



### **Absent with apologies**

Hon. WONG Yung-kan, JP	Representing Fishing Industry
Mr. Danny WU	Representing River Trade Cargo Operations
Mr. LO Ngok-yang, Ken	Representing Ship Building and Repairing Industry
Mr. Martin CHU	Representing Ship Survey Work

### **Presentation of Papers**

Paper No. 8/2008	Mr. LEUNG Man-chiu	SS/CRT, MD
Paper No. 10/2008	Mr. Conrad NG	Technical Director, Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited
	Mr. Daniel CHUNG	Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (2), Highways Department (HyD)
	Mr. Raymond YIP	Chief Engineer, HyD
	Mr. LAW Shun-lee, Peter	Senior Engineer, HyD

## **I. Opening Remarks**

1. The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting. He extended, in particular, welcome to Mr. YUEN Chung-biu and Mr. CHAN Hon-bun who were attending the meeting for the first time.
2. He also welcomed the following persons who were attending the LVAC meeting as observers for the first time: -

Mr. Bosco CHAU  
Mr. CHEUNG Tai-kee  
Mr. CHAN Shu-man  
Mr. LEE Wing-tark  
Mr. CHICK King-fai

and the following guests from the Highways Department and its consultants who would present the LVAC Paper No. 10/2008 at the meeting: -

Mr. Conrad NG  
Mr. Daniel CHUNG  
Mr. Raymond YIP  
Mr. LAW Shun-lee, Peter

## **II. Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

3. The minutes of last meeting held on 24 April 2008, which had been revised as per the amendments proposed by members, had been re-circulated to members for endorsement. The minutes of last meeting were confirmed without further amendment.

## **III. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes**

### *LVAC Paper No. 5/2008 – “Control of Smoke Emission from Vessels in the Waters of Hong Kong”*

4. Mr. CHAN Hon-bun reported that MD was discussing the issue with bureaux and departments concerned with reference to the comments made by members at the last meeting.

## **IV. Presentation of Papers**

### *LVAC Paper No. 8/2008 – “Amendments to Rules Associated with Local Certificate of Competency”*

5. Mr. LEUNG Man-chiu presented the details of the paper on the proposed amendments to rules associated with Local Certificate of Competency to members.
6. Mr. SO Ping-chi suggested that members of the sub-committees concerned should be consulted with the proposed amendments before the paper was brought to LVAC. After some discussions, Mr. CHICK King-fai agreed to withdraw the paper from the Committee and re-submit the amendments to LVAC at a later stage.

### *LVAC Paper No. 9/2008 – “Proposal of Expanding the Pool of Authorized Surveyors under the Merchant Shipping (Local Vessels) Ordinance”*

7. Mr. SO Ping-chi presented the details of the paper and invited members to comment on the proposal to expand the pool for appointment as Authorized Surveyors (ASs).

8. Dr. Alan LAU asked if the users had preferred the surveys to be conducted by MD's surveyors because of lower charges. Mr. SO Ping-chi replied that the charges by the MD's surveyors and ASs should be about the same.
9. Mr. TAM Mo-pun raised the following comments on the proposal which he had received from some ASs –
  - (i) The table in the paper did not include Class IV vessels, for which the number of surveys conducted by ASs was high;
  - (ii) The high number of surveys carried out for Class IV vessels by ASs was a result of MD's extensive promotion among owners of Class IV vessels; on the other hand, owners of Class II and III vessels were not aware of the services of ASs;
  - (iii) MD should clearly explain the criteria on the acceptance of maritime institutes and define 'corporate (professional) membership'; and
  - (iv) ASs might be classified into two categories: one included professionals who were qualified with engineering qualifications and experiences in approving design calculations; and the other included professionals who did not possess engineering academic or professional qualifications, but had gained experience in marine survey work. ASs of both categories should be allowed to carry out the survey work but only ASs of the first category should be allowed to approve design calculations.
10. Mr. Terry TAM, an AS, had submitted similar comments as those of Mr. TAM Mo-pun on the proposal in writing which had been tabled for members' reference.
11. In response to the comments of Mr. TAM Mo-pun and Mr. Terry TAM, Mr. SO Ping-chi said that –
  - (i) The table showed the number of surveys carried out by ASs where ship owners had a choice between ASs and MD's surveyors. As all necessary surveys for Class IV vessels should be conducted by ASs, Class IV survey figures were not included. Likewise, all the surveys for Class I vessels carried out by MD were not included in the table;

- (ii) The criteria on accepting marine institutes would be comparable to those for appointing MD surveyors. It was not possible to list out all the criteria as they were under review by individual institutes from time to time;
  - (iii) Individual institutes had their own definitions of the term 'Corporate' membership. Members interested in the institutes' definitions could access such via the Internet; and
  - (iv) The performance of ASs relied very much on the professional conduct of individual ASs and the monitoring by MD.
12. Mr. WONG Miu-sang said that the proposed expansion of the pool was supported, but more promotion of the services of ASs for ship owners would be welcome.
  13. Mr. TAM Mo-pun said that he was not against the proposed expansion of the pool, but MD should ensure that ship owners understood that ASs might carry out surveys on behalf of MD. Mr. TAM also said that the arrangement whereby an audit had to be carried out by MD after a survey had been completed, would cause inconvenience to ship owners. Ship owners therefore preferred having surveys carried out by MD so that both the survey and audit could be done at the same time. Mr. SO Ping-chi replied that audits were needed to ensure the standard of the surveys carried out. In order to minimize the inconvenience caused to ship owners, the audit might be carried out while the vessel was in operation.
  14. Mr. TAM opined that 4 years' relevant experience might be enough for MD surveyors as they had the back up of their supervisors, but not necessarily enough for ASs.
  15. Mr. WONG Yiu-kan said that his members were very well informed of any changes, and therefore disagreed that his members were not aware of the services of ASs.
  16. Mr. Bosco CHAU asked and Mr. SO Ping-chi replied that even with the expansion, the estimated number of ASs would still be small with an increase probably of not more than 10.

17. Mr. KEUNG Siu-fai opined that owners of fishing and small vessels in general supported the proposal as the expansion would mean more choice for ship owners. Moreover, he expressed that he had full confidence in MD in monitoring ASs' performance and maintaining the safety of local vessels.
18. The Chairman concluded that the proposal was endorsed by members unanimously, and MD always accorded high priority on safety and would ensure that surveys carried out by ASs were able to meet the required standard.

***LVAC Paper No. 10/2008 – “Options for Re provisioning of Affected Moorings and Anchorage during Trunk Road Tunnel Construction at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter”***

19. Mr. Daniel CHUNG briefed members that the public consultation on the re-provisioning of affected mooring and anchorage areas during trunk road tunnel construction at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) had been carried out in the past few months. The first stage consultation had now been completed. Members were now being consulted before going into the second stage consultation. Mr. Conrad NG presented the details of the paper and invited members to comment on the six proposed options for temporary re-provisioning of the typhoon shelter.
20. Dr. Alan LAU opined that there were about 20 small operational vessels which were associated with business operations in the Victoria Harbour that needed to remain within the harbour area. It would not be feasible for these vessels to move to other shelters as it would increase their fuel cost and time of travelling. One option would be to moor at the ex-Public Cargo Working Area (ex-PCWA) in Wan Chai. In the case of typhoons, they might go to Yau Ma Tei, To Kwa Wan, Shau Kei Wan and Aberdeen Typhoon Shelters etc. For pleasure vessels, they might need to be temporarily relocated to other areas as they normally picked up users of the vessels elsewhere. For dwelling vessels, some of them had been there for a long time, and it might be necessary to consider whether they should be allowed to stay in the area.
21. Mr. KEUNG Siu-fai said that fishermen had the right to remain in the area based on historical background. If Government decided to relocate the fishing and dwelling vessels, appropriate compensation should be made to them.

22. Mr. PANG Wah-kan said that about 80 fishing vessels were still active. If they were relocated to other areas, their living would be affected. If they were relocated to other typhoon shelters, the operations of the other shelters would also be affected. The Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter would not be suitable for the fishing vessels in CBTS as it would be too windy.
23. Mr. Daniel CHUNG said that members' comments would be considered in formulating the re-provisioning proposal. The aim was to minimize the hardship on the livelihood and inconvenience to the CBTS users.
24. Mr. WONG Yiu-wah said that about 20 members of the Marine Excursion Association used to moor in CBTS and would like to be relocated in the same area as their businesses were mainly conducted in Tsim Sha Tsui, Central, Kowloon City and Kwun Tong areas. If they were relocated to Aberdeen, their fuel cost and time of travelling would increase.
25. Mr. KWOK Tak-kee said that he supported relocating the business vessels to the nearby ex-PCWA, which would minimize their inconvenience and best suit their operations.
26. Mr. KEUNG Siu-fai asked if mobile gates could be installed at the entrance to ex-PCWA to replace the breakwater. Mr. Conrad NG replied that the gates could not be opened or closed quickly in case there were emergency during typhoons. Mr. NG said that they had also examined some types of floating gates, but these could not effectively stop the long period waves during typhoons.
27. Mr. Daniel CHUNG pointed out that if the ex-PCWA in Wan Chai was used for the re-provisioning of the affected moorings and anchorages, there would be additional stages of construction resulting in a delay of at least two years, so the road traffic would be adversely affected for at least two more years.
28. The Chairman concluded that the project was complicated and hoped that HyD could consider the members' comments in detail.

## **V. Any Other Business**

### ***Safety of High-speed Ferries***

29. The Chairman said that Mr. Danny WU had raised the safety issue arising from the increase in the number of high-speed ferries and the aging of ferry officers. Mr. CHICK King-fai said that measures had been taken by MD to help resolving the situation. Mr. John HUI expressed his worry that his staff were still being poached and the average age of new recruits of officers was generally high. Mr. Tony YEUNG opined that from his experience the competency of a captain was not necessarily related to his age, and that sufficient training would help. Mr. CHICK added that MD already had a type-rating mechanism to ensure the competency of all officers to work on high-speed ferries irrespective of age.

### ***Re-validation of Crew Certificate***

30. Mr. Tony YEUNG said that the Crew Certificate (commonly known as Yellow Card) required for crew of vessels operating in mainland waters had already expired. Mr. YEUNG said that the Marine Services Training Institute (MSTI) was responsible for providing safety training for the Certificate but not the authority to decide how the certificates were to be issued. Mr. LAI Hoi-ping suggested that the necessary arrangements for renewing the Certificate should be simplified. Mr. LEUNG Man-chiu undertook to follow up the issue.

### ***Matters arising from Sub-committee meetings***

31. Mr. SO Ping-chi reported that the meeting of the Sub-committee on Safety for Works on Vessels had been held on 28.5.2008.

## **VI. Date of Next Meeting**

32. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:00 p.m. The date of next meeting would be announced in due course.