

**New Energy Transport Fund**

**Final Report**  
**On**  
**Trial of Single-deck Electric Bus for**  
**Coach Hiring Service**  
**(Chun Yan Management Limited)**

(7 November 2025)

PREPARED BY:  
Dr. Rick MO

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. Rick MO (Team Leader)**

Smart City Division  
Hong Kong Productivity Council

**Ms. Rachel CHAN**

Smart City Division  
Hong Kong Productivity Council

**Mr. Miracle SUN**

Smart City Division  
Hong Kong Productivity Council

**Mr. Sam SHAN**

Smart City Division  
Hong Kong Productivity Council

**New Energy Transport Fund  
Trial of Single-deck Electric Bus for Coach Hiring Service  
(Chun Yan Management Limited)**

**Final Report  
(Reporting Period: 1 March 2024 – 28 February 2025)**

**Executive Summary**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 The New Energy 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. Chun Yan Management Limited (Chun Yan) was approved under the Fund for trial of one single-deck electric bus for coach hiring service. Chun Yan, through the tendering procedures stipulated in the Agreement entered into with the Government, procured a BAZN GTZ6128BEVCF single-deck electric bus (EV) for trial.

1.2 Hong Kong Productivity Council has been commissioned by the Environment and Ecology Bureau (Environment Branch) (EEB) as an independent third party assessor (the Assessor) to monitor the trial and evaluate the performance of the trial vehicle. Chun Yan assigned a Daewoo BH117L single-deck diesel bus (DV) providing same services as the conventional counterpart for comparison.

1.3 This Final Report summarises the performance of the EV in the 12 months of the trial as compared with its conventional counterpart, i.e. the DV.

**2. Trial and Conventional Vehicles**

2.1 The trial EV, BAZN GTZ6128BEVCF single-deck electric bus, has a gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 18,000 kg capable of carrying a driver with 65 passengers. It has a 373.4 kWh lithium iron phosphate battery pack and a driving range of 330 km according to its manufacturer. The DV, Daewoo BH117L single-deck diesel bus with a GVW of 16,000 kg and a cylinder capacity of 7,640 c.c. was used as the conventional counterpart for comparison in this trial. Both the EV and the DV were used for providing shuttle bus service. The route of the EV was between Lin Tong Checkpoint and Tsuen Wan, while that of the DV was between Tin Shui Wai and Kwun Tong. There was a designated driver assigned to drive the EV and another designated driver assigned to drive the DV.

2.2 Chun Yan shared a 60 kW DC charger at the car park at 30 Tin Tsz Road, Tin Shui Wai and a 200 kW mobile DC charger with 2 DC charging outputs in Tseung Kwan O at its own cost with L & T Success Company Limited, Wan Chong Company Limited, Allied Grand Development Limited and Super Land International Limited for charging the EV. A mobile energy storage system is connected to the mobile DC charger and is recharged from the power grid in the depot in Tuen Mun. Key features of the EV, the charging facility and the DV are detailed in Appendix 1 and photos of the vehicles and the charging facilities are shown in Appendix 2.

### 3. Trial Information

3.1 The trial commenced on 1 March 2024 and lasted for 12 months. Chun Yan was required to collect and provide trial information including the EV's mileage reading before charging, amount of electricity consumed and time used in each charging, operation downtime due to charging, and cost and downtime associated with scheduled and unscheduled maintenances of the EV. Similar data of the DV were also required. In addition to the cost information, reports on maintenance work, operational difficulties and opinions of the driver, passengers and Chun Yan were collected to reflect any problems of the EV.

### 4. Findings of Trial

4.1 The following table summarises the statistical data of the EV and the DV. The average fuel cost of the EV was HK\$7.97/km (about 82%) lower than that of the DV. The average total operating cost of the EV was HK\$8.51/km (about 79%) lower than that of the DV, taking the maintenance cost into account.

Table 1: Key operation statistics of each vehicle (1 March 2024 – 28 February 2025)

	<b>EV</b>	<b>DV</b>
Total distance travelled (km)	34,900	31,502
Average daily mileage (km/working day)	127	109
Average fuel economy	(km/kWh)	0.87
	(km/litre)	-
	(km/MJ)	0.07 <sup>[1]</sup>
Average fuel cost (HK\$/km)	1.74 <sup>[2]</sup>	9.71 <sup>[3]</sup>
Average total operating cost (HK\$/km) <sup>[4]</sup>	2.30	10.81
Downtime (working day) <sup>[4][5]</sup>	22	7

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

<sup>[2]</sup> The electricity cost was calculated using average electricity tariff rates of HK\$1.513/kWh (March 2024); HK\$1.507/kWh (April 2024); HK\$1.499/kWh (May 2024); HK\$1.500/kWh (June 2024); HK\$1.496/kWh (July 2024 – August 2024); HK\$1.495/kWh (September 2024); HK\$1.494/kWh (October 2024); HK\$1.493/kWh (November 2024); HK\$1.500/kWh (December 2024) and HK\$1.537/kWh (January 2025 – February 2025) as reported by CLP.

<sup>[3]</sup> The market fuel price was used for calculation.

<sup>[4]</sup> Maintenance due to incident not related to the performance of the vehicle was not included for comparing the performance.

<sup>[5]</sup> Downtime refers to the equivalent number of working days in which the vehicle is not in operation due to charging or maintenance, counting from the first day it stops operation till the day it is returned to the operator.

4.2 Apart from the fuel cost, maintenance cost and other indirect costs which may include parking fee, towing fee, vehicle replacement fee and cost of operation downtime due to charging and maintenance of the EV are also included in Table 1. In the 12 months of the trial period, the EV had two scheduled maintenances and four unscheduled maintenances, while the DV had one scheduled maintenance and two unscheduled maintenances. The scheduled maintenance of the EV included service for government annual vehicle inspection and regular inspection, while that of the DV included service for government annual vehicle inspection. The unscheduled maintenance of the EV included repair of passenger door, lighting and tyre change, while that of the DV included repair of air system and vehicle body.

4.3 In the 12 months of the trial period, the EV had no downtime due to the charging and 22 days of downtime due to maintenance, while the DV had 7 days of downtime due to maintenance. Thus, the EV had 22 days of downtime in total while the DV had 7 days of downtime. Hence, the utilisation rates of the EV and the DV were 92.6% and 97.6%, respectively. Based on the above, the average daily driving distances of the EV and the DV were 127 km and 109 km, respectively.

4.4 The driver of the EV liked driving the EV and had no operation difficulties in driving the EV. He agreed that the EV is quieter than the DV. Overall, he was satisfied with the performance of the EV and would promote the EV to other drivers. Chun Yan was satisfied with the EV since the EV could meet the operational requirements and save the operation cost. Given the opportunity, Chun Yan would consider replacing all existing conventional vehicles with EVs and encourage other transport operators to try the EVs. In general, passengers were satisfied with the performance of the EV.

4.5 It is observed that the amount of electricity stored in the battery after a full charging operation could be maintained at the level of 373.4 kWh after the 12-month trial period. The deterioration in battery capacity within the 12-month trial period, if any, would be insignificant and did not affect the operation of the EV.

4.6 Based on the total mileage of the EV and the fuel economy of the DV, the equivalent carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2e</sub>) emission from the DV could be estimated for comparison purpose. In the 12-month trial period, the CO<sub>2e</sub> emission from the EV and the DV were 15,080 kg and 36,862 kg respectively. Hence, there was a 21,783 kg (about 59%) reduction of CO<sub>2e</sub>, with the replacement of the DV by the EV in the trial.

## 5. Summary

5.1 The average fuel cost of the EV was HK\$7.97/km (about 82%) lower than that of the DV. Taking the maintenance fee and other costs into account, the average total operating cost of the EV was HK\$8.51/km (about 79%) lower than that of the DV. The utilisation rates of the EV and the DV were 92.6% and 97.6%, respectively. There was a 21,783 kg (about 59%) reduction of CO<sub>2e</sub>, with the replacement of the DV by the EV in the trial.

5.2 It is observed that the amount of electricity stored in the battery after a full charging operation could be maintained at the level of 373.4 kWh after the 12-month trial period. The deterioration in battery capacity within the 12-month trial period, if any, would be insignificant and did not affect the operation of the EV.

5.3 The driver of the EV liked driving the EV and had no operation difficulties in driving the EV. Overall, he was satisfied with the performance of the EV. Chun Yan was satisfied with the EV since the EV could meet the operational requirements and save the operation cost. Given the opportunity, Chun Yan would consider replacing all existing conventional vehicles with EVs and encourage other transport operators to try the EVs. In general, passengers were satisfied with the performance of the EV.

5.4 The findings showed single-deck electric buses are becoming more affordable and feasible to the transport trade for saving operating cost and reducing CO<sub>2e</sub> emissions, provided that the vehicles can get easy access to charging facilities.

## Appendix 1: Key Features of Vehicles and Charging Facilities

### 1. Trial EV and Charging Facilities

#### (a) EV

<b>Registration mark:</b>	<b>ZB7781</b>
Make:	BAZN
Model:	GTZ6128BEVCF
Class:	Public Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	18,000 kg
Seating capacity:	Driver + 65 passengers
Rated power:	195 kW
Travel range:	330 km (light and air-conditioning off conditions)
Battery material:	Lithium iron phosphate
Battery capacity:	373.4 kWh
Year of manufacture:	2022

#### (b) EV Charging Facilities (at Recipient's own cost)

Make:	珠海米雲新能源科技有限公司
Model:	MCEV-60KW750V
Output:	60 kW Mode 4 DC, max. 150 ADC
Charging Standard:	GB mode

Make:	珠海米雲新能源科技有限公司
Model:	TEEV-A84kW/D200kW
Output:	2 × 100 kW (i.e. 200 kW) Mode 4 DC, max. 266 ADC
Charging Standard:	GB mode

### 2. DV Used for Comparison

<b>Registration mark:</b>	<b>SY8755</b>
Make:	Daewoo
Model:	BH117L
Class:	Public Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	16,000 kg
Seating capacity:	Driver + 49 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	7,640 cc
Year of manufacture:	2014

## Appendix 2: Photos of Vehicles and Charging Facilities

### 1. Trial EV (ZB7781) and Charging Facilities

	
<p>Front view of EV</p>	<p>Rear view of EV</p>
	
<p>Left side view of EV</p>	<p>Right side view of EV</p>
	
<p>60 kW DC charger in Tin Shui Wai (at Recipient's own cost)</p>	<p>200 kW mobile DC charger with mobile energy storage system in Tseung Kwan O (at Recipient's own cost)</p>

**2. DV (SY8755) Used for Comparison**



Front view of DV



Rear view of DV



Left side view of DV



Right side view of DV