

# COUNCIL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

## Digest of notes of meeting held on 17 January 2011

- Date** : 17 January 2011  
**Time** : 3:00 p.m.  
**Venue** : Room 4690, 46/F, Revenue Tower, Wanchai, Hong Kong
- Chairman** : Mr Bernard Chan, GBS, JP
- Members** : Ms Christine Fang, BBS, JP  
Mr Michael Lai, MH, JP  
Professor Ho Kin-chung, BBS  
Professor Lam Kin-che, SBS, JP  
Mr Victor Li  
Dr Lo Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP  
Professor Poon Chi-sun  
Mr Sin Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Ms Iris Tam, JP  
Dr Andrew Thomson  
Professor Wong Siu-lun, SBS, JP  
Mr Edward Yau, Secretary for the Environment  
Ms Florence Hui, Under Secretary for Home Affairs  
Mr Yau Shing-Mu, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing  
Mr Enoch Lam, Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)<sup>2</sup>
- Apologies** : Mr Chan Siu-hung  
Mr Benjamin Hung  
Mrs Miranda Leung  
Mr Tai Hay-lap, BBS, JP
- In attendance** : Ms Vivian Lau, Deputy Secretary for the Environment,  
Environment Bureau (ENB)  
Mr Damian Chan, Assistant Secretary for the Environment  
(Sustainable Development)<sup>1</sup>, ENB  
Ms Elia Wong, Assistant Secretary for the Environment  
(Sustainable Development)<sup>2</sup>, ENB  
Mr Wang Yuen, Senior Environmental Protection Officer

(Sustainable Development), ENB  
Miss Alice Liu, Senior Town Planner (Sustainable  
Development), ENB  
Ms Winnie Young, Executive Officer (Sustainable  
Development), ENB  
Ms Pennie Lai, Campaign Manager (Sustainable Development),  
ENB

For agenda items 3 & 4

Dr Andrew Chan, Chairman, Hong Kong Green Building  
Council (HKGBC)  
Mr Wong Kam-sing, Director and Chairman of Green Labelling  
Committee, HKGBC cum Support Group Convenor  
Mr Kevin Edmunds, Executive Director, HKGBC

**Secretary** : Ms Jennifer Chan, Principal Assistant Secretary for the  
Environment (Sustainable Development), ENB

**Item 1 – Confirmation of minutes of the last meeting (25 October 2010)**

As Members had no comment on the draft minutes of the meeting of 25 October 2010 circulated on 10 January 2011, the latter was taken as confirmed. A non-attributable digest of the notes would be posted on the SDD website for public information.

**Item 2 – Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting**

There was no matter arising from the last meeting.

**Item 3 – Presentation of Hong Kong Green Building Council on its work relevant to climate change****Item 4 – Proposed framework for the public engagement and public education and awareness programmes on climate change-related issues (SDC paper No. 01/11)**

[Items 3 & 4 were discussed in one go.]

Members were briefed on the Hong Kong Green Building Council (HKGBC)'s work relevant to climate change.

The meeting noted that Hong Kong's power consumption versus GDP was comparably low. The major carbon emission arose from electricity generation, and buildings consumed a large part of the electricity generated. According to HKGBC's estimation, energy saving measures in buildings proposed in ENB's public consultation paper on climate change strategy and action agenda would achieve 8% carbon emissions reduction in Hong Kong. There was, however, much room for further reduction of carbon emissions from existing buildings. Taking energy saving measures in existing buildings was

important because such buildings would still exist and be responsible for a significant portion of energy consumption in 40 years' time.

Members had the following views on Items 3 and 4 –

- Suggested Hong Kong consider more demand-side measures to further increase the originally projected 8% reduction in the carbon emissions. This could help convince the public of the need to make behavioural changes.
- Although the effect of the demand-side management might not be as significant at the initial stage, it would have a great impact in the longer term.
- Hong Kong people stayed in the same residence for about five years on average. The occupation duration of office space was even shorter. Therefore, it did not make good business sense for property owners to invest in green measures with a payback period longer than that. There was a need to fill the financial gap. Since building owners had a shorter investment period than infrastructure owners, such as power companies, it might be easier to target the latter to take action first.
- The Government should take different measures catering to the different needs of different stakeholders in buildings, e.g. tenants, owners, etc.
- While the Council would seek to identify solutions during the process for making recommendations to the Government, it could not possibly aim to solve all the problems.
- Considered it necessary to make known to the general public the possible solutions available, including what the infrastructure service providers could do to significantly reduce carbon emissions.
- Opined that the spirit behind the public engagement exercise should be driving for cultural change.
- A 6-8% reduction in GHG emissions on the demand side was considered a very modest and minimal target. Whether there should be a higher target for the demand-side management in general, as well as higher sectoral targets, for commercial buildings for example, could be discussed.
- The public engagement activities and questionnaire should target not only

the general public, but also the various key user groups and big players.

- The stakeholders targeted by the engagement should include not only the users, but also the financiers, power companies, etc.
- The public engagement would be a good educational opportunity for the public. As 90% of the electricity generated in Hong Kong was consumed in buildings, it was important to educate people living and working in buildings to adopt a low carbon lifestyle.
- Believed that the public education programme should take a broader scope, while the public engagement process should focus on carbon emissions mitigation.
- An appropriate title would need to be identified for the public engagement exercise. It should not be too broad, but needed to strike a balance between emphasizing on buildings or lifestyle.
- Figures showing Hong Kong being a “low carbon city” might lead to misconception and needed to be clarified. In some carbon emissions calculation, Hong Kong’s score was rather low due to its economic structure. However, on aggregation, Hong Kong’s carbon emission was actually not low. One could compare the carbon emissions of the commercial buildings in Hong Kong with their counterparts overseas.

#### **Item 5 – Report on the work of the Education and Publicity Sub-committee (Paper No. 02/11)**

The meeting noted that –

- (a) 56 submissions had been received for the eighth round of the Sustainable Development Fund applications and a Sustainable Development School Award ceremony would be held on 19 February 2011;
- (b) the School Outreach Programme (SOP) was very successful and had thus far reached out to a total of 320 schools up to 2010. A total of 48 schools had signed up for seminars/talks and nine new workshops

would be organised in the coming round; and

- (c) the WWF-Hong Kong would be invited to organise a low-carbon leader training programme for senior secondary school students and teachers.

**Item 6 – Any other business**

There was no other business.

**Item 7 – Date of next meeting**

The Secretary would confirm the date of the next meeting nearer the time.

Secretariat  
Council for Sustainable Development