

**A summary of views of various stakeholder groups on the Pilot Scheme**

1.1 During the public engagement (“PE”) exercise, we received a total of 515 submissions, of which 462 were “submissions from the general public or organisations” and their major views are summarised in the first part of this Annex. Another 50 were “submissions from major stakeholder groups” and their major views are summarised in the remaining part of this Annex. The remaining 3 submissions set out the findings of three “opinion surveys” which were summarised in **Annex 3**.

**(1) The general public or organisations**

1.2 The Government considers it necessary to implement the Pilot Scheme to tackle road traffic congestion in the Central District and it is crucial to draw up a comprehensive implementation proposal. The main objective of this PE exercise is to collect views from the public and stakeholders on the basic elements and pertinent issues of the Pilot Scheme. Among the 462 “submissions from the general public or organisations”, some members of the public clearly stated their support for or opposition to the Pilot Scheme, while some only provided their views or expressed concerns over the Pilot Scheme. These views can be broadly grouped into seven categories, as shown in **Table 1**.

**Table 1 Seven categories of views on the Pilot Scheme**

1) support the Pilot Scheme
2) support the Pilot Scheme on conditions (e.g. exemption will be granted to certain vehicle types / usages)
3) express views on the Pilot Scheme without stating their stance
4) maintain a neutral position / have no comments on the Pilot Scheme
5) request implementation of other measures (e.g. strengthening enforcement) or awaiting the commissioning of other transport infrastructure (e.g. the Central – Wan Chai Bypass) before considering the implementation of the Pilot Scheme
6) express negative views on the Pilot Scheme but without stating any opposition to it
7) oppose the Pilot Scheme

1.3 Among the members of the public who supported the Pilot Scheme, more considered that there was a need to charge motorists for using the roads in the charging area during peak hours to reduce the number of vehicles entering and leaving the Central District and alleviate the serious traffic congestion in the district at present so that business operations and efficiency could be improved. Some supporters pointed out that the Pilot Scheme would be more in line with the “user pays” principle and is fairer when compared with other congestion relief measures (e.g. raising first registration tax or annual licence fee for vehicles). There were also supporting views that the Pilot Scheme could help reduce emissions of vehicle exhaust and greenhouse gases, thereby improving the air quality in

the Central District and providing better walking environment for pedestrians. Moreover, some pointed out that the traffic data collected from the Pilot Scheme could be put into wider use for the development of intelligent transport system, which is conducive to developing Hong Kong as a smart city. They called for an early implementation of the Pilot Scheme.

- 1.4 Among the members of the public who opposed the Pilot Scheme, many held the view that the Pilot Scheme could not effectively solve the traffic congestion problem in the Central District which would be caused by a host of factors. They opined that instead of implementing ERP, the Government should adopt measures like stepping up enforcements against traffic offences and restricting the growth of private cars to solve the traffic congestion problem, or should await the commissioning of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass, before considering the need to take forward the Pilot Scheme. Some opposing views also considered that the Pilot Scheme might add to the fare burden on public transport passengers and affect the commercial activities in the district. There were also views that the Pilot Scheme would virtually give priority to the rich in using the roads in the Central District and would cause inconvenience to those who need to use the roads (e.g. residents living in the charging area).
- 1.5 Members of the public generally concerned more with the exemption and concession arrangements of the Pilot Scheme. A considerable number of views requested granting exemption to public transport. Some residents in the Central District were concerned with the inconvenience and extra financial burden brought on them by the Pilot Scheme. Some members of the public requested that the revenue generated from the Pilot Scheme be allocated for specific transport-related purposes (i.e. “dedicated-fund-for-dedicated-use”), such as reducing public transport fares, building new roads and implementing traffic management measures. Regarding the technology to be deployed, more members of the public supported the use of dedicated short-range radio communication (“DSRC”) technology mainly because of privacy concerns on personal data.

However, some indicated that they had no strong preference on the technology to be adopted.

## **(2) LegCo members and political parties**

- 1.6 During the PE exercise, we attended two meetings of the LegCo Panel on Transport<sup>1</sup>, at which views of 15 LegCo members<sup>2</sup> on the Pilot Scheme were collected. Moreover, six political parties<sup>3</sup> provided submissions.
- 1.7 Four political parties<sup>4</sup> expressed positive views on the Pilot Scheme and agreed with the Government's rationale for implementing the Pilot Scheme. They called on the Government to exempt public transport from ERP charges in order to encourage people to use more public transport and reduce the usage of private cars.
- 1.8 Three political parties<sup>5</sup> and nine LegCo members<sup>6</sup> requested the Government to implement other measures (e.g. strengthening enforcement actions against illegal parking, addressing the issue of inadequate parking spaces, rationalising the traffic distribution of the three road harbour crossings, etc.), or to await the commissioning of other transport infrastructure (e.g. the Central – Wan Chai Bypass, the South Island Line (East), etc.) before considering the need to take forward the Pilot Scheme.

---

<sup>1</sup> The two meetings of the LegCo Panel on Transport were held on 16 December 2015 and 5 January 2016 respectively.

<sup>2</sup> They included Hon Chan Han-pan, Hon Christopher Chung Shu-kun, Hon Kwok Ka-ki, Hon Lee Cheuk-yan, Hon Leung Kwok-hung, Hon Lo Wai-ki, Hon Charles Peter Mok, Hon Poon Siu-ping, Hon Tang Ka-piu, Hon Michael Tien Puk-sun, Hon Tony Tse Wai-chuen, Hon Wong Kwok-hing, Hon Wu Chi-wai, Hon Frankie Yick Chi-ming and Hon Yiu Si-wing.

<sup>3</sup> They included the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong, the Civic Party, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, the Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the New People's Party.

<sup>4</sup> They included the Civic Party, the Democratic Party, the Labour Party and the New People's Party.

<sup>5</sup> They included the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong and the Liberal Party.

<sup>6</sup> They included Hon Chan Han-pan, Hon Christopher Chung Shu-kun, Hon Kwok Ka-ki, Hon Charles Peter Mok, Hon Poon Siu-ping, Hon Tang Ka-piu, Hon Wong Kwok-hing, Hon Frankie Yick Chi-ming and Hon Yiu Si-wing.

- 1.9 Some LegCo members objected to the implementation of the Pilot Scheme, claiming that strengthening enforcement actions in the Central District would be far more cost effective than implementing the Pilot Scheme. Besides, some LegCo members were concerned with the long-term effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme.
- 1.10 Some political parties requested the Government to provide more comprehensive data and information on the Pilot Scheme for public discussion during the next PE exercise, given that the Pilot Scheme could bring about far-reaching socio-economic impact. Some political parties considered it necessary to conduct opinion surveys during the next PE exercise to gauge public views on the Pilot Scheme in a more scientific and objective manner.
- 1.11 Several LegCo members requested granting exemption to commercial vehicles. As far as charging mechanism was concerned, more LegCo members and political parties preferred the cordon-based mechanism (charging per pass). Some LegCo members advocated that vehicles should be charged based on their durations of stay within the charging area.

### **(3) District Council members**

- 1.12 A District Council (“DC”) forum was held at which views of 15 DC members<sup>7</sup> from 10 DCs<sup>8</sup> on the Pilot Scheme were gathered. Among the DC members who spoke at the forum, more were in support of the Pilot Scheme or made positive responses. Some supporters pointed out that Hong Kong was a small place but the vehicle fleet was ever growing, resulting in serious traffic congestion in some parts of Hong Kong. They

---

<sup>7</sup> They included Mr. Joseph Chan Ho-lim, Mr. Chan Shung-fai, Mr. Chiu Chi-keung, Mr. Hui Chi-fung, Ms. Kwan Sau-ling, Ms. Kenny Lee Kwun-yee, Mr. Leung Ming-kin, Mr. Lo Siu-kit, Mr. Mak Ip-sing, Mr. George Pang Chun-sing, Mr. So Shiu-shing, Mr. Wong Ka-wa, Mr. Yip Man-pan, Mr. Michael Yung Ming-chau and Mr. Paul Zimmerman.

<sup>8</sup> They included the Central and Western, Eastern, North, Sha Tin, Southern, Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Wan Chai, Yau Tsim Mong and Yuen Long DC.

considered that, sooner or later, the Government inevitably needed to implement ERP in congested areas.

1.13 At the DC forum, some DC members expressed reservation about the implementation of the Pilot Scheme, claiming that there was currently no pressing need to introduce the scheme as the traffic congestion in the Central District would ease off upon the commissioning of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass. Certain DC members pointed out that the traffic congestion problem at the Cross Harbour Tunnel (“CHT”) was far more serious than that in the Central District and requested the Government to first tackle the congestion at the CHT.

1.14 Since the Pilot Scheme is proposed to be implemented in the Central District, we attended the Central and Western (“C&W”) District Council meeting during the PE period to listen to the views of the DC members<sup>9</sup> at district level. At the meeting, most of the DC members did not agree to the rash implementation of the Pilot Scheme in the Central District. They opined that the main causes of traffic congestion in the Central District were rampant illegal parking causing road obstruction and inadequate parking spaces. They therefore requested the Government to first strengthen enforcement actions and increase the number of parking spaces in the district. Only a few C&W DC members held positive views about the Pilot Scheme, yet they suggested that if the Pilot Scheme was to be introduced in the Central District, a multi-pronged approach, with the implementation of various measures, should be adopted to tackle the congestion in the district. In the end, the following motion was passed at the meeting:

*“That the Council opposes the rash implementation of the ERP Pilot Scheme in Central, and that the Administration should first step up efforts to combat illegal parking to release the original road traffic capacity, instead of leaving law-abiding citizens required to travel to the district to*

---

<sup>9</sup> They included Mr. Stephen Chan Chit-kwai, Mr. Chan Choi-hi, Mr. Joseph Chan Ho-lim, Mr. Chan Hok-fung, Ms. Cheng Lai-king, Mr. Cheung Kwok-kwan, Mr. Hui Chi-fung, Mr. Kam Nai-wai, Mr. Sidney Lee Chi-hang, Miss Lo Yee-hang, Mr. Ng Siu-hong, Ms. Siu Ka-yi, Mr. Yeung Hoi-wing, Mr. Yeung Hok-ming and Mr. Yip Wing-shing.

*bear the responsibility for traffic congestion caused by law-breaking drivers.*"<sup>10</sup>

1.15 We noticed from the DC forum and the C&W DC meeting that quite a number of DC members requested granting exemption or concession to public transport, vehicles of residents living in the charging area and environment-friendly vehicles. Some DC members raised concerns on the complementary measures that should be implemented together with the Pilot Scheme, such as strengthening enforcement actions, enhancing public transport services serving the charging area, providing additional facilities for parking, park-and-ride and loading/unloading of passengers and goods, providing appropriate information to facilitate motorists who seldom drive to the Central District, etc.

#### **(4) Professional bodies**

1.16 During the PE exercise, a total of 15 professional bodies<sup>11</sup> provided submissions or sent representatives to attend the focus group meeting organised by the TD. Nine of them gave their support to the Pilot Scheme or made positive responses. They included:

- 1) Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
- 2) Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (Hong Kong Branch)
- 3) Hong Kong Institute of Planners

---

<sup>10</sup> In response to the motion, the TD gave a reply in Chinese to the C&W DC Secretariat on 30 March 2016 (see **Annex 9** with Chinese version only).

<sup>11</sup> They included Association of Consulting Engineers of Hong Kong, Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Ltd., Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong, Institution of Civil Engineers - Hong Kong Association, Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation - Hong Kong Branch, Hong Kong Institute of Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners, Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Hong Kong Institution of Highways and Transportation, Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (Hong Kong Section), Intelligent Transportation Systems Hong Kong Ltd and Internet Professional Association.

- 4) Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
- 5) Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
- 6) Hong Kong Institution of Highways and Transportation
- 7) Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association
- 8) Intelligent Transportation Systems, Hong Kong Ltd.
- 9) Internet Professional Association

1.17 The professional bodies which supported the Pilot Scheme agreed that ERP would be a sustainable congestion relief measure and there were mature charging technologies readily available for application. Some professional bodies considered that the implementation of other draconian traffic management measures (e.g. restricting the number of private vehicle licences issued or allowing only vehicles with number plates ending in odd or even numbers to travel on alternate days) might face greater obstacles than the implementation of the Pilot Scheme. Moreover, the Pilot Scheme would be a more effective measure to tackle traffic congestion problems occurring in specific areas at specific times.

1.18 For the remaining six professional bodies, some expressed reservation about the Pilot Scheme while others indicated that they would not state their stance until the Government put forward more solid options during next PE exercise. Of those expressing reservation, some took the view that the commissioning of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass might suffice in addressing the traffic congestion problem in the Central District. They also considered that the traffic congestion problem of the Central District was mainly caused by the rampant illegal parking and loading/unloading of passengers and goods.

1.19 The professional bodies generally agreed that the charging levels should be linked to factors directly related to congestion (e.g. differential charging levels should be set based on traffic conditions at different times, locations and travel directions). They tended to support adopting DSRC technology which required the installation of in-vehicle units. Moreover,

the professional bodies generally opined that the Pilot Scheme would not give rise to privacy problem and believed that the existing technologies were adequate in safeguarding motorists' privacy. Some professional bodies also indicated that the revenue of the Pilot Scheme should be used for specific transport-related purposes (i.e. the “dedicated-fund-for-dedicated-use” approach), such as enhancing the public transport services serving Central District and being ploughed back into the day-to-day operation of the Pilot Scheme.

## **(5) Academics**

1.20 A total of 23 academics<sup>12</sup> provided submissions or presented their views at the focus group meeting. They unanimously agreed to the introduction of the Pilot Scheme and supported its early implementation. Some academics were worried that if the Pilot scheme would not be introduced after this PE exercise and the completion of the feasibility study, the public would doubt the Government's determination to implement ERP. Some academics pointed out that the Government had, upon the completion of the second ERP study in 2001, claimed that there was no need for the implementation of ERP at that time considering that the annual growth rate of the number of private cars had not reached 3%. Over the past decade, the annual growth rate of private cars had soared to a level far exceeding 3%, thus it is an opportune time now to re-activate the planning for ERP.

1.21 Quite a number of academics who supported the Pilot Scheme were also the members of the “Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass”<sup>13</sup> set up in 2005. Back then, the panel had

---

<sup>12</sup> They included Dr. Chan Yan-chong, Dr. Gu Weihua, Dr. Timothy D Hau, Prof. Sylvia He Ying, Prof. Huang Bo, Dr. Hung Wing-tat, Dr. Kuo Yonghong, Dr. Andy Kwan Cheuk-chiu, Prof. William Lam Hing-keung, Dr. Leng Zhen, Prof. Janny Leung May-yee, Prof. Lo Hong-kam, Prof. Becky Loo Pui-ying, Prof. Mak Ho-yin, Dr. Ng Cho-nam, Dr. Jason Ni Meng-cheng, Dr. Sze Nang-ngai, Dr. Szeto Wai-yuen, Dr. James Wang Jixian, Dr. Wang Yuhong, Prof. Wong Sze-chun, Prof. Alan Wong Wing-gun and Prof. Yang Hai.

<sup>13</sup> “Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass” was appointed by the “Sub-Committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review” under the “Harbour-front Enhancement Committee” in 2005. The terms of reference of the Expert Panel were mainly to review and make recommendations on the sustainable transport planning for the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island.

already pointed out that the most opportune time to introduce ERP would be upon the commissioning of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass. There were views that the Government should seize the opportunity arising from the commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass to implement the Pilot Scheme promptly.

- 1.22 Most of the academics considered that the Pilot Scheme should not grant any exemption or concession as far as possible because all vehicles entering or leaving the charging area contributed to road traffic congestion. Besides, a lot of academics suggested that the revenue generated from the Pilot Scheme should be used for specific transport-related purposes (i.e. the “dedicated-fund-for-dedicated-use” approach) which could greatly benefit the community at large, such as enhancing public transport services, lowering fares of public transport services, reducing annual licence fee or first registration tax for vehicles, improving the overall pedestrian environment in the charging area, etc.

## **(6) Transport trades**

- 1.23 During the PE period, we solicited views from the following nine transport trades on the Pilot Scheme through three different channels (including meetings with the transport trades, LegCo Panel on Transport meeting and written submissions):

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1) tram                                     | 6) franchised bus     |
| 2) green minibus (“GMB”)                    | 7) non-franchised bus |
| 3) Hong Kong-Guangdong cross-boundary coach | 8) school bus         |
| 4) goods vehicle                            | 9) urban taxi         |
| 5) public light bus                         |                       |

1.24 Six transport trades (namely tram, franchised bus, Hong Kong-Guangdong cross-boundary coach, school bus, GMB and non-franchised bus) were inclined to support the Pilot Scheme. They considered that the Pilot Scheme could provide a more efficient operating environment for the road-based public transport modes and commercial vehicles, thereby minimising service delays caused by road traffic congestion and indirectly encouraging users of private cars and taxis to switch to use public transport. The above six transport trades all requested that exemption or concession be provided to their trade vehicles based on the three major reasons:

- 1) Routings and frequencies of trams, franchised buses and GMBs were prescribed by the TD and could not be altered by the operators at their discretion. Therefore, despite mandatory charges are applied to these public transport vehicles, their number going in or out of the Central District cannot be reduced.
- 2) Trams, franchised buses and GMBs are more efficient passenger carriers in that they can carry more passengers while occupying less road space. The granting of exemptions to these mass carriers could spare their operators the need to pass on the ERP charges to passengers and provide an indirect financial incentive to encourage passengers to make more use of these three transport modes, which is in line with the Government's transport policy of according priority to public transport services.
- 3) Operators of non-franchised buses, Hong Kong-Guangdong cross-boundary coaches and school buses considered that they were providing public bus services to the general public and school children. They remarked that all buses (including franchised and non-franchised buses) were allowed to use bus-only lanes when the Government implemented them. If franchised buses are granted exemption, other public buses, including non-franchised buses, Hong Kong-Guangdong cross-boundary coaches and school buses, should also be given the same treatment for the sake of fairness.

- 1.25 The goods vehicle, taxi and public light bus trades expressed slightly negative views about the Pilot Scheme. Some representatives of the three trades unequivocally stated their opposition to the Pilot Scheme, and some of the opposing reasons were similar to those held by the public.
- 1.26 All the nine transport trades requested granting exemption or concession to their trade vehicles. Some of the transport trades (e.g. the taxi and franchised bus trades) clearly stated that they would support the Pilot Scheme if they were granted exemption. The goods vehicle, taxi and public light bus trades expressed their worries that if their trade vehicles were not exempted under the Pilot Scheme, their revenues and businesses would be seriously affected and some of their drivers would not be able to sustain their living.
- 1.27 The goods vehicle trade pointed out that both goods vehicles and public transport modes serve the community at large, and goods vehicles play an important role in supporting the commercial activities of the Central District. It therefore requested that goods vehicles should be exempted. The taxi trade pointed out that if taxis were not exempted, vacant taxis would avoid entering the charging area to ply for hire, resulting in an inadequate number of taxis to meet passenger demand and leading to a lose-lose situation for taxi drivers and taxi passengers.
- 1.28 Some representatives of the goods vehicle, taxi and public light bus trades indicated that if they were not given exemption, they would pass on all the related charges to passengers or users, who would end up paying higher fares or delivery charges.
- 1.29 Apart from requesting exemption or concession, the transport trades were generally concerned about the complementary measures that would be implemented with the Pilot Scheme, including controlling the growth in the number of private cars, providing more kerbside facilities for loading/unloading of passengers and goods, providing turnaround facilities outside the charging area, etc. The transport trades were also concerned about the demarcation of the charging area and opined that the Government

should ensure that the roads outside the charging area would not become congested as a result of the implementation of the Pilot Scheme.

## **(7) Business associations**

- 1.30 We received submissions from five business associations<sup>14</sup> and attended meetings of the Economic Policy Committee of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce and Small & Medium Enterprises Committee. The five business associations which provided submissions unanimously gave their support to the Pilot Scheme, considering that this was the first step towards enhancing Hong Kong's competitiveness. They stressed that socio-economic and environmental benefits of the Pilot Scheme could only be achieved if it is properly planned and designed, and its implementation ought to conform to the overall transport policy.
- 1.31 The Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce suggested the Government conducting cost-benefit analysis of the Pilot Scheme, and publicise the results, so as to enhance public understanding and facilitate further discussion. Some members of the Small & Medium Enterprises Committee suggested that when designing the charging system, the Government should consider releasing the data related to road usage to the public and the business sector so that the creative industries might be benefitted from using such data. Some business associations raised concern over the implementation timetable of the Pilot Scheme and suggested the Government adopting the "public-private partnership" approach in taking forward the Pilot Scheme.
- 1.32 Several business associations drew attention to the uneven traffic distribution among the three RHCs and suggested that this issue should be taken into account when deciding the boundary of the charging area. Regarding the charging mechanism, several business associations

---

<sup>14</sup> They included the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, the Australian Chamber of Commerce - Hong Kong and Macau, the British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong and the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce.

supported adopting the cordon-based approach (charging per pass) as it would be more in line with the “user pays” principle.

## **(8) Green groups**

- 1.33 During the PE period, a total of 13 green groups<sup>15</sup> provided submissions or sent representatives to attend the meeting of the LegCo Panel on Transport or the focus group meeting. Nine of the green groups<sup>16</sup> tended to support the Pilot Scheme, considering that it could relieve traffic congestion and the associated air pollution and thus enhancing the city’s livability. Some green groups requested setting the roadside air quality improvement as one of the objectives of the Pilot Scheme to conform to the “polluter pays” principle. They also requested the Government providing more data on how the Pilot Scheme could reduce the air pollution at the next PE exercise. A few green groups had some reservations about the Pilot Scheme, claiming that it could only mitigate air pollution problems in the local area.
- 1.34 A number of green groups suggested designating a larger charging area so that the Pilot Scheme could achieve greater effect in mitigating traffic congestion and air pollution. Quite a number of green groups also suggested that the charging level should be linked to vehicle emissions and requested using roadside air pollutant concentrations in the charging area as the performance indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme.
- 1.35 Regarding the vehicle types that should be given exemption or concession, views of green groups were mixed. Some green groups opined that no vehicles should be exempted except emergency vehicles to avoid weakening the effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme. Some green groups

---

<sup>15</sup> They included Business Environment Council Limited, Civic Exchange, Clean Air Network, Clear the Air, Designing Hong Kong, EarthCare, Friends of the Earth (HK), Green Sense, Green Technology Consortium, Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance, The Conservancy Association, World Green Organisation and “關注香港空氣大聯盟 (with Chinese name only)”.

<sup>16</sup> They included Business Environment Council Limited, Civic Exchange, Clean Air Network, Designing Hong Kong, Friends of the Earth (HK), Green Sense, Green Technology Consortium, Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance and “關注香港空氣大聯盟 (with Chinese name only)”.

were of the view that even electric vehicles should not be exempted, because although electric vehicles have zero emission, they still contributed to road traffic congestion which in turn caused other non-environment-friendly vehicles to emit more pollutants. Nevertheless, some green groups considered that trams, low-emission buses and electric vehicles should be exempted.

## **(9) Other organisations**

1.36 In its Report on Study of Road Traffic Congestion in Hong Kong, the TAC suggested that the Government should start planning for an ERP pilot scheme as soon as possible. The TAC discussed the PE document at its meeting on 15 December 2015. Apart from welcoming the Government's proposal of implementing the Pilot Scheme, the TAC also concurred with the Government's stance that ERP is an effective traffic management tool to tackle localised road traffic congestion and that the Central District is a suitable location for implementing the Pilot Scheme.

1.37 We also received another 11 submissions from other organisations<sup>17</sup>. Their views were rather diverse with both supporting and opposing views. The views of these organisations on the implementation of the Pilot Scheme were largely the same as those of the public and other stakeholder groups as summarised in this Annex.

---

<sup>17</sup> They included Community for Road Safety, Dashun Foundation, Frontline Tech Workers Concern Group, Hong Kong Electric Company Limited, Hong Kong Land Holdings Limited, Inchcape Motor Services Limited, Momentum 107, Octopus Cards Limited, Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, Public Transport Research Team and Rehabilitation Alliance Hong Kong