

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC247/16-17
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(7)

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 11th meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 11 February 2017, at 9:00 am

Members present:

Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Members absent:

Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim

[According to the Judgment of the Court of First Instance of the High Court on 14 July 2017, LEUNG Kwok-hung, Nathan LAW Kwun-chung, YIU Chung-yim and LAU Siu-lai have been disqualified from assuming the office of a member of the Legislative Council, and have vacated the same since 12 October 2016, and are not entitled to act as a member of the Legislative Council.]

Public officers attending:

Ms Elizabeth TSE Man-yee, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Carol YUEN, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ¹
Mr Alfred ZHI Jian-hong	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mrs Vicki KWOK WONG Wing-ki	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning)

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
--------------	-------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Derek LO	Chief Council Secretary (1) ⁵
Ms Ada LAU	Senior Council Secretary (1) ⁷
Mr Raymond SZETO	Council Secretary (1) ⁵
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1) ³
Miss Yannes HO	Legislative Assistant (1) ⁶

Item No. 2—FCR(2016-17)79**RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 30 NOVEMBER 2016****EC(2016-17)19****HEAD 44—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DEPARTMENT****Subhead 000—Operational Expenses**

The Chairman said that this item invited the Finance Committee ("FC") to approve the recommendation made by the Establishment Subcommittee at its meeting on 30 November 2016, i.e. the recommendation set out in the paper EC(2016-17)19, to create a supernumerary Principal Environmental Protection Officer post in the Environmental Protection Department with immediate effect upon approval by FC up to 31 March 2019 so as to lead the Food Waste Management Group ("FWMG") for implementing the various strategies set out in "A Food Waste and Yard Waste Plan for Hong Kong: 2014-2022" ("Food Waste Plan"). Some members requested separate voting on the recommendation at the FC meeting.

Measures to encourage businesses to use Organic Waste Treatment Facilities

2. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was dissatisfied with the absence of the Secretary for the Environment ("SEN") from today's meeting. Mr CHU referred to the meeting of the Panel on Environmental Affairs held on 24 October 2016 at which Mr Tommy CHEUNG expressed his concern about whether the development of Organic Waste Treatment Facilities ("OWTFs") by the Administration implied that it would charge commercial and industrial ("C&I") businesses for food waste treatment. Mr CHU also quoted from the minutes of the meeting the response given by SEN at that time, saying that according to SEN, "for the time being, the Administration did not intend to charge C&I establishments for their food waste delivered to OWTFs for recycling". Mr CHU asked, in the process of food waste separation, delivery and arrival at OWTFs for treatment, which of the aforesaid step(s) was/were covered by the "no charge" policy referred by the Administration. Mr YIU Si-wing also raised a similar question. Mr CHU enquired whether such "no charge" policy meant that subsidies would be provided to businesses for food waste treatment; if so, the justifications for providing subsidies; and whether conditions or timetables of implementation or cancellation had been set for such subsidy policy (if any). In the view of Mr CHU, if the Administration did not implement a mandatory C&I food waste recovery policy, it might not be able to

effectively regulate the sectors' behaviors towards food waste treatment or drive the trade to participate in source separation.

3. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that, in order to save costs, some C&I businesses did not deliver food waste to food waste treatment facilities for processing. Private food waste treatment operators in the market also said that the current treatment quantity of their facilities was significantly below the design capacity. Mr CHAN was worried that the construction of OWTFs might not be able to create sufficient economic incentives for C&I businesses to keenly deliver their food waste to OWTFs for treatment. He enquired how the Administration would deal with this situation. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked the Administration whether it would provide C&I businesses with incentives in respect of delivery services or fees and charges so as to increase the amount of food waste to be collected. She enquired about the number of OWTFs to be built by the Bureau and their completion timetables.

4. Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DDEP(2)") explained that the policy of not charging C&I sectors applied only to the treatment of food waste by OWTFs. In other words, C&I establishments would have to deliver food waste to OWTFs at their own cost. She supplemented that at present, C&I businesses were also paying for the delivery of waste (including food waste) to landfills or other waste treatment facilities out of their own pocket. In order to encourage the trade to deliver food waste to OWTFs for treatment and raise the usage of OWTFs, the Administration did not intend to impose charges upon the completion of OWTF Phase 1. In her view, this measure could attract businesses which currently delivered their food waste to landfills for disposal to directly transport food waste to OWTFs for treatment. The Administration hoped that this measure could encourage businesses to share part of the cost of food waste treatment starting from source separation. Noting Mr CHAN Hak-kan's concern, DDEP(2) advised that an active involvement in food waste treatment could help businesses improve their social image and attract customers who cared about environmental protection so as to open up markets. Such benefits were also economic incentives.

5. DDEP(2) advised that at the next stage, some other measures, such as mandatory source separation, might be needed to better tie in with the food waste treatment policy. The Administration had planned to submit a bill on municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging to the Legislative Council later this year to match up with the overall policies of municipal waste treatment. If the MSW charging policy was implemented, businesses would have greater demand for food waste treatment services and hence

greater incentive to make use of OWTFs starting from source separation. Although the Administration did not intend to provide food waste delivery services to businesses free of charge, it had actively assisted in linking up waste delivery service contractors with businesses, hoping that the former would consider opening up business opportunities by operating food waste delivery lines, thereby saving the cost borne by businesses. The Administration had planned to build five to six OWTFs under the Food Waste Plan, with the first one to be commissioned at the end of 2017. As for the remaining OWTFs, the Administration would conduct their tendering exercises and studies one after another.

Duration and performance indicators of the proposed post

6. Noting that the food waste reduction target was set for 2022 but the proposed post would merely last till 2019, Mr YIU Si-wing held that the Administration should set clear performance indicators for the proposed post as at 2019. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that he could hardly understand why the proposed post, which was responsible for performing and following up long-term tasks, would merely last till 2019. He urged the Administration for an explanation.

7. DDEP(2) explained that the responsibility of the proposed post was to monitor the completion of OWTF Phase 1 and the construction progress of OWTF Phase 2, which was expected to be commissioned in 2022. She understood that members were greatly concerned about whether the proposed post could be extended upon its expiry. She also acknowledged that policy initiatives for food waste treatment would have to be implemented continuously and would require manpower support in the long run. The Administration would conduct a timely review on manpower and operational needs of FWMG and take into account members' views in its consideration of seeking the conversion of the proposed post into a permanent post in due course.

8. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired about the performance indicators of the proposed post (e.g. the target of reducing food waste disposal) and whether the duties of the proposed post involved coordinating with other bureaux in respect of the implementation of food waste recycling policy, research and development as well as the promotion of food waste recycled products. Dr CHENG noted that food waste recycling operators did not think there was a market for their products.

9. DDEP(2) advised that one of the duties of the proposed post was to step up efforts in implementing strategies under the Food Waste Plan promulgated in 2014, with a view to meeting the target of reducing the amount of food waste disposed of at landfills by 40% by 2022. She pointed out that, after the launching of the Food Wise Hong Kong Campaign ("FWHKC"), the per capita disposal rate of food waste in 2015 dropped by 8% compared with that in 2014. In addition, upon the commissioning of the first two phases of OWTFs of which the construction would be monitored by the holder of the proposed post, OWTFs would have the capacity to treat half of the daily food waste generated by C&I businesses.

10. The Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates was launched in 2011. So far, 30 housing estates had applied for and had been granted the Environment and Conservation Fund ("ECF") to set up on-site food waste treatment facilities within their estates areas. The proposed post would continue to carry out relevant duties, including strengthening professional support given to schools at the next stage to assist them in conducting on-site food waste treatment, so as to raise social awareness about food waste reduction. Compost currently produced by the Administration's food waste treatment facilities in Kowloon Bay was widely popular among the agricultural sector.

11. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired whether the proposed post would be responsible for promoting food donation policies. Dr Junius HO was of the view that the holder of the proposed post should be more active in liaising with social welfare organizations to implement food donation programmes. Considering that the implementation of mandatory source separation was a requisite for effectively reducing MSW (including food waste), Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked whether any preliminary study on mandatory source separation (including making reference to overseas experiences) had been conducted in the past and how the proposed post would continue to carry out duties in this respect.

12. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning) ("ADEP(NC&IP)") supplemented that as food donation was one of the initiatives under the Food Waste Plan, the proposed post would be responsible for promoting food donation and preparing for conducting a study on mandatory food waste separation at source. Given that many businesses had registered as members of FWHKC, the proposed post would be required to keep on linking non-profit-making organizations with food donation businesses (e.g. stall keepers in markets), organizing dedicated personnel to make regular contact with businesses and non-profit-making organizations to

facilitate their pairing-up and continuing with the conduct of relevant policy studies. DDEP(2) advised that the Administration could not rule out the possibility that it might, in the future, introduce a policy on mandatory food waste separation at source but this had to depend on the actual situation in Hong Kong and the development of the bill on MSW charging. The proposed post would be responsible for the preparatory work for conducting the preliminary study, including making reference to overseas experiences. According to the information obtained from a brief look at similar foreign policies, no matter what policy initiatives would finally be taken by the Administration, a well-organized recovery network and good treatment facilities would be necessary.

13. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan asked how the holder of the proposed post would put through the five strategies of food waste management (i.e. reduction at source, food donation, recycling, food waste-to-energy and clean landfilling) and what their order of priority was. She remarked that as the Environment Bureau had published the Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022 ("the Blueprint") in 2013, she hoped that the duties of the proposed post would include assessing the effectiveness of the Blueprint.

14. DDEP(2) and ADEP(NC&IP) advised that both the Blueprint and the Food Waste Plan were the key initiatives of the Administration. The proposed post would mainly be responsible for continuing with the implementation of the Food Waste Plan (including promoting food waste reduction at source through FWHKC), extending food waste recovery, promoting on-site treatment facilities to schools and proceeding with the construction and planning of the first three phases of OWTFs.

Design capacity of OWTFs and food waste recovery network

15. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired whether sufficient food waste could be collected from the food waste collection network for subsequent treatment by OWTFs and, among such food waste, whether there were any unsold fresh food products collected from markets which were still in good condition but had been treated as food waste for disposal.

16. DDEP(2) advised that the design capacity of OWTF Phase 1, which was currently under construction, was 200 tonnes per day while that of OWTF Phase 2, which was at the tender stage, was 300 tonnes per day. It was expected that, upon their commissioning, OWTF Phase 1 and Phase 2 could handle almost half of daily food waste generated by the C&I sectors. According to the information provided by contractors, at the initial stage after the completion of OWTF Phase 1, there would be 80 to 100 C&I

businesses providing a total of about 100 tonnes of food waste to OWTFs for treatment each day and this amount, on the whole, met the targeted capacity set by the Bureau for OWTFs at the pilot stage. It was believed that after the pilot stage, businesses which had provided food waste before would continue to deliver their food waste to OWTFs for treatment. Therefore, the supply of food waste for treatment by OWTFs would be relatively stable. DDEP(2) pointed out that, regardless of what measures would be introduced to tie in with the food waste recovery and treatment policies, it was essential to have a well-organized recovery network and well-equipped recovery and treatment facilities.

Compost market and electricity output

17. Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Dr KWOK Ka-ki were concerned about whether compost produced by OWTFs would be in excess supply. Dr KWOK enquired whether such compost would be distributed for use by members of the public in need. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked whether OWTFs would consider developing products other than compost.

18. ADEP(NC&IP) supplemented that OWTF Phase 1 and Phase 2 would adopt anaerobic digestion and composting technologies to turn food waste into energy and compost. OWTF Phase 1 would mainly use food waste to generate electricity and it was estimated that the output would be sufficient for use by 3 000 households; compost would be a by-product. As for OWTF Phase 2, food waste would be used to generate electricity or biogas, depending on the operational mode of contractors. In its formulation of the Food Waste Plan in 2014, the Bureau had taken into account the size of the compost market in Hong Kong. Therefore, food waste would mainly be used by OWTFs for generating electricity, with its residual being used to produce compost for local markets such as organic farming, planting at estate gardens, roadside planting and landscape composting. The Administration would consider distributing compost for use by non-profit-making organizations, schools and members of the public. Pursuant to the agreement between the Administration and the operating contractors, the Government would distribute 10% of the compost produced for the use of relevant organizations. The contractors would have to submit proposals suggesting how the remaining products should be promoted and the Administration itself would also promote the use of compost.

19. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that the compost products of OWFTs had to obtain certification from the Hong Kong Organic Resource Centre of the Hong Kong Baptist University ("HKBU") before they could be used for organic farming. Otherwise, the relevant agricultural produce could not obtain organic certification. He asked the Administration about its current progress on applying for relevant certification. He pointed out that it was very important for those engaging in organic farming to obtain relevant certification for their produce. However, under the existing certification mechanism of HKBU, as the source of food waste could not be verified, compost produced from food waste would neither be accepted as organic compost nor used in organic farming. Mr CHU opined that if the Administration could assist local food waste treatment facilities operated by private sectors in obtaining organic certification, private food waste treatment operators would have the initiative to actively collect food waste and this would greatly reduce the cost of the Administration in supporting on-site treatment facilities.

20. ADEP(NC&IP) advised that OWTFs would establish a mechanism for verifying the source of food waste. It was believed that OWTF operators would also strive to expand the selling channels of their products. OWTFs would be open to the public to demonstrate the ways to use compost for farming.

Expenditure of OWTFs

21. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked the Administration for information on fees payable to operating contractors of OWTFs for food waste treatment. Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired about the respective total costs of treating one tonne of food waste by OWTFs and other food waste treatment facilities. Considering that the introduction of source reduction policies (including the enactment of legislation) might possibly be a more effective way to save treatment cost, he asked whether any study had been conducted in this regard.

22. ADEP(NC&IP) replied that in the agreement signed with contractors, there was a basic fee for treating the first 50 tonnes of food waste, while the treatment of the remaining food waste would be charged on a quantity basis. Taking into account the construction cost of OWTFs and calculating on a cost-sharing basis, the treatment fee would be about \$1,400 per tonne. Treatment cost for on-site food waste treatment facilities would range from \$10,000 to \$20,000 per tonne. He advised that even though there was a gap between the operating costs of the two types of facilities, the Administration was still in support of on-site food waste treatment and would support various local projects through ECF. While

the treatment costs incurred by different treatment methods might vary, generally speaking, the centralized treatment model of OWTFs was most cost-effective. He said that the construction cost of OWTF Phase 1 was \$1.6 billion in money-of-the-day prices. Given that the tendering exercise of OWTF Phase 2 and the conduct of study on OWTF Phase 3 were pending, information about their construction costs was not available.

23. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok considered that concerns over food waste treatment policies and facilities of OWTFs were wider policy issues. Members should probably follow up such concerns at other Panels or through other channels instead of raising questions at FC meetings.

Food donation

24. Dr Fernando CHEUNG advised that potential legal liabilities had deterred some C&I businesses from food donation. As a result, unsold food products, though edible, had become food waste. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung asked the Administration if it had considered introducing legislation similar to the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act ("Good Samaritan Act") to protect businesses which were willing to join food donation and enquired about the factors of consideration for not enacting such legislation.

25. Dr Junius HO suggested that a charitable institution or trust should be established under Section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance (Cap. 112) to represent the authorities in organizing food recovery and donation activities so as to save time from drafting and scrutinizing a piece of legislation modelling on the Good Samaritan Act and reduce waste caused by C&I businesses, which would have dumped unsold but edible food products for fear of liabilities.

26. DDEP(2) advised that food donation was one of the important strategies under the Food Waste Plan. Through ECF, the Administration had put in great efforts to pair up businesses with non-profit-making organizations so as to assist the former in giving away unsold and intact food products to the latter. The participating businesses and the benefiting non-profit-making organizations were required to sign a disclaimer to deal with legal liabilities. The Centre for Food Safety had also issued a set of safety guidelines on food recovery and donation. In the view of the Administration, if it had to introduce a piece of legislation which was similar to the Good Samaritan Act, it would have to conduct a series of studies and a detailed review on overseas practices beforehand. The support of a well-organized recovery network and well-equipped

infrastructure would also be necessary. At this stage, the Government had no plan to introduce legislation modelling on the Good Samaritan Act.

27. ADEP(NC&IP) advised that the Administration had contacted non-profit-making organizations which were interested in joining food donation activities and provided them with necessary assistance. Generally speaking, for non-profit-making organizations participating in food donation, insufficient funding and storage spaces were their common difficulties. The Administration had funded 20 projects through ECF, providing financial support of about \$32 million to non-profit-making organizations. It also assisted non-profit-making organizations in looking for sites to store the donated food that they had received.

Public education

28. Mr HUI Chi-fung considered that the success of the Food Waste Plan depended on the collaboration between businesses and members of the public. He enquired whether there were other relevant measures targeting at changing personal behaviors in addition to the construction of OWTFs for collecting and treating food waste generated by businesses. In his view, consideration should be given to conducting studies on other related policies simultaneously.

29. DDEP(2) acknowledged that public support and participation were essential to the success of the Food Waste Plan. FWHKC was a food waste reduction campaign implemented throughout the territory to encourage various sectors of the community, including C&I sectors and households, to make behavioral and habitual changes. Moreover, the "Food Wise Eateries" Scheme was launched, with a list of participating food eateries issued, to further reduce food waste. She said that, upon the implementation of the MSW charging policy, the public would better understand the benefits of food waste reduction at source, food waste recovery and food donation for the community as a whole. The Administration had been carrying out food waste recovery and treatment work at community level to allow public participation.

Legislative proposal

30. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered the construction of OWTFs for food waste treatment as a palliative. To reduce food waste, it was necessary to start with the policy of reduction at source, including legislative regulation. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and the Chairman each asked the Administration about the policy of food waste reduction at source to be formulated, including legislative timetable.

31. In response, DDEP(2) said that the Administration attached great importance to source reduction initiatives and its first step was the launching of FWHKC with a view to first changing people's habits in treating food waste and edible food. When FWHKC was beginning to deliver results, the Administration would proceed to deal with food waste generated in daily lives. The Administration would determine its future measures based on the effectiveness of the MSW charging policy after its implementation.

Other recommendations

32. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that some district organizations formed by volunteers had successfully treated food waste by adopting an organic and small-scale approach. They used their compost products for local farming and the farm produce was sold to local residents. Dr CHEUNG criticized the Administration for building large-scale OWTs but failing to support district organizations which treated food waste in a sustainable way. He enquired whether the Administration would strengthen its support in respect of land planning and whether it had any plan to develop more small-scale food waste treatment facilities.

33. DDEP(2) advised that housing estates had all along been encouraged to treat food waste by using on-site treatment facilities when circumstances permitted. Corresponding assistance had also been provided through ECF. In line with the Policy Address, on-site food waste treatment would be promoted in tertiary institutions and schools so as to raise awareness about food waste reduction at source. As for land planning support, collaboration from other bureaux would be needed.

34. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired whether the Offices of the Chief Executive ("CE"), the Chief Secretary for Administration, the Financial Secretary and the Secretary for Justice as well as residences of CE and Secretaries of Departments had signed the Food Wise Charter. Pointing out that the Administration had not collected food waste from public housing estates, he criticized it for failing to set an example and take the lead in implementing the source reduction policy. DDEP(2) explained that currently over 600 government bodies as well as public and private organizations providing catering services had signed the Food Wise Charter. However, as some government departments, including the CE's Office and the Offices of the three Secretaries of Departments, did not provide catering services, they were not the signatories of the Food Wise Charter.

35. Regarding the Food Waste Plan, Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired about the target set for reducing the amount of discarded food from C&I businesses which was in good condition and suitable for donation. He also enquired about the amount of expired food dumped by C&I businesses per day and the recoverable amount. DDEP(2) advised that, under the Food Waste Plan, the target was to reduce the amount of food waste disposed of at landfills by 40% by 2022, but no benchmarks had been set for individual tasks under this target. The amount of expired food discarded by C&I businesses was commercial information concerning business operation and the Administration had not maintained such information.

36. At 11:00 am, the Chairman declared that the meeting be adjourned.

Legislative Council Secretariat
26 July 2017