26 January 2002

Ms Connie Szeto
Clerk to the Panel on Commerce and Industry
Legislative Council Secretariat
3/F, Citibank Tower
3 Garden Road
Hong Kong

Dear Ms Szeto,

Legislative Council Panel on Commerce and Industry, 14 January 2002
Proposed New Exhibition Centre at Chek Lap Kok

At the Commerce and Industry Panel meeting on 14 January 2002, we agreed to seek the agreement of the Chairman of the Hong Kong Exhibition and Convention Organisers' and Suppliers' Association (HKECOSA) to provide Members with a copy of his letter of 11 January to the Airport Authority (AA).

The letter (copy at Enclosure A) proposes a number of improvements and modifications to the initial design concept put forward by the AA of the new exhibition centre at Chek Lap Kok. We also enclose a position paper setting out the Government's and the AA's joint response to the letter from HKECOSA (copy at Enclosure B).

Yours sincerely,

(M J T Rowse)
Director-General of Investment Promotion

Encl.

Enclosure A

HKECOSA
香港展覽會議業協會
HONG KONG EXHIBITION AND CONVENTION ORGANISES' AND SUPPLIERS' ASSOCIATION

11 January 2002

Mr.Allen Yeung
Airport Authority HONG KONG
1 Cheong Yiu Road
Hong Kong International Airport
Lantau
Hong Kong

Dear Allan,

Re: HKECOSA's input for Cox's 'Design Brief' for the new exhibition facility at the Airport

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to put forward our Association's views. Since we have not received any minutes of the meeting held on 10 Dec 2001, we feel obliged to write formally to register our concerns.

Our views are summarized as follows:

1. It would be good to keep the principal dimension of each hall to 100m x 100m, perfect square, like the Singapore Expo. However, at lease two halls should be divisible into two halves. Therefore, it is very important to maintain the perfect square hall dimension so that when a hall is divided, the divided space will not be too narrow a rectangle. The plan presented by Cox showing five 90m x 110m rectangular halls with visitor access foyer at the narrower side is objectionable.

2. The ceiling height of 16m is good, like the Singapore Expo. It should be kept uniform throughout all the halls.

3. The cargo entrances, utility trenches running at 6 m apart at Singapore Expo are practical and useful.
4. The 50,000 sq m should be built at one go and as early as possible, to meet the market demand. In fact, members feel that the total budget of HK$4 b is enough

to build a 100, 000 sq m facility which is what HK needs by the year 2005. The AA should expand the plot size for this project as the plot size is still not quite finalized yet.

5. Should the construction be split into 2 phases, piling for the 2nd phase should be completed together with the first phase. This will minimize disturbances to the users of the first phase facility.

6. The facility would have roof area totalling well over 50,000 m. If it can be designed to collect rain water for cooling the air-con systems, flushing and washing toilets, watering plants……., it would be a big saving for the operator of this facility. It is also a good 'green' practice that Hong Kong can be proud of .

7. Out of the total building budget, it would be good to allocated a budget or minor modification / rectification of the facility after an initial period of operation. There are always need to alter certain parts of the facility to suit situations not thought of at design stage. It is of course essential to minimize this type of additional works and therefore we would like the Design Consultant to take note of the details listed under point no.8 which has 13 sub-points.

8. According to the Position Paper submitted by HKECOSA to the Government in February 2001, the exhibition industry would like to have a practical / functional and 'no-frills' facility. We are definitely against having any expensive 'design' or 'iconic' features which are not cost effective and serving mainly the 'aesthetic needs'. We expect that such additional building costs finally be translated into rental cost which will be borne by users. It is therefore essential that the problems of Singapore Expo are recognized and addressed. The main issues are :

   a. One of the key design features presented by Cox i.e. was the centralize Grand Foyer, like the Singapore Expo. This is not cost effective and it particularly fails to serve common situations when there are multiple events taking place simultaneously. Each hall should have its own self sufficient foyer. At Singapore Expo, each hall has only a 'foyer walkway', not even a foyer. The situation was made worse by having the glass curtain wall of the foyer walkway sloping inwards which aggravated the already narrow foyer walkway of each hall.

   In short, this 'central grand foyer' design concept is widely considered a major pitfall of Singapore Expo and we would not want to see the same mistake

repeated in Hong Kong.

b. The central grand foyer of Singapore expo is like a ‘fire wall’ that makes Halls 1&2 of Singapore Expo very obscure and unpopular. It is important to make all halls equal as much as possible for maximum untility.

c. Singapore Expo’s roof has motorised ventilation louvres which cost extra money but users expressed that this feature hardly serves the intended purpose. In fact Singapore Expo ended up spending more money to block out the natural lighting that came through the lourves because the natural lighting cause disturbance to many technology shows. The roof should be simple flat roof like Shanghai Pudong’s new facility designed by Germans who are also investors. HKECOSA Members present at the meeting would like Cox and AA decision to make a trip to Pudong and learn from their simple, elegant and highly functional exhibition facility.

d. A number of users criticized that the outdoor sheds with lourve roof in front of the foyer should have been a proper water proof roof to cater for the needs of users. It rains so often in Singapore hat most users had to put up another roof below the lourve roof to provide cover from rain.

e. Toilet facilities are grossly inadequate whenever a concert is held at Singapore Expo. For normal trade shows, this is not a big problem.

f. Space for loading and unloading are inadequate at Singapore Expo and it is expected to be a problem since the plot available is not big enough for the intended facility, going by prevailing plot and hall size ratios in Germany.

g. Carparks are inadequate when ever the Singapore Expo is fully used. Singapore Expo should have 6000 care park lots for their 60, 000 sq m of covered hall space. Therefore, the HK Centre should have at least some 3000 car parking space.

h. Catering facility is inadequate at Sijngapore Expo. Each hall should have basic cafeteria kitchen facility so that not all catering needs are served by the central foyer.

i. Signage at Singapore Expo needs improvements. There should be large electronic signs at major / strategic entry points to announce what events are in which halls.

j. Covered access from Central Foyer to halls 1 & 2 are narrow an the outdoor access is not useful because it rains so often in Singapore.

k. Conference facilities should not be all centralized. Each hall should have some class-room size seminar rooms each can hold 40-50 people. The whole Centre should have one conference hall to hold 500-500 people, plus 2 smaller ones to hold 200 people.

l. The construction of the mezzanine floor for organiszrs' office is not cost-effective and it disturbs the perfect square dimension of the halls. This is not good for booth layout.

m. Raw space exhibitors taking big chunks of space have to place fire hydrants in their booth. This could be a local fire regulation problem or design problem to be resolved.

n. The foyer walkway at Singapore Expo was initially not air-conditioned. Air-con had be to installed to rectify the situation.

We hope our above points could help Hong Kong build the second large scale exhibition facility that would meet the requirements of the Hong Kong exhibition industry.

Lastly, we would like to re-iterate our interest to join the working committee for this project which is now in the good hands of the Hong Kong Airport Authority.

Thank you for your attention and support.

Yours sincerely,

Louis Cheng
Chairman
HKECOSA

Cc: Mr. Mike Rowse, Director-General, Invest HK
Mr. Hans Bakker, Commercial Director, HK Airport Authority

Enclosure B

Joint Response of the Government and Hong Kong Airport Authority to the Letter from HKECOSA dated 11 January 2002

	Summary of Comments from HKECOSA	**AA/Government Response**
1	It would be good to keep the principal dimension of each hall to 100 m x 100 m, perfect square, like the Singapore Expo. At lease two of the halls should be divisible into two halves and the divided space will not be too narrow a rectangle.	Agreed with the requirement but there are cost implications. The long span column free structure and operable walls required to sub-divide the halls would incur costs.
2	The ceiling height of 16 m is good, like the Singapore Expo. It should be kept uniform throughout all the halls.	Agreed to adopt ceiling height similar to Singapore Expo. The ceiling height in Singapore Expo ranges from lowest 10 m to highest 16 m.
3	The cargo entrances, utility trenches running at 6 m apart at Singapore Expo are practical and useful.	Agreed.
4	The 50,000 sq. m should be built at one go and as early as possible to meet the market demand. In fact, Members feel that with the budget of HK$4 billion, it is enough to build a 100,000 sq. m facility which is what HK needs by the year 2005. The AA should expand the plot size for this project as the plot size is still not quite finalised yet.	Agreed in principle. Subject to further views gathered during the international road show, we are prepared to go straight to single phase development of 50,000 sq. m. We are keen to go ahead as soon as possible. The actual cost will only be known once the design is developed and the construction contract competitively tendered. If the cost is lower than present estimates, we will have the choice of <u>either</u> saving on the amount spent <u>or</u> building a larger facility for the same budget. AA has agreed to make available sufficient land to allow the ready expansion of the centre from a 50,000 sq. m to a 80,000 sq. m one. If necessary to meet the needs at the industry, there are options for going to 100,000 or more sq. m.

5	Should the construction be split into two phases, piling for the 2nd phase should be completed together with the first phase. This will minimise disturbances to the users of the 1st phase facility.	Agreed in principle but single phase now preferred.
6	The facility would have roof area totalling well over 50,000 sq. m. If it can be designed to collect rainwater for cooling the air-conditioning systems, flushing and washing toilets, watering plants, it would be a big saving for the operator of this facility. It is also a good 'green' practice that Hong Kong can proud of.	Agreed in principle but there are cost implications as a full water supply system from reliable source will still be needed for back up.
7	Out of the total building budget, it would be good to allocate a budget for minor modification/rectification of the facility after an initial period of operation. There are always needs to alter certain parts of the facility to suit situations not thought of at design stage.	Agreed. This can also be provided through a special sinking fund from the operating expenses account.
8	Design issues related with cost effectiveness of the centre: a. One of the key design features presented by Cox, i.e. was the centralised Grand Foyer, like the Singapore Expo. This is not cost effective and it particularly fails to serve common situations when there are multiple events taking place simultaneously. Each hall should have its own self sufficient foyer. At Singapore Expo, each hall has only a /foyer walkway', not even a foyer. The situation was made worse by having the glass curtain wall of the foyer walkway sloping inwards which aggravated the already narrow foyer walkway of each hall. In short, this 'central grand foyer' design concept is widely considered a major pitfall of Singapore Expo, and we would not want to see the same mistake repeated in Hong Kong.	Agreed but there are cost implications. Wider pre-function space will increase building area and construction costs significantly.

	b. The central Grand Foyer of Singapore Expo is like a 'fire wall' that makes Halls 1 & 2 of Singapore Expo very obscure and unpopular. It is important to make all halls equal as much as possible for maximum utility.	Concern noted, agree to take into account in detailed design.
	c. Singapore Expo's roof has motorised ventilation louvers which cost extra money but users expressed that this feature hardly serve the intended purpose. In fact Singapore Expo ended up spending more money to block out the natural lighting that came through the lourves because the natural lighting cause disturbance to many technology shows. The roof should be simple flat roof like Shanghai Pudong's new facility designed by the Germans who are also investors. HKECOSA Members present at the meeting would like Cox and AA decision to make a trip to Pudong and learn from their simple, elegant and highly functional exhibition facility.	Agreed that the roof should be simple and the most cost-effective form should be adopted. Currently no specific form has been designed.
	d. A number of users criticised that the outdoor sheds with lourve roof in front of the foyer should have been a proper waterproof roof to cater for the needs of users. It rains so often in Singapore that most users had to put up another roof below the lourve roof to provide cover from rain.	Concern noted, agree to take into account in detailed design.
	e. Toilet facilities are grossly inadequate whenever a concert is held at Singapore Expo. For normal trade shows, this is not a big problem.	Concern noted, agree to take into account in detailed design.
	f. Space for loading and unloading are inadequate at Singapore Expo and it is expected to be a problem since the plot available is not big enough for the intended facility, going by prevailing plot and hall size rations in Germany.	Concern noted, agree to take into account in detailed design.

	g. Car parks are inadequate whenever the Singapore Expo is fully used. Singapore Expo should have 6,000 car park lots for their 60,000 sq. m of covered hall space. Therefore, the HK Centre should have at least some 3,000 car parking space.	Agree that sufficient parking space should be provided and should be calculated by professional traffic planner.
	h. Catering facility is inadequate at Singapore Expo. Each hall should have basic cafeteria kitchen facility so that not all catering needs are served by the central foyer.	Agreed.
	i. Signage at Singapore Expo needs improvements. There should be large electronic signs at major/strategic entry points to announce what events are and in which halls.	Agreed.
	j. Covered access from Central Foyer to halls 1 & 2 are narrow and the outdoor access is not useful because it rains so often in Singapore.	Concern noted, agree to take into account in detailed design. Wider pre-function space will increase building area and construction costs significantly.
	k. Conference facilities should not be all centralised. Each hall should have some classroom size seminar rooms each can hold 40-50 people. The whole Centre should have one conference hall to hold 500-500 people plus 2 smaller ones to hold 200 people.	Agreed in principle, but will examine further. The provision of breakout rooms for each hall and dedicated conference hall will have cost implications.
	l. The construction of the mezzanine floor for organisers' office is not cost-effective and it disturbs the perfect square dimension of the halls. This is not good for booth layout.	Agreed.
	m. Raw space exhibitors taking big chunks of space have to place fire hydrants in their booth. This could be a local fire regulation problem or design problem to be resolved.	Agreed. We will make appropriate arrangements for fire safety at the design stage.

	n. The foyer walkway at Singapore Expo was initially not air-conditioned. Air-conditioning had to be installed to rectify the situation.	Agreed that air-conditioning should be installed in the halls and walkway. The air-conditioner will be on a hall-by-hall basis.