

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1863/12-13
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 22 April 2013, at 2:30pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Chairman)
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Members attending : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP

Member absent : Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun,
BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)

**Public Officers
attending** : **For item III**

Ms Christine LOH
Under Secretary for the Environment

Miss Amy YUEN
Assistant Director (Water Policy)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr CHENG Hung-leung
Assistant Director/Projects & Development
Drainage Services Department

Mr Gabriel WOO
Chief Engineer/Consultants Management
Drainage Services Department

For item IV

Mr WONG Kam-sing
Secretary for the Environment

Ms Michelle AU
Political Assistant to Secretary for the Environment

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

Dr Alain LAM
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Waste Management Policy)
Environmental Protection Department

**Attendance by
invitation** :

For item IV

Ever Green Association

Mr Graham KWOK
Assistant Project Officer

Greeners Action

Mr Angus HO
Executive Director

World Green Organization

Mr Angus WONG
Policy Advocacy Manager

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Ms Celia FUNG
Environmental Affairs Officer

Hong Kong General Association of Recycling Business

Mr LO Yiu-chuen
Chairman

On Kee (HK) Environmental Recycling Ltd

Mr HO Ping-wah
Manager

Hong Kong Dumper Truck Drivers Association

Ms April LAI
'Green Glass Green' Project co-ordinator

Hong Kong Federation of Restaurants & Related Trades

Mr Simon TAM
Chief Executive Director

Hong Kong Catering Industry Association

Mr Thomas WOO
Vice Chairman

Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of
Hong Kong

Mr CHIU Man-leong
Deputy Spokesperson of Environmental Affairs

Hong Chi Association

Mr YIM Yat-keung
Services Supervisor

The Hong Kong Association of Property Management
Companies

Ir Alkin KWONG
The President

2 Gather

Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing
Vice Chairman

Construction Industry Council

Mr Ivan WONG
Senior Manager - Council Services

Hong Kong Bar & Club Association

Mr CHIN Chun-wing
Vice Chairman

Civic Party

Ms Karen MAK
Committee Member, Environment & Sustainable
Development Branch

The Federation of Environmental and Hygiene Services

Mr Richard LAW
Convenor, Environmental Subcommittee

Wine Association of Hong Kong

Mr Jacky CHEUNG
President

Hong Kong Green Building Council

Mr Sam CHENG
Director

Individual

Mr NG Kam-hung
Shatin District Council Member

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen
President

The Hong Kong Beverage Association Limited

Mr WONG Kam-chuen
Environmental Committee Member

Hong Kong Wine Merchants' Chamber of Commerce

Mr Henry HO
President

The Hong Kong Food, Drinks & Grocery Association

Mr Michael GLOVER
Chairman

Hong Kong Environmental Industry Association

Mr Luther WONG
Vice President

West Kowloon Environmental Protection Association

Mr Harris YEUNG
Chairman

Living Lamma

Ms Jo WILSON
Chairperson

Eco Action

Mr Dennis YEUNG
Chairman

Hong Kong Environmental Protection Association

Mr FAN Hai-tai
Chairman

Labour Party

Mr MAK Tak-ching
Community Officer

K. Wah Construction Materials

Ms Teresa LAI
Deputy General Manager

Tai Po Environmental Association

Mr LEUNG Ying-chi
Project Assistant

The Hong Kong & Kowloon Provisions, Wine & Spirit
Dealers' Association Ltd

Mr PUN Pak-kuen
Vice Chief of Community Affairs Dept

Clerk in attendance : Ms Miranda HON
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mrs Mary TANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

I. Information paper issued since last meeting

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

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(01) — List of follow-up actions

LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 27 May 2013, at 2:30 pm –

- (a) Proposed injection into the Environment and Conservation Fund;
- (b) External lighting in Hong Kong; and
- (c) Controlling the impact of dumping and dredging activities on the marine environment.

Action

3. The Chairman reminded members that a special meeting would be held on Monday, 13 May 2013, at 2:45 pm to discuss the "Retirement of pre-Euro IV diesel commercial vehicles".

III. 355DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – Lamma village sewerage phase 2

(LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(03) — Administration's paper on "355DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – Lamma village sewerage phase 2"

LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(04) — Submission from Living Lamma (English version only))

4. The Assistant Director of Drainage Services/Projects & Development (ADDS/P&D) gave a power-point presentation on "355DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – Lamma village sewerage phase 2".

(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)903/12-13(01) on 22 April 2013.)

5. Mr SIN Chung-kai questioned the long construction time for the proposed village sewerage project, which was expected to start in December 2013 for completion in July 2018. ADDS/P&D replied that in general, village sewerage projects would take about four years to complete. As Lamma Island was an outlying island with no proper road network and transport means, and also with no concrete batching plant, more time was needed for the transport of the needed construction machineries, equipment and materials.

6. Mr KWOK Wai-keung enquired about the working hours for the proposed sewerage project and whether the sewerage works would be carried out during Sundays and public holidays as he was concerned about the impact of the works on tourists. He also asked if the works would be carried out at the tourist attractions. ADDS/P&D said that the working hours would be from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm daily except Sundays and public holidays when no works would be performed. Affected villagers would be consulted if there was a need to perform sewerage works beyond normal working hours. Mr KWOK was concerned that it would be too disturbing to the neighbourhood if the works were to start at 7:00 am and suggested deferring the starting time to 9:00 am instead. ADDS/P&D responded that the working hours from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm for construction works were prescribed by legislation. In general, contractors usually would not start work as early as 7:00 am and they would be

Action

requested to reduce the noise disturbances to locals as far as practicable.

7. Mr KWOK also enquired if the manhole covers could be designed in such a way as to reflect the uniqueness of Lamma Island instead of using the Drainage Services Department ("DSD")'s logo, as suggested in the submission from Living Lamma. ADDS/P&D stated that while consultation would be held with Lamma residents on the improvements to be made to the design of the manhole covers, the covers would need to be suitably marked to facilitate identification and future maintenance.

8. Referring to the submission from Living Lamma about the markers to be used on manhole covers, Ms Claudia MO said that she would disapprove of using the word "foul" as marker for sewers as suggested by DSD. Instead, she would prefer using the words "used water". She was also concerned about the pollution arising from septic tanks and the foreseeable problems with connection charges.

9. The Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") stated that Living Lamma had been in close liaison with DSD and the Environmental Protection Department on the provision of sewerage on Lamma Island and very often a consensus could be reached. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Water Policy) ("ADEP(WP)") said that the Administration would further consider how to improve the design of the manhole covers and the choice of words for the markers, but the covers would have to be suitably marked to facilitate identification and differentiation between sewers and storm water drainage pipes. The Chief Engineer/Consultants Management, Drainage Services Department ("CE/CM, DSD") added that in consultation with Living Lamma, a recessed-type manhole cover would be used in Lamma Island instead of the usual standard iron-frame manhole covers. Markers would be provided on the manhole covers to differentiate between sewers and storm water drainage pipes by using the English word "foul" and Chinese word "污". In this particular case on Lamma Island, DSD would be open about the choice of words to be used in the markers and the suggested use of alphabets was being considered. The Chairman said that the words to be used in the markers for the manhole covers should reflect the actual usage and more consultation with Lamma residents was necessary.

10. Mr KWOK Wai-keung noted that a total of 35 private agricultural lots would need to be resumed for implementation of the proposed works and according to the Administration, the land resumption and clearance would not affect the households or domestic structures. He sought elaboration on how this could be achieved. ADDS/P&D explained that the land resumption and clearance would not affect the households or domestic structures because most of the land to be resumed was for access or vacant land. On Mr KWOK's further question on the objections received, ADDS/P&D said that two

Action

objections had been received and one of them was subsequently withdrawn unconditionally after meeting with the objector. The other objection was about construction noise and would be submitted to the Executive Council for consideration in accordance with the statutory procedures if unresolved.

Admin

11. The Chairman enquired whether the scale of the proposed sewerage project would be large enough to meet the sewerage demand arising from the planned developments of Lamma Island in the foreseeable future. She also enquired about the compensation package for the resumption of the 35 private agricultural lots and whether this was accepted by affected owners. ADDS/P&D replied that at present there were about 483 village houses in Lamma Island. Provisions for sewerage had been made for the eight village houses under planning and a further addition of 64 village houses. He undertook to provide the details of the compensation package for the resumption of the 35 private agricultural lots.

12. The Chairman noted with concern that the proposed project would generate about 42 160 tonnes of construction waste. ADDS/P&D explained that of the 42 160 tonnes of construction waste generated, about 34 690 tonnes (82.3%) of the inert construction waste would be reused on site while another 6 580 tonnes (15.6%) would be delivered to public fill reception facilities for subsequent reuse. The remaining 890 tonnes (2.1%) of non-inert construction waste would be disposed of at landfills. In response to the Chairman's questions about the types of non-inert construction waste to be disposed of at landfills, CE/CM, DSD replied that such would include rubbish, debris, used packaging materials, lunch boxes and excavated soft soils that were not suitable for reuse as fill materials. The Chairman remarked that construction workers should try to reduce the generation of non-inert construction waste.

13. Mr WU Chi-wai asked if the proposed sewerage project would enable the use of recycled water. He considered that it might be necessary for the Administration to look into the feasibility of using recycled water as part of the water resources management policy. ADDS/P&D responded that the use of recycled water had not been included under the proposed project. As in most village sewerage projects, the sewage treated would be discharged into the sea. The Water Supplies Department would be conducting studies on the feasibility of using recycled water. ADEP(WP) supplemented that recycled water was used on a small scale in some sewage treatment works. As seawater was widely used for flushing in Hong Kong, there would be greater scope to first use recycled water from treated sewage for non-potable uses where fresh water was used for flushing. USEN said that the subject of the use of recycled water and management of water resources was worthy of further discussion, with participation by representatives from the Water Supplies Department and other relevant departments.

Action

Admin

14. Noting that the estimated cost for the project was \$340.2 million for a length of 9.1 kilometres of sewers (averaging close to \$38 million per kilometre), which appeared to be on the high side, the Chairman requested that a cost comparison be made between the proposed sewerage project at Lamma Island and other similar sewerage projects.

15. The Chairman concluded that members supported the submission of the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee.

IV. Public Consultation on a Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage bottles

(LC Paper No. CB(1)569/12-13(04) — Administration's paper on "Public Consultation on a Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage bottles"

LC Paper No. CB(1)569/12-13(05) — Background brief on "Introduction of a new producer responsibility scheme for glass beverage bottles" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

16. At the Chairman's invitation, 33 deputations/individuals presented their views on the Scheme. A summary of the views of the deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

17. Members also noted the following submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting –

(LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(06) — Submission from Green Sense (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(10) — Submission from Advisory Council on the Environment

LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(11) — Submission from 逸東社區網絡協會 (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1) 905/12-13(06) — Submission from Designing Hong Kong (English version only)

Action

Discussion

18. The Secretary for the Environment ("SEN") provided a consolidated response to the views and concerns raised by the deputations/individuals as follows –

- (a) the feedback from the public consultation on the Producer Responsibility Scheme on Glass Beverage Bottles ("GBBs") ("the Scheme") was positive and most were in support of the Scheme;
- (b) efforts would be made to expand the collection network for GBBs and to promote public awareness of the need for waste recycling;
- (c) in cooperation with the construction trades and the works departments, efforts would be made to identify more outlets for recycled glass materials;
- (d) the works departments should be able to use up the construction materials manufactured from waste glass in public works projects;
- (e) an open approach would be adopted on the use of recycled glass materials in other sectors apart from the construction sector;
- (f) further details on implementation of the Scheme would be worked out in consultation with stakeholders;
- (g) the recycling fees collected under the Scheme would be used to finance the collection and transportation costs for the recycling of GBBs; and
- (h) the Government would be playing a leading and proactive role in the recycling of GBBs.

19. Mr Albert CHAN said that Hong Kong should implement mandatory source separation of waste, in line with the practice of many overseas countries. This would be more cost-effective than having to introduce separate producer responsibility schemes on each kind of recyclables. SEN shared the views on the need to formulate a comprehensive policy on waste recycling. The Blueprint on the Sustainable Use of Resources which would be published soon would set out the waste treatment strategy in Hong Kong. With the collection and treatment of GBBs, the recycled glass materials could be manufactured for use as construction materials in public works projects. A recycling fee was required in the recycling of GBBs in meeting the high transportation cost.

Action

20. Mr WU Chi-wai stated that more efforts should be made to recycle waste glass as otherwise it would end up in landfills. He opined that if waste glass had a recycling value similar to that of aluminum cans and waste paper, there would be incentive in its recycling. He supported that more efforts should be made to identify outlets for recycled glass materials, but was concerned about the price competitiveness of eco-pavers and their durability. SEN responded that apart from eco-pavers, there were other construction materials that could be manufactured from recycled glass materials. Such construction materials could be put to wider use in public works projects.

21. Mr WU Chi-wai further said that efforts should be made to expand the capacity for recycling GBBs and to incorporate existing recycling operations into the tender for the Glass Management Contractor ("GMC"). SEN responded that consideration would be given to expanding the recycling of GBBs through a phased approach. Meanwhile, the tender for GMC would be required to take into account the services offered by existing recycling operations.

22. Dr Kenneth CHAN opined that there was a need to ensure fairness and to avoid collusion in the tender for GMC. More thoughts should be given to providing job opportunities in the implementation of the Scheme. As GBBs accounted for 63% of the overall waste glass generation, he supported that food/sauce, cosmetics, medicine and other glass bottles, which collectively accounted for the remaining 37%, should also be included in the Scheme. He also shared the view on the need to identify more outlets for recycled glass materials. SEN said that there would be jobs created in the collection and transportation of GBBs as well as the manufacture of construction materials from waste glass. Efforts would be made to identify the potential use of recycled glass materials in the construction sector.

23. Mr KWOK Wai-keung noted with concern that the amount of waste glass which had been recycled and manufactured as construction materials was very limited. He pointed out that there was a need to promote the wider use of such materials so that they would not only be used in public works projects but in private projects as well. Consideration should also be given to developing an export market for such recycled materials. As development of a circular economy would create more job opportunities, he enquired about the Administration's plans in this respect. SEN responded that the Scheme should be able to enhance the collection of GBBs and hence the recycling of waste glass. While the construction materials manufactured from waste glass could be used up in public works projects, the Administration would also step up efforts to promote the wider use of such materials in the private sector.

24. The Chairman pointed out that restaurants and bars could facilitate the recycling of GBBs if they separated GBBs from food waste. As suggested by

Action

some deputations, owners of restaurants and bars should be reminded of their corporate responsibility of separating/recycling GBBs upon being issued with liquor licences. She sought elaboration from the trades on the practical difficulties encountered in the collection of GBBs and suggested that representatives from the Administration should pay site visits to the collection points to observe the process. She also suggested enlisting cooperation from social enterprises in the recycling of waste glass. Mr LO Yiu-chuen/Hong Kong General Association of Recycling Business said that recyclers had all along been assisting in the recycling of GBBs. More publicity should be launched to promote public awareness of the need to recycle GBBs. SEN responded that restaurants and bars would be reminded to separate GBBs from food waste. The recycling of GBBs would have to be financed by a recycling fee because unlike aluminium cans, GBBs did not have a high recycling value. The suggestion of enlisting cooperation from social enterprises in the recycling of waste glass would be worthy of consideration.

25. Dr Helena WONG stated that members of the Democratic Party would support providing incentives for recycling GBBs and expanding the coverage of the Scheme to include other glass bottles as well. She shared the view that owners of restaurants and bars should be reminded to shoulder their corporate responsibility of separating/recycling GBBs upon being issued with liquor licences. She was concerned about the adequacy of collection points and suggested that separate bins be provided at each refuse transfer station to facilitate collection of GBBs. To avoid the monopolization of services, consideration should be given to appointing more than one GMC for the purpose.

26. SEN said that the Administration would look into the provision of incentives to encourage the recycling of GBBs as well as the means to engage restaurants and bars in the separation of GBBs at source. As far as collection was concerned, GMC would be responsible for operating several regional collection points to help restaurants, bars, and clubs dispose of GBBs in bulk. Five pilot community green stations would be developed to enhance logistics support at the community-level recycling. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Management Policy) added that GBBs and food bottles constituted about 95% of the 250 tonnes of waste glass bottles generated per day. The remaining 5% were mostly cosmetic bottles which required the use of solvents in cleansing and would not be suitable for recycling. Cooperation would be sought from the property management of residential developments on the installation of recycle bins for the collection of GBBs.

27. The Chairman thanked the deputations and individuals, as well as the Administration for attending the meeting. She said that members and deputations could submit their further views on the Scheme to the Administration before expiry of the public consultation on 7 May 2013.

Action

V. Any other business

28. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:33 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 October 2013

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Meeting on Monday, 22 April 2013, at 2:30pm

Public Consultation on a Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage bottles

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
1.	Ever Green Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Producer Responsibility Scheme ("PRS") on glass beverage bottles ("GBBs") ("the Scheme") would increase the operating costs of beverage suppliers which would be transferred to retailers and consumers; • retailers would also incur extra costs in separating and delivering GBBs to collection points and such costs would be transferred to consumers; • need for clear guidelines on the types of GBBs which would be covered under the Scheme; • more assistance should be provided to waste glass recyclers to facilitate waste glass recycling; and • more recycling bins for collection of waste glass should be provided
2.	Greeners Action [LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(05)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme; • supported extending the coverage of the Scheme to food/sauce glass bottles as well as other forms of beverage containers such as plastic bottles and carton boxes; • need for a time table for the Scheme which should be implemented as soon as possible; • need to monitor the collection and treatment of waste GBBs and to provide incentives as appropriate; • the recycling fees collected should be used to set up a fund to promote environmental awareness and to assist waste recycling operations; • supported the introduction of a landfill ban on GBBs; and • need for publicity efforts to promote waste recycling
3.	World Green Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme; • it would be administratively easier to impose recycling fees on

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>beverage suppliers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incentives should be provided for the return and collection of GBBs to promote recycling; • supported extending the coverage of the Scheme to include food/sauce glass bottles as well as other beverage containers such as plastic bottles and carton boxes; and • supported the implementation of other PRS
4.	<p>Friends of the Earth (HK) [LC Paper No. CB(1)895/12-13(01)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcomed the introduction of the Scheme; • was concerned whether the Scheme could achieve the target recycling rate; • need for incentives to encourage the recycling of GBBs; • reference should be made to the Green Dot System adopted in Germany in encouraging waste recycling; • more supporting facilities should be provide to facilitate recycling of GBBs; • need to implement the municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging scheme; and • supported extending the coverage of the Scheme to include food/sauce glass bottles as well as other beverage containers such as plastic bottles and aluminum cans
5.	<p>Hong Kong General Association of Recycling Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme; • need to provide incentives for encouraging the recycling of GBBs and to widen the collection network; and • the glass management contractor ("GMC") should be able to operate on a self-financing basis
6.	<p>On Kee (HK) Environmental Recycling Ltd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the extension of the Scheme to include plastic bottles as there was a need to encourage recycling of plastics in Hong Kong following the tightened control on the import of plastic recyclables with the launching of Operation Green Fence in the Mainland; • supported the landfill ban on GBBs and other glass bottles; and • supported having separate collection points for GBBs to facilitate collection as the recyclables collected by recycling bins were often mixed with other wastes

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
7.	Hong Kong Dumper Truck Drivers Association [LC Paper No. CB(1)905/12-13(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hong Kong Dumper Truck Drivers Association had organized the "Green Glass Green" project for the recycling of GBBs and had been successful in recycling over 1 100 tonnes of GBBs, 70% of which were from wine bars; • supported the implementation of the Scheme which would reduce pressure on landfills; • owners of restaurants and bars should be reminded of their corporate responsibility of recycling GBBs upon being issued with liquor licences; and • supported the deposit-refund system to incentivize the recycling of GBBs
8.	Hong Kong Federation of Restaurants and Related Trades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to clearly define the coverage of the Scheme which was not intended to include food/sauce bottles; • was concerned whether recycling fees would apply to beverages sold in glass bottles for export; • was concerned that the recycling fees would be increased to beyond \$1.00 per litre if extra funding was required to finance the operation of GMC; • was concerned whether there would be enough space to store the GBBs in retail premises pending collection; and • was concerned about the cost implications of the Scheme and the impact on the trades
9.	Hong Kong Catering Industry Association [LC Paper No. CB(1)905/12-13(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • was concerned that the recycling fees would be transferred to the catering trades, resulting in increased operating cost; • there were other concerns such as large energy consumption of GMC, price-competitiveness of eco-pavers, as well as sustainability of waste glass recycling operations; • some of the trades had been participating in the recycling of GBBs using the funding from the Environment and Conservation Fund, but there were difficulties associated with the high transportation cost; and • the Government should seek the assistance of District Councils in promoting the recycling of GBBs
10.	Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcomed the public consultation on the Scheme and supported the offer of incentives to encourage the recycling of GBBs; • more educational and publicity efforts should be made to encourage the recycling of GBBs;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to assist waste glass recyclers who were faced with operational difficulties due to high rentals and production costs, as well as the lack of markets for recycled products; • need to promote green procurement and the wider use of construction materials made from waste glass, e.g. eco-pavers; and • recycling fees collected under the Scheme should be used to promote waste glass recycling
11.	Hong Chi Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the early implementation of the Scheme; • there should be several tenders for GMC so that more social enterprises would be able to participate; • more collection points should be provided to facilitate the collection of GBBs; and • need to promote the wider use of recycled glass materials in the construction sector
12.	The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies [LC Paper No. CB(1)924/12-13(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the Scheme which should be implemented in phases to deal with two most common types of glass bottles i.e. wine bottles and food/sauce bottles; • a licensing system should be introduced for beverage suppliers; • beverage suppliers who had put in place a deposit-refund system should be exempted from payment of recycling fees; • retailers of glass-bottles beverages should provide consumers with information relating to the recycling of GBBs and should make efforts to implement the deposit-refund system; • there were administrative difficulties in implementing the landfill ban on GBBs; • need for more publicity efforts to promote the Scheme; • more collection points should be provided to facilitate the recycling of GBBs; and • need to promote the wider use of recycled glass materials in the construction sector
13.	2 Gather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the early implementation of the Scheme; • recycling fees collected under the Scheme should be used to promote waste glass recycling;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to widen the collection network for GBBs in an attempt to achieve the target recycling rate of 70%; • need for more educational and publicity efforts to promote the Scheme; • need to promote the wider use of recycled glass materials in the construction sector and to identify more outlets for eco-pavers manufactured in Hong Kong; and • supported the implementation of a deposit-refund system for GBBs
14.	Construction Industry Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the Scheme and the appointment of GMC for the manufacture of construction materials using waste glass; and • given the shortage in the supply of river sand, the technical feasibility of using grinded waste glass to replace river sand in the production of cement mortar for building and refurbishment works would be explored
15.	Hong Kong Bar & Club Association [LC Paper No. CB(1)905/12-13(03)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the Scheme as it had not taken into account the interest of the trades; • was concerned about the unfairness of the Scheme as wine suppliers could transfer the recycling fees to operators of wine bars and clubs but the latter could not transfer such to consumers due to keen competition; • there were additional costs associated with the collection and storage of GBBs but no supporting facilities were provided to facilitate compliance with the Scheme
16.	Civic Party [LC Paper No. CB(1)980/12-13(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme; • the manufacture of eco-pavers from waste glass should be transitory as this was not cost-effective given the limited usage of eco-pavers and the fact that they were more expensive than conventional cement bricks; • in the long run, waste glass should be recycled for use as GBBs or other glass products, or be exported elsewhere to reduce the pressure on landfills; • beverage suppliers who had put in place a deposit-refund system should be exempted from payment of recycling fees; • supported the implementation of a deposit-refund system for GBBs; and • questioned the setting of the recycling fee level at \$1.00/litre

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		which was higher than most countries
17.	The Federation of Environmental and Hygiene Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme; • need to promote the wider use of recycled glass materials as otherwise there would be no outlet for the vast amounts of recycled glass materials produced by GMC; and • need to provide assistance to waste glass recyclers
18.	Wine Association of Hong Kong [LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(07)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the Scheme in principle but there should be adequate consultation with the trades and the public before implementation; • while accepting the setting of recycling fee at not more than \$0.75 per 750 ml bottle, it would be more preferable to set it at \$0.50 per bottle at the start of the Scheme; • supported that the recycling fee should be shared among manufacturers, import distributors, retailers, restaurants and consumers so that each stakeholder would only have to pay \$0.125 to \$0.1875 per 750 ml bottle; • the collection of recycling fee should be made at the import and distribution level; • recommended the exemption of recycling fees for entrepot trade and exports of wine; • recommended that a 90-day payment period be allowed such that importers did not have to pay the recycling fees before the products were sold; and • need for more efforts to promote waste separation at source
19.	Hong Kong Green Building Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the waste treatment policy in Hong Kong; and • need to promote the wider use of recycled materials in the construction sector
20.	Mr NG Kam-hung, Sha Tin District Council member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to implement more waste reduction and recycling measures before introducing the Scheme; • eco-pavers were not durable and they would end up in landfills; • enquired about the existing number of recyclers engaged in the recycling of waste glass in Hong Kong and their scale of production; and • need to explain how the recycling fees to be collected under the Scheme would be used

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
21.	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers [LC Paper No. CB(1)895/12-13(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme and its subsequent extension to include other types of glass bottles; • the recycling fees collected should be put into a fund designated for supporting the collection and recycling of waste GBBs; • the Government should administer the tendering process to license and award contracts to GMCs for specified districts; • GBB suppliers with a satisfactory corporate reuse/recycling plan should be exempted from payment of recycling fees; • supported more practical initiatives to convert waste GBBs into construction materials and to promote their wider use in construction projects; and • more resources should be provided to assist local industries and research institutions to develop and improve recycling technologies
22.	The Hong Kong Beverage Association Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the views of Hong Kong Beverage Association Ltd would be the same as that of the Hong Kong Food, Drinks and Grocery Association to be presented by Mr Michael GLOVER
23.	Hong Kong Wine Merchants' Chamber of Commerce [LC Paper No. CB(1)905/12-13(04)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the sharing of eco-responsibility, but had grave reservations on the imposition of the recycling fee on beverage importers and distributors; • as 70% of the waste GBBs were generated from households, there was a need to provide incentives to encourage the recycling of GBBs; • need to understand the operation of the wine industry and to study the applicability of the Scheme to the import, distribution, transshipment and export of wines; and • recycling fees should be collected at the retail level and the adoption of the deposit-refund system should be encouraged
24.	Hong Kong Food, Drinks and Grocery Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the waste charging scheme and source separation of waste; • supported the provision of collection points for recyclables such as metals, waste glass and plastics; • need for a buoyant secondary market for processed materials including waste glass; • questioned how the Government could impose a recycling fee on GBBs in isolation of an overall waste charging scheme as both schemes should be examined together;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if consumers had already paid for glass containers, there would be no incentive to separate and recycle them at source; • differentiating GBBs from other glass containers would confuse consumers; • as not all importers were registered under the Food Safety Ordinance, there were compliance, auditing and administrative concerns in the implementation of the Scheme; • there was insufficient recycling capacities to process all waste glass; and • the Scheme, if implemented, should include all glass containers
25.	<p>Hong Kong Environmental Industry Association [LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(08)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme and the polluters pay principle; • the coverage of the Scheme should not be confined to GBBs but should include food/sauce bottles and other beverage containers such as carton boxes, aluminum cans and plastic bottles; • a decentralized collection network should be set up in preparation for the implementation of the Scheme; and • the apportionment of the recycling fee should be as follows: (i) the consumer would pay 100% of the recycling fee; (ii) 30% of the fee would be refunded to consumers upon return of GBBs under the deposit-refund system; (iii) 40% would be used to fund the operating cost of the collection centre; and (iv) 30% would be used to fund the operating cost of GMC
26.	<p>West Kowloon Environmental Protection Association [LC Paper No. CB(1)905/12-13(05)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the levy of recycling fees for GBBs but was concerned about the resultant increase in the use of other beverage containers; • need for incentives to encourage the recycling of GBBs; • supported waste recycling measures which would reduce the pressure on landfills; and • more efforts should be made to promote waste recycling at the district level and in cooperation with non-government organizations
27.	<p>Living Lamma [LC Paper No. CB(1)864/12-13(09)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living Lamma had been pushing for environmental improvement but there was little support from the Government; • there were bureaucratic constraints in putting forth waste recycling initiatives;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lamma residents group had put forward a waste reduction and recycling plan including glass recycling in 1995 but it was only until recently that Lamma Island had its first waste separation bin; • more efforts should be made to recycle wine bottles given that Hong Kong was Asia's wine hub; • everyone had to take responsibility for the waste produced and there was a need to inspire changes in attitude and behaviour in every sector of the society, including the Government; and • need for a fair PRS on waste recycling which would provide the right penalties rather than a piecemeal approach
28.	ECO Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme in principle but was concerned about the risk associated with the accumulation of large number of GBBs at collection points along the streets; • provision of collection points for GBBs would reduce the collection and transportation cost for the recycling of waste glass; and • supported the imposition of a landfill ban on GBBs to be followed by plastic bottles
29.	Hong Kong Environmental Protection Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of the Scheme which would facilitate waste glass recycling; • while grinded waste glass could be used as an alternative to replace river sand in the construction process, it was worthy to note that glass was made originally from sand; and • need for the Government to explore more outlets for the increased supply of recycled glass materials following the implementation of the Scheme and the practicability of their potential re-use in the construction sector
30.	Labour Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the implementation of PRS, including that for GBBs; • beverage suppliers and consumers should jointly be held responsible for the recycling of GBBs; • as GBBs could be cleansed and reused, the recycling of GBBs would be able to generate job opportunities; and • the Government should formulate a waste recycling policy on GBBs and assist in their source separation and collection
31.	K. Wah Construction Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste glass could be recycled for use as construction materials such as eco-pavers and eco-partition blocks;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the recycling of GBBs would involve a cumbersome process including source separation, collection, cleansing and grinding; • to facilitate the recycling of GBBs, there was a need for a clear policy on waste recycling and more publicity efforts to promote waste recycling; • need to provide subsidies and tax incentives to assist waste recyclers in their operations; • need for the Government to take the lead to promote the wider use of recycled glass materials in the construction sector; and • supported the local collection, manufacture and use of recycled materials and products
32.	Tai Po Environmental Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the early implementation of the Scheme which would promote the recycling of GBBs; • need to set an appropriate level of recycling fees taking into account the operational cost of GMC; • need to identify more outlets for recycled glass materials and reference should be made to the experience of Taiwan where such materials were used for road paving; and • the recycling fees collected under the Scheme should be used to provide environmental education and to assist waste recyclers in their recycling operations
33.	The Hong Kong & Kowloon Provisions, Wine & Spirit Dealers' Association Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the recycling fees imposed on beverage distributors and suppliers under the Scheme would ultimately be transferred to consumers; • the responsibility for recycling GBBs would be placed upon retailers who would be required to dispose of GBBs at collection points; • was concerned about the availability of collection points and whether they were conveniently located; • more publicity efforts should be made to educate the public on the recycling of GBBs; and • was concerned about the availability of a market for the recycled glass materials manufactured by GMC