

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 723/05-06
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Thursday, 15 December 2005, at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP (Chairman)
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon SIN Chung-kai, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP

Member absent : Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP

Public officers attending : **For item IV**

Dr Sarah LIAO, JP
Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works

Mr K K KWOK, JP
Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Environment)

Mr Raymond FAN
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)

For item V

Mr K K KWOK, JP
Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Environment)

Mr Raymond FAN
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)

Mr TANG Kin-fai
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (EcoPark)

Clerk in attendance : Miss Becky YU
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mrs Mary TANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)4

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes**
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 484/05-06 — Minutes of the meeting held on
28 November 2005)

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2005 were confirmed.

II Information paper issued since last meeting

2. Members noted the following information paper which had been issued since the last meeting -

LC Paper No. CB(1) 347/05-06(01) — A report entitled “Drivers and Barriers to Engaging Small and Medium-Sized Companies in Voluntary Environmental Initiatives” published by the Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management of the University of Hong Kong

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 486/05-06(01) — List of follow-up actions)

3. The Chairman advised that the Administration had proposed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 23 January 2006, at 2:30 pm -

- (a) Progress of measures to improve air quality, including those taken by the two power companies to meet the Government's emission reduction targets by 2010;
- (b) Provision of grease trap waste facility at refuse transfer station; and
- (c) Draft Hong Kong implementation plan under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

To allow sufficient time for discussion of each item, in particular item (a), members agreed that the Administration should be consulted on the feasibility of deferring either item (b) or (c) to the meeting in February 2006.

(Post-meeting note: After consultation with the Administration, all the three items were included in the agenda for the meeting on 23 January 2006. Item (c) was subsequently replaced by "Proposed Capital Injection into the Environment and Conservation Fund" at the request of the Administration.)

4. The Chairman informed members that arrangement was being made for the Panel to conduct a duty visit to Guangdong and she hoped that members would actively take part in it. As regards the itinerary for the visit, the Chairman advised that this had yet to be worked out with the Guangdong authorities, but some possible candidates would include the closed aqueduct for Dongjiang water, wind farms in Shantou, green lake in Heyuan, ecological park in Zhuhai, sewage treatment facilities and nature conservation education farms in Guangzhou etc. On the time of the visit, Mr Jeffrey LAM said that it might not be an appropriate time to conduct the visit in January 2006 since most factories in the Mainland would be closed during the holiday season. Members would not be able to observe the actual impact of polluting industries on the environment. Mr Albert CHAN added that effort should be made to avoid scheduling the visit on the second Monday and Tuesday of January 2006 since many Panel meetings would be held during that time. Besides, ample notice should be given to members so that they could be able to adjust their plans. To facilitate members' attendance, Mr Martin LEE suggested that consideration should be given to conducting the visit during weekend. His views were shared by Mr Albert CHAN and Ms Emily LAU. The Chairman agreed to further liaise with the Mainland on the arrangements for the visit.

IV A policy framework for the management of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong

- LC Paper No. CB(1) 486/05-06(03) — Updated background brief on management of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 486/05-06(04) — Paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 536/05-06(01) — Initial response from the Democratic Alliance for Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (Chinese version only)

5. At the Chairman's invitation, the Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (SETW) briefed members on the Policy Framework for the management of municipal solid waste (MSW) in Hong Kong, which aimed at providing a comprehensive strategy for the management of MSW for the 10 years from 2005 to 2014. Given that the reliance on landfills as the only means of disposal of MSW was clearly not sustainable in the long run, there was great urgency in putting in place advanced treatment methods which could effectively reduce the volume of waste to be disposed of at landfills. There was also a need to promote waste recycling with a view to developing a circular economy. It was hoped that the Policy Framework would complement the Government's efforts in encouraging the community to take an active part in the avoidance and reduction of MSW. SETW added that apart from introducing legislation on Product Responsibility Schemes (PRS), a number of incentives would be introduced to encourage waste reduction and recycling. These would include charging for MSW in accordance with the polluter-pays principle taking into account public affordability. More publicity and education programmes would also be conducted to solicit community support and participation in waste reduction activities, in partnership with the Government.

6. The Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) (DDEP(2)) supplemented that despite the average population growth of 0.9% per year, the increase in generation of MSW was 3% per year. The remaining landfill capacity would be exhausted in the next six to 10 years if MSW was allowed to increase at the current trend. He then gave a power-point presentation on the Policy Framework for the management of MSW in Hong Kong by highlighting the salient points in the information paper.

(Post-meeting note: Copies of the power-point presentation materials were circulated to members under LC Paper No. CB(1) 554/05-06.)

7. The Chairman recalled that when the management of MSW in Hong Kong was discussed at the Panel meeting on 28 February 2005, members were informed of the Administration's plan to issue a White Paper on waste management strategy for

public consultation. She however noted that the present Policy Framework was not a White Paper, and enquired if this was meant for public consultation and if so, the expiry date for consultation since many deputations had indicated interest in expressing their views on the subject. SETW said that the Policy Framework had set out the strategy and targets for waste management of MSW for the next 10 years. It was not intended to be the subject of another round of normal public consultation as the Council on Sustainable Development (CSD) had already consulted the public extensively on many elements covered by the Policy Framework in the context of its earlier public engagement process. The objectives in the Policy Framework which largely reflected the consensus of the community forged during CSD's engagement process would be adhered to as far as possible and amendments would only be considered if there was a practical need. Notwithstanding, further consultation on specific measures, such as PRS, would be conducted given their far-reaching impact on the community as a whole.

8. The Chairman said that members were under the impression that the public would be further consulted on the waste management strategy after the Panel meeting on 28 February 2005. She was disappointed to learn that the Administration had published the Policy Framework without further public consultation. SETW said that the proposals for waste treatment presented at the meeting on 28 February 2005 had taken into account the findings of the study on Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF). At the meeting, the Chairman had expressed concern that much emphasis had been put on waste treatment technologies rather than measures to reduce, recycle and reuse waste. Following the public engagement process conducted by CSD in which members and the public had taken part, some consensus had been reached on the way forward. It was based on the outcome of the public engagement process and other studies that the present Policy Framework was mapped out. The Administration had taken the decision not to dwell on with further consultation, but to go ahead with the publication of the Policy Framework in an attempt to meet the aspiration of members and the community for the early implementation of the waste management strategy. She welcomed further views from members in this respect.

9. Ms Audrey EU commended that the Policy Framework was an interesting and informative document. Mr Martin LEE also said that he was very impressed with the Policy Framework which contained pictures of the younger generation taking part in the waste recycling activities. DDEP(2) said that it was the Administration's intention to make the Policy Framework a more attractive publication for the benefit of students. In fact, it was hoped that the Policy Framework could be used as a textbook for teaching the subject on waste recycling. Apart from uploading it onto the Internet, the Administration would also produce the Policy Framework in the form of compact discs for distribution to schools.

10. Mr Martin LEE enquired if students had been involved in the formulation of the Policy Framework and whether there were any plans to attract participation of students in the waste recycling programmes. SETW agreed that community involvement was an integral part of sustainable development. Through CSD's public

engagement process, various fora had been held in different districts and views of schools and community were sought and taken aboard in the formulation of the Policy Framework. The Environmental Campaign Committee had also been actively engaging students as “green ambassadors” to organize waste recycling projects in schools. With the active participation of students, environmental awareness had been enhanced in both schools and families. DDEP(2) added that 750 schools with a total of about 12 000 students had taken part in the “Student Environmental Protection Ambassador Scheme” in 2004. Schools and green groups also joined hands in organizing waste recovery projects, including the cleaning of Victoria Park and the collection of moon cake boxes after the Mid-autumn Festival. Waste avoidance and recycling had been made the theme in many of the school projects and awards had been given to encourage participation.

11. In view of the far-reaching implications of the Policy Framework, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that a further meeting was required to exchange views with deputations. She also requested the Administration to respond to the submission from the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong regarding the Policy Framework.

(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, a special meeting had been scheduled for Thursday, 19 January 2006, at 8:30 am to exchange views with deputations and the Administration on the Policy Framework on the management of MSW.)

Waste reduction and recycling

12. Ms Emily LAU noted that the Government’s target was to reduce the amount of MSW generated in Hong Kong by 1% per annum up to the year 2014, based on 2003 levels. Given that the average increase in generation of MSW was 3% per year, she enquired if the Government could consider setting a higher reduction target. SETW explained that the reduction target of 1% per annum had already taken into the annual growth rate of 3% for MSW generated in Hong Kong. In other words, the reduction target represented a total gross reduction of 4% of MSW per annum.

13. Mr Jeffrey LAM opined that education and publicity, particularly at the district level, should be stepped up to solicit community support and participation in the recycling of waste. He also questioned why three-colour waste segregation bins were not found in business districts like Central. SETW advised that as the recycling of waste papers and other waste materials had been very effective in the business offices in Central, there was no need for the provision of three-coloured waste segregation bins in the area. As regards efforts to encourage waste recycling practices, SETW said that the Administration had all along been working in partnership with the commercial sector in the recycling of waste. It was found that the trades would be willing to participate in the recycling process for the creation of a circular economy as long as incentives were provided. Assistance from property management companies would be sought in the waste recovery activities. The

Administration would also continue to make use of the ingenuity of students in the recycling process as in the case of the deposit arrangement for bottled drinks. DDEP(2) acknowledged the importance of education in inducing behavioural changes and gaining public support. More efforts would be made to mobilize community groups to organize environmental activities to enhance public awareness on waste reduction and recycling. The commercial sector would also be requested to give their support to promote recycling of waste. Apart from schools, publicity programmes and waste segregation projects were being carried out in housing estates, with the assistance of green groups.

Product Responsibility Schemes

14. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong enquired whether, apart from waste charging and advanced treatment methods, the Administration would consider introducing legislation on producer responsibility. He said that it would be unfair to require the public to shoulder waste charges while producers were not responsible for disposal of the products they produced. SETW agreed that PRSs, which had been practised in many developed countries, were an integral part of the Policy Framework. The Administration intended to introduce the Bill on Product Eco-responsibility, which provided the legal framework for PRSs, into the Legislative Council in 2006, with product-specific measures introduced through subsidiary legislation subsequently. These regulatory measures would delineate the main responsible parties, including importers, distributors and retailers, in the supply chain. According to overseas experience, affected trades would take voluntary measures to ensure compliance with PRSs before the relevant legislation was introduced. In the case of Australia, voluntary PRSs were so effective that legislation was not required. In addition to PRS, consideration would also be given to imposing landfill disposal bans on certain end-of-life products, such as vehicle tyres and bulky electrical appliances. Consumers or commercial users would be required to separate from their main MSW streams the banned materials/products and prepare them for proper recycling or treatment outlets. By way of illustration, all electrical appliances in Japan were mandated to have 60% of their contents recyclable. On the legislative timetable for PRSs and product-specific measures, SETW said that these would be prioritized having regard to their bulk, biodegradability, toxicity and value of contents to be recovered.

15. Referring to the submission from the Friends of the Earth, Ms Emily LAU noted that Hong Kong had already lagged behind Germany by 15 years on the implementation of PRS. She then enquired if the Administration was prepared to strictly adhere to the proposed legislative timetable on PRS as set out in the Policy Framework, and whether the necessary public consultation had been completed. The Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment) (PSETW(E)) advised that affected trades were being consulted on the introduction of the Bill on Product Eco-responsibility. SETW added that the Bill would provide the legal framework while product-specific regulatory measures would be set out in the subsidiary legislation. Separate consultation with the trades concerned would be

carried out for each product. The Chairman was concerned that the Legislature might not have sufficient time to scrutinize the product-specific measures, particularly those which were quite complicated and controversial, if these were introduced in the form of subsidiary legislation under the negative vetting procedure.

16. Ms Emily LAU said that she would look forward to the early introduction of the legislation on PRS. Noting that consultation with the trades was underway, she then enquired about the preliminary response of the trades since the lack of support from the trades might lead to further delay in the implementation of PRS. SETW said that generally speaking, the main concern of importers was the possible increase in product costs as a result of the inclusion of disposal cost, which might render their products less competitive with parallel imports as the latter would become even cheaper by comparison. On specific areas, SETW said that the PRS on rechargeable batteries had met with cooperation from the trades as the Government had been taking the lead in collecting these batteries and exporting them to Korea for centralized recycling. The PRS on electrical appliances might not be easy to implement having regard to the low value of the recyclable content. Consideration was being given to imposing a deposit requirement whereby a levy would be collected at the time of purchase to facilitate recycling operations. Such a requirement was adopted by Japan in the sale of cars and was well received by buyers. The main deciding factor on the success of PRSs was whether consumers were prepared to pay for the recycling of products.

17. Mr SIN Chung-kai indicated his in-principle support for PRS as Hong Kong had already lagged behind others in this respect. He nevertheless noted the difficulties in putting forward PRS as this would involve different parties along the supply chain. It was therefore necessary for the Administration to conduct early consultation with the trades in an attempt to resolve their differences. He held the view that PRS and EcoPark could go hand in hand with each other. Consideration could also be given to assisting tenants of EcoPark in implementing projects associated with recycling of specific products under PRS as in the case of the recycling of computer parts in Australia. PSETW(E) said that priority would be accorded to the implementation of PRS and waste sorting, both of which would tie in with the introduction of the Bill on Product Eco-responsibility. The objective of EcoPark was to provide land at affordable prices to facilitate the operation of recycling industries. He also confirmed that recyclers involved in recycling of specific products under PRS would be given priority in the selection of tenants for EcoPark.

18. While supporting the waste recovery programmes, Ms Miriam LAU stressed the need to ensure their cost-effectiveness as otherwise they would not be sustainable in the long run. She held the view that the mere imposition of waste charges could not help resolve the problem of depletion of landfills. Efforts should be made to encourage recycling and to create a market for the recycled products conducive to a circular economy. For example, a proper business plan for the recycling of vehicle tyres should be put in place to ensure its financial viability. SETW said that when

setting the product costs, the disposal cost and the impact on the environment had often been overlooked. Under PRS, producers would not only have to take into account the production costs, such as cost of raw materials, but also the disposal cost. However, it would not be possible to provide a precise “cradle to grave” estimate on the manufacturing and disposal costs since the manufacturing process did not normally take place in Hong Kong.

19. Mr Jeffrey LAM said that the commercial sector was well aware of the need to reduce and recycle waste. The increase in oil and raw material prices had provided a greater incentive for recycling of waste. While agreeing that importers and distributors should be asked to invest more resources to implement PRS, he hoped that sufficient time would be allowed for the affected trades to adapt to the new requirements on PRS.

Disposal of biodegradable waste

20. Ms Audrey EU noted that of the 3 800 tonnes of putrescibles or primarily food waste (comprising about a quarter of total MSW) generated per day, only about 500 tonnes could be used up as soil conditioners. She was concerned that if no other uses could be made from the large amount of putrescibles, these would have to be disposed of at landfills. As putrescibles were biodegradable waste, they would significantly contribute to the emission of methane gas, being one of the recognized causes of the greenhouse effect. SETW said that the past practice of using putrescibles to feed livestock had ceased with the closure of most livestock farms in Hong Kong. Besides, livestock was being fed with alternative forms of feed nowadays. In Japan, putrescibles were being used as compost or fertilizers through a biotechnological process. However, the application of such biotechnology for the fermentation of putrescibles to compost would require considerable space and would generate a repulsive odour. In fact, composting had been tried out on a small scale in Hong Kong, but the fermentation process had been subject to numerous complaints from the neighbourhood. Given the odour problem and space constraints, it was unlikely that composting could be viable in Hong Kong. The unhygienic nature of putrescibles also rendered these not acceptable for export to the Mainland for treatment. In the end, these putrescibles would have to be disposed of at landfills. As regards the concern about generation of methane gas from putrescibles, SETW said that methane gas from landfills had been used to generate electricity to support facilities on site as in the case of the Shuen Wan Landfill where methane gas was used to generate electricity for leachate management.

21. Ms Audrey EU further enquired if measures would be introduced to encourage the reduction and segregation of putrescibles. SETW said that it would not be cost-effective to segregate food waste as no after use could be made from them. However, with the rise in petrol prices, some recyclers were collecting used cooking oil from restaurants for recycling as motor oil. It was worth to note that the traditional Chinese style of cooking tended to generate more food waste. While the use of comminutor, which was common in Western countries, might be able to reduce

large solid food waste into finer particles for disposal through the sewerage system, there were difficulties in adopting this in Hong Kong as the sewerage system and the building design would need to be adjusted to accommodate it.

Waste treatment technologies

22. Referring to the Policy Framework which stated that the estimated amount of waste generated per day would stand at 6 700 tonnes despite measures such as PRS and waste separation at source, the Chairman noted that with 1 000 tonnes of waste per day to be treated by the proposed Mechanical-Biological Treatment (MBT) process, the remaining 5 700 tonnes of waste would be treated by incineration. She questioned why the said measures had not been able to reduce the waste and whether more waste could be treated by MBT so that less would need to be incinerated. SETW said that the estimate of 5 700 tonnes of waste to be treated by incineration was a very conservative one. It was expected that a less amount would need to be incinerated after the implementation of waste reduction measures. The initial thinking of the Administration was to procure an incinerator of capacity between 1 000 to 1 500 tonnes, subject to expansion when need arose, to treat the non-recyclable waste. She further explained that there were constraints in the provision of large-scale MBT plants in Hong Kong since they were very space consuming and would generate excessive odour. Nevertheless, the Administration would keep abreast of latest developments in applying the MBT technology. The Chairman held the view that separation of dry and wet waste at source would effectively reduce the amount of waste. This would also help to minimize the waste charges to about \$10 per month.

23. Ms Miriam LAU stressed the need to use the most advanced technology for incineration even if this might entail a higher cost. She was aware that both Japan and Taiwan were adopting ash melting incineration technologies which were able to reach temperature as high as 1200°C, as compared to 850°C for most incinerators. It was found that the higher temperatures of these incinerators were more effective in reducing the generation of dioxin and other pollutants during the incineration process. Besides, the ash resulting from the incineration process could be recycled for use. She then enquired if the Administration was prepared to adopt these technologies albeit the higher cost. SETW said that while high temperature incinerators using gasification or plasma technology could be very effective in treating waste, these were much more expensive. Besides, the relevant technologies had not been tried on large-scale treatment of more than 1 000 tonnes of waste. The Administration would keep abreast of the latest developments in incineration technology and would identify the most appropriate and cost-effective means of treatment. Given the effectiveness of gasification and plasma technologies in the removal of dioxins and other pollutants, Ms Miriam LAU said that it would be worthwhile for the Administration to assess their feasibility when deciding on the treatment options. SETW said that the feasibility of various treatment options had been assessed in the studies on the development of IWMF. The Chairman said that details of the proposed treatment options would be discussed at a later stage.

V Development of EcoPark

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 486/05-06(05) — Paper provided by the Administration)

24. DDEP(2) briefed members on the Administration's proposal to expedite the development of the EcoPark and the upgrading of the PWP item 5703 CL to category A, the latter of which would be submitted for consideration by the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in February 2006 with a view to seeking funding approval from the Finance Committee in April 2006.

25. Mr Jeffrey LAM said that the commercial sector was in support of the Administration's proposal to expedite the development of the EcoPark. He hoped that tender for the EcoPark would be held in an open and fair manner, and that guidelines would be set out to ensure that recycling operations within the EcoPark would only be dealing with local waste rather than imported waste in order to create a circular economy. In response, PSETW(E) re-affirmed that the objective of the EcoPark was to promote recycling industry in Hong Kong with a view to creating a circular economy. As such, the recycling operations to be set up in the EcoPark would be dealing with local waste and not imported waste. The use of local waste in the recycling process would be one of the pre-requisites in the conditions of operation within the EcoPark. Only in the case where there were insufficient waste materials for recycling would consideration be given to the use of imported waste.

26. While acknowledging that the Government would be funding the capital construction cost of EcoPark, Mr SIN Chung-kai held the view that the operation of the EcoPark should be self-financing as otherwise it would not be sustainable in the long run. PSETW(E) said that although some recycling companies were self-sufficient and did not require Government subsidy, others had indicated that they would have difficulties in sustaining their operations if they were only allocated small plots of land under short-term leases. With the provision of the EcoPark, individual recycling companies could acquire land at affordable costs with tenures sufficiently long to justify their investments in value-added and higher end operations. The provision of bargaining facilities in the EcoPark would also facilitate the export of recycled products. DDEP(2) said that overseas experience had shown that the concept of EcoPark could indeed facilitate the recycling industry as in the case of Japan where the recycling operations were complementing each other within the shared facility.

27. Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the response of local recyclers to the concept of EcoPark and whether they were willing to operate their businesses in the EcoPark. He was also concerned about the viability of their operations and whether assistance would be provided in the recruitment of staff. PSETW(E) said that the trades generally welcomed the provision of the EcoPark which aimed at assisting the recycling operation. The Administration was confident that the lots in the EcoPark would be easily leased out. In fact, there were already plans to expedite Phase II of the EcoPark in view of popular demand.

28. Noting that the development of EcoPark was subject to the approval of re-zoning of land by the Town Planning Board (TPB), Ms Emily LAU was concerned that the EcoPark might not be ready for occupation in late 2006 as scheduled if approval from TPB was not given in time due to public opposition. DDEP(2) said that TPB had agreed to the re-zoning of the EcoPark site in Tuen Mun Area 38 as Other Specified Uses (Resource Recovery Park). The proposed change in zoning was published in the Gazette on 2 December 2005 for public inspection for two months until February 2006. Meanwhile, the Administration had met with green groups and recycling industries, both of whom were very supportive of the early provision of the two phases of EcoPark. The Administration had been encouraged by the positive response received. As regard consultation with District Councils, DDEP(2) said that the Tuen Mun District Council was also supportive of the timely provision of the EcoPark which would create job opportunities for the local community and form a landmark in Tuen Mun.

29. Noting that of the 40% recycled waste, over 90% of the recovered recyclable materials were exported for further re-processing while less than 10% were treated locally and re-manufactured into useful products, Ms Emily LAU enquired if the situation was expected to change with the provision of recycling facilities at the EcoPark. DDEP(2) said that it was the Government's intention to increase the percentage of recycled waste from 40% to 50%. With the provision of more land and facilities to enhance development of recycling operations, it was expected that more local recyclable wastes could be used in the recycling process, thereby creating a market for recycled wastes. While the exact percentages of recovered waste for local re-manufacturing were not available at this stage, efforts would be made to increase the said amount as far as possible through the local recycling operations. At members' request, the Administration undertook to set out the targeted percentages of waste recovery in its submission to PWSC.

30. The Chairman stressed the need for separate central sorting facilities to facilitate the recovery of local recyclable wastes as otherwise the EcoPark would only end up as a waste sorting centre and would not be able to achieve its intended purpose of enhancing the development of the recycling industry. The provision of central sorting facilities would also ensure sufficient supply of raw materials for recycling operations. DDEP(2) said that a circular economy would be established for the recycling trades to make good use of local recyclable waste. PSETW(E) reiterated that the EcoPark aimed at enhancing the development of value-added and higher end operations using local recyclable materials, which also formed the basis for selection of tenants for the EcoPark. As such, it was believed that EcoPark would not become a waste sorting centre, but he agreed with the Chairman that the provision of central sorting facilities would facilitate the recovery of recyclable wastes.

31. In concluding, the Chairman said that members did not raise objection to the submission of the proposal to PWSC.

VI Any other business

32. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
19 January 2006