

**Independent Committee in relation to the  
Fire at Wang Fuk Court in Tai Po**

---

**SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF  
Mr YUNG SIU LUN**

---

I, YUNG Siu Lun, Senior Maintenance Surveyor of Independent Checking Unit (“**ICU**”) of the Office of the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Lung Cheung Office Block, 138 Lung Cheung Road, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon, do say as follows:-

1. I am the same YUNG Siu Lun who gave a Witness Statement dated 16 January 2026 (“**First Statement**”) to the Independent Committee (“**Committee**”) in relation to the fire at Wang Fuk Court in Tai Po.
2. I make this second Witness Statement specifically to explain in greater detail the focus of ICU in the course of conducting the Audit Fundamental Check (“**AFC**”) on randomly selected minor works (“**MW**”) submissions related to Wang Fuk Court.
3. I understand that the Committee has circulated Bundles (e.g. Bundles I1-1 to I1-4 and I2) which contain relevant documents in ICU’s and other Involved Parties’ possession. In this Witness Statement, I shall refer to documents in the relevant Bundles by their designated reference, e.g. [I1-1/A/1/1] denotes Item 1 on page 1 of Part A of Bundle I1-1.

Manpower of ICU’s Minor Works Team (“**MWT**”)

4. As explained in paragraphs 6 and 7 of my First Statement, the Minor Works Control System (“**MWCS**”), which came into

operation on 31 December 2010, aims to facilitate building owners and occupants in carrying out small-scale building works safely and lawfully through simplified statutory procedures without the need to obtain prior written approval of plans and consent for the commencement of the works from the Building Authority (“BA”). The system was generally welcomed by both industry and the public.

5. Prior to the MWCS implementation, all building works were subject to the established statutory procedures under the Buildings Ordinance, Cap. 123 (“BO”), which required prior approval of building plans and written consent from BA before commencement of the works. As a consequence, many minor building works were carried out without complying with the law and were therefore unauthorised building works. The MWCS is to simplify the procedures in order to provide a lawful, simple, safe as well as convenient means for building owners to carry out minor works.
6. Under the current MWCS, there are 187 items of building works defined as MW and classified into three classes according to their nature, scale, complexity, and risk to safety. These MW can be carried out without obtaining prior approval and consent, provided that Prescribed Building Professionals (“PBPs”) and/or Prescribed Registered Contractors (“PRCs”) are suitably appointed.
7. The duties of PBPs and PRCs under the MWCS are set out in sections 4B and 9AA of the BO, under which they are required to supervise the carrying out of MW, notify BA of any contraventions of the regulations which would result from the carrying out of MW, and comply with the BO. Sections 42 and 43 of the Building (Minor Works) Regulation, Cap. 123N (“B(MW)R”) also set out

the duties of PBPs / PRCs, where they must give periodical and continuous supervision to ensure that there is no material divergence or deviation from the prescribed plans and details submitted. PBPs / PRCs are also responsible for ensuring the works are carried out in accordance with the BO. It reflects, as expressly stated in the Buildings Department (“BD”)’s MW Manual Section 5, Instruction No. 1 [I1-1/A/10/523]<sup>1</sup>, that the spirit of the MWCS primarily relies on self-regulation of the construction industry’s professionals for its implementation, having regard to the relevant background and context. [I1-1/A/10/523]

8. On the other hand, BA’s main roles in respect of the MWCS, as set out in BD’s Minor Works and Signboard Control Section Manual (“BD’s MW Manual”) Part 1 [I1-1/A/10/461, 469-470, 523-528 & 548-552], are summarised as follows:- [I1-1/A/10/461, 469-470, 523-528 & 548-552]
- (a) to monitor implementation of the MWCS through processing MW submissions and conducting checks (with the details as elaborated in paragraphs 12 to 17 of my First Statement) to deter abuse of the MWCS by PBPs and PRCs and ensure that the MW carried out comply with the BO and its subsidiary regulations, and the safety standards are met;
  - (b) to issue reminders and warning letters in case irregularities are found in the MW audit; and
  - (c) to instigate necessary prosecution or disciplinary action. As ICU is not delegated with such powers under the BO, for the cases warranting prosecution or disciplinary actions, ICU will refer to BD for handling.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Minor Works Control System (MWCS) is a self regulatory system.”

9. MWT in ICU is headed by a Senior Professional Officer (i.e. me being the incumbent) and underpinned by four Professional Officers (“POs”). The whole team comprises 10 professional and technical staff. In addition to conducting audits on MW submissions, the team is also responsible for handling enquiries and complaints, form screening, and other MWCS-related duties as described below. The volume of MW submissions received and the range of duties the team is required to perform are explained in more detail below.
10. In 2025, MWT received 27 585 MW submissions<sup>2</sup>, amongst which 1 425 MW submissions (5.17%) have been audited, where each audit team shall comprise one Assistant Clerk of Works as Vetting Officer and one PO, and the audit result would be submitted to Senior Professional Officer for agreement.
11. On average, each PO handled over 350 audited MW submissions in 2025. In addition to the random audit arrangement, MWT also conducted form screening for around 4 000 MW submissions related to windows and external wall repairs in 2025, with a view to ensuring the relevant MW are accurately categorised.
12. Furthermore, MWT is responsible for performing other MWCS-related duties including handling enquiries / complaints, uploading signboard information online for public viewing and enhancing the Minor Works Management System, etc.

#### Submission of Notice of Commencement under the MWCS

13. The works carried out under the MWCS are, in general, of

---

<sup>2</sup> The total number of MW submissions received by MWT in 2025 was 39 927, which included all specified forms for MW, as well as Forms W11 and W13 for Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme with prescribed repair carried out (which is a type of MW). Amongst them, 27 585 were MW submissions on Notices of Commencement and Certificates of Completion of Minor Works.

relatively smaller scale as well as lower complexity and risks when compared to those under the “approval and consent” system. This is consistent with the underlying rationale of the MWCS, which was designed to facilitate building owners and occupants in carrying out small-scale building works safely and lawfully through simplified statutory procedures, as described above. By contrast, more substantial works such as alteration and addition works (“**A&A works**”) remain subject to the full “approval and consent” system, which carries with it a higher level of oversight and supervision by BA.

14. For building plans submitted by an Authorized Person (“**AP**”) under the “approval and consent” system for A&A works in existing buildings, the officers will inspect the site to check if the submitted plans conform with the actual site conditions. In case of any discrepancies, the officers would ask the AP to amend the plans. BA may disapprove the plans if the submitted plans are found to contravene the BO. Consent must also be obtained from BA prior to commencement of works.
15. On the other hand, under the MWCS, the responsibility of conducting inspection rests primarily with PBPs and PRCs as explained in paragraph 7 above. The minor works can commence without prior approval and consent from BA.
16. Indeed, in consideration of the scale, complexity and risks, only MW of Classes I and II are required to submit Notices of Commencement (i.e. Forms MW01 and MW03 respectively) to BA before commencement of works. In general, a Notice of Commencement is submitted together with photographs, prescribed plans and details of works which cover the location, material, size and dimension of the final building works resulted from the MW. For certain types of Class I MW, structural

calculations and Supervision Plan (“SP”) are required. However, under the simplified procedures of the MWCS, there is no mandatory requirement for PBPs / PRCs to provide the working procedure, method statement or construction process for the erection of building works in MW submissions (while PBPs / PRCs may voluntarily set out such information in the SP, this is not the case of the two subject MW submissions for the Wang Fuk Court Renovation audited by ICU (see more details at paragraphs 22 to 23 below)).

17. While MWT is tasked to process and conduct audit on MW submissions received as per the arrangement set out in ICU’s Control Procedures 7.14 for Minor Works (“**COP 7.14**”) [I1-1/A/13/593], given that an MW submission consists of various documents, teams other than MWT may also be involved if an MW submission is selected for audit. For example, if a Class I MW submission with SP is selected for audit by MWT, the Structural Vetting Team may be consulted on matters relating to structural calculations / details (if any), and the SP will be referred to the Site Monitoring Team for audit check.
18. As set out in BD’s MW Manual Section 5, Instruction No. 1 [I1-1/A/10/523-528], AFC focuses on the procedural compliance of the B(MW)R. ICU has developed a checklist based on BD’s MW Manual for MWT officers to follow when conducting AFC (“**the AFC Checklist**”) [I1-1/A/14/607-609]. The focus of MWT in the course of conducting AFC is to check if the works and specification of the **final building works** (in other words, the final product) stated in the MW submission are in accordance with the procedures and description of building works under the B(MW)R.
19. Whilst clear non-compliances with the relevant statutory provisions and / or guidelines may also be picked up in the course

of AFC, the primary responsibility for ensuring such compliance rests with the PBPs and PRCs who prepared and certified the MW submissions. This is consistent with the self-regulatory spirit of the MWCS as described above.

20. Given the volume of MW submissions received and limited resources of MWT as described above, **MWT's AFC focuses on procedural compliance (e.g. whether the description of the MW stated on the form is clear and corresponds to the MW item, tallies with the MW shown in the submitted photographs and plans, and whether the submission is made in time) rather than a comprehensive, substantive review of every submission (e.g. whether the works from commencement to completion has been submitted to BA for approval / consent / acceptance). Correspondingly, AFC is concerned with the final building product as it will stand upon completion.**

#### The case of Wang Fuk Court

21. All MW submissions made to ICU are subject to audit arrangement as described in paragraphs 11 to 28 of my First Statement. For the case of Wang Fuk Court, there were 48 MW submissions related to renovation works in the common area which were still ongoing before the fire broke out. Eight out of these 48 MW submissions were Class I MW submissions (which were Notices of Commencement, i.e. Forms MW01) related to the erection of protective barrier and alteration of windows along the staircases of all eight blocks of Wang Fuk Court. **These eight MW submissions were made by LAI Ka Wing as AP and CHI Wuh Jian Joseph Duncan as Registered Structural Engineer ("RSE") (both are PBPs for these submissions).** In addition, **Motive Design Limited was the PRC for Blocks A to B, and Chi Fu Construction Co was the PRC for Blocks C to H.** This

echoes what is stated above, i.e. the primary responsibility for ensuring compliance rests with the PBPs and PRCs who prepared and certified the MW submissions.

22. Two of these eight MW submissions (for Blocks F and H) were randomly selected for AFC (**“the two audited MW Submissions”**). MWT performed the check on these two Submissions according to the AFC Checklist. As explained in paragraphs 19 and 20 above, the focus of MWT in AFC is to check if the works and specification of the **final building works** as stated in the MW submission (when the works are completed) are in accordance with the description of building works under Schedule 1 to the B(MW)R. As such, when reviewing the two audited MW Submissions including the photographs therein (i.e. the “before” / “pre-commencement” photos), MWT focused on **whether they could show the locations of the works to be carried out and if they tallied with the plans and forms submitted such that they provided a proper basis for the final building works to rest on.** The relevant items in the AFC Checklist are:-

(12) - “Plans / Photographs showing the physical condition of the premises immediately before the commencement of minor works have been provided / are clear”; and

(13) - “The information (e.g.: address, item description, etc.) as shown on the plans / photographs tallies with the submitted form / are clear”.

23. Given that the plan and the required photos provided in the two audited MW Submissions met the above requirements, the Vetting Officers recorded no irregularity in the relevant AFC at the time.
24. Separately, as AFC is concerned with the final building works,

much focus was placed on the design and drawings of such final building works – indeed there is a specific plan of the new windows with dimensions, the structural calculations and an SP, which was examined and looked into in the course of AFC.

Review of pre-commencement photos

25. One may question why ICU, when conducting the relevant AFC, was not aware that some pre-commencement photos included in the two audited MW Submissions show certain windows covered with boards (wooden or otherwise) and altered to become workers' access to and egress from the scaffolding. It should be highlighted that the photos included in the two audited MW Submissions were submitted to ICU in support of MW which had a particular intended purpose of replacing the original openable, non-fire-rated windows with fixed windows with fire-rated glass panels (see paragraphs 53 to 54 of Mr KU Siu Ping's First Statement). Since such replacement is regarded as an upgrade in terms of fire safety, the immediate existing condition of the original windows, which would be overtaken by event as they were meant to be replaced and would have been overtaken by the time the subject works were complete, was not a matter of primary concern during the relevant AFC. Consistent with the focus of AFC as described above, MWT's attention was directed at **ensuring that the final building works resulted from the MW (i.e. the windows in replacement) would satisfy requirements under the BO.**
26. Furthermore, throughout my professional career of 27 years, I have **not** encountered cases where existing window openings in escape staircases are altered to become door openings for worker access and egress, and / or delivery of building materials to the scaffolding. Therefore, while with the benefit of hindsight I can relate the window coverings as depicted in those photos to what

are now identified as door openings, this did not occur to me when reviewing the same at the time.

27. As a Maintenance Surveyor in the Housing Department by profession, I had been responsible for overseeing maintenance works in public housing estates before my posting in ICU. It is noteworthy that in public housing estates, repair works of external walls are mostly carried out by using suspended working platforms, and there is no need to create additional access for workers from within the residential buildings. The said practice of creating door openings was not made known to me until it was revealed after the Wang Fuk Court fire. As such, it did not come to my attention during the relevant AFC that the windows were altered for purposes beyond the replacement as stated in the two audited MW Submissions.
28. In these circumstances, it did not occur to me at the time that those were openings put in place specifically to become workers' access to and egress from the scaffolding. I should add that the duration and manner of use of any temporary protective works are not matters required to be disclosed in MW submissions. I note in passing that as a matter of fact, most if not all of the windows at the escape staircases of Wang Fuk Court had been replaced with fire-rated ones other than those removed for use as workers' access / egress.
29. On the other hand, according to the SPs of the two audited MW Submissions at Wang Fuk Court **[I1-3/B/II/Block F/9/6261-6283]** and **[I1-3/B/II/Block H/9/8001-8023]**, the PBPs, including the AP (i.e. LAI Ka Wing) and RSE (i.e. CHI Wuh Jian Joseph Duncan) would conduct weekly inspections of the proposed works, while representatives of the PRC (i.e. CHONG Po Chung and TSANG Kai Kwong) would conduct full-time and weekly

[I1-3/B/II/Block  
F/9/6261-6283]  
and  
[I1-3/B/II/Block  
H/9/8001-8023]

inspections respectively. During the course of works, the Authorized Signatory of the PRC (i.e. KWONG Kwok Siu) would also conduct necessary inspections as and when required to ensure compliance with the prescribed plans. It is noteworthy that under paragraph 4.9(b) of BD's Code of Practice for Site Supervision 2009 (2024 Edition) [J1-1/A45b/3434], when the temporary [J1-1/A45b/3434] works, the sequence of construction or method statements are not required to be shown on prescribed plans, the Registered Contractor has the sole responsibility of ensuring the integrity of temporary works and that the carrying out of temporary works should be safe and should not endanger the workers on site, the public and adjoining buildings.

30. Given the roles and responsibilities of the PBPs and PRCs as explained in paragraph 7 above, if the windows being altered to become workers' access to and egress from the scaffolding were noted during the inspection conducted by the PBPs / PRCs, according to sections 4B and 9AA of the BO, they should have rectified the situation so as to comply with the BO, and/or should have notified BA of any contravention of the regulations which would result from the carrying out of MW so as to allow BA to take enforcement actions as necessary.
31. I confirm that the contents of this Witness Statement are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026.

  
YUNG Siu Lun