

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)507/14-15
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 15 December 2014, at 8:30 am
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Public Officers attending : **For item III**

Ms Christine LOH, JP
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Howard CHAN, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Environmental Protection Department

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

Mr Davie KAN
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Special Waste & Landfill Restoration)
Environmental Protection Department

For item IV

Ms Christine LOH, JP
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Howard CHAN, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr David WONG
Assistant Director (Environmental Compliance)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Samson LAI
Assistant Director (Waste Management Policy)
Environmental Protection Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Shirley CHAN
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Miss Lilian MOK
Senior Council Secretary (1)1

Ms Mandy LI
Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

I. Information papers issued since last meeting

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

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(01) — List of follow-up actions

LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 26 January 2015 –

- (a) Policy briefing on environmental initiatives in connection with the Policy Address 2015;
- (b) Provision of sewerage in Yuen Long and Port Shelter; and
- (c) Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment.

3. The Chairman said that the next regular meeting would be advanced to start at 2 p.m. and extended to end at 5 p.m. to allow sufficient time for discussion.

Action

4. The Chairman also reminded members that a special meeting had been scheduled for Tuesday, 6 January 2015 at 9 a.m. to receive public views on "Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System and its related impacts on the environment".

III. 233DS – Sludge Treatment Facilities

(LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(03) — Administration's paper on "233DS – Sludge Treatment Facilities"

LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(04) — Background brief on "Sludge Treatment Facilities" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

5. The Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DDEP(2)") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to increase the approved project estimate ("APE") of 233DS – Sludge Treatment Facilities ("STF") by \$307.9 million from \$5,154.4 million to \$5,462.3 million in money-of-the-day prices due to the need to increase the provision for price adjustment.

Operation of STF

6. Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Tony TSE enquired about the treatment capacity and future expansion plan of STF. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) ("ADEP(EI)") advised that STF would have a design capacity of 2 000 tonnes of sludge per day. Upon the completion of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme ("HATS") Stage 2A and the extension and upgrading of some existing sewage treatment works ("STWs"), it was anticipated that the total amount of sludge generated in Hong Kong would substantially increase from the current 900 tonnes per day to some 1 300 to 1 500 tonnes per day by end 2015 and subsequently to 2 000 tonnes per day by 2020s. As STF had a design capacity of 2 000 tonnes of sludge per day, it should have adequate capacity to handle the anticipated increase in the quantity of sludge requiring disposal.

7. Mr Tony TSE sought explanation on the delay in the operation of STF Phase 1 from the end of 2012 to early 2015. DDEP(2) advised that the reasons for the delay were mainly two-fold. Firstly, upon the completion of the tendering process, the returned tender prices for the project had been higher than expected. After negotiation, the tender as approved by the Central Tender Board according to the established tendering procedures was finally awarded

Action

and the project commenced in October 2010. Secondly, since STF was a complicated project, the contractor had encountered considerable difficulties during construction. There had been another 12 months' delay from the original works schedule. Despite the delay, DDEP(2) assured members that STF Phase 1 would be able to meet the anticipated increase in the quantity of sludge requiring disposal by 2015. When STF Phase 2 came on-stream by 2016, the entire facilities could treat 2 000 tonnes of sludge a day at maximum capacity. ADEP(EI) supplemented that as stipulated in the Design-Build-and-Operate ("DBO") contract of STF, if the contractor failed to adhere to the works schedule, the Administration could seek compensation from the contractor for the delay. Notwithstanding this, under the Contract Price Fluctuation System, the Government was still required to adjust the monthly payments to contractors to cover market fluctuation in labour and material costs.

Admin

8. Mr Tony TSE considered it unreasonable for the Government to bear the extra costs arising from increases in labour wages and construction material prices given that the project was implemented under a DBO contract arrangement. He requested the Administration to provide a written explanation in this regard after the meeting. Mr Albert CHAN and Mr Frankie YICK also shared similar views that a contractor should bear the increases in labour and construction costs of a project which was implemented under a DBO contract arrangement. They requested the Administration to provide information on the different procurement approaches for public works projects, e.g. the DBO approach and the Build-Operate-Transfer (commonly known as "BOT") approach, including the criteria for adopting individual approaches.

Admin

9. Mr WU Chi-wai sought elaboration on how the Administration would seek compensation from the contractor for the losses incurred in works delay. DDEP(2) responded that the Administration was seeking legal advice on the appropriate actions to be taken.

10. In reply to Mr WU Chi-wai's enquiry about the energy recovery from sludge incinerated by STF, ADEP(EI) advised that there would be four incineration units in STF, which were specifically designed for treating sewage sludge and each had a treatment capacity of about 500 tonnes of sludge per day. It was anticipated that when STF reached its full capacity of treating 2 000 tonnes of sludge a day, it would generate about 2 MW electricity for exporting to the public power grid. The Administration would negotiate with the power company the terms of sales and the corresponding electricity tariffs would become a source of public revenue.

11. In response to Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's enquiry about the operating cost of STF, ADEP(EI) advised that the operating cost of STF was estimated to be about \$220 million per year. DDEP(2) added that the project was implemented under a DBO contract arrangement and the contractual operation period was

Action

15 years. The operating cost of STF would be paid under the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD")'s departmental recurrent expenditure.

Increase in APE

12. Noting from the Administration that the actual price deflators were 4.7% per annum in average from 2009 to 2013, Mr Kenneth LEUNG enquired whether the rate of change in the actual price deflators was mainly attributed to the increases in the wage level of construction workers and prices of construction materials. DDEP(2) advised that according to the original APE of STF, labour wages accounted for about one-third of the price adjustment of the project. ADEP(EI) advised that construction material costs and construction worker wages under the civil engineering contract had been taken into account in calculating the actual price adjustment. The construction materials used in the STF project included aggregates, cement, steel reinforcement, timber formworks, etc. As requested by Mr LEUNG and Mr KWOK Wai-keung, the Administration undertook to provide actual and estimated statistics on the respective percentage increases in labour wages and construction material price index of the project in each year from 2009 to 2018.

Admin

13. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok noted that the original APE of STF had been approved by the Finance Committee in June 2009 when the global financial tsunami occurred. Against this background, the surging material costs and labour wages in recent years might not be accurately quantified when the original APE was made. He expressed concern about whether the proposed increase in APE was adequate to cover the anticipated increase in construction costs in future. DDEP(2) advised that when working out the proposed increase in APE, the Administration had taken into account the actual increases in labour wages and construction material prices over the past few years as well as the projected movement of prices of public sector building and construction output. The proposed increase in APE would cover both STF Phases 1 and 2 and save for major unforeseen circumstances would not be increased further.

14. Referring to Enclosure 3 to the Administration's paper, Mr Albert CHAN noted with concern that there were substantial differences between the original APE and the latest project estimate of different expenditure items under the STF project. ADEP(EI) advised that the variations reflected the differences between the awarded tender and the original APE in pricing different project items. Despite the variations, the difference between the total amount of the original APE and the latest project estimate was not substantial. Mr CHAN criticized the Administration for not providing accurate financial estimates for the STF project. He requested the Administration to provide reasons for the differences between the APE and the latest project estimate of different expenditure items as set out in Enclosure 3 to the Administration's paper.

Admin

Action

Drawdown of project contingencies

15. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the drawdown of project contingencies. DDEP(2) responded that a provision of \$428.7 million had been made for project contingencies. Due to tender outcome, \$111.1 million had been deployed from the project contingencies to meet the higher-than-expected tender price. Of the remaining balance of \$317.6 million of project contingencies, \$200 million would be reserved to meet costs arising from claims during construction of the works, valuation of works during finalization of the project account and unforeseeable circumstances, etc. For example, it might be possible for the Administration to utilize part of the \$200-million project contingencies for the installation of new facilities to treat bottom ash generated from the incineration process for recycling as construction materials. In the meantime, an amount of \$117.6 million of project contingencies would also be released to partly offset the increase in price adjustment of \$425.5 million. As such, a shortfall of \$309.7 million remained to be met.

16. Mr WU Chi-wai doubted whether the study on the treatment of bottom ash should be included as an expenditure item under the scope of project contingencies. ADEP(EI) explained that the treatment of ash was closely related to the operation of STF and the Administration should take initiative to adopt any new technologies to reuse or recycle the bottom ash generated from the incineration process of STF. In this connection, such measures should be regarded as an expenditure item under the scope of project contingencies. DDEP(2) supplemented that any enhancement works which helped to enhance the environmental performance of STF would fall within the scope of project contingencies. Notwithstanding the Administration's explanation, Mr WU requested the Administration to explain what kinds of expenditure items could be utilized under the project contingencies, as well as whether the study on the treatment of bottom ash fell within the scope of project contingencies.

Admin

17. Noting that an amount of \$117.6 million of project contingencies would be released to partly offset the increase in price adjustment of \$425.5 million, Mr KWOK Wai-keung opined that the increase in price adjustment should not be met by project contingencies as the latter should be used as buffer against unforeseeable circumstances. DDEP(2) explained that based on the latest assumptions, the Administration estimated that \$200 million of project contingencies were appropriate and adequate to meet costs arising from claims during construction of the works, valuation of works during finalization of the project account and unforeseeable circumstances, etc., in the contractual period of STF of 15 years. As such, an amount of \$117.6 million of project contingencies could be released to partly offset the increase in price adjustment.

Action

Management of marine fill and marine disposal of dredged/excavated sediment

18. Mr Christopher CHUNG commented that the Administration had failed to discourage unnecessary dredging of sediments and monitor marine disposal operations. To protect the marine environment and make the best use of the limited capacity of open sea disposal grounds, he enquired whether STF would provide treatment for dredged/excavated sediment.

Admin 19. ADEP(EI) responded that STF would only provide treatment for sewage sludge generated from HATS and other regional STWs. On dredging of sediments, the Civil Engineering and Development Department was responsible for working out a management framework for dredged sediments to ensure that any marine disposal operations would not cause unacceptable impact to the marine environment. The Administration undertook to provide information on the management of marine fill and marine disposal of dredged/excavated sediment for members' reference. The Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") also agreed that the Administration should make it clear that STF was a dedicated outlet for the handling of sludge arising from HATS and STWs to avoid misunderstanding.

Clerk 20. As requested by Mr Steven HO, the Chairman directed that the management of marine fill and marine disposal of dredged/excavated sediment be included in the list of outstanding items for discussion by the Panel.

Concluding remarks

21. The Chairman invited members to indicate whether they agreed that the Administration might submit the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration. As no member indicated objection, the Chairman concluded that the Panel agreed that the Administration might submit the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration.

IV. Implementation of the extension of the Plastic Shopping Bag Charging to all retail outlets

(LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(05) — Administration's paper on "Implementation of the extension of the Plastic Shopping Bag Charging to all retail outlets"

LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(06) — Updated background brief on "Environmental Levy Scheme on Plastic Shopping Bags" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

Action

22. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Compliance) ("ADEP(EC)") briefed members on the trade facilitation and publicity actions to prepare for the implementation of the extension of the Plastic Shopping Bag ("PSB") Charging which would take effect on 1 April 2015.

Implementation of the extended PSB Charging

23. Mr Albert CHAN objected the implementation of the Environmental Levy Scheme on PSB ("the Levy Scheme") which was launched on 7 July 2009 as the first mandatory Producer Responsibility Scheme ("PRS"). He opined that the Administration should put in place a comprehensive and holistic waste management plan setting out the whole spectrum of waste issues ranging from waste reduction, recycling and recovery to disposal, as otherwise the implementation of various PRSs would not serve any useful purpose in the long run if the public continued to generate a large amount of waste. He also criticized the Administration for using plastic bags and excessive packaging on its own events. For example, the Administration had been using large plastic bags for the collection of yard waste. USEN took note of Mr CHAN's comments.

24. Mr James TO sought clarification on the application of the extended PSB Charging in various scenarios. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Management Policy) ("ADEP(WMP)") explained that under the law, a retailer would be required to charge a customer not less than \$0.5 for each PSB provided to that customer at the time of sale for promoting the goods or otherwise in connection with the sale, irrespective of the type of business of the retailer or where the sales transaction was completed, unless the PSB was sold at a price of \$5 or more. Decisions on prosecution in individual cases would be made having regard to the actual circumstances of the cases.

25. Mr WONG Ting-kwong said that he did not support PSB Charging as he doubted the effectiveness of the scheme in reducing the excessive use of PSBs. He held the view that the scheme might have potential implications on the operation of retail outlets, particularly those small and medium enterprises ("SMEs"). Conflicts between customers and retailers might also arise over whether PSB charges should be collected while the Administration might not have sufficient manpower to conduct surprise checks at retail outlets and conduct follow up investigations.

26. USEN emphasized that the Administration would not change its plan as the extended PSB Charging would come into full implementation on 1 April 2015 and any review could only take place after implementation when effectiveness could be assessed. ADEP(WMP) supplemented that under the

Action

extended PSB Charging, a seller of goods by retail should charge the customer an amount not less than \$0.5 for each PSB provided. However, plastic bag wholesalers would not be subject to the charging requirements.

27. Mr WONG Ting-kwong did not accept the Administration's explanations. He held the view that the imposition of environmental levy at the wholesale level would be more effective in addressing the problem of indiscriminate use of PSBs. PSB Charging should also target importers of PSBs and PSB charge should be levied at the import level.

28. Mr Vincent FANG also did not support PSB Charging. He echoed Mr WONG Ting-kwong's views that the scheme might not be effective in reducing the excessive use of PSBs and would lead to difficulties in compliance and enforcement given the unclear criteria for exemption. He opined that the Administration should formulate other complementary measures, for example, promoting the use of reusable shopping bags or biodegradable plastic bags, to encourage the public to reduce the use of PSBs. In response, ADEP(WMP) stressed that after the implementation of the Levy Scheme, the number of PSBs distributed to customers by registered retailers had been reduced significantly by up to 90%. Although the number of PSBs disposed of at landfills had increased in recent years according to the landfill surveys, the Administration would continue to organize publicity and public education activities to help reinforce the green message of using reusable shopping bags.

29. As regards the exemption arrangements under the extended PSB Charging, ADEP(WMP) explained that free distribution of PSBs would be banned at all points of retail sale of goods, and no less than \$0.5 should be charged for each PSB provided to customers, except for exemptions given on food hygiene grounds. However, plastic bags provided in the course of services (e.g. by laundry business) would not be subject to the charging requirements. Drawing reference from the overwhelming public support for the extension of PSB Charging, it was envisaged that the habit of "Bring Your Own Bag" ("BYOB") would continue to gain prevalence in the community. As regards the requests by Mr Vincent FANG for statistics on the reduction in the number of PSBs distributed by prescribed retailers and the use of large black plastic garbage bags for waste collection after the implementation of the Levy Scheme, ADEP(WMP) undertook to provide relevant statistics where available.

Admin

30. Noting the rapid growth in the number of tourists travelling to Hong Kong, the Chairman enquired how the Administration would publicize the upcoming extension of PSB Charging to them to prevent unnecessary conflicts between retailers and tourists over whether PSB charge should be collected. ADEP(EC) assured members that the Administration would step up publicity among tourists at various immigration control points to promote the extended PSB Charging to tourists visiting Hong Kong.

Action

31. Mr Gary FAN asked about the statistics on the municipal solid waste ("MSW") generated by tourists in Hong Kong. USEN responded that the MSW generated by tourists would mix up with other wastes in the waste stream. It was therefore difficult to have reliable statistics in this regard. Nevertheless, she expected that upon the introduction of MSW charging, waste producers would be more conscious about the amount of waste they generated and more efforts would be made in compiling reliable statistics on different types of MSW generated in Hong Kong.

32. In response to Mr KWOK Wai-keung's enquiry about the enforcement of the extended PSB Charging, ADEP(EC) advised that under the extended PSB Charging, a fixed penalty notice of \$2,000 would be issued to retailers found not charging for PSBs provided at the time of sale while oral warning would not be given beforehand. To facilitate the retailers to prepare for the implementation of the extended PSB Charging, the Administration had commenced extensive trade facilitation and publicity activities to arouse the awareness of the retail trade. Enforcement officers would show their warrant cards for identification when executing their duties.

Retention of PSB charge by retailers

33. Mr WONG Ting-kwong criticized the Administration for adopting a "retention" approach whereby a seller would retain the PSB charge collected without the need of remitting it to the Government. He opined that the Administration should require all retailers to submit the PSB charge collected to the Government for environmental purposes. The Chairman enquired whether and how the Administration would encourage the retail trade to use the PSB charge collected by them to support environmental causes. ADEP(EC) responded that the Hong Kong Retail Management Association ("HKRMA") had taken the initiative to encourage its members to favourably consider designating revenue raised from the PSB charge for environmental protection. The Administration would also facilitate collaboration between retailers and green groups to make use of PSB charge to support the organization of environmental protection activities.

34. Mr Gary FAN also expressed reservation about the "retention" approach and the removal of the record keeping requirements of the Levy Scheme. He commented that after the removal of the record keeping requirements, there would not be any means to assess the effectiveness and monitor the compliance of the extended PSB Charging.

35. USEN stressed that the removal of the record keeping requirements would not undermine the objective of the extension of PSB Charging to inculcate behavioral change of customers on using less PSBs. To facilitate the

Action

retail trade to prepare for the implementation of the extended PSB Charging, the Administration had commenced extensive trade facilitation and publicity activities to arouse the awareness of retailers. Key messages targeting both the general public and the retail trade on the implementation details of the extended PSB Charging would be disseminated through various public media and channels, such as TV and radio announcements of public interests.

36. ADEP(EC) advised that during the initial launch of the extended PSB Charging, the Administration would engage trained contract personnel to be stationed at major retail hotspots to help explain the charging requirements to customers and provide support to retailers. The Administration would also reach out to about 20 000 to 30 000 small retailers to publicize the commencement of the extended PSB Charging. After the implementation of the scheme on 1 April 2015, the Administration would conduct random checks and mystery shopping at retail outlets of different districts to help monitor the compliance of the extended PSB Charging. A dedicated hotline would also be set up for the public to make reports of suspected violations. EPD would then conduct follow up investigations to the reports.

37. Mr Gary FAN remained unconvinced. He criticized that the removal of the record keeping requirements would not only undermine the deterrent effect against non-compliance of the extended PSB Charging, but would also extend the reporting obligation to customers. He further requested the Administration to provide statistics on the import of PSBs after the implementation of the Levy Scheme.

Admin

Trade facilitation and publicity programmes

38. Mr KWOK Wai-keung sought elaboration on how the Administration would facilitate retailers, in particular SMEs, to prepare for the implementation of the extension of the PSB Charging which would take effect on 1 April 2015. ADEP(EC) acknowledged that some small retailers might not be aware of the implementation of the PSB Charging and omit the collection of PSB charge inadvertently. To get the retail trade prepared for the PSB Charging, the Administration would stage necessary public and public education programmes on district level. For example, briefings at each of the 18 districts targeting at local small retailers in the districts were being held in collaboration with the District Councils. The Administration would also reach out to about 20 000 to 30 000 small retailers to publicize the commencement of the PSB Charging. Promotion and advertisements would be conducted through various public media and channels.

39. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok noted that since its implementation in 2009, the Levy Scheme had yielded positive results as reflected by an increase in the number of people bringing their own shopping bags. As the extended PSB Charging

Action

would be implemented on 1 April 2015, the Administration should further promote the BYOB habit as part of Hong Kong's green culture to encourage the public to switch to reusable shopping bags. The Administration should also step up its efforts in public education and publicity while continuing the liaison with the retail trade to facilitate compliance with the extended PSB Charging.

40. In response to Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's further enquiry about the implementation of the voluntary reporting system under which retailers would be encouraged to provide information on their PSBs usage on a yearly basis, ADEP(EC) responded that the Administration had explored with HKRMA the feasibility of the reporting system and how the retail trade could publish the aggregate distribution figures of PSBs on an annual basis. As discussed, HKRMA would act as a single platform to collate figures provided by retailers and help release the aggregate figures to EPD which would release the figures on an annual basis. HKRMA had been encouraging their members to participate in the voluntary reporting system to provide information and statistics on the use of PSBs with a view to monitoring the situation of PSB distribution and the effectiveness of the extended PSB Charging.

Use of other types of bags

41. Mr Frankie YICK pointed out that PSB Charging should aim at changing consumers' behavior in using PSBs rather than collecting PSB charge from them. If consumers did not minimize the use of PSBs and adopt the habit of BYOB, the scheme would be in vain. He also expressed concern that there might be a drastic increase in the distribution of non-woven bags after the implementation of the extended PSB Charging on 1 April 2015. Separately, he was aware that it was common for property management companies to give out plastic garbage bags to residents, but many such garbage bags were unused ending up as waste.

42. ADEP(WMP) responded that non-woven bags were made of plastic materials and hence were subject to PSB charge. In any case, the Administration would embark on a series of publicity and public education programmes to raise public awareness of BYOB. As regards the wastage of garbage bags, ADEP(WMP) advised that the direction of MSW charging was to mandate the use of pre-paid designated garbage bags for MSW disposal. The Administration would work on the design of the pre-paid designated garbage bags to ensure that they would be functionally suitable for use by households in Hong Kong.

43. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the use of biodegradable garbage bags, ADEP(WMP) explained that the biodegradability of plastic materials was mostly valid only in laboratory settings with carefully controlled background environment in moisture, sunlight, temperature, etc. which might not reflect the actual situation in landfills. In this connection, the

Action

Administration would not require that all PSBs used in Hong Kong should be biodegradable.

V. Report of the Delegation of the Panel on Environmental Affairs on its duty visit to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden to study these countries' experience on thermal waste treatment facilities

(LC Paper No. CB(1)336/14-15(07) — Report on the duty visit to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden to study these countries' experience on thermal waste treatment facilities)

44. Members noted the Report of the Delegation of the Panel on its duty visit to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden to study these countries' experience on thermal waste treatment facilities. The Chairman advised that according to Rule 29A(f) of the House Rules, the Report would be submitted to the House Committee at its meeting on 19 December 2014.

VI. Any other business

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:25 am.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 February 2015