

# **Government's Response to the Council for Sustainable Development's Report on the Public Engagement Process on Municipal Solid Waste Charging**

## **Introduction**

The Council for Sustainable Development (“SDC”) published a report on 16 December 2014 setting out its recommendations on how to implement quantity-based municipal solid waste (“MSW”) charging in Hong Kong. On the same day, the Secretary for the Environment, Mr Wong Kam-sing, issued a statement welcoming the report and pledged that the Government would thoroughly consider and follow up on the report’s recommendations. Subsequently, in February 2015, the Government submitted to the Legislative Council (“LegCo”) Panel on Environmental Affairs a framework proposal on the way forward. This note presents the framework proposal to the SDC as a formal response to the SDC’s report.

## **Background**

2. Quantity-based charging can create financial incentive to drive behavioural changes in waste generation thus reducing the overall amount of waste required for disposal. In 2012, we conducted an extensive public consultation to collect views from the public on whether MSW charging should be introduced in Hong Kong and, on the basis of majority support obtained, affirmed the introduction of quantity-based MSW charging in Hong Kong, which is also featured as one of the major waste reduction initiatives under *Hong Kong: Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022* (“*The Blueprint*”) published in May 2013. Notwithstanding the majority support, views collected during the 2012 public consultation were fairly mixed about the charging mechanism particularly in the case of household waste charging. Amongst other things, the multi-storey and multi-tenant building setting in Hong Kong has posed a lot of operational challenges. Therefore, in December 2012, we invited the SDC to conduct a second-stage public engagement on the implementation framework of the MSW charging scheme.

## **The SDC's Recommendations**

3. In September 2013, on the basis of views collected during the preparatory stage<sup>1</sup>, the SDC published an Invitation for Response (“IR”) document, which covers four key issues including (i) charging mechanism; (ii) coverage of charging scheme; (iii) charging level; and (iv) recycling, and accordingly launched the public engagement. The public involvement stage of the SDC’s engagement ended in January 2014. After further deliberation, the SDC published its report on 16 December 2014, detailed recommendations of which are summarized at Annex A.

### **The Government’s Response**

4. The Government notes that of the various recommendations of the SDC, it will be most challenging to put in place a full system for charging all MSW producers in one go. This charging system must be broadly compatible with the collection and disposal system which is highly complex and is heavily loaded. The necessary preparatory work will involve complex operational issues that cut across the responsibilities of Bureaux and Departments. In addition, continuing public education is critical to shape behavioral change in the community to promote compliance. A Working Group has been convened by the Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”) comprising senior representatives of EPD, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”), Housing Department (“HD”) and Home Affairs Department to steer and co-ordinate the preparatory work. Where necessary, representatives from other relevant departments may also be co-opted. The Working Group will give due consideration to the interface issues between the proposed mandatory MSW charging and other public services such as efficiency of waste disposal/collection for environmental hygiene, public housing management, and balancing effective enforcement of the charging scheme with privacy considerations and compliance costs.

5. In broad terms, there are four key areas of preparatory work –

- (a) formulating effective implementation plans to give effect to the charging mechanism at the various types of MSW

---

<sup>1</sup> A Support Group for the public engagement comprising representatives from relevant sectors was formed in early 2013. The SDC also held seven focus group meetings between April and May 2013 before the public engagement formally started in September 2013.

reception points;

- (b) development of relevant complementary systems;
- (c) stepping up of public education and community involvement programmes; and
- (d) drafting of the enabling legislation to provide the legal basis for implementation of the MSW charging system.

An outline of work plan for the four key areas of preparatory work is set out below. We aim to complete the development phase of MSW charging within three years. As for the other recommendations of the SDC, the Government's position/work plan is summarized at Annex B.

### Effective Implementation Plans at MSW Reception Points

#### *EPD's Landfills and RTSs: MSW Disposed of by Private Waste Collectors*

6. Due to privacy and practical resource considerations, implementation of MSW charging will primarily be based on the activities at the MSW reception points, which are FEHD's Refuse Collection Vehicles ("RCVs") and Refuse Collection Points ("RCPs") and EPD's landfills and Refuse Transfer Stations ("RTSs"). At present, commercial and industrial ("C&I") establishments engage private waste collectors to collect their waste. Some residential buildings also hire private collection services. These private waste collectors deliver about 3 800 tonnes per day ("tpd") of MSW to landfills or RTSs direct. For such MSW, charging arrangements would be made through "gate-fees" and could be implemented in a relatively straightforward manner. On the other hand, there would be concerns of fly-tipping, which will demand stepping up of enforcement actions and resources.

#### *FEHD's RCVs: MSW from Residential Buildings managed by Property Management Companies ("PMCs")*

7. FEHD manages a collection fleet of RCVs providing direct collection service at its RCPs and refuse collection chambers in residential buildings and public institutional premises. It serves most residential buildings managed by the PMCs including the public housing estates and various institutional premises and collects some 3 700 tpd of MSW. In such premises, MSW is often collected centrally by the PMC concerned who acts as a service agent for handing the waste over to

FEHD and the waste will then be conveyed by FEHD's RCVs to either a landfill or an RTS. If new laws are enacted to implement charging "by household using pre-paid designated garbage bags", the PMCs will play a pivotal role in facilitating the migration to a successful charging system where individual households pay as they throw. The PMCs will have to engage their residents to consider suitable response measures, including for instance whether and how to adjust their refuse collection arrangements for effective monitoring of compliance, whether or not to discontinue the existing provision of free garbage bags by the PMCs, need of new house rules to sanction against free-riders, how to enhance recycling support within the premises and whether or not to opt for the interim option of "by volume of waste disposed by the building" etc. Accordingly, we will closely and comprehensively engage the property management sector (including HD) to ascertain their plans and will work with the stakeholders to develop necessary facilitating measures for transition to ultimately disposal by pre-paid designated bags by households.

#### *FEHD's RCPs: MSW from "3-nil" Buildings and Rural Villages*

8. FEHD's direct collection service does not however cover residential buildings and village houses that are not readily accessible by RCVs (mainly single-block buildings in old districts or remote areas) and the rural sector. Households in these residential buildings and village houses are instead served by a network of RCPs which also handle street waste collected by street cleaners and other trade waste (usually from street level shops) subject to a 100-litre disposal limit with a total usage of about 1 600 tpd of MSW. These buildings do not normally hire property management services and some so-called "3-nil" buildings<sup>2</sup> might not have even proper building management. This has presented unique challenges in mobilizing the residents to follow the charging scheme. Most RCPs, in particular those in rural areas, are unmanned<sup>3</sup> thus leading to additional constraints on effective enforcement. There must be comprehensive engagement and suitable strategy to deter non-compliance. Otherwise we will be expecting prevalent free-riding behaviour in these sectors for whom MSW charging is unlikely to achieve its intended results in reducing waste.

---

<sup>2</sup> Buildings without owners' corporations, residents' organizations or PMCs.

<sup>3</sup> Only some 150 out of over 3 160 are permanent facilities and attended by workman of FEHD or its contractor; the others are small concrete or metal structures or simply bin-sites which are unattended.

### *Enforcement against Non-compliance of MSW Disposal*

9. On the whole, for the mandatory requirement to wrap MSW in designated garbage bags, we envisage that non-compliance cases would occur more at RCPs (particularly those unmanned) than at refuse collection chambers in residential buildings served by FEHD's collection fleet. FEHD's staff at RCPs may help turn away people who intend to deposit MSW not wrapped in pre-paid designated garbage bags. Likewise, FEHD's collection fleet may reject the reception of MSW that is not wrapped in pre-paid designated garbage bags. Other additional measures will be needed to deter non-compliance or free-riders, which the Inter-departmental Working Group will develop in consultation with relevant parties.

### Development of Complementary and Other Technical Systems

#### *Modifications at the MSW Reception Points*

10. During the transitional period, residential buildings using FEHD's refuse collection service may adopt an interim charging mechanism on the basis of "by volume of waste disposed of by the building", i.e. in practice counting the number of garbage collection bins used to contain the MSW disposed of. With the support of FEHD and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, EPD will conduct a small-scale trial to test out the technical feasibility of an automated bin-counting system in Hong Kong starting tentatively from July 2015. We will consider the way forward based on the experience gained from the trial.

11. We tried out charging "by volume of waste disposed of by the building" in the pilot scheme for PMC-managed residential buildings which started in April 2014. It was found that reliance on manual procedures (such as measurement and recording) in the charging system would lead to a lot of operational challenges, for instance, the additional time and human error in recording and taking measurements of each waste bin. For the purpose of a statutory charging scheme, a manually operated system would also open up loopholes for abuses. Installing an automated system onto FEHD's RCVs to support charging will help address the operational issues identified. When fully implemented, the automated system will also operate in conjunction with necessary software to support the registration of and billing to those users of FEHD's direct collection services who have opted for this charging

mechanism.

12. Separately, we will take stock of the practical situation in all RCPs and accordingly consider scope of improvement for say facilitating enforcement and enhancing recycling support. To tie in with the implementation of MSW charging, FEHD will review the overall provision of litter bins placed in public places and the design of such litter bins. EPD will correspondingly review the need of enhanced provision of collection facilities for various types of recyclables in public places.

#### *Installation of Appropriate Technical Systems*

13. For the purpose of collecting an MSW gate fee at EPD's landfills and RTSs, all these facilities have already been equipped with weigh-bridges. However certain software and hardware upgrade will be needed for billing systems. In addition, there should be a proper distribution network through which users (including households, PMCs, and C&I establishments and even cleansing workers) procure the designated garbage bags conveniently. This may include an online portal.

#### *Design of "Designated Garbage Bags"*

14. A huge number of designated garbage bags will be consumed in everyday MSW disposal through FEHD (either through its RCVs or RCPs). We will draw up the technical specifications for such bags taking into account feedback received during past and future trials and develop an efficient system to manufacture these bags. For instance, we have received different views on the size (now ranging from family-sized at 5 to 15-litre to industrial-sized at 30 to 70-litre), shape (i.e. flat-top or t-shirt, with or without gusset) and other physical characteristics (e.g. translucency and toughness) of the bags. There are also suggestions about the chemical content of the bags, e.g. whether they can be made from uncontaminated plastic shopping bags locally recovered in Hong Kong or other bio-degradable materials.

#### Public Education and Community Involvement Projects

15. The SDC's recommendation for MSW charging to be implemented in all sectors in one go will directly impact on over 2.2 million domestic households in all kinds of residential settings, a wide range of different C&I establishments and other institutions or community service units. We need to adequately inform them of the

new initiative and prepare them for the expected behavioural change in response to charging. Throughout the preparation period, we will also need to extensively engage relevant stakeholders such as general members of the public (as domestic MSW producers), chambers of commerce, professional bodies, private waste collectors, cleansing contractors and property management etc.

### *Community Green Stations (“CGSs”)*

16. As announced in the 2014 Policy Address, we are progressively developing CGSs in each of the 18 districts. These stations will be operated by non-profit-making organizations and the Government will provide funding for their operation. At this stage, we have confirmed the sites for 11 CGS projects after District Councils consultations. The first facility will commence operation in Sha Tin District in early 2015 and the second in Eastern District by mid-2015. Apart from enhancing the logistics support for local recycling initiatives, progressive CGS development will also enhance our capacity in environmental education and community engagement in support of MSW charging and other waste reduction initiatives.

### *Stakeholder Forums*

17. In addition, we are preparing for the establishment of a platform for stakeholders to be engaged in the development of MSW charging on an on-going basis. We are inclined to organize relevant parties into four to five stakeholder forums, each of which will focus at the implementation of MSW charging in/for (i) PMC-managed residential buildings, (ii) residential buildings without proper building management, (iii) rural or less densely populated areas, (iv) businesses and (v) institutions and community service units. The stakeholder forums will be interactive and participatory by nature. They are expected to contribute to the Government’s preparatory work by (i) reflecting views from within the stakeholder groups on relevant operational issues, (ii) sharing examples of best practices and contributing to the development of practicable guidelines for wider promulgation in the stakeholder groups and (iii) mobilizing the stakeholder groups in the engagement of the wider community for conducting trials to prepare for the full implementation of MSW charging.

### An Enabling Legislation for Necessary Legal Basis

18. Finally, MSW charging has to be implemented by legislation.

EPD will take the lead in preparing the legislative proposals which will amongst other things (i) mandate proper wrapping of MSW using pre-paid designated garbage bags for disposal through FEHD's RCVs or RCPs, (ii) provide for an alternative, interim charging mechanism for MSW handed over to FEHD's RCVs during the transitional period, and (iii) enable the charging of an MSW gate fee at EPD's landfills and RTSs. There will also be specific fee proposals which will be drawn up after giving due considerations to the "polluter pays" principle and the SDC's findings about community acceptability<sup>4</sup>.

## **Implementation Timetable**

19. An inter-departmental working group has commenced overseeing the preparatory work as mentioned in paragraph 4. EPD is conducting a thorough assessment of the legislative proposals or amendments required in consultation with relevant departments and aim to commence law drafting as soon as practicable. In parallel, a stock-taking trawl will be conducted to collect comprehensive information on the actual refuse collection arrangements in all residential buildings so that the future statutory regulatory framework and best practice guidelines can cater for different scenarios.

20. Publicity, public education and community engagement through CGSs, stakeholder forums and other means will be an on-going process. We will closely engage the relevant stakeholders at different stages and will from time to time report progress to the Advisory Council for the Environment. Where there are demands, we will also consider seeking new funding support under the Environment and Conservation Fund for pilot trial in different residential settings at a suitable juncture. We will also proceed with other preparatory work under a coordinated programme such that they will be readily completed in step with the legislative timetable.

## **Conclusion**

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on the feedback received during the public engagement, the SDC noted that most respondents prefer the lowest charging level option at \$30 to \$44 per month for a three-member household and a gate fee between \$400 and \$499 per tonne and recommended that this range should be taken as a reference.



21. The Government welcomes the SDC's recommendations, which are both progressive yet pragmatic, and at the same time compatible with the prevailing situation in Hong Kong. We are committed to adopting the proposed framework in mapping out the implementation detail, and will progressively carry out the preparatory work outlined above.

**Environment Bureau/Environmental Protection Department**  
**April 2015**

**The Extract of the Executive Summary of the  
SDC's Report on the Public Engagement Process on MSW Charging**

Key Issues	SDC's Recommendations
Charging Mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>For waste disposal through the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) refuse collection fleet (mainly residential buildings with property management companies (PMCs) that handle refuse collection and environmental hygiene of the buildings) –</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The ultimate goal is to implement charging “by household using pre-paid designated garbage bags”. This allows tracing of the volume of waste disposed of by individual households and ensures fairness in implementing quantity-based charging. It also offers direct economic incentive to foster behavioural change and waste reduction of individual households;</li> <li>▪ Residential buildings that already have the appropriate conditions may implement “by household by bag” charging from the start;</li> <li>▪ Some residential buildings may need time for residents to reach a consensus on the implementation details of waste charging, such as the need to alter waste collection arrangements or facilities to trace waste source, so that they may institute a system for charging on the basis of “by household by bag”. A transitional period should be established to allow these residential buildings to adopt a charging mechanism on the basis of “by volume of waste disposed of by the building”;</li> <li>▪ The transitional period is expected to last for a maximum of three years and the Government should conduct a review on the effectiveness of the waste charging scheme after the first year of implementation; and</li> <li>▪ During the transitional period, the Government should</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Key Issues	SDC's Recommendations
	<p>formulate administrative guidelines to assist property owners/residents and PMCs in devising measures to apportion waste charge among households based on the “Waste Less, Pay Less” principle. The Government should also support and encourage residents to migrate to “by household by bag” charging as soon as possible, e.g. introducing a differential charging scale of which the rate of charging “by building by volume” would be higher than “by household by bag”, and with progressive annual increase in the rate for charging by building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>For waste disposal at refuse collection points (RCPs) (mainly residential buildings without PMCs, rural areas, and commercial and industrial (C&amp;I) organisations disposing of limited amount of waste) –</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residents must use pre-paid designated garbage bags for disposing of waste at FEHD's RCPs by themselves or through their hired cleaners. Waste in non-designated garbage bags shall be rejected for disposal at RCPs;</li> <li>▪ The Government should consider allowing C&amp;I organisations to use pre-paid designated garbage bags for the disposal of limited amount of trade waste at RCPs; and</li> <li>▪ The Government should examine the need for retrofitting relevant facilities, and increase the manpower to enhance management and monitoring for deterring non-compliances and fly-tipping.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>For waste disposal through private waste collectors (mainly C&amp;I organisations and a small number of residential estates, of which the waste is transported to refuse transfer stations (RTS) or landfills) –</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Charging should be based on the weight of waste disposed of at RTS and landfills. This is the so-called “gate fee”. Private waste collectors should discuss with clients on methods to apportion the waste charges among individual waste producers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>Supporting measures –</i></b></li> </ul>

<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>SDC's Recommendations</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Step up efforts on education for enhancing the public's awareness on waste reduction and recycling which, from a macro perspective, would foster a greener, "waste less" lifestyle, and the sustainable development of Hong Kong;</li> <li>▪ Explore areas for further cooperation with District Councils, Heung Yee Kuk and rural bodies, housing estates, schools, green groups, chambers of commerce, waste collectors and other stakeholders in education and publicity;</li> <li>▪ Consider ways to facilitate the effective implementation of charging by household using pre-paid designated garbage bags in residential buildings, including enhanced monitoring, additional recycling facilities, and more recycling programmes; and</li> <li>▪ Enhance manpower for patrol and law enforcement as well as increase the level of penalties for deterrence effect.</li> </ul>
<b>Coverage of Charging Scheme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MSW charging should be implemented in all sectors in one go; and</li> <li>▪ The Government should consider introducing a "preparatory phase" of 12 to 18 months before the legislation comes into effect for all sectors to get prepared.</li> </ul>
<b>Charging Level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The charging level should be in line with the quantity-based and the "polluter pays" principles, and it should be effective in waste reduction but not too excessive;</li> <li>▪ During the public engagement process, most respondents chose the lowest charging level option for C&amp;I waste (i.e. HK\$400 to \$499 per tonne). The Government should consider this as a reference;</li> <li>▪ There should be parity between the charging levels of C&amp;I waste and domestic waste to ensure fairness;</li> <li>▪ Most respondents chose the lowest charging level option for domestic waste, which is HK\$30 to \$44 per household per month (based on a three-person household). The</li> </ul>

<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>SDC's Recommendations</b>
	<p>Government should take this range as a starting point for the charging level of domestic waste. It should conduct a review on its effectiveness in waste reduction after implementing the scheme for one to two years;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The needs of people with financial hardship should be addressed. The Government should explore it in-depth and work out relevant details; and</li> <li>▪ The Government should explain clearly the differences between and the underlying principles of the Rates and MSW charge in response to concerns in the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Recycling</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide additional recycling facilities in residential estates and public areas with the support of PMCs, owners' corporations and other relevant organisations, and step up education efforts to promote recycling;</li> <li>▪ Explore feasible outlets, such as to increase the types of recyclable materials for collection at recycling facilities;</li> <li>▪ Expedite the construction of organic waste treatment facilities, and explore feasible measures to support on-site source separation of food waste;</li> <li>▪ Explore the feasibility of installing additional recycling facilities near RCPs to provide more incentive and create a synergy that encourages residents of single block buildings to recycle;</li> <li>▪ Examine the feasibility of gradually reducing the number of roadside litter containers or redesign them to prevent the public from using them to dispose of domestic and trade waste;</li> <li>▪ Provide more supporting measures to the recycling industry, including land provision, facilitation for collection of recyclables, encourage technological research, increase green procurement, and promote training and development of recycling workers;</li> <li>▪ Explore implementing measures (including the Producer Responsibility Schemes (PRS) in the long run) to increase the recycling of materials where such recyclables may not be economically viable for recycling in the market now;</li> <li>▪ The Government should further step up the PRS; and</li> </ul>

<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>SDC's Recommendations</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="432 286 1385 568">▪ Enhance the education and promotional campaigns before the implementation of MSW charging to raise public awareness and encourage waste reduction, source separation and cleaning of recyclables. Such education efforts should also be sustained in schools and the community.</li> </ul>

**The Government's Position and Work Plan on Other Recommendations of the SDC**

	Recommendations of the SDC	The Government's Position/Work Plan
	<i>Charging Level</i>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The charging level should be in line with the quantity-based and the “polluter pays” principles, and it should be effective in waste reduction but the level not too excessive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the outcome of the 2012 public consultation, the Government has affirmed the direction of introducing quantity-based MSW charging. EPD will draw up specific fee proposals and propose to the LegCo after giving due considerations to the “polluter pays” principle and the SDC’s findings about community acceptability.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the public engagement process, most respondents chose the lowest charging level option for C&amp;I waste (i.e. HK\$400 to \$499 per tonne). The Government should consider this as a reference.</li> </ul>	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be parity between the charging levels of C&amp;I waste and domestic waste to ensure fairness.</li> </ul>	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most respondents chose the lowest charging level option for the domestic waste, which is HK\$30 to \$44 per household per month (based on a three-person household). The Government should take this range as a starting point for the charging level of domestic waste. It should conduct a review on its effectiveness in waste reduction after implementing the scheme for one to two years.</li> </ul>	

	<b>Recommendations of the SDC</b>	<b>The Government's Position/Work Plan</b>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The needs of people with financial hardship should be addressed. The Government should explore it in-depth and work out relevant details.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPD will explore whether relief measures are genuinely necessary in the case of the needy.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Government should explain clearly the differences between and the underlying principles of the Rates and MSW charge in response to concerns in the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As recommended by the SDC, EPD will clearly explain the difference between the proposed MSW charges and Rates, and that there is no double-charging between the two. The objective of quantity-based MSW charging is to create economic incentives, with a view to cultivating behavioural change for waste reduction and recycling. Rates, on the other hand, is charged on the basis of the rateable value of a property, and serves as an important source of Government revenue.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Recycling</i></b>		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide additional recycling facilities in residential estates and public areas with the support of PMCs, owners' corporations and other relevant organisations, and step up education efforts to promote recycling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On top of other efforts on separation of waste at source, EPD is progressively developing CGSs to enhance environmental education at community level and logistics support to local recycling programmes.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore the feasibility of installing additional recycling facilities near RCPs to provide more incentive and create a synergy that encourages residents of single block buildings to recycle.</li> </ul>	



	<b>Recommendations of the SDC</b>	<b>The Government's Position/Work Plan</b>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore feasible outlets, such as to increase the types of recyclable materials for collection at recycling facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various on-going or new initiatives under <i>The Blueprint</i> will contribute to the development of the local recycling system. Amongst other things – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ a Recycling Fund will be established to upgrade the operational capabilities of the recycling industry, increase the quantity of the recyclables recovered, raise the quality of treated materials and establish a stable outlet for recycled materials; and</li> <li>▫ the Steering Committee to Promote the Sustainable Development of the Recycling Industry chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration will continue to explore and formulate complementary measures such as promotion of manpower training, green procurement, and encouraging research and development of technology and products.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more supporting measures to the recycling industry, including land provision, facilitation for collection of recyclables, encourage technological research, increase green procurement, and promote training and development of recycling workers.</li> </ul>	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expedite the construction of Organic Waste Treatment Facilities (“OWTFs”), and explore feasible measures to support on-site source separation of food waste.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first OWTF is already under construction at Siu Ho Wan (North Lantau) and will cater for 200 tpd of food waste. We will also explore feasible measures to support on-site source separation of food waste with due consideration of the available treatment capacity of OWTFs.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the feasibility of gradually reducing the number of roadside litter containers or redesign them to prevent the public from using them to dispose of domestic and trade waste.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To tie in with the implementation of MSW charging, FEHD will review the overall provision of litter bins placed in public places and the design of such litter bins.</li> </ul>

	<b>Recommendations of the SDC</b>	<b>The Government's Position/Work Plan</b>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore implementing measures (including the Producer Responsibility Schemes (“PRS”) in the long run) to increase the recycling of materials where such recyclables may not be economically viable for recycling in the market now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As pledged in <i>The Blueprint</i>, EPD is progressively putting in place various PRSs to promote waste reduction and recycling –               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>full extension of plastic shopping bag charging has taken place since 1 April 2015;</li> <li>the PRS for waste electrical and electronic equipment (“WEEE”) has been introduced into the LegCo and EPD has also obtained funding approval for the development of a local WEEE treatment facility;</li> <li>the PRS on glass beverage bottles is also under preparation; and</li> <li>we are also supporting a number of trade-led recycling programmes for recovery of compact fluorescent lamps and rechargeable batteries.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Government should further step up the PRS.</li> </ul>	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance the education and promotional campaigns before the implementation of MSW charging to raise public awareness and encourage waste reduction, source separation and cleaning of recyclables. Such education efforts should also be sustained in schools and the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please see paragraphs 15 to 17 on the Government's work plan in relation to publicity, public education and community engagement.</li> </ul>