

**Confirmed Minutes of the 129th Meeting of
the Advisory Council on the Environment
held on 12 September 2005 at 2:30 pm**

Present:

Prof LAM Kin-che, J.P. (Chairman)
Prof HO Kin-chung, B.B.S.
Prof Paul LAM
Mr Peter Y C LEE
Dr NG Cho-nam, B.B.S.
Prof POON Chi-sun
Mr Markus SHAW
Ms Iris TAM, J.P.
Mr TSANG Kam-lam
Prof WONG Yuk-shan, B.B.S., J.P.
Ms Josephine CHEUNG (Acting Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Mr James GRAHAM
Prof Howard HUANG
Ms Goretti LAU
Mrs Mei NG, B.B.S.
Prof WONG Tze-wai

In Attendance:

Mr K K KWOK, J.P.	Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)
Mr Eric CHAN	Assistant Director (Conservation), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) (for Agenda Item 4)
Mr C C LAY	Assistant Director (Conservation) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr Jimmy LEUNG	Assistant Director/Technical Services Planning Department
Ms Monica KO	Principal Information Officer, EPD
Miss Sarah NG	Executive Officer (CBD), EPD

In Attendance for Agenda Item 3 :

Mr Derek ZEN	Chairman of Environmental Committee, Hong Kong Construction Association (HKCA)
Mr Russell JONES	Vice-Chairman of Environmental Committee, HKCA
Mr Anthony CHAN	Vice-Chairman of Environmental Committee, HKCA
Mr Patrick TANG	Technical Secretary, HKCA

Action

Agenda Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 128th meeting held on 15 August 2005

The draft minutes were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2 : Matters arising from the minutes of the 128th meeting held on 15 August 2005

2. The Chairman informed Members that there were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

3. A Member referred to the emissions loading or inventory discussed at the last meeting under agenda item 3 (paragraphs 48 and 52) and reiterated his view that it would be useful to get information on the emissions inventory of fireworks displays of the Hong Kong Disneyland. The Chairman agreed that it would be useful to follow this up as he noticed that there was a significant discrepancy in the scale of the fireworks displays referred to by the project proponent as recorded in the minutes of the meetings in 2000 and 2005. In 2000, the project proponent said that the magnitude in terms of firework material to be used for the displays in the theme park would be about 3% of that used for those carried out in the territory during Chinese New Year. At the meeting in July 2005, the project proponent said that the number of aerial shots and devices in the Disneyland shows would be about 10 to 12% of that of those in the Victoria Harbour fireworks shows. Another Member considered that it would be more meaningful to express the emissions inventory in absolute rather than relative terms as the scale of the Victoria Harbour fireworks shows would also change. By expressing the emissions loading in terms such as pounds or equivalent loading of certain chemicals, it would be more useful for scientific analysis.

Secretariat

Agenda Item 3 : Green Construction – Measures Taken by the Hong Kong Construction Association Members
(ACE Paper 22/2005)

4. The Chairman welcomed the representatives from the Hong Kong Construction Association (HKCA), who kindly attended the meeting, upon the Council's invitation, to brief and update Members on measures taken by the Association's members in green construction.

5. Mr Derek Zen briefed Members on the HKCA's role in promoting green construction, external forces on environmental concerns in the construction industry, efforts made and initiatives taken in reducing construction waste and encouraging environmental-friendly practices as well as the challenges ahead. Mr Zen said that the HKCA and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had been working very closely in enhancing the environmental performance of the industry through the Partnering Programme. He considered, however, that coordinated efforts from all major stakeholders, including industry players, the private sector and relevant Government departments, were crucial in promoting green construction.

6. The Chairman agreed that the promotion of green construction required the joint efforts of major stakeholders for the benefit of the community. He applauded the HKCA for taking the lead and playing an active role in promoting green construction as shown in the setting up of designated websites and publication of practice guides and handbooks.

7. A Member asked why hoardings on the construction sites had to be erected and dismantled during each stage of the construction process, such as during the demolition, site formation and superstructure building stages. He also noted that some of the hoardings were unnecessarily high or large and were painted with volatile organic compound chemicals. These would have negative impacts on the environment and generate a huge amount of construction waste, in particular cement concrete, pinewood and steel. He suggested the contractors adopt overseas technology of using steel bars which could be fitted or welded together as hoardings. They could be used throughout the construction process and dismantled for reuse in other construction sites. Mr Derek Zen agreed that it was common to have several rounds of hoardings in the construction process. The contractors were very passive in erecting hoardings. There were usually different contractors for different construction stages and the contractors had to follow the contract requirements specified by project proponents. To address the problem, he considered that project proponents should take an active role in specifying the requirements for hoardings which could be used during different construction stages. He added that contractors seldom used pinewood to erect hoardings and most of them used iron or steel. As for paintings on the hoardings, the contractors had to follow the specifications required by their clients.

8. Upon the Chairman's enquiry on the reason for project proponents' lack of initiative, Mr Derek Zen said that it was probably because the cost of erecting and dismantling the hoardings was relatively low compared with the total construction cost and the need to meet the tight timeframe in completing the projects was even more important. Moreover, not much attention was paid to this area and project proponents would normally act upon pressure from the Government or industry players. Thus, he considered that there was a need to set up a champion team comprising relevant stakeholders such as project proponents, relevant Government departments and green groups to work out practicable ways to address various problems in reducing construction waste and include these measures in the contract specifications for compliance.

9. A Member said that according to his understanding, there were different requirements for the hoardings during different construction stages and approval had to be obtained from the Buildings Department during each stage under statutory requirements. It was important to involve the Buildings Department in the discussion process. Mr Anthony Chan added that it also depended very much on whether the consultants or architects could afford the time to plan and design hoardings which could cater for the requirements during different construction stages. The contractors played a very passive role by executing what was written in the contracts.

10. A Member asked about the main reasons for the significant drop in the number of successful convictions against the Association's members and she observed that the rate of reduction over the past five years for private works projects (82%) was higher than that for public works projects (77%). Mr Derek Zen considered that the significant drop in successful convictions was mainly due to the members' increasing awareness of statutory requirements and environmental performance in general as well as the change in construction methods and practices to meet the requirements. After the significant drop in the past few years, the number of convictions for private works projects was still about two times that for public works projects.

11. A Member was concerned about the possible aggravation of the problem of illegal dumping on private land after the introduction of the Construction Waste Disposal Charging Scheme by the end of the year and asked how the Trip Ticket System could help tackle the potential problem. Mr Derek Zen said that the Association supported the charging scheme, but had expressed grave concern to EPD about the potential danger of fly-tipping as the amount of charge involved for one truck of construction waste would be as high as \$1,400. The Trip Ticket System which was already in place could help keep track of the whereabouts of the trucks from the loading point to the disposal point. He learnt from EPD that with the installation of a computerized system for processing waste transactions and visual aids at the disposal sites after implementation of the charging scheme, the contractors could check through the EPD website the timing of arrival and departure,

content of waste and tonnage charged for a particular truck. Some of the Association's members had volunteered to join the trial scheme and would suggest further ways to improve the system. They hoped that the tight control could have a deterrent effect and stop malpractices as far as practicable.

12. The Chairman said that it would be important to have a comprehensive monitoring system to avoid the potential danger of fly-tipping. Mr K K Kwok said that the department was very conscious of the risk of fly-tipping due to the introduction of the charging scheme. This was the reason for devising a system such that it would take away any possible incentives for the lorry drivers to fly-tip, for example, the lorry drivers would not handle any cash and the Trip Ticket System would ensure the tracing of every truck loaded at the public landfill.

13. A Member asked whether the level of charge proposed for the charging scheme would be appropriate for contractors to encourage on-site sorting and waste minimization. He considered that the charge was still quite low when compared with those in other countries. Mr Derek Zen considered that the level of charge was attractive enough to encourage contractors to minimize the production of waste to be dumped at the public landfill. The cost in fact would not be borne by contractors but would be built in the project cost to be covered by project proponents. It would be for the Government and project proponents to encourage sorting and minimization of waste by contractors. He anticipated that the charging scheme would have a positive effect on reducing solid waste generation though its effectiveness had yet to be ascertained.

14. Regarding the environmental management plan, Mr K K Kwok said that it was a contractual requirement for the contractors to submit a waste management plan for public works projects. This system had been working well and the environmental performance of the contractors was of a good standard. He wondered whether the construction industry was ready to consider extending this system to private works projects as he anticipated a great advantage in improving the overall environmental performance of the contractors. Mr Derek Zen agreed that it would benefit the industry and contractors would also welcome the arrangement if private developers followed the same practice by incorporating the requirement of a waste management plan into their contracts. However, it depended very much on the willingness of the clients in the private sector. Mr Kwok said that with the experience of public works projects, the time was mature to extend the system across the board and the Administration would take necessary actions to take forward the proposal.

15. A Member complimented the HKCA on being very proactive in promoting and implementing environmental-friendly measures in the construction industry. At the same time, he shared their concerns on the

reluctance of the private sector with the lack of appropriate legislation. He regretted that the Buildings Department had been very reluctant to set out statutory management standards and measures to be adopted by the industry. After about five years' negotiation, the Buildings Department had only managed to set out some advisory or practice notes as some kinds of advisory measures for the industry. The progress of green construction in the private sector was very slow as it was only voluntary rather than mandatory for project proponents to adopt green measures such as minimizing erection of hoardings and requiring environmental management plans as just discussed by the Council. He considered that the Government had taken far too long a time to take the lead and make the move.

16. A Member asked whether it was the right direction for the Government to decide not to pursue the production of recycled aggregates for construction purposes. Mr Derek Zen said that it was necessary to look at the issue from a macro perspective. The production of recycled aggregates would benefit society as a whole rather than individual parties. To concrete producers, it would cost them more to use recycled aggregates as aggregates from the Mainland were very cheap and not all concrete could be produced by recycled aggregates. They had no incentives in producing concrete at a higher cost. However, for society as a whole, the cost of not promoting the use of recycled aggregates would be much higher when the cost of landfill space was taken into account. The situation was a dilemma. The Government had been very active at the beginning in promoting the production of recycled aggregates but it was a pity that the activity had not been further pursued. He considered that the issue had been handled in a piece-meal manner and it was important for parties concerned, especially relevant Government departments, to sit down together to work out practical ways, such as by redistributing costs or providing subsidies, to resolve the dilemma.

17. A Member expressed concern about the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition materials. He considered that the charging scheme could only help resolve part of the problem of the generation of construction waste. The Government seemed to have not taken an active role in setting up a framework to require the use of recycled materials. Mr K K Kwok explained that the use of recycled materials for public works projects was required as part of the waste management plan. Contractors were encouraged to use recycled materials generated from the site as far as possible. Such information had to be included in the submissions to the Public Works Subcommittee of the Legislative Council for funding approval and normally the rate of reuse and recycling was very high.

18. The Chairman asked whether the use of recycled materials such as recycled aggregates would increase the cost of the contractors and thus undermine their chance of winning the contracts. Mr K K Kwok explained that the contractors would compete on a level-playing field for public works projects. The contractors would be expected to achieve a certain level of

performance in the use of recycled materials when they bid for Government projects. The contractors adopting more expensive practices would not be at a disadvantage. The information on reuse and recycling of construction materials was open and transparent as set out in the Public Works Subcommittee papers.

19. Mr Derek Zen said that the Government had introduced an assessment system on contractors and would take into account the assessment results when awarding future contracts. The Association considered that it was important to have objective criteria and standards in order to differentiate the contractors' environmental performance and achieve the intended purpose. The assessment system should be a reward system for contractors. At present, the assessment was rather subjective and there had been cases in which the site inspection teams used the assessment as a threat against the contractors. With objective criteria, they did not mind the authority reviewing and raising the standards as necessary so long as the standards were the same for all. He added that the Association had been working closely with EPD on the issue. However, there was a need for relevant parties, including the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, which was the authority on the issue, and relevant departments, to sit down together for detailed discussion. A Member supported the need for objective and transparent criteria in order to have a meaningful assessment system. She suggested that the rating scales could have more than three grades to distinguish the outstanding performers from the acceptable ones.

20. Upon a Member's enquiry on environmental training for construction workers, Mr Derek Zen said that workers were provided with site-based training and tool box talks which included not only the safety aspect but also the environmental aspect. The same training courses were provided to their members' workers as well as the subcontractors' workers. The Construction Industry Training Authority also organized some environmental training for workers. Under the proposed Pay for Environment Scheme, the clients would pay for the costs of conducting relevant training courses. This would be a further incentive for contractors to conduct environmental training, thus promoting environmental awareness among workers. He considered that education and training, especially for frontline workers, would require much time and effort but it had gradually gained attention in recent years.

21. A Member said that he was impressed by the HKCA's efforts. While the paper covered major topics on green construction, he was disappointed that one of the issues had not been covered. He was concerned about the amount of rubbish and refuse generated, such as lunch boxes, water bottles and plastic or bamboo strips for scaffoldings, on construction sites as there seemed to be no control on such kinds of waste generated. He noticed that there were rules and procedures on the health and safety of workers but there seemed to be no rules and procedures on the cleanliness of construction sites to encourage workers to pay attention to the environment within the sites.

It appeared that some construction sites did not have rubbish bins for workers to dispose of their rubbish. Though it seemed to be a relatively trivial issue, the large amount of rubbish and refuse generated would drift off to the sea and affect the marine environment. He considered that this would be an area worth looking into and site management should consider issuing codes of practice on how to keep construction sites clean and tidy.

22. Mr Derek Zen said that the Association had tried to promote awareness of the cleanliness of construction sites through the websites and practice guides. He would send the Member a copy of the “Best Practice Guide for Environmental Protection on Construction Site” published by the Association for his reference. They would also consider bringing this issue up in the Association’s coming meeting to draw the attention of their members.

(Post-meeting note: A copy of the “Best Practice Guide for Environmental Protection on Construction Site” had been sent to the Member after the meeting.)

23. A Member considered that there should be a check box in the assessment form to assess the cleanliness of the construction site during and after the completion of a project. Mr Derek Zen said that there was a column on environmental performance in the quarterly reports to assess the performance of a particular project. However, there were no details or standards specified. He considered that while there was a mechanism in place to assess the environmental performance of contractors, it should be a fair and open assessment system with specified standards in order to reward the good performers and raise the service quality of the industry.

24. Upon a Member’s enquiry on littering on construction sites, Mr Russell Jones said that construction sites were work places and thus littering on these sites was different from littering in public places. He would like to point out a general phenomenon that contractors were sensitive to economic gains in order to maintain competitive advantages. They would react positively to better environmental practices given monetary considerations. The Construction Waste Disposal Charging Scheme and penalties related to noise pollution beyond conditioned hours were good examples. In fact, contractors were keen to complete the projects within the contract timeframe and within the legal framework. Another Member considered that it was also a matter of education by increasing the awareness of workers to keep the sites clean as their work places were not only construction sites behind the hoardings but also the countryside, public roads and public areas. The Chairman considered that it would be useful to encourage the contractors and management staff to pay more attention to construction site management in particular littering on construction sites during the construction phase. A Member would like to obtain information from relevant Government departments on enforcement against littering on construction sites.

Secretariat

25. The Chairman thanked the HKCA for the opportunity to exchange views on the issue of green construction. He concluded that the Council's views were as follows –

- (a) The Council complimented the HKCA on taking the lead and putting efforts in promoting green construction, such as by setting up designated websites and publishing practice guides and handbooks;
- (b) The Council noted the HKCA's support for the Construction Waste Disposal Charging Scheme to be implemented. While noting the potential benefit of the scheme in reducing solid waste generation, the Council and HKCA shared the same concern about the potential risk of fly-tipping as a result. Both parties hoped that there would be a comprehensive monitoring system for ensuring proper disposal of construction and demolition waste;
- (c) The Council agreed with the HKCA that green construction was an issue concerning not just the contractors and EPD. It also required the joint efforts of other major stakeholders, including project proponents, developers, the private sector as well as other Government departments such as the Buildings Department. There should be a platform for major stakeholders to maintain a dialogue on effective means to promote green construction activities, such as by expanding the existing Partnering Programme;
- (d) The Council considered that there should be a reward system in environmental assessment with objective and transparent criteria as a driving force to encourage environmental-friendly practices on construction sites;
- (e) The Council encouraged the contractors and management staff to pay more attention to construction site management, particularly littering on construction sites during the construction phase; and
- (f) The Council was concerned that there might be some reluctance in the use of recycled construction materials and hoped that there would be measures to encourage the use of recycled construction materials.

Agenda Item 4 : Report of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee on “New Nature Conservation Policy – Pilot Conservation Management Agreement Proposals”
(ACE Paper 23/2005)

26. The Chairman noted that the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), in which he was serving, was one of the supporting organizations for the proposal submitted by the Tai Po Environmental Association (TPEA). He clarified that he did not have any direct or indirect involvement in the project. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that he did not envisage any conflict of interest as CUHK was merely one of the supporting organizations and not the applicant and CUHK was a very large institution. He suggested and Members agreed that the Chairman should stay to chair the meeting.

27. A Member declared interest for his heavy involvement in the proposals submitted by the Conservancy Association (CA) and the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) as he was the Director of the CA and the Vice-Chairman of the HKBWS. Another Member declared interest for his direct involvement in the proposal submitted by the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) as he was the Chairman of the WWF. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed that both Members should refrain from taking part in the discussion by leaving the venue in accordance with the clause regarding avoidance of conflict of interests as stipulated in the Guide to Application for the Pilot Conservation Management Agreement (MA) Projects. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Eric Chan said that the application guideline was set by the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) Committee after agreeing to the allocation of \$5 million for the implementation of the pilot MA projects.

28. A Member declared interest as Green Power, of which he was the President, agreed to provide assistance to the TPEA in implementing the education programme of the proposal. The two organizations had not started any dialogue on the education programme. In view of the relative indirect relationship between the Member and the TEPA's proposal, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that the Member could stay at the meeting.

(The two Members concerned left the meeting at this juncture.)

29. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that the Government had announced a new nature conservation policy in November 2004. Under the new policy, 12 priority sites had been identified for enhanced protection and the Administration undertook to implement a pilot scheme for MAs as one of the measures to enhance the ecological value of these sites. Under this pilot scheme, non-government organizations (NGOs) might apply for funding from the Government for entering into MAs with the landowners. On 1 September 2005, the Subcommittee considered the four

applications received and recommended that all four applications be supported. The Subcommittee also discussed and made recommendations on issues of sustainability and monitoring of the projects as well as collaboration among project proponents.

30. A Member said that the Ramsar site and Deep Bay Wetland outside the Ramsar site proposed for the Fish Farming Scheme by the WWF were very large. He questioned whether it was appropriate to provide Government land and subsidies to NGOs and fish farmers to carry out commercial activities. He cautioned that the applications had to be handled carefully as economic gains would be generated, involving the interests of different parties. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee clarified that the land or fishponds concerned were privately owned. It was due to the deteriorating ecological state that the site was identified for enhanced protection through joint efforts by providing financial incentives. Income generated would be invested into the project in order to ensure the sustainability of the project and thus the site. Nevertheless, he did not expect the project to generate huge income during the pilot stage given the heavy initial investment. Moreover, all the project proponents had stated clearly in the proposals how the funding would be deployed. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) would also closely monitor the implementation of the projects, including the financial aspect.

31. A Member questioned why it was necessary for the landowners to co-operate with NGOs in carrying out the projects. For developing and sustaining the fish-farming industry, the Government could consider setting up a scheme to provide land or subsidies to interested parties direct to encourage fish-farming activities. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee considered that this involved issues at the policy level and outside the scope of the agenda item. The Chairman pointed out that the Council had endorsed the new nature conservation policy including the pilot scheme in late 2004. It was open to all interested parties to make MA applications.

32. Mr C C Lay explained that the objective of the WWF's proposal was not to increase fish production but to enhance the ecological value of the site. By encouraging the fishpond operators to resume traditional fish-farming management such as clearing the fishpond annually, it would also enhance the protection of birds in the area. To offset the higher cost in adopting more eco-friendly methods, the WWF proposed some revenue-generating activities such as "foster parents". The pilot project aimed at exploring ways to strike a balance between nature conservation and commercial activities. The Chairman considered that on top of maintaining agricultural or fishing activities, the pilot projects could help manage the ecological system of the sites for enhancing the ecological value of the sites.

33. A Member considered that it would be a win-win situation if the pilot projects would enhance the ecological value of the sites and generate

income for the landowners. The Chairman shared her view and said that higher economic gains for landowners would make the proposals more financially sustainable. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that as the funding would be one-off in nature, it would be important for the project proponents to identify alternative sources of funding as proposed by the Subcommittee.

34. A Member noted that both the HKBWS and CA would enter into MAs with landowners inside Long Valley and he considered that their objectives were quite similar. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that the Subcommittee had also raised similar concern. Based on the explanations given by the two project proponents, the sites covered by the two projects did not overlap and the two proposals had different focuses. The HKBWS's proposal, covering the southern part of Long Valley, focused more on the enhancement of habitats for birds while the CA's proposal, covering the northern part, put more emphasis on formulating a sustainable habitat management strategy for the local community. After detailed deliberation, the Subcommittee considered that both proposals were worth supporting. Nevertheless, the Subcommittee had suggested clearly that the two organizations should collaborate closely with each other by sharing experience and information so as to ensure that resources would be effectively used.

35. Mr K K Kwok agreed that the two project proponents should collaborate closely to gain complementary benefits of the two projects for enhancing the ecological value of Long Valley as a whole, in particular in the provision of services or launching of activities for the public, project management as well as sharing of data and information.

36. A Member pointed out that the site area of Long Valley was not very large. To ensure successful implementation of the pilot scheme and avoid confusing the public, he agreed that the two organizations should maintain close coordination, particularly in public relations work such as releasing information and liaising with the public.

37. Noting that the total amount of funding requested by the four proposals exceeded the allocation of \$5 million, a Member asked why the HKBWS and CA were not requested to combine their proposals with a view to cutting down the funding requirements. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that the two organizations had a dialogue with each other and stated in their proposals that they would support each other's project. They also agreed to the Subcommittee's suggestion for close collaboration. As the two projects were complementary and the two organizations had different visions on their endeavours to improve the environment, it was not desirable to press for merging the projects. Moreover, healthy competition might lead to better results. The Member shared his views. A Subcommittee Member pointed out that it was the

Subcommittee's sentiment that the two organizations should be able to work towards the goal of joining hands after two years' cooperation. The Chairman said that as highlighted in the judgment of the appeal case on the Spur Line, it was important that the wetland in Long Valley should be handled as a contiguous land. Therefore, the two project proponents should work towards the benefit of the whole piece of wetland in Long Valley.

38. A Member asked how the two parts in Long Valley were physically divided. He considered that it might appear strange to the public for the site to be covered by two separate projects. Another Member said that the two parts were generally divided by the rail tunnel running across Long Valley. Mr C C Lay explained that the CA's project focused on green and organic farming. There was more active agricultural land in the northern part of Long Valley and thus the chance of encouraging farmers to adopt organic farming would be higher. On the other hand, there was more abandoned agricultural land in the southern part which provided more flexibility for the HKBWS to create small habitats to increase the biodiversity of avifauna. He highlighted that the two organizations had stated clearly in their applications that they would liaise closely on division of work and collaboration to minimize duplication of efforts. For example, the HKBWS would oversee bird watching issues while the CA would oversee ecological monitoring for Long Valley as a whole.

39. A Member considered that the capacity of the two projects to generate income would be quite different and it might be more cost-effective to have a single project for the entire site. Chairman of the Nature Conservation Subcommittee said that land covered by the two projects belonged to different landowners. He considered that the two-year pilot scheme could help resolve uncertainties and give a more concrete indication on the future development of the site.

40. A Member agreed that it was not desirable to press for merging the projects though a joint project might appear to be more cost-effective. Being a pilot scheme, it would be a good experiment for the two organizations with different visions to adopt different management approaches to implement nature conservation proposals. This would help identify the best way to enhance the ecological value of the site as a whole in the future.

41. The Chairman concluded that the Council endorsed the Subcommittee's recommendation that the four applications be supported, and made the following suggestions -

- (a) Project proponents should start early in identifying alternative sources of funding with a view to achieving sustainability of the projects;
- (b) The AFCD should actively monitor the implementation of all

the approved projects; and

- (c) The HKBWS and CA, both proposing to enter into MAs with landowners inside Long Valley, were advised to closely collaborate with each other and share experience and information to ensure that resources would be effectively used.

Agenda Item 5 : Any Other Business

Tentative items for discussion at the next meeting

- 42. The agenda was being compiled. Members would be informed in due course.

Agenda Item 6 : Date of Next Meeting

- 43. The next meeting was scheduled for 10 October 2005.

(Post-meeting note: The meeting scheduled for 10 October 2005 was cancelled.)