

LEGCO QUESTION No. 22

Annex

	Nature of the case	Follow-up action
Case 1	The owner reported that the inspection result of the qualified person (QP) was inaccurate and that the QP had not submitted a window inspection certificate within a specified timeframe after completion of the prescribed inspection.	Investigation is still in progress.
Case 2	The owner reported that the inspection result of the QP was inaccurate and that the QP required him to carry out unnecessary repair works.	BD has completed investigation and found no evidence to substantiate the allegation. No further follow-up action is required.
Case 3	The owner reported that inspection result of the QP was inaccurate and that the QP required him to carry out unnecessary repair works. Later, the owner appointed another QP to carry out an inspection. That QP considered that no repair works was necessary and had submitted a window inspection certification to BD.	Investigation is still in progress.
Case 4	The owner reported that the QP had arranged two members of staff to carry out an inspection at his premises, but the required repair items suggested by the two persons were different.	Investigation is still in progress.
Case 5	After completing a window inspection, the owner made an enquiry to BD on the standard of acceptance and the classification of minor work items.	The case was classified as a general enquiry. BD has issued a reply.
Case 6	The owner complained that BD's arrangement for MWIS was unsatisfactory.	Upon liaison with the owner, it was found that he mainly complained about the unsatisfactory service and arrangement provided by the property management company of his estate for assisting owners in carrying out window inspection. The case was classified as a general enquiry. BD has issued a reply.