



土木工程處

Civil Engineering Office

Web site 網址 : http://www.cedd.gov.hk
 E-mail 電子郵件:
 Telephone 電話 : (852) 2762 5006
 Facsimile 傳真 : (852) 2714 0079
 Our reference 本署檔號: () in LW-04-0035-1C Pt.
 Your reference 來函檔號: CB4/PAC/R72

香港九龍公主道 101 號
 土木工程拓展署大樓
 Civil Engineering and
 Development Building,
 101 Princess Margaret Road,
 Kowloon, Hong Kong

Public Accounts Committee
 Legislative Council Complex
 1 Legislative Council Road
 Central, Hong Kong
 (Attention: Mr. Anthony CHU)

27 May 2019

By Fax (2543 9197)
and email

Dear Sir,

Public Accounts Committee

Consideration of Chapter 2 of the Director of Audit's Report No.72

Management of Greening Master Plans

I refer to your letter dated 15 May 2019 regarding the captioned. Please find enclosed our responses to your queries for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

(WONG Chi-pan, Ricky)
 for Director of Civil Engineering and Development

c.c. (w/e)

Director of Audit
 Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury
 Secretary for Development
 Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

(Fax No.: 2583 9063)
 (Fax No.: 2147 5239)
 (Fax No.: 2147 3691)
 (Fax No.: 2691 4661)

Civil Engineering and Development Department's Response to Questions raised by the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Council on Chapter 2 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 72
Management of Greening Master Plans

- 3) According to Note 1 to Table 3 of paragraph 2.7, “a total of 2,568 additional trees... and 713,187 additional shrubs were planted”, please advise the purpose of planting these additional plants, the additional expenditure and staff resource incurred?

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)'s Reply

During the construction phase, the resident site staff would review the greening design as necessary to suit site condition. The engineering team would also endeavor to identify the possibility of additional planting locations to enhance the green setting in the district.

Under the seven contracts of Phase 3 Urban Greening Master Plan (GMP) as a whole, the cost of additional greening works concerned was around \$19M (including civil engineering works, landscape softworks and establishment works, miscellaneous works such as irrigating systems, tree guards, etc.), i.e. about 8% of the total contract expenditure. Overall speaking, the environment of the districts was further improved as more trees/shrubs were planted compared to the original design. On the other hand, as the overall awarded tender price for the seven contracts was lower than expected, the total expenditure was still less than the approved funding. In relation to the additional greening works concerned, no additional staff resource was incurred in the Government and the consultants.

- 4) According to Table 4 of paragraph 2.7, one of the reasons for not planting at potential planting areas under the works contracts for Phase 3 of urban areas was objections, please advise what were the reasons involved in the objections?

CEDD's Reply

Before the commencement of the planting works on site, the engineering team would consult the relevant stakeholders such as district councils, local residents, owners of the nearby shops and

estate management offices, etc. Various reasons for objections included the concerns on reduction of footpath width due to greening works, the planters becoming blackspots for littering, blockage of shop frontage and signage, and fallen leaves or fruits into private property, etc.

- 5) According to paragraph 2.8(a), “more investigation works had been carried out during the design stage, including excavating more trial pits (from about 10% in urban areas to about 16% in Southeast and Northwest NT)”, please advise:
- (a) As it was said that the no-dig utility detection method was quick, inexpensive and effective in detecting metallic cables or pipes, will this method be 100% used in future for utility detection ?
 - (b) If the answer to (a) is positive, what will be the required additional expenditure and additional staff resource?
 - (c) If the answer to (a) is negative, what are the reasons and difficulties for not fully applying this method?

CEDD’s Reply

There are many types of underground utilities and of different materials, such as metal, plastic and concrete, etc. As the no-dig detection method can only detect metallic utilities but no other materials, the accuracy of this detection method is not absolute. The situation of underground utilities cannot be comprehensively reflected if we solely adopt the no-dig detection method for utility detection. Therefore, the consultants have to review utility records provided by utility undertakers, verify the locations of manhole covers on site, excavate trial pits or adopt no-dig detection method in order to obtain more information to reveal the actual situation of underground utilities on site in order to increase the successful rate for planting.

- 6) Referring to Table 5 of paragraph 2.9, please advise why it was not necessary to propose additional shrubs for planting at potential planting areas after contract commenced?

CEDD’s Reply

For Yuen Long district, the total number of shrubs planted at potential planting areas happened to be similar to the quantity as

stipulated in the contract. Therefore, there was no additional quantity of shrub planting at potential planting areas as shown in Table 5 of the Audit Report.

However, in order to enhance greening of the districts, we also identified other suitable planting areas. For Yuen Long district, a total of 846,505 shrubs were planted, exceeding the estimated quantity of planting 655,542 shrubs in the contract (please refer to Appendix E of the Audit Report on the actual planting number for all districts).

- 7) According to Case 1 in paragraph 2.11, although CEDD reduced the proposed planting quantity after identifying the presence of underground utilities to avoid clash with the utilities, planting at Location A still could not be implemented due to the obstruction of utilities, and this caused waste of manpower resource and cost. Please advise:
- (a) The current methods for detecting underground utilities;
 - (b) Will CEDD consider adopting other measures in order to enhance the assessment on the feasibility of planting at locations with underground utilities? If positive, what are the details? If negative, what is the reason?
 - (c) The consultants conducted 3 trial pits in March 2013 and another 5 trial pits during construction stage at Location A. Please advise the details, cost and human resource involved in carrying out these 8 trial pits.

CEDD's Reply

- (a) For general planting projects, the planting locations would be clearly specified within the site under the contract. In view of the extensive area of NT GMPs and the planting proposals are widely scattered in each districts, we anticipated that the planting areas might have to be adjusted to address the actual site condition. Therefore, the greening proposals under the works contracts were specified as "potential planting area". At design stage, the consultants assessed the feasibility of tree planting proposals through checking utility records provided by utility undertakers, inspecting exact locations of manhole covers on site, excavating trial pits at selected locations and applying no-dig utility detection method.
- (b) We will conduct more trial pit excavation and no-dig utility detection at the proposed planting locations in NT Northeast and

NT Southwest taking into account the cost-effectiveness and the experience gained during implementation of greening works under NT Northwest and NT Southeast. For those planting proposals which cannot be implemented at potential planting areas, we will endeavor to identify suitable alternative planting locations adjacent to the original proposals as priority in order to fulfill the expectation of the local residents on greening in the district.

- (c) The cost for site investigation was covered in the consultancy agreement. In view of the extensive area of NT GMPs and cost-effectiveness, trial pits were recommended at selected locations by the consultants to eliminate infeasible tree planting proposals. CEDD then arranged the Term Contractor to carry out 3 trial pits at Location A (including about 900m long footpath and cycle track along the riverside of Shing Mun River) and the cost involved was about \$9,000. No additional staff resource was incurred. During construction stage, the contractors conducted 5 trial pits in order to ascertain the site condition and further identify possible locations for planting. The cost was included in the contracts and no additional staff resource was incurred.
- 8) According to Case 2 of paragraph 2.11, the works contract for the greening works in NT Southeast (i.e. including Sha Tin) commenced in December 2014. The contract included planting of 1,901 shrubs at Location C. However, after construction of a planter for shrub planting in June 2016 at Location C, CEDD received public objections expressing the concerns on occupying one-third of the footpath by the planter. As a result, CEDD did not proceed with planting works at Location C and the planter at a cost of \$70,000 was subsequently removed. An additional cost of about \$105,000 was incurred under the works contract for demolishing the planter and reinstating the pavement and beam barriers. Please advise:
- (a) Had pedestrian flow survey been conducted during the preparation of design proposals under GMPs?
 - (b) Whether consultancy agreement clearly specified the relevant duties of the consultants?
 - (c) In addition to assessing the feasibility of planting proposals, paying attention to the width of footpath and reviewing pedestrian flow and pavement condition, please advise other factors to be considered during site investigation?
 - (d) After formulation of the greening proposals under GMPs through

site investigation, how the consultants ensure that the planting proposals could be implemented on site?

- (e) The additional cost of about \$105,000 was incurred under the works contract for demolishing the planter and reinstating the pavement and beam barriers. Who were the responsible government officers and who should bear the cost incurred?

CEDD's Reply

- (a)&(b) The consultant had inspected the pedestrian flow condition of existing footpath and proposed suitable locations for planting, with adequate clearance reserved to meet the width requirements of footpath. When conducting site investigation, the consultant was also required to consider the conditions of underground utilities such as exact location of manhole covers, sightlines of pedestrians and drivers, width of central medians, areas reserved for loading/unloading and other business activities, obstructions from nearby structures to determine the feasibility of planting proposals and the appropriate species for planting.
- (c)&(d) During the detailed design stage, the consultant assessed the feasibility of tree planting proposals through checking of utility records and relevant site investigation results. At construction stage, the contractor would carry out trial pit excavation to confirm the feasibility of each planting proposal on site.
- (e) Although the greening proposals had obtained support from consultations with district councils and site investigation had been conducted, it was unavoidable that greening proposals have to be adjusted on site to address the actual site condition. In order to address the latest requests of local stakeholders and to cope with the increased pedestrian flow generated from nearby new residential development, that section of footpath was reinstated to its condition before planting works. The cost of \$105,000 for reinstatement of footpath was paid under the works contract.
- 9) According to Case 3 in paragraph 2.11, in September and October 2013, the Housing Department (HD) presented to the Sha Tin District Council (DC) a development proposal for Phase 2 of a public housing estate including the associated realignment of a road section, which covered Location D, and obtained its support for the proposal.

In June 2015, CEDD received an enquiry from a member of the Sha Tin DC expressing concerns that greening works under the Sha Tin GMP might be affected by the development proposal for Phase 2 of the public housing estate and the associated road realignment works. In July 2015, CEDD decided not to proceed with planting at that location after discussion with HD. Please advise:

- (a) Why the consultants could not identify any conflicting development during the formulation of greening proposals under GMPs?
- (b) Is there any written record showing that the consultant had consulted HD regarding the planting proposal within or near the housing site?
- (c) Will CEDD consider strengthening measures to ensure the works under GMPs and other projects could be coordinated?
- (d) CEDD invited and awarded tenders in August 2014 and December 2014 respectively. What was the resource deployed? As planting at Location D was not implemented, how did CEDD handle the issue associated with the tender and contract awarded?

CEDD's Reply

- (a)&(b) During the design stage in 2012 to 2014, the consultant consulted relevant departments in writing, including Housing Department, on the proposed greening works and we had received no opinion or suggestion on the planting proposals.
- (c) In view of the possible changes of the actual site condition before the commencement of construction works, we would liaise with the relevant district councilors to ascertain the latest development and concerns of the district. We will also strengthen communications with other departments to coordinate the project interface issues.
- (d) In view of the fact that the potential planting areas might have to be adjusted to suit the actual site condition, the greening works under NT Northwest and NT Southeast adopted re-measurement contract containing Bills of Quantities. The final contract sum would base on the actual work done on site. Therefore, the final works expenditure did not include the omitted planting proposal at location D. In the process of tendering and award of the contracts, no additional staff resource was incurred.

- 10) In paragraph 2.12, it mentioned that “while CEDD had stepped up efforts in development of GMPs for Southeast and Northwest NT, a considerable number of trees and shrubs were still not planted at potential planting areas. Unlike that for Phase 3 of Urban GMPs, CEDD had not made specific review on the reasons for the significant deviations.” Please advise:
- (a) How CEDD review the reasons for the significant deviation?
 - (b) What were the difficulties during review?
 - (c) Did the arrangement in the review of GMPs for NT Northwest and NT Southeast different from that of for Phase 3 Urban GMPs?

CEDD’s Reply

The arrangement in the review of GMPs for NT Northwest and NT Southeast is similar to that in Phase 3 of GMPs for urban areas. After completion of planting works, the contractors were required to maintain the plants for one year before handover to relevant departments. All planting works under the GMPs for NT Northwest and NT Southeast were handed over to relevant parties for maintenance in December 2018. We then conducted a review of the completed greening works to summarize the reasons for not planting at potential planting areas. The review was completed in May 2019 and it is found that the reasons are underground utilities obstruction, public’s objection and the effect of latest development in the district.

- 11) According to Table 8 of paragraph 2.18, the percentages of theme trees planting in Sha Tin and Tuen Mun under works contracts as well as the actual percentages of theme trees planting in Sha Tin, Sai Kung and Tuen Mun could not meet the internal reference rates. Please advise:
- (a) Why the internal reference rates were not specified in the works contract;
 - (b) Why the internal reference rates could not be achieved;
 - (c) How to monitor the works in order to achieve the internal reference rates for theme tree planting by the government? How to follow up if the internal reference rates cannot be achieved?

CEDD’s Reply

- (a) We adopt the ‘Right tree, right place’ principle to select suitable plant species at appropriate locations taking into consideration on

the comments from the local stakeholders and maintenance concerns. Therefore, there is no specific requirement on planting percentage of individual species under the GMPs in design stage. The rate of 20-30% theme tree species was proposed by the consultants upon review during implementation of the planting works as internal reference for consideration when changes of species were required during implementation.

- (b) Due to underground utilities or other site constraints adversely affecting the potential planting areas in the original proposals, new planting locations had to be identified for planting. Under the new planting locations, we had to review the plant species to address comments from local stakeholders and maintenance concerns. Theme tree species were replaced by other more suitable species at the new planting locations and so the number of theme trees planted varied from the estimated quantities stipulated in the contract. Apart from the theme tree species, reference could also be made to plant palette consists of other recommended species for each districts. With reference to the plant palette of each districts, suitable plants were selected in line with the district theme, with over 70% of the planted tree species in Sha Tin, Sai Kung, Tuen Mun and Yuen Long districts being theme tree species and recommended species under the plant palette.
- (c) There is no specific requirement on the planting percentage of theme tree species in the GMPs. We will adopt the recommendation from the Audit Report and request the consultants of future GMP projects to set an appropriate rate for planting theme tree species in the formulation of planting design and follow the implementation of the planting works according to the established rate for planting theme tree species.

12) Regarding Table 9 of paragraph 2.22, please advise:

- (a) Why one of the focal points was not included in contract and no planting was proposed;
- (b) Among the 18 focal points without planting of theme tree species, 8 focal points had no planting and the remaining 10 focal points were planted with species other than theme tree species. How does the government address the issue? Will there be any guideline in the future to ensure that theme tree species can be selected for planting?
- (c) Will there be any measure to strengthen the assessment on the feasibility of planting at focal points under GMP.

CEDD's Reply

- (a) One of the focal points in Sha Tin was located in central median. During design review, it was found that the planting space was too restrictive and planting of theme trees or other plant was not suitable. As a result, the site was not included in the contract.
 - (b) Focal points are mainly located at areas with high pedestrian or vehicular flow (for example, bus terminus, roundabout and road central median) and they are subject to relatively more site constraints. Therefore, theme tree species and other plants might not be suitable for planting at some of these focal points. At focal points with available space for planting, apart from the theme tree species, we will also select suitable plant species as recommended in the plant palette of respective district to tally with the theme for greening and effectively improve the environment.
 - (c) We will obtain the most updated information of underground utilities from public utilities authorities and companies and increase the amount of trial pits to ascertain the distribution of underground utilities in order to facilitate the identification of suitable planting locations within focal points. Subject to the concerns on cost-effectiveness, impact on programme and extent of nuisance to the public, relocation of the underground utilities to provide suitable space for planting will also be considered if practically feasible.
- 13) As mentioned in paragraph 2.30 “CEDD had repeatedly reminded the consultant engaged for monitoring the contractor’s works to plant more native species to meet the estimated rate of 35% reported to LegCo.”, please advise:
- (a) Whether the quantity of native species planted was reported in the consultant’s monthly progress report;
 - (b) If positive, the follow up action, other than verbal requests from CEDD, when the estimated rate could not be achieved; If negative, will CEDD strengthen the current measure or establish a more effective monitoring mechanism to ensure that the consultant can follow the requirement to meet the rate of planting native species?

CEDD's Reply

- (a) The rate of planting native species was based only on the estimate of planting quantity during design stage. As we adopt the 'Right tree, right place' principle to select suitable plant species at appropriate locations taking into consideration on the comments from the local stakeholders and maintenance concerns, there is no specific requirement on planting percentage of native species under the GMPs. During the implementation of the greening works, the quantity of native species planted was reported in the consultant's monthly progress report for reference.
 - (b) We will adopt the recommendation from the Audit Report and request the consultants in future GMP projects to set an appropriate rate for planting native tree species in the formulation of planting design and follow the implementation of the planting works according to the established rate for planting native species.
- 14) Regarding paragraph 3.7, please advise:
- (a) CEDD and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had different definitions of tree and different measurements basis for shrubs which led to significant problems associated with the handover records. Please advise the measure to resolve the problem.
 - (b) How to ensure that officers involved can properly archive the handover records?

CEDD's Reply

- (a) During the handover of plants to Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for maintenance, we had provided memos/letters with record drawings covering the planting information such as plant species, quantity and planting locations, etc. for reference by LCSD. CEDD makes reference to the "Check List of Hong Kong Plants" (the Checklist) published by Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to determine whether a plant is classified as a tree. As for LCSD, apart from making reference to the Checklist, they also follow the Technical Circular issued by the Development Bureau (DEVB) to determine a plant with 95mm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) (i.e. trunk diameter at 1.3m height) as a tree so as

to carry out routine tree maintenance works and annual tree risk assessment as required by DEVB. Since most of the plants planted under GMPs were young trees with DBH less than 95mm, there were differences in the number of trees recorded by CEDD and LCSD. Regarding shrub planting, we adopt “number” as the unit for shrub based on the design and contract drawings. LCSD measures planting area for shrubs instead of number to facilitate maintenance works.

For the GMPs for NT Northeast and NT Southwest, in addition to the information (including the quantity of newly planted trees and shrubs) currently provided to LCSD, we will include records showing the trees with DBH 95mm or more and the planting areas of shrubs to clearly record the quantities of plants to be handed over and to facilitate maintenance works after handover of the plants.

- (b) We will provide both hard copy and electronic copy to LSCD to facilitate updating of maintenance record.

15) According to Case 5 mentioned in paragraph 3.19, CEDD planted 3 *Michelia x alba* along a footpath in Kowloon City in June 2011. In January 2019, all the 3 trees were removed. Please advise:

- (a) LCSD advised that upon taking over the handover records from CEDD, the trees were damaged by typhoon on 1 July 2017 before the data of these trees were uploaded in its tree inventory. Had CEDD encountered similar problem in the past? Had CEDD enhanced communication with LCSD for sharing of experience in tree maintenance?
- (b) The site at Location F was very windy and not suitable for tree planting. Had it taken into account the effect of weather condition during the formulation of planting proposals under GMPs?

CEDD's Reply

- (a) We do not have the record on the condition of plants after handover to the maintenance departments. We will strengthen communication with LCSD to share experience in the maintenance of plants in order to facilitate implementation of the planting works under GMPs.
- (b) We have to consider the site conditions and constraints (including micro-climate and maintenance requirements, etc.) and consult maintenance departments in order to select suitable

plants species in the planting proposals based on the principle of “Right tree, right place”.

- 16) It is mentioned in paragraph 4.6 that “the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had not reported the implementation progress to the Greening Master Plan Committee (GMP Committee) and the Steering Committee on Greening, Landscape and Tree Management (GLTM) since commencement of the contracts for the related greening works.” In this connection, please inform this Committee:
- (a) of the prevailing reporting procedures and guidelines;
 - (b) of the definition of “problematic” cases mentioned in paragraph 4.7(b), which states that “only problematic cases would be escalated to the Steering Committee on GLTM for resolution”;
 - (c) given that it is mentioned in paragraph 4.20 that the Department agrees with the recommendations in paragraph 4.18 to ensure the periodic reporting of the progress and results in implementing greening works under GMPs for the New Territories (NT) to the GMP Committee and Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section (GLTMS), of the expected dates for implementation of the related recommendations as well as the staff establishment and expenditure in relation to such work?

CEDD’s Reply

- (a) The progress of implementation of greening works under GMPs will be reported during the meetings or by circulation of information paper to the committee members.
- (b) Unresolved inter-departmental interface issues arising from the formulation of the GMPs and the implementation of the greening works could be escalated to the Steering Committee for decision.
- (c) We reported to the Greening Master Plan Committee (GMPC) and the Steering Committee on Greening, Landscape and Tree Management (GLTM) (including the GLTM Section of the DEVB) on 22 March 2019 and 1 April 2019 respectively regarding the achievement of the greening works completed under GMPs in NT Northwest and NT Southeast. We will keep on reporting the progress and achievement of the GMPs for NT Northeast and NT Southwest at appropriate milestones. No additional staff or financial resource would be incurred on reporting the progress on the implementation of greening works under GMPs.

- 17) It is stated in paragraph 4.10 that “GMPs for urban areas had not set any time frame for completion of medium and long-term measures”, and as indicated in Table 14, of the 288 to-be-followed-up measures, 102 (35%) were classified as “to be kept in view”, 156 (54%) as “to be explored” and 30 (11%) as “to be implemented”. In this connection, please provide information on the following:
- (a) It is further stated in paragraph 4.14 that “While GLTMS had taken certain follow-up actions with the responsible departments on the implementation progress of the 221 measures under their purview..., it had not taken specific follow-up actions”. Please advise what the certain follow-up actions were and why no specific follow-up actions had been taken.
 - (b) What are the latest situation and progress of the 288 to-be followed-up measures?
 - (c) Currently, are there any guidelines and manpower to assist the assessment officers to follow up on the progress of the measures and allow such officers to complete their monitoring work precisely according to guidelines? If yes, what are the details? If no, will the Administration consider the formulation of them?
 - (d) What are the reasons that the GMPs for urban areas had not set any time frame for completion of medium and long-term measures? Does it have anything to do with problems relating to expenditures and staff establishments?
 - (e) Further to the above question, what can be done to alleviate the problems?

CEDD’s Reply

Question 17 has been referred to DEVB and DEVB’s reply is as follows:

- (a) The GLTMS of the Development Bureau had, through letters and memoranda, instructed the departments and encouraged private sector/public organisations to follow up actively on taking forward the implementation of the proposed medium and long-term greening measures whenever the right condition arises (for example, in cases where a related public works project is taken forward or a redevelopment programme is commenced). Subsequently, the GLTMS also obtained constant updates on the progress through face-to-face conversations and phone calls. The “certain follow-up actions” refers to such verbal follow-up actions.

For most of these measures, their next stage of work could only be formulated subject to the actual circumstances. Hence, the GLTMS had not taken specific actions to make it mandatory for the departments to submit written progress reports.

- (b) Regarding the 288 measures mentioned above, the GLTMS made written requests to the departments and private sector/public organisations to report on the implementation of the greening measures, and provide reasons if the measures are yet to be implemented since March this year. Amongst all measures, 65 measures have been completed, 11 measures will be implemented, 66 measures are found infeasible (reasons include the following: the original proposed planting locations are either no longer suitable for planting due to changes in the site surroundings or have been used for other purposes amidst development in local areas) and remaining measures are being reviewed and required further clarifications.
- (c) The GLTMS has been overseeing the work related to GMPs at the policy level covering project proposals, progress, funding applications and greening targets. Officers responsible for assessing the progress of medium and long-term greening measures are from professional grades with professional qualifications. Being familiar with the implementation of greening works and experienced in project management, they are competent to conduct the monitoring work.
- (d)&(e) The medium and long-term greening measures for GMPs should be incorporated with other programmes and urban redevelopment projects. Only by doing so can these measures be taken forward during the delivery of related public works or redevelopment programmes. Works project takes time and we have to take into account the actual circumstances (such as the surrounding developments and public views consideration) before an implementation timetable can be formulated. In view of the various uncertainties, it is indeed difficult to set an exact time frame for completion of medium and long-term greening measures. This has nothing to do with expenditures or staff establishments.

The urban environment is constantly developing and changing while medium and long-term measures involve a long time during which the land situation, public opinion, social demand, etc. may also change. It may be unrealistic to formulate medium and long-term greening measures solely based on the current environment. Hence, the GLTMS issued a technical circular in 2012, stating that for any works projects involving designs for greening on new roads, the departments concerned should make reference to the GMP themes to ensure that the greening themes for various districts can be brought out. The newly developed GMPs for the NT no longer include medium to long-term greening measures, which are susceptible to changes in the actual environment.

- 18) Regarding paragraph 4.23, please advise:
- (a) the reasons of delaying the uploading of GMPs information for NT Southeast & Northwest and NT Northeast & Southwest onto CEDD website;
 - (b) How CEDD can improve the situation;
 - (c) When will CEDD upload the information on planting species of GMPs in NT Northeast & Southwest onto its website?

CEDD's Reply

In response to Audit's recommendations, we have uploaded the relevant information of NT GMPs to CEDD website. We will timely update the information when necessary.

- 19) Para 4.26 mentioned "community forums had been arranged, and stakeholders from public organizations and private sector had been invited to participate in the formulation of GMPs"; "arranged exhibitions and talks to schools, tertiary institutions and relevant professional bodies"; "arranged community planting ceremonies to cover all districts under GMPs". Please advise:
- (a) the numbers of community forums, exhibitions, talks and community planting ceremonies held in the past 5 years;
 - (b) Please advise CEDD's expectation on the effectiveness of these activities? What are the expenditure and staff establishment involved?

CEDD's Reply

- (a) During the planning stage of the NT GMPs from 2010 to 2014, we organized 12 community forums. In past 5 years, we organized 11 public participation activities, including talks, community planting events and planting ceremonies

- (b) Public participation not only enables us to tap into valuable local knowledge about a district but also let public understand more about greening works within the district and promotes ownership of the GMPs by the local residents, which is instrumental to the smooth implementation and long-term caring of vegetation. The involved manpower resources and expenditure were absorbed by departmental establishment and included in the works contracts.