

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 961/10-11
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 22 November 2010, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon CHAN Hak-kan (Chairman)
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Member absent : Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP

Public officers attending : **For item III**

Dr Kitty POON
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Albert LAM
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)

Dr Ellen CHAN
Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr WONG Wai-yuen
Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Waste
Reduction & EcoPark)
Environmental Protection Department

For item IV

Dr Kitty POON
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Albert LAM
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)

Mr Vincent TANG
Assistant Director (Nature Conservation &
Infrastructure Planning)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr LUI Ping-hon
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Infrastructure Planning)
Environmental Protection Department

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. Information paper issued since last meeting

Members noted that no information paper had been issued since last meeting.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 461/10-11(01) — List of follow-up actions
LC Paper No. CB(1) 461/10-11(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 20 December 2010, at 8:30 am –

- (a) Pilot Green Transport Fund; and
(b) District Cooling System at the Kai Tak Development

Ms Audrey EU enquired if the trial on retrofitting of selective catalytic reduction device for the franchised bus fleet formed part of the Pilot Green Transport Fund. The Chairman advised that according to his understanding, the trial was a separate issue. The Administration had undertaken to provide an information paper on details of the trial before its commencement in July 2011.

3. The Chairman reminded members of the special meeting on Friday, 26 November 2010, at 4:30 pm to receive deputations' views on the Public Consultation on Hong Kong's Climate Change Strategy and Action Agenda.

III. Development of EcoPark

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 461/10-11(03) — Administration's paper on development of EcoPark
LC Paper No. CB(1) 479/10-11(01) — Paper on development of EcoPark prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief))

4. The Under Secretary for the Environment (USEN) briefly explained the progress of development of the EcoPark and the proposed leasing arrangement for EcoPark Phase 2 lots, taking into account the experience gained in the leasing of EcoPark Phase 1 lots. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) (ADEP(EI)) gave a power-point presentation on the subjects.

(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 547/10-11(01) on 23 November 2010.)

5. Noting that the majority of recovered recyclable materials were exported to other places for further processing, Mr IP Wai-ming opined that more should be done to provide value-added services for the recyclable materials to support the local recycling industry on the one hand and to generate more job opportunities for local workers on the other. Expressing similar views, Mr CHAN Kin-por enquired about the assistance provided by the Administration to encourage local recyclers to undertake value-added processes in Hong Kong. USEN said that the purpose of EcoPark was to provide long-term land at affordable cost for the development of recycling and environmental industry with a view to encouraging investment in more advanced technologies and value-added processes. A robust tender assessment was recommended to be put in place for Phase 2 lots to ensure the technical competency and financial viability of the applicants so that the successful tenants were fully ready and capable of undertaking recycling processes in the EcoPark. However, it was worth noting that with the relocation of local industries to the Mainland, many tenants had to export the raw materials recovered from recycling processes to their plants in the Mainland for further manufacturing processes.

EcoPark Phase 1

6. Referring to the Public Account Committee (PAC) Report No 54, Mr Jeffrey LAM noted that the Director of Audit had pointed out the inadequacies in the planning and administration of EcoPark which had adversely affected the leasing of Phase 1. USEN said that the unsatisfactory progress of EcoPark Phase 1 was attributable to various factors, one of which was the financial crisis which had led to a decrease in both demand and prices for recyclable materials. Some recycling operations had since become financially non-viable, thus affecting the collection of segregated recyclable materials. Some recyclers had delayed the commissioning of operations. There were others who had difficulty in complying with various statutory requirements, such as those relating to fire prevention. At present, all six lots of EcoPark Phase 1 had been leased out. Of these, five tenants had commissioned their operation while the remaining one was expected to commission by March 2011.

7. Mr KAM Nai-wai noted that some small and medium enterprises had complained about the difficulty in applying for lots in the EcoPark. He enquired about the number of applications for EcoPark Phase 1 lots which had been rejected and the reasons for rejection. The Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) (DDEP(2)) added that five tender exercises had been conducted for EcoPark Phase 1 lots. There were 13 applications for the first tender exercise, 11 for the second, five for the third, four for the fourth and two for the fifth. There were also quite a number of enquiries on the tender

exercises. Based on the feedback from tenderers and the experience gained from Phase 1, improvements had been made to the leasing arrangements for Phase 2 lots.

8. Given the land constraint of EcoPark, Mr Jeffrey LAM enquired if additional storage space could be provided in the proximity of EcoPark for temporary storage of recyclable materials while awaiting process. USEN said that tenants could seek assistance from the EcoPark management which was responsible for assisting tenants in the planning and operation of their lots. Short-term tenancies (STT) would be provided as necessary to allow for temporary storage of recyclable materials so that the needed space in EcoPark could be reserved for processing. DDEP(2) added that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and the Lands Department had been working together in identifying suitable sites for STT for recovery and temporary storage of recyclable materials, taking into account the views of the neighboring community. At members' request, the Administration agreed to provide information on STTs being leased to the recycling industry.

Admin

EcoPark Phase 2

9. Mr CHAN Kin-por noted that the Administration had set up two waste recycling centres in EcoPark Phase 2 for waste plastics and waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) which were being managed by non-profit making organizations. He questioned why professional recyclers were not engaged in running these operations. USEN said that following the financial crisis, the cost of plastics had been substantially reduced. As there were no outlets for waste plastics, these had to be disposed of at landfills. To tackle the problem, the Administration had set up two waste recycling centres in EcoPark Phase 2 to provide secured outlets for waste plastics and WEEE which currently had rather limited opportunities of recycling in the local market. With funding support from the Environment and Conservation Fund, social enterprises selected through an open tendering process were engaged to not only operate the centres but also to provide job opportunities for low-skilled workers.

10. Ms Miriam LAU stressed the need to ensure the viability of recycling operations. Given that there might not be a market for certain wastes, such as waste computer parts and waste car batteries, the Administration should work out a waste recycling strategy taking into account market needs. She further enquired whether WEEE from the Producer Responsibility Scheme (PRS) would be processed in EcoPark Phase 2 or whether a separate site would be identified for the purpose having regard to the many complexities involved in the processing of WEEE, particularly in respect of detoxification of certain computer parts. She also emphasized that the Administration should help promote the market for recycled products by taking the lead in procuring these

green products. Ms Audrey EU echoed that recycling operations would not be viable unless complementary policies were put in place. By way of illustration, policies on waste charging and measures against fly-tipping would help encourage waste recycling and recovery. She enquired about the anticipated increase in the rate of recycling of different waste types following the commissioning of EcoPark Phase 2, and whether EcoPark could assist in implementing the PRS. She added that the provision of rental concessions alone would not be helpful to the recycling operations. More attention should be given to the recycling of waste, in particular food waste and waste plastics.

11. In response, USEN said that the outcome of public consultation on the new PRS on WEEE would be reported to the Panel soon. She agreed that a holistic approach should be adopted in implementing the waste management strategy, the progress of which (including the charging scheme on municipal solid waste) would be discussed at the Panel meeting in January 2011. She added that the Administration had taken the lead in green procurement and had since revised its procurement policy to include more green products. On the anticipated increase in recovery rate after the commissioning of EcoPark Phase 2, USEN advised that EcoPark Phase 1 was able to handle about 50 000 tonnes of recyclable materials per annum. It was hoped that EcoPark Phase 2 with its large size would be able to attract recyclers operating on a larger scale. However, as the tendering exercise for Phase 2 had yet to commence, it would not be possible to project the increase in recovery rates of different waste types at this stage. DDEP(2) supplemented that EcoPark Phase 2 covered an area of 10 hectares which limited the amount of recyclables to be handled. He agreed to provide an estimate as far as practicable.

Proposed leasing arrangement for EcoPark Phase 2 lots

Open waste types

12. Mr CHAN Kin-por noted that most of the waste types in the initial list of waste types to be processed in EcoPark Phase 2 were similar to that in Phase 1. He questioned why new waste types were not introduced. Mr KAM Nai-wai also enquired whether asphalt would be included as one of the waste types for concrete waste. USEN said that the types of waste to be processed in the EcoPark would be market driven and open for applicants to propose from a general list which would be formulated based on the recycling market situation and consultation with the trade. It was expected that waste glass and inert construction materials would be processed in EcoPark Phase 2.

Flexible lot size

13. Noting that the lot size would be changed from a standard size of around 5 000 square metres (m²) to different sizes within a reasonable range of say from 5 000 m² to 20 000 m², Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired if lot sizes under 5 000 m² would also be available. DDEP(2) said that based on the feedback from previous tendering exercises, 5 000 m² would be an optimal lot size for most recycling operations. However, as some recycling processes would require larger space, flexibility could be allowed for applicants to bid larger lot sizes to suit their operational requirements.

Length of tenancy

14. Apart from tenants, Mr CHAN Kin-por asked if the Administration could also early terminate the tenancy in the event of poor performance of tenants. DDEP(2) said that if a tenant failed to comply with the terms and operational requirements as set out in the tenancy, actions could be taken to terminate the tenancy. The proposal to lengthen the tenancy to 20 years was made so that initial capital investment could be amortized over a reasonably longer period, which was critical to tenants in raising finance with banks and financial institutions.

15. Referring to the PAC Report No 54, Ms Cyd HO noted that the Director of Audit had criticized the leasing arrangement for EcoPark Phase 1. While acknowledging that the Administration had made certain improvements to the leasing arrangement for Phase 2 lots taking into account the experience gained from Phase 1 development, she questioned why no reference had been made to PAC's recommendation on levels of rents, which in her view should reflect the savings in the cost of waste treatment and disposal. It was worth noting that recycling operations were not profitable businesses but these could help reduce and recover waste which would otherwise be disposed of at landfills. USEN explained that the rental levels would be reviewed on a regular basis and adjusted according to a pre-determined formula. The current rental level of EcoPark at around \$10 per m² per month was below the market rate. To facilitate better understanding, the Administration was requested to provide information on the setting of rents for lots in EcoPark, with particular reference to the savings in the cost of treatment and disposal of waste.

Admin

Tender assessment

16. Miss Tanya CHAN noted that some recyclers were not able to process all the recyclables because of the quantity and quality of the materials. As a result, some of these materials had to be disposed of at landfills. She enquired if the capability of applicants in dealing with the waste collected formed part of

the tender assessment. She also asked if assistance could be provided in the sourcing of recyclable materials to ensure the quality of materials collected, and that there was a market for the recycled products. Mr IP Wai-ming supported waste segregation at source to facilitate recyclers in the recycling processes. USEN said that the recycling trades were well aware of the supply of recyclable materials and the demand for recycled products. They would optimize the collection of recyclable materials to facilitate recycling processes and to meet market needs. Apart from providing land for recycling processes, the EcoPark would also foster a synergy among tenants. For example, one tenant engaged in the recycling of waste plastics had given away those of inferior quality to another tenant for the manufacture of biodiesel. Also, a tenant engaged in the recycling of WEEE had provided another tenant with recyclable computer parts. In response to Miss CHAN's further enquiry on the record of unused recyclable materials by EcoPark which had to be disposed of at landfills, ADEP(EI) agreed to provide the requisite information as far as practicable.

Admin

17. Ms Cyd HO noted that in the tender submissions for Phase 2, applicants were required to provide a comprehensive business and work plan for meeting the statutory approvals and licences that were required for the proposed recycling process. She pointed out that the delay in commissioning of the recycling operations in Phase 1 was probably due to the difficulty in complying with the time-consuming statutory requirements, particularly when most of the recycling operations were newly established. To avoid similar recurrences, EPD should liaise with the Government departments concerned to provide the needed assistance to facilitate tenants of EcoPark in fulfilling the statutory approvals. USEN said that while the responsibilities for fulfilling the statutory approvals were on the tenants, the EcoPark management company would assign designated staff to liaise and support every tenant in their planning for commissioning of the operations as far as possible. Furthermore, EPD should liaise with all Government departments concerned to expedite the processing of tenants' application for statutory approvals.

Additional guidance and assistance to tenants

18. Mr IP Wai-ming enquired whether assistance would be provided to recyclers who had the technical competence but did not have the financial means to operate recycling processes at EcoPark. USEN said that applicants would need to demonstrate the financial viability of their recycling operations. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked if tenants had to demonstrate their financial capability before they were allowed to enter into tenancy with the EcoPark management. Mr CHAN Kin-por also enquired if the Administration would assist tenants in improving their recycling processes. USEN said that based on experience gained in the leasing of Phase 1, the length of tenancy had been extended from 10 to 20 years to enable tenants in raising finance with banks and financial

institutions. The EcoPark management company would also assign designated staff to liaise with and support each tenant in planning for commissioning of the operations as far as possible. Furthermore, EPD would liaise with all Government departments concerned to expedite the processing of tenants' applications for statutory approvals as far as possible. DDEP(2) added that while tenants were required to provide rental deposit and a performance guarantee, part of the deposit and/or performance guarantee would be released to tenants after injection of substantial capital investment as part of the supporting measures.

Way forward

19. Mr Albert CHAN was concerned that EcoPark was more of a showcase than a waste recycling centre. He stressed the need for a comprehensive recycling strategy for Hong Kong to allow for the setting up of recycling centres in different districts for the collection and recycling of materials to meet market demand. Reference should be made to the successful experience of Taipei in waste recycling. More commitment was needed in implementing waste recycling policies, which would include introduction of legislation on mandatory segregation and recycling of waste. He requested to put on record his dissatisfaction at the lack of commitment on the part of the Administration in taking forward waste recycling policies. USEN said tenders for EcoPark Phase 2 would be invited shortly with a view to increasing the waste recycling rate.

20. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he had reservation on the proposed leasing arrangement for EcoPark Phase 2, which had failed to take into account the recommendations in PAC Report No 54.

IV. 5172DR – Development of Organic Waste Treatment Facilities – Phase I in Siu Ho Wan, North Lantau

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 461/10-11(04) — Administration's paper on 5172DR – Development of Organic Waste Treatment Facilities – Phase I in Siu Ho Wan, North Lantau

LC Paper No. CB(1) 479/10-11(02) — Paper on the development of the First Phase Organic Waste Treatment Facilities prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief))

21. USEN briefly introduced the background and scope of the project on the development of the Organic Waste Treatment Facilities (OWTF), Phase I in Siu Ho Wan, North Lantau by highlighting the salient points in the Administration's paper.

22. Mr LEE Wing-tat supported the need to promote good eating culture and habit. The over-ordering of food should be avoided to reduce wastage. He said that a lot of food had been wasted because of over-ordering and such practice should not be encouraged. Government officials should set an example of good eating culture by avoiding the over-ordering of food when hosting lunch/dinner functions. Food wastage should also be avoided at home. USEN said that educational and publicity efforts would be made to promote public awareness on the need to avoid food wastage. The Administration would work closely with the relevant stakeholders, including the domestic sector, property management companies and green groups to encourage households to generate less food waste

Sites for OWTF

23. Given the odour nuisances associated with treatment of food waste, Mr LEE Wing-tat was pleased that the Administration was able to identify a remote site which was far from the residential community for the development of OWTF. Professor Patrick LAU was however concerned that the remote location of OWTF in Siu Ho Wan would mean that the food waste had to travel a distance covering various districts before this could be treated. Consideration should be given to identifying suitable sites for more OWTF. USEN said that a stringent environmental impact assessment had to be carried out before consideration could be given to developing OWTF. Two potential sites at Siu Ho Wan, North Lantau and Shaling, North District were identified in 2007 taking into account various factors, such as environmental and transport impacts on the neighboring areas, planning restrictions and the proximity of residential developments. The Siu Ho Wan site was selected for the first phase of OWTF because of its relatively more accessible location. Suitable sites would be identified for the development of additional treatment facilities for organic waste. In response to Professor LAU's query that the location plan of OWTF Phase 1 at Enclosure 1 was not clear, USEN agreed to provide a clearer copy of the plan for members' reference.

Admin

24. Referring to the letter from the Chairman of the Discovery Bay City Owners Committee tabled at the meeting, Mr KAM Nai-wai noted that residents were concerned about the setting up of OWTF at Lantau. He enquired about the measures to be taken to mitigate the possible environmental nuisances associated with the operation of OWTF, particularly in the transport of organic waste. As the Chek Lap Kok Airport Expressway formed part of the route to

OWTF, Mr IP Wai-ming was concerned that the odour nuisance associated with the transport of food waste might give tourists a bad impression of Hong Kong. Ms Audrey EU also enquired about the types of dump trucks to be used in transporting organic waste and the means to reduce the odour nuisance. USEN said that the Discovery Bay was located way beyond the radius of 1.5 kilometres of OWTF. Besides, the vehicles engaged in the transport of organic waste would be sealed. The Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Infrastructure Planning) added that at present, sealed containers were used to transport food waste for treatment at the Pilot Composting Plant at the Kowloon Bay Waste Recycling Centre. So far, no complaints against the odour nuisance associated with the delivery of food waste to the Plant had been received. Reference would be made to Taiwan and Korea where purpose-built tankers were used for the delivery of food waste.

Treatment capacity

25. Noting that combined treatment capacity of OWTF Phase 1 and Phase 2 was some 500 tonnes per day, Mr IP Wai-ming said that this was too small as compared to the total amount of food waste generated per day. He enquired about the feasibility of providing OWTF on a district basis. In view of the limited capacity of OWTF Phase 1, Mr LEE Wing-tat supported that more remote sites should be identified for setting up one or two more OWTF. Given the difficulties in identifying suitable sites for development of OWTF, the Chairman asked whether consideration could be given to expanding OWTF Phase 1 at Siu Ho Wan. USEN said that the public would need to be consulted on the provision of OWTF on a district basis. DDEP(2) added that efforts would be made to optimize the use of OWTF Phase 1 at Siu Ho Wan. Consideration would be given to expanding the treatment facilities but environmental impact assessment studies had to be carried out. More sites would be identified for further phases of OWTF if necessary.

26. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired about the timetable for the development of the second phase of OWTF at Shaling. USEN said that the initial plan was to invite tenders for OWTF Phase 1 at Siu Ho Wan in the second quarter of 2011 for completion by 2014, to be followed by OWTF Phase 2 at Shaling towards late 2010's.

Treatment technologies

27. Noting that anaerobic digestion and composting technologies would be adopted to recycle organic waste into biogas and compost products, the Chairman enquired if there were sufficient outlets for the huge amount of compost to be generated daily from OWTF. USEN said that at present, the compost generated from the Pilot Composting Plant at the Kowloon Bay Waste

Recycling Centre was used by Government departments and other non-governmental organizations in greening and agricultural activities. The many parks and estates in Hong Kong which required some 35 000 tonnes of composting materials each year would provide outlets for the compost generated from OWTF. Professor Patrick LAU questioned why the successful composting project using earthworms to recycle horse manure during the East Asian Games was not allowed to continue in the agricultural land in Hong Kong. USEN agreed to look into the case. The Chairman suggested that the project proponent could consider setting up a recycling plant on horse manure in the EcoPark.

28. Ms Audrey EU noted that apart from internal use by OWTF Phase 1, the biogas generated could be used to generate surplus electricity up to 28 million kWh for export to the grid each year. She enquired if arrangements for grid connection had been made with the power companies. USEN said that the Administration was liaising with the power companies on the export of the surplus electricity to the electricity grid and members would be informed of the outcome in due course. DDEP(2) added that there should not be any technical problems with the grid connection.

On-site treatment of food waste

29. Mr IP Wai-ming enquired if consideration would be given to requiring residential developments to provide on-site treatment facilities for food waste. USEN said that there was practical difficulty in collecting food waste from domestic households for on-site treatment because the majority of households in Hong Kong were residing in multi-storey multi-tenant buildings. Most of these buildings did not have enough space for dedicated food waste containers at both the household and building levels. Besides, frequent collection of food waste would be required as otherwise the food waste could cause potential hygiene and odour problems given the hot and humid weather of Hong Kong. Nevertheless, trial schemes on separation of wet and dry waste as well as use of on-site treatment facilities for food waste would be encouraged in private residential developments. Meanwhile, efforts had been made to promote the wider use of on-site treatment facilities to deal with food waste from commercial and industrial (C&I) establishments, such as shopping centres, food processing companies as well as major restaurants and eateries. Technical advice would be given to interested C&I establishment in using food waste treatment facilities. In fact, some C&I establishments had already installed treatment facilities of different scales. DDEP(2) added that some shopping centres had provided on-site facilities of different scales for treatment of food waste generated within the centres. Other establishments, schools and residential developments, would be encouraged to apply funding under the Environment and Conservation Fund to carry out trial schemes on on-site treatment for food waste.

30. Miss Tanya CHAN was disappointed at the slow progress of waste reduction schemes in Hong Kong, which in her view had lagged way behind its counterparts, including Taipei. She pointed out that Taipei was just as hot and humid as Hong Kong, but it was able to deal with the problem of food waste. There should be more commitment on the part of the Administration to optimize source separation of waste (including the separation of dry and wet waste) as well as waste recovery/recycling before resorting to waste incineration. She noted that there were small-scale on-site waste treatment facilities which could be installed in residential estates for treatment of food waste. There should be more experience sharing on the use of such facilities, and developers/property management companies should be encouraged to conduct trials on the use of on-site food waste treatment facilities.

31. In response, USEN said that OWTF Phase 1 and Phase 2 would provide treatment for source separated organic waste primarily from C&I establishments, including hotels, food processing establishments, restaurants, shopping malls and wet markets, which were the major source of food waste. Some of these establishments had their own on-site waste treatment systems and it was hoped that there would be more experience sharing among them. On treatment of food waste at residential estates, the Assistant Director (Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning) made reference to the experience of Park Island at Ma Wan, which was one of the few residential developments with on-site food waste treatment facilities. A collection arrangement for food waste had also been worked out in collaboration with the residents. At present, about 10% of the 5 000 households used the facilities and the number of participating households was expected to increase in the future. In view of the progress, the management company was planning to purchase new additional facilities. The existing on-site waste treatment facility had been in use for about three to four years to treat about 100 kilogrammes of food waste per day. It was hoped that the successful experience of Park Island could be shared with other estates. At members' request, the Administration agreed to provide information on the experience of the management of Park Island in the treatment of food waste.

Admin

32. Ms Audrey EU was concerned about the problem arising from the use of disposable lunch boxes in many schools. Noting that OWTF Phase 1 at Siu Ho Wan would be mainly used to treat source separated organic waste primarily from C&I establishments, she asked if the food waste would include those from schools and households. USEN said that a number of schools had signed the Green Lunch Charter. They had since stopped using disposable containers and adopted the central portioning approach where possible with a view to reducing food waste and protecting the environment. However, not all schools were able to adopt the central portioning approach because of space constraints. Some schools had recycled food waste to compost. She agreed that more efforts

should be made by domestic households to reduce food waste.

33. In concluding, the Chairman said that members did not raise objection to the proposed OWTF.

V. Any other business

34. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:25 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 January 2011