

立法會

調查赤鱘角新香港國際機場自1998年7月6日 開始運作時所出現的問題的原委及有關事宜 專責委員會

第18次公開研訊的逐字紀錄本

日期： 1998年11月18日(星期三)
時間： 上午9時
地點： 立法會會議廳

出席委員

周梁淑怡議員(主席)
何鍾泰議員(副主席)
何承天議員
李永達議員
吳靄儀議員
陳鑑林議員
單仲偕議員
劉江華議員
蔡素玉議員

決席委員

馬逢國議員
張永森議員
陸恭蕙議員
劉慧卿議員

證人

香港機場管理局資訊科技部主管
陳達志先生

陪同證人出席研訊的其他人士

香港機場管理局
機場系統及用戶支援經理
林福康先生

立法會調查赤鱘角新香港國際機場自1998年7月6日
開始運作時所出現的問題的原委及有關事宜
專責委員會
Legislative Council Select Committee to inquire into the circumstances
leading to the problems surrounding the commencement of the operation of
the new Hong Kong International Airport at Chek Lap Kok
since 6 July 1998 and related issues

主席：

多謝各位出席今天舉行的專責委員會第18次研訊。

在未正式開始研訊前，我想提醒各位委員，整個研訊過程必須有足夠的法定人數，即連主席在內共5名委員。

我想藉此機會再次提醒公眾人士及傳媒，若在研訊進程序以外披露研訊上提供的證據，將不受《立法局(權力及特權)條例》所保障。因此傳媒應就他們的法律責任，徵詢法律意見。

在未傳召證人香港機場管理局資訊科技部主管陳達志先生之前，我想徵詢委員的意見，陳達志先生要求帶同以下人士出席研訊：香港機場管理局機場系統及用戶支援經理林福康先生。如委員沒有異議，我建議容許林福康先生在研訊進行期間陪同陳達志先生，但他不可以在席上發言或提示證人回答問題。

如委員對研訊程序沒有其他意見，我宣布研訊開始，並傳召證人香港機場管理局資訊科技部主管陳達志先生。

(陳達志先生進入會議廳，
並由林福康先生陪同)

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, thank you for attending the hearing of the Select Committee again. You are summonsed before the Select Committee today to give evidence and to produce papers, books, records and documents related to the Select Committee's scope of inquiry. Please note that you are still under oath when giving your evidence.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, madam.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, the Select Committee has agreed that you may be accompanied by Mr Thomas LAM during the hearing to assist you in the handling of documents when necessary, but he will not be allowed to address the hearing or to prompt you in any way in your replies to Members.

The Select Committee will now deal with papers, records and documents that the witness has produced after the hearing on 17 November 1998. The Select Committee notes that the witness has already provided the following

documents in the evening of 17 November 1998:

Letter dated 17 November 1998 from Mr Kiron CHATTERJEE to Clerk to the Select Committee and documents attached in :

Attachment a,
Attachment b(i)-(iv),
Attachment c(i)-(iv),
Attachment d,
Attachment e(i)-(iii) and
Attachment f to Mr CHATTERJEE's letter.

Mr CHATTERJEE, are you now formally producing to the Select Committee all the documents mentioned above as evidence?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, Madam Chairman.

Chairman:

I now declare that all the documents mentioned above are admitted as evidence produced to the Select Committee.

We now continue with the hearing. Mr CHATTERJEE, could you please turn to Paper no. B283. That is the System Task Force's monthly progress report for February 1997.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have my copy, Madam Chairman.

Chairman:

Could you turn to Page 3 of the report?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have the page, my own copy, Madam Chairman.

Chairman:

I will read it out:

"As a result of the current delays the contractor is proposing a phased approach to delivering some components of FIDS. The resulting deferral

of certain functionalities will be based on what is critical relative to overall airport project key dates (e.g. airport opening, confidence trial, etc.) Although EDS have identified specific areas, the AA project teams still required EDS to provide a comprehensive recommendation that will ensure that all user requirements and the overall project schedule/cost will still be met. Since this proposal also requires the prioritisation of all affected FIDS components as determined by the main users, the availability and/or completeness of AMD's intended operational procedures will be critical."

Mr CHATTERJEE, yesterday Members asked you whether you knew the proposed different approach that EDS put forward regarding the phased approach which was different from the one they were taking before and whether you were aware that there were certain proposals regarding deferred functionality. You told this Committee that you were not aware of it until it was actually put to you in the presentation in June. We think that looking at this document you will agree that what you told us yesterday and what appears in this paper differ somehow. Since you are giving evidence under oath, could you please clarify exactly what the situation was?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As I said yesterday, my memory was jogged when I saw the paper from Chern HEED. I was aware of the phased approach. I said yesterday in my testimony that I was not aware of the dates by which those phases were going to be delivered, nor in which components in terms of Builds, whether it be 1.4, 1.5, but the fact that a phased approach was being put forward I was aware.

Chairman:

You mean to say that you are somehow clarifying that what you put forward yesterday was not quite accurate?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because I could not remember, yes.

Chairman:

After all, this System Task Force's progress report was actually put forward in February 1997 well prior to the negotiation between Project and EDS in April.

Could you tell us exactly what took place between Project and yourselves before this report came into place and also what your advice to the Project Division was regarding this deferred functionality and the phased approach?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Madam Chairman, first of all, may I make a correction? This is not a System Task Force report. This is a progress report provided by my teams within my department that was part of the reporting that I asked for. As you will see from the evidence, this report was tabled to AMD and was not discussed with Project Division. It was relayed to Project Division via AMD.

Chairman:

Sorry, it was relayed to Project Division by AMD?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Via AMD.

Chairman:

Could you turn to Paper no. B285. That was a meeting of AMD general managers on 21 February. On Page 2 under "matters arising" Paragraph 2, there was a presentation by IT on System Task Force. The paper I referred to now, was that included as part of that presentation or not, or does this refer to another presentation?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Would it be possible for me to look through the other documents?

Chairman:

Yes. Paper no. B285.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Madam Chairman, this report would not have been tabled at this meeting because this monthly progress report would have been completed at the end of

February and would have been tabled at the March meeting which you will find in Paper no. 282, Paragraph 1.

Chairman:

It is getting a little bit confusing. Can you please clarify whether this monthly progress report was prepared by your department?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, it was.

Chairman:

It was. The report on deferred functionality and phased approach was actually taken on board by your department based on information from Project, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on what we were being told by Project, yes.

Chairman:

You put this forward to AMD in the March meeting?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

My question is, what was your advice vis-a-vis deferred functionality and phased approach?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was concern in terms of the phased approach and we needed to provide to Project Division the views. Those views were contained in the paper that was written by Chern HEED to Project Division.

Chairman:

So there is no paper which contains your views as separate and different from the one that you have presented under the progress report which contains specifically IT Division's views regarding the phased approach or the deferred functionality?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

Was it made verbally? Were your views regarding these 2 things made verbally to AMD?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

They would have been made verbally in these meetings.

Chairman:

But not recorded?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Not recorded.

主席：

李永達議員。

李永達議員：

主席，我想就新的範圍提問。

Chairman:

Any questions on this particular area.? Mr Edward HO.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

We were just told that this report here was not a System Task Force report. It just seems strange to me that the footnote on every page says System Task Force. Conventionally speaking, one would say that that was a report of the System Task Force.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is true. That would have been reported at the end of the month where I was asking for the work of the System Task Force as they had seen it. But I need to repeat, the Task Force was working under Project Division with very clear roles that were made very known to them. I have presented that also in my weekly Task Force status minutes that I provided under Appendix B.

Chairman:

I think, Mr CHATTERJEE, the whole structure of the Task Force has been very confusing for Members. Can you just tell us the entire step by step progress or formation of the Task Force? According to the papers submitted to Members, we can see a development from December when you started talking to Project. You then came up with the paper outlining the job description of the Task Force well before AMD was on board. Based on Ms Emily LAU's question to you yesterday, AMD in fact did not agree to the Task Force until February. We saw that you made a presentation with the job description of the Task Force to AMD in that meeting on 21 February that we referred to. It was only on 21 February that you made that presentation. Then we saw further E-mail among yourself, Mr Thomas LAM and AMD regarding that Task Force. Are you actually telling us that the Task Force in fact started functioning before AMD came on board, then you went and presented it to AMD, and then AMD came on board? Was that the picture? Was that the real course of events?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The resources needed for the Task Force were mobilised from Central Plaza to Chek Lap Kok during the month of January. I recognised that it was important for us to also involve AMD, as the E-mails will show, as well as the records that I was corresponding with Chern that we should be attending his AMD management meetings in order to provide progress reports. That time frame, to get that arranged in terms of people on site working with Project

Division took 6 to 8 weeks, yes. That explains the shift and the differences in timing.

Chairman:

You described the working procedure.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The logistics.

Chairman:

But I was asking about the formation of the Task Force. In fact, when you presented the monthly progress report, AMD at that point had not even joined the Task Force; is that a fact?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In December?

Chairman:

No. When you came up with the System Task Force report which you told us was prepared by yourself, that was in fact before the System Task Force was completely formed.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

I think Mr Edward HO's question was, underneath the page you wrote "System Task Force" but in fact it had not existed at that point in time, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It was formalised, finalised within February, yes. Again, the Task Force's

duties were to work as a subcontractor, if you will, to Project Division.

Chairman:

Sorry, come again? Can you repeat that?

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

I think what I want to clarify is very simple. I think Mr CHATTERJEE said this report here was his department's report rather than a System Task Force report. But it does say at the bottom of every page, System Task Force. I want to clarify whether it is what you said.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It is a confusing footnote but it was a report I asked for, yes.

Chairman:

You prepared, your Division prepared that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My Division prepared reports to me on a monthly basis.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

But not a System Task Force report?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Just now you said that the System Task Force was working as a subcontractor to Project Division, did you say that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

At the same time you are reporting to Mr Chern HEED who is Head of AMD.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You are supposed to be the expert representative of the AMD.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

How can you be representing both Divisions, working for one Division and representing the other one? How can you do that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In the memo that Chern HEED and Raymond LAI wrote, you will note that there was a matrix arrangement. In order to discharge our ability for being a representative of AMD on the technical operation side, because it ended up as being a tripartite store of AMD, IT and Project Division, the work of the Task Force on a day-to-day basis was the responsibility of Project Division.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Was it really a tripartite arrangement?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe it was.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You believe so?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Was it so?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

According to some E-mail records here, Mr Tom LAM disagreed with this concept.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

He misunderstood. You will see from the top that I corrected him at the beginning of the memo.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Also at the same time Mr K S NG of AMD disagreed with this in his E-mail to you.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Again, that was a clarification. We were clarifying each other's roles. My view was that AMD was very important. As I said yesterday, the system owner they had to be involved.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

But if your Division signed an agreement with the Project Division at the same time 2 sections out of 5 were disagreed by the AMD, there was no

subsequent document to wrap up the final agreement among the 3 divisions. Was there one?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, that was an omission.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Even after the agreement signed between your Division and Project Division there was still confusion in the relationship between the 3 Divisions.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, there was not. After that series of E-mails I think the relationship was very clear.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Such as what?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That AMD and IT would be working together and the roles of the Task Force would evolve. At that time, the immediate need was to support Project Division on the testing of the various systems. As we approached airport opening, the roles of the Task Force would evolve and we would be assisting AMD in planning for airport opening.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

There is no document stating all this?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes there is. The memo from Chern HEED and Raymond LAI. That is the one.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

As far as yourself are concerned, if I continue, Madam Chairman. If I could ask you the question I asked you yesterday towards the end of the session? Apart from the role that you are playing in this System Task Force, being the Head of the IT Division, you also look after all the IT related matters as far as the Airport Authority is concerned, is that right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Only those that were given to me as part of my responsibility, yes. For those systems that were contracted out under Project Division, they were not my responsibility.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Would you see that you have the role to play in advising whoever within the Airport Authority is carrying out works related to IT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Again, only for those that were given overall responsibility for systems that were within my scope. It is very clear to me that under the contracts those were not my responsibility.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

For instance, FIDS is under the responsibility of another person, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Under Mr TSUI?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Unless you are approached, you would not make any comment on whatever happens within that contract. Is that so?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Just now we were referring documents to you that you were aware of what was happening as far as that context was concerned, as far back as the early part of last year. So you were aware of what was happening to that contract.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

And concerns that were provided. The best forum to channel those concerns back to Project Division was AMD who was the recognised Division to which Project Division would hand over.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

When the contract still received changes proposed by the Airport Authority resulting in making additional payment to EDS, were you involved in the changes proposed by the Authority?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I was not.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were not approached at all by anyone?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I was not.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You did not take any initiative to make any suggestions as to why all these changes are necessary at such a late stage?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because the contracts were under Project Division and Project Division took the decisions with the Board and the executive committee, to which I am not a member I was not made aware of those.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Are you saying, Mr CHATTERJEE, your role as the Head of IT Division is secondary to your role in the System Task Force?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I do not understand the context behind that question.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You had 2 roles you had to play, System Task Force and also Head of IT. Do you agree? Not all the jobs you were assigned to do.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

System Task Force was part of my role as Head of IT where it was recognised that skills within the IT group could be directed to assist Project Division .

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That means you are the number 1 expert on IT. That is why you were assigned the title “Head of IT”?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The title was provided to me when I was hired by the company but it was made very clear --

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Authority, not company.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry, Authority. It was made very clear what my roles were going to be. It was in my job description which I have submitted, which was in 1994, which is to support the Divisions as called for.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

In the same document which we received this morning, on Page 3 of Paper no. B284, decision-making authority, it says, "Full authority to implement IT related policies and procedures or decisions emanating from the Board or executive directors."

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Does it mean that yesterday you confirmed to the Committee that you were the most senior person on IT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Mr HO, the key words there are "decisions emanating from the Board or executive directors." By virtue of the structure of their contracts, very clearly, I was not responsible for the systems contracts under Douglas OAKERVEE.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Are you saying the Board or executive directors, or some of them, or most of them are not IT experts or very knowledgeable IT persons. Being the number 1 person on IT, you would not make any comments on whatever decisions they make and decisions they ask you to implement?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Very clear to me again, I was to follow instructions. Those instructions were to deal with all the other systems and requirements of the company as an internal organisation plus any other directors. The contracts under Douglas OAKERVEE and Project Division were not included in these.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

In other words, you took a kind of secondary or passive role?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am sorry, not a passive role, it is not a passive role. There was an enormous amount of work that still had to be done and I was advised the contracts under Douglas OAKERVEE and Project Division remain the responsibility of Douglas OAKERVEE.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Even when Mr K C TSUI decided to ask EDS not to carry out FAT you were not making any comment?

Chairman:

I think we can leave FAT until a little later, OK?

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, just to clarify something the witness said yesterday. In general we were given the view yesterday that this witness first became involved in December 1996 when this Task Force was established. But FIDS was only one of the many things that he had somehow to look after. He was not involved in the specifications. He did not know the details of FIDS. June of the following year was the first time he got involved in FIDS in any sort of way, and that is only towards the end of 1997 that he was fully involved because of the testing and commissioning of FIDS.

That seems to be quite a different picture as presented by the documents. I would very much like the witness to clarify because that sets a background of exactly how much he knew at what time. Madam Chairman, may I invite Mr CHATTERJEE to look at Paper no. B283, the document we have been looking at. Mr CHATTERJEE, you have just clarified that this is not a System Task Force report but a report you have personally asked for?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

Looking at the contents, you were fully conversant with the contents of this report at that time, is that not right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

At the end of every month this progress report would be reviewed in our departmental meetings.

Hon Margaret NG:

Yes. If you look at Paragraph 1.1, "Key Critical Issues", the very first line, "FIDS remains to be the contract on critical path". This focuses immediately on FIDS, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

Second Paragraph in 1.1, "Steps have been taken to look at the phasing of the deliverables of FIDS, so that the mandatory items are delivered on time for airport opening." This, again, already focuses on the time deliverableness.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

That was critical.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

You were aware of the critical state of FIDS as far back as February 1997.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

Turn the page.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Can I clarify?

Hon Margaret NG:

Yes.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That information was passed through to us, not from Project Division, but AMD. Project Division was providing that information to AMD and then we were being made aware of it. That is the contractual structure upon which ...

Hon Margaret NG:

Thank you. Mr CHATTERJEE, we will go a lot faster if you just

concentrate on the question which is, you knew. Never mind the source, never mind how it was passed to you but you were conversant with this background as far back as February. Your mind was directed to FIDS, to the criticalness of the deliverables, yes?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

Let us turn the page. Paragraph 2.3, "Contract 381", that is FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

The first line says, "The EDS has submitted version 2.1 of the Systems/Segment Specifications which will finalised the user requirements." So this paragraph is about the various variations of specs, this version 2.1. Of course, you are aware that the specifications were set and the contract was signed some time before you arrived upon the scene, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Are you also aware that these specifications had been varied from time to time and there were a great deal of discussions about the variations?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Only through not ...

Hon Margaret NG:

You were aware? In this particular discussion, Mr CHATTERJEE, it is immaterial to me where you got your information from. The importance is whether you know or not. If you consider it important to clarify the source of your information I am sure Madam Chairman will allow you to do so. You were aware of the variations, the discussions on the variation of specifications?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

This is an example of it.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

It was very much a live issue, what the final specifications were at this time?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

You were aware?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Let us go to the third page, 2.3.1, "Key/Critical Issues", do you see that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

It starts with the sentence:

"Given that FIDS is the central application that feeds operational and flight data to others, a potential delay in FIDS can have significant impact."

So it was appreciated at the time how important and critical it was?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

In fact in the table that follows this is put in a very concrete manner how the potential delay would affect AOD.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Finally, we arrive at the conclusion which Madam Chairman had already read out to you, "that as a result of current delays" and so on and so forth.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

You were fully in the picture by February 1997.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

By the end of February, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

So in the light of that, would you like to modify what you told us yesterday as to your degree of involvement and the depth of your awareness of the whole ongoing questions about FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As I said earlier on, I had not remembered initially until I had been reminded of these documents.

Hon Margaret NG:

I appreciate that, Mr CHATTERJEE. I am not saying you were deliberately trying to keep things from this Committee, nevertheless, it was very misleading what you said yesterday.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I accept that.

Hon Margaret NG:

We formed the picture that you were not involved, you had no knowledge, June was the first time you heard of the different Builds and different dates, but here obviously it shows that you were very keenly aware of the dates.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Even in February.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

In view of that, would you like to clarify, amend, modify anything you said yesterday? Can you give us another chronology now?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe I have already given an answer to that. Based on these documents, now with my memory, I was involved, aware.

Hon Margaret NG:

Specifically, in that case as far as the negotiations between the Project Division and EDS is concerned, do you say that you still had third hand or were you involved in the discussion, in the negotiation?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

With EDS?

Hon Margaret NG:

Yes.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Between AA?

Hon Margaret NG:

We understand the negotiation was between EDS and AA. But within AA, do you maintain that you had not given advice other than in a very informal way? Because Chern HEED happened to have consulted you and in some informal discussions you have voiced concern so that the only thing which was manifested in was the memo cc to you? Do you say that your role was fuller, if so, please tell us the full extent to which you were involved and the advice you gave?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Through Madam Chairman, your question had 2 parts. Was I involved with the negotiations between EDS and AA at a deeper level? The answer is no. Was I involved in being aware of these issues and did I pass them through AMD? The answer is yes. These issues were tabled at the AMD meetings.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, does the witness still say that he did not know about the Hook negotiations until afterwards?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

You were not aware that the Project Division was actually talking about phased approach and deferred functionality with EDS before the negotiations in April?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

This report, which was actually written and considered in February, went into quite some detail as to how the whole thing was being changed. Are you telling this Committee because you started talking about the source, you did not in fact talk to Project Division about this at all? They did not talk to you at all about this and you just got it sort of second-hand from AMD? You did not actually take the trouble to look into it, understand what it was all about, given that it was such a major change of direction?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct. Very clearly, again, Project Division were taking the

decisions as they would be ...

Chairman:

We are not talking about the decisions. We are not asking whether the decisions were taken by yourselves. We are asking about the process that led to those decisions, Mr CHATTERJEE. You have to tell us exactly how deeply you were involved in the direct process that led to the decisions. What part you played in that process?

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, may I ask Mr CHATTERJEE more concretely? That report was February. You have already referred us to the meeting at Paper no. 282 in March. So, your views in that report were discussed?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In March, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

From that March meeting on, was there any follow up? Was it discussed in this meeting that there was going to be this negotiation with EDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, because I was not aware that that was going on. That was followed up through the discussions with AMD and ended up in the memo or the letter that Chern HEED had written to Project Division.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman may I follow with one final question? Looking at the minutes of the general manager's meeting, it was attended by Chern HEED and it was attended by Vivian CHEUNG. Do you say that the pending meeting and negotiation with EDS was not raised at this meeting? I know you were not there but you must have followed up on the meeting.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. Because at this point in time if you look at the second paragraph of 1, we were still of the opinion, or AMD, IT were still of the opinion that we still had to comment on the FIDS programme and to get back by 21 March 1997.

Hon Margaret NG:

Is it your clear recollection that the possible, the pending discussions with EDS was not mentioned at this meeting?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I cannot remember specific discussions at that meeting 18 months ago.

Hon Margaret NG:

When was the first time do you say you heard that there was a meeting at Hook?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Where, sorry?

Hon Margaret NG:

The negotiation with EDS in the United Kingdom, when did you first hear about it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

When did I first hear?

Hon Margaret NG:

You have the February report and the 7 March meeting. As you have pointed out, there was supposed to be a further discussion on 21 March. Then,

we already had the memo expressing that deferring functionality was unacceptable by 3 April. So why was this chunk missed out? Suddenly you were not told something. When did you first learn about it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

First, Project Division did not inform IT that they were working with AMD. I heard about it. I guess that there was going to be a meeting so that K C TSUI was going to be going to the UK in the end March/April, that time frame. I cannot remember the exact date.

Hon Margaret NG:

So you knew before he went?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Which was not the information you gave to this Committee yesterday. I strongly suggest, Mr CHATTERJEE, that when you give evidence to this Committee it has to be accurate.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Madam Chairman, I apologise for that. As I said, I did not remember, therefore going back over these documents has jogged my memory.

Chairman:

It is also your duty to look at documentary evidence or material to refresh yourself.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, madam.

Chairman:

About the sequence of events. It is no good coming back to us all the time to say, I am sorry I have forgotten this, I have forgotten that. I would really not like to waste all our time.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, I do not know if you wish to follow through at this point since Mr CHATTERJEE admits that he knew about the meeting before K C TSUI went to EDS. Whether you want to go into the advice on what steps he took to make sure that his advice ...

Chairman:

I did ask that question and he replied that it was done through Chern HEED's note of 3 April. Please answer accurately whether there is anything on paper which would represent IT's views or IT's objections if you like, because you did tell us that it is not good to have deferred functionality and not good to have phased approach. You did not like that idea. Did you put that expert advice anywhere on paper and if so where did you send them to?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was no specific correspondence between myself and Project Division, laying out these concerns. The concerns and points were discussed with AMD and relayed via AMD.

Chairman:

But that was already when the Task Force was in operation, was it not?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The Task Force was entirely different, as I have stated before. This Task Force was a group of people working with Project Division specifically on testing and commissioning. There is no implied responsibility that was put to me. It meant that I was supposed to be responsible for the other systems or for the contracts or for the functions. That responsibility remained with K C TSUI.

主席：

請李永達議員先發問，接着是何承天議員及劉江華議員。李永達議

員。

李永達議員：

我可否就新的範圍提問？

主席：

不可以。何承天議員。

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

I want to finish up this issue. Thank you. Madam Chairman.

Referring to this report that we were looking at, Mr CHATTERJEE's departmental report, the key or critical issues, the phasing of deliveries and deferred functionalities were cited. This was the state on 10 February, is that correct?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Can you remind me of the reference number?

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

It is Paper no. B283.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Thank you.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

This was a report that outlined the status as at 10 February 1997, this is in the first paragraph.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The first paragraph says that the Task Force was mobilised.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

What is the date of this report?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

End of February. Monthly progress report for February, which is end of February.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Was this report the subject of discussion at a meeting of AMD?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, it was presented to AMD on 7 March 1997.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

7 March, that is...

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Paper no. B282.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

B282. As an outcome of that, Chern HEED asked Tom LAM to work with Vivian CHEUNG on the FIDS programme and come back on 21 March.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

The next event was the 21 March meeting, is that right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That would have been 2 weeks later. That is correct.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Anyway, before I go on to that, on 7 March - the notes are very cryptic, they did not say anything at all. The reports pointed out a lot of critical factors. Were these fully discussed, as far as you know, in this AMD meeting?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As far as I know, yes. The concerns were then summarised. These minutes are produced by Airport Management Division and are action minutes as opposed to a record of everything that was said in the meeting. That is the way that the organisation was working.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

We were trying to find out Mr CHATTERJEE's own role in advising the AMD in case of any problems, potential problems, and so on and so forth. So far it is very difficult to locate where you have given advice, that is the problem.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I understand that.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Mr CHATTERJEE, if you can provide us ...

Chairman:

I have already asked that question twice.

主席：

劉江華議員。

劉江華議員：

主席。我認為我們尚有很多事情需要查詢，特別是在1998年發生的

事情，而現時我們只討論在1997年發生的事情。我認為陳達志先生在昨天及今天所作的證供有多處地方前後矛盾。舉例而言，昨天你對我們說，你事前不知道徐先生前往英國，但今天你卻說你實際上知道這事。此外，據你表示，直到6月份的“workshop”，你才知道系統有很多改變；但今天你卻對我們說你在6月前已知道這事。鑑於我們在編寫報告時必須非常嚴謹，我們需要知道實際的情況，我建議請陳達志先生就這兩天證供中有前後矛盾之處提供書面解釋，詳細說明實際的情況。

主席：

劉江華議員，由於大家可能不能清楚記得昨天我們所研究的每項問題所涉及的細節，因此要“Mr CHATTERJEE”就證供中前後矛盾之處提供書面解釋，我相信雙方均會有困難。其實，我們稍後會閱覽證供，屆時我們如發現有前後矛盾之處，需要“Mr CHATTERJEE”進一步澄清，我們可以書面要求他逐點澄清我們的疑問，甚至可邀請他再次出席本委員會的研訊。事實上，我們剛才已要求他就“Task Force”方面的問題澄清。劉江華議員。

劉江華議員：

主席，稍後我們便會有研訊的逐字紀錄本，記載他在這兩天所作出的證供。

主席：

我知道。我的意思是，如我們待紀錄本備妥後才逐點查詢，則會較為清楚。倘若你對昨天的某點證供有疑問，希望再次提問，你可以現時提出。若你要求證人就昨天和今天所作證供中所有矛盾之處作出澄清，我認為證人實在難以作答。陳鑑林議員。

陳鑑林議員：

主席，我想徵詢法律意見。鑑於證人是在宣誓下作供的，若日後我們發現證人的證供與事實不符，證人會否被起訴？

主席：

法律顧問。

法律顧問：

主席，有關證人在宣誓下向專責委員會作供一事，《立法局(權力及特權)條例》第18條是有所規範的。其實，證人亦有這套法例條文，所以我認為證人已清楚知道他須承擔哪些法律責任。此外，《刑事罪行條例》內關於宣誓下作假證供的條文亦適用。主席，我認為證人可就其法律責任徵詢獨立的法律意見。

主席：

澄清了這點，我們繼續研訊。請問哪位同事想就昨天收到的文件提問？我想就文件B287號提問。“Mr CHATTERJEE, have you got it?”

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Can you clarify to this Committee what exactly the first paragraph means? When the Vice-Chairman asked you about the tripartite group, you said it was a tripartite group. On the other hand, according to this E-mail, when your Mr Thomas LAM put to you that he disagreed that it was a tripartite group, you agreed with him. So, it is a bit unclear whether the group was actually a tripartite group. Also, can you please clarify what exactly you meant by:

"AMD have to be involved from a user's perspective. We are the expert representatives on the technical operations of these systems not on the user's operation."

The distinction between "user" and "technical" is crucial. Can you please clarify?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believed, and I still believe, that when we are talking about computer systems and their applications, there are 2 parties. One is the organisation that will use the system. The other is the organisation that will maintain the system from a technical point of view. Both these parties must be involved. That was

what I was reiterating to Tom LAM.

Chairman:

How is it translated into actual operation? You yourselves, who are the expert representatives on technical operations, are not the user operation. What exactly does it mean? When the user uses a system, surely the user needs - how can you draw the line? What is the differentiation? It is quite important for us to understand that so that we understand exactly how you represent AMD. You are drawing the line to say that we represent them on technical operation. We do not represent them on user operation. What exactly does it mean?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I will try. The computer systems are complex and require quite a lot of technical tools to build them. For example, the hardware, the operating software, like the operating system, then we have got database upon which the system runs. Those are all technical components. Those technical components are used by the supplier or whoever wrote the application to build what is called an application, a series of code that will allow a user to input data, receive output from that data, apply some logic in terms of the workings. If a user wants a computer system, they must be the ones that work to define or specify their requirements to fit their mode of operating on a day-by-day basis. They are the only ones who can understand how they are going to work on a day-by-day basis and what they want from the computer system, from the application. That portion is AMD. They are the day-to-day managers and operators of the airport. They are the day-to-day users of flight information.

Chairman:

What about your role?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My team's role is to understand the database that is being used, the technology that is being used, the way it is being applied, how the code has been written. We also try to understand what the user is trying to do. That is important. But the focus is on the technical rather than the operational. When we finally have responsibility, when something does go wrong, we can work with the user to identify where the system has developed a fault or where something

has gone wrong. A long explanation, but an 80/20 rule is that the user must be 80 per cent user oriented and 20 per cent understanding of the system; my people and my team must be 80 per cent understanding the technology underneath and 20 per cent understanding what the user is trying to do.

Chairman:

So what was your understanding when K S NG says AMD needs no representation from IT? Vivian CHEUNG could adequately represent AMD. Why should we need representation from IT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry?

Chairman:

This is quoted in the E-mail which I was referring to under Paper no. B287. Based on your explanation which was just given, you are saying that they do need your 80 per cent expertise. Because they do not have 80 per cent user, 20 per cent expertise, that is not enough. So your 80 per cent expertise would come in and then you should really be holding hands, the two of you. So, you could have 2 representatives. Is that the idea?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is what is normal in the IT industry, yes. The user is very important.

Chairman:

I am sure you remember what you said yesterday that you had some pretty strong personalities in AA. From what we see here, we certainly see the signs of strong personality. Could you tell us whether this wrangle between AMD and PD regarding the Task Force, regarding the whole FIDS system and so on? Would you say that the strong personalities in AMD also made your life very difficult? I have just quoted an example, one instance that AMD feels that they ought to be represented and maybe IT does not need to come in. Do you say that equally the strong personality there would be the AMD people involved?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I would not because this was a record of a meeting where both sides were trying to understand the contexts upon which this group was provided. KS supported that by the last paragraph saying that he suggested that the Task Force was a tripartite group and therefore AMD would be represented by its only staff, Vivian, and needed no representation from IT who had a distinct technical role to play. This was specifically focused on sections E and F of the roles and responsibilities of the Task Force to which I agreed that it should have a user lead. I was pleased by the outcome of this set of discussions.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Who was in this tripartite?

Chairman:

AMD, IT and PD.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

We were just told that IT was not involved in that. There is no need for IT to be represented.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, that is not true.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

According to the E-mail and what Mr CHATTERJEE just said.

Chairman:

Would you like to clarify it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am trying to look for a statement in here that says IT is not needed.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Mr K S NG's E-mail, the last sentence.

Chairman:

K S NG is saying that AMD can well represent itself without IT coming in to represent it, but previously Mr CHATTERJEE did actually explained to us his idea of how the representation goes. They give the technical representation and AMD should represent themselves as the users.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, Madam Chairman. K S NG is saying that IT have a distinct technical role to play. That was clearly understood.

Chairman:

Can we move on? 李永達議員。

李永達議員：

主席，我想就陳達志先生的證人陳述書第26段提問。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry?

Chairman:

Paragraph 26 of your statement.

李永達議員：

請參閱第26段。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Forgive me, I need the time to find it.

Chairman:

This is your statement, i.e. Paper no. B220.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Thank you.

Chairman:

Paragraph 26.

李永達議員：

陳達志先生，根據該段所述，自1997年12月左右開始，你按照柯家威先生的指示，更進一步參與有關航班資料顯示系統的工作。在1997年年底，你曾否參與討論有關取消航班資料顯示系統的在廠驗收測試（即“Factory Acceptance Test”）的事宜？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

When I joined those weekly meetings the decisions regarding Factory Acceptance Test had already been taken.

李永達議員：

在作出有關決定前，曾否有人徵詢你的意見？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. As I said, the contract was firmly the responsibility of Project Division and they were taking the decisions.

李永達議員：

“System Task Force”在1997年2月成立至1997年年底這10個月內，是否從未討論可能取消“在廠驗收測試”這個問題？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, because the Task Force was not considered to be focused on discussions about the contracts and the contractual management. The Task Force was focused only to work on testing and commissioning and other matters under the supervision of Project Division.

李永達議員：

陳達志先生，你剛才說這個“Task Force”主要負責“testing and commissioning”。你認為“Factory Acceptance Test”是否一個“test”？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, it is. But the decisions on when to do the Factory Acceptance Test was not part of the Task Force's responsibilities.

Chairman:

I have to remind you Mr CHATTERJEE. Mr LEE's question was whether you have been involved in the deliberation process and whether you have been consulted on that. I really do not want to face another scenario where we need to go back on arguing whether it was the decision taken. We know who takes the decision. In fact, when we asked K C TSUI he admitted that he took the decision. But we are talking about the internal process whereby the decision was based on certain advice and discussion. We ask whether you took part in that advice and those discussions.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I did not.

李永達議員：

陳達志先生的意思是否指在1997年2月至12月的10個月內，“System Task Force”從未討論關於“Factory Acceptance Test”的問題？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because the role of the Task Force did not include that, yes, that is true.

李永達議員：

你在甚麼時候知道“Factory Acceptance Test”已經取消？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe it was towards the end of December.

李永達議員：

你在1997年12月知道。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

李永達議員：

你知道這事後有何反應？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I was concerned and wanted to understand the reasons behind and the steps that were being taken.

李永達議員：

既然你關注此事，並希望瞭解為何要取消測試，你曾透過甚麼途徑瞭解這事？你有沒有向任何知道這事的同事發出文件或便箋，以瞭解情況？請問你如何表達你的關注及如何瞭解取消測試的原因？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Through these weekly meetings which Douglas OAKERVEE was having with the contractor, GEC and EDS.

李永達議員：

你在這些會議席上提問為何取消“Factory Acceptance Test”時，他們

如何答覆？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

EDS and GEC were very concerned about meeting deadlines and they would not compromise on testing, but we also needed to have - I am trying to remember.

李永達議員：

慢慢記憶清楚。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was confidence that they would be able to handle the testing through a re-arrangement and realignment of the testing schedule.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, can you tell us how important in your mind was the FAT? At that point in time how important did you regard FAT? How important do you regard it now?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

A Factory Acceptance Test is an opportunity for a supplier to test their system before a customer sees it. It determines whether the system is going to behave according to the specifications.

Chairman:

Right.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It is an important phase in the life cycle of a systems development.

Chairman:

Would you say it is indispensable?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have to think about that one. If no other plans are made to accommodate adequate testing then, yes, it is indispensable.

Chairman:

When you, as the technical expert in IT representing AA, representing AMD, found out that they had cancelled FAT, did you regard that as a very, very unacceptable thing to have happened?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I was hearing that there was going to be a series of tests which included Pre-SAT at Hook in January as well as a SAT in Hong Kong. Based on that, whilst there was concern, I accepted Project Division's explanation of the changed schedule.

Chairman:

Did you establish what that Pre-SAT and the SAT were going to do to compensate the cancellation of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The tests under normal circumstances for FAT and Pre-SAT are to check the system according to specifications. Both the FAT and the Pre-SAT were going to do that.

Chairman:

They were duplication then?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

The Pre-SAT was a duplication of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is my understanding. That is the way it was planned.

Chairman:

You mean it was just a waste of time to have 2 things happening?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. Very important. You test a system with a set of test scripts to judge whether the system is performing. The success of those test scripts give you confidence on whether and how the system is going to behave. The fact that we did not do FAT but we did do a Pre-SAT, or EDS did do a Pre-SAT, it was going to be with the same set of test scripts.

Chairman:

Why was it necessary to have 2 in the first place?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I do not know the answer to that. I think K C TSUI is the best person to ask.

Chairman:

We are asking you as an IT expert representing AA, representing AMD. You are the 80 per cent technical expert that you just told us. We are asking you how critical it was to have FAT and how detrimental it was, in your view, not to have FAT in your expert opinion.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on the fact that there was going to be a Pre-SAT, Madam Chairman, the consequence of not having FAT was diminished. What was lost was that the supplier did not have its own opportunity to check the system themselves before

showing it to the supplier.

Chairman:

Without that FAT, how would you identify whether the product was actually what it claimed to be?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The next set of tests would show how the product was going to behave the way it was supposed to be. For every single test, there were specific test procedures and test scripts that had been designed by the testing and commissioning team to run against the system.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, in your job description of the Task Force, the main tasks under A in Paragraph 5, the first test for which you are responsible is actually FAT.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry?

Chairman:

Paper no. 286, in Paragraph 5 "main tasks", testing System Task Force tasks. You have told this Committee that you are actually responsible, or IT, as the technical expert representative of AMD is responsible for testing and commissioning. The first one is FAT. You are responsible, are you not?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. That Task Force was working under the directions of the Project Division, project management representative, the lead is the contractor.

主席：

Fair enough. 李永達議員。

李永達議員：

主席，我想請證人參閱文件第X冊第23段。這份文件是項目工程科顧問“CSE”編寫的每月報告。6.7.1第2段最後4行實際上已說明當時的情況。該段載述“The AA have instructed 381 to concentrate their resources on getting Build 2.0 operational in the PTB. This is now top priority for 381 and has resulted in the cancellation of FAT which was due to start at EDS in the UK on 19 December 1997. The FAT is now to be combined with the SAT and will take place in the PTB starting 19 January 1998. CSE consider this change in priority will have an adverse effect on the testing and proving of the system and be detrimental to progress overall.”。陳達志先生是這方面的專家，“CSE”則是另一個部門所聘請的專家，負責監督有關航班資料顯示系統的工作和測試。為何這位專家的意見和你的意見大有分別？根據他的意見，這安排並非沒有問題，而“Pre-SAT”亦不可以代替“FAT”。此外，這安排會帶來嚴重後果，帶來“detrimental”的後果。他所說的與你剛才對委員會所說為何大有分別？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I agree with you. What you are saying is absolutely right. The message that were coming back to me was that Pre-SAT would take place in Hook. If it was to take place in the PTB I would have been very concerned. But, what I was made aware of was that it would take place in Hook and it did take place in Hook.

李永達議員：

你是否對本委員會說，就測試方面而言，“CSE”在報告中所說的與事實不符？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Mr LEE, my understanding from reading this is that at the time this report was written, the plan was to do a Pre-SAT in the PTB. The PTB reflects ...

Chairman:

The Pre-SAT where?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In the Passenger Terminal Building. The Passenger Terminal Building represents the last place in the cycle, because testing should take place either in the UK or in Interface House and then move to the Passenger Terminal Building. Yes, if this statement, I would have been very concerned. But my understanding at the time was Pre-SAT in the UK. That is what finally happened.

李永達議員：

據你所知，“Pre-SAT”最後是否在英國進行？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

李永達議員：

陳達志先生的意思是否指就算兩個測試均在英國進行，你亦認為“Pre-SAT”可以完全取代“Factory Acceptance Test”？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The understanding at the time was that the FAT could be replaced by the Pre-SAT before it actually then comes across to Hong Kong for the formal SAT.

李永達議員：

我希望陳達志先生提供專業意見，而並非你的“understanding”。根據你的專業判斷，“Pre-SAT”是否可以完全取代“FAT”？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Madam Chairman, I am just trying to think of what differences there might have been so that I can give you a proper answer. Under normal circumstances there is no Pre-SAT planned in any development life cycle. It is a Factory Acceptance Test then followed by a Site Acceptance Test. In this case, yes, the Pre-SAT could have replaced the FAT because it was a test in the UK in their premises.

Chairman:

Did you take this step to understand what the Pre-SAT was supposed to cover before you came to the conclusion that the cancellation of FAT was acceptable?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. Because at the time the messages were coming directly from Project Division with their assurances that Pre-SAT would cover the FAT. Please remember that the responsibility for that project was totally in the control of Project Division and K C TSUI. Those decisions were being made by them.

Chairman:

But you are the IT expert for AA as well as for the user, AMD. You have just told this Committee of the reason you are representing them on the 80 per cent technical side because of your expertise. We are now asking you as the professional expert on IT what your position was vis-a-vis the cancellation of FAT at the time. Now you are telling us that because Pre-SAT was there, it could have been all right. At the time when you heard that it was cancelled what was your advice to the AA and to AMD? Did you take steps to understand what the Pre-SAT was all about before the event?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was discussion within the Divisions, yes. Concern about the cancellation of FAT was expressed. That is how Pre-SAT came about.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, that does not answer your question. This is a frightfully important question. Mr CHATTERJEE is supposed to act for AMD.

Chairman:

And the AA.

Hon Margaret NG:

And the AA to protect AMD's interest to make sure that things are all right. A very important test has been cancelled. I do not understand why this witness has to consider here before us the difference between the 2 tests and whether one can replace the other. That process should have already been taken place at the time when this witness had to advise AMD. Madam Chairman, I do not understand this.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, can you tell us why at the time you did not raise hell because FAT was so important in the process?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because the decisions had already been made by the Project Division, Madam Chairman.

Chairman:

You mean there was absolutely no discussion between yourselves, AMD, and Project, maybe separately, not necessarily together, concerning this cancellation prior to the commitment?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Not that I am aware of. Not that I can remember, no.

Hon Margaret NG:

Did this witness discuss this with AMD? Even if he only got to know about it afterwards, did he then sit down with AMD and advise them of the adverse situation that they are facing and what remedy can be taken?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Those discussions did take place. There was concern but at the end of the day ...

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, please do not tell us at the end of the day. Please tell us what those discussions were? What your advice was at what time?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That the FAT had been cancelled, yes, but what steps were being taken.

Chairman:

First of all, did you just accept that FAT was cancelled? Did you just accept that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We all collectively accepted it, yes.

Chairman:

No, you. Did you accept the cancellation of FAT at the time?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

You accepted it. On what basis did you accept it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because we were continuously being assured by Project Division that plans were being put to ensure that the quality of testing did not drop.

Chairman:

What evidence was given to you? On what basis did you come to that

conclusion? What did you examine and what did your staff examine to come to that conclusion that it was all right? That decision to cancel FAT was all right? It was well replaced by Pre-SAT? What did you see? What did they give you to look at? On what basis? Was it just a statement that Project told you, "Oh, it is all right, there is going to be Pre-SAT?" Was it that? Or did they give you the information as to what the Pre-SAT was and that you were satisfied that each and every one component was all right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. In addition, we said that we wanted staff in Hook to observe the Pre-SAT. One of my staff was sent there.

Hon Margaret NG:

That was Miss Rita LEE, was it not?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

She was not satisfied.

Chairman:

We will come to that later.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, the witness did not answer your question. What did he examine? What was the process? What was the basis? What were the criteria? Please, these are questions of fact.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

With AMD as part of the tripartite group, the team of ...

Chairman:

Never mind about AMD. We are asking you.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My people worked with AMD to review the schedules that were being put forward to us.

Chairman:

What schedules?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The programme schedules that had been put forward for the remaining testing.

Chairman:

Where? What? Can you give us documentary evidence as to what you actually examined?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We can look through our records in terms of the testing schedules, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

At this point, the witness should already be able to list the material that he considered at that time, Madam Chairman. It is such an important matter. We are only in 1998. I cannot believe that he could not at least tell us what documents, what materials did he consider?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because that - I am sorry, but I am going to come back to this all the time. The project was firmly in the control of Project Division and it was they who were working with EDS and GEC. The AMD, IT people were not involved in that decision making.

Chairman:

I am sorry, Mr CHATTERJEE, we are not talking about the decision. We are talking about your expertise opinion regarding the cancellation of FAT. We want to know, because you just told this Committee you considered that the Pre-SAT could actually replace FAT. You told this Committee that.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on the information that was provided to us.

Chairman:

We want that information.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Right, Project Division.

Chairman:

We want that information. What information? Your view, your opinion. You have to tell us where and when you put your view forward that the Pre-SAT can adequately and reliably replace FAT based on certain information put to you by the Project Division, you told us that. We want that information because we want to know what you have actually considered and based on what? What was your advice and your view based on? Could you let us have that information?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We will check.

主席：

李永達議員。

李永達議員：

主席，證人剛才對我們講述有關情況時，其實很強調一點，就是這計劃是由項目工程科負責的。陳達志先生，你的意思是不是這樣：既然已經作出了決定，無論你的專業判斷為何，也不能更改這決定？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The final decision was taken by Project Division.

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

My question is, as the decision was taken by the Project Division before your involvement, no matter what was the result or effect of the decision, you had to conform with that and tried your best to do what you can?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

So even if there are very adverse effects after the decision, what you can do is to accommodate yourself or your Division to go along with the schedule put forward by the Project Division?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

Can I say that you have not upheld your professional knowledge on this part because the schedule of the Project Division may have very bad consequential effects on the whole process of testing the FIDS afterwards.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of upholding my profession, no, you cannot say that. What we were working to was to work with the schedules that had been decided upon.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

Have you ever tried to object to cancellation of the FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In writing, no.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

In meetings?

Hon Margaret NG:

The witness did object.

Chairman:

Wait. Answer the question, please, Mr CHATTERJEE.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In discussions with Project Division, yes.

Chairman:

Where?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In December. One of the things that did happen was that Project Division arranged for a demonstration of the system in the PTB at the end of December to assure us that the system had got far enough along and that their decision was an acceptable one. I think it was on 24 December or 22 December a demonstration by GEC/EDS was arranged by K C TSUI to show us to what steps and how far the system had developed.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

I do not know whether it is true or whether you have made a mistake again. K C TSUI in front of this Committee several days ago said that no one objected to the cancellation of FAT within AA.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I cannot respond to that. I do not understand the context upon which he was making that.

Chairman:

Did you or did you not object?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Concerns were raised, Madam Chairman. In term of outright objection, no. We do not believe the FAT should be cancelled. No, because of the assurances that were coming from Project Division.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

Madam Chairman, these are the kind of facts - our secretariat can give you a verbatim transcript of K C TSUI for you to read his evidence. K C TSUI mentioned several times that no one within AA objected to him regarding the cancellation of the FAT. This is a matter of facts. If you have ever objected, maybe I do not know whether K C TSUI will proceed, will insist on cancellation of FAT. I want to make sure whether you did object. Please clarify this point. This is evidence. On what occasion did you object? We will ask K C TSUI to verify in writing whether he heard your objections.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As I said, Madam Chairman, in terms of outright objections, no, I said that earlier. In terms of expressing concerns, yes.

Chairman:

Where did you express concern?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Again at the discussions and those were informal discussions with Project Division. I cannot remember whether it was with KC.

Chairman:

Informal discussions?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

One last question. As a profession of IT, do you agree that it is a mistake not to object to the cancellation of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

If looked in the singular context of FAT with no other plans, then, yes, it was a mistake. But taking into account the adjustments to plans, no.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

The witness has advised this Committee that the Pre-SAT can replace FAT, he said that. My question is, what is the difference between a Pre-SAT and a FAT? Is he aware of the difference?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The FAT requires testing at the UK with a script, a series of planned tests. These are controlled tests that are designed to check the system against the specifications. The Pre-SAT was designed to do the same thing.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

If they were designed to do the same thing, then it is just another name for FAT. Is that what we are told?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is what we understood.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

As it turned out, there are limitations. I think Mr CHATTERJEE would probably know, if he refers to Paragraph 30 of that document, Volume X, which is some E-mail from Vivian CHEUNG to Chern HEED regarding the pre-test report from the UK, so on and so forth. If you look down at the bottom of the page, it says:

"Owing to the limitation of the host server set up and network configuration in Hook, tests like host server failover, display server failover and stress test were not included in Pre-SAT. Other tests like volume tests, data base locking, concurrent usage, system facilities (such as backup, restore) were not covered. Tests on MMIs were very minimal. Some of these test cases are deferred to SAT or Plant Integration."

It is very clear here. When FAT was cancelled I do not know whether it was clear that there are limitations to cancel FAT and substitute it by Pre-SAT.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

You are absolutely right and that is why our Rita LEE was supposed to be in Hook. She reported the actual limitations that were coming out. She was doing her job.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

When Mr CHATTERJEE said that Pre-SAT was equivalent to FAT, either he was telling us that he and his Division were misled by Project Division that there were no limitations- he said that, so he must have been misled- or he and his Division did not go into it deep enough because they have all the technical expertise, that they did not go deep enough to analyse what Pre-SAT meant. Can we be told either one or the other?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

They assured us that the limitations would have been present in the FAT as well. These comments are being made on the setup of the equipment at Hook. It became very clear to us that the Hook setup by EDS was not the same as the

setup under normal operating environment. In hindsight again, if the FAT had been done we would have found these things earlier. I am glad that we did find these things by doing the tests in Hook. We were able to identify what tests were missing and needed to be focused on.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

Were these tests in fact originally in the specifications that the supplier must do?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Very much so, which is why Rita was reporting.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

After this report, how does IT react and how does it advise AMD or Project Division?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

According to the procedure, this detail was passed through to the project management representative of the contract, Paul EVANS, and then made known to the Project Manager, K C TSUI. These reports were then passed back to EDS for their advice on how they were going to cover these tests.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

In reading the previous answer, you are saying your Division was misled by Project in the sense that these limitations were only discovered and found out when one of your staff went to Hook, right? Can we draw that conclusion that you were misled?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I do not know whether "misled" is the right word. I do not know whether it was deliberate misled.

Chairman:

Whether it was deliberate or not, you were misled.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We were given to understand differently, that is correct.

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

To conclude, may I ask one more question. What would Mr CHATTERJEE regard his role in all this? He kept on saying he accepted certain things because of assurances from Project Division. As we knew it, Project Division did not have the kind of expertise that Mr CHATTERJEE and his Division have insofar as IT is concerned. What I want to ask him is whether he would see his own role as to just go along with Project Division, , go along with its decision and hope things would work out, or, if he saw that things were not working out, technically speaking, he would insist on his own expert opinion? No matter whether Project Division listened or not, he would insist upon his own expert opinion?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Stepping back a bit, Mr HO. I will provide the answer to the question. At this point in time the Booz-Allen report recommendations were known. That recommendation was that IT should take over responsibility for the day-to-day management of AODB and FIDS after airport opening. As a result of being asked by Douglas OAKERVEE to be more involved in the daily meetings, this was our way of getting an IT/AMD person fully involved at a deep level with the testing so that we could see for ourselves.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you did not answer Mr HO's question. Mr HO's asked whether you regard your duty to go along with the decision of the Project Division, however unacceptable professionally, to go along and do the best you can, or whether it is your duty to voice your opinion based on your expertise to say whether a certain step taken by Project is not professionally acceptable? You have to answer that question. Never mind about the Booz-Allen report.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

At this point in time, I was able to voice my opinions and it is proven by the fact that one of the ...

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

He is still not answering my question. The question was not "able" or "not able". Regarding you yourself, how do you regard your own role, your own responsibility?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I regarded my role and responsibility as following what was instructed by my directors. I am sorry, the responsibility is very clearly and I have been told many times that the responsibility for these systems and these contracts are Project Division. I had no way of

Chairman:

You are repeating yourself again but again not answering the question. The question is, as the expert, the top IT man, Head IT man within AA, how do you see your role in terms of tendering your professional opinion? Whether you regard yourself as someone who just goes along with whatever decision, however professionally unacceptable, making the best you can, or whether it was your duty to put forward your professional opinion.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of these contracts ...

Hon Edward HO Sing-tin:

In terms of anything.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of these contracts and the way they were managed my role was to accept the decisions that Project Division had made.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Following from Mr HO's question, you mentioned the Booz-Allen report. Can you explain that a bit further because that report came out in October?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Last year.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Before the Pre-SAT started.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

What changes did that report make as far as your duties and your role were concerned?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The Division was moved from reporting to the Finance Director to the CEO. The timing of the move was preliminary in November and I started reporting to the CEO. Following final agreement of the IT Division structure, because some structural changes needed to be taken place, and in terms of roles and responsibilities, agreement with Project Division was finalised in March 1998.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Does it mean that it actually elevates your position because you are then reporting direct to the CEO instead of the Finance Director?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe it was recognition of the IT function that did not have a role just to the Finance and Commercial Divisions. It had a role to the whole of the organisation as a support organisation. As a result, it should report to the CEO. That was the outcome of the report.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

My question was, did it actually elevate your position as far as the whole management structure was concerned?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, it did not. I am still a department head reporting to the CEO.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were not reporting to the CEO initially before November 1997?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were then reporting to the CEO instead of the Finance Director?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

After November.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Did you not consider that to be an elevation of your position?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Elevation of position means you get involved with the Executive Committee and Board at those discussions. That did not change.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Still, you should have been able to air your views despite decisions made by others such as Board or other technical directors. You were not restrained from making comments or airing your views.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

At any meeting the CEO was fully involved and was present.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were able to make your views.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Where those views were possible, yes. As a result, Rita LEE went to Hook.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That Rita LEE went over to the UK was decided in the early part of December.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, it was in the middle of January, late January when the Pre-SAT began. Pre-SAT began on 19 January and Rita went soon after that because we realised we needed to keep track of what EDS was testing. We wanted to see what they were testing and how they were testing.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were aware of this position in December?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. In January the decision was made.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were aware of the cancellation of FAT in December?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I thought you were talking about Rita. Cancellation of FAT, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That is what I am getting at. You were aware of the cancellation of FAT in December and at the same time Pre-SAT was proposed. Although it started a little later it was proposed at the same time when FAT was cancelled.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe so, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That was a time where you were already reporting to the CEO. You were aware of the changes, any significant change?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The CEO was involved with all of those meetings as well.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The CEO is not an IT expert, you are.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am not sure of what you are driving at in terms of the context.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

These major decisions, you said all the time the CEO was present, you said it many times.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You were the IT expert sitting alongside, talking to the CEO. You had every opportunity to air your views, your professional views?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You did not actually make it thoroughly and very clearly that this was some very major change to the whole concept of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. The whole concept of testing is a major change. I have already said that. But at the same time one has to take into account the adjustments that are being made and then judge on the basis of those adjustments. If we just cancel FAT and go straight on to SAT, that would have been completely unacceptable.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That is my next question. FAT was cancelled because of the lack of time, agree? Because EDS was falling behind this programme, that is why FAT was cancelled?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is what I understand, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Hence Pre-SAT was proposed.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

At a later date, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That means Pre-SAT is a compromised FAT, even if you put it that way.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct. It is a compromise.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

A compromise solution would mean reduction of standards.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

On the face of it, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Professionally, would it mean reduction of standards?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Lowering of standards?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, if the intention is to continue the same level of testing that would have taken place in FAT.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

How could that be, even with commonsense, if there was not enough time to carry out FAT as prescribed in the tender documents? Even when FAT was actually prescribed in the contract document which the contractor must carry out, he is paid the contract sum. If that is not possible because of the lack of time, then he proposed Pre-SAT which obviously he would have to do less. Do you agree it is a kind of compromised solution? Then professionally, it must be lowering of standard when a kind of modified version is carried out instead of the original solution.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

On the face of it, yes. In normal life cycle terms, yes, that is the case. Where the real compromise was I think is that EDS reduced the amount of time that they had in order to be able to correct any problem reports that arose. Particularly from our view of it, the Pre-SAT on 19 January did replace FAT. It did run the tests that were expected of FAT but we also found out a month later that there were some tests that FAT could not have covered, like the host server failovers. If we had done the FAT in December we would have found these in December.

Chairman:

But in December you were given a presentation and you said you were satisfied that in fact the Pre-SAT could replace the FAT. You accepted that as an acceptable replacement of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

You must have then gone through what was supposed to be covered by Pre-SAT at that stage already. How could you be taken by surprise 2 months later?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Probably just accepted the assurances from Project Division and EDS that they would be able to cover it.

Chairman:

That presentation ...

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry, what presentation?

Chairman:

The December one.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The demonstration, Madam Chairman, sorry.

Chairman:

Demonstration, presentation, where you said you were actually given the details of the replacement.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The demonstration was to show us how far EDS had gone so far in their development. It was a 2-part demonstration, one in Interface House to show us some of the functionality ...

Chairman:

Never mind about the details. You gave us the understanding just now that you were actually supplied with certain information in this presentation by GEC/EDS about the replacement of FAT. What would happen in the place of FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I am sorry. It was a demonstration of what the system was capable of to assure us that the testing would still be comprehensive.

Chairman:

Exactly. So the purpose of that was to convince you that it was all right to cancel FAT.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

And Pre-SAT coming up, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Madam Chairman, the question was really, FAT was prescribed so that full simulation for Build 2.0 was carried out under factory conditions.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

We are not going to carry that out according to that specification, but a kind of lower standard in Pre-SAT conditions, Pre-SAT requirements. How can they be equal in professional terms?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am having trouble with lowering of standards in terms of testing.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You already agree that it was a lowering of standard procedure.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. Because the same tests to be run in FAT were expected to be run in Pre-SAT.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

How could they be the same if you were not able to, or EDS was not able to carry out FAT because of the lack of time? I do not want to go back to what we were talking about 10 minutes ago. You have already confirmed everything and now you want to go back and change what you gave us as evidence.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

FAT was cancelled by a decision from K C TSU but the Pre-SAT was an attempt by us to get some form of testing before SAT.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

What do you mean by some form of testing?

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, I have to remind you that you have already told this Committee that in your view there was a certain compromise of standard. Are you actually saying to us that there is no compromise? Are you going back on that again?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of compromise of standards and in terms of less time, yes. Sorry, I am not going back on it.

Chairman:

Less time and compromise of standard are 2 different things. Lowering of standards, compromising of standards is different from time.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You already confirmed to us that because of less time, the lack of time, EDS was not able to carry out FAT in accordance with the contract documents.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

They were allowed to carry out Pre-SAT tests in Hook.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Obviously, it must be a kind of reduced scope of work. You have already agreed that it is a kind of lowering of standards otherwise they would have carried out FAT in total.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Madam Chairman, Mr HO, I have no evidence that there was a lowering of standards in terms of the number and types of tests that they took. What we found out during the Pre-SAT was that there were some tests they could not do.

Chairman:

You only found at Pre-SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Correct. They could not do as a result of the way the systems had been set up in Hook.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

I am not sure if this is a kind of red herring or not. What is mentioned here just now is maybe a very small number of items that were found out when Pre-SAT was carried out. FAT had a lot of items which were not able to be carried out at Hook when you were doing Pre-SAT or when they were doing Pre-SAT.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I need to refer to a comparison of the tests.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

Let us take an example. Would you turn to Paragraph 33 in Volume X. This is an independent report by CSE, which is an AA consultant on monitoring the projects. In the second paragraph it says:

"As a result of this programme change, the formal Factory Acceptance Test at Hook was downgraded to an unwitnessed activity, remaining Model Tests planned in Interface House were cancelled and the primary test of system function was to become the Site Acceptance Test at Chek Lap Kok."

Here it says the test of FAT was downgraded. This document is written in February after FAT has been cancelled. I would also like to draw your attention to another document, Paragraph 23 in Volume X. This is the December report prior to the cancellation of the FAT, Paragraph 23. In the second paragraph, "CSE consider this change in priority will have an adverse effect." So CSE objected to the cancellations. You are the Head of IT, did you read this report?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I haven't. I was not provided with these reports.

Hon SIN Chung-kai:

You were not provided with these reports?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No.

Chairman:

On the other hand, you know the result of Pre-SAT of course because Rita LEE, your own staff, reported to you.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct. That was the first time it became clear to me.

Chairman:

You still have not answered the question. What your understanding was before you started Pre-SAT? You accepted Pre-SAT as a viable replacement for FAT and only to be taken by surprise 2 months later that a lot of the things which Pre-SAT, in your mind, were supposed to cover, were not covered.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Chairman:

How could you have been taken by surprise? Was it a dereliction of your duty not to have established what those tests should have been in the first place?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I do not consider any dereliction of duty in making sure that one of my people was available at the Pre-SAT and reported back, which is what she did.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Madam Chairman, I would like to come back to this point, it is very important. Mr CHATTERJEE, at that time when you had representatives going to Hook, did you actually have an opportunity to read the requirements for FAT in the EDS or GEC/EDS contract document?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I did not.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Did you attempt to read it or did you just not care? You did not want to read it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Those contract documents, in terms of contract documents remained with Project Division. I am sorry, but that is the truth. They were with Project Division.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You are the expert ...

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was a particular technical specification that laid out the purpose of Factory Acceptance Test and Site Acceptance Test. Yes, I did read through those. Those were general paragraphs on each type of test.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Only the general paragraphs. What does it mean? Does it mean that you were not given the full document?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Did you ask for it?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am trying to remember whether I asked for it then. I cannot remember.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

This is very surprising because you had to send your people to the EDS factory at Hook. Being the expert on IT, you are the number one person on IT in AA, did you not try to find out what actually had to be carried out at Hook by EDS before you sent your people there? Before you gave instructions to your people what to look for?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My people knew what was expected of the Pre-SAT.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You did not?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That was a level of detail that I was not aware of, no.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

When you knew that FAT was cancelled you must have tried to find out why that was cancelled. If that decision was already made then you would have tried to see whether that cancellation would have any adverse effects on the whole thing. Would you not think so?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Had I been responsible for those systems or even had the authority, yes. But up until then I still did not have access.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You did not have access but you did not ask for access?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is true. It was on the basis that I knew I would not be able to get

access.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

That is interesting. You knew that you would not be able to get access. Why is that so?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It has always been made very clear again throughout the whole of the year. The people working from IT in that Task Force had a duty. They had to take their instructions from Project Division and Project Division was going to be the only source of information to anyone outside of Project Division.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

It comes back to what you told us yesterday. Because of certain very strong characters in AA, particularly in the Project Division, you knew that you would not be able to get access even if you asked for it. You think that although you are the top expert on IT and even though you knew that this cancellation of FAT was important as far as the whole project is concerned, you just kept quiet?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In December, yes. In January, no.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

What did you do in January?

Chairman:

A change of organisation.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

And the fact I did have my own people from IT with the agreement of Project.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The change of organisation was in November.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The change of organisation was a process that did not end until March when we finally got agreement on staffing.

主席：

劉江華議員。

劉江華議員：

主席，我想跟進這問題。陳達志先生說“Pre-SAT”可以等如“FAT”，但你卻從來沒有看過有關“SAT”和“FAT”的文件，直至機場啟用前，你似乎仍未看過這些文件，你是否同意？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of detailed testing plans, no. That was part of the responsibility of the team under Project Division. In terms of what they are supposed to achieve, yes. The Factory Acceptance Test is to be run at the factory and then witnessed those tests. The system is then to be brought back to the customer's site and the tests run again on the customer's premises, using the customer's equipment. It is the same series of tests.

劉江華議員：

我再想問你是否同意直至機場啟用前，你沒有看過軟件設計的詳情？你是否沒有看過關於“FIDS”的軟件設計的詳情？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of detailed software design at my level, no. But in terms of representatives that I had focused on the project, IT Division, working with AMD on the project, got more involved from time to time, fully involved in January, yes. We knew, we had the software design specifications and we understood what the software was trying to do. We understood what tests were going to be

performed at the Pre-SAT and we judged the Pre-SAT success based on those tests.

劉江華議員：

主席，我想證人看看文件第23段……

Chairman:

Paragraph 23.

劉江華議員：

第X冊第23段最後一頁的圖表……

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Last page.

劉江華議員：

那圖表列出“CSE”從沒收到的那6份載有詳情的文件，包括我剛才所說的軟件設計、“FAT”和“SAT”的“test”的詳情。我想問陳達志先生，是否在機場開幕前，你本人也未收到和細閱這6份“CSE”表示從未收過的文件？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My understanding is that these were formal submissions that had not been received. However, draft submissions had been provided by EDS to Project Division and were being commented on by Project Division. To take one example, the detailed software design is a document called the SSS, the systems segment specification. That arrived in February 1997, beginning of 1997, and was supposed to be commented upon. However, those comments did not go back from Project Division, but a draft or a version of all of these documents did exist.

劉江華議員：

若沒有一份正式的文件，你如何判斷“Pre-SAT”可以代替“FAT”？

你由1月接手成為測試工作的主要人物，卻完全沒有看過正式的文件，你在那6個月是做甚麼的呢？你根據甚麼去進行測試？連正式的文件也沒有，你根據甚麼判斷測試結果滿意與否？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Again, I need to reiterate that the testing and commissioning was under the complete responsibility of Project Division. At that point in time that team had the detailed steps that were going to be taken for FAT and SAT. Those tests were created. It was being left to that team and Project Division to complete the tests. As Head of IT, at that time when I became more involved in January, I was assured that they knew what tests were going to be done. The tests had been discussed with EDS and the tests were going to be conducted in Hook.

劉江華議員：

若全部測試均由項目工程科負責，由他們保存了所有文件，既然你沒有看過這些文件，你便認為應該是他們的責任。換句話說，在那半年內，是否別人說測試成功你便接受這測試是成功的？其實根本沒有資料作依據，支持你測試是否不成功的結論，而你本身完全欠缺有關資料。你是否處於這樣的位置？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Can I ask for a clarification, Madam Chairman?

Chairman:

Yes.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

When you say "half year" ...

劉江華議員：

由1月開始，即你接手做.....

劉江華議員：

1998年。

Chairman:

January 1998 to AOD.

劉江華議員：

至7月。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, from that point in time I took a proactive role which is evidenced by the fact that we have got these E-mail reports from Rita and ongoing reports on the other tests. Plus the involvement in the every Tuesday weekly meetings with Douglas OAKERVEE chairing and the CEO present.

劉江華議員：

我並非查詢你曾出席甚麼會議，而是希望清楚瞭解，在這半年(即1998年1月至機場啟用當日)，你既然沒有正式文件，你如何進行測試？就“IT”方面而言，你是否只依靠項目工程科提供測試結果？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Those formal documents were not formalised in terms of signatures, but they did exist with Project Division. Project Division had given me assurances that those tests would be conducted according to the agreed process.

Chairman:

Did you have access to those draft documents?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Not me personally, but my team did.

Chairman:

So you did have access?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, IT did have access.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, may I ask the witness to look at Paragraph 33 in Volume X. Mr CHATTERJEE, you were the testing and commissioning man by December 1997, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is not correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

That testing and commissioning man including for FIDS.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Testing and commissioning man, no, that is not correct. Testing and commissioning was still the responsibility of and decision made by Project Division. With the Task Force that had been set up working ...

Hon Margaret NG:

I am sorry, this is what you told us yesterday that you were involved fully in December 1997 in testing and commissioning.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am sorry, I think that there must have been a miscommunication.

Hon Margaret NG:

Correct me, say what the position was.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As stated my position was that the Task Force under Project Division was

responsible for testing and commissioning. The contract quite clearly stipulates that Project Division is responsible for the complete testing and commissioning and delivery of those systems.

Hon Margaret NG:

Never mind delivery. You, as the most senior IT man, were responsible for the testing and commissioning.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I was not.

Chairman:

I refer you to Paragraph 17 of your statement, Mr CHATTERJEE. You put to this Committee the fact that Project Division requires support with testing and commissioning of the system contracts. Yesterday, when you were questioned why, whether it was because of the lack of expertise, or whether it was because of human resources, you gave us an answer. But, nevertheless, in this paragraph it says:

"Testing and commissioning was essential before the systems could be handed over to AMD for day-to-day use. Accordingly, a Task Force was set up to support the Project Division in testing and commissioning of the systems."

This is from your own statement. Can you tell this Committee that you do have a role to play or you do not have a role to play?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The role was clearly spelt out in the roles and responsibilities and that the group under Tom LAM would operate to the instructions and directions of Project Division.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, do we understand from Mr CHATTERJEE now that he has no responsibility in testing and commissioning of FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

You had no responsibility in testing FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We had responsibility working under Project Division.

Hon Margaret NG:

That is a different matter. When you say you have no responsibility whatsoever, it does not concern you. Do you have or do you not have responsibility for testing FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Through the Task Force in terms of assisting with the testing and commissioning, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Yes. Let us start here. Yes, you have responsibility for testing, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Through the Task Force, not me personally, I was not given that responsibility or accountability.

Hon Margaret NG:

I am not asking you about accountability. I am asking you about your responsibility. You say that you do not have sole responsibility but you have responsibility as part of the Task Force, is that right? Have I got you right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. No responsibility was directly given to me for testing and commissioning. The Task Force was to provide a group of people to work under Project Division at the direct instruction of Project Division. That has been made very clear to us by Project Division many times.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, let me ask the question in another way. Mr CHATTERJEE, what is your role in testing FIDS?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The role up until December/January when I began ...

Hon Margaret NG:

No, from December 1997.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

From December 1997, that role was to work with Project Division to provide them with views, but Project Division had the final decision on testing and commissioning, and to provide and build the expertise within my group so that we could prepare ourselves to take over for opening day.

Hon Margaret NG:

Within your group you were the Head?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Margaret NG:

At least you admit to have a role in providing the IT advice, technical expert advice on the testing of FIDS, is that fair?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Once from the date that I was given accountability, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

So could you look at Paragraph 33 in Volume X? Have you got that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

There are 2 documents there. The second document is headed "Executive Summary", do you see that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

This is Site Acceptance Test report, 23 February to 19 March.

Chairman:

No. This is FIDS Status Report, Executive Summary; do you see it, Paragraph 33?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, I have it now.

Hon Margaret NG:

Can you turn to the second page of that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

At the bottom it says "sheet 4 of 20", is that right.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

You can identify that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

The second paragraph says this:

"The lack of a normal FAT step means that the Authority has forgone the usual opportunity to trap faults before delivery. This omission has resulted in a large number of problems caused to the commissioning process which have been aggravated by the requirement to maintain a functional system for training purposes."

As you can see, this is the view of CSE. Do you agree with that view?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, fully.

Hon Margaret NG:

You agree with that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

So you agree that that was the effect of removing the FAT step?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

So you agree that the Pre-SAT does not actually replace FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, the Pre-SAT found those faults.

Hon Margaret NG:

In spite of Pre-SAT, FAT was not replaced. You were telling us earlier that although FAT was cancelled, you thought that that was acceptable in view of the Pre-SAT.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In view of the Pre-SAT at the time, yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

This tells you that because of the cancellation of FAT you have all these problems and you say you fully agree. Is there a contradiction or have I missed it, Mr CHATTERJEE?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The results of the Pre-SAT clearly show that there were many bugs in the system.

Chairman:

Miss Margaret NG asked you in the first place whether you agreed with this finding, and you said you agreed.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

In other words, whatever the Pre-SAT did, it did not actually perform what the normal FAT should have performed.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of finding the bugs, FAT would have found the bugs, the errors.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, I am quite content not to argue with the witness. He said he fully agreed with that. The next paragraph.

"The quality of the delivered system remains unknown since there has been no opportunity to subject the system to the detailed scrutiny of a formal test against a specification."

Does he agree with that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Margaret NG:

Thank you, these are all the questions that I want to ask, Madam Chairman.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

I think according to what you have said, is it right to understand that even though the testing and the commissioning is the decision and responsibility of the Project Division, you are part of the Task Force and you are part of the team, you are the IT expert, so you are the supporting role to support Project Division in terms of IT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Given clear roles identified within the bounds of those roles, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You have the responsible as a member of the Task Force.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As defined by the roles, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

In terms of the evidence that you have given, you have agreed that with the cancellation of FAT you have hoped that the Pre-SAT is going to replace FAT if it is going to be done according to schedule.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

At the time that was the understanding that Pre-SAT would give us an opportunity to conduct.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

That is your comfort level?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That was my comfort level, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

It turns out in the actual situation that the Pre-SAT has not been done according to schedule?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You have lost the comfort level?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Therefore, you raise concerns?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

At that stage what action and what is actually in your mind? What suggestions have you made to try to seek another stage of comfort level or to remedy the situation knowing Pre-SAT does not replace FAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

You are talking about - as a result of the Pre-SAT?

Chairman:

As a result.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Right. The comments from Rita were conveyed to Project Division through Douglas OAKERVEE at the weekly meetings. Mr OAKERVEE pressed EDS for actions that they would take to ensure and recover. My memory is that EDS assured the Authority in the meeting through Mr Michael

KORKOWSKI that EDS would put as many resources as they possibly could to address the problem reports that had appeared.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

From your professional experience and your technical knowledge, can those be recovered?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We were talking in March with SAT starting with prioritisation of the problem reports, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Technically, that is possible?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That was our belief, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You then moved and compromised your comfort level to SAT, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry, let me understand the context.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You have recognised certain problems concerning incomplete Pre-SAT and you have told us that technically those incomplete tests can be recovered.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. We were assured by EDS that they could be recovered. They were working hard on that.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

I am not asking about the assurance of EDS. I am asking, from your professional knowledge, whether technically that is viable or possible?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It was possible, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

If it is possible, when are you going to recover that? In which test are you going to recover that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

You will note from the schedules that we had both SATs, a regression SAT and another regression test. The SAT was conducted and then we monitored EDS's performance in terms of fixing and delivering problem reports. The comfort level, as you put it, would have gone towards the results of the re-SAT and the regression test after that.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

So that would go to SAT and the re-SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

A SAT followed by a re-SAT, followed by, as we did conduct, another regression test.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you gave us information that you have not been given the CSE report at a certain point in time. Exactly when did you start being given the CSE report?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have never ever automatically received the CSE reports. There was only one CSE report that I was involved in, that was a report by CSE in February to Douglas OAKERVEE on the possibility of unzipping Build 2.0 back to its component parts, if I remember correctly.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Can you identify that report? That is the only report that you received? That is the only report you read about CSE?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on my memory, yes. I can confirm with you that I was not a regular receiver of the CSE report.

Chairman:

Was that the report you were asked to advise on whether you could unstash?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There were 2 occasions, Madam Chairman, where I was advised. One was to Billy LAM and we have seen that. The second one was when I was responsible for the notes of the meeting conducted with Douglas OAKERVEE on unstitching Build 2.0 back into its component parts. At that meeting it was attended both by Douglas and CSE who were providing the report. We wanted to go over the report.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Perhaps the witnesses can identify the report subsequently.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. I would be happy to provide that.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You told us and you agree that you moved on your comfort level to SAT and re-SAT. What action and what concrete proposal have you done to actually scrutinise the schedule of the SAT to make sure that what has not been done by FAT and Pre-SAT are recovered in the SAT schedule?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Two things. Rita LEE continued. Yvonne MA, another one of my group, was involved in the day-to-day running of the SAT and the conducting of the tests. The reporting in terms of the results of those tests and whether there was a deferral of functionality or whether it was because of deferral or because of a contention. The request to EDS to provide to us a status report on the level of problem reports, when they were being fixed, how many have been fixed, how many have been raised so that we could judge EDS's progress. That was taken at the weekly meetings and adopted by Douglas OAKERVEE.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Then you proceed personally to monitor the SAT testing?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

On a day-by-day basis as the SAT was being conducted we were getting daily reports on the progress of the SAT, correct.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Then are you happy that the SAT is done in accordance to what you have hoped and scheduled?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I was comfortable that the SAT was done in accordance with the procedures that had been developed and the correct amount of recording of either differences of opinion, success or failure were made, yes.

Chairman:

You were satisfied with the recording. Were you satisfied with the tests?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The tests, if I remember correctly on the SAT, I cannot remember the figure, but I believe something like 90 per cent of the tests were passed.

Chairman:

Passed?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Was it not true that as EDS overcame the PRs and new PRs came up?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Did that not bother you that as you went along to resolve problems new problems cropped up all the time?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Did that not reflect instability of the system?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It did reflect instability of the system. The team made absolutely sure that the PRs were being attended to. There was a period in time where we prioritised the problem reports so that they could be categorised as operationally critical or minor, and that was done. EDS were directed to focus on the operationally critical which lent towards stability. The minor problems like character fonts or

some of those, that process included AMD staff as well as IT staff, and those were made known to EDS. At this point in time EDS were continually assuring us that they would be able to make the schedules. We were getting very deeply involved.

Chairman:

But the question was, were you satisfied that FIDS was indeed stable enough for AOD given that during those tests when PRs were resolved new PRs kept cropping up? So while you were actually debugging on the one hand, new bugs were actually discovered. Did that not illustrate to you instability of the system?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Instability of the system in March and April, yes. There was deep concern about instability of the system. The only process was through Project Division to push EDS and EDS was being pushed. It was not until June that we began to feel more comfortable with stability. During that time, even with a third trial where the results were more successful, we were still having concerns about the stability and still pushing EDS.

Chairman:

I would really like to break here for perhaps 10 minutes. We have to consider the way ahead.

(The hearing resumed at 12:08 pm)

Chairman:

The hearing resumes. 張永森議員。

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you just now told us that you were happy that the SAT, being a vigorous SAT, was being done on schedule and to your satisfaction, is that correct?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

According to the revised schedule, yes.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Can I refer you to Paragraph 34 in Volume X, which is a report done by Rita LEE of your Division. If you look at Page 3 on the section on recommendations, the second paragraph of the recommendations, it was pointed out:

"The SAT basically concentrated on testing the application software for driving the display device's. Hardware configuration (such as host server failover), network and stress/ volume tests were not conducted. Extensive tests on these areas must be conducted in the re-SAT before plant integration."

Again, clearly your staff has reported to you that they are not satisfied with the SAT arrangement. There are tests that have not been done and now the suggestion is to postpone that to re-SAT. It is a further postponement. Is that your understanding?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Your question is, was I satisfied with the SAT? As per the new schedule, it was conducted satisfactorily. The answer I gave you was yes. There were tests that could not have been completed. These recommendations were made very clearly. Look at each of these. Host server failover is a test that has got nothing to do with the application, it has a lot to do with the technical operations. I was satisfied that the results and recommendations that came out of it, that we had not missed anything.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

This clearly says that certain tests were not conducted. What do you mean by "not conducted"?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My understanding was that they could not be conducted at that time.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

You expect that to be conducted and after the SAT you thought that it could not be conducted? I do not understand. Are those tests included in the schedule in respect of the test for SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I cannot answer that question without going back to the documentation. I cannot remember that.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you told us just now that the tests could not be conducted. So you thought that you just accepted that those tests could not be conducted, that is it. I think the question must be asked, if those tests were scheduled to be conducted and reported to you as not conducted, your comfort level must have diminished?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

As I said, Madam Chairman, the comfort level was low in terms of instability. I admitted it. These recommendations were put forward as a result and we have got an assurance from Project Division and EDS that these tests would be followed up.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

But not carried out.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Right. I cannot remember ...

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Then why were you satisfied?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I cannot remember the reasons why they were not carried out. There must have been a reason at that time.

Chairman:

Never mind the reasons. Your job or the job of your staff was to ensure that the tests were carried out. When your staff told you that certain tests which she felt ought to have been carried out but were not carried out, it must have affected your assessment of confidence and reliability of these tests?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

Why did you tell us that you were satisfied?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The satisfaction was in the context of, was the SAT and the purpose of the SAT in terms of schedule carried out, the answer was yes.

Chairman:

No. I asked you whether you were satisfied with the SAT, and you said yes.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In that case I misunderstood you, madam, I am sorry.

Chairman:

In that case can you answer that question again? Were you satisfied with the SAT tests in terms of giving you confidence and comfort as far as the system was concerned?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Overall there was an improvement in the comfort, but as we see here some tests still needed to be completed and those tests were not completed until the re-SAT. Overall improvement in comfort.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Now you are pushing what has not been completed further down to re-SAT. Are you happy with re-SAT? The result of re-SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I believe there was an improvement.

Chairman:

Were you satisfied with re-SAT, I think that was the question?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I would need to refer back to the documentation in order to be complete. I believe that improvement continued. In terms of failover tests, and stress and loading tests, they still were not done by re-SAT.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you seem to give me an impression that even as at today you are not very sure what has been done in FAT, SAT, Pre-SAT and re-SAT. You seem to suggest that you need to refer back to the result of those important tests. Why do you need to do that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because these activities took place 8 months ago, there was an enormous amount of activity going off on the side.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

I am not asking you about details. I am asking you whether you were

satisfied or not satisfied.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That talks to the details, Madam Chairman, I am sorry.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Do you have an overall impression of your impression of whether you were satisfied with the re-SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The impression overall, as I said, was there were improvement but still tests were outstanding that did not completely provide comfort. I have said that already.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

To those defects and discomforts, what sort of action do you propose to remedy that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I followed the only line of action. I was to impress upon Project Division through Paul EVANS and Douglas OAKERVEE and through that channel press EDS to put either more resources or provide assurances. There was no other channel that I could take because of the contract structure even at that time.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Are you giving this Committee the impression that whatever defects and problems arise from SAT and re-SAT there are something that can be remedied just simply by assurances of EDS and just simply by assurances from Project Division?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That was the only course of action I had to take sir. The responsibility and even at the lower level decision making was still the responsibility of Project Division and the project team.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Is there a time that you are under any impression that this sort of situation is irreversible, irrecoverable, since the delay, the compromise and the comfort level has been pushing down closer and closer to AOD? Realistically from your professional competence, are all these recoverable? Are you able to catch up with all this?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Evidence in March showed that they looked as if they were able to recover. In re-SAT in April, there was an improvement and genuinely they were able to get towards July. Was I comfortable? Would I have been comfortable? No. I had already said in February that we would not be entirely comfortable if we did not have 4 to 6 months of settling down. I had said that. But weighed against an opening date which was not moving.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

In which document have you said that?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My memo to Billy LAM dated 10 February.

Chairman:

Before all these tests? We are now talking about at SAT, at that stage. We are asking you about your assessment of the situation as a result of tests conducted under SAT?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Recovering would be exceptionally tight. Every effort was going to be made to reduce the number of problem reports and complete those tests ready for opening.

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Why did you not actually raise that again after the re-SAT in April?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We were doing that at the weekly meetings with Douglas OAKERVEE and CEO. Unfortunately, they were not minuted. At those meetings Douglas would turn to EDS and say, “What are you going to do about it?”

Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum:

Can you give us one recollection of exactly what sort of wording you told Mr OAKERVEE about your concern, your objection or your comments? Give us a recollection.

Chairman:

Maybe you can supply that afterwards. 李永達議員。

李永達議員：

主席，陳達志先生是否同意，在安裝航班資料顯示系統前，除需進行“FAT”、“Pre-SAT”、“SAT”及“Re-SAT”外，還需進行一系列測試，包括“regression test, resilience test, stress and loading test, reliability test, response time test, data integrity test and display check”？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, under normal circumstances.

李永達議員：

你是否贊同，為了確定航班資料顯示系統是否穩定、可靠及能否有效運作，這6項測試是很重要的？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

李永達議員：

根據你的記憶，這6項測試(即“regression test, resilience test, stress and loading test, reliability test, response time test, data integrity test and display check”)曾否進行？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Response time tests and stress and loading tests were not conducted.

李永達議員：

“Response time test”及“stress and loading test”並沒有進行。據你所知，其他測試(包括“regression test, resilience test, reliability test, data integrity test and display check”)有否進行？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I cannot remember whether the data integrity test was conducted but the others were. Data integrity I need to double-check.

李永達議員：

你認為曾進行其中3項測試(即“regression test, resilience test, reliability test”)。這3項測試的結果如何？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

From the re-SAT and the regression tests, we drew a conclusion that there was an opening day version we could use in terms of its application.

Hon LEE Wing-tat: (in Cantonese)

Resilience?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There is one test which you forgot, if I may, the plant integration tests.

李永達議員：

我稍後會問。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The resilience and reliability tests were conducted in the middle of June, ending in June.

李永達議員：

我想問測試的結果。

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Improved stability, yes.

李永達議員：

請不要用“improved”這字。我想知道測試的結果能否使你認為該系統穩定、可靠，又能有效運作？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. We came to that conclusion.

李永達議員：

你有沒有看過“FIDS daily site progress meeting records”？你有沒有這份文件？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry, Madam Chairman, I need to refer - could you be a little bit more clearer in terms of which?

李永達議員：

我不想說文件的編號，我只想你回答，你有否或曾否聽聞“FIDS daily site progress meeting records”？

Chairman:

You were given the site records, were you not, on a daily basis?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The daily site ...

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

The daily site progress meeting.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, through Paul EVANS.

李永達議員：

這些紀錄是否顯示，“resilience test”事實上並不成功，而“reliability test”亦沒有完成(即“incomplete”)？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Because there were some failover tests that had to be completed after, yes.

李永達議員：

既然其中一項測試並未完成，而另一項則不成功，為何你剛才表示對這些測試的結果感到滿意？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

You asked me for a comment based on the tests that had been completed. There were some failover tests that took place in June, from around about 20-21 June. After those tests had been completed, we began to feel that the system was far more reliable. I was answering based on that time frame. Within the time frame, just reliability tests, no, there were some failures.

李永達議員：

我知道在機場啟用後，你有再進行測試，但你承認在機場啟用前未有進行“response time test”及“stress and loading test”，而“resilience test”及“reliability test”雖曾進行，但實際上並不成功或未完成。既然在機場啟用前，這6項測試當中有那麼多項未進行、不成功或未完成，為何你

仍然充滿信心，相信這個系統穩定、可靠，並能正常運作？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Reliability and stability, there were tests that followed up after. In the 22-23 June week, that increased our comfort. We went through a 14 June trial. The 14 June trial emulated a full day. In terms of the same period, it was a half day that it emulated. The results from that 14 June trial was that FIDS was stable but there were problems with monitors. There was something like 101 monitors which were going to be addressed. That was the first thing. The second thing, stability or availability of the hardware at that time was 98 per cent. Throughout the whole 2 weeks, it went down to 91 per cent because of various things, but there was stability at that range. Thirdly, the system has fall-back as it has 2 servers. There are 2 computer systems. One is a hot stand-by that takes over as a result of the problems with the first one. So if there is a problem with one, the other one will take over.

Chairman:

This is the stand-by system?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. The FIDS system has 2 computer systems, so I am just talking within those 2 computer systems. You add the result of the 14 June trial and you have got an application that is usable. According to AMD, known things still have to be fixed but EDS beginning to fix them. 95 per cent monitors, the indications were that we would be able to open. That discussion took place in a GEC/EDS meeting with Douglas and it was a collective decision to which I agreed.

Chairman:

Was AMD represented in that meeting?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, AMD were not represented in those meetings.

李永達議員：

主席，即使有些測試未完成或未做，你是否認為第5次測試(即“fifth trial”)令你信心增強？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

李永達議員：

請你參閱吳其成先生致徐景祥先生的信件，即第IX冊文件B220-12。這是“K S NG”於6月11日寫給“K C TSUI”的信件，而你亦收到這信件的副本。吳其成先生在信中表示非常擔心航班資料顯示系統，他列出38項他認為重要但仍未完成的項目。他在“remarks”(即備註)內指出，該38個項目中有很多沒有“workarounds”，而你看過這信件後亦有作出回覆，向他表明應如何處理有關事宜。在那階段，你是否認為應妥善完成該38個項目，並再測試系統是否穩定，以確定在機場啟用時，系統可達到運作暢順、穩定和可靠的目標？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

When this came out I was very, very concerned because he was looking at it from a user's point of view. This was brought up at the next weekly meeting which was a couple of days later. I particularly brought this up with Douglas and said that this was an area of concern. Douglas agreed and we immediately put together the right people. We had AMD, Vivian and our people, Rita, the Project people, Paul EVANS as well as EDS to go through the individual points, one by one, and identify actions that EDS would take before AOD. Those internal meetings continued and it ended up on a meeting on 17 June that I called where I wanted to know one way or another what the problems were. We reviewed those 38 items.

李永達議員：

你除了與一批同事一同檢討及跟進處理該38個項目外，其實你跟進處理該等項目後有沒有再進行測試？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Where there were technical solution, my understanding was that those tests had been completed. For example, the first one is response time. Memory had been added and there was agreement that the response time was better. In the end it was not but at that time it was better.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, the question was, with the outstanding items you did something to them, were they tested after something was done and was there a report of the tests done on them if tests had been conducted?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, there was no report on whether the tests had been conducted.

李永達議員：

雖然你已與同事討論如何解決這些問題，但該38個項目如此重要，為何在作出決定前，你們不再進行測試，以確定該等項目能否達到你們所要求的效果？為何你有信心，無需再進行測試？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was a mix of things that were tested and agreed. In the record on 17 June it is written what the workarounds would be. I was basing my decision on the response that I was getting from the people in that meeting.

李永達議員：

陳先生，當時已是6月11日，加上這些項目很重要，為何你不堅持進行測試？你曾盡力解決這些問題，但如要確定問題是否獲得徹底解決，則須進行測試，你為甚麼不進行測試？你其後在6月18日向“Vivian CHEUNG, Rita LEE, Karen DRIVER, Kenneth SIM”發出“memo”，並把副本送交“CEO”。你在“memo”指出，“It was agreed that there are no outstanding showstopper items preventing the AA from using FIDS from AOD”，請問你如何得出這個結論？你根本沒有測試該38個項目，在未該等項目“fixed”了之後系統能否合理運作、是否穩定和可靠前，你便寫這封“memo”，你認為這是否負責任的做法？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes, I was, in the sense that the meeting had been called.

李永達議員：

請問你為何在未經測試的情況下寫這份“memo”？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

A number of workarounds were known to be working.

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

I want to know the operational side, the stability and reliability of the main system. Do not talk about workarounds. Workaround is another item that we will follow. 我想問你為何在未經測試的情況下便寫這份“memo”？為甚麼？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I was basing my opinion on the response that I was getting from professionals at that meeting. I went around to every single person, looked them in the eye and said, "Are there any problems stopping us?" They were saying, "Including workarounds, no." Did I after that ask them to specifically test everything? No, I did not.

李永達議員：

你是否認為，你身為一位專業人士，除須徵詢你同事的意見外，更保險的方法是在“fixing”之後，再測試系統一次。這樣，即使你同事估計錯誤，你亦有補救方法。這是“common sense”，我即使不是“professional”，也知道要這樣做。你為何不進行測試？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Mainly because there were a number of workarounds known to work.

Hon LEE Wing-tat:

Do not talk about workarounds.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I am sorry, but workarounds are an important thing because we were talking about airport opening.

Chairman:

Mr CHATTERJEE, you have spotted 38 critical problems which could impact on AOD. You called a meeting, you acted on it, you called a meeting to set in motion the process of resolving the 38 problems. The question is what step did you take to ascertain that actions you took or the various parties took, indeed, arrested these problems to get the airport ready for AOD? I think that question needs to be answered.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

In terms of a formal set of steps where I asked them to report back to me formally, I did not take that.

Chairman:

Formally or informally, did you actually take any action to ascertain that whatever measures you set in motion in your meeting of the 17th, they indeed achieved the result that it would in fact rendered the system stable for AOD?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Of course, there was continuous monitoring. For example, again slow response time. Although improvement was noted here and acceptable for airport opening, we were continuously monitoring the performance of the system with the tests that continued. As a result, at the end of June there was another upgrading in memory. Flight missing for displays because of faulty lines. Change the assignment to bypass the monitor. We know that that was done.

Chairman:

No. I think Mr LEE asked you this question. You know that certain

steps were going to be taken. You knew that these steps had been taken. How did you ascertain that in fact the result that you wanted to ensure before AOD in fact happened? I think that is behind his question of whether you took the tests. For example, very slow response time, you told us that action had been taken. How did you know that these actions which had been taken in fact achieved the result you wanted them to achieve? In fact, the results were not achieved, were they, because on very slow response time that was one of the crucial problems that you had on AOD?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on information that we had at the time, Madam Chairman, yes. There was a problem on slow response time on AOD. We noted it, made the improvements, but when it came to AOD, it was not enough.

李永達議員：

證人已重覆這個答案多次，我亦不想就這問題再追問。據我了解，吳其成先生告訴你需要跟進處理該38個項目，而你採取行動後，並沒有進行測試，以確定解決問題後，系統能否達到預期的效果，即系統能夠穩定、可靠，並且正常地運作。最重要的是，你身為“IT Head”，你向多位同事和行政總監發出這份“memo”，指出“no showstopper item”，以致他們每個人均根據該份“memo”，表示認為系統沒有問題。你是否知道這份“memo”可能對未經專業訓練的行政人員造成很大影響？若你當時說“*There are still some showstopper items*”，你的高層管理人員，甚至機場管理局，便可能會重新考慮機場啟用日期的問題。由於你向他們保證系統沒有問題，使他們安心，因此他們仍然把機場啟用日期定於7月6日。你是否認為這份“memo”有很大影響？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, the memo is not questionable. It was provided based on evidence and reports that I was getting from individuals in that meeting. In the meeting I had the professionals of EDS, I had my professionals in IT, I had the professionals within AMD present at that meeting. It was a very clear picture to me that they were saying, no, there were no show-stoppers.

李永達議員：

我剛才說你沒有堅持進行測試，這方面我不再重覆。我想問的是，

在7月6日機場啟用時出現的問題中，是否有很多項(例如剛才主席說的“slow response time”)其實已包括在該38個項目內。雖然你的同事告訴你該等問題已經“fixed”，但問題卻依然發生。你是否認為這些事情反映你辦事不夠謹慎、全面和徹底？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, I disagree in the sense that when you have got a big system that is brought in terms of stability. There are bugs that are always going to be found and problems always going to be found. We got to AOD, fixing as many of the problems and identifying as many of the workarounds as we possibly could within our knowledge at the time.

李永達議員：

你有沒有估計，如“bugs”未能徹底解決，又未能提供“workarounds”，就會造成這問題？

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. The assurances that I was getting at that late date on 17 June was that these items could be managed by the people that were going to be managing them.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, the witness has said several times that he relied on specialists in his department when he came to the view that there are no show-stoppers. Can he please name these people so that we can follow up with them?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Rita LEE is with IT and Vivian CHEUNG is with AMD.

Hon Margaret NG:

Is the witness saying that he relied on the views of these 2 people to arrive at the conclusion that there were no show-stopper items?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Just now you were saying that although all these outstanding items are there, you think that there are enough workarounds to take care of them. Is that correct?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is the message I was getting, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

If I may refer you to Paper no. B272, Volume XI.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have it.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

It is a memo from K S NG to K C TSUI of Project Division, copied to yourself.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

He did in this memo say that he had a concern about whether or not AMD - if I just read out that part for you:

"...you will appreciate that neither AMD nor IT would have sufficient resources to operate the FIDS with so many workarounds."

He raised the concern in his memo because the reliance on the large number of workarounds may not give the results as desired.

Chairman:

Because they did not have sufficient resources.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Do you have any comment to make on this one?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

This memo followed the earlier memo on the outstanding issues of FIDS, which are the 38 issues.

Chairman:

No, this came before.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

No, before, 8 June.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

He is referring to above memo of 6 June of Vivian's. I am just wondering if I could refer back to that one.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The other memo is dated 11 June.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

He is referring to Vivian's memo of 6 June. I am just wondering if I can refer back to that one. Do we have that?

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

We do not have that one.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It is important to understand the context upon which this was ...

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

According to this memo here, Mr NG refers to Vivian CHEUNG's memo to Mr K C TSUI on 6 June highlighting those major outstanding PRs of FIDS which would have an impact on airport operations.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

My memory, I think it is wrong. Is that still referring to some of these 38 outstanding items?

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The 38 came afterwards.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I realise that, but there is a period where those 38 came to prominence. I think that it is to do with that. We need to double-check that.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Do you agree that you were forewarned ...

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Absolute, absolutely.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

I think we will have to follow that one up later.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I absolutely agree with you.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Can I refer you to the FIDS trial? The next reference, Paper no. B273. This is the problem log for the FIDS trial which took place on 14 June.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You realised that there were a number of items for the IT Division to carry out?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

These items are all for the contractor to carry out. These are reports by IT and AMD that were to be fed back to the contractor via the Project Division for them to carry out.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

It shows that the number of PRs is really large.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Sorry, Mr HO, these are not PRs.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The number of outstanding items is quite substantial.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

These consist of reports and observations that were made by the observing

team during the trial on the 14th. There were reports about monitors not showing displays. There are reports that a check-in desk could not display its logo, so there were some logo problems. There are a variety of observations here that consist of logos, monitors, response times, but mostly monitors. As a result, I think you will find in other evidence that there was something like 101 monitors that were not working.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

How would you rate the performance of the fifth trial or the results of the fifth trial?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It was a successful trial from the way we were, from the feedback we were getting. These problems were either known PRs being fixed or monitors that were not working.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You attended the ADSCOM meeting on 4 July?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Shortly before AOD.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

At the meeting on FIDS you reported that permanent FIDS continued to be stable.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

If you refer to - I am not sure whether you had NAPCO's Sit-Rep reports?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You had the impression that the test was successful, the trial was successful?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That was the collective belief, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Paper no. A47 in Volume I, this was the AOR Status Report.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

This is FIDS recommendations from the management, this is the one you were familiar with.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The permanent FIDS also again reported here as sufficiently stable.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Despite that a number of things still had to be rectified on 14 June?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Overall stability. There were monitor problems, 101 monitors, that signifies 5 per cent out of 1,900-odd monitors. Monitors we thought could be fixed and depended on. By the time this report had been made and had gone to the Board, stability had improved and we were feeling much more comfortable about stability. We were also feeling much more comfortable about the application, the package, the users plus the workarounds. On that basis we made these recommendations to the Board, yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

On AOD the result was there was substantial instability of the system.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, there was not. In terms of instability there was response time problem where it was beginning to get slower because of error messages that were building up.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The slow response, you do not think that that is to do with stability?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Slow response means that the system was working but moving slower. That is the approach that we were taking. It was the system but from a user's point of view the system was not just working.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You have got two problems, slow response and also instability. You are saying that these were not the problems?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No, slow response was a problem.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Do you think this has something to do with the preparation of SAT requirements?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

No. It was continuous testing. Your question is, could we have found that in SAT? Really, is that what you are really asking?

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Yes.

Chairman:

Perhaps we should ask you, SAT, then there was also re-SAT, then after that you had these meetings trying to arrest all these problems, and you told us that there was no testing after those actions?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

There was continuous testing all the way up to airport opening because we added more memory, for example.

Chairman:

So you were satisfied that all the tests in fact delivered to you a system which was AOD ready?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

All of us were satisfied up to that point in time. We truly believed, I truly believed that we would be able to open.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Do you accept the report from Miss Rita LEE in Paragraph 34 in Volume X that she thought the script writer for SAT did not have enough airport operation experience.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes. That was supplemented by the fact Rita was there as well as in further tests we had AMD completely involved and there were intense sessions during SAT with AMD people. These meetings lasted until 11 o'clock, 12 o'clock at night from the morning. They were very intense.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

Based on that, you were satisfied?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Based on that ...

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

With the recommendations that you put forward to ADSCOM?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

The same document, Paper no. A47, I would like to ask you point 3 under Paragraph 8 at the bottom of that page.

"As a permanent measure, weekly flight schedules be maintained also in a stand-by FIDS system so that data is always current and immediate cut-over to the stand-by system can be made if the main system fails."

Could you explain "immediate cut-over"?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

"Cut-over" means that at any point in the time of the day, following the procedures, we could cut-over to the stand-by.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

"Immediate cut-over", what does that mean?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Immediate cut-over does not imply, as you are asking, immediate, electronic switch cut-over. But the decision could be made to cut-over at any time given that the procedures of setting the stand-by system up and making the physical changes are followed. We could do it at any time.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

You could do it at any time?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

What is the time element involved?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Now you are asking about stand-by FIDS?

Chairman:

I think we better leave it until tomorrow.

Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:

We will come back to this one tomorrow.

Chairman:

Miss CHOY So-yuk.

Hon CHOY So-yuk:

I have a simple follow-up question to Mr LEE's previous question about Papers B220-13 and B220-12. We are referring to the letter from K S NG to K C TSUI. There you said you were aware of the whole list of crucial items that were still outstanding. One week after this memo was sent, i.e. on 18 June, you send out this letter to the various persons saying that there were no outstanding show-stoppers.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct.

Hon CHOY So-yuk:

You were saying that during that week you were told by Vivian CHEUNG and Rita LEE that there would be no show-stopper items. I would like Mr CHATTERJEE to tell us exactly what kind of paper or what kind of wording these staff told you to convince you that within this week you were able to come to the conclusion that there would be no show-stopper items.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Some clarification, thank you for allowing me to do that. Number 1. The original list showed the 38 items and AMD's view of workarounds. There was a meeting immediately with Vivian and her staff, Rita and Yvonne and her staff in Project Division. They worked on the list and they agreed actions. Those actions are recorded. Then I had a meeting. I did not obtain opinions but got those individuals together with me in my office. I sat them down at the table and I said, "Yes, right, I want to go through this one, one by one." It was an actual meeting with all of them present.

Hon CHOY So-yuk:

You were saying that there were no minutes for that meeting?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

The notes of that meeting are recorded as my handwriting.

Hon CHOY So-yuk:

Could Mr CHATTERJEE show us that document?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It is Paper no. B220-13.

Chairman:

Attached to your notes of the 18th, right?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

It was part of my witness statement, Madam Chairman, I show that as Paper no. B220-13.

Chairman:

This was a note which had an enclosure which contained your handwriting.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

That is correct. The process was, all four around the table, including myself, each and every single raw discussed, understood and agreement put down using my handwriting. I felt that that was the fastest way I could get.

Hon CHOY So-yuk:

Would Mr CHATTERJEE feel that this is already good enough to come to the conclusion? Without an actual integrated testing but in the original ...

Chairman:

We have already covered that. We have asked that question.

Hon Margaret NG:

Madam Chairman, a small clarification. So it is not that Rita LEE or Vivian CHEUNG told you that there were no show-stoppers. You have talked to them, listened to what they have to say about the problems and you arrive at the conclusion that there are no show-stoppers?

Head of Information Technology, AA:

We all arrived at the conclusion, Miss NG. Because at the end of this meeting with all of us there, I went around to every person around this table and I said, "Are there anything?" And they said no. That is what I based it on.

Chairman:

I think that time is running out. There is still quite a crucial area that we have not covered. Apart from certain other isolated questions we would still like to ask on other systems. Primarily, we still have to finish off FIDS with questions on the stand-by system which is under your area of responsibility.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Yes.

Chairman:

In which case we would have to ask you to come back tomorrow at 2:30 pm.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

I have a problem in that I am scheduled for the Commission. They rescheduled their schedule in order to fit me coming here. Then I am slated,

basically, for the next 3 to 4 days with the Commission of Inquiry. May I make a suggestion, Madam Chairman? Is there any way we could perhaps do this in writing?

Chairman:

It is a bit difficult with the stand-by system.

Hon Margaret NG:

Can we discuss this before getting back to this witness seeing that tomorrow afternoon is not a possibility.

Chairman:

We will have to ascertain whether it is a possibility. We do not know how the schedule is being run on the other side. What we will do is, we will come back to you on a date. You will need to come and answer on the stand-by system because it is very complex. Thank you very much. Also, can you provide the Clerk with some of the papers that we have asked for, whether they exist or not. If they exist, then let us have them. If not, you have to let us know.

Head of Information Technology, AA:

Would you have any objection Madam to the letter that I send being signed by Tom? As it turns out, I have got a meeting with the barristers all afternoon. Tom will find the papers and send them on my behalf.

Chairman:

Legal Advisor, is that possible because we'll admit that as evidence.

Legal Advisor:

I think, Mr CHATTERJEE is going to come some day.

Chairman:

立法會調查赤鱘角新香港國際機場自1998年7月6日

開始運作時所出現的問題的原委及有關事宜

專責委員會

Legislative Council Select Committee to inquire into the circumstances
leading to the problems surrounding the commencement of the operation of
the new Hong Kong International Airport at Chek Lap Kok
since 6 July 1998 and related issues

OK. The papers can be submitted in the name of Mr LAM, but when you come we will formalise the process. Thank you.

(The hearing ended at 1:02 pm)