

**Task Force on Water-land Interface**  
**Eighth Meeting**

Date : 23 September 2014 (Tuesday)  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Room 46) at Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui

Minutes of Eighth Meeting

Present

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui                      Chairman

Organization Members

Mr Tom CALLAHAN	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy LEUNG Kit-man	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU Po-lung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Sujata GOVADA	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr Vincent NG	Individual Member
Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Individual Member
Captain CHEUNG Tai-kee	Co-opted Member
Mr WONG Yiu-kan	Co-opted Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism)2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr LEE Man-ho	Chief Transport Officer/Housing Project,

Ms YING Fun-fong	Transport Department (TD) Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam	Chief Leisure Manager (Management), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHUNG Siu-man	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Venus TSOI	Secretary

In attendance

Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Member of Harbourfront Commission
Ms Lily CHOW	Member of Harbourfront Commission
Miss Debby CHAN	Member of Harbourfront Commission
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2 (Des.), DEVB
Mr Adrian CHAN	Senior Marine Officer/Planning & Development (1), MD
Mr Mann CHOW	Senior Town Planner/Studies and Research 3, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Roger EASTHAM	Co-opted Member
Mr Karl KWOK Chi-leung	Co-opted Member
Ir Peter WONG Yiu-sun	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

For Agenda Item 3

BMT Asia Pacific Ltd.

Dr Richard D COLWILL	Managing Director
Ms Jennifer YUE	Senior Consultant
Mr Jonathan HSU	Consultant

WWF – Hong Kong

Ms Samantha LEE	Assistant Conservation Manager, Marine
-----------------	--

For Agenda Item 4

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
-------------------	--

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Harbourfront Commission Members were also invited to join the discussion of agenda items 3 and 4 of this meeting for a better understanding of marine spatial planning and the latest overview of water-dependent land uses in Victoria Harbour.

He introduced **Miss Christine AU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of Development Bureau (DEVB) who took over the post from Mrs Winnie KANG; and **Ms YING Fun-fong**, Head of Kai Tak Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), who took over the post from Mrs Sorais LEE. He also thanked Mrs KANG and Mrs LEE for their contributions to the Task Force.

He advised Members that that **Mr LEE Man-ho**, Chief Transport Officer/Housing Project of Transport Department (TD) attended on behalf of Ms Stella LEE, Principal Transport Officer/Urban; **Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam**, Chief Leisure Manager (Management) of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) attended on behalf of Mr Donald CHOY, Assistant Director (Leisure Services)<sup>3</sup>; **Mr Edward LEUNG** of Tourism Commission (TC), Senior Manager (Tourism)<sup>2</sup> attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism<sup>2</sup>.

## **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting**

1.1 The draft minutes of the seventh Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWL) meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 10 July 2014. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 17 September 2014. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

## **Item 2 Matters Arising**

Revised Terms of Reference (ToR) of TFWL (paragraph 2.6 of the confirmed minutes of the seventh meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** said that the revised ToR of TFWL was submitted and endorsed in the 16<sup>th</sup> Harbourfront Commission (HC) meeting on 29 April 2014. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's request, the Secretariat circulated Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggested amendments on the revised ToR for Members' information on 10 July 2014. No further action was required on this front.

Briefing on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) (paragraph 2.7 of the confirmed minutes of the seventh meeting)

2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat had circulated the relevant briefing materials on Protection of the Harbour Ordinance for co-opted Members' perusal on 3 April 2014.

Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process (paragraphs 2.10, 2.11 and 2.27 of the confirmed minutes of the seventh meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** advised that the Secretariat would update Members on the information on water-land facilities around the Victoria Harbour and suggest approaches to handle corresponding interface issues under agenda item 4. In addition, two presentations on marine spatial planning (MSP) was arranged under agenda item 3.

An Overview of Ferry Piers within Victoria Harbour (paragraphs 3.6, 3.13, 3.25 and 3.28 of the confirmed minutes of the seventh meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** reported that Transport Department (TD) had responded to Members' concerns on (i) the shared use of spaces and facilities inside underutilized ferry piers and (ii) the way to incorporate waterborne inner harbour transport into TD's study on public transport in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes.

2.5 With regard to the regular ferry services in Hung Hom, **the Chair** noted that TD would liaise with the developer at Hung Hom harbourfront and assess public demand for the resumption of regular ferry services at Hung Hom.

Other Matters (paragraph 4.9 of the confirmed minutes of the seventh

meeting)

2.6 Regarding Members' concerns about the use of water body at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, **the Chair** said that the Secretariat had arranged a joint-Task Force site visit cum briefing session at Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) on 16 June 2014. Members discussed the short-listed entries of the Kai Tak Fantasy and were briefed on the progress of EKEO and Kai Tak Office (KTO) projects.

2.7 **The Chair** recalled that another joint-Task Force visit to Kai Tak Cruise Terminal was held in July 2014 during which the operator of the Cruise Terminal briefed Members on the proposal of a new marine access point near the tip of the Kai Tak Runway. Members had no further enquires or comments on this matter.

### **Item 3 Marine Spatial Planning (Paper No. TFWL/02/2014 and Paper No. TFWL/03/2014)**

3.1 In response to Members' suggestions at the sixth Task Force meeting, the Secretariat invited BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) and World Wide Fund Hong Kong (WWF - HK) to brief Members on the concept of marine spatial planning (MSP). **The Chair** advised Members that the Secretariat would brief Members on the latest position of water-dependent land uses in Victoria Harbour under agenda item 4, which would provide a better context for Members to contemplate the overall planning of Victoria Harbour.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Dr Richard COLWILL**, Managing Director; **Ms Jennifer YUE**, Senior Consultant and **Mr Jonathan HSU**, Consultant of BMT. He also welcomed **Ms Samantha LEE**, Assistant Conservation Manager (Marine) of WWF - HK. **Dr COLWILL** and **Ms LEE** presented the Papers with the aid of PowerPoints.

3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquiries:

- (i) what was the potential for the regeneration of biodiversity within the Victoria Harbour from an ecological

- perspective;
- (ii) how would MSP allocate waterfront land uses in correlation with water uses and water-dependent facilities;
  - (iii) what was the process and timeframe required to gather and analyse available data and information from government departments;
  - (iv) would the future Harbourfront Authority be a suitable body to implement MSP; and
  - (v) how to engage various government departments to participate in the process of MSP.

3.4 Ms LEE replied (responding to item 3.3(i)), that corals were discovered within the Victoria Harbour. She believed that marine biodiversity would be enriched if MSP was applied on designated marine protected areas. Meanwhile, she opined that more scientific research on marine lives in Hong Kong was required.

3.5 Dr COLWILL made the following responses to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiries (responding to items 3.3(ii) - (v)):

- (i) BMT was extensively involved in Marine Traffic Impact Assessment (MTIA) which assisted decision making on marine safety issues. The MTIA mapping exercise was an effective tool to review and identify opportunities and potential constraints for developing marine facilities at different locations around the Harbour, and included elements of the MSP process that could deliver foresight in identifying opportunities and constraints;
- (ii) modern computing and Geographic Information System (GIS) technology could rapidly condense large volume of available data. Nevertheless, the process of stakeholder engagement and the deduction of qualitative data on value needed for MSP would be more time consuming;
- (iii) the proposed Harbourfront Authority could be a suitable body to take this forward; and
- (iv) collaboration across government departments in implementing MSP would allow a greater good for the ecology and population of Hong Kong, and minimize

future user conflicts.

3.6 **Dr GOVADA** enquired about the opportunity cost of not conducting MSP and the information on Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP). She considered that the culture of positive thinking was one of the key success factors for MSP.

3.7 **Dr COLWILL** said that without a thorough water and land use planning strategy, society would bear potential monetary costs due to the delay in infrastructural developments and might forgo ecological value, especially in terms of sustainability.

3.8 **Ms LEE** supplemented that MSP could bring about a better management system and use of marine ecological resources, and hence increase the value of our ecosystem services, such as the recovery and protection of ecology and forecast of the new ecosystem services. She suggested that a pilot scheme of MSP could be launched within and outside the Harbour limit. For the BSAP under the Convention of Biological Diversity, she explained that the committee and its working groups examined the existing condition and gave recommendations on the preservation of biodiversity in Hong Kong. The BSAP Marine Biodiversity Working Group targeted to achieve at least 10% of Hong Kong water as designated marine protected area with the help of MSP.

3.9 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** agreed that MSP was a useful tool to optimise water space usage. With regard to water-land interface issues, he queried whether the methodologies adopted in MSP could be applied on both water and land use planning.

3.10 **Dr COLWILL** expressed that MSP could be broadly applied to the immediate foreshore. He believed that stakeholder engagement and delivery of plans as proposed under MSP would be directly applicable to both the water space and waterfront.

3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** was concerned about the mapping of water intake/outflow in the plan and its constraints.

3.12 **Dr COLWILL** explained that relevant information in

digital format was readily available within government departments and constraint mapping could reveal the limitations and prospects of future development at waterfront edges.

3.13 **Mr Thomas CHAN** opined that the Task Force should identify the objectives and purposes of conducting MSP in Hong Kong before considering the suitability and discussing necessary institutional arrangements. He questioned the applicability of MSP in the local context and raised the following enquires:

- (i) given that MSP was usually applied to marine surface on a macro-scale, how likely could it fit in a comparatively confined waterbody of the Victoria Harbour;
- (ii) since water use was largely dynamic in nature, whether the planning of Harbour use from a functional or a spatial perspective would be more suitable; and
- (iii) with the conventional practice of exploring possible water uses as projected by existing land-side uses, what difference would MSP (i.e. to study the waterbody and water use first, then propose supporting land use) bring if it was adopted in Hong Kong.

3.14 **Mr Andy LEUNG** agreed with Mr CHAN. He commented that there was no single authority currently in charge of spatial planning for Victoria Harbour. Despite the experience in planning the harbourfront, he doubted that the Task Force was equipped with adequate knowledge to plan for the Harbour or the entire Hong Kong water surface. He suggested that the government should first establish a responsible body for harbour spatial planning, and then engage the HC as a major stakeholder to work with other departments concerned.

3.15 **Dr COLWILL** said that MSP could be applied on a micro-scale. He restated that MSP could work as a framework for identifying compatible and beneficial water uses in Hong Kong.

3.16 **Dr GOVADA** enquired whether the feasibility of introducing new modes of water transport such as water taxi could be



investigated through MSP. She commented that leadership and vision were required for active promotion of water transport and other water-land interface initiatives.

3.17 **Dr COLWILL** said that MSP could help identify the most suitable location and routes, as well as constraints, for marine traffic as reference for decision making. However, he admitted that the operation of water transport was financially challenging in Hong Kong.

3.18 As an alternative to establishing a new authority, **Ms LEE** noted that government departments that were involved in environmentally-related policies were appointed to lead and implement MSP in overseas jurisdictions. She also shared that inter-departmental working groups were commonly formed.

3.19 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** noted that he thought MSP to be a tremendously useful tool that should be incorporated in a proactive manner into a true strategic plan for Victoria Harbour and its harbourfront areas. He subsequently sought clarification for the meaning of “adequate financing” and “the first round of MSP” as stated on slide 22 of WWF – HK’s presentation PowerPoint.

3.20 **Ms LEE** explained the meaning of “first round of MSP” with reference to slide 12 of the PowerPoint, and added that another round of MSP would have to be done every 3 to 5 years. In terms of financing, she said that MSP was centrally funded and/or self-financed in a number of jurisdictions. She cited examples from the UK that the cost for information collation and statutory plan formulation was around £100,000 and £3.2 million per annum respectively for over 20 years’ time. To estimate the cost of conducting MSP in Hong Kong, she advised that factors such as the location for implementation, number of stakeholders involved and the number of researchers required *etc.* should be taken into account.

3.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** believed that the HC was an appropriate advisory body to engage stakeholders on marine uses and water-dependent uses, draw up strategic plans to visualize the need for water-land interface facilities at the right locations and recommend

corresponding usage of the waterfront. He urged for a quick response from Members.

3.22 Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comment was noted. Considering that it was the first time Members were briefed on the concept of MSP, **the Chair** would be cautious when making decisions.

3.23 **Mr PY TAM** opined that the outline zoning plan (OZP) was to regulate various land uses and keep them in control. However, it was not the same for water use planning, given that the waterbody was more mobile and dynamic where overlapping uses could be accommodated. He believed that if MSP was to be implemented, it would have to be policy-driven from a strategic level. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments on the planning of water-dependent facilities, he suggested that micro-scale developments along the waterfront such as marine recreation and water sports could be regarded as ancillary land use. Echoing Mr Andy LEUNG's views, he opined that the committee should concentrate on the planning of harbourfront.

3.24 **Mr Ken SO** enquired whether MSP could be introduced in Hong Kong without legislative amendments.

3.25 **Ms LEE** shared that MSP could be either advisory or regulatory in nature, and legislative amendment would be required if it was regulatory.

3.26 **The Chair** thanked BMT and WWF - HK for their presentations. The agenda item was drawn to a close.

3.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised that Members should agree on some concrete programme on the subject of MSP.

3.28 **Mr Thomas CHAN** responded that the Secretariat would update Members on the "Water-dependent Land Uses in Victoria Harbour" under agenda item 4 and Members could then discuss the way forward. **The Chair** agreed.

**Item 4 An Update on Water-dependent Land Uses in Victoria Harbour (Paper No. TFWL/04/2014)**

4.1 **The Chair** informed that the Secretariat briefed Members on the “Overview of Water-dependent Land Uses/ Activities in Victoria Harbour” at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Task Force meeting in February 2012. In response to the Chair’s request at the 6<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting, the Secretariat, in coordination with relevant bureaux and departments, had provided an update on the water-dependent land uses and water-land interfaces in the Victoria Harbour. Relevant paper was circulated for Members’ reference on 19 September 2014.

4.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Miss Christine AU** to update Members on the water-dependent uses in Victoria Harbour. **Miss AU** presented the Paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** reminded Members that the Task Force should focus on the overall planning of water-land interface issues. Location-specific issues or projects should be discussed at the respective geographical Task Forces.

4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned whether the government would have further actions subsequent to the update of stock-taking exercise.

4.5 **Mr Thomas CHAN** replied that Harbour Unit’s presentation responded to Members’ request for an update of the overall water-dependent land use and water-land interfaces within the Harbour. He advised the following points for Members’ consideration:

- (i) in terms of water-land interface facilities, whether Members had in mind any particular use that they would like to pursue in the Harbour, and if so, where the suitable locations would be;
- (ii) having regard to the long-established port and industrial use at the western side of the Harbour, the scope for reconfiguration or planning of new recreational and

leisure uses should centre around the eastern side of the Harbour;

- (iii) for the issue on berthing and sheltered space, the Secretariat would invite Marine Department (MD) to brief Members on the findings upon the completion of the two reviews being conducted;
- (iv) noting that there was little regulatory impediment on the operation of waterborne transportation, the introduction of “water-taxi” services was a matter of entrepreneurial interest and market decision. There was no concrete proposal received by TD or MD as yet; and
- (v) Members might discuss the type of water sports and general recreational use, and their possible locations particularly on the eastern side of the Harbour.

4.6 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** opined that Task Force should proactively initiate pilot exercises, for instance on waterborne transportation at West Kowloon and water sports at Kai Tak. There should also be closer communication with the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to understand the progress of water quality improvement and the cost required.

4.7 **Dr GOVADA** agreed with Mr BROOKE that the Commission should adopt a more proactive approach.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the presentation was comprehensive but not exhaustive. In particular, the stock-taking exercise only listed out the existing water-land interface facilities, but did not point out the adequacy or limitations for further development. He supported the idea of conducting pilot exercises and considered that government should engage and respond to stakeholders while doing so.

4.9 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** appreciated the importance of public engagement exercise if MSP was to be introduced. However, noting the length of time required for the process, he opined that pilot exercise for aspects long discussed by Members, such as water sports and water transport, should be launched first.

4.10 **Miss Christine AU** noted from previous meetings that the Task Force had agreed to adopt a parallel approach towards water-land issues, which was to develop an overall plan while working on specific identifiable issues. She opined that it might be premature for Members to decide whether the Task Force should pursue on the broad scope of a MSP process without first having more in-depth discussions on the subject. Alternatively, **Miss AU** suggested that it might be useful to extract certain elements and virtues from the concept of MSP and incorporate them into the standard planning process. She agreed with Members that pilot exercises could be conducted in parallel.

4.11 **Mr WONG Yiu-kan** expressed that water use was very dynamic in nature. He reminded Members that future development should take note of the shared-use of water spaces.

4.12 **The Chair** recapped that Members were briefed on MSP and updated of water-dependent land uses in Victoria Harbour. Members' comments were heard and noted. **The Chair** proposed a closed-door brainstorming session on the overall planning of Victoria Harbour. Members agreed.

**The  
Secretariat**

*(Post-meeting note: The closed-door brainstorming session on the overall planning of Victoria Harbour was held on 3 November 2014 at the 18<sup>th</sup> HC Meeting.)*

4.13 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that the HC Secretariat had invited Planning Department (PlanD) to brief HC Members on "Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process" in the coming HC meeting. For the brainstorming session, she would suggest inviting both Members of TFWL and HC to participate.

**HC  
Secretariat  
& PlanD**

*(Post-meeting note: PlanD briefed HC Members on "Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process" at the 18<sup>th</sup> HC Meeting on 3 November 2014.)*

4.14 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** enquired about the timeframe of the brain-storming session.

4.15 **Miss Christine AU** replied that the closed-door brainstorming session would be arranged as soon as in October 2014 and the Secretariat would inform Members of the exact date nearer the time.

4.16 **The Chair** thanked Miss AU for her presentation and closed the agenda item.

## **Item 5 Any Other Business**

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the issue of “safety at public piers and landing steps” for discussion. The Secretariat had prepared and tabled relevant news clippings for Members’ information.

5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that only very little information about the incident of “Junk trip man drowns after falling off boat near Central ferry pier” was available from the media. He was concerned about the safety of landings steps and asked whether there were any similar reports over the past 3-5 years.

5.3 **The Chair** enquired whether relevant government departments had records or statistics on incidents related to landing steps. He suggested that TD, CEDD and MD could jointly brief Members on the safety measures on public landing facilities in future meetings. **TD, CEDD & MD**

*(Post-meeting notes: Regarding the safety measures on public piers and public landings, CEDD has implemented safety measures including installing stainless steel handrails along the landings, non-slip yellow nosing at each landing step and tactile warning strips at the top side of the landings. TD had no record/statistics on incidents related to public landing steps. TD was mainly responsible for (a) coordinating complaints involving more than one department and (b) providing justifications for improvement/reconstruction works from the utilisation perspective. )*

5.4 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's query, **Mr CHUNG Siu-man** said that incidents in relation to public landing steps were rare. The incident on 20 September 2014 was under investigation. MD would provide relevant statistics and information for Members' reference when available.

MD

*(Post-meeting notes: Regarding the incident on 20 September 2014, it was a man overboard incident and was still under investigation pending the autopsy report from coroner. MD had incident figures on man overboard cases close to or at landing facilities, and there were: (i) two in 2012, (ii) one in 2013 and (iii) two in 2014.)*

5.5 **Miss Christine AU** updated Members on the study of Barrier-free Access (BFA) on public landing facilities. She recapped that an inter-departmental working group was formed to investigate the said subject. She reported that the working group visited several marinas in Hong Kong and concluded that the demand for BFA facilities was minimal. The working group also found that no vessels in Hong Kong had barrier-free installations. She conveyed to Members that Mr Roger EASTHAM of Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC) had kindly advised that persons who needed BFA facilities could apply to Shelter Cove Marina under RHKYC free of charge. Noting the minimal demand for the initiative and the availability of alternative arrangement, **Miss AU** suggested that a consultancy on the subject might no longer be necessary. The Secretariat would keep an eye on the demand and liaise with relevant bureaux and departments to see how this initiative could be taken forward.

5.6 **The Chair** announced that **Mr Roger EASTHAM**, a co-opted Member from the marine recreation sector, had resigned from the Task Force as he would relocate to Australia in November 2014. He thanked Mr EASTHAM for his contribution to the Task Force and valuable sharing of his expertise.

5.7 **The Chair** announced that **Miss Venus TSOI** would be posted out from her current post in Harbour Unit on 24 September 2014. He thanked Miss TSOI for her efforts and welcomed **Miss Ingrid TJENDRO**, successor of Miss TSOI, on board.

5.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** reminded Members that a press conference on Phase II Public Engagement (PE) Exercise for the Proposed Establishment of the Harbourfront Authority would be held on 25 September 2014. He invited Members to give support.

5.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Secretariat of the Public Relations Core Group should keep Members posted on the dates of public engagement exercises and meetings. **Mr BROOKE** agreed.

*(Post-meeting notes: The Secretariat of the Public Relations Core Group issued invitation to HC Members for the public forums arranged for Phase II PE Exercise.)*

#### Date of Next Meeting

5.10 **The Chair** informed that the tentative date of the upcoming meeting would be on 15 December 2014. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting venue nearer the time.

5.11 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

**Secretariat**  
**Task Force on Water-land Interface**  
**February 2015**