

Page 1	Page 3
<p>1 Monday, 14 January 2019</p> <p>2 (10.02 am)</p> <p>3 MR PENNICOTT: Good morning, sir.</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN: Good morning.</p> <p>5 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, you will see around the room this</p> <p>6 morning that there are some perhaps unfamiliar faces to</p> <p>7 you. That is because we are starting the structural</p> <p>8 engineering expert evidence this morning, and I think,</p> <p>9 although I haven't counted, that most if not all of the</p> <p>10 structural engineering experts are in the room.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN: Yes.</p> <p>12 MR PENNICOTT: As you know, Prof McQuillan is sat next to</p> <p>13 me, I can see Mr Southward is there, and I think</p> <p>14 Dr Glover is at the back as well, and at the moment</p> <p>15 Prof Au is in the witness box.</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN: Yes.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Mr Pennicott, before we move on to</p> <p>18 structural matters, can I just raise one matter of</p> <p>19 project management which is residual from last week.</p> <p>20 MR PENNICOTT: Of course.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: This probably directed mainly to</p> <p>22 Mr Boulding. You will recall that Mr Huyghe's evidence</p> <p>23 and his expert report had an appendix D, which was MTR's</p> <p>24 update on their progress made on Turner &amp; Townsend's</p> <p>25 report.</p>	<p>1 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And maybe if we could look it --</p> <p>2 I don't know, something like 25 January; bring it as</p> <p>3 up-to-date as we possibly can.</p> <p>4 MR BOULDING: It may well even be the case that we could</p> <p>5 take it up to 29 January. We will see what can be done</p> <p>6 and we will update it as much as we possibly can.</p> <p>7 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you very much.</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN: Good.</p> <p>9 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, before we get to Prof Au -- good</p> <p>10 morning; we'll be with you shortly, Prof Au -- could</p> <p>11 I just mention this. I think it's a matter that has</p> <p>12 been drawn to the Commission's attention, but there have</p> <p>13 been some enquiries from the media, and in particular</p> <p>14 the Apple Daily, in relation to questions concerning the</p> <p>15 potential lack of independence of certain experts who</p> <p>16 have produced reports for the Commission on behalf of</p> <p>17 various parties.</p> <p>18 In particular, my understanding is that so far as</p> <p>19 Leighton are concerned, Mr Scott Allan from COWI -- and</p> <p>20 I understand it's pronounced with a V although it's</p> <p>21 spelt with a W -- Mr Allan from COWI, there's a question</p> <p>22 mark regarding his independence that has been raised in</p> <p>23 fact by China Technology and the Apple Daily.</p> <p>24 Likewise, the Apple Daily has raised some concerns</p> <p>25 with regards to Mr Southward, and also, I understand,</p>
Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 The Commission found that very useful, but what the</p> <p>2 Commission would find particularly useful would be</p> <p>3 an update on that, perhaps at the time of MTR's closing</p> <p>4 submission, so that we are up-to-date with the progress</p> <p>5 that's been made by on MTR's work against the Turner</p> <p>6 &amp; Townsend recommendations, if that would be</p> <p>7 appropriate.</p> <p>8 MR PENNICOTT: Obviously Mr Boulding has heard that on</p> <p>9 behalf of MTRC and I'm sure that can be accommodated.</p> <p>10 What I would say is if we ask MTR to do that, I would</p> <p>11 suggest that's outwith their 100 pages. They can do</p> <p>12 that additional to that.</p> <p>13 CHAIRMAN: Obviously.</p> <p>14 MR PENNICOTT: Just in case there was any concern on that</p> <p>15 front. Obviously Mr Boulding perhaps can comment.</p> <p>16 MR BOULDING: Yes, of course I can. Mr Pennicott is</p> <p>17 absolutely correct. We will take the opportunity to</p> <p>18 update that, Professor, and provide that to the</p> <p>19 Commission, because you regard that as being useful and</p> <p>20 we want to assist you, as we made clear, as much as</p> <p>21 possible. So those behind me will pass on that message</p> <p>22 today and the necessary steps will be put in train.</p> <p>23 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you. Because I believe that</p> <p>24 was dated 3 January.</p> <p>25 MR BOULDING: 3 January, it's signed off --</p>	<p>1 latterly, the Apple Daily has raised some queries in</p> <p>2 relation to Dr Mike Glover, the MTRC's structural</p> <p>3 engineering expert.</p> <p>4 I just wonder whether it would be appropriate and</p> <p>5 perhaps more efficient if we dealt with those matters</p> <p>6 now and I understand that perhaps Mr Shieh and</p> <p>7 Mr Boulding are in a position to do so, and I certainly</p> <p>8 am as well.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN: I think it's essential we deal with those matters</p> <p>10 now, because we don't want the experts sitting here with</p> <p>11 any suggestion that they may not be able to assist the</p> <p>12 Commission at the end of the day. That would be</p> <p>13 an entirely wasted exercise for them. So we do need to</p> <p>14 deal with them first.</p> <p>15 MR PENNICOTT: Yes. I am happy to deal with them, as it</p> <p>16 were, sequentially, so if Mr Shieh would like to deal</p> <p>17 with COWI first, Mr Allan, and then obviously deal with</p> <p>18 Mr Southward at the same time, and then I'll deal with</p> <p>19 that, and then if Mr Boulding wishes to say something on</p> <p>20 behalf of Dr Glover, he can do so as well.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.</p> <p>22 MR PENNICOTT: Can I pass the baton to Mr Shieh on that</p> <p>23 basis.</p> <p>24 CHAIRMAN: Yes.</p> <p>25 MR SHIEH: Mr Chairman, Mr Commissioner, can I deal with</p>

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 COWI and Mr Scott Allan first, followed by Tony Gee and 2 Mr Nick Southward.</p> <p>3 In relation to COWI, the position is this. COWI had 4 no involvement in the development and delivery of the 5 work at Hung Hom Station. COWI's work -- now, COWI is 6 a catchphrase to describe the expert, but what I'm now 7 going to describe is the precise set-up. COWI's work in 8 relation to the provision of the expert report for the 9 Commission is being delivered by COWI UK Ltd, in 10 particular by Mr Scott Allan and his team based in 11 Glasgow.</p> <p>12 That work has been undertaken independently of COWI 13 Hong Kong Ltd and COWI Singapore Ltd.</p> <p>14 There's a project known as the Hong Kong Express 15 Railway twin bored tunnel project under Lam Tsuen Park. 16 COWI Hong Kong was employed by the main contractor for 17 that project, Kier-Kaden-OSSA JV. COWI Hong Kong did 18 not have a contractual relationship with MTRC. The 19 relevant people from COWI who worked on that project had 20 limited contact with MTRC and they do not recall having 21 any contact with the sub-contractor, Tak Cheong Civil 22 Engineering Ltd.</p> <p>23 COWI Hong Kong completed its work on that project 24 before COWI UK was engaged for the present matter by 25 those instructing me, O'Melveny &amp; Myers on behalf of</p>	<p>1 observer could form the impression otherwise or could 2 suggest otherwise based on the facts I have just 3 described.</p> <p>4 I now move on to the question about Tony Gee and 5 Partners. Tony Gee and Partners had no involvement in 6 the development and delivery of the work at Hung Hom 7 Station. In media reports, it has referred to 8 engagements that were completed by Tony Gee and Partners 9 many years ago. In particular, Tony Gee and Partners 10 completed its work in relation to the Saadiyat Island in 11 Abu Dhabi, the Brisbane Gateway in Australia, the Ampang 12 Elevated Expressway project in Malaysia and the MTR's 13 Airport Express viaduct projects many years ago. 14 Tony Gee and Partners performed a discrete role for 15 Leighton in relation to the HAECO hangar at the 16 Hong Kong International Airport. That was completed 17 about eight years ago.</p> <p>18 With the exception of the work in relation to the 19 expert report produced for this Commission, Tony Gee and 20 Partners is not performing any work for Leighton or any 21 of the other parties before the Commission, and Mr Nick 22 Southward and his team who prepared the expert report 23 have no connection to any of the parties before this 24 Commission.</p> <p>25 In the light of media enquiry, Tony Gee and Partners</p>
Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 Leighton.</p> <p>2 There's another project in Singapore called 3 Singapore Deep Tunnel Sewerage System. The relevant 4 work on this Singapore project was delivered by COWI 5 Singapore and COWI Hong Kong Ltd. COWI's work on that 6 project, the Singapore project, was completed before 7 COWI UK was engaged for the present matter.</p> <p>8 Mr Scott Allan and his team who prepared the report 9 for this Commission were not involved in the Hong Kong 10 Express Railway project or the Singapore project. With 11 the exception of the present case, COWI is not 12 performing any work for Leighton or the other parties to 13 the Commission. Mr Scott Allan and his team who 14 prepared the expert report have no connection to any of 15 the parties to the Commission.</p> <p>16 COWI A/S is an international consulting group, 17 specialising in engineering, environmental science and 18 economics, based in Denmark. It has been involved in 19 more than 50,000 projects in 175 countries and has 20 approximately 6,400 employees, including engineers, 21 biologists, geologists, economists, surveyors, 22 anthropologists, sociologists, architects, and we 23 respectfully submit that Mr Scott Allan and his team are 24 not subject to any conflicts of interest or anything 25 which could impair their independence and no reasonable</p>	<p>1 had conducted further conflicts check beyond what was 2 usually required and wishes to disclose for the record 3 that in the year 2015, a Mr Jonathan Gray from its UK 4 office was seconded to Leighton for seven days, on the 5 1, 2, 4 and 7 to 10 December 2015 as a principal 6 engineer for SCL1112. Tony Gee and Partners was not 7 responsible for Mr Gray's work during this period of 8 secondment for seven days.</p> <p>9 Likewise, we submit that neither Mr Southward nor 10 Tony Gee could be subject to any conflict of interest or 11 anything which could impair their independence, and no 12 reasonable observer could suggest otherwise, based on 13 the facts I have mentioned.</p> <p>14 Could I add two points: first, this Commission is 15 not comparable to a conventional civil trial where 16 a lay, untrained judge -- when I say untrained, I mean 17 untrained in the expert discipline in question -- may 18 need to rely upon experts solely in order to be educated 19 on technical points. In that scenario, it may be that 20 the court would be more vigilant to check the 21 independence of the expert and to decide what weight to 22 place on the expert. But in this case, the Commission 23 has its own independent expert, and one member of the 24 Commission, Prof Hansford, is also a qualified and 25 respected expert in the field. In the circumstances, we</p>

Page 9	Page 11
<p>1 respectfully submit that whatever facts or matters one  2 may raise in respect of Mr Scott Allan/COWI or  3 Mr Southward/Tony Gee should be regarded as a kind of  4 disqualifying feature so as to rule them out completely.  5 As a corollary to the point I have just made,  6 I respectfully submit and suggest that insofar as the  7 Commission remains under any lingering doubt about  8 possible lack of independence, those are matters which  9 could only, if at all, go to the weight to be placed on  10 the evidence given by the expert and not amount to any  11 disqualifying feature so as to rule them out completely  12 at this juncture.  13 These are the matters I wish to say in respect of  14 the queries made about the two experts on behalf of  15 Leighton.  16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  17 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, could I --  18 MR BOULDING: Sorry.  19 MR PENNICOTT: You go first. I suggest you do.  20 MR BOULDING: Sir, Professor, MTR and Dr Glover welcome this  21 opportunity to dispel any suggestion that Dr Glover's  22 evidence to the Commission will not be completely  23 independent. In order to achieve that, I've been  24 authorised by both Dr Glover and the MTR to make the  25 following statement to you. It's hoped the media are</p>	<p>1 as you will see, sir, when Dr Glover comes to give  2 evidence, it will be clear from the way he deals with  3 matters and his demeanour in the box that you can rely  4 upon his evidence as being totally independent.  5 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.  6 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, can I thank both Mr Shieh and  7 Mr Boulding for those observations --  8 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr Pennicott, I'm just wondering as to  9 process, whether other parties may wish to be heard and  10 then you come at the end.  11 MR PENNICOTT: I'm happy for that. I don't know if anybody  12 else wishes to say anything.  13 CHAIRMAN: I would like to double-check that.  14 MR PENNICOTT: Please do. That may well be appropriate.  15 Thank you very much.  16 CHAIRMAN: All right. We will hear from the Commission --  17 perhaps Mr Connor?  18 MR CONNOR: Thank you. There is nothing from Atkins on this  19 topic, sir.  20 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much indeed.  21 From the government?  22 MR KHAW: Nothing from the government.  23 MR SO: Nothing from China Tech.  24 CHAIRMAN: Intrafor, at the back?  25 MR COHEN: Nothing, sir.</p>
Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 listening.  2 Dr Mike Glover, OBE, is a veteran civil engineer  3 with a rich professional knowledge and has nearly  4 50 years of experience in structural engineering. He  5 has wide, multidisciplinary project experience in major  6 infrastructure and building structures, industrial  7 facilities and transportation projects in the UK and  8 overseas for public, commercial and industrial sectors.  9 Arup's business covers engineering design, planning and  10 architectural aspects. Arup and Dr Mike Glover, who is  11 an Arup fellow and a fellow of the Royal Academy of  12 Engineers, have previously performed work for MTRCL but  13 Dr Glover confirms -- I emphasise confirms -- that this  14 previous work does not affect his independence.  15 In accordance with the Rules of the High Court, all  16 expert witnesses have to abide by the code of conduct  17 for expert witnesses. An expert witness is obliged to  18 help the Commission of Inquiry impartially and  19 independently on matters relevant to his area of  20 expertise, and his paramount duty is to the court, not  21 to the person from whom the expert has received  22 instructions or by whom he is paid.  23 Dr Glover has a high professional standing. We  24 believe he will give unbiased professional views to the  25 Commission based on the Commission's requirements, and</p>	<p>1 CHAIRMAN: Fang Sheung?  2 MS CHONG: No submission on this point.  3 CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to double-check. Thank you.  4 Mr Pennicott.  5 MR PENNICOTT: Thank you, sir. I'll be very brief.  6 Obviously, the statutory backdrop to the  7 admissibility of evidence in this Commission is to be  8 found in the Commissions of Inquiry Ordinance at  9 section 4(1), which provides, broadly, that:  10 "The Commission may, for the purpose of complying  11 with the directions issued under section 3 [that is by  12 the Chief Executive-in-Council] and for conducting the  13 inquiry generally --  14 (a) receive and consider any material whether by  15 which of oral evidence, written statements, documents or  16 otherwise, notwithstanding that such material would not  17 be admissible as evidence in civil or criminal  18 proceedings".  19 So the Commission is given a very, very wide  20 discretion as to the admissibility of evidence.  21 However, it is right to point out that in the Rules of  22 Procedure and Practice that the Commission published  23 back on 24 September at the preliminary hearing, it was  24 made clear in paragraph 11 of those rules that any  25 expert evidence to be advanced or adduced by any of the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 parties should be independent -- and the word 2 "independent" was used.</p> <p>3 The media has enquired as to whether the Commission 4 has, as it were, fleshed out the meaning of the word 5 "independent". The answer to that is no, it hasn't, but 6 I am about to do so.</p> <p>7 Sir, really it comes to -- many of the points that 8 have been mentioned by both Mr Shieh and Mr Boulding -- 9 the reason why the word "independent" was inserted 10 before the words "expert evidence" in the rules was to 11 ensure, essentially, that the various involved parties 12 didn't seek to adduce expert evidence from their own 13 employees, from their own staff. That was really the 14 reason why the word "independent" was there and we 15 didn't want the government producing a senior engineer 16 from the government, MTR producing a senior engineer 17 from MTR, and Leighton and all the other parties 18 likewise; we wanted people who were independent, that is 19 independent from the parties. What does that mean? 20 It's always a question of degree, but certainly it is 21 not the case, it is not the law in Hong Kong, that 22 simply because there is some historic commercial 23 relationship between the organisation that the expert 24 works for and the party that he is now giving expert 25 evidence on behalf of, or indeed any of the other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 will see and you may have seen already, if you have read 2 the reports, there are indeed many points of agreement 3 between the experts. They have achieved an agreement 4 which we'll be looking at shortly. And certainly there 5 is a lot of common ground between Prof McQuillan, 6 Dr Glover and Mr Southward, that's for sure, as well as 7 the other experts.</p> <p>8 So, sir, for all those reasons, I hope that the 9 media will be satisfied with the explanations that have 10 been given and in my submission they certainly should.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.</p> <p>12 It is, in our view, quite proper that the 13 independence of experts should have been raised as 14 a matter for consideration by the Commission, especially 15 bearing in mind the very real public interest in 16 ensuring structural integrity of the station.</p> <p>17 That said, the Commission has looked at the reports 18 provisionally. It has looked at the curriculum vitae of 19 Mr Allan, Mr Southward and Dr Glover. And, for the 20 reasons already put forward, it has no doubt whatsoever 21 that they will give entirely independent expert 22 evidence.</p> <p>23 It needs to be said that none of the parties 24 represented legally today have stood up to make any form 25 of objection or to even obliquely suggest that the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 parties that are here, is sufficient to question of 2 itself his independence. That simply isn't the 3 position. Not only historic commercial relationships 4 but indeed current commercial relationships.</p> <p>5 Indeed, in the courts in Hong Kong it has been held 6 in a number of cases that indeed employees of companies 7 and organisations can qualify as expert witnesses. It 8 was that that we sought to avoid here, and in my 9 submission we have avoided it.</p> <p>10 Sir, for all those reasons, it's certainly the 11 Commission's legal team's position that for the reasons 12 that Mr Shieh has set out in detail and the reasons 13 Mr Boulding has given, that neither Mr Allan, 14 Mr Southward nor Dr Glover can in any way be suggested 15 not to be independent.</p> <p>16 Sir, we are satisfied, having had advance notice of 17 what was going to be said on behalf of Leighton and the 18 gentleman concerned and on behalf of MTRC and Dr Glover, 19 that they are independent; that their reports clearly 20 should be admitted and their evidence heard by this 21 Commission, which I am convinced will also be extremely 22 helpful to the Commission.</p> <p>23 I might add that I wholly endorse the point that 24 Mr Shieh makes that of course the Commission has, in 25 Prof McQuillan, its own independent expert, and as we</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 evidence of a particular expert should be viewed with 2 anything other than open rationality, and certainly from 3 our point of view, although it's quite proper that the 4 matter has been raised, we have not the slightest 5 concern as to their independence.</p> <p>6 Thank you very much.</p> <p>7 MR PENNICOTT: Thank you, sir. On that basis, sir, we 8 will -- before we come to Prof Au, can I just make one 9 further point. It's really by way of reiteration of 10 a point that was made during the course of my opening 11 address some weeks ago now and also made by other 12 parties as well, and it's this. Sir, we are aware -- 13 you are aware, we are all aware -- that during the 14 course of the last few weeks, from about mid-December, 15 a process of opening up the various parts of the slabs, 16 the EWL slab and the NSL slab, at the station, has been 17 taking place.</p> <p>18 For better or worse, on a daily basis, the 19 government has been publishing, in summary form, the 20 results of those tests, so that they have been available 21 to the public and of course the media. That has given 22 rise to this consequence, that there has been a running 23 commentary in various parts of the media over the past 24 few weeks about the results that have come to light on 25 a day-by-day basis.</p>

Page 17

1 Sir, I mention that because I reiterate this point,  
 2 that this Commission will reach its findings in its  
 3 report on the evidence, and the expert evidence in  
 4 particular, that it hears in this room and not through  
 5 any media organisation or those who have felt it  
 6 necessary to comment to the media over the last few  
 7 weeks. So I just thought it would be appropriate to  
 8 make that absolutely clear, that it is the evidence that  
 9 is to be heard over the next coming days that is vital  
 10 to this Commission and its findings.

11 Sir, with that, I will sit down and hand over to  
 12 Mr Khaw, who is going to call the first expert, that is  
 13 Prof Au, unless you wish to say anything.

14 CHAIRMAN: Might I just add to what you have just said,  
 15 Mr Pennicott. You would need to be both blind and deaf  
 16 not to appreciate that the issue of the structural  
 17 integrity of the Hung Hom project has raised very real  
 18 concerns in the media and therefore among members of the  
 19 Hong Kong public. That the media should express its  
 20 concerns is quite proper in an open, democratic society,  
 21 and is in all respects to be encouraged.

22 However, that said, this Commission has a mandate  
 23 unto itself. That mandate is not to come to a decision  
 24 based on any popular concern. It is a mandate to be  
 25 reached upon the evidence put before it, while not

Page 18

1 ignoring any concerns that may be there and, where  
 2 necessary, putting those concerns to the experts who  
 3 will appear. That will certainly be done during the  
 4 course of this week. So we are not ignoring what is out  
 5 there in the public domain, but our mandate is very  
 6 limited. It is clear, it is absolute, and we will  
 7 pursue that mandate and only that mandate. Thank you.

8 (Discussion off the record)

9 Yes, Mr Khaw.

10 MR KHAW: Just to echo what Mr Pennicott said in his last  
 11 sentence, I will also sit down because I will let  
 12 Mr Chow discuss the structural matters with Prof Au.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14 MR CHOW: Good morning, Chairman and Prof Hansford. With  
 15 the permission of the Commission, the government would  
 16 like to call our structural engineering expert,  
 17 Prof Francis Au from the University of Hong Kong, to  
 18 give evidence, who has actually been sitting in the  
 19 witness box for some time.

20 Good morning, Prof Au. Sorry to have kept you  
 21 waiting this morning.

22 PROF AU TAT KWONG, FRANCIS (sworn)  
 23 Examination-in-chief by MR CHOW

24 Q. Thank you. You can now sit down.  
 25 Prof Au, would you mind to give your professional

Page 19

1 address as well?

2 A. You mean the physical address of my university?

3 Q. Yes, please.

4 A. It's department of civil engineering, the University of  
 5 Hong Kong, Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong.

6 Q. I understand that you have prepared an expert report to  
 7 assist the Commission.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And your report should be in front of you.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Can I ask you to take a look at page 1.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. The report runs all the way up to page 17. Can you just  
 14 quickly flip through the report --

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. -- and confirm this is your expert report?

17 A. Yes, indeed.

18 Q. After page 17, we should see a copy of your CV; all  
 19 right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Can I ask you to go back to page 2.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Would you confirm that the signature that we see on this  
 24 page is your signature?

25 A. Yes.

Page 20

1 Q. Insofar as your report refers to facts, would you  
 2 confirm that those facts are true to the best of your  
 3 knowledge and belief?

4 A. Yes, indeed.

5 Q. Insofar as you express any opinion in your report, would  
 6 you also confirm that they are your honest opinion?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. We understand, on 18 December last year, there was  
 9 a meeting among experts from various parties.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. At the end of that meeting, a document was signed, and  
 12 that is the joint expert memorandum. Do you recall  
 13 that?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. I understand that, for obvious reasons, some of the  
 16 matters that you raised during the meeting were not  
 17 recorded in writing --

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. -- because the joint memorandum is meant to contain  
 20 areas of agreement between the experts.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Subsequent to the meeting, you have prepared another  
 23 document --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. -- in which you set out your comments on various matters

Page 21	Page 23
<p>1 mentioned in the joint expert memorandum. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. You also recall that; right? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Can I ask you to go to bundle G20, page 15046. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. The document is entitled, "Additional comments on the 8 joint expert memorandum of 18 December 2018" -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- by you, and the document actually contains three 11 pages. 12 A. Yes, correct. 13 Q. The last page is 15048. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Do you confirm this is the document that you have 16 produced? 17 A. Indeed, yes. 18 Q. Would you also confirm that insofar as this document 19 contains any facts, they are true facts to the best of 20 your knowledge and belief? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. And to the extent that it contains opinions, they are 23 your honest opinions as well? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. You would also adopt the contents of these additional</p>	<p>1 MR CHOW: Of course. 2 CHAIRMAN: Because if we are given a copy, Prof Hansford 3 will be able to speed-read that very easily. I will be 4 able to read it at a more plodding pace. But I think 5 between us, without having to adjourn for a quarter of 6 an hour or something like that, we will be able to catch 7 up as we proceed. Thank you very much. 8 MR CHOW: Right. I will make sure that a hard copy will be 9 prepared, perhaps during the break. But from my 10 recollection -- 11 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, actually, can we have it 12 quicker than the break? 13 CHAIRMAN: We would like it now. Thanks. 14 MR CHOW: Yes. I'm sure colleagues from the Department of 15 Justice will be doing it right now. 16 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. 17 MR CHOW: May I just add that from my recollection, we 18 should not find anything surprising from this document. 19 They are I believe all covered by Prof Au in his expert 20 report, perhaps even more in detail. 21 The next point I would like to move on to is -- 22 Prof Au, we know that after you have produced your 23 expert report, there were further results from the 24 opening-up exercise. 25 A. Yes.</p>
Page 22	Page 24
<p>1 comments as part of your evidence to this Inquiry? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, could I just ask -- we have no knowledge 5 of this document at this moment. 6 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I've not seen this document either. 7 Can I also -- 8 CHAIRMAN: It seems to me it's not merely two paragraphs and 9 perhaps we do need to have some knowledge of it. 10 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Can I just supplement that by: do 11 these comments in this document -- are they covered by 12 Prof Au's expert report of 7 January? 13 A. I think so. 14 MR CHOW: Yes, I believe the main points raised in this 15 document are actually covered in Prof Au's expert 16 report. 17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Obviously we have seen Prof Au's 18 expert report of 7 January, but neither the Chairman nor 19 I have seen this document. 20 CHAIRMAN: Perhaps what we could do -- sorry, I'm cutting 21 across you. My apologies, I didn't mean to do that. 22 MR CHOW: No problem. 23 CHAIRMAN: But while I'm now puffing along, I might as well 24 just continue. Could we just have a copy of it, do 25 you think?</p>	<p>1 Q. Did you have a chance to look at the latest results of 2 the opening-up? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Can I ask whether these further results from the 5 opening-up exercise would in any way affect your opinion 6 expressed in your report? 7 A. Actually, the results reinforce my belief that there is 8 a real need to continue the opening-up process to find 9 out more, because actually the results are sort of 10 a real concern. I remember that there are a few 11 couplers which are unconnected. Now, that is another 12 concern because apparently, a coupler that is not 13 connected can be easily seen on site. So then it 14 obviously has escaped the attention of the contractor's 15 staff and staff of the sub-contractors and also the site 16 supervising staff. So that is a real concern, whether 17 that kind of thing is isolated or whether it is going to 18 happen elsewhere. 19 Q. Thank you. Prof Au, you have set out in your report 20 your opinion -- 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. -- on various technical matters. 23 CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Just forgive me. A question arises 24 from that. One is project management -- 25 A. Right.</p>

Page 25

1 CHAIRMAN: -- supervision and/or inspection, which may be  
 2 that if there hasn't actually been any form of  
 3 connection of rebar to coupler, that may go to issues of  
 4 adequacy of oversight.  
 5 A. Right.  
 6 CHAIRMAN: That's one question. The next question is if  
 7 there has been a level of failure to connect at all,  
 8 does that go to structural integrity?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 CHAIRMAN: And your answer would be --  
 11 A. Of course that would affect.  
 12 CHAIRMAN: The structural integrity of the work?  
 13 A. It depends on the amount of couplers unconnected.  
 14 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Good. Thank you.  
 15 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you very much.  
 16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Chow.  
 17 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I don't want to speak out of  
 18 turn, but please wait until the question has finished  
 19 before you answer, because I need to get the question on  
 20 the record.  
 21 WITNESS: Understood.  
 22 MR CHOW: Prof Au, I understand, to better assist the  
 23 Commission, you have prepared a short PowerPoint  
 24 presentation to summarise your main points set out in  
 25 your expert report.

Page 26

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. If you are ready, I will hand over the floor to you, but  
 3 after you finish I will still come back because  
 4 I understand you would like to respond to a few matters  
 5 raised by the other experts in their expert reports. So  
 6 that we will do later on. But now, if you are ready  
 7 with your PowerPoint presentation, you can start now.  
 8 A. Okay. Thank you.  
 9 Before I give my oral synopsis, here is a little bit  
 10 about myself. I am currently a professor and head of  
 11 the department of civil engineering at the University of  
 12 Hong Kong. Here are some of my qualifications. I've  
 13 got a bachelor's degree with first class honours,  
 14 a master's degree with distinction and a doctorate  
 15 degree, all in civil engineering. I'm a fellow of the  
 16 Hong Kong Institution of Engineers and the Institution  
 17 of Structural Engineers. I'm also a member of the  
 18 Institution of Civil Engineers.  
 19 Before I joined academia around 30 years ago, I had  
 20 spent seven years, roughly, in the industry, including  
 21 one and a half years on site and the rest of the time  
 22 I spent in various design offices.  
 23 After joining university, apart from teaching and  
 24 administration, I do research, primarily on bridge  
 25 engineering, concrete structures, vehicle-bridge

Page 27

1 interaction and structural fire engineering and so on.  
 2 I work both on the theoretical side of research as well  
 3 as the experimental part of research. For example, in  
 4 the laboratory, we fabricate specimens of structures and  
 5 we load test them to failure, to find out more, to learn  
 6 more about their behaviour. So we try to observe the  
 7 phenomena before failure, including for example the  
 8 cracking, crushing, buckling of components or materials  
 9 and in some fire tests we even observe explosive  
 10 spalling of concrete.  
 11 So from that experience I knew that there are  
 12 certain limitations in the calculations, so the reality  
 13 can be different, so that's why there is a need to do  
 14 research. From our research findings we also publish  
 15 papers to propose new theories or propose new methods of  
 16 calculation. I have published over 150 journal papers  
 17 and over 90 conference papers. I have given over 20  
 18 invited and keynote lectures. I have won a few research  
 19 awards.  
 20 Perhaps I could ...  
 21 MR PENNICOTT: The next page.  
 22 A. All right. So I start from fundamentals. I believe all  
 23 of us know what a force is. If we apply a force at  
 24 a distance from a pivot, we are creating a moment.  
 25 Next, please. There are materials which are brittle

Page 28

1 or easily broken, including glass, porcelain and  
 2 concrete. There are some other materials which are  
 3 ductile, they can be easily deformed without breaking,  
 4 including copper and steel.  
 5 Next, please. To help you understand what happens  
 6 to a concrete structure, the left diagram shows a plain  
 7 concrete beam, that is a beam constructed entirely of  
 8 concrete, nothing else. If we carry out a loading test,  
 9 if we overload it, then sooner or later it is going to  
 10 break into two pieces without any warning. Of course  
 11 that is undesirable.  
 12 Next, please. Now, if we introduce reinforcing bars  
 13 into the concrete beam, it becomes a reinforced concrete  
 14 beam. If we load test it, of course it can carry  
 15 certain loading. If we overload it, of course it is  
 16 going to deform further and it will also crack. Now,  
 17 the excessive deformation and cracking are not bad,  
 18 because they are warning signals so that the occupants  
 19 can evacuate.  
 20 Next, please. Of course ductility is something that  
 21 is desirable. Now, in a construction project, the works  
 22 have to satisfy various requirements. So, in the local  
 23 situation, of course the Concrete Code published by the  
 24 Buildings Department is one of them, and for this  
 25 particular project the MTRCL's in-house design manual is

Page 29

1 another, and then there are later on the contract  
 2 requirements.  
 3 Very often, proprietary products are used in  
 4 a contract and then the supplier's requirement has to be  
 5 satisfied as well.  
 6 In the design process, engineers normally consider  
 7 a lot of loading combinations and then they carry out  
 8 structural analysis and design. In addition, there are  
 9 certain miscellaneous rules laid down in various design  
 10 codes, for good reasons.  
 11 Next, please. The MTRCL has submitted a holistic  
 12 proposal to the government which has been accepted. It  
 13 describes a sampling approach to -- well, for two  
 14 purposes, including the verification of as-built record  
 15 and the workmanship. I believe that this opening-up  
 16 process is necessary and pragmatic.  
 17 The binomial statistics approach adopted is  
 18 considerable acceptable, simply classifying the outcome  
 19 as compliant or non-compliant. However, for those  
 20 outcomes which are non-compliant, ie for couplers'  
 21 non-engagement with the threads, follow-up investigation  
 22 for strength, elongation, et cetera, is necessary.  
 23 From the outcomes of the opening-up process, after  
 24 completion of it, it can be reviewed if there is a need  
 25 for further opening-up. For the non-destructive test of

Page 30

1 the couplers exposed, I believe that the phased array  
 2 ultrasonic testing is quite reliable.  
 3 Next, please. Regarding the acceptance criteria of  
 4 couplers, they are supposed to comply with the code and  
 5 whatever standard. In particular, they have to satisfy  
 6 the requirements of strength, deformation, et cetera,  
 7 not just strength. From the visual inspection, manual  
 8 or similar, of BOSA, the couplers are supposed to be  
 9 fully tightened and a maximum of two full threads may be  
 10 exposed. However, in another letter of BOSA dated  
 11 7 January 2019, "10 full threads" are supposed to be  
 12 engaged and it should be tightened so that the bars are  
 13 "butt-to-butt", otherwise the assembly may be considered  
 14 "loose".  
 15 There may be some slight discrepancy between the  
 16 last two bullet points.  
 17 Next, please. That is about the opening-up of the  
 18 upper slab or EWL slab, adjacent to the diaphragm wall.  
 19 From the calculation based on the normal load  
 20 combinations, it's true that in respect of strength  
 21 there may not be any need for bottom reinforcement.  
 22 However, that is also required by the Concrete Code,  
 23 that is 50 per cent of the reinforcement area at  
 24 mid-span should be provided there and well anchored  
 25 there.

Page 31

1 Now, this additional amount of reinforcement is not  
 2 useless. It also provides ductility, serviceability,  
 3 and so on. Actually, in our department, a few  
 4 colleagues, including myself, have worked on the  
 5 ductility of concrete structures. The compression  
 6 reinforcement helps to enhance the ductility of the  
 7 cross-section.  
 8 Here are two papers published over ten years ago.  
 9 Then, again, depending on the outcome, there could  
 10 be further increase of random sample size, to help us  
 11 understand further the workmanship, and the sequence of  
 12 the actual opening-up may also be revealed.  
 13 Next, please. The case of the lower slab or NSL  
 14 slab is a bit different, actually quite different. Now,  
 15 because of the water pressure acting upwards on the  
 16 bottom of the NSL slab, bottom reinforcement is normally  
 17 under tension adjacent to the diaphragm wall. We also  
 18 know that it is impractical to open up the bottom  
 19 reinforcement for verification, so therefore the random  
 20 samples of the top couplers will be very useful to let  
 21 us have a better understanding of the workmanship of all  
 22 the couplers in this NSL slab.  
 23 Also, in the rare case of future dewatering in the  
 24 vicinity, the top reinforcement may also take tension.  
 25 Next, please.

Page 32

1 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, dewatering -- I know what it means -- what  
 2 does it mean in engineering terms here?  
 3 A. All right. Let's say supposing in future there is  
 4 a need to further extend the station and they have to  
 5 dig downwards, so they need to pump out water, they have  
 6 to dewater, and so the groundwater table would come  
 7 down. So if it comes down and below the NSL slab, then  
 8 the self-weight of the NSL slab take effect and it would  
 9 reverse the bending moment.  
 10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
 11 A. All right. Now, on the compliance of works, the MTR New  
 12 Works Design Standards Manual is used, and it specifies  
 13 that seismic design and ductility detailing would be  
 14 required. And the original design has been accepted by  
 15 the Building Authority, as far as I understand.  
 16 However, there are various issues, such as the  
 17 non-compliant couplers which have been discovered from  
 18 the opening-up process, the additional construction  
 19 joints due to the revision of the connection between the  
 20 slab and the diaphragm wall, honeycombing discovered  
 21 on site, and some missing or misplaced shear links,  
 22 et cetera.  
 23 So there are certain parts of the work which are  
 24 non-compliant.  
 25 Next, please. The connection between the slabs and



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 the east diaphragm wall. If we look at an assembly of 2 the coupler, we understand that the coupler is essential 3 to ensure that the assembly is an integral component 4 that can take force. Similarly, the connection between 5 the slabs and the diaphragm wall are very important 6 connections. I understand that rigidity has been 7 assumed in the analysis so far. So in case the 8 connection is defective, then that would affect the 9 internal forces and in the extreme case it may even 10 affect the stability. So these are things that have to 11 be followed up. 12 Next, please. To help you understand more what 13 happens at the connection -- now, the left diagram shows 14 a cross-section of the station. In particular, we would 15 like to focus on the connection between the upper slab 16 and the diaphragm wall over there, and the top-right 17 diagram shows an enlarged view of that. 18 If you look at the left diagram -- it is not loaded, 19 so it is just a platform slab over there, so the 20 platform slab is just supporting its own weight, and you 21 can -- if you refer back to the top-right diagram -- 22 now, you can see that on the left of the connection, 23 there is a moment, there are two forces acting on that 24 face of connection. On the right of the connection, 25 there is also a downward force and a bending moment.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 Because of that bending moment, it would create some 2 tension in the top reinforcement; the slab is having 3 a quite long span, and then the bending moment is also 4 quite large, and because of that there is a need for 5 a large tension to take up that moment. 6 But on the right side of the connection, in 7 comparison the bending moment is smaller and so the 8 tension acting on the free body is also smaller. 9 Next, please. If you look at the left diagram, now, 10 in this case, the platform is fully loaded by people and 11 trains. So obviously the bending moment and forces 12 acting on the interface shown in the top-right diagram 13 are all larger, in particular the bending moment and 14 shear force. 15 So if you look in the bottom-right diagram, the 16 tension caused by the bending moment must be larger as 17 well, and because of that the shear force acting on the 18 bottom of the yellow free body must be larger. In other 19 words, what I am trying to demonstrate is that the 20 internal force inside the connection varies with the 21 loading condition. So the larger the loading applied, 22 the larger the force and the stress inside the 23 structure. 24 Next, please. Now, here shows the enlarged 25 connection detail of one of the versions. The</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 There may also be a very small horizontal force. 2 Now, the yellow part of the concrete which has been 3 cast afterwards is enlarged in the bottom-right diagram. 4 This is what we call a free body diagram. This is 5 a simplified version of the free body diagram that is 6 very often used by engineers to understand what happens 7 to various parts of a structure. So you can see that on 8 the right of that yellow block there is a tensile force 9 acting -- sorry, on the left there is a tensile force 10 acting, and then on the right there is a smaller tensile 11 force acting. To ensure equilibrium or balance of 12 force, there is a need for a shear force at the bottom, 13 the horizontal force at the bottom; okay? So this is to 14 ensure equilibrium, it would always behave like this. 15 Next, please. 16 MR CHOW: Prof Au, can I pause you here. Can we just stay 17 in slide 13. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Earlier, you mentioned about the tensile force on the 20 right is smaller than the tensile force acting on the 21 left side of the free body. Could you elaborate a bit 22 further why we have a difference in the magnitude of 23 this force between the two sides of the free body? 24 A. Yes. So if you refer back to the top-right diagram, 25 there is a bending moment acting on that interface.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 connection is something that is very important, 2 connecting the slab and the diaphragm wall, enabling it 3 to transfer the forces between them. Because of the 4 change of the design of the connection, there is 5 an additional construction joint. This is just one of 6 them. There are more complicated construction joints. 7 In addition, there are some other cross-sections which 8 may cause concern. There is a need to check the 9 stresses inside the connection, to ensure that it can 10 act as an integral component in the structure. 11 Next, please. 12 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, if I can just interject, 13 Prof Au. You say there's a need to check the stresses 14 inside the connection. 15 A. Right. 16 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: How long would that take? How long 17 is an exercise to check the stresses inside the 18 connection? How long would that take? 19 A. I think for someone who understands the behaviour of 20 beam-column joints, it's very simple. But the 21 problem -- 22 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Are you talking about one day, one 23 week? 24 A. I think half a day. The problem is that very often, the 25 behaviour of beam-column joints is taught in</p>

Page 37

1 postgraduate level, and very often such courses are not  
2 compulsory, so I'm not surprised that some engineers may  
3 have no knowledge of the behaviour of beam-column  
4 joints.  
5 Having said this, there are certain requirements for  
6 the design of beam-column joints in the Concrete Code,  
7 but that is only for the more regular beam-column  
8 joints, there is a formula, and so people simply use  
9 that formula to find out the required amount of  
10 reinforcement. That's it. But then if some people try  
11 to alter that, take away something, that would be more  
12 complicated, and I'm afraid not everyone is capable of  
13 doing that.  
14 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I understand. So, basically, you  
15 are telling me that it's about half a day for someone  
16 who's properly qualified to do that?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Understood. And somebody properly  
19 qualified would include yourself, would it?  
20 A. Yes. Well, actually, I have two PhD students having  
21 worked on the research of beam-column joints.  
22 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Who could do this sort of work?  
23 A. I think practising engineers under the instruction of  
24 someone who knows the behaviour of beam-column joints.  
25 That's it.

Page 38

1 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you.  
2 A. All right. Here is a list of issues that we need to  
3 look at. From the outcomes of the opening process so  
4 far, over one-third of the couplers are defective. I'm  
5 afraid the effects can't be ignored. In particular,  
6 some couplers have been discovered to be unconnected.  
7 We need to find out more.  
8 Of course, for those couplers that are not fully  
9 engaged, there is still some strength. There is a need  
10 for conducting a holistic assessment of such partially  
11 engaged couplers, not just to look at the strength but  
12 also to look at the behaviour in other aspects specified  
13 by the design code, including the ability to sustain  
14 cyclic loading and the elongation and so on. We need to  
15 look at the connection between the slab and the  
16 diaphragm wall, looking at the strength of the  
17 connection itself and also stresses at the additional  
18 construction joints, which may be critical. The  
19 honeycombing area --  
20 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, before we move on, again -- where you are  
21 talking about no connection, any tests of course would  
22 be dependent upon the regularity of the occurrence of no  
23 connection?  
24 A. I believe for those couplers that have not been  
25 connected, of course it cannot develop any strength.

Page 39

1 I think the important point is there is a need to assess  
2 through statistical method the possible, let's say,  
3 percentage of such occurrence, so that when -- I think  
4 that is stage 3 of the holistic assessment -- so that  
5 there is something to base upon to evaluate the strength  
6 of the structure.  
7 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.  
8 A. So the honeycombing area of the slab should be repaired,  
9 and there is also a need to evaluate the effect on the  
10 overall structure, because very often the honeycombing  
11 areas are in the most congested area where the  
12 reinforcing bars are lapping, and so these reinforcing  
13 bars are not effective anymore, and how these  
14 ineffective reinforcing bars are going to affect the  
15 structural performance I believe there is a need to  
16 assess.  
17 There have been some calculations performed to  
18 assess the structural utilisation factor. I believe the  
19 structures have been assumed to be intact, no problem at  
20 all, no defective couplers, no honeycombing whatever.  
21 Now, it is too early to conclude. I believe more  
22 calculations should be conducted.  
23 Next, please.  
24 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, what sort of calculations,  
25 Prof Au?

Page 40

1 A. For example, if we know that there is a certain  
2 percentage of couplers which are found to be defective,  
3 and -- well, there are two aspects. The first aspect is  
4 on strength, which a lot of people have been talking  
5 about. So we need to carry out calculations, also  
6 modelling those parts which are affected by the  
7 defective couplers, and then we have to find out the  
8 effect of this structure with some defects, and then  
9 find out whether other parts will be overstressed or  
10 whatever. And what is more, we need to find out if  
11 there is the feasibility of strengthening so as to bring  
12 this structure up to the required level. That is the  
13 strength aspect.  
14 The other aspect is the elongation. According to  
15 the design code, certain tests would be carried out, and  
16 afterwards we have to measure the residual elongation.  
17 So, at the location where couplers are required to  
18 connect reinforcing bars, in case there is excessive  
19 elongation at that part, there may be excessive crack  
20 width. For example, at the connection between the  
21 diaphragm wall with the lower slab -- now, it is  
22 entirely connected by couplers. In case, well, there is  
23 a higher percentage of defective couplers, there is  
24 a concern of excessive crack width over there and the  
25 groundwater may get into the reinforcement, and so on.

Page 41

1 Now, I'm not saying that it must be unacceptable but  
 2 we need to do calculation with some scientific basis,  
 3 let's say on the percentage of defective couplers, to  
 4 find out how serious it is or whether it is still  
 5 acceptable. There is still a chance that it may be  
 6 acceptable.  
 7 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: You talked about possible  
 8 strengthening.  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: But that would only be required  
 11 presumably, if the structure was found to be inadequate?  
 12 A. Yes. But I need to add that to assess whether  
 13 a structure is adequate or not, strength is of course  
 14 something very important, but in addition to that  
 15 ductility, serviceability and other things should also  
 16 be considered.  
 17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Okay. Thank you.  
 18 A. All right. So if I --  
 19 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, what does "serviceability" mean?  
 20 A. "Serviceability" means -- okay, in design of  
 21 a structure, we need to consider two types of limit  
 22 state, what we call -- okay, let's call them conditions.  
 23 The first condition is what we call serviceability limit  
 24 state; that is the working condition. Let's say, in  
 25 this room, all of us are sitting over here, so there

Page 42

1 would be loading coming from the furniture, from the  
 2 people over there, the self-weight of the floor over  
 3 here, and if we try to calculate the stresses based on  
 4 that, that is what we call the serviceability limit  
 5 state or the working condition.  
 6 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.  
 7 A. The second bullet point. Both the strength and  
 8 deformation of the couplers are important, so couplers  
 9 with only six threads engaged may not be acceptable. So  
 10 we need to carry out more tests with the coupler  
 11 assembly partially engaged to understand more their  
 12 performance not only in respect of strength but also in  
 13 respect of deformation and ability to sustain cyclic  
 14 loading and so on. There is a need to continue opening  
 15 up the bottom of the EWL slab and the top of the NSL  
 16 slab.  
 17 There are miscellaneous issues, some of them I have  
 18 already covered, that should be followed up, and then  
 19 the outcomes will enable a future decision to be made  
 20 regarding whether there is a need for strengthening, and  
 21 so on.  
 22 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, when you say that more tests need to be  
 23 done to see, for example, if there's only six threads  
 24 engaged or something like that --  
 25 A. Right.

Page 43

1 CHAIRMAN: -- are you talking about doing that away from the  
 2 work site, I mean away from --  
 3 A. Yes, inside a laboratory.  
 4 CHAIRMAN: So you would take the couplers and you would  
 5 conduct a series of tests at different thread  
 6 engagement?  
 7 A. I understand that some tests have already been carried  
 8 out using similar couplers, not those couplers taken  
 9 from the works, so they have used similar couplers with  
 10 some partial engagement of the threads and then they did  
 11 some tests. And actually, in my report, I have also  
 12 included a table showing the results from that test  
 13 report. But the results are not enough. The samples  
 14 are not enough. And then they have to carry out more  
 15 tests -- in addition to finding out the strength, other  
 16 performance attributes should also be found out.  
 17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Why are the samples not enough?  
 18 A. What I mean is -- if you look in my report, so in that  
 19 table, there are results of I think 100 per cent  
 20 engagement, I can't remember, 80 per cent, 60 per cent,  
 21 50 per cent, whatever. Now, the strange thing is that  
 22 the maximum strength occurs at 60 per cent engagement  
 23 but not more. It's very strange. So I believe the  
 24 results are having a very large variability. And so,  
 25 for example, for the case of 60 per cent engagement,

Page 44

1 I would believe, let's say, ten samples like this should  
 2 be tested. For every percentage engagement, there  
 3 should be more samples tested, so that we can find out  
 4 the mean value, we can find out the standard deviation,  
 5 to understand how variable the results can be.  
 6 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Okay. Thank you.  
 7 A. I think I have finished my presentation. Thank you.  
 8 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, on what you have just spoken about, would  
 9 this mean that you are looking to a mean average related  
 10 to the strength entirely across the whole length, or are  
 11 you talking about particular areas? Well, no, it would  
 12 be very difficult to isolate to areas, wouldn't it, it  
 13 would be impossible, without basically opening  
 14 everything up?  
 15 A. No, I am not advocating taking out all of the couplers  
 16 for testing. I am suggesting that similar couplers are  
 17 let's say manufactured by the same company and if  
 18 possible similar reinforcing bars would be employed to  
 19 carry out tests inside a laboratory. So these are new  
 20 samples not taken --  
 21 CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that, yes. And then?  
 22 A. So the results would help us understand the behaviour or  
 23 the possible behaviour of this structure with some  
 24 defective couplers.  
 25 The defective couplers still carry some loading.

Page 45	1 They still have some strength. So the purpose of doing 2 this is to let us have a better estimate of the 3 available strength and then the possible deformation, so 4 that in future, when further calculations are carried 5 out, we can be more realistic; we try to model the 6 situation of the structure better. 7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. How long do you think that would 8 take? 9 A. I think doing the tests would take, let's say, a few 10 weeks, if the couplers are around, if the bars are 11 around -- I think perhaps one to two weeks, that could 12 be done. 13 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Why would it take so long? 14 A. I think, first of all, I understand that the industry 15 has been sort of experiencing a change in the use of the 16 reinforcing bars, because previously we were using grade 17 460 but now people are using 500. So if we really want 18 to find out the kind of reinforcing bars used at that 19 time, I don't know whether we really can find them, but 20 even though we can't find them I think anything, let's 21 say grade 500, and if we can carry out similar tests, 22 that would help us understand better. 23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 24 MR CHOW: Thank you, Prof Au. 25 Prof Au, on the basis of your report, it appears to	Page 47
Page 46	1 me that the main difference between your opinion and the 2 opinions from experts of the other parties is that you 3 say the internal stresses in the connection have to be 4 checked properly and numerically; is that right? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. That is really the main difference between you and the 7 other experts. 8 A. Yes, indeed. 9 Q. Can I ask you to go to part of Mr McQuillan's report. 10 You will find that in I believe it's tab 3 of the same 11 bundle. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Paragraphs 99 and 100 at pages 41 and 42. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Do you need to read the paragraphs again? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. The diagram that we see on top of page 42, that is right 18 above paragraph 100 -- 19 A. Right. 20 Q. -- is a similar diagram that we have seen earlier -- 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. -- your free body diagram. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. In paragraph 100, Mr McQuillan made the following 25 statement:	Page 48

Page 49	1 sorry, I will do that again. 2 So the important part is this connection 3 (indicating). So if we can find out the bending 4 moments, shear forces and so on at this cross-section 5 (indicating), and then similar forces and moment here 6 (indicating), similar forces and moment there 7 (indicating), I think it would be very simple; just 8 a few hours, one can do that. So that is the basic 9 principle of the design of beam-column joints. But 10 I haven't done that myself. 11 But then perhaps I could add that some rough 12 calculations have been worked out, but then it is not to 13 say that everywhere it is not satisfactory but then 14 there may be some concerns somewhere. The other thing 15 that I may add is that checking the stresses at 16 construction joint is a standard practice in the design 17 of composite bridges, bridges comprising precast beams 18 and in situ slab, at the interface it is a regular, 19 standard practice to check the stress over there. So 20 I don't think it is difficult. 21 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Mr Chow, we are going to hear from 22 all the other experts this week, of course, but if this 23 exercise needs to be done, it would seem to me that we 24 should do it rather quickly. 25 MR CHOW: Prof Hansford, it all depends on the answer of	Page 51
Page 50	1 Prof Au to my next question. 2 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Ah. 3 MR CHOW: Prof Au, can you explain to us what you mean by to 4 carry out that exercise is to know that the moment, 5 shear force and the external actual force on the free 6 body that we looked at -- 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. -- how long would it take you to gather those 9 information for you to carry out that checking? 10 A. The important thing is to look at the entire -- well, 11 I think a very simple thing to do is just to look at the 12 typical cross-section of that station, so it is 13 something like a frame, collecting all this loading 14 acting on it, and then carrying out a plain frame 15 analysis, finding out the bending moment, shear forces, 16 axial forces adjacent to the joint, and then the rest 17 would be very simple calculation using a calculator, 18 based on certain assumptions that we normally use for 19 reinforced concrete design. 20 Q. Let me put it this way. If you were asked to do this 21 exercise, how long would it take to gather all this 22 information and carry out the sort of checking that you 23 mention? 24 A. I think just a few hours. That's fine. 25 CHAIRMAN: So if we were to ask that you come back, shall we	Page 52

Page 53	Page 55
<p>1 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. 2 MR CHOW: Lastly, can I ask you to go to Mr Southward's 3 report in tab 5. 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Page 40 of 83, under section 14.2 -- 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. -- do you see the second-last paragraph from the bottom 8 of the page? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Mr Southward basically says the platform slab and 11 diaphragm wall structures would be treated as 12 superstructure. 13 Do you have any response to that? 14 A. Now, I don't think that is the common use of the term. 15 So if we consider a building with a basement supported 16 on piles -- now, obviously the basement is not part of 17 the superstructure. I think the part of the building 18 above ground level can be termed superstructure. 19 Anything below can't be called superstructure. I think 20 if we call that a basement, fine, I have no objection. 21 Well, certain parts of that may be part of the 22 foundation, but I don't think that can be called 23 a superstructure. 24 Q. How about substructure? 25 A. I think the term "substructure" is fine, really.</p>	<p>1 a layperson, it's a little bit fuzzy, and that's simply 2 my lack of comprehension because a number of tests have 3 been suggested quite quickly, one upon the other. All 4 right. Would that help? 5 MR KHAW: We will be able to supply the Commission with such 6 information after Prof Au finishes his evidence. 7 CHAIRMAN: That's what I'm saying. 8 Quarter of an hour. Thank you. 9 (11.30 am) 10 (A short adjournment) 11 (11.52 am) 12 Examination by MR PENNICOTT 13 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, good morning. 14 Prof Au, good morning. As you have probably 15 realised, I'm one of the counsel to the Commission, my 16 name is Ian Pennicott, and I have a few questions for 17 you but first of all thank you very much for coming 18 along to give evidence to the Commission. 19 Sir, can I just confirm that the pieces of paper you 20 were given earlier are numbered G15046 to 48? 21 CHAIRMAN: They are. 22 MR PENNICOTT: Thank you. I just wanted to double-check, 23 with the haste with which that was done, you have been 24 given the right pieces of paper. 25 Prof Au will confirm this -- what happened, and I'm</p>
<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 MR CHOW: Prof Au, I have no more questions. 2 WITNESS: Thank you. 3 MR CHOW: I have no more questions for you, Prof Au. What 4 is going to happen is counsel for the Commission may 5 have questions for you, and after that there may be 6 further questions from various lawyers acting for 7 different parties, and meanwhile Mr Chairman and 8 Prof Hansford may also ask you questions. After that, 9 if necessary, I will also have a chance to ask you a few 10 more questions by way of wrap-up. 11 So, if you are ready, please remain seated and take 12 questions from the other counsel. 13 Mr Chairman, I understand -- 14 CHAIRMAN: Perhaps -- 15 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, before we do that, a coffee would be 16 good. 17 MR CHOW: Certainly. 18 CHAIRMAN: One thing, as a warning request, not a warning 19 order, is we have a number of suggested tests that 20 Prof Au has spoken of. It would help us, perhaps, if at 21 some stage, Mr Chow, you are able to come back to us and 22 say, "These are the tests, these are their parameters, 23 this is how long it will take to have them done, and if 24 they are successful, this will be the result", that 25 would help us. Because at the moment, for myself, as</p>	<p>Page 56</p> <p>1 not making any complaint about this because I'm about to 2 ask Prof Au questions about it, is that following the 3 expert meeting, we received a letter from the 4 government, with Prof Au's additional comments 5 attached -- we can see they are dated 22 December -- 6 four days after the meeting, so we've had them for some 7 time and I apologise if they haven't been brought to 8 your attention, but I'm well aware they have been there 9 for some time. 10 Prof Au, that's how it happened, as I understand it; 11 is that right? 12 A. (Nodded head). 13 Q. Good. Prof Au, can we look at the very first page of 14 your report, please, which is in bundle ER1 at tab 7. 15 You set out there your instructions and the matters upon 16 which you have been asked to express a view? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Can I ask you this: have you read the terms of reference 19 of the Commission? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. You have. So you will be well aware that the key issue 22 is safety? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And whether the EWL slab and the NSL slab in particular 25 are safe?</p>

Page 57

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. I'll come to that in a moment.

3 Could I ask you, please, to look at the joint

4 statement that was signed by the experts on 18 December.

5 Sir, it will be found in ER1 as an attachment to

6 Prof McQuillan's report at appendix XI. It's at

7 page 117, the internal numbering of Prof McQuillan's

8 report.

9 Prof Au, could we look at the first item, towards

10 the bottom of that page --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- which is -- there's a heading, "General code

13 requirements"; do you see that?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. The first bullet point is that:

16 "All agreed there was no requirement for ductility

17 couplers."

18 Do you see that?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. As I understand it, that's the first point upon which

21 you have made some additional comments.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. So if we could take page 15046 in bundle G20.

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You say:

Page 58

1 "The discussion on the use of ductility couplers was

2 mainly on seismic design of structures. I have raised

3 the point in the meeting that, in general, ductility is

4 a desirable quality of all structures, irrespective of

5 whether a structure is designed for seismic resistance

6 or not."

7 And then you make the point that the MTRC proposals

8 required certain zones to be ductile.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Then you have also referred to the Code of Practice

11 which also has ductility requirements in it.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Have you had the chance to read Prof McQuillan's report?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Could I ask you, please, to look at paragraphs 42 to 44

16 of that report.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Again, here we see Prof McQuillan has referred to the

19 relevant Code of Practice, the ductility requirements

20 that are set out in that Code of Practice. He's

21 referred to an information note from the government, and

22 then says this:

23 "Accordingly the BD currently does not have any

24 specific design and construction requirements in respect

25 of" --

Page 59

1 A. Sorry, which one?

2 Q. Paragraph 44.

3 A. Right.

4 Q. "Accordingly the BD currently does not have any specific

5 design and construction requirements in respect of

6 seismicity but requires compliance with the ductility

7 requirements of the code, including couplers. In other

8 words, code-compliance is deemed to provide some

9 inherent structural resilience against seismic events."

10 As I understand it, you agree with all that,

11 Prof Au; is that correct?

12 A. So are you referring to the second sentence?

13 Q. I am. Well, first and second sentences.

14 A. Yes.

15 Well, my understanding is that MTRC was designing

16 the structure to comply with their in-house design

17 manual as well. That in-house design manual requires

18 the seismic resistance design, and apparently that was

19 submitted to the Buildings Department, as far as

20 I understand, and the Building Authority accepted that.

21 And the requirement is the use of ductility couplers

22 somewhere; right?

23 Q. Okay. That's what Prof McQuillan says a bit further on:

24 "I note, however, that MTRCL do include specific

25 seismic design requirements and loading in their

Page 60

1 performance specifications ..."

2 And the reference is given. I think that's the same

3 reference you have given us in your report.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So, as I understand it, in relation to those three

6 paragraphs in the requirement for ductility couplers,

7 there is no difference in fact between yourself and

8 Prof McQuillan?

9 A. So you are referring to this particular paragraph only?

10 Q. Paragraphs 42, 43 and 44, 44 in particular.

11 A. 44?

12 Now, 44 is okay, but there is certain requirement

13 from the BD regarding the use of the ductility couplers.

14 Yes. So that is my understanding, that BD requires the

15 use of ductility couplers somewhere; okay?

16 Q. Yes.

17 A. Because according to the older code, that was not

18 allowed unless ductility couplers are used, and that is

19 a specific sort of requirement in accepting the design,

20 as far as I know.

21 Q. All right. Now, with that in mind, one -- or certainly

22 I do -- ask myself the question: why did you all agree

23 that there is no requirement for ductility couplers?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Could I ask you, please, to look at paragraphs, first of

Page 61

1 all, 89.1 and 89.2 of Prof McQuillan's report at  
 2 page 38.  
 3 A. Well, actually, I need to add that the reason why  
 4 I submitted later on the additional comments was that  
 5 I found the record was not accurate. Actually, I wasn't  
 6 given sufficient information before that date, there  
 7 wasn't any agenda, and the meeting started at 11.00 and  
 8 it went on until 2.30 in the afternoon.  
 9 Actually, in the meeting, I raised objection to many  
 10 points already; okay?  
 11 Q. Prof Au, we have to be a bit careful here. These were  
 12 without-prejudice discussions that took place between  
 13 the five experts, and I don't want to get into  
 14 a discussion about what was said by whom. All I'm  
 15 interested in is what was signed at the end of the day  
 16 and you put your name to along with the other experts.  
 17 Do you understand?  
 18 A. I understand, but actually, at that time -- now, that  
 19 was a very lengthy meeting and I wasn't given any idea  
 20 how long that meeting would be, and I was starving, and  
 21 then if I raised further objection, the meeting will  
 22 prolong. Probably it would end at evening time,  
 23 dinnertime or whatever. I don't think it is a proper  
 24 record.  
 25 Q. You could have refused to sign it, Prof Au, but you

Page 62

1 didn't?  
 2 A. Yes, I know. I also knew that I would be given a chance  
 3 to qualify the record -- well, provide additional  
 4 comments.  
 5 Q. Can I suggest we do it this way. Could you just bear  
 6 with me, please, and go to paragraphs 89.1 and 2 of  
 7 Prof McQuillan's report, where he says this:  
 8 "The following summary facts inform my opinion:  
 9 1. There is no requirement for the structures to be  
 10 specifically designed for seismicity provided the design  
 11 is code-compliant in respect of the ductility and bottom  
 12 steel continuity clauses."  
 13 Do you agree with that?  
 14 A. Now, so by code-compliant are you referring to the  
 15 Concrete Code 2004?  
 16 Q. Yes.  
 17 A. Yes, agree.  
 18 Q. Right. Then, secondly, he says this:  
 19 "2. The geometry of the connection between the EWL  
 20 slab and the east D-wall, however, precludes any  
 21 ductility. The structural 'plastic' deformation which  
 22 might occur during seismic activity will develop lower  
 23 down the D-wall. Ductile-grade couplers are not  
 24 therefore required where used in the EWL slab to D-wall  
 25 joint."

Page 63

1 Pause there for the moment before I ask the  
 2 question. Could you also, please, look at paragraph 4.6  
 3 of Dr Glover's report, which is in tab 6 at page 4,  
 4 internal number.  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. 4.6, and then it's bullet point 4. I presume, Prof Au,  
 7 you have had a chance to look at Dr Glover's report as  
 8 well. What Dr Glover says is:  
 9 "Due to the disproportionately stiffer and stronger  
 10 EWL slab (3,000 millimetres deep) relative to the  
 11 diaphragm walls (1,200 millimetres thick), it would be  
 12 impossible to develop ductile behaviour in the slab or  
 13 its connection to the walls since the wall would have  
 14 failed structurally under ultimate load conditions long  
 15 before the rebar in the slab would have reached its  
 16 yield stress, ie the slab connection would remain in the  
 17 elastic range. This is clearly demonstrated by ..."  
 18 Then Dr Glover refers to an appendix in his report.  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. So do you agree with paragraph 89.2 of Prof McQuillan's  
 21 report and that bullet point at paragraph 4.6 of  
 22 Dr Glover's report?  
 23 A. No.  
 24 Q. What do you disagree?  
 25 A. Okay.

Page 64

1 Q. Why do you disagree, rather?  
 2 A. Let me explain, using something people can understand.  
 3 Actually, in one of my first few slides, I mentioned  
 4 that in the structural design, we do structural analysis  
 5 based on some of the load combinations, some of the load  
 6 cases, and then we try to find out the forces, whatever,  
 7 provide reinforcement, whatever. In addition to that,  
 8 there are certain rules of detailing whatever that we  
 9 have to follow, for good reason.  
 10 Let me cite an example. When I drive on the road,  
 11 I obey all the road signs, so the road signs are there  
 12 for good reasons. I may not be aware of certain dangers  
 13 ahead of me, but I obey the road signs. Coming back to  
 14 the technical question, there are certain requirements  
 15 for detailing. It's right that if you just look at the  
 16 load cases that you have considered, under normal  
 17 circumstances, that load, which is the self-weight of  
 18 the structure, live load, the weight of the people,  
 19 trains, whatever, it's true that over there, that slab  
 20 is very stiff and then the diaphragm wall is more  
 21 flexible, whatever, yes. But the problem is providing  
 22 the reinforcement over there, providing ductility  
 23 couplers over there, also serves certain purposes.  
 24 I can give you some examples.  
 25 Now, I understand that there is no requirement to



Page 65	Page 67
<p>1 carry out fire design for that, for structural fire. 2 Considering certain scenarios for fire, if there is 3 a fire breaking out above the upper platform slab and 4 it's confined somewhere, and then let's say the top part 5 of the slab is heated to let's say 800 degrees Celsius, 6 and perhaps before that, it is going to heat up the top 7 part of the slab, and there is a so-called thermal 8 bowing. So the top part of the slab is trying to 9 expand, and this is going to reverse the bending moment. 10 So the bottom part of the slab reinforcement may be 11 in tension, maybe. This is just one example. 12 If the fire goes on and then somehow the top 13 reinforcement is affected, let's say the top 14 reinforcement is heated to 600 or 700 degrees Celsius, 15 the strength would be substantially affected. So even 16 the bending resistance would come down to a very low 17 value. If there is sufficient reinforcement at the 18 bottom, well anchored, possessing good ductility, then 19 it is going to save the structure. That is what we call 20 catenary effect. So the floor may tend to deflect 21 a lot, but then it will be hanging like a net. That is 22 what we call catenary effect. 23 CHAIRMAN: And the spelling? 24 A. C-A-T-E-N-A-R-Y, like a cable. So the bottom 25 reinforcement is also useful.</p>	<p>1 interface was required for code compliance." 2 You agree with that? 3 A. No. Now -- 4 Q. Sorry, Prof Au, but why did you sign it? 5 A. That actually wasn't too appropriate, but then if 6 I decline to sign then it is going to prolong the 7 meeting. 8 The problem with that meeting is I wasn't provided 9 with sufficient data, so -- 10 Q. When were you first instructed, Prof Au? 11 A. Earlier but then -- 12 Q. When were you first instructed on behalf of the 13 government to give expert evidence? 14 A. Probably sometime in December. I can't remember 15 exactly. 16 Q. Beginning of December? 17 A. I can't remember exactly. I need to check. 18 The problem is there wasn't any agenda and -- now, 19 I expressed certain reservations regarding certain 20 points, but unfortunately, even though I raised it 21 several times, it wasn't accurately recorded, and at 22 that time I found myself almost the only dissenting 23 voice, I think for much of the time. 24 Q. Could you look at paragraph 2, please, of the joint 25 statement.</p>
Page 66	Page 68
<p>1 Now, it is not a requirement to consider that load 2 case, but I don't agree that such rules cannot be -- 3 well, need not be followed. 4 MR PENNICOTT: I put what I thought, by reference to those 5 paragraphs, Prof Au, was a relatively straightforward 6 proposition which is clearly expressed by Dr Glover and 7 Prof McQuillan that in the event of seismic activity, 8 which we know is a low possibility in Hong Kong, to put 9 it in layman's terms, the D-walls would go first and 10 therefore the fact that there were or were not ductility 11 couplers in the slab was neither here nor there. That's 12 the basic proposition. Firstly, do you agree with that 13 basic proposition: the walls would go first? 14 A. I agree with you, only for the seismic load case. 15 Q. Okay. All right. 16 The second bullet point in the joint statement -- 17 A. I beg your pardon? 18 Q. Can we go back to the joint statement, please, if you 19 can find that. The second bullet point under "General 20 code requirements" -- I don't think there's much between 21 us, Prof Au: 22 "All agreed that an amount equivalent to 50 per cent 23 of the top tensile steel was required in the bottom of 24 the EWL slab to be carried through in the D-wall. It 25 less than 50 per cent of the bottom steel at the</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. So we are over the page now to 118. That says: 3 "All agreed that irrespective of the code 4 requirement the EWL slab does not, in theory, rely on 5 steel at the interface, at the bottom, for flexure and 6 shear capacity." 7 In other words, as I understand it, at the bottom of 8 the EWL slab it is in compression -- 9 A. Now, we are to be very careful -- 10 Q. -- "yes" or "no"? 11 A. Wait a minute, I have to qualify that. At that time in 12 the meeting, I have mentioned several times we should 13 not be just talking about strength. Strength is not 14 everything. We have to consider other things, ductility 15 and other things. There would be other scenarios which 16 may not be included in the standard loading cases. 17 Now, if we follow those requirements, then the 18 structure would be safer. 19 Now, it's true that in this case, under the standard 20 loading cases that they have considered, yes, it's true 21 that in respect of strength, there is no need for bottom 22 reinforcement. However, if we are also mindful of the 23 need for ductility, the bottom reinforcement is also 24 needed. 25 Q. Can I ask you, please, on this point, to look back at</p>

Page 69

1 paragraph 89 of Prof McQuillan's report, page 38.  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Where he says:  
4 "To satisfy code requirements, part of the bottom  
5 steel requires to be continued into the east D-wall."  
6 Do you agree with that sentence?  
7 A. The first sentence?  
8 Q. Yes.  
9 A. Right.  
10 Q. "This should be equivalent to 50 per cent of the EWL  
11 slab top tension steel (at the D-wall connection)."  
12 Do you agree with that sentence?  
13 A. Yes, agree.  
14 Q. "The approved design was therefore conservative in that  
15 all four layers of bottom steel were continued through  
16 into the D-wall when 50 per cent would have sufficed."  
17 Do you agree with that?  
18 A. Yes, agree.  
19 Q. "89.4:  
20 "The bottom of the EWL slab at each D-wall is always  
21 in compression."  
22 Do you agree with that?  
23 A. Not necessarily. I think for those load cases  
24 considered in the regular design, yes, possible, but  
25 then there may be extreme events that may happen and

Page 70

1 we -- now, I think just for that, yes. So for the  
2 regular loading cases considered, yes, in compression.  
3 But then there may be some other events which we may not  
4 have foreseen, then if you provide reinforcement over  
5 there, that would be safer.  
6 Q. All right. Then can I ask you, please, to look at  
7 paragraph 3 of the joint statement -- I'm sorry to keep  
8 jumping back and forth, Prof Au.  
9 A. No problem.  
10 Q. We are I think going to come back to a topic that you  
11 were discussing with Mr Chow and the Commissioners  
12 a short while ago, that is calculations and the like,  
13 but let's just take this, if we may, Prof Au, in stages.  
14 First of all, paragraph 3 says this:  
15 "The cutting-down of a D-wall is a normal part of  
16 the construction process with the methodology governed  
17 by the specification and is analogous to the  
18 construction of a shear key."  
19 As I understand it, you are okay with that?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Then, and perhaps more controversially -- let's see how  
22 we go -- I want to look at this next part in three  
23 stages. The first stage is this:  
24 "All agreed that the change from couplers to  
25 through-bars in the top of the east D-wall was a better

Page 71

1 detail and provided more steel across the interface ..."  
2 Now, subject to the bit in brackets we are going to  
3 look at in a moment, I understand you agree with that  
4 first proposition, subject to what's in brackets?  
5 A. No. Actually, in the meeting, I pointed out several  
6 times that there was a need to check the stresses at the  
7 construction joints.  
8 Q. Okay. I said "subject". Now, the bit in brackets is  
9 this:  
10 "... (subject to a review of the internal stresses  
11 at the top-of-wall construction joint relating to the  
12 'first change' and its rebar detailing)."  
13 A. Well, are you talking about the second change or the  
14 first change?  
15 Q. I'm just looking at what has been agreed, signed up to  
16 and recorded in paragraph 3 of the joint statement,  
17 because I can't do anything else. It says:  
18 "... (subject to a review of the internal stresses  
19 at the top-of-wall construction joint relating to the  
20 'first change' ...)."  
21 Which we all know is all to do with missing U-bars.  
22 Do you agree?  
23 A. Now, the problem is -- so you are talking about the  
24 first sentence; okay? So the problem is -- so there are  
25 two issues. The first one is the first change, but

Page 72

1 apparently this is mainly related to the second change.  
2 Now, I am aware that the change has increased the amount  
3 of continuous reinforcement at the top, but the problem  
4 is when there is a change, it also introduces a weakness  
5 at the construction joint, that -- of the part of the  
6 concrete that is hacked away. Now, that can be the  
7 weakest link of the revised detail.  
8 So whether or not it is going to be -- now, it can  
9 only as good as the original one, but it can't be  
10 better. Now, if we can ensure that it is strong enough  
11 at the construction joint, then it will be as good as  
12 the previous one.  
13 Q. I'm just trying to understand what your position is,  
14 because I think I know what everybody else's position  
15 is. What it says here is:  
16 "All agreed that the change from couplers to  
17 through-bars in the top of the east D-wall was a better  
18 detail and provided more steel across the interface ..."  
19 Now, that's the second change.  
20 A. Yes, second change.  
21 Q. But your reservation was "subject to a review of the  
22 internal stresses at the top-of-wall construction joint  
23 relating to the 'first change' ..."  
24 A. No, I think that is inaccurate. Actually the  
25 construction joint has been caused by the introduction

Page 73

1 -- or has been caused by the second change, not by the  
2 first change. So at that meeting I was referring to  
3 another --  
4 MR BOULDING: Sir, I hesitate to intervene. My learned  
5 friend Mr Pennicott has already made the point that this  
6 witness is going in to, we would say, inadmissible  
7 without-prejudice discussions. He's signed off  
8 an agreement, we can see his signature, and in my  
9 respectful submission that should be the end of the  
10 matter. The idea that by rehearsing everything that was  
11 said before or allegedly said before and seeking to  
12 undermine this agreement is, in my respectful  
13 submission, not only outrageous but contrary to every  
14 rule of law concerning evidence that I've ever known.  
15 Once one has an agreement, one has an agreement, unless  
16 there's a principle of non est factum or something such  
17 as that.  
18 I'm most concerned that I've been instructed to make  
19 this point because I don't quite know where we are  
20 going.  
21 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, on this particular point, where we are  
22 going is this, that we know as a matter of fact that  
23 because of the reservation that was put in the  
24 brackets -- and we know that that was put in by Prof Au;  
25 there's no issue about that -- what then happened was

Page 74

1 Atkins went away and did a load of calculations to meet  
2 the point that's in brackets, and that's where I was  
3 going with the next question, because then what happened  
4 was Prof Au comes along with his report and criticises  
5 the Atkins calculations, as I understand it. That goes  
6 back to the point that you were discussing with Prof Au  
7 this morning as to, first of all, did Atkins do the  
8 right calculations; if they did the right calculations,  
9 are there errors in those calculations; if so, do we  
10 need to start the calculation process again? And that's  
11 all against the backdrop, as I understand it, of  
12 Prof McQuillan, Dr Glover and Mr Southward all saying,  
13 "Actually, you don't need to do any calculations because  
14 there's no shear stresses involved in any event."  
15 So I'm just trying to work out what has happened as  
16 a consequence of the bit in brackets. Unfortunately, to  
17 get to the bit in brackets, you have to look at the rest  
18 of it as well. You can't just look at it in isolation.  
19 I have to say I'm doing my best not to get into  
20 a discussion about what was said or not said at the  
21 agreement, and I agree with Mr Boulding in principle  
22 that an expert's agreement is an expert's agreement.  
23 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Mr Pennicott, not that I need to  
24 understand them all myself, but have we seen Atkins'  
25 calculations?

Page 75

1 MR PENNICOTT: Well, they are referred to in  
2 Prof McQuillan's report and elsewhere.  
3 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Okay.  
4 MR PENNICOTT: And also in Prof Au's report.  
5 CHAIRMAN: We would just like to discuss a couple of things,  
6 if we could. We will let you know when we are ready.  
7 It shouldn't be more than four or five minutes.  
8 MR PENNICOTT: Certainly.  
9 (12.23 pm)  
10 (A short adjournment)  
11 (12.28 pm)  
12 MR PENNICOTT: There are one or two participants missing,  
13 but never mind.  
14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We just wanted to have  
15 a brief discussion about this matter. We are very  
16 concerned that the methodology by which  
17 a without-prejudice agreement was reached should now  
18 become subject to discussion.  
19 The fact is the agreement was reached, and I think  
20 in respect of expert evidence it's open, Professor, to  
21 you to say, "Since reaching that agreement I have  
22 certain personal reservations." That I think is  
23 a matter that we believe you can discuss, and you can  
24 discuss matters that may concern you as a consequence of  
25 that agreement; for example, Atkins carrying out certain

Page 76

1 mathematical calculations.  
2 But to go into the methodology and what was said,  
3 how it was said, who agreed to what during the course of  
4 that very lengthy meeting I think would not assist  
5 anybody at all. The fact is, from what we can see, that  
6 we had a group of eminent engineers who spent a deal of  
7 time together, debating the issue, as we encouraged, so  
8 they were free to say what they wished to say, they were  
9 free to put their reservations in, and to enter into no  
10 doubt very robust argument when necessary, and they did  
11 come to an agreement to which all of them put their  
12 signature. I think that's an important issue, and  
13 equally important, of course, Professor, if you have  
14 since had concerns, that's another matter.  
15 Thank you. That's the reason we wanted to have a  
16 brief discussion.  
17 Mr Pennicott, I don't know how that assists or does  
18 not assist you.  
19 MR PENNICOTT: It assists in some ways and doesn't in  
20 others, in the sense that I am trying my best to avoid  
21 getting into a debate with Prof Au as to what or wasn't  
22 said at the meeting, and let's try to avoid that going  
23 forward, as it were.  
24 On the other hand, I am trying to unravel, if I can,  
25 the one express reservation that I know Prof Au had,

Page 77

1 which is the bit in brackets in paragraph 3, because  
 2 there clearly was a reservation in those words and  
 3 I have no problem with that and I imagine nobody else  
 4 has a problem with that.  
 5 So what I was endeavouring to do was to, as it were,  
 6 identify for the Commission what followed on from that  
 7 reservation.  
 8 CHAIRMAN: That's fine.  
 9 MR PENNICOTT: And that's fine. The only problem that we  
 10 then ran into was that it appears, if I've understood  
 11 Prof Au's position correctly, that he's now saying,  
 12 actually, when it says "the first change", in his mind  
 13 it really should say "the second change", or perhaps  
 14 both, I don't know.  
 15 A. May I -- I think there is some inaccuracy in the part  
 16 within brackets. As far as I know, the first change is  
 17 related to the omission of the L-bar and U-bars. It  
 18 doesn't create any additional construction joint.  
 19 Q. Correct.  
 20 A. Now, it says "subject to a review of the internal  
 21 stresses at the top-of-wall construction joint relating  
 22 to the 'first change' ..."  
 23 So the construction joint is not caused by the first  
 24 change but by the second change. It's inaccurate.  
 25 Q. That's why I say I think what is now being said by

Page 78

1 Prof Au is that this is related to the second change.  
 2 The construction joints, I agree with Prof Au, clearly  
 3 can only relate to the second change --  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. -- not the first change?  
 6 CHAIRMAN: All right. Good. So that's looking back on the  
 7 agreement, that is a patent error, in your view,  
 8 a common error, and you are saying it should relate to  
 9 the second change?  
 10 MR PENNICOTT: Well --  
 11 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Just as a consequence of that, can  
 12 I just ask a question: was the additional work done by  
 13 Atkins related to the second change or the first change?  
 14 MR PENNICOTT: My understanding was that it was both.  
 15 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Both?  
 16 MR PENNICOTT: But I will --  
 17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: If it's both then I'm satisfied.  
 18 MR PENNICOTT: I think that's right but I may need to  
 19 double-check that. Can I just have a moment?  
 20 Sir and Prof Au, can we look at paragraph 101 of  
 21 Prof McQuillan's report, page 42.  
 22 A. All right, yes.  
 23 Q. That's under the diagram that you were taken to earlier,  
 24 Prof Au. Prof McQuillan makes the point that I repeated  
 25 earlier in paragraph 100 that the diagram illustrates

Page 79

1 why no tension or shear can occur at the interface.  
 2 However, at paragraph 101, it's recorded by  
 3 Prof McQuillan that:  
 4 "Atkins subsequently produced design calculations  
 5 for the first and second changes which demonstrate ..."  
 6 And then bullet point, bullet point, and several  
 7 more bullet points. The reference is given there.  
 8 Those calculations were provided on 31 December, so, as  
 9 I say, postdating the joint statement. If one looks at  
 10 the covering letter to the calculations -- that's at  
 11 J6/4556, if we can get that up on the screen; this is  
 12 Mr Blackwood writing on 31 December, the Commission  
 13 having requested the calculations:  
 14 "We refer to your email of 19 December 2018  
 15 requesting calculations to demonstrate that the internal  
 16 stresses at the construction joint ... are within  
 17 acceptable limits for the 'first change' necessitated by  
 18 the missing U-bars at the top of the D-wall. Similar  
 19 calculations in relation to the 'second change' were  
 20 also requested.  
 21 The requested calculations for both the 'first  
 22 change' and 'second change' are enclosed."  
 23 So, sir, to answer your question, both have been  
 24 supplied. That's where we've got to.  
 25 However, as I understand it, Prof Au has

Page 80

1 reservations about those calculations.  
 2 Is that right, Prof Au?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 CHAIRMAN: About both or ...?  
 5 A. About both.  
 6 MR PENNICOTT: Prof Au, when you were having a discussion  
 7 with Prof Hansford earlier this morning, and he was  
 8 asking you about some calculations that could be done,  
 9 as I understand it the focus will be on those  
 10 calculations, the Atkins calculations, and to your way  
 11 of thinking at least -- I'm not sure everybody else  
 12 agrees with you -- but if your criticisms of those  
 13 calculations are accepted, then essentially what you are  
 14 saying is that those calculations should be redone --  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. -- in a proper way?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 CHAIRMAN: Has that been done? Has there been  
 19 an exchange --  
 20 A. I'm not aware of any.  
 21 MR PENNICOTT: That's where I was going next, because in  
 22 your evidence this morning, when you were answering  
 23 questions from Mr Chow and Prof Hansford, I thought that  
 24 you had indicated to the Commission that some  
 25 calculations perhaps had been done by -- I think you

Page 81	1 mentioned some other consultants engaged by the 2 government, but I'm afraid -- perhaps you could tell us 3 a bit more about those calculations? Have they been 4 done? Are they available? Do they address this 5 particular point that we are looking at? 6 A. Let me qualify my earlier statement. I'm not aware of 7 any calculations submitted to perhaps COI or the 8 government from, let's say, MTRC or Atkins or whatever. 9 But then the other firm that is assisting Highways 10 Department has done some checking. 11 Q. Who are they? 12 A. Mannings. 13 Q. Do you know whether they have done some calculations on 14 this particular topic that we are debating at the 15 moment? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. They have? Okay. 18 CHAIRMAN: Have you seen those calculations? 19 A. Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN: What is your view of them? 21 A. Well, actually, in some of the design variations, there 22 may be problem. 23 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, my fault. Do you agree with the accuracy 24 of those calculations, mathematically? 25 A. Okay. Actually, we have gone through a certain learning	Page 83	1 sophisticated one. 2 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, is that half a day the same 3 as what you said just now, which was a few days? 4 A. Something like that, yes. Well -- 5 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Which? Is it half a day or a few 6 days? 7 A. The problem is there are so many design variations, so 8 there is a need to check each and every one. So what 9 they have done is just to check a few of them; okay? 10 But to check all the design variations, perhaps it would 11 take a few days or whatever. 12 CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Commission's concern is structural 13 integrity. 14 A. Yes. 15 CHAIRMAN: Safety. 16 A. Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN: That's the public's concern. So if it's going to 18 require esoteric mathematical calculations over several 19 months, then that's what it will require, but I think 20 you are saying, as interesting as that may be, one 21 doesn't need to go into that area -- 22 A. No, not really. 23 CHAIRMAN: -- more simple calculations will be sufficient -- 24 A. Yes. 25 CHAIRMAN: -- to ensure safety or to ensure that it is safe?
Page 82	1 curve, because those engineers were not too familiar 2 with that. So actually, in the process, we were 3 tutoring them; okay? And, at the end, we came up with 4 some calculations. 5 I need to further elaborate because what I mentioned 6 earlier this morning, that it takes half a day or 7 whatever, that is simplified calculations. If we would 8 like to do very sophisticated calculations, it may take 9 months. I'm not talking about this kind of calculation, 10 but just simple calculations. So they have done some 11 calculations and I am satisfied that they are 12 trustworthy, at least based on those input data, it 13 indicates that there is a need for further checking, 14 numerically. 15 CHAIRMAN: Does that mean trespassing into the area of 16 highly complex mathematical calculations that could take 17 months? 18 A. Well, I'm not -- yes, it's true, because some of my 19 research students are really doing something like this, 20 but I'm not talking about this kind of sophisticated 21 calculations but just simple calculations; perhaps a few 22 days, that would be good enough. 23 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So, Prof Au, when you answered me 24 this morning that it could be done in half a day -- 25 A. Yes, simple calculations. Simple calculations, not the	Page 84	1 A. Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. 3 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Which could be done over a few days? 4 A. Yes. Well, provided that there are available numbers of 5 the internal forces, whatever, not necessary to build 6 from square one. 7 CHAIRMAN: Provided the base data? 8 A. Yes, yes, yes. 9 CHAIRMAN: I understand. 10 MR PENNICOTT: Presumably the base data is there, otherwise 11 these calculations wouldn't have started already? 12 A. So I believe the consultant firms of MTRC should have 13 the base data. 14 Q. All right. I won't pursue that. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, you mean Atkins? 16 A. Atkins. 17 CHAIRMAN: Or Mannings? 18 A. Well, Mannings doesn't have all the base data -- 19 MR PENNICOTT: That's why I'm querying the position. 20 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 21 MR PENNICOTT: Because if you are saying that Mannings, who 22 have been apparently doing some calculations, don't have 23 all the base data, I'm really not quite sure how useful 24 that's calculations are going to be, but anyway. 25 I mean, we will see if anybody else wants to take this

Page 85	1 further or if the Commission does, because there is this 2 overarching point, sir, that you may hear from other 3 experts to say you really don't need to trouble yourself 4 about these calculations for reasons they will give. 5 CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that, but from my point of view -- 6 MR PENNICOTT: But obviously we've got Prof Au here and we 7 need to get his views, I understand that. 8 CHAIRMAN: Myself and Prof Hansford need to know what the 9 position is for the various expert parties. 10 MR PENNICOTT: Correct. 11 CHAIRMAN: And my understanding is that Prof Au is saying 12 there are some calculations that can be done within 13 a limited period of time, subject to the base data being 14 made available, and that base data should already be 15 available, even though it may need to be checked. So 16 these calculations and the results of them will confirm 17 the view already held that the structures do have 18 an integrity that makes them safe. 19 A. Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN: That's what you are looking for; you are looking 21 for confirmation? 22 A. Yes. 23 CHAIRMAN: That's my understanding of the professor's 24 position at this moment in time. So it's feasible and 25 could be done before we have to bring out our report.
Page 87	1 discussing are reasonably clear, and that's this, that 2 the top mat of steel in the EWL slab is in tension and 3 essentially that's the critical rebar and the 4 connections with which we are concerned. There may be 5 others but that's the really important one? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So far as the top of the west diaphragm wall is 8 concerned, because of its different design and 9 configuration, vertical couplers, we are not concerned 10 with the top of the west diaphragm wall? 11 A. Agree. 12 Q. So far as the top of the east diaphragm wall is 13 concerned, essentially, because of the second change -- 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. -- the vast majority of the top of the east diaphragm 16 wall, I think something like 95 per cent or so, does not 17 have couplers in the top rebar, because it now has 18 through-bars? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Therefore, in terms of couplers at the top mat of rebar, 21 we are only talking about a small number of panels or 22 sections? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And it's those that, as I understand it, and, Professor, 25 your understanding as well, are being focused on so far
Page 86	1 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: That's our concern. 2 MR PENNICOTT: Yes. All right. 3 CHAIRMAN: I notice Prof Au is nodding his head, so that 4 seems to accord with his view. 5 A. (Nodded head). 6 MR PENNICOTT: Yes, that's right. Going back to the debate 7 we were having about the joint statement just now, 8 of course, I was going to the last sentence in 9 paragraph 3 which again, there it is. One can see what 10 the experts have agreed. So notwithstanding all of 11 what's preceded it, they have all agreed that the 12 outcome would not show the construction joint to be 13 problematic. So I'm not going there. That's what's 14 been agreed. The calculations may be of great interest 15 to some, but obviously read subject to that last 16 sentence which has been agreed. 17 Prof Au, can I just ask you some questions about the 18 holistic proposal and the opening-up and some questions 19 about that particular topic. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Can we first of all focus on the EWL slab. 22 A. Okay. 23 Q. Top slab. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. As I understand it, the basic parameters of what we are
Page 88	1 as the holistic proposal is concerned? 2 A. You are talking about the top one? 3 Q. Yes. 4 A. Purpose (i)? 5 Q. Yes, purpose (i), indeed. 6 So far as the top mat of rebar is concerned, the 7 potential problem areas, subject to the discussion we've 8 just had about the calculations of shear and so forth -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- the potential problem so far as couplers are 11 concerned is in a very limited area? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. So if there is a problem that's discovered, it will 14 necessarily be very localised, so far as the top mat of 15 rebar is concerned? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. And so far as the bottom mat of rebar is concerned, as 18 I understand it, the connections both on the west and 19 the east diaphragm wall are essentially the same? 20 A. Mm-hmm. 21 Q. But they are subject to the 50 per cent requirement in 22 the code? 23 A. Right. 24 Q. So when one comes to look at the results that the 25 opening-up is giving us, one has to bear all those

Page 89

1 different factors in mind; do you agree?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Because it's not just a question of whether the couplers  
4 are screwed in sufficiently, it is also rather important  
5 to know where those couplers are?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. As I understand it -- and perhaps you can help me with  
8 this, Prof Au -- in your PowerPoint slides this morning,  
9 you referred I think to one-third of the couplers  
10 being -- I'm not sure what word you used  
11 "problematic" --  
12 A. Over one-third.  
13 Q. Over one-third non-compliant couplers, over one-third?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. As I understand it, your definition of "non-compliant"  
16 is less than 37 millimetres; is that right?  
17 A. Yes. Yes. I think that is the criterion used in the  
18 holistic proposal; right?  
19 Q. 37 millimetres engagement into the coupler?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Okay. It's against that criteria that you've reached  
22 your one-third assessment or over one-third assessment?  
23 A. I think that is the result published on the net.  
24 Q. And that figure, one-third, is simply by reference to  
25 the 37 millimetre figure that government are using, and

Page 90

1 does not take into account the tests that have been done  
2 at the various percentages of engagement that you  
3 discussed briefly this morning?  
4 A. So when I mentioned over one-third are non-compliant,  
5 I was referring to the results published. I haven't  
6 referred to the test.  
7 Q. Indeed, because, in a nutshell, we've seen reference to  
8 60 per cent engagement, which is equivalent to about 25  
9 or 26 millimetres engagement, and with the results that  
10 we have from the tests done by BD, BOSA and CASTCO, they  
11 show, on one view, that 26 millimetres engagement is  
12 good enough for safety. Do you agree?  
13 A. No.  
14 Q. On one view, that's what they show, because you can see  
15 the figures on their face, Prof Au: 60 per cent, and  
16 they are perfectly strong enough.  
17 A. Okay. So I have mentioned several times that the  
18 acceptance criteria do not just contain strength but  
19 also deformation; okay? Now, it is necessary to carry  
20 out more tests to find out the performance of these  
21 non-compliant couplers, I mean similar couplers, how  
22 they behave.  
23 Q. Right.  
24 A. And then the data must be sort of made reliable, because  
25 right now the data don't appear reasonable, having

Page 91

1 a maximum value at 60 per cent.  
2 Q. So to assist the Commission, Prof Au, as I understand  
3 it, what you are saying is, "Okay, I've seen these tests  
4 that have been done by BD, BOSA and CASTCO back in  
5 November 2018. I see what they say, but I don't think  
6 those tests are sufficiently robust or sufficient in  
7 number"?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Just to help me, Mr Pennicott -- you  
10 refer to BD, BOSA and CASTCO.  
11 MR PENNICOTT: Yes.  
12 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Is that three lots of tests?  
13 MR PENNICOTT: No. BD, CASTCO and BOSA did these joint  
14 tests back in November.  
15 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you very much.  
16 MR PENNICOTT: It was an exercise that was done by the three  
17 parties. I think the BD, rather like the Commission,  
18 has asked BOSA to assist it on occasions, and  
19 I understand that BOSA invited BD to be present at the  
20 tests, and so forth. We have the results, we've seen  
21 the table, I think it's just about in -- everybody's  
22 expert report refers to the table that BOSA came up  
23 with.  
24 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So the testing laboratory was  
25 CASTCO?

Page 92

1 MR PENNICOTT: Correct, that's right, sir. The independent  
2 laboratory was CASTCO.  
3 So you have Prof Au's position. As I understand it,  
4 we will hear from the other experts on what they  
5 conclude from those tests, but Prof Au's position is  
6 that more needs to be done.  
7 However, Prof Au, can I just look at the latest set  
8 of results that we have, just to ask you a couple of  
9 questions. They are in the OU bundle, OU314.  
10 As of Friday, 11 January, Prof Au, I don't know  
11 whether you've come back up to date -- you've looked at  
12 this sheet -- you've got 67 results. Does that  
13 accord --  
14 A. I have seen some results just this morning, but I'm not  
15 sure it's exactly the same.  
16 Q. Anyway, my understand at the moment, subject to being  
17 corrected by somebody else, is that as of 12 January,  
18 which was Saturday, these are the results that we have,  
19 and they are at OU314, no results having been done  
20 yesterday, on the Sunday.  
21 Can I just ask you to -- we can all do the exercise,  
22 but just so that we've got a bit of an understanding of  
23 what's on this sheet -- first of all, Prof Au, there are  
24 two rather blindingly obvious rogue results. That is at  
25 number 5, where one has an engagement length of

Page 93	Page 95
<p>1 6.22 millimetres; do you see that?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And number 22, where one has an engagement length of</p> <p>4 9.4.</p> <p>5 A. Right.</p> <p>6 Q. So they are completely out of kilter with all the other</p> <p>7 results.</p> <p>8 A. Oh, yes, right.</p> <p>9 Q. And I think not shown on this sheet is another piece of</p> <p>10 rebar --</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. -- near the West Wall, I understand, which is not</p> <p>13 connected at all and is not shown on this sheet. So, on</p> <p>14 one view, we have 68 results, but 68 is not shown on</p> <p>15 here.</p> <p>16 A. (Nodded head).</p> <p>17 Q. Thank you. Okay.</p> <p>18 Can I just ask you, first of all, to focus on the</p> <p>19 NSL, that's the lower slab, and you will see that there</p> <p>20 are five results at 32 to 36; do you see that?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And save for number 36, which is 0.64 out, they are all</p> <p>23 compliant with the 37 millimetre criteria?</p> <p>24 A. I beg your pardon, are you referring to 36?</p> <p>25 Q. Number 36, yes. It's 36.36.</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. -- is that there are 14 results in total, three of which</p> <p>3 are under 37 millimetres -- sorry, four of which are</p> <p>4 under 37 millimetres but one only just?</p> <p>5 A. Right.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. But if one looked at -- if one applied the</p> <p>7 strength requirement derived from the tests that we were</p> <p>8 discussing earlier --</p> <p>9 A. Right.</p> <p>10 Q. -- and you looked at 35 and 36 millimetres, rather than</p> <p>11 37, they would all pass?</p> <p>12 A. Strength, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. All right.</p> <p>14 Prof Au, can I just ask you this. You have looked</p> <p>15 at a lot of evidence, a lot of material, for the</p> <p>16 purposes of preparing your report and coming to give</p> <p>17 your evidence today.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Taking your academic hat off for one moment and applying</p> <p>20 some engineering judgment, practical engineering</p> <p>21 judgment, and perhaps, dare I say, some practical</p> <p>22 engineering common sense, but based on all that evidence</p> <p>23 that you've seen and heard, including the evidence of</p> <p>24 your fellow experts, do you agree that the most likely</p> <p>25 position is that the EWL slab is safe for its intended</p>
Page 94	Page 96
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. So it hasn't quite achieved 37, it's 0.64 off?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. But the others meet the 37 criteria?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Then if you go down a bit further to 43, 44 and 45,</p> <p>7 three more NSL results?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And they all meet the criteria?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Then more recently we've got 59, 60 and 61, which are on</p> <p>12 the NSL but they are on the West Wall; do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. They all do not meet the 37 criteria?</p> <p>15 A. Correct.</p> <p>16 Q. Then lastly, so far as the NSL is concerned, the last</p> <p>17 three results, all back on the East Wall this time, all</p> <p>18 comfortably meet the requirement?</p> <p>19 A. Right.</p> <p>20 Q. And that's the way we are to read this table --</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. -- I've just focused on the NSL. And the overall</p> <p>23 summary, so far as the NSL is concerned -- and</p> <p>24 of course, with the NSL, we know all the results are on</p> <p>25 the top, not the bottom --</p>	<p>1 purpose?</p> <p>2 A. Well, now, I think some more investigations should be</p> <p>3 done, such as checking of the stresses. But my</p> <p>4 impression is that even though there are problems, they</p> <p>5 should be solvable, my impression.</p> <p>6 Q. And so -- I will put it again -- you believe, despite</p> <p>7 the fact that there are problems which need further</p> <p>8 investigation, I will put it my way, the most likely</p> <p>9 position is that the EWL slab will prove to be safe?</p> <p>10 A. Well, after doing the necessary strengthening works or</p> <p>11 whatever.</p> <p>12 Q. But we haven't reached that stage yet.</p> <p>13 A. Yes, wait and see.</p> <p>14 Q. Let me put it again --</p> <p>15 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I don't wish to interrupt you, but I think</p> <p>16 what Prof Au is saying is he cannot agree that the most</p> <p>17 likely result at this moment in time is that the EWL</p> <p>18 slab is safe and fit for purpose.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 CHAIRMAN: However, he believes that further investigation</p> <p>21 will resolve that issue and it may be necessary to add</p> <p>22 some extra reinforcing measures in order to make it</p> <p>23 safe.</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN: Would that be right?</p>



Page 97	1 A. Yes. 2 MR PENNICOTT: And it's a "maybe" required in terms of 3 additional work or reinforcement? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. I asked the question specifically in relation to the EWL 6 slab, and would you agree the same applies as far as the 7 NSL slab is concerned, probably even more so because 8 there seemed to be, with respect, a lot less problems 9 with the NSL slab? 10 A. I think that is reasonable because of the order of 11 construction, the workers should have gone through the 12 learning curve so when they came to the NSL slab they 13 should be more experienced. So I'm glad to see that the 14 results for the NSL slab are better than those for EWL 15 slab. 16 Q. Right. 17 CHAIRMAN: All right. Could we approach it more on 18 an engineering basis rather than "workmen getting 19 better"? I don't mean to say that in a disparaging or 20 condescending way, but it may be -- we don't know what 21 our findings will be -- that the standard of workmanship 22 remained the same or perhaps even got worse. So I'm 23 a bit concerned as to dealing with a result on 24 an assumption of improving work quality, absent some 25 compelling evidence that that was taking place.	Page 99	1 locations of the structure, which will help to assess 2 the structural performance." 3 What sort of long-term structural health monitoring 4 system did you have in mind? 5 A. Well, actually, in Hong Kong, the first structural 6 health monitoring system was installed on the Lantau 7 Link, Tsing Ma Bridge and so on, over 20 years ago. The 8 system consists mainly of accelerometers, displacement 9 sensors, temperature sensors, whatever. I think for 10 this particular station, probably some displacement 11 sensors and accelerometers will be sufficient. I don't 12 think we need a very extensive monitoring system. 13 I think just placing certain instruments at certain key 14 locations, to provide data, I think that would boost the 15 confidence of the public. 16 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And fibreoptics or would that be too 17 much? 18 A. Well, actually, it is very common. I think using 19 fibreoptic sensors for measurement of strength, I think 20 we did that over ten years ago. It's not too expensive. 21 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And you would be advocating that 22 here as part of what you regard is sensible long-term 23 structural health monitoring system? 24 A. Yes. I think it would be cheaper than doing a loading 25 test.
Page 98	1 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So, therefore, it would be helpful 2 if the answer was revisited, ignoring the possibility of 3 learning curve. 4 A. I agree. 5 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So perhaps Mr Pennicott can ask you 6 the question again. Could we have the question based 7 upon engineering? 8 A. Apparently, from the findings of the opening-up, it 9 supports that kind of, well, argument. So the NSL slab 10 results are better. 11 MR PENNICOTT: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. 13 Is that an opportune moment? 14 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, it is, and subject to any thoughts over 15 lunch, I have probably finished for now. 16 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Is there time for one question from 17 me? 18 CHAIRMAN: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Prof Au, in your paragraph 8.1 of 20 your witness statement, it's your last paragraph, your 21 very last paragraph, your witness statement, you refer 22 to -- well, you say: 23 "It may be desirable to install a long-term 24 structural health monitoring system to monitor the 25 variations of displacements and deformations at key	Page 100	1 CHAIRMAN: And in fact, just so we can confirm that, the 2 agreed expert memorandum, paragraph 5, actually says: 3 "All agreed that a load test was unnecessary because 4 it would yield no meaningful result ..." 5 And then, and I emphasise: 6 "... and long-term monitoring would be a better 7 approach to allay public safety concerns." 8 A. Yes. 9 CHAIRMAN: So presumably a very doable, presumably 10 financially feasible way of putting in monitoring things 11 to ensure public safety and that people can have 12 confidence in using that station in the future? 13 A. Yes. 14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 15 MR PENNICOTT: Sir, if I can say, just to add to that, that 16 is one thing that clearly the Commission's expert 17 Prof McQuillan also agrees with; see paragraph 113 of 18 his report, where he says: 19 "To allay public concern ... the EWL slab should ... 20 -- have more sensitive instrumentation, eg 21 a fibreoptic system, installed. 22 -- have its structural performance monitored in 23 terms of deflection ..." 24 So that point is certainly agreed and puts a bit of 25 flesh on the bones of paragraph 5.

Page 101	Page 103
<p>1 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much. Good. It's 10 past 2 one. 3 Sorry, Mr Chow. 4 MR CHOW: I hope I'm going to be helpful to the Commission. 5 Just now, my learned friend Mr Pennicott referred to the 6 test results carried out by CASTCO and BOSA. My 7 instruction is BD did not or was not part of the test. 8 BD only witnessed the test. Subsequent to that, what is 9 more important is that subsequent to that, there was 10 correspondence between the Buildings Department and 11 BOSA. I will probably take Prof Au to those 12 correspondence. In fact one of those correspondences 13 has been referred to by Prof Au in one of his slides. 14 If I may at this point give the Commission the page 15 references, just in case the Commissioner, sir, you have 16 time over lunch time to take a look at those 17 correspondences because that is highly relevant to the 18 interpretation and the validity of the test results. 19 The first letter is from the Buildings Department to 20 BOSA dated 28 December and it's bundle H26 from 21 page 45479 to 45481. And then we have the response from 22 BOSA on 7 January this year, same bundle, H26, 45640 to 23 45643. Then we have a further letter from the Buildings 24 Department to MTRC dated 10 January 2019 at bundle H26, 25 45853.</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Prof Au, I see that you have a hard copy in front of 3 you. 4 A. Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Hold on, Mr So. We don't have it in 6 front of us yet. 7 MR SO: Thank you. 8 Prof Au, this is appendix VI, as you can see, of the 9 QSP. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Can I trouble you to C116, that you can see paragraph 5 12 of that. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. If that can be blown up a bit. 15 Sorry, I'm afraid there is a technology issue. 16 CHAIRMAN: It's done now. Thank you. 17 MR SO: In paragraph 5, there mentioned -- if you focus on 18 paragraph 5(b), there is a mention of static tension 19 test. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. I believe that is the test actually being done currently 22 by the collaborative effort of BOSA and the laboratory; 23 correct? 24 A. I believe so. 25 Q. If you can focus on paragraph (a), there is</p>
Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 I hope that will make the position clearer. 2 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I think that's useful, Mr Chow, and 3 I'm sure our Secretariat will provide us with copies of 4 those over the lunch break. 5 MR CHOW: That's what I expected, if I may. 6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you all very much. 2.30. 7 (1.11 pm) 8 (The luncheon adjournment) 9 (2.30 pm) 10 MR SO: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman. Good afternoon, 11 Professor. There are some questions from China 12 Technology. 13 CHAIRMAN: Yes. 14 Cross-examination by MR SO 15 MR SO: Good afternoon, Professor. I represent China 16 Technology. 17 I heard you this morning on no less than one 18 occasion -- that you have mentioned that when looking 19 into the strength of the thread, you would have to carry 20 out more tests; correct? 21 A. Are you referring to the couplers? 22 Q. Yes. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. I wish to take you to one document. That is in 25 bundle C1, C114.</p>	<p>1 an experiment on permanent elongation, and in 2 paragraph (c) there is a static compression test. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And in paragraph (d) there is a cyclic tension and 5 compression test. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Professor, are those tests that you have referred to 8 there further tests that should be taken in order to 9 ascertain the full picture of the couplers? 10 A. Yes, correct. 11 Q. If you can go back to the same document, paragraph 5(b), 12 there it mentioned the tensile strength of the bar, and 13 there is a mention of grade 460. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And, as you have just mentioned to us this morning, 16 those are the common types of tensile strength bars used 17 at the time when the Hung Hom Station was actually 18 built? 19 A. Correct. 20 Q. So one expects, if a test is to be conducted in terms of 21 the tensile strength, then a reasonable test specimen 22 would be using the grade 460 threads; correct? 23 A. Yes, correct. 24 Q. Can I bring you to your expert report, which is at 25 paragraph 2.4.</p>

Page 105	Page 107
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. In paragraph 2.4, you have referred to the experiment in</p> <p>3 which the test results were actually incorporated in</p> <p>4 page 44521 to 44525; correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. So far, we haven't taken a look at the actual test</p> <p>7 report itself. We are often referred to the table. Can</p> <p>8 I just trouble you to go to the actual test result that</p> <p>9 was actually produced by CASTCO. It is in bundle H26.</p> <p>10 This time, I want you to focus on page H44526.</p> <p>11 MR PENNICOTT: That's H25.</p> <p>12 MR SO: I do apologise. It should be bundle H25. Thank</p> <p>13 you. If that could be blown up slightly. Yes, thank</p> <p>14 you.</p> <p>15 Prof Au, this is page H44526.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. I understand that this particular page of the report was</p> <p>18 not included in your expert report.</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>20 Q. If we can focus on the box that writes, "Specified yield</p> <p>21 strength of bar", where it writes "900 Megapascals".</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you kindly explain why in this test a grade 900 bar</p> <p>24 was used?</p> <p>25 A. I believe that is mainly to test the strength of the</p>	<p>1 A. Because normally, in a laboratory, there should be some</p> <p>2 qualified people, including the authorised signatory,</p> <p>3 and so on, that should be looking at all these tests,</p> <p>4 and I believe -- now, the other strange thing is that</p> <p>5 the number 900 has been typewritten, whereas the other</p> <p>6 numbers have been handwritten. It looks strange. So it</p> <p>7 looks like the worksheet has been designed for testing</p> <p>8 of assemblies having strength of 900 Megapascals.</p> <p>9 Q. But as you have just told us, Prof Au, these tests</p> <p>10 should be for grade 460 instead?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, of course.</p> <p>12 Q. Can I then trouble you to go to H45861. This is</p> <p>13 a photograph which shows the specimen itself and also it</p> <p>14 was typewritten with the test results on it.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. You have told us earlier this morning, and I don't need</p> <p>17 to trouble you to go to the transcript -- it was in</p> <p>18 [draft] page 43 of today's transcript, when</p> <p>19 Prof Hansford asked, "Why are the samples not enough?",</p> <p>20 and you said there was a strange thing in that the</p> <p>21 maximum strength occurs at 60 per cent engagement but</p> <p>22 not more, and you say that's very strange.</p> <p>23 Can you kindly explain more about what is the</p> <p>24 strange thing about that?</p> <p>25 A. Well, in coupler, having different lengths of</p>
Page 106	Page 108
<p>1 coupler itself.</p> <p>2 Q. Right.</p> <p>3 A. Because in the other cases, very often the reinforcing</p> <p>4 bars themselves broke.</p> <p>5 Q. So, in other cases, they would not use the grade</p> <p>6 900 bars?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. They would use grade 460 bars?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, correct.</p> <p>10 Q. You have told us this morning, in answering to</p> <p>11 Prof Hansford's question, it might take some time to</p> <p>12 gather grade 460 bars nowadays?</p> <p>13 A. I believe so.</p> <p>14 Q. Can I then bring you back to the results that have</p> <p>15 actually been used and incorporated in your expert</p> <p>16 report. They are in H44521 to H44525.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Again, can I ask you to pay attention to the box of</p> <p>19 "Specified yield strength of bar".</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Can you kindly assist us, why is that actually crossed</p> <p>22 out with two dots above?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I am not aware of the reason. It looks very</p> <p>24 strange.</p> <p>25 Q. Why is it looking very strange to you?</p>	<p>1 engagement, normally people would expect that the longer</p> <p>2 the length engaged, the higher the strength, but</p> <p>3 actually it is not proportional, because I have recently</p> <p>4 read a paper offered to me by a colleague, and the paper</p> <p>5 described a very sophisticated finite element analysis</p> <p>6 by advocates showing all the variation of stresses in</p> <p>7 the threads or whatever. Actually not all of the</p> <p>8 threads are taking equal loading. So the first few</p> <p>9 threads are taking a lot higher loading.</p> <p>10 That's why, when we have different lengths of</p> <p>11 engagement, some of them look quite similar, but the</p> <p>12 problem is there may be some other issues. For example,</p> <p>13 for smaller engagement length, then its ability to</p> <p>14 survive fatigue damage could be an issue.</p> <p>15 I wonder if I need to explain what I mean by</p> <p>16 "fatigue". I'm talking about the fatigue failure of</p> <p>17 a metal.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN: Yes.</p> <p>19 A. Because it is caused by the cyclic loading. So, in</p> <p>20 a railway structure, normally cyclic loading is</p> <p>21 an issue. Now, if the structure is very bulky, it may</p> <p>22 not be very serious, but if it is quite slender,</p> <p>23 whatever, that can be an issue.</p> <p>24 Now, when I look at the results, I felt very strange</p> <p>25 in that the maximum value appeared at 60 per cent</p>

Page 109	Page 111
<p>1 engagement. It may be caused by the large variation, 2 but it looks strange. So that's why just testing one 3 sample definitely is not enough. 4 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Prof Au, the structural elements 5 here are not slender, are they; they are bulky? 6 A. Yes, correct. 7 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And you said just now that if they 8 are bulky, it may not be an issue? 9 A. Correct. 10 MR SO: Just to pause there, Prof Au, when you just 11 mentioned cyclic loading, that's the cyclic loading we 12 have just seen in the QSP; correct? 13 A. Correct. 14 Q. In light of this photograph and in light of the test 15 sheets I have just given to you, would it be a fair 16 comment to say, at least on the face of these 17 worksheets, we cannot be sure the threads that were 18 actually tested for these readouts were 460 grade 19 threads? 20 A. Well, I don't know, but -- now, I think it is reasonable 21 for people to cast doubt on it, because the worksheet 22 used doesn't appear to be for general purpose. I think 23 the major problem is with the very strange trend of the 24 results. I think that is a major problem. I find that 25 very strange.</p>	<p>1 Q. Paragraph 3: 2 "In response to paragraph 2(a)(i) of your letter, 3 please note that our couplers are designed to the 4 specifications provided in our manual as per your 5 enclosure at appendix A, and for a 40mm diameter type 2 6 coupler, the threaded length is 40mm. Please note this 7 threaded length includes 2mm chamfer at the tip and 2mm 8 exit thread at the tail ...", et cetera. 9 Prof Au -- 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. -- I want to cast your mind then to another piece of 12 document you have been shown this morning by my learned 13 friend Mr Pennicott. This is the document at OU314. 14 Can I trouble the Secretariat to blow it up at the 15 top, where we have the titles of the columns. 16 Prof Au, all along in the phased array test, we are 17 testing the engagement length. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. We know that from BOSA's response that in the end of the 20 coupler there is something called a 2mm chamfer at the 21 end. 22 A. Yes, correct. 23 Q. That 2mm chamfer is, if I put it graphically, is 2mm 24 chamfer and then the couplers, the threadings and then 25 the 2mm tail; is that correct?</p>
Page 110	Page 112
<p>1 Q. In any event, you would accept that there were nowhere 2 whatsoever mentioned in this worksheet that the threads 3 being tested are grade 460 threads; correct? 4 A. Well, the worksheet appears to have something scribbled 5 there. I'm not sure whether that's 460 -- 6 Q. We can take a look at that, Prof Au. H44521 and if you 7 wish, 44522 and 44523. 8 A. So that is a signature -- the initial, probably. That 9 is not 460. It looks very strange. 10 Q. But there was certainly nothing there saying it was 460? 11 A. Yes, correct. 12 Q. Thank you. 13 Now I want to move to another issue that I want to 14 discuss with you. I know this report was prepared by 15 you on 7 January 2019, this year; correct? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. I want to show you a letter that was sent by BOSA to the 18 Buildings Department. This was at bundle H26, H45858. 19 Prof Au, have you had an opportunity in reading this 20 letter before you come to give evidence? 21 A. Yes, I should have read that, because I can recognise 22 "butt-to-butt", "loose", these terms. 23 Q. Thank you very much. I want you to cast your eye to 24 paragraph 3 in particular. 25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And that 2mm chamfer, structurally speaking, is of no 3 structural function; can I say that? 4 A. Well, it is not having the full structural function. 5 Perhaps it has a little bit. 6 Q. But when we are talking about the phased array result, 7 that engagement length would have included that 2mm 8 chamfer; correct? 9 A. Yes, correct. 10 Q. Can I suggest that if we merely look at the engagement 11 length, when we are talking about the 37mm -- where we 12 call the passing benchmark, should we actually add in 13 that 2mm chamfer or should we deduct that 2mm chamfer? 14 A. Well, now, it actually depends on the acceptance 15 criteria of the supplier. So if the supplier has 16 spelled out certain acceptance criteria and we know that 17 this chamfer is already there, I would be happy to 18 accept that. But having said that, what is the effect 19 of the chamfer on the strength of the coupler assembly? 20 I think that can be reflected in the test results. 21 Q. Thank you very much. 22 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, in what say, Prof Au, can it 23 be reflected in the test results? 24 A. In the test results, the bars, the couplers, already 25 have certain chamfers, the threads, and so on. So, when</p>

Page 113	Page 115
<p>1 we test it, then the results should have already taken 2 into account the features. 3 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I see. 4 A. So, in that case, I would have accepted that, provided 5 that it is proved by test results. 6 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I see. 7 MR SO: Thank you. When you were actually engaged to 8 complete this expert report, was it brought to your 9 attention that in SCL project there were certain 10 practices of planting dowels into the diaphragm walls? 11 A. Do you mean at the bottom? 12 Q. Yes. 13 A. I have seen some sketches of that. I think perhaps that 14 applies to some of the diaphragm walls. 15 Q. And do you understand that when planting dowels, they 16 are in substitution of what we call T40 bars? 17 A. That I'm not aware of. 18 Q. Can I bring you to a transcript of our hearing. It is 19 in Day 20 of the hearing, page 40. 20 Mr Chairman and Professor, this is the evidence of 21 Mr Andy Ip. 22 Can I bring you to page 40, line 16 onwards. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. That is when Mr Andy Ip was being examined by counsel 25 for the Commission, when he was asked about planting</p>	<p>1 MR SO: If we go to page -- 2 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: No, on the page you are on, line 3 25. 4 MR SO: "Again, Mr Ip, are you aware of that type of 5 remedial work measure having been carried out? 6 Answer: This one, yes, I think at the time we did 7 submit what we call TQ [technical query], that is the 8 engineering department submitted that to the consultant 9 company and asked whether it could be done this way. At 10 the end, drilling was done to add the T25 bar. That's 11 the remedial measure that was taken at the end." 12 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you. That's helpful. 13 MR SO: Thank you very much, Professor. I have no further 14 questions. 15 Cross-examination by MR CONNOR 16 MR CONNOR: Thank you, sir. 17 Good afternoon, Prof Au. I'm Vincent Connor, 18 I represent Atkins China Ltd, and I have a few questions 19 for you this afternoon. 20 A. Right. 21 Q. Could you have before you, please, your report, which is 22 ER1/7 in the bundle. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. You note in that report, in the first line after the 25 word "instructions" --</p>
Page 114	Page 116
<p>1 dowels in the diaphragm walls. Just for the benefit of 2 everyone and for completeness, it reads: 3 "When the starter bar was at the correct level but 4 installed in the incorrect direction (that is not 5 perpendicular to the face of the diaphragm wall), in 6 some instances the starter bar (T40) was bent to the 7 intended alignment and one additional T25 starter bar 8 drilled and fixed using Hilti chemical resin HIT-RE500 9 adjacent to the existing T40 starter bar." 10 Now, Prof Au, insofar as I understand, T40 and T25 11 are concerning the diameters of bars; right? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Would it be structurally anything compromising by using 14 a T25 starter bar to substitute a T40 bar? 15 A. I don't fully understand whether it means that the T25 16 bar is replacing the T40. Now, I think if it is really 17 the case, there is some concern, because the strength of 18 T25 is less than that of T40. 19 Q. Right. Maybe I can help you. Can we turn to page -- 20 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I'm sorry, actually, before we move 21 on, can you read the next couple of lines on that 22 transcript. 23 MR SO: Of course. 24 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Because I think Mr Ip goes on to say 25 he wasn't aware of that ever being used.</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. -- that you "have been instructed to provide your 3 opinion in respect of the following issues". 4 A. Yes, correct. 5 Q. You then narrate eight issues at that point; do you see 6 that? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. You mentioned, I think, in response to questions from 9 Mr Pennicott this morning that you received instructions 10 in December. Do you recall when? 11 A. It's very complicated because at the very beginning 12 I was invited by the Highways Department to act as 13 adviser, but then later on -- well, the date wasn't too 14 clear. Later on, I was asked to -- so I was invited to 15 meetings, and then later I was asked to come up with 16 some report. Then much later I was invited by the DoJ 17 to serve as expert witness and I received that quite 18 late. Yes, so I think probably that was sometime in 19 December, so that's the second one. 20 But then -- well, when I helped the Highways 21 Department, I wasn't sort of told to serve in that 22 capacity, so I was only asked to give some comments or 23 whatever. 24 Q. Thank you. That's helpful. So if we understand it 25 then, your instructions for the purposes of this report</p>

Page 117	Page 119
<p>1 came in December? 2 A. Yes, I believe so. 3 Q. But that you had some involvement prior to that point, 4 giving some advice to the Highways Department? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Thank you. That's helpful. 7 So, in fairness to you, and I say that given the 8 depth of the questions that you've received so far, you 9 don't come to this Commission of Inquiry with the 10 benefit of many months or indeed years -- 11 A. No, no. 12 Q. -- of involvement in the design of these structures that 13 we've been discussing? 14 A. You mean design of the structure of the station? 15 Q. Indeed. 16 A. I wasn't involved. 17 Q. No. 18 A. No. 19 Q. Nor do you come with months or years of involvement in 20 checks or calculations -- 21 A. Of this structure? 22 Q. Of that structure, yes. 23 A. No. 24 Q. And listening carefully to your evidence, as I have been 25 so far, would I be right in really assessing this of</p>	<p>1 A. Well, now, normally, yes, but then in case there are 2 problems -- for example, I understand that the expert 3 reports from various parties contain the strength 4 utilisation factors and there are variations, and in 5 some cases fairly large variations. 6 Q. Let's come to the perceived problems in just a moment, 7 if we may. 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Before proceeding further, you will recall you were 10 asked some questions by Mr Pennicott in particular as 11 regards the joint statement. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Which you agreed just before Christmas. If you would be 14 good enough to have in front of you the expert report of 15 Prof McQuillan, which is ER3, and in particular the 16 appendix XI, where the agreed expert memorandum is set 17 out, from page 117 onwards; do you see that? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. In particular, if you turn to page 118, article 3, I'd 20 like to ask you a question about that. 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. In view of our discussions this morning and the comments 23 from the Commissioners, you will understand that to some 24 extent we will for legal purposes regard this as 25 a document upon which the Commissioners will have views</p>
Page 118	Page 120
<p>1 what you are sharing with us -- 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. -- that your primary concern in this report and the 4 evidence that you've given to the Commissioners so far 5 is less about, shall we say, a criticism of what has 6 been done by way of checking and calculation so far, but 7 more a view that more needs to be done to satisfy your 8 personal interest and concerns? 9 A. Not my personal interest and concern, no. 10 Q. Then if I adjust that last part: but that is principally 11 your view; it is that what has been done is okay, but 12 more needs to be done to satisfy concerns as to the 13 integrity of the structure that we have discussed? 14 A. Yes, correct. 15 Q. And so to the extent we have heard evidence already from 16 those who have had an in-depth involvement in 17 calculations and checking, and indeed we may hear more, 18 because of the limited nature of your involvement, you 19 would obviously respect those views of such persons? 20 A. Yes, in terms of the involvement, yes, they have been 21 involved much longer, it's true, yes. 22 Q. And as far as they have an involvement in the detail of 23 the checking of the calculations, you would, to a very 24 large extent, as we all do, defer to them and rely on 25 them in relation to such calculations and checking?</p>	<p>1 in due course. But we did understand, I think, from you 2 that the words in brackets in section 3, part 3 of this, 3 were derived from your own concern; yes? 4 A. I believe that is the concern not only of me but also of 5 the government. 6 Q. We are only asking you questions just now, Professor. 7 A. Yes, it's my concern, it's my concern. 8 Q. So if we can stick to your concerns at this stage. 9 The paragraph I have in mind is the second 10 paragraph. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. "All agreed that the change from couplers to 13 through-bars in the top of the east D-wall was a better 14 detail and provided more steel across the interface ..." 15 And then there follow some words in brackets: 16 "... (subject to a review of the internal stresses 17 at the top-of-wall construction joint relating to the 18 'first change' and its rebar detailing)." 19 Then it goes on to say: 20 "Notwithstanding, all agreed the outcome would not 21 show the construction joint to be problematic." 22 Do you see that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. So the part I'm asking you about is that which appears 25 in brackets. Mr Pennicott asked you some questions</p>

Page 121

1 about this, and the purpose of my question, and perhaps  
 2 as much for your comfort as it is for the learned  
 3 Commissioners, is not to question what's set out here,  
 4 but do we understand that with the benefit of reflection  
 5 that your evidence to the Commission is that in fact  
 6 your concern -- as expressed in those brackets -- was  
 7 not particularly with regard to the first change but  
 8 with regard to the second change?  
 9 A. No. Actually, in the meeting, I raised both.  
 10 Q. Yes.  
 11 A. I raised both. So that is shown in one of -- well,  
 12 I think the third figure of my report, showing different  
 13 cross-sections. The labelled cross-sections -- I raised  
 14 both. So one of the cross-sections is a potential  
 15 problem arising from the first change, and I believe  
 16 that has caused the error of mixing the two together.  
 17 So the additional construction joint has been caused by  
 18 the second change.  
 19 Q. Yes.  
 20 A. So actually I raised two concerns.  
 21 Q. And today what is your position?  
 22 A. Still --  
 23 Q. Do you remain concerned about both changes?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. So when I proceed to ask you some questions about the

Page 122

1 calculations and the checks that you see as being  
 2 important, as we move forward, you have in mind a need  
 3 for checks and calculations in respect of both the first  
 4 change and the second change?  
 5 A. Yes, correct.  
 6 Q. That's helpful because that will help us frame what we  
 7 look at as we go forward.  
 8 Now, putting that document to one side, please, and  
 9 returning to your own report -- would you turn, please,  
 10 to paragraph 6.4.1.1. For the record, this is document  
 11 ER1/7, and it begins at the foot of page 9, that is  
 12 where the heading of the section is set out, "Issues  
 13 related to connection between the EWL slab and the east  
 14 diaphragm wall"; do you see that?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Your opening paragraph here, if I can put it this way,  
 17 sets the scene for what you go on to comment on in more  
 18 detail in the rest of this section; is that so?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. What you say is as follows:  
 21 "In the structural design, it has been assumed that  
 22 the EWL/NSL slabs are rigidly connected to the diaphragm  
 23 walls. The diaphragm walls serve both as the foundation  
 24 supporting the station as well as the retaining  
 25 structure to support the soil outside the station

Page 123

1 structure."  
 2 Do you see that?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. You go on to say:  
 5 "If the slab-wall joint cannot perform as a rigid  
 6 joint as expected, the internal forces may be different  
 7 from those predicted from structural analysis based on  
 8 the rigid joint assumption."  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. "In particular, the mid-span bending moments in the  
 11 slabs will increase."  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. "If the slab-wall joint is improperly detailed and/or  
 14 poorly constructed, the stiffness of the slab-wall joint  
 15 will be reduced. In this unfortunate case, not only  
 16 will the mid-span bending moments in the slab increase,  
 17 but the structural stability of the station may also be  
 18 affected, eg excessive side-sway of station structure."  
 19 Do you see all of that?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. Just against this background -- and we'll come to look  
 22 at these words in a little bit more detail, Professor --  
 23 I'd like to just understand this. It's not your  
 24 position that when one designs a structure such as the  
 25 one under discussion, that one needs to design for

Page 124

1 extreme events, beyond those that the codes require, is  
 2 it?  
 3 A. Sorry?  
 4 Q. It is not your position that one should design for  
 5 extreme events, beyond those that the codes, et cetera,  
 6 anticipate?  
 7 A. Normally, in our design, we would consider certain load  
 8 cases required, but there are rules and the provision of  
 9 these rules would help in -- well, helping the structure  
 10 to survive extreme events.  
 11 Q. You certainly don't design or expect to design for  
 12 unforeseeable events which are not provided for within  
 13 the applicable codes?  
 14 A. Now, put it -- well, I think I need to clarify. That  
 15 is, there is one part which is based upon calculations;  
 16 okay? To do calculations, normally an engineer would  
 17 consider a list of load combinations; okay?  
 18 Q. Mm-hmm.  
 19 A. But it is possible that there could be some scenarios  
 20 not covered in all of these scenarios. So the other  
 21 rules -- the rules of detailing or whatever will provide  
 22 additional safety measures.  
 23 Q. Assuming when one goes through the relevant codes, the  
 24 relevant standards, as imposed through, for example,  
 25 a consultancy agreement for the purpose of the design of

Page 125	Page 127
<p>1 a structure of that which is under discussion, one 2 doesn't have to start designing for things that are not 3 allowed for within there? 4 A. Correct. I hope that you understand my point. What I'm 5 saying is that there are certain rules laid down by the 6 design codes, such as provision of certain reinforcement 7 that normally is not required because of the 8 calculations. 9 Now, I can give you one example. 10 Q. Please do. One will be fine, thank you. 11 A. Okay, just one. Very often, the provision of 12 reinforcement provided at locations not deemed necessary 13 may help in providing certain robustness. Actually, one 14 of my awards, in the year 2016, was from a paper on the 15 robustness of concrete bridges. So it would help. 16 Q. Where you describe in this paragraph, the sentence 17 beginning "If the slab-wall joint cannot perform as 18 a rigid joint as expected, the internal forces may be 19 different from those predicted from structural analysis 20 based on the rigid joint assumption" -- 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. -- your statement there is not based upon any particular 23 evidence that has been put before you that the slab is 24 behaving in that way? 25 A. No. It's a structural engineering sort of concept.</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And if it were to come about, then significant distress 3 would self-evidently be apparent from the slab 4 concerned? 5 A. I believe so. 6 Q. There would, for example, be cracking on the top of the 7 joint? 8 A. Now, the problem is -- 9 Q. Sorry, if you could caveat that, and I will come back to 10 you explaining your problem, but if we can deal with 11 this point by point -- there would be cracking visible 12 on top of the joint? 13 A. Not necessarily. The problem is -- 14 Q. Okay, please -- 15 A. -- in the joint there are certain parts, primarily the 16 reinforcement, taking tension, and concrete is taking 17 compression. The problem with concrete -- well, relying 18 a lot on the compression of concrete is that the 19 behaviour is brittle, just like two of my slides showing 20 brittle failure and ductile failure. 21 So the problem with the joint is that in case 22 anything goes wrong, it could be brittle, so we may not 23 be able to see anything prior to its failure. 24 Q. So your position is side-sway, as you alert us to as 25 being an example of what might arise here, would have to</p>
Page 126	Page 128
<p>1 Q. To what extent does your view of that possible 2 performance of the slab depend upon, for example, the 3 nature of a hinge within the structure? 4 A. Could you say that again? 5 Q. The nature of a hinge within the structure. 6 A. I don't see any proper hinge in the structure. There is 7 no hinge so far. 8 Q. That is fine. So you and I are in agreement that there 9 is no hinge in the structure. 10 A. Correct. 11 Q. But what we do have, as has been observed by 12 Prof McQuillan in his report, has been discussed between 13 you and Prof Hansford, 3 metre thick slab that's heavily 14 reinforced? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. So if there is, as you conclude at the end of this 17 paragraph, the potential, I think you were saying, for, 18 for example, excessive side-sway of the station 19 structure, to bring that set of circumstances about, one 20 would have to have a hugely significant and unexpected 21 turn of events, would one not? 22 A. That is a very extreme case. 23 Q. Thank you. And if it were the case that such side-sway 24 were to happen, you would need some very significant 25 external forces to bring that about, would you not?</p>	<p>1 arise as a result of excessive and unusual 2 circumstances? 3 A. It would be unusual, yes. 4 Q. But one would not necessarily see evidence in the form 5 of cracking of the concrete until it happened? 6 A. No. Cracking is just one form of distress. 7 Q. What other forms of distress would one expect to have 8 seen if this were to happen? 9 A. Crushing of concrete. That would be immediate. So that 10 is the cause of brittle failure. 11 Ah, yes, one more. Shear failure also is very 12 brittle. 13 Q. And what would be the physical manifestation of that? 14 A. So, actually, in some of my slides, I have shown some of 15 the vertical forces acting on one section of the slab. 16 That is a shear force. If the shear force is excessive, 17 and if the shear strength is not sufficient, for example 18 insufficient shear length, then the failure would be 19 brittle, yes. 20 Q. Pausing at that point, and I ask the point not for 21 anything other than to confirm the position, there is no 22 evidence so far of any of these things coming to pass? 23 A. Not yet, no. 24 Q. Can you help the Commission with precisely what checks 25 and tests you say must be carried out to ensure that one</p>



Page 129

1 is satisfied that this risk of extreme failure arising  
 2 from unusual forces is excluded?  
 3 A. Sorry, I beg your pardon.  
 4 Q. Let me break that down a little bit.  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. And, sir, in asking this question, I'm not at all  
 7 ignoring the Chairman's point of this morning that it  
 8 may be helpful after Prof Au's evidence to have a list  
 9 of those tests, et cetera, that he considers may be  
 10 helpful, but if you will permit me it's probably  
 11 important as we go through on a point-by-point basis to  
 12 understand where he's coming from in terms of those  
 13 likely checks and tests. Thank you.  
 14 So if I break that down a little bit, Professor, in  
 15 fairness to you.  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. In the situation that you have described in 6.4.1.1 --  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. -- and in particular to anticipate and to deal with, and  
 20 indeed confirm that your concerns are not well placed as  
 21 regards, for example, excessive side-sway of the  
 22 structure arising, what checks or calculations do you  
 23 commend or require be carried out to satisfy us that  
 24 this is not going to happen?  
 25 A. I'm going to recommend, okay, certain checks. So,

Page 130

1 first, check all the stresses along the additional  
 2 construction joints. And the other concern is that the  
 3 detail -- can I go on, please?  
 4 Q. Yes. If we just take it slowly, your first thing is  
 5 check all the stresses along the additional construction  
 6 joints -- sorry, if I may just pause there. To make  
 7 sure that I at least understand that, these are those  
 8 additional joints that arise from the so-called "second  
 9 change"?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. I know you have more to say so I will come back to that  
 12 in a moment, but in response to questions from the  
 13 professor earlier on, I think perhaps before lunch, the  
 14 professor was asking you to draw the distinction between  
 15 those checks and calculations which were simple and  
 16 therefore capable of being carried out within a few  
 17 hours to a half day, and those that were sophisticated  
 18 and would take many months.  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Is what you just described something that would be in  
 21 the former category, namely the simple one?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Thank you. Now, I cut you off and I didn't mean to.  
 24 You were going to go on to a second check or  
 25 calculation.

Page 131

1 A. Yes. The second concern is that the detail right now is  
 2 not one of those standard details, because of the first  
 3 change. So the problem is that there can be some  
 4 critical shear planes within the joint, and I think  
 5 there is a need to change -- sorry, a need to check the  
 6 stresses along such critical shear planes. There may be  
 7 several.  
 8 Q. Again, that check that you've just described is within  
 9 the simple category that you described to the professor?  
 10 A. Yes, simple.  
 11 Q. Thank you very much.  
 12 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So, therefore, that's all part of  
 13 the same numerical process that you've referred to?  
 14 A. Yes. Now, the reason why I feel that there is a need to  
 15 check is that because of the first change, because of  
 16 the omission of the L-bars, U-bars or whatever -- now,  
 17 if you look up those design manuals for structures,  
 18 normally there would be such details. If we omit some  
 19 of these bars, that's not to say it must be  
 20 unacceptable, but then one has to check whether or not  
 21 there are problems.  
 22 MR CONNOR: Thank you.  
 23 Professor, does that answer the question you had in  
 24 mind?  
 25 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Yes.

Page 132

1 MR CONNOR: Thank you.  
 2 When you describe -- and forgive me because I'm  
 3 a layman for these purposes asking you the question --  
 4 critical shear planes, can you explain what it is that  
 5 you say has to be checked and how?  
 6 A. May I draw it over here, please (indicating whiteboard)?  
 7 CHAIRMAN: Sure, absolutely.  
 8 COURT REPORTER: You need to speak into the microphone  
 9 though. Can it move?  
 10 A. (Drawing on the whiteboard) Now, here is one example.  
 11 I'm not saying this is the only critical shear plane.  
 12 Note that there are several layers of very big bars, 40,  
 13 50 millimetres, whatever. Then they are supposed to be  
 14 anchored within this slab; okay?  
 15 Now, perhaps for each of them anchorage may not be  
 16 a problem, but the major problem is that at the end of  
 17 the bars, because of the lack of lapping, the stresses  
 18 at the end of that must be zero, effectively zero; okay?  
 19 Here is a very large tensile force acting downwards, and  
 20 if we isolate that as a free body, there will be  
 21 a downward shear force acting, which is shown here  
 22 (indicating). We are just looking at that part.  
 23 So if we consider that as the free body and  
 24 considering just vertical equilibrium, vertical balance  
 25 of forces, there must be a very large shear force acting

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 on this joint. So that is within the joint. 2 Now, we need to check the stress over here, whether 3 it is excessive or not; okay? So that is the major 4 problem. In case the original design has been just 5 marginal, in case, adding another construction joint is 6 going to harm it further. So the problem is if we have 7 two changes, two possible weakening, the total effect 8 may not be just the sum of the two. It may be more. 9 That's why if we are aware of any of these possible 10 weaknesses, we have to check. 11 MR CONNOR: Thank you very much. 12 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Just as a question of process, it's 13 very useful to have these drawings on these flip charts. 14 Is there a way we can bring these into evidence; will we 15 be taking photographs of these and then including them 16 somewhere in the bundles? 17 MR PENNICOTT: We can do that, sir. 18 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you. 19 MR CONNOR: Thank you very much. Thank you for that helpful 20 explanation, Professor. 21 Again, so I understand, at the very least, the two 22 areas of checking and calculation that you've described, 23 can you help the Commissioners with against what 24 standards or codes these checks are to be carried out? 25 Because you will understand that the idea of numerical</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 which would require to be referred to to provide the 2 checks and the numerical calculations that you have 3 described as necessary? 4 A. Yes, this is a difficult question. So what people 5 normally do is to -- when they do the design, they would 6 look at a certain region, what people call the D region. 7 I mention that. Then people normally use the 8 strut-and-tie model, to arrive at the arrangement of 9 reinforcement satisfying that the concrete can take the 10 stresses, whatever, without problems. 11 Now, if we, let's say, modify something, and then we 12 try to do a back analysis to check whether it is okay or 13 not, it is not that simple. It would be very involved; 14 okay? 15 Now, using this approach, if the stress turns out to 16 be very low, there is no problem, but then if it is 17 higher, then just doing that would not be sufficient. 18 So normal design codes would not tell you how much 19 is acceptable in this rather unusual scenario. 20 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: So what would? If normal design 21 codes would not tell you what is acceptable, what would 22 tell you what's acceptable? 23 A. People normally -- there are some standard situations, 24 normal beam-column joints like that -- so a beam and 25 a column like that. So for this very standard case,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 checks and calculations and so on is a little bit 2 lacking in detail, with no disrespect. So precisely 3 what codes and standards do you say must be applied in 4 relation to the checks that are to be carried out? 5 A. This is a very difficult question. So that is why 6 normally engineers would follow standard details. At 7 the joints, they have certain bars, L-bars, U-bars, 8 whatever. If they follow such details, then normally 9 there would be no problem, but if they modify, they omit 10 something, it would be very difficult. 11 Now, the major -- now, if we do that, that's 12 simplified check. If we discover that the stresses are 13 very low, no problem. But then if they are high, let's 14 say 5 megapascals, the next question is what is the 15 acceptance criteria. There is no simple answer. 16 Q. Let's pause at that point, because I don't want us to 17 get too far ahead of ourselves. You have described to 18 the Commissioners the simple tests that may be done, and 19 you quite rightly say, of course, if certain things are 20 found as a result of those, then there's, if you will 21 excuse the colloquial expression, a deeper dive that may 22 have to be done in that regard. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. But that's for the future. Initially, for these checks, 25 can you help us with precisely the codes and standards</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 people can refer to the Code of Practice, and there is 2 a formula for people to work out the required amount of 3 reinforcement. 4 But for some other more complicated cases, then it 5 would be difficult and people would have to do the 6 design from first principles, and normally people would 7 try to, first of all, come up with the forces, look at 8 what happens inside the connection and then provide 9 sufficient reinforcement. 10 If we reduce some of the reinforcement, if we omit 11 some of the bars, would that be acceptable? This 12 question is more difficult to answer. Then people can, 13 for example, use three-dimensional finite element to do 14 that. Even for a reinforcing bar we are not treating 15 that as a bar but a lot of small elements, volumes, it's 16 very complicated. Normally, people doing research, 17 postgraduate level, would do that, so things would take 18 several months or whatever. It would be very 19 complicated. 20 MR CONNOR: Professor, if I may. 21 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you. 22 MR CONNOR: You will forgive me if I push you a little bit 23 further on the question, Professor. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Because we are not in the complicated area yet. We are</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 not in the many months of sophisticated calculations. 2 We are in the simple zone in terms of these. If you 3 cannot help us with this, please just say, but I would 4 like to come away from your evidence, subject to the 5 learned Commissioners allowing me to do so, with 6 an understanding of what you demand. 7 A. I'm not demanding. 8 Q. Well, I'm sorry, you are. 9 A. I'm just raising certain concerns. 10 Q. Professor, bear with me. If you say that the checks and 11 calculations carried out by others who have been steeped 12 in this design and construction for months and years are 13 not acceptable but you want more things done, you do 14 have to say to us what precisely it is that you require 15 to be done, and if you are not in a position to do so 16 then simply say that and we can move on to another 17 question. 18 A. Now, allow me to say so. So far, I'm not aware of any 19 design calculations of the joint were submitted. I may 20 have overlooked something. 21 Q. I'm not testing you on your memory here, sir. I'm 22 asking you a question. You've told the professor this 23 morning that you believe there is a series of simple 24 checks that should be carried out. You have told us 25 we'll check along the shear planes, that we'll look at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 evidence and we are none the wiser about what it is that 2 he thinks is required, and then out of discussion we get 3 a list. I don't know how long that list will be. 4 I don't know if it will be in the simple zone or the 5 sophisticated. 6 CHAIRMAN: I see your point. 7 MR CONNOR: I think you both have it. 8 Professor? 9 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I think we do, but my understanding, 10 unless I've missed something -- my understanding is that 11 the only calculations and tests that Prof Au has been 12 suggesting today have been, one, related to the stresses 13 in the construction joints at the top detail of the 14 diaphragm wall, and two, further tests relating to 15 partially engaged couplers. 16 I have not registered any other tests or 17 calculations that Prof Au is suggesting. Perhaps I can 18 just check: am I right? 19 A. Well, actually, there could be some potential weakness, 20 as shown in the vertical red line over there (indicating 21 the whiteboard). 22 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: But that's also related to the 23 change in detail at the top of the diaphragm wall? 24 A. Yes. 25 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Therefore the point I'm making is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 the new design details and we'll look at the second 2 change. What are the tests, Professor, and by reference 3 to what codes or standards or otherwise? Because if you 4 do not tell us, then we are none the wiser as to what 5 you think is important to allay your or the government's 6 concerns about this matter. 7 CHAIRMAN: I think -- sorry I'm interrupting. 8 MR CONNOR: Of course. 9 CHAIRMAN: My approach, which is not a criticism of your 10 approach, earlier was to say to Mr Khaw, and Mr Khaw 11 agreed, that it would help us if, at the end of his 12 evidence, we could then have from Mr Khaw, when he's 13 able to discuss matters more fully with Prof Au, what 14 tests, in accordance with what criteria and the like. 15 I'm just wondering if on the hoof, so to speak, the 16 professor is able to tie it all into codes and various 17 things like that. I may be wrong. I just mention that 18 in case it helps. 19 MR CONNOR: I had your comment very much in mind, as you may 20 recall a few moments ago, sir, where I referred to that 21 idea that after the professor's evidence there would be 22 such a list. I probed it a little bit and I think 23 I have taken it as far as I can really with Prof Au. 24 You will understand, I'm sure, both of you, sirs, 25 that the concern here is that we close Prof Au's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 what I understood is that you are recommending further 2 numerical tests relating to this detail which is the 3 detail between the EWL slab and the diaphragm wall? 4 A. Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And you are recommending some 6 further tests relating to partially engaged couplers. 7 A. Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: And I don't think I have heard you 9 recommending any other tests or calculations. 10 A. Not really, no. 11 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: When you say "not really", is that 12 "not"? 13 A. "Not". 14 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Thank you. 15 MR CONNOR: Thank you, Professor. I take that "not", thank 16 you. 17 Let's move on then, Professor, to 18 paragraph 6.4.2.2 -- 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. -- of your report. It is in there that you say as 21 follows: 22 "The revised details in the drawings [and you then 23 cite various drawings, B19/25487 to 9 and B19/25491] 24 show the formation of additional construction joints at 25 the connection. As the additional construction joints</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 introduced by breaking out part of the completed 2 diaphragm wall may create potential surfaces of 3 weakness, they should be checked by proper structural 4 calculations to ensure that the internal stresses 5 generated at these joints would not be excessive." 6 Just pausing at that point, I think that aligns with 7 your last response to Prof Hansford? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. "Apparently, no such calculations have been provided by 10 MTRCL to the Building Authority so far. If the stresses 11 at the actual locations of construction joint are 12 excessive, remedial works may be needed." 13 Just pausing at that point and to test it -- you 14 will recall this morning that Mr Pennicott referred you 15 to Prof McQuillan's opinion, and in particular 16 paragraphs 98 and those following it. For the 17 reference, this is ER3. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. In Prof McQuillan's report at paragraph 98 and in those 20 paragraphs following it, he's dealing there with the 21 amended EWL slab to east D-wall connection, and he goes 22 on -- in paragraph 98, he talks about, in his opinion, 23 the amended detail, as represented by the first change 24 to second change, is superior. You have given your view 25 on that already.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 against the D-wall." 2 Do you see that? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Do you not recognise and agree -- 5 A. I don't agree. Well, actually, in my presentation this 6 morning, there were two slides showing why we have shear 7 stresses, and when there is a change in the loading the 8 internal forces, the stresses will all change. So, in 9 particular, over this additional construction joint, 10 there would be shear forces. There would be. 11 Q. Professor, you have helped with that view already. But 12 the short position is this, is it not, that the clamping 13 action as described by Prof McQuillan is exactly what is 14 to be expected, given the make-up of the slabs that he 15 has described? The weight of the structure is such that 16 the vertical forces which are being deployed create 17 a bending moment which compresses the slabs. It is 18 reinforced to a very, very large extent, and therefore 19 the risk of anything of the type that you are concerned 20 with arising is simply not realistic. 21 A. No, it's incorrect. It's incorrect. We always look at 22 the mechanics and find out the forces. That is not the 23 correct way. 24 Q. So you take the view that therefore what Prof McQuillan 25 has described ignores the likelihood or at least the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 Then at paragraph 99 he says the following: 2 "Intuitively, and from experience, the shelf joint 3 is superior to the butt joint in terms of its ease of 4 construction and rigidity." 5 He then goes on to make reference to a schematic 6 diagram below, which illustrates, as he says in line 4 7 onwards, "how the trimmed-down D-wall is encapsulated 8 and 'clamped' by the EWL slab bending away in one 9 direction, the OTE bending away in the opposite 10 direction, and the self-weight of the integral 'block' 11 of reinforced concrete (coloured in blue) which bears 12 down on the top-of-wall construction interface. The 13 'block' is prevented from splitting above the D-wall by 14 the embedded tension rebar. In my opinion the 15 'clamping' action compensates for the lack of 'U' bars 16 in the top of the D-wall." 17 Do you see that? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. He continues at paragraph 100, where he says: 20 "The internal stresses at the top of wall 21 construction joint are all of a compressive nature. The 22 diagram illustrates why no tension or shear can occur at 23 the interface. Any tendency for a shear force to 24 develop across the interface would be resisted by the 25 'clamping' action of the EWL and OTE slabs which bear</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 risk that something might arise? 2 A. I believe so. 3 Q. And by that "something", we see the application of 4 forces such that there is some significant distress that 5 will be found within the structure? 6 A. Now, the -- 7 Q. Please answer the question. Prof McQuillan has got it 8 wrong and actually you say that because of the evidence 9 that you have given to this Commission, there is a risk, 10 perhaps no higher than that; there will be a failure in 11 the slab? 12 A. I'm not saying that there will be a failure. I am just 13 saying that at the construction joint there will be 14 shear. There will be shear. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: But you are not saying about the 16 expected consequences of that shear? 17 A. Well, it depends on the magnitude. It may not be very 18 big. I think there may be marginal problems over there. 19 So I'm not expecting -- well, it really depends on the 20 result of the checking. 21 MR CONNOR: So if -- sorry, I will let you finish your 22 point. 23 A. If you are talking about clamping, there is one way to 24 mobilise this clamping action. That is to do 25 post-tensioning. Probably Prof Hansford would</p>

Page 145

1 understand that. So if we provide some tendons and do  
 2 post-tensioning, then there will be clamping action, but  
 3 if we just cast it in situ, there won't be any clamping  
 4 action that is useful.  
 5 Q. Thank you. Just going back to your comment of a moment  
 6 ago, so we understand the extent of this risk that  
 7 troubles you, I think you say at best here of course it  
 8 depends upon the tests that you have told the  
 9 Commissioners should be carried out, but as you say:  
 10 "... it depends on the magnitude. It may not be  
 11 very big. I think there may be marginal problems over  
 12 there. So I'm not expecting ..."  
 13 You are not expecting much, are you?  
 14 A. Not really. If we have to check -- we have to check.  
 15 There may be certain issues over there, so the  
 16 horizontal shear stresses may exceed what we normally  
 17 accept. Well, in the normal design process, when the  
 18 horizontal shear stresses are exceeded, then we need to  
 19 provide additional reinforcement, perhaps in the form of  
 20 some additional dowel bars or whatever. It's quite  
 21 common.  
 22 Q. Okay. Moving on then to paragraph 6.4.3.3 -- in this  
 23 paragraph, you refer to the submission of calculations  
 24 by Atkins, and these are the calculations to which you  
 25 have made some reference in your evidence already. Do

Page 146

1 you see that?  
 2 A. 6.4.3.3?  
 3 Q. Yes, paragraph 6.4.3.3.  
 4 A. Yes, yes.  
 5 Q. Now, at the time when these calculations were requested,  
 6 do you know what the purpose of those -- pardon me, if  
 7 you would allow me to correct that question for the  
 8 purposes of the professor.  
 9 The report that you have referred to has been  
 10 produced in response to a request on behalf of the  
 11 Commission to Atkins.  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. And you are aware that that request was borne of  
 14 a discussion that you and the other experts had on or  
 15 about 18 December?  
 16 A. Say again, please.  
 17 Q. Let's just unpack that a little bit. When you sat down  
 18 to look at the Atkins report that you refer to at  
 19 paragraph 6.4.3.3 --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- did you know for what purposes it had been produced?  
 22 A. I believe that -- well, that should be a concern raised  
 23 on the stresses at the construction joints, additional  
 24 construction joints, so that's why Atkins has come up  
 25 with some additional calculations.

Page 147

1 Q. I think I can probably help you with that, Professor,  
 2 because that's not the point.  
 3 If you have regard to the letter which accompanied  
 4 these, which I think you will find in exhibit J6/28; do  
 5 you have that?  
 6 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Can we have it on the screen?  
 7 MR CONNOR: Yes.  
 8 That is a letter, which is at J6/28 from Atkins to  
 9 the solicitors for the Commission.  
 10 MR PENNICOTT: That's it.  
 11 MR CONNOR: Thank you very much.  
 12 MR PENNICOTT: We looked at this this morning.  
 13 MR CONNOR: Yes, quite right, Mr Pennicott. This is to  
 14 Lo & Lo:  
 15 "We refer to your email of 19 December 2018  
 16 requesting calculations to demonstrate that internal  
 17 stresses at the construction joint (cut-down wall top  
 18 interface) are within acceptable limits for the 'first  
 19 change' necessitated by the missing U-bars at the top of  
 20 the D-wall. Similar calculations in relation to the  
 21 'second change' were also requested.  
 22 The requested calculations for both the 'first  
 23 change' and 'second change' are enclosed."  
 24 Do you see that?  
 25 A. Yes.

Page 148

1 Q. Then you will see, if you go on to the next page,  
 2 please, J6/28.1, which again I think Mr Pennicott took  
 3 you to this morning, which begins as follows:  
 4 "The Commission's expert, Atkins were asked to make  
 5 the following request".  
 6 I think perhaps there might be a glitch in the  
 7 grammar of that, but if we go to the second paragraph:  
 8 "We refer to the 'first change' necessitated by the  
 9 missing U-bars at the top of the D-wall."  
 10 This is a quote, I think, from the request that is  
 11 made on behalf of the Commission.  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. "We should be grateful if your client [and for these  
 14 purposes read Atkins] could produce calculations to  
 15 demonstrate that the internal stresses at the  
 16 construction joint (cut-down wall top interface) are  
 17 within acceptable limits. Similar calculations in  
 18 relation to the 'second change' should be provided as  
 19 well."  
 20 Do you see that?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Just pausing at that point. When I asked you a few  
 23 moments ago, did you understand, when you looked at the  
 24 Atkins report, the purposes for which it had been  
 25 provided, is this what you understood?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. So it didn't arise from a concern, it arose from</p> <p>3 a question that had been posed of Atkins to provide some</p> <p>4 calculations?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Thank you. So what you then go on to say, returning to</p> <p>7 your report, if you look at the second sentence, is:</p> <p>8 "In Atkins' report only some calculations for</p> <p>9 a typical slab-wall joint are provided ..."</p> <p>10 And you go on to say:</p> <p>11 "... it is certainly not enough."</p> <p>12 If we pause at that point, the typical slab-wall</p> <p>13 joint that Atkins address in their report, J6/4557 and</p> <p>14 those pages following it, are indeed the same as those</p> <p>15 that you address in your figure 6.4.3.3.1; is that</p> <p>16 right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. So in fact both you and Atkins --</p> <p>19 A. Sorry, are you referring -- okay. So are you referring</p> <p>20 to this?</p> <p>21 Q. I'm referring to the figure that is set out at the</p> <p>22 bottom of page 11 of your report.</p> <p>23 A. Yes. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. So when you say that Atkins have provided some</p> <p>25 calculations for a typical slab-wall joint, it is the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 Q. We understand what your position is on this, but your</p> <p>2 position, firstly, as I understand it, is that there is</p> <p>3 a range of simple checks that you would like to have</p> <p>4 done --</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. -- and your position is that this should be done now for</p> <p>7 all of the amended joint details?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. How many of those are there, sir?</p> <p>10 A. Well, there are so many. If you look at the drawings,</p> <p>11 there are many, many different details, or some details</p> <p>12 with very complicated construction joints.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, when you say there are "many,</p> <p>14 many", are we talking about five?</p> <p>15 A. No, more than that.</p> <p>16 MR PENNICOTT: Four basic ones.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Is four "many, many"?</p> <p>18 A. Well, the drawings show many, but then some of them may</p> <p>19 be having similar characteristics, perhaps a bit</p> <p>20 different to reinforcement. In terms of the shape,</p> <p>21 I think they can be categorised into just a few.</p> <p>22 MR CONNOR: Precisely. So what you are requiring is not</p> <p>23 "many, many" checks to be done; you would like four</p> <p>24 types of detail looked at?</p> <p>25 A. It depends. It depends.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 same typical slab-wall joint that you yourself focus on</p> <p>2 in your report; okay?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Your complaint about this typical slab-wall joint --</p> <p>5 well, you say "it is certainly not enough" -- do</p> <p>6 I understand really that where you are coming from there</p> <p>7 is in your professional view, to become comfortable with</p> <p>8 the concerns that you express in your report, you wish</p> <p>9 to see more construction joint details covered by</p> <p>10 calculations similar to this one?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. So it is not a criticism of the use of that as a typical</p> <p>13 detail; it is that you would like to see them all</p> <p>14 covered?</p> <p>15 A. I think to ensure safety it is necessary to check all of</p> <p>16 them.</p> <p>17 Q. I understand what your sentiment is there, Professor,</p> <p>18 but simply so we understand it --</p> <p>19 And is that series of checks, if carried out in</p> <p>20 respect of the other slab-wall joints, within the</p> <p>21 category of simple checks that you described to the</p> <p>22 Commissioners this morning?</p> <p>23 A. I think simple checks should be done first. If there is</p> <p>24 problem or if there is doubt, then either one goes for</p> <p>25 very sophisticated checks or to do retrofitting.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 Q. What does it depend on?</p> <p>2 A. Because for a certain shape, there may be different</p> <p>3 reinforcement, and then for different cases, yes,</p> <p>4 of course, there is a need to check.</p> <p>5 Q. Professor, please can we hone this down to</p> <p>6 an understanding of what your position is. You have</p> <p>7 said in this report, lodged for the purposes of the</p> <p>8 learned Commissioners, that:</p> <p>9 "Calculations must be carried out on all design</p> <p>10 variations of slab-wall joint to ensure their safety."</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Are we speaking now of four or five?</p> <p>13 A. Actually it depends on the final design that is adopted</p> <p>14 by the contractor. So if there are many, then there is</p> <p>15 a need to do many checks.</p> <p>16 Q. Professor, subject to such direction from the learned</p> <p>17 Commissioners as they choose to give me, I am pressing</p> <p>18 you a little bit here to help us, and it doesn't help</p> <p>19 us, with respect, if you simply raise another conundrum</p> <p>20 from a question that otherwise needs to be answered.</p> <p>21 We have said to you, I have said to you, we are</p> <p>22 talking about four typical details that might be</p> <p>23 considered in these simple checks. Another view might</p> <p>24 be that there are five. Do you agree that that is in</p> <p>25 the order of the numbers that require to be considered?</p>

Page 153	Page 155
<p>1 A. I have seen many different details but I am not yet in 2 a position to classify them into just several. 3 Q. Thank you. If we have a look at a drawing which is 4 B25487, in B19. 5 MR PENNICOTT: That's it. 6 MR CONNOR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr Chairman and 7 Mr Pennicott. 8 So, Professor, you have in front of you -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- there B25487. Does this help you in assisting the 11 learned Commissioners on the number of details which 12 would sensibly be checked as part of the simple checks 13 that you are commending? 14 A. Perhaps, let's say, in this structure, how many -- well, 15 different types of slabs are there; okay? So probably, 16 even for the design of the slab, there may be many 17 different types. 18 Now, in this drawing -- now, there are several 19 types, but the detail may appear at different locations, 20 and at different locations the bending moment, shear 21 force, whatever, may be different. 22 Now, of course, if one tries to look at all of them 23 and tries to come up with the most critical one, just do 24 one check, fine, and if it is found to be acceptable, 25 fine. But then if that is not the case, then there will</p>	<p>1 at the top of page 12. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Do you have that? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. It's there that you refer, in the first sentence, to 6 "Atkins attempts to calculate the horizontal shear 7 stress", and you go on to refer to the calculation which 8 was used. 9 You recognise the calculation, I take it? 10 A. Yes, this one? 11 Q. Yes. When you read the report, you recognised the 12 calculation that had been deployed? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And you recognised it as one which was used, as you put 15 it, "for evaluation of shear stresses in a homogeneous 16 beam under shear due to flexure at elastic state"? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. You accept, do you not, that part of the assessment of 19 shear, that that is a perfectly proper equation to use? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Your point is that you would like more done? 22 A. Well, now, I believe that what the designer or whoever 23 is trying to do is to find out the horizontal shear 24 stress inside the joint. But that equation doesn't give 25 the shear stress inside the joint. It is within the</p>
Page 154	Page 156
<p>1 be many different cases. 2 Q. Of course. But that's helpful I think, sir, because if 3 we take this in stages, as regard the simple checks that 4 can be done within a half-day or so, then I think what 5 you are helping us is, "Yes, Mr Connor, you are probably 6 right, it's four or five for those initial simple 7 checks", but of course always subject to your 8 qualification that "if I find something there that 9 I don't like which causes further investigation, then 10 that will have to be done"? 11 A. Yes. 12 MR CONNOR: Thank you very much. Just close that over then. 13 Sir, Professor, I do have more. I'm conscious of 14 the time. I'm very happy to plough on but I think 15 I will be at least another 15 or 20 minutes with the 16 professor. 17 CHAIRMAN: All right. We will have the afternoon 18 adjournment now. Thank you very much. 15 minutes. 19 Thank you. 20 (3.51 pm) 21 (A short adjournment) 22 (4.12 pm) 23 MR CONNOR: Chairman and Professor, thank you. 24 Prof Au, thank you. We were looking just before the 25 break at paragraph 6.4.3.4 of your report, which begins</p>	<p>1 beam, outside the joint. 2 Q. So, as you would say, it applies to a beam theory 3 situation? 4 A. Yes, not within the joint. It's outside. 5 Q. But it would be sufficient, would it not -- 6 A. No. 7 Q. Sorry, if you bear with me, please. It would be 8 sufficient, would it not, as a calculation, an equation 9 to be deployed, to check, in the situation where the 10 designer knows the make-up of the structure involved, he 11 is familiar with the extent of reinforcement, for 12 example? 13 A. I don't understand your question. 14 Q. I put it to you that given that this designer, in 15 carrying out that calculation and deploying that 16 equation, is familiar with the nature of the structure, 17 the extent of reinforcement deployed in it, the weight 18 of the structure, the thickness of the structure, that 19 to provide an estimate as to shear stress, this is 20 a perfectly appropriate equation to deploy? 21 A. Actually, what the designer is trying to calculate is 22 the shear stress, the horizontal shear stress, inside 23 the connection; okay? But in his equation, he has just 24 made use of the vertical shear force at the end of the 25 beam.</p>

Page 157

1 Now, in order to find out what's going on within the  
 2 connection, we have to know a lot. The bending moments  
 3 at the two sides -- actually, the most important would  
 4 be the bending moment rather than the shear force, the  
 5 vertical shear force -- that is totally wrong.  
 6 Q. It is not wrong, Professor. It is a start. Your view  
 7 is that more needs to be done; is that right?  
 8 A. No.  
 9 Q. You say it's wrong, full stop?  
 10 A. It's wrong. So what he has calculated is the shear  
 11 stress inside the beam, not within the connection, and  
 12 that is only for the elastic state.  
 13 Q. So what should he do?  
 14 A. Sorry?  
 15 Q. What should he do?  
 16 A. Well, I think he has to learn beam-column joint theory.  
 17 It's totally wrong.  
 18 Q. Let us put your personal assessment to one side because  
 19 what I'm really asking you is, if it's not that  
 20 equation, what equation is it, Professor?  
 21 A. Well, are you trying to ask me to again explain to you?  
 22 Q. No, I'm asking you a very straight question, Professor.  
 23 You say wrong equation used. I ask you what one should  
 24 it be then?  
 25 A. There is no simple equation. We have to look at the

Page 158

1 free body, go to the basics, go to the first principles.  
 2 Actually there is a section in the Concrete Code on  
 3 beam-column joint, but the problem is that it only gives  
 4 the equation so that people can apply to find out the  
 5 required reinforcement without giving the basics. So  
 6 that's why some engineers may not understand the basics.  
 7 So, in this case, without knowing the basics, there is  
 8 no way to calculate that.  
 9 Q. So you go to that point in the final sentence of  
 10 6.4.3.4, when you say that equation 6.19 of the Concrete  
 11 Code is normally used to estimate the shear stress of  
 12 beams and slabs at ultimate limit state and the  
 13 behaviour is assumed to be inelastic.  
 14 A. Now, mind you -- so in this sentence I'm talking about  
 15 shear stress of beams and slabs, not within the  
 16 connection. So what I'm saying is that he has used  
 17 a wrong equation to calculate, and that equation only  
 18 gives the shear stress within the beam, and even within  
 19 the beam the normal practice is not to use this  
 20 equation. It is the other equation.  
 21 And we are now trying to work out the shear stress  
 22 within the connection. This is totally wrong.  
 23 Q. Do you propose that equation 6.19 of the Concrete Code  
 24 is the appropriate --  
 25 A. No.

Page 159

1 Q. -- equation? Well, why do you mention it, Professor?  
 2 A. I'm just saying that even for calculation of the shear  
 3 stress in the beam, it is not correct.  
 4 Q. So 6.19 of the Concrete Code you cite at the end of that  
 5 paragraph doesn't help us at all?  
 6 A. No.  
 7 Q. Why do you refer to it then?  
 8 A. It's just to show that this original equation that he  
 9 has used is inappropriate. It is not used at all in the  
 10 design of reinforced concrete structures.  
 11 Q. So, as far as 6.19 of the Concrete Code is concerned,  
 12 you would accept that it's not an alternative to address  
 13 your concern because it also assesses the shear across  
 14 the whole section?  
 15 A. Equation 6.19 is for calculation of shear stress within  
 16 the beam.  
 17 Q. Yes.  
 18 A. I think probably I need to explain. Let's say if that  
 19 is a beam (holding a marker pen) and if let's say this  
 20 is -- well, the connection (holding a water bottle),  
 21 what that equation -- let's say the equation that that  
 22 designer has used to calculate would be the shear stress  
 23 within this (indicating marker pen) at elastic state.  
 24 But it is not acceptable. To evaluate the shear stress  
 25 of that at the ultimate limit state, we have to use

Page 160

1 6.19, to find out what's over here (indicating water  
 2 bottle), to find out the horizontal shear stress over  
 3 there -- sorry, these two equations would not help.  
 4 Q. No. Well, 6.19 won't help, will it, Professor? Because  
 5 it also relies upon similar considerations as apply in  
 6 the equation which was deployed. So again I have to ask  
 7 you the question, if it's not the calculation and  
 8 approach that was used, what do you propose to this  
 9 Commission is the appropriate step that should be taken?  
 10 A. Well, it's just to consider the free body. Perhaps  
 11 I can draw that again. (Drawing on the whiteboard).  
 12 Q. I wonder if for the purposes of this note -- I will be  
 13 guided by Mr Pennicott -- are you happy on behalf of the  
 14 Commission that this be on the same drawing?  
 15 MR PENNICOTT: Yes, I think the same.  
 16 MR CONNOR: Thank you, sir.  
 17 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: It may subsequently require a bit of  
 18 annotation, but we can deal with that later, I'm sure.  
 19 A. All right. What I'm trying to demonstrate is that again  
 20 looking at the bending moment on this side, it is  
 21 possible for us to come up with the tension carried by  
 22 this, by this group of reinforcement, and then looking  
 23 at the bending moment on the other side (indicating), it  
 24 is also possible for us to work out the tension carried  
 25 by the group of reinforcement.



Page 161

1 Now, if we look at this free body, in particular the  
2 horizontal balance of force or equilibrium, it is  
3 possible for us to work out the horizontal shear force  
4 or horizontal shear stress.  
5 So neither of the equations would help. We have to  
6 consider this equilibrium.  
7 Q. Okay. Let's come to look at that in a moment. Just so  
8 we have it for the record, you don't see the equation  
9 being deployed by Atkins as relevant at all to helping  
10 the assessment --  
11 A. It's irrelevant.  
12 Q. In your view?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. And you do not even see it as part of the exercise?  
15 A. Sorry?  
16 Q. Part of the exercise of assessing and reporting upon the  
17 structure in the way that Atkins were asked to do.  
18 A. So this part of the calculation has calculated something  
19 else, not something within the connection.  
20 Q. You then move on to talk about, as you say, the free  
21 body.  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. In 6.4.3.5, which is the next paragraph of your report,  
24 that is where you refer to Atkins' report in the lower  
25 half of the page 3 of 5.

Page 162

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. "... to a cross-sectional diagram of the revised joint  
3 (which is reproduced ... below) claiming that the pink  
4 down-stand part of OTE wall can act as a shear key to  
5 help resist the horizontal shear stress at the  
6 additional construction joint."  
7 Yes?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Then you say:  
10 "However, no calculation has been provided by Atkins  
11 to substantiate this claim."  
12 Do you see that?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Just pausing at that point, before you get to your  
15 comment about the lack of calculation to support it, as  
16 a proposition do you agree that the pink down-stand part  
17 of the OTE wall can act as a shear key to help resist  
18 the horizontal shear stress at the additional  
19 construction joint?  
20 A. It depends very much where the weakest section is.  
21 Now, allow me to do a demonstration. Supposing I'm  
22 holding a weight of 10 kilograms (indicating water  
23 bottle). If I hold it like this, very close to my body,  
24 then my body essentially is carrying axial load. The  
25 problem with a down-stand is there is an eccentricity.

Page 163

1 If I try to hold like this the 10 kilograms (holding  
2 water bottle away from body), I don't think I can hold  
3 it for ten minutes because of this distance. That is  
4 what we call eccentricity. This is going to create  
5 a moment. So in addition to the axial force, I have to  
6 carry that moment as well.  
7 The problem is there is a need to check the strength  
8 of the part of -- the pink part of the concrete above  
9 the diaphragm wall.  
10 Q. Very good. But that last part of your evidence I think  
11 reveals really where you come from on this, consistent  
12 with what you have said earlier on this afternoon,  
13 namely this, that you do not quarrel with the  
14 proposition that, if I put it this way, it might be the  
15 case that the pink down-stand part of the OTE wall acts  
16 as a shear key to help resist the horizontal shear  
17 stress at the additional construction joint; it's simply  
18 that you want more evidence that that's so.  
19 A. Let me explain.  
20 Q. Sorry, we'll come to your explanation in a moment.  
21 Please answer my question, under direction, if need be,  
22 from the learned Commissioners. If you go back to my  
23 question -- you say it might be the case that the pink  
24 down-stand part of the OTE wall acts as a shear key to  
25 help resist the horizontal shear stress at the

Page 164

1 additional construction joint, but you want more  
2 evidence of that. Is that so? Do I understand you  
3 correctly?  
4 A. The problem is whenever we look at a structural  
5 component, we always look at the weakest part, because  
6 the strength is governed by the weakest part.  
7 Apparently the designer hasn't checked the strength of  
8 the pink part of the concrete above the diaphragm wall.  
9 That is the concern.  
10 Q. So you have a concern?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. And you want more checked; yes? In fact, if you would  
13 be good enough to dip back into Prof McQuillan's report,  
14 at a paragraph you have looked at already, in ER3,  
15 paragraph 100 -- in fact, you were kind enough to look  
16 at this earlier this afternoon -- he says:  
17 "The internal stresses at the top of wall  
18 construction joint are all of a compressive nature. The  
19 diagram [which is the one he refers to above]  
20 illustrates why no tension or shear can occur at the  
21 interface. Any tendency for a shear force to develop  
22 across the interface would be resisted by the 'clamping'  
23 action of the EWL and OTE slabs which bear against the  
24 D-wall."  
25 In fairness to you, you have already told the

Page 165

1 Commissioners you don't agree with that.  
 2 A. No.  
 3 Q. But it is the case, I have to put to you, Professor,  
 4 that Prof McQuillan is right, the proposition from  
 5 Atkins is right, and in fact no calculation is actually  
 6 required, given how self-evident the position is  
 7 applying these engineering principles?  
 8 A. It is similar to the case when we are talking about  
 9 a chain. If there is a weak link in the chain, no  
 10 matter how we claim -- now, the strength is governed by  
 11 the weakest link. Actually, it violates the basic  
 12 principles of mechanics.  
 13 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Sorry, in what way?  
 14 A. Well, we always look at free bodies. We always look at  
 15 equilibrium. So if we isolate a certain part as a free  
 16 body, we have to satisfy ourselves that equilibrium can  
 17 be satisfied, strength is there. Otherwise -- well,  
 18 I think it's just -- I think for an engineer that  
 19 understands the basic -- well, the basic behaviour of  
 20 a joint like this, and when the engineer looks at the  
 21 free body, then the engineer should be able to  
 22 understand what is happening to that part.  
 23 So actually, there would be a lot of tension, and  
 24 there must be shear, must be, because -- so one argument  
 25 that I put forward earlier is that the stresses depend

Page 166

1 on the loading applied. It is not possible, it is  
 2 impossible, to have zero shear stress there all the  
 3 time. There may be one instance but then when you vary  
 4 the loading, obviously that will change; there will be  
 5 some shear stresses.  
 6 MR CONNOR: Using your word of earlier on, Professor, the  
 7 risk of that is marginal in the circumstances.  
 8 A. Well --  
 9 Q. Let's pause at that point. Don't go on to say "well".  
 10 Your word of earlier on was the risk is marginal; yes?  
 11 A. Well, in some cases, yes.  
 12 Q. Thank you. Let's proceed down paragraph 6.4.3.5 of your  
 13 report. You say "Apparently" --  
 14 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I'm interrupting there. It's a question  
 15 where I can be assisted later, no doubt, but one of the  
 16 issues of course that arises in my mind as a layperson  
 17 is when you talk about marginality is I'm sure engineers  
 18 would have their own tests for when are you able in  
 19 respect of any structure to disregard certain risks  
 20 because they are simply not feasible in respect of that  
 21 particular structure and the stresses and dynamics that  
 22 that structure must deal with over its lifetime. If  
 23 that comes up at any stage -- and it may already be in  
 24 a report that I've missed -- but because the argument  
 25 may be I think that -- what the professor is suggesting

Page 167

1 maybe are issues which go beyond that limit of  
 2 marginality.  
 3 Does that make any sense?  
 4 MR CONNOR: It absolutely does, sir, and I think it maybe  
 5 just allows me to clarify with Prof Au where he is on  
 6 that, but I think we have it already -- that really,  
 7 Professor, as far as the assessment of the marginality,  
 8 as we put it, of that risk is concerned, we go back to  
 9 the simple checks that you discussed with Prof Hansford,  
 10 because, as I understand your evidence, if those are  
 11 carried out, and if the results are as one would hope  
 12 and expect, then we are within hopefully the area of  
 13 what would be acceptable to you and other experts.  
 14 A. Mmm.  
 15 MR CONNOR: Thank you, if that helps.  
 16 CHAIRMAN: That does. Thank you.  
 17 MR CONNOR: Thank you. We were just looking -- if I may,  
 18 sir -- just at that last sentence of 6.4.3.5, where you  
 19 were saying:  
 20 "Apparently, the top reinforcement has not been  
 21 designed to resist the combined tension and bending  
 22 moment. It is uncertain if the horizontal shear  
 23 resistance at the additional construction joint and the  
 24 bearing resistance at the down-stand can indeed act  
 25 together but not fail progressively. It should be

Page 168

1 demonstrated by calculations and/or experiments."  
 2 Just a short question there. Would I be right in  
 3 understanding, just looking at your diagram,  
 4 6.4.3.5.1 --  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. -- of course what we have here, if I'm right, Professor,  
 7 is a strut-and-tie configuration?  
 8 A. No.  
 9 Q. You disagree with that? How would you describe it?  
 10 A. You mean this detail?  
 11 Q. Yes.  
 12 A. It's a rather unusual detail, to be honest.  
 13 Q. Can you give it a description beyond the expression  
 14 "rather unusual", in engineering terms?  
 15 A. So are you referring to the construction joint or are  
 16 you referring to the reinforcement?  
 17 Q. We have here a situation where there is force being  
 18 deployed horizontally.  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. There is force being deployed vertically into the joint;  
 21 yes?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. There must, therefore, be a greater force that as  
 24 a result of that action is deployed diagonally into the  
 25 structure?

Page 169	Page 171
<p>1 A. Okay. So which part are you talking about? The pink 2 part or the white part? 3 Q. In the pink part, where you have a circle with a blue 4 arrow pointing to it, to the left. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Are you with me? 7 A. The problem is when we look at the white part, that is 8 not -- well, in this case, in this argument, this is not 9 the critical part. The critical part is the pink part 10 above the diaphragm wall. 11 Now, there are other problems associated with the 12 white part of the connection which we have discussed 13 earlier. 14 Q. Yes, we have discussed that. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. So you don't agree that subject to there being 17 sufficient anchorage that goes into the D-wall, that the 18 combination of those horizontal forces and those 19 vertical forces, the creation then of the diagonal force 20 into the joint, together with the T40 bars that we see 21 along to the left-hand side of the pink area, all 22 adequately -- 23 A. No. 24 Q. -- will deal with the forces being deployed on that 25 structure?</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, still, of course. 2 Q. But I think you told us already, you told Prof Hansford 3 this afternoon and you told Mr Pennicott I think this 4 morning, that as far as the Concrete Code is concerned 5 in these regards, it of course is -- in terms of 6 beam-column joints -- of greater relevance in terms of 7 those columns that we find in buildings rather than in 8 large civil engineering projects? 9 A. Now, well -- 10 Q. Do you recall that evidence? 11 A. Well, actually -- 12 Q. Sorry, let's unpack it a little bit, Professor. Do you 13 recall your evidence? 14 A. Can you say that again, please? 15 Q. Yes, of course. So you told Prof Hansford this 16 afternoon and I think you told Mr Pennicott this 17 morning -- 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. -- that as far as the application of the Concrete Code 20 is concerned, its relevance insofar as columns and the 21 joints required within them is greater in relation to, 22 shall we say, structures which are more slight in their 23 nature than heavy diaphragm walls and slabs which are 24 heavily reinforced in civil engineering projects? 25 A. Well, the slab and wall joint here behaves like</p>
Page 170	Page 172
<p>1 A. The major -- 2 Q. Sorry, is that no? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Or no subject to the calculations and/or experiments 5 that you would like to have done? 6 A. Okay, yes, you are right. Now, but the problem is -- 7 the problem is -- so if you are talking about the top 8 part of that connection, especially just -- I think the 9 top 1 metre or so, so the vertical reinforcing bars may 10 not have sufficient anchorage. Again, checking. 11 Q. And again those checks are within the parameters of the 12 simple checks -- 13 A. Yes, simple checks. 14 Q. -- that you commend? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Then moving on to 6.4.3.6. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. You say: 19 "... Atkins has not considered the stresses inside 20 the slab-wall joint using the principles underpinning 21 the design of common beam-column joints as described in 22 section 6.8 of the Concrete Code on standard beam-column 23 joints." 24 A. Right. 25 Q. Do you still have that view?</p>	<p>1 a beam-column joint, although it is not the standard 2 type of beam-column joint. 3 Q. The Concrete Code, section 6.8, is of very limited 4 application in a situation such as we have here, where 5 we have a structure, Professor, that is adequately 6 reinforced to deal with all the forces being deployed 7 upon it; correct? 8 A. Well, with certain qualification. 9 Q. Okay. Let us have your qualifications now, but I will 10 take your affirmative answer. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Please can you help the Commissioners with your 13 qualifications. 14 A. The beam-column joint section in the Concrete Code 15 doesn't spell out all the fundamental principles, it 16 just gives the equations for calculation of 17 reinforcement. But unfortunately that equation may not 18 apply to unusual cases like this. But the basic 19 principles would be the same. 20 Q. So a criticism that is articulated by reference to not 21 deploying the terms of section 6.8 of the Concrete Code 22 is not really fair in these circumstances; do you agree? 23 A. Say that again, please. 24 Q. A criticism which you make by reference to the terms of 25 a particular part of the Concrete Code is, in the</p>

Page 173	Page 175
<p>1 circumstances that even you have just described, hardly 2 fair; do you agree? 3 A. Well, the same principles should be applied, the same 4 principles. 5 Q. Let us assume that the principles being deployed have 6 taken full account of the fact that this is a heavily 7 structured, heavily reinforced, heavy structure in 8 itself, and for all the reasons covered by Atkins and 9 for all the reasons covered by Prof McQuillan in his 10 report, there is no significant risk of there being 11 shear in the nature that you describe. 12 A. I don't agree. 13 Q. You do not agree with that -- 14 A. We have to check. 15 Q. Thank you. Just to close on that, what I understand, 16 from the dialogue that we had between the Commissioners 17 and Mr Chow and yourself this morning, that the checks 18 that you consider we ought to require, the simple 19 checks, are going to be capable of being pulled together 20 by you in a table and advised to this Commission so that 21 we know what it is you say needs to be done and how long 22 it should take and who is going to do it; am I right? 23 A. I can probably recommend a textbook and a certain 24 section, so that people can follow. 25 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Actually, sorry, Prof Au, a textbook</p>	<p>1 A. Last couple of hours? 2 Q. I know it won't feel that way but this afternoon. 3 A. Well, I -- 4 Q. Let me unpack it to help you. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. You told the learned Commissioners that you haven't 7 carried out any of these simple calculations yet, you 8 haven't looked at coming up with the simple tests, but 9 you think Mannings have; yes? 10 A. Well, Mannings actually did the work under the 11 supervision of a colleague and me, yes. 12 Q. What was their brief? 13 A. I think you have to ask the Highways Department. That 14 is to help in coming up with certain background 15 calculations to help us understand more about the 16 structure. 17 Q. Perhaps we should unpack it a little bit because I think 18 you told the Commission earlier that your involvement as 19 an expert and the preparation of your report really 20 began in December. 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. When did the Mannings work take place? 23 A. Probably late November to December. 24 Now, the problem is, at the very beginning, it's 25 very unclear, and then when I was sort of confirmed to</p>
Page 174	Page 176
<p>1 might be of interest, but I think we need somebody to do 2 the calculations, because I don't think we can be relied 3 on to follow the textbook properly. 4 A. Well, that is a fairly advanced one, but that was 5 written by Park and Paulay who are experts. 6 MR CONNOR: I may not thank you for an advanced textbook or 7 this, Prof Au, but I appreciate, Professor and 8 Mr Chairman, that we are straying here into dialogue 9 that perhaps counsel will have with you. 10 But perhaps if I can close the point in this way. 11 If it be the case, Prof Au, that government agrees on 12 a suggestion by the learned Commissioners that there 13 should be produced a very clear list of the tests, the 14 calculations, the numerical working-out that you say 15 needed to be done, within the context of the simple 16 checks, if that is to be produced, that we understand is 17 something to which you will willingly contribute? 18 A. That is something that is extra. Of course, if time 19 allows, I will be happy to do that. 20 Q. You mentioned Mannings in response to questions I think 21 just before lunchtime. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Can you help the Commission with their brief and what 24 they have looked at in relation to the calculations we 25 have been looking at in the last couple of hours?</p>	<p>1 be asked to appear over here, I think that was sometime 2 in December, but then in the adviser capacity, I have 3 also made suggestions. 4 Q. Let me deal with this briefly, because it may be it can 5 be dealt with very briefly. 6 A. Okay. 7 Q. You talk about problems; let me share a problem with 8 you. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. The problem here is that you've told us that Mannings 11 have carried out some calculations which might be 12 relevant and might be similar to those which you have 13 discussed with the Commissioners already -- you 14 understand? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And you have hinted that the fact that maybe having 17 carried those out, the results have not been terribly 18 helpful. Do you remember? 19 A. Well, some of them, yes. 20 Q. Against that background, that is why I am asking you 21 what is to be done under your direction, what have they 22 applied in terms of codes or standards, and what have 23 they found. But in fairness to you, if you can't help 24 the Commissioners with this, then we can draw a line 25 under it and move on, but if you have evidence, it's</p>

Page 177	Page 179
<p>1 important, I think, that you clarify it.</p> <p>2 A. They have done some work to countercheck the strength</p> <p>3 utilisation factors, but the problem is that they don't</p> <p>4 have all the background data, so they just work from the</p> <p>5 raw data, whatever. They also did some work on the</p> <p>6 joints, the connections, and then they did find some of</p> <p>7 the joints to be problematic.</p> <p>8 So that's why we are of the view that it is better</p> <p>9 to carry out further checking. Now, what they have used</p> <p>10 are reasonable, but then whether they are really</p> <p>11 accurate, we are not 100 per cent sure.</p> <p>12 Q. So, as I understand, your point is that they don't have</p> <p>13 the base data and if you want to come up with accurate</p> <p>14 results, you need to have that?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And that's the base data that Atkins will have?</p> <p>17 A. Now --</p> <p>18 Q. Sorry, that is the base data that comes from the</p> <p>19 designer?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. So if we want to have the right answer, we had better</p> <p>22 get that data?</p> <p>23 A. It would be better, but an experienced engineer will be</p> <p>24 able to come up with some typical parameters which are</p> <p>25 useful. Okay?</p>	<p>1 because you have to also consider potential problems</p> <p>2 caused by the new construction joint; correct?</p> <p>3 A. Correct, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. That, if I understand you correctly, is the horizontal</p> <p>5 joint --</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. -- between the concrete poured at the place where the</p> <p>8 D-wall was chipped off; correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. That would be the horizontal joint?</p> <p>11 A. Right. That's one of the cases, because there are some</p> <p>12 other, more complicated cases.</p> <p>13 Q. Right. Before I go further, I know you are a very</p> <p>14 distinguished professor, accustomed to teaching very</p> <p>15 learned people, but I wish you to understand there is</p> <p>16 a public interest dimension in this hearing.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And you are not only addressing people who know what you</p> <p>19 are talking about.</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. So sometimes it may not be entirely helpful to address</p> <p>22 professors and doctors. In particular, you have to</p> <p>23 remember there are journalists outside who are not as</p> <p>24 learned as you are who may, some of them, genuinely want</p> <p>25 to understand what's going on and write something about</p>
Page 178	Page 180
<p>1 Q. But you have nothing of detail in this regard to share</p> <p>2 with us this afternoon?</p> <p>3 A. No. So that's why I am not saying that certain details</p> <p>4 are unacceptable, but just propose whatever parties to</p> <p>5 follow up with checking.</p> <p>6 Q. And therefore, when we get to the end of your evidence,</p> <p>7 we can look forward to clarity as to what those checks</p> <p>8 should be?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 MR CONNOR: Thank you. Sir, Professor, I have no further</p> <p>11 questions at this stage. Thank you.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.</p> <p>13 MR SHIEH: A few questions from Leighton, if I may?</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN: Certainly.</p> <p>15 Cross-examination by MR SHIEH</p> <p>16 MR SHIEH: Professor, I represent Leighton. Let's talk</p> <p>17 about this question of the new construction joints --</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. -- under the latest design change, what we call change</p> <p>20 number 2, which you say may cause problems; all right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Because, as I understand it, you accept that under what</p> <p>23 we call the second change, there are more rebars --</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. -- across. You say that's not necessarily better</p>	<p>1 it. You understand what I am saying?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Could I respectfully ask that when you give answers, try</p> <p>4 your very best -- I know it may be quite some time ago,</p> <p>5 but try your very best to imagine that you are speaking</p> <p>6 to an intelligent five-year-old.</p> <p>7 I'm not going to look at detailed plans, but I'm</p> <p>8 looking at Tony Gee's report. Can I ask you to look at</p> <p>9 the expert bundle, tab 5, internal page 27.</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. The bottom diagram, that is an attempt to present</p> <p>12 schematically -- forget about dimensions, et cetera, but</p> <p>13 in a rough and ready way --</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. -- the situation before the second change; yes?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, the left-hand side, the burgundy part is the EWL</p> <p>18 slab?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. The middle part, the blue part, is the D-wall, and the</p> <p>21 right-hand side, the green part, is the OTE; right?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Under the previous design, which was -- under the</p> <p>24 previous design, rebars would go through, forgive my</p> <p>25 layman-like language -- imagine the rebars coming in</p>

Page 181	Page 183
<p>1 from the left, through the EWL, and get connected by 2 couplers to the blue bit in the middle. 3 A. Right. 4 Q. And on the right-hand side of the blue bit, again, there 5 will be couplers; right? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And then connected to the OTE on the right-hand side; 8 correct? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. If you look at this, you agree that on this depiction, 11 it correctly shows two construction joints vertically? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Can you turn to the next page then. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. This is a depiction of the change the -- of the 16 situation after change number 2; right? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. We have seen different attempts to present this change, 19 but since Tony Gee, and in particular Mr Nick Southward 20 is my expert so I'm using this diagram presented in his 21 report; all right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. What I am going to ask you is this. Even though, as 24 depicted, you can see the joint -- 25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>1 trained in engineering how this structure is ever going 2 to break because of what you call the shear force in 3 that notional line between burgundy and blue. Forget 4 about diagrams, forget about equation; just describe 5 physically how it's going to break at the line. 6 A. You mean the horizontal line? 7 Q. Correct. 8 A. Well, if the shear strength is really insufficient and 9 so much below the shear force applied there, then the 10 upper part of the concrete is going to slide towards the 11 left, and then the other thing is the part -- well, the 12 down-stand part of the OTE whatever is going to perhaps 13 fail in flexure. There will be bending failure, yes. 14 Q. You mean the burgundy part on the right-hand side -- 15 A. Yes, could fail in flexure, depending on -- well, 16 of course, one has to do checking. 17 Q. Thank you. But I'm sure academics thrive in asking 18 questions, but if you look at the previous page, again, 19 if you forget about the colouring -- 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. -- if you forget about the colouring, it's one lump of 22 concrete? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. So for an outsider, for a layman, the shape of that lump 25 of concrete, between this and the next page, is again,</p>
Page 182	Page 184
<p>1 Q. -- the horizontal joint -- 2 A. Right. 3 Q. -- meaning the horizontal line between the burgundy part 4 on top and the blue part in the bottom -- 5 A. Right. 6 Q. -- the final product, once concrete is poured, is one 7 lump of concrete; do you accept that? 8 A. You mean including all the areas of different colours? 9 Q. Yes. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. It's one lump of concrete. 12 A. It's one lump of concrete. 13 Q. One lump of concrete? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Of course there will be forces within that lump of 16 concrete, but there's nothing special about that line, 17 the notional line between the burgundy and the blue; is 18 that correct? Do you accept that? 19 A. I think to someone outside the engineering profession, 20 that may be the view, but then for -- well, engineers, 21 then they have to look at what happens at the 22 construction joints. 23 Q. Right, which is what I am now going to ask you to do, 24 because I am not an engineer. 25 Explain to me and those in the room who are not</p>	<p>1 forgive my loose language, roughly similar? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. So if there is a force, a very strong force, pulling the 4 whole thing to the left, if it doesn't fail, if it 5 doesn't result in the breakage of the structure at the 6 bottom of page 27, a layman would be forgiven for 7 thinking that it should not break for the structure over 8 the next page; do you accept that? 9 A. I beg your pardon -- now, because engineers normally 10 explore how a structure failed, and there are different 11 failure mechanisms. 12 Q. Yes. 13 A. We need to look at a lot of different things, and for 14 each of them there is a possible failure mode, and for 15 combinations of them there would be another failure mode 16 possible. 17 So, for this particular case, just looking at 18 that -- now, that may not be the location of failure. 19 The structure may be failing elsewhere. So it's hard to 20 answer that question just picking that part of the 21 structure. 22 Q. But this is the part of the structure that I think 23 everyone is most interested in -- 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. -- in relation to what we call the revised design; do</p>

Page 185	Page 187
<p>1 you accept that?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, indeed.</p> <p>3 Q. So that is why I am asking. So what you are saying is</p> <p>4 if a force -- looking at the diagram at page 28, what</p> <p>5 you are saying is if you apply a strong enough force by</p> <p>6 pulling the burgundy part on the left, you pull that to</p> <p>7 the left --</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. -- it may be that the right-hand side part of the</p> <p>10 burgundy structure will bend or fail or crack; that is</p> <p>11 what you mean?</p> <p>12 A. Actually, when you look at that, if you are really</p> <p>13 serious in exploring the possible failure modes -- so,</p> <p>14 actually, there are many possible failure modes.</p> <p>15 Failure along the horizontal construction joint</p> <p>16 (indicating diagram on page 28) is a possibility, and</p> <p>17 then perhaps some cracking over here (indicating) is</p> <p>18 another possibility. Some cracking over there is</p> <p>19 another possibility; okay? Some shear cracking over</p> <p>20 here is also a possible failure mode.</p> <p>21 So we have to check all this to find out which one</p> <p>22 would be the failure mode to appear first. So all these</p> <p>23 are possibilities.</p> <p>24 Q. You mentioned the first possibility, that is to say you</p> <p>25 pointed at that horizontal line on the left?</p>	<p>1 Q. Because we know that concrete was poured there. But</p> <p>2 after concrete is poured, that is one lump of concrete;</p> <p>3 do you accept that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So there should not be any sliding because it is not two</p> <p>6 blocks of concrete, it is one piece of concrete; do you</p> <p>7 accept that?</p> <p>8 A. I can tell you, in Hong Kong, there are many composite</p> <p>9 bridges. Island Eastern Corridor and I think Canal Road</p> <p>10 Flyover, they are composite bridges and they are</p> <p>11 constructed by precast beams together with in situ slab;</p> <p>12 okay? One lump of concrete. But we still need to check</p> <p>13 the horizontal shear stress. That is a must.</p> <p>14 Q. Yes. But whether you need to as a matter of caution or</p> <p>15 as a matter of --</p> <p>16 A. No, it is a requirement.</p> <p>17 Q. I'm talking about structural safety.</p> <p>18 A. Yes, it is related to structural safety too.</p> <p>19 Q. But that is why I wanted to know how that horizontal</p> <p>20 line could contribute to failure.</p> <p>21 A. Now, okay. So if this horizontal construction joint is</p> <p>22 very strong, indeed it acts as a whole piece, then there</p> <p>23 will be a certain distribution of internal forces. In</p> <p>24 case it is very weak and sliding starts to occur over</p> <p>25 there, then the internal forces will be different and</p>
<p>Page 186</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. That's got nothing to do with the vertical line. Can</p> <p>3 you hold up that sheet for me?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. You first of all pointed at that vertical line on the</p> <p>6 left-hand side between the burgundy and the blue; is</p> <p>7 that right? Not the horizontal one but the vertical</p> <p>8 one.</p> <p>9 A. This one?</p> <p>10 Q. Yes, the vertical one. You say there may be failure</p> <p>11 there, it may --</p> <p>12 A. A possibility? Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. But that possibility has nothing to do with the</p> <p>14 horizontal new joint; correct?</p> <p>15 A. Well, now, again, one has to --</p> <p>16 Q. The problem is --</p> <p>17 A. -- checking.</p> <p>18 Q. I thought you were going to say "the problem is".</p> <p>19 A. Yes, the problem is if -- now, when we look at -- if</p> <p>20 there is sliding over here, then there will be tearing,</p> <p>21 possible tearing, over here, and the force taken by this</p> <p>22 part could be bigger, could be.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. But there is a line between burgundy and</p> <p>24 blue.</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>Page 188</p> <p>1 certain parts may be overstressed, perhaps leading to</p> <p>2 some other modes of failure.</p> <p>3 So there is no simple answer.</p> <p>4 Q. Can I ask you how there could be sliding on this</p> <p>5 configuration, by coming back to a point put to you</p> <p>6 previously, because there was clamping on both sides by</p> <p>7 the burgundy part, so I am struggling to understand how</p> <p>8 there could be sliding.</p> <p>9 A. Now, first of all, imagine the construction sequence.</p> <p>10 So when the contractor casts the EWL slab, after</p> <p>11 casting, the slab was still supported by the ground. So</p> <p>12 the concrete inside carried zero stress; okay? Well,</p> <p>13 virtually zero stress. Then people started to excavate</p> <p>14 and then the self-weight of the slab will begin to take</p> <p>15 place. This is going to extend -- this is going to</p> <p>16 extend that (indicating diagram on page 28), and this</p> <p>17 part is going to elongate. Depending on the strength</p> <p>18 against shear, then there may be something happening.</p> <p>19 If the strength is sufficient, then it can act as</p> <p>20 a whole piece. But if the strength is insufficient,</p> <p>21 then some horizontal shear cracks will start to appear.</p> <p>22 Then perhaps some parts will be overstressed.</p> <p>23 Q. Physically how would that manifest itself along that</p> <p>24 line, a crack appearing in the middle on that notional</p> <p>25 on line.</p>

Page 189	Page 191
<p>1 A. That normally will be accompanied by some other 2 cracking. There can be some other cracking. 3 Actually, in the behaviour of reinforced concrete 4 beams, very often there are cracks appearing just at the 5 middle, shear crack. Engineers will understand that. 6 Shear cracks normally would appear at the middle -- not 7 the flexural cracks, the cracks caused by bending -- it 8 would start from the bottom -- but shear cracks will be 9 appearing at the centre of a beam. Say a beam like that 10 (demonstrating with hands), normally the shear cracks 11 will be closer to the supports. 12 So having a crack somewhere at the middle is nothing 13 new. It's quite common actually. We actually see a lot 14 of such cases in our laboratory. 15 Q. You are saying that there could be a crack -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- caused by, you know, a bad joint, appearing where 18 that horizontal line is now appearing? 19 A. Possible, yes. 20 Q. Only there, without -- Professor, let me just suggest to 21 you again from a layman's point of view what I have in 22 mind and see what you say about it. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. After chipping off the top part of the D-wall, and after 25 concrete is poured on top of -- you know the way the</p>	<p>1 So that is possible. 2 Q. As I say, applying strong enough force, I'm sure cracks 3 can appear everywhere, but I'm saying cracks or failures 4 caused by the appearance of that notional line in the 5 middle. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. I'm suggesting that that by itself doesn't cause any 8 failure. 9 A. Well, one has to check. Now, we are discussing that 10 qualitatively. We need to quantify what is going to 11 happen. So we have to do calculations. 12 Q. You see, but as I've told you when I started my 13 questioning, for laymen and for the public to be able to 14 visualise or understand why we are concerned about this, 15 they have to be able to visualise how that added joint 16 contributes to any failure, because there's no point 17 saying if you apply a strong enough force the whole 18 thing collapses. It may well do. But you can't blame 19 it on that joint. Do you understand my point? 20 A. I understand your point. 21 Q. What you are saying is there is something about that 22 joint in the revised design that is causative of 23 something bad, and I want to explore with you to explain 24 to laymen how qualitatively that would happen. 25 A. Okay. Let's say -- now I get a few sheets of paper.</p>
Page 190	Page 192
<p>1 revised design is done? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Concrete is poured monolithically? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. So the top of the EWL slab, the top of the D-wall, the 6 top of the OTE poured at the same time and 7 monolithically, so there's one lump of concrete up 8 there? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Forming, again, a monolithic structure -- 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. -- together with the D-wall down there? 13 A. Right. 14 Q. You can talk about forces going in (demonstrating with 15 a sheet of paper), et cetera. If you apply strong 16 enough force, the whole thing can collapse. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. But what I suggest to you is that has nothing to do with 19 the appearance of that notional joint line buried in 20 there, in this diagram. Do you accept that? 21 A. No. This is something that we have to check. Now, so 22 if you are interested in what happens if it is not 23 strong enough -- now, there can be sliding crack over 24 here (indicating diagram on page 28), that part may 25 develop a crack. That part may also develop a crack.</p>	<p>1 Now, you can imagine that -- so now we have a few sheets 2 of paper. If I bend it, it's very easy, but if I put 3 glue between them, it would be stiffer. We can imagine 4 that. 5 If when I mentioned about the example of the 6 composite bridges, precast beam and in situ slab, we 7 have to make sure that the interface between them is 8 strong enough. If it is not strong enough, they can 9 slip. So you can see that it is weaker; it can deform 10 a lot more. I think that would help people to 11 understand the strength of construction joints. To 12 explain that would be very difficult. I think for those 13 interested, they had better do a degree. 14 CHAIRMAN: Can I ask this, assuming procedurally everything 15 went in accordance with the Building Code, the Buildings 16 Department was approached, and assuming that the 17 through-bars are actually there and everything was done. 18 Do you think that there would have been any reason for 19 the Buildings Department to say no? 20 A. Possible. Now, I think certainly they would ask the 21 competent person to demonstrate that there is no problem 22 within the construction joint, there is no problem 23 within the connection at other places. I think they 24 probably would demand that. 25 CHAIRMAN: All right.</p>



Page 193	Page 195
<p>1 MR SHIEH: Because doing the best I can, again, as a layman, 2 if you pull the whole thing to the left -- 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. -- and what you are saying is if that joint between the 5 burgundy and the blue is not, let's say, glued properly 6 and there is sliding, then it could somehow drag the 7 right-hand side burgundy together with it -- 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. -- and therefore all kinds of things can happen to the 10 right-hand side burgundy? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Again forgive me. If the right-hand side burgundy is as 13 thin as a hair-pin, then I can understand if you have 14 a little bit of sliding then the vertical hair-plain 15 will break. But if you, again using language of my 16 learned friend for Atkins, take off a scholar's hat and 17 put on a common-sense hat, looking at this depiction, is 18 it really realistic to suggest that, oh, with the chunk 19 of -- because basically you are saying that the OTE slab 20 would crack? 21 A. Well, it is possible. If something happens, let's say 22 if it fails at the construction joint, then there can be 23 some other cracks. It is not surprising at all, if it 24 occurs. 25 Q. We have had enough discussion about qualitative</p>	<p>1 requirement under the Code of Practice for Structural 2 Use of Concrete ..." 3 Then you gave the reference to the code; do you see 4 that? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. H8/2818. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. So can I ask you to look at H8/2818. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. That's the first page of the Concrete Code. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. If I ask you to look at 2821. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. That's the foreword. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Look at the penultimate paragraph. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. It says: 19 "Although this Code of Practice is not a statutory 20 document, the compliance with the requirements of this 21 Code of Practice is deemed to satisfy the relevant 22 provisions of the Buildings Ordinance and related 23 regulations." 24 Do you see that? 25 A. Yes.</p>
Page 194	Page 196
<p>1 layman-like matters. I may revisit it tomorrow morning 2 but can I just move on to another small topic. 3 I can see that it's 5.10. I know we started 4 a little bit late but I am going to move on to the next 5 topic so maybe it would be an opportune moment. 6 CHAIRMAN: Prof Hansford has a conference call at 5.30. 7 I don't know how counsel feel. I'm more than happy to 8 continue on to, say, 5.20. I don't know if that 9 achieves anything for you, Mr Shieh. 10 MR SHIEH: Yes, I can finish probably the next topic, if not 11 the one after next, and then maybe I'll call it a day 12 and then see if I have anything else after the evening 13 adjournment. If not, then maybe -- 14 CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Good. Thank you. 15 MR SHIEH: Can I ask you to look at your report, at 16 paragraph 3.1.1. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Here, you deal with the codes. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. You say: 21 "Whilst provision of flexural strength for hogging 22 moment at the EWL slab adjacent to the connection 23 between the EWL slab and the east diaphragm wall ... 24 does not necessarily require bottom reinforcement, 25 provision of bottom reinforcement is a mandatory</p>	<p>1 Q. First of all, I wish you to confirm that it is indeed 2 your understanding that it is not a statutory document; 3 correct? 4 A. Correct. 5 Q. So no statute actually says that Buildings Department or 6 whatever department, Highways Department, can promulgate 7 a code which must be complied with; it's not statutory? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. It actually only has the status of a "deemed to satisfy" 10 document, in the sense that if you do what the code 11 requires you to do, then basically the government can't 12 make life difficult for you, they can't reject, because 13 you are deemed to have satisfied the requirements? 14 A. Right. 15 Q. Whatever requirements there are. 16 A. Right. 17 Q. So it is not mandatory in the sense that if you fail to 18 comply with it, then you are forever and ever doomed 19 because the government would then be able necessarily to 20 say you failed, therefore you are rejected; do you 21 accept that? 22 A. Let me explain. Now, yes, it's true that compliance 23 with that code will be accepted by the Building 24 Authority. It is also possible for the competent person 25 or the registered structural engineer to come up with</p>

Page 197	Page 199
<p>1 an alternative design which doesn't follow that, but 2 then it is the responsibility of the competent person to 3 demonstrate that it is not inferior to the requirements 4 over here. 5 There are two possibilities. First, in respect of 6 a certain requirement, it is exactly the same. Second, 7 it exceeds it. And because of that, in a sense, it is 8 mandatory, because it would very often be more costly, 9 more time-consuming, to come up with an alternative 10 design which doesn't comply with that but which can 11 provide the same or even better performance. 12 Now, if we are talking about a very large project 13 and a certain part of the structure is repetitive, many, 14 many times, that may be worthwhile. So I think, in this 15 sense, saying that the requirements here are mandatory 16 is reasonable. 17 Q. "Mandatory" has one meaning. "Compulsory" must follow. 18 But you are not in any way suggesting that the 19 requirements must be followed? 20 A. Now, I understand that the requirements are set down 21 over here. You can come up with alternatives which are 22 not inferior to what is required here. 23 Q. Thank you. I think I know what you mean. I'm not going 24 to get bogged down in the meaning of "mandatory". We 25 can all form our own conclusions.</p>	<p>1 that our discussion takes place within the context of 2 the Foundation Code promulgated by the Buildings 3 Department -- 4 A. Right. 5 Q. -- which is in the middle of page 40 of the report. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. "That part of a building, building works, structure or 8 street in direct contact with and transmitting loads to 9 the ground." 10 Do you see that? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Can you look at the diagram on the next page. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. That describes, again pictorially, the way what we call 15 the box will look; right? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. You know what I mean by "the box"? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. "The box" is that part enclosed by the burgundy? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. That's the box. The top burgundy is EWL; the bottom 22 burgundy is NSL. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Do you see that? 25 A. Yes.</p>
Page 198	Page 200
<p>1 My next point that I want to explore with you before 2 we break for the day is the question about foundation. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Can I ask you to look at the page in Mr Southward's 5 report, tab 5, at page 40, which you were asked to look 6 at by Mr Chow when he examined you in-chief this 7 morning. You remember you were asked questions about 8 whether or not the D-wall amounted to foundation; do you 9 remember that? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. That discussion as to whether or not the D-wall amounted 12 to part of the foundation takes place in a certain 13 context? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Because obviously, if you simply look at the word 16 "foundation", it can carry different shades of meaning, 17 depending on context? 18 A. Right. 19 Q. You apply to university, there's a foundation course, 20 but obviously we are not talking about that kind of 21 foundation; right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. I don't think we need to actually bother you about why 24 there is a need to touch upon the meaning of the word 25 "foundation" for present purposes. It suffices to note</p>	<p>1 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: I think it's magenta in mine, for 2 the NSL. 3 MR SHIEH: The box, yes. 4 I will move on relatively quickly. The point 5 I would put to you is that the foundation for the 6 purpose of the definition of the code that we have 7 looked at is the D-wall below the NSL slab, because it 8 is that part of the D-wall which transmits load to the 9 ground and which supports the box on top of it. Do you 10 accept that suggestion? 11 A. If you are talking about the middle part, yes, but then 12 the east and the west diaphragm walls I would consider 13 them as foundation as well. They are also taking 14 loading. They are transmitting the loading to the 15 ground. They are in contact with, well, the ground, the 16 soil. The east and west, yes, they are also part of the 17 foundations. 18 Q. But there's a little bit of a conundrum I need you to 19 help us. You know about hit and miss? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. You know the hit and miss panels in this case? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. So even within the D-wall, not all the panels are in 24 direct contact with the bedrock or the soil? 25 A. I'm talking about the ground. I'm talking about soil.</p>

Page 201	Page 203
<p>1 If you are talking about the hit panel, then it is sort                  2 of touch being the bedrock. The miss would not be                  3 touching. But at the back, it still in contact with                  4 soil.                  5 The other thing is that what we assume in                  6 calculation may not be exactly the same as its                  7 behaviour; okay? So it's true that probably in                  8 calculation we assume all the loading to be taken by the                  9 hit panels. However, those miss panels may also take                  10 some loading because underneath there is still soil,                  11 although the loading carried by that may not be as big                  12 as those hit panels.                  13 So I would consider all of them part of the                  14 foundation.                  15 MR SHIEH: Would it be an appropriate moment to take the                  16 adjournment now?                  17 CHAIRMAN: Yes, it would.                  18 MR SHIEH: I would wish to reflect on whether I need to test                  19 Prof Au any further, but I have covered most if not all                  20 the topics I wish to explore with him.                  21 CHAIRMAN: Good.                  22 COMMISSIONER HANSFORD: Mr Chow is on his feet.                  23 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr Chow, I didn't see you behind Mr Shieh,                  24 the imposing figure of Mr Shieh there.                  25 MR CHOW: Because he is much grander. I just want to flag</p>	<p>1 INDEX                  2 PAGE                  3 PROF AU TAT KWONG, FRANCIS (sworn) .....18                  4 Examination-in-chief by MR CHOW .....18                  5 Examination by MR PENNICOTT .....55                  6 Cross-examination by MR SO .....102                  7 Cross-examination by MR CONNOR .....115                  8 Cross-examination by MR SHIEH .....178                  9                  10                  11                  12                  13                  14                  15                  16                  17                  18                  19                  20                  21                  22                  23                  24                  25</p>
Page 202	
<p>1 up at this point that I understand Prof Au has some                  2 teaching commitments tomorrow afternoon. I don't                  3 anticipate that we will need to go into tomorrow                  4 afternoon, but I just think perhaps it is good for us to                  5 flag it up at this stage.                  6 CHAIRMAN: All right. I'm sure, Professor, we will be able                  7 to let you go in good time to go back to your students.                  8 WITNESS: Thank you.                  9 CHAIRMAN: Could I mention one thing, and I omitted to                  10 mention it earlier for the luncheon adjournment. Even                  11 though you are an expert, you are giving evidence at the                  12 moment, and when you are giving evidence you are                  13 an island unto yourself; do you understand?                  14 WITNESS: I understand.                  15 CHAIRMAN: You are not allowed to discuss matters with other                  16 people. They can't come up to you and say, "Oi, what                  17 about this, what about that?"                  18 WITNESS: I understand that.                  19 CHAIRMAN: I thought you did but I forgot to mention it                  20 earlier.                  21 We will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 am.                  22 Thank you.                  23 (5.21 pm)                  24 (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)                  25</p>	