

# **COUNCIL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

## **Education and Publicity Sub-Committee**

Paper 01/04

### **Sustainable Development Fund – First Round of Applications**

#### **Purpose**

This paper invites Members to consider the recommendations of the Vetting Committee in respect of applications to the Sustainable Development Fund (SDF) and to advise as to which applications should be approved.

#### **Proposal**

2. We propose that Members –
  - (a) note the views of the Vetting Committee (VC) summarised at **Annex A** in respect of the 32 applications that are recommended for further assessment; and
  - (b) bearing in mind the recommendations of the VC described below, advise as to which applications are suitable for the award of grants under this funding “round”.

Applications previously not recommended by Members for grants are listed at **Annex B** for reference.

#### **Considerations**

##### *Preliminary Vetting*

3. The Sustainable Development Unit (SDU) received 127 applications, for grants totalling some \$138 million, by the funding deadline

of 1 December 2003. Given the large volume of applications, as well as the large total sum of money requested (which exceeded the entire SDF allocation for the next ten years), VC Members agreed to form three sub-groups, to conduct an initial vetting of these applications, with assistance from staff of the SDU. As a result of this process, Members agreed on a “shortlist” of 32 applications that were suitable for further detailed assessment by the SDU.

#### *Detailed Assessment*

4. The SDU conducted a detailed assessment of the 32 applications on the “shortlist”, using the standard marking form at **Annex C**, in order to ensure as far as possible that the process was fair and objective. Subsequently, VC Members considered these assessments at a meeting on 28 January. A summary of VC Members’ recommendations is at Annex A.

#### **Recommendations of the Vetting Committee**

5. The VC’s recommendations at Annex A take into account the extent to which proposed projects are consistent with the aims of the SDF, the financial and operational track records of applicants, the likely outcomes of the projects and their effectiveness in raising the wider community’s understanding of the principles of sustainable development. Having considered the various factors, the VC identified **nine** projects that would be suitable to be awarded grants. Details are in paragraph 6 below. As regards a further **five** projects, VC Members asked the SDU to seek further clarification from applicants before seeking a final recommendation from this Sub-committee. Details relating to these five applications are set out in paragraph 7 below.

#### *Projects Suitable for Grants*

6. The VC recommended that the following 9 projects (listed at Part One of Annex A) be considered for the award of grants from the SDF -

1. “Education for Sustainable Development in Primary Schools” by the Centre for University and School Partnership, Faculty of Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (SDF007) - \$900,000 over a period of 20 months
2. “Sustainable Management of Coastal Wetland in Hong Kong and South China” by the Institute for Natural Resources and Environmental Management, Department of Biology, Hong Kong Baptist University (SDF047) - \$3,078,660 over a period of 35 months
3. “建立可持續發展社區：從綠色網絡推動成可持續發展社區”  
 (“Establishing an SD Community: To promote SD Community through Green Networks”) by Baptist Wing Lung Secondary School (SDF048) - \$493,100 over a period of 14 months
4. “Urban Green (城市綠洲)” by Aberdeen Kai-fong Welfare Association Social Service Centre (SDF056) - \$1,689,330 over a period of 36 months
5. “Project S+E+E” by Veronica Luk (SDF064) - \$232,490 over a period of 12 months
6. “21 世可持續發展社區藍本 – 灣仔版”  
 (“Blueprint for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Society – Wan Chai Edition”) by St. James’ Settlement Community Development Services (SDF078) - \$1,582,300 over a period of 36 months
7. “持續新動力 – 離島創意商機”  
 (“Environmental Synergy”) by the Hong Kong Family Welfare Society (SDF081) - \$499,200 over a period of 18 months

8. “青年獻策:凝聚意念 .持續發展” – 香港公共政策創意獎勵計畫”  
 (“Youth Policy: A Concerted Vision. Sustainable Development” – Hong Kong Public Policy Innovation Scheme) by the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (SDF088) - \$1,214,700 over a period of 34 months (Note: The applicant has revised the project to \$901,200 over the same period.)
9. “Peng Chau as a Green Culture Island in Hong Kong” by Green Peng Chau Association (SDF102) - \$2,452,200 over a period of 30 months

Upon receipt of the latest cash flow forecasts of the above projects, a total of **\$11,828,480** would be required to meet the cost of these projects, of which **\$5,066,168** would be spent in financial year 2004-05.

*Projects on which Further Advice is Sought*

7. A further five projects, listed at Part Two of Annex A, have been assessed as meeting the broad funding criteria and in all or most respects fulfill the detailed assessment requirements. However, the VC asked the SDU to clarify certain elements of the applications before seeking this Sub-committee’s views on whether or not the projects should be supported. Clarification has been sought from the relevant applicants, and the further information provided by them is summarised in Part Two of Annex A. The five projects are -

1. “綠色女流建設環保屯門”  
 (“Green Females Building Environmentally Protected Tuen Mun”) by Yan Oi Tong (SDF020) - \$1,531,750 over a period of 24 months
2. “Sustainable Development Case Study Development and Distribution” by Civic Exchange Limited (SDF067) - \$1,048,720 over a period of 24 months (later revised to \$316,450 over a period of 6 months)

3. “Cross-Boundary Socio-Economic Integration and the Environment: A study of Public Awareness on Sustainable Development in the Greater Pearl River Delta” by The University of Hong Kong (SDF094) - \$1,606,000 over a period of 24 months (The applicant has later revised the project cost to \$1,404,800)
  
4. “Transforming Our Community Heritage- Schools- Parents- Community- Professionals and Government Partnership in Enhancing Sustainable Development for Our Community” by Centre of Architectural Research for Education, Elderly, Environment and Excellence Ltd. (SDF100) - \$2,199,800 over a period of 33 months
  
5. “The Environment and Mankind in Unity and Sustainability Challenge / ‘EMUS Challenge’” by The Australian Chamber of Commerce - \$8,066,780 over a period of 42 months (The applicant has since confirmed that they would revise the scope and budget of the project, and re-submit it in a subsequent round of applications to the SDF)

Upon receipt of the latest cash flow forecasts of the above projects by some applicants, excluding the project of The Australian Chamber of Commerce, a total of **\$5,452,800** is required for these projects, of which **\$2,560,244** would be spent in 2004-05.

#### *Projects Not Recommended For Grants*

8. As noted above, the VC considered at the initial assessment stage that 95 projects were not suitable for grants. The VC then further considered that 18 of the remaining 32 “short-listed” projects were not suitable for grants at this stage.

#### **Further Action**

9. Subject to the advice of this Sub-committee, where the amount of grant requested by applicants is **less than \$500,000**, we will seek the

approval of the Director of Administration to award grants in respect of the recommended projects, and inform unsuccessful applicants for grants of the outcome of their applications. For a recommended project where the applicant has sought grants of **\$500,000 or more**, we shall prepare a submission for consideration by the full Council for Sustainable Development, in accordance with the agreed guidelines. The submission to the Council will also list in full the applications *not* recommended for SDF grants, as well as the recommendations for the award of grants to successful applicants. With the advice of this Sub-Committee and the full Council as appropriate, we shall then notify all applicants of the results of their applications. As advised by the ICAC, we shall also briefly advise unsuccessful applicants as to the reasons for their not being approved.

Council Secretariat  
February 2004