

**Minutes of 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting (Part 2) of Environment and Conservation Fund**  
**Waste Reduction Projects Vetting Sub-Committee**

Date : 17 June 2014 (Tue)  
Time : 2:00 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Rm 502), 5/F, Southorn Centre, 130 Hennessy Road, Wanchai

**Present**

Professor LO Man-chi, Irene (Chairperson)  
Dr. CHAN Chi-kau, Johnnie, BBS, JP  
Ms CHEUK Fung-ting, Phyllis  
Mr. FAN Jor-ching, Jor  
Mr. LO Yan-lai  
Mr. TAM Wai-kit, Alex

Dr. CHUI Ho-kwong, Samuel Environmental Protection Department (EPD)  
Mr. LEE Siu-tak, Derek Environment Bureau (ENB)  
Ms Elaine CHUNG EPD (Secretary)  
Ms MA Yin-ling, Amber EPD (Assistant Secretary)

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. CHAN Ho-lim, Joseph  
Ms CHAN May-kuen, Sylvia  
Ms FUNG Dun-mi, Amy  
Mr. LEONG Lap-kan, James  
Mr. LOCK Kwok-on, Anthony  
Mr. POON Yuen-fong, Sanford  
Mr. WONG Tze-kang, Rico

**In Attendance**

Dr. CHAN Ying-lung, Ellen EPD  
Mr. YUEN Po-hung EPD  
Dr. LAM Siu, Zola EPD  
Mr. TAM Chin-hung, Alex EPD

**Welcoming Remarks**

The **Chairperson** welcomed all Members and representatives of the EPD to the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting (part 2) of the Waste Reduction Projects Vetting Sub-committee (WRPVSC). The application forms received and the summary of the applications for Waste Reduction Projects were circulated to Members before the meeting. A summary of the applications received, including the budgets of the proposals and the quantities of items/waste to be collected/recycled of the applications, were tabled for Members' reference (*key information extracted at **Appendix I** <sup>Note</sup>*).

## **Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 39th meetings (Part 1) and (Part 2) held on 19 November 2013 and 10 December 2013 respectively**

2. Agenda item 1 was deferred and placed after AOB.
3. The draft minutes of the 39th meetings (Part 1) and (Part 2) held on 19 November 2013 and 10 December 2013 respectively were confirmed without any amendment, but with 1-vote less than the quorum required.

*[Post-meeting note: The draft minutes were circulated to Members after the meeting through e-mail for confirmation in order to have sufficient quorum for drawing a final decision. After the circulation, 2 more votes were cast. In addition to the 7 votes cast in the Meeting, the minutes were approved by the majority on 5 August 2014.]*

## **Agenda Item 2: Vetting of (4) New Waste Reduction Projects (WRP) Applications**

4. **Dr. CHUI Ho-kwong, Samuel** (Dr. CHUI) briefed Members on four (4) new WRP applications, i.e. WRP 320, 323, 328 & 331 and invited Members' views. After discussion, the **Meeting** rejected all the four applications. Details of the decision were given at **Appendix II** <sup>Note</sup>.
5. Before the discussion of WRP 320, Ms CHEUK Fung-ting, Phyllis joined the meeting at 2:14 p.m.

## **Agenda Item 3: Vetting of (5) New Waste Reduction Projects (WRP) Applications (SSW Model Cases)**

6. **Dr. CHUI** briefed Members on five (5) new WRP applications, i.e. WRP 309, 310, 311, 314 & 322 and invited Members' views. After discussion, the **Meeting** supported four (4) applications, i.e. WRP 309, 310, 311 & 314 and supported WRP 322 in principle. Details of the decision were given at **Appendix III** <sup>Note</sup>.
7. During the discussion on WRP 309, **Ms. Elaine CHUNG** sought approval from the Meeting to increase the budget on safety training courses generally for each SSW Model Project from \$15,000 to \$18,000, taking into account the latest advice from the EPD. The increase in the budget item was approved by Members.

## **Agenda Item 4: Vetting of New and Revised Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates (FWR) Applications**

8. **Mr. TAM Chin-hung, Alex** briefed Members on four (4) new FWR applications, i.e. FWR 046, 072, 071 & 074 and a budget revision of FWR 036 and invited Members' views. After discussion, the **Meeting** supported all the four applications. Details of the decision were given at *Appendix IV* <sup>Note</sup>.
9. After the discussion of agenda item 4, Ms CHEUK Fung-ting, Phyllis left the meeting at 3:15 p.m. and Dr. LAM Siu, Zola joined the meeting at 3:18 p.m.

## **Agenda Item 5: Any Other Business**

10. <sup>Note</sup>
11. **Dr. CHUI** recapitulated that it was concluded in the 39<sup>th</sup> WRPVSC Meeting (Part 2) on 10 December 2013 that there should be less emphasis on generation of revenue from SSW Model Projects and the organisations concerned should aim to reduce the reliance on the commodities for exchange of plastic recyclables from the participants. After taking into account concerns of the project organisations, the **Meeting** decided that the use of revenue from selling of plastic recyclables by organisations for waste-to-commodity activities (以物易物) should generally be allowed in order to sustain the momentum of participants and facilitate the increase in quantity of plastic recyclables. On the other hand, the **Meeting** considered that the give-out items should mainly target those participants who delivered "clean" plastic recyclables to the Recycling Centre. Such arrangement would help educating the participants on proper recycling.
12. The discussions on the two items in paragraphs 10 and 11 were advanced and placed before agenda item 1.
13. <sup>Note</sup>
14. <sup>Note</sup>
15. **Dr. CHUI** briefed Members on the feedbacks from the applicant organisations of two projects on food donation, i.e. WRP 315 and WRP 317, which were supported in principle in the 41st WRPVSC Meeting (Part 1) on 10 June 2014. The organisations were asked to consider increasing the targeted total tonnage of surplus food to be recovered under the respective projects to make them generally align with the average food recovery cost in other previously approved projects of similar scope and nature. The **Meeting** noted that the maximum food recovery cost of the previously approved projects ranged between \$20,000 to \$25,000 per tonne. After calculation, total recovery of 55 tonnes and 100 tonnes of food throughout the project period were set as the target for WRP 315 and WRP 317 respectively so as to meet the general performance target. The organisations of WRP 315 and 317 subsequently indicated acceptance of the proposed target on 13 June 2014 and 17 June 2014 respectively.
16. **Dr. CHUI** sought approval from the Meeting to adjust the Reference Transportation Fee in relation to food donation projects to take into account the number of days of project operation, which

were considered unique and different from that of SSW projects. Whilst the ceiling fee would remain unchanged at \$400/day, the monthly ceiling of \$3,200/month should no longer apply and the actual amount to be approved would be considered on a case by case basis having regard to the operational plan of the project. The **Meeting** agreed to the recommended adjustment.

17. **Dr. CHUI** informed Members that a paper on the funding scheme of “Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates” was being prepared and would be submitted to the WRPVSC and ECFC for advice and approval when ready.

18. For the items in paragraphs 11, 13 to 16 under the A.O.B., there was 1-vote less than the quorum required.

*[Post-meeting note: Items for approval under A.O.B. were circulated to Members after the meeting through e-mail for confirmation in order to have sufficient quorum for drawing final decisions. After the circulation, 3 more votes were cast for WRP 312 and 2 more votes were cast for the other items. In addition to the 7 votes cast in the Meeting, the Meeting's decisions for the cases were approved by the majority on 5 August 2014.]*

## **Agenda Item 6: Date of Next Meeting**

19. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date and venue of the next meeting in due course. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

## **Waste Reduction Projects Vetting Sub-committee Secretariat September 2014**

Note: The paragraph/appendix will not be included in the version of notes to be uploaded to the webpage of ECF according to the standing practice of not disclosing the detailed reasons for supporting or rejecting an application. The ECF webpage contains a general disclaimer that “Reasons for supporting/rejecting an application had been made known to the project proponents concerned, and the public could ask the project proponents direct for such information.”