used are important? P

Q A. Yes. Our chief chemist also said that one of the Q
R important ways to assess risk would be to monitor the R
S occurrence of certain events. After the lead in water S
T incident, we now recognise that there are irregularities T
U and non-compliance with specifications, so we need to U
V improve our work. V

Q. The question is, if you were able to detect this problem
earlier, and if the form had been revised and the trade
was informed, then that would mean a very different
scenario?

A. Well, when there's an incident and there are risks identified, you need to do something else. But without the incident, you may not be able to gain so much insight into the risk.

CHAIRMAN: I agree with you, but we are not just talking about local incidents. You can assess the risk based on events elsewhere.

If we look at what happened in the past, the old one was about functional control, and in 1938 you ban the use of lead pipes, so to WSD, the fact that lead is hazardous is nothing new?

A. I agree. I agree.

CHAIRMAN: It happened a long time ago, but it isn't something entirely new. There is a chance, though the chance isn't high, I dare not say that we don't have such buildings at all: there may be a very small number of buildings still using lead pipes from the 1930s. So from water quality's perspective, lead in water was a problem in the past, and as a result, it was banned?

A. You mean in 1938?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

A. If I may just supplement what I think. When we talk about risk, there are two points. First of all, probability; second, consequence.

Lead has an impact on health. It is a consequence

that we recognise. As to the probability, it depends on the occurrence of events, so that we can tell about the probability and thus the risk.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, I understand. And then you will have corresponding sorts of changes. You are now looking at the radiological aspect of water. You are worried about impact from Daya Bay, causing an impact on water quality, but in fact it has never happened at all.

A. So it is a matter of risk assessment. Before Daya Bay, might be we didn't do that. Yes, when something happens and you recognise that there is an increase in risk, you will work on it.

COMMISSIONER LAI: Looking back, there were incidents of the use of leaded solder. Say, for example, in 1989, there was the issuing of the memo by the HKPSWTA, and you have also advised people to be careful about this. So something must have happened, otherwise you would not have singled this out.

A. When we talk about something happening, it doesn't mean something major happened.

COMMISSIONER LAI: But at least your WSD colleagues were aware of that. So you can't say that it was something really very major and then you regarded it as an incident, like what we are dealing with today. You are an expert department. Well, at the time, your

colleagues did notice that there was a problem, but it's a matter of whether you could sort of assess the significance of this matter arising from this incident, and whether you have worked on it. Well, we encourage you to go back to look up this information; otherwise, when you always talk about you didn't know, it is difficult to convince us whether you knew nothing at all. On the face of it, it seems not. Whether your industry or yourself, leaded solder would impact upon water quality.

A. Yes. I will go back to gather more information.

CHAIRMAN: When we talk about "you", we are talking about you in the WSD, the department as a whole, not as an individual. Nobody can know everything.

The WSD people went to the VTC, to attend meetings, and you talked about having concerns. That person was a representative of the WSD, and he represented the WSD. We don't care about his individual capacity.

MR HO: Before we go to part IV, about the testing of water, I have some other questions here.

There is this term, "(in English) Not listed", "(in English) Pipes and fittings not listed". Now, you think that the AP could cover everything; right? Your thinking is that "not listed" would cover everything.

Now, my question is, first of all, when the AP fills

out part I, that's before the commencement of the works,
right, before commencement of plumbing works?

A. Yes.

Q. So all he can say is, "I'm now submitting the
materials"; that is, the main contractor submits the
materials to the developer. The developer takes a look
at the materials to be used in the future, and they
should meet the requirements of the BS, et cetera, and
then part I will be filled out. That is in the annex.
Then part I will be signed.

A. Yes.

Q. At that stage, to you, it isn't a matter of controlling
the use of materials. So, to you, it cannot be
an assurance?

A. It must have been an assurance. This is for the AP to
sign on it, to certify, that is whether listed or not
listed, he is going to follow the WWO. In other words,
he is assuring us that in future he is going to oversee
the project, to ensure that the requirements of the WWO
will be translated into the contract and will be
complied with. I believe he can do it. This is because
he has a supervising system.

Q. Let's not talk about supervision. Now, you ask him to
certify, then the person will say that the LP has
submitted the information to the main contractor; the

main contractor has submitted the information to the AP,
and the AP has vetted it, and then he will say it's
FRY 99.

So for you to ask the AP to fill in annex 1, and
assuming that -- assuming, but of course you don't --
you have a requirement to say that soldering materials
have to be stated as well, then obviously the AP will
put down "FRY 99", because that's the material that has
been submitted and approved.

So for the step involved, that's the LP will use
FRY 99, this on its own cannot be regarded as
an assurance. You are simply certifying that this will
be used?

A. Well, we have a difference here. For an AP to put down
his name, to sign and say that this is to be intended to
be used, whether listed or not listed, I think it is
based on the contractual obligations and to comply with
the statutory obligations. This is to ensure that the
project will comply with the specifications and then the
AP is saying that he can certify that.

Q. So your concept is that if somebody is asked to sign and
he signs it, then you can count on him?

A. Well, I think putting down your signature is something
very serious.

Q. I understand. So for part V, we will look at your

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C signature. C

D Part IV. I would like to talk about testing of D

E water. Testing. Let me invite you to look at the E

F witness statement from your department. That is F

G Mr Cheung Yip Kui's statement. C19.5. That is annex 2. G

H You find it on page 13802. H

I A. Yes, I am reading it. I

J Q. There is this: J

K "(In English) Summary of water sampling and tests K

L involving WSD". L

M A. Yes, I see it. M

N Q. Let's go to box No. 2, "(in English) For newly N

O constructed inside service". O

P A. Yes. P

Q Q. "(Partially in English) For newly constructed inside Q

R service: R

S (a) (before 2012) water samples were taken for S

T testing near connection point (8 parameters) ... T

U (b) (from 2012 to 2015) water samples were taken for U

V testing near connection points (8 parameters) as V

It appears that for samples to be taken from the

inside service, it only happened after 2012. Then, for

subparagraph (c):

"(In English) (after discovery of the excess lead in water incident ...) water samples have been taken for testing both near connection point and from the inside service ..."

Do you see it?

A. Yes.

Q. So there's the evolution. Before 2012, you said that samples were only taken near connection point. That was a conscious decision. That is, you decided against taking samples from the inside service and only near the connection point.

A. When you see this document, you can see that it is an evolution. Before 2012, you knew that for all the housing contracts and developer's contracts, when the inside service was completed, they were required to clean the whole system. They will clean the whole system.

As I have already said all the time, the AP has a responsibility towards the developer, and they want to have a system which is suitable for use. At that time, when you install a system, it should be clean enough, and it shouldn't contaminate the public system, because that would have a huge impact; it will have a huge impact on the nearby residents.

Therefore, at that time, that's the most important point to us; whereas for the inside service, we believe that the AP would ensure that it would be clean.

Then came 2012. There was a case of LD in Tamar. We found that, yes, it would be cleaned, but then in 2012, another guideline was issued. It carried a lot of details and teaching them how to cleanse it. Then we told them how to tell whether it would be clean enough. The best way was to get water samples to check whether it was up to standard. If it failed, it had to be cleaned again. So it was a reminder.

Then in 2015 we had to take a step further. That is, water samples had to be tested. We had to be satisfied that it was fine, including heavy metals, and then we would provide water connection.

You can see, you can tell that the evolution was as follows: that is, if the AP can do what they are supposed to do and if the risk is not high, then it is better for us to have a division of responsibility, and we each play our own role.

So you can see that bearing in mind the risk, we are enhancing the requirements.

Q. Before 2012, you told us why samples were tested near the connection point. You said you would like to find out whether the cleansing and disinfection was proper.

A. Well, that was meant to safeguard the public system so that the new development would not contaminate the system, causing an impact on nearby residents.

Q. Yes, understood. So the focus was on cleansing and disinfection. That is, you shouldn't sort of control the biological risk or microbial risk?

A. As Prof Fawell has said, we have been exercising material control.

Q. Before 2012, what was the philosophy? What was your monitoring of material risk? When you talked about the checking of samples, I don't think it was your consideration at all.

A. Mr Chan Kin Man and Prof Fawell have said that according to the WHO, the best way to prevent heavy metal contamination would be to ensure that the right materials are used in the construction. But for the microbial risk, it cannot be controlled at the construction stage. You have to cleanse the system first, to eliminate the risk.

Q. Prof Fawell and other people have said, and in some papers -- well, you have the APs and the LPs to do something to prevent heavy metal contamination, so that when you carry out the tests, you don't have to test everything. That's on the premise that the prevention system is effective. Prof Fawell has also said that.

A. We all along hope that the AP, who is a professional, responsible for the entire project, structural safety and everything, and so on -- we will rely on him to ensure everything is okay.

I remember Prof Fawell said that unless we had that kind of foresight, all these measures would fail. Then we would need to build in some system like that on our own.

Q. So you rely on the prevention mechanism that other people would carry out, so that you don't have to do more at the verification process. That depends on whether the prevention is effective or not. You need to assess whether the prevention is effective or not, when you do the "(in English) passive identification of risk management or control points", when you carry out the test, so that you can be sure whether prevention is effective.

CHAIRMAN: So verification of control is important.

MR HO: So it's what you should have done during the water sampling. You want to rely on this arrangement to justify your position in supervision. You cannot say that you do prevention. You have look at whether prevention is effective and you need to look at certain things on the risk management, so that you are assured. Then you can reduce the work in the final verification.

CHAIRMAN: But prevention is a control measure.

Verification of control measures is important. Whether the prevention works or not, you need something else to verify it.

MR HO: So you need to have the fourth element, so to speak.

After the verification, then you can follow the WHO papers that prevention would be effective in guarding against certain hazards.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Fawell says chemical monitoring is very expensive and not very practicable. So it's important to monitor the use of materials. This is not a point of contention here. Material monitoring is the control measure. Then the question is how or whether you should verify this multi-barrier prevention.

A. When you talk about verification, when the WHO made the recommendation, I believe it was based on a very detailed study. So the recommendation is that you should do a good job in material verification.

CHAIRMAN: I think I have read the WHO drinking water guidelines more than you do. They always talk about adapting to your local situation. They never say that, "I will tell you everything that you need to do." It's always talking about the different local conditions, socioeconomic factors, are all at play, so you have to revise the arrangement, to come up with your own

mechanism. What they give you is just is a framework.

A. That I can agree. That's why in Hong Kong we have a very good system. The construction industry is performing well, in the private sector and public sector as well. I think we have a rather good system with multi-barrier prevention. Material control is, in my view, the proper approach.

Q. On the verification of prevention, your part IV -- that is, you are informed of completion. Then you take water samples. Then that should be where the verification is done.

A. We have to be practical. I think Mr Chan Kin Man has said a lot about this. I am not an expert like him.

When you take water samples for tests, in accordance with the WHO Guidelines, we should be looking at microbial risk.

CHAIRMAN: Come again?

A. Microbial.

CHAIRMAN: Please state that again.

A. When the completion is reported, and you have to take water samples, we should focus on microbial risk, which is in line with the WHO Guidelines.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think so.

A. Otherwise, the compliance cost would be rather exorbitant, if you have to test heavy metals; we are

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C talking about a big compliance cost here. C

D CHAIRMAN: I can partially agree with you, but I don't quite D

E agree with some other parts. At first, you tested for E

F eight parameters. Are they all about microbiological F

G hazards? G

H A. No. H

I CHAIRMAN: It's not really the microbiological emphasis, I

J although you have E.coli, total coliform, and according J

K to Prof Fawell they are all general indicators of water K

L quality. They are not specifically for the purpose of L

M testing which parameter is in compliance. Well, there M

N were health outbreaks in the past, due to N

O microbiological pathogens. So these parameters are O

P there to test the general quality. It's just like pH, P

Q colour, conductivity, residual chlorine; they are just Q

R general parameters. R

S A. Well, these parameters are WHO parameters. S

T CHAIRMAN: Yes. WHO mentions that -- for example, if you T

U check for conductivity, what are you testing? You are U

V testing for the quality of raw water. V

Q A. We are also concerned about the mixing of fresh and Q

R seawater. R

S CHAIRMAN: So the eight parameters are not just about S

T microbial contamination but general quality; it's T

U a general thing. Prof Fawell has told us that apart U

V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C from E.coli, we are going to consider Enterococci virus. C

D So it's just a test for the general qualities? D

E A. Chairman, I am not really an expert on this. E

F CHAIRMAN: Okay. F

G MR HO: On water sampling, I want to talk about the G

H rationale of doing this. H

I CHAIRMAN: Let's return to the eight parameters. So they I

J are not targeting at the material use. So the J

K verification of the material use cannot be tested K

L through the eight parameters. So, basically, I agree, L

M if you have to control the use of lead, you should look M

N at the material. You should do it through material. N

O A. Yes. We can agree this up to stage 3. O

P CHAIRMAN: But in stage 4, as the guardian of water quality, P

Q you do not take any measures to verify what's happened Q

R in the third stage; the eight parameters you adopt R

S cannot do this? S

T A. Well, I'm no expert in this aspect, so I don't think T

U I can elaborate any further. U

V MR HO: There's a smaller issue here. Before 2012, you took V

samples near the connection point. That is to say

before 2012, you had made a decision not to look into

the inside service.

CHAIRMAN: Up to 2012.

MR HO: There was a conscious decision that, "I will take

the samples at the connection point; I wouldn't care what happens in the inside service"?

A. Well, this is a construction worker, after all. We understand that the inside service, you are going to do yourself, your system. The AP would deliver plumbing systems suitable for use for their client or a future user. So we have to make sure that the public waterworks would not be contaminated by this new inside service. There's a supervision system for the inside service, and there's the assurance of the inside service, and if you are doing a good job, I don't need to be involved, but if you are not, then we need to become involved in monitoring. So we are now covering more and more.

Q. I think that's the answer "yes" to my question. At that time, you thought it was not necessary to look at the inside service, so you stopped at the connection point.

A. Because we thought you would be doing a good job.

Q. The AP and the LP would be doing a good job?

A. Yes.

Q. So that's your understanding of your role back then.

Let's look at a paper of 2009. C4, page 3579.

I think it's a working group of your department, "(in English) Divisional meeting of Customer Services Division -- Working Group for Action Items". This is in

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	2009. Page 3579; can you see it?	C
	A. Yes.	
D	Q. For those present, is that you?	D
	A. I'm not an inspector at that time.	
E	Q. You weren't involved -- you didn't attend this one?	E
	A. This is not me, CL Wong here is not me.	
F	Q. Let's look at page 3582. Paragraph 2.7, "(in English)	F
	Issue No. 3 -- Taking water samples for new building	
G	project".	G
	It was said:	
H	"(In English) In 2004, [technical services unit]	H
	with CE/CS's endorsement had clarified the doubts in	
I	circular letter 6/2002 that water samples would be	I
	required for only underground fresh water mains	
J	underneath roads."	J
	In relation to the doubts here, would it be the case	
K	that someone raised the point that beyond the connection	K
	points, maybe samples should be required?	
L	A. I can't tell you. I cannot answer this question, as to	L
	what doubts were involved.	
M	Q. Doubts in circular letter 6/2002?	M
	A. I'm not aware of the background.	
N	Q. Please look at the list of people present. Was there	N
	anyone who will be appearing as a witness in this	
O	Inquiry?	O
P		P
Q		Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

A. I don't think so.

Q. In other words, we cannot pursue this line.

Among the attendees in the list, is anybody still in
service?

A. Yes.

Q. Let's go back to Mr Cheung's witness statement, on
page 13802 of C19.5.

A. Where?

Q. C19.5, page 13802.

A. Yes, I see it.

Q. I want to know about the changes. It appears to me that
for the period from 2012 to 2015, you included inside
service?

A. We provided guidelines. We issued a circular 2/2012.
We told them how to cleanse it, and reminded them to
check the water samples upon completion of cleansing, to
make sure that it was clean.

Q. You changed the practice, you included the inside
service, but then it was by way of a piece of advice.
Does it mean that, to a certain extent, you had
an assessment, and you would like to know what should be
examined as well; that is, not just the connection point
but also inside service as well?

A. I'm not too clear about that. Maybe later on my
colleague, Mr Lam Ching Man, can give you more

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	information.	C
D	Q. Now, for the circular, 2/2012, in B15.1, page 37558.	D
E	A. Yes.	E
F	Q. Page 37558 -- I would like to look at 37560. It starts with:	F
G	"(In English) Under the provision of Waterworks Regulation 7, a consumer or the agent shall be responsible for keeping an inside service clean."	G
H	So it starts with the subject matter of this circular. That is, it is about the inside service.	H
I	So please go to (A) (I), "(in English) Newly installed underground fresh water mains"; do you see it?	I
J	A. Yes.	J
K	Q. Please go to the next page, 37561.	K
L	A. Yes.	L
M	Q. Then, for the title, under (II) -- (I) was about underground water mains -- (II):	M
N	"(In English) Newly installed fresh water inside service other than those covered in (A) (I) above".	N
O	So it must be that in 2012, the attention was shifted to include more than the water mains; in other words, you also paid attention to the inside service?	O
P	A. Yes. We talked about the development.	P
Q	Q. I would like to know about the consideration. Was it that at that time you thought you had to include the	Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

inside service as well?

A. Well, as a result of the incident at Tamar, we would like to remind people that you had to be sure that the inside service is clean. The Tamar incident, that is the LD.

Q. I want to say that under this broad heading, you talk about inside service, please turn over the page and please go to 37562.

A. Yes, I see it.

Q. In the middle, we have this title, "(in English) Methods using disinfectants other than chlorine". It is still under the heading called "Inside service". Then, for the first paragraph, in the middle of it:

"(In English) After successful disinfection, the inside service shall be immediately drained and thoroughly flushed with potable water."

A. Yes.

Q. Then, in subparagraph (3), I would like to draw your attention to that paragraph:

"(In English) After disinfection, arrange with either the Water Authority or an accredited laboratory to collect samples at representative sampling point(s) as agreed by the Water Authority for bacteriological and chemical analysis."

Let me go on and read the remaining sentence:

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	"(In English) If the results are satisfactory, the fresh water inside service can be put into operation.	C
D	If not, the above disinfection and testing procedures	D
E	shall be carried out again."	E
F	When you tried to deal with the inside service, you talk about the bacteriological and chemical analysis?	F
G	A. We talked about the residual chlorine.	G
H	Q. At that time, you didn't pay attention to the following point, that is chemical analysis should include other	H
I	things?	I
J	A. Well, as I have said, I am not an expert. At that time, the philosophy was that material control should be	J
K	relied upon. For water samples we talk about microbial	K
L	risk, and here, for chemicals, we talk about residual	L
M	chlorine.	M
N	Q. So even when you examined the inside service, you still thought that there was no need to look at the possible	N
O	risk of leaded solder? It was still not within your	O
P	horizon?	P
Q	A. Well, the philosophy was still that the best way was to have material control.	Q
R	Q. My question was, at that time, it didn't come into your horizon? You didn't think about that?	R
S	A. This is because we thought material control would have dealt with that issue.	S
T		T
U		U
V		V

Q. So it was handed to others?

A. No, I don't think so. We have included this requirement in the system.

Q. Now, going back to Mr Cheung's statement, point 3, "2015", 12 parameters were included, that is including four heavy metals.

A. Yes.

Q. You believe that currently, it is an effective way to deal with the risk pertaining to heavy metals?

A. As I have said, we have to watch the development of the risks, and then you develop the control measures to deal with the risk. Today, we see the risks. That is, there are people breaching the requirements, therefore we need to introduce the control measures. It isn't a matter of verification. Verification is about verification of control measures. This is a control measure, to tackle the risk of non-compliance.

Q. Well, this step has already been introduced.

A. Yes.

Q. You don't encounter any problem in terms of implementation; right? Well, post-2015, in the light of that incident, you have included a further requirement, but prior to that it didn't attract the attention of anybody?

A. Yes. Such a risk has arisen and so we need to tackle

this risk.

Q. 12 parameters -- after part IV has been dealt with, before moving on to part V, you don't encounter any implementation problems?

A. I don't understand you.

Q. There isn't any practical consideration to prevent you from doing this? There isn't a problem of resources; right?

A. Well, for the compliance costs on the part of the industry, it has increased. Because you need to take more samples, the compliance cost must have gone up.

CHAIRMAN: The compliance cost has gone up drastically?

A. Whether by a large degree or not, I can't say. It has increased.

MR HO: Slightly or a lot, it is relative. For a building project, there must have been increase; it's a matter of who should take it up.

A. If it is for the LPs, a lot. For the main contractors --

Q. I want to know that in terms of implementation, the 2015 requirement can be implemented?

A. Yes, it can. It's a matter of compliance cost.

Q. Prior to 2015, there was no requirement of this nature?

A. No.

CHAIRMAN: Four more parameters -- I think at most \$1,000

more?

MR HO: I think it's a matter of relativity. I don't agree with you that it has been substantially increased.

CHAIRMAN: Prof Lee told us that \$180 for one chemical. So four more samples, you can regard it as \$1,000 more.

For the eight parameters, they have always been there, so it's a matter of incurring \$800 more.

A. But then you are getting more samples.

CHAIRMAN: But then that's a separate issue.

MR HO: So the LP and the AP will sign part IV. Let me talk about the AP. The AP will only talk about the meter position. That's the case for the former form. Sorry to have to go back, talking about risk assessment.

For part IV, you are not asking the AP to play the role of material control?

A. Well, the AP will certify the materials. I think you should find it in form 132 rather than part IV here. In form 132, we asked the AP to sign again to confirm that all the WWO requirements have been met. It is important because that relates to the certificate. It has to do with the occupation permit.

Q. Yes. We are going to look at 132 in a moment. So the AP was not supposed to be responsible for material control?

A. Well, not in the previous version of the form.

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	Q. You then signed part V. If the samples are tested to your satisfaction, then you supply water; right?	C
D	A. Come again, please?	D
E	Q. So, after the samples are tested, and they are okay --	E
F	A. Can I have a look at part V?	F
G	Q. B15.1, page 37625. Part IV is just the previous page. Part V, after doing the inspection and after checking the material against the annex or an amended annex, then you sign part V?	G
H	A. Yes.	H
I	Q. "(In English) Plumbing detailed in part IV are last inspected on [a date]. Pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, no irregularities were found and the plumbing detailed in part IV is approved."	I
J	So you state here, "(in English) Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, no irregularities were found", so you are the final gatekeeper here for the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations?	J
K	A. In a new development, we are talking about tens of thousands of fittings and components in the water supply chain. It would be based on a spot-check, and we state here, "no irregularities were found"; we found no irregularities. As a regulator, we do the inspection. We do not find any irregularities, so we are sort of saying it's okay.	K
L		L
M		M
N		N
O		O
P		P
Q		Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

Q. If you only check one item, and that one is okay, you would still sign this form? So you are saying that, "I have checked something. Those things are okay, no irregularities are found"; that's okay?

A. We can look at the design of the form. We ask the AP and LP to certify something, that they will follow the Waterworks Regulations, and based on that as well we gave the approval.

Q. So all along, from what we have discussed, the design of this form 46, is that you asked the AP and LP to exercise control over material, and the WSD can take a step back from all that?

A. We can explore more effective alternatives to this arrangement.

Chairman, if you don't mind, I would like to say something about that.

After the incident, we did have some discussion with the trade over the possibility of doing surprise inspections. The plumber will have to inform us when work commences and where they are going to work. So we need to have the information before we can do the surprise inspections, because there's so much happening on the site and we may not be able to find plumbing works going on. Then they may inform us that they would commence work in two weeks' time, but things can change

on the site.

Then the trade suggest that we should ask for enhanced on site supervision. Our task force and the submission from HKIE all agree that we should better ask the BSI or BSE to ensure that the proper materials are used.

So we have this system. The current system is what we have. We can ask ourselves whether there are better alternatives. We have explored one alternative. We discussed the matter with the trade, and the initial view is that maybe the site supervision by the BSE and BSIs should be enhanced.

Q. So the philosophy is that for different professional aspects, they should take care of those, but the WSD's role is rather ambiguous?

A. No. The WSD is the regulator. Then we have to ask ourselves what we as the regulator should do, and second whether we as the regulator can put in place a system that I can rely on to ensure compliance with the Ordinance and Regulations.

If the regulator does everything to ensure compliance, that may not be in the best public interest, and that may not be the most cost-effective approach, because we would be expending public resources. We need to strike a good balance between what should be done by

us and what should be achieved through putting in place a system.

We now have a system that relies on the APs, who are professional people, responsible for the entire project. We believe this is a robust arrangement.

Q. So you put in place a system that you can rely on. That brings up the issue that you need to carry out a comprehensive risk assessment before you can say that this is a system robust enough for you to rely on. Then we need to do the risk assessment, and so on and so forth.

So your philosophy is that you want the AP to take up the so-called important role of monitoring. You know there are different types of AP? There are different professionals -- AP may not necessarily be an architect. He can be a surveyor, he can be an engineer, he can be a structural engineer. In the past, a geotechnical engineer could be an AP.

A. I know that engineers and surveyors can also be APs.

Q. So APs are not necessarily architects. And even architects -- well, they may know something about plumbing, but they may not have any hands-on experience. So their knowledge about plumbing may be limited, even if they are architects?

A. Well, the architects would be doing similar things. As

suggested by HKIA, there are things that would be beyond his own experience and knowledge. Then they would have to appoint qualified people to do the job.

Q. I just want to know the reliability of your philosophy.

A. The AP is the overall controller.

Q. Why do you have to rely on the AP?

A. The AP is responsible for the entire development.

Q. Let's say the AP is a structural engineer or surveyor, and he signs the building plans for submission, and the architect may be doing the periodical supervision, and that may not be the AP?

A. Well, the AP can entrust certain duties to other people.

The AP may not know every detail of the works involved.

Q. But we were looking at a box presented by HKIA. The first co-ordinator is the architect, and then you have the AP next to that, on site, and the structural engineer, and so on and so forth. Can you remember that chart? A4, page 2977.

A. Yes.

Q. The architect is the co-ordinator, and then you have the AP, RSE, RGE; can you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. If you say that you are the one ultimately responsible for the site -- the AP may not have that role of the architect. Maybe the plans are signed by the surveyor,

as the AP. You put the responsibility on the AP. Have you considered this arrangement on the site, or is it because you assume the AP would be the architect?

A. No, no, no. We always know that professionals in different disciplines can be the AP, not necessarily the architect. The AP is not necessarily the architect.

Q. Exactly. According to this chart, the lead co-ordinator is the architect, not the AP.

A. When you proceed to the construction stage, you have the AP, who may belong to one of the three disciplines.

Q. Unless I have misread this chart, page 2977, I think you are -- I just want to clarify your understanding -- you want to get the one who is responsible on the construction site, and put the responsibility on that person, relying on him. But I am trying to tell you -- let's look at this chart. If I do not misunderstand this chart, the co-ordinator, the lead co-ordinator, is the architect of the site.

A. I think here the architect is the lead consultant for the delivery of the project.

Q. Well, the AP is there to deal with the BO, the Building Authority, to submit plans, to get approval, to get the occupation permit, to comply with the Buildings Ordinance. That's the responsibility of the AP.

A. That's why he has to make sure that the entire

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	development would be delivered in accordance with various requirements.	C
D	Q. So he can be a structural engineer?	D
E	A. Yes.	E
F	Q. So the first thing I want to say is that he may not be an architect. It may take an architect to do the	F
G	co-ordination on the site.?	G
H	A. It may be an architect. It may be a building services engineer or building services inspector.	H
I	Q. You put the responsibility on the AP. I want to test if	I
J	this is an appropriate approach.	J
	I would like to go to 132.	
K	CHAIRMAN: Let's take a 20-minute break.	K
L	(11.30 am)	L
	(A short adjournment)	
M	(11.54 am)	M
N	CHAIRMAN: How long would you take, Mr Ho?	N
O	MR HO: I think 15 minutes.	O
P	Before that, if I can, I will be asking questions about form 132. I won't be talking about the	P
Q	philosophies; all right? I know what you are trying to say.	Q
R	Please look at B15.1, page 37630.	R
S	A. Yes, I can see it.	S
T	Q. There are two parts, part I and part II. The heading,	T
U		U
V		V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C "(in English) Application for certificate regarding water supply availability/connection". C

D It's about the Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments ...) Regulations. This is a certificate required for the granting of the occupation permit. D

E

F A. Yes. We have to issue a certificate to certify that F

G water supply has been connected and then the AP would G

H use this to apply for an occupation permit. H

I Q. Under the Buildings Ordinance, there are a number of I

J steps that the AP has to take. Part I, a few things J

K here: K

L "(In English) Proposed development: estimated daily L

M demand", in terms of litres of water. M

N Then a breakdown: "(in English) Residential", N

O "(in English) Commercial" and "(in English) Industrial"; O

P do you see that? P

Q A. Yes. Q

R Q. Do you agree that this is under the Sanitary Fitments R

S Regulations? If it is a residential building, that you S

T have to look at the number of toilets, the number of T

U residents, so you have to indicate "(in English) the U

V number of flats and the anticipated population"; is that V

correct? V

A. Well, the heading, item 1, "(in English) Availability of water supply" -- if I want to know whether I can supply

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	water to you, I want to know how many people there are.	C
D	Q. So it's for residential, commercial or industrial uses;	D
E	the supply would be different?	E
F	A. Well, the demand would be different.	F
G	Q. So you agree with me?	G
H	A. We collect the information to ascertain the demand.	H
I	Q. From the angle of the Buildings Ordinance, the important	I
J	thing is to look at the sanitary fitments, and the	J
K	number of sanitary fitments is dependent on the number	K
L	of residents, the number of toilets, and then you need	L
M	to know what kind of water supply would be made	M
N	available?	N
O	A. Which regulation?	O
P	Q. Sanitary fitment.	P
Q	A. But the important thing for us is to know the demand for	Q
R	water supply.	R
S	Q. But this form will be submitted to the Building	S
T	Authority.	T
U	A. For part I, it's centred on the amount of water	U
V	required, and whether the WSD can supply it. So we need	V
	to know your demand and whether the water mains in that	
	district can provide the supply.	
	Q. The AP needs this certificate. The AP has to comply	
	with the Building (Sanitary Fitments) Regulation.	

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C Can I ask you to take a look at the regulation? C

D I don't know whether it is in the bundle. I can give D
you a spare copy. (Handed).

E Under this regulation, do you see regulation 4? E

F A. Yes, regulation 4. F

G Q. It sets out that there are certain requirements. If it G
is a residential unit, table 1, table 2; if it is
H a household of eight or more than eight, the number of H
I female persons, the number of male persons; and then the I
water fitment closet requirements are clearly defined.

J A. Well, from this, you cannot directly calculate the water J
in demand.

K Q. Well, you apply to the BO, from the building K
L administration perspective, this is WWO132, a form from L
the WSD. But then they would like to get 1005 from you.

M You designed this form. It is carrying this M
N heading. It is "(In English) Sanitary Fitments". N

O A. We want to prove -- we need a proof from you because O
P I would like to meet the requirements under sanitary P
fitments regulation so that I can get the OP. Yes, for
Q part I, I would like to know, since you would like to Q
get water supplied from me -- now, setting aside
R everything else, the simple question is I don't know how R
S much water you need, so you need to tell me before I can S
T say whether I can supply the water to you. T

U

V

So for part I, I don't think we need to make reference to the Buildings Ordinance.

Q. It isn't such a question. When they fill out this form, they would be interested in getting a certificate from you, so that I can get an OP. So my focus is on whether I have met all the sanitary fitments requirements, say how many people are there, how many urinals in the case of a commercial building, drainage and the sanitary fittings.

A. They have to meet all such requirements. As to the urinals and also the drains, that's not our focus. Our focus is on water supply. For us, part I doesn't go to the stage of getting a certificate for the sake of an OP. Parts I and II may have a lapse of a few years. For part I, you simply ask me whether there will be water supply, so you need to get information for me so that I can say whether it is an answer of "yes" or "no".

Q. Part II, it means that under the Sanitary Fitments -- I want to know whether you can give me a certificate.

A. I don't think we need to make reference to the Buildings Ordinance in part II. For part II, it is about the issuance of a certificate to say that I can provide water supply to you.

Q. So for part II, that's for the sake of getting a 1005?

A. Yes, to get 1005 from you.

Q. Let us take a look at 1005. Page 37802.

Pages 37801 and 37802, that's the case for Kai Ching. We have two parts; first of all, blocks 1 to 6. Then stage 2, for the commercial portion.

You asked the AP -- now, for 132, the AP would like to get the certificate from you. You can see that for this certificate, it is issued directly to the Buildings Department.

A. So you confirm what we ask you to confirm, then we give you a certificate.

Q. For this one, it starts with saying that it is in relation to Building (Administration) Regulation 25A.

A. They need such a certificate.

Q. Exactly. For 25A -- maybe I will go to 25A in a moment -- but for the two certificates they want from you, in paragraph 2 of regulation 10A of Sanitary Fitments --

A. Sorry, which one are you referring to now?

Q. Please take a look at paragraphs 1 and 2 of the certificate.

A. Yes.

Q. It says that you have issued a paper, that is under regulation 10A of Sanitary Fitments, paragraph (2) of 10A and also paragraph (1) of regulation 10A. Do you see it?

A. Yes.

Q. So, when you issued this certificate regarding water supply connection, you are interested in the Sanitary Fitments Regulations?

A. I'm not a lawyer. Well, the term being used here is, "(in English) for the purposes of". In other words, I issued this certificate regarding water supply connection "(in English) for the purposes of" -- in other words, I tell you that there is already water supply, therefore, with this, you can go to apply for an OP. So this is "(in English) for the purpose of" that.

Q. Yes, understood. Again, I'm interested in "(in English) for the purpose of", I apply 132 for the purpose of the Sanitary Fitments Regulations, so that I can get the OP; right? In other words, the whole focus is on how to enable or facilitate the AP in his application for a certificate under the Sanitary Fitments Regulations?

A. I don't agree it's a matter of enabling him or facilitating him. The Water Authority has to certify that water is being supplied. You need to certify that water is supplied.

Q. For the purpose of the Sanitary Fitments requirements?

A. No, for the purpose of issuing this certificate so that you can get OP.

Q. Well, in my submission, I can cover this point. I think everybody can see what this is for.

Let me be frank with you. This isn't about water safety.

A. If not, why would I want you to confirm the compliance?

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean?

A. For 132, there is this requirement. The AP has to confirm that the materials are in compliance with the WWO provisions and requirements. There's an explicit requirement. Before I issue the certificate and before I confirm connection of water supply so that you get the OP, there's this requirement, to ask for the confirmation.

MR HO: Well, if you look at the Sanitary Fitments Regulations, there are a lot of provisions concerning the pumps, et cetera. All of them, in relation to bathroom drainage works, et cetera, they start from the perspective of sanitary concerns?

A. Well, this is a WWO form. WSD's form. There is a requirement. So of course I will mention things related to the Waterworks Authority. As the chairman said, drainage has nothing to do with me. There is no reason for me to ask you to confirm things that are totally unrelated to me. There's no need for that.

Q. For your WW Ordinance, there is one part about pipes and

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C fittings, just a schedule. WWR, parts V and VI. C

D Sorry -- yes, it is right. Schedule 2, parts V and D
part VI of the Waterworks Regulations. (Handed).

E Have you got it? E

F A. Yes, I see it. F

G Q. Part V, under schedule 2, as with part VI. Under the G
Waterworks Regulations, you talk about the flushing
H applications, internal diameters, bath, lavatory, H
basins, sinks; do you see it?

I A. Yes. I

J Q. I believe, from your perspective, this has to do with J
use of water or the prevention of waste water. I don't
K know if you can answer this question. Under the K
L buildings regulations, they want to be sure that water L
supply is connected, so that sanitation can be upheld.
M There will be flushing water for the toilet, and you M
N have a certain number of bathrooms in a residential N
O premises, and it will be adequate for the use of the O
P household. Then, for the commercial premises or P
Q industrial or recreational premises in the public area, Q
you also have the corresponding facilities to meet the
R requirements of sanitation. R

S A. I haven't read the regulation, but logically, it is S
T fine. That is when you want to get an OP, you have to T
U make sure that the sanitary facilities are fine and you U
V

need water supply. Therefore, you need to approach the Waterworks Authority for water. You need the WA to confirm that water supply has been connected. With that, you can get the OP. Otherwise, the BD will think that the facilities cannot work.

When the WA would like to give you water, the WA want you to confirm that your plumbing system is proper, and then we can confirm that we can give you water. So it is a logical and reasonable sequence of steps. We need to be satisfied, we give you the cert. With our a cert to confirm that everything is fine, and then you will go to get the OP.

Q. So there is a process for you to get the certificate. Everybody will see it differently, from different perspectives. But ultimately, when we want to maintain the standard of water quality, then of course you need to have the right forms, the correct circulars, or there are points for you to monitor. You can't simply willy-nilly give the responsibility to somebody simply by asking for a signed form and then you say that you rely on the signed form, assuming that everything has been confirmed?

A. Well, it means that we go back to the beginning of our lengthy discussion.

Q. Let's not dwell on this with you, otherwise it will be

a bit complicated to go through all the regulations.

I will leave it to be addressed in my final submission.

I just want to make sure that you don't have the
impression that I don't allow you the chance to explain.

Mr Chairman, that's it from me.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr Lee?

Cross-examination by MR LEE

MR LEE: I would like to ask you to take a look at your
functions. (Handed). Both will be needed.

First of all, please take a look at the Chinese
version.

A. Yes.

Q. It starts with "The following":

"The following are the functions of the WSD".

A. It's from our website.

Q. So is that your responsibility, as to what you mean?

A. Of course, I did oversee that.

Q. In a moment, I am going to ask you questions. If you
don't think that you are the right person to answer the
question, please tell us who I should ask and then
I will ask the right person.

If there are things you should know or things that
you have forgotten, and you need to get information,
please tell us. I don't mind even if you have to make

telephone calls to get the answer.

So we are told about the five main tasks. You talk about planning water supply; second, design and construct water facilities or infrastructure, that's about the major infrastructure; thirdly, operating the distribution system and maintenance:

"We oversee the catchment, reservoirs, water treatment works, service reservoirs, trunk and distribution mains in relation to the operation maintenance, to make sure that each customer will get a steady supply of water."

So you guarantee 24-hour supply for each and every account holder.

Then water quality:

"We test the water quality from raw water and from water taps of customers. We take samples to carry out chemical, bacteriological, limnological, biological and radiological tests."

In other words, you are responsible for taking water samples and testing them at the customers' taps?

A. Yes, we did do so. I think Mr Chan Kin Man has referred to this. Every year, we take 16,000 pairs of samples, a microbial risk, that is whether there will be bacteria, whether it is dirty; that's our focus.

Q. You talk about customers' taps. I think we have been

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C told that you talk about the commercial centres. C

D A. I think we do have this question of having access to D

E individual households. It is difficult. You know that E

F some households may not want us to enter their premises. F

G In the past, we have mainly been going into accessible G

H premises. H

I Q. Have you tried to seek the help of, say, the management I

J office? If you just knock on the door, it may not work, J

K because maybe nobody is inside. If you ask for K

L assistance -- L

M A. Well, usually we go to the property management office. M

N They may have a toilet and then we will get water N

O samples there. O

P Q. So you don't go upstairs? P

Q A. As you have said, we don't go to such a detailed degree. Q

R From WSD colleagues, we have been told that it is not R

S that easy, because others may not want us to enter their S

T premises. T

U As to whether we have been refused entry, I cannot U

V give you an answer now. V

Q. But after the incident, you went to check many public Q

R rental housing units? R

S A. Yes. We assisted the Housing Department in doing it. S

T Q. Who accompanied you? T

U A. The Housing Department staff. U

V

Q. So with the Housing Department staff accompanying your people, there was no problem?

A. We still had to get the consent of the tenants.

Q. Well, if this one refuses, you just get the next tenant's consent? I don't think you would be refused by all of the tenants?

A. Most of them allowed us, to let us in.

Q. Then, "To provide customer services and to enforce the Waterworks Ordinance".

Let's look at the English version, the last part:

"(In English) To provide customer services and to enforce the Waterworks Ordinance".

It tallies. Let's go back to the Chinese version:

"The department is responsible for the administration of the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations. The department also scrutinises plumbing proposals for new and revised plumbing system ..."

And here's the English version:

"(In English) The department is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations."

Back to the Chinese version, you don't see the word

"(in English) enforcement"?

A. Maybe there's a translation problem.

Q. You are not suggesting that you have got nothing to do

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C with enforcement? It's not intentional? C

D A. I have to ask my colleagues to check. D

E Q. I don't think it's intentional, because it's in the heading, "enforce the Waterworks Ordinance". E

F Of course, you did not prepare these yourself, so we need to find someone responsible. So it would be okay to ask you to be accountable? Are you the executive arm to the Water Authority? F

G H A. It's not like the relationship between the Housing Authority and the Housing Department. The Water Authority is the director of water supplies. I'm not sure whether we are the executive arm. But the Water Authority has to ask people to help him. G

H I Q. Do you have anyone who is working for the Water Authority? I

J M A. The entire Water Supplies Department has to work for the Water Authority. J

K N Q. So your boss, if he wants someone to help him, everyone in the department would help? It's not like the previous Governor who has his own Secretariat? K

L O A. No. L

M Q. So the two terms can be interchangeable, "Water Authority" and "Director". You have referred to Prof Fawell. He's an expert; you think he's an expert, right? M

N O

P T

U

V

A. He is certainly an expert.

Q. You have been referring to his observations. But you don't follow his ideas strictly. I will be coming to that later.

Now, we have some booklets here. A1/21 and A1/22.

I don't need to introduce this to you. In the last part, it is dated August 2015.

A. It was published in August 2015.

Q. You can see that's in small print, "8/2015". It's the back cover.

A. We don't have the last page.

Q. Also the first page, "Designed by the Information Services Department. Printed by the Government Logistics Department ..."

So you were involved to a great extent, I suppose?

A. I don't know whether the extent is great or not. The Department of Health is also involved. The Housing Authority as well.

Q. You can see the topics: "Drinking water supply in Hong Kong".

"Hong Kong's Water Supply" is on the cover, "Reducing Lead in Drinking Water". The incident was exposed in July.

The first page -- I won't be reading out everything -- page 1, "Drinking Water Supply in

Hong Kong" -- can you see it?

"The Water Supplies Department is committed to providing quality drinking water supply 24 hours a day to the public."

Then, at the end of the page, it's a long sentence. In the middle part:

"It is delivered via a huge and enclosed network of pumping stations ... It is then routed through the building's internal plumbing system which includes a sump tank, a roof tank, pipes and fittings before reaching the customer's tap."

Do you agree that for quality drinking water, 24 hours a day, your department is responsible for providing, continuously, quality drinking water to the consumer's tap? Do you agree it's your responsibility?

A. Yes. We would be responsible for sending quality drinking water to the boundary lot, and then through legislation and publicity and other building systems, we hope that at the consumer's tap -- just like going to my home. Outside my flat it would be very clean, but I would be responsible for the cleanliness of my flat. We would like our customers to maintain their system.

Q. This is a question of who should do what, but is it what is said here?

A. That's our goal. We hope that at the consumer's tap the

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C water quality is good. C

D Q. It's your objective; it's also your responsibility. If D
I turn on the tap and there's no water, who is D
E responsible? Of course you are. If the water is dirty, E
F who is responsible? F

G A. Then we have to find out the reasons. If it's because G
of a dirty sump tank they have in the building -- let's G
H say we receive a complaint, we send our colleagues to H
I take a look and find out the source of the problem. If I
J it's about a dirty internal system, we ask them to fix J
K it. If it's about our problem, we would clean it. K

L Q. Of course, when a resident turns on the tap and there's L
no water, they will call the management office. Some L
M will call the WSD? M

N A. Yes. N

O Q. Because your phone is there. O

P Then "Maintenance of water supply system", and P
O there's a chart, government land in green, government O
P main, it reaches out to the end of the arrow at the P
Q connection point? Q

R A. Yes, connection point. R

S Q. And then the yellow part is the private premises. S

T A. The communal parts. T

U Q. And then, after passing through the system, the water U
will go into the residential -- the units, the premises. U

V

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	Day 60
C	A. Yes.	C
D	Q. Then "Waterworks", on this side, "Communal Service System", and then "Inside Service System", in different colours.	D
E	"Water pipes that join the WSD's water mains to the connection point at the lot boundary are maintained by the WSD."	E
F	That is the mains on the street would be your responsibility, in terms of repair and maintenance.	F
G	"The communal service including the service pipes from the building's lot boundary to the building as well as those communal pipes inside the building are maintained by the agent (usually the property management agent ...)	G
H	The inside service of a flat or property is maintained by the property owner."	H
I	That is the pink one.	I
J	Now, you only talk about maintenance and not about water quality.	J
K	A. But both are interrelated, closely related.	K
L	Q. But this is what is said in this leaflet.	L
M	A. Water quality has a lot to do with maintenance. By maintaining the system, you can be sure of water quality.	M
N	Q. Of course, it is a question of the final responsibility.	N
O		O
P		P
Q		Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

So I can understand that all the stakeholders have to play a role. For the water safety plan, it's also embracing this concept.

A. Yes. Prof Fawell also said that -- like take the part from the yellow part to the pink part -- he has also said that there may be the need for a water safety plan, and maybe the Water Authority can take the lead or provide guidelines, so that the stakeholders can develop their own water safety plan. We have started to consider it.

Q. Only "started"?

A. In the past, we haven't got water safety plans for buildings. All around the world, it is not that common to have water safety plans in buildings. If you have paid attention to Prof Fawell's recommendations, we need the stakeholders. For the Water Authority, we can't do it on their behalf. When we go inside, there will be a lot of risks, and they will know them better. Say, for example, the frequency of inspections, how many people will be overseeing the system. I think the direction is worthy of our consideration. That is, whether in future we should develop water safety plans inside buildings and we will get the developers, et cetera.

Q. You say that it is "possible" and "maybe"?

A. Well, of course, for the developers to develop a water safety plan, relatively it is easier, because they have assistance of the professionals. But then, for individual owners, if you impose a requirement on individual small owners, it may become a large burden on them.

In the past, basically we have been providing guidelines, say guidelines for maintenance. We give talks. We also have the Quality Water Supply Scheme for Buildings. I won't say that this is the water safety plan, but then it can become part of it. This is to do with the microbial risk.

We have been working on public education. We have introduced the Quality Water Supply Scheme for Buildings. As to whether we can consider water safety plans for buildings and impose it on owners and the management officers, I think we can study the feasibility.

Q. That means that you may not do it?

A. I think we can promote the idea. It may not be difficult. However, if you want to make everybody do it, you have to be cautious.

Q. Have I ever said that I want everybody to do it?

A. Okay.

Q. Do you think that it should be done?

A. If you want to further improve the system and be assured of water quality, it would be good. We have got one, to make sure that the water is safe for the system. If you want to do it at the customer's end, it is something that we can consider.

Q. You say that you have done it on your own, up to the connection point. You do it for your own sake?

A. No, for the entirety of the Hong Kong population. If our water is not safe, it is pointless, even if their own system is clean.

Q. So this is to put yourself on the alert? You want to make sure that you are up to the standard? Well, take lead as an example. At the connection point, what is your expectation in relation to the lead content? It should be low; right?

A. I haven't collected the data.

Q. Have you got any standard?

A. In line with the WHO guideline value, 10 micrograms.

Q. Then it must be very high, 10 micrograms per litre?

A. Yes, I know there has been a lot of discussion on this point here, but if you look around the world, and I can appreciate that in the US and the UK, they used to have lead pipes --

Q. I don't want to waste time. Maybe you have misunderstood the WHO's guideline value of

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C 10 micrograms, but for the time being let's assume that C

D that's it, but don't tell me that this is your target. D

E As long as it doesn't exceed, you think it is fine? E

F A. No, it is not that we want to reach 10. F

G Q. I think in theory it would be best if it was zero. G

H A. We can allow for a small amount, but in reality, it H

I can't be done. I

J Q. We should not consume lead, as the toxin is cumulative. J

K It is best to have no lead in water. Do you agree? K

L That's the theory; right? L

M A. Yes, in theory. M

N Q. You won't add lead; you may add chlorine? N

O A. Yes, we add chlorine. O

P Q. So in theory, it should be zero, but that can't be P

Q achieved, so what is the maximum limit that you would Q

R permit up to the connection point? Currently, you set R

S it at 10. S

T A. 10. Yes, 10 is the standard. T

U Q. Is that because it is the recommendation of Mr Chan U

V Kin Man? V

CHAIRMAN: I couldn't catch your question, the question

before that.

MR LEE: Are you saying that as long as the water up to the

connection point doesn't contain more than 10 micrograms

per litre, you are happy?

A. I think we should put it in this way. Currently, the compliance or standard has been set in accordance with the WHO, and that's 10 micrograms per litre. This is our standard. So we want to comply with this standard.

Q. In other words, if it exceeds 10, then it should not be tolerated, it has to be rectified? As long as it doesn't exceed 10, it will be fine, up to the connection point? If it can be complied with, then it is okay?

A. I think, for all the water quality limits and standards, that's how we treat it. That is, it shouldn't exceed 10 micrograms per litre up to the connection point.

Q. So it will be fine for 9.99?

A. Yes, in theory, it is.

Q. In theory, I don't think it should be like that, because once it enters the inside service, and when there is a small addition, then it will exceed 10.

CHAIRMAN: Well, there's no end to this debate. If he starts to agree with you that it is not good to have 9.99, then you will say, "What about 9.98?"

MR LEE: For the sake of lunch break, I need to quicken my pace.

CHAIRMAN: Whether we have a meal break, it is not important.

MR LEE: It's important to me!

CHAIRMAN: Exactly what is the point you are trying to get

from Mr Wong? A lower limit?

I think I should put it in this way. The WHO has its own limits. Hong Kong should have its own limits.

In the light of our circumstances, I think we can pitch it at a far lower level than 10. I think we can keep it below 5. Do you agree?

A. During the hearing, a lot of comments of this sort have been aired. Even for the health-based argument, the views have not been consistent. I have been asking around. Some colleagues have told me that in Australia, 10 has been taken as a risk-based limit. In Scotland, it is also health-based. But Prof Fawell said that it is not health-based.

CHAIRMAN: In Scotland, certainly it is not.

A. It doesn't matter. We will certainly study the matter.

MR LEE: I think this is arguable, but let me tell you:

Prof Fawell made it very clear, currently it is not health-based. Moreover, every nation, every place, should try for a lower limit, and it should be as low as possible.

A. As low as possible. But of course, if you look around the world, even in the case of New Zealand and Australia and Singapore, they don't have problems with lead pipes, and they still have 10.

Q. But we have our own circumstances.

A. Right, so we have to study the matter.

Q. Prof Fawell has said that the water quality in Hong Kong is good up to the connection point. Prof Lee has also tested the water taps. In many samples, the lead content was found to be 0.000, so undetectable. Have you followed the hearing?

A. Not up to that degree of details.

Q. Both of them thought that the water quality in Hong Kong is good, so we should praise you. So you shouldn't have a requirement of 10 as the standard.

A. Like the passing mark is 50, but I can achieve 100 marks.

Q. So, just like being beautiful, if you are 50 per cent, others may say it is still inadequate.

Page 4, "Water quality conforms to international standards", so you get 100 per cent mark.

"Water quality conforms to international standards.

The quality of drinking water supplied by the WSD fully conforms to the WHO Guidelines."

In other words, you mean less than 10 micrograms?

A. It must be the case.

Q. "A water safety plan in accordance with the WHO Guidelines has been in place since 2007 to further ensure a safe water supply to customers."

In other words, in 2007, you introduced the idea of

water safety plan, but up to the connection point;
right?

A. Yes.

Q. But then you said that it is in accordance with the WHO
Guidelines, to ensure a safe water supply to customers.

But according to page 1, it should be up to the water
taps, because on page 1 you talk about 24 hours a day to
the public, reaching the customer's tap. So people may
think that the water safety plan will cover up to the
water taps.

A. In fact, it should be up to the connection point.

Q. That's why people won't know that you are talking about
the connection point only. You are not being
deliberate, but it may be misleading.

A. The water safety plan, by having the water safety plan,
we can ensure safe water supply to the people of
Hong Kong.

Q. Well, if the water is of poor quality up to the
connection point, then quality at the water tap cannot
be good, but not the other way around.

A. (Chinese spoken).

COMMISSIONER LAI: Mr Wong, please speak closer to the mic.

It is difficult for us to hear you.

MR LEE: "Hong Kong's water quality monitoring programme is
comprehensive and stringent. Water quality throughout

the supply system is systematically and regularly monitored at representative sampling points for analyses including physical (pH, colour ...), chemical ([including lead, et cetera]), radiological, bacteriological ... examinations."

What's the purpose in putting together this leaflet?

In July, the incident broke out, and in August you issued this leaflet. Was that meant to allay the fears of the people?

A. Well, when the incident broke out in relation to lead in drinking water, members of the public weren't too sure about the impact. We thought it would be good to provide information to the public, so that they can understand more.

In fact, towards the end of the leaflet, we also have some advice for citizens, to tell them what they should do and could do.

Q. Is it right that first of all you tried to tell them that there's no need to worry; at least the quality of water up to the connection point is good?

A. We want to tell them that the quality is fine, to allay their fears. We want to tell them that the water supplied by the WSD up to the connection point is safe, is up to the WHO standards.

Q. But you didn't mention "connection point".

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C A. But the whole booklet read as a whole might be able to C

D give people the impression that we are responsible for D

E waterworks up to the connection point, we are E

F responsible for the waterworks, and then after entering F

G the communal part, the management office would be G

H responsible. H

I Q. Yes, it's clear, as far as maintenance of the system is I

J concerned. Under the Quality Water Scheme, you didn't J

K mention "connection point". It's a fact. K

L I am not going to read out the entire paragraph. L

M Page 5: M

N "Drinking water can be contaminated in a number of N

O ways after entering the inside service system in O

P a building." P

Q "Inside service" is in bold type. Q

R "Contamination mainly arises from old and worn-out R

S inside service systems ..." S

T This time, the incident has nothing to do with T

U worn-out inside service system, then it's not about U

V rusted pipes, but it's about improperly jointed pipes. V

It is not related to old storage tanks.

"Water can also be contaminated by substandard pipes and fittings installed during construction, renovation or replacement ..."

But not related to this incident, I think?

A. Well, this time it's about solder.

CHAIRMAN: Fittings as well?

A. But the impact is not big.

MR LEE: The tap and the fittings are made of copper alloy, and if there's lead -- if you go to a unit and you check the tap, and then if you carry out the tests and if you find out that it's 10 micrograms of lead per litre of water, can you tell how much comes from the solder and how much from the fittings?

A. I was involved in the task force investigation. It was a static test. We tried to apportion the share. But when the water flows in the pipe, in the system, we cannot really tell.

I am also interested to know -- let's see whether the CFD model of Prof Lee can be employed, to look at the contribution of different parts, because when the water is flowing, things can be different.

Q. Yes, there may be some contamination inside the pipe.

A. According to the investigation carried out by the task force, if you have lead solder, there may be lead deposits in the pipe affecting the water quality. So it's complicated.

If you know the proportion due to certain components in a fluid situation, it's complicated.

Q. So far, you have no answer to that?

A. No.

CHAIRMAN: What about static?

A. Well, we have done the static tests. For 24 hours, the water is stagnant for 24 hours in that test.

MR LEE: But it can be done. Now that we know that the tap can be a contributing factor up to a certain stage, up to a certain level, we know the relevant BS.

A. But it would be complicated task. It's not easy.

CHAIRMAN: I know it is not easy.

A. So that's why I haven't done it. It would be difficult for my department as well.

CHAIRMAN: In the whole water supply chain, there are many parts, and I think if it's going to be done, it's going to be costly.

A. Yes.

MR LEE: Have you considered asking Prof Lee to do it?

A. I was saying that the CFD model of Prof Lee will be one of the options, because it's difficult to test for the dynamics scenario. So far, we haven't got any information, any answer.

Q. So you want to tackle the contamination of lead due to solder; that's the main thing now, solder?

A. Yes, that's the main thing.

Q. You have said, "Where does lead come from?", page 5. At page 5, "Where does lead come from?"

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C Paragraph 4: C

D "Copper pipes contain less than 0.1 per cent D
impurities, including lead."

E Also, you have banned the use of lead solder, E
lead-based soldering, since the 1980s.

F "However, copper alloy components with a minor F
percentage of lead ... can still comply with the British
G Standards or other accepted standards ... G

H Since some pipes or fittings, including valves and H
I taps, may contain a small amount of lead, particularly I
J those made from copper alloy materials ..." J

K So you have learned from incidents elsewhere? K

L A. Not me personally. L

L Q. Your department knew? L

M A. I have to gather information, as I have said. M

M Q. You can give us a call if you find out what happened; M
N okay? N

O Your department cannot say, "I will only know after O
there's an incident"?

P A. Well, we have a radar system. We have our colleagues P
Q going out to check. I don't know what kind of Q
R information has been gathered further. At that point, R
S our so-called radar system couldn't see. Mr Chau S
Sai Wai of my department will be giving evidence.

T Q. He would have known? No? T

U

V

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	A. Well, he will be saying what system was there.	C
D	Q. There was a problem in Scotland, there was a problem in Ireland. Would someone in your department be	D
E	responsible for making reports?	E
F	A. We would not know what happened elsewhere in the world.	F
G	Q. You can watch CNN, BBC.	G
H	A. For some world-class authorities such as the WHO, and so on, we can collect information. But can we cover	H
I	everything all over the world? That cannot be done.	I
J	Q. Well, small incidents that happen to a building or to a city, of course you don't have to pay attention. But	J
K	what about a national event?	K
L	A. That's not the scale of the Scotland incident.	L
M	Q. Do you have any dedicated people to make reports to you?	M
N	A. Mr Chau Sai Wai's statement will be telling you the details.	N
O	Q. I cannot ask him. You are the senior officer. Who is responsible for that reporting process?	O
P	A. Many colleagues. For example, Mr Chan Kin Man's team, on water science, they have chemists. Depending on the	P
Q	need of the discharge of duties, they would be referring us to incidents in other parts of the world.	Q
R	At one point, there was an incident causing death in	R
S	Australia, concerning CNG, and we did respond.	S
T	CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Lee is asking that your department	T
U		U
V		V

should have a co-ordinator who is responsible for this. So water science people would be interested in whatever is related to water science and they would be looking at lead from the analytical angle. They may be interested in knowing what to do, if the level has changed from 8 to 5. There are other people who don't care about water science. For example, we are not interested in this knowing whether your equipment can detect a level of 5, but I would be interested in knowing how to grade lead solder or to regulate the use of lead solder.

Another group of people may have other areas that they would pay attention to. The question is, do you have a central unit to co-ordinate everything? There must be one person who doesn't have to know a lot of things about everything, but he has to know something about everything.

Mr Lee's suggestion is that you should have this person in your department. Let's look at the doctors -- doctors know something about everything medical. For example, if there's a new drug which may have an implication, someone in the Department of Health will have to know that this drug may cause problems if used on this subpopulation instead of that other group such as children. The doctors would maybe have different specialities, but you need to have one person who would

know that this is important.

Mr Chan Kin Man may be working all day long in the lab. He may have an AD for customer service. He may be interested in the counter service. So different people are doing different jobs. So no one is joining all the dots. For example, the Scotland incident. We just glance over the journals -- I glance over law journals, I look at the topics which are not my area of concern, then I flip through without a second glance. So you must have a central unit. It may be the customer service, focusing on customer service.

One may be interested in the British Standards. I know you have people responsible for amendments of British Standards and the amendments are made and documents filed in the library, and that's the end of the matter. Not many people know what they are doing. It has happened to your department and it has happened to the Housing Department. Some people knew some amendments would be required and some amendments were actually made. But the Housing Department, the building services people knew that there are such problems, and then when submission was made to the chief, the chief said, "Well, it's put into the documentation, but implementation has nothing to do with me", and then to the development meeting a submission is made and it's

endorsed and approved, but no one in the department,
according to them, knew that this was the rationale.

The same could have just happened to your
department, to the WSD. So Mr Lee is saying, "If that's
what happened in the past, how can you ensure that this
will no longer be the situation in the future?"

MR LEE: Do you have any people doing this?

A. We have a research and development unit. But all the
divisions are also responsible for some R&D work.

I have noted the chairman's suggestion. I will take it
back for consideration.

Q. We are talking about two periods. One is related to the
period before the incident. If the R&D people didn't
know this problem, it's a big issue now we have this
incident, someone should be held accountable. You
cannot allow people to know or not know as they like.
You should do something about this.

A. We will consider this.

MR LEE: Is it the right time?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Let's have a lunch break.

(1.01 pm)

(The luncheon adjournment)

(2.34 pm)

MR LEE: Mr Chairman, I would like to continue with my
questions in relation to this leaflet.

Page 7, please.

A. Yes.

Q. At the top, "Concerted efforts to deal with lead in water. Concerted efforts are needed to minimise the level of lead in drinking water. It entails the co-operation and participation of all stakeholders, including the government, property developers, building contractors, authorised persons, plumbing workers, licensed plumbers, plumbing workers, pipes and fittings suppliers, property owners, property management agents and customers."

So even "plumbing workers" is included. How come?

How come that they have to take part as well?

A. I think everybody should minimise using leaded solder materials, among others. Everybody should watch out.

Q. I'm not trying to criticise, but for those who are carrying out the soldering work, they need to know what they need to be careful about. So on the face of it, all those who are involved, including customers, have to take part?

A. I myself did not take part in the drafting of this particular paragraph. I think the concept is that all stakeholders should pay attention to this matter, and then it will certainly be better.

Q. No. It says here, "It entails the co-operation and

participation". I think it is right to say this. You don't agree?

A. I do not disagree. I'm just saying that I didn't take part in the drafting of this paragraph. I agree that we should co-operate.

Q. I will criticise you if you don't agree. Everybody should contribute. If everybody does his part except the plumbing workers, then something wrong will happen.

A. Developers and contractors should make sure that the soldering materials provided will not contain lead. The more people understand the matter more, there will be more barriers and better.

Q. In other words, are you saying that plumbing workers don't need to be added to the list?

A. No, that's not what I mean. I'm saying what is considered here is that all stakeholders should carry out concerted efforts and then it will be better.

Q. Well, just now we talked about the water safety plan. Do you agree that for the water safety plan, everybody should be included, though we may attach a question mark to the plumbing workers? Do you agree?

A. For the water safety plan, the concept isn't so much about stakeholders. Of course all stakeholders would influence that. My knowledge, my understanding, is that when you talk about a water safety plan, we are more

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C concerned about the system, and we try to identify the C

D hazards, and then we assess the risk. Then we carry out D

E some control measures, to minimise the risk. So it's E

F more about addressing the issue within the system. F

G Q. Probably you are wrong here. For the WHO, I think the G

H intention is that everybody, including the customers, H

I should join hands to work hard. I think you are right I

J to have it drafted in this way. J

K A. Well, I remember I had the opportunity to read the WHO K

L paper on water safety plan in buildings. It does talk L

M about the roles to be played by individual stakeholders. M

N Q. Well, even customers must have knowledge. Say if N

O something goes wrong, customers know how to deal with O

P it, and what is even better is that we all try to P

Q prevent things going wrong. So stakeholders should Q

R include all the people listed here? R

S A. Yes, stakeholders. S

T Q. But then what about the definition of stakeholders? Do T

U you think that there is a problem? Do you think it is U

V too widely worded? V

Q A. You talk about the system, but then I was talking about Q

R something else. I said the water safety plan was more R

S about the supply system. That is, we should identify S

T the hazards in the system, and then we assess the risk T

U and then we introduce control measures. So it may not U

V

be directly connected with the stakeholders, though they have a part to play.

For the WHO paper on Water Safety in Buildings, it does say that all stakeholders have their own responsibilities to work towards water safety.

Q. Let me ask you the question in this way. On page 4, we have already been told about the water safety plan, and then it is up to the connection point; right?

But then at least you need to have another water safety plan up to the water taps. I think you already have it; right, water safety plan up to the water taps?

A. No, for the time being, the water safety plan doesn't go up to that part.

CHAIRMAN: No, you are not totally right, deputy director.

You do have a general water safety plan.

A. Yes, we do have a target.

CHAIRMAN: No. Of course, for individual treatment works, for individual pumping stations, you have your WSP. For your Customer Services Branch, you have also got the WSP.

A. Well, for the WSP, yes, we have it annexed.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, in the annex.

A. But then, if we are really talking about a WSP for a building, I think Prof Fawell would agree with me, that is the property management office has to develop

the WSP, because they would be in the best position to understand the system in the building.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Look at your WSP. Please look at the specific stage. I think you have read the water safety plans of the WHO, and WSPs are for buildings and there are different roles and responsibilities for the stakeholders. So it depends on the extent you want to involve the stakeholders and how early.

Well, theoretically speaking, the WSD does have this for buildings, because our consumer branch does cover this. But then, as to how deep and whether it is simply a way to echo the WHO Guidelines 2004, then that's a separate issue and it's a separate issue as to how practical it is.

A. Let me supplement. For what we are trying to do, it's that we want to have a water safety plan developed by the customers or the property management office. We want to move a step forward.

CHAIRMAN: You know that Prof Fawell's criticism of your water safety plan is that, basically, it is top-down, it has a skeleton, without the meat, without the substance. That's what he said. It's not a comment from me.

A. Well, we have a number of tiers concerning the plan.

CHAIRMAN: He has examined all those. He said you had a skeleton. But then for a water safety plan, it should

not be comprising of one single document or one piece of paper. There should be a lot more. I don't know exactly what is involved.

But then he has said he went to Northern Ireland and then he spent six months to go through and prepare the plan.

A. Well, on our part, we also spent a lot of time on drawing up the plan.

CHAIRMAN: But still, he was saying that it was inadequate.

You might very well have spent a lot of time on the plan, but then to him it is merely a skeleton. It is still lacking in meat and substance. Well, I don't think we can have a discussion here and now as to how it should be sort of enhanced. If you really want to work on it, then you need to talk to the authorities in such an area.

I don't know, maybe in the beginning the WSD introduced the WSP and had already been given assistance from somebody from overseas.

A. According to Mr Chan Kin Man, he did have assistance from someone from Australia who had experience with the WHO.

CHAIRMAN: I think Australia has done a very good job in this regard. I did ask a specific question of Prof Fawell. I said that I read the WSP. In his report

he did make such a comment and that's why I asked him.

At the hearing, he did make this comment so I did ask

him why he said it was a skeleton only.

A. Well, for our water safety plan, we have been told that
it was well prepared.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you can achieve it.

MR LEE: Who said it was well prepared? Was it Chan
Kin Man?

A. I can't recall the name. If necessary, I can dig up the
information.

MR LEE: An overseas expert?

A. I'm not sure. I think the director has also referred to
this point, that is our WSP has been given recognition.

MR LEE: But, at the same time, others have said that it
wasn't good enough.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it wasn't that it wasn't good but then it
was lacking in details.

MR LEE: My understanding is that in drawing up the WSP, you
must get all the stakeholders involved. First of all,
you have to find these people to start. Do you agree?

A. Well, I'm not an expert on water safety plans. Mr Chan
Kin Man is the expert; I really cannot comment.

Q. So who is doing this job in your department?

A. The chief chemist.

Q. Who is the chief chemist now?

A. Mr Kwok Yau Ting.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lee, we should adopt the idea proposed by Prof Fawell about water quality manager, and the manager should also update information from around the world. This is the so-called "key man", if you want to have one central co-ordinator. Do you agree?

A. In answering Mr Khaw, I already said that this is a direction worthy of further exploration.

MR LEE: I hope you do it.?

A. There hasn't been any detailed discussion in the department, but we think this idea is worth further exploration.

Q. Who would be handling this?

A. Maybe I myself. My department would look into the idea in greater detail.

Q. We know there should be someone taking the lead. Are you willing to take up this role?

A. No problem for me.

Q. It can't be done without anyone taking the lead. You want to enter each and every building and each and every unit in the building under the WSP? That will be a lot of work to do. You can't even cover all the public rental housing estates. The Housing Department's representatives are here. You should get them involved, get them on board.

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C You have an interdepartmental meeting; right? C

D A. We have regular meetings with the Housing Department. D

E This can be one of the items we discuss. E

F Q. All right. F

G In the middle part of page 7: G

H "In response to the discovery of excessive lead H

I levels in drinking water in some [PRH] estates July I

J 2015, the WSD has taken a number of measures since July J

K 13 to minimise the potential risk of contamination by K

L heavy metals from the inside service system of new L

M buildings: M

N -- For all applications for new water supply, if N

O soldering is used in connecting water pipes, O

P a supporting document of lead-free soldering materials P

Q is required." Q

R So this has been done. This is already R

S a requirement. Can we be shown some form? How can they S

T prove? T

U A. They had to supply a certificate of lead-free soldering U

V material. V

Q. What do you mean? Q

R. The supplier would have to give a certificate to certify R

S if soldering material is lead-free. S

T. Where can we find such a certificate? T

U. The LP or the AP would provide the certificate to us. U

V

But we don't use a specified form for them to complete.

They just give us a certificate. That will be okay.

Q. But you have a number of standard forms?

A. The certificate may come from different suppliers, and different countries may use different forms, and there's no reason why we have to specify how the certificate should look like.

Q. It's very rare that the government don't use a standard form for this purpose. Can you give us a sample tomorrow?

A. I'll ask my colleagues, to see if we can get one.

Q. I have never heard anything about this so far, so I want to see one.

So there's a new requirement since 13 July.

"-- Four additional test parameters ... were added for testing of water samples during the final inspection of newly installed fresh water inside service systems in buildings."

I won't read out the names of the metals.

Then "International Standards for Drinking Water supply" is the next part:

"The WHO produces international norms on water quality and human health in the form of guidelines that are used as the basis for regulation and standard setting in developing and developed countries worldwide.

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C The WHO's guidelines are not the only international standard." C

D So you understand this is health-based? D

E A. In general, yes, health-based. But as I said this morning, there has been some discussion as to whether it's really health-based. E

F F

G Q. Well, it's not a discussion. Prof Fawell said yes, in the past it was health-based, but not now. Do you agree that it's no longer health-based? G

H H

I A. As I said this morning, we have to look into this. I

J Mr Chan Kin Man, our chief chemist, told me that in Australia they took the level of 10 micrograms as the health standard, the health-based standard. J

K K

L Q. The professor is a leading expert, is an authority. Mr Chan Kin Man is not. L

M CHAIRMAN: Let's not put it like that. We look at the reasoning. M

N N

O MR LEE: Mr Chan Kin Man has retired. Are you still following the line he adopted, or are you following the position he adopted for himself? O

P P

Q A. We have heard a number of views. We would study in greater detail. Q

R As regards whether the 10 micrograms can be further enhanced -- not enhanced; reduced. R

S S

T Q. So you don't quite agree that the latest WHO Guidelines T

U U

V V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C are not health-based? C

D A. I'm talking about lead. There are many WHO Guidelines D

E which are health-based. E

F Q. But for lead? F

G A. As I said, there are different views. Some said yes, G

H some said no. H

I Q. What about you in this regard? I

J A. Well, I am not an expert on this subject. J

K Q. So you have no position to take? K

L A. Well, we might have to consult other experts. L

M Q. I thought you would have your experts coming to testify. M

N A. Well, in the future, we can try to get hold of some N

O other international experts for advice. O

P Q. Page 9: P

Q "For heavy metals, the current international Q

R standards are ..."

S Lead is 10 in Hong Kong, and on our side we don't R

T think this is health-based, and you say you disagree. T

U Also, there is something in small print: U

V "10 [micrograms per litre] is approximately V

equivalent to one drop of water in 40 standard-sized

swimming pools."

So upon reading this, people should say, "Oh,

there's nothing to worry"?

A. We just want to give people an idea what a microgram is.

We are not trying to tell people that it's okay, it's all right. We just want to tell people that this is a very minute amount.

Q. My concern is that it's so small an amount, it's 1 drop in 40 swimming pools.

A. We are just talking about the concentration.

Q. Do you need to put this in? You may mislead people into not worrying about this.

A. We just want to tell people the notion of a microgram.

Q. They don't really care what a microgram is. They are more concerned about the health implications.

All right. Page 10 now, "Precautionary measures".

All in bold letters:

"In early July 2015, the lead content of some water samples from PRH estates were found to exceed the guideline value set by the WHO. Subsequently, lead was found in the solder used on the water pipe joints of these estates. The government has attached great importance to this matter. An interdepartmental meeting chaired by the [CS for A] was held on July 11 during which decisions were made on crucial follow-up work and measures. The Development Bureau has established a task force to determine the cause of the incidents ..."

Whilst the Hong Kong Authority has formed a Review

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C Committee -- so the government has attached great C

D importance to the incident. The Chief Secretary for D

E Administration chaired the interdepartmental meeting E

F involving three bureaus and three departments: the F

G Housing Department, WSD and the Department of Health? G

H A. Yes. H

I Q. Do you keep any notes of meeting? I

J A. Not according to my recollection. J

K Q. Were you in attendance? K

L A. I was the chairman of the task force set up by the L

M Development Bureau, so I had to attend the meeting to M

N report progress. N

O Q. The first meeting of the interdepartmental meeting was O

P held on 11 July? P

Q A. Yes. Q

R Q. And your first meeting was convened on 17 July, just six R

S days after the first interdepartmental meeting. Then, S

T after that, you attended all the interdepartmental T

U meetings? U

V A. Yes. Well, no. When I have to report progress. V

Q. Or else your supervisor, your superior, would attend? Q

A. Yes. Q

R CHAIRMAN: Let's refer to page 826. Now that Mr Lee has R

S raised a point, I have a concern. Left-hand side, the S

T second paragraph: T

U

V

C "According to the WHO, the guideline values C
D represent the concentration of constituents in drinking D
E water that will not result in any significant health E
F risk to a person weighing 60 kilograms over a lifetime F
G consumption of 2 litres per day for 70 years."

F A. I can tell you now that this is definitely wrong. We F
G are talking about the guideline values. G

H CHAIRMAN: That's wrong. H

H A. Prof Fawell was referring to the PGV, the provisional H
I value. I

J CHAIRMAN: You have to look at the WHO guideline values in J
K greater detail now. It's definitely wrong. K

K Not all guideline values are set on this basis. K
L They have the TDI, tolerable daily intake. So for TDI, L
M it's 2 litres per day for a 60-kilogram person for M
N 70 years. That's the normal guideline value. In many, N
O many chemical aspects, it's the basis, but for some O
P heavy metals, for some chemicals, it's not the basis. P
I can tell you why lead is not set on this basis.

P I have read Prof Fawell's report and the WHO document. P

Q First, lead is not calculated based on a 60-kilogram Q
R adult but a baby or an infant, and they do not refer to R
S something called -- they refer to PTWI, which is S
T provisional tolerable weekly intake. Young children T
U would not go to -- for young children, we don't adopt U
V

C a 70 years' basis. So we talk about the provisional
D tolerable weekly intake. So the figure was
E 25 micrograms per kg per week, and if you have it
divided by seven, it becomes 3.5 micrograms per day.

F Do you understand? In the beginning, it was set at
G 10 micrograms as a GV. It's a guideline value. Then
H I think it was in 2004 or 2008, whatever -- no, it
wasn't 2004. Yes, 2004-2008, they revisited the former
I value. They still regarded it as a guideline value.

I Well, I should put it in this way. In the
J beginning, they had their calculations on the basis of
K TDI. Later on, it was a PTWI for babies or for infants.
L Then they came up with a threshold, and then in 2011 it
was said that even the threshold could not be adopted.
M It was said that the PTWI would no longer be
an acceptable value, and so the PTWI was also abolished.
N Based on treatment performance and analytical
O capabilities, the provisional guideline values were
introduced.

P So here, when you talk about a person weighing 60 kg
Q over a lifetime consumption of 2 litres per day for
R 70 years, it may not apply to all the guideline values.
S Some parameters have not been calculated on such
a basis.

T For the WHO standards, they have already informed us

that under certain circumstances, we have it as a provisional guideline value, and in fact a number of factors have to be present. Treatment performance would be one of them. Analytical achievability is another. I think there are a few others as well, to explain why it has been set as "provisional".

So, for others, I dare not say, but to me, this particular sentence must be wrong.

MR LEE: So let's hope that you will go back and take a good look.

A. Yes. I will consult our chemists.

CHAIRMAN: The question is, you have set out this as the overriding principle, and then you go on to talk about the overseas experience. Then, on the page on the right-hand side, you talk about the WHO and the EU, et cetera. Then you talk about one drop in 40 standard swimming pools' volume of water.

I'm quite certain that you are wrong in relation to what I referred to. For what follows, to a very large extent, it is not entirely accurate. I won't say that you are misleading, but it cannot be accurate.

MR LEE: Thank you.

Let me go back to page 10. This is about the interdepartmental meeting.

Let me show you some documents. AC1, tab 16,

page 334. This is an interdepartmental meeting, following up on the water quality incident in Kai Ching Estate. 8.14 pm on 11 July.

It is said that in the morning of 11 July, the CS for A, Ms Carrie Lam, called an interdepartmental meeting to discuss about the follow-up work on the lead in drinking water incident in Kai Ching Estate of HD and made important decisions about the form work as well as the relevant measures. Participating bureaus and departments include the Transport and Housing Bureau, Development Bureau, Food and Health Bureau, Housing Department, WSD and the DoH. Then it is said that the secretary for Transport and Housing has said at the press conference that the government took the matter seriously and it was suspected that the licensed plumber was involved and would like to deal with the problem ASAP. So that's the interdepartmental meeting.

Then let's turn to page 336. The earlier one was on 11 July. This one was dated 8 October. It is said that the CS for A attended a special meeting of the House Committee of the Legislative Council and what follows is her opening remarks.

The second paragraph: on 10 July, it was found that there was excessive lead in water in Kai Ching Estate. Three months had passed and I chaired

an interdepartmental high-level meeting. So far 70 meetings have been held to co-ordinate the co-operation among departments. As I have said, we have adopted three major principles: transparent and open, people-oriented, and followed investigation.

In other words, for the first three months, 70 meetings were held. Do you know how many meetings have been held so far?

A. I don't know.

Q. Roughly speaking?

A. I think in the beginning, meetings were very frequent.

Q. I want to know whether later on the frequency has been reduced?

A. I cannot recall. As I have said, whenever I was there at the meeting, I was there to report on the progress. I didn't attend every time. So I'm not sure.

Q. I want to know whether all the important topics have been referred to the meeting in relation to lead in water incident?

A. Well, I mainly went there to report on the progress of the task force. For other topics, I don't know.

Q. Let me ask this question, say for example about taking of water samples for testing -- should it be first draw or fully flushed samples? For such projects, they discussed at such a higher level interdepartmental

meetings?

A. I do not recall it being covered at those meetings that I attended.

Q. Do you think it is important enough to be raised there?

A. I think it is rather sort of specialised. If you ask for my opinion, it seems that Mr Chan Kin Man has the most knowledge.

Q. Well, he is very insistent, or you may say he is stubborn?

A. I think he has his own professional principles. I think you know that he is a chemist, he is a scientist. So, in relation to his knowledge, he has his own views.

Q. I want to know whether you follow his opinions?

A. Well, for our team, I think he has his professional knowledge in this regard, and I think he would recall that he has been involved in water sampling work for the WSD for three decades. So, as far as our team is concerned, I think I can say that he is the most knowledgeable person.

CHAIRMAN: If I may try to ask this question. At the time, did you ask the Government Laboratory for their expert advice?

A. I don't know. I don't think I can answer this question.

MR LEE: Now let's come back here. If you don't know, who knows? Then it would be Chan Kin Man again, but he has

retired, and then for his replacement, Mr Kwok, does he know?

A. What do you mean?

Q. For the questions that we are asking, that is the taking of water samples?

A. I believe he has knowledge.

Q. Please ask him and find out from him clearly.

CHAIRMAN: We have been calling --

MR LEE: Well, Mr Chan Kin Man has admitted that he made the decision. Now that he has left, his influence is still there. What can we do?

CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need to ask such questions.

I am sure somebody is succeeding his post.

MR LEE: Well, for the first meeting of the task force, please go to C19.6, tab 132, page 13896. The first meeting of the task force.

We have the date, 17 July last year, 6 pm. Of those who are present, "CL Wong", that is you. What about the other "CL Wong"?

A. An inspector.

Q. "Deputy Director of Water Supplies", that's you, and then we see the name "Chan Kin Man".

Let's turn to the following page, towards the end, item 4.0, "(in English) Item 3 -- Proposed physical sampling work."

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C 4.2: C

D "(In English) The meeting analysed the testing D

E results of the water samples previously collected at E

F Kai Ching and Kwai Luen Estates. It is noted that the F

G water samples collected at sump tanks and roof tanks do G

H not contain lead. As such, it is reasonable to conclude H

I that plumbing system upstream of the roof tanks is not I

J contaminated by lead." J

K In other words, the water go the to the public K

L housing estate. It goes up to the roof tank, then it is L

M still fine. M

N 4.3: N

O "(In English) Water samples and pipes and fittings O

P along the whole water supply chain (including joints and P

Q water taps) are to be taken from the following locations Q

R for testing of lead content". R

S Then you have (a), (b) and (c), referring to the S

T locations. T

U 4.4: U

V "(In English) Members expressed that the procedures V

to collect water samples would affect the testing

results of lead content. Flushing tests (sampling with

different flushing time) and stagnation tests (sampling

with different stagnation time) are to be conducted at

different time intervals so as to address the

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C controversy over the procedures of taking water samples." C

D So it is very clear here you were aware of the D

E different views; there was controversy? E

F A. Yes. It is already said that different procedures may F

G give you different results. G

H Q. In other words, you can have it the other way around: if H

I you want to have certain results, then you can pick the I

J procedures. If you want to have a particular result, J

K then you can choose a particular procedure? K

L A. No, no, you can't say it in that way. You can only say L

M that you understand that different sampling procedures M

N would give different results. That's why you need to N

O choose a reasonable sampling procedure. O

P Q. I think we all know about the crux of the matter in P

Q relation to controversy. Q

R A. Yes. R

S Q. So, if you want to know whether there is excessive lead S

T in the water, so should you use the flushed samples or T

U the stagnation samples? U

V A. It depends on whether the WHO -- V

Q. No, no. Say we have a water tap, I want to know whether

the water from the tap will have excessive lead, so do

you want to flush it? Once you have flushed it, then

the lead will all be gone.

A. No, no, you can't say it that way, because many samples have lead. Even for many flushed samples, they contained lead.

Q. Now, I go to a kitchen tap, I am supposed to drink directly from it. I want to test the water sample to find out about the lead content. Now you insist that it should be flushed?

A. No, I think Chan Kin Man has explained.

Q. I'm not talking about him. I want to ask for your opinion.

CHAIRMAN: Or you can say you agree with him.

A. Basically, I agree with him. I agree with his position, if you want to check the water quality as compared with the WHO Guidelines.

MR LEE: You still agree with him after you have heard Prof Fawell, and you are still in agreement with Mr Chan Kin Man?

A. I think he has explained in great detail.

Q. So has Prof Fawell.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think this line of questioning is going to be fruitful.

MR LEE: You still think that Mr Chan Kin Man is right? Do you think he is right?

A. Both have explained themselves very clearly. I would say the sampling method for that purpose is reasonable.

C Mr Chan Kin Man said, when he took the water
D samples, he wanted to compare the result with the WHO
E Guidelines. I would say what he said was reasonable.

E Q. I want to use the water for cooking. Is there excessive
F lead or would that pose a risk to my baby? Do I have to
G flush the water first?

G A. Mr Chan Kin Man said it should be done.

H Q. Do you agree?

I A. I think he has reasons to suggest that. I agree with
J his views.

J Q. Is this the government's position? Is that the view
K adopted by the government?

L CHAIRMAN: Well, he is from the government. I can't
M remember the answer of the director.

N MR LEE: Well, they are the government, as far as we are
O concerned.

O CHAIRMAN: Yes. When you are in such positions, sometimes
P it's difficult to avoid being imposed such obligations.

Q MR LEE: Has there been any discussion in the task force?

R A. As we set out here, we understood that there were
S different sampling protocols, which may have affected
T the results. That's why the task force wanted to find
U out. We were not in the business of devising
V a different sampling protocol, but we wanted to know
whether stagnation would have any effect to the lead

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	content. For example, how much would the level rise. That's what we want to see.	C
D	Q. Was this issue discussed in the interdepartmental	D
E	meeting?	E
F	A. I have no recollection of any discussion.	F
G	Q. You may be wrong, because you didn't attend all the	G
H	meetings.	H
I	A. But I can't comment on those other meetings.	I
J	Q. Did Mrs Carrie Lam, the CS for A, ask you this question,	J
K	or Prof Anthony Cheung, the secretary for Transport and	K
L	Housing?	L
M	A. No.	M
N	Q. Now you have read the expert report by Prof Fawell, and	N
O	he issued the interim report and now there's a final	O
P	report. Were the findings reflected relayed to the	P
Q	interdepartmental meeting?	Q
R	A. I did not attend any interdepartmental meeting after	R
S	Prof Fawell's report was published.	S
T	Q. Don't you think this is important?	T
U	A. The bureaus would have a chance to have access to the	U
V	expert report. This report was available to everyone.	V
	Q. There was no discussion, according to your recollection?	
	A. Well, there was some discussion within my department,	
	but I did not have any discussion with other	
	departments.	

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	Q. What about the task force?	C
D	A. Well, the work of the task force had been completed at that point.	D
E	Q. What people? What are the people involved in your department, in the discussion?	E
F	A. Oh, many people. The chemists --	F
G	Q. What about the director?	G
H	A. Yes.	H
I	Q. How many people, roughly?	I
J	A. I really cannot count. There are different items.	J
K	Q. I'm talking about this item.	K
L	A. In the two expert reports -- well, many issues are touched on, such as we would talk about the CPD and other things.	L
M	Q. Was there any divergent view, or did you all agree with Chan Kin Man? So you all agreed with Chan Kin Man, or you rejected Prof Fawell's views?	M
N	A. Well, I remember Prof Fawell said there was no universal method to find the average water quality. He said the flushed samples might not be representative, and the unflushed samples might also not be representative.	N
O	Q. He said very categorically that you must test the first draw.	O
P	A. There was such statement in his report.	P
Q	Q. Did you hear his evidence given to this Commission?	Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

A. I didn't follow the entire proceeding.

Q. So you just take one statement out from his report, to support your position?

A. Well, if you read the report --

Q. You should look at the entire report, not just one particular statement?

MR SHIEH: It's just like what we have seen with Ms Ada Fung. The departmental staff have said that was what they understood the matter to be.

Of course, we have examined the experts and the witnesses and the WSD team -- Mr Wong is not here -- may have to look into the various issues. Maybe the witness will have to talk to the people in his department before he sticks his neck out to represent the department in stating a position.

If Mr Lee thinks that the WSD is stubborn in not accepting the expert's advice, he can say so in his submission.

MR LEE: I think I am going to get the same answer even if I ask you ten more times.

A. I have already stated my answer very clearly.

Q. Please look at page 13967. C19.6.

Or maybe we should look at page 13963. This is a paper, TF paper No. 3/02, "(In English) Task force to investigate cause of excessive lead content in drinking

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C water. C

D Review the interim findings." D

E "(In English) Objective", 1: E

F "(In English) To study the leaching rate of lead in the Kai Ching Estate by carrying out a stagnation test and a flushing test." F

G So you do both? G

H A. Yes. H

I Q. "(In English) Methodology": I

J "(In English) A vacant flat is selected in the Kai Ching Estate for the investigation. J

K A stagnation test is conducted by firstly flushing thoroughly the water supply system from a tap in the K

L flat for at least 2 plumbing system volumes or 15 hours. L

M -- Samples will be taken from the kitchen tap at M

N hour 0 and then at 4, 8, 12, 24, 48 hours (250 N

O each) ...". O

P A. It's mL. P

Q Q. One-quarter of a litre? Q

R A. Yes. R

S Q. "(In English) ... for lead analysis. Care should be S

T taken not to disturb the water column during the whole T

U stagnation test period. U

V -- A flushing test will immediately be carried out V

after the stagnation test such that the water being

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C tested has already been stagnant for 48 hours. Samples C
D (250 mL each) will be taken 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 and 30 D
E minutes after flushing for lead testing." E

F Then the results -- here we can see the results. E
G Please turn to page 13967. F

H The first part, "(In English) Stagnation test" at F
I the top, and then at the bottom, "(In English) Flushing G
J test" -- there's still some waiting time, at 0 minutes, H
K that is immediately after stagnation. That's I
L effectively the first draw. I

M On the right-hand side, last-but-one column, 34.7 J
N micrograms per litre. J

O A. Yes. K

P Q. It's high; right? L

Q A. Okay. L

R Q. This is the result of the first draw. One minute, it M
S dropped to 6. So it's okay, according to your N
T department? N

U A. Yes, it's up to standard. O

V Q. 2 minutes, 3.1; 3 minutes, 2.6 -- the reduction is not P
significant -- 4 minutes, 2.5, 5 minutes, 2.3; Q
10 minutes, 2.0; 30 minutes, 1.6. Q

R So the first minute sees the most significant drop. R
S After flushing 1 minute, you will meet the standard, S
T 60 seconds is all it takes. T

U

V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C So looking down, page 13965, paragraph 3.2, C

D "(In English) Flushing test": D

E "(In English) The water had been stagnant for E

F 48 hours before the [flushing test]. F

G Individual test results for flushing test are shown G

H in annex A." H

I You see the steep drop from 35 to the bottom, to 5, I

J a little bit over 5 or 6, it's in minutes, and then the J

K second minute, third minute, fourth minute and fifth K

L minute. L

M Another diagram. 3.2.1: M

N "(In English) 1 minute flushing was sufficient to N

O bring down the lead content of 34.7 micrograms per litre O

P to comply with the WHO GV of 10 micrograms per litre for P

Q lead." Q

R One minute would do, from 37.7 to 6. R

S So it's clear, the members of the task force would S

T also be clear about this, is it stagnant water, stagnant T

U for a long, long time, is subject to flushing for one U

V minute, you are almost going to flush all the lead? V

A. It will reduce.

Q. Very effectively reduce the lead content, 34.7 down to

R 6; from serious exceedance to complying with the R

S standard. So flushing for one minute and you carry out S

T the test, it will not be excessive? T

U

V

A. You cannot say that for sure. In the water test programme, you cannot say that after flushing there would be no excessive lead. I think Prof Lee also recognised this problem. It's not as straightforward as that. Sometimes the second draw registered a higher value.

Q. On 3 August, the third meeting, page 13952, you at that time knew that after flushing, the result would be such and such; you knew?

A. We saw two things. We knew two things. If you take a sample of stagnant water, the level would be very high.

Q. It could be very high? It's just a possibility.

A. Then, after flushing, the level would be brought down.

Q. Would definitely be brought down?

A. Yes. And sometimes the second draw registers something different.

CHAIRMAN: You have to be very careful about Prof Fawell's report. For second draw it is T plus 20 seconds?

A. You mean Prof Lee?

CHAIRMAN: Prof Lee's report. T plus 20 seconds, at most T plus 40 seconds. We are talking about half a minute, within half a minute. So if you flush it for two minutes, it's almost totally gone, flushed away.

Even for Prof Lee's, they said that it may peak

later, but it would still only appear at T equals to 20 seconds or T plus 20 seconds.

So even if you got an odd one, it would only be T plus 60 seconds. I think your guideline was to flush for two to five minutes.

Even if we take the minimum, two minutes only, everything would have been flushed out. But then, after you have flushed for two minutes, and you can still find a lot of lead in the water, that means your first draw will have very serious exceedance. Do you understand?

You understand?

A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It must be a very serious exceedance before you get such a result. Do you agree?

A. This is what we get from the flushing test and the stagnation test.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, the first draw will certainly indicate a problem; do you agree?

A. (Chinese spoken) ... observation.

MR LEE: For some provinces, they don't have a problem at all, because they haven't used such solder materials or they don't use solder materials. For Prof Lee, he has got many results measuring 0.000. Whether you flush or not, it won't indicate a problem. For those with exceedance, if you flush for a minute or two, everything

would be gone. After flushing for that period of time, if you still get an exceedance, that means it is a major problem.

I'm trying to ask about the logic. After flushing for two minutes, if you still have exceedance, then it must be a very serious matter?

A. Yes, based on stagnation tests, we have made such an observation.

Q. Even after flushing for two minutes, if you still get 6, then it is no simple matter?

CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't think we need to repeat this point. Even if you ask, there won't be different answers.

MR LEE: You understand, from your perspective, you have the so-called affected estates and the unaffected estates. Maybe the difference is just one sample. When there is one sample that has tested positive among the dozen or so, you will give it the benefit of the doubt, and then the entire estate will be regarded as an affected estate.

So, after you have flushed the water, you found that it is meeting the requirement, you will regard it as an unaffected estate?

A. I think I need to repeat the arguments. Mr Chan Kin Man has said that when we took the samples, we would like to reflect the quality of the water consumed daily and

compare it with the WHO's standards.

Q. We have cross-examined Mr Chan Kin Man. Did you hear about the cross-examination?

A. I did.

Q. Let's turn to page 10. Sorry, A1, tab 22. Page 10, you talked about the interdepartmental meeting and then treatment of water.

"If water has not been used overnight, run water taps for one to two minutes each morning before taking any water for drinking or cooking."

It is clear that for this information published in August, probably at that time you were already aware of the results of the water sampling tests?

A. I don't know. For such advice, it has been available overseas, in the UK and the USA.

Q. So for you, flushing it for a minute or two would be safe?

A. Well, the flushing advice has been available overseas. This can help you to prevent an excessive lead content in water.

Q. I showed you an example. Flushing it for a minute will have significant results and you want to play safe and you say one to two minutes?

A. It depends on the flow as well. You can't have it generalised, whether it should be 30 seconds or one

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C minute. C

D Q. One minute will do; right? Because you talk about one D
to two minutes, and then you say:

E "To avoid wastage, you may use a container to E
collect the water for non-drinking purposes."

F Prof Fawell has said that what is important is to F
make it clear to the residents, and you shouldn't

G confuse them. Now, you say to play safe they should G
flush the water. To avoid wastage, you ask them to

H collect the water in a container. H

I A. If you use it for drinking or cooking, then you need to I
flush it. J

K Q. But if you use it to wash your face, it's fine, or for K
washing other things? L

L A. Okay. M

M Q. Prof Fawell has also said the first thing he gets up in M
the morning, he will turn on the tap to boil the water, N
and then he will be drinking that water throughout the O
day. So we do have people having such habits. O

P Prof Fawell is one of them. Do you understand? P

Q So if you say that as long as you flush it, it will Q
be fine, yes, we can keep the water. Flushing it for

R a minute or two will seem a long time. Every morning, R
I would do it. I didn't look at my watch. I know

S I can't stand it. I don't have the patience. It will S
T T

U U

V V

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C be a waste of water. I don't wash anything there, so C

D it's pointless to collect the water. I just want to D

E wash my face, shave myself and brush my teeth. E

F A. If you just use it to wash your face and brush your F

G teeth, you don't need to flush the water. G

H Q. I want to be safe, so I prefer to flush it. H

I Well, the message is that you need to flush the I

J water and you need to conserve water. J

K A. The message is that yes, indeed, you can collect the K

L water for other purposes. L

M Q. Yes, indeed, you may, but it will be too troublesome. M

N All right. You want to conserve water as well. N

O Page 12, it's rather interesting here. "Inspection O

P of water supply system": P

Q "You may engage an accredited laboratory to take Q

R water samples for testing. The list of accredited R

S laboratories is available ..."

T Paragraph 9: T

U "If the test results show that the level of lead in U

V drinking water does not comply with the WHO standard, V

you should act immediately according to the health

advice given by the Centre for Health Protection. For

details, please refer to [a website].

10. You should discuss with your estate/building

management office, flat owner or the owners' committee

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C to engage relevant professionals, including licensed C

D plumbers, building services engineers or building D

E surveyors, et cetera, to inspect the inside service E

F system to identify the source of excessive lead content F

G and take appropriate remedial measures." G

H In other words, take advice and do it yourself. H

I A. If they have worries or doubts about their inside I

J service, then they can carry out an examination. J

K Q. Paragraph 11, all the more, in the case of works of K

L a minor nature, there's no need to report. Then: L

M "... all materials that come into contact with M

N drinking water ... comply with the relevant British N

O Standards for potable water use." O

P Then you also talked about licensed plumbers. You P

Q do give information but then it is confusing to the Q

R general public, because -- R

S A. What do you mean? S

T Q. The general public don't know what to do. T

U A. If necessary, they can get a licensed plumber to carry U

V out the inspection for them. V

Q. Yes. Okay.

Now, had you had a water safety plan, then it would

be good, in that they know what's happening and what

they should do; do you agree with me? That is, had

there been such a plan.

- 115 -

Transcript by DTI Corporation Asia, Limited

A. I'm not too sure whether a water safety plan is for such a purpose, because I'm no expert in preparation of water safety plans.

Q. I have a few brief questions for you. Many others have asked the same questions. Forms WWO46 and WWO132. Same questions only.

The way I understand your evidence is that what your responsibilities are -- you are the regulator, you set down the standards; that's your role. So you set down the standards, and they are the British Standards. Then the AP and LP will carry out the work?

A. Yes, we hope that they will oversee the construction and the materials to be used to meet the standards.

Q. In other words, you are of the view that since the forms are very clear, there's no way that you shouldn't trust them? There's no way that you should doubt that they would not follow it?

A. Yes. Prior to July 2015, we had no suspicion that they would not follow.

Q. My question is -- I think you have a supervisory role. I referred you to your own website. You need to carry out enforcement. So the Ordinance is there and you are supposed to enforce it. So it isn't just about administration.

Prior to July 2015, did any AP or LP, as a result of

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C excessive lead in water, get punished? C

D A. No, I don't think so. D

E Q. So prior to July 2015, no AP had been penalised for lead E

F in water? F

G A. No. G

H Q. And it's because you weren't aware? Just tell us H

I whether you know or not. Do you know whether they can I

J be penalised at law? J

K A. Yes, if they breach the Ordinance, they may. K

L Q. In what way? L

M A. If they contravene the WWO, then the LP can be M

N disciplined. My understanding is that if you breach the N

O WWO in relation to use of materials, we may take out O

P prosecution action. I'm not too sure about the details. P

Q Q. Criminal or civil? Q

R A. I don't think I can answer this question. R

S Q. So you have never had this before. S

T Now, the question, when you give the responsibility T

U to the LP and the AP, relying on the two forms, that is U

V 46 and 132 -- V

A. Yes, we asked them to certify in the forms. A

Q. But for many years, for so many years, your department Q

R has not taken any action, and then they will think that R

S it is fine? S

A. I don't think I share your view. The authorised person T

U

V

is a professional. As a professional, it doesn't mean that we have never made any arrest and it means that it is all right.

CHAIRMAN: Please speak to the mic.

A. I mean authorised persons are professional people.

I don't think they would have this mentality that since no one has been caught, you don't have to be serious in certification. I don't think that's the case.

MR LEE: They have to follow professional ethics, so they should have done what are required to be done; if they don't, there's nothing you can do?

A. Now we know that there is a risk of non-compliance, so we need to do more.

Q. You know the current problem is caused by lead solder. If the AP doesn't know this, they can rely on building services engineer.

CHAIRMAN: What's that in Chinese?

A. (Chinese spoken).

MR LEE: And they know?

A. Certainly.

Q. You also said APs know this.

A. Well, if you read the HKIA and HKIE submissions, they also suggest that we should ask building services engineers to oversee this. We believe the professional people of this discipline should know what to do.

I said this morning that when the APs provide the certification, it's on the basis of someone else informing him that things have been done satisfactorily.

Q. I have to ask this question. Please look at a document, and that is B4.6, tab 94, page 7365. Mr Ho asked you the same question. Can you see this?

A. Yes.

Q. "To" -- that's an LP. It's part V.

A. That's a WSD colleague.

Q. "To Yue", he's a licensed plumber. Kwai Chung, the location. Then:

"(In English) Plumbing detailed in part IV are last inspected on 15 [April] 2014."

So there was an inspection from you.

"(In English) Pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, no irregularities were found and the plumbing detailed in part IV is approved."

Two parts here. There was an inspection, in 2014, then pursuant to the Waterworks Ordinance and Regulations, nothing wrong was found.

On that day, on the day of inspection, no irregularities were found, therefore approval was granted. It doesn't say, "Pursuant to your certification, this is approved".

A. Well, part I already states that they will work in

accordance with the Waterworks Ordinance.

Q. Well, it is issued to the licensed plumber. Why do you have to state so much here? Either approval is granted or it's not. You can say just it's approved. Why do you have to point out the date of inspection? It's for the licensed plumber, not for his boss.

If the AP is from the Housing Department, an in-house architect, is he subject to the regulation of the Buildings Ordinance?

A. My understanding is that they are not.

Q. So you cannot really do anything about the AP?

A. Well, he's a professional, and when he puts his signature to something, he shoulders some responsibility.

Q. But he is not regulated by the Ordinance.

A. In any case, we are not dealing with such cases under the Buildings Ordinance. The AP is from the private sector, and the one from the Housing Department is not strictly speaking the AP.

Q. If you think you have done your duty, you trust the information provided. In your 3rd statement it is clearly stated -- C21, tab 172, page 18772, paragraph 9, you talk about form 46, the AP. Three or four lines down, form WW0132. Then, line 7 and line 8:

"(In English) As such, one would reasonably expect

the AP to confirm with the LP and other relevant stakeholders (eg the main contractor or plumbing subcontractor) on whether there are further documents or developments relating to the factual basis of the matters which the AP is to certify. One would also reasonably expect the LP and other relevant stakeholders (all of whom are directly or indirectly engaged by the developer to construct the inside service for the developer's premises) to readily provide the AP with relevant information to enable the AP to make the relevant certifications. In light of the above, it is reasonable to expect that there should be adequate communication between the AP and the LP and other relevant stakeholders including the provision of relevant drawings and changes of the pipes and fittings installed."

So it's reasonable to expect, "reasonably expect" -- you mentioned it three times.

Paragraph 10:

"(In English) Similarly, the AP may obtain information from the LP and/or the contractors regarding any subsequent changes to materials used [you are talking about WWO46] it is reasonable to expect that the LP and/or the contractors would provide such information to the AP in order to facilitate the process."

So there's no reason why these people won't do what is required. The AP would think that the LP has no reason to cheat him. So you have some reasonable belief. The AP also can hold reasonable belief in the LP. The question is whether it's reasonable to believe. So do you think that you have reasonable grounds to believe?

A. Well, we have reasonable grounds to believe the AP. The AP is a professional, responsible for the entire project.

Q. Some LPs are big contractors, undertaking very costly projects. So the AP can also say he believes in the LP?

A. The question is whether it's a belief reasonably held and whether there's adequate communication.

Q. Now that we have had the incident already, although with the benefit of hindsight, do you think that your department should be held responsible, that you were unaware of the matters for so long?

A. As I said this morning, as regulator, we have our duties, and on the other hand we also put in place a system, in the hope that the system would enable people to follow the regulation, in doing whatever they should do. That's the philosophy.

If you ask whether there is a better alternative, well, we need to look into that.

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	Day 60
C	Q. So you haven't been able to find a better alternative so far?	C
D	A. Well, we have put in place more control measures: the	D
E	taking of water samples, checking on the material used,	E
F	and so on. Before the incident was exposed, we were	F
G	unaware of the risks, these risks. We have put in place	G
H	a system.	H
I	Q. Now, looking back, do you find that there was something	I
J	wrong back then?	J
K	A. Personally speaking, I would say it's a reasonable	K
L	system.	L
M	Q. So it's not your department's fault; it's the	M
N	community's fault?	N
O	A. Who said "fault"?	O
P	Q. The system was devised by you. I think this Inquiry --	P
Q	well, you should ask yourself, at the same time.	Q
R	A. I said we put in place a system which we reasonably	R
S	thought would enable people to follow the regulation.	S
T	Q. But then we had this major incident. Have you reflected	T
U	upon what your department did?	U
V	A. We were not able to identify the risk, and now we can	V
	identify the risk.	
	Q. But it was found out by somebody else.	
	A. So, once the risks are known to us, we immediately	
	implement the control measures.	

Q. So was there any problem with your mechanism?

A. I would say that system that was put in place, that was reasonable, and of course we need to learn from experience.

Q. So you think that you were not at fault?

CHAIRMAN: He has already answered the question.

MR LEE: Maybe I can phrase it on another way.

CHAIRMAN: On the same thing? On the same subject?

MR LEE: Chairman, you understand what I am trying to say.

Paragraph 32 of your statement. Page 18778.

Paragraph 31:

"(In English) Within the above control mechanism involving multiple stakeholders ..."

Your people are looking at different things.

"(In English) ... WA's role is regulatory and inspection of plumbing installation is generally guided by risk-based approach."

So that's the context. Paragraph 32 now:

"(In English) WA considers that the current inspection of the finished plumbing works is pitched at the right level taking into account the multilayered control mechanism."

And the professional institutions would like to have an independent building service section within WSD, and you said:

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C "(In English) To have an independent building service section within WSD on top of the existing control mechanism is not an effective way of administering public resources. Setting up an independent building service section will mean deploying public resources to duplicate the efforts of various stakeholders ... The considerable resource implication is hardly justified." C

D D

E E

F F

G G

H H

I Then paragraph 33 -- I

J MR A CHAN: (In English) In fairness, Mr Chairman, could Mr Lee just read the sentence he skipped? J

K MR LEE: (In English) Okay. Sure, I'll go back: K

L "(In English) To have an independent building service section within WSD on top of the existing control mechanism is not an effective way of administering public resources. Setting up an independent building service section will mean deploying public resources to duplicate the efforts of various stakeholders. This independent building service section of WSD will have to be substantial in size given that WA's regulatory remit is territory wide. The considerable resource implication is hardly justified." L

M M

N N

O O

P P

Q Q

R Then you go on -- you think, actually, in terms of the mechanism, the oversight and the monitoring, with regard to the compliance with the British Standards, the R

S S

T T

U U

V V

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	Day 60 B
C	current mechanism is adequate?	C
D	A. Well, it's reasonable.	D
E	Q. When it comes to water quality and lead content in water, do you think it's adequate also in that sense?	E
F	A. The material used and water quality are related. If the materials are okay and up to standard, the water quality	F
G	should be okay. So I put in a system, and we hoped that	G
H	everyone would follow the requirements regarding the material, and that would ensure water quality.	H
I	Q. So you need to pay attention to two. The current	I
J	inspection of materials would mean that the materials and the water quality would both be okay?	J
K	A. Here, we are talking about inspection.	K
L	Q. Are you saying the same thing about water quality?	L
M	A. The two are intertwined. If the water supply chain is reviewed with materials up to standard, then water	M
N	quality would be okay.	N
O	Q. You talk about it's pitched at a reasonable level. It's the right level.	O
P	A. But that's the premise, that other people would also be doing their part in overseeing the construction.	P
Q	Q. So you think that if the materials are okay, there's no	Q
R	reason why the water quality would be substandard? So	R
S	you have this reasonable expectation, and water quality	S
T	should be okay. So you think that that's the right	T
U		U
V		V

mechanism to monitor water quality?

Paragraph 33:

"It should be noted that the current arrangement is in line with the role of a regulator as identified by the Construction Industry Review Committee report ..."

There's a footnote down there, "In 2001", issued in 2001, that:

"(In English) ... Chief Executive decided to appoint an independent committee to carry out a comprehensive review of the construction industry. The Construction Industry Review Committee was set up in the light of various incidents involving non-complying construction building works which revealed some inherent weaknesses in the construction industry."

So you quote from that report:

"(In English) ... Given resource constraints, all regulators face the same challenge of how best to target their enforcement action. We recommend that our regulators should explore with the industry, whenever appropriate, ways for industry participants to assume a greater responsibility over their behaviour through a degree of self-regulation. The regulator will continue to police the system, but with greater emphasis on those particularly at risk and with appropriately raised stakes for those who attempt to abuse the

regulator's trust ..."

So what you are saying is that this report agrees
with your approach?

A. Well, I can't say that they agree with us, because they
existed before us. In the year 2001, there was this
report, and we think that our approach is in line with
what is said in that report.

Q. So great minds think alike.

A. I dare not say whether we are great minds.

Q. Let's take a look at your report.

A. Our report? (Handed).

Q. It's a thick volume, so we have an extract. There is
a letter here, "Construction Industry Review Committee",
dated 18 January 2001, addressed to the then CE,
CH Tung, by Henry Tang, chairman of the Construction
Industry Review Committee.

So you note the letter, and then a report was
attached. We can skip page 1. Page 2:

"(In English) In order to achieve the envisaged
results, radical improvements are called for in the way
construction projects are delivered, the way risks are
shared, the way industry participants interact with one
another and the ethical standards within the industry.
We have attempted in this report to set strategic
directions for a change programme that encompasses all

sectors of the industry. However, our efforts represent but the initial steps of a major reform process for the construction industry. The successful transformation of the industry will hinge critically on strong leadership and commitment from both the government and industry in implementing the change programme.

As a major client of local construction, the government has an overriding interest in ensuring that the construction industry delivers better value."

The end of this letter:

"(In English) A reformed construction industry that strives for excellence will provide firm support to our efforts in making Hong Kong a world class city."

It is very positive. Let's take a look at the report, page 39 of the internal pagination.

4.15, it emphasises accountability:

"(In English) The satisfactory delivery of a project depends on the commitment of all stakeholders to perform to the best of their abilities in full alignment with the objectives of the project. We look to all members of the project team (including client organisations, designers, engineers, contractors, subcontractors, site supervisors, workers and others) to take a responsible attitude to their work and to perform their duties to a high standard. To facilitate the development of

a performance-oriented culture in the construction industry, we need to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved in the project delivery process and the expected standards of their performance. At the same time, we need to put in place a fair system of sanctions so that when things go wrong, the responsible parties are brought to account. Regulators, clients, professional institutions and industry bodies can all assist in establishing a clear accountability structure in the industry."

It is clear, if something goes wrong, there must be a good system to sanction those who are being naughty, so to speak.

"(In English) Consistent with our philosophy that the construction industry should be motivated to strive for excellence through market forces as far as possible, we take the view that construction legislation should be kept to a minimum that is necessary for the protection of worker safety or other wider public interest. Where regulations are necessary, they should clearly and fairly set out the responsibilities of the concerned parties and put in place appropriate sanctions proportional to the seriousness of the offence. Taking site safety as an example, we note that under the existing regulatory framework, the main contractor is

held liable for safety offences committed on his site.
Given the prevalence of subcontracting in local
construction, this approach means that where the offence
actually committed by a subcontractor, the sanction
fails to target the party that is at fault ... This
should be rectified in order to bring the full force of
the regulation to bear on those who abuse the system."

So sometimes the main contractor has been wrongly
penalised as the subcontractor hasn't been penalised.

What follows is important. I think you have quoted
this paragraph:

"(In English) Legislation will lose its sting
without effective enforcement."

Good legislation doesn't help if you don't enforce
it. If you don't investigate into the breaches, then
no one will be arrested.

But you haven't quoted this sentence from this
paragraph. I have read out your quotation. Please read
it again. Paragraph 33 on page 18779. You start with,
"Given resource constraints ..."

Now, if you go back to 4.17, again, we have "Given
resource constraints", but you have missed out the first
sentence.

I think this is exactly what has happened. Even if
you have the legislation, the sting will be rendered

ineffective, if you don't have effective enforcement.

You say that you have because you rely on the APs and the LPs, but you don't have effective enforcement, so the legislation has lost its sting.

A. Well, it says towards the end:

"(In English) ... with greater emphasis on those particularly at risk and with appropriately raised stakes ..."

Q. But then the first point is important. Legislation will lose its sting without effective enforcement. I think this can accurately summarise what we have got here. You say the water quality is good up to the connection point. Once it is into the inside service, then trouble comes. If all the pipes and fittings follow the BS, there will still be trace amounts of lead going into the water, but it will be undetectable. Where does the lead come from? It comes from the solder materials. So, had they followed the BS, then according to your thinking, lead should not be found there. Without effective enforcement, even though you have got a good system, it will not be working?

A. Perhaps I have to repeat myself. A final inspection will of course be carried out. If we see anything irregular, we will certainly penalise those involved.

Q. But you haven't investigated, and your record shows that

nobody has been penalised. But you talk about lead, but for other things, demerit points have been recorded.

A. But nobody has been penalised for lead. We haven't detected --

Q. It's because you haven't examined. You haven't inspected. You have said you tried to have surprise visits, you talked to the industry, but it was not necessary.

A. No, that's after the incident. We tried to see if this can be done. I have said this morning, as a regulator, there are two parts of our work. First of all, we can have our own inspections. Second, we can put in place a system, hoping that the LPs and APs can assure us.

Now, you say that on top of that, you say perhaps we can have an additional system to check that. We need to study the matter.

What is important is to see whether there is an effective means to do it.

Q. I need to say this seriously to you. I think it is a case of serious dereliction of duty on the part of your department.

A. I don't think it is a fair comment for my colleagues.

Q. I say this because you have so many things in place but you just build everything on faith and trust, but you never carried out any investigation or inspection, not

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	Day 60 B
C	even once. You are the regulator. You are the	C
D	regulator. You would just set a standard. What's the	D
E	purpose of it? Say I have a football team. I have	E
F	a standard. It's useless if you can't score a goal and	F
G	get hold of the ball.	G
H	Well, what action have you taken to tell yourself	H
I	that the system works and everybody is complying with	I
J	the requirements? Have you ever tried to find out	J
K	whether it is a case of compliance on the part of	K
L	everybody? A simple question, "yes" or "no". What is	L
M	it, "yes" or "no"?	M
N	A. You need to -- well, we have carried out final	N
O	inspection.	O
P	Q. Final inspection?	P
Q	A. No. We also went there on site. We did find out that	Q
R	in general, they were able to meet our requirements.	R
S	Q. Did you go there and witness the soldering?	S
T	A. When we carried out our work, final inspection, it had	T
U	been completed.	U
V	Q. Why didn't you go while the soldering is being done?	V
	A. It's a matter of whether you can effectively carry out	
	a surprise inspection. You need to consider.	
	Q. No, no need to consider. If you want to do it, if you	
	have the will, you can do it.	
	A. We have to consider the effectiveness.	

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* A

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 B

C Q. I did ask you whether your department has taken any C
D action to try to dig out the truth, to find out whether D
E they have really been following your requirements, and E
F they have been obedient. F

G A. I would say the final inspection would to some extent G
H look at assessing the final product. It's whether it's H
I in line with what we want. It's what we can find out. I

J Q. Will you consult and find out whether it's in compliance J
K with the British Standards? K

L A. If you want to use a certain fitting on the system, L
M there will be testing first. M

N Q. Who would tell you that? N

O A. The accredited laboratory which has tested the material. O
P The supplier would have to give the sample. P

Q Q. Of course, the sample will be up to the standard. The Q
R supplier won't submit a substandard material for R
S an inspection. S

T A. Well, the system in other countries, like the UK, is T
U that the sample is taken to a laboratory, to test that U
V it complies with the British Standards and so on. V

Q. Let's look at building construction. Can you just go to Q
R the completed building and take out one section of the R
S pipe to test? S

A. Unless we have some doubts, then we can do it. T

Q. But up to that incident, you did not have any doubt? U

V

A. We look at the approved list of say taps and other fittings.

Q. I didn't say that you are in dereliction of duty lightly. You still are not aware -- you are still considering doing this and that, and you are not willing to admit that you were wrong. Why didn't you take one more sample after testing the flushing sample? Why don't you use one more stagnation sample for the test, just to assure people? But you don't want to do it, and now you are still not aware of the inadequacy.

A. I have explained the sampling methodology.

Q. I am telling you that there's no reason why you would not take one more step in the sampling.

A. Yes, of course, that's the observation.

Q. You don't agree, obviously?

A. No, I don't agree.

Q. Why? Why don't you agree?

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lee, that's not entirely fair.

MR LEE: You will test the pipes to see whether they comply with the BS.

CHAIRMAN: How many sections of pipes have you tested?
When are you talking about?

MR LEE: After the incident.

Have you removed any pipes for testing?

A. We don't test the pipes, but the soldering joint. We

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	have a quick lab test and we can put some swab on the joint to see whether there's any discoloration.	C
D	Q. Is it being used?	D
E	A. Yes, it's being used.	E
F	Q. Where is it used?	F
G	A. All new plumbing systems.	G
H	Q. What about the old, existing ones? Are you going to test them again? Those "unaffected estates" may not be unaffected. Say, in a building, you have taken 10 or 8 samples, and if there's no exceedance, then there's nothing, and all those are flushed samples. You flush the system for two minutes, and you are not using first draw.	H
I	All right. Let's see if we can try to test first draw, just to assure people, if not for anything else.	I
J	A. Whether it's an independent sampling by Prof Lee or our approach.	J
K	Q. Okay. Well, I think you are not being fair to Prof Lee. He didn't take as many samples as you, because of time and money constraints.	K
L	A. Well, the results match.	L
M	Q. You are not taking a lot of samples, and he has taken even fewer, and he identified some cases of exceedance.	M
N	A. If you look at Prof Lee's conclusion, he said his findings largely conform to ours.	N
O		O
P		P
Q		Q
R		R
S		S
T		T
U		U
V		V

CHAIRMAN: Please note the word "largely". It's not "entirely". It's a broad approach. It's largely in conformity. It's a "largely conform to" situation. But for individual housing estates, things might be different. I still don't understand the case with Kwai Chung Estate, honestly speaking, although he explained something about environmental contamination, or there's a lot of dust on the exhaust fan. I think the estate looks like one affected.

A. Prof Lee has done some investigation. We have done ours. I don't want to be entangled on this.

CHAIRMAN: And your question -- you are saying they are reluctant to move forward, they are reluctant to make improvements, and they are unwilling to take even one more step.

So he disagrees, so he has answered your question.

MR LEE: This time, I won't ask you why. If we adopt the method of Prof Lee, if we adopt your thinking, and that is you take some samples at the estates. If there's one sample exceeding 10, then you think that the whole estate is affected?

A. Well, we don't -- it's a systematic sampling. It's not done willy-nilly. We have a lot of down-feeds from the water tank to different sumps. We look at the lowest one and the one furthest away from the source, and if

A	<i>Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation</i>	A
B	Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water	B
	Day 60	
C	that unit is not available, then we use another one.	C
D	Q. So it's not random?	D
E	A. It's systematic. We want to take a sample farthest away from the source.	E
F	Q. But is it random when it comes to selection of the buildings?	F
G	A. No.	G
H	Q. So, if there's one water sample exceeding 10 micrograms, then you think the estate is affected?	H
I	A. (Chinese spoken).	I
J	Q. Prof Lee has adopted a different calculation approach, and they don't use the same sampling approach, if the	J
K	criteria is that one sample exceeding 10 would mean the	K
L	entire estate is affected.	L
M	A. He used the first draw, and I think it's reasonable, and	M
N	there's no reason to use the one highest up to represent	N
O	the whole estate, or you assume that you will put the	O
P	kettle to the tap first thing in the morning. And the	P
Q	level would not be the highest? Well, after a minute, it's almost entirely gone. For a normal kettle, it's	Q
R	just 1 litre or up to 4 litres.	R
S	Q. So the level would be low?	S
T	A. That's once it's in the kettle.	T
U	CHAIRMAN: You know lead is cumulative. Prof Lee has some	U
V	idea behind this, 20, 40, 60 and 80-second intervals,	V

and there's a thinking behind his calculations.

MR LEE: He used first-draw samples. Let's say it's 20.

That's excessive lead. You will not accept it. In a public rental housing estate, at the lower storey, and the one at the longest distance, and if you test, the result is 20, not 10. What will happen? You won't accept it, because it's first draw.

A. In the first place, we do not take the first-draw samples, because we think that they are not representative. Prof Lee has his own sampling protocol and he used calculation to do some exploration.

Q. If there's a Government Laboratory people accompanying him taking the sample, saying that this is 20 micrograms, and you would say this doesn't count?

A. We think it is not representative.

Q. You would take another sample?

A. But we would use our sampling protocol.

Q. So it would drop to 6?

A. Then I have to repeat. We will be going back to previous discussions.

CHAIRMAN: (Chinese spoken).

MR LEE: It's time to adjourn. I am going to move on to the next subject. I will try to reduce the number of questions.

CHAIRMAN: What about the time that you need tomorrow?

A *Annex: Realtime English Transcription based on floor / Simultaneous Interpretation* **A**

B Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water Day 60 **B**

C MR LEE: One and a half hours. **C**

D CHAIRMAN: All right. Let's start at 10.00 tomorrow. **D**

E (4.26 pm) **E**

F (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day) **F**

G **G**

H **H**

I **I**

J **J**

K **K**

L **L**

M **M**

N **N**

O **O**

P **P**

Q **Q**

R **R**

S **S**

T **T**

U **U**

V **V**

C INDEX

PAGE

D MR WONG CHUNG LEUNG (on former affirmation)1

E Cross-examination by MR HO (continued)1

F Cross-examination by MR LEE52

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V