

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

主席：

各位同事，現在開始今天的第二個聆訊事項，即審計署署長第三十號報告書第11章，關於政府車輛維修及採購。應邀出席的證人包括機電工程署署長傅立新先生、機電工程署營運服務經理黎仕海先生、政府車輛管理處處長王亮嘉先生、庫務局局長俞宗怡女士、工務局局長鄭漢生先生、資訊科技及廣播局局長鄭其志先生。先請劉慧卿議員。

劉慧卿議員：

多謝主席，現先提問前庫務局局長鄭其志先生，報告書講及有關96年5月政府就甲級及乙級大型房車招標，大型房車是提供予首長級官員使用的，尤其是甲級，差不多是供最高級即七至八級的首長級官員使用。5月時的招標結果失敗。數月後重新招標，審計署署長研究過這幾次招標的程序，在報告書第77段，提及政府車輛管理處向中央投標委員會呈交的建議如下：“甲級大型房車 - 雖然乘客的舒適在草擬標書的規格時已被考慮，但用者在評審期間的反應顯示，縱使車輛符合技術上的規格，但沒有一部能符合他們的要求，特別是影響後座乘客舒適程度的淨空高度、腳部活動空間和座位濶度。政府車輛管理處建議政府應該：(i) 為甲級車輛重新招標，以取得更合適車輛的供應；(ii) 修訂車輛規格，以反映後座乘客的舒適要求；及(iii) 釐定一套除了價格考慮因素，還包括乘客的舒適及其他無形因素的質素評審的甄選方法，並提交中央投標委員會通過。”主席，報告書第46頁表十五，列出甲級大型房車的尺寸規格，若將其作比較，由92年3月、96年5月及96年10月車廂內及車身外部的尺寸已有改變。相信是因為96年5月招標時不合格，所以在10月便訂定比較寬敞的尺寸，而結果中標。審計署署長報告載述，在記錄裏沒有提出車身外部附加最低尺寸要求的理據，故此，請鄭局長清楚說明當時的用家如何提出舒適程度欠佳的意見，令該次投標取消，並加入新的要求，導致多花了700多萬元。

主席：

鄭局長。

資訊科技及廣播局局長鄭其志先生：

用家方面的資料，由政府車輛管理處向中央投標委員會提交，所以需要請政府車輛管理處處長代答。

主席：

我想提一提，邀請鄭局長到來，是因為根據報告書英文版第65頁第103(i)段

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

說，“user feedback was channelled to the GLTA through the FB”。Mr Walker，局長希望由你回答，究竟資料來自何處？審計署署長看不到任何載述的資料，委員會亦需要瞭解有關資料的來源。Mr Walker

Mr P B Walker, Government Land Transport Administrator (GLTA):

Yes, the information was just part of our routine dialogue that we carry out with users as part of the normal tender process. And this came from a number of different departments. Protocol were heavily involved because of the future projected requirement for VIP cars in the handover requirement of 1997. So, we were having at that time extensive discussions with Protocol, also with other user departments. And that was fed back to the FB and also the FB were feeding back to us their views on users at the senior level.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I think we are asking for documentary evidence of the views reflected by the users and so on. And also of course a justification and what weight has been put on what sort of views expressed?

GLTA:

Yes, at that stage it was just a general dialogue. We were not intending to use it as part of the process to actually select the model. What we were trying to do was to see whether in fact the offers that we had attracted met the users' requirements. It subsequently proved that they didn't, and so we had to seek views as to which course of action we should then take. And it was subsequently decided that the fairest method would be to cancel the tender to allow us to re-examine the specification and try and build in the additional requirements for comfort.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I think if you decide to cancel the tender that is quite a significant thing, so you must do it on some firm basis, and that's why we are asking for documents to show that what sort of procedures you have gone through and what sort of points did you take on board to come to that decision. And if we look at Paragraph 77 it seems that the major reason at that time was the users' views, isn't it, that they don't find the cars comfortable enough?

GLTA:

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

Yes, well, we hadn't built into the tender process a qualitative assessment at that stage so there was no formal method to measure users' views which we would have needed had we been going to take it into account in the tender process itself. What we were concerned with was whether the specification, which is our best estimate of what the market can offer to meet our requirements, whether that met users' requirements. Subsequent events would suggest that it didn't.

The specification was drawn up early in '96. By the time the tender was evaluated in July we were looking at a whole different set of requirements. By then agreement had been reached about any handover ceremony. We were being told that Government may have to provide all of the VIP resources, cars, from its own resources so we also took the opportunity to review the tender at that stage to see whether in fact it would meet those requirements.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I find that quite astounding. You are saying that you have the tender process and you have not even ascertained or finalised the users' requirements but it is afterwards that you interview the users and they have some requirements which have not been clearly spelt out. And those requirements have not been met. How can they meet the requirements if the requirements are not specified before you invite the tender? Is that what you are telling us?

GLTA:

Not at all. The tender was drawn up originally to cover two grades of car, Grade A and B, and as such had to be a compromise between the requirements of those two grades.

What we have to try and do is take into account users' needs and requirements, the hierarchical system of Government car allocation to maintain relativity between the different models, what the market can offer, we have to look at advances in technology, safety and environmental issues, and try and build these into a specification that will be as broad as possible to allow as much competition as we can get to ultimately ensure best value for money. And I think maybe we went too far towards the Grade B and tended to overlook the requirements at the higher level.

That, we had a second chance to assess that, of course, when we evaluated the tender. It was at that point that we again started to seek users' views on the possible models that we were thinking of introducing. Now, we couldn't use that in any quantitative way to determine the tender because we hadn't built it in at the onset. It would have been unfair so the only fair thing was to seek advice from the Tender Board as to

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

where to go, and that advice, the best thing was to cancel the tender, have a look at the specification and start again.

Miss Emily LAU:

So, are you telling this Committee that in the process of trying out the cars the users had some requirements. The requirements were not originally spelt out in that tender and you said, "those requirements are fair enough and if you use those requirements that is mainly, I can see, the degree of comfort and that of course cannot be matched, so OK, we cancel this and we increase the requirements so that we know that what sort of cars we are looking at", and then have a new tender a few months later? Is that the process that you used?

GLTA:

Well, the problem is that dimensions alone only tell half the story. We can specify. That's the only thing that we can go on initially without actually physically trying cars. But there is far more to it than just the dimensions. It depends on the roof line, the angle of the door opening, the height of the seat, the width of the transmission tunnel. All of these things are factors that influence access and comfortability in the rear. And of course we couldn't take these into account until we knew which models had been offered.

Miss Emily LAU:

But would you agree with the Director of Audit that by concentrating on the dimension, by altering the requirements, you are of course aware what is available in the market. By increasing the number of centimetres you know certain cars will be thrown out. You are left with a very small number of cars that would qualify.

GLTA:

Well, of course we have to have some reference to what we are looking for, otherwise we would just put out an open specification. We have to have some idea and therefore we have to see whether that idea can be met by whatever is in the market. So, yes, we have a broad picture of the models that would meet that requirement.

Miss Emily LAU:

But would you explain to this Committee whether that, the process that you went through in May that year was quite unusual, that you actually had the thing, you thought you have got all the requirements. You called tender and then you come back, the users say "Oh, no, I'm sorry, it's not comfortable enough. I need a few more cm's here and there", and then you say, "Oh, good, let's cancel this and let's up the requirement" and then have

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

another one a few months later and get more luxurious cars?

Chairman:

Mr Walker?

GLTA:

No, not at all. It is not that simple. We had no idea what sort of cars we were going to produce anyway at the end of the day. What we had to do was to try and take into account the users' requirements. We are there to provide this service, and there is no point in us buying cars that are not acceptable or useful for the users. So, we had to see what the market could offer, because there is no point, as has sometimes happened in other areas, putting out to tender that no-one in the market can meet. So, we have to have some reference points to go on, but having said that we have to try and make that specification as broad as possible, otherwise we end up in a single tender situation.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I want to ask to what extent did the users have a say? Can they just say, "Oh, I'm sorry, it's not acceptable to me because I need a few more cm's. It is not comfortable enough"?

GLTA:

No, we have ...

Miss Emily LAU:

What weight do you put on it?

GLTA:

We had feedback through the Bureau representing the views of the policy secretaries. There is an on-going dialogue with heads of department and bureau secretaries at all sorts of levels and meetings. We had a considerable number of meetings with Protocol who were, as I said early, heavily concerned because of the potential requirements for 1997 which were coming into focus at that time. And these were the reasons that supported our own view that maybe the cars that the tender had generated were not exactly what we wanted.

So, we then got two, the two lowest conforming offers for trial. We tried them

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

ourselves under actual operating conditions. We took them to the Bureau. They were tried by staff from the Finance Bureau and also, I believe, from Protocol Department. And we took a sounding of all of these different views, which confirmed, as I say, our own view that perhaps they were not quite what we wanted.

劉慧卿議員：

主席，他不斷提及有關97移交儀式的事項，但報告書並無提及，另外在報告書第53頁第103(d)段，有關附加車身外部尺寸的最低要求，他提出有這些要求的原因：“目的是確保不同級數的車輛有所對比，反映某部門或某局首長所屬職級和職位身分的尊貴程度。這樣做是必須的，而且並無違反政府所訂的公開公平競爭採購原則。要是單憑車廂內尺寸挑選，車身外觀和大小未必能夠適當反映使用官員的職級及職位身分”。這點是否真的那麼重要嗎？政府官員尊貴到要斤斤計較車輛大小相差的數寸。審計署署長認為，這會妨礙公平競爭的原則，不少車輛供應商已無法競爭，尺寸的評審相當嚴緊，相差數寸便不符合規格。

主席：

處長。

GLTA:

This may not have been mentioned in the report but it was certainly a consideration that we took into account. It was something that was right at the forefront of our thinking at that time, the possibility that we would have to provide, using Secretaries' cars, up to 200 cars for the handover and possibly the subsequent World Bank conference. So, it was something that we certainly took into account and we were definitely getting representations from Protocol, who of course were very heavily involved with the overseas dignitaries. And the representations were that the cars that we were looking at did not offer the requisite degree of comfort and access into the rear seats.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I am asking Mr Walker to comment on the dignity and the ranking. That point.

主席：

處長。

GLTA:

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

I don't think I can comment on the dignity of the officers concerned, but the Government has a hierarchical car structure and we have to maintain some sort of relativity, otherwise the Chief Executive could be running around in a car smaller than the head of department. And I mean, this is even more difficult when you are buying cars from different manufacturers at different times. Because of model changes it is very difficult to maintain this relativity.

劉慧卿議員：

請問鄭先生在當時收回的意見，用家是否向你表示，若車輛的尺寸短了幾寸會導致尊貴程度受損？

主席：

鄭局長。

資訊科技及廣播局局長：

主席，在購買車輛時，我們要顧慮乘客的舒適程度、車內設施等，這是合理的做法。96年5月的招標，我們確是利用尺寸量度代替舒適程度，政府車輛管理處提交予中央投標委員會的報告亦有詳細載述，雖然部分車輛尺寸合符標準，但舒適程度很難以尺寸表達，譬如若車輛的後座有3位乘客便會非常擠迫。甲級、乙級的車輛，並非只供局長或署長使用，在有需要時，局長／署長的同事亦會一起使用此車輛。所以我們需要考慮到使用者的要求，單單以尺寸衡量，並非最合理的方法。但招標既然開始了，若在該階段加入額外要求，招標的公平性備受質疑。所以當時中央投標委員會決定，首先應該取消招標，然後要求政府車輛管理處考慮採用加權計分法，除基本尺寸要求外，質素上有一個客觀的衡量方式，包括舒適程度等。再將質素及價格的評分，以加權方法計算，這項做法與我們在購買其他物品的情況相同。除基本設備的需求，希望還有可取的要求，可取的要求要以客觀的方法決定應佔比重，最後以價格一起考慮，才作出整體的決定。所以中央投標委員會在8月決定取消5月的招標，接着政府車輛管理處將他們建議的加權計分法交予中央投標委員會審議，經中央投標委員會接納後，再重新招標。我認為整體的過程是公平而合理的。

主席：

在我聽完處長的證供後，似乎用家是知道你們已選擇的車輛類型，才會反映該等車輛的舒適程度不足。請問用家反映舒適程度不夠的時間是否在5月投標有結果後？5月招標，到8月才宣布取消，中間相隔3個月，一般的招標，無理由數月後才公布

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

結果。你們是否擔心選擇的車輛，會不被局長禮賓司接受，所以專誠再徵詢他們的意見，然後才發覺此情況？第二，可否稍後以書面給予委員會一份你們曾徵詢的部門用家的清單？不要只針對禮賓司，與你的報告書所指稱並不一致。

GLTA:

We didn't conduct any surveys as such. As I say it was routine dialogue which is a normal thing in the tender evaluation process, just talking to officers, certainly to our Policy Bureau in regular meetings that we have with them, talking to E & M, to the police and other principal users but not necessarily as a separate issue, because it was not part of the evaluation process.

When we included the qualitative element in the second tenders in September and October then of course we did it formally because it was intended to be part of the process. We drew up a proper evaluation form. We invited members of selected departments to ride in the cars and to complete the questionnaires. So, that was all documented because it was intended to be part of the process. It was just verbal feedback in a number of different forum that confirmed our own opinion that perhaps the cars that we had attracted in the May offer were not attractive.

I suppose at the end of the day the specification didn't really reflect what the customers wanted at the Grade A level. And taking into account, the major weight of our decision was based on the forthcoming arrangements in 1997 which were not known in early '96. No-one knew at that stage what the requirement was going to be.

主席：

剛才你表示在5月知悉所選擇的車輛後，卻擔心部門不接受才作出意見調查。調查的時間是在5月投標之後。可否再證實這點？

GLTA:

Yes, evaluation was not completed until July. May was the date that the tender was launched, so it was not until July that the evaluation, the technical evaluation had been completed by E & M and that we were aware of what offers conformed. It was then that we started to do the further work necessary before we made a recommendation to the Tender Board.

主席：

通常這類投標，由收集文件至中央投標委員會同意，所需時間為何？

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

GLTA:

Normally the tender is valid for three months so we have to do it within that period. Now, simple tenders are done fairly quickly. Longer tenders, more complicated tenders for larger numbers of vehicles involving greater numbers of departments take longer, and sometimes we even have to extend the validity to allow us to fully evaluate the offers. Because sometimes they are extremely complicated.

主席:

李華明議員。

李華明議員:

主席。96年5月的招標失敗，接着在10月底再重新招標，並附加條件，將車廂內外尺寸增加，是否因局長們增磅了？換言之，是否愈大愈理想呢？你又沒有作市場調查，倒不如選擇又便宜、又寬大的車輛，再將之分配給A、B級的官員，這樣更為簡單。又大、又便宜是否可以作為一個衡量的標準？

主席:

處長。

GLTA:

Well, comfort is a relative thing, of course. As I said earlier it doesn't relate just to dimensions. There are other factors that have to be taken into account, and this we try to do. People come in all shapes and sizes, of course, and each one has his own perception of what is comfortable and what is accessible. We have to try and get something that will accommodate not only all of the serving officers but the visiting dignitaries that use these cars, and there is quite a high demand for visitors.

What we have to do is to try and translate this into a users' specification which is then further refined by E & M into a technical specification, and this has to be based on reality. There is no point in us dreaming up a specification that no one can meet. So it has to have some basis in fact, that there are vehicles out there than can meet this specification.

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

李華明議員：

實際上現時所制定的規格根本沒有可能符合，倒不如不用定規格，而是在市場上以大作標準。關於舒適的問題，這種是很主觀的。難道要請每位局長試坐，覺得舒適才符合？由誰決定是否舒適？

主席：

處長，是否有請幾位代表作過舒適的測試？

GLTA:

We did have some tests, yes. We don't normally name individual officers. In fact I can't remember the names of all the individual officers that were concerned. But certainly the Director of Protocol, senior police officials, there were officials from CSB and officials from FB, which we felt covered a representative number of users. Obviously, as you say, we can't have everyone in there. It has to be a compromise at the end of the day, and it has to have some basis in reality as to what the market can offer, and there are only a few vehicles at that sort of level that offer the space and comfort that we need at Grade A.

主席：

似乎報告載述了幾位政府的代表曾進行測試。請問該項測試有關評語是否有紀錄？抑或只是口頭回覆？處長。

GLTA:

Which tests are we talking about now? The May tests?

Chairman:

Yes, you just mentioned that a representative from a number of departments, the Police, Protocol, etc., they have also tested the comfort and other specs of these cars. Was there any record of their opinion or comments at all?

GLTA:

No, no record was kept of the May test because it was really just a verbal fact-finding to see whether in fact the specification we had originally written met the requirements.

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

Chairman:

There were obviously tests and comments and test results and user-requirement questionnaires were completed and they were on record for the subsequent test. Can I ask another question then? Before the May test you have done several of these tenders. Were there records of those tests prior to May '96?

GLTA:

Which types of vehicles are we talking about now? I mean, we buy up to ...

Chairman:

Any type, obviously there are tenders for Grade A, Grade B. There were tests and tenders before. Were there comments from the user departments, were they documented?

GLTA:

It is normal practice to seek views. Whether they were documented I couldn't say because quite often they would be sought in different types of meetings. Unless it was built into the tender process then formal comment would not be sought. It would really be just a matter of testing the water or confirming that what we had got did actually meet, and nine times out of ten it does.

Chairman:

So, maybe, I think, we would ask you for a documentary search to see if there is any documentation for tenders prior to May '96.

GLTA:

Specifically confined to large cars or, because the previous exercise was three years before?

Chairman:

Mr Walker, I really can't see the difference of Grade A cars or Grade B cars. I think the tender, I am really more interested in the way you conduct the tender exercise, whether it is for Grade A or Grade B cars. But I think we will formalise something in writing to you.

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

GLTA:

Yes.

主席:

劉慧卿議員。

劉慧卿議員:

主席，剛才處長表示，若有三位乘客同時坐車，便會感到擠迫。這點在報告書內並無載述，可否提供有關乘客感到車輛過於緊迫，以致要求提高的文件。根據表十五，為何從92年至96年，條件是不斷地增加？92年司憲們可以接受的車輛，到96年卻不能接受？

主席:

劉議員，或許是處長認為他們更為尊貴，李華明議員則以為他們體胖了。不知誰為真正原因？

劉慧卿議員:

主席。他們是否體胖，報告書並無紀錄。至於尊貴和身分則有記載。我希望處長或局長稍作解釋。為何92年可以接受的車輛，至96年又不能接受？是否因為股市上升而公帑多了？

主席:

處長。

GLTA:

It would be presumptuous of us to reflect on the dignity of the officers concerned. We are talking about the dignity of the post. We have to have some relativity between the types of cars we use for different purposes, and that's the whole object of the graded A, B and C scheme.

The reason there are differences in dimensions between the various tenders is because it is a dynamic situation. We are constantly looking at improving and refining the spec and getting better value for money. And also it reflects what the market can offer. As I say, there is no point in putting out specs that nobody can meet because it means you

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

have no conforming offers.

劉慧卿議員：

請處長解釋，是否在92年房車的大小規格對局長們是有所虧待？請說出有何文件說過若有三人坐於後座便很擠迫？以我們所觀察，局長們出席會議時，座駕很少坐三人，多數只是一位司機和一名乘客。主席，審計署署長有補充。

主席：

審計署署長。

審計署署長陳彥達先生：

第78段有記載。

劉慧卿議員：

署長，請詳細解釋。

主席：

陳署長。

審計署署長：

在第78段載述：「鑒於甲級及乙級車輛同樣需要後座可容納三名乘客。」這段相信是 Mr Walker 想提出的。

主席：

後座要有三座位的要求是一向存在的。

劉慧卿議員：

92年與96年的舒適標準是否不同了？是否表示92年的舒適程度不可以接受，現時需作出更改，卻在96年5月的招標後才徵詢用家的意見，得到的回應是車輛不舒適。報告書第98段提及有關《物料供應及採購規例》，加權分數評審方法是質素的得分佔30%，價格佔70%；但現時卻改為各佔50%。當然，這是可以靈活對調，不過，

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

是否在92年的標準，現時卻完全不可以接受？像李華明議員所說，車輛要更大、更長及更豪華。我認為以你們的尺寸規格，某類車輛供應商是完全無法提供的。難道在這數年間，香港社會的標準提高至要供應這類車輛予各局長使用？

主席：

處長。

GLTA：

As I have said before, the specification is just our best attempt to match user requirements with what the market offers, to allow the widest possible competition under the greatest degree of transparency to get the best value for money. And each tender reflects the situation at that particular time. 1992 should not necessarily be looked at in connection with '96 because the situation was different. You have had model changes, and we are constantly refining our specification based on user feed-back as in any customer service orientation. We are looking to improve our produce and service levels. And if we can give more room and still achieve value for money then that is what we are looking to do.

劉慧卿議員：

最後我想請問俞局長，在報告書第105段她是同意政府車輛管理處對車輛質素和價格因素的比重。我們現在是向前看，請問政府是否沒有打算作出修改？以後在招標購買大型房車時，仍然沿用現存的方法，以用家認為的舒適程度的比重最為重要，是嗎？

主席：

俞局長。

庫務局局長俞宗怡女士：

多謝主席。我們首先要考慮的是購買何種類型的車輛，今天大家所討論的是乘客用的車輛，乘客的舒適情況是相當重要的因素。我們的指引只是概括性的指引，並非硬性規定，應用時需經過非常仔細的程序，任何部門在採購之前，若與指引有別時，他們首先要提交建議予中央投標委員會，由中央投標委員會考慮有關因素後，再由中央投標委員會建議提交庫務局局長，審議是否接受該部門的建議。在96年10月購買甲級乘客車輛時，政府車輛供應處依照所有程序，提交一份文件予中央投標委員會，建議不採用70%和30%加權評分，而採用50%和50%加權評分，中央投標委員會經過謹

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

慎考慮，同意部門的建議，並支持庫務局局長採用50%和50%加權評分。

劉慧卿議員：

即將來靈活性仍相當大，到時政府仍可以偏離指示？

庫務局局長：

我們每次都是重新檢討，所以在下次重新招標和採購這類乘客用的車輛時，要視乎當時政府車輛供應處提供一份甚麼的建議予中央投標委員會。

主席：

好，劉慧卿議員，妳想在另一部分跟進嗎？

劉慧卿議員：

好，主席。報告書第29(c)段有關預防性維修及矯正性維修費用，政府有一個為期3年的車輛維修外判的試驗計劃。機電工程署署長回應時表示，該計劃在98年年底才完成，他認為審計署署長在該計劃尚未結束時，過早利用部分數據來下結論，認為外判較為平宜，實不適當。署長是否要我們不應相信審計署署長提出的論點？

主席：

傅署長。

Mr Hugh B Phillipson, Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS):

Yes, I would repeat that point. In fact Members would be interested that we do have some updated information which was not available when the Director of Audit wrote his report or indeed when we replied. And that is the results for the month June '98, which we received in October. And that shows that our figures for that two and a half year period are now \$242,900, and that compares with the contractor's figure for the same period of \$240,100. So, if you compare those two figures of \$240,000 with \$242,000 you will see those are pretty well the same, within about a percent.

Now, the report, the interim report the Director of Audit had available showed a difference of nineteen percent, so I think that confirms the fact that really until the trial is completed, which won't be until the end of this year and we have the final report, will the

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

true comparison be available.

Miss Emily LAU:

So, Chairman, I want to ask the Director whether he is asking our Committee to hold our discussion and conclusion and wait until the whole thing has run its course and then see the final figures before we come to any conclusion?

DEMS:

Chairman, I am happy to cooperate in anyway on this. We are happy to come back when the trial is complete or to discuss the current results, because we certainly totally agree with the Director of Audit for the need for continuous improvement in our vehicle services. In fact we have got an on-going programme which I think is bearing fruit.

We have already, for example, reduced the number of staff involved in looking after our vehicle fleet by five percent. At the same time our vehicle numbers have gone up by six percent. And this productivity improvement, improvement of service to customers and the streamlining of procedures will continue on-going. So, we totally agree with the spirit of the Director of Audit's report about the need for continuous improvement.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, maybe the Director can explain to us a bit more why it is necessary that we wait until the whole three year trial period is over before we take out some figures and try to draw some conclusions?

DEMS:

No, I am quite happy, Chairman, for that conclusion to be drawn now.

Miss Emily LAU:

Because in the report you say it is inappropriate to draw any conclusion. I mean, you say that?

DEMS:

Yes, well, I think the latest figures show that that point was valid. The Director of Audit in good faith took the figures available to him, but more figures are available now

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

which show that that comparison on the two year report is not valid. The comparison shows now we are very, very similar.

Miss Emily LAU:

That is why I asked you whether we should wait. You have to give us a straight answer. You cannot try to be both. If you disagree with the Director of Audit's approach then you have to say so. If you think it is fair enough to try to do some interim investigations and draw interim conclusions, also say so. You have to assist the Committee.

Chairman:

Director?

DEMS:

Chairman ...

Miss Emily LAU:

I repeat what you said here again: "The partial and premature use of data by Audit at this stage is considered inappropriate for drawing any conclusion, especially when the accuracy of the data collected is being queried."

DEMS:

Yes, and perhaps I could supplement, Chairman, that the committee that is reviewing this vehicle trial, when they met in September to consider the interim report that the Director of Audit used, were not prepared to endorse it because there was some incorrect use of information. So, I am saying that that interim report has been superseded by the latest information.

If the Committee feel they would like to wait I am very happy to report or provide any information they would like. But in the context of the overall philosophy of the Director of Audit we agree with the general principles that he is outlining in the way of improvements.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I want to ask the Director which committee is it that refused to endorse

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

the interim report? Who are the people sitting on that committee?

DEMS:

It is chaired by the GLTA, has representatives of the Finance Bureau and various users departments, ourselves, the Police, the Management Services Central Agency, and the Regional Services Department, Urban Services Department. So it is a comprehensive committee and their view was that the interim report was not presenting the information in a way that was a fair comparison.

主席：

OK.

劉慧卿議員：

主席。這些情況在報告亦沒有載述。

主席：

剛才講述的是兩個不同的數據和不同的證供，似乎亦有不同的意見和不同的結論。審計署署長對傳署長的陳述有否回應？

審計署署長：

主席。我沒有新的資料，在這裏不適宜作評論。我們並不是作出結論，最重要的是帶出有關問題和我們觀察所得。

主席：

審計署署長，相信這些對我們來說並沒有很大用處。本委員會是絕對可以作出自己的結論，我們不能根據一些不知可否接納的證據作出結論，否則這樣的結論便十分危險，除非是十分原則性的事項，任何時間說均是對的，如提高生產率等，若不是這樣，我們的報告書的用處便非常低。

劉慧卿議員：

主席。機電工程署署長的回應是「審計署在計劃尚未結束的階段，過早利用

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

部分數據來下結論，實不適當。」這點審計署署長是沒有回應的。稍後我們亦請庫務局局長說明她是否同意試驗計劃未結束前不作處理，因他們亦不支持有關的中期報告。

主席：

還有機電工程署署長認為你們所收集的數據的準確性受質疑，這點亦需要作出回應，否則我們如何根據報告書的資料作出結論？審計署署長。

審計署署長：

這是方法的問題，若每件事均等待最後完成階段，很多事我們均無法處理，我們只是透過現有資料部分，引出一個暫時的結論，希望能及早改善。

主席：

你是否清楚和同意機電工程署署長所說你們引用了錯誤的數據？

審計署署長：

我不同意，這是見仁見智的，我認為我們沒有引用錯誤。

主席：

若署方願意向你提交新資料，你是願意繼續審視新的資料，是嗎？

審計署署長：

對的。

劉慧卿議員：

主席。我們請俞局長或鄭局長回應，因中期報告仍未能完成。

主席：

現時我們有兩套不同的陳述和不同資料的引用，不知這是否適當的時間讓我們作結論。鄭局長。

工務局局長鄭漢生先生：

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

主席。我認為這個問題可以分兩方面看，審計署署長報告書第28段對改善現時服務的建議，主流的方向我們是沒有異議的，我們會繼續檢討營運基金的車輛維修服務的成本效益等。相信傅署長是認為當時的數據並不足夠和完整，故利用那些數據未必適當。現時我們已有較多的數據，相信最適當的方法是根據現時最新的數據重新檢討車輛維修是否有可改善之處。我們會繼續進行工作，與審計署署長報告書並沒有大衝突，我們會重新審視數據。

劉慧卿議員：

主席。那麼我們採納那一種數據作出結論？是否不理會報告書的數據？

資訊科技及廣播局局長：

主席。結論是我們認同報告書第28段所提建議。

主席：

這些只是你們認同了審計署的建議，我們委員會尚未作結論。你怎能說我們認同了這就是結論呢？

資訊科技及廣播局局長：

那當然是由你們決定。

主席：

從委員會的角度來說，是絕對不能接受的，審計署署長應盡快審計有關資料，提供準確的數據，根據甚麼資料作研究等。證據不足夠，一點也不專業。審計署署長。

審計署署長：

主席。請各位靜心再翻看報告書內指出費用的高低，主要是由於預防性維修服務的次數。在我們未作審查時，他們的預防性維修服務次數過密，所以需要費用較多，雖然試驗未完成，但在他們知道我們的意見後，便立即把進行預防性維修服務的時間延長，自然會降低費用，有關數據亦得以改善。

主席：

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

署長，我積極鼓勵你繼續審視除了那12部車輛以外的資料，這些資料是非常有用的。因部門說有新資料提供，又提出你們引用資料不正確，若在短期內不能辦到，本委員會會考慮要求跟進報告，我不希望草草作結論。劉慧卿議員。

劉慧卿議員：

請問署長過往也曾審計一些進行中未完成的試驗計劃，這是否慣常的處理方法？

審計署署長：

這是慣常的做法，若等待試驗計劃完成才進行審查，便會浪費很多資源，當然是越早作出處理和改良越好。

劉慧卿議員：

主席。但部門可能會辯稱在完成測試時，便能達到理想，在中途進行審計會否出現不公平的情況。

審計署署長：

這類事情在國際上亦會這樣處理，最好的時間當然是完成試驗計劃後才作審計，但中途進行並非不能接受，這樣可使他們立即作出改善。

主席：

傳署長。

DEMS:

Chairman, if I could supplement? The point is that the Director of Audit has made some very valid points about maintenance frequencies, and we have accepted the philosophy that he has made in the report, and we have, this is part of our current thinking to improve our service, and we have reduced the frequencies.

We can't reduce them in all areas because there are some particular types of vehicles, like ambulances for example, police vehicles, where reliability and security are very, very important. But we totally accept the spirit of what the Director of Audit has said. We are not waiting for the end of the trial. We have to improve our service right now and we feel that the figures at the end of the trial may tell a different story. But the points that

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

the Director of Audit makes are valid, and we have absorbed them into our improvement of services.

劉慧卿議員：

主席。我們現時需要處理的是採納何種數據以達至最後的結論，你是否請審計署署長提供多些新的數據，讓我們合併再作研究。

主席：

我需要清楚知道他們爭辯所採用的數據是否合適的理由，我們需要弄清楚這些事實才能作最後的判斷。所以我鼓勵審計署署長除了審視這幾部測試中的車輛外，還需審視整個署方的有關資料。這些資料是很有用的。若傅署長認為這些資料無用，他需要給我們提供明確和清楚的理由。審計署署長。

審計署署長：

主席。相信你在會計界亦明白，我們核數不能全部進行，只採用抽樣進行，不可能做足100%，我們是採用合理的樣本作觀察，希望有關部門盡快作出改善，所以不可能等待整個檢討完結或試驗完成後，才提交報告。我和傅署長正互相合作，我們所提出的意見，他亦接受了，並立即作出改善，故數字在整個試驗後定會較好。我們最重要是向前看，改良整個制度，並不是單針對採用數據的對錯，雖然我們不同意他質疑我們所採用的數據，但在大前題上我們是合作愉快的。

主席：

劉江華議員。

劉江華議員：

主席。若沒有審計署的建議，你們的頻率是否照舊至試驗期完結？

主席：

傅署長。

DEMS:

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

Chairman, there are a whole area of improvements that we are making. The frequency of preventive maintenance is something that we were thinking of. This has accelerated our action on this, this particular topic.

主席：

我希望本委員會報告書向立法會提交時，不論數據或論據，都與結論相符。我不希望大家只是同意一些大方向的結論，便不理會各自的數據和論據是否一致，便作出結論。我們是難以處理這些證供的。希望審計署署長與署方繼續保持合作的關係，協助委員會在數據上有明確的觀點。若繼續在論據和數據上有爭拗，我們委員會亦會繼續進行工作，令各方面對事件之數據和論據能一致認同，這才是較專業的處理方法，而不是含糊地說結論方面沒有爭拗，委員會便不理會其他數據或論據的疑點，這是難以接受的。劉慧卿議員。

劉慧卿議員：

主席。最後我想問關於編制以外及過剩車輛的處理。根據報告書中文本第35頁表十一，編制以外的車輛數目是261輛，過剩車輛數目是250輛，超出部門核准車輛總數的車輛數目有511輛。雖然資料是政府車輛管理處提供，但該處亦超出18輛。但在如何處理過剩車輛和舊車處置方面，政府車輛管理處及機電工程署營運基金是有所爭拗的，在報告書第54及55段載述營運基金不希望因扣留過剩車輛的事而影響與客戶的關係，但政府車輛管理處不同意營運基金的說法，認為他們有責任管制待處置的舊車。請問現時這事的進展如何？請營運基金方面解釋，為何不肯扣留過剩車輛以便處置？

主席：

傅署長。

DEMS:

Chairman, we feel it is the GLTA's role, and I think the current situation, I don't know whether Ms Lau really wants to, the current situation, how we deal with the current situation?

The fact is we are in the trading fund and that our clients, our customers will be having a choice of alternative providers. They are hardly likely to choose us if they feel if they send these vehicles for us to be servicing they will be confiscated! So, I think from a practical point of view we would rather not be in the business of confiscating surplus vehicles from our client departments. But perhaps Mr Walker might wish to add his

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

perspective.

Chairman:

Mr Walker?

GLTA:

This has been a problem that we have been looking at for several years in conjunction with E & M. It is true there has been a grey area about, particularly with E & M's change into a trading fund, there was a grey area as to who should actually be responsible for enforcing it. The situation now is that there are no surplus vehicles. They have all been recalled and disposed of in the appropriate way, and the supernumerary vehicles have, the number has been considerably reduced. A tighter control system has been put in to ensure that, where approval is given, it is given only under the most stringent operational requirements, vehicles are kept only for six months and there are adequate safeguards on the amount of maintenance expenditure that should be incurred.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, I think that's new information. I don't think it is in the report, that there are now no surplus vehicles and all of them have been recalled and you have got the six month period. Because if you look at Table 12 some departments have kept the cars for seventeen, eighteen, nineteen months. So, can you tell us when did you take this action? So, now who is doing it?

GLTA:

We are now doing it.

Miss Emily LAU:

Yes, how did you do it and when did that happen, please?

Chairman:

Mr Walker?

GLTA:

We have to thank the Director of Audit because his report obviously gave a lot of impetus to the action that we had been trying to take for two years. So, the majority of this enforcement action has taken place in the few months following the Audit report.

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

We used the simple expedient that we de-licensed vehicles. If people refused to, or if people wouldn't return them as requested we just de-licensed them so this had a very salutary effect and all of the surplus vehicles were reclaimed.

Supernumerary vehicles are a slightly different situation. They do actually fulfil a very useful need often as short-term requirement when it is not worth buying a vehicle. The Police particularly have to keep these vehicles for a period of time to allow transfer of specialised radio equipment and communications equipment from the old the new. And so this control system has now been enhanced and tightened up and with the help and assistance of E & M as far as the maintenance expenditure part is concerned.

The vehicles that you particularly refer to here are in fact not vehicles. They are items of fire plant, not under the GLTA's jurisdiction, but I do know what they are. I believe it is a turntable ladder and I would imagine that it has been kept purely as a stand-by. This would be a normal practice in Transport, that if a vehicle were replaced, particularly something like that, that would only be used very, very infrequently, it would make good sense to keep it as a spare.

And the vehicles that GLTA or at least some of those are the old Daimlers that we took from Government House some years ago. We kept those purely as a stand-by for high-profile visitors, people too large to fit in the standard Government A saloons.

Miss Emily LAU:

Chairman, can we look at Table 11? If Mr Walker can assist us, do you have the latest figures? So, I think all should be zero then, isn't it now?

Chairman:

Mr Walker.

GLTA:

Yes, I have been desperately trying to find them. They are here somewhere but ...

Chairman:

I think it would be useful to have it in writing.

Miss Emily LAU:

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

I know, but if he can just briefly inform the Committee now and the public that all those figures there have now all been cut down.

GLTA:

I can give you the assurance that the figures have been reduced, that all of the surplus have gone.

Miss Emily LAU:

And the supernumerary ones?

GLTA:

And the supernumerary ones have been reduced.

主席:

我們先給時間 Mr Walker 找尋資料，李華明議員尚有問題發問？

李華明議員:

根據審計署報告書表十二，現時署長正找尋新的資料，我們只能以1997年10月31日的資料作分析，編制以外的車輛，約有15%是保留了3年以上的，其中1部是超過96個月，另外過剩的車輛約有10%是保留超過3年，我以3年作為標準，請問庫務局局長，你能否接受部門保留這些車輛超過3年？我們現在說的是過剩或編制以外的車輛，即部門有新的車輛送到，但仍保留舊車輛不肯交還，只要部門肯負責維修的費用便可以。此會為機電工程署增加工作，因有那麼多舊車輛要維修，形成一個假象，營運情況十分忙碌和緊張，以及有可觀的收入，這是一個連帶的關係，你有否研究這些事項？

主席:

庫務局局長。

庫務局局長:

多謝主席。亦多謝李議員的問題。以庫務局的角度審視這件事，過去情況，

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

即由審計署署長在報告書載述的情況，是十分不滿意的，過剩的車輛應該歸還給政府車輛管理處。編制以外的車輛，若有很短時期的需要，是可以讓部門保留，但應是相當短的時期，只是幾個月，並不能保留到85至96個月，甚至超過96個月，這情況是不滿意的。我們透過審計署署長的工作，理解了這個問題，所以即時採取了相應的行動。剛才 Mr Walker 已講述全部二百多輛過剩車輛已全部歸還。另外，政府車輛管理處亦已定立了兩個較新的機制，第一個機制是替換車輛，換車的部門必須把舊車交還政府車輛管理處，才能領取新的車輛。第二個新的機制，是專門針對編制以外的車輛，任何部門若要保留編制以外的車輛，定要以書面向車輛管理處處長取得批准，而車輛管理處處長批准的最長時期只是6個月。若6個月後，真的有很例外的情況，在理由充分的情況下，部門仍需要保留這些編制以外的車輛，政府車輛管理處處長只會再批准延期6個月，這是最後的時限，之後必須把車輛交還政府車輛管理處。這些措施是最近一、兩個月因審計署署長的審計結果所作出的跟進工作。

主席：

Mr Walker 似乎已找到資料，現讓他繼續回答。

GLTA:

There are 170 vehicles kept by departments for operational purposes, and a further 100 by the Police for the short-term purpose of transferring coms equipment.

Miss Emily LAU:

Yes, Chairman, maybe later the Director can provide us in writing. I just want to ask a final question about the decision to de-licence those cars. Under what ordinance or where do you derive that power and have you always had that power but you didn't use it and you forced the EMSD to do things in the past?

Chairman:

Mr Walker?

GLTA:

Well, no, in fact it was probably an empty threat but it certainly worked. We don't licence our vehicles. Our vehicles are not licensed in the normal sense as are private cars, so it was really a matter of taking them off authorization so that they were no longer allowed to be used.

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

Miss Emily LAU:

Can you explain a bit more about this empty threat? Now that you have told everybody it is an empty threat. It's not going to work. I am sorry for exposing this, but you have better explain it to us, how it is going to work?

Chairman:

Mr Walker?

GLTA:

All Government vehicles obviously have to be on the Government inventory and have to be authorised to be used by departments. If that authorization is withdrawn they are no longer allowed to be used on the roads. And it was simply the fact that we said we would withdraw the authorization for the vehicles to be used. And as far as the supernumeraries are concerned, to avoid this happening in future, as the Secretary for Treasury has said, we insist on a one-for-one swap.

主席：

黎先生是否有補充？

機電工程署營運服務經理黎仕海先生：

多謝主席。現時 Mr Walker 已下指令，若有舊車要換新車，需要得到他的批文才可發放新車。

劉慧卿議員：

即要有他的批准才發放新車。

機電工程署營運服務經理：

部門是要交出領車信，我們才能發放新車。

劉慧卿議員：

有沒有另一張文件註明要交回舊車？

機電工程署營運服務經理：

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購

領車信內包括了提取新車時需要把舊車交還的條款，我們會跟 order 辦事。

劉慧卿議員：

這樣的做法是根據甚麼法例或守則賦予這樣的權力？

主席：

抑或只是政府內部的指令，Mr Walker？

GLTA：

It is an internal administrative order.

劉慧卿議員：

我們要求處長提供那封領車信。

主席：

是。希望處長提供那封領車時所要出示的信件，或是部門的指令。在這裏結束這個討論的議題，很多謝各位證人出席。

Maintenance and procurement of government vehicles

政府車輛維修及採購
