

Minutes of 35th Meeting of Environment and Conservation Fund
Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-Committee

Date : 18 September 2012 (Tue)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Rm 502), 5/F, Southorn Centre, 130 Hennessy Road, Wanchai

Present

Prof. Jonathan WONG (Chairman)

Ms CHEUK Fung-ting, Phyllis

Mr. CHUA Hoi-wai

Mr. Jor FAN

Mr. James LEONG

Mr. LO Yan-lai

Mr. LUI Tung-ming, MH

Mr. POON Yuen-fong, Sanford

Mr. Alex TAM

Mr. TSANG Kam-lam

Dr. YAU Wing-kwong

Dr. William YU

Ms Eunice CHAN Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Ms Elaine CHUNG EPD (Secretary)

Miss Rainy LO EPD (Assistant Secretary)

Absent with Apologies

Dr. Carol MA

In Attendance

Dr. Ellen CHAN EPD

Dr. Alain LAM EPD

Ms Betty CHEUNG EPD

Dr. Lawrence WONG EPD

Mr. Lawrence CHEUNG EPD

Mr. Stanley LAU EPD

Mr. YUEN Po-hung EPD

Mr. TAM Chin-hung, Alex EPD

Welcoming Remarks

The **Chairman** welcomed all Members and representatives of the EPD to the seventh meeting of the Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-committee (WRPVSC).

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of the last meeting held on 19 July 2012

2. The draft minutes of the last meeting held on 19 July 2012 were confirmed without any amendment.

Agenda Item 2: Discussion Paper on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Recycling Centre at EcoPark Phase II in Tuen Mun

3. **Dr. Alain LAM** briefed Members on the WRPVSC Paper 01/2012-13. The proposal aimed to continue funding support for the WEEE Recycling Centre (“WRC”) from the Environment and Conservation Fund (“ECF”).

4. The funding support for the WRC currently operated by St. James Settlement at the EcoPark would expire in October 2013. As at end of March 2012, the WRC project had been operative for 18 months and had processed 385 tonnes of WEEE (i.e. 57% of the total processing target). Performance of the operator and effectiveness of the project were considered as satisfactory.

5. Under the proposal, a competent NGO operator would be selected through open tender to proceed with a second phase (subject to a \$10-million project budget ceiling) for 36-month period until October 2016 with suitable adjustments to the project objectives and performance targets. Taking into account the experience gained from the WRC project, the Government was actively pursuing the development of a WEEE treatment plant at the EcoPark with a capacity of 30,000 tonnes annually. Since the new facility would not be commissioned until 2015/16, there was a strong case to retain the project as a stop-gap measure pending the commissioning of the permanent facility so as to maintain a proper WEEE recycling outlet in Hong Kong.

6. The Chairman invited Members’ views on the proposal and key points of the deliberation were summarized below -

(a) Sufficiency of funding support

Noting the enhancement in the second phase of the project, **Members** queried on the sufficiency of the funding amount. **Dr. Alain LAM** replied that the operator was expected to explore more business opportunities to attain a more independent financial position within these 3 years. To achieve this, the project objectives in the second phase would be adjusted in relation to processing of WEEE.

(b) Collaboration with the permanent WEEE treatment plant

The capacity of the future permanent WEEE treatment plant of 30,000 tonnes per annum would be significantly larger than the current operation of the WRC project, and the treatment processes could be conducted by mechanical and automation process, which would be more efficient than the current manual operations. **Members** suggested that the WRC project could collaborate with the future treatment plant, and dismantling work could be conducted by automation at the treatment plant in order to increase efficiency. In addition, the operating organisation of the WRC project could consider selling the WEEE collected to the treatment plant for generating

profit to cover part of the operating cost. **Dr. Alain LAM** anticipated that the possibility of collaboration between the two parties would be high, while liaison between the two parties was expected to start after the confirmation of the operator of the permanent WEEE treatment plant. The EPD would closely monitor the development.

(c) Outlet of refurbished WEEE

In response to **Members'** query on the outlet of the refurbished WEEE, **Dr. Alain LAM** indicated there would be no designated recipient organisations for the donation, and the operating organisation would donate the WEEE to the needy directly through the arrangements and referral by registered social workers.

7. Emphasizing the importance of public education by way of the WRC project before the implementation of the mandatory producer responsibility scheme, the **Chairman** concluded after the deliberation that the **Meeting** supported the proposal in the WRPVSC Paper 01/2012-13 with \$10-million project budget ceiling for 36-month period from ECF.

8. After the discussion for the agenda item 2, Dr. Alain LAM and Mr. Lawrence CHEUNG left the meeting at 3:00p.m.

Agenda Item 3: Discussion Paper on Funding to Support Non-governmental Organizations to Operate Plastic Resources Recycling Centre at EcoPark Phase II in Tuen Mun

9. **Dr. Lawrence WONG** briefed Members on the WRPVSC Paper 02/2012-13. The paper sought Members' agreement to continue to provide ECF funding support to facilitate the continuous operation of the Plastic Resources Recycling Centre (PRRC) by a NGO at EcoPark Phase II to support the community plastic waste reduction and recovery initiatives.

10. The current 3-year term of funding support by ECF for Yan Oi Tong (YOT) to operate the PRRC would end on 2 March 2013. Since the commencement of operation in March 2010, YOT had been performing satisfactorily in achieving the designated objectives of the project, in particular in enlisting community participation in plastic waste recovery and recycling. The PRRC had so far received a large number of public visitors and organized many education, promotion and publicity activities to promote recycling of plastic waste. Many organisations had signed up to be partners of PRRC engaging in daily recovery of plastic waste for recycling at the PRRC. The PRRC had processed over 2,730 tonnes of plastic waste (as at end August 2012) into value-added materials which were sold to the market. The daily throughput had been enhanced steadily to about 6 tonnes in the past half year. In addition, the PRRC had offered employment and training opportunities to low-skilled workers and the underprivileged. The PRRC had served as a visible and secure outlet for the plastic waste collected from the Source Separation of Waste (SSW) Programme as well as many ECF community recycling projects. The PRRC was also extending its role in supporting the newly established Community Recycling Network (CRN), a major initiative under the waste management action plan announced by the Government in early 2011. In addition, the PRRC was a useful platform for engaging District Councils (DCs) in promoting waste reduction and recycling at the district level. It was therefore desirable to maintain the PRRC after 2 March 2013 as the new community waste reduction and recycling initiatives were being developed and consolidated.

11. The present proposal aimed to seek continued funding support from the ECF with appropriate adjustments to the performance targets, subject to a \$10-million project budget ceiling for 36-month period. The holistic assessment mechanism approved by the WRPVSC in November 2011 would continue to be applied to measure the overall performance of the next PRRC operator. To ensure fairness to interested NGOs, a competent NGO operator would be identified through an open tendering exercise.

12. The Chairman invited Members' views on the proposal and key points of the deliberation were summarized below -

(a) Sufficiency of funding support

Noting the fluctuation in the operating environment and difficulties encountered in the current project, **Members** queried on the sufficiency of the funding amount. **Dr. Lawrence WONG** replied that, with the established collection system and network, the next operator should be able to generate more revenue from the project. The operator could also establish a highly visible profile and project a positive image in the community, which would be intangible benefits to the operator.

(b) Inheritance of resources

In view that YOT had generated many employment and training opportunities to low skilled workers and a large number of organisations had signed up to be partners of the PRRC engaging in daily recovery of plastic waste, with some of them launching publicity activities jointly with the PRRC or making donations to the PRRC to promote plastic waste recycling, **Members** suggested that the new operator should adopt those resources and networks from the existing operator as far as possible.

(c) Outlet of plastic waste

In response to **Members'** query on the outlet of plastic waste, **Dr. Lawrence WONG** indicated YOT had cooperated with some factories in Mainland China. These factories were able to make use of the plastic pellets produced by the PRRC and the market for plastic pellets had been stable. However, the outlet for plastic recyclables which had not been sorted and processed was limited. Thus, the operator would be encouraged to increase the ratio of sorted and processed plastics.

13. The **Chairman** concluded after the deliberation that the **Meeting** supported the proposal as stated in the WRPVSC Paper 02/2012-13, with \$10-million project budget ceiling for 36-month period from ECF.

14. After the discussion for the agenda item 3, Dr. Lawrence WONG left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Agenda Item 4: Discussion Paper on Funding Support to Housing Estates for Collection and Recycling of Source Separated Food Waste

15. Mr. Stanley LAU briefed Members on the WRPVSC Paper 03/2012-13. This paper sought Members' views on the proposal to roll out Phase 2 for Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates.

16. In February 2011, the ECF Committee endorsed the provision of funding support to the scheme with an earmarked amount of \$50 million. It was also agreed to adopt a phased approach in implementing the scheme in order to gain experience for fine-tuning the operation and logistics. The response from the housing estates was positive. In the 32nd WRPVSC meeting in November 2011, 11 housing estates were approved for the Phase 1 scheme with a total funding commitment of \$9 million.

17. In view of the generally positive results and in response to the public's expectation to fast-track the food waste recycling projects in Hong Kong, the Phase 2 scheme was proposed to be rolled out in October 2012. Based on experience gained during the preparation of Phase 1 projects, the major scope of Phase 1 funding scheme including eligibility, capacity of treatment facility, leasing arrangement, technical support and education programme were considered appropriate and suggested to be retained. On the other hand, with the information gathered from Phase 1, the estimated budget for each project needed to be fine-tuned. Having regard to the increased in labour costs, the estimated project sum was revised from \$0.8 million to \$0.95 million. The EPD would continue to engage a professional consultant to operate a Help-desk and provide technical support to the applicant housing estates.

18. It was anticipated that the first batch of Phase 2 applications would be considered by the WRPVSC in early 2013. Applications would be processed as far as the earmarked funding of \$50 million could cover, and it was estimated that about 45 additional housing estates could be covered. If the number of applications received was larger than the remaining sum, it was suggested that the eligible applications be prioritised taking into account various criteria such as sitting of composter, effectiveness of the proposed education programme and distribution of geographical locations of participating housing estates etc. Depending on the response from housing estates to the Phase 2 scheme and subject to resource availability, WRPVSC and the ECF Committee would be consulted for allocating additional sums to the scheme.

19. The Chairman invited Members' views on the proposed funding scheme and key points of the deliberation were summarized below -

(a) Maintenance Frequency

Members enquired about the qualities of composters and their maintenance service frequencies, as well as the qualities of compost produced. Mr. Stanley LAU replied that different suppliers provided different maintenance service frequencies. In order to assure a higher quality of after-sale services, the composters in the projects were rented instead of purchased. At the end of the project, the housing estate would decide whether to purchase or continue to rent the composter. The rental fee and repair cost would need to be borne by the housing estate after the project period. It was expected that, with the experiences and information gathered from the projects in Phase 1 and other food waste recycling projects, the relevant technical requirements and specifications could be reviewed for excluding sub-standard composters.

(b) Batch processing of Phase 2

In view that around 45 additional projects would be covered in Phase 2, Members' raised whether the applications should be processed batch-wise. Mr. Stanley LAU responded that since interested housing estates would need to go through steps such as conducting preparation work, seeking approvals from residents' organisations, tendering for works and renting of composters etc, approved projects would not be commenced at the same time according to past experience. Members suggested the Secretariat/EPD should take measures to avoid large number of applications being processed and approved within a short timeframe.

20. The Chairman concluded after the deliberation that the Meeting supported the proposal as stated in the WRPVSC Paper 03/2012-13.

Agenda Item 5: Discussion Paper on Level of Funding Support for Expenses of Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates

21. Ms Elaine CHUNG briefed Members on the WRPVSC Paper 04/2012-13. The paper sought Members' views on the proposal to set the level of funding support for expenses of individual items of Food Waste Recycling Projects in Housing Estates.

22. From the projects under the Phase 1 Scheme, data on budgets needed for various activities and materials for conducting food waste recovery programmes had been gathered. A more comprehensive list of budgets was drawn up for providing reference to residents' organizations and property management companies in preparing their applications under the Phase 2 scheme. The provision of the list would also streamline the vetting process and facilitate consistency to be maintained in project vetting. Moreover, it was suggested that for certain budget items that were also commonly found in Community Waste Recovery Projects, the relevant funding limits should also apply to maintain consistency amongst projects under the two funding schemes.

23. The Chairman concluded after the deliberation that the Meeting supported the proposed level of support as stated in the WRPVSC Paper 04/2012-13.

Agenda Item 6: Vetting of New and Revised Waste Recovery Projects (WRP) Applications

24. Ms Elaine CHUNG briefed Members on the 4 new WRP applications, i.e. project 230, 231, 237 & 240 and 1 budget revision for project 210, respectively and invited Members' views. After the discussion, the Meeting supported 1 new application, i.e. 230, deferred 1 application, i.e. 231, rejected 2 applications, i.e. 237 & 240 and partially-supported 1 budget revision, i.e. 210 Details of the decision were given at the *Appendix I*.

25. Dr. YAU Wing-kwong, Mr. POON Yuen-fong, Sanford and Mr. Stanley Lau left the Meeting at 3:35pm, 5:10p.m and 5:16pm respectively.

Agenda Item 7: Progress report on Source Separation of Waste (SSW) Programme

26. Mr. YUEN Po-hung reported that since the last Meeting in July 2012, 25 more housing estates/buildings had signed up, making a total of 1,900 housing estates/buildings to join the SSW programme. Moreover, 6 more commercial & industrial (C&I) buildings, making a total of 775 C&I buildings, had signed up to join the SSW programme.

27. He added that there were enthusiastic responses for the application of free waste separation bins provided by the Environmental Campaign Committee (ECC) under the “Promotion Programme on Source Separation of Waste”. Since the last Meeting, there were 31 new applications received from residential buildings and 18 new applications received from C&I buildings requesting for the waste separation bins.

Agenda Item 8: Discussion Paper on Review on Progress of the Source Separation of Waste Model Case Framework for NGOs to Recruit Old Buildings to join the SSW Programme

28. Dr. Ellen CHAN briefed Members on the WRPVSC Paper 05/2012-13. The paper reported the review on the effectiveness of the Waste Recovery Projects developed under the Source Separation of Waste Model Framework for recruiting buildings in old districts (SSW Model Project) and proposed the way forward for Members’ discussion and consideration.

29. Dr. Ellen CHAN reported that, as at August 2012, there were 15 SSW Model Projects approved by the WRPVSC. Out of these, 12 were operating in 10 districts and 9 recycling centres had been operating for more than 9 months. The performance of the Model Projects was generally good and had significantly exceeded the 1-year target termination parameters set in the application. Yet, a few of them were still having problems and termination of funding support to these projects might need to be considered. She noted that the projects with good project managers and lower staff turn-over rate were usually able to achieve better performance. Some of the projects were able to adapt to different environment, for example, for some recycling centres which were not located near housing estates, they reached out for retail shops nearby instead.

30. The latest challenges to the Model Projects were high costs of labour insurance and rental fee. The Employees’ Compensation Insurance Residual Scheme had recently completed risk assessment for the recycling industry. Starting from 1 April 2012, the premium benchmark rate in terms of percentage of payroll for recycling industry was set at 17.68%. A seminar on occupational safety and health was held jointly by the Labour Department and EPD for recyclables collectors in July 2012. It aimed at minimising the risk of recyclables handling work at the ECF funded recycling centres. Meetings with insurance agents would be arranged to help them understand more clearly the nature and operation of the Model Projects and the extensive monitoring and supervision of the projects carried out by the EPD and Labour Department.

31. While there was a genuine need to maintain the existing Model Project recycling centres, the Government was actively considering appropriate arrangements to facilitate the efficient collection and recycling of producer responsibility scheme products and other recyclables in all 18 districts in

Hong Kong. It was proposed to generally maintain the current situation, with requirements on enhancement in project output and possible integration of these centres to improve cost-effectiveness. It was also proposed to support the Model Project recycling centres for 2 to 3 more years and review the position when the new collection network comes into operation.

32. **Members** discussed the paper and suggested that a sharing session amongst organisations of the Model Projects could be held for the Model Projects with better performance to share their experiences.

33. The **Chairman** concluded after the deliberation that the **Meeting** supported the proposal as stated in the WRPVSC Paper 05/2012-13.

34. Mr. TSANG Kam-lam left the Meeting at 5:35pm.

Agenda Item 9: Vetting of New WRP Applications and Progress Reviews (SSW Model Cases)

35. **Ms Elaine CHUNG** briefed Members on the 8 new WRP applications (SSW model cases), i.e. project 225, 232, 235, 236, 239, 241, 238 & 220, 4 budget revisions, i.e. project 189, 171, 178 & 198 and 1 progress review, i.e. project 176, respectively and invited Members' views. After the discussion, the **Meeting** supported 5 new applications, i.e. 225, 239, 241, 238 & 220, rejected 3 new applications, i.e. 232, 235 & 236, supported 4 budget revisions, i.e. 189, 171, 178 & 198 and rejected 1 progress review, i.e. 176. Details of the decision were given at the **Appendix II**.

36. During the discussion on revision for increasing the budget for labour insurance, **Members** remarked that the organisation could clearly specify the job nature of the staff concerned (e.g. whether the staff would conduct mainly manual or non-manual work, work outdoor or indoor, etc) to the insurance agencies for more appropriate assessment on the safety risk of the job positions and more reasonable insurance premium levels.

37. During the discussion on the budget revision of WRP 189, **Members** suggested that the budget for purchasing souvenirs for the waste-to-commodities activities should depend on the amount of recyclables collected, actual expenditure in purchasing the souvenirs and revenue gained in the projects. It was suggested that a standard equation should be set to calculate the budgets for revised applications on relevant budget in the SSW Model Projects. The Secretariat would work out the implementation details for the organisations to follow. Moreover, **Members** remarked that the public engagement in recycling activities should not rely mainly on giving out of souvenirs. The ultimate aim should be behavioural change in which the public would take their own initiatives in participating in recycling activities.

Agenda Item 10: Any Other Business

38. **Dr. Ellen CHAN** raised the issue on whether projects relating to the redistribution of surplus food should be supported under WRPs. She pointed out that apart from food waste recycling projects, projects on various form of food donation (e.g. turning unsold vegetables from markets/supermarkets into meals and donating ready to eat food to the needy etc) which would help ease the food waste problem in Hong Kong were also worth supporting. If such food was not utilised, it would turn into waste. The **Meeting** was generally open-minded on the scope of projects under WRPs that could help promote food waste reduction and recovery, subject to further deliberation on the merit of individual project types.

39. As the membership for the current term (2010 – 2012) of the WRPVSC would end on 15 October 2012, the **Chairman** thanked all Members and the representatives of the EPD for their continual support and contribution to the Meeting over the past 2 years.

40. The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

**Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-committee Secretariat
December 2012**

**Summary on New and Revised WRP Applications Vetted at 35th Meeting of
Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-Committee on 18 September 2012**

New WRP Applications

No.	Proponent	Project Title	Proposed Budget (\$)	Approved Amount (\$)	Decision	Remarks
230	2M Club 美孚曼克頓之友社	Reuse and Recycle of Electric Appliances and Electronic Products 家庭電器及電子產品循環再用及回收再造計劃	245,525	-	Supported-in-principal	<p>The Meeting supported-in-principle the application but considered the applicant should review and provide revised details on the project for further vetting–</p> <p>(a) The applicant should re-consider the need of renting storage areas for the WEEE collected. The proposed budget should be revised accordingly;</p> <p>(b) The applicant should review the need of deploying a full-time project co-ordinator; and,</p> <p>(c) The proposed eco-tours were recommended to be replaced by visits related to waste recycling.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant should work closely with the property management companies of the housing estates with a view of facilitating the company to take over the WEEE collection activities after completion of the project.</p> <p><i>[PMN: The revised proposed budget at \$129,025 from the applicant was circulated to Members on 11 October 2012, which was approved by the majority on 15 October 2012.]</i></p>

231	Hong Chi Association 匡智會	Promoting Food Waste Recycling through establishment of a Food Waste Recycling Education Village 打造『廚餘循環再造』教育村、推廣『廚餘循環再造』概念	1,497,416	-	Deferred	The Meeting deferred the application, and commented that the applicant should review and provide revised details on the project for further discussion in the next meeting – (a) The food waste recovery work under the project could be more effectively demonstrated to the visitors of Pinehill Village through integrating and incorporating the activities and facilities concerned into the existing features of the Village, instead of setting up a designated Showroom. The applicant should consider the need of setting up of the Showroom; and, (b) The applicant should review the need for a full-time Project Coordinator.
237	Hong Kong Environmental Protection Association 香港環境保護協會	Waste Wood Recycling Scheme 廢木回收計劃	1,999,500	0	Rejected	The Meeting rejected the application in view of limited direct involvement of waste producers and the community in the project. In addition, the effectiveness of the project in raising the awareness of waste recycling in the overall community was doubtful.
240	Kowloon Federation of Associations (Community Services) Foundation 九龍社團聯會社會服務基金有限公司	Educational Recycling Installation 廢物再用推廣計劃 - 廚餘變美景	1,908,600	0	Rejected	The Meeting rejected the application as there was reservation in the feasibility and sustainability of the project. Moreover, the involvement of the participants in the process of food waste recycling was limited.

**Summary on New and Revised WRP Applications Vetted at 35th Meeting of
Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-Committee on 18 September 2012**

WRP Applications - Budget Revision and Project Variations

No.	Proponent	Project Title	Proposed Budget (\$)	Approved Amount (\$)	Decision	Remarks
210	Ever Green Association 綠長青環保協進會有限公司	Tai Po District Food Waste Collection Pilot Project 大埔廚餘回收展生機試驗計劃	1,765,889	1,379,238	Partially-supported	<p>The organisation had submitted an application for budget revision. Proposed changes included budget increases in insurances, renting of a shop, recruiting a gardening instructor and miscellaneous equipment for the project.</p> <p>The Meeting supported most of the revised items while rejecting the budget requested for renting a shop, renovating the shop and recruiting a gardening instructor. In addition, The Meeting remarked that the farmer recruited under the project should also be responsible for teaching planting.</p>

**Summary on WRP Applications (SSW Model Cases) Vetted and Progress Reviews at 35th Meeting of
Waste Recovery Projects Vetting Sub-Committee on 18 September 2012**

No.	Status	Proponent	Project Title	Proposed Budget (\$)	Approved Amount (\$)	Decision	Remarks
225	New	Ma On Shan Youth Association 馬鞍山青年協會	Shatin Rural Area Waste Recovery Scheme 沙田區鄉村/舊區居民廢料回收計劃 (沙田回收中心)	1,621,760	1,552,210	Supported	The Meeting supported the application which followed the standard SSW model case framework.
232	New	The Institute of China Business Management Consultant Limited 中國商業管理顧問學會有限公司	Stanley Community Waste Recovery Scheme 赤柱區社區廢物回收計劃	2,148,950	0	Rejected	The Meeting rejected the application after considering that more than half of the target buildings in the project had already joined the Programme on Source Separation of Domestic Waste held by the EPD. In addition, many of the buildings listed in the proposal were not target buildings for SSW Model Projects.
235	New	The Institute of China Business Management Consultant Limited 中國商業管理顧問學會有限公司	North Point Community Waste Recovery Scheme 北角區社區廢物回收計劃	1,074,090	0	Rejected	The Meeting rejected the application taking into account the lack of community network in the district and experience in implementing waste recovery activities of the applicant organisation.

236	New	Environmental Advancement and Education Association 中華環保文化促進協會	Kowloon City -Tokwawan Community Waste Recovery Scheme 九龍城區 - 土瓜灣區社區廢物回收計劃	958,930	0	Rejected	The Meeting rejected the application as there were already other ECF projects on implementing source separation of waste and setting up community recycling networks in the proposed district.
239	New	Fong Chung Social Service Centre Limited 坊眾社會服務中心有限公司	Source Separation of Waste Programme for Commercial Buildings and Restaurants in Central & Western District (Extension of WRP211) 中西區商廈商舖及食肆廢膠回收計劃	1,999,020	1,516,582	Supported	The Meeting supported the application which followed the standard SSW model case framework. The Meeting remarked that the organisation should deploy their existing manpower for the road show activities in weekends. Moreover, in order to be consistent with other SSW Model Projects, the salary of the shop officer in the project would be adjusted to the same level of similar projects.
241	New	Cheung Sha Wan Kai Fong Welfare Association Ltd 長沙灣街坊福利會有限公司	Sham Sui Po and YTM Community Waste Recovery Scheme (Extension of WRP181) 深水埗及油尖旺區社區廢物回收計劃	1,885,492.4	1,457,494.40	Supported	The Meeting supported the application which followed the standard SSW model case framework, while advising that the organisation should take appropriate improvement measures and conduct more out-reaching work in order to achieve the target on number of households using the collection service provided.
189	Budget Revision	Tai Po Environmental Association 大埔環保會	Ways for Plastic Recycling PR 工作坊	1,558,220	1,468,220	Supported	The organisation had submitted an application for budget revision. Proposed changes included increase in budget for salary of staff and purchasing souvenirs for the waste-to-commodities activities, and re-allocation of budget for shop renovation and baling machine maintenance. The Meeting considered the revision

							<p>reasonable and supported the budget revision. On the other hand, while approving-in-principle the budget for purchasing souvenirs for the waste-to-commodities activities, the Meeting suggested the Secretariat to confirm the actual expenditure for such item since such budget should depend on the actual expenditure, as well as the amount of recyclables collected and revenue gained.</p> <p><i>[PMN: The actual expenditure on purchasing of souvenirs was subsequently confirmed and the approved budget for such item was concluded to be \$90,000 based on the relevant implementation details worked out by the Secretariat in the email circulated to Members on 15 October 2012.]</i></p>
238	New	Tai Po Environmental Association 大埔環保會	Ways for Plastic Recycling (Extension of WRP189) 塑膠回收棧	1,894,320	1,662,270	Supported	<p>The Meeting supported the application which followed the standard SSW model case framework.</p> <p>The Meeting advised that the organisation should take appropriate improvement measures and conduct more out-reaching work in order to achieve the target on number of households using the collection service provided.</p> <p>Moreover, the Secretariat should confirm the name of the applicant to be used for the application and request the applicant to provide reasons if a different name would be used.</p> <p><i>[PMN: The applicant had</i></p>

							<i>subsequently confirmed the name “大埔環保會” instead of 大埔環保協進會 would be used for the application.]</i>
171	Budget Revision	Ever Green Association Limited 綠長青環保協進會有限公司	Green Community Pilot Project – Plastic Recycling 社區回收先導計劃 -- 紅磡家居塑膠回收增值創明天	1,771,497	1,771,497	Supported	The organisation had submitted an application for budget revision to increase the budget in labour insurance. The Meeting considered the revision reasonable and supported the budget revision. The insurance purchased should cover the extension of the project, i.e. project 220, which was supported in the same meeting.
220	New	Ever Green Association Ltd 綠長青環保協進會有限公司	Hung Hom Waste Recycling Project (Extension of WRP171) 化廢為寶愛環保@紅磡	2,573,704	1,006,014	Supported	The Meeting supported the application which was adapted from the standard SSW model case framework, while adjusting the project period from 24 months to 12 months.
178	Budget Revision	New Opportunity Ltd 新機有限公司	Plastic Recycle Partnership Scheme 塑膠回收夥伴計劃	1,989,870	1,983,570	Supported	The organisation had applied for budget revision to increase the salaries of staff in the project. The Meeting considered the revision for the assistant officer and environmental ambassadors reasonable and supported the budget revision, while adjusting the salary of project officer to the same level of similar projects.
198	Budget Revision	Central & Western Mid-Levels Owners Association 中西區半山業主聯會	Source Separation of Waste Programme in C&W District & Mid-Levels 中西區及半山居民廢料	3,280,369.80	3,280,369.80	Supported	The organisation had applied for budget revision to increase the budget for labour insurance in the project. The Meeting considered the revision reasonable and supported the budget

			回收計劃				revision. [PMN: Since the budget of the project exceeded \$2 million, the application was required to be submitted to the ECFC for final approval. The ECFC approved the application in the Meeting on 3 October 2012.]
176	Progress Review	The Association of Chinese Evangelical Ministry Limited 中國福音事工促進會有限公司	Waste Recycle Project In Old Districts – Tai Kok Tsui/Sham Shui Po 大角咀深水埗舊區居民廢料回收計劃	-	-	Not-supported	The Meeting noted that the project performance was below satisfactory level. Targets of the project including the amount of plastics collected and the number of buildings joining the project were not met. In this connection, the Meeting decided that the organisation should be requested to improve their performance which would be further reviewed in about 2 months for consideration of project termination if the performance had still not improved at that time. The Meeting agreed that necessary disbursement amount for the project should continue until the next review could be made payable.