

**Country and Marine Parks Board (CMPB)**  
**Confirmed Minutes of the 70<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

---

Date : 16 July 2019 (Tuesday)

File Ref.: AF CPA 01/1/0

Time : 2:30 p.m.

Venue : Room 701, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)  
Headquarters

---

**PRESENT**

**Chairman**

Mr TANG King-shing, GBS, PDSM

**Members**

Mr Jan CHAN

Ms CHAN Po-kam, Beatrice

Ms Suzanne M. GENDRON

Dr HE Shen-jing

Ms KIU Kin-yan, Judy

Mr LAM Chung-lun, Billy, GBS, JP

Dr LAU Tai-wai, David

Mr LEE Chung-ming, Eric

Dr LEE Nam-yuk, Amelia, MH

Mr LEE Yee-keung, Charles

Professor LEUNG Mei-ye, Kenneth, JP

Ms MA Miu-wah, Katherine

Dr MAN Chi-sum, JP

Mr MO Ka-hung, Joseph

Professor NG Sai-leung

Ms SO Ka-man

Ms WONG Pik-yan, Nicole

Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP	Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Dr SO Ping-man, JP	Deputy Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Ms Daisy LO	Assistant Director (Nature Conservation), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Ms Eugenia CHUNG, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms CHAN Suet-ching, Angela	Assistant Director of Lands (Specialist 2), Lands Department
Mr LAI Chi-tung, JP	Assistant Director of Marine (Port Control), Marine Department
Mr Wilson CHAN	Assistant Director of Planning (New Territories), Planning Department

Secretary

Ms Phyllis CHAN	Assistant Secretary (Boards)1, AFCD
-----------------	-------------------------------------

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Mr Patrick LAI	Assistant Director (Country and Marine Parks)
Mr Franco NG	Senior Country Parks Officer (Management 1)
Ms Y N NGAR	Senior Country Parks Officer (Management 2)
Mr Alfred WONG	Senior Country Parks Officer (Ranger Services 1)
Ms Louise LI	Senior Marine Parks Officer
Mr Felix YEUNG	Country Parks Officer (Enhancement Projects 2)

Dr T W TAM

Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (Hong Kong)

Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr CHEUNG Wing-keung, Wicky      Chief Leisure Manager (Management)

Water Supplies Department (WSD)

Mr FU Sau-bong      Senior Engineer (Planning Policy) (Acting)

Other attendees

Miss KO Wing-lam      Student / Job-shadow of the Director of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Conservation

Mr CHEUNG Kwan-ting      Student / Job-shadow of the Director of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Conservation

For Agenda Item III only

Urbis Limited

Mr Alan MACDONALD      Director (Planning and Urban Design)

Miss YIM Hoi-yan, Anson      Town Planner

For Agenda Item IV only

Environmental Resources Management – Hong Kong, Limited (ERM)

Mr Terence FONG      Partner

Ms Grace YANG      Senior Consultant

**ABSENT WITH APOLOGIES**

Mr CHAN Ka-kui, SBS, JP

Honourable HO Chun-yin, Steven, BBS

Mr SO Kwok-yin, Ken

Mr LIU Wai-shing, Simon

Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services  
(Leisure Services)<sup>3</sup>, LCSD

Mr WONG Yan-lok, Roger

Assistant Director of Water Supplies (Development)  
(Acting), WSD

**OPENING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

38/19 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular Ms CHAN Suet-ching, Angela, Assistant Director (Specialist 2) of Lands Department, who was attending the meeting for the first time.

39/19 Upon the Chairman's invitation, Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP introduced to members, Miss KO Wing-lam and Mr CHEUNG Kwan-ting, who were shadowing him that day.

40/19 The Chairman informed members that, as an established practice and to facilitate the taking of minutes, sound recording would be made during the meeting. The audio records would be destroyed after the minutes were confirmed.

**AGENDA ITEMS****I. Confirmation of Minutes of the 69<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 30 April 2019**

41/19 The minutes of the 69<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30 April 2019 were confirmed without amendments.

## II. Matters Arising

42/19 There was no matter arising from the last meeting.

## III. Consultancy Study on Enhancement of the Recreation and Education Potential of Country Parks and Special Areas – Recommendations and Way forward (Working Paper: WP/CMPB/6/2019)

43/19 The Chairman reminded members to declare if there were any potential conflicts of interest in the matter to be discussed under this agenda item. No member made such declaration.

44/19 The Chairman invited and welcomed the representatives of Urbis Limited to the meeting.

45/19 Mr Alan MACDONALD briefed members on the outcome of public consultation for the consultancy study on enhancement of the recreation and education potential of country parks and special areas (hereinafter referred to as “the Study”), and the recommendations on taking forward the enhancement proposals (Working Paper: WP/CMPB/6/2019).

46/19 In response to a member’s enquiry, Mr MACDONALD said that to prevent over-commercialisation of glamping sites and eco-lodges, contract conditions on the pricing strategies, types of facilities and performance requirements should be drafted very carefully. In addition, a competitive tender system for appointing contractors should be adopted to ensure a fair competition between potential contractors. The member suggested that the tenderers should be required to guarantee that people of different levels of affordability would have equal opportunities to use the facilities. Mr MACDONALD noted the suggestion.

47/19 In answering another member’s question about the issue of transportation, Mr MACDONALD said that transportation was one of the important aspects that needed to be considered in detail at a later stage before implementation. For the introduction of new facilities or attractions, there should be traffic impact assessments and corresponding improvement of transport facilities. Mr MACDONALD also noted the member’s suggestion of

creating separate entry and exit points when designing the routes in order that visitors would not need to retrace their steps to the starting point to leave.

48/19 In answering another member's enquiry also about accessibility of country parks, Mr MACDONALD said that he would suggest the Government to improve the public transport and parking facilities to facilitate visits to country parks, particularly those that were not popular at the moment.

49/19 A member envisaged that more people would visit country parks after the facilities and accessibility were enhanced. In this connection, she asked the consultant the possible ways to address the likely increase in the number of visitors. In response, Mr MACDONALD said that it was important to spread visitors across various country parks. Besides, improving the durability of hiking trails and increasing the number of trails were also fundamental. He said that improvement of hiking trails was covered in one of the enhancement proposals and was deeply supported by the public.

50/19 A member noticed from the Working Paper that some comments recognised the opportunity of making use of the existing resources in country park enclaves to provide "Bed and Breakfast" type of accommodation. He hoped that the consultant could study this opportunity in detail and suggest a concrete approach to providing this type of accommodation. He also suggested that the consultant could look at the home-stay lodgings in Taiwan and Japan for reference purposes. Mr MACDONALD said that the provision of overnight accommodation in country park enclaves was subject to regulations and licensing requirements. He believed that similar to the considerations for the provision of glamping sites and eco-lodges within country parks, any overnight accommodations to be developed in country park enclaves should be accessible to groups of different affordability. Besides, he said that they had looked at the examples of home-stay lodgings in places like Taiwan and Japan. While their facilities and licensing requirements varied, some of their implementation methods might be applicable to Hong Kong's situation. Further study on the details of the "Bed and Breakfast" type of accommodation would be required as they were beyond the scope of the current study.

51/19 In response to a member's enquiry, Mr MACDONALD said that there was general support for the enhancement proposals across all age groups. For example, "Tree Top Adventure" was supported by adults and families with children of different ages.

52/19 The Chairman asked the consultant what he foresaw would be the most difficult issue during the implementation stage. Mr MACDONALD replied that implementation was always the most difficult issue for any projects. He believed that AFCD should next develop an action-oriented implementation programme, setting out the tasks and requirements for each project in each phase. It would help take forward the enhancement proposals.

53/19 A member asked if the consultant could list the implementation details of each enhancement proposals, such as the estimated cost and manpower requirement, for the reference of AFCD. He believed it would facilitate the implementation of the projects. Mr MACDONALD replied that they could provide some suggestions on management and lease conditions to AFCD. However, they were unable to advise on the costs, because cost estimate would only be possible after the design stage.

54/19 Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP said that the Study provided directions for enhancing the recreation and education potential of country parks and special areas in the short, medium and long terms. Enhancement proposals recommended in the short term could be started fairly soon, as they were either straightforward or already on-going in country parks. Nevertheless, enhancement proposals recommended in the medium to long term each warranted a detailed study and design before implementation. Taking the recommendation of an advance booking system for popular campsites as an example, he said that AFCD would need to take into account the views of the community collected through a pilot scheme and then come up with a fair and convenient advance booking system. As for other facilities, such as visitor hub and tree top adventure, the Department would need to conduct a detailed feasibility study for each facility to address the site selection, environmental and transportation issues. He assured that CMPB would be further consulted on the implementation of the proposals.

55/19 As members had no further enquiries for the consultant, the Chairman thanked the representatives of Urbis Limited for attending the meeting.

(The representatives of Urbis Limited left the meeting at this juncture.)

56/19 A member believed that the ultimate goal of the enhancement proposals was to attract more people to appreciate and use country parks and eventually make them recognise the importance of country parks. To work towards this goal, he hoped that AFCD would not take too many years to commence the enhancement proposals recommended in the medium to long

term, and he suggested that AFCD should carry out some simple enhancement measures immediately. For example, AFCD could cooperate with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in providing guided tours in country parks in terms of ecology and historical relics. AFCD could also expand the functions of existing visitor centres by allowing participants of guided tours to assemble in the centres and acquire relevant information there. He also advised AFCD to consider engaging the private sector in the design and implementation process to a greater extent, which he believed would generate more diverse ideas and help expedite the process.

57/19 Concurring with the views of the above member, a member remarked that AFCD should carry out the enhancement proposals recommended in the short term as soon as possible, so that people would know that the Government was working on the improvement of country parks.

58/19 A member suggested incorporating some research and educational elements into the new facilities. For example, biodiversity observation spots could be added to the tree top adventure facilities. It would not only enrich the educational experience of visitors but also enable AFCD to collect data for scientific researches.

59/19 In response to enquiries from the Chairman and two members about the timetable and preparation for the enhancement projects, Mr Patrick LAI said that AFCD would take actions in accordance with the plan outlined in paragraph 5.1 of the Working Paper. Agreeing with members' views, the plan recommended that certain straightforward enhancement proposals be implemented in the short term. He said that some of them were actually ongoing efforts by AFCD. For example, the Department had recently built new viewing platforms at Dragon's Back and in Tai Lam Country Park, which were very popular with visitors. Regarding manpower requirement, he said that the current manpower of the Department should be able to carry out some of the enhancement proposals recommended in the short term. As for the proposals recommended in the medium to long term, he said that some members of the public, concern groups and stakeholders had raised concerns on environmental compatibility, possible over-commercialisation and carrying capacity. Therefore, as suggested by the consultant, the Department would need to conduct detailed feasibility studies on the enhancement proposals and further consult the public as appropriate.



**IV. Consultancy Study of the Proposed Robin's Nest Country Park – Study Summary and Recommendations**  
**(Working Paper: WP/CMPB/7/2019)**

60/19 The Chairman reminded members to declare if there were any potential conflicts of interest in the matter to be discussed under this agenda item. No member made such declaration.

61/19 The Chairman informed members that Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG) and Mr Ruy Barretto SC had written to CMPB on 26 and 27 June 2019 respectively, to provide their views on the proposed Robin's Nest Country Park (RNCP) and request for presentations to CMPB. The two letters concerned had been circulated to members for information on 8 July 2019. He informed members that in this session, they would first listen to the presentation by AFCD and their consultant on the summary and recommendations of the Consultancy Study of the proposed RNCP (hereinafter referred to as “the Study”), which would cover the two letters amongst other written comments received and major views gathered in the consultation process. After that, members would be invited to provide comments to AFCD and deliberate on whether to accede to the requests from KFBG and Mr Barretto.

62/19 After Mr Felix YEUNG briefed members on the background and progress of the Study, the Chairman invited and welcomed the representatives of ERM to the meeting.

63/19 Mr Terence FONG of ERM briefed members on the Study Summary (Part 3 of Working Paper: WP/CMPB/7/2019). He started the presentation by giving members a brief account of the baseline review on the environmental, ecological, cultural/historical profile and the ecotourism resources of the proposed RNCP. Then, he briefed members on the key comments collected in the stakeholder engagement and consultation exercises, and introduced the proposed Management and Operation Plan of RNCP.

64/19 Ms Y N NGAR followed to explain the major considerations of AFCD in respect of delineation of the boundary of the proposed RNCP, management and operation, accessibility and traffic arrangement, visitor services and local engagement, and compliance with the Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (Part 4 of Working Paper: WP/CMPB/7/2019).

65/19 Regarding the joint-statement from green groups proposing to extend the boundary of the proposed RNCP to cover a larger area of about 1 120 hectares, Ms NGAR highlighted that their proposal significantly deviated from the proposed RNCP boundary and the initiative of the 2017 Policy Address. A further detailed study with extensive public consultation would be required to explore the feasibility of such a substantial extension. Also, their proposal would most likely give rise to strong local objection as the rural sector and local communities had expressed that they were against the inclusion of private lands and permitted burial grounds (PBGs) into the proposed country park. She said that the concerns of the green groups could be addressed in other ways. For example, while Fung Shui Woods (FSWs) in the vicinity of the proposed RNCP were already protected by “Conservation Area” or “Green Belt” zones in their respective Outline Zoning Plans under statutory land use control, AFCD could inspect the FSWs during routine patrol of RNCP and take appropriate follow-up actions if irregularities were detected. Besides, AFCD would carry out hill fire prevention measures to minimise the risk of hill fires and protect the vegetation and wildlife therein.

66/19 Nevertheless, Ms NGAR said that taking on board the stakeholders’ suggestion of minimising the buffer area between the proposed RNCP and PBGs / private lands, AFCD recommended revising the proposed RNCP boundary as shown in Figure 2 of the Working Paper. She invited members to comment on the proposed revision to the boundary and the proposed Management and Operation Plan. She also informed members that subject to CMPB’s support, AFCD would seek the direction of the Chief Executive, who had delegated the authority to the Secretary for the Environment, to prepare the draft map showing the proposed RNCP. CMPB would be consulted on the draft map before it is published in the Gazette for public inspection.

(Dr HE Shen-jing, Dr LEE Nam-yuk, Amelia, MH and Ms SO Ka-man left the meeting at this juncture.)

67/19 Mr Patrick LAI supplemented that AFCD had consulted stakeholders from various sectors over the past year. The stakeholders generally supported the proposed designation of Robin’s Nest as a country park, and the majority of them agreed that nature conservation should be the main objective of the proposed country park. Mr LAI stressed that support from the local community was essential to the effective management of a country park. Learning from the experience of managing the Hong Kong UNESCO Global Geopark that nature and heritage conservation could be done better and smoother through collaborations with the local rural community, AFCD would try to enlist the support and participation of local villagers in the

management of the proposed RNCP. For example, the Department would try to enlist villagers' help in providing guided tours to introduce the historical and cultural relics to visitors. The Department would also maintain close communication with the villagers with regard to hill fire prevention and conservation of FSWs. Moreover, Mr LAI said that the RNCP proposal was supported by Heung Yee Kuk and the relevant district councils and rural committees. AFCD also responded to green groups' concerns by proposing the revised boundary and promising to enhance the protection of natural habitats through regular patrol and hill fire prevention measures. He would like to solicit members' support for moving forward with the RNCP proposal.

68/19 A member agreed with Mr LAI that support of the local rural community to the proposed RNCP was of fundamental importance. Regarding the boundary of the proposed country park, on one hand, the member found the reasons given by the green groups for further extending the boundary understandable, but on the other hand, he considered that it would waste the years of study efforts and discussions if the whole procedure were to start afresh to consider such substantial change. Therefore, he strongly recommended that if RNCP was successfully designated in accordance with AFCD's latest proposal, AFCD should then study the feasibility of extending the country park as suggested by the green groups.

69/19 Concurring with the above member's view, a member supported the designation of the proposed RNCP but also recommended AFCD to consider the feasibility of further expanding the country park in the future, in order to provide a more comprehensive protection of the ecology of the Robin's Nest area. Regarding the function of the proposed RNCP as an ecological corridor between the protected areas in Shenzhen (SZ) and Hong Kong (HK), she enquired what collaborative efforts AFCD and the SZ counterpart would take to strengthen the protection of the various natural habitats there. In response to the two members' comments, Ms NGAR said that AFCD carried out ecological surveys in different areas from time to time contributing to monitoring of areas with conservation concerns, irrespective of whether they were country parks. She believed that there was always room for further studies for enhancing nature conservation. As regards the ecological corridor function of the proposed RNCP, she said that AFCD and the SZ Urban Management Bureau and the Management Office of the SZ Wutongshan National Forest Park had established direct communication channels in the past few years, and recently both sides exchanged information on park management and ecological data, and shared experiences of nurturing native seedlings common to both sides. Besides, both sides started removing Mikania, an invasive species that grow wildly and rapidly, along the border to prevent its proliferation. Due to security reasons, it was envisaged that the ecological corridor would mainly facilitate the crossing of flying animals and plants propagation but not

land-based animals. AFCD and the Wutongshan counterpart would continue to work on these two aspects.

70/19 A member welcomed AFCD's plan to inspect the woodlands in the PBG of San Kwai Tin and the FSWs during routine patrol of RNCP, but he queried the statutory power of AFCD to enforce the law outside the country park areas. In response, Ms NGAR indicated that in the areas concerned, AFCD could take enforcement actions against acts of damages to any forest or plantation on government land in accordance with the Forests and Countryside Ordinance (Cap. 96).

71/19 A member supported the designation of about 500 hectares of Robin's Nest area as a new country park. To preserve biodiversity, she suggested that AFCD should identify what species were of particular concerns within the country park area and formulate some strong action plans to protect those species. Ms NGAR said that AFCD would identify conservation zones within the country park and make detailed action plans for the protection of the specific habitats and species.

72/19 A member said that he was glad to see that AFCD tried to include more areas into the proposed RNCP in their latest proposal, and he would like to see the proposed country park be established as soon as possible.

73/19 Another member also appreciated the boundary adjustment recommended by AFCD and considered that this latest proposal was reasonable and pragmatic. Besides, he recalled that in the last Country Parks Committee (CPC) meeting held on 27 May 2019, CPC members generally agreed that AFCD should move forward with the designation of the proposed RNCP and could look into possible expansion afterwards. He believed that most of the members would like to see the establishment of the proposed RNCP as soon as possible so as to better protect the valuable habitats. Regarding the management of the proposed country park, the member took the view that conservation of ecology and cultural heritage were equally important. He hoped that the future management and operation of the country park could respect the traditional lifestyle and culture of villagers and pay due attention to the conservation of cultural heritage.

74/19 A member clarified that in the last CPC meeting, some members from green groups, including the member himself, had voiced the opinion of extending the proposed boundary to cover about 1 120 hectares of land.

75/19 Professor NG Sai-leung, Chairman of CPC, elucidated that in the last CPC meeting, members generally agreed with the designation of about 500 hectares of Robin's Nest area as a country park on the basis that it was supported by a detailed study and also by the local villagers. While members were aware of the green groups' opinion and recognised the benefits of further extending the boundary, most of them considered that AFCD should proceed with the designation of the approximately 500 hectares first and then consider alternative ways to conserve the areas in the vicinity that had certain degree of ecological and cultural values.

76/19 A member remarked that he was one of the CPC members who supported adopting AFCD's proposal first. In his opinion, the FSWs and the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) were already protected by current statutory frameworks. In addition, the country park boundary could be improved in the future. Moreover, the member encouraged AFCD to try out new technologies in the management of the new country park, such as real-time monitoring of hill fires using artificial intelligence (AI) technology.

77/19 Pointing out that the proposed RNCP is very close to the border, a member worried that the mobile phone network coverage would be particularly weak there. Sharing her experience in managing the Mai Po Nature Reserve, she indicated that signal strength varied with mobile network operators and locations. She suggested that apart from checking with individual mobile network operators, AFCD could also survey visitors to the country park to collect information on the signal strength of different service providers and at different locations.

78/19 Mr FONG responded that there were some blind spots in the proposed RNCP, where calls could not be connected to any local mobile networks. At some spots, calls could be connected to a Mainland network instead. To address this issue, AFCD and Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA) had inspected the signal strength at different locations of the proposed country park and identified some spots with weak mobile phone network coverage. OFCA would next communicate with mobile network operators to explore opportunities of increasing their network coverage. Mr Felix YEUNG added that AFCD and OFCA staff members had inspected and measured signal strength along the hiking trails in the

proposed RNCP. Their aim was to make sure that calls could be connected to at least one of the local mobile networks along these trails, so that hikers would be able to make emergency calls by dialing '112'. AFCD and OFCA would work closely to follow up this matter.

79/19 In reply to a member's enquiry with regard to accessibility, Mr FONG said that during the consultation, villagers had expressed concern that visitors to the proposed RNCP might add to the traffic load of the district, particularly on weekends. Some villagers had made some constructive suggestions, such as making good use of the Lung Shan Tunnel to alleviate the traffic load. AFCD was discussing with Highways Department and Transport Department on such matter, and they would work together with a view to enhancing the ancillary transport facilities for the new country park.

80/19 As members made no further enquiries for the consultant, the Chairman thanked the representatives of ERM for attending the meeting.

(The representatives of ERM left the meeting at this juncture.)

81/19 Regarding the requests from KFBG and Mr Barretto for presentation to CMPB, Ms NGAR provided members with some background information. She said that KFBG and Mr Barretto had already written to AFCD on 30 April and 3 May 2019 respectively to provide their views on the proposed RNCP. Their letters of 26 and 27 June 2019 additionally requested for a meeting with CMPB members to express their concerns and present their proposals. Their letters were all enclosed in Annex A to the Working Paper (Letters from KFBG at enclosure no. 4 & 12, and letters from Mr Barretto at enclosure no. 8, 13 & 14). She said that the presentation by AFCD and its consultant at this meeting had already covered their comments, such as on PBGs, FSWs and compliance with BSAP, and explained AFCD's considerations in respect of these areas. She invited members to raise questions if there were anything unclear.

82/19 Pointing out that there were private lands in the existing country parks, a member asked for the reason why private lands could not be included in the proposed RNCP this time. In response, Mr Patrick LAI indicated that for every new country park proposal, the Government conducted comprehensive consultations to gauge the views of different stakeholders. There were some instances in the past where the proposed country park boundaries were modified in response to strong opposition from local communities during consultations. For the proposed RNCP, both the studies by the Planning Department in 2010

and by AFCD in recent years received a strong message from the local communities that they were against the inclusion of private lands. Therefore, if private lands were included in the proposed RNCP, there would not only be objections to its designation but also serious management problems in the future. Having carefully considered the objectives of the proposed RNCP, the views collected in the consultation exercises, and the conservation value of the private lands concerned, AFCD decided not to include those private lands in the proposed RNCP.

83/19 The member hoped that AFCD could communicate with the green groups direct and explain to them the measures that AFCD would take to protect the lands that would not be included in the proposed country park. Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP responded that AFCD was always glad to engage in direct dialogue with the green groups. He also said that if AFCD had members' support for the RNCP proposal, the Department would commence the statutory procedures for designating the country park. It was hoped that the proposed RNCP could be designated by the end of 2020.

84/19 A member said that he would be happy to see the establishment of the country park in 2020. Besides, he suggested AFCD to consider introducing the new facilities and activities as discussed under Agenda Item III to the new country park. He also highlighted the need to secure resources for establishing and managing the new country park and suggested that AFCD could set out their resources requirements when submitting the proposal to the Executive Council.

85/19 Another member also supported AFCD to kick start the statutory procedures and advised AFCD to maintain close communication with the local villagers in the future management of the country park.

86/19 After the discussion, the Chairman concluded, and members agreed, that (1) presentations by KFBG and Mr Barretto to the Board were not necessary; and (2) commencement of the statutory procedures for designating the proposed RNCP was supported.

(Dr MAN Chi-sum, JP left the meeting at this juncture.)

**V. Summary Report of Country Parks Committee  
(Working Paper: WP/CMPB/8/2019)**

87/19 Professor NG Sai-leung, Chairman of CPC, briefed members on Working Paper WP/CMPB/8/2019, which provided members with a summary of the issues discussed at the CPC meeting held on 27 May 2019. Members noted the Report.

**VI. Summary Report of Marine Parks Committee  
(Working Paper: WP/CMPB/9/2019)**

88/19 Professor LEUNG Mei-ye, Kenneth, JP, Chairman of the Marine Parks Committee (MPC), briefed members on Working Paper WP/CMPB/9/2019, which provided members with a summary of the issues discussed at the MPC meeting held on 3 June 2019.

89/19 A member shared with other members his experience and observations in a triathlon recently took place in the marine protected areas in Hawaii. He appreciated that instead of prohibiting people from visiting the coral areas, the local community actually encouraged people to swim and snorkel there to enjoy the coral reefs. Besides, the local people had high environmental awareness that they would prevent using sunscreens with chemicals which were harmful to corals, and they would also proactively advise visitors to use coral-friendly sunscreens. The member considered that this knowledge should be promoted in Hong Kong.

**VII. Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report  
(Working Paper: WP/CMPB/10/2019)**

90/19 Mr Patrick LAI briefed members on the Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report for the period from 1 April to 30 June 2019 (Working Paper: WP/CMPB/10/2019). Mr LAI highlighted that only two hill fires happened inside country parks during the reporting period, which was lower than the record in the same period last year. He also informed members that AFCD was conducting a trial at a fire lookout in Tai Lam Country Park on the use of AI to detect hill fire. If the trial was successful, the Department would explore the feasibility of applying such technology in the proposed RNCP.

91/19 With reference to Section 1.3 of Part A about permitted events, a member suggested AFCD to provide a breakdown of the events in future reports. Mr LAI noted the suggestion.



92/19 With reference to Section 2.1 of Part A about visitor statistics, the above member asked AFCD (1) what method they used to count visitor number, and (2) why the number of visitors in the reporting period dropped this year. Mr Alfred WONG answered that AFCD staff conducted visitor count at strategic locations in country parks, and then projected the monthly figures from that. As for the drop in visitor number in the reporting period, he believed that it was mainly due to inclement weather in the past months. The member hoped that the visitor number would not drop further in the next reporting period.

93/19 A member suggested that AFCD could include charts or graphs on the weather alongside the figures of hill fire and visitor number, so that members could see the correlation between them.

### **VIII. Any Other Business**

#### (a) Member Self-recommendation Scheme for Youth (Phase III)

94/19 Mr Patrick LAI informed members that CMPB participated in the Member Self-recommendation Scheme for Youth (Phase III) (hereinafter referred to as the Scheme). People aged between 18 and 35 with a commitment to serve the community could self-nominate to become members of CMPB through the Scheme. CMPB offered two seats for application. The application period already started on 18 June 2019 and would end on 17 July 2019. After the end of application period, an assessment panel would be formed to assess the applications and conduct interviews. It was hoped that the two young members to be recruited through the Scheme could bring the voices and insights of the young generation to CMPB in the next term.

95/19 Members did not raise any other business for discussion.

#### (b) Vote of Thanks

96/19 Since this was the last regular meeting of the current term of membership, Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP thanked the Chairman and members for their enthusiastic support to the work of the Board. The Chairman also expressed gratitude to members for their valuable contribution to the Board.

**IX. Date of Next Meeting**

97/19 The Chairman informed members that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 22 October 2019 (Tuesday) at 2:30 p.m.

98/19 The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

– End –