

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC131/14-15
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(1)

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 9th meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 7 November 2014, at 5:15 pm**

Members present:

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau

Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP

Public officers attending:

Ms Elizabeth TSE Man-yee, JP

Ms Esther LEUNG, JP

Mr Alfred ZHI Jian-hong

Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP

Mr Howard CHAN Wai-kee, JP

Dr Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, JP

Mr Lawrence LAU Ming-ching

Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP

Permanent Secretary for Financial
Services and the Treasury (Treasury)

Deputy Secretary for Financial
Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1

Principal Executive Officer (General),
Financial Services and the Treasury
Bureau (The Treasury Branch)

Secretary for the Environment

Deputy Director of Environmental
Protection (2)

Assistant Director of Environmental
Protection (Environmental
Infrastructure)

Principal Environmental Protection
Officer (Landfills and Development)

Environmental Protection
Department

Assistant Director of Environmental
Protection (Nature Conservation and
Infrastructure Planning)

Clerk in attendance:

Mr Andy LAU

Assistant Secretary General 1

Staff in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT

Mr Derek LO

Mr Daniel SIN

Mr Ken WOO

Principal Council Secretary 2

Chief Council Secretary (1)5

Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Raymond SZETO
Mr Frankie WOO
Ms Christy YAU

Council Secretary (1)5
Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

Item No. 1 – FCR(2014-15)31A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
164DR – Southeast New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 2 – FCR(2014-15)32A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
163DR – Northeast New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 3 – FCR(2014-15)33A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse disposal
165DR – West New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 4 – FCR(2014-15)34A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
177DR – Development of integrated waste management facilities phase 1

The meeting continued the combined discussion of the motion to adjourn discussions on item FCR(2014-15)31A moved by Mr Gary FAN, and the motions to adjourn discussions on item FCR(2014-15)32A and FCR(2014-15)33A moved by Mr IP Kwok-him pursuant to paragraph 39 of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FC Procedure").

2. The Chairman said that the way that he allowed Mr IP Kwok-him to move the motions to adjourn discussion on the two items when Mr Gary FAN was speaking was the same as he had previously allowed Mr LEE Cheuk-yan to move a motion to adjourn further proceedings and Mr Gary FAN to move a motion to adjourn discussion on an item pursuant to the paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure when it was Ms Emily LAU's turn to speak. The Chairman further said that he had the responsibility to conduct meetings in an orderly and efficient manner and that he did not see any compelling reasons that the three motions to adjourn discussion of the items must be discussed separately. Thus, it was appropriate to combine the discussion on all three motions. Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr Martin LIAO expressed support for the Chairman's decision.

3. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Alan LEONG expressed disagreement with the Chairman's decision, and said that the Chairman should proceed with Mr Gary FAN's motion to adjourn discussions on item FCR(2014-15)31A before dealing with Mr IP Kwok-him's motions to adjourn discussions on item FCR(2014-15)32A and FCR(2014-15)33A. Mr LEONG contended that according to the paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure, a member could move a motion to adjourn an item and the relevant discussion should be limited to that one item. Mr Martin LIAO considered that a motion moved under paragraph 39 of the FC of the FC Procedure could cover one or more than one item.

4. Mr Gary FAN and Mr IP Kwok-him gave concluding remarks regarding their respective motions to adjourn discussions on items FCR(2014-15)31A, FCR(2014-15)32A and FCR(2014-15)33A.

5. The Chairman put to vote the motion to adjourn discussion on item FCR(2014-15)31A. At Mr Gary FAN's request, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Nineteen members voted in favour and 34 members voted against the motion. The individual voting results were as follows –

For:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan	Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr James TO	Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing	Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan
Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip	Ms Claudia MO
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Mr Charles Peter MOK	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok	Mr Kenneth LEUNG
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung	Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan
Mr IP Kin-yuen	
(19 members)	

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam	Dr LAU Wong-fat
Mr TAM Yiu-chung	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung
Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Kwok-him	Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee
Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun	Mr James TIEN Pei-chun

Mr NG Leung-sing	Mr Steven HO Chun-yin
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming	Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms CHAN Yuen-han	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung	Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong
Mr POON Siu-ping	Mr TANG Ka-piu
Dr Ann CHIANG Lai-wan	Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen
(34 members)	

6. The Chairman declared that the motion was negated.

7. The Chairman put to vote the motion to adjourn discussion on item FCR(2014-15)32A. As requested by members, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Nineteen members voted in favour and 34 members voted against the motion. The individual voting results were as follows –

For:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan	Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr James TO	Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing	Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan
Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip	Ms Claudia MO
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Mr Charles Peter MOK	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok	Mr Kenneth LEUNG
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung	Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan
Mr IP Kin-yuen	
(19 members)	

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam	Dr LAU Wong-fat
Mr TAM Yiu-chung	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung
Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Kwok-him	Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee
Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun	Mr James TIEN Pei-chun
Mr NG Leung-sing	Mr Steven HO Chun-yin
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming	Mr YIU Si-wing

Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms CHAN Yuen-han	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung	Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong
Mr POON Siu-ping	Mr TANG Ka-piu
Dr Ann CHIANG Lai-wan	Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen
(34 members)	

8. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived.

9. The Chairman put to vote the motion to adjourn discussion on item FCR(2014-15)33A. As requested by members, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Eighteen members voted in favour and 34 members voted against the motion. The individual voting results were as follows –

For:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan	Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr James TO	Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing	Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan
Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip	Ms Claudia MO
Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai	Mr Charles Peter MOK
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Dr Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Mr Kenneth LEUNG	Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	Mr IP Kin-yuen
(18 members)	

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam	Dr LAU Wong-fat
Mr TAM Yiu-chung	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung
Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Kwok-him	Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee
Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun	Mr James TIEN Pei-chun
Mr NG Leung-sing	Mr Steven HO Chun-yin
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming	Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms CHAN Yuen-han	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr KWOK Wai-keung

Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung	Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong
Mr POON Siu-ping	Mr TANG Ka-piu
Dr Ann CHIANG Lai-wan	Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen
(34 members)	

10. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived.

11. The meeting continued the combined discussion on the items.

Southeast New Territories landfill extension

12. Dr Helena WONG enquired whether the proposed extension of SENT landfill would differ in design as it will only receive construction waste and will no longer accept municipal solid waste ("MSW"), and whether the construction cost would be lowered. Dr WONG also asked the Administration to elaborate on its measures to divert MSW to other refuse disposal facilities.

13. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) ("AD(EI)") replied that the design of the SENT landfill extension would not be altered according to the type of waste received as ancillary facilities required, such as the landfill liner system, were similar. AD(EI) said that the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department had already commenced to divert a small portion of MSW away from the SENT landfill. The Administration would also proceed with the Waste Diversion Plan to facilitate diversion of MSW to other waste facilities upon approval of the SENT landfill extension and completion of the necessary preparatory work.

14. Noting that the Administration planned to prolong the operating life of SENT landfill to six years, Ms Cyd HO asked whether the Administration intended to further extend SENT landfill. Ms HO urged the Administration to specify a date for the permanent closure of the SENT landfill and make a commitment that the landfill would not be further extended.

15. Secretary for Environment ("SEN") replied that the Administration had adopted various mitigating measures to minimize the impact of the SENT landfill on nearby residents. When the SENT landfill was extended and would only accept construction waste, the odour problem would be solved. Moreover, it would conduct a study on future waste management infrastructure requirements in Hong Kong with a view to minimizing reliance on landfills.

16. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan said that Tseung Kwan O residents were under the impression that the SENT landfill would not be further extended, and

urged the Administration to make such a commitment, as IWMF phase 1 would help reduce the amount of waste to be disposed at landfills.

17. SEN said that whilst the Administration's long-term goal was to phase out disposal of MSW at the landfills, it could not rule out the extension of the SENT landfill entirely. In fact, the Administration had actively planned for the extension of all landfills in the past decade.

West New Territories landfill extension

18. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan and Mr Albert HO questioned the need to extend the West New Territories ("WENT") landfill for about 200 hectares in spite of other waste reduction measures to be implemented by the Administration. Mr LEE expressed doubt on the effectiveness of these other measures implemented, such as diverting waste via refuse transfer stations ("RTS"). He queried whether the Administration would further reduce the scale of extension of the WENT landfill if the Administration's measures had been so effective. Mr HO said that Tuen Mun residents were against the WENT landfill extension as the current capacity of the Lung Kwu Tang Road, used for transporting refuse to the WENT landfill, was already saturated.

19. SEN and AD(EI) replied that compaction of solid waste at RTSs would not reduce the amount of waste to be disposed of at the landfills. Landfills would still be needed for disposal of inert materials and incineration residues, etc. The main concern of Tuen Mun residents was the odour dissipating from the WENT landfill. The Administration had been consulting with Tuen Mun District Council on mitigating measures, such as increasing the transportation of refuse by sea thereby reducing the number of trips of RCVs on the road. Moreover, the funding sought for WENT landfill extension was for conducting the detailed study of technical issues raised during local consultation including the feasibility of reducing the scale of the extension of the landfill.

Development of IWMF phase 1

20. Mr James Mr TO expressed concern about the health impact of the emission from IWMF phase 1 on the inmates and staff of Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre ("SKCTRC") located nearby, and asked if the Administration had conducted an authoritative health impact analysis and if SKCTRC required relocation. SEN assured that the emission performance of IWMF phase 1 strictly adhered to the EU emission standards and modern incineration technology could minimize hazards to public health despite the incinerator's close proximity to neighbouring communities. Assistant Director (Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning) ("AD(NC&IP)") supplemented

that the environmental impact assessment ("EIA") study of IWMF phase 1 had already confirmed that the health risk of the emission of the facilities would comply with the USEPA's guidelines and that the Department of Health had endorsed such assessment. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide the relevant information separately in writing.

21. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern about the emission of hazardous pollutants, including carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, emitted by IWMF phase 1. He questioned the justification for using incineration in IWMF phase 1 which was not environmentally friendly as it would emit carbon. In contrast, plasma gasification, which would not produce any carbon emission, was more aligned with the global trend of reducing carbon in waste management than was incineration.

22. AD(NC&IP) pointed out that plasma gasification would still produce carbon dioxide emission and that the modern incineration technology could generate electricity thereby in effect helping reduce the carbon dioxide emission emitted by power plants which generated electricity by burning fossil fuels and the methane emission from landfills.

23. Prof Joseph LEE and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung expressed concerns about the emission performance of IWMF phase 1. Prof LEE asked the Administration to explain its measures to assure inmates and workers of SKCTRC, that they would not be exposed to health risks caused by the operation of IWMF phase 1. Mr LEUNG queried how the Administration would monitor incinerator operation and properly penalize any breach of terms in emission limits.

24. SEN said that the Administration involved stakeholders at SKCTRC at an early stage of public consultation, and a district liaison group would be set up to establish regular communication with relevant stakeholders including representatives of SKCTRC. He also noted that the public monitoring of emission performance of IWMF phase 1 would also help ensure strict adherence to statutory requirements. AD(NC&IP) supplemented that there were three levels of safeguard on air quality, namely the terms set out by the contract for the Design-Build-Operate contractor of IWMF phase 1, requirements set out in the EIA report, as well as air quality objectives under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance. Also, to strengthen community liaison efforts, the Administration had been in contact with the Society of the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers, the operator of SKCTRC, and would strengthen the monitoring of the construction site to minimize impact to SKCTRC during construction and operation of IWMF phase 1. The Administration would also conduct regular liaisons with relevant stakeholders.

25. Mr WU Chi-wai expressed concern about the risks arising from the transport of residual ash to and from IWMF phase 1 by sea, particularly during inclement weather.

26. SEN and AD(NC&IP) said that at present, the transport of refuse by sea in containers had been in place for over two decades and had been proven to be effective and there were established contingency plans to handle emergency situations. IWMF phase 1 would also have sufficient storage space for refuse to ensure uninterrupted operation.

27. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Administration had considered collaborating with nearby cities in the Mainland in waste incineration instead of building an incinerator in Hong Kong since Hong Kong could make use of the new incinerators recently built in those cities in recent years. Mr WU expressed concern about whether IWMF phase 1 would be underutilized, in the event that waste reduction at source pursued by the Administration succeeded in reducing waste.

28. SEN said that a principle adopted by the Administration in waste management was that Hong Kong as a city must treat its own waste. Moreover, even if the target for waste reduction at source was met, the amount of waste generated by Hong Kong would still exceed the capacity of IWMF phase 1.

29. Mr Albert HO expressed concern about the cost-effectiveness of IWMF phase 1, since it would produce a lower amount of electricity and a much higher amount of ash than Zhuhai's waste treatment plant using plasma gasification and its a construction cost several times that of the latter. He asked why the Administration would not consider the better technology in gasification. He also asked whether the Administration liaised with Zhuhai authorities for further information.

30. AD(NC&IP) said that information available on the Zhuhai plant was limited. Plasma gasification technology was still in an experimental stage and applied in small-scale plants, while moving grate incineration used by IWMF phase 1 was a proven technology used by EU countries and Japan for waste management. SEN further said that to his understanding, the quoted Zhuhai incinerator was not used to treat MSW.

31. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the Administration should await the outcome of relevant judicial review cases before seeking funding approval of IWMF phase 1. Mr CHAN expressed concern that the Administration's efforts to carry out its policies in reduction of waste at source would slow down if the

funding proposals for landfill extensions and IWMF phase 1 were approved by this Committee, because the pressure of treating waste at source would be reduced.

32. SEN replied that the Committee's approval of funding sought for IWMF phase 1 was urgently required in order that the Administration could commence relevant preparatory work, which would take several years. The Administration would await the final outcome of the relevant JR cases before awarding the contract. SEN said that there was strong public support to expedite the construction of IWMF phase 1 and the Administration was firmly committed to the "Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013 - 2022" ("the Action Blueprint") with a view to reducing waste through a multi-pronged approach.

Waste reduction and management

33. Mr Michael TIEN said that by charging the use of RTSs rather than landfills, the Administration could not provide adequate financial incentives for operators of private refuse collection vehicles ("RCV") to use RTS for waste disposal instead of delivering their waste directly to landfills. Mr TIEN suggested that the Administration should consider waiving the fees for refuse disposal at RTS.

34. DDEP(2) said that based on the Administration's consultation with the waste collection trade, it was unlikely that private RCV operators would opt to carry their waste directly to landfills instead of RTS due to higher transportation cost and extra transportation time. He took note of Mr TIEN's view on RTS charges and would take it into consideration in subsequent reviews on charges of RTS.

35. Mr James TIEN expressed doubt about the Administration's waste reduction target at 40% by 2022, as it had pledged to increase housing supply which would in turn generate more construction waste.

36. DDEP(2) said that the bulk of construction waste was recycled as inert fill materials for land reclamation and only a small proportion of it was disposed at landfills. The Administration would continue to co-operate with industry representatives such as the Construction Industry Council to seek further ways to reduce the generation of construction waste.

37. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan said that since the Administration claimed that incineration was an effective means in reducing waste with minimal environmental impact on neighbouring residents, the Administration should

expand the scope of refuse disposal by incineration. He also questioned the effectiveness of waste recycling measures and said that waste reduction at source should be adopted as the primary objective in waste management.

38. SEN said that the need for landfill extensions had long been identified, and the Administration would conduct a strategic study on the future waste infrastructure requirements with a view to minimizing the utilization of landfills. The Administration was committed to implementing the multi-pronged measures outlined by the Action Blueprint, such as the establishment of the Steering Committee to Promote the Sustainable Development of the Recycling Industry.

39. Mr Alan LEONG pointed out that since there was misreporting in the waste export statistics, the basis for the target set on the waste recycling rate in the Action Blueprint would not stand. Mr LEONG enquired whether there were measures to calculate the amount of recyclable waste.

40. SEN said that the current calculation method was in line with internationally accepted practices. He added that the key aspect of the Action Blueprint was to reduce waste and waste recycling was only one of the measures to reduce waste in Hong Kong. DDEP(2) and AD(EI) said that the subject was discussed extensively in the Panel on Environmental Affairs in March 2014 and the Administration had implemented measures to strengthen the accuracy of the relevant trade declarations made to the Customs and Excise Department ("C&ED"). The Administration had also reinforced liaison efforts with plastic recycling businesses and trade declarants to prevent misreporting of data and stepped up measures to ensure compliance by the trade, including provision of guidelines by C&ED, as well as proactively clarifying dubious export claims.

41. Dr Fernando CHEUNG commented the current fee charged for disposal of construction waste disposal was very low compared to that of other cities overseas such as Tokyo, and was ineffective in reducing the generation of construction waste. He requested the Administration to review the level of charging on construction waste.

42. Ms Emily LAU said that various green groups, namely the Friends of the Earth, the Conservancy Association and the Greeners Action, had submitted a joint submission to the Committee to express disappointment towards the Administration's lackluster progress on waste reduction at source according to the Action Blueprint, and asked the Administration to provide a response. She enquired whether the timelines proposed by the Administration for

Action

implementing MSW charging and expanding the scope of the Producer Responsibilities Scheme met the expectations of green groups.

43. SEN said that the Administration had been in close contact with environmental groups, and the Action Blueprint was actively pursued with support from scholars and the public. The Administration would also commence its preparation of the legislative process for MSW charging in 2015.

44. The meeting was adjourned at 7:14 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

20 March 2015