

**Pilot Green Transport Fund**

**Final Report**  
**On**  
**Trial of Hybrid Public Light Bus for**  
**Green Minibus Service**  
**(Goden Par Co)**

(24 January 2024)

PREPARED BY:  
Dr. W.T. Hung

The Monitoring and Evaluation Team's views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Environment and Ecology Bureau (Environment Branch), HKSAR.

## **List of Monitoring and Evaluation Team Members**

**Dr. C.S. CHEUNG (Team Leader)**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. C. NG**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Mr. K.S. TSANG**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. Edward W.C. LO**

Department of Electrical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. W.T. HUNG**

PolyU Technology and Consultancy Company Limited  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Pilot Green Transport Fund  
Trial of Hybrid Public Light Bus for Green Minibus Services  
(Goden Par Co)**

**Final Report  
(Trial Period: 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2023)**

**Executive Summary**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 The Pilot Green Transport Fund (the Fund) is set up to encourage transport operators to try out green innovative transport technologies, contributing to better air quality and public health for Hong Kong. The Fund has subsidized Goden Par Co (Goden Par) to trial out a hybrid public light bus (HV) for green minibuses services.

1.2 PolyU Technology and Consultancy Company Limited (PTeC) has been engaged by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)<sup>1</sup> as an independent third party assessor to monitor the trial and evaluate the performance of the trial vehicles. The Assessor regularly visited Goden Par to collect information for evaluating the performance of the HV and compared it with the performance of a LPG vehicle (GV) which provided the same service in the same areas. The information collected included the said vehicles' operation data, fuel bills, maintenance records, reports on operation difficulties, and opinions of the HV driver, the public light bus passengers, and Goden Par through survey questionnaires.

1.3 This Final Report summarizes the performance of the HV for green minibuses services in the 24-months trial as compared with the GV.

**2. Trial and Conventional Vehicles**

2.1 Goden Par procured one GMI Gemini 19-seats diesel-electric hybrid public light bus (i.e., HV) with gross vehicle weight (GVW) 7,000 kg and cylinder capacity 2,776 cc for trial. One Toyota 16-seats LPG public light bus (i.e., GV) of GVW 4,350 kg cylinder capacity 4,104 c.c. operating in the same service areas was assigned for comparison with the HV.

2.2 Both HV and GV were used for green minibuses services serving a fixed route 22M between Kwun Tong MTR station and Lok Wah South Estate. They provided services 24 hours everyday, 365 days per year.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Administration of the New Energy Transport Fund was migrated to the Environment Branch of the Environment and Ecology Bureau [EEB (Environment Branch)] since 1 January 2023 after internal re-organisation of EEB (Environment Branch) and EPD.

2.3 Key features and photos of the HV and GV are in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively.

### 3. Trial Information

3.1 The trial started on 1 July 2021 and would last for 24 months. Goden Par was required to collect and provide trial information including the distance travelled, fuel consumed, fuel cost as well as costs and downtime associated with scheduled and unscheduled maintenance of the HV. A similar set of data from the GV was also required. In addition to the cost information, reports on maintenance work, operational difficulties and opinions of the driver, passengers and Goden Par were collected and provided to reflect any problems of the HV.

### 4. Findings of Trial

4.1 Table 1 summarizes the statistical data of the HV and GV. The average fuel economy of the HV was 0.012 km/MJ (about 19%) higher than that of the GV. However, since the market fuel price of diesel was higher than that of LPG and the HV carried 3 more passengers than the GV hence with a higher loading, the average fuel cost of the HV was higher than that of the GV by HK\$4.63/km (about 157%). When the fuel price discounts<sup>2</sup> were taken into account, the average fuel cost of the HV would be about 27% higher than that of the GV. The HV had two scheduled and two unscheduled maintenances; but no charge was incurred within the warranty period, whereas the GV had two scheduled maintenances and three unscheduled maintenances. The average total operating cost of the HV was higher than that of the GV by HK\$4.00/km (about 112%). When the fuel price discounts were taken into account, the average total operating cost of the 19-seats HV would be about 1.3% higher than that of the 16-seats GV.

Table 1: Key operation statistics of each vehicle (1 July 2021 – 30 June 2023)

		HV	GV
Total distance travelled (km)		71,618	63,411
Average distance travelled per working day (km/day)		102	88
Average fuel economy	(km/litre)	2.63	1.45
	(km/MJ) <sup>[1]</sup>	0.073	0.061
Average fuel cost (HK\$/km) <sup>[2]</sup>		7.59	2.95
Average total operating cost (HK\$/km) <sup>[3]</sup>		7.59	3.59
Downtime (working day) <sup>[3][4]</sup>		23	7.5

<sup>[1]</sup> Assuming lower heating value of 36.13 MJ/litre for diesel fuel and 23.67 MJ/litre for LPG.

<sup>[2]</sup> The market fuel price was used for calculation.

<sup>[3]</sup> Maintenance due to incident not related to the performance of the vehicle was not included for comparing the performance.

<sup>[4]</sup> Downtime refers to the equivalent number of working days in which the vehicle is not in operation due to maintenance, counting from the first day it stops operation till the day it is returned to the operator.

<sup>2</sup> Goden Par obtained discounted rates for diesel from the suppliers throughout the trial period and reduced LPG rates from Government from 1 May to 31 December 2022.

4.2 The HV had two scheduled and two unscheduled maintenances incurring 23 days of downtime while the GV had two scheduled and three unscheduled maintenances incurring 7.5 days of downtime, the utilization rate of the HV and the GV was 96.8% and 99.0% respectively.

4.3 To remove the effect of seasonal fluctuations, 12-month moving averages are used to evaluate the trend of the HV's fuel economy. The results show that the fuel economy of the HV had no sign of deterioration.

4.4 The carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) emission from the HV was 75,566 kg while that from the GV on HV mileage would be 83,277 kg. There was a reduction of 7,711 kg CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions (9.3%) by using the HV. Therefore, the adoption of the HV shows environmental benefit in this trial.

4.5 The HV drivers had no problem in operating the HV and felt the HV was more environmentally friendly compared to the GV. The passengers felt that the air was cleaner within the HV. Goden Par was satisfied with the performance of the HV and did not detect any deterioration in the performance of the HV.

## **5. Summary**

5.1 In the 24-month trial period, the average daily mileage of the HV was 102 km, while that of the GV was 88 km. Taking the fuel price discounts into account, the average fuel cost and the average total operating cost of the HV was about 27% and 1.3% higher than that of the GV, but the HV had 19% higher average fuel economy than that of the GV and carrying 3 more passengers. There was 7,711 kg CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions (9.3%) reduction by using the HV as compared with the GV.

5.2 Excluding the downtime of vehicles unrelated to the performance due to the scheduled and unscheduled maintenances, the HV and GV had 23 days and 7.5 days downtime respectively in the 24-month trial period, the utilization rate of the HV and the GV was 96.8% and 99.0% respectively.

5.3 No sign of deterioration in the fuel economy of the HV was observed in the trial.

5.4 In the 24-month trial period, the operation of the HV was smooth. The HV drivers, passengers and Goden Par were satisfied with the performance of the HV and felt that it was more environmentally friendly.

## Appendix 1: Key Features of Vehicles

### 1. Trial HV

<b>Registration Mark:</b>	<b>DG6306</b>
Make:	GMI
Model:	GEMINI
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	7,000 kg
Seating capacity:	driver + 19 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	2,776 cc (diesel)
Year of manufacture:	2020

### 2. GV for comparison

<b>Registration Mark:</b>	<b>NN5765</b>
Make:	TOYOTA
Model:	BZB40RZCMSCYY
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	4,350 kg
Seating capacity:	driver + 16 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	4,104 cc (LPG)
Year of manufacture:	2008

## Appendix 2: Photos of Vehicles

### 1. Trial HV – DG6306



HV - Front view



HV - Right side view



HV - Left side view



HV - Rear view

2. GV for comparison – NN5765



GV - Front view



GV - Right side view



GV - Left side view



GV - Rear view