

**Confirmed Minutes of the 244th Meeting
of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE)
on 8 March 2021 at 2:30 pm**

Present:

Mr Stanley WONG, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Nora TAM, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ms Carmen CHAN, BBS, JP
Ms Sylvia CHAN, MH
Ms Ada FUNG, BBS
Ir Samantha KONG
Ms LAM Chung-yan
Prof Alexis LAU, JP
Ms Julia LAU
Dr Winnie LAW
Mr Andrew LEE
Prof Kenneth LEUNG, JP
Dr MA Kwan-ki
Dr Jeanne NG
Dr SUNG Yik-hei
Ms Christina TANG
Mr Simon WONG, JP
Dr WONG Kwok-yan
Prof WONG Sze-chun, BBS, JP
Dr Raymond YAU
Mr Owin FUNG, JP (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Prof LAU Chi-pang, BBS, JP

In Attendance:

Ms Maisie CHENG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment / Director of Environmental Protection
Ms Fanny HUI	Chief Information Officer, Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Simon CHAN	Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Ms Maggie CHIN	Assistant Director of Planning / Technical Services (Acting), Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Becky LAM	Chief Executive Officer (CBD), EPD
Miss Sally SHEK	Executive Officer (CBD) 1, EPD
Miss Ingrid SUEN	Executive Officer (CBD) 2, EPD

In Attendance for Item 4:

Mr Bruno LUK	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (Special Projects), EPD
Ms Iris LEE	Assistant Director (Waste Management), EPD
Mr Stephen SIU	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Strategy Development), EPD

In Attendance for Item 5:

Mr Bruno LUK	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (Special Projects), EPD
Miss Jessica CHENG	Assistant Director (Special Projects), EPD

Action

The Chairman welcomed Members to the meeting in person or by Zoom and informed that apologies of absence had been received from Prof Lau Chi-pang. He welcomed Ms Ada Fung, Prof Alexis Lau, Dr Ma Kwan-ki, Dr Jeanne Ng, Dr Wong Kwok-yan and Dr Raymond Yau who joined the meeting for the first time.

Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 243rd meeting on 7 December 2020 (Closed-door session)

2. The draft minutes were confirmed with proposed amendments in paragraph 50 and endorsed by the meeting with no further amendments.

Item 2 : Matters arising (Closed-door session)

3. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

Item 3 : Election of Chairman/Deputy Chairman of the three subcommittees (Closed-door session)

4. The Chairman informed Members that 14 Members had signed up for the EIA Subcommittee (EIASC), 11 for the Nature Conservation Subcommittee (NCSC) and 13 for the Waste Management Subcommittee (WMSC) in the new term.

5. The Chairman advised that according to the ACE House Rules, the Chairmen of the three subcommittees as well as the Deputy Chairman of EIASC would be elected amongst the respective subcommittee members. He also reminded Members that only those who had signed up for the relevant subcommittee could take part in the nomination and election.

6. The Chairman called for nominations for the chairmanship of the three subcommittees one by one and presided over the election process. The outcomes of all the subcommittees were reached by consensus. The Chairman announced the results as follows –

	Chairman	Deputy Chairman
EIASC	Prof Nora Tam	Prof Kenneth Leung
NCSC	Prof Kenneth Leung	Not Applicable
WMSC	Ms Julia Lau	Not Applicable

Item 4 : Public Consultation on the Producer Responsibility Scheme on Plastic Beverage Containers
(ACE Paper 1/2021)

7. The Chairman referred Members to *ACE Paper 1/2021* on the three-month public consultation launched by the Government on 22 February 2021 about introducing a producer responsibility scheme (PRS) on plastic beverage containers (PPRS) for the proper and effective management of waste plastic beverage containers.

8. A Member declared that his company was involved in the provision of reverse vending machines (RVMs). The Chairman agreed that the Member could continue to participate in the meeting and the discussion of this item.

(The presentation team joined the meeting at this juncture.)

Presentation cum Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)

9. Mr Bruno Luk made opening remarks and Mr Stephen Siu briefed Members on the details of the proposed scheme with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Proposed framework of the PPRS

10. A Member opined and another Member concurred that the PPRS might be confused with the message of waste reduction at source and suggested the Government emphasize the importance of waste reduction at source when promoting PPRS. Mr Bruno Luk advised that on one hand, the PPRS aimed to encourage the public to properly handle and recycle the waste plastics; on the other hand, the Government would continue to implement other measures to encourage waste reduction at source, for instance, banning the sales of bottled water at the Government facilities and venues, such as sports facilities.

11. A Member suggested, and echoed by another Member, the Government consider imposing a sale tax to discourage members of the public from purchasing bottled beverage. Mr Bruno Luk explained that the introduction of any new tax was a sensitive and controversial issue. In terms of financial incentives, Mr Luk advised that EPD proposed to allow moderate reduction of the recycling levy for suppliers based on the amount of containers collected and recycled on the suppliers' own initiatives. Drawing experiences from PRS implemented in overseas countries, he observed that suppliers would be motivated to modify and produce more environmentally-friendly beverage containers to facilitate recycling if the levy could be reduced.

12. A Member expressed his support on introducing the PPRS and suggested the Government consider a deposit refund system to motivate recycling. Mr Bruno Luk advised that the general principle of the PRS was to provide financial incentive to encourage the public to return used beverage containers. However, a bottle deposit refund system would increase the administration cost especially for small and medium-sized retailers whereas a rebate arrangement would be simpler in terms of scheme administration.

Scope of coverage

13. The Chairman remarked that plastic beverage containers only accounted for 5%, i.e. 106 tonnes per day, out of the 2 320 tonnes of waste plastics disposed of at landfills daily in 2019. Two Members concurred with the Chairman that apart from the plastic beverage containers, the Government should devise a holistic plan or blueprint for handling all types of plastic containers. Another Member aspired that the other types of plastic containers could also be included in the scheme in the near future.

14. Mr Bruno Luk responded that plastic beverage containers were comparatively light in weight but numerous in number and had occupied much spaces in the landfills, thus the significance of plastic beverage containers was in fact higher than it seemed. As plastic beverage containers were one of the most popular single-use plastic products in daily life, PPRS would be the first step of the Government to tackle waste plastics problem. In fact, the consultancy study on PPRS, as commissioned by the Government, also included another part on examining the management of plastic personal care product containers.

15. Mr Bruno Luk supplemented that apart from the PPRS, the Government had launched various initiatives in parallel with a view to reducing overall municipal solid waste. For instance, EPD was reviewing the Plastic Shopping Bag Charging Scheme and conducting a consultancy study regarding the handling of single-use plastic tableware, in order to alleviate the plastic waste problem in Hong Kong. To strengthen the support for waste reduction and recycling at the district level, EPD was building a community recycling network which facilitated members of the public to recycle eight types of recyclables at convenient locations.

16. A Member suggested the Government provide information on the spaces occupied by plastic beverage containers in the landfills to illustrate to members of the public the significance of PPRS in reducing the burdens in the landfills.

17. A Member welcomed the implementation of PPRS, but suggested that the scheme should cover beverage cartons as well. Mr Bruno Luk explained that recycling of beverage cartons was more complicated than plastic beverage containers as members of the public were required to cut and rinse the cartons before recycling. He further explained that the Government might have to make the necessary preparatory work and ascertain the capability of relevant recycling

facilities before extending the coverage of the PRS to beverage cartons.

18. In response to two Members' question regarding the volume of containers covered in PPRS and the justifications, Mr Bruno Luk advised that it was proposed to cover containers with volume ranging from 100mL to 2L in PPRS as some 99% of the plastic-bottled beverage products available in the market was within this range. In addition, many RVMs could only accept containers up to 2L in volume. He said that for containers below 100mL, the RVMs might have technical constraint to identify the small verification barcode on the plastic containers.

19. The Chairman remarked that the suppliers of plastic-bottled beverage might change the packaging of beverage to cartons in order to evade the recycling levy. Mr Bruno Luk considered that the chance of changing the packaging of the beverage to evade the levy would be small as it involved high investment costs and not all beverage could be served in cartons.

Rebate for return of used containers

20. Regarding the rebate for return of used containers, the Chairman pointed out and a Member concurred that a proposed rebate of 10 cents per container might not provide sufficient incentive for the public to return the used containers. Two Members also suggested that at least 50 cents would be considered more effective in driving behavioural change. With reference to another Member's experiences with RVMs in two commercial buildings, he shared that people were generally receptive to RVMs although he noticed a drop in the use of RVMs when the rebate was reduced from 20 cents to 10 cents. However, the Member reminded that the suppliers might transfer the costs to consumers if the rebate was too high and might arouse negative sentiment among members of the public.

21. Mr Bruno Luk observed that the public had different views on the proposed rebate level. He shared that the Government had rolled out a pilot scheme in January 2021 with a total of 60 RVMs installed at different locations in phases, which offered a rebate of 10 cents per container and over 200 000 plastic bottles had been collected during the first five weeks of the scheme. He opined that the rebate level of 10 cents appeared to be effective to a certain extent in incentivising the public to return the containers. He further explained that if the rebate level was too high, problems such as attracting used plastic containers from other countries and the use of fraudulent barcodes might arise.

22. Two Members pointed out that the Government should take appropriate measures to counter any potential problems incurred by the proposed rebate instead of reducing the attractiveness of the rebate level. Mr Bruno Luk responded that the Government would review the rebate level after gauging the public's views through the current public consultation.

23. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Bruno Luk said that members of the public could choose to redeem the rebate via different e-payment platforms or donate the rebate to designated charities under the RVM pilot scheme.

24. In response to a Member's question on the differences of rebate and recycling fee, Mr Bruno Luk advised that a flat rate was adopted for rebate regardless of container sizes to encourage the public to return containers regardless of the size. On the other hand, as the recycling levy was used to cover the costs for collecting and processing waste plastics, the recycling fee was set in proportion to the container volume.

Return points

25. A Member enquired whether RVMs or related facilities could include functions for cleaning the plastic containers to minimise the potential hygiene problems arising from the returned containers. Mr Bruno Luk advised that currently, the RVMs could identify the shape and weight of the containers to ensure that only eligible and empty containers would be accepted. As some RVM models (like those used in RVM Pilot Scheme) were equipped with compression function, this could minimise hygiene problem after compression.

26. A Member remarked that the influx of people to return plastic containers at the retail stores might cause disturbances to their operation and business. In this connection, another Member enquired whether there would be any financial incentive for the retailers to install RVMs in their stores. Mr Bruno Luk advised that it was proposed to engage retail stores with retail floor area of, say, over 200m² to serve as designated return points. Such retailers could provide return service either manually or automatically through the application of RVMs. As the retailing industry played an important role in the operation of the PRS, Mr Luk said that the Government would maintain close communication with the industry and might consider providing financial incentive to encourage their participation.

27. A Member suggested the Government install RVMs in strategic locations where lots of plastic beverage containers were disposed of, such as the country parks and piers. Mr Bruno Luk said that the Government would take into account the public's views on the proposed locations of return points gathered in the current public consultation.

28. In reply to a Member's suggestion to ensure that the RVMs would not overflow, Mr Bruno Luk advised that the RVMs were currently equipped with functions to monitor, in real time, the used and remaining capacities of the storage compartments in RVMs and would alert the contractor for collection when the RVMs were almost full. The status of each RVM was also available on the designated website of the Pilot Scheme for reference of the public before they set off for plastic beverage container recycling.

29. A Member suggested incorporating educational elements on the RVMs, such as showing promotional messages regarding the urgency of recycling or the proper handling of recyclables collected on the screen of the RVMs. Mr Bruno Luk replied that the suggestion would be taken into consideration when reviewing the scheme with the contractors.

Proper recycling and treatment

30. A Member was supportive of the PPRS and enquired whether the local recyclers would be able to handle a sudden surge of plastic beverage containers collected from the PPRS. Another Member concurred with the Member and stressed the importance of ensuring the local recyclers were prepared and equipped to properly handle the collected containers.

31. Mr Bruno Luk advised that different return points would be set up by Return Network Operators (RNOs) and they were required to supply the collected containers to recycling facilities with licences. Mr Stephen Siu said that in developing the PPRS, the Government had reviewed the plastic recycling industry in Hong Kong and market research showed that the capacity of the local recyclers could absorb the collected plastic containers from PPRS. He added that recycling of plastic beverage containers was a profitable and sustainable business insofar there was a steady supply of the recyclables in sufficient quantity. The local recyclers were keen to have the waste plastic containers provided by PPRS for recycling.

32. A Member expressed his support on imposing licensing control on the recycling facilities which handled the plastic beverage containers collected under the proposed PPRS. As the recyclers were expected to report back to the Government, the licencing system could ensure the recyclables collected be properly treated and tracked. On the other hand, the public would be able to know the containers they returned were properly treated.

Education

33. A Member remarked that education should be one of the key elements in the proposed PPRS to drive behavioural change of the public. Another Member suggested the Government educate the public on the impact or the cost of disposing of plastic beverage containers without recycling. Mr Bruno Luk advised that the Government had various education initiatives to promote clean recycling and waste reduction at source. He assured that the Government would spare no efforts on public education for environmental protection.

Timetable

34. With a view to meeting the targets set in the *Waste Blueprint for Hong Kong 2035*, a Member enquired about the timeframe for the implementation of the proposed PPRS. Mr Bruno Luk advised that the Government targeted to introduce the legislation into the Legislative Council in around 2022 and expected that the PPRS could be implemented in around 2024-25 the earliest.

35. In reply to a Member's enquiry on the differences between the PRSs for glass beverage containers and the plastic beverage containers, Mr Bruno Luk advised that for glass beverage containers, the Government rolled out a voluntary scheme prior to the implementation of the mandatory PRS. For PRS on plastic beverage containers, voluntary recycling scheme was not adopted before introducing the legislation into the Legislative Council which would enhance the implementation of the PPRS.

Conclusion

36. The Chairman summarised the views made by Members and concluded that Members were in general supportive of the proposed PPRS. He thanked the representatives of EPD for their presentation and detailed explanations.

(The presentation team left the meeting at this juncture.)

Item 5 : Municipal Solid Waste Charging - Invitation for Submissions by the Legislative Council to the Bills Committee Formed on 16 October 2020 to Study the Waste Disposal (Charging for Municipal Solid Waste) (Amendment) Bill 2018

(ACE Papers 2/2021 and 3/2021)

37. The Chairman informed that *ACE Paper 2/2021* briefed Members on the latest position of the Waste Disposal (Charging for Municipal Solid Waste) (Amendment) Bill 2018 (the Bill), various waste reduction and recycling initiatives launched and planned by EPD and invited Members to consider whether to respond to the invitation for submissions by the Legislative Council to the Bills Committee. A background note on the subject matter, i.e. *ACE Paper 3/2021*, prepared by the Secretariat had been circulated to Members for reference before the meeting.

38. Upon the invitation of the Chairman, a Member declared that she was a member of the Council for Sustainable Development and the Convenor of the Support Group on Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Charging that conducted the public engagement in 2012. Another Member declared that he was the Chief Executive Officer of LH Group and had interests in the food and beverage industry. The Chairman agreed that both Members mentioned above could continue to participate in the meeting and the discussion of this item.

(The presentation team joined the meeting at this juncture.)

Presentation cum Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)

39. Mr Bruno Luk gave an opening remark and Miss Jessica Cheng briefed Members on the Bill as well as various waste reduction and recycling initiatives launched and planned by EPD with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Proper handling of recyclables

40. A Member opined and another Member concurred that it was crucial to ensure the proper handling of the recyclables collected which would encourage members of the public to practise recycling at source. Mr Bruno Luk responded that the cleanliness of the recyclables might have caused problems in their handling

in some cases. He said that EPD had taken over the management of recycling bins in public places from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) since October 2020. Under the new contract for recyclables collection services, the contractor had to ensure that the collected recyclables would be properly handled and turned into resources. EPD also made improvements to the design and distribution of the recycling bins with a view to enhancing their effectiveness and efficiency in collecting recyclables. He agreed that strengthening the public's confidence in the proper handling of recyclables collected was vital and would continue to strengthen the monitoring on recyclables collection services.

Publicity and public education

41. Three Members expressed support for the MSW charging and agreed that it was necessary and overdue. A Member echoed the view of another Member that the Government should promote a concept that waste collection and recycling was a public service and hence the charging was reasonable and justified. Miss Jessica Cheng explained that MSW charging aimed to provide financial disincentive to drive behavioural changes to reduce waste generation and disposal. It was not the Government's intention to raise revenue or recover the costs incurred by the Government in providing waste collection and disposal service through MSW charging.

42. Three Members stressed the importance of education and publicity to enhance the public's understanding on the importance of MSW charging and cultivate a sense of responsibility to protect the environment. A Member suggested enhancing cross-departmental collaboration with a high-level steer for devising long-term plan and blueprint for education in respect of sustainable development and environmental protection, which would achieve more effective education in the longer run. He also suggested conducting research under the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) to evaluate the effectiveness of public education on environmental protection in the past.

43. Mr Bruno Luk agreed that it was necessary for EPD to collaborate with other government bureaux and departments (B/Ds) in taking forward environmental protection education. He said that a high-level Steering Committee on Climate Change chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration had been set up to steer and co-ordinate among relevant B/Ds in combating climate change, including waste management.

44. A Member shared that the efforts in promoting environmental protection in schools depended on the schools' mission, which varied among the schools. Another Member further remarked that cross-departmental collaboration with high-level steer for promoting environmental protection specifically in schools as well as the inclusion of environmental protection in the schools' regular curriculum would bring about more substantial and sustained impact than unstructured and occasional education campaigns. Mr Bruno Luk replied that EPD would explore with the Education Bureau on the suggestion proposed by the Member.

Non-compliance and enforcement actions

45. Two Members raised concerns about non-compliances of the Bill such as illegal dumping and use of non-designated garbage bags. The Chairman suggested that EPD might consider the detailed implementation issues such as the penalty for illegal dumping at roadside in public places and country parks. A Member highlighted the effectiveness of strict enforcement actions in driving behavioural changes. Miss Jessica Cheng responded that it would take time to cultivate the necessary behavior change and it was expected that fly-tipping problem might aggravate during the initial period of the implementation of MSW charging. In this regard, the FEHD had set up dedicated enforcement teams to step up enforcement actions against various public cleanliness offences including fly-tipping problem at black spots. EPD would strive to maintain a stable supply of designated garbage bags and designated labels in the market with some 4 000 authorised sales outlets. Publicity and public education would be stepped up to further raise public's understanding of the charging regime.

46. In response to a Member's enquiry of the consequences of using a counterfeit garbage bag, Miss Jessica Cheng replied that depending on the actual circumstances of each case, it might be an offence under the Bill if a person disposed of MSW wrapped in counterfeit garbage bags. The sale or use of counterfeit garbage bag for disposal of MSW could also amount to relevant offences under other existing Ordinances such as Trade Descriptions Ordinance.

Preparatory and phasing-in period

47. While acknowledging that there would be challenges in the initial implementation of MSW charging, a Member opined that it was necessary to pass

the Bill as soon as possible. She highlighted that majority of the public was supportive of MSW charging during the public engagement conducted by the Council for Sustainable Development in 2012 and that MSW charging was long overdue as compared with cities in other jurisdictions. In view of the readiness of the public and the prolonged discussion of MSW charging in Hong Kong, the Member suggested that, with the support of the Chairman and another Member, the Government might shorten the preparatory period and phasing-in period and commence the implementation of MSW charging as early as possible.

Complementary measures

48. A Member recommended the Government to strengthen complementary measures on community support to facilitate easy and convenient recycling, such as mandatory placement of recycling bins on each floor of housing estates. Another Member also highlighted the importance of complementary measures such as advanced technological research on recycling and research on the public awareness to provide further insight on the implementation of MSW charging. Miss Jessica Cheng responded that various measures had been carried out by EPD including MSW charging trial projects, which engaged residents of public rental housing estates to try out MSW charging in real life situation. Publicity and public education activities had been carried out to encourage residents to practise waste separation at source and waste reduction. She said that EPD would continue to carry out complementary measures to solicit community support.

49. A Member suggested that a reduction in the number of litter containers by phases would help drive behavioural changes. While acknowledging that some people might resort to illegal dumping, Mr Bruno Luk agreed that it would be reasonable to gradually adjust the number of litter containers and recycling bins in public places.

Stakeholders consultation

50. Highlighting the importance of collaboration with the business sector, a Member enquired whether EPD had taken into account the comments of stakeholders in the public engagement in 2012. Miss Jessica Cheng shared that some stakeholders were concerned with the use of public money collected from MSW charging. She explained that EPD had deployed additional resources to support various waste reduction and recycling initiatives since the introduction of

the Bill in November 2018. These initiatives included the Pilot Scheme on Waste Plastic Collection and Recycling to provide free collection service for waste plastics in three districts, the Pilot Scheme on Food Waste Collection, the Waste Paper Collection and Recycling Services etc.

Effectiveness of MSW charging and trial projects

51. A Member enquired about statistics regarding the effectiveness of MSW charging in the short to long term. Another Member further enquired about the effectiveness of MSW charging trial projects launched. Miss Jessica Cheng shared that different sectors were invited to try out the use of dummy designated garbage bags for waste disposal. A mock statement was given to individual participating party to show them the estimated payable MSW charges. These completed trials project, which did not involve actual payment of MSW charges, showed that there was a reduction of MSW by around 10% on average. She aspired that the effectiveness in waste reduction should be higher upon the implementation of MSW charging.

Targets in Waste Blue Print for Hong Kong 2035

52. With regard to the *Waste Blueprint for Hong Kong 2035*, a Member enquired whether the Government had taken into account the challenges faced by the local waste paper recycling industry, such as the downturn of the external recycling market, in setting the targets on per capita MSW disposal and recovery rate. Mr Bruno Luk explained that the targets were set with reference to the experiences of implementation of quantity-based charging in other cities as well as the launching of various waste reduction and recycling measures.

53. In response to a Member's comment on the outcome of the previous Blueprint for 2013-2022, Mr Bruno Luk explained that the measures set out in the previous Blueprint had largely been implemented except for MSW charging. As MSW charging was not implemented as planned and the external recycling market experienced a downturn, the outcome of the previous Blueprint fell short of the expectation. He aspired that successful implementation of MSW charging would play a significant role in the reduction of wastes at source.

Catering business and food waste

54. A Member expressed that charging the business owners of the catering industry might not be effective in the reduction of food waste as the diners were the contributors of the food wastes. Another Member considered that the catering industry would be more incentivised to practise food waste separation and recycling if subsidies could be provided to them for delivering food waste to the food waste treatment facilities. Miss Jessica Cheng replied that the Pilot Scheme on Food Waste Collection and some ECF projects had been launched to collect food waste generated from some restaurants. She said that EPD was planning to expand the scope of pilot scheme to cover more restaurants from different settings.

55. With regard to the low percentage of food waste being treated currently, a Member suggested the Government provide a more comprehensive blueprint on the reduction of food waste including the expansion of food waste treatment facilities and complementary measures in wet markets. Miss Jessica Cheng responded that experiences in overseas cities showed that it would not be desirable to withhold the implementation of MSW charging until all recycling or waste treatment facilities were in place. A multi-pronged approach was being adopted by the Government to tackle waste management problem.

Recycling facilities for new housing projects

56. With a Member's experiences from various pilot schemes or trial projects at shopping malls or buildings, he shared that tenants were in general receptive and positive towards MSW charging. The Member suggested that the Government should encourage the provision of more recycling facilities in buildings by stipulating the requirement in Buildings Ordinance or by offering Gross Floor Areas concessions to developers. Another Member suggested that the Government might set out the requirement on provision of recycling facilities in new development projects in relevant Guidelines or Code of Practices. Miss Jessica Cheng replied that EPD was exploring with the Development Bureau on the possibility of enhancing the provision of recycling facilities in new development projects.

Conclusion

57. The Chairman summarised that Members were in general supportive of MSW charging and were of the view that it was long overdue and should be implemented as soon as possible. In this regard, the Chairman suggested the ACE submit a resolution to the Bills Committee after this meeting to express its support on MSW charging and urged the early passage of the Bill. The Chairman thanked the representatives of EPD for their presentation and detailed explanations.

Internal Discussion Session (Closed-door session)

58. A Member shared that ACE submitted a written resolution to Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Bills Committee in 2018 after the 233rd ACE meeting to urge the Government and the Legislative Council to work together and facilitate the early passage of the Bill. In this regard, she suggested submitting another resolution to DEP and the Bills Committee after this meeting for the same purpose. To facilitate early submission of the views of ACE to DEP and the Bills Committee, a draft resolution was circulated for Members' reference before the meeting.

59. A Member suggested and the meeting agreed that the resolution should also mention that appropriate support should be provided to the catering industry. As Members had no further comments, the Chairman agreed to submit the resolution to Bills Committee after the meeting as soon as possible.

(Post-meeting notes: The resolution was issued to DEP and the Bills Committee respectively on 12 March 2021.)

(The presentation team left the meeting at this juncture.)

Item 6 : Any other business (Closed-door session)

EIA Report not selected by EIASC for submission to ACE

60. The Chairperson of the EIASC reported that since the last Council meeting, EIASC received the Executive Summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on "Revised Austin Road Flyover" which the Subcommittee had not selected for discussion. The Executive Summary of the

EIA report had been circulated to EIASC Members upon commencement of the public inspection period, with the relevant hyperlinks copied to non-EIASC Members for information. Individual Members were advised to provide their comments, if any, on the EIA report directly to the DEP within the public inspection period. Given that the EIA report had not been selected by EIASC for presentation and discussion, the Chairperson concluded that EPD would take that ACE had no comments on the EIA report under section 8(3)(b) of the EIA Ordinance.

Item 7 : Date of next meeting (Closed-door session)

61. The next meeting was scheduled for 12 April 2021 (Monday). Members would be advised on the agenda in due course.

**ACE Secretariat
March 2021**