

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)1993/15-16

(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/FE

**Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 14 June 2016, at 2:00 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

- Members present** : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu
- Members absent** : Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau

**Public Officers : Item III  
attending**

Mr Kenneth CHAN Siu-yum  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 1

Dr Gloria TAM Lai-fan, JP  
Controller, Centre for Food Safety  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Dr LEE Siu-yuen, JP  
Assistant Director (Food Surveillance and Control),  
Centre for Food Safety  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

**Item IV**

Miss Vivian LAU, JP  
Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene

Mrs Avia LAI, JP  
Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene  
(Administration and Development)

Miss Diane WONG Shuk-han  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 2

Mr CHIU Yu-chow  
Assistant Director (Grade Management and Development)  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

**Item V**

Mr Christopher WONG Kwok-bun, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 1

Ms Hanny LAM Shuk-ye  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 3

Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP  
Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation

Dr Thomas SIT Hon-chung  
Assistant Director (Inspection and Quarantine)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr Mary CHOW Ka-wai  
Senior Veterinary Officer (Animal Management) Development  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Josephine SO  
Chief Council Secretary (2) 2

**Staff in attendance** : Miss Carrie WONG  
Assistant Legal Adviser 4

Ms Wendy LO  
Senior Council Secretary (2) 2

Mr Roger CHUNG  
Council Secretary (2) 2

Miss Emma CHEUNG  
Legislative Assistant (2) 2

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1610/15-16 and CB(2)1637/15-16)

The minutes of the meetings held on 2 February 2016 and 12 April 2016 were confirmed.

**II. Information papers issued since the last meeting**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1674/15-16(01) and CB(2)1692/15-16(01))

2. Members noted that the following papers had been issued since the last meeting:

- (a) referral from the Public Complaints Office of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat on Government's policies relating to the provision of public markets; and
- (b) letter dated 6 June 2016 from Hon CHAN Han-pan concerning the preventive and control measures adopted by the Administration to address the problem of biting midges.

**III. Implementation of the Food and Drugs (Composition and Labelling) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulation 2014**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1675/15-16(01) and (02))

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Assistant Director (Food Surveillance and Control) of the Centre for Food Safety ("AD(FS&C)/CFS") updated members on the implementation of the Food and Drugs (Composition and Labelling) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulation 2014 ("the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation"), details of which were set out in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(01)). Members also noted the information note prepared by the LegCo Secretariat on the subject (LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(02)).

Implementation and enforcement

4. The Deputy Chairman noted that for the period from 13 December 2015 (the date when the requirements on nutritional composition and nutrition labelling of infant formula came into effect) to 31 May 2016, the Centre for Food Safety ("CFS") collected 40 samples of infant formula products for nutrient content analysis. He enquired about the details of the sampling method adopted and the test results.

5. AD(FS&C)/CFS advised that CFS had examined the nutrition labels of 44 infant formulae available in the market. All were found with satisfactory results. Regarding the 40 samples collected for nutrient content analysis, while 10 samples were awaiting test results, the rest of the samples were found to have complied with the legal requirements. In addition, CFS had collected 20 samples for fluoride testing, all with satisfactory results. The fluoride content of these products did not exceed the maximum level stipulated in the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation. The Deputy Chairman considered it necessary for the Administration to collect more samples for nutrient content analysis with a view to ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the test results. AD(FS&C)/CFS responded that the 40 samples collected for nutrient content analysis came from 34 formula products presently available in the market. CFS would conduct another round of sampling and nutrient tests when formula products which had yet to be tested arrived at Hong Kong later.

6. Mr SIN Chung-kai opined that apart from collecting samples for laboratory testing of nutrient content, the Administration should explore other more effective ways to enforce the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation. He suggested that consideration be given to requiring the manufacturers/exporters concerned to provide certificates issued by a third party which showed the nutrient content of their formula products.

Action

7. AD(FS&C)/CFS responded that CFS had conducted nutrient content analysis on all formula products available in the market. While 10 samples were awaiting test results, the rest of the samples collected were found to have complied with the legal requirements. She stressed that if discrepancy was identified with the information on the nutrition labels through laboratory tests, the manufacturer/exporter/importer concerned would be required to provide an explanation.

8. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry, AD(FS&C)/CFS advised that the definition of infant formula was provided in the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation to mean (a) a product that, according to its descriptions or instructions for use, was intended for consumption as a substitute for human breast milk that was specially manufactured to satisfy, by itself, the nutritional requirements of persons of any age up to and including 12 months until the introduction of appropriate complementary feeding (even if it was also claimed in the descriptions or instructions, if applicable, to be suitable for consumption by persons of any age over 12 months); or (b) a product marked or labelled as "infant formula" or "嬰兒配方產品", or with any other words of similar meaning.

9. Pointing out that in some overseas countries, there were no specific nutrition labelling requirements for follow-up formula products, the Chairman was concerned that overseas manufacturers might be unwilling to re-package their formula products specifically to fulfil Hong Kong's nutrition labelling requirements. Eventually, overseas manufacturers would give up the Hong Kong market and this would reduce the food choices of local consumers. The Chairman called on the Administration to study the impact of the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation on the supply of formula products to Hong Kong.

10. AD(FS&C)/CFS responded that the Administration had studied the supply of formula products in Hong Kong before the implementation of the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation, and would continue to gauge the views of stakeholders and collect relevant data for analysis on the impact of the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation. Ms Cyd HO considered that should there be case where overseas manufacturers withdrew from the Hong Kong market, the Administration should look into the reasons behind their withdrawal and ascertain whether it was due to non-compliance with the nutritional composition and labelling requirements as set out in the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation.

Exemptions for formula products of small package size

11. Mr WONG Kwok-hing noted that the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation exempted products packed in small packages (i.e. formula products packed in a container with a total surface area of less than 250 cm<sup>2</sup> or prepackaged food for infants and young children packed in a container with a total surface area of less than 100 cm<sup>2</sup>) from the nutrition labelling requirements. He expressed worries that unscrupulous manufacturers and suppliers might pack for sale their formula products in small packages to circumvent the requirements in the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation. He enquired how the Administration would monitor the exempted products.

12. AD(FS&C)/CFS responded that the Administration exempted products packed in a container with a small surface area from the nutritional labelling requirements because such container was too small to be labelled by the trade with all the required nutrition information in a legible font size. However, if products in small packages were packed together and sold in a container with a total surface area of equal or more than the exemption limit, they would not be exempted and nutrition labels had to be affixed at the outer packaging of the products as required by the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation. Controller of CFS added that the Amendment (No. 2) Regulation was devised with reference to the Codex Alimentarius Commission standards, prevailing international practice as well as local market situation. The Administration would monitor and review the exemption arrangement from time to time in the light of prevailing circumstances.

**IV. Fee proposals for the Private Columbaria Bill**  
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(03))

13. At the invitation of the Chairman, Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene ("DFEH") briefed members on the Government's fee proposals in respect of various service items under the Private Columbaria Ordinance ("the Ordinance") upon its commencement, as detailed in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(03)).

14. While expressing support for the adoption of the "user pays" principle in determining the relevant fees and charges, Mr SIN Chung-kai expressed concern about the relatively high service charge (i.e. \$390,000) for issue of licence to private columbarium whose ash interment capacity in approved plan exceeded 50 000. The Deputy Chairman raised a similar concern and asked about the considerations behind the proposed five fee bandings (i.e. fee item (iii) (a) to (e) under paragraph 5) for issue of licence to private columbaria.

Action

15. DFEH responded that in line with the "user pays" principle, the fees and charges were set at levels sufficient to recover the full cost of providing the services. In order to reflect the difference in the processing cost for private columbaria of different scales, the Administration proposed five fee bandings for the issue of a specified instrument on the basis of the ash interment capacity (for licence) or ash interment quantity (for exemption or temporary suspension of liability). In proposing the fees and charges, the Administration had made reference to relevant information concerning private columbaria collected under the Notification Scheme launched in 2014 upon the introduction of the Private Columbaria Bill ("the Bill"). The information so collected had provided useful reference for the Administration in determining the five fee bandings for issue of specified instruments.

16. DFEH further said that the service charge for issue of a licence to a private columbarium whose ash interment capacity in approved plan exceeded 50 000 was in fact as low as \$7.8 per niche space and the validity period for the licence could last up to a maximum of 10 years. The Administration considered the proposed fee of \$390,000 reasonable.

17. Noting that the estimated revenue to be generated from the fee proposals would be \$10.8 million per annum for the first two years, and thereafter \$5.3 million per annum from the third to sixth year, the Deputy Chairman asked how such estimations were arrived at. DFEH explained that only the net expense (e.g. the manpower resources and time directly involved) for processing applications for issue of specified instruments was considered as the cost of providing the services. Applicants would be required to pay the fees and charges at levels sufficient to recover the full cost, only upon issue of the specified instruments. Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Administration and Development) ("DDFEH") added that the actual amount of revenue to be generated would depend on the number of applications that might be received and the time taken to process these applications by the Private Columbaria Licensing Board ("the Licensing Board") which would be set up under the Ordinance.

18. The Chairman and the Deputy Chairman asked whether a review on the fees would be conducted in future. DFEH said that the fees to be charged would be prescribed by way of a Schedule to the Bill. The Secretary for Food and Health ("SFH") might amend the relevant Schedule by notice published in the Gazette and such notice was a piece of subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting by LegCo. It was the plan of the Administration to review, among others, the fees and charges on a regular basis, after the implementation of the new licensing regime for regulating private columbaria.

Action

19. Noting that the Bill provided that the validity period of a licence must not exceed 10 years, Ms Cyd HO enquired about the criteria for determining the validity period of a licence to be granted to a private columbarium. She was of the view that in the interest of business certainty, a licence valid for a period of 10 years should be granted except in cases where the premises concerned was under a tenancy of less than 10 years. DFEH and DDFEH advised that the Licensing Board would normally grant a 10 years' licence to private columbaria fulfilling the licensing requirements except in circumstances where the premises concerned was under a tenancy of less than 10 years. The actual validity period of a licence would be determined by the Licensing Board on a case-by-case basis, having regard to all relevant factors. The Chairman suggested that SFH should, during the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill, make clear in his speech the Government's policy intention to grant a 10 years' licence to private columbaria under normal circumstances. Ms HO considered that the Administration should provide explanation if a licence was granted to a private columbarium for a shorter term due to other considerations.

*(The Chairman ordered a break of five minutes.)*

*(The meeting resumed at 3:05 pm.)*

**V. Code of practice on animal trading**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1675/15-16(04) and (05))

20. At the invitation of the Chairman, Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation ("DAFC") briefed members on the proposed Codes of Practice ("CoPs") for licensed animal traders trading in dogs and licensed dog breeders, which would be attached as part of the licence conditions under the new licensing regime when the Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Animal Traders) (Amendment) Regulation 2016 ("the Amendment Regulation") came into operation, as detailed in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(04)). Members also noted the information note prepared by the LegCo Secretariat on the subject (LC Paper No. CB(2)1675/15-16(05)).

Factors to be considered in determining whether to grant a licence

21. Mr SIN Chung-kai considered that DAFC should take into account the requirements in the land leases and deeds of mutual covenant ("DMCs") in considering licence application and/or renewal of the Dog Breeder Licence Category A ("DBLA"), the Dog Breeder Licence Category B ("DBLB") and the Animal Trader Licence. He suggested that the Administration should verify with the Owners' Corporation concerned if dog keeping was allowed at



Action

the applicant's premises upon receipt of an application for a licence. Members, including the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, Mr SIN, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr Alvin YEUNG, sought clarification on whether DAFC would grant or renew a licence if the land leases and DMCs in relation to the premises contained provisions forbidding the keeping of dogs/animals.

22. DAFC and Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 3 responded with the following points:

- (a) in general, it was the responsibility of the applicant to ensure compliance with all the requirements imposed under the relevant legal document relating to the premises concerned, including the relevant provisions in DMCs. Application and enforceability of the relevant requirements set out in DMCs were outside the ambit of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD")'s regulatory power for the related licensing regime as provided for under the Public Health (Animals and Birds) Ordinance (Cap. 139); and
- (b) if there was evidence to indicate that any breach of the relevant provisions in the relevant DMCs might render it not suitable to use the premises concerned for the regulated activity, i.e. breeding of dogs in this case, or affect compliance with the relevant requirements, depending on the circumstances of the particular case, it might be one of the relevant factors for DAFC to take into account when considering whether or not to grant the licence.

23. Ms Claudia MO and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked how DAFC would handle such a case in which the Owners' Corporation disallowed the keeping of dogs at a licensed premises due to complaints or other reasons after DAFC's granting/renewal of the licence. DAFC responded that during the validity period of a licence, DAFC might cancel the licence if there was a breach of the licence condition. When considering applications for licence and/or renewal of licence, DAFC would take into account all relevant factors including a licensee's compliance with the law and the applicable licence conditions.

24. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the Administration would follow any formula or take into account the number of people living at the premises in considering whether to grant a DBLA licence. DAFC responded that upon receipt of a licence application, AFCD would arrange inspection to the concerned premises to ensure the applicant could fulfil the licence

Action

conditions, such as the provision of primary enclosures and exercise area for the dogs, before determining whether to grant a licence and the total number of dogs allowed to be kept therein. The total area required for keeping all the dogs was calculated by reference to the number of dogs kept on the premises and the area required for each dog. The area required for one dog varied according to the size of the dogs. Where necessary, AFCD would request licence applicants to provide further information to ensure their compliance with the relevant requirements.

Requirements in CoPs

*Training of licensees and their staff*

25. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that all licensees and their staff working at a licensed premises would be required under CoPs to receive structured training at a training institution recognized by AFCD. In his view, CoPs should specify clearly the minimum number of staff working at a licensed premises. He sought details on the training of the licensees and their staff, e.g. content and duration of the training programmes, examination method and qualification of the trainers, etc.

26. In response, DAFC and Senior Veterinary Officer (Animal Management) Development of AFCD ("SVO(AM)D/AFCD") made the following points:

- (a) regarding the requirement on staff establishment, since DBLA holders kept their dogs as pets and lived with them in a household under their care, these licensees might not employ staff. AFCD would however assess the number of staff required to perform the relevant duties at a DBLB licensed premises in light of the number of dogs kept by the licensee to ensure that adequate manpower was provided to meet the operational needs of that licensed premises and the welfare requirements of the dogs as detailed in the respective CoP for DBLB;
- (b) in drawing up the basic syllabus for the training programmes, AFCD had drawn reference from similar training programmes offered in other places, such as Singapore, and consulted the Animal Welfare Advisory Group;
- (c) the content and duration of the training programmes would vary depending on the type of licence applicable and the occupational position of individuals. As far as dog breeding activity was concerned, DBLA and DBLB holders must have a good

Action

understanding of the local legislation related to dogs, knowledge pertaining to animal welfare, basic requirements of dogs, hygiene condition of the environment, health care, first aid, grooming, as well as how to handle the dogs properly. Apart from the above subjects, licensees and their staff must also be familiar with genetics and hereditary diseases, dog breeding, dog mating, and dog whelping, etc;

- (d) licensees, their operational management personnel and staff would be required to enrol themselves at institutions in the open market which offered training programmes recognized by AFCD. Licensees must also keep record of the training attended for AFCD's inspection. AFCD would ensure that the preferred syllabus was covered in the programmes provided by such institutions, while licensees and their staff must attend the training programmes in person and pass the examination set by the institutions upon completion of training. The assessment results would have to be recognized by AFCD; and
- (e) so far, a number of institutions, including the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Hong Kong Kennel Club, the City University of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Continuous Learning Centre, had indicated interest in providing training programmes for licensees and their staff. These institutions had relevant experience in offering similar training programmes.

*Facility and space requirements*

27. Dr Helena WONG noted that general standards for licensed premises and enclosures for individual dogs, if required, were laid down in CoPs. She was concerned whether restricting the movement of dogs by use of primary enclosures on the part of DBLA holders would be in breach of any conditions in CoP for DBLA. SVO(AM)D/AFCD advised that the relevant CoP stated that dogs under breeding should generally be kept freely within the licensed premises under a household-setting and their movement should not be further restricted by use of primary enclosures unless there existed an overriding reason (e.g. for whelping or nursing a litter, isolation during oestrus or on the advice of a registered veterinary surgeon).

*Information provided to buyers*

28. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan noted that it would be stipulated in CoPs that all licensees should advise buyers, especially those who had not kept a dog

Action

before, to act responsibly and exercise a "duty of care" for the well-being of the dogs. She suggested that the Administration should request the licensees to provide their buyers with relevant information in this regard.

29. Assistant Director (Inspection and Quarantine) of AFCD ("AD(IQ)/AFCD") responded that AFCD had been working in close collaboration with various animal welfare organizations ("AWOs") in promoting the message on responsible pet ownership through different activities and training courses. As set out in CoPs, a licensed dog breeder should provide the new owner with the following information at no extra charge:

- (a) instructions on the feeding of the dog with a complete nutritious diet appropriate for its breed and age;
- (b) instructions on how to house-train a dog;
- (c) requirements for the licensing of dogs; and
- (d) basic training, socialization and care of the dog.

AFCD's enforcement and its manpower resources

30. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Ms Cyd HO and Ms Claudia MO were concerned about the practical difficulties in enforcing some of the requirements in CoPs, such as whether the licensees had provided the dogs with appropriate behaviour enrichments and adequate exercise time, whether the licensees had bred dogs in accordance with the ideal breeding age and frequency, and whether the licensees had provided socialization to the puppies, etc. These members considered that the Administration, in monitoring licensees' compliance with CoPs, should not rely solely on the records kept by the licensees on the breeding activities.

31. In response, DAFC and SVO(AM)D/AFCD advised that:

- (a) the primary objective of CoPs was to protect the welfare of dogs under the care and management of the licence holders at the licensed premises by placing a "duty of care" on the licensees. Detailed requirements were set out in CoPs based on the above principle and should be observed under the licensing regime. The requirements in CoPs were applicable to the licensed premises, licensees, any staff working at the licensed premises and all dogs within such premises at all times;

Action

- (b) all licensees must keep records for all breeding dogs and litters bred at a licensed premises. The records should be available for inspection by authorized officers of AFCD; and
- (c) CoPs contained enforceable requirements and best-practice recommendations. Those best-practice recommendations were incorporated into CoPs after discussion with members of the Animal Welfare Advisory Group comprising representatives of AWOs and veterinary surgeons, with a view to educating the public and further improving the standards of animal welfare.

32. Dr Helena WONG and Ms Claudia MO expressed concerns about the possible pressure on the manpower resources of AFCD in performing its regulatory work under the new licensing regime. They were worried whether AFCD, with its current manpower resources, could ensure licensees' compliance with the statutory requirements and licence conditions.

33. DAFC advised that to cope with the anticipated increase in workload, through the additional provision of seven permanent civil service posts and redeployment of staff currently engaged in duties related to the Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Animal Traders) Regulations (Cap. 139B), there would be some 30 staff members deployed to discharge duties in relation to the licensing of animal trading activities and enhancing the relevant control measures after commencement of the Amendment Regulation. AFCD would devise an appropriate enforcement strategy to optimize the utilization of its resources.

34. In response to Dr Helena WONG's enquiry about AFCD's inspection work after the implementation of the Amendment Regulation, SVO(AM)D/AFCD advised that upon receipt of a licence application, AFCD would arrange inspection to the concerned premises to ensure that the applicant could fulfil the licence conditions. During the validity period of a licence, authorized officers from AFCD would inspect the licensed premises and check the licensees' records on a regular basis to ensure their compliance with the statutory requirements and conditions attached to the licence.

35. In response to Ms Cyd HO's enquiry about the prosecution actions to be taken against those licensees who breached the requirements in CoPs, SVO(AM)D/AFCD advised that all licensees would be subject to one common condition, i.e. they must comply with CoPs applicable to their respective licences. Any breach of CoPs might be considered as a breach of licence condition, rendering the licensee liable to prosecution. Under the Amendment Regulation, the maximum penalty for breach of a licence condition was \$50,000.

### Implementation of the Amendment Regulation

36. In response to the enquiries raised by the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and Mr Alvin YEUNG on whether and when the Administration would review the new licensing regime, DAFC advised that it would keep in view the effectiveness of the new regulatory regime and report to the Panel on progress made in implementing the Amendment Regulation in around two years' time after the new regulatory regime had come into operation.

37. Ms Claudia MO said that inbreeding of dogs would result in genetic diseases. She called on the Administration to consider prohibiting inbreeding activities when reviewing the licensing regime. AD(IQ)/AFCD responded that genetic diseases might appear not only in inbreeding animals and most overseas countries did not have regulation over inbreeding activities.

38. Ms Claudia MO held the view that animals' lives should be respected. The requirements of CoPs were however far from adequate to safeguard animal welfare. She was worried that the Amendment Regulation might produce an unintended effect of legalizing private breeding of dogs. DAFC advised that the sale of one's own pet dogs and keeping for breeding and sale of dogs were excluded from the control of the existing licensing regime. The main object of the Amendment Regulation was to put such activity under regulation.

39. Dr Helena WONG asked whether the Administration would make public information about the licensees under the new regulatory regime. DAFC and SVO(AM)D/AFCD replied that the Administration would consider uploading licensees' information to AFCD's website after obtaining their consent.

## **VI. Any other business**

### Report of the Subcommittee on Issues Relating to Animal Welfare and Cruelty to Animals

40. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee on Issues Relating to Animal Welfare and Cruelty to Animals ("the Subcommittee") formed under the Panel had completed its work, and the report of the Subcommittee (LC Paper No. CB(2)1704/15-16) had been circulated for members' reference.

Action

Report of the Panel for submission to LegCo

41. As this meeting was the last meeting of the Panel in the current legislative session as well as in the Fifth LegCo, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank members, the Administration and the LegCo Secretariat for their support and contribution to the work of the Panel throughout the whole term.

42. The Chairman said that he would, in his capacity as the Panel Chairman, make a report on the work of the Panel in the 2015-2016 legislative session to the Council at its meeting of 6 July 2016.

43. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:26 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
24 August 2016