

**Confirmed Minutes of the 114th Meeting of
the Advisory Council on the Environment
held on 8 March 2004 at 2:30 p.m.**

Present:

Prof. LAM Kin-che, J.P. (Chairman)
Prof. Peter HILLS
Prof. HO Kin-chung
Mr. Peter Y. C. LEE
Dr. NG Cho-nam
Mrs. Mei NG, B.B.S
Prof. POON Chi-sun
Mr. Otto L. T. POON, B.B.S.
Mr. Michael J. D. RUSHWORTH
Ms. Iris TAM, J.P.
Prof. WONG Yuk-shan, J.P.
Ms. Jessie WONG (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Mr. LIN Chaan-ming
Prof. LUNG Ping-yee, David, S.B.S., J.P.
Mr. Markus SHAW
Prof. WONG Tze-wai

In Attendance:

Mr. Thomas CHOW	Acting Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport) (Environment)/Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)(E)2
Ms. Doris CHEUNG	Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)(E)1
Mr. Rob LAW, JP	Director of Environmental Protection
Mr. C C LAY	Assistant Director (Conservation) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr. Jimmy LEUNG	Assistant Director/Technical Services Planning Department
Miss Konnie KONG	Senior Information Officer (Environment and Works), Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB)
Ms. Polly LEUNG	Principal Information Officer Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Miss Petula POON
Mr. Eddie CHENG

Chief Executive Officer (E), ETWB
Executive Officer (E), ETWB

In Attendance for Agenda Item 4 :

Ms. Jessie WONG	Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment & Transport) E4
Mr. C C LAY	Assistant Director (Conservation), AFCD
Dr. P M SO	Senior Conservation Officer (Biodiversity), AFCD

In Attendance for Agenda Item 5 :

Mr. K L CHOW	Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)5, ETWB
--------------	--

In Attendance for Agenda Item 6 :

Mr. Thomas TSO	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)1
----------------	---

Action

The Chairman congratulated Prof. Poon Chi-sun for being elected as the Chairman of the Waste Subcommittee of the Council. He also thanked Prof. Poon and other Members who had joined the Waste Subcommittee.

Agenda Item 1 : Confirmation of Minutes of the 113th Meeting held on 9 February 2004

2. The draft minutes were confirmed subject to the amendment proposed by Mr. Jimmy Leung that the fourth sentence from the end of paragraph 42 should be replaced by “Mr. Jimmy Leung said that HPLB was studying the case but there would be difficulties in initiating enforcement actions against the land owners as landfilling activity did not constitute an unauthorised development in agriculture zone.”

(Post-meeting note: the proposed amendments were provided by Mr. Leung after the meeting.)

Agenda Item 2 : Matters Arising

Para. 5 Information on the Joint Air Quality Study of the Pearl River Delta Region

3. The Chairman informed Members that the above information had been sent to Members for reference.

Para. 19 Information on the changes in air quality when airport activities dropped significantly during the episode of the Severe and Acute Respiratory Syndrome

4. The Chairman informed Members that EPD was compiling the information and would provide it to Members once available.

Para. 42 To write to the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) to reflect Members' concern on the land filling activities in an agricultural lot in Tai Po

5. The Chairman informed the meeting that the Secretariat had written to HPLB to reflect Members' concern on the issue which would be further discussed under agenda item 6 of the meeting. In addition, a visit to the site in question would be held on 10 March following the scheduled visit to the To Kau Wan Thermal Desorption Plant.

Agenda Item 3 : Report on the 84th meeting of the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee
(ACE Paper 8/2004)

6. The EIA Subcommittee Chairman presented the report to the meeting. He said that the condition on epidemiological monitoring was not included in the report because, subsequent to the meeting, the Assistant Director of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) clarified in writing after consulting the Department of Health that since the cremators would operate at 850 °C, all microorganisms would be destroyed. There was, hence, no risk of transmitting infectious diseases through aerial emissions from the cremation process.

7. Two Members indicated that during the discussion at the Subcommittee meeting, they were not aware that the Subcommittee had to make a recommendation to the Council on whether the EIA report should be endorsed or not. Both of them expressed reservation in endorsing the report because they were not satisfied that an exhaustive site search had been conducted. The EIA Subcommittee Chairman informed Members that during the EIA Subcommittee meeting, the FEHD representative explained the site requirements in detail and that they had failed to find a suitable site that could meet all the requirements after conducting a thorough search in

1998 and 2000 respectively. Though some Members were not fully convinced by the explanation, he understood that it was reprovisioning of an existing facility and hence site selection was outside the purview of the Subcommittee. Mr. Rob Law concurred and said that if the EIA report of a project concluded that all the environmental criteria had been met, there would be little ground for the Authority to refuse approval of the EIA report. Another Member also agreed that the project should be assessed on its environmental impact. He pointed out that the location of cremation facilities was a territory-wide issue and should be considered separately in the long term.

8. A Member said that the project proponent did not consider other sites due to time constraint, cost implication and possible objections from local residents. She considered that a better site should be identified for the sake of the Diamond Hill residents. Another Member pointed out that since there were complaints that the existing cremators broke down frequently, they should be replaced as soon as possible. The identification of a new site for cremation facility would involve a very lengthy process which might not be feasible for the present case. Mr. Jimmy Leung and a Member agreed with the second Member's views and said that at present, the best choice was to reprovision the existing facility in-situ. Mr. Thomas Chow added that since the new cremators would meet more stringent air quality standards, the air quality of the area would be greatly improved after the implementation of the project. On the other hand, if the EIA report were not approved, the old cremators would continue to operate.

9. A Member said that he was not satisfied with FEHD's reply that epidemiological study was not required because the cremators would operate at 850 . He considered that, although pathogens would be destroyed under that temperature, their complete destruction would depend on the smooth operation of the cremators. Hence, an epidemiological study should be conducted to assess the risk of incomplete combustion. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, the Member said that the study should assess the impact of dioxin emission as well as pathogen emission on public health. The EIA Subcommittee Chairman informed the meeting that, according to the project proponent, there would be regular monitoring of the temperature of the combustion chamber to ensure that the cremators would operate in best conditions. In addition, there would be regular monitoring of dioxin emission. The Chairman added that the Subcommittee had already recommended that the frequency of dioxin monitoring and stack monitoring should be increased.

10. A Member was of the view that if there was stack monitoring, epidemiological monitoring might not be useful because it would be difficult

to establish the relationship between public health and the project. In fact, it was quite likely that the project would bring benefit to public health because the new cremators would meet more stringent air quality standards. He agreed that there was a concern about public health but monitoring of public health on a project basis might not be appropriate.

11. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed to endorse the EIA report with the conditions set out in the Subcommittee's report. In view of some Members' concerns, he suggested that EPD should consult the Department of Health on the need to conduct epidemiological monitoring for the project and consider whether permit conditions could be imposed in that respect. The reservation of two Members on the site selection process of the project should also be recorded.

Agenda Item 4 : Proposed application of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to Hong Kong
(ACE Paper 9/2004)

12. The Chairman welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. Ms. Jessie Wong briefed Members on the proposal.

13. In response to the Chairman's question on the impact of trans-boundary movement of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) on biodiversity, Ms. Jessie Wong explained that it would depend on the categories of the LMOs. Among the three categories mentioned in the presentation, LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment had the biggest potential risk on the environment and hence conservation of biodiversity. Mr. C C Lay added that introducing LMOs into the environment might cause gene contamination.

14. In reply to a Member's question, Mr. C C Lay said that an LMO list was being prepared in consultation with the trade. Flowers developed through cross breeding were not LMOs and hence would not be included in the list. Dr. P M So added that there was only one species of LMO flower (i.e. carnation) in the international market. However, that species normally could not produce viable pollens and its impact on the environment would be limited.

15. In response to a Member's question, Ms. Jessie Wong confirmed that the proposed control over trans-boundary movements of LMOs would cover those between the Mainland and Hong Kong. She said that reference would be drawn to the current practice adopted for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora when drafting the new legislation for the proposed application of the

Protocol to Hong Kong.

16. A Member pointed out that the definition of “intentional introduction into the environment” would be crucial to the protection of biodiversity. Some genetically modified pets were not meant to be introduced into the environment but might be accidentally released into the ecosystem. In response, Dr. P M So clarified that the term “intentional introduction into the environment” was not defined under the Protocol. At present, there were a number of definitions adopted by the Parties to the Protocol in their local legislations. The Administration would make reference to them when drafting the legislation. The definition could be included in the ordinance under the section on “interpretation”. In reply to another Member’s question, Dr. So said that products manufactured from LMOs but contained no living organism would no longer be LMOs and hence would not be covered by the Protocol.

17. A Member commented that exporters might have difficulties in conducting thorough risk assessments. In response, Ms. Jessie Wong clarified that risk assessments would only be required for the first export of a LMO for intentional introduction into the environment. For LMOs intended for use as food, feed or for processing, risk assessments would not be required. She added that the information on risk assessments would be uploaded onto the webpage of the Biosafety Clearing House and would be made available to the public for information.

18. In reply to a Member’s question on how to limit the impact on the trade while achieving the aim of conserving biodiversity, Mr. C C Lay said that, according to their consultation with the trade and other stakeholders, the control mechanism was their main concern. To minimize the impact on them, the proposed control measures would only be those required by the Protocol. Ms. Jessie Wong added that the Protocol had tried to strike a balance between conserving biodiversity and minimizing the impacts by imposing different levels of control on different categories of LMOs according to their usages. Parties to the Protocol were working on the documentation requirements that would be standardized and easy to follow. Those requirements were imposed on trans-boundary movements of LMOs so as to enable easy identification of the status of the LMOs and facilitate tracing of the shipments, if necessary.

19. A Member pointed out the difficulties in implementing the Protocol in Hong Kong. He said that some products that originally did not contain LMOs might be accidentally contaminated with LMOs during transportation. It would be very difficult to establish the responsibility under such circumstances. In addition, countries such as the USA and

Japan had adopted a more lenient standard (4%) of LMO content in a product when classifying whether a product should be subject to control while countries such as Australia and New Zealand had adopted a stricter standard (1%). Hong Kong, being an import/export centre, should adopt a more lenient standard. In reply, Dr. P M So said that an expert group had been set up under the Protocol to discuss that issue and more details would be available by around 2005/06. The issue of liability would also be considered by another expert group. Ms. Jessie Wong added that the Administration was well aware of the trade's concerns on those issues, and would further consult them when more details were available. For LMOs to be used as food, feed or for processing, the current proposal only required the provision of shipment documents.

20. A Member said that an import country might not accept the certificate issued by the producer and that a new certificate would have to be issued by the authority in Hong Kong. He was also worried that if products were contaminated with LMOs during transportation, traders in Hong Kong had no way to find out beforehand. In response, Ms. Jessie Wong clarified that re-export products which were not intended for introduction into the environment in Hong Kong would only need to fulfil the documentation requirements. The re-export certificate would be issued based on the original certificate. Another Member said that contamination during transportation was possible in theory but the possibility was very low.

21. A Member disagreed with a point in the paper that research on biotechnology was limited in Hong Kong. In his view, research on biotechnology was developing rapidly in the territory. The impact of the Protocol might have been underestimated in that respect. Another Member concurred and suggested that more monitoring was needed. She also said that risk assessment might require the input of independent arbitrators and universities. In response, Ms. Jessie Wong clarified that the Administration had not underestimated the development of biotechnology in Hong Kong. At present, agricultural activities and research on biotechnology were limited and most of the trans-boundary movements of LMOs would be subject to documentation requirements only. It was considered that the implication of the Protocol on the trade concerned would not be significant. The need for the application of the Protocol to Hong Kong was further justified in view of the potential for biotechnology research in Hong Kong. She also said that risk assessment requirements for the first export of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment was imposed on the exporters, and universities or accredited laboratories could provide assistance. The authority of the importing country would consider the results of the risk assessments when considering whether the import should be approved.

22. In response to the Chairman's questions, Ms. Jessie Wong said that the Administration would draw up a more detailed implementation plan by taking into account the views received during the public consultation and proceed with the law drafting process. She said that the objective of the current consultation was to consult the public, in particular the stakeholders, on the proposed application of the Convention and Protocol to Hong Kong. More focus group meetings would be conducted with the stakeholders when further details about the implementation of the requirements of the Protocol were available. The views collected would be considered by the Administration before finalizing the legislative proposal and introducing the bill to the Legislative Council next year.

23. As a separate matter, a Member asked about the progress of the nature conservation policy review. In response, Ms. Jessie Wong reported that the Bureau was examining the comments received during the public consultation. The Administration planned to draw up a more comprehensive nature conservation policy and an implementation plan around the middle of the year.

24. The Chairman thanked the presentation team and said that the Council endorsed the proposal, as it would help to protect the biodiversity of Hong Kong.

Agenda Item 5 : Environmental management of works sites of government projects
(ACE Paper 10/2004)

25. The Chairman welcomed Mr. K L Chow to the meeting. Mr. Markus Shaw, who was unable to attend the meeting, presented his views through a video film. Mr. K L Chow then briefed Members on the measures taken by the Government for better environmental management of government works sites.

26. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr. K L Chow said that while the trip ticket system was generally effective, he believed that less than 10% of the illegal dumping cases were probably associated with government projects. To improve the trip ticket system, they would shorten the time frame to return the trip tickets and designate a person of the supervising team to ensure that the system was effectively implemented. As regards the Chairman's suggestion to make use of information technology to further enhance the effectiveness of the system, Mr. K L Chow said that they were improving the trip ticket system in that direction.

[Post-meeting note : Mr. K L Chow clarified after the meeting that the

percentage of illegal dumping cases associated with government projects was less than 1%.]

27. A Member said that some contractors were unable to ensure that the lorry drivers actually disposed of the construction waste at landfills. Indeed, she had heard about faked trip tickets. She suggested that the global positioning system might be used to keep track of the lorries. In reply, Mr. K L Chow said that they would consider upgrading the system to detect false tickets, if any, and would impose penalties on the parties concerned.

28. A Member commended the Bureau for the measures in place. However, he pointed out that some sites with contracts awarded before 2002 were rather untidy and asked whether actions could be taken to deal with those sites. In response, Mr. K L Chow informed the meeting that a circular was issued in 2002 to make it part of the contract term for contractors of government projects to clean up areas adjacent to the project site. For projects without such contract term, requiring contractors to clean up additional areas might lead to claims. Nevertheless, a circular was issued in 2003 requesting contractors to clean up areas adjacent to their project and that any contractual disputes would be settled with the contractors. Another Member wondered whether contractors would comply with the request if they were not required to do so by the contract. He asked whether there were any statistics on that type of contracts. Mr. K L Chow admitted the difficulties faced by the Administration and estimated that about one third of the existing contracts, i.e. 100 contracts, were without the contract term mentioned.

29. A Member asked about the number of adverse reports issued by the works departments and whether such reports would result in any regulatory actions on the contractors. She also asked whether sanctions other than adverse reports would be considered, for instance uploading the list of contractors that had received adverse reports on the Internet. In response, Mr. K L Chow said that the issue of adverse reports was very effective because two consecutive adverse reports would result in suspension of the contractor from taking part in tendering exercise for government projects. To further upload their names on the Internet might not be fair because they might perform badly in some of the projects only.

30. In response to a Member's concerns about the heavy workload of the safety officers, Mr. K L Chow said that environmental management duties should not be assigned to safety officers because they had their statutory duties on safety. However, if there were more than one safety officer for a project, one of them might be charged with the environmental

management duties. In fact, the most important thing was that a person should be held responsible for the environmental management of each contract.

31. In reply to the Chairman's question, Mr. K L Chow said that at present, a specific person on site was tasked with waste management duties. They were planning to extend the duties of that person to look after environmental management.

32. In response to the Chairman's question on site inspection, Mr. K L Chow said that a three-tier inspection system was in place. Firstly, the site staff would perform environmental inspection at least once a week. Secondly, departmental safety and environmental advisors would inspect the sites on a monthly or quarterly basis. Thirdly, contract advisors would check if the contract requirements had been met. In addition, ETWB organised a Considerate Contractors Site Award Scheme and introduced a new category of award for site cleanliness and tidiness last year to encourage contractors to maintain their work sites clean and tidy.

33. While commending the three-tier system, a Member said that problems would still arise, and he believed that more civic education on work ethics should be the key to the problem in the long run. Introduction of more stringent regulations and proper training for site staff would help improve the situation in the short term. Another Member commented that the provision of training was preferred since compliance with more regulations might increase the project cost. Mr. K L Chow agreed that it was necessary to promote work ethics among construction workers and to spell out the standards of tidiness and cleanliness for general compliance.

34. In reply to the Chairman's question on how the public could help, Mr. K L Chow said that the public could make use of the hotline and report to the departments concerned if government works sites were found untidy.

35. A Member pointed out that some sites were small in size, and environmental measures would increase the cost to the contractor significantly. Also, most contractors would further contract out their projects and that would make it difficult for the main contractor to supervise the sites. In response, Mr. K L Chow said that they would take the size of a works site into consideration when implementing the measures. For example, for smaller sites, they would require that there should be a person responsible for environmental management but that person could have other duties as well.

36. The Chairman thanked Mr. K L Chow. He appreciated the hard work of the Bureau but considered that there was still room for improvement. To improve the situation would require changing the mindset of the construction industry, rigorous implementation of the control measures and also improvement to the trip ticket system.

Agenda Item 6 : Land-filling activities at She Shan Tsuen, Tai Po
(ACE Paper 11/2004)

37. The Chairman welcomed Mr. Thomas Tso to the meeting. Mr. Tso briefed Members on the recent landfilling activities at She Shan Tsuen, Tai Po.

38. In response to the Chairman's question on whether the Administration was concerned about the landfilling activities there, Mr. Thomas Tso said that the issue involved a number of bureaux/departments and he could not speak on behalf of them. He nevertheless agreed that the activities constituted a problem and had to be tackled as soon as possible. The Chairman emphasized that despite the difficulties, the Administration had to look for ways to resolve the problem without further delay.

39. Members were of the view that the problem had to be tackled effectively, otherwise many places in the New Territories would be turned into landfills, especially after the implementation of the landfill charging scheme. Members also found it hard to accept the claim that the site was being filled up for agricultural purpose and urged the Administration to take the case to court as a test case as soon as possible. In reply to Members' enquiries, Mr. C C Lay said that according to the preliminary views of his colleagues in the agricultural section of AFCD, the landfilling activities at the site would in no way be regarded as agricultural activities. He added that the department's agriculture experts might give expert advice in court.

40. Mr. Thomas Tso informed the meeting that a number of departments concerned were reviewing the case to see if enforcement and other actions could be taken. According to the legal advice provided by the Department of Justice, it might not be possible to prosecute the landowner for unauthorised land use because of the difficulty to prove that the landfilling activities were not for subsequent agricultural purpose. For example, the landowner might defend that he was forming a platform for rearing of pigs or growing potted plants. He agreed that the legal advice might sound strange, but they had to have the backing of the Department of Justice before initiating any legal action but they would seek further legal advice. In response to a suggestion to take prosecution action under the Waste Disposal Ordinance, Mr. Rob Law explained that it would not

constitute an offence if construction waste were dumped on private land with the consent of the owner.

41. A Member said that according to his memory, the landowner applied for permission to develop the land some years ago. The landfilling activities might be related to the development proposal. He reiterated that any person with common sense would not believe that the platform in question was for agricultural use. The case should be taken to court and let the judge rule. To avoid reoccurrence of similar incidents, he suggested limiting the height of platforms to be formed in agricultural land, as it was not necessary to form a high platform for agricultural use.

42. In response to a Member's worry that the case would set a bad example for other lots in the New Territories, Mr. Jimmy Leung said that sites zoned as Conservation Area and Sites of Special Scientific Interest were better protected under the statutory plans. Any filling of ponds or evacuation of land even for permitted uses would require the permission of the Town Planning Board. As regards the suggestion of taking the case to court, he said that land filling in itself did not contravene the permitted use in the Agriculture zone. The landowner could claim that the land filling on the site was for agricultural purpose, and he could easily defend himself by operating a potted plant nursery on the site. Another Member said that even though potted plants could be put there after the charge was initiated, it was the reasonableness of the case that should count. There had to be a reasonable height for site formation in agricultural land and such height should be defined by the Administration to prevent improper use of agricultural land.

43. Noting that the landfilling activities at the site had been going on for some time, a Member asked whether the District Lands Office concerned was aware of the problem and whether any warning had been issued to the landowner. In response, Mr. Thomas Tso said that the District Lands Office would conduct site inspections from time to time and would check the land status if irregularities were noted. Since the site in question was on private agricultural land under Block Government Lease with loose conditions, the District Lands Office had very little power to stop the activities.

44. A Member pointed out that construction wastes and excavated soil were dumped at the site partly because there was a lack of facility for the disposal of that type of waste, and contractors found it more convenient to dump the waste nearby. In response, Mr. Thomas Tso agreed that the source of the construction waste would be a concern. Contractors found it cheaper to dump the waste there and the landowner could get a fee in return

for accepting the waste. With the trip ticket system in place, the construction waste should have gone to landfills properly. The Chairman pointed out that if the landowner received payment for accepting the waste, it could be a proof that the land was not used for agricultural purpose. In response, Mr. Tso said that according to the legal advice, whether or not a fee was received for accepting the waste was not relevant to how the land was used.

45. A Member suggested exploring ways to stop the landfilling activities. He said that one possibility was to restrict the use of She Shan Road and other access roads to the site to vehicles of certain size only so that lorries and heavy vehicles could not transport materials there. Another suggestion was to require all landfilling activities of certain scale on agriculture land to conduct EIA study in view of their potential impact on the environment. In reply, Mr. Thomas Tso said that the control of the usage of the access roads fell under the purview of the Transport Department and would be dealt with in a different context.

46. A Member said that agricultural land had to have certain characteristics and that those characteristics could be incorporated into the land lease for management or control purposes. In reply, Mr. Thomas Tso said that there were difficulties in adopting such an approach unilaterally. At present, uses that were permitted under Agriculture zone were specified in the Notes attached to statutory plans. Due to the different nature of agricultural activities ranging from rearing of pigs to plant nursery, it might be necessary for some of the uses to require site formation works. To impose a blanket control over such kind of works might not be considered reasonable. In any case, extensive public consultation and amendment of the Notes would be needed.

47. A Member queried the need for plenty of agricultural land in the New Territories and suggested reviewing all agriculture zones by the Planning Department. She considered that agriculture lots that were easily accessible should have more suitable land use. Another Member suggested that a Task Force on Agricultural Blackspots should be set up.

48. In response to the Chairman's question on the way forward, Mr. Thomas Tso said that the departments under HPLB had held a meeting and possible solutions some of which were within the ambit of ETWB were identified. They would consider involving ETWB in taking collective actions in future. While meetings with ETWB would be arranged as soon as possible, he could not make any commitment in being able to resolve the issue quickly.

49. In response to the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Thomas Tso replied that he would join Members for the visit to the site on 10 March 2004 if he had no other commitment. The Chairman reiterated that the Council was very concerned about the issue. He hoped that the Administration would consider Members' views, seek further legal advice on the feasibility of taking prosecution action and take whatever steps feasible to resolve the issue. Collective efforts from various departments would be needed and relevant policy and legislation should be reviewed to see if the loophole could be plugged.

Agenda Item 7 : Any Other Business

Boat trip to possible landing points of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge

50. The Chairman informed the meeting that the boat trip to the possible landing points of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge was held on 28 February 2004.

Site visit to To Kau Wan Thermal Desorption Plant and inspection of landfilling activities at She Shan Tsuen, Tai Po

51. The Chairman reminded Members that the visit would be held on 10 March 2004 and that seven Members had signed up for the visit.

Environmental education policy

52. A Member said that the environmental education policy had not been discussed by Members since 1999 and he suggested revisiting the policy at future Council meetings. As the paper presented to Members in 1999 mainly focused on environmental activities organized, he suggested that environmental education strategy and policy should be discussed.

ETWB

Agenda Item 8 : Date of Next Meeting

53. The next meeting would be held on 13 April 2004.

**ACE Secretariat
March 2004**