

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)1884/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/FE

**Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene**

**Minutes of special meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 2 April 2019, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki (Chairman)  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Members absent** : Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP

**Public Officers attending** : The Administration

Dr CHUI Tak-yi, JP  
Under Secretary for Food and Health

Mr Bill WONG Kwok-piu  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 3

Mr Mickey LAI Kin-ming  
Assistant Director (Fisheries)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr Jim CHU Chun-wa  
Senior Fisheries Officer (Aquaculture Fisheries)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**Attendance by invitation** : Item I

Hong Kong Fishery Alliance

Mr KEUNG Siu-fai  
助理主席

Individual

Mr SHEK Dai-hei

Individual

Mr SO Chi-hung

Individual

Mr CHUI Ka-ho

Individual

Mr LUI Fu-hung

Individual

Mr Woody WU Wai-kwong

Individual

Mr LAW Kwong-choi

Individual

Mr CHEUNG Chuen

Individual

Ms NG Siu-yan

Individual

Mr YIM Ying-pan

Individual

Ms CHAN Chun-chun

Individual

Mr LEUNG Kwok-chu

Individual

Mr MA Kan

Individual

Mr WAN Chiu-wah

Individual

Mr YUEN Tim-yeung

Individual

Mr CHEUNG Ching-wan

Individual

Mr FUNG Shue-lick

Individual

Mr SO Lau-sang

Hong Kong Fishermen Consortium

Mr YEUNG Sheung-chun  
Vice Chairman

Hong Kong Fishermen Association

Mr LEE Yat-loong  
Representative

Individual

Mr CHAN Ping-yau

Individual

Mr WONG Siu-keung

Individual

Mr LEUNG Kam-chuen

Individual

Mr WONG Mok-yau

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

**Staff in attendance** : Ms Wendy LO  
Senior Council Secretary (2) 2

Miss Cally LAI  
Legislative Assistant (2) 2

---

Action

**I. Administration's proposal to tighten the management of licensed fish rafts and to review the licence conditions**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1059/18-19(01) & (02), CB(2)923/18-19(02), CB(2)797/18-19(02) and CB(2)902/18-19(01))

At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Food and Health ("USFH") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms and support provided to the mariculture sector, as set out in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(01)). Members noted the information note (LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(02)) prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat.

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

2. The Chairman reminded the deputations attending the meeting that they were not covered by the protection and immunity provided under the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382) when addressing the Panel. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 24 deputations/individuals presented their views. A summary of the deputations' views is in the **Appendix**. Members also noted that 14 written submissions from organizations/individuals not attending the meeting were received by the Panel.

The Administration's responses to deputations' views

3. USFH and Assistant Director (Fisheries), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AD(F)/AFCD") said that the Administration strived to promote the sustainable development of aquaculture by providing appropriate support and environment to encourage fish farmers to upgrade their husbandry and technical standards for providing quality fisheries products to the public. The Administration was of the view that proper management of fish culture zones ("FCZs") and effective use of finite culture areas were essential to the sustainable development of mariculture. To rectify the current idling situation of some fish rafts and promote sustainable development of mariculture, AFCD, as the licensing authority, had the responsibility to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms so as to ensure the effective use of public resources.

4. In response to deputations' views and concerns raised at the meeting, AD(F)/AFCD made the following points:

- (a) supply of fish fry: the Administration noted that in the absence of local supplier of fish fry, Hong Kong's fish farmers had to purchase fish fry from neighbouring regions. Fish farmers were

Action

welcome to send samples to AFCD for testing the presence of fish disease in the fish fry. The Government had been providing financial assistance through the \$500 million Sustainable Fisheries Development Fund ("SFDF") since 2014 to help the fisheries sector move towards sustainable or high value-added operations and enhance the overall competitiveness of the fisheries sector. To assist local fish farmers in developing fish fry hatching and breeding techniques, SFDF funded a project to introduce fish hatching and larval rearing techniques in brackish water ponds in Lai Chi Wo with a view to supplying quality marine fish fry to the local aquaculture industry at a lower cost;

- (b) use of fish feed: it was a traditional practice for mariculturists in Hong Kong to feed their stock with trash fish, i.e. by-catch or small fish, including fingerlings with commercial value. However, using trash fish as feed adversely impacted on the marine environment and was not a sustainable aquaculture practice. Nowadays, the aquaculture sector all over the world generally adopted dry pellet feed to replace trash fish. In terms of cost-effectiveness, while the price of trash fish per kilogram was lower than that of dry pellet feed, the total cost of using trash fish was higher as cultured fish had to consume a larger quantity of trash fish to meet nutritional needs due to the feed's high moisture content (about 70%) and lower feed conversion rate. Local fish farmers were encouraged to try dry pellet feed. AFCD regularly collected from the market dry pellet feed samples for testing and provided content analysis for free. Fish farmers could contact AFCD for free information and technical advice on the use of dry pellet feed;
- (c) monitoring water quality: in recent years, AFCD had been introducing new technologies such as implementation of a real-time water quality monitoring system and test run of real-time phytoplankton imaging and computer modelling tools to detect changes in water quality and occurrence of red tides, so as to give timely alerts and reduce the risks of red tides to fish farmers. In the past three years, AFCD issued a total of about 200 alerts to fish farmers. Measures had also been taken to improve the water quality in FCZs. In recent years, there was an overall improvement in the environmental conditions in most FCZs where nitrogen loading (the most serious environmental problem brought about by mariculture) was reduced by more than 90% from 1990 to 2018. The number of red tides recorded each year had reduced from 20-odd during the period from 1980s to 1990s to around 15 in the past 10 years;

Action

- (d) sale channels of local aquaculture products: AFCD and the Fish Marketing Organization ("FMO") had spared no effort in promoting local aquaculture products. Since 2005, AFCD had been implementing the Accredited Fish Farm Scheme ("AFFS") to build up a brand name of quality and safety of local aquaculture products. AFCD and FMO had also been actively publicizing local quality fisheries products through various promotional activities. For the sale of local fisheries products, about 90 retail points had been established, covering supermarket chains, green food stores, online and mobile phone sales platforms and the catering industry. Among others, FMO was planning to sign procurement contracts with some of the fish farmers registered under AFFS to help them draw up plans to produce local fisheries products that could meet market demand with greater certainty and confidence; and
- (e) application procedures of SFDF: in response to the feedback that fishermen and fishermen organizations had encountered difficulties in preparing and filing applications for SFDF, AFCD would provide technical support and streamline the application procedures to encourage fish farmers to make good use of SFDF. To promote modernization of the fisheries sector, the Equipment Improvement Project scheme had also been set up under SFDF to help fish farmers acquire equipment for enhancing productivity.

Discussion

*Proposal to tighten the management of licensed fish rafts*

5. Mr Steven HO and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan said that according to their understanding, the majority of local fish farmers were opposed to the proposed mariculture standards which suggested that (a) the area of fish cages should not be less than 70% of the raft and (b) the output should reach the level of 10 kg/m<sup>2</sup> during the production cycle. Pointing out the challenges faced by fish farmers in their daily operations, Mr HO, Ms YUNG and Dr Elizabeth QUAT considered that the Administration should enhance the support measures for the mariculture sector, before exploring the feasibility of setting mariculture standards.

6. Mr Steven HO further said that some fish farmers lacked confidence in the prospects of mariculture and were not prepared to invest in their fish farms to increase production. He and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan suggested that the Administration should step up promotion of local aquaculture products to enhance the competitiveness of the sector (e.g. outsourcing the marketing

Action

promotion work to non-government organizations). Mr HO was also of the view that AFCD should implement a natural disasters protection mechanism for the industry and review whether certain licence conditions could be relaxed to facilitate mariculture operations.

7. Dr Elizabeth QUAT considered that the Administration should devise corresponding measures to promote both mariculture and recreational fishing for further development of the local fisheries industry. She urged the Administration to enhance communication with fish farmers on the development of the mariculture industry.

8. The Chairman considered it hasty for the Administration to introduce measures to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms. He shared some members' view that the Administration should first enhance its support measures for the mariculture sector in order to restore fish farmers' confidence in investing in their fish farms. He asked whether the Administration would consider adjusting the proposed mariculture standards for renewal of existing marine fish culture licence ("MFCLs"). Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that many fish farmers had expressed worries that they might lose their licences due to a failure to meet the proposed mariculture standards for licensing. In Mr CHU's view, the Administration should withdraw its proposal to tighten the mariculture standards and enhance the support provided to the mariculture industry in order to improve the operating environment for fish farmers.

9. Mr Jeremy TAM was of the view that in the long run, it was necessary for AFCD to properly manage existing FCZs to make better use of the culture areas. The Administration, however, should thoroughly consult the trade before implementing any new licensing requirements. Initiatives on which consensus had been forged between the Administration and the trade could be implemented first.

10. AD(F)/AFCD and Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 3 ("PASFH(F)3") made the following responses:

- (a) marine fish culture involved the use of water areas which were public resources. Based on AFCD's observation and assessment, about 20% of licensees were actively conducting mariculture activities on rafts. Production of some individual fish farms might even exceed ten tonnes per annum. However, the remaining 80% of licensees maintained an extremely low level of mariculture activities while some rafts were left idle. At present, the licence conditions required that the licensees should "maintain raft(s) actively engaged in fish culture". In order to enforce the licence conditions effectively and make the



Action

requirements clear to licensees for conducting culture operations, AFCD intended to lay down standards in the licence conditions of what "maintain the raft(s) actively engaged in fish culture" entailed, which should be reflected in the operation and output of fish rafts;

- (b) in drawing up the preliminary mariculture standards, AFCD used fish cages and output as the basis, taking into account existing practices of fish farmers, environmental factors and cost analysis. Recognizing that, in practice, certain part of the fish raft must be set aside for installation of ancillary facilities (e.g. equipment and feed storage, watch sheds and structural partitions of rafts) and thus could not be fully used for fish cages, AFCD recommended that the area of fish cages should not be less than 70% of the raft. In setting the production standard, AFCD took into account the findings of annual statistical surveys that the median production was about 20kg/m<sup>2</sup> for active fish farmers, and over 50kg/m<sup>2</sup> for top producers. AFCD recommended that the output should reach the level of 10 kg/m<sup>2</sup> during the production cycle;
- (c) AFCD had been liaising with the fisheries organizations on the proposal to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms. In December 2018, AFCD wrote to all licensees to invite them to attend consultation sessions. From January to March 2019, eight consultation sessions were held to listen to the views of licensees and other stakeholders. AFCD also attended a meeting of Tai Po District Council on 7 March 2019 to discuss the mariculture standards, and provided information to Sai Kung District Council in writing to facilitate its discussion on the same subject; and
- (d) AFCD would continue to listen to the views of the mariculture sector, including those on the feasibility of mariculture standards, implementation timetable and the Government's support measures. The Administration had not set any timetable for the implementation of the proposed mariculture standards. AFCD would only implement the new requirements after thorough discussion and consultation with the sector as well as allowing sufficient time for compliance. The Government would continue to implement appropriate support measures to promote the sustainable development of mariculture so as to provide the public with quality local fisheries products.

Action

11. In response to the Chairman's enquiry as to whether targeted measures would be formulated to assist fish farmers (particularly those who maintained a low level of mariculture activities) in improving the output of their fish rafts, AD(F)/AFCD and PASFH(F)<sup>3</sup> advised that the Administration was willing to listen to fish farmers' views on how the support measures (e.g. supply of fish fry and fish feed) could be enhanced. The Administration would also step up publicity on the existing assistance and resources available to fish farmers to help them move towards high value-added operations. As mentioned earlier, AFCD would streamline the application procedures to encourage fish farmers to make good use of SFDF. Up to now, three applications had been approved under the Equipment Improvement Project scheme with a funding of about \$20 million for fishermen's or fish farmers' acquisition of equipment.

12. Mr CHU Hoi-dick suggested that the Administration should consider setting up demonstration farms in large FCZs (e.g. Yung Shue O and Yim Tin Tsai) to show how the practical difficulties encountered by fish farmers in actual operations could be tackled such that the production of fish farms could be improved and hence meet the proposed mariculture standards. AD(F)/AFCD reiterated that about 20% of licensees were actively conducting mariculture activities on rafts and the annual production of their farms could meet the proposed production standard. That said, AFCD was planning to set up a modern mariculture demonstration farm in Hong Kong to serve as a base for promoting modern mariculture technologies as well as training and research purposes.

13. In response to the Chairman's follow-up enquiry, AD(F)/AFCD said that it was the Administration's preliminary plan to establish the demonstration farm by 2020. Mr CHU Hoi-dick hoped that the Administration would meet with active fish farmers to understand the challenges they faced in maintaining a high production output.

14. Mr Steven HO remarked that the Administration had not promptly addressed the concerns and enquiries raised by fish farmers at the consultation sessions. He said that some fish farmers had got such a message that the Administration would implement the proposed mariculture standards on 1 April 2019 and it would not renew the existing MFCLs if licensees could not meet the new requirements within one year. Mr SO Lau-sang and Ms NG Siu-yan said that representatives of AFCD had, at some consultation sessions, given fish farmers an impression that the Administration was going to implement the proposed mariculture standards in early 2019 and this had aroused grave concern in the mariculture sector. AD(F)/AFCD stressed that there was no timetable for implementing the proposed mariculture standards.

15. Mr LEUNG Kwok-chu queried the accuracy of statistics on active fish farms provided by the Administration, and sought information on the

Action

distribution of active fish farms in the territory. AD(F)/AFCD responded that according to AFCD's observation, there were active fish farms in nearly all 26 FCZs, each maintaining a satisfactory production output.

16. Mr SO Chi-hung criticized that AFCD had underestimated the problems and difficulties faced by fish farmers and been slow in providing support for the mariculture sector. Mr SHEK Dai-hei said that to his understanding, some active fish farmers suffered great financial losses in instances of red tides. He expressed dissatisfaction that AFCD had revoked his MFCL and refused to renew the letter of consent for him to continue recreational fishing business on his raft. AD(F)/AFCD responded that he would not comment on individual cases concerning licence revocation.

*Recreational fishing activities on mariculture rafts*

17. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he had learnt from some mariculturists running recreational fishing business that they were required to keep at least half of the size of their rafts for normal mariculture operations. These fish farmers had been told that they should first dismantle certain facilities to ensure that the area used for recreational fishing activities would not be larger than 50% of their rafts and they had to meet the proposed mariculture standards for conducting mariculture operations in the remaining part of their rafts. Mr CHU expressed concern that the above requirements, if adopted, would be too stringent for mariculturists conducting recreational fishing business.

18. Mr Steven HO opined that as the Administration had not clearly explained the relevant fish culture requirements to licensees when giving consent to them for running recreational fishing business, it would be difficult for the licensees concerned to increase the production output of their fish farms after they had expanded the scale of recreational fishing business on the rafts.

19. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the policy direction for regulating recreational fishing business. The Chairman asked whether consideration would be given to adopting a separate set of regulatory requirements on mariculture rafts which had been allowed to conduct recreational fishing.

20. AD(F)/AFCD said that to meet the growing public demand for recreational fishing facilities and provide an additional source of income for mariculturists, starting from 2002, AFCD allowed marine fish culture licensees to operate recreational fishing business on their rafts as long as public safety could be ensured and that the mariculture activities and environment in FCZs would not be affected. Interested mariculturists could apply to AFCD for a consent to conduct recreational fishing activities on

Action

mariculture rafts. The Administration had already clarified with the trade that the proposed mariculture standards, if implemented, would apply to licensees who were mainly engaged in mariculture. The Administration had no plan at the present stage to review the conditions for conducting recreational fishing activities on mariculture rafts. AFCD would renew the letter of consent for conducting recreational fishing if the relevant conditions were complied with.

21. PASFH(F)3 added that among the 930 licensed fish farms, only 50 rafts were issued with AFCD's letter of consent for conducting recreational fishing. In the long run, the Administration considered it appropriate to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms which maintained an extremely low level of mariculture activities.

22. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the enforcement actions taken against construction of recreational facilities on rafts for personal entertainment. AD(F)/AFCD responded that marine fish culture was protected and regulated by the Marine Fish Culture Ordinance (Cap. 353) ("MFCO") which required all marine fish culture activities to operate under licence in designated FCZs. The licence conditions required that licensees had to maintain rafts actively engaged in fish culture. In accordance with MFCO, AFCD had instituted actions against about 10 licensees in recent years for constructing on rafts unauthorized facilities/structures which were not related to fish culture activities. Licences were revoked in some cases due to breach of the licence conditions. AFCD would continue to take enforcement actions against contravention of MFCO.

*Use of fish feed*

23. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about the differences between using trash fish and dry pellet feed in fish farming, AD(F)/AFCD said that trash fish were irregular in size with low palatability and tended to sink quickly, leading to a high degree of wastage. The residue deposited on the seabed would result in a heightened risk of hypoxia and death from disease. On the other hand, pellet feed tended to sink at a slower pace. Pellet feed of specific sizes and densities could also be made to minimize size irregularity to enhance the feed palatability and accommodate the feeding habits of cultured species in different growth stages, which in turn would reduce environmental pollution caused by uneaten feed.

24. Mr WONG Mok-yau said that a net was normally installed at the bottom of the rafts to collect uneaten trash fish. Mr Woody WU Wai-kwong said that the residue, if deposited on the seabed, would be consumed by crabs or other fish and would not cause pollution to the seabed. Mr WU said that to his understanding, the ingredients of some dry pellets might include food waste. He expressed concern whether cultured fish fed with dry pellets

Action

would be less delicious and more susceptible to disease. He also wondered whether there was a sufficient variety of dry pellet feed available in the market to suit the needs of different species of fish.

25. AD(F)/AFCD said that in recent years, pellet feed had become more popular. Dry pellets could be formulated to suit particular fish species as well as specific nutritional needs and growth stages of fish. When used properly, dry pellet feed was a better choice in terms of cost, hygiene and impact on the environment. If in doubt about the contents of the dry pellet feed currently available on the market, fish farmers could seek advice from AFCD.

Admin

26. The Administration undertook to provide the following information in writing:

- (a) the differences between using trash fish and dry pellet feed in fish farming in respect of cost, nutritional content, hygiene, availability, effectiveness in fish culturing and impact on the environment and ecology (backed up with scientific and technical information where available); and
- (b) types of dry pellet feed available in the local market.

27. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman requested the Administration to report back to the Panel if there was any progress on/outcome of the consultation with stakeholders on the proposal to strengthen the management of licensed marine fish farms.

**II. Any other business**

28. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:01 pm.

**Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene**  
**Special meeting held on Tuesday, 2 April 2019, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Item I - Administration's proposal to tighten the management of  
licensed fish rafts and to review the licence conditions**

**Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations**

No.	Name of deputation	Submission / Major views and concerns
1.	Hong Kong Fishery Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1096/18-19(01)</li> </ul>
2.	Mr SHEK Dai-hei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expression of dissatisfaction that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD") had revoked his marine fish culture licence ("MFCL") and refused his application of renewal of the letter of consent for continuing recreational fishing business on his mariculture raft.</li> </ul>
3.	Mr SO Chi-hung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(01)</li> </ul>
4.	Mr CHUI Ka-ho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(02)</li> </ul>
5.	Mr LUI Fu-hung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Administration should take into account the actual operating environment of fish farmers in formulating policy on the development of mariculture.</li> </ul>
6.	Mr Woody WU Wai-kwong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(03)</li> </ul>
7.	Mr LAW Kwong-choi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Administration should curb the illegal importation of fisheries products from the Mainland, which seriously affected the business of the local mariculture sector.</li> <li>• The Administration should strengthen the support and assistance provided to local fish farmers to encourage them to increase production output and consider launching a "buy-back" scheme for inactive fish farmers to facilitate their surrender of licences and retirement from the business.</li> </ul>
8.	Mr CHEUNG Chuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/18-19(01)</li> </ul>
9.	Ms NG Siu-yan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed mariculture standards were opposed by many fish farmers.</li> <li>• The Administration should withdraw its proposal to tighten the mariculture standards first and enhance the support provided to the mariculture industry to improve the operating environment for fish farmers.</li> </ul>
10.	Mr YIM Ying-pan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/18-19(02)</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation	Submission / Major views and concerns
11.	Ms CHAN Chun-chun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As all marine fish culture activities were required to operate with valid MFCLs, the Administration should refrain from tightening the licence conditions for licensing.</li> </ul>
12.	Mr LEUNG Kwok-chu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(03)</li> </ul>
13.	Mr MA Kan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(04)</li> </ul>
14.	Mr WAN Chiu-wah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In view of recurrence of red tides in fish culture zones ("FCZs"), the proposed mariculture standards were particularly worrisome.</li> </ul>
15.	Mr YUEN Tim-yeung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expression of support of the views of fish farmers.</li> </ul>
16.	Mr CHEUNG Ching-wan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1139/18-19(01)</li> </ul>
17.	Mr FUNG Shue-lick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the water quality in FCZs was poor, fish farmers had difficulties in conducting culture operations. The Administration should withdraw its proposal to tighten the mariculture standards first and enhance the support provided to the mariculture industry to improve the operating environment for fish farmers.</li> </ul>
18.	Mr SO Lau-sang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1191/18-19(01)</li> </ul>
19.	Hong Kong Fishermen Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(05)</li> </ul>
20.	Hong Kong Fishermen Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Association noted the challenges faced by fish farmers in their daily operations. However, there were views that it was necessary for AFCD to properly manage existing FCZs, as prolonged idling of fish rafts was not desirable and would hinder the development of the mariculture sector.</li> <li>While fish farmers were willing to make better use of the culture areas, a consensus had to be reached among relevant stakeholders on the direction of developing the mariculture industry.</li> </ul>
21.	Mr CHAN Ping-yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(04)</li> </ul>
22.	Mr WONG Siu-keung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(05)</li> </ul>
23.	Mr LEUNG Kam-chuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(06)</li> </ul>
24.	Mr WONG Mok-yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1059/18-19(07)</li> </ul>
<b>Written submission from organizations/individuals not attending the meeting</b>		
1.	Mr CHENG Hoi-chi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LC Paper No. CB(2)1096/18-19(02)</li> </ul>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name of deputation</b>	<b>Submission / Major views and concerns</b>
2.	Mr BO King-yin	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1096/18-19(03)
3.	Mr CHEUNG Lai-ming	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1113/18-19(02)
4.	Hong Kong Fishing Rafts Association	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(06)
5.	Mr CHENG Sum	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(07)
6.	Mr NG Ngau-tai	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(08)
7.	Mr FONG Fuk-loi	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(09)
8.	Hong Kong Trawler Association	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(10)
9.	Mr CHENG Muk-shing	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(11)
10.	Mr LEUNG Kam-ming	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(12)
11.	Mr LEE Yat-loong	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(13)
12.	A member of the public	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(14)
13.	A member of the public	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(15)
14.	Hong Kong Institute for Satoyama Initiatives	• LC Paper No. CB(2)1145/18-19(16)